UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 81st CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 95—PART 1

JANUARY 3, 1949, TO FEBRUARY 17, 1949

(PAGES 1 TO 1412)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1949

Congressional Record

United States of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 81st CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 3, 1949

The 3d day of January being the day prescribed by the Constitution of the United States for the annual meeting of Congress, the first session of the Eighty-first Congress commenced this day.

The Senate assembled in its Chamber at the Capitol.

ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, President pro tempore, called the Senate to order at 12 o'clock meridian.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., of Washington, D. C., offered the following

PRAYER

O Lord our God, look with favor upon the Members of the Senate, and bless each one of them according to his needs. May they be aware of a mandate higher than that of the ballot box, a mandate from Thee, to legislate wisely and well. We believe that Thou wilt accept these men as representatives of the people, and art willing to work in them and through them that they may become instruments of Thy will. Grant that they be willing to have it so, through Jesus Christ our Lord, who taught us to pray together:

Our Father which art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: for Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever.

Amen.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The first privileged order of business this morning is the administration of the oath to the 32 Senators-elect. Under the practice of the Senate they will proceed to the desk by fours, alphabetically, to take the oath of office. The clerk will call the names of the first four Senators-elect.

The Chief Clerk (Edward E. Mansur, Jr.) called the names of Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BROUGHTON, and Mr. CHAPMAN.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. BENTLEY, Mr. TOBEY, and Mr. HOEY, advanced to the desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the President pro tempore.

The Chief Clerk called the names of Mr. CORDON, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. EASTLAND, and Mr. ELLENDER.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. MORSE, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. STENNIS, and Mr. LONG, respectively, advanced to the desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the President pro tempore.

The Chief Clerk called the names of Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FREAR, Mr. GILLETTE, and Mr. GREEN.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. MCGRATH, respectively, advanced to the desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the President pro tempore.

The Chief Clerk called the names of Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HUNT, and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. SMITH, Mr. THYE, Mr. O'MAHONEY, and Mr. BARKLEY, respectively, advanced to the desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the President pro tempore.

The Chief Clerk called the names of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KERR, and Mr. MAYBANK.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, respectively, advanced to the desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the President pro tempore.

The Chief Clerk called the names of Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. MURRAY.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. GURNEY, and Mr. ECTON, respectively, advanced to the desk, and the oath of office was administered to them by the President pro tempore.

The Chief Clerk called the names of Mr. NEELY, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. SALTONSTALL.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. BYRD, Mr. GEORGE, and Mr. LODGE, respectively, advanced to the desk, and the oath of office was administered to them by the President pro tempore.

The Chief Clerk called the names of Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. WHERRY.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. REED, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. HILL, and Mr. BUTLER, respectively, advanced to the desk, and the oath of office was administered to them by the President pro tempore.

ALBEN W. BARKLEY

Mr. BARKLEY rose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair notes that the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] rises and asks for recognition. Before the Chair recognizes the Senator from Kentucky he would like to assume that he has unanimous consent to say a word to him upon this first occasion when he has appeared in this Chamber since his recent election. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Assuming the unanimous consent of the Senate, the Chair would like to offer two or three observations.

As a result of the recent accident [laughter], the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky will soon lose his right to stand upon this floor and be recognized. He will soon lose his right of free speech within these walls. He will soon lose his vote. In fact, his civil liberties are disintegrating faster than in any other instance the Chair recalls. [Laughter.] But as a result of the same accident the senior Senator from Michigan is about to recognize the Senator from Kentucky, or any other Senator, for the last time. [Laughter.]

It seems to the Chair that this makes the occasion something of an event for both the senior Senator from Kentucky and the senior Senator from Michigan. Therefore, the President pro tempore, with great emphasis on the Latin part of that title, would like to say to the Senator from Kentucky—and he knows he speaks for the entire body—that though he may lack the right of recognition on the floor, many other recognitions can never be taken from him.

There will always be the recognition of the fact that he is one of the great Senators of his time and generation. [Applause.]

There will always be recognition of integrity without a blemish through more than three decades of public service beneath the dome of the Capitol of the Republic.

There will always be recognition of difficult achievements in successful leadership during critical times when his fidelity as a partisan was always matched by his faithfulness as a patriot and by his constant courtesy and good faith toward those of us in loyal opposition.

There will always be recognition of courage and eloquence. There will always be recognition of patience and humility. There will always be recognition of rare capacity for friendly fellowship. There will always be recognition of a great human soul.

The Chair recognizes the next Vice President of the United States. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the generosity of the Chair and of my colleagues here has almost made me forget the purpose for which I rose. That was to submit a formal resolution following the ascertainment of a quorum of the Senate. I will not submit that resolution, however, until I have very feebly expressed my deep appreciation not only of what the President pro tempore has said but of the response made by my colleagues here without regard to politics upon this occasion.

There was one thing about the remarks of the President pro tempore which disturbed me a little, and that was the evident pleasure, if not hilarity, with which he announced that he was retiring from the chair. Inasmuch as I am to enter upon what Vice President Marshall called a 4-year period of silence when he took the oath of office as Vice President, I am somewhat disturbed about the pleasure with which the Chair retires from the position of President of the Senate.

I recognize the fact that by this transfer I shall lose a good many of my civil liberties; but I presume there are some liberties that the Chair may assume while occupying the chair that are equal to civil liberties—provided they are always civil. [Laughter.]

I do not know how I shall adjust myself to the role of Presiding Officer. I have been here in what I call the "bull pen" for so many years that I fear that some day I may walk down from the rostrum, roll up my sleeves, and begin to engage in debate, to be called down by whoever happens to be in the chair at the time.

I thank the Chair and my colleagues for their generous demonstration. I am not sure whether that demonstration and that evidence of favor and good will is due to the fact that I am getting out of the Senate, or that I am going to preside over it. Whatever may have prompted it—and I accept it in good faith—I greatly appreciate the good will which the Chair has shown, and the cordiality and respect with which we have dealt with one another here in the legislative process during the years of my membership in the Senate.

The Senate of the United States comes in for its share of criticism and denunciation, and it comes in now and then for what I think is an overplay of contemptuous asseverations with respect to its processes; but after all, with all its failings and shortcomings—and they are outstanding in some respects—it yet remains the one great forum for the debate of legislation and for the working out of the democratic process among the nations of the world. It will be a sad day in the history of this country if the United States Senate—or, for that matter, the House of Representatives—ceases to be the forum where men express their opinions and advocate whatever appeals to their judgment and their conscience in the process of making our Nation a greater example of democracy and self-government.

I leave this seat with sentiments of deep regret. I leave it with a sense of appreciation, not only, but with a sense of humility. I realize how far short I may fall in the performance of my duty as the Presiding Officer of this body. But with the cooperation and good will of Members on both sides, I hope I may discharge the duties acceptably to the Senate and to the country, and in fulfillment of our ideals of democracy.

Before I submit the resolution to which I have referred, I wish also to say a word in regard to the retiring Presiding Officer of the Senate of the United States. Because of the death of President Roosevelt and the assumption of the Presidency by the then Vice President, Mr. Truman, the Senator from Michigan became, to all intents and purposes, Vice President of the United States, in the sense that he is President of the Senate.

During my membership in this body and during my observation of it, no man has ever occupied that position with greater dignity, greater force, or greater understanding of the proprieties of leadership, not only in the Senate, but as the Presiding Officer of the Senate, than has the Senator from Michigan, who is about to retire. We have all enjoyed his performance of the function of Presiding Officer of the Senate. We have respected his views in regard to decisions. Though sometimes disagreeing with them, we have always known that his decisions and rulings came out of a deep consciousness of his obligation to the Senate and to the country.

While I cannot say in all candor that I am sorry that the Senator from Michigan is retiring from the position of President pro tempore, because in the very nature of things, politics being what it is, we must have another President pro tempore, I will say that if we had not won the election last November, and if there were not to be a Vice President of the United States—as there has not been for now nearly 4 years—and we had to have a Republican President pro tempore, I would rather the Senator from Michigan would preside over the Senate than any other man. [Applause.]

Mr. President, I now submit the resolution, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair suggests to the Senator from Kentucky that it might be advisable to have a quorum call first.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I beg the Chair's pardon. I intended to suggest the absence of a quorum, but the eloquence of the Chair frustrated me.

I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Byrd	Eastland
Anderson	Cain	Ecton
Baldwin	Capehart	Ellender
Barkley	Chapman	Ferguson
Brewster	Connally	Flanders
Bricker	Cordon	Frear
Bridges	Donnell	Fulbright
Broughton	Douglas	George
Butler	Downey	Gillette
Green	Long	Reed
Gurney	Lucas	Robertson
Hayden	McCarran	Russell
Hendrickson	McCarthy	Saltonstall
Hickenlooper	McClellan	Schoeppel
Hill	McFarland	Smith, Maine
Hoey	McGrath	Smith, N. J.
Holland	McKellar	Sparkman
Humphrey	McMahon	Stennis
Hunt	Malone	Taft
Ives	Martin	Taylor
Jenner	Maybank	Thomas, Okla.
Johnson, Colo.	Miller	Thomas, Utah
Johnson, Tex.	Millikin	Thye
Johnston, S. C.	Morse	Tobey
Kefauver	Mundt	Tydings
Kem	Murray	Vandenberg
Kerr	Myers	Watkins
Kilgore	Neely	Wherry
Knowland	O'Conor	Wiley
Langer	O'Mahoney	Williams
Lodge	Pepper	Young

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

LIST OF SENATORS BY STATES

Alabama.—Lister Hill and John Sparkman.

Arizona.—Carl Hayden and Ernest W. McFarland.

Arkansas.—John McClellan and J. William Fulbright.

California.—Sheridan Downey and William F. Knowland.

Colorado.—Edwin C. Johnson and Eugene D. Millikin.

Connecticut.—Brien McMahon and Raymond E. Baldwin.

Delaware.—John J. Williams and J. Allen Frear.

Florida.—Claude Pepper and Spessard L. Holland.

Georgia.—Walter F. George and Richard B. Russell.

Idaho.—Glen H. Taylor and Bert H. Miller.

Illinois.—Scott W. Lucas and Paul H. Douglas.

Indiana.—Homer E. Capehart and William E. Jenner.

Iowa.—Bourke B. Hickenlooper and Guy M. Gillette.

Kansas.—Clyde M. Reed and Andrew F. Schoeppel.

Kentucky.—Alben W. Barkley and Virgil Chapman.

Louisiana.—Allen J. Ellender and Russell B. Long.

Maine.—Owen Brewster and Margaret Chase Smith.

Maryland.—Millard E. Tydings and Herbert R. O'Conor.

Massachusetts.—Leverett Saltonstall and Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.

Michigan.—Arthur H. Vandenberg and Homer Ferguson.

Minnesota.—Edward J. Thye and Hubert H. Humphrey.

Mississippi.—James O. Eastland and John C. Stennis.

Missouri.—Forrest C. Donnell and James P. Kem.

Montana.—James E. Murray and Zales N. Ecton.

Nebraska.—Hugh Butler and Kenneth S. Wherry.

Nevada.—Pat McCarran and George W. Malone.

New Hampshire.—Styles Bridges and Charles W. Tobey.

New Jersey.—H. Alexander Smith and Robert C. Hendrickson.

New Mexico.—Dennis Chavez and Clinton P. Anderson.

New York.—Robert F. Wagner and Irving M. Ives.

North Carolina.—Clyde R. Hoey and J. Melville Broughton.

North Dakota.—William Langer and Milton R. Young.

Ohio.—Robert A. Taft and John W. Bricker.

Oklahoma.—Elmer Thomas and Robert S. Kerr.

Oregon.—Guy Cordon and Wayne Morse.

Pennsylvania.—Francis J. Myers and Edward Martin.

Rhode Island.—Theodore Francis Green and J. Howard McGrath.

South Carolina.—Burnet R. Maybank and Olin D. Johnston.

South Dakota.—Chan Gurney and Karl E. Mundt.

Tennessee.—Kenneth McKellar and Estes Kefauver.

Texas.—Tom Connally and Lyndon B. Johnson.

Utah.—Elbert D. Thomas and Arthur V. Watkins.

Vermont.—George D. Aiken and Ralph E. Flanders.

Virginia.—Harry Flood Byrd and A. Willis Robertson.

Washington.—Warren G. Magnuson and Harry P. Cain.

West Virginia.—Harley M. Kilgore and Matthew M. Neely.

Wisconsin.—Alexander Wiley and Joseph R. McCarthy.

Wyoming.—Joseph C. O'Mahoney and Lester C. Hunt.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BARKLEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 1), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. WHERRY the committee on the part of the Senate.

NOTIFICATION TO THE HOUSE

Mr. WHERRY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 2), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

HOUR OF DAILY MEETING

Mr. LUCAS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 3), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the hour of daily meeting of the Senate be 12 o'clock meridian, unless otherwise ordered.

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will now proceed to the election of its officers.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I offer the resolution which I sent to the desk, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. With full anticipation of its sinister purpose, the Chair orders the clerk to read the resolution.

The ~~Chief Clerk~~ read the resolution (S. Res. 4), as follows:

Resolved, That Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR, a Senator from the State of Tennessee, be, and he is hereby, elected President of the Senate pro tempore, to hold office during the pleasure of the Senate, in accordance with the resolution of the Senate adopted on the 12th day of March 1890, on the subject.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to consider the resolution.

The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish merely to suggest that there is nothing sinister at any time about the performance of one's duty. Therefore, I offer the resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the resolution, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out the words, "Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR, a Senator from the State of Tennessee," and insert the words, "Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, a Senator from the State of Michigan."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky stole my speech, earlier today, about my candidate. I wish to endorse everything he said about our candidate's qualifications and the respect in which he is held not only on this side of the aisle but on the other side of the aisle, as well. I wish to say that the Republican conference unanimously has asked me to present this name; and I can think of no higher tribute of love and affection which we hold for the senior Senator from Michigan who is, as he has said, about to retire, than to place his name in nomination.

I recommend to Senators on the other side of the aisle their worthy consideration of the unanimous choice of the Republican conference as President pro tempore.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is nothing sinister about that; is there?

Mr. WHERRY. There is nothing sinister about it, except I think we should have a yea-and-nay vote, if that meets with the approval of all Senators present. I think that is proper, at least. Therefore, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska to the resolution offered by the Senator from Kentucky. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCKELLAR (when his name was called). Mr. President, as I am advised, I have a pecuniary interest in the result of this vote; I am so advised by the present President pro tempore of the Senate. Having a pecuniary interest, in the shape of a car that is assigned while I hold the office, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from voting.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Tennessee will be noted as voting "present."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who are necessarily absent, would vote "nay" if present.

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 50, answered "present" 2, as follows:

YEAS—40

Aiken	Hendrickson	Saltonstall
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Schoeppel
Brewster	Ives	Smith, Maine
Bricker	Jenner	Smith, N. J.
Bridges	Kem	Taft
Butler	Knowland	Thye
Cain	Lodge	Tobey
Capehart	McCarthy	Watkins
Cordon	Malone	Wherry
Donnell	Martin	Wiley
Ecton	Millikin	Williams
Ferguson	Morse	Young
Flanders	Mundt	
Gurney	Reed	

NAYS—50

Andersen	Hoey	Maybank
Barkley	Holland	Miller
Broughton	Humphrey	Murray
Byrd	Hunt	Myers
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	O'Conor
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Downey	Kefauver	Pepper
Eastland	Kerr	Robertson
Ellender	Kilgore	Russell
Frear	Long	Sparkman
Fulbright	Lucas	Stennis
George	McCarran	Taylor
Gillette	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Green	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Hayden	McGrath	Tydings
Hill	McMahon	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

McKellar Vandenberg

NOT VOTING—4

Chavez	Magnuson	Wagner
Langer		

So Mr. WHERRY's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question recurs on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ordinarily the senior Senator from Michigan would be entitled to the privilege from the floor of escorting his long-time and very precious friend, the Senator from Tennessee, to the chair to assume his new responsibilities. Since he cannot perform that function, he asks the next senior Member on the Republican side of the Senate, the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], to escort the President pro tempore-elect to the chair, to receive the oath and take over.

Thereupon, Mr. McKELLAR, escorted by Mr. BRIDGES, advanced to the desk, and the oath was administered to him by the retiring President pro tempore.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Members of the Senate, I present the new President pro tempore. [Applause, Senators rising.]

ELECTION OF SECRETARY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it gives me peculiar pleasure to offer the resolution, which I now send to the desk and for which I ask immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk (Emery L. Frazier) read the resolution (S. Res. 5), and the Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to its consideration, as follows:

Resolved, That Leslie L. Biffle, of Arkansas, be, and he is hereby, elected Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the resolution, to strike out the name "Leslie L. Biffle" and substitute "Carl A. Loeffler."

The amendment was rejected.

The resolution was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair appoints the retiring Secretary a committee of one to escort Mr. Biffle to the desk for the administration of the oath.

Mr. Biffle, escorted by Mr. Loeffler, advanced to the desk, and the oath of office was administered to him by the President pro tempore. [Applause on the floor.]

ELECTION OF SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER

Mr. BARKLEY submitted a resolution (S. Res. 6), which was read and considered, by unanimous consent, as follows:

Resolved, That Joseph C. Duke, of Arizona, be, and he is hereby, elected Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to strike out the name "Joseph C. Duke" and insert "Edward F. McGinnis."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of the group of Senators on this side of the aisle, I am sure I speak the view of the entire Senate when I now express deep appreciation to Mr. McGinnis, who has served us so efficiently and faithfully during his term as Sergeant at Arms of the Senate. He has had a very brilliant record in and out of the Senate; he has a great record as a veteran of both World Wars, and he has demonstrated once again that when it comes to carrying out the rules of the Senate, be it against a Republican or Democrat, it is possible to enforce them fairly, impartially, and in a nonpartisan manner.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I rise to say substantially what has already been so well said by my friend the Senator from Oregon. It has been my privilege to observe, as have all of us, the work of Mr. McGinnis as Sergeant at Arms of this body. As has been said, he served his country well in the capacity of a sergeant in the Army in the First World War, and in the capacity of commander in the Navy in the Second World War. He has distinguished himself in this body by his courtesy and attention to duty. Should the amendment which has been proposed with respect to him not be adopted he will retire with the respect, admiration, and affection of the Members of the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am opposed to the amendment, but I wish to say a word with respect to the life, character, and public service of Ed McGinnis. He is a veteran of both World Wars, and between them was one of the most active members of the American Legion in the Nation. I have met him at a number of national conventions of that organization. He is a loyal and patriotic American who has served his country well in war and in peace; and as he relinquishes his office of Sergeant at Arms, I am sure he carries with him the best wishes of all Senators on this side of the aisle, who appreciate his efficient and courteous service.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before we vote on the amendment I wish to add just a word in expression of our appreciation of the courtesy with which not only Mr. McGinnis has performed the duties of Sergeant at Arms, but of the courtesy with which Mr. Carl Loeffler has performed the duties of Secretary of the Senate. I think Carl Loeffler has been an employee of the Senate for probably as long as anyone else connected with the Senate, if not longer. I had occasion to refer to that fact a year or two ago.

I did not know Mr. McGinnis until he became Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, but I have appreciated and have taken note frequently of his courtesy, his efficiency, and his devotion to the interests of the Senate.

I did not want this occasion to pass without expressing my appreciation, and, I am sure, that of all of us, regarding these two gentlemen.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question recurs on the resolution as originally offered.

The resolution was agreed to.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BARKLEY submitted a resolution (S. Res. 7), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the United States be notified of the election of Hon. KENNETH McKELLAR, a Senator from the State of Tennessee, as President of the Senate pro tempore, and of Leslie L. Biffle, of Arkansas, as Secretary of the Senate.

NOTIFICATION TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BARKLEY submitted a resolution (S. Res. 8), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives be notified of the election of Hon. KENNETH McKELLAR, a Senator from the State of Tennessee, as President of the Senate pro tempore, and of Leslie L. Biffle, of Arkansas, as Secretary of the Senate.

ELECTION OF SECRETARY FOR THE MAJORITY

Mr. BARKLEY submitted a resolution (S. Res. 9), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That Felton M. Johnston, of Mississippi, be, and he is hereby, elected secretary for the majority of the Senate.

ELECTION OF SECRETARY FOR THE MINORITY

Mr. BRIDGES submitted a resolution (S. Res. 10), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That J. Mark Trice, of Maryland, be, and he is hereby, elected secretary for the minority of the Senate.

COUNT OF ELECTORAL VOTE

Mr. HAYDEN submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 1), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall meet in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Thursday, the 6th day of January, 1949, at 1 o'clock postmeridian, pursuant to the requirements of the Constitution and laws relating to the election of President and Vice President of the United States, and the President pro tempore of the Senate shall be their presiding officer; that two tellers shall be previously appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate on the part of the Senate and two by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives, to whom shall be handed, as they are opened by the President pro tempore of the Senate, all the certificates and papers purporting to be certificates of the electoral votes, which certificates and papers shall be opened, presented, and acted upon in the alphabetical order of the States, beginning with the letter A; and said tellers, having then read the same in the presence and hearing of the two Houses, shall make a list of the votes as they shall appear from the said certificates; and the votes having been ascertained and counted in the manner and according to the rules by law provided, the result of the same shall be delivered to the President pro tempore of the Senate, who shall thereupon announce the state of the vote, which announcement shall be deemed a sufficient declaration of the persons, if any, elected President and Vice President of the United States, and, together with a list of the votes, be entered on the Journals of the two Houses.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I should like to offer a suggestion as to a change in the language of the resolution as read. As I remember the reading of it, it says "in the alphabetical order of the States, beginning with the letter A." Is it not a reflection on the Congress to suggest that the alphabet begin with any other letter than the letter A? [Laughter.]

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement with respect to the order of business. It is customary and is the precedent in the Senate that no bills, resolutions, or other documents of any kind are introduced until after the conclusion of the President's message on the state of the Union. I respectfully request that that precedent and custom be adhered to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Illinois that so far as a resolution which I intended to submit today is concerned, I shall not present it at this time. I shall be very glad to comply with the practice and custom of the Senate, and shall introduce my antifilibuster resolution at the session of the Senate held immediately after the President's state of the Union message.

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, there will be no session of the Senate tomorrow. I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, January 5, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 3, 1949

This being the day fixed by the twentieth amendment of the Constitution for the annual meeting of the Congress of the United States, the Members of the House of Representatives of the Eighty-first Congress met in their Hall, and at 12 o'clock noon were called to order by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, Hon. John Andrews.

The Chaplain of the Eightieth Congress, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following

PRAYER

Glory be to Thy name, O Lord God of hosts; let Thy work appear unto Thy servants. As we wait in this sacred stillness, we beseech Thee to bless abundantly our country. We pray for that guidance which enables us to weave characters which will stand the judgment of time, for the worth of life is measured not by the distance traveled but by the road taken.

Grant that these Thy servants may safeguard and advance the rights of all, free from discord and intolerance, and bind us together with an invincible purpose to labor for justice and freedom without compromise.

Let the Congress unite in praying the Lord's Prayer:

Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever.

Amen.

The CLERK. Representatives-elect, this is the day fixed by the Constitution for the meeting of the Eighty-first Congress. Certificates of election covering the 435 seats in the Eighty-first Congress have been received by the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Eightieth Congress, and the names of those persons whose credentials show that they were regularly elected as Representatives in accordance with the laws of their respective States or of the United States will be called. As the roll is called, following the alphabetical order of the States, beginning with the State of Alabama, Representatives-elect will please answer to their names to determine whether a quorum is present.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll by States, and the following Representatives-elect answered to their names:

[Roll No. 1]

ALABAMA

Boykin, Hobbs, Elliott, Grant, Bates, Jones, Andrews, DeGraffenried, Battle

ARIZONA

Murdock, Patten

ARKANSAS

Gathings, Tackett, Harris, Mills, Hays, Trimble, Norrell

CALIFORNIA

Scudder, White, Doyle, Engle, Werdel, Hinshaw, Johnson, Bramblett, Sheppard, Havenner, Nixon, Phillips, Welch, Douglas, McKinnon, Miller, McDonough, Allen, Jackson, Anderson, King

COLORADO

Carroll, Marrillis, Aspinall, Hill

CONNECTICUT

Ribicoff, McGuire, Patterson, Woodhouse, Lodge, Sadlak

DELAWARE

Boggs

FLORIDA

Peterson, Sikes, Herlong, Bennett, Smathers, Rogers

GEORGIA

Preston, Davis, Wood, Cox, Vinson, Brown, Face, Latham, Camp, Wheeler

IDAHO

White, Sanborn

ILLINOIS

Dawson, Hoffman, Chiperfield, O'Hara, Chesney, Simpson, Lanham, Jonas, Mack, Buckley, Church, McMillen, Gorski, Reed, Yorty, O'Brien, Mason, Price, Sabath, Allen, Bishop, Gordon, Arends, Yates, Velde

INDIANA

Madden, Walsh, Wilson, Halleck, Harden, Harvey, Crotty, Noland, Jacobs, Kruse, Denton

IOWA

Martin, LeCompte, Jensen, Tolle, Cunningham, Hoeven, Grone, Dolliver

KANSAS

Cole, Meyer, Hope, Scrivner, Rees, Smith

KENTUCKY

Gregory, Chelf, Perkins, Whitaker, Spence, Bates, Morgan, Underwood, Golden

LOUISIANA

Hébert, Brooks, Lanham, Boggs, Passman, Allen, Willis, Morrison

MAINE

Hale, Nelson, Fellows

MARYLAND

Miller, Garmatz, Sasscer, Bolton, Fallon, Beall

MASSACHUSETTS

Heselton, Bates, Kennedy, Furcolo, Lane, McCormack, Phillips, Goodwin, Wigglesworth, Donohue, Nicholson, Martin, Rogers, Herter

MICHIGAN

Sadowski, Blackney, O'Brien, Michener, Wolcott, Rabaut, Shafer, Engel, Dingell, Hoffman, Potter, Lesinski, Ford, Bennett, Dondero

MINNESOTA

Andresen, McCarthy, Andersen, O'Hara, Judd, Blatnik, Wier, Marshall, Hagen

MISSISSIPPI

Rankin, Abernethy, Williams, Whitten, Winstead, Whittington, Colmer

MISSOURI

Magee, Christopher, Sullivan, Moulder, Short, Zaret, Welch, Carnahan, Karsten, Irving, Cannon, Bolling, Jones

MONTANA

Mansfield, D'Ewart

NEBRASKA

Curtis, Stefan, Miller, O'Sullivan

NEVADA

Baring

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Merrow, Cotton

NEW JERSEY

Wolverton, Case, Addonizio, Hand, Thomas, Kean, Auchincloss, Canfield, Norton, Howell, Towe, Hart, Eaton, Rodino

NEW MEXICO

Fernandez, Mills

NEW YORK

Mace, Celler, LeFevre, Hall, Murphy, Kearney, Leonard W. Cowdert, Byrne, Latham, Marcantonio, Taylor, Clemente, Klein, Kilburn, Quinn, Bloom, Davies, Delaney, Javits, Eickelman, Pfeifer, Powell, Hall, Joseph L. Lynch, Edwin Arthur, Keogh, Dollinger, Taber, Sutton, Buckley, Keating, Heffernan, McGrath, Wadsworth, Rooney, Cretella, Pfeiffer, O'Toole, Gamble, William L. Molitor, St. George, Reed

NORTH CAROLINA

Bonner, Chatham, Doughton, Kerr, Durham, Jones, Barden, Carlyle, Redden, Cooley, Deane

NORTH DAKOTA

Lemke, Burdick

OHIO

Ekton, Jenkins, McGregor, Wagner, Brehm, Hays, Breen, Vorys, Kirwan, McCulloch, Weichel, Feighan, Clevenger, Baker, Crosser, Polk, Secrest, Bolton, Brown, McSweeney, Young

OKLAHOMA

Gilmer	Steed	Wickersham
Stigler	Monroney	Wilson
Albert	Morris	

OREGON

Stockman	Angell	Ellsworth

PENNSYLVANIA

Barrett	Fenton	Morgan
Granahan	Rhodes	Graham
Scott, Hardie	Gillette	Coffey
Chudoff	Rich	Kelley
Green	McConnell	Kearns
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Simpson	Davenport
James	Kunkel	Corbett
Lichtenwalter	Gavin	Fulton
Dague	Walter	Eberharter
O'Neill	Lind	Buchanan
Flood	Van Zandt	
	Cavalcante	

RHODE ISLAND

Forand	Fogarty

SOUTH CAROLINA

Rivers	Hare	Richards
Sims	Bryson	McMillan

SOUTH DAKOTA

Lovre	Case

TENNESSEE

Frazier	Priest	Cooper
Gore	Sutton	Davis
Evins	Murray	

TEXAS

Patman	Thomas	Bentsen
Combs	Thompson	Regan
Beckworth	Thornberry	Burleson
Rayburn	Poage	Worley
Wilson	Lucas	Mahon
Teague	Gossett	Kilday
Pickett	Lyle	Fisher

UTAH

Granger	Bosone

VERMONT

Plumley

VIRGINIA

Bland	Abbitt	Harrison
Hardy	Stanley	Smith
Gary	Burton	Fugate

WASHINGTON

Mitchell	Mack	Horan
Jackson	Holmes	

WEST VIRGINIA

Ramsay	Bailey	Kee
Staggers	Burnside	Hedrick

WISCONSIN

Smith	Biemiller	Hull
Davis	Keefe	O'Konski
Withrow	Murray	
Zablocki	Byrnes	

WYOMING

Barrett

The CLERK. The roll call discloses the presence of 420 Members. A quorum is present.

STATEMENT REGARDING CERTAIN CREDENTIALS

The CLERK. A certificate of election is on file in the Clerk's office, showing the election of JOHN C. DAVIES as a Representative-elect to the Eighty-first Congress from the Thirty-fifth Congressional District of the State of New York.

Several communications have been received from the executive deputy secretary of state for the State of New York informing the Clerk that a case is pending before the supreme court, Albany County, N. Y., and that the said secretary of state is restrained from certifying the election of a Representative from this congressional district. However, in view of the fact that a certificate of election in due form has been filed with the Clerk by JOHN C. DAVIES, the Clerk has therefore placed his name on the roll.

The Clerk will state that credentials, regular in form, have been filed, showing the election of the Honorable E. L. BARTLETT as Delegate from the Territory of Alaska and the Honorable JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON as Delegate from the Territory of Hawaii.

The Clerk has also received a certification of election signed by the Governor of Puerto Rico, showing the election of the Honorable A. FERNÓS-ISERN, as Resident Commissioner for a term of 4 years beginning January 3, 1949.

Since the regular election of Representatives to the Eighty-first Congress one change has occurred as a result of which one vacancy now exists in the Seventh Congressional District of the State of New York, occasioned by the death of the late Honorable John J. Delaney.

ELECTION OF SPEAKER

The CLERK. The next business in order is the election of a Speaker of the House. Nominations are now in order.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Clerk.

The CLERK. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. WALTER. As chairman of the Democratic caucus, I am directed by the unanimous vote of the caucus to present for election to the office of Speaker of the House of Representatives for the Eighty-first Congress the name of the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Representative-elect from the State of Texas.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Clerk.

The CLERK. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. EATON. By authority, by direction, and by unanimous vote of the Republican conference representing the minority of this House, I have the honor to nominate for Speaker of the House of Representatives the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., a Representative-elect from the State of Massachusetts to the Eighty-first Congress.

The CLERK. The Honorable SAM RAYBURN, a Representative-elect from the State of Texas, and the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., a Representative-elect from the State of Massachusetts, have been placed in nomination. Are there further nominations? [After a pause.] There being no further nominations, the Clerk will appoint the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], the gentlewoman from Indiana [Mrs. HARDEN], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] to act as tellers.

The roll will now be called and those responding will indicate by surname the nominee of their choice.

The tellers will please take their places at the desk in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The tellers having taken their places, the House proceeded to vote for Speaker.

The following is the result of the vote:

[Roll No. 2]

RAYBURN—255

Abbitt	Aspinall	Battle
Abernethy	Bailey	Beckworth
Addonizio	Barden	Bennett, Fla.
Albert	Baring	Bentsen
Allen, La.	Barrett, Pa.	Biemiller
Andrews	Bates, Ky.	Bland
Blatnik	Grant	O'Toole
Bloom	Green	Pace
Boggs, La.	Gregory	Passman
Bolling	Hardy	Patman
Bolton, Md.	Hare	Patten
Bonner	Harris	Perkins
Bosone	Harrison	Peterson
Boykin	Hart	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Breen	Havenner	Philbin
Brooks	Hays, Ark.	Pickett
Brown, Ga.	Hays, Ohio	Poage
Bryson	Hébert	Polk
Buchanan	Hedrick	Powell
Buckley, Ill.	Heffernan	Preston
Buckley, N. Y.	Herlong	Price
Burleson	Hobbs	Priest
Burnside	Holifield	Quinn
Burton	Howell	Rabaut
Byrne, N. Y.	Huber	Raitis
Camp	Irving	Ramsay
Cannon	Jackson, Wash.	Rankin
Carlyle	Jacobs	Redden
Carnahan	Jones, Ala.	Regan
Carroll	Jones, Mo.	Rhodes
Cavalcante	Jones, N. C.	Ribicoff
Celler	Karst	Richards
Chatham	Karsten	Rivers
Chelf	Kee	Rodino
Chesney	Kelley	Rogers, Fla.
Christopher	Kennedy	Rooney
Chudoff	Keogh	Sabath
Clemente	Kerr	Sadowski
Coffey	Kilday	Sasscer
Colmer	King	Secrest
Combs	Kirwan	Sheppard
Cooley	Klein	Sikes
Cooper	Kruse	Sims
Cox	Lane	Smathers
Crook	Lanham	Smith, Va.
Crosser	Larcade	Spence
Davenport	Lesinski	Staggers
Davies, N. Y.	Lind	Stanley
Davis, Ga.	Linehan	Steed
Davis, Tenn.	Lucas	Sugier
Dawson	Lyle	Sullivan
Deane	Lynch	Sutton
DeGraffenried	McCarthy	Tackett
Delaney	McCormack	Teague
Denton	McGrath	Thomas, Tex.
Dingell	McGuire	Thompson
Dollinger	McKinnon	Thornberry
Donohue	McMillan, S. C.	Trimble
Doughton	McSweeney	Underwood
Douglas	Mack, Ill.	Vinson
Doyle	Madden	Wagner
Durham	Magee	Walsh
Eberharter	Mahon	Walter
Elliott	Mansfield	Welch, Mo.
Engle, Calif.	Marcalis	Wheeler
Evins	Marshall	Whitaker
Fallon	Miles	White, Calif.
Feighan	Miller, Calif.	White, Idaho
Fernandez	Mills	Whitten
Fisher	Mitchell	Whittington
Flood	Monroney	Wickersham
Fogarty	Morgan	Wier
Forand	Morris	Williams
Frazier	Morrison	Willis
Fugate	Moulder	Wilson, Okla.
Furcolo	Multer	Wilson, Tex.
Garmatz	Murdock	Winstead
Gary	Murphy	Wood
Gathings	Noland	Woodhouse
Gilmer	Norrell	Worley
Gordon	Norton	Yates
Gore	O'Brien, Ill.	Young
Gorski, Ill.	O'Brien, Mich.	Zablocki
Gossett	O'Hara, Ill.	
Granahan	O'Neill	
Granger	O'Sullivan	

MARTIN—160

Allen, Calif.	Case, N. J.	Gamble
Allen, Ill.	Case, S. Dak.	Gavin
Andersen, H. Carl	Chiperfield	Gillette
Anderson, Calif.	Church	Golden
Andresen, August H.	Clevenger	Goodwin
Angell	Cole, Kans.	Graham
Arends	Corbett	Gross
Auchincloss	Cotton	Gwinn
Barrett, Wyo.	Coudert	Hagen
Bates, Mass.	Cunningham	Hale
Beall	Curtis	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Bennett, Mich.	Dague	Hall, Leonard W.
Bishop	Davis, Wis.	Halleck
Blackney	D'Ewart	Hand
Boggs, Del.	Dolliver	Harden
Bolton, Ohio	Dondero	Harvey
Bramblett	Eaton	Herter
Brehm	Ellsworth	Heselton
Brown, Ohio	Elston	Hill
Burdick	Engel, Mich.	Hinshaw
Byrnes, Wis.	Fellows	Hoeven
Canfield	Fenton	Hoffman, Ill.

Hoffman, Mich.	Mack, Wash.	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Holmes	Macy	Scrivner
Hope	Martin, Iowa	Scudder
Horan	Mason	Shafer
Hull	Merrow	Short
Jackson, Calif.	Meyer	Simpson, Ill.
James	Michener	Simpson, Pa.
Javits	Miller, Md.	Smith, Kans.
Jenkins	Miller, Nebr.	Smith, Wis.
Jensen	Morton	Stefan
Johnson	Murray, Wis.	Stockman
Jonas	Nelson	Taber
Judd	Nicholson	Taffe
Kean	Nixon	Taylor
Kearney	O'Hara, Minn.	Thomas, N. J.
Kearns	O'Konski	Towe
Keating	Patterson	Van Zandt
Keefe	Pfeiffer, William L.	Velde
Kilburn	Phillips, Calif.	Vorys
Kunkel	Plumley	Vursell
Latham	Potter	Wadsworth
LeCompte	Reed, Ill.	Weichel
LeFevre	Reed, N. Y.	Welch, Calif.
Lemke	Rees	Wendel
Lichtenwalter	Rich	Wigglesworth
Lodge	Riehlman	Wilson, Ind.
Lovre	Robeson, Va.	Withrow
McConnell	Rogers, Mass.	Wolcott
McCulloch	Sadlak	Wolverton
McDonough	St. George	
McGregor	Sanborn	
McMillen, Ill.	Scott, Hardie	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Marcantonio

NOT VOTING—16

Bulwinkle	Jennings	Somers
Burke	Murray, Tenn.	Taurielle
Cole, N. Y.	Norblad	Tollefson
Crawford	Phillips, Tenn.	Woodruff
Gorski, N. Y.	Poulson	
Jenison	Smith, Ohio	

The CLERK. The tellers agree in their tally. The total number of votes cast is 416, of which the Honorable SAM RAYBURN has received 255, and the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., 160; 1 "present." Therefore the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, a Representative-elect from the State of Texas, having received the majority of all the votes cast, is duly elected Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Eighty-first Congress.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] will please escort the Speaker-elect to the chair.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, 2 years ago the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] and I both were on this platform at the beginning of the session. At that time he paid a most glowing tribute to me. You know, at that time, Sam, I really thought you meant it. I did not think you were giving an "Indian gift" to be recalled within 2 years. Seriously, it is a pleasant duty that I have to perform this morning, if we had to have a Democratic Congress. Any regrets that I might have concerning the Speakership decision are mitigated by your splendid choice. You have elected a Member of the House as Speaker who has served for nearly a third of a century in this great debating Chamber. He is a man of great ability, of rare parliamentary acumen, and skillful in debate. He is devoted to his country and to upholding all the fine traditions of Congress. We are very fortunate that we have selected that type of man as Speaker of the House. He has been my friend for 25 years and that friendship has been highly cherished. It is one of the compensations of service, the true and loyal friends we make here. So it is a pleasant duty that I have today.

I am very happy to present to you a man who is a great Speaker, one who, when he completes this term, will have served longer than any other man as Speaker of the House. To achieve that goal one must have ability, fairness, integrity, and character, and our Speaker has all these sterling attributes. It is a privilege and pleasure for me to present your new Speaker of the House, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, of Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. MARTIN, and my colleagues in the House of Representatives of the Eighty-first Congress, I would be less than human if I were not deeply touched by the tribute that my old friend JOE MARTIN has just paid me. One of the beautiful things about service in this House is that personal relationships and personal friendships are not divided by any center aisle. Some of the nearest and dearest friends I have ever had in the House of Representatives were on the left of the Speaker's stand. I hope it may always be so.

Especially to my Democratic colleagues, who have again conferred upon me this high honor, allow me to say that I and my family shall never cease to hold in grateful memory this gracious thing you have done for me and for them.

I am happy, of course, not only as a party man but personally, that this honor has come to me again, but I might say to you and all of you today that at this time I occupy the place that has been my supreme and only ambition in American politics since I began here many years ago as a very young man. I am charged with a great responsibility. The thrill of being elected to this office the second time does not quite compare with what it was the first time, but I have already expressed to you my gratitude for calling me to this place again. As I said to my colleagues in the Democratic caucus on last Saturday, I feel more that it is a call to duty, to hard work, and I am sure my friend who is retiring from this place will say that some of it approaches drudgery.

I want to work with you. I will be fair. I will try to be helpful to each and every Member of this House with his personal problems, and to all the Democrats with their political problems.

A call has come to us as Members of this House and as the Democratic Party, from the Chief Executive down, a call to duty and a tremendous and crushing responsibility.

We have the most prosperous country upon the face of the earth, more prosperous than this or any other nation ever was, from an economic standpoint as well as from a potential military standpoint. God forbid that our military might should ever be called into action again, but potentially, from a military standpoint, we are the most powerful nation that ever existed in the world. Not even the Caesars in the age in which they lived, when they thought they bestrode the world like colossi, were as powerful as the United States of America is capable of being now.

On matters of great national interest, national defense, the preservation of our liberty and keeping the leadership of the world that has been thrust upon us in recent years, I feel certain there will be little division at the center aisle. On great questions of international affairs on which we are again trying to assert and to keep, and to be of service by having, this world leadership, it has been gratifying to me in the past 2 years, and I feel certain I will be gratified in the next 2 years, that on those great questions of whether we live and remain free, whether there is a world that is fit to live in, we will not divide at the center aisle. I have that faith and confidence in the men and women with whom I shall have the pleasure and honor of working.

On many domestic issues we will divide. You, individually, were not called by the American people to solve such issues. The Democratic Party has been called upon to solve them, and we will miss our mark and fail in our duty if we do not live up to the expectation of the American people.

With as little division as possible, I trust, we could go far toward the accomplishment of these great purposes, doing great things for our own country, that it may remain the freest, the most prosperous, and the most powerful government upon the face of the earth.

Again allow me to thank you and to say that it shall be my unfailing purpose to serve you in this capacity in a fashion that will not be displeasing to you, and that in this position of responsibility I may accept the challenge to higher and better service. Again I thank you.

The Chair will ask the dean of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], to administer the oath of office.

Mr. SABATH then administered the oath of office to Mr. RAYBURN.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

The SPEAKER. When I first came here, it was the policy in administering the oath of office to Representatives-elect to call the States, and for the Representatives-elect to take the oath of office when their State was called. It was, I believe, during the time when Nicholas Longworth was Speaker that he inaugurated the policy of swearing in all of the Members at one time. Therefore, if the Members will rise, the Chair will administer the oath of office.

The Members and Delegates-elect rose and the Speaker administered to them the oath of office.

MAJORITY LEADER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I have been directed to report to the House that the Democratic caucus has unanimously selected as majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts, Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

MINORITY LEADER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey, Dr. EATON.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Republican conference, I am directed by that conference to officially

notify the House that the gentleman from Massachusetts, Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., has been selected minority leader.

ELECTION OF CLERK OF THE HOUSE, SERGEANT AT ARMS, DOORKEEPER, POSTMASTER, AND CHAPLAIN

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution (H. Res. 1), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That Ralph R. Roberts, of the State of Indiana, be, and he is hereby, chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives;

That Joseph H. Callahan, of the State of Kentucky, be, and he is hereby, chosen Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives;

That W. Mosely Miller, of the State of Mississippi, be, and he is hereby, chosen Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives;

That Finis E. Scott, of the State of Tennessee, be, and he is hereby, chosen Postmaster of the House of Representatives;

That Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., of the District of Columbia, be, and he is hereby, chosen Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a substitute resolution and ask for its consideration, with the exception of the office of Chaplain.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the election of Dr. James Shera Montgomery as Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

The question was taken, and Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., was elected Chaplain.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the substitute resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That John Andrews, of the State of Massachusetts, be, and he is hereby, chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives;

That William F. Russell, of the State of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby, chosen Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives;

That M. L. Meletio, of the State of Missouri, be, and he is hereby, chosen Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives;

That Tom Kennamer, of the State of Missouri, be, and he is hereby, chosen Postmaster of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the substitute resolution.

The question was taken, and the substitute resolution was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

The officers-elect presented themselves at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

NOTIFICATION TO SENATE OF ORGANIZATION OF HOUSE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution (H. Res. 2) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That a message be sent to the Senate to inform that body that a quorum of the House of Representatives has assembled; that SAM RAYBURN, a Representative from the State of Texas, has been elected Speaker; and Ralph R. Roberts, a citizen of the State of Indiana, Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Eighty-first Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution (H. Res. 3) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of three Members be appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join with a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled, and that Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to join a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled, and that Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make, the following gentlemen: The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

NOTIFICATION OF ELECTION OF SPEAKER AND CLERK

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution (H. Res. 4) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Clerk be instructed to inform the President of the United States that the House of Representatives has elected SAM RAYBURN, a Representative from the State of Texas, Speaker, and Ralph R. Roberts, a citizen of the State of Indiana, Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Eighty-first Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADOPTION OF RULES FOR THE EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution (H. Res. 5) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the rules of the House of Representatives of the Eightieth Congress, together with all applicable provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, be, and they are hereby, adopted as the rules of the House of Representatives of the Eighty-first Congress, with the following amendment included therein as a part thereof, to wit:

"Paragraph (2) (c) of rule XI is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(c) The Committee on Rules shall present to the House reports concerning rules, joint rules, and order of business, within three legislative days of the time when ordered reported by the committee. If such rule or order is not considered immediately, it shall be referred to the calendar and, if not called up by the Member making the report within seven legislative days thereafter, any member of the Committee on Rules may call it up as a question of privilege and the Speaker shall recognize any member of the Rules Committee seeking recognition for that purpose. If the Committee on Rules shall adversely report, or fail to report within 21 calendar days after reference, any resolution pending before the committee providing for an order of business for the consideration by the House of any public bill or joint resolution favorably reported by a committee of the House, on days when it shall be in order to call up motions to discharge committees it shall be in order for the chairman of the committee which reported such bill or joint resolution to call up for consideration by the House the resolution which the Committee on Rules has so adversely reported or failed to report, and it shall be in order to move the adoption by the House of said resolution adversely reported, or not reported, notwithstanding the adverse report, or the failure to report, of the Committee on Rules, and the Speaker shall recognize the Member seeking recognition for that purpose as a question of the highest privilege. Pending the consideration of said resolution the Speaker may entertain one motion that the House adjourn; but after the result is announced he shall not entertain any other dilatory motion until the said resolution shall have been fully disposed of.'"

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a substitute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has moved the previous question.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we have a right to be heard.

The SPEAKER. The previous question is not debatable.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary inquiry is, If the previous question should be voted down, then would it be possible to offer other amendments to the rules than the one proposed in the pending motion?

The SPEAKER. It would be.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if the previous question is voted down, then my substitute would be in order?

The SPEAKER. An amendment would be in order.

The question is on the motion ordering the previous question.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 275, nays 143, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 3]

YEAS—275

Abbitt	Bennett, Fla.	Brehm
Addonizio	Bennett, Mich.	Brooks
Albert	Bentsen	Brown, Ga.
Allen, La.	Bermiller	Buchanan
Andersen, H. Carl	Bland	Buckley, Ill.
Angell	Blatnik	Buckley, N. Y.
Aspinall	Boggs, La.	Burdick
Bailey	Bolling	Burleson
Barden	Bolton, Md.	Burnside
Barrett	Bonner	Burton
Barrett, Pa.	Bosone	Byrne, N. Y.
Beckworth	Breen	Camp
		Canfield

Cannon	Herlong	O'Sullivan
Carlyle	Heselton	O'Toole
Carnahan	Holifield	Pace
Carroll	Holmes	Passman
Case, N. J.	Horan	Patman
Celler	Hunter	Patten
Chatham	Hull	Patterson
Chelf	Irving	Perkins
Chesney	Jackson, Wash.	Peterson
Christopher	Jacobs	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Chudoff	Javits	Phillips
Clemente	Jones, Ala.	Polk
Coffey	Jones, Mo.	Poulter
Combs	Jones, N. C.	Powell
Cooley	Kamp	Preston
Cooper	Karsten	Price
Corbett	Kean	Priest
Cotton	Kearney	Quinn
Crosby	Kee	Rabaut
Crosser	Keefe	Rabin
Davenport	Kelley	Ramsay
Davies, N. Y.	Kennedy	Redden
Davis, Tenn.	Keogh	Rhodes
Dawson	Kerr	Riehlman
Deane	Kilday	Rodino
DeGraffenried	King	Rogers, Fla.
Delaney	Kirwan	Rogers
Denton	Klein	Sadlak
Dingell	Kruse	Sabath
Dollinger	Lane	Sadowski
Donohue	Latham	Sasscer
Doughton	Lemke	Secrest
Douglas	Lemaski	Sheppard
Doyle	Lind	Sikes
Durham	Lipscomb	Simpson, Ill.
Eberharter	Lodge	Sims
Elliott	Lyle	Smathers
Elsworth	Lynch	Spence
Engel, Mich.	McCarthy	Staggers
Engle, Calif.	McCormack	Stanley
Evins	McCulloch	Steed
Fallon	McDonough	Stigler
Feighan	McGrath	Sullivan
Fernandez	McGregor	Sutton
Fisher	McGuire	Tackett
Flood	McKinnon	Taylor
Fogarty	McSweeney	Teague
Forand	Mack, Ill.	Thomas, Tex.
Ford	Madden	Thompson
Frazier	Magee	Thornberry
Fugate	Mahon	Tover
Fulton	Mansfield	Trimble
Furcolo	Marcantonio	Underwood
Garmatz	Marshall	Van Zandt
Gary	Martin	Vinson
Gilmer	Merrow	Wagner
Golden	Miller	Walter
Gordon	Miller, Calif.	Walsh
Gore	Mills	Weaver
Gorski, Ill.	Mitchell	Welch, Calif.
Granahan	Monroney	Welch, Mo.
Granger	Morgan	Whitaker
Grant	Morris	White, Calif.
Green	Morrison	White, Idaho
Grow	Morrow	Whittington
Hagen	Moulder	Wickersham
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Murdock	Wier
Hand	Murphy	Willis
Hardy	Murray, Wis.	Wilson, Okla.
Harris	Nelson	Wilson, Tex.
Harrison	Nolan	Winstead
Hart	Norrell	Worley
Havenner	O'Brien, Ill.	Wright
Hays, Ark.	O'Brien, Mich.	Wood
Hays, Ohio	O'Hara, Ill.	Yates
Hebert	O'Hara, Minn.	Young
Hedrick	O'Konski	Zablocki
Heffernan	O'Neill	

NAYS—143

Abernethy	Case, S. Dak.	Gillette
Allen, Calif.	Chiperfield	Goodwin
Allen, Ill.	Church	Gossett
Anderson, Calif.	Clevenger	Graham
Andresen, August H.	Cole, Kans.	Gregory
Andrews	Colmer	Gwinn
Arends	Crouch	Hale
Auchincloss	Cox	Hall, Leonard W.
Barrett, Wyo.	Curtis	Halleck
Bates, Ky.	Dague	Hinshaw
Bates, Mass.	Davis, Ga.	Hope
Battle	Davis, Wis.	Jackson, Calif.
Bell	D'Ewart	Jenkins
Bishop	Dolliver	Jensen
Blackney	Dondero	Johnson
Boggs, Del.	Elston	Jonas
Bolton, Ohio	Fenton	Judd
Bryson	Fellows	Kearns
Buffett	Fenton	Kilburn
Bramblett	Gamble	Kunkel
Brown, Ohio	Gathings	Lavalle
Bryson	Garrett	Latham
Byrnes, Wis.		LeCompte
		LeFevre
		Lichtenwalter
		Lovre
		Lucas
		McConnell
		McMillan, S. C.
		McMillen, Ill.
		Mack, Wash.
		Meade
		Martin, Iowa
		Martin, Mass.
		Mason
		Meyer
		Michener

Miller, Md.	Scrivner	
Miller, Nebr.	Scudder	
Murray, Tenn.	Shafer	
Nicholson	Short	
Nixon	Simpson, Pa.	
Norrell	Smith, Kans.	
Keating	Smith, Va.	
Pfeifer, William L.	Smith, Wis.	
Phillips, Calif.	Stefan	
Pickett	Stockman	
Plumley	Taber	
Poage	Talle	
Rankin	Thomas, N. J.	
Reed, Ill.	Tibbe	
Reed, N. Y.	Vorys	
Rees	Vursell	
Regan	Wadsworth	
Rich	Weichel	
Richards	Wendel	
Rivers	Wheeler	
Rogers, Mass.	Whitten	
St. George	Wigglesworth	
Sanborn	Williams	
Scott, Hardie	Wilson, Ind.	
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Winstead	
	Wood	

NOT VOTING—15

Bulwinkle*	Jenison*	Smith, Ohio*
Burke*	Jennings*	Somers
Cole, N. Y.*	Norblad*	Taurielle*
Crawford*	Phillips, Tenn.*	Tollefson*
Gerlach, N. Y.*	Poulson*	Woodruff*

So the previous question was ordered.

Messrs. SMATHERS of Florida, BREHM, COTTON, and ANGELL changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

Messrs. HART and EATON changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLERK AND ASSISTANT CLERK TO MINORITY LEADER

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution (H. Res. 6) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective January 4, 1949, the positions of Clerk and Assistant Clerk to the minority leader of the House, at the basic salary rates of $9,100 and $2,100 per annum, respectively, shall be vacated and in lieu thereof there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, effective January 4, 1949, until otherwise provided by law, compensation at the basic salary rate of $6,500 per annum for the employment of a secretary to the minority leader of the House.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, your committee appointed on the part of the House to join a like committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled and is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make has performed that duty. The President of the United States requested that the committee state that he would communicate with the Congress in person on Wednesday, January 5, 1949, at 1 o'clock p. m.

*Not sworn.

JOINT SESSION OF THE CONGRESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Con. Res. 1) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Wednesday, the 5th day of January 1949, at 1 o'clock p. m. for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make.

The resolution was agreed to.

HOUR OF MEETING

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 7) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That until otherwise ordered, the daily hour of meeting of the House of Representatives shall be at 12 o'clock meridian.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS—AUTHORIZATION TO SIT DURING SESSIONS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 8) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations and the subcommittees thereof be authorized to sit during sessions and recesses of the Eighty-first Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

DECLARATION OF RECESS JANUARY 5 AND 6

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, January 5, and Thursday, January 6, 1949, it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess at any time subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Con. Res. 2) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall meet in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Thursday, the 6th day of January 1949, at 1 o'clock p. m., pursuant to the requirements of the Constitution and laws relating to the election of President and Vice President of the United States, and the President pro tempore of the Senate shall be their presiding officer; that two tellers shall be previously appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate on the part of the Senate and two by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives, to whom shall be handed, as they are opened by the President pro tempore of the Senate, all certificates and papers purporting to be certificates of the electoral votes, which certificates and papers shall be opened, presented, and acted upon in the alphabetical order of the States, beginning with the letter A; and said tellers, having then read the same in the presence and hearing of the two Houses, shall make a list of the votes as they shall appear from the said certificates; and the votes having been ascertained and counted in the manner and according to the rules by law provided, the result of the same shall be delivered to the President pro tempore of the Senate, who shall thereupon announce the state of the vote, which announcement shall be deemed a sufficient declaration of the persons, if any, elected President and Vice President of the United States, and together with a list of the votes, be entered on the Journals of the two Houses.

The resolution was agreed to.

JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make a statement.

After consultation with the majority and minority leaders, and remembering the terrific jams we have had upon the floor upon the occasion of appearances by the President of the United States at joint sessions of the Congress, with the consent and approval of the floor leaders the Chair announces that on Wednesday next the doors immediately opposite the Speaker will be open and the doors on the Speaker's left and right, and none other.

No one will be allowed upon the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House.

INTRODUCTION AND REFERENCE OF BILLS TODAY

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to make a statement concerning the introduction and reference of bills today.

As Members are aware, they have the privilege today of introducing bills. Heretofore on the opening day of a new Congress several thousand bills have been introduced. It will be readily apparent to all Members that it may be a physical impossibility for the Speaker to examine each bill for reference today. The Chair will do his best to refer as many bills as possible but he will ask the indulgence of Members if he is unable to refer all of them that may be introduced. Those bills which are not referred and do not appear in the daily RECORD as of today will be included in the next day's RECORD and printed with a date as of today. The Chair feels that he should make this statement at this time so Members may be aware of the difficulties that immediately present themselves.

HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 40, sections 175 and 176, United States Code, the Chair appoints the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS] members of the House Office Building Commission to serve with himself.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

Senate Resolution 1

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

Senate Resolution 2

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

Senate Resolution 3

Resolved, That the House of Representatives be notified of the election of the Honorable KENNETH MCKELLAR, a Senator from the State of Tennessee, as President of the Senate pro tempore, and of Leslie L. Biffle, of Arkansas, as Secretary of the Senate.

THE LATE GEORGE CROMWELL SCOTT

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I announce to the House of Representatives the death of a former Member, the Honorable George Cromwell Scott. Mr. Scott passed away at his home in Sioux City, Iowa, on October 6, 1948, at the age of 84 years.

Born on August 8, 1864, in Monroe County, N. Y., he was orphaned at an early age; and when he was 16, moved to Iowa, where he worked on a farm while studying law. Being admitted to the Iowa bar in 1887, the young lawyer began his practice in the city of Le Mars, and in 1901 he transferred his practice to Sioux City, which became his permanent home. He was elected as a Republican to the Sixty-second Congress from the Eleventh Congressional District to fill a vacancy caused by the death of Elbert H. Hubbard, and took his seat on December 12, 1912. He was subsequently reelected to the Sixty-third and Sixty-fifth Congresses, after which time he retired from political life. The Eleventh Congressional District was formerly a part of the present Eighth Congressional District which I have the honor to represent.

Mr. Scott maintained a partnership with William Milchrist and Harry W. Pitkin of Sioux City until 1922, when he was nominated by President Harding as judge of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Iowa, in which capacity he served until his retirement. It was on the bench, perhaps, that he won his greatest distinction, his judgment on matters of law commanding wide consideration. With the possible exception of his ruling in a labor case, the case in his court that attracted the greatest national attention was that of Oscar M. Hartzell, promoter of the alleged Drake estate fraud.

Judge Scott was a man of high character. He was a man of sagacity and great ability, a conscientious legislator, and a patriotic American. Through his friendship, I know the high principles which have guided him throughout the years of his splendid service in the interest of his State and his country. I express my deep sorrow at his passing. As a fellow Iowan, I share in the feeling of pride toward his accomplishments. The State of Iowa has lost a truly great citizen.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement.

Mr. POAGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in nine instances and to include two brief newspaper editorials.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in five instances.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain brief excerpts.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "Republican Responsibility" by the Honorable LAWRENCE H. SMITH.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, January 17, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by our former colleague, Mr. Bruce Barton, entitled "Are We Biting Off More Than We Can Chew?"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. GORE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Eva Conley.

Mr. BLATNIK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KEOGH (at the request of Mr. PRICE) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include an article in each instance.

Mr. GORDON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a timely article which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and to include a telegram, a resolution, and an editorial.

Mr. FULTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include extraneous matter in each.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SOMERS (at the request of Mr. O'TOOLE), on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned to Wednesday, January 5, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting a report for the period from July 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948, both inclusive, giving names of statutory and contingent-fund employees of the House and their respective compensations, including clerks to Members; the expenditures from the contingent fund and from certain specific appropriations; to the Committee on House Administration.

2. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting, in compliance with the requirements of rule XI, clause 2, of the Rules of the House of Representatives, a list of reports which it is the duty of any officer or department to make to Congress (H. Doc. No. 32); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to Public Law 313, Eightieth Congress, as amended by Public Law 764, Eightieth Congress, a report setting forth the number of positions established pursuant to this act in the National Military Establishment during that calendar year, and the name, rate of compensation, and description of qualifications of each incumbent together with a statement of the functions performed by each, this report to be made to Congress as of December 31 of each year; to the Committee on Armed Services.

4. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the First Report of the Secretary of Defense, pursuant to the National Security Act of 1947; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report on the operation of the agricultural conservation program for the program year 1947, with a financial report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation's operations for 1948; to the Committee on Agriculture.

7. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948, covering the receipts, expenditures, and work of the agricultural experiment stations in Hawaii and Puerto Rico under the Hatch, Adams, Purnell, and supplementary acts; the Bankhead-Jones Act of June 29, 1935; and title I, section 9, of the Research and Marketing Act of 1946; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of the activities of, funds used by, and donations to the regional research laboratories established pursuant to section 202 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as required by paragraph (e) of the section; to the Committee on Agriculture.

9. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a bill to extend the benefits of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 to the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

10. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting reports from the following departments and independent establishments: Department of the Army, Federal Works Agency, General Accounting Office, Office of the Housing Expediter, Department of the Interior, the Panama Canal, The Tax Court of the United States, and the Tennessee Valley Authority (pursuant to sec. 5 of the act of June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 763)); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

11. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an itemized report covering transactions during the fiscal year 1948 for account of the Pershing Hall memorial fund (pursuant to the act of Congress approved June 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 426, sec. 3)); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

12. A letter from the Director, Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, transmitting the Twenty-first Annual Report of the Work and Operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory (pursuant to Public Law 350, 70th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 10); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

13. A letter from the clerk, Court of Claims of the United States, transmitting a statement of all judgments rendered by the Court of Claims for the year ended December 3, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

14. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to enhance further the security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information concerning the cryptographic systems and the communication intelligence activities of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

15. A letter from the Chief Justice of the United States, transmitting a report of the proceedings of the regular annual meeting of the Judicial Conference of the United States held in Washington, D. C., September 27, 29, 1948 (pursuant to the provisions of title 28, U. S. Code, sec. 331) (H. Doc. No. 31); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

16. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the amendments to the Rules of Criminal Procedure for the United States District Courts (H. Doc. No. 30); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

17. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a bill to amend the second paragraph of section 7 of the Columbia Basin Project Act, an act approved March 10, 1943 (57 Stat. 14); to the Committee on Public Lands.

18. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend section 10 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939"; to the Committee on Public Lands.

19. A letter from the Chairman, National Archives, transmitting the report of the National Archives Trust Fund Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

20. A letter from the Postmaster General, Chairman, Board of Trustees, transmitting the report of operations of the Postal Savings System for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (H. Doc. No. 11); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 1. A bill to provide an annuity of $25,000 per annum for former Presidents of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2. A bill to provide a residence for the Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 3. A bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to complete the requirements for the positive identification of yellow oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 4. A bill relating to the tax treatment of chain stores operated at a loss; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5. A bill relating to certain discriminatory pricing practices affecting commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6. A bill to create a commission to prepare a plan to enable selected students who are training or who desire to train for Government service to actually serve an internship within the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 7. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a

prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 8. A bill to provide pensions for disability and age under Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a), part III, in the same amounts as now provided for veterans of the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the Boxer Rebellion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 9. A bill to extend the time for filing applications for the payment of World War I adjusted service certificates under the provisions of the Adjusted Compensation Payment Act, 1936; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 10. A bill to facilitate the deportation of aliens from the United States, to provide for the supervision and detention pending eventual deportation of aliens whose deportation cannot be readily effectuated because of reasons beyond the control of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 11. A bill to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to facilitate sustained progress in the attainment of such objective, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 12. A bill to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 13. A bill to establish the requirement that political statements concerning certain candidates for public office shall contain information relating to sponsorship and cost of publication or transmission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 14. A bill to provide free mailing privileges for patients in or at veterans' hospitals; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 15. A bill to provide for the incorporation, regulation, merger, consolidation, and dissolution of certain business corporations in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 16. A bill to safeguard the admission of evidence in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 17. A bill to provide for trials of and judgments upon the issue of good behavior in the case of certain judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 18. A bill to repeal the prohibition against the filling of a vacancy in the office of district judge in the northern district of Georgia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 19. A bill to provide for the acquisition of sites and the preparation of plans for Federal public buildings outside the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 20. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1947, as amended, to authorize the creation of 10 professional and scientific positions in the headquarters and research stations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 21. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 22. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act (U. S. C., title 49, sec. 3 (1)), so as to prohibit the segregation of passengers on account of race or color; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 23. A bill to prohibit race segregation in the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 24. A bill to assure to all persons within the District of Columbia full and equal privileges of places of public education, accommodation, resort, entertainment, and amusement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 25. A bill to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union as a State; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 26. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the Original States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 27. A bill providing for taxation by the States and their political subdivisions of certain real property acquired for military purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 28. A bill to provide for home rule and reorganization in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 29. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide parity for tung nuts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 30. A bill to impose a duty on tung oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 31. A bill to repeal the war-tax rate on certain admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 32. A bill to provide for the deepening of the channel at Pascagoula Harbor and Horn Island Pass, Miss., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 33. A bill to authorize Joe Graham Post, No. 119, American Legion, upon certain conditions, to lease the lands conveyed to it by the act of June 15, 1933; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 34. A bill to exempt persons who served in the merchant marine of the United States between September 16, 1940, and June 24, 1948, from induction or service under the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 35. A bill to amend section 327 of the Communication Act of 1934 so as to permit, subject to certain conditions, the use of Coast Guard radio stations for the reception and transmission of commercial messages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. R. 36. A bill authorizing the appointment of X-ray technicians as commissioned officers in the Medical Corps of the Army and the Medical Corps of the Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H. R. 37. A bill to provide for the procurement and installation of mechanism for recording and counting votes in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 38. A bill to provide that the rate of interest charged veterans of World Wars I and II on loans secured by their Government life insurance shall not exceed 3 percent; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 39. A bill to grant annual and sick leave to certain temporary rural carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 40. A bill to make permanent the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 41. A bill to restore the status quo as of June 13, 1948, in the matter of coverage under the social-security system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 42. A bill to reimpose the excess-profits tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 43. A bill to reduce certain excise tax rates, to equalize Federal income taxes upon married persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELSTON:

H. R. 44. A bill to provide military status for women who served overseas with the Army of the United States during World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 45. A bill to extend certain benefits under title II of the Social Security Act, as amended, to husbands and widowers of insured wives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 46. A bill to amend section 12 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 47. A bill to exempt persons who served in the merchant marine of the United States during World War II from induction under the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 48. A bill to incorporate United States Navy Veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 49. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 50. A bill to extend section 12 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 to cover travel of dependents in anticipation of orders of permanent change of station; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 51. A bill to amend the act of August 13, 1946, entitled "An act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 52. A bill for the relief of Nevada County, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 53. A bill to make the calendar fixed and perpetual; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 54. A bill to retrocede to the State of New Mexico exclusive jurisdiction held by the United States over lands within the boundaries of the Los Alamos project of the United States Atomic Energy Commission; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 55. A bill to include certain lands in the Carson National Forest, N. Mex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 56. A bill to authorize a project for the rehabilitation of certain works of the Fort Sumner Irrigation District in New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 57. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Hungarian Reformed Federation of America," approved March 2, 1907, so as to permit such federation to extend certain benefits to all its members; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 58. A bill to provide for the conversion of national banking associations into and their merger or consolidation with State banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 59. A bill to authorize payment of certain personal-property claims of military personnel and civilian employees of the War Department or of the Army, or of the Navy Department or of the Navy, in the case of death, to their survivors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 60. A bill to provide that beneficiaries of national service life insurance maturing prior to August 1, 1946, may elect to receive the proceeds of such insurance in a lump sum; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 61. A bill to broaden the cooperative extension system as established in the act of May 8, 1914, and acts supplemental thereto, by providing for cooperative extension work between colleges receiving the benefits of this act and the acts of July 2, 1862, and August 30, 1890, and other qualified colleges, universities, and research agencies, and the United States Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 62. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 63. A bill to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans of World War I and World War II with service-connected disabilities, who have dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 64. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 65. A bill to provide pensions for disability and age under Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), part III, in the same amounts as now provided for veterans of the War With Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the Boxer Rebellion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 66. A bill to authorize the construction of a research laboratory for the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, at or in the vicinity of Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 67. A bill to remove certain restrictions on the acquisition and holding, or transportation, of gold coin, bullion, currency, certificates, or securities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 68. A bill to amend section 201 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 69. A bill to amend the Federal Alcohol Administration Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 70. A bill relating to the disposition of permanent housing acquired or constructed by the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 71. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 72. A bill to promote the American merchant marine by facilitating the effectuation of vessel-replacement programs and by eliminating certain discriminations against unsubsidized American shipowners; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 73. A bill to provide for the development of civil transport aircraft adaptable for auxiliary military service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 74. A bill to prescribe the procedures of committees of the House of Representatives and to protect the rights of parties under investigation by such committees; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 75. A bill to amend section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, so as to permit the transportation of coal to Ogdensburg, N. Y., in foreign vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 76. A bill to amend section 4 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act, approved September 7, 1916; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 77. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, Public Law 101, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 78. A bill to amend chapter 310 of the laws of the Sixty-ninth Congress, Public Law 713 of March 3, 1927 (44 U. S. Stat. 1356); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 79. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act approved June 21, 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 80. A bill to establish a United States Air Force Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 81. A bill providing for an additional military academy in the southern district of the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 82. A bill providing for an additional naval academy in the southern district of the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 83. A bill to outlaw the Communist Party; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 84. A bill making appropriations for and on behalf of the Department of the Air Force for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 85. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Navy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 86. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to make such act applicable to the officers and employees of the Columbia Institution for the Deaf; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 87. A bill relating to the promotion of veterans of World War II in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 88. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, relating to the classification and compensation of postmasters and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 89. A bill to amend the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948 so that the pay increase granted by such act shall apply to officers and employees of the municipal government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 90. A bill to provide the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence, to make immigration quotas available to Asian and Pacific peoples, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 91. A bill to provide for a research and development program in the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 92. A bill to extend the gratuitous insurance benefits granted by subsection 602 (d) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to parents of certain deceased members of the armed forces without any requirement as to the dependency of such parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 93. A bill to authorize the American River Basin development, California, for irrigation and reclamation, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 94. A bill to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to facilitate sustained progress in the attainment of such objective, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. NIXON:

H. R. 95. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 96. A bill to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 97. A bill to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false advertising, and false invoicing of fur products and furs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 98. A bill to provide for the extension of the term of certain patents in the case of persons who served in the land or naval forces of the United States during the present war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 99. A bill to provide for the assignment after the war of certain patent rights of the United States to the servicemen who made the inventions and discoveries patented; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 100. A bill to amend the Declaratory Judgments Act of June 14, 1934, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 101. A bill relating to the performance by Federal judges of services for the United States not related to their judicial duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 102. A bill to amend the Code of Law for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 103. A bill to establish a Federal Traffic Bureau, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 104. A bill to repeal section 5a of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, relating to exemption from the antitrust laws in the case of certain agreements between carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 105. A bill to amend the act of March 19, 1918, so as to provide that standard time shall be the measure of time for all purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 106. A bill to provide retirement pay and other benefits to certain disabled veterans of the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection, and the Boxer Rebellion; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 107. A bill to amend section 2402 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and to repeal section 2402 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 108. A bill to terminate certain wartime excise-tax rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 109. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to provide that payments be made to survivors for unused leave accumulated after September 8, 1939, by a member of the armed forces who was separated from service by death before September 1, 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 110. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of the town of Lancaster, Mass., for the loss of taxes on certain property in such town acquired by the United States for use for military purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 111. A bill to provide for certain tax-exempt purchases for hospitalized veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 112. A bill relating to the eligibility for pensions of certain widows and children of veterans of World War I and II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 113. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act to provide for rural telephones, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 114. A bill for the retirement of the public debt; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 115. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of citizens of the United States and other persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 116. A bill relating to the status of certain natives and inhabitants of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 117. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 118. A bill to amend section 58d of an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 119. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; and to repeal subdivision b of section 64 and subdivision h of section 70 thereof and all acts and parts of acts inconsistent therewith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 120. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 121. A bill to amend title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, to make clear the authority of the Administrator to negotiate rates of compensation for training in certain institutions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 122. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to the Helena Chamber of Commerce certain described parcels of land situated in the city of Helena, Mont.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 123. A bill to clarify the provisions of section 602 (u) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 124. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt payments under such act from taxation; to the committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 125. A bill to authorize the incorporation of the Polish Legion of American Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 126. A bill to authorize Sacramento Valley Irrigation Canals, Central Valley project, California; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 127. A bill to amend Public Law 668, Seventy-sixth Congress, so as to protect the badge, medal, emblem, or other insignia of auxiliaries to veterans' organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 128. A bill to provide that acreage planted to cotton, in 1949, shall not be used in computing cotton acreage allotments for any subsequent year; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 129. A bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 130. A bill to provide for compensation to blind persons for loss of earning power due to blindness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 131. A bill to amend sections 112 and 113 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 132. A bill to provide for certain payments to States and their political subdivisions as compensation for loss of revenues occasioned by the acquisition of real property by the United States for military purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 133. A bill to amend section 2 of the act approved June 20, 1936, entitled "An act to extend the benefits of the Adams Act, the Purnell Act, and the Capper-Ketcham Act to the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 134. A bill repealing certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to the tax on oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 135. A bill to exempt admissions to certain charitable entertainments from the Federal admissions tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 136. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 137. A bill to make the educational benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 available to the children of persons who died in active service or who died as a result of wounds received in World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 138. A bill to increase the compensation of new employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 139. A bill to extend the coverage of Federal old-age and survivors insurance to self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 140. A bill relating to the furnishing of transportation and housing facilities for the immediate family of members of the armed forces on duty outside the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 141. A bill to provide for Federal participation in the financing of certain aeronautical developments; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 142. A bill excepting certain persons from the requirement of paying fees for certain census data; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 143. A bill to amend section 6 (b) of the War Claims Act of 1948 with respect to compensation payable to individuals who, while held by the enemy as prisoners of war, were not furnished food in accordance with the terms of the Geneva Convention; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 144. A bill to amend section 5 of the War Claims Act of 1948, relating to detention benefits payable to civilian American citizens; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 145. A bill to authorize States and their political subdivisions and instrumentalities to elect coverage of the old-age and survivors' insurance benefit provisions of the Social Security Act for their employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 146. A bill relating to the computation of Federal grants to States for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 147. A bill granting pensions to veterans, and the widows and dependent children of veterans, of the World War equivalent to pensions granted to veterans, and the widows and dependent children of veterans, of the war with Spain; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 148. A bill to extend certain benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to widows of veterans and to wives of certain totally and permanently disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 149. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Freedom National Historical Park in Duval County, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 150. A bill to authorize the making of grants and loans to the States to assist in providing adequate public elementary and secondary school facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 151. A bill to provide for assistance by the Federal Government in the repair of damage caused by erosion by waves and currents to the shores of the United States and in the prevention of future damage to such shores; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 152. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of Jules Creek, Westmoreland County, Va., and of channel connecting said creek with Nomini Creek; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 153. A bill granting exemption from income tax in the case of retirement pensions and annuities received by State, county, and municipal employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H. R. 154. A bill to create the office of Senator at Large in the Senate of the United States for ex-Presidents of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. R. 155. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of citizens of the United States and other persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 156. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 157. A bill authorizing the Attorney General of the United States to recognize and to award to outstanding courageous young Americans a medal for heroism known as the Young American Medal for Bravery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHELF (by request):

H. R. 158. A bill to provide for the establishment in the city of Mumfordville, Hart County, Ky., of a suitable memorial, "Community Center Building," to the late Lt. Gen. Simon Bolivar Buckner, Jr., and others who gave their lives in service to their country in World War II, Mumfordville being the birthplace of General Buckner; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 159. A bill to amend section 1 of the Federal Power Act, with respect to the terms of office of members of the Federal Power

Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 160. A bill to amend section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 161. A bill to provide for the acceptance and use of funds for support of the national weather service supplementing the funds appropriated for the operation of the Weather Bureau of the Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 162. A bill to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 163. A bill to authorize Sacramento Valley irrigation canals, Central Valley project, California; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 164. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the Churchtown Elementary School District, California; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 165. A bill to authorize the American River Basin development, California, for irrigation and reclamation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 166. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to provide air-mail service to Kalaupapa, county of Kalawao, T. H.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 167. A bill to provide for the admission into the United States of persons of the Korean race, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 168. A bill to provide for the admission into the United States of persons of the Japanese race, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 169. A bill to increase the compensation of the members of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 170. A bill to increase the compensation of the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 171. A bill to amend the act approved December 28, 1945, entitled "An act to expedite the admission to the United States alien spouses and alien minor children of citizen members of the United States armed forces"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 172. A bill to increase the number of midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy allowed for Delegates in Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 173. A bill to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act to prevent the loss of nationality, by reason of continuous residence for 5 years in a foreign state, of certain persons declared to be citizens of the United States under such act; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 174. A bill to increase the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy allowed for Delegates in Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 175. A bill to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act so as to reduce the residence qualification in divorce proceedings from 2 years to 1 year; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 176. A bill to amend section 80 of the Hawaiian Organic Act to provide that women may serve on juries in the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 177. A bill for the erection of a public building at Honolulu, T. H.; and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 178. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act with respect to the apportionment of funds to Hawaii and Alaska; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 179. A bill to provide for the appointment of the adjutant general of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. R. 180. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. R. 181. A bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 182. A bill to increase the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H. R. 183. A bill to exempt from tax tobacco sold to veterans' organizations for distribution, as gifts, to hospitalized veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 184. A bill to create an executive department of the Government to be known as the Department of Health, Education, and Security; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 185. A bill to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 186. A bill to provide special priorities for former owners of surplus agricultural real property and veterans who intend to live on farms and to engage in farming as their principal occupation, to eliminate the priorities of tenants of former owners with respect to such property, to reduce from 90 to 30 days the priority period within which former owners of surplus real property may exercise their priorities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department.

H. R. 187. A bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 188. A bill to protect the United States against un-American and subversive totalitarian activities; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

H. R. 189. A bill to raise the minimum wage rate; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 190. A bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 191. A bill to prescribe the procedures of investigating committees of the Congress and to protect the rights of parties under investigation by such committees; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 192. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 193. A bill to change the name of Eastern Avenue in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 194. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of an experiment station in the Hocking Valley coal region in the State of Ohio for research on the production, refining, transportation, and use of petroleum and natural gas from coal and oil shale; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 195. A bill to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 196. A bill to exempt from the tax admissions and dues admissions to school entertainments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 197. A bill terminating issuance of immigration visas to natives of certain countries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 198. A bill to clarify the definition of controlled housing accommodations in the Housing and Rent Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 199. A bill to provide the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence, to make immigration quotas available to Asian and Pacific peoples, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 200. A bill to establish the United States Air Academy at Randolph Field, Tex.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 201. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 202. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (Public Law 346, 78th Cong.) by extending the benefits of titles II and III; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 203. A bill to guarantee that the civil liberties of labor shall not be abridged; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 204. A bill to repeal the retailers' excise tax on toilet preparations and on luggage, purses, and similar articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 205. A bill to repeal the tax on transportation of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 206. A bill to terminate the war excise tax rate on theater tickets and other types of amusement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 207. A bill to repeal the tax on certain telegraph, telephone, radio, and cable facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 208. A bill to repeal the tax on transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 209. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H. R. 210. A bill to authorize the conveyance of a portion of the United States military reservation at Fort Schuyler, N. Y., to the State of New York for use as a maritime school, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 211. A bill to repeal the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 212. A bill to amend section 3 of the act approved June 20, 1936, entitled "An act to extend the benefits of the Adams Act, the Purnell Act, and the Capper-Ketcham Act to the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 213. A bill to provide for the abolition of the 30-rod reserved spaces between claims on shore waters in Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 214. A bill to make the workmen's compensation laws of Alaska applicable to land and premises of the United States in such Territory; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 215. A bill to amend section 5 (a) of the Farm Credit Act of August 19, 1937 (50 Stat. 703); to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 216. A bill transferring the jurisdiction, supervision, administration, and control over the salmon and other fisheries of Alaska, except the fur-seal and sea-otter fisheries, from the Department of the Interior to the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 217. A bill to provide that judges of the district court for the Territory of Alaska shall hereafter be appointed to hold their offices during good behavior; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 218. A bill to forbid the appointment of any person but a resident of the Territory of Alaska to the office of Governor of said Territory; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 219. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to determine the amounts due to and render judgment upon the claims of the employees of the Alaska Railroad for overtime work performed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 220. A bill to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to revise the Alaska game law," approved July 1, 1943, as amended (57 Stat. 301); to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 221. A bill to amend section 8 of the act of June 17, 1886, as amended (46 U. S. C., sec. 289), and section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, as amended (46 U. S. C., sec. 883); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 222. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery at Juneau, Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 223. A bill to provide that veterans may obtain copies of public records in the Territory of Alaska, without the payment of any fees, for use in presenting claims to the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 224. A bill to authorize a program of useful public works for the development of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 225. A bill authorizing the Legislature of Alaska to alter, amend, or repeal certain laws of Alaska imposing taxes for carrying on business and trade, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 226. A bill to amend the Oil Pollution Act, 1924, to increase the penalties specified in such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 227. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of Cubitt Creek, Northumberland County, Va., and the channel connecting with the Chesapeake Bay; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 228. A bill to authorize the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to prepare estimates and plans for improvement of certain river and harbor projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 229. A bill to provide for an examination and survey of Pope Creek, Westmoreland County, Va., and of channel connecting said creek with Potomac River; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 230. A bill to promote effectual utilization of the fishery resources of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 231. A bill to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 232. A bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to complete the requirements for the positive identification of yellow oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 233. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit the use of additional means, including stamp machines, for payment of tax on fermented malt liquors, provide for the establishment of brewery bottling house on brewery premises, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 234. A bill to fix the salaries of certain justices and judges of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 235. A bill to provide for the tenure of office of the justices of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, the judges of the circuit courts of the Territory of Hawaii, and the judges of the United States District Court for the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 236. A bill to authorize the interservice transfers of officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KELLEY:

H. R. 237. A bill to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 238. A bill to amend section 203 (a) of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948, to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 239. A bill to allow for income-tax purposes a deduction for depreciation and repairs on the residence of a taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 240. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 241. A bill to increase the salaries of Federal judges and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 242. A bill to provide for the conferring of the degree of bachelor of science upon graduates of the United States Merchant Marine Academy; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 243. A bill to amend section 3761 of the Internal Revenue Code and section 3469 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 244. A bill to provide for the furnishing of the Congressional Record to members of the Federal judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 245. A bill for postal employees' longevity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 246. A bill to provide study periods for post-office clerks, terminal and transfer clerks; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 247. A bill to amend section 22, subdivision (b), paragraph (2), of subparagraph (B) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 248. A bill granting leave of absence to postal employees on account of death in family; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 249. A bill to amend section 25 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 250. A bill to allow certain periods of service to be credited to certain employees of the postal service for purposes of promotion under the act of July 6, 1945; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 251. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional Federal district judge for the southern district of Texas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 252. A bill to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital in south Texas; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 253. A bill to amend the act of June 25, 1938, relating to the appointment of postmasters under civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 254. A bill to amend section 1000 of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to imposition of gift tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 255. A bill to amend title 18, Criminal Code, to declare certain papers, pamphlets, books, pictures, and writings nonmailable, to provide a penalty for mailing same, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 256. A bill to limit grounds for exclusion from the United States in the case of certain classes of honorably discharged veterans who are aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 257. A bill to amend section 3402 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 258. A bill to extend the coverage of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to the self-employed, employees of nonprofit institutions, and, under voluntary agreements, employees of State and local governments, increase the benefits payable under such system, lower the age requirements for female beneficiaries, and liberalize the eligibility provisions of the system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 259. A bill to repeal the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and to reenact the National Labor Relations Act, 1935, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 260. A bill to suspend certain import taxes on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 261. A bill to authorize the furnishing of especially equipped automobiles to amputees whose injury was incurred while on active service before World War II and who were not discharged until after December 7, 1941; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 262. A bill to permit the naturalization of certain persons whose sons and daughters have served with the land or naval forces or the maritime service of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILLIPS of California:

H. R. 263. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the County of Orange, Calif., a perpetual easement for the maintenance and operation of a public highway, and to grant to the Irvine Co., a corporation, a perpetual easement for the maintenance, operation, and use of a water-pipe line, in the vicinity of the naval air base, Santa Ana, Orange County, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 264. A bill to amend Public Law 521, Seventy-eighth Congress, chapter 626, second session; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 265. A bill to strengthen national security and the common defense by authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce potable water from sea water, or other liquids, elements, or substances in order to promote the general welfare of the Nation and to conserve and increase the national water resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PICKETT:

H. R. 266. A bill to authorize appropriations for carrying out the provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 of the act of June 7, 1924

(43 Stat. 653), as amended, to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 267. A bill to assist the States in the development and maintenance of local public-health units, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 268. A bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 269. A bill to make the Federal Bureau of Investigation an independent agency of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 270. A bill to amend chapter 311 of title 18, United States Code, relating to the parole of United States prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 271. A bill to exempt from admissions tax admissions to recreation facilities and activities operated or conducted by the Federal Government, the several State governments, or political subdivisions thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 272. A bill to amend section 60 of an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 273. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into law title 14 of the United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 274. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into law title 38 of the United States Code, entitled "Pensions and Veterans' Benefits"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 275. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 276. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 277. A bill to exempt certain religious, charitable, scientific, literary, and educational organizations from the requirement of withholding tax at source on wages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 278. A bill granting additional allowance for military and naval personnel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 279. A bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 280. A bill to provide certain equitable adjustments in disability compensation and pension to meet the rise in the cost of living; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 281. A bill to amend the income limitation governing the granting of pension to veterans and death-pension benefits to widows and children of veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 282. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to permit the veteran to select his prosthetic appliance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 283. A bill to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 284. A bill to amend section 3413 of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to tax on lubricating oils; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 285. A bill to amend subparagraph (X) of paragraph II, part I, of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to authorize increased compensation for blindness of one eye with 5/200 visual acuity or less; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 286. A bill to amend subparagraphs (a) and (d) of paragraph 1 of part III of Veterans Regulation 1 (a), as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 287. A bill to provide 4 years of college education, or the equivalent, to the children of persons whose death resulted from service in the armed forces during World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 288. A bill to encourage employment of veterans with pensionable or compensable service-connected disabilities through Federal reimbursement to any employer, insurer, or fund, of amounts of workmen's compensation paid on account of disability or death arising out of such employment; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 289. A bill to provide for a statutory award of 10 percent to any war veteran who was wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled by an instrumentality of war in a zone of hostilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 290. A bill to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 291. A bill to provide veterans' benefits based upon service as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 292. A bill to provide that veterans now receiving compensation for certain so-called presumptive disabilities equivalent to 75 percent of the amount to which they were previously entitled shall henceforth have such compensation restored to 100 percent thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 293. A bill to provide compensation or pension for the widows and children of deceased veterans of World War I or World War II who had disabilities caused or aggravated by examination, hospitalization, or medical treatment; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 294. A bill to provide for an Administrator's Advisory Group in the Veterans' Administration to insure review by the Administrator of certain decisions of the Board of Veterans' Appeals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 295. A bill relating to the eligibility for pensions of certain widows and children of veterans of World Wars I and II, to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 296. A bill to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital for Negro veterans at the birthplace of booker T. Washington in Franklin County, Va.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 297. A bill for the admission to citizenship of aliens who came into this country prior to July 1, 1924; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 298. A bill relating to the admission into the United States, as nonquota immigrants, of certain individuals who have served in the Polish Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 299. A bill to provide free postage for gift packages of food and clothing mailed to certain foreign countries; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 300. A bill granting pensions to veterans of World War I and World War II who are 60 years of age or over; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARDIE SCOTT:

H. R. 301. A bill to authorize the construction of a research laboratory for the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, at or in the vicinity of Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 302. A bill to provide for the issue of a series of United States annuity bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 303. A bill to provide for capital-gain treatment with respect to income received on the redemption of certain United States savings bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 304. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 305. A bill to promote maximum employment, business opportunities, and careers in a free competitive economy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STEFAN:

H. R. 306. A bill to establish a Department of Transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments.

By Mr. SUTTON:

H. R. 307. A bill making an additional appropriation to carry out the provisions of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, to provide for the construction of one steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 308. A bill to provide the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence, to make immigration quotas available to Asian and Pacific peoples, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 309. A bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELCH of California:

H. R. 310. A bill to authorize the American River Basin development, California, for irrigation and reclamation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 311. A bill to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 312. A bill to authorize the composition of the United States Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 313. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, so as to make the provisions thereof applicable to service personnel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 314. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish land-based air warning and control installations for the national security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 315. A bill to authorize the composition of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 316. A bill to require statutory authorization for certain ship construction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 317. A bill to amend sections 22 and 1621 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 318. A bill to provide benefits for members of the Reserve components of the armed forces who suffer disability or death from injuries incurred while engaged in active-duty training for periods of less than 30 days or while engaged in inactive-duty training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 319. A bill to amend the act of June 7, 1939, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 320. A bill to provide for disregarding small amounts of compensation for labor performed by persons eligible for old-age assistance in determining need for such assistance until title I of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 321. A bill to promote more economical and efficient use of the Nation's resources by providing for a single supply catalog system for the National Military Establishment; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 322. A bill to transfer funds to the town of Craig, Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 323. A bill to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to amend section 624 of the Public Health Service Act so as to provide a minimum allotment of $100,000 to each State for the construction of hospitals" (Public Law 630, 80th Cong.); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 324. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of McKanes Bay, a branch of Rappahannock River; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 325. A bill to amend the act of September 7, 1916, by providing for a hearing of claims of employees of the United States before the United States Employees' Compensation Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 326. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of Pecks Creek, Richmond County, Va.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 327. A bill to amend the act approved August 24, 1935, as amended May 23, 1938, entitled "An act to authorize the erection of a suitable memorial to Maj. Gen. George W. Goethals within the Canal Zone"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 328. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to create the Inland Waterways Corporation for the purpose of carrying out the mandate and purpose of Congress as expressed in sections 201 and 500 of the Transportation Act, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 329. A bill to amend section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to provide for the reduction of the public debt by at least $2,500,000,000 during each fiscal year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 330. A bill to authorize the use of oleomargarine by the armed forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 331. A bill to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 332. A bill to provide a pension for certain physically handicapped veterans of World War I and World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 333. A bill to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to facilitate sustained progress in the attainment of such objective, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 334. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 335. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, so as to increase the amounts of Federal contributions to the States for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the blind; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 336. A bill repealing certain taxes with respect to oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H. R. 337. A bill authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish headstones to mark honorary burial places, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 338. A bill to exempt from admissions tax general admissions to agricultural fairs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 339. A bill authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish headstones to mark honorary burial places, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. R. 340. A bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 341. A bill relating to the rights of the several States in lands beneath inland navigable waters and to the recognition of equities in submerged coastal lands adjacent to the shores of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 342. A bill to authorize the admission into the United States of persons of races indigenous to Indonesia, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 343. A bill to permit the exportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 344. A bill to amend section 11F of the Immigration Act of 1924; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 345. A bill to provide a national health-insurance and public-health program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 346. A bill to establish a national housing policy and provide for its execution; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 347. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, with respect to air transportation by marine transportation and shipping companies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 348. A bill to provide increased Federal-aided public housing for families of low income; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 349. A bill to amend the National Housing Act so as to provide increased limits on cost in the case of federally aided low-rent housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 350. A bill to amend chapter 16 of the Judicial Code, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 351. A bill to provide for the appointment of public defenders in the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 352. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 353. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 354. A bill to promote the development and conservation of certain resources in the submerged coastal lands adjacent to the shores of the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 355. A bill to increase the guaranty by the Government of real-estate loans to veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 356. A bill to amend section 211 of the Criminal Code, as amended (relating to certain nonmailable matter); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 357. A bill to repeal the special tax on retail dealers in oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 358. A bill to establish a commission on the legal status of women in the United States, to declare a policy as to distinctions based on sex, in law, and administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 359. A bill to promote the progress of science and the useful arts, to secure the national defense, to advance the national health and welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 360. A bill to repeal the Silver Purchase Act of 1934; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 361. A bill to repeal the act to extend the time within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund and alteration of the weight of the dollar may be exercised; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 362. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits and to reduce the age requirements for old-age and survivors insurance benefits from 65 to 60 in the case of men, and from 65 to 55 in the case of women; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 363. A bill to extend the benefits of title II of the Social Security Act to employees of certain nonprofit organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 364. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 365. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 366. A bill to aid in the naturalization of persons with wartime service in the merchant marine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 367. A bill to grant naturalization rights to all persons regardless of race, color, or national origin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 368. A bill to amend section 52 of title 18, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 369. A bill to amend section 51, title 18, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 370. A bill to empower the Supreme Court of the United States to promulgate a code of ethics for attorneys at law practicing before the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 371. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 372. A bill to repeal Public Law No. 252, an act to prevent pernicious political activities; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 373. A bill to amend certain provisions of the immigration laws which discriminate against women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 374. A bill to authorize the admission into the United States, under a quota for Koreans, persons of the Korean race, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 375. A bill to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 376. A bill for the relief of 29 Latvians who entered the United States on July 22, 1948, at Provincetown, Mass.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHRISTOPHER:

H. R. 377. A bill to establish a United States Air Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 378. A bill to amend section 25 of the Interstate Commerce Act to require certain common carriers by railroad to install and maintain communication systems and to establish and observe operating rules, regulations, and practices to promote safety of employees and travelers on railroads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 379. A bill to provide increases in compensation for all officers and employees of the municipal government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 380. A bill exempting from tax cigarettes sold to certain organizations for distribution, as gifts, to hospitalized veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 381. A bill to exempt admissions to religious, educational, and charitable entertainment and to certain concerts from the tax on admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. R. 382. A bill to assure to all persons within the District of Columbia full and equal privileges of places of public accommodation, resort, entertainment, and amusement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 383. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 384. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 385. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 386. A bill to incorporate the Moms of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 387. A bill to permit the sale of gold within the United States, its Territories and possessions, including Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 388. A bill to permit the mining, development, and utilization of the mineral resources of all public lands withdrawn or reserved for power development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 389. A bill for the relief of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 390. A bill for the relief of the county of Maui, T. H.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 391. A bill to confer United States citizenship upon certain inhabitants of the island of Guam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 392. A bill to confer United States citizenship upon certain inhabitants of American Samoa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 393. A bill to repeal the tax on transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 394. A bill to provide for the retirement of the justices of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, the judges of the circuit courts of the Territory of Hawaii, and the judges of the United States District Court for the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 395. A bill to require the Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration to execute and deliver to present owners of real property quitclaim deeds to the interest in the minerals in or under such property reserved by the United States pursuant to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act in those cases in which such interest has only a nominal value; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 396. A bill to authorize the construction of a research laboratory for the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, at or in the vicinity of Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 397. A bill providing an allowance for the purchase of uniforms for city and village delivery letter carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 398. A bill to provide for a cash allowance for uniforms for employees of the United States Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 399. A bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 400. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 401. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional judge for the district of New Jersey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 402. A bill to authorize a program for the construction of county agricultural buildings, through assistance in planning and financing such projects in counties where agriculture is a predominant industry, thereby providing centralized housing and facilities for Federal, State, and local offices engaged in administering agricultural and related programs concerned with the welfare of the farm population; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 403. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and for the construction of a suitable building thereon for the use and accommodation of the United States post office at La Canada, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 404. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and for the construction of a suitable building thereon for the use and accommodation of the United States post office at La Crescenta, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 405. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and for the construction of a suitable building thereon for the use and accommodation of the United States post office at Tarzana, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 406. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and for the construction of a suitable building thereon for the use and accommodation of the United States post office at Sunland, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 407. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and for the construction of a suitable building thereon for the use and accommodation of the United States post office at Sierra Madre, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 408. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and for the construction of a suitable building thereon for the use and accommodation of the United States post office at Altadena, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 409. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and for the construction of a suitable building thereon for the use and accommodation of the United States post office at Roscoe, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 410. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and for the construction of a suitable building thereon for the use and accommodation of the United States post office at Pacoima, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 411. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and for the construction of a suitable building thereon for the use and accommodation of the United States post office at Montrose, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 412. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and for the construction of a suitable building thereon for the use and accommodation of the United States post office at Reseda, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 413. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and for the construction of a suitable building thereon for the use and accommodation of the United States post office at Encino, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 414. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and for the construction of a suitable building thereon for the use and accommodation of the United States post office at Sepulveda, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 415. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and for the construction of a suitable building thereon for the use and accommodation of the United States post office at Verdugo City, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 416. A bill to provide for the improvement of post-office facilities at Van Nuys, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 417. A bill to provide for the alteration, extension, and remodeling of the post-office building in Pasadena, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 418. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and for the construction of a suitable building thereon for the use and accommodation of the United States post office at Tujunga, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 419. A bill to provide for a new post office at North Hollywood, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 420. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, so as to limit the power of the Securities and Exchange Commission to regulate transactions in exempted securities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 421. A bill to exempt air carriers from statutory provisions requiring payments for compensation for customs employees overtime services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 422. A bill to repeal an act granting certain public lands situated in Mono County in the State of California, to the city of Los Angeles; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 423. A bill to extend the franking privilege to persons receiving hospital treatment furnished by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 424. A bill to exclude service performed by certain real-estate salesmen from the definition of "employment" under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 425. A bill to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide increased rates of compensation for certain veterans with specific service-incurred disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HUBER:

H. R. 426. A bill to provide pensions for disability and age for veterans of World War I, in the same amounts as now provided for veterans of the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the Boxer Rebellion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 427. A bill to establish a Columbia Valley Authority to provide for integrated water control and resource development on the Columbia River, its tributaries, and the surrounding region in the interest of the control and prevention of floods, the irrigation and reclamation of lands, the promotion of navigation, the providing of employment, the strengthening of the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 428. A bill for the relief of the State of Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 429. A bill to increase the capital stock of the Inland Waterways Corporation and to extend the service of such Corporation to the Tennessee and Cumberland Rivers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 430. A bill to promote maximum employment, business opportunities, and careers for veterans in a free competitive economy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 431. A bill to amend the income limitation governing the granting of pension to veterans and death-pension benefits to widows and children of veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 432. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to prohibit the unauthorized wearing, manufacture, or sale of medals and badges awarded by the War Department," as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 433. A bill to grant a nonquota status to certain alien veterans and their wives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 434. A bill to provide for the erection of a memorial to the four heroic chaplains who sacrificed their lives in the sinking of the steamship *Dorchester*; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 435. A bill to assist local communities in financing the construction of lowcost houses; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 436. A bill to provide a plan for greater opportunities of employment, for distribution to management and to labor certain amounts of corporate income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 437. A bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 438. A bill to provide nonquota immigration status for the alien parents of American citizens and to expedite admission of certain adopted children of American citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 439. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 440. A bill to provide for additional tax deductions from the gross income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 441. A bill to amend Public Law 368, Eightieth Congress, first session, approved August 5, 1947, so as to provide for allowances for private interment of repatriated war dead of World War II; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 442. A bill to amend section 23 of the Internal Revenue Code (26 U. S. C., sec. 23), as amended, to provide for deductions from gross income of the fair value of relief parcels sent to persons in foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 443. A bill to provide for the application and enforcement of provisions of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States and article 55 of the Charter of the United Nations and to assure the protection of citizens of the United States and other persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 444. A bill to amend the Social Security Act (49 Stat. 620) to extend coverage therein provided, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 445. A bill providing for taxation by the States and their political subdivisions of certain real properties owned by the United States of America or its agencies; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 446. A bill to amend the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 447. A bill to increase the benefits payable under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system, to liberalize the eligibility provisions of such system, to extend the coverage provisions of such system to agricultural labor, the self-employed, and, under a waiver of exemption, to employees of nonprofit institutions and, under voluntary compacts, to employees of State and local governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 448. A bill to promote interstate and foreign commerce and strengthen the national defense by providing for cargo aircraft adaptable for both commercial and military service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 449. A bill to authorize the Attorney General and his assistants and United States attorneys and their assistants to act as notaries public; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 450. A bill to name the Veterans' Administration hospital to be constructed at Erie, Pa., the Carl Louis Mango Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 451. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for United States marshals and deputy marshals of the courts of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 452. A bill to amend section 3466 of the Revised Statutes to subordinate tax claims of the United States to wage claims in State insolvency proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 453. A bill to provide that a general assignment for benefit of creditors shall not constitute an act of bankruptcy unless connected with some other act of bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 454. A bill to prohibit the registration of trade-marks containing the words "White House"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 455. A bill to provide for the admission to the United States of an additional number of aliens of Italian nationality; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 456. A bill to amend section 22, subdivision (b) paragraph (2), of subparagraph (B) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 457. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and preparation of plans and specifications for a new courthouse building for the eastern district of New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 458. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administrator and the Postmaster General to finance the construction or acquisition of post offices, in certain cases, by borrowing from local lending institutions; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 459. A bill to authorize the payment of employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry for overtime duty performed at establishments which prepare virus, serum, toxin, or analogous products for use in the treatment of domestic animals; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 460. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to reduce from 65 to 60 the qualifying age for old-age and survivors insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 461. A bill to make the Smaller War Plants Corporation a peacetime agency of the Government with power to make loans to small-business concerns and to insure loans made to such concerns by banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 462. A bill to amend the Federal old-age and survivors insurance provisions of the Social Security Act by liberalizing benefits, by increasing amounts beneficiaries may earn without loss of benefits, and by lowering the age of eligibility of women beneficiaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 463. A bill to establish a Merrimack Valley Authority to provide for unified water control and resource development on the Merrimack River and surrounding region in the interest of the control and prevention of floods, the promotion of navigation and reclamation of the public lands, the promotion of family-type farming, the development of the recreational possibilities, and the promotion of the general welfare of the area, the strengthening of the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 464. A bill to amend the act of June 20, 1936, so as to broaden the application of laws governing the inspection of steam vessels to vessels propelled by internal-combustion engines; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 465. A bill to incorporate the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 466. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide unemployment benefits for individuals who have been employees of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 467. A bill providing for the incorporation of the Franco-American War Veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 468. A bill to amend the United States Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, so as to increase the maximum and minimum monthly compensation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 469. A bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 470. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, act of February 10, 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 471. A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Foreign Service Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 472. A bill to name the Veterans' Administration facility at West Roxbury, Mass., the William P. Connery, Jr., Memorial Veterans' Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 473. A bill to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 474. A bill to provide retirement benefits for certain emergency officers of World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 475. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 476. A bill to amend the act of September 7, 1916, providing compensation for injuries to employees of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 477. A bill to amend the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944, as amended, to provide mustering-out payments for certain persons discharged or relieved from active service in the armed forces to accept employment; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 478. A bill to further amend section 3 of the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 479. A bill to provide pensions for disabled veterans of World War I under similar conditions, and in the same amounts, as now provided for disabled veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 480. A bill to provide pensions for disability and age under Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a), part III, in the same amounts as now provided for veterans of the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the Boxer Rebellion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 481. A bill to amend the Hatch Act; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 482. A bill to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 483. A bill to extend the time limit within which certain suits in admiralty may be brought against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 484. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and preparation of plans and specifications for a new postal building, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 485. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at North Andover, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 486. A bill to establish a self-sustaining national pension system that will benefit retired citizens 60 years of age and over, to stabilize the economic structure of the Nation; and to induce a more equitable distribution of wealth through monetary circulation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 487. A bill to provide for the construction of a Veterans' Administration office building in Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 488. A bill to credit to active and retired officers of the Medical Department of the Army all service performed as interns in Army hospitals on a civilian-employee status; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 489. A bill to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to facilitate sustained progress in the attainment of such objective and to provide for the coordinated execution of such policy through a National Housing Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 490. A bill to impose a duty of 2 cents per pound on patna rice cleaned for use in the manufacture of canned soups and for other purposes, rice meal, and broken rice; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 491. A bill making an emergency authorization and appropriation for the purpose of erecting in Lake Charles, La., a post office and courthouse building; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 492. A bill to amend section 421 of the Internal Revenue Code relating to income taxes of members of the armed forces dying in service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 493. A bill to make section 112 (b) (7) of the Internal Revenue Code applicable with respect to certain corporate liquidations in 1945; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 494. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to provide that the absorption of exchange and collection charges shall not be deemed the payment of interest on deposits; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 495. A bill to authorize the acquisition of a site for a national cemetery in southwest Louisiana for the burial of members of the armed forces of the United States dying in the service, of former members whose last discharge therefrom was honorable, and certain other persons as provided for in the United States Code, title 24, section 351, as amended; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 496. A bill to provide for the erection of a World War II memorial; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 497. A bill to extend the time for filing certain applications for insurance payments under the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 498. A bill to provide free mailing privileges for war-veteran patients in United States veterans' hospitals; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 499. A bill to extend the educational benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to persons who served in the merchant marine of the United States during World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 500. A bill to provide that veterans pursuing educational and training courses in public institutions shall receive the books, supplies, and other equipment they would receive if they pursued similar courses in private institutions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 501. A bill to provide that certain persons who served in the merchant marine shall not be liable for induction into the armed services under the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 502. A bill to amend section 22 (b) (2) (B) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 503. A bill granting pensions to veterans of World War I and World War II who are 55 years of age or over; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 504. A bill to provide for the reduction of the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 505. A bill for the erection of a public building at Lake City, S. C., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 506. A bill for the erection of a public building at Loris, S. C., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 507. A bill for the erection of a public building at Timmonsville, S. C., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 508. A bill to grant service pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 509. A bill for the erection of a public building at Myrtle Beach, S. C., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 510. A bill for the erection of a public building at Florence, S. C., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 511. A bill for the erection of a public building at Andrews, S. C., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 512. A bill for the erection of a public building at Latta, S. C., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 513. A bill for the purpose of enlarging the post office at Hartsville, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 514. A bill to check inflation and aid in preserving a competitive economic system by requiring publicity on the pricing policies of certain large corporations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 515. A bill to establish a system of longevity pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 516. A bill to define partnerships and partners for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 517. A bill to repeal certain excise-tax rates on watches and clocks and cases and movements therefor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 518. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of February 18, 1922, so as to transfer from the Secretary of Agriculture to the Attorney General jurisdiction for determination of undue enhancement of prices by cooperative associations monopolizing or restraining trade and proceedings in connection therewith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 519. A bill to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 520. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 521. A bill to provide for the deduction from gross income for income-tax purposes of expenses incurred by farmers for the purpose of soil and water conservation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 522. A bill granting exemption from income tax in the case of retirement, annuities, and pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 523. A bill to exempt from income tax compensation and pensions paid by the United States to its employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NIXON:

H. R. 524. A bill to provide for the release of all the right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain portion of a tract of land conditionally granted by it to the county of Los Angeles; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 525. A bill to establish a national housing policy and provide for its execution; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 526. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1948, approved July 3, 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PERCY:

H. R. 527. A bill to exempt from admissions tax admissions to concerts conducted by civic and community membership associations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 528. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the East Side Levee and Sanitary District of Madison County and St. Clair County, Ill., for run-off and water-flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 529. A bill to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 530. A bill to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads, and to protect the public by requiring certain common carriers by railroad to install and maintain communication systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 531. A bill to incorporate the Army and Navy Union; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 532. A bill to extend to June 30, 1950, the time within which the unexpended balances of certain appropriations made for the purpose of assisting the States in making advance provision for construction of public works shall be available for such purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 533. A bill to exempt from estate tax national service life insurance and United States Government life insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 534. A bill to exempt from admissions tax general admissions to agricultural fairs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 535. A bill to exempt from estate tax national service life insurance and United States Government life insurance in certain cases; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 536. A bill to extend the coverage of the old-age and survivors insurance system, to increase certain benefits payable under such system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 537. A bill to extend capital gains treatment to certain distributions under employees trusts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 538. A bill to provide for the deduction from gross income for income-tax purposes of expenses incurred by farmers for the purpose of soil and water conservation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 539. A bill to extend the franking privilege to persons receiving hospital treatment or domiciliary care furnished by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 540. A bill to provide terminal leave pay for certain officers of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 541. A bill to authorize payment of benefits for injuries or death incurred by veterans as a result of training under part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 542. A bill to provide for the uniform administration of efficiency ratings; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 543. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt annuity payments under such act from taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 544. A bill to provide for terms of court to be held at West Palm Beach, and at Fort Myers, in the southern district of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 545. A bill to authorize and request the President to undertake to mobilize at some convenient place in the United States an adequate number of the world's outstanding experts, and coordinate and utilize their services in a supreme endeavor to discover means of curing and preventing cancer; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 546. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, so as to provide a minimum wage of 61 an hour; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 547. A bill to amend section 8 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended, to provide that the name of a veteran eligible is selected from and certification of eligibles by the Civil Service Commission; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 548. A bill to grant free postage to members of the armed forces who have been inducted into the service under the provisions of the Selective Service Act of 1948 (Public Law No. 759, 80th Cong.); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 549. A bill to provide for a research and development program in the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 550. A bill to provide nonquota immigration status for certain adopted children of American citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 551. A bill providing direct Federal old-age assistance at the rate of $60 per month to needy citizens 60 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 552. A bill to provide for the payment of a death gratuity to the dependents of officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army who died between October 5, 1917, and December 18, 1919; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.:

H. R. 553. A bill to authorize the construction of a research laboratory for the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, at or in the vicinity of Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 554. A bill to provide for the construction, extension, and improvement of school buildings in Hoopa, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 555. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, Northern Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons for reimbursement for damages and losses sustained as a result of a flood which occurred in December 1937 in levee district No. 10, Yuba County, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 556. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 with respect to the eligibility for benefits of certain employees on furlough on the date of enactment of such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 557. A bill to amend the sporting goods' section of the Internal Revenue Code to exempt children's sleds from the manufacturers' excise tax of 10 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 558. A bill to repeal the excise tax on electric, gas, and oil ranges; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 559. A bill for the relief of the city of Needles, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. R. 560. A bill relating to the extension to transferors and transferees in nontaxable reorganization of unused excess-profits credit carry-overs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 561. A bill to provide for the temporary free importation of zinc; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 562. A bill to amend section 801 (d) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, in relation to exports; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 563. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide certain exclusions from gross income with respect to the pay of military personnel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 564. A bill to extend disability and death benefits to personnel of the Reserve components of the armed services while on active duty or in training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 565. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims of military personnel and civilian employees of the War Department or of the Army for damage to or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of personal property occurring incident to their service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 566. A bill to aid in preventing shortages of petroleum and petroleum products in the United States by promoting the production of synthetic liquid fuels; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 567. A bill to provide that pensions shall be extended to the widows and children of deceased World War II veterans on the same conditions as they are now extended to the widows and children of deceased World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 568. A bill to provide for payments to the States with respect to certain lands of the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 569. A bill to promote the general welfare through the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in providing more effective programs of public education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. R. 570. A bill to provide for an Air Force capable of preserving and maintaining peace, the security of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Res. 1. Resolution electing various officers of the House of Representatives.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. Res. 2. Resolution to inform the Senate of the election of SAM RAYBURN as Speaker of the House and Ralph R. Roberts as Clerk.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. Res. 3. Resolution appointing a committee of three to notify the President the House is ready for business.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. Res. 4. Resolution instructing the Clerk to notify the President of the election of SAM RAYBURN as Speaker and Ralph R. Roberts as Clerk.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. Res. 5. Resolution adopting the rules of the Eightieth Congress as the rules of the Eighty-first Congress, with an amendment.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 6. Resolution employing a secretary for the minority leader of the House.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. Res. 7. Resolution fixing the daily hour of meeting of the House of Representatives.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. Res. 8. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Appropriations and its subcommittees to sit during sessions and recesses of the Eighty-first Congress.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. Res. 9. Resolution for a survey of the San Francisco Bay; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. Res. 10. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as a whole or by subcommittee, to investigate the effect of cartels on commerce with foreign nations and among the several States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BIEMILLER:

H. Res. 11. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the conduct of investigations and studies by committees of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CARROLL:

H. Res. 12. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the conduct of investigations and studies by committees of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 13. Resolution to erect a monument to the memory of Mohandas K. Gandhi; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. Res. 14. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the conduct of investigations and studies by committees of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. Res. 15. Resolution to create a select committee to conduct a continuing study with respect to executive agreements made by the United States with foreign nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. Res. 16. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the conduct of investigations and studies by the committees of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. Res. 17. Resolution to amend rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. Res. 18. Resolution to amend rule XI (2) (e) 1 of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. Res. 19. Resolution to create a Select Committee on the Revision of the Laws; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Res. 20. Resolution authorizing the House Committee on the Judiciary to investigate the decree of the United States District Court for the District of Maryland in re James B. Dunn; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. Res. 21. Resolution to increase personal income-tax exemptions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 22. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study and investigation of the problems of small business; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. Res. 23. Resolution for the relief of Beatrice Kelley; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Res. 24. Resolution providing for the expenses incurred by the special committee authorized by House Resolution 20; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. J. Res. 1. Joint resolution to amend the act to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. J. Res. 2. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. J. Res. 3. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to jurisdiction of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. J. Res. 4. Joint resolution requiring that notice be sent to the Members when the President convenes the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. J. Res. 5. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. J. Res. 6. Joint resolution authorizing the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor to report periodically on labor conditions in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. J. Res. 7. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation for construction of buildings and facilities in or near the University of Alaska for research in Arctic health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. J. Res. 8. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of Dr. William Crawford Gorgas, of Alabama, who achieved national distinction in the field of preventive medicine by conquering yellow fever, thus making possible the building of the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. J. Res. 9. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to redefine treason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. J. Res. 10. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. J. Res. 11. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. J. Res. 12. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to fix the number of Justices of the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEBERT:

H. J. Res. 13. Joint resolution extending to January 1, 1950, certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. J. Res. 14. Joint resolution providing for membership by the United States in the International Trade Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. J. Res. 15. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H. J. Res. 17. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance for public use of certain highways in the Shenandoah National Park; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HUBER:

H. J. Res. 18. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the abolition of capital punishment in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 19. Joint resolution creating a Joint Committee on Civil Rights; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. J. Res. 20. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on National and International Movements; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. J. Res. 21. Joint resolution to provide for the utilization of a part of the unfinished portion of the historical frieze in the rotunda of the Capitol to portray the story of aviation; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. J. Res. 22. Joint resolution to establish a joint congressional committee on aviation policy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. J. Res. 23. Joint resolution designating November 19, the anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, as Dedication Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLEY:

H. J. Res. 24. Joint resolution to create a Temporary Labor Relations Commission to make a study and recommendations concerning labor relations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. J. Res. 25. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of a permanent memorial to the memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. J. Res. 26. Joint resolution proposing an equal-rights amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. J. Res. 27. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to removal of judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 28. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the eligibility of foreign-born citizens of the United States to the office of President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. J. Res. 29. Joint resolution designating the fourth Sunday in September of each year as "Interfaith Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 30. Joint resolution to suspend the operation of section 403 (e) of the Nationality Act of 1940 in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. J. Res. 31. Joint resolution to grant free postage to members of the armed forces, while confined for treatment in a military or naval hospital, and to veterans while being furnished hospital treatment or institutional care in institutions operated by or under contract with the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LAROCHE:

H. J. Res. 32. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the term of office of Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. J. Res. 33. Joint resolution providing for the ratification by Congress of a contract for the purchase of certain Indian lands by the United States from the Three Affiliated Tribes of Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak., and for other related purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. J. Res. 34. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1949, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of

Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. J. Res. 35. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the Grand Army of the Republic; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. J. Res. 36. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to treaty ratification; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. J. Res. 37. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIXON:

H. J. Res. 38. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. J. Res. 39. Joint resolution to authorize a sum, not to exceed $80,000,000, to provide adequate protection from flooding of the Minnesota River in the Minnesota River Valley; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. J. Res. 40. Joint resolution designating the fourth Sunday in September of each year as "Interfaith Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILLIPS of California:

H. J. Res. 41. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. J. Res. 42. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to a quorum in either House of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. J. Res. 43. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President to the people of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. J. Res. 44. Joint resolution granting additional allowance for military and naval personnel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. J. Res. 45. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of the thirtieth anniversary of the founding of the American Legion in April 1949; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. J. Res. 46. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11, 1949, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. J. Res. 47. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1949, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. J. Res. 48. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the selection of the successors of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress who become unable to perform their duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. J. Res. 49. Joint resolution proposing an amendment the the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President and the Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. J. Res. 50. Joint resolution proposing an equal-rights amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 51. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committion on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. J. Res. 52. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. J. Res. 53. Joint resolution approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof; expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the negotiation of certain treaties; providing for making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. J. Res. 54. Joint resolution relating to emergency crop, seed, and feed loans and to regional agricultural credit corporation loans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. J. Res. 55. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. J. Res. 56. Joint resolution to designate payments to disabled veterans as partial repayment of debt owed, and not as gratuities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. J. Res. 57. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. J. Res. 58. Joint resolution requesting the President to designate December 7 for annual observance as Gold Star Mothers' Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. J. Res. 59. Joint resolution to provide for the American Joint Commission to assist in the unification of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. Con. Res. 1. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress on January 5, 1949.

H. Con. Res. 2. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress on January 6, 1949, pursuant to the requirements of the Constitution and laws relating to the election of President and Vice President of the United States.

H. Con. Res. 3. Concurrent resolution relative to reform in procedure before congressional committees; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. Con. Res. 4. Concurrent resolution to establish fair hearing procedures for congressional investigating committees; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Con. Res. 5. Concurrent resolution recommending the revision of the United Nations Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. Con. Res. 6. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress that the national interest demands that immediate and effective aid should be given the Republic of China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution providing for a 70-group Air Force and insuring air supremacy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. Con. Res. 8. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that the issues raised by the action of the Government of Hungary in arresting and imprisoning Josef Cardinal Mindszenty should be referred to the United Nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that the issues raised by the action of the Government of Yugoslavia in imprisoning Archbishop Aloysius Stepinac should be referred to the United Nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 571. A bill for the relief of Bankers & Shippers Insurance Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 572. A bill for the relief of Sylvia M. Misetich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 573. A bill for the relief of Harry O. Cole; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 574. A bill for the relief of Fred E. Weber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 575. A bill for the relief of the estate of James Patrick Hackett and Charles Stover; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 576. A bill for the relief of Arthur O. Robinson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 577. A bill to correct possible inequity in the case of a certain application for letters patent of William R. Blair; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARDEN:

H. R. 578. A bill for the relief of Carlton C. Grant and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 579. A bill to permit the motor vessel *FLB-5005* to engage in the fisheries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 580. A bill for the relief of the Bank of Kodiak, Kodiak, Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 581. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court for the Territory of Alaska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim, or claims, of Hilda Links and E. J. Ohman, partners, and Fred L. Kroesing, all of Anchorage, Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 582. A bill for the relief of John Picco, of Kimshan Cove, Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 583. A bill for the relief of the Alaska Juneau Gold Mining Co., of Juneau, Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 584. A bill for the relief of Mike Clipper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 585. A bill for the relief of Jacob A. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 586. A bill for the relief of Mildred K. Maynard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 587. A bill for the relief of Dick Walcok and Alfred L. Woods; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 588. A bill for the relief of Col. David R. Wolverton, United States Army, retired; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 589. A bill for the relief of C. M. Smart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 590. A bill for the relief of William A. Hallett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 591. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lucille Davidson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 592. A bill for the relief of James W. Keith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 593. A bill for the relief of Hampton Institute; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 594. A bill for the relief of Mamie L. Hurley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 595. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Harry W. Sharpley, his heirs, administrators, or assigns, against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 596. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of John E. Parker, his heirs, administrators, or assigns, against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 597. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of J. T. Melson against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 598. A bill to provide for the readmission to citizenship of Mrs. Ruth Obre Dubonnet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio:

H. R. 599. A bill for the relief of Victor R. Browning & Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 600. A bill for the relief of Dorothy J. Souther; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:

H. R. 601. A bill for the relief of Kenelm E. Rucker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 602. A bill for the relief of Fritz Busche; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 603. A bill for the relief of Jeptha R. MacFarlane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 604. A bill for the relief of Vartan Chamsarian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 605. A bill for the relief of the estate of James B. Stirling, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 606. A bill for the relief of Allen Pope, his heirs or personal representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 607. A bill for the relief of Harvey M. Lifset, formerly a major in the Army of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY of New York:

H. R. 608. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Devine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 609. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mathew C. Cowley, deceased, and the estate of Louisa Cowley, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 610. A bill for the relief of Lorenzo H. Froman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 611. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of certain property owners adjacent to Fort Knox, Ky.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 612. A bill for the relief of Col. W. M. Chubb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 613. A bill for the relief of the alien Gheorge Ion Dimian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 614. A bill for the relief of Nicholas G. Niedermiller, Peter A. Beklemishev, and Nicholas M. Tikmenev; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. R. 615. A bill for the relief of the Dixie Margarine Co., a Tennessee corporation, of Memphis, Tenn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 616. A bill for the relief of W. T. Martin Luckett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 617. A bill for the relief of Mid-South Airways Corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 618. A bill for the relief of Eugene J. Bearman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 619. A bill for the relief of Alice Randolph; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 620. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mary B. Buckley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 621. A bill for the relief of A. T. Steele and J. C. Corbitt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H. R. 622. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tjitske Bandstra Van Der Velde; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. R. 623. A bill for the relief of Sadako Takagi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 624. A bill to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of alien Man Hee Fong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 625. A bill for the relief of Edmondo Deli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 626. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Deli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELSTON:

H. R. 627. A bill for the relief of Southern Fireproofing Co., of Cincinnati, Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 628. A bill for the relief of Edward J. Emmerling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 629. A bill for the relief of O'Connell & Sweeney, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 630. A bill for the relief of Wright H. Huntley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 631. A bill for relief of Mrs. Dorothy Vicencio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 632. A bill for the relief of John E. Burns; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 633. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Victor V. Greg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 634. A bill for the relief of George J. Hiner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 635. A bill for the relief of Stephen L. Carmalt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 636. A bill for the relief of B. G. Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 637. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Harriett Patterson Rogers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 638. A bill for the relief of Lt. Comdr. John W. Baker, Medical Corps, United States Navy, retired; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 639. A bill for the relief of certain employees of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 640. A bill for the relief of Bianca Marie Bertolotti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 641. A bill for the relief of George Kedzierski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 642. A bill for the relief of Frank D. Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 643. A bill for the relief of the aliens Harry Owen White and his sister-in-law, Cecilia M. B. de Silva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 644. A bill for the relief of Marino Bello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 645. A bill for the relief of Arundale Vrabec; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 646. A bill to provide for the admission to citizenship of Arundale Vrabec; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 647. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Renzie Graham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 648. A bill for the relief of Bertha Ebersbach; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 649. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alice N. Korma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. R. 650. A bill for the relief of George A. Kirchberger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 651. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Paul E. Queneau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 652. A bill for the relief of Laura Spinnichia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 653. A bill for the relief of Antonio Valenti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 654. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Hawaiian Airlines, Ltd.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 655. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria V. Yosko and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 656. A bill for the relief of the Peerless Oil Co., of Brooklyn, N. Y.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 657. A bill for the relief of Paul Bernstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 658. A bill for the relief of Paul Rintrens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 659. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elisabeth B. Murphy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 660. A bill for the relief of Julia Busch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 661. A bill for the relief of Thomas A. Trulove, postmaster, and Nolen J. Salyards, assistant postmaster, at Inglewood, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 662. A bill for the relief of Ella Spielman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 663. A bill for the relief of George Geiger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 664. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alfonsina M. Corradini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 665. A bill for the relief of Marie and Max Cassran; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 666. A bill for the relief of Antonio Sorotas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 667. A bill for the relief of Benedict Kleitsch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 668. A bill for the relief of Alex Bail; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 669. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Shirley Leinwand; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 670. A bill for the relief of Ricardo Garcia y Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 671. A bill for the relief of Leonid Zankowsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 672. A bill for the relief of Gronislav Vydaevich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 673. A bill for the relief of Alberta Manna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 674. A bill for the relief of Aron Rosendor, Sara Rosendor, Batia Rosendor, Sammy Rosendor, and Suzanne Rosendor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 675. A bill for the relief of Nandor Frieder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 676. A bill for the relief of Beno Demenyi and Margit Demenyi, his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 677. A bill for the relief of Nicoletta and Guilia Pontrelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 678. A bill for the relief of Nicolo Locicero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 679. A bill to authorize the admission of Mrs. Julia Balint to the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 680. A bill to provide for the adjudication of certain tort claims of William P. Novotny, Sr., and others against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 681. A bill for the relief of Mario Generazzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 682. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Harry E. Hewitt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 683. A bill for the relief of Louise Peters Lewis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 684. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Gordon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 685. A bill for the relief of Vincent or Vincenzo Tripoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 686. A bill granting the Distinguished Service Cross to William A. Sullivan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 687. A bill for the relief of Bartolo Rando; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 688. A bill for the relief of John P. Reilly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 689. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Mortatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 690. A bill for the relief of William W. Maddox; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 691. A bill for the relief of Lawrence Fontenot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 692. A bill for the relief of Joseph Thompson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 693. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award a special Congressional Medal of Honor to Gen. Dwight David Eisenhower, United States Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 694. A bill for the relief of George H. Allen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 695. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary A. Bailey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 696. A bill to provide for the extension of Patent No. 1,808,654, issued June 2, 1931, relating to poison or powder distributing machines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 697. A bill for the relief of Samuel W. Peorvu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 698. A bill for the relief of Peter I. Tirbak, Ekaterina Tirbak, and Igor Tirbak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 699. A bill for the relief of Zikmund Teba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 700. A bill for the relief of Egon Newman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 701. A bill for the relief of Dolan Calcutt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 702. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ethel N. Plunkett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 703. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Mrs. Oteein Foxworth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 704. A bill for the relief of Mary Alice Keels; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 705. A bill for the relief of Thomas W. Williamson, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 706. A bill to provide for the retirement with pay of Lt. Comdr. Harold Kaminski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 707. A bill for the relief of H. C. Biering; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 708. A bill for the relief of Rustom Bana, Adi Russie Bana, Nasli Russi Bana, and Narie Russi Bana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 709. A bill for the relief of the General Engineering & Dry Dock Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 710. A bill for the relief of C. T. Maddrix; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 711. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Gregg Dilnot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 712. A bill for the relief of Calvin D. Lynch & Son; W. Thomas Lockerman; Sudlersville Supply Co.; George C. Moore and H. A. Moore; J. McKenny Willis & Son, Inc.; Hobbs & Jarman; Royse R. Spring; and C. S. Thomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 713. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of W. C. Jackson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 714. A bill for the relief of Pieter Cornelis ten Wolde and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIXON:

H. R. 715. A bill for the relief of Manuel Uribe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 716. A bill for the relief of Mark H. Potter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 717. A bill for the relief of Groover O'Connell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 718. A bill for the relief of Gertrude O. Yerxa, Mrs. G. Olive Yerxa, and Dr. Charles W. Yerxa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. R. 719. A bill for the relief of Urho Paavo Patokoski, his wife, and their three children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 720. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios Ioanou Golias, also known as James John Golias, also known as Demetrios Joana Golias, also known as Demetrios John Golias, also known as Demetrics Golias, also known as Lampros Lampropoulos or Lambros Lampropoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 721. A bill for the relief of Mihran Moses Koeroghlian, also known as M. M. Koeroghlian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 722. A bill for the relief of Nagibe Chalhoub; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 723. A bill for the relief of Clarence King; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 724. A bill for the relief of Tanios Elias Rahme; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 725. A bill for the relief of Mike A. Tsataronis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 726. A bill for the relief of Simon Broder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 727. A bill to authorize the President of the United States to posthumously award the Congressional Medal of Honor to Marc C. Dauber; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 728. A bill for the relief of Oliver P. LaTour and Marie L. LaTour; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 729. A bill for the relief of John J. O'Neil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 730. A bill for the relief of Franz Eugene Laub; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 731. A bill for the relief of James Flynn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 732. A bill for the relief of Joaquin Faustino Justaniano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILLIPS of California:

H. R. 733. A bill for the relief of Frank Haegele; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PICKETT:

H. R. 734. A bill for the relief of Curtis R. Enos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. R. 735. A bill for the relief of Phil H. Hubbard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 736. A bill authorizing the appointment and retirement of John Tomlinson as a second lieutenant, United States Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 737. A bill for the relief of Sam Patterson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 738. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Minerva C. Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 739. A bill for the relief of Mary Jane Harris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 740. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Martha W. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 741. A bill for the relief of Frank Healy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 742. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eleanor K. Savidge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 743. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret D. Surhan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 744. A bill for the relief of William Park Catchpole; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 745. A bill for the relief of B. John Hanson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 746. A bill for the relief of August Michela, infant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 747. A bill for the relief of Gaspare Vallone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 748. A bill for the relief of Louis Esposito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 749. A bill for the relief of Morris Giannace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 750. A bill for the relief of Leo F. Bertuccioli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 751. A bill for the relief of Stanley John Rybczyk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 752. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Edward Gray, Sr.; Edward Gray, Jr.; Bertha Mae Gray; Bertha Patmon; and Lindsay Gardner, all of the city of Hamtramck, Wayne County, Mich.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 753. A bill for the relief of Alexander Polychroniu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 754. A bill for the relief of Michael Pirog; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 755. A bill for the relief of George Ely Vasu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 756. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo or James Bologna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 757. A bill for the relief of Orlando Portale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 758. A bill for the relief of Georgios Ecaterinis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARDIE SCOTT:

H. R. 759. A bill for the relief of Antonio Cardella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 760. A bill for the relief of A. I. Lang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 761. A bill for the relief of Catherine S. Tremayne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 762. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Franciska V. C. Bugel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 763. A bill for the relief of Angela Siradakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 764. A bill for the relief of Elderina Janna Pols; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 765. A bill for the relief of the California-Pacific Utilities Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. R. 766. A bill for the relief of John F. Galvin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 767. A bill for the relief of Eugene Spitzer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 768. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Tsan Paing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 769. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Emanuel Frangescos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 770. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Mon Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 771. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Paul Hettasch; his wife, Ellen Marie Hettasch; and their daughter, Katie Ellen Margarete Hettasch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 772. A bill for the relief of Michele Francesco Fasolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 773. A bill for the relief of Engelbert Axer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 774. A bill granting a renewal of patent No. 92187 relating to the badge of the Sons of the American Legion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 775. A bill granting a renewal of patent No. 54296 relating to the badge of the American Legion; by extending Public Law 200, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 2, 1935; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 776. A bill granting a renewal of patent No. 55398 relating to the badge of the American Legion Auxiliary, extending Public Law 231, Seventy-fourth Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 5, 1949

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in Heaven, give us the long view of our work and our world.

Help us to see that it is better to fail in a cause that will ultimately succeed than to succeed in a cause that will ultimately fail.

Guide us how to work and then teach us how to wait. O Lord, we pray in the name of Jesus, who was never in a hurry. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HAYDEN, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 3, 1949, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that a quorum of the House of Representatives had assembled, that SAM RAYBURN, a Representative from the State of Texas, had been elected Speaker; and Ralph R. Roberts, a citizen of the State of Indiana, had been elected Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Eighty-first Congress.

The message also informed the Senate that a committee of three Members had been appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join with a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House had assembled, and that Congress was ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The message announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 1. Concurrent resolution providing that the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Wednesday, the 5th day of January 1949, at 1 o'clock p. m., for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them; and

H. Con. Res. 2. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress on January 6, 1949, pursuant to the requirements of the Constitution and laws relating to the election of President and Vice President of the United States.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HAYDEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Capehart	Flanders
Anderson	Chapman	Frear
Baldwin	Connally	Fulbright
Barkley	Cordon	George
Brewster	Donnell	Gillette
Bricker	Douglas	Green
Bridges	Downey	Gurney
Broughton	Eastland	Hayden
Butler	Ecton	Hendrickson
Byrd	Ellender	Hickenlooper
Cain	Ferguson	Hill
Hoey	McClellan	Saltonstall
Holland	McFarland	Schoeppel
Humphrey	McGrath	Smith, Maine
Hunt	McKellar	Smith, N. J.
Ives	McMahon	Sparkman
Jenner	Malone	Stennis
Johnson, Colo.	Martin	Taft
Johnson, Tex.	Maybank	Taylor
Johnston, S. C.	Miller	Thomas, Okla.
Kefauver	Millikin	Thomas, Utah
Kem	Morse	Thye
Kerr	Mundt	Tobey
Kilgore	Murray	Tydings
Knowland	Myers	Vandenberg
Langer	Neely	Watkins
Lodge	O'Mahoney	Wherry
Long	Pepper	Wiley
Lucas	Reed	Williams
McCarran	Robertson	Young
McCarthy	Russell	

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I regret to announce the death of the mother of our colleague, the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR]. The Senator from Maryland is, therefore, necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are also necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. WHERRY advanced to the center of the aisle, and Mr. BARKLEY said:

Mr. President, the committee on the part of the Senate appointed by the President pro tempore to act in conjunction with a similar committee on the part of the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the Congress has assembled and is ready to receive any communication he might be pleased to make to it, report that they have performed that duty and the President has indicated that he will address the two Houses of Congress in person today at 1 o'clock p. m.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a concurrent resolution coming over from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 1) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Wednesday, the 5th day of January 1949, at 1 o'clock p. m., for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I wish to announce that immediately upon the conclusion of the delivery of the President's message today the Senate will reassemble in order to give Senators an opportunity to introduce bills and resolutions as in the ordinary morning hour of business.

THE COUNT OF ELECTORAL VOTES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a concurrent resolution coming over from the

House of Representatives, which will be read.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 2) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall meet in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Thursday, the 6th day of January 1949, at 1 o'clock p. m., pursuant to the requirements of the Constitution and laws relating to the election of President and Vice President of the United States, and the President pro tempore of the Senate shall be their presiding officer; that two tellers shall be previously appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate on the part of the Senate and two by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives, to whom shall be handed, as they are opened by the President pro tempore of the Senate, all certificates and papers purporting to be certificates of the electoral votes, which certificates and papers shall be opened, presented, and acted upon in the alphabetical order of the States, beginning with the letter A; and said tellers, having then read the same in the presence and hearing of the two Houses, shall make a list of the votes as they shall appear from the said certificates; and the votes having been ascertained and counted in the manner and according to the rules by law provided, the result of the same shall be delivered to the President pro tempore of the Senate, who shall thereupon announce the state of the vote, which announcement shall be deemed a sufficient declaration of the persons, if any, elected President and Vice President of the United States, and, together with a list of the votes, be entered on the Journals of the two Houses.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under authority of House Concurrent Resolution 2, the Chair appoints the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] as the tellers on the part of the Senate to count the electoral votes for President and Vice President at the joint session of the two Houses on tomorrow.

REPORT ON LEND-LEASE OPERATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the twenty-sixth report of operations under the Lend-Lease Act.

The attached "Report on Lend-Lease Fiscal Operations" was prepared by the Treasury Department and submitted to the Secretary of State in accordance with Executive Order No. 9726. The period covered is from March 11, 1941, through September 30, 1947.

Activities to complete fulfillment of the various "pipe line" agreements have continued since the issuance of the twenty-fifth report.

A final settlement agreement was signed with Norway on February 24, 1948. In March Haiti paid the balance due on its account. An arrangement was concluded with Brazil on April 15, 1948, fixing the terms of payment of the amount due under the original master agreement with Brazil.

As stated in chapter 4 of the Twenty-Third Lend-Lease Report, one of the important remaining lend-lease functions is the collection of payments due under various international agreements. Some of these agreements involve matters other than lend-lease, such as surplus property and claims. Recent payments arising out of agreements covering lend-lease, and in some cases other matters as well, are shown in the following list:

Brazil: $5,000,000 principal paid on July 15, 1948; installment on its remaining lend-lease obligations.

France: $13,000,000 interest paid in francs on July 1, 1948, under Settlement Agreement dated May 28, 1946.

Iran: $711,753.40 paid on April 29 and $711,753.40 on July 15, 1948, principal under Settlement Agreement dated December 21, 1945.

Netherlands: $960,000 interest paid in dollars on June 30, 1948, under Settlement Agreement dated May 28, 1947.

United Kingdom: $76,617.50 paid on March 31, $262,112.50 on April 30, $403,250 on May 28, and $403,250 on June 15, 1948 (paid in pounds), principal under Settlement Agreement dated December 6, 1945.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 15, 1948.*

REPORT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the first report of the Economic Cooperation Administration created by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, Public Law 472 of the Eightieth Congress, approved April 3, 1948.

This report is for the period April 3 to June 30, 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 4, 1948.*

SUPPLEMENT TO FIRST REPORT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States which, with the accompanying supplement, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the Supplement to the First Report to Congress of the Economic Cooperation Administration created by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, Public Law 472 of the Eightieth Congress, approved April 3, 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 21, 1948.*

REPORT ON ASSISTANCE TO GREECE AND TURKEY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Transmitted herewith in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 75 (80th Cong., 1st sess., 61 Stat. 103) is the fourth quarterly report of expenditures and activities in conjunction with the program for aid to Greece and Turkey.

This legislation was enacted at a critical juncture in the history of the struggle for peace, involving the right of small nations to self-determination of their future. The conspicuous success of this program in enabling the people of Greece to meet the military and economic crisis which confronted them, and in supporting the Turkish determination to remain independent in the face of external pressure, has contributed significantly toward stabilizing this strategic area of the world in the interest of world peace.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 4, 1948.*

REPORT ON MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO GREECE AND TURKEY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Transmitted herewith is the fifth quarterly report—covering the first quarter of the fiscal year 1949—on United States military assistance to Greece and Turkey. Military aid to Greece and Turkey was inaugurated under the authority of Public Law 75, Eightieth Congress, and was continued under the authority of title III of Public Law 472, Eightieth Congress, known as the Greek-Turkish Assistance Act of 1948. Responsibility for United States assistance in the economic rehabilitation of Greece begun under Public Law 75 was, pursuant to Public Law 472, title I, transferred effective July 1, 1948, to the Economic Cooperation Administration, and results are reported to the Congress under that title.

The encouraging prospect for substantial elimination of the Greek guerrilla forces which existed at the time of the victory of the Greek National Army in the Grammos Mountains and which was referred to in the report for the period ending June 30, 1948, has unfortunately not materialized. A military stalemate has ensued which has prolonged the struggle. The United States is, of course, through the American Mission for Aid to Greece, continuing to deliver to the Greeks necessary military supplies and equipment and to advise and assist the Greek armed forces, in accordance with the assistance act.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 6, 1948.*

REPORTS ON UNITED STATES FOREIGN RELIEF PROGRAM

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following messages

from the President of the United States which, with the accompanying reports, were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the third quarterly report of expenditures and activities under the United States foreign-relief program authorized by Public Law 84 of the Eightieth Congress, approved May 31, 1947, to provide relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war. This report covers the quarter ending March 31, 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 1, 1948.*

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the fourth quarterly report of expenditures and activities under the United States foreign-relief program, authorized by Public Law 84 of the Eightieth Congress, approved May 31, 1947.

This report covers the period from April 1, 1948, through June 30, 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 4, 1948.*

REPORT ON UNITED STATES FOREIGN-AID PROGRAM

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the third quarterly report of expenditures and activities under the United States Foreign Aid Program authorized by Public Law 389 of the Eightieth Congress, approved December 17, 1947.

This report covers the period from April 1 through June 30, 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 8, 1948.*

REPORTS ON EXPENDITURES AND OPERATIONS UNDER THE UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following messages from the President of the United States which, with the accompanying reports, were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the thirteenth quarterly report of expenditures and operations under the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration Joint Resolution, Public Law 267, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved March 28, 1944. This report covers the period from July 1, 1947, through September 30, 1947.

As a consequence of the substantial closure of UNRRA's activities on June 30, 1947, the present report is limited primarily to a statement of the status of United States appropriations as of September 30, 1947.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 13, 1948.*

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the fourteenth quarterly report of expenditures and operations under the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration Joint Resolution, Public Law 267, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved March 28, 1944. This report covers the period from October 1, 1947, through December 31, 1947.

As a consequence of the substantial closure of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration's activities on June 30, 1947, the present report is limited to a statement of the status of United States appropriations as of December 31, 1947.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 13, 1948.*

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the fifteenth quarterly report of expenditures and operations under the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration Joint Resolution, Public Law 267, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved March 28, 1944. This report covers the period from January 1, 1948, through March 31, 1948.

As a consequence of the substantial closure of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration's activities on June 30, 1947, the present report is limited to a statement of the status of United States appropriations as of March 31, 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 13, 1948.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred, as indicated:

REPORT OF FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the operations of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, for the year 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORTS ON CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

Two letters from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, United States and Mexico, for the months of July and August, 1948 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Two letters from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, United States and Mexico, for the months of June and September, 1948 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Farm Credit Administration covering its operations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION (S. Doc. No. 2)

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, president, National Forest Reservation Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Commission for the fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

REPORT ON CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of October 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATIONS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering the receipts, expenditures, and work of the agricultural experiment stations, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON REGIONAL RESEARCH LABORATORIES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the activities of, funds used by, and donations to, the regional research laboratories (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the operation of the agricultural conservation program, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, his first annual report, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON CONTRACTS FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AND INDUSTRIAL MOBILIZATION BY THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report listing the contracts for research and development and industrial mobilization awarded by the Departments of the National Military Establishment, for the period May 19 through June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON POSITIONS ESTABLISHED IN NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the number of positions established in the National Military Establishment, the name, rate of compensation, and description of qualifications of each incumbent, together with a statement of the functions performed by each, for the calendar year 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON TRANSPORTATION FURNISHED GOVERNMENT AND OTHER PERSONNEL

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on transportation furnished certain Government and other personnel, for the period July 1, 1947, through June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON REAL AND PERSONAL PROPERTY LEASED BY NAVY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of real and personal property leased by the Department of the Navy, for the period ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

FLIGHT PAY OF CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, information as to rank and age of officers above the rank of lieutenant commander in the Navy and major in the Marine Corps on duty involving flying, with the average monthly flight pay authorized by law to be paid to such officers during the 6 months ended December 24, 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF STEEL PONTOON BARGE TO JUNIOR MIDSHIPMEN OF AMERICA, NEW LONDON, CONN.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the Junior Midshipmen of America, Inc., New London, Conn., had requested the Navy Department to transfer a steel pontoon barge for use by that organization in training boys and in the maintenance of equipment; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON TRANSPORTATION FURNISHED TO CERTAIN NAVAL PERSONNEL

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on adequate transportation to and from their places of employment for personnel attached to or employed by naval establishments and Navy contractors, for the fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON CREDITS AND DISBURSEMENTS, HELIUM-PRODUCTION FUND

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on moneys credited and disbursements made from the helium-production fund, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED BY THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

A letter from the executive secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting, pursuant to law, an interim report covering the contracts negotiated by that Committee, for the period May 19, 1948, through June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON JUDGMENTS RENDERED BY COURT OF CLAIMS (S. Doc. No. 1)

A letter from the clerk, Court of Claims of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on judgments rendered by that Court, for the year ended December 3, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS ON EXPORT CONTROL AND ALLOCATION POWERS

Two letters from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fourth and fifth quarterly reports on export control and allocation powers under the Second Decontrol Act of 1947 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

VOLUNTARY PLAN COVERING ALLOCATION OF PETROLEUM PRODUCTS

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to section 2 (e) of Public Law 395 (80th Cong.), copies of the voluntary plan covering the allocation of petroleum products (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

VOLUNTARY PLANS COVERING ALLOCATION OF STEEL PRODUCTS

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to section 2 (e) of Public Law 395 (80th Cong.), copies of the voluntary plan covering the allocation of steel products for factory-made steel houses, and copies of requests for compliance therewith (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to section 2 (e) of Public Law 395 (80th Cong.), copies of the voluntary plan covering the allocation of steel products for tank and oil field production equipment, together with copies of requests of compliance therewith (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency).

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to section (2) (e) of Public Law 395 (80th Cong.), copies of the voluntary plan covering the allocation of steel products for requirements of the Armed Forces, together with copies of requests for compliance therewith (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting pursuant to section 2 (e) of Public Law 395 (80th Cong.), copies of the voluntary plan covering the allocation of steel products to the anthracite industry, together with copies of requests for compliance therewith (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to section 2 (e) of Public Law 395 (80th Cong.), copies of the voluntary plan covering the allocation of steel products for construction, conversion, and repair of domestic freight-carrying barges and towing vessels, together with copies of requests for compliance therewith (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to section 2 (e) of Public Law 395 (80th Cong.), copies of the voluntary plan covering the allocation of steel products for the construction, reconversion, and repair of merchant vessels, together with copies of requests for compliance therewith (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to section 2 (e) of Public Law 395 (80th Cong.), copies of the voluntary plan covering the allocation of steel products for oil tankers, together with copies of requests for compliance therewith (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to section 2 (e) of Public Law 395 (80th Cong.), copies of the voluntary plan covering the allocation of steel products for the requirements of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, together with copies of requests for compliance therewith (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the first annual report of that Agency for the calendar year 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

A letter from the Chairman of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the operations of that bank as of the close of business June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF THE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting, pursuant to law, his annual report for the year 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF COMMISSION ON LICENSURE HEALING ARTS PRACTICE ACT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the activities of the Commission on Licensure Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

A letter from the Chairman of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, reporting, pursuant to law, on the operations and expenditures of that Agency since its inception in the spring of 1947; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Chairman of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Commission for the year ended December 31, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS ON PROPERTY EXEMPT FROM TAXATION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a report of institutions or organizations whose properties were specifically exempted by special acts of Congress prior to the passage of the act of December 24, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to section 3 of Public Law 846, Seventy-seventh Congress, copies of reports of every institution, organization, corporation, or association other than the United States Government, the Government of the District of Columbia, and foreign governments, owning property exempt from taxation under the provisions of said act (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AUDIT REPORT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS COMPANY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Virgin Islands Company, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

AUDIT REPORTS BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and Affiliated Companies, Metals Reserve Company, volume 6, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of Defense Homes Corporation, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Inter-American Affairs Corporations, fiscal years ended June 30, 1945, and June 30, 1946, together with an audit report of the Inter-American Navigation Corporation, through February 25, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of Government Services, Inc., for the year ended December 31, 1946 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Tennessee Valley Authority, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1946 and 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PROGRESS REPORT OF WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of the War Assets Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the quarterly progress report of that Administration for the period July-September 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

A letter from the director, national legislative commission, the American Legion, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the financial statement of the American Legion up to and including October 31, 1948 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO HELENA (MONT.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Executive Assistant Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to the Helena Chamber of Commerce certain described parcels of land situated in the city of Helena, Mont. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF 1940

A letter from the Executive Assistant Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to clarify the provisions of section 602 (u) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS PROPERTY IN FOREIGN AREAS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the eleventh report of the Department of State on the disposal of United States surplus property in foreign areas (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PAYMENT OF WAR DAMAGES TO SWITZERLAND

A letter from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the payment of a sum not to exceed $10,607,000 to the Swiss Government as partial compensation for damage inflicted on Swiss territory during World War II by United States armed forces in violation of neutral rights, and authorizing appropriations therefor (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CONVENTION ON PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES OF UNITED NATIONS

A letter from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting a copy of the Convention on Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations, approved by a resolution of the General Assembly, adopted February 13, 1946 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF PHILIPPINE WAR DAMAGE COMMISSION

A letter from the director, Washington Office, Philippine War Damage Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the third semiannual report of that Commission for the period ended December 31, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AMENDMENT OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1946

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the benefits of the Vocational Educational Act of 1946 to the Virgin Islands (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT ACT

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Columbia Basin Project Act with reference to State lands (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PLAN FOR DEVELOPMENT OF SNOWFLAKE PROJECT, ARIZONA

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report and findings on a plan for the development of the Snowflake project, Arizona, together with related data (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PLAN FOR DEVELOPMENT OF CHINO VALLEY PROJECT, ARIZONA

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report and findings on a plan for the development of the Chino Valley project, Arizona, together with related data (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON CONDITIONS IN UNDERGROUND BITUMINOUS-COAL AND LIGNITE MINES

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fourth quarterly report covering conditions in the underground bituminous-coal and lignite mines inspected by Federal coal-mine and inspectors for the year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON BUREAU OF MINES ANTHRACITE RESEARCH LABORATORY, SCHUYLKILL HAVEN, PA.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to, the Bureau of Mines Anthracite Research Laboratory, Schuylkill Haven, Pa.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF RECLAMATION PROJECT ACT OF 1939

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 10 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PLAN FOR DEVELOPMENT OF CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report and findings on the Central Arizona project (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS ENACTED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the municipal council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ACT OF MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. CROIX, V. I.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of an act of the municipal council of St. Croix, V. I. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ACT BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy on an act enacted by the municipal council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with an accompanying pamphlet); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS OF LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, AND MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. CROIX, V. I.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the legislative assembly, the municipal council of St. Thomas and St. John, and the municipal council of St. Croix, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ACTS OF LEGISLATURE OF PUERTO RICO

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of acts of the seventh special session of the sixteenth legislature of Puerto Rico, July 12 to 25, 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

JOURNAL OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF LEGISLATURE OF HAWAII

A letter from the Governor of Hawaii, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the journal of the house of representatives of the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, regular session of 1947 (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, as chairman of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of all tort claims paid by the Department of the Interior under the Federal Tort Claims Act, for the fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Administration for the fiscal year 1948, and up to and including October 31, 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON LICENSED HYDROELECTRIC PROJECTS AND PERSONNEL OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report and information on licensed hydroelectric projects and on personnel of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION ON ALASKA OCEAN TRANSPORTATION

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting,

pursuant to law, the fourth quarterly report outlining the activities of that Commission relating to ocean transportation to, from, and within Alaska (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION UNDER MERCHANT SHIP SALES ACT OF 1946

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the activities and transactions of the Commission under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, for the period July 1, 1948, through September 30, 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY THE PANAMA CANAL

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by the Panama Canal under the Federal Tort Claims Act, for the period July 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY PANAMA RAILROAD COMPANY

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by the Panama Railroad Company under the Federal Tort Claims Act, for the period July 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by the Department of the Army under the Federal Tort Claims Act, for the fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by the Department of Commerce under the Federal Tort Claims Act, for the fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON WAR CONTRACT TERMINATIONS AND SETTLEMENTS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the seventeenth report of the Treasury Department on war contract terminations and settlements, for the period July 1 through September 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON CLAIMS PAID BY FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report showing the names of all persons against whom claims in excess of $1,000 have been settled, the addresses of such persons, the nature of the claims, the amounts of the settlements, and the reasons therefor, in accordance with section 41 (g) 4, of the Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 35 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Service under the authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENTS TO RULES ON CRIMINAL PROCEDURE FOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, amendments to the Rules of Criminal Procedure for the United States District Courts (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, withdrawing the name of Victor Gama-Bermudez from a report relating to aliens whose deportation he suspended more than 6 months ago, transmitted by him to the Senate on April 15, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Attorney General, withdrawing the name of Costos Kolitses from a report relating to aliens whose deportation he suspended more than 6 months ago, transmitted by him to the Senate on March 1, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENTS TO RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE FOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of amendments to rules of civil procedure for the United States district courts, dated December 29, 1948 (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON CLAIM SETTLED BY UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, reporting, pursuant to law, that as of September 30, 1948, that Commission had settled the claim of the Corpus Christi Shipbuilding Corp. at Corpus Christi, Tex.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the proceedings of the regular annual meeting of the Judicial Conference of the United States, September 27-29, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF TORT CLAIMS PAID BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Executive Assistant Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the tort claims paid by that Administration during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944

A letter from the Executive Assistant Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, to make clear the authority of the Administrator to negotiate rates of compensation for training in certain institutions (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PENALTY MAIL MATTER

A letter from the Postmaster General, reporting, pursuant to section 2 (b) of Public Law 364, approved June 28, 1944, the quantity of penalty inscribed material on hand and on order on June 30, 1947, the number of pieces procured, estimated mailings, balance on hand June 30, 1947, and estimated cost of handling for the fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ON WITHIN-GRADE SALARY ADVANCEMENTS TO FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

A letter from the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report and supporting data covering additional within-grade salary advancements as rewards for superior accomplishment made by the several Government departments and agencies, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

Two letters from the Acting Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transmitting, pursuant to law, two reports of his determinations during the quarter ended June 30, 1948, and the quarter ended September 30, 1948, of the number of employees required for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of the executive departments and agencies of the Government (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ARCHIVES TRUST FUND BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the National Archives Trust Fund Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT OF RENTAL COLLECTIONS FROM CERTAIN UNDEVELOPED BUILDING SITES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of rental collections from undeveloped building sites under control of the Federal Works Agency, and Public Building Administration in the District of Columbia, for the year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF SENATE

A letter from the Secretary of the Senate, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Secretary (Carl A. Loeffler) for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

SENATOR FROM MICHIGAN ELECTION CONTEST

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the petition of Frank E. Hook contesting the election for United States Senator from Michigan for the term beginning January 3, 1949, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

INVESTIGATION OF DEMOCRATIC RUN-OFF PRIMARY ELECTION IN TEXAS—PETITIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Texas, praying an investigation of conditions affecting the Democratic run-off primary election in 1948 for Senator from that State, which were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

RECESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. What is the further pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if there is no business immediately to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 20 minutes to 1 o'clock, whereupon we will proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until 12 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.

At the expiration of the recess the Senate reassembled.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES—THE PRESIDENT'S ANNUAL MESSAGE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives to listen to the delivery of the President's annual message, and that, immediately upon the conclusion of the joint session, the Senate reassemble in its Chamber and resume its session.

The motion was agreed to.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the Senate, preceded by its Secretary (Leslie L. Biffle) and its Sergeant at Arms (Joseph C. Duke), and the President pro tempore, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the purpose of attending the joint session of the two Houses and to receive such communication as the President of the United States might be pleased to make to them.

(The annual message this day delivered by the President of the United States to the joint session of the two Houses of Congress appears beginning on p. 74 of the House proceedings in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The joint meeting of the two Houses having been dissolved, the Senate returned to its Chamber at 1 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to make a very brief statement, of which I am sure most Senators will approve.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, last Monday the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] was sworn in for his third term as a Member of this body. The conference of Republican Senators did not end the meeting on that day until a few minutes before the convening of the Senate. As chairman of that conference, it was my duty to brief the press about the proceedings of the conference meeting. By the time that had been done, my distinguished colleague had taken the oath of office.

I doubt whether Senators of different political faiths from any State have a finer personal or official relationship than that which exists between the senior and junior Senators from Colorado. I make this statement so that there cannot be any possible misunderstanding as to why I had to forego the honor and privilege, which I had anticipated, of escorting my colleague to the desk on that occasion.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will now proceed to the routine morning business. The first item is that of petitions and memorials.

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore, which were referred as indicated:

A resolution adopted by the Dairymen's League Cooperative Association, Inc., Saratoga Springs, N. Y., favoring continuation of Federal and State aid for school lunches in public schools; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from John A. Smith, of Cleveland, Ohio, relating to relief for the needy people of the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the house of delegates of the American Dental Association, Chicago, Ill., commending the Congress on the enactment of legislation to provide additional inducements to physicians, surgeons, and dentists to make a career of the United States military, naval, and public health services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by Local 3931, United Steelworkers of America (CIO), Louisville, Ky., favoring the enactment of legislation to restore price controls; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from local 40 (ACA-CIO), New York City, N. Y., signed by Marie Murphy and C. Diebold, and sundry other members, praying for the enactment of legislation to restore price controls; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by local 3931, United Steelworkers of America (CIO), Louisville, Ky., favoring the enactment of the so-called Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the council of the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, requesting the United States Housing Administrator to withhold evictions from public housing projects until additional housing can be provided to meet the existing critical shortage, and favoring the enactment of legislation providing for an adequate housing program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from Percy Bohlen Gifford, of Los Angeles, Calif., remonstrating against certain rules of the Housing Expediter; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from Mary Michalsky, of Garfield, N. J., remonstrating against continuation of rent control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Rome, N. Y., favoring an appropriation of sufficient funds, in lieu of taxes, for the maintenance and ownership of Federal property in the city of Rome; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Fourth International Convention of United Cement, Lime, and Gypsum Workers International Union, at Atlantic City, N. J., relating to the official recognition of the provisional government of the free and democratic state of Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by members of the student body, faculty, and administration of the Juilliard School of Music, New York, N. Y., requesting the Eighty-first Congress to rededicate itself to the struggle for peace and security; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Municipality of Jimalalud, Province of Negros Oriental, Republic of the Philippines, expressing appreciation to the United States Government through the Philippine War Damage Commission for rehabilitating their damaged public buildings; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Telegrams and letters in the nature of petitions from O. Ventola Venerable Giuseppe Mazzini Lodge, No. 1115, Order of the Sons of Italy in America, of Boston; Umberto Primo Lodge, No. 1069, Sons of Italy in America, of Newton; officers of Loggia Regina Margherita, No. 1402, of Waltham; and Mrs. Carmela Iorio and Mrs. Dominick Russo, of Pittsfield, all in the State of Massachusetts, relating to the return to Italy under United Nations trusteeship all the pre-Fascist Italian colonies; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Miscamis Occidental Chapter, Philippine Veterans Legion, Mindanao, P. I., protesting against the resumption of Philippine-Japanese trade; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the National Plant Board, Chicago, Ill., favoring the enactment of Senate bill 2419, providing for the inspection of airplanes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the United Cement, Lime, and Gypsum Workers International Union, at Atlantic City, N. J., requesting an investigation and relief in the ruling of the Federal Trade Commission and the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the so-called basing-point or delivered-price system used by the cement industry in marketing their product; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting resolutions of the county chief and county council of Mauputasi County, and the district governor and district council of Manu'a District, American Samoa, favoring change in the government of American Samoa (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the delegates to the Lions International, Philadelphia, Pa., favoring statehood for Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Miscamis Occidental Chapter, Philippine Veterans' Legion, Mindanao, P. I., favoring return or refund to war veterans the equivalent of emergency notes which have been deducted from their back pay; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Mrs. Gertrude P. Jones, secretary, chapter 75, Blue Star Mothers of America, Detroit, Mich., favoring a national charter for the Blue Star Mothers of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from R. H. Meredith, of Chicago, Ill., relating to alleged violation of his constitutional rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Lucie Trevor, New York, N. Y., relative to alleged violations of the election laws (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Matthew W. Pope, of Atlanta, Ga., relating to conditions at the Veterans' Administration hospital in Augusta, Ga.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the common council of the city of Rome, N. Y., favoring sufficient funds to assist the city of Rome, N. Y., in a program of capital construction of school buildings; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the municipal council of Palo, Leyte, P. I., favoring the construction of a veterans' hospital at Palo, Leyte, P. I.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Department of Virginia, the American Legion, Richmond, Va., relating to on-the-job-training for veterans; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Florida Trucking Association, Inc., Tampa, Fla., expressing gratitude and appreciation for the enactment by Congress of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter in the nature of a petition from James G. Patton, president, Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, Washington, D. C., praying for the enactment

of legislation to insure the maintenance of full employment in the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Leslie Byington Post, No. 88, the American Legion, of Lava Hot Springs, Idaho, praying for the confirmation of the nomination of Arthur B. Peck, to be postmaster at Lava Hot Springs; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

STATEMENT OF VIEWS AND RESOLUTIONS BY AMERICAN MUNICIPAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the American Municipal Association held its twenty-fifth annual conference here in Washington earlier this month. This association is the national federation of 42 State leagues and of 9,500 member city, town, borough, and village governments of all sizes.

During the conference this year six important statements of national municipal policy and several resolutions of broad national interest were adopted. These are the beliefs and the aims of the Nation's municipal governments. All of them are of considerable interest to the Members of the Congress.

I appreciate the privilege of having been asked by the national association to submit these statements to the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSING—WHAT IS THE MUNICIPAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR HOUSING?

Municipalities are vitally concerned about the housing needs of their citizens.

To date those needs have not been adequately met.

Inadequate housing creates additional municipal problems and increases municipal expenditures.

We believe a solution can be found within the framework of our democratic institutions.

The responsibility of the municipality in that solution lies:

First. In adequate planning of our cities and neighborhoods;

Second. Through urban redevelopment statutes including exercise of power of eminent domain to assist in acquiring proper sites and regulations for construction of adequate housing;

Third. In the elimination of slums after provision has been made for rehousing occupants of the slums;

Fourth. In doing our reasonable share by way of subsidies or otherwise to make such housing possible;

Fifth. That the American Municipal Association urge Federal and State governments to undertake an intelligent and complete program of housing, including provision for research into lower-cost production techniques, using to the fullest extent the machinery of private enterprise, and using Federal credit for extension of mortgage loans and reducing interest payments, thereby expanding opportunities for private ownership.

Sixth. We urge the Eighty-first Congress to immediately pass housing legislation similar to the original T-E-W bill to begin again the basic urban task of our Nation's slum clearance. We feel that this legislation should provide sufficient funds for long-term Federal loans and subsidy contracts for slum clearance and construction of low-rent public housing for low-income groups including the construction of permanent low-rent housing projects to replace temporary war and veterans' housing projects.

We urge legislation to permit completion of previously authorized war-frozen housing projects by granting additional loans and raising per room limits in accordance with inflation trends.

Seventh. That any Federal action for disposal of temporary wartime housing should be carried out only after mutual understanding with local officials of the community where such units are situated, and that none of the temporary housing ever be sold to private interests except for the purpose of demolition.

RESPECT AND RECOGNITION OF MUNICIPAL OFFICIALS

Municipal officials and employees must take the lead in creating respect and recognition for themselves and their public positions. In this effort they should seek the help of the press and radio and the cooperation of civic and industrial leaders. They cannot expect respect unless their personal conduct and the general quality of their administration warrants it. First, responsibility lies with the officials themselves.

Municipal employees should be selected, paid, and promoted on the basis of their individual competence and value to their governments. Appointive employees should be retained while their services are satisfactory. Adequate retirement allowances should be provided so that employees may leave when they are too old to be most effective and so that younger persons can succeed to places of responsibility. Municipal positions should pay the same compensation, job for job, as private employment, assuming all other conditions of employment are comparable.

A program of public relations is needed in each municipality to tell what the government and its employees do and why they deserve the respect and recognition of the people whom they serve from day to day.

A program of public relations must also keep the avenues of communication open so that appropriate municipal personnel may keep accurately informed concerning the desires and the attitudes of the citizens whom they serve, since that is equally stressed by personnel men with the function of interpretation.

HOME RULE FOR AMERICAN CITIES

The people of an incorporated city should have the right to handle their own affairs under a constitutional grant of power from the State. Home rule would permit cities to amend their own charters by action of the local electors, to choose the activities they wish to perform, and to raise their revenue as they see fit. They should be free to choose their own form of government, not merely to operate a government given them by the State. They should have the right to decide for themselves what services they require without asking State permission for each new undertaking. They should have authority to raise revenues from any local sources without being required to beg for funds to pay for the services they need. The municipalities should not be required to support State projects, pay for State services, or carry financial burdens imposed on them by the State.

The principle of municipal independence carries with it the obligation of cities to face their own problems, to meet their own responsibilities, to finance their own enterprises, within the limits of local resources, and consistent with practical economic and social factors.

Local government in the United States should be autonomous so far as practical and consistent with public welfare. While the Federal Government and governments of the several States may invoke their broad powers and greater financial resources to make possible some local government services, still these powers and finances should be delegated for the purpose of administration to the municipal authorities in a manner consistent with responsible local self-government.

The American Municipal Association believes in and will work for effective governmental and administrative organization and practices in municipalities, seeking to preserve the representative character of municipal government, and to assure the people a high standard of municipal service, to the end that the greatest public benefit may result from the use of public funds. While no municipality can have complete autonomy, the cities should have the maximum local authority consistent with their position as constituent elements in a sovereign State.

CIVILIAN DEFENSE

The matter of an American Municipal Association civil-defense policy shall be referred to the board of trustees with the understanding:

1. That the executive director seek maximum participation in the development of the ultimate Federal policy to be recommended by the President;

2. That at the earliest appropriate time the executive director advise the leagues and member cities of AMA of the details of any such civil-defense program in sufficient time for the expressions of opinions received to be used by the board of trustees in formulating a policy to be presented to the Congress and in this connection the trustees are requested to take into account the report of the civil-defense technical committee of AMA; and

3. That the AMA civil-defense policy and the technical committee be continued in existence not only for the purpose of making representations with regard to specific proposals presented to the Congress and to the States but also for much more careful study of the type of local civil-defense organization which should be created in the light of Federal action.

PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES

The delegates and representatives of the 9,500 municipalities of the American Municipal Association at this twenty-fifth annual conference, favor and desire the enactment of Federal legislation authorizing the assessment and collection of local property taxes on Federal property or requiring the payment of annual sums in lieu of full taxes to municipalities by the Federal Government.

The American Municipal Association will cooperate with other organizations and with the Federal Congress in formulating legislation that will remove the burdens from localities with tax-exempt properties.

Within each State the organization of municipalities is urged to organize vigorous municipal support of such Federal legislation.

FINANCE—HOW SHALL WE FINANCE MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT?

Municipal governments are entitled to sufficient revenue to finance the activities required of them by custom or by law. Where the local citizens demand a local service they must expect to pay for it. When a State imposes duties or standards of performance on a local government, the State should be responsible for providing the money necessary to carry out its mandates. Where social services require expenditures that cannot be financed appropriately from local revenues, then the State (or in some cases the Federal) Government must furnish the funds for equalization.

Within reasonable limits of their economic ability, and considering the funds withdrawn by State and Federal taxation, the municipalities should be permitted to raise as large a portion of their revenues as they can from locally imposed taxes.

The States cannot appropriately say that municipalities can solve their revenue problems alone if given the right to use a greater

number of local revenue sources. Such a theory is not sound because the State may take for its own use some easily collected highly productive sources such as sales, income, and gasoline taxes, while requiring local governments to finance from inadequate sources the cost of city streets, traffic control, education, social services, and many others.

But the municipalities should be permitted to adopt a larger number of taxes for local use. Unless the State provides adequate revenue by other measures, municipalities which can administer them should be authorized to use as local taxes the payroll-income tax, local sales taxes, license taxes based on volume of business, cigarette and tobacco taxes, amusement or admissions taxes, hotel taxes, liquor taxes, utility taxes, and various service charges.

Simplicity and directness of the entire local, State, and Federal tax system should be considered when new local taxes are imposed. If a single new tax can equitably provide additional needed funds, it would be preferable to use one tax instead of many. A logical and orderly tax system will not evolve without some leadership and direction. As far as the cities are concerned, the State-local tax system should be carefully planned by joint State and local action. Otherwise confusion for the taxpayers and municipal officials is bound to follow the search for new revenues.

In addition to the elements adopted in the above statements, the representatives of the 9,500 municipalities in the American Municipal Association at the twenty-fifth annual conference adopted resolutions which also are elements of the national municipal policy.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I also ask that the several resolutions adopted at the conference be included at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL MUNICIPAL POLICY

Resolved, That the convention endorse the democratic and representative procedure of ascertaining by means of open discussion and debate the will of the delegates on the various subjects appearing on the program, and that the final results of such discussion be adopted as a part of the national municipal program of the American Municipal Association, and that additional ways and means to insure further development and refinement of policy be used throughout the year.

CENSUS BUREAU RESEARCH

Whereas current Nation-wide statistics on the finances and employment of States and local governments are important for the planning and administration of city affairs; and the Government's Division of the United States Bureau of the Census is the only national source for such data; and the scope, timeliness, and analysis of such data have been substantially improved by the Bureau in recent years: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Muncipal Association commend the Secretary of Commerce for the work of the Bureau of the Census in reporting on public finances and employment and urge it to maintain and strengthen its compilation and reporting of such basic statistics.

FEDERAL ADMISSIONS TAX

Whereas it is increasingly recommended by tax authorities and study commissions that the Federal Government should reduce or eliminate those taxes which can be administered best by State and local governments; and

Whereas congressional committees, the Council of State Governments, and many State leagues of municipalities have suggested that admissions and amusement taxes, among others, should be specially considered for release for State and local government use; and

Whereas admissions and amusement taxes are peculiarly suited to municipal administration and justified as a municipal resource: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Municipal Association recommend to Congress the elimination of the Federal excise taxes on admissions and amusements, and call upon State legislatures to make admission tax authority available to their municipalities.

SOCIAL SECURITY EXTENSION

Whereas the exclusion of local governmental employees from coverage under the old-age and survivors' insurance provisions of the Social Security Act is in a sense discriminatory against such employees; and

Whereas the continued lack of retirement provisions for a great many local governments is resulting in serious losses of personnel to private industry and other employments providing retirement and survivors' benefits; and

Whereas municipal officials and employees have repeatedly suggested, and the Advisory Council on Social Security of the Senate Committee on Finance in its report dated April 8, 1948, has recommended that the old-age and survivors' insurance provisions of the Social Security Act be extended to employees of local governments; and

Whereas municipal employees are clearly entitled to the protection offered by old-age and survivors' provisions of the Social Security Act to the same extent as other workers now covered by the said act: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be petitioned by the American Municipal Association to amend the Social Security Act to include municipal employees thereunder according to a plan of permissive coverage whereby such inclusion shall be at the option of the duly constituted legislative body of each municipality by individual compacts made by the Federal Government direct with each municipality, that such permissive form of extension shall apply uniformly to all employees of a municipality regardless of their duties or occupational classification, whether such employees are performing services of a governmental or proprietary nature; that such extension shall include only the old-age and survivors' insurance provisions of the Social Security Act, and that supplementation of these provisions by local pension or retirement funds or systems shall not be prohibited nor precluded by any such amendment of the Social Security Act.

MUNICIPAL AIRPORTS ADMINISTRATION

Be it resolved by the American Municipal Association in convention assembled:

Whereas the development of aviation in the United States has been greatly fostered and encouraged by the municipally owned and operated airports of the various cities of the country; and

Whereas the Federal Airport Act of 1946 was designed to furnish financial Federal assistance to cities for airport purposes that they might effectively promote and expand aviation facilities to cooperate with the Federal Government in establishment of a Federal airport plan; and

Whereas the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, entirely on his own initiative and without any mandate from Congress, has sought to withhold Federal funds from municipalities unless municipalities would agree to various objectionable restrictions on the handling of aviation gasoline and oil; and

Whereas the operation of the economic and business administration of a municipally owned airport is a local responsibility and should not be determined arbitrarily by a Federal agency: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Municipal Association in convention assembled most vigorously protest against any restrictions on the handling of aviation gasoline and oil at municipally owned airports imposed by the Civil Aeronautics Administration and we do respectfully request that all reference to aviation gasoline and oil be removed from the standard Civil Aeronautics grant agreement form; and be it further

Resolved, That the executive director of the American Municipal Association be directed to furnish a copy of this resolution to the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.

PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES ON PUBLIC HOUSING PROJECTS

Whereas the Federal Government has modified its system of payments in lieu of taxes on certain housing projects where such payments were in excess of the amounts originally specified in the contracts between the various housing authorities and the Federal Government; and

Whereas later agreements between such housing authorities and the Federal Government have provided for payments in lieu of taxes more economically sound than those authorized in the original contracts; and

Whereas cities are unnecessarily embarrassed by being unable to secure the benefits of the larger sums which the housing authorities are able to pay in lieu of taxes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Municipal Association record its opposition to the Federal policy recently invoked which prevents municipalities from receiving increased payments in lieu of taxes; further

Resolved, That this organization support legislation and administrative measures which will permit the payment of the increased amount in lieu of taxes under prevailing contracts.

FWA APPROVAL OF LOCAL PLANS

Resolved, That the American Municipal Association request Congress for the amendment of applicable Federal statutes so as to provide for an extension of the time limit within which plans, specifications, and working drawings may be submitted for approval to the Federal Works Agency, to the end that municipalities and other local government units may receive the remainder of interest-free loans from the Government as provided under their respective contracts.

AIR-TRAFFIC CONTROL

Whereas the Federal Government is primarily responsible for air safety and has operated air-traffic-control towers on many municipal and other public airports throughout the country by annual appropriations to the Civil Aeronautics Administration; and

Whereas municipal airport operators generally wish the Federal Government to continue to operate such control towers in the interests of safety and economy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Municipal Association urge the Congress of the United States to continue appropriations to the Civil Aeronautics Administration for the operation of air-traffic-control towers.

SLUM CLEARANCE

Resolved, That the Congress be urged to enact a complete and workable program developed in cooperation with the individual municipality which will provide for the removal of all substandard temporary warhousing units and the rehousing of the occupants in permanent standard housing, employing for this purpose, along with other

moneys, the net profit already received from rentals of such temporary war housing.

FIRE PROTECTION

Resolved, That the American Municipal Association offer its cooperation to the International City Managers' Association in a study of the methods, procedures, or services by which municipalities may obtain a disinterested appraisal and grading of their fire-protection facilities, and the relation of such facilities to fire-insurance rates.

TITLE TO TIDELANDS

Whereas the title to lands lying beneath tidal and navigable waters has been resolved against the States and political subdivisions thereof by the Supreme Court decision in the case of United States against California; and

Whereas this decision has created multiple conflicts of opinion as to the validity of the title to these lands in the States and their several grantees; and

Whereas Federal legislative action appears to be sole remedy which States and cities have to secure title to these tidelands upon which billions of dollars have been expended by such State and local governments: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Municipal Association urge the Congress of the United States, during its next session, to adopt legislation to correct the injustices which would follow from the Supreme Court's decision and restore to the States and their municipalities their property rights and titles in accordance with the law of property established by the Supreme Court of the United States in a long line of decisions handed down throughout 100 years, to the effect that the States and their grantees hold complete title and ownership to all lands lying beneath tidewaters and navigable waters within their respective boundaries; and that this organization lend its cooperation and full support to securing the enactment of such legislation.

CIVIL DEFENSE

Whereas the National Government proposes to call upon the cities to organize for civil defense; and

Whereas the report of the War Department Civil Defense Board makes the obvious point that in case of war the personnel of fire, police, and other emergency services of cities must be augmented rather than depleted; and

Whereas the uncontrolled and uncoordinated recruitment of municipal personnel by the various branches and units of the armed services, if made effective in time of war, would destroy the capacity of municipal government to function to protect life and property; and

Whereas these absolute contradictions in national policy must be reconciled and eliminated without delay: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Municipal Association respectfully requests and urges the President of the United States and the Secretary of National Defense to take cognizance of this critical situation and to adopt and enforce policies relating to the recruitment of municipal personnel which will preserve the capacity of municipal government to protect its citizens and to discharge its national obligations for civil defense in case of national emergency.

SHARING HIGHWAY USER TAXES WITH MUNICIPALITIES

Whereas local municipal streets carry variously in the several States from 20 percent to 50 percent of total automobile traffic and, therefore, earn 20 percent to 50 percent of State and Federal highway user taxes; and

Whereas local municipal streets receive inadequate or no shares of such highway user taxes in many States; and

Whereas highway user taxes collected by State and Federal governments are now expended in substantial amounts to give this Nation good State highways and rural roads, although municipalities are still required to finance local streets primarily from property taxes, other general revenues, and borrowed funds: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Municipal Association endorse the principle that reasonable shares of highway user taxes be used for local streets on the basis of use.

REPORT OF IMMIGRATION SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee during the Eightieth Congress, I have received a progress report from the Immigration Subcommittee. This subcommittee was headed by the former junior Senator from West Virginia, Mr. Revercomb. The progress report will, I believe, be very helpful to Members of Congress in their review of the controversial and complicated immigration and displaced persons' problems. All of us, I am sure, are seeking the answer to the immigration and displaced persons problem—a problem with grave humanitarian aspects, and one which we want careful consideration given from the standpoint of discharging our obligation to the foreign peoples and from the standpoint of national security. I, therefore, send to the desk, a copy of this progress report and ask that it be appropriately numbered and printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1. A bill to create an independent Civil Aeronautics Authority and an independent Air Safety Board, to promote the development and safety and to provide for the regulation of civil aeronautics, and to promote world leadership by the United States in aviation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2. A bill to provide for the use of 25 percent of grazing receipts from national forests for the making of range improvements within such forests; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 3. A bill to further implement the full faith and credit clause of the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 4. A bill authorizing the advanced training in aeronautics of technical personnel of the Civil Aeronautics Administration; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. WAGNER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. McGRATH):

S. 5. A bill to provide a national health insurance and public health program; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 6. A bill to aid in preventing shortages of petroleum and petroleum products in the United States by promoting the production of synthetic liquid fuels;

S. 7. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938; and

S. 8. A bill to create an independent Air Safety Board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 9. A bill authorizing the appointment of three additional judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia, prescribing the qualifications of appointees to the municipal court and the municipal court of appeals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 10. A bill providing for the issuance of certificates of statutory compliance with certain national standards to certain corporations, trade associations, and labor organizations engaged in or affecting commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 11. A bill to protect the foreign relations and to promote the trade and commerce of the United States, to require the disclosure to the United States of information affecting such trade and commerce, and to safeguard the security of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 12. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 13. A bill to permit the sale of gold within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, including Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 14. A bill to improve the administration of justice and reduce expenditures by eliminating overlapping functions of Federal agencies, preserving State and local jurisdiction, utilizing existing judicial remedies, and forbidding unnecessary proceedings;

S. 15. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to prevent purchase and sale of public office," approved December 11, 1926; and

S. 16. A bill to amend the act providing for the appointment of court reporters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 17. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for certain lands to certain settlers in the Pyramid Lake Indian Reservation, Nev.; and

S. 18. A bill authorizing the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, to make payment to school districts as compensation for education of children of Federal employees residing on federally owned property; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 19. A bill to amend the act of May 28, 1896, as amended, relating to the appointment of assistant United States attorneys;

S. 20. A bill to regulate the review of judgments of conviction in certain criminal cases; and

S. 21. A bill to regulate habeas corpus proceedings in the courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 22. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code; as amended, and the Federal Alcohol Administration Act, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 23. A bill to facilitate the investment of venture capital in new enterprises; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 24. A bill conferring jurisdiction on United States circuit courts of appeals to hear certain appeals from convictions by general courts martial; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 25. A bill to provide for the payment of a lump sum to the State of Nevada in lieu of taxes at Davis Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 26. A bill for the relief of Jose Babace; and

S. 27. A bill for the relief of certain Basque aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 28. A bill to supersede the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1946 by reestablishing the offices of registers of land offices,

and providing for appointment of the Director and Associate Director of the Bureau of Land Management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 29. A bill to authorize payment of claims based on loss of or damage to property deposited by alien enemies; and

S. 30. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims of persons employed in Federal penal and correctional institutions for damage to or loss or destruction of personal property occurring incident to their service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 31. A bill to amend the Taylor Grazing Act for the purpose of providing for greater participation by district advisory boards in administration of the act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 32. A bill for the relief of Milo Jurisevic, Mrs. Jelena Jurisevic, Svetezar Jurisevic, and Radmila Jurisevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 33. A bill to establish a National Water Conservation Authority, and for other purposes;

S. 34. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to stop injury to the public grazing lands by preventing overgrazing and soil deterioration; to provide for their orderly use, improvement, and development; to stabilize the livestock industry dependent upon the public range; and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1934, as amended; and

S. 35. A bill to establish a national natural resources policy, to create a Natural Resources Council, to provide for a national resources inventory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 36. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act so as to provide that regulations adopted pursuant to such act for any area, section, or flyway shall be based on conditions existing within such area, section, or flyway, and to create a Migratory Game Bird Advisory Committee; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 37. A bill to cancel authority under the act of June 23, 1936, for the conveyance of certain lands owned by the United States to the city of Los Angeles, Calif.; and

S. 38. A bill to repeal an act which withdrew certain public lands of the United States in the State of California from settlement; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 39. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administration, as an adjunct to the Federal public-works program, to make loans and grants for the construction, remodeling, improvement, and extension of school facilities; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 40. A bill for the relief of William D. Norris;

S. 41. A bill for the relief of the city of Reno, Nev.;

S. 42. A bill for the relief of Ellen Hudson, as administratrix of the estate of Walter R. Hudson;

S. 43. A bill for the relief of Jacobus Lubbertus Muller;

S. 44. A bill for the relief of Arthur O. Fisher;

S. 45. A bill for the relief of the owners and operators of certain gold mines which were closed or the operations of which were curtailed by War Production Board Limitation Order L-208;

S. 46. A bill for the relief of Primitivo Urcelay-Ruiz;

S. 47. A bill for the relief of Fawn S. Louie;

S. 48. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, section 456, so as to increase to $15 per day the limit on subsistence expenses allowed to justices and judges traveling while attending court or transacting official business at places other than their official stations, and to authorize reimbursement for such travel by privately owned automobiles at the rate of 7 cents per mile;

S. 49. A bill to establish uniform qualifications for jurors in the Federal courts;

S. 50. A bill to provide for a jury commission for each United States district court, to regulate its compensation, to prescribe its duties, and for other purposes; and

S. 51. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, section 962, so as to authorize reimbursement for official travel by privately owned automobiles by officers and employees of the courts of the United States and of the administrative office of the United States courts at a rate not exceeding 7 cents per mile; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. McCARRAN also introduced Senate bill 52, to authorize the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

S. 53. A bill to incorporate the Federal City Charter Commission; and

S. 54. A bill to provide for the incorporation, regulation, merger, consolidation, and dissolution of certain business corporations in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. HUNT):

S. 55. A bill to authorize completion of construction and development of the Eden project, Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 56. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 730), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 57. A bill to authorize the construction of a research laboratory for the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, at or in the vicinity of Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mr. MYERS also introduced Senate bill 58, to raise the minimum-wage standards of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MYERS (for himself and Mr. McMAHON):

S. 59. A bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 60. A bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 61. A bill for the relief of the Plymouth Manufacturing Co., Inc.;

S. 62. A bill for the relief of Fritz Y. Mercer; and

S. 63. A bill to renew and extend certain letters patent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAYBANK (for himself and Mr. RUSSELL):

S. 64. A bill to establish a Savannah Valley Authority to provide for unified water control and resource development in the basin of the Savannah River in the interest of the control and prevention of floods, the promotion of navigation, and the strengthening of the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 65. A bill to provide for the air security and defense of the United States, to establish the composition of the Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mr. TYDINGS (for himself and Mr. MALONE) (by request) introduced Senate bill 66, to provide for the national security of the Nation by requiring that all qualified young men undergo a period of training, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 67. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 in respect to rates of wages in Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. NEELY:

S. 68. A bill to authorize and request the President to undertake to mobilize at some convenient place in the United States an adequate number of the world's outstanding experts, and coordinate and utilize their services in a supreme endeavor to discover means of curing and preventing cancer; and

S. 69. A bill to repeal the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, Public Law 101, Eightieth Congress, chapter 120, first session, commonly known as the Taft-Hartley law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 70. A bill to make effective in the District Court for the Territory of Alaska rules promulgated by the Supreme Court of the United States governing pleading, practice, and procedure in the district courts of the United States; and

S. 71. A bill for the relief of Constance Jenkins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 72. A bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America;

S. 73. A bill for the relief of Samuel M. Inman; and

S. 74. A bill to extend the time within which suit may be commenced against the United States by Hubert James, of Argyle, Ga.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFARLAND (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN):

S. 75. A bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes; and

S. 76. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey a certain tract of land in the State of Arizona to Lillian I. Anderson; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 77. A bill to repeal section 509 of title 34 of the United States Code, approved June 30, 1876 (ch. 159, 19 Stat. 69); to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 78. A bill to authorize the appropriation of $300,000,000 to assist in providing telephone facilities in rural areas;

S. 79. A bill authorizing the appropriation of $1,000,000,000 for the purposes of rural electrification; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 80. A bill to increase the insurance protection of depositors in federally insured banks from $5,000 to $15,000; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 81. A bill granting service pensions to veterans of World War I and World War II;

S. 82. A bill to provide a $25 credit for income-tax purposes for persons who vote in elections of Federal officers;

S. 83. A bill to increase the credit allowed for dependent children of a taxpayer in computing net income; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 84. A bill to amend the provisions of the postal salary law relating to rural carriers; and for other purposes;

S. 85. A bill to provide maternity leave for Government employees; and

S. 86. A bill to provide equipment for use by examination applicants; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 87. A bill granting exemption from income tax with respect to $1,500 of the amount paid to any individual by the United States

or by any State or political subdivision thereof as a pension, retired or retirement pay, or as a retirement annuity; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 88. A bill to amend section 60 of an act entitled "An act to Establish a Uniform System of Bankruptcy Throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended;

S. 89. A bill to extend the statute of limitations with respect to suits by certain immigrant inspectors and employees for extra pay for Sunday and holiday services;

S. 90. A bill to provide for the naturalization of Richard Kim; and

S. 91. A bill to provide for the better assurance of the protection of persons within the several States from lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 92. A bill to raise the minimum-wage standards of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 93. A bill to prohibit the payment of retirement annuities to former Members of Congress convicted of offenses involving the improper use of authority, influence, power, or privileges as Members of Congress;

S. 94. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 with respect to the priority rights of veterans entitled to 10-point preference under such act; and

S. 95. A bill to provide for 26 days' annual leave and 15 days' sick leave for employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 96. A bill to provide for preliminary examination and survey of River Rouge, Mich., for the purpose of determining action necessary to control floods in the River Rouge drainage area; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 97. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. FERGUSON (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 98. A bill to amend section 3 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 so as to remove the requirement that immigration visas issued thereunder be charged against immigration quotas;

S. 99. A bill to amend section 3 (a) of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, relating to the distribution of visas thereunder among the various groups of displaced persons; and

S. 100. A bill to amend section 2 (c) of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 relating to the definition of an eligible displaced person; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOBEY:

S. 101. A bill to provide for the conversion of national banking associations into and their merger or consolidation with State banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TOBEY (for himself and Mr. O'MAHONEY):

S. 102. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis and related neurological diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. LUCAS (for himself, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. FLANDERS, and Mr. BALDWIN):

S. 103. A bill to increase rates of compensation of the President, Vice President, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and heads and assistant heads of executive departments and independent agencies; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 104. A bill to safeguard the health, efficiency, and morale of the American people; to provide for improved nutrition through a more effective distribution of food supplies through a food-allotment program; to assist in maintaining fair prices and incomes to farmers by providing adequate outlets for agricultural products; to prevent burdening and obstructing channels of interstate commerce; to promote the full use of agricultural resources; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mr. TOBEY, and Mr. IVES):

S. 105. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to establish a minimum wage of 75 cents an hour; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 106. A bill for the relief of Louise Peters Lewis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 107. A bill relating to the salary grades of certain substitute employees of the postal service upon appointment to regular positions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(Mr. MORSE introduced Senate bill 108, to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to provide for a single executive department for the operation and administration of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force; and to give the Secretary of Defense adequate power to enable him to formulate and place in operation integrated programs for the national security, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. MORSE introduced Senate bill 109, to require certain members of the legislative, judicial, and executive branches of the Government to file statements relating to amount and sources of income, and dealings in securities and commodities, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. THYE):

S. 110. A bill to broaden the cooperative extension system as established in the act of May 8, 1914, and acts supplemental thereto, by providing for cooperative extension work between colleges receiving the benefits of this act and the acts of July 2, 1862, and August 30, 1890, and other qualified colleges, universities, and research agencies, and the United States Department of Labor; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. CAIN:

S. 111. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Pearl Shizuko Okada Pape;

S. 112. A bill for the relief of Alexy W. Katyll and Ioanna Katyll;

S. 113. A bill for the relief of Floyd Oles and Helen Louise Oles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 114. A bill to provide for the acquisition of sites and the preparation of plans for Federal public buildings outside the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 115. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 with respect to preference accorded in Federal employment to disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FLANDERS:

S. 116. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to permit an adopted child of a deceased individual to receive benefits thereunder without regard to the period during which he shall have occupied such status; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. FULBRIGHT introduced Senate bill 117, to repeal the tax on oleomargarine, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to complete the requirements for the positive identification of yellow oleomargarine, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 118. A bill for the relief of Clemente Sabin Dopico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 119. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND):

S. 120. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Freedom National Historical Park in Duval County, Fla.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 121. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act to provide for rural telephones, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 122. A bill relating to the disability pensions payable to veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 123. A bill for the relief of R. L. Fulford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 124. A bill to require the identification of cotton products for the protection and benefit of the producers and consumers thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 125. A bill to provide for one national cemetery in every State and Territory and such other national cemeteries in the States, Territories, and possessions as may be needed for the burial of members of the armed forces of the United States dying in the service or former members whose last discharge therefrom was honorable and certain other persons as provided for in United States Code, title 24, section 281, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 126. A bill to supplement the national transportation policy and to aid in achieving such policy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 127. A bill to provide that schools constructed under the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, may be donated to local school agencies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 128. A bill to restore the status quo in respect to certain employment taxes and social-security benefits pending action by Congress on extended social-security coverage; and

S. 129. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. DOUGLAS):

S. 130. A bill to provide for the demonstration of public library service in areas without such service or with inadequate library facilities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. HILL):

S. 131. A bill to exempt admission to certain charitable entertainments from the Federal admission tax; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CHAPMAN:

S. 132. A bill to assist the States in the development and maintenance of local public health units, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 133. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist in the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. McGRATH (for himself and Mr. GREEN):

S. 134. A bill to provide for the preservation of the frigate *Constellation*; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McGRATH:

S. 135. A bill to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight saving time in the District; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 136. A bill to provide for the naturalization of persons legally in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 137. A bill to authorize the making of grants and loans to the States to assist in providing adequate public elementary and secondary school facilities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(Mr. ELLENDER (for himself and Mr. WAGNER, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. MYERS, Mr. HILL, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. LONG) introduced Senate bill 138, to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TAYLOR:

S. 139. A bill for the relief of Guillermo Chacartegui;

S. 140. A bill for the relief of Peter W. Anderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 141. A bill for the acquisition of additional land adjoining the Federal building in Idaho Falls, Idaho; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 142. A bill authorizing the construction of a multipurpose reservoir on the Pend Oreille River in Idaho for flood control and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works;

S. 143. A bill to amend section 4450 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by the act of July 29, 1937, and for other purposes;

S. 144. A bill to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act to prevent the loss of nationality, by reason of continuous residence for 5 years in a foreign state, of certain persons declared to be citizens of the United States under such act;

S. 145. A bill for the relief of Anacortes Shipways, Inc. (Pacific shipways division), and for other purposes;

S. 146. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Oregon to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of J. N. Jones, and others;

S. 147. A bill for the relief of H. Lawrence Hull; to the Committee on the Judiciary;

S. 148. A bill relating to the administrative jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Oregon;

S. 149. A bill authorizing annual payments to States, Territories, and insular governments, for the benefit of their local political subdivisions, based on the fair value of the national forest lands situated therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs;

S. 150. A bill to amend section 12 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CORDON (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 151. A bill to provide for the construction, equipment, and operation of an additional military academy and an additional naval academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER:

S. 152. A bill to retrocede to the State of New Mexico exclusive jurisdiction held by the United States over lands within the boundaries of the Los Alamos, N. Mex., project of the United States Atomic Energy Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 153. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes," approved April 4, 1944; and

S. 154. A bill to provide for the reappointment to the retired list of officers of the Navy of Henry Eastin Rossell, former commander, Construction Corps, United States Navy, retired; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 155. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; and

By Mr. KNOWLAND (for himself and Mr. CORDON):

S. 156. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 157. A bill to authorize the construction of a research laboratory for the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, at or in the vicinity of Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 158. A bill for the relief of Lawrence G. McCarthy; and

S. 159. A bill for the relief of the L. J. Houze Convex Glass Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 160. A bill for the relief of Ellen F. Barbee;

S. 161. A bill for the relief of Arthur A. Broyles; and

S. 162. A bill to permit retired officers of the armed forces to act as agents or attorneys for prosecuting certain claims against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 163. A bill to authorize a mileage allowance of 7 cents per mile for post-office inspectors for travel on official business; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. PEPPER):

S. 164. A bill for the relief of certain claimants who suffered losses and sustained damages as the result of the campaign carried out by the Federal Government for the eradication of the Mediterranean fruitfly in the State of Florida; and

S. 165. A bill for the relief of William F. Thomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 166. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the conveyance to Pinellas County, State of Florida, of certain public lands herein described," approved June 17, 1948 (Public Law 666, 80th Cong.), for the purpose of correcting a land description therein; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 167. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Weber Basin reclamation project, Utah;

S. 168. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Central Utah project; and

S. 169. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Virgin River subbasin reclamation project in Arizona, Nevada, and Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WATKINS (for himself and Mr. THOMAS of Utah):

S. 170. A bill to authorize the transfer of certain property to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 171. A bill to incorporate the Society of the Fifth (Red Diamond) Division, United States Army, Veterans of the World Wars;

S. 172. A bill for the relief of Valeriu Constantin Georgescu and wife, Lygia Maria Georgescu; and

S. 173. A bill to repeal the prohibition against the filling of a vacancy in the office of district judge in the southern district of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES (for himself, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MYERS, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. SMITH):

S. 174. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 175. A bill to encourage increased production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 176. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum-foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 177. A bill to authorize and direct the construction by the Tennessee Valley Authority of a steam power plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 178. A bill relating to custom duties on articles coming into the United States from the Virgin Islands;

S. 179. A bill to suspend for 1 year certain import duties on aluminum;

S. 180. A bill to provide for the disposition of internal-revenue collections on articles produced in the Virgin Islands; and

S. 181. A bill exempting from tax the transportation of persons to and from an airport in a motor vehicle having a seating capacity of less than ten passengers; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 182. A bill to amend section 8 of the act of June 17, 1886, as amended (46 U. S. C., sec. 289), and section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, as amended (46 U. S. C., sec. 883); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 183. A bill to authorize an appropriation for the construction, extension, equipment, and improvement of public-school buildings and facilities at Winnebago, Nebr.;

S. 184. A bill to provide a civil government for the insular possession of American Samoa, and for other purposes;

S. 185. A bill to provide a civil government for the island of Guam, and for other purposes;

S. 186. A bill to emancipate United States Indians in certain cases;

S. 187. A bill to provide for the settlement of certain obligations of the United States to the Indians of New York; and

S. 188. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the several States over offenses committed by or against Indians on Indian reservations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 189. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Nebraska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Mrs. Florence Benolken; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 190. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, so as to exempt from the requirements of sections 6 and 7 of such act employees engaged in the capacity of outside buyers; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BUTLER (for himself and Mr. WHERRY):

S. 191. A bill for the relief of Louis J. Waline; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER (for himself and Mr. IVES):

S. 192. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the courts of the State of New York with respect to civil actions between Indians or to which Indians are parties; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 193. A bill to provide for the payment by the United States of premiums on bonds of Government officers or employees; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 194. A bill for the relief of Bernadette Jones Marchbanks;

S. 195. A bill for the relief of James A. Stapleton, Ruth Burk, and Mildred Ovren, copartners doing business under the name and style of Stapleton Lumber & Piling Co.;

S. 196. A bill for the relief of James G. Smyth;

S. 197. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Wesley Berk (formerly Mrs. Ruth Cameron);

S. 198. A bill for the relief of the city and county of San Francisco;

S. 199. A bill for the relief of Chin Suey Hong and his wife, Lee Suey You;

S. 200. A bill for the relief of Lee Wee and Chan Suey;

S. 201. A bill for the relief of Maria Geertruide Mulders;

S. 202. A bill for the relief of Jesus T. Esteva and his family;

S. 203. A bill for the relief of Albert Vita Sciama; and

S. 204. A bill for the relief of Eugenio Maisterrena Barreneche; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 205. A bill to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. DOWNEY (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 206. A bill relating to the immigration status of the lawful wives and children of Chinese treaty merchants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 207. A bill to authorize the construction of access roads necessary to the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 208. A bill for the relief of Ella L. Browning; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 209. A bill to create the office of Senator at Large in the Senate of the United States for ex-Presidents of the United States; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 210. A bill to retrocede to the State of New Mexico exclusive jurisdiction held by the United States over lands within the boundaries of the Los Alamos project of the United States Atomic Energy Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHERRY (for himself, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. LONG, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, and Mr. THYE):

S. 211. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to create the Inland Waterways Corporation for the purpose of carrying out the mandate and purpose of Congress as expressed in sections 201 and 500 of the Transportation Act, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 212. A bill for the relief of John Joseph McKay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 213. A bill to provide benefits for members of the Reserve componenta of the armed forces who suffer disability or death from injuries incurred while engaged in active-duty training for periods of less than 30 days or while engaged in inactive-duty training;

S. 214. A bill to amend the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948;

S. 215. A bill to extend disability and death benefits to personnel of the Reserve components of the armed services while on active duty or in training;

S. 216. A bill to create an official ribbon to be known as the Army Reserve Special Commendation Ribbon;

S. 217. A bill to create an official ribbon to be known as the Air Force Reserve Special Commendation Ribbon;

S. 218. A bill to create a medal to be known as the Air Force Reserve Medal;

S. 219. A bill to create a medal to be known as the Army Reserve Medal;

S. 220. A bill to provide for the payment of a uniform allowance to officers of the Reserve components of the United States Army and the United States Air Force;

S. 221. A bill to authorize lump-sum payments to Air Corps Reserve officers who are selected for commission in the Regular Army;

S. 222. A bill to provide for payment to certain retired Naval and Marine Corps Reserve officers of a lump sum equal to their active-duty pay and allowances for the period during which such officers remained in an inactive status without pay;

S. 223. A bill to remove the limitation on amount of retirement pay, under certain conditions, of persons retired for disabilities resulting from injuries or disease incurred in line of duty in the military or naval services of the United States;

S. 224. A bill to amend further the act of April 3, 1939, as amended; and

S. 225. A bill to provide for the erection of headstones for certain members of the armed forces buried outside the United States, lost at sea, or reported missing in the performance of duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 226. A bill for the relief of Lawrence Portland Cement Co.;

S. 227. A bill for the relief of Stone & Cooper Coal Co., Inc.;

S. 228. A bill for the relief of Charles W. Durang;

S. 229. A bill for the relief of E. W. Eaton Coal Co.; and

S. 230. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sonia Kaye Johnston; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 231. A bill to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 232. A bill relating to the disposition of housing acquired or constructed by the United States;

S. 233. A bill to establish the Passamaquoddy power project development and use of tidal energy in the waters of Passamaquoddy Bay for the production of electrical power;

S. 234. A bill authorizing preliminary examination and survey of Round Pond Harbor, Maine; and

S. 235. A bill to authorize the construction of access roads necessary to the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 236. A bill to clarify and formulate a consistent and coordinated national policy with respect to transportation costs in interstate commerce; to strengthen the antitrust laws of the United States and to provide for their more effective enforcement; and to promote competition by permitting sellers to have access to distant markets;

S. 237. A bill to promote interstate and foreign commerce and strengthen the national defense by providing for cargo aircraft adaptable for postal, commercial, and military service, and for other purposes; and

S. 238. A bill to amend section 25 of the Interstate Commerce Act to require certain common carriers by railroad to install and maintain communication systems and to establish and observe operating rules, regulations, and practices to promote safety of employees and travelers on railroads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MCKELLAR:

S. J. Res. 1. Joint resolution to authorize the Tennessee Valley Authority to build a steam power plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LODGE (for himself, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. HOEY, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. NEELY, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. FLANDERS):

S. J. Res. 2. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. HILL, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. LODGE, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, and Mr. TOBEY):

S. J. Res. 3. Joint resolution to provide that any future payments by the Republic of Finland on the principal or interest of its debt of the First World War to the United States shall be used to provide educational and technical instruction and training in the United States for citizens of Finland and American books and technical equipment for institutions of higher education in Finland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MCCARRAN (for himself, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. KNOWLAND, and Mr. MALONE):

S. J. Res. 4. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. J. Res. 5. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. J. Res. 6. Joint resolution designating the fourth Sunday in September of each year as Interfaith Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER (for himself, Mr. ECTON, Mr. MALONE, and Mr. LANGER):

S. J. Res. 7. Joint resolution to provide for the transfer to the Bureau of Reclamation of functions relating to irrigation projects on Indian reservations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McCARTHY (for himself and Mr. WILEY):

S. J. Res. 8. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOBEY:

S. J. Res. 9. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment of a Commission to be called the National Monetary Commission; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. J. Res. 10. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to terms of office of President, and providing for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President, and for election of such candidates, by popular vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. J. Res. 11. Joint resolution providing for the ratification by Congress of a contract for the purchase of certain Indian lands by the United States from the Three Affiliated Tribes of Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak., and for other related purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTSON (for himself and Mr. BYRD):

S. J. Res. 12. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week in which June 6, 1949, occurs as Patrick Henry Week in commemoration of the sesquicentennial anniversary of the death of Patrick Henry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL:

S. J. Res. 13. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of blue and gray stamps to symbolize our national unity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. J. Res. 14. Joint resolution providing for awards of honor for agricultural production; to the Committee on Armed Services.

UNIFICATION OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I reintroduce at this time my bill for unification of the armed forces in fact rather than in name only, which is the present status of our legislation.

I wish to say only this in regard to this bill, which I consider of vital importance to the security of this country, that I think it will save a minimum of $3,000,000,000 a year to the taxpayers of the country.

The bill (S. 108) to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to provide for a single executive department for the operation and administration of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force; and to give the Secretary of Defense adequate power to enable him to formulate and place in operation integrated programs for the national security, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

INCOME REPORTS BY GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

Mr. MORSE. I introduce a bill requiring Government officials to report the amount and the sources of their income, as a matter of public record.

The bill (S. 109) to require certain members of the legislative, judicial, and executive branches of the Government to file statements relating to amount and sources of income, and dealings in securities and commodities, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY SERVICE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the American Legion has gone on record in favor of universal military service. They have prepared a bill for the information of the committee and the Congress, which I have been requested to introduce, and I herewith present it.

At the same time, inasmuch as the 70-group air force bill was considered by the Committee on Armed Services of each House, and passed one House, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] I am introducing it again for the attention of the Armed Services Committee.

The bill (S. 66) to provide for the national security of the Nation by requiring that all qualified young men undergo a period of training, introduced by Mr. TYDINGS (for himself and Mr. MALONE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

MINIMUM-WAGE STANDARDS

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to raise the minimum wage from 40 cents to 75 cents an hour, and I request that a statement in connection with the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 58) to raise the minimum-wage standards of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, introduced by Mr. MYERS, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement presented by Mr. MYERS was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY MR. MYERS

Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, said today he will have ready for introduction in the Eighty-first Congress at its opening session Monday a bill to raise the minimum wage from 40 cents to 75 cents an hour.

MYERS, who has been a cosponsor of various administration bills during the last 4 years to expand the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act as well as to raise the minimum wage, said his own bill will be restricted entirely to the wage-raising provision.

"There is no controversy over the need to increase the minimum wage for work done in interstate commerce from the present obsolete, starvation level of $16 for a 40-hour week," he declared. "Most of the Republican leaders of Congress have gone on record at one time or another, as has Governor Dewey, in favor of an increase.

"There is, however, considerable controversy over proposed changes in other sections of the Fair Labor Standards Act having to do with coverage, overtime, and so on. I strongly believe that we must not hold off on the enactment of legislation increasing the minimum wage to a realistic level until all of the many other issues involved in the Fair Labor Standards Act are settled in an omnibus bill.

"An increase in the minimum wage is an immediate, urgent necessity. While we are seeking to fight inflation with effective means, we must not forget that millions of Americans have already been impoverished by inflation and need the protection of a better minimum wage.

"This bill can be enacted into law almost immediately because the only controversy surrounding it has to do with the amount of the increase. President Truman and the Democratic platform are committed to a minimum wage of at least 75 cents. I think most members of the majority party in Congress agree with that platform promise. Many Republicans also concede 75 cents to be a reasonable figure. The bill, as I see it, can be disposed of promptly. After we have passed this bill, the Labor Committees of the House and Senate can then take up the fundamental issues involving other phases of the Fair Labor Standards Act and can consider them separately from the matter of minimum wage, which is of an emergency nature."

MYERS introduced a similar bill, S. 1288, in 1947, providing for a 65-cent minimum on the day that President Truman signed into law the Portal-to-Portal Act. The President at that time had urged a 65-cent minimum wage be adopted immediately. However, no action was taken on this or any other minimum wage bill by the Labor Committee of either House in the Eightieth Congress.

At the time the portal bill was before the Senate, on March 21, 1947, the Pennsylvania senior Senator introduced an amendment to it to increase the minimum to 60 cents, a figure he said then was so noncontroversial that he thought it would be accepted without discussion. However, on motion of Senator TAFT, the Myers amendment was tabled. Although Senator TAFT promised that the Senate Labor Committee would promptly get to work on a minimum wage bill, that was the last opportunity which either the Senate or the House had in the Eightieth Congress to vote on an increase in the minimum wage.

MYERS' 75-cent minimum would become operative 60 days after its enactment.

ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for additional circuit and district judges. I request that a statement showing the justification for this legislation, together with the full text of the bill, be printed at this point in the RECORD for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement and the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 52) to authorize the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement and bill are as follows:

BILL FOR THE CREATION OF ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGESHIPS

(Statement by Senator PAT McCARRAN)

The judicial conference of the United States, consisting of the Chief Justice of the United States as chairman, and the chief judges of the 11 judicial circuits, at its last regular meeting held in September 1948, recommended that the Congress provide for a number of additional circuit and district judgeships in specified circuits and districts. In the report of the meeting of the conference issued by the Chief Justice it is said

that the recommendations "contemplated the absolute minimum increase in judgeships necessary to adequately man the courts, and to provide for the continued efficient and orderly processing of the business of the courts." The report instructed the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts "to present these recommendations to the Congress and to inform it that the prompt enactment of legislation necessary to achieve the objectives sought thereby was, in the view of the conference, a matter of extreme urgency and importance to the judiciary."

I have today introduced a bill to carry out the recommendations of the judicial conference.

The legislation, if enacted, will provide for two additional circuit judgeships for the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, one additional circuit judgeship for the Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and one additional circuit judgeship for each of the Courts of Appeals for the Seventh and Tenth Circuits. It will provide for four additional district judgeships for the southern district of New York, two for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, two for the western district of Pennsylvania, one for the district of New Jersey, and one for the northern district of Georgia. It will provide for a district judgeship for the northern and southern districts of Florida, and an additional district judgeship for the southern district of Texas, with a proviso that the official residence of one of the judges shall be in the southern half of the district. It will make permanent the present district judgeship for the eastern and western districts of Missouri, held by Judge Richard M. Duncan. It will provide for two additional district judgeships for the northern district of California, and one additional district judgeship for each of the districts of southern California, Oregon, and Kansas.

This legislation is necessary in order to relieve an insufficiency in the number of Federal judicial personnel both in the district courts and in the courts of appeals which has become increasingly evident in recent months. Although this is most serious in the circuits and districts to which the legislation relates, it is due in part to tendencies in the business of the Federal courts which are of rather general application. Most important is the fact that the types of cases calling for the greatest amount of time on the part of the judges for their disposition have been increasing in recent years.

Criminal cases in the Federal courts are about at the level that they were in the fiscal year 1940, the first year of the administrative office, in fact slightly below. The number of criminal cases filed in the fiscal year 1948 was 33,300, compared with 33,401 in the fiscal year 1940. All the Federal courts recognize an obligation to give priority in disposition to criminal cases, and this is done. But criminal cases as a class do not make a large demand proportionately upon the time of the judges because the great majority of criminal cases are ended by a plea of guilty, and less than 1 defendant in 10 is tried. The business that is creating congestion in the Federal courts is in general certain types of civil cases, to a large extent private civil cases.

The total number of civil cases filed in the district courts went down from 1947 to 1948 as a result of a sharp decline in cases of price regulation. These cases, however, took relatively a small amount of time of the judges. While they were going down, the other types of civil cases making greater exactions upon the judges were going up. The number of civil cases, exclusive of price regulation cases, filed in 1948 was 43,156, which was 8,000 above the corresponding number filed annually in the years before the recent world war, 1938 to 1941. The annual average of private civil cases filed in the 84 districts in the States (exclusive of the District of Columbia) having purely Federal jurisdiction, in the years 1947–48 was 20,266, compared with an average of 15,149 for the years 1938 to 1941, an increase of 33.8 percent. Mr. Shafroth, Chief of the Division of Procedural Studies and Statistics, stated in his annual report for 1948 that "a comparison of the present work of the district courts with the prewar volume shows that total civil actions commenced annually, excluding Government price-control cases, are now running one-fifth more in number than before the war and private cases one-third more."

It is cases in these classes that place the greatest burden upon the judges. Eleven judges who kept time records for a 3 months' period during the fall and winter of 1947 reported that 73.8 percent of their time spent on all civil cases in court and chambers was devoted to hearing and deciding private civil cases. The comments of district judges virtually without exception, confirm the fact that it is the contested civil cases and cases usually between private parties which take the heaviest toll of their time. Among the commoner types of this nature are cases under the Federal Employers Liability Act which were 10 times as numerous in 1948 as they were in 1941, cases under the Jones Act on account of injuries to seamen which were well above the 1941 level, and contract and tort actions brought in the Federal courts on account of diversity of citizenship in numbers nearly twice the 1941 level. Moreover in 1948, 1,503 cases were filed in the district courts under the Federal Tort Claims Act of 1946 which brought an entirely new class of cases within the jurisdiction of the district courts.

This increase in the time-consuming types of civil cases brought in the Federal courts since the prewar years, amounting as stated anywhere from a fifth to a third or more, has not been matched by anything like a corresponding increase in the judicial personnel. No new judicial district has been created in 20 years since 1928 when the State of Indiana was divided into two districts. The judicial conference at the same meeting at which it recommended the increases in circuit and district judgeships which have been specified, expressed its opinion that the creation of new districts was not the advisable way to solve the problem, and said that where it was found that additional judicial service was necessary it would recommend that such service be provided for by the creation of additional judgeships within the existing judicial districts. But from January 1, 1940, to June 30, 1948, the number of district judgeships provided for by the Congress increased only 10, from 189 to 199, or approximately 5 percent.

The district judges in 1948 increased their rate of disposition of private civil cases, terminating 26,417 such cases as compared with 23,091 in 1947. But with the lessened proportionate judicial power they could not keep pace with the increased volume of such litigation. The number of such cases pending rose during the year and congestion developed and increased. There is no way to meet this except by recognizing the condition and increasing the judicial power.

The number of private civil cases pending at the end of the fiscal year 1948, 29,899, was nearly 4,000 more than the number at the beginning, 25,973, and 9,000 more than the number 8 years earlier, June 30, 1940, which was 20,240. Inevitably the time required for the disposition of civil cases in the United States district courts has begun to rise. The median time elapsing from filing to disposition of civil cases disposed of after trial in the 84 district courts of the districts in the States (exclusive of the District of Columbia) during the fiscal year 1948 was 9.9 months, compared with 9 months in 1947, an increase of 10 percent. Earnest efforts are being made by the judges through use of the most efficient methods, including pretrial procedure and the assignment of judges to points of strain both within and beyond their circuits, to dispatch the business as promptly as possible. But there can be no question that more judges are needed, and unless they are provided congestion and delay will be bound to increase to the detriment of the litigants and the public.

The need for additional judges does not exist in all circuits and districts, although in nearly all, including jurisdictions which have heretofore been free from strain, the increased volume of private civil cases is putting a heavier burden upon the Federal courts than in previous years. There is less scope for the practice of temporarily assigning judges to areas of congestion outside of their circuits, because more and more judges who formerly responded to calls for help of this nature, are finding all or more than they can do to keep up with the work in their own courts. The increased burden of litigation became manifest first in the district courts, but it is now appearing in the courts of appeals, and will do so more and more as cases tried in the district courts reach the courts of appeals for review. The recommendations for additional judges, circuit and district, by the Judicial Conference were based upon a consideration by the members of the conference of the conditions within their individual circuits, and as stated in the report of its action, represent the minimum which in its judgment will enable the work of the courts to be carried forward effectively.

Salient facts in reference to the recommendations for the different circuits and districts are as follows:

CIRCUIT JUDGESHIPS

The District of Columbia circuit

The bill provides for an increase in the number of circuit judges of the court of appeals for this circuit from 6 to 8.

The number of cases filed in this court increased from 264 in 1947 to 348 in 1948. Because of its location in the Capital of the Nation, the court receives many more cases involving Federal administrative agencies and high Government officers than the courts of appeals of other circuits. The pending case load per judge at the end of the fiscal year 1948, 45, compared with an average for all circuits of 28 and was the highest in the country. The median time from the filing of the record to the final disposition of cases terminated after hearing or submission in the court during the fiscal year 1948 was 8.7 months, compared with an average for the country of 6.3 months.

Chief Judge Stephens of the court estimated shortly prior to the beginning of the present court year in the fall of 1948, that after allowance was made for cases which would be disposed of without argument or opinion, there would be a remainder of 370 cases to be disposed of during the current year by opinion after argument. If this could be done it would require each of the six present judges to write some 62 opinions during the year which compares with an average of 27 opinions per year written by the judges of the court during the past nine fiscal years. The addition of two judges will still require a high average output.

The third circuit

The bill provides for an increase in the number of circuit judges of the court of appeals for this circuit from 6 to 7.

The number of cases pending in this court per judge at the end of the fiscal year 1948 was 39, which next to the District of Columbia was the highest of any circuit. Judge Albert B. Maris is counted in the number of judges in this computation, although he is the presiding judge of the United States Emergency Court of Appeals, and his duties on that court require most of his time. By the Housing and Rent Act of 1949 jurisdiction was given to the Emergency Court of

Appeals to review the recommendations of local advisory boards in defense-rental areas in reference to the maximum rents of classes of housing accommodations if requested by the Housing Expediter. There seems reason to think that the volume of work under this provision will be considerable. In order to save the Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit from falling behind, the proposal for an additional judge of that court is made.

The seventh circuit

The bill provides for an increase in the number of circuit judges of the court of appeals for this circuit from five to six.

The seventh circuit, which includes the States of Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin, has a population which, according to the census of 1940, was approximately 14,460,000. Although it includes the city of Chicago, which is the second largest city in the country and a center of large-scale industry and commerce, the court of appeals for the circuit has fewer judges than that of any other circuit except the first, fourth, and tenth. It has been recognized for some years that on account of the complexity of the cases coming before it the court needed six judges. The number of pending cases in the court at the end of the fiscal year 1948 averaged 37 per judge, in comparison with an average of all circuits of 28.

The tenth circuit

The bill provides for an increase in the number of circuit judges of the court of appeals for this circuit from four to five.

The recommendation of an increase in the number of circuit judges in the tenth circuit results from a marked increase in the number of cases filed in the court of appeals for that circuit recently. The number in the fiscal year 1948 was 194 compared with 159 in the previous year. This trend has continued into the current year. The number of cases filed in the first 5 months ended November 30, 96, was almost equal to the number filed in the first 6 months of last year, 98. The pending case load on November 30 this year, 132 (which is the latest information available) compares with 99 at the end of the second quarter of the last fiscal year on December 31, 1947.

DISTRICT JUDGESHIPS

The northern district of California

The bill provides for an increase in the number of district judges for this district from five to seven.

The work of the court for the northern district of California and other districts bordering the Pacific Ocean cannot fail to be affected by the marked increase in the population and business of that area, in the decade since 1940 now approaching a close. It is estimated that the population of each of the States of California, Oregon, and Washington, has increased somewhere between 40 and 50 percent since the last census. The private civil cases filed in the northern district of California were 537 in the fiscal year 1948 compared with 302 in the fiscal year 1940, and 279 in the fiscal year 1941 which was the last full year before the war began to have its effect. The number of private civil cases pending in the court rose from 234 at the end of the fiscal year 1946 to 488 at the end of 1947, and 608 at the end of 1948. The average number of trials per judge in 1948 was 61.4 in comparison with an average for the 84 districts of 42.1. The average number of civil trials per judge was 45.2 compared with an average for the 84 districts of 30.1. For some time the resident judicial personnel of the district court for this district has been insufficient. Effort has been made to compensate in part by the assignment of outside judges, but the additional permanent judgeships which the judicial conference has recommended are the only way of meeting the situation satisfactorily.

The southern district of California

The bill provides for an increase in the number of district judges for this district from eight to nine.

The increase in population and business in the Pacific Slope States in the last decade has had an important effect upon the work of the district court for the southern district. There has been a marked increase in the population of San Diego County which, in 1947 it was estimated, had risen from 289,000 in 1940, to 460,000. There is need for the court to spend more and more time at its headquarters in San Diego. The number of private civil cases pending before the court, 406, at the end of 1948 compares with 234 at the end of 1946, an increase of nearly 200 in 2 years. The State court system recently took account of the increasing volume of work for the courts in this part of California by increasing the number of superior court judges for Los Angeles County from 51 to 58 and the number of municipal court judges in Los Angeles from 41 to 51. The Federal court has an extraordinarily high criminal case load which in 1948 was an average of 423 per judge, compared with 167 for the 84 districts, and 153 only 6 years before. This is due in considerable part to the immigration cases that arise on the border with Mexico. While as stated these cases do not make so great a demand upon the judges per case as civil cases, and particularly private civil cases, yet the unusual volume of such cases in the southern district makes it a factor of some consequence in the burden upon the court.

The average number of trials per judge in the southern district of California in 1948 was 54, as compared with an average in the 84 districts of 42.1, and the average number of civil trials, 41.6, compared with an average of 30.1 in the 84 districts. Judge McCormick, the chief judge of the district court, is a judge of long experience, and he is emphatic in his judgment that the court cannot function satisfactorily without additional judge power.

The northern and southern districts of Florida

The bill provides for the creation of a district judgeship for the northern and southern districts of Florida.

The action recommended will only restore the number of district judgeships for the two districts in the State of Florida, namely 5, which existed until October 1, 1947, when Judge Dozier A. DeVane, who was then a judge for the northern and southern districts, became a judge for the northern district in consequence of the retirement of Judge Augustine V. Long, of that district. The statute providing for a judge for the two districts then lapsed according to its terms. There can be no question that the judgeship for the two districts should be restored. All the reasons which existed for providing for the judgeship when it was created in 1940 now exist in accentuated form.

There has been a marked increase in the population of the southern district in recent years, and the business of the court for that district has grown. The private civil cases filed in the district per judge have risen from 91 in 1946 to 129 in 1947, and 212 in 1948, compared with an average for the 84 districts in 1948 of 117, and an average for the southern district of Florida in 1942 of 76. The southern district is in great need of reinforcement which is being met as far as it can be by the assignment of judges from other jurisdictions. But the amount of help of this nature which can be given is comparatively small. There is urgent need for the appointment again of a judge for the two districts who, as in the case of Judge DeVane, would give most of his attention to the southern district.

The northern district of Georgia

The bill provides for an increase in the number of district judges for this district from one to two.

This action as in the case of Florida would only restore the active judge power which existed until recently. A statute enacted in 1940 authorized two district judges for the district but provided that the next ensuing vacancy should not be filled. The second judgeship consequently lapsed upon the retirement of Judge E. Marvin Underwood on March 5, 1948, and at the present time there is only one active judge.

Unquestionably two active judges are needed. At the end of 1948 the number of pending private civil cases was 137 compared with 105 in the fiscal year 1941, the last full year before the war. Retired Judge Underwood recognizing the need has given an unusual amount of service to the court since his retirement, but there is a manifest limit to the help which can be fairly asked from him. When it is remembered that the city of Atlanta with its active population and industry is in the district, it would seem that there could be no doubt that the second active judgeship which the district formerly had, should be restored.

The district of Kansas

The bill provides for an increase in the number of district judges from one to two.

The provision recommended in reference to this district will also only restore the status which recently existed. A law passed in 1945 increased the number of judges from one to two. From the appointment of the present judge, Arthur J. Mellott, who took the oath of office on November 27, 1945, until the death on July 5, 1946, of Judge Guy T. Helvering, who, during that time, was the senior judge, the district had two judges. But the law which provided for the second judgeship prohibited the filling of the vacancy resulting from the death of Judge Helvering, and since that time, as before 1945, Kansas has had only one judge.

The population of Kansas, according to the 1940 census, was approximately 1,800,000. Except for one other State, Colorado, which, according to the 1940 census, had a population of around 1,100,000, Kansas is the only State in the Union with a population of 850,000 or more which does not have two or more district judges. The district of Nebraska, which adjoins it on the north, with a population in 1940 of around 1,300,000, has two judges.

The work of the district court for the district of Kansas imperatively calls for an additional judge. The load of private civil cases for the one judge in 1948 was 156, compared with a national average of 117 per judge, and 113 in the fiscal year 1942. Almost constantly district judges from other districts in the tenth circuit are being assigned by Chief Judge Phillips to the district of Kansas to help the resident judge. But the condition plainly calls for the creation of a second permanent judgeship.

The eastern and western districts of Missouri

The bill provides for making permanent the second district judgeship of the two districts presently held by District Judge Richard M. Duncan.

This judgeship was created by an act approved December 24, 1942. But it contained a proviso that the first vacancy occurring should not be filled. The purpose of the legislation recommended is to avoid the lapse of time which otherwise will occur if there is a vacancy in the judgeship before a statute can be enacted to continue it, and to assure the permanence of the position.

The judges of the court have arranged that Judge Duncan will make his headquarters in Kansas City and devote his attention to the western district and that Judge Roy W. Harper, who holds an interim appointment

to the permanent judgeship for the two districts. will make his headquarters in St. Louis and give his attention to the business of the eastern district. Presumably, this division of duties between the two judges for the eastern and western districts will continue indefinitely. Consequently, it is the business of the western district which has the principal bearing on the recommendation to make permanent the judgeship held by Judge Duncan.

The experience since the passage of the act of 1942 above referred to shows plainly that three judges will be continuously needed in the western district. The volume of business in that district is approximately at the level at which it was when the law was passed. The number of private civil cases filed in 1948 and pending at the end of the year which, as has been said are the most important categories from the standpoint of the load upon the judge, is greater than in the fiscal year 1942. The number of such cases filed in 1948 was 314, compared with 292 in 1942, and the number pending at the end of 1948 was 238, compared with 136 at the end of 1942. Consequently, every reason which existed for creating the temporary judgeship held by Judge Duncan now exists for making it permanent, and it is desirable that this be done in order to avoid any hiatus in the position in the future.

The district of New Jersey

The bill provides for an increase in the number of district judges from five to six.

As pointed out hereinbefore private civil cases are the most time consuming. At the close of the fiscal year 1948 there were pending in the District of New Jersey 866 private civil cases, a number slightly in excess of 173 per judge, while pending private civil cases in the 84 districts of the United States averaged but 131 per judge. It should be noted also that the number of pending private civil cases has risen from 572 in the year 1940 to 866 in the year 1948 and there has been a continuous increase since the end of the war.

The situation is further complicated by the fact that there have been constant vacancies in the court by reason of death or resignation, and the District Court of the District of New Jersey has been badly in arrears in the disposition of cases for more than a decade. It should be noted in this connection that while the median time interval from filing to disposition in the 84 districts in 1948 was 9.9 months, the similar time interval in the district of New Jersey was 20.1 months.

There have been frequent assignments of additional judges to the district of New Jersey both from within and without the circuit, but for the prompt and effective disposition of the business of the district it is necessary that there be created at least one additonal judgeship.

The recommendation of an additional district judgeship for the district of New Jersey has been made by the judicial conference each year for the last 5 years.

The southern district of New York

The bill provides for an increase in the number of district judges from 12 to 16.

Of the four additional district judgeships recommended, one, if created, will merely restore the position that lapsed under the terms of the statute when the late Judge John M. Woolsey retired on December 31, 1948. His retirement reduced the number of resident judges from 13 to 12 where it has since stood. Since that time the number of civil cases filed in the court has all but doubled, rising from 2,949 in the fiscal year 1943 to 5,896 in the fiscal year 1948. The number of private civil cases filed, which was 1,977 in 1943, was 4,302 in 1948, and the number of such cases pending at the end of the year, which was 2,474 in 1943, was 6,738 in 1948. The court with its present force of 12 resident judges is burdened with an intolerable load which their utmost exertions and the help of many outside judges who are assigned to the district, are insufficient to carry. As an example, the number of private civil cases per judge filed in the court in 1948 was 359, compared with an average for the 84 districts of 117.

Under these conditions, the number of pending private civil cases has necessarily risen sharply in the last 3 years, going from 2,820 in 1946 to 4,706 in 1947, and 6,738 in 1948. The median time elapsing from filing to disposition of civil cases in which a trial was held in the court in the fiscal year 1948, was 22.5 months, which was the highest in the country, compared with a median for the 84 districts of 9.9 months. The present condition entailing unavoidable delay is plainly unjust to litigants besides being wearing to the last degree upon the judges of the court. The four additional judgeships which are recommended will give the court no more than a moderate judicial force to handle the cases coming before it which not only are numerous, but because of the concentration of commerce and business in New York, include an unusual proportion of complex and difficult problems for decision.

The district of Oregon

The bill provides for an increase in the number of district judges from two to three.

The work of the court for the district of Oregon is affected by the increase in population and business of the Pacific Coast States to which reference has been made in connection with the districts of California. The valley of the Willamette River, in which Portland lies near its confluence with the Columbia River, became a center for shipbuilding and other large-scale industry during the war, and this activity is continuing. In recent years the number of civil cases filed in the district has increased from 320 in 1945 to 370 in 1946, 474 in 1947, and 482 in 1948. The increase in 1948 over the number a few years previously was not due to price regulation cases because only five such civil cases were filed. The number of private civil cases begun increased from 92 in 1945 to 111 in 1946, 172 in 1947, and 174 in 1948, and the number of such cases pending rose from 62 in 1945 to 72 in 1946, 127 in 1947, and 140 in 1948.

The court for the district of Oregon is known as a court in which pretrial procedure is regularly and vigorously used. Both of the judges are recognized as highly capable jurists and skilled in dispatching work. The increase in the number of private civil cases pending under these conditions shows that the judge power has become insufficient, and that the additional judgeship recommended by the judicial conference is needed.

The eastern district of Pennsylvania

The bill provides for an increase in the number of district judges from five to seven. It should be pointed out that Judge Frederick V. Follmer, who was appointed as a district judge-at-large over the three districts of Pennsylvania, adds in effect the equivalent of a one-third judgeship.

At the end of the fiscal year 1948 there were pending in the eastern district of Pennsylvania 1,514 private civil cases which, as stated hereinbefore, constitute the most time-consuming group, or an average of 284 per judge. This is to be contrasted with the corresponding figure for the 84 districts of 131 private civil cases to a judge.

To put it bluntly the eastern district of Pennsylvania is overwhelmed in judicial business despite the fact that there have been continuous assignments of additional judges to that district both from within and without the circuit. These assignments have been both by the Chief Justice of the United States and by the chief judge of the circuit, and while they have been of substantial assistance it has been impossible to dispose of the heavy case load by such means.

The median time interval from issue to trial of civil cases terminated after trial in the 84 districts of the United States in 1948 was 5.8 months, whereas the similar time interval in the eastern district of Pennsylvania was 10.3 months, or almost 100 percent longer.

It should be noted that there has been a steady increase in the number of private civil cases (with the exception of the war years) filed in the district. In 1941 there were 454 private civil cases filed, whereas in the year 1948 there were 1,087 like cases filed. This amounted to 204 per judge as contrasted with 117 per judge in the 84 districts of the United States. It should also be observed that whereas there were but 538 private civil cases pending in the district at the end of the year 1941, there were pending 1,514 private civil cases at the end of the year 1948, an increase of almost 200 percent.

Unless prompt aid is given to the eastern district of Pennsylvania by the creation of at least two new judgeships there will follow a substantial failure of justice in that district due to inevitable delays.

The western district of Pennsylvania

The bill provides for an increase in the number of district judges from three to five, with a proviso that the first two vacancies occurring on the court should not be filled. It should be pointed out that Judge Frederick V. Follmer, who was appointed as a district judge-at-large over the three districts of Pennsylvania, adds in effect the equivalent of a one-third judgeship.

Though the case load in the court is not unusual, two of the present judges, including the chief judge, are of advanced years and have not been in continuous good health.

The condition of this district must be considered in conjunction with that of the eastern district of Pennsylvania, since Judge Follmer, the judge-at-large over the three districts, is compelled to spend a very great portion of his time at Philadelphia, the pressing necessity of additional judge power in the latter district being overwhelming.

The southern district of Texas

The bill provides for an increase in the number of district judges from two to three, with a proviso that the official residence of one district judge shall be in the southern half of the district.

The southern district of Texas is another area in which there has been a marked increase in population and industry during and after the war. The number of civil cases begun in 1948 was 1,111, compared with 508 in 1942, or more than double. The number of private civil cases begun in 1948 was 576, compared with 301 in 1942. The number of all civil cases pending at the end of 1948 was 1,030, compared with 277 at the end of 1942, and the number of private civil cases pending at the end of 1948 was 408, compared with 143 at the end of 1942. The case load per judge of private civil cases filed in 1948 was 288, compared with the average for the 84 districts of 117. The load per judge for this district in 1942 was 151.

The criminal case load, because of cases arising on the border, is proportionately very high, and while, as stated, it is the private civil cases which, per case, require the largest amount of time on the part of the judges, still, criminal cases in the volume in which they arise in this district add to the burden. The load is increased by the very large area of the district and the long distance which it is necessary for judges to travel between the seats of the court. The conditions obviously call for the additional judgeship which the Judicial Conference has recommended.

The proviso that the official residence of one of the judges shall be in the southern half of the district, was approved by the conference in compliance with what the conference was informed was the general sentiment of the district, and was deemed by the conference to be equitable.

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, two additional circuit judges for the District of Columbia circuit, one additional circuit judge for the seventh circuit, and one additional circuit judge for the tenth circuit. Accordingly title 28, United States Code, section 44 (a), is amended to read as follows with respect to said circuits:

"Circuits:	*Number of judges*
District of Columbia	8
Seventh	6
Tenth	5"

(b) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one additional circuit judge for the third circuit.

SEC. 2. (a) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, two additional district judges for the northern district of California, one additional district judge for the southern district of California, one district judge for the northern and southern districts of Florida, one additional district judge for the northern district of Georgia, one additional district judge for the district of Kansas, one additional district judge for the district of New Jersey, four additional district judges for the southern district of New York, one additional district judge for the district of Oregon, two additional district judges for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, and one additional district judge for the southern district of Texas, and the existing judgeship for the eastern and western districts of Missouri created by the act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri," approved December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1083), shall be a permanent judgeship. Accordingly title 28, United States Code, section 133, is amended to read as follows with respect to said districts:

"Districts:	
California:	*Judges*
Northern	7
Southern	9
Florida: Northern and southern	1
Georgia: Northern	2
Kansas	2
Missouri: Eastern and western	2
New Jersey	6
New York: Southern	16
Oregon	3
Pennsylvania: Eastern	7
Texas: Southern (*Provided*, That official residence of 1 district judge shall be in the southern one-half of the district)	3"

(b) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, two additional district judges for the western district of Pennsylvania: *Provided*, That the first two vacancies occurring in the office of district judge in said district shall not be filled.

(c) The act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri," approved December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1083), is hereby repealed and the incumbent of the judgeship created by said act shall henceforth hold his position under title 28, United States Code, section 133, as amended by this act.

REPEAL OF TAX ON OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to repeal Federal antimargarine legislation.

In the light of developments at the last session and since Congress went home, I am hopeful that repeal of the burdensome and unfair antimargarine laws will be one of the first orders of business of the Eighty-first Congress. In my opinion, only the legislative jam which developed during the closing days of the Eightieth Congress prevented complete repeal during that session.

As will be recalled, the House approved a repeal bill by a more than 2 to 1 vote; the Senate Finance Committee reported the House bill by a 12 to 0 vote. Test votes near the close of the session indicated that a bill to repeal the antimargarine laws would pass the Senate with votes to spare.

The issues in the margarine controversy are thoroughly known. Committee hearings were held in the House and Senate last session and the matter was thoroughly debated in both Houses. I see no reason for committee hearings at this session and feel that a vote should come as quickly as possible.

Since the session ended, the butter interests have come forward with the proposal that the taxes on margarine be lifted but that yellow margarine be banned by law altogether.

This simply represents an attempt to confuse the issue. The butter interests offered no concession whatever until it became apparent they could no longer resist the drive toward repeal of the unfair and outmoded legislation.

The butter lobby claims that the ban on yellow margarine is necessary to prevent margarine from being sold as butter.

A similar argument can be made in the case of hundreds of products which imitate and compete with an original product. If we accept butter's theory, we must prevent imitation leather from being colored brown. Otherwise, somebody might be deceived. The whole field of imitation jewelry is in danger for these imitate in color and in other ways the characteristics of the genuine gems. Furthermore, there are instances on record where these imitation gems have been sold as the real article. In the food field, we might have to color shortening some hue other than white, for fear that otherwise it imitates lard too closely. These examples could be continued at length.

Some of the illustrations I have given may sound ridiculous but when examined closely they are no more ridiculous than butter's assertion that it has a right to prevent a competitor from using a certain color.

Butter apparently is the only product in this country which claims a monopoly on any color. And, paradoxically enough, butter uses artificial coloring freely and, by law, butter is specifically exempted from the requirement that the use of artificial coloring must be stated on the label. If color is used in margarine that fact must be stated and the requirement applies to all other foods—with the exception of dairy products.

Butter has the yellow hue traditionally associated with the food only during some of the spring and summer months. In the winter, when the cows are no longer feeding on green grass, butter's color is likely to be white, and artificial coloring is used to make it yellow.

It is readily apparent that the proposal to ban yellow margarine cannot be defended from a logical standpoint. It clearly is an attempt by one commodity to cripple a competitor through punitive legislation.

No one, least of all myself, wants to see margarine sold as butter. There are laws against such sales now, both Federal and State. If these are not sufficient, let others be passed.

In this connection, an amendment was added to the oleomargarine tax repeal bill last year, when it was reported to the Senate by the Finance Committee which made the serving of margarine as butter in public eating places a Federal offense.

The amendment is substantially acceptable to me and I have included similar provisions in the bill I am introducing today. It provides that—

First. Each separate serving of margarine sold by a public eating place must bear labeling identifying it as oleomargarine; and

Second. A public eating place serving colored oleomargarine must place a prominent and conspicuous notice in the establishment stating that oleomargarine is served there, or notice be printed on the menu. These requirements apply regardless of whether the margarine served is transported in interstate commerce or whether it is sold in the same State or Territory in which it is produced.

In my opinion, a ban on yellow margarine actually would do much less toward the elimination of fraud in the sale of margarine than my amendment proposes.

Approximately 90 percent of all margarine sold is sold through stores for home consumption. Under the food and drug laws margarine must be clearly identified, and there is little danger of fraud in store sales for these reasons: Not only are the majority of the grocers honest and conscientious men but the penalty for removing the wrapping from margarine and selling it as butter is very severe. A grocer who deliberately does so may be sent to prison for 3 years or fined $10,000, or both. No grocer in his right mind would risk such a punishment for the comparatively small amount to be made from fraud in the sale of margarine.

We have then the fact that there is no danger of fraud in the case of 90 percent of the margarine sold. The remaining 10 percent goes mostly to the bakers, who do not care whether margarine is yellow or white. They use it to mix with other ingredients. There is no possible danger of fraud in the case of sales to bakers.

Thus, we have a situation where solely in the case of public eating places, there is a possibility of fraud. This possibility, as I have shown, exists in substantially less than 10 percent of margarine sales. Yet the butter interests want to force housewives all over the country to continue extra and unnecessary work in mixing color into margarine and to waste food in the process.

If the butter interests want to prevent fraud, let them support repeal with an amendment which makes the sale of margarine as butter in public eating places a Federal offense and which places enforcement of the amendment in the very efficient hands of the Food and Drug Administration.

There is more at stake in the repeal of antimargarine legislation than is readily apparent. The law is in reality an internal tariff. If the precedent it establishes is followed, this country would be Balkanized.

Antimargarine legislation discriminates not only against consumers but against cotton and soybean farmers and other farmers who produce fats and oils which go into margarine. This discrimination has been going on a long time and has been particularly costly to the cotton producers.

Nor will repeal injure the dairy farmers, for butter today is the least profitable use of milk. Over the years it has become steadily less and less important to dairying.

The bill (S. 117) to repeal the tax on oleomargarine, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to complete the requirements for the positive identification of yellow oleomargarine, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

SCHOOL-FACILITIES AID BILL

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a school-facilities aid bill.

One of the most acute problems facing our Nation today is that of providing adequate public-school facilities. Our population is increasing more rapidly than was anticipated and this, together with wartime restrictions upon construction, has resulted in an accumulated need for school buildings estimated last year by the United States Office of Education at $6,600,000,000.

The States and local school districts, faced with the related problems of providing more teachers with increased pay to compensate for higher living costs, are having great difficulty in financing building programs that are regarded as essential. This is a field in which Federal assistance is justified.

I am, therefore, reintroducing today the bill (S. 2909) which I offered at the special session of the Eightieth Congress last summer to provide $300,000,000 in grants and an additional $300,000,000 in loans for public school buildings and related facilities. This money would be distributed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to State educational authorities on a basis proportional to each State's population of school age as compared with the national population in the same age bracket. The plan proposed by my bill is similar to that under which the PWA helped to finance 15,300 new school buildings or major additions providing accommodations for 2,384,000 students.

I feel that this approach not only offers Federal aid to education at a point of great need, but it also gives maximum assurance to those who would like to see aid provided but who fear ultimate interference of the Federal Government with our educational system. My bill sets up no new agency and gives no added authority to an existing agency, except for the simple provision that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation may act as disbursing agent. State educational authorities are left with full power to use the funds allocated to them in whatever way will best meet their individual building needs. No additional appropriations will be required to enable the RFC to finance this undertaking.

The bill (S. 137) to authorize the making of grants and loans to the States to assist in providing adequate public elementary and secondary school facilities, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

NATIONAL HOUSING OBJECTIVE

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on behalf of Mr. WAGNER, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. MYERS, Mr. HILL, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. LONG, and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish a national housing objective, and so forth.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD a short synopsis and explanation of the bill, together with another document showing the major differences between the bill I am sending to the desk and Senate bill 866 which was considered by the Senate during the Eightieth Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the synopsis and explanation of the bill presented by the Senator from Louisiana, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 138) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public-housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The synopsis and explanation of the bill, presented by Mr. ELLENDER, are as follows:

MAJOR DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE BILL TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL HOUSING OBJECTIVE AND THE POLICY TO BE FOLLOWED IN THE ATTAINMENT THEREOF, TO PROVIDE FEDERAL AID TO ASSIST SLUM-CLEARANCE PROJECTS AND LOW-RENT PUBLIC-HOUSING PROJECTS INITIATED BY LOCAL AGENCIES, TO PROVIDE FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE BY THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE FOR FARM HOUSING, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES, AND THE COMPARABLE TITLES OF S. 866, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, AS PASSED BY THE SENATE

TITLE

There has been included in the title of the draft bill a specific reference to the provision of financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing.

Section 2. Declaration of national housing policy

The declaration of policy has been clarified by the addition of specific provisions with respect to governmental assistance for farm housing, and by the inclusion of provisions to make it clear that the portion of the policy relating to governmental assistance to localities for slum clearance and low-rent public housing is concerned with nonfarm families. A clause has also been added to the effect that appropriate local public bodies shall be encouraged and assisted to undertake positive programs of assisting housing cost reductions and increased efficiency in residential construction.

TITLE I—SLUM CLEARANCE

The maximum maturity of the long-term definitive Federal loans has been reduced from 45 years to 40 years. This is contained in the second sentence of section 102 (a) of the bill.

Provisions have also been included to authorize the Administrator to make loans to local public agencies for surveys and plans in preparation of projects which may be assisted under this title, and to permit contracts for such loans to be made upon the condition that such loans shall be repaid, with interest at not less than the applicable going Federal rate, out of any moneys which become available to such agency for the undertaking of the project or projects involved. These provisions are contained in section 102 (b) of the bill.

The total loan authorization has been reduced from $1,010,000,000 to an even $1,000,000,000, and the maximum period over which such authorization becomes available has been reduced from 6 years to 5 years. The rate at which the loan authorization becomes available has been changed as follows: $25,000,000 (in lieu of $10,000,000) in the first year (July 1, 1949), $225,000,000 (in lieu of $200,000,000) in the second year (July 1, 1950), and $250,000,000 (in lieu of $200,000,000 in each of the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth years) in each of the third, fourth, and fifth years, respectively (July 1, 1951, July 1, 1952, and July 1, 1953). Provisions have also been included to permit the increases in the loan authorization becoming available in any year to be increased (subject to the total loan authorization of $1,000,000,000), at any time or times, by not to exceed an additional $250,000,000 upon a determination by the President that such action is in the public interest. Provisions have also been included which make the issuance of obligations by the Administrator for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury under the loan authorization subject to the approval of the President. These provisions are contained in section 102 (c) of the bill.

The capital grant authorization remains at $500,000,000, becoming available at the rate of $100,000,000 each year over a 5-year period, and provision has been included to make the availability of these contract authorizations subject to the approval of the President. Provisions have also been included to permit the rate at which such authorization becomes available to be accelerated. Thus, the bill provides that (subject to the total capital grant authorization of $500,000,000) the initial $100,000,000, and each subsequent annual increase therein, may be increased, at any time or times, by an additional $100,000,000 upon a determination by the President that such action is in the public interest. These provisions are included in section 103 (b) of the bill.

The provision that capital grant contracts shall contain a condition that no funds shall be disbursed by local public agencies for the purchase of land in connection with projects assisted under this title prior to July 1, 1950, is retained, but provisions have been added to direct the Administrator to waive such condition upon a determination by the President that the disbursement of funds by such agencies for such purpose prior to such date would be in the public interest. These provisions are contained in section 103 (b) of the bill.

The provisions prohibiting the demolition of residential structures prior to July 1, 1951, except upon a finding that such demolition would not result in undue hardship for the occupants of such structures have been changed so that such action is prohibited unless the governing body of the locality finds that such demolition would not reasonably be expected to cause undue housing hardship in the community. These provisions are contained in the proviso of section 105 (c) of the bill.

The former provisions with respect to the preparation of budget programs and the maintenance of accounts in accord with the Government Corporation Control Act, "as amended as of the date of the enactment of this act" have been changed by deletion of the words "as amended as of the date of this act." These provisions are contained in sections 106 (a) (1) and (2) of the bill.

The provisions with respect to an annual report have been changed to require such report to be submitted as soon as practicable following the close of the year for which it is made, rather than a specific requirement that such report must be on a fiscal-year basis, with transmission not later than January 15 following the close of the fiscal year for which it is made. These provisions are contained in section 106 (a) (4) of the bill.

Provisions have been included to make it clear that the competitive bidding and other restrictive statutes with respect to the acquisition, handling, or disposal of real property by the United States are not applicable to any real property which may be acquired by the Administrator pursuant to this title. These provisions are included in section 106 (c) (2) of the bill.

Provisions have been added to specifically exclude from the local grants-in-aid in connection with a project or projects assisted under this title (1) land in streets, alleys, and other public rights-of-way which may be vacated in connection with the project; and (2) any demolition or removal work, improvement, or facility for which a State, municipality, or other public body has received, or has contracted to receive, any grant or subsidy from the United States, or any agency or instrumentality thereof, for such work, or the construction of such improvement or facility. These provisions are included in section 110 (d) of the bill.

TITLE II—LOW-RENT PUBLIC HOUSING

Throughout the revised bill the provisions applicable to the extended program are made to apply to projects initiated after March 1, 1949, instead of after July 1, 1948. A definition of the term "initiated" is also added in subsection 207 (b).

Section 201 now provides that no contract for financial assistance may be entered into unless the governing body of the locality involved has first entered into an agreement with the local public housing agency to provide the required local cooperation. This is in lieu of the provisions which merely required prior approval by the governing body of the provision of the low-rent housing. The gap of 20 percent between the lowest rents in available private housing and the top rents in a new low-rent public housing project must be established before a contract for contributions can be entered into, instead of prior to the time when a preliminary loan contract is entered into.

Section 201 in defining the requirements for eligibility of families as tenants of a law-rent housing project has been revised to include families which, at the time of their admission, actually are or are about to be without housing as a result of a court order of eviction due to causes other than the fault of the tenant.

The requirement that the question of greatest need be given due consideration in selecting tenants, has been strengthened by providing that, among applicants eligible for occupancy in a dwelling at a given rent, preference be granted to the families having the most urgent housing need.

The provisions of S. 866 (subsections 601 (b) and 602 (c)) permitting the removal of overincome tenants notwithstanding the provisions of any other laws, and authorizing the Public Housing Administration to exclude pensions for service-connected disability or death in determining net income for the purpose of tenant eligibility, have been deleted since such provisions are now contained in other legislation heretofore enacted by the Congress.

The cost limits on dwelling facilities and equipment for low-rent housing projects contained in section 203 have been revised in the following particulars:

(a) The former differential between the cost limits for projects developed in cities or metropolitan districts having a population of 500,000 or over and for projects in smaller localities has been eliminated. Such differential is no longer realistic due to the increased uniformity in construction costs, including both labor and material, irrespective of city size.

(b) The former limitations of $1,250 and $1,500 per room have been increased to a uniform $1,750 per room because of the increase in building costs; for dwelling projects in Alaska, the cost limitation has been increased from $2,200 to $2,500 per room.

(c) The provisions of S. 866 which authorized, under certain conditions, an increase of $250 per room in the applicable cost limitations for construction and equipment for any project initiated on or before December 31, 1952 (formerly December 31, 1951) have been revised to permit an increase in such cost limits of $750 per room without limit as to time.

Subsection 204 (c) which changes the definition of the going Federal rate has been revised so as to tie this rate to the interest on bonds of the Federal Government having a maturity of 10 years or more instead of 20 years or more, and has been further revised so that if there are two or more such rates the highest instead of the lowest thereof shall be applicable.

In subsection 204 (e), the maximum annual contribution rate is increased by one-half of 1 percent of development cost to compensate for the withdrawal of Federal income-tax exemptions on the interest of the obligations of the local public housing agencies.

Subsection 204 (h) which formerly authorized the Public Housing Administration to have outstanding at any one time notes and other obligations in the amount of $800,000,000, has been revised to increase this amount to $1,500,000,000, in recognition of the increased size of the program and of the increased construction costs anticipated in the extended program.

Section 205, which formerly authorized the Public Housing Administration to enter into contracts for annual contributions for low-rent housing projects in the amount of not more than $32,000,000 on or after the first day of July 1948, which limits were increased by further amounts of $32,000,000 in the years 1949, 1950, 1951, and 1952, respectively, thus providing for an aggregate authorization of $160,000,000, has been amended in the following particulars:

(a) The aggregate amount of annual contributions which may be contracted for in connection with the extended program has been increased to $445,000,000 in recognition of the increased size of the program and of increased construction costs.

(b) The Public Housing Administration is authorized to enter into contracts for not more than an aggregate of $85,000,000 after July 1, 1949, which limit is increased by further amounts of $90,000,000 on July 1 in each of the years 1950 through and including 1953, respectively. Subject to the total authorization, the President may accelerate this schedule by increasing any of the amounts by not more than $90,000,000.

(c) Provisions have also been included to make the availability of these contract authorizations subject to the approval of the President.

The provisions of S. 866 limited the new program of low-rent housing to a total of 500,000 dwelling units. Under section 205 of the bill, the Public Housing Administration can authorize the commencement of the construction of not more than 150,000 dwelling units after July 1, 1949, which limit is increased by further amounts of 150,000 dwelling units on July 1 in each of the years 1950 through and including 1955. The President is given the authority (subject to the total limitation of 1,050,000 units) to accelerate such construction by increasing any of the amounts by 150,000 dwelling units if he determines that this is in the public interest.

A new subsection 205 (b) has been added, which requires that low-rent housing projects initiated after March 1, 1949, be exempt from all real and personal property taxes, but authorizes payments in lieu of taxes in an annual amount not in excess of 5 percent of shelter rents charged in such project. These provisions are in lieu of the present requirements of the act as to local contributions. The subsection also permits the revision of contracts for projects initiated prior to March 1, 1949, on similar terms. These provisions are necessary to clear up the matter of payments in lieu of taxes which has been brought into question by limitations in the Government Corporations Appropriation Acts for 1948 and 1949.

A new section 206 has been added to better meet the needs of large families. The present provisions of the act are modified so that there will be a larger spread between the incomes for eligibility of families with few children and for those with a relatively large number of children. In addition, for the purpose of continued occupancy only, the income of a secondary worker who is under 21 years of age may be excluded in whole or in part, but such income must be taken into account in fixing rents.

A new subsection 207 (a) has been added, which amends the declaration of purpose of the United States Housing Act by changing the words "rural or urban communities" to the words "urban and rural nonfarm areas." This is done in view of the fact that farm housing will not be a responsibility of PHA under the act.

TITLE III—HOUSING RESEARCH

Provision has been included to exempt the dissemination of the results of technical research and studies from the existing provisions of law prohibiting any agency from distributing through the mail, free of postage, reports and other documents, unless a request therefor has been previously received by such agency. This is contained in the last sentence of section 301 (a) of the bill.

Provision has been included in the subsection relating to the preparation by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator of periodic estimates of national housing needs and reports with respect to the progress being made toward meeting such needs to make it clear that such estimates and reports relate to urban and rural nonfarm housing. This is contained in section 301 (b) of the bill.

Provision has been included for the Administrator to consult with, and make recommendations to, other appropriate Federal agencies with respect to means for overcoming existing gaps in available housing data and facilities for the collection of such data. Provision has also been included to make it clear that the research and studies

can be undertaken cooperatively with industry and labor, as well as with agencies of State and local governments, educational institutions, and other nonprofit organizations. These provisions are contained in section 302 of the bill.

TITLE IV—FARM HOUSING

The basis of the definition of the term "farm" for the purposes of this title has been changed from the production of one or more agricultural commodities for sale or home use of "a gross annual value of not less than $400" to "a gross annual value of not less than the value as determined by the Secretary to be equivalent to a gross annual value of $400 in 1944." This is contained in section 401 (b) of the bill.

Provision has been included for the preparation by the Secretary of Agriculture of periodic estimates of national farm housing needs and reports with respect to the progress being made toward meeting those needs. This is contained in section 405 (b) of the bill.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Provisions have been included to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to appoint such advisory committees as may be necessary in carrying out his functions, powers, and duties under this or any other act. Provision is also included that service as a member of any such advisory committee shall not constitute any form of service or employment within the provisions of title 18, section 198 or 203, United States Code, or within the provisions of title 41, section 119, United States Code. These provisions are contained in section 501 on the bill.

(Provisions of title 18, section 198, United States Code, prohibit an officer of the United States, or a person holding any place of trust or profit, or discharging any official function under or in connection with any executive department, and others from acting as agent or attorney for prosecuting any claim against the United States or assisting in the prosecution or supporting any such claim or receiving any gratuity or favor or interest in any claim, and provides a fine of not more than $5,000, 1 year's imprisonment, or both.)

(Provisions of title 18, section 203, United States Code, prohibit an officer or clerk of the United States directly or indirectly from receiving or agreeing to receive any compensation for any services rendered or to be rendered in relation to any proceeding, contract, claim, controversy, charge, accusation, arrest, or other matter in which the United States is a party before any court or bureau, and provides a fine of $10,000 and not more than 2 years' imprisonment.)

(Title 41, section 119, United States Code (which is part of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944), prohibits any person employed in any Government agency to prosecute or act as counsel, attorney, or agent for prosecuting any claim against the United States or for any person within 2 years after such employment to prosecute or act as counsel or agent involving any such matter directly connected with which such person was so employed to perform duties. It provides $10,000 fine or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.)

In recognition of the special security features which would attach to the definitive bonds issued by public-housing agencies, there has been included an amendment of the National Banking Act so that national banks, and (to the extent permitted by State laws) State member banks of the Federal Reserve System, would be authorized to purchase larger amounts, and to underwrite, local public-housing agency definitive bonds. Without this amendment, investment in such bonds by these banks would continue to be subject to the same restrictions as are applicable to local public-housing agency definitive bonds, which are now issued without these special security features. In other words, they could be purchased for the bank's own account only to the extent of 10 percent of unimpaired capital and surplus.

The amendment would also cover the short-term notes issued in connection with the slum-clearance program, and those issued in connection with the low-rent public-housing program, when secured by a pledge of proceeds of Federal loans in an amount sufficient to pay the principal of and the interest on such short-term notes at maturity.

The Secretary of Labor has been included in the membership of the National Housing Council in the Housing and Home Finance Agency. This provision is contained in section 503 of the bill.

A new section 504 has been included to repeal the provisos which were inserted in the Government Corporations Appropriation Acts of 1948 and 1949 limiting payments in lieu of taxes. These provisos necessitated violations by the Public Housing Administration of certain contracts which had been legally entered into. Their repeal will permit payments in lieu of taxes to be made in accordance with such valid contracts. These provisos are superseded by subsection 205 (b) which establishes a permanent policy as to payments in lieu of taxes. Subsection (c) of section 504 repeals a proviso limiting the number of employees of the Public Housing Administration above grades CAF-10 and P-3 to not exceeding 20 percent of the total number of administrative employees. This repeal is necessary to permit the recruitment of the trained personnel which will be necessary to put the new program into operation.

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY OF THE BILL TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL HOUSING OBJECTIVE AND THE POLICY TO BE FOLLOWED IN THE ATTAINMENT THEREOF, TO PROVIDE FEDERAL AID TO ASSIST SLUM-CLEARANCE PROJECTS AND LOW-RENT PUBLIC HOUSING PROJECTS INITIATED BY LOCAL AGENCIES, TO PROVIDE FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE BY THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE FOR FARM HOUSING, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Section 1. Short title

This section provides a short and convenient form of citation.

Section 2. Declaration of national housing policy

The purpose of this section is to set forth our national housing objectives as established by the Congress and the basic principles to be followed in attaining these objectives. In so doing it stresses the Nation's interest in housing production and related community development because of the basic contribution they can make both (1) toward improving the health and living standards of the people and (2) toward an economy of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power. Thus, the section calls attention specifically to the need for housing production and related community development sufficient to remedy the serious housing shortage, to eliminate slum and blighted areas, to realize as soon as feasible the goal of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family, to redevelop communities so as to advance the growth and wealth of the Nation, and to enable the housing industry to make its full contribution toward an economy of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power.

The keystone of the national housing policy established by the Congress in this section to facilitate the attainment of these objectives is that private enterprise shall be encouraged to serve as large a part of the total need as it can, and that governmental assistance shall be utilized where feasible to enable private enterprise to serve still more of the total need, and that local public bodies shall be encouraged and assisted to undertake positive programs of assisting housing cost reductions and increased efficiency in residential construction. As a complementary policy, the section states that governmental aid to clear slums and provide adequate housing for urban and rural nonfarm families whose incomes are so low that they are not being decently housed in new or existing housing shall be extended to those localities which estimate their own needs and demonstrate that these needs are not being met by reliance solely upon private enterprise, and without such aid, and that governmental assistance for decent, safe, and sanitary farm dwellings and related facilities shall be extended only where the farm owner demonstrates that he lacks sufficient resources to provide such housing on his own account and is unable to secure necessary credit for such housing from other sources on terms and conditions which he could reasonably be expected to fulfill.

TITLE I—SLUM CLEARANCE

General summary

This title provides for Federal aid to local communities for the clearance of their slums and blighted areas, so as to make such areas available for redevelopment, with the active participation of private enterprise. Two types of assistance are authorized:

1. Loans, both temporary and long-term (but not in excess of 40 years in the case of long-term definitive loans), where needed to finance necessary project costs, at an interest rate designed to return to the Government the cost to it of the funds it obtains to make the loans; and

2. A capital grant subsidy where necessary to enable the land in the slum or blighted area to be made available for redevelopment at prices consistent with proper and sound land use and planning.

The administration of the program would be under the jurisdiction of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator. In the administration of the program adherence to the following principles is required:

1. That any project assisted be related to the improvement of housing conditions in the locality.

2. That Federal assistance be confined to purposes of land assembly and preparation for redevelopment, as distinguished from actual redevelopment of the area.

3. That every project assisted be a local undertaking, locally planned, locally approved, and designed to serve local needs.

4. That plans for redevelopment afford maximum opportunity to, and require maximum reliance upon, private enterprise.

5. That there shall be local financial participation in an amount equal to at least one-third of the difference between the project cost and the new reuse value of the land comprising the project area.

6. That there be adequate provision for the rehousing of the families displaced by the clearance of the area.

Section 101. Local responsibility to aid housing cost reductions

This section provides that in extending financial assistance under this title, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator shall give consideration to the extent to which the locality has undertaken a positive program of encouraging housing cost reductions and efficiency in construction through the adoption and improvement of building and related codes.

Section 102. Loans

This section, together with section 103, sets forth the forms and extent of Federal financial assistance. Section 102 provides for assistance in the form of loans which (whether temporary or definitive) must bear interest at not less than the rate specified in the most recently issued bonds of the Federal Government having a maturity of 10 years or more at the date the contract for the loan is made. The long-term definitive loans must mature within a period not exceeding 40 years from the date of the bonds evidencing such loans.

While providing for Federal assistance in the form of loans where necessary, the section also contains provisions to facilitate financing by private capital. It contains a provision to enable the local public agency to obtain loan funds from sources other than the Federal Government to the fullest extent practicable, and to substitute such funds for borrowing from the Government.

The section also provides that the Administrator may make loans to local public agencies for surveys and plans in preparation of projects which may be assisted under this title, and that the contracts for such loans may be made upon the condition that such loans shall be repaid, with interest at not less than the applicable going Federal rate, out of any moneys which become available to such agency for the undertaking of the project or projects involved.

To provide the funds necessary to make the loans, the Administrator is authorized, with the approval of the President, to issue and have outstanding at any one time notes or other obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury aggregating not more than $1,000,000,000. This loan authorization becomes available over a 5-year period at the following rate: $25,000,000 on and after July 1, 1949, increased by $225,000,000 on and after July 1, 1950, and by $250,000,000 on and after July 1 in each of the years 1951, 1952, and 1953, respectively. The section also permits the increases in the loan authorization becoming available in any year to be increased (subject to the total loan authorization of $1,000,000,000), at any time or times, by not to exceed an additional $250,000,000 upon a determination by the President that such action is in the public interest.

Section 103. Capital grants

This section provides for Federal subsidy, in the form of capital grants, in those cases where such assistance is necessary, if the land in the project area is to be available for proper use and soundly planned redevelopment at prices consistent with such use and redevelopment. The capital grants would be limited in amount to two-thirds of the net cost of the projects assisted in the locality.

The Administrator is authorized to contract to make capital grants aggregating not more than $500,000,000. This capital-grant authorization becomes available over a 5-year period at the following rate: $100,000,000 on and after July 1 in each of the years 1949, 1950, 1951, 1952, and 1953, respectively. The section also permits the specified amounts of the capital-grant authorization becoming available in any year to be increased (subject to the total capital-grant authorization of $500,000,000), at any time or times, by not to exceed an additional $100,000,000 upon a determination by the President that such action is in the public interest.

While contracts for capital grants may be entered into beginning with July 1, 1949, the section contains a provision that such contracts shall contain a condition that no funds shall be disbursed by the local public agency prior to July 1, 1950, for the purchase of land in connection with a project assisted under this title. Such condition may be waived upon a determination by the President that the disbursement of funds for such purpose prior to such date would be in the public interest.

Section 104. Requirements for local grants-in-aid

This section requires the locality to share the cost of any project assisted under this title and to call upon the Federal Government for aid only to the extent necessary. It provides that the local community must itself participate financially to the extent of at least one-third of the net project cost. Such local financial participation may take the form of direct reduction of project costs or expenditures, by contributions made in cash or its equivalent, demolition or removal work, or site improvements in the project area, and public improvements and facilities (other than low-rent public housing) which are primarily of direct benefit to the project and which are necessary to serve or support the new uses of land in the project area.

Where a locality undertakes more than one project with Federal assistance, this requirement relates to such projects considered in the aggregate.

Section 105. Local determinations and responsibilities

This section assures that aid to projects under this title will be based upon local determination of need and maximum reliance upon private enterprise. It provides that any contracts for financial aid under the title may be made (1) only with a duly authorized local public agency, and (2) only if the redevelopment plan is approved by the governing body of the locality. Moreover, such approval must include findings that the Federal financial aid to be provided in the contract is necessary to enable the land in the project area to be redeveloped; that the redevelopment plans will afford maximum opportunity for development or redevelopment by private enterprise; and that the redevelopment plan conforms to a general plan for the development of the locality as a whole.

This section also assures that all projects assisted will (1) conform to the locally approved redevelopment plan, and (2) be consistent with the interests of the locality as a whole. It therefore provides that as a condition to Federal assistance, the local public agency must agree to obligate those to whom it sells or leases the land in the project area, to devote the land to the uses specified in the redevelopment plan and to begin the building of their improvements within a reasonable time.

The section also requires that there be a feasible method for both the temporary and permanent relocation of the families who have been living in the area and who are displaced as a result of the clearance of the area. Also, in view of the present acute housing shortage, this section would prevent the demolition of residential structures in connection with this program prior to July 1, 1951, unless the governing body of the locality determines that such demolition would not reasonably be expected to create undue housing hardship in the community.

Section 106. General provisions

This section gives the Administrator the technical powers necessary for the performance of his duties under this title. In so doing, it provides for the appointment of a director to administer the provisions of this title under the direction and supervision of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

Section 107. Payment for any land used for low-rent public housing

This section assures that the financial assistance under this title will not result in a double subsidy to federally assisted low-rent public housing, by providing that any land in the project area made available for such low-rent public housing must be paid for by the public-housing agency undertaking such low-rent public-housing project.

Section 108. Surplus Federal real property

This section authorizes the sale of any Federal real property surplus to the needs of the Government and within the area of a land-assembly project, to the local public agency undertaking the project, at a price equal to its cash value. The proceeds from any such sales would be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Section 109. Protection of labor standards

This section, designed for the protection of labor standards, requires that not less than prevailing wages be paid to those employed in the development of any land assembly and clearance project assisted, makes the "kickback" statute applicable to all such projects, and requires monthly reports by all contractors used on the project to the Secretary of Labor as to the number of persons employed by them, the aggregate amount of their pay rolls, the total man-hours worked, and expenditures for materials.

Section 110. Definitions

This section sets forth the definitions of the basic terms used in the title. Through these definitions, the section provides that no area selected for redevelopment would qualify for Federal aid unless it involves either the clearance of a slum area or the development or redevelopment for predominantly residential uses of a deteriorated or deteriorating area or a defunct subdivision or other open land whose development is necessary for sound community growth. Through these definitions also, the section limits Federal assistance to the furtherance of such purposes as (1) the acquisition of the land in the area requiring development or redevelopment; (2) the removal of existing structures; (3) the provision of the utilities essential for the new land uses contemplated; and (4) the making of the land available for development or redevelopment at prices consistent with its proposed new uses. Aid under this title to assist the construction of any of the buildings contemplated by the redevelopment plan is expressly barred.

Through these definitions, this section also provides that there may not be included in the local grants-in-aid (1) land in streets, alleys, and other public rights-of-way which may be vacated in connection with a project, or (2) any demolition or removal work, improvement or facility for which a State, municipality, or other public body has received or has contracted to receive from the United States, or any agency or instrumentality thereof, any grant or subsidy for such work or for the construction of such improvement or facility.

TITLE II—LOW-RENT PUBLIC HOUSING

This title provides for an extension of the low-rent public-housing program to serve urban and rural nonfarm families whose incomes are so low that they are not being adequately housed in new or existing private housing.

This title contains provisions to assure complete consistency with the basic objectives of primary reliance upon private enterprise to do as much of the total housing job as possible; increasing emphasis on local responsibility and initiative; special preferences to meet the needs of veterans of low income and their families; enlistment of private capital to finance substantially all of the capital cost of low-rent public housing projects; and an adaptation to current needs with respect to the amount and period of Federal annual subsidy to achieve low rents. The title also contains a miscellany of technical and perfecting amendments to the United States Housing Act of 1937 that the 11 years of operations under it have indicated to be necessary and desirable.

Section 201. Local responsibilities and determinations; tenancy only by low-income families

This section provides that no contract shall be made for any Federal financial assistance, even for preliminary loans, unless (1) the local public housing agency has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Public Housing Administration that there is need for such low-rent housing in that locality which is not being met by private enterprise, and (2) the governing body of the locality has entered into an agreement with the local

public housing agency to provide the local cooperation and assistance which is required by the Public Housing Administration pursuant to this act.

This section also provides that no contract shall be made for annual contributions unless the local public housing agency has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Public Housing Administration that a gap of at least 20 percent has been left between the upper rental limits for admission to the proposed project and the lowest rents at which private enterprise is providing (through new construction and available existing structures) a substantial supply of decent, safe, and sanitary housing toward meeting the need of an adequate volume thereof. This section thus establishes as basic national policy that even with respect to the segment of housing need which private enterprise is not now serving, every opportunity is to be given to it to extend its servicing capacity downward in the income scale.

This section also provides that every contract for annual contributions shall require the local public housing agency to fix, subject to approval by the Public Housing Administration, maximum income limits for admission and for continued occupancy in the project; that, as indicated by actual investigation, every family admitted to the project was actually one of low income, and that every such family admitted came from an unsafe, insanitary, or overcrowded dwelling, or had been displaced by slum-clearance or land assembly and clearance projects, or was (without fault of its own) either without housing or was about to be without housing pursuant to a court order of eviction. For a period of 5 years, however, these requirements as to previous housing conditions do not apply to veterans or servicemen of low income. In the selection of tenants for low-rent housing, it is also required that there be no discrimination against families otherwise eligible on the ground that their incomes are derived in whole or in part from public assistance, and that (subject to the veterans' preference in sec. 206) families will be selected on the basis of the most urgent housing need. After admission, periodic examinations must be made of the incomes of all families which are tenants in the project so that, if their incomes increase to the point where they exceed the applicable income limits for continued occupancy they will be required to move from the project.

Section 202. Veterans' preference

This section guarantees preference to veterans and servicemen of low income in all new projects initiated under this title after March 1, 1949. Specifically, as between applicants who are eligible for a dwelling of given size and rent, it requires that preference be given to the families of veterans and servicemen (including families of deceased veterans and servicemen) who apply for admission within 5 years after March 1, 1949. First preference is to be given to disabled veterans whose disability is service-connected.

Section 203. Cost limits

This section is designed to end certain inequities and uncertainties resulting from present cost limits on low-rent housing assisted by the Federal Government, and to compensate for the drastic increase in building costs since the enactment of the United States Housing Act in 1937.

Experience has indicated that existing provisions, which place a ceiling on dwelling-unit costs as well as on room costs, and which provide for higher cost ceilings for cities of more than 500,000 population, are inadequate or faulty, in that (1) a limitation on cost of the entire dwelling unit hampers the provision of housing for larger-sized families of low income and so discriminates against such families; and (2) a differential in cost limits based solely on the size of the community is no longer realistic due to the increasing uniformity in construction costs, including both labor and material, irrespective of city size. The section, therefore, eliminates the limitation on dwelling-unit cost (but not the limitation on room cost, so that the essential limitation on construction costs is still retained in the act) and establishes a uniform ceiling, not dependent upon city size, for the cost of dwelling construction and equipment. In addition, the section simplifies determination of compliance with the cost limitations by specifically basing these limitations upon the cost of dwelling construction and equipment. This will ordinarily permit firm determination of compliance with the cost limitations of the act at the time the main construction contract is awarded.

In order that the drastic increase in building costs and the now apparent long-term nature of the housing shortage may not prevent the provision of housing needed for families of low income, the section provides for a higher cost limitation of $1,750 per room, as compared with existing limitations of $1,000 and $1,250 in small and large cities, respectively. It also authorizes an increase in this cost limitation by not more than $750 per room in areas where it would not be feasible without such an increase to construct the project without sacrifice of sound standards of construction, design, and livability, and where there is an acute need for such housing. The percentage of increase in the cost limitation as provided in this section is substantially less than the percentage of increase in construction costs which has actually occurred since 1937.

Because of special cost problems in Alaska, the section also has special provisions permitting higher costs in that Territory if found necessary.

The authorization increasing cost limits is applicable to any low-rent project completed after January 1, 1948. This will make the increased cost limitations available in the case of low-rent projects which were deferred during the war, on some of which a small amount of construction work was done before they were deferred. It will also make the increased cost limitations applicable to, and permit the revision of contracts for, any projects which have proceeded (prior to enactment of this bill) under the provisions of Public Law 301, Eightieth Congress.

Section 204. Private financing

The basic purpose of this section is to amend the financing provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to make possible the permanent financing of substantially all of the capital cost of low-rent housing projects by the sale of bonds to private investors, and thus in effect limit Federal lending assistance for low-rent housing primarily to the temporary interim financing necessary prior to the issuance of definitive bonds.

Essentially, this section provides that, in the event of a substantial default by a local public-housing agency in its covenants to the Public Housing Administration, such local agency shall be obligated to convey the project to the PHA (subject to the right of the local public-housing agency to reconveyance upon a satisfactory curing of the default), and PHA would continue to make annual contributions for the project, but not in excess of the amounts contracted for pursuant to statute. This would assure both (1) that the project will continue to operate as a low-rent housing project, and (2) that investors who have furnished the capital funds for its construction in reliance upon the continuance of its low-rent character and the making of annual contributions therefor during the entire life of the loan, will have their investment adequately protected. With this assurance there is every reason to anticipate that private capital will be willing to furnish practically all of the capital cost through long-term loans and to do so at low interest rates.

Subsection (c) revises the provisions in the act relative to the going Federal rate (which determines the minimum loan interest rate and the maximum annual contribution rate) so as to provide that the governing rate is the one as of the date of Presidential approval of the contract for loan or annual contributions, respectively, rather than the date the contract happens to be signed by PHA and the local public-housing agency. Further, it provides that in the event there are two or more rates of interest on such date, the rate used shall be the highest thereof, and that in no event shall such rate be deemed to be less than 2½ percent.

Subsection (d) reduces the maximum loan period from 60 to 40 years in the case of projects initiated after March 1, 1949. It also reduces the minimum interest rate on Federal loans made for projects where the maximum loan and annual contribution period is 40 rather than 60 years, from the applicable going Federal rate plus one-half of 1 percent to simply the going Federal rate. Contracts for projects initiated prior to March 1, 1949, may thus be amended to reduce the loan and annual contribution period to not more than 40 years and thereby make the project eligible for an interest rate at simply the applicable going Federal rate.

Subsection (e) limits the period over which annual contributions may be paid on projects initiated after March 1, 1949, to 40 years as contrasted with the present authorization of 60 years. In order to make this possible, and thus substantially reduce the total amount of the annual contributions, and also to assure a highly marketable local housing agency bond even under adverse market conditions, this paragraph would, in respect to projects where the contribution period is limited to 40 years, amend the present requirement that the contribution shall not exceed a sum equal to the going Federal rate plus 1 percent upon the cost of the project so that the limitation would be a sum equal to the going Federal rate plus 2½ percent upon such cost. Contracts for projects initiated prior to March 1, 1949, may thus be amended to reduce the annual contribution period to not more than 40 years and thereby make the project eligible for annual contributions at the applicable going Federal rate plus 2½ percent. The shortening of the period over which contributions may be paid will more than compensate for these permitted increases in annual rate.

In addition to substantially reducing the need for Federal loan assistance, subsections (f) and (g) also revise certain conditions with respect to Federal subsidy assistance. This is done by providing: (1) that, instead of an adjustment in the maximum amount of annual contributions at 5-year intervals, in any year when the receipts derived in connection with the project exceed expenditures and charges, the excess must be used for purposes which will reduce subsequent annual contributions; and (2) that contracts for loan and annual contributions based on a certain going Federal rate may, in the case of a change in such rate, be amended so as to base the interest rate on Federal loans, or the maximum contribution payable, on the new rate whenever this would promote economy or be in the financial interest of the Federal Government.

Subsection (h) requires that borrowings by PHA be from the Treasury. At the same time, the statutory language with respect to PHA's borrowing authorization is adapted to the changes in PHA's lending program that would result from the provisions of this title, by relating the gross amount authorized to the amount of obligations that may be outsanding rather than to the aggregate amount that the PHA may issue exclusive of refunding obligations. The gross amount authorized is increased from $800,000,000 to

$1,500,000,000 in recognition of the size of the extended program and the increased construction costs anticipated. It is expected that with this amendment the PHA borrowing power will make it possible to provide all of the capital funds required from the Federal Government in connection with the extension of the low-rent program.

Subsection (i) provides a definition of development cost (which is not defined in the present act) which will include in capital cost all items which would be capitalized under standard business practice, including the cost of capital improvements made at any time during the life of the project. This definition, in accordance with business practice, includes appropriate carrying charges, such as interest, insurance, payments in lieu of taxes, local housing authority overhead, and any initial operating deficit. Carrying charges subsequent to the date of physical completion, however, may not be capitalized.

Section 205. Annual contributions

Subsection 205 (a) increases the Public Housing Administration's annual contributions authorization in order to provide for an extension of the program of low-rent nonfarm public housing. It authorizes PHA, after July 1, 1949, to contract for annual contributions aggregating not more than $85,000,000 a year (in addition to the existing authorization), which limit would be increased by further amounts of $90,000,000 in each of the following 4 years. The new authorization thus totals $445,000,000 per annum. In order to avoid possible increases in the level of construction costs due to putting the whole program under construction at an early date, it is provided that PHA may authorize the construction of not more than 150,000 additional dwelling units after July 1, 1949, which limit would be increased by further amounts of 150,000 on July 1 in each of the years 1950 through and including 1955, respectively, thus making a total of 1,050,000 dwelling units in 7 years. The authorized schedules for entering into annual contributions contracts and for commencing construction may be accelerated by $90,000,000 additional in any year for contributions or 100,000 additional units in any year, by the President if he determines that such action would be in the public interest.

Under subsection 205 (b), contracts for annual contributions on projects initiated after March 1, 1949, shall require exemption of the projects from all real and personal property taxes, but the contracts may authorize payments in lieu of taxes not in excess of 5 percent of shelter rents. This requirement of tax exemption is in lieu of existing provisions in the act as to local contributions. Contracts on projects initiated prior to such date may also be amended to include similar provisions in respect to annual contributions payable after July 1, 1949; but if the contracts on such projects are not so amended, payments in lieu of taxes will hereafter be limited solely to the amounts provided under contracts outstanding on July 1, 1947. As to contributions payable between July 1, 1947, and July 1, 1949, any payments in lieu of taxes (unless already made in larger amounts) will be made in the amounts specified in contracts validly in effect on July 1, 1947.

Section 206. Special provisions for large families of low income

Experience has proven that the existing provisions of the United States Housing Act make it difficult to meet the needs of large families of low income. In addition to the provisions in section 203 revising the cost limitations so as to permit the construction of larger dwelling units, this section revises the requirements as to eligibility for families with a relatively large number of children. In lieu of the present provision which requires that income at the time of admission may not exceed five times the gross rent, or six times the gross rent for families with three or more minor dependents, this section provides that the 5 to 1 ratio shall be used for all families, but that, in determining family income for admission and continued occupancy an exemption of $100 shall be given for each minor member of the family (defined, for the purposes of this section, as a person of less than 21 years of age). Under this new provision, there will be a somewhat larger spread between the incomes for eligibility of families with few children and those with a relatively large number of children, in recognition of the very substantial differences in their respective living expenses.

A further difficulty has arisen in the case of families who are eligible to remain in a project on the basis of the income of the regular, principal worker or workers, but who become ineligible if a child goes to work upon the completion of his schooling. Even though this be a temporary condition which will end as soon as a child marries and establishes his own home, the family would nonetheless be required to move from the project. The present provisions thus tend to force children to leave the home in order to continue the family eligibility. This section therefore authorizes the exclusion of the earnings of such a secondary worker from family income in determining eligibility for continued occupancy, but not for original admission to a project. This exclusion will be only a temporary matter, since it is limited to secondary wage earners who are under 21 years of age. Moreover, the income of such children will not be excluded in determining the actual rent to be paid by the family.

Section 207. Technical amendments

Subsection 207 (a) amends the declaration of policy contained in section 1 of the act so as to limit the future low-rent public-housing program of the Public Housing Administration to urban and rural nonfarm areas. It is contemplated that no assistance to farm housing will be provided under this title of the act.

The other subsections of this section provide technical amendments to the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, which are required either as a result of the substantive amendments to the act provided in this bill or have been shown to be necessary as a result of experience under the bill.

TITLE III—HOUSING RESEARCH

The purpose of this title is to assist in progressively reducing housing costs and increasing the production of better housing, and in making available necessary data on housing needs, demand, and supply.

Section 301

This section authorizes the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to undertake a program with respect to technical research and related studies which will stimulate and promote progressive reductions in housing costs and the increased and sustained production of housing through new and improved techniques, materials, and methods, improvement and standardization of building codes, modular coordination, and the development of other sound methods and standards, and other necessary housing data which will help attain the objectives of this title and of the act.

The section also provides that the results of such technical research and studies shall be disseminated in such form as shall be most useful to industry and to the general public. It also exempts the dissemination of the results of such technical research and studies from the existing provisions of law prohibiting any agency from distributing through the mail, free of postage, reports and other documents unless a request therefor has been previously received by such agency.

The section further contemplates inventories to be made by the Administrator, as necessary, of urban and rural nonfarm-housing needs and the progress being made in meeting those needs, and authorizes the Administrator to encourage localities to make studies, surveys, and plans with respect to their own housing needs, markets, and development.

Section 302

This section stresses the intention of cooperative effort between the Housing and Home Finance Administrator with industry and labor and with other Federal and local governmental agencies, educational institutions, and other appropriate agencies in carrying out the research program. The section further provides that the Administrator shall consult with, and make recommendations to, the other appropriate Federal agencies with respect to such action as may be necessary and desirable to overcome existing gaps and deficiencies in available housing data and the facilities available for the collection of such data.

TITLE IV—FARM HOUSING

While assistance to families of low income in urban and rural nonfarm areas is authorized under the present provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937, the special and different problems attaching to farm housing require special provisions for such housing. This title, in making these provisions, recognizes the intimate relationship between farm housing and the entire farm economy and so places the responsibility for aids to provide adequate housing on farms upon the Department of Agriculture.

Section 401. Assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture

This section authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to provide financial assistance to farm owners in the United States, and in Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and in the Virgin Islands, when necessary to enable them to provide decent farm dwellings and related facilities for themselves, their tenants, lessees, share croppers, or laborers. (For the purposes of the title, a farm is considered to mean a parcel or parcels of land operated as a single unit which is used for the production of one or more agricultural commodities and which customarily produces such commodities for sale and for home use of a gross annual value of not less than the values determined by the Secretary to be equivalent to a gross annual value of $400 in 1944.) Financial assistance under the title is explicitly limited to farm owners who are without sufficient resources to provide the necessary housing on their own account and who are unable to secure the credit necessary for such housing from other sources upon terms and conditions which they could reasonably be expected to fulfill.

Section 402. Loans for dwellings on adequate farms

This section provides for the assistance needed for those farmers lacking acceptable housing for themselves, tenants, share croppers, or laborers who cannot afford to improve the housing facilities on their farms if they are required to secure the needed credit assistance on the usual cooperative or private credit terms prevailing in the area, but who could do so on the basis of liberal credit terms. For farm owners in this group, the section authorizes loans for periods not in excess of 33 years, bearing interest at a rate not exceeding 4 percent per annum, and secured by the applicant's equity in the farm. In order further to assure the use of cooperative and other private credit sources to the fullest practicable extent, the section requires that the borrower shall refinance his loan through such credit sources whenever he should reasonably prove able to do so.

Section 403. Loans for dwellings on potentially adequate farms

This section provides for the assistance needed for those farmers whose present income is such that some assistance over and

above the long-term, low-interest credit provided in section 402 is necessary in order to put them into a position to acquire and maintain acceptable housing and related facilities, but whose farm enterprise is capable of being redeveloped by improvement or enlargement of the farm, or by adjustment of farm practices or methods, so as to bring them within a reasonable period of time within the group of farmers in need only of liberal credit aids. With respect to such farmers, the section provides that if the applicant undertakes an adequate farm enlargement or improvement or adjusted-practices plan (either with or without special assistance from the Department of Agriculture) the loan assistance provided in section 402 may be supplemented by annual contributions during the temporary period of time (which may not exceed 10 years) that the redevelopment of the farm enterprise is being effected. These contributions would take the form of credits against the installment of principal and interest due for any annual installment period and would be limited to the sum, not greater than the annual installment of interest plus one-half of the annual installment of principal, by which the net income of the borrower is insufficient to make the full amortized annual payment.

Section 404. Other loans and grants for minor improvements to farm housing

This section provides for the assistance that may be given to those farmers who do not possess adequate family-type farms and for whom there are no apparent means of providing an adequate income by a process of farm enlargement or redevelopment within a 10-year period. In order to avoid the possible danger that by establishing permanent dwellings for farmers under these circumstances, the perpetuation of the present unsatisfactory situation (which would seem to require different approaches) would be encouraged, the section authorizes only special loans and grants for improvements such as roof repairs, toilet facilities, a sanitary water supply, and other facilities designed to protect the health of the farmers and to so improve their living conditions that their situation is not a threat to the public health. Such assistance is limited to $1,000 per family unit (not over $500 of which may take the form of a grant or contribution), and to $2,000 in the aggregate to any one individual.

Section 405. Technical services and research

In order to facilitate the provision of decent farm dwellings generally, this section authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish, without charge (or at appropriate charge), to all persons technical services such as building plans, specifications, construction supervision and inspection, and advice and information regarding rural dwellings and other farm buildings. The section authorizes the Secretary and the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to cooperate in research and technical studies in the rural housing field and also authorizes the Secretary to utilize (through the Agricultural Extension Service) the facilities of State agencies and educational institutions in furnishing the services and information authorized by this section.

This section also authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to prepare and submit to the President and to the Congress estimates of national farm housing needs and reports with respect to the progress being made toward meeting such needs, and to correlate and recommend proposals for such executive action or legislation necessary or desirable for the furtherance of the national housing objective and policy established by this act with respect to farm housing, together with such other reports or information as may be required of the Administrator by the President or the Congress.

Section 406. Preference for veterans

This section requires that the Secretary of Agriculture give preference to veterans in administering the provisions of the title.

Section 407. Local public agencies and committees to assist Secretary

This section authorizes the use by the Secretary of Agriculture of local county or parish committees of farmers to examine applications of farmers desiring to obtain the benefits provided by the title and to submit recommendations in appropriate form to the Secretary with respect to each application.

This section further enables the Secretary to make the assistance authorized under sections 402 to 405, inclusive, available through the use of local public agencies authorized to assist in providing housing for families in rural areas.

Section 408. General powers of Secretary

This section vests in the Secretary the power to establish standards of adequate housing necessary for the purpose of operations of the title. It also authorizes him to require that any recipient of financial assistance agree that the housing provided with such assistance shall not be a justification for changing the terms of the lease or occupancy agreement with the occupants of such housing to the latter's disadvantage without the approval of the Secretary.

Section 409. Administrative provisions

This section provides the various administrative and related powers necessary in order that the Secretary of Agriculture may administer the program authorized in the preceding sections.

Section 410. Loan funds

This section provides that the Secretary of Agriculture is to obtain the funds to make loans under the title from the Treasury. Such borrowings are limited to the amounts necessary to make loans not in excess of $25,000,000 on or after July 1, 1949, and the additional sums of $50,000,000 on or after July 1, 1950, $75,000,000 on or after July 1, 1951, and $100,000,000 on or after July 1, 1952.

Section 411. Contributions

This section authorizes the Secretary on or after July 1, 1949, to make commitments for contributions pursuant to section 403 of not to exceed $500,000 per annum, and additional commitments aggregating $1,000,000 per annum on or after July 1, 1950, additional commitments aggregating $1,500,000 per annum on or after July 1, 1951, and additional commitments of $2,000,000 per annum on or after July 1, 1952.

Section 412. Authorization for appropriations

This section authorizes the appropriation of the amounts necessary to permit payments on obligations of the Secretary of Agriculture equivalent to the contributions he makes under section 403 and interest on such sum; to make grants under section 404 aggregating not more than $1,000,000 on and after July 1, 1949, and additional sums of $2,500,000, $4,000,000, and $5,000,000, on and after July 1 of each of the years 1950, 1951, and 1952; and for such other amounts as may be necessary for the carrying out of the provisions of the preceding sections of the title.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Section 501. Advisory committees

This section authorizes the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to appoint such advisory committees as may be necessary in carrying out his functions, powers, and duties under this or any other act.

The section also provides that service as a member of any such advisory committee shall not constitute any form of service or employment within the provisions of title 18, section 198 or 203, United States Code, or within the provisions of title 41, section 119, United States Code.

Title 18, section 198, United States Code, prohibits an officer of the United States or a person holding any place or trust or profit or discharging any official function under or in connection with any executive department from acting as agent or attorney for prosecuting any claim against the United States or assisting in the prosecution or supporting any such claim or receiving any gratuity or favor or interest in any claim, and provides a fine of not more than $5,000, 1 year's imprisonment, or both.

Title 18, section 203, United States Code, prohibits an officer or clerk of the United States directly or indirectly from receiving or agreeing to receive any compensation for any services rendered or to be rendered in relation to any proceeding, contract, claim, controversy, charge, accusation, arrest, or other matter in which the United States is a party before any court or bureau, and provides a fine of $10,000 and not more than 2 years' imprisonment.

Title 41, section 119, United States Code (which is part of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944), prohibits any person employed in any Government agency prosecuting or acting as counsel, attorney, or agent for prosecuting any claim against the United States or for any person within 2 years after such employment to prosecute or act as counsel or agent involving any such matter directly connected with which such person was so employed to perform duties. It provides $10,000 fine or imprisonment or not more than 1 year, or both.

This section follows title III, section 303 (b), Public Law 253, Eightieth Congress—the National Security Act of 1947—except that this section of the bill provides a complete exception from title 41, section 119, United States Code, whereas the National Security Act provision grants exception from such provision unless the act of such individual is made unlawful when performed by such individual, with respect to any particular matter which directly involves the department or agency which such person is advising or in which such department or agency is directly interested. The provisions of this section of the bill necessarily must be broader so as not to bring a member of the advisory committee who is doing business with the Federal Housing Administration within the prohibition of that section.

Section 502. Amendment of National Banking Act

By reason of the provisions of the new section 22 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (which new section is added by section 204 (b) of the bill), special security features would attach to definitive bonds issued by local public housing agencies in connection with the low-rent public-housing program. Special security features would also attach to short-term notes issued by local public agencies in connection with slum clearance projects, and by public housing agencies in connection with low-rent housing projects, when secured by a pledge of rights of any such agency under its loan contract with the Government.

In recognition of these security features, this section provides for an amendment of the National Banking Act so that national banks, and (to the extent permitted by State laws) State member banks of the Federal Reserve System, would be authorized to purchase larger amounts, and to underwrite, local public housing agency definitive bonds and, when adequately secured, short-term notes issued by local public agencies in connection with slum-clearance projects or by public housing agencies in connection with low-rent public housing projects. Without this amendment, investment in such obligations by these banks would continue to be subject to the same restrictions as are applicable to local public housing agency definitive bonds, which are now issued without these special security features. In other words, they could be purchased for the banks' own account only to the extent of 10 percent of unimpaired capital and surplus.

Section 503. National Housing Council

This section provides that the Secretary of Labor or his designee shall be included in the membership of the National Housing Council in the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Section 504. Amendments of the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1948, and the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1949

The Government Corporations Appropriation Acts for 1948 and for 1949 included provisos to the effect that no payments of annual contributions should be made which were occasioned by payments in lieu of taxes in excess of amounts originally contracted for. This reference to original contracts had the effect of prohibiting payments under revised contracts which had legally been entered into prior to July 1, 1947, the date on which the first of the appropriation-act restrictions was effective. These limitations on funds appropriated for annual contributions made it impossible for the Public Housing Administration, in a number of cases, to comply with contracts validly in existence. These provisos of the two appropriation acts are therefore repealed as of the beginning of the fiscal year for which they apply, in order that payments validly contracted for may be made. These provisos are superseded by subsection 205 (b) which establishes a permanent policy as to payments in lieu of taxes.

The Government Corporations Appropriation Act for 1949 also limits the number of employees of the Public Housing Administration above grades CAF-10 and P-3, to not exceeding 20 percent of the total number of administrative employees. Under the expanded program of low-rent public housing, a relatively greater number of trained technical employees will be required than were necessary under the former operations of the agency when low-rent public housing represented only a small portion of its total responsibilities. This section also repeals this 20-percent limitation in order to permit the recruitment of the trained personnel which will be necessary to put the new program into operation.

Section 505. Amendment of Internal Revenue Code

This section withdraws from the exemption from Federal income taxes (provided for by section 22 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code for interest upon obligations of a State, Territory, or any political subdivision thereof) interest upon—

1. Obligations issued by any local public agency in connection with a slum clearance project assisted under title I of the bill when such obligations are secured by a pledge of the rights of such agency under a loan contract, as provided for in section 102 (a) of the bill; and

2. Obligations issued by a public housing agency in connection with a low-rent public housing project assisted under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, when such obligations are secured either (a) by a pledge of the rights of such agency under a loan contract entered into under section 9 of said United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, or (b) by a pledge of annual contributions under an annual contributions contract between such public housing agency and the Public Housing Administration if such contract contains the covenant by the Public Housing Administration which is authorized by section 22 (b) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended.

Section 506. Act controlling

This section contains the standard provision providing that the provisions of this act shall control in the case of inconsistency with other legislation.

Section 507. Separability

This is the usual separability clause.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry. I shall make no further remarks regarding this measure except to point out that it is the same bill which was introduced by the same introducers in the last session, at which time it was Senate bill 984. I would further point out that it is being introduced by four Democrats and four Republicans. The approach is being made on an entirely bipartisan basis, and I pray and I hope that it will continue to be in that situation so long as this type of legislation is before the Senate.

The bill (S. 174) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry, introduced by Mr. IVES (for himself, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MYERS, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

BILLS RELATING TO INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference three bills, and ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to make a brief statement with respect to one of the bills.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, during the past 8 months businessmen engaged in interstate commerce have been greatly disturbed by the confused status of the law as to the payment, or absorption, of transportation charges. Last spring this body directed a subcommittee, of which I am now chairman, to study that problem. The testimony before that subcommittee shows that not only are businessmen confused, but that the members of the Federal Trade Commission and its staff are in complete disagreement as to when a seller may pay or absorb transportation costs.

The subcommittee has now heard 109 witnesses, including 4 of the men who buy everything the Government purchases. It is now time for the subcommittee to turn from its general study, to specific efforts to clarify the present chaos resulting from the Supreme Court interpretation of the law. This is not an administrative problem, it is not a political problem, and it is not a judicial problem. It is an economic problem which, in the best interests of our national economy, the Congress must decide. Whether we shall permit sellers acting in good faith to pay or absorb transportation costs to promote competition is a legislative problem.

Obviously, sellers conspiring to fix prices are not acting in good faith. I am certain all right-thinking men join me in urging the vigorous enforcement of the laws against conspiracies. The bill which I now introduce makes it clear that all such conspiracies are illegal and will in fact strengthen the powers of the Federal Trade Commission in dealing with them.

This bill is an attempt to eliminate confusion. I do not pretend that it is in perfected form, and constructive criticism is invited. Our subcommittee should like to hear the views of all interested parties on the effect of this bill, in order that we may ultimately report to the Senate the legislation most desirable to end the current chaos.

Mr. President, I have said that the members of the Federal Trade Commission and its staff are in complete disagreement as to when a seller may absorb transportation costs. I desire here and now to offer documentary proof that my very serious charge is correct.

On December 28, 1948, 3 days prior to his retirement from the Federal Trade Commission, the then Chairman of that Commission, Robert E. Freer, delivered a very carefully prepared speech before the City Club in Denver.

The Denver Post, commenting editorially on this speech, said, "Mr. Freer 'Bicycles' All Over the Ring," and followed that headline with the following devastating editorial:

Robert E. Freer, retiring Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, accomplished a great deal on his visit to Denver to speak before the City Club.

For one thing he convinced many Denver businessmen that a man may be a Washington bureaucrat and a strong defender of free competition at the same time.

He spoke convincingly on the theme—which is too likely to be forgotten—that a free economy requires government police work to prevent monopoly from getting a throttlehold on competition. In other words, there can be no freedom, except for the thugs, if the policeman is fired.

But when it came to discussing the basing-point issue, Mr. Freer engaged in the same kind of shadow boxing which has marked the FTC's statements of its views ever since the United States Supreme Court decided the Cement case in a manner to throw a chill into businessmen, large and small, throughout the country.

Mr. Freer reiterated his former declarations that, in spite of the recent court cases, a company is not barred from the use of a basing-point price system, provided it is not engaging in illegal price conspiracy or discriminating unjustifiedly against some of its customers in favor of others.

Mr. Freer asked us to take his word for that statement. He didn't try to prove it. He ignored all the arguments which have been presented to show that a succession of cases has brought us to the point where the courts are ready to outlaw any use of the basing-point system, if they have not already done so.

He ignored the fact that at least one member of the FTC believes the basing-point system already has been made illegal, for all practical purposes. He avoided any mention of excerpts from court decisions which indicate no company using a basing-point system can be sure that fact will not be used against it in Federal court.

He didn't even mention that it has been the aim for years of certain FTC officials and the men who surround them to outlaw all price systems except the system of f. o. b. mill.

Mr. Freer would have us believe the alarm which has spread over the business community because of basing-point decisions has been inspired almost entirely by the steel and cement industries. His respect for the intelligence of independent businessmen in other lines cannot be great.

In his Denver address, Mr. Freer said, "Personally I believe in freight absorption to meet competition." That certainly is an admission that the basing-point system may be used for good purposes as well as bad.

If that is Mr. Freer's position, he is hardly on sound ground when he objects to any amendment to Federal law which would simply give businessmen the assurance that the use of a basing-point system would not by itself be held against them unless there also is evidence of price fixing or unjustified price discrimination.

How such an amendment might hamper the work of the FTC, Mr. Freer does not explain, but he is against it. He and the other Commissioners are doing a lot of fancy footwork and dodging but very little solid infighting.

In this speech Freer, the former Federal Trade Commission Chairman, said:

During all of the time that this uproar has been going on officials of the Federal Trade Commission have been stating that the law does not require uniform f. o. b. mill prices, that the law does not prevent the absorption of freight to meet competition, and that the recent decisions apply only to situations in which there is organized monopoly and conspiracy to suppress and restrain competition.

Furthermore, he has disclaimed repeatedly any intention by the Commission to force "everybody in the country to sell at f. o. b. mill prices." Yet when our Senate subcommittee chairman wrote the Federal Trade Commission asking it to suggest suitable witnesses for his committee, this very same Robert E. Freer, on behalf of the Commission, officially suggested that the committee call Dr. Vernon Mund, Dr. Frank A. Fetter, and Mr. Walter Wooden. Dr. Fetter publicly testified that he believed all sellers should be required to sell at f. o. b. mill prices, and if that is not now required by the law, the law should be amended to so provide. Dr. Mund testified to the same effect, and the Commission's legal expert, Mr. Wooden, testified:

Dr. Fetter believes that there ought to be uniform mill-net prices; * * * I am inclined to believe he advocates the uniform f. o. b. mill price * * * and I think I agree with his economics 100 percent.

In a speech in New York on December 7, 1948, the Commission's Chairman said:

I will further state, as strongly as I know how, that no businessman, acting in a genuinely competitive way, need fear that the decisions in either the Cement or Rigid Steel Conduit cases will be used as precedents for declaring his competitive conduct unlawful.

But the attorneys for the Commission gave contrary testimony before the Senate subcommittee. Attorney Paulson testified:

The avenues of competition are being unnecessarily narrowed by reason of the Commission's having proceeded against freight absorption on an individual basis. * * * It is now the law that the individual and separate practice or system of a company in absorbing all or part of the freight costs to distant customers to match lower prices of nearby competitors results in varying mill-net returns and is illegal.

The Federal Trade Commission Chairman said in his Denver speech that—

During all the time that this uproar has been going on officials of the Federal Trade Commission have been stating that the law does not require uniform f. o. b. mill prices, that the law does not prevent the absorption of freight to meet competition.

But Attorney Walter Wooden testified at the Senate public hearings that the only "absolutely safe" way for a seller to be sure that he was not violating the law was to sell at f. o. b. mill prices, and Commission Attorney Paulson testified:

My answer, in the light of the Conduit order, as I read it, would have to be that its practical effect is to require f. o. b. mill selling.

The former Federal Trade Commission Chairman, Mr. Freer, said in his recent Denver speech:

The recent decisions apply only to situations in which there is organized monopoly and conspiracy to suppress and restrain competition.

Yet on May 19, 1948, the Commission, with Freer as its Chairman, issued an official press release on one of those "recent decisions"—the Conduit case—which said:

Court holds basing-point method of pricing to be unfair irrespective of conspiracy.

In a speech at Dixville Notch, N. H., on September 18, 1948, Freer said:

Basing-point and delivered-price systems, as such, are under no special attack. The Commission has attacked those delivered price systems where they appeared to be the core of price-fixing conspiracies.

And in a speech in Washington on August 4, 1948, the Commission's chief economist, Dr. Edwards, said:

Basing-point systems as such are under no special attack.

But the Freer and Edwards statements that all basing-point systems are not illegal are contrary to the statements of Walter Wooden, their own senior associate counsel, who argued before the Supreme Court that the cement company's pricing methods, apart from combination and conspiracy, results in unlawful discriminations, and who shortly after the decision, in a speech in Washington, quoted the Supreme Court as saying that the effect of these cases "was to forbid the adoption for sales purposes of any basing-point system." In fact, the inconsistent position of Federal Trade Commission officials testifying before the Senate committee was nothing less than shocking and scandalous. Diametrically opposing answers were given to identical questions submitted by Senators to them.

The Commission attorneys were asked if the Commission's orders in the Conduit and Pittsburgh-plus cases required f. o. b. mill selling. Commission Attorney Walter Wooden, senior associate counsel, replied "No," but Commission Attorney Lynn Paulson answered, "As a practical matter, I say 'Yes.'".

When those attorneys were asked if "knowing parallel conduct" was illegal "irrespective of whether it results from conspiracy or from competition," Attorney Wooden replied "No," but Attorney Paulson replied "It is in the Conduit order."

And when those attorneys were asked if the Supreme Court had limited the right to meet competition to individual cases, Commission Attorney Wooden said "Yes," and Commission Attorney Paulson said "No."

They were asked if the Conduit and Pittsburgh-plus orders permitted those sellers to absorb freight to meet competition. Commission Attorney Wooden said "Yes." But Commission Attorney Paulson said, "I say the practical effect of those two orders is to require f. o. b. mill selling." These quotations by the Commission attorneys are taken directly from the stenographic transcript of the public hearings of the Senate Trade Policies Committee. They are of course available to the public, and I am advised that the Federal Trade Commission purchased a copy from the reporter, so that presumably this testimony was available to Chairman Freer before he made his Denver speech.

This disagreement within the Commission is not limited to the attorneys. The Commission's chief economist, Corwin Edwards, appears to be in disagreement with Commission Attorney Walter Wooden, who was the trial attorney in the Cement case. Attorney Wooden testified before the Senate committee, "I think I would disagree with Dr. Edwards to some extent," and when asked if he disagreed with Dr. Edwards' writings that "when you outlaw freight absorption you impair competition by denying the buyer the right to buy competitively from distant sellers," Mr. Wooden replied, "I think I disagree with that."

The disagreement of these men is apparently mutual. For when Dr. Edwards was asked on the witness stand if he agreed with the views of Fetter and Wooden favoring required f. o. b. pricing for everyone, he replied, "In that respect, no."

The extent to which confusion prevails on this subject is further illustrated by the first draft of a book which Dr. Edwards wrote 2 months before he was hired recently by the Federal Trade Commission as its Chief Economist. In that draft of his book he said:

It is to be hoped, however, that the Federal Trade Commission will abandon its present efforts to require rigid f. o. b. mill pricing in the terms of orders which it issues in cases of this class, or that the courts will modify the Commission's orders sufficiently to avoid that result.

Dr. Edwards testified at the Senate public hearings that after writing the book he submitted it to friends on the Commission, from whom he learned that he had incorrectly judged the Commission's attitude on this subject. He testified that after reading the printed material available to the public, he had come to the above conclusion, and only after checking with the people in the Commission did he find the view was erroneous.

On October 12, 1948, the Commission published a nine-page single-spaced statement intended to clarify the law on this subject. The following month Commission attorneys were asked at the Senate hearings the following question: "Do you think there is now confusion in the law as to what pricing policies are legal?" Two Trade Commission attorneys answered, "Definitely." Many other examples of inconsistencies in the public statements of Commission officials could be pointed out.

The printed record makes it crystal clear that officials of the Federal Trade Commission have not been saying that the recent cases are limited to conspiracy situations, and the printed record is equally clear that the Commission is divided within itself. While Commissioner Freer says that the law does not prevent freight absorption, does not require uniform f. o. b. mill prices, and is limited to conspiracy cases, Commissioner Mason in a speech at Harvard University on May 14, 1948, said:

Freight absorption is out. This affects every basic industry in the United States. * * * Individual universal delivered price system is out. * * * The basing point pricing system is out as a matter of law.

Industry and the Congress do not know who to believe, since all the people at the Federal Trade Commission were supposed to be experts. In the present confused status businessmen must learn the hard way and the expensive way who is correct. Candidly the American people are entitled to know what pricing systems are legal, and apparently the only place where a clarification of this important economic problem can be obtained is in the Congress. It dare not permit any Commission to continue to be all things to all people. We cannot permit some officials of the Commission to publicly state one view to be the policy of the Commission, while other officials give a diametrically opposed view of the same Commission's position. Congress must clear this thing up once and for all.

The bills introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado were read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as follows:

S. 236. A bill to clarify and formulate a consistent and coordinated national policy with respect to transportation costs in interstate commerce; to strengthen the antitrust laws of the United States and to provide for their more effective enforcement; and to promote competition by permitting sellers to have access to distant markets;

S. 237. A bill to promote interstate and foreign commerce and strengthen the national defense by providing for cargo aircraft adaptable for postal, commercial, and military service, and for other purposes; and

S. 238. A bill to amend section 25 of the Interstate Commerce Act to require certain common carriers by railroad to install and maintain communication systems and to establish and observe operating rules, regulations, and practices to promote safety of employees and travelers on railroads, and for other purposes.

CHANGE IN METHOD OF ELECTING PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and myself, I reintroduce in the form of a joint resolution my proposal for a constitutional amendment abolishing the electoral college and splitting the electoral vote in each State in exact proportion to the popular vote. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a very brief statement descriptive of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 2) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice Presdent was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. LODGE was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LODGE

The present arrangement whereby each State has a number of electoral votes equal to the number of its Representatives and Senators is retained under the Lodge amendment, but these votes would be divided between the candidates according to the proportion of the popular vote each receives. Under this arrangement, a candidate who receives 60 percent of the popular vote in a State with 10 electoral votes would get 6 votes and his opponent would get 4. Under the present system, the winner gets all 10, even when he beats his opponent in a photofinish.

In reintroducing this measure, LODGE pointed out how the 1948 Presidential election illustrated, in three different ways, the need for reform:

1. The will of the largest group of American voters which wanted to keep President Truman in the White House came dangerously close to being utterly frustrated by the antiquated "unit rule" system. A switch of fewer than 100,000 votes in five States (Illinois, Ohio, Wisconsin, Iowa, Nevada) would have given Governor Dewey the election, even with Mr. Truman still retaining his lead of two and a half million popular votes. Under the Lodge proposal, this comparatively small switch would not have changed the result. Short of a direct popular election of the President, the Lodge amendment comes as close as possible to reflecting exactly the will of the people.

2. A shift of a few thousand votes in as few as two States would have created a situation in which no candidate would have received a majority of the electoral votes. This would have left the country uncertain as to who would be President until the new House of Representatives made its choice, with State delegations voting as a unit so that each State would have only 1 vote. Not only would this have created grave uncertainty, unrest, and confusion, but it might well have been disastrous because of the delicate international situation. Because the Lodge amendment provides that the candidate receiving the greatest number of electoral votes shall be President, the possibility of such deadlocked decisions is eliminated, as is also the clumsy and universally condemned system of election in the House.

3. In one State (Alabama) it was not possible to vote for President Truman because his "electors" were not on the ballot. Consequently, many citizens of that State were in effect disenfranchised. Since the electoral college—and the dummy office of elector—is abolished in the Lodge amendment, such an undemocratic procedure becomes impossible.

The effect of the Lodge amendment would have several other important results:

1. It ends the present practice of concentrating Presidential politics on those States having the largest population and consequently on the voting minorities in those States.

2. It means that each candidate is credited with the votes cast for him and that he does not get credited with the votes actually cast against him.

3. It spreads the Presidential campaign and any subsequent Presidential activity into all the 48 States, tending, therefore to break up so-called "solid" or one-party areas.

4. It preserves completely the rights of the small States who still retain their two-vote credit (for the two Senators) in the number of electoral votes awarded.

5. It recognizes that the electoral college system has never functioned as originally conceived by the framers of the Constitution, for the electoral college has become a rubber stamp—and an inaccurate rubber stamp at that.

6. It discourages the tendency to select Presidential nominees only from among the residents of States having a significant electoral vote.

7. It weakens the strength of minority splinter-party pressures.

8. It confers no partisan or sectional advantage.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

Mr. MYERS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 11), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That subsection 2 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, relating to cloture, be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"If at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate, the

Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

"'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a majority vote of those voting, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

Mr. MORSE. I submit a resolution to amend the so-called cloture rule of the Senate, and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and I wish to say that I hope at a later hour to explain it at some length.

The resolution (S. Res. 12) was received and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That subsection 2 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, relating to a cloture, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"If at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or of rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

"'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a majority vote of those voting, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 2 hours on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same; except that any Senator may yield to any other Senator all or any part of the aggregate period of time which he is entitled to speak; and the Senator to whom he so yields may speak for the time so yielded in addition to any period of time which he is entitled to speak in his own right. It shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

Under the order of business of "Introduction of Bills and Joint Resolutions," the following occurred:

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], I submit a resolution relating to cloture. This resolution is in the exact language of Senate Resolution 25, Eightieth Congress, second session, which was reported in April 1947 by the Committee on Rules, which remained on the calendar under my name until final adjournment. This resolution seeks to make it possible, when two-thirds of the membership of the Senate shall approve, to end debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, and to vote upon the merits of the question. In plain words, it endeavors to make it possible for the Members of the Senate to vote on any subject within a reasonable time and after reasonable debate on the pros and cons when two-thirds of its membership believe that it is desirable to come to a vote. I think the American people expect such action. I hope that this resolution will be considered at an early date.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to offer it at this time.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Are we not operating under the heading of "Bills and resolutions," and is it necessary to get unanimous consent to offer a resolution under that heading?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is proceeding under the order of bills, joint resolutions, and other resolutions.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I understood, when I desired to offer my anti-filibuster resolution earlier today that it required unanimous consent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. At that time it could be offered under unanimous consent.

Mr. MORSE. Is the Senator from Oregon mistaken in understanding that in reply to the Senator from Kentucky the Chair ruled that unanimous consent was not necessary to offer the resolution which was offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]? So far as the subject matter is concerned, the situation is identical with that of the resolution of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as I understand the situation, the Senator from Oregon asked unanimous consent to offer his resolution.

Mr. MORSE. No; the Senator from Oregon did not. The Chair ruled earlier that unanimous consent was necessary.

Mr. BARKLEY. No Senator raised the point of order that it was necessary to have unanimous consent. I raised a parliamentary inquiry as to whether, under the heading of "Bills and resolutions," unanimous consent was required to offer a resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair did not so understand.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, that is exactly what I am trying to find out: whether, when the Senator offered his resolution, unanimous consent was required by the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. At this stage, unanimous consent is required for the submission of a resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let us clear it up. Does that refer to joint resolutions only?

Mr. MORSE. That is the point I am trying to have settled.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To bills and joint resolutions.

Mr. BARKLEY. Introduction of bills and joint resolutions is the present business, and there is another heading for concurrent and other resolutions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

The resolution (S. Res. 13) submitted by Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. IVES) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That subsection 2 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, relating to cloture, be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"If at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

"'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a two-thirds vote of those voting, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

AGE LIMIT FOR SENATE PAGES

Mr. HAYDEN (for himself and Mr. WHERRY) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 14), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the following resolution of the Senate agreed to on December 6, 1870, namely:

"*Resolved*, That in no case shall a page of the Senate be appointed for duty in the Senate Chamber who is younger than 12 years, or remain in office after the age of 16 years," be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"*Resolved*, That in no case shall a page of the Senate be appointed for duty in the Senate Chamber who is younger than 14 years, or remain in office after the age of 17 years, and who has not completed the eighth grade of school."

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

Mr. HAYDEN (for himself and Mr. WHERRY) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 15), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That subsection 2 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, relating to cloture be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"If at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

"'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a two-thirds vote of those voting, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

HOSPITALIZATION PROGRAM FOR FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES

Mr. LANGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 16), which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation with respect to all matters relating to the desirability and feasibility of instituting a hospitalization program for the benefit of civilian employees of the Government of the United States, such program to include provision for prepayment of hospitalization and surgical costs in hospitals to be designated by such employees to be attended by physicians and surgeons also of their choice.

SEC. 2. The committee is directed to complete its studies and submit a report and recommendations for appropriate legislation not later than May 1, 1949.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold hearings and to act at such times and places during the Eighty-first Congress, to employ such assistants as may be needed and to request such assistance and information from any departments and agencies of the Government, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths and to take such testimony and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report the educational material and data on such hearings shall not exceed 25 cents per 100 words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $10,000 for this project, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO GERMANENESS OF AMENDMENTS

Mr. KNOWLAND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 17), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the standing rules of the Senate are amended by adding at the end thereof the following new rule:

"RULE XLI

"GERMANENESS

"No amendment to any bill or resolution pending in the Senate which is not germane or relevant to the subject matter contained in such bill or resolution shall be received or considered; nor shall any amendment to any item or clause of any such bill or resolution be received or considered which does not directly relate thereto. All questions of germaneness or relevancy of amendments under this rule, when raised, shall be submitted to the Senate and decided without debate."

INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF MARTIAL LAW IN THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 18), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the administration of martial law in the Territory of Hawaii subsequent to December 7, 1941, including suspension of the writ of habeas corpus, peonage, involuntary servitude, other infringement of constitutional rights of civilians, and other abuses or alleged abuses in connection therewith.

Such committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is further authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the operation of the court-martial systems of the Army and Navy, both within the United States and abroad, and of the prisons, jails, and other places of incarceration or confinement of Army and Navy prisoners with particular emphasis on (1) alleged miscarriages of justice arising out of the operation of such systems and places of incarceration or confinement; (2) the question of whether variations in such systems or in the administration and application thereof in different areas or theaters of operations, with respect to review procedure or otherwise, constitutes or has constituted denial of due process or of equal protection of law in violation or derogation of the Constitution of the United States; (3) the question of whether or not punishments meted under such systems are unduly excessive; (4) the alleged lack of uniformity in punishments meted under such systems; (5) the question of whether or not present methods of holding courts martial are desirable and proper; and (6) any desirable improvements in or modifications of such court-martial systems and places of incarceration or the administration thereof.

The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date not later than December 15, 1946, the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings; to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-first Congress, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

Mr. PEPPER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 19), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That that part of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate relating to cloture (as shown on page 28 of the Senate Manual) is amended to read as follows:

"If a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate (1) upon a motion to take up a measure, together with any and all points of order against such measure, or (2) upon any pending question, is presented to the Senate at any time after 10 calendar days have elapsed since such debate has begun, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by an aye-and-nay vote the question:

"'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"If such question shall be decided in the affirmative by a two-thirds vote of those voting in the case of any such motion to take up a measure, together with any and all points of order against such measure, then such measure shall be deemed to be the unfinished business.

"If such question shall be decided in the affirmative by a two-thirds vote of those voting in the case of any such motion to bring to a close the debate upon any pending measure, then such measure shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of. Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the pending measure, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or

dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

REFORM OF PROCEDURE BEFORE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution dealing with congressional reforms, an identical measure having been introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative McCORMACK.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the following provisions of this resolution are adopted as an exercise of the rule-making power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively.

SEC. 2. Any person who believes that testimony or other evidence given in a public hearing before any committee tends to defame him or otherwise adversely affect his reputation may file with the committee a sworn statement, concerning such testimony, which shall be made a part of the record of such hearing.

SEC. 3. Such a person shall in addition have the right (a) to testify personally in his own behalf, (b) to have the committee secure the appearance of witnesses requested by him for the purpose of testifying in his behalf, and to examine such witnesses, either personally or by counsel, but no more than four such witnesses shall be called; and (c) to have the committee secure the appearance of witnesses whose testimony adversely affected him, and to cross-examine such witnesses, either personally or by counsel, but such cross-examination shall be limited to 1 hour as to any one witness.

SEC. 4. Any person who wishes to avail himself of the rights accorded by section 3, shall, within 30 days of the receipt by the committee of the testimony complained of, file a petition with the committee requesting the fixing of a time and place for the receiving of testimony or the conduct of cross-examination and designating the witnesses to be summoned. Such a petition shall be accompanied by the sworn statement of the petitioner that the petition is not filed for the purpose of delaying or obstructing the work of the committee, but because his reputation has been unjustifiably damaged or otherwise adversely affected by false accusations or inference. The committee shall, within 10 days after the receipt of such a petition, fix a time and place for the receiving of testimony or the conduct of cross-examination, which time shall not be later than 30 days after the receipt of the petition, and shall secure the appearance at such time and place of the witnesses designated in the petition.

SEC. 5. Any witness summoned at a public or private hearing before any committee shall have the right to be accompanied by counsel. Such counsel shall be allowed to observe the hearing, but shall not be allowed to participate therein or to advise the witness while on the witness stand unless the committee, in its discretion, shall otherwise determine.

SEC. 6. In the conduct of hearings, the evidence received shall, so far as possible, be relevant and germane to the subject of the hearing.

SEC. 7. If the testimony of a witness at a private or public hearing before any committee is reported stenographically, such witness shall be entitled to a stenographic transcript of such testimony upon payment of the cost of the transcript.

SEC. 8. A committee shall not publish or file any report, interim or final, unless and until a meeting of the committee has been called upon proper notice and such report has been approved by a majority of those voting at such meeting.

SEC. 9. No committee or employee thereof shall publish or file any statement or report alleging misconduct by, or otherwise adversely commenting on, any person unless and until such person has been advised of the alleged misconduct or adverse comment and has been given a reasonable opportunity to present to the committee a sworn statement with respect thereto as provided in section 2.

SEC. 10. No member or employee of a committee shall for compensation speak, lecture, or write about the committee, its purposes, procedures, accomplishments, or reports during the existence of the committee and while he is a member of the committee or in its employ.

SEC. 11. As used in this concurrent resolution, the term committee includes a standing or select committee of either House of Congress, a joint committee of the two Houses, and a duly authorized subcommittee of any of the foregoing.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 3), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 2,500 additional copies of Senate Document No. 248, Seventy-ninth Congress, entitled "Administrative Procedure Act—Legislative History, Seventy-ninth Congress," of which 1,000 copies shall be assigned to the Senate document room and 1,500 copies to the House document room.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON SUBVERSIVE AND UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. McCLELLAN submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 4), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That (a) there is hereby established a Joint Committee on Subversive and Un-American Activities (hereinafter referred to as the joint committee) to be composed of seven Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and seven Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. In each instance not more than four Members shall be members of the same political party.

(b) Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection.

(c) The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice-chairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. (a) The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make, from time to time, investigations of—

(1) the extent, character, and objects of subversive activities and un-American propaganda activities in the United States;

(2) subversive activities and un-American propaganda activities within the United States Government;

(3) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda which is instigated or supported from foreign countries or of domestic origin, which attacks or seeks to destroy the principles of the form of government as guaranteed by the Constitution; and

(4) un-American activities generally and any other matter relating to the foregoing subjects that would aid the Congress in determining and enacting necessary remedial legislation.

(b) The joint committee shall make a full report to the Congress annually on or before the first day of February, and interim reports at such other times as it deems necessary, of its activities under this resolution, giving the results of its investigations and studies and its recommendations as to necessary remedial legislation or action.

SEC. 3. (a) The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, either in public or executive session; to sit and act at such places and times; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths; to take such testimony; to procure such printing and binding; and, within the amount appropriated therefor, to make such expenditure as it deems advisable to carry out and perform effectively its duties. Subpenas shall be issued by the chairman or the vice chairman of the joint committee, or by the chairman of any duly authorized subcommittee, and may be served by any person designated by the chairman or the vice-chairman or the chairman of a subcommittee.

(b) The cost of stenographic services to report hearings of the joint committee shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

SEC. 4. Within 30 days after the appointment of all the members who constitute the first joint committee, the joint committee shall formulate general rules of practice governing the conducting of investigations, the holding of hearings, and the conducting of proceedings by the joint committee and shall report such rules to the Congress. Such rules shall become effective upon approval thereof by the Senate and House of Representatives by concurrent resolution or at the expiration of 30 days after the report thereof to the Congress without action thereon, whichever first occurs. Amendments and additions to such rules shall be made in the same manner as provided for the adoption of the original rules.

SEC. 5. (a) The joint committee shall have the power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as it deems necessary to carry out its duties, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923 for comparable duties. All such officers and employees shall be appointed by the chairman, with the approval of the joint committee, without regard to political affiliation and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties assigned to them.

(b) Members of the joint committee shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties outside the District of Columbia.

(c) The joint committee is authorized to utilize the information and, with the consent of the head of the department, agency, or establishment concerned, the services, facilities, and personnel of the departments, agencies, and establishments in the executive branch of the Government.

SEC. 6. Appropriations for the expenses of the joint committee shall be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate upon vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY AT THE TOWN HALL DINNER HONORING SENATOR BARKLEY

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Senator O'MAHONEY at the Town Hall dinner honoring Senator BARKLEY at New York, December 15, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

SUPREME COURT DECISION IN CEMENT CASE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR CAPEHART

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "United States Supreme Court Decision in Cement Case Brings Serious Problem," delivered by him, and published in the Journal of the National Association of Retail Druggists for December 20, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PRESERVATION OF A FREE ECONOMY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Preservation of a Free Economy," delivered by him to the New York Security Dealers' Association at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, on December 10, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE BUSINESSMAN'S OBLIGATIONS TO THE GOVERNMENT—ARTICLE BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article prepared by him on the subject of the businessman's obligations to the Government and to the people, published in Dun's Review, December 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

GOVERNMENT AND HEALTH—ARTICLE BY SENATOR SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

[Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article prepared by him, entitled "Government and Health," which appears in the Appendix.]

PLANNING FOR CHAOS—EDITORIAL BY MERRYLE STANLEY RUKEYSER

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Planning for Chaos," by Merryle Stanley Rukeyser, from the New York Journal-American of December 30, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SEATTLE TIMES—ARTICLE FROM NEWSWEEK MAGAZINE

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article with respect to the public service rendered by the Seattle Times, published in Newsweek, January 3, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

"EXHUMING" AN ECONOMIC LAW—EDITORIAL FROM THE DESERET NEWS

[Mr. WATKINS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "'Exhuming' An Economic Law," published in the Deseret News, of Salt Lake City, Utah, on January 2, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

AFTER TAFT-HARTLEY, WHAT?—EDITORIAL FROM THE REGISTER-GUARD

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "After Taft-Hartley, What?" from the Eugene, Oreg., Register-Guard for December 30, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS—RESOLUTION BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE PORTLAND LABOR-MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Portland Labor-Management Committee regarding labor-management relations, which appears in the Appendix.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The morning business is closed.

REPUBLICAN REPRESENTATION ON FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I understand that the able majority leader is not presenting for action this afternoon the recommendation of the Democratic majority in respect to committee memberships in the Eighty-first Congress. I understand that consideration of this subject, through his courtesy, is put off until tomorrow in order to permit the Republican side of the Senate to submit its suggestions at the same time the majority suggestions are presented.

Since I shall not be here tomorrow, because of personal reasons with which most Senators are familiar, I cannot allow this occasion to pass without stating for the RECORD my very great disappointment that the Democratic conference has seen fit in this connection to take the first partisan action in opposition to the theory and spirit of bipartisan cooperation in foreign affairs which has prevailed in the past 2 years.

I do not question the right of my friends across the aisle to apply their percentage of membership, as they see fit, to any committee in the Senate. They had to make a voluntary choice as between committees in selecting those to which the more drastic penalty of curtailed minority membership should be applied, the penalty of reducing the minority membership to five members. I merely wish to express my profound regret that in the exercise of that discretion and in the operation of that purely voluntary will they chose the Committee on Foreign Relations as one of those upon which the minority side of the committee should be reduced to the maximum possible.

Mr. President, I repeat, I do not question their right to make this order. I do not question the character of the splendid Senators who are recommended for new membership, but I do question the wisdom of an act which is implicit with hostility, as it will be interpreted by the country, to the maintenance in the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations of an atmosphere in which partisan politics has not entered for one single second during the past 2 years. The Senator from Texas suggests to me the past 4 years; I agree with him.

But here is a decision, Mr. President, which is a political decision. I absolve the Senator from Kentucky and his associates from any conscious purpose to do the thing I am talking about in respect to its implications, but I submit that the implications are inevitable. The implications will be viewed by the country as inevitable, and the implications are without justification, and the implications are utterly unsound as a matter of public policy.

When the maximum reduction in the Republican membership is deliberately applied to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations what is the implication? The implication must be that in connection with the Administration's foreign program for this year, Republican Senators are not quite trustworthy, and that there must be faithful partisan Democrats, to the maximum, put upon the committee for the sake of the national welfare.

Mr. President, my friends across the aisle probably do not intend that challenge or that purpose. But I submit that the implication is inevitable. It is an implication which I have heard from disillusioned colleagues on this side of the aisle ever since the news became known. It is an implication which will inevitably be construed by the country as I have indicated.

I ask, Is the implication just? That is the reason for my rising. I care far less about the impact of the new percentage itself. Of itself, it is a very little thing. But I care a very great deal about whether or not the Democratic side of the Senate is justified in an action which carries the dubious implication to which I have referred.

Mr. President, I shall never live long enough not to be unalterably proud of the solidarity of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Democrats and Republicans alike, during the last two critical years of this country's history. I shall never cease to be proud of the fact that never once was a partisan word uttered in all the considerations of that committee.

I shall never cease to be proud of the fact that although upon many occasions we started with violent differences of opinion in the committee in respect to various phases of proposed legislation, that never once through long, patient, careful quest of a common denominator in our thinking did we fail to produce a unanimous result. I am proud of the indispensable Republican contribution to that record which clothed American international authority with the power of unity.

I shall never cease to be proud of the fact—I hope some day a record of equal unpartisan values can be made—I shall never cease to be proud of the fact that upon 47 critical occasions in the Eightieth Congress, which in this aspect was not the worst Congress in history, the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding, but was the best Congress in history, this committee voted 13 to 0 in behalf of the national welfare. Thus we denied any possibility that any alien enemy might think they could divide and conquer us.

Mr. President, I submit that that sort of a record invites and deserves a different treatment—a far different acknowledgment—than is accorded to the Republican side of the Chamber in the Democratic proposal to reduce the Republican membership upon this committee to the utter minimum.

I desire to refer to one other factor in passing. If we Republicans were permitted to have the same minority representation in the Eighty-first Congress that the minority had in the Eightieth, the Republican side of the Senate would produce representation on the Foreign Relations Committee for the great west coast of the country. We should have filled our one vacancy, which is now

denied to us, with a distinguished Republican Senator from the Pacific area. Due to the fact that we shall not be permitted to correct this lapse, which we have recognized for a long time, the committee, as it will stand, will again be without a single representative from that great Pacific area of the United States which has such a desperately intimate interest in foreign affairs.

Under all the circumstances my colleagues will understand why I deeply regret the situation which we confront. I would not overemphasize it. Of itself it is perhaps relatively insignificant. But I hope it is not an omen for the future, because in my view we are still in the grip of those times, Mr. President, when in respect to foreign relations we must think of our country first and our party second. I am sure that will continue to be the general pursuit and aspect of affairs. I am sure our friends across the aisle will undertake to permit us a full measure of cooperation. But I respectfully submit, Mr. President, that this is a very unhappy initiation of the enterprise, because cooperation has to be a two-way street and confidence must be mutual.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I regret the necessity in this first real session of the Senate to indulge in anything that might even seem to be a controversy over the assignment of Members of the Senate to committees. The situation which we confronted in determining in the first place how many committees should have a ratio of 8 to 5, and how many should have a ratio of 7 to 6, was one that presented difficulties.

We have, as a result of the election, a majority of 12, the ratio being 54 to 42. In the Eightieth Congress the majority of the Republicans was 6, the ratio being 51 to 45. Obviously the Democratic steering committee in undertaking to provide membership on committees for the increased majority of Members on this side was compelled to increase the number of committees that would have a ratio of 8 to 5.

In the last Congress, with a majority of six, the then majority decided on three committees that would have a ratio of 8 to 5, not including the Appropriations Committee, which had a larger ratio because of a larger membership.

The steering committee decided, and, based upon the representation of the two sides it seems a just decision, that we should have eight committees that would have a ratio of 8 to 5.

In the discussion of the question as to whether the Committee on Foreign Relations should be one of those eight there were many things that had to be considered. In the first place, 2 years ago, when the committee was organized, it became necessary to drop three Democratic members from the Committee on Foreign Relations because of the Reorganization Act, which limited the membership of committees and limited the number of committees in the Senate.

In addition to that we had a larger proportion, I should say, of Members on this side who had tried to become members of the Committee on Foreign Relations for a number of years, or ever since they had been in the Senate, than of any other committee. It is a desirable committee, and, naturally, in view of world affairs, Senators appreciate membership on it because they wish to contribute whatever they can to the solution of the international problems that face us.

I appreciate all that the Senator from Michigan has said in regard to the attitude of the Committee on Foreign Relations during the past 2 years during which I have been a member of it, and for a longer time than that. But I also want to call attention to the fact, and emphasize it, that even in the Seventy-eighth Congress, when we had a larger majority than we have now, and when the Committee on Foreign Relations was larger than it is now, and when we had a larger proportionate majority than would provide for even that 8-to-5 ratio, we initiated the so-called nonpartisan and bipartisan approach to all problems of international character.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], who was then the chairman of that committee, in appointing a subcommittee to confer with the President and with the Secretary of State to try to work out a nonpartisan, bipartisan foreign relations program, appointed a subcommittee of eight, four Republicans and four Democrats. My recollection is that the Senator from Michigan, Mr. Vandenberg, the then Senator from Vermont, Mr. Austin, the then Senator from Maine, Mr. White, and the then Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. La Follette, were the four representing the minority. The Senator from Texas, the Senator from Georgia, Mr. George, the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. Barkley, and first the then Senator from Iowa, Mr. Gillette, and later the Senator from Utah, Mr. Thomas, represented the majority on that committee.

So that even long before the war ended, and before the death of President Roosevelt, the Committee on Foreign Relations thought that it saw far enough ahead to begin the foundations of a foreign policy that would be bereft of partisan politics, and even with a larger majority than we have now, the Senator from Texas provided an equal representation from both sides in that committee in trying to work out the foreign policy; and I think the Senator from Michigan will agree also that we did not hand the minority a bill of goods and say "take this."

In the very initiation, in the very beginning of the talks and conversations, first with Secretary Hull and later with Secretary Stettinius, we started from scratch, and we worked our way along inch by inch and sentence by sentence and page by page, and everybody, regardless of his politics, had an opportunity, and exercised it, to express his views in regard to everything leading up, for instance, to the Charter of the United Nations, and the entire foreign policy of our Government.

So that it is not quite accurate to emphasize that only in the Eightieth Congress was this nonpartisan and bipartisan approach maintained, for it was maintained even back in the Seventy-eighth Congress and through the Seventy-ninth Congress and it was continued in the Eightieth Congress.

I have heretofore expressed my profound appreciation and gratitude to the Senator from Michigan and to other Senators on the Republican side serving on the Committee on Foreign Relations, and even those who are not members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, for the unity of approach which we have been able to attain in regard to foreign relations and international policy.

In determining what we should do in regard to the proportion of membership on this committee, we had no thought of any partisan division in respect to the actions of the committee. We had a problem to solve in regard to our own membership. We were confronted with twice the majority the other side had in the last Congress. We worked out a proportion which is based upon the pattern set by the Eightieth Congress. Wherever there was a fraction of a percentage, the majority took the whole and not the fraction. There is no way by which we can divide a man into halves or thirds. We must deal with whole numbers. We adopted the same pattern, and the proportion is almost the same, though slightly different both in the Appropriations Committee and in the Committee on Foreign Relations. However, we did not feel, and we do not now feel that the presence or absence of any one man on the Committee on Foreign Relations would make any difference so far as its attitude toward international problems is concerned. In view of the situation which confronted us in trying in the first place to restore to membership on the committee Senators who had to be dropped under the law 2 years ago, and the fact that there was an effort to give membership on the committee to some Senators who had sought to obtain membership upon it, whose records in the Senate are equally satisfactory and equally positive with respect to our international relations, I do not feel that we were in any way violating the proprieties by including the Committee on Foreign Relations as one of those to have a ratio of 8 to 5.

I shall regret it if there is any implication to be drawn from this fact from a partisan viewpoint. I do not know to what extent such implication would have been drawn by the public if nothing had been said about it today. But inasmuch as it has been mentioned, I wish completely to disclaim, not only for myself, but for the entire Democratic majority and for the steering committee which worked out these assignments, any sinister motive. I refuse, with all the force I command, any implication on the part of anyone that we have in any way been actuated by partisan politics or by any remote reflection upon the good faith, patriotism, or willingness of the members of that committee to go forward, as they have in the past, in a united spirit in dealing with our relationships with other nations.

This was one of the practical situations with which we had to deal. I suppose those who wish to do so may draw some implication from the circumstances, to which they will attribute motives of party politics. The question of politics

was not even discussed. The question of the attitude of Democrats or Republicans on the committee was not even discussed. We were seeking to meet a situation which confronted us, and we have met it, we think, in the best and most practical way possible.

It is always regrettable that Senators may not be assigned to the committees which they prefer. That applies to both sides of the Chamber. But we are all young yet, and there is a great future before us. As the Republican candidate said in the last campaign, our future lies before us. Therefore all Members of the Senate have a perfect right to aspire to membership on this committee as soon as circumstances will permit.

Mr. President, there is quite a difference between the existing situation and the situation which prevailed 2 years ago. This proportion takes no Senator off the committee, whereas 2 years ago we lost four members of the committee by reason of the operation of the law at that time. It may not be important, but it is a fact that by this ratio we do not remove any Senator from the committee. All Senators who are on the committee will remain on the committee, both majority and minority, with the exception of Senator Hatch, of New Mexico, who has retired from the Senate, and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who suggested that he be switched from the Committee on Foreign Relations to the Committee on the Judiciary, partly in order to take care of Senators who had been previously dropped. Furthermore, when I assume the office of Vice President, there will be a vacancy on the committee.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to make a few remarks on the subject on which the Senator from Michigan so ably addressed the Senate this afternoon.

I listened to the Senator from Kentucky in his reply to the Senator from Michigan. So far as I am concerned, I wish to say that I felt that most of his remarks were irrelevant and immaterial to the question which the action of the Democratic caucus has raised in regard to the continuation of a bipartisan foreign policy.

I wish to make one point very clear at the beginning: I am willing to eliminate myself from the consideration of this subject matter. If it be true that it appeared that if the Foreign Relations Committee remained on a 7-to-6 basis, the junior Senator from Oregon would be appointed to that committee, and if that was one of the reasons why the Democrats adopted an 8-to-5 ratio, I here and now, for the good of the country and the principle of a bipartisan foreign policy, wish to assure the Democrats that I withdraw from any further consideration. However, there are other Republican Senators from the Pacific coast and other Democratic Senators from the Pacific coast who should be considered for membership on the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall not yield until I finish.

As I have just said, there are other Republican Senators from the Pacific coast and other Democratic Senators from the Pacific coast who should be considered for membership on the Foreign Relations Committee, because in my section of the country the people have Asia at their front door, and for some time now they have tried to make clear that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee should have at least one west coast member on it. I say that in the Eighty-first Congress the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate should have either one Republican or one Democratic member from the west coast.

The Senator from Kentucky talks about implications. I wish to say that the implications of the actions taken by the Democratic Members of the Senate in their caucus are perfectly clear. A few minutes ago we listened to the President of the United States deliver his message on the state of the Union. In that message there was not one word about the bipartisan policy, for which the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is at least as responsible as is any other public servant in America. The least the President could have done would have been to recognize by name the distinguished Senator from Michigan and give credit, it seems to me, for what he has done in recent years in developing a truly bipartisan foreign policy. There can be no doubt that the wise counsel and able leadership of the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] prevented some of the mistakes that otherwise would have been made in the conduct of our foreign affairs.

Of course, the implications are clear. The implications are that the Democrats propose to play partisan politics with war and peace. The implications are clear that if occasions arise where they think it desirable to play politics with foreign policy, they will stack the committee with a great majority of Democrats. That is quite out of line with the spirit and purpose of a bipartisan foreign policy. I wish to say that when the Senator from Kentucky talks about the situation which confronted the Democrats in the Seventy-eighth Congress, he should point out that since then we have had the Reorganization Act; and it is the Reorganization Act which, so far as ratio is concerned, gives to the Democrats, and also to the Republicans, their problems in regard to the number of Members who shall serve on the committees.

But let us consider what the Republican Congress did under the Reorganization Act. We recognized, Mr. President, that if we are going to have a bipartisan foreign policy, clearly there is a relationship between it and the membership of that committee. I submit that bipartisanship, so far as the personnel of the committee is concerned, means equal numbers to the extent that such an arrangement can be mathematically worked out. I here and now charge that mathematically the Democrats did not attempt to carry out the bipartisan foreign policy which characterized the Republicans, when we had the majority and reassigned membership on the Committee on Foreign Relations. We thought the best way to carry out a bipartisan foreign policy was to give, under the ratio, on that committee, as near an equal number to Senators on both sides of the aisle as was mathematically possible—and thus the 7-to-6 ratio.

I come now to the last point I wish to make, Mr. President. I do not desire to embarrass the Senator from Michigan, because I think my love for him and the great esteem with which I hold him are well known both in this body and throughout the country. But let us deal with a political reality; let us face the fact that not always has the great senior Senator from Michigan been confronted with unanimity among Senators on this side of the aisle in regard to a bipartisan foreign policy. Through his magnificent qualities of leadership, Mr. President, he has been a great co-captain with administration forces in carrying forward a bipartisan foreign policy, sailing our Ship of State on a rather even keel, in my judgment, in the interests of a true bipartisan foreign policy. What do Democratic Senators think they have done to the standing of the Senator from Michigan as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, among other Senators on this side of the aisle, when in this Congress he has to come before his fellow Republican Senators and raise his voice again and plead for a position which he thinks is right, in the interests of the country? I shall give you one man's opinion, Mr. President. My opinion is that if Democratic Senators wished to set about undermining the effectiveness of the great work of the Senator from Michigan among Senators on this side of the aisle, they could not have done a better job of it than they did when they adopted an 8-to-5 ratio for membership on the Foreign Relations Committee. I think I know whereof I speak, because today I have talked with a considerable number of Members of the Senate on this side of the aisle. I tell the Senate now, and Senators can take it for what it is worth—but from the standpoint of the country, it is a matter of vital importance—that from the point of view of a Senator on this side of the aisle, in my judgment, as of this moment, the action of the Democratic Senators has weakened the position of the Senator from Michigan so far as concerns his leadership in support of what Democratic Senators will in the future contend to be a bipartisan foreign policy. Members of the Senate on the Republican side of the aisle are saying, "What do you mean when you say 'bipartisan foreign policy'? The best evidence we have of what the Democrats mean by a 'bipartisan foreign policy' is that they took the first opportunity they had to undermine the position of the Senator from Michigan by changing the ratio of membership on the Foreign Relations Committee from 7 to 6 to 8 to 5." I consider the action taken to be in effect an insult and an act of effrontery to the Senator from Michigan because it weakens his position, on our side of the aisle, in support of a bipartisan foreign policy.

So far as the junior Senator from Oregon is concerned, I shall continue to fight for the type of foreign policy which my record stands for; and so far as I can recall, it is a record which does not show

one vote at variance with the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Michigan. Because of my love for him and my appreciation of what he has done for our country, I say these words with a feeling of resentment against the action taken, for it will, in my opinion, be interpreted by some as a reflection on the leadership of the Senator from Michigan.

I hope that before Democratic Senators get through with this problem they will at least recognize the importance of taking the course of action necessary to give us at least one Democratic Senator from the west coast on the Foreign Relations Committee, so that the people of that section of the country will feel that they have a direct spokesman from their own territory who can help interpret, for the other Members of the Senate, what we consider to be the great, vital problems of the Pacific.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to belabor this subject, but the Senator from Oregon rather intimated that the action of the Democratic steering committee was based upon some intimation that he might be a member of the Foreign Relations Committee if the ratio were different. I wish to assure the Senator from Oregon that so far as I am concerned, I had no knowledge or suspicion or intimation as to who might be an additional Republican member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. The matter was not discussed or mentioned in the steering committee. I think the Senator from Oregon will give me credit for a sufficient degree of friendship for him over the years to understand that I would not be actuated by any such motives as that. So far as I am concerned, if I were still a member of that committee I should welcome the Senator from Oregon as a member of it.

Insofar as putting somebody from the West on the committee is concerned, I do not wish to be partisan in any respect, but the majority in the Eightieth Congress could have done that if they had seen fit to do so. They did not do it. They now, being the minority, complain because we are not doing it for them. The membership of a committee depends a good deal on the desire of Members of the Senate. They make their requests, and the requests are acted upon. They do not always concur with the viewpoint or the policy of the committee itself, and I do not think the question that there has been nobody on the Foreign Relations Committee from the West is any particular party's fault or any individual Senator's fault. It is just one of those things that has not worked out. Largely, as a rule, Senators from the West are interested in other matters besides foreign relations. They are interested in problems that affect the West, and they put in their requests as a rule for committees dealing with subjects in which they are vitally concerned.

So far as the Senator from Michigan is concerned, I do not think that anybody, especially the Senator from Michigan, and none of his friends, need be uneasy about the Senator's place in the history of the Senate or the history of the country, or the history of our foreign relations. Certainly the absence or the presence of one member of either party on the Committee on Foreign Relations will have no effect upon the Senator's standing in the country and in the Senate. I have too much respect for the patriotism and the sincerity of members of the Republican Party to believe that their attitude on the great question of international cooperation and interparty cooperation in dealing with foreign policy and affairs is to be affected by one man, and as to whether one man is or is not on the Committee on Foreign Relations. The position of the Senator from Michigan is safe. His place in the history of the country and in the Senate is secure, so he need not worry on this account, and I think no friend of his need worry. Certainly I am not worrying about it, because I do not think it is affected in the slightest degree.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, it is not possible for me to sit here and listen to what has been said without identifying myself completely with my distinguished colleague from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] in what he said, and with what my colleague from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has just said. I have served on the Foreign Relations Committee for 2 years, and all of us on that committee, Republicans and Democrats alike, had a great experience of inspiration and patriotism in serving our country together in an absolutely nonpartisan way and as Americans in dealing with basic international problems.

My heart has been full ever since I first ran for public office with my belief that the peace of the world depended on a united America and a united American front in our dealings with other nations of the world. I supported every measure in this body, whether introduced on our side or on the Democratic side, which looked toward the cooperation of the world, and which has called upon us to stand together as Americans in this critical period of the world's history. I went through the experience of the whole development of the ECA program. I knew the difficulties and the opposition that would come to that. I pay tribute to the Senator from Michigan for the inspiring leadership which he displayed in taking what was originally the administration measure and bringing about an agreement, a meeting of the minds between both sides of the aisle, without any thought of partisanship. We all acted for the best interests of the people of America in presenting this form of recovery aid to the other nations of the world. No act could have been more important than the way in which that program was handled during this last year. I desire to go on record as sharing with the Senator from Michigan his statement that the Congress, which has been designated as the worst Congress in history, was the outstanding and best Congress in American history so far as our foreign relations are concerned.

Naturally, then, this morning when I heard that the change had been made in the committee set-up I felt deeply shocked. Certainly the 7-to-6 ratio could have been retained in this vital committee. There were other committees where necessary political adjustments could have been made. Heretofore, with full approval of the American people we have agreed that politics should be adjourned at the water's edge. We cannot let the American people down at this time.

Mr. President, I should be the last one ever to desert the bipartisan approach. I could not contemplate such a thing, not for one minute. I desire to continue to identify myself with an all-American approach to these problems. But, Mr. President, I have a sinking in my heart that this should have been done without giving thought to the implications of this action and the reflections on our own leader, who has done so much in joining with the President of the United States and with the Secretary of State in developing our all-American foreign policy. It is distressing to me beyond measure, and I say it is especially distressing because of the deep affection that I have come to hold for my colleagues on the left of the aisle, Democrats with whom we worked together, with whom we traveled together abroad, with whom we roomed together, in trying to find the answer to these problems, without ever a whisper of partisanship.

Mr. President, it is not possible for me to sit here and not express my convictions, and my regret that this should have happened at the very inception of the Eighty-first Congress.

THE NATIONAL HOUSING PROGRAM

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, today the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] introduced a national housing bill, which, so far as the general form is concerned, follows almost exactly the terms of the bill which he and I introduced at the last session and which has been introduced with bipartisan cooperation for the past 5 years.

This bill is 46 pages long. It was prepared without my knowledge by the administrative departments and sent to the Senator from Louisiana this morning. He called me up about an hour before the Senate met and showed me the bill. I had offered to sponsor with him the same bill which was introduced last year, but he pointed out that there were substantial changes, to which I shall refer. I had no opportunity to read the bill. Furthermore, the changes are very substantial.

The subject of housing has been a matter of bipartisan cooperation for 5 years. I was chairman of a subcommittee in a Democratic Congress which made the first over-all study of postwar housing and submitted certain recommendations. Both in the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses the bill was introduced with the support of the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and myself. I regret very much that I am unable to add my name to the list of sponsors of the bill which has today been introduced with purely Democratic sponsorship—the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from

Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I prefer to complete my statement. At the conclusion of my statement I shall be glad to yield.

Because of the shortness of time, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] also declined to permit their names to be used on the bill. We regret that we have not been able to join in sponsorship of this bill.

There are certain substantial changes, about which I certainly was not consulted at any time. The number of houses has been increased from 500,000 to the possibility of building more than 1,000,000 in 4 years. The annual expense of the subsidy has been increased from $190,000,000 to $445,000,000. The bonds of the various metropolitan housing authorities have been made taxable, which makes the expense to the Federal Government considerably greater.

I have not had an opportunity to examine the bill to determine whether there are other changes. In any event, the bill has been prepared without any consultation whatever with us, or any attempt to continue the bipartisan cooperation which has previously existed in regard to the housing policy.

The President of the United States used the following language in his message to the Congress today:

> I hope for cooperation from farmers, from labor, and from business. Every segment of our population and every individual has a right to expect from his Government a fair deal.
>
> They have a right to expect that the Congress and the President will work in the closest cooperation with one objective—the welfare of the people of this Nation as a whole.
>
> In the months ahead I know that I shall be able to cooperate with this Congress.

I can only conclude that in using that language the President meant cooperation with the Democratic majority, and not cooperation with the Republican minority in this Congress.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, my name is on the bill. Through the generosity of the Senate I shall be the chairman of the committee. I shall welcome any suggestions for changes which the distinguished Senator from Ohio desires to offer.

What the Senator from Ohio says about nonpartisan cooperation in the past few Congresses is correct so far as the Senate is concerned. But every time we passed a housing bill for the veterans or for the people of the United States, the Republican House of Representatives defeated the bill, either on the floor of the House because a rule could not be obtained for its consideration, or in conference.

So I wish to assure my friend the Senator from Ohio that, as chairman of the committee, I shall use every effort to bring about cooperation on the part of the Republican and the Democratic Members of the Senate, because certainly the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio has done much for housing legislation.

RUSSELL J. HOPLEY

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on December 10, last, it was my privilege to attend a public affairs luncheon given by the citizens of Omaha, Nebr., in honor of one of its most distinguished citizens, who had but recently returned from a term of service here in Washington. I refer to Mr. Russell J. Hopley, president of the Northwestern Bell Telephone Co., who had been named Director of Civil Defense. The appointment was made by the President of the United States. Mr. Hopley was in Washington on this very important assignment for nearly a year. His services were rendered gratis. Mr. Hopley's address, delivered to the people of Omaha, should be made available to the Members of this body, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent that the brief introductory remarks made by the vice president of the Omaha Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Charles S. Reed, be printed ahead of the address by Mr. Hopley.

Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial published in the Omaha Evening World-Herald of December 15, 1948, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, immediately following the address by Mr. Hopley.

There being no objection, the addresses and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS OF CHARLES S. REED, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE OMAHA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, AT TESTIMONIAL LUNCHEON OF THE OMAHA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE ON DECEMBER 10, 1948, HONORING RUSSELL J. HOPLEY, RETIRING DIRECTOR OF CIVIL DEFENSE

Senator BUTLER, Governor Peterson, ladies and gentlemen:

Russell Hopley has honored the chamber of commerce by making his first general public appearance here since his return from Washington. Although I know that your presence today is solely a testimonial of your regard for Mr. Hopley, I do, on behalf of the chamber of commerce, wish to express our appreciation for your attendance at this luncheon.

We are especially grateful that Senator BUTLER and our Governor are here.

Since Russell Hopley came here in 1929, we have come to regard him as our own. I am sure, however, that no Omahan is the least bit jealous because his civic service was expanded into national fields. I have the pleasure of reading a message of national appreciation:

"I join with the citizens of Omaha in paying respect to one of its distinguished citizens, Russell J. Hopley. He has well served the National Military Establishment and the Nation during this past year as chairman of a committee studying civil defense planning, the report of which reflects the thoroughness of his organizational and administrative abilities. It is a fitting tribute that his fellow citizens have assembled at this testimonial luncheon to honor him.

"JAMES FORRESTAL,
"Secretary of Defense."

Before presenting the man you came to hear, I cannot resist a short recap of a life devoted to service.

I have heard the presiding officers, in keeping with the occasion, paint some very glowing pictures of our guests of honor. Sometimes the pictures were better than the subject, but I am not worried about such a possibility today because no one can overstate the accomplishments and character of our Russ Hopley.

Since he is an active leader in more than 25 local, State, and National organizations, I can only give you the high spots in his career.

He was born in Blue Island, Ill. Ambitious young people can take hope in the fact that his business career started as a collector for the telephone company at Fort Madison, Iowa. He served with distinction in the Signal Corps in World War I.

Early in life he began to devote a large share of his time and energy to the welfare of his community and State. His usefulness virtually forced him into leadership in a list of organizations that reads like a roster of human aspirations. Without attempting to emphasize one more than another, I refer to his devoted and sagacious leadership as chairman of the Omaha city-wide planning committee, which received national acclaim.

In the business field he was rapidly promoted to positions of increasing responsibility, until in 1937, he became operating vice president of the Northwestern Bell Telephone Co. He was elected president of his company in 1942, and we are glad that he continues in that capacity today.

With the invention and perfection of the airplane, radar, the atomic bomb, and guided missiles, and with the increasing possibility of mass destruction by bacteriological and chemical warfare, our Nation has become conscious of the necessity of planning for the security of our civil population in the unhappy event of another war.

It became the duty of the President of the United States to select a citizen to assume the responsibility of planning for the safety of our people in a national emergency. Even as a Republican, I am forced to admit that the President's selection of Russell Hopley was a stroke of genius. In March 1948, Mr. Hopley accepted the assignment as Director of Civil Defense Planning. The task ahead of him was new and uncharted. As he has always done in business and civic affairs, Russell Hopley devoted all of his keen insight, calm judgment, organizational ability, and tireless industry to getting the job done quickly and efficiently. His services were rendered gratis.

The character of his service is brought into relief by a consideration of the fact that in directing the work of a panel of 133 experts, organized into 10 advisory committees, he employed a staff of only 43 key persons.

On his judgment rested the possible future safety of millions of his fellow citizens. The consciousness of this obligation did not leave him for a minute. I had the pleasure of spending an evening with him in Washington several weeks ago. While he was his usual calm and gracious self, I could see evidence of his feeling of responsibility and the expenditure of his energy.

His approach to the problem and his ability were the talk of the Pentagon. Typical of the Russell Hopley we know, he completed his assignment with dispatch, and now he has returned to Omaha with no trace of Potomac fever.

His report has met with practically unanimous approbation. On November 22, President Truman personally expressed his thanks to Mr. Hopley, and the following day he was awarded a certificate of appreciation by Secretary Forrestal, the first such certificate ever presented a civilian.

Your attendance is a testimonial of your pride in this great Omaha citizen whose life is an example of civic service. Speaking for the Omaha Chamber of Commerce, I am proud and happy to present our distinguished fellow townsman, Mr. Russell J. Hopley.

ADDRESS BY RUSSELL J. HOPLEY, PRESIDENT, NORTHWESTERN BELL TELEPHONE CO. (FORMER NATIONAL DIRECTOR OF CIVIL DEFENSE PLANNING), OMAHA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, PUBLIC AFFAIRS LUNCHEON IN HONOR OF THE SPEAKER, DECEMBER 10, 1948

CIVIL DEFENSE FOR NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. Chairman, Senator BUTLER, Your Excellency Governor Peterson, distinguished guests, distinguished ladies at the center table, and friends, I want you all to know that I deeply appreciate this splendid recognition and tribute on the occasion of the completion of my special assignment in Washington. Even though, from my own standpoint, I know that this high compliment is not fully deserved, I nevertheless want you all to know that I appreciate it very much.

After almost 9 months of intensive work and activity as Director of Civil Defense Planning with Secretary of Defense Forrestal, it is good, indeed, to be back in Omaha.

An intimate picture of the Washington assignment, which has been referred to by some authorities as one of the most important undertakings in government at this time, and some of the significant developments in the activity might be of interest.

I will endeavor to relate a few of the high lights together with a brief historical outline in connection with this most important undertaking.

On February 15 of this year, the report of the then War Department Civil Defense Board, which later became known as the Bull Board since it was headed up by Maj. Gen. Harold Bull, was released for public information. One of the principal recommendations of this board was that a general civil defense plan should be formulated for the United States, its Territories and possessions.

Little time was lost following the issuance of this report since 7 days after its release—on February 22—my telephone rang and as a result of a meeting at that time with Secretary of Defense Forrestal, and other high-ranking members of the Military Establishment and representatives of the Federal Government, he asked me to head up, organize, and direct the development of the fundamental civil defense plans and organizational structure for the country.

To visualize the need and necessity for a strong and sound civil defense plan and organization for our country, it is first necessary to think in terms of past, current, and future developments, such as:

1. Until this century, wars had been mainly contests between opposing bodies of fighting men and armies. Relatively few civilians were exposed to actual physical contact with the fighting—and those that were were the ones unfortunate enough to be caught in the paths of armies. Generally, civilians far from the scene of actual fighting suffered only heartaches and hardships.

2. That our homeland has been fortunate enough not to have suffered the devastation apparent everywhere in the stricken cities of Europe and Japan during World Wars I and II.

3. That there is no guaranty that if we are unfortunate enough to be involved in another conflict, that the cities of this country and our teeming industrial areas will not be potential targets of an enemy.

4. In the last decade, there has been an ever-growing list of instruments of destruction. Their use has not been confined merely to opposing armies—and one need only think of London, Coventry, Hamburg, Cologne, Berlin, Tokyo, Nagasaki, and Hiroshima to realize how war can now reach into cities far from the scene of actual battle.

5. Up to this time, we here in the United States have been fortunate—since two great oceans have served as effective barriers against large-scale enemy operations.

6. No American city has listened to the wail of a siren warning of real danger in this country, the rush of falling bombs, or the thunder of bomb explosions.

7. Nor, during enemy operations, have we had to live in constant fear that high-explosive bombs, incendiaries, atomic bombs, guided missiles, or buzz bombs would, with destructive force, land in our midst at any moment.

8. No longer can we in this country assume that we are safe from these dangers.

9. Weapons developed in the last stages of World War II, new weapons that have come into being since, as well as those that will be developed in the future, have made our country just as vulnerable as any other part of the world.

10. Both time and distance have dissolved and no one needs a crystal ball to see the possibility that the future may bring another Pearl Harbor or even a score or more of simultaneous Pearl Harbors to our own shores.

11. The objective of enemy action against our country today would be to render our cities and production facilities inoperative, thus minimizing the will to resist on the part of the people.

It is not within my sphere to make predictions as to whether this country will experience another war—I certainly hope and we all hope, and we all must assume, that the various peace agencies of governments throughout the world will be successful in negotiating a basis for lasting peace.

Certainly we all hope that another war with all of its horrors and suffering and loss of life and destruction will never come.

Yet, in these days of insecurity it is wise for us to go a step further than the classic statement of "keeping our powder dry." We must be prepared for the day of a new type of war more terrible, more frightful, more destructive, and more devastating than any of those of the past.

We have heard much, since World War II, of the necessity for a strong national defense. We in this country have taken steps to strengthen our Army, our Navy, and our Air Force and their supporting agencies but there is a missing link in our defense structure, and that missing link is civil defense.

Civil defense as related to national defense broadly means the organization of the people to minimize the effects of and recovery from enemy action—more specifically, it is:

The mobilization, organization, and direction of the civilian populace and necessary supporting agencies to minimize the effects of enemy action directed against people, communities, industrial plants, and other installations—and to maintain or restore those facilities essential to civil life and to preserve the maximum civilian support of the war effort.

With all of this as our premise, we undertook the process of carrying out the terms of the directive which was issued in establishing our organization—

"To prepare and submit a program of civil defense including a plan for a permanent Federal civil defense agency which, in conjunction with the several States and their subdivisions, can undertake those peacetime preparations which are necessary to assure an adequate civil defense system in the event of an emergency."

As the first step, it was necessary to recruit an able and effective organization. To do this, and to effect a good balance, we reached out over all geographical sections of the country and brought in the top talent and ability in all of the various specialized fields that would be involved in a broad civil defense activity.

We deliberately kept our organization on the small side and carried on our work with 43 key people—including our good friend, Jim McCrory, who is assisting in the preparation of training material—together with an outstanding group of 133 consultants and advisers selected from the fields of science, education, business, industry, and labor and other similar groups. It was highly significant that in asking people to serve with us, we had not one refusal on the part of anyone to serve.

Very often people would ask the question "How many people are working on the civil defense activity?" My usual answer was "In the first place, all of our people are working. Actually, we have 43 key people and 133 consultants and advisers"—then, the usual response would be something like this, "Well, my goodness, with the large amount of work involved in a problem of this sort, we thought perhaps you had four or five hundred people on the job."

In taking up our work, we had available to us the experience, recommendations, and findings of the United States strategic bombing survey in Europe and Japan and the World War II activities and experiences of the civil defense organizations in Europe, Japan, and in England, and in our own country.

It may surprise some of you to learn that Japan had the oldest civil defense system, since theirs was first organized in 1923. Japan's system was not too effective for the reason that the military kept telling their people that an enemy attack could never come to Japan—the result was the people did not work at it.

Germany had what could have been a strong system of civil defense, but for the fact that there were too many people reaching out for power and constantly attempting to exert political control over the various segments of the organization. In addition, the organization was hampered by administrative muddles. The result was constant conflict and their system did not work too well.

England had the strongest and most effective civil defense program—their system was organized 4 years prior to World War II. The people worked at it and the result was an effective system and one that contributed greatly to the survival of England and the actual winning of the war.

In our current planning activity we undertook to avoid the pitfalls and errors in all of the previous experiences and to develop a plan that would stand up as being sound, simple, workable, and acceptable and to avoid overlapping, duplication, and confusion.

In addition, we approached every phase of our work on the basis that as far as the end result was concerned that there could be no road blocks, no barriers, and no obstacles in the way of our turning out the right kind of a job—and further, that "we had been given the job to do and that we were going to do it."

During the course of our work, we held many meetings with representatives from the armed services; the various branches of Federal, State, and local government; representatives from some foreign governments; and many private organizations, groups, and individuals. We had the finest of cooperation and assistance from all of these groups.

In a nut shell, we brought together the best advice and experience of all interested groups in our entire activity.

Briefly, our final program entitled "civil defense for national security" proposes:

1. The establishment of a permanent Federal Office of Civil Defense to be established within the executive branch of the Government and to be headed by a strong and able civilian director.

2. Within this Office would be a technical staff, headed by a deputy director, with divisions comprising: communications, engineering, fire services, police services, warden services, and emergency transportation.

3. A plans and operations staff, headed by a deputy director, with divisions comprising:

organization and methods, mobile reserves and mutual aid, evacuation, aircraft observers and air raid warning, manpower and matériel, plant protection, and civilian war aid.

4. A training staff, headed by a deputy director, including: field services, methods and training materials, public education, schools and colleges, and leadership training.

5. A medical and health services and other special weapons defense staff, headed by a deputy director, to include medical and health services, radiological defense, chemical defense, and other special weapons defense.

6. We also propose the establishment of regional coordinators to assist in coordinating matters between the States and Federal organization and with the military and other agencies, when involved.

7. Our plan contemplates the establishment of a civil defense agency within each State—starting with the governor as the responsible head—then the appointment of an advisory council, composed of representative citizens of the State to advise and counsel on civil defense matters, and the State activity to be headed up by a director. The various operating divisions in the State organization would be similar to those in the Federal organization.

8. Similarly, in each community the establishment of a civil-defense agency under the mayor as the responsible municipal official, with an advisory council of representative citizens to advise and counsel on civil-defense matters, and the local activity to be headed up by a director. Here too, the various operating divisions in the local organization would be similar to those in the State and Federal organization.

9. Our entire plan is proposed on the basis of:

A. Placing full responsibility for operations in the States and communities where we think it properly belongs.

B. The Federal organization to furnish the leadership and guidance in organizing and training the people for civil-defense tasks, coordinating, training materials, and the advice and counsel that is needed.

C. Maximum utilization of volunteers, existing agencies and organizations—governmental, public, and private—and all available skills and experiences.

D. Well organized and trained units in communities throughout the country prepared and equipped to meet the problems of enemy attack, and to be ready against any weapon an enemy may use.

E. Intensive planning to meet the particular hazards of atomic or other modern weapons of warfare. (The atomic bomb is a triple-threat combination of (1) a high explosive, (2) a superincendiary, and (3) one of extreme radiation.)

F. A small nucleus peacetime organization which could be used in event of peacetime disasters such as fires, floods, explosions, tornadoes, and other similar catastrophies, and that could be quickly expanded to meet the exigencies of a given situation in a war emergency.

G. The plan and the legislation that we propose have been developed on a model basis for the Federal, State, and municipal organization, and can be easily modified and adjusted to meet a particular situation in the community or State.

H. Our plan and legislation also contemplate that the organization will not engage in any political activity or any other activities outside of the purely civil-defense field. We recognize that many other activities of various types will need to be carried on under different conditions but it is our thought that these should be organized separately from civil defense.

The basis of civil defense as related to a community sums up as follows:

1. The individual, who, with proper training and information, such as first aid, fire detection and prevention, detection of areas contaminated by war gases, ionizing radiation and other similar training, must in the event of an emergency take care of himself.

2. The family, similarly, with training, must take care of itself.

3. The community should as a general proposition organize to handle any emergency within the community. If the emergency were of such proportions that the community were completely overwhelmed and beyond its own capacity to take care of itself, then the calling in of—

4. Mobile reserves set up on the basis of mutual aid. Our plan proposes the organization of mobile reserve battalions (class A and class B) that can be moved into an overwhelmed community from various locations throughout the several States.

Briefly, and without going into the complete detail, it is proposed that these mobile reserve battalions be organized on the basis of setting aside a certain percent or a certain part of the protection services in each community in the State (such as fire, police, medical, etc.), to be supplemented by volunteers in sufficient numbers to round out an effective unit.

Each unit would comprise medical services, fire-fighting services, rescue, and debris clearance, police services, radiological defense services, emergency feeding services, and installation and repair services.

Each unit would also have assigned to it 6 planes and 12 pilots from the Civil Air Patrol to assist in transportation, traffic control, and similar duties.

If, after the mobile reserves were called in and the community was still overwhelmed beyond the combined capacity of the community and the mobile reserves to handle the situation, then we believe the next step should be—

5. Military aid to civil power to operate under emergency plans that have been and are being developed. The last step then would be—

6. Martial rule. And then the civil defense would continue operations, but under a new boss.

Those who are in a position to know have termed the structure of our plan as the best that has been developed for any country up to this time.

I have been most interested and greatly impressed by the almost universal endorsement and approval that our recommended program has received far and wide over the country as a whole.

A typical cross section of reactions to our plan is well summed up by these excerpts from editorials appearing throughout the country:

Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, November 24, 1948: "A job well done. * * * It is simply a prudent and reasonable plan to supplement this country's armed might with an adequate civil-defense program. The * * * committee has submitted such a program."

New York (N. Y.) Times, November 14, 1948: "We commend it (the plan) to Congress and to all citizens as a reasonable and important document. * * * The sooner a Civil Defense Act is passed here and put into effect the better it will be. This is an act of prudence that should not be long delayed."

New York (N. Y.) Herald Tribune, November 15, 1948: "The able report on this subject represents a minimum structure. * * * The proposed system has been very carefully constructed."

Washington (D. C.) Post, November 16, 1948: "Precisely because it is the efficiency of the civil defense organization that may determine whether this country can withstand atomic war. That is the purpose of a new and admirably thorough study—Civil Defense for National Security."

Washington (D. C.) Evening Star, November 15, 1948: "To ignore the warnings contained in the remarkably comprehensive report, to fail to make reasonable preparations to deal with some future emergency because the prospects seem too remote, would be to take risks of the gravest sort."

Baltimore (Md.) Sun, November 15, 1948: "The report shows wisdom in that * * * it calls only for an establishment on a nucleus basis * * * at the moment the quality of leadership and basic organization is more important than the total number of persons enrolled."

Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press, November 19, 1948: "One of the important merits of the civil defense organization which has been proposed * * * is its use in times of peacetime emergency."

Birmingham (Ala.) Post, November 15, 1948: "With world affairs constantly on edge, no time should be lost in placing on paper at least plans for any emergency."

Dallas (Tex.) Daily Times-Herald, November 16, 1948: "The program * * * as outlined * * * serves as a grim reminder of the sort of world in which we live. Therefore, it is up to those of us who are civilians to start getting ready * * * without delay."

Waterloo (Iowa) Courier, November 17, 1948: "Careful study has been given the subject by the Office of Civil Defense Planning. There is no possible harm in the enactment of such a measure, and it might save precious time in the future."

Cheyenne (Wyo.) State Tribune, November 19, 1948: "It (the civil defense report) does not offer any glib answers."

St. Albans (Vt.) Daily Messenger, November 19, 1948: "The plan for a civil defense organization to meet the hazards of an enemy attack on this country, just set forth * * * is a most important adjunct of our national defense system."

Boston (Mass.) Herald, November 16, 1948: "It is not warmongering to be prepared, particularly in the crucial field of civil defense. * * * The new Congress should lose no time in studying these proposals and providing legislation to put them into effect."

Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal, November 14, 1948: "A thoroughly comprehensive * * * plan has been submitted. * * * It is a monumental piece of work reflecting tremendous credit."

Houston (Tex.) Post, November 16, 1948: "A comprehensive blueprint for the protection of the home front in case of war has been placed before Defense Secretary Forrestal."

Detroit (Mich.) Free Press, November 17, 1948: "Unhappily, every word of it is true. All we have is the book—a good basic text."

Lincoln (Nebr.) Evening Journal, November 15, 1948: "The committee * * * approached the problem as realistically as possible."

Fort Worth (Tex.) Star-Telegram, November 17, 1948: "It is not hysteria to exercise foresight in providing adequate defense for the American home front. * * * Every detail for civil defense for the United States should be supplied by the Voice of America and other means to the people of Russia and other militaristic states. When knowledge is world wide, another conflict on modern terms may be impossible."

We have reviewed our plans with many organizations and groups, such as the council of state governments, the conference of mayors, the American Municipal Association, and others, and have received splendid and encouraging reactions from all quarters.

As a result, we feel that we have achieved our original objective of producing a sound plan and one of which all can be justly proud.

I should like to take this opportunity to pay my tribute to Secretary Forrestal as being a great American who is devoting himself unselfishly to our country; and to our fellow Omahans Lieutenant General Wedemeyer and Major General Gruenther—with

whom I had many contacts—as being great military leaders.

In conclusion, may I also compliment the chamber of commerce under the effective leadership of Tom Ashton and Charley Reed for their foresight and vision in undertaking a project of great importance to Omaha—I refer to adequate housing, not only to take care of the normal growth of the city—which, according to our company figures today, approaches 270,000 within the corporate limits and about 300,000 in the metropolitan area this side of the river—but to house the people who are now making Omaha their new home base such as the personnel of the Strategic Air Command and the other business and industries that are currently planning to locate here.

Thank you very much.

[From the Omaha Evening World-Herald of December 15, 1948]

THE ATTACK ON HOPLEY

A great many Government executives—President Truman and Nebraska's Governor Peterson among them—have commented that it is difficult, and becoming increasingly so, to persuade first-rate Americans to accept appointment to public office.

The reason? Not enough salary and too much abuse.

The recent experience of Russell J. Hopley illustrates the latter point. As Director of the Office of Civil Defense Planning, Mr. Hopley didn't get any salary at all. He took the job, for a limited time, as a public service—as one of the things a responsible man ought to do when his country calls.

But as soon as his report had been completed and handed to Secretary Forrestal, the shooting started.

Walter Winchell screamed over the air that the Hopley report was part of a military conspiracy to take over the country and destroy the Bill of Rights. Drew Pearson echoed a week or two later with "Congratulations to Walter Winchell on the firing of Russell J. Hopley as the head of Forrestal's Civil Defense Committee. A great job for the people." Winchell added shortly afterward: "The best news for all Americans, except a few perhaps in Mr. Forrestal's Department, is this—there will be no Hopley bill. This was the plan for civil defense that would have superseded your Bill of Rights. Thank you, Mr. President."

Now, let's look at the record.

First, Russell Hopley was not "fired." We make that statement categorically. When he left Omaha to take charge of civil-defense planning he said repeatedly, emphatically, and publicly that he would stay only long enough to complete the necessary study and make a report. At that time he said he hoped he would be in Washington no more than 6 months.

He stayed 3 months longer—9 months, in total—to get the job finished. Then, as he had told Secretary Forrestal he would, he resigned. The Secretary asked him to reconsider, but he refused.

So much for the Pearson canard. Now let's look at the Winchell theory that Russell Hopley engineered a sneak attack on the Bill of Rights.

If Winchell had read the Hopley report, which on the evidence seems doubtful, he would have learned that its chief emphasis is on civilian cooperation at the local level. The Hopley planners simply attempted to set up a stand-by organization which would reduce losses and save lives if this country should become involved in an atomic-biologic-chemical war.

This Nation-wide organization would be headed by a small Federal department or bureau which would provide leadership and coordination—but which would have no authority whatever over the civil rights of the people.

In only one circumstance would the procedure outlined in the Hopley plan impinge on anybody's rights. The plan suggests that if a monstrous calamity—such as atomic bombing—should befall any community, probably martial law would be declared there. Can any rational person doubt that? Could any rational person oppose it?

It is conceivable that an atomic war might wipe out not only the Bill of Rights but the whole Constitution, the Capitol, the White House, the radio networks and the Messrs. Winchell and Pearson and their Hooperatings.

But Russell Hopley didn't invent the atomic bomb.

He is simply an honorable and patriotic American who gave 9 months of his life to devising a plan to protect his countrymen against the furies which may be launched against them in World War III, if it comes.

For that he has been subjected to vicious and ill-informed attack. Can anyone wonder that decent and self-respecting men, who value their good name, hesitate to take public jobs which may expose them to abuse by the likes of Walter Winchell and Drew Pearson?

DEFERMENT OF COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity to thank the distinguished majority leader for withholding temporarily the assignments of the majority Members to committees. In my discussion with him I made the observation that it would please the minority if we might have 24 hours to consider the contemplated realinement of committee appointments and be able to iron out on our side of the aisle the assignments to committees in order that there should not be so much discussion on the floor of the Senate with reference to the subject. In my discussion with the distinguished majority leader I also made the observation that I felt we would be ready tomorrow to consider the minority assignments. I made that observation on the theory that the minority might caucus and consider today the assignments of the minority members. A conference has now been set for tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock. I am wondering if the distinguished majority leader is ready to state when the assignments may be offered. I think they should be offered together. As I indicated, I think it will be difficult to get our realinement made before noon tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am glad to accommodate our side to the requirements of the minority. I had hoped that we might have the committee assignments ready for tomorrow so that we might adjourn over until Monday. Otherwise I think we should have a session on Friday, because the matter should not go over into next week, for the reason that there is some proposed legislation which it is desired to consider very promptly. Therefore I express the hope that the minority may be ready tomorrow. If not, we can recess until Friday.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I want to thank the distinguished majority leader for that announcement, and I assure him now that if it is physically possible the minority will make every effort to be ready by tomorrow noon. In the event the minority does not make its realinement then, I ask the membership to note now that there will be a session on Friday. It is very necessary that the committee assignments be made and the legislative committees organized so as to consider immediately the bills which are introduced.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I hope that the suggestion of a session on Friday will not operate automatically to retard action by the other side.

DEMOCRATIZING CONGRESSIONAL PROCEDURES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an address which I delivered on the subject, Democratizing Congressional Procedures, before the Association of American Law Schools at Cincinnati, Ohio, December 28, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRATIZING CONGRESSIONAL PROCEDURES

(Address by WAYNE MORSE, United States Senator from Oregon, before the Association of American Law Schools, December 28, 1948, Cincinnati, Ohio)

Political scientists have long been concerned about the intricacies of parliamentary procedure in the Congress of the United States and the opportunities presented for obstructionist tactics. Students of politics have discussed and written at some length concerning various proposals for liberalizing these procedures so that majority sentiment in the Senate and the House may be expressed by votes on proposed legislation. The problem should rightly concern lawyers and teachers of law as well, because it goes to the heart of the democratic process.

With particular reference to the Senate rules permitting unlimited debate, former Vice President Dawes said these rules put into the hands of individuals and minorities at times a power greater than the veto power given by the Constitution to the President. Dr. George B. Galloway, in his informative and very excellent and readable book, Congress at the Crossroads, in a sentence succinctly describes the hazards flowing from minority rule in making our national laws. "There are," he says, "many points on the legislative highways and byways where a few legislators can lurk, like the pirates of Tripoli, and take toll of the passing traffic."

In recent years some significant efforts have been made in the campaign to modernize our National Legislature and make it a stronger instrument of representative government. The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is an outstanding example.

However, it should be remembered that the Reorganization Act of 1946 did not deal in any respect with the parliamentary rules of either the House or the Senate, but only with such organizational matters as a consolidation of committees, the organization of committee staffs, the designation of standing committees, the status of special committees, and the salaries of Members of Congress.

The failure in 1946 of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress to make specific recommendations covering changes in the rules was not an oversight on the part of the committee. The limitation of the jurisdiction of the committee specifically denied it any authority to make recommendations for changes in the rules of either the House or of the Senate. This limitation of the jurisdiction of the committee was the price which was exacted by the Congress as a whole before it would agree to the resolution authorizing the creation of a joint committee to conduct a study and make recommendations on the problems of reorganizing the Congress.

The incident shows how difficult it is to obtain any consideration by the Congress itself of any proposals for pruning some of its bewhiskered Rip Van Winkle rules.

I do not wish to minimize the accomplishments of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. Under the chairmanship of the then senior Senator from Wisconsin, Robert M. La Follette, Jr., it accomplished much good by way of streamlining the chassis of Congress. However, the engine is still of model T vintage and is in need of a complete overhauling—or better still, a new engineering design.

Nevertheless, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 was a very good beginning on the job of reorganizing the Congress, which sorely needs to be completed.

On the eve of the convening of the Eighty-first Congress, the movement for further congressional reform is gaining momentum. The interest of the general public in proposals for reform of the procedures of the Congress is making some dent upon the politicians. The last election will undoubtedly have its effects—at least on those Members of Congress who come from districts where a two-party system makes a real contest out of a political campaign by forcing candidates for office to take "yes" or "no" positions on issues raised by the electorate.

It is to be hoped that the results of the last election will cause those Members of the Congress who heretofore have seemed to take the position that the rules of the Congress are the business of the Congress and not of the people, to wake up to the political fact that the American people are rapidly coming to understand that in a very real sense their substantive legislative rights, which they hope to gain through the Congress, are determined in a large measure by their procedural rights now existing under the archaic rules of the Congress.

There is much evidence flowing from the public forums across America that the people of this country are putting a finger of protest on the rules of the Congress. They are calling the attention of the politician to the fact that the rules of the Congress too frequently deny to the people as a whole their legislative rights in accordance with the great democratic principle of majority rule.

The politicians had better give heed, before it is too late, to this growing demand for a revision of the rules of the Congress in the interest of democratizing the Congress, because the American people—once convinced of an existing injustice—can be counted upon to deal at the ballot boxes with politicians responsible for a do-nothing attitude in this regard.

It is a safe prediction to suggest that in the Eighty-first Congress a series of proposals for reform of the rules of Congress will be offered.

On the House side we have the proposal of Congressman EBERHARTER, of Pennsylvania, to be offered on the opening day, which would deprive the House Rules Committee of "its broad powers to block consideration of, or to demand changes in, legislation" and confine it to what he and many others regard as its proper role—"a traffic director on the legislative highway."

Also, the American Civil Liberties Union and the bill of rights committee of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York have recommended reforms in the standards of congressional investigating committees which would provide greater protection and fairer treatment for witnesses and for persons whose names are brought into testimony before these committees.

Various groups interested in obtaining favorable consideration of civil-rights legislation are active in formulating suggestions designed to liberalize House and Senate rules which in the past have been so successfully used by the minority of legislators unalterably opposed to civil-rights proposals.

Among the many devices used to block legislation are the filibuster in the Senate and the autocratic power of the House Rules Committee. The seniority system of selecting committee chairmen also has a close relationship to any moves to democratize congressional procedures. I should like to discuss these institutions and some of the proposals for reforming them. Finally, I think it definitely worth while to consider what needs to be done by way of adopting a code of fair procedure for congressional investigating committees.

THE FILIBUSTER

Under the present rules of the Senate—which have not been changed in this respect for 30 years—it is possible for a third plus one of the Senators to block any attempt to limit debate, since petitions to invoke cloture require the support of two-thirds of the Senators voting. Moreover, cloture may be invoked only with respect to a "pending measure," a term which does not encompass many matters. The history of the Senate affords many examples of the extreme difficulty of obtaining affirmative action on such a petition even if an overwhelming majority of the Members are in favor of bringing an issue to a vote.

In 1917, following President Wilson's denunciation of the filibuster which defeated the armed ship bill, the Senate adopted rule 22, providing for closing debate upon motion signed by 16 Senators and adopted by two-thirds vote. The extreme difficulty of obtaining the required two-thirds majority is shown by an analysis of cloture petitions since 1917.

In the intervening 30 years 19 petitions have been filed. Only 4 obtained the necessary two-thirds majority; 7 received a majority of the entire membership; 12 received a simple majority of those present and voting; 6 obtained a minority of those present and voting; and 1 resulted in a tie vote. It is apparent, therefore, that the purpose of the committee that drafted the rule—to terminate successful filibustering—has not been realized.

Since 1917 at least a score of resolutions have been introduced in the Senate, in varying ways proposing limitations on debate. Many of these resolutions got no further than being referred to committee. In 1947 the Senate Rules and Administration Committee reported favorably a resolution, the principal feature of which was to permit a cloture motion to be laid before the Senate and not avoided by such parliamentary stratagems as amending the Journal, or raising other highly privileged matters. No change was proposed in the two-thirds voting requirement. However, the Senate took no further action, and it is obvious that the effort to obtain reformation of the cloture rule will have to be renewed in the Eighty-first Congress which convenes next week.

The time to reform the rules of the Senate to eliminate the filibuster is at the beginning of the session. On the first day of the next Congress all Senators who believe in the establishment of majority rule in the Senate should support an amendment to the rules aimed at preventing any future filibusters. There is little doubt, of course, that adoption of such a proposal will be vigorously resisted. It is equally clear that protagonists of obstruction will wage a last-ditch fight against antifilibuster legislation itself with their customary weapon, the filibuster. However, a filibuster can be defeated. The FEPC filibuster in the Seventy-ninth Congress could have been broken if a serious attempt to do so had been made.

At that time the Democratic majority in the Senate, supported by many Republicans, recessed the Senate between 4 and 6 o'clock each afternoon during the filibuster, and on Friday afternoons recessed until each following Monday at noon. The Democratic administration made public statements in support of the FEPC, but took no effective action against the filibuster. No Democratic Senator and only a few Republican Senators were willing to join in my suggestion at that time to hold the Senate in continuous session for 24 hours a day for as many days, weeks, and months as might be necessary to break the obstructionist tactics. An opportunity to establish, once and for all, majority rule in the Senate was passed up. It should not happen again.

For 3 weeks in January and February 1946, the technical issue before the Senate was the correction of the Journal, an issue against which a cloture motion could not be brought because of the ruling that a motion to correct the Journal was not a "pending measure" within the meaning of the cloture rule.

For several days during the special session last summer the Senate debated the motion to take up the anti-poll-tax bill. A cloture petition was presented, but the Presiding Officer, Senator VANDENBERG, upheld a point of order against the petition, pointing out that the term "pending measure" as used in the rule and as interpreted in the past cannot reasonably be construed to include a motion. In support of his ruling, he adverted to the fact that "numerous resolutions have been submitted from time to time having for their purpose an amendment of the rule so as to give a privileged status to a cloture motion, and expressly making its presentation in order at any time upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business."

There is no doubt that Senator VANDENBERG was entirely correct in his ruling, in light of binding precedents which have been handed down by preceding Presiding Officers who have been called upon to interpret the meaning of the words "pending measure" in existing rule 22. The answer to the problem is the one recommended by Senator VANDENBERG at a meeting of the Republican conference last July, when he suggested that rule 22 itself must be amended so that the words "pending measure" shall include any item of business pending before the Senate.

There has been some suggestion that Senator BARKLEY, who will be the Presiding Officer after January 20, may reverse the Vandenberg ruling. Apparently support for this view is found in Senator BARKLEY's statement last summer, in which he urged that cloture be applied to the motion to consider the anti-poll-tax bill. He expressed the view that the object of the rule is to bring to a conclusion a discussion upon a pending matter, and if we cannot bring it to a conclusion upon the preliminary motions which may be regarded as measures toward that end, then the effectiveness of the rule is completely destroyed, and the object of those who wrote it and adopted it has been completely defeated.

It is impossible to know how Senator BARKLEY will rule if a similar issue is presented to him. However, it is suggested that a reversal of Senator VANDENBERG's ruling would not materially help the cause of keeping debate within reasonable bounds, because it could be reversed by another presiding officer, while the fundamental reform needed might well lose some momentum.

It is obvious therefore that the cloture rule, in order to be effective, must be amended so as to apply to any motion, measure or pending matter. That is what has been proposed in the resolution reported by the Rules Committee.

On the questions of how large a majority should be required to impose cloture and how much time should be allowed for debate thereafter, opinions differ among proponents of reform. The Senate committee resolution leaves both matters as they are today—a two-thirds majority of those voting is necessary, and each Senator is entitled to speak an hour.

As experience with the present rules shows, a two-thirds vote has been mustered on only 4 out of 19 occasions, and only 7 petitions obtained a majority of the entire membership. However, if the rule required only a

majority of those voting, as is the case with all legislation except treaties or measures proposed to be passed over the President's veto, 12 of the 19 cloture petitions would have passed. If we bear in mind that it is the imperative duty of a legislative body not only to debate but to legislate, it would seem clear that no greater majority should be required to close debate, once there has been adequate discussion, than to enact a measure.

It is very important that adequate time be given for Members to debate the merits of an issue after cloture. My resolution proposes that 2 hours be allowed each Senator after cloture, with the right to farm out all or part of his time; in round numbers this conceivably would give 8 days of debate if necessary. However, we all know that, once the Senate has adopted a rule fixing a time definite and certain for a vote, there is no serious danger of consuming the maximum time just for the sake of filibustering. Nevertheless, adequate time for debate—erring, if at all, on the side of lengthy debate—is an essential safeguard to the people's interests, for there have been many instances where a full Senate debate prevented the enactment of very unsound legislation.

A valid and obvious distinction must be drawn between a filibuster, the purpose of which is to prevent a measure from ever coming to a vote, and a debate which seeks only to delay a vote for a reasonable length of time. The first type is a filibuster, pure and simple, and the possibility of its recurrence must be eliminated by changing the rules of the United States Senate. The second type, prolonged debate but technically not a filibuster, will never occur if the cloture rule is amended so as to guarantee the minority in the Senate a reasonable time limit after cloture in which to present its point of view in an endeavor to try to change itself from a minority to a majority.

If majority rule is to characterize the procedures of Congress, the voters of this country must make that clear to their representatives. Either we are going to reestablish the principle of majority rule in our Congress or we are going to continue to drift into government by minority interests and bloc pressures. The issue so framed furnishes another test of liberalism versus reactionism.

It is important that the American people recognize that our form of government can protect their rights only so long as they keep it strong and effective. Representative government is not a machine that works automatically. It is but a set of rules and principles which the people by their own consent have decreed shall be binding upon their own conduct. These principles cannot work unless they are administered by men and women responsive to the will of the voters who elected them.

The people must be ever watchful against institutions, like the filibuster, which permit the perversion of free government by self-seeking men. If the people relax their vigilance, they may lose the fruits of democracy which promote the greatest good for the greatest number within the framework of our private-property economy.

An example of the need for a rule which will permit the minority adequate time to debate proposals for unsound legislation, and make the necessary attempt to win enough votes through debate to convert themselves into the majority, can be easily illustrated.

In 1945 President Roosevelt proposed that workers be drafted into industry and moved from place to place across the country. Under this proposed bill the War Manpower Commission was to be given the power to assign workers to work for private industry under the direction and for the profit of private employers. A few of us in the Senate led the fight against that proposal and blocked an attempt on the part of the majority leader to force an early vote on the issue. When we announced that we would debate the issue for a week, the majority leader good-naturedly advised us that he would try to force the vote immediately because at that time he felt he had us beaten by eight votes. However, we did discuss the issue for a week and when the final vote was taken our view prevailed by a substantial number of votes. Thus, a reasonably short period of debate prevented the passage of a piece of legislation which threatened some basic principles of freedom.

Our success in this instance can be attributed to two main factors. First, the delay in the vote gave the people throughout the country time to react to the proposal for a draft of men into industry, and once they came to appreciate the threat to the principles of freedom which were involved, they made their objections known to the Members of Congress. In the second place, the debate itself had a great influence on some legislators who at first blush and without serious consideration had been enticed by the plausibility of this proposal. A scanning of the speeches made in that week's debate will show that the lawyers in the Senate did some very effective work in pointing out the constitutional weaknesses of the industry manpower draft proposal even in time of war.

The primary reason why the fight to pass an antifilibuster resolution should be waged at the beginning of the next Congress is that if the resolution is followed by a filibuster—as it undoubtedly would be—it will not hold up any other legislation, since none will be ready for Senate action. It would be very difficult to break a filibuster near the close of a session, because the unity of action required on the part of Senators is difficult to obtain when so many of them are anxious to recess and go home. It is likewise difficult to wage a successful fight against a filibuster in the middle of a session, since the argument is always made that taking the time to defeat a filibuster blocks action on other legislation vital to the welfare of the country.

The time is near for a major effort to secure majority rule in the Senate. Unfortunately, it may develop into a test of physical endurance, and on the surface it may seem an undignified and dramatic struggle. But it is a fight that must be made, or else representative government will continue to be perverted to undemocratic ends, and the promises of political and economic democracy will remain an empty mirage for millions of American people.

THE HOUSE RULES COMMITTEE

The House, unlike the Senate, does not permit unlimited debate. However, by reason of the powers that it has assumed, the Rules Committee effectively keeps bills favorably reported by the appropriate legislative committees from reaching the floor, or gives them clearance only on such terms as satisfy the members of the Rules Committee.

The criticism frequently heard is that the Rules Committee, while supposed only to control procedure in considering legislation, increasingly injects itself into the merits of measures and substitutes its judgment for that of legislative committees and not infrequently the desires of a majority in the House.

One of the most glaring instances of usurpation of power by the Rules Committee occurred 2 years ago, when it took the extraordinary step of substituting the Case bill for the labor relations measure drawn by the House Labor Committee. The Committee on Rules, dissatisfied with the Labor Committee's labor bill, refused to give it clearance and instead substituted the Case bill which had been introduced only 2 days before and had not even been considered by the Legislative Committee. This action was vigorously denounced by both the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Rules Committee.

For many years the Rules Committee has followed the practice of insisting upon changes in legislation reported by other committees, as a condition of sending the bills to the floor of the House. In the second session of the Eightieth Congress the committee's action on the housing bill brought strong protests. The committee required elimination from the housing measure of provisions for public housing and slum clearance before it would grant a rule permitting House consideration, and then the rule forbade the offering of amendments on the floor of the House. Senator TOBEY condemned these tactices as thwarting "the will of the Senate and of the House committee and of the people of the country," and warned that if allowed to continue "the democratic processes will have gone by the wind."

On another occasion the Rules Committee refused to allow a vote on the administration-backed universal military training bill, although it had been favorably reported by the Armed Services Committee. After heavy pressure had been brought to bear on the House leadership, the Rules Committee granted a special rule for the Armed Services Committee's bill to revive the Selective Service System. Former Supreme Court Justice Roberts characterized the committee's obstructionists tactics in this instance as "a travesty on the American system of representative government."

What steps can be taken to trim the dictatorial powers of the Rules Committee? One of the first items of business when the new Congress convenes is the consideration of the standard resolution that the House adopt the rules of the previous Congress. At this point the way is open for the proponents of reform, because amendments to the rules can be adopted by a simple majority vote without reference to the Rules Committee.

Representative EBERHARTER has written all Members of the Eighty-first Congress soliciting their support for such a move. Press accounts report that he has received impressive backing. It is to be hoped that during the brief period available, he and his colleagues will seize the golden opportunity to strike a blow for democratic procedure and majority rule.

THE SENIORITY SYSTEM

For a hundred years the prevailing custom in the Senate has been to select committee chairmen and make assignments on committees according to the principle of seniority in point of service. The same rule has been in vogue in the House since 1910.

The seniority rule ignores all other qualifications except the accident of tenure. Inevitably, the result is that chairmanships of major committees go to Members representing safe districts, who may be wholly out of sympathy with the most recent expression of the electorate in the country as a whole.

Defenders of the seniority system argue that the automatic method settles harmoniously the selection of chairmen, avoiding factional fights, logrolling, and political trading. Doubtless this method results in greater contentment and less danger to morale—for those high on the seniority roster—but the question may well be asked whether this device is likely to promote responsibility in office and responsiveness to the wishes of the people.

Business would be shocked if advancement to higher and more responsible positions in industry were governed solely by length of service. The usual response to such a suggestion in labor-management relations is that the principle of seniority, while entitled to weight, leads to mediocrity if rigidly followed. Congressmen are fond of criticizing the application of this rule in Government bureaus, rightly pointing out that it stifles the promotion of more able but younger men. In my judgment, a case for

ignoring these and other arguments against slavish adherence to seniority in the legislative branch of our Government has not been made.

There are times when the rule of seniority is ignored by the respective political party organizations within the Congress, particularly when the leaders of the party organization wish to discipline a Member of the Senate or of the House who seeks to exercise an honest independence of judgment on the merits of issues irrespective of the recommendations of the party policy makers.

In the Republican Party, liberal Republican Senators from time immemorial have felt the whiplash of party discipline inflicted in the form of denying them their rights, under the seniority rule, to important committees and other assignments within the Congress. On this point your speaker knows whereof he speaks.

Since the considered judgment of most students and critics of the congressional committee system is that the seniority custom ought to be abolished, what better alternative methods can be suggested?

With respect to assignments to membership on standing committees, it has been suggested by Senator White, who is qualified to speak from a lifetime of experience in Congress, that these committees should be composed of men representing both the principal sections of the country and the chief interests affected by legislation within the jurisdiction of the committee. In addition, it has been proposed that recent changes in public opinion would be reflected if assignments were made in proportion to the division of the membership into length-of-service brackets.

Thus, if in the House 25 percent of the membership are first-termers, the composition of each standing committee would be one-fourth first-termers. Under this formula the balance of the committee assignments would be divided in proportion between second-termers and those who have served three terms or longer. The result would be more equitable representation of the country as a whole and the sentiment of the electorate.

As to the selection of committee chairmen—who should, of course, meet the tests of ability, loyalty to national rather than sectional interests, and party responsibility—a great many suggestions have been made. Those which seem most likely to meet the foregoing tests are selection by party caucus, by the committee on committees, and by the presiding officer or majority leader.

Of these three methods, the party caucus is probably the least desirable, because of the size of the selecting body and the opportunities it affords for electioneering and logrolling. Other devices, such as election of committee chairmen by committee members or from the floor, or by seniority, do not satisfy the important test of party responsibility.

It would seem that a fair balancing of all the interests involved would be accomplished best by the following suggested procedure for the selection of personnel of Senate committees, including the selection of committee chairmen.

The rules should provide for the election of the committee on committees of each party in the Senate by a majority vote of the respective party caucus or conference, which committee on committees would make nominations for committee membership. These nominations should be submitted to a full party caucus or conference with the right of any member of the conference to make additional nominations from the floor, the full conference by a majority vote then passing final judgment on the membership of each committee. The chairman of each committee then would be elected by a majority vote of the full committee after each party has designated its party representatives on each committee.

It is to be noted that by democratizing the selection of members and chairmen of committees in this fashion the result could conceivably be the election of a member of the minority party as chairman of a committee, if in the opinion of his colleagues on a committee his qualifications and their confidence in his nonpartisanship and statesmanship were such as to cause them to want to entrust him with the leadership of the committee.

As a practical matter, there would be few if any instances where anyone but a member of the majority party would be selected as chairman. However, it would be salutary to have a rule which would permit of a full operation of democratic procedures in the selection of committee chairmen, irrespective of partisan lines.

It is true that such a suggested procedure might occasionally result in some loss of party responsibility. However, the instances in which a chairman of a committee would be selected from the minority party would be so rare and exceptional that no great damage to party responsibility could be envisioned by such a rule.

On the other hand, the existence of such a rule which would permit of the selection of the individual considered by his colleagues on the committee as the best qualified to carry on the work of chairmanship of a committee would provide a healthy reassurance to the American people that the rules of the Senate as to committee assignments subordinate narrow partisanship to the public interest.

Of course, a necessary corollary to such a proposed rule would be an additional rule providing that the procedures, appointment of committee personnel, setting of hearings, and the conduct of all the business of a committee of the Senate shall be by a majority vote of the committee members. A chairman of a Senate committee should be required by the rules to function as a presiding officer of the committee and as a servant of the members of the committee—not their master.

Under existing practices and traditions in the Senate, committee chairmen over the years have acquired broad and sweeping administrative authority over the business and affairs of committees, so that in many respects they exercise almost dictatorial powers. If the committee procedures of the Senate are to be democratized as they should be in the interest of conducting the people's legislative business in an efficient manner, then the present practices of committee chairmen must be drastically revised by the adoption of rules of procedure which give to the full committee, through the operation of the majority-vote principle, full and complete authority over the business of the committee, leaving to the chairman the primary responsibility of administering those policies.

It is not very difficult to predict what will happen to the seniority rule in the Eighty-first Congress. The safe answer is "Absolutely nothing." However, there is growing discussion throughout the country of the need for a change in the seniority rule; and it is equally safe to predict that the demand for a change in the rules of Congress, including the rule of seniority, will not abate until Congress does something about the rules. In the meantime, democratic action at the ballot boxes will register its effect on those candidates for reelection who continue to take the position that the status quo should be preserved.

Political commentators have pointed out that if the seniority rule is followed in the new Congress, the likelihood is that some of the pledges in the Democratic Party platform will not receive sympathetic treatment from committee chairmen.

PROCEDURES OF INVESTIGATING COMMITTEES

It is not an overstatement to say that some of the procedures pertaining to House and Senate investigations result in a denial of the basic principles of judicial process taught in American law schools.

The shameful record being made by some congressional investigating committees needs no elaboration; it is painfully apparent to anyone who can read the daily papers. Witnesses, who for all practical purposes though not in strictly legal terms, are on trial, have been denied or closely restricted in their right to counsel. They have little or no right to question their accusers or examine the evidence on which they are brought to trial. Lurid charges and broad hints of sensational developments are aired in press conferences to the irreparable injury of individuals and to the utter shame of the Congress and the country. It is no answer to offer the accused—and even this is not always done—the opportunity later to deny the charges. As one witness recently observed, the sad truth is that denials seldom catch up with accusations.

Some of the hearings of congressional committees are in the class of "kangaroo court" procedure and certainly many of them do not give to a free American citizen, called before the committee, the basic judicial protection afforded in a police court. The committee conducting the investigation into Communist and subversive activities in our Government is a notorious example. While I firmly believe that Congress should investigate these and other matters and ferret out those working to destroy the American Government, I deplore the procedures being used.

As a lawyer, my confidence in the American judicial system is so complete that I know we can find whatever facts exist without ignoring the safeguards of the American judicial process which should be available to any accused person, the innocent as well as the guilty. Of course, legislative inquiries cannot be conducted in all respects as judicial trials, but I know of no reason why congressional investigations and hearings cannot be conducted with decorum and in complete compliance with those basic and fundamental protections of the American judicial process prevailing in the courts.

Much of the criticism of the House Un-American Activities Committee is sound, not only because the committee has failed to observe basic principles of fair procedure but also because it has so obviously engaged in political dramatics and sensationalism of the crudest sort. Even though realism teaches that politicians must pay some attention to public relations and to keeping the public informed, they ought to perform this function with dignity and in a manner which is calculated to educate the public as to the facts involved rather than to arouse public prejudice and partisanship.

Perhaps the most arresting statement coming from this committee was the remark of the chairman correctly summarizing the rights of witnesses before the committee. He said to a lawyer who protested being ordered to take the stand without benefit of counsel: "The rights you have are the rights given you by this committee. We will determine what rights you have got and what rights you have not got before this committee."

If further evidence were needed of the fact that reform in procedure is long overdue, the new low reached by the Un-American Activities Committee in the Duggan case should persuade even the die-hard defenders of the committee. This shocking exhibition of headline hunting compels agreements with the observation in the Washington Post editorial last Friday that committee proposals for self-reform must be viewed in a new perspective.

Just as the Congress adopted the Administrative Procedure Act so as to establish uniformity in the procedure and hearings of administrative agencies, so each House should enact over-all rules or a code of fair procedure to guide its committees. Proposals such as those advanced by the American Civil Liberties Union and by the New York City Bar Association committee have real merit. Of course there are minor differences, but the objective and the substantive suggestions are about the same. Any code of fair procedure should embrace the following points:

1. Before hearings are commenced, the subject of the investigation should be clearly stated, and the evidence elicited should be relevant

2. Witnesses should have the right to counsel, who would be allowed to advise his client while testifying.

3. The right to supplement testimony by oral or written statements, confined to relevant matters, should be accorded witnesses.

4. Accurate stenographic records of testimony should be kept of all testimony, whether given in public or executive session, and inspection allowed by the witness or his counsel. Copies of the transcript of public sessions should be furnished if requested, and in the case of executive sessions, it should be made available if later referred to in public session.

5. Persons mentioned or specifically identified in a public hearing should be afforded certain privileges before the committee or any member or employee comments adversely. Among these privileges should be the right to file a sworn statement, to be made a part of the record; the right to appear and testify; the right to limited cross-examination of witnesses whose testimony has adversely affected him; and the right to call, in the discretion of a majority of the committee, a reasonable number of witnesses in his own behalf.

6. No committee report should be issued except on adequate notice and with the approval of a majority of the committee.

An interesting suggestion of the New York City Bar Association committee is that no photographs, motion pictures, television or radio broadcasting of the proceedings be permitted while any witness is testifying. Much can be said for this proposal, for it is questionable whether the dispassionate search for the truth is materially aided by a battery of network microphones, klieg lights, and an imposing array of television and motion picture cameras.

The power of the Congress of the United States to conduct investigations should not be curtailed, because the investigative power of the Congress is one of our most effective checks against governmental abuses and one of our most valuable aids in finding the factual basis for needed legislation. It is only the procedures of congressional investigations that need to be subjected to careful surveillance in the interest of protecting the individual citizen from abusive practices of the Congress itself.

Under our system of checks and balances we must always be alert to the danger that any agency of Government, including the Congress itself, may, through the men in charge of its affairs, at any given time substitute caprice and arbitrary discretion for government through law.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this address which I delivered in Cincinnati deals in its major part with the subject matter of a resolution which seeks to outlaw the filibuster from the floor of the United States Senate. Briefly, that resolution, which I have in my hand, requires that after a cloture petition has been signed by 16 Senators and presented to the Senate, then, by a majority vote, it can be agreed to. This is urged because if we are to deal with the whole question of majority rule in the Senate of the United States, let us get back to the simple procedure of the majority vote.

The second major provision of my antifilibuster resolution is one which guarantees to each Member of the Senate, after cloture has been approved, a maximum of 2 hours to discuss the merits of the issue involved in the legislation in regard to which cloture has been invoked, with the right to farm out all or part of that time.

Mr. President, as the Members of this body have heard me say before, I think it of utmost importance, as we seek to eliminate the filibuster from the Senate, that we adopt a rule which will guarantee to the minority in this body ample opportunity to make their case on the merits of any issue.

The Senate will recall that in the fight on the President's veto message on the Taft-Hartley bill, the junior Senator from Oregon objected to the effort to force a vote on that veto message on the afternoon it came in, or on the succeeding afternoon, as the attempt was made by the leadership on my side of the aisle, by means of a unanimous-consent request. I took the position at that time that the vote should not occur prior to Monday afternoon at 3 o'clock in order that Senators might then have the reaction of the country to the President's message. It should be observed that the time suggested for voting—3 o'clock Monday afternoon—was the soonest that a vote could have been taken, even under a cloture situation, if no Senator had wished to make use of the 1 hour debate provision under the existing cloture rule.

Mr. President, in the cloture amendment which I am offering, each Senator is allowed 2 hours, which, in round numbers, if all Senators desire to use their time, or farm out the time so that the total time would be used, would mean a maximum debate of eight full days. As I pointed out in my Cincinnati speech, it is very important that, on the great issues over which filibusters usually start, the people be given ample opportunity to make their position known. I recall distinctly the situation in 1945 when President Roosevelt sent to the Congress a proposal to draft free workers into industry, under the jurisdiction and power of the Manpower Commission. American workers would have been compelled to labor for private employers, for their profit dollar, and obliged to go wherever that Commission should decide to send them—all in the name of prosecuting the war. That bill passed the House after very short debate, but when it came to the Senate there were some of us who stood up in opposition to that proposal of President Roosevelt because we thought it challenged and jeopardized some basic rights of freedom.

The distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] notified us on a Tuesday that he hoped to obtain a vote on that measure by Wednesday or Thursday, and with equal good nature we said to the distinguished majority leader, "You are not going to get a vote on this measure for another week." He laughed and said, "What are you fellows going to do—filibuster?" We said, "No, but we are going to talk at length on the merits and demerits of this proposal." He said, "We have you beat by eight votes." We replied to him, "Yes, you have us beat by eight votes today, but you will not have us beat by eight votes a week from today, when we let this matter go to a vote."

If one will go back and check the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that week, he will find it very interesting to note that a series of very able speeches on the merits and demerits of that proposal of the President of the United States filled the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. When we voted a week later we defeated the bill in the Senate, and thereby protected, in my judgment, some basic freedoms which that bill would have jeopardized.

I make that point, Mr. President, because I think it is of the utmost importance that we see to it that when we adopt a rule of procedure in the Senate by way of a modification of the cloture rule, we see to it that the new rule guarantees to the minority ample time to discuss the merits of the issue, and gives to the people of the country ample time to be heard from before a vote is forced through the Senate.

Our job of statesmanship in this matter is one of trying to strike that delicate balance between guaranteeing that the elected representatives of the people shall follow the majority vote rule in the Senate, and at the same time give to the minority a reasonable amount of time to try to change themselves into a majority.

Thus, under the amendment I offer, Mr. President, I propose that cloture shall be adopted by a majority vote, in contrast to the two-thirds vote provided for in the proposal offered by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and that after cloture has been adopted by a majority vote, then 2 hours shall be allowed each Senator to debate the issue, with the right to farm out all or a part of his time.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Not until I finish my remarks. Then I shall be glad to yield.

The third provision of my proposed amendment to the rules is that cloture shall be applicable to all items of business, irrespective of the present provisions of rule III and rule VI or any other rule, so that never again will we present to the country the spectacle of filibustering for some 14 days on the question whether or not the Chaplain's prayer should be included in the daily Journal.

Mr. President, I think we can start out the Eighty-first Congress by making a clear record for putting into practice the principles of majority rule in the Senate, by this afternoon adopting the amendment to the rules which I offer.

Therefore, Mr. President, I send to the desk the resolution I propose, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). The clerk will read the resolution for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 12), as follows:

Resolved, That subsection 2 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, relating to cloture, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"If at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

"'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a majority vote of those voting, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 2 hours on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same; except that any Senator may yield to any other Senator all or any part of the aggregate period of time which he is entitled to speak; and the Senator to whom he so yields may speak for the time so yielded in addition to any period of time which he is entitled to speak in his own right. It shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon requests unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution just read at the desk. Is there objection?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am not familiar with all the details of the resolution which the distinguished Senator has proposed. I know it seeks to amend the rules of the Senate and limit debate.

However, I do know from observation the great ability of the Senator from Oregon to delay action by the Senate and postpone a vote on measures to which he is opposed. He is a past master of dilatory procedure. I therefore assume that the resolution he has been discussing, which he says is directed at filibusters, would give us a rule which would absolutely prevent extended speeches or discussions here in the Senate. If there is any virtue in the old adage that it takes a thief to catch a thief, the Senator from Oregon can draw a resolution which would virtually prohibit discussion in the Senate to the extent that no Member could even explain a bill at any length.

Mr. President, the Senate of the United States is a great institution which has been able to function for more than 150 years under the existing rules. Through times of peace and many wars it has never failed the American people. It is true that ofttimes the Senate is irritated and annoyed by lengthy speeches. I myself have felt that irritation.

But, Mr. President, when we look down the vista of the years which encompass our history, we do not find a single occasion where material damage has been done to the interests of the Nation or to the people through the operation of the rules assuring free and full discussion to every Member of this body. The present rule has prevented much more harm than it has worked.

Under the rules of this body we have acquired the proud title of the greatest deliberative body on earth. Under our existing rules the Senate of the United States stands as the last citadel of free and full discussion where the rights of the minority can be heard and fully protected. We alone among all the parliamentary bodies of the earth may speak fully and freely and bring to the attention of the American people vices in measures which are not readily apparent, which the majority gloss over, and which are not brought to light by the press or radio.

Mr. President, I shall not belabor this question at this time. I assume from what has been said here today that it is likely to be discussed at length in the future. I do know that this matter is of too much gravity to the future of our Nation, the freedoms of our people, and the rights of minorities and of the States to be considered in this manner and adopted in such shotgun fashion. Nothing more important than amendments to the rules which have heretofore guided the Senate will be before us at this session. I am, therefore, compelled to insist upon the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the resolution will go over for a day under the rule.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Oregon whether the proposed 2-hour limitation contained in his resolution applies only to the bill itself which may be under discussion, or does it also include any amendments which may be pending at the time or which may be offered to the measure?

Mr. MORSE. It applies to the matter to which the cloture petition is directed. It means that once the cloture petition is adopted each Senator shall have not more than 2 hours to debate the entire matter before it comes to a vote.

Mr. LANGER. That includes amendments also?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. President, I wish to say that the reply made by my good friend, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], in no way surprises me. I expected it to be in just about the form in which I heard it. I think I have demonstrated that I can talk at length on the floor of the Senate, if the occasion necessitates, when I am fighting for the minority. But I think that even the junior Senator from Oregon, and I am certain the distinguished Senator from Georgia, ought to be required to work under a rule that at least limits them to 2 hours' discussion after cloture has been invoked.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the resolution offered by the Senator from Oregon should be adopted it would prevent any Senator in the future from challenging his record for long-distance speaking on the floor of the Senate. If his resolution should be adopted by the Senate it would enable him to retire with the championship. No other Senator could ever even seek the laurels which he now so deservedly wears.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, inasmuch as other measures dealing with the same subject have been submitted today and have gone to the Committee on Rules and Administration, it seems to me appropriate that the resolution submitted by the Senator from Oregon should take the same course. Has the Senator from Oregon any objection to his resolution taking the same course?

Mr. MORSE. Not at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution submitted by the Senator from Oregon is referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARKLEY. If there is nothing further to be brought before the Senate at this time, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 6, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 5, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou who art infinite in love and mercy and power, we humbly wait in Thy holy presence. We pray that neither by word nor deed may we ever defile the image with which Thou hast endowed us.

In this fear-haunted world, do Thou give us light in our blindness, that by a wise and deeper understanding of our high calling we may rise above selfish joys and selfish sorrows. Guided by a higher conception of our responsibility to our Republic, may we be keepers of Thy commandments, defenders of Thy law, and towers of strength in all Thy righteous ways.

Let Thy spirit attend our President, our Speaker, and all who labor here. We pray in our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 3, 1949, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which

the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 1. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session on Thursday, January 6, 1949, to count the electoral votes for President and Vice President.

ANNOUNCEMENT AS TO EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that after the message of the President all Members who desire to speak for a minute or to extend their remarks in the RECORD will be recognized. Before that time the Chair will administer the oath to two Members who were not here on the 3d, if they will present themselves at the bar of the House.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

Mr. CHESTER C. GORSKI and Mr. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO presented themselves at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess until 12:40 o'clock p. m.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess until 12 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 12 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 1. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress on January 5, 1949; and

H. Con. Res. 2. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress on January 6, 1949, pursuant to the requirements of the Constitution and laws relating to the election of President and Vice President of the United States.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE

At 12 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper announced the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Members of the United States Senate.

The Senate, preceded by the President pro tempore of the Senate and by its Secretary and Sergeant at Arms, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore of the Senate took the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate took the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair on the part of the House appoints as members of the committee to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore of the Senate. On the part of the Senate, the Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

At 12 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper announced the ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments.

The ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 12 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 1 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper announced the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, I have the distinguished honor of presenting to you the President of the United States.

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The PRESIDENT. Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Congress, I am happy to report to this Eighty-first Congress that the state of the Union is good. [Applause.] Our Nation is better able than ever before to meet the needs of the American people and to give them their fair chance in the pursuit of happiness. It is foremost among the nations of the world in the search for peace. [Applause.]

During the last 16 years the American people have been creating a society which offers new opportunities for every man to enjoy his share of the good things of life.

In this society we are conservative about the values and principles which we cherish; but we are forward-looking in protecting those values and principles and in extending their benefits. We have rejected the discredited theory that the fortunes of the Nation should be in the hands of a privileged few. [Applause.] We have abandoned the "trickle down" concept of national prosperity. Instead, we believe that our economic system should rest on a democratic foundation and that wealth should be created for the benefit of all. [Applause.]

The recent election shows that the American people are in favor of this kind of society and want to go on improving it. [Applause.]

The American people have decided that poverty is just as wasteful and just as unnecessary as preventable disease. We have pledged our common resources to help one another in the hazards and struggles of individual life. We believe that no unfair prejudice or artificial distinction should bar any citizen of the United States from an education, or from good health, or from a job that he is capable of performing. [Applause.]

The attainment of this kind of society demands the best efforts of every citizen in every walk of life, and it imposes increasing responsibilities on the Government.

The Government must work with industry, labor, and the farmers in keeping our economy running at full speed. The Government must see that every American has a chance to obtain his fair share of our increasing abundance. These responsibilities go hand in hand.

We cannot maintain prosperity unless we have a fair distribution of opportunity and a widespread consumption of the products of our factories and farms.

Our Government has undertaken to meet these responsibilities.

We have made tremendous public investments in highways, hydroelectric power projects, soil conservation and reclamation. We have established a system of social security. We have enacted laws protecting the rights and the welfare of our working people and the income of our farmers. These Federal policies have paid for themselves many times over. They have strengthened the material foundations of our democratic ideals. Without them, our present prosperity would be impossible.

Reinforced by these policies, our private enterprise system has reached new heights of production. Since the boom year of 1929, while our population has increased by only 20 percent, our agricultural production has increased by 45 percent, and our industrial production has increased by 75 percent. We are turning out far more goods and more wealth per worker than we have ever done before.

This progress has confounded the gloomy prophets—at home and abroad—who predicted the downfall of American capitalism. The people of the United States, going their own way, confident in their own powers, have achieved the greatest prosperity the world has ever seen. [Applause.]

But, great as our progress has been, we still have a long way to go.

As we look around the country, many of our shortcomings stand out in bold relief.

We are suffering from excessively high prices.

Our production is still not large enough to satisfy our demands.

Our minimum wages are far too low.

Small business is losing ground to growing monopoly.

Our farmers still face an uncertain future. And too many of them lack the benefits of our modern civilization.

Some of our natural resources are still being wasted.

We are acutely short of electric power, although the means for developing such power are abundant.

Five million families are still living in slums and firetraps. Three million families share their homes with others.

Our health is far behind the progress of medical science. Proper medical care is so expensive that it is out of reach of the great majority of our citizens.

Our schools, in many localities, are utterly inadequate.

Our democratic ideals are often thwarted by prejudice and intolerance.

Each of these shortcomings is also an opportunity—an opportunity for the Congress and the President to work for the good of the people.

Our first great opportunity is to protect our economy against the evils of "boom and bust."

This objective cannot be attained by Government alone. Indeed, the greater part of the task must be performed by individual efforts under our system of free enterprise. We can keep our present prosperity, and increase it, only if free enterprise and free government work together to that end.

We cannot afford to float along carelessly on a postwar boom until it collapses. And it is not enough merely to prepare to weather a recession if it comes. Instead Government and business must work together constantly to achieve more and more jobs and more and more production, which mean more and more prosperity for all the people.

The business cycle is man-made; and men of good will, working together, can smooth it out.

So far as business is concerned, it should plan for steady, vigorous expansion, seeking always to increase its output, lower its prices, and avoid the vices of monopoly and restriction. So long as business does this, it will be contributing to continued prosperity, and it will have the help and encouragement of the Government.

The Employment Act of 1946 pledges the Government to use all its resources to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power. This means that the Government is firmly committed to protect business and the people against the dangers of recession and against the evils of inflation. This means that the Government must adapt its plans and policies to meet changing circumstances.

At the present time, our prosperity is threatened by inflationary pressures at a number of critical points in our economy. The Government must be in a position to take effective action at these danger spots. To that end, I recommend that the Congress enact legislation for the following purposes:

First, to continue the power to control consumer credit and enlarge the power to control bank credit.

Second, to grant authority to regulate speculation on the commodity exchanges.

Third, to continue export control authority and to provide adequate machinery for its enforcement.

Fourth, to continue the priorities and allocation authority in the field of transportation.

Fifth, to authorize priorities and allocations for key materials in short supply.

Sixth, to extend and strengthen rent control.

Seventh, to provide stand-by authority to impose price ceilings for scarce commodities which basically affect essential industrial production or the cost of living, and to limit unjustified wage adjustments which would force a break in an established price ceiling.

Eighth, to authorize an immediate study of the adequacy of production facilities for materials in critically short supply, such as steel; and, if found necessary, to authorize Government loans for the expansion of production facilities to relieve such shortages, and furthermore to authorize the construction of such facilities directly if action by private industry fails to meet our needs.

The Economic Report, which I shall submit to the Congress shortly, will discuss in detail the economic background for these recommendations.

One of the most important factors in maintaining prosperity is the Government's fiscal policy. At this time, it is essential not only that the Federal budget be balanced, but also that there be a substantial surplus to reduce inflationary pressures [applause], and permit a sizable reduction in the national debt, which now stands at $252,000,000,000. [Applause.] I recommend, therefore, that the Congress enact new tax legislation to bring in an additional $4,000,000,000 of Government revenue. This should come principally from additional corporate taxes. A portion should come from revised estate and gift taxes. Consideration should be given to raising personal income-tax rates in the middle and upper brackets.

If we want to keep our economy running in high gear, we must be sure that every group has the incentive to make its full contribution to the national welfare. At present, the working men and women of the Nation are unfairly discriminated against by a statute that abridges their rights, curtails their constructive efforts, and hampers our system of free collective bargaining. That statute is the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, sometimes called the Taft-Hartley Act.

That act should be repealed. [Applause.]

The Wagner Act should be reenacted. However, certain improvements, which I recommended to the Congress 2 years ago, are needed. Jurisdictional strikes and unjustifiable secondary boycotts should be prohibited. The use of economic force to decide issues arising out of the interpretation of existing contracts should be prevented. Without endangering our democratic freedoms, means should be provided for setting up machinery for preventing strikes in vital industries which affect the public interest. [Applause.]

The Department of Labor should be rebuilt and strengthened and those units properly belonging within that Department should be placed in it.

The health of our economy and its maintenance at high levels further require that the minimum wage fixed by law should be raised to at least 75 cents an hour. [Applause.]

If our free enterprise economy is to be strong and healthy, we must reinvigorate the forces of competition. We must assure small business the freedom and opportunity to grow and prosper. To this purpose, we should strengthen our antitrust laws by closing those loopholes that permit monopolistic mergers and consolidations. [Applause.]

Our national farm program should be improved—not only in the interest of the farmers but for the lasting prosperity of the whole Nation. Our goals should be abundant farm production and parity of income for agriculture. [Applause.] Standards of living on the farm should be just as good as anywhere else in the country.

Farm price supports are an essential part of our program to achieve these ends. Price supports should be used to prevent farm price declines which are out of line with general price levels, to facilitate adjustments in production to consumer demands and to promote good land use. Our price support legislation must be adapted to these objectives. The authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation to provide adequate storage space for crops should be restored. [Applause.]

Our program for farm prosperity should also seek to expand the domestic market for agricultural products, particularly among low-income groups, and to increase and stabilize foreign markets.

We should give special attention to extending modern conveniences and services to our farms. Rural electrification should be pushed forward. And in considering legislation relating to housing, education, health, and social security, special attention should be given to rural problems. [Applause.]

Our growing population and the expansion of our economy depend upon the wise management of our land, water, forest, and mineral wealth. In our present dynamic economy, the task of conservation is not to lock up our resources but to develop and improve them. Failure today to make the investments which are necessary to support our progress in the future would be false economy.

We must push forward with the development of our rivers for power, irrigation, navigation, and flood control. [Applause.] We should apply the lessons of our Tennessee Valley experience to our other great river basins. [Applause.]

I again recommend that action be taken by the Congress to approve the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. [Applause.]

This is about the fifth time I have recommended it.

We must adopt a program for the planned use of the petroleum reserves under the sea, which are—and must remain—vested in the Federal Government. [Applause.] We must extend our programs of soil conservation. We must place our forests on a sustained-yield basis, and encourage the development of new sources of vital minerals.

In all this we must make sure that the benefits of these public undertakings are directly available to the people. Public power should be carried to consuming areas by public transmission lines where necessary to provide electricity at the lowest possible rates. [Applause.] Irrigation waters should serve family farms and not land speculators. [Applause.]

The Government has still other opportunities to help raise the standard of living of our citizens. These opportunities lie in the fields of social security, health, education, housing, and civil rights.

The present coverage of the social-security laws is altogether inadequate, and benefit payments are too low. One-third of our workers are not covered.

Those who receive old age and survivors insurance benefits receive an average payment of only $25 a month. Many others who cannot work because they are physically disabled are left to the mercy of charity. We should expand our social-security program, both as to size of benefits and extent of coverage, against the economic hazards due to unemployment, old age, sickness, and disability. [Applause.]

We must spare no effort to raise the general level of health in this country. In a nation as rich as ours, it is a shocking fact that tens of millions lack adequate medical care. We are short of doctors, hospitals, and nurses. We must remedy these shortages. Moreover, we need—and we must have without further delay—a system of prepaid medical insurance which will enable every American to afford good medical care. [Applause.]

It is equally shocking that millions of our children are not receiving a good education. Millions of them are in overcrowded, obsolete buildings. We are short of teachers, because teachers' salaries are too low to attract new teachers, or to hold the ones we have. All these school problems will become much more acute as a result of the tremendous increase in the enrollment in our elementary schools in the next few years. I cannot repeat too strongly my desire for prompt Federal financial aid to the States to help them operate and maintain their school systems. [Applause.]

The governmental agency which now administers the programs of health, education, and social security should be given full departmental status.

The housing shortage continues to be acute. As an immediate step, the Congress should enact the provisions for low-rent public housing, slum clearance, farm housing, and housing research which I have repeatedly recommended. The number of low-rent public housing units provided for in the legislation should be increased to 1,000,000 units in the next 7 years. [Applause.] Even this number of units will not begin to meet our need for new housing.

Most of the houses we need will have to be built by private enterprise, without public subsidy. By producing too few rental units and too large a proportion of high-priced houses, the building industry is rapidly pricing itself out of the market. Building costs must be lowered. [Applause.]

The Government is now engaged in a campaign to induce all segments of the building industry to concentrate on the production of lower-priced housing. Additional legislation to encourage such housing will be submitted.

The authority which I have requested, to allocate materials in short supply and to impose price ceilings on such materials, could be used, if found necessary, to channel more materials into homes large enough for family life at prices which wage earners can afford. [Applause.]

The driving force behind our progress is our faith in our democratic institutions. That faith is embodied in the promise of equal rights and equal opportunities which the founders of our Republic proclaimed to their countrymen and to the whole world.

The fulfillment of this promise is among the highest purposes of government. The civil rights proposals I made to the Eightieth Congress, I now repeat to the Eighty-first Congress. [Applause.] They should be enacted in order that the Federal Government may assume the leadership and discharge the obligations clearly placed upon it by the Constitution.

I stand squarely behind those proposals.

Our domestic programs are the foundation of our foreign policy. The world today looks to us for leadership because we have so largely realized, within our borders, those benefits of democracy for which most of the peoples of the world are yearning.

We are following a foreign policy which is the outward expression of the democratic faith we profess. We are doing what we can to encourage free states and free peoples throughout the world, to aid the suffering and afflicted in foreign lands, and to strengthen democratic nations against aggression.

The heart of our foreign policy is peace. We are supporting a world organization to keep peace and a world economic policy to create prosperity for mankind. Our guiding star is the principle of international cooperation. To this concept we have made a national commitment as profound as anything in history. To it we have pledged our resources and our honor.

Until a system of world security is established upon which we can safely rely, we cannot escape the burden of creating and maintaining armed forces sufficient to deter aggression. We have made great progress in the last year in the effective organization of our armed forces, but further improvements in our national security legislation are necessary. Universal training is essential to the security of the United States. [Applause.]

During the course of this session I shall have occasion to ask the Congress to consider several measures in the field of foreign policy. At this time I recommend that we restore the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act to full effectiveness, and extend it for 3 years. We should also open our doors to displaced persons without unfair discrimination.

It should be clear by now to all nations that we are not seeking to freeze the status quo. We have no intention of preserving the injustices of the past. We welcome the constructive efforts being made by many nations to achieve a better life for their citizens. In the European recovery program, in our good-neighbor policy, and in the United Nations we have begun to batter down those national walls which block the economic growth and the social advancement of the peoples of the world.

We believe that if we hold resolutely to this course, the principle of international cooperation will eventually command the approval even of those nations which are now seeking to weaken or subvert it.

We stand at the opening of an era which can mean either great achievement or terrible catastrophe for ourselves and for all mankind.

The strength of our Nation must continue to be used in the interest of all our people rather than a privileged few. It must continue to be used unselfishly in the struggle for world peace and the betterment of mankind the world over.

This is the task before us.

It is not an easy one. It has many complications, and there will be strong opposition from selfish interests.

I hope for cooperation from farmers, from labor, and from business. Every segment of our population and every individual has a right to expect from our Government a fair deal.

When I first appeared before the Congress and addressed you on the 16th of April 1945, I quoted King Solomon's prayer wherein he asked for wisdom and ability to govern his people as they should be governed. I explained to you at that time that the task before me was one of the greatest in the history of the world and that it was necessary to have the complete cooperation of the Congress and the people of the United States.

We are now taking a new start with the same situation. It is absolutely essential that your President have the complete cooperation of the Congress to carry out the great works that must be done to keep the peace in this world and to keep this country prosperous. [Applause.]

The people and the country have a right to expect that the Congress and the President will work in the closest cooperation with one objective—the welfare of the people of this Nation as a whole.

In the months ahead I know that I shall be able to cooperate with this Congress. [Applause.]

I am confident that the Divine Power which has guided us to this time of fateful responsibility and glorious opportunity will not desert us now.

With that help from Almighty God which we have humbly acknowledged at every turning point in our national life, we shall be able to perform the great tasks which He now sets before us. [Applause, the Members rising.]

At 1 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m., the President retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The members of the President's Cabinet retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

At 1 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m., the Speaker announced that the joint session was dissolved.

Thereupon the President pro tempore and the Members of the Senate returned to their Chamber.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess until 2 o'clock p. m.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess until 2 o'clock p. m.

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 2 o'clock p. m. by the Speaker.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 1)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the message of the President just presented be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered printed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS OF WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 25) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives: ROBERT L. DOUGHTON (chairman), North Carolina; JERE COOPER, Tennessee; JOHN D. DINGELL, Michigan; WILBUR D. MILLS, Arkansas; NOBLE J. GREGORY, Kentucky; A. SIDNEY CAMP, Georgia; WALTER A. LYNCH, New York; AIME J. FORAND, Rhode Island; HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, Pennsylvania; CECIL R. KING, California; THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, Illinois; J. M. COMBS, Texas; HALE BOGGS, Louisiana; JOHN A. CARROLL, Colorado; STEPHEN M. YOUNG, Ohio.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 26), which I send to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives: DANIEL A. REED, New York; ROY O. WOODRUFF, Michigan; THOMAS A. JENKINS, Ohio; RICHARD M. SIMPSON, Pennsylvania; ROBERT W. KEAN, New Jersey; CARL T. CURTIS, Nebraska; NOAH M. MASON, Illinois; THOMAS E. MARTIN, Iowa; HAL HOLMES, Washington; and JOHN W. BYRNES, Wisconsin.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OATH OF OFFICE, HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 27) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas ROY O. WOODRUFF, a Representative-elect from Michigan, from the Tenth District thereof, has been unable from sickness to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of the House, and there being no contest or question as to his election: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Speaker be, and he is hereby, authorized to administer the oath of office to said ROY O. WOODRUFF, at Bethesda, Md., and that the said oath be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said ROY O. WOODRUFF.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OATH OF OFFICE, HON. A. L. BULWINKLE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 28) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas A. L. BULWINKLE, a Representative-elect from North Carolina, from the Eleventh District thereof, has been unable from sickness to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of the House, and there being no contest or question as to his election: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Speaker be, and he is hereby, authorized to administer the oath of office to said A. L. BULWINKLE, at Bethesda, Md., and that the said oath be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said A. L. BULWINKLE.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DESIGNATION OF MAJORITY WHIP

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to announce to my colleagues of the House that I have designated and appointed as the majority whip for the Eighty-first Congress our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

APPOINTMENT OF TELLERS TO COUNT ELECTORAL VOTES ON JANUARY 6

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 2, the Chair appoints as tellers to count the electoral votes on January 6, 1949, the following Members on the part of the House: The gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GAMBLE].

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three separate instances, and in two of them to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a magazine article.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, on Monday I received permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD. I have been advised by the Public Printer that the extension will take two and one-fourth pages and cost $195.25, notwithstanding which I ask permission that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the excess, without objection the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three separate instances, in one to include an editorial which appeared in the Lynn Telegram-News; in one to include a letter from the Social Security Committee of the Associated Industries of Boston; and in one to include an editorial that appeared in the Columbia Magazine.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances, in one to include a newspaper article by Margaret Mara, and in the other a eulogy delivered by Rev. Vincent O. Jenova.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times.

Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include editorials from the Camden Evening Courier and the New York Times, one of which extols the virtues of the Speaker.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee appeared before the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

TOMORROW WILL BE BETTER

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow will be better for the world, our country, and Brooklyn; for Brooklyn, tomorrow will always be better, not in the dull, disinterested, and degrading way of Miss Smith in her latest feeble, fictional, and vacuous novel, but rather in the holy, hopeful, and humane manner befitting the inhabitants of that great community, a community of respectable residents and religious Americans of all classes and origins who shall remain ever alert to improve and promote themselves, their neighbors, and their great borough.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, for Brooklyn, tomorrow will be so much better that this year shall not pass without the reelection of New York's and Brooklyn's great Mayor O'Dwyer and the rightful return to Brooklyn of the world's baseball championship.

THE MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, President Truman's message to Congress presented in substance a program for state socialism.

It is a program of defeatism that pretends to look forward but actually is backward. He recommended that the United States follow the example of the tired, bankrupt, regimented people of Europe.

He seeks to induce the American people to sell their American birthright of individual freedom and opportunity for a mess of Truman political pottage: More

debts, more taxes, more Government control, and more bureaucracy.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the magazine the Work Boat.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HUBER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an excerpt from a statement by the New York Bar Association.

Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a telegram.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article in reference to the Honorable ROBERT L. F. SIKES, of Florida.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. HERTER (at the request of Mr. AUCHINCLOSS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. COX asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

THE MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, more than a quarter of a century ago a great President, Theodore Roosevelt, gave to the people of the United States the Square Deal.

In 1932 a great Democratic President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, brought to the people of the United States the New Deal.

Today, another fighting, courageous Democratic President, Harry S. Truman, brought to the Congress and the people of the United States the Tru Deal.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) on account of illness in family.

To Mr. WALTER (at the request of Mr. EBERHARTER), for a few days, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 6, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

21. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to prevent retroactive checkage of payments erroneously made to certain retired officers of the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

22. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the advance on the retired list of Lt. John T. McDermott, United States Navy (retired), to the grade of lieutenant commander; to the Committee on Armed Services.

23. A letter from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the payment of a sum not to exceed $10,607,000 to the Swiss Government as partial compensation for damage inflicted on Swiss territory during World War II by United States armed forces in violation of neutral rights, and authorizing appropriations therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 777. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to provide homes, and the necessary public facilities therefor, for veterans of World War II through veterans' housing associations, and to make available more adequate financing for the acquisition of homes and farms by such veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 778. A bill to authorize payment for the transportation of household effects of certain naval personnel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 779. A bill to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act to increase the time within which claims under such act may be presented to Federal agencies or prosecuted in the United States district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 780. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by providing for the delegation of certain authority of the Administrator, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 781. A bill to amend title II of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. R. 782. A bill to constitute the Federal Security Agency a Department of Welfare; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 783. A bill to provide a national health insurance and public health program; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 784. A bill to increase the pay and to provide tax-exempt expense allowances for the President, Vice President, and Speaker of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 785. A bill to assist the States in the development and maintenance of local public-health units, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 786. A bill defining benefits to disabled veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 787. A bill to provide that certain mortgages and loans shall not be eligible for insurance or guaranty under the National Housing Act or the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 unless a warranty is provided against structural and other defects in construction of the dwelling involved; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 788. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 789. A bill to establish a commission on the legal status of women in the United States, to declare a policy as to distinctions, based on sex, in law and administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 790. A bill to authorize and request the President to undertake to mobilize at some convenient place in the United States an adequate number of the world's outstanding experts, and coordinate and utilize their services in a supreme endeavor to discover means of curing and preventing cancer; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 791. A bill to continue rent control until June 30, 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 792. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 793. A bill to promote the general welfare through the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in providing more effective programs of public kindergarten or kindergarten and nursery-school education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 794. A bill relating to migratory farm labor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 795. A bill to declare certain rights of citizens of the United States, and for the better assurance of the protection of such citizens and other persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 796. A bill to create the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Redwood Forest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 797. A bill providing equal pay for equal work for women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 798. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended, with respect to farmer-debtor relief; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 799. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Weber Basin reclamation project, Utah; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 800. A bill to provide for price support for soybeans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 801. A bill to exempt from income-tax compensation and benefits paid to seamen on account of their internment by the enemy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 802. A bill to amend the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 803. A bill to amend the act of July 2, 1945, by changing the basis of award of merit for uncompensated personnel of the Selective Service System from 2 years of service to 1 year of service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 804. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act and the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 so as to penalize black marketing of transportation tickets; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KELLEY:

H. R. 805. A bill to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 806. A bill to extend section 205 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act to authorize refund to manufacturers of certain wearing apparel; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 807. A bill for the relief of Chattooga County, Ga.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 808. A bill to increase rates of compensation of the President, Vice President, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and heads and assistant heads of executive departments and independent agencies; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 809. A bill to authorize discounts in sales and leases of surplus property to educational institutions; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 810. A bill relating to the use for Federal tax purposes of the last-in, first-out inventory method; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 811. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act and Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 so as to penalize black marketing of transportation tickets; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 812. A bill to provide that certain persons who served in the merchant marine shall not be liable for induction into the armed services under the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 813. A bill creating a commission to examine and render final decisions on all claims by American nationals who were members of the armed forces of the United States and who were prisoners of war of Germany, Italy, or Japan, for payment of its awards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHITAKER:

H. R. 814. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 815. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide for a 20-percent increase in the survivor annuities payable under such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BATES of Kentucky:

H. R. 816. A bill for the relief of certain veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 817. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Albert Sidney Johnston National Monument; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 818. A bill granting pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 819. A bill to provide that postmasters shall be reimbursed for certain incidental expenses of third- and fourth-class post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 820. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to permit certain officers and employees of county agricultural conservation committees to elect to come within the purview of Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 821. A bill to amend the act of August 7, 1946, to authorize relief in cases where the Government has actual or constructive notice or knowledge of certain losses incurred under war contracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 822. A bill to provide for the payment of traveling and hotel expenses of the parents and/or wife to attend funeral of servicemen whose remains must be buried in a mass grave because of inability to identify same; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 823. A bill to amend the Social Security Act of 1935; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 824. A bill to prescribe the procedures of investigating committees of the Congress and to protect the rights of parties under investigation by such committees; to the Committee on Rules.

H. R. 825. A bill to amend section 5 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 826. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide that individuals who have completed at least 35 years of service may retire on a full annuity without regard to age; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H. R. 827. A bill to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 so as to authorize the payment of fair compensation to persons contracting to deliver certain strategic or critical minerals or metals in cases of failure to recover reasonable costs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. R. 828. A bill to regulate subsistence expenses of officers and employees in the executive branch of the Government while absent from their designated posts of duty on official business; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 829. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to accept buildings and improvements constructed and affected by the Buffalo Rapids Farm Associations on project lands in the Buffalo Rapids water conservation and utilization project and canceling certain indebtedness of the association, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 830. A bill to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 831. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act (U. S. C., title 49, sec. 3 (1)) so as to prohibit the segregation of passengers on account of race or color; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 832. A bill to provide for the acquisition of additional land along Mount Vernon Memorial Highway in exchange for certain dredging privileges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 833. A bill to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon common carriers engaged in interstate commerce by railroad by requiring such carriers to maintain tracks, bridges, roadbed, and permanent structures for the support of way, trackage, and traffic in safe and suitable condition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 834. A bill to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 so as to authorize the payment of fair compensation to persons contracting to deliver certain strategic or critical minerals or metals in cases of failure to recover reasonable costs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 835. A bill granting exemption from income tax in the case of retirement pensions and annuities of governmental employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 836. A bill to authorize the transfer of certain property to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 837. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code with respect to alimony and separate maintenance payments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 838. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission over certain foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 839. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of Public Buildings to convey to the Temple Methodist Church, a nonprofit corporation, of San Francisco, Calif., a portion of the federally owned building known as 100 McAllister Street, San Francisco, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 840. A bill to punish bribery in connection with interstate athletic competition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEDRICK:

H. R. 841. A bill to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, to promote the construction of veterans' housing; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 842. A bill to amend the patent statutes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 843. A bill to authorize the erection of a United States naval hospital at the naval shipyards at Brooklyn, N. Y.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 844. A bill to provide for the erection of a memorial to women members of the military or naval forces of the United States who lost their lives in World War II; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 845. A bill to provide increased subsistence allowances to veterans pursuing certain educational courses; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 846. A bill to refund certain interest payments made by World War I veterans on loans secured by adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois:

H. R. 847. A bill granting service pensions to veterans of World War I and World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 848. A bill to provide for retirement of the Government capital in the central and

regional banks for cooperatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 849. A bill to establish conservation and orderly development of the Nation's agricultural land and water resources as a basic policy of the United States, to provide for a national agricultural land-and-water conservation program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 850. A bill to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation and to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 851. A bill providing for the conveyance to the regents of the University of Texas of that portion of the San Antonio Arsenal determined to be surplus to the needs of the Department of the Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 852. A bill to correct the inequities of Public Law 317, Seventy-ninth Congress, and to provide credit for faithful service to all substitute clerks and carriers of the postal service when appointed to regular positions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 853. A bill to authorize the Federal Housing Administration to make loans to members of local home owners' leagues to finance the purchase or construction of homes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 854. A bill to amend Public Law 810, Eightieth Congress, approved June 29, 1948, designated as the "Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 855. A bill to regulate the registration, manufacture, labeling, and inspection of fertilizer and fertilizer materials shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 856. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 857. A bill to prohibit experiments upon living dogs in the District of Columbia and providing a penalty for violation thereof; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 858. A bill to clarify the overtime compensation provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, as applied in the stevedoring and building-construction industries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 859. A bill to strengthen national security and the common defense by authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce potable water from sea water or other liquids, elements, or substances, in order to promote the general welfare of the Nation and to conserve and increase the national water resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 860. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 861. A bill to provide for the construction of a post-office garage building at Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 862. A bill to provide for the construction of a new post-office building at Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 863. A bill to provide for the construction of a customhouse building at Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 864. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to design and construct a new Federal office building at Los Angeles, Calif., on land now owned or hereafter acquired by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 865. A bill authorizing annual payments to States, Territories, and insular governments, for the benefit of their local political subdivisions, based on the fair value of the national-forest lands situated therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 866. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and state government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 867. A bill to provide for the purchase of a site for a new Federal office building at Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 868. A bill to provide for the purchase of a site for a customhouse building at Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 869. A bill to provide for the acquisition of sites and the preparation of plans for Federal public buildings outside the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 870. A bill to provide for the purchase of a site for a new post office building at Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 871. A bill authorizing additional appropriations for the prosecution of the Los Angeles County drainage area project for flood control; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 872. A bill to provide for the purchase of a site for a post-office garage building at Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MACK:

H. R. 873. A bill to liberalize the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system by providing wage credits for military service during World War II; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. R. 874. A bill to provide for the demonstration of public-library service in areas without such service or with inadequate library facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 875. A bill to broaden the cooperative extension system as established in the act of May 8, 1914, and acts supplemental thereto, by providing for cooperative extension work between colleges receiving the benefits of the act and the acts of July 2, 1862, and August 30, 1890, and other qualified colleges, universities, and research agencies, and the United States Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 876. A bill to repeal the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 877. A bill to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 878. A bill to amend the Civil Service Act to remove certain discrimination with respect to the appointment of persons having any physical handicap to positions in the classified civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 879. A bill to repeal the taxes on telegraph, telephone, radio, and cable services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 880. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Baton Rouge, La., a post-office and courthouse building; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 881. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Amite, La., a post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 882. A bill to provide adjusted compensation for veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 883. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to standardize the amount to be contributed by the United States for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 884. A bill to increase the maximum amount of any deposit or trust fund which may be insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation under section 12B of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 885. A bill to amend section 301 (a) (1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the first sentence of paragraph (1) of section 2 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, approved June 3, 1937, as amended, so as to include the cost of all farm labor in determining the parity price of agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 886. A bill to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice and gambling in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 887. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their system of public education and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and public secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 888. A bill to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Americus, Ga., as the Marcus George Veterans Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 889. A bill to deny admittance into the United States to all immigrants while the number of unemployed persons within the United States is 100 or more; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 890. A bill to amend section 32, as amended, of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1935; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 891. A bill to repeal the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947 (Taft-Hartley Act); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 892. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Federal Interagency Committee on Recreation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. R. 893. A bill to provide for the erection of a memorial to the four heroic chaplains who sacrificed their lives in the sinking of the steamship *Dorchester;* to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 894. A bill to provide for the creation of conservation authorities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 895. A bill to appropriate funds for the construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 896. A bill to restore full compensation awards in World War I presumptively service-connected cases; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 897. A bill to provide pensions for disability and age under veterans' regulation No. 1 (a), part III, in the same amounts as now provided for veterans of the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the Boxer Rebellion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 898. A bill to provide pensions for veterans of World War I and World War II based on non-service-connected disability and attained age; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 899. A bill to liberalize the basis for award of disability pension, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 900. A bill to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 901. A bill to provide minimum ratings for service-connected arrested tuberculosis; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 902. A bill to provide for service connection of disabilities aggravated by active military or naval service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 903. A bill to increase compensation and pension rates under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 904. A bill to provide Government protection for widows and children of deceased veterans of World Wars I and II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 905. A bill to provide an equitable basis for determining dependency of parents under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 906. A bill to facilitate cooperation of recognized organizations with the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 907. A bill to provide funds for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, for carrying out certain provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 908. A bill to provide certain equitable adjustments in disability compensation and pension to meet the rise in the cost of living; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 909. A bill to provide for an increase in monthly rates of compensation and pension payable to veterans of World War I and World War II and dependents of such veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 910. A bill to amend the act of July 2, 1948 (Public Law 377, 80th Cong.), to include persons whose service-connected disability it rated not less than 10 percent; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 911. A bill to provide that veterans now receiving compensation for certain so-called presumptive disabilities equivalent to 75 percent of the amount to which they were previously entitled shall henceforth have such compensation restored to 100 percent thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 912. A bill to amend subsection 200 (c) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 913. A bill to amend the income limitation governing the granting of pension to veterans and death-pension benefits to widows and children of veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 914. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 so as to provide readjustment insurance for those persons who served in the armed forces of the United States during World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REDDEN:

H. R. 915. A bill to authorize the Department of Agriculture to investigate and report on projects for reclaiming lands by drainage; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 916. A bill to provide for two judicial districts for the State of Kansas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. R. 917. A bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 918. A bill to provide for United States post offices at certain places in the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 919. A bill providing for the conveyance to the State of South Carolina of that portion of the Fort Moultrie Military Reservation determined to be surplus to the needs of the Department of the Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 920. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to furnish headstones to mark the actual or honorary burial places of deceased members or former members of the military and naval forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 921. A bill to amend the income limitation governing the granting of pension to veterans and death-pension benefits to widows and children of veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 922. A bill to provide for the coverage of barbiturates under the Federal narcotic laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 923. A bill to provide minimum ratings for service-connected arrested tuberculosis; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 924. A bill to provide that Fort Montgomery, N. Y., may tap the West Point water-supply line, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 925. A bill to authorize the temporary admission to the United States as agricultural workers of students in countries receiving assistance pursuant to the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 926. A bill providing an allowance for the purchase of uniforms for city and village delivery letter carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 927. A bill relating to appointments of veterans of World War II in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 928. A bill to provide minimum ratings for service-connected arrested tuberculosis; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 929. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 930. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948 to authorize an additional amount to be appropriated for construction of certain roads; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TOWE:

H. R. 931. A bill to incorporate the Legion of Guardsmen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VURSELL:

H. R. 932. A bill relating to the promotion of veterans of World War II in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. J. Res. 60. Joint resolution designating March 30 of each year as "Shut-In's Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. J. Res. 61. Joint resolution approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof; expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the negotiation of certain treaties; providing for making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. J. Res. 62. Joint resolution designating the first Tuesday of March of each year as National Teachers Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGEL of Michigan:

H. J. Res. 63. Joint resolution to provide for the observance of October 11 of each year to commemorate the death of Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. J. Res. 64. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joiner of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. J. Res. 65. Joint resolution relating to the assignment of a section of the 50-megacycle band of radio frequencies for frequency modulation (FM); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. J. Res. 66. Joint resolution designating the first Sunday in June of each year as "Shut-in's Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. J. Res. 67. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of the disabled veterans of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. J. Res. 68. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 69. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp to commemorate the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Hambletonian; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. J. Res. 70. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the one hundred and seventieth anniversary of the Battle of Stony Point; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. Res. 29. Resolution expressing the sense of the House that the President should direct the Export-Import Bank of Washington to lend $150,000,000 to Israel; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. Res. 30. Resolution to discontinue the use of Alcatraz Island in California as the site of a Federal penal or correctional institution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 1009. A bill for the relief of the Central Bank, a California corporation, as

assignee of John C. Williams, an individual operating under the fictitious name and trade style of Central Machine Works, of Oakland, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1010. A bill for the relief of Mrs. May K. Y. Mok, Frederick W. S. Mok, and Vincent W. C. Mok; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1011. A bill for the relief of the Pearl Assurance Co., Ltd., and the Bankers & Shippers Insurance Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1012. A bill to extend the benefits of section 2 of the act of June 29, 1943, to provide that Lt. Col. Francis R. Hunter, United States Army, retired, shall receive the retired pay of a lieutenant colonel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 1013. A bill for the relief of Arthur B. Tindell; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 1014. A bill for the relief of the Baggett Transportation Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1015. A bill for the relief of James Greenwood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1016. A bill for the relief of Dr. Pradisth Cheosakul; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1017. A bill for the relief of John Aaron Whitt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1018. A bill for the relief of John D. Garrard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1019. A bill for the relief of George M. Ford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1020. A bill for the relief of Moody L. Smitherman, Jr., a minor, and Moody L. Smitherman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1021. A bill to continue in full force and effect patent No. 1,861,647; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 1022. A bill for the relief of Alvin Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1023. A bill for the relief of Lois E. Lillie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1024. A bill for the relief of Jacob Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 1025. A bill for the relief of Waymon H. Massey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1026. A bill for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 1027. A bill for the relief of Speros Psaros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CROOK:

H. R. 1028. A bill to legalize the admission into the United States of Edmea Pacho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 1029. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Haward C. Heckenlively; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1030. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Francis Howe; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1031. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mark Wolfe; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1032. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Estella Wolfe; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1033. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ethel Barrington MacDonald; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 1034. A bill for the relief of Jansson Gage Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 1035. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ada M. Ryan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORE:

H. R. 1036. A bill for the relief of R. C. Owen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 1037. A bill for the relief of Samuel Ensler and Louis Puccinelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1038. A bill for the relief of William Richard Geoffrey Malpas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1039. A bill for the relief of Amy Alexandrovna Taylor and Myrna Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1040. A bill for the relief of Alfonso Felice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1041. A bill for the relief of Jeannette and Jesus Esteva and their four children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1042. A bill for the relief of Hoy C. Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1043. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ruth Cameron; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1044. A bill for the relief of Glen G. Wetzel and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1045. A bill for the relief of James G. Smyth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 1046. A bill for the relief of the estates of Arthur F. Saladino, Joseph Spivack, and Irving Weinberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1047. A bill for the relief of Aero-Bocker Knitting Mills, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1048. A bill for the relief of Joseph H. Dowd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1049. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider and render judgment on the claim of the Cuban-American Sugar Co. against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1050. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Liebermann Gordon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 1051. A bill for the relief of Five Boro Personal Loan Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H. R. 1052. A bill for the relief of Lawrence G. McCarthy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 1053. A bill for the relief of Frank O. Ward; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1054. A bill for the relief of the Riegel Textile Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1055. A bill for the relief of Agnese R. Mundy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

H. R. 1056. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Preston L. Watson as administrator of the goods and chattels, rights, and credits which were of Robert A. Watson, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 1057. A bill for the relief of John Keith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1058. A bill for the relief of Frederick W. Lass; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1059. A bill for the relief of Louis Serlin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1060. A bill for the relief of David Dortort; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1061. A bill for the relief of Bernice Green; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1062. A bill for the relief of Lorrayne E. Graus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 1063. A bill for the relief of Jack Phillips; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 1064. A bill for the relief of Wladyslaw Kedzierski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 1065. A bill for the relief of the estate of James Lander Thomas to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1066. A bill for the relief of James Leon Keatson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1067. A bill for the relief of Emile G. Peltier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1068. A bill for the relief of Maj. Jewell J. Frey (O340983), Monroe, La.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1069. A bill for the relief of Albert Burns; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1070. A bill for the relief of Marion N. Harper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1071. A bill for the relief of Mary Wyshoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1072. A bill for the relief of Max Schlomowitz (also known as Alec Frederick Reeves); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1073. A bill to authorize the President of the United States to present the Congressional Medal of Honor to Thomas W. Doyle; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 1074. A bill to authorize and direct the District Court for the Southern District of Florida to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Bessie Irene Edgar without regard to previous settlements with other tort-feasors and lapse of time; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 1075. A bill for the relief of Harry C. Metts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 1076. A bill for the relief of Jennie Olsen Andersen, widow, and Arthur Andrew Andersen, infant son, of Carl Edward Andersen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SOMERS:

H. R. 1077. A bill for the relief of John Dionysios Theodoracopoulos and Mando John Theodoracopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1078. A bill for the relief of the estates of Arthur F. Saladino, Joseph Spivak, and Irving Weinberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1079. A bill for the relief of Maria Veltri Magnone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1080. A bill for the relief of Elias Kulukundis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 1081. A bill to provide for the relief of Chester J. Babcock; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1082. A bill for the relief of the Bunker Hill Development Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1083. A bill for the relief of Anita Bloom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1084. A bill for the relief of John Masters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1085. A bill for the relief of Eva Eneyoldsen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1086. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helene Pelzmann, of Salzburg, Austria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1087. A bill for the relief of Janos and Marianne Mero Somogyi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1088. A bill for the relief of Dr. Victor J. Cabasso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1089. A bill for the relief of Hemming Adolf Andersen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1090. A bill for the relief of Ewa K. Sudol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1091. A bill for the relief of Alexander and Alma Hofer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1092. A bill for the relief of Man Kwi Ling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWE:

H. R. 1093. A bill for the relief of D. Lane Powers, Elaine Powers Taylor, and Monroe W. Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1094. A bill for the relief of Nellie M. Clark; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 1095. A bill for the relief of Pittsburgh DuBois Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 6, 1949

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

In this prayer, O God, we come to Thee as children to a loving Father. We pray that Thou wilt help our Senators to face the problems that confront them, not alone by giving them wisdom greater than their own, but also by relieving their minds of all other anxieties. May they now turn over to Thee loved ones who need the healing touch of the Great Physician, with every confidence that Thou wilt hear our prayers of intercession, and as we do the work that is before us, Thou wilt do Thy work of healing in those whom we love. May Thy help be so plain and practical in our family affairs that we shall come to believe strongly in the help Thou dost offer in our national affairs.

Deliver Thy servants from personal worries, that they may be able to give themselves wholly to the challenges of this hour. In Jesus' name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 5, 1949, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

ASCERTAINMENT OF ELECTORS FOR PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, certified copies of the final ascertainment of the electors for President and Vice President of the United States from the States of Arizona, Connecticut, Kansas, Rhode Island, Texas, Utah, and Wyoming, which, with the accompanying papers, was ordered to lie on the table.

TRANSPORTATION OF SENATORS IN MILITARY OR NAVAL AIRCRAFT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of Defense, which was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, December 31, 1948.

Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR VANDENBERG: With the consolidation of the Air Transport Service and the Naval Air Transport Service into the Military Air Transport Service, it has become desirable that all requests for air travel in military or naval aircraft by Members of the Senate be directed to the Secretary of the military department (Army, Navy, or Air Force) in whose primary interest the travel is being performed. Cases not sponsored by any one of the individual services but which may be considered in the primary interest of the Military Establishment as a whole will be referred to the Military Air Transport Board. Such requests should preferably be in writing with the certification by the chairman of the Senate committee concerned that the travel is necessary. If time is short, telephonic requests (Army telephone: Republic 6700, extension 5792; Navy telephone: Republic 7400, extension 4590; Air Force telephone: Republic 6700, extension 5316; Secretary of Military Air Transport Board telephone: Hillside 3100, extension 4131 or 3137) may be honored with the understanding that such written certification will be furnished at a later date.

Such air transportation, without reimbursement, may be furnished only when the traffic is primarily of official concern to the National Military Establishment.

It is hoped this will result in better service and an economy of effort for all concerned. I would appreciate such measures as you consider desirable to inform Members of the Senate of this policy and to encourage uniform interpretation thereof.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

ADJUSTMENT OF SALARIES OF FOREIGN SERVICE EMPLOYEES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting draft of proposed legislation to amend sections 412 and 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 to adjust salaries of officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION AND ITS SUBSIDIARIES

A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Corporation and its subsidiaries for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON GOVERNMENT-OWNED TIN SMELTER AT TEXAS CITY, TEX.

A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., and the program for purchase and sale of tin metal in the United States, as of December 31, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD AND NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the National Mediation Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Fourteenth Annual Report of the National Mediation Board, including the report of the National Railroad Adjustment Board (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting three reports stating that no records have been disposed of during the year 1948 under sections 7, 10, and 11 of the act approved July 7, 1943, as amended July 6, 1945 (57 Stat. 382; 59 Stat. 434) (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Florida State Chamber of Commerce, Orlando, Fla., favoring the enactment of legislation modifying the national airport-aid law so that funds allocated by it to the several States may be used for airport maintenance where such funds are no longer required for airport construction, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 239. A bill to amend section 4 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act, approved September 7, 1916; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN):

S. 240. A bill to stimulate the exploration, production, and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals and for the establishment within the Department of the Interior of a Mine Incentive Payments Division, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 241. A bill to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 so as to authorize the payment of fair compensation to persons contracting to deliver certain strategic or critical minerals or metals in cases of failure to recover reasonable costs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 242. A bill for the relief of the C. H. Dutton Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. LODGE):

S. 243. A bill to authorize the construction of a research laboratory for the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, at or in the vicinity of Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STENNIS (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 244. A bill to supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize regular appropriations for the construction of rural local roads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 245. A bill to provide for the acquisition of sites and the preparation of plans for Federal public buildings outside the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for himself, Mr. HILL, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. LONG, Mr. TAFT, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. IVES) introduced Senate bill 246, to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for himself, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. SALTONSTALL) introduced Senate bill 247, to promote the progress of science; to advance the national

health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for himself, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MYERS, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. WAGNER) introduced Senate bill 248, to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. THOMAS of Utah introduced Senate bill 249, to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. AIKEN) introduced Senate bill 250, to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to assist the States in the development of community recreation programs for the people of the United States, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. THOMAS of Utah introduced Senate bill 251, to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Weber Basin reclamation project, Utah, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. WILEY introduced Senate bill 252, to define and limit the jurisdiction of the courts, to regulate actions arising under certain laws of the United States, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. LODGE introduced Senate bill 253, to provide for a comprehensive survey to promote the development of hydroelectric power, flood control, and other improvements on the Merrimack and Connecticut Rivers and such other rivers in the New England States where improvements are feasible; which was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL:

S. 254. A bill repealing certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to the tax on oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. REED:

S. 255. A bill to amend section 205 of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to joint boards;

S. 256. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; and

S. 257. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide limitations on the time within which actions may be brought for the recovery of undercharges and overcharges by or against common carriers by motor vehicles, common carriers by water, and freight forwarders; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 258. A bill authorizing the appointment of an additional judge for the district of Kansas; and

S. 259. A bill to discontinue divisions of the court in the district of Kansas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 260. A bill to provide for payment of extra compensation for work performed by customs employees on Sundays and holidays during the period between September 29, 1931, and June 2, 1944; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 261. A bill for the relief of Cesare Buia, Gabriela Buia, and Daniela Buia;

S. 262. A bill for the relief of the city and county of San Francisco; and

S. 263. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, Northern Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons for reimbursement for damages and losses sustained as a result of a flood which occurred in December 1937 in levee district No. 10, Yuba County, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 264. A bill to provide for the granting of honorable discharges to certain persons who served in the armed forces during World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 265. A bill to amend section 301 (a) (1) of the National Housing Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 266. A bill removing a limitation affecting the pension, compensation, or retirement pay payable on account of an incompetent veteran without dependents during hospitalization, institutional or domiciliary care;

S. 267. A bill to facilitate filing and settlement of veterans' claims, and for other purposes;

S. 268. A bill to provide temporary pensions for veterans suffering total disability not the result of service, without regard to the permanence of such disability, and for other purposes; and

S. 269. A bill to amend section 602 (v) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to provide for the payment of disability benefits to certain totally disabled veterans who had insurance in force on August 1, 1946; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 270. A bill to change the name of Culbertson Dam on the Republican River in the State of Nebraska to "Trenton Dam"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GEORGE (for himself and Mr. RUSSELL):

S. 271. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional district judges for the northern and middle districts of Georgia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 272. A bill to facilitate the admission of certain foreign workers desiring to perform agricultural work in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. J. Res. 15. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCGRATH:

S. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution making January 20 and 21, 1949, holidays for Federal employees and employees of the District of Columbia in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS ON FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION, NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION, AMENDMENT OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT, ETC.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I am about to introduce several bills, and I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to make a very brief statement concerning them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Senator from Utah may proceed.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, first I introduce the Federal aid to education bill in the identical form in which it passed the Senate during the last Congress under the leadership of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. This is the bill which was known as the Taft-Thomas-Hill bill. I am introducing it on behalf of myself, Senator TAFT, and many other Senators.

I also introduce at this time the science foundation bill, which was sponsored by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and myself, and several others at the last session of Congress. This bill, also, is in the identical form, with the exception of necessary date changes, in which it passed the Senate. I may say for the benefit and information of Senators, that the bill meets the objections of the President when he vetoed a similar measure passed in the session before the last.

I am also reintroducing a bill amending the Fair Labor Standards Act. This bill is sponsored by several Senators, and was given committee consideration during the last Congress. The bill raises the minimum wage to 75 cents, and provides for one or two other necessary changes. The bill does not in any way conflict with the wage feature of the bill introduced by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] yesterday.

I also introduce a bill providing for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley features of the National Labor Relations Act, restoring the National Labor Relations Act as it was before the 1947 amendments were incorporated in it. I am making one change only, and that is to leave the National Labor Relations Board composed of five members instead of three. I am doing this primarily because the business of the Board must be continued and carried on, and also because I do not like to have it said that I am introducing a bill which would cut down my former colleague in this body, and an associate of so many Senators now serving.

The effect, Mr. President, of the introduction of these four measures will put before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare bills consistent with the message of the President, and measures in connection with which the suggestion for new law may be considered by the committee. The repeal of the features of the 1947 law, the Taft-Hartley law, will call for other legislation, and the President's message recommended other legislation. At the same time, these other proposals may be worked out as amendments or additions to the National Labor Relations Act as it stood before 1947, quite as well as if they were offered as amendments to the act as it stands today.

In regard to the Federal aid to education bill and the science foundation bill, since the Senate has already passed these bills with substantial majorities, it seems most consistent to present them to the Senate in the form in which they have already been acted upon.

Mr. President, I also introduced a bill, on behalf of myself and other Senators, authorizing the Federal Security Administrator to assist the States in the development of community recreation programs for the people of the United States.

I also introduce a bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Weber Basin reclamation project in Utah.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills introduced by the Senator from Utah will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 246) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for himself, Mr. HILL, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. LONG, Mr. TAFT, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. IVES), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The bill (S. 247) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for himself, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. SALTONSTALL), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The bill (S. 248) to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for himself, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MYERS, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. WAGNER), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The bill (S. 249) to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. THOMAS of Utah, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The bill (S. 250) to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to assist the States in the development of community recreation programs for the people of the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. AIKEN), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The bill (S. 251) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Weber Basin reclamation project, Utah, introduced by Mr. THOMAS of Utah, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DEFINITION OF REGULAR AND OVERTIME PAY RATES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which is identical with one I introduced in May of last year providing for fair definition of regular and overtime rates of pay. This bill, popularly known as the overtime-on-overtime bill, has been urged by numerous business groups who are deeply concerned by the flood of suits that have been filed in our courts for overtime-on-overtime pay. Unfortunately, sufficient time was lacking in the Eightieth Congress to take up and consider this legislation. I am, therefore, hoping that it will be considered on a nonpartisan basis in this present Congress.

When Congress was confronted by a similar challenge with the portal-to-portal pay dispute it enacted a bill which was subsequently validated by the United States Supreme Court. The wisdom of that bill has been proved by experience and I feel that the wisdom of overtime-on-overtime legislation has also already become apparent. I send to the desk, therefore, and ask to be printed this overtime-on-overtime measure.

The bill (S. 252) to define and limit the jurisdiction of the courts, to regulate actions arising under certain laws of the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WILEY (by request), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RIVER DEVELOPMENT IN THE NEW ENGLAND STATES

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I introduce a bill calling for authorization of an appropriation of funds for a complete and comprehensive survey of the Merrimack and Connecticut Rivers, together with their tributaries and watersheds, and other rivers in the New England States having possibilities of power, flood control, and other development. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief explanatory statement of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 253) to provide for a comprehensive survey to promote the development of hydroelectric power, flood control, and other improvements on the Merrimack and Connecticut Rivers and such other rivers in the New England States where improvements are feasible, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The statement presented by Mr. LODGE was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT BY SENATOR LODGE

One of the principal purposes of this joint survey by the Army engineers and the Federal Power Commission is to determine the full potentialities of these rivers as sources of sorely needed and reasonably priced hydroelectric power which New England farmers, manufacturers, and home owners must have. The recently manifested trend of large industrial concerns to move away from New England to other sections of the country because of the high rates locally charged for power makes this study especially vital.

Citizens of New England are required to contribute millions of dollars for low-cost hydroelectric projects on the rivers of the South, West, and Northwest. It is only fair that the people of New England share in the benefits of such policies.

The bill also calls for a study of New England rivers from the point of view of improving flood-control measures. The recent flash floods in the Berkshires caused millions of dollars of unnecessary waste and damage in addition to the tragic loss of life. Action should be started immediately to protect this area from future calamities of this type.

Another factor which this bill takes into consideration is the problem of water pollution. We have these fine rivers in New England which in many areas constitute a menace to healthy living conditions because of pollution. Moreover, pollution prevents development of these rivers for recreational purposes. There are many areas which would provide splendid, beautiful recreational facilities for citizens living in nearby cities and towns—swimming, boating, fishing, and picnicking. Licking the pollution problem would mean much to residents of these areas for that reason alone.

The joint engineer and power commission survey authorized in my bill is modeled on existing river-and-harbor legislation under which official action on the TVA and other power projects was initiated in 1926. My bill also includes such other important subsidiary matters as improvement of navigation, reforestation, and soil conservation.

The text of Senator LODGE's bill is as follows:

A bill to provide for a comprehensive survey to promote the development of hydroelectric power, flood control and other improvements on the Merrimack and Connecticut Rivers and such other rivers in the New England States where improvements are feasible

Be it enacted, etc., That the Chief of Engineers, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, and the Federal Power Commission are jointly hereby authorized and directed to make a complete and comprehensive examination, survey, or other investigation as, in their opinion, may be required, of the Merrimack and Connecticut Rivers, together with their tributaries and watersheds, and such other rivers in the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut whereon power development appears feasible and practicable, with a view to the formulation of plans for the most effective and efficient improvement of such streams for the purposes of hydroelectric power development and the prosecution of such improvement in combination with the development of navigation, the control of floods, the needs of irrigation, reforestation, the conservation of soil and other natural resources, the control of water pollution, and the establishment of recreational facilities. The Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission are further jointly hereby directed to report to Congress as soon as practicable the results of such examination and survey, together with such recommendations as they may deem advisable.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

ADDITIONAL CLERK FOR CALIFORNIA SENATORS

Mr. DOWNEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 20), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That until an appropriation shall be made to pay the compensation of the additional clerk to which each Senator from the State of California is entitled by reason of the fact that the population of such State exceeds 10,000,000, there is authorized to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate the compensation of an additional clerk to each of the Senators from such State at the basic rate of $1,500 per annum.

FEDERAL AID TO STATES IN CONNECTION WITH NONTAXABLE GOVERNMENT-OWNED LAND

Mr. KNOWLAND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 21), which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the burdens imposed upon the States, and political subdivisions thereof, by reason of the location within their boundaries of real property of the United States which is not subject to State and local taxation, and with respect to the extent, if any, to which the United States should contribute to the financial support of the governments of the States, and political subdivisions thereof, in which such real property is located.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its investigation together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

PRINTING OF LAWS RELATING TO THE FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES IN OKLAHOMA

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 22), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the manuscript of the laws, agreements, Executive orders, proclamations, and so forth, relating to the Five Civilized Tribes, Oklahoma, passed and proclaimed from 1890 to 1948, inclusive, to be known as "Laws relating to the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma, 1890 to 1948," be printed as a Senate document, and that 50 additional copies be printed for the use of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Indian agencies, 30 additional copies for the use of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and 30 additional copies for the use of the House Committee on Public Lands.

THE BIBLE AND THE CONSTITUTION—ARTICLE BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Bible and the Constitution," prepared by him and published in the January 1949 issue of the Christian Herald, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY—CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN MRS. ALMA G. MADDEN AND SENATOR CAIN

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD correspondence between Mrs. Alma G. Madden and himself, relative to the Republican Party, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRAYERS BY THE SENATE CHAPLAIN, DR. PETER MARSHALL

[Mr. ROBERTSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Richmond Times-Dispatch of January 6, 1949, regarding the prayers of Dr. Peter Marshall, Chaplain of the Senate, which appears in the Appendix.]

END THAT PRESS SUBSIDY—EDITORIAL FROM ROCKY MOUNTAIN NEWS

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "End That Press Subsidy," published in the Rocky Mountain News, of Denver, Colo., of the issue of November 21, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE UNITED STATES NEEDS EXPERTS—EDITORIAL FROM OMAHA (NEBR.) EVENING WORLD-HERALD

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The United States Needs Experts," published in the Omaha Evening World-Herald of December 16, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

DISPOSITION OF PAYMENTS BY FINLAND

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, if it is appropriate at this time, I ask unanimous consent that I may make a few remarks in connection with the introduction of the Finnish-aid joint resolution which I introduced yesterday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, a little over a year ago, in collaboration with a number of my colleagues in the Senate, I introduced a joint resolution to provide that any future payments by the Republic of Finland on the principal or interest of its debt of the First World War to the United States shall be used to provide educational and technical instruction and training in the United States for citizens of Finland. Because of the uncertainties with regard to the Finnish situation at that time, and at the request of the State Department, we postponed consideration of the joint resolution during the Eightieth Congress. I am now advised by the State Department that the way ahead is clear, and that the Department has no objection to the proposal. Yesterday, in consequence, I introduced a new joint resolution having the same general objective.

In collaboration with the State Department, and in response to suggestions that came to me from the Acting Secretary of State, Hon. Robert Lovett, the new joint resolution has been slightly revised and given a somewhat wider application than was afforded by the draft I introduced last year. The purpose, however, is the same.

During the past year the Republic of Finland has paid to the United States the interest due on its World War I indebtedness, just as it has in previous years. To make this payment, it was difficult for Finland to secure the necessary dollars. The fact of these payments is of vastly more importance and significance than the mere payment of money from one country to another to settle a debt. As I said last year, it is my judgment that this is a matter of such importance that we should properly commemorate it. It has seemed to some of my colleagues and myself that now may be an appropriate time to review what Finland has done through the years in meeting her payments on her World War I debt, and to do some significant act to demonstrate our appreciation of her integrity. It was in this spirit that we offered our joint resolution of last year, and it is in this spirit that my colleagues and I are offering a revised joint resolution this year with the same end in view.

And now for the record let me review briefly the history of this obligation. Twenty-eight years ago, on the 30th day of June 1919, the American Relief Administration, an organization created and financed by the United States Government, consigned a quantity of foodstuffs and other relief aid to the newly created Government of the Republic of Finland. Eleven months later this same organization sent the people of Finland a second consignment of relief supplies. The total value of these two consignments was $8,281,926.17. At that time, just after emerging from centuries of control by other governments—and I regret to say that at the present time Finland is suffering from that situation—neither the people of Finland nor their Government could do more than promise to pay for these supplies at some time in the future.

Since that time other nations, great and small, rich and poor, have been compelled to default on their debt payments to the United States. I am not commenting on or criticizing that fact, but I do want to emphasize that at the time when this was happening the heroic people of little Finland have repeatedly demonstrated that they place integrity above comfort or convenience. They have constantly made payments on their indebtedness to the United States as those payments fell due.

These remarkable people, who contend with adverse destinies in a severe climate and who struggle for a living in a land which nature has treated with so little generosity, appear determined in a world of forgotten principles to make their country an example of integrity.

It is true that Finland faltered in her debt payments three times, but these falterings were only for brief periods—once, in 1932, under the shock of a world depression, and twice in the 1940's, when a World War made debt payments impossible. But let me note here that each time Finland carefully arranged for a moratorium agreement to cover these temporary defaults.

I am well aware that other countries which owed money to the United States after the First World War, and which have since defaulted on their debts, had serious difficulties to encounter, and that there may be reasons why their obligations could not be met. We find the appalling figure of nearly $15,000,000,000 owed by these other countries, with less than $3,000,000,000 repaid in principal and interest. Whereas other nations have repaid 18½ percent of their original indebtedness, Finland to date has paid a sum equal to more than 103 percent of her original debt. That is to say, against an original debt of $8,281,926.17, Finland has paid $8,541,558.43, including some $309,000 of interest on the debt before it was funded. The balance due to the United States today, counting interest payments of approximately $560,000, which were deferred by the moratorium agreements, amounts to the sum of $7,963,640.02, according to figures furnished by the Treasury Department. This is comparable to what Finland has paid already, and as a matter of fact it is nearly the full amount of the original indebtedness.

Some may seek to disparage Finland's payment record because she owed so little in comparison with the amount other nations owe us, but that is wholly beside the point. In the first place, Finland's resources are slender and her needs great, but of far greater importance is this fact: Integrity is a question of quality not quantity. Her payment of her debt proves that the quality of Finland's integrity has successfully met all financial tests. The attitude of her people toward the people to whom she owes this debt proves that they are a truly superior people. To them America is not a grasping, materialistic land. Instead, immediately after their own country, it is the land of their heart's desire.

Circumstances, of course, make it impossible for Finland to send her people here in any large numbers, and, of course, obviously, the suggestion is impractical, but there is something we can do to aid them in their grim struggle against disease, destruction, and want. We can extend to them the hand of friendship in their desperate need by helping them to train a new generation of technical experts to replace their war-lost generation. On the basis of population Finland's war losses were 10 times greater than those of the United States.

Our offer to help Finland train the experts she so desperately needs carries other important possibilities. Such an act of disinterested helpfulness on our part will serve as an expression of good will which will warm the hearts and strengthen the hopes of the brave people of Finland.

In proposing that we apply the moneys hereafter paid by Finland to us on her World War I debt to the education of her young people—and that is the proposal I made yesterday in introducing the joint resolution—we are not proposing something new or untried. We are not establishing any new precedent. The precedent we are suggesting was established by the United States when nearly 40 years ago we remitted to China the balance of the Boxer indemnity payment "as an act of friendship in order to further develop the educational and other cultural activities of China."

I can tell Senators out of my own experience something about the beneficial results which have followed another project of a similar nature. The organization of which I speak is the Belgian-American Educational Foundation, of which I have been a director since it was created, in 1920, by former President Herbert Hoover. The funds for this foundation were derived from the liquidation of supplies which had been handled by the Belgian Relief Commission. During the 27 years of its existence, this foundation has arranged for the exchange of more than 700 individual students between the two countries. Several important results have followed. At the outbreak of World War II nearly one-quarter of the teaching and research faculty of the Belgian universities had been graduate students in American universities. One prime minister and six cabinet members have likewise done graduate work in American universities. Numbers of American and Belgian professors and specialists have been exchanged between our American and Belgian universities. I doubt whether there is a country in Europe where the ideals and purposes of the American people are better understood and respected than they are in Belgium. Belgium, in Europe, is a small country geographically, but I think I am safe in saying that there is no other country of Europe for which we in the United States have greater respect and affection.

These two acts of friendship with China and Belgium respectively are outstanding landmarks in our history which have closely cemented the cordial relations—and, yes, affections—of the people of the United States for the Chinese and the Belgians.

In light of these experiences, in light of Finland's need, and following our own Government's precedent of good will in handling the Boxer indemnity in China, in behalf of my colleagues and myself, yesterday I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 3, authorizing the President of the United States to hold in a special fund any payments which the Government of the Republic of Finland in the future may make in discharge of its World War I indebtedness to our Government. This fund shall be used to finance—

(a) Studies, instruction, technical training, and other educational activities for citizens of the Republic of Finland in the United States and its Territories and possessions, including payment for travel—together with transportation to and from Finland—tuition, subsistence, and other expenses incident to such activities, for the purpose of enabling the people of Finland to have the services of a new generation of technical experts to aid them in their efforts to rebuild the shattered economy and destroyed areas of their country; and

(b) The selection, purchase, and shipment of (1) American scientific, technical, and scholarly books and books of American literature for higher educational and research institutions of Finland, and (2) American laboratory and technical equipment for higher education and research in Finland.

Mr. President, as I previously stated, yesterday I introduced this revised joint resolution on behalf of myself and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY].

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to make a brief statement in connection with a bill introduced by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. TAFT. I have joined today in reintroducing, together with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the bill to provide Federal aid to education in an annual sum of approximately $260,000,000.

This is the same bill passed by the Senate in 1948. Its main purpose is to equalize educational opportunities for our boys and girls throughout the United States and increase the money available for that purpose, especially in the poorer States. Experience shows that many of these States, even though they make a greater comparative financial effort than the wealthier States, are unable to provide a minimum basic education for many children. The result has been widespread illiteracy in certain districts, and that means, of course, a failure of the equality of opportunity which we desire for all children born in this country.

Assistance is given to a State only after it has provided from its own funds a percentage of its people's income in excess of the general average throughout the United States. The only condition is that it shall make available from its own and Federal funds, at least $50 per child for every school, including separate colored schools, within the State. Except for this requirement, the bill forbids any Federal interference in the educational policy of a State, and prohibits Federal interference with school administration.

A number of amendments have been suggested. In the committee, a study of present statistics of income may permit amendments increasing further the standard prescribed. The standard now contained in the bill is $50. We may wish also to consider other amendments.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to propound an inquiry. I am glad to say that I was given the privilege of joining in the introduction of the bill to provide Federal aid for education, to which so many of us have been so long attached.

However, there is one amendment which I hope the committee may consider, and that is an amendment to provide funds on some proper basis for the construction of school buildings. I believe that the bill as introduced this year, and as passed by the Senate last year, provided funds for operating expenses, and primarily for teachers' salaries. However, it did not provide funds for the construction of buildings for public schools. May I ask whether the present bill includes such a provision?

Mr. TAFT. This bill does not contain any such provision. This bill is exactly the same as the bill passed by the Senate last year.

Mr. PEPPER. I raise this question because I wish to invite the attention not only of the sponsors of the bill but of all

Senators to the great need, which certainly prevails in my State—and I presume throughout the country—for funds with which to construct school buildings.

We have made progress in the field of teachers' salaries and in providing other facilities, but everywhere I turn in my State I find the greatest need for funds to aid in building construction. We simply do not have sufficient facilities to accommodate the growing school population and to accommodate the teachers we are able to provide. I give notice that it is my desire and intention to bring to the attention of the committee, when this subject is considered by the committee, the need for funds to aid in building construction.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it seems to me that if we are going into the field of Federal aid for local public works, we become involved in a different principle from that of granting aid to pay the current operating expenses of schools. Certain districts are so poor that they cannot even operate schools.

I suggest to the Senator that if he wishes to present that issue, it should be presented in a separate bill. I think it presents a different fundamental principle. While any amendments, of course, will be considered by the committee, I hope the Senator will present that issue in the form of a separate program. Such a program would involve a great many other considerations. Standards for school construction must be provided, just as standards for hospital construction are prescribed.

I hope that question will not become involved in the bill which the Senate has already once approved, and which I hope we may approve without controversy or long-drawn-out discussion, so that the House may have ample time to give the bill more favorable consideration than it received last year.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I would not want to do anything to retard passage of the bill. I am glad to have the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio. At the same time, I do not see any difference between the Federal Government giving aid to States for the construction of school buildings and the Federal Government providing aid in furnishing instruction. Nor do I distinguish between construction of school buildings and construction of hospitals, which is already a Federal policy. Nor do I distinguish between Federal aid in the construction of highways and Federal aid in the construction of school buildings.

Moreover, I find in my State great need for the construction of dormitories and faculty housing at our colleges and universities.

I see no reason why the principles of Federal housing aid and housing assistance, generally, should not be extended to the construction of dormitories for students at colleges and universities, and the provision of faculty housing. I invite the attention of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to the possibility of considering that function as well as those already included in the bill, in the introduction of which I am proud to be privileged to join.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does not the Senator believe that the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio is a good one, and that the matter of construction should be taken up in a separate bill?

Mr. PEPPER. That may prove to be the advisable approach to the subject. I am not interested in the particular bill in which the subject may be included. I merely wish to see some Federal assistance to the States in construction of school buildings. If we do not provide the buildings, naturally there will be no place for the teachers to teach or for the children to study.

I suspect that all over the country the situation is comparable to the situation in my State, and probably throughout the South. The local communities and the States are unable to provide the schools to accommodate the enlarged school population, which should be provided for.

Mr. LANGER. I fully agree with the Senator; but I believe that the subject should be treated in a separate bill.

Mr. PEPPER. That may prove to be the wisest course. When we come to consider the subject in committee we can discover what may be the better way to approach the subject.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, under an order previously made the Senate is to assemble in the Chamber of the House at 1 o'clock. I think there should be a quorum call before we depart for the House Chamber. I believe that we shall not be required to depart quite as early as we did yesterday. If we leave here at 10 minutes to 1, that will allow ample time.

Before making the point of the absence of a quorum, I wish to say that it had been my hope that by tomorrow the minority would be in position to present their committee assignments. I am advised by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and also the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] that they will not be able to do that before Monday. Therefore, there is no point in having the Senate reconvene before Monday. Accordingly, I shall ask unanimous consent that when the count of the electoral vote has been concluded in the joint session of the two Houses, the Senate stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next. I make that request at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, do I correctly understand the request to mean that the adjournment will be taken after the Senate returns from the joint session and receives the report of the count of the electoral vote, when that report may be made to the Senate? It is customary for the tellers to report to the Senate what has been determined at the joint session.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does that have to be done today?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised that it can be done subsequently.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; it can be done Monday, anyway.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request with respect to the adjournment? Without objection, it is so ordered; and at the conclusion of the joint session of the two Houses today, the Senate will stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Morse
Anderson	Hill	Mundt
Baldwin	Holland	Murray
Barkley	Humphrey	Myers
Bricker	Hunt	Neely
Bridges	Ives	O'Mahoney
Butler	Jenner	Pepper
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Connally	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kem	Schoeppel
Donnell	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Downey	Langer	Sparkman
Eastland	Lodge	Stennis
Ecton	Long	Taft
Ellender	Lucas	Taylor
Ferguson	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Flanders	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Frear	McClellan	Thye
Fulbright	McFarland	Tobey
George	McGrath	Tydings
Gillette	McKellar	Watkins
Green	McMahon	Wherry
Gurney	Maybank	Wiley
Hayden	Miller	Williams
Hendrickson	Millikin	Young

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is unavoidably detained, and he asks unanimous consent that he may be excused from attending the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senators from North Carolina [Mr. BROUGHTON and Mr. HOEY] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] is necessarily absent because of the death of his mother.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senate stand in recess until 10 minutes to 1.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until 12 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.

At the expiration of the recess, the Senate reassembled.

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES—COUNT OF ELECTORAL VOTES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The hour of 12:50 p. m. having arrived, the Senate will now proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.), the Senate, preceded by its Secretary, Leslie L. Biffle, its Sergeant at Arms, Joseph C. Duke, and the President pro tempore, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the purpose of counting the electoral votes for President and Vice President of the United States.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

The joint session of the two Houses having been concluded, the Senate (at 2 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.), under the order previously made, stood in adjournment until Monday, January 10, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 6, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Arthur J. Hagan, of St. Cecilia's Roman Catholic Church, Boston, Mass., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Grant us, Thy servants, O Lord God, to enjoy perpetual health of mind and body. Thou who art the strength of them that hope in Thee, favorably give ear to our supplications, since without Thee, mortal infirmity can do nothing. Grant the help of Thy grace to the President of these United States, who this day is officially elected the Chief Executive of our beloved country; to the members of his Cabinet, the Speaker, and the Members of the Congress, and all others who have been or will be invested with authority. Guide and direct them, O Heavenly Father, in the way of righteousness and justice that our Nation, believing in Thee, may be a beacon light of hope to the nations of the world toward the attainment of a universal peace. Drive out of our hearts all hate and intolerance that charity and brotherly love might prevail among all men. Thus, we ask for all the blessing of God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that some Members who have not yet taken the oath of office are here. If they will present themselves in the well of the House, the Chair will be glad to administer the oath to them.

Mr. WOODRUFF, Mr. COLE of New York, Mr. FOULSON, and Mr. NORBLAD appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

SPEAKER RAYBURN'S BIRTHDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the birthday of any person is a matter of significance to him and to his family. The birthday of a great American in the life of our country is a matter of significance to the people of the country. But the birthday of our beloved Speaker is a matter of great significance to each and every Member of the House of Representatives, without regard to his or her party affiliation.

This is the birthday anniversary of our beloved Speaker. I know I speak the sentiment of all of my colleagues when I extend to him my congratulations and our very, very best wishes, with the hope that God will bless him with at least 50 more birthday anniversaries. From the democratic angle, I know my Republican friends will not be disturbed or offended if he continues as Speaker for countless years to come.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my sincere best wishes to those of your legion of friends throughout the country and the world who are today reminding you again of another anniversary. However, your spirit of fair play, your zeal to serve, and your ability to lead will never grow old. Your enthusiasm, your friendliness, and your dynamic personality will continue to lead, especially us newer Members of Congress, into paths of richer happiness and service. My personal wish is that the years may bring to you increased happiness through service in the very important position which is the fulfillment of your heart's desire.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess until 12:50 p. m.

(Whereupon, at 12:09 p. m., the House stood in recess until 12:50 p. m.)

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, at 12 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m., the House was called to order by the Speaker.

APPOINTMENT OF SUBSTITUTE TELLER ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GAMBLE] is unavoidably detained and is unable to serve as teller.

The Chair designates the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM] to act as teller in his stead.

COUNTING THE ELECTORAL VOTES

At 12 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper, Mr. W. Mosley Miller, announced the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Senate of the United States.

The Senate entered the Hall, headed by the President pro tempore and the Secretary of the Senate, the Members and officers of the House rising to receive them.

The President pro tempore of the Senate took his seat as the Presiding Officer of the joint convention of the two Houses, the Speaker of the House occupying the chair on his left.

The joint session was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the Congress, the Senate and the House of Representatives, pursuant to the requirements of the Constitution and laws of the United States, have met in joint session for the purpose of opening the certificates and ascertaining and counting the votes of the electors of the several States for President and Vice President. Under well-established precedent, unless a motion shall be made in any case, the reading of the formal portions of the certificates will be dispensed with. After ascertainment has been made that the certificates are authentic and correct in form, the tellers will count and make a list of the votes cast by the electors of the several States.

The tellers, Mr. GREEN and Mr. WHERRY, on the part of the Senate, and Mrs. NORTON and Mr. GRAHAM, on the part of the House, took their places at the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hands to the tellers the certificates of the electors for President and Vice President of the State of Alabama, and they will count and make a list of the votes cast by that State.

Mr. GREEN (one of the tellers). Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Alabama seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that J. Strom Thurmond, of the State of South Carolina, received 11 votes for President, and Fielding L. Wright, of the State of Mississippi, received 11 votes for Vice President.

The tellers then proceeded to read, count, and announce, as was done in the case of Alabama, the electoral votes of the several States in an alphabetical order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Gentlemen of the Congress, the certificates of all of the States have now been opened and read, and the tellers will make final ascertainment of the result and deliver the same to the President pro tempore.

The tellers delivered to the President pro tempore the following statement of the results:

The undersigned, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN and KENNETH S. WHERRY, tellers on the part of the Senate, MARY T. NORTON and LOUIS E.

GRAHAM, tellers on the part of the House of Representatives, report the following as the result of the ascertainment and counting of the electoral vote for President and Vice President of the United States for the term beginning on the 20th day of January 1949:

Electoral votes of each State	State	For President: Harry S. Truman, of Missouri	For President: Thomas E. Dewey, of New York	For President: J. Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina	For Vice President: Alben W. Barkley, of Kentucky	For Vice President: Earl Warren, of California	For Vice President: Fielding L. Wright, of Mississippi
11	Alabama			11			11
4	Arizona	4			4		
9	Arkansas	9			9		
25	California	25			25		
6	Colorado	6			6		
8	Connecticut		8			8	
3	Delaware		3			3	
8	Florida	8			8		
12	Georgia	12			12		
4	Idaho	4			4		
28	Illinois	28			28		
13	Indiana		13			13	
10	Iowa	10			10		
8	Kansas		8			8	
11	Kentucky	11			11		
10	Louisiana			10			10
5	Maine		5			5	
8	Maryland		8			8	
16	Massachusetts	16			16		
19	Michigan		19			19	
11	Minnesota	11			11		
9	Mississippi			9			9
15	Missouri	15			15		
4	Montana	4			4		
6	Nebraska		6			6	
3	Nevada	3			3		
4	New Hampshire		4			4	
16	New Jersey		16			16	
4	New Mexico	4			4		
47	New York		47			47	
14	North Carolina	14			14		
4	North Dakota		4			4	
25	Ohio	25			25		
10	Oklahoma	10			10		
6	Oregon		6			6	
35	Pennsylvania		35			35	
4	Rhode Island	4			4		
8	South Carolina			8			8
4	South Dakota		4			4	
12	Tennessee	11		1	11		1
23	Texas	23			23		
4	Utah	4			4		
3	Vermont		3			3	
11	Virginia	11			11		
8	Washington	8			8		
8	West Virginia	8			8		
12	Wisconsin	12			12		
3	Wyoming	3			3		
531	Total	303	189	39	303	189	39

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Tellers on the part of the Senate.
MARY T. NORTON,
LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
Tellers on the part of the House of Representatives.

The state of the vote for President of the United States, as delivered to the President pro tempore of the Senate, is as follows:

The whole number of electors appointed to vote for President of the United States is 531, of which a majority is 266.

Harry S. Truman, of the State of Missouri, has received for President of the United States 303 votes.

Thomas E. Dewey, of the State of New York, has received 189 votes.

J. Strom Thurmond, of the State of South Carolina, has received 39 votes.

The state of the vote for Vice President of the United States, as delivered to the President pro tempore of the Senate, is as follows:

The whole number of electors appointed to vote for Vice President of the United States is 531, of which a majority is 266.

Alben W. Barkley, of the State of Kentucky, has received for Vice President of the United States 303 votes.

Earl Warren, of the State of California, has received 189 votes.

Fielding L. Wright, of the State of Mississippi, has received 39 votes.

This announcement of the state of the vote by the President pro tempore of the Senate shall be deemed a sufficient declaration of the persons elected President and Vice President of the United States, each for the term beginning on the 20th day of January 1949, and shall be entered, together with a list of the votes, on the Journals of the Senate and House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Gentlemen, the purpose for which the joint session of the two Houses of Congress has been called, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 2, having been accomplished, the Chair declares the joint session dissolved.

Thereupon (at 2 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the joint session of the two Houses of Congress was dissolved.

SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] will kindly take the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

Mr. COOPER assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS].

THE LATE WILLIAM J. DRIVER

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to announce to the House the passing of a distinguished former Member of this body, my predecessor, Hon. William J. Driver, who passed on at his home city, Osceola, Ark., on October 1, 1948.

Judge Driver was a Member of this House for a period of 18 years, during which time he served on the important Committee on Flood Control. He was instrumental in the passage of various proposals for the construction of flood-control projects in the First District of Arkansas. The last few years of his service here was on the great Rules Committee of the House. He was an outstanding, learned, and able legislator. He was most generous in assisting me when I came to this House. He extended himself in my behalf like few, if any other, would have done.

In his early days he was a practicing attorney in Mississippi County and eastern Arkansas. He later became circuit judge of the second judicial district of the State of Arkansas, a member of the Arkansas Legislature, and a member of the constitutional convention of Arkansas in the year 1918, having been elected to the Congress in the Sixty-seventh Congress. He was reelected to the Sixty-eighth, Sixty-ninth, Seventieth, Seventy-first, Seventy-second, Seventy-third, Seventy-fourth, and Seventy-fifth Congresses.

He was beloved by the people he so nobly served.

He was a gentleman in the truest sense. He was friendly and likable.

He made friends readily. He always retained friendships made. He was kind and considerate of everyone with whom he was associated.

One attribute with which he was endowed was his devotion for his loved ones—his wife, who preceded him in death; his son, William J. Driver, Jr.; his grandchildren; and other members of the family.

He was a scion of an illustrious family who were pioneer settlers in Mississippi County. His father was most outstanding and public spirited, being one of the original promoters of a levee system to protect the highly productive alluvial area from the ravaging floodwaters of the Mississippi River.

In recent years Judge Driver had devoted his energies to serving as president of the Planters Bank. He also had joined his son in the operation of farming interests and the managing of business properties.

My heart goes out to the bereaved ones who must carry on without his guiding counsel and loving, tender kindness.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the sad things about service in this House is the frequency with which the "milestones along the highway of life become monuments to departed friends."

I came to the Congress at the same time Judge Driver did in 1921 and was intimately associated with him all during the years he was a Member of this body. He was one of the finest Representatives I have ever known.

He was one of the greatest characters I have ever known.

He was one of the finest Americans I have ever known.

In his services here he put the welfare of his country above all other considerations.

I knew the members of his family and was intimately associated with him, having lived next door to them, and I can truthfully say there never was a finer or more affectionate husband and father than "Bill" Driver was at all times.

Measured from every standpoint, I do not believe I have ever met a finer character.

In the words of Shakespeare:

> His life was gentle, and the elements so mixed in him that Nature might stand up and say to all the world, "This was a man."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the custom of pausing in the proceedings of the House to take notice of the passing of former Members is most appropriate.

I gladly join in tribute to the memory and the services of the late William J. Driver, of Arkansas. Our districts are separated by the Mississippi River, but our interests and our problems are substantially identical. They are located in the alluvial valley of the lower Mississippi River. They are subject to the flood hazards of that mighty river. It was natural, therefore, for me, who came to Congress some 4 years after he began his service, to be closely associated with him in promoting flood control not only along the Mississippi River but along all other rivers of the United States. He was an authority on the Mississippi River. From his youth he had been interested in the construction of levees and

other protective work. He and I served as members of the Committee on Flood Control until he left that committee to spend the remainder of his service in the House as a member of the Committee on Rules.

William J. Driver was born on March 2, 1873, and died on October 1, 1948, at Osceola, Ark., in the community in which he spent his entire life. He was a patriotic citizen and grew up in the public service. He took an active interest always in civic and political affairs. He was a Member of the House of Representatives in Arkansas. He served with distinguished ability as a judge of the circuit court and attracted State-wide attention by his ability as a presiding judge. He was courageous, fearless, and insisted upon obedience to the laws of the land.

He was a member of the constitutional convention of Arkansas in 1918. He was among the leaders of that epoch-making convention.

For 18 years—from March 4, 1921, to January 3, 1939—William J. Driver was a Member of the House of Representatives. He served on the Committee on Flood Control and on the Committee on Rules. He was often called upon to preside in the Committee of the Whole. He had the capacity to make and keep friends. He believed in party government and majority rule. He was among the leaders of the House of Representatives.

Following his retirement from the House of Representatives on January 3, 1939, he engaged in banking and agricultural pursuits. He continued to take an active interest in public and political affairs. At the age of 75, as one of the elder statesmen of Arkansas, he passed away, full of honors and full of years.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], our distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry to hear the announcement of the death of our late beloved colleague, and I join in the expressions of sorrow that have been made by those who preceded me.

Bill Driver was one of the ablest men with whom I have ever served; a sincere, conscientious legislator; one possessed of a fine outlook on life and a very sound philosophy. If ever a man amplified love of neighbor, Bill Driver did. He always had a national outlook on public questions. As a Member of the House, particularly coming from Massachusetts, I regret his passing. But I am pleased to make these observations about one of the most nationalistic minded—and when I say nationalistic I mean from the broad national angle—legislators with whom I have ever served in the person of our late beloved colleague, Bill Driver.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it was my great pleasure to have had the honor of serving with Mr. Driver for many years on the Committee on Rules. Though I have served with many outstanding and able Members I believe beyond any doubt that he was one of the greatest Americans that ever served on that committee. He had a noble soul. He was a man of vision and ability, and he was fair at all times, ever striving to do justice to all. I, too, deplore the sad report of his passing. I hope that other gentlemen will follow in his views and ideals and have the interest of our country at heart as he had in his service in this body.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to this House 20 years ago as a young man, one of the first Members in this body with whom I became acquainted was the late and lamented Judge Will Driver. I represented then the old Fourteenth District of Missouri, in the southeast corner of our State, which bordered on Judge Driver's district. We had many interests in common. We served together on the Committee on Flood Control. Both of us have served as president of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. Judge Driver was tremendously interested in the conservation and utilization of our soil and water resources, not only flood control, irrigation, and reclamation but also navigation and transportation.

I was not very much pleased when he was defeated. I had not, of course, met his successor, the present Member from Arkansas, Mr. GATHINGS. But I remember that I asked the judge, after serving so many years here, how he was defeated. He said, "DEWEY, my boy, I was defeated by a very fine young man, and I predict he is going to have a great career in the House." He is. TOOK GATHINGS is a worthy successor to an able Congressman and a noble man. Then I remember when the present Member, Mr. GATHINGS, arrived here. Judge Driver took him around personally and introduced him to various Members and helped him get located. That only goes to show the generous heart that he had. He was a kind man. He was an able jurist. He was always eminently fair. His judicious mind always saw both sides of an issue.

He was my personal friend. I thoroughly enjoyed every hour that I spent with him, whether it was in committee or when we took many trips throughout different sections of the country.

I shall miss him greatly, and extend my sympathies to his loved ones.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. It was with deep regret, Mr. Speaker, that I learned of the passing of Judge Driver. He was an honorable, useful, and worthy citizen of our State of Arkansas. Though it was not my privilege to know him very intimately, I met him since I have been in Congress. His advice and counsel on matters of great importance were of exceedingly great benefit to me. Judge Driver had an outstanding record in this House. He was not only known in the State of Arkansas as an outstanding and useful citizen, but we feel and we know that the entire country has lost a great and honorable man.

I join my colleague and other friends in paying this tribute of respect to him and expressing our deep sympathy to his family at his passing. May his soul rest with God.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. I desire the RECORD to show that I endorse everything that has been said about Judge Driver. He was a fine businessman; he was an excellent lawyer; he was a great orator; he was an able legislator; and he was a good man.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who may desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD in connection with the passing of Judge Driver.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas.

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, it was not my privilege to serve in the House with Mr. Driver, but I knew him well and admired him profoundly. He was one of the ablest Representatives of our State ever to serve in the Congress, and I join my colleagues in these expressions of sorrow at his passing.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I, too, greatly regret to receive the word of the death of one of our former colleagues, the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas, Judge Driver. I wish I could recount, as so many others have done here today, the interesting things in connection with his service here in the House, but most of his service here was before I came. One thing does stand out in my mind: He was unusually considerate of me as a new Member when I came here in 1937. He accorded me privileges in connection with flood-control measures and other matters coming before the River and Harbor Committee over and beyond what any new man might expect. From this kindly consideration I can appreciate all that my preceeding colleagues have said concerning this great and good man. My sympathies are extended to his family.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address he delivered before the Council of State Governments at Detroit, Mich., on December 2, 1948.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial which appeared in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette.

Mr. KILBURN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an excerpt from the address of Governor Dewey before the Legislature of New York State.

REPEAL OF FEDERAL TAXES ON OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to call the attention of the Members of the House to a resolution adopted on November 9, 1948, by the Fifth District, Georgia Federation of Women's Clubs, urging Congress to take immediate action to repeal the Federal taxes on oleomargarine. The women of my home district are intensely interested in the repeal of these taxes and have set forth in this resolution reasons and facts which justify us in giving this legislation the right-of-way and in promptly passing the bill which will permit the sale of this wholesome, nutritious article of food, free from the unjustifiable, discriminatory taxes with which it has been burdened for more than half a century. I ask your consideration of this resolution, and express the hope that prompt action will be taken to bring this legislation to the floor of the House for quick passage.

REPEAL OF FEDERAL TAXES ON YELLOW MARGARINE

Whereas repeal of heavy Federal taxes on yellow margarine means real relief for the food budgets of millions of Americans, since margarine is the only table spead within the reach of consumers in the low-income brackets; and

Whereas no other consumer issue had such widespread public support during the last Congress; and

Whereas an antimargarine tax repeal bill was passed by the House of Representatives by a vote of 260 to 106, and reported favorably by the Senate committee; and

Whereas no action was taken, lack of time being one explanation given by Senate leadership; and

Whereas butter production this year is estimated to be the lowest on record—one-sixth less than in 1947—barely 10 pounds per person—and butter prices are high; and

Whereas Americans are entitled to the right to get yellow margarine without heavy Federal tax now more than ever before: Be it

Resolved, That the members of the Fifth District, Georgia Federation of Women's Clubs, write, wire, or telephone our Congressmen, urging that repeal of Federal antimargarine taxes be one of the first acts of the new Congress.

Mrs. R. H. JOHNS,
Chairman, Consumer Relations.
Mrs. D. N. MCCURDY,
Chairman, American Home.
Mrs. WILLIAM S. TAYLOR,
President, Fifth District, Georgia Federation of Women's Clubs.
Mrs. OSCAR PALMOUR,
National Economic Council.
Mrs. P. D. CHRISTIAN, Jr.,
Chairman, Legislation.

ATLANTA, GA., *November 9, 1948.*

DELAYED BUT WELCOME COOPERATION

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion if the leaders of organized labor had shown as much practical common sense at the time the Taft-Hartley bill was being written as they are now showing, much time, money, and ill will could have been averted.

Some of us on the committee who were only interested in trying to establish more harmonious and peaceful labor relations tried repeatedly to induce various labor leaders to cooperate with us in preparing legislation which would correct some of the all too apparent inconsistencies which existed. However, instead of cooperating or admitting that any irregularities existed, they took the adamant attitude that unions were perfect, could do no wrong, and that anyone connected with the labor movement was simon-pure. I talked with many leaders in my office, but not a single one of them would admit that any condition existed which should be corrected. They even denied the presence of Communists in the labor movement. Now I notice that these same leaders promise their cooperation in working with Congress on constructive amendments to the Wagner Act. This is exactly what I tried to have them do almost 2 years ago when we were writing the Taft-Hartley Act. Therefore, if the passage of this act has done nothing more than induce labor leaders to admit that constructive amendments were necessary, as well as to have induced the CIO in convention to take action to drive Communists out of their union, it has justified its existence even though it is repealed within the next 24 hours.

I have maintained from the beginning that if the closed shop had not been outlawed and if the title had been known as the Truman Act, the Wagner Act, or the Murray-Green-Lewis Act, that opposition would have been less violent. From my observations and inquiries some of these same leaders who are now willing to cooperate hate the authors of the act much more than they dislike the act itself. If changing the title and amending the act in a few instances will give us the guarantee that labor leaders will cooperate for the best interests of their members, of industry, and of the country in general, then I think that this would be a small concession to make in exchange for industrial peace and production.

I also believe that leaders of organized labor should take more time and educate new members in the real meaning and purpose back of the labor movement. For instance, the other day in Ohio I heard a young, newly made union member remark that he had just given the boss "a d—— good cussing." When I asked him why he had done so he replied: "Well, the so-and-so can't fire me, so I just thought I'd let him know what I thought of him." In other words, instead of selling union members on the idea that the real purpose of organized labor is to provide not only better hours, wages, and working conditions for themselves, but also increased production for management in order that their jobs may continue, many of them are being indoctrinated with the idea that management is their natural enemy and that class hatred should be exemplified. I am quite certain that this indoctrinating course is the work of subversive elements within the labor movement, and now since labor is attempting to drive them out of their organization I sincerely trust that the loyal patriotic leaders in the labor movement will educate their members to the real purpose back of the labor movement.

I believe in organized labor and collective bargaining, and all the rights and benefits which labor can obtain legally by collective bargaining. However, I also believe in the rights and privileges of the 128,000,000 unorganized workers, and I hope and pray that the leaders of the labor movement will cooperate with those of us on the committee who are only interested in seeing that both groups are treated fairly and equally under the law.

THE PRESIDENT'S PROGRAM

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, disgusted with the actions of the Eightieth Congress, the American people on November 2 gave a mandate to the President and to this Eighty-first Congress to get busy and enact a real program for their benefit. Yesterday, President Truman outlined the main points of that program.

The President's speech makes me proud to be a Member of the Eighty-first Congress. The program which he has proposed to us will, I trust, be speedily enacted, and will make us live in history as one of the most potent and progressive Congresses ever elected.

We shall be honored to work with him to continue prosperity at home and to extend it to all our people. We shall be proud to help spread it to the rest of the world and to do whatever is in our power to dispel the shadow of war which today hangs over us all. The re-election of President Truman with a Congress friendly to his principles has reassured the people of America and of the world that the United States is going forward again, after a brief lapse caused by the unfortunate election of 1946.

Already the apostles of reaction—those political bourbons who have learned nothing and forgotten everything since 1932—are assailing the President's program. They are the spiritual heirs of those who attacked Jefferson and Jackson as dangerous radicals. They are the political descendants of those who assailed Theodore Roosevelt's Square Deal and Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal as socialism and communism.

It is worth noting that the reforms of the Square Deal and the New Deal are now law and accepted by practically all Americans as a basic part of our political and economic structure.

President Truman's message is in the same tradition. If this Congress is true to the mandate the people gave it on November 2, the Tru Deal will become an integral part of American life and be as widely accepted as the Square Deal and the New Deal.

I believe President Truman's message gives us a chance to carry on in the fine American tradition enunciated so ably by Abraham Lincoln when he said:

> The legitimate object of government is to do for the people what needs to be done, but which they cannot, by individual effort, do at all, or do so well, for themselves.

That thought should be the guide for all our votes in the Eighty-first Congress.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I also ask that the special order I had for today be vacated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

THE FEDERAL SALES TAX

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, the principal responsibility, I believe, in the task of representing our districts is to know what our people back home want and how they are thinking.

To ascertain these things, a few days ago, I sent out 60,000 letters designed to reach every family in my district. In this message, I pointed out that if each person would answer the questions I asked, it would help me to do my job of representing the home folks better.

The questions I asked were about some of the leading issues the new Congress will have to settle. They dealt with the Taft-Hartley Act, price control, farm-price supports, the oleomargarine tax, with the bonus for World War II veterans, and with the sales tax.

While returns thus far received are fragmentary in comparison with what eventually will come in, I am prepared to draw a definite conclusion on one important subject.

I find that sentiment is running practically unanimous against a Federal sales tax. There just is not any support for this vicious proposal.

Of course, my stand against the sales tax is well known back home. I have always hated the very thought of such a tax.

To me, it is the perfect way for the rich man to shift his burden of tax responsibility to the poor man. The sales tax is the most diabolical method of raising revenue devised by the boys in the star chamber.

I wish to make my position emphatically clear at this time, if I was ever misunderstood before, that I will fight to the last ditch all attempts on the part of the administration or the White House to include the sales tax in the new demands for a tax increase to our Federal taxpayers and the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent on behalf of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] that he may extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

MEXICAN OIL SITUATION

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an article by Arthur Krock from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, under House Resolution 595, Eightieth Congress, has conducted a continuing investigation of the subject of fuel supply and demand with particular reference to a long-range national fuel policy and the part played by various energy sources in our national defense.

Various hearings were held, and among the different aspects of the problem impressing your committee was the fact that, during these hearings, no mention was made of Mexico as a present and future source of petroleum supply. Accordingly, your committee undertook, at the invitation of the Government of Mexico, an on-the-spot study of the Mexican situation with a view to determining the place of petroleum in the economy of that country, in relations between that country and the rest of the world, particularly the United States, and the possibilities of increasing Mexican production.

The results of this study are contained in the committee's report—House Report 2470, Eightieth Congress, second session—on Mexican petroleum, which was prepared with a full realization that the development of Mexico's petroleum resources could be comprehended only in the light of its entire economy and its internal and external trade and financial position. This report, therefore, includes not only a discussion of Mexican petroleum but also the other aspects of the problem, all of which bear upon petroleum and most of which fall within the direct legislative jurisdiction of your Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Your committee's activities in the study of Mexican petroleum and the factors affecting the whole problem were discussed by Arthur Krock in the New York Times of December 30, 1948, as follows:

IN THE NATION—THE VITAL QUESTION OF MEXICAN OIL

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, December 29.—While other committees of Congress have monopolized the headlines, the group which makes up the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with a very able staff, has been quietly engaged in a study of more enduring importance. This is a survey of the actual and potential fuel supply in the Western Hemisphere, with special attention to Mexico and Venezuela; and the relation of this resource to Pan-American economy and the security of the United States is direct and vital.

Sometime this week the committee, headed by Representative WOLVERTON, of New Jersey, is expected to publish a progress report with the essential approval of the Democratic Members, soon to become the majority, as well as that of the Republicans. Those who have concentrated on the paramount importance of the subject are hopeful that the findings will hasten an adjustment of the current national policy which, if continued, could make Mexico an importer instead of an exporter of fuel—a very threatening prospect to the security of the United States. How threatening this would be was stressed by recent testimony at the Capitol by James Forrestal, the Secretary of Defense, to the effect that our petroleum deficiency in event of large-scale war could be 2,000,000 barrels a day.

Fifteen of the twenty-six members of the Wolverton committee investigated the Mexican oil situation at first-hand in August and September, and a subcommittee returned later on the same errand. They inspected all the major installations and fields of Petroleos Mexicanos (Pemex), the Government oil company, and returned with these impressions, which will probably be reflected in the progress report:

1. The cost and efficiency of the Marshall plan, the motive power of our own defense machinery, and that sound economy on this continent without which no "good neighbor" policy can be more than two empty words require each hemisphere supply its own petroleum needs. The reverse is true today.

2. This could come to reasonably early maturity in the Western Hemisphere, and assure enough fuel to the United States for any conceivable needs, if the Mexican potentials were properly explored and put in readiness for production.

3. The United States exports goods to the value of $500,000,000 to Mexico annually. But that cannot continue unless means are found to increase Mexico's supply of its great export crop of petroleum.

4. The obvious means is for the United States Government to give earnest consideration to loans to Mexico for this purpose. Pemex has a 5-year program, at an estimated cost of $470,000,000, to increase production from the present rate of 167,000 barrels a day to 463,000 barrels. A loan through the Export-Import Bank, to be disbursed at intervals under the supervision of an American-Mexican Commission by a United States agent, should be studied by the State Department with a view to early clearance.

It is in the area of oil production that private United States capital and the Government of Mexico have had the differences, leading to expropriation in 1938, that brought about the present situation. The Export-Import Bank, for example, has given an authorized credit of $150,000,000 for various plants, railroads, and roads in Mexico, but only $10,000,000 of this was earmarked for the state petroleum industry.

The ill feeling aroused by expropriation particularly affects certain United States petroleum companies, but others have neither inherited it nor strongly object to proposals made to them by Pemex if this Government will revise its current policy to that purpose. In fact, there have recently been discussions between Pemex and representatives of these latter companies in which the parties have found themselves near together on these proposals.

The terms offered are that, with approved financing by the Export-Import Bank, the private American companies would act as agents for Pemex, themselves choosing the sites for exploratory work, and, after discovery of sources, continue in that capacity, with the Mexican Government retaining title to the oil. After being reimbursed for capital costs and risks with about 35 percent of net income, the companies would have an option on all the supply not absolutely required by Mexico. All this could be done without changing the Mexican law.

Some American companies, however, including those which were in the thick of the expropriation battle, think 45 percent of the net income is the minimum fair arrangement, or object to other aspects of the proposal, among these the supervision by Pemex and retention of title to the product by the Mexican Government. They insist the law be changed, an attitude toward which the United States Government has been sympathetic and which has stood in the way of the Export-Import Bank loan that Mexico wants.

Thus once more two public policies of the United States are in conflict—that which is dedicated to building neighboring economy and getting adequate supplies, especially of petroleum, for any threat to our security, and that which seeks to protect American private capital abroad in its rights and agreements with foreign governments. The House committee has been searching for a meeting-ground of these policies, and its forthcoming report will demonstrate whether it has found one acceptable to most of those concerned.

Certainly Mexico, as a source of petroleum, is a better prospect for this Nation in troubled times than Venezuela, because the product can be brought in by pipes and overland conveyances without hazards of a sea voyage.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I have dropped into the hopper a bill to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act and to reestablish the Wagner Labor Act as the basis for relations between labor and management.

Coming from a district which is strongly labor, I campaigned on the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, and certainly the results of the November election, both for President and Members of Congress, prove that the majority of the people favor the repeal of this act.

When the bill was approved, its backers assured us that it would reduce the number of strikes. Statistics for 1947 and the first 10 months of 1948, released by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, show a striking similarity in the number of strikes, the total of strikers, and the volume of lost working time. In some cases, the law was found to be the underlying cause of strikes.

The conservative magazine Business Week concedes that the law went too far, and, by going that far, the law defeated itself. It warns that a law, in a democratic society, will fail unless it has the consent of the people.

It is true that some amendments to the Wagner Act may be necessary. I am sure that the Labor Committee will give both labor and industry equal opportunities to present their views on any proposed changes, and thus the amendments finally submitted to the Congress should be satisfactory to both groups. Such acceptance by both sides is absolutely necessary in the interest of industrial harmony, a worthy goal for this Congress.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a short pamphlet.

Mr. ZABLOCKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Milwaukee Journal.

Mr. JOHNSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial and in the other to include a bill.

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. NIXON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the text of some resolutions and a statement by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. ARENDS (at the request of Mr. REED of Illinois) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, peace with justice in the Middle East is what the world seeks. Britain's mysterious maneuvering in Egypt and Palestine and Transjordan do not seem to be contributing to that result. The British, for instance, appear to be trying to maneuver Egypt into invoking the 1936 Anglo-Egyptian treaty of assistance which Egypt has denounced as negotiated under coercion. The United States shows every sign of not being tied up with this policy of intrigue. We should throw our weight behind the new Palestine Conciliation Commission of the UN to bring peace quickly, if direct negotiations between Israel and the Arabs prove to be impossible. We should urge also that Britain make clear her stand to fully back the Conciliation Commission's search for peace, stop her maneuvers in Palestine, refrain from adding to the conflagration by sending her troops there, or renewing her arms shipments to the Arab states, and use her very real influence with the Arab states to get them to withdraw their aggressor forces from Palestine and to establish the conditions for a just peace. In no case should we be a party to British intrigues; that is not the course of security in the Middle East or of peace.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials and some extraneous matter.

Mr. WILSON of Texas asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Admiral Holloway made at Dallas, Tex., before the Fleet Reserve Association National Convention.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Gordon Clapp, head of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BAILEY for Monday, January 10, 1949, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 7, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

24. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the amendments to the Rules of Civil Procedure for the District Courts of the United States (H. Doc. No. 33); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

25. A letter from the Chairman, National Mediation Board, transmitting the Fourteenth Annual Report of the National Mediation Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948, together with the Annual Report of the National Railroad Adjustment Board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

26. A letter from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting a copy of the draft resolution on convention on privileges and immunities of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

27. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting three copies of a report of activities by the Department of Agriculture as requested in House Resolution 432, Eightieth Congress, second session; to the Committee on Agriculture.

28. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting his recommendation for the increase of compensation of the heads and assistant heads of the executive departments and of other Government officers of comparable rank (H. Doc. No. 34); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed.

29. A letter from the director, Washington office, Philippine War Damage Commission, transmitting three copies of the Fourth Semi-annual Report of the United States Philippine War Damage Commission for the period ending June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

30. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the report of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Agriculture.

31. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting certificates of the final ascertainment of the electors of President and Vice President of the United States for the States of Arizona, Connecticut, Kansas, Ohio, Rhode Island, Texas, Wyoming, and Utah, supplementing material of December 30, 1948; to the Committee on House Administration.

32. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of John I. Malarin, former Army mail clerk at APO 932, a branch of the San Francisco, Calif., post office, relative to a shortage in his fixed credit account; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

33. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting a report to the Congress on the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., and the program for purchase and sale of tin metal in the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 933. A bill to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum clearance projects and low rent public housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 934. A bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 935. A bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 936. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said land and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 937. A bill to provide certain equitable adjustments in disability compensation and pension to meet the rise in the cost of living; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 938. A bill to provide free postage for members of the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 939. A bill to promote the settlement and development of the public domain in the Territory of Alaska by facilitating the construction of necessary housing therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 940. A bill to authorize public improvements in Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 941. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to locate, establish, construct, equip, and operate a hospital for the insane of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 942. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to amend section 9 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 512)" (Public Law 593, 80th Cong.); to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 943. A bill to amend section 3 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 944. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 945. A bill granting service pensions of $75 per month to veterans of World War I, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 946. A bill to provide for preference under the immigration quotas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEEFE:

H. R. 947. A bill to provide for old-age assistance payments to the States with respect to needy individuals who are voluntary inmates of public institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 948. A bill to exempt graduates of the United States Merchant Marine Academy who hold commissions in the Naval Reserve from induction or service under the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 949. A bill for the purpose of erecting in De Quincy, La., a post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. R. 950. A bill to amend section 1700 (e) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILES:

H. R. 951. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Vermejo reclamation project, New Mexico; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MORTON:

H. R. 952. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 953. A bill to provide that certain persons who served in the merchant marine shall not be liable for induction into the armed services under the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 954. A bill to authorize the interment in adjoining graves in national cemeteries of certain parents and their children; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 955. A bill to provide military status for women who served overseas with the Army of the United States during World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POLK:

H. R. 956. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. POTTER (by request):

H. R. 957. A bill to provide for judicial review of administrative decisions declaring forfeit veterans' benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POTTER:

H. R. 958. A bill to exempt admissions to activities of elementary and secondary schools from the tax on admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 959. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 with respect to the priority rights of veterans entitled to 10-point preference under such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 960. A bill to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery at or near Charlevoix, Mich.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 961. A bill to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 962. A bill to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery at or near Rogers City, Mich; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 963. A bill to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery at or near St. Ignace, Mich.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 964. A bill increasing the immigration quotas for Italy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 965. A bill to establish the name of Kiser Glacier on Mount Baker, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. REGAN:

H. R. 966. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a certain housing project in Kermit, Tex., to the Kermit Chamber of Commerce; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 967. A bill for the relief of the city of El Paso, Tex.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 968. A bill declaring Good Friday in each year a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 969. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the three hundredth anniversary of Annapolis, Md.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 970. A bill authorizing the appointment of an additional judge for the district of Kansas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 971. A bill to discontinue divisions of the court in the district of Kansas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 972. A bill to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

H. R. 973. A bill to regulate in the United States Court of Claims and in the United States district courts suits for payment for the infringement of patents infringed by or for the Government and for the use of inventions used by or for the Government and for the better protection of the rights of inventors and owners of patents, and to stimulate the making of inventions useful to the Government and insure payment for the use

thereof when used by or for the Government and its contractors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 974. A bill to amend section 4915, title 35, section 63, of the United States Code, as amended by section 72a of the code, and for the protection of inventors and owners of patents and applications for patents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 975. A bill to promote maximum employment, business opportunities, and careers in a free competitive economy; to the Committe on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 976. A bill to stimulate the exploration, production, and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals and for the establishment within the Department of the Interior of a Mine Incentive Payments Division, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 977. A bill to authorize appropriations for carrying out the provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 of the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653), as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 978. A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, so as to equalize credits for service in the armed forces for pay and longevity purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 979. A bill to increase the monthly rate of service pension payable to certain widows or remarried widows of Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 980. A bill providing for the incorporation of the Franco-American War Veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 981. A bill to change the name of Culbertson Dam on the Republican River in the State of Nebraska to Trenton Dam; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 982. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act, as amended, by establishing a policy for the administration of such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 983. A bill to provide a deduction, for estate-tax purposes, of the value of estate-tax bonds purchased for the purpose of paying Federal estate taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 984. A bill to extend to the veterans of the Mexican border service of 1916 and 1917 and their widows and minor children all the provisions, privileges, rights, and benefits of laws enacted for the benefit of veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 985. A bill to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 986. A bill authorizing and directing the United States Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to undertake a continuing study of species of fish of particular interest to sports anglers of the Atlantic coast, with respect to the biology, propagation, catch records, and abundance of such species, to the end that such Service may recommend to the several States of the Atlantic coast through the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission appropriate measures for increasing the abundance of such species and promoting the wisest utilization thereof; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. R. 987. A bill to amend an act of June 24, 1936, the same being chapter 746, United States Statutes at Large, entitled "An act making it a felony to transport in interstate or foreign commerce persons to be employed to obstruct or interfere with the right of peaceful picketing during labor controversies," by adding four new sections thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 988. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 730), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 989. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, act of February 10, 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 990. A bill to provide for revenue revision, to correct tax inequities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEEFE:

H. R. 991. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance for the construction of hospitals furnishing domiciliary care; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 992. A bill providing for the examination and survey of the San Antonio River, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 993. A bill to amend section 302 (a) of Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MILES:

H. R. 994. A bill to provide for disposition and use of tribal funds of the Navajo Tribe of Indians; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 995. A bill to amend section 213 (52 Stat. 1067, as amended by 53 Stat. 1266) of title 29 of the United States Code, the same being a section of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, so as to eliminate the exemption of small telephone exchanges from the overtime and minimum-wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 996. A bill to authorize retroactive payment of compensation or pension barred because of capture, internment, or isolation by the enemy during World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 997. A bill to extend the benefits of section 1 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to employees who were involuntarily separated during the period from July 1, 1945, to July 1, 1947, after having rendered 25 years of service but prior to attainment of age 55; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 998. A bill to provide reduced annuities at age 55 after 5 years of civilian service for persons involuntarily separated from the Federal service not by removal for cause; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 999. A bill to extend to December 28, 1949, the period within which application may be made by alien spouses and children of World War II veterans for admission to the United States under the act of December 28, 1945; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 1000. A bill to establish a United States Commission for the Promotion of Physical Fitness and making an appropriation for such Commission; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 1001. A bill to clarify and formulate a consistent and coordinated national policy with respect to transportation costs in interstate commerce; to strengthen the antitrust laws of the United States and to provide for their more effective enforcement; and to promote competition by permitting sellers to have access to distant markets; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 1002. A bill to require identification of Communist-front organizations to appear on matter sent, or caused to be sent, by or for them through the mails; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 1003. A bill to extend disability and death benefits to personnel of the Reserve components of the armed services while on active duty or in training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1004. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the northern and southern districts of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1005. A bill to reduce juvenile delinquency by providing for the care and prompt return home of run-away, transient, or vagrant children of juvenile age, going from one State to another without proper legal consent, through the use of funds appropriated under the provisions of the Social Security Act for aid to dependent children, under certain conditions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1006. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act so as to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to purchase home loans guaranteed or insured under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1007. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide for the inclusion, for purposes of calculating benefits under such act, of time spent in vocational rehabilitation by veterans injured while in the armed forces; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 1008. A bill to create the Board of Postal Rates and Fees in the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. J. Res. 71. Joint resolution providing for membership by the United States in the International Trade Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. J. Res. 72. Joint resolution to create a joint commission on basic industries to investigate production facilities in basic industries; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. J. Res. 73. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. J. Res. 74. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the nomination and election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. Con. Res. 10. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that there should be a bipartisan platform on foreign policy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEEFE:

H. Res. 31. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Public Lands to investigate and study the status of American Indians with respect to social security and voting rights and the opportunities for self-support; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. Res. 32. Resolution to authorize an investigation of ECA aluminum transactions; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. Res. 33. Resolution creating a select committee of the House of Representatives to conduct an investigation of the economic and political foreign policy of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 34. Resolution providing for the expenses incurred by the special committee authorized by House Resolution 33; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 1096. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. James Linzay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1097. A bill for the relief of Edgar Pinhro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1098. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Andrew Ferdinand DeWitt, Jr., a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1099. A bill to provide for the reappointment to the retired list of officers of the Navy of Henry Eustis Rossell, former commander, Construction Corps, United States Navy, retired; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 1100. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vera Suhrawardy and her two sons, Oleg-Jerry Calder and Gleb Zahid Suhrawardy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 1101. A bill for the relief of Anna Malone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1102. A bill for the relief of Rita Anderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1103. A bill for the relief of Miriam Barkle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1104. A bill for the relief of Emmet Wood and Viola Wood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 1105. A bill for the relief of Hazel L. Giles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 1106. A bill for the relief of King V. Clark; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CROOK:

H. R. 1107. A bill for the relief of the former shareholders of the Goshen Veneer Co., an Indiana corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 1108. A bill for the relief of Lillie E. Morgan; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 1109. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Phena M. Anderson; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 1110. A bill for the relief of Ann Irene Felkema; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 1111. A bill for the relief of Tamara Bolz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1112. A bill for the relief of the estate of James J. Barnett, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 1113. A bill for the relief of James A. Stapleton, Ruth Burk, and Mildred Owen, copartners doing business under the name and style of Stapleton Lumber & Piling Co.; to the Committe on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 1114. A bill for the relief of Hedwig Pospischil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 1115. A bill for the relief of Farmers Rural Telephone Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1116. A bill for the relief of Mexican Fibre & Twine Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 1117. A bill for the relief of Angelina Gonzales y Soto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 1118. A bill for the relief of Czeslaw Lunkewski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1119. A bill for the relief of Patrick James O'Connor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1120. A bill for the relief of Carl Eggers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILES:

H. R. 1121. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Adolphus M. Holman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER:

H. R. 1122. A bill for the relief of Quinto Signorelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILLIPS of California:

H. R. 1123. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Florence Mayfield; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1124. A bill for the relief of Lee Freddie Lambert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1125. A bill for the relief of Ellis C. Wagner and Barbara P. Wagner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1126. A bill for the relief of Lewis M. Burford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTER:

H. R. 1127. A bill for the relief of Sikka Siiri Saarelainen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 1128. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ethel Bloom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1129. A bill for the relief of José Antonio Elias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1130. A bill for the relief of Hanna Moosbuch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REGAN:

H. R. 1131. A bill for the relief of James Fred Girdley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 1132. A bill for the relief of Mabel H. Slocum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1133. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Merle Leatherbury Pyle and Patricia M. Pyle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1134. A bill for the relief of Rex Daniels; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1135. A bill for the relief of Henry A. Bowie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1136. A bill for the relief of June C. Dollar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1137. A bill for the relief of J. W. Greenwood, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1138. A bill for the relief of John G. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITAKER:

H. R. 1139. A bill for the relief of Gertrude Hancock, administratrix of the estate of Arch F. Hancock; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1. By Mr. HOLMES: Petition of 185 citizens of Walla Walla, Wash., asking the removal of rent controls in Walla Walla, Wash.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Francis Jean Beutler, Silver Spring, Md., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to his case against the Air Corps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3. Also, petition of Joseph A. Durgin, secretary-treasurer, Alaska Moose Association, Juneau, Alaska, petitioning consideration of their resolution favoring immediate statehood for Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JANUARY 7, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in Heaven, we acknowledge our imperfections and pray that we may be strong and falter not in the presence of temptation.

When the way is uncertain and confused, do Thou show forth the light of Thy wisdom. Without fear or hesitation may our devotion to the public good be without stint or reservation. Grant that the Christ spirit may be the ruling passion of our conduct, that the strong may help the weak, the wise the foolish, and the rich the poor, and that peace and good will may extend and bless our people everywhere. In our Saviour's name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that, pursuant to the authority conferred upon him by House Resolution 28, he did, on Thursday, January 6, 1949, administer the oath of office to the Honorable A. L. BULWINKLE at Bethesda, Md.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 35) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, Whereas A. L. BULWINKLE, a Representative from the State of North Carolina, has been unable from sickness to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of this House, but has sworn to and subscribed the oath of office before the Speaker, authorized by resolution of this House to administer the oath, and the said oath of office has been presented in his behalf to the House, and there being no contest or question as to his election: Therefore

Resolved, That said oath be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said A. L. BULWINKLE as a Member of this House.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAYRE] desires to take the oath of office.

Mr. FREDERICK C. SMITH presented himself at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the

House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have some information about the program next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I do not know of any business to come up next week. Of course, we have to wait until the committee assignments on both sides are made in order to secure real organization of the House. That will be done as speedily as possible.

On Monday it is my intention to ask unanimous consent that the House adjourn over until the following Thursday. I might make a qualification in case something develops. I do not want to say that nothing will be done, because when I make a promise to the House, as the Members know, I keep the promise. I do not see anything that will interfere at this time with going over except possibly to receive a message. I do not expect any, nor do I know of any. Therefore, there will be no business next week, so far as I know.

I may say further that we are hopeful something may be worked out by both branches between now and the 20th in relation to the salary situation confronting the President and Vice President. Of course, none of us would permit any increase to go through without due consideration of our own Speaker. I do not believe that can be worked out next week, but, as I stated, it should be done on or before January 20. It is a matter to be worked out by the leadership of both parties.

There may be one or two minor matters noncontroversial in nature which could go through only by unanimous action on the part of the House, with the leadership of both parties in complete understanding. I know of nothing, but I do want that slight qualification to be noted in case anything should develop. With that statement, I repeat I know of no business next week.

Mr. HALLECK. I have had several inquiries about the matter of increase in salaries of the President and Vice President. I recognize, of course, that it might be reached for consideration next week. Perhaps it might be well to take it up next week and dispose of the matter.

Mr. McCORMACK. I cannot say now that it will, but I would like to have the RECORD show that qualification, that little flexibility, to meet any situation that may develop, because we all know that if anything does develop it has to be done by agreement of the leadership on both sides, with complete unity as to any action taken.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the majority leader a question in reference to the salaries of the executive officers. I am willing to pay as high salaries as anyone, commensurate with the duties which they perform. I want to see that done. But I wonder whether we ought to grant a $50,000 expense bill, which will be worth more than $100,000 to him. Let us give him $100,000 additional, if necessary, but let him pay his taxes like everybody else and let him feel the pinch of paying taxes so he knows what it means to the other people of this country. If you do that I will go along with you in raising his salary, but I want him to know that he has got to do likewise when he wants other people to pay taxes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the observation of the gentleman from Pennsylvania is well to be considered by the gentleman himself. We have to consider the question outside of any individual who might occupy the White House. The President of the United States has tremendous expenses which arise as a result of being President. A great deal of this comes out of his salary. I do not think the gentleman from Pennsylvania or any other American would want to have any President subjected to that situation.

Mr. RICH. Let us make his salary what it ought to be, but let him pay his taxes just the same as anybody else and let him feel the pinch of paying taxes.

Mr. McCORMACK. We have a $2,500 expense account. We provided that exemption ourselves and I do not think the American people have condemned us for that. I am one who has made two speeches on the floor of the House to the effect that we should increase our salary to $25,000 a year, and I repeat that now. That is my viewpoint, but I am only one of a few who probably would go that far. I respect the gentleman from Pennsylvania very much, as he knows, but let me say that I do not know now just what the bill will provide, but some action should be taken. I am not discussing the contents of the bill because I have no knowledge of its ultimate scope. But, in making my announcement to the House, and being frank at all times, I wanted sufficient reservation that if it can come up, it should be brought up as expeditiously as possible.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 36)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Economic Report and ordered to be printed:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C., January 7, 1949.

The honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

The honorable the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIRS: I am presenting herewith my Economic Report to the Congress, as required under the Employment Act of 1946.

In preparing this report, I have had the advice and assistance of the Council of Economic Advisers, Members of the Cabinet, and heads of the independent agencies.

Together with this report I am transmitting a report, the Annual Economic Review, January 1949, prepared for me by the Council of Economic Advisers in accordance with section 4 (c) (2) of the Employment Act of 1946.

Respectfully,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances and include in each extraneous matter.

Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short article.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Sam Pettengill and an editorial appearing in the Bristol Courier.

Mr. PRESTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter regarding the proposed Blairs Creek Dam on the Current River, Mo.

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Chicago Sun-Times.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Washington Post entitled "Code for Investigators."

Mr. HUBER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day, and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day, and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

ARMORY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a measure to provide national defense buildings for the use of the Reserve components of the National Military Establishment of the United States.

The armory construction program, by which States and communities have provided facilities for the National Guard, is well known to the public. Of less general public knowledge is the Naval Reserve armory program, under which the Federal Government provides training facilities for naval units.

These are insufficient to meet the needs for the expanded Reserve of the present day. It is not possible for the local communities to pay the cost of additional armory construction needed for guard and Army Reserve activities. There is an added weakness of costly inefficiency in the present program, in that it encourages the construction of armories for the different services side by side in the same town.

The National Guard has long since outgrown its historic function as a State force. Other Reserve units are entirely Federal in scope. In consequence, my bill proposes to relieve State and local communities of the expense of armory construction.

It is my belief that a common armory can be shared by all Reserve components in a community and by the recruiting officers of the various services. Generally, but one night's training is required of a Reserve unit each week. This will permit common use of the drill floor. Separate offices and supply rooms should be provided for the separate Reserve components. Use as a community center during other periods will increase its value and popularize Reserve activities.

The Reserve, under the American system, is the most practical and inexpensive way of providing a backing of trained men for defense in the event of a national emergency. One of the greatest remaining drawbacks to a strong Reserve is the lack of armories for training and study. The cost of a program of armory construction as outlined here would total at least $500,000,000, but armories are long lived, and their construction would be extended over a period of years.

I believe the construction of national defense buildings will constitute one of the greatest boons now possible for the Reserve components. The need for such buildings is now generally recognized and I believe the proposal will have the backing of the administration, the armed services and the Reserve organizations. It is my earnest hope that active consideration by the Congress can proceed at once.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF GOV. W. KERR SCOTT, OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was a great day in North Carolina. It was the occasion of the inauguration of Hon. W. Kerr Scott as Governor. Previous to his election as Governor, Mr. Scott had served as North Carolina commissioner of agriculture for approximately 12 years. He brings to the office of governor a wealth of experience, honest convictions, and a courageous spirit.

Because of the significance of the content of his inaugural message, I am pleased to include as a part of my remarks the text of his inaugural message. It charts a program of outstanding and progressive services and policies for the people of North Carolina. In many respects it parallels the state of the Union message by President Truman.

I would label Governor Scott's message as one of the most ambitious and deserving programs ever launched in North Carolina, and it should not only have the support of every forward-looking citizen in North Carolina but might well become a pattern for the Nation. It is with a sense of pride I kindly invite my colleagues to study this message from a great Democratic Governor of a great Democratic State.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF GOV. W. KERR SCOTT, OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, members of the general assembly, and my friends from all over North Carolina, as I assume the duties of Governor today I am deeply conscious of the great responsibilities of the office. My campaigning dealt with definite proposals for the expansion and improvement of the public service. I take office with what I believe to be a clear mandate from the people to carry out the pledges I have given. I am deeply appreciative of the great honor this State has bestowed upon me, but I am even more acutely aware of the work ahead, and I dedicate myself with all the energies of my heart and mind to the discharge of the duties of the governorship.

You ladies and gentlemen of this general assembly have been elected by the people as their lawmakers. I have been elected their chief executive. Together we have a job to do. I cherish the opportunity to work with you. I want you to know that the resources of the Governor's office will always be at your disposal.

Our State stands now at a point where it must take counsel of courage rather than fear in plotting its advance.

We know we cannot chart the future with certainty. In business, and in government—which is the biggest business of all—it is necessary to plan 1, 4, and more years ahead. Budgets and all great public-service programs must be projected in order that what we do today will dovetail into what we do tomorrow.

Without claiming to be a prophet, I say here and now that I face the future with confidence. We are now in a period of readjustment. I see it as the leveling-off process expected since the end of the war—the normal change from a seller's to a buyer's market inevitable as production catches up with shortages. There is evidence that we have passed the peak of high prices, and in the months immediately ahead it would be surprising if the economic adjustment did not exert a toll in business casualty and individual unemployment. We would be foolish not to take this probability into consideration, but I think we would be equally foolish to magnify the consequences of what should prove to be a normal adjustment, due after years of almost unbroken upward movement.

We have returned the Government in Washington to control of the Democratic Party, under which we enjoyed our greatest prosperity. President Truman and the Democratic Congress have a mandate from the people to safeguard our economy with proper supports and controls. I cannot see the possibility of depression such as we experienced under the last Republican administration. Our party has created safeguards. Bank depositors are insured against loss. Labor has more than trebled its average wage in this State, and workers are insured against total loss of income in case of temporary unemployment. Farmers have support prices to insure them against selling below cost of production. Reserve funds have been accumulated to maintain subsistence payments to large numbers of the aged and needy through the social-security program. Out of substantial profits in the last 8 years, business, by and large, has been able to set aside reserves against temporary reverses.

I repeat, I face the future with confidence. I face it, too, with the conviction that now is the time to build for a greater future by bringing our public services current with the needs of the times. In doing this we can set the stage for the greatest era of prosperity ever experienced by our people.

During the war and postwar years, when neither labor nor materials were available, I think our State leadership wisely husbanded tax resources. Our State is in sound fiscal position. But we cannot overlook the vital factor: In amassing a hoard of tax dollars we accumulated a vast backlog of urgent public service needs. We must conclude that we do not have a real surplus, but actually a deficit in public services. To go forward, we must wipe out this deficit.

To begin as rapidly as possible to fund this deficit of service to the people, and to do it as rapidly as the resources of the State will permit, I submit now a 15-point program to the members of this general assembly chosen by the people in our 100 counties to speak and act for them in charting the course of our State for the biennium ahead.

1. Roads: We have made great progress in road building in the last three decades. We now have more than 62,000 miles of roads, nearly 16,000 miles of them hard-surfaced, but a great part of our State still does not have all-weather transportation. In my opinion, the most inexcusable waste in our economy is the road tax. I propose repealing the road tax just as rapidly as it is possible to build and improve roads that will enable every school bus to operate every day in the year, and provide all-weather access to markets, places of employment, churches, and medical care.

The rounding out of our road system with a network of all-weather secondary mileage is essential to the economic as well as the cultural development of North Carolina. We are a State of thickly populated rural areas and small cities. Industry more and more is dependent upon rural and suburban labor. By improving the roads upon which this potential labor supply lives, we increase our attraction for new industry to locate here. In getting the worker to the factory, we have a service of importance almost equal to that of getting the child to school, and getting the farmer's produce to market in good condition.

I am, of course, aware of the colossal nature of the task of building in 4 years a dependable school bus route system and service roads for the industry of farm and factory. It may require both an increase in the gasoline tax and borrowing money for repayment over a long period. I am giving the matter of financing this road-building program the most serious thought and I am seeking advice on it from the most competent sources I know.

The cooperation of all concerned is essential. I realize that I, as your Governor, can go no further toward achieving this objective than the general assembly and the people are willing to go along with me.

2. Education: The most valuable crop we raise in North Carolina is our children. We have so recognized this in the allocation of tax moneys on a steadily increasing scale. From 1900, when the great educational crusade began under Aycock, the State government has increased annual appropriations for public schools from $100,000 to over $63,000,000. In the last 5 years the amount has been quadrupled. For next year, our educational leaders are asking for $35,000,000 more than the State is spending on its public schools this year, and in addition a program of school building which would cost $150,000,000, spread over a period of years. The question is not whether we need to increase our expenditures for public schools, but how far we can afford to go—or not to go.

I regard a comprehensive educational program, properly implemented with road, health, and utilities programs, as the soundest insurance policy the State of North Carolina can underwrite for the protection of its future.

The general assembly of 1947 provided for a special commission to make a study of the entire public-school system. I commend the members of the commission and those who helped make this report possible, and I recommend it to this legislature as a chart to our educational future.

I urge the general assembly to take positive action toward improving and enlarging teacher personnel by increasing teacher pay. I favor a minimum salary for A-grade teachers of $2,400 and increments to encourage better qualified teachers to remain in the service. I feel that this is imperative to make the teaching profession attractive to the kind of people needed in it. We may look, as a result of the Democratic victory in the Nation, for substantial Federal aid in paying for this—possibly as much as $20,000,000 a year.

I recommend that the legislature give consideration to the establishment of a system of State aid to counties for the construction of school buildings. Any such program would require reconsideration of the State's present policy and the careful examination of the present division of the cost of public services as between ad valorem and other local taxes and the State's tax levies. We may not know, before the session of the general assembly adjourns, the extent to which Federal aid may be available for this purpose. If it is necessary, I would not hesitate to call a special session to deal with any proposals in connection with Federal aid.

I am not convinced that our system of higher education is either the best or the most economical system we can devise. We know there is a tremendous economic loss due to a number of factors such as poor preparation, poor discipline and the unfitness of many young men and women for the sort of college education we offer them. We need only to look at the high fatality rate in the first- and second-year classes in our State supported colleges to appreciate the fact that something is wrong with the system and that something needs to be done about it. The answer may be that we need to develop a system of junior colleges as a part of the greater university. I therefore recommend that the general assembly provide for a careful survey of our system of higher education in order that recommendation may be made to the next general assembly with respect to the advisability of establishing a system of junior colleges with facilities for affording vocational education.

3. Health: The importance of improving our general health program was brought sharply under the public spotlight by distressing disclosures in the selective-service physical examinations. Two administrations have grappled with this problem realistically, and the result of studies of two able commissions has been approved by the people's representatives in the last legislature. We have made progress toward placing this over-all plan into effect, and we should continue to implement it as rapidly as our resources will permit. I would guard only against any phase of this health program being overemphasized at the expense of another. Headway is now being made on the 4-year medical school and teaching hospital at the State university. This is an integral part of the program, but it cannot fulfill its mission without correlated development of rural hospitals and clinics. The encouragement of country practice for the doctor and nurse is dependent upon the availability of such modern health service stations. It is my earnest belief that this part should take precedence, if for financial reasons we are unable to carry the entire program forward at this time.

There is, also, no question as to the need of a dental school, and the proposal to build one deserves serious consideration.

Our hospitals for the mentally sick must be made adequate physically and staffed with properly trained personnel. At no time, save perhaps overnight, should a jail be the waiting room for patients requiring mental treatment.

In increasing provisions for treatment of the sick, we must not overlook the part of the medical program devoted to the prevention of sickness as carried on by the State board of health.

We are lagging in providing facilities for the treatment and prevention of tuberculosis. Farmers long ago stamped out tuberculosis among cattle. I think it is high time we showed more progress toward eradicating it in the human family.

4. Welfare: We are not current with need in our humanitarian services. The Board of Public Welfare has submitted proposals for increasing aid to the aged and indigent. These proposals affect the physical and moral health of our people. Our old-age benefits should be adjusted in line with living costs and our relief standard generally should be brought up at least to the national average. Vigilance against fraud should be increased and local communities should be encouraged to shoulder greater responsibility toward caring for those unable to care for themselves.

Great work is being done for the blind through the State blind commission and a special project of one of our largest civic clubs. This public service is to be commended in the highest terms, and might well serve as an example for other organizations of this nature.

I am concerned about the frequency of serious crimes of violence. It disturbs me to hear that a large part of the large flow of convicts into our prison system consists of ex-service men of the late war. If we are to obtain social improvement through our courts of justice, our prisons must be more than merely places for detention. There must be greater emphasis upon returning prisoners to useful places in society, and to this end we should look critically at our system of prison administration and parole and probation.

5. Natural resources: In our department of agriculture, the experiment and extension services of our agricultural colleges, and the department of conservation and development, we have the facilities for promoting the broadened economic base that is vital to our continued progress. We face challenging opportunity to improve land usage. Forestry may be restored as a major industry. Commercial fishing may be expanded, and we have untold mineral wealth awaiting development. Here, especially, I mention our ports and harbors. These are of vital concern to the entire State—not merely areas adjacent to them.

6. Public utilities: A large number of our people are being penalized by not having electric power and telephone service. Our industry has been retarded by inequitable power and transportation rates.

Electric power is the cheapest labor the farmer, as well as the manufacturer, can hire. Yet there are still around 100,000 farms in North Carolina that do not have electricity, and there are sections in which industry is being throttled because it cannot get electric power on terms that will enable it to compete with similar industries elsewhere. I want to see these service deficits wiped out during my administration.

The telephone ranks at the top of modern conveniences. Yet the surface has barely been scratched in making the instrument available to all the people. This service deficit is not only retarding rural development but constricting our whole economic and social progress by encouraging movement of our people into already congested areas. Telephone service is a natural corollary to all-weather roads and electrification. It is essential to bringing about the better health services, marketing facilities, and broadening the scope of our labor supply which industry must have.

Our utilities are privately owned and they should be permitted a reasonable return upon their investment, but to justify their monopolistic franchises granted them by the people of the State, they must also provide the service to which the people are entitled.

In the field of regulating public utilities we must have fair and aggressive administration of fair laws designed to protect the public interest as well as the interests of investors in public utilities. Our laws regulating utilities are, in some respects, cumbersome, out of date, and inadequate to meet modern conditions. Our State utilities commission needs to be reorganized and supplied with the services of experts so that it can act promptly and effectively in the public interest.

I mention specifically here the urgency of eliminating freight-rate discriminations against our industry and agriculture.

7. Democratic representation: I have stressed the importance of broadening our economic base. I lay equal stress upon broader representation on the boards and commissions which serve the public interest. I consider such broadened representation a mandate of last year's election.

You will have before you for your consideration the report of the commission set up by the preceding legislature to study our present system of State examining boards. I find widespread belief that this business has been carried beyond the bounds of public welfare. We should go slow in creating new boards and scrutinize every such board already in existence where there is the slightest indication that it is serving special privilege and restriction of opportunity.

8. Referendum: The people have the right to express themselves on any important issue affecting their well-being. Our constitution stipulates that: "Elections should be frequent. For redress of grievances and for amending and strengthening the laws, elections should be often held." I urge this legislature to present the alcoholic-beverage question fairly to the people in a State-wide referendum without delay. A gag rule, or any rule, which stifles democratic processes of free and open debate and discussion is contrary to the spirit of our people.

9. Elections: Our election laws are in some respects archaic. They are generally not conducive to bringing out the participation of the people in government. This is the keystone of democracy. I consider it a disgrace that barely one-third of the people eligible to vote in our State took part in the November election. We have permitted our processes of voting to lag behind the times, and I advocate modernization of our election machinery to the end that people will be encouraged in exercising their rights of citizenship. It is my opinion that the time has

come for us to seriously consider the use of mechanical devices for the deposit and counting of ballots in all our elections.

10. Veterans: The more than 250,000 men and women who were in the armed services are now for the most part back in civil life. A great number are in positions of leadership in the State and its various localities. These men and women merit every consideration the State can show them in gratitude for their sacrifice, but I am convinced that the majority of veterans do not desire to be set apart as a special class. A great many of them have told me that, and also that the best bonus their State can grant them is better government and improved public services that will bring about better living conditions and open greater avenues of opportunity. That also is my belief.

11. Labor: No State has enjoyed better relations between labor and management than ours. We have a definite responsibility for continuing and improving these good relations. I have observed with deep satisfaction the increase in the last 10 years of the average weekly wage in industry from $16 to $41. Private business as well as public funds have felt the enriching effect of these enlarged pay rolls. We cannot have a well-balanced economy without wide distribution of buying power. A fair return for labor, whether it be in factory or on the farm, is essential to that condition.

Two years ago the general assembly enacted the so-called anti-closed-shop law. This was done at a time when labor's demands at the national level were influencing lawmakers all over the Nation to pass restraining legislation. I feel that the passage of time has convinced those willing to look upon both sides of this question that this law was harsh, and I recommend revision of this and other State labor laws to bring them in line with legislation adopted by the National Congress. I specifically recommend wage-hour legislation to remove discrimination as between business engaged in interstate commerce and business engaged solely in business within the State.

I also favor increasing unemployment benefits to a level in keeping with advanced living costs. I am informed that we can do this and at the same time lower the tax levied on business for this purpose.

12. Business and industry: The rapidly advancing industrialization of our State is responsible in large measure for our unprecedented prosperity in recent years. Our goal should be an economy soundly diversified between agriculture and industry. We can increase our attraction to industry by broadening our supply of competent labor through better training in our schools and better accessibility and communications, so that labor can be drawn from extended areas and not be confined to urban limits. Tax structures are important, and we should guard against our taxes on industry getting out of line with those of competing States, but even more important than the tax consideration is the supply of labor and natural resources. We have both awaiting development. This will become increasingly important as the dispersion of industry is accelerated by the atomic age.

I am opposed to any legislation unduly favoring or discriminating against any form of legitimate business enterprise.

Business in the last decade has built up a great bulwark against repetition of the panic of the early thirties by its contributions to the unemployment-compensation fund. There are now more than $150,000,000 in this fund and about 1,000,000 workers are covered in North Carolina. Payments from this fund are not large enough to encourage idleness, but they serve to tide workers, and the businesses dependent upon industrial pay rolls, over periods of temporary inactivity without danger of economic paralysis. This danger was ever-present before the establishment of the social-security plan.

In view of the large reserves accumulated in the unemployment fund, I feel that business should be given all the relief possible in reduction of this assessment, and recommend serious consideration of the proposal to this end made by the employment security advisory commission. As I have already mentioned, I am informed that this reduction can be made and at the same time unemployment benefits can be increased more in line with present living costs.

13. Personnel: The State cannot render services commensurate with the needs of its people, nor in fair exchange for the tax moneys it collects, without able and adequate personnel. This is true in every branch and division of our Government. To attract and retain personnel capable of rendering the services to which the taxpayers are entitled, compensation for public service must be reasonably commensurate with salaries and wages prevailing in competitive enterprise, both public and private. Our salary and wage scales do not at this time reflect such a condition. We should now raise these scales with a view to compensating for increased living costs with an equitable retroactive adjustment.

The State has lagged behind industry in personnel management, and should remedy this condition immediately. To this end I recommend removal of the duties of personnel administration from the office of the assistant director of the budget to a new personnel division under the direction of a specialist in this field. This office should proceed without delay to survey the whole field of State employment and to make revisions and adjustments that are needed as rapidly as possible. This office, too, must always be open to any State employee for hearing and investigation of any complaint regarding terms or conditions of employment by the State.

14. Local government: Cities and counties are reporting budgetary difficulties as expenses increase without commensurate increase of their revenues. There is a growing tendency to appeal to the State government for aid. At the same time, criticism arises in some quarters against the concentration of political power at the State capital. During the campaign there was a confusing mingling of the two ideas—that the central State should take on more financial responsibility for local government, and that it should restore to local government some of its powers.

This discussion, spurred on primarily by the municipalities, strongly suggests that the time has come for very careful study of the whole framework of North Carolina's government. The record of the concentration of power and financial responsibility at Raleigh shows little evidence in support of the theory that the State government sought to take on new power for the sake of exercise of the power itself. Usually, fiscal circumstances led to willing surrender of authority to the State by local governments as they struggled with problems such as roads and schools.

In the course of this political evolution, the areas of taxation occupied by the State, as compared with those areas left to local government, have been clearly defined in some instances. In other instances they have been barely indicated with some overlapping. The State gave up ad valorem taxation of real property and restricted local government in certain other areas. The time is near, if not immediately at hand, when we must make a critical survey of our situation with a view to determining more definitely and expertly how the costs of government should be divided. This thinking leads inevitably to consideration of the haphazard, uneven valuation of property in the counties and cities for ad valorem levies.

The mercurial character of the State's tax levies, as well as the mounting costs of State services under the present constitutional and statutory responsibilities demand that we deliberate with great care all proposals to load the central State with large new obligations at the instance of local government. I say this while recognizing, with sympathy and understanding, that local government is entitled to the best we can do in equity and fairness to afford relief.

I have suggested the surrender by the State of a limited portion of the tax field wherein revenue now is derived from business licenses without State supervision or service of the business so licensed. By release of this revenue source to local government under statutory limitation, substantial local government aid could be provided. I am recommending, also, that the road-maintenance funds allocated to city streets be doubled.

Knowing that greater demands will be made upon the legislature for aid of local government, including the demand that the State help with the construction of needed school buildings, I trust that the general assembly will confide to a special committee or a subcommittee the duty to make a prompt study of this pressing problem. I hope that this will be done early in the session, in order that all legislative proposals for new aid to local government may be scrutinized and acted upon with an eye not only to immediate needs, but also to long-range policy.

15. Federal cooperation: We are now receiving millions of dollars each year from the Federal Government in our road, school, health, and other programs. This aid may be increased. We should take full advantage of it. We have the campaign pledge of the Democratic Party that such Federal aid will be extended without interference with State administration in accordance with custom.

Some of these proposals I have outlined involve a substantial increase in spending, but the people understood that when they encouraged me in my campaign. I have not and do not now minimize the cost of the major items in this go-forward program.

We know from experience that these things cannot be had cheaply. We know from experience, too, that social progress cannot far outrun material progress.

Our tax income is now at the highest place in our history, but we have little assurance that our revenues will continue to climb as they have climbed in recent years. Our sales, income, and utility taxes are extremely sensitive to economic conditions. They mount rapidly in good times. They could drop rapidly in adverse times. We must bear that in mind as we match our spending against revenue.

There are certain injustices in our present general tax schedule. I have pledged my support to their removal. These include abandonment of the present sales tax on meals served in public eating places in order to place such meals on tax equality with those served at home. This would complete the movement begun several years ago of taking the sales tax off all food. I also advocate the equalization of the sales tax upon farm machinery and industrial machinery. These recommendations would entail some loss of revenue. To keep our budget in balance, and it is imperative that we do so, we are faced with the need to obtain good value for our tax dollars in every case.

This will mean, aside from improving administrative efficiency wherever possible, the withnowing of services merely desirable from those urgently necessary.

The program of permanent improvements authorized by the general assembly of 1947 has scarcely been started because of the constantly increasing building costs. It is manifest that this program should be completed and the additional funds necessary should be provided. With respect to further permanent improvements at our various State institutions, it is necessary that the need be evaluated realistically and in relation to other needs. It is my belief that money we invest

in better roads and in better schools and in better health facilities will go further and faster, in the immediate future, toward creating new taxable wealth and in social well-being essential to the progress our people desire. I have, therefore, placed roads, schools, and health first.

A go-forward program calls first for long-range planning.

Every farmer will not get his all-weather road as soon as he would like it, and every community will not get a modern hospital this year. New and needed school buildings will not spring up everywhere immediately, and new factories will not rise in every community.

We are a great State, and a large State. We have over 3,500,000 people and nearly 32,000,000 acres of land and inland waters. We are inclined to judge a program by what is transpiring at our doorstep. Some will see the things I am advocating materialize sooner than others. Some must inevitably wonder at the slowness of their government to get to them.

But this I pledge: With the cooperation of the legislature, the things I have promised will be done in an orderly manner and as rapidly as our resources will permit. We will make North Carolina, in the 4 years ahead, a better place in which to live, in which to invest, and in which to play after the work is done.

To do this we must bring our over-all efficiency current with the times. Governments can no more maintain a competitive position with methods of a decade ago than can industry. Where I see our government in a rut I shall do everything in my power to get it out. If this means reorganization or even abolition of time-honored practices, I shall not hesitate to recommend such changes as appear in the public interest.

Nor shall I hesitate to slash red tape or push aside tradition if it is necessary to eliminate bottlenecks.

Government should never be remote. The people are entitled to know what is going on. It is my purpose to go on the radio from time to time and make first-hand reports of my stewardship. I shall also make information about our Government available as fully and completely as possible through the reporters of press and radio. Secrecy has no place in a people's government.

I come into office with no skeletons in my closet, and I shall strive zealously to see that none creep into the State's closets while I am Governor.

The door to the Governor's office will continue to be open during my administration.

I am most acutely aware of the fact that both the office of the Governor in the capitol and the executive mansion, and all the institutions and departments of government belong to you—the people—not to me whom you have designated as tenant in the office of Governor for the next 4 years.

In conclusion, I would not be speaking with candor if I did not say in no uncertain terms that I am proud of the progress made by our State under the guidance of a long line of distinguished men who have served as governor during the past 50 years.

I have had the opportunity of serving the State in the administration of our last four Governors—Ehringhaus, Hoey, Broughton, and Cherry. I cherish the opportunity to carry on the high tradition of public service established by my predecessors. I know that you ladies and gentlemen of this general assembly also succeed a long line of patriotic citizens who have served the State faithfully as members of the legislatures which have been the authors of the State's charter of progress. The record of our predecessors is a challenge to us to work shoulder to shoulder in the interest of all our people.

Let's go forward.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, on the first legislative day following the receipt of the budget, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative business of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one a speech delivered by Assistant Secretary of the Navy Brown and in the other an address delivered by General Kenney.

Mr. JACOBS (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LEMKE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Norbert O'Leary which appeared in the Daily Telegram of Garden City, Kans.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a very fine article appearing in the Boston Herald of November 28 with regard to our distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. BLOOM].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of correcting an honest but erroneous impression that many newspapers, and particularly editorial writers, throughout the country seem to have, and that even some of our own Members did have, with regard to the meaning and effect of the amendment liberalizing the rules that the House adopted last Monday.

I have read a number of editorials, and all that I have read are favorable to this change in the rules, but most of them indicate that they feel the Speaker has the power to recognize or not to recognize when the chairman of a committee, on the day on which it is in order to call up motions to discharge committees, rises to call up a rule that has been in the Committee on Rules for 21 days or more or that has been reported adversely by that committee. That is an honest but incorrect impression.

The amendment liberalizing the rules makes it mandatory that the Speaker recognize the chairman of a committee under such circumstances. The language of the amendment is, "and the Speaker shall recognize the Member seeking recognition for that purpose as a question of the highest privilege."

Therefore, recognition under these circumstances is not a question of discretion with the Speaker.

May I say that the Speaker and I did not consider that proposition even for a minute. We would not consider that as a liberalizing amendment.

The two plans under consideration were the Eberharter plan and the proposal that a smaller number of signatures be required on a motion to discharge the Committee on Rules from further consideration of a rule providing for the consideration of a public bill reported out of a committee.

But the agreement was to recognize the chairman of a committee. Where there has been a noncompliance by the Committee on Rules with the rule as amended, the chairman of the committee, as a matter of right, can rise and be recognized. My purpose now is to correct that honest but erroneous impression.

The newspapers of the country and the editorial writers and others who are interested will know that this is really an effective liberalizing amendment.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, I yield to my friend.

Mr. HALLECK. In order to add to the clarification of the situation, would it be in order to say that under this new arrangement any measure that is reported out by a legislative committee and which then goes to the Committee on Rules may be called up on the floor of the House even against the majority sentiment of the Committee on Rules or the sentiment of the leadership itself?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the gentleman is referring to any public measure.

Mr. HALLECK. Yes; I am referring to any public measure.

Mr. McCORMACK. In reply to the gentleman's statement, the answer is "Yes." The rule applies both ways. The rule applies to a situation where any public bill has been reported out of the standing committee and a rule has been applied for and the Committee on Rules fails to act within 21 days or should report adversely, which, of course, is a rare occurrence, but that language had to be included in order to cover that possibility. Then on any discharge petition day the chairman of a standing committee could rise and call that rule up just as any member of the Committee on Rules can now do after a rule has been reported out for more than 7 days. That is part of the rules, and we are simply

extending the same privilege or, rather, the same right—not a privilege—to the chairman of a standing committee where the Committee on Rules fails to act in 21 days, just as any member of the Committee on Rules now has that right when a rule is reported out and has not been programed for the consideration of the House by the majority leader within 7 days.

Of course, as my friend knows, in practical operation the chairman of a committee would come to me as majority leader and ask me to program it, just as members of the Committee on Rules would come to me if they desired that a bill should be called up after the expiration of 7 days. I am sure that Members have come to my distinguished friend during the time that he was majority leader, in similar situations. I am sure they would come to the leadership to see about programing any proposed legislation before exercising the high privilege that is now theirs under the rules as amended.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I sincerely hope for the sake of the Treasury of the United States, in view of the wish expressed by the President of the United States that we achieve a balanced budget and have a surplus to pay on the national debt, that the prophecy of the gentleman from Massachusetts as to what will transpire will prove to be correct, because under the gentleman's explanation as to the effect of this rule the legislative committee is in complete control of the situation and may bring any measure to the floor of the House without regard to the wishes of the leadership or of the Committee on Rules. As a matter of fact, committees often direct and require their chairman to press for passage of bills he does not favor personally. May I say further to the gentleman that in my service in the House of Representatives under the leadership of the able gentleman from Massachusetts and preceding leaders of Democratic Congresses, and at one time in my capacity as leader of the majority in the House, I know that bills aggregating billions and billions of dollars which would have completely bankrupted the country have not come to the floor of the House because it was decided by the responsible leaders that they should not come to the floor for consideration. I realize the great wish of so many people to liberalize the rules of the House and to bring everything to the floor of the House. But the gentleman knows as well as I do that many of those very bills will get practically a unanimous vote if they come to the floor.

May I say again, hoping that we do not run headlong into bankruptcy, that the gentleman and his colleagues in the leadership will be able to control the situation indirectly, having completely destroyed the power of the Rules Committee in respect to bills coming to the floor.

Mr. McCORMACK. My friend the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has been proceeding upon and reacting to fear for 16 years. It is very evident that the gentleman is still proceeding upon fear. This is a rule effectively liberalizing the rules of the House, and I compliment the 49 Republicans who joined with the Democrats in that action. I was very sorry to see the Republican leadership make a test of this on the first day. They have to take the responsibility for the test on liberalizing the rule, where we will be able to carry out the will of the House and not be frustrated by six men who may be assigned to the Rules Committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 10, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

34. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the Annual Report of the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, covering operations for the fiscal year 1948; to the Committee on Agriculture.

35. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting for the consideration of the Congress, a repeal of a proviso contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Act for 1949 (H. Doc. No. 25); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

36. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of the Comptroller General of the United States on the results of a study of restrictions on the expenditure of appropriated funds; to the Committee on Appropriations.

37. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the presentation by the United States of a statue of Gen. George Washington to the people of Uruguay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

38. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Fourteenth Annual Report of the Federal Communications Commission, for the fiscal year 1948; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

39. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 8, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on the Monongahela River and West Fork River, W. Va., with a view to providing navigation improvements from lock and dam No. 15 on the Monongahela River to Clarksburg on the West Fork River, authorized by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on February 28, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

40. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 11, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Fishing Creek, Cumberland County, N. J., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

41. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 10, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Charlotte Harbor, Fla., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on March 21, 1945; to the Committe on Public Works.

42. A letter from the Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, transmitting the Thirty-second Annual Report of the United States Tariff Commission, in compliance with the provisions of section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 1140. A bill to protect and conserve the salmon fisheries of Alaska; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 1141. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Rehoboth-Assateague National Seashore in the States of Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 1142. A bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GOLDEN:

H. R. 1143. A bill to repeal the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, commonly known as the Taft-Hartley law, and which is Public Law 101, Eightieth Congress, chapter 120, first session; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1144. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H. R. 1145. A bill to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the Eighty-third and Final National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, to be held in Indianapolis, Ind., August 28 to September 1, 1949; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 1146. A bill to exempt certain fraternal societies operating under the lodge system from the tax imposed on billiard and pool tables; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 1147. A bill providing for the incorporation of the United American Veterans and Auxiliary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 1148. A bill to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 1149. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Vinton, La., a post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 1150. A bill to restore cash allowances to retired enlisted persons of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, in lieu of allowances in kind heretofore authorized under the provisions of the act of 1885 establishing military retirement; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1151. A bill to amend the act establishing grades of certain retired noncommissioned officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1152. A bill to provide retirement and retired pay for enlisted men of the Army at the highest grade they held in World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H. R. 1153. A bill to amend the National Motor Vehicle Theft Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 1154. A bill to provide authorization for additional funds for the extension and improvement of post-office facilities at Los Angeles, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 1155. A bill to amend section 77 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to create a Swainsboro division in the southern district of Georgia, with terms of the court to be held at Swainsboro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1156. A bill for the relief of Evans County, Ga.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 1157. A bill to amend paragraph VIII of the Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended by Public Law 439, Seventy-eighth Congress, which defines line of duty and misconduct for pension and compensation purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REGAN:

H. R. 1158. A bill to provide for the conveyance by the United States to the city of Marfa, Tex., of certain lands formerly owned by that city; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. R. 1159. A bill relating to the disposition of war housing acquired or constructed by the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 1160. A bill to provide national defense buildings for the Reserve components of the National Military Establishment of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 1161. A bill to provide for the conversion of national banking associations into and their merger or consolidation with State banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WALSH:

H. R. 1162. A bill to authorize the establishment of an additional coinage mint of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JACKSON of California:

H. J. Res. 75. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES:

H. J. Res. 76. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the organization of the Veterans of Foreign Wars; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DAVENPORT:

H. Res. 36. Resolution to abolish the Un-American Activities Committee; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. Res. 37. Resolution to amend rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives with respect to committee reports on bills and joint resolutions authorizing new programs of grants-in-aid; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 38. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 754, Seventy-ninth Congress, entitled "Communism in Action"; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 1163. A bill for the relief of Paul D. Wells; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COX:

H. R. 1164. A bill for the relief of the estate of H. M. McCorvey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 1165. A bill for the relief of Arnett Wells Leslie, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1166. A bill for the relief of W. A. Chisholm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1167. A bill for the relief of W. A. Chisholm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIND:

H. R. 1168. A bill for the relief of Walter H. Boring; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 1169. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marion T. Schwartz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

H. R. 1170. A bill for the relief of Mrs. John Kaudy (formerly Stella Cappler); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 1171. A bill for the relief of the Reese & Argust Wrecking Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1172. A bill for the relief of Jack W. Darby; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1173. A bill for the relief of Florence Bryant Peters and E. B. Peters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWE:

H. R. 1174. A bill for the relief of Harold H. Naylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1175. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Corrina Arena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 1176. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Leroy Hann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 10, 1949

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, since we cannot always do what we like, grant that we may like what we must do, knowing that truth will one day be vindicated and right in the end must prevail.

Bless thy servants this day and keep them all in Thy peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 6, 1949, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before the business of the morning hour is begun, I understand that the minority are ready with the report of their assignments to committees, and, inasmuch as it is privileged, I ask that this routine matter be immediately attended to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I may say to the majority leader that the minority are ready to present their committee assignments, and I am perfectly agreeable that they be taken up at this time.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest that the lists be sent to the desk and read by the clerk.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I send to the desk the minority list of committee assignments, and join in the request of the majority leader.

Mr. BARKLEY. I present the list of the majority committee assignments, which I send to the desk, and ask that both lists be read according to the alphabetical order of the committees, and that both majority and minority members be assigned as set forth in the lists.

Mr. WHERRY. In behalf of the minority I have already sent to the desk the minority list of committee assignments, and I join the majority leader in the request he has made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk will read the lists.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On Agriculture and Forestry: Elmer Thomas, of Oklahoma, chairman; Allen J. Ellender, of Louisiana; Scott W. Lucas, of Illinois; Clyde R. Hoey, of North Carolina; Olin D. Johnston, of South Carolina; Spessard L. Holland, of Florida; Guy M. Gillette, of Iowa; Clinton P. Anderson, of New Mexico; George D. Aiken, of Vermont; Milton R. Young, of North Dakota; Edward J. Thye, of Minnesota; James P. Kem, of Missouri; Bourke B. Hickenlooper, of Iowa.

On Appropriations: Kenneth McKellar, of Tennessee, chairman; Carl Hayden, of Arizona; Elmer Thomas, of Oklahoma; Richard B. Russell, of Georgia; Pat McCarran, of Nevada; Joseph C. O'Mahoney, of Wyoming; Dennis Chavez, of New Mexico; Burnet R. Maybank, of South Carolina; Allen J. Ellender, of Louisiana; Lister Hill, of Alabama; Harley M. Kilgore, of West Virginia; John L. McClellan, of Arkansas; A. Willis Robertson, of Virginia; Styles Bridges, of New Hampshire; Chan Gurney, of South Dakota; Clyde M. Reed, of Kansas; Homer Ferguson, of Michigan; Kenneth S. Wherry, of Nebraska; Guy Cordon, of Oregon; Leverett Saltonstall, of Massachusetts; Milton R. Young, of North Dakota.

On Armed Services: Millard E. Tydings, of Maryland, chairman; Richard B. Russell, of Georgia; Harry Flood Byrd, of Virginia; Virgil Chapman, of Kentucky; Lyndon B. Johnson, of Texas; Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee; Lester C. Hunt, of Wyoming; Styles Bridges, of New Hampshire; Chan Gurney, of South Dakota;

Leverett Saltonstall, of Massachusetts; Wayne Morse, of Oregon; Raymond E. Baldwin, of Connecticut; William F. Knowland, of California.

On Banking and Currency: Burnet R. Maybank, of South Carolina, chairman; Robert F. Wagner, of New York; Glen H. Taylor, of Idaho; J. W. Fulbright, of Arkansas; A. Willis Robertson, of Virginia; John Sparkman, of Alabama; J. Allen Frear, Jr., of Delaware; Paul H. Douglas, of Illinois; Charles W. Tobey, of New Hampshire; Homer E. Capehart, of Indiana; Ralph E. Flanders, of Vermont; Harry P. Cain, of Washington; John W. Bricker, of Ohio.

On the District of Columbia: J. Howard McGrath, of Rhode Island, chairman; Olin D. Johnston, of South Carolina; Matthew M. Neely, of West Virginia; Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee; Lester C. Hunt, of Wyoming; J. Allen Frear, Jr., of Delaware; Bert H. Miller, of Idaho; John J. Williams, of Delaware; Joseph R. McCarthy, of Wisconsin; Karl E. Mundt, of South Dakota; Margaret Chase Smith, of Maine; Andrew F. Schoeppel, of Kansas; Robert C. Hendrickson, of New Jersey.

On Expenditures in the Executive Departments: John L. McClellan, of Arkansas, chairman; James O. Eastland, of Mississippi; Clyde R. Hoey, of North Carolina; Glen H. Taylor, of Idaho; Herbert R. O'Conor, of Maryland; Russell B. Long, of Louisiana; Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota; Joseph R. McCarthy, of Wisconsin; Irving M. Ives, of New York; Karl E. Mundt, of South Dakota; Margaret Chase Smith, of Maine; Andrew F. Schoeppel, of Kansas; Arthur H. Vandenberg, of Michigan.

On Finance: Walter F. George, of Georgia, chairman; Tom Connally, of Texas; Harry Flood Byrd, of Virginia; Edwin C. Johnson, of Colorado; Scott W. Lucas, of Illinois; Clyde R. Hoey, of North Carolina; J. Howard McGrath, of Rhode Island; Eugene D. Millikin, of Colorado; Robert A. Taft, of Ohio; Hugh Butler, of Nebraska; Owen Brewster, of Maine; Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania; John J. Williams, of Delaware.

On Foreign Relations: Tom Connally, of Texas, chairman; Walter F. George, of Georgia; Elbert D. Thomas, of Utah; Millard E. Tydings, of Maryland; Claude Pepper, of Florida; Theodore Francis Green, of Rhode Island; Brien McMahon, of Connecticut; J. W. Fulbright, of Arkansas; Arthur H. Vandenberg, of Michigan; Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin; H. Alexander Smith, of New Jersey; Bourke B. Hickenlooper, of Iowa; Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., of Massachusetts.

On Interior and Insular Affairs: Joseph C. O'Mahoney, of Wyoming, chairman; James E. Murray, of Montana; Sheridan Downey, of California; Ernest W. McFarland, of Arizona; Clinton P. Anderson, of New Mexico; Bert H. Miller, of Idaho; Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma; Hugh Butler, of Nebraska; Eugene D. Millikin, of Colorado; Guy Cordon, of Oregon; Zales N. Ecton, of Montana; George W. Malone, of Nevada; Arthur V. Watkins, of Utah.

On Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Edwin C. Johnson, of Colorado, chairman; Ernest W. McFarland, of Arizona; Warren G. Magnuson, of Washington; Francis J. Myers, of Pennsylvania; Brien McMahon, of Connecticut; Herbert R. O'Conor, of Maryland; Lyndon B. Johnson, of Texas; Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee; Charles W. Tobey, of New Hampshire; Clyde M. Reed, of Kansas; Owen Brewster, of Maine; Homer E. Capehart, of Indiana; John W. Bricker, of Ohio.

On the Judiciary: Pat McCarran, of Nevada, chairman; Harley M. Kilgore, of West Virginia; James O. Eastland, of Mississippi; Warren G. Magnuson, of Washington; J. Howard McGrath, of Rhode Island; Robert F. Wagner, of New York; J. Melville Broughton, of North Carolina; Bert H. Miller, of Idaho; Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin; William Langer, of North Dakota; Homer Ferguson, of Michigan; Forrest C. Donnell, of Missouri; William E. Jenner, of Indiana.

On Labor and Public Welfare: Elbert D. Thomas, of Utah, chairman; James E. Murray, of Montana; Claude Pepper, of Florida; Lister Hill, of Alabama; Matthew M. Neely, of West Virginia; Paul H. Douglas, of Illinois; Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota; Robert A. Taft, of Ohio; George D. Aiken, of Vermont; H. Alexander Smith, of New Jersey; Wayne Morse, of Oregon; Forrest C. Donnell, of Missouri.

On Post Office and Civil Service: Olin D. Johnston, of South Carolina, chairman; Kenneth McKellar, of Tennessee; Herbert R. O'Conor, of Maryland; J. Melville Broughton, of North Carolina; Russell B. Long, of Louisiana; Matthew M. Neely, of West Virginia; J. Allen Frear, Jr., of Delaware; William Langer, of North Dakota; Ralph E. Flanders, of Vermont; Raymond E. Baldwin, of Connecticut; Edward J. Thye, of Minnesota; Zales N. Ecton, of Montana; Robert C. Hendrickson, of New Jersey.

On Public Works: Dennis Chavez, of New Mexico, chairman; Sheridan Downey, of California; John L. McClellan, of Arkansas; Spessard L. Holland, of Florida; John Sparkman, of Alabama; John C. Stennis, of Mississippi; Virgil Chapman, of Kentucky; Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma; Harry P. Cain, of Washington; Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania; Arthur V. Watkins, of Utah; George W. Malone, of Nevada; James P. Kem, of Missouri.

On Rules and Administration: Carl Hayden, of Arizona, chairman; Theodore Francis Green, of Rhode Island; Francis J. Myers, of Pennsylvania; John C. Stennis, of Mississippi; Russell B. Long, of Louisiana; Guy M. Gillette, of Iowa; Lester C. Hunt, of Wyoming; Kenneth S. Wherry, of Nebraska; William F. Knowland, of California; Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., of Massachusetts; William E. Jenner, of Indiana; Irving M. Ives, of New York.

Mr. BARKLEY. The reading of the lists having been completed I move that the names and assignments as read by the clerk be approved by the Senate as constituting the members of the various committees referred to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the committee assignments as read by the clerk will be approved. Is there objection?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may I ask unanimous consent to say a few words on the subject of the method of establishing committees?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, my attention was diverted. May I inquire what the Senator from Ohio asked.

Mr. TAFT. I have in mind the matter about which I just spoke to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senate will have a morning hour now, after which the Senator can make his statement.

Mr. TAFT. I thought the statement would be appropriate in connection with the actual assignment of committees. I will wait, however, until the morning hour is concluded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the committee assignments as read are agreed to.

ASCERTAINMENT OF THE ELECTORAL VOTE

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I desire to make a report on behalf of the Senators appointed on the part of the Senate on the result of the election of the President and Vice President of the United States, which I understand is privileged.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island may proceed.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the tellers appointed on the part of the Senate, in pursuance of House Concurrent Resolution 2, to ascertain the result of the election for President and Vice President of the United States, I beg leave to report that the two Houses met in joint session on last January 6, that thereupon the certificates of electors of the several States of their votes for those offices were opened by the President pro tempore of the Senate and delivered to the tellers, and on being examined it appeared that the votes of the several States had been cast in accordance with the list as submitted to the two Houses in joint session, a copy of which I submit herewith.

That from those votes it appeared that the whole number of electors appointed to vote for President and Vice President of the United States for the term of office beginning on the 20th day of January 1949, was 531, of which a majority was 266.

The state of the vote for President of the United States appeared to be:

For Harry S. Truman, of the State of Missouri, 303.

For Thomas E. Dewey, of the State of New York, 189.

For J. Strom Thurmond, of the State of South Carolina, 39.

The state of the vote for Vice President of the United States appeared to be:

For Alben W. Barkley, of the State of Kentucky, 303.

For Earl Warren, of the State of California, 189.

For Fielding L. Wright, of the State of Mississippi, 39.

Which result, having been ascertained and counted by the tellers, was delivered by them to the President pro tempore of the Senate;

Whereupon,

The President pro tempore announced the state of the vote to be that Harry S. Truman, of the State of Missouri, had received 303 electoral votes; that Thomas E. Dewey, of the State of New York, had received 189 electoral votes, and J. Strom Thurmond, of the State of South Carolina, had received 39 electoral votes for the office of President of the United States; and that Alben W. Barkley, of the State of Kentucky, had received 303 electoral votes; that Earl Warren, of the State of California, had received 189 electoral votes, and that Fielding L. Wright, of the State of Mississippi, had received 39 electoral votes for the office of Vice President of the United States.

The list referred to, as submitted by Mr. GREEN, is as follows:

The undersigned, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN and KENNETH S. WHERRY, tellers on the part of the Senate, MARY T. NORTON and LOUIS E. GRAHAM, tellers on the part of the House of Representatives, report the following as the result of the ascertainment and counting of the electoral vote for President and

Vice President of the United States for the term beginning on the 20th day of January 1949.

Electoral votes of each State	States	For President: Harry S. Truman, of Missouri	For President: Thomas E. Dewey, of New York	For President: J. Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina	For Vice President: Alben W. Barkley, of Kentucky	For Vice President: Earl Warren, of California	For Vice President: Fielding L. Wright, of Mississippi
11	Alabama			11			11
4	Arizona	4			4		
9	Arkansas	9			9		
25	California	25			25		
6	Colorado	6			6		
8	Connecticut		8			8	
3	Delaware		3			3	
8	Florida	8			8		
12	Georgia	12			12		
4	Idaho	4			4		
28	Illinois	28			28		
13	Indiana		13			13	
10	Iowa	10			10		
8	Kansas		8			8	
11	Kentucky	11			11		
10	Louisiana			10			10
5	Maine		5			5	
8	Maryland		8			8	
16	Massachusetts	16			16		
19	Michigan		19			19	
11	Minnesota	11			11		
9	Mississippi			9			9
15	Missouri	15			15		
4	Montana	4			4		
6	Nebraska		6			6	
3	Nevada	3			3		
4	New Hampshire		4			4	
16	New Jersey		16			16	
4	New Mexico	4			4		
47	New York		47			47	
14	North Carolina	14			14		
4	North Dakota		4			4	
25	Ohio	25			25		
10	Oklahoma	10			10		
6	Oregon		6			6	
35	Pennsylvania		35			35	
4	Rhode Island	4			4		
8	South Carolina			8			8
4	South Dakota		4			4	
12	Tennessee	11		1	11		1
23	Texas	23			23		
4	Utah	4			4		
3	Vermont		3			3	
11	Virginia	11			11		
8	Washington	8			8		
8	West Virginia	8			8		
12	Wisconsin	12			12		
3	Wyoming	3			3		
531	Total	303	189	39	303	189	39

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Tellers on the Part of the Senate.

MARY T. NORTON,
LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
Tellers on the Part of the House of Representatives.

The state of the vote for President of the United States, as delivered to the President pro tempore of the Senate, is as follows:

The whole number of electors appointed to vote for President of the United States is 531, of which a majority is 266.

Harry S. Truman, of the State of Missouri, has received for President of the United States 303 votes.

Thomas E. Dewey, of the State of New York, has received 189 votes.

J. Strom Thurmond, of the State of South Carolina, has received 39 votes.

The state of the vote for Vice President of the United States, as delivered to the President pro tempore of the Senate, is as follows:

The whole number of electors appointed to vote for Vice President of the United States is 531, of which a majority is 266.

Alben W. Barkley, of the State of Kentucky, has received for Vice President of the United States 303 votes.

Earl Warren, of the State of California, has received 189 votes.

Fielding L. Wright, of the State of Mississippi, has received 39 votes.

This announcement of the state of the vote by the President pro tempore of the Senate shall be deemed a sufficient declaration of the persons elected President and Vice President of the United States, each for the term beginning on the 20th day of January 1949, and shall be entered, together with a list of the votes, on the Journals of the Senate and House of Representatives.

ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 36)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C., January 7, 1949.

The honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,

The honorable the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIRS: I am presenting herewith my Economic Report to the Congress, as required under the Employment Act of 1946.

In preparing this report, I have had the advice and assistance of the Council of Economic Advisers, members of the Cabinet, and heads of independent agencies.

Together with this report, I am transmitting a report, the Annual Economic Review: January 1949, prepared for me by the Council of Economic Advisers in accordance with section 4 (c) (2) of the Employment Act of 1946.

Respectfully,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

INCREASE IN COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN HEADS IN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

A communication from the President of the United States, requesting prompt action to increase the compensation of the heads and assistant heads of the executive departments and of other Government officers of comparable rank; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRESENTATION OF STATUE OF GEORGE WASHINGTON TO URUGUAY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the presentation by the United States of a statue of Gen. George Washington to the people of Uruguay, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON CERTAIN REFUNDS OF INTERNAL REVENUE

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing refunds of internal revenue in excess of $500 made by the Bureau of Internal Revenue during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORT OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, for the fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN FIELD STATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the transfer of certain agricultural dry land and irrigation field stations to the States in which such stations are located, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Agricultural Extension Service, fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

JOHN I. MALARIN

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of John I. Malarin, former Army mail clerk at APO 932, a branch of the San Francisco, Calif., post office, relative to a shortage in his fixed credit account (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON SPECIAL ASSISTANTS EMPLOYED BY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the special assistants employed by the Department of Justice, for the period July 1 to December 31, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

FLIGHT PAY OF CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE AIR FORCE

A letter from the Secretary of the Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the number of officers above the rank of major receiving flight pay and the average monthly payments made to such officers during the period April 1 to October 1, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF STUDY OF RESTRICTIONS ON EXPENDITURE OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report as to the cost of complying with restrictions placed in general appropriation acts, with such recommendations as deemed necessary or desirable (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT OF FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Commission for the fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Commission for the year 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

PERMISSION TO CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE TO RECEIVE FOREIGN DECORATIONS

Two letters from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation granting permission to Hildrus A. Poindexter, senior surgeon (Reserve), and Mary L. Mills, senior assistant nurse officer, of the Public Health Service, to accept the diplomas and wear the insignia of certain decorations bestowed upon them by Liberia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON EXPENDITURES BY UNITED STATES COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on expenditures of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORT OF FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

A letter from the Director, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Service for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

RESOLUTIONS IN TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR OVERTON AND THE LATE SENATOR BILBO

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD resolutions adopted by the Democratic conference as tributes to the memories of Hon. John H. Overton, late a Senator from the State of Louisiana; and Hon. Theodore G. Bilbo, late a Senator from the State of Mississippi.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN H. OVERTON

Whereas almighty God in His infinite wisdom has taken from us our colleague, the Honorable John H. Overton, late a Senator from the State of Louisiana; and

Whereas throughout his long career in the United States Senate he rendered to our Nation and to his State a most distinguished service; and

Whereas as our trusted friend and close associate, he was ever ready to lend his judgment and his efforts in behalf of the Democratic Party: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, his Democratic colleagues in the United States Senate, express our deep sense of loss at his passing; and

Further, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the family of the deceased, that they may be assured of our deep respect for the late Senator and of our condolences upon the passing of our friend.

Adopted by the Democratic conference, this 31st day of December 1948.

THEODORE G. BILBO

Whereas almighty God in His infinite wisdom has taken from us our colleague, the Honorable Theodore G. Bilbo, late a Senator from the State of Mississippi; and

Whereas throughout his long career in the United States Senate he rendered to our Nation and to his State a most distinguished service; and

Whereas as our trusted friend and close associate, he was ever ready to lend his judgment and his efforts in behalf of the Democratic Party: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, his Democratic colleagues in the United States Senate, express our deep sense of loss at his passing; and

Further, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the family of the deceased, that they may be assured of our deep respect for the late Senator and of our condolences upon the passing of our friend.

Adopted by the Democratic conference, this 31st day of December 1948.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE CENTRAL NEBRASKA BEET GROWERS ASSOCIATION RELATING TO ACREAGE OF SUGAR BEETS, ETC.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference resolutions adopted at a recent meeting of the Central Nebraska Beet Growers' Association, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE CENTRAL NEBRASKA BEET GROWERS' ASSOCIATION, DECEMBER 7, 1948

Resolution 1

Whereas a reasonable acreage of sugar beets is essential to a proper rotation program in the central Nebraska area; and

Whereas an early agreement upon contract terms would aid in promoting a large acreage of sugar beets: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the board of directors be directed to request the officials of the American Crystal Sugar Co. to give consideration to the 1949 marketing contract immediately after the results of the cost survey being conducted by the Sugar Section of the Department of Agriculture are made available.

Resolution 2

Be it resolved upon condition that a fair and equitable marketing contract for 1949 is agreed upon between the American Crystal Sugar Co. and the directors of this association that the board of directors be instructed to offer to the factory officials all facilities of the association to assist in securing a normal acreage of sugar beets and a representative number of growers in all parts of the factory district.

Resolution 3

Be it resolved, That the Central Nebraska Beet Growers' Association express its appreciation to the American Crystal Sugar Co. for its cooperation in the collection of association dues and in permitting the use of its facilities by the association chemist.

Resolution 4

Whereas many prospective sugar-beet growers are hesitant about contracting beet acreage until a determination of labor rates has been made: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Central Nebraska Beet Growers' Association urge the Department of Agriculture to make an early determination and release the findings on labor rates by January 1, 1949.

Resolution 5

Whereas both the growers of sugar beets and the sugar processors are at a disadvantage in negotiating a marketing contract without full information as to production costs and consumptive estimate for the ensuing year: Be it therefore

Resolved by the Central Nebraska Beet Growers' Association, That we request the Department of Agriculture to make public not later than January 1, 1949, the 1949 consumptive estimate and the results of the cost survey which has been carried on by the Sugar Section of the Department of Agriculture.

Resolution 6

Be it resolved by the Central Nebraska Beet Growers' Association, That the board of directors be instructed to request closer cooperation between the factory officials and the association in regard to the recruitment and employment and compensation of free labor.

Resolution 7

Be it resolved, That the American Crystal Sugar Co. be requested to make available to the members of the association all pertinent data obtained from the operation of their fertilizer and seed experimentation plots in this area, and we express our commendation of the factory for carrying on these experiments in the central Nebraska area.

Resolution 8

Be it resolved, That the Central Nebraska Beet Growers' Association again request from the American Crystal Sugar Co. that individual soil analysis be provided for the growers as a guide in selecting proper fertilizer.

Resolution 9

Be it resolved by the Central Nebraska Beet Growers' Association, That the factory officials be requested to establish closer cooperation with the growers on harvesting methods and conditions.

Resolution 10

Be it resolved, That the Central Nebraska Beet Growers' Association express its appreciation to the National Beet Growers' Federation for its services in behalf of the beet growers in matters of Federal legislation, and that the directors of this association be instructed to continue the affiliation of the association with the National Beet Growers' Federation during the ensuing year.

Resolution 11

Whereas the available supply of free Mexican labor will not be adequate for the care and harvesting of the 1949 sugar-beet crops: Be it therefore

Resolved by the Central Nebraska Beet Growers' Association, That we urge the Department of Agriculture to attempt to make Mexican national labor available for the 1949 season.

Resolution 12

Whereas our Nebraska Senators and Congressmen rendered invaluable service to the sugar-beet growers in the adoption of sugar legislation in the past session of Congress: Be it therefore

Resolved by the Central Nebraska Beet Growers' Association, That we express our sincere appreciation to our Nebraska Senators and Congressmen for their fine support of the sugar-beet growers in matters of national legislation.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY NORTH DAKOTA FARM BUREAU RELATING TO SOIL CONSERVATION, ETC.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference resolutions which were adopted at the sixth annual convention of the North Dakota Farm Bureau. The resolutions deal specifically with soil conservation, submarginal land soil conservation, irrigation, consolidation of Government farm service agencies, sugar commodity storage, the parity program, research, the wheat agreement, surplus versus reserves, farm credit, rural electrification, and roads and highways. I do not request that the remaining resolutions, which deal with State problems, be included. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOIL CONSERVATION

Be it resolved: Realizing that the welfare of the people of North Dakota is dependent upon the soil and its productivity, and that soil conservation and prevention of soil erosion is of the utmost importance and that in recent years there have been instances of soil sacrifice in efforts to meet the demand for farm products, the North Dakota Farm Bureau recommends an accelerated soil-conservation program through the extension service of the North Dakota Agricultural College, by cooperation with other State and Federal agencies interested in soil conservation, by the encouragement of good farming practices and by a soil-conservation educational program among the people of our State.

SUBMARGINAL LAND SOIL CONSERVATION

Be it resolved, That the North Dakota Farm Bureau favors an extensive soil-conservation program designed particularly for submarginal land in North Dakota.

IRRIGATION

Be it resolved, That inasmuch as the growing season in North Dakota is shorter than in more southern areas in the United States and is a one-season program, and inasmuch as the crops suitable to our climate and soil require larger acreages to be a profitable enterprise than crops such as fruits, which are grown in more southern or western areas, it is urged that the American Farm Bureau Federation support a plan on irrigation for North Dakota which will permit irrigation tracts of sufficient size to be a profitable enterprise, and to make a good economic unit.

CONSOLIDATION OF GOVERNMENT FARM SERVICE AGENCIES

Be it resolved, in the interests of rendering the best service to the farmers of North Dakota, it is recommended that the Soil Conservation Service and Production Marketing Administration be consolidated into one governmental agency.

SUGAR

Whereas under existing law the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States sets a consumptive estimate on sugar consumption within the United States upon which import quantities are determined causing an effect upon market prices for sugar: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the Secretary of Agriculture be urged to set said consumptive estimate, consistent with the facts so that the prices paid for the raising of sugar crops and the profits therefrom, compare favorably with the prices and profits paid for the raising of other farm crops; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Charles Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

COMMODITY STORAGE

Be it resolved: 1. That the farmers of North Dakota be encouraged to use existing storage facilities and to provide additional storage facilities for the storing of grain on farms as a sound business and farming practice and as a stabilizing factor on grain markets;

2. That legislation be enacted enabling and empowering the Commodity Credit Corporation to maintain sufficient storage facilities to protect their own operations and maintain a reserve of farm products to meet national emergencies; be it further

Resolved: 1. That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Fred G. Aandahl, Governor of the State of North Dakota, the Honorable Charles Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture, and to the congressional delegation from North Dakota at Washington, D. C.

PARITY PROGRAM

Be it resolved: That the North Dakota Farm Bureau go on record favoring continuance of parity for agriculture and that we instruct our Representatives and Senators in Congress to work for the continuance of the AIKEN or long-range agricultural program of 1948 to fully protect agriculture.

RESEARCH

Be it resolved: We urge that the American Farm Bureau Federation exercise vigilance as to the progress made in the administration of the Research and Marketing Act in order that the funds appropriated may be expended wisely and to the best interests of agriculture. We believe that research should be made on major items rather than on minor items and that studies should be made for the development of new outlets for agricultural productions. We further recommend that the North Dakota Farm Bureau set up an appropriate committee to study the matter of finding new uses for small grains and for products derived therefrom and to determine what plan might be feasible for the North Dakota Farm Bureau to adopt further such research. It is further recommended that as a matter of policy, the producer should assist in bearing the cost of research in the development of new market outlets for the products which he produces.

WHEAT AGREEMENT

Be it resolved, That the North Dakota Farm Bureau recommends a thorough study of the International Wheat Agreement be made on both county and State levels so that the public may be more conversant with this matter when and if it should again come before our Congress.

SURPLUS VERSUS RESERVES

The Government of the United States has justly and properly assumed world leadership. Billions have been invested in military personnel together with the most powerful Navy, Air Force, etc., in the world.

The fruits of these huge investments are not labeled "surpluses," but are properly termed instruments of defense.

While this building program is being carried on this Nation's producers of foodstuff are engaged in producing the most bounteous harvests on record, which are so essential at this time in building and keeping the peace of the world.

While the American farmer appreciates the cooperation on the part of our Government in its efforts to support farm prices, these very necessary supports are distasteful to the American consumer at this time of inflated values. They feel that the Government, while trying to control inflation on the one hand, is on the other hand, by supporting farm commodity prices, in the face of commodity surpluses, unnecessarily holding prices up.

The heroic efforts on the part of the American farmer promise to build immense reserves, which we fear may lower farm commodity prices, reduce the farmers' buying power, and destroy that economic balance upon which our country's prosperity depends.

America's economy is faced with the possibility of commodity surpluses on the one hand and consumer resistance on the other hand, which conditions could result in monetary loss to our Government in its program to support commodity prices at reasonable levels.

We feel that our Government should regard food as an instrument for defense just as much as our Army, Navy, and Air Force, and it should acquire a great store of farm commodities while such commodities are available and hold it for use in national emergencies.

Such action on the part of our Government would not only remove possible future commodity surpluses and accompanying consumer resistance resulting in Government loss, but would create another powerful arm in our national defense program.

Such action on the part of our Government would also serve the double purpose of removing the pressure of commodity surpluses from our price supports and would also act as a guaranty against food shortage in case of war or crop shortages in future years.

It would also have a stabilizing effect on commodity markets which in turn would reflect stability to our consumer markets: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Government be requested to acquire and hold a large reserve of farm commodities to be used only in case of national emergencies.

FARM CREDIT

Be it resolved, That inasmuch as there are no adequate credit facilities available in the State of North Dakota for the purchase of farms and to enable persons to begin farming operations, and inasmuch as the Federal land bank makes loans in other States; and inasmuch as such loans are based primarily on the security interest in such land, the North Dakota Farm Bureau urges that the Federal land bank resume making North Dakota farm loans under existing North Dakota laws; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of Agriculture at Washington, D. C.; to the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration at Washington, D. C.; and to the Honorable Fred G. Aandahl, Governor of the State of North Dakota, and to the North Dakota congressional delegation at Washington, D. C.

MORE DEMOCRACY

Whereas the selection of the PMA State committeemen is not democratic; be it

Resolved, That the people of our State be allowed to select their own. We would recommend that one be elected from each judicial district by the members of each district.

REA

Be it resolved, The North Dakota Farm Bureau reaffirms the stand that it has previously taken that it is solidly in favor of the extension of REA electric service within North Dakota. As of this time, REA electric service has been extended to only a small fraction of the farms in North Dakota. It is, therefore, urged that Congress and all governmental agencies make available the funds necessary and expedite the extension of REA electric service so as to make electrical service available to the greatest number of farms in North Dakota at the earliest possible time; be it further

Resolved, That the American Farm Bureau make every effort to defeat any proposed legislation which would give private power companies control of the power developed at Government dams and that REA cooperatives, governmental agencies, and municipalities be given first priority on said power.

A copy of this resolution to be sent to Claude Wickard, REA Administrator, Washington, D. C., all North Dakota Congressmen, and REA officials of the State.

ROADS AND HIGHWAYS

Be it resolved:

1. That the North Dakota Farm Bureau favors the centralization of all highway location and construction, in each county, under the supervision of a county administrative engineer. Said county administrative engineer shall have the duty of supervising and cooperating with county and township officers in the location, construction, and maintenance of all roads within the county. In the cases of State or Federal roads running through said counties, such administrative engineer shall cooperate with State and Federal officials and with the administrative engineer and officials of the adjoining counties.

2. That the North Dakota Farm Bureau establish a county road committee in each county who shall have the duty to consult with the county administrative engineer, the county and township officials, and with State and Federal officials concerning road matters, and in matters involving more than one county. Said county road committee of the counties involved shall consult and work with each other and with the county engineer and county, township, State, and Federal officials involved. The manner of selection of said county committee, the number of persons thereon, and the terms of office shall be determined by the county farm bureau.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. LODGE introduced Senate bill 273, to provide for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 274. A bill for the relief of Constantin E. Aramescu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOBEY:

S. 275. A bill for the relief of Arthur C. Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 276. A bill to authorize a project for the rehabilitation of certain works of the Fort Sumner irrigation district in New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 277. A bill to enhance further the security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information concerning the cryptographic systems and the communication intelligence activities of the United States;

S. 278. A bill to prevent retroactive checkage of payments erroneously made to certain retired officers of the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes; and

S. 279. A bill to authorize the advance on the retired list of Lt. John T. McDermott, United States Navy (retired), to the grade of lieutenant commander; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 280. A bill to incorporate National Service Star Legion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 281. A bill to insure the maintenance of full employment in the United States; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 282. A bill to authorize appropriations for carrying out the provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 of the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653), as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 283. A bill to protect producers, manufacturers, distributors, and consumers from the unrevealed presence of fiber content in spun, woven, knitted, felted, or other manufactured fiber products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 284. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, part III; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. FEPPER):

S. 285. A bill to authorize the acquisition of lands for the Everglades National Park, Florida; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 286. A bill to remove the restrictions upon the acquisition, possession, and ownership of gold and to permit the sale of gold within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, including Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. NEELY:

S. 287. A bill to provide for grants to assist the States, Territories, and dependencies in the construction of elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 288. A bill to provide equal treatment to disabled enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard on parity with existing law pertaining to disabled enlisted men of the Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 289. A bill for the relief of Tania Ipolo and Lana Boulanovsky; and

S. 290. A bill for the relief of Maria Franzia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEM:

S. 291. A bill to establish a United States Air Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 292. A bill to authorize the establishment of the St. Croix Island National Monument, in the State of Maine; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 293. A bill relating to the disposition of war housing acquired or constructed by the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 294. A bill for the relief of Hernando J. Abaya, his wife, and two children;

S. 295. A bill for the relief of Adolph Musil;

S. 296. A bill for the relief of Daniel George Fischer and Ladislas (Vasile) Taub;

S. 297. A bill for the relief of Ruggiero Di-Costanzo;

S. 298. A bill for the relief of John Rowland;

S. 299. A bill for the relief of Roberto De Vasconcellos;

S. 300. A bill for the relief of Margit Sigray;

S. 301. A bill for the relief of Joseph Bernstein;

S. 302. A bill for the relief of Dr. Elias Stavropoulos, his wife, and daughter;

S. 303. A bill for the relief of Artin Djoundjian;

S. 304. A bill for the relief of Salomon Henri Laifer;

S. 305. A bill for the relief of Julio Lafitte; and

S. 306. A bill for the relief of Alfred Fuiga, his mother, Aurelia Filipescu, and the latter's nurse, Steliana Istrate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMAHON (by request):

S. 307. A bill for the relief of Engebert Axer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH:

S. 308. A bill for the relief of Kaarlo Kalle Kalervo;

S. 309. A bill for the relief of Gabe Budwee; and

S. 310. A bill limiting the operation of sections 281, 283, and 284 of title 18, United States Code, and of section 190 of the Revised Statutes, with respect to the representative of the United States of America on the United Nations Commission for Conciliation in Palestine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH (for himself and Mr. NEELY):

S. 311. A bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 312. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of George W. Norris, of Nebraska; and

S. 313. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of commemorative stamps in honor of the Diamond Jubilee of American Nursing; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUTLER (for himself and Mr. WHERRY):

S. 314. A bill authorizing the transfer of a certain tract of land in the Robinson Remount Station to the city of Crawford, Nebr., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 315. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chung Kwai Lui;

S. 316. A bill for the relief of Francisco Irilli;

S. 317. A bill for the relief of Margita Kofler;

S. 318. A bill for the relief of Ludovit Sturc, and his family, and Michael Frauwirth, and his family; and

S. 319. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to determine the amounts due to and render judgment upon the claims of the employees of the Alaska Railroad for overtime work performed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE (for himself, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. MORSE):

S. 320. A bill to assist the States in the removal of adult illiteracy by the development and maintenance of special programs of basic elementary education for adults, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HOEY:

S. 321. A bill for the relief of Lloyd D. Lyles; and

S. 322. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gertrude Westway, legal guardian for Bobbie Niles Johnson, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

S. 323. A bill to restore for a period of 1 year the special income-tax exemption previously applicable to military and naval personnel and to increase such exemption to $1,200 in the case of commissioned officers and commissioned warrant officers; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 324. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the Postal Service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(Mr. WILEY introduced Senate bill 325, to amend the income limitation governing the granting of pension to veterans and death-pension benefits to widows and children of veterans, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 326. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. McCARRAN (for himself and Mr. BREWSTER) introduced Senate bill 327, to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for the creation of a consolidated international air carrier for the United States, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 328. A bill to amend the act of July 8, 1943 (57 Stat. 388), entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust titles to lands acquired by the United States which are subject to his administration, custody, or control"; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 329. A bill to increase the number of copies of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD furnished to the Vice President and each Senator; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 330. A bill for the relief of George Gabriel Herrmann, Greta (Marketa) Herrmann (wife), and Alice Herrmann (daughter); and

S. 331. A bill for the relief of Ghetel Pollak Kahan, Magdalena Linda Kahan (wife), and Susanna Kahan (daughter, 12 years old); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. J. Res. 17. Joint resolution to authorize an increase in the professional and clerical staffs of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. HOEY (for himself and Mr. BROUGHTON):

S. J. Res. 18. Joint resolution for the relief of the First Citizens Bank & Trust Co., administrator of the estate of C. A. Ragland, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. J. Res. 19. Joint resolution to provide for collecting and publishing the writings of Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S. J. Res. 20. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue a proclamation designating October 31 of each year as Youth Honor Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

S. J. Res. 21. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim national observance of Defenders' Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. J. Res. 22. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the three hundredth anniversary of Annapolis, Md.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TAFT:

S. J. Res. 23. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the three hundredth anniversary of the birth of Elihu Yale; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(Mr. MORSE introduced Senate Joint Resolution 24, to provide for a suitable and adequate system of timber access roads to and in the forests of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and appears under a separate heading.)

ENLISTMENT OF ALIENS IN REGULAR ARMY

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I reintroduce for appropriate reference, in modified form, a proposal which the Senate passed last year; authorizing the Army to enlist up to 25,000 qualified aliens, and I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD a brief statement I have prepared which presents in succinct form the reason for my introducing the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts will be appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 273) to provide for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army, introduced by Mr. LODGE, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The statement presented by Mr. LODGE is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LODGE

This simple proposal permits the Army (with the concurrence of the Secretary of State) to accept up to 25,000 enlistments from young men of different nationalities between the ages of 18 and 35. It authorizes the Army to conduct this experiment for a 2-year period. The number 25,000 represents about 7 percent of the total of our Regular Army and is an amount which qualified experts believe can be effectively absorbed. These men would serve for 5 years, after which they would be eligible for American citizenship. They could be used wherever the Army found it desirable, and I believe that it is the Army's intention to use them initially in Alaska, the Caribbean, and the Far East.

This bill is similar to the amendment I offered last year to the Selective Service Act and which the Senate approved on a roll-call vote. I was disappointed when it was dropped from the act during the conference with the House and I hope that it will fare better this time.

Some of the points which should be emphasized at this time in connection with this plan are:

1. It is of enormous potential value to our national defense. We receive, in return for the benefits conferred, human talent which we can obtain in no other way and which the experiences of World War II, in our relations with friendly foreign troops, prove beyond question that we must have for training, combat, liaison, and intelligence.

2. It does not contemplate any sort of foreign legion at all. These young foreign soldiers would be scattered as individuals throughout all Army units. They would not be isolated in separate organizations or wear any kind of distinctive insignia. They would wear regular GI uniforms and would live in intimate daily contact with other young Americans.

3. The literally hundreds of letters which I have received from young men all over the world show that this plan has captured the interest and enthusiasm of the cream of young manhood abroad. We could expect fine human material. Of course, the initial screening of applicants would be highly exacting and discriminating; continuous supervision during the entire term of enlistment would likewise be aggressive. This is certainly more thorough than anything of which our immigration and naturalization services are normally capable.

4. It is neither a sign of weakness nor a radical policy for the United States to welcome allies in American uniform. Foreign soldiers have fought and given their lives for the United States from the Revolutionary War through the Civil War down to World War II. My plan simply seeks to substitute an orderly legislative long-range program for the old hit-or-miss method.

5. This proposal is truly one for the benefit of the United States. It is not a "hand-cut." It is no cold-blooded hiring of mercenaries. It is an honorable exchange whereby both parties benefit—and therein, I think, lies its special strength.

6. Of overriding importance is the fact that there are millions of people the world over who look to the United States as the guardian of democracy. It is only right that the young and able-bodied men among these people should have the privilege of helping us carry the torch. For many reasons, they cannot put their armies into the field. But their young men can help as individual allies and should be enabled to do so. We have gone to great lengths and much trouble and expense in order to leave no stone unturned to have as many allies as possible in this troubled world. This is yet another way in which to secure more friends—this time an ally in the uniform of the United States Army.

INCOME LIMITATION GOVERNING GRANTING OF PENSIONS TO CERTAIN VETERANS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing for upward revision of income limitations affecting the entitlement to pensions of disabled veterans of World War I and the widows of such men. A measure similar to this bill was considered in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 4242. It was reported from the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, but, unfortunately, did not receive further action. I am, however, hoping that such action will be forthcoming in this Eighty-first Congress. This is one of the bills on the comprehensive legislative program for veterans' and widows' welfare of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, whose distinguished national legislative representative is Mr. Omar B. Ketchum, past national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The bill (S. 325) to amend the income limitation governing the granting of pension to veterans and death-pension benefits to widows and children of veterans, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for the creation of a consolidated international air carrier for the United States, and for other purposes. In this bill I am joined by the able Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]. I ask that the bill be printed in full in the body of the RECORD, and that a statement prepared by me in connection therewith be printed immediately thereafter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and the statement presented by the Senator from Nevada will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 327) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for the creation of a consolidated international air carrier for the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN (for himself and Mr. BREWSTER), was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for the merger and the consolidation of international air carriers for the United States, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"TITLE XII—CONSOLIDATION AND MERGER OF INTERNATIONAL AIR CARRIERS

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 1201. As used in this title—

"(1) The term 'domestic air carrier' means any air carrier, the major portion of whose traffic and revenues from common-carrier business is derived from domestic air transportation.

"(2) The term 'international air carrier' means any air carrier, the major portion of whose traffic and revenues from common-carrier business is derived from international air transportation.

"(3) The term 'consolidated carrier' means the international air carrier which acquires or operates properties and facilities unified and integrated by consolidation or merger pursuant to this title.

"(4) The term 'domestic air transportation' means the carriage by aircraft of persons or property as a common carrier for compensation or hire, or the carriage of mail by aircraft, in commerce, between points in the United States, or between a point in the United States and a point in Canada.

"(5) The term 'international air transportation' means the carriage by aircraft of persons or property as a common carrier for compensation or hire, or the carriage of mail by aircraft, in commerce, between any point in the United States and any point in a foreign country other than Canada.

"(6) The term 'consolidation or merger' includes the legal consolidation or merger of two or more corporations and the acquisition by a corporation through purchase, lease, or

in any other manner, of the whole or any part of the property, securities, facilities, services, or business of any other corporation or corporations, or of the control thereof, in exchange for its own securities or otherwise.

"(7) The term 'continental United States' means the several States and the District of Columbia. The term 'United States' has the meaning set forth in section 1 (31).

"(8) The term 'Board' means the Civil Aeronautics Board.

"(9) The term 'flight equipment' shall include in addition to aircraft, engines, and propellers.

"DECLARATION OF PUBLIC INTEREST

"SEC. 1202. It is hereby declared that the interests of the commerce of the United States, the national defense and the postal service require that the United States shall have a system of international air transportation (a) sufficient to carry a substantial portion of its own international air commerce commensurate with the large proportion of such air commerce originated by it, to obtain a fair share of air commerce between other nations of the world, and to provide it with air communications on all routes essential to the national interest; (b) capable of serving as an aid to its military forces in time of war or national emergency, both directly and as a source of trained personnel; (c) owned and operated under the United States flag by citizens of the United States; and (d) composed of the most modern, safest, and most suitable types of aircraft constructed in the United States and manned with citizens thereof; and that, in order to foster the development and encourage the maintenance of such a system of international air transportation, it is necessary to avoid destructive rivalries between American companies abroad and to present a united American front against the competition of foreign air monopolies. It is therefore declared to be the policy of the United States that its international air transportation should be consolidated into a single company, to be formed under a plan approved or prescribed by the Board, which shall operate in the national interest under private ownership and management as a public utility under regulation by the Board.

"CONSOLIDATION OR MERGER OF INTERNATIONAL AIR CARRIERS

"SEC. 1203. (a) Within 60 days from the date of enactment of this section, or such longer period not exceeding 90 days from the date of enactment of this section as the Board may determine, one or more international air carriers or domestic air carriers engaged in international air transportation may file with the Board a proposed plan of consolidation or merger. Upon the filing of any such plan, the Board shall transmit a copy thereof to the President and to the Policy Committee hereafter named, and shall order a public hearing to be held with respect thereto, and shall give reasonable notice of such hearing in writing and an opportunity to be heard to any person whose properties are affected by the plan and to such other persons as the Board may deem advisable. If no such plan is filed within the period above specified, the Board shall as soon as practicable thereafter issue a proposed plan of consolidation or merger and shall transmit a copy thereof to the President and to the Policy Committee hereafter named, and shall order a public hearing to be held with respect thereto and shall give reasonable notice of such hearing and an opportunity to be heard as aforesaid.

"(b) Any proposed plan filed with or issued by the Board under subsection (a) of this section shall include the following provisions and may include such other provisions as shall be appropriate:

"(1) A statement that the consolidated carrier will acquire, by the issuance of an appropriate amount of its ordinary common stock, all of the assets, or all of the outstanding stock, of all international air carriers existing on the effective date of the plan, and, if the assets of such carriers are to be acquired, that the consolidated carrier will assume the liabilities of such carriers existing on the effective date of the plan;

"(2) A statement that the consolidated carrier will acquire the following:

"(i) All real estate and ground equipment owned by domestic air carriers which is located outside the continental United States and is used or held for use by such air carriers in international air transportation on the effective date of the plan;

"(ii) Any stock, notes, or other securities or evidences of indebtedness of any person engaged in any phase of aeronautics in a foreign country which are owned by any air carrier or person controlling an air carrier on the effective date of the plan, except that the plan need not provide for the acquisition by the consolidated carrier of any such stock, notes, or other securities or evidences of indebtedness acquired by an air carrier or person controlling an air carrier after October 25, 1945;

"(iii) Flight equipment owned by any domestic air carrier which on the effective date of the plan is primarily used or held for use in international air transportation or has been committed for by such a carrier primarily for such use, and such additional flight equipment owned or committed for by any domestic air carrier on the effective date of the plan so that the total flight equipment purchasable under this clause (iii) will constitute an amount of the flight equipment of any domestic air carrier engaged in international air transportation fairly representing the proportion of such flight equipment used in or committed for international air transportation, to such extent as any such domestic air carrier may request within a reasonable time to be fixed by the Board in its order approving the plan.

In any case where property is to be acquired by the consolidated carrier pursuant to this clause (2) directly from a person entitled to subscribe for carrier shares, the purchase price shall be payable in such shares and the right of such person to subscribe for such shares shall be reduced accordingly: *Provided*, That the carrier shares so issuable upon such purchase shall not exceed 3 percent of the proposed initial common stock capitalization of the consolidated carrier and any amount by which the purchase price shall exceed said 3 percent shall be payable either in cash or in notes of the consolidated carrier maturing not later than 2 years from the effective date of the plan and bearing interest at 3 percent per annum, or partly in cash and partly in such notes.

"(3) A statement as to the proposed initial capitalization of the consolidated carrier.

"(4) The form of charter of the consolidated carrier, which may be a charter under the laws of any one of the United States, and the form of bylaws of the consolidated carrier.

"(5) Provisions for the offer for subscription (i) to all domestic air carriers, (ii) to all citizens of the United States who are common carriers by water in foreign commerce or in commerce between the continental United States and a territory or possession of the United States, as defined in the Shipping Act, 1916, and (iii) to all class I carriers by railroad subject to the Interstate Commerce Act (other than terminal and switching companies and carriers which are not citizens of the United States as defined in this act), of three special series of common stock of the consolidated carrier (hereinafter referred to as 'carrier shares'). The series of carrier shares to be so offered to domestic air carriers shall constitute approximately 25 percent of the proposed initial common-stock capitalization of the consolidated carrier, the series of carrier shares to be so offered to citizens of the United States who are common carriers by water, as above defined, shall contribute approximately 20 percent of the said proposed initial common-stock capitalization, and the series of carrier shares to be so offered to class I carriers by railroad, as above defined, shall constitute approximately 10 percent of the said proposed initial common-stock capitalization. Such shares shall be allotted within each of the three classes on a fair and equitable basis which shall take account of the gross revenues and net worth of the respective members of each class, and other relevant facts, subject, however, to the provisions of subsection (b) (2) of this section and of section 1204 (a). The plan shall contain appropriate provisions (1) fixing a reasonable time of not less than 6 months within which carriers initially entitled to subscribe to carrier shares shall elect as to the extent to which they desire to avail themselves of their subscription rights and providing that the consolidated carrier may call for the payment of such subscriptions over a period of not less than 6 months nor more than 1 year from the date of such election; (2) stating what disposition, if any, shall be made of shares not so subscribed for; (3) establishing that if the consolidated carrier shall from time to time issue additional common stock (except where such stock is issued for property, services, or to employees of the consolidated carrier) each of the classes of persons herein specified as entitled to subscribe to a proportion of the shares originally issued shall be entitled to subscribe for a like proportion of such newly issued shares, the allotment of such newly issued shares within each class to be based upon the facts existing at the date of such new issue without regard to the amount of shares then actually held by any member of such class; (4) restricting the transferability of carrier shares; and (5) providing for representation of the holders of each of the special series of carrier shares upon the board of directors of the consolidated carrier: *Provided*, That the total number of directors provided to represent each of said special series of carrier shares shall approximate the proportionate amount of common stock of the consolidated carrier represented by such series.

"(6) Fair and equitable provisions to assure the continued employment of all citizens of the United States who are employed by international air carriers or who are employed by domestic air carriers engaged in international air transportation and whose duties have related primarily to such transportation, and the reemployment of employees of the same categories who since August 27, 1940, have left their positions for the purpose of entering the military or naval forces of the United States, which provisions shall confer benefits at least as extensive as those provided in respect of the consolidation or merger of telegraph carriers by subsection (f) of section 222 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended by the act of March 6, 1934, and which shall apply to all flight personnel of the character above described without regard to the restriction imposed by subdivision (ii) of said subsection (f).

"(7) An agreement that the consolidated carrier will assume and perform the terms and conditions of any and all collective-bargaining agreements in respect to rates of pay, wages, hours, and working conditions which shall be in effect immediately preceding the approval of such consolidation or merger with respect to the employees specified in clause (6), and that the consolidated carrier will agree that any disputes or controversies that may arise as to seniority of the employees of the respective carriers and

similar questions shall be arbitrated under the terms of the Railway Labor Act.

"(8) An agreement that if any individual or organization shall have been certified by the National Mediation Board, prior to the approval of such consolidation or merger as the representative of any craft or class of employees of an international air carrier, and if such certification shall still be in effect immediately preceding the approval of such consolidation or merger, that the consolidated carrier shall recognize and treat with such individual or organization as the representative of said employees until such time as the National Mediation Board shall certify another representative or find that no representative is entitled to be certified.

"(9) An agreement that the consolidated carrier will render air-transportation service between the United States and every country in the world having a population of more than 5,000,000 persons to which such service can be operated, except such countries as to which the Board, on the recommendation of the Policy Committee hereinafter designated, shall find that air-transportation service is not required by the public convenience and necessity or otherwise to further national policy.

"(10) An agreement that the consolidated carrier will file rates, fares, and charges for foreign air transportation which shall not be higher than reasonable maximum rates, fares, or charges, or lower than reasonable minimum rates, fares, or charges which may be determined from time to time by the Board.

"(11) An agreement that the consolidated carrier will enter into through-traffic arrangements with domestic carriers, in such form or forms as may be approved or prescribed by the Board, in order to assure the domestic carriers fair and equitable treatment with respect to the routing of through traffic between points outside the continental United States served by the consolidated carrier and points within the continental United States served by more than one domestic carrier, and also to enable the consolidated carrier to compete effectively with foreign companies which have a preferential position with domestic connections in their respective countries, by utilizing the selling offices and organizations of the domestic carriers or otherwise.

"(12) An agreement that the consolidated carrier will enter into agency agreements with citizens of the United States who are common carriers by water, in such form or forms as may be approved or prescribed by the Board, for the solicitation by such water carriers through their selling offices and organizations abroad of air traffic for the consolidated carrier.

"(13) An agreement that, in time of war, the United States, acting by such agency or agencies as the President may determine, may take over the possession or may direct the operation of the properties of the consolidated carrier during such emergency, under such terms and conditions as will afford just compensation to the consolidated carrier.

"(14) Provisions insuring that the consolidated carrier shall be at all times a citizen of the United States as defined in section 1 (13).

"(15) Provisions for placing the plan in effect and for defining its effective date.

"(c) After the hearing provided for in subsection (a), the Board shall within 60 days render a report and order in which it shall approve a plan, which may be different from the plan proposed, upon finding that such plan will in its opinion meet the requirements of subsection (b) of this section, is fair and equitable, and will be compatible with the public interest. The Board may thereafter, upon petition for good cause shown, filed within 30 days of the date of its order, and upon further hearings if the Board shall deem necessary, in a supplemental report and order modify any plan which it has so approved. The members of the initial board of directors of the consolidated carrier shall be fairly representative of its respective constituent elements and shall be subject to approval by the Board.

"(d) Upon the approval of a plan by the Board, any law or laws which would otherwise make unlawful any transaction provided for in any such plan shall not apply with respect thereto, and any carrier participating in or resulting from any transaction provided for in any such plan shall have full power to carry such transaction into effect without securing approval otherwise than as specified in this section: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein shall in anywise affect the application of the antitrust laws as defined in the act of October 15, 1914, chapter 323, section 1, to transactions other than those provided for in this title.

"(e) Any plan approved by the Board shall be carried out by the parties thereto within such reasonable period as the Board may determine. Nothing in this title shall in anywise affect the right of the United States by appropriate legislation to require modifications or changes with respect to the consolidated carrier or to require the consolidated carrier to divest itself of its property in whole or in part and in such event shall have no rights other than to fair compensation for its property.

"(f) If any plan approved by the Board is not carried out within the period fixed by the Board as provided in subsection (e), the Board may apply to a court as provided in section 1007 (b) of this act, to enforce compliance with any such plan. In any such proceeding the court, as a court of equity, may to such extent as it deems necessary for purposes of enforcing compliance with such plan, take exclusive jurisdiction and possession of the company or companies or the assets thereof which are subject to such plan, wherever located, and the court shall have jurisdiction in any such proceeding to appoint a trustee, and the court may constitute and appoint the Board as sole trustee to hold or administer under the direction of the court the assets so possessed. In any such proceeding the trustee shall dispose of such assets in accordance with the plan approved by the Board.

"(g) The provisions of title I, section 5, of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, shall not apply to the issuance, sale, or exchange of any securities provided to be initially issued in any plan approved by the Board, which securities and transactions shall for the purposes of said Securities Act be treated as if they were specifically mentioned in sections 3 and 4 of said Securities Act.

"(h) The provisions of sections 1801 and 1802 of the Internal Revenue Code shall not apply to the issuance, transfer, or exchange of securities of the consolidated carrier or the making or delivery of conveyances in connection with the acquisitions by the consolidated carrier of the property, stock, or assets provided for in any plan approved by the Board.

"(i) (1) Section 112 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to recognition of gain or loss upon certain exchanges) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"'(11) Gain or loss not recognized on consolidation or merger of international air carriers: No gain or loss shall be recognized if property of a corporation is transferred in pursuance of a plan of consolidation or merger approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board under title XII of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to another corporation organized or made use of to effectuate such a plan of consolidation or merger, in exchange solely for stock or securities in such other corporation.'

"(2) Section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to recognition of gain or loss) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"'(m) Exchanges by security holders in connection with consolidation or merger of international air carriers: No gain or loss shall be recognized upon an exchange consisting of the relinquishment or extinguishment of stock or securities in a corporation pursuant to a plan of consolidation or merger approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board under title XII of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 in consideration of the acquisition solely of stock or securities in a corporation organized or made use of to effectuate such a plan of consolidation or merger.'

"(3) Section 113 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code relating to basis of property is amended by inserting after paragraph (22) the following:

"'(23) Property acquired pursuant to plan of consolidation or merger of air carriers: If the property was acquired by a corporation organized or made use of to effectuate a plan of consolidation or merger approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board under title XII of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, the basis in the hands of the acquiring corporation shall be the same as it would be in the hands of the corporation whose property was so acquired, increased in the amount of gain recognized to the corporation whose property was so acquired.'

"OWNERSHIP OF STOCK IN CONSOLIDATED CARRIER

"SEC. 1204. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person, partnership, association, or corporation to buy, acquire, hold, own, or control directly or indirectly, an amount of the common stock of the consolidated carrier which shall exceed 3 percent of the proposed initial common stock capitalization or the amount of common stock actually outstanding, whichever shall be higher. If any person, partnership, association, or corporation, by virtue of its stock ownership in an international air carrier or in a domestic air carrier engaged in international air transportation or otherwise, shall receive more than such 3 percent, such person, partnership, association, or corporation shall within 6 months after such receipt sell, distribute, or otherwise dispose of so much of the common stock of the consolidated carrier so received as shall exceed such 3 percent.

"(b) No person, partnership, association, or corporation entitled to acquire carrier shares of the consolidated carrier pursuant to subdivision (6) of subsection (b) of section 1203 shall acquire, directly or indirectly, any other voting stock of the consolidated carrier, except stock acquired by such person, partnership, association, or corporation as a result of the initial issue of stock of the consolidated carrier for property acquired by the consolidated carrier or stock distributed as a dividend on stock so initially issued or acquired pursuant to rights appertaining to stock which shall have been so initially issued or shall have been distributed as a dividend thereon.

"POLICY COMMITTEE

"SEC. 1205. There is hereby established a committee in the executive branch of the Government to be known as Policy Committee, International Civil Air Transportation (herein referred to as 'the Policy Committee'). The Policy Committee shall be composed of the Secretary of State, who shall act as its chairman; the Secretary of War; the Secretary of the Navy; the Secretary of Commerce; and the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board. The Board shall consult with and obtain the approval of the Policy Committee before ordering the establishment of new routes or services or directing the suspension or abandonment of routes or services pursuant to section 1205 (d). The Policy Committee shall have regular meetings at least once in each 3 months and shall have special meetings at such times as the chairman shall direct. The chief executive officer of the consolidated

carrier shall, unless otherwise directed, attend all meetings of the Policy Committee for the purpose of informing the Committee but without the right of vote.

"AIR TRANSPORTATION TO BE PROVIDED BY CONSOLIDATED CARRIER

"SEC. 1206. (a) The consolidated carrier shall have power to engage in international air transportation in all parts of the world. The consolidated carrier shall also have power to engage in air transportation between a point or points in the continental United States and a point or points outside the continental United States, and between one or more points in the United States outside its continental borders, to such extent and only to such extent that such air transportation shall have been authorized in a certificate of public convenience and necessity held at the effective date of the plan by an international air carrier the assets or capital stock of which are acquired by the consolidated carrier pursuant to the plan or thereafter issued to the consolidated carrier pursuant to section 401.

"(b) The consolidated carrier shall not hold or acquire, directly or indirectly, any interest in a domestic air carrier or consolidate with such a carrier or merge its properties, or any part thereof, with those of such a carrier.

"ROUTES AND SERVICES TO BE OPERATED BY CONSOLIDATED CARRIER

"SEC. 1207. (a) Except as provided in subsection (e), the consolidated carrier shall not operate any route or service unless such route or service shall have been specified in a statement of service plan filed with and permitted to become effective by the Board or shall have been required by the Board as hereinafter provided and shall not suspend or abandon any such route or service unless a statement as to such suspension or abandonment shall have been filed with and permitted to become effective by the Board or shall have been required by the Board as hereinafter provided. At least 30 days before the effective date of the plan, the consolidated carrier shall file with the Board and with the Postmaster General a statement of service plan setting forth the routes and services which the consolidated carrier proposes to operate during the year in which the consolidated carrier proposes to commence its operations. Such service plan may include services on any and all routes authorized by certificates of public convenience and necessity with respect to international air transportation held by any of the air carriers the capital stock or assets of which are being acquired pursuant to the plan, and on such other routes, if any, as may be deemed advisable in the public interest. Not later than the 1st day of December in each year, the consolidated carrier shall file with the Board and with the Postmaster General a statement of service plan setting forth the routes and services which the consolidated carrier proposes to operate in the ensuing year. The consolidated carrier may from time to time file with the Board and with the Postmaster General statements of proposed changes in any service plan theretofore filed.

"(b) Upon the filing of any statement pursuant to subsection (a) hereof, the Board shall give due notice thereof to the public by posting a notice of such statement in the office of the Secretary of the Board and by giving notice to such other persons as the Board may by regulation determine.

"(c) The initial statement of service plan required to be filed by the consolidated carrier and the statements required to be filed annually thereafter shall become effective within 30 days after the filing thereof and any other statement shall become effective within the time specified therein (which shall not be less than 10 days, unless the Board shall otherwise permit in a particular case), unless 5 days prior to the date when such statement would otherwise have become effective the Board shall give notice to the consolidated carrier postponing the effective date of any route or service proposed. If such notice shall have been given, the Board shall within not more than 20 days thereafter, either permit the statement to become effective or require it to be canceled or modified, as the Board shall determine to be in the public interest.

"(d) If the Board is of the opinion that routes or services in addition to those being operated by the consolidated carrier are required in the public interest or that any routes or services being operated should be suspended or abandoned, the Board shall give notice to the consolidated carrier to that effect. Unless within 20 days after the receipt of such notice the consolidated carrier shall file with the Board a statement of service plan complying with such notice and shall thereafter diligently proceed to initiate such service, the Board may require the consolidated carrier to take action in accordance with such notice. Any interested person may at any time request the Board to take action pursuant to this subsection.

"(e) The consolidated carrier may, without filing a statement of service plan pursuant to this section, operate extra sections, make charter trips or perform any other special service, subject, however, to the limitations provided in section 1206 (a) and to such regulations as the Board may prescribe.

"TRANSPORTATION OF MAIL

"SEC. 1208. The consolidated carrier shall provide necessary and adequate facilities and service for the transportation of mail on the routes operated by it, and shall transport mail whenever required by the Postmaster General, as provided in section 405 of this act. The consolidated carrier shall be paid reasonable compensation for such transportation. Such payment shall be at the same rates provided for payment by the United States for similar trasportation to foreign air carriers in any international treaty, convention, or agreement to which the United States is a party. If no such rate shall be applicable, the Board shall fix and determine the fair and reasonable rates of such compensation in the manner provided in section 406 of this act, except that the Board shall not take into account the third of the rate-making elements set forth in said section 406 (b).

"CONSTRUCTION-DIFFERENTIAL SUBSIDY

"SEC. 1209. (a) The Board is authorized and directed to grant to the consolidated carrier a construction-differential subsidy and other financial assistance for the construction by manufacturers in the United States of flight equipment to be operated by the consolidated carrier in international air transportation, as hereinafter provided.

"(b) The consolidated carrier may submit to the Board at any time plans for the acquisition of new flight equipment with respect to which it desires a construction-differential subsidy or other financial assistance under this section, giving such detail as to types, numbers, characteristics, cost, and the like as the Board may require. The Board, with the advice of the Policy Committee and any other interested agencies, shall promptly review such plans and, to the extent that it determines them to be adapted to effectuating the purposes of this title, shall certify them as qualifying for the financial assistance provided in this section upon the terms and conditions provided in this section and such further terms and conditions as it shall prescribe in the public interest. In such certificate the Board shall estimate the prospective economic life of such flight equipment.

"(c) In the case of any flight equipment which the Board has certified as provided in subsection (b), the Board will (i) as a construction-differential subsidy, pay to the manufacturer, or, if the consolidated carrier shall have made payment directly to the manufacturer, will reimburse the consolidated carrier for, the excess of the cost of the flight equipment (excluding the cost of any features incorporated therein for national defense purposes, which shall be paid by the Board in addition to the construction-differential subsidy) over the fair and reasonable estimate of cost, as determined by the Board, of the construction of such flight equipment under similar plans and specifications (excluding national defense features as above provided) in foreign aircraft plants deemed by the Board to furnish a fair and representative example for the determination of the estimated foreign cost of construction of flight equipment having the same general characteristics; and (ii) if the consolidated carrier shall so request, will advance not in excess of 75 percent of the net cost of the flight equipment to the consolidated carrier, any such advance to be secured by mortgage upon the flight equipment and to be repayable in a number of equal semiannual installments fixed by the Board over the prospective economic life of the flight equipment as certified by the Board and the unpaid balance to bear interest at the rate of 3½ percent per annum.

"(d) No flight equipment for which a construction-differential subsidy has been received pursuant to this section shall be sold, leased, or otherwise disposed of by the consolidated carrier during the economic life of such equipment as certified by the Board unless the consolidated carrier shall repay to the Board that proportion of the said subsidy (plus the cost of national-defense features) which the remaining economic life of such flight equipment bears to the economic life certified by the Board, or on such other terms and conditions as the Board may prescribe in the public interest. To the extent that any flight equipment for which a construction-differential subsidy has been received pursuant to this section is used by the consolidated carrier otherwise than in international air transportation, the consolidated carrier will pay to the Board annually that proportion of the construction-differential subsidy divided by the economic life of the flight equipment as certified by the Board which the gross revenues derived by the consolidated carrier from operations conducted by such flight equipment in other than international air transportation bears to the entire gross revenues earned by the consolidated carrier with such flight equipment during such year.

"(e) If the consolidated carrier proposes to acquire new flight equipment to replace flight equipment which is deemed by it to be obsolete or inadequate for successful operation, the Board is authorized in its discretion to buy such replaced flight equipment at a fair and reasonable valuation which shall not exceed the cost thereof to the consolidated carrier plus the actual cost previously expended thereon for reconditioning and less reasonable and proper depreciation, and shall apply such purchase price to that portion of the construction cost of new flight equipment which is to be borne by the consolidated carrier. The Board may scrap flight equipment so acquired or sell it after appraisement and due advertisement and upon competitive sealed bids.

"OPERATING-DIFFERENTIAL SUBSIDY

"SEC. 1210. (a) The consolidated carrier shall be entitled to receive from the Board an operating-differential subsidy as herein provided.

"(b) The Board, with the advice of the policy committee, shall from time to time determine which of the routes and services included within the service plan of the consolidated carrier are subject to competition

by foreign-flag air carriers of such a character as to require the payment of an operating-differential subsidy in order to effectuate the purposes and policy of this title. The Board shall establish appropriate means for segregating the operations on account of which such an operating-differential subsidy is to be paid from other operations conducted by the consolidated carrier.

"(c) The amount of the operating-differential subsidy shall equal the excess of the fair and reasonable cost of wages and subsistence of flight and ground personnel, materials, insurance, and any other items of expense in which the Board shall find and determine that the consolidated carrier is at a substantial disadvantage in competition with one or more foreign-flag air carriers which constitute substantial competitors of the consolidated carrier on a particular route or service.

"(d) The basis for the payment of the operating-differential subsidy shall be initially established within 30 days after the initial service plan of the consolidated carrier shall have become effective. Such subsidy shall be payable on the basis of a final accounting made as soon as practicable after the end of each year or other period fixed by the Board. The Board may provide for the payment from time to time during any such period of such amounts on account as it deems proper. The basis of payment initially established shall be subject to review and readjustment from time to time but not more frequently than once a year at the instance of the Board or of the consolidated carrier. If any such readjustment cannot be reached by mutual agreement, the Board, on its own motion or on the application of the consolidated carrier, shall, after a proper hearing, determine the facts and make such readjustment in the amount of such future payments as it may determine to be fair and reasonable and in the public interest. The Board's decision shall be based upon and governed by the changes which may have occurred since the last preceding determination with respect to the items theretofore considered and other relevant facts and shall be promulgated in a formal order which shall be accompanied by a report in writing in which the Board shall state its findings of fact.

"(e) No operating-differential subsidy shall be paid for the operation of flight equipment which the Board shall determine to be obsolete unless the Board finds that the failure to replace such flight equipment has been occasioned by causes beyond the control of the consolidated carrier or that such payment is otherwise in the public interest.

"(f) If at the end of any 10-year period the net profit of the consolidated carrier (without regard to capital gains and capital losses) after deduction of appropriate depreciation and amortization charges has averaged more than 10 percent per annum upon the capital investment of the consolidated carrier used in or useful for the operations of the consolidated carrier, the consolidated carrier shall pay to the Board an amount equal to one-half of such profit in excess of 10 percent per annum: *Provided, however,* That the amount of profit so recaptured in respect of any period shall not in any case exceed the amount of the operating-differential subsidy payments made to the consolidated carrier for such period: *And provided further,* That if the effective date of the plan is prior to July 1 in any year the first computation under this subsection shall be for the period ending on the last day of December in the tenth year thereafter and if the effective date of the plan is on or after July 1 the first such computation shall be for the period ending on the last day of December in the eleventh year thereafter.

"(g) The consolidated carrier shall create and maintain a special reserve fund in such depository or depositories as the Board shall approve. If the profits of the consolidated carrier without regard to capital gains and capital losses in any year exceed 10 percent per annum upon the capital investment of the consolidated carrier used in or useful for its services, the consolidated carrier shall deposit annually such excess profits in this reserve fund. From the special reserve fund the consolidated carrier may make the following disbursements and no others:

"(1) Reimbursement to its general funds for the amount by which its net income for any year without regard to capital gains and capital losses shall be less than 10 percent per annum upon its capital investment used in or useful for its services.

"(2) Payment of amounts due from the consolidated carrier to the Board as provided in subsection (f) hereof, but such reimbursement shall be deferred until the amount on deposit in the special reserve fund shall be sufficiently in excess of 5 percent of the capital investment of the consolidated carrier used in or useful for its services so that payment of such reimbursement to the Board will not reduce the special reserve fund below a sum equal to such 5 percent.

"(3) If at the end of any year the amount in the special reserve fund shall exceed 10 percent of the capital investment of the consolidated carrier used in or useful for its services and if the amount in the special reserve fund shall also exceed the sum of 5 percent of the capital investment of the consolidated carrier used in or useful for its services and the amount that would be payable by the consolidated carrier to the Board pursuant to subsection (f) hereof if such payment were required to be made at such time, the consolidated carrier may withdraw part or all of such excess reserve and pay the sum so withdrawn into its general funds.

"The Board shall adopt and prescribe rules and regulations for the administration of the reserve funds contemplated by this subsection and shall include definitions of net income and the capital investment of the consolidated carrier used in and useful for the business: *Provided, however,* That in computing net income proper allowance shall be made for charges for depreciation and amortization and that in computing the capital investment used in or useful for the business there shall be included capital borrowed for terms exceeding 1 year and investments in and advances to associated companies as defined in section 1213 to such extent as the Board may determine that such investments or advances are in furtherance of the objectives of this title. The earnings of the consolidated carrier which are deposited in the special reserve fund as provided in this section, except earnings withdrawn from the special reserve fund, shall be exempt from all Federal taxes. Earnings withdrawn from such special reserve fund shall be taxable as if earned during the year of withdrawal from such fund.

"NATIONAL INTEREST AND OTHER SPECIAL SERVICES

"SEC. 1211. (a) If the Board, pursuant to section 1207 (d), shall require the consolidated carrier to establish routes or services (unless such route or service was agreed to be established as provided in sec. 1203 (b) (9)), or if the Board shall refuse to permit the suspension or abandonment of a route or service as requested by the consolidated carrier (unless such route or service was agreed to be maintained as provided in sec. 1203 (b) (9)), the consolidated carrier may advise the Board that, in its opinion, the route or service, the establishment of which has been required or the suspension or abandonment of which has been forbidden by the Board, will not, after taking into account amounts receivable by way of operating-differential subsidy as provided in section 1210, provide a reasonable return (computed on an additional cost basis upon the additional investment required for the operation of such routes or services), and shall furnish the Board with all pertinent facts. If the Board shall nevertheless require the said route or service to be operated, the Board shall establish the additional amount to be paid to the consolidated carrier as fair compensation for such operation and shall, to such extent as it deems appropriate, make grants to the consolidated carrier for capital investment in ground facilities outside the continental United States required for such operation: *Provided, however,* That in any case where such a grant is made appropriate steps shall be taken that the property obtained therewith shall be used generally for the benefit of the United States and that no such property shall be deemed a part of the capital investment of the consolidated carrier.

"(b) The Board may from time to time enter into contracts with the consolidated carrier for the operation of particular routes and services primarily noncommercial in character, for the construction, maintenance, or operation of airports, air navigation, communications and other ground facilities outside the continental United States and for such other purposes as the Board, with the approval of the Policy Committee, may deem to be in furtherance of the objectives of this title, upon such terms and conditions as the Board may determine.

"SUBSIDY TO MEET GOVERNMENTAL AID PAID TO FOREIGN COMPETITORS

"SEC. 1212. If in the case of any particular route or service the Board shall find that the governmental aid provided for in this title is in any respect inadequate to offset the effect of governmental aid paid to foreign-flag competitors, it may grant such additional aid as it determines to be necessary for that purpose: *Provided,* That no such additional aid shall be granted except upon an affirmative vote of four of the members of the Board.

"ASSOCIATED COMPANIES

"SEC. 1213. The consolidated carrier shall continue to hold all securities of aeronautical enterprises organized under the laws of foreign countries which it may acquire pursuant to the plan of consolidation, except as the disposition of such securities may be approved from time to time by the Board, with the advice of the Policy Committee. The consolidated carrier may from time to time, with the approval of the Board, to be granted with the advice of the Policy Committee, make additional investments in the securities of such aeronautical enterprises.

"REPORTS TO CONGRESS

"SEC. 1214. The Board shall include in its annual report to Congress a detailed statement of all transactions with the consolidated carrier under the provisions of sections 1209, 1210, 1211, and 1212.

"CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS

"SEC. 1215. In addition to amounts payable by way of construction-differential and operating-differential subsidies pursuant to sections 1209 and 1210, which shall be paid out of sums to be appropriated therefor, the Board is granted authorization to enter into contracts or to make grants as provided in sections 1211 and 1212, in an amount not to exceed $25,000,000, which shall also be paid out of sums to be appropriated therefor.

"EXEMPTION OF CONSOLIDATED CARRIER FROM CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF TITLE IV AND MODIFICATION OF CERTAIN OF SUCH PROVISIONS

"SEC. 1216. (a) The consolidated carrier is exempted from section 401 of this act except subdivisions (l) and (m) thereof, subject to the limitations provided in section 1206 (a), with respect to any routes

or services specified in a statement of service plan filed with and permitted to become effective by the Board or required by the Board pursuant to section 1207 of this act; from section 408 of this act with respect to any transaction approved by the Board pursuant to section 1213 of this act; and from section 409 of this act insofar as concerns any interlocking relationship between the consolidated carrier and any carrier which shall have acquired carrier shares as provided in clause (6) of subsection (b) of section 1201 of this act or which shall have acquired stock of the consolidated carrier pursuant to the plan of consolidation.

"(b) All certificates of public convenience and necessity issued to international air carriers and all certificates of convenience and necessity issued to domestic air carriers insofar as the same authorize international air transportation shall be canceled upon the effective date of the plan of consolidation.

"(c) If the Postmaster General shall find at any time that the needs of the postal service require the transportation of mail by aircraft between the United States and foreign countries in addition to the transportation of mail being effected by the consolidated carrier at the time, the Postmaster General, in lieu of proceeding under section 401 (n) of this act, shall certify such finding to the Board which, if it concurs therein, shall thereupon take action pursuant to section 1207 (d) of this act.

"(d) From and after the enactment of this section and pending the effective date of the plan of consolidation, no certificate of public convenience and necessity to engage in international air transportation shall be issued except to an international air carrier, and from and after the effective date of the said plan no such certificates shall be issued.

"(e) Section 408 of this act is amended by adding the following at the end thereof:

"'ACQUISITION OF INTERESTS IN FOREIGN AERONAUTICAL ENTERPRISES

"'(f) It shall be unlawful for any domestic air carrier as defined in section 1201 (2) of this act or any person controlling such an air carrier or any other common carrier to purchase, lease, contract to operate the properties or any substantial part thereof, or acquire control in any manner whatsoever, of any foreign air carrier or any person engaged in any phase of aeronautics otherwise than as an air carrier in any foreign country.'

"Subsection (e) of section 408 is modified by striking out in the first sentence the words 'subsection (a)' and inserting in place thereof the words 'subsections (a) and (f).'

"(f) Agreements made on behalf of the consolidated carrier in the plan of consolidation as provided in section 1203 (b) shall have the same force and effect as orders made by the Board pursuant to title IV of this act and violation of any such agreement shall be subject to the sanctions and penalties prescribed in titles IX and X in respect of the violation of any such order."

The statement by Mr. MCCARRAN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAT M'CARRAN

Mr. President, I am today reintroducing my bill to provide for the creation of the all-American-flag line as a single instrument to carry the flag of the United States, throughout the world, in the field of international air transportation.

In reintroducing this bill, I am not unmindful of recent developments which have indicated a substantial change in attitude by certain persons, and by certain interests, with regard to the principle involved in this bill.

More than 4 years ago, when I introduced my first all-American-flag-line bill, I made the statement that what I then proposed was the only workable solution to the problems which the United States then faced and would face in meeting the competition of the chosen instruments of other nations in the field of international air transportation. Further, I made the prediction that whether the United States adopted the single-company principle for its overseas commercial aviation as the result of congressional enactment, or in some other manner, this principle was certain to be adopted ultimately, because the hard realities of the situation would require it.

Every major event in the field of global air transportation, since I made that statement, has helped to prove the truth of it; and one does not now have to look very far ahead on the horizon to see that my prediction, also, is soon to come true.

Merger of Pan-American Airways and American Overseas Air Lines is a very long step toward a single company. In fact, I think this merger, if approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board, will make the accomplishment of a single company, either by further merger or by attrition, a virtual certainty within a relatively short period.

While I naturally welcome any developments which show the correctness of my views, I think it is important that the single company which seems about to come into being will not be precisely the same kind of single company that I have envisioned from the beginning, or which is provided for in the bill which I am about to reintroduce. My conception of a single company is an organization in which every transportation interest in America will have representation and monetary interest, in which the public at large will have a substantial interest, and which will be fully backed by all the resources and powers of the Federal Government, in realistic recognition of its importance as an instrument of national policy, national commerce, and even national diplomacy.

The word "monopoly" has many undesirable connotations. I have always been anxious that the single company which would ultimately carry the American flag in the airways of the world would be able to escape the application of that word in all its offensive connotations.

I have been consistent about this matter from the beginning. Though my bill has been rewritten several times, its objectives and basic principles have remained unchanged. When others have wavered in their position with regard to this proposal, tolerating it one day, supporting it the next, and disowning it a little later, I have never changed my course.

Our choice today—that is, our choice for the immediate future—is not between having a single instrument, and having several competing companies, but only between having a single instrument which is a creature of Congress, set up under law and joining all the transportation agencies of the country in a bond of common interest, or having a single company which is entirely the result of business maneuvers and established not as a matter of national policy and as an instrument of national policy, but as a matter of commercial expediency and an instrument of private gain.

That is our choice; and it is to provide an instrument and a forum for intelligently considering and wisely making that choice that I am reintroducing my all-American-flag-line bill.

BUILDING OF ACCESS ROADS IN FEDERAL FORESTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution providing for an appropriation of $30,000,000 for the building of access roads in the Federal forests of the United States. I desire to comment briefly on the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on this subject I wish to say that if we are to adopt a program of sustained yield, as the President recommended in his state of the Union message, if we are to make salable thousands of acres of presently federally owned timber, much of which is overripe, then we must afford access to the timber. If we wish to think about protecting the people's pocketbook, if we desire to adopt a program of sound economy in this Congress, this is one little item which will help to eliminate waste. At the present time there is great waste in the harvesting of the Nation's forests. Such waste takes the form in one particular of unavailability and inaccessibility of federally owned timber to those Government agencies which have control over it.

I recognize that there is some cause for believing that certain timber interests are opposed to an access road program, because, without the building of the roads—and they cannot be built unless the Congress of the United States appropriates the money—they find themselves in a preferred competitive position over small timber owners. I am advised by Government officials who have some jurisdiction over federally owned timber that it would be feasible for them, it certainly would be highly economical, to work out timber trade and timber contracts with small operators if the Government built access roads into Government timber so that such contracts could be consummated.

I have fought for this proposal heretofore. So far as economy is concerned, so far as need for a sound, sustained yield program is concerned, the evidence is all on my side. So far as opposition from large timber interests is concerned, interests which are seeking to prevent the passage of this type of legislation, I am perfectly willing always to meet them on the issue.

Therefore I am introducing this joint resolution again in this session of Congress. I respectfully urge an early hearing and an opportunity to present the economic data which, in my judgment, clearly support the measure.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 24) to provide for a suitable and adequate system of timber access roads to and in the forests of the United States, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE OLYMPIC NATIONAL PARK

Mr. CAIN submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 5), which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Whereas there is a need to conserve the scenic and the natural and historical objects and the wildlife within areas known as national parks, monuments, and reservations, and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations, and a need for the preservation for public enjoyment of the Nation's

greatest natural spectacles make it imperative that they be reserved for posterity; and

Whereas the inclusion of areas within national parks, monuments, and reservations is necessary to carry out the afore-mentioned objectives even though the inclusion of such lands within such areas may cause hardships on the communities, industries, and individuals dependent on such areas for their economic development; and

Whereas an unlimited extension of this otherwise sound policy leads to an improper balance between the preservation aims of the Park Service of the Department of the Interior and the needs for a sound program for the conservation of natural resources; and

Whereas our natural resources have been depleted by the demands of World War II and will for some years to come be overtaxed by the unfilled needs of our domestic economy, the requirements of national defense, and the European recovery program; and

Whereas there is a need for the highest degree of utilization of our natural resources under a sound conservation plan which will foster sustained production rather than nonproductive holding of our natural resources in order to satisfy the social and economic needs of our people, to strengthen the Nation against the ravages of discontent, to combat inflation, to fulfill our commitments for the European recovery program, and to prepare for any eventualities that may arise due to world unrest; and

Whereas the Congress by act of June 29, 1938 (52 Stat. 1241), creating the Olympic National Park, determined that in light of the domestic needs existing at that time that the Olympic National Park area could be extended to include a total area not exceeding 898,292 acres, but because of the demands caused by World War II and the needs of our domestic economy circumstances have so changed as to necessitate the review by the Congress of the acreage contained in the Olympic National Park; and

Whereas there are lands included within the Olympic National Park which are submarginal recreational areas and not suitable for park purposes; and

Whereas the national interest, as well as the communities of the Olympic Peninsula and particularly the Grays Harbor area and Port Angeles, require the sustained production and conservation through utilization and renewal of the forest resources of the Olympic Peninsula in order to provide an annual long-range supply of timber, such as will result from the operations of a sustained-yield program, for the production of products of the forest necessary for the national defense and the national housing program; and

Whereas a sound forest conservation program requires the transfer from the Park Service of the Department of the Interior to the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture of those areas which are not particularly suitable for recreational or park purposes but would be highly beneficial in the maintenance and furtherance of a sound sustained-yield program by the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture under the provisions of the act of Congress of March 29, 1944 (58 Stat. 132); and

Whereas certain lands within the park can be transferred to the Forest Service without impairing the program established for the purpose of conserving the scenery and the natural and historical objects and the wildlife within said park: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on the Olympic National Park (hereinafter referred to as the "committee"), and to be composed of (a) four Members of the Senate, two of whom shall be members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and two of whom shall be members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to be appointed by the Vice President; and (b) four Members of the House of Representatives, two of whom shall be members of the Committee on Agriculture, and two of whom shall be members of the Committee on Public Lands, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. A vacancy in the membership of the committee shall not affect the powers of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. The committee, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, shall conduct a thorough study and investigation as to the lands included within the Olympic National Park, including but not limited to—

(a) the extent to which such lands are adaptable for park purposes;

(b) the extent, if any, to which such lands are not necessary to effectuate the program of the National Park Service;

(c) the extent, if any, to which such lands as found unnecessary for park service can be transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture for administration by the Forest Service for operation in connection with conservation through utilization programs proposed by the Forest Service for that particular area;

(d) the establishment of a permanent boundary line for the Olympic National Park and a need for the establishment of highways, trails, and other accommodations both within the area under the control of the Park Service and the area under the control of the Forest Service in order to provide the greatest utilization of the two areas for the enjoyment of the American people and for sound and economic forest management; and

(e) such other problems and subjects relating to the Federal control and management of park lands and forest lands within the Olympic Peninsula as the committee deems appropriate.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report to the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than December 30, 1949, the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation and such other recommendations as it may deem advisable.

SEC. 4. The committee is authorized to call on the Director of the Park Service, Department of the Interior, and Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, to make available to the committee such technical services, information, and facilities as the committee shall require and may request the governments of the several States, representatives of business, industry, finance, and labor, and such other persons, agencies, organizations, and instrumentalities as it deems appropriate to attend its hearings, to give and present information, advice, and recommendations.

SEC. 5. The committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings; to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-first Congress; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths; to take such testimony; to have such printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services in reporting such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman or vice chairman of the committee and shall be served by any person designated by them.

SEC. 6. The expenses of carrying out the provisions of this resolution, incurred by the Joint Committee on the Olympic National Park, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $25,000, including expenditures for the employment of experts, assistants, and other employees, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee thereof, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives on vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman of the committee. Disbursements shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made.

INVESTIGATION OF LOBBYING ACTIVITIES

Mr. KILGORE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 23), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Whereas there has developed much doubt and confusion concerning the application of the laws relating to the registration and reporting of lobbyists; and

Whereas there is widespread public belief that lobbying activities are being carried on by persons not making reports thereof as prescribed by law, in some instances because they do not believe the law applies to them and their activities; and

Whereas Members of the Congress and citizens petitioning their Congress in behalf of measures are not able to ascertain through the disclosures now being made under the law the affiliations of many of those persons who are lobbying; and

Whereas it is desirable in strengthening the democratic process to have complete identification of all individuals and organizations lobbying before the Congress, the nature, sources, and amounts of their support; and

Whereas there is every evidence of general public support for enactment of legislation to strengthen the Lobbying Registration Act of 1946: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States does hereby authorize the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to make a full and complete investigation of all lobbying activities, and all efforts to influence, encourage, promote, or retard legislation, directly or indirectly.

The Committee on the Judiciary shall report to the Senate, as soon as practicable, the result of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems necessary to remedy any undesirable conditions that may exist under the present lobbying registration law.

For the purpose of this resolution, the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions and recesses of the Eighty-first Congress, to employ such paid assistants as required, to require by subpena, or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of the stenographic service to report such hearings shall not exceed 25 cents per 100 words. There is hereby authorized from the contingent fund of the Congress the sum of _____ to defray the costs of the committee, to be paid upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

FREEDOM HOUSE AWARD FOR 1948—ACCEPTANCE SPEECH BY SENATOR VANDENBERG

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Senator VANDENBERG accepting the

Freedom House Award for 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THINGS TO BE THOUGHTFUL ABOUT IN THE PRESENT WORLD SITUATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Things To Be Thoughtful About in the Present World Situation," delivered by him on December 8, 1948, at the Mission Inn, Riverside, Calif., under the auspices of the Institute of World Affairs of the University of Southern California, which appears in the Appendix.]

REPLY BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH TO NEW YORK TIMES EDITORIAL OF OCTOBER 3, 1948

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a reply made by him to a New York Times editorial of October 3, 1948, relating to the support by the New York Times of Mr. Dewey, which appears in the Appendix.]

STRUCTURE OF PEACE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Structure of Peace," delivered by him on October 3, 1948, at Provo, Utah, under the auspices of the Brigham Young University Women's Auxiliary Organization, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICA'S DOMESTIC PROBLEMS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR SMITH OF MAINE

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on domestic problems delivered by Senator SMITH of Maine at the National Women's Press dinner in Washington, D. C., on January 8, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

POLITICAL STABILIZATION IN CHINA—ADDRESS BY STANLEY K. HORNBECK

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Political Stabilization in China—United States Interest In," delivered by Stanley K. Hornbeck at the meeting of the American Political Science Association in Chicago on December 28, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

ZIONIST MEMORANDUM ON BRITISH ROLE IN WAR AGAINST ISRAEL

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Zionist memorandum on the British role in the war against Israel, which appears in the Appendix.]

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION IN HUNGARY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement sent by him to Milwaukeeans of Hungarian extraction in regard to religious persecution in Hungary and a telegram received by him from two clergymen relating to the same subject, which appear in the Appendix.]

DECISION OF SUPREME COURT ON CLOSED SHOPS—EDITORIAL FROM THE MILWAUKEE JOURNAL

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "States Can Ban Closed Shops," published in the Milwaukee Journal of January 5, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

BERLIN AIR LIFT—ADDRESS BY HON. EUGENE M. ZUCKERT

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of the relief of Berlin by the United States Air Force delivered by Hon. Eugene M. Zuckert, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, before the Commonwealth Club at San Francisco, Calif., on December 10, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

NEW YEAR'S MESSAGE BY REV. FREDERICK BROWN HARRIS, D. D.

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Guidance—And Your Level Best," written by Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., former Chaplain of the Senate, and published in the Washington Star of January 2, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR FREE PRESS ASKS NO SUBSIDY—EDITORIAL FROM THE WORCESTER (MASS.) SUNDAY TELEGRAM

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our Free Press Asks No Subsidy," published in the Worcester (Mass.) Sunday Telegram of December 19, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD several editorials regarding the bipartisan foreign policy and the effect on it of the change in the ratio on the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, which appear in the Appendix.]

WASHINGTON SPY CASE—EDITORIAL FROM SALT LAKE TRIBUNE

[Mr. WATKINS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Washington Spy Case May Tax Imagination, but It Happened, and Can Happen Again," published in a recent issue of the Salt Lake Tribune, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SEATTLE AIR TRAGEDY

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed by Lawrence M. Arnold to Joseph J. O'Connell, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, under date of January 6, 1949, an editorial from the Seattle (Wash.) Post-Intelligencer of January 5, 1949, and a news column from the Seattle (Wash.) Times of January 5, 1949, relating to the Seattle air tragedy on January 2, 1949, which appear in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR DONNELLY, OF MISSOURI, BEFORE MISSOURI RIVER STATES COMMITTEE

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD immediately following my remarks a copy of a speech which was made at a recent meeting of the Missouri River States Committee by the Democratic Governor of Missouri, Hon. Phil M. Donnelly, who is the outgoing chairman of that very important committee. He is succeeded for the current year by the Republican Governor of Nebraska, the Honorable Val Peterson.

The Missouri River States Committee is a very important organization. It was provided for by the law passed in 1944 by Congress, and it is doing a very splendid job. I think the speech that was made on the occasion in question by the Honorable Phil M. Donnelly should be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I want to thank Governor Peterson for his invitation to address this group. I have enjoyed my work with the Missouri River States Committee and with the Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee. As you know, under the Missouri constitution a Governor may serve 4 years but cannot succeed himself. My term of office will expire on next January 10, so this is the last meeting I will attend.

For a few minutes I want to look back over the past 4 years in an attempt to recount some of the progress made by these committees and use this as a background for a picture of the future.

For your information, the Missouri River States Committee is composed of the Governors of the 10 Missouri River States, together with two additional representatives from each State. This group was organized to promote closer cooperative action among the States of the Missouri Valley and to represent the interests of those States. It has done all this and more. It has promoted a better understanding of the multiplicity of problems throughout the basin and made us all cognizant of the necessity for cooperation.

The Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee is composed of five governors selected by the Missouri River States Committee and five Federal representatives from the Departments of the Army, Agriculture, Interior, Commerce, and the Federal Power Commission.

This group was organized initially to coordinate the work of the various Federal agencies. It has done this and a great deal more. It has succeeded in establishing a close working relation between Federal agencies in the Missouri Basin; perhaps closer than anywhere else in the country. It has established close working relations between the various States and between State agencies and Federal agencies. It has solved some of the most intricate and difficult problems of State-Federal relationship. It has programed the Missouri River Basin development, not only for this year and next year but for the next 6 years, thus providing for orderly and efficient progress in the future. All these things have been done under existing principles of law without additional legislation. That is why I am proud to be a member of such a group.

Although construction of many important projects has been started in the Missouri Basin during the last 4 years, I would say that the greatest progress has been the increase in our breadth of vision.

In the fall of 1944 the President signed Public Law 534 and the Pick-Sloan plan became law.

With the Pick-Sloan plan as a nucleus we have been able to formulate a plan of development for the Missouri Basin which may truly be called comprehensive. The plan includes flood control, drainage, irrigation, hydroelectric power, soil conservation, improved land use, forestry, recreation, fish and wildlife, industrial expansion, public health, and many other conservation and developmental measures. Although much of this is in the planning stage considerable progress has been made in carrying out the initial phases of the plan. I believe that a large part of the credit for the comprehensive plan of development for the Missouri Basin and for the progress made during the past 4 years should go to the Missouri River States Committee and to the Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee.

The Missouri River Basin is a region of vast area and enormous resources. Let us look back into history for just a moment. The United States made the Louisiana Purchase in 1803. The population of the United States at that time was approximately 4,000,000 people, the same as in the State of Missouri according to the 1940 Federal census. The Louisiana Purchase comprised 827,987 square miles of territory, 529,000 of which are located within the Missouri River Basin. You can readily see how important that purchase was, is now, and always will be to our country. The total cost of the Louisiana Purchase was around $27,000,000. We have before us a developmental program

which calls for an expenditure of something over 100 times the total of that cost to be spent in developing navigation and flood control, irrigation and reclamation, soil conservation, and land improvement in order that we may enjoy the resources of that purchase. We have the opportunity of enhancing its value to our future citizens where it may again become worth many times the original cost and what we may spend on it. The job we have undertaken will require many years to accomplish completely, and, in fact, the improvement of the valley and the use of its resources will never end, so long as man resides therein and uses it for producing his daily needs.

The development of those resources presents a multiplicity of problems. For instance, Nebraska is the only State of the 10 States that lies wholly within the basin that has no means of ingress or egress without crossing over the borders of some of the other States. Anyone in the other nine States can get out of the basin by crossing the divide within the borders of the particular State in which he may reside.

Nebraska is about centrally located in the basin and contains a good cross section of the resources and problems of the basin. In the upper part of the basin one of the major problems is a deficiency in rainfall. Floods are relatively unimportant. In the lower part of the basin the major problem is excessive rainfall at times. Our problem in the lower basin is to protect ourselves from this damaging excess of water and to control it in such a way as to make use of it rather than to allow it to destroy our economy. We in the lower basin do not as yet find it practicable to use this excess water for irrigation. There is the problem of soil erosion almost throughout the basin. There is a shortage of power in every part of the basin. All of these problems and many others exist right here in your own State of Nebraska. All of these problems and many more are in the process of being solved by the Missouri River development program. In the northern and western part of your State you have the problems common to the upper part of the basin. You need to irrigate thousands of acres of land to increase your agricultural production and stabilize your economy. You have hydroelectric power resources to be developed. In the southern and eastern part of your State you have the problems common to the lower part of the basin. You are chiefly concerned with the loss of your soil and with the tremendous losses caused by floodwater.

Over half of my own State of Missouri lies in the Missouri River Basin. In this area one of our primary concerns is the alarming rate at which we are losing our soil. This is a severe loss to us in several ways. The economy of this area is largely agricultural and always will be. About 68 percent of all raw materials for manufacturing in the area comes from the farm. We cannot continue to lose our valuable soil at the present rate and maintain the economy of this region, to say nothing of improving it.

Records show that for a certain county in northwest Missouri the average corn yield 50 years ago was 30 bushels per acre. The average corn yield for this same county at the present time is still 30 bushels per acre. Experts tell us that due to improved seeds and farming techniques in the last 50 years the average yield should be 60 bushels per acre. The reason it is not this high is because the soil has lost about half of its original productivity. In other words, scientific improvements in seed selection and plant breeding together with improvements in farming technique during the past 50 years have barely kept up with the loss in soil productivity.

In addition to the loss in fertility of our uplands due to erosion, we have further damaging effects from silt. It increases maintenance costs and shortens the effective life of drainage and flood-control structures. It is damaging to improvements on our alluvial land. It sometimes decreases the fertility of our alluvial land.

Another important problem in the Missouri portion of the basin is the destructiveness of excess flood water. This was forcibly brought to our attention during the spring of 1947 when the Missouri River and its major tributaries caused a flood damage of about $60,000,000 in the State of Missouri alone. At one time the flood problem at Kansas City was considered to be one of the most critical in the country. I am happy to say that works completed within the past 2 years and work now under way and soon to be started by the Corps of Engineers have this problem pretty well in hand. Work now under way on agricultural levees and other work in the advanced planning stages will protect thousands of acres of our agricultural land from the ravages of floodwater. The huge reservoirs now under construction on the main stem of the Missouri River in the Dakotas will also give us important relief in this respect.

In the beginning we in Missouri were not in complete agreement with the original Pick-Sloan plan, as authorized in the 1944 Flood Control Act. We felt that certain changes and adjustments in the plan were necessary and that it offered little as a solution to some of our most pressing problems. It was particularly devoid of any remedy for our soil erosion and land-use problems. It called for tremendous sacrifices of land for reservoirs on our tributary streams without adequate benefit to offset these sacrifices.

However, through our relationship with the Missouri Basin interagency committee we were able to get a reconsideration of the plan for our State. During the past 2 years we have been engaged in cooperative State-Federal studies and have found the solution to some of our most difficult problems. These studies are continuing and we are confident that a satisfactory plan will eventually be worked out. Our procedure is to study each tributary stream basin individually and attempt to arrive at the best plan of land and water resource development for that particular basin, while at the same time giving due consideration to the over-all Missouri Basin development. All State agencies having responsibilities and interests in land and water resource development are cooperating in these studies. Likewise such Federal agencies as the Corps of Engineers, Soil Conservation Service, Federal Power Commission, Fish and Wildlife Service, Public Health Service, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, and others are participating. Regardless of the problem that arises, I believe we have the best available technical skill to solve it, either at the State or Federal level, or both.

I want to stress the fact that the task of developing the Missouri River Basin can best be solved by cooperative effort on the part of the States located in the basin and the United States Government. If the people living within the basin do not put forth an honest effort to secure the best advantages for all, the United States Government can do little effectively and economically to secure the benefits desired. The 10 States concerned the most under this development do not have the resources by which they can do the things necessary in an effective way and in a way that will conserve the resources located within the basin.

I want to impress upon you that the States themselves cannot do the job in such manner as to conserve those resources. For example, in the State of Missouri, and I know it is true in the other States, we have been using the land for agricultural purposes in a most wasteful way. If we could have foreseen years ago what has been and is happening to our farm lands that wastes the soil and seriously reduces the productivity of that land, we would have taken steps to conserve it for future generations.

It is a difficult task for the people who are making their living from the soil to become financially able to do the things necessary to conserve the soil and retain its fertility. Likewise, those who are tilling the soil do not have the opportunity through their own efforts to gain the knowledge that is required for them to know how best to conserve the land for continuous use, so it necessarily becomes the problem of all of us through our governments to assist in the problem of determining how best to use our lands in order that we may live and that future generations may also have the same or similar uses of that land which we enjoy.

We sometimes hear objections to the granting by Congress of Federal funds for developing resources that are at times looked upon as being for local interests. Such objections should take into consideration all the benefits as well as the objectionable features.

The Missouri River States Committee and the Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee are concerned in the over-all problem of the basin. We have held our conferences and have worked on the principle that what is good for us collectively is good for us individually. We have demonstrated we can cooperate 100 percent in our efforts to bring about the development of the resources of the basin. The physical structures needed are being brought into existence and the problems of conserving our natural resources are being solved.

I would not leave you with the impression that all this progress has been easy or that there is not a big job ahead. There have been differences and conflicting interests. There will continue to be. This would be disheartening if it were not for the fact that we have in existence two well-organized bodies to solve these differences. I refer to the Missouri River States Committee and the Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee. These two groups always have been and I am confident always will be free from domination by any special interest. The public interest in the work of these two groups requires this must be so. Likewise these groups must remain free from domination by any State or Federal agency within their membership. Only in this way can they hope to continue to function properly in a democratic manner and for the public good.

One of the greatest dangers I can see for this great development program is that it could become overloaded with unsound accessories. In any large program of this kind there is always a temptation to throw in items here and there which may have nothing whatever to do with the main objectives of the program or which may be economically unsound. Too much of this can hurt the program as a whole and possibly destroy it altogether. I urge the members of the committees to analyze thoroughly proposed measures before placing them into the program.

I cannot urge too strongly active participation by the States in this development program. The people of the basin will never receive the full benefit from the program without the help of the States involved. I believe the States of the basin recognize this and will continue to fulfill their obligations in that respect. We see enormous dams and other engineering structures under construction. We are inclined to point to these structures with pride as evidence of the progress we are making. We are wholly justified in doing this.

But we must also recognize these structures for what they are—a means of improving the economic and social status of the Missouri Basin and of the entire Nation. These structures will help us to increase the supply of food and fiber for the Nation; they will light the homes of the Missouri Valley; they will help to do the work of the overburdened farmer; they will save the homes and property of the valley from destructive floods; they will provide an incentive for new industries to spring up.

But to do all this they must first be properly planned, then properly constructed, and finally, properly used so that their full potentialities are made available for public benefit. State governments can and should be of great assistance in helping to see that all this is done.

By widespread use of soil conservation and improved land-use measures, we can greatly increase the agricultural production of the basin. We can at the same time reduce the damage from silt. Above all, we can conserve one of our most fundamental natural resources for those who come after us.

To do this job properly, we need the cooperation of every citizen in the basin. There is a tremendous educational task involved. Here again the States can and should render valuable assistance. This by no means exhausts the list of responsibilities which the States have in connection with the Missouri River Basin development program.

Before the job will have been completed, many of us now carrying on the work will cease to be actively connected with it and others will take over. Because of that, it requires continuous effort to transmit what we have learned to those who follow and to encourage all concerned to cooperate in order that we may receive the greatest development possible for the money that is to be spent in carrying out the work.

I should not fail to say that the work we can do in controlling the Missouri River to reduce the destructive effects of the floods within its basin, will also aid in protecting farmers and cities in the lowlands below the mouth of the river in the States that border the Mississippi extending to the Gulf of Mexico. So it is difficult to measure all the benefits that may come to the Nation from what we are engaged in doing.

I might say it would be very difficult to find an organization, made up of the two committees in the field actively carrying on this work, that would perform their task with as little dissension and with more honest effort than is being put forth by those connected with the Missouri River Basin development as being carried out under the Pick-Sloan plan.

In my work as a member of the Inter-Agency Committee I have traveled throughout the Missouri Basin. I have never failed to find enthusiastic support for the Missouri Basin development program. That has made possible the progress to date. Such support will assure continued progress. Such support indicates to me that the people of the valley are fully aware of the significance of this development and are willing to assume their share of the responsibility.

In concluding I want to say that I have thoroughly enjoyed working with my fellow governors and with the Federal representatives on these two committees. I am proud of any contribution I may have made to the Missouri Basin development program. Good progress has been made but we are only started. Much remains to be done. With continued cooperation between the people, the States, and the Federal Government, the program should not fail.

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION—BARRING OF RETURN TO GERMANY OF CERTAIN NUNS

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement prepared by me dealing with a serious situation which should be the subject of inquiry by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HERBERT R. O'CONOR

Shocking revelations have come to us which indicate that we have not yet attained the objectives for which our people fought in the recent World War. That terrible conflict with its cost of lives and resources was waged primarily to save men everywhere from the degradation of slavery—slavery of the mind as well as of the body.

Today, unfortunately, in the midst of our continuing struggle for peace, there are disquieting evidences of such control of men's minds throughout the world which demand our vigorous protests if the world is not to lose completely the benefits of that recent costly struggle.

Yesterday news dispatches from Munich reported the barring, evidently by Communist officials, of a group of German nuns who had been teaching in Rumania from returning to their German homes. I believe that this action is of such grave concern as to warrant the investigation and study of the Foreign Relations Committee of this distinguished body.

America has furthered the doctrine of tolerance and of freedom of thought. Our country has been the leading exponent of this doctrine with regard both to our own citizens and to visitors from other lands. Continuingly, however, as in this case, we find concrete evidence that Moscow and the countries within the Russian orbit are not granting to their own subjects, or to others under their domination, that freedom of thought and mind which is so necessary to world understanding.

Again and again we have been given assurance from the Kremlin that freedom of thought and of conscience is permitted throughout Russia and throughout its allied countries. Again and again, however, their actions have belied their words.

The extraordinary vigor of the protest lodged with the Hungarian Government very recently by our Acting Secretary of State in connection with the arrest of Cardinal Mindszenty, Catholic primate of that country, brings into focus the very disturbing policies of the countries behind the iron curtain with respect to all those freedoms which we in America hold dear, and which must be fostered throughout the world if ever a true peace is to be had.

In this particular instance of the application of Communist policy a group of 40 nuns, who had been teaching for several decades in Rumania, were returning to their home in Germany, following efforts in their behalf by the American military government religious affairs officer and the Catholic archbishop of Munich. On their arrival at Salzburg they were warned by officials of an unidentified country not to return to Germany. If they did, they were told, none of their compatriots still remaining in Rumania would be permitted to leave.

Mr. James Eagan, United States military government religious affairs officer in Bavaria, did not identify the offending country. Nevertheless it is well known that both Russia and Rumania maintain liaison officers in Salzburg, and the inference is unmistakable.

Because America is responsible for a portion of Germany under occupation agreements, this recent action might be interpreted as the fault of our representatives in the American zone. We should disavow any such refusal to permit these nuns or any other religious groups from returning to their homeland. We should question further and protest vigorously against the action of any other nation in refusing freedom of conscience and of worship. Most important of all, we should protest to the world against the action of a tyrannical government which has embarked upon a course of oppression and persecution in order to accomplish an impossible task, namely, of wiping out religious beliefs from the hearts and souls of human beings.

I respectfully suggest that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee investigate this serious situation and report upon its findings for the information of the United States Senate and of the entire Nation.

THE BUDGET

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which the Chief Clerk proceeded to read.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, this is a very lengthy message. I think the letter of transmittal comprises approximately 80 pages. I suggest that the further reading be dispensed with, and that the entire message be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the message, with the accompanying budget, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

(For letter of transmittal, see pp. 134–153 of House proceedings of today.)

LABOR LAW STRIKE-DELAYING MACHINERY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there appears in the Washington Post of this morning an article which reads in part as follows:

Cyrus S. Ching found fault yesterday with the elaborate strike-stalling machinery of the Taft-Hartley Act in national emergencies. He said important features of it delay agreements.

The Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service also said in a report to Congress that Government mediators must remain impartial to be effective in settling labor disputes.

But Ching refrained from stating any stand in the current controversy over whether his agency should remain independent or, as asked by Secretary of Labor Maurice Tobin, return to the Labor Department as it was prior to the Taft-Hartley Act.

READY TO RECOMMEND

However, Ching strongly insisted that Government mediators are at maximum usefulness only as long as they remain neutral as between labor and management. He said he was ready to make legislative recommendations when requested.

As a member of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, I certainly shall call upon Mr. Ching to make recommendations at the earliest possible date, as soon as we can have a meeting of that committee. I say that because I know of no one in all America—and I make this statement in the utmost sincerity—whose views as to impartial processes in the field of labor relations I would rather have than those of the present Director of the Mediation and Conciliation Service. I served with him for 2 years on the War Labor Board when he sat there as a representative of industry. Although he was a very able representative of industry in seeing to it that the legitimate rights of industry were at all times considered by the Board, he was more than a representative of industry. In my judgment he fully filled the quasi-judicial position which was his

during the war as a member of that Board. So, I am satisfied that when he makes recommendations to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, we shall have the recommendations, first, of a public servant who understands how to be impartial on great controversial issues.

The article continues to quote Mr. Ching, as follows:

It is essential to the effective performance of the mediator's duty, Ching advised Congress, that his institutional and personal relationships be such that neither side will have its suspicions aroused, however unjustly, that he is answerable to another with a suspected partisan stake in the dispute.

I digress further, Mr. President, to say that I am completely in agreement with that observation by Cyrus Ching; and therefore I shall assume, until he recommends to the contrary, if he should, that it would be rather difficult to make a case for a return of the Conciliation Service to the Department of Labor. I happen to hold to the view that the Conciliation Service should be neither a part of the Department of Labor nor a part of the Department of Commerce; and it is just as sensible to make it a part of the Department of Commerce as it is to make it a part of the Department of Labor, inasmuch as the Conciliation Service is now an independent agency. It is true that housekeeping work is done for it in the Department of Labor; but certainly where we need to keep it is in a position of unquestioned impartiality, beyond suspicion either on the part of the general public or on the part of industry, in this case. Returning the Conciliation Service to the Department of Labor would, in my judgment, once more subject it to the charge of being biased. Such a charge would greatly weaken the effectiveness of the Service, even if bias did not, in fact, exist. I think great progress has been made in the effort to have the employers give full recognition to the service the Mediation and Conciliation Service can perform for them in bringing them together with the leaders of labor around a free collective-bargaining table.

Although Mr. Ching in his report does not make a definite commitment in regard to where the Service should be located, I take it for granted that his advice that the conciliators should always be answerable to both parties to a dispute, and that neither side should be in a position of even suspecting the impartiality of a conciliator, leaves no room for doubt as to where he will finally have to take his position in answer to specific questions which I intend to ask him when he comes before our committee.

The article continues:

The Mediation Service's report on its experience under several Taft-Hartley provisions included these observations:

1. The 80-day court injunctions in national emergency disputes have tended to delay rather than facilitate settlement, because both sides tend to sit out the period, leaving a question whether there should be a shorter injunction period or one of indefinite duration.

Mr. President, I particularly recommend this finding by the head of the Conciliation Service to the Members of the Senate on my side of the aisle, most of whom voted for the Taft-Hartley bill. I make this recommendation because, prior to the passage of the bill, I urged a consideration of the very observation which Mr. Ching now makes after more than a year's experience with the law.

I read further from the article:

2. The requirement that a Presidential fact-finding board must report its findings before an injunction can be obtained interferes with collective bargaining in the crucial period before a strike deadline.

I think Mr. Ching is quite correct. Once again I point out that those of us who opposed the passage of the Taft-Hartley bill in the form in which it was finally passed urged further consideration of this particular section of the bill. In fact, Mr. President, in a speech which I delivered on November 12, 1948, at the University of Pennsylvania, before a labor institute conducted by the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce, the speech being entitled "The Emergency Dispute Provisions of the Taft-Hartley Law," I discussed at some length this particular point which Mr. Ching raises in his annual report. Therefore, at this point in the RECORD, as part of the body of my remarks, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have my speech of November 12, on the emergency dispute provisions of the Taft-Hartley law, printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EMERGENCY DISPUTE PROVISIONS OF THE TAFT-HARTLEY LAW

(Address by WAYNE MORSE, United States Senator from Oregon, before the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, November 12, 1948)

Chairman Balderston, President Stassen, ladies and gentlemen, you couldn't have paid me a finer compliment than to have me introduced by Harold Stassen. In his introduction of me he referred to the fact that at one time I was one of his teachers at the University of Minnesota. However, as a teacher I tried to put into practice the teaching rule that to be a good teacher one must be willing and able to learn from his students.

Let me tell you that Harold Stassen was one of those students who taught me much during my years at the University of Minnesota. He has taught me a great deal ever since in the school of American politics, and I am looking to him to keep right on teaching all of us in the Republican Party a great many lessons that need to be learned by the party.

I want to congratulate the University of Pennsylvania and the State of Pennsylvania in selecting such an American statesman to the presidency of the University of Pennsylvania. I am positive that Harold Stassen will prove to be a great educational statesman, as the head of this university. He would think it flattery, and I mean no flattery, if I proceeded to tell you of the high esteem in which I hold this fine American. Nevertheless, I want him to know that I expect to continue to sit at his feet, both in the field of education and of politics. I think there is a great future ahead for him because America needs the type of statesmanship Harold Stassen is giving to our country.

You all make me feel very homesick here, tonight, because as Harold has mentioned, for some 21 years it was my privilege and my opportunity to live in an academic environment where the motivation is, and should be, a search for the truth. I don't always live in that environment these days. Sometimes partisan politics and political strategy rather than a search for the truth and action based upon objective data come to prevail in the Congress of the United States. I offer the recent record of the Eightieth Congress as exhibit A in support of that observation. However, if my political fortunes should ever turn into misfortunes, I am sure I shall always be very happy to return to the cloistered walls of a great university again, working with teachers and students who recognize that after all the search for truth and putting the truth into practice represent the only hope for the democratic form of government.

In my comments here tonight I shall read a short paper on the Taft-Hartley law and national emergency disputes. Then, if time permits, I shall ad lib. a bit regarding my personal observations as to the problems which I think are ahead of us in regard to labor legislation.

It is with considerable diffidence that I approach a discussion of our experiences under those provisions of the Taft-Hartley law dealing with public emergency disputes.

In the months that have elapsed since the act became law in June 1947—and even before that time—I have spoken frequently and on occasion at considerable length in opposition to the Taft-Hartley law. Most of my comments have been concerned with needed amendments to the Wagner Act as a substitute program for the Taft-Hartley Act. My impressions of the operation of the Taft-Hartley law as it touches emergency disputes have been obtained primarily from the sidelines. I have no doubt that other speakers at this conference—such as Sumner Slichter and Harry Shulman, who spoke this afternoon, or Dean Balderston or George Taylor, can give you a much more intimate and informative discussion of the emergency disputes section of the law. They have had first-hand experience as members of boards of inquiry appointed by the President pursuant to the Taft-Hartley Act to report on specific national emergency disputes.

There can be no doubt that my good friend, Cy Ching, from his vantage point as director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, is better qualified to give you a well-rounded picture of the national emergency sections of the Taft-Hartley Act than I. Perhaps, speaking jocularly, I should suggest that the reason those who have served on boards of inquiry have not been prevailed upon to appraise the operations of the emergency disputes provisions of the act and to make suggestions to this conference is that their discussion might be construed as recommendations. Thus, they, mindful of the terms of the law which provide that reports of boards of inquiry shall not contain any recommendations, might feel constrained to refrain from expressing opinions or recommendations at this conference.

It is somewhat difficult to understand why those who have served as members of boards to inquire into the issues of labor disputes, and who have had the responsibility of ascertaining the facts regarding the causes and circumstances of a given dispute, should then be specifically enjoined from making recommendations for settlement of the dispute. I shall touch on the soundness of this provision of the law later in my discussion, but I do want to observe at this point that a flat prohibition against recommendations by boards of inquiry seems to me to be of questionable validity, assuming that the fact-finding technique serves a useful purpose.

Probably it is unnecessary to sketch for this audience, even briefly, the steps provided in the Taft-Hartley Act for coping with national emergency disputes. However, it may be well to recall the over-all scope and procedure of the act in this regard, before commenting on specific provisions.

Whenever, in his opinion, a threatened or actual strike or lockout involving all or a substantial part of an industry, not subject to the Railway Labor Act, will imperil national health or safety, the President is authorized to appoint a board of inquiry consisting of a chairman and such other members as the President shall determine. The board is authorized to hold public or private hearings and is vested with the power of compulsory process. After inquiring into the issues and ascertaining the facts of the dispute, the board is required to make a written report to the President which, however, shall not contain any recommendations. The President then makes the report available to the public and the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.

In the words of the statute, the President, "upon receiving a report from a Board of Inquiry"—but apparently not before—may instruct the Attorney General to seek an injunction. If the court finds that the dispute affects all or a substantial part of the industry and will imperil national health or safety, it may enjoin the strike or lock-out and make any other orders it deems appropriate. The Norris-LaGuardia Act is not applicable in these cases. After an injunction has issued, it is the duty of the parties to make every effort to adjust and settle their differences, aided by the Mediation and Conciliation Service. The law says, however, that the parties are under no duty to accept any proposals made by the Service.

After an injunction has issued, the President is required to reconvene the Board of Inquiry. If the dispute is not settled at the end of a 60-day period dating from the issuance of the injunction, the Board reports to the President the current position of the parties and the efforts made toward settlement, including the employer's last offer of settlement. Within the next 15 days, the NLRB must take a secret vote of the employees as to whether they wish to accept the employer's last offer. Five days later the Board must certify the results of the vote to the Attorney General, who then must ask the court to discharge the injunction. The motion has to be granted.

The final step is the requirement that the President make a full report to Congress, together with such recommendations as he sees fit.

Boiled down even further, it is, I think, fair to say that the emergency dispute sections of the Taft-Hartley Act enforce an 80-day "cooling-off" period, during which a Presidential board reports the facts without recommendations, and employees vote on the question whether to accept or reject, in toto, the last offer of their employer. If the dispute is not settled during this period, the President lays the problem before Congress.

One of the difficulties I see in the emergency dispute procedure is that the timetable established by the law may have the effect of interfering with direct negotiations and hampering the effective use of mediation at a time when continued negotiation and mediation would be especially helpful. This is occasioned by the provision which seems to require that before an injunction can be sought, the Board of Inquiry must have made its first report. While it may not be absolutely necessary that the Board report precede the petition for an injunction, apparently that chronological order of events was intended, because section 208 says that the President may direct the filing of an injunction petition "upon receiving a report" from the Board. In any event, the practice has been to follow this order, and it is fairly clear that the Board's findings materially aid the Government in persuading the court that an injunction should be granted.

The necessity for attending hearings of the Board and acquainting its members with the facts of the dispute, during the last week or two before the zero hour, not only takes valuable time which the parties might spend to better advantage in further negotiations and mediation, but also tends to an early crystallization of position. It is, of course, understandable that all preliminary steps should be completed in advance of the date any injunction needs to be obtained if a stoppage which seems likely to occur is to be delayed or averted. Assuming for the moment that the injunctive remedy is desirable, production is less likely to be interrupted if it is invoked before, rather than after, a work stoppage has taken place. Since the Board's report is regarded as an essential preliminary step to an injunction, it is of course desirable, once the President has concluded that an emergency situation is likely to arise, to convene the Board of Inquiry early enough so that it will have time to report the facts before the time arrives for petitioning for the injunction.

I believe that serious consideration should be given to revising the law so as to permit of greater flexibility in deciding whether the report of the Board of Inquiry should precede or follow application for an injunction. An alternative might be to provide that the President may direct the Attorney General to petition for court relief either upon receiving the Board of Inquiry's report or upon certification by the Director of the Mediation and Conciliation Service that the dispute threatens to imperil national health or safety. The Mediation Service is no stranger to the facts of an impending dispute, since it closely follows the progress of negotiations and frequently furnishes mediation and conciliation services. Hence its judgment as to the seriousness of the dispute and the likelihood of a stoppage is entitled to a great weight and, I suggest, could furnish the basis for action. As a matter of fact, the decision to appoint a Board of Inquiry in the first place is made, in large part, upon the basis of the appraisal by the Mediation Service. I see no compelling reason why the report of the Service could not, in many cases, be substituted for the first report of the Board of Inquiry as the preliminary step in the injunction proceedings.

A more debatable provision in the law, in my judgment, is the prohibition against recommendations by boards of inquiry. This provision stems from the Senate committee bill, which in turn was derived from proposals by Senator IVES. The theory behind it probably represents a reaction to the experiences of the war period. As explained in the report of the majority of the Senate committee, a procedure which amounted to compulsory arbitration was utilized through the instrumentality of the War Labor Board, and this system tended to emphasize unduly the role of the Government with the result that employers and unions tended to avoid solving their difficulties by free collective bargaining. Recommendations of fact-finding boards or over-all mediation tribunals, the report found, tend to set patterns of wage settlements for the entire country which are frequently inappropriate to the peculiar circumstances of certain industries and certain classes of employment. Hence the fact finders were prohibited by law from making recommendations—at least in public. The minority members of the Senate committee, on the other hand, said that the prohibition against recommendations was "unwise" and that there are many occasions upon which it is desirable for boards of inquiry to make recommendations.

While it is a mistake to draw too heavily upon experience under the Railway Labor Act, so frequently cited as a model of labor legislation, nevertheless, I have heard no serious suggestions that it should be amended so as to strip emergency boards of the power to make recommendations for settlement. Granted that there are historical differences between the labor problems of the railroad industry and other basic industries, and in the methods evolved for their settlement, I am not convinced that they are so great that we must avoid recommendations by governmental boards in one case and foster them in the other.

Undoubtedly the effect of recommendations by a governmental board is to bring public pressure to bear upon the parties to settle their dispute by accepting the recommendations of the fact-finding body. To that extent, there is an element of compulsion. However, it seems to me that this process cannot rightly be termed compulsory arbitration. If it can be so labeled, then we should also avoid fact-finding without recommendation, for the basic theory of both devices is the same: that the public, once apprised of the facts, will make its opinion known with such force that the parties will reach a settlement. In either case, I submit, our hopes are pinned to an effective mobilization of public opinion for an equitable settlement in the light of the facts. The question really is whether that opinion shall be enlightened and effective or confused and diverse. If boards of inquiry, composed of men well known and respected for their impartiality, were allowed, but not required, to make recommendations, the settlement of national emergency disputes might be aided rather than handicapped.

There is some evidence that the 80-day injunction is not altogether unwelcome in emergency disputes. While labor leaders uniformly protest in public against the injunction, it is probably no secret that in some of the recent cases they have privately attempted to pressure the Mediation Service and the executive offices to have a Board of Inquiry appointed and to secure an injunction prior to the strike deadline. Doubtless a partial explanation of this circumstance is that unions are understandably reluctant to have to bear the onus of a strike in a vital industry and hope that during the "cooling off" period a peaceful solution will be found. On the other hand, we have the Board of Inquiry in the maritime dispute, under the chairmanship of Harry Shulman, reporting that "some of the unions persist in the view that the injunction and the 'cooling off' period * * * impede, rather than encourage, settlement," because with respect to parties willing to cooperate the effect is to postpone settlement, while in the case of parties unwilling or unable to get along "resistance is stiffened and resentment heated."

There is danger, of course, that the existence of governmental machinery for arriving at suggested or recommended solutions to labor disputes will encourage one or the other of the disputants to bring about Government intervention in the hope that his cause will be supported by the recommendations of the official body. Certainly we must recognize that such an attitude was a significant factor in many disputes that appeared on the docket of the War Labor Board and that it was encouraged by the ready availability of the governmental decision-making agency. The result was to short circuit and discourage voluntary collective bargaining. We must be on our guard to avoid a repetition of that experience.

However, if we accept this premise that boards of inquiry in national emergency cases serve a useful purpose by finding and reporting the facts, and assume that discretion will be exercised in how frequently and in what disputes they are used, I am inclined to believe that it would be desirable to give them power to make recommendations. Especially would public recommendations be helpful if the parties were to agree, in advance, that recommendations should be made and that they would be adhered to on all or certain designated issues. The process would then take on the attributes of voluntary arbitration.

The requirement that the NLRB poll the employees on the last offer of the employer is, in my judgment, unnecessary and unsound. It perpetuates a device which experience with a similar provision of the War Labor Disputes Act demonstrated to be wholly ineffectual in reducing strikes. You will recall that Congress eventually came to the conclusion that these strike votes were of no value, and attached a rider to the appropriation of the NLRB prohibiting it from conducting any further such votes.

There are at least two fallacies in the last-offer vote provision. First, it erroneously assumes that the latest offer at the time the vote must be taken is in fact the employer's final offer. However, we all know that parties frequently are still in negotiation and may modify their positions considerably even before the poll can be conducted.

Second, the vote becomes a vote of confidence in the union's bargaining representatives, rather than an expression of satisfaction with the terms of the employer's proposal.

In most labor disputes, if you put up to the union members an issue of whether or not they are going to vote to sustain the union officers or overrule the union officers, you know what the result usually is—they vote to sustain. Thousands and thousands of dollars of public monies, in my judgment, have been wasted on these so-called last-offer votes, when what they are voting on is whether they want to go along with the union officers. I will make the guess that in 90 percent of the cases the union members have rejected the employer's last offer and thereby voted to sustain their union officials. This section has not produced the results hoped for by the proponents of the Taft-Hartley Act. Some of us had the temerity during the debates on the Taft-Hartley bill to predict that this provision entailed an empty gesture and showed a very unrealistic approach to labor disputes by the proponents of the Taft-Hartley bill.

In the history of the current west coast maritime dispute, we have a striking illustration of the fact that employees may be voting on a supposed offer of an employer which is nonexistent or which has been substantially modified prior to the vote. In this maritime case after the Labor Board had gone to the expense and trouble of sending ballots to seamen in far-off ports, the employers withdrew all offers. More recently, it appears that a new formula may have been found for settling this strike. But in any event, this one case should suffice to demonstrate the ineffectiveness of the last-offer vote. In any revisions of the Taft-Hartley Act in the coming session of Congress, I believe it would be advisable to eliminate this provision.

Mentioning the current maritime dispute on the west coast, I want to take at least a minute once again to express my opinion about that strike. It is an opinion I have been expressing for many weeks on many platforms of America. I want to express it here again tonight even though it is an opinion which has caused me to receive some kicks from the leaders of the union and has not brought me any bouquets from the shipowners. Nevertheless, I am going to express the opinion that there is no justification for a continuance of that stoppage of work. Further there never was any justification for its starting in the first place, either on the part of the shipowners or on the part of the maritime unions. Here is an industry with one of the finest arbitration set-ups in any collective-bargaining agreement in the country, and it should have been used without any strike. I have said to the shipowners and to Mr. Bridges and his union in public statements, and I repeat it here tonight, "You are performing a great disservice to the economy of this country in continuing the dispute when you have in your own labor contract peaceful procedures of arbitration through which to settle your differences."

I say to them from this platform tonight that the irrelevant issues which both sides are raising in this dispute have nothing to do with the wages, hours, or conditions of employment about which the dispute is supposed to have arisen. The strike is costing us over $4,000,000 a day, and it should be stopped at once by returning to arbitration.

I want to commend two great men in the field of labor relations tonight, in connection with the west coast maritime strike—one representing the employer point of view, outside of the shipping industry, and the other representing labor's point of view, outside of the maritime unions. I refer, of course, to Almon Roth, of the San Francisco Employers' Council, and to Philip Murray, of the CIO. Both of these men, if I read the press aright, and if they are accurately quoted, and I think they are, recognize the fact that irrelevant issues have been raised by the parties to this dispute and that at the present time the fight is being fought not on issues that involve good-faith collective bargaining but rather over attempts to destroy the personal leadership of the men representing both the shipowners and the unions. I take the position that it is improper for the shipowners to try to break a union's leadership, irrespective of what they may think of that leadership, and I say, likewise, that it is equally improper for a union leadership to bring into a dispute involving wages, hours of work, and conditions of employment, political factors that have no connection with those issues. I hope I make myself clear.

Congress can perform a real service to the country if, in the consideration of proposals to amend or repeal the Taft-Hartley Act, it also gives careful attention to existing procedures for handling national emergency cases. Unfortunately, the tendency has been to act on little or poorly digested evidence, or to ignore the recommendations of those who are equipped to offer constructive suggestions. The objective is and should be the development and strengthening of voluntary procedures and free collective bargaining, rather than enlarging the role of Government as the decision maker.

The conclusions drawn early in 1947 by the labor committee of the Twentieth Century Fund, headed by William H. Davis, bear repeating in this connection. That committee concluded:

1. That there should be no Federal legislation prohibiting strikes or lock-outs, and that dispute settlement "should continue to be by industrial self-government through genuine collective bargaining with full freedom of contract";

2. That in industries essential to health or safety a stoppage is intolerable, and, in recognition of that fact, responsible management and labor should by agreement provide an adequate substitute for strikes and lock-outs;

3. Arrangements are needed to discourage the declaration of emergencies, which could be done by legislation authorizing the President to appoint emergency boards only on condition that the parties agree to try out board recommendations for a limited period;

4. If an emergency develops in an essential industry, chief reliance should be placed on emergency powers exercised through existing agencies; and

5. Any new legislation should prohibit strikes and lock-outs only after Government seizure, and adequate provision should be made for due process and just compensation, during Government operation, to both employer and employees.

Now, on the question of amendment of the act, I here and now recommend to the Labor Committee of the Senate, of which I am a member, the most careful and thorough consideration of the recommendations which Mr. Davis and his committee set out in that brilliant report of theirs. I recommend also to the Labor Committee that at the forthcoming hearings on proposals for amendment of the Taft-Hartley law men who know the business of labor relations, on labor's side and the employer's side, and particularly on the public's side, such as George Taylor, Harry Shulman, Will Davis, and the other great leaders representing the public at this conference, be brought to Washington for testimony based on their expert knowledge.

Now, before I close this address I wish to take just 2 or 3 minutes to express some observations as to the political implications of the Taft-Hartley law.

I have just finished a little speaking tour across the country in connection with the late lamented campaign. I made some 70 major speeches before many labor audiences. In those speeches I tried, as a constitutional liberal within the Republican Party, to tell American labor why I thought it should help elect a Republican President. It was very interesting. Results show that I was most unsuccessful. Labor didn't like the fact that a Republican-controlled Congress passed the Taft-Hartley law. Labor didn't like the failure of the Republican Party to make specifically clear just what amendments to the law it planned to offer and fight to pass through the next session of Congress if a Republican President were elected. A failure to take a clear-cut position on drastic revisions of the Taft-Hartley Act which are needed was very costly to the Republican Party in the election. The Republican Party speakers for the most part did not take specific stands on specific issues.

I didn't have to worry about discussing specific issues at my meetings—they were thrown at me, sometimes right between the eyes. My meetings were open forum affairs at which we discussed, for example, specific proposals for amending the Taft-Hartley law. I want to make this comment in all seriousness: Through the election we have seen a great example of democracy in action. Some of us may not like the results. I do not, but I refuse to ignore the results. I campaigned for my party because I am weary of liberals within the Republican Party who accept office from their party, hold high positions in the Republican Party, accept Republican committee assignments in Congress, and then at election time sulk in their tents because their party does not take their suggestions as though they spoke with the voice of infallibility. Such Republican liberals in the party have never grasped the full meaning, in my judgment, of the political ethics involved in party loyalty. The liberal must try to get his party into a position at election time so that it can assume full legislative responsibilities for the affairs of the Government. I think that is a test of political ethics which liberals within my party must be willing to meet if they are to accept the benefits that accrue to them as Republican officeholders.

I know there are those among the opposition party, as well as independent voters, who think I am inconsistent when I campaign for the Republican Party because as a member of the Senate I don't always vote with the recommendations of the Republican policy committee. My answer is that my party consists of the registered Republican voters of the party and not of the Republican policy committee. I am willing to let my voting record speak for itself as to whether or not it is consistent with the views and wishes of the majority of the Republican voters of the country.

As I sit in the Senate of the United States, the chairman of the Republican policy committee in the Senate, whoever he is, be he "BOB" TAFT or anyone else, will never cast my vote for me. The people of Oregon sent me to the Senate to cast my own vote on the merits of the facts involved in bills as they come before the Senate. They did not send me to the Senate to become a rubber stamp for the Republican policy committee.

I offer no apologies to this or any other audience for making the fight I made in the Senate of the United States on my side of the aisle against the Taft-Hartley bill. Subsequent events have shown that the position I took certainly was the position of the great majority, at least, of the overalls of America. It is time for politicians to stop thinking in terms of disfranchising the overalls of America, because the legs that carry the overalls also carry heads that know how to vote. Believe me when some Republican leaders tried to sell the bill of goods that it was only the labor leaders who didn't like the Taft-Hartley law they got their answer in the form of millions of votes against the Republican Party by the workers of the country on November 2, 1948.

Another fallacious argument that some Republican leaders have been making, in an attempt to rationalize their support of the Taft-Hartley law, is that the reduction in the number of strikes since the passage of the Taft-Hartley law is one of the direct beneficial results of the law. However, such an argument falls into the classification of a non sequitur fallacy. The politicians who, prior to the election, tried to convince the American people that there is a causal relationship between the Taft-Hartley law and a reduction of strikes since the passage of the law have simply illustrated once again the old tested formula that partisanship often blinds the partisan to the truth.

Thus, the politicians who voted for the Taft-Hartley bill and who are now confronted with the task of proving to labor that they knew what was best for labor, a la the Taft-Hartley bill, are defending their vote by pointing out that there have been fewer strikes since the Taft-Hartley bill was passed than there were during a similar period before it was passed. Oh, Aristotle, what fallacies are committed in thy memory.

Official Government labor statistics show also that during the period following the passage of the Taft-Hartley law national employment has increased. Surely the proponents of the Taft-Hartley law must be able to find some cause to effect relationship between the law and increased employment. It is no less a non sequitur to argue that because there have been fewer strikes since the passage of the Taft-Hartley law than there were for a similar period before its passage the Taft-Hartley law is the cause of the decrease in strikes.

It also is to be noted that the level of the cost of living has risen considerably since the passage of the law in spite of the flurry of recession in recent days. Surely the fact that the two phenomena have occurred in a close time relationship to each other must establish and bear out a causal relationship if we are to follow the logic, or lack of it, of the proponents of the Taft-Hartley law in respect to strike statistics.

Of course, when it is pointed out to the proponents of the Taft-Hartley law, who now are attempting to rationalize their votes on the basis of the decline in strikes since the passage of the law, that thousands upon thousands of American employers entered into evasive and subterfuge agreements with labor in order to get around the provisions of the law and avoid conflict with the workers over the act, their response is chiefly characterized by extra vocalization that doesn't even formulate itself into words.

When it is pointed out to these defenders of the Taft-Hartley law that there would have been strikes in major industries of this country whose labor contracts terminated after the passage of the Taft-Hartley law, if management in those industries had not yielded to the major economic demands of the unions in order to avoid a test under the Taft-Hartley law, these defenders of the Taft-Hartley law have a common reply; namely, "We just don't believe it." However, all they need to do is to talk to a cross section of employers who have signed labor agreements since the passage of the Taft-Hartley law. They will find that employer after employer will tell them, if they win his confidence, that he made many concessions which he is sure he would not have needed to make if he had not considered it so very desirable that he avoid a test with his union over the Taft-Hartley law.

Until courts pass upon various provisions of the act it cannot be said within a certainty just how far the parties to a labor agreement can go in contracting out from under the provisions of the act. However, there is no doubt about the fact that thousands of labor contracts have been entered into since the passage of the act which cannot be reconciled with the spirit and intent of Congress in passing the act. It certainly is clear that in passing the act Congress had no intention of passing a so-called private act but rather the putting upon the statute books a public-policy act frequently referred to throughout the debate as union-control law.

Prof. Edwin E. Witte, of the University of Wisconsin, and one of the top labor economists of the country, comments upon the doubtful legal status of the many labor agreements which seek to exclude by agreement of the parties the application of the Taft-Hartley law to the terms of the agreement as follows:

"An illustration of the present uncertainty surrounding the new law is afforded by the public statements which the two Members of Congress whose names this measure bears made concerning the agreement concluded recently between John L. Lewis' United Mine Workers and the bituminous coal operators of the country. Congressman HARTLEY denounced this agreement as a clear violation of the labor law, and warned the operators that they faced criminal prosecution and heavy penalties if they observed the provisions of the agreement. Senator TAFT thereafter gave it as his view that the coal agreement was not 'in any way a violation of the law,' and going beyond this, he cited the agreement as illustrating that under the new law 'employers and employees should be able to make any contract they want.'" (Edwin E. Witte, Labor Management Relations Under the Taft-Hartley Act, Harvard Business Review, autumn, 1947, p. 554.)

In the same article, on page 573, Professor Witte writes:

"What has been most disturbing to managements sincerely desirous of maintaining or developing better relations with their unions has been the bitterness the new law has aroused among the leaders of union labor and the stanch union members. It has opened old sores of extreme distrust of business, which had been pretty well healed. It also has confronted managements with the prospect of having to find a solution before long for difficult problems of labor-management relations arising out of the new law. Looming large among these are the union insistence upon eliminating no-strike clauses in contracts and the problem of what to do when union-security provisions expire. In this connection it is worthy of note that most of those management witnesses who in their testimony in the congressional hearings strongly condemned the closed shop never had such a provision in their contracts."

Then, too, there have been those employers who, since the passage of the law, have signed agreements without such collective-bargaining controversy because they have been very anxious to grant substantial increases in wages for a variety of reasons, such as their desire to maintain an inflated price structure, out of which they are reaping, at the expense of a long-suffering public, excessive profits. Such employers have followed the course of avoiding any stoppage of work by going along with labor for the most part, even though it has meant substantial increases in wages because they know the pattern of American industry since the end of the war has been to increase prices, at least twice the amount necessary, to take care of any increase in wages.

In many instances the increase in prices has been several times the amount necessary to pay for increased cost of labor. However, by granting a wage increase they have been able to pass along to the consumer greater than necessary price increases under the half-truth that increased labor costs require it.

Then there have been other employers who have followed the advice of certain employer and trade associations that now is not the time to challenge labor under the Taft-Hartley law. This antilabor group of employers, who fortunately, at least at present, represent a minority of American industry, are adopting the strategy of acceding to the major demands of labor for the time being until they can feed public opinion with another prescription of propaganda opiates which will becloud the public into thinking that maybe after all the Taft-Hartley law is good for labor.

This group of employers is well trained in industrial warfare and appreciates the fact that the timing of a battle often means the difference between victory and defeat. They know that their battle against strong unionism by use of the legal weapons provided in the Taft-Hartley law can easily be won in time of declining employment rather than in a period of expanding employment such as still characterizes the American postwar economy. The truth is that it is going to take 2 or 3 years for the Taft-Hartley law to show its legal effects and it is to be expected as long as full employment exists and labor's economic demands are generally complied with there will be few strikes resulting from the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law.

However, when recession starts in with its inevitable resulting unemployment the labor-relations picture will change and then the opportunity will present itself under the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law for those employers who wish to take advantage of organized labor to do so. Then industrial conflicts will move from the arena of a few court-test cases which are presently being carried on to the arena of economic industrial warfare. Labor will be at a disadvantage at first in that struggle, but as always it will learn the hard way and in due course of time another legislative record in defense of the legitimate rights of free workers will be written into the statute books of America as was the case when the battles of the Norris-LaGuardia Act and of the Wagner Act were won. Be that as it may, the fact remains that statesmanship has a great opportunity to help avoid that potential industrial war by proceeding now to revise in many major respects the Taft-Hartley law.

Now, I want to say something to you labor representatives in regard to the type of legislation to be passed by the Eighty-first Congress. You know my position. I told some of you when you came before the Senate committee in January, February, and March of 1947 that you let American labor down by taking the position that no legislation at all restricting labor excesses should be passed. I told you that you were acting outside of the framework of American public opinion, and that whenever any group in our society acts outside of the framework of American public opinion, be it business, labor, doctors, or any other group, the pendulum of public opinion tends to swing too far to another extreme. That is the only way one can explain how it happened that a Congress under heavy public demand for the passage of some labor legislation came to pass such an extreme bill as the Taft-Hartley law.

Now, what is going to be labor's position? The principle for which I stood in 1947 in urging fair legislation will not change one iota in the next session of Congress. My

mind is open to considering the question of labor legislation on the basis of facts and the preponderance of evidence submitted to the committee for a new labor law. However, you will not find the junior Senator from Oregon taking the position that no labor legislation shall be passed. I shall vote for repeal of the Taft-Hartley law. As I said on the Senate floor, it should not have been passed in the first place. I refuse to call it names. Labor hasn't helped its case against the Taft-Hartley law by calling it such names as a slave-labor law. Labor needs to inform the public about the serious injustices of the law. It is proof of its unfairness and violations of legitimate rights of American labor which the public wants to hear about. Labor has a good case against the Taft-Hartley law but it has failed to date to explain its case to the public.

I shall always continue to talk of the Taft-Hartley law in terms of its specific injustices and weakresses and what I consider to be some of its unconstitutional provisions. I am also going to vote for a substitute in the form of amendments to the Wagner Act. I am going to vote for the type of bill which will give us what we ought to have had by way of a new labor law in 1947, and on which American labor leaders should have helped. Labor leaders made it tough for us in the Senate time and time again in 1947. When some of us would get up and offer a proposal for changing the Wagner Act, the fairness and justice of which couldn't be denied, proponents of the Taft-Hartley bill would say, and rightly, "You can't even get labor's support for that proposal." They were right about it because labor leaders had missed taking the pulse of the American people and were so blinded by labor's own shortcomings that they didn't see that in the interest of American labor it was desirable to have a fair and balanced revision of the Wagner Act. In this next session of Congress, I shall again stand for the principle which I stood for in 1947, namely, that there must be an equal application of the law to all parties falling within the same operative facts involved in a given dispute. This means, of course, that we must have a piece of labor legislation that is fair and square to the legitimate rights of labor, the employers, and the public.

The labor leeders of this country should stand up now and do the greatest job of industrial statesmanship that can be done in America. They recognize that the Taft-Hartley law should be repealed, but they must also come forward and help those of us who are devoted to only one ideal in government—namely, making our democratic system work for the common good in passing a revised Wagner Act including those changes necessary to equalize the rights of employers and of labor. Such a bill along the lines of the Morse-Ives proposals should have been enacted in 1947 instead of a Taft-Hartley law. Unfortunately, the Morse-Ives bill was emasculated by more than 35 procedural changes adopted in conference committee and by certain amendments which were passed by the Senate before the bill ever went to the conference committee. However, the bill which was reported to the floor of the Senate by the Labor Committee and which consisted for the most part of a combination of the Morse-Ives bills should have received the cooperation of the labor leaders of the country. Without that cooperation the Taft-Hartley bill was the inevitable result. The administrative law approach of the Morse-Ives bill was changed by amendments into the common law court action procedure of the Taft-Hartley bill. The American people need to be informed as to why the social and economic problems of labor relations cannot be settled successfully by common law court actions. They need to be told why the Taft-Hartley law will not work.

The public is fair once it comes to know the facts about any issue. It must be informed as to the reasons that support the argument that if we keep the Taft-Hartley law on the books it will once again weave into the fabric of American industrial life the same old pattern of resentment against employers. On the basis of resentment there can be no industrial peace in this country. I am pleased to see that increasing numbers of employers, as I go about the country, are now pleading for modifications of the Taft-Hartley law, in the direction of putting into practice the basic principle of American jurisprudence for which I have raised my voice in defense, tonight, namely the same rules must apply to both teams. The Taft-Hartley law as well as the old Wagner Act violated that rule of equal justice for all.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Ching is quoted further in the article, as follows:

3. Fact-finding boards, being prohibited from recommending any settlement terms, are unable to mobilize public opinion behind the disputing parties to reach an agreement.

4. The emergency dispute requirement that workers must be polled on an employer's last offer has proved useless. The ballots are expensive to conduct, and the experience of a year demonstrates they do nothing to promote settlement; to the contrary, they are a disrupting influence in collective bargaining and mediation. They have been repeatedly rejected by the workers.

5. Parties in labor disputes are required by law to participate in conferences called by the Mediation Service. But there is no penalty. A few employees and unions have refused to cooperate.

Mr. President, in regard to the third point raised by Mr. Ching in his report, that "Fact-finding boards, being prohibited from recommending any settlement terms, are unable to mobilize public information behind the disputing parties to reach an agreement," I think once again he calls attention to a very important criticism of the Taft-Hartley law in its present form. In fact we were treated to a rather weird experience of the operation of this particular section this summer when for weeks, because of the emergency disputes section of the Taft-Harley law, the shipping industry of the west coast was tied up in one of the most costly strikes that has ever afflicted the west coast, a strike which the minimum estimates of cost—and I am sure they were minimum—indicated a loss of more than $4,000,000 a day to the parties concerned and to the shippers. That strike, taking place under the operation of the Taft-Hartley law, proved, if proof should ever be needed, the unworkability of the so-called emergency disputes section of that law.

What is provided, in essence, by that section of the law? There is the injunction, following the report of a fact-finding board. The fact-finding board is, however, prohibited from even making a recommendation as to how the dispute ought to be settled. One would think that one of the primary purposes of a fact-finding board, composed of a group of experts, after it obtained the facts, would be to advise the American people as to how a particular strike ought to be settled. But in that case we were confronted with a section of the law which specifically made it impossible for the fact-finding board to make recommendations to the American people as to what the next steps should be in solving that costly dispute, and if I may say, while I comment on that dispute, what I said across this country during the weeks it took place, there never was a time when that strike was justified either on the part of the union or on the part of the employers concerned. Both sides to that dispute permitted to come into the dispute irrelevant and immaterial issues that had nothing to do with free collective bargaining. The employers on one hand publicly announced through their representatives that they were out to break the union leadership; and there is no question about the fact that the union leadership on the other hand itself was taking a position on matters irrelevant to disputes over hours, wages, and conditions of employment.

I have said, in decisions in the past, I have said on the floor of the Senate, that a political strike is never justified in this country, and it seems to me in that great maritime strike there should have been in operation at the time a law which would have given, as Taft-Hartley law did not, the people of the United States effective relief from the type of strike that was involved in that instance. Rather, we have a law that says "The fact-finding board shall make its finding." But what happens after that? To reduce it to its skeleton, after the fact-finding board makes its second report to the President of the United States, which must be within 60 days after the injunction, and after a 20-day period during which a vote is taken on the employer's last offer, the injunction that is involved vanishes into thin air; the injunction evaporates. It ought to be obvious to anyone that the health and the safety and the welfare of the people are just as much at stake in a strike or in a strike situation after a fact-finding board reports, as before. Why should the injunction then automatically be dissolved?

What does the law then provide? It then provides that the President shall make a report to the Congress. In the case of that particular strike, which lasted about 95 days, so far as I know, we have yet to receive the report of the President to the Congress. Of course, the strike is now ended. The strike was ended because some great industrial statesmen, not direct parties to the dispute, outside the shipowners and outside the union concerned—in this particular instance, Mr. Phil Murray, for the CIO, and Mr. Almon Roth, for the Employers' Council of San Francisco—recognized that the particular procedure made available to them under the Taft-Hartley law was not worth the paper it was written on, proceeded to use their industrial statesmanship to call the attion of shipowners and the CIO union involved to the fact that a continuation of that strike could not be justified in the public interest. The result was that through the intervention of that kind of industrial statesmanship, but not through the Taft-Hartley law, that strike finally was settled. Never should it have occurred in the first place.

I want to say, as one who took a very active part in the Eightieth Congress in trying to bring about the enactment of

legislation that would balance interests and protect legitimate rights, that I shall once again make a fight on the floor of the Senate and in committee for legislation that will protect the legitimate rights of American industry and of American labor; yes, also, Mr. President, and primarily, the interests of the public. That means that in my judgment we must have a drastic revision of the emergency-disputes section of the Taft-Hartley law, as well as the other major sections of that law. I repeat what I said during the campaign. I think the Taft-Hartley law was bad; I am convinced that it never should have been passed in the first place, and I recognize, as I think anyone who will read the handwriting on the wall should recognize, that it cost the Republican Party millions of votes in the last election—and it should have—because the "overalls" of America walked to the polls and made perfectly clear that they would register their resentment against a party primarily responsible for the passage of that law. It cost us one congressional seat after another. As I have said heretofore and now repeat, I think the farmers primarily cost us the Presidency; but the Taft-Hartley law cost us for the most part the control of both Houses of the Congress. In this session of Congress, we have the renewed obligation and responsibility of proceeding to work and vote for a law that will revise the Wagner Act. That causes me to make a comment that I know organized labor will not like, but I want to say from this seat today that organized labor, in the public interest, has no right to expect the Eighty-first Congress to repeal the Taft-Hartley law and merely replace it with the Wagner Act unchanged.

The junior Senator from Oregon, who need make no excuse for his defense of the legitimate rights of labor, once again, as he has from other platforms in America, serves notice that he is not going to vote for a labor legislative program which, in his opinion, cannot be reconciled with the public interests.

In my judgment, what the Wagner Act needs is the type of revision for which I fought in the Eightieth Congress, namely, legislation which will revise the Wagner Act, giving to labor—and mark this, Mr. President—giving to labor and employers the same procedural rights and safeguards which labor enjoyed under the old Wagner Act.

I repeat what some have heard me say before that any law which violates an elementary rule of the playground by providing that one set of rules shall apply to one team and that another set of rules shall apply to the other team is not a law which will solve any controversial subject, such as the problems of industrial relations.

Therefore, American employers are entitled to receive from the Eighty-first Congress those drastic procedural changes in the Taft-Hartley law that will give to them, under an administrative-law approach to these problems, the same rights which labor enjoyed under the Wagner Act. Mark you, Mr. President, that means a drastic change in the procedural approach to labor problems. It means that we discard what I say is the underlying motif of the Taft-Hartley law, in the last analysis, namely, the approach to labor problems through common-law court action. Common-law courts are not the proper tribunals in which to solve the economic, social, and human problems involved in labor relations. Wages, hours, and conditions of employment are basically not legal questions; they are basically social, economic, and human questions.

So we have a great challenge as Members of the United States Senate to proceed now to draft legislation which will replace the Taft-Hartley law. By all means it ought to be replaced. I, here and now, have incorporated into my remarks every syllable I uttered from the floor of the Senate in my fight against the passage of the Taft-Hartley law. I know of no vote I have ever cast in the Senate of the United States of which I am more proud, save and except one other vote of which I am equally proud. I refer in the latter case to my vote for the passage of the compulsory world court jurisdiction resolution through this body. I know of no other vote of which I am equally proud than my vote against the Taft-Hartley law and my vote to sustain the veto, because I think the evidence is cumulative in support of the propositions I fought for then, when I said on the floor of the Senate to the Senators on my side of the aisle during that debate, "Gentlemen, if you incorporate certain provisions into the law you will hear from it through the ballot boxes of America." They got their answer on November 2, 1948. They will get it again in 1950 and 1952, Mr. President, if my party once again makes the pattern of the Taft-Hartley law the labor policy of the Republican Party, because the workers of America, the independent voters of America, will never put their stamp of approval upon a law which has in it so many unworkable, unsound, and unfair provisions as has the Taft-Hartley law.

I say to the Senators on the other side of the aisle, Do not become intoxicated by victory. Do not indulge the assumption that you have any mandate from the American people to repeal the Taft-Hartley law and replace it with the Wagner Act without drastic change, because if that be the policy, dangerous as prophecy is, I am willing to prophesy today that the great body of the independent voters of the country will reach the conclusion that you have not been fair to the public interest.

The Eighty-first Congress, Republicans and Democrats, should be motivated by one desire, and that is to enact legislation that will return to the collective bargaining tables of America the symbol of peace by way of fair legislation, rather than the symbol of war, which the Taft-Hartley law is, in the field of industrial relations.

Therefore I raise my voice on the floor of the Senate to Republicans and Democrats alike to throw political strategy out the window in regard to labor legislation. Let us go forward as two great political parties dedicated to the proposition that what we need is legislation which will be fair to all sides concerned in industrial disputes, and thereby protect the public interest. To do that, Mr. President, we need, yes, repeal of the Taft-Hartley law, but at the same time let us enact a revised Wagner Act along the lines of administrative-law procedures which recognize that employers are entitled to the same procedural provisions which the old Wagner Act gave to the unions against employers.

THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, 1947

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has criticized the Taft-Hartley law in general terms, but he has specifically criticized the national emergency section of the law, to the general effect that it is unworkable because it did not work on the west coast in the maritime strike.

I very much like the approach of the Senator from Oregon to this problem, because he is now dealing with specific provisions of the law on their merits. If we can deal with each section and each problem involved in the Labor-Management Relations Act on its merits, and act on the merits of the various features of the act, I shall be more than satisfied, because I am quite clear that if the great majority of the individual issues are treated on their merits, it will result in a vote in favor of the provisions adopted by the Senate at the last session by an overwhelming vote.

As to the particular question of the national emergency section, of course, we faced a serious dilemma, when we entered upon the consideration of that provision. One of the questions was, should we prohibit a strike? Others were, is it possible to prohibit a strike and still maintain freedom? What procedure shall we provide? We finally reached a conclusion in the committee, I think probably to the complete satisfaction of no member of the committee, on a procedure by which a board would be appointed, and under which an injunction might delay a strike for 80 days, but after that, and after a vote indicating a determination to proceed, the men should be able to proceed.

I do not think any of us were particularly satisfied with that. The report and the bill were approved by the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon, who was one of the members of the committee who approved the bill as it was reported by the Senate committee. I do not remember that any important changes in this particular section were made after the bill was reported from the committee.

This is one of the main sections which the President himself desires to have retained, and of course it should be dealt with on its merits, and should be debated in the committee and on the floor of the Senate, so that we may obtain the best possible machinery for delaying or preventing a strike which involves a national emergency.

I call the attention of the Senate to the report of the Joint Committee on Labor Management Relations, headed by the distinguished former Senator from Minnesota, Mr. Ball, which deals with this question on pages 16 to 22, in which the committee discussed all the cases in which that section had been used. In

general, I think it has been at least suggested in about 10 cases, and injunctions have been issued in 6. There was failure, in the case of the maritime workers, to prevent a strike. There was success in other cases.

The committee which had the function of determining the law has recommended two important changes, one of which is that which was referred to by the distinguished Senator from Oregon as advanced by Mr. Ching, head of the Mediation Service, who also appeared before the joint committee and recommended the changes. Those amendments will be found in the report, together with a proposal that the requirement of an actual vote on a strike be eliminated. The report deals on a factual basis with all the cases which have arisen under the act in all the different fields.

All I wish to say on this subject at this time is that I think we should proceed as the Senator from Oregon is proceeding, with a discussion of the different features of the law, and should determine each feature on its merits.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting the nominations of Dean G. Acheson, of Maryland, to be Secretary of State, and James E. Webb, of North Carolina, to be Under Secretary of State, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

INCREASE OF MEMBERSHIP OF CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES, ETC.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit a Senate resolution, and I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 24) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate as enacted in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 be amended as follows:

SECTION 1. The number of Senators on the following standing committees shall be increased from 13 to 15: Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, Committee on Armed Services, Committee on Finance, Committee on Foreign Relations, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Committee on the Judiciary, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

SEC. 2. Paragraph (4) of rule XXV is amended to read as follows:

"Each Senator shall serve on two standing committees, and no more; except that no more than eight Senators of the minority party may serve on three standing committees, and no more, if one of such standing committees is the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the Committee on Public Works, or the Committee on Rules and Administration; and except that Senators of the majority party who are members of any said five committees may serve on three standing committees and no more."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to explain the object of the amendment to the rules covered by the Senate resolution I have just presented. It proposes that eight committees of the Senate be increased in membership from 13 to 15, and it proposes an amendment in that section of the law which now prevents any minority Senator from holding membership on more than two committees.

There are two reasons why I think this change should be made in the Reorganization Act. In the first place, I think that in many cases a committee of 13 is too small a committee. Where there are, as in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, four major subjects for consideration, and four major subcommittees, namely, on labor, education, health, and veterans, it is almost impossible for a Senator who serves on that committee to serve on two different subcommittees. Very much the same comment applies to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, which combines the former functions of the Committee on Commerce and the Committee on Interstate Commerce. Very much the same is true in regard to the Committee on Appropriations. It is also true with respect to the Armed Services Committee, which combines the functions of two previously important committees.

In the second place, in endeavoring to allot memberships on the minority side in particular—and I think the majority is bound to admit this—we have found that the provisions of the act are so rigid that it is almost impossible to give every Senator an important committee assignment. The 15 committees were intended to be the same in importance, but they are not. There are three, or four, or five committees, membership on which is not sought, two or three of which are of lesser importance. The inevitable result is that the new Members of the Senate are assigned the committees of least importance.

Under the provisions of the act no member of the minority may hold membership on more than two committees. The majority is not so bound. There are 203 places on the committees, and 2 places to each Senator would make a total of 192. Therefore, 11 Members of the majority may serve on three committees, and they may be assigned to one of the least important committees. Thereafter the least important committees are gradually filled up. Roughly speaking, I should say that 10 of the committees are better than the other 5, and there would be a sufficient number of places on the major committees to give every Senator a place.

Before the Reorganization Act went into effect there was a rule which protected the junior Senators. Under that rule every Senator was entitled to membership on three major committees and two minor committees. Consequently, a senior Senator could not take all his committee assignments on major committees and leave only the minor committees for the junior Senators. The result of the present act, however, is that that is exactly what he may do.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. If I recall correctly, the only exceptions, however, to a Senator, whether he be a member of the majority or minority, being allowed to be on more than two committees, is in respect to the Committee on the District of Columbia and the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Mr. TAFT. That is correct. But the result is that the restriction is not nearly so severe on the majority as it is on the minority.

My proposal roughly is to increase the total number of committee seats by 16; and have 8 members of the minority able to serve on a third committee, and there would then be 19 members of the majority able to serve on a third committee, but only on a third committee of the second class, so to speak.

I submitted this matter to the majority before the committees were chosen, and pointed out the difficulties which have resulted in six of our members having membership on secondary committees, and no committee membership on committees of great importance. The majority does not desire to do anything at this time. I am submitting this matter to the Committee on Rules and Administration in order that it may be thoroughly discussed.

We have now had 2 years of operation of the Reorganization Act. Perhaps other changes should be made in the Reorganization Act, but in any event I hope very much that the Committee on Rules and Administration may give serious consideration to the rule so that present conditions may be adjusted, the work of the Senate may be somewhat more evenly distributed, and the situation will not prevail that a certain number of Senators have important jobs to do and a certain number of Senators are assigned to work which, while important, is not of the greatest interest. I hope, Mr. President, that the Committee on Rules and Administration will give consideration to this particular rule.

I may say that the minority—I think rightly so—2 years ago faced the problem we face now. That is true. The Reorganization Act was then a new act. No one had had any experience under it. No one knew how it would operate. The readjustments which would be required in any event were so tremendous that this particular matter was never considered at all, so far as I know. It was never presented to us. I think that, looking forward to the time when the majority will be the minority, they should also take an interest in seeing that such a change as this is made.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I must compliment the Senator from Ohio on having the long sight. He certainly is not nearsighted when he predicts that the majority will at any time within the foreseeable future become the minority of the Senate. Certainly he needs no nearsighted glasses in order to affect his vision at the moment.

I realize the difficulty which always arises when there is a change in the political control of the Senate, with respect to the assignment of committee memberships. We experienced it in a very drastic form 2 years ago when we had a wholesale exodus from the membership of most of our committees. When the Reorganization Act was passed it was the desire of the Senate, and of the Congress, to avoid a number of situations which had grown up like Topsy over a period of generations in the Senate, and also in the House.

One was the multiplicity of committees resulting in duplication, in various committees doing the same work, and the difficulty to draw the line of demarcation between the jurisdiction of committees, and also the membership of Senators on numerous committees. Frequently a Senator was on two or three, and in some cases four major committees, all meeting at the same time, and he had to exercise his own discretion as to which one of those committees he would attend. Obviously he was unable to function adequately and efficiently on all of them. That was one of the reasons why the Reorganization Act provided that no Senator should be a member of more than two committees, except in the case of the Committee on the District of Columbia, which was not regarded as a major legislative committee, so far as the country generally was concerned, and the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, which had up to that time not assumed major proportions, but which is potentially one of the most important committees of the Senate. The purpose was to avoid having Senators serve on several important committees and being unable to attend all their meetings. Perhaps he would have no voice himself in determining when they should meet, and even if he did he would have difficulty in determining when the various committees of which he was a member should meet in order that he might attend all of them. So the Congress wrote the Reorganization Act to avoid that situation, to avoid duplication in the jurisdiction of committees, and to give a more efficient legislative over-all coverage of the committees and the membership of the committees.

I appreciate the embarrassment which any minority, after having been the majority of the Senate, experiences in the assignment of membership to the committees. But it works as well for one as for the other. Certainly the embarrassment on the Republican side is nothing to compare to ours 2 years ago when we were compelled to drop nearly every Senator from one or more of the major committees.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I may remind the Senator that the majority also had to drop many Senators from many major committees. I had to drop my membership on a committee on which I had served for 6 years. That was the Committee on Banking and Currency. In other words, the act required a complete realinement of all committees. I think this particular point, however, was not given very deep consideration.

Mr. BARKLEY. When I was speaking of the majority I was referring to the party that had previously been in the majority, and had then become the minority party. Senators from both the majority and the minority had to give up memberships on committees. I had to give up memberships on two committees. I had to give up my membership on the Committee on Banking and Currency, on which I had served along with the Senator from Ohio, a committee on which I had enjoyed service since I was a Member of the Senate. I also had to give up membership on what is now the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I had served on the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce during the entire time I was a Member of that body. It was the only committee on which I served, because it was one of the 12 major committees, and membership on a major committee precluded the possibility of serving on any other committee. Two years ago I had to make a choice in membership on four major committees, and I chose membership on the Finance Committee and on the Foreign Relations Committee. That situation will exist every time there is a change in control.

I am not a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration. Even if I now were a member of that committee, I would not be a member long. Therefore, nothing I may say would necessarily bind that committee. But my fear is that in meeting a temporary situation at the beginning of every Congress we will whittle away at the Reorganization Act until we get back to the point where we were before the act was enacted—and that we will again have a large number of members on committees in order to meet some temporary situation that results in a hardship, but over a period of years it is no greater hardship on one party than on the other—until we get back to the point of duplication in the jurisdiction of committees.

What I am concerned about is that we may confront what an old judge in Kentucky used to speak of as the "numerosity" of membership on committees until we will come to the realization that there really is no Reorganization Act left. I believe the Committee on Rules and Administration will act on this matter. But I wish to express my fear, my anxiety, over the gradual whittling away of the Reorganization Act itself, which, on the whole, I think, has worked well. If we begin to tinker with it every time someone is dissatisfied or disappointed, or even a hardship is worked upon a Member of this body, we will gradually emasculate the Reorganization Act until there will be no Reorganization Act left.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. I trust that the Senator from Kentucky, when he comes to consider the application of this proposal, will take into view what is, under prevailing rules, happening to the Committee on the District of Columbia. I have just looked at the list as announced today of the membership of the Committee on the District of Columbia, on the Republican side. I note with real interest that no Senator from the Republican side who has ever served on that committee before will serve on the District Committee during the Eighty-first Congress.

We are all conscious of the fact that the problems of the District are becoming larger and more difficult and awkward. Many Senators on both sides of the aisle are interested in the suggestion made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. I think perhaps that somewhere within the suggestion we might find a real way in which to achieve a continuity of effort in the solution of problems which, if tackled on a temporary, 2-year basis, will never be solved.

Mr. President, I know that the Senator from Kentucky will be glad to study and consider the observation which I have made.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator.

Speaking of the Committee on the District of Columbia, of course, the District Committee is always a problem. I believe it was 4 years ago, when we were in the majority, that we placed on that committee every ex-Governor who came into the Senate as a member of the majority, on the theory that Governors had had more experience in government than other Senators, and therefore would be good members of that committee. I believe that they rendered excellent service on the committee. However, we cannot expect a Senator, whether he was ever a Governor or not, or whatever may have been his profession or official experience, or from whatever State he may come, to wish to remain on that committee forever. It is a committee which deserves the utmost consideration, because the people of the District of Columbia and the District of Columbia itself are the children of the Congress and of the Constitution. The Constitution makes the Congress the exclusive legislative body to consider District matters. Someday I may have something to say on that question, but not now.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to make one further brief observation, if I may. The District of Columbia is a magnificent place as a city, as a symbol, and as an institution. If I may use the case of the junior Senator from Washington merely as an example; in the Eightieth Congress I served on three standing committees. One of those committees was the Committee on the District of Columbia. As a member of the minority party I must resign from one of the three committees on which I had previously served. There was no decision concerning choice to be made. I come to the Senate as a representative of the sovereign State of Washington, and therefore necessarily any decision must be made in favor of that constituency. But I think it is safe to say that my illustration is only an example of a number of other Senators on both sides of the aisle, who, when in the minority, if given an opportunity, would serve on the two national committees, and would say, "Certainly; if I can make

a contribution I shall continue my membership on the District of Columbia Committee in addition to my other committee assignments, so long as the leadership deems it advisable."

Let me say to the Senator from Kentucky that I am serious in hoping that we can find an answer at this time—this year, if possible—which will insure an experienced Committee on the District of Columbia—for the fiscal involvement which surrounds and bewilders Members of Congress and administration officials of the city itself is in need of thoughtful attention and action which becomes more difficult of attainment as inexperienced committees undertake the task every 2 years.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, that is all I have to say.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for yielding to me.

AUTHORIZATION FOR A COMMITTEE TO SUBMIT REPORT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is my purpose to move that the Senate adjourn until Thursday. The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service wishes to consider a matter during the recess, and to be authorized to make a report. I therefore ask unanimous consent that that committee be authorized to report to the Senate during the recess any legislation it may agree upon, in the hope that the Senate may take it up on Thursday and consider it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OUR TREATMENT OF THE NAVAJO INDIANS

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I shall take a few minutes today to explain the purpose of a bill which I introduced last Wednesday, Senate bill 170, for myself and the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I think the bill and its subject matter of sufficient importance to merit a brief explanation at this time to the Members of the Congress and to the people of the United States.

Last year the American press printed many thousands of lines and hundreds of pictures in an effort to tell the present-day story of the deplorable conditions under which the American Navajo Indian is forced to live. Radio also played its part by bringing to the American listener a word picture of the situation in hundreds of broadcasts.

The reports of these agencies, it will be remembered, stirred deep and intense feelings in the hearts of all Americans. Our citizens arose and contributed tremendous quantities of material things—principally food and clothing—in an effort to ease the desperate situation of the Navajos.

The present condition of the Navajos—I like to refer to them as early Americans—is not of their own doing. They made way for the westward advance of the white man during the early colonization of this great country.

In a spirit of peace and in an effort to assure themselves of a future in this great new country, the Navajo Tribe signed a treaty of peace with the United States of America in 1868—just 80 years ago.

This 80-year-old treaty with the Navajo Tribe committed each party to certain conditions. The Indians primarily agreed to live within the area of the reservation and to live in peace with their white brothers.

The United States, on the other hand, agreed to set aside a reservation, about 30,000 square miles in area, where the Navajo could live.

This great Government also made certain other commitments in that treaty, one of which was to educate the children of the Navajo. We were to provide one teacher for every 30 Navajo children of school age.

What the United States has done for these people during this 80-year interval is next to nothing. They are still the most primitive people in the United States.

This Nation, which could fight a war on any of the seven seas, which has airplanes and men to fly them that can bomb any place in the world, which has a standing military strength of millions of men, and which has appropriated billions upon billions of dollars for the rehabilitation of the downtrodden people of the world, today has not taken the time nor spent the money—infinitesimal when compared with war and foreign monetary expenditures—necessary to help these western American Indians and to meet the terms of a treaty which we signed.

This Indian reservation lies in an area stretching from southeastern Utah into Arizona and New Mexico. The reservation is as large as the combined areas of the States of Rhode Island, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts.

The land on which these Indians live is so submarginal that it is impossible for them to achieve any reasonable economic standard. It has been estimated that at least half of the Indians should be moved off the reservation if the other half is to be permitted to attain any acceptable living standard.

Mr. President, I should like briefly to consider from the factual point of view the conditions under which the Navajos are forced to live, and then I should like to discuss my bill and emphasize its importance in the over-all Navajo problem.

The Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held hearings nearly a year ago to investigate and consider a possible program for the education and general aid of these Indians.

It was found at these hearings that reservation schools were not the entire answer to the educational needs of the Navajos. There are very few sites where schools can be located. There are practically no settlements of any size, as settlements are known in the West. There is a scarcity of water. Many times it is necessary to drill deep wells and pump the water to the surface, if a water supply is to be obtained at all.

It is not contemplated that educational facilities on the Indian reservation shall be abandoned. The educational program for the Navajos would provide on-reservation day schools which ultimately could take care of the needs of approximately one-half of the tribe.

It has also been found that it will be necessary to move at least half of these Indians, some 30,000, from the reservation to other localities where they may earn a living.

The Navajos have increased in number from about 8,000 when they were placed on the reservation at the end of the Navajo war following the days of Kit Carson, to approximately 61,000.

These Indians have made their scanty living in the past on the reservation itself, largely by keeping small flocks of sheep and goats and doing a little farming where rainfall would permit. The bleak Navajo plateau country is so short of rainfall that it grows but a small amount of forage.

The Indian Service found that it was impossible for all 61,000 of the Navajos to be maintained by the sheep industry, and that other means would have to be found to provide for at least half of them.

Mr. President, this is an emergency situation. There are 16,000 Indian boys and girls who should be in school. We cannot move too rapidly to discharge our duty to these unfortunate people. Our obligations under our treaty and under the dictates of humanity demand that we act at once.

Important as the Navajo program is, it is but one facet in the solution of the Indian problem confronting this country. While the over-all Indian problem is broad, we must start somewhere. My bill to transfer Bushnell is a move in the right direction. It is my intention to introduce subsequent bills dealing with the solution of other Indian problems.

A 10-year program was outlined to our committee last year. It provided for development on the reservation, but it did not offer adequate means for removing the 30,000 Navajos who must find homes elsewhere.

Before anything much can be done to help these people, they must be taught the rudiments of the English language, so that they may be able later to understand what is said and being taught to them by their teachers.

It is difficult for them to work among white people, simply because they cannot understand instructions that are given them about the work they are to perform.

Dr. G. G. Salsbury, who is head of the Presbyterian Ganado Navajo mission—a mission which, by the way, has done a great deal of practical good for these Indians over the years—gave it as his judgment that an emergency program should be instituted at once.

He said even temporary school plants, to teach this new generation of Indians the English language so that they might be given lessons and help in industry and vocational training, would be most beneficial. After that, they would be much more able to take care of themselves among the white people, where they would have to get most of their employment and livelihood.

Mr. President, a day's journey by bus to the north of the Navajo Reservation there is a military hospital, built by the United States during World War II, for the care of wounded soliders. It is located at Brigham City, in the very heart of agricultural and industrial Utah. This plant was built at a cost of more than $10,000,000. It is a permanent type of construction, with all modern improvements; in fact, it is a small but very modern city in itself. It is complete, with practically every facility needed, from fire station to a sewage disposal plant, recreational quarters, gymnasiums, swimming pools, picture houses, dormitories, officers' quarters, paved sidewalks and streets, and 26 acres of lawns, all located on a site of nearly 300 acres of some of the finest land in the State of Utah.

At one time during the war, nearly 4,000 wounded American soldiers were taken care of in this hospital. Immediately upon the close of the fighting, the Army decided the hospital was not located in the right place, or that it was no longer needed, and abandoned it. It was turned over the War Assets Administration for disposal.

That was in 1945. The War Assets Administration has been unable to find a suitable purchaser, either public or private, for this plant. It is costing the Government considerable money each year for caretakers and maintenance. It consists of 108 permanent buildings, which are in good condition.

Mr. President, I had held high hope that we might prevail upon the Army or the Veterans' Administration to reactivate this plant for the original purpose for which it was constructed. It seemed to me that this enormous expenditure of money should not be all in vain. However, all possibilities for utilizing Bushnell have been found to be impracticable, for a variety of reasons which I shall not discuss here.

The idea was then proposed by me to convert the hospital into a school for Indian children. Full advantage could be taken of all the physical facilities of this permanent institution, and, as a matter of fact, nearly 100 percent of its cost could be salvaged if it were used for such an institution

The matter was called to the attention of Acting Commissioner William Zimmerman, of the Indian Bureau. He, in turn, requested the War Assets Administration not to dispose of the plant, but to give the Indian Bureau an opportunity to investigate its possibilities.

Dr. Willard T. Beatty, head of the Department of Education of the Indian Service, and professional staff members, investigated the plant, and they came to the conclusion that it did have some very excellent possibilities as an Indian school site.

Members of the tribal council of the Navajos visited Brigham City, and, after a thorough inspection, became very enthusiastic about its possibilities. These men, who were sent to make the investigation on the ground, reported favorably to their superiors in Washington. Also, the people of Utah support the proposal.

The plan which has been outlined to date is to convert this hospital to an Indian vocational school for the education of the Indians of the nearby States, principally the Navajos, who are so badly in need of immediate facilities for educational purposes.

The bill I have introduced would authorize the War Assets Administrator to transfer Bushnell to the Department of the Interior for the purpose of establishing an Indian vocational school. This step was deemed necessary by legal authorities who have gone into the matter of the authority of the War Assets Administration to transfer the hospital, and likewise the authority of the Indian Service to receive it for the purposes named.

If this transfer is made, the Indian Service will be in a position to put the plant to almost immediate use. By "immediate," of course I mean such use as would come after a remodeling job has been done on the dormitories and after equipment necessary for the operation of the school has been put in place.

However, in order to get the fullest use of this plant—and all of it is needed—it will be necessary to construct some additional buildings, particularly classrooms.

The dormitories which were used for hospital beds and other facilities are readily adaptable for dormitories for Indian students. These dormitories should be used to their fullest extent, inasmuch as there are more than enough Indians to use the entire plant.

It is estimated that 2,000 students can be provided board and room in this institution, if the necessary classrooms are built nearby. There is ample room on the grounds for such additional school buildings as are necessary.

If immediate action is taken on this bill and if the necessary funds are provided as a deficiency appropriation, this plant could be put to use next September as a school, at least on a partial basis, even though the construction of the extra school buildings would not be completed by that time. Between 700 and 800 students, it is estimated, could use it during the construction period.

It is necessary to use to the limit all facilities that may be obtained for these Indians. I cannot emphasize too strongly that these boys and girls, future Americans, should not have so much of their lives spoiled by our delay in getting them into schools.

I think the American people are determined that an adequate program shall be provided for these people, so that they may have the same right that other American boys and girls have been enjoying for years, the right to an education.

Time is of the essence. Even a year saved will be of great value to these people. No one can measure its value in dollars and cents.

If this plant is accepted by the Indian Bureau and if Congress appropriates the necessary money for construction of the extra buildings and furnishing them with the needed equipment, at least a year and possibly 2 years will be saved in getting into a school at least 2,000 of the 16,000 Navajo children not now in school. The time of these 2,000 young people is important.

I urge that the committee to which this bill has been referred give it immediate attention. Upon its report to the floor of this body, as I believe it will be reported with a favorable recommendation, I shall ask that it receive immediate consideration.

I shall further urge, upon its passage, that the Congress of the United States, in the deficiency appropriation bill, appropriate sufficient funds to permit the immediate commencement of construction of the necessary school buildings. I shall request that the deficiency appropriation bill contain items for the construction of the necessary school buildings, so as to permit the utilization of this plant to its fullest extent, and also that the bill provide funds for remodeling and for equipping it, so that it may be put into use, even if only partially, by September 1949.

As a matter of fact, establishment of an Indian school at Bushnell would save the Government millions of dollars in new school-building construction. It also would serve as an excellent foundation upon which to build an off-reservation educational program for the Indians.

Mr. President, I have supported Federal aid to education. I voted for the bill when it was before the Senate last spring, and I shall vote for Federal aid to the States for the purpose of helping the children of this land. I am convinced that it is necessary. Indian education, which we have agreed to give by solemn treaty, has just as much merit, if not more.

It is true that the utilizing of these buildings will still leave 14,000 Navajo Indian children without school facilities. I intend to present other programs to put these youngsters into school in the near future. The Bushnell Indian school proposal is a beginning. We should take this step now and be ready to adopt a wider and larger program for the 14,000 not taken care of by this particular program.

Mr. President, I shall now conclude, but in so doing, I should like to leave with the Members of this distinguished body the wisdom expressed many years ago by an unknown western Mormon pioneer:

> The Indians are better than many of the whites—the Indians may scalp their enemies, but they don't skin their friends.

Mr. President, the News-Journal, of Brigham City, Utah, successor to the Box Elder News and the Box Elder Journal, recently published an editorial regarding the use of Bushnell Hospital for an Indian school. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial published in the RECORD, following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Texas in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE'RE FOR THEM

> Being only human, we are all afraid and suspicious of things we don't know and understand.
>
> When we think about a Government Indian school at Bushnell, here at our very doorstep, we can't help wondering just how it will affect us. All of us like our town the way it is. The people we know we like, and the people we don't know—possibly the reason is because we're afraid we wouldn't like them—give us no trouble.

We have a good thing, here, in this community. And our first inclination is against sharing it with anyone else, against accepting any changes.

And would you believe it, the Navajos are just like us, they're afraid and suspicious of things they don't know and understand. They can't help wondering how we, as a community, will affect their young people if they should be sent to a boarding school adjacent to our town.

Can you imagine that? A little afraid, a little suspicious of us? Why, we're the best people in the world.

Take John Jones (providing there isn't a John Jones—if there is, make it Alexander Jones), when he moved to town, a few years ago, we were suspicious of him. He might complicate our smooth and satisfactory existence, in some way. He might compete with us for something we want—and be too tough competition, or at least make us extend ourself. We didn't bother to get to know him, right away. After all, we had plenty of friends.

Then, somehow, we got acquainted with Mr. Jones. He became a customer of ours, or he offered us a job, or he tackled one of those nonpaying community betterment assignments and did a good job of it. We couldn't believe it possible at the time, but we have a better town, and a better life, and one more friend, because Jones came to town.

Logic and reason make no difference. We're a little suspicious of the unknown, always have been and always will be, because we're human.

And so are the Navajos for the same reason.

The wise men of the Navajo Tribal Council who visited our town yesterday had their suspicions allayed for the most part. And they did much to allay our own suspicions. Of all the things we might have expected them to be, we were hardly prepared to find them to be just what they were—ordinary people, "God's chillun," just like the rest of us. Some of them were uneducated, but talking with them you realize once again that it is the wisdom of the years and experience that really counts.

And in all of their hearts—indeed, worn on their sleeves—is one burning desire: That their children shall have an education and opportunity, that they shall, after generations, claim the lost heritage that first was theirs, to have and hold, and live full American citizenship. These fine, wise, mild-mannered, bright-eyed Indian men, hold as their highest ambition a hope that their children may have a better, fuller life than they themselves have had.

Is that so much different from the rest of us?

Frankly, we're for them. Even if it doesn't mean a penny's business to Brigham City, even if there's nothing in it for anyone now living here, we still hope the Navajos can have the spendid school for 1,500 to 2,000 of their children that is possible with the excellent facilities at Bushnell.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want first to say to my good friend from Utah that I am glad to assure him of my cooperation again on this Indian matter, as I have cooperated with him in the past on other Indian matters. I am aware of the valuable work he has been doing on the committee that has charge of Indian affairs. I think he knows of my view on the general proposition, that it is incumbent upon us to give to the Indians of the country a full measure of freedom and also of the responsibility that goes along with freedom, because I hold again to the view I expressed before, that one of the great needs, so far as taking care of civil rights in this country is concerned, is to be found in connection with our Indian affairs. I hope to see the time in the not too distant future when we shall make very clear to the Indians that they must also assume the responsibility of a granted citizenship, and I hold fast to the view that one of the great contributions we could make for greater efficiency in our Government would be to have a drastic overhauling of the Indian Bureau. I am satisfied that what has happened over the years is that we have really built up a counterpart, so far as the Indian Service is concerned, of another WPA, and I am for taking the Indians off "WPA" and granting to them as rapidly as possible full and complete freedom and citizenship.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator from Oregon for what he has just said, and express to him my appreciation of the support he gave our program during the Eightieth Congress. It was very helpful indeed.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

Mr. MORSE. It was a pleasure to support it.

Mr. President, I really arose to make brief comment on another matter. I do not usually talk twice in one day on the floor of the Senate, but I am going to have to leave the city on business at the close of the day, and I wanted the RECORD to show the following comments before my return.

Mr. President, last Wednesday I submitted my antifilibuster resolution (S. Res. 12), and a number of other Senators also submitted resolutions on the same subject. My purpose in rising at this time is to urge that the first item of business of the Committee on Rules and Administration, after the committee is organized, be the consideration of these resolutions, because, as I have said many times, I believe it is of the utmost importance that this matter of amending the Rules of the Senate be considered and accomplished as early as possible in the Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point an editorial which appeared in yesterday's Washington Post, entitled "Curb on Filibusters."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CURB ON FILIBUSTERS

Now that the House of Representatives has curbed the powers of its Rules Committee to veto legislation before it reaches the floor, the Senate can scarcely do less in liberating itself from the filibuster. Many Senators are alert to this necessity. On a single day last week five resolutions proposing amendments to the existing ineffectual cloture rule were introduced. Certainly the public is eager to see this reform put into effect. The time is ripe for its sponsors to press their case with all the vigor they can command.

All the resolutions offered last week would effect some improvement over the present helplessness of the Senate in the face of a talkfest. But the majority of them would merely extend the operation of cloture upon a two-thirds vote. Obviously, this would leave the major defect in the present system untouched. Under the existing requirement for a two-thirds vote, cloture has been adopted only 4 times out of 19 tries since 1917. In other words, cloture applied by a two-thirds vote is little better than no restraint at all on filibusters.

In principle, moreover, the two-thirds provision is wrong. It means that the action of the Senate, when a filibuster gets under way, may be controlled by the minority instead of the majority. That is the negation of democratic practice. If we believe in representative government, surely a simple majority can be trusted to make the decision as to when debate should be ended no less than to make other decisions. In these days when rapid action must often be taken to cope with an emergency, and when Congress is always faced by more needed legislation than it can possibly enact, the only argument that can be made for the two-thirds cloture rule is that obstruction of the democratic process is sometimes justified. And that argument seems to us indefensible.

Fortunately, two of the proposed amendments—those submitted by Senator MYERS and Senator MORSE—would permit the closing of debate by majority vote. Senator MYERS would limit each Senator to 1 hour of debate after a cloture motion had been voted. Senator MORSE would allow 2 hours. Neither limitation would work any real hardship, for the Senate has usually debated a bill thoroughly before any thought of invoking cloture arises. To assume that the Senate would throttle itself by this device seems absurd to anyone who knows the tradition of unlimited debate in that body. Rather, the proposed rules would save the Senate from making a ridiculous spectacle of itself when the country is demanding action in place of talk.

Mr. MORSE. I should also like to observe, Mr. President, that on Wednesday last I requested unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of my resolution, but that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], my very good friend, of whom I am very fond, objected.

Let me say, Mr. President, that I asked for immediate action on my resolution because during the special session of Congress the Republican Senators in conference assembled agreed to a motion, which was released to the public, notifying the American people that, come the first session of the Eighty-first Congress—and at that time we were of the opinion we would be in control of the Senate of the United States—the first item of business which we as Republicans proposed to take up was a resolution eliminating the filibuster from the Senate of the United States. There is some division among us as to just what the procedure should be, but there is no division on this side of the aisle as to the desirability and necessity, if we are really going to have the people's business transacted in the Senate of the United States, of having an antifilibuster resolution adopted at the earliest possible date. And of course the record is perfectly clear that, over the years, the barriers and blocks which have been thrown in the way of an antifilibuster resolution being adopted by this body have come almost invariably from the Democratic side of the aisle. I think it is very important that the American people understand first that it was the Republican program for the Eighty-first Congress to make an antifilibuster resolution the first

major item of business in that session of Congress. To keep faith with the spirit and intent of the action taken by the Republicans in conference last summer, I last Wednesday asked for immediate consideration of my antifilibuster resolution. I wanted the record made clear again as to where the objections came from, and once again the objections came from the Democratic side of the aisle. I venture to suggest that that is where the objections are going to come from again, as we go into this matter in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. But let us get the record perfectly clear from the very beginning. My good friend from Georgia, in objecting to immediate action of my antifilibuster resolution the other afternoon, among other things stated in substance that use of the filibuster had not over the years in any single instance resulted in material damage to the interests of the Nation. In this connection, I wish to call attention to a very able study of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, Public Affairs Bulletin No. 64, entitled "Limitation of Debate in the United States Senate," prepared by George B. Galloway. We find in that bulletin that an incomplete listing shows 37 major bills, some of them on three or four different occasions, have been defeated by the filibuster. This list does not include numerous appropriation bills that were talked to death. A partial list of such bills that failed because of the filibuster totals 82 between 1876 and 1916.

While I recommend to my colleagues that they give careful study to this excellent bulletin, I think it would be helpful if at this point in the RECORD there appeared the tabulation of legislation defeated by filibusters as shown in that bulletin at pages 20 and 21. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that tabulation be printed in the body of the RECORD, as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Legislation defeated by filibusters[1]

Bills	Year
Reconstruction of Louisiana	1865
Repeal of election laws	1870
Force bill (Federal elections)	1890–91
River-and-harbor bills (3)	1901, 1903, 1914
Tri-State bill	1903
Colombian treaty (Panama Canal)	1903
Ship-subsidy bills (2)	1907, 1922–23
Canadian reciprocity bill	1911
Arizona-New Mexico statehood	1911
Ship-purchase bill	1915
Armed-ship resolution	1917
Oil- and mineral-leasing bill and several appropriation bills	1919
Antilynch bills (3)	1922, 1935, 1937–38
Migratory-bird bill	1926
Campaign investigation resolution	1927
Colorado River bills (Boulder Dam project) (2)	1927, 1928
Emergency officers' retirement bill	1927
Washington public-buildings bill	1927
National-origins provisions in immigration laws, resolution to postpone	1929
Oil-industry investigation	1931
Glass banking bill	1933
Supplemental deficiency bill	1935
Work-relief bill (prevailing-wage amendment)	1935

Legislation defeated by filibusters[1]—Con.

Bills	Year
Flood-control bill	1935
Coal-conservation bill	1936
Anti-poll-tax bills (4)	1942, 1944, 1946, 1948
Fair-employment-practices bill	1946
Case strike-control bill	1946

Numerous appropriation bills. For a partial list of 82 such bills that failed from 1876 to 1916, see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 28, 1916, pages 10152–10153.

[1] 37 bills appear in this incomplete list, not including the many appropriation bills that have either been lost in the jam that resulted from filibusters or were talked to death because they failed to include items that particular Senators desired for the benefit of their States or because grants they made were considered excessive. Several successful filibusters have sought and achieved the enactment of legislation favored by the filibusterers. Filibusters have succeeded not only in preventing the passage of legislation, but also in preventing the organization of the Senate, the election of its officers, and the confirmation of Presidential appointees. They have also succeeded in modifying the terms of legislation; in delaying adjournment of Congress; in forcing special sessions, the adoption of conference reports, of neutrality legislation, and of a ship subsidy; in postponing consideration of legislation, and in raising the price of silver. Legislation has also often been defeated or modified by the mere threat of a filibuster.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should merely like to say to the able Senator from Oregon that I think he is performing a very useful service both to the Senate and to the country in bringing up the matter of the necessity of making a change in the existing rules of the Senate. I speak as one of the minority members of the Senate Rules Committee. While there may be some honest difference of opinion as to what procedure should be followed in closing the loopholes which now exist in the rules, I think all of us will agree that under the present precedents of the Senate we have no cloture whatever in the Senate of the United States. So long as a filibuster may be conducted against a motion to take up a bill, not even two-thirds of the Members of the Senate can bring to a close the debate whenever it is the desire of one man or a small group of men to obstruct the legislative process.

I hope that the able Senator from Oregon will direct a communication to the able Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who is the new chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and request an immediate hearing on his proposed amendment to the rules. I can say to the Senator from Oregon that I have today addressed a communication to the Senator from Arizona as chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, asking for an immediate hearing on amendment of the rules offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] on behalf of himself, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and myself, the junior Senator from California. I think that all of these measures should be brought before the committee during the first week the committee is functioning, so that whatever is reported by the committee may be brought to the floor of the Senate during the month of January; and if we are to have a filibuster on some correction of the present rules of the Senate, then let it come immediately, and not later in the session, when it may obstruct important public business.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am very glad to have the views of the able Senator from California. He has been one of the leaders on our side of the aisle in the fight to do something about changes in the present rules which permit filibusters as a practice on the floor of the Senate. I wish to say to the Senator from California that I shall continue to work to that end. There is a difference between the resolution of which he is one of the coauthors and my resolution, to which I shall direct my attention momentarily.

I have heard the Senator from California say—and he is quite correct—that it is not safe, from the standpoint of this country, and I paraphrase his statement, to give any small group of men the tremendous power that such a group has in the Senate of the United States when they organize a filibuster. Many of us have said the same thing in different language forms.

On this side of the aisle we considered the subject in the Republican conference last July and came out with the unanimous opinion that it should be Republican policy to take steps necessary to try to force action on an antifilibuster resolution.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am in hearty agreement with what the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] has said and with what the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has said. In 1942, at the end of a filibuster, I declared myself by saying that there comes a time when any self-respecting legislative body should stop talking and should vote. The defect in our rules has not been corrected up to this time. I hope that the Republican policy committee will take early action to bring the subject to a focus so that we can debate it in January, when we shall not be very busy, and there will be plenty of time to discuss all phases of the proposed changes in the rule.

I thank the Senator from Oregon for yielding to me.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kansas for his assistance and for his contribution to the debate.

I have only a word or two more to say on this subject at this time. I want to direct my attention to the proposal which I understand the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is supporting. Being chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, his support is, of course, a matter of considerable weight, so far as

action of the Senate is concerned. The Senator from Arizona talked to me regarding his proposal a day or two ago, and I told him I could not accept his proposal, because it was not a solution of the problem which confronts us, and that, in my judgment, his proposal will simply delay action for a long period of time, that it will be dilatory in its nature, and will be encouragement to further delay because it does not come to grips with the fundamental issue. Of course, there should be a change in the rule so as to provide that any item of business in the Senate, whether it be the approval of the Journal, a motion, or no matter what it be, shall be subject to a cloture motion. The Senator from California is correct when he says that in the rules today there is no effective rule on cloture.

Mr. President, we cannot get away from the objective data on the subject. The solution offered by the Senator from Arizona, in my judgment, is no solution at all, because the solution we must have is one which makes it possible by a majority vote to stop debate in the Senate and proceed with the people's business, guaranteeing, at the same time, sufficient time for the minority to seek to change itself into the majority. The Senator from Arizona does not propose to give to the Senate the power by majority vote. He seeks to retain the two-thirds vote requirement. I say, Mr. President, that the statistics are all against him, and demonstrate that such a requirement is not an effective measure. Even to the extent we can apply cloture under the present rule, Mr. President, in applying it to measures since 1917 the record shows that it has been possible to get a two-thirds vote only four times.

Mr. President, I want to participate in something more than a mere sham. I think filibustering should be stopped in the Senate of the United States. The way to stop it is to give to this body the power, by majority vote, to stop debate and, at the same time, amend the rules so that the minority will be adequately protected.

For future reference, let us quickly go through the procedure to which I am referring. My resolution, Mr. President, would require 16 Senators to sign a cloture petition before action could be obtained. As we watch the Senate in actual operation, it will have to be a matter of great moment—it must be made perfectly clear that the time has come to take action on limiting debate—before 16 Senators will put their signatures on a petition to end debate. But when, in the view of 16 Senators, debate should end, and a majority of the other Senators agree that debate should end following the filing of the cloture petition, plus a guaranty to the minority that every Senator on the floor shall have 2 hours in which to debate the merits, after cloture, and shall have the right to farm out all or part of his time to any of his colleagues, we shall then have an effective check on filibustering, and certainly, Mr. President, we shall have an effective rule which protects both the majority and the minority.

I shall urge, Mr. President, that consideration be given to the majority-vote principle, because a retention of the passage of cloture by a two-thirds vote will not give us the results we need, for we cannot marshal on many occasions, particularly those which involve such issues as full constitutional protection to all our citizens through civil-rights legislation, the necessary two-thirds vote, which is presently required.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope that the Committee on Rules and Administration will give full hearing to the proposition that cloture be passed by action of the majority of the Senate, and that then each Senator have the privilege of speaking for 2 hours or farming out his time, so that the minority and the country can be amply protected on a given issue.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have no intention of engaging in a partisan debate over the question of cloture. It is a matter about which neither party can contend that it has a clean record altogether, because historically over a period of years, involving a generation or more, neither party has been clear-handed in regard to the use of the device of the filibuster.

I recall that many years ago the Congress automatically adjourned every other year on the 4th of March, so that whether the business of the session was concluded or not it had to adjourn. Many times Senators took advantage of that fact to filibuster in the late hours or days of a session against some measure to which they were opposed, and there was no particular priority on the part of either party as to the use of that device. I have a very vivid recollection of it being used on many occasions by members of the party across the aisle.

I have fought the filibuster ever since I have been a Member of the Senate, and I have been the victim of several filibusters which I undertook to stop, but I was not always successful in doing so. I have frequently announced myself in favor of such rules, or such fair interpretation of the present rules, as would give the Senate power to do business whenever it was ready to vote. I have always felt that the filibuster was an anachronism, that it had no place in a democratic legislative body. As a matter of fact, the effort to secure cloture usually takes place after there has been full debate, and not before there has been full debate.

I have already spoken to the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration in regard to bringing in an amendment to the rules as soon as possible. There is no guaranty that it would be the first matter taken up, because no one knows what committees will bring in measures, or whether they will bring them in at all, but I think I can say that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, intends to give the promptest consideration to this proposal.

With respect to the amendment to the rule offered by the Senator from Oregon, he charged the Democratic side with responsibility for its lack of consideration the other day. Of course, the Senator from Oregon knew when he asked for consideration he could not get an important matter like that taken up by unanimous consent without committee consideration, because his proposal was entirely different from that which had theretofore been considered. So the fact that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] objected to the immediate consideration of the resolution carries with it no political implication except that the Senator from Georgia, in the exercise of his right, felt that that sort of a resolution should not be considered on the floor immediately without going to the Committee on Rules and Administration, which had already had referred to it other proposals of the same kind.

As to the Senator's proposal that each Senator have 2 hours, and that he be allowed to farm out his 2 hours to some other Senator, that does not strike me, I am frank to say, with much force. Under the proposal that each Senator be allowed 1 hour, if every Senator desired to talk about any pending proposal, that would mean 96 hours of debate. We might say that every Senator would not talk about the matter, but every Senator would have the right to talk about it, and that would mean 96 hours, and dividing that among the days in which we were likely to be in session, it would mean that there would be at least 2 weeks before there would be a vote on the proposal on which cloture was sought or had been voted.

If each Senator were allowed 2 hours, that would means 192 hours of debate, and if each Senator were allowed to farm out his 2 hours, and if we assume that half the Senators would farm out their 2 hours, it would mean that 48 Senators would have 4 hours each if they desired to use it to debate a proposal after cloture had been voted.

Mr. President, it seems to me that would not bring about as prompt a consideration of the final determination of the matter on which cloture had been voted as should be brought about.

I have always felt that 1 hour for each Senator is enough, after there has been ample debate. We assume there will have been ample debate when a cloture petition is filed, and that 96 hours is sufficient, and that 1 hour is enough for each Senator. I do not believe that the 2-hour proposal, with the right to farm out time, is in the interest of speeding determination of legislation after there has been debate to such an extent that the Senate would be willing to vote cloture, either by two-thirds vote or majority vote.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate the Senator's point of view. I would, however, call his attention to two points, namely, that if such a rule as I am proposing were adopted, the Senate would then have a rule which would make definite and certain a terminal date, a time for the end of debate, and I think that is all we need in order to stop a filibuster, that is, have the Members of the Senate know that, come a certain day and a certain hour, automatically debate will end. In my judgment, my 2-hour rule would give ample time for Senators to state their views on the merits of the pending question, it would give the country ample time to be heard from, and it would not stop the Senate from transacting other business. I think the Senator from Kentucky has overlooked that point.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not understand it possible to fix a definite date for the termination of debate so long as 96 Senators have the right to debate 2 hours. It would all depend on how long the Senate remained in session each day, and how many Senators desired to utilize 2 hours each. As the Senator has just suggested, other business might be transacted which would itself tend to postpone a final vote upon the matter on which every Senator had 2 hours for debate, and half of them 4 hours if the other half decided to yield their time to the other 48 Senators.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield for a comment?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. If the language needs to be changed in order to carry out the intention, I shall be happy to have that done, but the intention is to have the clock start ticking the moment the Senate adopted the cloture petition.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is not necessary to amend the rule in order for the clock to start ticking, if cloture is adopted.

Mr. MORSE. Undoubtedly.

Mr. BARKLEY. The point is that the number of 2-hour speeches or the number of 1-hour speeches which could be made in any one day would depend on the length of time the Senate was in session on that day. If it were in session 4 hours, it might be assumed there would be four speeches. If it were in session 6 hours, there might be six speeches, if 1 hour was the limitation; or a shorter session would bring fewer speeches, which would postpone the final vote. So that so long as each Senator has an hour or 2 hours it is impossible to fix an hour, or a day, on which there could be a final vote, until it had been determined that no other Senator wished to exercise the right to speak under the cloture rule, whether it be 1 hour or 2 hours.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to say to the able Senator from Kentucky, who is soon to leave the floor of the Senate and to preside over its deliberations, that I can testify that on a number of occasions he has been vitally interested in finding some way to terminate a filibuster, as were some of us on this side of the aisle. But I also wish to point out to the able Senator from Kentucky, and I think he will agree to this, that if we are ever to get an amendment to the rules of the Senate we should endeavor to get it very early in the session, because unless the amendment is brought to the floor very early, we are then faced with the problem of appropriation bills, of the new ECA legislation, of other aid to Europe, perhaps in armaments, of social-security legislation, and the pressures become so great that there is a tendency to drop the fight to correct the rules in order to pass legislation dealing with other public business.

It seems to me that if there is the will to adopt a resolution providing for such a change in the rules of the Senate—and I know the able Senator himself desires such a change—on the part of both the majority leadership of the Senate and the minority leadership, they can bring the amendment of the rules to the floor within a very short period of time, and then instead of recessing for 3-day periods in the early part of the session, when there is ready for consideration very little legislative business, if the Senate should be kept in session each day to a reasonable hour in the evening, and, if a filibuster develops, should hold, if necessary, all-night sessions, before the legislative calendar becomes too cumbersome, then I think we would have a reasonable opportunity, working together, to close this loophole in the rules which I am sure the Senator from Kentucky recognizes exists.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator from California, and I agree with him that the proposal ought to be brought before the Senate promptly. I recall what happened in the last Congress. The matter of bringing in a rule to amend the rules was taken up in the committee early in that session, and the proposed amendment to the rule was reported to the Senate months before the end of the Congress and placed on the calendar. No one, however, made any effort to get it up. It might be said that anyone on the floor of the Senate could move to take up a certain matter that is on the calendar, and that is true. But the responsible leadership on the other side, which was then the majority, made no effort to bring it up. I can understand that, because it came in at a time when other matters of importance were under consideration, and therefore, I suppose, anticipating a very lengthy debate on the matter, it was thought expedient not to undertake to bring it up at that session. I recall the notice served by the then Republican majority in its conference that they were going to start something, inaugurate a movement of this kind quickly, as soon as they got back in the present session, but I think that was a sort of a death-bed confession, in view of the fact that nothing had been done in two whole years, and it turned out to be more of a death-bed confession than was at the time thought possible, I suppose.

At any rate, no matter who is responsible, or how many filibusters there have been, or on what side they originated, I agree wholeheartedly that the rules of the Senate should be amended, if it is necessary to amend them in order that this body may transact business. It is the only legislative body in the world where a single individual or a few individuals can interfere with the orderly procedure in regard to the consideration of legislation, to the point where the Senate can never vote on a measure which an overwhelming majority might favor. That does not apply to any particular type of legislation. It applies to anything that may come before the Senate.

REPRINT OF BILL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent to have Senate bill 110 reprinted so that the name of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] may be added to the names of the other sponsors of the bill. The title of the bill is as follows:

S. 110. A bill to broaden the cooperative extension system as established in the act of May 8, 1914, and acts supplemental thereto, by providing for cooperative extension work between colleges receiving the benefits of this act and the acts of July 2, 1862, and August 30, 1890, and other qualified colleges, universities, and research agencies, and the United States Department of Labor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, January 13, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 10, 1949:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Dean G. Acheson, of Maryland, to be Secretary of State.

James E. Webb, of North Carolina, to be Under Secretary of State.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 10, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. Edward H. Pruden, pastor of First Baptist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, as we begin a new week and a new legislative day we pause to acknowledge Thee as the source from whom all our blessings come, and to seek that leadership of Thy Holy Spirit without which we shall surely go astray. May Thy blessing be upon the Members of Congress and upon all legislative bodies everywhere that men of good will working together in every nation may establish peace in the earth. We pray, our Father, that Thou wilt help us to recognize the tremendous significance of the responsibilities which rest upon us; and in deep seriousness of purpose and in a dedication to the God of all mankind may we approach our tasks today. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 7, 1949, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next at 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask if the majority leader expects to have a quorum here on Thursday?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a question of fact that the majority leader is unable to answer. I think it is immaterial. I doubt if any Member will raise that question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

MINORITY EMPLOYEES

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution (H. Res. 39) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That pursuant to the Legislative Pay Act of 1929, as amended, six minority employees authorized therein shall be the following-named persons, effective January 4, 1949, until otherwise ordered by the House, to wit: John Andrews and William F. Russell, to receive compensation at the basic rate of $5,000 per annum, respectively; James P. Griffin (minority pair clerk), to receive compensation at the basic rate of $4,000 per annum; M. L. Meletio, John McCabe, and T. J. Kennamer, to receive compensation at the basic rate of $3,800 per annum, respectively.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands there are several Members who desire to take the oath of office this morning. If they will present themselves at the bar of the House, the Chair will see that the oath is administered.

Mr. THOMAS H. BURKE, Mr. FRED L. CRAWFORD, Mr. JOHN JENNINGS, Jr., Mr. EDWARD H. JENISON, and Mr. THOR C. TOLLEFSON presented themselves at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

THE BUDGET—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 17)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting my recommendations for the budget of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950.

Under the laws of our country, the budget, when approved by the Congress, becomes the plan of action for the Federal Government. It thus embodies decisions of tremendous importance, particularly in these times, to the American people and to the entire world. The preparation of the budget is one of the most important duties of the President. It represents a carefully prepared plan for carrying out the many activities and services of Government which the Congress has authorized, and others which I am recommending, in response to the needs and desires of the American people.

This is the fourth budget prepared since the close of World War II. The character of the postwar world still presents many complex problems and unanswered questions. This budget is the clearest expression that can be given at this time to the program which the Government of the United States should follow in the world today.

It is founded on the conviction that the United States must continue to exert strong, positive effort to achieve peace in the world and growing prosperity at home. Substantial direct assistance is provided for other members of the family of nations, and expenditures in support of our armed forces are materially increased. Funds are included for the necessary strengthening of our economy through the development and conservation of the Nation's productive resources. Increased emphasis is placed on the provision of badly needed measures to promote the education, health, and security of our people.

To support this program, the budget provides for expenditures of 41.9 billion dollars for the fiscal year 1950, about 1.7 billion dollars above the requirements for the present year. Under existing law and with continuing high levels of economic activity, revenues for the fiscal year would be 41 billion dollars. This would result in an estimated deficit of 873 million dollars.

In a period of high prosperity it is not sound public policy for the Government to operate at a deficit. A Government surplus at this time is vitally important to provide a margin for contingencies, to permit reduction of the public debt, to provide an adequate base for the future financing of our present commitments, and to reduce inflationary pressures. I am, therefore, recommending new tax legislation to raise revenues by 4 billion dollars. Because of the normal lag in the collection of taxes, however, tax receipts in the fiscal year 1950 would be considerably less.

In presenting this financial program to the Nation, I have carefully considered the present economic situation of our country and the effect upon it of large Government expenditures. The Economic Report, submitted recently to Congress, emphasized the compelling need for financial prudence by the Government at this time. The actions taken in preparing this budget reflect that policy.

Because of heavy prior commitments requiring larger expenditures for a number of continuing programs in the fiscal year 1950 and the presence of inflationary forces in our economy, it has been necessary to deny many requests for additional funds which would normally be desirable. Necessary increases in our national defense program are expected to result in additional expenditures in 1950 of 2.5 billion dollars, or 21 percent, over 1949. Public works already authorized and now under way also require higher expenditures. Despite these and other unavoidable increases, the total expenditures contemplated for 1950 are only 1.7 billion dollars above the level of the present fiscal year.

Within the framework of this budget, provision is made for inaugurating certain essential economic and social programs which should no longer be delayed. An estimate of 290 million dollars is included for aid to education. An additional 500 million dollars is included for such programs as housing and slum clearance, expanded social security and the national health program. In addition, there will be an increase in receipts and expenditures of trust accounts under my recommendation for strengthening the contributory social insurance system.

The plans of each Government agency have been thoroughly reviewed, and the amounts shown in the budget represent, in my judgment, the minimum requirements for the next fiscal year. I believe that this budget reflects the necessities of our national policy and the desires of our people and that an extensive review by the Congress will result in its acceptance as a sound program of governmental action.

Budget totals

[Fiscal years. In millions]

	1948 actual	1949 estimated	1950 estimated
Receipts	$42,211	$39,580	$40,985
Expenditures	33,791	40,180	41,858
Surplus (+) or deficit (−)	+8,419	−600	−873

NOTE.—Estimated expenditures are based on existing and proposed legislation. Estimated receipts exclude new tax proposals. Throughout this Budget, payments of refunds of Government receipts are reported as deductions from total receipts; in the past, they have been reported as expenditures.

The 1950 budget, like all those since the end of the war, is dominated by our international and national-defense programs. Together, they are expected to amount to 21 billion dollars, or half of all budget expenditures.

International affairs and finance account for 6.7 billion dollars of expenditures in the fiscal year 1950, compared with 7.2 billion dollars in 1949. Most of these funds will be spent as part of the strong economic support we are extending to the free nations of western Europe, whose recovery is the key to continued independence and to safeguarding freedom in many other parts of the world. Our investment in European recovery will repay us many times in terms of increased strength and improved organization for peace.

But in existing circumstances, economic strength is not enough to assure continued independence to free peoples. Under the Charter of the United Nations, therefore, we have been discussing with some of the western European countries measures designed to increase the security of the North Atlantic area. To further this objective, I expect later to request funds for providing military supplies to those countries and to certain other countries where the provision of such assistance is important to our national security. It is not possible now to predict accurately what will be needed, and I have therefore included no allowance in the budget. The fact that additional funds will be required to meet the demands of this program emphasizes

even more strongly the need for increased revenues in the years ahead.

While we believe that active participation in the work of the United Nations and support for the economic recovery and growing strength of free nations are the most important steps we can take toward peace, we must also maintain adequate national-defense forces. In this budget, expenditures for national defense are estimated to total 14.3 billion dollars in 1950, compared to 11.8 billion dollars for 1949. New authorizations recommended for national defense in 1950 total 15.9 billion dollars. Defense expenditures to maintain the present program are expected to be higher in 1951, as a result of expanding programs now under way and the large orders already placed for aircraft, ships, and other material and equipment, which will be delivered and paid for in the next few years.

The military forces recommended in this budget are the most powerful this Nation has ever maintained in peacetime. The principal objective we should have in mind in planning for our national defense at this time is to build a foundation of military strength which can be sustained for a period of years without excessive strain on our productive resources, and which will permit rapid expansion should the need arise. The recommendations in this budget move toward this objective. I believe that they will permit this Nation to maintain a proper military preparedness in the present uncertain period.

Two other commitments of the Government will continue to have a major impact on budget expenditures in the fiscal year 1950. These are interest on the public debt and our program of services and benefits provided for veterans and their dependents. Together they total 11 billion dollars, or 26 percent of the budget.

A general decline in the number of veterans drawing readjustment benefits reduces expenditures for veterans to 5.5 billion dollars, 1.3 billion dollars below the current year. Interest on the public debt, however, shows an increase from 5.3 billion dollars in 1949 to more than 5.4 billion dollars in 1950.

Expenditures for all activities of the Federal Government, exclusive of those required for the four items—international, national defense, veterans, and interest on the public debt—total 10 billion dollars or 24 percent of the budget.

Programs devoted to social welfare, health, and security require expenditures of 2.4 billion dollars. Of this amount nearly half is in direct grants to States for public assistance.

Development of our natural resources, including atomic energy, is estimated to cost 1.9 billion dollars. Programs devoted to agriculture and agricultural resources require expenditures of 1.7 billion dollars. Provision for transportation and communication facilities and services, many of them supporting our national defense activities, requires 1.6 billion dollars.

All other activities of Government—for housing, education, labor, finance, commerce, and industry and the costs of general government—amount to 2.3 billion dollars, or 5 percent of the total budget.

Expenditures of 6.4 billion dollars are included within the foregoing budget totals for new legislation. Of this amount, 5.6 billion dollars is directly concerned with international and national defense activities, while the remainder provides for domestic needs.

There are many activities of Government, authorized at various periods, which impose continuing financial obligations and tend to represent fixed elements in the budget. A careful review has been made of these programs to assure that they meet only the most essential needs in the light of present conditions. As a result, cut-backs have been recommended in the veterans' hospital construction program, recommendations for new public works have been included only where it is not in the public interest to postpone them, as in the case of some power projects, and an increase in postal rates has been recommended to lower the postal deficit. Similar changes are reflected in other areas.

In addition, a great deal of effort has been devoted to achieving the economies which should be obtained through more effective organization and conduct of Government operations. There is no easy way of attaining this type of economy, but the size and complexity of our governmental activities require that we devote continuing attention to improving the management of the public business. Further, we must make it possible for responsible Federal executives to take the actions which will lead to increased efficiency, economy, and closer coordination of activities.

To make more rapid progress toward this goal, to which I am firmly committed, this budget includes a request for a management improvement fund of $1,000,000 to be appropriated to the President and utilized by him to carry on necessary and worth-while management improvement activities. The budget also reflects certain anticipated savings which should result from management improvement activities now under way.

To strengthen further the management of the Government, I am recommending the immediate enactment of legislation to increase the salaries of the heads and assistant heads of the departments and agencies. The budget includes a tentative estimate of the funds needed to provide these increases. I also recommend that the Classification Act be revised to permit the payment of more realistic salaries to career employees and to correct the dislocations and inequities created in recent years. The Government and its employees should be assured that the salaries paid for positions at all levels are fair compensation for the work performed.

Fiscal prudence requires that we consider the Government's program, not on the basis of a single year alone but in the light of the continuing national policies already adopted. It must be recognized that expenditures in the fiscal year 1951 are likely to be larger than those for 1950. Expenditures for national defense can be expected to rise substantially above the level estimated for 1950. We cannot expect any material decline in our international responsibilities. We must face squarely the fact that we foresee a deficit in the fiscal year 1950 under existing tax laws, even without any allowance for new military aid, and that even higher expenditures will probably be required in future years.

Furthermore, in the fiscal year 1950, the present large excess of receipts of trust accounts, with its anti-inflationary effects, will be sharply reduced by the scheduled payment to veterans of a dividend of about 2 billion dollars from the national service life insurance fund.

Finally, it must be apparent that in times like the present we must be in a position to make new plans if conditions change. I do not consider it prudent under such circumstances for the Government finances to be in unbalance, or even in precarious balance. In prosperous times like the present, we should take the necessary steps to reduce the public debt and place the Government finances on a sounder footing.

Therefore, I am recommending that the Congress enact new revenue legislation.

It is not an easy step for me to take to recommend new taxes. I do so with a double conviction, first, that under present circumstances a prosperous country cannot afford an unbalanced budget; and second, that after thorough review of the cost of each Government program my recommendations represent a level below which our responsibilities will not permit us to go in the next fiscal year.

The budget of the United States Government is large because its responsibilities are large. The budget reflects the realities of our international position and our concern for a strong and progressive domestic economy. This Nation is today the strongest bulwark of freedom in the world. The decisions we make concerning our national finances must be based on a sober understanding of this fact.

BUDGET RECEIPTS

On the basis of existing tax legislation, budget receipts for the fiscal year 1950 are expected to total $41,000,000,000, an increase of more than a billion dollars over receipts in the current fiscal year. The estimates assume the continuance of full employment and approximately the current levels of economic activity.

Income taxes: Income taxes on individuals and corporations are the major source of revenue of the Federal Government. Receipts from these taxes represent over two-thirds of budget receipts at present.

The Revenue Act of 1948, passed over my veto, is causing a sharp reduction of individual income-tax collections in the fiscal year 1949. Even though the continuation of the present high level of personal income is assumed, these receipts in the fiscal year 1950 will remain below the corresponding receipts in the fiscal year 1948.

Receipts from taxes on corporations are expected to increase substantially in the fiscal years 1949 and 1950. With the end of the war, the rates of these taxes were reduced and collections declined sharply from the high levels of the war years, but the general prosperity that

followed the reconversion period has brought steadily rising profits and higher tax yields.

Excises and miscellaneous receipts: Excise taxes and miscellaneous receipts are the other major sources of Federal revenue. Excise taxes are expected to continue the gradual upward trend of recent years, reflecting the continued high level of business activity. Miscellaneous receipts have been declining from the peak reached in the fiscal year 1947. The disposal of war surplus is nearing completion, and consequently by the fiscal year 1950 miscellaneous receipts will be approaching a more stable level.

Budget receipts (including proposed changes in employment taxes and miscellaneous receipts)

[Fiscal years. In millions.

Source	1948 actual	1949 estimated	1950 estimated
Direct taxes on individuals:			
Individual income taxes	$20,997	$18,530	$19,135
Estate and gift taxes	899	797	633
Direct taxes on corporations:			
Corporation income taxes	9,851	11,515	12,112
Excess profits taxes	321	194	140
Excises	7,402	7,715	7,900
Employment taxes:			
Existing legislation	2,396	2,610	3,324
Proposed legislation:			
Health insurance	------	------	260
Expanded coverage, old-age and survivors insurance	------	------	1,700
Customs	422	407	407
Miscellaneous receipts:			
Existing legislation	3,809	2,276	1,750
Proposed legislation	------	------	81
Deduct:			
Appropriation to trust funds:			
Existing legislation	1,616	1,754	2,430
Proposed legislation:			
Health insurance	------	------	260
Expanded coverage, old-age and survivors insurance	------	------	1,700
Refunds of receipts	2,272	2,709	2,097
Budget receipts	42,211	39,580	40,985

NOTE.—Payments of refunds of Government receipts are now reported as deductions from total receipt; previously, they were reported as expenditures. Overpayments by taxpayers are not true receipts of the Government nor are they, when refunded, properly chargeable as operating costs of the Government. Payments by wholly owned Government corporations and enterprises for retirement of capital stock and surplus, which were formerly reported as miscellaneous receipts, are also excluded from both receipts and expenditures, since they do not represent operating costs or true receipts of the Government. These improvements in reporting practice result in reducing budget receipts and expenditures for each year by equal amounts, and therefore have no effect upon the amount of surplus or deficit.

Employment taxes: The continuation of full employment brings gradually rising revenues from employment taxes. Furthermore, under existing legislation, the tax rate for railroad retirement increases in January 1949 and that for old-age and survivors insurance in January 1950. I recommend that the rate increase for the latter tax be moved forward to July 1949.

I have recommended programs of health and disability insurance and expansion of coverage for the social insurance programs now in operation. These measures would result at the outset in added collections of employment taxes greater than the added payments for benefits, but the funds would be transferred to trust accounts and would not appreciably affect budget receipts.

Refunds: This budget reflects the recent change in Federal financial reporting, under which refunds of receipts are shown as deductions from receipts, rather than as expenditures. These refunds are not true operating costs of the Government but are for the return of overpayments of taxes and duties. Such refunds are exceptionally high in the fiscal year 1949, because of the unusual "overwithholding" of individual income taxes for January through April 1948, resulting from the lower rates set retroactively by the Revenue Act of 1948. Interest paid on refunds continues to be shown as an expenditure.

RETIREMENT OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

The change in the budget outlook in the last 12 months has meant a corresponding change in the rate of reduction of the public debt. Instead of the budget surplus of nearly 5 billion dollars estimated last January for the fiscal year 1949, we now face a deficit of 600 million dollars. Accordingly, there will be no net reduction in the debt during fiscal year 1949, other than that made possible by a small reduction in the Treasury's cash balance during the year. The debt on June 30, 1949, is estimated to be 251.6 billion dollars.

The major reason for the failure to achieve any sizable debt reduction in 1949 is the tax reduction enacted by the Eightieth Congress. The increase in taxes which I am recommending should permit us to make, in 1950, the minimum reduction consistent with responsible fiscal policy in prosperous times such as these.

BUDGET EXPENDITURES AND AUTHORIZATIONS

The complex budget of the Government can best be summarized in terms of major functions. These major functions—national defense, international affairs and finance, veterans' services and benefits, and so forth—set forth the broad purposes for which the Government spends money, regardless of which department or agency carries them out. Estimated expenditures for the fiscal year 1950 of 41.9 billion dollars include all expenditures from the general and special accounts of the Treasury, as well as the net expenditures of Government corporations and enterprises. They exclude expenditures made from trust accounts.

The full impact and direction of the Government's program cannot be measured in terms of expenditures alone in any one year. Many of the commitments made under the appropriations and other authorizations enacted by the Congress for any year do not result in expenditures until a later year. For example, of the estimated 1950 expenditures, 34 billion dollars will be made from new appropriations and authorizations recommended in this budget, and 7.9 billion dollars will be made from those enacted in prior years.

In order to give a comprehensive picture of the financial requirements of Government programs, my budget message sets forth the net new appropriations and other authorizations requested. "Net new appropriations," totaling 38.5 billion dollars for fiscal year 1950, represent total appropriations requested—including permanent appropriations—less those to be used to liquidate prior year contract authorizations. "Other authorizations," totaling 6 billion dollars for fiscal year 1950, include contract authorizations which permit the placement of specific contracts but require later appropriations to liquidate these contracts, and special authorizations to use the proceeds of Treasury borrowing to finance certain types of Government programs. Together, "net new appropriations" and "other authorizations," totaling 44.6 billion dollars represent the new obligational authority recommended for carrying on the Government's business.

Budget expenditures and authorizations by major functions

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Function	Expenditures			1950	
	1948 actual	1949 estimated	1950 estimated	Net new appropriations	Other authorizations
International affairs and finance	$4,782	$7,219	$6,709	$6,349	------
National defense	10,924	11,745	14,268	13,219	[2] 2,455
Veterans' services and benefits	6,567	6,799	5,450	5,701	------
Social welfare, health, and security	1,853	1,963	2,358	2,271	92
Housing and community facilities	82	349	388	227	1,987
Education and general research	75	85	414	452	18
Agriculture and agricultural resources	375	1,805	1,662	745	350
Natural resources	1,091	1,616	1,861	1,549	482
Transportation and communication	1,267	1,757	1,586	444	648
Finance, commerce, and industry	68	102	107	82	------
Labor	183	184	187	187	------
General government	1,504	1,187	1,224	1,160	7
Interest on the public debt	5,188	5,325	5,450	5,450	------
Reserve for contingencies	------	45	150	200	------
Adjustment to daily Treasury statement basis	−388	------	------	------	------
Total	33,791	40,180	41,858	[1] 38,556	6,039

[1] In addition, this budget includes 3,636 million dollars of appropriations recommended to liquidate prior year contract authorizations.

SPECIFIC PROGRAMS

The following sections describe in broad outline the Government programs in each of the major functional areas and the principal changes proposed in this budget.

International affairs and finance

Two world wars and the years between have convinced the people of the United States that their security and well-being depend on conditions of peace and stability in the world. The complexity of the international postwar recovery problem and the tensions which make the transition to peace more difficult have deepened this conviction.

The fundamental objective of United States foreign policy is to achieve world peace and international security resting on the strength, mutual interests, and cooperation of free nations. The budget reflects this policy in the funds provided for our participation in the United Nations and for the regular operations of the State Department and other agencies. But the instruments of our policy requiring the largest measure of budgetary support are the extraordinary programs of economic and military aid to those nations and peoples who share our international objectives and our determination to make them effective. Through all these means, we are acting to strengthen the great moral force of

freedom on which we believe the advancement of people everywhere depends.

Total expenditures for international activities, exclusive of possible expenditures for a new program of providing military supplies to certain countries, are expected to be 6.7 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1950—a drop from the 7.2 billion dollars estimated for the fiscal year 1949. Expenditures for economic assistance may be expected to decline in subsequent years with continued progress toward world economic recovery. But any forward estimate of our international expenditures must be highly tentative in view of the present uncertain world situation.

Reconstruction and military aid: Our aid to European recovery is the major program of economic assistance in which we are now engaged. Begun in April 1948, this program is expected to result in 4.6 billion dollars of expenditures in the present fiscal year, and 4.5 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1950—nearly 70 percent of our 1950 expenditures for international activities.

International affairs and finance

[Fiscal years. In millions]

	Expenditures			1950 net new appropriations
	1948 actual	1949 estimated	1950 estimated	
Reconstruction and military aid:				
Economic Cooperation Act—ERP (existing and proposed legislation)	$154	$4,600	$4,500	$4,300
Other proposed aid legislation	------	------	355	600
Greek-Turkish Aid (acts of 1947 and 1948)	156	255	136	------
Export-Import Bank loans	460	0	146	------
Treasury loan to the United Kingdom	1,700	------	------	------
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	4	−31	−35	------
Foreign relief:				
Army (occupied areas)	965	1,265	1,030	1,000
Assistance to China (act of 1948)	1	350	49	------
Other (mainly under Foreign Aid Act, UNRRA and post-UNRRA)	1,027	185	7	------
Palestinian refugee program (proposed legislation)	------	16	------	------
Displaced Persons Commission	------	1	2	5
Foreign relations:				
Department of State:				
Present programs	144	171	171	160
Proposed legislation (mainly war damage claims)	------	17	1	2
Other	5	7	4	1
Philippine war damage and rehabilitation:				
War damage claims (Philippine War Damage Commission)	23	171	165	165
Rehabilitation program	25	51	46	4
Interest on deposits (Treasury)	2	4	3	3
Participation in international organizations:				
International Refugee Organization	69	73	70	70
Other present programs	18	53	57	31
FAO building loan and ITO (proposed legislation)	------	------	2	8
Total	4,732	7,219	6,709	[1] 6,349

[1] In addition, this budget includes 3,036 million dollars of appropriations recommended to liquidate prior year contract authorizations.

United States aid to western European countries and the mutual self-help which it has stimulated among them are already resulting in substantial progress toward economic recovery and political stability. The volume of production—both agricultural and industrial—is increasing as the months go by. This momentum must be maintained if the European economy is to become independent of extraordinary outside assistance by the target date of July 1952. To meet this objective, it is also extremely important for this Nation to undertake through such means as an extended and less restrictive reciprocal trade act, those adjustments in our foreign-trade pattern which will help to bring about a higher level and a better balance of world trade.

Further authorizing legislation by the Congress will be necessary before the end of the current fiscal year in order to carry the European recovery program forward without interruption. By the end of December, authorizations issued to the European countries for procurement had nearly reached the limit set by the presently available Economic Cooperation Administration funds. The bulk of the commodities involved will be shipped by the end of March. This budget accordingly anticipates a supplemental appropriation request for 1,250 million dollars for the remainder of the current fiscal year, in addition to the 4.3-billion-dollar appropriation requested for the fiscal year 1950.

I recommend that, in extending the Economic Cooperation Act, the Congress eliminate the present legal requirement which in effect charges 3 billion dollars of the fiscal year 1949 expenditures for European aid against the fiscal year 1948 surplus. This wholly artificial bookkeeping shift in no way affects the Government's actual financial operations, but it does result in a distorted picture of the budget surplus or deficit in these 2 years.

I have already referred to the prospective North Atlantic arrangements, now under discussion. In addition, we are considering furnishing military supplies to certain countries in furtherance of our national security. As with the European recovery program, military aid will call for a large measure of mutual aid and self-help among the participating countries. Because of present uncertainty as to cost and timing, no amounts are included for this program in the budget.

The scope and magnitude of several of our other current assistance programs cannot be accurately foreseen at this time. These now include aid to Greece, Turkey, China, and Korea. Funds are provided for assistance programs of this character in the budget under "other proposed aid legislation," with appropriations tentatively estimated at 600 million dollars and expenditures at 355 million dollars for the fiscal year 1950. I shall recommend specific legislation and appropriations to the Congress at a later date.

The Export-Import Bank will continue to make loans in fiscal year 1950 for promoting international trade and economic development, particularly in Latin America. Net expenditures of the bank in the fiscal year 1950 are expected to be relatively low because of rising collections on earlier loans and because our aid to Europe is now financed almost entirely from ECA funds. Mainly because of a large Canadian repayment, the bank is expected to show no net expenditures in the current fiscal year.

Foreign relief: Our principal foreign relief activities at the present time are those under the Army's program of government and relief in occupied areas—primarily Germany and Japan. Tentative estimates of about 1 billion dollars of appropriations and expenditures for fiscal year 1950 are included in this budget—a substantial decline from 1949. These estimates include funds to continue the rehabilitation program now under way in Japan. With these additional sums for rehabilitation and with further ECA recovery aid for Germany in the next fiscal year, progress toward economic recovery in the occupied areas should continue, with a resulting further decline in expenditures in subsequent years.

Foreign relations: The principal change contemplated in the program of the Department of State is the planned expansion of information and education activities. Expenditures for Foreign Service buildings are expected to decline, so that total expenditures for foreign relations activities are expected to be about the same in the fiscal year 1950 as in 1949. As part of our general program for improved Federal administration, provision is made for increased flexibility in management for the Secretary of State through the consolidation of appropriations. Amounts are included in this budget to cover the cost of proposed legislation granting Foreign Service personnel pay raises similar to those given most employees under the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948.

I am requesting legislation authorizing the payment of 17 million dollars in the fiscal year 1949 for payment of war-damage claims of neutral European countries.

Philippine aid: Our assistance to the Philippine Republic in its recovery from war devastation is now at a peak level. Total expenditures for rehabilitation and for payment of war-damage claims are expected to decline slightly in the fiscal year 1950 and to fall much more sharply in the fiscal year 1951. In our veterans' program we are continuing to give compensation to disabled Philippine veterans who fought in our joint efforts against the Japanese. Provision for financing veterans' hospitals and medical services, authorized by recent legislation, are included in the reserve for contingencies, pending the development with the Philippine Republic of detailed plans for carrying out this program.

International organizations: Our contribution to the International Refugee Organization is estimated at 70 million dollars in the fiscal year 1950, approximately the same as in 1949. With the expected migration of refugees to the United States and other areas, the IRO program should be substantially completed by June 30, 1950. It is my hope that the present Displaced Persons Act will be speedily stripped of its restrictive

and discriminatory provisions in order that we may make a contribution to this program more worthy of our best traditions. A tentative estimate of 16 million dollars for the fiscal year 1949 is also included in this budget for our contribution to the United Nations program of relief for Arab and other refugees from Palestine.

Outlays for our participation in other international organizations, including the United Nations, will continue in the fiscal year 1950 at about the same level as in 1949. A 1949 supplemental appropriation of 65 million dollars is included for the loan for the United Nations' headquarters construction. Tentative estimates are included in 1950 for a loan to the Food and Agriculture Organization for construction of a headquarters building, and for our contribution to the International Trade Organization.

National defense

In my budget message for the fiscal year 1949 I indicated that in spite of the reduction of our armed services to a small fraction of their wartime strength, national defense still remained the largest single Government program. I further indicated that the funds recommended, about 11 billion dollars, provided for only the minimum national defense requirements.

Before the Congress could complete action on that budget, the uncertainty of world conditions made it necessary to consider steps to develop additional military strength which would give evidence of continuing firmness in world affairs. Therefore, in an address to the Congress on March 17, 1948, I recommended the prompt enactment of universal training legislation and the temporary enactment of selective-service legislation. Shortly thereafter, I recommended additional authorizations for national defense, bringing my total recommendations for fiscal year 1949 to more than 14.7 billion dollars.

Since then I have given continued study to our national security requirements for the present and the future. For the time being it is essential to continue the selective service process. However, this is not the solution to the Nation's long-range military manpower and training problem. Permanent legislation providing for universal training is essential if we are to achieve an acceptable degree of national security.

My budget recommendations for national defense in the fiscal year 1950 are based on a plan for a national defense positio of relative military readiness, coupled with a higher degree of mobilization preparedness. This type of military planning will permit us continuously to revise our tactics and develop our weapons to meet modern conditions, but is clearly consistent with our traditional concept of military strength for purposes of defense.

In arriving at my recommendations, I have had the benefit of the considered advice of civilian and military leaders best qualified to evaluate the international, strategic, and economic aspects of our national defense requirements. I believe that these recommendations reflect a proper relationship between our security requirements and our economic and financial resources, and envision an Army, Navy, and Air Force in a condition of relative readiness, all functioning as an integrated team. Moreover, I am convinced that we should plan our military structure at this time so as to insure a balanced military program in the foreseeable future at approximately the level recommended in this budget.

At the same time we must recognize that preparations for defense must be flexible, and not rigid. They must reflect changes in the international situation, changes in technology and in the economic situation. We must be in a position to alter our military programs as circumstances change.

The National Security Act of 1947 established an organizational framework better than we have ever had before and provided for a more flexible control and adjustment of our military program. The establishment of a Weapons Evaluation Board under the Secretary of Defense is an example of the type of development we are continuously making to achieve the best possible assignment of weapons and tasks among the military services. However, we have had enough experience under that act to recognize that further improvements need to be made which cannot be accomplished under existing law. Therefore, I expect to recommend certain changes in the National Security Act which will help to assure readjustments of our defense program as a whole and in all its parts as security requirements change.

The recommendations for the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year 1950 mark a beginning toward a national defense program in which our air, naval, and land forces plan and operate as a team under a unified strategic concept. The 1950 program gives priority to air power and to strengthening the civilian Reserve components, and continues to emphasize research and development and industrial mobilization. The budget provides for maintaining the necessary occupation forces in the former enemy areas for which satisfactory international settlements have not yet been worked out. The budget also provides substantial amounts to continue the matériel improvement programs for which large authorizations were enacted under the augmented fiscal year 1949 budget. Continuing expenditures will be necessary for an orderly replacement program in future years as existing inventories are used up and as matériel wears out or becomes obsolete.

Expenditures by the National Military Establishment for defense purposes in the fiscal year 1950 are expected to amount to somewhat over 13.1 billion dollars, including a tentative estimate of 385 million dollars for programs for which new authorizing legislation will later be requested. The stock piling of strategic materials and other activities supporting defense are expected to require additional expenditures of about 530 million dollars. Furthermore, a tentative estimate of 600 million dollars has been added for the first year cost of universal training—when in full operation this program may require expenditures of 2 billion dollars annually. In total, the national defense budget I am recommending will require estimated expenditures of slightly less than 14.3 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1950, an increase of 2.5 billion dollars over the 1949 level. Somewhat higher expenditures are likely in subsequent years.

National defense

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			1950	
	1948 actual	1949 estimated	1950 estimated	Net new appropriations	Other authorizations
National Military Establishment (excluding payments under Armed Forces Leave Act):					
Pay and maintenance of military personnel:					
Pay and allowances of regular personnel	$3,555	$3,434	$3,601	$3,596	------
Pay of retired personnel	148	168	192	194	------
Subsistence, travel, and other	1,192	1,407	1,359	1,488	------
Civilian components	350	580	760	795	------
Research and development	534	557	505	534	------
Aircraft and related procurement	701	1,157	1,718	330	[1] 1,992
Naval ship construction	271	309	406	5	[2] 47
Military public works construction	395	286	302	93	20
All other	3,316	3,422	3,908	4,317	------
Tentative estimate for proposed legislation	------	------	385	645	185
Subtotal, National Military Establishment	10,552	11,350	13,136	11,994	[1] 2,244
Activities supporting defense:					
Universal training	------	------	600	800	------
Stock piling of strategic and critical materials (Treasury)	99	350	525	314	211
Payments under Armed Forces Leave Act	269	14	1	------	------
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	−66	−42	−29	------	------
Other	70	93	45	36	------
Total	10,924	11,745	14,268	[1] 13,144	[1] 2,455

[1] In addition, the budget includes 2,061 million dollars of appropriations recommended to liquidate prior contract authorizations and 75 million dollars to cover other prior year obligations.

[2] In addition, 279 million dollars is being made immediately available in the fiscal year 1949 to cover increased cost of completing authorized naval ship construction program.

Net new appropriations and other authorizations specifically recommended in this budget for the National Military Establishment in the fiscal year 1950 are 13.7 billion dollars. This total, however, includes an upward adjustment of 279 million dollars for increased cost of the naval ship construction programs authorized in 1949 and prior years. In addition, 830 million dollars is provided as a tentative estimate for additional public works, for military pay adjustments, and for other special programs, dependent upon the passage of necessary enabling legislation. In all, 14.5 billion dollars

of new obligational authority is provided for the National Military Establishment for use in the fiscal year 1950, an increase of 700 million dollars over amounts enacted for the fiscal year 1949.

Of the 13.7 billion dollars of specific recommendations for new obligational authority for the National Military Establishment, 11 million dollars is requested for the Office of the Secretary of Defense, 4.6 billion dollars for the Air Force, 4.5 billion dollars for the Army, and 4.6 billion dollars for the Navy, counting the upward adjustment for ship construction costs mentioned above.

In addition to the new obligational authority for the National Military Establishment, this budget includes 525 million dollars of new authority for procurement of critical and strategic materials, 36 million dollars for other defense-supporting activities, and a tentative appropriation estimate of 800 million dollars for the inauguration of universal training.

In all, new obligational authority for national defense programs of nearly 15.9 billion dollars is included in this budget. This compares with 14.7 billion dollars for the fiscal year 1949, including 2.9 billion dollars made available in 1948, and also including tentative supplemental authorizations of 341 million dollars chiefly for stock piling.

Of the 15.9 billion dollars, 13.2 billion dollars is requested in the form of appropriations and 2.7 billion dollars in contract authorizations. In addition, appropriations of 2.1 billion dollars are requested to liquidate prior year contract authorizations.

Military strength—summary: The requirements of the various services have been determined, not separately, but in relation to our total security position and the degree of military readiness which is planned. The basic concept upon which my recommendations are based is that this Nation's military security should rest on a nucleus of highly trained and mobile forces—Army, Navy, and Air—backed by ready reserves of trained men, stand-by equipment and productive facilities, and an integrated mobilization plan which relates our national security requirements to the tremendous productive capacity of American industry. Taken as a whole, the amounts recommended in this budget will permit the maintenance and operation in the fiscal year 1950 of the augmented defense forces now reached under the increased 1949 budget program.

Under this budget, the Air Force in fiscal year 1950 will continue at about the present strength of 412,000 officers and men on active duty. It is contemplated that the Air Force will be organized with a minimum of about 48 combat groups and 10 squadrons, together with 27 groups of the Air National Guard. Within the limit of the funds provided, it is possible that adjustments in unit structure or strategic planning may at any time require changes in the number of active groups. At the end of fiscal year 1950, the Air Force program contemplates an active inventory of 9,200 aircraft of all types from trainers to heavy bombers. Increased funds in the budget will permit the build-up of supporting forces in the Air National Guard to an average of 45,000 personnel and in the Air Force Reserve to 68,000 personnel in regular training status.

Military strength

[In thousands]

	Regulars and Reserves on full-time active duty			Reserves in regular training status			Other Reserves		
	April 1, 1948	Dec. 1, 1948 (estimated)	1950 average (estimated)	Dec. 1, 1948 (estimated)	1950 average (estimated)		Dec. 1, 1948 (estimated)	1950 average (estimated)	
Air Force	398	411	412	58	113		400	400	
Army	538	662	677	375	553		650	650	
Navy and Marine Corps	488	531	527	222	281		900	1,050	
Total	1,394	1,604	1,616	655	949		1,950	2,100	

NOTE.—The recommended strengths for all the services include 18-year-old 1-year enlistees and other personnel in training but exclude cadets and midshipmen at the Military and Naval Academies.

Personnel in the Army will be continued at 677,000 officers and men in order to maintain 10 divisions at increased strengths, together with 59 battalions. The active Army will be backed by the National Guard with an average strength of 325,000 personnel, an Organized Reserve of 230,000 in regular training status, as well as by other reserve personnel and equipment. Continuing responsibilities in the occupation of Germany, Austria, and Japan and in manning outlying bases will engage about 40 percent of the Army strength overseas in fiscal year 1950.

In the naval and marine forces a strength of 527,000 officers and men throughout the fiscal year 1950 is provided. The size of the active naval fleet is planned to be 731 ships, including 268 combatant ships. Its composition will be changed somewhat from the present fleet to accord with assigned functions and presently foreseen defense requirements. The active inventory of Regular Navy and Marine Corps aircraft is expected to be 7,450 in the fiscal year 1950.

Under the reserve programs of the Navy and Marine Corps, 281,000 officers and men will be trained in 1950. Stand-by ships and matériel to augment the active Navy will remain available if needed.

Although present recruiting rates indicate that only small inductions, if any, will be necessary under selective service, it is essential that such authority remain available in the event that voluntary enlistments drop. Moreover, it must be recognized that the existence of the Selective Service Act has in itself been a contributing factor to the current results of the recruiting program of the services.

Pay and maintenance of military personnel: The pay and maintenance for the average of 1,616,000 officers and men on active duty in the fiscal year 1950 will require estimated expenditures of 5 billion dollars, 38 percent of all defense expenditures by the National Military Establishment. Expenditures for pay, allowances, subsistence, travel, welfare, training, clothing, and medical care will average about 3,100 dollars per man in the fiscal year 1950.

The increases in rates of military pay and allowances in 1942 and 1946 did not provide a balanced pay structure for the military services. A general overhauling of the military pay, allowance, and benefit structure is overdue. Since it is desirable for remuneration of military personnel to be in line with salaries of Federal civilian employees and other comparable groups, a tentative amount for this adjustment has been included in the budget, pending later legislative recommendations.

Civilian components: Our concept of national defense places important reliance upon the readiness of citizen-soldiers. This budget provides for larger and better-trained reserves for the Air Force, Army, and Navy. Expenditures for civilian components in the fiscal year 1950, exclusive of amounts for construction of facilities, are estimated at 760 million dollars, 30 percent above outlays in the present year and more than twice the amount spent last year. These expenditures cover drill and training pay and maintenance of reservists, operating expenses, and procurement of equipment over and above amounts transferred from wartime stocks.

The budget recommendations of 795 million dollars of obligational authority for the fiscal year 1950 contemplate expansion of the reserve programs in 1950 and in later years toward the objectives outlined in my recent Executive order. Such expansion is planned at as rapid a rate as is consistent with sound organization, economical operation, and effective integration with the regular forces. The funds recommended for 1950 will permit an average of 949,000 officers and men in regular training status in air, naval, and ground units, as compared to 655,000 now participating.

Research and development: Scientific and technical advances are vital to a dynamic national defense program. To develop improved weapons and equipment and add to our basic knowledge, new appropriations of 534 million dollars are recommended for direct costs of research and development for the fiscal year 1950. This amount does not include substantial outlays for indirect costs such as the pay and maintenance of military personnel engaged in research and development activities, and the construction and maintenance of facilities.

Direct expenditures for research and development in the fiscal year 1950 are estimated at 505 million dollars. This is somewhat below the estimate for the fiscal year 1949, when payments for programs initiated at the end of the war will be completed. About one-half of the expenditures for research and development will be for aeronautical research and development.

Aircraft and related procurement: For the fiscal year 1949, 2.8 billion dollars of new obligational authority was provided for aircraft and related procurement, of which 2 billion dollars for the Air Force was made available for

obligation until the end of 1950 and included some amounts for nonrecurring expenses.

It is estimated that 3.2 billion dollars in unexpended authorizations from 1949 and prior years will be carried forward to the fiscal year 1950. New obligational authority of 2.3 billion dollars is recommended for the fiscal year 1950 to permit contracts for approximately 34 million airframe pounds. This will make a total of 5.5 billion dollars in aircraft and related equipment to be delivered and paid for in 1950 and subsequent years.

Expenditures for aircraft and related procurement in the fiscal year 1950 are estimated at 1.7 billion dollars, about 500 million dollars more than in the present year. Deliveries of 37 million airframe pounds are now scheduled for fiscal year 1950 and are expected to be slightly higher in fiscal year 1951.

Aircraft from wartime reserves will continue to meet a part of the replacement requirements in fiscal year 1950. In subsequent years, when these reserves are depleted, an increase in aircraft procurement may be required if the strength and structure of the Air Force and naval aviation are to be maintained at the level and replacement rates contemplated in this budget.

Naval ship construction: Expenditures for naval ship construction in fiscal year 1950 are estimated to be 406 million dollars, an increase of about 100 million dollars over the estimate for 1949.

Including the construction in fiscal year 1949, more than 1 billion dollars of naval ship construction, under present authorizations, will remain to be completed in fiscal year 1950 and later years. I am including in the budget 279 million dollars to cover increased costs of completing the present construction program, with some readjustment in types of ships to be built. In addition, I am requesting 52 million dollars of new authorizations for certain ships which will be substituted for some of those previously authorized.

Military public works construction: Expenditures for military public works construction by the Air Force, Army, and Navy in the fiscal year 1950, under existing legislation, are estimated at about the current level of 300 million dollars. This construction is largely for research and development facilities and badly needed housing for troops and dependents, both in the United States and overseas. This budget recommends new obligational authority for the fiscal year 1950 of 113 million dollars for projects for which legislative authorization exists.

There are, however, additional requirements for family housing, for research and development facilities, and for other military construction which are not yet authorized. A tentative estimate for these additional military public works is included in the budget, pending the enactment of authorizing legislation.

All other military expenditures: The remaining expenditures of the National Military Establishment in fiscal year 1950, are estimated at 3.9 billion dollars compared with 3.4 billion dollars in 1949. These expenditures cover the procurement of other matériel (in addition to aircraft and ships), supplies, and services. The largest part of these expenditures will be for civilian workers engaged in production, maintenance, and administrative activities, both overseas and in the United States. Of all Federal civilian employees, approximately 865,000, or about 40 percent, will be employed in defense activities by the National Military Establishment.

Expenditures for procurement of equipment (exclusive of aircraft and ships), particularly for the Army, will increase in the fiscal year 1950 as deliveries on 1949 contracts are made, even though new obligations for this purpose in 1950 will be lower. Expenses of maintaining and operating facilities and equipment including aircraft will also increase over the 1949 level, largely in the Army and Air Force.

Increased emphasis has been given to industrial mobilization preparedness in the budget for the National Military Establishment with the recommendation of appropriations of approximately 129 million dollars for fiscal year 1950 as contrasted with 57 million dollars provided for 1949. In addition to making provisions for the continued maintenance of tools and industrial plants held in stand-by status, the programs for industrial mobilization planning with industry and within the military establishments are being increased. Added emphasis is being given to coordinating the cataloging of supply items among the military services, and a greater integration of current procurement with industrial mobilization plans.

Stock piling and other defense activities: The aim of the stock piling program is to provide a basic reserve of materials in which accessible resources are deficient, thereby permitting a rapid and sustained economic mobilization in the event of emergency. Stock-pile procurement continues to be hampered by materials shortages and rising prices, since it must meet the competition of current industrial consumption, including that for military purposes. However, the concentration of procurement on the more urgently required materials should permit us to make substantial progress toward our goal of a reasonably adequate stock pile with minimum effect on current consumption.

Toward the stock-pile goal, this budget recommends 525 million dollars of new obligational authority for the fiscal year 1950 and supplemental authorizations of 310 million dollars for the present fiscal year. Of these amounts 211 million dollars for 1950 and 270 million dollars for 1949 are in contract authorizations to be used primarily for developmental contracts. A total of 800 million dollars in obligational authority has already been enacted in the last 3 years. In addition, by the end of fiscal year 1950, materials valued at about 700 million dollars will have been transferred to the stock pile from war surplus inventories and from Economic Cooperation Administration operations. Of the total stock-pile objective of 3.7 billion dollars, materials and authorizations amounting to 2.3 billion dollars will have been provided.

Deliveries and expenditures, of course, will lag behind authorizations. Expenditures in the fiscal year 1950 are estimated at 525 million dollars, an increase of 175 million dollars in outlays over the current year. By the end of the fiscal year 1950, materials valued at about 1.6 billion dollars are expected to be on hand.

The stock pile represents an addition to the supplies obtainable in an emergency from domestic production and imports from protected sources. The recommended authorizations will permit the stock pile to be built up to the point at which, with the aid of prompt and effective allocations, a comparatively high degree of protection will be afforded to our economy in the event of emergency.

Expenditures for all other defense programs, including expenses of the Selective Service System, maintenance of reserve industrial plants by the Federal Works Agency, and by other agencies, are estimated at 46 million dollars in the fiscal year 1950. On the other hand, net receipts of 39 million dollars are estimated in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation defense program.

Veterans' services and benefits

As a nation, we have sought to give our veterans opportunities to work, to earn, and to recapture the normal pattern of their lives. In addition to our general programs for full employment, increased health services, improved housing, and greater security for all, we have provided an extensive program of special benefits and services to veterans and their dependents.

The extent and scope of constructive measures to assist veterans of our earlier wars to return to useful civilian life were limited. Too often prior to World War I our country belatedly attempted to discharge its obligation to veterans merely by bestowing upon them pensions and gratuities. In contrast, servicemen of World Wars I and II have received more timely and better treatment both in the service and out. Improved medical and hospital care, insurance benefits, vocational rehabilitation, compensation, and other benefits have been provided to disabled servicemen or to the dependents of the deceased. Servicemen of World War I received adjusted compensation, while World War II veterans are receiving readjustment benefits to assist them in obtaining education, training, jobs, businesses, and homes.

At the present time our expenditures for veterans' programs are declining as readjustment benefits for World War II servicemen fall off. However, the long-run trend of compensation and pension costs and of hospital and medical care is gradually upward. This means that over-all expenditures under present legislation will remain high even after the completion of the temporary programs under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

The program of veterans' services and benefits should reflect the fundamental fact that our primary long-run obligation is to dependents of veterans deceased from service causes and to veterans disabled in the service. In the fulfillment of these obligations we have two basic purposes. The first is to alleviate financial hardship to dependents of veterans deceased from service causes. The second is to help veterans surmount the physical and economic handicaps of their service disabilities. At the same time, we should preserve and stress our basic objective of assisting the recipients of these benefits to be as nearly as possible self-reliant and self-sustaining members of our society.

The necessity for new or extended benefits for veterans without service disabilities should be judged, not solely from the standpoint of service in our armed forces, but in the light of existing social welfare programs available to all, veterans and nonveterans alike. In recent years social-security protection, including unemployment and old-age and survivors' insurance and old-age assistance, has been made available to a large percentage of our general population. Prior to World War I the lack of such general benefits was, of course, one of the main reasons for the enactment of special benefits to veterans. At the present time we seek to broaden and extend these social-security programs and to enact a comprehensive national health and disability insurance program for all our people, including veterans, who with their immediate families will soon constitute 40 percent of the population.

Veterans' services and benefits (excluding trust accounts)

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			1950 net new appropriations
	1948 actual	1949 estimated	1950 estimated	
Readjustment benefits (Veterans' Administration):				
Education and training	$2,497	$2,481	$1,993	
Unemployment and self-employment allowances	677	424	78	$2,552
Loan guarantees	64	48	48	
Other	75	88	80	
Pensions (Veterans' Administration)	2,080	2,140	2,111	2,221
Insurance (Veterans' Administration)	151	488	62	77
Hospitals, other services, and administrative costs:				
Construction:				
Veterans' Administration	17	56	81	
Corps of Engineers (Army, civil functions)	36	127	179	------
Federal Works Agency	53	3	1	
Current expenses:				
Veterans' Administration:				
Hospital and medical care	536	597	574	567
Other activities	377	345	287	282
All other agencies	4	2	2	2
Total	6,567	6,799	5,496	5,701

Total expenditures for veterans' benefits and services are expected to be 5.5 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1950, about 1.3 billion dollars below estimates for the current fiscal year. This drop reflects the virtual completion of unemployment and self-employment allowances, an expected sharp decline in educational training programs, and the inclusion in the fiscal year 1949 of a nonrecurrent payment to insurance trust funds. Even at the expected lower level, expenditures for veterans' programs will still comprise more than one-eighth of the total budget.

Readjustment benefits: The readjustment program has provided valuable educational and other opportunities to veterans of World War II. It is estimated that by the end of the fiscal year 1950, 6,000,000 veterans will have used education and training benefits, more than 9,000,000 will have received unemployment and self-employment allowances, and nearly 2,000,000 will have obtained loan guaranties for homes and businesses. By the end of the fiscal year 1950 total outlays under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act since 1945 will have exceeded 13 billion dollars.

Enrollment in school, job, and farm-training courses is estimated to decline to 1,575,000 in 1950 from this year's average enrollment of 2,000,000. In 1950 more than two-thirds of the participants in this program will be in on-the-job, on-farm, and below-college-level training, while less than one-third will be in colleges and universities. Total expenditures, estimated at approximately 2 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1950, reflect the increased rates of subsistence allowances enacted in the last session of the Congress.

I am recommending reenactment in its present form of the provision of the 1949 appropriation act prohibiting the use of funds for avocational and recreational training. This constructive action on the part of Congress in eliminating expenditures for courses which are inconsistent with the basic purpose of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act is expected to save more than 50 million dollars this year.

Under present law only a small number of veterans will be eligible for unemployment and self-employment benefits after July 25, 1949. The average number of claimants to be paid in these two programs during the fiscal year 1950 is estimated at 74,000, as compared to about 400,000 in the fiscal year 1949. Expenditures decline correspondingly to 78 million dollars. By the end of the fiscal year 1950 aggregate outlays for veterans' unemployment and self-employment benefits since 1945 will have exceeded 3.5 billion dollars.

Under the loan-guarantee title of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, veterans obtained loans amounting to 7.4 billion dollars up to June 30, 1948, more than nine-tenths for homes, and the rest for farms and businesses. About 45 percent of this total is guaranteed or insured by the Government. Recent experience has shown a decline in the number of loans guaranteed. The estimates assume 322,000 loans in the fiscal year 1949 and 293,000 in 1950.

Pensions: It is estimated that an average of 2,968,000 individuals and families will receive compensation and pension payments in the fiscal year 1950, an increase of 52,000 over the number for the present year. About one-fourth of these payments involve non-service-connected death or disability. The 1950 expenditure estimate of 2.1 billion dollars for pensions includes 1.4 billion dollars in compensation for service-connected cases, and 500 million dollars in pensions for non-service-connected cases. It also includes 180 million dollars for subsistence allowances to service-disabled veterans in training, a decline of 70 million dollars from the present year. These expenditures reflect the increased rates of compensation enacted by the last Congress for dependents of veterans deceased or disabled from service causes.

Insurance: The Government contributes to the veterans' life insurance funds for war hazard claims. Budget expenditures for veterans' insurance, largely for such contributions, are estimated at 62 million dollars in fiscal year 1950. A tentative estimate of 413 million dollars is included for an additional contribution to the national service life insurance fund in the fiscal year 1949. This large nonrecurring item in the present year results from a re-evaluation of the Government's liability for war risk claims.

Hospital and domiciliary construction: The construction program under which the Veterans' Administration has been proceeding was planned and authorized during and immediately after the war. Now that we have the benefit of a period of postwar experience, I have reviewed the veterans' hospital and domiciliary construction program and find that to continue with the construction of the full number of 90 authorized hospitals will result in a serious overbuilding, in terms of beds needed to meet foreseeable requirements. A reduction in the program will still make it possible to provide for all service-connected patients in every geographical area and will provide an even more liberal allowance of beds for nonservice-connected patients than at present.

I have therefore directed that the program which I had previously authorized be curtailed by approximately 16,000 beds and asked the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to recommend specific adjustments in the program. I have approved his recommendations for the cancellation of 24 hospital projects, and the reduction in planned capacity of 14 additional hospitals. This will result in a reduction of 279 million dollars in the total of 1.2 billion dollars of construction previously authorized, and will reduce expenditures in the fiscal year 1950 by 115 million dollars. However, hospitals scheduled for completion will cost 42 million dollars more than originally estimated. Therefore, a net rescission of 237 million dollars in contract authorizations is recommended. Under this revised program, expenditures in the fiscal year 1950 for construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities are estimated at 260 million dollars, an increase of 77 million dollars over the fiscal year 1949, due to the progress of construction already under way.

Hospital and other services and administration: Current expenses for hospital and medical care are estimated at

574 million dollars in the fiscal year 1950, 23 million dollars less than the peak expenditure in 1949. This decline reflects largely a downturn in the out-patient medical-care program and increased use of excess supplies now in stock. Expenses of the in-patient care program will increase. The 1950 estimates provide for an average daily patient load of about 140,000, an increase of 4,000 over the current year.

Other current expenses, which are chiefly the costs of administering the nonmedical benefit programs of the Veterans' Administration, continue to decline in line with work loads.

Trust accounts: Veterans of the two World Wars hold 7,500,000 active policies under the Government life and national service life insurance programs. Premiums and earnings, supplemented by Government contributions to cover claims involving war risks, have built up substantial accumulations in these trust funds.

Assets of the national service life insurance fund will reach an estimated 7.7 billion dollars in the current fiscal year. The Government contributions anticipated for the fiscal years 1949 and 1950 will bring total Government contributions to the national service life insurance fund to over 4 billion dollars.

Veterans' life insurance funds (trust accounts)

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Item	1948 actual	1949 estimated	1950 estimated
Receipts:			
Transfers from general and special accounts	$145	$482	$56
Premiums, interest, and other	677	712	745
Total	822	1,194	801
Expenditures for benefits, refunds, and other (deduct)	377	381	2,421
Net accumulation	445	813	−1,620

An initial dividend estimated at about 2 billion dollars is scheduled for payment during the fiscal year 1950 to all servicemen who hold or have held national service life insurance. The Veterans' Administration is now reviewing insurance records to determine the status of the fund, after which the amount of the dividend and the method of payment can be decided.

Social welfare, health, and security

In the last 15 years the Federal Government has established a basic pattern of activities in the field of social welfare, health, and security. The national system of old-age and survivors' insurance, the system of regular grants to States for public assistance payments to the needy aged and blind and to dependent children, the Federal-State system of unemployment insurance, and several grant programs for the promotion of public health and of children's welfare were established by the Social Security Act of 1935. More recent laws established the railroad retirement system and grants to States for the school lunch, hospital construction, and mental health programs. Also included in the Government's social welfare, health, and security programs are the older system of grants to States for vocational rehabilitation and those Federal services directed toward the prevention of crime and the apprehension and detention of criminals.

Under the Social Security Act, the national policy contemplated that old-age and survivors' insurance would be the primary Government measure affording economic protection to the needy aged and dependent children, and that unemployment compensation would provide temporary assistance to the unemployed. Other types of social insurance were to be added later to provide more adequate protection against major economic hazards of our society. Public assistance was designed as a backstop, a second line of defense, eventually to be replaced in large measure by social insurance benefits. We have not made progress toward this objective in the last decade. Individual benefit payments under public assistance now are substantially higher than under old-age and survivors' insurance. They are more adequate, in many cases, than under unemployment insurance.

Three principal steps should be taken now to strengthen and complete the system of social insurance, and thereby to make our governmental programs consistent with the basic national policy in this field.

First. Old-age and survivors insurance should be extended to nearly all the 25 million gainfully employed persons not now covered; the scale of benefits should be sharply raised; benefits should be provided for women at an earlier age; and higher part-time earnings should be permitted. (In addition, coverage under the unemployment-compensation system should be extended and benefits made more adequate, as indicated in the "Labor" section of this message.)

Second. Disability insurance should be provided to protect against loss of earnings during illness or other temporary disability, and to assure continuing annuities to workers who become permanently disabled and therefore unable to earn a livelihood.

Third. A comprehensive national health program should be established, centering in a national system of medical-care insurance, accompanied by improved services and facilities for public health and medical care.

These recommendations have had extended public discussion. Action is long overdue. I am confident that the Congress will enact promptly the legislation needed to achieve an integrated, comprehensive system of social insurance. In addition, I repeat my recommendation that the Congress give departmental status to the Federal Security Agency.

The needed legislation includes not only measures to establish administrative procedures and authorize benefit payments but also provisions for financing them. At present, workers and employers each contribute to the old-age and survivors insurance fund at a rate of 1 percent of the covered pay roll. Under present law, this rate will advance on January 1, 1950, to 1½ percent each for employers and workers. The tax applies only to the first 3,000 dollars of earnings of each employee in any year, and earnings in excess of that amount are not counted in calculating the retirement benefits. My recommendations contemplate raising the tax rate on presently covered employment on July 1, 1949, the date when increased benefits should be made available. In addition, I propose that we raise the ceiling on taxable earnings, as well as extend the pay-roll tax to workers and employers not now covered. The addition of insurance coverage for medical care and disability benefits will also require some additions to the pay-roll-tax rates in order that the whole social-insurance system will continue to be substantially self-supporting.

The financial impact of these recommendations is mainly in the trust accounts. For the fiscal year 1950, benefit payments and administrative expenses from the major trust accounts in the field of social welfare (other than unemployment insurance) are estimated at 1.3 billion dollars under existing laws. Under the legislation which I recommend, these payments would be doubled. Apart from this new legislation, they would rise by more than 100 million dollars above the total for the current fiscal year.

The total of budget expenditures for social welfare, health, and security also is expected to rise in the fiscal year 1950, to nearly 2,358 million dollars, exclusive of expenditures from trust accounts. The increase over the fiscal year 1949 is 394 million dollars, of which 147 million dollars is in transfers to the railroad retirement trust account and 86 million dollars is for increased grants to the States for public assistance under present Federal law. Most of the remainder of the increase is divided between present programs for the promotion of public health and proposed new legislation for medical care insurance and public assistance.

Excluding trust-account transactions, new appropriations requested for social welfare, health, and security for the fiscal year 1950 are estimated at 2,271 million dollars. In addition, 92 million dollars of new contract authority will be needed, making a total of 2,363 million dollars of new obligational authority for these programs. This does not include 40 million dollars of appropriations necessary to liquidate contract authority made available in prior years, mainly for hospital construction grants. Of the new appropriations in budget accounts, 84 million dollars is for proposed legislation. All the rest is for programs under present laws.

Public assistance to the aged and other special groups: The public assistance programs of the Federal Government are all carried on in cooperation with the States, and the expenditures are almost entirely in the form of grants to State governments.

By far the largest amounts are for assistance to the aged, the blind, and dependent children, for which Federal Government expenditures under present laws are estimated at 1,064 million dollars in the fiscal year 1950. Each State determines its own scale of benefits to individuals in these public-assistance categories, and the Federal Government reimburses the States for from 50 to 75 percent of the payments in each case, up to maximum individual benefit rates specified in the Federal law. The level of these matching payments was raised by action of the last Congress.

Social welfare, health, and security (excluding trust accounts)

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			1950	
	1948 actual	1949 estimated	1950 estimated	Net new appropriations	Other authorizations
Assistance to the aged and other special groups:					
Federal Security Agency:					
Public assistance:					
Present law	$733	$977	$1,064	$1,059	------
Proposed legislation	------	------	65	65	------
Vocational rehabilitation and other programs	27	23	23	23	------
School lunch (Department of Agriculture)	68	75	75	75	------
Retirement and dependents' insurance:					
Railroad Retirement Board	763	569	716	716	------
Federal Security Agency and other	3	5	9	9	------
Promotion of public health:					
Federal Security Agency:					
Present programs	135	177	234	174	$91
Medical care insurance system (proposed legislation)	------	------	15	15	------
Federal Works Agency and other	11	21	35	12	------
Crime control and correction (Department of Justice and other)	84	90	91	92	1
Other programs:					
Present programs (Federal Security Agency and other)	28	26	27	26	------
Federal Security Agency, change in employees' accident compensation rates (proposed legislation)	------	------	4	4	------
Total	1,853	1,963	2,358	[1] 2,271	92

[1] In addition, this budget includes 40 million dollars of appropriations recommended to liquidate prior year contract authorizations.

NOTE.—The Federal-State system of unemployment compensation and the Federal system of railroad unemployment insurance, formerly included in this category, are now reclassified under Labor.

Because of this grant arrangement, the amount of Federal expenditure for public assistance in any one year is not directly subject to Federal budgetary control, but is determined by the action of the several States in fixing benefit rates and approving individual claims for assistance. The total amount of Federal expenditures has steadily increased as the rising cost of living has compelled the States to give more assistance and the number of needy aged persons in our population has continued to rise. This increase in public-assistance expenditures would be slower, and should ultimately be reversed, if other contributory insurances are made adequate to carry most of the load.

The budget includes 65 million dollars as the tentative estimate of first-year expenditure under proposed legislation to improve the present public-assistance system and to help cover State relief payments to persons not now eligible for assistance from Federal grants.

Railroad retirement insurance: The expected rise in transfers to the railroad retirement trust account, from 565 million dollars in this fiscal year to 716 million dollars in 1950, reflects mainly a statutory increase in the tax rate, which has just become effective, and the continued rise in railroad pay rolls.

The estimates for 1950 assume favorable legislative action on several proposed changes in the timing of transfers from budget accounts to the trust accounts. These relate to Federal Government payments for military service credits, administrative expense appropriations, and the transfer of the special railroad taxes to trust accounts. The changes would not affect the benefit rights of any individual or the tax liabilities of any employer.

Good budgeting requires that the law be revised so that payments by the Federal Government to the railroad retirement trust fund on account of military service credits allowed to railroad employees may be made annually in the years ahead on the basis of the actuarial value of claims actually approved as workers retire. As the law now stands, these payments are to be made in advance, without adequate relationship to eventual requirements for actual benefits. We have already advanced 160 million dollars to the trust fund to cover such future claims. Unless the law is amended, a further transfer of about the same amount may be required in the fiscal year 1950, and this would have to be added to the total of budget expenditures.

Good budgeting requires also that the railroad retirement tax be transferred to the trust fund as it is collected, rather than on the basis of annual specific appropriations in advance of collections, as is the present practice. The estimates assume that an annual indefinite appropriation will be substituted, and also that the administrative expense appropriations will be consolidated and financed directly from the trust account.

Public health: Federal expenditures for public health purposes comprise substantial grants to State and local governments to help them combat disease and to meet part of the cost of new hospitals, as well as expenditures for direct Federal operations.

For the fiscal year 1950, I am recommending appropriations sufficient to double the general health grants to States, raising them to 22 million dollars, in order that the States in turn may extend and strengthen local health services. These stronger health services are an essential part of our national health program. I recommend that the present statutory limitation on the amount of such general health grants to States be removed from the Public Health Service Act, so as to authorize in later years the provision of larger amounts for the further improvement and expansion of local public health services. It is clearly more desirable to follow this course than to add new and separate grant programs or to continue to expand existing specialized health programs.

The estimates for 1950 provide for continuing at about the 1949 level the grants to States for specialized health programs, such as venereal disease and tuberculosis. Provision is made for new grants under the National Heart Act of 1948 and for grants for initial surveys under the Water Pollution Control Act of 1948. The Federal-aid hospital construction program will require additional contract authority to maintain the current limited volume of new hospital building.

I have included in budget accounts for the fiscal year 1950 a tentative estimate of 15 million dollars for initial expenditures for inaugurating the system of medical care insurance.

New facilities for medical and related research to be carried on directly by the Public Health Service are in process of construction. As these are completed and staffed, we shall achieve a substantial expansion of specialized types of research which will contribute significantly to the health and longevity of our people.

Crime control and correction: The work load of the Federal Bureau of Investigation is expected to continue at a high level in the fiscal year 1950, largely because of investigations of personnel employed in atomic energy work and international activities and the strengthening of the internal security program. A decline is expected in the inmate population of Federal prisons, and this will permit some reduction in staff, but the saving will be partly offset by higher per capita costs for care of prisoners.

Federal employees' accident compensation: Expenditures under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act of 1916, as amended, are estimated for the fiscal year 1950 at 9 million dollars more than in 1949, but the increase is wholly for war claims payments to American citizens abroad who were injured or suffered damage from wartime enemy actions. These payments will be covered by some of the proceeds of certain enemy-owned property.

Compensation payments to Government employees injured and to dependents of those killed in line of duty will continue under present law at about 14 million dollars a year. The benefit rates have not been changed since 1927. They are now quite inadequate. I recommend that these benefit rates be liberalized. The budget includes a tentative estimate of 4 million dollars for this proposed legislation.

Trust accounts: As I emphasized in a message to the Congress last May, this period of high employment and earnings offers a particularly opportune time for strengthening and broadening our social insurance system. At such a time, our people are best able to begin providing

for protection against the major economic hazards to which everyone is exposed. Although the recommended improvements will mean an immediate large increase in benefit payments, they will also result at the outset in a sizable increase in savings held in the social insurance trust accounts. This will help to reduce inflationary pressures and build a cushion of consumers' purchasing power against possible future recession.

Social welfare, health, and security (major trust accounts)

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Fund and item	1948 actual	1949 estimated	1950 estimated
Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund:			
Receipts:			
Appropriation from general receipts	$1,616	$1,734	$2,420
Interest and other	194	231	266
Proposed legislation extending coverage, raising tax base, and adding disability benefits	------	------	1,700
Payments of benefits and administrative expenses (deduct):			
Existing legislation	559	656	745
Proposed legislation	------	------	1,500
Net accumulation (including proposed legislation)	1,248	1,330	2,141
Railroad retirement account:[1]			
Receipts:			
Transfers from budget accounts	778	565	716
Interest on investments	39	51	62
Payments of benefits, salaries and expenses (deduct)	222	289	317
Net accumulation	575	327	461
Federal employees retirement funds:			
Receipts:			
Salary deductions and transfers from budget accounts	486	566	693
Interest	108	120	139
Payments of annuities and refunds, and expenses (deduct)	244	274	277
Net accumulation	350	412	555
Medical care insurance trust fund (proposed legislation):			
Receipts from pay-roll contributions	------	------	260
Payments for benefits (deduct)	------	------	------
Net accumulation	------	------	260

[1] Adjusted for proposed changes in legislation.

Despite benefit payments of more than 1.3 billion dollars under present laws, the major trust funds for social welfare, health, and security for the year are expected to add 3 billion dollars to their assets during the fiscal year 1950. This will bring the aggregate assets of these funds above 19 billion dollars. The legislation I have recommended will add an estimated 460 million dollars to these assets in the fiscal year 1950.

The trust account assets are invested in Government securities, and the interest earnings are added to the principal of each trust fund. Although all benefits are paid directly from these accounts, the handling of contributions varies. Pay-roll tax collections under the railroad retirement system are included in budget receipts and the transfers to the trust account appear as budget expenditures. Proceeds of the pay-roll tax for old-age and survivors insurance are transferred to the trust account without affecting expenditures; this transfer is made through a deduction from receipts and an equal credit to the trust account. Amounts withheld from the salaries of those Government employees covered by Federal employees' retirement acts, as their payments to the retirement funds, are credited directly to the trust accounts.

Housing and community facilities

The objective of the Federal housing program is to improve the housing standards of the Nation and in particular, to help low-income and moderate-income families obtain more adequate housing in a suitable community environment. To this end the Federal Government provides a wide variety of financial aids for both private and public housing construction as well as research and other assistance on cost reduction.

In the past 3 years, housing construction has risen to the level it took 6 years to reach after World War I. Conversions of older houses have also increased the housing supply, and extensive repairs and modernization have improved housing standards. As a result, many of the most acute emergency needs, especially of veterans, have been met, and the number of families compelled to live with others or to make other temporary arrangements has been reduced.

Despite these encouraging gains, we still have a long way to go. The programs recommended in this budget, both under existing and proposed legislation, are directed primarily toward improving the housing of low- and moderate-income groups. These programs emphasize lowering of housing costs and production of rental housing, and provide continued preference for veterans' housing requirements.

Research in costs and markets: Basic to the entire housing program, both private and public, is the use of all available methods to lower construction costs. Technical research on the limited basis authorized by the Housing Act of 1948 has already begun. More extensive technical research, and analysis of housing markets and land-use, which would be authorized in the further legislation which I have recommended, are needed to assure effective use of both private and public funds in meeting our housing needs. The Housing and Home Finance Administrator will take the leadership in bringing potential cost reductions to the attention of industry and of State and local agencies in the form most useful to them.

A census of housing should again be authorized as part of the regular decennial census in 1950. Such a census would provide comprehensive and up-to-date information needed by both private industry and public agencies.

Slum clearance and urban redevelopment: I have recommended for several years legislation to authorize the Federal assistance needed to permit cities to start clearing their slums and preparing the sites necessary for sound urban development, primarily private housing. We should not delay longer in authorizing initiation of the first installments of this long-term program. I recommend, therefore, that the Housing and Home Finance Administrator be authorized to contract for Federal grants amounting to 100 million dollars a year for 5 years. In addition, I recommend loan authorizations of 25 million dollars for the fiscal year 1950 and larger authorizations in the following 4 years, totaling 1 billion dollars for the 5-year period. The only Federal expenditure likely in the fiscal year 1950 are loans of 10 million dollars for planning the projects.

Housing and community facilities

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			1950	
	1948 actual	1949 estimated	1950 estimated	Net new appropriations	Other authorizations
General aids to housing:					
Housing and Home Finance Agency:					
Existing programs	$1	$1	$2	$2	------
Proposed legislation:					
Research and administration	------	(1)	2	2	------
Slum clearance	------	------	10	------	$125
Alaska housing	------	------	5	10	------
Commerce Department:					
Proposed census of housing	------	------	6	15	------
Housing Expediter (excluding rent control)	6	------	------	------	------
Aids to private housing:					
Housing and Home Finance Agency:					
Federal Housing Administration	−19	5	7	------	------
Home Loan Bank Board:					
Home Owners' Loan Corporation	−156	−123	−95	------	------
Proposed stand-by borrowing authority:					
Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation	------	------	------	------	750
Federal home loan banks	------	------	------	------	1,000
Reconstruction Finance Corporation:					
Existing programs:					
Mortgage purchases, net	113	333	149	------	------
Loans to large-scale producers	------	5	13	------	------
Other	4	2	(1)	------	------
Proposed assistance for rental and cooperative housing	------	------	50	------	------
Department of Agriculture: Proposed farm housing program	------	------	20	1	27
Public housing programs:					
Housing and Home Finance Agency:					
Public Housing Administration:					
Existing programs:					
War housing	48	48	34	162	------
Veterans' re-use housing	44	12	1	12	------
Low-rent housing	11	−1	12	6	------
Other	−5	2	1	1	------
Proposed low-rent housing	------	15	129	5	85
Other agencies	−1	−1	−1	(1)	------
Provision of community facilities:					
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	25	35	32	------	------
Federal Works Agency:					
Existing programs	10	15	8	1	------
Proposed legislation:					
Disaster relief	------	------	3	5	------
Alaska public works	------	------	1	2	------
Total	82	349	388	227	1,987

[1] Less than one-half million dollars.

Private housing: The great bulk of the housing of the Nation is today and should remain privately owned and privately financed. In addition to the general aids provided for all types of housing, the Federal Government aids private housing through sharing financial risks and providing a supplementary source of funds.

Over one-third of the new housing started in the next fiscal year, it is estimated, will be financed by mortgages insured by the Federal Housing Administration. In the years ahead our mortgage insurance system should give increased emphasis to assisting housing cooperatives and production of rental housing and lower-priced sales housing. Amendments are needed for these purposes, as well as to simplify the variety of insurance aids now available. Both the Federal Housing Administration and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will encourage increased production of lower-priced housing by special financial assistance to producers using efficient large-scale construction methods. In addition, as part of our veterans' program, the Government will continue to guarantee loans made to veterans to help finance construction and purchase of homes.

The Federal National Mortgage Association, a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, will continue to assist private lenders in certain cases where credit is short by purchasing federally insured and guaranteed mortgages. In the fiscal year 1950 these purchases, under the present authority, will result in estimated net expenditures of 149 million dollars. I am recommending revisions of the present limitations on mortgage purchases which will result in an estimated 50 million dollars of additional expenditures. In order to prevent inflationary pressures, any such broadening should, of course, be confined to measures urgently required to finance the most-needed types of housing construction, particularly rental housing and housing cooperatives.

As another credit aid to private housing, the Federal home-loan banks provide an important supplementary source of credit for the savings and loan associations, which make about one-third of all home-mortgage loans. The Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation insures the share-accounts of its member associations. Both the banks and the Corporation are supervised by the Home Loan Bank Board.

I am recommending basic revisions in the financial structure of these agencies designed to encourage substitution of private capital for Federal investments, to permit them to borrow from the Treasury in the event of any future emergency, and to give the Home Loan Bank Board more specific authority over the borrowing and lending operations of the member associations. Under this legislation, the additional retirement of Federal investment in home loan bank stock in the fiscal year 1950 will increase budget receipts by an estimated 81 million dollars. The stand-by borrowing authority requested for the home loan banks and the Corporation amounts to 1,750 million dollars. I do not anticipate that any use will be made of this new authority except in time of emergency, but it will provide additional assurance to the millions of shareholders, comparable to the assurance now given to bank depositors.

I am again recommending that the Congress provide for more adequate Federal aids to construction and improvement of privately owned farm housing. The new program would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide loans for farm housing, as well as contributions for housing for farmers on potentially self-supporting farms and limited grants to improve substandard housing of low-income farmers.

Public housing: Except for 3,000 permanent low-rent units authorized before the war, Federal assistance for new public housing since the war has been limited almost entirely to provision of temporary accommodations under the veterans' reuse program. With every month that passes, legislation to authorize a new and broader program of Federal assistance for low-rent public housing becomes more necessary. Only through such a program can cities make a substantial start in providing permanent housing for the low-income families for whom private enterprise cannot reasonably be expected to provide.

The legislation which I am now recommending would provide the Federal assistance required to permit construction of 1,050,000 low-rent units over a 7-year period. It would authorize the Public Housing Administration to make contracts with local public agencies providing for annual Federal contributions over a 40-year period sufficient to assure acceptable housing for low-income families at rents they can afford to pay. Contracts involving maximum annual contributions of 85 million dollars would be authorized for the fiscal year 1950, rising to a maximum annual amount of 445 million dollars by the end of the fiscal year 1954. In addition, the lending authority of the Public Housing Administration would be increased by 700 million dollars primarily for temporary financing. To minimize the cost of the program, the local housing agencies would meet their long-term financial requirements by selling to the public taxable obligations fully protected by the pledge of annual Federal contributions. Disbursements during the first year will amount to an estimated 129 million dollars, almost entirely for short-term loans.

The Public Housing Administration also has been administering the disposition of permanent and temporary units built under the war housing and veterans' reuse programs. I am recommending legislation to make possible more expeditious sale to private owners of all permanent war housing units, except those transferred to local housing agencies for low-rent housing. Adequate protection would be provided for present occupants. Legislation also is needed to permit transfer of all Federal ownership and other rights in temporary housing (with limited exceptions) to local communities which apply for such transfer. This step would permit the entire responsibility for such housing to be vested in local authorities, who can most readily determine the continuing emergency need.

Community facilities: In accordance with the economic stabilization program, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is limiting its new loans to public agencies to relatively low levels. Other expenditures will be made to complete the Brooklyn-Battery tunnel and to meet other prior commitments.

I again recommend legislation authorizing the Federal Works Agency to provide prompt assistance to communities in rebuilding facilities after floods and other disasters. A tentative appropriation estimate of 5 million dollars is included for this purpose.

Alaska housing and public works: As part of the program to develop the resources of Alaska, I have recommended special assistance for both private and public housing. Such housing is badly needed, but is hampered by excessive construction costs. This budget provides for a 10-million-dollar revolving fund to finance loans and construction by the Alaska Housing Authority. I also recommend a 2-million-dollar appropriation to the Federal Works Agency to provide for certain urgently needed public works in Alaska.

Appropriations and other authorizations—summary: Most of the expenditures for existing programs in the fiscal year 1950 will be financed from the corporate funds of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation provided in earlier years.

New appropriations of 44 million dollars and other authorizations of 1,987 million dollars would be called for under my legislative recommendations. The proposed stand-by borrowing authority of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation and of the Federal home loan banks accounts for 1,750 million dollars. Slum clearance, low-rent public housing, and farm housing proposals require contract and loan authorizations of 237 million dollars in the fiscal year 1950. An increase of 700 million dollars in the lending authority of the Public Housing Administration would be provided in the fiscal year 1949. It is estimated that 35 million dollars of the 174 million dollars in permanent appropriations, representing anticipated receipts from war housing and veterans' reuse housing, will be spent for current management and disposition activities. The remaining 139 million dollars will be transferred to the general fund of the Treasury without affecting budget expenditures.

Education and general research

It is important to the continued progress of the Nation that we raise our educational standards and expand our fundamental research. At the present time the Federal Government promotes education by providing professional leadership and advice to educators, and

by supporting vocational education and the land-grant colleges through grants-in-aid to the States. It also supports Howard University and educational institutions for the blind and deaf, and provides for the education of Indians. The Government provides library and museum services through the Library of Congress, the Smithsonian Institution, the National Gallery of Art, and the Botanic Gardens, and carries on general research through the National Bureau of Standards, the Bureau of the Census, and the Naval Observatory.

Expenditures in the fiscal year 1950 for education and general research are estimated at 414 million dollars. The increase of 329 million dollars over 1949 is almost entirely for proposed grants to States for education and for the decennial census of population.

Education and general research

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			1950	
	1948 actual	1949 estimated	1950 estimated	Net new appropriations	Other authorizations
Promotion of education:					
Office of Education (Federal Security Agency):					
Present programs	$33	$34	$34	$34	-----
Federal aid to education (proposed legislation)	-----	-----	290	300	-----
Survey of educational building needs, and study of scholarships and fellowships (proposed legislation)	-----	-----	1	1	-----
Federal Works Agency and other	6	4	1	(1)	-----
Educational aid to special groups:					
Bureau of Indian Affairs (Interior)	12	11	12	12	-----
Howard University (Federal Security Agency) and other	3	6	12	5	$6
Library and museum services	8	10	10	10	-----
General-purpose research:					
Department of Commerce:					
Seventeenth decennial census	(1)	2	36	70	-----
Other Census Bureau programs	7	7	6	6	-----
National Bureau of Standards:					
Present programs	5	9	8	9	-----
Radio propagation building (proposed legislation)	-----	-----	(1)	(1)	-----
National Science Foundation (proposed legislation)	-----	-----	2	3	12
Other agencies	2	1	1	(1)	-----
Total	75	85	414	452	18

[1] Less than one-half million dollars.

[2] In addition, this Budget includes 6 million dollars of appropriations recommended to liquidate prior year contract authorizations.

In addition to these general programs, many Federal agencies carry on specialized education and research activities which are included in other functional groupings. Some of these are the education benefits for veterans, fellowship and other training programs designed to produce needed specialists, and research for military and other purposes.

Aid to education: Although the Federal Government is engaged in this broad range of educational activities, we are not yet assuring all the children of our Nation the opportunity of receiving the basic education which is essential to a strong democracy. In many areas, teachers' salaries are low, particularly in the elementary grades. Too many are leaving the profession; too few are entering. Enrollments are rising. As a result, overcrowded classrooms and substandard instruction are common. As the large number of children born during and after the war reach school age, the situation will become even worse.

Many States are finding it difficult, even with high tax rates, to pay adequate salaries or to take other corrective measures. It is therefore urgent that the Congress enact legislation to provide grants to the States in support of a basic minimum program of elementary and secondary education for all our children and youth. This budget includes a tentative appropriation estimate of 300 million dollars for such grants in the fiscal year 1950.

We know that a shortage of school buildings exists in many parts of the country as a result of wartime deferment of construction and the increase in the school-age population. We do not know the over-all extent of the shortage, the particular areas in which it exists, and whether State and local governments can alleviate it without special Federal aid for construction. In order to provide an adequate factual basis for further consideration of the problem, I ask the Congress to authorize a survey of educational building needs and the adequacy of State and local resources available to meet these needs.

It has become increasingly obvious that the national welfare demands that higher education be made available to more of our talented young people. We should now determine the soundest and most practicable means of providing additional opportunities for capable young people who could not otherwise afford a college or university education.

The budget estimates include 1 million dollars as a tentative estimate of appropriations needed for these surveys when authorized by the Congress.

Howard University: An extensive building program is under way at Howard University to meet part of the need which results from the doubling of student enrollment since 1946. Additional contract authorizations of 6 million dollars are requested in connection with this building program.

National Science Foundation: The strength and economic welfare of our country in years to come are largely dependent on the advances that can be made in basic scientific research. To maintain and expand the Nation's efforts in scientific research and to help assure an adequate supply of trained scientists in the future, I again urge that the Congress enact legislation creating a National Science Foundation in a form which does not contain the basic administrative defects of the bill passed by the Eightieth Congress. This budget includes tentative estimates of 2.5 million dollars of appropriations and, in addition, 12.5 million dollars of contract authority to enable the Foundation to establish its organization and initiate its program during the fiscal year 1950.

Agriculture and agricultural resources

Federal programs for agriculture include a wide variety of services, grants, loans, and other payments designed to promote the conservation and development of agricultural resources and to improve the efficiency of farm production. They include financial and other assistance aimed to assure reasonable stability in farm income. Finally, they include special aids to farmers whose farm resources are limited in order to give them an opportunity to improve their economic status. The common objective is to promote adjustments within the farm economy and between it and other parts of the national economy which will enable agriculture to contribute its part to the economic development of the Nation as a whole and assure farmers a fair share in the fruits of that development.

Agriculture and agricultural resources

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			1950	
	1948 actual	1949 estimated	1950 estimated	Net new appropriations	Other authorizations
Loan and investment programs:					
Department of Agriculture:					
Commodity Credit Corporation	−$200	$866	$538	-----	-----
Grain storage facilities (proposed legislation)	-----	-----	25	-----	-----
Farmers Home Administration	61	122	116	$115	-----
Rural Electrification Administration, net	239	283	330	6	$350
Other corporate transactions	−67	−63	−14	7	-----
Other agencies	2	(1)	2	2	-----
Other financial aids:					
Department of Agriculture:					
Conservation and use	236	227	274	290	-----
Exportation and domestic consumption	51	87	55	50	-----
Sugar Act	60	71	65	65	-----
International Wheat Agreement (proposed legislation)	-----	-----	56	(1)	-----
Other agencies	−3	(1)	(1)	-----	-----
Agricultural land and water resources:					
Present legislation	48	59	61	60	-----
Flood control—Missouri Basin (proposed legislation)	-----	1	4	-----	-----
Other development and improvement of agriculture	147	153	151	149	-----
Total	575	1,805	1,662	745	350

[1] Less than one-half million dollars.

The calendar year 1948 was another year of high prosperity for American agriculture. Because of the high level of national income and the continuing need abroad for American food and fiber, cash receipts from farm marketings totaled approximately 30.8 billion dollars—slightly larger than the 30.2 billion dollars in 1947. With rising production costs, however, net farm income declined for the first time in 10 years—from 17.8 billion dollars in 1947 to an estimated 17.2 billion dollars in 1948. This compares with 6.4 billion dollars in 1941.

The ratio of prices received by farmers to prices paid has gradually declined from the peak of 133 in October 1946 to 109 in December 1948. A continuation of the downward trend in this ratio will mean smaller net incomes for farmers in 1949 and 1950, an adjustment from the high levels of the immediate postwar years. This adjustment, prevented from becoming excessive by the operation of price supports, will contribute to over-all stabilization of the economy and to a lowering of the cost of living.

The principal factor causing the fluctuation in total agricultural expenditures is the volume of price support outlays by the Commodity Credit Corporation. This program largely accounts for the estimated increase of 1,230 million dollars in expenditures from the fiscal year 1948 to 1949, and the decrease of 143 million dollars from 1949 to 1950. Apart from price support outlays, expenditures in 1950 for agriculture and agricultural resources are expected to be larger than in 1949 because of the higher level of loan disbursements for rural electrification, larger outlays to encourage conservation of agricultural land resources, smaller net repayments on loans made by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, and the proposed International Wheat Agreement.

Price support: Net outlays of the Commodity Credit Corporation are estimated to be 866 million dollars in 1949 and 538 million dollars in 1950, as compared with net receipts of 200 million dollars in 1948. Because of the very large production of wheat, corn, and cotton in the 1948 crop year, market prices of these commodities have declined to support levels, resulting in loan outlays or the acquisition of considerable stocks in the current fiscal year. Price support expenditures are expected also to be large on potatoes, eggs, and flaxseed.

For the 1949 crop year production of cotton, wheat, and corn will probably again exceed anticipated domestic and export requirements, even assuming lower yields per acre than in 1948. If 1949 production should equal the magnitude of the 1948 crops, expenditures of the Commodity Credit Corporation would be considerably larger in the fiscal year 1950 than now estimated.

As I said a year ago, price supports should be regarded "chiefly as devices to safeguard farmers against forced selling under unfavorable conditions and economic depression." Their purpose is to bring an element of stability into agriculture. At the same time they should not place excessive burdens on the Treasury and taxpayers or inhibit shifts in production needed to meet peacetime demands and to promote adequate conservation of our soil resources. The postwar revisions in the price-support programs, which take effect largely in the fiscal year 1951, need certain amendments to make the price support mechanism and the quota provisions more workable.

Two major defects were noted at the time I signed the bill granting a Federal charter to the Commodity Credit Corporation. The first, the restriction on the Corporation's authority to acquire storage facilities, has prevented the Government from fulfilling its obligations under the price-support program. The second, the provisions removing the Corporation from the direct supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture, divide responsibility and make more difficult the sound administration of our agricultural program. I recommend that the charter of the Commodity Credit Corporation be amended to correct these deficiencies.

Rural electrification: Despite the extreme shortages of materials and electrical equipment since the war, the rural electrification program has made notable progress. The percentage of total farms electrified has risen from 48 percent on June 30, 1945, to over 68 percent on June 30, 1948. With the carryover of approximately 120 million dollars from prior-year loan authorizations of the Rural Electrification Administration, I recommend that the new loan authorization be reduced from 400 million dollars to 350 million dollars in 1950. New loan advances to rural cooperatives are estimated to be 360 million dollars in the fiscal year 1950, compared with 310 million dollars in 1949. With the rising percentage of total farms electrified, Rural Electrification Administration loans may be expected to level off in 1951 and decline in later years.

Conservation: The long-run well-being of both the farmer and the Nation depends on the preservation of our soil resources. To accomplish this objective, the Soil Conservation Service provides technical advice and services to farmers. The ultimate goal as it affects the farmer is a plan of management for his farm which will insure both sustained full production and preservation of the soil. The Federal Government also makes payments to farmers to encourage desirable conservation practices. Expenditures for this program are estimated to increase from 227 million dollars in the fiscal year 1949 to 274 million dollars in 1950. For the 1950 crop-year conservation program—to be reflected in expenditures in the fiscal year 1951—I recommend planning for a 262.5-million-dollar program to include the cost of administering any acreage allotments or marketing quotas which may be adopted, as well as payments to farmers and related administrative expenses.

A flood-control survey report covering the watershed of the Missouri will soon be presented to the Congress. If this report is approved by the Congress, a 1949 supplemental appropriation of approximately 5 million dollars will be required to initiate needed land-use changes and the construction of terraces and other structures to retard water flow and soil erosion on the lands in the Missouri Basin. These operations are essential supplements to the flood-control works of the Corps of Engineers on the downstream channels. Larger appropriations will be required in the years following 1950.

Wheat agreement: If the International Wheat Agreement is successfully renegotiated, I shall recommend its ratification and the enactment of the necessary legislation to fulfill its provisions. Under this proposal, the principal exporting and importing countries would guarantee over a period of years an annual trade of a large volume of wheat within an agreed-upon price range. Thus, the agreement would provide an orderly solution of some of the problems of international trade over the next few years without the demoralizing effect of unilateral action by governments acting independently. Approximately 56 million dollars is allowed in this budget to cover the probable loss to the Commodity Credit Corporation in bridging the gap between the price of wheat for the farmer under the price-support program and the price at which wheat is made available to foreign purchasers under the Agreement. Costs are expected to be less in later years and will be more than balanced by benefits to farmers and to the Nation in terms of greater stabilization of world trade.

Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation: In order to simplify the Government-lending operations which assist agriculture, I recommend that the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation be abolished, and that its functions and the capital stock revolving fund be transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture. Under this proposed change the Secretary could direct existing farm-credit agencies to draw upon the revolving fund to extend emergency credit to farmers in the event of floods, droughts, or other natural disasters.

Natural resources

The Federal Government has far-reaching responsibilities for the conservation and development of our natural resources. It must necessarily assume responsibility for the development of atomic energy; it must assure the proper utilization of its extensive land holdings which contain valuable forest, grazing, mineral, water, fish, wildlife, and recreational resources; it must provide for the improvement of such public resources as the major streams of the country. In addition, the Government must foster reasonable standards of conservation and development of resources in private ownership in the interest of the national welfare. We should reappraise our plans for using and conserving our resources in the light of the marked changes that have occurred during and since the war.

In this budget, programs are being restricted to the lowest level consistent with the heavy demands on our natural resources for both civilian and national-defense requirements. The estimated expenditures give particular consideration to the serious needs for electric power in certain areas and for critical minerals. They also allow for work made urgent by repeated postponements during and since the war.

Expenditures for the Government's natural-resources programs in the fiscal year 1950 are estimated at 1,861 million dollars, an increase of 245 million dollars over 1949. The largest expenditures, 725 million dollars, will be made by the Atomic Energy Commission. Other large expenditures include 481 million dollars for flood control by the Corps of Engineers and 344 million dollars by the

Bureau of Reclamation for development of water resources in the West. These activities represent more than four-fifths of the total estimated expenditures in 1950 and largely account for the increase over 1949.

Natural resources

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			1950	
	1948 actual	1949 estimated	1950 estimated	Net new appropriations	Other authorizations
Atomic energy:					
Atomic Energy Commission	$466	$632	$725	$363	$427
Other agencies	9	2	(1)	.....	.....
Land and water resources:					
Corps of Engineers (Army, civil functions)	246	442	481	505	.....
Bureau of Reclamation (Interior)	175	282	349	380	.....
Rehabilitation and betterment projects (proposed legislation)	.....	.....	4	5	.....
Bonneville Power Administration and southwestern power transmission system (Interior)	18	31	41	27	24
Other Interior	9	15	15	15	.....
Tennessee Valley Authority	34	29	49	56	.....
Department of State and other	3	5	10	4	.....
Forest resources:					
Forest Service and other (Agriculture)	57	62	69	68	.....
Department of the Interior	2	5	5	5	(1)
Mineral resources:					
Bureau of Mines and other (Interior)	26	34	31	30	.....
Department of the Navy and other	7	15	18	10	.....
Commercial production of synthetic fuels (proposed legislation)	.....	1	.....	.....	30
Incentive payments for exploration and development of minerals (proposed legislation, Interior)	.....	5	.....	15	.....
General resource surveys (Interior)	10	14	17	18	.....
Fish and wildlife resources (Interior and other)	12	23	24	24	.....
Recreational use of resources (Interior)	16	22	26	25	.....
Total	1,091	1,616	1,861	[2]1,549	482

[1] Less than one-half million dollars.

[2] In addition, this budget includes 391 million dollars of appropriations recommended to liquidate prior year contract authorizations.

New obligational authority recommended in 1950 consists of 1,549 million dollars in net new appropriations and 482 million dollars in contract and loan authorizations, of which 427 million dollars is in contract authorizations for the Atomic Energy Commission. Appropriations required to liquidate prior-year contract authorizations amount to 391 million dollars.

Atomic energy: To an increasing extent our national welfare and security are linked to our atomic energy program. We must continue to add to our knowledge of this resource and move ahead with practical development. Special emphasis is given to the development of nuclear reactors as an eventual means for converting atomic energy into electricity and into power for propulsion of ships and airplanes.

The 1950 budget provides increased funds for the production of fissionable materials and the development of the science and technology of atomic energy. The present high costs of rapidly accomplishing these purposes must be balanced against the ultimate and far greater costs of failure to move ahead vigorously in this field.

Land and water resources: Present high costs of construction and large competitive demands from various sectors of the economy make it necessary to undertake new river basin projects only where urgency is evident. More than 90 percent of the recommended expenditures for river basin development in the fiscal year 1950 is to continue work started in prior years. Despite this restriction, Federal outlays for these resources will be about 1 billion dollars in 1950.

In view of the magnitude of the investment in these resources and its economic effects, there should be careful surveillance of the programs in order to prevent waste and assure sound development. We should apply the lessons of our Tennessee Valley experience without delay wherever they offer promise of improvement.

An essential first step for the flood control, reclamation, and other development activities is an expansion by the Geological Survey of its water resource investigations and topographic surveys.

The flood control program of the Corps of Engineers, involving the construction of major storage reservoirs, channels, and levees, will be limited in the fiscal year 1950 almost entirely to continuation of work on projects started in prior years. Particular emphasis is now given to the Mississippi River Basin but major projects are under construction in river basins on the Atlantic seaboard and Gulf coast, the Central Valley and Los Angeles areas in California, and the Columbia Basin.

The program of the Bureau of Reclamation is going forward on major projects in the Central Valley of California, the Columbia Basin, the Colorado River area, and the Missouri Basin. Because of the great increase in the estimated cost of the Missouri Basin development, the present plan should be reexamined to determine needed changes.

The anticipated shortage of power in some areas of the country makes it urgent that we move forward at a faster rate on certain of the Federal hydroelectric power projects in order to obtain benefits as early as feasible. Two large projects to be constructed by the Corps of Engineers are recommended for initiation in the Columbia Basin in the fiscal year 1950, in order to meet increasing power demands.

The Tennessee Valley, where the Government has broad responsibilities for power supply, faces a power shortage in the near future. Expansion of Tennessee Valley Authority's generating capacity is vital not only for the growing normal power demands, but also for the expanding needs of the atomic energy program. I recommend an immediate appropriation for 1949 to initiate construction of a steam plant to permit more effective utilization of the hydroelectric power resources of the area, and additional funds for 1950 to expedite progress on the project.

Construction by the Government of transmission and distribution facilities is essential in some areas for marketing the power from Government projects in compliance with law, which gives priority to public agencies and cooperatives. Funds have been recommended in the budget for this purpose.

The Federal lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management contain resources that are both large and diverse in character. A large portion of these lands is in the grazing districts of the West and is an important part of the livestock economy of that area. The Bureau's administration of mineral resources includes not only the resources on the public lands, but also those on several million acres of land where surface rights have passed into private ownership. Aggregate receipts from these Federal land resources greatly exceed the costs of administration.

Mineral resources: Two World Wars as well as subsequent needs for world recovery have drawn heavily on our mineral resources. The Federal Government has a responsibility for assuring the adequacy of these resources through intensive surveys, investigations, and exploration; fundamental research; and sound conservation practices. Funds recommended for the Bureau of Mines and some activities of the Geological Survey are directed to these purposes. In addition, I recommend legislation which will authorize incentive payments for the exploration and development of strategic and critical minerals.

The country must face squarely the fact that a major portion of its rapidly increasing energy requirements is being met by oil and gas, which constitute only a small portion of our energy reserve. The prospects are that we shall become increasingly dependent on foreign sources of oil unless appropriate action is taken. I recommend legislation to provide for proper conservation and planned use of the oil reserves under the sea which are vested in the Federal Government. The Federal Government should take steps also to encourage commercial production of synthetic liquid fuels from our abundant reserves of coal, lignite, and oil shale. I recommend legislation to authorize the Government to provide financial assistance for this purpose.

Other resource programs: Programs for the development of our forest, fish, and wildlife resources will be at about the same level in 1950 as in 1949. The increase in expenditures for forest-resource development is explained by the inclusion in this function of forest-development roads, previously classified with forest highways under the transportation function. An increase is recommended for the operation and improvement of the national parks. This increase is in recognition of the problems created by severe curtailment of upkeep

in recent years, and the increased use of the parks as indicated by a trebling of the number of visitors since the close of the war.

Alaskan resources: In my message to the Congress in May 1948, I stressed the need for certain immediate actions to aid in the development of Alaskan resources. I recommend in this budget funds for housing, community facilities, and transportation in this important area. In addition, the budget includes increased expenditures for the investigation and development of Alaskan timber, water, land, mineral, fish, and wildlife resources.

Transportation and communication

The Federal Government has a major responsibility in the development and regulation of the vital transportation and communication industries. The Government has, at various times, provided direct or indirect assistance to most segments of these industries. It must continue to do so where necessary. The ultimate objective of such assistance is the balanced development of these industries, to the end that they can eventually provide all necessary services at the minimum cost to the immediate user and to the taxpayer.

A major part of the Federal expenditures for transportation and communication are for basic facilities such as highways, airports, waterway improvements, and navigation aids. As postwar programs have developed, expenditures for such facilities have increased considerably in recent years. By fiscal year 1950, most of these programs will reach a level which is likely to be sustained with relatively little change in the near future.

While expenditures for these programs will increase between fiscal years 1949 and 1950, total expenditures for transportation and communication are estimated to decline from 1.8 billion dollars in fiscal year 1949 to 1.6 billion dollars in 1950. This decline results from an estimated reduction in the postal deficit, in line with my recommendation for postal rate revisions.

Postal service: The postal deficit for fiscal year 1950, on the basis of current postal rates, would be more than 400 million dollars. A deficit of this size is unsound; it imposes upon the general taxpayer a financial burden which should properly be borne by the users of the service.

Large postal deficits are resulting from a record volume of postal business, most of which is carried at rates which do not cover handling costs. The low rates for parcel post have led to substantial diversion of express traffic from common carriers, with the result that the Post Office Department is now receiving a volume and type of parcel business which it cannot efficiently handle with existing facilities. Present rates for second and third class mail are so low that they make only a small contribution to the costs of handling such mail. While the national interest in disseminating information justifies some preferential treatment for periodicals and other second-class matter, there is no sound basis for the extremely low rates now in effect.

Transportation and communication

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			1950	
	1948 actual	1949 estimated	1950 estimated	Net new appropriations	Other authorizations
Promotion of aviation:					
Civil Aeronautics Administration (Commerce)	$98	$130	$196	$127	$67
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	38	44	60	36	22
Promotion of the merchant marine:					
Maritime Commission	183	152	182	70	60
Inland Waterways Corporation (Commerce):					
Present programs	.....	2	1	1	.....
Proposed legislation	.....	.....	2	2	.....
Provision of navigation aids and facilities:					
Panama Canal (Army, civil functions)	11	20	16	15	.....
Corps of Engineers (Army, civil functions):					
Present programs	114	168	209	229	.....
Proposed St. Lawrence seaway and power project	.....	.....	8	20	.....
Coast Guard (Treasury)	105	111	148	130	.....
Department of the Interior	(1)	1	1	.....	.....
Provision of highways:					
Public Roads Administration (Federal Works Agency)	321	444	501	16	470
Forest roads and trails (Agriculture)	18	26	3	2	.....
Alaska and Indian roads (Interior)	7	19	28	12	7
Regulation of transportation (Interstate Commerce Commission and Civil Aeronautics Board)	15	15	15	15	.....
Other services to transportation:					
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	−1	−4	2	.....	.....
Coast and Geodetic Survey (Commerce)	10	11	11	11	.....
Alaska Railroad (Interior)	25	33	40	20	22
Postal service deficit (Post Office):					
Present programs	304	527	402	404	.....
Proposed legislation	.....	.....	−250	−250	.....
Regulation of communication (Federal Communications Commission)	6	7	7	7	.....
Alaska communications system:					
Present programs	1	2	3	3	.....
Proposed legislation	.....	.....	1	4	.....
Total	1,267	1,757	1,586	[2]946	648

[1] Less than one-half million dollars.

[2] In addition, this budget includes 495 million dollars of appropriations recommended to liquidate prior-year contract authorizations.

In the last 2 years, I have recommended that the Congress raise postal rates to bring them more nearly into line with the increased costs of postal operations. A partial revision in rates was effected by the Eightieth Congress, but this did not offset the cost of the postal pay raise which was concurrently enacted. I therefore strongly urge again that the Congress enact at once an adequate revision of the postal rate structure. I have asked the Postmaster General to submit his recommendations for rate revisions sufficient to reduce the deficit to a reasonable level. The added revenue from such revisions, estimated at 250 million dollars for the fiscal year 1950, is shown in the budget under proposed legislation. The remaining deficit would represent largely the costs of Government penalty mail, franked mail, airline subsidies, and other costs not properly chargeable to the users of the postal service. Aside from such costs, postal operations should be conducted on a self-sufficient basis, with rates maintained at a level adequate to accomplish that objective.

Aviation: Commercial aviation, the newest of our transportation industries, is still in a stage of development that requires subsidy assistance. The program of the Civil Aeronautics Administration for modernizing the Nation's airways will assist the air lines in achieving greater safety and regularity, higher load factors, and thus eventually in reducing their dependence upon Federal financial aid. This program includes principally the installation of landing aids at major airports, and of new airway facilities to permit greater precision and flexibility in air navigation. The present transitional program, utilizing types of equipment currently available, is now getting fully under way, and the 1950 budget recommendation contemplates its completion within a few years. Research and development work required for a longer-range program will be actively started in the fiscal year 1950, looking toward a complete all-weather air-navigation system within a period of about 15 years.

New obligational authority for the Federal aid airport-construction program is held to 40 million dollars in this budget. Within these funds, primary emphasis will be placed upon the construction and improvement of large airports which are required for commercial air transport, and which would also have potential national defense importance.

The basic aeronautical research conducted by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics is essential for the design and development of improved aircraft, both military and civilian. The 1950 budget provides for new facilities, and increased use of existing facilities, primarily for research upon military aircraft requirements.

Water transportation: Promotion of the merchant marine, through Maritime Commission construction and operating subsidies, will require some increase in expenditures in the fiscal year 1950. The budget recommendations provide for the construction of new vessels related to the national defense. With minor exceptions, contracts for sale of these vessels to private operators will be required before construction is begun. Within recent months, the Commission has let contracts for the construction of five passenger-cargo vessels, and has received bids on the construction of a large, high-speed passenger liner. Construction activity on these and other merchant vessels will increase Maritime Commission shipbuilding expenditures from 26 million dollars in fiscal year 1949 to 121 million dollars in fiscal year 1950.

By the end of the fiscal year 1949 the Maritime Commission expects to have determined the postwar operating subsidy rates for all essential trade routes. Subsidy expenditures will therefore be on a full-year basis in fiscal year 1950, and are estimated at 22 million dollars,

more than twice the 1949 level. The substantial increases in construction and operating subsidy programs will be largely offset by declines in other Maritime Commission expenditures, particularly those for vessel operation and for liquidation of prior-year obligations.

The activities of the Coast Guard in maintaining rescue stations, enforcing maritime laws, and operating navigational aids, are of primary importance to safety at sea of both air and surface transportation. These programs are expected to cost 148 million dollars in fiscal year 1950. This is slightly higher than in 1949 as a result of the full-year operation of ocean weather stations and a higher level of maintenance of other Coast Guard facilities.

River and harbor improvement by the Corps of Engineers is held in the 1950 budget to the minimum required for navigation and related purposes. Most of the 1950 program will represent work on existing projects. Only 12 new projects, of high urgency, are proposed to be started in 1950.

I again urge the Congress to give early approval to the St. Lawrence waterway and power project. The navigational aspects of this project have recently assumed an increased importance as a result of the prospects for developing high-grade iron-ore deposits in Labrador. As our domestic deposits become depleted the proposed seaway will become an important link between our steel industry and this new potential source of ore. Furthermore this dual-purpose project is needed as a source of low-cost power.

The Inland Waterways Corporation, which helps bring the advantages of water transportation to shippers, large and small, urgently needs additional capital to modernize its equipment. Such rehabilitation should enable the Corporation to demonstrate the prospects for profitable operation of its services, and permit the sale of the Corporation to a private operator at terms which would safeguard the interests of both the Government and the users of the service. I recommend that the Congress authorize the additional capital funds needed.

Highways: Federal grants-in-aid for road construction have been increasing substantially in recent years, and in fiscal year 1950 will be close to the level authorized in existing legislation. Even with this high level of Federal aid, our highways are not being improved as fast as they wear out, nor are they being modernized to the extent required by postwar traffic conditions. Nevertheless, present high costs and the limited capacity of the construction industry make it undesirable for expenditures in the fiscal year 1950 to exceed the estimated level of 501 million dollars.

Federal regulation: Although most of the expenditures in this function are accounted for by the services, facilities, and subsidies discussed above, a highly important Federal responsibility is exercised by the regulatory agencies in this field. The regulation of rates and other aspects of transportation and communication services help to assure that the public interest will be adequately and efficiently served. The general economic adjustments within the past few years have substantially increased the normal work loads of these agencies. The Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Communications Commission in particular have been faced with major technological and economic developments within their expanding fields. Despite these increased problems, the present budgetary situation makes it desirable to hold these agencies to essentially their present levels.

Appropriations and other authorizations—Summary: To carry out the above programs, I am recommending 1,593 million dollars in new obligational authority. Of this amount, 648 million dollars represent new contract authorizations, and 945 million dollars represent net new appropriations. Excluded from the total of new obligational authority are additional appropriations of 495 million dollars which will be required for the liquidation of prior-year contract authorizations.

Finance, commerce, and industry

Except in times of war or other emergency, the Federal Government's finance, commerce, and industry programs are limited in the main to enforcing effective competition and to providing a wide variety of financial and nonfinancial aids to private industry. The principal agencies administering these programs are the Department of Commerce, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and the various business regulatory agencies. I have already discussed the more specialized regulation and promotion of particular industries such as transportation and communication.

Total expenditures for finance, commerce, and industry programs are estimated at 107 million dollars in 1950, or slightly above the 1949 level. To carry out these programs, I am including in the budget appropriations of 82 million dollars for fiscal year 1950, including tentative estimates of 44 million dollars for extension of existing stabilization activities and for new controls under the proposed stand-by authority. Supplemental appropriations of 24 million dollars will also be required for the current fiscal year, chiefly for stabilization activities and for completion of the Census of Business.

Stabilization program: The major economic problem facing our country is to prevent further inflation and to move on into a stable economic situation without an intervening recession. To provide the necessary legislative authority, I recommend extending and strengthening the existing statutes covering rent, export and transportation controls, materials allocations, control of consumer credit, and bank-reserve requirements. In addition, I am recommending new authority for stand-by price and wage controls and for the allocation of a broader list of commodities, for use if voluntary measures prove inadequate, and for studies of the need for expanding productive capacity in shortage industries. Budget expenditures for this stabilization program are estimated at 41 million dollars in 1950.

Antimonopoly program: A strong antimonopoly program is essential for the preservation of our free enterprise institutions. It can also provide immediate assistance in the present effort to restrain inflation. By concentrating enforcement activities in major consumer commodities, conspiracies responsible for high prices can be broken and the cost of living reduced.

Finance, commerce, and industry

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			1950 net new appropriations
	1948 actual	1949 estimated	1950 estimated	
Promotion and regulation of business:				
Stabilization program:				
Housing Expediter—rent control and veterans' priorities:				
Present programs	$19	$18	------	------
Proposed legislation	------	5	$25	$24
Department of Commerce:				
Present programs	1	4	------	------
Proposed legislation	------	1	5	5
Department of Agriculture	3	------	------	------
Treasury Department	------	1	------	------
Proposed stabilization legislation	------	2	13	15
Continuing programs:				
Antimonopoly program (Federal Trade Commission, Justice)	5	7	7	7
Other regulatory agencies	6	6	7	7
Department of Commerce	19	27	23	18
Business loans and guarantees (Reconstruction Finance Corporation):				
National defense loans	−5	−19	−6	------
Other loans to business	35	54	37	------
Aids to private financial institutions (Reconstruction Finance Corporation)	−21	−16	−9	------
War damage insurance (War Damage Corporation)	20	------	1	------
Control of private finance (Securities Exchange Commission)	6	6	6	6
Total	88	102	107	82

A substantial increase in funds for the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice has been made available for the current fiscal year. I am recommending a small further increase in 1950, which will permit more adequate investigation of the extent of monopoly and monopolistic practices.

Business loans: To restrain inflationary credit expansion, general loans to business in 1950 by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will be held to approximately the 1948 level. A somewhat higher level is estimated for 1949 owing to substantial authorizations early in the fiscal year.

Collections on national defense loans and holdings of preferred stock in financial institutions continue but at a declining rate, as liquidation of these large depression and wartime programs is now nearing completion.

Labor

In our free enterprise system the conditions of employment of the labor force of more than 63 million persons are primarily matters for the joint determination of labor and management. The role of the Federal Government is to assure that acceptable minimum standards of

wages and working conditions are maintained and that both individual workers and organized groups of working people have a fair opportunity to improve their economic status. The Federal Government also promotes apprenticeship training and collects and publishes labor statistics and related information which are used widely by business, labor, and the general public. For the fiscal year 1950, the Government's labor programs will require budget expenditures of 187 million dollars, approximately 3 million dollars more than in 1949.

The Labor Department should be substantially strengthened through reorganization to bring together the units which properly belong in it. Toward this end I shall recommend certain organizational changes essential for more effective administration of the Government's labor program.

Mediation services and regulation of employment conditions: In my Message on the State of the Union I have already recommended urgently needed legislative action to provide fair laws under which management and labor can develop more fully the opportunities for cooperative production that collective bargaining affords. I have also recommended that the Congress promptly amend existing laws in order to establish up-to-date minimum standards for wages.

Labor

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			1950 net new appropriations
	1948 actual	1949 estimated	1950 estimated	
Mediation services and regulation of employment conditions:				
Department of Labor:				
Present programs	$5	$6	$6	$6
Industrial safety program (proposed legislation)	------	------	3	3
National Labor Relations Board	5	9	9	9
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	2	3	3	3
National Commission Against Discrimination in Employment (proposed legislation)	------	------	1	1
Other	4	5	5	5
Labor information, statistics, and general administration: Department of Labor	8	7	8	8
Placement services and unemployment compensation activities:				
Federal Security Agency	71	137	140	139
Railroad Retirement Board	15	15	11	11
Department of Labor	70	------	------	------
Training of workers: Department of Labor	2	3	3	3
Total	183	184	187	187

NOTE.—The Federal-State system of unemployment compensation and the Federal system of railroad unemployment insurance, formerly classified in Social welfare, health, and security, are now included in Labor.

This budget includes tentative estimates to carry out the legislation which I have proposed to authorize grants to the States to foster safer working conditions, and to authorize establishment of a national commission against discrimination in employment.

Labor information and statistics: For programs now authorized in the Department of Labor, I am recommending increases to restore the facilities of the Department to meet more adequately the increasing needs for current information on employment, hours and earnings, consumer prices, and other subjects.

Placement services and unemployment compensation administration: Public employment services and administration of unemployment insurance will require approximately 150 million dollars or about 80 percent of all expenditures for labor programs. Except for 11 million dollars for the railroad unemployment insurance program, these funds are expended principally through grants to States.

Provision has been made, in the reserve for contingencies, for any added costs which may arise because of future statutory increases in State salary rates or because of unexpected increases in State work load.

Trust accounts: Total unemployment benefit payments are rising above the 1948 level, in large part because of increased labor turn-over, the return of prewar seasonal patterns and because many insured workers have exhausted their claims to veterans' unemployment allowances from the Federal Government and collect State benefits when unemployed. Growth of the labor force and liberalization of State laws are also factors. Receipts are below the 1948 level because of changes in the law relating to railroad unemployment.

My proposal to strengthen the unemployment compensation system contemplates that coverage will be extended to workers in small establishments, Federal employees, and other workers not now insured. It contemplates that in some States the level of benefits will be raised and their duration extended.

Unemployment trust fund (trust accounts)

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Item	1948 actual	1949 estimated	1950 estimated
Receipts:			
Deposits by States and railroad unemployment taxes	$1,148	$991	$1,017
Interest	165	181	185
Proposed legislation extending coverage and improving benefits	------	------	230
Payments (deduct):			
State and railroad unemployment withdrawals	856	963	1,020
Proposed legislation	------	------	150
Net accumulation	457	209	262

General government

Under "General government" are grouped not only the general management activities of the Government but also legislative and judicial functions, citizenship services, and government of the Territories. Most of the expenditures in this category are for collecting the internal revenue, interest on refunds of receipts, the Government contribution to the Federal employees' retirement system, property supply and disposal, and the maintenance and operation of public buildings. The Weather Bureau also is included under general government, because its activities relate to several major functions of the Government. Similarly, the general expenditures of a few departmental offices are classified in this category.

General government

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			1950	
	1948 actual	1949 estimated	1950 estimated	Net new appropriations	Other authorizations
Legislative functions	$32	$37	$40	$35	------
Judicial functions	18	20	26	21	------
Executive direction and management	7	7	10	8	------
Surplus property disposal, foreign and domestic:					
Present disposal programs (mainly War Assets Administration)	312	118	16	------	------
Proposed legislation	------	13	21	21	------
Deposits and transfers of receipts, foreign sales (Army, clearing account)	66	9	------	------	------
Federal financial management:					
Bureau of Internal Revenue	185	209	233	233	------
Other Treasury bureaus	194	150	133	136	------
General Accounting Office	24	36	37	37	------
Other	3	5	5	1	------
Interest on refunds of receipts	57	82	82	82	------
Government payment toward civilian employees' general retirement system	244	224	328	328	------
Federal Works Agency (mainly Public Buildings Administration):					
Present programs	71	78	91	74	------
Office building (proposed legislation)	------	------	5	7	------
Reconstruction Finance Corporation:					
Payment of interest to miscellaneous receipts	89	1	14	------	------
Other	−39	−26	−25	------	------
Cemeteries and return of war dead (Army)	87	73	30	6	------
Other:					
Present programs	115	150	168	160	$7
Salary increases for heads and assistant heads of agencies (proposed legislation)	------	------	2	2	------
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission (proposed legislation)	------	(1)	1	------	------
Special fund for management improvement (proposed legislation)	------	------	1	1	------
Total	1,504	1,187	1,224	[2] 1,160	7

[1] Less than one-half million dollars.
[2] In addition, this budget includes 26 million dollars of appropriations recommended to liquidate prior year contract authorizations.

Total expenditures for general government functions have declined from a peak in the fiscal year 1948 and are now leveling off at about 1.2 billion dollars. Although the biggest reductions in war-liquidation programs have already occurred, further reductions are expected. Some increases, however, are estimated in the expenditures for permanent programs and services, particularly, in 1950

for tax collections and the employees' retirement system. Total new authorizations requested for general Government activities for the fiscal year 1950 are 57 million dollars less than estimated expenditures. I am postponing requests for contract authority for a general public buildings program and requesting only 7 million dollars in contract authority for other construction.

Property management: Last year I submitted to the Congress proposals for a comprehensive property management program for the Federal Government. The Congress took action to repeal certain of the provisions of the temporary legislation for surplus property disposal and to provide for termination of the War Assets Administration February 28, 1949, but it failed to complete action on permanent property management legislation. Such legislation is urgently needed to achieve economies by modernizing the Government's supply and disposal systems. This legislation should designate a single property management agency. The remaining functions of the War Assets Administration should be transferred directly to this agency.

At the end of February, the War Assets Administration will have residual inventories of surplus property amounting to more than 2.5 billion dollars in terms of original cost. I am recommending a supplemental appropriation of 15 million dollars for the fiscal year 1949 and 21 million dollars for the fiscal year 1950 on the assumption that a single property management agency will be made responsible for these disposal activities upon dissolution of the War Assets Administration.

Revenue collection: The operations of the Bureau of Internal Revenue have been extensively reviewed by the Congress and also by a special management committee appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury. As a result the Bureau is currently engaged in decentralizing its administration, improving office procedures, expanding its enforcement staff, and training its personnel to do a better job. In addition to nearly 2,000 enforcement personnel to be added this fiscal year, the budget provides for a further increase of more than 7,000 in the fiscal year 1950. The Government has an obligation to its taxpayers to undertake complete collection of all the taxes that are legally due and to assure equitable treatment to each taxpayer. I am confident that the additional expenditures will represent a sound investment.

Retirement system: Last February legislation was enacted which liberalized the provisions of the Federal employees' general retirement system by increasing annuity payments and adding survivorship benefits. Higher payments to the retirement fund are required to finance these new provisions. The rate of deductions from employees' salaries for retirement purposes was increased from 5 percent to 6 percent. It is also necessary to increase by over 100 million dollars in the fiscal year 1950 the Government's payment toward the retirement system, based on the revised retirement provisions and the higher Federal pay roll estimated for the fiscal year 1950.

Public buildings: Because of the present inflationary conditions I am not now recommending a general public buildings program, although in many areas the Government is inadequately housed and such a program cannot be delayed indefinitely. However, I am proposing that work be started immediately on the construction of one building which should be completed in time for use by the Census Bureau in connection with the 1950 decennial census, and will thereafter be available for other needs.

Government Services Corporation: I recommend that the Congress create a new, self-supporting, Government corporation to provide certain cafeteria and recreational services, primarily for Federal employees, in Government buildings and on Government property. At present, these services are provided by several organizations which do not fall within the normal governmental framework. This is essentially a governmental responsibility, and should be subject to the usual processes of governmental review and control.

Virgin Islands Company: I renew my recommendation that the Virgin Islands Company be given a permanent Federal charter under comprehensive legislation. This Company is a chief contributor to the economic welfare of the Virgin Islands. The present stopgap measure, which extended the life of the Company for only 1 year and with narrow powers, contributes little toward making the Virgin Islands economically self-sustaining and raising the standard of living of its citizens.

The National Capital: The role of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission should be redefined and a stronger statutory basis established for the proper development of the District of Columbia and nearby areas in Maryland and Virginia.

I am not forwarding at this time an estimate of appropriation for the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency to provide for the assembly of property in slum or blighted areas in the District of Columbia. When the redevelopment plans now being prepared by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission are approved, an estimate will be transmitted for consideration by the Congress.

I recommend pay increases for the employees of the District of Columbia government, including the teachers in the public schools, who were unfairly excluded from the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948.

Interest on the public debt

Expenditures for interest on the public debt in the fiscal year 1950 are estimated at 5,450 million dollars, an increase of 125 million dollars over the fiscal year 1949; and the 1949 estimate is, in turn, higher than actual expenditures in the preceding year by approximately the same amount.

Interest on the public debt

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Agency	Expenditures			1950 appropriations
	1948 actual	1949 estimated	1950 estimated	
Treasury Department	$5,188	$5,325	$5,450	$5,450

The continued increase in interest on the public debt arises in several ways. Accruals on the large volume of savings bonds outstanding reach higher brackets each year. There will also be a further increase in the amount of special issues held by Government trust funds, and these issues bear relatively high coupon rates which are, in part, fixed by statute. In addition, the increases in short-term interest rates which were initiated in July 1947 are now beginning to be fully reflected in the cost of the debt. This latter factor is, to some extent, offset by the interest saving which has been effected by refunding maturing bonds bearing relatively high rates of interest into short-term issues bearing lower rates of interest.

Interest payments on marketable issues—issues which may be bought and sold freely in the market—will account for 55 percent of interest payments on the debt in the fiscal year 1950. The amount of interest paid on marketable issues is falling gradually because of a decline in the total volume of such obligations and the retirement or refunding of bonds bearing relatively high rates of interest. A portion of the interest paid out on marketable issues goes to the Federal Reserve banks, and most of such payments are coming back to the Government as miscellaneous receipts. This is a result of the Federal Reserve policy of paying approximately 90 percent of net Reserve bank earnings into the Treasury. Budget receipts from this source are estimated to rise from 140 million dollars in 1949 to 250 million dollars in 1950, thereby offsetting most of the increase in the total interest cost of the debt.

Interest payments are a fixed obligation of the Federal Government. Their payment is financed by permanent indefinite appropriations not requiring annual congressional action.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION—A SUMMARY

Estimated expenditures, appropriations, and other authorizations included in the budget total for programs under proposed new legislation are shown in the following table. The items in the table are of such importance as to warrant early enactment and financing in the next fiscal year. Moreover, legislative proposals for these items are sufficiently developed to permit tentative estimates of first year budgetary requirements.

The budget also contains a general reserve for contingencies. It is designed as a minimum provision both for unforeseen contingencies and for legislative proposals now in the discussion stage, which may require action before the end of the next fiscal year.

Proposed legislation (summary of amounts included in the budget)

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Function and program	Estimated expenditures 1950	Anticipated supplemental appropriations and other authorizations	
		1949	1950
International affairs and finance:			
Economic Cooperation Administration	$4,300.0	$1,250.0	$4,200.0
Other foreign aid	355.0		600.0
Food and Agriculture Organization building fund	1.0		7.0
Contribution to International Trade Organization	1.0		1.0
War damage claims		17.0	
Palestinian refugee program		16.0	
Foreign service pay increase	1.4	.6	1.7
National defense:			
National Military Establishment (public works, special programs, military pay adjustment, etc.)	385.		645.0 (185.0)
Universal training	600.0		800.0
Social welfare, health and security:			
Medical care insurance system	14.9		15.0
Public assistance	65.0		65.0
Change in employees' accident compensation rates	3.8		4.0
Housing and community facilities:			
Slum clearance, low-rent housing, farm housing and research	160.5	.2 (700.0)	11.7 (236.5)
Special assistance for rental and cooperative housing	50.0		
Census of housing	6.0		15.0
Stand-by borrowing authority:			
Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation			(750.0)
Federal home loan banks	(1)		(1,000.0)
Alaska housing	5.0		10.0
Alaska public works	1.0		2.0
Disaster relief	3.0		5.0
Education and general research:			
Federal aid to education	200.1		300.2
Survey of educational building needs, and study of scholarships and fellowships	1.0		1.0
Radio propagation building	.2		.2
National Science Foundation	2.0		2.5 (12.5)
Agriculture and agricultural resources:			
Amendment of Commodity Credit Corporation charter (grain storage)	25.0		
Flood control, Missouri River Basin	4.0	5.0	
International Wheat Agreement	55.7		.2
Natural resources:			
Commercial production of synthetic liquid fuels	1.0		(30.0)
Incentive payments for exploration and development of minerals	5.0		15.0
Bureau of Reclamation, rehabilitation and betterment projects	4.0		5.0
Transportation and communication:			
Additional revenue from increased postal rates	−250.0		−250.0
Inland Waterways Corporation, subscription to capital stock	2.0		2.0
St. Lawrence seaway and power project	8.0		20.0
Alaska communications system	.8		3.6
Finance, commerce, and industry:			
Anti-inflation program	13.5	3.0	15.0
Export control	4.7	1.6	5.0
Rent control	23.3	5.4	24.0

[1] Budget receipts of 81 million dollars from additional retirement of Federal home loan bank stock.

Proposed legislation (summary of amounts included in the budget)—Continued

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Function and program	Estimated expenditures 1950	Anticipated supplemental appropriations and other authorizations	
		1949	1950
Labor:			
Industrial safety program	3.1		$3.1
National Commission Against Discrimination in Employment	.5		.6
General government:			
Construction of Census Building	4.8		7.4
Surplus property disposal	20.6	315.0	21.0
Salary increases for heads and assistant heads of agencies	1.5		1.5
Special fund for management improvement	.9		1.0
National Capital Sesqui-Centennial Commission	1.2	1.5	
Total	[1] 6,175.5	(1,315.3 (700.0)	[1] 6,660.7 (2,214.0)

[1] Excluding additional postal revenue, total estimated expenditures are 6,425.5 million dollars and total anticipated supplemental appropriations are 6,910.7 million dollars.

NOTE.—Figures in parentheses are authorizations other than appropriations.

The responsibilities of freemen match the personal rights and political freedoms which are theirs. The Budget of the United States reflects our power for freedom and the advancement of mankind in our country and in the world.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

JANUARY 3, 1949.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after reading of the Journal and any other special orders, I may be allowed to proceed for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I note that the message of the President, as I understand it, has been referred to the Appropriations Committee.

The SPEAKER. No; the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. RICH. Would it not be proper to return it back to the Bureau of the Budget with instructions that it send in at least one that is balanced?

The SPEAKER. That is not a parliamentary inquiry, and no one knows that better than the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. It is certainly sense.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order which I have for today be postponed until Thursday next after disposition of other business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a joint statement by the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, the American Butter Institute, and the National Creameries Association.

Mr. DONDERO (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in each an editorial.

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Times-Herald today.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include in each extraneous material.

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from J. L. Webb, of Bartlett, Mo.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

THE LATE JOHN HARRIS SMITHWICK

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to inform the House of the death of John Harris Smithwick, who represented the Third Congressional District of Florida from 1918 to 1926. Mr. Smithwick was born near Orange, in Cherokee County, Ga., July 17, 1872. He graduated from Reinhardt Normal College, Waleska, Ga., in 1895 and from the law department of Cumberland University, Lebanon, Tenn., in 1897. He was admitted to the bar in 1898 and began the practice of law in Moultrie, Ga.

He moved to Florida in 1906, making his home in Pensacola. There he practiced law, and later engaged in the lumber, naval stores, and real-estate businesses.

Mr. Smithwick was elected as a Democrat to the Sixty-sixth Congress in 1918, and continued to serve the third Florida district until 1926. He was the first person who served that district in Congress for four terms, and is one of three

people who have been so honored to date.

As a Congressman he served with credit and ability. His record here was a commendable one and the friendships he made have endured down through the years.

Mr. Smithwick spent the later years of his life in Moultrie, Ga., and died on December 30, last. He is survived by his widow, formerly Miss Jessie Vereen, daughter of W. C. Vereen, Moultrie financier, one son, William Smithwick, and a daughter, Mrs. J. H. Moriarty.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members so desiring may extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

INDIAN AND NEGRO SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION REIMBURSEMENT

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill about which I would like to say a few words. It is a bill to provide that the Federal Government shall reimburse the States for the construction of Indian and Negro schools. At the present time there is a great need for both Negro and Indian school construction throughout the entire country. This bill is not a bill which deals with segregation or nonsegregation. The bill will apply to all sorts of schools throughout the country. There is a tremendous need today for this assistance, and I know of no other way in which it can be adequately met. It is obvious that the Indians should be taken care of. That obligation has been acknowledged but it has not been fully met. With regard to the Negroes, the "colored people" as we sometimes call them, the obligation has not even been fully acknowledged. But our Constitution provided, when originally drawn, that there should be slavery and then the Federal Government abolished slavery. Yet, the Federal Government never assumed its full responsibility for the things that it allowed to take place. Certainly, those people have a right to have a better education than they presently enjoy throughout our country. This bill would provide for reimbursing the States for expenditures for construction only in schools for Indians and Negroes for the next 10 years. The amount of money going to a particular State will equal the per capita construction cost of schools used for those purposes multiplied by the number of people of those races who will use the structures.

FULL EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1950, H. R. 1177

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the course of his splendid message to Congress on the state of the Union, President Truman struck out boldly on a new path of economic policy for the Nation. First, he said:

> The Employment Act of 1946 pledges the Government to use all its resources to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power. This means that the Government is firmly committed to protect business and the people against the dangers of recession and against the evils of inflation. This means that the Government must adapt its plans and policies to meet changing circumstances.

GOVERNMENT LOANS IF NECESSARY

Then, as a part of his program for dealing with immediate shortages in production, the President added that Congress should "authorize an immediate study of the adequacy of production facilities for materials in critically short supply, such as steel; and, if found necessary, to authorize Government loans for the expansion of production facilities to relieve such shortages, and, furthermore, to authorize the construction of such facilities directly if action by private industry fails to meet our needs."

MUST DEVELOP RESOURCES FOR HEALTHY GROWTH

Two days later, in his economic report to Congress, the President further indicated his concern with this problem of the achievement of an economy permanently stabilized at a high level of activity when, in his discussion of policies to promote balanced economic growth, he said:

> While alleviating the hardships of inflation and overcoming maladjustments which threaten our future prosperity, we must continue to develop our resources for healthy growth. We should press forward at once with some programs of high priority needed now to conserve and increase the strength of our Nation. In addition, we should be prepared with fully formulated plans for others. We cannot accept the dangerous idea that inflation's end will automatically bring about a period of stable prosperity. The continuing need for prudence in Government expenditures must not be translated into false economy.

It is clear from these statements that the President is leading the way toward an exploration of the ways and means whereby this Nation can achieve for itself stability, security, and increasing well-being without the abandonment of those traditional individual freedoms that have been the hallmark of American democracy.

As he said later in his state of the Union message, the American people are going their own way and will hammer out their own destiny without regard to the isms and theoretical formulas that have developed in other lands.

TO UPHOLD HAND OF PRESIDENT

In an effort to uphold the hand of the President in opening these magnificent new prospects for our people, I have today introduced a bill—H. R. 1177—the Full Employment Act of 1950, which represents one way of approaching this problem. The bill is brief and simple and I commend it to the attention of Members of the House. First, the bill would reorganize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. It provides for the appointment of seven directors to be paid at the rate of $25,000 a year, with the principal function of achieving the long-range program of production, employment, and investment goals set forth in the economic report. This title of the bill also provides for the establishment of a citizens' advisory board modeled on the advisory board of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, which rendered such yeoman service during the hazardous days of the last war.

TITLE II. DEVELOPMENT FUND

Next, title II would establish a capital development fund to enable it to carry out its responsibilities. This fund would amount to $15,000,000,000 and would be used to make loans required to carry out its programs.

In extending these loans, the new RFC is directed to attempt to maintain, first, desirable levels of investment not only nationally but regionally; second, to encourage investment in such industrial and business enterprises as are currently or prospectively understood; third, to give due regard to wise use of natural resources and to promotion of the Sherman and Clayton Acts.

STATE GOVERNMENTS MAY COOPERATE

Three types of loans are authorized in the bill. The first type is loans to existing or new private business enterprises, through which the purposes of this act may be achieved. Second, if it does not prove possible for the RFC to find the private enterprisers who are interested in this kind of industrial development required to achieve the Nation's needs, it is authorized to offer to State governments the opportunity of receiving such loans for the purpose of constructing needed industrial facilities for operation by the State. Finally, in certain instances, the RFC would be authorized to make loans to the TVA or to similar regional agencies if such loans are required in order to facilitate the expansion of other private business in the region affected. I cannot emphasize too strongly that this bill is an effort to use the financial strength of the Government to promote the extension of private enterprise production required for the maintenance of an economy of full production, services, and employment. It is not an attempt to get at the problem of employment by the construction of public works. While it may be necessary at some time in the future to embark on a large-scale public-works program as a means of stimulating investment and employment, it is the hope of myself and my fellow sponsors in the other Chamber that the enactment of such a bill as this would go far toward avoiding the necessity of embarking on such a works program for any reason other than that the works were needed in themselves.

ATTACKS MONOPOLY

Moreover, this bill proposes to tackle the problem of recurrent cyclical depressions not by simply an emergency, indiscriminant attempt to supplement the amount of private investment necessary to keep the wheels of business turning, but by the achievement of industrialization in those areas where it is most needed and where unemployment crises can become most serious. In other words, it proceeds on the view that the existence of impoverished areas in the Nation is just as great a threat to permanent prosperity as the existence of impoverished income classes. Next it gets at the problem of unemployment by promoting the initiation of new enterprises in fields where monopoly exists. Concentrated control of industries always limits employment in those industries and this limitation becomes most severe at those times when it does the most damage to the economy. When industrial activity is curtailed, monopolistic industries tend to reduce employment and to keep prices high. This bill would seek to expand competition in those industries and thereby afford more jobs both in the new enterprises and enterprises where the industry is now tightly controlled.

RISK CAPITAL NEEDED

There can be no doubt as to the growing need for some action to insure the abundance of risk capital if this country is to go on expanding, creating ever more of the necessities and luxuries of life for its people and finding ways to make sure that they are able to buy them. Already, it is clear that such venture capital is drying up.

Orders for machine tools, a sure sign in this field, are dropping off even with the stepping up of the European recovery program, which, one would have thought, would provide a large market for such tools in the reconstruction of Europe.

Why should not the financial power of the Government be used to supply this lack of investment and venture capital? I for one believe that it should do so, that the primary responsibility of a government in modern times is to care for both the civil and economic liberties of its people. But it should not do this haphazardly.

If the financial power of the Government is used without discrimination, then the whole objective of its use will be defeated. If it serves simply to concentrate more economic and financial power in those sections and in those hands which already have too much, then in the end the house of cards will come tumbling down.

Therefore, some way must be found of providing such investment capital in those areas that need it most and in those industries where monopoly reduces the number of available jobs and reduces the amount of production made available to the people. The end result of leaving some regions underdeveloped is to cause unemployment. So is the end result of monopoly.

END RECURRENT DEPRESSIONS

Further, in an economy so vast and intricate as ours, there is another problem that must be solved if we are to tackle intelligently the problem of ending cyclical depressions. This is the problem of the flexibility of the management and labor force. In many lines, particularly of consumers durable goods, such as washing machines and refrigerators, our industry has become so efficient that it would be possible to satisfy an almost unlimited domestic demand within a relatively short period. Thus, there is a growing problem of enabling our managerial and labor skills to transfer from such an industry to another where demand remains unsatisfied. Some device for enabling the wise use of our human and industrial resources, continuously adjusting to need, is urgently needed.

COMBAT BOOM-AND-BUST CYCLE

For all of these reasons, it seems to me that some such bill as the Full Employment Act of 1950 which I have introduced today, should be studied carefully by enlightened businessmen as well as legislators, farmers, workers, and other citizens. It would be a confession of intellectual bankruptcy for this Nation to confess that it cannot find a way to combat the boom-and-bust cycle other than by simply hoarding needed public works until an emergency arises and then building them in order to provide employment. Public works should be built as needed, not simply in order to provide employment.

But we ought to be able to discover democratic ways of using the tools of government to insure our prosperity through other devices. And there is no reason why we cannot do this without sacrificing our hard-won individual liberties. So long as we are careful to maintain our Government's democracy and responsiveness to the people, we will get along all right on this score.

NEW BASIS FOR STATES' RIGHTS

It should be noticed, too, that this bill provides a new kind of federalism, a new basis for States' rights. If, under this measure, it proves impossible for the new RFC to make the necessary loans to existing or new private enterprisers, then it is authorized to offer to make such loans to State governments.

In accordance with this provision, for example, my own State of Texas could obtain the funds for locating in east Texas those industrial enterprises that are so badly needed, yet which have failed to provide.

The decline in the dignity and power of the State governments has not been by any means an accidental factor. The subversion of many State governments by powerful vested interests in the years immediately following the War Between the States was as much responsible as anything for their weakening. It became obvious then, for example, that an individual State government could not hold its own with a powerful railroad monopoly, which might have an income and resources greater than that of the State itself.

Such conditions led to the demand for national controls that inevitably weakened the power of the States. This trend was upheld in many decisions of the Supreme Court during that period. Now, however, an opposite trend has set in.

For several years the present Court has quietly, persistently been upholding the rights and powers of the State governments against the demands of these powerful interstate corporations. Only recently, in an opinion read by Associate Justice Black, the Court upheld the right of State legislatures to adopt laws prohibiting the closed shop. The Court did not endorse the wisdom of such laws, but nevertheless the decision was one more stone in the legal structure of new power and dignity for the State governments.

This line of decisions cannot but have the result of renewing the health and vigor of our Federal system, that unique experiment in government.

USE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO ASSIST STATES

In such a context it is more than ever desirable that we use the power of the Central Government to assist the States in economic affairs. Just as the Congress has adopted legislation providing Federal funds for improvement of education, for building roads, providing rural electrification, and for a variety of purposes, so the Central Government should afford the funds for necessary industrialization that cannot be achieved in any other way.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FURCOLO and Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in one to include an editorial from the Detroit Free Press and in the other an editorial from the New York Journal.

Mr. POTTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address delivered by his colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in one an article by Dr. Conant, president of Harvard University.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and two articles which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a story by the Associated Press appearing in the Washington Post on the new United Mine Workers hospital and medical service program.

Mr. GRANT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in one a statement by Mr. Wayne C. Grover.

Mr. WELCH of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the St. Joseph News-Press.

Mrs. DOUGLAS asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include certain extraneous matter.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a statement containing the approved budget estimates for the fiscal year 1950 for rivers and harbors and flood-control projects which will be the subject for hearings before my subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations within the near future.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, the President's message containing requests for funds to run the business of the Government for the coming fiscal year will be presented today. There is great interest in the civil functions program and in order that interested parties may be promptly and correctly informed as to the amounts approved for rivers and harbors and flood-control projects I have obtained a break-down of such projects, State by State, and wish to have it placed in the RECORD following these remarks.

It will be noted that the budget approved amounts are in excess of the funds appropriated for the present fiscal year, and this is readily understandable. During the period of World War II projects such as these were stopped. Since the end of the war many large projects requiring a number of years to build have been started and are now at the period of construction requiring the greatest outlay of expenditure. It would be inefficient and expensive to the Government to curtail appropriations for these large projects at this time for the reason that it would prolong the construction time, prevent the work from going forward at an economical rate, and would delay to the Nation the benefits of the completed project. These projects have all been authorized, have had rather sizable sums expended on them, and there is no question that they are to be completed. Under such circumstances it is only feasible that the work should progress at a rate that will give the greatest value for the funds expended.

For the present fiscal year there was appropriated for rivers and harbors and flood-control projects the sum of $507,480,200, of which $166,989,100 was for rivers and harbors, and $340,491,100 for flood-control projects. The information I am now presenting shows budget approval for fiscal year 1950 in the amount of $659,461,700, of which $229,174,100 is for rivers and harbors and $430,287,600 for flood control; an increase in the request over the present fiscal year's appropriation of $151,981,500. While these amounts are large, it is to the credit of the program that all these expenditures will be made within the boundaries of the United States and the benefits therefrom will flow directly to all our people.

Approved budget estimates, rivers and harbors, fiscal year 1950

NEW WORK—CONSTRUCTION

State and project	*Approved budget amount*
Alabama:	
Demopolis lock and dam, Warrior system, Mobile to Birmingham	$1,200,000
Alaska:	
Nome Harbor	1,020,000
Wrangell Narrows	500,000
California:	
Crescent City Harbor	700,000
San Diego River and Mission Bay	3,000,000
Sacramento River Deep Water Channel	2,000,000
Connecticut: New Haven Harbor	300,000
District of Columbia: Potomac River, north side of Washington Channel	475,700
Florida:	
Jim Woodruff lock and dam (part of Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, and Flint River system) Fla. and Ga	8,900,000
The Intracoastal Water ay, Tributary Channel, Okeechobee waterway	350,000
St. Andrew Bay	136,000
St. Johns River, Jacksonville to the ocean	1,200,000
Tampa Harbor	617,700
Georgia	
Jim Woodruff lock and dam. (See Florida.)	
Savannah Harbor	533,000
Illinois:	
Illinois waterway, Ill. (excluding Calumet-Sag modification)	300,000
Chain of Rocks (part of Mississippi River between the Ohio and Missouri Rivers), Ill. and Mo	12,000,000
Mississippi River between the Ohio and Missouri Rivers (excluding Chain of Rocks improvement), Ill. and Mo	1,000,000
Mississippi River between the Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn., Ill., Wis., Iowa, Mo. (excluding St. Anthony Falls)	1,000,000
Iowa:	
Mississippi River between the Missouri River and Minneapolis. (See Illinois.)	
Missouri River, Kansas City to Sioux City	4,000,000
Kentucky:	
Cheatham lock and dam, Cumberland River, Ky., and Tenn	2,000,000
Ohio River (open channel work), Ky., Ohio, W. Va	300,000
Louisiana:	
Calcasieu River and Pass	995,000
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway between Apalachee Bay, Fla., and the Mexican border (New Orleans district)	3,500,000
Pearl River, La. and Miss	1,500,000
Waterway from Empire, La., to the Gulf of Mexico, La	588,000
Maine: Portland Harbor	800,000
Maryland: Baltimore Harbor and channels	800,000
Massachusetts:	
Boston Harbor	500,000
Fall River Harbor	1,050,000
Michigan: St. Marys River	3,000,000
Minnesota:	
Mississippi River, between the Missouri River and Minneapolis. (See Illinois.)	
St. Anthony Falls	$3,500,000
Two Harbors (Agate Bay)	1,250,000
Mississippi: Pearl River. (See Louisiana.)	
Missouri:	
Chain of Rocks. (See Illinois.)	
Mississippi River, between the Ohio and Missouri Rivers. (See Illinois.)	
Mississippi River, between the Missouri River and Minneapolis. (See Illinois.)	
Missouri River, Kansas City to mouth	2,500,000
Montana:	
Fort Peck Dam, Missouri River	3,400,000
New Jersey:	
Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers	1,000,000
New York and New Jersey Channels	1,500,000
New York:	
Buffalo Harbor	800,000
Hudson River	100,000
Hudson River Channel	450,000
New York and New Jersey Channels. (See New Jersey.)	
New York Harbor, entrance channels and anchorage areas	600,000
Ohio:	
Cleveland Harbor	2,000,000
Ohio River, open channel work. (See Kentucky.)	
Oregon:	
Bonneville lock and dam, Columbia River, Oreg. and Wash	1,500,000
Columbia and Lower Willamette Rivers below Vancouver, Wash., and Portland, Oreg	161,800
Coos Bay, Oreg	1,000,000
McNary lock and dam, Columbia River, Oreg. and Wash	40,000,000
Yaquina Bay and bar	35,000
Pennsylvania:	
Reconstruction locks 2, Monongahela River, Pa	4,500,000
Schuylkill River above Fairmount Dam	500,000
Rhode Island:	
Providence River and Harbor	210,000
South Carolina:	
Winyah Bay	508,200
Tennessee:	
Cheatham lock and dam. (See Kentucky.)	
Texas:	
Galveston Harbor	200,000
Houston ship channel	1,000,000
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway between Apalachee Bay, Fla., and the Mexican border (Galveston district)	700,000
Sabine-Neches waterway	1,000,000
Trinity River, channel to Liberty	1,000,000
Virginia:	
Norfolk Harbor (exclusive of spoil disposal area)	500,000
York Spit Channel	500,000
Washington:	
Bonneville lock and dam. (See Oregon.)	
Chief Joseph Dam	5,000,000
Grays Harbor and Chehalis River	800,000
Ice Harbor lock and dam, Washington, part of project for Snake River, Oreg., Wash., and Idaho	12,000,000

State and project	*Approved budget amount*
Washington—Continued	
McNary lock and dam. (See Oregon.)	
West Virginia:	
Morgantown lock and dam, Monongahela River	$3,953,700
Ohio River, open channel work. (See Kentucky.)	
Wisconsin:	
Mississippi River between the Missouri River and Minneapolis. (See Illinois.)	
Total, river and harbor construction	144,934,100

Approved budget estimates, flood control, general, fiscal year 1950

NEW WORK CONSTRUCTION

State and project	*Approved budget amount*
Arkansas:	
Bayou Bodcau Reservoir, Ark. and La. (See Louisiana.)	$3,000,000
Blakely Mountain Reservoir	48,000
Blue Mountain Reservoir	16,500,000
Bull Shoals Reservoir, Ark. and Mo	300,000
Carden's Bottom drainage district No. 2	106,000
Conway County levee districts Nos. 1, 2, and 8	11,000
Conway County levee district No. 6	319,500
Crawford County levee district	370,000
Little Rock to Pine Bluff	4,650,000
Narrows Reservoir	80,000
Nimrod Reservoir	1,000,000
Norfork Reservoir, Ark. and Mo	700,000
Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., Tex., and La	2,000,000
West of Morrilton	3,500,000
California:	3,000,000
Cherry Valley Reservoir	700,000
Farmington Reservoir	2,000,000
Folsom Reservoir	3,500,000
Isabella Reservoir	3,000,000
Los Angeles County drainage area	7,500,000
Merced County stream group	200,000
Pine Flat Reservoir	8,600,000
Sacramento River and tributaries	800,000
Whittier Narrows Reservoir	5,000,000
Colorado:	
Cherry Creek Reservoir	1,026,000
John Martin Reservoir	110,000
Connecticut:	
Hartford	76,000
Norwich	320,000
Florida:	
Central and southern Florida	1,000,000
Georgia:	
Allatoona Reservoir	7,148,700
Clark Hill Reservoir, Ga. and S. C	14,500,000
Macon	265,000
Idaho:	
Heise-Roberts area	277,500
Lucky Peak Reservoir	3,500,000
Illinois:	
Coal Creek drainage and levee district	607,100
Columbia drainage and levee district	500,000
East St. Louis and vicinity	700,000
Farm Creek Reservoirs	2,500,000
Grand Tower drainage and levee district	900,000
Mounds and Mound City	500,000
Prairie du Rocher and vicinity	900,000
Preston drainage and levee district	227,000
Reevesville	111,000
Rosiclare	300,000
Wood River drainage and levee district	500,000
Indiana:	
Cagles Mill Reservoir	$2,900,000
Cannelton	900,000
Delphi	67,000
Indianapolis (Fall Creek section)	908,400
New Albany	2,000,000
Iowa:	
Chariton River, Iowa and Mo. (See Missouri)	
Coralville Reservoir	3,300,000
Dry Run	395,900
Little Sioux River	500,000
Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, and Missouri. (See Kansas.)	
Missouri River, Sioux City, Iowa, to Kensiers Bend, Nebr. (See Nebraska.)	
Red Rock Reservoir	2,500,000
Kansas:	
Fall River Reservoir	277,500
Hulah Reservoir, Okla. and Kans. (See Oklahoma.)	
Kanopolis Reservoir	242,000
Kansas Citys, Mo. and Kans	5,700,000
Missouri River agricultural levees, Kansas, Iowa, Nebraska, and Missouri	8,000,000
Kentucky:	
Ashland	1,000,000
Covington	1,400,000
Dale Hollow Reservoir, Tenn. and Ky. (See Tennessee.)	
Dewey Reservoir	1,030,800
Hawesville	758,100
Louisville	5,500,000
Maysville	1,000,000
Newport	2,733,000
Taylorsville	50,000
Uniontown	130,000
Wolf Creek Reservoir	20,200,000
Louisiana:	
Aloha-Rigolette area	549,600
Bayou Bodcau Reservoir, Ark. and La	404,000
Jonesville	114,000
Lake Pontchartrain	600,000
Mermentau River	1,807,000
Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., Tex., and La. (See Arkansas.)	
Shreveport	375,000
Maryland:	
Cumberland, Md., and Ridgeley, W. Va	1,000,000
Savage River Reservoir	1,700,000
Massachusetts:	
Birch Hill Reservoir	46,000
Holyoke	264,400
Riverdale	517,000
Tully Reservoir	141,000
Michigan: Mount Clemens	302,000
Minnesota:	
Red Lake and Clearwater Rivers	1,500,000
Red River of the North, S. Dak., N. Dak., and Minn	1,000,000
Missouri:	
Bull Shoals Reservoir, Ark. and Mo. (See Arkansas.)	
Chariton River, Mo. and Iowa	445,000
Clearwater Reservoir	60,000
East Poplar Bluff and Poplar Bluff	92,100
Kansas Citys, Mo. and Kans. (See Kansas.)	
Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, and Missouri. (See Kansas.)	
Norfork Reservoir, Ark. and Mo. (See Arkansas.)	
Perry County levee districts Nos, 1, 2, and 3	1,000,000
Nebraska:	
Harlan County Reservoir	$12,500,000
Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, and Missouri. (See Kansas.)	
Missouri River, Sioux City, Iowa, to Kensler's Bend, Nebr	422,000
Omaha	1,700,000
New Hampshire: West Peterboro Reservoir	871,800
New Mexico: Conchas Reservoir	35,000
New York:	
Almond Reservoir	218,800
Arkport Reservoir	32,000
East Sidney Reservoir	897,700
Elmira	1,628,000
Mount Morris Reservoir	6,500,000
Olean	1,000,000
Portville	700,000
Syracuse	670,000
Whitney Point Reservoir	321,400
North Carolina:	
Buggs Island Reservoir, Va. and N. C	16,500,000
North Dakota:	
Baldhill Reservoir	235,800
Garrison Reservoir	31,000,000
Homme Reservoir	527,100
Mandan	40,000
Oahe, S. Dak. and N. Dak. (See South Dakota.)	
Red River of the North, S. Dak. and Minn. (See Minnesota.)	
Ohio:	
Big Walnut Creek Reservoir	1,800,000
Burr Oak Reservoir	1,295,600
Delaware Reservoir	999,400
Dillon Reservoir	1,717,000
Ironton	250,000
Massillon	2,133,700
Muskingum River Reservoirs	1,800,000
West Fork of Mill Creek Reservoir	1,400,000
Oklahoma:	
Canton Reservoir	183,100
Denison Reservoir, Tex. and Okla	300,000
Fort Gibson Reservoir	14,000,000
Fort Supply Reservoir	116,500
Great Salt Plains Reservoir	31,000
Hulah Reservoir, Okla. and Kans	4,748,000
Polecat Creek	1,000,000
Tenkiller Ferry Reservoir	6,146,000
Wister Reservoir	77,500
Oregon:	
Cottage Grove Reservoir	140,000
Detroit Reservoir	11,300,000
Dorena Reservoir	2,924,000
Fern Ridge Reservoir	208,000
Lookout Point Reservoir	11,000,000
Milton-Freewater	710,700
Willamette River (bank protection)	500,000
Pennsylvania:	
Conemaugh River Reservoir	8,500,000
East Branch Clarion River Reservoir	2,500,000
Punxsutawney	810,000
Sunbury	2,000,000
Wilkes-Barre-Hanover Township	380,000
Williamsport	2,110,000
South Carolina:	
Clark Hill Reservoir, Ga. and S. C. (See Georgia.)	
South Dakota:	
Fall River Basin	500,000
Fort Randall Reservoir	25,500,000
Missouri River, Sioux City, Iowa, to Kensler's Bend, Nebr. (See Nebraska.)	
Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak	2,000,000
Red River of the North, S. Dak., N. Dak., and Minn. (See Minnesota.)	

State and project	*Approved budget amount*
Tennessee:	
Center Hill Reservoir	$7,000,000
Dale Hollow Reservoir, Tenn. and Ky	631,000
Memphis, Wolf River and Nonconnah Creek	400,000
Texas:	
Belton Reservoir	2,000,000
Benbrook Reservoir	4,000,000
Brady	1,320,000
Denison Reservoir, Tex. and Okla. (See Oklahoma.)	
Garza-Little Elm Reservoir	3,000,000
Grapevine Reservoir	4,000,000
Lavon Reservoir	3,500,000
Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., Tex., and La. (See Arkansas.)	
San Angelo Reservoir and Floodway	4,800,000
Texarkana Reservoir	6,000,000
Whitney Reservoir	14,000,000
Vermont: Union Village Reservoir	601,000
Virginia:	
Buggs Island Reservoir, Va. and N. C. (See North Carolina.)	
Philpott Reservoir	2,800,000
Washington:	
Mill Creek	365,000
Mud Mountain Reservoir	464,000
Tacoma, Puyallup River	571,600
West Virginia:	
Bluestone Reservoir	1,562,200
Cumberland, Md., and Ridgeley, W. Va. (See Maryland.)	
Parkersburg	1,396,900
Point Pleasant	1,648,000
Total, flood control, general construction	412,502,600

A FANTASTIC STORY IN STEEL

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, a week ago today the President in his message on the state of the Union spoke of the shortage of steel in this country and suggested that unless it can be remedied the finances of the Federal Government might even be employed in the erection of steel plants.

On the Friday following troops toward whose pay we are contributing, troops that we are feeding, in the Essen section of Germany, were called out to prevent the workers there from interfering with the demolition of one of the largest steel plants in the Ruhr.

It just does not make sense for the United States to contribute to the destruction of steel plants there and then call upon the taxpayers here to ship steel to western Germany and the other nations of western Europe, thus creating a steel shortage in this country, and then propose to remedy this shortage by using money from the taxpayers to build new plants here.

The simple facts in this whole situation are fantastic.

We pretend to be rebuilding western Europe, and yet we tear down a plant which can produce what western Europe needs, and use troops to do it, troops and workmen whom we feed.

At the same time we ship steel and semifinished steel from the United States to supply the needs of western Europe. And that makes a shortage at home, a shortage in scrap, and a shortage in ore, and a shortage in steel. And that creates a crisis, the President says, which may call for direct appropriations and Government construction of steel plants.

In Germany there are millions and millions of tons of scrap. There are plenty of workers. They should be producing steel. But we feed them to tear down the plants; we pay out our dollars to carry out the dismantling program and defeat our announced objectives.

A year ago, Mr. Speaker, more than a year ago now, the subcommittee of the Select Committee on Foreign Aid, the subcommittee of which I had the honor to be chairman, spent over a month in Germany. One of our major recommendations was that this dismantling program be suspended.

I introduced two resolutions to give effect to that recommendation. One of them, a resolution of inquiry, the House passed. The investigation that followed developed the fact that a large number of the plants scheduled for dismantling could contribute to European recovery if allowed to continue.

But the story of the past few days is a tragic commentary on what is going on.

Dollars to tear down steel plants in Europe. Dollars to send over the steel of an intensified shortage there. Dollars to build more plants here to make up the shortage created here.

Unless our senses and mental processes are completely deadened, this kind of business should stop.

AMENDMENT OF HOUSE RULES

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, last Friday the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] addressed the House to explain the effect of the resolution he rushed through the House to amend the rules. He very frankly stated that he took the floor for correcting an erroneous impression of many, including some Members themselves, as to the meaning and effect of the resolution.

Let me say to the majority leader that no explanation would have been necessary had his side of the aisle permitted debate on the resolution. As soon as the resolution was read by the Clerk on the opening day of the session, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] moved the previous question, and the entire membership of the House was thereby obliged to vote on the subject without any discussion whatsoever.

If this is the type of procedure the majority intends to follow in this Congress, I fear that the distinguished majority leader will be constrained to take the floor on many occasions to explain later what action they forced through the House.

PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYEES OF CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes or less.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, in 1946 we passed the Reorganization Act. It provided as you know for the employment of professionals on the various committees. Section 202, subdivision G, of that act provides that if those professionals are let go by a committee they cannot be reemployed in any department of the Government, that is, in the executive department. I have this day introduced a bill to remove that injustice by permitting those men who are removed without cause to seek employment, if they so desire, in the executive department.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am rather well acquainted with that matter. It has brought about an unintentional injustice. I agree with the gentleman that certainly staff employees of the committees should not be penalized that way. If a bill is reported out I assure the gentleman that I shall program it as quickly as possible.

Mr. REED of New York. I am very thankful for the gentleman's statement and for whatever help he can give in this matter. It is working a tremendous injustice. Many of these men were employed and had no knowledge of that provision. They expected that their work would continue, that they would become experts, and become more valuable to the Government as time passed. Now they are out. They cannot support their families without work. If they seek employment in private industry, private industry will misconstrue the act of the committees in letting them go, and say that there must have been something wrong with them, otherwise they would have been retained on the professional staff.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

THE WATCH-MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to your attention the fact that the Reciprocal Trade Act allows the Swiss Government to enter into agreements with the United States to sell watches at half the price that we can in Waltham. The question that comes to my mind is whether we are less important than the Swiss. I do not have to tell you about the Swiss people. They are neutrals. They have always been neutral and we do not want to find any fault with them. But, Mr. Speaker, when a company that has been in business for 100 years; a company that built

machines during the war to help run our airplanes, is in bankruptcy and nobody will lend them any money, I wonder if that is a fair situation. We listened here today to a recital of the amount of money that we have to spend for people here and people there and people everywhere. For goodness' sake, Mr. Speaker, let us do something for the people of this country who want to work.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include newspaper articles.

REPORT TO THE FOLKS BACK HOME

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, events of the past few weeks have convinced me that this and future periodic reports are necessary.

Paid propagandists, employed for a specific purpose, have done their job well.

They have found willing servants to carry their thought-control program.

Some of their twisted and half-truth statements have been transmitted from mouth to ear by a whispering campaign. Other misguided stooges have carried their false pamphlets from house to house. These lying juvenile cartoons made their appearance in the closing days of the campaign; too late for the truth to be told.

Now it is the privilege of a majority of the voters in my congressional district to remove me from office whenever they choose; either with or without a reason. However, I do not intend to stand by and permit certain unscrupulous individuals to deliberately misrepresent my voting record. Therefore at various intervals I intend to submit a report from the record of how I voted.

I am confident that the vast majority of my people are intelligent and if given the facts will be able to decide for themselves. This is impossible when they are being fed false and many times vicious propaganda deliberately planned to confuse the issue.

Let me be specific, Mr. Speaker, and show you just what I mean. In the closing days of the recent campaign, cartoons appeared in my district which said in part:

> Your Congressman voted against veterans' housing, school lunch, land reclamation, minimum wage, rural electrification, soil conservation, small business, labor.

Let us look at the public record regarding my vote on the above-named issues.

It shows that I voted for each and every piece of legislation which was offered to honestly help the veterans and their dependents. It also shows that I tried to have World War I veterans granted a pension on a par with Spanish-American War veterans. One hundred and eighty-eight separate pieces of legislation were passed to aid the veterans and their dependents and I voted for all of them.

The Federal Government made a complete failure in trying to get homes for veterans. Instead of getting better homes at less cost, Government interference boosted the cost of construction by 30 percent. Their plan, if it had succeeded, would have taken already scarce material and labor from veterans' housing projects and started clearing city slums. I am in favor of slum clearance but I am not in favor of denying houses to our veterans at the expense of providing housing for slum clearance. Slum clearance will make a worthy project if and when all veterans are housed and material and labor more plentiful.

The record also shows that I voted for all amendments which provided additional money to be used for rural electrification, school-lunch program, land reclamation, and soil conservation. Various farm organizations will verify the fact that I am on record as favoring and voting for their program 100 percent, and yet the scandal sheets which were circulated list me as voting against the farmer.

The record further discloses that an increase in the minimum-wage law never even reached Congress for a vote. I was not even a member of the subcommittee of the Education and Labor Committee which held hearings on this important measure.

I have letters from the National Small Business Committee, veterans' organizations, many locals of organized labor, the National Milk Producers Co-op, and many other groups thanking me for the help which I gave them and pledging me their full support. These endorsements would not have been given if I had been against their organization.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the public record is replete with evidence which proves that this last-minute propaganda literature was filled with lies and half truths.

Therefore, I repeat that during this Eighty-first Congress I intend to submit periodic factual reports in order that those whom I represent may get the truth mixed in with the propaganda which will be offered them during the next 2 years.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois (at the request of Mr. REED of Illinois) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of pensions for World War veterans.

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include a letter on statehood for Hawaii and a speech on the treatment of leprosy.

THE STEEL INDUSTRY

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the statement made by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] on the matter of building steel mills and producing steel I want to state that we have in this country an annual steel capacity of about 95,000,000 tons. During the past year, I understand, that on account of strikes the production was cut approximately 22,000,000 tons.

In this formula which has been advocated by the President, I ask the question, "What tolerance is to be allowed between the productive capacity of the steel mills and the amount that will not be produced as a result of strikes in arriving at the necessity for the building of steel mills by the Federal Government?"

Suppose strikes cut production 50,000,000 tons, then it might be shown that the Federal Government should go in and build steel mills to supplement the production which did not appear by reason of strikes. I call your attention to this matter at this time because of what the President has said and in connection with what the gentleman from South Dakota pointed out as to what is taking place in Germany.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Bristol Courier of Saturday, January 8, In a Nation Rich as Ours.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. CELLER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement.

STEEL PRODUCTION

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, it had not been my intention to take up the time of the House, but when the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] said that 22,000,000 tons of steel were not produced because of strikes, I must challenge that statement. As far as I can remember, there was not any major strike at all last year in the steel industry. I think the steel industry produced at least 90 percent of capacity during the entire 52 weeks. In fact, I think their capacity now is running about 96,000,000 tons a year. I therefore felt called upon, coming from the greatest steel-producing city in the world, the city of Pittsburgh, to challenge the gentleman's statement. If the gentleman from Michigan has any reliable figures showing that we did lose 22,000,000 tons by reason of strikes, I think the gentleman should produce those figures for the record, because it is an indirect attack on the working men and women who are producing steel in this country.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] has expired.

THE LATE GEORGE HERON MILNE

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, the Congress lost one of its oldest and most useful servants when on October 25, 1948, death ended the long and useful career of George Heron Milne, custodian of the congressional reading room in the Library of Congress. The number of Members he personally assisted in the 31 years of his service in that position must almost equal the number who have served in the Congress during that time. The variety and the effect of the research which he performed for Members and their families in those years was enormous. Hundreds of men, now or in the past, in the Congress will recall the patience, the courtesy, and the skilled intelligence which he brought to bear on their requests for information. No matter what the urgency or impatience of the demands of a Member, he never volunteered that other Members already were equally urgently and impatiently demanding his time. His quiet telephone voice has been well known to virtually every Member of the Congress and certainly to every secretary on Capitol Hill.

George Heron Milne was born to Alexander and Isabella Metcalfe Milne on July 3, 1887, in Washington. From 1902 until 1905 he was a member of the staff of the Evening Star and from 1906 until 1909 he worked in a Washington business firm. In November 1909 he was appointed as a messenger in the reading room of the Library of Congress. Soon he was promoted from messenger to stack attendant. In 1911, the then superintendent of the reading room wrote to the Chief Clerk:

> I have placed Mr. Milne on deck 7, which is admittedly the most difficult deck in the Library to keep in order. He has shown exceptional ability and industry in his previous service and has studied outside of the Library with marked success since he has been with us. I regard him as the best suited person of his present salary for this promotion.

In the many years of his subsequent service, commendations were to come often and enthusiastically for George Milne. Toward the close of his service the Director of the Legislative Reference Service, in commenting on Mr. Milne's efficiency report, wrote:

> Mr. Milne is almost ideal as custodian of the congressional reading room. He makes the problems of Members of Congress his own and gives them the kind of superservice that they greatly appreciate. He does extremely well in training new staff members, he has cooperated fully * * * in working with the rest of the Legislative Reference Service * * * his spirit and devotion to his work are almost too much and are sometimes carried to the detriment of his health.

Mr. Milne was assigned to the Library station in the Capitol in 1910 and after a year's service there was transferred back to the main Library, where he secured further experience in public reference work in the main reading room. He went to the congressional reading room in 1917 and from that date until 1 week before his death, when he was stricken with a heart attack, George Milne, day and night, year in and year out, served the Congress with a devotion, a vigor, and a technical skill which has seldom been equaled. A gentle man, quiet, unassuming, and patient, even with all his vast and heterogeneous store of knowledge, his simple dignity and quiet character secured and maintained the affectionate esteem of the Members of the Congress. Whatever their political loyalty or intellectual interest, he was completely at their command.

Mr. Milne was married on May 30, 1917, to Eila Lower. In his private life he accumulated a distinguished collection of contemporary first editions and for many years served as the librarian of the Cosmos Club. In announcing Mr. Milne's death to the staff of the Library, the Librarian stated:

> His self-sacrificing concern with his duties exemplified the highest type of public service.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

MEMBERSHIP OF APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 43) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That, during the Eighty-first Congress, the Committee on Appropriations shall be composed of 45 members.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE LATE GEORGE F. JOHNSON

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I take this time today to eulogize one of the greatest Americans that ever lived. On November 28 last 150,000 people in the Triple Cities of Binghamton, Johnson City, and Endicott, N. Y., mourned and grieved at a dispatch which came to them in the papers of that locality and which was flashed over wire and radio to the world. The report read:

> Mr. George F. Johnson, world-renowned industrialist and humanitarian, Triple Cities pioneer, cofounder and chairman of the board of the Endicott-Johnson Corp., the largest shoe manufacturer in the world, died November 28 at his home. Although he had been in ill health for some time, his death was a great shock to the citizens of the Triple Cities, who always had the highest admiration and affection for the man who contributed immeasurably to the growth and prosperity of this area and who had described this section of New York State as the valley of opportunity.

Were this man just another employer, just another labor leader, I would not take the floor at this time to eulogize his life. The fact remains, however, that this was a man who was 50 years ahead of his time in labor relations, a man who believed in decent treatment of the working people of his factories as far back as 1881, when he was a foreman in the first shoe company in the city of Binghamton, N. Y. That was when many employers were looked upon as those who cracked the seven-tailed whip over their workers' backs.

Born of a fine New England family, George F. Johnson had a normal boyhood, participating in sports and studies with diligence. He took off his coat and in his shirt sleeves went into a shoe factory and worked his way from the bench up, making one of the most remarkable careers of advancement that has ever been known in American industry. He was born in Milford, Mass. He came to New York State, to Binghamton, in 1881, and for 66 years worked there and extolled the principle of the Golden Rule, which the industrial life of America can well emulate.

After assuming control of the Endicott-Johnson Corp. he immediately set about improving workers' conditions by doing the things which every employer in America should do today. Fifty years ago his conception of friendly relationships with the worker brought about a program of home building for workers who desired to have homes; and I may say that the 20,000 people who make up the personnel of the largest shoe corporation in the world constitute one of the happiest working groups the country has ever known. They are well satisfied with the home-building program which George F. Johnson brought to the valley of opportunity. As a testimonial of the admiration and devotion of the workers to this man they erected many years ago at the gateways to what they called the Square Deal Towns arches in tribute to his work and to his enlightened contact with his workers. I have spoken of the home-building program which he inaugurated 50 years ago. This has paid big dividends to all concerned. Every worker in the Endicott-Johnson Corp. has the chance of acquiring his own home, of having it built and financed with company assistance, the payments so spread out that he can afford to buy the home, become owner of it and be a forceful and respected citizen in his community.

Another program that George F. Johnson instituted, which was pioneering in labor relationships throughout the country, was the medical program that the Endicott-Johnson Corp. instituted. This has worked out admirably well for its workers. Every worker has free medical attention, every worker has the privilege of going to the medical clinic run by Endicott-Johnson and receiving for himself and his family adequate medical care. If any of his children are ill, he knows he can go to these clinics and get the attention they ought to have. I tell you that is a marvelous thing and is more satisfying than the relations most American industries generally have with their workers. It shows the desire on the part of this employer to do everything he could for the people who worked for him.

The good will which has been built up can be attested in an exhortation George F. Johnson has always had over

his roll-top desk, situated in a plain office without elaborate ornaments, and without an air of sophistication. It is taken from the Book of Galatians:

> And let us not be weary in welldoing: for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not.

Mr. George F. Johnson always emulated it during his lifetime.

In final tribute to him there was held one of the largest funerals ever to take place in America. This took place in Endicott, N. Y., when thousands and thousands of workers turned out to pay him homage for a great life and a good work well done. Those workers, 18,000 strong, were designated as Mr. Johnson's honorary pallbearers and they functioned at that funeral in one of the most impressive tributes paid any man on this continent.

Let me read to you, if I may, the words of George F. Johnson summing up his responsibility to the people who worked for him during the 50 years that he was head of Endicott-Johnson:

> If I have the right angle on life, he who receives much must give much. It does not matter whether it is much of power, much of wealth, much of influence or any other good thing. You must give much of all these things if you receive them—else you fall far short of your duty and your responsibility.

Further, he said:

> In cooperation with labor, large industries should provide homes needed by workers on a fair basis of interest charges, and sold at cost, with no profit.
>
> They should, if possible, operate a full and complete medical department to take care of the health of workers and dependent members of their families. Thus cooperative medicine will be furnished them for half the cost if bought in open market. All these things are vitally important.

Then he goes on to say, and I think this is significant for everybody in our free-enterprise system to grasp:

> My conception of the true relationship of labor and capital is for each industry—honestly capitalized, honestly organized, and economically conducted—to pay its labor as much as possible with a due regard for the rights of the investing and consuming public.
>
> This would bring into control and for distribution an immense amount of capital now squandered by management in useless overhead, taking from labor and the consuming public both what fairly belongs to them, which, if given to them, would change the whole appearance of the picture as between labor and capital.

That was the principle by which George F. Johnson regarded the workers of the Endicott-Johnson Corp. When I was a boy I can well remember playing in the public playgrounds which George F. Johnson built for the Endicott-Johnson workers throughout the Triple Cities—and there are a half dozen of them. He was very much concerned about the future of the youth of America. He was apprehensive over the dangers which might come to those young people who did not have proper recreational facilities. The playgrounds which have been built by George F. Johnson stand as a monument of what can be done with good relationships in the free-enterprise system as regards the working people of America. There is not a single person in the Endicott-Johnson Corp.—and there are over 20,800 of them—who does not love the memory of this great man.

> And let us not be weary in welldoing: for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not.

That Biblical observation which has inspired many was constantly before him, and caused him to create and to establish the most humane, the most satisfactory labor relationships that have been known in this country of ours.

I am happy to take the floor at this time to pay my tribute to this outstanding American to one who worked from the bench up and built, from first-hand knowledge, a shoe business which became the largest in the world. E.-J. turns out in times of peace vital necessities for the American public and also takes care, as was so greatly demonstrated in World Wars I and II, of the needs in our military footwear. This great organization has been one of service not only to its community but to its country.

I might go a little further in labor relationships, since they seem to be some of the most pressing and some of the most timely subjects of discussion of the hour. This Congress is going to be called upon to make many momentous decisions in the relationships between management and labor. I can point with pride to the magnificent American spirit existing in the Triple Cities: while they come from every nationality, the workers are free from intolerance; they possess the fundamental qualifications which go to make up citizenship in this land you and I so dearly love.

George F. Johnson, among the many things he accomplished for social betterment, was able to establish these playfields, playgrounds, these hospital facilities, this free medical care, which every worker in the country should have a chance to enjoy, at least a quarter of a century before anything was ever done about it by most other enterprises in the United States. It is comforting that a forward-looking individual, one man, should have brought happiness to so many people and thus earned the respect and admiration of the citizens of Binghamton, Johnson City, Endicott, and that section of New York State. The home-building program he instituted offers to every worker the chance to be a king, to gain ownership of the home he lives in.

Suffice it to say that he had a heart, and he realized that if he were to have real progress in the factories of which he was head he would have to treat the workers squarely, because, after all, the workers are the ones upon whose good will the progress of any factory or plant depends. So the home-building program, the recreational pursuits, and the institutions of aid he provided are testimony to the friendliness and the desire to help the individual worker that George F. Johnson had and which he labored so earnestly to carry out.

Oh, it was not all easy going. He met many obstacles in his way. He met obstacles from reactionary forces that were not so generous and willing to be solicitous of working men and women. Those forces tended to work against the humanitarian program which George F. Johnson put into effect 50 years ahead of the majority of other employers in America. They tended to work against some of the forthright principles in which he believed with respect to the problems between management and labor. They tended to barricade and obstruct some of the friendly relationships which he was so desirous of creating among those who worked with him.

As I have said, the best testimony any person could have of the appreciation he received during his lifetime was the spontaneous receptions he was given, for instance, on his homecoming, when he had been away attempting to improve relationships in other, less fortunate sections of the country.

I can remember one time, after he had been on a long tour which took him throughout the length and breadth of America in an effort to promote fair free enterprise and achieve better industrial relationships, when 100,000 people turned out to greet him at the train. As the bands played and as his praises were sung by untold thousands, he went his way to his unpretentious office. Plain as it is, it is still the office from which come the policies of a company throbbing with the vitality of 20,800 people who are satisfied with the high standard of living they enjoy in the Triple Cities area.

Countless thousands turned out in 1931 en masse to greet George F. Johnson when he came home. The same was true in 1935, when he returned from a similar trip, and on many other occasions.

Those were not organized group meetings and get-togethers. They were inspired meetings, where citizens of all races and religions came to give recognition and to lend their enthusiasm and affection to welcome a great man.

Equally inspired, I take the floor today, filled with pride and imbued with enthusiasm to sing the praises of an American entrepreneur who realized that his lasting friendship with the people who worked for him was based upon the principle of the Golden Rule, to do unto others as you would have them do unto you. He realized the meaning of that exhortation in the Book of Galatians to "be not weary in welldoing: for in due time we shall reap, if we faint not." The deeds that he did, brought about a higher living standard and brought much happiness to so many men and women. Those deeds were not in vain because they helped people throughout the length and breadth of the land. They brought to America satisfactory relations between labor and management.

I say at this time that America can well pause to pay tribute to this great man in recognition of that wonderful program of good will and fellowship and fraternity which he brought forth in the Square Deal towns, as the Triple Cities are called. Mr. Johnson will forever be an inspiration to every person who hopes good will in America and constitutional government will survive in this country. He will forever be a hope that the American form of representative government, the greatest form of government in the world today, will continue to bring forth those blessings of liberty which the Americans of my district and the Americans of your district realize are the only proper foundation of an orderly society. Because of Mr. Johnson's good works,

men and women of all races and religions can join together for the common good to build a strong and greater country for generations yet unborn. This man George F. Johnson is the personification and the apotheosis of good relations between management and labor. Yes, this message is spasmodic. I take the floor moved by the genuine accomplishments of this man, just as 18,000 workers responded as honorary pallbearers at a funeral last month which has scarcely had its parallel in expressing respect to any man on the American scene since our country first came into being.

The employer who emulates George F. Johnson will have little difficulty with labor. The employer who institutes free medical care to give every worker a chance to send members of his family to the hospital when the worker cannot pay a doctor bill, when the worker cannot pay the bill for maternity care, when he cannot pay for an operation for his wife, child, or any other member of his family, when even the life of members of his family may be at stake, will have little difficulty with labor.

The American employer should emulate George F. Johnson in instituting a program of over-all medical attention, of hospital care; of giving the worker an opportunity to own his own home on reasonable terms. He gives the worker a chance to enjoy recreational facilities; to go on Sunday afternoons to the playgrounds, where he and his wife and children can enjoy relaxation. This privilege is not known to some sections of the country.

The employer in this country must take into consideration the program which George F. Johnson gave to his workers, the public dance halls, the public entertainment centers, the public playgrounds, the public athletic fields. He gave all an equal opportunity to enjoy these things rather than just a few who happen to have sufficient salaries to enable them to join some golf club or to enjoy exclusive membership in some select club. George F. Johnson gave to every worker, to each and every one of them, a chance to relax on Sunday. He encouraged their going to church. In fact, he paid off the mortgages on many churches in the Triple Cities and thus made it possible for them to worship God as they pleased; to give them equal opportunity to enjoy freedom of religion which is guaranteed in the American Constitution, and which you and I have always held is the priceless heritage of American citizenship.

George F. Johnson wanted these opportunities for all. He went further than words. He exemplified his attitude in deeds. He carried out a policy which so many have emphasized only by mouth.

He was reared in Massachusetts, in that great New England State where so many shoes are manufactured and produced. He carried his trade and his business to the Triple Cities area. He built the greatest shoe company that has ever been known. It was built on the principles of the Golden Rule.

I am enthusiastic today in expressing admiration for this man. I come before you to say that the American employer, if he has any idea of continuing this American system as we know it, has no other choice but to emulate and to imitate the actions and the policies of that great American, George F. Johnson, whose memory is loved, is revered, and is respected by every man, woman, and child who has found the pursuit of his daily life in the Triple Cities area. He is recognized as 50 years ahead of his time in industrial relations, in friendliness to the men and women who today so assiduously and energetically revere his memory. As long as the principles of George F. Johnson are carried out on the American industrial scene, these friendly relations between worker and management will continue to grow. It is sacred. It is the very life of our industrial vigor and it is because of those principles that the American worker, during peacetime and in wartime, has carried out the job of producing the necessary equipment for society. As long as that attitude continues to grow, we in America can realize that we will occupy the position of the greatest nation on the face of the earth. We will continue to attain the highest standard of living for the men and women of this country that has ever been known, and remain an inspiration to those countries which have not yet shared this principle of decent treatment of the rank and file of the workers but who are desirous of living in an American system.

In the words of the ancient, "He who would be the greatest of all, must first be the servant of all." George F. Johnson could easily qualify for this exalted position.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter to the Department of Agriculture and the answer thereto.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, also to insert an editorial from the Doylestown Daily Intelligencer of January 7 as part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET MESSAGE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I attended church at the Metropolitan Memorial Methodist Church and heard a good sermon by Dr. Edward G. Latch, D. D. The subject of his sermon was, Learning To Take Criticism. As I listened to that sermon and heard a recital of the criticisms heaped against former President George Washington, former President Andrew Jackson, and former President Abraham Lincoln, I was amazed that such adverse statements could be directed against three such great men. Many times during life we have an opportunity to criticize men in public office, and I am going to take this occasion right now to criticize constructively the Budget Bureau which is directly under the supervision of the President of the United States.

At a time when our Treasury statement of January 3 shows we have a national debt of $252,472,787,150.55, at a time when the President comes in here with a budget in which he proposes to spend $41,888,000,000, at a time when he tells us he expects to take in only $40,985,000,000—or that we shall be in the red $873,000,000—some questions should be asked concerning such a proposition. It is not sound nor the sensible thing for them to do.

A few minutes ago I asked the Speaker why we should not send that message back to the Budget Bureau and ask that it be resubmitted and require them to come in here with a balanced budget. Naturally it is supposed to be referred to a committee of the House, but I think it should be sent back to the Budget Bureau. They ought to know better than to send an unbalanced budget of that kind to the Congress at this peacetime.

When the President asks for the expenditure of $41,858,000,000 he is asking for $2,150,000,000 more than his budget for last year. The President admits that this budget is $2,900,000,000 more than the budget for 1950 will be over the budget of 1949. So it is gradually going up, and up, and up. He cannot and never will balance our finances if he does not stop spending. Why does he not sound one word about economy?

Last year we cut taxes. Notwithstanding that we cut taxes, the Government revenues this year show an increase over last year. The President in his budget message admits they are going to be $1,700,000,000 more than a year ago. This shows that two things can be done: Taxation can be cut, with a resultant increase of business to provide additional revenue to the Government notwithstanding the lower taxes. It proves it was a sound thing to do. That is what happened back in 1921, when Andrew Mellon was Secretary of the Treasury. At that time our taxes were cut and the Government revenue increased. Of course, there is a limit to that procedure, and we about reached the limit in cutting taxes; but you have no sound reason to increase them if you want more jobs. Increase business taxes, and you stop progress rather than encourage it. You throw men out of jobs rather than create jobs. You go further into debt and closer to bankruptcy. So stop, look, and listen. Where will you get the money? Why, stop spending. Be wise and economize. Now, I ask the question, If you are going to do the many things suggested in the President's budget message, where are you going to get the

money to pay the bills? I have asked that question time after time, but I can never get an answer. I cannot conceive of why the Chief Executive of the United States would permit bills to come in here which are always demanding larger and larger outlays of Government funds.

We have had a deficit in this country for the last 15 years, with the exception of the last two, when we had a Republican House and Republican Senate. There were only 2 years since 1930 that we have not had a great deficit, all Democratic years. It is about time that the people wake up to the fact we are going to have a wreck in this country. It means eventual bankruptcy, socialism, or dictatorship.

Let us see what is happening here in Washington, taking the newspapers for the last week and noting the statements about the cost of living.

Here is a chart appearing in the Washington Post of January 2 showing that the cost of living has gradually come down all last year. Commodity prices are coming down. If you will look at the chart, you will see what is happening in this respect.

Here is an advertisement showing 20 percent to 50 percent off on furniture and another advertisement of a clearance sale in furniture with 20 to 50 percent off. I just picked these out of some of the local papers. Here is one that I took out of one of my home-town papers showing that $6,000 worth of rugs are being sold for $3,90^. Here are some fur sales with great reductions up to 50 to 60 percent. For instance, here is $108,000 worth of fine furs being sold for $66,325. It gives you the items, showing they are cutting down on furs; prices reduced on groceries, on meats, on clothing. Here is one about shoes that formerly sold for $29.95 now being sold for $13.90. This is a high-priced shoe store here in Washington. They also have shoes that were formerly $19.95 selling for $9.99. Here is an advertisement of topcoats, $50 reduced to $39; $50 to $60 suits reduced to $39; $59.75 suits reduced to $49.

Here is an advertisement of the Hecht Co. In January the Hecht Co. prices will come tumbling down. Grosner says that the semiannual sales are going to reduce all prices. You can take all of the stores in the city of Washington and observe the great reduction in prices. Why? The stores all have great stocks of merchandise.

The point I make is that you can go into the stores now and find everything. There is not a scarcity of anything. Prices are coming down. Radios at 50 percent of former value. Competition is becoming more keen. We have a surplus of merchandise at this time. If you are going to let the labor unions come in and demand more wages when all of these things are coming down, you are never going to stop the spiral that is going on in inflation. The time to stop, Mr. President, is now. You have the power to stop it if you have the backbone and the will. It is something this country has to cope with. It is a situation that is as serious as anything I can suggest to the Congress. You dare not let some of these things happen, or I fear the country will go to rack and ruin. We must get common sense or bust.

Let us see how much further we can go when we have a stock of goods on hand. You can buy anything with the exception of steel. The President in his message the other day stated that he will probably come in here and ask that the Federal Government go into the steel business in some manner, either by lending money or, if necessary, building steel plants. Over in Europe there is one of the greatest plants in the world. This is now under British control. In the German Ruhr the workers of Germany have refused to tear it down. We could go over there right now and start that plant to manufacturing steel that is so necessary for the people over there instead of our sending steel over to those countries and bringing it back in the form of pipes, automobiles, and things of that kind. They could operate this great steel plant and take care of the people over there, thus saving us from furnishing them steel, when they could do it themselves, and we save our own steel. Remember that we are over there trying to build all kinds of industry and all kinds of factories, yet here is a large steel factory already constructed and ready to operate, and we compel them to tear it down. We act like a bunch of boobs in permitting it to be torn down. It does not make sense to me. It is unsound, it is the work of vandals, not sensible, sane, sound people. When I think of some of the things we are doing today in shipping out so much of our materials of all kinds, creating scarcity here at home and keeping our prices up higher and higher, I am wondering, are we doing right by our own people in America? I say not.

Some of the President's proposals are good, but do not try to put everything into effect at once and break us up. One thing good at a time, and do that well before you start 10 things, would be my advice to the President. We do that in business, we do it in our home, and we should do it in Government.

I tell you it is high time that the Government bring a little common sense into the things here in America because the President, in his budget message, is asking us to send over there under the Marshall plan $4,600,000,000 in 1949 and $4,500,000,000 in 1950. What for? Why, to build a lot of plants to come out in competition with the plants and workers in this country. You heard one of the gentlemen from Massachusetts a few minutes ago say what is going to happen with these reciprocal trade agreements when they start putting watch plants up there in Massachusetts out of business. You will find that it is only going to be a few years when not only the watch plants but all kinds of plants will go out of business here in America and we will be here raising taxes, when the people in the foreign countries are going to manage things under the reciprocal trade agreements a whole lot cheaper than we can afford to manufacture them, unless you cut labor down 50 percent, and I do not want that to happen. But it will if you let imports put our factories out of business, or else we have no jobs for our workers. And who wants to do that? I do not. I say it is time for us to get a lot of good common sense into our legislatures and here in the Congress and stop some of these things that are being done for others that will only wreck our own economy. We heard the President come in here and ask for a lot of regulations in this message of his. I want to say that he gave 27 reasons the other day in his state of the Union message, and I say that most every one of those reasons that he gave here is a short road to managed economy; it is a short road to socialism, and eternal dictatorship, and it is a sure road to bankruptcy of our own free economy unless we wake up, stop, look, and listen. That is the duty of the Congress; it is your duty and mine, and I am not going to stand here and keep from criticizing somebody when I know he should be criticized. I herewith insert an editorial from the Doylestown Daily Intelligencer of January 7, 1949:

THIS IS IT!

True to predictions, the Truman proposals laid before the new Eighty-first Congress form a full-scale program in state socialism, closely imitating the Labor Party socialism now in effect in England.

It is a scheme of incredibly vast Government spending, with no reference to the Nation's earning capacity. If it is adopted, the weight of the program will call for ever-increasing Government controls—controls at the top of the economic heap, and filtering down to the smallest details of human affairs.

The end result of such a program will be a form of police state. Since the outlines of the Truman plan are not new, but have been tried out in various other countries, such as prewar Germany and Italy, and in Russia, it is easy to know where they will come out. If the American people allow themselves to be trapped into the program, they will wind up under a totalitarian dictatorship as complete as in the three nations just mentioned.

For the initial stages of this new radical departure from American methods, Mr. Truman has asked for a $4,000,000,000 tax increase for the coming year. The great bulk of the new costs, however, will be in the form of invisible taxes—largely tax deductions to be taken from pay envelopes.

The time may not be far distant when the wage earner will find from 20 to 50 percent of his wages gobbled up by the Government even before he receives them.

At the moment when the British Socialists are moving in on the steel industry, and planning to nationalize it just as they already have nationalized banking, coal, transportation, communications, etc., Mr. Truman produced a new gun to put at the head of private enterprise in the United States.

This weapon is the threat that the Government itself will go into direct competition with private industry for the production of steel, if the bureaucrats are dissatisfied with the way the Nation's present steel makers are operating.

He asked new laws permitting the Government to set up its own steel mills any time it wants to—or to go into any other line of production which Mr. Truman's appointees decide is in critically short supply.

This one provision alone, if Congress passes it and if it passes also the Truman ripper of the Taft-Hartley law, would be enough to plunge the country into full-scale nationalization of its basic industries—since all that would have to take place would be for conspirators in the labor movement to slow down production, and thus give Mr. Truman an excuse to open up Government mills and factories.

In several ways the President opened war on Congress—not on this Congress so much, as against any Congress ever exercising the powers assigned it under the Constitution. He attacked a basic principle of American Government—the parliamentary principle.

He served notice, for example, that the moment Congress tries to do what the Constitution intended—to use its own judgment on the kind of laws which are needed and the amount of taxes which ought to be collected—that moment the President will seek to beat Congress into line on the assertion that it is noncooperative.

The Truman forces, in reorganizing the new Congress, went to the furthest stage they dared in stripping minority factions of any power in the legislative branch of Government. All key committees were packed with hand-picked Democrats who can be depended on to do whatever the Truman payroll lobby demands. Neither the Republicans nor the large anti-Truman bloc of Democrats stands to have any say about the handling of the laws which Congress will have to consider.

In two major matters—labor laws and taxes—the President demanded that Congress reverse itself, and that it follow his own individual judgment against the decisions previously made by Congress by 3-to-1 majority.

A basic point of socialism is its unwillingness for the legislative branch to have any real voice in the Government. Socialism needs dictatorial powers in the hands of the Chief Executive; and it seeks to undermine any checks and balances which restrict the authority of the head of government.

Mr. Truman's attitude is precisely in line with this socialistic concept.

In the matter of taxes, he also is following the footsteps of the British Socialists. Every time the British Labor Government has received a new gift of American taxpayers' money, the first thing it has done has been to enlarge the number of those who pay no taxes, and to increase the amounts being given by the Government to the country's nonworkers.

Likewise, the Truman proposals in this field boil down to putting a penalty on energy, hard work, and thrift; and to putting a premium on laziness.

In England, the social program recommended by Mr. Truman has long been known to the Socialists as the Beveridge plan. Mr. Truman demands the same plan—but has picked a fancier (and more misleading) name for it: the "square deal."

Mr. Truman paused in his address to shed a tear for the decline of small business. He didn't point out, however, that it was the New Deal which drove small business to the wall in the United States—which started the herding of American production into one or the other of two great monopolies; either the big-business monopolies, or government monopolies.

The England of a generation ago was often called "a nation of small shopkeepers." Its greatness, in the days when it was great, rose from that fact. Much of the greatness of the United States came likewise from the fact that in earlier days anyone who wanted to, and who saved his money, could open up his own business.

The British Socialists are in process of wiping small business out of existence—along with liquidating the entire social stratum known as the middle classes. Mr. Truman's program, by design or by accident, would have the same effect in the United States.

But the implied hostility to small business in the Truman message does not mean that the major industries fare much better.

As noted above, Mr. Truman demanded laws which would let him put the Government directly into any major industry he wishes. By specific references in his message, he lays a predicate for the Government to enlarge its control and interference, by other methods, in the following: electric power, oil, housing, agriculture, transportation, commodity exchanges, and banking.

These are in addition to his demands for socializing medicine and nationalizing the school system.

In the broader field of ideology, Mr. Truman swallowed the dogma of socialism just as openly as he recommended a specific socialistic program.

Since the world began, it has been the assumption that those with initiative, vision, and skill enough to create wealth were entitled to at least a major portion of the fruits of their labor.

This, Mr. Truman denies. Instead, if he believes what he says he believes, he has decided that anyone—whether he works or not—is entitled to cut himself in for a share of what the worker produces, or buys with what he has saved.

What else could Mr. Truman mean when he said: "We believe * * * that wealth should be created for all"?

This is the essence of socialism, expressed in nine words—the "world owes me a living" complex which has slowed world advancement down to a snail's pace, and which, if it continues to grow, unquestionably will wreck civilization.

It touches the fundamental issue: are you to own what you earn—or do you have to give most of it away to those who are lazy or indifferent or shiftless?

And if a man doesn't profit by working, and is hereafter to make out just as well by taking it easy—then what's the use of working? Why not let's all quit?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

AN EDITOR AGREES WITH MR. MURRAY

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, acting under instructions of the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, I went to Kalamazoo, Mich., on the 4th day of December last to ascertain, among other things, whether the Congress of Industrial Organizations approved of commando raids in connection with labor disputes and strikes.

Hearings were held on the 4th and 6th, and notice of the hearings was carried in the press. During the hearings, it appeared that the raid and the subsequent rioting were carried on in part under the direction of representatives of the parent CIO organization.

A CIO radio commentator, over a local Kalamazoo station, announced on Tuesday, December 14, that at a union mass meeting and rally held the previous evening, a Mr. Sigman, who was the personal representative of Philip Murray, presided at the meeting.

A subpena had previously been, and another was subsequently, issued, asking Mr. Murray to appear first in Kalamazoo and then in Washington so that he might publicly express approval or disapproval of the commando raid carried out by individuals wearing CIO buttons and professing to act in the interests of the CIO.

Mr. Murray did not appear in Washington—the subpena for his appearance in Kalamazoo was not served in time to give him an opportunity to appear there—and gave as his reason the opinion of his counsel that there was no authority for a congressional one-man subcommittee,

One of the editors of the Cleveland Plain Dealer wrote an editorial, which was later republished in the CIO News, in the last paragraph of which it was asserted that, in the opinion of the editor, I acted either because of a desire for publicity or to satisfy a long-standing grudge against organized labor, and not to adduce information helpful to Congress.

My answer to the editor, and a copy of the editorial, reads as follows:

JANUARY 4, 1949.

EDITOR, THE CLEVELAND PLAIN DEALER,
Cleveland, Ohio.

DEAR SIR: Editors of so-called conservative papers often complain of what they charge is a lack of courage on the part of their congressional Representatives who fail to expose or oppose movements which the editors think tend to destroy constitutional government. These editors profess to fail to understand why more public servants do not take a forthright position on some controversial issues.

Perhaps the answer may be found in such editorials as the one printed in the January 3 issue of the CIO News, entitled, "'Murray Was Right' in Defying Representative CLARE HOFFMAN," quoting an editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer, under the caption, "Murray Was Right."[1]

Murray did not, as stated in the CIO News, defy HOFFMAN. He, as you charged, challenged the legal right of Congress, through a one-man subcommittee, to subpena a witness. If the Cleveland Plain Dealer agrees with Mr. Murray that a one-man subcommittee has no right to issue a subpena, it will find—if it will examine the authorities hereinafter cited—that it is in error.

If the reprint is accurate, a part of the answer to the apparent lack of courage of public servants is found in the last paragraph, wherein you write:

"In our judgment, HOFFMAN's action was motivated more by a desire to be meddlesome, to satisfy his long-standing grudge against organized labor and to get publicity for himself, rather than to adduce information helpful to Congress."

That type of typical gratuitous insult may be one of the reasons why many a Senator and Congressman remains silent when inclined to speak.

The quoted paragraph contains two conclusions, neither of which is justified by the record. It assumes that I have a grudge against organized labor; that my motive in subpenaing Murray was to gain publicity.

I doubt if you can cite one word, one act of mine, in 14 years of service, which shows that I have a grudge against organized labor. I have been fighting goon squads and a certain type of so-called labor leader ever since 1937, and that course I shall continue so long as I have breath and opportunity. But it does not follow that I oppose either employees or organized labor any more than it would follow that, because you condemn unfair monopolistic practices on the part of some corporations, you are opposed to what is known as "free enterprise."

You are entitled to your opinion as to whether I act from honest, sincere motives or merely to obtain publicity. As to the publicity angle, let me say this: You print the news. I do not. The fact is—I can get no publicity except as the gentlemen of the press or radio commentators publicize what I say or do. If I get undue publicity, you are a party to it. You fall for what you say is merely a stunt on my part.

When refusing to appear, Murray justified his refusal to answer to a subpena of a one-man House subcommittee by writing to me, in part:

[1] Copy of the Cleveland Plain Dealer editorial is attached to this letter.

"I am advised by counsel that the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 does not confer on standing committees (or subcommittees) of the House, other than the Committee on Un-American Activities, authority to issue subpenas."

Common sense, as well as an examination of the law, will show that Mr. Murray's counsel is mistaken. The very first words of section 1 of article I of the Constitution of the United States are these:

"All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

One without legal training knows that Congress cannot legislate effectively and intelligently without making investigations. The average citizen knows that neither the Senate nor the House can legislate without the approval of the other. High school students know that constitutional provisions cannot be overridden by the Congress. Hence, it follows that the House, as well as the Senate, under the Constitution, has authority to hold investigations by committees; subpena witnesses, compel the giving of testimony which is necessary to enable it to function under the Constitution.

But the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 did not limit the authority of standing committees of the House, take from the House its authority to make rules to govern its procedure, nor could it destroy the investigatory power which is an essential part of the authority granted to and the duty imposed upon the House as well as the Senate to legislate.

It is true that section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 authorizes standing committees of the Senate, including subcommittees of such committees, to hold hearings, issue subpenas, and require the attendance of witnesses, and that it does not confer a like power upon standing committees of the House and subcommittees of such committees.

However, section 101 (a) of the act expressly provides that the sections of the Legislative Reorganization Act "supersede other rules only[2] to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and (b) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House."

Moreover section 121 (f) of the act provides that "The rules of the House are hereby made the rules of its standing committees so far as applicable."

Under section 121 (f), from which I have quoted, the House at any time had the right to prescribe rules for the conduct of its business.

On February 21, 1947, the House adopted House Resolution 111. That resolution authorized the Committee on Education and Labor, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, to make investigations * * * to sit and hold hearings "whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned * * * and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses as it deems necessary."

It further provides that: "Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him * * *. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses."

There is a Federal statute authorizing committees to issue subpenas, and section 191 of title 2 of United States Code, authorizes any chairman of any committee and any Member of either House to administer an oath to witnesses. Sections 192 and 194 of title 2 make it an offense for a witness to refuse to appear or to testify before a House committee.

When the House Committee on Education and Labor was organized on the 27th day of January 1947, "The chairman was given authority to appoint standing subcommittees and, at the same time, authorized to designate special committees when, in the opinion of the chairman, such action was deemed advisable."

Mr. LESINSKI and two other members of the committee were not present at this organization meeting. Perhaps that accounts for Mr. LESINSKI's mistaken opinion given to Mr. Murray.

House Resolution 111, Eightieth Congress, and the committee's action expressly authorized the House Committee on Education and Labor, acting through its chairman, Mr. Hartley, to do just what it did in this case. The committee's action, just referred to, was taken on January 27, 1947.

As long ago as 1927, the United States Supreme Court, in *McGrain* v. *Daugherty* (273 U. S. 135), held that congressional committees not only had the power, but that it was their duty, to hold hearings to ascertain the kind of legislation the Congress should enact. Nor would it seem the authority of the House Committee on Education and Labor to act through a one-man subcommittee is open to doubt.

In *United States* v. *Morris* (300 U. S. Supreme Court Reports 566 (October 1936)), the United States Supreme Court upheld the conviction of a witness who testified falsely before a two-man committee. In the course of its opinion, the Court said, "The committee (of five) so appointed, authorized Senator Nye, the chairman, to act as a subcommittee and to name a subcommittee of one or more members." (Note the word "one".) In that particular case, Mr. Nye named himself and Senator Dale. The Supreme Court clearly recognized the right of the full committee of five to authorize the chairman (one man) to appoint a subcommittee of one or more.

Now, mark you, it is not contended that a one-man subcommittee is the better procedure in all cases. The executive departments and agencies in many, many cases hold hearings, make reports of their finding through a single individual. From a practical, political standpoint, this being a two-party Government, legislative committees should consist of at least one representative from both parties. And that has been the usual procedure, though the majority party usually, by appointment of subcommittee members, retains control. But there have without criticism been many one-man committees.

The House Labor Committee during the past session found the volume of work so great, its members so occupied with their varied duties, that it was physically impossible to hold the necessary hearings by subcommittees consisting of more than one member from each party.

From September 5, 1947, to December 22, 1948, the House Committee on Education and Labor, or subcommittees thereof, sat on 302 days, held 47 hearings, which would have given, had all been printed, more than 21,000 pages of printed record, and that does not include committee reports. The above figures, furnished by a staff member, do not cover all hearings and reports.

From a legal standpoint, you and Mr. Murray are wrong in assuming that he was justified in refusing to appear in answer to a subpena.

I agree with you and with Mr. Murray that the better rule would be that in hearings where there is a controversial political issue, both the majority and minority parties should be represented. But the failure to so provide does not make a one-man subcommittee impotent.

Let us take up the question of motive. What you refer to as a "commando" raid, was made by several hundred people, wearing CIO buttons, who traveled from the eastern side of Michigan, a distance of some 150 miles, to Kalamazoo, Mich., where, before dawn on December 1, they maliciously injured real property—a felony; burned an employee's truck, causing damage exceeding $100—a felony; overturned and injured employees' automobiles—a felony if the damage exceeded $100; beat defenseless workers, both men and women; defied and threatened police officers.

International representatives of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, of which Mr. Murray is president, according to the press, publicly assumed responsibility for the raid. At a mass meeting of Local 3619, they stated, in substance, that the Congress of Industrial Organizations, from whom they take orders and of which Mr. Murray is president, supported the position of the Kalamazoo local in this strike.

Mr. Murray, as president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, speaks for several million members. In holding hearings to ascertain the facts in connection with what you call the "commando" raid on Kalamazoo, was it not the logical thing for me to subpena the head of the organization which has jurisdiction over those engaged in the raid? Is not organized labor, is not the public, entitled to an unequivocal statement from Mr. Murray as to his position in connection with such a raid made in support of a picket line maintained by a local of the international and directed by international representatives and agents? Was the subcommittee seeking publicity in subpenaing Mr. Murray or was it going to the fountainhead for information to which the public was entitled?

Had I not every reason to assume that Mr. Murray would welcome the opportunity to publicly condemn such actions? That he would publicly announce that he would discipline those responsible for the raid?

Mr. Murray, after a delay of several years, publicly denounced the Communists within affiliated CIO organizations. That was a fine, patriotic stand and was so heralded by the press and the public.

If every Member of Congress, if every public official, is to be accused of publicity hunting when he ventures to question responsible officials of organizations under whose auspices and direction admitted illegal, vicious, cowardly acts have been committed; is to be denounced by editorials in conservative, supposedly accurate, papers like the Cleveland Plain Dealer, do you still wonder why some representatives of the public, who are so often accused of being cowardly, venture to speak out?

You have "guts" enough to jump on me, but have you enough "guts" to jump on labor leaders who refuse to denounce violations of law and who exercise tremendous political and economic power?

It is one thing, Mr. Editor, to give me a kicking around when I venture to give Mr. Murray, the leader of several million workers, an opportunity to explain his position on "commando" raids. It is something else again to ask why Mr. Murray relied upon a technicality—if such it be—in refusing to appear and make clear this deplorable union "commando" raid.

Enclosed you will find copy of a report I made on the Kalamazoo situation. It is somewhat repetitious because there was no opportunity to rewrite it, but it contains Mr. Murray's letter and my own. The hearings, a copy of which will, when released, be sent you, will show at least some of the vicious, cowardly acts of the men wearing CIO buttons who were acting for Local 3619, USA-CIO, for whose conduct, according to the press, an international officer assumed full responsibility. Mr. Murray did not choose

[2] Please note that word "only."

to condemn that "commando" raid by appearing before the House subcommittee; his reason, as given to me, being that the subcommittee had no legal authority, that it was a subcommittee of one.

Sincerely yours,

CLARE E. HOFFMAN.

[From the CIO News of January 3, 1949]

MURRAY WAS RIGHT

(Reprint of an editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer)

CIO President Murray was completely justified, this newspaper believes, in refusing to obey a subpena issued by a one-man subcommittee of the House Labor Committee, consisting of Representative HOFFMAN.

Murray challenged the validity of the subpena on the ground that there was no legal authority for HOFFMAN's appointment as a one-man subcommittee. He also expressed the opinion that any subcommittee ought to include representation from the minority party in Congress as well as the majority.

Even HOFFMAN conceded that the authority of a one-man subcommittee was debatable.

Murray's action has focused attention on an issue which should be resolved by the next Congress. That is the establishment of an orderly and uniform procedure for the conduct of investigations and hearings conducted by congressional committees.

There is no question that Congress has virtually unlimited authority to investigate matters which have any bearing whatsoever on legislative enactments proposed or in effect. It can investigate its own Members or other branches of the Government.

Thus the powers of a legislative committee are extremely broad, but the procedure for the conduct of a legislative investigation has never been explicitly defined. For that reason there has been widespread criticism of the manner in which various congressional investigations have been handled. Each committee has been a law unto itself, and has made its own rules. The result, in some cases, has been chaotic and has led to grave injustices.

The situation should be corrected, without in any way impairing the investigating powers of Congress, if Congress would establish a uniform procedure under which all committees would be required to function.

We have several suggestions along this line. No subcommittee should be appointed except by a majority vote of the full committee, not merely by the chairman or a majority of those present. No subcommittee should consist of less than three members, or be composed entirely of members of one political party. And no subcommittee report should be made public until after it has been approved by a majority vote of the entire committee.

These provisions would put a curb on Congressmen who are overenthusiastic, irresponsible, or whose main objective is publicity.

Witnesses also should be protected by a stipulation that they could confer with their attorneys if they so desired, although counsel for witnesses should not be permitted to take part in the proceedings. Also any person accused of misconduct in a public hearing before a congressional committee should have the right to confront his accuser and to testify in rebuttal.

Our approval of Murray's refusal to obey Hoffman's subpena does not mean that we believe there was anything improper in the subject Hoffman was proposing to investigate. He wanted to find out who was responsible for organizing and carrying out a "commando" raid on an industrial plant in Michigan which was attempting to operate in spite of a strike. Such violence is unlawful and cannot be condoned, and the House Labor Committee has every right to investigate it if it believes such an investigation would be helpful in framing legislation to prevent a repetition of such an outrage.

But we doubt whether the full committee or a subcommittee appointed with the approval of the full committee would have gone to the extreme Hoffman did in calling Murray as a witness.

In our judgment, HOFFMAN's action was motivated more by a desire to be meddlesome, to satisfy his long-standing grudge against organized labor, and to get publicity for himself rather than to adduce information helpful to Congress.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. JACOBS, for January 9 to 14, 1949, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Thursday, January 13, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

43. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the transfer of certain agricultural dry-land and irrigation field stations to the States in which such stations are located, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

44. A letter from the Director, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, transmitting the First Annual Report of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

45. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the Annual Report of the Secretary of the Navy, for the fiscal year 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

46. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report showing refunds of internal revenue in excess of $500 made by the Bureau of Internal Revenue during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

47. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the Annual Report of Cooperative Extension Work in Agriculture and Home Economics, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Agriculture.

48. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a copy of the detailed statement of expenditures of appropriations for the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

49. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report showing the special assistants employed during the period from July 1 to December 1948; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

50. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Air Force, transmitting the United States Air Force flying-pay report for the period April 1 to October 1, 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

51. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 14, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Cheesequake Creek, N. J., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

52. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 14, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of harbor at the mouth of Au Train River, Mich., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

53. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a combined statement of receipts, expenditures, and balances of the United States Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

54. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the Annual Report of the Secretary of the Air Force, for the fiscal year 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 1177. A bill to insure the maintenance of full employment in the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARING:

H. R. 1178. A bill relating to the discharge status of members and former members of the Air Forces Enlisted Reserve Corps who during World War II participated in the War, Navy, or Civil Aeronautics Administration training program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H. R. 1179. A bill to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital in south Texas; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1180. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional Federal district judge for the southern district of Texas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 1181. A bill to provide dispensary treatment and hospitalization in Army and Navy hospitals for retired personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 1182. A bill to amend section 3469 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the tax imposed on transportation of persons shall not apply to transportation on boats for fishing purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 1183. A bill to provide for cancellation of certain unenforceable judgments on the records of the United States district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAVALCANTE:

H. R. 1184. A bill to repeal the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. R. 1185. A bill to incorporate the National Safety Council; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1186. A bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 1187. A bill to eliminate the crop year 1949 from the base period in determining acreage allotments for cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 1188. A bill defining and regulating the practice of the profession of engineering and creating a Board of Registration for Professional Engineers in the District of Columbia; to the Commitee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HUBER:

H. R. 1189. A bill to name the twin highway bridge over the Potomac River in the District of Columbia the "Ohio Bridge"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 1190. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 1191. A bill to increase the compensation of all postal and classified employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 1192. A bill to make section 112 (b) (7) of the Internal Revenue Code applicable with respect to certain corporate liquidations in 1949; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1193. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Church Point, La., a post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 1194. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1195. A bill to amend part I of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, with respect to establishment of uniform permile rates for the transportation, by railroad or by railroad and water, of grain and grain products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 1196. A bill for the relief of certain claimants who suffered losses and sustained damages as the result of the campaign carried out by the Federal Government for the eradication of the Mediterranean fruitfly in the State of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1197. A bill to amend the act known as the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930 (46 Stat. 531), approved June 10, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 1198. A bill to authorize the construction of a new post office at Tishomingo, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1199. A bill making an appropriation for the construction and operation of a fish hatchery at North Attleboro, Mass.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 1200. A bill to extend World War I veterans' benefits to persons in active military or naval service in Haiti between July 25, 1915, and April 6, 1917; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 1201. A bill to provide that the United States shall reimburse the States for that portion of the construction cost of certain schools which is attributable to Negroes and Indians; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BIEMILLER:

H. R. 1202. A bill to authorize and request the President to undertake to mobilize at some convenient place in the United States an adequate number of the world's outstanding experts and coordinate and utilize their services in a supreme endeavor to discover means of curing and preventing cancer; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOLTON of Maryland:

H. R. 1203. A bill providing for a preliminary examination and survey of the channel in Back River, Baltimore County, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1204. A bill to authorize the construction of a Veterans' Administration general medical and surgical hospital in Baltimore, Md., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BREHM:

H. R. 1205. A bill to provide automobiles for blind veterans of World War II who are entitled to compensation for the loss, or loss of use, of one or both legs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 1206. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHURCH:

H. R. 1207. A bill amending the Internal Revenue Code to provide an alternative tax, at the election of the taxpayer, on income derived from an unincorporated business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 1208. A bill to extend the time for filing estimated income-tax returns in the case of farmers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 1209. A bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 1210. A bill to authorize the construction and operation of facilities for generating hydroelectric power at the Folsom project on American River in California and the use of power revenues therefrom to assist irrigation; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 1211. A bill to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 1212. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 1213. A bill for the relief of the owners and operators of certain gold mines which were closed or the operations of which were curtailed by War Production Board Limitation Order L-208; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 1214. A bill to provide the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence, to make immigration quotas available to Asian and Pacific peoples, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 1215. A bill to provide for a decennial census of housing; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 1216. A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, so as to provide an increase in pay for certain personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1217. A bill to provide longevity pay for postmasters; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 1218. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HEDRICK:

H. R. 1219. A bill to repeal the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 1220. A bill to amend the Veterans' Regulations to provide increased rates of compensation for certain veterans with specific service-incurred disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 1221. A bill to authorize the admission into the United States of persons of races indigenous to Siam, and to make them racially eligible for naturalization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1222. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain fishery facilities within the State of Washington; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 1223. A bill to authorize the American River Basin development, California, for irrigation and reclamation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 1224. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 1225. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 1226. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to prevent purchase and sale of public office," approved December 11, 1926; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1227. A bill to extend coverage of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to certain employees of the Panama Railroad Company and to provide that such employees shall be subject to State unemployment-compensation laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1228. A bill to repeal the tax on transportation of persons and the tax on transportation of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1229. A bill to provide for the appointment of conservators, receivers, and other fiduciary officers to take charge of the affairs of Federal savings and loan associations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1230. A bill to establish a national natural resources policy, to create a Natural Resources Council, to provide for a natural resources inventory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1231. A bill to amend the act of May 28, 1896, as amended, relating to the appointment of assistant United States attorneys; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1232. A bill to reestablish the original eleventh and twelfth Federal home-loan bank districts and to reestablish the original Federal Home Loan Bank of Los Angeles and the original Federal Home Loan Bank of Portland; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 1233. A bill to provide a Federal bonus for service in World War II by residents of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1234. A bill to authorize the admission into the United States of persons indigenous to Indonesia, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1235. A bill providing, in the District of Columbia, for the registration of locksmiths and certain other persons and imposing certain other requirements with respect to the practice and professions of locksmithing and key making; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 1236. A bill to provide compensation for civil-service employees and other Federal employees who receive permanent partial disabilities resulting from injuries incurred while in performance of their duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LINEHAN:

H. R. 1237. A bill to incorporate the Army and Navy Union; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 1238. A bill to amend paragraph (A) (1) of Public Law No. 662, Seventy-ninth Congress, chapter 869, second session, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 1239. A bill to stimulate the exploration, production, and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals and for the establishment within the Department of the Interior of a Mine Incentive Payments Division, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1240. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 730), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 1241. A bill to reclassify assistant postmasters and other supervisory positions in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 1242. A bill authorizing the transfer of a certain tract of land in the Robinson Remount Station to the city of Crawford, Nebr., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 1243. A bill to amend the Hatch Act; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 1244. A bill relating to the fixing of wage rates for employees in naval shipyards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 1245. A bill to increase the rates of compensation of the President, Vice President, and Speaker of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

H. R. 1246. A bill to repeal the act of June 5, 1940, entitled "An act to prohibit the exportation of tobacco seed and plants, except for experimental purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 1247. A bill to provide for cooperation with State agencies administering labor laws in establishing and maintaining safe and proper working conditions in industry and in the preparation, promulgation, and enforcement of regulations to control industrial health hazards; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 1248. A bill to establish a presumption of service connection for functional disorders of the nervous system and psychoses for certain veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 1249. A bill to provide for designation of the Veterans' Administration hospital maintained at Temple, Tex., as the Thirty-sixth Division Memorial Veterans' Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 1250. A bill to extend Veterans' Administration benefits to disabled retired enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, without impairment of their right to receive retired pay which they had earned for stipulated service prior to their reentry into the service in World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 1251. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into law title 46 of the United States Code, entitled "Shipping"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 1252. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 with respect to the eligibility for appointment in the executive branch of the Government of former professional staff members of committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 1253. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida to hear, determine, and render judgment in favor of all persons for damages or losses arising or resulting from the construction, further development, and improvement of the intracoastal waterway from Jacksonville, Fla., to Miami, Fla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 1254. A bill to authorize the acquisition of lands for the Everglades National Park, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 1255. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide for the inclusion of military or naval service in the computation of the 5 years of service necessary for entitlement to annuity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 1256. A bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to complete the requirements for the positive identification of yellow oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1257. A bill to amend subparagraph (k) of paragraph II, part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to provide increased compensation for blindness of one eye, having only light perception, in addition to increased compensation for loss or loss of use of one hand or one foot; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 1258. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to authorize public assistance grants for medical services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1259. A bill to amend the Social Security Act of 1935; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1260. A bill to provide for the payment of retroactive death pension to widows and children of veterans after 7 years' continued and unexplained absence; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1261. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1262. A bill to provide Federal aid to the States for the construction of armories and similar training facilities for the National Guard and Naval Militia; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 1263. A bill to enhance further the security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information concerning the cryptographic systems and the communication intelligence activities of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H. R. 1264. A bill to prohibit Federal land banks from reserving mineral or timber rights when they dispose of certain real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1265. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands (61 Stat. 913) to provide for competitive bidding on leases issued thereunder; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1266. A bill to provide that a stenographic record be made and a transcribed copy be furnished the veteran's preference employee and/or his designated representative, of all appeal hearings held under the provisions of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1267. A bill to amend the veterans regulations to provide additional compensation for World War II veterans who suffer the loss of the use of a creative organ; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1268. A bill to establish within the Civil Service Commission a Board of Appeals on Efficiency Ratings; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 1269. A bill to provide for the conversion of national banking associations into and their merger or consolidation with State banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. J. Res. 77. Joint resolution extending to July 1, 1949, certain income-tax exemptions of military and naval personnel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. J. Res. 78. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. J. Res. 79. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. J. Res. 80. Joint resolution to authorize the Postmaster General to make a study and report of mechanizing the postal-delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. J. Res. 81. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. J. Res. 82. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. J. Res. 83. Joint resolution to provide for designation of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Altoona, Pa., as the Corporal Harry R. Harr Veterans' Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. J. Res. 84. Joint resolution to provide for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train by the Archivist of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. Con. Res. 11. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on the Olympic National Park; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. Con. Res. 12. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to invite General MacArthur to visit the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. Res. 40. Resolution to amend rule XI (2) of the Rules of the House of Representatives with respect to the conduct of investigations; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 41. Resolution to transfer jurisdiction over un-American activities from the Committee on Un-American Activities to the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of Kansas:

H. Res. 42. Resolution providing for the payment of 6 months' gratuity and $250 funeral expenses to Mrs. Frances Hancock, widow of A. C. Hancock, late employee of the House; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. Res. 43. Resolution setting the size of the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. Res. 44. Resolution to prescribe tolls to be levied for the use of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. Res. 45. Resolution providing for compensation for three special messengers for the House Ways and Means Committee, effective January 1, 1949; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. McGUIRE:

H. Res. 46. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate and study existing Federal safety regulations for chartered passenger flights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KING:

H. Res. 47. Resolution to amend rule XI (1) of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 1270. A bill for the relief of John Thompson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 1271. A bill for the relief of Carl E. Lawson and Fireman's Fund Indemnity Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1272. A bill for the relief of Edward A. Seeley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1273. A bill for the relief of Fred H. Nichols; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 1274. A bill for the relief of Abraham Lipetz, Gittla Lipetz, Jacques Lipetz, Leon Matthew Lipetz, and Eric Lipetz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1275. A bill for the relief of Anna Helman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1276. A bill for the relief of the heirs of Ida Londinsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHURCH:

H. R. 1277. A bill for the relief of Mary Jane Sherman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 1278. A bill for the relief of Doris High; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVENPORT:

H. R. 1279. A bill for the relief of George Hampton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 1280. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Judge E. Estes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 1281. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Leslie Paul Schroeder; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 1282. A bill for the relief of Mrs. T. A. Robertson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1283. A bill for the relief of Walter W. Hearne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1284. A bill for the relief of the Wilson County Fair, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1285. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Lena Mae West, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1286. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Rowland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 1287. A bill to admit Maria Varanaki to the United States for permanent residence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1288. A bill for the relief of certain officers and members of the crew of the steamship *Taiyuan*; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 1289. A bill for the relief of Romulus Oscar Bean, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 1290. A bill for the relief of Charles W. Wulf, warrant officer, junior grade, United States Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLEY:

H. R. 1291. A bill for the relief of Eugene and Mary Potvoricky and children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1292. A bill for the relief of Jan and Juliana Magura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 1293. A bill for the relief of the Franco-Italian Packing Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1294. A bill for the relief of Lt. (jg) Svend J. Skou; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1295. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rosaria Cusimano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1296. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Masao Hayashi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1297. A bill for the relief of Alvin G. Patton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1298. A bill for the relief of Edward T. Hunter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 1299. A bill for the relief of Frank J. Patzke, Archie Mitchell, J. L. Shoemaker, Einar Engen, and N. L. Gifford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 1300. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hope Irene Buley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Texas:

H. R. 1301. A bill for the relief of the American Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VELDE:

H. R. 1302. A bill for the relief of Irene Maria Schneidmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. WOODHOUSE:

H. R. 1303. A bill for the relief of Dr. Elias Stavropoulos, his wife, and daughter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

4. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Harold Coles, executive vice president, Florida State Chamber of Commerce, Jacksonville, Fla., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to modifying the national airport aid law so that funds allocated by it to the several States may be used for airport maintenance where such funds are no longer required for airport construction, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 13, 1949

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Stop us, O God, for a minute of prayer.

Stop our anxious minds from wandering, and our hearts from desiring anything but to know Thy will.

Let us stand at attention before Thee and hear what Thou hast to say to us.

We believe that Thou canst tell us not only what to do but also how to do it.

If it needs making up our minds, Thou who didst make our minds canst show us how to make them up.

If it needs changing our minds, Thou canst work that miracle, too.

Speak, O Lord, and make us hear, for Jesus' sake. Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF SENATORS

DENNIS CHAVEZ, a Senator from the State of New Mexico, and WARREN G. MAGNUSON, a Senator from the State of Washington, appeared in their seats today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 10, 1949, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

NOMINATION OF HON. CARL A. HATCH

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the President has sent to the Senate the nomination of Hon. Carl A. Hatch to be Federal judge for the district of New Mexico. As we all know, Mr. Hatch was a Member of this body up to the present

Congress. It is usual for the Senate to take action on the nomination of a former Member of the body immediately but, due to the fact that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], who is chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, is temporarily absent, I cannot ask that action be taken now. I feel certain that if the Senator from Nevada were present he would have made a motion that the nomination be confirmed. At a later date I intend to say a few words about my former colleague, Hon. Carl A. Hatch.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained leave to be absent from sessions of the Senate for the remainder of this week.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE FILED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 10th instant,

Mr. O'CONOR, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, to which was referred the bill (S. 103) to increase rates of compensation of the President, Vice President, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and heads and assistant heads of executive departments and independent agencies, reported it on January 11, 1949, with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 1) thereon.

REPORT FOR PHILIPPINE ALIEN PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the First Annual Report for the Philippine Alien Property Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 13, 1949.*

RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS ON FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND (H. DOC. NO. 39)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Acting Secretary of State, showing all receipts and disbursements on account of refunds, allowances, and annuities for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948, in connection with the Foreign Service retirement and disability system as required by section 862, Foreign Service Act of 1946 (Public Law 724).

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 13, 1949.*

(Enclosure: Report concerning retirement and disability fund, Foreign Service.)

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

WOMEN'S BRANCH OF COAST GUARD RESERVE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of February 19, 1941, as amended, so as to establish a Women's Reserve as a branch of the Coast Guard Reserve (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SERVICE AS CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES IN FORMER BUREAU OF MARINE INSPECTION AND NAVIGATION, THE BUREAU OF CUSTOMS, AND THE COAST GUARD FOR MILITARY PAY PURPOSES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of July 23, 1947, so as to provide for the inclusion of time spent as a civilian employee in the former Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation, the Bureau of Customs, and the Coast Guard, for military pay purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN PROPERTY FROM RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION TO STATE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to transfer certain property from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Department of State (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

LAWS PASSED BY LEGISLATURE OF PUERTO RICO

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of laws enacted by the sixth, seventh, and eighth special sessions of the Sixteenth Legislature of Puerto Rico (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

COST OF REHABILITATION AND REPAIR OF DAMAGES BY UNITED STATES MILITARY FORCES AT SIX PUBLIC AIRPORTS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, certifications by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics of the cost of rehabilitation and repair of damages caused by United States military forces at six public airports (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EDWIN B. ANDERSON

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Edwin B. Anderson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN POSTAL EMPLOYEES

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of certain postal employees (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ISSUANCE OF COMMEMORATIVE STAMP OF THE TWO-HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF ALEXANDRIA, VA.

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va.," approved June 29, 1948 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES IN POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PERMISSION TO VERNON G. MACKENZIE TO ACCEPT AND WEAR A CERTAIN FOREIGN DECORATION

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation granting permission to Vernon G. MacKenzie, Sanitary Engineer Director, Public Health Service, to accept and wear a certain decoration bestowed upon him by the King of Greece (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF GEORGETOWN BARGE, DOCK, ELEVATOR & RAILWAY CO.

A letter from the president of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., reporting, pursuant to law, on the operations of that company, for the calendar year 1948; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the petition of James H. Schaffner, of Buffalo, N. Y., praying for redress of grievance under the Constitution, relating to his military status; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

THE POLL TAX—PETITION

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a petition signed by the mayor and sundry other citizens of Jackson, Mich., relating to the poll tax, and I ask unanimous consent that the petition, together with the names of the signers of the petition, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petition, together with the signatures, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We, citizens of the city in which the Republican Party first asserted its belief in equality of opportunity for all Americans, respectfully present to the Congress our appeal for further progress in the implementation of that belief.

We remind ourselves and the Congress of the profound promise made 94 years ago by the founders of the Republican Party under Jackson's spreading oaks: "That the law of nature, which is the law of liberty, gives to no man rights superior to those of another." And we urge that the pledges reiterated in the Republican platform of 1948 be given sincere consideration by the Eighty-first Congress, pledges which promised to abolish the poll tax, to legislate against lynching, to extend equal educational opportunities and to advance those other rights which are part of our concept of freedom. While we petition in prideful memory of the founders of the Republican Party, we speak without partisan consideration as both Democrats and Republicans, for we are aware that also in 1948 the

Democratic Party pledged itself to support legislation which would guarantee the rights of full and equal political participation, the right to equal opportunity of employment, and the right of security of person.

We humbly acknowledge our own failures to be true to the Republican principles of Lincoln, the Democratic principles of Jefferson and of this city's namesake, Andrew Jackson, in recognition of human rights. Such failures are not limited to any certain section of our country. We pledge ourselves in our own community and state to seek rectification of those injustices under which minority groups live.

Cognizant of the concern with which good people of our Southern States contemplate these issues, we propose no belligerent approach to a problem the gravity of which all good Americans must acknowledge. Yet progress has been made, great progress, and we appeal for further steps to bring all Americans to a plane of democratic equality in opportunity and in Government.

Therefore, we, citizens of Jackson, call on the leaders of both parties to unite in the Congress behind their own party platforms and make 1949 the year of advancement toward the hopes and aspirations of all God-fearing people, as reaffirmed in 1854 in our own city when the Republican Party came into being.

James N. House, Mayor; Munro S. Furman, President, Greater Jackson Association; Mrs. W. R. McInally, President, Woman's Club; Thomas Morano, President, CIO Council, Jackson; Robert E. Lee, President, Jackson County Federation of Labor; C. W. Moulton, President, Jackson County Realty Board; Mrs. John Maher, President, Jackson City Council, PTA; Lacerne Patch, Chairman, Board of Supervisors; G. L. Greenawalt, Superintendent of Schools; Carl M. Saunders, Editor, Jackson Citizen-Patriot; Floyd J. Poole, County Clerk; Mrs. Hugh T. Roberts, Republican County Vice Chairman; L. M. Godden, President, Junior Chamber of Commerce; H. E. Handley, President, Board of Education; Mrs. T. J. Powell, President, Jackson Business and Professional Club; E. D. Cattell, City Clerk; Mrs. Hubert E. Cox, President, University of Michigan Alumnae; W. Earl Holman, President, Jackson Exchange Club; Mrs. N. Rosenfeld, President, Jackson Branch, American Association of University Women; Mrs. G. W. Duguid, President, Women's Division, Republican National Committee; Wilfred G. Bassett, Chairman, Jackson County Veterans Council; Mrs. Charles Dengler, President, Peace Council; Mrs. Lloyd Wolfe, President, Council of Church Women; Haskell Nichols, State Senator; John W. Bannasch, State Representative; Stanley Shoemaker, President, Jackson Teacher Club; Clarence H. Elliott, City Manager; Vincent Holda, City Commissioner; William D. Hunt, City Commissioner; James P. Thomson, Republican County Chairman; James C. Mead, President, Jackson County Ministerial Association; Mrs. A. D. Vetesk, President, YWCA Board; Howard F. Andrews, Jackson County Council of Churches; C. J. Straayer, Jackson Optimists Club; and More Than 300 Others.

HOLIDAYS FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES ON JANUARY 20 AND 21

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably without amendment Senate Joint Resolution 16, making January 20 and 21, 1949, holidays for Federal employees and employees of the District of Columbia in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia.

At the appropriate time during the afternoon a request will be made for unanimous consent to consider the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received.

PRINTING OF REVISED EDITION OF RULES AND MANUAL OF THE SENATE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report an original routine resolution providing for the preparation and printing of a revised edition of the Senate Manual, which has been unanimously recommended by the committee, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 25), as follows:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 238, Eightieth Congress, a resolution providing for the preparation and printing of the Senate Rules and Manual for the Eighty-first Congress is hereby rescinded; and be it further

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration be, and it is hereby, directed to prepare a revised edition of the Senate Rules and Manual for the use of the Eighty-first Congress, and that 1,500 additional copies shall be printed and bound, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the Senate, 200 copies for the use of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and the remaining 300 copies shall be bound in full morocco and tagged as to contents and delivered as may be directed by the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I understand that this is a regular resolution that provides for the printing of 1,500 copies of the Senate Rules and Manual.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; for the Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. And it is in line with the usual procedure at the beginning of Congress.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to suggest that it might be practicable to defer the printing of the Senate Manual until we have amended the rules regarding filibusters. That would obviate the necessity for another reprinting of the rules within a short time after the printing provided for in the resolution presented by the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. Can the Senator from Maine indicate on what day certain that change will be made?

Mr. BREWSTER. Well, Mr. President, I defer to the judgment of the Senator from Arizona, who is chairman of the committee in charge of the matter. I am sure, however, that unless we settle the question now it never will be settled.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am not a prophet. I make no prediction.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator does not have a crystal ball in which he can gaze and tell us how soon we can secure amendment of the cloture rule.

Mr. HAYDEN. No.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator have in mind perhaps when it will be taken up?

Mr. HAYDEN. It will be taken up for hearing by the committee on the 24th of January.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 25) was considered and agreed to.

MEMBERS ON PART OF SENATE OF JOINT COMMITTEES ON PRINTING AND LIBRARY, RESPECTIVELY

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report an original resolution providing for Members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committees on Printing and the Library, respectively, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 26) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committees of Congress:

Joint Committee on Printing: Mr. HAYDEN, of Arizona; Mr. HUNT, of Wyoming; Mr. JENNER, of Indiana.

Joint Committee of Congress on the Library: Mr. HAYDEN, of Arizona; Mr. GREEN, of Rhode Island; Mr. LONG, of Louisiana; Mr. IVES, of New York; Mr. LODGE, of Massachusetts.

ADDITIONAL CLERK FOR CALIFORNIA SENATORS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 20, submitted by the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] on January 6, 1949, and I submit a report (No. 3) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The clerk will read the resolution for the information of the Senate.

The clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That until an appropriation shall be made to pay the compensation of the additional clerk to which each Senator from the State of California is entitled by reason of the fact that the population of such State exceeds 10,000,000, there is authorized to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate the compensation of an additional clerk to each of the Senators from such State at the basic rate of $1,500 per annum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, will the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration explain why such clerks are provided?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. There is a provision in the rules that any State which has a population of more than 10,000,000 shall be allowed an additional clerk for each Senator representing such State. California, according to the

latest United States census report available to the committee, now has a population in excess of 10,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. Has the committee unanimously endorsed the request?

Mr. HAYDEN. The committee has; yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

AGE LIMIT FOR SENATE PAGES

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 14, submitted by myself and Mr. WHERRY on January 5, 1949, and I submit a report (No. 4) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the following resolution of the Senate agreed to on December 6, 1870, namely:

"*Resolved*, That in no case shall a page of the Senate be appointed for duty in the Senate Chamber who is younger than 12 years, or remain in office after the age of 16 years," be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"*Resolved*, That in no case shall a page of the Senate be appointed for duty in the Senate Chamber who is younger than 14 years, or remain in office after the age of 17 years, and who has not completed the eighth grade of school."

ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 32), which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eighty-first Congress, $25,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, approved August 2, 1946.

REPORT OF WORK OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, 2 years ago, under the Reorganization Act, the scope of the work of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments was very much broadened. During the past 2 years it has been my privilege to be chairman of that committee. It has been a very happy privilege. I have had a splendid nonpartisan committee with which to work. My last act as chairman of that committee for the Eightieth Congress was to have prepared a report of the work of the first 2 years of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments under the broadened authority given it by the Reorganization Act. The report, unfortunately, was not completed until my term of office as chairman had expired.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed as a Senate document. I understand that the chairman of the Subcommittee on Printing, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], has no objection to the matter being handled in this way.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, furthermore I should like to say that, as I have already stated, the relationship which I had with the members of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has been very satisfactory and pleasant indeed, and I am glad that the chairmanship of that committee is now turned over to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], who has given me the fullest cooperation during the time I was chairman of the committee. I only regret that circumstances do not permit me to remain a member of the committee so that I could give him equally good cooperation on my part.

VOICE OF AMERICA (S. REPT. NO. 2)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], under authority of the order of the Senate of December 31, 1948, I submit herewith a joint report of a subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations of their investigation of certain allegations against radio broadcast operations under the Voice of America program.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed.

ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH—COMMUNICATION FROM HON. HERBERT HOOVER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Honorable Herbert Hoover, chairman of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, dealing with reorganization. The communication will be referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the communication printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The communication was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT,
Washington, D. C., January 13, 1949.

The Honorable KENNETH MCKELLAR,
President pro tempore,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: The necessity for reorganization of the executive branch of the Government was clearly recognized by the Congress when it created this Commission in July 1947, with the full approval of the President. Congress assigned the Commission the duty of examination and recommendation under the following statement from the act creating the Commission:

"It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to promote economy, efficiency, and improved service in the transaction of the public business in the departments, bureaus, agencies, boards, commissions, offices, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government by—

"(1) limiting expenditures to the lowest amount consistent with the efficient performance of essential services, activities, and functions;

"(2) eliminating duplication and overlapping of services, activities, and functions;

"(3) consolidating services, activities, and functions of a similar nature;

"(4) abolishing services, activities, and functions not necessary to the efficient conduct of government; and

"(5) defining and limiting executive functions, services, and activities."

This concern of Congress for economy and efficiency reflects the overwhelming interest of every thoughtful citizen and taxpayer in the land.

The writing and adoption of the Federal Constitution proved that a republic could deliberately analyze its political institutions and redesign its government to meet the demands of the future. The broad pattern that America then selected is sound. Today we must deal with the infinitely more complicated government of the twentieth century. In doing so, we must reorganize the executive branch to give it the simplicity of structure, the unity of purpose, and the clear line of executive authority that was originally intended under the Constitution.

As a result of depression, war, new needs for defense, and our greater responsibilities in the foreign field, the Federal Government has become the most gigantic business on earth. In less than 20 years the number of its civil employees has risen from 570,000 to over 2,100,000. The number of bureaus, sections, services, and units has increased fourfold to over 1,800. Annual expenditures have increased from about $3,600,000,000 to over $42,000,000,000. The national debt per average family has increased from about $500 to about $7,500. Such rapid growth could not take place without causing serious problems. Organizational methods, effective 20 years ago, are no longer applicable. The growth of skills and methods in private organization has long since outmoded many of the methods of the Government.

This Commission has found that the United States is paying heavily for a lack of order, a lack of clear lines of authority and responsibility, and a lack of effective organization in the executive branch. It has found that great improvements can be made in the effectiveness with which the Government can serve the people if its organization and administration is overhauled.

This Commission has been engaged in its task for the last 16 months and is reaching its conclusions only after the most painstaking research. We decided at an early date that we must have the aid of leading and experienced citizens to assist us in making findings of fact and recommendation of remedies. The Commission, therefore, divided its work into functional and departmental segments; it created 24 "task forces" with authority to engage such research aid as they might require. About 300 outstanding men and women, expert and experienced in the fields to which they were assigned, have now submitted to us their findings and recommendations. Thanks are due them. They brought great talent and diligence to their work. Their findings will be found useful by the Congress and the executive branch in solution of the problems considered.

Some of the recommendations contained in the volumes of our report, which we plan to file from time to time between now and the expiration of the life of the Commission, can be put into effect only by legislation. Others can be accomplished by executive action. But many of the most important

can probably be accomplished only if the Congress reenacts and broadens the power to initiate reorganization plans which it had previously granted to the President under an act which expired on March 31, 1948.

The Commission recommends that such authority should be given to the President and that the power of the President to prepare and transmit plans of reorganization to the Congress should not be restricted by limitations or exemptions. Once the limiting and exempting process is begun it will end the possibility of achieving really substantial results.

But, in saying this, the Commission should not be understood as giving sweeping endorsement to any and all reorganization plans. It does believe that the safeguard against unwise reorganization plans lies both in a sound exercise of the President's discretion and in the reserved power in the Congress by concurrent resolution to disapprove any proposed plan.

Limitations or exemptions upon this power to reorganize should not be imposed other than that of congressional disapproval. They have arisen in the past chiefly in connection with the regulatory commissions. In one of its reports the Commission will discuss these regulatory commissions in detail. It will point out in each case those regulatory functions which it is believed should continue to be performed independently. The Commission will also point out certain other functions which are of a different nature and which can be more efficiently and economically performed by purely executive officials. The inclusion in a reorganization act of provisions exempting certain agencies from its terms would prevent changes which are in accord with established principles in this field and which in no way impair the maintenance of independence and impartiality in the exercise of the great regulatory functions.

Similarly, the inclusion of general language, like that contained in section 5 (a) (6) of the Reorganization Act of 1945,[1] intended to prevent the submission of any plan which imposes limitations upon the independent exercise of quasi-legislative or quasi-judicial functions, would, in the Commission's judgment, be unwise. The phrases are extremely vague and of uncertain meaning. Ingenious and plausible arguments can be made to apply them to a wide range of functions which should clearly be subject to reorganization procedure. Such arguments would not be matters of purely theoretical concern or legislative debates, for the validity of reorganization could be made the subject of protracted litigation by private interests resisting the acts of a reorganized agency on the ground that it was illegally constituted. It might take several years of litigation to lay down interpretations of these general phrases and, even then, uncertainty would remain.

The Commission, in accordance with the act of Congress creating it, as amended, will file its report in a series of parts or volumes, the last of which will be delivered within 70 days of the organization of the Eighty-first Congress. These reports will contain its findings and recommendations. They will begin with the top organization and structure of the executive branch and proceed through the services which are common to the whole executive branch to the reorganizations recommended for particular agencies and groups of agencies.

Yours faithfully,

HERBERT HOOVER,
Chairman.

[1] SEC. 5. (a) No reorganization plan shall provide for, and no reorganization under this act shall have the effect of * * * (6) imposing, in connection with the exercise of any quasi-judicial or quasi-legislative function possessed by an independent agency, any greater limitation upon the exercise of independent judgment and discretion, to the full extent authorized by law, in the carrying out of such function, than existed with respect to the exercise of such function by the agency in which it was vested prior to the taking effect of such reorganization; except that this prohibition shall not prevent the abolition of any such function.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION BILL—ADDITIONAL SPONSOR

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, through some error the name of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] was left off as a sponsor of Senate bill 247, the so-called National Science Foundation bill. The Senator from Washington has had his name on similar bills from the beginning, and I am very sorry that the mistake was made. I ask unanimous consent that his name be added as a sponsor to the National Science Foundation bill to which I have referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISPLACED PERSONS ACT AMENDMENTS—ADDITIONAL SPONSOR

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on January 5, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and I introduced certain amendments to the Displaced Persons Act. These bills were S. 98, S. 99, and S. 100.

Entirely through an inadvertency, the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] was omitted from these amendments. I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD show that the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] was one of the cosponsors of this proposed legislation, and that his name appear on the amendments.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to state that the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] was inadvertently omitted from the list of sponsors of the three amendments to the Displaced Persons Act; and I join in the request of the able Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] in that regard.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the correction will be made, and the name of the Senator from New York will be added to the bill as a sponsor.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 332. A bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina also introduced Senate bill 333, to authorize the appointment of three additional judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia and prescribe the qualifications of the judges of such court, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 334. A bill for the relief of Olga Belokhovsky-Erelbe; and

S. 335. A bill for the relief of Claris U. Yeadon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 336. A bill to clarify the overtime compensation provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; as amended, as applied in the stevedoring and building construction industries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. NEELY:

S. 337. A bill for the relief of Roleigh Lee Stubbs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 338. A bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, so as to include thereunder the Cumberland River and Cumberland River Basin; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 339. A bill to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 340. A bill to facilitate the administration by the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with other Federal agencies, of the recreational uses of lands and waters within reclamation, flood control, power, and other Federal reservoir projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 341. A bill for the relief of the Yellow Cab Transit Co., of Oklahoma City; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCFARLAND (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado):

S. 342. A bill to facilitate cooperation of recognized organizations with the Veterans' Administration;

S. 343. A bill to increase compensation and pension rates under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration;

S. 344. A bill to provide pensions for veterans of World War I and World War II based on non-service-connected disability and attained age;

S. 345. A bill to liberalize the basis for award of disability pension, and for other purposes;

S. 346. A bill to provide Government protection for widows and children of deceased veterans of World Wars I and II;

S. 347. A bill to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents;

S. 348. A bill to provide an equitable basis for determining dependency of parents under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration;

S. 349. A bill to provide minimum ratings for service-connected arrested tuberculosis; and

S. 350. A bill to restore full compensation awards in World War I presumptively service-connected cases; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MCCARTHY (for himself and Mr. O'CONOR):

S. 351. A bill to authorize the Public Housing Commissioner to sell the suburban resettlement projects known as Greenbelt, Md., Greendale, Wis., and Greenhills, Ohio, without regard to provisions of law requiring competitive bidding or public advertising; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MCCLELLAN:

S. 352. A bill to regulate subsistence expenses of civilian officers and employees in the executive branch of the Government while absent from their designated posts of duty on official business; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 353. A bill to protect scenic values along and tributary to Aspen Basin Road, and contiguous scenic area, within the Sante Fe National Forest, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 354. A bill to authorize the conveyance of land to Clifford M. Phorpe; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 355. A bill for the relief of Lee Hong Dick;

S. 356. A bill for the relief of Hugo Geiger; and

S. 357. A bill to make it a crime for Federal employees to make unlawful threats to a taxpayer for the purpose of collecting taxes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 358. A bill to provide judicial procedure for determining a taxpayer's liability for income-tax deficiencies; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. TAYLOR) introduced Senate bill 359, to permit farmers to carry over and carry back net operating losses for 8 years for income-tax purposes which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 360. A bill for the relief of Isac Glickman, Reghina Glickman, Alfred Glickman, and Ana Glickman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 361. A bill exempting from tax the transportation of persons to and from an airport in a motor vehicle having a seating capacity of less than 10 passengers; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 362. A bill providing for contributions to States and local governmental units in lieu of taxes on real property held by the Federal Government; creating a commission to determine and pay such contributions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER (for himself and Mr. CAIN):

S. 363. A bill to repeal section 2 of the act of May 1, 1936 (49 Stat. 1250), and to rescind certain orders of the Secretary of the Interior establishing Indian reservations in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER (for himself and Mr. WHERRY):

S. 364. A bill for the relief of Bloom Typewriter Exchange; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER (for himself, Mr. THYE, and Mr. WHERRY):

S. 365. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation for 1 year of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding materials; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 366. A bill for the relief of John Masters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 367. A bill to provide support for basic commodities; to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and for other purposes;

S. 368. A bill providing for grants to aid in establishing farmers' markets; and

S. 369. A bill to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the protection of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable therefor," approved June 27, 1924; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 370. A bill to provide an appropriation for the reconstruction and repair of bridges on county roads in the flood-damaged areas of the State of Georgia; and

S. 371. A bill to provide emergency aid for the repair, restoration, or reconstruction of public facilities damaged or destroyed by certain catastrophes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

S. 372. A bill to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Americus, Ga., as the Marcus George Veterans Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 373. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of W. C. Shepherd, trading as W. C. Shepherd Co.;

S. 374. A bill to provide for the furnishing of quarters at Brunswick, Ga., for the United States District Court for the Southern District of Georgia;

S. 375. A bill for the relief of Charles Seraphim Peroulas and George Athanasios Peroulas;

S. 376. A bill for the relief of Louise S. Page;

S. 377. A bill for the relief of Ernest J. Jenkins;

S. 378. A bill to amend section 77 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to create a Swainsboro division in the southern district of Georgia, with terms of court to be held at Swainsboro; and

S. 379. A bill for the relief of Bram B. Tellekamp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 380. A bill for the relief of Peter I. Tirbak and his family;

S. 381. A bill for the relief of Low Way Hong;

S. 382. A bill for the relief of Wong Suey Wing; and

S. 383. A bill for the relief of William Jennings Bieller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 384. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of Public Buildings to convey to the Temple Methodist Church, a nonprofit corporation, of San Francisco, Calif., a portion of the federally owned building known as 100 McAllister Street, San Francisco, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 385. A bill to permit the furnishing of certain hydrographic charts without charge to official depositories in the university libraries of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 386. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Harry W. Sharpley, his heirs, administrators, or assigns, against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 387. A bill for the relief of William K. Burlen; and

S. 388. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of the town of Lancaster, Mass., for the loss of taxes on certain property in such town acquired by the United States for use for military purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 389. A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, so as to provide an increase in pay for certain personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 390. A bill for the relief of George M. Ford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 391. A bill to increase the compensation of new employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 392. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Thomas A. Pickett; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 393. A bill for the relief of Kala Helle;

S. 394. A bill to authorize the admission of Mrs. Julia Balint to the United States.

S. 395. A bill for the relief of Dorothea Singer; and

S. 396. A bill for the relief of Virgil L. Hesterly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. WAGNER):

S. 397. A bill for the relief of Franz Eugene Laub; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 398. A bill to establish a United States Air Force Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 399. A bill to extend to the veterans of the Mexican-border service of 1916 and 1917 and their widows and minor children all the provisions, privileges, rights, and benefits of laws enacted for the benefit of veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 400. A bill to provide for ascertaining the economic justification for proposed improvements to the inland waterways of the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 401. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended;

S. 402. A bill to establish a Department of Transportation, and for other purposes; and

S. 403. A bill to prohibit the introduction or movement in interstate commerce of articles of wearing apparel and fabrics which are so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 404. A bill for the relief of Emma L. Jackson;

S. 405. A bill for the relief of J. H. Westfield;

S. 406. A bill for the relief of Margaret Dunn;

S. 407. A bill to provide for the incorporation of the National Woman's Relief Corps, Auxiliary to the Grand Army of the Republic, organized 1883, 62 years old;

S. 408. A bill for the relief of Barbara O'Brien Farquer;

S. 409. A bill for the relief of George Bailey;

S. 410. A bill for the relief of the former shareholders of the Goshen Veneer Co., an Indiana corporation;

S. 411. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hattie Truax; and

S. 412. A bill to legalize the admission into the United States of Vendelin Krajci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 413. A bill to provide for an air parcel-post service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 414. A bill to authorize the allocation of funds to Grant County, Ind., for payment of one-half the cost of a certain bridge across the Mississinewa River in Grant County, Ind., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 415. A bill to amend section 514 of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, to permit States and political subdivisions thereof to impose taxes on the personal property of members of the armed services located in such States and political subdivisions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I introduce 17 bills dealing with aviation, which are, in large measure, those which were presented, but without opportunity for consideration, in the last session. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the new chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, indicated to me it would be agreeable if the bills were introduced under the aegis of the committee which functioned in the last session for appropriate reference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 416. A bill to provide for the planning of military aircraft requirements, to authorize the development and procurement of military aeronautical equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 417. A bill to amend the Immigration Acts of 1917 and 1924 to permit the mitigation of certain fines, and for other purposes;

S. 418. A bill to exempt Canadian citizens and aircraft crewmen from certain visa requirements; and

S. 419. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims arising from the termination of contracts of the armed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 420. A bill to provide for the avoidance of multiple taxation of air commerce, and for other purposes; and

S. 421. A bill to exempt air carriers from statutory provisions requiring payments for compensation for customs employees' overtime services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 422. A bill to provide for the more expeditious carriage of domestic and foreign first-class mail by air, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 423. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 424. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to local enforcement of safety regulations of civil aviation, and for other purposes;

S. 425. A bill to encourage the development of a safe United States flag international air-transportation system properly adapted to the present and future needs of foreign commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense, and to meet certain of the obligations incumbent upon the United States by virtue of its membership in the International Civil Aviation Organization, by providing for the transfer, establishment, operation, administration, and maintenance of airport and airway property located outside the continental United States, for the training of foreign nationals in aviation activities, and for other purposes;

S. 426. A bill to provide for the development of civil transport aircraft adaptable for auxiliary military service and for other purposes;

S. 427. A bill to authorize the United States Maritime Commission to provide for the development of lighter-than-air rigid airships for commercial use;

S. 428. A bill to provide for the establishment of a National Air Policy Board;

S. 429. A bill to provide for coordination of aviation policy, and for other purposes;

S. 430. A bill to provide for an independent Office of Air Safety, and for other purposes;

S. 431. A bill to improve the administration of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes;

S. 432. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for the regulation of interstate contract carriers by air, and for other purposes; and

S. 433. A bill to provide for coordination of aviation policy, to improve the administration of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, to provide for an independent Office of Air Safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(Mr. MYERS introduced Senate bill 434, to continue rent control until June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, ordered to be printed, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 435. A bill for the relief of Kathe Schlomtropp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 436. A bill for the relief of Arkady Tkachenko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 437. A bill to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false advertising, and false invoicing of fur products and furs;

S. 438. A bill to amend section 15 (4) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 439 (by request). A bill to amend section 327 of the Communications Act of 1934 to permit the use of Coast Guard radio stations for commercial messages;

S. 440 (by request). A bill to amend section 1 of the Federal Power Act, with respect to the terms of office of members of the Federal Power Commission;

S. 441 (by request). A bill to redefine the units and establish the standards of electrical and photometric measurements;

S. 442 (by request). A bill to amend the Air Commerce Act of 1926 (44 Stat. 568), as amended, to provide for the application to civil air navigation of laws and regulations related to animal and plant quarantine, and for other purposes;

S. 443 (by request). A bill to authorize the construction and equipment of a radio laboratory building for the National Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce;

S. 444 (by request). A bill to provide for the acceptance and use of funds for support of the national weather service supplementing the funds appropriated for the operation of the Weather Bureau of the Department of Commerce;

S. 445 (by request). A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to the regulation of civil aviation, and for other purposes;

S. 446 (by request). A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 447 (by request). A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to regulate the transportation, packing, marking, and description of explosives and other dangerous articles;

S. 448 (by request). A bill to improve the administration of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes;

S. 449 (by request). A bill to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes;

S. 450 (by request). A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by providing for the delegation of certain authority of the Administrator, and for other purposes;

S. 451 (by request). A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by providing for certain penalties for unlawful use of examination papers, and for other purposes;

S. 452. (by request). A bill to amend title II of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended;

S. 453 (by request). A bill to authorize the establishment of 10 positions in the professional and scientific service in the Department of Commerce with rates of compensation not in excess of $15,000 per annum;

S. 454 (by request). A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to reimburse employees of the Department for the expense of entertainment of representatives of other countries, and for other purposes;

S. 455 (by request). A bill to facilitate the development of a system of air-navigation aids adequate to meet the needs of the air commerce and the military requirements of the United States, and for other purposes;

S 456 (by request). A bill to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of a public airport in or in the vicinity of the District of Columbia; and

S. 457 (by request). A bill to amend the Transportation of Explosives Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 458. A bill to provide for a survey of physically handicapped citizens; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. MILLIKIN):

S. 459. A bill for the relief of Cornelis Ruhtenberg, also known as Cornelis Ruhtenberg Helmsing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 460 (by request). A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to the Helena Chamber of Commerce certain described parcels of land situated in the city of Helena, Mont.; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. GEORGE also (by request) introduced Senate bill 461, to clarify the provisions of section 602 (u) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 462. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of a mining-research station in the vicinity of Spokane, Wash., for investigation of methods of mining the ores and other mineral raw materials of the Northwest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 463. A bill for the relief of the Northwest Lead Co.;

S. 464. A bill for the relief of Hans Hauser;

S. 465. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Gottfried Schmidt-Ehrenberg;

S. 466. A bill for the relief of certain officers and members of the crew of the steamship *Taiyuan;*

S. 467. A bill to authorize the admission into the United States of persons of races indigenous to Siam, and to make them racially eligible for naturalization;

S. 468. A bill for the relief of Johnson & Gunstone, a copartnership;

S. 469. A bill for the relief of Catherine A. Giesener;

S. 470. A bill for the relief of Dr. Richard Grunberg;

S. 471. A bill for the relief of Lloyd Gordon Findley; and

S. 472. A bill for the relief of Osmore H. Morgan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 473. A bill to increase from $3,000 to $5,000 the maximum amount that a retired commissioned officer and certain other Federal employees may receive as combined retired pay and compensation from a civilian office or position under the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 474. A bill to amend the Hatch Act; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. KILGORE):

S. 475. A bill to aid in the naturalization of persons with wartime service in the merchant marine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY) introduced Senate bill 476, making the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November, in every even-numbered year, a legal holiday, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 477. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Winfred DeCoteau a patent in fee to certain land; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 478. A bill for the relief of Carl Piowaty and W. J. Piowaty; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 479. A bill to extend annuity benefits under the Foreign Service Act of 1946 to widows of certain foreign service officers who died prior to the effective date of such act; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 480. A bill for the relief of William R. Akers;

S. 481. A bill for the relief of C. J. Hartman;

S. 482. A bill for the relief of William H. Williams;

S. 483. A bill for the relief of Floyd H. Cropper;

S. 484. A bill for the relief of Jehuda Herszfeld;

S. 485. A bill for the relief of Joyce Violet Angel;

S. 486. A bill for the relief of Song Kwan Lee also known as Paul Molina; and

S. 487. A bill to amend title 18, U. S. C., sections 2312 and 2313, so as to include thereunder motor vehicles and aircraft which have been converted, or taken by fraud; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND):

S. 488. A bill for the relief of Sam Wooten, F. M. Maloy, and Mrs. Alethea Arthur; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 489. A bill to authorize the refund to the Florida Keys Aqueduct Commission of the sum advanced for certain water facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 490. A bill for the relief of Frank Miller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 491. A bill to limit power of radio broadcast stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 492. A bill to amend an act approved June 29, 1948, entitled "An act to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (by request):

S. 493. A bill to extend the benefits of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 to the Virgin Islands;

S. 494. A bill to amend the Columbia Basin Project Act with reference to State lands; and

S. 495. A bill to amend section 10 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McMAHON (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado):

S. 496. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through elementary and secondary schools, for the national security and general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. McFARLAND):

S. 497. A bill to authorize mining, milling, or smelting loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(Mr. GILLETTE (for himself, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. CAIN, Mr. HUNT, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. BROUGHTON, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. KERR, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. FREAR, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. LANGER, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MYERS, Mr. WILEY, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. REED, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. MILLER, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. MALONE, and Mr. SCHOEPPEL) introduced Senate joint resolution (S. J. Res. 25) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. J. Res. 26. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. J. Res. 27. Joint resolution to establish a Temporary Commission on Military Contract Audits; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. J. Res. 28. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Congressional Committee on Aviation Policy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. J. Res. 29. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the fiftieth anniversary of the National Jewish Hospital at Denver; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. MILLIKIN):

S. J. Res. 30. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the proposed United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Denver, Colo., as the Edward W. Combs Veterans' Facility Hospital; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(Mr. LUCAS (for himself and Mr. WHERRY) introduced Senate Joint Resolution 31, to provide for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train by the Archivist of the United States, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. CAIN):

S. J. Res. 32. Joint resolution to authorize the cancellation and release of an agreement dated December 31, 1923, entered into between the port of Seattle and the United States of America, represented by the United States Shipping Board acting through the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BYRD (for himself and Mr. ROBERTSON):

S. J. Res. 33. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance for public use of certain highways in the Shenandoah National Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. LONG, Mr. HOEY, Mr. BROUGHTON, and Mr. ROBERTSON):

S. J. Res. 34. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the qualifications of electors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LOSSES OF FARMERS IN COMPUTING INCOME TAXES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which is designed to permit farmers to carry over and carry back net operating losses for 8 years for income-tax purposes. At the present time the farmer is being discriminated against. He may have had a loss in 1 year or 2 years or 3 years, and yet if he happens to have a good crop and receives a good price he has to pay an enormous income tax without having the privilege that business has, to deduct for losses incurred during a certain period of years. In order to equalize the tax burden and to treat the farmer in the same way that all other businessmen are treated, I have introduced the bill, and I call it particularly to the attention of the Finance Committee.

The bill (S. 359) to permit farmers to carry over and carry back net operating losses for 8 years for income tax purposes, introduced by Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. TAYLOR), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ADDITIONAL JUDGES OF MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the appointment of three additional judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill prepared by me be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from South Carolina will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 333) to authorize the appointment of three additional judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia and prescribe the qualifications of the judges of such court, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina is as follows:

STATEMENT BY MR. JOHNSTON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

EXPLANATION OF BILL TO AUTHORIZE THE APPOINTMENT OF THREE ADDITIONAL JUDGES OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND PRESCRIBE THE QUALIFICATIONS OF THE JUDGES OF SUCH COURT

The primary purpose of this bill is to create three new judgeships on the municipal court for the District of Columbia.

The municipal court of the District of Columbia is at present greatly overworked, is running behind on its docket, and has no prospect except to run further behind, unless additional judges are provided. The court has not been increased in membership in recent years, in spite of a great increase in the population of the District of Columbia.

This is an important court, and litigants are entitled to the speedy justice which can only be provided when there are enough judges to handle expeditiously all cases filed.

It is important to note that this court has a net income of over $1,000,000 per year, which is paid into the general fund of the District of Columbia. Therefore, the proposal to increase the number of judges for the court is not one which will require any expenditure of the revenues of the United States.

A further purpose of this bill is to more adequately prescribe the qualifications of appointees to the municipal court for the District of Columbia.

At the present time, authority exists for the appointment of 2 of the 10 judges, now authorized for this court, from among nonresidents of the District of Columbia. As a matter of fact, all 10 of the present judges are residents of the District.

This bill would, in effect, require that 11 of the 13 judges of the court, which it would authorize, should be bona fide residents of the District of Columbia, and shall (except in the case of an appointee who shall have been a judge of one of the courts of the District of Columbia) have maintained an actual place of abode within the District for not less than 5 years immediately prior to appointment, and shall, during such 5-year period, have been actively engaged in the private practice of the law in the District of Columbia, maintaining an office in the District for the purposes of such practice, and devoting a major portion of working time to such practice and deriving the principal portion of income from such practice.

The bill would provide that service during the present emergency in the armed forces of the United States shall be included in the computation of the 5-year requirements specified.

Not more than 2 of the 13 judges which would be authorized under this bill might be either (1) a nonresident of the District of Columbia who shall have been for at least 5 years prior to appointment a member of the bar of the highest court in the State in which he has been domiciled, and who is a member of the bar of the District of Columbia, or (2) a member of the bar of the District of Columbia, for at least 5 years prior to appointment, who has been employed as an attorney in the District of Columbia in either the Government of the United States or the government of the District of Columbia. In applying this provision, members of the present court would be disregarded. The bill requires that in making appointments to the three additional vacancies authorized, at least one person shall be appointed from the classes mentioned in this paragraph.

Section 3 of the bill contains the technical provisions necessary to make available for the payment of the proposed new judges moneys appropriated for the government of the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949.

A similar bill was considered and passed by the Senate in the Seventy-ninth Congress. Although the bill was reported favorably by the House Committee on the District of Columbia, it was not acted upon by the House and failed to become law.

EXTENSION OF RENT CONTROL

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing for the extension of rent control to June 30, 1951. I ask unanimous consent that a statement I am issuing on this bill be printed at this point in the RECORD, as well as an analysis of the bill, and I ask that these be followed in the RECORD by the printing of the bill itself.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill together with the statement and analysis of the Senator from Pennsylvania will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 434) to continue rent control until June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MYERS was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Housing and Rent Act of 1949."

SEC. 2. The provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, are amended by inserting the following immediately preceding Title I—Amendments to Existing Law.

"DECLARATION OF PURPOSES

"This act is hereby declared to be in the interest of the national defense and security and necessary to the successful completion of the present war. The Congress recognizes that an emergency exists with regard to housing accommodations due to the acute shortage of all types of housing and especially rental housing.

"The purposes of this act are, during the transition period from war to peace, to stabilize rents for housing accommodations and to prevent speculative, unwarranted, and abnormal increases in rents for such accommodations; to prevent unwarranted evictions because they would cause grave hardships to tenants and because unlimited evictions would render it extremely difficult to control rents; to protect persons with relatively fixed and limited incomes, consumers, wage earners, and veterans and other persons dependent upon life insurance, annuities, pensions, and allowances granted to veterans attending school or learning trades, from undue impairment of their standard of living; to prevent the disruption of production due to the inability of employees to find adequate housing; and to assist veterans to obtain adequate housing for themselves and their families."

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE I OF HOUSING AND RENT ACT OF 1947, AS AMENDED

SEC. 3. Section 4 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by striking out "April 1, 1949" wherever such date appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1951."

TITLE II—MAXIMUM RENTS

SEC. 201. Section 201 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 202. Section 202 (c) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The term 'controlled housing accommodations' means housing accommodations in any defense-rental area, except that it does not include—

"(1) any housing accommodations rented or offered for rent exclusively for transient occupancy (temporary occupancy on a daily or weekly basis) in hotels; or

"(2) any motor court, or any part thereof; any trailer or trailer space, or any part thereof; or any tourist home serving transient guests exclusively or any part thereof."

SEC. 203. Section 202 (d) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The term 'defense-rental area' means any part of any area in which rents were regulated on March 31, 1949, under the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, and any part of any defense-rental area so designated under the Emergency Price Control Act, as amended, and any areas hereinafter designated and placed under regulation pursuant to the authority of this Act, as amended."

SEC. 204. Section 202 (e) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(e) The term 'rent' means the consideration, including any bonus, benefit, or gratuity demanded or received for or in connection with the use or occupancy of housing accommodations, or the transfer of a lease for such housing accommodations."

SEC. 205. Section 202 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by adding the following new subsections at the end thereof:

"(f) The term 'maximum rent' means the maximum lawful rent for the use of defense-area housing accommodations.

"(g) The term 'defense-area housing accommodations' means housing accommodations within any defense-rental area.

"(h) The term 'documents' includes records, books, accounts, correspondence, memoranda, and other documents and drafts and copies of any of the foregoing.

"(i) The term 'district court' means any district court of the United States and the United States court for any Territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States; and the term 'circuit court of appeals' includes the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia."

SEC. 206. Section 203 (b) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) On the termination of rent control under this title all records and other data (the cabinets or containers holding such records and data) used or held in connection with the establishment and maintenance of maximum rents by the Housing Expediter, and all predecessor agencies, shall, on request be delivered without reimbursement to the proper officials of any State or local subdivision of government that may be charged with the duty of administering a rent-control program in any State or local subdivision of government to which such records and data may be applicable: *Provided, however*, That any such records or data (and the cabinets or containers holding such records or data) shall be so made available subject to recall for use in carrying out the purpose of this title."

SEC. 207. (a) Section 204 (a) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by striking out "March 31, 1949" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1951".

(b) Section 204 (b) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) During the period from the effective date of the Housing and Rent Act of 1949 and ending on the date this act ceases to be in effect, the maximum rent for controlled housing accommodations, unless and until changed by the Housing Expediter in accordance with paragraph (5) of this subsection, shall be the rents fixed by the Housing Expediter determined as follows:

"(1) For housing accommodations for which a maximum rent was in effect on March 31, 1949, the maximum rent shall continue to be such maximum rent;

"(2) For housing accommodations not included within the definition of 'controlled housing accommodations' as this definition read prior to the effective date of the Housing and Rent Act of 1949, the maximum rent shall be the higher of (a) the rent generally prevailing in the defense-rental area for comparable accommodations on the maximum rent date for such area, plus due allowance, where new construction is involved, for general increases in the cost of construction in the area from 1939 until the date the construction is or was completed; (b) the maximum rent last in effect for such housing accommodations under Federal rent control;

"(3) For housing accommodations which were exempt from control pursuant to the second proviso of section 204 (b) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 as section 204 (b) read prior to amendment by the Housing and Rent Act of 1948, and for housing accommodations which were exempt from control pursuant to section 204 (b) (2) and (3) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, as section 204 (b) (2) and (3) read prior to the effective date of the Housing and Rent Act of 1949, the maximum rent shall be the rent established for such housing accommodations by such lease;

"(4) For housing accommodations recontrolled pursuant to the provisions of this act, as amended, the maximum rent shall be the maximum rent established by the Housing Expediter in the order or regulation of control;

"(5) The Housing Expediter may by regulation or order, make such adjustments in the maximum rents established under paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) of this subsection (b) as may be necessary to carry out the purposes and provisions of this act, as amended."

(c) Section 204 (c) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Whenever in the judgment of the Housing Expediter such action is necessary or proper in order to effectuate the purposes of this act, he shall issue a declaration setting forth the necessity for, and recommendations with reference to, the stabilization or reduction of rents for any defense-area housing accommodations within a particular defense-rental area. If within 60 days after the issuance of any such recommendations rents for any such accommodations within such defense-rental area have not in the judgment of the Housing Expediter been stabilized or reduced by State or local regulations, or otherwise, in accordance with the recommendations, the Housing Expediter may by regulation or order establish such maximum rents for such accommodations as in his judgment will be generally fair and equitable and will effectuate the purposes of this act. So far as practicable, in establishing any maximum rent for any defense-area housing accommodations, the Housing Expediter shall ascertain and give due consideration to the rents prevailing for such accommodations, or comparable accommodations, on or about April 1, 1941 (or if, prior

or subsequent to April 1, 1941, defense activities shall have resulted or threatened to result in increases in rents for housing accommodations in such area inconsistent with the purposes of this act, then on or about a date not earlier than April 1, 1940), which in the judgment of the Housing Expediter, does not reflect such increases, and he shall make adjustments for such relevant factors as he may determine and deem to be of general applicability in respect of such accommodations, including increases or decreases in property taxes and other costs within such defense-rental area. In designating defense-rental areas, in prescribing regulations and orders establishing maximum rents for such accommodations, and in selecting persons to administer such regulations and orders, the Housing Expediter shall, to such extent as he deems to be practicable, consider any recommendations which may be made by State and local officials concerned with housing or rental conditions in any defense-rental area. Whenever the Housing Expediter shall find that, in any defense-rental area or any portion thereof specified by him, the availability of adequate rental housing accommodations and other relevant factors are such as to make rent control unnecessary for the purpose of eliminating speculative, unwarranted, and abnormal increase in rents and of preventing profiteering, and speculative and other disruptive practices resulting from abnormal market conditions caused by congestion, the controls imposed upon rents by authority of this act in such defense-rental area or portion thereof shall be forthwith abolished; but whenever in the judgment of the Housing Expediter it is necessary or proper, in order to effectuate the purpose of this act, to reestablish the regulation of rents in any such defense-rental area or portion thereof, he may forthwith by regulation or order reestablish maximum rents for housing accommodations therein in accordance with the standards set forth in this act. Before issuing any regulation or order of general applicability under the foregoing provisions of this subsection, the Housing Expediter shall, so far as practicable, advise and consult with a national advisory committee composed of 15 members to be appointed by him which is representative of both landlord and tenant interests and of the general public."

(d) Section 204 (d) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The Housing Expediter is authorized to issue such regulations and orders as he may deem necessary to carry out the provision of this act. Any regulation or order under this section may be established in such form and manner, may contain such classifications and differentiations, and may provide for such adjustments and reasonable exceptions, as in the judgment of the Housing Expediter are necessary or proper in order to effectuate the purposes of this act, as amended. Any regulation or order under this act which establishes a maximum rent may provide for a maximum rent below the rent or rents prevailing for the defense-area housing accommodations, at the time of the issuance of such regulation or order. Regulations, orders, and requirements under this act, as amended, may contain such provisions as the Housing Expediter deems necessary to prevent the circumvention or evasion thereof. The powers granted in this section shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in established rental practice, except where such action is affirmatively found by the Housing Expediter to be necessary to prevent circumvention or evasion of any regulation, order, or requirement under this act, as amended."

(e) Section 204 (e) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(e) (1) The Housing Expediter is authorized and directed to create in each defense-rental area, or such portion thereof as he may designate, a local advisory board, each such board to consist of not less than five members who are citizens of the area and who, insofar as practicable, are, as a group, representative of the affected interests in the area, to be appointed by the Housing Expediter from recommendations made by the respective governors: *Provided*, That in any case where the governor has made no recommendations for original appointments to local boards or appointments to fill vacancies, within 30 days after request therefor (subsequent to March 31, 1949) from the Housing Expediter, the Housing Expediter shall without such recommendations appoint the original members of such boards or such members as may be required to fill vacancies. The Housing Expediter shall immediately subsequent to March 31, 1949, screen the membership of the boards to determine if their membership complies with the standards set forth in this section and shall promptly take steps to effectuate any change in the membership of any board necessitated by this provision.

"(2) The Housing Expediter shall furnish the local advisory boards suitable office space and stenographic assistance and shall make available to such boards any records and other information in the possession of the Housing Expediter with respect to the establishment and maintenance of maximum rents for housing accommodations in the respective defense-rental area which may be requested by such boards.

"(3) The local advisory boards shall have the following functions: (a) to make recommendations to the Housing Expediter with respect to the decontrol of the defense-rental area or any portion thereof; (b) to make recommendations to the Housing Expediter with respect to the adequacy of the general rent level in the area; (c) to make recommendations with respect to the operations generally of the area rent office; (d) to exercise such functions for educational, administrative, and compliance purposes as are delegated by the Housing Expediter.

"(4) The Housing Expediter on receipt of a recommendation from a local advisory board shall give full and careful consideration to such recommendation and to any data accompanying it, but the responsibility for deciding any matter so presented shall rest solely with the Housing Expediter. Within a reasonable time after receipt of any recommendation from a local advisory board concerning a general rent increase or the decontrol of housing accommodations, the Housing Expediter shall approve or disapprove such recommendations by issuing an appropriate order or amendment to his regulations accompanied by a statement of the grounds upon which his decision is based and any economic data and other facts of which he has taken official notice."

(f) Section 204 (f) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(f) The provisions of this title shall cease to be in effect at the close of June 30, 1951."

(g) Section 204 (g) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 208. Section 205 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by striking out from the heading of such section the words "by tenants"; and by changing the period at the end of the sentence, "Suit to recover such amount may be brought in any Federal, State, or Territorial court of competent jurisdiction within 1 year after the date of such violation" to a colon and inserting: "*Provided*, That if the person from whom such payment is demanded, accepted, or received, either fails to institute an action under this subsection within 30 days from the date of the occurrence of the violation or is not entitled for any reason to bring the action, the Housing Expediter may institute such action on behalf of the United States within such 1-year period. If such action is instituted by the Housing Expediter, the person from whom such payment is demanded, accepted, or received shall thereafter be barred from bringing an action for the same violation or violations."

SEC. 209. Section 206 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 206 (a) It shall be unlawful for any person to demand, accept, or receive any rent for the use or occupancy of any controlled housing accommodations in excess of the maximum rent prescribed under section 204, or otherwise to do or omit to do any act, in violation of this act, or of any regulation or order or requirement under this act, or to offer, solicit, attempt, or agree to do any of the foregoing.

"(b) Whenever in the judgment of the Housing Expediter any person has been engaged or is about to engage in any acts or practices which constitute or will constitute a violation of any provision of this act, or any regulation or order issued thereunder, he may make application to the appropriate court for an order enjoining such acts or practices, or for an order enforcing compliance with such provision, and upon a showing by the Housing Expediter that such person has engaged or is about to engage in any such acts or practices a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order shall be granted without bond.

"(c) Any person who willfully violates any provision of this act, or any regulation or order issued thereunder, and any person who makes any statement or entry false in any material respect in any document or report required to be kept or filed under this act, shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to a fine of not more than $5,000 or to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or to both such fine and imprisonment. Whenever the Housing Expediter has reason to believe that any person is liable for punishment under this subsection, he may certify the facts to the Attorney General, who may, in his discretion, cause appropriate proceedings to be brought.

"(d) The district courts shall have jurisdiction of criminal proceedings for violations of this act, or any regulation or order issued thereunder, and concurrently with State and Territorial courts, of all other proceedings under section 205 and subsection (b) of this section. Such criminal proceedings may be brought in any district in which any part of any act or transaction constituting the violation occurred. Such other proceedings may be brought in any district in which any part of any act or transaction constituting the violation occurred, or may be brought in the district in which the defendant resides or transacts business, and process in such cases may be served in any district wherein the defendant resides or transacts business or wherever the defendant may be found. Any such court shall advance on the docket and expedite the disposition of any criminal or other proceedings brought before it under this section. No costs shall be assessed against the Housing Expediter or the United States Government in any proceeding under this act.

"(e) No person shall be liable for damages or penalties in any Federal, State, or Territorial court, on any grounds for or in respect of anything done or omitted to be done in good faith pursuant to any provision of this act or any regulation, order, or requirement thereunder notwithstanding that subsequently such provision, regulation, order, or requirement may be modified, rescinded, or determined to be invalid. In any suit or

action wherein a party relies for ground of relief or defense upon this act or any regulation, order, or requirement thereunder, the court having jurisdiction of such suit or action shall certify such fact to the Housing Expediter. The Housing Expediter may intervene in any such suit or action.

"(f) The principal office of the Housing Expediter shall be in the District of Columbia, but he or any duly authorized representative may exercise any or all of his powers in any place, and attorneys appointed by the Housing Expediter may appear for and represent the Housing Expediter in any case in any court.

"(g) The Housing Expediter is authorized to make such studies and investigations, to conduct such hearings, and to obtain such information as he deems necessary or proper to assist him in prescribing any regulation or order under this act, or in the administration and enforcement of this act and regulations thereunder.

"(h) The Housing Expediter is further authorized by regulation or order, to require any person who rents or offers for rent or acts as broker or agent for the rental of any housing accommodations, to furnish any such information under oath or affirmation or otherwise, to make and keep records and other documents and to make reports, and he may require any such person to permit the inspection and copying of records and other documents, and the inspection of defense-area housing accommodations. The Housing Expediter may administer oaths and affirmations and may, whenever necessary by subpena require any such person to appear and testify or to appear and produce documents or both at any designated place.

"(i) For the purpose of obtaining any information under subsection (g), the Housing Expediter may by subpena require any other person to appear and testify or to appear and produce documents, or both, at any designated place.

"(j) The production of a person's documents at any place other than his place of business shall not be required under this section in any case in which, prior to the return date specified in the subpena issued in respect thereto, such person either has furnished the Housing Expediter with a copy of such documents (certified by such person under oath to be a true and correct copy), or has entered into a stipulation with the Housing Expediter as to the information contained in such documents.

"(k) In case of contumacy by, or refusal to obey a subpena served upon, any person referred to in subsection (i), the district court for any district in which such person is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Housing Expediter, shall have jurisdiction to issue an order requiring such person to appear and give testimony or to appear and produce documents, or both; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof. The provisions of this subsection shall also apply to any person referred to in subsection (h).

"(l) Witnesses subpenaed under this section shall be paid the same fees and mileage as are paid witnesses in the district courts of the United States.

"(m) No person shall be excused from complying with any requirement under this section because of his privilege against self-incrimination, but the immunity provisions of the Compulsory Testimony Act of February 11, 1893 (U. S. C., 1935 ed., title 49, sec. 46), shall apply with respect to any individual who specifically claims such privilege.

"(n) The Housing Expediter shall not publish or disclose any information obtained under this act that such Housing Expediter deems confidential or with reference to which a request for confidential treatment is made by the person furnishing such information unless he determines that the withholding thereof is contrary to the public interest.

"(o) Any person subpenaed under this section shall have the right to make a record of this testimony and be represented by counsel."

SEC. 210. Section 208 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(c) The Housing Expediter may, subject to the civil-service laws, appoint such employees as he deems necessary in order to carry out his functions and duties under this act, as amended, and shall fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The Housing Expediter may utilize the services of Federal, State, and local agencies and may utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services as may from time to time be needed. In the appointment, selection, classification, and promotion of officers and employees of the Office of the Housing Expediter no political test or qualification shall be permitted or given consideration, but all such appointments and promotions shall be given and made on the basis of merit and efficiency."

SEC. 211. Section 209 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 209. Whenever in the judgment of the Housing Expediter such action is necessary or proper in order to effectuate the purposes of this act, he may, by regulation or order, regulate or prohibit speculative or manipulative practices or renting or leasing practices (including practices relating to recovery of the possession) in connection with any defense-area housing accommodations, which in his judgment are equivalent to or are likely to result in rent increases inconsistent with the purposes of this act."

SEC. 212. Section 211 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 211. The provisions of this act shall be applicable to the several States and to the Territories and possessions of the United States and the District of Columbia."

SEC. 213. Title II of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by adding the following new sections at the end thereof:

"SEC. 214. (a) At any time after the issuance of any regulation, amendment to regulation, or order under section 204, any person, including any tenant, affected by any provisions of such regulation, amendment, or order, may, in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the Housing Expediter, file a protest specifically setting forth objections to any such provision and affidavits or other written evidence in support of such objections. Statements in support of any such regulation or order may be received and incorporated in the transcript of the proceedings at such times and in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Housing Expediter. Within a reasonable time after the filing of any protest under this subsection, but in no event more than 30 days after such filing, the Housing Expediter shall either grant or deny such protest in whole or in part, notice such protest for hearing, or provide an opportunity to present further evidence in connection therewith. In the event that the Housing Expediter denies any such protest in whole or in part, he shall inform the protestant of the grounds upon which such decision is based, and of any economic data and other facts of which the Housing Expediter has taken official notice.

"(b) In the administration of this act, the Housing Expediter may take official notice of economic data and other facts, including facts found by him as a result of action taken under subsections (g) to (m) of section 206 of this act.

"(c) Any proceedings under this section may be limited by the Housing Expediter to the filing of affidavits, or other written evidence, and the filing of briefs.

"(d) Any protest filed under this section shall be granted or denied by the Housing Expediter, or granted in part and the remainder of it denied, within a reasonable time after it is filed. Any protestant who is aggrieved by undue delay on the part of the Housing Expediter in disposing of his protest may petition the Emergency Court of Appeals for relief; and such court shall have jurisdiction by appropriate order to require the Housing Expediter to dispose of such protest within such time as may be fixed by the court. If the Housing Expediter does not act finally within the time fixed by the court, the protest shall be deemed to be denied at the expiration of that period.

"(e) Any person who is aggrieved by the denial or partial denial of his protest may, within 30 days after such denial, file a complaint with the Emergency Court of Appeals, specifying his objections and praying that the regulation or order protested be enjoined or set aside in whole or in part. A copy of such complaint shall forthwith be served on the Housing Expediter, who shall certify and file with such court a transcript of such portions of the proceedings in connection with the protest as are material under the complaint. Such transcript shall include a statement setting forth, so far as practicable, the economic data and other facts of which the Housing Expediter has taken official notice. Upon the filing of such complaint the court shall have exclusive jurisdiction to set aside such regulation or order, in whole or in part, to dismiss the complaint, or to remand the proceeding: *Provided*, That the regulation or order may be modified or rescinded by the Housing Expediter at any time notwithstanding the pendency of such complaint. No objection to such regulation or order, and no evidence in support of any objection thereto, shall be considered by the court, unless such objection shall have been set forth by the complainant in the protest or such evidence shall be contained in the transcript. If application is made to the court by either party for leave to introduce additional evidence which was either offered to the Housing Expediter and not admitted, or which could not reasonably have been offered to the Housing Expediter or included by the Housing Expediter in such proceedings, and the court determines that such evidence should be admitted, the court shall order the evidence to be presented to the Housing Expediter. The Housing Expediter shall promptly receive the same, and such other evidence as he deems necessary or proper, and thereupon he shall certify and file with the court a transcript thereof and any modification made in the regulation or order as a result thereof; except that on request by the Housing Expediter, any such evidence shall be presented directly to the court.

"(f) No such regulation or order shall be enjoined or set aside, in whole or in part, unless the complainant establishes to the satisfaction of the court that the regulation or order is not in accordance with law, or is arbitrary or capricious. The effectiveness of a judgment of the court in enjoining or setting aside, in whole or in part, any such regulation or order, shall be postponed until the expiration of 30 days from the entry thereof, except that if a petition for a writ of certiorari is filed with the Supreme Court under subsection (g) within such 30 days, effectiveness of such judgment shall be postponed until an order of the Supreme Court denying such petition becomes final, or until other final disposition of the case by the Supreme Court.

"(g) Within 30 days after entry of a judgment or order, interlocutory or final, by the Emergency Court of Appeals, a petition for a writ of certiorari may be filed in the Supreme Court of the United States, and thereupon the judgment or order shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court in the same

manner as a judgment of a circuit court of appeals as provided in section 240 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 edition, title 28, sec. 347). The Supreme Court shall advance on the docket and expedite the disposition of all causes filed therein pursuant to this subsection. The Emergency Court of Appeals, and the Supreme Court upon review of judgments and orders of the Emergency Court of Appeals, shall have exclusive jurisdiction to determine the validity of any regulation or order issued under section 204, and of any provision of any such regulation or order. Except as provided in this section, no court, Federal, State, or Territorial, shall have jurisdiction or power to consider the validity of any such regulation or order, or to stay, restrain, enjoin, or set aside, in whole or in part, any provision of this act authorizing the issuance of such regulations or orders, or any provision of any such regulation or order, or to restrain or enjoin the enforcement of any such provision.

"(h) (1) Within 30 days after arraignment, or such additional time as the court may allow for good cause shown, in any criminal proceeding, and within 5 days after judgment in any civil or criminal proceeding, brought pursuant to section 205 or section 206 of this act or section 37 of the Criminal Code, involving alleged violation of any provision of any regulation or order issued under section 204, except a regulation or order issued in connection with any recommendation of a local advisory board, the defendant may apply to the court in which the proceeding is pending for leave to file in the Emergency Court of Appeals a complaint against the Housing Expediter setting forth objections to the validity of any provision which the defendant is alleged to have violated or conspired to violate. The court in which the proceeding is pending shall grant such leave with respect to any objection which it finds is made in good faith and with respect to which it finds there is reasonable and substantial excuse for the defendant's failure to present such objection in a protest filed in accordance with subsection (a) of this section. Upon the filing of a complaint pursuant to and within 30 days from the granting of such leave, the Emergency Court of Appeals shall have jurisdiction to enjoin or set aside in whole or in part the provision of the regulation or order complained of or to dismiss the complaint. The court may authorize the introduction of evidence, either to the Housing Expediter or directly to the court, in accordance with subsection (e) of this section. The provisions of subsections (f) and (g) of this section shall be applicable with respect to any proceeding instituted in accordance with this subsection.

"(2) In any proceeding brought pursuant to section 205 or section 206 of this act or section 37 of the Criminal Code, involving an alleged violation of any provision of any such regulation or order, the court shall stay the proceeding—

"(i) during the period within which a complaint may be filed in the Emergency Court of Appeals pursuant to leave granted under paragraph (1) of this subsection with respect to such provision;

"(ii) during the pendency of any protest properly filed by the defendant under subsection (a) of this section prior to the institution of the proceeding under section 205 or section 206 of this act, or section 37 of the Criminal Code, setting forth objections to validity of such provision which the court finds to have been made in good faith; and

"(iii) during the pendency of any judicial proceeding instituted by the defendant under this section with respect to such protest or instituted by the defendant under paragraph (1) of this subsection with respect to such provision, and until the expiration of the time allowed in this section for the taking of further proceedings with respect thereto. Notwithstanding the provisions of this paragraph, stays shall be granted thereunder in civil proceedings only after judgment and upon application made within 5 days after judgment. Notwithstanding the provisions of this paragraph, in the case of a proceeding under section 206 (b) of this act, as amended, the court granting a stay under this paragraph shall issue a temporary injunction or restraining order enjoining or restraining, during the period of the stay, violations by the defendant of any provision of the regulation or order involved in the proceeding. If any provision of a regulation or order is determined to be invalid by judgment of the Emergency Court of Appeals, which has become effective in accordance with subsection (f) of this section any proceedings pending in any court shall be dismissed, and any judgment in such proceeding vacated, to the extent that such proceeding or judgment is based upon violation of such provision. Except as provided in this subsection, the pendency of any protest under subsection (a) of this section, or judicial proceeding under this section, shall not be grounds for staying any proceeding brought pursuant to section 205 or section 206 of this act or section 37 of the Criminal Code; nor except as provided in this subsection, shall any retroactive effect be given any judgment setting aside a provision of a regulation or order issued under section 204.

"SEC. 215. Nothing in this act shall be construed to require any person to offer any housing accommodations for rent: *Provided, however*, That the Housing Expediter may provide reasonable restrictions on evictions to prevent circumvention or evasion of this act."

"SEC. 216. The provisions of this act, and all regulations, orders, and requirements thereunder, shall terminate on June 30, 1951, or upon the date of a proclamation by the President, or upon the date specified in a concurrent resolution by the two Houses of the Congress declaring that the further continuance of the authority granted by this act is not necessary in the interest of the national defense and security, whichever date is the earlier; except that as to offenses committed, or rights or liabilities incurred, prior to such termination date, the provisions of this act and such regulations, orders, and requirements shall be treated as still remaining in force for the purpose of sustaining any proper suit, action, or prosecution with respect to any such right, liability, or offense."

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 301. If any provision of this act of the application of such provision to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act, and the applicability of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 302. This act shall become effective on the first day of the first calendar month following the month in which it is enacted.

The statement and an analysis presented by Mr. MYERS were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FRANCIS J. MYERS, OF PENNSYLVANIA, ON INTRODUCING NEW RENT CONTROL BILL, JANUARY 13, 1949

I am introducing today a bill to extend rent control until June 30, 1951, and to close most of the loopholes on effective regulation opened up by action of the Eightieth Congress in 1947 and 1948.

The most unfair thing about rent control as it now operates is that numerous property owners, as a result of one or another of the provisions in the present act, have been able to get out from under rent control and to charge their tenants whatever the traffic will bear, while the great mass of landlords are held rigidly under control. The answer to this inequity is not to turn all rental property loose, but to regulate all property owners in the same way.

Although this bill will strengthen rent control materially, it is not designed to eliminate present procedures under which hundreds of thousands of landlords have been able legally to obtain individual upward rent adjustments for their properties on the basis of increased operating costs, repairs or improvements, higher taxes or utility costs, or for a variety of similar reasons.

The intent in the bill is to close the avenues to chiseling, arbitrary evictions, gray-market practices in renting vacant properties, widespread violations of the law, and other slick tricks used by a small minority of landlords whose practices seriously undermine the whole rent-control program and spread insecurity and fear among tenants.

The Republican Eightieth Congress twice enacted rent-control laws which were essentially decontrol laws. From year to year, the Republican majority in that Congress indicated that each new rent control act would probably be the last one. The continuing housing shortage demonstrates how unrealistic that approach was. Unless we are satisfied to see wholesale suffering among the American people through rent inflation, we must not only continue rent control but bring it more into line with the realities of the housing shortage.

I intend to seek early hearings by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on this legislation which, I am sure, will receive sympathetic attention from a Congress elected to put the brakes on inflation.

MAIN PROVISIONS OF BILL

In general outline, the bill would restore rent control pretty much to the status it held prior to the enactment of the 1947 and 1948 acts. It sets up the machinery to recontrol all types of housing accommodations in defense-rental areas, with the exception of motor courts and trailers or trailer spaces and of transient accommodations in hotels and tourist homes. Thus, new construction, conversions, property previously owner-occupied, permanent hotel accommodations, including the so-called apartment hotels, would be recontrolled.

Authority would be provided for the control or recontrol of any areas not now under rent control.

No new 15 percent increase leases would be permitted, but those leases now in effect would continue and properties on which such leases had been negotiated would be continued at the higher ceiling.

Authority to regulate evictions would be returned to the Federal Government. Criminal powers against violators would be restored to the expediter. Also, the right of the expediter to sue for triple damages would be restored.

The act would be continued until June 30, 1951.

Both tenants and landlords would be given the right to appeal from regulations and decisions of the Housing Expediter.

The local boards would be continued, with certain safeguards as to their degree of representativeness, but the act would make it clear that their powers are advisory only. The Housing Expediter would be required to act publicly on every recommendation of these boards and to state his reasons and supporting data for approving or rejecting such recommendations.

A national advisory committee of 15 members representing landlords, tenants, and the general public would be set up to work with and advise the Housing Expediter.

The District of Columbia, for the first time, would be covered into the national law and uniform standards would thus be set up, particularly as regards the so-called cooperatives racket.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF BILL

Section 1 provides that the act may be cited as the "Housing and Rent Act of 1949."

Section 2 adds a new declaration of purposes.

Section 3 provides for the continuance to June 30, 1951, of the veterans' preference provisions in section 4 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended.

TITLE II—MAXIMUM RENTS

Section 201 repeals the declaration of policy in the present law which emphasized congressional intent to decontrol rents speedily.

Section 202 defines "controlled housing accommodations," including thereunder all types of housing accommodations in defense-rental areas except transient quarters in hotels, in tourist homes, and also any motor courts and trailers or trailer space.

Section 203 redefines "defense-rental area" in such a way as to permit once again extension of control to new areas and the recontrol of any areas which have been decontrolled.

Section 204 redefines "rent."

Section 205 adds definitions of "maximum rent," "defense-area housing accommodations," "documents," and "district court."

Section 206 provides for the delivery without reimbursement of the cabinets containing rent control records, as well as the records themselves, to local officials on the termination of national rent control.

Section 207 (a) extends the Office of the Housing Expediter to the close of June 30, 1951.

Section 207 (b) sets up standards for the establishment of maximum rents over recontrolled housing units, including due allowance, where new construction is involved, for general increases in the cost of construction; it continues present rent ceilings for housing covered by the 15-percent voluntary leases, and provides authority generally for the Expediter to set rents on any recontrolled housing which was at some time decontrolled under the 15-percent lease provision.

Section 207 (c) revises the machinery for control of new areas and decontrol of areas substantially along the lines of the original Emergency Price Control Act and further provides for the appointment of a national advisory committee composed of 15 members representative of both landlord and tenant interests and of the general public to advise and consult with the Housing Expediter under this subsection.

Section 207 (d) authorizes the issuance of regulations and adjustments to carry out the purposes of the act.

Section 207 (e) applies to the local advisory boards. It sets up standards for the appointment of the members. It limits their status to an advisory one only. It limits their recommendations to matters of area decontrol, adequacy of area general rent level, and operations of local rent offices and the exercise of "such functions for educational, administrative, and compliance purposes as are delegated by the Housing Expediter." Full authority for passing on any recommendations of a local board rests with the Expediter. However, he must approve or disapprove such recommendation within a reasonable time and give a statement of the grounds upon which his decision is based and any economic data or other facts of which he has taken official notice.

Section 207 (f) extends the provisions of title II having to do with maximum rents to the close of June 30, 1951.

Section 207 (g) repeals present prohibitions against the Housing Expediter's regulating the practice of requiring security deposits from tenants.

Section 208 provides for treble damage suits to be instituted by the Housing Expediter, restoring powers which he previously held.

Section 209 provides for criminal sanctions and the use of the administrative subpena by the Housing Expediter, restoring powers which he previously held.

Section 210 provides for standards for employment in the Office of the Housing Expediter.

Section 211 restores to the Housing Expediter the power he held prior to the enactment of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 to regulate evictions.

Section 212 makes the act applicable to the several States and to the Territories and possessions of the United States and to the District of Columbia, which has had a separate law of its own since before the original Price Control Act was passed.

Section 213 provides machinery for review of regulations and orders issued by the Housing Expediter and permits tenants and landlords to appeal to the Expediter and to the Emergency Court of Appeals. (Since recommendations of local boards would be advisory only, there would no longer be automatic appeal to the Emergency Court of Appeals by any local board in case the Expediter should reject a local board recommendation. However, tenants or landlords could appeal.) Section 213 also provides that nothing in this act shall be construed to require any person to offer any housing accommodations for rent; provided, however, that the Housing Expediter may provide reasonable restrictions on evictions to prevent circumvention or evasion of this act. This section also provides that rent control can terminate earlier than June 30, 1951, if Congress should rescind the authority or upon a proclamation by the President that the continuance of this authority is not necessary in the interest of the national defense and security.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

Section 301 is the separability clause.

Section 302 provides for the act to become effective on the first day of the first calendar month following the month in which it is enacted.

CLARIFICATION OF SECTION OF NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE ACT

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to clarify the provisions of section 602 (u) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, and I ask unanimous consent that a résumé of the bill, which was recommended by the Veterans' Administration, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the résumé presented by the Senator from Georgia will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 461) to clarify the provisions of section 602 (u) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, introduced by Mr. GEORGE (by request), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The résumé presented by Mr. GEORGE was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RÉSUMÉ OF PROPOSED BILL RECOMMENDED BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

PURPOSE OF BILL

To clarify the provisions of section 602 (u) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

To make it clear that as to insurance maturing on or after August 1, 1946, in cases where the beneficiary could not have elected to receive in a lump-sum settlement, any accrued installments on such insurance not paid to such beneficiary during his lifetime shall be paid to the estate of the insured rather than to the estate of the beneficiary.

The enactment of the proposed bill would not involve any cost and would lessen the probability of future litigation in insurance matters.

NOTE.—The present law provides payment to the estate of the insured:

(1) Where no beneficiary is designated by the insured;

(2) Where the beneficiary does not survive the insured;

(3) Where the designated beneficiary is not entitled to lump-sum payment and survives the insured, the remaining unpaid amounts go to the estate of the insured.

Under existing law payments go to the estate of the beneficiary in cases where the beneficiary is entitled to lump-sum payment, but elects some other mode of settlement and dies before receiving all benefits due and payable, the remaining unpaid amounts go to the estate of the beneficiary and not to the estate of the insured.

A comparison of the proposed bill with existing law, showing changes, is enclosed.

PORTION OF SECTION 602 (U)

[Changed language in brackets. New language in italics]

Present law	*Proposed bill*
(u) * * *; and in any case in which no beneficiary is designated by the insured, or the designated beneficiary does not survive the insured, or a designated beneficiary not entitled to [choose] a lump-sum settlement survives the insured, and dies before receiving all the benefits due and payable, the commuted value of the [insurance remaining unpaid] shall be paid in one sum to the estate of the insured.	(u) * * *; and in any case in which no beneficiary is designated by the insured, or the designated beneficiary does not survive the insured, or a designated beneficiary not entitled to (omits "choose") a lump-sum settlement survives the insured, and dies before receiving all the benefits due and payable, the commuted value of the *remaining unpaid insurance (whether accrued or not)* shall be paid in one sum to the estate of the insured.

NATIONAL HOLIDAY ON ELECTION DAY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill providing that national election day be a national holiday, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill prepared by me be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement of the Senator from Washington will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 476) making the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November, in every even-numbered year, a legal holiday, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY WARREN G. MAGNUSON, UNITED STATES SENATOR

NATIONAL ELECTION DAY SHOULD BE A NATIONAL HOLIDAY

Today I am introducing a bill on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Minnesota, which, if enacted, will make the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November

of every even-numbered year a legal holiday. Most of us in the United States Senate are aware of the fact this is national election day. Some of those who were Members of this body last year are also aware of that fact.

This bill, which I hope to see enacted in this first session of the Eighty-first Congress, should have the support of every Senator, Congressman, and citizen who believes in representative government and the democratic process.

July 4 has been designated as Independence Day—to commemorate the vision and achievements of that band of patriots whose action brought forth upon this continent a new Nation. This is as it should be. But certainly the day most closely associated—by concept and purpose—with Independence Day is election day.

At the ballot box every 2 years the electorate of this Nation have the opportunity to exercise the prerogative of a free people. Cumulatively their decisions, on men and issues, determine the social and political course of this Nation. It is regrettable that decisions of such vital import to the people of the United States are made by such a small percentage of eligible voters.

In 1940 there were 83,789,000 civilians of voting age in the United States. Only 49,820,000—59 percent—voted for Presidential electors. In the election just passed, 93,704,000 citizens were eligible to go to the ballot box. Only 48,600,000—52 percent—did so. In the 1900 Presidential election 74 percent of the eligible voters went to the polls. Nineteen hundred and forty and 1948 were Presidential years. In 1946 only 36 percent of the eligibles participated in the congressional elections.

From my own experience and observation I am convinced many more citizens would have gone to the polls if November 2 had been a legal holiday. Parenthetically, I do not think a heavier vote in November would have produced a change in tenancy at the White House. Nevertheless, many workers find it extremely difficult—if not impossible—to work an 8-hour shift and return to their precincts in time to vote.

Some people will argue that if the voting privilege means as much to Americans as it should, citizens will find a way to cast their ballots. There is some point to the argument. However, there is no doubt in my mind, participation in congressional and Presidential elections will be significantly increased if election day becomes a legal holiday.

All the Fourth of July means to our people finds its chance for expression on election day. I propose, therefore, that we—the elected representatives of the people—acting for the people, dedicate that day to the lofty concepts upon which this Nation is founded. Those concepts, with all the benefits emanating therefrom, will be preserved and increasingly activated, so long as free people exercise their free choice for men and issues at the ballot box.

EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT—SPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, a group of Senators have joined in the introduction of a proposed amendment to the Federal Constitution which is popularly known as the equal rights amendment. As Senators know, legislation dealing with this subject has been introduced in various Congresses, and has achieved certain progress, but has never passed the Congress for submission to the States.

The following Senators are joined in the introduction of the measure: The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BROUGHTON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS].

On behalf of these cosponsors and myself I send the joint resolution to the desk for introduction and appropriate reference.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 25) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women, introduced by Mr. GILLETTE (for himself, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. CAIN, Mr. HUNT, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. BROUGHTON, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. KERR, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. FREAR, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. LANGER, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MYERS, Mr. WILEY, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. REED, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. MILLER, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. MALONE, and Mr. SCHOEPPEL), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE FREEDOM TRAIN

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to provide for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train by the Archivist of the United States. A brief statement has been prepared which may be of some benefit to the committee when this measure is considered, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from Illinois will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 31) to provide for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train by the Archivist of the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LUCAS (for himself and Mr. WHERRY), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The statement presented by Mr. LUCAS was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LUCAS

THE FREEDOM TRAIN

The attached interim report of the president of the American Heritage Foundation to the board of trustees of the foundation, dated November 4, 1948, sets out the facts concerning the Freedom Train.

The American Heritage Foundation is a private charitable corporation organized to carry out a plan conceived by the Attorney General of the United States to make available to the people of the country the opportunity to see the documents which constitute milestones in the history of our country.

The original plan was that the foundation would underwrite the operation of the train for 13 months from September 17, 1947. Because of the tremendous demand for the train, sponsorship of it by the foundation was extended, first, to January 1, 1949, and now, finally, to January 22, 1949. The foundation desires now to terminate its sponsorship.

However, tremendous demand for continuance of the train's tour still exists. As of a recent date the train had visited 350 cities in the United States. To carry out the purpose of giving opportunity to view the documents aboard the train to all sections of the country, it was possible usually for the train to stop only 1 day in each city. Approximately 43,000,000 people have participated in ceremonies relating to the train. However, because of the physical limitations on the number of people who can pass through the train in a given time, only 4,500,000 have actually seen the documents aboard the train and countless millions had to be turned away disappointed.

It appears that there is a large amount of sentiment in the Congress for the continuance by the Government of the tour of the train. Congressmen MCCORMACK and MARTIN of Massachusetts have introduced a bill for this purpose (H. J. Res. 84). Preliminary inquiries indicate that if the Government desires to continue operation of the Freedom Train the American Heritage Foundation will turn over to it, free of charge, the equipment, of very considerable value, which the foundation assembled for storage and display of the documents. No negotiations have yet been had with respect to use by the Government of equipment and facilities not owned by the American Heritage Foundation.

The train is made up of an engine and seven cars. The engine, a Diesel electric, has been loaned, with fuel and crews, by the American Locomotive Co. and the General Electric Co. The three cars presently containing the documents are owned by the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. but were transformed into museum cars at very considerable expense by the American Heritage Foundation. It had been indicated that the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. will be willing to sell these cars to the Government at their second-hand value when they were delivered to the American Heritage Foundation. An additional car, containing humidifying, firefighting, and similar equipment, has been loaned by the Santa Fe Railroad, and three pullman cars for accommodation of the crews, the guard of honor, and other personnel aboard the train have been rented from the Pullman Co. It is believed that there will be no difficulty about continuing arrangements appropriate to retaining the last four mentioned cars. All units of the Freedom Train are, of course, especially painted.

Approximately 80 percent of the documents aboard the Freedom Train are owned by the Government. The majority of these come from the National Archives, the rest from the Library of Congress. The other documents, 20 percent of the total, have been

loaned by private owners. The Archivist and the Librarian of Congress favor the continued operation of the train, because of its tremendous educational value, and they have agreed, as has the Attorney General, that the Archivist is the logical person to continue operation of the train if its operation is taken over by the Government. It is believed that the owners of private documents will be glad to continue their loan for continued exhibition.

Preliminary estimates indicate that acquisition of the train and its operation by the Government until June 30, 1950, will cost between $2,000,000 and $2,500,000.

UTILIZATION OF GERMAN AND JAPANESE INVENTIONS, ETC.

Mr. CAPEHART submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 27), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete inquiry for the purpose of determining the best method, in the interests of our interstate and foreign commerce and particularly of American consumers and small business, of disseminating information with respect to, and promoting the utilization of, those inventions, discoveries, and copyrighted works which have come into the possession of the Department of Commerce as a result of the examination of German and Japanese Government archives.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date but not later than March 15, 1950.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable, and is authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $15,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers by the chairman of the committee.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and myself, I submit a resolution asking for an appropriation to complete the payment of all salaries and terminal leave for the employees of the Small Business Committee, which committee expires by the terms of a Senate resolution, on January 31, and I ask for its appropriate reference.

The resolution (S. Res. 28), submitted by Mr. WHERRY (for himself and Mr. MURRAY), was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Special Committee to Study the Problems of American Small Business Enterprises, created by Senate Resolution 20, Eightieth Congress, agreed to January 24, 1947, and extended by Senate Resolution 153, Eightieth Congress, agreed to July 26, 1947, and Senate Resolution 191, Eightieth Congress, agreed to March 15, 1948, and Senate Resolution 280, Eightieth Congress, agreed to December 31, 1948, is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate $12,608.24 in addition to the amounts heretofore authorized for the same purposes.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL-BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

Mr. MURRAY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 29), which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Resolved, That a special committee consisting of 12 Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is hereby authorized and directed to study and survey by means of research all the problems of American small-business enterprises, obtaining all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest but which would aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation. The committee shall begin its study and research survey as soon as practicable and shall continue and prosecute such study and research survey expeditiously and with all possible dispatch and shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable with recommendations for legislation.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold hearings; to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate during the Eighty-first Congress; to employ such experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants; to request such information from any departments and agencies of the Government; to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths; and to take such testimony and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report the educational material and data on such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. The expense of the committee, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SEC. 3. The special committee created pursuant to Senate Resolution 20, Eightieth Congress, agreed to January 24, 1948, as extended and supplemented, is hereby terminated as of January 31, 1949: *Provided*, That the authority of such special committee to hold hearings and conduct investigations shall terminate on the date this resolution is agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF PRICES OF AGRICULTURAL AND OTHER COMMODITIES

Mr. MAYBANK submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 31), which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation of prices of agricultural and other commodities with a view to ascertaining the causes for unreasonably large spreads between prices received by farmers, manufacturers, and other producers and prices paid by ultimate consumers.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date but not later than June 30, 1949.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable, and is authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $20,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

DECENTRALIZATION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I desire to submit a resolution. I should like to read it into the RECORD and then make a few remarks about it. The resolution reads as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to possible methods by which the Department of National Defense may be further decentralized and the activities of the Department transferred to field offices for purposes of greater national security, economy, efficiency, and a better and more expeditious handling of the problems of the Nation's armed services.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report to the Senate not later than 6 months from the date of this resolution's adoption the result of the study and investigation together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

Mr. President, the resolution I am submitting directs the Senate Armed Services Committee to make a full and complete study of ways and means of decentralizing the National Defense Department, and report back to the Senate in 6 months.

The problem of all the world is how best to make each nation more adequate to meet the challenges of the present and the future. This resolution is similar to Senate Resolution 136, which I submitted in the Eightieth Congress, for the purpose of securing a similar study by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on ways and means of decentralizing the Department of Agriculture. At that time I stated in substance that the Department of Agriculture needed to be decentralized for very apparent reasons. Here on the east coast we are trying to prescribe the medicine for agricultural districts all over the Nation. I am still vitally interested in securing a dispersion to field offices of our overcentralized agricultural organization. However, it is quite obvious that our primary need is for decentralization of our vastly overcentralized Military, Naval, and Air Force Establishments from the Pentagon Building across the river, and from other jammed buildings throughout this congested city.

I need not call attention to what happened in Japan because of one bomb. I need not call attention to what could happen here, so far as concerns the Nation being totally put out of business if its heart in the armed services and in the legislative and executive services were blown to smithereens.

There is no need to become agitated over what I am saying. But, Mr. President, I am seriously concerned. We are in the habit of believing that a New York doctor can prescribe for a sick patient in one of the Dakotas. I think it was clearly demonstrated in the last election that that could not be done. I am satisfied that it cannot be done in connection with some other things.

It is necessary that we get away from petty considerations and realize that we are living in a world in which New York City could be blotted out by one bomb. The same statement applies to the Capital of our country. If in this city is located the heart of the defense of the Nation, it is more than important that the legislative branch begin to think in terms of today, and not in terms of yesterday or 10 years ago.

I need not point out that a recent newspaper item purported to describe an incident which occurred on the shores of the Caspian Sea. The item was undoubtedly authentic. A great explosion occurred. It was recorded by the seismograph, or whatever other instruments Georgetown University and other universities throughout the country have. The intelligence branch of the Government went into action and ascertained that it was not an earthquake. We need not surmise as to what happened. It undoubtedly was an experimentation with fission. The result was the destruction of life and property. Russia is moving ahead.

I need not call attention to the fact that on the shores of the Mediterranean there is a possible volcano. The same situation prevails in China and in many other places. If that be true, are we going to proceed on the theory that we are sufficient if we adopt the ways and means of yesterday? No, Mr. President.

The first step is the decentralization of our thinking. The next step is the decentralization of the brains which unite the great organization which we call the National Defense Department. That Department is centralized in Washington. Time and time again I have pointed out that a single atomic bomb hitting Washington could with one blow blast the very brain and central nervous system and the heart of our entire national security organization. For many long months I have been in contact with the National Security Resources Board, the Department of Defense, and other officials in our Government regarding this suicidal military overcentralization. We have heard promises of dispersion of some of the central organization, but those promises mean as little to me as they must mean to the Soviet high command, which undoubtedly recognizes that America would be a sticker for an atomic punch against the Pentagon. I recognize the tremendous administrative problems involved in decentralization; but when has America ever hesitated to meet, head on, problems of this character, problems which go to the safety and the future of our Nation?

Obviously, dispersing our security setup cannot be accomplished overnight, but it should be begun at the earliest possible date. As civilians, I am sure that no Member of the Senate, including myself, would want the Defense Department to breach any security regulations by telling to what extent secret plans already have been made for decentralization. At the same time, as civilians, we have the right to know of those plans which can be made a matter of public information. There are all sorts of rumors of secret master plans and super plans to disperse central military headquarters from Washington; but, from the look of things, those plans will not go into operation until Washington is decentralized by an atomic bomb blasting this city to rubble.

I yield to no one in my love and admiration of this Capital City, but I do not want to see it become a death trap for a million people or for 148,000,000 people who look to our military chiefs for adequate security.

Mr. President, in the days which lie ahead, our time will be taken with a great many small matters, relatively speaking; and we shall be overlooking the big problem. We shall be thinking that we can deal with Russia—and I hope to God we can; but in this world there are 3,200,000,000 human beings, and there are less than 300,000,000 of us who think in terms of personal liberty and the American way of life. We can make all the arrangements and agreements we want to make; but the Kaiser's idea of a treaty as being merely a scrap of paper is still the order of the day, except insofar as we have dealings, for we keep faith. However, on the commercial basis, Mr. President, and on the political basis there is but one power, and that is the power of force and foresight and ingenuity and invention that will determine the course of human beings for centuries to come. The millennium is not just around the corner, so we had better decentralize.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me ask whether it would be better to have the resolution require a report within 4 months. Six months will be about the 15th of July.

Mr. WILEY. In the resolution I used the words "at least."

Mr. LANGER. I wonder if the Senator would mind amending the resolution so as to provide for a report within 4 months.

Mr. WILEY. I shall be glad to accept that amendment.

The resolution (S. Res. 30) as modified was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to possible methods by which the Department of National Defense may be further decentralized and the activities of the Department transferred to field offices for purposes of greater national security, economy, efficiency, and a better and more expeditious handling of the problems of the Nation's armed services.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report to the Senate not later than 4 months from the date of this resolution's adoption the result of the study and investigation together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

THE PRESIDENT'S STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HENDRICKSON

[Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by Senator HENDRICKSON commenting on the President's state of the Union message, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMPENSATION OF HIGHER FEDERAL OFFICIALS — ARTICLE BY SENATOR O'CONOR

[Mr. FLANDERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "We've Got To Pay More for Leadership," written by Senator O'CONOR, and published in the American Magazine for January 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

ITALIAN COLONIES—STATEMENT BY SENATOR McMAHON

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him on the subject of Italian colonies, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE AMERICAN AIR FORCE—TRIBUTE TO SENATOR BARKLEY—ADDRESS BY W. STUART SYMINGTON

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. W. Stuart Symington, Secretary of the Air Force, at the Town Hall dinner honoring Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY, Vice-President-elect, on December 15, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

POLICIES OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Secretary of Defense, dated January 11, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICA, THE LAST HOPE OF MANKIND—ADDRESS BY DANIEL L. MARSH

[Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Last Hope of Mankind Rests With Us," by Daniel L. Marsh, president of Boston University, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN BUSINESS AND EDUCATION—ADDRESS BY FRANK W. ABRAMS

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "How Can American Business Help American Education?" delivered by Frank W. Abrams, chairman of the board of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, to the thirty-fifth annual meeting of the Association of American Colleges on January 11, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES—LETTER BY HAMILTON FISH

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated December 23, 1948, addressed by Hamilton Fish to President Truman, which appears in the Appendix.]

SOME ENDURING ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE LINCOLN ADMINISTRATION—ESSAY BY J. DUANE SQUIRES

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an essay on the subject, Some Enduring Achievements of the Lincoln Administration, 1861-65, by J. Duane Squires, professor of the department of social studies at Colby Junior College, New London, N. H., which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON NEWS

[Mr. ECTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Beyond Safe Limits," from the Washington News of January 11, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

BRITISH AID TO EGYPT—ARTICLE BY GENE CURRIVAN

[Mr. GILLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Gene Currivan from the New York Times of January 10, 1949, relating to British arms delivery to Egypt, which appears in the Appendix.]

REASONS FOR THE RECENT ELECTION RESULTS

[Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Why It Happened," published in the El Paso Herald Post of November 4, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

CASH VALUE OF THE DISPLACED PERSONS—EDITORIAL FROM THE PHILADELPHIA BULLETIN

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Cash Value of the DP's," published in the Philadelphia Bulletin for January 8, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S MESSAGE TO CONGRESS—EDITORIAL FROM RICHMOND (IND.) PALLADIUM-ITEM

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Just As We Expected," published in a recent issue of the Palladium-Item, of Richmond, Ind., which appears in the Appendix.]

ECA DOUBLE-CROSS—EDITORIAL FROM SOUTH BEND (IND.) TRIBUNE

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "ECA Double-Cross," published in the South Bend Tribune of December 16, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

NO UMT ACTION?—EDITORIAL FROM SOUTH BEND (IND.) TRIBUNE

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "No UMT Action?" published in the South Bend Tribune of December 7, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MAN WHO FIGHTS—EDITORIAL FROM THE ARKANSAS GAZETTE

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Man Who Fights," published in the Arkansas Gazette, Little Rock, Ark., for November 6, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE TRUMAN DEMOCRATIC VICTORY—EDITORIAL FROM BIRMINGHAM AGE-HERALD

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Stupendous Surprise," published in the Birmingham Age-Herald of November 4, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NEW CRISIS IN THE REPUBLICAN PARTY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MORSE

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The New Crisis in the Republican Party," delivered by him on Saturday, December 4, 1948, to the Young Republicans Convention at Salem, Oreg., which appears in the Appendix.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE—NOTICE OF HEARINGS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, a moment ago the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] referred to the question of limitation of debate in the Senate, and I said that hearings would soon be held by the committee on the subject. I now announce that the Committee on Rules and Administration decided yesterday to begin hearings on the several resolutions which have been submitted with respect to the limitation of debate in the Senate, at 10:30 on Monday, January 24. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] was the first to request the hearings, and we will hear him first. Other Senators are invited to appear if they so desire.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona a moment ago inquired of me whether I could indicate on what day certain the change with respect to the Senate rule would be made. I call his attention to the fact that when the President presented a very formidable program, including this particular matter, last summer to us at the so-called turnip session, he advised us that 15 days should be ample to accomplish the entire program. So I hope members of the committee will have the President's admonition very much in mind in considering the subject of limitation of debate, and all the rest of the program which we now have before the Congress.

Mr. HAYDEN. This particular matter was not mentioned by the President.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think Members of the Senate should be under no delusion that before we accomplish anything respecting civil rights we will have to do something about filibusters.

INCREASED COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 103.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Will that motion require unanimous consent?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will not. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that all that is required is a majority vote. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Morning business has been concluded, has it not?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It has.

Mr. WHERRY. Is not the motion to proceed to the consideration of any bill debatable?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Not in the morning hour.

The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill, S. 103, to increase rates of compensation of the President, Vice President, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and heads and assistant heads of executive departments and independent agencies.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may present an amendment at this time, in order that the amendment may be before the Senate, before the Senator proceeds with his address?

Mr. O'CONOR. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I send to the desk an amendment to the bill and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after line 15 on page 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 2. The provisions of this act shall become effective at noon on January 20, 1949.

It is proposed to amend the title so as to read: "A bill to increase rates of compensation of the President, Vice President, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 103.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may submit an amendment?

Mr. O'CONOR. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be read at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, after the period in line 2, it is proposed to insert a new sentence, as follows:

In determining the amount to be deducted from the compensation of any official whose salary is determined under this act for the purposes of section 3 (a) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and in computing the amount of any annuity under such act, any increase in compensation provided by this act shall be disregarded until further action of the Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 103.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 103) to increase rates of compensation of the President, Vice President, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and heads and assistant heads of executive departments and independent agencies, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with amendments.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the legislation embodied in Senate bill 103 now before the Senate is of greatest importance to all the people of the United States. If the Congress acts favorably on this bill it will be the first time in the

history of our country that comprehensive action has been taken to consider and evaluate the salaries of the men we hold responsible for the day-to-day management of our governmental agencies.

The first section of the bill would increase the salary of the President to $100,000 and provide him with an additional expense allowance of $50,000 a year. It would also increase the salaries of the Vice President and the Speaker of the House of Representatives to $30,000 each and provide these officials with expense allowances of $10,000 a year.

Section 2 of the bill would increase the compensation of Cabinet members to $25,000 a year.

Sections 3, 4, and 5 would increase the rates of compensation of heads of independent agencies, members of independent boards and commissions, and certain White House officials to $22,500, $20,000, and $17,500, upon the basis of their respective responsibilities. The positions covered and the salaries to be paid are specifically set forth in the bill.

Section 8 of the bill corrects certain inequities resulting from the exclusion from the provisions of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948 of employees of the District of Columbia municipal government and certain employees in the Foreign Service by granting to such employees the $330 increase provided by that act for Government employees generally.

The bill under consideration has been developed after more than 1½ years' study by a subcommittee composed of the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], and the junior Senator from Maryland, appointed by the chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee in July 1947.

The subcommittee has made a very thorough study of the problem. It began by taking a complete inventory of all positions in the Government paying $9,975 and above. There are approximately 3,000 positions in that category in the Government, including the 223 covered by Senate bill 103. All available information was assembled concerning these three thousand-odd positions: the salary rate for each position, how the salaries are fixed, how appointments to the positions are made, and when the salary rate was established. This information was tabulated in various ways to give the subcommittee an opportunity to study and compare the positions individually, by groups and by agencies. These data were studied by the subcommittee to determine how the salaries should be fixed for these top-level positions, and what rates would be a fair compensation for the heavy responsibilities carried by the men in such positions.

Following its consideration of the matter in the spring of 1948, the subcommittee submitted its recommendations to the entire Senate Committee on Civil Service. The committee then gave attention to the subject matter and reported favorably a bill, S. 1537, Eightieth Congress, but insufficient time was left for the discussion of the matter in the Senate and the portion of the bill relating to the top-bracket officials was deleted when the measure was passed.

After months of study the subcommittee held hearings on a proposed redraft of a bill. The President's views were expressed in these hearings regarding the pay of positions in the bill, other than his own, the Vice President's and that of the Speaker of the House. Also, the subcommittee heard former President Hoover, Mr. John Stevenson, president of the Penn Mutual Life Insurance Co.; Robert Ramspeck, former long-time Member of Congress, now vice president of the Air Transport Association; Arthur Flemming, former Civil Service Commissioner, now president of Ohio Wesleyan University; and representatives of Federal employee groups.

Before testifying for the President in favor of the bill, the Director of the Budget circulated the draft of the bill prepared by the subcommittee to all agencies in the executive branch with the request that they express their views in writing concerning the provisions contained therein.

Each of these agency replies was carefully considered in relation to the organizational structure of the executive branch, and, where possible within the framework approved by the President, their suggestions were incorporated.

Therefore, S. 103 as introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] represents the best judgment of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, of representatives of the executive branch, the Hoover Commission, competent persons from private industry, and representatives of the employee organizations.

On January 20 a new presidential term will begin. Because of this fact it is of utmost importance that this legislation be enacted. Two factors control the necessity for immediate action. First, unless the salaries of the President and Vice President are acted upon before January 20, the Constitution would prevent this act from becoming operative for the duration of the term of office upon which they will enter on that day. Second, the men and women in the positions covered in the bill include the executives with whom the President must surround himself to carry out his tremendous task of managing the Government programs approved by the Congress.

To secure for the Government the services of the best management talent available for these positions, the President must be able to compete with private enterprise and to offer opportunities for public service without at the same time asking that too great personal sacrifices be made. To do this he must be in a position to offer them fair salaries. Fair salaries will attract good men, and good men are needed in our Government. Unfortunately too many capable officials have been forced to leave the Government service because of insufficient compensation. After acquiring valuable experience and knowledge in Government posts, they have been compelled to accept better paying positions with private concerns.

Because of the action taken by Congress in recent years to increase salaries at the lower levels, the salaries which the President can offer top officials today are in many instances lower than those of subordinates whose work they will be guiding and supervising. This is an unsound condition which would not be tolerated in any private business. It is a situation which the Congress must correct immediately if opportunity is to be afforded to the President to secure the most capable executives and improve the management of our agencies.

I submit, Mr. President, that the Congress should act forthwith to correct this intolerable situation, and to increase the efficiency of governmental processes. Certainly the best available talent must be attracted to public service if the President is to be assisted in carrying out the tremendous tasks which confront him as he begins his new term.

The salaries of the key positions in our Government are today out of line in comparison to the responsibilities attached to them. They bear no relationship to each other and certainly have no rational relationship to the salaries paid for subordinate positions, when the salaries for many subordinate positions are higher than those paid the agency head. This situation has been brought about because of the fact that before Senate bill 1537 was introduced in the last Congress, relating to the positions now covered in Senate bill 103, the Congress had never given consideration to the problem of the salaries for the heads of agencies, except on a piecemeal basis. Actually, the rates of pay for these positions have in practically every case been considered and fixed individually.

Under these circumstances, no study could be made of the relationships between them, and none was made. Consequently, we have subordinate positions paying salaries as high as $15,000 in agencies where the men responsible for the entire agencies' operations are receiving $10,000. There are also instances where certain subordinate positions have been taken out of the Classification Act pay scale, and the salary fixed by statute at several thousand dollars above the rate paid for other comparable positions under the Classification Act, and above the rates for positions as agency heads.

In any sensibly operated organization, whether it be public or private, the rates of pay for the positions making up the organization should reflect the relative responsibility of the position. Senate bill 103 represents the first comprehensive effort to accomplish this simple principle of management in the Federal Government. It is a most important step. It will bring order into a salary structure which Congress has allowed to get badly out of adjustment. It will establish fair salaries for these important positions in the Government, and will provide the President a much-needed asset. Moreover, it will provide a benchmark and guide to the Congress in fixing the salaries for subordinate positions.

It became apparent to the subcommittee studying the problem of top-level

salaries that in determining what positions the bill should cover, there was only one clear distinction that could be drawn among the 3,000 positions which are compensated at $9,975 and above. That is the distinction between positions as the heads and assistant heads of departments and agencies, and the positions subordinate to them. Every conceivable combination was considered; and in every case it became apparent that in order to be absolutely fair in the judgments applied, the distinction between positions as the heads and assistant heads of the departments and agencies and subordinate positions was the only one that could possibly be made on a sound basis by the Congress.

The committee is of the definite opinion that this bill does not cover all the top-rank positions, the salaries of which should be readjusted. Furthermore, it emphasized the fact that this is but one step in what should be a comprehensive effort to correct the inequities throughout the governmental service. Included among the very important posts which the committee feels should be the subject of further correction and increase are those of Administrator of Rural Electrification Administration, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Commissioner of Public Roads, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, among others. The salaries paid for these positions are admittedly too low, and should be raised at the earliest possible date. However, in the opinion of the subcommittee and the others who have studied this problem, the salaries of these positions should be fixed under the provisions of the Classification Act, as is now the case for the majority of them.

Therefore, it was the recommendation of the subcommittee that the Classification Act salary scales be revised early in this session of Congress. Any revision of that act should provide a maximum salary which would be sufficient to increase the salaries of the bureau chiefs and the heads of subordinate agencies to a realistic level and place them in their proper relationship with the positions covered in the bill now under consideration.

Senate bill 103, if enacted, will be the first step in a program which will bring about a realistic and well-balanced structure for the Federal Government from the top to the bottom. With its enactment, the endless confusion and argument as to what should be the proper level for the top management positions in the Government will be resolved.

It will make possible early consideration of the proper pay scales for subordinate positions, without extended committee discussions which otherwise might develop.

Such discussions might well result in the failure of the Congress to take action at this session on this highly important matter. If Senate bill 103 is not enacted by the Congress and if early action is not taken to revise the Classification Act so as to make higher salaries possible for persons in subordinate positions, other capable men can be expected to leave the Government service; and at the present low salaries their replacement with well-qualified men will be, as the President has found in many cases in the past, almost an impossible task.

The simple fact that the salaries of many of the men filling subordinate bureau-head and other positions are at present higher than that of the head of the agency in which they are employed is proof that the salaries of their positions have been increased to some degree without any consideration of the salaries of their superiors.

Again it can be emphasized that after exhaustive study of this problem, our subcommittee, in considering the three-thousand-odd positions at $9,975 and above, concluded, first, that there was only one clear line of demarcation that could be fairly drawn, namely, the line between the heads and assistant heads of departments and agencies and subordinate positions; secondly, that positions immediately below the heads and assistant heads of the departments and agencies should be paid under the salary scales of the Classification Act; and, third, that the salaries of practically the entire group of 3,000 are too low to allow the Government to secure and keep top management talent in these positions.

Mr. President, great importance was attached to the authorization for the appointment of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. Considerable funds have been expended in the study of this Commission under the able leadership of the former President of the United States, Mr. Herbert Hoover. This bill has the unqualified endorsement of that Commission. Mr. Hoover himself testified in favor of this bill. Mr. John Stevenson, president of Penn Mutual Life Insurance Co., and chairman of the Hoover Commission task force on Federal Personnel Management; Arthur Flemming, former Civil Service Commissioner, now president of Ohio Wesleyan University, and member of the Hoover Commission; and Robert Ramspeck, executive vice president of the Air Transport Association, and former chairman of the House Committee on Civil Service, all supported the purpose of the bill and the proposed salary rates contained in it.

All of these men stated that they believed the Government must pay more adequate salaries for its top-management positions in order to attract and retain the services of competent persons for these jobs. The importance of having capable men in these positions was greatly stressed by every witness before the committee. The representatives of the employee organizations were 100 percent in favor of immediate enactment of this bill.

They are aware of, and stressed the importance of, having competent men in these positions as well as the imperative need for immediate action to raise the salaries for the positions involved. While they recognize that the bill does not include the positions of subordinate officials, they believe the increases provided in this bill will make early action possible to adjust those other salaries and put them in their proper relationship to the salaries of the heads and assistant heads of the departments and agencies.

Finally, Mr. President, the cost of the provisions of the bill which would increase the salaries of the heads and assistant heads of the departments and agencies will be $1,600,000 a year. That is a relatively small cost for the benefits which will accrue to the Government as a result of the enactment of this legislation.

In conclusion, I wish to refer briefly to a portion of the letter transmitted to the President pro tempore of the Senate by the President of the United States, from which I read as follows:

That bill—

Referring to S. 103—

establishes a salary range of from $17,500 to $25,000 for the officials in question. These provisions are in accordance with recommendations made to the subcommittee by the administration. I urge their passage in their present form. Questions concerning the compensation of Federal officers and employees not included in this bill should not be permitted to impede or delay its passage, but should be considered separately at an early date.

The letter from the President of the United States to the President pro tempore continues:

On January 20, a new Presidential term will begin. During that term the executive branch of the Government will be called upon to bear responsibilities of great magnitude. Prompt action on this bill is of great importance to me in strengthening the management of the executive branch to meet those responsibilities. Its small cost will be repaid many times. I ask the Congress to give me the means which will make it possible for me to get and keep the men who are required for the job ahead.

I hope that this legislation will be enacted into law immediately.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield for a question?

Mr. O'CONOR. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I invite the Senator's attention to section 105 of the United States Code, and I ask whether the Senator will state how many assistants the President is going to have?

Mr. O'CONOR. Eleven.

Mr. LANGER. I now call the Senator's attention to lines 16 and 17, on page 4 of the bill, reading as follows:

Two at rates not exceeding $22,500 per annum, three at rates not exceeding $20,000 per annum, and seven at rates not exceeding $17,500 per annum.

Do not those three items, "2," "3," and "7," total 12?

Mr. O'CONOR. That is very true.

In answer to the question of the Senator from North Dakota, with respect to secretaries, as I have stated, there is in addition one other secretary of the Executive, the Secretary of the National Security Council, who is included in the category to which the Senator from North Dakota refers. Eleven is the correct answer as to the number of secretaries.

Mr. LANGER. How many does the Chief Executive have at the present time?

Mr. O'CONOR. Eleven.

Mr. LANGER. That is, now?

Mr. O'CONOR. That is correct. In other words, the bill does not create any new positions. Its primary purpose is to determine the proper pay for the positions already created.

Mr. LANGER, Mr. CAPEHART, and Mr. FLANDERS addressed the Chair.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Maryland has concluded, I should like to have the floor in my own right.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the pending subject has been before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in some form or other for approximately 8 years. The entire matter of salaries for Federal employees has been considered repeatedly. The Senate and the country as a whole owe a great debt to the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] for the very complete and detailed study he made of the matter while a member of the committee, as chairman of a subcommittee appointed by former Senator Mead, of New York, when he was acting chairman of the committee, which appointment, I believe, was confirmed by the distinguished President pro tempore now occupying the chair, and which was later confirmed by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. A very careful study was made. Finally the Byrd-Langer amendment was agreed to, which provided that within practically every department a certain number of persons should be removed from the Federal pay roll. Enforcement was left to the Bureau of the Budget so that the number of persons on the Federal pay roll could be reduced. Immediately after the war there were approximately 3,000,000 employees on the Federal pay roll. The Byrd-Langer amendment was enforced, but, as every Senator knows, legislation was subsequently enacted particularly exempting new employees from its provisions. The result was, for example, that some 250,000 employees were added by the Veterans' Administration alone. Employees were added by the Atomic Energy Commission. The distinguished Senator from Virginia has repeatedly drawn the attention of the Senate to the fact that the number of Federal employees has not been decreasing so rapidly as we might desire.

As the distinguished junior Senator from Maryland stated a few moments ago, in July 1947, I, as chairman of the committee, appointed a subcommittee consisting of the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], and the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR]. Bear in mind that was in July 1947. I am sure all the senior Members of the Senate are familiar with the fact that in the month of June 1948 our committee, upon recommendation of a subcommittee, reported a pay-increase bill. The bill was amended on the floor upon motion of the distinguished Senator from Virginia. Certain of the top-flight salaries were eliminated through the action of the Senate. Immediately thereafter we again took up the matter of pay increases for various Federal employees. The distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] raised a question with respect to employees within the District of Columbia. The committee refused to report the bill for a pay increase to those employees unless a District sales tax were enacted. Certain Senators who were opposed to the sales tax fought the measure, with the result that when the Congress adjourned nothing had been accomplished for those employees.

Today, Mr. President, we face a very peculiar situation. My friend on the opposite side of the aisle, for whom I have the most affectionate regard, knows that, as a member of the committee, I was in a hopeless minority of 1 against 10. I alone opposed the passage of the measure in its present form. I was astounded at that time, as I was astounded this morning, to have the distinguished Senator from Maryland quote as a great authority, as the man who says the bill should be passed, a former President, Herbert Hoover, now head of the Hoover Commission. My mind goes back to a time only a few years ago when I heard certain of the same distinguished gentlemen, who the other day quoted with approval Mr. Hoover at our committee meeting, say that everything Herbert Hoover did was wrong. They made fun of him and ridiculed him. Now it is said to be a great tribute to Herbert Hoover, when the very Senators who a few years ago ridiculed him now rise on the Senate floor, as did the junior Senator from Maryland, and say the bill should be passed because Herbert Hoover, that great authority, said it should be passed because he had made an investigation of the subject and found the legislation was desirable.

Mr. President, so far as the study mentioned by the distinguished Senator from Maryland is concerned, I call attention to the fact that last June some of the members of the Bureau of the Budget were called before the committee and were asked how long a time would be required to draw up a bill which would include the heads of bureaus and departments. Mr. Winslow at that time stated that it would take between 6 and 7 months. We come back today, and what do we find? Under this bill, if it be passed, the head of the Rural Electrification Administration, a man who passes on millions of dollars worth of contracts, is omitted from the suggested salary increase; he is not to receive an increase. The head of the Bureau of Immigration, which has charge of 6,000,000 aliens, and which has charge at this time of deportation proceedings in 12,000 cases—the man whose duty it is to keep Communists out of this country—is excluded from the proposed salary increase. The head of the Bureau of Internal Revenue is excluded, as are all the other officials named a few moments ago by the distinguished Senator from Maryland. It is said that they will be taken care of some time in the dim and distant future; it may be within 2 years or 3 years. Who says that, Mr. President? I have here the report of the subcommittee, and I wish to call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Maryland to page 13 thereof, on which it is stated that an effort will be made to accomplish it in the near future, possibly at this session of the Congress.

Mr. President, I submit that the subcommittee has not made a thorough study of the subject. I submit, on the contrary, that the report states that there are 3,107 positions in the executive branch and certain other agencies receiving annual salaries of $9,975; but less than 300 positions are covered by the bill.

Mr. O'CONOR. The number as previously stated by me is 223.

Mr. LANGER. In other words, out of the 3,107 the committee has picked out 223. It does not make any difference how honorable and fine is the record of the head of the REA or the head of the FBI. They are excluded. The report says that it is not sure whether their case will be taken up this year.

One of the reasons for passing this bill, it is said, is that it will improve morale. Maybe it would improve morale in the particular departments affected, but I submit that in 2,700 other places the morale, instead of being improved, would be lowered, because of the fact that men who do no more work, in some instances, and much less important work, in some instances, suddenly have their salaries increased, while other salaries are left at $10,600. That is certainly not the way to improve morale.

Mr. President, an Assistant Attorney General will have his salary increased to $22,500, under this bill. But Mr. Hoover, who is head of the FBI and who employs as many as 10,000 agents, will have his salary remain at $10,000.

I again refer, Mr. President, to the Commissioner of Immigration. In my judgment there is no more important job than is his. He is omitted from the salary increase. His salary will be left at the sum of $10,000.

Mr. President, both the Republican platform and the Democratic platform pledged economy. We went before the people, both the Republicans and the Democrats, and said we would economize. Yet here is bill No. 1, Mr. President, to raise the salaries of 223 Government employees, from the President down, as the first action of the majority party toward economy.

When I inquired in the committee meeting I was told that it was an action for economy, because those 223 employees affected will do much better work when they receive more salary; their morale will increase. I submit, Mr. President, that when 2,700 other officials are omitted, we have the very kind of piecemeal legislation which the distinguished Senator from Maryland said a few moments ago had been in effect for many years. As a matter of fact, the subcommittee was appointed to take care of all the Federal employees at one time.

Mr. President, I take issue with the expressions in the majority report of the Senate Committee on Post Office and

Civil Service, entitled "Compensation of Top Government Officials." My reasons are as follows:

The President of the United States unwittingly is being made an example of the need for adjusting the compensation of salaries of top Government officials. Considerable has been said on the necessity for adjusting the President's personal expense account, although the subcommittee was silent on the entire matter of the President's salary during the Eightieth Congress. I object to any means of putting the President in the position of having to draw the load of pulling several hundred high-placed officials into even more lucrative salaries without first calling attention to the actual facts.

What are the facts, Mr. President? We do not find them in the report of the subcommittee. There is nothing in the report stating the amount of the President's personal expense allowance. I want to set the record straight by stating that, although I find nothing in the report stating just what the President's personal expense allowance is today, today's figure actually is $40,000 and not the popularly supposed $25,000 so often referred to. As recently as 1946, the $25,000 figure was raised to $40,000; nor need the President account in any way except by voucher for the expenses so authorized. This, of course, is as it should be considering his exalted office.

The majority views of the committee have not explained to the Senate that, although the President is authorized to have an entertainment and travel fund for his personal account of not less than $40,000, during the 2 years such authorization has existed he has not used this amount, despite the national campaign intervening. For the fiscal year 1948 the President used only $32,039 of the $40,000 granted. Therefore, there has been no demonstration of the need for increasing this personal, tax-free expense account.

So far as the salary of the President is concerned, I find no reason for failing to adjust the figure from $75,000 to $150,000, if the majority so desires, although it should still be noted that there is no provision for changing the language as today expressed, which says the salary should be "in full."

It is possible the committee majority does not intend to set $90,000 as the actual figure, but the amount of the allowance is not freely discussed in the report.

I call attention further to the fact that, inasmuch as there is no conflict in language between S. 103 and section 42, title 3, of the United States Code, we are entitled to assume that the President shall receive in full for his services the amount so provided in the bill, $100,000, as salary. This means that if the Bureau of Internal Revenue sees fit it may rule that the President may receive this salary "in full," which can have no connotation other than that there shall be no tax levied on the remuneration.

In the Congress' zeal to be fair to men in high office, it must not lose its sense of proportion in dealing even-handedly with those whose classification as taxpayers will in nowise be distorted.

A great deal has been said recently about the desire of the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission to deal with the chiefs of the bureaus separately from the proposed legislation, and for this reason such chiefs have been barred from consideration under the provisions of S. 103.

During the committee consideration on January 11, 1949, of the purposes of S. 103, we were told by the spokesman for the bill that bureau chiefs would be given separate and secondary attention for purposes of adjusting salaries.

Mr. President, I submit that the committee majority voiced sympathetic views on the subject, but failed to support my position in favor of actual attention to the financial plight of these officials.

Mr. President, I want every Senator on this floor to understand that the Bureau of the Budget in taking care of itself all right. At the very time when they bar every other bureau, the Bureau of the Budget is getting full consideration. Yet it, too, is only a bureau. Therefore we have rank discrimination as between the officials of bureaus, despite the protestations that bureaus are to be dealt with in separate legislation. It is interesting to note that it is the Bureau of the Budget which is one of the main activators in favor of this legislation, and that this bureau and its representatives have traipsed all over Capitol Hill, in session and out, actually writing the legislation to which the Congress is to be called upon to give its favor.

It is significant that the Bureau of the Budget is taken care of, and no other bureau is. If we can take care of one bureau by the proposed legislation, we should take care of every other bureau.

At no time has the pending legislation ever been considered or examined or participated in by the committee as a whole, despite the fact that this committee has employed a staff equipped and ready to give its assistance. Not until the entire transaction was completely finished has the committee been given more than a preview of the purpose of the bill. It is noteworthy that in the two hearings, one an executive session, the other public, no one was invited and no one was welcome to speak in opposition to the legislation. For a substantiation of this statement I invite careful study of the hearings. Of course, there were some union heads who appeared, the testimony showed, and what did they say? They were in favor of the proposal. "Just as soon as possible we want our union members to be reached, too."

Contrast the report on S. 103 to the evidence arrived at by the subcommittee in extensive and public hearings on S. 1848, S. 1849, S. 1930, S. 1931, and S. 1949. Those bills, Mr. President, were bills to raise the salaries of the little fellows, like the man who is trying to support his wife and child, as a mail handler, on $1,900 a year. When the bill affecting mail handlers was up for consideration, of course, we had to have public hearings. There were several hundred pages of public hearings, which lasted weeks and months, on every one of these four bills.

These bills were considered in support of the contention that the rank and file of Government employees and officials should be given like recognition for salary purposes. When those bills were up for consideration before the same three members of the subcommittee, before the distinguished Senator from Vermont, the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, and the distinguished Senator from Maryland, who had charge of the same four bills, public hearings were held. They were granted by the full committee. Everyone who wished to come and testify was permitted to do so, and notice was given on the floor of the Senate inviting people to testify. Yet here we find that bill No. 1 is presented to us, and if the District of Columbia employees were included, it would cost more than $1,600,000. I ask the distinguished Senator from Maryland if that is not correct.

Mr. O'CONOR. That is, the payments to the 7,500 employees of the District, which of course are made from another fund.

Mr. LANGER. How much does that amount to?

Mr. O'CONOR. It amounts to $2,700,000.

Mr. LANGER. What is the total involved, then?

Mr. O'CONOR. Six million two hundred-odd thousand dollars.

Mr. LANGER. In other words, we are not considering passing a bill for $1,600,000, but it involves more than $6,000,000. That is what this bill involves.

As to the four bills I have mentioned, anyone could appear to testify, and they were considered in support of the contention that the rank and file of Government employees and officials should be given like recognition for salary purposes. At that time the Bureau of the Budget was completely silent as to the necessity for adjusting salaries.

The President has been quoted as saying that he wants to bring down the cost of living as a means of bringing relief to Government employees. The cost of living has not even yet declined.

I wish to say to every Senator in all candor that the total salary increases since 1925 have been 49 percent. Those in the lower grades are getting salaries of $1,500 and $2,000, and some veterans get $2,400 or $2,500 a year. The cost of living has gone up 75 percent, according to the subcommittee's own report, while the salaries have increased only 49 percent. Yet it is proposed today to increase the salaries, not of the little fellows, but of those receiving large salaries. Some seem to be afraid those receiving the large salaries cannot get along on their salaries.

I submit, Mr. President, that we should carry out the original purpose of the legislation submitted back in July 1947, at the time the subcommittee considering it reported on the subject, and that there be no increase in higher salaries unless at the same time the little fellow is taken care of. He must eat, Mr. President. The little fellow, the veteran with a wife and child or children receiving $2,450, and in some cases $2,350, must eat, and so must

his family. I submit that the Senate should see to it that, if we are going to have salary increases for the big fellows, at the same time we should take care of increasing the salaries of the little fellows down below.

WHAT THE REED-BULWINKLE BILL IS AND WHAT THE REED-BULWINKLE BILL IS NOT

Mr. REED. Mr. President, in 1942 the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice began proceedings before a Federal grand jury in Chicago involving certain railroads. It was contended that they had violated the antitrust laws by their participation in routine rate conferences among railroads and between railroads and shippers. These conferences had been openly and publicly carried on over a period of more than 40 years without question from any source. It was contended that such conferences, in and of themselves, were price-fixing conspiracies which violated the antitrust laws. I shall later discuss in some detail the situation thus created.

In 1944 the Department of Justice and the State of Georgia brought injunction suits against various railroads. These suits went further than the original contention that rate conferences, as such, violated the antitrust laws. They alleged an underlying conspiracy among the railroads to discriminate against the South and the West in the rates fixed and to discriminate against the West in services and other matters. Discriminatory freight rates for many years have been, and still are, unlawful under the terms of the Interstate Commerce Act.

That distinction is important. Those supporting the Reed-Bulwinkle bill, both in and out of Congress, were, and now are, interested solely in fixing a legal status for rate conference machinery necessary to the maintenance of an equitable structure of rates. It was never the purpose, or the result, of that bill to legalize discrimination in the rates fixed or conspiracy to fix discriminatory rates.

Under edicts laid down by Congress, rates charged by regulated carriers must not only be "just and reasonable" but must be fairly related so as to avoid preference and unfair discrimination. Railroads, for more than 40 years prior to 1942, had been engaging in conferences with each other and with their shippers concerning rates the individual carriers would file with the Interstate Commerce Commission. The purpose of these conferences was not only to establish rates to be filed by connecting lines but to work out differences between competing lines, as well, so the carriers might obey the mandate of the law in maintaining sound economic conditions in transportation and in avoiding preference, prejudice, and unfair practices in the rates filed. These organized conferences and public hearings had become a necessity in keeping the rate structure flexible and in step with the needs of commerce. They were only a preliminary step in the rate-making process. Any rates thus agreed to were no more than proposals, for they must still be filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission and remain subject to the complete power of the Commission under all the requirements of the law. The rights and interests of the traveling and shipping public were under the complete protection of Commission authority.

Since each carrier retained its right of individual and independent action and since the rates discussed were subject to complete control by the Commission, no one had assumed that there was anything unlawful or improper about those rate conferences. For more than 40 years they had been permitted to operate as public institutions without serious question.

But in 1942, during the darkest days of the war, the Antitrust Division came forth with the assertion that those rate conferences, and rate bureaus through which they were conducted, in and of themselves were price-fixing conspiracies carried on in violation of the antitrust laws.

There was instant reaction from the shipping public. Agitation for clarifying legislation began. All experienced traffic men regard these conferences as absolutely necessary to the movement of the Nation's commerce.

On the intervention of the Army, the Navy, and the Office of Defense Transportation, the criminal proceeding at Chicago was dropped. Under a law dealing with wartime emergencies, the Chairman of the War Production Board issued a certificate declaring such rate conferences to be "requisite to the prosecution of the war," and making it illegal to commence, under the antitrust laws, any civil or criminal action "with reference thereto." Early in 1943 a bill, S. 942, was introduced by Senator Wheeler to make sure those conferences would be valid and place them under the supervision of the Commission. Extended hearings were held on that proposal, but, under the assurance of the WPB certificate, that legislation was not then pressed.

However, in 1944, in the face of that certificate, the Antitrust Division and the State of Georgia brought the injunction suits mentioned a moment ago. These cases were known as the Lincoln case and the Georgia case. In both cases the defendant railroads pressed motions to have the cases dismissed, contending, among other things, that the suits were with reference to rate bureaus and were therefore barred by the WPB certificate. Against those contentions the courts, in each case, held that the broad purposes of those suits were to enjoin the railroads from carrying on an alleged conspiracy to discriminate against the South and West in freight rates and from conspiring to discriminate against the West in services rendered and in other matters.

In 1945 Representative BULWINKLE introduced a new bill intended to accomplish, in a somewhat different way, the purpose of the earlier bill, S. 942. It became known as the Bulwinkle bill and later as the Reed-Bulwinkle bill. It sought to establish a distinction between the treatment accorded a regulated industry and that accorded to business not subject to regulation. Its purpose and effect was not to validate discrimination against the South or West or any other part of the country, nor conspiracies to discriminate, but to make it clear that conference procedure in establishing rates and services, when found to be in the public interest and in furtherance of the national transportation policy, would not be unlawful and would be placed under the continuing regulation and supervision of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

That legislation made the same distinction that had been made by the courts. The courts distinguished between an ordinary rate conference, as covered by the WPB certificate, and an underlying conspiracy to discriminate. Despite the certificate protecting ordinary rate conferences, the courts permitted the Government and Georgia to carry on suits the purposes of which are to enjoin conspiracy to discriminate. With that same distinction in mind the Reed-Bulwinkle Act was for the purpose of making certain that rate conferences are to be valid without at the same time validating conspiracy to discriminate. To make that distinction clear the bill made valid only those conferences and agreements expressly found to be in "furtherance of the national transportation policy." A high percentage of the time spent in debate by those opposed to the bill was devoted to the "discrimination" and "conspiracy to discriminate" features of the Georgia and Lincoln suits. Again and again supporters of the bill pointed out the confusion among those opposing the bill on this vital point.

Probably no transportation bill in history has evoked such public support from all parts of the country. Certainly no transportation measure has had a comparable record of hearings, debate, and action by both Houses of Congress. Beginning with the hearings on S. 942 in 1943 down through action on H. R. 2536 by the Seventy-ninth Congress and on S. 110 by the Eightieth Congress, there have been 71 days of public hearings before committees, 259 witnesses have testified, filling 4,551 printed pages of reports of hearings. More than a thousand organizations representing shippers, farmers, State and Federal commissions, labor organizations, and others have endorsed the bill. There have been four favorable reports by committees, requiring 76 pages to express majority views and 13 pages to show the minority views of one Senator and one House Member. There have been 11 days of debate in the House and Senate, filling 253 pages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. There have been 35 speeches by Senators which inspired questions or comment from 48 Senators. The bill first passed the House by a vote of 277 to 45 on December 10, 1945. In the Eightieth Congress the bill was passed by the Senate by a vote of 60 to 27 on June 18, 1947, and was passed by the House on May 11, 1948, by a vote of 271 to 53. The conference report was adopted by both Houses without a record vote, was vetoed by the President, and the veto was overridden in the Senate by a vote of 63 to 25 and overridden in the House by a vote of 297 to 102.

When the Senate first passed the bill in 1947 the opposition was ably led by my friend and colleague from Georgia

[Mr. RUSSELL]. His opposition was based upon the belief—which I did then and do now contend was unfounded—that adoption of the bill would legalize or validate conspiracy by the carriers to establish or maintain a structure of freight rates which would discriminate against the people of Georgia and the South. A review of his statements makes this clear. His principal speech appears at pages 6601–6618 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 9, 1947. I have taken the time to review that speech and call attention to some quotations explaining his position. At the beginning of his speech, the Senator from Georgia said:

> Furthermore, Mr. President, the measure would remove from the jurisdiction of the courts of this land two tremendously important pieces of pending litigation against the railroads and the appurtenant freight bureaus, one of them being the State of Georgia case, pending in the Supreme Court of the United States sitting as a court of original jurisdiction, the other being the civil action filed through the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice in an effort to break the stranglehold which the railroads have had upon the people of the West, and to obviate the discrimination against them in freight rates which they have so long borne.

At page 6603 appears an exchange between the Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. Moore, and the Senator from Georgia, as follows:

> Mr. MOORE. I am anxious to understand the gravamen of the case which the State of Georgia filed in the Supreme Court as a court of original jurisdiction. Did that case have anything to do with matters dealt with in the pending bill, that is respecting rate-fixing bureaus, or is not that case an action brought to determine whether there was discrimination in freight rates?
>
> Mr. RUSSELL. The charges were conspiracy to invoke unfair freight rates against the State of Georgia.

At page 6606 appears a statement by the Senator from Georgia in reply to comment by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON]. It is as follows:

> Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut may intrigue himself with the idea that the railroads could not be run without rate bureaus; but I do not think we should become involved in that question, for I think it has no relationship to the issue which is now before us. No one is undertaking to abolish the rate bureaus. We are simply saying that the railroads should be operated in the same way that other corporations in the United States are operated.

The discrimination complained of was alleged to be not only against the South, but against the West as well. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], in commenting upon studies by the Board of Investigation and Research, said (p. 6609):

> I might further suggest that it is my recollection, from the many meetings which I attended when we endeavored to have additional money appropriated in the Appropriations Committee in the last 2 years to continue the Board of Investigation and Research, that the western discriminations were even greater than the southern, particularly in the Nebraska area.

In reply to the statement by the Senator from South Carolina, the Senator from Georgia said:

> Yes. There is no doubt that some of the States in the western regions are laboring under greater discriminations than we are confronted with in the South.

In his closing remarks the Senator from Georgia said:

> Mr. President, we have been the victims of discriminatory practices which have affected us at every turn. We have been the victims of cartels which, through the discriminatory practices which this bill seeks to perpetuate, have held us in economic bondage because we could not wage this unequal struggle against the obstacles which have been inflicted upon us. * * * Mr. President, in the bill now before us we are asked to give our blessings to an indefinite prolongation of this subversion of our transportation system to the purpose to deny the West and the South any industrial development.

The above quotations and review of the full speech by the able Senator from Georgia show that he made it perfectly clear to the Senate that his objections to the bill, and those of his colleagues who joined with him, were based upon the fear that enactment of the legislation would legalize action to perpetuate a structure of freight rates which would discriminate against the South and West, and that the pending suit of the State of Georgia was not to destroy rate conferences but to enjoin conspiracy to discriminate.

In the closing moments of the consideration of the bill the Senate adopted the so-called Russell amendment, the purport of which was to insulate the Georgia suit against any possible effect of the bill.

In the spring of 1948 the House passed the bill, but in doing so it made changes, at least two of which are important to this discussion. It eliminated the Russell amendment and narrowed the scope of the bill so that it covered only agreements as to rates and related matters and excluded agreements as to matters of service. The conferees finally adopted the House version of the bill and the conference report was then adopted by both Houses. The bill was vetoed by the President and was then presented for passage in the Senate notwithstanding the veto.

My attention has been called to a recent memorandum opinion by the Court in the Lincoln case which refers to statements I made on the floor of the Senate during debate on the veto message. During oral argument on a motion in that case, one of the attorneys for the Government read to the Court one or two of my sentences. The attorney who quoted my language took it out of context, failed to quote the qualification which was implicit in the full text of my statement, and attributed to it a meaning which was never intended. That would have been apparent to one who had had the benefit of the full text and who was familiar with the background and history against which my statements were made.

The Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] questioned me as to the reasons for and the effect of the elimination of the Russell amendment by the conferees. The statements I made, and which were quoted to the court at Lincoln, Nebr., were parts of statements in reply to those questions. I was quoted as saying:

> There is nothing in the bill that would affect the antitrust proceeding pending in the court at Lincoln, Nebr.

Further:

> The bill will not affect the Georgia case or the Lincoln case in the slightest degree.

Those quotations taken alone do not constitute a fair statement of what I said and of what I meant. In this connection, it is proper to look at the full context of my remarks and to bear in mind the position of the Senator from Georgia. Knowing that his real concern was the fear of legislative action which would legalize conspiracy to discriminate against the South, I said in my reply to the Senator from Georgia:

> Be that as it may, I want to say to my friend from Georgia and my friend from Alabama, there is nothing in the bill that in any way allows or permits discrimination against the South in the freight-rate structure; there is nothing in the bill that would affect the validity of the Georgia suit in the Supreme Court, and there is nothing in the bill that would affect the antitrust proceeding pending in the court at Lincoln, Nebr. This bill has been trimmed down to where the only thing it does is to give exemption in the making of rates, fares, and charges and the actual handling of equipment and costs of handling equipment as between the different railroads.

A few moments later, in reply to a question from the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] I said:

> Mr. President, the case of the State of Georgia rests upon the allegation of a conspiracy between the railroads to establish rates which were illegal because discriminatory. The bill has no relation at all to any case that rests upon conspiracy. The bill, if enacted into law as I firmly believe it will be today, will not affect the Georgia case or the Lincoln case in the slightest degree.

It is abundantly clear that the statements I made, when read in their full context and against the background of the whole debate, related to the real issues that were there under discussion. There was nothing in that bill, and there is nothing in the law today, that would authorize, or legalize, or validate in any way, conspiracy to discriminate against the South, or the West, or any other part of the country. My statements were meant, and I am sure they were understood to mean, that there was nothing in that bill which would interfere with those suits in the slightest degree, in their purpose to enjoin a conspiracy to establish or maintain discriminatory freight rates.

A simple reading of the bill, which was then officially before every Member of the Senate, made it abundantly certain that the only agreements authorized by the bill were those which the Commission may expressly find to be in furtherance of the national transportation policy. Anyone with sufficient interest to read the opening paragraph of the Interstate Commerce Act may plainly see that a conspiracy to discriminate or an agreement which would promote or encourage

unfair discrimination is contrary to and not in furtherance of that policy.

It is well to observe that there is not, and never has been, any confusion as to what that bill was intended to do. Its plain language leaves no room for doubt. In response to popular demand, clearly and eloquently expressed, and based on a half century of experience, the bill was passed by the overwhelming vote of Congress—by the votes of the majority of the Democrats and the majority of the Republicans. Its purpose was to make rate conferences in transportation legal, to give to the Interstate Commerce Commission the power and the duty to determine whether or not a proposed conference is "in furtherance of the national transportation policy," to place such conferences under the continuing regulation and supervision of the Commission, to remove any doubt about the validity of proper rate conferences and to prescribe means by which they could be preserved and regulated.

The legal effect of that legislation upon the pending suits has been the subject of differences of opinion. But those differences result not from doubt or confusion as to the intent of the legislation but from apparent confusion as to the purpose of the suits.

It is not the duty nor the responsibility of Congress or its Members to interpret the objectives of litigation pending in the courts. Those objectives are often obscure and the results are frequently at variance with the expectations of all the parties involved. But it is our duty to declare the national policy and to spell it out in laws that may be understood. Where there is need for clarification of policy or of the law, as was the occasion for the enactment of this bill, we are not obliged to await disaster nor to sit idly by awaiting action by the courts to interpret that which we may have said or to reconcile conflicting pronouncements we may have made in the past. By the enactment of that bill we made it clear that rate conferences between regulated carriers, when found by the Commission to be "in furtherance of the national transportation policy," are not to be considered as "conspiracies in restraint of trade" which we prohibited by the enactment of the antitrust laws; we designated the Interstate Commerce Commission as the body to determine whether or not proposed conferences are "in furtherance of" that policy; and we placed the conferences expressly found to be of that character under the continuing supervision of that Commission. The very fact of controversy as to the effect of that legislation upon the Lincoln suit and the Georgia case is further justification for the enactment of that bill at the time we passed it. By the adoption of the Reed-Bulwinkle bill we validated only that which is "in furtherance of the national transportation policy." If it was not the purpose of these suits to frustrate that policy, then they will not be affected by the legislation. As I have said, if the purpose of those suits was to enjoin conspiracy to fix or maintain a structure of freight rates which discriminate against any part of the country, the passage of the bill did not affect them, because the bill did not validate conspiracy to discriminate. If the Government proves charges of that character, the legislation would not give the carriers relief. On the other hand, if the real purpose of those suits was to declare illegal and to destroy rate conferences expressly found to be "in furtherance of the national transportation policy," then the language of the bill is clear and necessary.

INCREASED COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN FEDERAL OFFICERS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 103) to increase rates of compensation of the President, Vice President, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and heads and assistant heads of executive departments and independent agencies.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I desire to speak briefly on the pending measure, Senate bill 103. I wish to address myself particularly in support of the very fine presentation made by the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] on the relationship of this bill and its proposals to the exceedingly important subject of economy in the administration of our Government.

The proposals of this bill constitute step No. 1 in the attainment of a greater and exceedingly necessary measure of economy in the operations of the Federal Government. Attention has been called again and again to the comparatively low rates of salary which are offered in Government administration, as compared with what the same degree of experience and ability can obtain under private business. In the proposals of this bill there is no endeavor to make the return to the individual official as great, for the experience and ability required, as the return which would be offered him or the return which he may have been getting under private employment. Mr. President, it is assumed that some degree of sacrifice is involved in working for the Federal Government, rather than in working for private business. However, this bill endeavors to make sure that the degree of sacrifice involved is not so great that it becomes impossible to hold the men of the required degree of experience and ability to carry on in an economical and effective way the enormous operations of the greatest big-business organization the world has ever seen, which, of course, is the administration of the Federal Government of the United States of America.

I said, and I wish to repeat, that this is the first step in any endeavor to cut down the expense of the operations of the United States Government. Without this first step, no second step can be taken.

The first requirement is that there shall be available for the administration of the various branches of the Government men who are able to handle, with experience, with good judgment, and with integrity, the billions of dollars which are involved—amounts far exceeding in total, and in many of the subdivisions of the total, any amounts handled by any private business undertakings whatsoever the world over. Any President, be he a Democrat or be he a Republican, will not only be handicapped, but will be hamstrung if he is unable to obtain the services of men of requisite qualities for the enormous responsibilities the President has had handed to him by the legislation enacted by the Congress and by the conditions of the world and of the country which he must consider.

I should also like to address myself to the question of why the bill before the Senate stops at the point where it does in going down from the top officials toward those who are lower. One practical point is involved, and that is that it was necessary to find a stopping place. There is one point at which a line of demarcation can clearly be drawn, and that is the point at which the line is drawn in this bill. It is drawn so as to include the heads of departments, the Cabinet members, who are the secretaries in charge of the various departments, the under secretaries, and the assistant secretaries, the heads of the independent bureaus, and the heads and members of the important independent commissions. That line can be drawn. It is not merely practical, in that it can be drawn; it is also logical, in that it includes practically everyone in the way of a policy-determining administrator for all the branches of the Government and all the undertakings of the Government. No one who has been working on this bill or who has supported this bill or understands this bill would for a moment say that it includes more than a fraction of those who are holding important positions, who have held them faithfully, who have done good work for the Government, and who in the months and years to come, throughout their tenure of office, can be expected to render to their Government service of which they can be proud and with which we can be satisfied.

It is not the intention in thus limiting the application of the bill to pick out this official or that official, or the other group of officials, and reward them on the basis of good service. The line is drawn, as I said, from the practical standpoint of there being a place at which to draw the line, and from the logical standpoint of including those on whom the ultimate responsibility must be fixed for the carrying out of the Federal governmental operations with which under the law they are charged. The work of arranging or providing adequate compensation extends then beyond the limits of the bill. There is very much more to be done, but it should be done in order.

I have in my hand a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, indicating the status of the studies of that branch of the Government on the question of adequate pay for the remainder of the salary list. It is addressed to the junior Senator from Maryland, and, with his permission, I shall read it:

MY DEAR SENATOR O'CONOR:

In response to your request concerning the status of recommendations for a revision of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, please be advised that within the next few days there will be transmitted to the Congress for its consideration a proposed draft of bill providing for a complete revision of that act.

I wish to say a word on another phase of the matter, that of having separated the top group for early action. It would be understandable, it would be without the bounds of any reasonable criticism that we should have done this in the Congress and have done it early, had the event of a new President transpired. As most of us know, that did not happen; we have the same President, and largely the same administration. However, the principles which would have applied to a new President in giving him the means of attracting and holding men of the great ability required to transact the business of the Nation hold, in only a slightly less degree, to the present incumbent, who holds over from last year, and whom we shall shortly inaugurate as the President of the United States. I say, "in only a slightly less degree," because there has been, and will continue to be, in the early months of his administration, a rather high degree of turn-over in top officials. We read in the newspapers that this Cabinet official and that Cabinet official and the other, and the head of this agency, the head of this administration or bureau, or what have you, is not going to resign, and then, within a short space of time, he resigns. I think we are all resigned to that perfectly practical situation. There is a turn-over at the beginning of a new administration. Who the officials will be, we do not know, but we do know that in order to get men of the requisite caliber in the first few months, whether the Chief Executive be Democrat or Republican, he must be assured that he has within his power the means of attracting and holding men of ability, and in particular, men who do not have large private means of their own, so that he will not have to search principally among the uncommonly well-to-do to find men of the type he wishes to employ.

Those are the reasons, Mr. President, on which I would support first the passage of the bill as a whole; and, second, the line which determines the particular group which the bill covers. But, thirdly, I want to refer to one other point in the bill which to my mind is overwhelmingly important from the standpoint of justice.

In the closing hours of the special session last year, we eliminated from the pay-bill increase for the civil-service employees, one large group. We did it because there were in sight at that time no funds with which to pay them. That very practical appeal was agreed to by the Members of the Senate. We left out every civil-service employee of the District of Columbia, and we gave the pay increase to every other civil-service employee the country over, with one exception.

I submit, Mr. President, that in spite of the budgetary situation involved, we should and must find the funds to bring civil-service employees in the most expensive city in the United States on a par with those in the other sections of the country.

Mr. CAIN. Will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to ask the Senator how section 8 of the bill cures the distressing situation to which the Senator has just referred?

Mr. FLANDERS. It gives the $330 increase and makes it retroactive.

Mr. CAIN. To whom among the employees of the District of Columbia does it give the $330 increase?

Mr. FLANDERS. It gives it to those in the classified service.

Mr. CAIN. I may ask the Senator, for I think it is a very fair and important question, what provisions are to be made for the unclassified workers of the District of Columbia, who outnumber by several thousand the classified workers?

Mr. FLANDERS. I may say to the junior Senator from Washington that I would expect that question to fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the District of Columbia. It does not fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee which reported the pending bill.

Mr. CAIN. I am very conscious of that fact, but I wondered what would result administratively within the District of Columbia if, through the passage of section 8 of Senate bill 103, we provided a retroactive increase in salary for 7,000 workers, leaving 11,000, working side by side with them, without a penny by way of a pay increase.

Mr. FLANDERS. Those salaries, as between the classified employees and those directly under the jurisdiction of the District Committee, have always been handled separately. In evidence thereof, I should like to call the attention of the junior Senator from Washington to the fact that in 1947, I believe it was, the salaries of a large number of those under the jurisdiction of the Committee on the District of Columbia were raised without raising the salaries of those under the classified service.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, it is quite true that school teachers, who are unclassified workers, were given increases to make up for the fact that previously they had not been given increases commensurate with those given to other employees. But may I ask the Senator this question? In view of the fact that there are 18,000 employees of the District of Columbia, would it not be much better, from every point of view, particularly because the Senate has already given evidence of its wish to make any pay increase retroactive, to handle the problem of the 18,000 employees at one time, rather than to take a specialized group of 7,000, increase their wages at this time, and leave for some future action the rights of 11,000 other employees?

Mr. FLANDERS. I would say to the Senator from Washington that, so far as I am concerned, I can only feel and act on a responsibility to which I am committed by my position on the committee.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I thoroughly appreciate the responsibility which confronts the Senator from Vermont, but our concern for the District of Columbia, the Capital City of the Nation, the only Federal city in the United States, gives to both of us an over-all responsibility which certainly extends beyond the confines or limits of a particular committee responsibility.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I would accept that extension of responsibility which the Senator has so plainly and logically indicated. I find my refuge in an ancient Latin proverb which I endeavored to give in Latin on the floor of the Senate at one time and concerning which I had to be corrected by the erudite reportorial force. I shall not now endeavor to give it in Latin; I shall give it in plain English:

Let justice be done though the heavens fall.

That, it seems to me, is properly applicable to this situation. I would therefore suggest that we proceed with remedying the injustice and that the members of the District Committee proceed as rapidly as possible with any other adjustments which may have to be made.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont and I differ in this instance only on the interpretation and definition of what justice really is. I think that, to be just to the problem confronting us with reference to the District of Columbia, we have a very high obligation to do no less for one segment of the workers of this grand community than we are willing, at the same time, to do for any other segment.

Aside from that, may I inquire of the Senator from Vermont where the money—we are all interested in money—is coming from to meet this obligation to pay the classified workers retroactively a $330 increase?

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, with regard to that question, I would defer to any suggestions, any legislation, which may come before the Committee on the District of Columbia. I wish to assure the Senator that so far as the Senator from Vermont is concerned, any reasonable endeavor to meet these moral obligations of the United States of America will have my support.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I think that is very important to the future. Certainly the heads of the government of the city of Washington would be very grateful. But I should like to inquire whether there have been before the Senate within recent months reasonable revenue-raising measures which, if passed, would have met the obligation with money in hand some time ago? It is far different today. The Senator is very well aware that we are proposing to pay out money which we do not happen to have in sight. May I ask, if it be a fair question, whether or not Congress has met its responsibility both in raising revenues, and in deciding to whom those revenues will be given?

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, so far as the arrears are concerned, and, I believe, so far as the fiscal year is concerned, the President's budget recently submitted to Congress has in it provisions for the extension of $330 to which reference has been made.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I do not care to labor the point, but if the Senator will permit me, I want to urge that it is important. The President submitted a budget of $103,000,000 for the District of Columbia, the largest budget ever dreamed of by this community. It is a balanced budget—balanced on

two assumptions, both of which are likely to turn out to be completely meaningless. In order to balance the budget, the first assumption the President made was that a sales tax to provide $13,000,000 would be passed. The Senate has not passed a sales tax, nor has the Congress. Such a measure was before us last year, but it was filibustered. The second assumption of the President in the $103,000,000 budget for the District of Columbia was that no consideration would be given to retroactively paying employees of the community $330, nor would the $330 increase be included in the 1950 provision for the District of Columbia employees. The basic question I raise is, How far can we go, either in or out of the District of Columbia, in passing legislation which obviously is intended to help people, without having the faintest or slightest idea as to the source of the money?

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I wanted to call the attention of the Senate to one other piece of injustice which has occurred, by inadvertence, through inability to see where the money was coming from, to which the Senator from Washington has so logically referred, without, however, I believe, trying to indicate that injustice should not be remedied, if possible, somehow and somewhere.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, may I inquire as to how we are going to remedy it in the face of a lack of revenue with which to meet the obligation we intend to incur?

Mr. FLANDERS. I should gladly appear before the Appropriations Committee and ask that the money be appropriated from the funds of the Government, if there is no other way to do it.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, does that mean that, from the Senator's point of view, we should ignore and pass over the possibility of meeting the obligation through the imposition of a sales tax similar to that which already has been passed by most of the States of the Union, or at least by quite a number of them?

Mr. FLANDERS. I said, if there were no other way.

Mr. CAIN. Does the Senator consider that the sales tax is a reasonable way by which to meet the responsibility?

Mr. FLANDERS. The sales tax certainly is a reasonable way. It is one which has been tried in other places. I shall want to balance it against other possibilities before I commit myself to it.

Mr. CAIN. Does the Senator from Vermont think that the requirements of the situation demand that before we give consideration to proper methods for financing the District of Columbia and its obligations we should meet such obligations without the money in hand?

Mr. FLANDERS. I believe that we should do that first. The Senator has stated my position very clearly. It should not be taken out of the employees. The responsibility lies with the Congress, and it should not be taken out of the income of those who are working at comparatively low salaries in the most expensive city in the United States.

Mr. CAIN. Yet one fact, I think, is rather obvious, that during the debates in the closing days of the last Congress it was agreed by the Congress in an informal fashion, but I think a very proper one, that when moneys were found—which called for a complete restudy and reappraisal of the whole awkward, bad financial situation in the District—they would apply retroactively to the salaries of District employees, both classified, as the Senator from Vermont has referred to them, and unclassified, as well, to which the junior Senator from Washington and a good many other Senators have referred in times gone by.

I raise only that question, as to whether it is not proper, in the name of good government and sound financing, for those who know that when the problem is solved they will be taken care of, through retroactive salary increases, to wait a reasonable length of time, and place the responsibility for reasonableness on this Congress, until a solution which makes good, hard-headed, common sense can be found by the Congress.

Mr. FLANDERS. My memory may fail me, it does in many situations and as to many matters, but I should be very much surprised to find that the record showed that I voted to postpone that obligation.

Mr. CAIN. There was no personal reference by the junior Senator from Washington to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. I understand that, but I am merely indicating to the Senator from Washington that that argument did not appeal to me particularly at that time. I think we have incurred an obligation, which we are bound to make good at the earliest possible moment, to these men and women—again, I say, in the most expensive city in the United States.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator agree with me that one of the reasons why this is "the most expensive city in the United States," to use the Senator's words, is because on too many occasions we create obligations without first having determined how we are going to finance them, and in consequence we move too rapidly toward the attainment of our otherwise acknowledgedly good goals?

Mr. FLANDERS. That, I submit, is a proposition to be proved, not simply to be stated.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator. I should like to ask one last question, with the Senator's permission. Assume we pass this provision, which says the classified workers shall get an increase, to which I for one, and everyone else in this Chamber, I know, says they are entitled, then it necessarily follows, in the Senator's words and mine, and those of others, that we must give comparable consideration to unclassified workers. If we take such action, we are going to create a deficit of approximately $10,000,000 beyond and above what we have now for the District of Columbia, which has its gigantic and largest budget of $103,000,000. Where is that money to come from? We have not met the issue of a sales tax head-on. We are going to take the easy way out.

The question I wish to ask the Senator is this: Does not the passage of this legislation, as proposed, mean that we are likely to continue to avoid a full discussion of the sales tax, in favor of taking these moneys from the only other available source, namely, the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. FLANDERS. First, as to the amount involved, so far as the classified service is concerned it amounts to about two and one-half million dollars a year, retroactively, for approximately 6 months, which would mean $1,250,000. The Senator from Washington can say in a very much more informed and clearer manner than I can what he would assume to be the necessary adjustments in other salaries, involving the expenditure mentioned to go along with the proposed action, which has been taken following the line of the jurisdiction of the committee.

Mr. CAIN. Yesterday I called up Mr. Fowler, the budget officer of the District, and I found that the $330 obligation, which we are considering for the classified workers, in accordance with the budget which the President recently sent to Congress would amount, for 7,000 workers, to $2,208,000 plus. If we gave the same consideration to the 11,000 unclassified workers, the cost would be $3,077,000. So we are talking about a total obligation in the future, to meet these increases of more than $5,000,000, in addition to what the retroactive amounts would actually cost.

I am very grateful to the Senator from Vermont for the light which he has shed on a difficult subject. I know I have not been misunderstood in my questions. I am completely satisfied that we share the same desire, namely, to be of service to the workers of the District of Columbia. I have merely maintained, and very seriously, too, that by setting precedents of this character in securing wage increases, we shall in due time be doing a great disservice not only to the workers of the District of Columbia, but to the average, ordinary American taxpayer as well.

Mr. FLANDERS. I wish to say, in return, if the Senator from Washington does not mind, that his material has given me food for thought, but with the overriding necessity for justice still in my mind, and I am sure he still understands that.

There is one other group which was left out, by inadvertence, in the bill which we passed in the closing hours of the Eightieth Congress, namely, those in the classified service under the Foreign Service Act. They are certainly as much entitled to an increase as were the other members of the classified service to whom an increase was granted. So in the final section of the bill, in order to remedy that inadvertent injustice, we ask that they be included in the $330 raise, again retroactively.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. During the time the distinguished Senator from Vermont and myself were on the committee together we worked along very well, and I wish to ask the Senator now whether he thinks that under his Latin proverb, which he gave in English a few moments ago, it would be just to pick only 223 out of

3,107 employees who are getting $9,975 a year?

Mr. FLANDERS. I think there are two things to be said with regard to that. In the first place, this is not a cost-of-living bill. This is a practical bill, designed to procure and retain the very highest ability that can be attracted to the Government service for the most important jobs.

Mr. LANGER. Would the distinguished Senator say that at the present time we do not have them?

Mr. FLANDERS. There have been certain times and with reference to certain positions when the junior Senator from Vermont was in a pessimistic state of mind, when he wondered whether in all cases we did have such men.

Mr. LANGER. Let me ask the distinguished Senator, then, if he thinks that raising certain salaries to $22,500 and others to lesser amounts will make it possible to attract such men, like those on the long list the Senator mentions in the report, for example, the head of the United States Rubber Co., who receives $300,000 a year. Does the Senator expect to attract men of that caliber to Government service?

Mr. FLANDERS. Let me say to the Senator from North Dakota that I have not the slightest idea whether the president of the United States Rubber Co. would make a good government official. I think he would last about 2 weeks, blow up, and buy a ticket home. But there are men farther down the line, still earning salaries higher than any that is proposed to be paid in the bill, who might be more useful than the president of the United States Rubber Co.—and I am saying nothing against him, I want that clearly understood—men who have had experience in dealing with widespread details and organizing those under them, who might be persuaded to enter the Federal service at salaries considerably below those now being paid them.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I have no desire to prolong the discussion. Has the Senator had any agreement with the majority as to when action shall be taken with respect to the remainder of the 3,107, if we pass the bill providing for the 223?

Mr. FLANDERS. There is no agreement on the part of the members of the committee with the majority. I did read a letter from the Bureau of the Budget—I think I read it while the Senator from North Dakota was absent from the floor—in which the writer said that the Bureau of the Budget was prepared to report and would very shortly report its recommendations for the full salary list.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Vermont a further question. The Senator was chairman of the committee which acted during the last night of the Eightieth Congress, when the matter of the last pay increase was taken up jointly with the House. Is that not true?

Mr. FLANDERS. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. At that time the bill as it was reported by the Senate committee, and acted upon in the Senate, contained the Reclassification Act. Is that not true?

Mr. FLANDERS. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. Did not at that time the House Members say that if that were left out, and the bill as it was, without the Reclassification Act, were passed, they would immediately get together in the next 6 or 7 months and prepare a complete reclassification measure? Did the Members of the House not promise that?

Mr. FLANDERS. They promised that. Of course, technically one House cannot promise anything for another. The House does not hold over as the Senate does. But I am sure the Senator from North Dakota will be glad to know that the information is that they are now working on that bill as promised by the members with whom we dealt in that joint committee.

Mr. LANGER. Then may I ask, why would it not be just, right, and proper to wait until that report is made, and then at that time to take up the entire question of all the employees in one bill, rather than do it piecemeal the way we have been doing in the past 6 or 7 years?

Mr. FLANDERS. I may say to the Senator from North Dakota that I have tried to give my reasons for feeling that this top group should have the earliest possible action so that in the early weeks of this administration the President may be free to make such changes in the top group as he deems wise. In that regard I feel the members of the minority party have a particular responsibility for giving the President those means, so that there shall not rest on them at least one scintilla of responsibility for any maladministration in any remote nook and corner of the administration of the opposite party.

Mr. LANGER. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Vermont in conclusion that if the Senator's theory is correct, and if that is the reason why the Senator is in favor of the pending bill, then the Democratic Party, the party of the Members on the other side of the aisle has been negligent in the past 16 years in not taking care of the Federal employees. Does the Senator agree with that statement?

Mr. FLANDERS. I will say to the distinguished Senator that I agree with practically anything on principle that expresses doubt as to the complete wisdom of the action of our friends on the other side of the aisle, and we can only hope that now and in the future they will show a higher degree of wisdom.

I might read from a letter sent to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, on January 6, from the President, this concluding paragraph:

> On January 20 a new Presidential term will begin. During that term the executive branch of the Government will be called upon to bear responsibilities of great magnitude. Prompt action on this bill is of great importance to me in strengthening the management of the executive branch to meet these responsibilities. Its small cost will be repaid many times. I ask the Congress to give me the means of making it possible to get and keep the men who are required for the job ahead.

A Republican President entering upon a new administration would very properly have written the same message to the heads of the two Houses here in the Capitol, and whether he be a Republican or whether he be a Democrat, I think we have the responsibility for upholding him upon this matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is before the Senate with amendments.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to Senate bill 103 and ask only that it be read for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 8 it is proposed to strike out subsection (a) of section 8.

SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF PURDUE UNIVERSITY—AWARD TO WALT DISNEY

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, on the 15th day of this month that great Hoosier institution, Purdue University, at Lafayette, Ind., will celebrate its seventy-fifth anniversary.

Needless to say, suitable ceremonies have been planned for this memorable occasion. Proper tribute will be paid then to one of the Nation's outstanding symbols of progress.

At the same time, the university will pay tribute to another symbol of Americanism. It will present its distinguished service award to Walt Disney and declare him an honorary member of its alumni association.

These happy events combine to make this an occasion not only of great interest but of great significance. It can truly be said that it is world-wide in both interest and significance.

We of Indiana, Mr. President, are justly proud of Purdue. As one of the greatest of all institutions for education, it has greatly contributed to the leadership of America in the world and it has enriched the world itself.

In the professions for which Purdue prepares its students it has exacting standards. It is no less exacting in its selection of those who receive its distinguished-service award.

This award is not come by lightly. It has been awarded only twice before, and Walt Disney is the first American to be accorded this unique and distinguished honor.

He is only the second man to be made an honorary member of the Alumni Association of Purdue University, being preceded only by the immortal Will Rogers.

Mr. President, I am certain that my colleague [Mr. JENNER] and the other Members of the Indiana delegation in the House of Representatives, join me in this tribute to Purdue and to its worthy choice for one of its highest honors.

Walt Disney is a living example of the creative spirit which has made America great. As with all true artists, he blends inspiration and imagination with precisionist technique.

Mr. Disney has created a beloved character that has become a friend of all the world—the enchanting, beguiling little sprite of the inkwell, Mickey Mouse.

Known in every country, I believe Mickey Mouse is destined to live forever with other immortals of tradition, song, and story, such as Columbine and Pantaloon, Santa Claus and Robin Hood.

Mr. President, we of the Indiana delegation to the United States Congress believe that the words of citation which will be delivered to Walt Disney by Purdue University are apt and perfect tribute to him. That citation reads:

> To Walt Disney, artist, producer, director, and creator, but above all, welder of the arts of painting, music, and the drama into a new unity that has made a world public sensitive to the values inherent in motion pictures, Purdue presents this citation to show its recognition of his effectiveness in bringing pleasure to a humanity that needs a healing power of laughter and beauty.

ISRAEL AND GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, later this afternoon I shall have a few remarks to make in regard to an amendment to the pay bill, in the form of a bill which now is being prepared, but at this time I wish to address myself to an entirely different subject.

The other day five Royal Air Force fighters and bombers were shot down—some on Israeli territory and some on the Israeli-Egyptian border. There has been an angry reaction on the part of Great Britain, but it is fair to ask the question, "What were British planes doing over that area, anyway?" They had, in my opinion, as little right to be flying over the battlefield in Israel and Egypt as they would have had to be flying over Long Island. The act of the British Government in sending planes to that area was a deliberate and provocative one. Even the kindest interpretation must see it as a provocative act. The British Foreign Office asserts that the planes, though armed, were under orders not to shoot, and were sent only for reconnaissance. But I ask, What were armed planes doing in an area in which they had no business to be—an area thrice delicate by the conflict in which it was involved?

Reconnaissance in military science is recognized as a military activity. It is not a harmless act.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I do not care to yield until I finish my remarks, and then I shall be glad to yield.

Reconnaissance, as every military man knows, is the first phase of attack, and is thus recognized. If Mr. Bevin is now seeking an incident, he chose no better method than to send armed fighter planes of the RAF over an area in which the forces of another country lie waiting with antiaircraft guns to defend their soil against aggression.

Mr. President, there is no doubt that today we are witnessing a war of nerves in the Middle East. What we are seeing is a definite, deliberate, and consistent British attempt to force their way into the Jewish-Arab conflict. It is the more reprehensible because that conflict seems well on its way toward resolution. United Nations representatives are holding peace talks in Rhodes between Egyptians and Israelis. A truce has been achieved on the once-bloody Israeli-Transjordan front. Peace—and ultimate stabilization—are coming more and more into view, day by day.

This is the moment when the great powers of the world should be studiously correct and most circumspect in every word and in every act which might tend to disturb the delicate equilibrium now reached in the Middle East.

Yet this is the moment when Great Britain chooses to send British troops into the port of Aqaba, in Transjordan, just across the border from Israel; to land British fighting planes at Mafrak, Transjordan; to reassemble her naval forces in the Middle East; to announce that they are taking precautionary measures likely to deter any aggressive intentions that the Jews might have; and to send armed planes over Israeli territory.

It is certainly subject to suspicion, to say the least, that Mr. Bevin's real intent is to precipitate a major crisis in the Middle East; to throw a ring of armed might around Israel; and thus finally to demand that the new state acquiesce to those designs for its suicide which Mr. Bevin was unable to sell the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on Palestine in 1946, the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine in 1947, and the United Nations itself in 1948.

I am not alone, Mr. President, in criticizing Mr. Bevin. I find myself in a goodly company each time I do so. Only recently, Mr. Winston Churchill and Mr. Anthony Eden, speaking in the House of Commons, demanded to know—as I ask today—why the RAF was sticking its nose into a territory in which it had no business.

The Manchester Guardian, on Monday morning, said bluntly:

> Mr. Bevin is taking perilous and needless risks in the Middle East. * * * His policy is making fools of us and is in danger of doing worse.

Mr. President, this country has a very profound stake in a stabilized Middle East. Through the past years American foreign policy has aimed at achieving a measure of stability in Palestine and the surrounding Arab states. It has been a matter for congressional resolutions and for Presidential statements. It has been part of our major party platforms. The issues have been discussed and debated, and have been the subject of innumerable analyses and investigations by committees and by the United Nations itself.

If that stability now, at last, appears on the horizon, every responsible power should do all in its ability, and use every resource at its command, to encourage the cessation of hostilities and the arrival of peace. Mr. President, sending fighter and bomber planes over Israel is not the way to promote peace.

I maintain that we are well tired of war and the alarms of war in that unhappy corner of the world, and that long ago there would have been peace were it not for the interference of Great Britain. Today, even though Britain has presumably washed her hands of the Palestine issue, having turned it over to the United Nations, it is obvious that Britain is very much an upsetting factor in the problem.

It is fear of British armed intervention which today halts every peace move in the Middle East. This fear makes for ill will among both Israelis and Arabs. It strengthens those Arab leaders who stand for intransigeance. It weakens those Israeli leaders who seek genuine peace. It keeps the entire situation in flux, and makes fools, not only of the British, to quote the Manchester Guardian's words, but it makes fools of all who attempt to achieve a final agreement between the warring parties.

To our own people I say: Upon us devolves the important task of making clear to Mr. Bevin and those few British ministers, if any, who support his bitter, provocative policy, that this Government will not ignore what has happened.

We are pledged to support Israel's territorial integrity. We are pledged to support the United Nations decision which gave that territory to Israel. We cannot remain unaware of this war of nerves, which may develop into a far more serious matter, and which threatens to upset every constructive step taken thus far in the long, arduous road toward Middle East peace. Nor can we permit the British, through Mr. Bevin, to make fools of the United Nations itself.

Let us say, clearly and without subterfuge: "This is far enough, Mr. Bevin. You have failed in 3 years of intrigue and war against the Jewish people in Palestine. Your policies have not been endorsed either by the British people as a whole, or by the community of nations at large. Thus far, and no further. Our interest in peace, our stake in Middle East stability, is too grave for us to allow you to jeopardize all that has been achieved so far."

As one Member of this body, Mr. President, those are my views and that is my answer to Mr. Bevin.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like first to comment on what the Senator from Oregon has said, and to ask him whether he is aware that this morning the British authorities have issued a statement attributing a portion of the responsibility for the reconnaissance to the United States. I read the dispatch which has just come over the cables or radio from London:

> British authorities reported that scouting planes were sent over the Egyptian-Israeli battle front only after talks with the United States made clear to both sides an urgent need for precise information on Jewish invasions of Egypt.
>
> Five British planes were shot down in the frontier area last Friday.
>
> British authorities said they initiated the use of reconnaissance planes in the battle zone after Anglo-American conversations in Washington at the end of the year.
>
> At that time, it was said at the Foreign Office, the need for word on the extent of Israeli incursions into Egypt was clear to both sides. As such information could not be had from United Nations sources, British authorities used the only means of obtaining information—aerial reconnaissance.

I ask the Senator from Oregon whether he feels that we should be backed into intervention of this character through casual conversations such as are indicated in the report now issued to the public by the British Foreign Office?

Mr. MORSE. I can say to my good friend from Maine that if the British report is true as to such American conversations, then of course those conversations were carried on clearly outside the framework of United Nations procedure.

Mr. BREWSTER. Precisely.

Mr. MORSE. If we have any Americans in the State Department or Foreign Service who are conducting any such conversations as the Senator has mentioned, then it is high time, in my judgment, that the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate should proceed with a thorough investigation as to the policies of the State Department in operating outside the framework of the United Nations.

In fact, I may say, in view of the trends which have taken place recently in the Senate of the United States, in respect to an undermining of a bipartisan foreign policy, I think it has now become incumbent upon many of us in the Senate to center greater and greater attention on the State Department in regard to its foreign policy, because I think the time has now come when he must make perfectly clear to the people of the United States that there is a group in the Senate who recognize that bipartisan foreign policy in America has become nothing but a name, and that it is now incumbent upon us to find out what the policies of the State Department are, by whatever Senate investigations may be necessary.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think it should be clear that there is nothing in the statement to indicate, and I should certainly be most reluctant to believe, that anyone in the Senate of the United States was consulted in action being taken of the sort indicated here, although if the conversations were sufficient to warrant the British in carrying aerial reconnaissance of that character over the country now in possession of the Israeli Government, which we have ourselves recognized de facto, it certainly would be a most unfriendly and most unwarranted act, particularly when it required the superseding of the authority of the United Nations, which is now so obviously involved. I say this in all deference to the one who, more than anyone else perhaps in this body, was responsible for the development and evolution of the United Nations as a means of stabilizing the peace of all the world. Not until there is clearer evidence than is presented here, shall I believe that any Member of the Senate was in any way involved or responsible for the action which the British Government alleges it took upon warrant of conversations with individuals apparently in our State Department.

NECESSITY FOR ECONOMY IN FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—BRITISH ACTIVITIES IN MIDDLE EAST

Mr. President, the budget message recently received by this body from the President of the United States places on our shoulders a tremendous responsibility. The expenditures recommended by the President cannot be incurred without either raising the national debt, even beyond its present staggering height, or further increasing the heavy load of taxation with which individuals and business enterprises in this country are burdened.

In the circumstances, and before agreeing to either of these two serious alternatives, it is our duty to consider most carefully whether it is not possible to reduce the budget on the expenditure side here and there without threatening the essential needs and interests of the United States. The main purposes toward which these expenditures are directed cannot, of course, be questioned. The day-to-day functioning of all branches of the United States Government must be assured. A certain minimum of social services and of expenditures seeking to maintain the American people on a high level of prosperity must by all means be continued, perhaps even, in some instances, increased. Our obligations to pay the interest and part of the principal of the national debt are beyond doubt. In the present international situation an adequate budget for national defense is essential. For the same reason, as well as in order to insure the return of economic stability in the world, a certain measure of economic aid to friendly foreign countries may well be desirable.

And, yet, we have no alternative but to scan closely and carefully each one of these items in order to see whether we cannot reduce them without jeopardizing the general purpose of these expenditures. In doing so, we must look at the evidence and try to find out whether there is anywhere an indication that our moneys are being spent carelessly or for purposes with which our Government is not in accord. Wherever we find such evidence, it is our obligation to the people of the United States to reduce such expenditures, before calling on the American people for greater sacrifices in the form of increased taxation or a heavier national debt burden.

Reserving to myself the right to bring up at a later time other items where such reductions may be possible, I want to suggest today that, judging from recent events, we might well be justified in recommending a considerable decrease in this country's economic aid to Great Britain. As is well known, Britain is the principal beneficiary of the European economic-aid program and is scheduled to remain the principal beneficiary for some time to come. Several billion dollars—billions, and not millions—have been and are being placed at the disposal of the British Government for various purposes. A considerable portion of these billions is to be spent in the coming year. It is clear that if any important saving can be attained in this item, a great deal would be achieved toward our purpose of balancing the budget at a lower figure and toward easing the burden on the taxpayers of America.

Now the purposes for which our economic aid is granted to Great Britain are manifold. We want to help the people of Britain who suffered so much destruction and deprivation during the war to get on their feet economically and otherwise. We are doing this because of our deep sympathy for and our traditional kinship with a people with whom we have so much in common. We are also doing it because Britain is one of the principal centers of world trade and an important customer of this country. Anything that will help the British achieve economic prosperity will be a step in the direction of world economic stability and may well contribute to the maintenance of prosperity in America as well. Furthermore, we regard the people of Britain as one of the mainstays of our western way of life, and anything that will strengthen the internal structure of Britain will help maintain successfully our common traditions against the forces which now seek their overthrow.

But the very fact that both the Government of the United States and the British Government believe it necessary to invoke American economic aid for those purposes shows their belief that Britain, even when straining and exercising every effort, cannot achieve them by its own means. Surely the British people would have been too proud to ask for our assistance if they could pull themselves out of their present economic difficulties without it. And surely our Government could not justify to the American people the sending of tremendous amounts of money and goods to Britain if Britain were able to achieve the purposes mentioned above without such aid. Of course, if Britain is shown to be able to spend large amounts of money on capricious military and diplomatic adventures, this can be taken as prima facie proof that its need for help in connection with its most basic requirements must be exaggerated.

I refer to recent newspaper accounts of British military and diplomatic activity in connection with Palestine. I am not concerned at the moment with the political justification which may or may not exist for these activities. Personally, I think that these activities are quite unjustified, most provocative, likely to threaten the peace, indicate a contempt for the United Nations, and show a rather arrogant determination by the British Government to set its own will above the will of the international community. From reports in the newspapers, I gather that the Government of the United States is inclined to view these activities in a somewhat similar light.

I say that in spite of the report of the British Foreign Office this morning attributing to their conversations with the United States State Department the responsibilities for the aerial reconnaissance by the British planes which were shot down, which I find it is very difficult to believe. I do not see any warrant for such action.

But Great Britain is an independent and sovereign country, and far be it from us to suggest that the Congress of the United States should attempt to tell the British Government what to do or what not to do.

But there is one side of the issue with which the Congress of the United States is fully competent to deal. Not only is it competent to deal with this issue, but the Congress of the United States, in

my judgment, is under a duty to the American people to deal with this aspect. The question I have in mind is as follows: If the Government of Great Britain can afford to spend its own resources for military and diplomatic adventures of that kind—and from all we know they must be fairly expensive adventures—can it be said that the British Government is as badly in need of our economic assistance as we have been led to believe?

From evidence on hand, there would seem much reason to believe that the answer should be in the negative. I am inclined to believe that if the British Government is in a position to squander its resources on an attempt to intervene in the conflict between Arabs and Jews, that Government must be able to get along without economic help from us or, at any rate, with a much reduced amount of American aid. I suggest that the appropriate committees of the Senate review most carefully the expenditures proposed for American aid to Britain in the light of this situation.

I understand that there may arise an even more direct connection between American aid to Britain and current British activities in the Middle East. I understand that there is some question about Britain using in its military adventure in the Middle East airplanes placed at Britain's disposal under the American-aid program, tanks and guns and other military supplies procured in America or with funds coming from our economic-aid program.

I might say that in the disposal of war surplus at the end of the war vast stores of American military equipment were turned over to the British in the Middle East. The disposition of those stores in connection with the current problem is something to which I trust the appropriate committees of the Senate will give their very careful attention in the tense months or moments which are obviously ahead.

I trust that the appropriate committees of the Senate will investigate this question most thoroughly, for not for a moment do I believe that the Congress had intended to send funds and supplies to Britain with a view to their use in a threatened war against the tiny State of Israel.

But even if this is not found to be a fact, it would fail to satisfy me, and I suggest it should fail to satisfy the United States Congress. It does not matter whether the man to whom I give a dollar bill and a piece of iron pipe for his own needs uses that same dollar bill and that same piece of iron pipe to attack a third party for his own selfish reasons, or whether he uses in his attack a different dollar bill and a different piece of iron pipe which he had lying in his closet all along. What is important is that because he received aid from me he is in a position to use part of his own resources in an attack which he might not have been able to mount if I had not subsidized him. I submit, Mr. President, that a profligate use of funds for an unnecessarily aggressive policy by a government which is the recipient of so many billions of American economic aid places upon us squarely the responsibility for reexamining our expenditure under that item.

Mr. BREWSTER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the remarks which I made earlier in the day, dealing with events overseas, an item reported in the Washington Evening Star of today, under an Associated Press date line from London, dealing with the Palestine situation. It should be in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. It points out the extent to which oil is a factor in our difficulties in Palestine and the Middle East.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITAIN MOVES FOR UNITED STATES ACCORD ON SETTLING PALESTINE CONFLICT; ENVOY TO CALL ON TRUMAN TODAY—FRANKS IS REPORTED ORDERED TO STATE STAND ON ISRAEL

LONDON, January 13.—The Foreign Office announced British Ambassador Sir Oliver Franks will see President Truman today in a meeting apparently aimed at patching up deepening British-American differences over Palestine.

(The White House disclosed that Franks was on the calling list to see the President at 10:30 o'clock this morning.)

A Foreign Office spokesman said Franks will seek to "make plain the attitude of His Majesty's Government, and to learn further the attitude of the American Government, in the hope that the two countries can cooperate" in settling the Holy Land conflict.

INSTRUCTIONS REPORTED GIVEN

An informed diplomatic source said Franks has received instructions from Foreign Secretary Bevin since yesterday's 4-hour-long British Cabinet session telling him to make these points to President Truman:

1. Britain regards the Jews as the aggressors in the present phase of the Palestine war.

2. Britain feels that unless Jews and Arabs get a settlement the "security, tranquillity, peace" of the Middle East will remain upset, with results that can only benefit communism.

3. Britain will regard a Jewish attack on the Red Sea port of Aqaba or on any other part of Transjordan, as an attack on itself, now that King Abdullah has invoked the British-Transjordan mutual defense treaty.

4. Britain does not intend to suspend the precautionary measures it has taken in the conflict area. (This includes alerting of naval units in East Mediterranean bases, dispatch of British troops to Aqaba, placing of RAF airfields in the Suez Canal zone of Egypt on a war-preparedness basis.)

EDEN FEARS BREAK

Earlier, Anthony Eden, the Conservative spokesman, expressed fear of a British-American break over Palestine, and termed Mr. Bevin's handling of middle eastern affairs confused.

Mr. Eden declared in a political talk at Warwick last night the British Labor government and the State Department must share the blame "for failure either to declare a firm policy or take a firm line."

"I have long been anxious lest these Palestinian events should imperil Anglo-American friendship," said the man who was wartime Foreign Secretary under Winston Churchill and is second only to Mr. Churchill in the Conservative Party leadership. "Surely the time has now come when a supreme effort must be made to agree on an Anglo-American policy and carry it out."

PLANE ATTACK HELD UNWARRANTED

Mr. Eden said the destruction of five British planes by Israeli forces during a battle between Jews and Arabs on the Palestine-Egyptian border last Friday was an unwarranted and aggressive act.

But he added:

"Why were our aircraft sent to carry out a reconnaissance over battle areas in such conditions?

"What useful British purpose could the flight be held to serve?"

Those were a sample of the questions expected to be asked Mr. Bevin by both Conservative and Laborite critics when Parliament meets again next week. It resumes sessions Tuesday.

A Labor Member of Parliament, W. N. Warbey, told a Jewish Socialist Party gathering in London the British-Israeli tension grew out of "the great irresponsibility of British authorities in sending military aircraft into the battle area."

Another view was emphasized in the Daily Express, an independent imperialist newspaper. It said Britain must give everybody notice she is not a lodger, but one of the landlords in the Middle East.

PRIMARY INTEREST IN OIL

Aside from defense, a primary British interest is access to middle eastern oil. This asset was emphasized in the prediction of Egyptian Government officials in Cairo yesterday that the Sinai Desert area east of the Suez Canal will become one of the richest oil-producing regions in the world.

A prospecting well drilled by Socony Vacuum not far from Sidri came into production this week. Government officials estimated the new field will yield 5,000 tons of petroleum a day. This is more than the daily production of all Egyptian fields in 1946.

The Negeb Desert of Palestine, focal point of recent Israeli-Egyptian fighting, juts down like an arrowhead toward the Red Sea between Egypt's Sinai Desert and Transjordan. The Negeb, which the United Nations partition plan assigned to the Jews, is believed to have oil possibilities.

OLD CAMPS REFURBISHED

Just off the tip of the Negeb arrowhead British troops are refurbishing old camps, digging trenches, and consolidating their positions in Aqaba. Transjordan, like Egypt, an Arab foe of Israel, called for the troops under terms of her mutual-aid treaty with Britain. Israel protested to the United Nations against this and other British activity. Security Council delegates have side-stepped a direct show-down.

"I do not think we will initiate any incursions or start hostilities," a senior regimental officer said, "but we will not allow anybody to approach Aqaba or attack our forces."

INCREASED COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN FEDERAL OFFICERS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 103) to increase rates of compensation of the President, Vice President, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and heads and assistant heads of executive departments and independent agencies.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I send to the desk, on behalf of the junior Senator from Oregon and myself, three amendments proposed to Senate bill 103. I should like to be heard with respect to those amendments at this time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bricker	Byrd
Anderson	Bridges	Cain
Barkley	Broughton	Capehart
Brewster	Butler	Chapman

Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	O'Conor
Cordon	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Donnell	Kem	Pepper
Douglas	Kerr	Reed
Downey	Kilgore	Robertson
Eaton	Knowland	Russell
Ellender	Langer	Saltonstall
Ferguson	Lodge	Schoeppel
Flanders	Long	Smith, Maine
Frear	Lucas	Smith, N. J.
Fulbright	McCarthy	Sparkman
George	McClellan	Stennis
Gillette	McFarland	Taft
Green	McGrath	Taylor
Gurney	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Hayden	McMahon	Thye
Hendrickson	Magnuson	Tobey
Hickenlooper	Malone	Tydings
Hill	Martin	Vandenberg
Hoey	Maybank	Watkins
Holland	Miller	Wherry
Humphrey	Millikin	Wiley
Hunt	Morse	Williams
Ives	Mundt	Young
Jenner	Murray	
Johnson, Colo.	Myers	

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, as stated immediately before the quorum call, I desire to be heard on the amendments which I have sent to the desk, and I respectfully request that the clerk read them for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk will read the amendments.

Mr. DONNELL. I suggest that the clerk read the amendment pertaining to the President first, then the one with respect to the Vice President, and then the one with respect to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read as requested.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1 it is proposed to strike out lines 6, 7, and 8, and on page 2, to strike out lines 1 to 8, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 102. The President shall receive in full for his services during the term for which he shall have been elected compensation of $100,000 a year, to be paid in equal monthly installments, and an annual allowance of not to exceed $50,000 for defraying expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, for which allowance no tax liability shall accrue and for which an accounting shall be made by him, and which allowance shall be payable in monthly installments on vouchers duly presented He shall be entitled also to the use of the furniture and other effects belonging to the United States and kept in the Executive Mansion.

On page 2 it is proposed to strike out lines 17 to 22, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 111. There shall be paid to the Vice President an expense allowance of not to exceed $10,000 per annum for defraying expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, for which allowance no tax liability shall accrue, and for which an accounting shall be made by him, and which allowance shall be payable in monthly installments on vouchers duly presented.

On page 3 it is proposed to strike out lines 3 to 10, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(e) There shall be paid to the Speaker of the House of Representatives an expense allowance of not to exceed $10,000 per annum (which shall be in lieu of the allowance provided by sec. 601 (b), Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended) for defraying expenses to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, for which allowance no tax liability shall accrue, and for which an accounting shall be made by him, and which allowance shall be payable in monthly installments on vouchers duly presented.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire of the Chair just what is now before the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments were simply read for the information of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the President pro tempore.

Mr. DONNELL. The three amendments which have just been read by the clerk, and which have been presented on behalf of the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and myself, are based on the premise that an allowance for expenses should not be free from the obligation of accounting. The present provision of the bill as reported to the Senate, insofar as it relates to the President of the United States, is as follows:

The President shall receive in full for his services during the term for which he shall have been elected compensation in the aggregate amount of $150,000 a year, to be paid monthly, consisting of $100,000 for salary and an expense allowance of $50,000 to assist in defraying expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, for which expense allowance no tax liability shall accrue and for which no accounting shall be made by him. He shall be entitled also to the use of the furniture and other effects belonging to the United States and kept in the Executive Mansion.

The provision relative to the expense allowance for the Vice President is, generally speaking, to similar effect. It reads as follows:

There shall be paid to the Vice President in equal monthly installments an expense allowance of $10,000 per annum to assist in defraying expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, for which no tax liability shall occur or accounting be made by him.

The provision relative to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, as it appears in the bill as introduced and reported, generally speaking, is to the same effect, and is as follows:

There shall be paid to the Speaker of the House of Representatives in equal monthly installments an expense allowance of $10,000 per annum (which shall be in lieu of the allowance provided by section 601 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended) to assist in defraying expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, for which no tax liability shall occur or accounting be made by him.

Mr. President, it will be observed that in each of the three provisions which I have read from the bill, as it has been presented to the Senate, there is a freedom from the obligation to account for the expenditures of the moneys which are granted as expense allowances. I want to call attention, before discussing this matter more fully, to two rather important portions of section 102, namely, that although $50,000 of the $150,000 is therein described in one breath as an expense allowance, nevertheless it is included in the term "compensation," for the word "compensation" as used in said section 102 is, to quote the section:

In the aggregate amount of $150,000 a year.

I submit, Mr. President, that the use of the term "compensation" as applied to the $50,000 included in the $150,000, although it is thereafter amplified in the section as being an expense allowance of $50,000, is a contradiction in terms, for if it is an expense allowance, it is not compensation, and if it is compensation, it is not an expense allowance.

I call attention also, Mr. President, to the fact that in the bill as presented—and I refer to line 2 on page 2 of the bill—it is stated that the expense allowance, so-called, of $50,000, is, and I quote the language:

To assist in defraying expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties.

We listened with interest only a short time ago today to the address made by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and I quote a portion of one of the sentences of that address. He said:

The majority views of the committee have not explained to the Senate that, although the President is authorized to have an entertainment and travel fund for his personal account of not less than $40,000, during the 2 years such authorization has existed he has not used this amount, despite the national campaign intervening. For the fiscal year 1948 the President used only $32,039 of the $40,000 granted.

Mr. President, it occurs to me that it is somewhat curious that, although in 1948, as the distinguished Senator from North Dakota says, despite the national campaign intervening, the President used only $32,039 of the $40,000 granted to him, we now have a bill which undertakes to increase by $50,000 his expense allowance. The $50,000 allowance, instead of being provided to cover all of it, or to cover it all with whatever provision now exists, is expressed in the pending bill as being merely to assist in defraying expenses. Why this enormous increase in expense? I do not know whether the expenses of the campaign included the trip of any of the campaign trains, particularly the one which went forth on the so-called nonpolitical trip early in the spring or summer of last

year. Regardless of that fact, and whatever the fact may be, why is it that, although only $32,039 was used in 1948, despite the intervention of the national campaign, we should now be called upon to leave to the President the existing sum, whatever it may be, that is provided by statute, and then, merely to assist—and I underscore the word "assist"—in defraying his expenses, is it proposed to authorize a further sum of $50,000?

Mr. President, the fundamental point to which I invite the attention of Members of the Senate is that it is not sound public policy for us to be giving as expense allowances substantial amounts without requiring accounting as to the purposes for which those amounts shall be used.

Many of the Members of this body have been governors of their States.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator will recall that when we increased the salaries of United States Senators we gave them an expense account of $2,500 without any accounting whatsoever. As I recall, the Senator from Missouri was here and agreed to that provision. He made no such argument at that time as he is now making. I wonder if he would care to explain that inconsistency.

Mr. DONNELL. I shall be very glad to explain what the Senator refers to. I have in my hands the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, to which the distinguished Senator has referred. I was fully aware of that act when these amendments were presented to the Senate today. I may say in frankness that there is an inconsistency. To my mind a mistake was made in the process of enacting the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, in omitting to provide for an accounting.

I do not recall whether there was a record vote. If there was, I voted for the bill, because I was in favor of it. But regardless of that fact, to my mind what we should have done—and I think it should still be done—was one of two things: Either to provide in the law that the $2,500 which by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is declared to be an expense allowance shall be subject to the obligation of accounting, or if it be deemed proper and just to Members of Congress, that there be a provision describing that amount as compensation. If it is desired to have that portion of the compensation free from tax liability, all well and good. That may be entirely proper. It might be entirely proper to have a $12,500 salary subject to income tax, and $2,500 not subject to income tax. But in response to the distinguished Senator from Illinois, I say, first, that he is correct in saying that there is an inconsistency; second, that although there is that inconsistency, we should not commit an error similar to or identical with that which was committed in 1946; third, the proper procedure would be to amend the act of 1946.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. As I understand the amendments submitted by the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Oregon, the purpose is to leave the bill with respect to these three items as it stands, except to call for an accounting in each case of the sum which is provided to assist in bearing the expense of the office.

Mr. DONNELL. The statement by the Senator from Georgia, although it strikes at and refers to the fundamental principle of the amendments, is not quite correct, in this respect: Although the bill as it is now pending before the Senate, and as it was introduced in the Senate, provides for an outright sum of $50,000 in any event, no matter if $1 or $50 or $100,000 of expense shall be incurred, this amendment—and I am reading now with relation to the President of the United States—provides as follows:

> The President shall receive in full for his services during the term for which he shall have been elected compensation of $100,000 a year, to be paid in equal monthly installments, and an annual allowance of not to exceed $50,000 for defraying expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, for which allowance no tax liability shall accrue, and for which an accounting shall be made by him, and which allowance shall be payable in monthly installments on vouchers duly presented.

Let me say in concluding my response to the distinguished Senator from Georgia that the effect of this amendment—at least the intent, and I believe the effect—is that the President is granted an additional $50,000 for expenses, or rather up to but not exceeding $50,000, but that he shall receive of that sum only such amount as is actually expended, and for which vouchers are presented.

Mr. GEORGE. I thought the difference to which I first alluded was the only difference between the original and the amendment. But what troubles me—and I should like to have the Senator address himself to that point—is this: Since no requirements are made of the President and Vice President and Speaker of the House which would call for the expenditure of money by them in connection with their offices, that is, since nothing is made mandatory upon them in connection with their offices except such duties and responsibilities as are prescribed for the Vice President and the Speaker of the House, how is the requirement for an accounting consistent? Our beloved Vice President-elect might spend the full $10,000 on anything he thought had to do with his office. Since there are no prescribed extra duties which he must perform, and in connection with which he might have some expense, what is he to account for?

Mr. DONNELL. I think the bill itself, as it has been introduced and reported, answers the question of the Senator from Georgia. With respect to the Vice President, it provides:

> There shall be paid to the Vice President in equal monthly installments an expense allowance of $10,000 per annum to assist in defraying expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties.

Mr. President, obviously that section contemplates that there are "expenses"—and again I quote—"relating to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties."

Mr. GEORGE. Will the Senator be kind enough to enumerate those duties or to refer to some statute which does enumerate them?

Mr. DONNELL. I know of no such statute; but I think obviously the Vice President will be called upon to incur numerous expenses—as, for illustration, in responding to invitations to speak, either in the United States or possibly abroad. He will be required to incur expenses for transportation, even locally, and doubtless other expenses. In the absence of bad faith—and, of course, there will be no bad faith; I have the utmost confidence in our good friend who will be called upon shortly to assume the Vice Presidency—I undertake to say that "expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties" will in fact relate to or result from the discharge of his official duties. I do not think there is any practical or legal difficulty in connection with the query made by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I am greatly disturbed by it, because the amendment would require an accounting, and presumably the General Accounting Office would look over the account, and might say that certain items were spent foolishly.

Mr. DONNELL. If that be so, then the proposed act is foolish in providing $10,000 for expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of the official duties of the Vice President.

Mr. GEORGE. That may be true; but when we provide official duties, and when no standard is fixed for them, and when nothing applies to them, except the discretion of the officer concerned, I do not think there would be any accounting standard, other than a statement at the end of the year, "I have a certain amount left of the $10,000, and I will put it back in the jug."

Mr. DONNELL. I do not share the apprehension of the Senator from Georgia. The Vice President of the United States unquestionably does incur expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties; and in the absence of an unreasonable construction of what expenses are embraced within that term, I think his certificate would be accepted and, as a matter of fact, in practicality would be of the utmost finality in determining the amounts allowed to be charged to it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say that I completely share the views expressed and the analysis made by the Senator from Missouri. I think the Senator from Georgia has raised a point which points out the Achilles heel of the measure presented by the Democrats. When the Senator from Georgia makes the point that the office of President and the office of Vice President do not maintain itemized lists of so-called official expenses to which he thinks our amendment would be applicable, my reply is that the American taxpayer should not be called upon to pay the expenses of any Government officer if those expenses are not official expenses. If there are expenses of the

White House and of the Vice Presidency which ought to be paid by the American taxpayer, then it is the duty of the Congress of the United States to enumerate them and make them official. It is our duty to set forth the standards for official expenses to which the Senator from Georgia refers.

Mr. President, I share the view of the Senator from Missouri in regard to the so-called tax-exempt expense allowance for United States Senators. I voted for it, but I voted for it under protest, and with a public statement in opposition to that particular section of the bill. But, Mr. President, once again we were confronted, as so frequently we are confronted on the floor of the Senate, with a composite bill which we had either to vote for in its entirety or else vote it down in its entirety. I wish to say, because the Senator from Missouri and I talked about this very point earlier this afternoon, that I am one who believes that the section of our salary law which allows Senators $2,500 for expenses without an accounting and makes it tax-exempt in addition should be modified so that United States Senators would not benefit from any type of tax-exempt expense allowances such as the one we voted ourselves under the 1946 reorganization law. If we think we should have a $15,000 salary, then let us vote it as $15,000, subject to taxation. If we think we should have a $12,500 salary and have certain specific expenses paid, then let us list the expenses in the law and require an accounting. But I say it is a bad practice for the Congress of the United States—and it is bad for the American people—to have a provision of the type contained in the Senators' salary section of the 1946 reorganization bill.

Therefore, I take the position, in support of this amendment, that if the salary of the President of the United States and the salary of the Vice President and the salary of the Speaker of the House should be raised, let us raise them some fixed and definite amount. I protest including in the bill language which would permit a hidden expense account for which any officer of this Government would not have to make an itemized accounting, be he the President or the most lowly employee in our Government service.

Mr. President, what do you imagine thousands upon thousands of Government employees think down in their hearts about the legislation on the statute books which permits United States Senators to have a $2,500 expense account for which they have to make no accounting, whereas every time a Government employee has to take a trip on Government business, he has to make a detailed accounting of his expenses. Just consider the vouchers and the accounting he has to make for the very small sums we allow him even on his per-diem expense account. I am satisfied that the American people will not approve of a continuation of this tax-exempt, no-accounting expense fund policy. We should end it now.

There is something I wish to say further, if the Senator from Missouri will permit me to do so while I am on my feet, and then I shall not have to add further comment when he finishes. I desire to say that I think the time has come when certainly we should see to it that Government salaries for high offices are adequate for services performed; but Mr. President, there are compensations in public service, over and above money. There are those intangible values and personal satisfactions which come from serving one's fellow citizens through high office. There are the values of patriotic service which make public office a great inspiration to those of us who seek to make our contribution to human welfare through politics. I wish to say that I do not share the views of the subcommittee, in offering this bill today, that we have to pay salaries as high as those the subcommittee has provided in this bill, in order to have good, effective, able public service. I say some of these salaries are entirely too high. Some of the salaries listed in the bill—proposed salaries for certain jobs of $22,500 and $20,000 and $17,500—are entirely too high for the services rendered by the men in those jobs. This is especially true when we take into account the intangible values and satisfactions which such persons get out of the opportunity to serve their country through public office. People should not be encouraged to go into public service in order to make money. I want them to have a decent living; but I do not think we help to any extent the cause of good government by setting up a salary schedule for high Government officials in this country which makes it possible for them to either make lots of money out of their jobs or live lavishly in Washington at the taxpayers' expense. That is not the way we have built up strong, democratic principles of public service in this country. We will weaken the quality of unselfish public service in our Government if we make the economic benefits of the jobs something to be sought after rather than make the jobs a source of rich opportunity for public service. I refuse to concede that the only way we can obtain able and qualified public officers is to substitute the motive of money making for the patriotic motive of public service.

Let me say here—and I say it kindly, but I say it by way of observation after having been in Washington for some years—that there is entirely too much high living in Washington on the part of high Government officials. In Government service in this country, Mr. President, there is a trend that I do not think is consonant with the simple, democratic way of American life. I do not think it is necessary for Assistant Secretaries, Under Secretaries, and Cabinet officers to spend the amount of money that many of them spend in connection with their jobs. The type of living that characterizes so many of them in Washington, D. C., is resulting in an overemphasis of the social aspects of Government service and is out of keeping with simple democratic ways. Cocktail parties that cost from $500 to $1,000 should not be considered as being a necessary expense or social obligation of the job of serving in high public office in this country. One reason for the demand that the salaries of our high officials be raised is that the social expenses which have been allowed to develop around those jobs in Washington have become ridiculously extravagant and highly undemocratic. Poor men hesitate to take the jobs because of the expensive social tinsel which has been draped around the jobs. It is time to cut out much of the social extravaganza of the official life of Washington.

What Washington, D. C., needs is some simple living. We ought to set an example here in the Congress of the United States by not voting for a proposal which, in my judgment, will be an inducement, an encouragement to some of the unnecessary high living that has come to characterize to a considerable extent public service in Washington, D. C. The high costs of social life in Washington is having an effect, I may say, down in the grass roots of our democracy. Men of little wealth who would like to run for public office are discouraged when they hear of the expenses that some seem to think they have to incur if they are to meet the social obligations of the job. They are being told, and the example certainly is being set for them in Washington, that unless they have considerable economic backing of their own they cannot come here and meet the standard of living which some of our Government officials have been setting in so-called Washington social life. I want to say that one does not have to associate and rub shoulders with the rank and file of the American people very long without detecting a growing resentment over the extravagant living that has come to characterize so much of public life in Washington, D. C.

Certainly I want to see decent salaries paid; but I am not going to sit here, Mr. President, and vote for salaries which, in my judgment, will give encouragement to some of the unfortunate features of social life in Washington, which I think are not setting a good example so far as simple democratic life in America is concerned. In my opinion, some of the salaries are entirely too high. We should pay salaries adequate to enable the Government to obtain the services of competent men; but let such men recognize that the taxpayers are not going to pay them salaries which will permit them to conduct themselves on a social level of high living and social extravagance which have come to characterize so many of our official functions here in Washington. It is not true that one has to become involved in that social whirl in order to serve the interests of his State in Washington or perform the functions of any appointive job in Washington. Unfortunately too many Government officials seem to hold to a contrary view, but they should not receive any aid from Congress by such large increases in salary as this bill proposes.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri indulge me just a moment? I do not want to trespass on his time.

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I wish to say I raised only the one question as to accounting, not the question whether the expense

account ought to be exempt from taxation. I think that is a very bad principle. I would not undertake to defend it here and now, or hereafter, so far as that feature of it goes. But I call the Senator's attention to the fact that, without prescribing the duties relating to the office of President, Vice President, and Speaker, there is introduced an incongruous, inconsistent, and illogical provision, when it is sought to prescribe that there shall be an accounting for what they do with that money. There is a difference that I wanted to point out in the case of senatorial salaries. While personally I argued with the author of the bill against the exemption from tax of the $2,500 there is this distinction, and it is very vital: Under our revenue laws, in all businesses where any officer or agent representing the business is required to go away from his home to discharge his duties, he has a right to charge against his income all legitimate items of expense incurred by him, including the hiring of rooms or the maintenance of an apartment, if his business carries him into a city frequently enough; his meals, and everything else. It was thought, with a great deal of reason and common sense, that inasmuch as the official duties of a Member of Congress were performed principally, but not wholly, in Washington, and partly also in the State of the residence of the Senator and the Member of the House, when the Member of the Congress was away from his home on official business under the requirement of the law, he should have a perfect right to charge his actual expenditures: that is to say, all legitimate expenses incurred in attending to his official duties away from his home.

That is precisely why it was arbitrarily said that $2,500 of the amount is certainly a minimum for the expenses incurred by the Member of Congress when he is on his official duties and is away from his home. He maintains his home anyway; his expenses go on at home, and when he comes to Washington he simply has an additional expense account. That is why $2,500 was provided in the reorganization bill free of tax, and I dare say there is no Senator who will not agree at once that $2,500 will not defray the expense of any single one of the Senators in Washington while he is in Washington carrying on his official duties.

That is the explanation of that. I do not think there is any real inconsistency in supporting that principle, except I think it a bad principle to exempt anything that is in the nature of compensation or income from the payment of the tax. But that is the only legitimate ground, as I see it, upon which any just criticism can be made of the $2,500 allowance in the salary of Members of the House and Senate, or attaching to that salary.

I am still worried, I may say to the Senator, that without any standard to go by, and without any legal requirement regarding the expenditures the President and the Vice President and the Speaker of the House, respectively, may make, the accounting is tantamount to saying, "Well, you have this money, and at the end of the year we shall take a look at it. Perhaps it will be publicized in the press, as to how much you have spent for this, that, or the other, or what you have spent it for, and how much you still have left." If we are to allow an expense account, a sum total, the fair way of doing it is not to require an accounting of it, but do just as we do in the income-tax law. We say that if the taxpayer employs the short form of return, he may deduct 10 percent of his total income, or $500, to cover such items as contributions to charity, taxes, and so forth. That is an arbitrary determination; and we can likewise arbitrarily determine that the President should have $50,000 for expenses and the Speaker and the Vice President $10,000.

I think it would be better to subject all allowances of every kind in the nature of compensation to taxation, so that if the tax is too burdensome, when the President asks us to raise $4,000,000,000 additional taxes, he will have a gentle reminder of what it all amounts to. I think from that aspect the Senator stands on a very sound basis, but when it comes to accounting for something in one's own free discretion, it strikes me that the amendment is not well considered on that point, and for the reason I have stated.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I may say to the Senator from Missouri it has been ruled by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, practically ever since the income-tax law went into effect, that allowances for quarters, light, heat, rations, and travel, and all other allowances to Army and Navy officers, were not even to be listed on their income-tax returns. Those items were totally and completely exempted from taxation, so that the only tax levied against such persons was on the actual pay they received, the remainder being considered as expenses of their business, just as officials of private companies and their employees are allowed an exemption for personal expenses.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the discussion has certainly been interesting to me, and I am very happy to have the comments of the distinguished Senators who have spoken, all three of them, the Senator from Oregon, the Senator from Georgia, and the Senator from West Virginia. The point made by the Senator from Georgia, namely, that there probably should be more definite standards in the law than there are now, of course appeals to everyone.

Perhaps I am not stating quite fairly the position of the Senator from Georgia, and I shall rephrase my statement. The Senator takes the view, as I understand, that because statutes at the present time do not set forth with particularity the duties of these various officers and for what they may expend funds, therefore there would be difficulty in requiring an accounting for expenditures which are not specifically authorized or the purposes of which are not specifically assigned in connection with the duties of those respective officers.

Mr. President, I can see that point, and it may well be that there should be amendment made to the statutes of the United States more clearly and definitely stating just what it is for which these various officers may expend money. I should have no objection, Mr. President, to the passage of a statute which would provide that the President of the United States may expend money for transportation, for food, upkeep, and various other matters which may be outlined in detail.

I see on the floor of the Senate this afternoon various Senators, including the distinguished proponent of this bill who presented the initial argument in favor of it, who have served as governors of their States. While I am not familiar with the statutes of other States, I have no doubt that their statutes are somewhat similar to those of my own, which require, at least in most instances, a very considerable accounting on the part of the Governor of the State as to the expenditures which he makes and for which vouchers are issued to him.

Mr. President, I think the amendment in which the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and I have joined, is a wholesome amendment. I undertake to say that the people of the United States, who are the stockholders of this great corporation or entity, namely, our Government, are entitled to know for what purposes the moneys which are allotted as expense allowances are expended. I take it that they are entitled to know it.

Furthermore, Mr. President, in answer to the Senator from Georgia, apparently those Senators who prepared the bill were of the opinion that it is possible to recognize what items constitute expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of the official duties of each of these three officials. If, Mr. President, it is impossible to determine what the expenses are, what they relate to, or whether they result from the discharge of official duties, what justification is there for this bill reciting as the purpose of the expense allowance assistance in defraying expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of official duties? If it be proper to use that language in the bill for the purpose of justifying the so-called expense allowance which in the earlier portion of the same sentence is referred to, as I have pointed out, not merely as expense allowance, but as compensation, or if it be proper to use the language "relating to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties," it certainly would be possible for the man who spends the money, the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, or the Speaker of the House of Representatives, reasonably to state on paper, over his signature, what the expenses are and how they relate to or result from the discharge of official duties.

I should not be averse to supporting, in due time, an appropriate amendment more clearly and specifically outlining the purpose for which these officers may spend money. Every proponent of the bill, as I understand, every member of the committee, except the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], voted in favor of reporting the bill to the Senate, thereby voting in favor of the proposition that the expenses referred to relate to or result from the discharge of the official duties of these various officials. I undertake to say that is strong presumptive evidence that the President, our distinguished Vice President-elect, and the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives can point out with very clear distinctness what it is they have spent and why those expenses relate to or result from the discharge of their respective duties.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, does not the Senator agree with me that it is no reflection on the President, Vice President, or the Speaker to make an accounting for the money they spend? In my State, as Governor I had to account for every item of $1 or more, and I had to do so under oath. The distinguished Senator from Missouri has just said that that is the custom in his State, and, I believe, in many other States. Certainly I believe that the President of the United States should set an example for every other public official in this country.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator from North Dakota. I thoroughly agree with him, Mr. President.

As the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has pointed out, when one of the subordinate officials of our Government, or one of the employees, or one of the auditors, goes out over the United States on an official trip of some kind, upon official duty, he must put down that he spent so much for board and lodging, so much for telegrams, so much for Pullman fare, so much for airplane passage, or whatever the expense might be. It seems to me that it is hardly appropriate to suggest that the President of the United States shall have prepared for his benefit a provision that no accounting shall be made by him for his expense allowance.

Mr. President, I think the fact which has been previously mentioned, namely, that according to the information of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], of the $40,000 already available to the President, he has used only $32,039 for the year 1948, raises very clearly a question, first, as to why he should have any additional allowance for expenses, and, secondly, if he should have it, why should he not account to the people of the country, the stockholders who pay the bill, and why should he not tell us for what purposes he spends the money?

I had some experience many years ago in traveling around a little for a private corporation. It was required of me, as I recall, that I furnish an expense account to the corporation for which I traveled. There is nothing unreasonable about it. There is no reflection upon anyone. It is wholesome. It is an example which should be given by the Chief Magistrate and the other high officials of the people of the country.

Mr. President, I see across the Chamber one of the Senators from the State of California. I recall with clear distinctness that it was only last spring that the legislature of his State passed a bill providing for a certain amount—I have forgotten the amount at this time——

Mr. LANGER. It was $25,000.

Mr. DONNELL. Twenty-five thousand dollars which should be available for the purpose of advocating a certain measure called the Tidelands measure. In the bill passed by the legislature of the State of California there was a provision to the effect, in substance, that the persons spending money need not file vouchers for their expenditures. I think I saw local newspapers in Washington—certainly I saw newspapers from California—which commented upon the curious spectacle of a sum of money authorized without the obligation of accounting and with an affirmative statement that the filing of vouchers was not necessary. What happened? The Governor of the State, who had been previously nominated and elected as the candidate of both the Democratic and Republican Parties, failed to sign the bill. I have no doubt, Mr. President, that the wave of feeling which was engendered by the passage of that bill at least rendered some possible service in calling to the attention of the chief magistrate of California the fact that it was improper and unwholesome that such legislation should be passed.

Mr. President, I shall not trespass longer, at this time, at any rate, upon the Senate. I merely rose upon the proposition that the bill as it now stands is unwholesome in that it relieves the President, the Vice President, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the obligation to account; and upon the further proposition that it is wholesome, and for the best interests of our Nation, that every person in this country may know what every dollar of an expense account is expended for.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I rise to support the amendments offered by the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Oregon. I had planned to offer similar amendments, but since they have previously offered theirs, I shall support the amendments offered by the two Senators.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Am I to understand the Senator would like to join as one of the cosponsors of the amendments?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should be very happy to join.

Mr. MORSE. I am sure I speak for the Senator from Missouri when I say that he and the junior Senator from Oregon will welcome the Senator as a cosponsor of the amendments.

Mr. DONNELL. We certainly will, Mr. President.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, after 2 weeks of work at this session it seems ironic to note that the first piece of legislation to be considered by the Eighty-first Congress should be a bill to raise the salaries of the President, Vice President, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and well over 200 of other top executives heading the numerous Government agencies. Furthermore, there is not a single one of the sponsors of this bill who will dispute the fact that the proposed salary increase for these executives is no other than a forerunner of a general salary increase for all executive branches of the Government service, and that another bill incorporating a substantial increase for all of the other thousands of this group will be following in the very near future.

As a background for this increase, the sponsors of the bill S. 103 have relied upon the report of the Hoover Commission as endorsing these salary adjustments, but what they have completely ignored is the fact that the Hoover Commission in making recommendations for these salary increases in certain executive departments of our Government has also recommended a drastic reorganization of these departments, eliminating many of the overlapping agencies and, in general, achieving a substantial economy in the administration of our Government.

This latter recommendation for the overhauling of our Government departments is going to be the major, not the minor, recommendation of the Hoover Commission and while I am not opposed to an upward revision in the salary schedules of these executives as recommended by the Hoover report I do feel that such salary increases should be made contingent upon the adoption or at least the consideration of the report itself.

It is common gossip in the cloakrooms now, as every one of us knows, that the work of this Commission, which was authorized by the Eightieth Congress and endorsed by the President himself, is expected to be ignored by the Congress in fear that its adoption would eliminate some of the patronage it now enjoys. I feel very strongly that any action whatsoever in revising salary scales of the heads of these departments, as recommended in this report, should be postponed until such time as consideration can be given to the report in its entirety.

I do recognize, however, that consideration toward revising the salary scale of the President and Vice President is in a different category in that any changes made in their salary base in order to be applicable during the next 4 years must be taken prior to the 20th day of January. For that reason I feel that it is proper that consideration should be given and a decision made as to what we intend to do in regard to their two salaries.

The office of the President of the United States is the highest and most important position in our country, and the requirements demanded of the man who holds that position, in addition to the social obligations demanded of him by virtue of his position, are such that this office should carry a salary commensurate with his responsibility.

Here again we find that the Hoover Commission approached this subject upon a sound and realistic basis when it recognized the social obligations of the President, and recommended that the Government should take over the complete expenses of the operation of the White House. In President Hoover's testimony before the committee upon this subject, he stated:

Perhaps if the Government should take over the obligation of running the White House, which I think should have been done

20 years ago, it might be even a better solution than increasing the President's salary.

If we are to follow President Hoover's recommendation in this respect, which I think is a sound approach to the problem, then there is no necessity for rushing this bill through Congress at this time, because action could be taken after January 20, at some time when we were considering the Hoover report itself.

As it is now, the President, in addition to the $75,000 annual salary, receives a $40,000 expense allowance which must be accounted for. I agree with the Senator from Missouri that expenditures from this expense account should be accounted for. During the war years this $40,000 fund was augmented by a special contingency fund which Congress allocated to the President to be handled at his discretion.

Senate bill 103 proposes to continue this expense allowance of $40,000, in addition to any other money which may be appropriated by the Congress toward the payment of expenses of the White House. Supplementing these expense allowances, the bill under consideration proposes to increase the President's salary from the current $75,000 to $100,000 a year, and at the same time grants him a special $50,000 tax-exempt payment upon which no accounting would be required. Simply stated, the proposed salary for the President under this bill is $150,000, of which $50,000 is tax-exempt.

I am unalterably opposed to the establishment of a precedent under which a portion of the salary of the President or of any other Government official would be made in the form of a tax-exempt payment. The system now in operation, under which a portion of the salaries of the Members of Congress are tax-exempt, is wrong, and if I had been a Member of the Congress at the time the law was enacted, I most certainly would have voted against that provision.

The President of the United States, the Members of Congress, and other top officials of the executive branch of our Government, are responsible for the fiscal affairs of our country. We as policy makers authorize these large expenditures which necessitate increased tax rates, amounting in some instances to confiscation. I think it is a healthy condition for our own good, and particularly for the good of the country, that we as officials of the Government suffer along with the other taxpayers. For this reason I feel that whatever increase in salary is proposed for the President and Vice President or any other Government official should be made on a flat basis, subject to all such rates of taxation as are applied to other individuals in this country. This can be done by increasing the figures in the bill as salary compensation to a point adequate to take care of the desired objective.

Another advantage to this approach is that it will bring home forcibly to the President and to all officials responsible for the fiscal policy of our Government the seriousness of our existing and future tax burdens, by making all taxes applicable to their own fortunes as well as to the fortunes of the other 145,000,000 Americans.

There is no use in our kidding ourselves. We all know that the only reason for this approach of making a portion of their salaries tax-exempt is that we are afraid to call to the attention of the American people the seriousness of our present tax structure by inserting in this bill a salary figure high enough to bring the take-home pay up to that point which is desired at this time. Under this proposal the salary of the President is set at $150,000, of which amount $50,000 is tax-exempt. This formula is used because the sponsors of the bill wish to grant to the President a net take-home pay, after taxes, of around $93,000. To have achieved this result by merely granting the President a salary increase high enough to leave a take-home pay of this amount under our existing tax laws would have necessitated an increase in his salary from the current $75,000 a year to about $300,000, or an increase of about 400 percent. This was called to the attention of the committee by President Hoover himself, who said:

The President and the Speaker and the Vice President, as all of you gentlemen, are afflicted with the increased income tax; and the salary, nominal salary, does not at all represent what is left. That is also one of your problems in the upper brackets of civil service; that the greatly increased income taxes tend to greatly lessen all these incomes.

Mr. Hoover continued:

Every citizen has to bear his share of that burden, but particularly on the President, I think, it is too hard a burden. The President has to carry a great many public burdens that can only be met indirectly, and I would like to suggest to you a line of inquiry.

I am not prepared to say whether the President should not have an increase in salary, but if you look at the effect of the income tax upon an increased salary, you will see he does not get much if you double it. * * *

I looked into the income tax, State and Federal, and I note that the salary of $75,000 for the President, after deduction of State and Federal income taxes, leaves about $43,000. Whereas, if you put his salary up to $150,000, he would have about $68,000 left.

The committee recognized this situation, where, under our existing tax rates, to achieve its objective of leaving the President around $90,000 take-home pay, his salary would have to be set near $300,000. In other words, were we to set his salary at $300,000 annually and allow him to pay all of the taxes now being demanded of any other American citizen making a similar amount, the President would have left actually less money than he would have under the bill before us. There are many people in our country who do not realize that once a man reaches these upper brackets 81 percent of his earnings is returned to the Federal Treasury and out of the remaining 19 percent which he has left he is still called upon to pay his State and local taxes.

To me this adds up to confiscation, but in spite of this astounding fact we find the President himself in his message to this Congress urging that we enact laws to raise these rates even higher on all those individuals who are earning in excess of $5,000, and particularly that we should raise rates on those who are earning exceptionally high salaries. To extend to the President at this time a special tax exemption would be, it seems to me, inconsistent with the President's own recommendations to this Congress when he said that the burden of paying the running expenses of the Government should always fall on those who are earning high salaries. As I said earlier, I am not opposed to a revision of the President's salary, but I know of no better way to emphasize to the President himself the fact that our tax rate has almost reached the confiscation level than to keep him and all other Government officials always in a position where their own salaries will be taxed along with the rest of the people.

For the information of those who are not familiar with our tax rates, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a chart showing our present graduated tax rates and would urge that each Member of Congress keep those rates forever in mind when advocating unnecessary expenditures.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Over $2,000 but not over $4,000: $400, plus 22 percent of excess over $2,000.

Over $4,000 but not over $6,000: $840, plus 26 percent of excess over $4,000.

Over $6,000 but not over $8,000: $1,360, plus 30 percent of excess over $6,000.

Over $8,000 but not over $10,000: $1,960, plus 34 percent of excess over $8,000.

Over $10,000 but not over $12,000: $2,640, plus 38 percent of excess over $10,000.

Over $12,000 but not over $14,000: $3,400, plus 43 percent of excess over $12,000.

Over $14,000 but not over $16,000: $4,260, plus 47 percent of excess over $14,000.

Over $16,000 but not over $18,000: $5,200, plus 50 percent of excess over $16,000.

Over $18,000 but not over $20,000: $6,200, plus 53 percent of excess over $18,000.

Over $20,000 but not over $22,000: $7,260, plus 56 percent of excess over $20,000.

Over $22,000 but not over $26,000: $8,380, plus 59 percent of excess over $22,000.

Over $26,000 but not over $32,000: $10,740, plus 62 percent of excess over $26,000.

Over $32,000 but not over $38,000: $14,460, plus 65 percent of excess over $32,000.

Over $38,000 but not over $44,000: $18,360, plus 69 percent of excess over $38,000.

Over $44,000 but not over $50,000: $22,500, plus 72 percent of excess over $44,000.

Over $50,000 but not over $60,000: $26,820, plus 75 percent of excess over $50,000.

Over $60,000 but not over $70,000: $34,320, plus 78 percent of excess over $60,000.

Over $70,000 but not over $80,000: $42,120, plus 81 percent of excess over $70,000.

Over $80,000 but not over $90,000: $50,220, plus 84 percent of excess over $80,000.

Over $90,000 but not over $100,000: $58,620, plus 87 percent of excess over $90,000.

Over $100,000 but not over $150,000: $67,320, plus 89 percent of excess over $100,000.

Over $150,000 but not over $200,000: $111,820, plus 90 percent of excess over $150,000.

Over $200,000: $156,820, plus 91 percent of excess over $200,000.

These rates are subject to the reductions approved under Public Law No. 471—Eightieth Congress.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I hope and urge that this bill will be amended by the Senate, removing this tax exemption in favor of the President, Vice President, and the Speaker of the House—the three men who more than any others should be held responsible for the solvency of our Government.

Let us extend whatever salary increase we wish to give these officials in the open.

If this special tax exemption feature is not removed from the bill, I will be compelled to vote against the measure as a matter of principle.

Confronted as we are today with a national debt of over $250,000,000,000 and a record peacetime budget for the next fiscal year in excess of $41,600,000,000, it is unthinkable that we should even consider setting aside a special group of Government officials to be exempt from their obligations of helping to support the Government.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the first amendment of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The first amendment was on page 3, after line 10, to strike out:

(f) The allowance for clerical assistance to the Vice President contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1949, at rates of compensation to be fixed by him in multiples of $5 per month, hereby is increased from $32,385 per annum to $45,000 per annum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

Mr. MORSE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Morse
Anderson	Hill	Mundt
Barkley	Hoey	Murray
Brewster	Holland	Myers
Bricker	Humphrey	Neely
Bridges	Hunt	O'Conor
Broughton	Ives	O'Mahoney
Butler	Jenner	Pepper
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Chapman	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kem	Smith, Maine
Connally	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Knowland	Sparkman
Donnell	Langer	Stennis
Douglas	Lodge	Taft
Downey	Long	Taylor
Ecton	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	McCarthy	Thye
Ferguson	McClellan	Tobey
Flanders	McFarland	Tydings
Frear	McKellar	Vandenberg
Fulbright	McMahon	Watkins
George	Magnuson	Wherry
Gillette	Malone	Wiley
Green	Martin	Williams
Gurney	Maybank	Young
Hayden	Miller	
Hendrickson	Millikin	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 3, after line 10.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 8, to insert:

Notwithstanding the act of February 23, 1931 (5 U. S. C. 152a), the salary of the legal adviser of the Department of State shall not be increased as a result of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after line 15, on page 3, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 2. The provisions of this act shall take effect at noon on January 20, 1949.

It is also proposed to amend the title so as to read:

A bill to increase rates of compensation of the President, Vice President, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, to include the $330 not added to the salaries of the classified employees of the District of Columbia and of the Foreign Service.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I inquire who has the floor?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. FLANDERS. I am offering an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. How can the Senator offer an amendment to my amendment until I yield the floor?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont will be given an opportunity when the Senator from Illinois has concluded.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, this amendment strikes out of Senate bill 103, beginning on page 3, line 16 of the bill, section 2, and the remaining part thereof, merely leaving for consideration that portion of the bill which seeks to increase the rates of compensation of the President, the Vice President, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Before I discuss these three provisions briefly, let me say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], who was responsible for the appointment of the subcommittee to hear evidence on this important measure, that the majority desire to thank him for that service, and also to thank the members of the committee for the contribution which they have made in reporting a bill of great importance.

We on this side regret exceedingly that we are compelled at this time to offer this amendment. We do it for a very good and valid reason. It has already been demonstrated here today, as a result of these debates, that insofar as employees in the lower classifications are concerned, there is some disagreement as to whether or not other individuals should be included; and perhaps some who are included should be excluded.

I think it goes without saying that in the event we should send this bill in its present form to the House of Representatives, as a result of the debates which we have had today, it would be defeated through delay because in paragraph 6 of section 1 of article II of the Constitution of the United States it is provided that:

The President shall, at stated times, receive for his services, a compensation, which shall neither be increased nor diminished during the period for which he shall have been elected, and he shall not receive within that period any other emolument from the United States, or any of them.

Unless the Congress of the United States acts with dispatch, the President of the United States will not be able to receive during the next 4 years the benefits provided in the bill. I am informed by the leadership in the House of Representatives that as yet the House committees have not been organized. The turnover was great in the House of Representatives. There are many difficulties in the assignment of committees. Consequently, if this measure is to become law before the 20th of January, it will be necessary for the House of Representatives to obtain unanimous consent in order to take up this measure. The leaders of the majority as well as the leaders of the minority in the House of Representatives have agreed, insofar as they can, to go along with those three provisions of the bill, provided we get the bill over to the House of Representatives as expeditiously as possible.

That is the parliamentary situation in the House of Representatives. I am certain that the great majority of the Members of the Senate desire to increase the salary of the President of the United States and to increase his expense account. I think it would be short of elemental justice to him if we did not do this immediately. That is especially true if we give those in the lower classifications and others who are not included in the classifications an increase in salary later on.

Remember, Mr. President, that this subcommittee was composed of the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], and the able Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR]. Two Republicans and one Democrat made this subcommittee report to the full committee, and the full committee reported the bill by an affirmative vote of 10 to 1. Surely the least we can do, in view of the study made by the subcommittee and the action of the full committee, is to pass the bill with the amendment which I have offered. I hope that the bill will go to the House of Representatives in the form suggested, with the exception of one amendment which I have agreed to with the minority leader and which will be offered in due course.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois. I apologize to him for having interrupted him out of order. I had supposed that the President pro tempore was about to put the question on the amendment. That was the reason for my jumping up hastily as I did.

The amendment which I am about to offer would retain in the bill the last section, section 8, on page 8, relating to the

two groups who did not receive an increase last July when an increase was granted to all other members of the classified service. Therefore, I move to amend the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois by retaining section 8, and renumbering it as section 3. I offer that as an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Vermont is simply offering the amendment to my amendment; is that correct?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is all.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, speaking as the minority leader, and referring to the amendment just proposed by my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Vermont, to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, I think it necessary to state that in the minority policy committee meeting this morning, at which the pros and cons of the question of taking up this bill or any part of it were discussed, it was the opinion of the minority policy committee that only the part that is included in the so-called Lucas amendment—namely, the provision increasing the salaries of the President, Vice President, and Speaker of the House—should be reported from the committee and debated by the Members of the Senate, because of the fact that if we were to consider the entire subject, there would be many meritorious proposals which Senators would like to consider.

So, not only because of the parliamentary situation which prevails, as was so ably pointed out and discussed by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] but because of the fact that if we are to pass the bill and have it passed by the House of Representatives, we must pass it promptly, it was the opinion of the policy committee that, even though the meritorious position taken by the distinguished Senator from Vermont might be entirely justified, yet the only feature of the bill which should be brought up for debate and on which the minority should take a position, was the part relating to the salaries of the President, Vice President, and Speaker of the House.

Therefore, much as I hate to do so—because there are many provisions which I should like to see debated and incorporated in a complete bill—for the reasons just stated it will be necessary to oppose the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Vermont to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

I hope, as minority leader, I have made my position clear.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I bear witness to the fact, since I was present, that the minority leader is carrying out the decision of the minority policy committee.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska whether—assuming that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois is defeated—the minority will cooperate in seeing that justice is done to the District of Columbia employees, in securing for them the pay raise which was denied them last summer, which denial has worked a grievous injustice upon them.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to answer the Senator.

The minority is always glad to cooperate in seeing that justice is done anywhere along the line. But for me to say that the minority will agree to that particular matter is useless. All I can say now is that we are perfectly willing to agree now, as the minority, to see to it that the salaries of the President, Vice President, and Speaker of the House of Representatives are increased. We are willing to agree to that in order to get the bill passed by the Senate and sent promptly to the House of Representatives, so as to make it possible for the House to pass the bill by the 20th of January.

There are other amendments which will be offered, and when they are offered it will be up to each individual Senator to take his own position in regard to how he feels about the amendments themselves. But as the minority, we have taken this position in the hope that we can be most cooperative and can expedite the passage of the bill at this time.

In further answer to the Senator, let me say that I am satisfied that when we come to all other pay bills we shall be glad to give full consideration to the reporting and debating of bills which we hope will do justice all around.

Mr. O'CONOR. But does not the Senator feel that an unusual situation exists with respect to District of Columbia employees, in that they have been denied an increase which has been granted to others during the past 6 months?

Mr. WHERRY. No doubt that is correct, but if we take up that matter today, the bill will not be passed today, as I believe it should be, for, as stated on both sides of the aisle, if we are to do anything in this connection promptly, we must do only this much. Therefore, I think we should act as I have indicated.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like to discuss a matter which was brought up by the minority floor leader.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly.

Mr. FLANDERS. Am I correct in saying that the amendment I have offered to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois was not brought up before the minority policy committee, so that it is not a policy matter, but is an individual matter for each Senator to decide?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; except that the minority policy committee took the position that we would go this far and no further at this time, on account of the parliamentary situation and also because of other reasons which were brought out at that time.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Maryland one or two questions if I may do so.

In his observation several minutes ago, the Senator from Maryland said he was hopeful that Senators on this side of the aisle and all other Senators would take an active interest in seeing that justice is done to the employees of the District of Columbia. Do I correctly infer from his otherwise splendid statement that the Senator from Maryland means to indicate that the section of the bill relating to the matter would provide a retroactive pay increase for all District of Columbia employees?

Mr. O'CONOR. I answer the question by saying that it would provide a retroactive increase for all who were excluded from the Pay Revision Act of 1948.

Mr. CAIN. Let me suggest to the Senator from Maryland that in part—and in part only—is he correct. The provision of the bill would give increases to 7,000 out of 18,000 civil-service servants of the District of Columbia. In the absence of legislation which will adequately provide for all those having equal rights to such advantages, I should certainly think that at this time the amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois should be voted down.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I am in thorough agreement with the Senator from Washington in his expressed desire to see justice done to all employees of the District of Columbia. However, as the Senator well knows, a certain segment of that group was excluded last July.

In this bill we were attempting to put back into that status the group which was excluded, and we were hopeful that that would be the first step in doing justice to the entire group, as the Senator from Washington undoubtedly wants done.

Mr. CAIN. But I suggest that in the last weeks of the session of Congress last summer, the entire 18,000 were excluded, for the bill would have made increases, not only for the 7,000 referred to in the measure now before us, but for the entire 18,000.

Mr. O'CONOR. Of course it is our desire to see that justice is done both to the 7,000 and to the entire 18,000.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois. I do so for yet another reason, which I hope the Senate will bear in mind.

It was my experience, upon going home after the last session, at which we increased by $330 the salaries of various classified employees in the civil service and other employees, that there are a great number of the lowest paid employees of the Government, not included

in the civil service, as to whom that pay raise does not apply. I understand now that the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, simply would provide a raise—as should be done, at the proper time—for those who were excluded in the District of Columbia; that is, employees of the District of Columbia; and perhaps some of the Foreign Service employees. I think, before any such sweeping action is taken, a measure should be drafted that will do justice to the many thousands of unclassified employees who, either by design or by accident, were excluded from the provisions of the act passed by the last Congress. For that reason—and I think it is an excellent one—I certainly object to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont. I hope it will be voted down by the Senate.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should again like to call the attention of the Senator from Florida to the fact, which is important in the proceeding, those in the classified service are the only employees over whom the Post Office and Civil Service Committee has any authority. It has no jurisdiction in any way over the other employees of the District of Columbia.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to say merely one more word, that I neglected to say, in the previous short address I made to the Senate upon the pending measure. I talked to the President of the United States last night about the bill. In fact, he called me. In substance he said—and he wanted the Senate to know this—that he is more anxious and more interested in the groups in the lower classifications getting what is necessary in the way of adequate pay in order that they may render efficient service to the Government than he is in his own increase in salary. I assured him that the moment we were able to pass the pending bill in the Senate, I would be prepared to introduce a measure dealing with all the other officials and employees of Government in the various classifications. I have conferred with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], chairman of the committee, and I have a bill ready to be introduced today, as soon as the pending bill is passed. It is a bill which will bear the names of the same Senators who introduced a similar bill heretofore. The bill will be referred immediately to the committee. The Senator from South Carolina has assured me that hearings will be held and every opportunity given to individual Senators to present further their views, and the bill will be reported with all convenient speed. I think I am correct in that statement.

Mr JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois is entirely correct. At this time I want to say I have talked to the Senators on the committee. A majority of the Members feel that at this time, under the circumstances in which we find ourselves, we should go along and pass the bill the acting majority leader wants passed, and then later we take up another bill, and include in it not only the employees covered by this particular bill, but many others who ought to be covered, such as those the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] mentioned a few minutes ago.

We mean to have hearings, and try to report a satisfactory bill, if possible. Work is being done on the matter. The subcommittee worked tirelessly for long hours, and did a good job, but at the same time, after the pending bill was brought before the full committee, I think it was agreed that other officials and employees and groups of employees should be provided for. We certainly want provision made for them. I refer, for example, to the FBI, the Farm Credit Administration, and the REA head. We could go on to name others. That matter will be taken up at the proper time in the hearings. But we find ourselves in a position at the present time where we must act quickly. We can carry only so much of the load. We want to carry as much as we can, but no more. For that reason I shall have to vote against the amendment which has been offered to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois, because I do not want to load the bill with anything that might prevent its passage when it goes to the other House.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I noticed that the Senator from South Carolina named certain officials that he said would receive consideration. In looking over the bill, it occurred to me that it was very ironic that the official who is responsible for raising all the money the Government spends, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, who has a job of vast responsibility, who is supposed to raise the $44,000,000,000 that is to be expended, was omitted entirely. He was left with a $10,330 salary. All the officials of the Government who have the duty and responsibility of giving away our money or loaning our money receive very substantial pay increases. It does seem to me that the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, who has the stupendous job of collecting the money and getting it into the Treasury, should have a little consideration.

The bill in its present form also increases greatly the pay of all the Assistant Attorneys General, and of nearly all the other lawyers connected with the independent agencies; but the general counsel for the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, who has to wrestle with the greatest tax lawyers in the Nation, working day and night in protecting the Treasury, has received no recognition whatever in the bill.

I wanted to bring that matter to the attention of the Senate. I think certain of the salaries are entirely too high, and I cannot support the pending bill as written. I shall support a fair salary-increase bill. But certainly if we are going to increase the salaries of all those whose duties are to spend the money or to give the money, we should give some recognition to the very important officer who has to sweat out the job of supervising the collection of all the tax funds throughout the United States.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I desire to ask a question. It may be that it should very well be addressed to the Senator from Maryland, who, as I understand, served as chairman of the subcommittee that reported the bill.

From a reading of the language in the first section, amending section 102 of title III, it appears that the aggregate amount we are allowing to the President is $150,000, consisting of $100,000 salary and an expense allowance of $50,000. From all reports, the newspaper reports and various things we have heard, it is my understanding that the purpose is to give the President an additional expense allowance of $50,000, for which there shall be no accounting; which is in addition to another $40,000 that is allowed him. That is the purpose, is it not?

Mr. O'CONOR. That is the purpose. The Senator's statement is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I ask the question because it appears from reading the language of the bill, particularly when reference is made to the aggregate amount of $150,000, the intention of the bill would be to allow the President only $150,000, and not that amount in addition to the $40,000 he is already receiving.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the explanation is that the allowance of $40,000 is by separate authorization. It is not mandatory. The statute specifically says, "There may be expended by the President an amount not to exceed $40,000, if and when it is authorized and appropriated by the Congress." So that the amount mentioned in Senate bill 103 is in addition to and separate and distinct from that authorization.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is not intended by the language of the bill to repeal the authorization of that additional amount of $40,000, is it?

Mr. O'CONOR. It is not so intended.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, with reference to the remarks made relative to the determination of the policy committee of the minority this morning, I want to have it strictly understood it was only in the form of a recommendation. It is not a question of party policy. Each member of course, can do as he pleases in voting on the bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I desire to make it clear that this is a perfect illustration of what it means to have a policy committee within the Republican Party. Here are 11 Senators holding a meeting of the policy committee, in which six have control, yet the minority member of the committee is not invited to attend. I offered an amendment at the time we met, providing that the policy committee should consist of every single Republican, the entire 42. At that time I was assured by the distinguished Senator from Ohio that whenever anything came up involving the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I should be invited. On the very first bill, we find that the policy committee of 11 men met, without the minority member being called in.

I now serve notice that I shall give the week's notice which is required by the

rules of the Republican organization, and that I shall call again upon every Member of the Republican Party to vote upon the proposition as to whether six Republicans are to control Republican policy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, with reference to the remarks just made by the Senator from North Dakota, I wish to back up the statement made by our able minority leader. No six Republicans are trying to determine our policy in this instance. I happen to be acquainted with the situation to which the minority leader refers. The policy committee is a part of this body under the Reorganization Act, and it has certain responsibilities. It took action and recommended that the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr LUCAS], as modified by the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], be approved.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I may say in response to that statement that the trouble with the argument is that the views of the different members of the Republican Party are not even brought before all the members of the policy committee. It goes down to the very roots of the difficulty. If I were a lobbyist, the only members of the Republican Party I would have to see would be six men. If I convinced those six men, I would know the Republican policy. The same may be true of the Democratic Party, although I am not familiar with the rules of that party. Even though the verdict of the policy committee is not binding, nevertheless it does influence certain Senators, especially new ones, in some instances. That is my entire objection. I state it now because this is an appropriate time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question recurs on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I offer to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, and which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the amendment of Mr. LUCAS it is proposed to insert at the appropriate place a new section 2, as follows:

In computing the amount to be deducted from the compensation of any official whose salary is increased under this act for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and in computing the amount of any annuity under such act, any increased compensation provided by this act shall be disregarded until further act of Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the amendment provides that the increases in compensation provided by the bill shall not be considered in determining the amounts of annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act. At the present time the President and the Vice President are not covered by the Retirement Act. It affects the Speaker of the House. However, we felt that it might establish a precedent, and in view of the fact that the complete Retirement Act and amendments thereto will be gone into at this session, we felt that it should be separated, because it is a pay bill and not a retirement bill. That is the purpose of the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question recurs on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], as amended.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARKLEY (when his name was called). In view of the possible interest that I may have in this legislation, I ask to be excused from voting.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Kentucky is excused from voting.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senater from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

I announce further that if present and voting the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senators from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR and Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 84, nays 2, as follows:

YEAS—84

Aiken	Douglas	Hoey
Anderson	Downey	Holland
Brewster	Ellender	Humphrey
Bridges	Ferguson	Hunt
Broughton	Frear	Ives
Butler	Fulbright	Jenner
Byrd	George	Johnson, Colo.
Cain	Gillette	Johnson, Tex.
Capehart	Green	Johnston, S. C.
Chapman	Gurney	Kefauver
Chavez	Hayden	Kem
Connally	Hendrickson	Kilgore
Cordon	Hickenlooper	Knowland
Donnell	Hill	Langer
Lodge	Morse	Sparkman
Long	Mundt	Stennis
Lucas	Murray	Taft
McCarthy	Myers	Taylor
McClellan	Neely	Thomas, Utah
McFarland	O'Conor	Thye
McKellar	O'Mahoney	Tobey
McMahon	Pepper	Tydings
Magnuson	Robertson	Vandenberg
Malone	Russell	Watkins
Martin	Saltonstall	Wherry
Maybank	Schoeppel	Wiley
Miller	Smith, Maine	Williams
Millikin	Smith, N. J.	Young

NAYS—2

Ecton Flanders

NOT VOTING—10

Baldwin	Kerr	Thomas, Okla.
Barkley	McCarran	Wagner
Bricker	McGrath	
Eastland	Reed	

So the amendment of Mr. LUCAS, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, is it in order now to offer the amendments which have been presented and which were discussed a little while ago?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is in order now to offer the amendments.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, at this time I offer the three amendments which have been previously presented for reading and for discussion by the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL]. Inasmuch as the principle involved in each of the three amendments is identical, I respectfully ask unanimous consent that the amendments may be voted upon en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the question is on agreeing en bloc to the amendments.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays, and desire to be heard upon the amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second to the request for the yeas and nays?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I desire to be heard in respect to these amendments, in view of the fact that a very considerable number of Senators are now on the floor who were not here at the time the previous discussion of the amendments occurred.

The amendments present the proposition that instead of having a provision, as the bill would otherwise provide, by which no accounting is to be made by the President, the Vice President, or the Speaker of the House of Representatives, of an expense allowance of, respectively, $50,000, $10,000, and $10,000 per annum, there shall be a requirement that an accounting shall be made by each of these respective officers of the amount granted as an expense allowance.

In addition, Mr. President, the amendments present this proposition: The bill itself, in the form presented, provides that there shall be, in addition to a salary of $100,000 to the President, an expense allowance of $50,000, regardless of whether any of it is spent, or regardless of how much of it is spent. The amendments, applicable to each of these respec-

tive three offices, provide for an allowance of not to exceed a specified amount, in the case of the President $50,000 per annum, in the case of the Vice President $10,000 per annum, and in the case of the Speaker of the House of Representatives $10,000 per annum, with a provision that an accounting shall be made by each of these respective officers, and that the respective allowances shall be payable in monthly installments on vouchers duly presented.

I shall not take the time of the Senate to read all three of the amendments, but I should like to have the indulgence of Senators while I read the one applicable to the President, and I can assure the Senators that the principle involved in each of the other two is identical with that in the one which I shall read.

I think it would be well to read first the provision of the bill itself, as now before the Senate, in respect to the President, and then the provision of the amendment. The bill provides:

The President shall receive in full for his services during the term for which he shall have been elected compensation in the aggregate amount of $150,000 a year, to be paid monthly, consisting of $100,000 for salary and an expense allowance of $50,000 to assist in defraying expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, for which expense allowance no tax liability shall accrue and for which no accounting shall be made by him. He shall be entitled also to the use of the furniture and other effects belonging to the United States and kept in the Executive Mansion.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. I heard the Senator's remarks, and I know how sincere he is in everything he says. This question arises in my mind: We of the Senate are allowed $2,500 in an expense account, payable in monthly installments. There is no requirement on us to make a return as to how we expend that $2,500, is there?

Mr. DONNELL. There is not, and I am glad the Senator asked the question, because earlier this afternoon we discussed the identical question on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. TOBEY. The only point in my mind is that the two are entirely similar. The principle is the same, is it not?

Mr. DONNELL. I think it is. There has been a suggestion by one of the Senators on the other side that there is a difference in principle with respect to the Executive provision and that applicable to the Congress. To my mind there is an inconsistency, and I shall be happy, if I may, to answer the inquiry, unless the Senator from New Hampshire desires to elaborate upon it.

Mr. TOBEY. I do not.

Mr. DONNELL. The same point, I may say, Mr. President, was raised earlier this afternoon by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the then acting floor leader of the Democratic Members of the Senate, and the point was one which had occurred to the three of us who submitted the amendments, before their submission. I have now in my hand, and had upon my desk at the moment that the Senator from Illinois raised the question, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. There is a provision in it which I should like to read:

Effective on the day on which the Eightieth Congress convenes, there shall be paid to each Senator, Representative in Congress, Delegate from the Territories, Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, an expense allowance of $2,500 per annum to assist in defraying expenses relating to, or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, for which no tax liability shall incur, or accounting be made; such sum to be paid in equal monthly installments.

I take it, Mr. President, that the principle of what I have read from the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is precisely the same as that contained in the bill now pending before the Senate for consideration. I stated in response to the question of the Senator from Illinois that in my mind there is an inconsistency between the two positions, and that to my mind the position which we took, and for which I certainly voted, if there was a record vote, and certainly approved if there was no record vote, when we voted on the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, is not consistent with the proposition I am advocating this afternoon.

But my proposition, Mr. President, is that the action taken in 1946, insofar as it undertakes to grant an expense allowance and then provide no obligation for an accounting—indeed the act contains an affirmative provision that there shall be no accounting—was a mistaken type of legislation, and were the vote to occur again this afternoon I should oppose it just as I am opposing this provision in the pending bill.

I may say further that to my mind there should be introduced in the Senate of the United States an amendment to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to correct what I deem to be an unwise piece of legislation.

Mr. MORSE rose.

Mr. DONNELL. I shall yield in just a moment to the Senator from Oregon.

In the third place, I may say that the provision in the Legislative Reorganization Act, which is therein set forth, to my mind should by proper legislation be changed in either one of two ways. Either that each Member of Congress shall be granted a salary of $12,500 plus an expense allowance, to be supported by vouchers, and to be paid only on vouchers, or if it be deemed just and proper to the Members of the Congress that there shall be a $12,500 portion of the salary which is subject to income tax, and a $2,500 portion of salary—not expense money—of salary, which is exempt, then we should state it, rather than stating it on the basis of an expense allowance not supported by vouchers.

I now yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I simply wish to add to what my good friend, the Senator from Missouri, has said, that under the parliamentary situation which existed when we debated the Reorganization Act of 1946, we either had to vote for the entire bill as it came back to us from conference or vote against it in the entirety. It is true that some of us objected to the particular principle in the Reorganization Act of 1946 which authorized a tax-exempt expense account for Senators. Earlier this afternoon we served notice that it was our intention to eliminate this principle of a tax-exempt expense account for United States Senators, by way of an amendment to the act. Our amendment will be offered in this session of Congress. However, as to the pending bill, I would point out that two wrongs never make a right. We have an opportunity here to stop the extension of the entire principle of tax-exempt expense accounts for Government officeholders. Therefore, the amendments which we have offered merit approval.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I agree with the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Oregon that the Reorganization Act provision relating to expense allowances to Members of Congress should be corrected. However, I would point out that there is a difference between a provision for expense allowance for Members of Congress and a proposed expense allowance for the President. It is common knowledge that the expenses of a Member of Congress living in Washington amount to more than $2,500 a year, whereas it is evidenced by the reports submitted to the Congress that the expenses of the President have not amounted to $50,000 a year, and that any difference between the actual expenses and the $50,000 would constitute a tax-free increase in his salary. I am not going to vote against the bill if the amendment is not adopted. I simply want to point out that there is a difference because the expense of a Member of Congress amounts to considerable more than the $2,500 a year allowance. But it is wrong to have it written as it is in the Reorganization Act. It should be clean-cut expense allowance with expenses proved, or it should be a straight increase in salary.

Mr. DONNELL. Does not the Senator from Vermont believe that a similar clean-cut statement of an expense allowance, supported by vouchers for actual expenses incurred, would be a wholesome thing in the bill now pending on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. AIKEN. I will answer that by saying that I shall vote for the Senator's proposed amendment.

Mr. DONNELL. I may say to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] further that a similar suggestion came from the other side of the aisle, and I may say it came from a very distinguished member of the majority in whose opinion I have great confidence. I refer to the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who made somewhat the same point, though perhaps slightly different, as that made by the Senator from Vermont. The point made by the Senator from Georgia, as I recall it, was that inasmuch as a large part of the

services of Members of Congress are rendered away from home, obviously it is clear that we will incur expenses which, I think he said, every Member of the Senate would agree unquestionably do amount to more than $2,500. While to my mind that is a fact, I do not think it is consistent in one bill to say that there shall be an expense allowance without accounting, and in another bill that there shall be an expense allowance with accounting. I stand on the proposition that in every case where an expense allowance is given, as distinguished from compensation, there should be an accounting to the people of the United States for the money that is spent, and that the accounting should designate the purposes for which the expenditures were made.

Mr. TOBEY. Will the Senator yield again?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. As I understand the amendments submitted by the Senator from Missouri, they do not change the Reorganization Act. Do they?

Mr. DONNELL. They have no effect on the Reorganization Act.

Mr. TOBEY. But a moment ago the Senator from Missouri very constructively said that he did not believe in having one bill framed in one way and another bill dealing with a similar subject framed in another way. So if the Senator's amendments are adopted, will they not have that unhappy result? Will we not pass the bill now before us in one way, whereas the Reorganization Act was passed in the other way?

Mr. DONNELL. Which I think can be remedied by an amendment to the Reorganization Act.

Mr. TOBEY. That is true.

Mr. DONNELL. In that connection, if I may answer the Senator further, I will say that I am in thorough accord with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who said that two wrongs never made a right, and that even though we made a mistake in 1946 in providing an expense allowance for Members of Congress without an accounting, we should not now do the same thing in this instance.

Mr. TOBEY. We have heard a great deal of talk lately with respect to the Taft-Hartley Act, and that action should be taken by Congress with respect to it, some contending that legislation on the subject matter should all be contained in one package, rather than to be embraced in two separate bills. The consensus of opinion seems to be that it should be acted upon in one package. Similarly, would not the Senator be of opinion that what he seeks to do by his amendments should apply to all alike, and that any change made should apply to Members of Congress as well as to the President, the Vice President, and the Speaker; in other words, that action should be taken in one package? If we adopt the Senator's amendment, we shall then impose upon the President, the Vice President, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives conditions which are not imposed upon Members of Congress under the Reorganization Act. There is no guaranty that legislation imposing those conditions on Members of Congress can be passed. The Chief Executive and the Presiding Officers of both branches of Congress will be in one position, and Members of Congress will be on a different basis. Is not that true?

Mr. DONNELL. I think the Senator is entirely correct; but I think we are confronted by the fact that as a practical matter we cannot at this time undertake to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and still provide the increase in salary for the President which is here advocated, and which doubtless has justification.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I point out to the Senator that this amendment takes nothing away from the President, because, as I understand, under existing law he is required to make an accounting.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator from Vermont points out that the amendments now under discussion take nothing away from the President, because it is his understanding that the President is required to account for the $40,000 which he now receives. I may say in that connection that I am not certain whether he is required to account for the $40,000. I have not read that particular section. However, I am clear about the fact that the bill now before the Senate distinctly provides that he shall make no accounting for the $50,000 which it is proposed to grant him.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. Let me finish this one point before I overlook it.

The point was made a few moments ago by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that the President has not in fact utilized all of the existing $40,000 allowance; that is to say, he has not spent the entire $40,000 per annum granted to him by existing law. Again I invite the attention of Senators, as I did earlier this afternoon, to the very clear statement on that question made on this floor this afternoon by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] in this language:

> The majority views of the committee have not explained to the Senate that although the President is authorized to have an entertainment and travel fund for his account of not less than $40,000, during the 2 years such authorization has existed, he has not used this amount, despite the national campaign intervening. For the fiscal year 1948 the President used only $32,039 of the $40,000 granted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I promised to yield first to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART].

Although nearly $8,000 of the $40,000 allowance was not used in 1948 the bill undertakes to do what? According to its own language, it provides an expense allowance of $50,000—

> To assist—

It is not completely to cover the expenses, but to help, aid, or assist—

> To assist in defraying expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties.

As the Senator from North Dakota has pointed out, notwithstanding the fact that the national campaign has intervened, the President has not found it necessary to use even the $40,000; yet it is proposed to give him $50,000 more to assist him—not to give him all he needs, but to help him with his expenses. Notwithstanding these facts, it is affirmatively provided that no accounting shall be made by him.

I now yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have been absent from the Chamber during a part of the discussion. I am wondering if it has been suggested that possibly a better plan would be to give the President a salary which would net him the same amount as would the $50,000 expense item, which would be tax exempt, plus the $100,000 salary.

Perhaps a better plan would be to give him a salary which would net him $95,000. That would require a salary of between $400,000 and $450,000. The tax on a $100,000 salary for a married man, such as the present occupant of the White House, is $45,000. Therefore he would have $55,000 left. It is proposed to give him a $50,000 allowance which would not be taxable; so he would have $105,000 of net income or take-home pay, the kind that he could put in his pocket. We would have to give the President an additional $300,000 in salary, on top of the $150,000 we are talking about, to give him $105,000 which he could put in his own pocket.

Why would it not be better to increase the President's salary to $450,000, and let him pay income taxes, just as everyone else does? Would not that be more honest? Would it not be better? Then if income taxes should go down, as they possibly never will—let us pray that they will—the President would have more take-home pay, or more money that he could spend. I believe that the better plan would be simply to increase his salary to $450,000. If my figures are correct—and if they are not, I wish some Senator would correct them—he would then have $105,000 left after paying his taxes, which is exactly what would remain under the system of giving him $100,000, on which he would pay a tax of $55,000, and then giving him an allowance of $50,000 which would be nontaxable. The net result would be exactly the same as though we were to increase his salary to $450,000. That might be the better way to do it. I agree that the President's salary should be increased. I am wondering if an amendment will be offered to increase the President's salary to $450,000.

Mr. DONNELL. Let me answer the Senator from Indiana in this manner:

It is extremely interesting, I am sure, to those of us who were in the Chamber during the earlier portion of this debate, to recall the admirable and constructive address delivered today by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], one of the sponsors of the amendment for which I am now arguing. He joined in sponsorship of the amendment after it was submitted.

Mr. WILLIAMS rose.

Mr. DONNELL. I see the Senator from Delaware on his feet. In a few

moments no doubt we shall hear from him. He takes substantially the same position as does the able Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, had I known that, I would not have taken the time of the Senator. However, I thought that point should be brought to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. DONNELL. I am sure that it is always of value to the Senate to have the views of every Senator. The distinguished Senator from Indiana has a wide range of knowledge of business affairs, and he is adequately qualified to enlighten and assist us.

Before yielding to the Senator from Delaware, let me say that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] has indicated his desire to say a word.

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Who has the floor?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri has the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. I respectfully suggest that we have a little order in debate, if we may.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To whom does the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I point out to the Senator from Indiana that this afternoon I brought to the attention of the Senate the fact that the bill is an indirect method of achieving the result of giving the President take-home pay of approximately $100,000, and that in order to attain the same result we would have to raise the salary of the President to approximately $300,000.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further comment?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. The reason why I think it might be a better method is that when taxes do come down, if they ever do, under a $450,000 salary the President would have more take-home pay than we otherwise might give him.

Mr. DONNELL. Let me say that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] pointed out very clearly this afternoon that there is real merit in calling the attention of the President of the United States to the tremendous burden of taxation existing today, as well as in having the rest of us realize something of that burden.

Mr. CAPEHART. I wonder whether the authors of the bill would care to tell us why they arrived at a figure of $50,000 without the payment of taxes, rather than a $450,000 straight salary. There must be some merit to it; otherwise, they would have arrived at a salary of $450,000 for the President, which would give him the same amount of take-home pay the pending bill would give him. Will the authors of the bill tell us why they did not propose a $450,000 straight salary?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I have no objection to having the authors of the bill make such a statement, but I think the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is correct in saying that we should preserve ordinary debating order, and I think we shall make better progress if I am permitted to complete my statement, rather than to have an undisclosed Senator or Senators called upon now.

Mr. CAPEHART. May we have an opportunity to hear the authors of the bill state why they arrived at this method, rather than the method of increasing the salary of the President to approximately $450,000, which would give him the same amount of take-home pay that is proposed by the pending bill?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me——

Mr. DONNELL. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me suggest that we hope to stay here tonight until we finish action on this bill. I am merely apprising Senators who may contemplate leaving of that fact.

Mr. President, I feel sure that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] will answer the argument and question propounded by the Senator from Indiana. If the Senator from Maryland does not do so, I shall, because the argument the Senator from Indiana is making is utterly fallacious.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President——

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Let me say to the Senator from Illinois—I do not know whether he is the majority leader or not, although, of course, he hopes to be—that he starts out, already in the session, by saying that the Senator from Indiana is trying to do something that is not right.

Mr. LUCAS. No; I did not say that.

Mr. CAPEHART. I say we have a perfect right to ask the authors of the bill why they arrived at the conclusion they did reach. I say there is some sinister motive on the part of the authors of the bill, with the result that they are not willing to disclose why they arrived at that proposal.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Missouri will permit me to reply——

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, my friend, the Senator from Indiana, made a very far-reaching statement when he said there was a sinister motive back of the bill.

I had nothing to do with the taking of the testimony in the committee; I am not even a member of the committee. All I said was that the argument of the Senator from Indiana is a fallacious one. If he takes exception to the use of that word, I will say his argument is an incorrect one. The facts will appear in due course. The Senator from Indiana should not become excited about that statement, and he should not charge those responsible for this bill with having sinister motives. I am certain he has committed a grievous error, because he includes some of his own Republican colleagues.

Mr. CAPEHART. All I say——

Mr. LUCAS. I ask the Senator to wait just a moment; the Senator from Missouri has been kind enough to yield to me.

Let me say I can understand how the Senator from Indiana might make such a charge against some Senators on this side of the aisle, but I suggest he apologize to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], who sits on the Republican side of the aisle, and who is one of the most conscientious and honest Members of the Senate, as well as to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], who is absent at this time and cannot now protect himself, although I am sure some Republican Senator will defend the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois said I was fallacious in this matter, and he was intimating that I was not sincere about it. All I say is that it is a repetition of what occurred in the last Congress. When they do not want to be frank and do not want to answer questions correctly, they charge someone else with insincerity. I said exactly what I intended to say, and if it applies to any Senator on this side of the aisle, I am sorry.

Mr. LUCAS and Mr. FLANDERS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I regret that my friend the Senator from Indiana simply did not hear what I said. I did not charge him with any insincerity. I simply said I thought he was making a fallacious argument. If he objects to the use of that word, then I should say he was making an incorrect argument. If he objects to the use of that word, then I withdraw the statement entirely, because I would not want to offend my friend the Senator from Indiana in the opening days of this Congress. Perhaps later I might if I feel justified.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, if I misunderstood the Senator from Illinois, I apologize.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President——

Mr. DONNELL. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, the part of the bill which apparently, from what I have been able to learn from the newspapers, is to be the only part which will be passed before January 20, was not in the original bill. The so-called authors of this bill originally did not have in it anything with relation to the President, the Vice President, or the Speaker of the House. The provision referring to the President, the Vice President, and the Speaker of the House, which was put into the bill by the so-called authors of the bill, was put in at the suggestion and with the advice of that sterling New Deal Democrat, ex-President Hoover, and in exactly the terms he suggested. He told us that his Commission had given a great deal of thought to this particular question. We had not. We are giving thought to it now, evidently. But these are the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

Two or three misunderstandings are current among the Members of the Senate now in the Chamber. Under present conditions, the President has a $40,000

expense account for travel and entertainment. That has nothing to do with the ordinary expenses of the White House. It has nothing to do with any other of the President's expenses here in Washington. It was Mr. Hoover's estimate—after having some experience; of course, whether he applied the inflationary ratio to it, I do not know—that it costs at least between $25,000 and $30,000 a year to conduct the White House. That money comes out of the President's own pocket.

Senators talk about take-home pay of $95,000, but there is no such thing for the President of the United States. An official of a business firm getting a salary of, let us say, $105,000—mention was made of such a sum—could live as simply or as elaborately as he pleased. He could have his wife cook his breakfast, his luncheon, and his dinner and they could live in one of the new $9,000 five-room houses; or they could spend every cent they had, and could borrow more. But that is not possible for the President of the United States. Although I am not one of the authors of this bill, in the sense of having originally proposed or originally worked out with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] these provisions for the President of the United States, nevertheless I was strongly impressed, as were the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Connecticut, by the experience and advice of ex-President Hoover and by the thought that he and those working with him had given to this matter; and we were glad to put the provision into the bill, and I am glad to support it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I merely wish to address a question or two to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. Does the Senator from Vermont know of any of the White House expenses to which he has referred in his remarks that could not very well and simply be listed in an accounting by the President of the United States? Does he know of any reason why they should not be listed in an accounting by the President of the United States?

Mr. FLANDERS. He does account for the $40,000.

Mr. MORSE. I am speaking of the $50,000 covered by the bill.

Mr. FLANDERS. So I come to the $50,000. It could be done. Without any doubt, it would require an accounting department, because it is made up of an enormous number of small bills. But an accounting department could be set up, and it could be done.

Mr. DONNELL. He does account for the $40,000, does he not?

Mr. FLANDERS. He accounts for travel, and he accounts for entertainment.

Mr. DONNELL. What kind of accounting does he make, may I ask the Senator?

Mr. FLANDERS. I will read the statement.

Mr. DONNELL. Very well.

Mr. FLANDERS. I read:

> There may be expended for or on account of the traveling expenses of the President of the United States such sums as Congress may from time to time appropriate, not exceeding $40,000 per annum such sum when appropriated to be expended in the discretion of the President and accounted for on his certificate solely.

As we heard today, he does not always use that $40,000.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator yield, that I may ask the Senator one more question?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield, Mr. President, for the purpose of a question to be addressed to the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Vermont agree with me that it is apparent that the real purpose of the bill is to increase the President's salary, not only the $25,000 in the new $100,000 figure but an additional flat $50,000, and give him, as to that amount, tax exemption? Is not that the underlying purpose of the bill?

Mr. FLANDERS. The purpose of the bill, yes, is that he shall have tax exemption on the expenses incident to his office.

Mr. MORSE. But he is to have tax exemption on the amount of money under the name of "expenses," when the fact is that the total salary he is going to get will be $150,000. Why do we not call it what it really is?

Mr. DONNELL. I emphasize, Mr. President, that the answer of the Senator from Vermont to the query by the Senator from Oregon is obviously correct, because the framers of this very bill, before they ever got down to the expression "expense allowance," called the entire $150,000 "compensation."

It is perfectly clear, Mr. President, that the purpose of the framers of the bill was to do exactly what the Senator from Oregon says, to give the President $150,000, and to call $50,000 of it expense allowance, and to free him from the obligation of making an accounting, which by the very terms of the act now in effect with respect to the $40,000 he is required to make.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am glad the Senator brought up the point, as I have prepared an amendment which I shall offer at the proper time, designed to meet it. It seemed to me originally that we should use the language on the first page of the bill, saying that the President should have compensation in the amount of $150,000. My amendment will provide that he shall have compensation in the amount of $100,000, and, in addition, an expense account.

I do not know about Missouri, but I know in my own State of Maine, which is a rather frugal State, there was allowed the Governor, during my period of service, an expense account at that time of $10,000, for which an accounting was not required. I think that very many States—we have many governors here—have followed that practice, so I was not particularly disturbed that this amount, on the recommendation of Mr. Hoover, was proposed. But I certainly think the language of the bill should be clarified. I have discussed it with some of the authors, and they say it is entirely agreeable to insert that change.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. In just one moment, if I may finish. In reference to the contribution made by the Senator from Maine to the discussion, I may call to his attention the fact that in the respect to which he refers, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is not guilty of the same fallacy of language as is the bill now before us, because the $12,500 allowed to the Senators and Representatives is what is therein termed the "compensation," whereas the other $2,500 is distinctly referred to as an "expense allowance," and is not included within the term "compensation."

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator from Maine is precisely correct, as I see it, in taking the view that Senate bill 103, which is now before us, is in error in calling the $50,000 compensation.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I promised to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. I should like to address an observation to the Senator from Vermont. It may not be pertinent, but it may not do any harm. On the testimony given in my presence this afternoon, reference has been made to the $40,000 allowance for travel which the President had. He had, did he not, $40,000 for travel?

Mr. DONNELL. He was entitled to it.

Mr. TOBEY. He was entitled to it?

Mr. DONNELL. May I answer that?

Mr. TOBEY. Yes.

Mr. DONNELL. And the Senator from North Dakota stated that during the 2 years such authorization has existed, he has not used that amount, despite the national campaign intervening.

Mr. TOBEY. Exactly. That is my point.

Mr. DONNELL. Pardon me just a moment. For the fiscal year 1948 he used, so the Senator from North Dakota tells us, only $32,039.

Mr. TOBEY. Will the Senator hold that a minute?

Mr. DONNELL. I hold it.

Mr. TOBEY. I address my remarks jointly to the distinguished Senator from Missouri and to the distinguished Senator from Vermont. If the President of the United States, Harry Truman, with a $40,000 expense account for travel assured him under the law, only spent $32,000 and won the election by 303 electoral votes, I ask the Senators, as authorities, how big a majority he would have had in the electoral college had he spent the whole $40,000?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, although the Senator, with his clarity and

beauty of expression, has perhaps somewhat appealed to the jocularity of certain Members of the Senate, I undertake to say there is a lot in what he says, because if the President of the United States with an expenditure of $32,000 can carry this country as he did, how much more would he be able to exert by way of effective influence, perhaps, with an expenditure of $90,000, without obligation to account for the $50,000?

Mr. TOBEY. That is a political logarithm, is it not?

Mr. DONNELL. It is, and it is to the *n*th degree.

Mr. TOBEY. Yes.

Mr. DONNELL. I think it is decidedly in point in this case.

I now yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I am thankful for the opportunity of getting down to something I can understand. We have in the original bill this section, which I will now read. I refer to the original bill as we presented it for examination by the General Accounting Office.

Mr. DONNELL. May I ask the Senator, if he will pardon me for a moment, does he know whether or not in the amount accounted for by the President in the fiscal year 1948, this $32,000, in round figures, there is any item for a special train carrying the President of the United States on a nonpolitical trip earlier in 1948 to the western area of the country?

Mr. FLANDERS. I do not know, and I would suggest that that inquiry be addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. I am not informed.

Mr. DONNELL. Very well.

Mr. FLANDERS. This is the way the bill was presented to the General Accounting Office for their consideration of the legal aspects, and as I have said before on the floor of the Senate, there are rare times, God forgive me, when I regret that I am not a lawyer. The original section read as follows:

> There shall be paid to the President in equal monthly installments an expense allowance of $50,000 per annum, to assist in defraying expenses resulting to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, for which no tax liabilities shall accrue or accounting be made by him.

Mr. DONNELL. Who introduced that particular language?

Mr. FLANDERS. That language came—and I did not object to it—from the subcommittee, and was agreed to by them on December 23, 1948. It was submitted to the General Accounting Office for criticism. They took up certain legal aspects of the language which I am completely, absolutely, irrevocably, and eternally unable to pass judgment upon. But this is the way in which the General Accounting Office asked us to reword that provision:

> The President shall receive in full for his services during the term for which he shall have been elected compensation in the aggregate amount of $150,000 a year to be paid monthly, consisting of $100,000 for salary, and an expense allowance of $50,000 to assist in defraying expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, for which expense allowance no tax liability shall accrue and for which no accounting shall be made by him, and shall be entitled to the use of the furniture and other effects belonging to the United States and kept in the Executive Mansion.

In the viewpoint of the General Accounting Office, there was something dubiously illegal about the original wording, in spite of the fact that there were two lawyers and only one layman on the subcommittee.

Mr. DONNELL. Was there any suggestion made by the General Accounting Office that it would be impossible for the President to account for what he does with the $50,000?

Mr. FLANDERS. That question was not raised.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, it happens that we raised that question, and the General Accounting Office representative said there would be nothing illegal about it. They advised the subcommittee to change the language of the bill, to separate the amounts and call $50,000 an expense account, as it was evident on the surface that the $50,000 was nothing more than an additional salary, part of which would evidently accrue to the President as a net gain. It was stated that it would not be constitutional to include it unless it should be designated as an expense account.

I shall read a statement made by the Senator from Vermont in the committee, which it may be he has forgotten. He was discussing with former President Hoover the same question, and Mr. Hoover called attention to the fact that, even if the President's salary were doubled, there would be very little gain accruing to the President. The Senator from Vermont made this statement——

Mr. FLANDERS. Will the Senator refer to the page?

Mr. WILLIAMS. At page 56 of the hearings of December 13 and 14, 1948, following what Mr. Hoover had said. I now read the statement made by the Senator from Vermont at that time:

> Well, one of the criticisms made of this proposal in the Eightieth Congress was the expense of a million dollars or so. Just on plain arithmetic, I suppose we could have figured out that Uncle Sam would get back a considerable part of that $1,000,000, but, of course, that is not the point at all.

But I say that is the point. An attempt is being made to raise the take-home pay of the President by an indirect method.

I talked with a gentleman in the General Accounting Office who stated that this was the only legal way they could raise the take-home pay of the President, by separating those two items, making the salary $100,000 and calling the other an expense account $50,000. Of course, it could be raised to four or five hundred thousand dollars, or to a million dollars; but the only way the President could be given an exemption from income tax would be to call part of it an expense account.

Mr. DONNELL. In doing that, Mr. President, they inadvertently failed to eliminate the word "compensation." I do not know whether it was done inadvertently, but the word was eliminated. The expense allowance of $50,000 is to assist in defraying expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of the President's official duties, although he did not need all of the $40,000 previously received; at least, it was not needed through 1948.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is true, Mr. President. If it was needed, there would be no objection on the part of the committee to its being accepted as an expense allowance.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I am not arguing against giving the President $50,000 or so much thereof as he may expend as an allowance for expenses. That is provided for in the amendment which the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and I are sponsoring before this body. But we think—and we reiterate it as strongly as we can—that just as it is possible for the President now to account for $40,000, and just as I understand the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is of the opinion that he could account for the $50,000, I say it is equally true that it is sound business judgment and wholesome legislation to require an accounting.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I think it might be worth while to read what Mr. Hoover stated about the expense of living in the White House. He said:

> Mr. HOOVER. I have not looked recently into the exact appropriations for allowances for the President, but in my time there was an allowance of $25,000 a year. However, it was confined to traveling expenses, purely official relationships and functions, and had nothing to do with the ordinary living in the White House.
>
> If there has been no change since that time, I should think the American people would be perfectly willing and glad to see the Government give board and lodging to the President. He does not get it now for he must pay his own board and that of numerous other people. He gets his lodging free, but even there he has to pay part of the upkeep cost. I should think the minimum cost to the President is somewhere between $25,000 and $30,000 a year of conducting the White House in such a fashion as it should be conducted.
>
> He must receive a great many guests that he cannot charge to his allowance account, and so forth. We want the White House to be the leading and gracious home of the Nation. At least, I feel the American people would want that to be.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I agree thoroughly with the remarks so well made regarding the desire that the White House be a gracious home in which our people can be entertained, but I fail to see anything in any argument which has been presented to indicate that the expense of operating the White House, the

cost of soap, labor, material, food, clothing, and other things, cannot be listed on a piece of paper and filed under certificate of the President, just as is true in the case of the $40,000 to which reference has been made.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I shall yield in a moment.

Mr. President, earlier this afternoon I referred to the senior Senator from California, who is also now on the floor, and I mentioned the fact that in his State the legislature had considered a certain bill. We had been talking about the custom in various States. I do not recall my own State's having any fund available until a few years ago, at any rate, that could be used without some type of accounting. As I say, we were talking about the States and their requirements, and I mentioned this afternoon, as I again mention now since both Senators from California are present, the fact that only a few months ago the Legislature of the State of California, in its zeal to advocate and assist in passing a bill which would undertake to give to the State the tidelands, passed a bill providing a $25,000 appropriation for expenditure by a committee, with a provision that there should be no obligation to file vouchers with respect thereto. As I indicated earlier this afternoon, the press, certainly in California—I would not be sure about it here—distinctly called that fact to the attention of the public, and the Governor of the State, elected, as he was, as the candidate of both the Democratic Party and the Republican Party, did not sign the bill providing for the $25,000 payment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. DONNELL. I shall yield in a moment. To my mind there can be no answer to the proposition that it is wholesome that when a public official handles money of any sizable amount and expends it, he should account to the people of the United States as to the purposes for which the money is used. The very illustration I have employed with respect to the State of California indicates that there is a revulsion in the minds of the citizenry of the country against any plan under which sizable amounts of money are handed forth for expenditure by public officials without an obligation to account.

I now yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator has been stating to the Senate that there is an accounting with respect to the $40,000 that is allowed the President of the United States for travel expenses. The provision of the law specifically states that the President shall make a certificate only of the total amount he has spent during the year, as I understand. He does not make any itemized accounting whatsoever of the money he has spent for travel expenses. I merely wanted to call that to the attention of the Senator, because I think he has been quoting the provision incorrectly. The President makes a certificate of the amount he has spent and the balance on hand. As I recall, last year he had some money left in the travel-expense fund.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, as I stated earlier this afternoon, I have not read the statute with respect to the $40,000. It was given to us a few minutes ago for the first time this afternoon, and then by the Senator from Vermont. I read it now:

> There may be expended for or on account of the traveling expenses of the President of the United States such sum as Congress may from time to time appropriate, not exceeding $40,000 per annum; such sum, when appropriated, to be expended in the discretion of the President, and accounted for on his certificate solely.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. DONNELL. To my mind it is perfectly clear that the public official required to give a certificate as to how money was expended certainly would be required to say how it was expended. That is what the sponsors of these amendments are asking for in the instant case.

Mr. LUCAS. I challenge the Senator to show where the President of the United States at any time in the past has ever submitted an itemized statement, under a provision of the kind we are now discussing. It has been the custom, as I understand it, all down through our experience as a republic, for the President to make nothing more than a certificate of whatever amount is expended. This is the first time anyone has ever raised a question with respect to the expenditures being itemized by the President of the United States.

I wish to say to the Senator that we never had such argument as this when the Senate was voting on an increase in its salaries. We raised our salaries, we gave ourselves a $2,500 exemption for expenses, and the Senator spent no time on the floor of the Senate making the arguments then he is making now. He accepted that situation. In other words, we all have confidence in ourselves to spend the $2,500 which we get under an exemption, without accounting to anyone, but we have no confidence, according to the Senator's argument, in the President of the United States, in the Vice President of the United States, or in the Speaker of the House of Representatives. That is what it amounts to. Senators of the United States can do no wrong. We can spend the $2,500 the way we see fit, and no one is going to suspect us in our spending of it. But some Senators do not have any faith in the President of the United States in spending this money in the manner in which it should be spent. They want him to make an accounting; they want him to present an accounting for every item he spends in the White House, every time he buys a can of fruit, every time he engages a painter or a carpenter, every time he buys a ham, every time he sends a messenger boy across the street on an errand and so on ad infinitum. They want him to make an accounting—How absurd and ridiculous. He would have to have three bookkeepers and one certified public accountant to keep a record of the $50,000 he is getting for expenses for the White House down at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

To me it seems preposterous that we should spend time charging the President of the United States, a man elected to the highest office within the gift of the people, with not spending money honestly and accurately and fairly, as Senators are attempting to do in the amendments.

The Senator from Missouri even said in the beginning of his remarks that possibly the train the President used at one time, along last May, I think it was, might have something to do with this very provision we now have placed in this bill. Yet the able Senator from Vermont said that the individual responsible for it was not the President from the Senator's State of Missouri, but was the Honorable Herbert Hoover, former President of the United States, who was chiefly responsible for this provision. Harry Truman had nothing to do with it. Any implication on the part of the Senator from Missouri that the President is responsible for this provision does not square with the facts. As I said before, Harry Truman told me last night that he would rather not have a single dime of this money if there was any way for him to accomplish the real purpose of the bill, namely to take care of the men in the lower echelons, in the lower classifications, whom he needs to assist him in the enormous national and international responsibilities which have been thrust upon the shoulders of the Chief Executive of this Nation.

Mr. President, the Senator is wholly wrong. The amendments should be defeated, and especially so, in view of our own vulnerable position upon this point. We should not require the President of the United States, or the Vice President-elect, one of our own Members, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to make this type of accounting for these moneys, when we do not do so with our own expense accounts, and that is exactly what is being done when this kind of an argument is made.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. DONNELL. In a moment. In regard to the very vigorous presentation made by the distinguished Senator from Illinois, so skillfully and eloquently, so far as I am aware there has not been one word uttered upon the floor of the Senate this afternoon which has directly or indirectly charged the President of the United States with any improper conduct with respect to money, or with respect to anything else. However, there has been presented, as well as I can do it, the proposition that the stockholders of a great institution, namely, the people of the United States of America, are entitled to know what their money is spent for. I undertake to say that the men I see right before me now, who were Governors of the States wherein they reside only a few years ago, did not resent the requirements of their statutes, or perhaps of their constitutions, if there were such provisions requiring an accounting of money expenditures.

The distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota has told us that in his State every governor is required to account for every item of expenditure that exceeds the sum of $1. Is not that correct?

Mr. LANGER. That is exactly correct, and he does it under oath.

Mr. DONNELL. Let me ask the distinguished Senator, while he is on his feet, if he ever felt any resentment, or thought that there was any disgrace on him, when he was Governor of North Dakota, because of that provision of the law?

Mr. LANGER. Of course not, because it has been the law since we adopted a constitution.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. DONNELL. I promised to yield first to the Senator from Utah, but if I may continue for a moment, I say that it is equally possible to account for $50,000, for such purposes as are described in the bill, as expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of official duties, as it is in the case of the $40,000 covered by the statute to which reference has been made.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

With respect to the train that went to the West, I do not know whether it was paid for by the United States Government, or by the Democratic National Committee, or by the railroad companies, or who paid for it. I think, Mr. President, it is an entirely proper inquiry to propound as to who did pay for it. I am not ashamed for having mentioned that train here this afternoon. It went out to the West on the theory that it was on a nonpolitical expedition, and yet as the campaign proceeded we noted, or at least some of us did, that the reference to the so-called nonpolitical character became one of satire and of laughter. Obviously, Mr. President, it is proper to know who paid for that train. Furthermore, it is just as possible to put down in a certificate what the items of expense were, how many dollars were paid for the train, how many dollars were paid for food, as it would be to provide for expenses of any other item.

I now yield to the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] for his question.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, can the distinguished Senator from Missouri advise me whether or not the $50,000 provided for in the pending bill is in addition to the $40,000 which is now allowed?

Mr. DONNELL. It is. It is in addition to the $40,000, and it has no relation to it, except that it is in addition to it.

Mr. WATKINS. If the bill as it is now before us were to be passed it would mean, would it not, that $90,000 would be provided the President to use for expenses?

Mr. DONNELL. There will be $40,000 under the existing statute. There will be up to $50,000 more provided by the bill, but only such part of the latter $50,000, under our amendment, can be used as is covered by vouchers duly presented. But under the bill as it comes before us the entire $50,000 additional amount will be available to the President, with an express provision that no accounting shall be made by him. That is the provision that is before us in the bill. That provision, as I have indicated, says that he shall be allowed up to $50,000 additional, depending on what his expenses are, as properly vouchered.

Mr. WATKINS. I should like to make an observation with reference to what the Senator from Illinois said concerning Congress voting itself expense money for which it does not need to account. I was not here at the time action was taken on that measure, and I did not vote for it. If the question were up for action today I would not vote for such a measure. I think it is wrong in principle.

Mr. DONNELL. Permit me to interrupt the Senator from Utah to say that I previously made a similar statement twice this afternoon. Although I either voted for the Reorganization Act, or certainly approved it if a vote were taken on it without a record of the vote being made, yet I agree thoroughly with the Senator from Utah that it is unwholesome for either the legislative body, the executive branch, or the judicial branch to expend money without accounting for the purposes for which it was expended.

Mr. WATKINS. I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Missouri if it is not true that all employees of the Government who have expense accounts, including Cabinet members, must render an accounting before they receive the expense money?

Mr. DONNELL. I have never studied the statute covering that point, but that is my impression.

Mr. WATKINS. It is my understanding that all employees of the Government have to render expense account vouchers for the money they have expended, before they can obtain the money. Should there be any different rule for Senators, members of the Cabinet, and the President than there is for other employees of the Government?

Mr. DONNELL. My answer is unequivocally "No."

I now yield to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN].

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, would the distinguished Senator from Missouri be content with the same sort of accounting in the cases we are now discussing as applies under existing provisions respecting expenditures, that is by certification?

Mr. DONNELL. I assume that the certificates state the purposes for which money is expended. I have not seen such certificates, but I do not propose to change the language of the amendment merely because other language was not clearly and closely drawn. I think we are entitled to have filed with the appropriate officer a voucher, just as the governors of the various States—certainly in many instances—file vouchers showing how money is expended by them.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I remind the Senator that many of the governors have so-called contingent funds, as to which they make no certificate at all. They are not required to make any kind of an accounting. Personally, I would be entirely content if the President of the United States made a certificate that he had spent a certain amount of money for expenses, without requiring him to present an itemized list. In the limited field we are talking about, covering the President, Vice President, and Speaker of the House, I would not require them to go around with notebooks in their pockets making records of every nickel they spend, and making that kind of detailed accounting. I am speaking of my own sense of the morals and the proprieties involved in this particular limited situation. I would take the word of any President of the United States that he had spent so much personal expense money, on his mere certification. I would suggest to the distinguished Senator from Missouri that when we cannot do that we shall have come to a very bad pass.

Mr. DONNELL. I certainly would believe the President of the United States on certificate; that is certainly true; but, Mr. President, at the same time, while we see vividly, from the language of the Senator from Colorado, the notebook that is being carried around, and the notes being made, nevertheless the President is not actually the man who is making the expenditures. He is not the man who goes across the street as the messenger boy. He is not the man who engages the train. The man who makes the expenditures certainly can file a voucher showing for what purpose the expenditures were incurred. I see no reflection, I see nothing that indicates that we have come to a miserable pass by requiring that that be done. I think we would be safe with the other plan. I should have no special objection to it from my own standpoint, but I feel that from the standpoint of sound bookkeeping, for a permanent record for the United States, we should have vouchers duly presented evidencing the expenditures of funds.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I simply want to say that the suggestion of the Senator from Colorado that our amendment be changed in order to allow the President to just file a certificate, without an accounting, would be most unsatisfactory to me, as one of the sponsors of the amendment. There is no office in the United States so high, or no person in the United States occupying high office, who should not be made to account for the expenditure of the taxpayers' money. The President of the United States, I hope, is still in principle the servant of the people of this country. He should be required as a servant of the people to report to the people the expenditures of operating the White House if he is to receive by this bill an extra $50,000 for that purpose. However, the real rub is that this entire expense proposal is but a subterfuge for hiding the real intent of the bill, namely, to increase the President's salary another $50,000 and call it an expense account. It is an immoral principle and I object to it.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I agree with that statement, and I want it distinctly understood that although I stated

a moment ago that, so far as I am personally concerned, I would be willing to accept any certificate from any President of the United States—certainly I would, just as I would accept a certificate from many subordinate officials—nevertheless, in my opinion, the proper accounting practice would be best carried out by a provision such as is contained in the amendment now pending. It is not unreasonable. It does not require the President to go around with a notebook and make an entry every time he buys a postage stamp. That is obviously a total distortion of the actual situation, and the requirement of presentation of vouchers is reasonable and proper.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I simply want to point out that in this limited category, by analogy to long-continued practice in the States, I believe that many of our people—or it would not be a long-continued practice—are perfectly willing to carve out an exception to the usual accounting practices. Certainly I have no desire to have a keyhole or transom view of the personal expenditures of the President of the United States.

Mr. DONNELL. Neither do I desire any such thing, Mr. President. But we are entitled to have a record of expenditures. If an individual expends a thousand dollars for telegrams, we are entitled to know the purpose for which the telegrams were sent and to whom they were sent, and the amount expended.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I suggest that the present occupant of the White House has demonstrated that the matter can be left to his certification. That is demonstrated by the fact that he has accounted for a surplus during the time that he has had an expense fund.

Mr. DONNELL. I do not think, Mr. President, that answers the point involved here at all.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I will admit, if the Senator will again yield, that it does not answer the point, except that it goes to the practice, and that is important.

Mr. DONNELL. May I ask the Senator from Colorado if he knows of his own knowledge what is stated in the certificates that are issued in connection with the $40,000?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I hope it is in his certificate, as is any other certificate. I hope his certificate will be in substance that "I have spent so much expense money pursuant to authorization of a certain act of Congress." So far as I am concerned, if he will make such a certificate, that is sufficient. Nothing less than that would be satisfactory to the junior Senator from Colorado.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. As one of the sponsors of this amendment, I am not so much concerned, perhaps, as is the Senator from Missouri, with the point he is making. I was talking with the Comptroller General regarding the point raised by the Senator from Colorado, and he stated that in his experience in auditing accounts, all the Presidents, including President Truman, had gone out of their way to list their expenditures, and that such expenditures were listed better by Presidents than by any other officers, and I agree with the Senator from Colorado that any President should be trusted.

Mr. DONNELL. As I understand, no difficulty has thus far been experienced in listing them in detail.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There is certainly no criticism with regard to what has been done in the past.

Mr. DONNELL. And there is no reason why such accounting could not be rendered in the future, is there?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I know of no reason.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it not a fact that there is a very much larger sum than the sum we are discussing here, namely, a sum of several hundred thousand dollars now in the hands of the President under very similar regulations? Is the Senator from Missouri familiar with that fund?

Mr. DONNELL. I am not.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think I am correct. I think the fund approaches $1,000,000, for which he gives no accounting whatsoever. I believe that fact shows a recognition of the peculiar responsibilities of his office.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I should like to invite the particular attention of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] to a matter with reference to which he has just stated his views.

As I understood him, he stated that he would be satisfied with the certificate of the President of the United States that he had spent so much money pursuant to a certain appropriation or a certain law, and that he would not be satisfied with anything less. This bill does not require any certificate of any kind. The payment is made monthly, as the salary payment is made monthly. There is no requirement of a certificate for any payment. The only certificate of the President is his endorsement on the back of the Treasury check, that he has received the money.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I hope the Senator from Missouri will accept the suggestion that the President be permitted to report his expenses on certificate, as he now does. I told the Senator from Missouri that I would vote for his amendments, and I will do so; but when I made that statement, I thought that the President was submitting itemized accounts, as do other employees of the Government. I find that he does not do so, but that he is required to report by certificate only the amount which he has spent.

I find also that that requirement was last reiterated by the Congress on August 2, 1946, only a little more than 2 years ago, when the limit on expenses was raised to $40,000.

I had intended to support the provision requiring the President to make reports to the Congress. I shall vote for the Senator's amendments because I promised to do so, whether or not he accepts the suggestion.

Mr. DONNELL. I do not insist on the Senator voting for them.

Mr. AIKEN. I will take the word of the President of the United States that his expenses have been so much, without requiring him to account for every pair of shoe laces. However, I point out that this requirement was last reiterated by the Congress about 2½ years ago. I believe that the President's party was in control of Congress at that time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire from the Senator how much longer he intends to take?

Mr. DONNELL. I was about to say that I think we should conclude this discussion shortly, and I shall endeavor to do so.

Mr. President, I think it is entirely true that none of us would question the word of the President of the United States as to an expenditure. My proposal is simply that, as a matter of sound business, as an example of the way business is transacted in the Government, these amendments should be adopted.

Let me conclude these observations with mention—which I think is proper—of a point which was made very forcefully by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. He took the position this afternoon on the floor that he was very much worried over the difficulty of determining what items would be properly included—in other words, that no standard is prescribed by law as to the duties of any of these officers.

In answer to that point, it seems to me, first, that if there is no standard, there should be a standard.

In the second place, the drafters of the bill have distinctly recognized that the duties of these officers are sufficiently defined in the law to determine what are expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of official duties, because the drafters of the bill have used that language not only once, but I believe three times in the course of the various sections. They have used the term "expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties." To my mind it is entirely possible for an adequate accounting to be made, and I submit that these amendments are wholesome and should be adopted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Missouri. Under a previous order of the Senate, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I have checked the emergency fund of the President, which is the item to which I referred previously. It has been in existence for many years under a similar provision, as I understand. Last year it was $200,000. In the current budget it is carried at $1,000,000. So that item will

come under examination in the course of time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Missouri. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARKLEY (when his name was called). For the same reason heretofore assigned, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from voting.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Kentucky will be excused from voting.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BROUGHTON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. MCGRATH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

If present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BROUGHTON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is unavoidably detained.

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 61, as follows:

YEAS—22

Aiken	Hendrickson	Taft
Butler	Jenner	Vandenberg
Byrd	Kem	Watkins
Capehart	Langer	Wherry
Cordon	Malone	Wiley
Donnell	Martin	Williams
Ecton	Morse	
Gillette	Schoeppel	

NAYS—61

Anderson	Hunt	Murray
Brewster	Ives	Myers
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	O'Conor
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Connally	Kefauver	Pepper
Douglas	Kerr	Robertson
Downey	Kilgore	Russell
Ellender	Knowland	Saltonstall
Ferguson	Lodge	Smith, Maine
Flanders	Long	Smith, N. J.
Frear	Lucas	Sparkman
Fulbright	McCarthy	Stennis
George	McClellan	Taylor
Gurney	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Hayden	McKellar	Thye
Hickenlooper	McMahon	Tobey
Hill	Magnuson	Tydings
Hoey	Maybank	Young
Holland	Millikin	
Humphrey	Mundt	

NOT VOTING—13

Baldwin	Eastland	Reed
Barkley	Green	Thomas, Okla.
Bricker	McCarran	Wagner
Bridges	McGrath	
Broughton	Miller	

So Mr. DONNELL's amendments were rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there further amendments to be proposed?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk. I shall state it briefly, and then ask that it be read.

The amendment applies to the term "compensation," on the first page of the bill, as it seems to be perfectly ridiculous, the General Accounting Office to the contrary notwithstanding, to call as "compensation" the sum of $50,000 which is allowed the President for expenses.

My amendment accordingly provides, on the first page, that "compensation" shall be "in the aggregate amount of $100,000 a year, to be paid monthly;" and I continue by striking out, on the second page, the words, "consisting of $100,000 for salary"; and then inserting the words "in addition," so as to read "and in addition an expense allowance of $50,000"—which it seems to me is a much more realistic presentation of the situation, and one which would do much more justice to what the Senate apparently contemplates in this enactment.

I now ask that the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, in line 8, it is proposed to strike out "$150,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$100,000".

On page 2, in line 1, it is proposed to strike out "consisting of $100,000 for salary."

On page 2, in line 2, it is proposed to insert, after the word "and", the words "in addition."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine.

Mr. LUCAS. I am familiar with the amendment. I think it is proper. I have no objection to it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I move to strike out the word "no" in the fifth line on page 2; to strike out the word "him" in line 6 on page 2; and to insert, after the word "by", at the commencement of line 6 on page 2, the words "his certification."

That would carry out the thought of having the President certify whatever his expenses may be.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, before we vote on that amendment, will the able Senator from Colorado give us an explanation of exactly what he means by "certification," because there are different interpretations of what a certification is, and different constructions have been placed upon that word during this debate this afternoon. So before we agree to the amendment, I should like to know what it means.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes. Mr. President, from the standpoint of the Senator from Colorado, "certification" means certification, that it is discretionary with the President whether he wishes to add any stuffing, that on certification alone the requirement would be met. That is the interpretation of the junior Senator from Colorado.

As I said during the debate I am not interested in having a transom or a keyhole view of the President's expenditures so far as personal affairs are concerned, where we cover them by appropriation, and I do not intend any such result; but if the President wishes to supplement his certification with a detailed accounting, I, of course, could have no objection.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if I understand the Senator correctly, then, if the President of the United States is given this $50,000, and he certifies that he spent $47,000, that would be sufficient?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That would be sufficient, and in accordance with my intent in offering the amendment. It would be up to the President, whether he wanted to add anything else. I understand that is now the law, as it relates to the expenditures which have already been authorized.

Mr. LUCAS. I take it he could not draw it in monthly installments under the certification proposed?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not understand why not. I mean, that is an accounting procedure that I would not be familiar with, but I do not understand why not.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I know that is the custom in the executive offices of the Governor. It is done in precisely that way each month. He simply files a certificate.

Mr. LUCAS. I want to thank the Senator from Colorado for the observations he made a short time ago with respect to his confidence in the President of the United States. I also want to thank the Senator from Maine with respect to his statement of what the governors in his State do. That is exactly what is done in the State of Illinois. In other words, I think in most States the governors have been given a specific sum for expenses to take care of the mansion and other incidental expenses, and have never been required to make any itemized accounting such as has been requested and proposed to be required here this afternoon of the President of the United States.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. If that were done, it would cause the personal and official business to become mixed up to the point where, if a report were made of any kind, the newspapers, the columnists, and the radio commentators would be happy to come in and see each month what the President of the United States was doing, and what the Vice President was doing, and what the Speaker was doing, and they would eventually get to the question of what Senators of the United States were doing with respect to their $2,500—a perfect set-up for distortions. I say the proposal is utterly foolish.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator that when I was a young man I worked in a governor's office. The legislature of that State habitually gave the governor what we called a contingent fund, for which he did not even have to make a certification. All he had to do was to draw on it. He made no accounting at all. But I

should say also, we took great pains against the possibility of future attack by keeping a very careful private account of it.

Mr. LUCAS. That is right, and the governor was absolutely correct in doing that. But if the time comes in this country when the governor of a State cannot be trusted, or the President of the United States cannot be trusted, or the Vice President, or the Speaker, to keep an honest account with respect to this little expense money without itemizing every item, then America is not very safe.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Oh, I agree entirely. Would it satisfy the point in the Senator's mind if the word "annual" were inserted before the word "certification"?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, certainly that would be desirable, because the President might spend twice as much money one month as he would spend in another month. It ought to be an annual certification.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Then, Mr. President, I would add the word "annual" before the word "certification."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment of the Senator from Colorado will be so modified.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Colorado will yield, I wonder if he would go further, when the various appropriation bills are presented this year, and whether he intends to endeavor through legislation to require the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chief of the Air Force, generals of every rank, and, as a matter of fact, all officers in the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, who have various allowances, to meet a similar requirement? Are we going to make the same requirement of Members of Congress? We do not make any certification.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Colorado, I hope, made it very clear awhile ago that his remarks on this subject apply only to the office of the Presidency, the Vice Presidency, and the Speaker of the House. We shall have to decide as to the others when we reach them.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield gladly.

Mr. WATKINS. When the Senator says "certification," does he mean that the certificate shall show that the money was spent for expenses?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes; it would naturally be that kind of certificate, because it would have to relate back to the enabling statute; and that is the nature of the statute.

Mr. WATKINS. That is what I wanted to get clear in my mind, whether the Senator intends that it shall be a certification that he spent the allowance for Presidential expenses.

Mr. MILLIKIN. For Presidential expenses, as authorized by this particular statute.

Mr. WATKINS. And not in a campaign?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Not in a campaign.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am not going to vote on the pending amendment, but I should like to know what it means, inasmuch as it applies to an office which I am soon to assume. The bill as reported provides that the expense allowance shall be paid in monthly payments. It is entirely possible that during any one month not half of the amount would be expended for the purposes indicated. It might be that in the following month twice as much as the monthly allowance would be expended. For efficient purposes, what sort of certificate would be required, for instance, of the Vice President or the Speaker, in order that he might draw the allowance monthly? Would he be allowed to draw it in monthly installments of equal amount, or would he draw only the amount for which he made a certificate at the end of the month? If the certificate were for only a part of the monthly payment out of a fund, would he be allowed to certify a larger amount in the following month, if the expenses had been larger than the one-twelfth of the entire amount that was paid?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, it is my understanding, under the explanations which have been made here, that the beneficiaries of this fund could draw it all out at once, that they could draw any part of it out from time to time and without it being any fixed, regular, stated time. They are required only to make an annual certification that it was for expenses.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understood the bill as written to provide that the allowance should be paid in monthly installments, which means an equal amount each month.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. On page 2, line 1, I think, the Senator will observe that equal monthly payments are required. How could that come about, if the recipient has to wait until the end of the year to make a certificate as to the amount he has expended?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I understood the distinguished Senator from Maine to state that under the practice——

Mr. BREWSTER. I think perhaps the Senator did not realize the purport of my amendment, which would strike out the provision as to the monthly payment of the $50,000, that was in the earlier provision. On the adoption of my amendment, that passes out.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator's amendment apply to all three of the offices?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes. I wanted to raise the question as to whether the annual certification would not present a difficulty. It seems to me it is much better to leave it "certification", because under the word "annual" the President necessarily would have to wait until the end of the year, and would be obliged to put up the $50,000 for expenses, with no means of recoupment. Certainly he could not certify, on July 10, that his expenses next June would be a certain amount. If it is left without the word "annual" he can file a monthly, bimonthly, or tri-monthly certificate and receive compensation for whatever his expenses have been.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think what the Senator from Colorado wishes to do, as I understand, and what the Senator from Kentucky is hoping will be done, as I understand, could be reconciled by making the salary part of the appropriation payable monthly, and the expense amount, payable if, as, and when the recipient desired to draw it. That could be done simply by transposing the words "be paid monthly" in connection with the $100,000 salary, saying nothing about when the $50,000 expense money would be paid, except that there would be a certification required annually for the expenditure of that fund.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Would the Senator please indicate where his words would come in, and what they are?

Mr. TYDINGS. Strike out the words "to be paid monthly" on page 2, line 1. It would then read "a year, consisting of $100,000 for salary." Then insert, "to be paid monthly"——

Mr. BREWSTER. That is already in, is it not?

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator will wait just a moment, until the meaning is made plain, it would then go on to say, "and an expense allowance of $50,000 a year," which would not necessarily have to be paid monthly. It could, as the Senator from Colorado has pointed out, all be drawn in 1 day, 1 month, or 6 months, or a year, depending upon when the recipient desired to use the money. But the salary would be paid in 12 monthly installments. The only requirement, then, as the amendment has been redrafted, would be a certification for the expense money annually, at the end of the year. I believe that is what the Senator from Colorado desires, and I think it would meet the point of view of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, that is what the junior Senator from Colorado desires to do.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, if I heard the Senator from Colorado correctly, that is exactly what he stated when he suggested his amendment. My understanding of the amendment which was offered by him is that it provides compensation in the amount of $100,000 a year, to be paid monthly, and an expense allowance of $50,000. The provision for payment monthly goes fully to compensation and not to the expense account.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I shall yield first to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I do not understand that the Senator from Colorado is proposing any new restrictions on the President's fund. Congress has continued the proviso that the President shall certify each year as to what his expenses have amounted to during the year. The legislation which we are now considering proposes to drop the requirement that the President certify the amount of expense for the White House

each year. The Senator from Colorado is certainly proposing no new restrictions.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I agreed to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, do I understand that the Senator from Colorado stated that certification, so far as the President is concerned, is annual?

I wish to bring out the point that so far as I can see by reading the amendment handed to the Clerk, the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] does not apply to the Vice President or to the Speaker of the House of Representatives. I bring that out because the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] asked with reference to his expense account. Is the Vice President to be on a monthly basis as opposed to an annual basis for the President?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as I understand the situation the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine takes care of the contingency which the Senator from Colorado and I were discussing, so that the President's regular salary is paid in twelve regular installments, but his expense account can be drawn upon whenever the President desires, and there is an annual certification. If the Millikin amendment prevails for the present, and we have not corrected the comparable condition in which the Vice President's expense account and the Speaker's expense account find themselves, I suggest to the Senator from Maine, who has drafted the first amendment, that if he will redraft the language relating to the Vice President's and the Speaker's expense accounts, along the same line, I think the bill will be in consonance and every Senator will have what he seems to want.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I would explain to the Senator from Maryland that my amendment has been adopted, and the question is now on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. It seems to me better to omit the word annual and have it subject to one certification. The addition of similar language with reference to the Vice President and the Speaker of the House would bring about the same objective.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I should like to modify my amendment, and I would ask the Clerk to read my proposed modification.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 6, the words proposed to be inserted are, "his annual certification." The modification reads, "his certification."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask if the amendment which has already been adopted referred to the President's salary and expense account. We have been assured by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] that like language will be introduced as to the Vice President and the Speaker of the House. I should like to ask with reference to the Vice President's salary and expense account. If the amendment is agreed to, where will it leave the Vice President relative to the amount of expense to which he is entitled?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, it would be the intention of the junior Senator from Colorado to conform the language of the bill so that the same privilege is available to both the Vice President and the Speaker of the House. I understand that the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is working on such an amendment at this time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if I correctly understand the amendment, the President, the Vice President, or the Speaker of the House of Representatives can draw at any time desired the amount of money desired, and he is required to make certification whenever he draws it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. All I am seeking is information. I shall not vote on the amendment one way or the other. I should like to inquire if it is proposed to strike out the monthly installment entirely. I am endeavoring to find out what I have to do.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I will say to the distinguished Senator that it is my intention to conform the language relating to the Vice President and the Speaker of the House with the language relating to the President.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, does it provide for an annual certification?

Mr. MILLIKIN. It requires certification at the time expense money is drawn out. The word "annual" has been taken out.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if that be the interpretation, then I want to ask again if the Vice President would have to finance himself until he drew out the money, in order to certify his expenses?

Mr. MILLIKIN. When the Vice President has a need for reimbursing himself for expense money within the limits provided for in the bill, he makes a certification at any time he wants to make it within the appropriating year, in such amounts as he wants to make it, within the over-all limitation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I ask if that means that he must certify that he has already expended the money or that he wants to expend it?

Mr. MILLIKIN. He must certify that he has expended the money.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the result is that the Vice President and the Speaker of the House have to finance the expenses to be covered by their allowances and then be reimbursed by a certification some time during the year.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I suggest to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky that it would be rather difficult to make a certification that money has been spent on an advance. I do not know of any practical way in which that could be done.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I realize that; and that presents a difficulty, because it is obvious that the same amount may not be expended each month for expenses incident to the two officers. It creates confusion in the mind of the recipient as to what his rights are. As I understand, under the language of the Senator's amendment, the officer certifies only what he has spent in any one month, and the amounts may be different each month, depending entirely on circumstances. I find it difficult to understand how he can comply with this requirement.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It is the intention of the junior Senator from Colorado that any time the distinguished Vice President or the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives or the President finds that he has spent money attributable to this account he can clear it with a certification that he has spent it. Otherwise we would be operating on an advance basis. I have no intention of putting in an amendment to give advances for expenses before anyone knows what the expenses are.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. For purposes of clarity, would it not be better to follow the "$50,000" by the words "per annum," in the second line, the same as is done in line 19 on page 2 and line 5 on page 3? Otherwise, there may be some complications from the Comptroller General's office as to the amount.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I would accept the Senator's amendment to that effect.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not care to be a nuisance in inquiring about what the result may be, but to whom is this certificate to be presented, to the Comptroller General, the General Accounting Office, the Secretary of the Treasury, or to the Disbursing Officer of the Senate? Where is the certificate to be presented in order to allow these two particular officers to draw whatever they can draw out of this expense allowance?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I would assume that whoever officially pays that kind of money to the President would be the person to receive the certification, and the same would apply to the Vice President or the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BARKLEY. In the case of the Vice President, the Disbursing Officer of the Senate pays him.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think that is true. I do not know how the matter is handled so far as the Speaker of the House is concerned. Nor do I know who directly pays the President, but whoever pays him is going to take the certificate to clear his account.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I suggest that there will not be too much difficulty about it. Since 1906 the law has provided for the allowance of travel expenses and for funds to the President for entertainment. It has always been provided that that is to be for the President, and the language is, "to be accounted for solely on his certificate,"

which is exactly the same thing the Senator suggests, so unquestionably the modus operandi has been worked out.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as I understand the amendment of the Senator from Colorado, to take a practical case as applied to the Vice President or the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Vice President could simply say, "I hereby certify that I require the sum of $1,500, or $2,000, or $360, in connection with the expenses of the duty of the office of Vice President."

Mr. MILLIKIN. I would put it slightly differently.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not mean to choose the words; I am getting at the spirit of it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I would say, "I require $1,500 to reimburse me for the expenses of my office, which I certify have been incurred under this statute."

Mr. TYDINGS. That certainly could be made the day the expense was incurred, or the day after.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Exactly.

Mr. TYDINGS. And the payments would come immediately.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Exactly.

Mr. TYDINGS. The whole purpose of the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado is to give to the Vice President, without any accounting, the money he needs whenever he needs it, but he will simply say so in writing.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If he will make his certification, and the same applies to the President and the same applies to the Speaker of the House, and of course all those officials are at liberty to make such supplemental accounting as they wish.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] as modified.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In the event the $50,000 or the $10,000 which is certified as being required for expenses relating to the office is not spent, does the remainder stay in the Treasury? Does it revert back to the Treasury, or can it all be drawn out?

Mr. MILLIKIN. As I understand, we are making an allowance of expense money.

Mr. WILLIAMS. At a maximum?

Mr. MILLIKIN. If it is not spent, I imagine, in an appropriating period, it probably goes back into the general fund, and we would have to reappropriate it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In other words, they can draw out only that which is expended in the course of their business?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I would say that is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In order that the matter may be clearly understood by the Senate, the clerk will state the amendment of the Senator from Colorado as modified.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

SEC. 102. The President shall receive in full for his services during the term for which he shall have been elected compensation in the aggregate amount of $100,000 a year, to be paid monthly, and in addition an expense allowance of $50,000 per annum to assist in defraying expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, for which expense allowance no tax liability shall accrue and for which accounting shall be made by his certification.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I would call attention to the fact that the amendment as read by the clerk does not cover the Vice President or the Speaker.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. We have not gotten to that yet. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. (Putting the question.) In the opinion of the Chair, the "noes" have it.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, in view of this vote, I should like to clarify the situation. I think my amendment was agreed to. The other amendment simply applies to the certification.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question was on the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BREWSTER. Which was not the one read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment of the Senator from Maine was agreed to.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Maine said the amendment voted on was not the one read. I am now completely at sea. I desire to know what amendment we just voted on.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The vote was on the certification amendment presented by the Senator from Colorado, and in the opinion of the Chair it was rejected.

Mr. KNOWLAND. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Would a division be in order on the amendment of the Senator from Colorado?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The result has already been announced.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask unanimous consent——

Mr. BARKLEY. In view of the confusion, I ask unanimous consent, notwithstanding the announcement of the Chair that the amendment was defeated, that a division be allowed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to have the situation clear. Is it understood that the amendment which I proposed has been agreed to?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. BREWSTER. And that the only question is now about the proposal of certification made by the Senator from Colorado?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct. [Putting the question.]

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARKLEY (when his name was called). Under the same circumstances referred to before, I ask to be excused from voting.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Kentucky is excused from voting.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BROUGHTON], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. MCGRATH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

If present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is unavoidably detained.

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—38

Aiken	Jenner	Saltonstall
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Butler	Kem	Smith, Maine
Cain	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Langer	Taft
Ecton	Lodge	Thye
Ferguson	McCarthy	Tobey
Flanders	Malone	Tydings
Gillette	Martin	Watkins
Gurney	Millikin	Wherry
Hendrickson	Mundt	Williams
Hickenlooper	Robertson	Young
Ives	Russell	

NAYS—38

Anderson	Humphrey	Magnuson
Chapman	Hunt	Maybank
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Morse
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Murray
Donnell	Kefauver	Myers
Douglas	Kerr	O'Conor
Ellender	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Frear	Long	Pepper
Fulbright	Lucas	Sparkman
Hayden	McClellan	Stennis
Hill	McFarland	Taylor
Hoey	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Holland	McMahon	

NOT VOTING—20

Baldwin	Downey	Neely
Barkley	Eastland	Reed
Bricker	George	Thomas, Okla.
Bridges	Green	Vandenberg
Broughton	McCarran	Wagner
Byrd	McGrath	Wiley
Capehart	Miller	

So Mr. MILLIKIN's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief explanation of the vote I have just cast. I voted against the certification requirement because in my judgment it is perfectly clear from the discussion this afternoon that the real purpose of the alleged expense account has been to increase the salary of the President of the United States. There is no real desire on the floor of the Senate, in my judgment, to make the President of the United States give a true accounting of his expenditures. I am not one who believes in voting for mere form. I think that the amendment we voted on in regard to certification was nothing but an empty gesture, a matter of empty form. Unless we are willing to do directly what we ought to do I am not going to seek, by way of indirection, to put on the books what I consider to be a matter of empty form. It is a subterfuge to conceal what the proponents do not want to do directly, namely, grant the President a $150,000 salary.

I repeat, the President of the United States ought to be required to give a full accounting of $50,000 of the taxpayers' money allegedly given to him in this bill for the purposes of running the White House. The people ought to know what that money is spent for. We should not allow the President to get away with the $50,000 by simply filing a mere formal certification that he used it for expense money. Thus, if we cannot have a full accounting, my vote necessarily had to be "no" because I think there is a great moral principle involved in this matter.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I desire to say that my vote of "nay" on this amendment was for the reason that I think the proper method of handling this matter is by accounting which states what the items were for which the expenditures were incurred—not a mere certification. Furthermore, it is entirely possible that the accounting could be definite, certain, clear as to what the items were. A mere statement that the moneys have been used for expenses relating to the office to my mind is not proper, is not the proper example for the public, is not the proper example for the United States Government, and my vote was "nay" for that reason.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that in the event Senate bill 103 is passed by the House without amendment, the President pro tempore be authorized to sign the enrolled bill after the adjournment of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is on the third reading of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, it has just been called to my attention that the only office which we are acting upon which must be acted upon prior to January 20 is that of the President, and that after January 20 we can still act on these expense accounts in the committee, and perhaps reach a more intelligent conclusion as to what we should do. With that thought in mind, Mr. President, I move to strike out, beginning on page 2, line 1, after the word "year", all the remainder of the bill, inserting a period after the word "year." That strikes out all action with respect to the salaries of the Vice President and the Speaker.

Article II, section 1, paragraph 6 of the Constitution provides as follows:

The President shall, at stated times, receive for his services, a compensation which shall neither be increased nor diminished during the period for which he shall have been elected, and he shall not receive within that period any other emolument from the United States, or any of them.

There is no reference to the Vice President or Speaker, and we can take action with respect to them at some later date. There seems to be quite a difference of opinion on the question, and that is why I am offering my amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware. [Putting the question.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair the "noes" have it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware has asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest to the acting majority leader the point of no quorum.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska suggests the point of no quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Holland	Millikin
Anderson	Humphrey	Morse
Barkley	Hunt	Mundt
Brewster	Ives	Murray
Butler	Jenner	Myers
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Connally	Kefauver	Robertson
Cordon	Kem	Russell
Donnell	Kerr	Saltonstall
Douglas	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Ecton	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Ellender	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Ferguson	Lodge	Sparkman
Flanders	Long	Stennis
Frear	Lucas	Taft
Fulbright	McCarthy	Taylor
George	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Gillette	McFarland	Thye
Gurney	McKellar	Tobey
Hayden	McMahon	Tydings
Hendrickson	Magnuson	Watkins
Hickenlooper	Malone	Wherry
Hill	Martin	Williams
Hoey	Maybank	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). Seventy-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, there seems to be a difference of opinion as to whether or not the President would be the only one included. Therefore I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment may be withdrawn.

The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. MORSE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARKLEY (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as I have heretofore made, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from voting.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection the Senator from Kentucky is excused from voting.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BROUGHTON], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. MCGRATH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

If present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BROUGHTON], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. MCGRATH] the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is unavoidably detained. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 68, nays 9, as follows:

YEAS—68

Aiken	Hoey	Maybank
Anderson	Holland	Mundt
Brewster	Humphrey	Murray
Butler	Hunt	Myers
Cain	Ives	O'Conor
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Cordon	Kefauver	Russell
Douglas	Kerr	Saltonstall
Ecton	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Ellender	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Ferguson	Lodge	Smith, N. J.
Flanders	Long	Sparkman
Frear	Lucas	Stennis
Fulbright	McCarthy	Taft
George	McClellan	Taylor
Gillette	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Ecton	McKellar	Thye
Gurney	McMahon	Tobey
Hayden	Magnuson	Tydings
Hendrickson	Malone	Wherry
Hickenlooper	Martin	
Hill		

NAYS—0

Donnell	Langer	Watkins
Jenner	Millikin	Williams
Kem	Morse	Young

NOT VOTING—19

Baldwin	Downey	Reed
Barkley	Eastland	Thomas, Okla.
Bricker	Green	Vandenberg
Bridges	McCarran	Wagner
Broughton	McGrath	Wiley
Byrd	Miller	
Capehart	Neely	

So the bill (S. 103) was passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the title will be amended in accordance with an amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I renew my previous request, by asking unanimous consent that in the event Senate bill 103 is passed by the House of Representatives without amendment, the President pro tempore be authorized to sign the enrolled bill after the adjournment of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMPENSATION OF HEADS AND ASSISTANT HEADS OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS—ADDITIONAL BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce at this point for appropriate reference a bill to increase rates of compensation of the heads and assistant heads of executive departments and independent agencies.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 498) to increase rates of compensation of the heads and assistant heads of executive departments and independent agencies, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

CHARTER OF ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY FROM CHARTER

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate remove the ban of secrecy with regard to the charter of the Organization of American States, Executive A, Eighty-first Congress, first session, which was sent to the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the ban of secrecy is removed from the charter, and the charter, together with the President's message of transmittal, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; and the President's message will be printed in the RECORD.

The President's message is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of the Charter of the Organization of American States, formulated at the Ninth International Conference of American States, and signed at Bogotá, Colombia, in the English, French, Portuguese, and Spanish languages on April 30, 1948, by the plenipotentiaries of the United States of America and by the plenipotentiaries of the other American Republics.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report which the Acting Secretary of State has addressed to me in regard to the Charter above mentioned, together with a copy of the report of the United States delegation on the Bogotá Conference.

The principles, purposes, and provisions of the Charter have my complete and wholehearted approval and I am happy to recommend the Charter to the favorable consideration of the Senate.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 13, 1949.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report by the Acting Secretary of State; 2. Charter of the Organization of American States, Bogotá, April 30, 1948—certified copy; 3. Report of the United States delegation on the Bogotá Conference.)

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR SAFETY OF LIFE AT SEA—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY FROM CONVENTION

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate remove the ban of secrecy with regard to the international convention for the safety of life at sea, Executive B, Eighty-first Congress, first session, which was sent to the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the ban of secrecy is removed from the convention, and the convention, together with the President's message of transmittal, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; and the President's message will be printed in the RECORD.

The President's message is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, 1948, signed at London on June 10, 1948, by the respective plenipotentiaries of the Government of the United States of America and the governments of 27 other states.

The character of the convention, which is intended to replace the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea signed at London on May 31, 1929, is explained in the enclosed report of the Acting Secretary of State.

I also transmit, for the information of the Senate in connection with its consideration of the convention, a certified copy of the Final Act of the International Conference on Safety of Life at Sea, 1948, held at London from April 23 to June 10, 1948, and a copy of the report of the delegation of the United States of America to that conference.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 13, 1949.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report of the Acting Secretary of State; 2. Certified copy of International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, 1948, signed at London June 10, 1948; 3. Certified copy of Final Act of the International Conference on Safety of Life at Sea, 1948; 4. Copy of report of the United States delegation.)

CONVENTION OF WORLD METEOROLOGICAL ORGANIZATION—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY FROM CONVENTION

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate remove the ban of secrecy with regard to the Convention of the World Meteorological Organization, Executive C, Eighty-first Congress, first session, which was sent to the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the ban of secrecy is removed from the convention, and the convention, together with the President's message of transmittal, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; and the President's message will be printed in the RECORD.

The President's message is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of the convention of the World Meteorological Organization, in the English and French languages, which was opened for signature at Washington on October 11, 1947 for a period of 120 days, and was signed, during that period, by representatives of the United States of America and of 41 other states.

In this connection, there is transmitted herewith a certified copy of a protocol which was also opened for signature at the same time as the convention.

I also transmit, for the information of the Senate, the report made to me by the Acting Secretary of State regarding the aforementioned convention.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 13, 1949.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report of the Acting Secretary of State; 2. Certified copy of the convention of the World Meteorological Organization; 3. Certified copy of protocol.)

INTER-AMERICAN CONVENTION ON GRANTING OF POLITICAL RIGHTS TO WOMEN—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY FROM CONVENTION

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate remove the ban of secrecy with regard to the Inter-American Convention on the Granting

of Political Rights to Women, Executive D, Eighty-first Congress, first session, which was sent to the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the ban of secrecy is removed from the convention, and the convention, together with the President's message of transmittal will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; and the President's message will be printed in the RECORD.

The President's message is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of the Inter-American Convention on the Granting of Political Rights to Women, formulated at the Ninth International Conference of American States, and signed at Bogotá, Colombia, on May 2, 1948, by the plenipotentiaries of the United States of America and by the plenipotentiaries of other American Republics.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report which the Acting Secretary of State has addressed to me in regard to this convention.

The purpose of this convention, and the principle underlying it, have my complete and wholehearted approval and I am happy to recommend the convention to the favorable consideration of the Senate.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 13, 1949.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report by the Acting Secretary of State; 2. Inter-American Convention on the Granting of Political Rights to Women, Bogotá, May 2, 1948—certified copy.)

CONVENTION ON THE INTERNATIONAL RECOGNITION OF RIGHTS IN AIRCRAFT—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY FROM CONVENTION

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate remove the ban of secrecy with regard to the Convention on the International Recognition of Rights in Aircraft, Executive E, Eighty-first Congress, first session, which was sent to the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the ban of secrecy is removed from the convention, and the convention, together with the President's message of transmittal will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; and the President's message will be printed in the RECORD.

The President's message is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a copy, as certified by the Secretary General of the International Civil Aviation Organization, of the Convention on the International Recognition of Rights in Aircraft, signed at Geneva on June 19, 1948.

I also transmit, for the information of the Senate, the report made to me by the Acting Secretary of State with respect to this matter.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 13, 1949.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report of the Acting Secretary of State; 2. Certified copy of Convention on the International Recognition of Rights in Aircraft.)

PROTOCOL ON REGULATION OF PRODUCTION AND MARKETING OF SUGAR—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY FROM PROTOCOL

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate remove the ban of secrecy with regard to the protocol prolonging for 1 year after August 31, 1948, the international agreement regarding the regulation of production and marketing of sugar, Executive F, Eighty-first Congress, first session, which was sent to the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the ban of secrecy is removed from the protocol, and the protocol, together with the President's message of transmittal, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; and the President's message will be printed in the RECORD.

The President's message is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of a protocol dated in London August 21, 1948, prolonging for 1 year after August 31, 1948, the international agreement regarding the regulation of production and marketing of sugar, signed at London on May 6, 1937.

I also transmit, for the information of the Senate, the report made to me by the Acting Secretary of State with respect to this matter.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 13, 1949.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report of the Acting Secretary of State; 2. Certified copy of protocol of August 31, 1948.)

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RELATING TO QUALIFICATIONS OF ELECTORS

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, some hours ago I sent to the desk, for introduction and proper reference, a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment. It was introduced for the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BROUGHTON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and myself. I had expected to ask unanimous consent to make a statement regarding the joint resolution; but because of the lateness of the hour I simply ask now that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD, showing the introduction thereof.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 34) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the qualifications of electors, introduced by Mr. HOLLAND (for himself, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. LONG, Mr. HOEY, Mr. BROUGHTON, and Mr. ROBERTSON), was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax or to meet any property qualification.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

INAUGURATION HOLIDAY FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES IN THE DISTRICT AND METROPOLITAN AREA

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], who is chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, reported today Senate Joint Resolution 16, making January 20 and 21 of this year holidays for Federal employees and employees of the District of Columbia in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia. Unanimous consent is required to take up the joint resolution at this time. I hope it may be granted, and that we may complete action on it today. Otherwise, we shall have to adjourn until tomorrow, and have a session then.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader why it is necessary that we have a legislative enactment setting aside these two days for a holiday.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me say to the distinguished minority leader that it is my understanding that in the past all inaugural days have been a holiday for employees in the District of Columbia, either through an Executive order by the President of the United States or through congressional action.

This inauguration falls on Thursday the 20th of January. Of course, Friday will be the 21st; and Saturday and Sunday will be holidays in the regular course. Many persons from all over the United States will be coming to this inauguration. Many friends and relatives of Senators upon both sides of the aisle will be here. In view of the fact that one day definitely will be a holiday it was thought that it would be just as well to include the next day, which is Friday. That will give the employees 2 days as a holiday or vacation.

I may say to my friend the Senator from Nebraska that I think on inauguration day there will be quite a celebration. I understand that the number of people coming to Washington next week possibly will be greater than the number who have come to any other inauguration in the history of the United States, and I think there will be a rather gay and glorious patriotic time around the Capital. I may add that there is to be an inaugural ball and a general celebration all over the city, and I assume that probably the employees would like another day for vacation, on Friday, after the night before.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the majority leader for the explanation as to the holidays. I am not at all quarreling with the celebration that is expected to be put on. In fact, I do not know whether the acting majority leader knows it or not, but I happen to be one of the members of the inaugural committee that is trying to provide the facilities and help as much as possible in carrying out the inaugurational program. But that is not the question I asked my distinguished friend. What I want to know is, Why does there have to be legislative authority for this? I have not checked the history of it, but in times gone by I think it has simply been done by executive decree or proclamation.

Mr. LUCAS. I may say to my friend it has, with respect to 1 day. It so happens that this year Inauguration Day falls on Thursday, and the President of the United States feels that the holiday period should be extended to 2 days. He does not desire to take all the responsibility for it; but he would like to go along with the Congress in making it 2 days.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not going to object to the unanimous-consent request, because the Senate, I understand will not convene until next Monday. The resolution was reported today, and it would have to lie over 24 hours, in order to be brought up in regular order. I think there is no doubt that we want to cooperate in the inauguration. For that reason, I shall offer no objection to the unanimous consent. I should like at this place in my remarks however to include a short statement relative to the authority the President now has to make Inauguration Day a holiday by proclamation. For that reason, I wanted to know why it was necessary to have a legislative enactment, when there is a custom that has been followed in inaugurations gone by.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

The President has the authority to make January 20 and 21 holidays for Federal employees and employees of the District without the necessity of any congressional action. In 1923 the Acting Attorney General rendered an opinion to the President (33 Op. Atty. Gen. p. 485) stating that the power to close the executive departments and independent bureaus in the District of Columbia and the District government offices, whenever he deems proper in the interest of the public service, is inherent in the President. The opinion points out that there are numerous precedents for such action, none of which have ever been questioned, and cites 22 Opinions of the Attorney General 472, 474, for additional precedents. Since 1923 this power has been exercised on numerous occasions both with respect to employees in the District and with respect to employees in the field service.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I think so long as we are going to have many functions going on, taking on the characteristics of a Roman holiday, that the Government employees certainly ought to be allowed to share in it and observe it. However, I do want to say that when I compare the plans being made for this inauguration with the very simple and dignified inauguration that last occurred in this city, down on the lawn of the White House, it is most unfortunate that we are wasting the great sums of money which are being spent on the inauguration. I think it is another bit of proof of my remarks made earlier this afternoon, when I commented upon the expenditures that are laid out in the city of Washington, D. C., under the name of social functions. When I think of the thousands of dollars which are going to be spent unnecessarily on this inauguration, I wonder what has happened to the word "economy." I am led to believe that the inauguration is a fitting introduction to what has every evidence of becoming anything but an economic administration.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I do not know that I shall object, I should like to ask the acting majority leader a few questions. I understood him to say—which, of course, is correct—that every previous Inauguration Day has been a holiday, and I do not think on either side of the aisle there is any question about that. I should like to inquire, however, whether to his knowledge there has heretofore ever been a case, and I imagine that Thursday has been an Inauguration Day a number of times in the country's history, when a 2- or 3-day holiday has been granted for the inauguration?

Mr. LUCAS. Saturday, of course, is a holiday anyway. I cannot answer that question. I will say to my friend from California. It may be that some member of the Committee on the District of Columbia can answer it. I am merely presenting the joint resolution, because the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH] was compelled to go to New York.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from California will yield, I might answer his question. Only during the past 3 or 4 years has Saturday been a holiday among Government employees. Heretofore there has been no Saturday holiday in the District of Columbia, and the joint resolution is offered because of Saturday now being a holiday, and it would have to be, anyway, even if there were no inauguration. It was thought that inasmuch as Thursday is a holiday and Saturday is a holiday, there is no particular point in requiring the Government employees to work on Friday.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, still reserving the right to object, I should like to make an observation and ask whether the majority leader had given thought to it. People will be coming into Washington in order quite properly to take part in the inauguration of the President of the United States, and they will be coming in regardless of partisanship, because the man being inaugurated is President of the entire United States and not of any one political party. But when they come into this city, it might well be that with the expense they are undergoing, they might have some public business to transact, if the public offices were open on Friday. After they had participated in the inauguration of the President of the United States and paid their respects to him, it seems to me that they then might want to carry on some public business in some of the public offices. Under this arrangement, it seems to me they would have to stay over two extra days or three extra days in order to transact any public business in their Nation's Capital.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I think the record should be clear that this is only a holiday for the employees. As I understand, the banks did not want it made a regular holiday, which would compel them to remain closed on Friday. So that this is not a holiday, to all intents and purposes.

Mr. LUCAS. No.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is merely to give a vacation to the employees designated in the bill itself; is it not?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct. It does not apply to business houses at all.

Mr. FERGUSON. It does not apply to them as a holiday.

Mr. WHERRY. The resolution applies only to the metropolitan area. It does not extend beyond that; does it?

Mr. LUCAS. I think it extends to Virginia.

Mr. WHERRY. It would extend only to the metropolitan area; would it not?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to say that I have yet to find any justification for a holiday on Friday. It is entirely different from situations of this kind that might occur when there is a normal national holiday, and the employees of the Government might be going home for a vacation, and they might need an extra day, in which case as a gesture to their convenience and their good times, an extra day is often given. This is a celebration to be observed in Washington only. There is no occasion, so far as I know, for employees going to their distant homes and no advantage in giving them another day for that fundamental purpose. I see utterly no justification. I do not believe that I shall object to the Senate acting on the resolution, if they care to act on it today, but certainly I see no justification for an extra holiday at public expense on Friday, merely because Saturday happens to follow Friday, and Sunday happens to follow Saturday, and they all three follow the inauguration. I feel that it is setting a dangerous, bad, and ill-advised precedent. I might not oppose it at all, and I might support such a move, if it were a day following Thanksgiving. I have voted for such holidays, if they really served the convenience of the people in the District for travel purposes or added time with their families, or something of that kind. But

in this instance there is nothing but the stoppage of Federal work for 1 day, with an excuse that I have been unable to find, in any explanation, or in the resolution itself. I shall not object, if the majority wants to have it done, as a vacation for the people in the District. I shall not object to the consideration of the resolution, but I want to say now that, without further justification, my conscience will not permit me in the public interest to support this extra holiday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the joint resolution is passed.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator, and I thank the Senate. Before I take my seat, let me say just one word in response to what has just been said.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I did not hear the ruling of the Chair. I realize I am a little late on the decision, but my understanding was there was no objection to considering the joint resolution. Was it also passed? There was no opportunity for anyone not in favor of the resolution even to express himself, before final action was taken.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the ruling of the Chair will be rescinded. Any Senator who wants to be heard on the joint resolution will be heard. The resolution is before the Senate and open to amendment. There being no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 16) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SIGNING OF ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that in the event the House of Representatives passes Senate Joint Resolution 16 without amendment, the President pro tempore be authorized to sign the enrolled joint resolution after the adjournment of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ALLEGED EXTRAVAGANCE IN CONNECTION WITH INAUGURAL CEREMONIES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief reply to what my good friend from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] said a moment ago regarding extravagance in connection with the coming inauguration of President Truman. I am surprised that my friend did not know that the Republican committee, before the election on November 2, had full charge of making all contracts with respect to this inauguration. It is my understanding that no Democrat was consulted as to what was to be done. The truth of the matter is that they built the stands for the inauguration of Mr. Dewey, not Mr. Truman, and the contracts were let by the Committee on Rules and Administration, of which my former colleague, former Senator Brooks, was chairman.

The Democrats had nothing to do with the $100,000 which is being spent here. The contracts were let before we came into power. We suggested that something be done, if possible, to do exactly what the Senator from Oregon has referred to; in other words, to cancel the contracts, if possible, have the inaugural ceremonies upon the White House balcony, which was built by the President of the United States, for which many people criticized and condemned him, and let the people of the country extract such amusement as they could from that situation. But the contracts had been let and could not be terminated.

So I want my friend to know that any extravagance in connection with the inaugural ceremonies must be laid to the Republicans, and not to the Democrats.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to assure the Senator from Illinois that he cannot shuffle off responsibility quite so easily.

Mr. LUCAS. I am doing it, however.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is trying to. I want to say to the Senator from Illinois that I am aware of the fact that some Republicans apparently entered into an agreement to waste a great deal of lumber in front of the Capitol in anticipation of a Republican inauguration. But I want to say that I have also gone into the factual questions behind the type of statement which the Senator has just made on the floor of the Senate, because I have been reading statements similar to his made to the press by other Democrats. The facts will not bear out the statement of the Senator from Illinois, if he means to assert that the Democrats have not been adding to the expense of the inauguration ceremonies. There are many items which the Democrats have added to the costs, including some amusing ones. I call the attention of the Senator from Illinois to the calliope which will tag end the circus and which was not in the original plans for the inauguration. I think the Senator knows me well enough to know that the division caused by the middle aisle of the Senate does not make any difference, so far as I am concerned, in trying to protect the people's money. The Democrats should have made some rescission of the plans, if the Senator thinks the Republicans are responsible for the waste. It will not be found in the record that any such rescission was attempted.

I simply wish to say that this inauguration, in my judgment, entails the waste of many thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money which should be saved.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 17, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 13, 1949:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons for promotion from Foreign Service officers of class 1 to Foreign Service officers of the class of career minister of the United States of America, to which office they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Ralph H. Ackerman, of California.
David McK. Key, of Tennessee.
Karl L. Rankin, of Maine.
Howard K. Travers, of New York.
H. Lawrence Groves, of Pennsylvania, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 3 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America, to which office they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Stephen E. Aguirre, of Texas.
Archibald E. Gray, of Pennsylvania.
Robert M. Taylor, of Washington.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 4 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls of the United States of America, to which office they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Charles W. Adair, Jr., of Ohio.
Frederick J. Cunningham, of Massachusetts.
H. Francis Cunningham, Jr., of Nebraska.
Sherburne Dillingham, of the District of Columbia.
Harrison Lewis, of California.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 5 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls of the United States of America, to which office they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Charles Gilbert, of New York.
George Lybrook West, Jr., of California.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America, to which offices they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Robert Alexander, of the District of Columbia.
Charles R. Enlow, of Kansas.
William Kling, of New York, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 4, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America, to which offices they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

James F. Amory, of Virginia.
Raymond J. Barrett, of New York.
Jack B. Button, of Kansas.
Stuart B. Campbell, Jr., of Virginia.
Thomas F. Conlon, of Illinois.
Robert W. Eastham, of Virginia.
Benjamin A. Fleck, of Pennsylvania.
Jackson E. Keffner, of California.
Jack T. Kilgore, of Indiana.
James F. Leonard, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Ralph J. McGuire, of the District of Columbia.
Daniel J. Meloy, of Maryland.
Richard B. Parker, of Kansas.
John B. Root, of New York.
Robert W. Ross, of California.
John A. Sabini, of the District of Columbia.
Michel F. Smith, of Texas.
Karl E. Sommerlatte, of Florida.
Christopher T. Taloumis, of Massachusetts.
George E. Tener 2d, of Pennsylvania.
Sidney Weintraub, of New York.
Don A. Gribble, of Vermont, a Foreign Service reserve officer, to be a consul of the United States of America, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

The following-named Foreign Service reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America, to which office they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Mallory Browne, of New York.
George Kenneth Holland, of Maryland.
William R. Tyler, of the District of Columbia.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America, to which office they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Ernest L. Eslinger, of Tennessee.
Arnilioth G. Heitberg, of California.
Frederick C. Johnson, of New Jersey.
Ernest V. Polutnik, of Montana.
James R. Riddle, of Alabama.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Edward H. Foley, Jr., of New York, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury, in place of A. Lee M. Wiggins, resigned.

Mr. Foley is now serving under temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

John S. Graham, of North Carolina, to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, in place of Edward H. Foley, Jr.

Mr. Graham is now serving under temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Jesse J. Gilbert, of Ohio, to be Assistant Registrar of the Treasury, in place of Byrd Leavell, resigned.

Mr. Gilbert is now serving under temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Daniel A. Bolich, of New York, to be Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue, in place of Stewart Berkshire, resigned.

Mr. Bolich is now serving under temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

BUREAU OF MINES

James Boyd, of Colorado, to be Director of the Bureau of Mines, terminating recess appointment. Vice Boyd R. Sayers.

BUREAU OF THE MINT

George B. Gillin, of California, to be Superintendent of the Mint of the United States at San Francisco, Calif., to fill an existing vacancy.

Gilroy Roberts, of Pennsylvania, to be Engraver in the Mint of the United States at Philadelphia, Pa., to fill an existing vacancy.

These officers are now serving under temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

Charles F. Murphy, of Massachusetts, to be Comptroller of Customs with headquarters at Boston, Mass. (Reappointment.)

COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Ralph W. Cripe, of South Bend, Ind., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Indiana, to fill an existing vacancy.

John J. Fitzpatrick, of Connecticut, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Connecticut, to fill an existing vacancy.

Mr. Fitzpatrick is now serving under temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Stuart L. Crenshaw, of Virginia, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Virginia, to fill an existing vacancy.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

John H. Alsmiller, of Kentucky, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 42, with headquarters at Louisville, Ky., in place of Harry M. Brennan, deceased.

Tully Garner, of Texas, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 29, with headquarters at Laredo, Tex., in place of Harry P. Hornby, deceased.

These officers are now serving under temporary commissions issued during the recess of the Senate.

William H. Burke, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 4 with headquarters at Boston, Mass. (Reappointment.)

ASSISTANT ATTORNEYS GENERAL

Hon. Alexander M. Campbell, of Indiana, to be an Assistant Attorney General. (He is now serving under a recess appointment.)

Hon. David Northon Edelstein, of New York, to be Assistant Attorney General, customs division. (He is now serving under a recess appointment.)

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

William Marvel, of Delaware, to be United States attorney for the district of Delaware. (He is now serving under a recess appointment.)

Gilmore S. Haynie, of Indiana, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Indiana, vice Alexander M. Campbell, resigned.

Joseph F. Deeb, of Michigan, to be United States attorney for the western district of Michigan. (Mr. Deeb is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 5, 1948.)

John B. Tansil, of Montana, to be United States attorney for the district of Montana. (Mr. Tansil is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 17, 1948.)

Miles N. Pike, of Nevada, to be United States attorney for the district of Nevada. (He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires January 22, 1949.)

George L. Grobe, of New York, to be United States attorney for the western district of New York. (Mr. Grobe is now serving under an appointment which expired October 1, 1947.)

Gerald A. Gleeson, of Pennsylvania, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Pennsylvania. (Mr. Gleeson is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired December 7, 1948.)

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Paul B. Messick, of Delaware, to be United States marshal for the district of Delaware. (Mr. Messick is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 17, 1948.)

Frederick Elliott Biermann, of Iowa, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Iowa. (Mr. Biermann is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired September 27, 1948.)

Thomas N. Curran, of Maine, to be United States marshal for the district of Maine. (Mr. Curran is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 29, 1948.)

Edwin D. Bolger, of Michigan, to be United States marshal for the western district of Michigan. (Mr. Bolger is now serving under an appointment which expired March 31, 1948.)

Fred A. Canfil, of Missouri, to be United States marshal for the western district of Missouri. (Mr. Canfil is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired January 17, 1948.)

Harold K. Claypool, of Ohio, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Ohio. (Mr. Claypool is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 9, 1948.)

Jack R. Caufield, of Oregon, to be United States marshal for the district of Oregon. (Mr. Caufield is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired October 28, 1947.)

Carl H. Fleckenstine, of Pennsylvania, to be United States marshal for the middle district of Pennsylvania. (He is now serving under a recess appointment.)

THE JUDICIARY

Hon. F. Ryan Duffy, of Wisconsin, to be circuit judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, vice Hon. Evan A. Evans, deceased.

Hon. Paul P. Rao, of New York, to be judge of the United States Customs Court. (He is now serving under a recess appointment.)

Herbert W. Erskine, of California, to be United States district judge for the northern district of California, vice Hon. Adolphus Frederick St. Sure, retired.

Hon. Edward Allen Tamm, of the District of Columbia, to be United States district judge for the District of Columbia. (Judge Tamm is now serving in this post under a recess appointment.)

William T. McCarthy, of Massachusetts, to be United States district judge for the district of Massachusetts, vice Hon. Arthur D. Healey, deceased.

Thomas Patrick Thornton, of Michigan, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Michigan, vice Hon. Ernest A. O'Brien, deceased.

Hon. Roy W. Harper, of Missouri, to be United States district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri. (He is now serving under a recess appointment.)

Hon. Carl A. Hatch, of New Mexico, to be United States district judge for the district of New Mexico, vice Hon. Colin Neblett, retired.

James T. Foley, of New York, to be United States district judge for the northern district of New York, vice Hon. Edward S. Kampf, resigned.

Hon. Samuel Hamilton Kaufman, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York. (He is now serving under a recess appointment.)

Hon. Wilson Warlick, of North Carolina, to be United States district judge for the western district of North Carolina, vice Hon. Edwin Y. Webb, retired.

Hon. Albert M. Cristy, of Hawaii, to be an associate justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, vice Hon. Emil C. Peters, term expired.

Edward A. Towse, of Hawaii, to be second judge of the first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii, vice Hon. Albert M. Cristy, elevated.

Willson C. Moore, of Hawaii, to be fourth judge of the first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii. (Judge Moore is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired December 27, 1947.)

Hon. Aubrey B. Fennell, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate judge of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia. (Judge Fennell is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired July 7, 1948.)

Hon. Angel R. de Jesus, of Puerto Rico, to be chief justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico. (He is now serving under a recess appointment.)

Luis Negron Fernandez, of Puerto Rico, to be an associate justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico. (He is now serving under a recess appointment.)

MILITARY AND NAVAL STAFF COMMITTEE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Rear Adm. Bernhard H. Bieri, United States Navy, to be the senior naval member of the Military and Naval Staff Committee of the United Nations.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

Brig. Gen. Peter A. Feringa, Corps of Engineers, to be president and a member of the Mississippi River Commission, under the provisions of section 2 of an act of Congress approved June 28, 1879 (21 Stat. 27:33 U. S. C. 642), vice Maj. Gen. Robert Walter Crawford, relieved.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment and promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be senior assistant pharmacists (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective January 1, 1949:

Abraham Wolfthal
William E. Dudley
Robert L. Capehart

To be assistant pharmacists (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective January 1, 1949:

Jean M. Lynch
Joseph J. Hackett

To be junior assistant pharmacists (equivalent to the Army rank of second lieutenant), effective January 1, 1949:

Edward J. Vesey
Lowell R. Pfau
Adelbert E. Briggs

Senior assistant surgeons to be surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective January 1, 1949:

Isaac M. Zigler
J. Howard Beard

Assistant surgeons to be senior assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective January 1, 1949:

Charles M. Gillikin
Robert F. Wettingfeld
Harry R. H. Nicholas III
Edward B. Lehmann
Alan F. Thometz
Daniel M. Enerson
James V. Woodworth

Assistant dental surgeons to be senior assistant dental surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective January 1, 1949:

Edmond G. Vanden Bosche
Tyler C. Folsom, Jr.

NOTE.—The above-named officers were appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

To be senior surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective dates indicated:

Charles L. Newberry, October 20, 1948.
Hildrus A. Poindexter, November 5, 1948.
Richard F. Boyd, December 29, 1948.

To be surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective dates indicated:

Harold Heller, June 30, 1948.
Frederick G. Gillick, July 16, 1948.
Michael J. Clarke, November 20, 1948.
James G. Telfer, December 14, 1948.

To be senior assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective dates indicated:

Calvin W. Applewhite, June 29, 1948.
James B. Gilbert, June 29, 1948.
J. Carter Wright, June 29, 1948.
Frederick E. Phillips, June 30, 1948.
J. D. Leggett, June 30, 1948.
Eldis M. Christensen, July 1, 1948.
Ted E. Becker, July 1, 1948.
Allen N. Koplin, July 1, 1948.
Roland H. Corbet, July 1, 1948.
John H. Tuohy, July 1, 1948.
P. Councilman Morgan, July 1, 1948.
Edwin B. Thomas, July 1, 1948.
David M. Dumville, July 1, 1948.
R. Raymond Green, July 1, 1948.
Donald J. Ottenberg, July 2, 1948.
Harold H. Davidson, July 2, 1948.
Jules Glenn, July 2, 1948.
John J. Johnson, July 2, 1948.
Eugene V. Nininger, July 3, 1948.
William H. Gutstein, July 3, 1948.
Frederick A. Thompson, Jr., July 5, 1948.
Richard A. Reiss, July 6, 1948.
Gerald Giges, July 6, 1948.
Robert W. Mowry, July 8, 1948.
Reed M. Broadbent, July 14, 1948.
Andrew G. Morrow, July 15, 1948.
Paul W. Rogers, July 15, 1948.
Robert O. Scow, July 22, 1948.
John P. Montroy, July 24, 1948.
Victor A. McKusick, October 1, 1948.
Charles H. Fish, October 1, 1948.

To be assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective dates indicated:

Victor A. McKusick, July 1, 1948.
John M. Vogel, July 1, 1948.
R. Guy Lewis, July 1, 1948.
David S. Wilder, July 1, 1948.
Glenn M. Gordon, July 1, 1948.
Robert L. Price, July 1, 1948.
Stewart M. Williams, July 1, 1948.
McClain Johnston, July 1, 1948.
Richard A. Saavedra, July 2, 1948.
Arnold W. Pratt, July 2, 1948.
Edward A. Rogers, Jr., July 3, 1948.
Gordon L. Farrell, July 8, 1948.
Albert L. Patrick, July 9, 1948.
Milton Sheinbein, July 16, 1948.
John F. Lowney, July 23, 1948.

To be dental surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date indicated:

Harry G. Trautman, June 28, 1948.

To be senior sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective dates indicated:

Hugh R. McCall, October 27, 1948.
Alfred H. Wieters, October 29, 1948.

To be sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective dates indicated:

M. Allen Pond, August 25, 1948.
Duncan A. Holaday, September 9, 1948.
Hayse H. Black, December 27, 1948.
Paul D. Haney, December 30, 1948.

To be senior assistant sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective dates indicated:

Bernard B. Berger, October 7, 1948.
Frederick S. Kent, October 8, 1948.
Donald J. Schliessmann, October 9, 1948.
Samuel R. Weibel, October 11, 1948.
Ernest P. Dubuque, November 23, 1948.
Ralph J. Johnson, November 24, 1948.
Sheldon L. Lang, November 24, 1948.
Lawrence B. Hall, November 24, 1948.

To be assistant sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective dates indicated:

Irwin P. Sander, October 1, 1948.
Robert L. Stenberg, October 7, 1948.
Ronald E. Bales, November 15, 1948.
Gerald N. McDermott, November 30, 1948.

To be junior assistant sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of second lieutenant), effective dates indicated:

Albert L. Platz, September 29, 1948.
Mary E. Rydberg, September 30, 1948.
Howard E. Ayer, October 1, 1948.
Frederick Nevins, October 1, 1948.
John G. Morris, October 2, 1948.
Leo Weaver, October 2, 1948.
Charles E. Sponagle, October 3, 1948.
Leland J. McCabe, Jr., October 3, 1948.
George W. Burke, Jr., October 7, 1948.
Dade W. Moeller, October 8, 1948.
John V. Miner, Jr., October 8, 1948.
George R. Shultz, October 28, 1948.
Robert A. Gerber, November 12, 1948.
James P. Sheehy, November 12, 1948.

To be pharmacists (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective dates indicated:

Guy H. Trimble, November 1, 1948.
J. Solon Mordell, November 10, 1948.

To be scientist directors (equivalent to the Army rank of colonel), effective dates indicated:

Lyndon F. Small, November 12, 1948.
Helmuth H. Schrenk, November 13, 1948.

To be scientists (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective dates indicated:

Clarence M. Tarzwell, June 29, 1948.
Leon Jacobs, December 30, 1948.

To be veterinarians (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective dates indicated:

William T. S. Thorp, July 1, 1948.
Robert T. Habermann, December 30, 1948.

To be senior assistant nurse officers (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective dates indicated:

Mary E. O'Connor, October 29, 1948.
Marie D. Grant, December 27, 1948.

To be assistant nurse officers (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective dates indicated:

Mary E. Allen, November 2, 1948.
Albina A. Bozym, November 19, 1948.
Joyce B. Beveridge, December 13, 1948.

To be assistant nurse officers (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective dates indicated (continued):

Mildred E. Barnett, December 27, 1948.
Ruth E. Anderson, December 27, 1948.

To be junior assistant nurse officers (equivalent to the Army rank of second lieutenant), effective dates indicated:

Florence A. Canada, November 2, 1948.
Marion E. O'Neil, November 15, 1948.
Frances R. Donoghue, November 26, 1948.

Surgeons to be senior surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective dates indicated:

Fortunat A. Troie, July 1, 1948.
Oswald F. Hedley, July 1, 1948.
Paul A. Neal, July 1, 1948.
Erwin W. Blatter, July 1, 1948.
George G. Van Dyke, July 1, 1948.
Waldemar J. A. Wickman, July 1, 1948.
Donald W. Patrick, July 1, 1948.
Calvin B. Spencer, July 1, 1948.
Victor H. Haas, July 1, 1948.
Bert R. Boone, July 1, 1948.
Carroll E. Palmer, July 1, 1948.
W. Palmer Dearing, July 10, 1948.
Alexander G. Gilliam, July 10, 1948.
Leonard A. Scheele, July 10, 1948.
Frederick J. Brady, August 20, 1948.
Thomas H. Tomlinson, Jr., August 22, 1948.
John R. Heller, Jr., October 15, 1948.
Henry A. Holle, November 1, 1948.
Arthur B. Price, November 3, 1948.
Paul E. Walker, December 1, 1948.
Theodore J. Bauer, December 1, 1948.
Thorburn S. McGowan, December 1, 1948.
Wilson T. Sowder, December 1, 1948.
John W. Hornbrook, December 1, 1948.
Seward E. Miller, December 1, 1948.
John E. Dunn, December 1, 1948.
Eugene A. Gillis, December 15, 1948.
Anthony Donovan, December 20, 1948.
John W. Cronin, December 29, 1948.
Havelock F. Fraser, December 29, 1948.
Jonathan B. Peebles, Jr., December 29, 1948.
Edgar W. Moreland, December 29, 1948.
Harry Heimann, December 29, 1948.
John B. Alsever, December 29, 1948.
Alexander A. Doerner, December 29, 1948.
Russell E. Teague, December 29, 1948.
Abraham Wikler, December 29, 1948.
Mabel Ross, December 29, 1948.
Lydia B. Edwards, December 29, 1948.
Ira Lewis, December 29, 1948.
Carl M. Eklund, December 29, 1948.
Ladislaus J. Zbranek, December 29, 1948.
Erwin C. Drescher, December 29, 1948.
Marion B. Noyes, December 29, 1948.
John B. Hozier, December 29, 1948.
Virgil J. Dorset, December 29, 1948.
Curtis R. Chaffin, December 29, 1948.
Paul T. Erickson, December 29, 1948.
Eugene W. Green, December 29, 1948.
Hugh L. C. Wilkerson, December 29, 1948
Robert L. Cherry, December 29, 1948.
Charles F. Blankenship, December 29, 1948.
Frederick J. Krueger, December 29, 1948.
Frank S. French, December 29, 1948.
Harold M. Janney, December 29, 1948.
Russell O. Settle, December 29, 1948.
Robert F. Martin, December 29, 1948.
Herman E. Hilleboe, December 29, 1948.
John R. McGibony, December 29, 1948.
Theodore L. Perrin, December 29, 1948.
Harris Isbell, December 29, 1948.
David J. Zaugg, December 29, 1948.
Howard D. Fishburn, December 29, 1948.
Rolla R. Wolcott, December 29, 1948.
James F. Lane, December 29, 1948.

John N. Bowden, December 29, 1948.
Ralph B. Hogan, December 29, 1948.
Waldo B. Edwards, December 29, 1948.
Henry W. Kassel, December 29, 1948.
Vernon B. Link, December 29, 1948.
Norman H. Topping, December 29, 1948.
James A. Grider, Jr., December 29, 1948.
Byron J. Olson, December 29, 1948.
Harold R. Sandstead, December 29, 1948.

Senior assistant surgeons to be surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective dates indicated:

Samuel C. Ingraham II, July 7, 1948.
David M. Gould, July 7, 1948.
Robert E. Miller, July 11, 1948.
Donald J. Birmingham, July 14, 1948.
Roland K. Iverson, December 18, 1948.
Bernard D. Davis, December 29, 1948.
Raymond Hofstra, December 29, 1948.
Will H. Aufranc, December 29, 1948.
James A. Hunter, December 29, 1948.
Burnet M. Davis, December 29, 1948.
Paul V. Joliet, December 29, 1948.
Gilein F. Meadors, December 29, 1948.
William L. Hewitt, December 29, 1948.
George A. Shipman, December 29, 1948.
John C. Cutler, December 29, 1948.
David S. Ruhe, December 29, 1948.
Carruth J. Wagner, December 29, 1948.
George W. Comstock, December 29, 1948.
H. Charles Franklin, December 29, 1948.
William C. Jenkins, Jr., December 29, 1948.
Randolph P. Grimm, December 29, 1948.
Elmer L. Hill, December 29, 1948.
Robert M. Foote, December 29, 1948.
James F. Maddux, December 29, 1948.
Eugene J. Gillespie, December 29, 1948.
Bertrand E. Bennison, December 29, 1948.
I. Ray Howard, December 29, 1948.
Robert H. English, December 29, 1948.
Edward T. Blomquist, December 29, 1948.
John B. Spriggs, December 29, 1948.
William H. Errgong, Jr., December 29, 1948.
James L. Elliott, December 29, 1948.
Willys M. Monroe, December 29, 1948.
John J. Davies, December 29, 1948.
Leon A. Heppel, December 29, 1948.
Arthur Kornberg, December 29, 1948.
Andrew P. Sackett, December 29, 1948.
Fred W. Thyng, December 29, 1948.
Leroy R. Allen, December 29, 1948.
Theodore E. Hynson, December 29, 1948.
Glenn H. Algire, December 29, 1948.
Mary Walton, December 29, 1948.
John C. Hume, December 29, 1948.
Elton S. Osborne, Jr., December 29, 1948.
Robert W. Rasor, December 29, 1948.
William W. Richards, December 29, 1948.
Lewis C. Robbins, December 29, 1948.
Willoughby J. Rothrock, Jr., December 29, 1948.
James A. Salmons, December 29, 1948.
Frederic C. Bartter, December 29, 1948.
Herbert Tabor, December 29, 1948.
Milton I. Roemer, December 29, 1948.
Carl R. Kunstling, December 29, 1948.
Griffith E. Quinby, December 29, 1948.
Robert J. Huebner, December 29, 1948.
Jacob C. Wagner, December 29, 1948.
Fred W. Harb, December 29, 1948.
Arthur L. Koven, December 29, 1948.
Leo P. Krall, Jr., December 29, 1948.
William G. Hollister, December 29, 1948.
George J. Cooper, Jr., December 29, 1948.
Joseph Kovacs, Jr., December 29, 1948.
J. Frederick Bell, December 29, 1948.
William Roemmich, December 29, 1948.
Paulo de A. Pamplona, December 29, 1948.
James O. Davis, December 29, 1948.
Richard B. Stephenson, December 29, 1948.
Maurice L. Brodsky, December 29, 1948.
Raymond F. Corpe, December 29, 1948.
George Adams, December 29, 1948.
James T. Hearin, December 29, 1948.
Robert Guthrie, December 29, 1948.
Robert L. Faucett, December 29, 1948.

Assistant surgeon to be senior assistant surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of captain):

Raymond W. Herrmann, December 29, 1948.

Dental surgeons to be senior dental surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective dates indicated:

Oscar Mikkelsen, July 1, 1948.
Ralph S. Lloyd, July 2, 1948.
John W. Knutson, July 2, 1948.
George E. Jones, July 2, 1948.
William P. Kroschel, July 2, 1948.
Bruce D. Forsyth, July 2, 1948.
Henry F. Canby, November 15, 1948.
Norman F. Gerrie, December 29, 1948.
Robert M. Stephan, December 29, 1948.
Herbert A. Spencer, Jr., December 29, 1948.
Charles H. Wright, Jr., December 29, 1948.
Howard J. Woodbridge, December 29, 1948.
Francis A. Arnold, Jr., December 29, 1948.
William W. Calhoun, Jr., December 29, 1948.
George E. Waterman, December 29, 1948.

Senior assistant dental surgeons to be dental surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective dates indicated:

Edward J. Driscoll, December 29, 1948.
George A. Nevitt, December 29, 1948.
Eugene H. Hess, December 29, 1948.
Howard K. Wyatt, December 29, 1948.
Dennis E. Singleton, Jr., December 29, 1948.
John C. Heckel, December 29, 1948.
Earl C. Hewitt, December 29, 1948.
Maurice S. Rodgers, December 29, 1948.
Carl E. Johnson, December 29, 1948.
John W. Holt, December 29, 1948.
David B. Scott, December 29, 1948.

Assistant dental surgeon to be senior assistant dental surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date indicated:

Frank W. Nelson, December 29, 1948.

Sanitary engineers to be senior sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective dates indicated:

Elmer J. Herringer, October 1, 1948.
Walter N. Dashiell, December 29, 1948.

Senior assistant sanitary engineers to be sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective dates indicated:

Russell W. Hart, August 1, 1948.
Malcolm C. Hope, September 19, 1948.
Fredrick C. Roberts, Jr., December 29, 1948.
Harry G. Hanson, December 29, 1948.
Wesley E. Gilbertson, December 29, 1948.
Callis H. Atkins, December 29, 1948.
Edmund C. Garthe, December 29, 1948.
Chris A. Hansen, December 29, 1948.
Frank Tetzlaff, December 29, 1948.
Albert H. Stevenson, December 29, 1948.
Ralph C. Palange, December 29, 1948.
Richard S. Green, December 29, 1948.
Richard S. Mark, December 29, 1948.
Arthur H. Neill, December 29, 1948.
George D. Clayton, December 29, 1948.
Richard F. Poston, December 29, 1948.
Charles D. Spangler, December 29, 1948.
Hershel Engler, December 29, 1948.
Leonard M. Board, December 29, 1948.
Kaarlo W. Nasi, December 29, 1948.
Richard L. Woodward, December 29, 1948.
Elroy K. Day, December 29, 1948.
Gerald W. Ferguson, December 29, 1948.
Conrad P. Straub, December 29, 1948.
Henry L. Roahrig, December 29, 1948.
Ernest C. Anderson, December 29, 1948.
George L. Carley, Jr., December 29, 1948.
Donald L. Snow, December 29, 1948.
Roscoe H. Goeke, December 29, 1948.
Graham Walton, December 29, 1948.
Ralph C. Graber, December 29, 1948.
Herbert W. Haas, December 29, 1948.
William W. Payne, December 29, 1948.
Howard W. Chapman, December 29, 1948.
William E. Holy, December 29, 1948.
Richard Hammerstrom, December 29, 1948.
Henry N. Doyle, December 29, 1948.
Leonard B. Dworsky, December 29, 1948.

Scientists to be senior scientists (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective dates indicated:

Howard L. Andrews, July 1, 1948.
Joseph M. Bobbitt, December 29, 1948.
Samuel W. Simmons, December 29, 1948.
Sidney H. Newman, December 29, 1948.
Harry J. Bennett, December 29, 1948.
John C. Kereszteszy, December 29, 1948.

Senior assistant scientists to be scientists (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective dates indicated:

Lewis J. Cralley, December 6, 1948.
Pope A. Lawrence, December 29, 1948.
Harry D. Pratt, December 29, 1948.
Roy F. Fritz, December 29, 1948.
Ralph C. Barnes, December 29, 1948.
H. Page Nicholson, December 29, 1948.
John A. Rowe, December 29, 1948.
Francis M. Middleton, December 29, 1948.
Don E. Eyles, December 29, 1948.
Raymond Fagan, December 29, 1948.
George A. Hottle, December 29, 1948.
William J. Bowen, December 29, 1948.
Falconer Smith, December 29, 1948.
Samuel B. Salvin, December 29, 1948.
William C. Frohne, December 29, 1948.
Harold B. Robinson, December 29, 1948.
Dohrman H. Byers, December 29, 1948.
Dale R. Lindsay, December 29, 1948.
Oliver R. Placak, December 29, 1948.
Marion M. Brooke, December 29, 1948.
William W. Smith, December 29, 1948.
David B. Lackman, December 29, 1948.
Howard W. Bond, December 29, 1948.
Elmer G. Berry, December 29, 1948.
John H. Hughes, December 29, 1948.

Senior assistant veterinarian to be veterinarian (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date indicated:

James H. Steele, December 29, 1948.

Assistant nurse officers to be senior assistant nurse officers (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective dates indicated:

Loretta C. Parsons, July 1, 1948.
Viola E. Matheson, July 1, 1948.
Madge M. Neill, July 1, 1948.
Ruth N. Crawford, July 1, 1948.
Florence T. Thieman, July 1, 1948.
Mary A. Brimberry, July 1, 1948.
Mary A. Rice, July 1, 1948.
Irma C. Thomsen, July 1, 1948.
Magdalene E. Roller, July 1, 1948.
Elizabeth C. Laczko, July 1, 1948.
Hazel E. Owen, July 1, 1948.
Katherine L. Tucker, July 1, 1948.
Mary Matthews, July 1, 1948.
Beatrice Zingle, July 1, 1948.
Adele L. Henderson, July 1, 1948.
Gertrude L. Anderson, July 1, 1948.
M. Lois McMinn, July 1, 1948.
Gertrude I. Miller, July 1, 1948.
Myra I. Johnson, July 1, 1948.
Helen Gertz, July 1, 1948.
M. Estelle Hunt, July 1, 1948.
Jean C. Feely, July 1, 1948.
H. Jean McIver, July 1, 1948.
Irma M. Lamberti, July 1, 1948.
Arne L. Bulkeley, July 1, 1948.
Dorothy G. Erickson, July 1, 1948.
Henrietta Smellow, July 1, 1948.
Stella M. Williams, July 1, 1948.
Winifred M. Mendez, July 1, 1948.
Sally Wladis, July 1, 1948.
Flora Jacobs, July 1, 1948.
Henrietta Rust, July 1, 1948.
M. Elizabeth McBride, July 1, 1948.
Sylvia Simon, July 1, 1948.
Helen E. Enright, July 1, 1948.
Mary E. Ingle, July 1, 1948.
Marie F. Henzel, July 1, 1948.
Edna L. Easterday, December 29, 1948.
Anne J. Lello, December 29, 1948.
Genevieve T. Piette, December 29, 1948.
Helen A. Gentilman, December 29, 1948.
Latis M. Campbell, December 29, 1948.
Anne K. Buck, December 29, 1948.
Mary F. Callan, December 29, 1948.
Dorothy L. Connors, December 29, 1948.
Vivian L. Gibson, December 29, 1948.
Mary B. Krause, December 29, 1948.
Emilie S. Wilson, December 29, 1948.
Florence J. Ullman, December 29, 1948.
Jennie Rakich, December 29, 1948.

Junior assistant nurse officers to be assistant nurse officers (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective dates indicated:

Joan M. Norkunas, July 13, 1948.
Norma G. Russell, August 1, 1948.
Margaret M. Sweeney, October 20, 1948.

Assistant dietitians to be senior assistant dietitians (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective dates indicated:

Myrtle M. Morris, July 1, 1948.
E. Grace Gibson, July 1, 1948.
Engla J. Anderson, July 1, 1948.

NOTE.—The above-named officers were appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Gen. Omar Nelson Bradley, O3807, Chief of Staff (major general, U. S. Army), for appointment as general in the Regular Army of the United States under the provisions of Public Law 791, Eightieth Congress, approved June 26, 1948.

Maj. Gen. Willard Stewart Paul, O5616, United States Army, retired, for advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list under the provisions of subsection 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

Lt. Gen. Stephen J. Chamberlin, O3397, United States Army (major general, U. S. Army), for appointment as Commanding General, Fifth Army, with the rank of lieutenant general.

NOTE.—Lieutenant General Chamberlin was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

To be major generals

*Maj. Gen. Alexander Russell Bolling, O7548, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Edmond Harrison Leavey, O8559, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Bryant Edward Moore, O8633, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Doyle Overlton Hickey, O10123, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. David Goodwin Barr, O10313, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

*Col. Vennard Wilson, O7207, United States Army.

*Col. Paul Wolcott Rutledge, O7289, United States Army.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of section 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be brigadier generals

*Col. Albert Pierson, O11838, United States Army.

*Col. Joseph Pescia Sullivan, O5328, United States Army.

*Col. Fenton Stratton Jacobs, O6931, United States Army.

*Col. Letcher Ogle Grice, O8273, United States Army.

*Col. Hugh Bryan Hester, O8405, United States Army.

*Col. Kester Lovejoy Hastings, O12219, United States Army.

NOTE.—Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (*) were appointed during the recess of the Senate.

The following-named officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army of the United States without specification of branch, arm, or service:

First Lt. John Marshall Evans, O39493, Medical Service Corps, United States Army.

First Lt. James Rock Walpole, O38579, Medical Service Corps, United States Army.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion.

To be first lieutenants

Donald Wesley Alberti, O56695.
Douglas Albright Armstrong, O38527.
Bud L. Jones, O38522.
×Leo Thomas McMahon, Jr., O41352.
William Jeremiah McNeese, O41354.
Howard Deschler Rhodes, O50525.
Jasper Clyde Vance, Jr., O56715.
John Henry Von Der Bruegge, Jr., O38523.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947:

To be first lieutenant, Women's Medical Specialist Corps

Joyce Bodycomb, J22.
Francine B. Bundt, M10018.
Josephine Mary Burt, M10081.
Ruth Eleanor Clevenger, M10049.
Mae Augusta Engsberg, M10032.
Theresa Maria Ferrazzoli, M10080.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE AIR FORCE

Gen. Carl Spaatz, AO3706, Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, for appointment as general, United States Air Force, with rank from February 11, 1945, under the provisions of Public Law 791, Eightieth Congress.

NOTE.—General Spaatz was granted a recess appointment as general under the provisions of this law on June 28, 1948, and retired thereunder on June 30, 1948.

The following-named officers for appointment to the positions indicated under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

Lt. Gen. Elwood Richard Quesada, AO16731, Air Force of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), to be special assistant to the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, for Reserve Forces, with the rank of lieutenant general, with rank from October 1, 1947.

Lt. Gen. Curtis Emerson LeMay, AO17917, Air Force of the United States (major general, U. S. Air Force), to be commanding general, Strategic Air Command, United States Air Force, with the rank of lieutenant general, with rank from October 1, 1947.

Col. Reginald Carl Harmon, AO28796, Air Force of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), for appointment as Judge Advocate General, United States Air Force, with the rank of major general, for the period of 4 years beginning September 8, 1948, under the provisions of Public Law 775, Eightieth Congress.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Air Force of the United States under the provisions of section 515, Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Richard Cox Coupland, AO9792, United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Kenneth Perry McNaughton, AO16491, Air Force of the United States (colonel, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. Thomas Sarsfield Power, AO17854, Air Force of the United States (colonel, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. Robert Whitney Burns, AO17961, Air Force of the United States (colonel, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. Carl Amandus Brandt, AO18171, Air Force of the United States (colonel, U. S. Air Force).

To be brigadier generals

Col. Abraham Robert Ginsburgh, AO9747, United States Air Force.

Col. Wallace Gordon Smith, AO11471, United States Air Force.

Col. James Francis Joseph Early, AO18212, United States Air Force.

Col. James Elbert Briggs, AO17103, United States Air Force.

Col. Howard Graham Bunker, AO17200, United States Air Force.

Col. Walter Campbell Sweeney, Jr., AO18080, United States Air Force.

Col. Millard Lewis, AO18163, United States Air Force.

Col. Robert Broussard Landry, AO16868, United States Air Force.

Col. Pierpont Morgan Hamilton, AO900788, United States Air Force Reserve.

Col. John Bevier Ackerman, AO18706, United States Air Force.

NOTE.—Prior to being placed on their present assignments, Lieutenant Generals Quesada and LeMay were assigned as Commanding General, Tactical Air Command, and Commanding General, United States Air Forces in Europe, respectively. All of the officers named on this nomination received recess appointments to the positions and/or grades indicated, except Col. John B. Ackerman, AO18706, United States Air Force, whose name is contained in paragraph 3 of this nomination.

IN THE NAVY

Admiral Raymond A. Spruance for permanent appointment in the grade of admiral in the Navy as authorized by Public Law 791, Eightieth Congress.

The following-named officers to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving under a designation in accordance with section 413 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

Vice Adm. George D. Murray, United States Navy.

Vice Adm. Gerald F. Bogan, United States Navy.

Vice Adm. Russell S. Berkey, United States Navy.

Vice Adm. Donald B. Beary, United States Navy.

Vice Adm. Felix B. Stump, United States Navy.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the line of the Navy:

Wesley M. Hague	Walter G. Schindler
Thomas H. Binford	George L. Russell
Walter E. Moore	Milton E. Miles
Burton B. Biggs	Harold D. Baker
Grover B. H. Hall	Thomas M. Stokes
Lorenzo S. Sabin, Jr.	Robert E. Blick, Jr.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 510 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion.

To be colonels, Dental Corps, with rank from August 10, 1948

Col. James Melvin Epperly, O16283, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Marvin Edward Kennebeck, O16523, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Walter Edwin Chase, O16937, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Mackey Joseph Beal, O16350, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Kenneth Pearce Fulton, O16938, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Harold George Ott, O16977, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Arthur Letcher Irons, O16526, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Dale Bowlby Ridgely, O17797, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Clarence Price Canby, O17964, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Roger Giles Miller, O17798, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. James Simon Cathroe, O18312, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Tyler James Walker, O19324, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 518 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion.

To be lieutenant colonels, Medical Corps, with rank from July 1, 1948

Lt. Col. Merrill Hubert Judd, O51128, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Albert Russel Dreisbach, O18928, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. William Weaver Nichol, O18939, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Richard Paul Johnson, O18940, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Joseph Upton Weaver, O18941, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leonard Frank Wilson, O19243, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Major Samuel White, O18944, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. George Prazak, O18951, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Roger Hubbard Allbee, O19299, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Urho Robert Merikangas, O19300, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. John Bernard Herman, O19301, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Joseph Pease Russell, O18919, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Paul Aloysius Keeney, O29143, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jackson Bernard Dipmukes, O29144, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Clifford Gordon Blitch, O19302, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Robert Shaeffer, O29152, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Purcell Rea, O19326, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Llewellyn Cox, O29153, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Houser Matuska, O29155, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Arthur Eugene White, O19328, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Henry Schuldt Murphey, O19338, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. George Merle Powell, O19340, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Henry Morhouse, O19342, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. John Lemoin Crawford, O19343, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Claude Cordray Dodson, O20495, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Walter Herbert Stevenson, O41705, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dan Roy Sewell, O39496, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. William Darrell Willis, C20496, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Joseph Marren, O41706, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Emmett Montgomery Smith, O29161, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Vernon James Erkenbeck, O19304, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Herbert Thompson, O19305, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Joe Alexander Bain, O19308, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Col. Cecil Spencer Mollohan, O19309, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Francis Whitney Hall, O19310, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Richard Howard Eckhardt, O19312, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. John Mars Caldwell, Jr., O19313, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Parmalee Ward, O19314, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elmer Arthur Lodmell, O19315, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Lester Paul Veigel, O19317, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. George Lewis Beatty, O19318, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Harold Irvin Amory, O19319, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Edgar Louis Olson, O19322, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Edwards Spellman, O19655, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Joe Harrell, O16929, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Merle Everett Smith, O56785, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Frank Errett Hamilton, O29170, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Col. Gordon G. Bulla, O19597, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. William Albert Todd, Jr., O19598, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. James Bowdoin Stapleton, O19656, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Floyd Lawrence Wergeland, O19599, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Stultz Brua, O19600, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. James Willis Howard, O19601, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. James Sherwood Taylor, O19602, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Jenner Garnett Jones, O19603, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Eaton Wesley Bennett, O19604, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Tom French Whayne, O19657, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Erling Severre Fugelso, O20950, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Joseph Garber Cocke, O19658, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Alfonso Michael Libasci, O19606, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Owings Alexander, O19607, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Daniel John Wallgora, O20055, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dell Fred Dullum, O21011, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Byron Ludwig Steger, O19661, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Louie Render Braswell, O19662, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Bateman Draper, O29176, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Estes Blount, O19612, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Curtis Franklin Culp, O41713, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Heinz Kuraner, O19665, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Emmett Leroy Kehoe, O19613, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Knox Dunlap, O19667, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stephen Dominic Berardinelli, O19668, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Col. Jacob Rell Till, Jr., O23657, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Lawrence Carter Ball, O19616, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Richard Leland Bohannon, O21012, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Col. John Knox Cullen, O19617, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Howard William Doan, O20037, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Weston Boal, O20058, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Max Plagens, O41714, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Dean Schamber, O20497, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Frank Dominick, O29190, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fred William Seymour, O19671, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Col. Joseph Arthur Baird, O19672, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Allan Arthur Craig, O19621, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. James Emile Graham, O19622, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Col. Jay Franchel Gamel, O19623, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Aubrey L. Jennings, O19673, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Titus Sichi, O19674, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Col. James Goree Moore, O20531, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert LaShore Callison, O19648, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. William Donald Graham, O20067, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene Coryell Jacobs, O20499, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. William Warren Roe, Jr., O19675, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earle Henry Christenson, O56792, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Quimby Simmons, Jr., O41720, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Albert Alfred Biederman, O20501, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas William Mattingly, O20068, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. William Fred Patient, O19626, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Hugh Latimer Westbrook, Jr., O19625, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alfred August Grebe, O20502, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Joseph Frank Peters, O20075, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. George Benjamin Green, O29196, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Col. Donald Davis Flickinger, O19677, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Marion Richmond, O19678, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Morris DeYoung, O20076, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Angvald Vickoren, O19680, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Emmert Carl Lentz, O20503, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. James Leslie Snyder, O19627, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Thair Cozzens Rich, O19631, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Hugh Lane, O19632, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Byron Glen McKibben, O19633, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Tuthill Gants, O19636, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. George Foster Peer, O19638, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Everus Harrison, O20078, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Warner Fremont Bowers, O29197, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Marshall Nelson Jensen, O20504, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stephen Christopher Sitter, O20079, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Angel Antonio Cardona, O24299, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Rudolf Wernitznig, O20505, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lewis Calvin Shellenberger, O20506, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. John Andrew Schindler, O38642, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Sheldon Seymour Brownton, O38643, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Woods Shiflet, O20507, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Paul Alexander Paden, O20981, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Delmar Eichler Domke, O22788, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gottlieb Leonard Orth, O20509, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Colvin Wood Salley, O29205, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roland Sigurd Aronson, O29206, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Alexander Cleve, O20510, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Douglas Blair Kendrick, Jr., O20511, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Walter McCoy, Jr., O19685, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. James Clark Van Valin, O20080, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lucius George Thomas, O19688, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Victor Robert Hirschmann, O20081, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Fred Howenstine Mowrey, O19687, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Hubert Thaddeus Marshall, O19689, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Byrd Stryker, O19691, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. William Langford Spaulding, O19704, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. John Thompson Brown Strode, O19709, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army.)

Lt. Col. Paul Hartsock Leach, O20082, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Felix Shelley Bambace, O56797, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Ralph Moody Patterson, O21013, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Louis Harmon Jobe, Jr., O22777, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Rex Clayton House, O20515, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Clifford Paul Michael, O20083, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Oscar Samuel Reeder, O20086, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert John Hoagland, O20516, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Kenneth Fair, O29222, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Leo Tobin, O19705, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Allen Nelson Bracher, O19706, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ronald Fisher Kirk, O20517, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Alvin Conrad, O39654, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Fisher, O20982, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Bryan Coleman Thomas Fenton, O20088, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Leon Marx, O22262, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Aloysius Thomas Waskowicz, O19708, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Anthony Czerwinski, O38646, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Joseph Farinacci, O20518, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Gladen Robert Hamilton, O20089, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward August Zimmermann, O29230, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alfred Joseph Ackermann, O51156, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earl Francis Harris, O41730, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Gus Warlick Neece, O20521, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ryle August Radke, O20522, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Scott Murray Smith, O20524, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Louis Keller Pohl, O21479, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Reed Kelley, O20964, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Warren Henry Diessner, O20519, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert LaTourrette Cavenaugh, O20090, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maurice Crawford Davidson, O20106, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Henry Bramlitt, O20030, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Stuart Nelson, O20111, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bruno Jastremski, O20526, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore Moffett Carow, O20527, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Polk Sullivan, O20528, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Wanless Clotfelter, O20029, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Col. George Frederick Baier 3d, O20034, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Louis Kenneth Mantell, O20035, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Harry King, Jr., O20036, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert White DuPriest, O20039, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marco Romolo Bonsignore, O29237, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Hyman Richard Ocheroff, O21015, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. William Edgar Wilkinson, O20529, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Henry Mitchell, O41731, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Harden Schutt, O20107, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Anderson Strickland, Jr., O20400, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Edwin Matthew Goyette, O20530, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Harold Allen Myers, O20532, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hartwin Adolph Schulze, O21474, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Frank Hiram Van Wagoner, O20095, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Clarence Asa Tinsman, O20390, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Bullen Peterson, O20535, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond McKinley Williams, O20399, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Lloyd Ethan Gould, O20538, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Horace Byrne, O29244, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Armand Kind, O20936, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Col. Theodore Cleveland Bedwell, Jr., O22701, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

To be majors, Medical Corps, with rank from July 1, 1948

Lt. Col. Wilbur Warren Hiehle, O22275, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Everett Marquis Chalker, O30901, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Col. Everett Charles Freer, O22275, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Eugene Hudson, O22278, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Hamilton Bryarlie Dear, O22279, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Gladding Moseley, O22765, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Harold Hammond, O51958, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Wellington Brown, O22296, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Wesley Hayes, O30903, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alva Edward Miller, O22283, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Gilmore McShatko, O22285, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Byron Atlee Nichol, O22286, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Norman Elwood King, O22287, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Mayo Talbot, O22289, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Rolland Bernard Sigafoos, O22291, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Leonce Hullinghorst, O22292, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Neil Ekman, O22293, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Laurence Addison Potter, O22294, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Patrick Lauer, O30904, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Marshall Salyer, O23570, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Carl Winn Hall, O22302, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Slowko Zelenik, O43124, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Tillman Davis Johnson, O22301, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Michael Deane Buscemi, O22303, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Col. James Samuel Flaackerly, O22306, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Curtis Harrell, O22307, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hensley Starling Johnson, O22309, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fredrick Clinton Hopp, O22311, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harvey Clark Boyd, O22312, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carroll Steiner Svare, O22313, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward John Doyle, O22314, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Russell Burton Watson, O23582, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Stanley Bagnall, O24382, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Herbott Kerr, O22699, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Andrew Kostecki, O30910, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Aaron Louis Kaminsky, O23593, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Knight Bayne, O30913, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Taylor Dubuy, O23650, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Larry Allen Smith, O22767, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Col. Frederick Joseph Frese, Jr., O23637, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carlos Coolidge Alden, Jr., O30915, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Dominick Minerva, O51962, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore Livingston Hartridge, O22763, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maurice Riordan Connolly, O22791, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Nagle, O23601, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Louis Berman, O22697, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Isaiah Alonzo Wiles, O22709, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Blackford Look, O23668, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Charles Ellison Melcher, O22708, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Franklin Leo Spann, O23641, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kermit Hudson Anderson, O23572, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Robbins deForest, O23584, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Woody Harwood, O36920, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Glenn Jesse Collins, O22687, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cannon Armstrong Owen, O22688, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Nelson Piper, O22690, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Ross Marshall, O22692, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Thomas Martin, O22694, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank James Shaffer, O22695, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Edward Thomas, O22700, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Otis Whittier Snyder, O22702, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Beverley Eugene Smith, O22706, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward James Dehne, O51965, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hubert Lynn Binkley, O23594, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Nelson Sumner Irey, O30926, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Murble Henry Pearson, O23661, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Eugene Shuey, O23640, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stuart Irvin Draper, O23599, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Gardiner, O23600, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jake William Hearn, O22780, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Gold, O24314, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Frederick Funsch, O22785, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Abram Salmon Benenson, O24295, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Claude Milton Eberhart, O51967, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Glenn Thompson, O23568, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hayden Waldo Withers, O23571, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Manah Robert Halbouty, O23580, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Augustus Marion Davison, O43130, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Henry Spillane, O30932, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Edward Lyons, O23639, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, United States Army).

Lt. Col. Oscar Peyton Moffitt, Jr., O22764, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Hardy Sullivan, Jr., O22770, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sterling James Ritchey, O22771, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Philip Alexander Bergman, O22772, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Brown Gordon, O22774, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Edward Sams, O22776, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Ward Regan, O22783, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry James Grossman, O22786, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Don S. Wenger, O22787, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Buffington Graves, O22790, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert Haney Brooks, O25152, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Brooks Dickerson, O40103, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Arista Wier, O26416, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Owen Allen Groves, O43133, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Charles Burry, O23569, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Christian Rauscher, O23573, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Fratie L. Duff, O23566, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert William Coone, O43135, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Warren Jackson Barker, O23638, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Robert Lawrence, O30944, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Goodwin Rate, O24372, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ivan Charles Dimmick, Jr., O24308, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bronko Peter Lelich, O23574, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Henry Crouch, O23587, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Thomas Rush, O23591, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Stanton Fraser, O23595, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Willard Ferguson Angen, O23596, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Roscoe Grunwell, Jr., O23597, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Jack Bollerud, O23602, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sanford Williams French 3d, O23603, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Morris Hardaway 3d, O24301, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Maj. N. Robert Drummond, O24367, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Norton Schwartz, O24324, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Spencer Amos O'Brian, O23658, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Raleigh Howard Lackay, O24366, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Walter Henrik Moursund, Jr., O24305, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Weldon Joseph Walker, O24307, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Phillip Benjamin Smith, O30952, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bruce Hardy Bennett, O26968, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Taylor Beeler, Jr., O23635, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Vincent Michael Downey, O30956, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Charles Hudson Talbott, O23655, Medical Corps, Army of the United States, (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William David Tigertt, O26412, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Louis Bernhard Arnoldi, O36822, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Frederick Tessmer, O24300, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Humbert Lewis Riva, O26947, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James William Humphreys, Jr., O23644, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elwyn Nickell Akers, O24379, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Harold Bornstein, O23648, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Irving Richard Lyman, O24319, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Willard Henry Cleveland, O23647, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Picicchy, Jr., O24327, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, United States Army).

Maj. Edwin Stow Chapman, O24318, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Ziegler Berry, O23665, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Raymond Henry, O24310, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Vernon Potter, O26434, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Selby Andreson, Jr., O30962, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Todd DeVan, O26440, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Nicholas Furst, O23653, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Anthony Butkus, O23659, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harvey George Tousignant, O23662, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Philip Harney, O23663, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vernon David Pettit, O23664, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lee Frank Ferrell, O23669, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Charles Hunter, Jr., O23680, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Shepherd Smith, O30968, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Thayer Smith, O24341, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Withers Lyddon, O26413, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carlton Willard Sargent, O26991, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Orland Stenberg Olsen, O26399, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Otto Albert Wurl, O24309, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David George Eisner, O30984, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Maj. John Edward Boysen, O30985, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Justice Brightwell, O51982, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Burt Nelson Coers, O30989, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Sivley Moore, O30992, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Millar Sabin, Jr., O30993, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alfred Allen Hellams, O56825, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Theodore Alexander Kiersch, O24386, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alex Brown, O24540, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alfred Hiller Bungardt, O26403, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U .S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Stoddert Parker, O24317, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Mitchell Willis, Jr., O24389, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Alphonzo Mantz, Jr., O26414, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Colin Francis Vorder Bruegge, O26958, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thurman Knight Hill, O26404, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Sugden Paul, O24311, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Sidney Rice, O24326, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Joseph Carbonell, O24626, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Celestin Le Golvan, O24634, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Edward Block, O24636, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Felix Claudius Feamster, O25145, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Laurence Mercer Hursh, O25146, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leo Joseph Geppert, O26406, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Louis Caspar Kossuth, O26437, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Lennox Brown, O26436, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Hicks Holmes, O24625, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Patrick Campbell, O24633, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Holmes Crosby, Jr., O24639, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Kernaghan Mills, O25142, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Joseph Maloney, O25147, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederic John Hughes, Jr., O26370, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Abraham Chartock, O24638, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Andrew Carroll Offutt, O25143, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Morrow Webb, O25148, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Archer Orbison, O26405, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Dan Crozier, O26408, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Emil Joseph Genetti, O26965, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Gregory Thalmann, Jr., O24303, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. William John Brown, O24315, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Henry Vogel, Jr., O24321, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

To be captains, Medical Corps, with rank from July 1, 1948

Capt. Samuel Oscar Smelsey, O37633, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Joseph Brennan, Jr., O56933, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Neal Rupert Fisher, O49943, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Hoyt Jenkins, Jr., O49944, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Elmore Mitchell Aronstam, O56211, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Osborn Rixey, O39341, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Thomas Long, O56936, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Carroll Sanders Crawford, O56937, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ben Allen Rutledge, O49950, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Byron Henry Johnson, O56941, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ralph Stewart Penner, O56223, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Guy Walker Dean, Jr., O56225, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Henry Moncrief, Jr., O37637, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Philip Makel, O56227, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Ehrenfeld Edwards, O56945, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richmond Shepard Paine, O56938, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Aubrey Kenna Brown, Jr., O49959, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Earl William Brannon, Jr., O56231, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Carter Hernquist, O56949, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Glenn Edward Horton, O49960, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel Currie Campbell, Jr., O49964, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lorenz Eugene Zimmerman, O56221, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vern Leo Lester, O56961, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Burt Rowen, O56245, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Valerius Hastings, O49968, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Edmond Purvis, O56963, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Randall William Briggs, O56962, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joe Hamilton Cannon, O56964, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Benjamin Garber Musser, O56894, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Stuart Hodge Walker, O56247, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Garland Wood, Jr., O56967, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Hubble Wilkins, O56222, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ralph Nicholas Kraus, O56969, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Bradley Hartney, O56244, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Witherspoon Inmon, O56254, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Prentiss Perrine, O56971, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert James Bradley, O56255, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lane Butler Cooke, Jr., O56257, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Arthur Henderson, O56972, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Milholland Patterson, O49571, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Paul Emil Joseph Kilnger, O56979, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edwin LeRoy Scott, O49975, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. William James Rees, O56271, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Chisholm Winter, Jr., O56274, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

To be lieutenant colonels, Dental Corps, with rank from July 1, 1948

Lt. Col. Edmund Fillmore Wipf, O56779, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Homer LeRoy Puderbaugh, O56780, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Thomas Williams, O19345, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Pinkard Campbell, O51129, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lynn Clifford Dirksen, O29146, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles William Buttermore, O29147, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Donald Strathern, O51130, Dental Corps, Army of the United States major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Wayne Gillinger, O56782, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Standish O'Grady, O29160, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. H. Beecher Dierdorff, O19347, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Fryer Houck, O29162, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

×Col. John Kenneth Sitzman, O18931, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Francis Bowden, O51133, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Newton Burgin, O18932, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Earl Hammersberg, O18933, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Wilburt August Schroeder, O29166, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hamilton Robert Young, O56786, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alfred Marvin Cayton, O29169, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore Jasper Post, O56787, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Irving Matthew Hauser, O51136, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earl Elmer Fisher, O29175, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dean Stirling Beiter, O19692, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Dwyer Collins, O51140, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Louis Schwinghamer, O29184, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Henry Becker, O51141, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Frederick Waldorf, O51142, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oscar John Ogren, O20037, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Aloysius Disch, O29186, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lyndon Sheldon Wilder, O56789, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Edgar Ramsey, O29191, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ottis Elbert James, O29192, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Stuart Daugherty, O41716, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herman Henry Kothe, O29194, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alfred Emerson Toye, O41723, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Castle Hampson, O19652, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Kenneth Welker, O51148, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Allen Cornish, O29198, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Joseph Cashman, O19653, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Wardwell Warren, Jr., O29207, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Joseph Tvrdy, O51151, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Nicholas Kracht, O20923, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Everett Schonen, O51152, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Albert McFall, O29215, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Conrad Toral Kvam, O20467, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bernice Julius Cehrs, O29220, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerald J. Collins, O29221, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Bowman Denny, O51153, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Charles William George Craig, O29224, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Thomas Perkins, O20468, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy L. Bodine, Jr., O20484, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. L. D. Alexander, O41728, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Farrer Jeffcott, O20077, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Harry McCue, O41729, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Michael A. Uram, O38648, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Leroy Bernier, O20093, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Morris Barrington Bell, O29233, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Julian Hemberger, O20485, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Noel Elmer Hoblit, O29234, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Taylor Richardson, O29236, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Morgan Hollenbach, O29240, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Joseph Walthers, O38649, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alfred Rashleigh Peel, O29245, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

To be majors, Dental Corps, with rank from July 1, 1948

Maj. George Henry Parrot, Jr., O28675, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Andrew Egan, O40096, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Max Ream, O30905, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Frank Stoltenberg Early, O30907, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Patrick Henahan, O30909, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Spencer McClench, O30911, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elbert LaFayette Fenske, O22254, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leslie Ray Allen, O51961, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Jackmond Burch, O22255, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. James Perry Williams, O22744, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Robert Eastman, O30916, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Reginald James Fallis, O22256, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Peter Christensen, O22257, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Hightower Traynham, O22258, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Louis Cook, O22259, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Scott Darrow Linn, O22260, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Wallace Swanson, O30925, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jesse Moyer Swink, O22315, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Benjamin Caldwell, O22316, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond George Waldmann, O22317, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carroll Godfrey Hawkinson, O22318, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Herbert Moulton, O22319, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Broughton Foote, O22320, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Grayson Gwynne Garrison, O23339, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. August Rudolph Huberwald, O40101, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Robert Garner, O30933, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Dayton Chase, O30936, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Glenn Snyder, O38654, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Chase Hazard, O24335, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Judson Newton, O22746, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Edward Chipps, O22743, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold John Malan, O22745, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Franklin Smith Lister, O22747, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Jacob Powers, O24869, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hubert Bernard Palmer, O23679, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Reese Clawson, O43134, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Leonard Walsh, O23677, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Hugh Madden, O30950, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Rex Hutchinson, Jr., O30957, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lee Emerson Montgomery, O30958, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clifford Herman Tornstrom, O43138, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Herman Moser, O30960, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Eugene Boudreaux, O23344, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Kenneth Ramage, O23348, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Pearson White Brown, O23610, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

To be captains, Dental Corps, with rank from July 1, 1948

Capt. Harold Goble Sandlin, O56932, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Leo Francis Baranowski, O56210, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard Arnold Moll, O49945, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Marlin Kleinfelter Gingrich, O56214, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald Elwood Ward, O56980, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Eugene Bates, O56939, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Blair White, O49952, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wilfred Harold Gladue, O56951, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Henry Clay Thompson 3d, O56973, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jack Roper, O56237, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Maness Eugene Laursine, O49965, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Paul Elwood Huchel, O56955, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Charles Schulte, O56959, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard Elfort Long, O49970, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Calvin Alling, O56253, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Douglas Charles Wendt, O49973, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Albert Watkins, Jr., O56259, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Roger Hombs, O56976, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Stanley Elisha McCoy, O56258, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Vernon Stanley Fricke, O49974, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Marvin Wilbur Carlus, O56261, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hosea Frank Sawyer, O56262, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hector Bethart, O56266, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Irvin Wian, Jr., O56267, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Theodore Thompson, O49976, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Willis Charles Gross, Jr., O49977, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Roscoe Chandler, Jr., O56983, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

To be lieutenant colonels, Medical Service Corps, with rank from July 1, 1948

Lt. Col. Bernard Norton Riordan, O56795, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Frank Cruse, O56802, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Stuart Morgan, O41696, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Edgar Haughey, O29142, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Ludwick Gilbert, O29148, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Lee Black, O17375, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Edward Selwyn, O41704, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Warren Chester Eveland, O29167, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bernard Joseph Kotte, O29172, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stanley J. Carpenter, O41712, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Rankin Cleland, O29178, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stanley Whiting Bullis, O29182, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Claude Carrol Britell, O29183, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Buel, O56810, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Othmar Frank Goriup, O29187, Chief of the Medical Service Corps (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Homer Clarence McCullough, O18314, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Louis Felix Williams, O18324, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Phillip Gibson Fleetwood, O29202, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Christian Borup, O18549, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Bernard Aabel, O29239, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Allen John Blake, O29229, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Donald Maxwell, O29265, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Adolf Pharo Gagge, O41742, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Thomas Sheen, O29268, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Guy Claymour Hill, O29272, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carrol Conrad Barrick, O19330, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerard Adrien Belanger, O19333, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Max Prince, O29288, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Gaines Mosley, O38656, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carlyle Steven Marchek, O29290, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Henry Mackin, O29300, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Rufus Dolton Huff, O29311, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dan Perry McGill, Jr., O29330, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilfred Arthur Emond, O19642, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harland William Layer, O19643, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene Gordon Cooper, O19644, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dwight Stephen Hollis, O30975, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Elton Rice, O30983, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stanley John Weidenkopf, O41771, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eli Egbert Daman, O19703, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Dale LeBaron Thompson, O39668, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Lorraine Deemer, Jr., O30995, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Everett Walter Partin, O19699, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Edward Paige, O31023, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Bradley Smith, O51997, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Dell, O56841, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

To be majors, Medical Service Corps, with rank from July 1, 1948

Maj. Arthur James Orange, O51986, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Monroe Edward Freeman, O56826, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Alexander Walkowski, O51994, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Russell Obed Pennepacker, O52005, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elmo Dorman Nolan, O52016, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leland Lloyd Fetterman, O56856, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick Madison Vandel, O52026, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leslie Earl Starks, O52029, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Joseph La Casse, O52034, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Guthrie Long, O52035, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Milton Butler, O31029, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Stepczyk, O20051, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jacob Bruce Martin, O20052, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry John Nelson, O20053, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Thomas Johnson, O20054, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Francis Quinn, Jr., O31031, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Renaldo Gerard Belanger, O40109, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. James J. Adams, O31044, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Edward Murphy, O31047, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Allen Pappas, O31056, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. R. L. Parker, O31057, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Di Giacomo, O40111, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Gibbons Alexander, Jr., O31058, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Floyd Clarence Plowman, O31059, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Nelson Read, O38864, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Augustus John Daniel Guenther, O31067, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elmer Fenn Chaffee, O52057, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Samuel Paul Daykin, O40114, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Auburn Harris Smith, O31073, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gordon Arthur Bohn, O31075, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jesse James Jarboe, O30921, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thaddeus John Domanski, O31082, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Martin Samuel Comella, O31084, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Howell Louis Curd, O31086, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Anthony Carlila, O40115, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Glenn Keith Smith, O20563, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Martin Hunt, Jr., O31089, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Miller Goss, O32059, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Frank Clark, O43161, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Miles Gilbert Bell, O31094, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Homer Herman Splittgerber, O52062, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roland Howard Wingo, O31098, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Almond Partlow, O31099, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Floyd Tolbert, O31104, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Walsh Fitch, Jr., O52064, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Floyd Lacewell Berry, O38866, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Allen Randolph Crow, O31105, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fenner Harvey Whitley, Jr., O31106, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Edwin Donovan McMeen, O31109, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Greenwood Lord, O38868, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Tolbert Henry Belcher, O40116, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Anthony John Zolenas, Jr., O31127, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gerald Edward Geise, O43167, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Tomas Carter Jefferis, O31137, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Brim Nelson, O20564, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Leslie Beeson, O31143, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Edward Gabriel Streidl, O31145, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Gordon Spencer Ejolsrud, O31147, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bertrand Nelson Beaudet, O40119, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Terence O'Reilly, O40120, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Harvey Lyons, O52079, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elwood Wilbur Camp, O43173, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leonard Paul Zagelow, O21006, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roy I. Weir, Jr., O38874, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Henry Nelson Parrish, O31158, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Huber Frick, O31160, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Earl Cochran, Jr., O31162, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Blackwell Frazee, O31165, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harvey Earl Archer, O31170, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joe Richard Kinney, O38877, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Ordway Reid, O31175, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Ambrose Hamrick, O38878, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Longro, O43185, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Henry Wilson, O21007, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Valdo Painter, O21010, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clarence Eugene McKeown, O31200, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Harris Douthitt Gamble, O31203, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Francis Doyle, O40127, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Winslow Chorpenning, O38882, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maxwell Dauer, O31217, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Joseph Kramer, O31221, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Oscar Hunter Adams, O40131, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

×Maj. James Wilbur Polkinghorn, O31227, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Zubkoff, O31228, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roy Elmore Brooks, O31238, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Goetz, O31239, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Benjamin Lindberg, O43205, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Blair Kegerreis, O31242, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Franklin Patrick Boeckman, O31247, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Otis Hastings, O31248, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Clark Thompson, O31250, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Claud Dale La Fors, O21704, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Andrew Ferguson, O31251, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Edgar Merriken, O31253, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bernard Korn, O21705, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ennis Dallas Sandberg, O21706, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Thomas Richards, O21707, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Ogden Stout, O31255, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Van Pamale Frey, O40134, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Gideon Coats, O31260, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Vail Cairns, O31261, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gerard Joseph Sheehan, O43221, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Jacob Zurcher 3d, O38888, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Lewis LaCombe, O31284, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Owen De Fields Cousins, O43222, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Burns Hunt, O31285, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Allen Wray Phelps, O31288, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Augustus Pendlyshok, O31304, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Cable Larnce, O22793, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Emerson Beery Taylor, O22794, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arvey Charles Sanders, O43236, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Azelle Carter, O31315, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fredrick Junior Haase, O31330, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elliott Powell Rigsby, O22865, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clyde William Henderson, O31324, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marion Crawley Stith, O37385, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Millard Christian Monnen, O37387, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Armand Walter LeMire, O37386, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Manley Glenn Morrison, O73389, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Kenneth Lawford, O37395, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Casimir Rogowski, O23622, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herman Abington Walker, O37402, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Perry Cecil Bullard, O37404, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Chris Dallas Hoover, O37408, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Craig Miller, O37409, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick Winsor Whittemore, Jr., O43255, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Tillmon Walden, O37422, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Russel Lee Bryant, O37423, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gordon Francis McCleary, O37425, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Howard Trenholm, O37427, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Jack Coker, O39330, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Alton Hill, O37431, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leo Edward Benade, O37433, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles S. Gersoni, O56185, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Basil Mayo Winstead, O56194, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Myron Ford Barlow, O56925, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jerome Gerald Sacks, O56199, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carmen Anthony Peterson, O49921, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

To be captains, Medical Service Corps, with rank from July 1, 1948

Capt. John Dietrich Flintjer, O56920, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Earl Keith Hurd, O56186, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lee Allen Grove, O56187, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Arthur Richard McAlpine, O56188, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Robert Freeman, O56189, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clifton Willard Bovee, O56190, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harold George Molyneaux, O56193, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Earl Lee Moore, O56921, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Howard Francis Vire, O56923, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Henry Lee, O56196, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Marlo Ernest Smith, O56924, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ernest Theodore Kretschmer, O56198, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Arthur Leonard Wilkins, O37438, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Glen Branch Wagnon, O56201, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Allan Duff Sutton, O56926, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marvin Austin Ware, O56203, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Conan Himber Millstein, O49920, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Louis Henry Muschel, O49922, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Everett Wayne Malone, O49925, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Preston Love, O37436, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Paul William Murphy, O37437, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Robert Francis, O37440, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ralph Eugene Thompson, O56205, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Walter Eledge, Jr., O37441, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Otto Stoler Good, O37442, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Bertram Samuel Wright, O41137, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Vernon Hubert Loisel, O37443, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Eugene Lawrence Shanahan, O37444, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Otto Krause, O37448, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Melville Clarendon Hutchinson, O37449, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Traub, O37450, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Norman Rulon Schlicher, O37452, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Raymond Scroggs, O37453, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Freeman Westra, O49938, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Andrew Jeline Colyer, O41138, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Sylvester Albrecht, O49937, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Paul Larson, O49936, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roy Ambrose Bryan, O37455, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles John Cowgill, O37457, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marion Joseph Pytlewicz, O37458, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lee Allen Ahr, O37429, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lawrence Lee Turnipseed, Jr., O37459, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Thomas Bridson Stewart, O39335, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hasty Wilson Riddle, O37456, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Marks, O41129, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alvin Felix Meyer, Jr., O37461, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph David Dowless, Jr., O37460, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Justus Gorrell, O49942, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sam Allen Edwards, O37466, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Redmond Wolf, Jr., O37467, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Milton Johnson, O37468, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Wallace Evans Jarboe, O37463, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Ovila Desautels, O39337, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Maynard Allen Sangster, O56208, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William White Southard, Jr., O37465, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Claude Robert Lenn, O37469, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Andrew Cubbler, O37470, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Kenneth Bradley Johnson, O36984, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Woodrow Wilson, O41141, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Francis Conrad, O37473, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hayes Moore Sadler, O37474, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Joseph Coleman, O39339, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Stanley William Egense, Jr., O37475, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Louis Schofield Wiegele, O56212, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Otto Henry Sandman, Jr., O37476, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Cease Tutor, O37477, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Templeton Gray, O37480, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Edgar Hill, O41142, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Joseph Martin, O41143, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Philip Caito, O37478, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Doyle Arnold, O49947, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Michael Hallahan, O37479, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Julian Richards, Jr., O37485, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Leonard Calvin Barney, O37487, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Eugene Sprott Alexander, O37488, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Charles Carmichael, O37489, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Hugh Snider, O37493, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

×Maj. James Thomas Haden, O26972, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard Steuart Greer, O39343, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Willard Edward Thompson, O37495, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Matthew James Kowalsky, O37496, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph John Strnad, O37497, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Louis Hahn, O41144, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Reubin Edwards, O37499, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald Keith Nashold, O37500, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Philip Leonard La Manche, O37501, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Henry Frederick Otter, O37502, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edwin Melvin Wehrman, O37504, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Thomas Brown, O37506, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Francis John Kelly, O37505, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Floyd Eugene Van Sickle, Jr., O41145, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dee Curtiss Buchanan, O37509, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Sidney Gaines, O39344, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ross Forrest Swall, O37511, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. R. V. Rivenbark, O49956, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Donald Grindell, O37515, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sam Andrew Plemmons, O37517, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lonnie Knox Blue, O37518, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank David Godwin, O37525, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Orville Jefferson Eslick, O37526, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Daniel Richard Kifner, O37530, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Walsh Dempsey, O37529, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Maurice Wilburn Nichols, O37532, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Vance Breyfogle, O37534, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Leo Gans, O37536, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Andrew Brown, O49963, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Warren Martindale, O37537, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elliott Gardner Parker, O37540, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Willie Cleveland Magness, O37541, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. William John Clegg, Jr., O37542, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Herbert Chester Barnett, O56236, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Kidd Fugitt, O39346, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Kenneth Gayle Howard, O37550, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Harry Wallace, O37552, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Thomas Saling, O37553, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Arthur Edward Britt, O37551, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Patrick James Pomphrey, O37557, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Austin Sylvester Hall, O41155, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Freeman Merritt, O56238, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Maurice William Hylden, O26980, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Henry Gelby, O37560, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wilmot Livingston Gibson, O37562, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Warren Harding Holmes, O37563, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Phillip James Buckler, O37564, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Woodrow Holt, O41154, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Dale Russell Maher, O37559, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Lamar Grow, O37573, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Felix George Rajecki, O37574, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Foster LaMarr Watts, O37569, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

(NOTE.—All of the above-named officers were promoted during the recess of the Senate.)

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 518 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion.

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from July 1, 1948

Lt. Col. Walter Francis Dix, AO50892, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Lothar Charles Maurer, AO41382, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Maj. Gen. Reginald Carl Harmon, AO28796, Judge Advocate General, United States Air Force (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Kirk Hamilton Scott, AO50896, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Llewellyn Goode Duggar, AO28799, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Ralph Wright Totman, AO50899, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Wayne Milton Roberts, AO50900, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Willard Gardner Barker, AO41387, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Merritt Smith, AO28807, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Reineman Forbes, AO28808, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Rogers Alan Gardner, AO16066, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Walter Grant Bryte, Jr., AO16076, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edgar Turner Noyes, AO16271, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Walter Llewellyn Wheeler, AO16304, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Norme D. Frost, AO16305, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Linus Dodge Frederick, AO16306, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Milton Miles Murphy, AO16309, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Emory Lee Bruns, AO41391, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Francis Wilson van der Veer, AO50906, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Ernest Osborne, AO50907, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Cecil Lloyd Stratten, AO50909, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Carroll Shaw Miller, AO41395, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Fletcher Pollard Jaquess, AO28817, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Ellis Harold Wilson, AO28821, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Samuel Norman Van Meter, AO41402, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William McKinley Miles, AO28828, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harry William Generous, AO28829, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Alstein Rollison, AO50914, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Ronald Francis Wilson, AO39530, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Edward Lee Hurlburt, AO28832, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edwin Parker Archibald, AO28833, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Edgar Winfrey Gardner, AO38603, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Francis David Glasheen, AO50915, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Jackson Knight, Jr., AO39531, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Raymond Fisher, AO50916, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Edwin Turner, AO41407, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Louis Denard Cooper, AO28841, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Samuel Gershon, AO28843, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Francis Colville Myers, AO28846, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Frank Harley Holmes, AO28849, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Raymond Frederick Wiseheart, AO41410, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lawrence Burnett Rhodes, AO41412, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Donald Plympton Mayhew, AO41413, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lebbeus Bigelow Woods, AO28853, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Fitzpatrick Payne, AO41415, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Frank Joseph Siebenaler, AO41417, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Albert Russell Weaver, AO41419, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Louis Wagner Marshall, AO28863, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Albert George Foote, AO39535, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Anthony Westphal, AO50920, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Harry Gordon Spillinger, AO28869, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Samuel Wallace Van Meter, AO16383, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force.).

Col. Charles Winslow O'Connor, AO16560, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Narcisse Lionel Cote, AO16569, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Hall Sparhawk, AO16586, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Felix Guillett, AO16570, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frederick August Bacher, Jr., AO16646, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Francis Edgar Cheatle, AO16663, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clinton William Davies, AO16690, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Dozier, AO50924, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Frank James Shannon, Sr., AO41434, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Merle Eugene Parks, AO50925, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Lewis Welling Jones, AO50926, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Jean Paul Harrison, AO28878, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Frank Edward Hoffman, AO28881, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Franklin Carter, AO39543, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Franklin Hornor Colby, AO41445, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Erwin Franklin Gardner, AO41373, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John James Wilson, AO41446, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Bernard Brice Smith, AO50931, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Francis Reed, AO39546, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Adkins, AO28891, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Walter Louis Weinaug, AO41450, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Oscar Moody, AO28893, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Gerald Charles Ward, AO50937, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Burton Gordon, AO28896, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Milton Blair Samuel, AO50939, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Earl Clinton Robbins, AO16714, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Russell Keillor, AO16716, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Andrew Morehouse, AO28898, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Edward Percefull, AO50943, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Joe Luther Dukes, AO50945, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Joseph Wells Jones, AO50946, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Leroy Gordon Cooper, AO41460, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Lowell Emmett Peaster, AO28914, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Henry Voeller, AO50951, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Bennett Moseley Venable, AO41464, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Gus Benning Hoffman, AO28917, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Baily, AO41466, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bertrand Ellwood Johnson, AO28920, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lee Bird Washbourne, AO16746, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Kenneth Earl Thiebaud, AO16785, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Lewis Easton, AO16933, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Walter William Gross, AO16953, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John N. Jones, AO16987, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Philip Marstin, AO41468, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Lucas Mason, AO41470, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Nicholas Kane, AO28925, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Oren Hanford, AO41471, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Richard Gear, AO17014, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Herbert Melvin Newstrom, AO17026, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ivan Maurice Palmer, AO17030, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Atticus Morris, AO38611, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ralph Wendell Crane, AO28931, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Neal James O'Brien, AO41476, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Orron Moore, AO29561, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Hampton Ray Kenaston, AO39562, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Ivon Doty, AO28948, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harley Sanford Jones, AO28952, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Beverley Habersham Rockwell, AO50980, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clare Wesley Bunch, AO41513, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Nicholas Dick, AO39583, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Leroy Gray Heston, AO29002, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bradford Allen Shaw, AO29007, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frederick Jensen Dau, AO17077, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Raymond Bienfang, AO17162, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Elmer Wentworth Gude, AO17272, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Francis Wadman, AO17277, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Marshall Ambler Glasebrook, AO41542, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Solomon Jack Zoller, AO29025, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Anderson Zartman, AO38620, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Frederick Funston, Jr., AO51007, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Melvin Spedden Hollidge, AO38624, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Karl Edward Baumeister, AO29058, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Monroe Thompson Smartt, AO41572, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Oscar Bond, AO29066, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harold Oscar Allison, AO28897, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bernard Cecil Rose, AO29075, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Donald Menzies Hamilton, AO41580, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Warren Herbert Higgins, AO17387, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Roland Ogden Strand Akre, AO17403, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Guy Frost Hix, AO17418, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Terrell Edward Phillips, AO29083, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ira David Snyder, AO29087, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Edward Jost, AO29090, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Sam Williamson Cheyney, AO17438, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ralph Rhudy, AO17444, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Mueller Jacobs, AO17470, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Wilson Stewart, AO17482, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Irvine Dugan, AO17486, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edgar Morris Scattergood, Jr., AO29115, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ward Terry Abbott, AO17513, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clayton Earl Hughes, AO17536, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Lee Scott, AO17545, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Lewis McCulla, AO17580, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Gilmer Bowyer, AO17663, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Melle John Coutlee, AO17699, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Luke Bruce Graham, AO17755, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Richard Lynch, AO17766, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Llewellyn Charles Howell, AO29121, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Lewis, Jr., AO38632, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jerome Brooks McCauley, AO29336, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Philo Orson Rasmusen, AO29354, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Joe A. Bennett, AO29359, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Howard Alton Moody, AO39631, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. David Barlow Lancaster, AO41638, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Glenn Phil Nell, AO39636, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Curtis Warren, AO41641, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Joseph Kennedy, AO51078, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Donald Harvey Baxter, AO17925, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Roy Thomas Wright, AO17929, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Waldron Egan, AO17948, Air Force of the United States (major U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Wiley Baylor, AO17968, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Albert Meldrum Kuhfeld, AO38663, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Algene Earl Key, AO29397, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Dahl Farr, AO38666, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lester William Light, AO41682, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Edward Reilly, AO39679, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lawrence Edward Brooks, AO41691, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Gerald Hoyle, AO17994, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Archibald Johnston Hanna, AO18017, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Cechmanek, AO38671, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Van Gorder Dunn, AO29428, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Marshall Gordon Lassek, AO38672, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. LeRoy Bartlett, Jr., AO18032, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles William Haas, AO18056, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Phillips Waller Smith, AO18112, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Neal Edwin Ausman, AO18137, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Brazelton Fillmore Dice, AO18162, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Othel Rochelle Deering, AO18164, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Buford Russell Nyquist, AO18173, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richards Montgomery Bristol, AO18184, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Gerry Leonard Mason, AO18221, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Hebern Paul Dellinger, AO18222, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Duncan Stenhouse, AO29444, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Elvin Freestone Maughan, AO18259, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Walton Peterson, AO29453, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Elmer Mayberry, AO41800, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John David Howe, AO29459, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert James Goewey, AO41801, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Stanley Dolan, AO41803, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Marvin Sledge, AO38675, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Stewart Sherman Maxey, AO23620, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ethelred Lundy Sykes, AO29494, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Michael Norman Wright McCoy, AO39698, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Hardin Lyle, AO41825, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Daniel Campbell, AO29498, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Edward Rentz, AO41841, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Walter Urbach, AO29527, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Mel Schweizer, Jr., AO29554, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Hamilton Monay, AO29559, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Tracy Kemp Dorsett, AO41874, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Charles Kingsbury, AO38694, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Elwin Herklas Eddy, AO18364, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Roger Willard Moore, AO18370, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Alfred Christian Gay, AO18377, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Francis Carroll, AO18390, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. A. J. McVea, AO18401, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Pickering Corbin, Jr., AO18402, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William John Bell, AO18441, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Edwin Barr, AO18459, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Louis Augustine Guenther, AO18462, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jermain Ferdinand Rodenhauser, AO18470, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Millard Chester Young, AO18472, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Freeman Fulton, AO18484, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Frederick Hartman, AO18501, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Carl Wilbert Carlmark, AO18504, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles North Howze, AO18506, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Hungerford Wise, AO18507, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Francis Densford, AO18508, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Travis Clayton, AO51239, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Irwin Barnard Anderson, AO41900, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Allen Wood Rigsby, AO24289, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Philip Blanchard Foote, AO29596, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Gilbert Kirk, AO29603, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Rex. James Elmore, AO51251, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Valentine A. Rutherford, AO51253, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Kenneth William Mosher, AO29617, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Wesley Schott, AO29632, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Aram Senekerim Tootelain, AO41944, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Norman Louis Callish, AO29636, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Marshall Allen Elkins, AO29639, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Dross Ellis, AO29643, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Curtis Morgan Anderson, AO29649, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Leonard Prine Kleinoeder, AO29655, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Ralph Fred Gallogly, AO51280, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Harvey Rothrock, AO29663, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Chester Grant Martz, AO41998, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Riley Kane, AO29680, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Bradford Richard, AO29682, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Douglas Hopson, AO29686, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Orville Laird, AO29699, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Jerome Lester Loewenberg, AO42035, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Junior Mac Nees, AO29942, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lester Maxwell Taylor, AO29722, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Earl Harold Jacobsen, AO29723, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Francis Babcock, AO38717, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Troy William Crawford, AO39778, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Gaston Davis, AO29752, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Arthur Hanson, AO42063, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Francis Ray Hoehl, AO18665, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Stanley Ronald Stewart, AO18675, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Torgils Grimkel Wold, AO18705, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Benjamin Jepson Webster, AO18714, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Forsyth Thompson, Jr., AO18717, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harry Cecil Porter, AO18746, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Merle Robbins Williams, AO18820, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Nicholas Earnest Powel, AO18823, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Albert Edward Stoltz, AO18839, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Walden Bernald Coffey, AO18853, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Richard Nuzum, Jr., AO29764, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Arthur Miller, AO29768, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Einar Axel Malmstrom, AO29775, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Jerome Davis Giddens, AO42083, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Fred Clemons Slagle, AO29779, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Howard Lee Halsey, AO29785, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank John Seiler, AO29791, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Alexander Stuart Young, AO42097, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Donald Casper Sloan, AO42108, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Theron Herman Whitneybell, AO38729, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Fred Oscar Easley, Jr., AO29832, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Fred McClendon, AO29834, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Aaron Lowell Johnson, AO42129, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Stewart Cassady, AO29861, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard William Henderson, AO29879, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Roscoe Townley Nichols, Jr., AO29883, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Carl Allen Addington, AO29894, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Francis Delaney, AO29913, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Carlos John Cochrane, AO29932, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Otto Gerhard Quanrud, AO29940, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Cecil Parker Lessig, AO29947, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Hogan Clark, AO29732, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Herbert Nathan Cowles, AO29960, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Platt Linn Welker, AO29985, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Bernard Card, AO18980, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Allen Glass, AO18997, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Livingston Travis, AO19009, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edward Joseph Hale, AO19018, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Glenn Armstrong, AO19029, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Vernon Cleveland Smith, AO19051, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harry Stephen Bishop, AO19055, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frederic Henry Fairchild, AO19062, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edward Deane Marshall, AO19092, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harry Nelson Burkhalter, Jr., AO19106, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Douglas Moore Cairns, AO19129, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Martin Breit, AO19171, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Leo Harold Heintz, AO19177, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Victor Haller King, AO19184, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Corwin Paul Vansant, AO19199, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Alton Alexander Denton, AO19219, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Thomas King, Jr., AO19232, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Roland Arthur Elliott, Jr., AO19324, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Karl Truesdell, Jr., AO19258, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Millard Loren Haskin, AO19274, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Mattern Montgomery, AO19289, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Herbert Aubertin Bott, AO29995, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Earl Johnson Nesbitt, AO30002, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clyde Daniel Gasser, AO30005, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Philip Senter Robbins, AO30007, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Francis Harold Monahan, AO51442, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Woodward Berkeley Mann, AO30012, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Herbert Charles Chambers, AO30013, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Anthony Heim, AO29597, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Taylor Thurman, AO26374, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Carl Eaton Rankin, AO30052, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henry Durham Smith, Jr., AO30057, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Elmer Jung, AO42298, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Roger Taube, AO30132, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Gilmore Vincent Minnis, AO30139, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Theodore Albert Fuller, AO30141, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Millard Archibald Libby, AO30153, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Clifford Jensen, AO30155, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Lewis Olinger, AO30182, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Walter Holmes, AO29716, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Wilfred James Smith, AO42370, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Maxwell Williams, AO30199, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Haskell Erva Neal, AO30202, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph D. Croft Caldara, AO30226, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Arthur Vernon Jones, Jr., AO30229, Air Force of the United States (captain U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harris Benjamin Hull, AO30230, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Orville Ernest Mohler, AO51530, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Orlin Butler, Jr., AO39915, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Neil Gray, AO42415, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Jones Schofield, AO42416, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Burroughs Cary, AO19352, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Carter Ashworth, AO19362, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edward Walter Moore, AO19376, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Curtis Delano Sluman, AO19378, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Sebastian Stone, AO19384, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Loveland Rogers, AO19388, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Bernard Dany, AO19389, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lawson S. Moseley, Jr., AO19393, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jean Paul Craig, AO19395, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Leslie Crystal, Jr., AO19400, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frederic Wood Barnes, AO19401, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Jack Holzapfel, Jr., AO19409, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Gene Huggins Tibbets, AO19431, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Tompkins Hanley, AO19435, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jack Edward Shuck, AO19436, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John dePeyster Townsend Hills, AO19443, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Monte Canterbury, AO19451, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Jerome Edward Blair 2d, AO19454, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles John Bondley, Jr., AO19462, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Dale Orville Smith, AO19465, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Perry Bruce Griffith, AO19478, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Wilson Hawkes Neal, AO19496, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Elvin Seth Ligon, Jr., AO19497, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Burton Winkle, AO19501, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Monroe Hutchison, AO19508, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Arno Herman Luehman, AO19513, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Lawrence Barton, AO19514, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Raymond Judson Reeves, AO19523, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Harvey Wise, AO19527, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Andrew Legg, AO19528, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harvey Thompson Ainess, AO19531, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Albert Theodore Wilson, Jr., AO19543, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John William White, AO19550, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Arthur Lafayette Inman, AO19559, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Stanley Joseph Donovan, AO19560, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Edward Barzynski, Jr., AO19595, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bruce Harley Perry, AO42435, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Claude Bryant Thompson, AO30276, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Channing Ernest Beasley, AO42476, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Thomas Quirk, AO42483, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Emmett Buckner Cassady, AO42493, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Christian Dale Kauffman, AO42497, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Luther Moran Bivins, AO51588, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Arthur McKerley, AO51593, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Berthold Eugene Nowotny, AO30388, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Stolle, AO42542, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ned Baker Chase, AO30395, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Benjamin Grad Holzman, AO30412, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Marion Daniel Unruh, AO42573, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James William Smith, AO42594, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Van Henry Albertson, AO42600, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Ovid Newell, AO51631, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lee William Fulton, AO30465, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Francis DeVos, AO30502, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Albert Joseph Shower, AO19714, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jack Wallis Hickman, AO19718, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Leighton Ira Davis, AO19721, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Van Gorder Wilson, AO19744, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Kimball Brown, Jr., AO19758, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Morris Stillman, AO19760, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Elmer Ellsworth, AO19767, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Gordon Russell, AO19795, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Kenneth Paul Bergquist, AO19802, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Arthur Allison Fickel, AO19809, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Downs Eugene Ingram, AO19813, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Howard Walsh, AO19824, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Willis Fred Chapman, AO19832, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Henderson Baynes, AO19835, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Aaron Warner Tyer, AO19847, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. German Pierce Culver, AO19855, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Morris, AO19869, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Richard Carlton Boys, AO19876, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lamont Saxton, AO19896, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Orin Houston Moore, AO19909, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Cebern Musgrave, Jr., AO19916, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Joseph Gent, Jr., AO19927, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Pelham Davis Glassford, Jr., AO19937, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Hollis Strauss, AO19940, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Maurice Monroe Simons, AO19941, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jack Roberts, AO19963, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Glenn Curtis Thompson, AO19978, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Samuel Barcus Knowles, Jr., AO19979, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Baird Buck, AO19981, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Dale Franklin Pocock, AO30508, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ray Willard Clifton, AO19987, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Randolph Lowry Wood, AO19988, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Arnold Theodore Johnson, AO19989, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Marvin Frederick Stalder, AO19991, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Noel Francis Parrish, AO19992, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Dolf Edward Muehleisen, AO19993, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Carl Swyter, AO19994, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Cole Weller, AO19995, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edward Morris Gavin, AO19996, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Edward Jarmon, AO19997, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Neff Moyers, AO20000, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Bynum Stanley, AO20003, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clarence Morice Sartain, AO20005, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Hughes Price, AO20006, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Caruthers Moore, AO20007, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lawrence Scott Fulwider, AO20008, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lester Stanford Harris, AO20009, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Donald Newman Wackwitz, AO20011, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clair Lawrence Wood, AO20014, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Bennett Harvin, AO20015, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bob Arnold, AO20017, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Burton Wilmot Armstrong, Jr., AO20018, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harold Lee Neely, AO20020, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Erickson Snowden Nichols, AO20021, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jasper Newton Bell, AO20022, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Russell Lee Waldron, AO20023, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Foster Day, Jr., AO20024, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Daniel Edwin Hooks, AO20027, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Raymond Patten Todd, AO20028, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Glenn Workman, AO30499, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lawrance Owen Brown, AO20042, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clayton Baxter Claassen, AO20045, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Thomas Hudnell, AO20046, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harold Lawrence Kreider, AO20047, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Oman Neal, AO20048, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henry Agnew Sebastian, AO19561, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Vincent Thomas Cannon, AO42660, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Walden Alexius Sundell, AO30562, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ralph Irwin Williams, AO51679, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Holmes Congdon, AO39995, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Herbert McCann, AO30574, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edward J. Hopkins, AO30587, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Clarence Harmon Lewis, AO30589, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Albert Milton, AO30620, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Rollo McNitt, AO30625, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Frank Collins, Jr., AO30630, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Pratt Brown, AO30638, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Russell Vaughn-Ritchey, AO30639, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jack Eugene Thomas, AO30644, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Xavier Krebs, AO30645, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Horace Donald Neely, AO42720, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Albert Abe Shumsky, AO42732, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Durson Forman, AO30672, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Richard Thomas Black, AO30673, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Allen Adams, AO42761, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Alban Boardman Ogden, Jr., AO40024, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Ellery David Preston, Jr., AO30706, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. David Spinx Blackwell, AO38836, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Elmer Van Ness Schuyler, AO30770, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Eugene Louis Clark, AO30781, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Joe Kennith McNay, AO30786, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Winzer Davis, AO51802, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Gifford Norman, AO30800, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Oliver Garfield Haywood, Jr., AO20113, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Cecil Edward Combs, AO20121, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Barnard Stewart, AO20126, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Dwight Oliver Monteith, AO20127, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Benjamin Oliver Davis, Jr., AO20146, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Gordon Harrison Austin, AO20161, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jay Dean Rutledge, Jr., AO20164, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Frederick Frost, AO20166, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Dean Gapen, AO20175, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Howell Marion Estes, Jr., AO20183, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Knox Arnold, Jr., AO20188, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clinton Dermott Vincent, AO20189, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Henry Carmichael, AO20203, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Walter Gillespie, AO20206, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Rutland Gunn, Jr., AO20207, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Nicholas Tate Perkins, AO20210, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Albert Patton Clark, Jr., AO20218, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force)

Col. John Richard Kelly, AO20225, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Norman Calvert Spencer, Jr., AO20228, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frederick Reynolds Terrell, AO20230, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Bernard Tyler, Jr., AO20232, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Fredrick Bell, AO20233, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Milton McCorkle, AO20239, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Denton Cairnes, AO20247, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Wilfred Henry Tetley, AO20252, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Walter Twaddell, Jr., AO20254, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Russell Grohs, AO20255, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Swinton Steele, AO20260, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Milton Bartella, AO20261, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clinton Utterback True, AO20271, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Turner Clifton Rogers, AO20272, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Paul Champion, AO20279, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Garnett Lee, Jr., AO20308, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Warren Newcomb Wildrick, AO20323, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Von Roy Shores, Jr., AO20335, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Ellerbe Covington, Jr., AO20336, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Rigden Van Dickson, AO20350, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Clark Lewis Hosmer, AO20356, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Wesley Jones, AO20358, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph James Nazzaro, AO20364, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edmund Whritner Miles, AO20371, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Levere Kimball, AO20372, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ernest Samuel Holmes, Jr., AO20379, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Wallace Conrad Barrett, AO20381, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Conrad Francis Necrason, AO20384, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Victor Hermann Wagner, AO20385, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Philip Holden Best, AO30817, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Martin Menter, AO30826, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William James Cummings, Jr., AO31325, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles James Lester, AO40058, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henry Grady MacDaniel, AO31359, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bernard M. Wootton, AO42916, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Henry Curtis, AO31363, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Marvin Marwell Harvey, AO31390, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Roland Ellsworth Sliker, AO31393, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Godfrey T. McHugh, AO31403, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Berton Root, AO20459, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Melville Brown, AO20462, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Herman Alfred Schmid, AO20464, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lloyd Pauahi Hopwood, AO20449, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Arthur DeMarco, AO20451, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Day Lee, Jr., AO20434, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Leslie Raybold, AO20457, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Wilbur Walter Aring, AO20458, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Oscar Guthrie, AO20425, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Phillip Hollstein, AO20426, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jack Lindley Randolph, AO20424, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Homer Astley Boushey, AO20438, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Don Orville Darrow, AO20429, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harold Austin Gunn, AO20443, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Francis Leslie Rivard, AO20422, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frederic Henry Miller, Jr., AO20416, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Allen Hilger, AO20437, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lawrence Clinton Coddington, AO20452, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Richardson Cook, AO20420, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Engberg Todd, AO20453, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Louis William Proper, AO20460, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ralph Charles Rockwood, AO20435, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Tom Jefferson Cunningham, AO30432, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Henry Gist, Jr., AO20430, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Ross Robertson, Jr., AO20463, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Stanley Holtoner, AO20423, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Clyde Selser, Jr., AO20427, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Douglas Ellsworth Williams, AO20455, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lewis Leo Mundell, AO20417, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Brooke Emple Allen, AO20465, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Beaumont Cornett, AO20446, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Hal Jeffus, AO20419, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Boyd Hubbard, Jr., AO20431, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Norman Lewis Peterson, AO20450, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Victor Raymond Haugen, AO20433, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Hilmer Cannon Nelson, AO20439, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Parker Fisher, AO20461, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Windeck Hall, AO20454, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Howard Dane, AO20466, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Graves Hubbard Snyder, AO20418, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Chester Witten Cecil, Jr., AO20440, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Markward Reynolds, AO20448, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Wester Luker, AO31417, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Augustus Maine Minton, AO42941, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Iddings Fletcher, AO31429, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Henry Mackey Smith, AO42956, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Virgil Floyd Fairfax, AO38906, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Allen Gardner, AO31452, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henry Bernard Hohman, AO42977, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Thomas Bohn, AO42992, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Oliver Tillman Simpson, Jr., AO38912, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Eugene Cobb Mallary, AO43017, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Walter George William Clatanoff, AO40159, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Miles Howlett Thompson, AO20555, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Emmett Murchison Tally, Jr., AO31545, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Andrew Jackson Curbo, Jr., AO43065, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Samuel LeNoir Moise, AO51899, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lawrence Bruin Ocamb, AO31605, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Orrin Beckwith, Jr., AO31611, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Richard Leofric Temple, AO31613, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Alexander Gunn 3d, AO31616, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jack Norman Donohew, AO20574, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Dudley Stevenson, AO20583, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Nils Olof Ohman, AO20586, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Lawrence Holcomb, AO20587, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Ray Clingerman, Jr., AO20591, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Asher Burtis Robbins, Jr., AO20596, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Walter Eckman, AO20602, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Noel Snouffer, AO20607, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Phillip Klocko, AO20608, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Francis Batjer, AO20627, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Kenneth Sayre Wade, AO20631, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Gordon Eriksen, AO20635, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert William Griffin, AO20641, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Risley Barden, AO20644, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edwin Allen Russell, Jr., AO20645, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard William Fellows, AO20655, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Whiteford Carlisle Mauldin, AO20659, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bruce Keener Holloway, AO20664, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Maurice Arthur Preston, AO20673, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ivan Wilson McElroy, AO20677, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Kienle Horrigan, AO20678, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Alan Doane Clark, AO20683, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Hensey Herman, AO20686, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Linscott Aldin Hall, AO20691, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Don Richard Ostrander, AO20697, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Caldwell McDowell, AO20709, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Young Parker, AO20712, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Sam Wilkerson Agee, AO20714, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Taylor 3d, AO20715, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Thomas Shields, AO20722, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Curtis Raymond Low, AO20732, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edwin Borden Broadhurst, AO20744, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Bainbridge Westover, AO20746, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Samuel Charles Gurney, Jr., AO20753, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harvey Charles Dorney, AO20755, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul William Scheidecker, AO20764, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Junious Harrison, AO20776, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Emmett McDonald, AO20778, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Russell Ulricson, AO20783, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Grover Hipps, AO20787, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Joseph George Focht, AO20791, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Marshall Randolph Gray, AO20792, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Augustin Mitchell Prentiss, Jr., AO20796, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Woodrow William Dunlop, AO20814, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Kenneth Oliver Sanborn, AO20819, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Joseph Cain, Jr., AO20833, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Malcolm Green, Jr., AO20836, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles William Stark, AO20839, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Morton David Magcffin, AO20847, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Ragland Maxwell, AO20849, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Theo Posey, AO20850, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Wesley Skilton Calverley, AO20854, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Leo Belton Smith, AO40189, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Arthur Howland Baker, Jr., AO20873, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George William Croker, AO20910, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Willard Wright Smith, AO20911, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Hart Hanson, AO20912, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Jenkins Huddleston, AO31657, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Neywood Hutchings Roberdeau, AO31658, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Gilbert Earle Teal, AO40197, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Samuel McClure Smith, AO31667, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Lafayette Musgrave, AO43358, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Nelson Ewbank, Jr., AO31702, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James William Thomson, AO43376, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Audley Thorpe, AO43379, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jack Alban Gibbs, AO20932, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Leon Howard McCurdy, AO31733, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lawrence Morgan Thomas, AO31750, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Daniel Martin Harvey, AO31759, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Herman Blase, AO31770, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Robert Orr, AO43427, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Daniel Graham Hawes, AO31782, Air Force of the United States (captain U. S. Air Force).

Col. Carlton Julian Martin, AO43460, Air Force of the United States (captain, United States Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Lester Hamrick, AO31838, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Louis Gordon Thorup, AO31847, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Chaney Sagrist, AO43478, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Barton Morrow Russell, AO31850, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Johnnie Radford Dyer, AO40253, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Joseph Friedman, AO31870, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Carl Woodrow Andrews, AO31871, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Douglas Howder, AO40256, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Frederick Mauger O'Neill, AO31873, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John William Oberdorf, AO52168, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Clinton Douglass Bannister Smith, AO43545, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Donald Pierce Hall, AO31927, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henry Hall Waller, Jr., AO31947, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Frank Edward Herrelko, AO31960, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Allen Breitweiser, AO21055, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Theodore Preuss, AO21060, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harold Killian Kelley, AO21068, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Brett Kieffer, AO21075, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Leo Vernon Harman, AO21077, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Marshall Batterson, Jr., AO21082, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Kenneth Skaer, AO21091, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Prescott Miner Spicer, AO21093, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Henry Leland Crouch, Jr., AO21100, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Glenn Craddock Coleman, AO21104, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Roy Cleveland Heflebower, Jr., AO21112, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Sherwood Ernest Buckland, AO21115, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Dale Ryan, AO21117, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Albert Peterson Sights, Jr., AO21123, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Omar Ellsworth Knox, AO21125, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Pleasants Sturdivant, AO21140, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lloyd Earl Johnson, Jr., AO21146, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Howard Doan Kenzie, AO21149, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edward Joseph York, AO21151, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bertram Cowgill Harrison, AO21152, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Keith Kincaid, AO21157, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clifford Field Macomber, AO21158, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Douglas Clinton Polhamus, AO21164, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Louis Edward Coira, AO21166, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Lee Snider, AO21168, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ashley Burdett Packard, AO21169, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Donald Ward Saunders, AO21172, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Peek Brett, AO21174, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Herbert Spangler, AO21183, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Nicholas Horace Chavasse, AO21187, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henry Charles Huglin, AO21188, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harry Cornelius Morrison, AO21191, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Franklin Bromiley, AO21199, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Maurice Raymond Lemon, AO21201, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Virgil Lee Zoller, AO21205, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Carleton McBride, AO21206, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Neil David Van Sickle, AO21209, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Cozart Pitchford, AO21210, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Philip Robert Hawes, AO21220, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Hugh Blanchard, AO21223, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Castex Paul Conner, AO21224, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Hugh Douglas Wallace, AO21232, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Rhea Luper, AO21240, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Carter Eugene Duncan, AO21242, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Fred Murray Dean, AO21245, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Henry Frederick, Jr., AO21262, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Vincent Morgan Miles, Jr., AO21264, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Breece Wells, AO21266, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harris Edward Rogner, AO21269, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Roy Ray Brischetto, AO21278, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Gibson Emerson Sisco, Jr., AO21281, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Richard Elam Sims, AO21282, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Mathes Young, AO21292, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Merrick Bayer, AO21294, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Littleton James Pardue, AO21300, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Wallace Stafford Ford, AO21312, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Claude Reddoch, Jr., AO21315, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Horace Isbell, AO21350, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Boddie Coleman, AO21352, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Felix Moses Hardison, AO21354, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Howard Monroe Means, AO21358, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Danville Brown, AO21384, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harry Philip Leber, Jr., AO21388, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Michael Joseph Comfeld, AO21394, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Waymond Austin Davis, AO21397, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lloyd Henry Dalton, Jr., AO21400, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Ray Kilgore, AO21402, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henley Vedder Bastin, Jr., AO21403, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edwin Shepard Chickering, AO21405, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Guy Leonard Hudson, Jr., AO21407, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Carl Orth, AO21412, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George William Prentice, AO32000, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Walter Erath Arnold, AO32458, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Mark Everett Hubbard, AO32026, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Walter Moore Bridgers, AO38960, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Hugh Harcourt Master, AO43646, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Joseph Stone, Jr., AO32052, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harold Lewis Jones, AO21484, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Herbert Madison West, Jr., AO21486, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Francis Dodge Shoemaker, AO21487, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. Alvin Roubal Luedecke, AO21488, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henry Russell Spicer, AO21489, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Willard Van Deman Brown, AO21490, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Haldane Councill, AO21492, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Kenneth Ray Kreps, AO21493, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Peter Havens Remington, AO21494, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Blaine Bailif Campbell, AO21497, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Morris Henry Shedd, AO21498, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Mayhue Delbert Blaine, AO21500, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Howard Fish Nichols, AO21501, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Philip Beeton Klein, AO21502, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Marion Malcolm, AO21503, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frederick Lawrance Moore, AO21504, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Emlen Marion, AO21505, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ben Ivan Funk, AO21506, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard William Simons, AO21508, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Spencer Hardy, AO21510, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harry Louis Donicht, AO21512, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ladson Green Eskridge, Jr., AO21514, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Francis Harry Matthews, AO21515, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ryder Waldo Finn, AO21516, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Franklin Hardy, AO21517, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Wietzel Zehrung, AO21519, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Arthur Jenkins Pierce, AO21520, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Francis Worden, AO21521, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Bradford Baker, AO21523, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Herbert Reed Volin, AO21525, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Alan Bennett, AO21526, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henry Garfield Thorne, Jr., AO21527, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Baskin Reid Lawrence, Jr., AO21529, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Sam Philippe Triffy, AO21530, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Earl Bernard Young, AO21531, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Mason Reid, AO21533, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bernard Adolf Schriever, AO21536, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harold Ernest Watson, AO21537, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Cy Wilson, AO21538, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Craven Clark Rogers, AO21539, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Lewis Curry, AO21540, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Audrin Rotha Walker, AO21541, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Calvin Ely Peeler, AO21542, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harold S. Ecklund, AO21544, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Kay Martin, AO21545, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. John Beverly Montgomery, AO21546, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Allen Way, AO21548, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Ferguson, AO21549, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Brewer Keese, AO21550, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Frederick Hunker, AO21551, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Bell David, AO21554, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Francis Burnham, AO21555, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clyde Box, AO21556, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Chris Henry William Rueter, AO21558, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. Horace Armor Shepard, AO21559, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Don Louis Wilhelm, Jr., AO21560, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Franklin Kendall Paul, AO21562, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Ben Allen Mason, Jr., AO21563, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Raleigh Hunter Macklin, AO21564, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Graeme Stewart Bond, AO21565, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Marcus Fleming Cooper, AO21566, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Raymond Victor Schwanbeck, AO21567, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Melville Caldwell, AO21568, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Abbott Thomas, AO21569, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Elbert David Reynolds, AO21570, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ralph Sheldon Garman, AO21571, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ernest Frederick Wackwitz, Jr., AO21572, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Marvin Christian Demler, AO21573, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Cecil Hampton Childre, AO21574, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jacob Jerval Brogger, AO21575, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Irvine Alfred Rendle, AO21576, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Junius Waldo Dennison, Jr., AO21577, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ernest Wilbur Keating, AO21580, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Sutton Brewer, AO21581, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Irving Lewis Branch, AO21582, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Arthur Charles Carlson, Jr., AO21586, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Eades, AO21587, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Donald William Eisenhart, AO21588, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Sam Maddux, Jr., AO21589, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Karl Lewis Polifka, AO21590, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Reed Stewart, AO21591, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Klahr McNown, AO21592, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert William Ryder, AO21595, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Avelin Paul Tacon, Jr., AO21598, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Conrad Joe Herlick, AO21599, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Evart Wilbur Hedlund, AO21600, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Franklin Helmick, AO21601, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Loughery Johnston, AO21603, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James John Roberts, Jr., AO21604, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lloyd Atwood Walker, Jr., AO21605, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Arthur William Schmitt, Jr., AO21606, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Kenneth Ray Martin, AO21608, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Maurice Edward Glaser, AO21609, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Franklin Strickland, AO21613, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henry Ovide Bordelon, AO21618, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clyde Charles Harris, Jr., AO21620, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jean Rogers Byerly, AO21621, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edward George Kiehle, AO21624, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Earl Eugene Bates, Jr., AO21625, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. David Wade, AO21627, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. J. Francis Taylor, Jr., AO21628, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edward Wilford Maschmeyer, AO21629, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Ray Hamilton Martin, AO21632, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frederick John Sutterlin, AO21633, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Murray Alston Bywater, AO21634, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Delmar Edmond Wilson, AO21635, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joshua Thomas Winstead, Jr., AO21636, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Duncan Jones, AO21637, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ernest Haywood Beverly, AO21638, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Edward Schaetzel, AO21640, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frederic Grenville Hulsh, AO21641, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Claude Edwin Putnam, Jr., AO21642, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Eugene Carl Weitz, AO21645, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Edwin Rouse, AO21648, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Vernon Lake Stintzi, AO21650, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clarence Theodore Edwinson, AO21651, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Carroll Cochran, AO21653, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Whitnell Tompkins Nixon, AO21656, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Leslie Ethridge Martin, AO21658, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Gwen Grover Atkinson, AO21660, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Harold Michael Keeffe, AO21661, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Wessler Bicking, AO21662, Air Force of United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Fred Edward Hild, AO32063, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Mark Curtis Bane, Jr., AO32076, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Vincent William Howard, AO40320, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Holliday Chick, AO32567, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Byron Manning Sansom, Jr., AO32095, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Hewitt Terrell Wheless, AO32096, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Clarence Glynn Poff, AO32100, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Leslie Wallace Holman, AO32102, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Thomas Screven Bond, Jr., AO40330, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Patrick Gerrity, AO32147, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Kenneth Rader Powell, AO32151, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Leonard Thomason Nicholson, AO32157, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harold Eugene Kofahl, AO32162, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Kyle Loyd Riddle, AO32161, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Howard Wendell Moore, AO32165, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Thornal Compton, AO32174, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert George Ruegg, AO32180, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Morris Brown, Jr., AO32188, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Ola Paul Thorne, AO32207, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Glen Robbins Birchard, AO32217, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Kenneth Leonard Johnson, AO32221, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Howell Starbuck, AO32228, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Sydney Thomas Smith, AO43603, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Oscar Reynold Schaaf, AO32262, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Arnold Delahay, AO32266, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Johnson Pugh, AO32269, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Elmer George Prohaska, AO43633, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Harry Edgar Goldsworthy, AO32283, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Loren George McCollom, AO32298, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Narce Whitaker, AO32305, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Joseph Ralph Buchert, AO32336, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Hugh O'Neill McTague, AO32340, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Stasia Rader, AO32342, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Delmer Joseph Rogers, AO21740, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Spoor Samuel, AO21742, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Roscoe Campbell Crawford, Jr., AO21752, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Yount Jumper, AO21763, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Henry Crandall Newcomer, AO21770, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Joseph George Perry, AO21771, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Harriman Curtin, AO21773, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Norman James McGowan, AO21776, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Josephus Alan Bowman, AO21785, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Benjamin Miller, AO21787, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Wilson Carpenter 3d, AO21790, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Wayne Laverne O'Hern, AO21793, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Edmund Howard, Jr., AO21806, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Adam Kirk Breckenridge, AO21815, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Roland Wallace Boughton, Jr., AO21816, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Arthur McDavid, AO21817, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Rufus Hardy Holloway, AO21826, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Allen Forrest Herzberg, AO21827, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henry Riggs Sullivan, Jr., AO21830, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Joseph Lawrence Dickman, AO21833, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Joseph Long, AO21834, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Henry Hillhouse, AO21838, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Roger Edwards Phelan, AO21842, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Merwyn Wray, AO21843, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Andrew John Kinney, AO21845, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Eugene Allen Romig, AO21856, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Orin Henry Rigley, Jr., AO21861, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Elbert Owen Meals, AO21872, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Edwin John Latoszewski, AO21875, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Richard Daniel Curtin, AO21883, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Frank Wallace Iseman, Jr., AO21889, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Barclay Knapp, AO21890, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Cecil Cerel McFarland, AO21894, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Benold Earl Glawe, AO21902, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Carver Sears, AO21906, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Evans Greer, AO21910, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Shepler Ward FitzGerald, Jr., AO21912, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Roy Little, AO21917, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Albert Leslie Evans, Jr., AO21925, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Richard Steele Morrison, AO21951, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Bernard Whitehouse, AO21958, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Daniel Farrington Tatum, AO21950, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Richard Gordon Lycan, AO21968, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Wallace Roger Zethren, AO21970, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Strother Banks Hardwick, Jr., AO21973, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Charlwood Richardson 3d, AO21975, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Brereton Bestic, AO21976, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Urban Brombach, AO21978, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Elliott Vandevanter, Jr., AO21989, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Wilbur Winston Bailey, AO21991, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Mercer Higginson, AO22003, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jack Gordon Merrell, AO22004, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Stein Boyd, AO22012, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Thomas Smith, AO22014, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Alfred Virgil Walton, AO22020, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Lee McDowell, Jr., AO22029, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ray Joseph Will, AO22030, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert John Rogers, AO22032, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Perry Milo Holsington 2d, AO22044, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Salvatore Edward Manzo, AO22053, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Leonard Nell Palmer, AO22055, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Kemp Martin, AO22061, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Royce Gideon, Jr., AO22064, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Prentiss Davis Wynne, Jr., AO22084, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ellsworth Reily Jacoby, AO22089, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Vincent Reardon, AO22111, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Theodore Kingsley, Jr., AO22112, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Christian Habecker, AO22117, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Carlos Edwards, AO22131, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Louis McCoy, AO22141, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Willard Barber Atwell, Jr., AO22142, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Manly Walton, Jr., AO22145, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Edwin Peter Schmid, AO22156, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lewis Wilson Stocking, AO22160, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Matthew James McKeever, Jr., AO22161, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Walter Wilson, AO22174, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Milton Bernard Adams, AO22178, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ronald Fredric Fallows, AO22362, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edwin Sterling Leland, AO43930, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Eugene Henry Berkenkamp, AO45932, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Byron Benjiman Webb, AO22197, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edwin Bruce Miller, Jr., AO22220, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Dale Donald Brannon, AO22228, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Fred Thomas Crimmins, Jr., AO22242, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Eugene Batchelder Fletcher, AO22243, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Marvin Leonard McNickle, AO22249, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Weeks Ingenhutt, AO22424, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Brooks Albert Lawhon, AO22446, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Howard Bayrand Selm, Jr., AO22448, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Oswald Weeks Lunde, AO22454, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Howard Franklin Bronson, Jr., AO22324, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Elbert Helton, AO22325, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henry Viccellio, AO22326, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frederic Colbert Gray, Jr., AO22327, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ralph Lowell Wessell, AO22329, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Osmond Jay Ritland, AO22332, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Victor Leuvik Anderson, AO22339, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joe Gordon Schneider, AO22340, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bourne Adkison, AO22342, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Harold Douglas Courtney, AO22343, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Benjamin Greene, Jr., AO22344, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Kenneth Crain, AO22345, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Loring Franklin Stetson, Jr., AO22346, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Glendon Philip Overing, AO22347, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Oscar Allen Heinlein, AO22348, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Emanuel Eubank, Jr., AO22349, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Edward Creer, AO22352, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Hubert Zemke, AO22353, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Thomas Kight, AO22356, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William John Bohnaker, AO22357, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Crawford McGehee, AO22358, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jo Kyle Warner, AO22359, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Stephen Chennault, AO22360, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Leroy Robinson, AO22362, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Eugene Herbert Snavely, AO22364, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Edward Northcutt, AO22365, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clarence Arthur Neely, AO22366, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Howard Alton Cheney, AO22370, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Allison Pechuls, AO22372, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Lynn Sullivan, AO22375, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Hiette Sinclair Williams, Jr., AO22378, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Fred Delaway Stevers, AO22379, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Glenn Carlyle Nye, AO22380, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Arthur Columbus Agan, Jr., AO22381, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ernest Gordon Ford, AO22382, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lee Bannerman Coats, AO22383, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant U. S. Air Force).

Col. Murray William Crowder, Jr., AO22385, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Edwin Basye, AO22386, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant U. S. Air Force).

Col. Wayne Earl Thurman, AO22390, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Edwin Miles Ramage, AO22391, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Don Coupland, AO22392, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Quentin Timson Quick, AO22393, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Beverly Howard Warren, AO22394, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Van Hatton Slayden, AO22395, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Wilbur Anderson, Jr., AO22398, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Horace Daniel Aynesworth, AO22399, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Erwin Elder, AO22402, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Hervey Haydon Whitfield, AO22405, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Edgar Davis, Jr., AO22406, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Kenneth Hodder Gibson, AO22410, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Jay Barrett, AO22411, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harold Walter Ohlke, AO22415, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Vernon DeShazo, AO22417, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Donald Bream Diehl, AO22418, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Chester Lee Sluder, AO22419, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Donald James French, AO22422, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Julian Marian Bleyer, AO22423, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Frederick Setchell, AO22428, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Karl Theodore Barthelmess, AO22429, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Donald Stuart Dunlap, AO22432, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bruce Burns Price, AO22434, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Duane Louis Kime, AO22435, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. David Arnold Tate, AO22437, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Allman Tenney Culbertson, AO22440, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jack Wesley Hughes, AO22442, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Ross Greening, AO22443, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Howard Walter Gray, AO22447, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Norman Luellen Ballard, AO22448, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Clyde Bagby, AO22449, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Leonard Boston Storm, AO22451, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henry Bosworth Darling, Jr., AO22453, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Austin Ames, AO22454, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Julian Mason, AO22456, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Paul Fulcher, AO22457, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Hugh Boyd Manson, Jr., AO22460, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Stanley Emrick, AO22461, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. A. J. Bird, Jr., AO22463, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Marvin Stoll Zipp, AO22465, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Estes Moore, AO22466, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edgar Wade Hampton, AO22468, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Richard Rowland, AO22470, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Albert Rouse, AO22472, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Allen Kurtz, AO22473, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Louis Rector Hughes, Jr., AO22480, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James William Chapman, Jr., AO22481, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. David Mudgett Jones, AO22482, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Richard Warren Philbrick, AO22483, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clair Arthur Peterson, AO22484, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Stanley Anthony Dallas, AO22485, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bingham Trigg Kleine, AO22486, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Hubbert Cleveland, AO22487, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Benjamin Reed, AO22488, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Dean Berry, AO22490, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Theron Coulter, AO22491, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clinton Curtis Wasem, AO22493, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Philip Henry Greasley, AO22497, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Cyrus William Kitchens, Jr., AO22499, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Troy Keith, AO22504, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Henry Schwartz, Jr., AO22506, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Walter Bennett Putnam, AO22508, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Brian O'Neill, AO22509, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Colonel John Timothy Fitzwater, AO22510, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Gladwyn Earl Pinkston, AO22511, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Oliver George Cellini, AO22517, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Henry MacDonald, AO22518, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Joseph Anthony Kelly, AO22519, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Arthur William Kellond, AO22520, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Broadus Beene Taylor, AO22522, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Monty Duran Wilson, AO22523, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Arthur Ray DeBolt, AO22525, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Harold Moore, AO22527, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank B. James, AO22529, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Theodore Wightman Tucker, AO22530, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Raymond Frank Rudell, AO22532, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ralph William Rodleck, AO22533, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Norton Harding Van Sicklen 3d, AO22534, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Gardner Chandler, Jr., AO22537, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Albert Vandenburgh Endress, AO22538, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, United States Air Force).

Col. William Sydnor Barksdale, Jr., AO22539, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Danforth Van Auken, AO22540, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Edwin Roberts, AO22541, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Leland Stanford McGowan, AO22542, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Carpenter Averill, AO22543, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Keith Karl Compton, AO22545, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jack William Saunders, AO22546, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Christopher Otho Moffett, AO22548, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Eugene Dougherty, AO22550, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Paul Christian Droz, AO22552, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Baird Tipton, AO22554, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Affleck Dunning, AO22556, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Eugene Lee Strickland, AO22557, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Dalene Edward Bailey, AO22558, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clemens Kleffer Wurzbach, AO22562, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Pinkham Smith, AO22563, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William David Gilchrist, AO22566, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Dellinger Dick, AO22569, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. J. C. Bailey, AO22571, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Valentine Edmundson, AO22573, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Adam Joseph Heintz, AO22575, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Vincent George Huston, AO22576, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Harry Joseph Holt, AO22577, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ansel James Wheeler, AO22580, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Guy Hamilton Rockey, AO22581, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Leo Francois Dusard, Jr., AO22585, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Kenton Hester, AO22586, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harry Blake Young, AO22589, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Horace Milton Wade, AO22592, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Renwick Nevitt, AO22595, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Giannatti, AO22599, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Richard Anderson, AO22600, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Milton Herbert Ashkins, AO22604, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Harry J. Bullis, AO22605, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jack Simmons Jenkins, AO22606, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Henry Mears, AO22608, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Adolph Edward Tokaz, AO22609, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. David Dickson Terry, Jr., AO22611, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Huie de Russy, AO22612, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Rufus Yancey, AO22613, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Francis Robert Feeney, AO22614, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clifford John Heflin, AO22617, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Kenneth Andrew Cavenah, AO22618, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Theodore Chadwell, AO22620, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Allison Johnson, AO22621, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harold Jacob Rau, AO22623, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Sam Wilkins Westbrook, AO22624, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Melvin Francis McNickle, AO22628, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Theodore Romaine Aylesworth, AO22629, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William James Wrigglesworth, AO22630, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Addison Blakey, AO32460, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Isadore Wood, AO22657, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Paul Howard Long, AO32489, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Randall Holzapple, AO32490, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edwin Allen Doss, AO32504, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Dumont Greenfield, AO32503, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Howard Elroy Watkins, AO32535, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lewis Plank Ensign, AO32554, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Watterston Veal, AO32568, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Salvador Phillip LaBarbera, AO32570, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Clayton Robertson, AO44101, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Benson Downer, AO32579, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Clarence Charles McPherson, AO32586, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Norman Gayle Morris, AO32597, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Oren James Poage, AO32601, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Ira Cornett, AO32617, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Tarleton Harvin Watkins, AO32623, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Osborn Hall, AO32624, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Howard Gorden Cook, AO32639, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Lee Delashaw, AO32646, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edward Charles Tates, AO32653, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Harley Camden Vaughn, AO32654, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Eugene Haile Callahan, AO32672, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Walter Elliott, AO32675, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Frederick Anderson, AO52433, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Robert Large, Jr., AO32707, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Eugene Bernard LeBailly, AO32720, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Harvard Wendell Powell, AO44223, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henry Dittman, AO32752, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Edwin Andrew Loberg, AO32757, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Warfield Tibbets, Jr., AO32761, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Todd Crowell, AO32769, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harry Owen Patteson, AO32779, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Ronald Dean Hubbard, AO32785, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Albert William Fletcher, AO32794, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Wallace Packard Mace, AO32800, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John George Glover, AO32806, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Hallock Peter Kindle Walmsley, AO32814, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert William Witty, AO32818, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Cecil Herbert Scott, Jr., AO32821, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joe Lennard Mason, AO32831, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Roswell Freedman, AO32839, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. David Arthur Burchinal, AO32840, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charlie Rankin Bond, Jr., AO32850, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Dalton Jones, AO52511, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Churchill Hutchinson, AO22802, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Peter Bostrom, AO22804, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Herbert Otto Wangeman, AO22805, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richmond Archibald Livingstone, AO22806, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Sylvan Davis Hand, AO22807, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Copeland Paul, AO22809, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Franklin Whisenand, AO22812, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Roland John Barnick, AO22820, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Thomas Harber Holbrook, AO22822, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Clarence Bernard Hammerle, Jr., AO22824, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John William Weltman, AO22825, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert John Koster, AO22826, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Daniel Mayden, AO22831, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Anthony Vincent Grossetta, AO22832, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Henry Carter, AO22833, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Brunow William Felling, AO22838, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Glen Webster Martin, AO22839, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Edward Gregory, AO22841, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Marion Eisenhart, AO22843, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Gilbert Louis Meyers, AO22848, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Keith Wesley Dech, AO22849, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Lowry Dunn, AO22856, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Jerome Hughey, AO22857, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Everett Wilson Stewart, AO22859, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Frank Robbins Pancake, AO22861, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Wallace Momyer, AO22862, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Nelson Boaz, Jr., AO22867, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph James Preston, AO22868, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Randolph Maney, AO22871, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Jerome Tarter, AO22872, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Dewey Slocumb, Jr., AO22873, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Adriel Newton Williams, AO22877, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Constantine Schauer, AO22879, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Echelbary Cranston, AO22882, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Loran John Anderson, AO44355, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Gilbert Lawrence Pritchard, AO32873, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Victor Edwin Warford, AO32914, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Franklin McConnell 2d, AO32920, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Elroy Kimmel, AO32926, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Winston Cureton Fowler, AO22893, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Cutright Sheetz, AO22895, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Austin James Russell, AO22906, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harry Albright French, AO22908, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Nathan Louis Krisberg, AO22931, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Edward Applegate, AO22933, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Carey Law O'Bryan, Jr., AO22936, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Jack Stewart DeWitt, AO22956, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Webster Bagstad, AO22986, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Hamilton Warren, AO22989, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Manford Jay Wetzel, AO22990, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Richard Josiah Kent, AO23005, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Willis Franklin Lewis, AO23013, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Wilbur Wilcox, AO23020, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Sargent Abbey, AO23022, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Francis Clare Gideon, AO23034, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Philip Courtney Loofbourrow, AO23050, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Davison Dalziel, AO23071, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Edward Buck, Jr., AO23072, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Joseph LaBreche, AO23075, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Raymond Starrat Sleeper, AO23088, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Robert Wilbraham, AO23091, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Beverly Campbell, AO23101, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Fant Berry, AO23125, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Dill Baynard Ellis, AO23133, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Everett Houston Ware, AO23134, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Reginald James Clizbe, AO23155, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Ernest Bryant Jones, AO23163, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Maurice Earle Parker, AO23166, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Andre Ringgold Brousseau, AO23209, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Ross East, Jr., AO23212, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Lester Cicil Hess, AO23214, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert William Strong, Jr., AO23215, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Henry Hudson Norman, Jr., AO23216, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John William Norvell, AO23223, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Allan Ashley Crockett, AO23227, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Warren Curtis Stirling, AO23230, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Raymond John Downey, AO23233, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Roy Willard Nelson, Jr., AO23238, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Arthur Theodore Frontczak, AO23246, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Stanton Thomas Smith, Jr., AO23266, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Julius Boswell Summers, Jr., AO23271, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Karl Tweeten Rauk, AO23272, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Francis Coleman, AO23280, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Burton Elmo McKenzie, AO23289, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Mason Smelley, AO23291, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, United States Air Force).

Col. William Powell Litton, AO23300, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Alvan Cullom Gillem 2d, AO23302, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Theodore Ross Milton, AO23307, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Kermit Robert Dyke, AO23318, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Frederick Stewart, AO23332, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Wendell Rogers, AO32929, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Olien Turner, AO44433, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Francis Robert Royal, AO32933, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Hubert Stonewall Judy, Jr., AO32937, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Weldon Marion James, AO23353, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Norton Reynolds, AO23354, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Elza McEntire, AO23355, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bryan Brand Harper, AO23356, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Alvin Edward Hebert, AO23360, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Miles McNeese, AO23361, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Condie Sanders, AO23366, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Ernest Roderic Manierre, AO23367, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Fleming Harris, AO23368, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Lee Baseler, AO23371, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Gerhard John Schriever, AO23373, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Adolf Milton Wright, AO23374, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Cecil James Looke, Jr., AO23375, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Edward Glober, AO23377, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Afton Gayle, AO23379, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Orville Herman Rehmann, AO23383, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Orie Olin Schurter, AO23384, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Ellsworth Boyd, AO23389, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Alexander George Evanoff, AO23391, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jerry Dentler Page, AO23392, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Rollen Henry Anthis, AO23393, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Austin Cunningham, AO23394, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Dorr Ellsworth Newton, Jr., AO23396, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Donald Leonard Clark, AO23397, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Stanley Jeffrey, Jr., AO23400, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Stephen Davenport McElroy, AO23467, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Roger McKee Crow, AO23476, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Horace Albert Hanes, AO23480, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Stuart Moss Porter, AO23481, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Alvan Neavitt Moore, AO23484, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Frank Lee Wood, Jr., AO23485, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Norton Graves, AO23506, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Robert Ford, AO23508, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Carl Paul Walter, AO23521, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ariel Wayne Nielsen, AO23537, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Barkeley McPherson, AO23538, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Edward Nitsche, AO23557, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

To be first lieutenants

Second Lt. Thomas Alonzo Webb, AO50407, United States Air Force, with rank from June 1, 1948.

First Lt. Elwood Dean Storrs, Jr., AO56563, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 2, 1948.

First Lt. Gordon Joseph James, AO38408, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 2, 1948.

First Lt. William George Morley, AO50408, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 4, 1948.

First Lt. Ward Ellsworth Protsman, AO27060, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Rean Lochry, AO27064, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Francis Hegenberger, AO27067, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Handford Lindsley Cummings, Jr., AO27031, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Hal Lloyd FitzPatrick, AO27097, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Wallace Gourley Hynds, Jr., AO27099, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Arnold Horowitz, AO27106, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. George Frederick Bond, Jr., AO27109, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Paul Baker, Jr., AO27113, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Estes Farrar, Jr., AO27116, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Gifford Merrill Holden, Jr., AO27120, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Edward Reuler, AO27123, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. David James Crawford 3d, AO27127, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Hugh Campbell Parker, Jr., AO27129, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Arthur Summer, AO27134, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

Second Lt. Henry Lee Warren, AO27137, United States Air Force, with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Standish Stoer, AO27144, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Albert Kellogg Stebbins 3d, AO27149, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Edward Richards, AO27152, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Arthur James Steele, AO27158, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Maxwell Oscar Johnson, Jr., AO27155, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Byron Franklin Knolls, Jr., AO27166, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Kendall Russell, AO27167, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Thomas Russell Marks, AO27173, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Francis Lish, AO27175, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Ross Karr, AO27182, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Arthur Willis Walton, AO27186, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Warren Marshall Briggs, AO27187, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Ofa Swann Nichols, Jr., AO27189, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Tuinenburg Preston, AO27192, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Arnold Reints, AO27195, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Roland Daniel Foley, Jr., AO27199, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Frank Freeman Marvin, AO27202, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Harry Lee Maynard, AO27205, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Robert Jarrell, Jr., AO27206, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Charles William Clark, AO27208, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Bobby Lee Marlow, AO27209, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Vergil Calvin Givens, AO27214, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Frederic William Hartwig, AO27215, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Eugene Duvall, AO27217, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Martin Harvey Brewer, Jr., AO27218, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Kelton Merrill Farris, AO27220, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Daniel Doremus Whitcraft, Jr., AO27221, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force) with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Will Coffey, Jr. AO27222, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Brierton Townsend, Jr., AO27223, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Derrick Raymond, AO27225, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Harlie Bacon, AO27243, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Roger Lundeen Johnson, AO27246, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Baird MacWherter, AO27250, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Frank Winthrop Draper, AO27262, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Malcolm Nebeker Stewart, Jr., AO27266, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Atkinson Jones 3d, AO27268, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Alfred Gardner Thompson, AO27269, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Jack Graham Crouch, AO27270, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Richard Patrick Conniff, AO27271, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Robert Manlove, AO27274, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. George Alexander Williams, Jr., AO27275, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Vernon Monroe Smith, AO27276, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Albert Roland Neville, Jr., AO27278, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Ray Scott Basham, AO27280, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert McChesney Smith, AO27281, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William King Moran, Jr., AO27283, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. David Wauchope Crockett, AO27284, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Harold Dow Swain, Jr., AO27286, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Chester Arthur Skelton, Jr., AO27287, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Jeptha Hughes Evans, AO27290, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Charles Edward Barnett, AO27305, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Franklin Chee Davies AO27306, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Henry Hull Stick, AO27307, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Graham Valpey, AO27311, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Marshall Glenn Coulter, Jr., AO27313, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Anthony Roberts Parrish, AO27314, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Frank Sylvester Attinger, Jr., AO27315, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Earl Milton Thompson, AO27316, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. John Samuel Holtze, AO27317, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Orlando Holway, 3d, AO27322, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Frank Gilbert, AO27325, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Ralph Joseph Ford, Jr., AO27328, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. J. F. Allen, Jr., AO27330, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Charles Lewis Gandy, Jr., AO27324, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Samuel Brown Adams, Jr., AO27335, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Wendell Jackson Long, AO27337, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Bradley Chickering, AO27338, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert George Lindsay, AO27339, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Shelton Gillespie Spear, AO27340, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Richard Byrd Minor, AO27341, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Richard Golden, AO27351, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Harry Randolph Patrick, AO27352, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Broomhall Swartz, AO27353, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Jack Chase Pettee, AO27354, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Charles Jerome Avery, AO27358, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John William Storb, AO27360, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Harrison Larkin, AO27366, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Kingdon Alva Davidson, AO27368, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Goodman Lake, AO27372, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Edgar Marvin Munyon, AO27377, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Billy Neel Hollis, AO27385, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Cecil Leland Rutledge, Jr., AO27386, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Sterling Wood, AO27387, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Paule Eckert, AO27391, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Blount Craig, AO27392, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Edmund Anthony Rafalko, AO27393, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

Second Lt. Basil A. Brockles, Jr., AO27867, United States Air Force, with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Roy Leon Marston, AO27402, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Grant Harrison Fenn, AO27406, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Samuel Kenric Lessey, AO27409, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Duncan Gault AO27414, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Thomas Bess, Jr., AO27417, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×Second Lt. Harold Howard Buth, AO27418, United States Air Force, with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Charles Brown Rupert, AO27420, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John William Pauly, AO27424, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Adolphus Giles, AO27425, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. David Murray Field, AO27426, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Clifford Edward Myers, Jr., AO27430, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Paul Clement Whelan, AO27439, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Edgar Walker Nichols, AO27443, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Calvert Lewis Estill, Jr., AO27444, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Wilson Patrick Hurley, AO27449, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John William Campbell, Jr., AO27450, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Henry Lee Cobb, Jr., AO27457, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

Second Lt. Ernest James Davis, Jr., AO27456, United States Air Force, with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Jack Norman Hoffman, AO27459, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Jesse Bethea Hearin, Jr., AO27460, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Joseph Denton Ledford, AO27465, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Edward McGlynn, AO27470, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Archie Rice Patterson, Jr., AO27472, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Jack Harding Romney, AO27482, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Jesse Cecil Gatlin, Jr., AO27483, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Russell Eugene Taliaferro, AO27500, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Charles Irvin Daubert, AO27502, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Richard Wale Williver, AO27505, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Ewing Lawrence, AO27506, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Duer Ludlow, AO27510, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Malcolm Fitzpatrick, AO27512, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Frederick Clifton Thayer, Jr., AO27513, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Clark Wayne, AO27517, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Walter Turbush Galligan, AO27518, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Lee Treester, AO27526, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Donald Ray Bissell, AO27528, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Spearman Simpson, AO27532, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Edward Francis Deacon, Jr., AO27533, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Richard Allen Perez, AO27534, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Rowland Charles William Blessley, Jr., AO27536, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Ralph Alan Ellis, Jr., AO27537, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Edwin Harry Bailey, AO27538, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James John Rouch, AO27539, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Clair Gene Whitney, AO27541, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Harold Ballard Wohlford, AO27548, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Kenneth Lee Jackson, AO27549, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Edward Jones Mason, AO27552, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Edward Pine, AO27557, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Wesley Sherwood, Jr., AO27559, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Charles William Cross, AO27561, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Ray Stanley Jones, Jr., AO27572, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Harry Richard Middleton, AO27573, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Kenneth Homer Werner, AO27576, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Finley Trimble, AO27588, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Edwin Godwin Kellum, AO27590, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Jacob Knight, AO27591, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Clarence Virgil Slack, Jr., AO27592, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force) with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Gale Breene, Jr., AO27596, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Scott Anthony Kuntz, AO27598, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Robert Lewis Babin, AO27599, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Charles Edward Moran, AO27606, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Dirck deRyee Westervelt, AO27615, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Ralph Granik, AO27617, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Augustine Stephen Puchrik, AO27620, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Frank Aloysius Lee, AO27621, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Gordon Mason, AO27625, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Charles Morgan Seeger, Jr., AO27626, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Clarence Leslie Linton, AO27630, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Simpson Bartron, AO27631, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Glen Chadwick Childs, AO27632, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

Second Lt. Yale Francis Trustin, AO27633, United States Air Force, with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Roff Horner, AO27637, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Frederick Wadsworth Robinson, AO27638, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James David Morrison Morris, AO27644, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Chauncey Brooks Vandevanter, AO27647, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Rumley Wallace, Jr., AO27650, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Winthrop William Widman, AO27654, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Walter Branham Dillard 3d, AO27657, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Daniel Jack Nelson, AO27659, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Barrett English, AO27660, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Alfred Lewis Bailey, AO27662, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Peter Van Matre, AO27663, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Lorrin Carlton Peterson, AO27665, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Homer Robert Minckler, AO27671, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Thomas Farr, AO27676, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Joseph Rice Byron, AO27686, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Joseph Schiblisky, AO27687, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Ash Callahan, AO27688, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Theodore Mayer Fite, AO27690, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Cole Dempster Bacon, AO27691, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. John Edward Coulahan, Jr., AO27692, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Nat Dulaney King, AO27694, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Earl Dudley Bruton, Jr., AO27705, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Richard Warren Hurdis, AO27706, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Ralph Francis Croal, Jr., AO27707, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Cannon Hanes, AO27709, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Louis Lyon Martin, AO27710, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Ivan Leon Foster, Jr., AO27716, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Claudius daSilva Fingar, AO27717, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Roger Eugene Miller, AO27718, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Max Findell, AO27720, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Jacques George Beezley, AO27730, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Leon Alexander Dombrowski, Jr., AO27731, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Charles William Pratt, AO27742, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Earl Vane Wilkinson, Jr., AO27754, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Randolph Carrington Heard, AO27755, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Allen Evans, AO27757, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Donald Valen Crowe, AO27758, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Marshall Pulliam, AO27762, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Pagenstecher Liebel, AO27763, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Devol Brett, AO27767, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Chester Val Braun, AO27768, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Price Smith, AO27769, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Thomas Benton Catron, 4th, AO27770, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Elmer Resides Haslett, AO27800, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Norman Gardiner Sauer, AO27773, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Donald Elner Huseby, AO27776, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Walter Aaron Carter, Jr., AO27778, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Morton Spiegel, AO27780, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Harry Grady Walker, Jr., AO27781, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Frederick Corbin Blesse, AO27784, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Alexander Otto Froede, Jr. AO27788, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Leonard William Lilley, AO27792, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Daniel Crawford Perry, AO27793, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force) with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Stewart Sylvester Stabley, Jr., AO27795, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Nathan Brown Chase, AO27799, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Joseph Francis McCaddon, AO27801, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Paul Kenneth Bullard, AO27804, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. George Elden Shaffner, AO27806, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Harold Frederick Brenneman, AO27611, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Philip Brown, AO27617, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Alfred Dixon Blue, AO27619, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

Second Lt. Harry Drake, AO27824, United States Air Force, with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Wilbur Raymond Pugh, AO27826, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Elias Spragins, AO27827, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Slade Nash, AO27828, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Emmet Rochfort, AO27832, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Joseph Thomas O'Neal, AO27835, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Walter Leslie Gerald, Jr., AO27841, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

Second Lt. Paul Walker Field, AO27850, United States Air Force, with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Lyman Screven Willcox, AO27851, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Thomas Hanley Curtis, AO27854, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Donovan Low McCance, AO27855, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Hally Delmar Chesney, Jr., AO27865, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Robert Stickman, Jr., AO27867, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Jacksel Markham Broughton, AO27870, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Daniel Ely Farr 2d, AO27878, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Kenneth Thompson Blood, Jr., AO27881, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Josiah Snow 2d, AO27882, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

Second Lt. Rodney Hugh Newbold, AO50409, United States Air Force, with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Dias Hippert, AO27884, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 6, 1948.

×First Lt. Jesse Henry Johnson, AO27888, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 7, 1948.

First Lt. Theodore Mark Jablonski, AO41394, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 9, 1948.

Capt. Anthony Joseph Rose, AO50412, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 10, 1948.

First Lt. Lloyd Gerald Miller, AO56567, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 12, 1948.

×First Lt. Lawrence Eugene Killion, AO56566, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 12, 1948.

Capt. Alvin Mathew Welbes, AO50413, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 13, 1948.

First Lt. Carl Edwin Fales, AO56569, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 13, 1948.

First Lt. George Drexel LeMay AO56505, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 14, 1948.

First Lt. Herbert Richard Dahl, AO56570, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force) with rank from June 16, 1948.

First Lt. Joseph Rodney Thomis, AO56573, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 16, 1948.

Second Lt. Lawrence Thomas Lawler, AO50414, United States Air Force, with rank from June 16, 1948.

First Lt. Walter Eugene Julin, AO56575, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 18, 1948.

First Lt. Harris Ong Poy, AO56576, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 19, 1948.

Second Lt. Alfonso Christopher Toler, AO56577, United States Air Force, with rank from June 21, 1948.

Second Lt. Don William King, AO50416, United States Air Force, with rank from June 23, 1948.

First Lt. Lewis Eugene Williams, AO50417, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 23, 1948.

First Lt. Alphons Edward Kosciuszko, AO56578, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 23, 1948.

First Lt. Ray Eugene Sterling, AO50418, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 23, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Francis Nee, AO56461, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 23, 1948.

First Lt. Edward Richard Van Sant, AO50420, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 24, 1948.

First Lt. Glendor D. McAdams, AO56563, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 27, 1948.

Second Lt. John Tilia Parish, Jr., AO50421, United States Air Force, with rank from June 27, 1948.

First Lt. William David Small, Jr., AO56460, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 27, 1948.

Second Lt. William George Metsopoulos, AO56581, United States Air Force, with rank from June 27, 1948.

Second Lt. James Holte Hegg, AO56580, United States Air Force, with rank from June 27, 1948.

Capt. Gail Eugene Jacobson, AO56582, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 29, 1948.

First Lt. Harley LeRoy Grimm, AO56584, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 29, 1948.

First Lt. Delphin Randolph Nasty, AO56585, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 30, 1948.

First Lt. James Joseph Connolly, AO56484, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 30, 1948.

(All of the above-named officers were promoted during the recess of the Senate.)

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the line of the Navy:

Theodore C. Lonnquest	Daniel V. Gallery, Jr.
Louis Dreller	Walter F. Boone
David H. Clark	Joseph F. Bolger
John E. Gingrich	Oswald S. Colclough
Austin K. Doyle	John H. Carson
Thomas H. Robbins, Jr.	Ernest E. Herrmann
William G. Tomlinson	Ernest H. von Heimburg
Richard F. Whitehead	
Charles Wellborn, Jr.	

The following-named officer for permanent apointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

Morton D. Willcutts

The following-named officer for permanent appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

Andrew G. Bisset

The following-named officer for permanent appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

Clemens V. Rault

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of captain in the line of the Navy:

Oliver W. Gaines	Jesse L. Hull
William L. Pryor, Jr.	Upton S. Brady, Jr.
Mario G. Vangeli	Charles N. Day
Willard M. Sweetser	John F. Greenslade
Clarence Broussard	John A. Winfrey
Karl F. Poehlmann	Theodore R. Frederick
James F. Byrne	William A. Dolan, Jr.
William G. Cooper	Theodore C. Aylward
William L. Anderson	Eugene F. May
Etheridge Grant	William T. Jones
Clarence W. McClusky Jr.	William Miller
Wendell F. Kline	William R. Smedberg 3d
Donald L. Mills	Francis L. Busey
Samuel M. Tucker	John P. Fitzsimmons
Clifford H. Duerfeldt	William R. Hollingsworth
Paul W. Watson	
Louis E. French	James E. Leeper
Clarence O. Taff	Ford N. Taylor, Jr.

Roy A. Gano
Robert R. Johnson
William K. Romoser
Edward L. B. Weimer
John E. Fradd
Robert B. Ellis
Ralph S. Clarke
Valery Havard, Jr.
Charles W. Moses
Robert S. Purvis
Gordon Campbell
Pondville L. Tedder
Gerald D. Zurmuehlen
John A. Glick
Gordon A. McLean
Robert G. Armstrong
John G. Foster, Jr.
Baron G. Lowrey
Joe B. Paschal
Ranson Fullinwider
John L. Woodbury
Charles Jackson
Henry T. Dietrich
Walter L. Dyer
Edward S. Hutchinson
Kenneth Craig
Oscar Pederson
Charles T. Singleton, Jr.
Lawrence H. Martin
Charles E. Crombe, Jr.
Laurence H. Frost
Leonard J. Dow
Paul L. Dudley
Burnham C. McCaffree
Eugene S. Karpe
Jacob E. Cooper
Luther K. Reynolds
Louis E. Gunther
Charles J. Whiting

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of captain in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

Omar J. Brown
John R. Weisser
Kenneth H. Vinnedge
Milton R. Wirthlin
Thenton D. Boaz
Frank P. Gilmore
Paul Vaughn
Carr E. Bentel
William L. Berkley
Norris M. Hardisty
Gerard B. Creagh
Anselm C. Hohn
Craig B. Johnson

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of captain in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

Fred L. Haerlin
Norman A. Helfrich
Lysle W. Cease
Mark W. Clay

The following-named officer for permanent appointment to the grade of captain in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy:

Edward B. Harp, Jr.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of captain in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

Clifford E. Allen
Raymond A. Lowry

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of commander in the line of the Navy:

Thomas K. Kimmel
Sydney S. Sherby
Ellis B. Orr
Archibald E. Teall
William Blenman
Otis R. Cole, Jr.
James J. Southerland II
Robert "W" McElrath
Charles S. Manning, Jr.
Thomas B. Dabney
Richard R. Bradley, Jr.
James H. Barnard II
Sherman "E" Wright, Jr.
Delmer F. Quackenbush, Jr.
Warfield C. Bennett, Jr.
Parker L. Folsom
Joseph A. Coppola
Henry A. Romberg
James R. Hansen
John N. Boland
Pitzhugh L. Palmer, Jr.
Bennett C. Oelheim
Harry A. Barnard, Jr.
John V. Noel, Jr.
Hoyt D. Mann
George H. Whiting
Malcolm C. McGrath
Frank G. Law
Paul E. Summers
Gilven M. Slonim
William A. Ellis
Donald G. Gumz
Paul C. Stimson
Everett M. Link, Jr.
Charles E. Houston
Marshall F. Thompson
Richard R. Pratt
Joseph B. Icenhower
Gordon Fowler
Frank E. Hayler
John K. Fyfe
James W. McCauley
Ed R. King
Bruce R. Ware, III
Robert H. Caldwell, Jr.
James B. Rutter, Jr.
John H. Carmichael
Daniel McE. Entler, Jr.
James W. O'Grady
Harlan G. Kirkpatrick
Robert C. Morton
Harry F. Holmshaw
Robert F. Kelly
Fred D. Michael
Donald G. Dockum
William H. Shea, Jr.
Norman C. Gillette, Jr.
Richard L. Fowler
William H. Wright
Ormond G. Sexton, III
Walter W. Boyd
John R. Millett
Renfro Turner, Jr.
William J. Lederer, Jr.
Richard A. Teel
Paul H. Bjarnason
Thomas W. Samuel
Paul B. Ryan
Jasper N. McDonald
John J. Kircher
Ray S. Thompson, Jr.
Ralph R. Humes
Edward E. Hoffman
Charles M. Holcombe
Oliver N. Fowler
Carlos L. Dean
William C. Mott
Francis A. Klaveness
James L. Foley
Charles K. Hutchison
Elliott M. West
Vincent P. Casey
John J. Lynch
Edgar E. Stebbins
Jack B. Dawley
Harry E. Cook, Jr.
Joseph A. Gage, Jr.
James O. Taylor
Forrest A. Roby, Jr.
Brendon J. Moynahan
William R. Staggs
Harry W. Harrison, Jr.
Ben Moore, Jr.
John P. Sager
William H. Hilands
Hawley Russell
Pliny G. Holt
Paul C. Griggs
John H. Pennoyer
Charles J. Eastman
Aram Y. Parunak
Alfred L. Gurney
Glenn W. Okerson
Harold H. Hirschy
James L. Skinner
Gordon E. Bolser
James W. Klopp
Eugene R. Dare
Charles H. Franklin
William C. Dunn
Howard M. Avery
Robert L. Eldridge
William G. Von Bracht
Richard L. Friede
Alfred I. Boyd, Jr.
Ernest L. Simpson, Jr.
Richard G. Touart
Gordon R. Fiss
Algernon S. Joyner, Jr.
Ramond C. Ericson
Thomas R. Langley
Paul W. Card
Oscar E. Loeser, Jr.
Philip A. Tague, Jr.
Curtis A. Myers
William I. Darnell
Alfred M. Aichel
Earl H. Pope
Edwin G. Conley
Charles F. Phillips
Alvin Robinson
Clarence F. Clark
Donald I. Mather
George H. Chapman, Jr.
Frank E. Blackmore
Joseph T. Thornton, Jr.
George P. Huff
Julius E. Smith, Jr.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

John E. Nardini
Martin Cooperman
Alvin J. Paulosky
Vernon E. Martens
Otto C. Baumgarten
Bruce L. Kendall
Harry T. Stradford
DeSales G. DuVigneaud
Paul Deranian
William J. James
Phillips L. Claud
Elvin E. Keeton
Ferdinand V. Berley
James Crawford
Hugh V. O'Connell
Leonard H. Barber
Horace D. Warden
Edward T. Byrne
Jacob G. Hebble 3d
John H. Moser
John H. Cox
LeRoy L. Kenney
Marvin M. McLean
Harold H. Hill
Roy E. Crowder
Harold D. Giddings
Wesley Fry
Rexel Goodman
Robert E. Henderson
Harold F. Thompson
Walter W. Gilbert
George M. Lynch
John S. Hanten
John S. Gruggel
Arthur B. R. Smith
Miles C. Krepela
James H. Gillen, Jr.
Jack Warren
Edward A. Hynes
Robert B. Shepardson
Bernard I. Kahn
Roger A. James
John R. Cavanagh
Ferold D. Lovejoy
Sidney A. Britten
William F. Lyons
Edgar F. Hooker
Paul W. Carrigan
Alexander N. Chaffin
Graham R. Johnston
Sidney F. Johnston
Leo W. Olechowski
Edward H. Taylor
George N. Schiff

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of commander in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

William J. Johnston
Martin Miller
Edgar D. Vestel, Jr.
Billy Johnson
William M. Huey, Jr.
Elton W. Sutherling
John D. Hyerle
Norbert C. Brady
Marcus A. Peel, Jr.
Stanton M. Trott
Irwin S. Moore
Richard E. Winslow, Jr.
Avery A. Pabst
James N. Witherell

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of commander in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy:

John P. Murphy
James E. Davis
Raymond C. Hohenstein

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of commander in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

John W. Gordanier
Richard E. Harris
Howard M. Lloyd
Jack G. Dodd
Gerald Q. Thacker
Roscoe A. Davidson
Clemens E. Spellman
Frank L. Endebrock
Kenneth M. West
John C. Sease
Richard W. Smith
Weston M. Johnson
Frank C. Tyrrell
George M. Gans
Samuel K. Wilson
John P. Roulett, Jr.
Robert B. Morris
William O. Treber
James F. Cunniff
Lattimer W. Reeder
Roscoe E. Van Liew
Edward H. Feldmann

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of commander in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

Sidney C. Liedman
Richard J. H. Stanton
Wilson P. Kemp
Richard C. Shaw
Theodore A. Lesney
Howard B. McKinney
William R. Stanmeyer
Harry B. McInnis
Robert A. Colby
William J. Charm
George R. Reynolds
Fred E. Goodell
Walter B. Lett
Clyde L. Martin

The following-named officer for permanent appointment to the grade of commander in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

Richard H. Lee

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant commander in the line of the Navy:

Richard H. Hart
Wylie M. Hunt
Charles W. Rainwater
John W. Mason, Jr.
Walter L. Fisher
Claude R. Frazier
William A. Rawls
George H. Sult
Shelby C. Gass, Jr.
William T. Amen
Jimmie E. Savage
Harris O. Torgerson
Robert B. Blodgett
Greenville R. Berkeley, Jr.
Mottrom J. Ball
Lawrence Kelley
Laurence L. Hamrick
Richard H. Shireman, Jr.
Arthur C. Cason
Samuel L. White
Bernard Amman
Chester D. Rogers
James L. Daily
Paul J. Siegel
James D. Taylor
Carl L. Speirs
Jewell S. Fahlgren
Andreas P. Anderson
Richard Z. Hughes
Harold C. Stirling
Ralph S. Taylor
Hollier G. Tomlin
Henry Suerstedt, Jr.
John C. O'Connor
Thomas R. McKelvey, Jr.
John C. Coulthard
George F. Nasworthy
Robert H. Jennings
Paul B. Garrison
Ciro N. V. Whited, Jr.
Paul E. Pugh
John D. Carter, Jr.
John M. Breen
Jesse T. Barker
William E. McLaughlin
Clarence B. Gregg
Bennie W. Jones, Jr.
Robert J. Beaudine
Willard D. Dietz
Richard D. Warner
Edmund W. Creekmore
Lester D. Olson
Nicholas Brango
Leslie J. Carr
Frederick M. Rountree
Bradford M. Dyer
Charles J. Schroeder
Robert J. Hunt
William S. Adams
Gaylord T. Forrest
Frank E. Standring
Archie L. Mills
Ferdinand J. Plumer
Albert J. Mayer
Samuel H. Dinsmore
Lauris J. Leary
Samuel W. Forrer
James A. Downs
Harley F. Thompson
William B. Craig
Charles S. Tanner
Dwight D. Nott
Marvin L. Ramsey
Lawrence E. Flint, Jr.
Rodger R. H. Lade
Harold E. Belew
Lawrence H. Reagan
James L. Harlan
Elbert O. Berns
William T. Sorensen
Matthew R. Grotnada
Robert I. Myers
Claredon H. Sigley
William B. Garrison, Jr
Harold L. Buell
John H. Bahlman
William M. Laird
Roy S. Reeves
Francis B. Mooney
John H. Bear
Patrick E. Russell
James L. Naftzger
Arthur E. Simmons
Frederick N. Conyne
Philip G. Marquart
Alan M. Thewlis
Robert W. Laughead
Wayne T. Wilcox, Jr.
Thomas R. Wheaton
Francis X. Timmes
Gaines B. Turner
Orville W. J. Dryer
Chester F. Rief
William D. Baird
Gordon M. Riddick
Wayne R. Waters
James R. P. Gotch

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant commander in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

Benn A. Fairchild
Edmund G. Oelkers
Paul J. Loegel
Richard B. Murto, Jr.
William Ward
Ernest M. Joyce
Ernest W. Rogers
James M. Williams

Clark Dunn
Joseph H. Lillis
Edgar M. Brown
Merwood R. Bishop
Walter C. Chapman
Goff E. Manuel
John A. Hagan
Dallas E. Kellum
Paul Tasker
David E. Fay

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant commander in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy:

Richard W. Ricker
Howard A. Seymour
James E. Reaves

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant commander in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

David E. Rogers
Harold I. Taylor, Jr.
Samuel C. Gill, Jr.
Harry C. Wills
Verne M. Tregonis

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant commander in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

Rupert S. Walker
Furman L. Sheppard
Arthur J. Loring
George E. Dudley
James G. Rogers, Jr.

The following-named officer for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant commander in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

Albert M. Gulledge

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant commander in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Nellie M. Quinn
Gladys Smith
Teresa M. Duggan
Anna L. Welsko

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 13, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Everlasting God, the Father of all men, we pray that our responsibility to our country may be revealed through our thoughts, our speech, and our works. Give us, O God, a faith that will not shrink from criticism, that seeks to do our whole duty to our people.

Whatever hardship may be entailed, make our daily procedure altogether worthy of the confidence of our fellow men. O come richly and abundantly to our beloved homeland, with a tremendous surging of brotherhood in the soul of our Republic. In the name of our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 10, 1949, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

Mr. SOMERS appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

EXEMPTION FROM TAX OF CERTAIN TICKETS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight next Saturday to file a report on House Joint Resolution 85.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. HALLECK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I am not going to object, will the gentleman from North Carolina explain what this joint resolution seeks to do?

Mr. DOUGHTON. This House joint resolution exempts from tax amounts paid for admission tickets sold by authority of the Committee on Inaugural Programs on the occasion of the inauguration of the President of the United States in January 1949.

Mr. HALLECK. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have a little explanation of the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. This is a resolution similar to what has been passed on other occasions. It has been introduced and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. The Committee on Ways and Means will consider it. This is a unanimous-consent request that the committee have until midnight Saturday to file a report.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What is the request?

Mr. McCORMACK. That the committee have until midnight Saturday to file a report.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. To file a report respecting what?

Mr. McCORMACK. Respecting the resolution which would exempt from the payment of the miscellaneous tax sales of tickets sold in connection with the ceremonies relating to the inaugural by the Inaugural Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman tell the House why these tickets should be exempted from taxation?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, that question will be discussed later.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I trust the gentleman from Ohio will not object. This is simply a request to file a report by Saturday night, a request that has been made many times by legislative committees, and the practice is one that has always been followed so far as I know.

Now, whether or not action should be taken on it afterward is a question to be determined by the House.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. My purpose is to bring before the House the underlying purpose and the real facts relating to this subject.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, may I ask whether this just applies to tickets for seats or does it include many other exemptions other than tickets?

Mr. McCORMACK. It applies to admission tickets sold by authority of the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies.

Mr. RICH. How far does it go beyond the sale of tickets for seats along the parade route?

Mr. McCORMACK. Without committing myself, that will be brought out later, but I should imagine it would probably apply to the inaugural ball and only official activities authorized by the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies, which has been officially appointed for the purpose.

Mr. RICH. If it does apply to more than seats along the parade route, are we going to have an opportunity to know about those things before we vote?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to remind the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] that we are getting ready to inaugurate a Democratic President on a Republican platform.

That platform was built to inaugurate Mr. Dewey on, and it cost a great deal of money.

Therefore, these tickets are rather high; and this measure is designed to lighten the burden of the individuals who come to witness the inauguration.

Mr. RICH. Then they ought to pay a tax on these tickets, in order to help defray the expenses of the inauguration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I have for today be vacated and that I may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour on Monday next following the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of deceitful propaganda.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 15 minutes today following the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, numerous reports have reached me in the last few days that hotels in Washington are overcharging for rooms during the period of the inauguration. I do not know whether rates have been raised generally, and

it may be that only a few hotels are overcharging. I know of one instance where a friend of mine from down in our district was quoted a price, for two ordinary adjoining rooms, of $38 per room, $76 per day, with a requirement for a minimum of 3 days' occupancy and an advance deposit of $200. I personally know that the price so quoted is at least four or five times the amount ordinarily charged.

If the hotels in Washington are overcharging visitors to the inauguration the facts should be ascertained and the practice exposed. Washington is the one city that belongs to all the people of our country and is the seat of the Government of all the people. And, therefore, Washington, of all places, should treat fairly the citizens who visit it. And to such hotels as may be charging exorbitant rates I should like to propound the question—Are you trying to keep the people who elected President Truman from seeing him inaugurated or shall we interpret your action as merely an invitation to the Congress to place hotel rates in Washington under rent control?

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table today, and any other special orders, I may be permitted to proceed for 40 minutes on the subject of air power in the 1950 budget.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW]?

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE ARTHUR D. HEALEY

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with keen regret that I inform the House of the death of a former Member and my immediate predecessor from the Eighth Massachusetts District, Hon. Arthur D. Healey. He passed away on September 16, 1948, in Somerville, Mass., the city of his birth and in which he had always lived.

Judge Healey was born December 29, 1889. He attended the public schools, was a graduate of the Somerville Latin School, and attended Dartmouth College. He later graduated from the Boston University Law School with the degree of LL. B. and began the practice of law in Boston with his brother, Robert T. Healey, under the firm name of Healey & Healey. He served in the infantry in the First World War, rising to the rank of lieutenant.

Upon the retirement of Congressman Charles L. Underhill, Arthur Healey was elected to succeed him in the Seventy-third Congress. He was reelected to the Seventy-fourth, Seventy-fifth, Seventy-sixth, and Seventy-seventh Congresses. He served on the Committee on the Judiciary and later on the Committee on Ways and Means, and it was mainly due to his efforts on the Judiciary Committee that legislation recommended by President Roosevelt and the Department of Justice was drafted into law to meet the crime wave then challenging the Government. Together with the late Senator David I. Walsh, he was one of the authors of the Walsh-Healey Act setting up fair labor standards for all Government contracts. He served also as a member of the Dies Committee on Un-American Activities, and although much interested in the work of that committee he was a frequent critic of the methods of the committee in the conduct of its hearings.

While serving in his fifth term as a Congressman he was appointed to the United States district court by the late President Roosevelt. As a judge on the Federal bench he exhibited the same capacity for industry and devotion to duty which characterized his earlier service in Congress. He was a kindly and sincere man possessed of the highest personal qualities and earned a reputation of being an able judge who was unfailingly just in his dealings with all who came before him.

He was married to Tresia Fisher, who survives him together with four children, Robert, Arthur Daniel, Jr., Elaine, and Ruth Mary. I know that I speak for all of his former colleagues in the House in expressing sympathy to his splendid family, who will take consolation from the fact that a devoted husband and father has bequeathed to them the priceless legacy of having crowded into 58 years of life so much of notable achievement as to make up a respected and honored career in the service of city, State, and Nation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODWIN. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the death of Arthur Healey is indeed a very sad one to those of us who served with him and who knew him. It is particularly so to me because of the very close personal friendship that existed between us during a lifetime in professional life, as well as his service in this body and in his distinguished career as a United States district judge in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Arthur Healey was one of the most sincere and conscientious Members I have ever served with, a man devoted not only to his work in this body, but also to his work on the bench, a judicial position he occupied with great distinction for several years prior to his death. Every one of us who served with him will always remember his genial personality, as well as his serious and sincere character. He was really an outstanding Member of this body. He was the author of several bills so properly referred to by my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. GOODWIN], bills which benefited the average person in this country, bills which made great contributions to the progress of our country.

In a sense it may be said that he died in line of duty. I remember that about a year and a half or 2 years prior to his death he suffered a shock. His condition remained serious for some time, but being of a determined spirit he went back to his judicial duties as quickly as he could, and labored in the performance of his work. I am satisfied that his devotion to the duties of his office aggravated his condition and precipitated his death. The entire Massachusetts delegation, and I particularly as a member thereof, join the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GOODWIN] in expressing to Mrs. Healey and her fine family our profound sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODWIN. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. It is indeed distressing to learn of the demise of Arthur Healey. I served with him over many a stormy period in this House. He was a distinguished Member of this body and later became a most exemplary jurist. He was beloved by all who came in contact with him. He was able, selfless, intelligent, hard-working. Well might we say with the prophet Micah that he did justice, he loved mercy, and he walked humbly before his God. Our condolences go to his widow and dear ones.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODWIN. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. I wish to add to what the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], and the gentleman from Massachusetts who just yielded to me, had to say about Judge Arthur Healey. When Judge Healey first came to the Seventy-third Congress he served a portion of the district I now have the honor of representing. I know that the people of Somerville and the surrounding areas all held him in the same high regard when he was first a Congressman as they did later when he served them as judge. I know I reflect the feelings of all the people in my district in expressing my regrets at the untimely passing of Judge Healey. His progressive and humanitarian service in the Congress of the United States has been indelibly imprinted on the Nation's statute books, in the many laws, such as the Walsh-Healey Act, which bear his name as author or coauthor.

In his role as judge, he upheld to the fullest the standards of humaneness, fairness, and justice.

Arthur Healey was indeed the ideal public servant.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODWIN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. I served here in this body with Arthur Healey, and it delights me to be able to testify to the high standing and to the high favor in which he was regarded by his associates. He was a man of extraordinary ability, always faithful and devoted in the discharge of the duties that devolved upon him as a public servant.

I regarded him very highly, as did all of my associates who come from the section of the country that I represent. He was a good citizen, he was a fine man, he was a man of profound convictions, deep faith, and he contributed much to the solution of the problems with which the country was afflicted at that time.

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and also that any Members who desire may extend their remarks on the late Judge Healey.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore granted, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered today I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement issued on November 21, 1948, by the bishops of the United States.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Boston Post.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include the text of the message of the Governor of Montana to the legislature of that State. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $301.25, but I ask that it be printed, notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLLINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BLOOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Miami Daily News.

Mr. HEDRICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include the West Virginia plan for veterans' housing.

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by C. W. Warren, of Mill Spring, Mo., taken from the Wayne County Journal-Banner, of Piedmont, Mo.

Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement in the form of a paid advertisement appearing in the New York Times of January 11, 1949.

Mr. EVINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a report of the Fair Employment Practices Commission of the State of Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two letters and an editorial.

Mr. SANBORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BEALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. COLE of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by the Honorable Alf M. Landon.

Mr. CAVALCANTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include editorials appearing in the Evening Standard, Uniontown.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by J. R. Breed, president, the University Bank, Kansas City, Mo., entitled "'Gimme' Checks" and also "Fifty-two Reasons Why Something Is Wrong 'When.'"

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

THE VOLUNTARY ALLOCATION PROGRAM

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to continue the authority of the President with respect to the making of voluntary agreements for the allocation of scarce materials.

This authority was given the President by the Eightieth Congress, but expires on March 1, 1949.

It is my judgment that the allocation of scarce materials by voluntary agreements has been a good thing. In a peacetime economy, it is the proper approach to such a problem. It provides for the Government to assist business in an advisory and helpful manner, rather than swinging a big club to require conformity with rigid, incentive-stifling red tape.

As late as July 1, 1948, the President wrote Secretary Sawyer, stating that he did not consider it appropriate to invoke the mandatory authority over steel, and requested the development of voluntary programs for the armed forces requirements.

With production rising in all lines of manufacturing, it would seem even more true today that the voluntary method is still appropriate. That in spite of the idea of price control, rationing, and mandatory allocations presented by the Fair Deal, we should insist that this program be given an opportunity to succeed. It is important that the Congress act at once on this measure. The termination date of the present law—March 1, 1949—has caused a lag in the program. The industrial processes involved must be planned on the basis of a fairly long period, and the uncertain future of the law has made negotiations difficult. I hope this bill will receive early and favorable consideration by the Congress.

STEEL OPERATIONS EXPECTED TO SET RECORD

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on steel operations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, the country's steel industry this week expects to achieve the greatest weekly production in history, the American Iron and Steel Institute announced on January 10, 1949. The output is expected to reach 1,830,600 net tons of ingots and steel for castings, surpassing by 26,300 tons the previous weekly record established in the week of November 29, 1948.

The anticipated production for the current week compares with 1,802,500 tons last week and a month ago, and with 1,723,200 tons in the week of January 12, 1948.

The industry's operating rate this week is computed on the revised capacity of 96,120,930 tons annually. Based on this new estimate, the rate will be 99.3 percent, compared with the revised figure of 97.8 percent last week, with 100 percent a month ago and 95.6 percent a

year ago on the former, lower capacity. The 1948 capacity was 94,233,460 tons annually.

In 1948, 88,509,083 tons were actually produced. Average annual output was 93.9 percent of potential capacity. The best year so far was 1944, when the wartime peak of 89,600,000 tons was produced.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on January 7, I was given permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Admiral Holloway. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $195.25, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

CONGRESSIONAL SECRETARIES CLUB

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, on next Monday night, January 17, the Congressional Secretaries Club, which is composed of our office staffs, is presenting their first program of the year at the Department of Commerce auditorium. The program is in the nature of a welcome to incoming secretaries, Members of Congress and their families.

Beginning promptly at 8 o'clock, the program will feature an address by the Honorable W. Stuart Symington, Secretary of the Air Force, and the Air Force symphony orchestra and glee club. Films depicting the operation of the Berlin air lift will also be presented. The subject of Mr. Symington's talk will be The New Department of the Air Force.

This event will be of special interest to all new Members of this House. I wish that every Member could see the Berlin lift in operation—short of that—I wish all could see this picture.

It is truly a stupendous spectacle.

There will be a gala musical event featuring the 90-piece Air Force Band, which will close the evening's meeting.

In behalf of the Congressional Secretaries Club, of which my able secretary, Merrill Winslett, is president, I invite all Members of the Senate and of the House, their wives and families to enjoy with our office staffs the talk of our Secretary of the United States Air Force—to see the great picture of the Berlin lift and close the evening by enjoying a splendid musical treat given by the Air Force Band, acknowledgedly one of America's greatest symphony bands.

As you know, the Congressional Secretaries Club, established many years ago, is an organization made up of the secretaries and other employees in the offices of the Members of both Houses of Congress. The objective of the organization is to assemble and disseminate information with respect to governmental departments, agency procedures, policies and all other factual information which might be helpful in the operation of their offices and the discharge of their duties to their respective Representatives and Senators.

The purpose of the Congressional Secretaries Club is primarily educational. During the first 2 months of each new session a series of lectures is given by the veteran members of the club. These lectures are followed by discussion period in order to afford all new secretaries and others in their staffs an opportunity of informing themselves how best to make departmental and other facilities available to their use. Discussions cover all manner of subjects with respect to correspondence, the dissemination of literature, booklets, and other items which make for the most efficient operation of their congressional offices.

The club meetings have long been patronized by members of the President's Cabinet and other top-flight departmental executives and diplomatic officials who intimately discuss, not alone the objectives of their several departments, but ways and means of developing closer cooperation between the legislative offices here on Capitol Hill and all governmental activities.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement made by a prominent San Francisco attorney on socialized medicine.

Mr. SCRIVNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a definition of success.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances, one with regard to a bill he is introducing, and in two instances to include extraneous material.

Mr. COLE of New York (at the request of Mr. KEATING) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Representative HERTER which appeared in the January issue of Nation's Business and is captioned "Everybody is for it, but."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered at the fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the first national forest in the Black Hills.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short item.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on the water problems of California.

Mr. FELLOWS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by the former Governor of Maine to the National Convention of Grangers.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore granted, I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I join with a distinguished member of Britain's House of Commons in concern over the consequences of the British Government's Palestine policy, and urge the British people not to be "Bevinized" in the current British-Israeli crisis. In other words, not to let hurt feelings over loss of the Palestine mandate, and attendant trying events, prevail over the best interests of Great Britain and the world in attaining a secure and peaceful Middle East.

Anthony Eden, in a speech yesterday, asked why the RAF carried out reconnaissance over an Israeli-Egyptian battle area, and what useful purpose it could serve. I am asking the same and other questions of our State Department in a resolution of inquiry which I am introducing, not intended, in any sense, as critical of our State Department, which has kept to an even-handed course in this crisis, but only intended to adduce for all our people a clear exposition of the facts.

There have been a number of truce resolutions by the United Nations Security Council since July of this year, and regardless of conflicting claims on violation of the truces, it is a fact that Israel and Egypt had already agreed to sit down with the United Nations mediator to negotiate an armistice, when British air forces appeared over an Israeli-Egyptian battle area and brought on the latest crisis. In this way the British Government by its action gave the impression of putting itself athwart the hopes for peace. Let us hope that Egypt and Israel will proceed, nonetheless, to consummate their armistice and to seek to attain a general peace in the Middle East.

BEVIN'S PETULANCE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Ernest Bevin's actions toward Israel are wicked, and President Truman deserves praise for his refusal to countenance Bevin's blustering and bellicose posturing. Even Anthony Eden has condemned Bevin and has indicated that the British had no right to be over the battle area in Palestine. One of the pilots who bailed out admitted that he was over Israeli territory. Bevin offers the excuse that they are giving aid under the Anglo-Egyptian Treaty. But Egypt has repudiated this document and has asked the United Nations to have it abrogated. Despite solemn warning by President Truman, Bevin is employing British armed might in the Mediterranean at Aqaba and Cyprus, which undoubtedly jeopardizes peace negotiations between Israel and Egypt.

There can be no hope of achieving stability in the Middle East with the continuance of Mr. Bevin's personal war against Israel. Achieving stability there is a matter of vital concern to the United States.

THE PLIGHT OF INVESTMENT CAPITAL

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of all the arguments that have been taking place with respect to the President's budget, it is indeed refreshing to read an article which appeared in the Washington Daily News of Wednesday, written by Eleanor Roosevelt, entitled "Investment Capital Is Getting Harder and Harder to Find."

I commend this article to the attention of my friends on the right, and to my colleagues on the left, as a statement emanating from one of our great leaders in America, indicating the problems that lie ahead when we consider the legislative program submitted by the President.

The article is as follows:

INVESTMENT CAPITAL IS GETTING HARDER AND HARDER TO FIND

(By Eleanor Roosevelt)

Tuesday.—One of the leading newspapers points out that among President Truman's economic advisers there seems to be less concern about the financial return to those who have capital to invest and who live on the income derived from that investment than there is consideration of the proper level of farm prices and the proper return to labor.

This always has been one of the most delicate balances that anyone guiding the financial interests of the country has had to make.

It is essential to a high level of employment that it be profitable for capital to be invested not just in safe enterprise but in new and untried enterprises.

There must be incentive for this, particularly in times of peace. In times of war, when many men are risking their lives at the battle fronts, many others are willing to risk their money to do whatever is necessary for the well-being of the country. However, in times of peace there is not the same patriotic motive with which to prod capital into productive enterprise and, therefore, incentives must be found.

Some of our biggest investors—such as trust companies, banks, and insurance companies—are limited by law in their investments in order to safeguard those whose money they are using. Therefore, if we expect to develop new enterprises, to employ more people and to have more buying power, there must always be available capital from the individual investors. This is getting harder and harder to find today.

It is of vital interest, of course, to the farmer and the wage earner that the things they have to buy keep on increasing in cost, because even though wages go up and farm prices go up they never seem quite to cover the increased cost of living brought about by inflation and the passing on to the public of whatever costs have been imposed on the manufacturer.

Therefore, it is going to be necessary, it seems to me, to examine everything not only with an eye to what we would like to do, but with the constant thought before us of what the essentials are that must be done.

The preservation of the credit of our Government is of vital importance to us and to the world as a whole, and while I believe there are many things in our program, as outlined by the President, that are essential and will help to bring us prosperity, I think even the best of them should be weighed with the viewpoint of their essentiality in attaining the objectives that we have before us. These objectives are rehabilitation in the world at large and stability and strength in our own economic system at home.

These ends should never be forgotten and their importance should be explained to the people as each step is taken in this carefully balanced program which alone will see us through the difficulties of the next few years.

INCREASING SALARIES OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address my remarks principally to the majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]. He has always been fair with me and I want to be fair with him, in this respect, because I understand they are going to bring a bill in here asking that unanimous consent be given to increase the salaries of Government officials.

I think we should increase the President's salary if it is necessary, but I think that we are doing wrong when we bring in a bill asking for $50,000 on top of a $40,000 expense account, making $90,000, as part of salary with no accounting. The President is now advocating the greatest expenditure of Government funds. He is not advocating a balanced budget. His budget for spending is $873,000,000 more than our income for 1950.

I think the President of the United States should pay taxes the same as everybody else in the country, especially when he is asking for a budget that is $873,000,000 out of balance. He should feel the pinch of taxes just the same as everybody else. I want the majority leader to know that I am not going to let that bill come up by unanimous consent. I give him that notice now so that he can prepare some way to get the legislation in here, if he wants it to pass. I say give the President a $200,000 salary, if that is what he needs, but do not grant a $50,000 expense account plus the $40,000 expense account he now gets. It does not make sense. No wonder he is so anxious to spend other people's money, no wonder he wants to tax everybody else. Let him have some of his own medicine, in the form of taxes. Suppose a president of a corporation recommended the great spending of corporate funds, much more than the corporation takes in, do you think the stockholders would permit it? If they did not arrange for a balanced budget sometime they would go into bankruptcy. The stockholders would not elect a board of directors that would have such a president. The stockholders would clean house with such a board of directors. Therefore, I feel it my duty to stop the Congress from doing the same thing to our President of the United States, from spending, spending, spending. I feel it my duty to stop it if I can, and I will always do my duty to my constituents, God being my helper.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUBER]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HUBER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by David Lawrence and in another instance to include another article.

FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—(H. DOC. NO. 39)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the Unted States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Acting Secretary of State, showing all receipts and disbursements on account of refunds, allowances, and annuities for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948, in connection with the Foreign Service retirement and disability system as required by section 862, Foreign Service Act of 1946 (Public Law 724).

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 13, 1949.*

(Enclosure: Report concerning retirement and disability fund, Foreign Service.)

FIRST ANNUAL REPORT OF PHILIPPINE ALIEN PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read by

the Clerk and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the First Annual Report for the Philippine Alien Property Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 13, 1949.*

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the ground upon which he seeks recognition on a question of personal privilege.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, before dawn on the morning of December 1, 1948, at the factory of the Shakespeare Co., located at Kalamazoo, Mich., where a picket line was being maintained by local 3619, USA-CIO, there was violence.

The Representative of the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, was authorized and directed by the chairman of the committee, the Honorable Fred A. Hartley, Jr., to proceed to Kalamazoo and to hold hearings to ascertain, among other things, whether the so-called Taft-Hartley Act was adequate, was being enforced, or whether the act should be amended.

The Member so designated proceeded to Kalamazoo, held hearings there on the 4th and 6th. Thereafter, and on the 14th day of December 1948, the Kalamazoo Gazette, a newspaper published at Kalamazoo and circulated in the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, the southwestern part of Michigan, and the northern part of Indiana, on the front page published a picture of the Honorable JOHN LESINSKI, Member of Congress from the Sixteenth District of Michigan, and under the picture were the words: "Representative JOHN LESINSKI ponders riot probe. Then followed a news story captioned, "HOFFMAN's quiz lashed by LESINSKI—Next House labor chairman speaks here."

The news story continued:

Representative JOHN LESINSKI, ranking Democratic member of the House Labor Committee and slated to become its next chairman, last night lashed out at Representative CLARE HOFFMAN's investigation of the December 1 mob attack on the Shakespeare plants and said he may conduct his own congressional investigation.

He declared that HOFFMAN had "no more authority than a rabbit" in conducting the recent investigation.

Further along in that news story are these words in bold-faced type: "Slaps at HOFFMAN." Those words were followed by the statement: "Representative LESINSKI called Representative HOFFMAN 'a pimp of Joe Stalin.'"

That statement, published in the Kalamazoo Gazette, reflects upon the integrity, the patriotism, in his official capacity as Representative of the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan. It tends to subject him to ridicule and contempt. It charges that he, acting in his Representative capacity and as a member of a standing committee of the House, was guilty of unpatriotic, disloyal conduct.

The SPEAKER. The Chair believes the gentleman from Michigan has stated grounds for addressing the House on a question of personal privilege. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this is a most unpleasant situation. It is one which I would like to avoid. But there should be, there must be, a limit to what can be printed and said about a Member of Congress.

This incident reflects upon the integrity of the House. It is a charge that there is in the House of Representatives an agent of a foreign government, a government commonly known as a potential enemy, a government with which we are waging a cold war; a Member the House permits to act as an agent of one of its committees.

It is a situation which calls for plain-speaking, the use of simple, understandable words.

It is a charge which, so far as it involves me personally, I will take care of at the proper time, in the proper way, before the proper tribunal. But because it is something more than a personal matter and because, as stated, it reflects upon the integrity of the House itself, this time is being used to warn the Members of Congress, and especially those who are serving a first term, of what they may expect if they oppose certain groups, politically powerful.

Members of the House have on occasion—and rightly—expressed a great deal of sympathy and indignation for individuals in the executive branch of the Government, who, it was charged, were smeared by a congressional committee. Have they any rebuke for those who in this instance seek to smear one of their colleagues?

Perhaps the greatest safeguard protecting the liberty of the people, the welfare of the Nation, is a free press, the right to speak freely.

The greatest danger to the citizen's liberty and the security of the Nation is false propaganda, designed to undermine the confidence of the people in their chosen representatives, in their existing form of government.

Notwithstanding the fact that we in this country have more of everything that contributes to prosperity, freedom and happiness, too many of us are inclined to listen to and follow the words and thoughts of those of and from other lands, where the people have less of everything that is desirable.

Communists seeking to destroy us find propaganda one of their most available and effective weapons.

For so long have radio commentators, editors, propagandists, unfairly criticized the Congress of the United States and its individual Members, that many newspapers, not realizing the effect upon Members of Congress of the unjustifiable and often untrue statements reflecting upon their ability, their sincerity, and their loyalty, have perhaps inadvertently given publicity to propaganda which was designed to, which does, shake the confidence of the people in their chosen representatives and in the Congress as a whole.

Elected to the Eighty-first Congress are 94 Members of the House who are now serving their first term. Twenty-two Members who formerly served in the House were elected in November.

It is to give to my colleagues who are serving their first term some warning of what they may expect from some critics that this time is taken.

A week ago today, the Supreme Court of the United States decided that the laws of two States, the constitution of another State, which protected the right of the individual who did not belong to a labor organization to earn his livelihood in the sweat of his face, were within the power of the States to enact, the right of the people to adopt.

The fact that it became necessary for the Supreme Court to render such a decision is most astounding. From the beginning of human existence, every individual who stopped to think knew that, if man would eat, wear, clothing, be protected from the elements, he must work.

But the decision was necessary, for, in this country, there has grown up in the last few years the theory that, to exercise his right to work, the individual must join, pay the initiation fees, dues, and special assessments prescribed by organizations which have no authority to limit a man's right to work, but which have been successful in doing just that.

Because, for more than 13 years, I have opposed that theory, fought for the right of a man to work when and where he wished, attempts have repeatedly been made to coerce and intimidate me, to force me to cast my vote here in the House in favor of or against certain bills. The alternative offered was political execution.

Because those attempts, the methods employed, and the procedure followed by certain politically powerful organizations in a campaign against me run parallel to those employed by the same organizations to deprive a man of his right to work, which the laws of some States and the constitution of one State recently outlawed, it is my purpose to point out to my colleagues some of the things they may expect if they vote contrary to the orders of the CIO.

The nonunion man, sometimes the union employee, who wishes to work in a struck factory, is oftentimes by massed pickets barred from his place of employment. If he attempts to force his way through a picket line, he is pushed and shoved, and sometimes beaten.

If it appears that the picket line is unable to keep men from work, then often in comes the goon squad.

What is a goon squad? Usually it is a gang numbering anywhere from 25 or 50 to one or several hundred big, able-bodied individuals, some of them apparently professional bruisers. They come sometimes from other factories, sometimes from other communities and cities, sometimes from other States. Sometimes they travel a hundred miles or more. For example, in the sit-down strikes in Michigan in 1937, some came in from Atlanta, Ga. In the Galion strikes in Ohio, some came from Buffalo, N. Y.

When they arrive on the scene the officers are defied, court orders are ignored, property is destroyed, and individuals are beaten.

Those are the methods employed to prevent a man from working, to deprive a man of an available job.

Now, how do these same organizations get at a Congressman? They do not beat him physically. Is it just possible that they are afraid of public opinion? Is it possible that they think he might be armed and oppose force with force? The goons seldom act except in a cowardly manner, when they have overwhelming force available.

No, they do not physically beat up a Congressman. They assail his reputation. They attempt to smear him. They lie about him. They vilify him. They try to humiliate him and the members of his family.

Sometimes they go into his district, as on one occasion they came into mine and put out two pamphlets with cartoons containing many false charges.

Some of their agents and sympathizers falsely assail him over the radio, in public meetings which are reported, as in the case to which I am now referring, in the daily press.

When picket lines are unable to stop returning workers at the factory gates, on occasion their sympathizers go to the worker's home, throw bricks through his windows, call his wife or members of his family over the phone and threaten them with bodily injury, sometimes with death.

The character assassins of the CIO likewise seek to reach a man through his family. They give utterance to and cause to be printed charges which bring grief, shame, and humiliation to his wife, to his children—yes, and in some cases, to his grandchildren.

And that was the method that was employed at Kalamazoo. Permit me to tell you something about that situation.

On September 7, 1948, local No. 3619, United Steelworkers of America, CIO, of Kalamazoo, Mich., called a strike against Shakespeare Co. and Shakespeare Products Co., two corporations engaged in manufacturing fishing tackle and automobile accessories. A picket line was established. The dispute ran along in what might be described as the customary manner from the 7th day of September until the 1st day of December.

A back-to-work movement had made such progress that, on November 30, out of a possible 778 employees, 538 were working.

During the strike, the local union had been advised and "serviced" by at least three representatives of the United Steelworkers of America, CIO, namely, Clarence (Jerry) Jackson, Thomas Shane, and Glen S. Sigman.

Before daylight on the morning of December 1, between 30 and 40 cars with license plates from counties on the eastern side of the State, more than 150 miles away, carrying between two and three hundred physically well-developed, well-dressed men, many of whom wore CIO buttons, parked before the plant entrance.

Those in the cars got out. They acted with military precision. Some of them threw missiles through windows, through the glass in the doors. Some overturned the cars of working employees; burned a truck; forced their way into the plant and there assaulted and beat both women and men.

Mrs. Judy Smalley, who lives in North Bloomingdale in Michigan, in the Fourth Congressional District, 25 years of age, punched in at the time clock at 6:25 a. m. She was sitting on a bench by the time clock, waiting to begin work, when she saw a man coming into the factory. Suddenly she heard cries of "Let's get busy." Men approached and one of them grabbed her by the hair, pushed her head back, and then another man, who had gloves on, according to her sworn testimony, slapped her on the face, first on one side and then on the other, while another man was holding her head back.

She said:

The one in the blue jacket slapped me. I saw these little white buttons they have—they had little white CIO buttons on. * * * You just cannot believe, sir, that men come in and hit women.

At this point, let me state that Mr. Glace, the president of that local, and Mr. Betz, the recording secretary, were both sitting in this young woman's presence as she told her story under oath. They both, upon being asked, stated emphatically that they did not approve of that kind of conduct.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] is present and heard the statement propounded by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] to the Speaker. If the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] used the language that is charged, he transgressed the rules of this House. I am sure he recognizes that to be so, and I am likewise sure that he is big enough to ask unanimous consent of this House to permit him to retract the statement made.

I wonder if the gentleman who now has the floor would not yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] to propound a unanimous-consent request. If granted, and the gentleman should make retraction, that would end the controversy which has now arisen.

Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will answer that in due time.

I may ask the gentleman from Georgia when he speaks about a retraction, how can a man retract a statement made before more than a thousand people in the city of Kalamazoo in the locality adjoining my home, only 23 miles from my home? I will give him an opportunity later on, but I want the House to know of this situation because, these 94 new Members who have come in here are entitled to know what may happen if they oppose certain political action groups whether they will have protection from the kind of conduct charges such as are set forth in this publication.

Mrs. Smalley continued her story:

Well, he slapped me. He caught me in the eye—you probably cannot see it—and in my mouth there was a little sore. * * * I thought that my heart would never beat again, and I got up and ran. * * * I ran and screamed. * * * I crawled under a machine and stayed there—so that I could hide. I did not want to get hit any more; I was so scared. * * * Then somebody found me and I went upstairs * * * and the doctor came and they took me in the ambulance * * * and they were taking employees out in the ambulance. * * * There was quite a mob down there and they stood there and they beat on the windows of the ambulance and said, "I hope you die; I hope you die."

Edwin Starrett, an employee, was working in the plant when the goons arrived. They beat and kicked him, though he had dropped to the ground to escape injury and pretended that he was unconscious. Finally, one of the goons said, "That's enough, fellows. Let's go."

Although this raid was in support of the picket line being maintained by local 3619, USA-CIO, at least two of its officers expressed their disapproval. The raid was carried out principally by those who came in cars from the vicinity of Detroit, who drove around 150 miles to stage their rioting.

What has all this to do with the false, slanderous, and libelous charges made against me? I will tell you.

The then chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor had, in writing, instructed me to go to Kalamazoo and hold hearings. Hearings were held on the 4th, 6th, and 17th of December 1937. From that sworn testimony, which was reprinted to some extent in the local press, the people of Kalamazoo learned of the lawlessness, the savagery, the viciousness, the cowardliness of this raid, and which turned public sentiment against the union.

Having through the raid lost much of its public support, the union decided to stage a public rally and mass meeting. On December 13 it ran an ad in the Kalamazoo Gazette and put out handbills which read as follows:

Attend the public rally and mass meeting in support of Shakespeare strikers, Monday, December 13, 1948, 7:30 p. m., Lincoln High School, North Burdick Street, Kalamazoo, Mich.

Speakers: Congressman JOHN LESINSKI, of Michigan, next chairman of the House Labor Committee; August Scholle, president, Michigan CIO Council and regional director of the State of Michigan; John Riffe, international representative, USA-CIO; Thomas Shane, director, district 30, USA-CIO, who will discuss Judge McDonald's proposal.

Everybody welcome. Follow the crowd.

Tuesday evening, over station WGFG, Kalamazoo, Ray Pasnick, speaking officially for the United Steelworkers, said:

A high point in the fight of the United Steelworkers at the Shakespeare plant was reached last night at a public indignation meeting held in the Lincoln High School auditorium and attended by more than 1,000 Kalamazoo citizens from all walks of life.

It was a meeting that will long be remembered. Congressman JOHN LESINSKI, of Michigan's Sixteenth District, the principal speaker, brought the house down with a wild and thunderous ovation when he promised that a full-dress investigation into all aspects of the Shakespeare strike would be conducted by Congress.

Congressman LESINSKI is slated to become the new chairman of the House Labor and Education Committee in the Eighty-first Congress and spoke last night with authority, although not officially.

It was a tense and expectant audience that waited for the Congressman to be introduced and I can assure you they were not disappointed. From the moment he began to speak until he concluded his address, the citizens of Kalamazoo saw a fighting, militant representative of the people in action.

The Congressman opened his remarks by saying he had listened carefully to previous speakers describe the struggle endured by Shakespeare workers in their fight for a new working agreement. "As I sat there," he said, "I wondered whether I was in Hitler Germany or Soviet Russia." He indicated that only under either of the dictatorship governments could the same thing happen. And then, amdist the rousing cheers and overwhelming applause of those present, he said, "I am going to find out just what is happening here."

Congressman LESINSKI had nothing but scorn for the 2-day inquisition into the Shakespeare strike conducted by Republican Congressman HOFFMAN here a week ago. He charged HOFFMAN with proceeding with the so-called investigation without authority. "I can assure you," Congressman LESINSKI added, "that CLARE HOFFMAN did not consult with any of the Democratic Party members on the House Labor and Education Committee before coming to Kalamazoo and giving this company aid and comfort."

He then went on to say that in the interest of justice and fair play, a new and impartial investigation was absolutely necessary.

* * * * *

While there was little doubt in anyone's mind last night that Congressman LESINSKI stole the show at the meeting, several other important speakers made vital contributions to the cause of the strike.

It might be added that, although the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] lives in Dearborn, which is in Wayne County—you will remember that some 27 of the goon-squad cars carried license plates issued to individuals residing in that vicinity—and although notice of the hearings of the Labor Subcommittee was carried in Detroit and other papers, and although the hearings were held on the 4th, the 6th, and the 17th of December and the union rally was not held until the 13th, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] never availed himself of the opportunity to protest a one-man hearing. He knew that similar meetings had been held in other cases.

If he knew of the organization of his own committee, he would have known that on the 27th day of January 1947 the chairman of the committee was authorized, by unanimous vote, to do just what he did in this particular case.

But the radio script does not carry all that was said at this rally on the 13th of December, sponsored by the CIO. Nor does it carry all that the Kalamazoo Gazette charges was said and which the Kalamazoo Gazette reprinted.

At that meeting, where the radio commentator for the Steelworkers said the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] brought down the house and was greeted with a wild and thunderous ovation, the Kalamazoo Gazette said that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] said "Representative HOFFMAN is a pimp of Joe Stalin."

What is a pimp? A pimp is a pander, a procurer. To the average individual it means a procurer, a solicitor, of business for a house of prostitution.

Sworn statements from individuals present at the meeting allege that the words above quoted were followed by the words, "a prostitute."

Inasmuch as, being a man, I cannot be a prostitute, and inasmuch as there has never been the slightest intimation or any evidence that I was a pander, the only logical conclusion that can be drawn is that the words as here used mean, and were intended to mean, that I was a despicable servant or agent of Joe Stalin.

But the Kalamazoo Gazette said that "Representative LESINSKI called Representative HOFFMAN 'a pimp of Joe Stalin.'"

If the gentleman from the Sixteenth District of Michigan made that statement, what did he mean?

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me now?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Briefly.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman having the floor now yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI], if he wishes to be recognized?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If he wants to tell me, first, did he say that I was a pimp? I will yield to him.

Mr. COX. I am not endeavoring to embarrass anybody. I am trying to end an unhappy sort of a controversy over a matter which can be remedied by a simple statement of apology or retraction by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman from the Sixteenth District of Michigan has never asked to be recognized, and he never denied that he made the statement. He never said, if he made it, that it was untrue.

Who is Joe Stalin? He is the head of the U. S. S. R., a nation commonly known as communistic.

We affirm "In God we trust." We open every session of the House with prayer. When this Congress convened, every Member bowed his head and joined in reciting the Lord's prayer. And we are not hypocrites.

What do the Communists advocate? The Communists do not believe in God. They seek the destruction of our Government by force.

The only meaning to be drawn from the charge against the Member from the fourth district of Michigan, as printed in the Kalamazoo Gazette, is that he is the agent of a government which advocates the overthrow of our Government by force. In short, a charge that he is guilty of disloyalty and treason.

It is a charge which is false. It is a charge which every Member of this House who has served here during the past 10 years knows to be false.

Does this House propose to let such a charge against a Member go unrebuked?

I challenge this House to call before it those responsible for that charge in the Kalamazoo Gazette; to have the writer of that charge, as printed in the Kalamazoo Gazette, under oath disclose the source of his information.

I challenge the House to then call before the bar of the House or before a committee of the House the gentleman who originally made the charge, if it was made; call upon him to substantiate the charge or to appear in the well of the House, withdraw his charge and accept whatever censure, if any, the Speaker may care to impose.

If there develops the slightest evidence that the Representative from the Fourth Michigan Congressional District has ever been or has ever acted as an agent of Joe Stalin, then he should be expelled from this House.

But let me proceed.

Why was I called a pimp of Joe Stalin? Was it because there is anything in my record that would lead anyone to believe that there was any truth whatever in that charge? No, there is not.

Then why was the charge made? Was it made because the Communists, because certain racketeers and ambitious politicians in certain labor organizations, by intimidation, by unjustifiable and despicable false charges against me, are trying to force me to refrain from exposing some of their activities?

Is it an attempt to shut the mouth, still the voice, silence the opposition, of a Member of Congress to certain union politicians?

They are trying to do to me what some try to do to the nonunion worker.

For 13 years, 11 months, and 347 days prior to the 13th day of December, the Member from the Fourth Congressional District served in this Congress.

He was assigned to serve on the Committee on Labor on January 12, 1940. For more than 8 years, at the meetings of that committee, he sat across the table in the committee room from the gentleman from the Sixteenth District of Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI]. Never once in all that time was there any personal controversy, although we differed in our views as to what was best for organized labor.

Did the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] make the statement attributed to him by the Kalamazoo Gazette?

When those responsible for the publication in the Gazette were told that they would be called to account for that publication, they told me they would justify it by showing that the paper did not originate the statement, that in truth and in fact it was made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI].

Did he make it? On the 29th day of December, by registered letter, postage fully prepaid, two letters were mailed to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI], calling his attention to the publication in the Kalamazoo Gazette. One letter went to him at his office address in Dearborn, Mich.; the other to his home address in Dearborn. In neither case was a registered mail receipt card received by me until the 11th day of January last, when two cards came back showing the following:

RETURN RECEIPT

Received from the postmaster the registered or insured article, the original number of which appears on the face of this card.

1. JOHN LESINSKI.
(Signature or name of addressee)
2. E. Corbett.
(Signature of addressee's agent. Agent should enter addressee's name on line one above.)

Date of delivery: January 10, 1949.

The second card and receipt was the same except as to number.

Friday last, Mr. LESINSKI was personally advised of the mailing of these letters and there was delivered to his secretary—and he was present in his office—a copy of that same letter. No reply from him has been received. Saturday last, his office was notified that I would speak from the well of the House on this matter. Last Monday I spoke to him personally—asked him about my letter, he said he had it. I told him I would comment on the situation from the well of the House today. He is here to make such answer as he is advised may be proper.

So to what does it boil down? What do the facts show?

The facts in this case show that, if a Member of Congress attempts to protect the right to work, even though he does it in a fair manner—and there is no justifiable charge in this case that in the hearings there was anything unfair—he may expect that the CIO will, in some way, sponsor dirty, nasty, vicious, false charges to be made against him.

The individual worker, seeking to go through a picket line is called a scab, vile and indecent names; sworn at; sometimes beaten; his family threatened; his wife and children frightened. The Congressman, protesting a commando goon-squad raid, is called, so it is charged in the Kalamazoo Gazette, "a pimp of Joe Stalin" by one of his colleagues.

Here, when a Member of Congress over the years ventures to express opposition to the racketeering of some union officers—and in the Philadelphia Dock Street case, after our committee had exposed their activities, three of the officers of a union were tried for racketeering, were convicted of a violation of the Hobbs Antiracketeering Act—if he speaks against the goon-squad method employed by a union whose officers have refused to sign anti-Communist affidavits, he is the victim of a campaign of vilification. A newspaper circulating in his home town and district says he is called a pimp of Joe Stalin.

He is subject to abuse and vilification.

Why do I say that? I know: I have taken it ever since, in 1937, I condemned the sit-down strikes and the lawlessness of, and the Communists in, the CIO.

But who would have dreamed that a Member of Congress would be assailed by one of his colleagues with the charge that he was—and I quote—"a pimp of Joe Stalin," and, I might add, according to sworn affidavits in my possession, that was not all that was said by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI]. The affidavits alleged that he said, and I quote, "Hitler couldn't do any worse than HOFFMAN. HOFFMAN is a pimp of Joe Stalin—a prostitute."

How much time do I have, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has consumed 33 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am going to offer a resolution to bring this matter to a head. If the gentleman from the Sixteenth District of Michigan wants 10 minutes of my time, he is welcome to it. I assume that he can get it anyway. I have no objection to any man having the floor to answer the proposition that I have made.

But I want to repeat. Outsiders smear the House as a whole. They vilify and falsely accuse Members of the House. I want to know and I am challenging the House to say what they are going to do in a case like this. The resolution I offer is for the appointment of a committee of three to ascertain what? First, whether the Kalamazoo Gazette is correct and accurate when it said that the gentleman from Michigan from the Sixteenth District made that statement.

Then to ask the gentleman from Michigan, from the Sixteenth District, to offer evidence on his oath and substantiate his charge if he can. If he can make it stick and if the House can find where I am guilty, then I should be expelled at once. If the charge is not substantiated, then for the good of the Congress, the gentleman from Michigan should appear before the bar of the House and be told by the Speaker what is and what is not proper conduct for a Congressman.

Mr. Speaker, I send a resolution to the Clerk's desk and ask that it be read.

Mr. McCORMACK. Just a moment. If the gentleman will yield, with reference to this resolution, the gentleman has not consulted the leadership on the Democratic side, has he, in relation to any intention to introduce a resolution today?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is right. Do you want to know why?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the gentleman does not have to tell me why.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. But I will be glad to.

Mr. McCORMACK. But I would be glad to hear why if the gentleman wants to tell us.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Ordinarily, if it were an ordinary resolution, of course I would consult the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] who in all the years that I have served here has been eminently fair. But, unless I am mistaken, and the precedents that I can cite do not bear me out, this is a privileged resolution.

Mr. McCORMACK. This is with reference to something that took place outside of the House of Representatives?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes. But I can cite, if the gentleman wishes, authorities where the same course has been followed.

Mr. McCORMACK. What the gentleman is doing then is with reference to alleged remarks carried in a newspaper—whether or not they are correct, I do not know because I know nothing about them—but they were made outside of the House during a campaign?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No, no, there was no campaign.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, they were outside of the House. That is immaterial. They were not made in the House by one Member against another. But the gentleman is trying to make those remarks a basis for action in this body?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am saying that those remarks raise not only a question of personal privilege——

Mr. McCORMACK. A question of personal privilege is one thing, but the question of action by the House of Representatives is another thing.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I trust the gentleman will permit me to continue?

Mr. McCORMACK. Surely.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. These remarks raise not only a question of personal privilege, but they also raise the question of privilege of the House which must be accompanied under the rule by resolution.

Section 661, page 275, of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives quotes the rule and cites some of the authorities. If the gentleman wants me to postpone this matter of the introduction of a resolution, I am perfectly agreeable. I am always willing to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] wherever I can, and whenever it will promote harmony. I would just as soon postpone this matter of the resolution and bring it up on a subsequent day and have the Speaker of the House rule on the matter of whether it raises the question of privilege of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not want my position misunderstood. The gentleman knows I have a very friendly feeling for him and I know he has for me. While we disagree on occasions, we respect one another. As majority leader, it being my position to do so, on this occasion I simply injected myself into this. This is none of my business, other than as majority leader. I am on the side lines when a couple of Members are having a fight. I do not believe in getting into those affairs, but when the gentleman offers a resolution, then it becomes a different proposition.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Nobody is asking anybody to get into a fight between two Members.

Mr. McCORMACK. No, no. I understand that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The question I am raising has two aspects.

Mr. McCORMACK. I did not make that observation except from my own angle, to show for the record why I am injecting myself into this, because it is my duty as majority leader in connection with the gentleman's statement that he is offering a resolution. Under those circumstances, I hope the gentleman will not offer the resolution today, even if it is within the rules, because the gentleman has not given any notice to the leadership. Personally, my offhand opinion would be that remarks made outside—for instance, if some Member up in Massachusetts attacked me on the outside, I do not consider that I could offer a resolution making an attack upon me on the outside the subject of official action by the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman is absolutely right about that. There is no disagreement between us. As I understand it, the gentleman is on his feet because he questions the right to raise this matter as a point of privilege of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is all.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I agree with you that if somebody said something outside, just as an individual, of a Member as an individual or even, though the authorities do not agree on this, as a Member of the House, well and good; no privilege of the House would arise.

But in this particular case, the gentleman from the Fourth District of Michigan had held public hearings there at Kalamazoo. This mass meeting where it is alleged the objectional remarks were made was called to protest the employer's attitude, which again was proper, but the speech made by the gentleman from the Sixteenth District of Michigan referred to the action of the Member from the Fourth District of Michigan as a member of the committee of this House acting as a subcommittee chairman under direction of the chairman of a standing committee of the House.

Now, I will withdraw this resolution and will ask unanimous consent at this time, Mr. Speaker, to revise and extend my remarks and include citation of certain authorities.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Let us have the facts in this case clear in our minds. There was a strike. There was a commando raid. There was a destruction of personal property and injury to real estate, a beating of defenseless citizens. It was carried on by individuals who invaded the city; who came from more than 150 miles away; who wore CIO buttons.

The press carried a stateme t from an international representative of the CIO to the effect that it assumed responsibility for the raid.

The hearings were held on the 4th and the 6th of December 1948. Spokesmen for the CIO condemned the hearings as being unauthorized. The gentleman from the Sixteenth District of Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] charged—and he admits the statement—that the subcommittee chairman holding the hearings "had no more authority than a rabbit." He compared the procedure to that followed by Hitler.

The Kalamazoo Gazette quoted him as making the charge to which reference has heretofore been made.

When the gentleman from the Sixteenth District of Michigan spoke at the rally on the night of the 13th of December, he was speaking of and condemning, not the conduct of an individual, but the course followed by a subcommittee chairman who was acting under the written authorization of the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, who, by House Resolution 111 and by the action of his own committee on January 29, 1947, had been authorized to appoint subcommittees to do just what was done in this case.

The remarks to which complaint is here made referred to a Member of the House in his official capacity, who at the time was acting as an agent of the House, and who, according to the newspaper publication, was charged with treasonable conduct.

Permit me to quote from Hinds' Precedents:

Hinds' Precedents, 1907, volume 3:

SEC. 2653. A resolution directing an inquiry into alleged treasonable conduct on the part of a Member was admitted as a question of privilege. On December 19, 1865, Mr. John F. Farnsworth, of Illinois, as a question of privilege, submitted the following:

"Whereas it is alleged that Benjamin G. Harris, a Representative in this House from the Fifth District of the State of Maryland, was, in the month of May last, before a very respectable and intelligent court martial tried, and by said court convicted, upon charge and specifications, to wit: 'Violative of the sixth article of war,' by giving aid and comfort to the public enemy and inciting them to continue to make war against the United States, declaring his sympathy with the enemy and his opposition to the Government of the United States in its efforts to suppress the rebellion; and

"Whereas it was proved at such trial (as is alleged) that the said Harris expressed his regret that the assassination of President Lincoln came too late to be of any use to the rebels, and at the same time declared that Jeff. Davis was a great and good man, all of which acts on the part of said Harris are inconsistent with the oath which he has taken as a Member of this House; and

"Whereas the said court martial sentenced the said Harris (among other things) to be forever disqualified to hold any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States, which sentence was approved by the President: Therefore

"*Resolved*, That the Committee of Elections be directed to inquire into the facts of the case and that they report the same to the House, together with such action as said committee shall recommend; and in making their investigations said committee to have power to send for persons and papers."

Mr. Charles A. Eldridge, of Wisconsin, raised the question of order that no question of privilege was involved.

The Speaker held that the question raised was a question of privilege, and of the very highest kind, since it involved the right of a Member to his seat.

The resolution was then agreed to, yeas 138, nays 21.

SEC. 2652. A charge that a Member had been holding intercourse with the foes of the Government was investigated as a question of privilege. On July 15, 1861, Mr. John F. Potter, of Wisconsin, offered the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Judiciary be directed to inquire whether the Honorable Henry May, a Representative in Congress from the Fourth District of the State of Maryland, has not been found holding criminal intercourse and correspondence with persons in armed rebellion against the Government of the United States, and to make report to the House as to what action should be taken in the premises, and that said committee have power to send for persons and papers and to examine witnesses on oath or affirmation, and that said Hon. Henry May be notified of the passage of this resolution (if practicable) before action thereon by said committee."

Mr. Henry C. Burnett, of Kentucky, made the point of order that the resolution was not in order as a question of privilege.

The Speaker submitted the question to the House, and the House decided that the resolution was in order as involving a question of privilege.

By a vote of 56 yeas to 82 nays the House refused to lay the resolution on the table. It was then agreed to.

SEC. 2649. A proposition to censure a Member presents a question of privilege.

Early instances wherein the Speaker passed on questions presented as of privilege instead of submitting them directly to the House.

On January 24, 1842, Mr. Thomas W. Gilmer, of Virginia, presented the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That in presenting for the consideration of the House a petition for the dissolution of the Union the Member from Massachusetts (Mr. Adams) has justly incurred the censure of this House."

Mr. Joseph R. Underwood, of Kentucky, objected to the reception of the resolution at this time, as not within the established order of business, and consequently not now in order.

The Speaker said that he considered this a matter of privilege, and referred to a precedent that occurred in 1836, in which the gentleman from Massachusetts offered a petition from certain slaves near Fredericksburg, Va., and on which occasion a resolution was offered by a gentleman from Virginia that the gentleman be brought to the bar and censured. Under this precedent the Chair did not feel at liberty to arrest the proceeding.

SEC. 2628. A newspaper charge that an officer of the House had conspired to influence legislation was considered as a question of privilege. On April 26, 1876, Mr. John D. White, of Kentucky, submitted as a question of privilege a preamble and resolution reciting an allegation from a newspaper charging that the Clerk of the House and some of his subordinates had conspired to prevent retrenchment of expenditures, and directing the Committee on Rules to investigate the charges and make report thereon.

Mr. William M. Springer, of Illinois, made the point of order that the resolution did not involve a question of privilege.

The Speaker overruled the point of order on the ground that the resolution, though going to the verge to which any matter of privilege of a Member of the House should go, involved enough of substance in its connection with the House and legislation to bring it within the rule and definition of a question of privilege.

If a newspaper charge that an officer is guilty of improper conduct or a crime raises a question of privilege, then most assuredly a newspaper charge that a Member is guilty of treason raises a question of privilege.

If the publication by a Member of false and scandalous charges against other Members raises a question of privilege, does not the publication of a charge by a Member that another Member is guilty of treason raise a question of privilege?

Note the following:

2637. The publication by a Member of alleged false and scandalous charges against the House and its Members, which he also reiterated in debate, was held to involve a question of privilege.

The House took action as to a Member who reiterated on the floor certain published charges against the House, although other business had intervened.

Instance wherein testimony taken before a committee and relating to the conduct of a Member was not reported to the House at once.

On July 29, 1892, Mr. Charles J. Boatner, of Louisiana, as a matter of privilege, submitted the following resolution, and demanded immediate consideration thereof, to wit:

"Whereas on page 216 of a book purporting to have been written by Thomas E. Watson, of Georgia, a Member of the House of Representatives, the following charge appears:

"'Drunken Members have reeled about the aisles, a disgrace to the Republic. Drunken speakers have debated grave issues on the floor, and in the midst of maudlin ramblings have been heard to ask: "Mr. Speaker, where was I at?"' and

"Whereas the publication of such charges, if untrue, is a grave wrong to this body, and if true the responsibility should be placed where it belongs; and

"Whereas the said Watson has reiterated the same on the floor of the House: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House*, That a committee of five Members be appointed by the Speaker to investigate and report to the House whether such charges are true, and, if untrue, whether the said Watson has violated the privileges of the House and their recommendations relative to the same. That said committee have leave to sit during the sessions of the House, to send for persons and papers, to swear witnesses, and to compel their attendance."

Mr. Thomas B. Reed, of Maine, submitted the question of order, whether, the House having failed to take action respecting the remarks of Mr. Watson at the time he reiterated the charges on the floor of the House, and having passed to other business, it was not now too late to hold him to account therefor.

Mr. Louis E. Atkinson, of Pennsylvania, made the further point of order that the pending business before the House was a conference report, which was itself a matter of the highest privilege.

The Speaker held that the resolution submitted by Mr. Boatner presented a question of privilege, and that whenever the Speaker is of opinion that a question of privilege is involved in a proposition, he must entertain it in preference to any other business.

The Speaker also held that the pending business was the amendments of the Senate to the bill H. R. 752, and that no conference report was pending. Both points of order were therefore overruled.

On August 8, 1892, Mr. Boatner submitted the report of the select committee authorized by the adoption of the resolution, and of which he had been made chairman.

This report stated that the committee summoned Mr. Watson and such witnesses as he indicated, and very soon the fact was developed that the charge as to drunken speakers referred to Mr. J. E. Cobb, of Alabama. The committee thereupon went on and examined testimony as to Mr. Cobb, no point of order being made that the testimony implicating a Member should first be reported to the House.

The committee concluded that the charge was a libel upon the membership, and recommended the adoption of the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the charges made by Thomas E. Watson in his book against the House of Representatives, viz, 'that drunken Members have reeled about the aisles, a disgrace to the Republic,' and 'drunken Members have debated grave issues on the floor,' etc., are not true, and constitute an unwarranted assault upon the honor and dignity of the House and that such publication has the unqualified disapproval of the House."

This report was made in the last hours of the session and does not appear to have been acted on.

There are other precedents cited in section 22, page 192, volume 11, Cannon's Precedents; also beginning on page 193, of the same volume.

This proposed resolution does not charge that the gentleman from the Sixteenth Michigan District made these allegations. It charges that the Kalamazoo Gazette printed the statement that he made the charges, and it asks only that a committee of three be appointed to ascertain first whether the charge made in the Gazette that the gentleman from the Sixteenth District actually uttered the words is true or false; then it goes on from there. It does not assume that anyone is guilty of anything. It only asks for an inquiry.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. As I understand it, the gentleman is not going to press his resolution now.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not care about pressing it now.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am stepping out now. That is all I am interested in.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. But I do say to the gentleman that I will press it at some later time.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not entering into that. I hope the gentleman will serve notice on the leadership when he intends to do so, because then he proposes a question of something other than a dispute or a fight or a contest between two Members.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The point which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has alluded to is one which I want to definitely establish. That is whether or not the remark which precipitated this was in connection with or related to the acts of the gentleman from Michigan from the Fourth District [Mr. HOFFMAN] as chairman of a subcommittee duly authorized to perform certain duties by the chairman of the House Committee on Labor and Education.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Certainly the Gazette article carries that implication; otherwise there would be no privilege of the House. The statement in the paper is that the chairman of the subcommittee had no more authority than a rabbit. The report of the speech made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] carries the statement that "HOFFMAN had no more authority than a rabbit." That, of course, was referring to the holding of the hearings.

As I said before, whether there was authority or whether there was not, I am not arguing about that proposition, although there is plenty of precedent for it, but what I am saying is that in referring to a Member of Congress, who was acting in his official capacity, as a "pimp of Joe Stalin," which can only mean that he was the agent of Joe Stalin and was engaged in treasonable activities—that is what it means when you boil it down—that and the other statements raise a question of privilege of the House. I say to the new Members and to the old Members I can throw as much mud as anybody. Other people can do the same. Are we to open the door to everyone who is so constituted that he wants to go out and destroy the people's confidence in their Congress and their Congressmen?

There are rules for our conduct here in the House. Should there not be some rules which limit our utterances when they refer to our colleagues who are acting under authority—or whom we assume in fact to be acting under authority—of the House? That is the point.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield briefly.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That, I think, makes clear that there has been raised an entirely different issue than that involved in a statement of one Member concerning the personal activities of another Member uttered possibly in the heat of the congressional campaign. Certainly, if a duly created committee or subcommittee can be referred to in any such language, stating that they are the tool of the head of any other government, and particularly carrying the implications that were made in the statement cited, there is quite a different issue before the House than a simple reference by one Member to another during the course of a campaign.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What any Member of this House cares to say about me as an individual is limited only by his good judgment and his good taste. What he says, however, as a Member of this House about me as a Member of the House who is attempting to act by authority of the House is something else again. If the House will not protect itself from the charge that it has within its membership a traitor, then why should we complain when editors and commentators try to smear us? That is the issue, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Briefly.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the gentleman intend to ask that the resolution be read for the information of the House and for its study between now and the time the gentleman may press his resolution?

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a statement?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes. Why does not the gentleman ask for time of his own?

Mr. LESINSKI. No; I will go right on.

Mr. Speaker, I realize the statement of the gentleman from Michigan. There are many words said during many different campaigns, and the gentleman evidently realizes it that way.

On that particular day I was invited by the steel workers to go along with them to Kalamazoo. While driving with them I asked many pertinent questions of the officials in the car in which I was riding, what the condition of the union was, what were their actual beliefs, whether they were "Commies" or not. That is what I wanted to know because I have always said that I have had no interest in any organization that was Commie-dominated.

When we got to Kalamazoo I found that the gentleman from Michigan was a one-man grand jury there, something in which I do not believe. Another

thing, being the ranking Member, I knew of no inquiry to be made by a committee. So when I got to the gathering I told the people there point-blank plain that I had no authority, that I was not there authorized to tell them what they should or should not do, that I came there on my own, and that what I said was my own personal word. Knowing of the gentleman's being there with an inquiry, I decided I would stay a couple of days and find out what was going on.

That evening I spoke at the gathering. The newspaper quoted me correctly, that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] had no more right than a rabbit. That is the statement I made. I went on to explain my situation. Then toward the end of my talk I said these words, and I want the gentleman to listen to them: "That to me is what Mr. Hitler tried to do to the unions in Germany and that is why he wrecked the unions and made one controlled union; and that to me Mr. Hitler is a pimp of Joe Stalin, a prostitute." Those are my words. I have nothing to apologize for because I did not talk of the gentleman. I had on my mind only one thing and that was to tell the people over there I had no use for fascism or communism. That is why I made those remarks.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman saw the article that was printed in the Kalamazoo Gazette, did he not?

Mr. LESINSKI. I have.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman got my letter, did he not?

Mr. LESINSKI. I have. I got them here in Washington.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Just a moment.

Mr. COX. Will not the gentleman content himself with the statement of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] that he was not referring to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I refuse to yield.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan has refused to yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman saw the statement in the Kalamazoo Gazette?

Mr. LESINSKI. The reporter told me about it and I told him plainly I was not quoted exactly as I said it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Did not the gentleman say at that meeting that HOFFMAN could do no worse than Hitler?

Mr. LESINSKI. No, sir.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman says on his honor as a Member of this House that he did not say that HOFFMAN was a pimp of Joe Stalin, a prostitute?

Mr. LESINSKI. That is not the way I said it. I said that to me Hitler was nothing but a pimp of Joe Stalin, a prostitute.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the question now is just as important as it ever was because if a newspaper can publish a statement charging a Member of the House with making a charge which I quoted here, then the gentleman from the Sixteenth District of Michigan is entitled, too, to the appointment of a committee, and so are the Members of the House, to learn whether or not the paper correctly quoted him. I have affidavits bearing out the charge carried in the newspapers. The Members of the House should know the truth. The gentleman from the Sixteenth District of Michigan has been libeled by the charge made in the Kalamazoo Gazette if the gentleman's statement that he never made the statement attributed to him is true. It is important that the House know whether the gentleman made the charge publicly, as an encouragement to a certain political organization, and as to whether or not it was true.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I was a member of the Committee on Expenditures last year of which the gentleman was chairman. Was there a subcommittee out there investigating?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. How many were on the subcommittee?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. One.

Mr. McCORMACK. Who was that?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I was. The gentleman from the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan.

Mr. McCORMACK. Who had the authority to appoint a subcommittee of one? I would like to know that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will tell the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would like to find out.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will tell the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman will have to do a lot of telling.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will tell the gentleman. It is very simple and clear. First, under authority of a decision of the United States Supreme Court (300 U. S.) in United States against Norris. Second, under Resolution 111, which gave the chairman of the Labor Committee authority to appoint committees and under the action taken by the Labor Committee according to its minutes of the 27th day of January, 1947. The foregoing authorities show the right of the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor to appoint a one-man subcommittee.

Mr. McCORMACK. Was this a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Not the Committee on Expenditures?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Not the Committee on Expenditures. The gentleman from the Sixteenth District of Michigan was not present at this meeting to which I referred where the full committee authorized the chairman to appoint committees. My appointment was by Mr. Hartley, the chairman, I have that in writing, and I have it by wire.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman was a member of a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor of one?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is unusual.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No, not this last summer.

Mr. McCORMACK. Not in the last 2 years. But never prior to that did we have subcommittees of one. The Democrats never allowed that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You have loaded the committees up now so it does not make any difference whether it is a committee of one or more. You are loading up these committees at the present time. You changed our own Committee on Expenditures from 15 to 10 to 18 to 7—we gave you 1 out of 3—now you take 2 to 1 and 4 extra.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman was not chairman of the Committee on Labor?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am an ex-member. I was never chairman of the Labor Committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. Did the chairman of the Committee on Labor officially delegate the gentleman from Michigan as a subcommittee of one?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. By wire and by letter, both.

Mr. McCORMACK. As a subcommittee of one?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Of one.

Mr. McCORMACK. Was there any discussion with any Democratic member?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No. At least I do not know of any.

Mr. McCORMACK. None?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No; although I do not know. Nor do I know of any protest until the speech on the 13th.

Mr. McCORMACK. So the Democrats on that committee were not even consulted about this?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. They never made any protest at any meetings that I ever held.

Mr. McCORMACK. But is it not rather arbitrary for the chairman to appoint a subcommittee without consulting the ranking minority Member? We know the procedure of committees. The gentleman, as chairman of the Committee on Expenditures would not appoint a subcommittee without consulting with Carter Manasco, would he?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I recall some of the Members on the gentleman's side writing reports, and they all signed them.

Mr. McCORMACK. Would the gentleman, as chairman, appoint a subcommittee without consulting with Carter Manasco, the ranking minority Member?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I know I always do——

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman would not do that, would he?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I never did. I appointed a subcommittee of one, Mr. HARDY, a Democrat from Virginia. He was appointed to go down into Florida and inquire into something, sure, and he submitted a report and a good one, and it was all right. The gentleman from Alabama, Mr. Manasco, who was ranking minority Member was consulted and he made no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the gentleman did not take any pride in that. Of course, you are the Republican Chairman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I was. And I sent a lone dyed in the wool Democrat from Ole Virginny all alone and the results could not have been better.

Mr. McCORMACK. Sure.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman has quite thoroughly, may I say to the gentleman——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. May I have a couple of more minutes, Mr. Majority Leader?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is commencing to be really enjoyable.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, but you are getting a little away from the topic.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is a perfectly worthy topic, yes.

Mr. KEEFE. Just a moment, the gentleman yielded to me. I rise to ask a question which perhaps might be in the minds of most people on the floor, and that is, are we to conclude as an ultimate fact from what has already thus far in this matter boiled down, that the contention of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI], is that he did not call the gentleman a pimp of Joe Stalin in the exact language which he charged was published in the papers?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, the gentleman can speak for himself, maybe.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there? We might just as well be fair about this thing and perfectly frank about it with ourselves and with one another. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI]—and I hold no brief for him—has stated in his place on the floor of this House what he contends was the language that he used, and his statement is a repudiation of the charges that have been made, that is, that he called the gentleman from Michigan a pimp of Joe Stalin. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that in good faith, as brethren here in a common cause, we ought to be willing to accept the word of our fellow Member. The gentleman from Michigan has denied that he called the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] a pimp, and that ought to satisfy everybody and end this controversy.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does the gentleman contend then that the House—where a paper publishes that statement, and where I can produce affidavits from the people who were present—should overlook it?

Mr. COX. I contend that under the circumstances that the House ought not to dignify an unimportant happening by the setting up of a committee to ascertain whether or not the gentleman from Michigan made such a statement as charged when the gentleman here on the floor, in the presence of the Members of this body, has stated in exact language exactly what he said, and since that language does not offend the rules the controversy is not a matter of further concern of the House. The setting up of a committee to ascertain what was said when we now know what was said, would be, in my judgment, a colossal piece of foolishness.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I would like to say to the gentleman from Georgia, I wonder if I went down in a district adjoining the gentleman's district and charged him with being a traitor to his country and several other things——

Mr. COX. But the gentleman——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. All right, let me answer—and if the gentleman had affidavits and statements of friends and then I came on the floor and said, "Well, I have always admired the gentleman from Georgia; he is a fine, good citizen. I never said it," must the House accept my denial?

Mr. COX. Under those circumstances I would accept the word of my brother Congressman as representing exactly his position as to what he said and did, and would not haggle about it. I think the gentleman does himself a disservice when he haggles.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If the gentleman is talking about me, my answer is that I am not haggling.

Mr. COX. Whether or not he will accept the statement of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] his fellow Congressman, as to what happened in Michigan on this occasion.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. All right. Now I will say to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox], all right, you can make that statement here on the floor if you want to.

What the argument of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] leads to is this: If newspaper A says that Congressman B said that Congressman C was a traitor and if Congressman B, when the statement is called to his attention on the floor, replies that he never made it, and, thereafter, testimony taken shows that Congressman B did say that Congressman C was a traitor, then, under the logic of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox], Congressman C is a traitor because, forsooth, the word of a Congressman must be taken, even when shown to be false. That sort of reasoning does not appeal to me.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And I will say this to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox]. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] had three opportunities to deny that he made the statement. He had written requests three times to deny it. He never did deny it. Only when it was brought here to the attention of the House and then he seemed rather uncertain about what he has said. Now, if you want to defend that sort of procedure, defend him.

Mr. COX. Let me say that I think the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] rendered a disservice to himself when he failed to embrace the first opportunity to make proper amends to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. My hide is thick. I am not overly sensitive. I do not hesitate to hand it out and I can take it. In the 14 years I have been here I have vigorously and bitterly assailed views and policies which I believed fallacious and injurious to our Nation, but I have never, no, not once, made a personal attack upon a colleague. I have taken a lot of abuse from political opponents who have no sense of decency. But there is a limit. This attack, under the sponsorship of the CIO, goes too far. This situation is brought to your attention today because, in my humble judgment, it is time that the House put its stamp of disapproval upon Members of the House who falsely charge their colleagues with disloyalty and worse, if that is possible.

Kalamazoo County juts into the block of counties which comprise the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan. The Kalamazoo Gazette has readers in my old home town of Constantine, which lies some 60 miles to the south, where I lived in my boyhood days, where I have many friends. It goes into Sturgis, Three Rivers, Mendon, Colon, Fabius, all through the farming district of St. Joe County. It goes into Paw Paw, Gobles, Bloomingdale, Hartford, Keeler, all through the farming community of Van Buren County; it goes into Cassopolis, Dowagiac, Jones, all through Cass County. It goes into Plainwell, Wayland, Otsego, yes, into my home town of Allegan in Allegan County.

It goes into the home of my son and his wife and my two grandchildren—boys of 12 and 13 years of age. It goes into the home of another son and his wife; the home of a grandson who is now a midshipman at the Academy; the home of a granddaughter, the winner of a scholarship, and now in the University of Michigan; the home of a granddaughter 12 years of age.

The 12-year-old girl, Evie, picks up the Kalamazoo Gazette which comes to her home 7 days a week. Kid-like, she looks at the funnies. It may be she thinks Grandpa is a nice old fellow. Perhaps she sees the words, "Representative LESINSKI calls Representative HOFFMAN a pimp of Joe Stalin." She says, "Mamma, the Kalamazoo Gazette says grampa is a pimp. What is a pimp, mamma?"

I say to you, my colleagues of the House, what do you, deep down in your hearts, honestly think of this situation?

Overlong, men and women throughout the country, who were dependent upon their pay checks for a livelihood, have been driven from their jobs by goon squads; have been vilified, slandered and libeled by propagandists who speak, not for the rank and file of the CIO, but for a few, a very few, of their leaders, who are using the union organizations for their own selfish ends.

Is it not time that the responsible officials at the head of the CIO—one of them, Philip Murray, its president—publicly condemn actions of that kind?

Overlong, Members of Congress, seeking to express their honest convictions as to what was good for labor, have been falsely charged with being antilabor, unkind, uncharitable, as taking the bread out of the mouths of the workers' children. Those charges have been made by union officials, sometimes by representatives of the international.

Just as the action taken against the individual worker seeks to deprive him of his right to earn a livelihood, so these false and malicious charges—in this case, this false and malicious charge—seek to intimidate the people's Representatives, to frighten them, to prevent them from

expressing their views on labor legislation.

This charge, according to the Kalamazoo Gazette, was made at a mass meeting which the CIO radio announcer said was presided over by Glen S. Sigman, personal representative of CIO President Philip Murray.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI], we are advised, is to be chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor. If he will go into Michigan at a mass meeting, attended, so it was said by the radio announcer of the union, by more than 1,000 people, there falsely charge, there make the untrue charge, that one of his colleagues is a "pimp of Joe Stalin," what will he do to industry's representatives when they appear here before the House committee, if they venture to oppose the legislation demanded by the CIO?

My colleagues, how many of you, if this charge published in the Kalamazoo Gazette goes unchallenged, will feel free to vote your convictions, when before the House comes a bill to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act, reenact the Wagner Act, write legislation affecting organized labor—legislation either opposed or supported by the politicians in the CIO?

It is apparent that it was the purpose of the goon squad to intimidate the employees of the Shakespeare Co. at Kalamazoo. It is apparent that it is the purpose of the CIO, its international and district representatives, to frighten, to intimidate the Members of Congress who are about to consider labor legislation.

The Washington press tells us there is a lobby of 45 CIO members on the Hill today.

The Supreme Court a week ago today publicly announced that the people of the States had the right to enact laws which would protect the man who desired to work.

This House, in my humble judgment, should in some way assure its membership that it will protect them from intimidation and coercion when they attempt to voice their convictions.

Although granted permission to print as a part of my remarks the resolution sent to the Speaker's desk, because that resolution contains other remarks published in the Gazette, which perhaps have not been referred to by me today, I will not print it here but will wait until it is offered on some future occasion.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I know nothing about this occurrence that has just gone on except what I have heard on the floor today, but many of us who were here in the House understood that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] sent a resolution to the Speaker and so stated. The gentleman has consumed the hour for which, under the rule, he was permitted to talk. He has talked. Then he buttressed that talk, as I understand from the floor here, by a resolution. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] seemed to indicate there was something in that resolution with which he did not agree. The rest of us would like to know just where the resolution is, and what is in it.

The SPEAKER. There is a paper lying on the desk of the Speaker. It starts by saying "Resolution." The gentleman from Michigan never did offer the resolution. He said he was sending up to the Speaker's chair, and he intended to offer, a resolution, but he did not.

Mr. MICHENER. Then the status is that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] sent a paper up there, and there it lies. What will become of it?

The SPEAKER. There is nothing before the House at this time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include one of the finest editorials I have ever read, which appeared in the Boston Post, entitled "Captain Courageous," when that great newspaper came out in a militant manner in support of President Truman and made such marked contributions to the President's carrying Massachusetts.

I further ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial that appeared in the Sheboygan Press, of Wisconsin, on November 11, 1948, and further to extend my remarks and include an address recently delivered by Floyd B. Odlum.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE BUDGET

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the Congress faces two grave responsibilities, the maintenance of peace abroad and the preservation of prosperity at home; we must keep out of war and we must avoid another depression.

The consequences of a Nation-wide depression are too recent in the minds of men to require elaboration.

And even clearer is the realization of the hazards of another war. It could mean the repudiation of the national debt; the establishment of economic and military dictatorships which might not be completely shaken off in 100 years. It would involve deficit financing of crushing proportions, possibly the confiscation of private property, as in Great Britain; in any event a return to rigid regimentation of the most drastic character and the abandonment of national fiscal and industrial status which probably could not be recovered within the next generation. It would mean—even if we won—the destruction of major cities and loss of life measured by millions.

There is only one way to avoid war, and that is to remain so strong that no nation will dare attack us. Weakness invites invasion. We must maintain superiority on land and sea, and especially in the air. We must equip and maintain the most powerful military force in the world, and support an adequate and progressive domestic economy at home.

This can be effected only through vast expenditures, and the budget just received from the President is designed to implement both national defense and national prosperity.

It is the largest budget ever recommended in time of peace. As a matter of fact it is not a peacetime budget. We have been fighting a cold war since 1945—and in recent months a losing war. The stalemate in Europe and the debacle in Asia have materially prejudiced our strategic position.

Defense of the Nation from subjugation and exploitation is a subject which brooks no debate and considered in this light the amounts proposed in the budget are not excessive.

It is essentially a war budget. Half the amount carried is to pay for measures to prevent or prepare for future war. Another quarter is consumed in the cost of past wars, in provisions for care of veterans; interest on the national debt, and related expenditures. In other words more than 75 percent of this budget relates to past and prospective wars. If the war items could be eliminated we could this year pay $30,000,000,000 on the public debt.

But these are arbitrary items on which we have little or no discretion. We have no choice but to pay and the only latitude we have is in the exercise of care and economy in their administration.

On a close analysis, many of these expenditures proposed by the budget are in the nature of capital expenditures. They fall within the same category as the purchase of rolling stock by railroads, or the construction of generating plants by utilities. They are part of a long-term program of national defense and continued economic stability, the benefits of which will continue to accrue through coming years.

The defense of the Nation is necessarily projected far into the future, and current expenditures for that purpose, beyond mere maintenance, should not be wholly charged to the annual supply bills of any one session of Congress.

It is a burden which must be borne regardless of cost or consequences. But, let me insist that, as necessary and imperative as it is, security should be provided at the lowest cost obtainable. We must spend generously for defense, but we should handle such expenditures soundly and wisely. We are confronted today with a debt of a quarter of a trillion dollars. Merely the interest on our existing debt, although funded at the lowest rate at which a public debt was ever financed, aggregates $5,000,000,000 a year, an amount which must come out of our tax income before unobligated revenue is available for any other purpose whatsoever.

Every item in the budget should be subjected to every possible test to determine whether the services or commodities so provided cannot be secured more economically or whether they cannot be dispensed with altogether. If, for example, national safety can be insured for one penny less than $15,000,000,000 that penny should be saved, and as many more as the situation permits under the most exacting analysis.

The welfare items should be especially scrutinized. Whether a dollar can be advantageously expended or invested is not the criterion. The question is whether it should be spent for any purpose other than debt retirement at this critical time.

There is a disposition to assume that the National Treasury is a bottomless well with a never-failing flow of inexhaustible funds untrammeled by natural economic law or economic principle, capable of creating something from nothing, adequate to meet every draft drawn by the Committee on Appropriations and endorsed by the Congress. Public funds, even when appropriated by Congress, are not like the oil from the widow's cruse, magically self-perpetuating, nor like Aladdin's lamp, to be invoked and replenished by the simple expediency of legislative enactment. Passing an appropriation bill does not create money.

The original plan under which each appropriation bill carried with it a revenue provision for raising the funds appropriated had many advantages; and no appropriation bill should be passed in this session without careful consideration simultaneously of the source from which such funds are to be drawn.

The only source of funds appropriated by this Congress is taxes or loans, and the public debt is long since too large to warrant a resort to loans except under the most urgent and imperative conditions.

Regardless of any merit, however convincing the argument that an item calling for an appropriation will contribute to the public welfare, it must always be subject to the question: Can we afford it? The situation is too critical, the public debt is too large, our national resources are too limited to provide for any expenditure which can be abandoned or postponed over this emergency. Desirable as are rivers and harbors, reclamation, irrigation, public works, aid to navigation, and the public health—however appealing social reforms may appear—when such expenditures involve deficit financing they must yield to the urgent necessity of national security and economic stability.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Do I understand that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is against an appropriation for public education, and so forth, and so on?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly not. I strongly favor all of them. Whether they should be provided for at this particular time is yet to be determined.

Mr. Speaker, the budget comes to us in the red. That is the lamentable fact, though not surprising. The expenditure program approved at the last session did not justify a deliberate lessening of income. That was quite apparent then. It is even more evident now.

May I remind you that within 6 months after the close of the fiscal year in which World War II hostilities ceased, President Truman submitted to the Congress a balanced budget. That was the budget for the fiscal year 1948 presented in January 1947. It was in balance despite the fact that debt retirement had but recently been effected to the extent of more than $20,000,000,000. If anyone desires a citation, he will find this set out on page M-13 of the 1948 Budget.

But there began at that time a 2-year hiatus in the complete control of our Federal finances, with the result that the present budget as now presented is again in the red.

Expenditures during the fiscal year commencing next July 1 are estimated to aggregate $41,858,000,000.

Availability for the liquidation of such estimated expenditures is estimated at $40,985,000,000, or a shortage of $873,000,000.

It is our job and our responsibility to make up that shortage, and we can undertake it mainly in three ways:

First. Search out ways of curbing proposed expenditures without hurt to the general welfare.

Second. Curtail current expenditure programs where changed conditions justify that course.

Third. Raise additional revenue.

The first step is largely a task for the Committee on Appropriations of the two Houses. I believe we can pledge that the House committee will endeavor in every way to discharge this task faithfully and scrupulously. And we solicit the cooperation of every Member of the House.

The following summation of proposed expenditures by objects indicates the difficulty of the job:

International affairs and finance	$6,709,000,000
National defense	14,268,000,000
Veterans' services and benefits	5,496,000,000
Interest on the public debt	5,450,000,000
Social welfare, health and security	2,358,000,000
Agriculture and agricultural resources	1,662,000,000
Natural resources	1,861,000,000
All other	4,054,000,000
Total	41,858,000,000

The second step is not altogether a function of the Committee on Appropriations. The appropriate legislative committees can be relied on to cooperate. The legislative committees might concern themselves not alone with current expenditures but with projected or potential commitments under existing authority entailing Treasury withdrawals in subsequent fiscal years. Our problem is not an immediate one. Our concern is to adopt a sound, dependable fiscal course.

The third step, of course, is within the province of the Committee on Ways and Means.

There is still another step and a very important one, that of authorizing legislation.

Expenditures flow from appropriations, and appropriations flow from legislative enactments. The appropriation committees are hampered in maintaining sound expenditure levels when authorizing legislation piles up new or added demands upon the Federal purse. All too often costs, when passing authorizing legislation, seem to be of secondary concern. It is of paramount importance with a public debt the magnitude of ours and tax burdens such as we are now carrying and which we cannot expect to lessen for some time to come. No more effective means exist of curbing expenditure than to check at the source measures embodying authority to make appropriations.

Congress should consider carefully the initiation of new expenditures and new Federal activities. All such proposals start with small appropriations, but with the practical certainty that in future years they will require millions of dollars as the program develops. It should be remembered that once begun, they cannot easily be discontinued, regardless of the expenditures which they entail. The initiation of activities on small-scale expenditures is a process familiar to us all. But as we will recall, they usually blossom forth into ramifications requiring the expenditure of unexpected sums which must be provided in future years, and in deficit budgets every added expenditure is reflected in corresponding increases in the public debt.

There are many who do not seem to be greatly concerned over the magnitude of the public debt; many who are not averse to letting it sort of coast along, curtailing it according to our circumstances, without any determined purpose to liquidate it as rapidly as might be under a definite plan. Of course, that is the easiest way, a hand-to-mouth plan; let tomorrow take care of itself, the line of least resistance. We had an example of that in the last session when in the face of rising expenditures, occasioned by the international situation, Congress proceeded to reduce the revenue. I have discussed the subject before, and I refer to it again because it is so vital to the fiscal stability of the Government and the welfare of present and future generations.

The public debt at its peak was $279,214,000,000. At the end of December—that is, at the end of last month—it had been reduced to $252,800,000,000. The interest appropriation on the debt for the peak year was $4,500,000,000, although it was floated at a minimum rate of interest. You might consult page 785, Senate Document No. 85, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, to get the exact amount of the interest upon the national debt at that time. For the fiscal year commencing next July 1, the interest item, according to the budget now before us, is $5,450,000,000, or an increase over the peak debt year, 1946, of $950,000,000, despite the debt reduction in the interim of $27,000,000,000.

Now, what does that indicate? It means that without a substantial and periodic debt retirement, there is a continually increasing interest bill, eventually attaining a level of possibly astounding proportions, depending upon the rate at which refunding may be accomplished, because as the vast amount of securities, none of which exceed 10 years in maturity, fall due, aggregating as much as $30,000,000 in 1 year under peacetime conditions, and with the demand for money which we may expect at that time, the rate of interest must be raised; it cannot be refunded at the present low rate of interest. Consequently, without

a substantial debt retirement, as rapidly as can be effected, a continually increasing interest bill of large proportions, depending upon the rate at which refunding must be accomplished, must be met annually.

That interest money is money which otherwise might be channeled into roads, into flood-control work, into assistance to States for education, into inland water transportation and power, into soil conservation, into rural electrification, into aid to the aged and infirm and many other worthy objects which would contribute to the enrichment of our people and so contribute to a happier and more prosperous America. But instead of spending it for that purpose we must pay it out in interest upon this great debt hanging over us, an old man of the sea in time of peace and a sword of Damocles in time of war.

It is our responsibility, therefore, to cut that interest bill and to effect economies which can be secured without injury or prejudice to the public welfare in order that the largest possible amount of the national revenues may be utilized for national benefits.

We should keep always in mind the devastating effect that would ensue from pyramiding upon the present debt, or any substantial part of it, the cost of another world conflict.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. There is an article in Look magazine, I believe, which states that we are spending $400,000,000 a year in Japan, in addition to the cost of our military operations there, trying to help the Japanese. Does not the gentleman think we had better let the Japanese go to work and make their own living, and use some of that money to improve our own country and make it possible for us to pay the interest and sinking fund on the debt we now owe?

Mr. CANNON. That is a subject which would require, for elaboration, more time than we have this afternoon; but let me say to the gentleman that whenever we abandon the Eastern Hemisphere to Russian communism we invite a situation which must be met in the future by sums compared with which the $400,000,000 to which the gentleman refers will be inconsequential.

Mr. RANKIN. This article goes on to say that what we are doing there now is provoking communism instead of discouraging it. I was just wondering if we are really getting anywhere. I do not mean provoking him but provoking those people who follow the Communist line. I did not understand we were fighting Japan just to take them over and raise them.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. After we have cut down our public debt from $279,000,000,000 to $252,000,000,000, it requires larger appropriations to take care of it than it did before. Will the gentleman elaborate on that?

Mr. CANNON. I have discussed that in my statement and, suggest that the gentleman look at my remarks when they appear in the RECORD.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. In order to reply to the question propounded by the gentleman from Mississippi, will the gentleman from Missouri be kind enough to permit me to comment briefly on it?

Mr. CANNON. I shall be glad to have the gentleman discuss the subject. He is perhaps as familiar with it as any Member of the House.

Mr. STEFAN. We should know that under international law we are obligated to feed the civilian population of conquered countries at a certain minimum amount. I want to make a statement with reference to the amount he mentioned in this newspaper article with which the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is familiar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATMAN). The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 15 additional minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, certainly there is no inclination on my part to object. Many Members have sat here listening with a great deal of interest to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. But there are many more special orders, including one, the next following, by the ranking Republican member of the committee. I do not know how much of his time would be used, but I do not believe there should be an undue extension of time, because that will prejudice others who have special orders.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. The Army under GARIOA is feeding these people in the occupation areas. The gentleman from Missouri, and the members of the Committee on Appropriations know that the Army has reduced the amount of money that we are spending in occupied areas to feed the people and is making every effort to make them self-sufficient.

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman from Nebraska had the information that I have, he would know that we never did admit that it was our obligation to feed the people of conquered countries. I know that because I lived in a country which was conquered once, and which was starved for 20 years.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Certainly the statement has been repeatedly made by representatives of the administrative branch of the Government to the Committee on Appropriations, and to the subcommittee dealing with the Army, as well as to the Committee on Defense, in connection with the presentation of requests for GARIOA that under the Hague and Geneva conventions we do have a responsibility to feed the country when we occupy it, at least to the extent necessary to prevent disease and unrest. I think he knows that that has been cited as authority for making of these appropriations and the responsibilities that we have incurred.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. On page 7 of the President's budget message he states he expects at a later date to request funds for providing military supplies to western European countries. Can the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations give us any rough idea at this time as to how much funds may be involved in that request?

Mr. CANNON. I imagine that no one in the department could at this time estimate accurately the amount which may be involved. As the gentleman knows, we must from time to time revise our estimates to meet rapidly changing conditions abroad. Certainly the Committee on Appropriations of the House will have an opportunity to pass upon the amount or the necessity for any amount for such purposes.

Mr. Speaker, the budget message portrays with considerable clarity our present and prospective financial status. It makes possible an understanding approach to the questions involved. Our final conclusions, of course, must rest on exhaustive inquiries in the course of the hearings.

I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that we can effect sizable and justifiable reductions in the budget.

I have yet to see a budget of which this was not true. It is the President's budget, true, but it would be humanly impossible for the President personally to determine the amount necessary to implement the thousands of objects which the budget embraces. He must rely upon subordinate agencies to work out such details, and I am certain will welcome any method we may find for efficiently attaining the same objectives proposed at less cost.

As I said earlier, much help in effecting economies can be given by the legislative committees, but I have in mind particularly the Committee on Armed Services.

The appropriations for the armed services for the current fiscal year, plus contractual authority of $220,000,000, amount to $10,674,477,413. That was the amount of new spending money voted, some of which, of course, will not be drawn from the Treasury until the fiscal year 1950 and fiscal years subsequent thereto. In addition to that vast sum, current fiscal year Treasury withdrawals will be augmented appreciably in consequence of the supplemental National Defense Act of 1948, which did not become a law until May 21, 1948.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATMAN). The time of the gentleman

from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has again expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 20 additional minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of all other special orders today I may be allowed to complete this speech.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, that act appropriated $929,000,000, and included contractual authorizations aggregating $2,275,000,000. For the fiscal year 1950 the budget proposed a new obligation available for the armed services under the heading of "National Military Establishment," including contractual authorizations of $2,058,000,000, amounting to $13,486,000,000.

On the expenditure or Treasury withdrawal side for the armed services alone the budget estimates these amounts, predicated upon existing legislation:

For the current 1949 fiscal year, $11,260,000,000.

For the fiscal year 1950, $12,760,000,000.

Is it necessary to devote that much money to national defense? Is it not possible, with altered circumstances, to permit the recapture of a part of the huge amount voted at the last session of Congress? Is it possible appropriately to ready our armed forces for appreciably less by pursuing more economical practices and eliminating many warborn practices of a costly nature, which do not contribute to military preparedness? Have all war-created activities, justified solely by war, been eliminated? Have all costly practices initiated during the war, no longer justified, been discontinued? Those are questions, the answers to which no one can be certain of until there is careful scrutiny of the estimates and justifications. So far as I am aware, there has been no searching inquiry as to some of these questions since the Seventy-ninth Congress when we were pursuing a systematic program of recapturing appropriation balances.

There must be further inquiries by the Appropriations Committee, and I trust also by the Armed Services Committee as well. If Members of the House have any ideas or suggestions in that connection I can assure them that such suggestions will be welcomed and carefully weighed by the committee.

Like many others, I feel that we should derive some substantial economies in consequence of the National Security Act of 1947. Thus far it would seem that about all that has been done is to superimpose upon existing agencies a super agency occasioning larger instead of lesser expenditures. It is to be hoped that the Armed Services Committee will review that law and inquire into its workings with a view to achieving more efficient and more economic results. It is a matter of no little urgency if we are to realize savings either during the remainder of this fiscal year or the ensuing fiscal year.

It is the generally accepted fact that material economies must come very largely from lessened pay rolls. It is my considered opinion that the armed services and those other agencies of the Government that were expanded during the war years have not reduced their staffs to levels which would be adequately efficient to the dispatch of the essential functions. Overstaffing no doubt exists in other places. I am inclined to doubt whether the heads of the agencies concern themselves enough on this matter. Maybe they lack the experience of having had to meet pay rolls. I do not recall any evidence of economy in pay rolls by the heads of agencies since the time the late Claude Swanson shortly after his assumption of office as Secretary of the Navy ordered a 10 percent reduction in the Navy Department's civilian staff. Possibly a helpful step would be to set up in each agency a qualified group whose business it would be to survey jobs and search out ways of economizing in their personnel. Overstaffing, however, is not alone responsible for heavy pay-roll costs. We liberalized the Classification Act of 1923 a few years back and we have since been passing a succession of pay increase measures all adding to the cost of standing Federal agenices and the cost of running the Federal Government. Despite the fact that we have a budget in the red and face a deficit this fiscal year, there is a hue and cry for further increases in the Classification Act ratings. How can we justify further pay increases under such circumstances? We can justify to the American people the grant of funds for paying a living wage to all employees who may not now be drawing a living wage, but beyond that common sense dictates that we must not go at this time. In the higher pay brackets of Civil Service employees there may be some isolated case where sufficient skills and talents might demand higher compensation in private employment, but it has always been so. In the great majority of cases I daresay that Federal employees are drawing higher pay than persons in comparable positions on the outside. The truth is we have too many employees in the higher pay brackets. The Classification Act has developed into an excellent vehicle for that very situation. There are too many employees now who are nothing more than senior clerks who have been clothed with high-sounding titles which carry added pay, and when one gets one of these titles it is apt to mean further expense such as a private room, a personal secretary, and possibly a special messenger.

I entertain no objection to advances within pay grades which occur periodically when efficiency standards are maintained, but pay rolls constitute such a large proportion of the cost of government that I feel we should exercise more voice in their circumscription and administration. We should see that a proper balance is established and maintained as regards distribution of employees in grade and that might mean stopping grade advancements above a certain level—say $5,000 or $6,000—without advance approval by Congress.

When we think of Federal pay we should not lose sight of the fact that we have provided a liberal retirement law, that there is a short workweek and a short workday, that there are numbers of holidays with pay and often with extra time off, and that that there are generous leave periods, including sick leave. These are benefits that cannot be overlooked in determining fair and just compensation. There are occasions when we lose good men to industry or other fields of employment, but that is the experience of every employer. By and large, the service is attractive to those who are in it and is sufficiently attractive to draw capable or promising new employees when needed. The fact cannot be stressed too often or too forcibly that our financial status demands the exercise of the most rigid economy. Essential demands are too heavy to allow any leeway for continued unessential costs or to take on new obligations that are not of a self-liquidating character or that will not immediately or in the future contribute in proportion to the national wealth.

As it all adds up we have a real task ahead of us to guard and preserve our financial integrity. The committee will have this objective in view. What it will be able to do depends upon its findings at the detailed examinations it will conduct on the budget estimates. What economies it can effect must await those examinations. Any prophecy of the final net result could only be a guess.

That raises the question of the legislative budget, provided for in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. We have had 2 years of experience under that law, and they have been rather disappointing. Its faults, and its disadvantages were clearly pointed out when the legislation was under consideration by the House, and still more effectively in the Senate. Its advocates, and they were few and relatively inexperienced, could not defend it, but pleaded for a trial, and the House consented to give it a trial. At the first session of the Eightieth Congress, the majority Members of the Legislative Budget Committee guessed, and I use the word advisedly, that there would be effected an expenditure saving of between four and one-half and six billion dollars. The Senate insisted on the lower figure and the House proposed the higher figure. Incidentally, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] and I cast the determining vote which committed the House to the larger proposed saving. However, the difference between the two Houses was never reconciled and no legislative budget was adopted. Now, bear in mind those amounts applied to expenditures and not to appropriations.

To make expenditure savings of such proportions would necessitate reducing appropriations by considerably larger amounts because appropriations remain available for expenditure after the close of the fiscal year for which made. The official record for the first trial year shows appropriation reductions of $3,162,877,443, as may be noted on pages 796 and 797, Senate Document 106. As I

have explained, that means a gross expenditure reduction well under that amount. So the first attempt with the legislative budget culminated in a difference between the two Houses, both dominated by same political party, which was never resolved, and in a net result of something less than half of the goal advocated by the House and about two-fifths less than the goal advocated by the Senate.

At the second session of the Eightieth Congress the majority members of the Legislative Budget Committee again hazarded a guess. The Members of the two bodies were more in unison and more conservative. Their joint aim was an expenditures saving of two and one-half billion dollars. The official record for the session shows appropriation reductions of $2,770,628,775, as may be seen on pages 894, 895, and 896 of Senate Document 205, and that, too, does not mean expenditure reductions of that amount, but rather an amount well under the objective which had been set.

Now, what was accomplished by these two attempts? What useful purpose was served? Some Member of the House—who was not a member of the joint committee—has been reported in the press as saying that the procedure creates an incentive to accomplish a more effective economy job. Let me ask, Mr. Speaker, do we need any more incentive than a glance at the public debt, the "must" expenditures, and the tax burdens we are carrying?

May I call attention, and particularly the attention of the new Members, to this very voluminous volume.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I have been listening to the gentleman from Missouri with a great deal of interest. I would like to ask this question: Does the gentleman, who is now chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, expect to make as good or better a showing regarding the reduction of needless expenditures of the Government as did the Eightieth Congress? I would like to know just what he is thinking, and I think the American people would like to know.

Mr. CANNON. That is the very thing I am talking about. As has been said, it is utterly impossible, without hearings and without investigation, and especially in view of rapidly changing conditions, to make anything like an accurate estimate at this time. That is why the legislative budget system in effect at this time is impractical and unworkable.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CANNON. With pleasure.

Mr. JENSEN. Then I would like to know, since the gentleman has given me the answer that he has, is the gentleman going to attempt to make any kind of savings whatever under the budget estimate of the President?

Mr. CANNON. I certainly am, and I trust I shall have the cooperation and help of the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman knows he always has that support.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONNER in the chair). The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. I think the gentleman knows my record well enough, since I have been on the Appropriations Committee with him for the past three terms, to know that I have always supported the gentleman or anyone else who attempted to cut out unnecessary expenditures.

I must say in all fairness to the new Members of the Congress and to the American people that there have been many times when I was terribly disappointed in the position the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] took on expenditures. There were many times when I felt he wanted to spend too much money on a lot of things that were not necessary. I hope that now, since we have a big job ahead of us, as the gentleman has just recited to the House, he will go along with the Republicans and the Democrats on the committee who do want to cut out unnecessary expenditures. I am sure, after listening to the gentleman, that that is what he intends to do.

Mr. CANNON. I trust that the gentleman, when he extends his remarks, will specify the times in which the gentleman from Missouri has approved expenditures of which the gentleman from Iowa did not approve, and I will say that I recall, myself, instances in which I advocated economy when the gentleman voted against me.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman then go to the trouble of picking out those instances where I have supported legislation or appropriation bills in greater sums than has the gentleman from Missouri? If the gentleman wants me to pick out the many instances where I have supported economies which I felt were necessary, and put them in the RECORD, then certainly I should expect the gentleman to do likewise, and I think the gentleman will in all fairness do that.

Mr. CANNON. I will not wait for that. When we brought on the floor a proposition to eliminate the yearly appropriation for guayule, on which we threw away millions of dollars.

Mr. JENSEN. For what?

Mr. CANNON. The appropriation for guayule.

Mr. JENSEN. Guayule rubber?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. What did I do?

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman voted to continue the appropriation when I urged its discontinuance, and we have spent millions of dollars on it.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman is picking out peanuts to talk about. Now let us talk about some of the things the gentleman has voted for which amount to tens and thousands of times the little guayule appropriation.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman may give them now, but $50,000 is not peanuts.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman give me time to name some of them?

Mr. CANNON. Yes; proceed.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman was quite instrumental as a Member in advocating not one but dozens of things that I opposed, but it happens that they were in full committee, and the gentleman knows, as everybody in the House knows, that we cannot talk about the battles we had in full committee.

Mr. CANNON. To what does the gentleman refer? The gentleman says I voted for appropriations of which he disapproved. Let the gentleman specify them.

Mr. JENSEN. All right. Then I will turn around and say the same thing to you. Name some of the things that I approved.

Mr. CANNON. I just named one.

Mr. JENSEN. Oh, yes; guayule.

Mr. CANNON. Yes; and the gentleman does not deny it. Fifty thousand dollars absolutely thrown away.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to this voluminous document. Every word in it and every figure in it must eventully come before the House and be passed upon by the membership of the House during this session of Congress. It is a 1,950-page volume. Apart from the transmittal message and various tables and indexes it comprises 1,345 pages of details which must be reviewed in detail by the Committee on Appropriations. It is a task that takes weeks of study and exploration before we can reach sound conclusions and bring our recommendations to the House.

This provision in the Legislative Reorganization Act specifies that before this detailed examination can be made, a joint committee of the House and Senate shall first make an estimate of all Federal receipts for the ensuing fiscal year.

Second, make an estimate of expenditures for the ensuing fiscal year.

Third, make a recommendation for the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditures during the ensuing fiscal year, including a reserve for deficiencies.

Note that it is not the maximum amount to be appropriated, but the maximum amount to be expended during the first year of the availability of these appropriations.

Fourth, make a recommendation for a reduction in the public debt if estimated receipts exceed estimated expenditures.

Fifth, make a recommendation to be included in a concurrent resolution which shall accompany the joint committee's report expressing the sense of the Congress that the public debt be increased by the amount of the excess if the estimated expenditures exceed the estimated receipts.

You understand there is nothing binding on anybody after all this is done. All these preliminaries are required before the regularly constituted agencies of the House having jurisdiction can make their studies and reach any sound conclusion. Manifestly, if the requirement were not to operate until such studies have been completed and decisions arrived at, we would be merely confirming

what we have done already, or what we are about to do.

The executive departments worked for more than 6 months preparing the budget estimates. The figures come to the Congress early in January. It is idle to believe that such a ceiling could be arrived at or could be maintained for the rest of the year in an era when almost every week is marked by some emergency requiring additional appropriations. It is a useless obstacle to the legislative process.

The Federal budget, Mr. Speaker, is not a national affair influenced by caprice or depending on the partisan policies of the party in power in the executive branch, but, on the contrary, is a documented volume of recommendations based largely on law previously enacted by the Congress to carry out Government policies inaugurated during the regimes of each political party.

The plan proposed by the Reorganization Act of determining in advance the fiscal requirements of the Government as a whole, and establishing a relationship between estimated revenues and expenditures is not new. It has been proposed many times, notably on February 28, 1913, when the inauguration of the budget system was under consideration, and again repeatedly in 1921, when the budget system was first adopted.

In each instance the House, after making every effort to incorporate the idea in a workable plan, found it impracticable. The inescapable difficulty is that it requires a report in the nature of a court verdict without considering the evidence. Long and detailed hearings are necessary before a figure can be accurately determined, and a figure arrived at by any other course is worthless and embarrasses the committee later in the session when justifiable reductions or warranted increases should be made in response to facts adduced in the hearings.

It is also an imposition on the public who are led to believe that the first figure announced is dependable. The man in the street gets the idea that the President's budget has been cut anywhere from $1,500,000,000 to $6,000,000,000 when a final tabulation at the close of the session may show that the budget has actually been increased. In other words, contrary to the general impression, no resolution under the Reorganization Act is binding on the committee or the Congress. No such resolution can establish any limitation on the Federal budget. Any such resolution is meaningless in effect and without force of law, misleading to the public, and imposes a duty on the Congress which—however laudable its objective—is impossible of attainment under the present law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for an additional 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONNER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, how much time has the gentleman consumed?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has consumed 60 minutes altogether.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I might say, of course, permission has already been given to the gentleman to extend his remarks and to have them appear in the RECORD as a continuation of the remarks he made earlier in the afternoon, so that to all intents and purposes this will constitute an extension beyond the 1 hour ordinarily permitted under the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri if he is prepared at this time to yield for the purpose of a question.

Mr. CANNON. Yes; I shall be glad to yield at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is the gentleman prepared to yield for the purpose of a question at this time, if the additional time is granted?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for an additional 10 minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The question I should like to propound to the chairman of the committee is whether or not he proposes to do something about the situation with respect to the legislative budget ceiling?

Mr. CANNON. That is our purpose, Mr. Speaker, in asking for a suspension of the provision until we can make further studies.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Then the chairman expects to proceed with the consideration of a legislative budget ceiling resolution, under the terms of the existing House rules?

Mr. CANNON. Not if the concurrent resolution is agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. So that the Appropriations Committee and the members of the Ways and Means Committee will have to act on this joint committee and try to get out this report by the 15th of February, just as we struggled to do in the last 2 years?

Mr. CANNON. It is to be hoped that will not be necessary; as the gentleman is aware, in the last 2 years no advantage has accrued from the larger amount of time and money wasted on the legislative budget.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That may be, but the responsibility is on that committee to make a report. Whether or not the House acted upon it, the responsibility was on the joint budget committee to report a resolution by the 15th of February, and they did so.

Mr. CANNON. Not in the first session. They adopted a figure in the second session, and thereafter paid no attention to it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. My memory is that the resolution was prepared by the joint committee in both sessions and whether the House acted upon it or not was not in the control of the committee. Did not the House act upon the report in the second session?

Mr. CANNON. Without any hearings or any basis of fact.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Whether the House acted or not, was it not the responsibility of the joint legislative budget committee to submit a report by February 15 under the rules embodied in the so-called Legislative Reorganization Act?

It has always been my contention that that particular part of the Reorganization Act was an unrealistic and futile gesture. Even if the Congress adopted the report, a subsequent act could always, in effect, repeal any ceiling figure mentioned in the report.

Mr. CANNON. The figure considered was not supported by any data. All members of the subcommittee agreed that the plan was unworkable. The chairman of the joint committee, Mr. BRIDGES, so announced in the Senate.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. There is no argument between the gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from South Dakota with respect to the practical difficulties of making any firm estimates before the 15th of February when the subcommittees have not had an opportunity to hold hearings. That is the point the gentleman has been making, and is well taken, but the basic question I am asking is whether or not as chairman of the Appropriations Committee in the Eighty-first Congress the gentleman from Missouri proposes to do anything about that in this year. I am sure that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] who was chairman of the committee in the Eightieth Congress also felt that the February 15 report was largely a futile thing but since it was the law and the first application of it, that it should be followed lest someone say it was not even tried.

Mr. CANNON. We propose to follow the law, but we trust that the House will agree to suspending that provision until we have had an opportunity to write a workable budget provision.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Suspending it in this session?

Mr. CANNON. Suspending it in this session.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And will a resolution on that point come up in the near future?

Mr. CANNON. That depends on action by the committee.

Too frequently, Mr. Speaker, the fact is overlooked that we have a Budget and Accounting Act which became a law on June 10, 1921. It was the product of the best and most experienced minds on the subject at that time. It was framed by Members of this body with long experience and proven and recognized capacity. It was adequate to our purposes then and it is adequate today, but its provisions are effective only so far as Congress is concerned, only as Members individually and the committees having jurisdiction conscientiously and diligently discharge their obligations.

The budget before us is presented in consequence of that law.

It estimates over-all receipts for the ensuing fiscal year as $40,985,000,000.

It estimates expenditures for the ensuing fiscal year as $41,858,000,000.

And it proposes appropriations and authorizations for expenditure during the ensuing fiscal years of $34,000,000,000.

Instead of prejudging those amounts and substituting, without any sound basis for so doing, figures of our own as objectives, we should view them in their true light as recommendations to the Congress and approach them with a determination to improve each category to the extent the situation permits. It is not a guessing proposition. It is a task requiring diligence and application and business common sense. We can perform the task more efficiently, and certainly more expeditiously, if our time is not wasted in going through all the formalities leading up to and preparing a useless and meaningless legislative budget.

I have introduced today a concurrent resolution suspending the operation of that section of the Legislative Reorganization Act applying to the legislative budget pending further study. It is the quickest approach to waiving the requirement pending study of a better method and it is a course made permissive by the Legislative Reorganization Act itself. The Appropriations Committee should be permitted to proceed immediately with the examinations and studies it must conduct without being needlessly delayed by the ponderous and useless routine entailed by the legislative budget requirement.

I trust that the concurrent resolution may have the benefit of your thoughtful study and consideration.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Did I understand the gentleman to say that he had introduced such a concurrent resolution?

Mr. CANNON. I have introduced such a concurrent resolution.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

What does the gentleman propose to do about the Appropriations Committee investigatory staff which was set up under the Reorganization Act? Of course, as the gentleman knows, we have had a staff which gave the Appropriations Committee much information, much assistance, and I am wondering just what the gentleman proposes to do with that staff.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I am familiar with it. I initiated the system, and it operated for 3 years during my chairmanship of the committee very effectively. We expect to continue it.

Mr. JENSEN. In like manner as we now have it, a permanent staff of investigators, or how?

Mr. CANNON. I would expect it to operate with increasing efficiency. The details of it will be taken up when the committee is organized.

Mr. JENSEN. Does the gentleman mean he is going to borrow an employee from one department of the Government to investigate another department?

Mr. CANNON. It will be taken up with the Committee on Appropriations. What plan will be evolved I cannot say at this time. I am merely one member of a committee of 45 and am not in a position to say what the committee will do, but I will say that the matter will be submitted to the committee and the decision reached by the committee will be followed.

Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with matters of too serious import, too far-reaching world-wide importance, too fraught with the possibility of national catastrophe to afford the luxury of partisanship. The committee earnestly invites the counsel and cooperation of the membership of the House both in the formation of the bills reported in response to the budget recommendations, and in their consideration on the floor.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the American Legion Magazine, notwithstanding the fact that the cost would exceed the amount allowed by $196.

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from Mr. Biggers, of Texas.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Standard Sentinel, of Hazleton, of January 7.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield back the time allowed me today under special order, and that I may be allowed to revise and extend my remarks and include a speech that I made on October 26 at Fond du Lac, Wis., in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE (at the request of Mr. COOPER) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FORRESTAL

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks by way of a letter in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, there has recently emanated from some of our columnists and radio commentators considerable material with reference to the conduct of Secretary of Defense Forrestal. Some of those comments were of such drastic character that I considered it advisable to communicate with Secretary Forrestal on the subject, and attached hereto is a communication from Secretary Forrestal with relation to the topics above referred to, which is self-explanatory. I personally want to commend Secretary Forrestal for the splendid manner in which he is handling many difficult problems.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, January 11, 1949.

Hon. HARRY SHEPPARD,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SHEPPARD: I have looked into the matters referred to in your telephone call of last week, and the only conclusion which I can draw is that the broadcast mentioned by your constituent appears to be an attempt to discredit the foreign policy of this Government.

The broadcast contained a statement to the effect that the administration was seeking power to "throw the country into war without even notifying the Congress." From other statements contained in the broadcast, it seems clear that this language has reference to proposed legislation which would set out in clear and simple terms the authority of the President, under certain circumstances directly involving our national security, to furnish military supplies to other countries.

As you know, the field of foreign policy is the responsibility of the President, and the President generally formulates policy in this field after seeking the advice of the Secretary of State. The National Military Establishment does not make foreign policy. The National Military Establishment is, however, one of the organizations which the President may, if he so desires, utilize in carrying out certain aspects of foreign policy. The occupation duties of the Army are an illustration.

In order that our foreign policy may be kept in balance with our military strength, Congress established the National Security Council, and gave the Council the duty of advising "the President with respect to the integration of domestic, foreign, and military policies relating to the national security so as to enable the military services and the other departments and agencies of the Government to cooperate more effectively in matters involving the national security."

In accordance with the congressional language just quoted, the National Security Council—with a membership including, among others, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense—recently advised the President of the desirability of seeking the legislation referred to above. The President has approved this recommendation of the National Security Council.

In his budget message of January 3, President Truman discussed this matter as one of the most important items of his legislative and budget program, and said: "In existing circumstances, economic strength is not enough to assure continued independence to free people. Under the Charter of the United Nations, therefore, we have been discussing with some of the western European countries measures designed to increase the security of the North Atlantic area. To further this objective, I expect later to request funds for providing military supplies to those countries and to certain other countries where the provision of such assistance is important to our national security."

This same subject was discussed at some length in a State Department press release of December 29, a copy of which I attach. It was also discussed at pages 13 and 21 of my annual report (copy attached), as released to the press for use in morning newspapers of December 30.

The broadcast referred to by your constituent described this proposed legislation as a request for "the power * * * to throw the country into war without even notifying the Congress." In the light of the information set out above, I trust you will agree with me that there is no basis whatever for such an allegation with respect to the proposed legislation—which, of course, as the President has clearly stated, is being submitted by him to Congress for congressional consideration.

In the broadcast referred to by your constituent, a second matter—and one which has no relation whatever to the subject I have discussed above—was mentioned. This second matter appears to be a reference to an investment which I made 20 years ago in a Canadian company organized by me. This 1929 investment was made 11 years before I severed all my connections with the banking firm with which I was associated, in order to become an administrative assistant to President Roosevelt.

In 1933, when I was testifying before a committee of the United States Senate, I stated that the applicable tax laws of the United States and Canada had led me to make the investment. On this same occasion, I also testified that the total income taxes paid by me to the United States and the State of New York, for the year under discussion, were in excess of $300,000.

This particular hearing was a public hearing conducted by the Committee on Banking and Currency of the United States Senate, and the full text of the testimony is readily available to the public in a volume which can be identified as follows: Stock Exchange Practices, Hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency, United States Senate, Seventy-third Congress, second session, on Senate Resolution 84 (72d Cong.) and Senate Resolution 56 and Senate Resolution 97 (73d Cong.).

If I can be of any further assistance to you in connection with any inquiries you may have concerning the broadcast in question, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE BUDGET MESSAGE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the President has submitted a budget message, including the liquidating of contract authorizations, for the fiscal year 1950 of $41,572,000,000. Of this figure $3,036,000,000 is for the liquidation of contract authorizations. There may be additional requests if additional authorizations are passed by the Congress.

These figures are what we will have to work on and correspond with actual appropriations of $34,273,000,000 in the fiscal year 1949 which is now about one-half over, indicating a proposed increase in appropriations of upward of $7,000,000,000.

A tremendous increase is included in the estimates for national defense totalling $4,500,000,000. A very large portion of this increase, $3,100,000,000—is for the Air Force. A $750,000,000 increase for the Navy and a decrease of approximately $1,100,000,000 for the Army.

In arriving at these figures, with the exception of the Army and the veterans, almost every single unit of the Government shows an increase. It is going to be necessary for us to review these appropriations with the utmost care to see that we do not provide funds for projects or purposes which are not necessary and without which we could get along just as well. We must take cognizance of the facts just as far as we can and try to avoid permitting the waste of money.

The President has shown us on page M39 of his budget statement, why we should eliminate one item from the consideration by this Congress, wherein he states:

In the past 3 years housing construction has risen to the level it took 6 years to reach after World War I. Conversions of older houses have also increased the housing supply and extensive repairs and modernization have improved housing standards. As a result many of the most acute emergency needs, especially for veterans, have been met and the number of families compelled to live with others or to make other temporary arrangements has been reduced.

This indicates clearly that the housing situation has improved very markedly in the last 2 years without the Federal construction of houses and that it will continue to improve if we permit private industry to continue to function. It indicates that, in his own opinion, the situation will continue to improve and that the shortage will be entirely eliminated if we do not do foolish things which will stop private construction. Public construction of houses means priorities for Government construction and that means breaking down the possibility of private contractors securing the materials necessary to build. It is a study of all of the demands that are made upon us, and a careful analysis of all the legislation that is introduced and the most exacting examination of these things by the Appropriations Committee that will prevent wasteful operations on the part of the President.

The President has asked for an increase in the appropriations for the veterans' services and yet he estimates expenditures $464,000,000 below the amount of the appropriations. I believe that the President is very much mistaken in a great many of his requests and that the need is not going to materialize in the way that he anticipates and that we are going to be able to find ways to save large sums of money just as we have been able to do in the past.

I ask of the Congress the utmost of good faith in approaching this problem and that they realize that all of these governmental expenditures are inflationary and dangerous and that, if we provide funds that are not absolutely necessary for the conduct of the Government, we are betraying the trust that the people of the United States have placed in us.

In 1948 the President's estimate of receipts turned out to be many billions of dollars below what the actual receipts were. The present situation is that, so far this year, down to the last date available, the revenue receipts of the Government are about $200,000,000 above what they were last year. It is therefore at least reasonable to expect that the revenues will run $42,500,000,000 for the fiscal year 1949, after deducting the tax refunds. In 1950, if business conditions continue anywhere near as good as they are at the present, the revenue receipts should be as large—actually larger because revenue receipts have always increased after a tax reduction bill so that, unless the Congress fails in its responsibility to properly review the requests of the President and properly cut them down, we should have a surplus instead of a deficit for the next 2 years.

The Congress handicapped itself by adopting an amendment wiping out the power of the Rules Committee and making it mandatory on the part of the Speaker to recognize the chairman of any committee 21 days after a resolution had been introduced in the House for the consideration of a rule after a bill had been reported. This takes away the protection that the people have had for the past 100 years in the House of Representatives. It makes it possible for the regular committees of the House to be sure that if they report a bill it can be brought up for consideration. This sort of thing will result in much larger appropriation requirements and must larger expenditures out of the Federal Treasury, unless we have a greater sense of responsibility on the part of every committee in the House of Representatives.

This action was the most reactionary step that has been taken in the Congress in my day. It was a step which indicated that the majority of the House was careless of their responsibilities to the people of the United States. Bad results flowing from that situation can only be prevented by the most exacting and the most careful committee work on the part of the Members of the House.

I ask that a special effort be made by them to be sure that no bills are reported that call for the expenditure of public funds unless it is absolutely necessary. It is only by that sort of conduct and activity that we can meet our responsibility to the people of the United States.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an article from Pathfinder magazine and in the other an article from the Seafarer's Log.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after disposition of the legislative business and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, President Truman in his message on the state of the Union, as was expected, urged the adoption of a legislative program to perpetuate and to perfect the Socialist regime patterned after that of Stalin and Hitler, which was formally launched by his predecessor.

Among other things, he asked Congress to give him power to again subject our people to the torture of the OPA era, black markets, empty store shelves, to reline the streets with long queues anxiously and tiresomely inching their way

to the counters for their daily allowances—price control and rationing.

To make political so-called loans to private industry.

To further socialize housing and thus add to the political corruption that so seriously afflicts the home-building industry—so-called low-rent housing, and so forth.

To continue and to strengthen the power of the political authority to liquidate owners of rental property and further aggravate the difficulty people are having to find a place in which to live—rent control.

To create the most fearful and the most avaricious bureaucracy of all, socialized medicine, and to engage in destroying the best medical care ever received by any people in the world.

To imitate the German Reich and other totalitarian states and bring the common school system under the jurisdiction of the political authority controlling the Federal Government for the purpose of indoctrinating our youth with the philosophy of socialism, and, of course, to secure the political support of teachers—so-called Federal aid to education. It is a law, but with very few exceptions, that every dollar loaned or granted by the political authority, whether to private individuals or political bodies, carries with it a degree of political control, which control expands progressively as such loans or grants are repeated, all legal verbiage, or absence of such, to the contrary notwithstanding. The very existence of these devices is contingent upon the political dividends they pay.

To implement the available political means for maintaining the artificial prosperity the farming community is experiencing and to move it closer to the brink of liquidation and collective farming—political soil conservation, triple A, subsidies, Marshall plans, and so forth.

To fetter the expansion of and to destroy private electric energy producing and distributing plants, and to implement the program under way for ultimate socialization of the entire electric power industry, more TVA's, and so forth.

To exact in taxes for current operating costs from the low-income groups, in the guise of soaking the rich, about three and one-half billion dollars for an indefinite period of years, for that is about the proportion of the burden these classes will be forced to bear if the President's proposal to raise an additional $4,000,000,000 in taxes annually goes through.

To broaden the insidious income tax, disguised as social security, to cover some 20,000,000 additional workers to feed the insatiable maw of politics.

The incidence of taxation is such as to cause wage earners and the other low-income groups to pay the greater portion of taxes no matter upon whom or what they are levied. This is inherent in the very nature of things. Just as white sheep give more wool than black ones, because there are more white ones to fleece, so wage earners and working people in general pay in the aggregate more taxes than the rich and well-to-do. Taxes are ultimately paid out of production. One cannot eat or wear money but only the things that money will exchange for. Since the low-income groups produce and consume much the greater proportion of the necessaries of life and since general taxes ultimately and inevitably fall upon consumption goods, the real source of taxes must always remain predominately with those groups.

Banks, agriculture, railroads, coal mines, in fact all industry is well in the process of socialization. President Truman recommended to Congress that he be given power to authorize the construction of facilities to produce materials "in critically short supply, such as steel, if action by private industry fails to meet our needs." This is a bold and forthright request for power to formally put the political authority in the business of producing steel, which, in the nature of things, would have to eventuate in the complete communization of the entire steel industry.

And, finally, the President asked for over-all power to impose upon the Nation universal conscription, the essence of tyranny and the ultimate resort for making the regimentation complete and for maintaining a permanent status of war to keep a ravaged, disillusioned, and restive people from staging a successful revolution.

President Truman has heretofore himself stated the powers he asked Congress to give him represent police-state methods and inferentially condemned them. Now he seeks to impose them upon the Nation in perpetuity and even proceeds on the preposterous assumption that he was given a mandate to do so in the last election.

The result of last November's election shows nothing remotely resembling anything like an authorization to President Truman to continue or advance the program of communizing the United States.

Only about one-half of the eligible voters took the trouble to go to the polls. Though the population has greatly increased in the last decade, the total vote cast in the Presidential election in 1940 was about 2,000,000 greater than that of the last election. Why? Because a great number of those who still believe in freedom and constitutional government of strictly limited powers, the kind of government under which this Nation achieved its greatness, viewed the platforms of the two major parties, and the conduct of party leaderships during the last decade or so, as being so completely and so similarly socialistic that there was no choice left to them but to stay home

Furthermore, millions who did take the trouble to go to the polls, whether they voted the Democratic or Republican ticket, did so with decided reservations, lacking faith that either party would do the right things instead of the politically expedient ones.

And by no means of least importance is the fact that millions voted outright for New Dealism not knowing its implications or realizing that it is leading this Nation into universal slavery, and, perchance, even to domination by some foreign power, as surely and as straight as the crow flies.

There is nothing whatever in the situation warranting the claim that the election gave President Truman a mandate to do anything. Only if, on the one hand, the voters had had a clear-cut choice of voting for the existing political system which is based wholly on plundering the producing elements of the population, and, on the other hand, for true government as expressed by Jefferson, one that "shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned," and President Truman had won out, then, but only then, could it be claimed that he was given a mandate to perfect the police state. But the voters had no such choice which completely exposes the pretension of any mandate.

The attitude of the electorate in respect of the several factions contending with each other for control of the Government and the election results clearly and unmistakably show dangerous political corruption of our national life. It is to this that we must look for an explanation of the true meaning of the recent election.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I should like to ask the gentleman from Ohio something about this low-cost housing he was talking about. Would the gentleman tell me and the rest of the Members of the House what low-cost housing is?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman from Ohio has so often expressed himself on that point to the Members that, if the gentleman from Massachusetts will permit, he prefers not to discuss it at the moment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONNER.) Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD—DANGER SIGNALS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this morning's press contains some danger signals. I wonder if they are caused by the Federal Reserve Board's policy, which is squeezing credit through Regulation W, or by causing the commercial banks to reduce their loans, or both.

GOOD WAGES AND FAIR PRICES

We are on a very high plateau in this country. We are on the plateau of a $250,000,000,000 national debt, jet propulsion and atomic energy. The only way we can pay off this national debt is with a high national income. There is only one way we can have a high national income, and that is through good wages and fair prices.

There is no other way that we can pay the debt. Therefore we must not go back to "horse and buggy" days or the ox-cart days, insofar as our national economy is concerned.

SLUMP IN LOANS

On the front page of the Washington Post this morning there is a headline, "Sharp drop in business loans laid to healthy inventory cut." This article discloses that there was a spectacular $195,000,000 slump in farm and trade

loans for the week ending January 5, but the Federal Reserve authorities consider it healthy. I wonder if it is healthy. I also wonder if it is a No. 1 danger signal that the Federal Reserve Board should recognize instead of trying to apologize for, or try to explain. The same article indicates that the banks increased their holdings of Government securities especially reflecting sharp increases in holdings of 1-year and 90-day securities. Does this mean that loans for production and distribution are cut down and the lack of earnings made up through purchases of Government bonds and securities?

BROAD POWERS

It is all right for the Federal Reserve Board to have broad powers, if they are exercised discreetly. But I doubt that they are being used discreetly. The people believe that the Federal Reserve Board caused the depression of 1920. Many of them also believe that the Board contributed to the depression in 1929 to 1932. Many of us believe that the Board almost caused another devastating depression in 1937 by doubling the reserve requirements or raising the reserve requirements of banks 100 percent. One more depression caused by the Federal Reserve Board and I predict that that will very likely be the end of the Federal Reserve Board.

Possibly consideration should not be given to require certain powers to be exercised by the Federal Reserve Board, only in collaboration with the United States Treasury Department. This morning's press also carries the following danger signals: "Hundreds of laid-off workers flocked to the offices of the Maryland Employment Security Department for compensation checks last week."

Maryland paid out $443,342 in unemployment benefits last week to 22,768 claimants. In the corresponding week a year ago, the sum of $139,000 was paid to 7,571 claimants. The number of applicants has more than doubled in the past 3 weeks.

Unemployment in New York State at the end of 1948 was about 40 percent higher than a year ago. It is reported in the morning press that that represents an increase of 65 percent in the past 3 months. The Bankers Trust Co. declares in its annual report issued yesterday that the firmer money policy of the monetary authorities helped to restrict credit expansion. What does this mean? Does this mean that the monetary authorities have sent word down to the commercial banks that they must not make so many loans?

It has always been insisted by financial experts that a little inflation is impossible. In other words, we have always been told that you cannot control it, that there is no way to keep it under control and that a little inflation must not be permitted. I wonder if a little deflation is likely to be equally devastating to our country. If you cannot control inflation, can you control deflation, and should we take drastic steps toward either inflation or deflation?

The Federal Reserve Board's record of becoming very active to deflate and never seemingly greatly concerned about increasing the ability of the people to consume is very disturbing to me. Another thing very disturbing to me is a report coming directly from a board member, from a member of the Federal Reserve Board, that a recession is long past due, and the earlier we have it the better off our country will be. In other words, the quicker the better. Is the Federal Reserve Board advocating and trying to cause a recession? I would like to know. Many of the steps they have taken and which they are now taking are steps in that direction. I hope they give careful consideration to withdrawing some of the drastic provisions they have put into effect affecting our economy to the extent that we now have a considerable credit squeeze.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. RICH. It seems to me that if the powers that be in the Administration would try to keep this country on an even keel, on a balanced budget, instead of trying to spend eight hundred and thirty-five million more than we are going to take in, if they would stop this squandering of money they would not need to issue such orders. You cannot spend yourself into prosperity and ever balance the budget.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] told us a while ago we are going to have a surplus. I am in favor of a balanced budget. I would be in favor of raising taxes in order to balance the budget. I do not want deficit financing. That is the reason why I voted twice last year against the tax-reduction bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman is discussing one of the most important subjects that will confront this Congress. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency. One way to prevent ruinous inflation and ruinous deflation would be the passage of a law fixing a limit beyond which Federal Reserve banks could not inflate or below which they could not deflate. You would have no trouble in stopping inflation. When they started to deflate you should provide that the Treasury Department should issue United States notes, with gold reserves behind them, to take the place of the Federal Reserve notes that are being retired, and in that way stabilize the currency, and let the American people know what they can depend upon, and prevent the disasters that were brought on in 1921 and 1929.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman to ask a question.

Mr. RICH. Where has the Federal Reserve or the Federal Government retired any of its indebtedness? No such thing has happened.

Mr. PATMAN. We retired $20,000,000,000 in the last year or two.

Mr. RICH. Oh, they took some notes that are coming due and they supplanted them with something else, but they are not retiring any debt. They are selling more bonds all the time.

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, no. The national debt was over $270,000,000,000 and now it is $250,000,000,000.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. If we let these Federal Reserve banks deflate the currency below the danger point, we never will pay our national debt. We must stabilize the currency within a given limit, or we are headed for disaster.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. RICH. You have been headed that way for 15 years.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, that sounds like campaign talk.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I would like to get one thing in my mind.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman will ask his question, I shall be glad to try to answer it.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Yes. I am not going to make any speech. I understood you were against the Federal Reserve System——

Mr. PATMAN. No. I am not against the Federal Reserve System. I am for the Federal Reserve System, properly operated. I am objecting to what the Federal Reserve Board has done.

Mr. NICHOLSON. What I want to bring out is, if I can, that because of laws passed in the Congress, the Federal agency had to go along with them.

Mr. PATMAN. The law did not specify how a regulation should be administered. It is not the duty of Congress to do that. It is now within the power of the Federal Reserve Board to change, for instance, regulation W; and I am insisting that they should liberalize regulation W.

Mr. NICHOLSON. May I tell the gentleman from Texas, although I am a new Member and he is an old Member here, that we in the Congress tell the Board what they can charge for interest, and so forth, and so on?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; we have passed a law about savings deposits, that the Federal Reserve Board can fix the amount of interest to be paid on savings deposits in certain banks; and we made it an absolute violation of the law for interest to be paid on demand deposits.

Mr. NICHOLSON. But the Committee on Banking and Currency can bring in a bill here and say what the Federal Reserve Board shall do. Is not that so?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; we could bring in a bill like that; but I regret that the people who administer these laws will not administer them in a way that the economy of the Nation will not be harmed or injured. That is what I am talking about, that they are not properly administering the laws of this Government—that is, according to my notion.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. It is a well-known fact, as any first-class economist will tell you,

that prices in a free economy, such as ours is supposed to be, are governed by two things, the volume of the nation's currency multiplied by the velocity of its circulation. For that reason I have insisted that the Banking and Currency Committee bring in a bill to stabilize the currency at a given limit. I want to ask the gentleman from Texas if he agrees with me on that proposition.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; generally, I do. I do not of course agree on the volume of actual currency multiplied by velocity, for I maintain that in currency must be included bank deposits and things of that kind that can be converted.

Mr. RANKIN. Things that grow out of the volume of currency.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; we will agree on that generally; yes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Is it not a fact that you have been printing money for the last 15 years at the rate of about three or four tons a day?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. RICH. And the Treasurer of the United States says that he has printed more money in the last 15 years than any other Treasurer who has ever been in the Treasury Department; and he goes on to say further that it is worth less.

Mr. PATMAN. I presume the gentleman is proud of that because we could not do business in this country without money. Money as the gentleman knows is being mutilated and made unusable every day, that is being worn out at the rate of 3 or 4 tons a day.

Mr. RICH. The Secretary of the Treasury is a Democrat, from St. Louis. He is a pretty good fellow. He does not agree in the printing of all this money.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman certainly could not stop it. We have got to have money to do business. We cannot go back to the old barter system, trading a couple of hogs for a horse, and and vice versa.

Mr. RICH. But if you keep printing it, it will be just like the German mark which once was worth 24 cents but which finally got so cheap you could go out and get it off the dump for nothing. That is what is going to happen to our own money if we do not stop the printing presses.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not think we are coming to any such situation as that.

Mr. RICH. That is the road we are on.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Does not the gentleman agree that there should be a limit to the amount of currency that can be in circulation at any one time, that there should be a ceiling above which it cannot rise and a floor below which it cannot fall? If we had such a system we could have prosperity in this country for the next hundred years. But if we do not, we will never know from one year to another where we stand.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not think we could make a feasible plan limiting the amount of actual money in circulation for the reason that it varies with the people's demand for their money in their bank deposits. You cannot control the demand of the people. Sometimes they want actual money, at other times things that money will buy.

Mr. RANKIN. But you can establish limits beyond which it cannot go and below which it cannot fall and keep the currency in circulation within a reasonable limit.

Mr. PATMAN. If that were possible I surely would like to see it done. If the gentleman's theory is the answer I certainly would like to see it in operation. I will give it further consideration.

Mr. RANKIN. By having a ceiling above which it cannot rise you stop runaway inflation, and by having a floor below which it cannot fall you prevent disastrous deflation and perpetuate the prosperity we now have.

Mr. PATMAN. We could have another $60,000,000,000 in the circulation today if the people just demanded it.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman mean $60,000,000,000?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; or up to the limit of the deposits in banks; probably more.

Mr. RICH. If that should happen your money would not be worth anything.

Mr. PATMAN. It would be worth just as much as it is worth now; as it would be the same kind of money. It is used as money now by giving checks on banks.

Mr. RICH. That is what Hitler did over in Germany. Do you want that to happen here?

Mr. PATMAN. I suggest the gentleman ought to give a little more consideration to the question and he will not likely have that opinion.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Massachusetts tell us what the program will be next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. On Monday there will be three suspensions. There will be a resolution in relation to tickets for the various inaugural activities which at prior inaugurals has been passed. There is also a Presidential salary bill which, I understand, is being considered by the Senate now. There is another resolution providing for a 2-day holiday on January 20 and 21 for Federal employees in the District of Columbia only. That bill is also up for consideration in the Senate and, if passed, will be considered under suspension of the rules on Monday.

For the rest of the week I know of no legislation that will come up but, always keeping faith with the House, I would like it understood that if anything should arise I may have a little flexibility in action so far as any matter of importance which we feel should come up, and then only by and through the consent of the leadership on the minority side. Those things are very carefully canvassed. It is not a question of my calling up anything. It has to go through the regular procedure and secure the consent of the leadership on your side.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is it to be understood that the bill dealing with increases if brought up under suspension will deal only with the emoluments of the Presidential office?

Mr. McCORMACK. The President, the Vice President, and the Speaker, according to my understanding. I may say that that is the only extent to which the leadership would permit any bill or any resolution to come up. It would have to be confined to those three officers. The others can wait, and I say that without in any way indicating that I am prejudiced to any part of a broader bill. However, this bill will be confined to the President, the Vice President, and the Speaker.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am glad to have the distinguished majority leader make that clear, because if the matter is to come up under suspension of the rules it is proper that the Members know the scope of the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, if we could get it through by unanimous consent, that would be much better. I may say that the President pays an income tax on his salary and any increase in his salary would be subject to a tax.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Would the majority leader be in position to advise the membership at this time with respect to any plans for the election of Members to the various committees? Would that come up next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. Of course, that is a matter for each side to determine. On the majority side we expect to hold a caucus on either Monday or Tuesday. That has not been definitely decided. It will be very shortly, however. The Democratic committee on committees will make its report to the caucus, then, of course, presentation of a resolution to the House for its action takes place immediately. It is a matter also of your committee on committees to bring it up through your processes, your conferences, by making a report. So that ought to be done the early part of next week.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Would the gentleman state whether or not it would be the plan to have the House in session on Tuesday or Wednesday to consider nominations to the various committees?

Mr. McCORMACK. If the situation arises, that could be done. I would not want to commit myself, because that is a matter for conference with the leaders on both sides, depending on what the situation is. I think that if both parties were in position to organize their committees on Tuesday, we ought to meet and organize them and get the committees going.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is your responsibility under the rules of the House to present a resolution or report relating to the legislative budget, because it cannot get to work until those committees have been designated.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is true.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I withdrew my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the majority leader if he can tell us what the salary bill is going to be that is coming in?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be frank with the gentleman. My understanding is that the increase will be from $75,000 to $100,000 a year, and that the expense account will be increased to $50,000. I do not know definitely now whether it is $20,000 or $30,000, but to increase it to $50,000.

Mr. RICH. The President now gets $40,000 expense account, does he not?

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not know; I will be frank. As I understand, we increase it to $50,000.

Mr. RICH. You are going to increase it to $50,000, and with the $40,000 he gets now, that would be $90,000 that he would not have to account for. Now, what I would suggest to do, to be right between man and man and between the taxpayers of the country, would be that you give the President $200,000 and eliminate the $50,000 expense money. I would vote for that, but I will not let unanimous consent come in here for $50,000 exemption, because the President is now squandering the taxpayer's money, and he ought to pay taxes just like anybody else.

The SPEAKER. The Chair calls for the regular order. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes on the rules governing Members on this floor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] is recognized for 40 minutes.

AIR POWER AND THE FISCAL YEAR 1950 BUDGET OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, the budget for 1950 has again brought to the forefront the question of the preservation of American leadership in the air. Those of us who have served in the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses are rather familiar with air-power problems because of a number of basic studies and surveys concluded during the lives of those Congresses by distinguished, impartial survey groups.

However, there are some 110 Members of this Congress who did not have an opportunity to study those surveys and findings about the condition of American air power. For their benefit and because of the importance of the issues raised by the budget message, I am going to review some of the background that led to the creation of the distinguished survey groups. I will also summarize some of the findings reported by these groups which bear directly upon the budget problem.

At the very outset I would like to emphasize something which I think the President's budget message also concedes, namely, that air power has now become our first line of defense. These are indeed critical times in international relations during which it would be the height of folly to fail to take the action required to insure our air power leadership.

THE POSTWAR DISINTEGRATION

It is difficult for anyone not actually a student of the problem to recollect or understand the extent of the disintegration of our military power following VJ-day. At the end of the war we possessed an aerial strength the like of which had never before been imagined. The Air Force was operating 243 air groups. Production of aircraft had soared to an annual rate of more than 100,000 planes a year. Our aircraft production was easily more than double the production of any other nation in the world. Our air power literally battered into rubble enemy defenses that had been considered almost impregnable and made possible a frontal assault by land and sea forces that forced final capitulation.

But pell-mell demobilization scattered all this strength to the four winds. Our Air Force plummeted down to a condition where it could scarcely muster 15 adequately equipped groups. Only three were rated "combat ready." Production of aircraft tobogganed to only 1,300 military planes in the entire calendar year 1946—the equivalent of only a couple of days' production at the peak rate of March 1945. Even with the few planes it was operating, the Air Force experienced severe difficulties and its accident rate soared for lack of adequate maintenance.

With the sharp cut-backs and cancellations, conditions in the aircraft industry were even more alarming. Almost every company plunged into the red in 1946 and the losses began to mount more sharply in 1947. Efforts to get enough commercial business to keep the invaluable teams of engineers, designers, and production technicians together were unavailing, and even compounded the losses. By the late spring of 1947 the very survival of an aircraft-manufacturing industry worthy of the name was in serious question.

CRITICAL IMPORTANCE OF THE INDUSTRY

To those who have not had the opportunity of making a study of modern national-defense requirements, the question could well be raised why there is any concern about the financial status or the well-being of the aircraft-manufacturing industry. The answer lies in some relatively simple facts. First, the aircraft industry is a specialized industry because of its very highly technological aspects. You cannot transform a household-appliance or automobile plant into the manufacture of aircraft, and experience has shown that neither can an aircraft company be transformed successfully into the business of manufacturing household appliances or automobiles. An aircraft company is in the business of research, design, testing, and manufacture of airplanes, or it is not in business.

Furthermore, an aircraft company is composed of highly trained specialists—from the president on down through the research and engineering departments, the production departments, to the last man on the production line, the field employees, and the test pilots. It took an almost superhuman effort to expand the aircraft industry to the peak production mark made in March 1945 from a relatively small and inconsequential industry in 1938. I may say to you with perfect confidence that if it had not been for British orders placed in 1938, along with British capital supplied for plant expansion, that President Roosevelt's then well-nigh fantastic production demand, made in 1940, of 50,000-plane production per year could not have been achieved, and quite probably that the war could not have been won in 1945.

No nation can afford to maintain a standing army, a standing navy, or air force in sufficient readiness to engage in all-out combat at a moment's notice, as that would require a tremendous reserve not only of men but of continuously modernized matériel. That reserve in storage would be necessary in order to meet the rapid attrition of matériel which would begin to occur at the very onset of war. Instead mobilization plans must be prepared which will permit the most rapid mobilization of the manpower, the plant capacity, and the equipment needed to prosecute a war when and if war comes. Under modern conditions the principal delaying factor in mobilization is always equipment and seldom manpower. This is more true in the field of aviation than in any of the others because of the time required to design, develop, accumulate parts and instruments, and then build airplanes.

The principal components of an aircraft-manufacturing company are a design team and a production team. It takes a long time to build a design team, a team of competent research men, engineers, draftsmen, and other technicians, and it takes a long time to develop a competent team of skilled production workers. The very existence of these design and production teams in a state of readiness to expand is an important aspect of the national security.

Consequently, it is of the highest importance to the national security that our Nation maintain at all times an aircraft industry capable of fulfilling its function in the national defense. The President of the United States stated this on August 8, 1945, when he said:

> It is vital to the welfare of our people that this Nation maintain developmental work and the nucleus of a producing aircraft industry capable of rapid expansion to keep the peace and meet any emergency.

Actually, under current conditions the demands upon the aircraft industry are considerably less than would appear on the surface. This is because our air forces, both naval aviation and the United States Air Force, are living off the fat of surplus planes left over from the war. For example, in the fiscal year 1948 the two air forces withdrew from

war-storage surplus a total of 43,000,000 air-frame pounds. The total thus withdrawn from surplus and placed into service in that year was more than double the total weight of new aircraft purchased.

In simpler terms, while the naval air arm and the Air Force put into service in the fiscal year 1948 airplanes whose air frame weighed approximately 64,000,000 pounds, 43,000,000 pounds came out of storage—World War II surplus aircraft—and the balance, less than 21,000,000 pounds, was from new modern production. To put it another way, better than two-thirds of the airplanes that went into service in the fiscal year 1948 were obsolete World War II stocks from surplus and the balance of less than one-third were modern aircraft.

But the surplus of World War II aircraft in storage will soon be exhausted. Where, then, will we obtain the production of aircraft to maintain even the 1948 rate of input of new aircraft into the armed services. It must come from new production, of course. Now, I want to give you some startling figures. Ordinarily, it takes a year and a half from the day the orders are issued to double the production of an aircraft factory. If, when that order is given, it is not merely to double production but to go all-out as did President Roosevelt in his orders of 1940, then the experience of that time indicates that to double the production again requires about half the length of time of the first doubling, and then to double it again requires a little more than half of that time, and so on until you reach your maximum potential output. The important point here is that you can achieve top speed much sooner from a running start than you can from a standing start.

The Air Coordinating Committee, the President's Air Policy Commission, and the Congressional Aviation Policy Board all realized those facts. They saw that World War II surplus storage aircraft were soon to be exhausted and that it was necessary to start more than 2 years in advance of exhaustion of storage to build the production industry to the point where it could carry the load of an annual input of new airplanes into the armed services at even the 1948 rate of 64,000,000 air-frame pounds per year. That is why we in the Congress in 1948 voted the appropriations necessary and the authorizations necessary to build the aircraft production industry to meet the requirements that we knew full well must be met in a few years.

Toward the close of my remarks I will insert a table showing the recommendations for minimum annual procurement of military aircraft, but at this point I shall present certain of those figures.

In 1945 the Air Coordinating Committee recommended that the minimum production rate of aircraft needed to "cooperate in maintenance of world peace" is 60,000,000 pounds of air frame per annum. On January 1, 1948, the President's Air Policy Commission recommended that the production rate for the calendar year 1949 be expanded to 56,000,000 pounds of air frame. On March 1, 1948, the Congressional Aviation Policy Board said that "the strength necessary to prevent the loss of a war" required an annual production rate of not less than 63,000,000 air-frame pounds per annum and that "the initial strength to mount promptly a successful air offensive" requires a production rate of 111,000,000 pounds of air frame per annum. A Stanford University survey—as quoted by the Associated Press in 1948—stated that the minimum annual production rate necessary to provide a base for expansion is 80,000,000 pounds of air frame per annum.

It is my belief that in the fiscal year 1949, while the figures are not available, that the same situation as existed in 1948 is continuing; that is, withdrawals from war-surplus storage by far exceed the new planes purchased. By this process we are, of course, eating up our stored war-surplus aircraft very rapidly. It is admitted that by the end of the next fiscal year our surplus of usable planes will be exhausted and we can only turn to new production for replacement of normal attrition losses and for modernization of our air groups.

With the available supply even of obsolete planes thus being used up, the vital necessity of not allowing our aircraft industry to disintegrate and disappear should be apparent—especially in view of the critical international situation.

SURVEYS AUTHORIZED

The history of the official surveys to which I have referred should perhaps be detailed at least in brief as follows:

Concern over the air-power situation increased in 1947 and Members of Congress and of the administration began to consider methods of developing a remedy. Legislation was introduced in both Houses of Congress to provide for comprehensive and exhaustive surveys of air-power problems and to make remedial recommendations.

The official Air Coordinating Committee had been studying the problem for 2 years, ever since their report on demobilization of the industry was published in 1945. In the late spring of 1947 that committee urged the President of the United States to set up a commission something like the famed Morrow Board of 1925 to study the problem.

Such a group was established in the executive branch of the Government by President Truman on July 17, 1947. This was the President's Temporary National Air Policy Commission, of which the chairman was the eminent Thomas K. Finletter. The other members, none of whom were connected with the services or the aircraft industry, were persons who have made notable contributions of disinterested public service to the country. They were: George P. Baker, the vice chairman; James J. Hill, professor of transportation at the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration; Palmer Hoyt, publisher of the Denver Post; John A. McCone, president, Joshua Hendy Corp., Los Angeles, Calif.; and Arthur D. Whiteside, president of Dun & Bradstreet, Inc. All had long records of service in various Government positions and were in a position to make an analytical study of the situation. The report of this Commission, Survival in the Air Age, graphically expressed the concern the Commission felt at the then low ebb of the Air Forces, the naval air arm, and the aircraft industry.

Almost simultaneously the Congress established the Congressional Aviation Policy Board, which was equipped with almost identical instructions to survey the whole field of air power and come back to the Congress with remedial recommendations.

The members of this board were Senators OWEN BREWSTER, of Maine; ALBERT W. HAWKES, of New Jersey; HOMER E. CAPEHART, of Indiana; EDWIN C. JOHNSON, of Colorado; and ERNEST W. MCFARLAND, of Arizona; Representatives CARL HINSHAW, of California, vice chairman; CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, of New Jersey; KARL STEFAN, of Nebraska; ALFRED L. BULWINKLE, of North Carolina; and PAUL J. KILDAY, of Texas.

In addition, the congressional board had the benefit of the advice and experience of outstanding leaders in American aviation, who served as members of the board's council. Serving as adviser to the board was Merrill C. Meigs, Director of the Aircraft Division of the War Production Board from 1940 to 1942, during the critical period in which production was being built toward war-needed goals. Among those who served as members of the council were such distinguished citizens as General of the Army H. H. Arnold; Admiral John H. Towers; William A. M. Burden, former Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Air; Richard R. Deupree, president of Procter & Gamble and Chief of the Munitions Board in 1946–47; Lt. Gen. James H. Doolittle; Joseph D. Keenan, noted labor attorney; Dr. Clark M. Millikan, professor of aeronautics, California Institute of Technology; L. Welch Pogue, former Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board; Charles E. Sorenson, vice chairman, Willys-Overland Motors, Inc., adviser, aircraft production, War Production Board, 1942; Col. Roscoe Turner; and Gill Robb Wilson. These and other distinguished citizens participated in the studies undertaken by the four subcommittees of the board.

The President's Commission held both open and closed hearings to obtain the voluminous information required for its conclusions. Its members sat almost constantly from the time of appointment until the report was submitted on January 1, 1948. The congressional board, taking advantage of the spadework accomplished by the painstaking work of the President's Commission, analyzed this testimony and then sought its own conclusions and verifications in independent investigation and in closed hearings with the Nation's top aviation authorities. Its report was made to the Congress on March 1, 1948—Senate Report 949, Eightieth Congress.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I will be glad to yield to my distinguished friend from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I cannot refrain from congratulating the distinguished gentleman from California for the very excellent and timely statement he is making to the House at this time. I trust that every Member of this body will carefully read the speech that the gentleman is delivering and that the Congress will take appropriate action and that regardless of politics, Members on both sides of the aisle will vote for the 70-group air force for our national security.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman is very kind in his remarks.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman from California has made an exhaustive and extensive study of this subject over a period of many years, and I know of no one in Congress or out of Congress who is better qualified or more competent to speak with intelligence and authority than the able gentleman who is now addressing the House.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman from California is embarrassed by the expressions of the gentleman from Missouri.

PARALLEL RECOMMENDATIONS

It is highly significant that these two bodies, working in coordination, but making their own independent investigations for the executive and legislative branches of the National Government, presented recommendations that virtually parallel themselves in the all-important field of military security.

Both recommended urgent attention to rebuilding the air forces and the naval air arm to the strengths of 70 groups for the Air Force and 14,500 planes for the naval air arm. Both issued sharp warnings that the air forces, the naval air arm, and the aircraft industry, upon which the country must depend in an emergency, were woefully short of meeting the elementary demands of our security.

The President's Commission reported that—

> It is the overwhelming view of those most qualified to know that the country must have a new strategic concept for its defense and that the core of this concept is air power.
>
> The conclusions of the Commission thus fix as the target date by which we should have an air arm in being capable of dealing with a possible atomic attack on this country at January 1, 1953. For convenience we will refer to this date as A-day.
>
> We believe that A-day divides the future into two clear phases for strategic purposes. The first phase is that which begins now and extends to A-day. We call this phase I. The second phase is that which will exist on and after A-day. We call this phase II.

SEVENTY-GROUP AIR OFFENSIVE

The congressional board examined the requirements for security and detailed the situation as follows:

PLAN A

> From the information made available to the board by the Air Force and by the Navy separately, it would appear that the initial strength necessary to mount promptly an effective, continuing, and successful air offensive against a major enemy, is what is termed the Air Force 70-group program of 20,541 aircraft, plus the Navy program of 14,500 aircraft, total 35,041 aircraft. At the level-off period in 1953 these programs would require thereafter an annual Air Force procurement of 86,000,000 air-frame pounds and an annual Navy procurement of 25,000,000 air-frame pounds—total 111,000,000 air-frame pounds annually.

PLAN B

> Based on the same sources of information, the strength necessary to prevent the loss of a war upon the outset of hostilities appears to be the same program outlined in plan A above, but without reserve aircraft, which means a combined Air Force and Navy aviation procurement of 63,000,000 air-frame pounds annually. For the purpose of comparative budget study we have assumed that the combined annual procurement of 63,000,000 pounds might be divided into approximately 45,000,000 for the Air Force and 18,000,000 for the Navy. This plan is designed to provide a force sufficient to (a) withstand an initial blow intended to cripple the United States, (b) form the basis for a strong Territorial defense, and (c) provide effective retaliation, but not a sustained offensive action. Under this plan it is estimated that the aircraft manufacturing industry would require a year longer to reach the volume of aircraft production necessary to cope with attrition, than it would under plan A.

COMMERCIAL AIR TRANSPORT AND NATIONAL SECURITY

A highly significant topic on which both the President's commission and the congressional board are in general agreement was their recognition of the importance of commercial air transport as an auxiliary of the national defense. Our congressional board said:

> Civil and military aviation are indivisible in assessing total American air strength. The air transport industry of the United States and the military air arms must fit into a single pattern.

Both groups as a result were in agreement upon the need of immediate adoption of and support for a program to encourage all-weather flying. There had been developed almost simultaneously with the report of the congressional board a comprehensive program of navigational aids which was calculated to bring an immediate improvement in the regularity of air schedules, and after a period of 10 years to insure almost 100 percent schedule reliability. The importance of such a system of navigational aids to the military air arm should be obvious. Without it the commercial air lines cannot develop into the healthy auxiliary required for the logistics of modern warfare. This plan is known as RTCA Report SC–31–3.

I am glad to see the new budget recognized the value of this program.

Both the congressional board and the Finletter commission also recognized the imperative need of providing modern up-to-date transports for the military services. Testimony presented to both indicated that the armed services required a larger number of modern cargo and passenger air carriers than they were able to order out of current procurement funds.

Actually, last year, when Congress was considering the appropriation measure to provide the first year of a 5-year plan of procurement for the 70-group air force and for naval aviation, it was proposed to add the sum of $922,000,000 to the measure as received from the defense establishment. This sum included $100,000,000 for the provision of new and modern transport aircraft for the armed services.

Unfortunately during consideration of this measure, $100,000,000 was eliminated from the appropriation and the Air Force wiped out the provision for new transport planes to that extent.

LESSON OF THE AIR LIFT

While the congressional board and the Finletter commission emphasized the important role of air transport in modern warfare it must be conceded they did not anticipate that their observations and recommendations were to be so dramatically confirmed in a few short months by the Berlin air lift. I believe the story of the air lift is familiar to all the Members of the Congress and I will not go into it now. It does demonstrate dramatically and indelibly the need for prompt action to restore the transport arm of the armed services to its highest efficiency. The already inadequate transport equipment available is being worn out in the Berlin operation far more rapidly than had been anticipated. I am glad to note that the Air Force has already recognized the situation by announcing recently an order for 27 additional Boeing Stratofreighters, which according to news reports are being paid for out of appropriations previously allocated to tooling for aircraft production.

It is my hope that the Air Force will take further action to remedy the situation and will come to the Congress and ask now that the $100,000,000 taken out of last year's appropriation measure be restored immediately to purchase badly needed transport planes. This $100,000,000 should be requested in the form of a deficiency appropriation so as to enable the placing of orders in the near future instead of late next summer, when funds for the next fiscal year become available. If we do not provide for the transports by a deficiency appropriation, the production lines for transport planes may shut down and tooling be scrapped before action can be taken to order the necessary transports.

THE IMPACT OF THE BUDGET

In this connection, Members of the Congress should be aware that the procurement of new transport airplanes takes longer than may be thought. Production of transport airplanes today is tion, there are shortages in production of materials and almost no sustaining orders from commercial air lines to keep production lines moving smoothly and consistently. It will take many, many months from the time of order by the Air Force before many transports would be available for actual use.

In order that the pipe line of transport aircraft production might flow properly and produce the airplanes needed when they are needed, it is necessary that the start of that pipe-line flow be made now, immediately.

Just a few days ago, it came to light that the first impact of the President's budget for the Air Force has caused a cancellation of production orders for several new and advanced types of military aircraft. To me and to you, I believe, these cancellations are a crying shame. The very cancellation of these orders for new and advanced types of aircraft with longer range and higher speed may of itself lend encouragement to predatory foreign forces. As one member of this distinguished body responsible as it is to the American people for supplying the

needs to maintain the peace, I am heartsick at the news.

I have reviewed at some length the conditions that led to the establishment of the congressional board and the Finletter commission mainly to show you that the 5-year program presented to the Congress last year is supported by an impressive amount of evidence. Adoption of such a program had been recommended by every impartial group that had studied the subject from 1945 on. The Congress last year passed the first year's appropriation for the 5-year program by such overwhelming margins as to constitute virtual unanimity.

In the face of this record it is almost unbelievable that the budget presented to the Congress this week completely disregards all of the study that had been given to the problem and ruthlessly scraps without question the 5-year program for restoration of American air power. I find nowhere in the message any assurance that would give reason for abandoning the 70-group air force or for scrapping the 5-year modernization program. The consequence of the action taken is admitted, however, on page M25 when the message admits that procurement will have to be increased in future years because of the curtailment now projected.

This paragraph in the budget very frankly admits we are living off our fat when it says:

Aircraft from wartime reserves will continue to meet a part of the replacement requirements in fiscal year 1950. In subsequent years, when these reserves are depleted, an increase in aircraft procurement may be required if the strength and structure of the Air Force and naval aviation are to be maintained at the level and replacement rates contemplated in this budget.

The budget provision for aircraft procurement not only disregards entirely the program initiated last year but also makes provision for procurement far below any level recommended as the very minimum requirement by the groups that have studied the question. The budget states that the procurement provided by the recommended appropriation will be 34,000,000 pounds. I present below a table showing the recommendations of the various groups that have surveyed the subject. None considered that it was safe at present to maintain a procurement lower than 56,000,000 pounds, while the most recent and most authoritative report recommends a minimum of 80,000,000 pounds. The recommendations are as follows:

Recommendations for minimum annual military aircraft—procurement and amount recommended by the budget for 1950

	Pounds
1. Air Coordinating Committee, 1945:	
Minimum after world peace is well assured	30,000,000
Minimum to cooperate in maintenance of world peace	60,000,000
2. President's Air Policy Commission 1948:	
Recommended for 1948 (calendar year)	34,000,000
Recommended for 1949 (calendar year)	56,000,000

Recommendations for minimum annual military aircraft—procurement and amount recommended by the budget for 1950—Con.

	Pounds
3. Congressional Aviation Policy Board:	
Initial strength to mount promptly an * * * successful air offensive requires	111,000,000
Strength necessary to prevent the loss of a war	63,000,000
4. Stanford University survey (quoted by Associated Press, 1948): Minimum annual procurement needed to provide base for expansion	80,000,000
5. Amount provided by 1950 budget	34,000,000
6. Amount ordered in 1949 appropriations (estimated)	45,000,000

While all of the groups that have surveyed the problem recommended an air force of 70 groups, the budget that has been given us proposes only 48 groups.

This budget is so startling that there is very little one can say about it except to ask for an explanation. What in the international situation has justified the abandonment of the long-term plan that competent authorities have deemed so essential? How have our foreign relations improved to justify abandoning the 70-group program? What reason is there for ignoring the findings of the Air Coordinating Committee, the Senate Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, the President's own Finletter Commission, the Congressional Aviation Policy Board, and the survey of Stanford University?

This budget means that aircraft-production programs, just barely started, must be cut back. Indeed, the cutbacks, with their attendant lay-offs of skilled workers, already have begun. In addition, large sums of money already expended for tooling, for expanded facilities, and for recruiting of workers will be wasted. Yet we are going to waste these sums of money and toss our expansion plans out of the window now, even though the budget message tells us quite plainly that 2 years from now we will have to go through the whole process again. We will at that time repeat the process of tooling up and expanding—only it will be more costly. We will have lost time.

NEED FOR MORE UNIFICATION

The report of the Congressional Aviation Policy Board emphatically warned the country and the defense establishment that more effective action should be taken to define the missions and the roles of the various components of the armed services. It was clear to all of us on that Board, as it has been to many other students of the problem, that without prompt and effective action to eliminate overlapping and duplication in the armed services it would never be possible to bring defense costs down to a reasonable level.

The current budget reduces the unification process to an absurdity, just as did the budget for fiscal year 1949. I can conceive of nothing more preposterous than a budget-making process that arrives at virtually identical figures for budget costs for each of the three services. The obligational authority for the Air Force in the new budget is $4,600,000,000; for the Navy is $4,600,000,000; and for the Army is $4,500,000,000. After a great deal of supposedly careful study of roles and missions and supposed adaptation of the missions to the realities of modern warfare, it has apparently been decided to toss a coin and divide the pie into three equal slices.

This is a fine way to settle a dispute among fraternity brothers, but it is patently absurd as a method of apportionment of the taxpayers' dollar. Think of a number and then divide it by 3 so as to provide us with the modern economical defense the Nation requires.

Unquestionably there must be a better way to eliminate overlapping and duplication in the armed services and to provide the funds we need to preserve our air power. Meantime, America's vaunted air power is being seriously crippled by the shut-down and cut-back in that productive capacity which is the basic of air power.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 36, TO ABOLISH THE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, the voters in my district have shown by their vote on Tuesday, November 2, 1948, what they thought of the Un-American Activities Committee. The people of the whole country are sick and tired of the silly antics of that committee. The Un-American Activities Committee should be abolished and abolished immediately.

Dr. Condon is not the only eminent scientist to feel the smear of the Un-American Activities Committee. Scores of prominent educators, scientists, writers, and liberals have been smeared, maligned, slandered, and scored by the headline-hunting committee. And none of them was given a chance to present his story.

The Un-American Activities Committee flouted the fundamental rights of many of our citizens. It is directly or indirectly responsible for either murder or suicide. It is to blame for broken homes, broken lives, and shattered reputations. It ruined many an innocent person. It destroyed the earning capacity of many a promising Government worker. It drove some of our finest and ablest educators and scientists from Government service. This country can ill afford to lose such valuable men—men who can earn tenfold their Government salaries in private industry.

Such shocking examples of totalitarian tactics as featured some of the hearings of this committee brought shame and fear to millions of Americans who believe in fair play. While they dragged the red herring through the headlines they caused red faces among real Americans.

This committee failed to unearth a single case of fascistic activities in this country. They failed to uncover and publicize the hordes of anti-Semitic, anti-Catholic, anti-labor, anti-Negro, anti-foreign-born groups that infest many sections of our country. Such activities undermine our form of government as much, if not more, than the Reds and pinks.

The Communists must and should be watched. Spies and saboteurs should be routed. Government employees should be 100 percent loyal to America and beholden to no foreign power or foreign ideology. But this should be done in the American way, under the American Constitution and American concept of fair play.

The country has lost respect for, or confidence in, the Un-American Activities Committee. It has an important work to do and no matter how well-meaning its new members may be, they will fail to recapture the public confidence and respect. That is why I urge you to support House Resolution 36, which seeks to abolish the Un-American Activities Committee and assign its duties to the Judiciary Committee, where it belongs and where much good can be done for our American way.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

LABOR EXTENSION SERVICE

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain resolutions from labor organizations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, 2½ years ago, I stood upon the floor of this House to speak in support of a bill to establish a Labor Extension Service within the Department of Labor. The bill had just been introduced by our former colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], who is now a valuable addition to the other body, and myself.

At that time—July 23, 1946—the Seventy-ninth Congress had just been bewitched by the siren voices of the NAM into providing for the removal of effective price control. These same siren voices were about to persuade the Eightieth Congress that it had a mandate to try to stampede the Nation back to normalcy, to use the words of the gentleman from Minnesota who was the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee in that Congress. This was to be done by refusing to restore price control, but cutting taxes so as to increase purchasing power for high-income-tax payers by 59 percent, but only 3 percent for low-income-tax payers and by enacting the so-called Management-Labor Relations Act, which came to be known unfavorably as the Taft-Hartley Act.

In introducing my bill at that time, I expressed the hope that the bill, which then had wide nonpartisan public support in addition to the unanimous support of all of organized labor, might receive nonpartisan support in this House and in the Senate and that it might be reintroduced and receive attention, hearings, and enactment in the Eightieth Congress.

Such a bill was introduced in the Eightieth Congress in the House under the joint sponsorship of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN]. In the other body, it was introduced by Senators WAYNE MORSE and ELBERT THOMAS.

In the other body, it received hearings in which broad support was manifested by witnesses representing labor, education, and other citizens' organizations and was reported favorably.

A subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor held hearings ending in May but took no action on the bill before Congress adjourned. I may say that this inaction was not unique. Many other excellent bills which would have contributed much to the health and stability of our people and our Nation were left in that committee's deep-freeze locker when the Eightieth Congress passed from the scene.

The bill is now being reintroduced by me, and again being reintroduced in the other body by Senators MORSE and THOMAS of Utah. It is practically identical with the bill reported out favorably last year. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] have introduced identical bills to mine in the House.

Mr. Speaker, enactment of such a bill is tragically overdue. When I stood on the floor of this House 2½ years ago to speak in behalf of this bill, I pointed out that in asking for its enactment labor was supported by organizations of teachers, civic, welfare, and church groups—all of them concerned, as were the responsible leaders of labor, with the working out of intelligent, fair, and peaceful solutions of industrial relations.

I pointed out then that the November 1945 management-labor conference called by the President, while unable to reach an agreement on some basic issues, had recommended in its report that there be greater educational activities among workers to stimulate a more constructive approach to collective bargaining and for the improvement of collective bargaining as a whole. That conference, held 3 years ago, recognized that the use of facts and reason is a desirable substitute for costly tests of economic strength in strikes and lock-outs.

In the Seventy-ninth Congress we heard much discussion of industrial relations. We heard heated denunciation and warm words in its defense.

In all this clangor in the Congress and throughout the Nation over management-labor relations in that first postwar year of readjustment, labor came forward with a united voice to ask for the enactment of this bill so that wage earners wanting access to facts and reason, and to training and skill in their use, as citizens and as workers in their relations with the community and employers, could have made available to them, as similar services have long been available to farmers, the accumulated knowledge and teaching resources of our institutions of higher learning.

Mr. Speaker, 2½ years ago I described the need for such a bill as urgent. There was a hunger and a demand then for more knowledge and understanding among wage earners themselves. It was and is a fact needing neither explanation nor apology that industrial workers and others in the lower-income groups of our population have for the most part been limited by the force of circumstances to education confined to the primary grades. Few have completed high school, and still fewer have been able to begin a university education.

Because of this hard fact, labor's part in the field of labor relations often reflects not only limited experience, but also a limited knowledge of relevant facts and limited facilities in dealing with such facts. Although labor leaders have displayed good American common sense and shrewdness in relations with management, some wage earners have had too little knowledge of the resources and methods available to them in equipping themselves for relations with management and with the community.

The demand which I described then has increased since. In 1946, support for the proposal had been expressed by more than 50 colleges and universities who were then offering on a small scale extension services to various kinds of wage earners and by many other institutions just starting such programs or prepared to undertake such programs if supplied with the necessary know-how and assistance.

Today, some 80 such institutions have small pilot operations under way. Surveys show that the demand is far beyond the ability of these institutions. In one instance, it has been reliably stated that a leading university is unable to meet more than 5 percent of the requests made for services. The demand for these services, to be made available by a labor extension division located within a rehabilitated Department of Labor, is supported by intelligent management, by educators, by church groups, and by other groups who are concerned with working out peaceful and equitable solutions of the many problems that now complicate industrial relations and the achievement of steady full production.

A labor extension service located within and drawing upon the resources of the Department of Labor and other agencies will make available to nonagricultural wage earners expanded resources and trained personnel, through the States and through institutions of higher learning within the States to aid in the diffusion of knowledge and understanding of these resources and training and experience in their use. Such understanding, such experience are prerequisite to the development of sound industrial relations. As I said 2½ years ago, before the enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act, the sooner a labor extension service is established, the sooner we will strengthen the foundation for equitable, reasonable, and peaceful industrial relations. Of course, labor cannot bring this about without the cooperation of management. The demand for this bill, which has grown steadily for the past 3 years, is proof positive that labor is

willing and anxious to do its share toward the peaceful negotiation and settlement of discussions with management by the use of facts and reason on both sides of the bargaining table, with less and less recourse to the test of naked economic force.

As I pointed out then—and I think it will be more generally recognized today after the experience of the past 2 years—such peaceful, reasonable negotiation, turning upon and being decided by the facts, by reason, equity, and justice, freely practiced and without diminishing by one whit the right of freemen to withhold their labor or employment—is in the most profound sense in the public interest, in the national interest, and is conducive to the welfare of individual citizens and the democratic strength of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the Eightieth Congress did not elect to act upon this bill. In my opinion, the Congress, along with the press, radio, and too many of the so-called leaders of thought and opinion in the Nation, were swept into an anti-labor hysteria which resulted in the adoption of that incredible and incomprehensible hodge-podge of legal gobbledy-gook, dead-falls, and backfiring bazookas called the Taft-Hartley Act that was put together under unique circumstances by attorneys for interested and notoriously reactionary corporations. At this point, I cite the statement by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] appearing on page 3421 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 15, 1947:

> The bill was actually written with the help of the National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce. Some of the most valuable assistance came from William Ingles, who represents Allis-Chalmers Co., Fruehauf Trailer Co., J. I. Case Co., the Falk Corp., and Inland Steel Co. Patrioteer Theodore R. Isserman put aside his rich Chrysler law practice for two full weeks to help out the House Labor Committee.

And also the opinion of the Taft-Hartley monstrosity expressed by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN], appearing on page 3543 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 16, 1947:

> The authors of this bill are clearly not interested in pushing the American economy steadily uphill to higher living standards. They are bent upon establishing monopoly control over the roller coaster and taking the American people for a dangerous ride.

Instead of choosing to promote fair and peaceful management-labor relations, insofar as men of good will and adequate information in the ranks of labor can do so, the Eightieth Congress preferred to adopt methods of regimentation, coercion, reprisal, division, and punishment, leveled unilaterally against the working men and women of America. That ill-starred venture, foisted upon the Congress and the American people under the misleading label of a bill to promote harmonious relations between management and labor, has been condemned and rejected by the American people in the November 2 elections.

Now we are ready for a fresh start in a new Congress and in a new climate of opinion in this country. We cannot make a better start than by accomplishing early repeal of the infamous and, I repeat, incomprehensible Taft-Hartley Act, and by speedily enacting this labor-extension service bill which, by promoting the quiet quest for truth, will help bring about peaceful collective bargaining and settlements between wage earners and employers—at least insofar as knowledge, skill, and good will among wage earners can promote that happy state of affairs. I make this qualification because peace, like war, requires two parties in its making. Employers must, of course, address themselves to facts and reason and meet labor half-way and deal fairly at the bargaining table.

The value and the urgency of this bill are not limited to the field of management-labor relationships, broad and important as that field is. Labor wants more than merely access to facts and knowledge that will equip and aid in matters related to employment. Labor wants access to other facts and skills that are stored up in our institutions of higher learning and, by public and private subsidy, are made available to those who can afford to attend these institutions as full-time resident students.

Labor wants parity with farmers in access to these riches of the mind so that nonagricultural wage earners and their families may participate more fully and effectively as citizens in the life of their community, their State, their Nation, and that part of the world which is still free.

Throughout our history, the relatively high level of education and informed intelligence among our people has been a principal source of national strength, welfare, and prosperity. It has contributed to our survival. It insured the production necessary to military victory.

As I pointed out 2½ years ago, our concern and practical provision for the diffusion of knowledge has been the shield of the Republic, protecting freedom and democracy against the stealthy encroachment of special privilege and economic power on the one hand and, on the other hand, that mob rule which lends itself so easily to the manipulations of cynical and unprincipled demagogs. Our defense against those dangers would have been even more effective if our provisions for the diffusion of knowledge had been more thorough and more practical.

Today this is truer and more obvious than ever. Nothing less than our maximum strength and intelligence as a nation of free individuals is enough for national security in the global conflict between freedom and totalitarianism. We need the more rapid diffusion of more and better knowledge among all our people.

For its part, labor is asking help in getting such access to that knowledge as other segments of our population already enjoy; the well-to-do because they have enough financial resources to take advantage of the public and private subsidized institutions; the farmers because the Federal Government, pursuant to the principles set up under the Morrill Act of 1862, has maintained the Agricultural Extension Service.

That act, be it noted in passing, established a national policy of promoting the diffusion among the people of useful knowledge for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts, and for the benefit of the human beings engaged in those occupations. Federal funds devoted to the Agricultural Extension Service, which serves some 6,000,000 farm families, aggregate $14,000,000 a year. The bill introduced today does not carry a money figure, but it is estimated that the amounts finally determined to be adequate would be much smaller proportionately than the amount appropriated for the Agricultural Extension Service, in view of the fact that educational facilities available to nonagricultural wage earners and their families are somewhat better than those available to farm people. However, since the total to be served would be in the neighborhood of 47,000,000 nonagricultural wage earners, the ultimate cost might be somewhat greater than the total now being appropriated for the benefit of 6,000,000 farm families, though the per capita cost would be smaller.

The bill declares its purpose to be the promotion of "the welfare of wage earners, through a program for the dissemination of useful knowledge to provide a means by which the Nation may conserve the creative capacities of workers, and to promote cooperative relations and mutual understanding between labor and management."

Section 2 sets forth plainly the nature of the program to be made available to wage earners:

> There shall be established in the Department of Labor a Labor Extension Service. The program of the Labor Extension Service shall include the following:
>
> 1. Promotion of the welfare of wage earners and thereby the industries of which they are a part by developing and making available information useful to wage earners and their bona fide labor organizations in presenting factually and effectively their contribution to production as a basis for compensation and by making available information on practices in writing collective-bargaining agreements and in carrying out collective-bargaining activities and practices;
>
> 2. Making available information and research facilities concerning principles and techniques in labor and management relations appropriate to assure both full and continuous employment and production in a free-enterprise economy;
>
> 3. Making available information concerning living and working conditions;
>
> 4. Making available information on labor law and legislation and its administration;
>
> 5. Promoting through dissemination of knowledge constructive relations between workers and management which will contribute to the advancement of the public interest and of the national welfare and security;
>
> 6. Making available information on the significance of the free-enterprise system in the economic history and growth of the United States, and on the history of trade-unions, their responsibilities in promoting the understanding and appreciation of democratic processes, their rights, responsibilities, duties, and obligations with respect to the public, their members and fellow workers, and management, and their relationship to the development of democracy in the United States.

The bill provides for the establishment of a Labor Extension Service within the United States Department of Labor, for

the establishment of a National Labor Extension Council, composed of representatives of institutions of higher learning and of the nonagricultural wage earners for whom the service is to be established.

The bill provides that services shall be provided only if, as, and when requested by nonagricultural wage earners themselves. When they wish such services, the bill provides that they may cooperate with an institution of higher learning in preparing a plan for classes and other methods of instruction. These plans, made to meet the needs of nonagricultural wage earners, within the purposes set forth in section 2 of the bill are then to be presented to State boards provided for in section 5 of the act and consisting of representatives of cooperating institutions of higher learning and nonagricultural wage earners in the State.

This board, appointed by the governors, would, under the bill, assemble requests and plans as received and formulate a State plan. After checking to make sure that funds were available out of the total earmarked for each State under the bill's formula apportioning the total available Federal funds appropriated among the States on the basis of proportion of nonagricultural wage earners in the State to the total in the Nation, the board would forward the consolidated State plan, or supplements thereto, to the Secretary of Labor.

The bill provides that "the Secretary of Labor shall approve any plan which complies with the standards for State plans to be set up by Congress in section 6A."

As a further safeguard against so-called Federal dictation of program content, section 6C provides:

> No department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or prescribe any requirements with respect to, any cooperating institution to which any funds which have been or may be available or expended pursuant to this act. No term or condition of any agreement or any other action taken under this act, whether by agreement or otherwise, shall seek to control in any manner, or prescribe requirements with respect to, the administration, the personnel, the curriculum, the instruction, the methods of instruction, or the materials of instruction of any cooperating institution.

Upon approval of a State plan, the Secretary would request the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the amount, "as determined by the State board," to each cooperating organization within each State, within the limits of the annual allotment earmarked for each State under the formula I have described.

Provision is made for matching Federal funds with at least 25 percent of State or local funds, which may be in cash, kind, or services.

The bill defines "cooperating institution" as meaning "any college, school, or institution in any State receiving the benefits of the act of July 2, 1862, and August 30, 1890, and acts supplemental thereto, and any other public or private nonprofit college, university, or research agency in any State, certified as eligible by the State board"—section 11 C.

I wish to insert this point in my remarks, a resolution adopted by the American Federation of Labor at its Cincinnati convention November 19, 1948, reading as follows:

> The convention appreciates the executive council's support of the labor extension service bill and are sure that they will continue their efforts in behalf of this bill until same is finally made into law. It is moved and seconded that this portion of the executive council's report be accepted.

The portion of the A. F. of L. executive council's report to which the convention action refers follows:

> Representatives of the American Federation of Labor appeared before the Senate and House committees in support of the principles of extension services for workers. Labor wants such a program. The Nation needs it. It seems unjustifiable that there should be an extension service program for agriculture and that a similar program for labor has not been provided by the Federal Government.
>
> The success of such a program of labor extension services would, as in the case of the agricultural extension services, depend upon maintaining it on a cooperative basis with local labor requests and proposals initiating all undertakings.
>
> Such an extension service would provide materials for workers in their union activities and educational projects.

And I also insert Resolution 14 adopted by the convention of the Congress of Industrial Organizations at Portland, Oreg., November 22–26, 1948:

> RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF A LABOR EXTENSION SERVICE IN THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR ADOPTED BY THE TENTH CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION OF THE CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS, PORTLAND, OREG., NOVEMBER 22–26, 1948
>
> Adult American wage earners suffer a gross inequity due to the almost total lack of public facilities for labor education, while American farmers have long enjoyed millions of dollars' worth of educational benefits through the Federal Agricultural Extension Service, and business and management representatives receive training and services through publicly supported State universities and other institutions.
>
> A bill to establish a Labor Extension Service in the United States Department of Labor was introduced in the Eightieth Congress, through which workers' education services would be made available to unions on a Nation-wide scale, and the bill was approved by the Senate Committee on Labor and Education but was killed by the Republican leadership of the House of Representatives: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved*, That legislation be enacted by the Eighty-first Congress to establish and provide Federal funds for a Labor Extension Service program to be administered by the United States Department of Labor to provide the Nation's adult workers with special educational services through the cooperation of universities and unions within the States; and that
>
> All affiliated international unions, councils, and local industrial unions are urged to support the campaign to enact a Labor Extension Service bill by resolution, publicity, and communications to Members of Congress and cooperation with and financial assistance to the National Committee for the Extension of Labor Education, which is coordinating the drive for its enactment.

Since 1942, both the A. F. of L. and CIO have by annual convention action adopted resolutions supporting the plan for a labor extension service to be located within the United States Department of Labor. I quote the resolutions adopted by the 1947 conventions of the A. F. of L. and CIO:

> RESOLUTION ON LABOR EXTENSION SERVICE PASSED BY THE SIXTY-SIXTH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR OCTOBER 1947, SAN FRANCISCO
>
> Whereas the United States Congress enacted the Morrill Act on July 2, 1862, donating public lands to the several States and Territories to provide colleges for the benefit of those engaged in agriculture and the mechanical arts; and
>
> Whereas these land-grant colleges over the years have not promoted the welfare of those engaged in the mechanical arts nor has the Department of Labor provided research and technical assistance to workers comparable to such services provided by the Department of Commerce for employers; and
>
> Whereas a labor extension service bill has now been introduced in both Houses of Congress (S. 1390 and H. R. 4078) to amend the Morrill Act making specific provision for research, information, and educational extension services for workers through universities, colleges, and research agencies: Therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved*, That the American Federation of Labor in convention assembled reiterate its support for the immediate establishment of a labor extension service to provide research, information, and extension services to workers throughout the Nation through the enactment of S. 1390.
>
> ———
>
> FROM THE REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR TO THE SIXTY-SIXTH CONVENTION, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., OCTOBER 6, 1947
>
> *Section on education (workers' service and education program)*
>
> Since the enactment of the program of Federal aid for the land-grant colleges, and the development, many years later, of the Agricultural Extension Service, the need for a similar service for industrial workers has been recognized.
>
> However, no funds have been made available for such service. With the growing need for the development of a sounder appreciation of industrial and labor conditions, the need for such a service has been more and more recognized. During the last year, the American Federation of Labor, in cooperation with other interested groups, helped draft legislation which would establish such a service-educational program in the Department of Labor similar to the agricultural extension program in the Department of Agriculture. The legislation, which the committee on education of the American Federation of Labor helped prepare, would establish a Federal-State system of labor service centers working in cooperation with State and local trade-unions and in cooperation with such educational and research institutions as meet the standards set up by a national advisory board on which would serve representatives of education, professional persons, and labor.
>
> Certain groups in the country, completely insensitive to the needs which such a service program would fulfill, have urged that the administration of such a program be placed in the United States Office of Education. However, there would be no more justification for transferring the Agricultural Extension Service from the Department of Agriculture, where it has always functioned, to the United States Office of Education than there would be for having the program affecting the industrial workers function away from the Department of Labor. It is important that such a program be recognized as a service program, which through research and educational assistance seeks to service the workers in a community, should be administered as a service program to these groups

and should not at any time promulgate educational theories or promote the distribution of educational content.

The bill which the American Federation of Labor helped prepare contains the necessary safeguards and merits the active support of the federation.

And I quote from 1946 resolutions.

First, from the A. F. of L.:

Such a service would give workers the material and tools with which to meet their educational needs. (Unanimously adopted, sixty-fifth convention, A. F. of L., Chicago, Ill., October 1946.)

Second, from the CIO:

All affiliated international unions, councils, and local industrial unions are urged to support this program, by resolution, publicity, financial assistance, and communications to their respective Members of Congress, and cooperate with the Committee for the Extension of Labor Education toward this end. (Unanimously adopted, eighth constitutional convention, CIO, Atlantic City, N. J., November 1946.)

Here is the endorsement of the bill by the spokesmen for railway labor:

Our association endorses the principle and objectives of this proposed legislation. (A. E. Lyon, executive secretary, Railway Labor Executives' Association, January 14, 1947.)

And I quote also statements by the presidents of these two great organizations of labor.

William Green, president of the A. F. of L., writing in the American Federationist, June 1946, said:

The Department of Labor should have a labor extension service similar to the Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture. The Morrill Act of 1862, under which the Agricultural Extension Service was set up, provided Federal aid for land-grant colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts. Labor was not represented in the executive branch of the Government at that time and did not benefit by this opportunity. Farmers, on the other hand, have been able to get research and technical advice on their daily problems, so that agricultural management has greatly improved. Every farmer has such aids readily available.

Workers need services to enable them to plan for progress and to promote their economic well-being. They need decentralized technical assistance to promote health and safety in places of work. They need to be sure of their rights as well as their responsibilities. They should have the necessary services readily available. All of the agencies properly within the Department should contribute information and experience to such a service.

And here is a statement by Philip Murray, president of the CIO, endorsing the principles, the purpose, and the method proposed in this bill for the establishment of a labor extension service:

A free labor movement is indispensable in a free world. This fact is often overlooked when labor disputes have given rise to demands for laws restricting labor's right to bargain collectively, to strike if need be, to defend its sacred political and economic rights.

To fetter labor with restrictive governmental regulation such as the Case bill is to endanger the very principle of American freedom. To establish constructive programs for the betterment of labor relations is to serve the welfare of the whole people.

A Labor Extension Service within the Department of Labor is one of many possible constructive programs which could foster good labor relations without sacrificing labor's freedom. It takes education and practical experience to participate effectively in collective bargaining. There must be a combination of skill, knowledge of facts, understanding of issues, knowledge of procedure. From the beginning the CIO has recognized this need. CIO has built an education department to supply information upon request from any CIO union. Many CIO internationals have developed their own education departments to fill the special needs of locals in the various industries. The larger the union know-how in collective bargaining the better the labor relations that will result.

It follows that a better stewardship will result in better grievance procedure through which the contract operates day by day.

Unions have grown by leaps and bounds in the last decade. Four million strong after Warld War I, organized workers now total 15,000,000. Each day new workers join our ranks. These numbers constitute a practical difficulty. We need more than skilled well-trained labor leaders. We must have skilled, well-informed union members. This means that we need new teachers, new techniques for teaching, new materials, pamphlet libraries, and educational films. Demands for education services are now so numerous and so urgent and have grown to such vast proportions that only a Government service can meet them. That service is a responsibility of the United States Department of Labor which can neither be ignored nor met halfheartedly.

A Labor Extension Service should be backed by all the resources of the Labor Department. In addition, the Labor Department should channel to the Labor Extension Service the many necessary facilities of other governmental departments. In other words, all the resources of Government should be integrated by the Labor Department to serve the people it was established to serve.

The country's farmers have had the benefit of extension services for many years. They can apply to the Department of Agriculture for technical help on their problems. They can ask for information, for research, for expert advice, and get them. As a matter of cold statistics the Nation's industrial workers outnumber the farmers, and no one seriously denies that the Nation's industrial health and well-being depend upon industrial workers. It is high time for the Labor Department to supply an extension service to the many workers upon whom so much of the country's future prosperity depends.

Finally, a partial list of organizations that have endorsed the plan for a Labor Extension Service within the Department of Labor:

LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS WHICH HAVE ENDORSED THE PLAN OF A LABOR EXTENSION SERVICE WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

American Federation of Labor.
Congress of Industrial Organizations.
The railway brotherhoods.
American Labor Education Service.
Workers Education Bureau of America.
Young Women's Christian Association.
United Council of Church Women.
National Farmers Union.
Michigan Consumers League.
Michigan Federation of Teachers.
Detroit Federation of Teachers.
Workers Educational Service, University of Michigan.
Labor and Management Center, Yale University.
Hudson Shore Labor School.

Mr. Speaker, in supporting and asking for the early enactment of this bill, labor makes a challenge to this Congress. It is a challenge that I hope we will accept, and at an early date. It is a challenge to give practical aid and implementation to a plan for promoting a wider knowledge, better understanding, and greater use of facts and reason in the day-to-day relations between management and labor—in the shop, mine, mill, and factory. Of equal importance, it is a challenge to give richer resources to the 47,000,000 wage earners and their families, to be used by them as fully participating citizens in their community, State, and Nation who aspire to a fuller, richer life not only in creature comforts but in what has been called the delights and satisfactions of the mind and spirit.

In the long run, yes, Mr. Speaker, and in the short run, too, this positive, constructive method for promoting understanding and cooperation—insofar as labor, as the party of the first part, can promote such cooperation—will contribute a great deal to more peaceful and equitable management-labor relations and greater strength, dynamic stability, and security to our Nation as we enter upon a new phase in the long effort of mankind to establish on this earth both security, freedom, and dignity for the individual human being.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from a magazine.

Mr. GWINN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech made by Dr. Benson, of Arkansas.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. GRAHAM), on account of death in family.

To Mr. KEARNEY (at the request of Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 17, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

55. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a copy of a proposed joint resolution granting permission to Vernon G. MacKenzie, sanitary engineer director, Public Health Service, to accept and wear a certain decoration bestowed upon him by the King of Greece; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

56. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a copy of a proposed joint resolution granting permission to Hildrus A. Poindexter, senior surgeon (reserve), and Mary L. Mills, senior assistant nurse officer, of the Public Health Service, to accept the diplomas and wear the insignia of certain decorations bestowed upon them by Liberia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

57. A letter from the president, Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., transmitting a report showing the stock, earnings, and expenses for the calendar year 1948 for the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

58. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a volume containing the acts of the sixth, seventh, and eighth special sessions of the Sixteenth Legislature of Puerto Rico, May 14 to 21, July 12 to 25, and August 30 to September 4, 1948, respectively; to the Committee on Public Lands.

59. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting the annual report of activities of the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948 (H. Doc. No. 8); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed.

60. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting a statement in regard to the filing of its report in a series of parts or volumes, the last of which will be delivered within 70 days of the organization of the Eighty-first Congress (H. Doc. No. 37); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

61. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 in the amount of $2,000,000 for the Treasury Department (H. Doc. No. 38); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

62. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of proposed transfers of various naval vessels; to the Committee on Armed Services.

63. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting certifications by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics of the cost of rehabilitation and repair of damages caused by the United States military forces at six public airports; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

64. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize payment of certain claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property and personal injury arising from activities of the Army; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

65. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act of July 23, 1947 (61 Stat. 409); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

66. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act of February 19, 1941, as amended, so as to establish a Women's Reserve as a branch of the Coast Guard Reserve; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

67. A letter from the Chairman, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the creation of 10 professional and scientific positions in the headquarters and research stations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

68. A letter from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to make certain Government-owned facilities available for international broadcasting in the furtherance of authorized programs of the Department of State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

69. A letter from the Postmaster General of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

70. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of November 1948; to the Committee on Agriculture.

71. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics concerning operations under the Federal Airport Act during the fiscal year 1948; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 1304. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 1305. A bill to provide for the national security of the Nation by requiring that all qualified young men undergo a period of training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 1306. A bill to exempt from the manufacturers' excise tax certain articles sold to fire-fighting companies not organized for profit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 1307. A bill to authorize payments of pensions to certain World War I veterans for partial disabilities not the result of service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1308. A bill to provide that the Legislative Reference Service shall compile and make available the voting records of the Members of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 1309. A bill to provide additional retirement benefits for certain persons serving in the Coast Guard who served in the former Lighthouse Service; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 1310. A bill to exempt from admissions to activities of elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 1311. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to make employees eligible for annuities after 30 years of service, regardless of age, and to make widows eligible for annuities, regardless of age; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1312. A bill to amend the civil-service retirement rights—persons in military service, approved November 9, 1945, in order to protect the retirement rights of persons who leave the service to enter the merchant marine; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1313. A bill to exclude from gross income lump-sum payments for service as aviators in the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 1314. A bill to require that the congressional committees having jurisdiction over the Coast Guard be notified before any Coast Guard installation is discontinued, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 1315. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 1316. A bill to authorize cancellation of interest and, in some cases, the principal on certain feed and seed loans; providing a penalty for falsifications; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1317. A bill to prohibit any elective or appointive officer or employee of the United States Government from gambling in food products, providing a penalty for the violation thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURNSIDE:

H. R. 1318. A bill to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CROOK:

H. R. 1319. A bill authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 1320. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps in honor and commemoration of the centennial of the Angora goat in the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 1321. A bill to grant recognition for wartime service in the United States merchant marine and to provide that persons who served in the wartime merchant marine shall not be liable for induction into the armed services under the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 1322. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of Joseph Lee, Sr., founder of recreational and civic groups and organizer of recreational activities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1323. A bill to amend the Norris-LaGuardia Act with respect to the definition of the term "labor dispute"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 1324. A bill to expedite the borrowing of funds from established lending institutions, for the acquisition of homes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 1325. A bill to provide additional income-tax exemptions to widowered heads of families; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1326. A bill to encourage the development of new domestic sources of zinc ores by amending the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1327. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt air taxis from provisions of the transportation tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 1328. A bill to provide for the Admiral David Glasgow Farragut Birthplace National Monument; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 1329. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, to provide income-tax exemption for obligations of certain corporations engaged in providing low-rent housing for veterans of World War II; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 1330. A bill to amend the act of July 1, 1902, as amended, to provide exemption from payment of personal-property tax in the District of Columbia for veterans' organizations incorporated by acts of Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 1331. A bill to provide for the publication of an illustrated history of the coins and currency of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

H. R. 1332. A bill to extend the applicability of certain provisions affecting the price-support program for agricultural commodities, and to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1333. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to support the price of milk at not less than 90 per centum of parity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 1334. A bill granting to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependent children pensions equivalent to the pensions granted to veterans of the War with Spain and their widows and dependent children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 1335. A bill to amend the Selective Service Act of 1948 with reference to the deferment of registrants engaged in agricultural occupations or endeavors; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 1336. A bill to authorize the American River Basin Development, California, for irrigation and reclamation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 1337. A bill to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the Alaska Council of Boy Scouts of America for recreation and other public purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H. R. 1338. A bill authorizing the transfer to the United States section, International Boundary and Water Commission, by the War Assets Administration of a portion of Fort Brown, at Brownsville, Tex., and adjacent borrow area, without exchange of funds or reimbursement; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BIEMILLER:

H. R. 1339. A bill to promote the general welfare of the people of the United States by establishing a publicly supported labor extension program for wage and salary earners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 1340. A bill for United States-flag shipping participation in Government-financed cargoes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 1341. A bill to authorize the appointment of three additional judges for the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 1342. A bill to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of Fort Stoddart, Ala.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 1343. A bill to encourage the prevention of stream pollution by allowing amounts paid for plants for the treatment of industrial waste as a deduction in computing net income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 1344. A bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHESNEY:

H. R. 1345. A bill to allow for income-tax purposes a deduction for depreciation and repairs on the residence of a taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLE of Kansas:

H. R. 1346. A bill to continue the authority of the President with respect to the making, by persons engaged in industry, business, and agriculture, of voluntary agreements; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. R. 1347. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of June 16, 1936 (49 Stat. 1524), as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 1348. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1349. A bill to permit the exportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 1350. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 1351. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of citizens of the United States and other persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1352. A bill to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a $1 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1353. A bill to prohibit race segregation in the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 1354. A bill to provide for a per capita payment for funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1355. A bill authorizing annual payments to States, Territories, and insular governments, for the benefit of their local political subdivisions, based on the fair value of the national forest lands situated therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1356. A bill creating a Commission on Federal Reimbursement to States and local governments by reason of Federal ownership of improved and unimproved real property; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FELLOWS:

H. R. 1357. A bill to authorize the establishment of the St. Croix Island National Monument, in the State of Maine; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FENTON:

H. R. 1358. A bill to provide certain benefits for employees in the field service of the Post Office Department who are veterans of World War I or World War II; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 1359. A bill to protect scenic values along the tributary to Aspen Basin Road, and contiguous scenic area, within the Santa Fe National Forest, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 1360. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a free bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Del Rio, Tex.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 1361. A bill to terminate the war-tax rates on admissions, cabarets, and so forth; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1362. A bill to provide for the display of the American flag on every post office in the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 1363. A bill to permit partially disabled World War II veterans to reenlist in the armed forces of the United States, including the Coast Guard for limited duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1364. A bill to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to States, municipalities, and other political subdivisions of States for the construction of devices to protect the shores of publicly owned property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1365. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, act of February 10, 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1366. A bill to establish a National Superhighway Commission in order to provide for the making of plans and surveys for the construction of a national superhighway system; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1367. A bill to provide for a service credit for veterans for purposes of title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1368. A bill to clarify and make certain freedom of expression; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1369. A bill to require approval by Congress of executive agreements with respect to the reduction of tariff rates before the same become effective; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 1370. A bill authorizing the appointment of three additional judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia, prescribing the qualifications of appointees to the municipal court and the municipal court of appeals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 1371. A bill to repeal the tax on cabarets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1372. A bill to repeal the taxes on admissions and cabarets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUBER:

H. R. 1373. A bill to designate as a depository of Government publications the public library of each city having a population of 100,000 or more in which there is no such depository; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HUBER (by request):

H. R. 1374. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the period during which readjustment allowances may be paid; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 1375. A bill to amend the Public Health Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 1376. A bill to provide assistance to farmers in securing farm housing and other farm buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 1377. A bill to correct an inequity existing in the case of holders of adjusted-service certificates who did not accept payment in bonds under the Adjusted Compensation Payment Act, 1936; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1378. A bill to incorporate the American Division, Inc., World War II Veterans Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1379. A bill to correct the inequities of Public Law 317 (79th Cong.), and to provide credit for faithful service to all substitute employees of the postal service when appointed to regular positions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1380. A bill to promote the general welfare of the people of the United States by establishing a publicly supported labor extension program for wage and salary earners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1381. A bill to incorporate the National PT Veterans Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1382. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make equitable adjustments of claims arising out of the sale of World War II surplus edible commodities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 1383. A bill to continue on a permanent basis a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1384. A bill to amend the act of December 20, 1944, to provide for the issuance, without examination, of licenses to certain persons to engage in business; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1385. A bill to amend Public Law 195, Eightieth Congress (ch. 258, 1st sess.), entitled "An act to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1386. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act to provide for the better control of the alcoholic-beverage industry in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1387. A bill to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 1388. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Sulphur, La., a post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LEFEVRE:

H. R. 1389. A bill to authorize the participation of States, Territories, and insular possessions in revenues from national parks, national monuments, and other areas subject to the primary administrative jurisdiction of the National Park Service, to provide for the acquisition of land within certain areas administered by the National Park Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 1390. A bill to amend the Mustering-out Payment Act of 1944, approved February 3, 1944; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1391. A bill to equalize the retirement benefits payable to Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1392. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in connection with the dedication of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1393. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for certain Federal employees who have rendered at least 20 years' service in the investigation, apprehension, or detention of persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1394. A bill to cancel emergency crop, seed, and feed loans where the maker of such loans has been disabled or killed in action in World War II; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 1395. A bill to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H. R. 1396. A bill to implement and augment existing statutes so as to increase the prevailing immigration quota for Greece; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 1397. A bill to provide pensions for disabled veterans of the World War under similar conditions, and in the same amounts, as now provided for disabled veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 1398. A bill to amend the act of May 29, 1944, so as to provide annuities for certain remarried widows; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 1399. A bill to provide for the deduction from gross income for income-tax purposes of expenses incurred by farmers for the purpose of soil and water conservation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1400. A bill to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of 160 years of cotton textile manufacturing in the United States of America; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MICHENER:

H. R. 1401. A bill relating to the disposition of certain recreational demonstration project lands by the State of Michigan to the Mount Hope Cemetery Association of Waterloo, Mich.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 1402. A bill to establish a Department of National Health and Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 1403. A bill to withhold Federal aid from National Guard organizations which practice discrimination or segregation on account of race, color, or creed; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NIXON:

H. R. 1404. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and for the construction of a suitable building thereon for the use and accommodation of the United States post office at Azusa, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1405. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and for the construction of a suitable building thereon for the use and accommodation of the United States post office at Arcadia, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 1406. A bill to provide pensions for veterans of World War I and World War II on the basis of age and on the basis of permanent and total disability; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1407. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Bad River Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1408. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Lac Courte Oreilles Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PASSMAN:

H. R. 1409. A bill to amend section 3771 (a) of title 26 of the Internal Revenue Code by reducing certain refund interest rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1410. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 1411. A bill to provide for the demonstration of public-library service in areas without such service or with inadequate library facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1412. A bill to provide for the distribution of motor-vehicle tires, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 1413. A bill to provide for service connection of disabilities aggravated by active military or naval service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1414. A bill to restore full compensation awards in World War I presumptively service-connected cases; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1415. A bill to provide minimum ratings for service-connected arrested tuberculosis; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1416. A bill to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1417. A bill to provide Government protection for widows and children of deceased veterans of World Wars I and II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1418. A bill to liberalize the basis for award of disability pension, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1419. A bill to increase compensation rates under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1420. A bill to provide pensions for veterans of World War I and World War II based on non-service-connected disability and attained age; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1421. A bill to facilitate cooperation of recognized organizations with the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 1422. A bill to amend title 18, section 61, and title 18, section 64, of the Code of Laws of the United States of America in force January 3, 1949, by adding thereto sections 61 (1), 61 (2), and 61 (3) relating to offenses in elections and providing penalties therefor; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 1423. A bill relative to granting and giving instructions in civil and criminal cases in the district court of continental United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 1424. A bill to appropriate funds for works of improvement for flood control on the Tombigbee River and its tributaries; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 1425. A bill to amend section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1426. A bill to provide terminal-leave pay for certain officers of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. R. 1427. A bill to clarify and formulate a consistent and coordinated national policy with respect to transportation costs in interstate commerce; to strengthen the antitrust laws of the United States and to provide for their more effective enforcement; and to promote competition by permitting sellers to have access to distant markets; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 1428. A bill to provide for the admission to the United States of an additional number of aliens of Italian nationality; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SECREST:

H. R. 1429. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of an experiment station in or near Marietta, Ohio, for research on the production, refining, transportation, and use of petroleum and natural gas; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 1430. A bill prohibiting membership in subversive organizations; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

H. R. 1431. A bill to designate as "Citizenship Day" each general election day and regular primary election day on which the people elect Presidential and Vice Presidential electors, Members of Congress, or candidates for President, Vice President, or Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 1432. A bill to amend an act approved June 29, 1948, entitled "An act to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va."; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 1433. A bill to provide 4 years of college education to the children of persons whose death resulted from service in the armed forces during World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1434. A bill to provide for the recall of officers to active duty for purposes of rehospitalization and evaluation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1435. A bill to authorize payment of $1,600 on purchase price in excess thereof of an automobile or other conveyance for certain disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 1436. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 1437. A bill to authorize the composition of the Army of the United States and the Air Force of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1438. A bill to clarify the application of title II of Public Law 759, Eightieth Congress, to the Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 1439. A bill to create additional Secretaries of the Armed Services for Reserve components; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 1440. A bill to incorporate The Mothers of World War No. 2, to set forth and establish the purposes and aims of the organization, fixing its corporate powers and establishing the rights of membership, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELCH of California:

H. R. 1441. A bill to extend pension benefits to persons who served on certain vessels operated by the Army during the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H. R. 1442. A bill for the relief of Amite County, Miss.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1443. A bill to provide for determination through judicial proceedings of claims for compensation on account of disability or death resulting from disease or injury incurred or aggravated in line of duty while serving in the active military or naval service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 1444. A bill to provide the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence, to make immigration quotas available to Asian and Pacific peoples, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. J. Res. 65. Joint resolution to exempt from the tax on admissions amounts paid for admission tickets sold by authority of the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1949; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. J. Res. 86. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the terms of office of judges of the Supreme Court of the United States and inferior courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. J. Res. 87. Joint resolution to provide that any future payments by the Republic of Finland on the principal or interest of its debt of the First World War to the United States shall be used to provide educational and technical instruction and training in the United States for citizens of Finland and American books and technical equipment for institutions of higher education in Finland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. J. Res. 88. Joint resolution extending the time for free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. J. Res. 89. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. J. Res. 90. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Fargo, N. Dak., as the Clarence Theodore Hoverson Memorial Veterans Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. J. Res. 91. Joint resolution to authorize the cancellation and release of an agreement dated December 31, 1923, entered into between the port of Seattle and the United States of America, represented by the United States Shipping Board acting through the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. Con. Res. 13. Concurrent resolution suspending legislative budget pending further study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. Con. Res. 14. Concurrent resolution to authorize the President to commence negotiations with the Canadian Government with a view toward extending the existing railroad system between the Territory of Alaska and the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAND:

H. Res. 48. Resolution to authorize and direct the Committee on Ways and Means to make a study of the relationship between the Federal Government and the States in all fields, with special reference to the field of taxation; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 49. Resolution amending the rules of the House of Representatives to change the name of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to "Committee on Maritime Affairs"; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. Res. 50. Resolution to obtain information from the Secretary of State on the Palestine situation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 1445. A bill to authorize Comdr. Morton C. Steinberg, USNR, to accept the appointment as honorary consul for the Republic of Panama as has been tendered to him by the President of the Republic of Panama; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 1446. A bill for the relief of Conrad L. Wirth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 1447. A bill for the relief of Miss Ethel Roth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 1448. A bill for the relief of Emma Thompson Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1449. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Florence Trapolin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1450. A bill for the relief of Charles C. Armbruster, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1451. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Katherine Doerr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1452. A bill for the relief of A. J. Crozat, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 1453. A bill for the relief of Anita Bloom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1454. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Stamatia Lymberopoulos and Leonidas Stavrou Limperopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1455. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sapho Diamantopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1456. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Virginia Preston; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 1457. A bill for the relief of Thomas H. Moss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 1458. A bill for the relief of Joseph R. Gregory; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARROLL:

H. R. 1459. A bill for the relief of E. Neill Raymond; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1460. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Silva Mapelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAVALCANTE:

H. R. 1461. A bill for the relief of the L. J. House Convex Glass Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHATHAM:

H. R. 1462. A bill for the relief of Numa A. Winstead; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COMBS:

H. R. 1463. A bill for the relief of J. E. Mitchell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1464. A bill for the relief of W. B. Terry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 1465. A bill for the relief of Tibor Kahan and Mrs. Ilona Kahan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 1466. A bill for the relief of Daniel Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 1467. A bill for the relief of Thomas O. Troth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1468. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Smolowitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1469. A bill for the relief of Miss Sylva D'Arpe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 1470. A bill for the relief of the estate of James F. Delahanty, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 1471. A bill for the relief of E. La Ree Smoot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 1472. A bill for the relief of the Olympic Hotel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1473. A bill for the relief of Garnet Green Morris III; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 1474. A bill for the relief of Miguel A. Viera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 1475. A bill for the relief of Domenico Salvi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1476. A bill for the relief of Emmanuel Coutoulakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1477. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jean Russo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1478. A bill for the relief of the Somerville Dressed Meat Co., of Somerville, Mass.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1479. A bill for the relief of Michael A. Driscoll; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1480. A bill for the relief of Harold E. Terwilliger and Alberta M. Terwilliger Palmer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1481. A bill for the relief of the estate of Julius Zaffareni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1482. A bill for the relief of Francis L. Marshall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1483. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Giovanna Polio Discepolo, and her three children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1484. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Capodanno, and the legal guardian of Vincent Capodanno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1485. A bill for the relief of Josephine Lisitano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1486. A bill for the relief of certain Latvians; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 1487. A bill for the relief of Lt. Giacomo Falco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 1488. A bill for the relief of Thomas C. Meehan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H. R. 1489. A bill for the relief of James I. Matthews; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1490. A bill for the relief of the estates of Arthur F. Saladino, Joseph Spivack, and Irving Weinberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1491. A bill for the relief of Father Louis Nacleriо; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1492. A bill for the relief of Harold L. Lindquist; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 1493. A bill for the relief of Cecil L. Howell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 1494. A bill for the relief of the Montana Engineering & Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 1495. A bill for the relief of the estate of Robert Joseph Welch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 1496. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Thelma Lee Rynaard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1497. A bill for the relief of Ralph A. Wood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1498. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nellie C. Mitchell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. R. 1499. A bill for the relief of John K. Jackson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H. R. 1500. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Barbara Guanapoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 1501. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Rose Mary Ammirato, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 1502. A bill for the relief of John L. Fitzpatrick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1503. A bill for the relief of George Washington; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1504. A bill for the relief of John E. Tate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1505. A bill for the relief of Harry Warren; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1506. A bill for the relief of Zoe Tjumerka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1507. A bill for the relief of George E. Wyman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 1508. A bill for the relief of Peter Drosd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELCH of California:

H. R. 1509. A bill for the relief of the city and county of San Francisco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1510. A bill for the relief of Herman Jung Ho and his wife, Yen Wai Har; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITION, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

5. Mr. CHIPERFIELD presented a petition of residents of the Nineteenth Illinois Congressional District opposing national compulsory health insurance, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 17, 1949

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Help us, O God, to treat every human heart as if it were breaking, and to consider the feeling of others as we do our own.

Help us to be gentle, and to control our tempers that we may learn to love one another.

Give us the grace so to live this day, in the name of Jesus, who loves us all. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 13, 1949, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

COUNTING OF ELECTORAL VOTES—ARTICLE BY ARTHUR KROCK

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in the New York Times of January 14 there appeared an article by Arthur Krock which describes what might be happening now if the election for President and Vice President had been thrown into the House of Representatives. The article is so carefully thought out that it really takes rank as historical source material. In view of the fact that there is now pending before the Senate Judiciary Committee a proposal to amend the Constitution so as to count the electoral vote in proportion to the popular vote, I believe this article would be of particular interest to the Members of the Senate, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE NATION—JUST ABOUT NOW IF THE HOUSE WERE CHOOSING

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, January 13.—Those citizens who were closely following the returns of the 1948 Presidential election in the early hours of November 3, and especially those whose business it was to inform the public of the outcome, will not soon forget the wobbling count in Ohio and California through the night. For until it became certain that these two States were to give their electoral votes to President Truman he lacked the majority necessary for election. They could not have brought victory to Governor Dewey by going Republican. He would have needed Illinois, too. But by doing so they would have thrown the election into the House of Representatives.

CLARITY ENDANGERED

Had that happened the House at this moment would probably still be balloting, with noon on January 20, 1949, drawing ever nearer, at which hour Mr. Truman's term as President expires by fiat of the twentieth amendment. The House would probably still be balloting because of the partisan compositions of the delegations from the 48 States that also were chosen on November 2. And if the deadlock had continued until noon on January 20, as well it might have, the country might have had a President whose title was not entirely clarified by the Constitution or the Statute of Presidential Succession.

The reasons are these:

1. When a national election is thrown into the House because no candidate has received an electoral majority—now 266—each State delegation is given one vote by the Constitution, and this vote is determined by the majority of its delegation. In the present House there are 21 delegations with a Democratic majority, 20 with a Republican majority, 3 that are evenly divided, and 4 which represent States carried by the Democratic States' rights ticket.

NO VISIBLE MAJORITY

2. The Constitution limits the House in such circumstances to make its choice from the three candidates who led in the national poll, and on November 2 these were President Truman, Governor Dewey, and Governor Thurmond. If each of the 45 delegations unevenly divided had obeyed the mandate of the voters in its State, none of the candidates would have had the required constitutional majority of 25 even if the three evenly divided delegations had contrived to vote.

3. Mr. Truman would have been obliged to swing four of the seven delegations from the evenly divided States, and those Democratic States in which he was defeated by Mr. Thurmond. Mr. Dewey would have required a shift of five. Mr. Thurmond would have required a shift of 21. So a deadlock on the Presidency might now be afflicting the Nation.

THE PRESSURE GROWS

4. As noon on January 20 drew nearer the pressures of these seven delegations would have produced violent emotions which can only be imagined by reading the history of similar situations in 1801, 1825, and 1877.

Of the delegations from these seven States (Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina—carried by Mr. Thurmond—and Connecticut, Idaho, and Montana—evenly divided), Louisiana, Idaho, and Montana—conceivably might have yielded to the pressure for President Truman. But it is difficult to envisage the same shift in Alabama, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Connecticut. So Mr. Truman, with 24, would still be one short of the required majority.

5. Until or unless a member shifted in the Connecticut, Idaho, and Montana delegations these would have been unable to vote. This would have left 45 State delegations to produce a requisite majority of 23. But that would have been the same problem expressed in lower figures. Mr. Truman, Mr. Dewey, and Mr. Thurmond would then have needed shifts in 2, 3, and 19 delegations, respectively.

TWO WAYS OUT

Suppose the deadlock had continued until close to noon on January 20. How could the United States have acquired a President? On this point the twelfth amendment, the twentieth amendment, and the Statute of Succession of 1947 are not wholly clear, but the destructive condition might have been resolved without successful legal challenge in one of the following ways:

1. The Senate is composed of 96 Members, of whom a majority of 49 can elect a Vice President; if no candidate for that office has an electoral majority, from the two who polled the highest number of votes—in this case Senator BARKLEY and Governor Warren. There are 42 Republicans in this Senate, to whom for speculative purposes might be added the 8 from the 4 States carried by the Thurmond-Wright ticket, reducing the regular Democratic membership of 54 to 46, or 3 less than enough to choose Mr. BARKLEY. A shift of only 3 Senators from the Dixiecrat States would have made him Vice President, and in such circumstances this is more than conceivable. On the failure of the House to choose a President by noon on January 20 this Vice President would have become President for the full term, but once again there would have been no Vice President.

2. If both House and Senate had been deadlocked at noon on January 20, Public Law 199, the Statute of Succession, seems to provide that the Speaker (now SAM RAYBURN) would have become Acting President.

This nightmare vision of a might-have-been furnishes another reason for such electoral reform as the Lodge-Gossett-Kefauver bill proposes.

DAMAGE FROM FLOODS IN BERKSHIRE COUNTY, MASS.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in Berkshire County, Mass., which is the county at the extreme western end of the State, there were very serious floods on December 31, 1948. These floods underline the need for farsighted action and planning to prevent the recurrence of such disasters in the future. They also point to the need for immediate help in every possible way. Because of the importance of this matter, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a statement published by the County Commissioners of Berkshire County descriptive of the harm which was done.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
OFFICE OF THE BERKSHIRE COUNTY COMMISSIONERS.

Estimated municipal damage caused by the flood in Berkshire County on December 31, 1948. These figures were submitted to the Berkshire County commissioners by the selectmen or road commissioner for each town and by the mayor or commissioner of public works for each city in the county, and they do not include private damage.

Town or city	Roads	Bridges	Other	Total
Adams	$17,000	$2,000	$11,000	$30,000
Alford	6,000	300	500	6,800
Becket	3,080		1,000	4,080
Cheshire	4,250			4,250
Clarksburg	3,000	600	1,400	5,000
Dalton	2,000	3,000		5,000
Egremont	6,000	200		6,200
Florida	14,150		85,000	99,150
Great Barrington	10,000	550,000	45,000	605,000
Hancock	6,350	15,000	6,500	27,850
Hinsdale	5,000	1,000		6,000
Lanesborough	7,925			7,925
Lee	14,900	3,000	151,000	168,900
Lenox	15,000	151,000		166,000
Monterey	4,950			4,950
Mount Washington	4,000			4,000
New Ashford	1,350			1,350
New Marlborough	4,500	15,000		19,500
North Adams	140,000	450,000	630,000	1,220,000
Otis	5,000	200	1,000	6,200
Peru	5,000			5,000
Pittsfield	5,000	80,000	15,000	100,000
Richmond	5,000			5,000
Sandisfield	6,063	250		6,313
Savoy	4,300		600	4,900
Sheffield	15,000	50,000		65,000
Stockbridge	17,500	200	1,750	19,450
Tyringham	8,250	1,000		9,250
Washington	1,150			1,150
West Stockbridge	12,000	5,000		17,000
Williamstown	70,000	63,500	28,000	161,500
Windsor	2,500	2,000		4,500
Total	427,418	1,393,250	977,750	2,798,418

IMPROVEMENTS IN ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION OF THE GOVERNMENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 42)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives.)

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON THE STATE OF FINANCES

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, his annual report on the state of the finances, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

GENERAL SUPPLY FUND OF BUREAU OF FEDERAL SUPPLY

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the more economical operation of the general supply fund of the Bureau of Federal Supply, Department of the Treasury, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

AUDIT REPORT OF DEFENSE HOMES CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Defense Homes Corporation, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORT OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the activities of that Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPEAL OF CERTAIN PROVISION OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT OF 1948

A letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal a provision of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 requiring certain expenditures in the fiscal year 1949 to be considered as expended during the fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the quarterly report of that Commission on its activities and transactions under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, for the period October 1 through December 31, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF WAGE AND HOUR AND PUBLIC CONTRACTS DIVISIONS

A letter from the Administrator of the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of those Divisions for the year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

CREATION OF POSITIONS IN CERTAIN HEADQUARTERS OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

A letter from the Chairman of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the creation of 10 professional and scientific positions in the headquarters and research stations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT OF CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the vice president and comptroller of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that company for the calendar year 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS

The following petitions were presented, and referred, as indicated:

By Mr. MAYBANK:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation equalizing the differential for the marketing of tobacco under the grading and tieing system

"Whereas the tobacco markets in the State of South Carolina are losing approximately 90,000,000 to 12,000,000 pounds of tobacco each year by reason of the fact that the system of grading and tieing is required in this State, while in the adjoining State of Georgia tobacco is sold ungraded and untied; and

"Whereas the differential of 4 cents per pound provided in this State is not sufficient to equalize the cost of labor and the loss of 5 to 10 percent in weight incurred in marketing tobacco under the grading and tieing system: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States of America is memorialized to enact legislation which will either increase the differential provided for the marketing of tobacco under the grading and tieing system from 4 cents to 10 cents per pound or require the acceptance of ungraded and untied tobacco by the flue-cured tobacco stabilization corporation in this State during the times in which the tobacco markets in the State of Georgia are open, to the end that the inequities accruing by the system of marketing tobacco in South Carolina under the grading and tieing system will be met; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each of the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives from South Carolina in the Congress of the United States of America."

By Mr. BUTLER:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Legislative Resolution 2

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States with respect to a national compulsory sickness insurance program

"Whereas the American people now enjoy the highest level of health, the best standards of scientific medical care, and the finest medical institutions ever attained by any major country in the world; and

"Whereas these accomplishments of American medicine are the results of a free people working under a system of free enterprise; and

"Whereas the experience of all countries where government has assumed control of medical care has been a progressive deterioration of medical standards and medical care, to the detriment of the health of the people: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in sixty-first session assembled:*

"1. That the Legislature of the State of Nebraska respectfully request the Congress of the United States to refrain from imposing upon the citizens of this Nation any form of compulsory insurance or any system of medical care designed for national bureaucratic control.

"2. That Nebraska Senators and Representatives now in the Congress of the United States be, and are hereby, respectfully requested to use every effort at their command to prevent the enactment of such legislation.

"3. That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to the President of the United States, the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate, the United States House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Congressman from Nebraska."

REPORT OF INVESTIGATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (S. REPT. NO. 5)

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I submit the First Annual Report of the Investigations Subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. This report summarizes the work of the Investigations Subcommittee since its organization on March 1, 1948.

This subcommittee, of which I had the privilege of acting as chairman, conducted a number of investigations which have resulted in financial savings in the executive branch of the Government, and have effected greater efficiency in several of the executive branches. I do not now intend to take up the time of the Senate discussing in detail the work of the subcommittee, because I believe that the record speaks for itself. However, I should like to mention one or two special cases in passing. As a result of the work of this subcommittee and its predecessor, the Special Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program, the Air Force has completely revised and streamlined its investigative procedures. This single action on the part of the Air Force will undoubtedly make for greater efficiency and savings in that important branch of our armed services and should go a long way to prevent the recurrence of cases similar to that involving former Maj. Gen. Bennett E. Meyers. In another case, involving the use of public storage facilities by the Government Printing Office in Baltimore, Md., it is estimated that the investigation by the subcommittee resulted in an annual saving to the Government of approximately $75,000 a year. This saving resulted from the fact that after our investigation started the Government Printing Office reviewed its storage requirements in the city of Baltimore and made substantial reductions in the amount of space being rented in that city.

Mr. President, the subcommittee also conducted several other investigations and submitted reports to the Senate in the following cases:

First. The investigation of the Federal employees' loyalty program.

Second. The administration of export controls.

Third. The conduct of the Ilse Koch war crimes trial.

Fourth. The Voice of America, which was a joint report with the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

There is little doubt that each of these investigations resulted in pointing out and correcting deficiencies in our Government.

Mr. President, as retiring chairman of the subcommittee, I wish to state here on the floor of the Senate that the success which this investigating subcommittee has enjoyed is attributable to the time and effort which the members and staff of the committee have devoted to the work. On several occasions various committee members came back to Washington during the recess period in order to take part in our investigations and they have spent many long hours examining the facts in the various cases presented to us and in taking testimony from the many witnesses who appeared in our public and executive hearings. Our staff, under the direction of its chief counsel, Mr. William P. Rogers, has done an excellent job. The subcommittee has been fortunate in having on its staff a number of men and women of wide training and experience in the investigative field. I believe that all the committee members of both parties will agree with me that our staff has always performed its tasks in an outstanding and bipartisan manner.

I regret that because of other committee assignments I will not be associated with the subcommittee in the Eighty-first Congress. But I wish to emphasize, as does this first annual report, the importance of the investigative function of the Congress. As the report states, and I reiterate:

The mere existence of an active congressional investigating committee has had a pronounced salutary effect on the executive departments. Employees and officials of executive agencies tend to give more thoughtful consideration to their decisions when they realize that Congress is in a position to call them to answer for their actions.

Mr. President, I sincerely believe that the continued existence of a fair-minded, progressive investigating subcommittee in the Congress is in the public interest.

Before I entirely dissociate myself with the investigating subcommittee I wish to point out one more important matter discussed in this first annual report, that is, the matter of the rules of procedure which were adopted and uniformly followed by the subcommittee. I believe, and I have always believed, it to be a fundamental matter of great importance that the proceedings of congressional investigating groups be conducted fairly and judiciously. Although I did not entirely agree with all the rules of procedure adopted by this subcommittee, as they are set out in the report, I have followed these rules as have the other members of the committee in the belief that it is necessary to protect the rights of individuals and the rights of the public in the conduct of congressional investigations. To my knowledge this is the first congressional investigating group which has ever adopted and followed such an elaborate set of rules, and to my knowledge this is the first time that such rules have been published publicly.

Mr. President, in view of the widespread discussion, both publicly and in the Halls of Congress, concerning rules of procedure for investigating committees, I believe that every Member of this body would do well to study and examine carefully the procedural rules which have been adopted by the subcommittee. These rules were adopted after careful study for the purpose of giving individuals under investigation every reasonable protection against unfair treatment or unjust defamation, without impairing or curtailing the traditional investigatory powers of Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

CONVENTION CONCERNING STATISTICS OF WAGES AND HOURS OF WORK IN PRINCIPAL MINING AND MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate remove the ban of

secrecy with regard to the convention concerning statistics of wages and hours of work in the principal mining and manufacturing industries, including building and construction, and in agriculture, Executive G, Eighty-first Congress, first session, which was sent to the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the ban of secrecy is removed from the convention, and the convention, together with the President's message of transmittal, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; and the President's message will be printed in the RECORD.

The President's message is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith an authenticated copy of the text of a convention concerning statistics of wages and hours of work in the principal mining and manufacturing industries, including building and construction, and in agriculture (No. 63), adopted by the International Labor Conference at its twenty-fourth session held at Geneva June 2–22, 1938.

This is the same convention which was transmitted to the Senate with the message of the President of April 24, 1939, with a recommendation favorable to ratification. As the Senate did not find it possible to take action with respect to the convention during the war, I informed the Senate of my desire to withdraw it for further study and consideration in the light of developments since 1939, and on April 17, 1947, the Senate directed that the convention be returned to me.

A fresh appraisal has been made of the provisions of the convention, and the Departments of State, Labor, and Agriculture have indicated that in their opinion the convention should be ratified. In this connection, I transmit herewith the report on the convention made to me by the Acting Secretary of State and copies of communications from the Secretary of Labor and the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture with regard to the convention.

In view of the desirability of furthering international efforts to assure the development of uniform statistics relating to basic enterprises, I request that the Senate give its advice and consent to ratification of this convention, subject to the understanding that, in accordance with the provisions of article 23 thereof, the convention shall apply only to the continental United States.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 17, 1949.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report of the Acting Secretary of State; 2. Authenticated copy of text of convention No. 63; 3. Letter from Secretary of Labor, copy; 4. Letter from Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, copy.)

NOMINATION OF DEAN G. ACHESON TO BE SECRETARY OF STATE—EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (EX. REPT. NO. 1)

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably the nomination of Dean G. Acheson, of Maryland, to be Secretary of State, and I submit a report thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and the nomination will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the able Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has just reported the nomination of Mr. Dean Acheson to be Secretary of State. May I ask him, for the information of the Senate, to indicate when he intends to have this nomination taken up on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, because of the fact that we are anxious to prevent any interregnum between the outgoing of Secretary Marshall and the assumption of the office by the new Secretary, it had been my purpose to ask that the Senate consider the nomination tomorrow.

Mr. VANDENBERG. May I ask the Senator from Kentucky if that is the prospect?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes, it is my purpose to move, when the Senate concludes its business today, that it adjourn until tomorrow.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. Has the Senator from Michigan any objection?

Mr. VANDENBERG. No; that is perfectly satisfactory.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 499. A bill for the relief of Edward Woolf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 500. A bill relating to the application of section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code to prisoners of war and others in the Philippines during the Japanese occupation; and

S. 501. A bill repealing section 202 (e) of the Sugar Act of 1948; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 502. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth and Lawrence Wong;

S. 503. A bill for the relief of Solly Manasse;

S. 504. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Petrita P. Chavez;

S. 505. A bill for the relief of Fred S. Tutton;

S. 506. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clara Gallegos; and

S. 507. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lorraine Malone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 508. A bill for the relief of Grace L. Elser; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 509. A bill to provide for the advancement of Commissioned Warrant Officer Chester A. Davis, United States Marine Corps (retired), to the rank of lieutenant colonel on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 510. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 with respect to the eligibility for appointment in the executive branch of the Government of former professional staff members of committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 511. A bill for the relief of Eugene Kahan, Gizella Kahan, and Marianna Maria Racz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 512. A bill to provide for payment to certain public school districts in the State of Nebraska of amounts owed by the United States under contracts for the education of Indian pupils; and

S. 513. A bill to establish the position of Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, and to give such Resident Commissioner and the Delegates from Alaska and Hawaii the right to vote in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 514. A bill to clarify the definition of partnership for Federal income tax purposes;

S. 515. A bill to amend the excise tax on photographic apparatus;

S. 516. A bill to amend the excise tax on toilet preparations;

S. 517. A bill to exempt admissions to agricultural fairs from taxation; and

S. 518. A bill to authorize the deduction from income of expenses of leveling farm lands; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BRIDGES (for himself and Mr. BYRD):

S. 519. A bill to limit the United States contributions to international organizations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 520. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Leo Farwell Glenn, a Crow allottee, a patent in fee to certain lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 521. A bill to increase the period of validity of passports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. CORDON, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MALONE, Mr. KEFAUVER, and Mr. KNOWLAND) introduced Senate bill 522, to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize assistance to States and political subdivisions in the development and maintenance of local public health units, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TAYLOR:

S. 523. A bill for the relief of Jesus Llona Mencheca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. TAYLOR also introduced Senate bill 524, authorizing the construction of certain works of improvement at Bonners Ferry, Idaho, in the interest of flood control and allied purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. HILL):

S. 525. A bill to remove restrictions upon loans by Federal agencies to finance the construction of certain public works; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(Mr. MCCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. HOEY, and Mr. O'CONOR) introduced Senate bill 526, to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MCCARRAN:

S. 527. A bill to provide general rules of practice and procedure before Federal agencies; and

S. 528. A bill to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 so as to authorize the payment of fair compensation to persons contracting to deliver certain strategic or critical minerals or metals in cases of failure to recover reasonable costs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. BARKLEY (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CAIN, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. HILL, Mr. JENNER, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. GREEN) introduced Senate bill 529, to promote maximum employment, business opportunities, and careers in a free competitive economy, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 530. A bill to amend section 801 (d) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, in relation to exports; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 531. A bill for the relief of Pittsburgh DuBois Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 532. A bill to provide for the temporary free importation of zinc; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 533. A bill to provide for the settlement of certain parts of Alaska by war veterans; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 534 (by request). A bill to amend the act of February 19, 1941, as amended, so as to establish a women's reserve as a branch of the Coast Guard Reserve;

S. 535 (by request). A bill to amend the act of July 23, 1947 (61 Stat. 409); and

S. 536 (by request). A bill to require that the congressional committees having jurisdiction over the Coast Guard be notified before any Coast Guard installation is discontinued, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. MCCARTHY):

S. 537. A bill to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false advertising, and false invoicing of fur products and furs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(Mr. WILEY introduced Senate bill 538, to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to support the price of milk at not less than 90 percent of parity, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. O'CONOR:

S. 539. A bill to amend section 498 (a) (1) of the Tariff Act of 1930 to increase from $100 to $250 the value of merchandise with respect to which the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to prescribe regulations relating to declaration and entry; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 540. A bill to reestablish and extend certain rights granted by Public Law 690, Seventy-ninth Congress, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 541. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, with respect to clerks in air-mail field railway post offices; and

S. 542. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, relating to the compensation of employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(Mr. O'CONOR also introduced Senate bill 543, to provide for United States flag shipping participation in Government-financed cargoes, which was referred to the Committe on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE:

S 544. A bill to further amend section 302 (c) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended by section 202 (a) of the Agricultural Act of 1948; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 545. A bill to provide for Federal participation in rights-of-way and other costs in connection with the authorized local flood protection project on Amazon Creek at and in the vicinity of Eugene, Oreg.; to the Committee on Public Works.

FEDERAL FUNDS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF LOCAL PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill authorizing the appropriation of Federal funds to assist the States in improving and expanding their local public health services. Most Americans today take for granted their local health departments, unaware of the shocking deficiencies in health protection which result each year in 200,000 needless deaths, in sickness, poor health, and tremendous economic loss.

They do not know that less than 10,000,000 of our 146,000,000 people have professional, full-time health departments to guard their water, milk, and meat supplies from contamination, to supervise disposal of sewage and garbage and control communicable diseases.

Forty million Americans lack the basic protection of full-time health departments. Another 85,000,000 have only the dubious protection of understaffed health offices.

Disease-carrying flies, mosquitoes, and rats cannot be quarantined. The germs in today's garbage can be on your lunch tomorrow.

Public health is too often the forlorn stepchild among governmental services. Public health departments are too often pushed off into courthouse basements or attics, in abandoned schoolhouses, or old-fashioned dwellings. Only one-tenth of the local health departments in the United States have facilities for carrying on a reasonably adequate public health program.

Health departments are desperate for trained, competent workers. Miserably low salaries are driving them into other jobs. There has been a 75-percent turnover among State health officers alone during the past 6 years.

The bill we are introducing, in providing Federal funds in aid to the States, would take a long step toward helping to get enough trained doctors, nurses, and technicians into the local and county health departments to carry on the great fight of preventive medicine against tuberculosis, syphilis, malaria, typhoid and undulant fever, hookworm, pellagra, infantile paralysis, dental caries, and the epidemic diseases.

The bill would help provide health examinations for our children at the all-important preschool age, when so many physical defects can be discovered and corrected.

The bill, which gives aid on the basis of need, fully protects State control and administration of health programs and has the endorsement of the State and Territorial Health Officers Association, the American Public Health Association, and the American Medical Association. The bill is sponsored by some 30,000 chapters and 5,000,000 members of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers.

In urging the bill Mrs. L. W. Hughes, PTA president, recently declared:

> This Nation is looked up to for its preeminence in medicine, sanitation, and cleanliness. Yet so long as millions of our people live under primitive public health conditions we must bow our heads in shame.

America has produced wondrous new drugs, equipment, and methods for mending and healing the human body. Yet we neglect to take the basic precautions of preventive medicine through adequate public health services. We must stop thinking of health so much in terms of remedies and cures, and begin thinking primarily in terms of prevention.

Benjamin Franklin said nearly 200 years ago that "public health is public wealth."

This bill will help America preserve her greatest resource—the health of her people—now being wasted by the pennywise denial of adequate support for public health services.

The bill (S. 522) to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize assistance to States and political subdivisions in the development and maintenance of local public health units, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. CORDON, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MALONE, Mr. KEFAUVER, and Mr. KNOWLAND), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN WORKS AT BONNERS FERRY, IDAHO

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the construction of certain works at Bonners Ferry, Idaho, in the interest of flood control and allied purposes.

Last year we suffered a very bad flood in Idaho, and this year there is a heavy snowfall, and unless action is taken, I am afraid it will result in the necessity for the expenditure of much more money than if we lock the stable before the horse goes out.

The bill (S. 524) authorizing the construction of certain works of improvement at Bonners Ferry, Idaho, in the interest of flood control and allied purposes, introduced by Mr. TAYLOR, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and myself I introduce for appropriate reference a

bill to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes, in line with the message from the President just read. If enacted, the bill would be designated the "Reorganization Act of 1949."

The purpose of the bill is to increase efficiency and economy by reducing the number of Government agencies, eliminating duplication and overlapping, and obtaining better organization of the Government.

The bill carries out the recommendations made to the Congress by the President in the message which was read a few moments ago, as well as the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, in accordance with the letter submitted by the chairman of that Commission, former President Herbert Hoover, which was incorporated in the RECORD last week.

Both the President and the Commission have advised Congress that a simplified method of reorganization similar to that formerly authorized by the Reorganization Acts of 1939 and 1945 is essential for the substantial improvement in organization of the Government. This bill generally resembles the Reorganization Act of 1945, which became inoperative on April 1, 1948, but it is broader in scope, and is intended to be permanent rather than temporary legislation.

The bill empowers the President to submit reorganization plans which become effective after 60 days unless rejected by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress.

Mr. President, I shall not at this time go into any further detail regarding the bill, but I should like to announce that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments will schedule hearings on the measure at an early date, and we shall undertake to hear, of course, those who are interested in the legislation, especially Members of the Senate who would like to be heard on it.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the bill as introduced, together with a statement indicating that part of the Reorganization Act of 1945 which has been eliminated from the bill. It also indicates new provisions included in the measure I am presenting which were not in the 1945 act.

I do this so that Members of the Senate may easily ascertain, by reading this material, what the differences are, better to enable them to prepare any testimony they may wish to present.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill, together with the statement by the Senator from Arkansas, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 526) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MCCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. HOEY, and Mr. O'CONOR) was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

TITLE I

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "Reorganization Act of 1949."

NEED FOR REORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 2. (a) The President shall examine and from time to time reexamine the organization of all agencies of the Government and shall determine what changes therein are necessary to accomplish the following purposes:

(1) to promote the better execution of the laws, the more effective management of the executive branch of the Government and of its agencies and functions, and the expeditious administration of the public business;

(2) to reduce expenditures and promote economy, to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government;

(3) to increase the efficiency of the operations of the Government to the fullest extent practicable;

(4) to group, coordinate, and consolidate agencies and functions of the Government, as nearly as may be, according to major purposes;

(5) to reduce the number of agencies by consolidating those having similar functions under a single head, and to abolish such agencies or functions thereof as may not be necessary for the efficient conduct of the Government; and

(6) to eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort.

(b) The Congress declares that the public interest demands the carrying out of the purposes specified in subsection (a) and that such purposes may be accomplished in great measure by proceeding under the provisions of this act, and can be accomplished more speedily thereby than by the enactment of specific legislation.

REORGANIZATION PLANS

SEC. 3. Whenever the President, after investigation, finds that—

(1) the transfer of the whole or any part of any agency, or of the whole or any part of the functions thereof, to the jurisdiction and control of any other agency; or

(2) the abolition of all or any part of the functions of any agency; or

(3) the consolidation or coordination of the whole or any part of any agency, or of the whole or any part of the functions thereof, with the whole or any part of any other agency or the functions thereof; or

(4) the consolidation or coordination of any part of any agency or the functions thereof with any other part of the same agency or the functions thereof; or

(5) the authorization of any officer to delegate any of his functions; or

(6) the abolition of the whole or any part of any agency which agency or part does not have, or upon the taking effect of the reorganization plan will not have, any functions, is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 2 (a), he shall prepare a reorganization plan for the making of the reorganizations as to which he has made findings and which he includes in the plan, and transmit such plan (bearing an identifying number) to the Congress, together with a declaration that, with respect to each reorganization included in the plan, he has found that such reorganization is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 2 (a). The delivery to both Houses shall be on the same day and shall be made to each House while it is in session. The President, in his message transmitting a reorganization plan, shall specify with respect to each abolition of a function included in the plan the statutory authority for the exercise of such function.

OTHER CONTENTS OF PLANS

SEC. 4. Any reorganization plan transmitted by the President under section 3—

(1) shall change, in such cases as he deems necessary, the name of any agency affected by a reorganization, and the title of its head; and shall designate the name of any agency resulting from a reorganization and the title of its head;

(2) may include provisions for the appointment and compensation of the head and one or more other officers of any agency (including an agency resulting from a consolidation or other type of reorganization) if the President finds, and in his message transmitting the plan declares, that by reason of a reorganization made by the plan such provisions are necessary. The head so provided for may be an individual or may be a commission or board with two or more members. In the case of any such appointment the term of office shall not be fixed at more than 4 years, the compensation shall not be at a rate in excess of that found by the President to prevail in respect of comparable officers in the executive branch, and, if the appointment is not under the classified civil service, it shall be by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

(3) shall make provision for the transfer or other disposition of the records, property, and personnel affected by any reorganization;

(4) shall make provision for the transfer of such unexpended balances of appropriations, and of other funds, available for use in connection with any function or agency affected by a reorganization, as he deems necessary by reason of the reorganization for use in connection with the functions affected by the reorganization, or for the use of the agency which shall have such functions after the reorganization plan is effective, but such unexpended balances so transferred shall be used only for the purposes for which such appropriation was originally made;

(5) shall make provision for winding up the affairs of any agency abolished.

LIMITATIONS ON POWERS WITH RESPECT TO REORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 5. No reorganization plan shall provide for, and no reorganization under this act shall have the effect of—

(1) abolishing or transferring an executive department or all the functions thereof or consolidating any two or more executive departments or all the functions thereof; or

(2) continuing any agency beyond the period authorized by law for its existence or beyond the time when it would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made; or

(3) continuing any function beyond the period authorized by law for its exercise, or beyond the time when it would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made; or

(4) authorizing any agency to exercise any function which is not expressly authorized by law at the time the plan is transmitted to the Congress; or

(5) increasing the term of any office beyond that provided by law for such office; or

(6) transferring to or consolidating with any other agency the municipal government of the District of Columbia or all those functions thereof which are subject to this act, or abolishing said government or all said functions.

TAKING EFFECT OF REORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 6. (a) Except as may be otherwise provided pursuant to subsection (c) of this section, the provisions of the reorganization

plan shall take effect upon the expiration of the first period of 60 calendar days, of continuous session of the Congress, following the date on which the plan is transmitted to it; but only if, between the date of transmittal and the expiration of such 60-day period there has not been passed by the two Houses a concurrent resolution stating in substance that the Congress does not favor the reorganization plan.

(b) For the purposes of subsection (a)—

(1) continuity of session shall be considered as broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die; but

(2) in the computation of the 60-day period there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain; except that if a resolution (as defined in section 202) with respect to such reorganization plan has been passed by one House and sent to the other, no exclusion under this paragraph shall be made by reason of adjournments of the first House taken thereafter.

(c) Any provision of the plan may, under provisions contained in the plan, be made operative at a time later than the date on which the plan shall otherwise take effect.

DEFINITION OF "AGENCY"

SEC. 7. When used in this act, the term "agency" means any executive department, commission, council, independent establishment, Government corporation, board, bureau, division, service, office, officer, authority, administration, or other establishment, in the executive branch of the Government, and means also any and all parts of the municipal government of the District of Columbia except the courts thereof. Such term does not include the Comptroller General of the United States or the General Accounting Office, which are a part of the legislative branch of the Government.

MATTERS DEEMED TO BE REORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 8. For the purposes of this act the term "reorganization" means any transfer, consolidation, coordination, authorization, or abolition, referred to in section 3.

SAVING PROVISIONS

SEC. 9. (a) (1) Any statute enacted, and any regulation or other action made, prescribed, issued, granted, or performed in respect of or by any agency or function affected by a reorganization under the provisions of this act, before the effective date of such reorganization, shall, except to the extent rescinded, modified, superseded, or made inapplicable by or under authority of law or by the abolition of a function, have the same effect as if such reorganization had not been made; but where any such statute, regulation, or other action has vested the function in the agency from which it is removed under the plan, such function shall, insofar as it is to be exercised after the plan becomes effective, be considered as vested in the agency under which the function is placed by the plan.

(2) As used in paragraph (1) of this subsection the term "regulation or other action" means any regulation, rule, order, policy, determination, directive, authorization, permit, privilege, requirement, designation, or other action.

(b) No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against the head of any agency or other officer of the United States, in his official capacity or in relation to the discharge of his official duties, shall abate by reason of the taking effect of any reorganization plan under the provisions of this act, but the court may, on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within 12 months after such reorganization plan takes effect, showing a necessity for a survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain a settlement of the questions involved, allow the same to be maintained by or against the successor of such head or officer under the reorganization effected by such plan or, if there be no such successor, against such agency or officer as the President shall designate.

UNEXPENDED APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 10. The appropriations or portions of appropriations unexpended by reason of the operation of this act shall not be used for any purpose, but shall be impounded and returned to the Treasury.

PRINTING OF REORGANIZATION PLANS

SEC. 11. Each reorganization plan which shall take effect shall be printed in the Statutes at Large in the same volume as the public laws, and shall be printed in the Federal Register.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The following sections of this title are enacted by the Congress:

(a) As an exercise of the rule-making power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in such House in the case of resolutions (as defined in sec. 202); and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(b) With full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

SEC. 202. As used in this title, the term "resolution" means only a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: "That the Congress does not favor the reorganization plan numbered transmitted to Congress by the President on , 19 ", the blank spaces therein being appropriately filled; and does not include a concurrent resolution which specifies more than one reorganization plan.

SEC. 203. A resolution with respect to a reorganization plan shall be referred to a committee (and all resolutions with respect to the same plan shall be referred to the same committee) by the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House of Representatives, as the case may be.

SEC. 204. (a) If the committee to which has been referred a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan has not reported it before the expiration of 10 calendar days after its introduction (or, in the case of a resolution received from the other House, 10 calendar days after its receipt), it shall then (but not before) be in order to move either to discharge the committee from further consideration of such resolution, or to discharge the committee from further consideration of any other resolution with respect to such reorganization plan which has been referred to the committee.

(b) Such motion may be made only by a person favoring the resolution, shall be highly privileged (except that it may not be made after the committee has reported a resolution with respect to the same reorganization plan), and debate thereon shall be limited to not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. No amendment to such motion shall be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which such motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

(c) If the motion to discharge is agreed to or disagreed to, such motion may not be renewed, nor may another motion to discharge the committee be made with respect to any other resolution with respect to the same reorganization plan.

SEC. 205. (a) When the committee has reported, or has been discharged from further consideration of, a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan, it shall at any time thereafter be in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of such resolution. Such motion shall be highly privileged and shall not be debatable. No amendment to such motion shall be in order and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which such motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

(b) Debate on the resolution shall be limited to not to exceed 10 hours, which shall be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. A motion further to limit debate shall not be debatable. No amendment to, or motion to recommit, the resolution shall be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution is agreed to or disagreed to.

SEC. 206. (a) All motions to postpone made with respect to the discharge from committee, or the consideration of, a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan, and all motions to proceed to the consideration of other business, shall be decided without debate.

(b) All appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan shall be decided without debate.

SEC. 207. If, prior to the passage by one House of a resolution of that House with respect to a reorganization plan, such House receives from the other House a resolution with respect to the same plan, then—

(a) If no resolution of the first House with respect to such plan has been referred to committee, no other resolution with respect to the same plan may be reported or (despite the provisions of sec. 204 (a)) be made the subject of a motion to discharge.

(b) If a resolution of the first House with respect to such plan has been referred to committee—

(1) the procedure with respect to that or other resolutions of such House with respect to such plan which have been referred to committee shall be the same as if no resolution from the other House with respect to such plan had been received; but

(2) on any vote on final passage of a resolution of the first House with respect to such plan the resolution from the other House with respect to such plan shall be automatically substituted for the resolution of the first House.

The statement presented by Mr. MCCLELLAN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCCLELLAN

DRAFT OF BILL ON EXECUTIVE REORGANIZATION

There is shown below a comparison between the text of the Reorganization Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 613) and the currently proposed draft bill (S. 526) on executive reorganization. The black bracketed text was included in the 1945 act but is not retained in the current bill; and the italic text is included in the new bill but was not included in the 1945 act.

By Senator MCCLELLAN (for himself and on behalf of Senators EASTLAND, HOEY, MCCARTHY, and O'CONOR):

"A bill (S. 526) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes

"*Be it enacted, etc.*—

"TITLE I

"SHORT TITLE

"SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the 'Reorganization Act of [1945.'] *1949.*'

"NEED FOR REORGANIZATIONS

"SEC. 2. (a) The President shall examine and from time to time reexamine the organization of all agencies of the Government

and shall determine what changes therein are necessary to accomplish the following purposes:

"(1) to [facilitate orderly transition from war to peace;] *promote the better execution of the laws, the more effective management of the executive branch of the Government and of its agencies and functions, and the expeditious administration of the public business;*

"(2) to reduce expenditures and promote economy to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government;

"(3) to increase the efficiency of the operations of the Government to the fullest extent practicable [within the revenues];

"(4) to group, coordinate, and consolidate agencies and functions of the Government, as nearly as may be, according to major purposes;

"(5) to reduce the number of agencies by consolidating those having similar functions under a single head, and to abolish such agencies or functions thereof as may not be necessary for the efficient conduct of the Government; and

"(6) to eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort.

"(b) The Congress declares that the public interest demands the carrying out of the purposes specified in subsection (a) and that such purposes may be accomplished in great measure by proceeding under the provisions of this act, and can be accomplished more speedily thereby than by the enactment of specific legislation.

"[(c) It is the expectation of the Congress that the transfers, consolidations, coordinations, and abolitions under this act shall accomplish an over-all reduction of at least 25 percent in the administrative costs of the agency or agencies affected.]

"REORGANIZATION PLANS

"SEC. 3. Whenever the President, after investigation, finds that—

"(1) the transfer of the whole or any part of any agency, or of the whole or any part of the functions thereof, to the jurisdiction and control of any other agency; or

"(2) the abolition of all or any part of the functions of any agency; or

"(3) the consolidation or coordination of the whole or any part of any agency, or of the whole or any part of the functions thereof, with the whole or any part of any other agency or the functions thereof; or

"(4) the consolidation or coordination of any part of any agency or the functions thereof with any other part of the same agency or the functions thereof; or

"(5) *the authorization of any officer to delegate any of his functions;* or

"(6) the abolition of the whole or any part of any agency which agency or part does not have, or upon the taking effect of the [reorganizations specified in the] reorganization plan will not have, any functions,

is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 2 (a), he shall prepare a reorganization plan for the making of the [transfers, consolidations, coordinations, and abolitions,] *reorganizations* as to which he has made findings and which he includes in the plan, and transmit such plan (bearing an identifying number) to the Congress, together with a declaration that, with respect to each [transfer, consolidation, coordination, or abolition referred to in paragraph (1), (2), (3), (4), or (5) of this section and specified] *reorganization included* in the plan, he has found that such [transfer, consolidation, coordination, or abolition] *reorganization* is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 2 (a). The delivery to both Houses shall be on the same day and shall be made to each House while it is in session. The President, in his message transmitting a reorganization plan, shall specify with respect to each abolition of a function [specified] *included* in the plan the statutory authority for the exercise of such function.

"OTHER CONTENTS OF PLANS

"SEC. 4. Any reorganization plan transmitted by the President under section 3—

"(1) shall change, in such cases as he deems necessary, the name of any agency affected by a reorganization, and the title of its head; and shall designate the name of any agency resulting from a reorganization and the title of its head;

"(2) may include provisions for the appointment and compensation of the head and one or more [assistant heads] *other officers* of any agency (including an agency resulting from a consolidation or *other type of reorganization*) if the President finds, and in his message transmitting the plan declares, that by reason of [transfers, consolidations, and coordinations made by the plan, the responsibilities and duties of such head are of such nature as to require such action] *a reorganization made by the plan such provisions are necessary.* The head so provided for may be an individual or may be a commission or board with two or more members. In the case of any such appointment the term of office shall not be fixed at more than 4 years, the compensation shall not be at a rate in excess of [$10,000 per annum,] *that found by the President to prevail in respect of comparable officers in the executive branch,* and, if the appointment is not under the classified civil service, it shall be by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

"(3) shall make provision for the transfer or other disposition of the records, property, and personnel affected by any [transfer, consolidation, coordination, or abolition] *reorganization;*

"(4) shall make provision for the transfer of such unexpended balances of appropriations, *and of other funds,* available for use in connection with any function or agency [transferred, consolidated, or coordinated,] *affected by a reorganization,* as he deems necessary by reason of the [transfer, consolidation, or coordination] *reorganization* for use in connection with the [transferred, consolidated, or coordinated] functions *affected by the reorganization,* or for the use of the agency [to which the transfer is made,] *which shall have such functions after the reorganization plan is effective,* but such unexpended balances so transferred shall be used only for the purposes for which such appropriation was originally made;

"(5) shall make provision for winding up the affairs of any agency abolished.

"LIMITATIONS ON POWERS WITH RESPECT TO REORGANIZATIONS

"SEC. 5. [(a)] No reorganization plan shall provide for, and no reorganization under this act shall have the effect of—

"(1) abolishing or transferring an executive department or all the functions thereof or [establishing any new executive department; or] *consolidating any two or more executive departments or all the functions thereof;* or

"[(2) changing the name of any executive department or the title of its head, or designating any agency as 'Department' or its head as 'Secretary'; or]

"[(3)] (2) continuing any agency beyond the period authorized by law for its existence or beyond the time when it would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made; or

"[(4)] (3) continuing any function beyond the period authorized by law for its exercise, or beyond the time when it would have terminated [if the reorganization had not been made, or beyond the time when the agency in which it was vested before the reorganization would have terminated] if the reorganization had not been made; or

"[(5)] (4) authorizing any agency to exercise any function which is not expressly authorized by law at the time the plan is transmitted to the Congress; or

"[(6) imposing, in connection with the exercise of any quasi-judicial or quasi-legislative function possessed by an independent agency, any greater limitation upon the exercise of independent judgment and discretion, to the full extent authorized by law, in the carrying out of such function, than existed with respect to the exercise of such function by the agency in which it was vested prior to the taking effect of such reorganization; except that this prohibition shall not prevent the abolition of any such function; or]

"[(7)] (5) increasing the term of any office beyond that provided by law for such office [.] ; *or*

"(6) *transferring to or consolidating with any other agency the municipal government of the District of Columbia or all those functions thereof which are subject to this Act, or abolishing said government or all said functions.*

"[(b) No reorganization plan shall provide for any reorganization affecting any agency named below in this subsection; except that this prohibition shall not apply to the transfer to such agency of the whole or any part of, or the whole or any part of the functions of, any agency not so named. No reorganization contained in any reorganization plan shall take effect if the reorganization plan is in violation of this subsection. The agencies above referred to in this subsection are as follows: Interstate Commerce Commission, Federal Trade Commission, Securities and Exchange Commission, National Mediation Board, National Railroad Adjustment Board, and Railroad Retirement Board.]

"[(c) No reorganization plan shall provide for any reorganization affecting any civil function of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, or of its head, or affecting such Corps or its head with respect to any such civil function. No reorganization contained in any reorganization plan shall take effect if the reorganization plan is in violation of this subsection.]

"[(d) No reorganization plan shall provide for a reorganization affecting any agency named below in this subsection if it also provides for a reorganization which does not affect such agency; except that this prohibition shall not apply to the transfer to such agency of the whole or any part of, or the whole or any part of the functions of, any agency not so named. No reorganization contained in any reorganization plan shall take effect if the reorganization plan is in violation of this subsection. The agencies above referred to in this subsection are as follows: Federal Communications Commission, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, United States Tariff Commission, and Veterans' Administration.]

"[(e) If, since January 1, 1945, Congress has by law established the status of any agency in relation to other agencies or transferred any function to any agency, no reorganization plan shall provide for, and no reorganization under this act shall have the effect of, changing the status of such agency in relation to other agencies or of abolishing any such transferred function or providing for its exercise by or under the supervision of any other agency.]

"[(f) No reorganization specified in a reorganization plan shall take effect unless the plan is transmitted to the Congress before April 1, 1948.]

"TAKING EFFECT OF REORGANIZATIONS

"SEC. 6. (a) [The reorganizations specified in the plan shall take effect in accordance with the plan] *Except as may be otherwise provided pursuant to subsection (c) of this section, the provisions of the reorganization plan shall take effect* upon the expiration of the first period of 60 calendar days, of continuous session of the Congress, following the date on which the plan is transmitted to it; but only if, between the date of transmittal and the expiration of such 60-day period there has not been passed by the two Houses a concurrent resolution stating in substance that the Congress does not favor the reorganization plan.

"(b) For the purposes of subsection (a)—

"(1) continuity of sessions shall be considered as broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die; but

"(2) in the computation of the 60-day period there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain; except that if a resolution (as defined in section 202) with respect to such reorganization plan has been passed by one House and sent to the other, no exclusion under this paragraph shall be made by reason of adjournments of the first House taken thereafter.

"(c) Any provision of the plan may, under provisions contained in the plan, be made operative at a time later than the date on which the plan shall otherwise take effect.

"DEFINITION OF 'AGENCY'

"SEC. 7. When used in this act, the term 'agency' means any executive department, commission, *council,* independent establishment, *Government* corporation [wholly or partly owned by the United States which is an instrumentality of the United States], board, bureau, division, service, office, officer, authority, administration, or other establishment, in the executive branch of the Government [.], *and means also any and all parts of the municipal government of the District of Columbia except the courts thereof.* Such term does not include the Comptroller General of the United States or the General Accounting Office, which are a part of the legislative branch of the Government.

"MATTERS DEEMED TO BE REORGANIZATIONS

"SEC. 8. For the purposes of this act *the term 'reorganization' means* any transfer, consolidation, coordination, [abolition, change, or designation of name or title, disposition, winding up of affairs, or provision for the appointment and compensation of the head or assistant heads of an agency,] *authorization, or abolition,* referred to in section 3. [or 4, shall be deemed a 'reorganization'.]

"SAVING PROVISIONS

"SEC. 9. (a) (1) Any statute enacted, and any regulation or other action made, prescribed, issued, granted, or performed in respect of or by any agency or function [transferred to, or consolidated or coordinated with, any other agency or function] *affected by a reorganization* under the provisions of this act, before the effective date of such [transfer, consolidation, or coordination,] *reorganization,* shall, except to the extent rescinded, modified, superseded, or made inapplicable by or under authority of law *or by the abolition of a function,* have the same effect as if such [transfer, consolidation, or coordination] *reorganization* had not been made; but where any such statute, regulation, or other action has vested [functions] *the function* in the agency from which [the transfer is made] *it is removed* under the plan, such [functions] *function* shall, insofar as [they are] *it is* to be exercised after the [transfer,] *plan becomes effective,* be considered as vested in the agency [to which the transfer is made under the plan,] *under which the function is placed by the plan.*

"(2) As used in paragraph (1) of this subsection the term "regulation or other action" means any regulation, rule, order, policy, determination, directive, authorization, permit, privilege, requirement, designation, or other action.

"(b) No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against the head of any agency or other officer of the United States, in his official capacity or in relation to the discharge of his official duties, shall abate by reason of the taking effect of any reorganization *plan* under the provisions of this act, but the court may, on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within 12 months after such reorganization *plan* takes effect, showing a necessity for a survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain a settlement of the questions involved, allow the same to be maintained by or against the successor of such head or officer under the reorganization [so] effected by *such plan* or, if there be no such successor, against such agency or officer as the President shall designate.

"UNEXPENDED APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 10. The appropriations or portions of appropriations unexpended by reason of the operation of this act shall not be used for any purpose, but shall be impounded and returned to the Treasury.

"PRINTING OF REORGANIZATION PLANS

"SEC. 11. [If the reorganizations specified in a] *Each* reorganization plan *which shall* take effect [, the reorganization plan] shall be printed in the Statutes at Large in the same volume as the public laws, and shall be printed in the Federal Register.

"TITLE II

NOTE.—The text of title II of the currently proposed bill is the same as the text of title II of the Reorganization Act of 1945, approved December 20, 1945, 59 Stat. 613. That title prescribes the procedure by which the two Houses of Congress consider and dispose of reorganization plans.

PROMOTION OF MAXIMUM EMPLOYMENT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill which I and a number of other Senators introduced in the last Congress. It was then Senate bill 1652. The bill is to promote maximum employment, business opportunities, and careers in a free-enterprise country. It has particular reference to the welfare of veterans. I shall not read the names of Senators whose names appear on the bill as sponsors. The names of some Senators who were on the bill in the last Congress also appear on the present bill as sponsors. There are quite a number of sponsors of the present bill who were Members of the last Senate. In addition the names of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] appear on the bill. On behalf of myself and the other Senators who are sponsors of it, I introduce the bill and ask for its appropriate reference.

The bill (S. 529) to promote maximum employment, business opportunities, and careers in a free competitive economy, introduced by Mr. BARKLEY (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CAIN, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. HILL, Mr. JENNER, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. GREEN was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

SUPPORT PRICE OF MILK

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to support the price of milk at not less than 90 percent of parity as the law provides, and I ask that it be appropriately referred. The bill covers all milk, regardless of ultimate use.

The bill (S. 538) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to support the price of milk at not less than 90 percent of parity, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement as to why I am introducing this bill, which, incidentally, is a companion measure to a bill already introduced in the House of Representatives (H. R. 1333) by my able colleague from Wisconsin, Representative REID F. MURRAY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

DECLINE OF MILK PRICES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as everyone who has been following the farm situation knows, milk prices have been gradually falling, and the health of the dairy segment of our economy is in jeopardy. When the agricultural section of our economy becomes impaired, the whole economy feels the impact and is impaired. It is just common sense that we begin to think of our own a little bit, as well as responding to our obligations in relation to our neighbors in foreign lands. We have heard a lot of discussion lately in relation to making sure that we do not go into an economic tailspin. The sort of measure which I am introducing today, if it became law, would stop the tailspinning of a very important section of our economy. While my own State is 50-percent agricultural, the production of milk is the main element in its agricultural program.

But the subject of this bill is not a partisan matter, or just a State-wide or regional matter. It is a subject that calls for earnest consideration by every thinking legislator. Most of the 170,000 dairy farms in my State are relatively small in size. As a consequence, they have not gotten the benefits of large-scale production as have the growers of wheat, for example, in the case of big farms in some other States.

The dairy farmer's income has been increasingly limited, and his lot has been helped only where he has been fortunate enough to have a large family to help him meet the problems of the labor shortage and the high costs of labor. But with the high costs of feed and fertilizer, the high costs of machinery, and other supplies, his net income has been relatively low. Throughout the war years, by working extended hours, he and his wife and children have been able to make a go of it, to purchase high-priced machinery in many instances.

I may say, Mr. President, that when I left Wisconsin last fall I paid $2,600 for a tractor, with a little addition, which in 1939 could have been bought for $900 for my farm. That is a slight indication of what is happening.

I may divert from my prepared remarks for a moment to say that, in relation to the general price of milk in Wisconsin, the farmer is getting about 7 cents a quart, but, of course, the consumer is paying anywhere from 19 to 21 cents for the same milk. The people of the United States were sold a bill of goods in the last campaign, particularly when a certain

group tried to make out that the farmer was getting the big end of the deal. The very milk which is produced and sold at a little over 7 cents a quart, in less than 2 or 3 hours reaches the housewife, and the price then is from 19 to 21 cents a quart.

During the war years, about which I have been speaking, we have seen a depletion in the soil on the farm and a depreciation in the farmers' houses and barns and sheds. They have deteriorated because the farmers have not been able to keep them up, first, because it was not possible to get the labor necessary; second, the farmer could not get the material; and, third, he did not have the time to do the necessary work. So, if farming is to continue, the farmer must have sufficient income to meet the costs entailed in rebuilding his soil and repairing his home. Otherwise there will be a continued exodus from the farms, with the result which may be expected.

As I have said, in my own State 50 percent of the income of the commonwealth depends upon agriculture. The economic life of the villages and cities depends upon the purchasing power of the farmers, and if we permit the condition of the farms to deteriorate, we will reap the whirlwind.

DANGERS OF DROP IN FARM INCOME

If aid cannot be given the farmers, it will be found that the milk-cow herds will gradually be reduced further in numbers, and with that reduction will come also further depletion in the soil and further depletion of the beef supply of the Nation. It is not generally known that a large portion of the meat supply of this country comes from these very dairy farms. More than 40 percent of that supply comes from that source. We think of it as coming from the plains of the West, but more than 40 percent comes from these very dairy cows.

Mr. President, let us remember that the dairy industry is the largest single source of farm income. This very industry, the dairy industry, supplies approximately 40 percent of our beef and veal, as well as all our milk. The dairy farmers of America have indicated in no uncertain terms that they are not going to stand idly by and allow their prices to go through the floor, or see the days brought back when they had to dump milk from trucks onto the road because they could not get a fair price for the so-called "surplus milk" they were producing.

Not only the farmers, but the businessmen, tradesmen, professional men, and bankers in villages and in the cities of the States where milk is produced, are clearly concerned over this situation. A threat to the farmer's income is a threat to everyone's income, because he is the greatest buyer and purchaser of the things labor produces. It is imperative, Mr. President, that we do not allow the whittling away of the farmers' income.

The farmer asks no more than the cost of production plus a reasonable profit. He asks no more than fair prices in return for his back-breaking toil. He is entitled to fair prices, and this bill will help assure such prices for him.

I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks a short article from a Wisconsin newspaper, the Arcadia News-Leader, entitled "The Milk Market," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MILK MARKET

The Wisconsin milk market is wavering uncertainly, and farmers and their leaders are angrily worried about it. Last July the average price paid Wisconsin producers for milk going into all uses was $4.43 per hundredweight. In December the price had declined to $3.65. Farmers wondered about the future market, as they studied their production plans and problems for the new year.

From the Pure Milk Products Cooperative, one of the State's largest and most enterprising, came a resentful blast about the price trend. Said W. O. Perdue, of Fond du Lac, cooperative manager: "There is no sound reason for today's low price paid to farmers for manufactured milk. Consumer demands remain firm. National income is still at a record high. * * * It leads us to believe there has been a great harvest for the speculator—at the expense of the farmer."

The cooperative and its members produce largely for the evaporated milk market, which has been shaky of late. Perdue said the cooperative would renew its efforts to obtain a Federal evaporated milk market order under which the producers would have a part in establishing prices.

UNITED STATES FLAG SHIPPING PARTICIPATION IN GOVERNMENT-FINANCED CARGOES

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for a United States flag shipping participation in Government-financed cargoes, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me explaining the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from Maryland will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 543) to provide for United States flag shipping participation in Government-financed cargoes, introduced by Mr. O'CONOR, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONOR RE INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION PROVIDING FOR UNITED STATES FLAG SHIPPING PARTICIPATION IN GOVERNMENT-FINANCED CARGOES

Recently the Administrator for ECA, Mr. Paul G. Hoffman, announced his intention no longer to require that 50 percent of the ECA bulk cargoes be carried on United States flag ships unless such ships are available at competitive rates. I believe that under existing circumstances this action is ill-advised.

The American people are making tremendous sacrifices to supply aid to the countries of western Europe whose economy has been disrupted by the ravages of war. It is essential, of course, that the great sums of money appropriated for this purpose be handled in accordance with good business practices. And unquestionably the Administrator is acting in conformance with the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, which provides that he shall assure, so far as is practicable, that at least 50 percent of the gross tonnage of commodities purchased within the United States out of ECA funds shall be transported on United States flag vessels to the extent such vessels are available at market rates.

While understanding the reasons prompting the Administrator's position, we must not forget that there is even more urgency in the protests that have been raised against ECA's contemplated reduction in shipping in American bottoms. It is of the greatest importance to our country that the American merchant marine be maintained on a level necessary for the conduct of America's business throughout the world. We cannot, in reason, provide funds that will be used to build up the merchant marine of other nations, while American shipping, on which the lifeblood of our country's economy is dependent, is allowed to remain idle.

The argument that it is good business to penalize American shipping because costs are somewhat higher would, if carried out to its logical conclusion, necessitate the passing over of countless American products, because they might be available at lower prices in other countries, where the standard of living is tremendously lower than here, and where costs of production are less.

In a bill which I have introduced in the Senate it is provided that products purchased by the Government or any agency of the Government or through funds or credits allocated for this purpose, i. transported by water, shall be transported on United States flag vessels, at market rates for United States flag vessels, to at least 50 percent of the gross tonnage of such commodities, computed by countries, and separately for dry bulk carriers, dry cargo liner, and tanker services.

The bill further stipulates that this minimum of 50 percent of gross tonnage must be maintained unless the United States Maritime Commission, after investigation, shall certify that United States flag vessels are not available in sufficient numbers or at market rates for United States flag vessels to effectuate the purpose of the act.

It further directs all departments and agencies to cooperate with the Commission through their agreements covering transportation of purchases and requires the Commission to report to the Congress within 90 days after the enactment of the act and every 4 months thereafter the record of shipping covered by this legislation.

HEARINGS BY COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. MAYBANK submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 33), which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the Eighty-first Congress to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SEC. 3. Upon the termination of the special committee, authorized pursuant to Senate Resolution 20, Eightieth Congress, to study the problems of American small business enterprises, the files and records of such committee shall be transferred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HON. F. RYAN DUFFY, TO BE CIRCUIT JUDGE, UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS, SEVENTH CIRCUIT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, January 25, 1949, at 11 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. F. Ryan Duffy, of Wisconsin, to be circuit judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, vice Hon. Evan A. Evans, deceased. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] chairman, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HON. WILSON WARLICK, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, January 25, 1949, at 11 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. Wilson Warlick, of North Carolina, to be United States district judge for the western district of North Carolina, vice Hon. Edwin Y. Webb, retired. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BROUGHTON], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HON. EDWARD ALLEN TAMM, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, January 25, 1949, at 11 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. Edward Allen Tamm, of the District of Columbia, to be United States district judge for the District of Columbia. Judge Tamm is now serving in this post under a recess appointment. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HERBERT W. ERSKINE, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, January 25, 1949, at 11 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Herbert W. Erskine, of California, to be United States district judge for the northern district of California, vice Hon. Adolphus Frederick St. Sure, retired. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HON. ROY W. HARPER TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, EASTERN AND WESTERN DISTRICTS OF MISSOURI

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, January 25, 1949, at 11 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. Roy W. Harper, of Missouri, to be United States district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri. Mr. Harper is now serving under a recess appointment. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF WILLIAM T. McCARTHY TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, January 25, 1949, at 11 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of William T. McCarthy, of Massachusetts, to be United States district judge for the district of Massachusetts, vice Hon. Arthur D. Healey, deceased. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF THOMAS PATRICK THORNTON TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, January 25, 1949, at 11 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Thomas Patrick Thornton, of Michigan, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Michigan, vice Hon. Ernest A. O'Brien, deceased. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF WILLSON C. MOORE, TO BE FOURTH JUDGE OF THE FIRST CIRCUIT, CIRCUIT COURTS, HAWAII

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, January 25, 1949, at 11 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Willson C. Moore, of Hawaii, to be fourth judge of the first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii. Judge Moore is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired December 27, 1947. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HON. ALBERT M. CRISTY, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF HAWAII

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, January 25, 1949, at 11 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. Albert M. Cristy, of Hawaii, to be an associate justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, vice Hon. Emil C. Peters, term expired. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF EDWARD A. TOWSE, TO BE SECOND JUDGE OF THE FIRST CIRCUIT, CIRCUIT COURTS, HAWAII.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, January 25, 1949, at 11 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon

the nomination of Edward A. Towse, of Hawaii, to be second judge of the first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii, vice Hon. Albert M. Cristy, elevated. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HON. ANGEL R. DE JESUS TO BE CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, January 25, 1949, at 11 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. Angel R. de Jesus, of Puerto Rico, to be chief justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico. Mr. de Jesus is now serving under a recess appointment. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BROUGHTON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF LUIS NEGRON FERNANDEZ TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, January 25, 1949, at 11 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Luis Negron Fernandez, of Puerto Rico, to be an associate justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico. Mr. Fernandez is now serving under a recess appointment. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BROUGHTON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL].

COUNTING OF ELECTORAL VOTES—STATEMENT BY SENATOR LODGE

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him regarding Senate Joint Resolution 2, providing for a constitutional amendment so that the electoral votes for President and Vice President will be counted in proportion to the popular vote, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRESERVATION OF AMERICAN PRIVATE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERTSON

[Mr. ROBERTSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Preservation of the American System of Private Enterprise," delivered by him at a meeting of the Virginia Medical Society at Richmond, Va., on January 15, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

TOTAL JUSTICE AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR McCARRAN

[Mr. McCARRAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Total Justice and Administrative Procedure," delivered by him before the graduating class of Notre Dame Law School on January 14, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO VICE PRESIDENT-ELECT BARKLEY BY THE HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address paying tribute to Senator BARKLEY, Vice President-elect, delivered by Hon. James A. Farley at Town Hall dinner at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City December 15, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE JEWISH STATE IN PALESTINE—STATEMENT BY SENATOR TOBEY

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued by him on January 15, 1949, regarding the state of Israel, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE BRITISH-ISRAELI SITUATION

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by George Sokolsky discussing the British-Israeli situation, published in the Washington Times-Herald of January 13, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

RED MASS SERMON BY THE MOST REV. JOHN J. WRIGHT

[Mr. McGRATH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a sermon delivered by the Most Reverend John J. Wright, D. D., auxiliary bishop of Boston, at the Catholic University of America, on January 16, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

WISCONSIN'S UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE SYSTEM—EDITORIAL FROM THE MILWAUKEE JOURNAL

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A New Jobless Pay Maneuver," dealing with the Wisconsin system of unemployment insurance credit ratings, published in the January 8, 1949, issue of the Milwaukee Journal, which appears in the Appendix.]

RESPONSIBILITY IN THE AIR—ARTICLE BY MARQUIS CHILDS

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Responsibility in the Air," by Marquis Childs, dealing with the recent chartered airplane disaster in Seattle, Wash., published in the Washington (D. C.) Post, of January 15, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

ECONOMIC HIGH LIGHTS

[Mr. ECTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Economic High Lights," sent to him by Mr. Dan B. Noble, of the Pacific Northwest Development Association, Portland, Oreg., which appears in the Appendix.]

ANALYSIS OF THE AMERICAN CHARACTER—ARTICLE BY HENRY STEELE COMMAGER

[Mr. BALDWIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from an article entitled "Analysis of the American Character," written by Henry Steele Commager, and published in the New York Times Magazine of January 2, 1949, which appear in the Appendix.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

ADDRESSES, ETC., AT INAUGURATION OF GOVERNOR OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately following my remarks certain statements made recently at San Juan, Puerto Rico, on the occasion of the inauguration of its first elected Governor, the Honorable Luis Muñoz-Marín. These statements include: First, the personal message sent by President Truman to Senator Muñoz-Marín, Puerto Rico's first elected Governor; second, the address made by the President's special representative at the Governor's inauguration, Oscar L. Chapman, Under Secretary of the Department of the Interior; and, third, the inaugural address delivered by the Governor-elect, Luis Muñoz-Marín.

Mr. President, I believe all will agree that the inauguration of the first elected Governor in Puerto Rico, 450 years after its discovery, marks an epoch in the history of the Western Hemisphere. It is further evidence that we in the United States are continuing to foster democratic processes, and shows that we are not interested in the growth or development of a colonial system. A similar epochal meeting in Manila on July 4, 1946, attended by representatives of the United States, also bears this out.

It was my good fortune to attend the Manila ceremonies, but it was impossible for me to be in Puerto Rico at the time of the Governor's inauguration ceremonies. Having been the author of the legislation authorizing an elected Governor for Puerto Rico, I very much wanted to be present, and regret that it was impossible. Since the ceremonies took place on January 2, 1949, many other Members of Congress who had planned to attend this historic ceremony were also unable to be there. I hope some of us will be able to go to Puerto Rico at a later date to pay our personal respects to Governor Muñoz-Marín and to the good people of Puerto Rico. I feel certain that all Members of Congress will be interested in reading the statements now being made a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S MESSAGE TO THE HONORABLE LUIS MUÑOZ-MARÍN ON THE OCCASION OF HIS INAUGURATION AS FIRST ELECTED GOVERNOR OF PUERTO RICO

DEAR SENATOR: Your inauguration as the first elected Governor of Puerto Rico is a happy and historic event. For you personally as a loyal son of Puerto Rico and of a distinguished father who spent his life in the service of his native land, it should be a profound satisfaction. It is no less so for all of us who have followed with interest and admiration the progress of the Puerto Rican people under your leadership.

Your election as governor by an impressive majority after a warmly contested campaign in which so large a proportion of the Puerto Rican people exercised their right to vote is a fine demonstration of American democracy in action.

The peaceful election of a citizen of Puerto Rico as Governor by the ballots of its own people is a further important step along the road to complete self-government which is the ideal and goal of American policy toward all our Territorial areas.

You have my congratulations and best wishes for an administration full of constructive achievements. I recall with great pleasure the cordial reception extended to me by the people of Puerto Rico when I visited the island last spring and I extend to them through you my New Year's greetings and the assurance of my deep interest in their welfare.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

SPEECH BY OSCAR L. CHAPMAN, UNDER SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, AND SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, AT INAUGURATION OF HON. LUIS MUÑOZ-MARÍN AS GOVERNOR OF PUERTO RICO ON JANUARY 2, 1949

My delight at being here on this very historic occasion is exceeded only by President Truman's disappointment at not being able to come. He asked me to express his deep regret and recall to you his very great enjoyment of his visit last spring. He recognizes, as do I, that this inauguration of Luis Muñoz-Marín, as the first elected Governor of Puerto Rico, is not only a long stride forward in the island's 50 years' march toward self-government, but it also marks the first time in the history of America, if not the world, that a Territorial people has been given the right to choose its own chief executive.

I know how much this means to the people of Puerto Rico. I can assure you that all Americans are just as happy as you are over what is happening here today. Those of us who, in our history, have suffered also the irritations of appointed authority, as you have, are happy because we feel this demonstrates to the world once again our fundamental belief in self-government and our desire to avoid anything that even resembles colonial exploitation.

From now on you make your own laws as before, and you administer them through your own elected Governor, and through men chosen by him. As of today Puerto Rico has virtually all of the advantages of self-government enjoyed by the 48 States of the American Union—plus many financial benefits not enjoyed by those States. Indeed, the status of Puerto Rico has become so favorable as compared with the States, that many of our businessmen are seriously considering, or have already decided upon, establishing their businesses and even their residences in your beautiful island.

On behalf of the President, and on my own behalf, I want to congratulate your new Governor, your retiring Governor, your able Resident Commissioner, and the people of Puerto Rico. President Truman has asked me to read the following message to Governor Muñoz-Marín:

(Mr. Chapman read and personally handed to the Governor President Truman's message, which precedes this address.)

In the sentiment he expressed in the message, President Truman was speaking for all the rest of the American people. Though most of us have never lived under an outside government, our whole tradition of self-government is based upon an unhappy experience of that kind about 150 years ago. In those days, I might add, our forefathers had neither the privilege of electing their own governors, nor the tax concessions enjoyed by Puerto Rico today. Had the leaders of the British Empire recognized our basic political and economic rights, our history might have been quite different.

I do not want to give the impression that I feel the glory of this occasion belongs to us, rather than to you. This unprecedented grant of self-rule was earned by the people of Puerto Rico who, through 50 years under the American flag, have shown a clear and unquestioned ability to govern themselves and handle their own problems with wisdom and maturity.

No people in the Western Hemisphere have struggled under more adverse circumstances. Your population is denser on your limited land resources than the population of any country in this hemisphere. You started this 50-year battle for economic independence and self-government with little education and with tremendous health problems.

Yet despite these handicaps, the people of Puerto Rico have maintained a steady climb upward on the ladder of economic and social progress, particularly during the past few years under two great American Presidents—Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman.

In the past 50 years your illiteracy has declined from 79 percent to 31 percent, and to a figure probably below that today. Despite the tremendous increase in your population, school facilities per child of school age have doubled. Your annual income has become the highest in the Caribbean; your doctors and your facilities for medical care have multiplied; your housing and diet, though still inadequate, have been improved tremendously; your transportation system has been developed from almost nothing, and your industry is now expanding at a sensational rate.

From the long-range standpoint this industrial expansion is the most promising of all your economic developments. Within recent years 40 new industries have been started and more are on the way. Industrial expansion offers hope for balancing your unfavorable trade balance with the mainland, for increasing your per capita income and your standard of living. I have tremendous faith in the future of Puerto Rican industry. Together with migration, I believe it can solve most of the economic problems resulting from your dense population.

Puerto Rico's growth to political maturity has been just as remarkable as her climb up the economic ladder. Only 50 years ago you were under military government as a conquered territory after 400 years as a colonial possession of Spain. The Foraker Act in 1900 set up a civil government, but under the complete control of the President and Congress. You were citizens of Puerto Rico, but not of the United States.

The first big advance came in 1917 when Congress passed the Jones Act which remains today as the Organic Act of Puerto Rico. That made you citizens of the United States, provided for a legislature elected by the people, and gave you a bill of rights similar to ours. This event today marks the next big advance. It results from congressional recognition of your political maturity.

Your recent progress has come under the leadership of a great man—your new Governor, Luis Muñoz-Marín. It would be difficult to find a more appropriate selection for your first elected Governor than Luis Muñoz-Marín on the basis of ability and accomplishment. Thoroughly trained in the traditions and culture of both the Americas, he has demonstrated outstanding qualities as a writer, an orator, a political leader, and a statesman. He has been the fountain head and the driving force behind much of the phenomenal progress made by Puerto Rico in the last decade. Furthermore, he was born, quite appropriately, the year Puerto Rico came under the American flag, as a worthy son of Luis Muñoz Rivera—distinguished patriot and leader of Puerto Rico in the difficult period of transition from the Spanish to the American way of life.

I cannot close these remarks without paying tribute to another great Puerto Rican and great American—Jesús T. Piñero—who as your Resident Commissioner and your first Puerto Rican Governor, was a powerful force in accelerating the progress we are celebrating today. Governor Piñero's warm personality, his integrity, and his perseverance, won the confidence and respect of Members of Congress and everyone else who knew him in Washington.

I wish it had been possible for me to make at least a portion of my remarks today in the beautiful Spanish tongue which most of you have always spoken. To me it is most appropriate that here where Anglo Saxon and Spanish cultures are mingled, both languages should be used and understood by everyone. It is inevitable that Puerto Rico will serve more and more as a very important bridge between the Americas, a source of trained bilingual technicians and leaders, a perfect place for international conferences, a common meeting ground where North America and Central and South America, and the Caribbean area can also feel at home and be understood.

In this very important cultural aspect, no less than in the fields of social and economic achievement, I foresee a brilliant future for Puerto Rico, a future which the people of the United States will be proud to share. To Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín and all his people I say good luck, and God bless you.

MUÑOZ-MARÍN INAUGURAL ADDRESS

I have just taken an oath to serve the people of Puerto Rico faithfully in the office which I have assumed today. Let it be understood as sincerity, and not a lack of humility, when I say that it was not necessary for me to do so. With an oath or without it, the forces of my conscience have sought to make my life an oath of service to my people. In the government or out of it, there is this obligation for everyone who sees ways of serving, and who feels that he has the strength to do so.

By the vital nature—not merely of law—of this oath, there is no reason why you should not all share it with me. The courage, the hope, and the fortitude of this people expect it from all—from all those who in one form or another of public administration, of legislation, in the capitol, in the departments, in the municipalities, in the barrios—have some one function of service, be it notable or humble. It is also expected from all those who in private activity have functions that affect the lives of many—those who make our industries, those who manage our marketing, those who develop cooperatives, those who give the workers the force of organization, those who think, those who study, those who teach, those who heal the sick, those who minister to the soul as before the mystery of the unknown. From all these, the great human masses of our island, who know how to face adverse destiny with strength and dignity, expect an oath of dedication. And they expect that this will not be an oath of condescending paternalism, but one with good democratic meaning.

The great masses owe it to themselves to take this oath that every life serve better the nobility of spirit that animates it, that every hand serve better the land that it cultivates and the tools that it uses and thus justice and liberty for all; that every mind serve better its own understanding and thus the clearer understanding of all. It is in this way and not by an oath and the dedication of one man alone, or of some men, that the people of Puerto Rico may, within the smallness of their territory, realize the greatness of their destiny. It is not necessary to say the oath out loud. Rather it belongs to the higher voice of the conscience of all those who are listening to me here, and of all those who tomorrow will hear those who have heard me today. This is the basis of my program of government, because it is the basis of a program of life for the people.

To this attitude the multiple actions of government itself, should refer, from the care of the most remote country road to the greatest plans for education, production, and justice. To this attitude should be referred also fundamentally, everything in private action that may be of public interest and consequence. To this attitude also

should be referred fundamentally, in accordance with the free determination of the consciences concerned, all that which, because of honest differences of thought is to constitute the opposition to the forms and manners in which the government directs the uphill struggle of this people.

The situation of this people growing on a small island is serious. But the ability of this people is greater than the seriousness of their situation. The affliction of this people is great; its courage is greater. Its spiritual qualities are magnificent, and they have scarcely begun to use these magnificent qualities. No plan of government, or of private initiative, can produce full results if these magnificent qualities are not put into day-to-day use.

Our people have the quality; all that has to be done is to continue clarifying it in order that it covert itself, definitely, into a creative attitude, already growing, with which it will better the plans, diagrams, and purposes, of its struggle in the great challenge that destiny presents to them.

Our people, naturally have virtues and faults. To deny the faults is to incur another fault. But it is a fact that the people of Puerto Rico have excellent virtues. Of these, I would say that the most valuable are: Natural intelligence that provides a great facility for learning techniques and democracy alike; fortitude, generosity; and a humanist attitude that keeps them at a healthy distance from obsolete contemporary nationalism and that makes them feel better as members of Christendom than as inhabitants of political frontiers. Because of this it is that Puerto Rico seemingly a colony, in a deeper sense is not one; and, able to be a nation in a narrow sense, has neither great objections to, nor great preoccupations about, being one.

I believe that ours is a people that does not need juridical definitions as an aid to spiritual welfare. And this, in the world of atomic energy, is a preeminent and pioneer virtue. To find its way out of obsolete colonialism it does not feel compelled to recur to obsolescent nationalism. It finds itself more compelled to search in its own understanding, and to look to its leaders, for new creative roads more in harmony with the immense fact of atomic energy and with the immeasureableness of the Christian attitude.

I have mentioned the two great forces—the only ones that are truly great—of the time in which we live. The only other force that can stand up against the atomic is the Christian, and not only in the sense of churches, but in the root that the equality of all men before the history of life has in the conscience. The people of Puerto Rico, without having thought, nor debated, nor analyzed, feel itself, by a spontaneous attitude to belong to the brotherhood of man. I suspect that it is not Puerto Rico alone, but many peoples, that have this quality and that only historical circumstances have prevented them from expressing it clearly.

I believe that this is the appropriate moment to point out, for today and tomorrow, the factors that contribute to my thinking on political status. There are two truths that I seem to see clearly. One is that colonialism is obsolete and is disappearing with relative speed from the face of the earth. The other is that the narrow nationalistic spirit is obsolescent, and is disappearing, with dangerous slowness, from the face of the earth. Conditions of modern life make colonialism undesirable, in many cases even for those who until yesterday were its beneficiaries. They also, with every day that passes, make enlightened living together more difficult, in terms of national sovereignty, for the creatures of God who inhabit the nations. It seems more evident each day that there is no way in which multiple weak hands, proud, jealous, suspicious, futilely authoritarian, of the multiple sovereignties, can cope with the atomic bomb, nor with creative atomic energy in its day. Neither socialism, nor capitalism, nor communism, nor nationalism, are forces comparable to the tremendous and ineluctable force of atomic energy. Only Christianity, in its practical sense of human equality, is a force of the spirit that can contend with material atomic force. Only by carrying the feeling of brotherhood to the modes and practical institutions of his life can man find his way out of the tragic blind alley, into which he has got himself by permitting his science to develop more rapidly than his wisdom to guide its use. I am not referring, it should be clear, to brotherhood in a merely sentimental sense. The change that is in order is that of the attitude deeply understood through wisdom, vigorously clarified by intelligence, and severely judged and maintained by conscience.

Within this frame, what are colonies? They constitute a form of political relationship that is disappearing, that is due to disappear completely. Those who live in them object to them. Those who dominate them—with some notable exception in Asia—no longer need them, although at times, because of a false sense of prestige, they avoid acting on the fact. If the narrow nationalistic concept is to disappear, so that it will not be civilization itself that disappears, and if the colonial concept is disappearing, then the situation is that archaic colonialism is in danger of becoming archaic nationalism. Without a stout revolution in thinking, that is the futility of the picture—the battle of the gig to convert itself into a carriage in a world of airplanes; the squandering of spiritual force in the fight to convert the obsolete into the obsolescent, to get out of something that has no reason to exist in order to enter into something that sooner or later will not have reason to exist either.

It seems clear to me that what an anquished community clamors for from its leaders—its intellectual, religious, scientific, cultural, and political leaders—is hard creative thought, deep understanding of human values.

Specifically, how is all this related to the problem or political status in Puerto Rico? We should not fall into the well-known intellectual vice of raising grand ideas in order to escape from practical obligations. Hardly could Puerto Rico contribute in any appreciable manner to the solution of the great world problem; and our obligation here is to try to solve the problem of Puerto Rico. One more small nationality is not going to aggravate the tragedy of the national concept in the face of atomic forces. One small nationality less is not going to mitigate it. Then, how is what I have said related to what it falls to us to do in Puerto Rico in fraternal cooperation with all the people of the United States?

The relation is this. The colonial system not only is going to disappear in Puerto Rico, but is already speedily disappearing, much more so than in other places. In what colony, in what part of the world or in what time, has there taken place an act like this? What colony has ever elected, with the free votes of its people, its own legislative and executive government? No greater tribute can be paid to the people of the United States, and particularly to their President and Congress, than recognition of the unprecedented nature of their action. Traces remain of the colonial system in Puerto Rico; but it is evident that colonialism is being abolished rapidly in this community. There is still some distance to travel. Precisely for this reason it should be our concern to see well where we are going, what the objective is ahead of us. Can it be the limited national concept?

The United States tomorrow can, without loss, declare Puerto Rico a nation apart; and the most notable political novelty would be a change in my title and that of my successors. But there could be economic changes that would be highly damaging in their effect of restricting the integral liberty, in their work, in their commerce, in the betterment of their homes, in security, in the creative dynamism of millions of human beings who could hardly be benefited by a change in my title.

It can be said that a people should not place high things of the spirit in the balance with material things. I not only admit this, but energetically affirm it; they should not. But it is not a mere material convenience to be free from want, to have path of hope that liberates from hopelessness; and, above all, the narrow national concept is not a high value of the human spirit in the times of anguish and creation in which we live. A people ought to be ready to make great material sacrifices in order to create an understanding of deep and clean human fraternity, which is a high ideal of the spirit and to dissolve the hardness which permits it to contemplate insensibly the misery of others, because to dissolve this hardness is a high ideal of the spirit; and to give root to attitudes that lead man to be more creative than acquisitive, which is a high ideal of the spirit; and to destroy bitterness of race, language, and culture, because to destroy them is a high ideal of the spirit. But a people cannot make such sacrifices for a concept of diminishing validity, plagued by the germs of hatred and violence because this ailment is not a high ideal of the spirit. Quite on the contrary, it is a high ideal of the spirit to contribute to its cure.

I know that this people of ours, in its humble masses, and in its leaders in all fields of thought, if it persists in creating solutions, will create solutions. That to which it cannot resign itself is to put aside its creative capacity and to feel that it is forever enslaved in its understanding by a banal dilemma under the terms of which it is obliged to believe that there are only two doors through which it can go out to meet its future, even if both are mined with destruction. To this it could be said by a habitually superficial school of thought that it is better to go out one of the two doors, even though they are mined, than not to go out at all. The answer to this is that nobody speaks of not going out. Does man perchance not know how to open doors where there are none? Is it not his duty to himself to look for ways of opening new ones when those that there are may be mined for his destruction? Is it not the essence of liberty to have the power to choose from among alternatives? And if intelligence multiplies the alternatives, is it not in that way widening liberty? The people always can, in choosing among many, old and new alternatives, decide for one of the old with the same freedom as for one of the new.

That which I have said so far, although in part it widens consideration of the theme by giving it a background of world in crisis, on the other hand has limited it to the mere political nature of status. A political status, of course, does not exist in an economic vacuum. Thinking on the political status cannot be developed in a vacuum of economic or cultural thought. Ways of living and working; the forward-looking habits in a community; the religious vision; the land and its crops, and the factories, and the tools, and the techniques, and the raising of children, and the cultivation of the understanding, and science, and art, and recreation, and health habits, and sustenance, and clothes, and sheltering roof, and justice, and light, and generosity and serenity—all these together, and their political status, and more—are the life of a people. The manner of expressing all these together in harmony is the ideal of life of a people. And the spontaneity and dynamism with which they are expressed constitute the people's integral liberty. It is on the basis of this conviction, that I have said before today that we must exercise responsible care in not risking unnecessarily many components of liberty by a fixation on only one of its components.

Of course, certain aspects of integral liberty are closely related to the possibility or impossibility of other aspects. If a community does not develop an economy which is founded, or has hopes of being founded, on a victorious productive effort, it will see other forms of its life and liberty impeded, or decayed, or destroyed. From this comes our great dedication, which we should further strengthen on this day, to the task of constantly increasing production in Puerto Rico—more rapidly than the growth in population; more rapidly still to absorb unemployment; more rapidly still to go on raising the standard of living and security; and more rapidly still so that present imperative necessity for aid shall not become permanent. And I want to say here, most emphatically, that sweatshop labor is definitely not one of the incentives we provide for new investments in industrial development. The production program is for the people. The workers form the largest part of the people. One of the basic necessities of all the people is a decent standard of living for the workers who are the majority of the people.

Tax exemption for 12 years for new industries is a counterbalance to factors which initially are adverse, such as the distance at which many raw materials are found, and the natural disadvantages inherent in all periods of apprenticeship in an agricultural economy which needs, in order to survive, to convert itself into an industrial economy.

I do not wish to close without paying tribute—and let us all pay tribute on this day—to a man great in spirit, strong in humility, who in his austere administration has aided the new form of government to begin auspiciously today. I refer to Jesús Piñero.

Neither do I wish to end without the expression of my most profound respect for the common man of Puerto Rico who has known how, beset by hardship and suffering, to establish with his vote a government that has not offered him sweets or marvels, but to lead him honestly along the difficult uphill road.

STEEL SUPPLIES—EDITORIAL FROM LONDON TIMES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial from the London Times of January 13, 1949, headed "Steel supplies." In view of the fact that the nationalization program has gone a long way in Britain, and that the steel industry is one of the few major industries which have not been nationalized, I believe that Members of the Senate will find this editorial of extreme interest, particularly in view of the President's recent proposal to start putting the United States Government in the steel business.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STEEL SUPPLIES

Over a year ago, when the target for the steel industry's output was set at 14,000,000 tons in 12 months, it was believed by some observers that the adaptability and vigor shown by the industry's achievements in the autumn of 1947 and the scope for further adaptations made it reasonable to lock for an output of 15 million tons. Actual output in the year, which has now been anncunced, was 14,877,000 tons. It is an impressive achievement, far above any earlier output in the British industry, and reflecting an important advance in output a man over the best results before the war. How this contrasts with the experience of coal mining needs no underlining. The estimates on which the low initial target was based probably took too cautious a view of the amount of old iron and steel scrap which could be got either from home sources or from imports for resmelting into steel. The scrap bought in the year exceeded forecasts by 800,000 tons, and not all of this was used; stocks, which had been drawn upon heavily in 1947, have now recovered by about 130,000 tons. How the consumption of pig iron in steel making compared with the plan is not published. Pig-iron output, while only a little higher than the estimate, was almost 1,500,000 tons above the 1947 figure, and of this about a million tons went into steel.

Steel output this year could be bigger still, if the flow of raw materials allows it. During the past year there has been growing appreciation of the desirability in present circumstances, with exceptionally high costs for wholly new plants and an immediate and urgent need for increased supplies, of making the most of existing facilities and of raising production by relatively small but quick adaptations of plants and processes. The determining factor will almost certainly be the supply of pig iron. More and better coke is indispensable, and this may well prove to be the weakest link in the chain of supply. Although imports of iron ore are larger than ever before, the cheap lower-grade home ores are now considerably less used than during the war, and there is no serious reason to suppose that the supply of ore need set any sharp limit to output. In wartime home ores were often transported longer distances than their value might justify in peacetime, but their value in comparison with imported ores is greater than was commonly estimated. Forecasts just after the war frequently expressed the hope that imported ores might come down in cost to about 30s. a ton at the ports here, but in fact they are now costing 56s. a ton.

The prospective demand for steel is more difficult to estimate than the supply. There have been many signs in the past year that the margin of unsatisfied demand is smaller than has been thought. Stocks in general seemed to be growing more rapidly than consumption. Some users were certainly building up abnormally large quantities of the kinds of steel most difficult to get. It was freely admitted early in the year that duplicate orders were placed with different steel suppliers as an insurance; and by the end of the year some steel users were being asked to place orders. Some requirements—for example, for locomotives and railway wagons—have been found to be much exaggerated; and stocks of steel at coal mines are believed to have reached unprecedented levels. Some industries, on the other hand, notably shipbuilding, had much less steel than they could use; and shipbuilders were critical of the stockbuilding and hoarding, as they conceived it, of other users of steel. Here again, however, it may be that if the shipbuilders were able to finish and deliver ships more quickly the apparent pressure of demand for new ships might be seen to be slackening.

Certainly there is some reason to suspect that the demand for steel is now more nearly satisfied than appears on the surface. This is an issue in the United States as well as in this country. One significant factor in the demand for steel receives far less notice than it should. There is little doubt that the same amount of finished articles which is obtained from the present output of steel could be got from an appreciably smaller tonnage of steel if methods and technique could be further improved. The qualities of steel could be more fully utilized if designs could be changed by discarding unnecessary safety factors which made no allowance for improvements in the manufacture of standard steels over the last 30 years, and if the more costly high-tensile steels could be used more extensively. In the war there were important advances in these directions, but there was also great resistance among some users. Since the war there has actually been some falling away; and it is unfortunate that, partly for political reasons, steel prices have been kept below costs, because this policy removes one of the most powerful correctives—the corrective of cost—to the carefree use of scarce materials. The savings which could be obtained by a better use of steel and the use of better steels are considerable, and, since this country is bound to be increasingly at a disadvantage in raw materials, economy in their use is a national necessity.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF BENJAMIN FRANKLIN

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, today is the two hundred and forty-third anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin. As a Senator from the State where Franklin was born and passed his early boyhood, I am glad to join on his birthday in commemorating his many services to his country and to the advancement of the happiness and welfare of people all over the world.

Our only regret in Boston is that Franklin left so soon for Philadelphia. While Boston's place in early American history is large and solid, much would be added to its glory had Franklin stayed there long enough to accomplish some of the many outstanding feats which have established him in the eyes of many historians as our greatest American.

Franklin left Boston as a boy of 17 and traveled to Philadelphia by water in October 1723. There he built, by intelligence, concentrated study, and long hours of work, a career whose glory is so bright as still to cast continuing reflections throughout the civilized world. Certainly few, if any men, have combined in one personality so many qualities of greatness as did Benjamin Franklin—statesman, diplomatist, scientist, author, inventor, printer, philosopher, philanthropist, and educator. He was preeminent in his time in all of these fields.

Today, as we honor him, we pay homage to a man whose greatness still grows, whose genius and intellect still serve his country and the world generally. A recent example of that homage is the opening of 36 Craven Street, the last surviving house in London in which he lived, as a permanent shrine to him.

Franklin's part in building the foundation of our Nation is so vast that it is impossible briefly to begin to scratch beneath the surface which time has laid upon it. But we cannot fail to recall his great service in helping to frame the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. Nor can we ignore the continuing dividends we all receive from such institutions as the University of Pennsylvania, which he founded, and the Franklin Institute, for which his philanthropy was responsible.

As a philosopher he has provided the foundation for many of the ideas which are today still spurring us onward to develop a happier, more peaceful and secure world. We do well to remember his words:

God grant that not only the love of liberty, but a thorough knowledge of the rights of man may pervade all the nations of the earth, so that a philosopher may set his foot anywhere and say, "This is my country."

ereignties, can cope with the atomic bomb, sors. But there could be economic changes exercise responsible care in not risking un-

At one time, it seems to me, we were nearer that objective which Franklin so clearly expressed than we are today. Had we attained that goal of Franklin's, we would not now be spending some $32,000,000,000 annually for past wars, the future security of our country, and living up to our responsibilities in many parts of the world. If our citizens could move about the world more freely, we would not feel that our security so much depended upon retaining under arms such a large number of our youthful citizens. We would not feel the need of concentrating so much of our capacities toward producing weapons to provide us with the best possible defense. We might not sense the vast difference between the varying ideologies in the world that we see today.

As a philosopher, Franklin visualized the enhancement of human rights so dear to him and so desired by all of us today, 200 years later. In a letter in 1780 to a friend of his, Joseph Priestly, the English chemist and early Unitarian, he said:

> The rapid progress true science now makes occasions my regretting sometimes that I was born so soon. It is impossible to imagine the height to which may be carried, in a thousand years, the power of man over matter. * * * Oh, that moral science were in as fair a way of improvement, that men would cease to be wolves to one another and that human beings would at length learn what they now improperly call humanity.

We have truly advanced far in the field of science and social services since Franklin's day, but we still have far to go before we reach that stage where men can settle their differences peacefully and without feeling the necessity of personal attack upon one another. But our spirit of optimism in making progress toward a peaceful world must always remain with us, as that spirit always remained one of Franklin's outstanding qualities.

In this connection truly we can learn today from one of his fables. In it he said:

> Has not the famous political fable of the snake with two heads and one body some useful instruction contained in it? She was going to a brook for a drink and on her way was to pass through a hedge, a twig of which opposed her direct course. One head chose to go on the right side of the twig, the other on the left; so that time was spent in the contest, and before the decision was completed, the poor snake died of thirst.

That fable emphasizes to us the continuing need for us here in the United States and those in other nations of the world to get together and to work toward a lasting peace in order that the many benefits that we still feel accruing from the genius of Franklin can have their full and lasting effect upon us, and we can derive the maximum benefit from the goals of science for which he, over two centuries ago, laid so skillfully the foundations.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania very much appreciates the fine tribute paid to Benjamin Franklin by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. As he has said, today is the two hundred and forty-third anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin, illustrious patriot of American freedom, vigorous advocate of human liberty, and first citizen of Pennsylvania.

It is almost impossible to recall a single step in the progress of mankind that was not given impetus by his all-embracing genius.

Volumes have been written about his amazing career. He was the foremost scientist of his time. His success as a diplomat contributed vastly to victory for American independence. His public service strengthened the young Republic in the early struggles of its formative years.

As a philosopher, author, publisher, businessman, and politician he worked unceasingly to advance the welfare of his fellow citizens, and all the world.

One outstanding feature in the greatness of Benjamin Franklin was his unlimited faith in the capacity of man for self-government. His steadfast devotion to individual liberty is worthy of study and emulation in these days of crisis when human rights have been swept away, in many parts of the world, by aggression and tyranny.

Franklin's own words express most eloquently his hope for a world of freemen at peace with each other.

"God grant," he wrote, "that not only the love of liberty but a thorough knowledge of the rights of man may pervade all the nations of the earth, so that a philosopher may set foot anywhere on its surface and say, 'This is my country.'"

Mr. President, another excerpt from Franklin's writings is most appropriate for solemn reflection at this time.

There is a profound lesson for every American in Franklin's words:

> They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety.

These are words of warning. If we fail to give them proper heed, we may find ourselves deprived of liberty, or safety, or both.

Unfortunately among a large element of our citizenship there is a disposition to hold lightly the sacred liberties that we enjoy under the American system of government. There is a tendency toward reliance upon government, rather than one's own initiative and enterprise, for security and well-being.

There is a growing trend toward surrendering to bureaucratic government many of the liberties, rights, and privileges that Franklin and the founding fathers rightfully insisted were the most precious possession of the people.

The record of history has demonstrated convincingly the wisdom of the framers of our Constitution. They were gravely concerned with the dangers that would inevitably arise from a government that would be the master and not the servant of the people. They were determined to establish safeguards against encroachment upon the liberties of the citizens by an all-powerful central government.

Their primary objective was to limit the powers of government over the lives of free men. The Bill of Rights was added because it was considered imperative to state explicitly the rights guaranteed by the Constitution.

In their wisdom and vision they foresaw clearly the dangers of big government.

Today we are confronted with proposals which—if adopted in their entirety—would defeat the principles of individual liberty to which the founders of our Nation were passionately devoted. Many of these proposals and recommendations are based upon socialistic theories which have failed in every part of the world where they have been attempted.

In many instances the doctrine of control by the Federal Government is made palatable to the people by sugar-coating it as social legislation. The promise of an easy way of life is held out to divert attention from the costs involved and the increased burden of taxation which must be imposed upon the people. The hope of security is advanced to overshadow the sacrifice of the greater boon of liberty and individual freedom under which all American progress has been achieved.

As I study the recent message of the President of the United States on the state of the Union, I cannot escape recalling the warning which has come down to us from Benjamin Franklin. If we are to deserve liberty and safety, we must not give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety or security.

Franklin would have been the first to point out that the fruits of individual effort, self-reliance, and thrift, are the basis of our national greatness and prosperity. He would have warned that dependence upon an all-powerful government to provide for every need would mean giving up our essential liberty.

Mr. President, I should like to recall an incident of the closing day of the Constitutional Convention, as recorded by James Madison. The delegates had completed their labors, which held so much significance to the future of the United States. The last members of the Convention were signing the document when Dr. Franklin—looking toward the President's chair, on the back of which a sun happened to be painted—remarked upon the difficulty of distinguishing between a rising and a setting sun.

> I have—
>
> Said he—
>
> often and often in the course of the session—and the vicissitudes of my hopes and fears as to its issue—looked at that behind the President without being able to tell whether it was rising or setting. But now, at length, I have the happiness to know that it is a rising and not a setting sun.

The rising sun of freedom—as observed by Benjamin Franklin on that historic occasion—has guided America to its powerful place among the nations of the world.

Chaos and destruction have been the tragic fate of nations where the people have surrendered freedom in the hope of achieving security.

From many centers of pressure and propaganda we are constantly bombarded with a philosophy that would destroy the principles of American free-

cautious a view of the amount of old iron and great resistance among some users. Since foot anywhere and say, "This is my country."

dom. I am deeply alarmed over the growing acceptance of that philosophy. Under its teachings we find ourselves drifting away from the time-honored lessons of history and the wisdom of Benjamin Franklin. Unless this course is checked, we may, in the not too distant future, find ourselves face to face with the same disasters that have overtaken many great nations which were led in socialistic experimentation.

Only by preserving—with true loyalty, honesty, and courage—the principles set forth in the Declaration of Independence and by unswerving allegiance to the Constitution and the Bill of Rights can we hope to go forward to a better world of freedom, justice, and human progress.

Americans must never forget the philosophy and the teachings of Benjamin Franklin.

NOMINATION OF CARL A. HATCH

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably the nomination of Carl A. Hatch, of New Mexico, to be United States district judge for the district of New Mexico, and request that it be read by the clerk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

> Carl A. Hatch, of New Mexico, to be United States district judge for the district of New Mexico, vice Hon. Colvin Neblett, retired.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on this morning it was my privilege and my pleasure to call a special meeting of the Committee on the Judiciary, and at that meeting I presented to the committee the nomination of former Senator Carl A. Hatch to be district judge for the district of New Mexico. The committee waived the rule which requires notice to be given for a period of 1 week, and unanimously recommended that the nomination of Carl Hatch be confirmed by the Senate.

It is now my pleasure to present that report and to say a few words about Senator Hatch.

Senator Hatch came to this body some 15½ years ago, shortly after the senior Senator from Nevada came to this body. Since that time he has demonstrated a fine knowledge of the law, a fine conception of justice, and, above all, a splendid understanding of Americanism.

Senator Hatch came from New Mexico to the Senate, after having served on the bench of that State and having served in other official capacities with honor and distinction to himself. He will return to the State of New Mexico by the endorsement of this body and the appointment of the President of the United States, to occupy the Federal bench there, in which position his colleagues here believe he will fill the place with honor and distinction to himself, as he has filled his place here in the Senate.

Now, Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be considered and acted upon at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—although, as the acting minority leader, I shall not object—let me say that Senator Hatch was a colleague of ours, and I understand that the procedure requested has been adopted many times in the Senate when a colleague has been appointed to a judicial position. I have heard of no objection from any Member of the Senate on this side of the aisle. I understand from the Senator from Nevada that the report of the committee is unanimous. Therefore, I shall not object.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, of course I shall not object. I wish to have quick action taken on the nomination.

I desire to thank the committee for acting so promptly on the nomination of our former colleague. Suffice it for me to say "Amen" to everything the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] has stated about by former colleague. We in New Mexico are proud of Carl Hatch, and his nomination has been received with the most popular approval of any nomination I can recall. I know he will make good in New Mexico. We wish to thank the President of the United States for having such confidence in Carl Hatch and appointing him to the high office of Federal judge in New Mexico. He will not be a disappointment to anyone, and we wish him Godspeed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration, as in executive session, of the nomination of former Senator Hatch to be United States district judge for the district of New Mexico?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in executive session, proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to say just a word before the nomination is acted upon. I congratulate the former Senator from New Mexico upon his appointment to the bench, I congratulate the President upon his selection, and I congratulate the judicial district over which he will preside. It is a matter of regret of course that we are losing Senator Hatch from the Senate. He had become prior to his retirement an influential, alert, penetrating, industrious Member of this body. He was a great legislator, in the real sense of the word. The only consolation for his loss is that we gain in his stead an outstanding citizen of New Mexico of long and varied experience to take his place. I shall not hesitate or cease to miss Senator Hatch here, his wise counsel, his level-headedness, his common sense, his knowledge of the legislative process, and his knowledge of the law. I wish for him a long and distinguished career upon the bench.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, when the Senate is considering Senator Hatch's nomination for this important office I cannot let the opportunity pass without saying a word because of my very happy association with him during the past few years, and especially the past 2 years on the Foreign Relations Committee.

It was my privilege to serve with Senator Hatch on a committee that went abroad a year ago, and to enjoy the intimate acquaintance with him that comes when friends travel together in a common purpose to try to promote the welfare of their country. It is a great regret to me personally, without reflecting on his distinguished successor, that Mr. Hatch did not remain in the Senate as one of our colleagues. But it is with the greatest pleasure that I rise to support the immediate confirmation of his nomination, and to express to him, here, to my full ability, my best wishes for the greatest possible success and for his happiness in the new work he is about to undertake in high judicial capacity.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, coming from the neighboring State of Colorado, I should like to say that my association with Senator Hatch has convinced me of his great abilities as a lawyer and his quality of fair-mindedness. I believe he will be an ornament to the Federal bench.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words before the nomination of former Senator Hatch is confirmed. It has been my privilege, and it has been a privilege in every sense of the word, to serve with this distinguished American, whose name is now before the Senate for confirmation as United States district judge, during the entire period of his service in this body. For some time we were desk mates, occupying seats across the aisle from each other. I am of course happy to see him realize his ambition to return to the judicial branch of the Government, which he left when he came to the Senate; but my pleasure is tempered with a knowledge of the loss that this legislative body will suffer by reason of his departure. I say that, Mr. President, of course, with appreciation of the fact that the State of New Mexico has sent a distinguished and outstanding American to succeed him. Carl Hatch possesses peculiar qualities of character that are very seldom found in men. He was my idea of a true liberal. He believed in social progress, but he did not believe in social progress as an end to political expediency. He would never have bent his knee to accede to the demands of groups that, in the guise of social progress, insist upon change for mere selfish advantage. Both clamor of numbers and political threats fell upon deaf ears when directed at Carl Hatch.

In his service here he was an independent thinker, and he possessed the courage when he arrived at a decision to do what he thought was right without regard to politics. I doubt if the question of political advantage ever entered his mind in the performance of any official act. In his leave taking of this body, the loss of the Senate will be the gain of the judiciary. He is an unusually able lawyer. He has a fine conception of the philosophy of our republican form of government, and of the Constitution of the United States as a charter of the liberties of all who live beneath our flag. The people of his beloved State of New Mexico are to be congratulated upon having him to serve them as a district judge. I profoundly regret that his great ability, his judicial temperament, and

his determination to do that which he thinks is right will not be at the service of all the people of this Nation.

Carl A. Hatch would be an ornament to any bench and his presence would add strength to the highest court in the land.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I concur in the encomiums that have been passed upon former Senator Hatch, now an appointee to the Federal judiciary. The reason I take the floor for a moment is that I served with Senator Hatch on the Committee on the Judiciary, and I there learned that he is a very profound lawyer. He has a grasp of legal principles which I greatly admire. I shall not discuss his general attitude in the Senate; all Senators who served with him are familiar with that; but I wanted particularly to stress his great knowledge of the law and his fine judicial mind, which I observed not only on the floor but in the intimate contacts on the Committee on the Judiciary, where we considered a great variety of legislation upon a vast number of public questions. I consider him one of the finest legal minds we have had in the Senate for some years. I have a high personal regard for Senator Hatch, and I think the judiciary is the gainer by his assumption of the duties of that responsible position. I wish him well.

To his distinguished successor I may say, of course, we are all pleased to have him here with us. We are sure that he will have a career of usefulness and efficiency to the Government and to the people of New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I would not attempt to compress into a few seconds a statement of the affection and esteem I have for a man whom I have known for 30 years, who has been my personal and political friend for a quarter of a century. I merely want to say that the people of New Mexico are thankful to the President for the nomination he has made, and particularly thankful to the Senate for its courtesy in permitting that nomination to come up for immediate confirmation. Senator Hatch, in the 15 years he was here, became an expert in the field of election reform, and a keen student of international affairs; but I am sure the Members here remember him best as a fine, amiable friend. I am deeply grateful to the Members of the Senate for permitting his nomination to come before it at once.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with those who have said a word in commendation of Senator Hatch. His personal touch and his understanding of the law will make him one of the outstanding judges in the Nation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was unanimously confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of the confirmation of the nomination.

AUTHORIZATION FOR RECEIPT OF MESSAGES AND SIGNATURE OF BILL AND RESOLUTION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am about to move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before the motion is made, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary be authorized to receive messages from the House subsequent to the adjournment of the Senate today, and that the President pro tempore be authorized to sign S. 103 and Senate Joint Resolution 16—the salary increase and holiday measures, respectively—in the event they are passed by the House without amendment and found truly enrolled.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM FOR TUESDAY AND DAYS FOLLOWING

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, before the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] makes the motion to adjourn, I should like to ask him what the plans are for tomorrow, or for the day to which it is now proposed to adjourn, in order that we may have the statement in the RECORD so all Members may be fully informed.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it is my understanding that on tomorrow it is proposed that the Senate consider the nomination submitted by the President of Mr. Dean Acheson to be Secretary of State.

There will also come over from the House tomorrow a joint resolution the purpose of which is to exempt from taxation the moneys paid for certain tickets of admission in connection with the inauguration. That measure will perhaps be handled by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. Aside from those two matters, I know of nothing that will be considered by the Senate at that time. Following that, I believe it is the plan to adjourn until Thursday, probably until 11:30 or 11:45, at which time the Senate will convene and proceed in a body to the inaugural stand.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if I may interrupt, I wish to say that the adjournment over from Tuesday to Thursday will depend on whether there is any business left over from tomorrow which ought to be handled on Wednesday.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Kentucky is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then, as I understand, there will be no business on Wednesday unless there is something left over from tomorrow, and there will be no business transacted in the Senate on Thursday.

Mr. LUCAS. There will be no business on Thursday, except the meeting of the Senate for the purpose of marching in a body to the inaugural stand.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And that will be at 11:30.

Mr. LUCAS. That will be at 11:30.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

EXEMPTION FROM TAXATION OF CERTAIN INAUGURAL TICKETS

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have House Joint Resolution 85 held at the desk in the event it is transmitted from the House today. I have canvassed all members of the committee respecting the joint resolution, and there is no objection to it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 18, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 17, 1949:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Maurice J. Tobin, of Massachusetts, to be Secretary of Labor, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Ralph Wright, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of Labor.

COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

Preston Delano, of Massachusetts, to be Comptroller of the Currency. (Reappointment.) Mr. Delano is now serving under temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

James M. Mitchell, of Illinois, to be a Civil Service Commissioner, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

John Monroe Johnson, of South Carolina, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term expiring December 31, 1955. (Reappointment.)

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

George McGill, of Kansas, to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission for a term expiring June 16, 1954. (Reappointment.)

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

William E. Willett, of Maryland, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for a term expiring June 30, 1950, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Oswald Ryan, of Indiana, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the term of 6 years expiring December 31, 1954, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Thomas Chalmers Buchanan, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 22, 1952, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

David J. Coddaire, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the United States Maritime Commission for the term expiring April 15, 1954, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Harry Alfred Curtis, of Missouri, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the remainder of the term expiring 9 years after May 18, 1948.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Frank P. Douglass, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the term expiring February 1, 1952. (Reappointment.)

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

John M. Houston, of Kansas, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of 5 years from August 27, 1948, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate. (Reappointment.)

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, United States Army, to be Director of Selective Service, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Cleon A. Summers, of Oklahoma, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Oklahoma. (Mr. Summers is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 5, 1948.)

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

Surgeons to be senior surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel):

Reuben F. Reider
Clarence A. Smith
Richard H. Smith

Senior assistant surgeons to be surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of major):

Norman B. McCullough	Clinton C. Powell
Harold S. Barrett	J. Russell Mitchell
Wade H. Etheridge	Pasquale J. Pesare
Marvin O. Lewis	George A. Spendlove.
Elisah M. Nadel	Rheim M. Jones
Birdsall N. Carle	Weldon C. Waite
	R. Carl Millican

Assistant surgeons to be senior assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain):

Robert M. Paine	Milton Sheinbein
Charles O. Metzmaker	Carlyle F. Stout
Laurence Finberg	Sidney Shindell
Keith H. Frankhauser	Richard A. Saavedra
Gorden L. Farrell	Leonard J. Ganser
John F. Lowney	Norman G. Hepper
Ralph S. Paffenbarger, Jr.	William H. Baker
	Stewart M. Williams

Assistant surgeons to be senior assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain) continued:

Arthur D. Fisher	John W. Cashman
Glenn M. Gordon	Delmo A. Paris
John P. Utz	Wendell L. Pierce
Robert A. Sammons	Robert L. Price
Russell G. Lewis	David S. Wilder

Dental surgeons to be senior dental surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel):

Harry G. Trautman
Arthur G. Malucky

Senior assistant dental surgeons to be dental surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of major):

Thomas J. Riley, Jr.
Maurice Costello

Assistant dental surgeons to be senior assistant dental surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain):

William J. Braye
Robert W. Anderson

Sanitary engineer to be senior sanitary engineer (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel):

Mark D. Hollis

Senior assistant sanitary engineers to be sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of major):

Howard W. Spence
Floyd B. Taylor

Senior assistant pharmacists to be pharmacists (equivalent to the Army rank of major):

Ronald G. Esson	Roberts L. Proper
Reid M. Hovey	Arnold H. Dodge
Francis R. Ellis	

Senior assistant scientists to be scientists (equivalent to the Army rank of major):

Milton Silverman	Richard P. Dow
Louis J. Olivier	James E. Lirren
Alan W. Donaldson	Morris B. Ettinger
Joseph Greenberg	George R. Weber
Libero Ajello	Julius S. Youngner
Isadore Zipkin	Herbert A. Sober

Assistant nurse officers to be senior assistant nurse officers (equivalent to the Army rank of captain):

Anne Woudema	Enid L. Taylor
Mary M. Bouser	C. Vistula Lancaster

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. David H. Clark, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Ships in the Department of the Navy, for a term of 2 years.

IN THE NAVY

The following named midshipmen (aviation) to be ensigns in the Navy to rank from date indicated after each name:

Arland A. Adams, June 4, 1948.
Robert G. Aldrich, June 3, 1949.
Frank J. Alfonso, June 4, 1948.
Glenn L. Allen, June 4, 1948.
Lawrence R. Allen, June 3, 1949.
James E. Alley, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Coe M. Anderson, June 4, 1948.
John B. Anderson, June 4, 1948.
William R. Anderson, June 4, 1948.
Joe E. Armstrong, June 4, 1948.
Albert L. Audette, June 3, 1949.
Max D. Barr, June 4, 1948.
Russell H. Baum, June 3, 1949.
Norbert L. Bausch, June 4, 1948.
Alan E. Beck, June 4, 1948.
Archie E. Benton, June 4, 1948.
John R. Berkey, June 3, 1949.
Robert L. Blood, June 3, 1949.
Allen M. Bosworth, III, June 4, 1948.
Keith D. Boyer, June 4, 1948.
Richmond D. Brannen, June 4, 1948.
William J. Brantley, June 4, 1948.
William E. Brodowski, June 3, 1949.
Charles H. Brown, June 4, 1948.
Eldon W. Brown, Jr., June 4, 1948.
William E. Brown, June 3, 1949.
Jesse A. Bruce, June 4, 1948.
Otis T. Budd, June 3, 1949.
Joseph H. Burke, June 4, 1948.
Kenneth A. Burrows, June 4, 1948.
James D. Burton, June 4, 1948.
William H. Busse, June 3, 1949.
Charles E. Butler, June 3, 1949.
Emery LaV. Campbell, June 4, 1948.
Arthur W. Carpenter, June 3, 1949.
William F. Carroza, June 4, 1948.
Durward L. Cecil, June 3, 1949.
James H. Chapman, June 4, 1948.
Frank L. Cheek, June 4, 1948.
Leonard R. Cheshire, June 3, 1949.
Gordon E. Clark, June 4, 1948.
Gordon T. Collier, June 4, 1948.
Kenneth W. Colman, June 4, 1948.
Orville T. Cooper, June 4, 1948.
Kenneth E. Cornell, June 3, 1949.
Henriques C. Cotton, June 3, 1949.
Rodney Crawford, June 3, 1949.
Stewart P. Crowell, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Jack G. Daubs, June 4, 1948.
Dale E. Davis, June 3, 1949.
Thomas E. Davis, June 4, 1948.
Donovan D. Day, Jr., June 3, 1949.
Manuel O. Delgado, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Dwight "L" Dennis, Jr., June 4, 1948.
John R. Dewenter, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Joseph P. Dobronski, June 4, 1948.
David A. Doll, June 4, 1948.
William E. Dozier, June 4, 1948.
Marion T. Dragastin, June 4, 1948.
Douglas E. Drake, June 4, 1948.
Frank J. Drechsler, June 4, 1948.
Willis H. Dukelow, June 3, 1949.
Norman L. Dunbar, June 4, 1948.
Luther F. Duncan, June 4, 1948.
Alex R. Dunn, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Peter M. Dyke, June 3, 1949.
Robert E. Ellertson, June 3, 1949.
Kenneth E. Ent, June 3, 1949.
Harry Epperson, June 4, 1948.
Stuart E. Ferguson, June 4, 1948.
Donald T. Fitzgerald, June 4, 1948.
Robert W. Ferraez, June 3, 1949.
Arthur B. Forrest, Jr., June 3, 1949.
Richard G. Forward, June 4, 1948.
Ralph E. Foster, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Albert J. Frainier, Jr., June 3, 1949.
Eugene L. Franz, June 3, 1949.
Oel "L" Futrell, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Francis G. Gergen, June 4, 1948.
Charles H. Gibson, Jr., June 3, 1949.
Wilmer R. Gilbert, June 3, 1949.
Floyd H. Gilkey, June 4, 1948.
William V. Gillen, June 4, 1948.
William H. Glasgow, June 4, 1948.
James C. Glover, June 4, 1948.
Coleman Goatley, June 3, 1949.
Donald R. Goodrum, June 3, 1949.
Ercel D. Goossen, June 3, 1949.
Ernest E. Grant, Jr., June 4, 1948.
John A. Grauer, June 4, 1948.
James B. Griffin, June 3, 1949.
Louis M. Guerrieri, June 4, 1948.
George C. Hafner, June 4, 1948.
Donald L. Hainworth, June 4, 1948.
Robert S. Hamilton, June 3, 1949.
Julian R. Hansen, June 4, 1948.
Perry W. Hanson, June 4, 1948.
Raymond A. Harding, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Frank H. Harvey, June 4, 1948.
Orleane K. Haugen, June 4, 1948.
Stanley M. Hayes, June 4, 1948.
William L. Hembree, June 4, 1948.
Donald E. Henning, June 3, 1949.
Robert R. Hensley, June 4, 1948.
William J. Hepburn, June 4, 1948.
Judd C. Hodgson, June 3, 1949.
Robert A. Holden, June 3, 1949.
Marvin A. Holgren, June 3, 1949.
George H. Hollod, June 4, 1948.
Allan P. Holmgren, June 3, 1949.
Archie N. D. Hood, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Richard F. Hood, June 4, 1948.
Charles E. Hopper, June 3, 1949.
John E. Horan, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Kenneth A. Horn, June 4, 1948.
Robert L. Horton, June 3, 1949.
Donald H. Howard, June 4, 1948.
Joe P. Howell, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Floyd E. Hower, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Roy T. Hynes, June 3, 1949.
Jack W. Ingram, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Burdett L. Ives, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Thomas Jardine, June 4, 1948.
James F. Jenista, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Harry T. Jenkins, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Robert H. Jenks, June 4, 1948.
Jack K. Johnson, June 4, 1948.
Bruce R. Jones, June 4, 1948.
David P. Jones, June 4, 1948.
Richard G. Jones, June 3, 1949.
Bernard C. Jongewaard, June 4, 1948.
Francis W. Joyce, June 4, 1948.
Joseph L. Kain, June 4, 1948.
Stanley J. Kakol, June 4, 1948.
Walter M. Karbowski, June 4, 1948.
Allyn W. Kaste, June 3, 1949.
Frederick E. Kelley, Jr., June 4, 1948.

Edward P. Kellogg, Jr., June 3, 1949.
Roger W. Kelly, June 4, 1948.
LeRoy M. Klie, June 3, 1949.
George R. R. Kinnear, 2d, June 4, 1948.
Richard T. Kirchhoff, June 3, 1949.
Joseph E. Klause, June 4, 1948.
Ralph C. Knight, June 4, 1948.
Karl H. Kober, June 3, 1949.
Otto R. Koafeld, June 4, 1948.
Frederick L. Krauth, June 3, 1949.
Hugh C. Kuhlman, June 4, 1948.
John E. Laurence, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Robert R. Leavitt, June 4, 1948.
Alan G. Lewis, June 3, 1949.
Gene R. Lewis, June 4, 1948.
George S. Locke, Jr., June 3, 1949.
Victor C. Lopez, June 3, 1949.
Louis M. Love, June 4, 1948.
Donald E. Luallin, June 4, 1948.
Preston Luke, June 3, 1949.
Robert R. McFarlan, June 4, 1948.
Ted R. McGinnis, June 4, 1948.
Robert LeR. McIntyre, June 4, 1948.
Donald P. McKay, June 4, 1948.
William E. Madden, June 4, 1948.
Stuart G. Madison, June 4, 1948.
William D. Mallinger, June 4, 1948.
Harold L. Marr, June 3, 1949.
Robert J. Martin, June 4, 1948.
John R. Martuccelli, June 4, 1948.
Rothwell B. Mason, June 4, 1948.
James E. May, June 3, 1949.
Richard D. Meldahl, June 4, 1948.
Roy D. Meyers, June 3, 1949.
Alexander A. Miller, 3d, June 3, 1949.
David B. Miller, June 3, 1949.
Harry G. Miller, June 4, 1948.
John R. Miller, June 3, 1949.
Daniel M. Morris, June 4, 1948.
William D. Morse, June 4, 1948.
John E. Mulcahy, June 4, 1948.
Godfrey L. Munter, Jr., June 3, 1949.
Roy D. Murphy, June 4, 1948.
William L. Murphy, June 4, 1948.
William R. Musgrove, June 4, 1948.
Harold L. Neely, June 4, 1948.
Carl C. Neidlinger, June 4, 1948.
Harold Nemer, June 3, 1949.
John D. Ness, June 4, 1948.
William L. Newell, June 4, 1948.
Fred S. Newman, June 3, 1949.
John R. Nicholas, June 4, 1948.
Jerome E. Nicholson, June 3, 1949.
John M. Nickell, Jr., June 3, 1949.
Richard H. Nickerson, June 4, 1948.
Frederick M. Nizich, June 4, 1948.
John H. Nyhuis, June 4, 1948.
Bruce A. Nystrom, June 3, 1949.
James A. O'Donnell, June 4, 1948.
Robert C. Olsen, June 4, 1948.
Lyle R. Olson, June 4, 1948.
George L. Page, June 3, 1949.
William B. Paradis, June 4, 1948.
Stanley J. Pederson, Jr., June 3, 1949.
Donald W. Perry, June 4, 1948.
Jack W. Perry, June 4, 1948.
Robert R. Perry, June 4, 1948.
James R. Peterson, June 4, 1948.
Rudolph E. Peterson, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Paul E. Petty, June 4, 1948.
Howard E. Phillips, June 3, 1949.
Ralph T. Phillips, June 4, 1948.
James T. Pilgreen, June 4, 1948.
Richard E. Pond, June 3, 1949.
Charles S. Porter, June 4, 1948.
Louis C. Potter, June 4, 1948.
Frank E. Price, June 3, 1949.
Jay C. Proctor, Jr., June 4, 1948.
William F. Quarg, June 3, 1949.
Richard R. Rak, June 4, 1948.
Robert E. Ramsay, June 4, 1948.
William J. Rankin, Jr., June 4, 1948.
James R. Redden, June 4, 1948.
John W. Reid, Jr., June 4, 1948.
John C. Reilly, June 4, 1948.
William L. Richards, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Lions R. Roberts, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Frank A. Rockwell, June 3, 1949.
Earl Rogers, June 3, 1949.
Richard J. Rosa, June 4, 1948.
George B. Rothrock, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Rex R. Rowell, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Roger E. Roys, June 3, 1949.
Richard O. Rudd, June 3, 1949.
Paul R. Rupert, Jr., June 3, 1949.
George G. Russell, June 3, 1949.
Maclyn K. Russell, June 4, 1948.
Paul E. Ryan, June 4, 1948.
James O. Santineau, June 4, 1948.
William F. Schallert, June 3, 1949.
Arthur S. Schlofman, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Carl E. Schluter, June 4, 1948.
Clifford W. Schmidt, June 4, 1948.
Ernest H. Schorz, June 4, 1948.
George M. Schrauth, June 4, 1948.
Richard M. Shrewsbury, June 3, 1949.
James C. Shows, June 4, 1948.
Edward S. Siergiej, June 4, 1948.
Louis H. Simmons, June 4, 1948.
William G. Sizemore, June 3, 1949.
John R. Skinner, June 4, 1948.
George F. Smith, June 4, 1948.
Gordon H. Smith, June 3, 1949.
John J. Smith, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Loren D. Smith, June 4, 1948.
Philip J. Smith, June 4, 1948.
Robert P. Smith, June 3, 1949.
Robert K. Smyth, June 4, 1948.
Floryan L. Soberski, June 3, 1949.
Dwight LeR. Souders, June 3, 1949.
Benjamin E. Spence, June 3, 1949.
Wensil M. Stanek, June 3, 1949.
Henry M. Stanley, June 3, 1949.
George E. Stanton, Jr., June 3, 1949.
Joe D. Steil, June 3, 1949.
Reynold F. Stelloh, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Claude M. Stephenson, June 4, 1948.
Charles W. Stevens, June 4, 1948.
Glenn McF. Stinchcomb, June 4, 1948.
George R. Stith, June 4, 1948.
Robert F. Stockwell, June 4, 1948.
Walter S. Stokes, June 4, 1948.
William J. Streetman, June 3, 1949.
Bobby J. Stringer, June 4, 1948.
John J. Sughrue, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Donald A. Sumner, June 3, 1949.
Harold C. Tapley, June 4, 1949.
Creigh W. Taylor, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Roy Z. Taylor 3d, June 4, 1948.
Bernard Tesch, Jr., June 3, 1949.
David G. Thomas, June 3, 1949.
Earle V. Thomas, June 3, 1949.
Lawrence W. Thomas, June 3, 1949.
Malcolm E. Thompson, June 4, 1948.
Keith E. Thomson, June 4, 1948.
Richard G. Thomson, June 3, 1949.
Ernest E. Tissot, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Robert G. Tombrinck, June 3, 1949.
Marland W. Townsend, Jr., June 3, 1949.
Paul R. Tripp, June 4, 1948.
Nicholas J. Vagianos, June 4, 1948.
Vere P. VanKeuren, Jr., June 3, 1949.
Eldon P. Varner, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Donald E. Viewegh, June 4, 1948.
Thomas A. Voorhees, June 4, 1948.
Donald W. Wachenfeld, June 4, 1948.
Robert H. Wade, June 4, 1948.
William G. Wald, June 4, 1948.
Russell G. Walden, June 4, 1948.
John S. Ward, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Lemuel O. Warfield, June 4, 1948.
Lawrence C. Warren, June 4, 1948.
William R. Warren, June 4, 1948.
Frederick C. Weber, June 3, 1949.
Dean E. Webster, June 4, 1948.
Albert J. Weil, June 3, 1949.
Charles H. Welling, Jr., June 3, 1949.
John W. Westad, June 4, 1948.
Charles L. Wharton, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Ward B. Whitten, June 4, 1948.
Thomas W. Wilbor, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Herbert W. Willis, June 3, 1949.
Robert Wochinger, June 4, 1948.
Richard J. T. Wood, June 3, 1949.
Kyle H. Woodbury, June 4, 1948.
Donald A. Yale, June 3, 1949.
Vern M. Yates, June 3, 1949.
Robert A. Zajichek, June 4, 1948.
Austin LeR. Zicht, June 4, 1948.
Herschel E. Zirger, June 4, 1948.

The following named (naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Navy to rank from date indicated after each name:

David W. Berger, June 3, 1949.
Lester N. Hill, June 4, 1948.
James A. Howe, June 3, 1949.
Fred B. Kosack, June 3, 1949.
Judah L. Siegal, June 3, 1949.
Robert L. Taylor, June 4, 1948.
Robert F. Valentine, June 4, 1948.

Edward Stanton (naval ROTC) to be an ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949.

Stephen B. Proflet (naval ROTC) to be an ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949.

The following named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Navy to rank from date indicated after each name:

Harry A. Ackley, June 4, 1948.
William K. Adams, June 4, 1948.
Richard P. Allen, June 4, 1948.
James J. Ashford, June 4, 1948.
John D. Austin, June 4, 1948.
Joseph F. Bachman, June 4, 1948.
Fred F. Bailey, June 4, 1948.
Homer D. Bailey, June 4, 1948.
Donald R. Baird, June 4, 1948.
Daniel Balish, June 4, 1948.
William R. Ball, Jr., June 4, 1948.
David "P" Barker, June 4, 1948.
Arthur J. Bauer, June 4, 1948.
James R. Bell, June 4, 1948.
Richard M. Bellinger, June 4, 1948.
Manuel A. Benero, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Guy J. Bennett, June 4, 1948.
Syd "A" Bennett, June 4, 1948.
Kenneth LeR. Bernstein, June 4, 1948.
Harry E. Betts, June 4, 1948.
Bartley J. Billings, June 4, 1948.
Louis Bilyk, June 4, 1948.
Carl E. Blaes, June 4, 1948.
George A. Blais, June 4, 1948.
Robert P. Blount, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Paul Bock, June 4, 1948.
Tudor M. Bogart, June 4, 1948.
Charles D. Bolan, June 4, 1948.
Herbert L. BonDurant, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Raymond J. Borntraeger, June 4, 1948.
Eugene H. Bouslog, June 4, 1948.
Joseph J. Braun, June 4, 1948.
Martin F. Bremus, June 4, 1948.
William N. Brook, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Charles O. Brown, June 4, 1948.
George Brown, June 4, 1948.
Oliver F. Brown, June 4, 1948.
Woolson S. Brown, June 4, 1948.
James D. Bryan, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Terry D. Bryson, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Clarence V. Burch, Jr., June 4, 1948.
David W. Carey, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Earl C. Carpenter, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Horace "B" Chambers, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Adrian E. Chavannes, June 4, 1948.
Eugene R. Christie, June 4, 1948.
James V. Clampet, June 4, 1948.
Graham S. Clark, June 4, 1948.
John G. Clifford, June 4, 1948.
William E. Conniff, Jr., June 4, 1948.
John A. Connors, June 4, 1948.
Joseph E. Coogan, June 4, 1948.
Robert G. Cox, June 4, 1948.
Richard S. Coy, June 4, 1948.
Richard H. Crangle, June 4, 1948.
John M. Cravens, Jr., June 4, 1948.
William R. Crawford, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Samuel R. Crowell, June 4, 1948.
Donald H. Dansby, June 4, 1948.
Ralph A. Davidson, Jr., June 3, 1949.
Walter M. DeLoach, June 4, 1948.
Thomas G. DeMuesy, June 4, 1948.
Richard N. DeMun, June 4, 1948.
Joseph C. Diedrich, June 4, 1948.
Henry C. Dinger, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Lewis L. Dobbs, June 4, 1948.
Henry H. Dodd, June 4, 1948.
William K. Donnell, June 4, 1948.
Richard W. Duerner, June 4, 1948.
John C. Dunn, June 4, 1948.

Gerald C. Edwards, June 4, 1948.
Donald L. Egger, June 4, 1948.
Frank N. Eklund, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Robert T. Ellsworth, Jr., June 4, 1948.
William A. Ellsworth, June 3, 1949.
Joseph T. Erk, June 4, 1948.
Oliver N. Evans, June 4, 1948.
William "J" Fade, June 4, 1948.
Richard E. Fahrenwald, June 4, 1948.
Andrew C. Ferguson, June 4, 1948.
Robert L. Field, June 4, 1948.
Ernest D. Fife, June 4, 1948.
Michael J. J. Fleming, June 4, 1948.
Philip T. Forsling, June 4, 1948.
James A. Forsyth, June 4, 1948.
Kenneth D. Posnaught, June 4, 1948.
Fredrick L. Foster, June 4, 1948.
Benjamin B. Fowke, June 4, 1948.
Alfred N. Fowler, June 4, 1948.
Fred A. W. Franke, Jr., June 4, 1948.
James R. Garner, June 3, 1949.
Alvin E. Geist, June 4, 1948.
William E. Gildow, June 4, 1948.
Claude F. Giles, June 4, 1948.
Donald A. Gillham, June 4, 1948.
Frank C. Gilmore, June 4, 1948.
Gordon B. Gish, June 4, 1948.
Roy M. Goldsmith, June 4, 1948.
Richard L. Graham, June 4, 1948.
Richard C. Guess, June 4, 1948.
Roy V. Gunther, June 4, 1948.
Edwin K. Hacker, June 4, 1948.
Robert F. Hackler, June 4, 1948.
James R. Hackney, June 4, 1948.
Joseph F. Hall, June 4, 1948.
Preston DeW. Hall, June 4, 1948.
Robert Hall, June 4, 1948.
Robert W. Hall, June 4, 1948.
Russell L. Handy, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Chester J. Hardenburg, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Joe W. Hargrove, June 4, 1948.
Edgar W. Harlan, June 4, 1948.
Willie A. Harter, Jr., June 3, 1949.
Arthur R. Hasler, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Edward A. Hawks, Jr., June 4, 1948.
John W. Healy, June 3, 1949.
Keith H. Helms, June 4, 1948.
William McG. Hepburn, Jr., June 4, 1948.
John G. Herndon, June 4, 1948.
Walter J. Hester, June 4, 1948.
Harry C. Hiatt, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Alvin S. Hibbs, June 4, 1948.
Peter B. Hill, June 4, 1948.
Rowland P. Hill, June 4, 1948.
Robert T. Hoar, June 4, 1948.
Leland A. Holdren, June 4, 1948.
Matthew V. Hoover, June 4, 1948.
John L. Hotes, June 4, 1948.
Claude "C" Howell, June 4, 1948.
Robert E. Huntzinger, June 4, 1948.
Richard W. Illgen, June 4, 1948.
John G. "W" Jackson, June 4, 1948.
Eldon A. Jacobs, June 4, 1948.
Rollin E. Jeffries, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Ronald H. Jermstad, June 4, 1948.
James B. Jones, June 4, 1948.
Henry F. Kaiser, June 4, 1948.
Robert C. Kaiser, June 4, 1948.
Martin J. Katcher, June 3, 1949.
John R. Kearney, June 4, 1948.
James H. Kendall 2d, June 4, 1948.
William H. Kernan, June 4, 1948.
Neal Kincannon, June 4, 1948.
George C. Kiser, June 4, 1948.
James W. Kissick, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Robert A. Komoroff, June 4, 1948.
Albert J. Kralik, June 4, 1948.
William A. Lebert, June 4, 1948.
John F. Leicester III, June 4, 1948.
Richard E. Lewis, June 4, 1948.
James E. Liles, June 4, 1948.
Richard L. Lombard, June 4, 1948.
Thomas A. Loomis, June 4, 1948.
Robert B. Luzader, June 4, 1948.
James A. McCalg, June 4, 1948.
Herbert P. McCaw, June 4, 1948.
Richard K. McCorkle, June 4, 1948.
Louis H. McCormick, Jr., June 4, 1948.
William W. McCue, June 4, 1948.
Carl J. McCurdy, June 4, 1948.
Jack H. McDonald, June 4, 1948.
Ralph I. McFarland, June 4, 1948.
Max R. McGlamry, June 4, 1948.
William "E" McLuckie, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Charles W. McMillan, June 4, 1948.
William M. McRostie, June 4, 1948.
Stuart C. MacIntire, June 4, 1948.
Thomas E. Maloney, June 4, 1948.
Richard E. Mankus, June 4, 1948.
Charles W. Mann, June 4, 1948.
John C. Mape, June 4, 1948.
Walter G. Markham, June 4, 1948.
Lee R. Marshall, June 4, 1948.
Lee C. Miles, June 4, 1948.
Carol R. Mohring, June 4, 1948.
Randolph Moore, June 4, 1948.
John C. Moorhead, June 4, 1948.
Charles T. Morden, June 4, 1948.
David H. Morris, June 4, 1948.
LeRoy O. Mosher, June 4, 1948.
William L. Mumma, June 4, 1948.
James F. Murphy, June 4, 1948.
Eugene R. Murray, June 4, 1948.
Arthur E. Nash, June 4, 1948.
John N. Neal, June 4, 1948.
Richard D. Nielsen, June 4, 1948.
Harry M. Noland, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Robert J. Norvell, June 4, 1948.
Raymond P. Notson, June 4, 1948.
Arthur Nuttall, Jr., June 4, 1948.
John D. Omvig, June 4, 1948.
Bryce Osborn, June 4, 1948.
Burdett A. Otis, Jr., June 4, 1948.
William B. Otto, June 4, 1948.
John S. Patton, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Jacob L. Pawer, Jr., June 4, 1948.
William V. Peacock, June 4, 1948.
Stuart A. Petrie, June 4, 1948.
Ira G. Plouff, June 4, 1948.
Bernard Poppert, June 4, 1948.
William Poulakis, June 4, 1948.
Ross S. Power, June 4, 1948.
Byron Price, June 4, 1948.
Joseph F. Rabbitt, June 4, 1948.
Wesley L. Ralston, June 4, 1948.
Thomas E. Rand, June 4, 1948.
Charles C. Ratcliff, June 4, 1948.
Earl L. Reardon, June 4, 1948.
Jackson B. Reavis, June 4, 1948.
William L. Redmon, June 4, 1948.
Alfred J. Reichel, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Elmer A. Rice, June 4, 1948.
Lonnie J. Robbins, June 4, 1948.
Keith H. Robertson, June 4, 1948.
Clarence O. Robins, June 4, 1948.
Frank J. Roehrenbeck, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Robert A. Rohr, June 4, 1948.
Allan W. Romans, June 4, 1948.
Brent C. Rosa, June 4, 1948.
Edmund I. Rosendahl, June 4, 1948.
Henry M. Ross, June 4, 1948.
John Ruggiero, June 4, 1948.
George E. Russell, June 4, 1948.
Donald F. Sager, June 4, 1948.
Kenneth M. Sandon, June 4, 1948.
James A. Schader, June 4, 1948.
John F. Schneider, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Richard A. Schnorf, June 3, 1949.
Lawrence W. Schultheis, June 4, 1948.
Harold C. Schwan, June 4, 1948.
Richard D. Schwartz, June 4, 1948.
William "S" Shaffran, June 4, 1948.
Alfred L. Shiner, June 4, 1948.
Frank J. Shoemaker, June 4, 1948.
Donald R. Simon, June 4, 1948.
Walter H. Singleton, June 4, 1948.
Charles A. Smith, June 4, 1948.
Lucian L. Smith, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Charles M. Sodersten, June 4, 1948.
Robert W. Somers, June 4, 1948.
Emory R. Sourbeer, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Raymond W. Spangrud, June 4, 1948.
William A. Staff, June 4, 1948.
Robert G. Staffney, June 4, 1948.
Earl M. Stein, June 3, 1949.
Billy M. Steubing, June 3, 1949.
Robert L. Steward, June 4, 1948.
Arthur J. Storeide, June 4, 1948.
James B. Stricker, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Max W. Stults, June 4, 1948.
Joseph L. Sunderlin, June 4, 1948.
Raymond H. Swientek, June 4, 1948.
Stewart E. Tangeman, June 4, 1948.
James J. Thompson, June 4, 1948.
James L. Thompson, June 4, 1948.
Benjamin K. Tice, June 4, 1948.
Eugene F. Timpe, June 4, 1948.
Robert E. Tisdale, June 4, 1948.
Dennis W. Tomlin, June 4, 1948.
Albert Towle, June 4, 1948.
James R. Trommlitz, June 4, 1948.
Neely E. Turner, June 4, 1948.
James F. Turney, June 4, 1948.
David J. Vaughan, June 3, 1949.
John C. Vogel, June 4, 1948.
Lek K. Von Kaesborg, June 4, 1948.
William F. Wade, June 4, 1948.
William G. Wagner, June 4, 1948.
Donald G. Wallace, Jr., June 4, 1948.
John I. Walling, June 4, 1948.
Robert N. Wallis, June 4, 1948.
William G. Walston, June 4, 1948.
Glenn W. Ward, June 4, 1948.
Richard K. Watson, June 4, 1948.
Lee E. Wells, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Howard W. Westervelt, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Otis "V" Wheeler, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Walter A. White, June 3, 1949.
James R. Whitehead, June 4, 1948.
Ralph G. Wilde, June 4, 1948.
William E. Willingham, Jr., June 4, 1948.
James L. Willson, June 4, 1948.
Frank M. Wilson, Jr., June 4, 1948.
John C. Wold, June 4, 1948.
Dwight E. Wood, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Robert C. Wood, June 4, 1948.
William H. Wood 3d, June 4, 1948.
Guy G. Wooten, June 4, 1948.
Bynum McW. Works, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Walter J. Wright, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Billy G. Yarbrough, June 4, 1948.
Richard E. Young, June 4, 1948.
Robert M. Young, June 4, 1948.
David E. Zacharias, June 4, 1948.
Walter P. Ziarnik, June 4, 1948.

The following named (women) to be ensigns in the Navy:

Carolyn E. Abrams	Vivian J. McLaughlin
Rhoda Berenfield	Olive A. Meining
Edith M. Blauvelt	Gloria E. Morenz
Patricia Cook	Carol L. Muth
Virginia Craig	Grace Olekszak
Mary C. Crombie	Annabelle Peterson
Genevieve E. Doherty	Judith S. Plaster
Mary E. Donnelly	Beverly M. Robinson
Jean F. Harrington	Ami W. Sear
Katherine J. Hinman	Anna M. Shaub
Dorothy V. Holliday	Dorothea H. Shinn
Constance L. Jones	Dorothy J. Taylor
Mary J. Linderman	June A. Tyler
Sara J. Lloyd	Mary J. Zurick
Iris C. McGlothlin	

The following named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy (special duty officers):

Ben M. Cole	John P. Maloney, Jr.
Dee W. Douglass	Walter W. Manley
Benjamin Gettler	Oscar H. Marsh
Harrell M. Graham	Donald J. Pepple
Daniel C. Jaquint	Robert Wrzesinski

The following named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

To be commander

George D. Skow

To be lieutenant commanders

Fred A. Ellis
David F. Hottenstein

To be lieutenants

James A. Brinson	Arthur G. Rink
John H. Hege	Karl R. Whitney

To be lieutenant (junior grade)

Frank B. Johnson

The following named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

Morton J. Aronson
Jack S. Biesenkamp
Arthur J. Blanchard
Winton R. Boyd
Leland C. Brannon
Carl A. Broaddus, Jr.
Edward F. Burkhart
Benjamin P. Burns
Jonathan G. Busby
Jack E. Byrd
John B. Caire
Edmundo V. Castillo Amy
William J. Champion
Kenneth "E" "M" Chapman
Frederick A. Clark, Jr.
Leon W. Clark
Walter T. Colbert
Robert E. Dent
Keith S. Ditman
Winfield D. Edgerton
Donald W. Edwards
James B. Flanagan
Samuel M. Fox, III
William L. Hall
Alfred K. Hawkes
Robert L. Hill
Harry L. Hoffman
Hampton Hubbard
Albert M. Jenkins
Clarence H. Johnston
Theo N. Kirkland, Jr.
Hoyt Kirkpatrick, Jr.
Stuart D. Kustermann
Edward D. Loweecey
Francis X. MacAulay
Charles E. Mangin
Joseph L. Mays
Robert E. Mitchél
Duncan O. Montgomery
Robert S. Mutch
Kenneth A. Parmalee
Robert O. Peckinpaugh
Maxwell G. Potter
Maurie D. Pressman
Anthony P. Prezyna
James S. Reed
Harry L. Roberts, Jr.
David R. Rogers
Neal D. Sanborn
Frederick W. Shillinger
William R. Sillery
Alexander C. Smith
James B. Smith
Ray T. Smith, Jr.
Ernest A. Sneddon
James E. Stark
James H. Stewart
Sam D. Waldrop
Robert Warren
James H. Wells

The following named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy to rank from date indicated after each name:

Philip S. Bashor, June 3, 1949.
William H. Bason, June 4, 1948.
James D. Bennett, June 4, 1948.
Charles R. Bowen, June 4, 1948.
John M. Bristow, June 4, 1948.
John R. Burke, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Elwood A. Carmer, June 4, 1948.
Dan M. Carpenter, June 4, 1948.
George I. Chegin, June 4, 1948.
Francis J. Chester, June 4, 1948.
Wayne R. Crozier, June 4, 1948.
Harry C. Dolbeck, June 4, 1948.
Robert F. Dunbar, June 4, 1948.
Vaughn H. Earley, June 4, 1948.
Glendale M. Eaton, June 4, 1948.
Melvin I. Freedman, June 4, 1948.
William F. Glase, June 4, 1948.
John C. Green, June 4, 1948.
William M. Hamilton, June 4, 1948.
Herschel B. Hamric, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Paul C. Herndon, June 4, 1948.
William W. Hoban, June 3, 1949.
Dale E. Jackson, June 4, 1948.
William H. Jeffery, June 4, 1948.
Selden D. Kelley, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Milton E. Kreyenhagen, June 4, 1948.
Robert S. Leventhal, June 4, 1948.
Harley D. Lindquist, June 3, 1949.
Walter E. Linthicum, June 4, 1948.
Donald C. Mehaffey, June 4, 1948.
George L. Moreman, June 4, 1948.
David F. Morrow, June 4, 1948.
Lawrence C. Murdoch, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Carl H. Newman, June 4, 1948.
Raymond B. Renne, June 4, 1948.
Bradley B. Ridge, June 4, 1948.
John H. Rolfs, June 4, 1948.
Homer D. Simons, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Roy F. Smith, June 4, 1948.
Thomas B. Stanley, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Charles C. Swanke, June 4, 1948.
Darrell E. Swenson, June 4, 1948.
Clarence G. Tatum, June 4, 1948.
Kay K. Thurman, June 4, 1948.
Richard E. Utman, June 4, 1948.
Wesley W. VanMalsen, June 4, 1948.
Wayne S. Vroman, June 4, 1948.
John W. Walsh, June 4, 1948.
Robert L. Weaver, June 4, 1948.
Harry K. Welge, June 4, 1948.
Emmett J. Wild, June 4, 1948.
Leslie W. Williams, June 4, 1948.

The following named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy:

John A. Abucewicz
Peter J. Bakker
Paul W. Chalfant
Richard P. Chase
Joseph P. Cloonan
Benjamin J. Davis
John P. Fay
Jack W. Hayes
William M. Hearn
Richard G. Hutcheson, Jr.
Kevin J. Keaney
Patrick A. Killeen
Henry T. Lavin
Carroll McB. Mershon
Daniel J. O'Leary
Glen A. Bademacher
George F. Rossbach
Homer L. Schnick
Eugene J. Sheridan
Charles A. Szczesny
Charles E. Webb
John A. Widman, Jr.
John E. Zoller

The following named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

Carlyle J. Baker, Jr.
Charles K. Bresett
Keith H. Dearth
William G. Hample
Robert Q. Heglund
Paul R. Jasper
Russell J. Klingenmeier, Jr.
Harold W. Merritt, Jr.
Frank R. O'Neill
Donald A. Patrick
Martin J. Roddy, Jr.
Winfred A. Shaw
Lloyd E. Stiffler, Jr.
William C. Stookey
William H. Sturman
James H. Vaughan, Jr.
Charles F. Zirzow

The following named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

To be commander

Max J. Brandt

To be lieutenant commanders

William C. Brandon, Jr.
William E. Crollus, Jr.
Leroy R. Frantz
Harold J. Ralston
George H. Sandman

To be lieutenant

William C. Riesenberg

To be lieutenant (junior grade)

Lewis L. Gunther

The following named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

Donald R. Bassett
George A. Besbekos
Frank D. Buckley
Melvin L. Calton
John J. Fritz
John W. Hardwick
Richard S. Hay
Aloys D. Heyen
Robert E. Hill
Milton Isaacson
William B. Kovacs
Frank A. Marmarose
Clifford H. Prince, Jr.
Ward E. Quilter, Jr.
Leo V. Ready
John P. Scullin
George D. Selfridge
Joseph Siegelman
William F. Sikes
Henry E. Snell
William T. Strahan

The following named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Jane E. Alexander
Wadealene Allen
Charlotte A. Antonelli
Mary J. E. Apollo
Edna L. Archibald
Frances L. Bartczak
Mary G. Bartlett
Sara J. Barton
Velva D. Berg
Ann A. Bergen
Lucille M. Bernson
Mildred J. Bishop
Arkie A. Bothwell
Patricia C. Bowers
Martha L. Boyette
Opal E. Bridges
Shirley L. Brooks
Irene R. Broski
Ruth M. Bruland
Jean D. Cairns
Oleta M. Cameron
Viola "C" Carboy
Ann E. Carlson
Mary E. Carmickle
Emma L. Carroll
Margaret E. Chapman
Barbara A. Chappell
Pauline M. Chisholm
Martha V. Chisolm
Kathleen J. Christensen
Nell M. Chumley
Kathleen Claffy
Virginia M. Cleary
Florence M. Collins
Pauline T. Cote
Shirley E. Cowan
Frances R. Crump
Jean M. Cushing
Alice LaV. Davis.
Betty M. Davis
Daisy L. Deem
Esther V. DeGree
Nettie A. DeLisa
Rose A. M. Dell'Acqua
Florence J. Delynko
Marionne L. deMoulin
Alice "M" DeReyes
Winifrede Devan
Mary V. Dewey
Louise H. Dewing
Janet F. Dixon
Margaret L. Donahue
Patricia L. Dowell
Mary J. Eico
Marilyn Ewing
Sarah J. Ezell
Rose C. Fidale
Jean M. FitzPatrick
Dessie J. Flood
Elizabeth A. Folan
Lillie M. Frank
Marion A. Fredrickson
Mary E. Frew
Dorothy J. Garber
Norma H. Gardill
Roma E. Garner
Mary M. Gilmore
Mary E. Glavin
Bessie Gochis
Dorothy J. Goodell
Marcia O. Graham
Alice T. Griffin
Frances T. Griffin
Helen K. Grubisich
Shirley A. Hakius
Shirley A. Harbaum
Laura C. Haring
Ima G. Harrell
Annie P. Hartin
Cristina Hernandez
Rhoda C. Hilke
Dorothy E. Holt
Enid Y. Horning
Joan L. Huber
Celeste M. Hughes
Barbara E. Hull
Mary A. Humphrey
Dorothy J. Hurley
Veronica D. Iasiello
Charlotte J. Jackson
Phyllis A. Jeffrey
Lois M. Johnson
Marion G. Johnson
Marjorie L. Johnson
Billie J. Johnston
Katherine L. Johnston
Eva D. Jones
Lenora M. Judy
Esther T. Kaczmarek
Mary L. Kaiser
Margaret B. Karas
Phyllis N. Keene
Mary A. Kelly
Florene Kelly
Arline L. Kennedy
Elizabeth G. Kennedy
Genevieve M. Kesner
Julia Kidda
Margaret E. Kissinger
Mary F. King
Geraldine M. Koliha
Aldona Krushinski
Tula J. LeNoir
Cornelia F. Long
Gloria Y. Lugar
Anna McConnon
Eleanor C. Mahoney
Ann Manley
Jackaline J. Marsh
Dorothy L. Martin
Lois C. Merritt
Dolores Michalski
Jeanne M. Milles
Betty M. Millsop
Dorothy E. Moore
Louise A. Morin
Arvice E. Moses
Jean E. Moury
Siran Mozian
Ila D. Mullenix
Eileen A. Murphy
Margaret M. Murphy
Esther G. D. Nielsen
Elizabeth J. O'Brien
Mary A. O'Connor
Eleanor L. Owens
Maribelle Page
Audrie M. Peplinski
Ruby T. Perrin
Jean E. Peterson
Geraldine E. Pike
Luisa A. Power
Shirley A. Raymond
Edna M. Riemann
Nathalie A. Roark
Ruth C. Robinson
Phyllis A. Rodenbaugh
Patricia A. Roe
Helen Roller
Eva K. Roth
Marcella Schmokel
Betty L. Sharp
Katherine G. Shea
Mary C. Sheridan
Dorothea M. Short
Dorothy B. Slaven
Leona Soback
Billie J. Sorrells
Angeline J. Spotto
Mary R. Staehling
Melva Stankovich
Anna M. Stary
Gloria J. Sterling
Mary J. Steverson
Lillis L. Stoops
Catherine E. Storms
Betty J. Streeb
Ada M. Strickland
Ellen E. Stricklin
Dorothy N. Sweetman
Alfreda Szkodna
Lucy I. Tarvin
Elizabeth Taylor
Kathryn A. Terhune
Jean E. Tolbert
Mary F. Trocchi
Dolores Troskoski
Virginia C. Trujillo
Katherine A. Trumble
Patricia C. Tye
Elzbieta A. Uka
Georgia Vassilakos
Geneva E. Walker
Barbara Warner
Dorothy J. Watson
Mary M. Wein
Florence J. Welty
Marjory H. Werme
Lois E. Wilkinson
Patricia A. Wilkinson
Helen A. Womac
Joan A. Wunder
Loree Young
Marvis E. Young
Kathryn E. Zabel
Joan B. Zdeblick
Mary A. V. Ziebol

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the line of the Navy (special-duty officers):

To be commander

Charles G. Duffy

To be lieutenant

Dennis D. Nelson 2d

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the line of the Navy (women):

To be lieutenant commanders

Mary E. Brown
Bess A. Dunn
Eleanor J. Durrett
Joy B. Hancock
Etta B. Kitchen
Marie E. McDonnell
Elinor D. Rich
Louise K. Wilde
Anna M. Willauer
Audrey F. C. Williams

To be lieutenants

Mildred D. Aaberg
Olive B. Andrews
Alice E. Applegate
Mary E. Appler
Mae D. Arata
Mary A. Armstrong
Lillian A. Arslanian
Mary C. Ashton
Rosina F. Bachhuber
Mary T. Baker
Shirley R. Baraw
Quana E. Barber
Frances E. Bladasz
Mary E. Birch
Helen E. Bisz
Mary K. Bonds
Ruth M. Boater
Alice W. Brackett
Dorothy A. Brennan
Blanche MacK. Broadway
Sophia E. Brogan
Sara E. Brown
Ruth Brownell
Mary E. Bruns
Virginia Cameron
Ann L. Canney
Zelda Carof
Carrie C. Carte
Margaret E. Carver
Marguerite C. Champagne
Mary D. Chapman
Josephine L. Chenault
Leona K. Cloutier
Margaret S. Coates
Laura C. Cobb
Leonora A. Cofer
Marie J. Colpoys
Carol M. Comstock
Barbara A. Conard
Patricia G. Conwell
Dorothy I. Council
Anita E. Crews
Almira B. Davis
Susan F. Davis
Dorothy C. Dennis
Katherine C. Doe
Kathryn Dougherty
Jane S. Dunning
Olive W. Ehrich
Jane G. Fisher
Mary T. Flynn
Jeanne M. Fontaine
Christine Forrester
Mary L. Fraitas
Josephine R. Garrison
Virginia L. Gilmer
Moriece Gleason
Sybil A. Grant
Dorothy M. Hagen
Elsie R. Hanson
Frances L. Hill
Mary W. Horton
Mabel V. P. Hughes
Helen L. Irby
Helen C. Jackson
Anne P. Jameson
Naomi Johnson
Myldred E. Jones
Dorothy J. Joyce
Dorothy V. Karabinus
Virginia A. Keener
Marie B. Kelleher
Anne King
Sue C. King
Genevieve Koester
Clara A. Kuehn
Ruth K. Laughlin
Helen W. Lawrence
Mary E. Leighton
Abigail P. Leik
Rita Lenihan
Nancy B. Long
Esther M. K. Lound
Winifred Love
Marie A. McCabe
Mary R. McCann
Marion J. MacDonald
Frances S. Mitchell
Mildred W. Myrick
Mary E. Noble
Melba R. Parks
Lillian M. Pimlott
Erma J. Potter
Winifred R. Quick
Elizabeth L. Rawl
Noma P. Reid
Dorothy E. Richard
Mildred A. Robertson
Jane E. Ryan
Carolyn W. Schaefer
Norphlett Scott
Miriam A. Shelden
Katherine E. Shilling
Eleanor J. Sowers
Gladys M. Sperrle
Jean M. Stewart
Mabel M. Stockert
Mildred E. Sutton
Dorothy F. Swanson
Grace A. B. Taylor
Geraldine F. Twining
Elizabeth L. Tyree
Ellen M. U'Ren
Hattie P. Vestal
Marion F. Wagner
Hazel P. Welch
Ethel A. Weyant
Dorothy J. Williams
Laura E. Wintersteen
Dorothy T. Yarnall
Kathleen Ziegler

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Gladys J. Adams
Mary M. Angas
Doris M. Armor
Helen Augustiny
Eudora L. Beadle
Gladys Bickmore
Irma E. Bibens
Vivienne F. Boudreau
Rosa A. Brannon
Frances L. Broughton
Eleanor M. Casey
Constance E. Clark
June M. Cogswell
Catherine E. Cox
Catherine V. Cronin
Beatrice E. Dalier
Doris A. Defenderfer
Jean E. Dilgard
Donna S. Doe
Elizabeth M. Dougherty
Olive I. H. Dunham
Frances E. Earle
Louise L. Edelmann
Florence L. Erickson
Patricia C. Evans
Betty M. Fannan
Vera V. Foster
Barbara L. Greenwood
Mary E. Hannan
Eleanor R. Homan
Helen J. Hooker
Helen M. Horne
Marguerite H. Kiernan
Betty J. Knighton
Mary E. Lardner
Mary J. Lynch
Virginia K. McKinley
Dorothy L. Maraspin
Charlotte P. Nevers
Muriel E. Neville
Martha M. Perry
Grace S. Person
Gloria R. Pignatelli
Jeanne E. Piper
Mary M. Pritchard
Anita W. Reinecke
Dorothy Riggle
Dorothea Ritchie
Viola B. Sanders
Lucile A. Selelstad
Mary Sharples
Thelma W. Sites
Sybil M. Space
Mary M. Stark
Ruth M. Streeter
Betty R. Tennant
Eleanor A. Thompson
Lucile S. Thompson
Frances A. Townsend
Margaret E. Tracy
Beatrice M. Truitt
Margaretta vonSothern
Elinor J. Wagner
Effie J. Walker
Ellen W. West
Ellen Word

To be chief ship's clerk

Alma H. Plakke

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

To be commanders

Vernal G. Backman
James J. Hayes
Vernon E. Martens
Thomas P. Rogers
John F. Wyman

To be lieutenant commanders

Warner D. Budens, Jr.
Charles A. Castle
Broor A. Johnson
Ross B. Lautzenheiser
Clifford A. Stevenson
Berger Thomas
Bennett A. Wight

To be lieutenants

John R. Bierley
Walter H. Jarvis, Jr.
John F. McCabe
Leo S. Madlem, Jr.
Trowbridge R. Mafit
John H. Stover, Jr.

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

William F. Bennett, Jr.
William E. Carter
August P. Cieli
Nathaniel M. Cohen, Jr.
Thomas J. Coleman
David C. Dixon
Leo J. Frank, Jr.
Frank D. Fuller
Harold W. Garvin
John S. Graettinger
Martin O. Greaney, Jr.
Walter F. Hansen
Tom C. Hardy
James H. Holmes
Raleigh M. Hood
George T. Van Petten
Burton Willard
Robert A. Loeffler
Jay D. Wilson

The following-named officers (women) to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

To be lieutenant commander

Frances L. Willoughby

To be lieutenant

Gioconda R. Saraniero

To be chief warrant officer, Hospital Corps

Marion E. Cramer

The following-named officers (women) to the grades indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

To be lieutenant commander

Dorothy M. Quinn

To be lieutenants

Isabelle G. Ashton
Clara E. Bassett
Natalie T. Bell
Maxine Carrell
Margaret A. Cunningham
Kathleen A. Deery
Jean R. Edwards
Ellen Ford
Helen R. Gorham
Bessie Hagopian
Eleanor J. Hennessy
Elayne Jones
Susan H. Magette
Marie A. Marek
Margaret W. Mayes
Yvonne Nelson
Jane E. Schopfer
Arlene M. Sheehan
Florence M. Smith
Bettie B. West
Mary W. Wooldridge

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Mary J. Aplin
Faynola V. Armstrong
Margaret E. Barton
Betty J. Brown
Rita F. Brychal
Kathleen D. Cornell
Virginia G. Finney
Dorothy McC. Harrah
Shirley J. Kaye
Rosemary Lafferty
Jean I. Moon
Grace J. Page

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

To be lieutenant commanders

Irvin R. Barker
John O. Booth
Frederick H. Bradshaw
Oscar A. Combs
Harry E. Denen
Walter V. Felcyn
Joseph R. Grysbeck
Richard C. Harwood
Derwood F. Hattendorf
John P. Jones
Jack J. Kelly
Oliver S. Levitz
Frederick B. Lukins
Willard R. McClellan
Lattimer C. Rucker
Theodore C. Sample
Ernest A. Thayer
John E. Wiseman

To be lieutenants

Charles A. Bill
Rosolino J. Curreri
George I. Gilchrest, Jr.
Clyde A. Harris
Gerald L. Hodgson
Edward J. Kamarit
Charles L. Kelso
Jan F. King
Albin J. Koenig
Patrick J. Lamb
Melvin R. Leonard
Arthur J. Loring
Robert A. Oswald
Thomas "J" Ownby
James F. Pennington
Frank B. Rhobotham
Robert J. Roesser
George Sturm, Jr.
Joseph G. Tippin, Jr.
Charles G. Walder
Harold F. Wimp
Zenan J. Woycik

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

John A. Bancroft, Jr.
Elwood R. Bernhausen
Clyde N. Campbell
Lyle W. Cohler
Richard "C" D'Vincent
Stewart T. Elder
Bertel T. Malmberg
Neale H. Morrow
Eugene S. Pawlicki
James H. Tanaka
William D. Ungricht
Enrique Valentin, Jr.
Walter F. Woodward

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

To be lieutenants

Gordon C. Bell
John J. Beretta
Leonard J. Bodenlos
Robert S. Herrmann
Frederick J. Lewis, Jr.
William J. Perry
Joseph F. Snyder
Rufus L. Thompson
Robert C. Will
Ulmer Wilson

To be lieutenant (junior grade)

Andrew D. Singleton

The following-named officers (women) to the grades indicated in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

To be lieutenant commanders

Margaret M. Diehm
Mildred R. Lewis
Mary T. Sproul

To be lieutenants

Lois Brownell
Dorothy L. Chandler
Lucille R. Clark
Doris Cranmore
Melba A. Grafius
Mary F. Keener
Frances Spear
Margaret A. Stirewalt
Paula Towle

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Maria E. Aquino
Gladys H. Brewer
Glenna L. Cahill
Virginia J. Eager
Elizabeth Reeves
Georgie I. Simpson
Mary W. Winter

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

To be lieutenants

Regina M. L. Harty
Helen A. Reid
Mary M. Trantham
Esther V. Walenga
Marion F. Wardell
Helen L. Young

To be lieutenant (junior grade)

Margaret B. Binkley
Catherine M. Cirillo
Kathryn R. Day
Martha L. Gebusda
Rose A. Gallagher
Winifred T. Gewehr
Mary T. Gilfedder
Eleanor C. Hayes
Helen A. Mieras
Thelma J. Moran
Ruth L. Price
Elizabeth L. Spangler
Mildred E. Tesas
Martha A. Van Wye
Antoinette M. Weixelman

To be ensigns

Marie C. Bringgold
Eleanor M. Lux
Martha G. McKelley
Aileen A. Salisbury
Mary C. Seaton
Rita B. Voth

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the line of the Navy, for limited duty only, classification deck:

To be lieutenant commanders

Troy Brashear
Earl W. Brown
Milton P. Dominguez
Robert Fisher
John D. Garland
Luin G. Kingman
William O. Kuykendall
Charles A. Parsons
Dewey Walley
Charles J. Wichmann

To be lieutenants

Irvin Boas
Daniel A. Boone
Adolph M. Bothne
Aubra Calhoun

William R. Carter
Earl H. Clark
Thomas L. Cleaver, Jr.
John R. Davidson
Victor L. Davis
Ernest W. Downey
George L. Dunn
Clifford W. Engler
William J. English
Biagio O. Furnari
Harold G. Gibson
Carl T. Gleason
Harry A. Guthrie
"J" "C" Hale
William S. Hall
Orion A. Hammett
Rex Harbert
Hubert E. Harroun
Edward G. Hatchell
Leslie Jones
Jesse E. Lee
James S. Lees
Stanley J. Lewandowski
George M. Maloof
Cecil H. McCullar
John K. Metzger
Charles A. Miller
Kenneth A. Mundy
Charles E. Napier
Arthur W. Nordquist
George E. Paris
Ralph N. Pickles
Marinus Pilkington
George E. Poore
Charles A. Rourk
James T. Schermerhorn
Robert J. Siegelman
Sidney M. Skjel
Caydar E. Swenson
William O. Talley
Clarence M. Taylor
Milfred W. Thomas
Ephraim R. Weaver
Raymond F. Willett
Thomas S. Williamson

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

William F. Adams
Theodore F. Aldous
Robert M. Beckley
Frank L. Brimmer
Evan M. Chantk
Homer W. Chellew
William T. Davern
Mack D. Ellis
Robert J. Erickson
Ned A. Gardner
John E. George
Ralph H. Habecker
Robert G. Hoffman
Boyd D. Hughes
Malcolm R. Massie
Clinton J. Merritt
Robert L. O'Brien
Quinnie B. Preston
Carl O. Quarterman
Elsworth C. Reynolds
Meredith C. Riddle
William H. Robb
John B. Saylor
Urban E. Schaffner
Mike Stapleton
Lloyd V. Sternberg
John S. Tuttle
Elwood Vaughan
Howard A. Westphal
Jesse L. White

To be ensigns

Ralph L. Anderson
Horace W. Atkisson
Richard K. Barley
Marion L. Bohgren
Clinton F. Churchill
Vardy D. Garvey
John G. Gilyard
Louis C. Hambley
Hans P. Hansen
William F. Harris
Vernon L. Homer
Charlie R. Jones
John P. Kreckel
Francis E. Law
Philip L. Mann
Robert D. McBain
William R. Morgan
Lawrence O. Nasset
Alfred F. Norwood
Eugene A. O'Brien
Aquilino L. Ponciroli
Robert F. Reed
Wilbur E. Reed
Russell L. Sanders
Joseph E. Sullivan
Harry E. Weber
Billis L. Whitworth
Louis J. Yakich
Harold M. Yelton

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the line of the Navy, for limited duty only, classification ordnance:

To be lieutenant commanders

Theodore R. Brown
John O. Cavanaugh
James M. Hale
William T. Hall
Wilbur R. Hunter
Eugene F. Marker
Magnus D. Olavsen
Hampton L. Outlaw
Gleason Sherman
Oscar G. Urquhart
Samuel J. Whitehead

To be lieutenants

Robert F. Ault
Albert H. Baker
Frederick M. Betts
William R. Boehlert
Charles H. Eaton
Edwin H. Edgerton
Robert W. Eichelberger
Francis A. Farrow
Harold J. Gilpin
Charles E. Hackwith
Charles W. Henning
William P. Hoag
George P. Koch
Robert H. Krombar
Arthur H. Larson
Howard W. Mabus
James W. McBrier
Lesley D. McVey
Joe R. Moring
Marvin Purcell
Samuel Roy
Charles E. Saxton
Joseph M. Schick
Robert S. Selby
Walter A. Sheltren
Garnet M. Smithson
Raymond F. St. John
Robert E. Weaver
Carl H. Wehr

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Norman W. Bixby
Bruce L. Black
William B. Dickson
John W. Gay
Emile R. Gemoets, Jr.
John S. Gibson, Jr.
Paul R. Hodgson
Leo T. Howard
Harvey B. Jones
Fowler H. Justus
Arthur N. L'Heureux
Howard B. Miller
Ernest J. Ogilvie
Sigmund Popko
Edwin P. Smith
Robert B. Stickles
Woodrow W. Thompson
John S. Walden

To be ensigns

Warren B. Brann
Warren L. Clary
William A. Dyrdahl
Alvin K. Fentress, Jr.
Vaughn H. Gary
Waldo D. Groom
Arthur L. Hage
Quentin R. Hatchl
Judson D. Huggins
Robert F. Jones
Willard Koone
Hugh W. Latham
Howard E. Lyon
William J. Miller
Robert L. Odell
Howard J. Owen
Charles F. Pape
Kenneth L. Shurtleff

The following named officers to the grades indicated in the line of the Navy, for limited duty only, classification administration:

To be lieutenant commanders

James E. Callan
Douglas N. Thomas

To be lieutenants

Edward A. Ballard
Joseph O. Bernier
Edgar O. Bonnell
Louis J. Broussard
William M. Calkins
Colie Chavis
Oakley W. Cheney
Moody O. Curry
William S. Edwards
Oliver E. Emmons
John S. Ervin
Loren P. Fitzgerald
Francis F. Garrett
Benjamin Groundwater
Donald L. Hartwich
Clarence C. Hawk
Harry L. Jackson
Homer L. Kisner
John M. Lynn
David L. Martin
William G. McClellan
Murrill C. Morris
James R. Morrow
Francis T. Nash
Leland Norton
Charles Olasky
Francis V. O'Leary
Carl J. Pritchard
William McK. Rigdon
Alexander K. Robinson
Martin Romano
Durwood G. Rorie
Robert R. Ruff
Guy R. Strickland
William E. Taylor
Paul A. Terry
Nicholas S. Thompson
Joseph W. Vercher
Charles H. Wainscott
Jeptha C. Weems
John E. Whitely
Donald A. Yetter
Clarence J. Zielke

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Edward G. Ames
John C. Arthur
Clarence J. Barry
Alvin C. Bergquist
Silas M. Blakely
Edward F. Block
Harold B. Boaz
William T. Coulson
Charles M. Dorris
Harry W. Enabnit
Elton E. Flowers
Harold M. Frediani
Lloyd E. Helwick
Max W. Henry
Frederick J. Hicken
Clayton F. Johnson
Ben G. Jones, Jr.
Wayne W. Litchfield
Herbert W. McGuire
Kenneth L. Mell
Roman G. Mislicky
Lennon T. Paige
James E. Plowden
Gilbert W. Rappelt
John R. Shannon
Theodore J. Wildman

To be ensigns

Lawrance L. Beese
Royal D. Berg
William G. Bigony
Douglas I. Blancheri
Willis J. Boo
Gustave L. Caros
William Q. Damon
Luis A. Dasso
Anthony Dombroski
Elmer H. Earnhardt
Dale C. Hillman
Reo M. Hood
Paul A. Hunt
Robert P. Javins
Charles E. Johnson, Jr.
Carl B. Kole
Charles L. Lowry
Eugene B. W. Meeker
David L. Miller
Kenneth Richardson
Russell D. Rider
Floyd Robertson
Francis J. Rodstrom
Lewis B. Shults
Donald D. Stone
Charles R. Sullenger

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the line of the Navy, for limited duty only, classification engineering:

To be lieutenant commanders

Robert F. Baker
Kenneth B. Bell
Fred W. Boettcher
Walter E. Burke
Bartholomew H. Faherty
Dean Fluss
Charles T. Foley
Charles F. Foster
Glenn Gardner
Joshua H. Garrett
Loren Henderson
Edwards R. Hinson
Michael J. Hurley
Wilfred S. Iredale
Kenneth R. Kee
Joseph M. Lenart
Robert H. Lynn
James J. Marron
Frank McDole
Herman Miller
Otis C. Oliver
Daniel Osburg
John M. Owen
John W. Poteet
Arthur H. Randall
Harry O. Reynolds
Charles S. Seidle
Richard G. Sly
William A. Smith
Chester M. Stearns
Edwin W. Streeter
Herbert J. West
Olen "C" Woodroof
Alphonse V. Zeis

To be lieutenants

William E. Bell
George "H" Boyd
Earl D. Bronson
Fred M. Burdette
Garland Casey
Francis E. Chamberlain
Woodrow D. Crossley
Joe B. Decker
Paul H. Dice
Paul E. Dignan
Lawrence J. Dobson
Henry V. Durlin
Harold E. Erickson
Otto A. Fennig
Jesse W. Franklin, Jr.
Harold C. Gabriel
Richard R. Garriott
Merle A. Grant
William T. Harrison
Ernest B. Hess
William I. Hobbs
Robert N. Huey
John J. Huggard
Clarence E. Johnson
Mathis S. Johnson
Marvin C. Jorgenson
Carl F. Lee
Roy E. Marsden
Philip N. MacDonald
Stanley Mandekic
Gerald M. Meter
William T. Miller
John S. Morse
John W. Nesbitt
Elmer E. Niebuhr
Ralph H. Packer
Richard A. Pohl
Rollin M. Reed
Frank E. Robb
Albert D. Robbins
Oscar E. Robinson
Donald K. Ross
John I. Rustin
Roy C. Shriber
Victor A. Schmalfeldt
John M. Siran
Norman L. Sorenson
Emmett C. Suggs
Clyde W. Summers
Norman Thompson
John J. Trimner
Herbert H. Vanaman
Adolph Viegelmann
Furman D. Waltrip
David A. Ware
Nelson J. Watkins
George S. Watson
James J. Whipps, Jr.
William Williamson
Virden J. Wixon
Wayne G. Wright
Oran W. V. Young

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Robert H. Armour
Thomas E. Beger
George R. Becker
Laurence G. Brooks
Jim W. Bryson
Morrison E. Cavanaugh
Vincent R. Dahlen
Joseph D. DeLuca
James D. Dodge
Leon S. Ertle
Jack M. Feliz
Paul E. Fournier
Laron S. Franklin
Theodore C. Gavett
John G. Gillissie
Stuart V. Glenn
Lyle T. Griffis
William E. Harper
Rollin F. Heassler
Orville B. Hoel
Spencer W. Horner, Jr.
Paul E. Huffman
George L. Kent
Lloyd C. Knowles
Roland L. Loper
Richard R. Matthews
Joseph F. Miller
Charles F. Murray
Stephen J. Nemeth
George W. Perrin
Harry R. Ridge
George S. Schlemmer
Russel D. Smith
James B. Taylor
Leo E. Therrian
John T. Timmerman
Joseph Turnauer
Frank W. Warrick

To be ensigns

Charles C. Allen
Fredrick R. Barker
Charles J. Barr
Francis M. Brosnihan
Stewart V. Buchanan
John J. Butlak
Frederick S. Butz
Don M. Cameron
Howard W. Carr
Hugh A. Cleveland
Charles W. Combs, Jr.
Leonard W. Cushing
Fred W. Davenport
Teloft Dmoch
Carl B. Ditto
Jesse W. Dunwoody
William J. Egan
Marion S. Evans
John W. Fletsch
George H. Gaddy
Donald Gaither
Stuart M. Johnston
Jack J. Jones
William Kahler
Harry R. Kohler
Travis A. Mathis
John L. Mlanick
James D. Moore
Francis C. Moses
Freeman H. Myers
Guy L. Pitsenberger
Chesley W. Richey
Claude E. Riley
Ray W. Selwert
Gerald O. Spears
Robert A. Stahl
Harold M. Steeves
Courtenay McK. Stone

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the line of the Navy, for limited duty only, classification hull:

To be lieutenant commanders

Harold L. Carpenter
Herbert L. Chapman
William J. Condon
Benjamin F. Edwards
Roy C. Parlier

To be lieutenants

Louis E. Biechlin
George H. Boyer
Gradie L. Carter
Edward M. Doran
Robert A. Dusch
Henry H. Frye
John R. Gorman
Edward N. Hann
William L. Henson
Christian T. Jensen
William A. Mahan
William C. McOwen
James W. Meehan
Robert M. Metzger
John F. Miller
Warner M. Minor
Louis W. Rash
Charles L. Schooler
Allen W. Bain
Francis W. Barrington
Albert O. Tate
Clyde H. Toland
Alfred J. Yuzakewich

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Thomas E. Acton
John W. Barden
William E. Barron
Allan R. Carlson
Gordon B. Dosskey
Harold F. Duval
William E. Fuller
Edward J. Kratochvil
James H. McDonald
John W. Newman
Loren J. Roberts
Lloyd P. Ross
Howard K. Smith
Cecil R. Thorne

To be ensigns

Albert A. Bartholomew
Henry F. Berck
John B. Griffin
Joe H. Hunt
George D. Jackson
Donald F. Krysan
Robert N. McKinney
Troy M. McKinney
Glenn O. Poplin
William H. Potts, Jr.
Richard F. Schumaker
Anderson V. Showen
Robert H. Smith
Charles C. Tidwell, Jr.

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the line of the Navy, for limited duty only, classification electronics:

To be lieutenant commanders

Wilby R. Brown
Frank H. Clarke
Adna R. Crawford
Charles S. Deaton
Gordon O. Denzin
Donald L. Dickson
Albert P. Hilar
Arthur T. Hodges
William C. Louderback
Chester Lovell
Hugh C. Overstreet
Edward S. Pelling
Paul R. Reed
Kirke G. Schnoor
Earl W. Sloan
Frank L. Smith
John R. Stacey
James E. Teague
Ralph A. Turner
Arvell B. Ward
Guy W. Warren

To be lieutenants

Carroll C. Andrews
Floyd C. Atnip
John J. Bartko
Myron E. Beard
William H. Benedict
Vane M. Bennett
George M. Chaffin
Irwin R. Colldeweih
Joe M. Danielski
Delmas H. Denton
Joseph W. Dochnahl
Charles T. Duvall
Ned A. Garretty
Eldon L. Guhl
William A. Harpster
Russell G. Harriman
Girthel R. Hill
John M. Jones
Chauncey B. King
Charles H. Klouck
Robert L. McClaren
James R. McKenzie, Jr.
Stewart C. Miller
Douglas T. Morse
Nels J. Nelson
Francis M. Oakley
Bascome K. Osborne
Oscar Osheim
Clarence O. Payne
Lafayette W. Remillard
Jackson M. Rightmyer
Fred C. Rupprecht
Otis L. Scheibeler
Walter Schimmelpfennig
Leland V. Starkey
Charles L. Suggs
Peter G. Trapani
Willard Triska
Truman E. Turnipseed
Fay W. Wadhams
Edward A. Waiswilos
Cecil E. Wilson

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Robert G. Blakely
Abrahm H. Brower
Donald F. Byers
Wade H. Cone
Lawrence W. Covert
Edward H. Daughtrey
Ivan H. Douglas
Harold M. Dubree
Lewis L. Edwards
David E. Goudy
John Grekzouk
Truman F. Grubl
Robert B. Harris
Bernard A. Middleton
Oscar B. Nelson
Victor S. Pedersen
James R. Rodman
John E. Russ
Crissie C. Sanders
James Sei
Will L. Stalnaker
Sumner K. Thompson, Jr.
Alfred H. Thorne
Joseph B. Tiara
Joseph W. Trumbo
Irving E. Wetmore
Paul H. Williams

To be ensigns

George A. Ales
James M. Arnold
Ira H. Ball
John H. Bilkey

Rudolph M. Buselmeier
Graig McD. Coley
Fred R. Crumbaugh, Jr.
William A. Evans
Alfred F. Ferguson
Charles J. Fox
Raymond A. Frady
Roy L. Hoffmann
Nathan H. King
Charles E. Landahl
Edgar H. LaRose
Alexander Lennox, Jr.
John D. MacKinnon
Roy W. McCotter
John E. Nichols
Ross Peters
Charles W. Postlethwaite
Elmer R. Rath
Francis L. Schlude
Harold J. Shapard
Robert E. Tyler
Merle W. Walton

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the line of the Navy, for limited duty only, classification operations aviation:

To be lieutenant commanders

Jesse A. Fairley
Theron R. Jordan
Leon G. Lehrer
James C. McCoy
John G. Pendergraph

To be lieutenants

Edward H. Bayers
Elton W. Bode
Donald V. Chacey
William E. Chase
Gordon E. Firebaugh
Donald R. French
Marion H. Hawkins
Robert M. Israel
William N. Livingston
Leroy Loewer
Winfield G. Maurer
George R. Mills
Bacil C. Wheatley

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

George W. Bolt
Joseph Buehlman
Paul E. Dickson
Mason O. Erwin
Frederick G. Hewitt
Dale S. Lyons
Johnnie E. Mattis
Walter Schauer

To be ensigns

Arthur C. Black
George W. Brooks
Reid E. Coble
Edmond F. Frazier
George E. Smith
Kenneth W. Scott
Gordon W. Jones

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the line of the Navy, for limited duty only, classification ordnance aviation:

To be lieutenants

Congrave C. Callaway
Thomas H. Davis
Ivan C. Floerchinger
Charles W. Gibbo
Fred J. Livingston
Edward M. Medart
Luther R. Miller

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Dwight F. Asmus
Arthur L. Bureau
David E. Hilton
Charles F. Yarbrough

To be ensigns

Richard D. Blair
Claude L. Dickerson
James D. March
Edward G. Phillips

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the line of the Navy, for limited duty only, classification engineering aviation:

To be lieutenant commanders

John C. Clarke
Joseph C. Clemens
Harry E. Holt
John C. Lafferty
John R. McCants
Gerard T. Morton
Clarence L. Pearson

To be lieutenants

Ernest J. Baldwin
Fletcher N. Baldwin
Daniel J. Bennett
Harry P. Beverage
Harold W. Bramblett
Michael P. Dennis
James F. Donnelly
Maynard S. Dubois
Howard W. Dye
Emery C. Geise
Oren E. Gibson
Eugene C. Gilbert, Jr.
William R. Guyer
Henry I. Harrison
Thomas W. Heath
John E. Hunt
John F. Ivy
John Kaspary
Paul E. Keith
Leif I. Larson
Stephen B. Lewis
George C. Littmann
Manuel Luke
Ira T. Lynn
James H. Manning
Don E. McLeod
Stuart R. Miller
Tom C. Pearce
Henry H. Philipsen
Glenn C. Poston
Vern A. Prather
Russel O. Reich
Preston R. Rucker
Raymond Rucker
Horace D. Schultz
Walter E. Schwartz
Frank M. Screws
Lewis E. Thompson, Jr.
Juston W. West

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

John T. Baker
Alfred V. Boutin
Nels E. Brugman
Lester D. Carter
Norbert A. Commons
Harry D. Hall
William D. Hall
Joseph H. James
Charles C. Kauffman
Omar F. Keith
Wesson A. Mansfield
Norman W. McLeod
Edward C. Miller
John B. Moore
Jerry P. Morelock
William J. Norton
Miles E. Piper
Richard M. Quattlebaum
Standlee L. Rank
Donald E. Runyon
William F. Salkowski
Arnold J. Scanzillo
William A. Simpson
Paul St. Jerne

To be ensigns

Louis A. Barich
Woodson P. Bremer
Max A. Crain
Anthony S. Creider
Edward O. Crosby
Daniel B. Delly
Eugene R. Forsht
Herbert A. Franck
Philip C. Gliem
Richard Green
George T. Hamilton
William C. Harrell
Willie W. Harris
Herbert L. Hope
Francis E. Jones
Norman N. LeMote
Francis F. Matthewson
Allan E. McArthur
Marcus McHenry
Champ C. Mulligan
Harry E. Ramsey
James M. Simpson
Donald E. Stanley
George Wilder

The following named officers to the grades indicated in the line of the Navy, for limited duty only, classification electronics aviation:

To be lieutenant commanders

Clayton W. Bailey
Samuel H. Foster
Mack C. Veltman

To be lieutenants

Albert L. Ballard
Paul J. Bartko
Irvin H. Bordihn
Curtis L. Downey
Joseph D. Ellis
Harry F. Grace
George K. Herman
Glen A. Herndon
Horton C. Kessler
Robert E. Mansard
Joseph P. C. Martineau
Alton R. McMullen
Alonzo R. Moeller
James F. Murray
Kenneth R. Norton
Earle B. Perce
George A. Tourville
Sam C. Violett
William P. Warwick
James A. Weatherbie

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Samuel B. Arnold
Jack G. Churchill
Russel L. Hendrickson
William E. Jenkins
Arthur C. McLean, Jr.
Lavern C. Moore
Leroy Perkins
Jack O. Polk
Lester A. Powers, Jr.
John A. Tennant
Ralph C. Thomas
Boyce St. C. Webb

To be ensigns

Walter R. Crandall
Roger E. Dickeson
Claude J. Hinds, Jr.
Robert L. Holt
Elmer E. Jackson
Edwin R. Jenks
Raymond A. Kulig
Robert G. Langland
Howard W. Masterman
Charles H. McMakin
John A. Pino
Lewis J. Polansky

The following named officers to the grades indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy, for limited duty only:

To be lieutenant commanders

Charles B. Cotton
John Peak

To be lieutenants

Montell Abercrombie
Albert Albert
Joseph F. Arnold
Emmett O'N. Barlie
Clifton Brewer
Arnold R. Bruhn
John E. Connelly
John N. Davis
Clarence Deeming
Marvin A. Desmither
Robert E. Gaffney
Henry L. Geoghegan
George G. Gorting
Samuel O. Grayson
Francis W. Hardacre
Simeon G. Higgins
Francis Illum
Gerald W. Jackson
Page N. Keesee
Stanley S. Logsdon
Jake F. Marshall
Irving W. Martin
Marson W. Morgan
Melvin E. Morse
Carleton H. Mundell
Austin B. Pomel
Edgar D. Reinhold
Clarence Roseneck
Brandon D. Rosser
Joe E. Schruhl
Boyd M. Shaffer
Thomas J. Sikes
William A. Smith
Bernard J. Stasey
Thomas I. Stephens
Kenneth H. Stimeling
Russell G. Vail, Jr.
Louis E. Yost

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Charles C. Alexander
Carl I. B. Anderson
Paul L. Anderson
Howard P. Conley
Curtis Cullen
Kenneth P. Dehart
Widar J. Forde
Loyd Goolsby
Robert F. Hart
Robyn H. Henderson
Eddie M. Johnson
Adolph Mathews
James H. Miller
Edward R. Morey
George L. Owen
Lawrence O. Purkaple
Willard N. Schneider
Horace D. Sharon
Joseph J. Snapp
William W. Statia
Ernest H. Wendt
Luther N. White
Roquel A. Wilson
William D. Wright

To be ensigns

James F. Armlin
William Backer
Mack B. Bingham
Emlin N. Brown, Jr.
Cassel O. Crain
William J. Crutchfield
Leonard D. Ellingwood
Gerald K. Gamber
Harold Kearsley
William D. Little
Richard C. May
Walter M. McCandless
John A. McCormick
Raymond A. Medlin
Paul J. Metcalf
Edwards M. Morris
Albert K. Pavelka
Robert V. Schmidt
John G. Slattery
Ralph A. Smith
Philip A. P. Stine
Joseph H. Tetrault
Kiehl E. Underhill
Stephen J. Walsh

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, for limited duty only:

To be lieutenants

John W. Aufdenspring
Herman L. Berube
Robert W. Epps
George O. Helms
Claude D. Masters
Lowell H. Muse

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Robert E. Dilley
Kerman C. McDuffie

To be ensigns

Arnold W. Ebert
Arthur E. Hackett
Nestor P. Michaleczko
Richard L. Tinklepaugh
John D. Watson, Jr.
Frank D. Wilson

IN THE NAVY AND NAVAL RESERVE

The following-named officers of the Navy and Naval Reserve, on active duty, for appointment to the ranks and grades hereinafter stated, and to correct typographical errors as previously nominated and confirmed:

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line of the Navy:

Allred, Jimmie "B", Jr.
Amos, John B., Jr.
Callahan, Francis J., III Jr.
Clark, Angus-Kerr
Connellee, William L.
DeBold, Joseph F.
Fisher, James R. M., II
Fleeger, Eugene G.
Galland, Frank J.
Gibbs, LeRoy C.
Gilles, Donald A.
Griswold, Richard A.
Hollingsworth, Robert J.
Holt, Edward
Kline, Edward C., Jr.
Lacewell, Lasley K., Jr.
Langille, Justin E., III
Leute, George M., Jr.
McGrane, Clarence V., Jr.
Ney, Kenneth C.
Redgrave, DeWitt C.
Reisinger, Edward A.
Rickman, Wilford M.
Robertson, Chaytor L., Jr.
Scheuhing, Robert E.
Schneider, Frank J., Jr.
Schubert, Allen H.
Searle, Willard F., Jr.
Skoog, Joseph L., Jr.
Smyth, Terence J.
Stevens, Mortimer, Jr
Stickels, Jack R.
Stiegelmar, Loren R.
Tice, John J., III
Tiemann, Wilbur F., Jr.
Timpson, Nephi H., Jr.
Vrolyk, Raymond F.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

August, Joseph J.
Clements, Daniel J., Jr.
Dooling, David
Haley, Robert S.
Jordan, Robert L.
Klecotka, Carl J.
Landis, Calvin D.
MacDonald, Albert P., Jr.
Maragides, Harry N.
Sueur, Charles A.
Weir, Robert A.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

LaLande, Albert M., Jr.
Roy, Vershall A.
Whyte, David P.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

Armitage, Horace G.
Stutler, David R.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

DiVincenzo, Julia J.
Fischer, Corinne A.
Forest, Yolande A. J.
Holmes, Mary A.
Hunsecker, Isabel V.
Kraince, Ethelyn E.
Lux, Eleanor M.
Sieland, Rita A.
Simpson, Elizabeth M.
Steinmetz, Anna M.
Troyan, Dorothy M.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of commissioned warrant officer in the Navy in the grades indicated:

TO BE CHIEF BOATSWAINS

Eikam, Joseph
McCammond, Earle A.
Pearson, Robert L.

TO BE CHIEF GUNNER

Grigsby, William

TO BE CHIEF ELECTRICIAN

Buell, Clement A.

TO BE CHIEF RADIO ELECTRICIAN

Young, Herschell B.

TO BE CHIEF MACHINISTS

Dallendorfer, Andrew J.
Fennig, Otto A.
Jones, Granvil H.
Stephens, James M.
Tegeler, Russell C.
Williams, Pinckney M.

TO BE CHIEF CARPENTER

Dosskey, Gordon B.

TO BE CHIEF PAY CLERKS

Knowles, "J" Marshall
Vail, Russell G., Jr.

TO BE COMMISSIONED WARRANT OFFICER, HOSPITAL CORPS

Witcofski, Louie K.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line of the Navy:

Belman, Kenneth B.
Donoho, Charles G.
Fellers, Howell E.
Hahne, Charles E.
Hicks, Thomas E.
Koza, Harold D.
Loveland, Edward C.
Miears, Roy R.
Premselaar, Seymour J.
Smiglewski, John J.
Terry, Charles F.
Vander Veen, Don

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

Burkholder, Arthur W., Jr.
Sumrell, Guy H., Jr.

The following-named officer for temporary appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

Borja, Arthur

The following-named officer for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line of the Naval Reserve:

Freedman, Alice R.

The following-named officer for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Naval Reserve:

McHugh, Edward A.

The following-named officer for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Nurse Corps of the Naval Reserve:

D'Auria, Gloria V.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment in the line of the Navy in grades hereinafter stated:

TO BE LIEUTENANT

Linder, Arthur E.

TO BE ENSIGN

Ryan, Joseph C., Jr.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy in grades hereinafter stated:

TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

La Barre, Carl A.
Vaklyes, John W.

TO BE LIEUTENANTS

Gillis, Arthur W.
Hough, Homer H.
Lachicotte, Albert S., Jr.
Sheen, Raymond H.
Standish, John C.
Werner, Sherwood H.

TO BE LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Anderson, Emil
Applegate, Richard C.
Chamberlin, Lewis C.
Clifton, Emory V.
Gibson, John C.
Hart, Carten M.
Johnson, Carl M.
Knight, Richard H.
MacEwan, Clarence L.
Morgan, Bobby G.
Noga, Edward L. S.
O'Neil, Gerald P.
Travers, Sumter L.
Vasey, Charles A.
Wingo, Rodney K.

TO BE ENSIGNS

Bagnall, Roger S.
Braley, Charles R.
Case, George O.
Havener, Millard F.
Johnson, John T.
Jones, Alfred H.
Owen, Frank T., Jr.
Sorge, Monroe B.
Stewart, Donald R.
White, Warren P.
Winslow, John A.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy in grades hereinafter stated:

TO BE LIEUTENANT

Chesnut, Luther T., 3d

TO BE LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Collier, James R.
Coyer, Charles B.
Mascenik, John
Walton Albion W., Jr.

TO BE ENSIGNS

Cassidy, Earle M.
Gaddis, Paul O.
Gentry, William W.
McGuire, Larry C.
Nichalson, Leroy F.
Otto, Carl W.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the line of the Navy in the grade hereinafter stated:

TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Linder, Arthur E.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy in grades hereinafter stated:

TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Hough, Homer H.
Werner, Sherwood H.

The following-named officers of the Navy and Naval Reserve, on active duty, for appointment to the rank and grades hereinafter stated:

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line of the Navy:

Andrews, Carroll A.
Armstrong, Richard G.
Armstrong, Russel I.
Askew, George V.
Athow, Robert F.
Aubrey, Joseph H., III
Banks, Charles A., Jr.
Barnett, Gene A.
Beam, Jay K. Y.
Beck, Lester H.
Beesley, David L.
Berry, Henry M.
Besel, Michael N.
Beydler, Warren H.
Blair, James A.
Blount, Robert H.
Bodamer, Robert E.
Body, Lawrence G.
Bose, Bertram L.
Bothwell, John H.
Brand, Richard G.
Brems, John H.
Brewer, Norman E.
Brooks, Richard I., Jr.
Brown, Barry W.
Buegler, Robert J.
Bueler, Charles M.
Buller, Ronald M.
Butler, John E.
Campbell, Kenneth C.

Campbell, William M.
Canto, Joseph V.
Cardillo, Robert J.
Carlin, Joseph W.
Carlstead, Edward M.
Carter, Otis D.
Castro, James
Chillemi, Richard L.
Cockrell, Jack R.
Coll, Charles L.
Collis, James E.
Comingore, Edward G., Jr.
Conditt, Leslie T., Jr.
Corey, Richard A.
Corrigan, John F., Jr.
Counihan, Henry R.
Coyle, Arthur J.
Crohn, Arnold E.
Cusumano, Robert D.
Cwirko, Walter A.
Darr, James, Jr.
DeLaVergne, Cornelius B.
Denissen, Richard J.
DeVeas, Thomas E.
Dille, Ralph E.
Dionne, Robert J.
Doescher, Walter W., Jr.
Dolan, Eugene F.
Dollard, Thomas J., Jr.
Dougherty, Edmund D.
Dunlap, George R.
Dunton, Stanley W.
Easley, David E.
Eckman, Charles J.
Eldridge, Richard A.
Essert, Antone
Evans, Donald W.
Everett, James G.
Ewald, Arden A., Jr.
Fenwick, Joseph E.
Ferguson, Robert E.
Filson, Paul L.
Fisher, Robert W.
Fisher, William B., Jr.
Forsyth, Donald D.
Fowler, Earle B., Jr.
Foy, George E.
Frazier, Holly G.
Fritsch, Edward C., Jr.
Gabrielsen, Carl A.
Gardner, Charles A.
Gardner, Harvey R.
Gaunt, Richard H.
Gebler, Gerard P.
Gettings, Harold W.
Glowasky, William A.
Goodman, Louis R.
Gordon, Jack W.
Gorsuch, Reynolds G.
Goudy, Maynard P.
Gott, Charles L.
Graham, John H.
Graham, Thomas A.
Gray, Gordon L., Jr.
Gray, Harland A., Jr.
Green, Robert P.
Gremer, Charles E.
Grigsby, Hubert C., Jr.
Gumb, Dana F.
Gurley, Walter P.
Hafner, Joseph J.
Hall, John C.
Hallen, Walter E.
Hancock, Burton W.
Hardy, Willis A.
Harris, William F.
Hartley, Cecil M.
Hartwell, James O.
Haycraft, Logan, Jr.
Hedgepeth, Charles H.
Heimbach, Hilton R., Jr.
Heising, John G.
Herbert, Christopher A.
Hesse, Theodore S.
Hessom, Robert C.
Hill, Arnold M.
Hilton, Calvin E.
Hilton, Jack
Hodges, Richard H.
Holm, Kenneth C.
Holmberg, Frank E.
Hopkins, Barry P.
Hord, John W.
Houck, John F., Jr.
Howe, Thomas
Hullihan, John W.
Hulka, Edward H.
Husty, Richard M.
Irvine, Harry B.
Iselin, Earl C., Jr.
Jackson, James A.
Jefferson, James E.
Jensen, William G.
Johnson, Charles E.
Jones, Allen, Jr.
Jones, Grover C.
Junghans, Robert C.
Justice, James O., Jr.
Keefe, William J., Jr.
Kelly, William F.
Kelly, William J.
Kemp, Glenn E.
Kennedy, Herbert S.
Kile, Newton A.
Kilgore, Frank J.
Killingbeck, William E.
Kinney, Donald E.
Kleczewski, Marion J.
Klepin, Leon E.
Klippstein, Thomas A.
Knueven, William H.
Krebs, Edward C., Jr.
Kroencke, William H.
Kuehn, Walter J.
Lackore, Raymond C., Jr.
La Perche, Jacques B.
Lasseter, Joe F., Jr.
Leask, Joseph A.
Ledridge, Robert B.
Leisk, William H., Jr.
Lember, David B.
Leo, Joseph P., Jr.
Levin, Philip
Lewis, Frederick E.
Lucero, William H.
Lyons, James I.
Mamber, Solomon
Mann, Frederick H., Jr.
Mann, John B., Jr.
Mark, Robert B.
McCabe, Robert E.
McGrath, Charles J.
McGucken, Paul M.
McHenry, Carl E.
McHugh, Paul J., Jr.
McMahon, Robert S.
McMurray, Samuel P.
Meyer, Wayne E.
Miles, Neagle W.
Mingo, John J.
Mongliardi, Peter, Jr.
Moseley, Richard E.
Mount, Harold W.
Negele, John H., Jr.
Nelson, Eugene L.
Newhouse, George B., Jr.
O'Meara, Charles K.
Pace, Robert D., Jr.
Panther, James E.
Parks, Thomas B.
Peddy, James T., Jr.
Phillips, George W., Jr.
Phinney, Glenn W., Jr.
Pierucki, Ervin J.
Pinkepank, Merril C.
Plunkett, Robert D.
Polson, Arthur D.
Pool, George R.
Potter, Eugene "W"
Presson, Herman W., Jr.
Price, Charles H.
Price, Mood B., Jr.
Purcell, Stephen E., Jr.
Ranzau, Walter W.
Rapalus, Henry W.
Rawls, Raymond L.
Reeb, Edward L., Jr.
Reichwein, Fremont E.
Richards, Kurt D.
Richardson, James P.
Ricker, Marshall A.
Riddick, John C.
Rider, Richard G.
Rodgers, Lawrence G.
Rowe, Donald E.
Rummelhoff, Warren E.
Russell, George A., Jr.
Ryan, Bayliss Q.
Ryan, Eugene P.
Sabin, Nelson
Salisbury, Thomas G. 2d
Saubers, Maurice D.
Sauter, George G.
Sawyer, Kenneth E., Jr.
Schatz, Clifford E.
Schneider, Robert F. S.
Schnopp, Robert W.
Schoenhere, Charles G.
Schwan, Alfred P. G.
Seay, Howard R.
Shuett, Donald W.
Shumaker, Charles E.
Simmons, Mitchell M.
Sisterhenn, William H.
Small, Rufus C.
Smerdon, John E., Jr.
Smith, Albert J.
Smith, Billie E.
Smith, Charles W.
Smith, George E.
Smith, Harold L.
Smith, James V.
Smith, Wendell K.
Snellman, William C.
Snyder, Charles E.
Snyder, Jack L.
Stanfield, Henry L.
Stansfield, Richard J.
Stecker, Kenneth W.
Steer, George L.
Stephens, Lawrence B.
Stewart, Richard C.
Stiles, Carl
Stobie, Edwin F.
Stockstill, Peter T.
Stone, John F.
Suttles, Raymond H.
Tait, Albert J.
Talago, Joseph, Jr.
Talmadge, Charles J.
Tanton, Paul W.
Thompson, Clifford E.
Thorson, Robert L.
Tigert, Marion A.
Truesdale, Francis E.
Tweddell, Miles E.
Vader, Robert L.
Vanderpool, Jay R.
Vaughan, Jack A.
Walters, Joseph A., Jr.
Waters, Alex "C"
Weaver, Keith T.
Webb, Milton G.
Werle, Joseph P., Jr.
Westmoreland, Arthur E.
Whaley, Lucien O. G.
Whitaker, Andrew W.
Whitehead, John D.
Whittle, Claude B.
Wilson, James G.
Wilson, William D.
Wise, Richard E.
Woerman, William B.
Wright, Merritt A.
Wright, William R.
Zuehlke, Lloyd T.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

Acree, Calvin "H"
Adams, Leroy W.
Anderson, John J., Jr.
Anderson, Oscar M., Jr.
Baccaro, Michael V.
Barber, Gayle E.
Barnett, Edward B.
Boltwood, Chester M.
Bruening, Paul M.
Bundren, Cecil E.
Cherryman, Rexford R.
Condon, Thomas P.
Cook, William H.
Cooper, William M.
Davis, Albert S.
Donahue, Daniel F.
Drzewiecki, Cazimir A.
Ehlers, Jerome E.
Flock, Jens B., Jr.
Gallagher, Granville W.
Galligan, Charles H., Jr.
Gaschen, Frederick S.
Goetzmann, John C.
Hawley, William F.
Hein, Joseph J., Jr.
Helvey, Roy
Heurich, Robert G.
Hurst, Gordon F., Jr.
Hynes, Edward J.
Jones, Ivor H.
Jongeward, Keith W.
Kammerer, John H.
Kamps, John H.
Kilcourse, William R.
Kuehm, Fred L. G.
Kuhlman, Norman H. C.
Kulow, Frederick C.
LaPlante, Robert W.
Lent, Robert E.
Link, Robert E.
Long, Samuel M., Jr.
Longmire, Billy R.
Luck, William E.
Lundberg, Eugene D.
Manore, Thomas E.
Masterson, James E.
McBroom, William M.
McStay, John J.
Mercadante, James A.
Minton, Horace L.
Mossing, Raymond L.
O'Brien, Richard J.
Pavelko, Anthony J.
Pavlick, Marvin S.
Polk, William E., Jr.
Potts, Stanley W.
Punch, Willard M.
Quintero, Donald B.
Radeke, Waldemar E., Jr.
Raney, William O.
Schutt, Richard C.
Searcy, William C.
Sylvester, Nelson J., Jr.
Teichler, Alfred H., Jr.
Thomas, Matthew L.
Thompson, Charles E.
Tylman, Frank J.
Unkrur, Arthur T.
Warner, Robert J.
Watson, Lawrence A.
Watson, Raymond A.
Watt, Robert J.
Waltrich, Walter F.
White, Francis H.
Zeiterle, Zeiter C.
Yoakam, Bernard

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

Black, Dock F., Jr.
Dunnells, Robert E.
Flippen, Homer W.
Goetzke, George A., Jr.
Jacobson, Ray O., Jr.
Locke, Harry A.
Mallory, Charles W.
Malvin, David W.
Michael, Edwin M.
Miles, Bert H.
Moffat, Robert R.
Rautenberg, Carl N.
Ross, Willard A.
Stapelfeld, Johann F.
Ward, Howard T.
Woods, Kenneth G.
Young, Robert C.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

Deatley, James M.
Kentner, Robert W.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Bennett, Elinor
Clark, Elizabeth E.
Gaffney, Elizabeth G.
Ince, Melanie
Johnson, Myrtle J.
Kratz, Hedwig L.
Moon, Dorothy M.
Nulty, Helen
Petit, Marita D.
Rennock, Eleanora W.
Worsham, Mildred I.
Wynn, Hazel A.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line of the Navy:

Ahles, Raymond W.
Bailey, Sidney E.
Blitz, Victor E.
Bloom, Stanley A.
Booth, Harold T.
Brown, Donald B. F.
Dickson, Earl S.
Dilley, Warren G.
Everson, Carl
Foster, Frank P.
Malinowski, John H.
Marona, "G" "L"
McWhorter, Harry W.
Nester, Charles E.
Niemann, Jay J.
Patterson, Harry E.
Pezzillo, Joseph F.
Peterson, Robert J.
Price, Frank J.
Pugh, Thomas B.
Smith, Bert H.
Walker, Harrison M., Jr.
Westcott, Robert O.
Whipkey, Arthur L.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line of the Naval Reserve:

Abernathy, Little F. B.
Boyer, Robert C.
Click, Carl E.
Cloyd, David E.
Dangl, John R.
DeBiase, Raymond G.
Doherty, Philip A.
Dolan, Vincent A.
Ellingson, Lemoyne E.
Enzler, Arthur J.
Fife, Glade W.
Finch, Truman W.
Foy, Henry K.
Furches, Stephen L., Jr.
Hanson, Pierce O.
Henyan, Richard R.
Hearn, John C.
Holcombe, Alan R.
Hoover, Charles W., Jr.
Johnson, Leland P., Jr.
Kenney, Harold T.
Kincheloe, William M., Jr.
Kreutz, Arthur R.
Kreuse, Floyd J.
Kyle, James W.
LaMorte, James F., Jr.
Lyon, Clarence S.
Martin, Louis H.
McEwan, Alexander W.
Mitchell, Franklin O.
Mitchell, Joe L.
Paradise, Fred V., Jr.
Patten, Paul H.
Paulsen, William
Powers, Donald F.
Ritter, Edmund U.
Santa Maria, Alberto H., Jr.
Scholl, Edmund R.
Schor, Morris
Slaiter, Vinson R.
Smith, John L.
Stiles, Robert G.
Strider, Donald H.
Thout, Clifford G.
Verndran, Joseph W.
Warren, Walter L.
Weinsberg, Stanley K.
Wells, John T.
Wentworth, John P.
Weimar, William R.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Supply Corps of the Naval Reserve:

McIntosh, Terrance E.
McKeen, Edward N.
Whittles, Carl, Jr.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following officers of the United States Coast Guard to be captains, to rank from March 20, 1945:

George F. Hicks
Alexander L. Ford
Stephen H. Evans
John A. Glynn
John E. Fairbank

The following officer of the United States Coast Guard to be a commander, to rank from October 20, 1942:

John S. Merriman, Jr.

The following officer of the United States Coast Guard to be a commander, to rank from November 18, 1942:

William H. Snyder

The following officers of the United States Coast Guard to be commanders, to rank from January 1, 1944:

Peter J. Smenton
Thomas R. Midtlyng
John B. Oren
Harry E. Davis, Jr.
Joseph Howe
George W. Holtzman
William W. Childress
John H. Wagline
John J. Hutson, Jr.

The following officer of the United States Coast Guard to be a lieutenant commander, to rank from October 1, 1942:

Warren L. David

The following officer of the United States Coast Guard to be a lieutenant commander, to rank from May 15, 1943:

Victor E. Eakanas

The following officer of the United States Coast Guard to be a lieutenant, to rank from December 31, 1942:

Robert S. McLendon

The following officer of the United States Coast Guard to be a lieutenant, to rank from May 15, 1943:

Vincent J. Cass

The following officers of the United States Coast Guard to be lieutenants (junior grade), to rank from the dates indicated:

Robert O. Bracken, December 31, 1942.
Charles Wayne, April 1, 1944.
Robert H. Roberts, May 1, 1945.
Albert G. Jones, November 15, 1946.
Donby J. Mathieu, November 15, 1946.
Donald E. Ullery, January 1, 1947.
Robert N. Rea, January 1, 1947.
John G. Milosic, January 15, 1947.
Theodore L. Roberge, January 15, 1947.
Francis Twarog, January 15, 1947.
Thurston L. Willis, January 15, 1947.
Bernard B. Wood, January 15, 1947.
Samuel W. Branin, January 15, 1947.
Jack E. Stewart, January 15, 1947.
Norman P. Weinert, January 15, 1947.
James A. Emery, January 15, 1947.
Paul L. Anderson, February 1, 1947.
William C. Carber, February 1, 1947.
Rubin E. Young, Jr., February 1, 1947.
Fred J. Michalson, February 1, 1947.
Richard C. Green, February 1, 1947.
James B. Reynolds, February 1, 1947.
Wesley J. Quamme, February 1, 1947.
William C. Akers, February 1, 1947.
Philip S. Bell, February 1, 1947.
Donald D. Davison, February 1, 1947.
Ivan C. McLean, February 1, 1947.
Edward G. Taylor, February 1, 1947.
Louis E. Price, February 1, 1947.
Franklin F. Bohlk, February 1, 1947.
Samuel H. Yearta, August 22, 1948.
Russell W. Lentner, August 22, 1948.
William H. Yates, August 22, 1948.

The following officers of the United States Coast Guard to be ensigns, to rank from January 15, 1947:

William C. Wallace
Henry G. Cassel
Harley B. Shank
Raymond M. Miller
Charles A. Haley
Everett B. Kopp
Philip G. Ledoux

The following professor (temporary) of the United States Coast Guard to be professor, with rank of lieutenant, to rank from October 1, 1942:

Robert E. Reed-Hill

The following officers of the United States Coast Guard Reserve to be lieutenant commanders, United States Coast Guard, to rank from the dates indicated:

Elvin C. Hawley, June 5, 1943.
Emery H. Joyce, June 5, 1943.
Frank McLaughlin, June 14, 1943.
Allan V. Falkenberg, June 24, 1943.
Russel O. Foster, July 7, 1943.
Frank T. Burtle, July 29, 1943.
Arnold J. Larsen, December 1, 1943.
Lionel H. DeSanty, December 1, 1943.

The following officers of the United States Coast Guard Reserve to be lieutenants, United States Coast Guard, to rank from the dates indicated:

David H. Douglas, May 15, 1943.
Theron H. Gato, May 15, 1943.
Paul F. Foye, July 1, 1944.

The following officers of the United States Coast Guard Reserve to be lieutenants (junior grade), United States Coast Guard, to rank from the dates indicated:

George A. Philbrick, March 1, 1944.
Henry W. Stinson, Jr., March 1, 1944.
John W. Day, January 1, 1947.
Thomas G. Condon, January 1, 1947.
Maurice W. Tiehen, January 1, 1947.
Leo M. Bracken, January 1, 1947.
Paul S. Hofmeister, January 1, 1947.
Albert P. Hartt, Jr., January 1, 1947.
George E. Tooloose, January 1, 1947.
William E. Sale, January 1, 1947.
Andrew B. Christensen, January 1, 1947.
Harold A. French, August 22, 1948.
Sam Pisicchio, September 15, 1948.

The following officers of the United States Coast Guard Reserve to be lieutenants (junior grade), dates of rank to be computed upon execution of oath in accordance with the regulations governing the determination of precedence as commissioned officers in the United States Coast Guard of Reserve officers, former Reserve officers, and former temporarily commissioned officers:

Walter J. Felton
Harry G. Kosky
Richard W. Bagnell
Edward P. Sawyer
Leonard A. Wardlaw, Jr.
Leonard J. Knight, Jr.
Jerry Komorech
Enoch A. Poulter
Douglas D. Vander Meer
Charles D. Zettler
Frank A. Klafs
Hugh C. McCaffrey
Owen B. Smith
Eric G. Grundy
Merle L. Harbourt
Harold L. Appleton
Gordon Crymes
William A. McCreary
Francis J. Bell

The following officers of the United States Coast Guard Reserve to be ensigns, dates of rank to be computed upon execution of oath in accordance with the regulations governing the determination of precedence as commissioned officers in the United States Coast Guard of Reserve officers, former Reserve officers, and former temporarily commissioned officers:

Robert E. Ogin
Roger J. Dahlby
Nelson W. Allen

The following officer of the United States Coast Guard Reserve to be professor (temporary), with rank of lieutenant, to rank from July 1, 1944:

Raymond J. Perry

The following person who served with the former Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation to be a lieutenant commander, United States Coast Guard, to rank from June 3, 1943:

Carl A. Anderson

NOMINATIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 518 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×), are subject to examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion.

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from July 1, 1948

Lt. Col. Francis Nicholas Miller, 041791, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Erwin Orlo Gibson, 029899, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

To be majors with rank from July 1, 1948

Maj. Robert Nicholas Smith, 039709, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stephen Allen Kallis, 038687, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Francis Victory, 041869, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Norman Michael Wagner, 051225, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Paul Carter, 029580, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vernon Milton Blum, 039728, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Maurice Brown, 018453, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Roger Urban, 018490, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Rosser Patterson, 018491, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John William Mackay Read, 018527, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Winston Candler, 018562, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dean Ambrose Herman, 018563, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dexter Lowry, 017628, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Taylor McAninch, 029601, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene Ernest Moyers, 041938, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marvin Antrim Saxton, 051275, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vasco Laub, 041975, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Duke Crinkley, 029669, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alfred Conway Knight, 029684, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Nelson Reed, 051297, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Willis Wilmore, 029706, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Ewing Johnson, 051309, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thore Fritjof Bengtson, 018670, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Philip Vibert Doyle, 018712, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gerard Charles Cowan, 018807, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Franklin Vines Johnston, Jr., 018836, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Deisher, 018852, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Bartlett Babcock, 018887, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Randall Everman, 018910, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clyde Wesley McKnight, 029760, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Donhouse Martz, Jr., 029769, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Francis McAneny, 042075, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Rennie Sanderson, 042076, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Nathan Sanborn Mathewson, 029771, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Herman Rasche, 051339, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Munson Elliott, Jr., 051340, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Alva Lawrence Ritchie, 039788, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Glenn Amos Hawes, 042077, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Adams Edwin Rackes, 042078, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Yenne Earl Snider, 051341, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Francis Gibbons, 038724, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Rolfe Archibald, 029776, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stanley Knapp Franks, 051343, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Armitage, 042079, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Wellford Taylor, 038725, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles John Timmes, 029777, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Franklin Gaffney, 051345, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Martin Michael Mendell, 042082, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Richard Crank, 051346, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herber Carlton Leney, 039789, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Orval James Baldwin, 039790, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Bell Butler, 029783, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ray King Bannister, 029784, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John George Wagner, 051348, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alan Beresford Todd, 042086, Army of the United States (catain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Loveaire Ackley Hedges, 029786, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cameron Forrest Woods, 042089, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Weldon Lester Slisher, 029787, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Alford Laforge, 051349, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Alton Hough, 042090, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Grant Waite, 030358, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arnold Vinson Wyss, 039788, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Tom Bryson Hembree, 029789, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Preston Tuggle, Jr., 042093, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Franklin Willis Clarke, 029792, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hans Wilhelm Helm, 029794, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alfred Maria Koster, 029796, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roland Dale Graves, 029795, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Albert Warner, 039791, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Grant Bent, Jr., 029797, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Russell Whitehead, 042095, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Winslow Randall Willis, 051352, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Thomas Haslett, 039792, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert H. Cole, 029798, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Herrward Maux, 029799, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Irvine Sanders, 042096, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Grant Learnard, Jr., 029801, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Virgil Guisleman, 039793, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Greenlief Smith, Jr., 029804, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Richard Boyles, 029803, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Raymond Judson, 039794, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clifford Lyman Sawyer, 051355, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenan McLendon Rand, 039795, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marion Monroe Brown, 029806, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Lindley Pickett, 042099, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Martin Sassé, 029807, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Ralph Thomas, 051356, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Raymond Robertson, 051357, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lauren Elmer Hannah, 051358, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Louis Buttner, 042100, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John William Maxwell, 039796, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Richard Hill, 042101, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ira Winfield Hart, 029808, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ray Joseph Laux, 042102, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alwyn Vincent Larkin, 029809, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Orville Rupp, 042103, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Oliver Irvin, 042104, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Irvin Louis Allen, 029810, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Truman Snowden, 029811, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Lewis Bivens, 042105, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Leo Sievers, 029814, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Charles Parsons, 029816, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Timothy Howard McKenzie, 039797, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lester W. Kale, 029815, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Loren Elmer Gaither, 042109, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Arthur Klinetop, 039798, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Ernest Newcomb, 038727, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Forrest Vinyard Diehl, 051361, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Emery Baya, 029817, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Pierre Augustine Kleff, 039799, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Luther Ruebush Andrews, 051362, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elmer Robinson Higgins, 038755, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Andrew Conlin, 042111, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter William Gerken, 042113, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Ellsworth Stoever, 042114, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edgar Lee Grider, 042112, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Ludwig Schulz, 042115, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard John Conran, 029820, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army.)

Maj. Wiley Burton Davis, 029822, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elmer Louis Littell, 029823, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Voorhies Nicholas, 051363, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Theodore Edson, 029827, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Hays Holmes, Jr., 029828, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank William Herberth, Jr., 029829, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John William Murray, 029833, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Charles Jones, 042119, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Miguel Joseph Pomar, 042120, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lowell Hugh Powers, 042123, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Seymour Walter Wurfel, 029835, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Milton Joseph Ingeman, 042124, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Clifton Creighton, Jr., 029836, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Erquiet Taylor, 029838, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clinton William Janes, 038730, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Floy William McGinn, 042127, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vincent Francis La Piana, 051365, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Sumner Standley, Jr., 029840, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Wortendycke Beggs, 039802, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wilfred Felix Menegus, 042128, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilburn Lesca Strickland, 029839, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Thomas Simpson, 029841, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Linwood Bush, 029843, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arnold Gerhard Iger, 029842, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Andrew Ralph Lolli, 029844, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Vernon Hart, 038732, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Curtis Lee Williams, O30082, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Malcolm Townsend Powell, O51368, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Gilbert Patrick Gibbons, O39904, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Mackentyre Thames, Jr., O29846, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Amos Byron Churchill, O29847, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Hill Greene, O42130, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Frederick Arny, Jr., O51369, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. George Eugene Pickett, O42131, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Arthur LeRoy Baker, O39805, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Lydon Briggs Cole, O29848, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Howard Frank Bogner O51370, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William David Smith, Jr., O29850, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Fred Herman Meinert, O29851, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. William Howard Bates, O39806, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Charles Askins, Jr., O29852, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Frederick James Cooke, O29853, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Harry Fredrick Kirkpatrick, Jr., O39807, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Holmes Hoffman Bevington, O42133, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edward Temple Johnson, O29856, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Paul Burns, O38733, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Lorraine Lynnhaven Manly, O51373, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Gardner Baker Gross, O29859, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Edwin Lee Andrick, O42134, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Alfred Harry Davidson, Jr., O39808, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Raymond Timothy Chapman, O29860, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Humphrey Tomlinson, Jr., O38734, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Evander Francis Kelly, Jr., O51377, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Charles Parmelee Babcock, O39809, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Robert Edgar Wilson, O29863, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Kirk Buchak, O29864, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Silas Rosswell Langlois, O29865, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Floyd Melvin Lundberg, O42136, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Silas Benjamin Dishman, O29052, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Jay Alexander Dasche, O39810, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Fred Joe Gosiger, O29867, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Arthur Edward Conn, O29868, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Richard Dwyer, O42138, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. George Neal Anderson, O51379, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harry C. Brindle, O51380, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. William Robinson Heard, O39811, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Homer Littlefield Davis, Jr., O29869, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Edward Daniel Fitzgerald, O29870, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Maxwell Rodgers, O39812, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Blair Eliot Henderson, O39813, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Edwin Samuel Winsper, O39814, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Charles Lacy Ringgold, O30115, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Franz Heiberger Ross, O29871, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Newell Skaggs, O39816, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Louis Benjamin Besbeck, O42142, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. James Marshall Sprake, O29872, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Willard Pumpelly, O51384, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. David Glenn Rees, O39817, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Frederick Gustin Hall Smith, O29877, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Russell Decatur Fagin, O42145, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Edwin Hart Druley, O29876, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Frank Strother Ison, O39819, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Joseph Anthony Sivigny, O51385, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. William Francis LaFarge, Jr., O42147, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Robert Weir-Mitchell Weir, O42150, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Theodore Hadrick Ebbert, O29885, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Royal Leonard Leidy, O29886, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Kermit James Silverwood, O42153, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Henry Lattin, O29887, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Oscar Melville Bisant, Jr., O51387, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Howard Sidney Levie, O38735, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Frederick Howard Loomis, O29889, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Braxton Eugene Small, O42156, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Chester Harold Meek, O29890, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Edward Heltzel, O29891, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Oscar Jackson Magee, O42158, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Lyndon William Merry, O51391, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Dwight Thornton Hamersley, O42159, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Quentin Samuel Quigley, O29894, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Teddy Hollis Sanford, O29893, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Joseph Rupel Walton, O39821, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Thomas Richardson Palmerlee, O29895, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Victor B. Fox, O29896, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Wenzel David Roth, O51392, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Stephen Bodner, O51393, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Robert Gibson Davis, O51394, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Roland Creighton, O42161, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Schaeffer Mansfield, O29898, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Herman Richard Siemers, O42162, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harllee Royall O'Neal, O42163, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harry Otto Fischer, O29901, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Conrad Hildebrant, O29902, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Lloyd Milton Reiser, O39823, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Jean Paul LaCour, O39822, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Earl Stewart Bessmer, O39824, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Raymond Keasey, O38736, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Beverly Taylor, O29903, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Otto Peterson, O29904, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Jackson Knight Judy, O39825, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Abner Richardson 3d, O29906, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Marion Claude Miller, O51396, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Harry Bauer Sames, O42167, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Dane Oatman Sprankle, O42169, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Gordon O'Brien, O42171, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Eldon Alfred Koerner, O42172, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Fred Wilbur Greene, O38737, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Humphrey Johnson, Jr., O29908, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Benjamin Major Ayars, O42173, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Byron Martin Shipley, O39827, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Mattison Albert Darragh, O42174, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Henry Conk, O29909, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Alexander George Eagle, O39910, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harley Derrell Brown, O29911, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Albert Joseph Hannon, O42175, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Knox Bell, O29912, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sidney Dilg Frampton, O42176, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Patrick McKenna, O42179, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Wesley Earl Farmer, O51398, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Paul Anthony Shaw, O42181, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Rudolph George Winckler, O51399, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Elvin Johnson, O39828, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Cecil Malcolm MacGregor, O42182, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Alfred Earl Stevens, O29916, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Douglas Osborne Toft, O42183, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Roland Haddaway del Mar, O29917, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Eugene Londahl, O39829, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. George Victor Johnson, O39831, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Frank Wright Roberts, O39830, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Roy Edward Goode, O29921, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Albert Havens Jackman, O51402, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Walter Lee Coleman, O38738, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Hamilton Gibson, O29923, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Charles Allen Leavitt, O51403, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Arthur Wilfred Gustafson, O51404, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Jack Farnell Hudson, O42184, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Orlando Adam Scott, O42787, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. James Reid Dorman, Jr., O51406, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Arthur Luther, O38740, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Weston Locke Blanchard, O29925, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Slaticho Katsarsky, O39832, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Robinson Baird Rider, O51408, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Albert Mark Smith 2d, O29927, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Lee Henry Morrison, O51409, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Sherburne Jackson Heltker, O29928, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Paul Levern Bates, O29929, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. James Glen Black, O39833, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. George Samuel Haviland, O42189, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Frazer Woodruff Rodman, O38741, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Leonard Kerr, O42191, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Charles Heron McNary, O38742, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Edward Jackson Grant, O38743, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Thomas Harwood Taylor, O29931, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. William Perl Dunn, O51413, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Maxwell Birge Fogarty, O42193, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Benjamin Chesson, Jr., O51414, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harold Edwin Bisbort, O29934, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Lewis Peyton, O29935, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Earl Leroy Icke, O42195, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Fred Lewis Plahte, O29936, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. William Arthur McAleer, O42196, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Seymour Austin Potter, Jr., O29937, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Charles Albert Fanning, O29939, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Paul Ashworth Robblee, O42198, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Ralph Bonner Garretson, O39835, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Lowrey Robert Moore, O29941, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Charles Beecher Reed, O30193, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Albertson Bradley, O39836, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. William James Whitehead, O39837, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Cecil Gordon Gealta, O38744, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Arthur Gustav Kiel, O42199, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Tom Watson Sills, O29949, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Thomas Evans, O29950, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William James Sutton, O29951, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Albert Martin, O51419, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Orman Goodyear Charles, O29954, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Dudley Peterman, O29955, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Arthur James Watson, O29730, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Edwin Courtney Shewbridge, Jr., O38745, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harold Andrew Cassell, O29956, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Alden Norell, O39838, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Ralph Anthony Devine, O42202, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Paul Howard Raftery, O39839, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Ernest LeeRoy Ritchie, O29957, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. George Harvey Stibbald, O29958, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Thomas Johnson Henderson, O42203, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Harry Jarvis Engel, O39840, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Joseph Sullivan, Jr., O29961, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Joseph Agoa, O42205, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Clayton Wallace Wells, O29962, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Frank Henry Preston, Jr., O42206, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Walter Lawrence Norfray, O51423, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Harold Ralph Yeager, O29567, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Peter West, O29964, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Angelo Michael Ricciardelli, O42208, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Charles Edwin Rust, O29965, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Robert Scott Cain, O42210, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Prentiss Bishop Reed, Jr., O39841, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Malcolm Wesley Courser, O42211, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Hans Godfrey Jepson, O29968, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Herbert Gregory Lux, O42212, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Ralph Kenneth Johnson, O42213, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Kenneth Paul Burns, O51426, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. James Francis Adams, O29968, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Delmer Pearl Anderson, O29969, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Argyle Phillips Jones, O39842, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Guy Vinton Miller, O42215, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Franklin Riley Patterson, O38746, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Frederick Miller Sperry, O51427, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Wilmer Arthur Edge, Jr., O38747, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Marcus William Heskett, O42218, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Reed Turman, O42217, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Joseph Dalton, O42219, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Noel Brewer, O42220, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edward Philip Thomson, O29974, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harry Herman Bittner, O42221, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. George Zinn Traeger, O51429, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Claude Elbert Ray, O51430, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Fay Kenyon Green, O29976, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Clarence Raphael Dunlap, O29978, Army of the United States (captain U. S. Army).
×Maj. Arnold Boogher, O39843, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Joseph Edward Stannah, O29977, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Fred LeRoy Baker, O42223, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Roy Charles Baker, O29979, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Paul Patrick Byrne, O51433, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Jack Reeves Murphy, O51431, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Frank Kellers, O51432, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Phil Dicks, O29982, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Valentine Motte Barnes, Jr., O51434, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Hensley Fulton, O29984, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Leroy Lewis, O42224, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dulaney Lee O'Roark, O29986, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Earle Nelson, O51435, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Francis Reed, O51436, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Armand Fulton, O42225, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Henry Peter, O29987, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Anthony Cain, O29988, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Rafael Montilla, O51437, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Warner Posse, O29989, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter August Kneyse, O42227, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Harold Bach, O42228, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jay Wesley Doverspike, O42229, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Curtis Theodore Ricketts, O51438, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Frederick Linthwaite, O29990, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Kenneth E. Fields, O18957, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Wood Beeler, O18958, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Duncan Hallock, O18960, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alfred Dodd Starbird, O18961, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Douglas Matheson, O18962, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Davis Meyer, O18963, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alden Kingsland Sibley, O18964, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Joseph Lincoln, O18968, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Campbell Tripp, O18972, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward George Herb, O18973, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt Col. William Jonas Ely, O18974, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Thomas Honeycutt, O18975, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Allen Harris, O18976, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Gardner Shinkle, O18979, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hoy D. Davis, Jr., O18982, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alvin Charles Welling, O18983, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Douglas Charles Davis, O18985, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ellsworth Barricklow Downing, O18986, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Amrine Turner, O18987, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Warren Gray, O18988, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Sherman Henry, O18989, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Orin Blandford, O18990, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Adonis Downing, Jr., O18991, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Guy Cecil Lothrop, O18992, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Crain Leslie, O18993, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Edward Watters, O18994, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Francis Joseph McMorrow, O18995, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Golding Dunn, O18996, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dabney Ray Corum, O19001, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lauren Whitford Merriam, O19002, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert George Sparrow, O19003, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Wolcott Meals, O19005, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Walter August Jensen, O19006, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Bodeau, O19008, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ferdinand Marion Humphries, O19012, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Denton Armitage, O19014, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore John Conway, O19015, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Elton LaDue, O19017, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Joseph Daniel, O19019, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Arthur Dahlen, O19020, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Joseph Lane, O19021, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Ira Whitehead Cory, O19025, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William York Frentzel, O19026, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Hilliard Polk, O19028, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Edward Otto, O19030, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lamar Cecil Ratcliffe, O19034, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerald Chapman, O19035, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert John Lawlor, O19036, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Alfred McCrary, O19037, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel Parker, Jr., O19038, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edgar Haskell Kibler, Jr., O19039, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Morris Oswald Edwards, O19041, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Joseph Zeller, O19043, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Beall Franklin, O19046, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Gordon Bartlett, O19047, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Nelson Gillon, O19048, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Rudolf Walters, O19050, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Thorndike Ashworth, O19052, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Bruce Logan, O19053, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lafar Lipscomb, Jr., O19054, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Sheldon Tubbs, O19056, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herman Henry Kaesser, Jr., O19057, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Charles Plapp, O19059, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Joseph Henry O'Malley, O19061, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Hobart Chapman, Jr., O19064, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Patrick William Guiney, Jr., O19066, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Frederick Thorlin, O19067, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Harris Shepardson, O19068, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William George Fritz, O19069, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Worman Hain, O19072, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Goyer Patterson, O19073, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clyde Lucken Jones, O19074, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Victor Edward Maston, O19075, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ethan Allen Chapman, O19076, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oren Eugene Hurlbut, O19077, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Warren White, O19079, Army of the United States (captain, United States Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Park, Jr., O19080, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Beverly DeWitt Jones, O19081, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Hadley Richardson, Jr., O19082, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Roosevelt Brindley, O19087, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marcus Tague, O19090, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Leon Van Way, O19093, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Henry Chase, O19095, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. David Virgil Adamson, O19096, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John William Ferris, O19097, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Penn Thompson, O19098, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Russell Roland Klanderman, O19099, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Neil Merton Wallace, O19101, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Paul Whelihan, O19102, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marshall Woodruff Frame, O19103, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robin George Speiser, O19104, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William James Given, O19105, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Avery John Cooper, Jr., O19107, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stephen Ogden Fuqua, O19109, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hardin Leonard Olson, O19110, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cam Longley, Jr., O19112, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Benton Neely, O19114, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Phillip Henshaw Pope, O19115, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Warren Stilwell, Jr., O19117, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Robert Cyr, O19119, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Wilson Tyson, O19120, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Menzie Pittman, O19121, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Allen Carver, O19122, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Joseph O'Connor, O19125, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Rushmore Gretser, O19126, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sherburne Whipple, Jr., O19130, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edgar Collins Doleman, O19131, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cyril Joseph Letzelter, O19132, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel Light Hine, O19134, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Wallace Rudolph, O19135, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Abell Cleveland, Jr., O19136, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Thomas Powers 3d, O19137, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joshua Robert Messersmith, O19139, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Tripp Evans, Jr., O19140, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Martin Cahill, O19141, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Francis Ryan, O19142, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Henry Skinner, O19144, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Anthony Frank Kleitz, Jr., O19145, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Thomas Carroll, O19146, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard John Meyer, O19147, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Randolph Whiting Fletter, O19148, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Harlow Miles, Jr., O19151, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Humbert Joseph Versace, O19152, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Franklin Guest Smith, O19154, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Henry Baumer, O19155, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Pugh Pearson, Jr., O19157, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earl Jacob Macherey, O19158, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Alspaugh, O19159, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerald Lorenzo Roberson, O19161, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Edward Bastion, Jr., O19162, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army.

Lt. Col. Thomas Herbert Beck, O19164, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maurice Evans Kaiser, O19165, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Thomas Harris, O19166, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gardner Wellington Porter, O19167, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry William Sweeting, Jr., O19168, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cyrus Abda Dolph 3d, O19170, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Lindsay Richey, O19172, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Bowes Evans, O19174, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Andrew Fleckenstein, O19175, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Franklin Gibney Rothwell, O19176, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Fant Damon, Jr., O19179, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Clay Bridgewater, O19182, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Mikell Clarke, O19183, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Keith Johnson, O19187, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Orr Boswell O19188, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Parker Gibbs, O19189, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maddrey Allen Solomon, O19194, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lyle William Bernard, O19195, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Shelby Francis Williams, O19196, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jean Evans Engler, O19198, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Abner Huntsberry, O19200, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Andrew Donald Stephenson, O19201, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Douglas Graver Gilbert, O19202, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Laurence Elder, O19203, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Cameron Cubbison, Jr., O19204, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Amsury Manuel Gandia, O19206, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Harrold Bayne, O19207, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gwinn Ulm Porter, O19210, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Robert Zierath, O19211, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Hulburt Douglas, O19212, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Darnell, Jr., O19213, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Brice Crawford, O19215, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick William Coleman 3d, O19216, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Wiltse Sellers, O19217, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick William Gibb, O19222, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Kemp Markle, Jr., O19223, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Talbot 3d, O19226, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Charles Ellsworth Leydecker, O19227, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Austin Andrew Miller, O19228, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Morris King Henderson, O19230, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Daniel O'Reilly, O19233, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Ralston Fredendall, Jr., O19235, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edson Schull, O19236, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Royal Reynolds, Jr., O19238, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Graydon Casper Essman, O19242, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Russell Franklin Akers, Jr., O19243, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Claude Leslie Bowen, Jr., O19244, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Duff Walker Sudduth, O19245, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Wagstaff, Jr., O19246, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Rhoden Pritchard, O19248, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Edward Gee, O19251, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alston Grimes, O19252, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Otto Hartel, O19254, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ivan Walter Parr, Jr., O19255, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Roberts Calhoun, O19256, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edson Duncan Raff, O19261, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Braddock Dagavre, O19262, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Agin Bailey, O19264, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Newman Scoville, O19267, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Field Due, O19268, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Peter Demosthenes Clainos, O19269, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Frederick Schmelzer, O19270, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Thomas Jellett, O19273, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Anthony Remus, O19275, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ben Harrell, O19276, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Allen Risden, O19278, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stanley Nelson Lonning, O19281, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Moore Blanchard, Jr., O19282, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Wilson Quinn, O19283, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charner Weaver Powell, O19284, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Pearce Bellican, O19285, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Spalding Ehlen, O19286, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Tallant Kilday, O19288, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Roberts Kimmell, Jr., O19291, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Vernard Thompson, O19292, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Wilkinson Rayburn, O19295, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Emmanuel Salvador Cepeda, O19297, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kimball Clay Smith, O29882, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Harper Rogers, O29992, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William James Marquette, O42231, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gus Hugh Montgomery, 29993, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roy Colella Evans, O42233, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Melvin Delos Losey, O42235, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alanson Tyler Leland, O42236, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Sidney Britt, Jr., O42237, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Ernest Harrison, O29991, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Duff Green, Jr., O42239, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Harper Pryor, O29996, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Lewis Seeger, O29997, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Franklin Decker, O29999, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Luther Wilkin, Jr., O39847, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Melville Hulbert Griffith, O39846, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Wilbur Barker 2d, O30001, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hughe Doyle Coleman, O39848, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marvin Arrington Middlebrooks, O51440, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wallace Jay Nichols, O30003, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Francis Curren, Jr., O33749, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Mary Woestenburg, O30004, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Taylor Miller, O30006, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Anthony McGuire, O51443, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Bohrer Thrift, O39349, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kurt Ladislaus Wallitschek, O42241, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Michael Peter Georges, O42242, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Le Page Beauchamp, O51444, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Seney Ballagh, O30009, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Porter Snooks, Jr., O30011, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerald Cornelius Kelleher, O38750, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Harland Stuart, O42244, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel David Mack, Jr., O30015, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elbridge Leroy Brubaker, O51445, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Francis Penaat, O29598, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Jackson Carson, O51446, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Reginald Conklin Miller, O26375, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Marshall Pitzer, O26378, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Alexandre Gulmond, O26379, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Wesley Booth, O26382, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oscar Charles Buser, O42246, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Adrian Leonard Hoebeke, O19334, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry von Kolnitz, O30018, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Richard Truden, O42248, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Cantey, O30019, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Joseph Soares, O30020, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry John Stark, O51448, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Snelson Neill, O51447, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Glover Lewis, O42250, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Angelo Domenic Bollero, O39853, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Jacob Berkowitz, O39854, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Joseph Maguire, O42251, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Taft Stump, O30023, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William James Evans, O30025, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ambelten Mangles Ahrens, O30026, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Louis Rehmann, O30027, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Ripley Lodge, O42252, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Hamilton Davin, O42253, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Luigi Francis Claps, O39855, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Wesley Darrah, O30029, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Victor Smith, O30030, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Harry Van Dine, O30032, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joe Calvin Lambert, O30033, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Augustus Wingo, O51451, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Anthony Gaul Merritt, O42255, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Ralph Yancey, O42256, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Joseph Conners, O30034, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Edward Kabrich, O39856, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Reeves Maddox, O30035, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Andrew Williams, O42257, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Irving Haumerson Eales, O38751, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Jennings Pritchard, O42258, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Alton Dresser, O30037, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Presley Horton, O42259, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Weldon William Cox, O51453, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Samuel Edward Spitzer, O30039, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry W. Cooper, O42261, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Edward Norton, Jr., O42262, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eusl Wister Culbertson, O42263, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charlie Lemon Young, O51455, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Frederick Clark, O30040, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carroll Conrad Mullen, O51456, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Rambo Dale, O39857, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leonard Earle Echols, O42265, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Rhoman Edward Clem, O51457, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alexander Cesario Granzin, O30041, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bruce Holley Johnson, O30042, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Julius Theodore Dargusch, O51459, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Harold Dicks, O30043, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Henry Edwards, O42267, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harrison Moore Markley, O38752, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Augustus Weaver, O30044, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elmore Patrick Moore, O51460, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Marshall Richardson, O42269, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gail Addison Eaton, O42268, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Arnold Mathewson, Jr., O38753, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Brookman Renninger Painter, O38754, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Terrance Marshall Longacre, O30047, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Robert Troth, O42270, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stanley Oliver Rishol, O51462, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jay Theodore Glen, O29953, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Robert Glen, O30049, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Garland Guthrie, O30050, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Forrest Hall Forcum, O51464, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Louis Lash, O42272, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Morse Johnson, O39858, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Regis Whitlo Luke, O39859, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dave John Cook, O30051, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Shaw Sabine, O39860, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Donald DeMarr, O42273, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Chapman Coleman, Jr., O30053, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stanley Llewellyn Stewart, O42274, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Martin George Tieman, Jr., O30063, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Nell Frederick Hein, O51467, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Russell Gilbert Spinney, O30054, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Heck, O51469, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Laron Street, O30055, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Werlen Franklin Cheney, O42276, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ray William Whitson, O30056, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel Aubrey Ranney, O39863, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harvey James Yost, O42277, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Boynton Lininger, O30059, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Orsen Branch, O42279, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Fuller Allen, O30060, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Otto Frederick Sonneman, Jr., O42280, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Asbury Haines Jackson, O29629, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clifton Frank Nooncaster, O30061, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Burdwell Hoyt Shipe, O30065, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Mitchell Franklin, O39864, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Milton LaFayette Johnson, O42284, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Halbert Jennings Slagle, O39865, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Edward Painter, O56813, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Tyra Stafford, O39866, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ivan Orville Walt, O42286, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arles Henry Miller, O42287, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Franklin Metcalf, O42288, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roger Elsbree Higgins, O39867, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Colonel Edwin William Grenelle, O38757, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Griffith Johnson, O38756, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Jenkins Butler, O30068, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Theodore Leslie Chenault, O30069, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clifford Cecil Hines, O42289, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Hatch Haines, O39868, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Winston Lewis Field, O39869, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wayne Hardman, O30072, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Curtiss Welt Oakes, O51471, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cecil Hamilton Bolton, O39870, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Wayne Coffman, Jr., O42293, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry John Hampton, O30073, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Arthur Hamilton, O42294, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leonard Amoroso, O30076, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Anderson Smith, O30079, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lee Dake Chilson, O39871, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gilbert Proctor Dubia, O39872, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Auspitz, Jr., O30081, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Hardy Duerson, O30084, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Clifton Howell, Jr., O30085, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Patterson Streetman, O30086, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eric Robert Osborne, O42299, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Adam Watts Meetze, O30087, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Charles Clayton Hanson, O39873, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Alvin Bergmann, O42300, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Peter Rinque, O39874, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Roy Miller, O51472, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marvin Leroy Tjostem, O30089, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Watson Sylvester, O51473, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Moses Nathan Squires, O38758, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Edward Frick, O42303, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clarence Philip Hendricks, O42302, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arvine Walter McElroy, O30090, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army)

Maj. Clarence Edwin Routh, O39876, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Martin McGrail, O39876, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leon David Gladding, O30095, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Edward Dashler, O42304, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Harley Anderson, O30096, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ervin Daniel Karl Hoehne, O39878, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Merwin Bishop Porter, O30097, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Leo Orton, O42306, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Henry Billings, O30098, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Stacus Tennant, O51474, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Truman Harry Kern, O42309, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert Earl Dorsey, O30100, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Paul Powhida, O51475, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Elwood Voorhees, O30101, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edmund Hawley Jones, O30102, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Henry Pochyla, O30103, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore August Rathje, O42311, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Nelson Isaac Decker, O30105, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marvin Henry Snyder, O30106, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Victor Morgan Ryan, O42312, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Edwin Hisle, O51476, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Evert Spencer Thomas, Jr., O39107, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Howard Willoughby, O30108, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Glenn Leonard Clinebell, O30109, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Millard Shaw, O42313, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clark Webber, O30111, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Terry Bill, O30112, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arnold David Blair, O51477, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Samuel Hastings Wrightson, O39879, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lewis Gabriel Villere, O42320, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Arthur Briggs, O42315, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Jackson Woolley, O51478, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Pasquale Pietro Malorano, O42316, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dana Emerson Smith, O38759, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stanley Archer Young, O51479, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Kenneth Hughes, O38708, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Llewellyn Corey, O56814, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Merle Leroy Mennle, O39880, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank John Culley, O30117, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Abner Stanley, O30118, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Russell Reifsnyder, O39881, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Martin Bradley, Jr., O42318, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Lester Lewis, O30119, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph James Griffin, O39882, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vincent Usera, O39883, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ramon Antonio Sandin, O39884, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Mervin C. Bowers, O42319, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Don Snowden Mathews, O30121, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John David George, O30122, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Arthur Augustus Weinland, O30123, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gustaf Adolph Engstrom, O30124, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Russell Hawkins Horton, O30125, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gines Perez, O30126, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Perry Henderson, O51483, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cornelius James Rinker, O30129, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Donald Kamy, O42321, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Merle John Senn, O42322, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John James Shoemaker, O30133, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Byron Edward Williams, O30134, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Langley White, O39885, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vernon Hammonds, O51486, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Harold McCreary, O42324, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alexander Thomas McElroy, O30135, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hartley Fuller Dame, O51487, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lee Huse Pray, O39886, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Andrew Seitz, O30137, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Kershaw Lee, Jr., O30136, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Ansel Gaston, O30138, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Larry James O'Neil, O38761, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Glenn E. Nida, O30140, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Angus Sanders, O51489, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Curtis Moultry Banks, O30143, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Quincy Bass, O39888, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fitzhugh Horton Chandler, O42328, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joe Le Roy Fincher, O30145, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leonard Marshall Johnson, O42329, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Richard Blankenship, O42330, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lewis Andrew Hunt, O39889, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. George William James, O30146, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Emil Albert Lucke, O42331, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Frank Mallalieu, O42333, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Rodgers Clifton, O30148, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Saenz, O38762, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Jay Jewett, O39890, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Arthur Minot, O42335, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hubert Paul Coleman, O42336, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William M. Campbell, O42337, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Emanuel Martin Robertson, O30149, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Graham Hanley, O30150, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald MacGlashan MacWillie, O30152, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hugh Painter Osborne, O30151, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Bradley Smith, O51491, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Courtland Forrest Brittain, O42341, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Edward Miller, O30156, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Shelly Prusher Myers, Jr., O30157, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stewart Hood Knowlton, O30159, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Arthur Shaw, O42343, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Terry DeJarnette, O42344, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Russell Spillman, O42345, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Oliver Cromwell, O42346, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stanley Woodard Smiley, O30160, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Alexander Mowery, O51492, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Stephens Neel, O51493, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Mason French Goodloe, O30161, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lund Foster Hood, O39892, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas William Bender, O30162, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Chester Bucher, O51494, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hugo George Goetz, Jr., O39894, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. James Ernest Akans, O39893, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Merwin Howard Smith, O42349, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elmer Harvey Harrelson, O42350, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leonard Edward Wellendorf, O29538, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Bradley Roelofs, O38764, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Doyle Nutt, O30164, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Richards Hubbard, Jr., O30165, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Stuart Meredith Cox, O39896, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Coward O51495, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Thomas O'Neill, O30166, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Glenn Joseph McGowan, O42353, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Theodore Grenier, O30167, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lewis Henry Keyes, O38765, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Guy Anthony Orsino, O30168, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William John McDonald, O30169, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Hawley Hayden, O42356, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Dudley Clark Breckenridge, O39897, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Forrest Phillips, O30170, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. James Richard Nagel, O30171, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Luther Harper, O51497, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gus Spicce Zinnecker, O42357, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Stanley Bochnowski, O51498, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick Thomas Kent, Jr., O30172, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Erman Milford Newman, O30173, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Thomas Massingale, O51499, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Thomas Wadsworth Eddington, O30174, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Carrithers Threlkeld, O51501, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest August Benser, O42360, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stuart Sheets Hoff, O38766, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Frank Day, Jr., O51502, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Homer Edwin Long, O30176, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Ray Ewing, O42362, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Victor Blaser, O42364, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Byron Feindel, Jr., O30177, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bertram Howard Johnson, O51503, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Louis Roper, O42365, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Alexander Murray, Jr., O42366, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Ralph Turner, O39899, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Edward Williamson, O30178, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Rubert Daniel Chapman, O42367, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wilton George Gaefe, O30179, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert McFarland Mouk, O42368, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Lewis Boyd, O30180, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alfred Ludman Stevens, O51506, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Elmer Brown, Jr., O39900, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Ernst Messner, O30181, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Charles Alexander, Jr., O39901, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elverson Earl Baker, O30183, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Christ Petros, O30184, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Roy Ridlehuber, O39902, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Nelson Swartz, O39903, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Martin Ernst, O42371, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Embree Ensign Reynolds, O51507, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lewis Tabor Martin, O30188, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vernon William Rice, O30189, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Merrill LeRoy Tribe, O42374, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Martin Hurst, O30191, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Dominic Limoncelli, O42375, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Bernard McNally, O30192, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Major George Edward Crane, O42377, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Ervin Huneycutt, O29946, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Major Townsend Canfield Anderson, O30195, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Thomas Brogan, O30194, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Buie Hess, O42379, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Luther Ford, O38767, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Murthas Jones, O30197, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Leonard Reed, O42380, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Marx Stiebel, O30198, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Manfred Jacques Haas, O30200, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Gustive Schepp, O42382, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Blanchard Jeffery, O30201, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lewis LeVerl Flamm, O42384, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Oscar Glenn Goodhand, Jr., O51511, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Willard Winfield Mize, O30204, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Gordon Harton, O42385, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Cooper Bush, O30205, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harlan William Hendrick, O30208, Army of the United States (captain, United States Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Lee Webb, O30207, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Edmund Trail, O30206, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Fredrick Ryan, O30213, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Glenn Roy Taylor, O42387, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Johnston Preston, Jr., O42388, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joe Albert McEachern, O39907, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Willard Caughron, O51513, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Clayton Parry, O39908, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald George Dow, O42389, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clewis Clayton Moffett, O39909, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Francis Moynahan, Jr., O30210, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lennart Yngve Ohlsson, O30211, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Patrick McGovern, O42391, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Blaire Aloysius Froehle, O42392, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clair M. Worthy, O39911, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Troy Alton Barker, O42394, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harper Brown Cowles, O51515, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maurice Levin, O39912, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Samuel Edward Baker, O42395, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Raymond Riley, O38768, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thornton Eugene Jones, O30214, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert B. Evans, O30215, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert John McBride, O30216, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Osmyn Arsene Vining, O42398, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Seaborn Hawes Mosely, O42399, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dallas Buford Pack, O51517, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Edward Boyce, O42403, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Lee Johnson, O30219, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Warren Karl Pratt, O51519, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Ernest Bellamy, O30220, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Cad Luna, O42403, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Aubrey Locke, O29967, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Danna Lee Lane, O51520, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Edward Harper, Jr., O42404, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William John Murphy, O30222, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Grant Harrison, O51522, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Marvin Larner, O30223, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sam James Rasor, O38769, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Stock Himes, O30224, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maskell Edward Brown, O39914, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stanley Walden Phillips, O42407, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Anthony Sabatelli, O51525, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Kelly Blair, O51526, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Lewis Willey, O42408, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vancel Ritson Beck, O30233, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Lincoln Nelson, O30232, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Paul Curtin, O30231, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Noble DeVaney, O38770, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Louis Ryan, Jr., O30234, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Joseph McNamara, O51528, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leland Veeder Miller, O30235, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Augustus Deagle, O30237, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Freebairn Jackson, O51529, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Constantine Vardas, O30236, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lloyd Dale Malen, O42410, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Courtland Parks, Jr., O30238, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leon Oscar Pond, O42412, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Willard Renwick Seymour, O38772, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gordon Douglas Cornell, O51531, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George William Barry, O39916, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bruce Hudson Vail, O51533, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bernard Garfield Wobbeking, O42417, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gerald Franklin True, O38773, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charlie Emmett Ashburn Morgan, O51535, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Beverly Matthews Leigh, Jr., O39917, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold John Pearson, O42418, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Louis Hart, O30241, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Frederick Kuster, O42419, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick George Ward, O39918, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leo Vincent Holly, O42420, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Michael Clisson, O30243, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Francis Tank, O19350, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas DeForth Rogers, O19351, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert Erlenkotter, O19354, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Staunton Lindsley Brown, O19356, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Moser Sieg, O19357, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ferdinand Julian Tate, O19359, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Burton Blodgett Bruce, O19360, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert George MacDonnell, O19361, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Leon Andrews, O19363, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Jackson Renfroe, Jr., O19364, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Joslin Himes, O19365, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Beauchamp Miller, O19366, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Francis Fell, O19368, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Rea Revie, O19369, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Ochsenschlager Killian, O19370, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Thomas Heber Lipscomb, O19371, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Edward Walsh, O19372, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Austin Wortham Betts, O19373, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Page Buehler, O19374, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Seymour Irving Gilman, O19377, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Butler Warren, O19380, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilford Edward Harry Voehl, O19382, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jonathan Owen Seaman, O19385, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kermit LeVelle Davis, O19386, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ellis Oakes Davis, O19387, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harvey Julius Jablonsky, O19390, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Urquhart Pullen Williams, O19391, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Peter Samuel Peca, O19392, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Ringo Moorman, O19394, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. James Oscar Baker, O19396, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Hicks Anderson, O19398, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Severin Richard Beyma, O19399, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Beehler Bunker, O19402, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore Frelinghuysen Hoffman, O19403, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Miles Birkett Chatfield, O19404, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Henry White, Jr., O19407, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Mathew Valois Pothier, O19410, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Sylvester Piram, O19411, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Edward Adams, O19412, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Almon White Manlove, O19413, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John DuVal Stevens, O19414, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Yale Harold Wolfe, O19415, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Farnsworth Smoller, O19416, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Craig Smyser, O19417, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Franklin Kemble, Jr., O19418, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Richardson Hester, O19419, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gersen Leo Kushner, O19420, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Edward Weber, Jr., O19421, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Charles Davall, O19425, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Delbert Womack, O19426, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Gardner Baker, O19427, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ronald LeVerne Martin, O19428, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Wadsworth Hill, O19430, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Donald Oliver Vars, O19432, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry William Ebel, O19434, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Belmont Routh, O19437, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lee Carl Miller, O19438, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Travis Ludwell Petty, O19439, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Peter James Kopcsak, O19440, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Griffith Finkenaur, O19441, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Scott Penn, Jr., O19442, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Willoughby Moorman, O19444, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Horace Lake Sanders, O19445, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Merlin Louis DeGuire, O19446, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alexander James Stuart, Jr., O19447, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Percy Thomas Hennigar, O19450, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Riffel Kenerick, O19452, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Lee McKee, O19453, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Howard Garrett Fuller, O19190, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stacy William Gooch, O19455, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clark Lynn, Jr., O19456, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leo William Henry Shaughnessey, O19458, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Jenkins Hubbard, O19459, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Knox Yarbrough, Jr., O19460, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joe Free Surratt, O19461, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Claude Morris Howard, O19464, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gordon Graham Warner, O19466, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Patterson Mossman, O19469, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Carl Bahr, O19470, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Carter Norvell, O19471, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Walker Darrah, Jr., O19473, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Hawkins Adams, O19474, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Glover McLennan, O19475, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Francis Franklin, Jr., O19476, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore Gilmore Bilbo, Jr., O19477, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Berton Everett Spivy, Jr., O19479, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stilson Hilton Smith, Jr., O19480, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Alonzo Cunin, O19481, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Eugene Wood, O19483, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fredric Carson Cook, O19484, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Elmer Fellenz, O19485, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Percival Stanley Brown, O19487, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Clary Foote, O19488, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Bernadou Elliott, Jr., O19490, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Richard Winn, O19491, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel Henry Heyne, O19493, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Evans Lardin, O19494, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Colonel Charles Herbert Wood, O19498, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dana Watterson Johnston, Jr., O19506, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel Murray Cheston 3d, O19507, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel Edward Still, O19510, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clifford Guldlin Simenson, O19511, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Frank Joseph Caufield, O19515, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James William Snee, O19516, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Dudley Wilmeth, O19519, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Lester Hillyard, O19524, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Hutcheson Craig, O19526, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Doak McKinney, O19529, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Edward Johnson, O19534, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Carson Kyser, O19535, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Dixon Lawlor, O19536, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Russell William Volckmann, O19537, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Linscott Durfee, O19538, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hallett Daniel Edson, O19541, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Rusteberg, O19542, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Karl Trueheart Gould, O19544, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Webb Browning, O19545, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Hadley Andrae, O19547, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Frederick Northam, O19547, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Lowe Eatman, O19548, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Berchman Stanley, O19549, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Edward Brown, O19552, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Nathaniel Plummer Ward, 3d, O19553, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Buchanan Wells, O19554, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Adams McPheron, O19555, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Hogan Hayes, O19556, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Conly Brookhart, O19562, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Messmore O'Connell, O19563, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Russell Walker Jenna, O19564, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerhard Leroy Bolland, O19565, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Bentley Kern, O19566, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Louis Alfred Walsh, Jr., O19567, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Horner Gerhart, O19569, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Andrew McCrary, O19570, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John George Benner, O19571, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Travis Tabor Brown, O19574, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Gantt Hickman, O19575, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Alexander Cunningham, 3d, O19579, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Meade Julian Dugas, O19582, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Almon O'Neil, O19583, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Emory Alexander Lewis, O19584, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Joseph Mullen, Jr., O19586, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Hammond Waugh, Jr., O19587, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Neilson, O19588, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert Hector McKinnon, O19590, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dennis John McMahon, O19592, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James O'Hara, O19593, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Nabors Tyson, O19594, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Buchanan Richardson, Jr., O19596, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marion George Stewart, Jr., O30244, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Shirley Guy Blencoe, O30245, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Harry Reynolds, O39919, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Clark Wilson, O30248, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Henry Naughton, O51536, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John O'Connell, O42422, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clark Graham Campbell, O38774, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Ferdinand Schmidt, O42423, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Valleau Rathbone, Jr., O42424, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Page Harrison Slaughter, O30250, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Fredrick Stein, O51538, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Edgar Yanka, O30252, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Howard Gregory Ford, O38775, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Grady Hattox, O30253, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Henry Fillmore, O30254, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hal Peter Andersen, O39920, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Eugene Foster, O30256, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marzelle Freeman Boyd, O39921, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerald King Gifford, O51539, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Barney McGary, O51540, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Walter Finn, O30257, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Claude Patrick Joyce, Jr., O42426, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Roy Falke, O51542, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Paul Ireland, O51543, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Thomas Trial, O30259, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ford Elliott Allcorn, O51544, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Bishop Crossman, O42428, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Franklin Morris Finiau, O30263, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Neal Woodrow Harper, O30262, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harlow Engle Allen, O39922, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Robert Richmond, O30265, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robley Dunglison Evens, O39924, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oliver Clark Harvey, O38776, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Francis Escudé, O30519, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Bascomb Miller, O30266, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Henry Burd, O42434, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Norby, O51548, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stuart Myron Alley, O30268, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Owen Thomas McCloskey, O30269, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Kilbourne Eggleston, Jr., O30271, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth William Gillespie, O30273, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earle Fillmore Mitchell, O30272, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Walter Edwards, O30274, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard John Grondona, O42439, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Franklin Roscoe Brickles, O30276, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Jay Banigan, O42443, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jesse Devon Jackson, O51555, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wentworth Hamilton Taylor, Jr., O30280, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Christopher Jesse, O42446, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Godbey, O30281, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Miller Davis, O30282, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hugh Montgomery Arnold, O30283, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Lewis De Haas, O30284, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robin Brem Gardner, O38777, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederic Donald Ray, O51558, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Dill Raney, O30285, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jacob Richard Hershey, O30286, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Stuart Wilkes, O30288, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Ferdinand Vering, O30289, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Goddard Foster, O30291, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Charles Bass, O30292, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thaddeus William Drobek, O42453, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Louis Martin Nawrocky, O30293, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Oscar Rooney, O42454, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Henry Watson, O42458, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Kreigh Moody, O38779, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Farles Pindar, O42463, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Archibald Douglass, O30296, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilfred Knobeloch, O42464, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Claudius Albert Beall, Jr., O39931, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sanford Joseph Butler, O30297, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles William Henry, O30299, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Robert Sievers, O30298, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Philo Milton Baumgartner, O38780, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Anthony Pongonis, O30301, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Arthur Miner, O39933, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Anthony Stahl, O39934, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wayne Pinkerton Litz, O30304, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Holman Don Hoover, O30305, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Philip Buckley Melody, O38782, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Emmett Rochford, O30307, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Perry Edwards, O30309, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Andrew Taylor, O51566, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Lee Ferguson, O30046, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Foley, O42474, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Patrick Miller, O42475, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Donald Peterson, O30311, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Louis Davids, O38783, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur John Cornelson, O51567, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Edgar Willis, O30313, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Max James Roadruck, O42479, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Edward McMaken, O30318, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Parker Barnett, O38784, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry William Berry, O42480, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin William Saurel, O42482, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Frank Blackmon, O51569, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edgar Allen Noel, O51570, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Louis M. Etherton, O39940, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Tilden McDowell, Jr., O30321, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Devitt Edmunds, O30323, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Delio Perez, O30324, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Eugene Stevenson, O38785, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Emery Douglas Middleton, O30329, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Douglas Hand, O30328, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Lee Rhea, O30327, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph William Jogl, O30330, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Willice Edgar Groves, O30075, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Francis Maguire, O30332, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Bennett Laugerman, O30333, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earl Floyd Pegran, O42487, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Edward Steck, O42490, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Erwin Edward Sullo, O42491, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilbur Wilson, O42494, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Lynn Hubert Webb, O39946, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gordon Charles Gill, O42495, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilton Briggs Moats, O30336, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Dasher Shearouse, O30337, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Joseph Wiltrakis, O51575, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Emery Erwin Hyde, O51576, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leo George Woerner, O30341, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Theodore Gustav Thomas, O30344, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Donald Hoisington, O30348, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Manlius Rupert Stewart, O42503, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul William Albert, O42507, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Taplin Scott, O30351, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lewis Drexel Morgan, O42508, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Emil Lange, O30353, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis William Anderson, O30354, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Curtis Chedister, O30355, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jesse Deaderick Willoughby, O38787, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maurice E. Webb, O30357, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Walter Bidwell, O20508, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Julian Alexander Wilson, O30359, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Russell Sage Hahn, O56815, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John D'Alessandro, O42510, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Helmer Halliden, O30360, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harrell Glenn Hall, O51580, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dale D. Dixon, O38788, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ronald Noel Maidt, O42511, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Robbins, O42512, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ward Conrad Howard, O42515, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Nyles Wesley Baltzer, O51581, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilber Alexander Stevens, O30365, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Bowen Potter, O30366, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Homer Stephens, O30367, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Henry Wagner, O42518, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lewis Matthew Flint, O42519, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Lindsay Hall, O51584, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert William Lockridge, O42524, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Frederick Zinser, O30370, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Preston Miller Motes, O30372, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Calvin Neely, O30374, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Peter Carberry, O38789, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Verner Burke, O38790, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Carl Fell, O30379, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Alexander Cawlfield, O30378, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Edgar Mickel, O38793, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Helmer August Holmstrom, O30382, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilton Louis Sanders, O38794, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Hert, O39952, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clair Edwin Towne, O30383, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Barney Oldfield, O42532, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Thomas McKee, O30383, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Scott Hays, O42534, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Wesley Gontrum, O51596, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ted James Madden, O42537, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Glenn Neely, O42538, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hugh Gordon Brown, O42539, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Murray Adams Little, O39956, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Glenn Lang, O51600, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lynn Wilson Pine, O30392, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Edward Burns, O30394, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Peter Peters, O39961, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Carl Garrison, O30144, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Morton Albert Rubin, O39962, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earl Milton Hamilton, O30398, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas John Trainor, O51604, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl McClellan Poston, O30400, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Frith Bienvenu, O30401, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Eugene Byrns, O51606, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Robert Berricklov, O56816, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Garnett Steffey, O30404, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clinton Adolph Waggoner, O42552, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Alexander Persell, O51608, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Peter Hermann Dahmlow, O30406, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Chandler Dodenhoff, O30407, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Mario De Malo, O30399, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leniel Edward McDonald, O30408, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Frederick Mudgett, O30409, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Edwin Jennings, O39964, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Clifford Peterson, O42555, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Ivor Jones, O30410, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leslie Duncan Goodall, O30411, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Levis Chalmers Wiggins, O42556, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elmer Russell Powell, O30414, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Herbert Mahoney, O51613, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward William Quinlan, O51617, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond George Trampe, O42561, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vernon Walter Brugger, O39966, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Bolling Seay, O30420, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Jefferson Hornaday, O30423, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Balthasar Steiner, O51622, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Edwin Johnston, O30424, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arent Orvil Wiken, O30426, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Archie Cheatham, O30427, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sidney Shelley, O42571, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oliver Cornelius Culbreth, O30429, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Chester Malcolm Stratton, O30431, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Nathan McQuade Quinn, O42574, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kennard Smith Vandergrift, O42575, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Edward McClish, O30432, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Frederick Coates, O30433, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Wilkens Burnett, O41576, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Floyd Eason, O30435, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Henry Overby, O30437, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Hudson Newton, O42579, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Thomas Colvin, O30434, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herman Albert Hauck, O30436, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John James Prokop, Jr., O38797, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dick Andrew King, O30438, Army of the United States (captain, United States Army).

Lt. Col. Morgan Barnes Heasley, O30175, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Tracy Gerard, O30445, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy George DeVecchio, O42584, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Richard Bech, O41585, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilbur von Molt DeLoach, O30449, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ivan Joe Dyekman, O30455, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Claude Emmanuel Fernandes, O30454, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alex Earl McKenzie, O39967, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Wilkes May, O39968, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jefferson Rueben Cronk, O30461, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Wilson Johnston, O30462, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Rossing, O42593, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leslie Leland Motz, O42596, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward McClam Foxworth, O42596, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Andres Troy, O42597, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Grant W. Mason, O30738, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Allen Darden, Jr., O42599, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Francis Condon, O39973, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Victor Hugh Moore, O42602, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Charles Nauman, O30467, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Henry McCann, Jr., O30468, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Lucien Fortin, O42608, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Edwin Skelly, O30473, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Kimball, O42607, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jacob Fargo Wagner, O30475, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Edward Brooks, Jr., O38801, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Blaine Frastus Anderson, O39976, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alexander Shadrick Turner, O51698, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bruce Wendell Caron, O30479, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Barton Emmons, O39979, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Samuel Mathes, O30481, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Justin William Stoll, O30482, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Jerome Newman, O51695, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph T. Mosley, O42611, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Lyle Barnett, O30489, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bert Kirkman Whaley, O42612, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James George Basbas, O42354, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Stevens Hardiman, O30492, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oliver O. Dixon, O30494, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Edward Roberts, O30499, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herrick Franklin Bearce, O30496, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Francis Lovell, O42616, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Jenkins Badger, O39981, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Frederick Ballentine, O39983, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Frederick Hansen, O42618, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stuart Lawrence Weinerth, O42620, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Byron Baker, O30239, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Slaughter Carpenter, O42622, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carlen Randolph Bryant, O30507, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Holbrook, O51646, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vernon Lester Lewis, O42628, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Drake Bristor, O19710, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Abeel Phelan, O19711, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Aaron Evan Harris, O19712, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Hamilton Gregg, O19713, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Campbell Wallace, O19715, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Houston Frye, Jr., O19716, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Caran Gee, O19717, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Allen Elliget, O19719, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clyde Calhoun Zeigler, O19720, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oliver Joseph Pickard, O19723, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Otto Jacob Rohde, O19725, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Somers Buist Dick, O19726, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Winston Lapsley, O19727, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. James DeVore Lang, O19728, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Charles Jephthiah Jeffus, O19730, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Lewis Hile, Jr., O19731, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Lathrop Throckmorton, O19732, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Ruhlen, O19733, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cornelis DeWitt Willcox Lang, O19734, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Richards Parker, O19735, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Carl Haug, O19736, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Sutton Growdon, O19737, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Joseph Duffy, O19738, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Warren Sylvester Everett, O19739, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Watkins Miller, O19740, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Salvatore Andrew Armogida, O19741, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Paulding Grieves, O19742, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stanley Tage Birger Johnson, O19743, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Alexander Osmanski, O19745, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bernard Sanders Waterman, O19746, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Benjamin Hall, Jr., O19747, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Langfitt Bowditch Wilby, O19748, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Dudley Cole, Jr., O19749, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Raymond Wilkins, O19750, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry James Lewis, O19751, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Albert Symroski, O19753, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Chaffee Thayer, O19754, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Yeates Adams, O19755, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Jacob Lemley, Jr., O19756, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Duncan Sinclair, O19757, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Geoffrey Dixon Ellerson, O19759, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ray Allen Pillivant, O19761, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ellery Willis Niles, O19763, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Rigby Glass, O19765, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Stafford Eckhardt, O19766, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alvin Dolliver Robbins, O19769, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sidney George Spring, O19770, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Stephen Bechtold, O19771, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Seth Lathrop Weld, Jr., O19772, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ivan Clare Rumsey, O19774, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel John Murphy, O19776, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Bidgood, O19777, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Albert Simpson, O19778, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hugh McClellan Exton, O19780, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Durward Ellsworth Breakefield, O19781, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sanford Welsh Horstman, O19783, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col Kelso Gordon Clow, O19784, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Herndon Critz, O19786, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Porter van Ormer, O19787, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Kraus, O19789, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Irwin Curtis, O19790, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Charles Moore, O19791, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Alexis Gloriod, O19793, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Nathaniel Macon Martin, O19794, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Salathiel Fred Cummings, Jr., O19796, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Martin Worthington, O19797, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Michael Donohue, O19798, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Clarence McDonald, Jr., O19799, Army of the United States (captain U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Waters Keating, O19800, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Halford Robert Greenlee, Jr., O19801, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Robert St. John, O19805, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerald Frederick Brown, O19806, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Willard George Root, O19807, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Maclean Peeke, O19810, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Boyd Firehock, O19812, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Milton Lawrence Rosen, O19814, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Mobley Kimbrough, Jr., O19816, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Ralph Wright, Jr., O19817, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harrison Barnwell Harden, Jr., O19818, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Moseley Harris, O19819, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Luke Frink, Jr., O19821, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elmer John Gibson, O19822, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Julius Desmond Stanton, O19823, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Joseph Bryde, O19825, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Washington Woodyard, Jr., O19826, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stuart Gilbert Fries, O19827, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Rich Hale, O19828, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Frederick Leonard, Jr., O19829, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Frank Skells, O19830, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Seneca Wilbur Foote, O19833, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Willoughby Totten, O19834, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene Henry Walter, O19836, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Curtis Wells, Jr., O19838, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Russell Melroy Miner, O19839, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Nevin Howell, O19840, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hamilton Austin Twitchell, O19843, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alfred Ashman, O19846, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Dyce Alger, O19848, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Edward Haines, Jr., O19849, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ewing Chase Johnson, O19851, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Johnstone Murdoch, Jr., O19853, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Pennock Hoyt Wollaston, O19854, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Theodore Isham, O19856, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Mark McGoldrick, O19857, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilhelm Cunliffe Freudenthal, O19858, Army of the United States (captain, United States Army).

Lt. Col. John Altrey, O19859, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Rieber Russ, O19860, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Henry Dilley, O19861, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene Charles Orth, Jr., O19863, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Duncan Gillis, O19864, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Autrey Joseph Maroun, O19865, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Milton Clay Taylor, O19867, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Cobb Stancook, O19870, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Brown Morgan, O19871, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Henry Wiechmann, O19874, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Foster Rhoades, O19875, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Robert Oglesby, O19877, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Calvin Stapleton, O19878, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Vincent Martz, O19879, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Arvid Skinrood, O19882, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Noel Maurice Cox, O19883, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Crook Anderson, O19884, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Hart Caughey, O19885, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Edward Schlanser, O19886, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Thomas Cherry, Jr., O19888, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edgar Joseph Treacy, Jr., O19892, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Reuben Henry Tucker 3d, O19894, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Genler Proctor, O19895, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elmer Hardie Walker, O19898, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clair Beverly Mitchell, O19899, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Williamson, O19900, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Louis Duzzette Farnsworth, Jr., O19904, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vernon Price Mock, O19906, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Allen Beall, Jr., O19907, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Wythe Gleaves Rich, O19910, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald William Bernier, O19911, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harvey Bower, O19912, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Allen Harvey Foreman, O19913, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Floyd Garfield Pratt, O19915, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Glenn Cole, O19917, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward William Sawyer, O19918, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Bradford Means, O19920, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Gibson Sherrard, Jr., O19922, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Andrew Jackson Boyle, O19924, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stephen Disbrow Cocheu, O19925, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin White Heckemeyer, O19930, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Nassieb George Bassitt, O19931, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oscar Rawles Bowyer, O19934, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John James Davis, O19935, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Basil Edwards, O19936, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Eugene Tucker, O19938, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alfred Kirk duMoulin, O19943, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Edward Bare, Jr., O19944, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul James Bryer, O19947, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Burnis Mayo Kelly, O19950, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lester Lewes Wheeler, O19951, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carmon Ambrose Rogers, O19952, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Russell Batch Smith, O19953, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marcus Samuel Griffin, O19954, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Hayden Agnew, O19956, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Leroy Thomas, O19958, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Russell Lynn Hawkins, O19960, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eric Per Ramee, O19961, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Hood Ferris, O19962, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Madison Jones, O19965, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Louis McGehee, O19969, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Graham Barnwell, Jr., O19589, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Albert Riemenschneider, O19970, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Pierce O'Neal, Jr., O19971, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Place Hill, Jr., O19972, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Melville Brown Coburn, O19973, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Bonesteel Stone, O19976, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Osborn Lashley, O19982, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Thomas Robert Clarkin, O19983, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Pope Blackshear, O19984, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George August Meidling, O42634, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Edward Lucas Austin, O30505, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Henry Elges, Jr., O30511, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Orth Beckner, O30512, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roland James Halada, O42635, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Philip MacGregor Judson, O30516, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Olin Hoffman, O30517, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leon Flores Punzalan, O42639, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Hamilton Colwell, O42640, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Milton Humphrey Price, O30518, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Clinton Whicher, O39966, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard William Bowden, O42642, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maurice Loring Driscoll, O30525, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Elbert Von Kaenel, O30527, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Joseph O'Connor, O51654, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Nason Walker, Jr., O51655, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Chesley Harris, O30529, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Allen Gross, O30528, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Russell Porter Grant, O42646, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Wilhelm Reisner, O51656, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Knight Britton, O30532, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul James Ritchie, O38808, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Luther Elman Johnson, O30535, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Millard G. Bowen, Jr., O30536, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Orval Calvin Thompson, O30539, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roland Hull Mapes, O30538, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Neal Wallace Lovsnes, O30540, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Edward Wilson, O30542, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harrison Schermerhorn Markham, O20073, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Floyd Edward Gidineky, O30543, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Vernon Munson, O42654, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Merle Garretson, O38809, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Nicholas Nahas, O39990, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Joseph Sackton, O30553, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Alvin Pace, O30552, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sture Alexander Ansel, O30554, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Heinrich Gary Schumann, O39991, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lowell Traxler Bondshu, O51670, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore Fox Astrella, O42656, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Pat M. Stevens 3d, O30557, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Hewitt, O30558, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Ivy Davis, O42658, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Wyttenbach Ewbank, Jr., O30474, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Smith, O30559, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Merlin Oscar Tryon, O38810, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alexander Hamilton Miller, O39992, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert French Evans, O42662, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Rellie Weldon Adams, O42663, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vernon Merriweather Smith, O39993, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Leslie Calhoun, O42664, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Byrd Gall, O30563, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Benson Alexander, O30565, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ramon Carl Dougan, O30566, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Erdie Otis Lansford, O30569, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Lucian Ward, O38811, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Horace Fenton McFeely, O38812, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Schnee Messec, O51682, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Celie A. Quinn, O30571, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Bennett Goodwin, O30573, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Whitwell Bowman, O38813, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles MacKinnon Ackley, O39997, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilbur Morgan Johnson, O30577, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Armel Dyer, O42674, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Horace Entricen Townsend, O30578, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Lewis Schaefer, O39999, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fay Edward Joseph Carey, O38814, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Everett Holman, O38815, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arland Eugene Bigelow, O51687, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carroll Barton McMath, Jr., O42678, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Douglas Stevens, O38816, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Irwin Thomas Shaw, O42679, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Russell Gilbert, O51689, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Guinn Burch Goodrich, O42680, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Louis Wenzel Correll, O30582, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leon Bieri, O42682, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gus Edward Lehmann, O40001, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Gerson Haskell, O30588, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Wells Vance, O51693, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Lamoreaux Warfield, O30590, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maurice Neal Clark, O42690, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Herman Bosbyshell, O30596, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Maxwell McClain, O42693, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Brown Richardson, O30597, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. LeRoy Beatty Woodbury, Jr., O30598, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Winston Butscher, O30599, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harrison Hines Finlayson, O42697, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Franklin Asbenfelder, O40008, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Lawrence MacKusick, O42695, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Albert Deason, O30601, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Spencer Simcox, O30602, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Paul Mulrooney, O42699, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Raymond Walter Burkett, O30603, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clyde Elhannon White, O42700, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Gilbert Turner, O31414, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roberts Homer Billingsley, O30608, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore Law Poole, Jr., O30606, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Eugene Michael Lill, O40011, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Andrew Paul Flanagan, O30609, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Giles Henry Gere, O51707, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Murphy Murray, O30610, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Adrian Johansson, O51710, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Milburn Neil Huston, O30612, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Lassetter, Jr., O51714, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Donald McPhail, O30613, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Joseph Raber, O30614, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Theodore Larned Eastmond, O40013, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Armington Baldry, O30615, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Cornelius Taylor, O30616, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Philip Eugene Pons, O30621, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lennard Charles Sorensen, O42710, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Myron Lawrence Williams, O30622, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Miles Albert Kinley, O51718, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Massie Throckmorton, O42711, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bruce Edward Kendall, O30623, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Wesley Philpot, O30627, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Warren Horton, O30626, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Yates Farrell, O30628, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Richard Guehring, O51723, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Edgar Baker, O42714, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herman William Dammer, O30634, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Douglas Edgar, O30635, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Warren Schroder, O30637, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lester Keith Olson, O30640, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Charles Brinsmead, O42715, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Joseph Matkovcik, O30641, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Cogswell Higley, O38821, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Irving William Finberg, O42716, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William John Scott, O42718, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Warwick King, O30646, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Earl Sheen, O40015, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Halsell Reynolds, O42721, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry William Meinecke, O42722, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Bill Bassett Hunkapiller, O40016, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roger Allen Rawley, O30648, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ambrose Thomas McGuckian, O42725, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Orvie Palmer Anderson, O42727, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fredolin William Kuhn, O51734, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Radam, O51736, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Byron Gregory, O51737, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Winston Langley, O30649, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Dillard Land, O30650, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Raymond Cupello, O38822, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stafford Ashley Cooper, O42730, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Russell Oliver Fudge, O30652, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. James Franklin Wells, O30654, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Lee Freshwater, O51739, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Harrison Dixon, O42733, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Graham Roy Evans, O30656, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Isadore Benjamin Burdick, O42735, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Allen Miller, O40018, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Blair O'Connor, O51740, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Frederick Kuenning, O42739, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Steven Malevich, O30660, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas William Donnell, O30663, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Donald Carnes, O30666, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Cliff Hudgins, Jr., O38824, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Carrol Settle, O30665, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Keith Thomas O'Keefe, O30669, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Aloysius Muth, O30670, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond LaVerne Blust, O30671, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles William Farnum, O42743, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Otis Wyatt, O40020, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Donald Rogers, O30676, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Bernard Markey, O38826, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Clifton Pennington, O42749, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. LeRoy Ernest Frazier, O30678, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bert de Melker, O30679, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bob Haynes Glover, O30680, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Fred Deakyne Bendler, Jr., O30681, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Philip Joseph Galanti, O30684, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Edward Hagerty, O30685, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Bailey Tibbs, O30688, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Lindley Ogden, O30689, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Willard Britten, O38828, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William John Fabritius, O40021, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Rensselaer Sanford, O38827, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Douglas Chesley Barton, O38829, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Crawford Farmer, O30691, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Frederick Durbin, O51748, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Donovan McCormick, O42765, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Berkeley Bush, O30692, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Josephi Helms, O30694, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Hora McLauchlin, Jr., O51752, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Glenn Carroll Hess, O51753, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ritchie Garrison, O30696, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry William Bues, Jr., O42772, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Edward Lobit, O30699, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hamilton Reger, O30700, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Edwin Lee, O42775, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Allen Thomas Stanwix-Hay, O51759, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Sidney Redfield, O30704, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marcus Webb Adams, O40025, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Louis Ziegler, O30707, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bolla Darby Pollock, O38832, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Ewell Grant, O42778, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George MacElwain Barker, O30708, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. B. J. Leon Hirshorn, O51762, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Laurence Terry King, O30713, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Emil Myers, O51765, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marter Denton Middleton, O51767, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Preston Vincent Phelps, O40026, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Arthur Tolve, O40027, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Weston Arthur McCormac, O30716, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Frederick Field, O42784, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Percy Davidson, O42785, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Robert Hector, O30717, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Adrianus Johannus Van Oosten, O40028, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marsh Patrick Stockton, O51769, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Harold Moore, O30721, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Fella Hill, O38835, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Vincent Douglas, O42786, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Thomas Laughlin, O30723, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earl Henry Hauschultz, O42789, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Edward Robb, O42790, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Shelby Linwood Gillette, O30727, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Bruce Layton, O30729, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Josef Albert Prall, O51772, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Henry Connerat, Jr., O30730, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edmund Robert O'Brien, O40032, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Wulfe Kuehler, O30731, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kermit Harry Glenn McCoy, O51776, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Edward Hughes, O30733, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Oliver Olson, O30734, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Gottfried Gramzow, O30735, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Cooke, O30736, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Luther Russell Miller, O30737, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Abraham Walk, O42796, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Ernest Kehke, O42797, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leo Vasserot Merle, Jr., O51778, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Thomas Bankus, O42799, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Lathrop Paddock, Jr., O30740, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Lloyd Williams, O42800, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Alph Hamberg, O30741, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army.)

Lt. Col. Ralph Harvey Elliott, O30744, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Garton Buck, O30745, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Fred Arfman, O42802, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Adolph Traeger, O30746, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald McBurney Curtis, O38837, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Merton Barnum, O51780, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clifford Earl Dykes, O51781, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Otto Max Boerner, O30747, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Kaighin Watts, O30752, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Marshall Slayden, O30754, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Clifton Conine, O30203, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Webster Wilder, Jr., O51784, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Georg Wilhelm Finke, O40037, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wheeler Godfrey Merriam, O30759, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert James O'Donnell, O51786, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Cassels Jeffrey, O30763, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul LeGrand Jolley, O30764, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Truman Alford, O30765, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richmond F. Thweatt, O30766, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wilson Harold Birch, O42816, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Richard Lutz, O30767, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Melvin Adolf Hoherz, O42819, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Pickett Smith, O30772, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Mayo Ogilvie, Jr., O30773, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Waldemar Johnson, O42821, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Brown Franks, O40041, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Marvin Brown, O30777, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Bernard Heyer, O40042, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Franklin Sutherland, O30779, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Melvin Hunt, O30782, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maurice Benjamin Gullion, O42826, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward William Fitzgerald, O30495, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene S. Tarr, O42827, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Oscar William Fulton, O30784, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Charles Hunter, O40045, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Elbert Dupree, O40044, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Benjamin Franklin Keist, O38843, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wythe Munford Peyton, Jr., O42830, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jesse Mellette Johnson, O51797, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Royden Arnold Konopaska, O30787, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gordon Benjamin Page, O40046, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Wendell Swanson, O30788, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Jennings Seigler, Jr., O30789, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Church Clark, Jr., O42834, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Clapper, Jr., O42835, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene Albert Salet, O30790, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Van Fleet, O51801, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Norman Welbec Parsons, O30793, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Poats Littlejohn, O42837, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Lawrence Leidenheimer, O30795, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clifford LeRoy Woodliff, O30796, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Myron Abraham Funk, O30798, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Wilbur Otto, O30799, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Clifton Davie, O40050, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Burton Keeney Philips, O40048, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Russell Summers, O42841, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Henry Waters, O20114, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Ralph Dickson King, O20115, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond John Harvey, O20116, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bruce Palmer, Jr., O20117, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Reeves Shuler, O20118, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Dean McCarty, O20119, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Herbert Kerkering, O20120, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Pierre Victor Kieffer, Jr., O20122, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Karl Theodore Klock, Jr., O20123, Army of the United States (captain U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Arthur Milton Jacoby, O20125, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Alexander Falks, O20129, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Ervan White, Jr., O20130, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gilbert Meding Dorland, O20132, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Jay Hayes 3d, O20134, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gordon Henry Holterman, O20135, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Alexander Finley, O20136, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Mellard Connor, Jr., O20137, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Jacob Katz, O20138, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wright Hiatt, O20139, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Kramer, O20140, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Allen Morris, O20141, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stephen Elliott Smith, O20142, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edgar Hall Thompson, Jr., O20143, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William David Milne, O20144, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Benjamin Lampert, O20147, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Reginald Joseph Beauregard Page, O20149, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Edward Laurion, O20150, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Bernard Bess, O20151, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Albert Cozart, O20152, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Andrew Davis Chaffin, Jr., O20153, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Nott Beard, O20154, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Edward Kelly, O20156, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stephen Walsh Holderness, O20157, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Emmett Goodwin, O20158, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Paul Francis Oswald, O20160, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cecil Eldon Spann, Jr., O20162, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Foster LeRoy Furphy, O20163, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Pinkney Persons, Jr., O20167, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Adam Stephen Buynoski, O20169, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Daniel McElheny, O20170, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Kenneth Einar Madsen, O20171, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Van Valkenburg Sutherland, O20173, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thea Lewis Lipscomb, O20174, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oren Swain, O20176, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David McCoach 3d, O20177, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Henry Kessler, O20178, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Edgar Mikkelsen, O20179, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Henry Kinard, Jr., O20180, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene Everett Lockhart, O20181, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maxwell Morrison Kallman, O20182, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Richard Ganns, O20184, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Everett George Hahney, O20185, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clifford Frederick Cordes, Jr., O20186, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Matthew Burnett, O20187, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Woodrow Hiester, O20191, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Dudley Hartman, Jr., O20192, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Selwyn Dyson Smith, Jr., O20194, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Lemuel Cato, O20195, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Walter Romlein, O20197, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Aldrich Davis, O20198, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Alexander Grove, O20200, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Barry Yost, O20201, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Bruce Partridge, O20204, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Worthington Williams, O20205, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilmer Charles Landry, O20208, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eldred George Robbins, Jr., O20211, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard McCrum Snyder, Jr., O20213, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Orville Newton Stokes, O20215, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. James Edward Landrum, Jr., O20216, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Davis Torrey, Jr., O20217, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Raymond Prince, O20219, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Gilbert Grothaus, O20221, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ned Taylor Norris, O20222, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Childs Westmoreland, O20223, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Earl Barlow, O20224, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Francis Dawalt, O20226, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Merritt Warfield, O20229, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leonard Copeland Shea, O20231, Army of the United States (captain, United States Army).

×Lt. Col. Harold Roy Low, O20234, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Beverley Evans Powell, O20237, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Read Bodine, O20238, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earl Franklin Holton, O20241, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ridgway Pancoast Smith, Jr., O20243, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Hall Safford, O20244, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Clare Dunn, O20245, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Victor Clifton, Jr., O20246, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilbur Maben Griffith, O20250, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Langdon Andrew Jackson, Jr., O20251, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joshua Asher Finkel, O20253, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry David Lind, O20256, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Paul Christensen, O20257, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Edward Gooding, O20258, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl LaVerne Rickenbaugh, O20259, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Charles Haneke, O20263, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Tillman Willis, O20264, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Claude Lee Crawford, O20266, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert George Ferguson, O20267, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Edward McCabe, O20269, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Joseph Jakle, O20270, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Walter Breaks, O20273, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Harold Gaston, Jr., O20276, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Wheaton Cole, Jr., O20277, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Rainier Weaver, O20278, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Arnold Heintges, O20281, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Harold Daly, O20284, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Daniel Mohlere, O20286, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Francis Meany, O20287, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Peter Woods Garland, Jr., O20288, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ned Butler Broyles, O20289, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Randolph Charles Dickens, O20290, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elmer Williford Grubbs, O20291, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fred Livingood Walker, Jr., O20293, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Weldon Childs, O20294, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Henry Chiles, O20295, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Creighton Williams Abrams, Jr., O20296, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Gregory Beggs, O20297, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Thomas Ryder, O20298, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Edward Sievers, O20299, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Latham Crandell, Jr., O20306, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Worthington Cooke, O20307, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. McPherson LeMoyne, O20309, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Wilkins Ripple, O20312, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Emmett O'Brien, Jr., O20313, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Philip Sheffield Greene, O20314, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thurman Wesley Morris, O20315, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Clyde Lafayette Layne, O20317, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jesse Cyrus Drain, Jr., O20318, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Marvin Williams, O20319, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Austin Glenwood Fisher, O20324, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Charles Lee Simpson, O20325, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Allen Leeds Peck, O20327, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Hersey Michaelis, O20328, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Franklin Rogers Sibert, O20329, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Michael Illig, O20330, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Kreitzer Benson, Jr., O20331, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Francis Curran, O20338, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Burnham Milliken, O20340, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Allen Clinton Miller 3d, O20342, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. James Renwick Hughes, O20343, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Franklin McManus, O20346, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert John Trout, O20347, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Horace Tiffany, O20348, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Glenn Austin Sikes, O20353, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Wallace Noake, O20357, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Lincoln Edwards, O20359, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Otto Turnage, Jr., O20360, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas James Lawlor, O20361, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Pelham Yarborough, O29362, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Aloysius Elliott McCormick, Jr., O20363, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Billingslea, O20367, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Franklin Evans, Jr., O20368, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Billy Leer, O20370, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Matthew Lynch, O20377, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Manly Pack, O20378, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore Janof, O20382, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Henry Nicolson, O30804, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Stanton Palmer, O30806, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Price Jones, Jr., O30807, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Lawrence Atkins, O30809, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James McCauslin Moynahan, O42848, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Arthur Claffee, O30810, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carroll James Williams, O30811, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Davidson Alexander 3d, O40052, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Burkitt Ameral Reynolds, O30814, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Philip Waters Regar, O40053, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Patrick Howard Devine, O31975, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gerald Alexander Paterick, O42853, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Rudolph Morgan, O30251, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leslie Adam Arnold, Jr., O30815, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Eugene Deering Billings, O30816, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Michael Scott, O30822, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Otto Gerot, O30818, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Barkin, O61809, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Ernest Doran, O38892, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Alderson Blair, O42858, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Vernon Porter, O31326, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sylvester Alvin Hall, O40057, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Argyle Campbell, O42861, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sam Frederick Fleming, O42863, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elmer Lawrence Slob, O42867, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Asa Calvin Black, O38894, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bolick Albert Saholsky, O31331, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Breckenridge Coffin, O33693, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur James McBride, O42870, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Emett Robert White, O31334, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Allan Benedict Rochford, O42876, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Ridley Spark, O51812, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Lewis Adams, O31339, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Arno Lorenz, O30534, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Ernest Schoenfeld, O31342, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Louis Siegel, O42879, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leonard Frank Walker, O31344, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Isaac Francis Bonifay, O40061, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Warren McCarthy, Jr., O40062, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leonard Joseph Julian, O51814, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Welch Hill, Jr., O31348, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Burton Edward Miles, O42886, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Vincent Shea, O40063, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Bruce Tomlinson, O31354, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Emil Lofstrand, O42889, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Waldo Wilburn Montgomery, O42890, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John James Moore, O31355, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Roy Dyer, O40065, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Co. Horace Bruce Frederick, O42891, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alfred Wyburd Furrell, O42894, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Wyatt Rawlings, Jr., O42895, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry A. Hall, Jr., O51819, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Gordon Belser, Jr., O42897, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Danahy Albro, O31360, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Finis Garrett Johnson, O40067, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert Platt Boyd, Jr., O40068, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jacob William Beaike, Jr., O31365, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ray Mason Bagley, O42902, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roger Hargreaves Williams, O40069, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Rollin Harvey Smith, O31367, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Thornton Walker, O31368, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Aaron Jenkins, O31369, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Cecil Williams, O31372, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maurice Kilburn Schiffman, O31375, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clyde Vernon Pickell, O31376, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bland West, O31378, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Nathaniel Ramsey Hoskot, O31379, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Bernard Jones, O42919, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Webster Marcy, O31380, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Reuben Star, O42920, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Lee Witt, O31382, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Joseph Stover, O31381, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin James Withers, O42921, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cyril Albert Millson, O42922, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Joseph Dunn, O31385, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Draper Easton, Jr., O51822, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Melvin William Kernkamp, O42923, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Julian Powers Fox, Jr., O51823, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Furman Walbridge Marshall, O42925, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roger Hunt Hemion, O40075, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Frank Whitton, Jr., O51825, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas William Akins, O40076, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Omer Siegmond Dews, O40079, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Paul Sampson, O42926, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Holmes Harrison, O31396, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clay Orville Collier, O42928, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Ezra Cuttino, O31397, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Albert Dunphy, O31398, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Adam Anson, O31400, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Edwin Sommers, O31405, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel Melvin Carter, O31406, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Daniel Hines, O38900, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Curry Ned Vaughan, O31407, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Carroll Martin Covington, O40083, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Ernest Lyman, O38903, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Albert Kuhn, O31419, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Mitchell Marr, O31420, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Andrew Woodbury, O42943, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Downing Temple, O51834, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Weisberg, O40085, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bradford Butler, Jr., O31426, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lyman Peter Marden, Jr., O40086, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Allen Ashley Futral, O42948, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ara Guy Lindley, O31427, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Michael Jesse Reichel, O40087, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dured Ellsworth Townsend, O31430, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Robert Magnusson, O31432, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Seymour Blair Satterwhite, O31431, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ford Edwin Pratt, O31433, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Leonard Whitney, O31435, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Livermore Whitten, O42954, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vernon Allen Shurm, O31436, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Levin Bruce Cottingham, O42955, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Gordon Fort, O31437, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Serle Blodgett, Jr., O31438, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Russell Springer, O38924, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Homer Cornelius Blake, O42959, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earl Sutton, O42961, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norbert Charles Miller, O38905, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gratian Michael Yatsevitch, O31442, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lewis Albert Hall, O40099, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lester Barney Johnson, O42963, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Hayden Arp, O31445, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Louis Crownover, O42968, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Milton Crton, O51844, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leonard George Robinson, Jr., O31446, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Joseph Martineau, O42971, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clair Hall Thurston, O31453, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Frances Quinn, O31454, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Frank Hill, O42973, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Major Aldon Mellroy Hoffman, O42975, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roland Philip Carlson, O31456, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Walton, O31459, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Francis Nowe, O31460, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dyson Crawford Sweger, O31461, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard William Keyes, O31467, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Richard Smoak, O31463, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Milford Freidinger, O42983, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Arthur Goshorn, O31465, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Darlen Duncan, O31466, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Harold Shell, O31472, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Loren Emerson Bishop, O40091, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Austin Stricklen, Jr., O31473, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene Mimms Lee, O31474, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Ambrus Thornton, O31818, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Duval Smith Adams, O42997, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Silas Gassett, O31461, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Hiram Champlin, O30661, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Carter Quinlin, O51860, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Norman Merod Schroeder, O43002, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Brennan Egan, O43003, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Arnold Anderson, O31463, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army)

Lt. Col. Edward Daniel Comm, O31464, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Wiley King, O51864, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edmund Herman Lang, O40000, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Mabry Griffin Miller, O31486, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Clifford Gilbert, O40095, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Claude Harvey Matchette, O31490, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Ron Lamar, O43014, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph LeRoy Dickle, O31493, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Robert Swarm, O43018, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert August Jordan, O38795, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Allen Clark, O31496, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Waldemar Alexander Solf, O40145, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Wesley Roberts, Jr., O40154, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilmot Thomas Baughn, O40155, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joe Arthur Clema, O43020, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ellis Dillon Blake, O43023, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Samuel Angus Bethune, O31502, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Glover Steiner Johns, Jr., O31501, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Edward McArdle, O30695, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Robert Clark, O31506, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Clarence Lee, O43030, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Clifton Dalrymple, O31509, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Lincoln McMackin, O31511, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Corydon Blake, O51875, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerald Edmond Feldt, O31513, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Albert Geddes, O31512, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vincent Camden Frisby, O20543, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edmonde Bernard Kelly, O20544, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Perry Jones, Jr., O20546, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Willard Paul McCrone, O20548, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Aldo Hector Bagnulo, O20550, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis James Loomis, O20551, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Henry Dillon, O20552, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jackson Graham, O20553, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Christian Hanburger, O20554, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Walter Sloat, O20556, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Karl Fred Eklund, O20557, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard James Lowe, O20558, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Edward Leonhard, O20559, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Nels Redling, O31516, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Joseph Lagasse, O31517, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Franklin Knapper Eberhard, O40161, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Hess Burba, O31518, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Joseph McLeod, O43036, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Benjamin Mangold, O31522, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robin Gloor Montgomery, O31525, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Austin Thetford, O38913, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Armond Ulrich, O31527, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jeff F. Hollis, O31528, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Royal Earle McShea, O31531, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Duda, O43041, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Frederick Jeffers, O40165, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Harry Scordas, O38914, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Allyn Ord, O31532, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Emerson Francis Hurley, O31533, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph John Peot, O31536, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Rudisill Bush, O40166, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Edward McShane, O51884, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Wilson Grant, O31539, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Denzil Laval Baker, O43052, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Donald Elster, O38915, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Robert Yost, O31542, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Fredric Rader, O31543, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marion Alexander Cromartie, O43057, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel Fitzhugh Shepherd, O43060, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Waldemar Martin Mueller, O31553, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Joseph Payne, O31554, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Lawrence Prahl, O31555, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Pierce Jacobs, O31556, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin William Weissman, O31559, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Francis Lambert, O38919, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Udell Clay, O43072, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Linwood Griffin, Jr., O43074, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cecil Harold Davidson, O31560, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Frederick Nelson, O43073, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Perry Benjamin Priest, O31562, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Henry Considine, O40172, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Raclene Mason, O31563, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick William Richards, O31565, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leonidas George Gavalas, O31569, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Arnold Clifford Gilliam, O31570, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Barry Foster Phillips, O51893, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sydney Emil Sacerdote, O38920, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerald D. Shepherd, O31571, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Leverett Sanford, Jr., O31572, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Haviland Arthur Neil Connolly, O31575, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Louis Gershenow, O31577, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Melville Gold, O40179, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick Julian Owens, O43087, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harvey Earl Sheppard, O43086, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Frankel, O40178, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Milton Robert Blum, O31695, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Lee Janes, O31587, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Franklin Earl Scott, O51898, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Edward Bledsoe, O31592, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Willis Bartling, O43091, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Thomas Adair, O51901, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Vincent Smart, O31597, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Dent Leroy Lay, O40181, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Nicholas William Willis, O43099, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Seaton Fransweil McDaniel, O43098, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Ashton Crosby, O43102, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Barney Driggs White, O31606, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Phillips Brown, Jr., O38922, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earle Bennett Butler, O43106, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Leonard Humphrey, O31609, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Nesen Brownson, O43108, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Hunter Smith, Jr., O31614, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lewis Frederick Shull, O43277, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lauren Arden Arn, O43290, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jean Paul Sams, O43293, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Rafael Cleveland, O31618, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Anton Cuphaver, O43296, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Christopher Dalla, O43297, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Olin Page Holt, O43298, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Alton Sturm, O40185, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Solon Moncrief, Jr., O31623, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur William Oberbeck, O20569, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Bennett Parker, O20571, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick James Clarke, O20572, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene Joseph Stann, O20573, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fred Earl Ressegieu, O20575, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Francis Mitchim, O20577, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Bayer Strandberg, O20579, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Moses McAfee, Jr., O20580, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Stanley Kuna, O20581, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Julian Vincent Sollohub, O20584, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Charles Boes Hines, O20585, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Chandler Spaulding, O20588, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Peter Clarke Hyzer, O20589, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Stephen Barko, O20590, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hamilton William Fish, O20592, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ellis Edmund Wilhoyt, Jr., O20593, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Lewis Register, O20594, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leigh Cole Fairbank, Jr., O20595, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Manning Cromelin, O20597, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Horace Lewis, O20598, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Otto Diercks, O20599, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Tice Griffin, O20600, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Giles Lincoln Evans, Jr., O20603, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jay Alan Abercrombie, O20604, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Douglass Phillip Quandt, O20605, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Brockenbrough Randolph Hines, O20606, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Francis Seedlock, O20609, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Gamble Schermerhorn, O20610, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Stanley Palmer, O20611, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Houghton Roes Hallock, O20612, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Noel Houk Ellis, O20614, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack West Chapman, O20616, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Henry Walker, O20617, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. George Joseph Murray, Jr., O20619, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carlin Hamlin Whitesell, Jr., O20620, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alexander Day Surles, Jr., O20622, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Carl Miller, O20625, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Walter Cinn DeBill, O20626, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Wilt Shive, O20628, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Perry Huston Eubank, O20630, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Graham Zierdt, O20632, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond William Rumph, O20634, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Mershon Spengler, O20636, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elwyn Norman Kirsten, O20637, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Milton Harvey Clark, O20638, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edgar John Ingmire, O20639, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Horace Greeley Davisson, O20650, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Armitt Scott, Jr., O20652, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William George Easton, O20656, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Franklin Leist, O20657, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Martin Cone, O20658, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Morris Lee, O20661, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Haynes Reeves, Jr., O20665, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Emmette Young Burton, Jr., O20672 Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Vernon Underwood, Jr., O20679, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Lee Johnson, O20681, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Stuart O'Malley, Jr., O20682 Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Nixon Peale, Jr., O20684, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Wise Bailey, O20687, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edgar Major Teeter, O20688, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel Allen Richards, O20689, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Chrysostom David Scherrer, O20690, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Harrison Wilson, Jr., O20693, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Bearse Nye, O20695, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas McGarey Metz, O20696, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Denman Neier, O20698, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Ollie Connor, O20699, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stanley John Cherubin, O20700, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Meyer Arendt Edwards, Jr., O20702, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert Clyde Gildart, O20703, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fred Pierce Campbell, O20704, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. James Early Norvell, O20706, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Henry Stumpf, O20707, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Brady Mitchell, O20713, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lukas Ernest Hoska, Jr., O20717, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Marion Postlethwait, O20718, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Battle Malone Barksdale, O20719, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Martin Levering Green, O20720, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Ludger Chabot, O20721, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Luis Fernando Mercado, O20724, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert Maurice Stegmaier, O20725, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Woodrow Wilson Stromberg, O20726, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Everett Marr, Jr., O20729, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dan Cashemere Russell, O20730, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cecil Himes, O20731, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Harper Hodges, Jr., O20733, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ferdinand Thomas Unger, O20734, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Clem Conway, O20735, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Laurence Powers, O20736, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Coy Lyman Curtis, O20737, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Max Shields George, O20740, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Lawrence Lindquist, O20748, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bernard Peter Major, O20750, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Hincks Montgomery, Jr., O20754, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Robert Johnson, O20756, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. LeRoy Lutes, Jr., O20757, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Heber Van Volkenburgh, Jr., O20758, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Maryan Maliszewski, O20759, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Samuel Brierley, O20760, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Robert Meyer, O20762, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oscar Gordon Kreiser, O20765, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Walter Elkins, O20766, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Whitelaw Browning, O20767, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James John Cosgrove, O20768, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Besson, O20771, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Ferris Pearsall, Jr., O20774, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stanley Warren Connelly, O20775, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Keisle Loomis Reaves, O20777, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Franklin Taylor, O20779, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Hertel Laflamme, O20781, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kelton Seymour Davis, O20786, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maxwell Awyn Tincher, O20793, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Thomas Clagett, O20799, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carroll David Wood, O20803, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Philip Delano Brant, O20804, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Delk McCorkle Oden, O20805, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Alexander McGee, Jr., O20806, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Dawes McKinley, O20807, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Ralls Lawson, O20808, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Winfield Lee Martin, O20809, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Allen Dodds, O20815, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kelley Benjamin Lemmon, Jr., O20816, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elery Martin Zehner, O20820, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Bidwell Sloan, O20821, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Kirkham Amos, O20822, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Olen John Seaman, Jr., O20825, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Jarvis Tolson 3d, O20826, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Huff Van Vliet, Jr., O20828, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Walter Richardson, O20830, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Howard Skeldon, O20831, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold McDonald Brown, O20832, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Wilson Duncan, O20834, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Noel Ambrose Menard, O20835, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ephraim Foster Graham, Jr., O20838, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Barrett Travis, O20840, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Millard Simmons, O20841, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gordon Talmage Kimbrell, O20851, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Norrington Smalley, O20853, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eads Graham Hardaway, O20855, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Brackett McClellan Chase, O20856, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Ray Harrison, O20858, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Fleming Polk, O20859, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Powers Connor, O20860, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles William Blauvelt, O20861, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ted Franklin Douthitt, O31626, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Loose Miller, O43302, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marvin Vincent Johnston, O43313, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Michael Popowski, Jr., O31633, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Peter Joseph O'Rourke, O38923, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Montague Blight, O40191, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Howard Saylors, O31638, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Clarke Ashby, Jr., O43320, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Vincent McLaughlin, O31639, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Victor A. Ishoy, O31640, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas William McGrath, O43322, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carroll Thompson Newton, O20865, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Clinton Clayman, O20866, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Warren Sisson, Jr., O20867, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Greene Hammond, O20868, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Russel Groves, O20869, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Whitsett van de Velde, O20870, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Arthur George Christensen, O20871, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Laurence Clifford Brown, O20876, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Andrew Enemark, O20879, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Merten Kenneth Heimstead, O20880, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leon John de Penne Rouge, O20882, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Sherbourne McCrea, O20884, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Frederick Thompson, O20885, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Gordon Nelson, O20886, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Unsworth Allen, O20889, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Byron William Ladd, O20890, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Washington, O20894, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Robert Etzler, O20895, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Steve Archie Chappula, O20899, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elmer Bolton Kennedy, O20900, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Brownbridge Simpson, O20902, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Thomas Boleyn, O20903, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fredrick William Nagle, O20904, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jabus Willie Rawls, Jr., O20906, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Leslie Coan, O20908, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Francis Kent, O20909, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Willis Paddock, O20913, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joe Stallings Lawrie, O20914, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Horace Edward Alphin, O43324, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Frederick Haberman, O40193, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Keith Orton Dicken, O43327, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Edward Peters, O31646, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Frederick Dyer, O43328, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earl Lester Edwards, O31647, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Ralph Pierce, O43332, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Homer K. Curtis, O51918, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Edward Grant, O31653, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Patton Brooks, Jr., O31654, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Norvell Riley Stark, O31335, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Aubrey Knox, O51921, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Mattle Griswold, O31660, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Claude Randolph Hinson, O51922, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Van Dyke Murphy, Jr., O31663, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Bisbing, O31665, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Floyd Edward Minor, O31668, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Joseph Gallagher, O31669, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Morris Edgar Galusha, O43345, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Dutee Wilcox, Jr., O43347, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elias Carter Townsend, O31680, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Kenneth Gaynor, O43354, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earl Robert Short, O31685, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Karl Conner, O31686, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin J. Briggs, O43363, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gilbert John Check, O51936, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Forbes Jenks, O31691, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Yancey Talbott, Sr., O31664, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl George Lutz, O43366, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Parrish McWhorter, O31692, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bernard Benjamin Blank, O43368, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William James McDonnell, Jr., O31693, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Major Walter Franklin Diesem, O43372, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. McClure Hudelson, O43371, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Homer Hewins Bowman, O31700, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jules Emmable Gonseth, Jr. O40211, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Max Ferguson Schneider, O31708, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Mann Haycock, O31712, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Hennigan Tyler, O31711, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Wallace Grote, O31717, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Austin James Montgomery, O51942, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carlton Wallace Nelson, O43381, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Brooksie Kemp, O43382, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Jay Redding, Jr., O43385, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Willis Edward Shelton, O51944, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Hurst Prather, O31722, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wallace Alfred Manning, O43386, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William George Van Allen, O20931, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Cortland Adams, O20933, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lavonne Edwin Cox, O20934, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles V. Ruzek, Jr., O20937, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Holmes Fielding Troutman, O20938, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ward Hamilton Van Atta, O20939, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Cottrell Rowland, Jr., O20940, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Anthony Smedile, O20942, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Allan Morrison, O20945, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Andrew Allgair, O20947, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Pierce, Jr., O38928, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Louis Edward Roth, O43387, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Dean Holm, O20948, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Forrest Wilson Duff, O43391, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alphonse Joseph Sockoloskie, O51945, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Louis Rowan, O31727, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dudley Randolph Berwick, O51946, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Forest Locke, O31728, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Henry Lanphier, O20949, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Carlysle Speedie, O31730, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Elmo Peddicord, Jr., O43397, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Wiles Pervier, O31736, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Riley Alexander Graham, O43404, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wilson Charles McNamara, O31738, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Stephen Saunders, O31737, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George William Durham, O31739, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Busby Hudiburg, O31741, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Ogle McGillin, O31743, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Oliver Churchill Dunbar, O43408, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Eric Hall, O31747, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Frederick Plank, O43410, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Henry Bronn, O31748, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Calvin Francis Finn, O43413, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Cullin Sandlin, O31752, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Selmer John Espelund, O43416, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Cecil Dinsmore, Jr., O40225, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry George Thomas, O31756, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lance Ernest Booth, Jr., O31755, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Martin, O42947, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Stanley Taylor, Jr., O31765, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Hoadley Dempsey, O31766, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William John Parsons, O40228, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis McCay Clark, O38931, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stanley Edwin Whitmore, O52122, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Lappe Walton, O31777, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Cyril Parker, O31778, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John William Koletty, O40230, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Augustus Theodore Terry, Jr., O31781, Army of the United States (captain, U. S Army).

Lt. Col. Greg J. Brown, O31783, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Randall Haywood Bryant, O31785, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Nicholas Christ Angel, O31789, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Willis George Ethel, O31786, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Bednarek, O38932, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Gordon Smigelow, O31791, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oliver William Schantz, O31795, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hughes Lanier Ash, O31799, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Melvin Morley Kernan, O40236, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roland Virgil Tiede, O31801, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Marshall Kenderdine, O43446, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alexander Gresham Fraser, Jr., O31805, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Lawerence Thornton, O31806, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald MacGrain, O38933, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Dowling Tanner, O52132, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Francis Gagne, O43452, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Edwin Reid, O31809, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James O'Biern Millott, O40240, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cameron Knox, O31815, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Will Dan Joslin, O31816, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herman Lorenzo Purkhiser, O31819, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Wiley Sellers, O31821, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Nash Ody Thompson, O31822, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Herbert Wishart, O38935, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Gergely Gregory, Jr., O31828, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Warren Holmberg, O38937, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest William Fischer, O31829, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Edward Bannon, Jr., O31830, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Rudolph Barlow, O31835, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Charles Holland, O31840, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Matthew John Bartosik, O52145, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Wallace Page, O40247, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Campbell Robertson, O31845, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wesley Brooks Edwards, O31848, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Clayton Williams, O52146, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carleton Edward Fisher, O31852, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward McWilliams 3d, O31853, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stephen Anthony Ucherek, O31854, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Wayne Whitney, O31855, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John George Hoffman, Jr., O31856, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Lafayette Burchell, O40251, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Daniel Hickey, O52152, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ivan Willard Elliott, O31863, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Elmer Loudenslager, O52155, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jeff George Ray, O31865, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Arthur McKee, O31867, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. LeRoy Clancy Hill, O31874, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Javier Buldain, O43495, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Nelson Beck, O40258, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Eagle Jurgens, O43496, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elmore Grenville Lawton, O38941, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dan Edward Craig, O31879, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chalmers Hilliard Armstrong, Jr., O31877, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Lee May, O40260, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alvin Lee Newbury, O38942, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Atwell O'Reilly, Jr., O31881, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Russell R. Reed, O52162, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fred James Reese, O31884, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elisha Orrin Peckham, O31885, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Alexander Craig, O43505, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Curtis Prentice, O31888, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Linton Mushen, O43506, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Willard Edmund Harrison, O31892, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Joseph McWade, O43512, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cornelius Cuthbert Albaugh, Jr., O40268, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Donald Klous, O31899, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edgar LeRoy Arnold, O31902, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Steven Zimmerman, O38946, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl C. Turner, O31909, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Ryan Rodgers, 043529, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Paul Baerman, 040273, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Mervin Sterling Waters, 043533, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maurice Alexander Belisle, 052175, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt Col. Allan Stanley Hirsch, 038947, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Louis Coates, 031912, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Mitchell Abraham Mabardy, 031913, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur James Downey, 031914, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Nolan Turner, 031921, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Matthew Conroy Stewart, 043541, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Cargill Erickson, 052177, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick Fenn Quist, 052178, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Thompson Hancock, 031923, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Niles Denniston, 043552, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Martin Minion, Jr., 031601, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Doane Willets, 040281, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Ransom Roderick, 031941, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Morgan Prosser, Jr., 031945, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roland John Meeker, 052185, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Patrick Burk, 043569, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Julian Hannibal Martin, 031958, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John William Carlson, 043577, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Robert Jannarone, 021053, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Matthew John Altenhofen, 021054, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. George Willard Bixby, 021056, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Desloge Brown, 021057, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Burney Chubbuck, 021058, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alexander John Frolich, 021059, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Eugene Kelsey, 021061, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Worrell Love, 021062, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Allen Orr, 021064, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Giles Stilwell, 021065, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John William Thompson, 021067, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Linn Lewis, 021069, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Glazier Williams, 021071, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Howard Anderson, 021072, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Gregory Wickham, 021073, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Stoddard Crocker, Jr., 021074, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Clinton Harvey, Jr., 021076, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Ward Smith, Jr., 021078, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Alan Langford, 021079, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Alfred Bailey, 021083, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Joseph Kasper, 021084, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Milton Paul Barschdorf, 021085, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vincent Martin Elmore, Jr., 021086, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Woodworth Jenkins, 021087, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Gray O'Connor, 021088, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Edward Lotz, Jr., 021090, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Claire Elwood Hutchin, Jr., 021092, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Mason Hogan, 021094, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Nelson Moorman, 021095, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Melvin Rhodes Russell, 021097, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Trevor Nevitt Dupuy, 021098, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dallas Fernald Haynes, 021103, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Iver Arthur Peterson, 021105, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fillmore Kennady Mearns, 021106, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Welby Beverley, 021107, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roland Bennett Anderson, 021108, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alfred John D'Arezzo, 021109, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Wade Norris, 021110, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army.

Lt. Col. John Fouché Brownlow, Jr., 021111, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Burton Robert Brown, 021113, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Charles Lough, 021118, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Braden Latta, 021119, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William McGregor Lynn, Jr., 021120, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col Joseph Conigliaro Conell, 021121, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Joseph Blake, Jr., 021122, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alvar Bertil Sundin, 021123, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Edward Michelet, 021131, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Knox Eaton, 021132, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ted Irving Sawyer, 021133, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jesse Fuller Thomas, 021135, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Robert Bailey, Jr., 021136, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Tracy Bovard Harrington, 021137, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Martin Lockwood Webb, 021138, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Joseph Weinnig, 021139, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Canning Davis, 021141, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Philip Yeager Browning, 021142, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Harland Swenson, 021143, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Lester Tittle, 021144, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Hollis Vail, Jr., 021145, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Burnett Harrison, 021147, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alvin Lee Burke, 021148, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Henry Corbett, 021150, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Anthony Sussmann, 021165, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arpad Arthur Kopcsak, 021167, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Charles Nickerson, Jr., 021170, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Simon Rudel Sinnreich, 021173, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Joseph Long, 021175, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ferdinand Joseph Chesarek, 021177, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gallon Myers McHaney, 021179 Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Lee Grubb, 021180, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edgar Stanton McKee, 021182, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Taylor, Jr., 021184, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Emmett Ekman, 021190, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jaroslav Folda, Jr., 021193, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Nevin Howell, 021194, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Charles Fremont Tillson 3d, 021196, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Albert Bassett, 021202, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lorenzo Dow Adams, 021203, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Loyd Jackson, 021207, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Charles Damon, 021208, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harlan Keith Holman, 021211, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elmer Ellsworth Hallinger, 021212, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Wallace Hayes, 021214, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Merton Singer, 021215, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Lee Clarke, 021216, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jefferson Johnson Irvin, 021217, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George William Rhyne, 021219, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Chilton Works, 021221, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Francis Gillivan, 021225, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Little Haley 3d, 021226, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Gray Duncan 3d, 021227, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Albert Johnson, Jr., 021228, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Carl Erlenbusch, 021230, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hubert Emmet Strange, 021231, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Davis Offer, 021233, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Henry Patrick, 021235, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Adolph Sundlof, 021236, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Henry Lynch, 021237, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Allen Douglas Hulse, 021238, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Earle Beck, 021239, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Patrick Wansboro, 021241, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Rudolph Laskowsky, 021243, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Rollin Benedict Durbin, 021244, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Benedict Missal, Jr., 021247, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Warren Rand Williams, Jr., 021250, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Milton Finn, 021252, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene Joseph Sweeney, 021254, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Melvin Charles Brown, 021256, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roberts Sherwood Demitz, 021259, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Sylvester Collins, Jr., 021260, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Milton Izenour, 021263, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Walker Thackeray, 021265, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles William Walson, 021267, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Edward Mrazek, 021268, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Dickson Miller, 021270, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Augustine Broberg, 021272, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Owen Byars, Jr., 021273, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Stephen Kujawski, 021276, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Nelson Sibley, 021277, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Mark Francis Brennan, 021279, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Arthur Machen, Jr., 021284, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ben Sternberg, 021286, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Allen Jones, Jr., 021287, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederic Charles Teich, Jr., 021288, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Carl Thomas, 021289, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Joseph Denholm, 021293, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Thomas English, 021296, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Alexander Norris, Jr., 021299, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Franklin Henrie Hartline, 021301, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Maxwell Murray, 021303, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Eliason Boyt, 021304, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vincent Wallace Siren, 021306, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Leaning Ashworth, 021308, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Warren Thomas Hannum, Jr., 021316, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Hodson Rhine, 021317, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Henry Lahti, 021322, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Birdsey Lee Learman, 021324, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Thomas Corley, 021325, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Thomas Ewing, 021326, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Eugene Henderson, 021327, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Clark Jackson, Jr., 021329, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Conyers Fite 2d, 021331, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Andy Archer Lipscomb, 021333, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Kent Schmidt, 021335, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Cornell Abert, 021337, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ward Sanford Ryan, 021339, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Howard York, 021341, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Artman, 021342, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Rapp Zohrlaut, 021344, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Gibson Sherrard, 021345, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Edward Hartman, 021346, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Chalgren, Jr., 021349, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Frost Staples, 031967, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Elliott Fonger, 031969, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Stinnie Huff, 043583, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elliott Burwell Cheston, 031976, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Henry Oliver, 043586, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Lafayette Nash, 043587, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Perkins Pope, O31981, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Kenneth McCormick, O31982, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Hilary Gomes, O21353, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Vincent Roddy, O21356, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Perry Elmer Conant, O21357, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Bruce Bissell, O21360, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Amos George Johnson, O21363, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carolus Adams Brown, O21364, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Raymond Peers, O21366, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Ernest Walker, O21368, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Morgan Summers, O21369, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clifton Ferdinand von Kann, O21371, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Laverne Arthur Parks, O21372, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Peter Hagen, O21373, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Murray Elroy Sparks, O21374, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Albert Armstrong, O21375, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Peter Stone, O21376, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank George White, O21378, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Arthur Theodore Sauser, O21379, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elwin Thomas Knight, O21380, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wayne Gill Springer, O21382, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gregory Leo Higgins, O21385, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Aaron Alexander Abston, O21391, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Winfred Alban Ross, O21395, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leo Bernard Burkett, O21398, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Harold Stangle, O21406, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Meredith Ernest Allen, O21408, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Emerson Babcock, O21413, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Burhyte Wilmot Corey, Jr., O21415, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Rollie Neel Blancett, O21416, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Benjamin Schweizer, O21418, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alfred Matthew Eschbach, O21419, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Kenneth Howell, O21421, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Brennan Stelzenmuller, O21422, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilmer Kersey Benson, Jr., O21423, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Ellsworth Skinner, O21425, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Myron Ellsworth Page, Jr., O21426, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carroll Hilton Dunn, O21427, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Judson Woodring Wark, O21428, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edmund Mortimer Fry, Jr., O21431, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry George Woodbury, Jr., O21432, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Chipman Holley, O21433, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Wright Bennett, O21434, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Evans Brown, O21437, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Claude Potter, Jr., O21439, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William John Ellison, Jr., O21440, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Milner, O21441, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Russell Rorabaugh, O21445, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Henderson Beddow, O21446, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earl Carpenter Paules, O21447, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Andrew Valden Inge, O21448, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

To be captains with rank from July 1, 1948

Maj. John Pachomski, O40252, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Henry Davitt, O43490, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Elmer Rownd, O31868, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elmer Henry Bauer, O43502, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Whitman Young, O31891, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jack Bernard Richmond, O43519, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Melvin Oscar Miller, O40263, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frank Milton Vinson, Jr., O31990, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Glade, O21181, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Starr Wright, Jr., O21328, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Samuel Salvatore Campanella, O21348, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Ellis Deshon, O21362, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Ernest Veale, O21435, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick Zitzer, O21444, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leon Commerford, Jr., O40293, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Earl Crump, Jr., O31983, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Felder Lavett Fair, O31984, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marvin Elza Waller, O40294, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Steele Long, Jr., O31985, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harold William Wheeler, O31986, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Captain John Adams Alley, Jr., O52203, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Edward Leckie, O40296, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Theodore Wesley Roe, O52205, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Haig Jackson, O52204, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Louis William Pflanz, Jr., O43600, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Howard Nelson, Jr., O31992, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Andrew Gordon Gorski, O31993, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Melville Bowman, Jr., O43601, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marion Burns Noland, O43603, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Stanley Tyler, O43602, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Allen Bucha, O31996, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Stephen Gerety, O43605, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Henry Koreman, O38953, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Roy Edwin Daniel, Jr., O38954, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Edward MacDonough, O52208, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Milton Irving Wallace, O21467, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Daniel Luther Blue, O31997, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sam Carter, O38955, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Francis Schiltz, O38956, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Arnold Bieri, O40298, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Foreman Wood, O32001, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Bryant Slimp, O43606, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jackson Stuart Lawrance, Jr., O32003, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Stacy Capers, Jr., O32004, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas William Ackert, O32005, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Lee Trout, O43610, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Tinsley Dodge, O21468, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Samuel Casto, O32007, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ted Joseph Palik, O43611, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Kendal Whitehead, O43612, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Luther Regan, Jr., O32008, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dan Scott McMillin, O32010, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Nelson Ostrom, O43614, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Eugene Woodrow, O32011, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Owen Waite Owens, O38958, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Justice Beeson 3d, O32013, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Spencer Campbell, O43615, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Oscar Stegall, Jr., O32014, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick West Hawksworth, O43619, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earle McDaniel Clarke, O32015, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Louis Haberstroh, O52210, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Mortimer Robert Staley, O43620, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Francis Rynska, O32017, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wesley Herbert Burr, O32019, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bruce Benjamin Caulder, O42626, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gardner Alston Williams, O40301, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Irvin Casterline, O43628, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Rudolph Charlemagne Koerner, Jr., O52211, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Dalton Walker Lain, O40302, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Herbert Bearss, O32020, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Moses Cockson, O32021, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fred Edward Gerber, O32023, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Joseph McCool, O32024, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Paul Jordan Brown, O38959, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Captain Wallace Creel Wardner, O52212, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. David Willard Jones, Jr., O43631, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Joseph Mackea, O40304, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Hugh Keefe, O43634, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Shirley Hicks, O32028, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Andrew Rice, O43635, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Cloake Small, O52214, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edwin Augustus Perry, O32030, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Henry Slover, O43638, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Hill Campbell, O32031, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Leon J. Fishkin, O52215, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leland Earle Anderson, O52216, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Karl Josef Wieker, O32033, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wilford Lloyd Willey, O38961, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Wellington Snoad, O32034, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Wilbur Baumgartner, O43642, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Henry Howard Marsden, Jr., O43643, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Kay Kipling Cowan, O52217, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Herbert Gregg, O32037, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clarence Paul Ehrhardt, O43644, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Damian Donlon, Jr., O32039, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Runyan Linvill, O40305, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Peter Ketcham, Jr. O38963, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas St. John Arnold, O32040, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Sigman White, O32041, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. David Dobley Fleming O32042, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Cornelius Spiedel, Jr., O32044, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Clayton Bane Lyle, Jr., O40306, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Joseph Burk, O32043, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dan Christie Kingman, O32045, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lionel Edward Scott, O32046, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward G. Edwards, O32048, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Emery Veatch, O32047, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack David Wolfson, O40307, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. David Neil Marshall, O52221, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jewett Agusta Dix, O32049, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harold Harvey Houser, O32050, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fred Edward Dueker, O32051, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Daugherty, O52222, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Stanley Victor Lesneski, O32053, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Preston Donald, O52223, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Weldon Winston Wilson, O32054, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Freeman Francis Gage, Jr., O32055, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Merritt William Briggs, O38964, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Campbell, Jr., O43649, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Claude Leonard Pridgen, Jr., O38965, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert LeRoy Staver, O43650, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Leon Adams, Jr., O43651, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Philip Charles Hess, O32059, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ayres William Stoddard, O43652, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Patrick Brown, O43653, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ford Murray Beardsley, O40311, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lloyd Earl Wills, O32060, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Sion Cook, Jr., O43655, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Priestley Napier, O43657, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Walter Flint, O43656, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Peter VanCourt, O38966, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Roy Frederick Benjamin, O32062, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Willis Everett Kooken, O43658, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Ellsworth Keough, O43659, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Harvey Williams, O38967, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Eugene Saffold, O43660, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Franklin Noble Allwine, O43661, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Gustavus Stotlar, O43662, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Orr Graham, Jr., O32064, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alexander Garrett Sutton, Jr., O43663, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Carroll Roder, O43664, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Alfred Martin, O43665, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lee Wallace, O32065, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Philip Murphy, O52226, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert James Robideaux, O32066, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oliver Gordon Kinney, O32067, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. John Joseph Kiely, Jr., O32069, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Cecil Ball, O32070, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Warren Morehead Hargrave, O32071, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roy Abram Jameson, Jr., O32072, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Keith Herbert Houlson, O52229, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Otto Rudolph Koch, Jr., O32074, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Edgar Wales 3d, O40315, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Eugene John Hollerbach, O32076, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Lawrence Norling, O32112, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Wright Williams, O32077, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. John Milliff, O40316, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Carl Gerlach Sory, O43670, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Grant Lavell, O32080, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Edward Rose, O32079, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hughes Alfred Carnes, O43674, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leonard Donald Mitchell, O31625, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Aaron Underwood Trimble, O43675, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Chase Rawson Teaboldt, O32082, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Henry Morrison Owen, Jr., O32083, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Don Osvold Currier, O40318, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Palmer Johnson, O43677, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ollie James Allen, O32085, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hobert Wayne Sharp, O43678, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Beeman Mullinix, O32086, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Norman Randolph Archer, O38968, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harold Herring Sharpe, O43682, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Anthony Slad, O32088, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick Bert Outlaw, O32089, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Perry Arthur Munro, O32090, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Atkinson Greer, O43685, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Fletcher Rolph, O32091, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elmer Joseph Attaway, O40321, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Wood Calvert, O52232, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harrison Sam Francis, O52233, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Elman Leighton, Jr., O43688, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Nicholas Dunlap, O32094, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Frank Albert, O32097, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Carlton Stack, O32098, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Gradon Reynolds, O32099, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Curtis Payne, O32101, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Boyd Claypool, O43693, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ben Elmer Allen, O32103, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Barrell, O32104, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Audemard Beplat, O43694, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Thomas Kellett, O40323, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Benjamin Murphy Goetz, O43696, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Laverne Woods Graff, O52239, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Warren Raymond Johnson, O43697, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Howard Clarence Parker, O32108, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John David Sapp, O32109, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Daniel Haskins, O32110, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Daniel Dean Harris, O32111, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Milton Jarrold, O43699, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerald Carlisle, O40324, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frank Adrian Bogart, O40325, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Phillip Ignatius Klein, O32113, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Snead Blocker, O32118, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maynard Byron Weaver, O32120, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Everette Johnson, O43704, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Joseph Convery, Jr., O52244, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harold Wilson Corder, O43706, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Charles Angster, O32124, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Albert Brinkerhoff, O43708, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Gordon Drouillard, O32125, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Oren Dean Chapman, O40328, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Arver Twomey, O32126, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leon Frederick Lavoie, O32127, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Shannon Delos Brown, O32247, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Freeland Allyn Daubin, Jr., O43709, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Wilbur Smith, O32128, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Anthony Eckstein, O40331, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Francis Wilson, O38971, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Luke Hustead, Jr., O43711, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stanley Lauriston Harding, O32134, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Sheldon Scott, O43712, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Millard Glen Gray, O32137, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Royal Ector Phillips, O32136, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ramon Francis D'Elosua, O43713, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Allen Rankin, O32140, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Paul Shepherd Fromer, O32141, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Lewis Whipple, O43714, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Laurence Thomason Ayres, Jr., O43715, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Thomas Evans, O32142, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Jackson Gillespie, O32143, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Calhoun Hooker, O43717, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jack Wesley Boyer, O32145, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charley Walker Haynes, O43719, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arnold Peter Murr, O43720, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Irwin Allen Edwards, O32149, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herman Bennett Wild, O40333, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bertil Bernhard Sandell, O32153, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Edward Michaels, O38972, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Lloyd Osborne, O32154, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank von Phul Williams, O40334, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Paisrok, O43722, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Moseley Bachelor, O43723, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond August Seifert, O52253, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Stanley Evers Jacobs, O52256, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Nathan Hanks Hixson, O52254, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ellis Harry Mist, O52255, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lester Henry Levine, O32155, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Murray Brannon, O32156, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maurice Aaron Hoard, Jr., O43729, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Daniel Drake, O32158, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Philip Lyke, O43731, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Dooley, O32159, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William May Myers, O32160, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Sailor Bowers, O38973, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Duncan Conley, O52260, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Alexander Johnston Rankin, O32166, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Ellis Lawrence, O52261, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harle Grady Bailey, Jr., O32167, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Law, O32169, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Julian Boyles, O32168, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Paul Edward Fives, O32170, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vincent Michael Witter, O32172, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Duncan Aboosh, O32171, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leonard Drazen, O40336, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Samuel Mathew Cromwell, O32176, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Darrell H. Burnett, O32177, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jorge Jose Lluy, O52898, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Fountain Fox Beattie, Jr., O52265, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Alexander Galt, O43742, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Hendric Byrd, Jr., O52267, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Emmett Sullivan, O43745, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Fred Emerson Perry, O38974, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph George Belon, O43746, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Julian Louis Hogan, O32178, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Edward Ronan, O43750, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Thomas Campbell, O32180, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Carroll Broadus Hodges, O43751, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Edward Feliz, O43752, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Andrew Cella, O52269, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Simon Kostanski, O43755, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Patrick James Brennan, O43756, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Gabriel Katin, O43758, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Francis Register, Jr., O43757, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamine Marvin Brothers, O32185, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Barney Golden, O40337, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Emmett Gilliam Scott, O43760, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cornell Dent Booth, O52271, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lucian Capers Croft, O32189, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wallace Austin, O32191, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Wilbur Wendt, O32190, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Warren Black, O32192, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Douglas Harvey Lane, O40338, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bruce Warner Reagan, O38975, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Howard Gibbs, O43764, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Albert Victor Bruni, O32195, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stanley Francis Flynn, O43765, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Lee Stahler, O32197, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis William O'Brien, O32196, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clarence Fred Ax, O32198, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Charles Kulp, Jr., O43768, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Bless Boswell, O38976, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerald Preston Lerner, O32199, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederic Morris Cramer, O52273, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Clement Hatchell, O32200, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arlo Willis Mitchell, O43772, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Miller Heiser, Jr., O43773, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hugh Middleton Rutledge, O32201, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Dalton von Rohr, O43774, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clifton Allen Peters, O32202, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Stone Livermore, O32203, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Lee Crouch, Jr., O43777, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edgar Theodore Guenther, O32206, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Floyd Kenneth Long, O43778, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Werner Holtz, O32209, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Monroe Johnson, O52276, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Carl Bernard Tenhagen, O43785, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Henry Donaldson, Jr., O32721, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Kenneth Hutson, O32212, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, United States Army).

Capt. Maxim James Dowd, O32210, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George McCutchen, O40341, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Mervyn Wilson, O38978, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Bennett Scott, O32213, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Tyrus Raymond Ambron, O32215, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Joseph Haberer, Jr., O52278, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Keith Saxe, O43790, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Paul Clark, O40342, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Park Trammell Jenkins, O32218, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Howard Miller, O32220, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Warren Atticus Thrasher, O32793, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maurice James Reynolds, O43793, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Eugene BeLieu, O32223, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Kenneth Walker, O32225, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Ephriam Downard, O32224, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Middleton Thompson, O43794, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Ellis Vandenberg, O38979, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Alfred Holder Crawford, Jr., O32229, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Aloysius Graham, Jr., O32231, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ellwood Frederick Hanson, O52281, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Leslie Maurice Payne, O43797, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Glen Ercil Daugherty, O38980, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jerome Sydney Jefferds, O52283, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Herman Heinrick Von Benge, O32237, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Elias Frederic Liakos, O32238, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. McLean Hampton, O32239, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William David Mouchet, O43802, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Myron McClure, O32241, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lynn Dillon Fargo, O32242, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Dan Earl Riggs, O52285, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Logsdon Albert, O40344, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thurston Tyler Paul, Jr., O32243, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Alfred Stanford, O43808, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Everett Moore, O32244, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Webster Holmes, O32247, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel Griswold Grandin, O32248, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Walker Tomlin, Jr., O32249, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leslie Ray Wilcox, O32251, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred Raymond Huston, O43812, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Dean George, O43815, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Homer Clair Hinckley, O52289, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Alonzo Chamblin, O32255, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Martin Charles Pertl, O40349, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Arthur Watkin Reese, O43818, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert John Cleland Osborne, O43819, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lewis Boice O'Hara, O31887, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Kenneth McWilliams, O32257, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Henry Pierre, Jr., O32258, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Reuben Nathan Salada, O32261, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Walter Ben McKenzie, O32264, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Morris John Naudts, O32265, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Carroll Case, Jr., O42824, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Charles Williams, O40352, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bill Woodrow Paden, O52291, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Berri Armstrong, O32267, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Robert Pershall, O43825, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Francis James Smith, Jr., O43826, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Emil Lawrence Mosheim, O32272, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Egbert Bruehl, O32270, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William David Gnau, O43828, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Leon Kelly, Jr., O52292, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thorvald Jorgen Guerdrum, O43829, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Curtis Everett Healton, O32275, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Young Canon, O43830, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Thomas Hennessey, O32274, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Harry Huppert, Jr., O32277, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Gray Patterson, O32278, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Edward Albert, O32279, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Henderson Hollis, O38981, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Martin Holmes Colley, O38982, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Patrick Scholl, Jr., O32281, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Norman Cordrey Pardue, O40354, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Anthony Emil Papa, O52294, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Ellis Nestlerode, Jr., O32282, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Austin Frederick Balkman, O32285, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Samuel Heywood Oakley, O43841, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Ellis Butts, O32286, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard Thomas Pullen, Jr., O52296, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. David Burnett Price, O43842, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eric Armand Rundquist, O43843, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Claude Bartholet, O43845, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Cummings Motter, O32288, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Douglas Hoskins, Jr., O43846, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Melvin Arthur, O32290, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Conrad Olla Mannes, Jr., O32293, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stockton Donald Bruns, O32292, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert David Hand, O32294, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eric Ray Edgerton, O43850, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Burton Staley Andrews, O43849, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Sharp Eary, O32296, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Emil Davidson, Jr., O32295, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Pierre Donald Boy, O32297, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Allan Louis Bogardus, O43853, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Hugh Wikoff, O32301, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Samuel Ryan, O32300, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl George Witte, O32303, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Justus Crawford Kennedy, O43856, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Franklin Schoonover, O32304, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Secord Smith, O32305, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Andrew Roy Cheek, O32306, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roman Irodian Ulans, O52302, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Byron Saul Smith, O43860, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ralph Robert Kenigson, O52303, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Joseph Hayes, O32309, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Lunsford Wyatt, O32310, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Eldon Hanks, O43866, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Richard Jeffrey, O40358, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Henry Innes, O43867, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hotenel James Huff, O43868, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Lee Redman, Jr., O32311, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bertram Isaac Nash, O40361, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sidney Loyd Cone, O40362, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earl George Peacock, O43873, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene Thomas Seaburn, O32314, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Leland Pence, O43875, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jack Lawrence Weigand, O32315, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Stanton Niccolls, O32317, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Michael Paul Gleriak, O40363, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ian Frederick Turner, O32318, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Thomas Specht, Jr., O32321, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gordon Cowley Jones, O32320, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel Nestor Black, O52309, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William McCaw Hughes, O32322, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene Claire Kreighbaum, O43883, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Prindle Bartow, O52310, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard William Martens, O32324, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roy Frederick Pille, O52311, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Emil Holt, O32326, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Hamor Hamlin, O52312, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Gordon Ulysses Tapper, Jr., O52314, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Darce Ronald Knight, O43887, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Daniel Henry Sweet, O38984, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Van Nostrand Grace, O40365, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Vivian Kling, O40366, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hugh Rowe O'Farrell, O43888, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Stuart Frederick Brady, O32329, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leland Rodman Drake, O43894, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert James Jackson, Jr., O38986, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Talbert Iredell Martin, O43893, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard Kinnicutt Brown, O32333, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Elmer Eckland, O32334, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hugh Francis Queenin, O40367, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Hugh Mize, O32335, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Burrell Curry Hassett, Jr., O38987, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. William Thomas Hillis, O40369, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Michael Mullen, O43896, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Ray Ware, O52317, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth William Wallace, O32338, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dale Laverne Etka, O43898, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elmer Wellington Fox, Jr., O52318, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Hustler Blair 3d, O44388, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Albert Willits Crowell, O52319, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Woodrow Way, O32341, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Joseph Bird, O32343, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Nicholas Lee Tate, O38988, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles John Kronke, Jr., O40371, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gerald August Lake, O43901, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Francis Zeoll, O32345, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Erwin Clarence Frederickson, O32347, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Bradfoot Lyle, O32348, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clayton Thomas Fry, O43904, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Watson Carter, Jr., O32349, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Franklin Leon Wilson, O32350, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Morris Solomon, O32351, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herman Albert Schmidt, O52322, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Spencer Skillman, O38989, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Mahlon D. Hickman, O32355, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Wilbur Casey, O32356, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sherman Dell Cosgrove, O38990, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Orlando Lee Greening, O43906, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Fred William Kellner, O32358, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harmon Henry Seale, O32360, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John White Yow, O32361, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earl Irving Seekins, O32362, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chesley Folsom Durgin, O32363, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Sylvanus La Mee 3d, O32364, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Salvador Francis Taranto, O40373, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Paul Raymond Steckia, O32366, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dale Martin Garvey, O43910, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lloyd Stanley Nelson, O52325, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Challen Clowes, O32367, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Francis Dudley, O42374, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lachlan Maclean Sinclair, O32369, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harold Glen Wilson, O32370, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Vinyard Christianson, O43913, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Juskalian, O32371, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Isaac Hoppenstein, O32373, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sterling Champ Bush, O43914, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Craig Dameron, O32376, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stanley Walter Drluban, O21738, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Andrew Jackson Goodpaster, Jr., O21739, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Louis Albert Kunzig, Jr., O21741, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Duncan Wolfe, O21743, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilmot Ruet McCutchen, O21744, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edmund Kirby-Smith, O21745, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Elting Coates, Jr., O21746, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harvey Reed Fraser, O21747, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Edgar McCollam, O21748, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jay Phelps Dawley, O21750, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Montgomery Lee Webster, O21751, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Marsden Duke, O21753, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Woodrow William Wilson, O21755, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John William Medusky, O21756, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Mason Matheson, O21757, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Lewis Cantrell, O21758, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Farrell, O21759, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Rila Ploger, O21760, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Donald Richardson, O21761, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Lloyd Winegar, O21764, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Nicholas Paraska, O21765, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Walter Johnson Wells, O21766, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Riel Stanton Crandall, O21767, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Thomas Bradley, O21768, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Sidney Taylor Martin, O21772, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward John Gallagher, O21775, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Evans Brinker, O21776, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Joseph Pavlck, O21780, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence LeRoy Beckedorff, O21781, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Francis Cassidy, O21783, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert William Studer, O21786, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Lawton Collins, Jr., O21788, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ladislaus Casimir Maslowski, O21789, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Julian Johnson Ewell, O21791, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilbur Eugene Showalter, O21794, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Hyde Camp, O21798, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel Joseph Minahan, Jr., O21799, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Mabry Williams, O21801, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Irvin Muir, Jr., O21802, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Joseph Wald, O21804, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Harry Kurth, O21807, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert Penn Haffa, O21809, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Walter Allen, Jr., O21810, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Belmont Stuart Evans, Jr., O21811, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter MacRae Vann, O21812, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Charles Dolle, O21813, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Philip Martin Royce, O21814, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Robert Schrader, Jr., O21818, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Peterson Winton, Jr., O21819, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Richardson Reeves, O21820, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Ray, O21821, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward McCleave Dannemiller, O21822, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Fenton Rollins, O21823, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Godfrey Urban, O21825, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas James Bartley Shanley, O21828, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jasper Jackson Wilson, O21829, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry McNeil Myers, O21835, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carroll William Dietz, O21836, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Dalton Byrne, O21837, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Mortimer Crawford, O21840, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Albert Hinternhoff, O21844, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles McNeal Mount, Jr., O21849, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vernon Gustavus Gilbert, O21850, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John William Dobson, O21851, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Livingston Nelson Taylor, Jr., O21853, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Haskett Lynch Conner, Jr., O21855, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard deForest Cleverly, O21862, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Putnam Scroggs, O21863, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Leon Yarnall, O21864, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Kummer Norris, O21865, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Young Nanney, O21866, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joel Furman Thomason, O21867, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James McMenamin Shepherd, O21868, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Raymond Anthony Janowski, O21869, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Howard Keller, O21871, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sterling Russell Johnson, O21873, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ulrich Georg Gibbons, O21874, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Barton George Lane, Jr., O21876, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hugh Wright Caldwell, O21877, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Wayne Reed, O21878, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Christopher Charles Coyne, O21879, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Michael John Krisman, O21880, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Martin George Megica, O21881, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles David Thomas Lennhoff, O21882, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore Norman Hunsbedt, O21883, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Keith Maughan Hull, O21885, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles David Kepple, O21886, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Millar Geary, O21887, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederic William Boye, Jr., O21891, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Leroy Robinette, O21892, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Chessman Beere, O21893, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph John Hanchin, O21895, A my of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Vernon Tuttle, Jr., O21896, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Campbell Bane, O21897, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Kosler Newcomer, Jr., O21898, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Bradner Marlin, O21899, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Watt, O21901, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Herbert Price, Jr., O21903, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Irving Coffey, O21904, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Ray Brownfield, Jr., O21905, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Herbert Wohlfeil, O21907, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Thomas Holt, O21908, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Edward Jordan, O21911, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Clark George, O21913, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Badger Goodwin, O21914, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Philip Randall Seaver, O21916, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hulen Dee Wendorf, O21919, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Frederick Roberts, O21920, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Turner Bowie, O21921, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Whitehead West 3d, O21922, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Davis McFerren, O21923, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roger Merrill Lilly, O21924, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Jay Henry, O21928, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Gordon Johnson, O21929, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Claude Lee Shepard, Jr., O21931, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Sykes Billups, Jr., O21932, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert John Hill, Jr., O21933, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Benton Raymond Duckworth 2d, O21934, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Edward Pickett, O21938, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Warren Chester Chapman, O21939, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Boller Maxwell 2d, O21942, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Max Cochran, O21945, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Seth Foster Hudgins, O21947, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Joseph Boyle, O21953, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles James Hackett, O21954, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Heinz Weisemann, O21956, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lincoln A. Simon, O21961, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Thomas Kerwin, Jr., O21963, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Richard Gifford, O21964, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Alexander McChristian, O21966, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene Albert Trahan, O21967, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Phillip Buford Davidson, Jr., O21969, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vester Melvin Shultz, O21974, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marshall Wallach, O21977, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Casper Clough, Jr., O21979, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Welborn Griffin Dolvin, O21980, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Mull Crawford, O21983, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wiley Burge Wisdom, Jr., O21985, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Donald Max Simpson, O21986, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Martin Higgins, Jr., O21987, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel Andrew Nolan, Jr., O21988, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry William Osborn Kinnard, Jr., O21990, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Thomas Mildren, O21992, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Lentz 2d, O21993, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Traywick McConnell, O21996, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Oliver Ellsworth Wood, O21998, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Dean Poinier, O21999, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Thomas Smith, O22001, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Henry Schellman, O22002, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Salvatore Joseph Mancuso, O22006, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joel Terry Walker, O22007, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Moorhouse Coleman, O22008, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Joseph Belardi, O22009, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Willis Walker, O22011, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Patrick David Mulcahy, O22015, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Mulford Van Harlingen, Jr., O22016, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Bertolet St. Clair, O22017, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Busby Miller, O22018, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry de Metropolis, O22021, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Stephen Charles Farris, O22022, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Langley Patrick Medinnis, O22023, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Keith Boles, Jr., O22025, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Matt Combes Cavendish Bristol, Jr., O22027, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Wright Allen, Jr., O22034, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Vincent Cooperider, O22035, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Matthew Comerford Smith, O22038, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Charles Wickboldt, O22047, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lee Manning Kirby, O22048, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Geoffrey Lavell, O22049, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Michael Shannon Davison, O22051, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William James McConnell, O22052, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fidelis David Newcomb, O22056, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Walker Davis 3d, O22059, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clarence Riley Bess, O22060, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Paul Smith, O22063, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Joseph McCaffrey, O22065, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Franklin Hull, O22067, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Olav Herstad, O22068, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Neary Davis, O22070, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Osburn Dickerson, O22071, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Samuel Goodhue Kail, O22072, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Patricio Laschè, O22073, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Carter Stone, Jr., O22075, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James LeRoy Rogers, O22076, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Malcolm Frank Gilchrist, Jr., O22077, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. John William Jaycox, O22078, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Beirne Spragins, O22080, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bernard George Teeters, O22081, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. DeWitt Nalley Hall, O22083, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Raymond Odom, O22086, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward MacDonald Serrem, O22090, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Chapman Williams, Jr., O22091, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles George Fredericks, O22092, Army of the United Stater (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Walter Herbert Grant, O22093, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stanley Robert Larsen, O22094, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Barclay Carvey, O22095, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Joseph Kelly, Jr., O22097, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Calvin Banning, O22098, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Montgomery Preston, O22099, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lester Leland Lampert, Jr., O22100, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Frank Goodwin Forrest, O22101, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Shields Warren, Jr., O22103, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Holloman Barnett, O22104, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Thomas Lowe Schwenk, O22106, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ned Woods Glenn, O22107, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Moushegian, O22109, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Henderson Patterson, Jr., O22110, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Bradford Smith, O22113, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jacob Kopf Rippert, O22115, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Elliot Rager, O22116, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Wesley Florance, Jr., O22119, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert William Page, Jr., O22120, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Lansing Scott, O22121, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Eric Olson, O22125, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clyde Terry Sutton, Jr., O22128, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Wilmarth Kouns, O22129, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Homer Griswold Barber, O22130, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Allen Matter, O22132, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earle Livingstone Lerette, O22133, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Tucker Clifford, O22135, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Emmet McMahon, O22137, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. James Anderson Roosa, O22138, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Pennell, O22139, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Lawrason Murray, Jr., O22140, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Jackson Fling, O22144, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Frederick Brockman, O22147, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clifford Lore Miller 2d, O22149, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Everett Reynolds, O22151, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Richard Harrison, Jr., O22152, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Patrick Aidan Kelly, O22154, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl August Buechner, Jr., O22155, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Peter Mial, O22157, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Law McCrorey, Jr., O22158, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vincent Laurence Boylan, O22162, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Robison Reilly, O22163, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Reeson Looney, O22164, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Edgar William Schroeder, O22168, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Wilson Collins, O22169, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Charles Chapla, O22170, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Josiah Scott Kurtz, O22171, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Levin Lane Lee, O22172, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Watson McClellan, O22173, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. David Samuel Dillard, O22175, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Henry Meyer, O22179, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Constant August Troiano, O22180, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Deimel Green, O22182, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles John Parsons, Jr., O22183 Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Herbert Hale, O22184, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Joseph Kelly, O22185, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Earl Mitchell, Jr., O52328, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lem Morris Kelly, O32378, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John James Petro, Jr., O32380, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Glendale Draper Gallaher, O43925, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Hugh Bedford, Jr., O43926, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Crawford Dean Lyons, O43924, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alexander Batlin, O43927, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bill James Tutin, O32381, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Sexton Simmerman, O40376, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Terrell Shaver, O43928, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Adams Laing, O43929, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hallie Augustus Matlock, O40377, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Oscar Witherspoon, Jr., O40378, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Louis John Aebischer, O32384, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Peter Allard Helfert, O32385, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Josiah Borden Miller, O32386, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Clifford Rountree, O32387, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harvey Seymour Browne 3d, O38992, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lee S. Kaufman, O32388, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Bell Erb, O40379, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Robert Tam, O43933, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joe Rufus Shepherd, O40380, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alexander Becker, O32392, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Anthony Joseph Scannon, O32393, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Mario John Zecca, O32396, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Oliver Jacob Helmuth, O32395, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Beryl Leon Boyce, O32400, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Victor Eli Delnore, O32398, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Delbert Leonard Bjork, O32399, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sterling Henry Abernathy, O32401, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leland Swarts Devore, Jr., O32404, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thornton Edgar Pfaff, O32405, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred Wilson Jacks, Jr., O32407, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. C. W. McConnell, O40381, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Alloyse Requarth, O22189, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walden Francis Woodward, O22190, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Carpenter Dewey, O22191, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert William Frink, O22192, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Merril Hoover, O22193, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Joseph Genetti, O22194, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Edward Hassenfelt, O22195, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bernard Richard Luczak, O22196, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Robert Donaldson, O22198, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Harley Lumry, O22199, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John William Gorn, O22200, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lewis Dowe Vieman, O22201, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Francis Slaughter, O22202, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kurt Gustav Radtke, O22203, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Pettingell Samson, O22204, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William John Alphonse Hussey, O22205, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Murphy Williams, O22206, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Gool Pavey, O22207, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Mylo LeRoy Heen, O22208, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Richard Myers, O22209, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Enos Wood, Jr., O22210, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Richard Christofk, O22212, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Irving Pray, O22214, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joe Ahee, O22215, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gerald Hamilton Ragsdale, O22217, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Balish, O22218, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oliver Kenneth Marshall, O22219, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Murray Dean Dougan, O22221, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Newton Shigley, O22222, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles William Reeves, O22223, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Earl Lay, O22224, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Thomas Schooley, O22225, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roger Martin Bachman, O22226, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Homer Edward Miller, O22227, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Allen Sharrer, O22229, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Franklin Bishop, O22231, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leslie Hector Cross, O22232, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Farris Ludeman, O22233, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Glenn Taylor Beelman, O22235, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leonard George Jewett, O22236, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Albert Swatta, O22237, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Glen S. Waterman, O22239, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Calvin Oliver Smith, O22240, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Claude Jones Merrill, O22241, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jesse Price Moorefield, O22244, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leo Gunnard Carlson, O22246, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Fleetwood Crocker, O32410, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harlan Moore Freeman, O32409, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Landon Greaud Cox, O32413, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edmund Victor Harnstrom, O32414, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Chester Emmett Canine, O43949, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Kendall Harrold, O32417, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gordon August Miller, O40386, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Norman Gray, O40387, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Louis Lossen, O32420, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Emil Delbert Sasse, O32421, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Lee Kinson, O43955, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl August Peterson, O52344, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Ripley Bruce, Jr., O32423, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Doe Gallagher, O43958, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. George Leslie Morelock, Jr., O43960, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Abraham, O32427, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Urban Edward Rohr, O38696, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Calvin Siddell Hannum, O32428, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles George Micheau, O32429, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Crawford Henry Lydle, Jr., O52349, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. David Carl Turner, O43965, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Don Leigh Husman, O32431, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frank Joseph Petrilli, O32433, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William John Peply, O22300, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Leonard Erickson, O32434, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Barnes Marshall, O52350, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Norman Hale, O43968, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Lloyd Jorgenson, O32436, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Edwin Fisher, O32435, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John William Baum, O36997, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Wendell Reynolds, O43969, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Amel Lavaine Cox, O43971, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wilbur Ainsworth Hamilton, O52352, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Benjamin Washington Johnson, O32351, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Thomas McKnight, O32439, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Richard Koshko, Jr., O43974, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Preston Dawson, Jr., O38998, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert William Wildey, O52353, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Eugene Hood, O32443, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ross Young, O39001, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Luther Wenbert Murphy, O43979, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Andrew Reid Duvall, Jr., O32444, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Melvin Bernard Sellers, O43981, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Everett Newman Smith, O32449, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Theodore Hays Wineman, O52354, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Max McCord, O52355, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Walter McWhinney, O32450, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles William Simms, O32451, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ned Evans Ackner, O32452, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Melvin Layman, Jr., O32455, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Morris Dantzker, O43992, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Pierce Reeves, Jr., O43996, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Ashton Ross, O39003, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lon Devere Marlowe, Jr., O32459, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Kenneth Doyle, O44000, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Herman Dickey 3d, O44001, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arden Isaiah Lewis, O43360, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Lee Richardson, O44002, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Parker Warner, O32462, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Walter Taylor, O32465, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Francis Myron Gray, O44007, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earl Franklin Giles, O56809, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Russell Harold Kyckelhahn, O32467, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Charles Wilkins, O44009, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Arnold Rodgers, O44010, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Edwin Arthur, O32468, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Bevelle Taliaferro Brown, O32469, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Elwyn James Fonk, O44015, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Dallas Burns, O32472, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Jackson Rushing, O40301, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bernard Edward Babcock, O44018, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Lionel Friedman, O32474, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edgar Seth Sanders, O52359, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Carl Vinning Clark, O40303, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oscar Glazier Piland, O52360, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Edward Eitt, O32477, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clyde Raymond Russell, O32478, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frederick Louis Schumm, O32479, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John William Keith, Jr., O32482, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Merle Fondren, O32481, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Nelson Jean, O22632, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hubert Denwood Thomte, O22633, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Sewanee Baskin, O22634, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Otto Johnson, O22635, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Gordon Ratliff, O22637, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Sylvan Preston Lay, O22638, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ira Bertram Richards, Jr., O22639, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene Allen Dees, O22641, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald William Coons, O22642, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Charles McCrum, O22643, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Reeve Bruyere, 3d, O22644, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Dunlap Hill, O22645, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lemuel Edwin Pope, O22646, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Vladimir Bohdan Kovac, O22647, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stephen Wheeler Downey, Jr., O22649, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Parrish McQuall, O22651, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lewis Lee Copley, O22652, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Johnson Grant Lemmon, O22653, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vernon Ehlert Rex Rawie, O22654, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sterling Charles Holmes, O22655, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Henry Hastings, O22658, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Robert Snow, O22659, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Willys Hicks Pearson, O22660, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Ezra Shoemaker, O22661, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Louis Robert Moore, Jr., O22662, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Latta Mann, O22663, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col William Overton Gall, O22664, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Francis Heasty, Jr., O22665, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Avery W. Masters, O22666, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Louis Thorkelson, O22667, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Longwell Foster, O22669, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Augustine Kenan, O22670, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Frederick Beaty, O22672, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick William Hasselback, Jr., O22673, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Burns Barry, Jr., O22674, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alan Buck White, O22675, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Franklin Kent, O22676, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Logan Irby, O22678, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Clay Holloway, Jr., O22679, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Morgan Garrott Roseborough, O22681, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Cantrell, O22682, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dorsey Elwood McCrory, O22683, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Dayle Bailiett, O22684, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Aleck Francis MacDonald, O22685, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Grady Ford Riale, O44022, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John James Christy, O44023, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Norman Ewing Cole, O32484, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Gerald Lucey, O44025, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Francis Kaiser, O52323, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Frederick MacLeod, O44026, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Cross Gee, O44027, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Robert Whittick, O32487, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Claude William White, O44029, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Elmer Rousek, Jr., O44030, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Schaeffer Bare, O32488, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Norman Ward, Jr., O32491, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harrison John Merritt, O32492, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William John Besser, O44039, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Earl Willard Ralf, O44037, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Christopher Worth Chaney, O32496, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Edward Brubaker, Jr., O32497, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Edward Hall, Jr., O32230, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert John MacLean, O44042, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Royce Lester Eaves, O32499, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Temple Heston, O52371, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Denton Callaway, O32502, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clifford John Van Sickle, O32505, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Page Hudson Brownfield, O40395, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Allen Corcoran, O31721, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Lewis Norwood, O44048, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Halland William Hankel, O44049, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Benjamin Thomas Behnken, Jr., O44052, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clarence Getty Fairchild, O40396, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Linden Kinder Cannon, Jr., O32509, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Eugene Allison Shaw, O32511, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Arthur Williams, O32513, Army of the United States, (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sidney Winston Landes, O40397, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Lewis Brooks, Jr., O44054, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Greene Rieley, O32516, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Stanley Getchel Maynard, O32515, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harauld Dean Langham, O32518, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Cannon Bradford, O32519, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Winford Leonard, O44056, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Victor Scott Kendall, Jr., O32521, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Virgil Glenn Brown, O40398, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Louis James Wadle, O44059, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Herbert Rankin, O32522, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Erik William Jordahn, O44060, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Wesleigh Molloy, O32526, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Edwin Carruth, O44064, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles E. Surber, O32528, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Brian Odell Montgomery, O32529, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Hodges, O44065, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Benjamin Newhall Page, O32530, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Dean Dickson, O32531, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Earle Tardy, O32532, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Martin Stuart Werngren, O39006, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Gordon Bennett, O40400, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Aloise Luzski, O44073, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Paul Killman, O32538, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Whitfield, O32537, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frank Girard Di Meo, O44074, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Reid Raber, O44076, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Calvin Featherston, O44075, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Warren Moon, O32540, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ross Putnam Frasher, O40401, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Glenn Arthur Welde, O40402, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Aloysius Sullivan, O44080, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Byron Mills, O32541, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Keagle Buck, O32545, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Rodney Douglas Brown, O32547, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Milton Michael Miletich, O32546, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Frank Lester Lear, O39007, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Benjamin McGrath, O32548, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Conn, O32550, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lloyd Wayne Engelland, O32551, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thad Sam Oliver, Jr., O32553, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Tony Francis Perpich, O32552, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lilbourne Wayne Sherrod, O40403, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Arthur Theron Strickland, O44085, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cleo Vernon Hadley, O44086, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maurice Raymond Brice, O32557, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Victor Doriot, O52386, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Albert Laliberte, O32558, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Theodore Philip Heller, O52389, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Wayne Gaines, O32559, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hudson Christie Hill, O32560, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Charles Johnson, O44090, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ernst Fredrich Liebmann, O44091, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Oswald Miller, O40404, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Bernard Graeves, Jr., O32563, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Baker Hallums, O32564, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. C. Craig Cannon, O39008, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Albert Walsworth, O32565, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jerome Francis Smith, O40406, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army)

Lt. Col. Laurence Edmund Chloupek, O44094, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Martin Trauger, O44095, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Terrell Dunn, O32612, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Seely Hutchinson, Jr., O32611, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Melvin Thompson, O44098, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Collyer Smith, O32572, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald Byron Gordon, O32573, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Pickering Nichols, O40407, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jack Leonard Lerner, O44103, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Shelton E. Lollis, O32575, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Clyde Morton, O39010, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Roger Whiting, O32577, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Samuel David Wilder, O44104, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Judson Hyde, O44109, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Gordon Russell, O32580, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Paul Kinnison, O32581, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Stuart Crossman, O32583, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Craig Beechley, O44115, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Benjamin Franklin Melvin, O32585, Army of the United States (first lieutenant U. S. Army).

Maj. Clem Garrison Hailey, O40409, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. LaMar Arthur DeSpain, O32587, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Franklin Carney, O52396, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Gilbert Raff, O32588, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frank McPherson Bullard, O44121, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bill Buerkle, O52399, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Harry Daubert, O32593, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Bartley Axum, O52400, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Broderick Huntley, O22714, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elbert Mack Sleeker, O22716, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Emil Barker, O22717, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Elbert Emerson Stickels, O22718, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Alan MacGregor, O22719, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dean Edgar Painter, O22720, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Max Lee Pitney, O22721, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Walter Stephenson, Jr., O22722, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jacob Shacter, O22724, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cecil Hubbard Strong, O22725, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Wilhoit Stulting, O22726, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Patrick Boisseau Watson, O22727, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joel McCord Hollis, O22728, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Matthew Charles Mautz, O22729, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Nelson Eddy, O22730, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marvin Arnold Kreidberg, O22733, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Lucius Walton, O22734, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Belton O'Connell, O22735, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Wright Williams, O22736, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilson Maxwell Hawkins, O22737, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Armistead Robison Harper, O22738, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene John White, O22739, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Xavier Bradley, O22740, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Ellison Hart, O22742, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Thornton Jones, O32595, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paull Alonzo Bane, Jr., O32596, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Sylvester Jones, O52403, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ogene Pitts, O44126, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Major Lyndon Peter Kramer, O40413, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Laurence Asher Stone, O40414, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank John Wasson, Jr., O39011, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Winston Anson Jones, O32602, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Gerald Woodrow Gray, O44130, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herald Heyman Smith, O32603, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Elliott Renaud, O44131, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Mildridge Frazier Vaughn, O40415, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Franklin Edward Duda, O52407, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Thomas Lorenz, O52408, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Anton Barten, O32605, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herman Monroe Marlow, O32606, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Louis Francis Hamele, O32610, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Alfred Knute Clark, O32608, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Martin Davis, O52410, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Osborn Cooper, O44135, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Edward Foxx, O40418, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Cecil Fralish, O32668, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles William Eifler, O32614, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Grover Chester Richards, Jr., O44139, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wallace McKee Kendrick, O32615, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Guy Luckett Campbell, O32616, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Michael Phillip Elcano, O44142, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Selby McKay Frank, O32620, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Jenkins Halsey, Jr., O32619, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Davis Sydnor, Jr., O32618, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Harold Duckworth, O32621, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hugh Arthur Allen, Jr., O32622, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Frank Taylor, O44143, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edwin Thomas Rhatigan, O52412, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Mitchell Dill, O32626, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Christian Neumann, Jr., O44145, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clarence William Drye, O52413, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Silas Rice, O32628, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Franklin Halsted Graham, O40420, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hugh Gaines Stark, O40421, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Byron Escar Cowart, O52415, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Lee Harllee, O44146, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Kenneth Blake Stark, O32633, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Myron Laithwaite Brewer, O32495, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard Allen Marshall, O52416, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jim Alva Campbell, O52417, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lorenzo Albino Mella, Jr., O52418, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elba Walter Bowen, O32634, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Victor Emile Morissette, O44149, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roderick Dermott Eason, O52420, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vernon Tommins Adler, O32635, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Howard Dunning, O52421, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Southward Robbins, O32636, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hiram Madison Merritt, O32638, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Timothy Augustus Moran, O32640, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel William Rachal, O44159, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herman Merrill Farmer, O44158, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wilbur Samuel Hilton, O32643, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Nat Giambelluca, O44161, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Morris Bailey Montgomery, O44162, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Henry Elmer Bates, O32644, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Barclay Wolff, O32645, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Tom Walker Barnett, O44164, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maurice Eugene Long, O40422, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Louis Mark, O32647, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Franklin Marshall, O32648, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Rutledge Greer, Jr., O32651, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Frederick Ottinger, O39012, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Clancy Cassaday, O32658, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Simpson Keisler, O32657, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Fairfax Bayard, O44169, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Minot Boyd Dodson, O32660, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Giles Houghton Kidd, O32659, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Philip Lovell Hooper, O32662, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Joseph McIntyre, Jr., O44171, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Kenneth Ramey Keller, O33248, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hayden John Price, O39013, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. LaRue Henry Ritter, O40424, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Buckley, O52429, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Robert Duffy, O52428, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Henry Miller Hartman, Jr., O44177, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Henry Farren, O32670, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Martin Gettys, O44181, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clyde Milton Dillender, Jr., O32671, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carmon Lavon Clay, O32673, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Goodwin Hubbard, O52430, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John William Hughes, Jr., O32676, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Emile Joseph Bussolati, O32677, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Wayne Sunderlin, O32678, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Thomas Heinrich, O39014, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Matthew Richard Joseph Giuffre, O40425, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Daniel Wise, Jr., O32682, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Edwin Kirk, O32681, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Harold McCord, O32683, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Legare Jenkins, Jr., O32684, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Weaver Henderson Gaines, O32686, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Nathan Guelsow Schmidt, O44188, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Marshall Garrett McBee, O39015, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edwin Bruce Jeffress, O44190, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edwin Gilbert Moran, O52434, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. David Herber, O52689, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Adolph Joseph Gondek, O44196, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Richard Radzwich, O32691, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Henry Murphy, O44201, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Garcia Lundy, O32692, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Merle Lee Goodrich, O32693, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Willett Wood, O44203, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Henry Birch, O32696, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Baker Clark, O32695, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raleigh Osborn Worrell, O32697, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas William Alvey, O32698, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Robert Lyle, O32700, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Douglas Patterson, O32702, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Storey McMillan, O32703, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Edward Welsh, O32706, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Perry John Roberts, O44206, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Lawrence Steinbacher, O32709, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hugh Alden Hurt, O44210, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Felix Edward Tharpe, O32204, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charis Roger Sparra, O32712, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Otis Ross, O52442, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Hays Hammond, Jr., O44213, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Clifford Freeman, O44214, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Elmer Godfrey, O52444, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edwin Charles Kingsley, O32717, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jack Hill Carter, O52445, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Lawrence Yerby, O32719, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard German Murdock, O44221, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Barton Ormsbee Baker, O44222, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Gerard James Grogan, O40429, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clifford Hayes Ruffner, Jr., O39017, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Milford Walter Wood, O32723, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Lewis Lucas, O40249, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Edward Carter, O40430, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Benjamin Ross, Jr., O32724, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur William Ries, O44226, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Glenn Byron Owen, O32725, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Paul Eric Blumensaadt, O32727, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Leon Herbert Rainville, O32726, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Murray Parker, O39018, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jonas Alvin Vilhauer, O32732, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Cyrus Reyon Shockey, O44234, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Edison Pell, O40432, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Talton Woodrow Long, O32735, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Willis Elmo Smitherman, O52455, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wendell Wright Gaffney, O44235, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Orville Emil Bloch, O32736, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Lyles Snyder, O52456, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edgar Charles Wall, O32738, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Alfred Joseph Montrone, O32737, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Raymond Ford Hoffman, O44240, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ronald Watson, O52459, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hal Hardenbergh, O32740, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Verner Helm, O32743, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clarence Flagg Murray, Jr., O32744, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Richard Riddle, O32745, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Benjamin Beckham, O32747, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Dexheimer, O32749, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lee George Kays, O32750, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Oakley McCurdy Lamb, O32751, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Chase Gleason, O44245, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Graham Buhmann, O32748, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Irvin Norris, O44246, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Bernhardt Schuppener, O52465, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Judson Spencer, O44248, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Slifer Leidy, O32755, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Walcott Watson, O32756, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Julius Willie Levy, O52466, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Hantzes, O52467, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Willhite Hannah, O32760, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Edgar Stuart, O52468, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Wright, O32765, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Thomson Guth, O32768, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Wells Johnson, O44258, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Oliver Glen Stutzman, O32771, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Herbert William Hartung, O44261, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Aubrey Wolfe, O44262, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Francis Ariel Swope, O32774, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Francis Leonard Dunn, O40437, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Henry Clayburn Tipton, O32777, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence August Mette, Jr., O32776, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. David Ewing Foster, O52471, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frederic N. Oettinger, Jr., O32782, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Warren Preston Stockwell, O40438, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Laurence Alvin Johnson, O33361, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Edward Harper, O32783, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Andre Harry Nelson, O44271, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Chester Herman Johnson, O44273, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jay Hunt, O32789, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marshall Bigelow Allen, O44275, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Craig, O52479, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John William Engl, O44278, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Harold Ward, O44230, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Guy Clifford Emery, Jr., O52481, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Eugene Nelson Axtell, O44281, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alvis Morrow Howell, O32797, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Curtis Allan, O32798, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Benjamin Frederick Cook, Jr., O32801, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Edward Twyon, O32805, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wilbur Samuel Dillon, O32807, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Carlyle Hegsted Shurtleff, O44288, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Gordon Elwood McQuain, O40441, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Taft Benson, O52484, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Norman Davis, O32808, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Patrick Francis Cassidy, O32809, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Ernest Meisell, O32812, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Chester Herman Hancock, O44292, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earl Thomas Wiley, Jr., O40442, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Asa Glass, Jr., O44293, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clifford Henry Dawson, O39023, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Bristow Sanford Hopper, O32815, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert William Sanders, O44296, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clark Vincent Telquist, O40443, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kermit Herbert Rosenberg, O52487, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Russell O'Grady, O40444, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Henry Wilson, O32820, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Albert Henry Woodman, O32822, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Witus Thybony, O39024, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. David Prior, O44304, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Smith McElhenny, O39025, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Eddison Wade, O32824, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Garland May, O32825, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army.)

Maj. Henry Harrison Hewitt, O32827, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Elmore Dalness, O44310, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Newton Lingenfelter, O32829, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Stack Hastings, O32830, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Fred Martin Ruck, O33049, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lee Samuel Stoneback, O44316, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Leo Davis, O44317, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Beverly Risque, O40446, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Donald Canfield, O44318, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred Louis Eistrup, O44319, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Claude Wilson White, O40448, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elwood Dale McSherry, O44322, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Larry Gene McPherson, O52498, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eben Randolph Jones, O32836, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Allen Law Morrison, O32837, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Everett Wellman Duvall, O32842, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leon Ryno Yourtee, Jr., O44329, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frank Alexander Penn, O32843, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter John Hewitt, O44332, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Anthony Henry Ortenzi, O33383, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Goldsmith Thompson, O32844, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lyle Eugene Hershey, O52502, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Rains White, O32847, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Curtis Yarnell Kimball, O32852, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lloyd Dayton Colvin, O32853, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Duane David Davis, O39026, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joe McAdoo Willis, O32854, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Frederick Langland, O52505, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Einar Watten, O44342, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Kenneth Bunney, O52507, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U S. Army).

Capt. David Hugh Darlington, O33440, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Otho Tindall Winstead, O44345, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Aubrey Sanford, O32857, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harlan Veatch Logsdon, O44347, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Lawrence Dean, Jr., O32860, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William George Barry, O40452, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Gross Stover, O32845, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frank Lewis Lillyman, O32861, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Everett Osthues, O52512, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Tyler Gilbert, O44348, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edwin Jackson Chatham, O52513, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Alexander Anthony Zaresky, O44353, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Victor Allen Davis, O40453, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Elwood Conway, O44354, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leroy French Clark, Jr., O32863, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Beverly Thomas Richardson, O32864, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lewis Charles Spinney, O44357, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walker Felton Nolan, O52516, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Russell Carl Krueger, O32865, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Emmett McKay Lewis, O32866, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Thomas Avery, Jr., O32867, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Paul Reed Behnke, O32869, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leon Gordon Evans, O52521, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Paul Blakely, O32870, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Allan Lee Swaim, O32871, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Preston Wintrode Wyand, O44363, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Edward Cook, Jr., O32876, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ray Frederick Coyle, Jr., O52523, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leopold Frederick Hofinger, O44368, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wilson Hoover, O44370, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Armour Stewart Armstrong, O44372, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Paul Denton Hickman, O44374, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Carl Edwin Strauss, O44375, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joe Melvin Dietzel, O32881, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Christopher Raymond Keegan, O44383, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Tuttle Barnaby, Jr., O44385, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Lee Baker, O40456, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Trevor Eifler Williams, O32883, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Major Willie Lee Tate, O32885, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Kruse Kolster, O32886, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Archie James Griggs, O44389, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Evert Cecil Way, O32888, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leo Emil Schulten, Jr., O40457, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Floyd Harrison Long, Jr., O32889, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Reino Oscar Lehtonen, O52532, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Aaron Ellsworth Blewett, O32893, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Julius Rozamus, O32892, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U S. Army).

Maj. John Edward Boothe, Jr., O52533, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Edward Rigel, O32894, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Leroy Hicks, O52535, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Allan Langdon Leonard, Jr., O32898, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ward Truett Blacklock, O32899, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Wallace Aux, O44399, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arley Leroy Outland, O44400, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harlos V. Hatter, O32901, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Harrington Griffith, O44403, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Henry Franklin Prysi, O32904, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Von Pawel, O52541, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Max Zaumeyer, O32906, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Edward Hudson, O44410, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roosevelt Thomas Plummer, O44412, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Lee Huffaker, O32911, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Frederick Hooper, O39028, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Ernest Beda, O32916, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Martin Scott, Jr., O52544, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carroll Evans McHenry, O52545, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Edward Murray, O44421, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Joseph Flanigan, O44422, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Everett Lawrence Cormier, O32923, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edwin Clayton McLaughlin, O44423, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Kenneth Nelson, O44426, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles William Stewart, O32925, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Charles Prunty, O32924, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Clifton Brown, O22888, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alan Edward Gee, O22889, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John William Burfening, O22891, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Anthony Graf, Jr., O22892, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Bellows Hazeltine, Jr., O22896, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leo Erway Dunham, Jr., O22897, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Francis Dixon, Jr., O22899, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ashod Michael Ahmajan, O22900, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Joseph Fuller, O22901, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Francis O'Neil, O22902, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Gordon Forbes, O22903, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Richard Peterson, O22904, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Stuart Parker, O22907, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Harold Goodrich, O22911, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Aiken Flanders, O22912, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Thomas Podufaly, O22913, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marvin Leroy Jacobs, O22915, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clayton Allen Rust, O22916, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Wilson Penney, O22917, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Duvall Quald, O22919, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Maurice Clock, O22920, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Carter Pfell, O22921, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Richard Sullivan, O22923, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leonard Landon Haseman, O22925, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Henry Free, O22926, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Gaylord Cook, O22927, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Eugene Gunster, Jr., O22928, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Hobart Krauss, O22932, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thaddeus Michael Nosek, O22934, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Joseph Legere, Jr., O22937, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oval Hale Robinson, O22938, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul David Phillips, O22939, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Harvey Banks, O22940, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Harvey Roedy, O22941, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Carmin Noble, O22942, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Morris Rogers, O22943, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Bunyan Corbly, Jr., O22944, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Philip Lovell Elliott, O22945, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Luther Dixon Arnold, O22946, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cuyler Llewellyn Clark, Jr., O22947, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerhard Evans Brown, O22948, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Edward Minahan, O22949, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Regis Shanahan, O22950, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Pershing Strauss, O22951, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Irving Dice, O22952, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Edmund Harrison, Jr., O22953, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Urey Woodson Alexander, O22954, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Payne Francisco, O22955, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Woodrow Maurice Smith, O22960, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Roger Guy, O22961, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Ray Williams, O22962, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Montgomery Moore, O22963, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wendell John Coats, O22964, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Ferrell Winton, Jr., O22966, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bernard Ambrose Ferry, O22967, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick Jacob Yeager, O22969, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Mayo, Jr., O22970, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Renola, O22971, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence William Clapsaddle, Jr., O22972, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Morris Loeb Shoss, O22973, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Moore Brewer, O22975, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth McRae Lemley, O22976, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Thomas Harvey Spengler, O22977, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond LeRoy Shoemaker, Jr., O22978, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Nils Martin Bengtson, O22979, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Hamilton Kyle, O22981, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Homer Barron Chandler, Jr., O22982, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dean Titus Vanderhoef, O22984, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stephen Silvasy, O22985, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Donald Haldeman Baumer, O22987, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dean Marti Benson, O22991, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Augustine Miley, Jr., O22993, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Robert Wendt, Jr., O22995, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Talmage Marsh, Jr., O22996, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Rolland Woodrow Hamelin, O22997, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clarence Edward Gushurst, O22998, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Raymond Weir Millican, O23000, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Vivian Bennett, O23001, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Allen Cunningham, Jr., O23003, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Woodrow Wilson Vaughan, O23004, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Willard Walters, Jr., O23006, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Daniel Carnahan, O23007, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Samuel Merrick Patten, O23008, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert John Fate, O23010, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Kirkbride Taylor, O23011, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Fahey Black, O23012, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robinson Riley Norris, O23014, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Henry Harrison Mullin, O23015, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Burdett Eugene Haessly, O23016, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Huntington Monroe, Jr., O23017, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hobart Burnside Pillsbury, O23019, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore Louis Hoffmann, O23023, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Manley Calbraith Perry, O23024, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Jacob Beiser, O23025, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Boyle Stewart, O23028, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Simonton Brice, Jr., O23029, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Henderson Scott, Jr., O23030, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Joseph Crown, O23031, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Everett DeWitt Light, O23033, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Alexander Shaunesey, Jr., O23036, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Andrew O'Brien, O23037, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Victor Woodfin Hobson, Jr., O23038, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jerry Spears Addington, O23041, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leonard Milton Orman, O23046, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Otis Maxwell Ulm, O23047, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Henry Hendrickson, O23048, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dennis Ladislaus Barton, O23049, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alan Griffith Baker, O23051, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Levin Belt, O23053, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Thompson Simpson, Jr., O23054, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Joseph Fellenz, O23055, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John MacNair Wright, Jr., O23057, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Campbell Cassibry, O23058, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Loring Clay, O23059, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Michael Paulick, O23060, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Jerome Delaney, O23067, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Roscoe Kintner, O23068, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wendell Burley Sell, O23069, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Armand de Latour, Jr., O23073, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Langworthy Beaudry, O23077, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Chester Kieser Britt, O23078, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Elroy Tyler, O23079, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Hobbs Fraser, O23080, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Carroll Haggard, O23081, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Melvin Herbert Rosen, O23082, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donovan Paul Yeuell, Jr., O23083, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stewart Lawrence McKenney, O23084, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edison Albert Lynn, Jr., O23085, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bertil Andrew Johnson, O23086, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alan Phillip Thayer, O23087, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Joseph Pidgeon, O23089, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederic Watson Oseth, O23090, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jordan Joseph Wilderman, O23092, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Harold Nelson, O23093, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Stevens Harnett, O23094, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Frederick Kreitzer, O23096, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Edward Aber, O23097, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alan Martin Strock, O23099, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gilbert Hume Woodward, O23102, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Osmund Alfred Leahy, O23106, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Butler Bonham, O23107, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Anthony Lotozo, O23109, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Alexander Aubrey, O23110, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul S. Cullen, O23111, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Frederick Gordon, O23112, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Joseph Kenney, O23114, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Edmund Collins, O23116, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Michael Francis Bavaro, O23117, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Frederick Horton, O23118, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Olin Lee Bell, O23119, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Mead Bowlby, Jr., O23120, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Scott Montgomery Case, O23121, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Edward Kramer, O23122, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Rowland Herman Renwanz, O23123, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Wilbourne Milner, O23124, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Schuyler Hardin, O23126, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jules David Yates, O23127, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sanford Patrick England, O23129, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Goodnow Stoddard, Jr., O23130, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Richard Maedler, O23132, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Philip John Moore 3d, O23135, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ronald Maurice Kolda, O23136, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Scott Greene, Jr., O23137, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hugh Jefferson Turner, Jr., O23138, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Salvo Rizza, O23139, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Robert McLean, O23140, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Deber Townsend, O23141, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Herold Wohner, O23142, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wing Fook Jung, O23144, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Corwin Chamberlain, O23145, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cornelius Arthur Murphy, O23146, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Michael Rooney, O23147, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Thomas Hennessy, O23148, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Edward Zahrobsky, O23149, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Anthony O'Brien, Jr., O23152, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Christie Emery, O23153, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Delbert Earle Munson, O23156, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roderick Wetherill, O23158, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Robert Barry, O23160, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bryce Frederic Denno, O23161, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Russell Dodderidge, O23164, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wallace Leo Clement, O23167, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dan Porter Briggs, O23169, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ford Prioleau Fuller, Jr., O23170, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Lionel Bierman, O23175, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Thomas O'Keefe, O23176, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel McClure Goodwin, O23177, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Carroll Cameron, O23178, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wallace James Hackett, O23179, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Barbour Byrne, O23181, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lester Frank Schockner, O23182, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, United States Army).

Lt. Col. John Dibble, Jr., O23183, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Henry Bates, O23184, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Ami Stella, O23185, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Bert Lane, O23187, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Eugene Farthing, Jr., O23188, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Martin Bell Chandler, O23189, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George John Bayerle, Jr., O23192, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Park Richards, O23194, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Kerr Roberts, Jr., O23195, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Hans Mueller, O23196, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Edward Balthis, Jr., O23199, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leland George Cagwin, O23200, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Henry Muller, O23201, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Silvio Emil Gasperini, Jr., O23203, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harmon Porter Rimmer, O23204, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James David Loewus, O23205, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Fielding Lewis, O23206, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Rockwell Crocker, O23207, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Myers Kasper, O23210, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Meszar, O23211, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Thomas Cassidy, O23213, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lee Watson Fritter, O23217, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Orville McDonald, O23218, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sanford Harvey Webster, O23222, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Frederick Williams, Jr., O23224, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Deming Lucas, Jr., O23225, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Washington England, Jr., O23226, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Francis O'Donnell, O23228, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick Anthony Schmaltz, O23229, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gilford Dalton Green, O23231, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Chittenden Mandell, O23234, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Emory Sherwood Adams, Jr., O23235, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Arthur Gordon Malone, O23237, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Ware Mabee, O23241, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Florian John Erspamer, O23242, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Eugene Ogleeby, O23244, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Theodore Biswanger, Jr., O23245, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bidwell Moore, O23248, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thaddeus Philip Floryan, O23249, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Dale Epley, O23250, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Webster Hough, O23251, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Anthony Lewis Paul Wermuth, O23252, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Andrew Donald Budz, Jr., O23253, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Talman Watrous, Jr., O23254, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Durward Henry Galbreath, O23255, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jodie Gibson Stewart, Jr., O23256, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, United States Army).

Lt. Col. Eben French Swift, O23258, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore Weisman Davis, O23259, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Neville Mackin 3d, O23260, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Alexander Shagrin, O23261, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Louis Gonzaga Mendez, Jr., O23262, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Joseph Gildart, O23264, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sidney Vincent Bingham, Jr., O23269, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stephen Bernard Morrissey, O23270, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Mark Clair Baugher Klunk, O23273, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Victor George Conley, O23276, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roland Merrill Gieszer, O23278, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Lee Mastran, O23279, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Drummond Swank, O23281, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Norman Holm, O23282, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Sorg Reinecke, Jr., O23284, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Edward Miner, O23285, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Charles Raleigh, O23287, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Dunphy Fitzpatrick, O23288, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Julian Aaron Cook, O23290, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Thomas Larkin, O23293, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Page Egerton Smith, O23294, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Force Daniels, O23295, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William White Saunders, O23296, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Harley Arnold, Jr., O23299, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marvin Hatfield Merchant, O23301, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Chester Moffet Freudendorf, O23303, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Russell Joseph Manzolillo, O23304, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Benjamin Franklin Delamater 3d, O23305, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jack Borden, O23306, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Philip Robert Cibotti, Jr., O23309, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Thomas Devlin, O23314, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Newlin Ross, O23315, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Landon Albert Witt, O23317, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Bertram Coontz, O23319, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Milton David Lederman, O23320, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Grinnell White, O23326, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alfred Jennings Floyd, O23328, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Michael Kuziv, Jr., O23330, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William John Bennett, O23331, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Cicero Fogle, O44428, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Douglas Gorrie Alexander, O32927, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Burrell Hewette, O44430, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Rasmus Anderson, O40461, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Willis Beals Scudder, O36179, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leon Francis Morand, O32980, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Joseph Bee, O44437, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Acton Kirk, Jr., O44442, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Meade Parker, Jr., O32936, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Burkhardt Marshall Senn, O52560, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ivan George Phillips, O32941, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Winston Lewis Olson, O32940, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Reeves Garton, O32945, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Paul D'Arezzo, O23333, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Frederick Freund, O23334, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hilton Densley, O32946, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Helmuth Simmons, O39029, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Camden Page Fortney, Jr., O32949, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Bruce Braid, O32950, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Howard James, O40463, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Charles Rohan, O32954, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Courtney Heald, O44454, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Neil Sands, O32957, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick William Baum, O23385, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Herbert Batte, O23401, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herman Walter Wright Lange, O23402, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Stanley Griffith, Jr., O23403, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alfred Washburn Bruneau, O23404, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Cook Tredennick, O23405, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Conrad Miller, O23406, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Hall Livingston, O23408, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hunter LeGear Stockton, O23409, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jene Earl Mills, O23410, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Woodrow Bryan Sigley, O23411, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Pratt Alexander Warren, O23412, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Warren Randall King, O23413, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Gray Platt, O23414, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leslie Joseph Harness, O23415, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Peter Denisevich, O23416, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Philip Archie Hatten, O23417, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gilbert Warren Curl, O23418, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alfred Lincoln Brassel, O23420, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Cobb Benjamin, O23422, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Blair Green, O23423, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Harlan Bull, O23424, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Burbank Webster, Jr., O23425, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Emerson Wallace Grant, O23427, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Blatchford Robinson, O23428, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clifford Ellwood Lippincott, O23429, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Stephen Dana Young, O23430, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Francis Carter, O23431, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Kethley Gillmore, O23432, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cyril Dean Sterner, O23434, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marion Walton Walker, O23435, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Alvin Kersting, O23436, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Walker Sample, O23437, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Benjamin Grant Taylor, Jr., O23438, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Irvine Manning, O23439, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Sheridan Eldridge, O23442, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Misha Nicholas Kadick, O23444, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Storey Sandiland, O23445, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Houghton Collart, O23447, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Scandrett, O23448, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Darrel Gee Costello, O23449, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bergen Brokaw Hovell, O23450, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Henry Symbol, O23452, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Samuel Daley, Jr., O23453, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Louis Howard Ressijac, O23454, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Finney Lane, O23456, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Mix Gilbert, O23457, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas O'Connor Blakeney, O23458, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Jackson Natzel, O23459, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Hammond Walker, Jr., O23460, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Otto Bismarck Cloudt, Jr., 023462, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Diedrich Hansen, 023468, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Emil Paul Eschenburg, 023469, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Edward Arn, 023470, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Cone Mahoney, Jr., 023486, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Chester Goers, 023487, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David William Iunghuhn, 023488, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Darrel Cavness, 023489, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lester Bennett Johnson, 023490, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Parker Ewan Connor, Jr., 023491, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Pancratius Fagan, 023496, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Edward Unverferth, 023499, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Edward Alban, 023500, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Thomas Metcalf, 023501, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earl William Edwards, 023502, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bert Perrin, 023503, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Raymond Thomas Shelby, 023504, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Henry Lorenz, Jr., 023505, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Christopher Wilkinson, Jr., 023512, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arden Charles Brill, 023514, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Washington Shivers, Jr., 023515, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Clyde Stump, 023516, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Cecil Evans, Jr., 023517, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Ernest Rice, 023518, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Fogg Twombly 3d, 023519, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Tom Spencer Phair, 023520, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Troxell Olin Mason, 023522, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jacob Franklin Mynderse, 023523, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Merle Reed Preble, 023524, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Charles Hall, 023525, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Alexander Schendel, Jr., 023526, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Charles Durgan, 023527, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Everett Albert Hansen, 023528, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Thompson Horner, Jr., 023530, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Milton Hightower 3d, 023531, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hal Dale McCown, 023532, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hugh William McClary, 023533, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Oscar Marion Brumfiel, 023534, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry John Richter, 023536, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin O'Connor, Jr., 023539, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Arthur Harold Lahlum, 023541, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Condit Ingalls, 023542, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vallard Cassius Smith, 023543, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Pershing Brown, 023544, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Peter Clerk Manson, 023545, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Claire Tillson, 023546, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Nye Maguet Scofield, 023547, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Greenwood, Jr., 023548, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Law Bryan, 023549, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Melvin Desmond Clark, 023550, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Howard Bayer, 023551, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Marvin Kinzer, 023552, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Brinkley Ramsey, 023553, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Donham Higgins, 023554, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Zim E. Lawhon, 023555, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Bradford Rosson, 023556, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elgin Gilbert Radcliff, 023558, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Somer Shapland, 023560, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Harry Pell, 023561, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Alexander Edens, 023563, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Vincent Wilson, 023564, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Irvin Albert Johnson, 040464, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Newell Barber, 052568, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred Charles Smith, 044457, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gordon Kenneth Smith, 032959, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Farrar Bristol, 044459, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Wayne Mather, 044453, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Raymond Budge, 052569, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Clifford Mellus, 044464, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Willard Pearson, 044466, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Bernhard Randle, 052570, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Edward Riley, 040465, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Osborne Romeo Rumph, 040466, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Ledford Lain, 032967, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Davis Preston, Jr., 032969, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earl J. Brown, 039031, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edgar Allen Poe McCarthy, Jr., 032970, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Jack Gleason Cornett, 032972, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Robert Hansen, 052571, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Alexander Higgins, 040468, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Lashlie Utley, 032977, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Delbert Lewis Jellum, 044478, Army of the United tSates (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herman I. Zimmerman, 052576, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. David Warren Sisco, 052579, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Max Hobart Gerard, 032982, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Albert Newlin, 032923, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Henry Colmer Whitting, 044487, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leon Adrain Michaelis, 044486, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ralph Neal Tudor, 039032, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Harrison Crowe, 032986, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Clark Bingham, Jr., 040471, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Vincent Schafbuch, 032990, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Morris Scott, Jr., 044501, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Le Vere Henry Strom, 032995, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maurice Hawley Matthews, 032997, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leland Henry Langbein, 040473, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Alexander Finlay Berol, 033000, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jack Schwartzman, 040475, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alva Thomas McDaniel, 044521, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Andrew Young, Jr., 044524, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Guice Kimball, 052599, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Gamble McIlhiney, 033005, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Clarence Aylesworth, 023614, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Louis Dickerson, 023615, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Earl Treadway, 029617, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Entwistle Burton, 044526, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ben Warner Legare, 039034, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Tracy James Hardman, 033007, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sam Andrew Roberts, 033008, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lester Alphonso Kearney, 033010, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Hyatt Malone, 033014, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ray Goodman Lawrence, 052606, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Neil Mackay Matzger, 044539, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Carlisle Griffin, 033016, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Gilbert Martin, 039035, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Rieder William Schell, 033021, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Roger Harris, 044544, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Fred Ballard Porter, 040477, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Clifford Pittman, 033022, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Reinoldi, 052610, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Kenneth Addison, 044547, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert David Branagan, 033024, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Branson Cobb, 033025, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Mayer Wilson, Jr., 033026, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Clements Blackwell, 040478, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Elmer Pederson, 040479, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Marion Conover, Jr., 033029, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Patrick Mullarkey, 033030, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harold Eugene Scherer, 033032, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles John Larsen, 044558, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Henry Clifford, 033033, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Bernard Benjamin Beck, 040481, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Brice Pace, 033035, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Walter Lang, 033034, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Russell Howard Hanson, 052615, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Herberts Bykerk, 033039, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Vincent Edward Osborne, 032039, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene C. Oates, Jr., 044576, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edwin Cooper Gibson, 044578, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Marcello Worthington Bordley, Jr., 044580, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Armand Leo Bellavance, 040484, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Dickson Polley 3d, 039034, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Norman Elwood Petty, 033041, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Edward Burrows, 023621, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hector Carrie, Jr., 033043, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Pratt Mason, 044587, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harold William Athan, 052624, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph James Delaney, 033048, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Daniel Throckmorton Ghent, 052626, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Leon Leva, 052627, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Anders Olof Wiklund, 044597, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Thomas Ryan, 052629, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Donald Allen, 052630, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Arthur Wooten, Jr., 044599, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Roger Orrain King, 044600, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Vincent Fahey, 033054, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Stern Quick, 044602, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Alfred Calone Bieri, 033055, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Alfred Collins, 040486, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Fred Brown Mitchell, 052633, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Roberts Prewitt, 044603, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward John Cullinan, 044604, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Milton Tillman Hunt, Jr., 033057, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Adams Hall, 044605, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wah Geung Chin, 033058, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Blackburn Stephens, 033060, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Ernest Ward Smith, 033064, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Garland Rawlings, 033065, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Clifford Wood, Jr., 052640, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clarence Francis Roberts, Jr., 044612, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel Webster, 033071, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Peter Parker, 040487, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Golden Bogle, 052642, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard Goulding Marriott, 033072, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Frederick Byers, 052643, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Thornton Boyle, 033074, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Karlton Warmbrod, 033077, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Gerald Irwin, 040490, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Sumstad, 052646, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert James Rosa, 033078, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Thro Haslam, O33079, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter John Todd, O40491, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Louis D'Amelio, O44627, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Blades, O33082, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Davis Skipper, O33083, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ralph Edwin Niffenegger, O33084, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Foster Ball, O39039, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frank John Kent, O33087, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Ira Waugaman, Jr., O33090, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Holt Green, O33095, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alton Randolph Taylor, O33092, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Max Edward Billingsley, O44631, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arlin John Kehe, O33094, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Strother Branch, O40494, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Henry Merriam, O33095, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Percy Leahy, O33097, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Thomas Reitz, O33096, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dwight Bennett Dickson, O33099, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Benjamin Franklin Clymer, Jr., O40495, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Clair Ritze, O44634, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Daniel Mucha, O44636, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marion Leon Daman, O40496, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Fletcher Smith, O41638, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred F. White, O33776, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Wilson Brotherton, O52658, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Gerard Downey, O33106, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Joseph Flahaven, O40497, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lewis Robert Adams, O39042, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John MacKellar Ansley, O39041, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Francis Palmer Hill, O33108, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Melvin Fletcher, O33111, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Harold Schwab, O44646, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clarence Alley Thompson, Jr., O33113, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Leo Wilbur Manning, O33114, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lynell William Green, O52665, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Edwin Dressler, O44653, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Emmet Kennington, O23623, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Trabue, O23625, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Love Latta, Jr., O23627, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Bangs Corbett, O23628, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alfred Martin, O23629, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Kenneth Warren, Jr., O23630, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Barwick Strahan, O23631, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Greenwood Thomas, O23632, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Michael Delaney, O23633, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Marion Smith, O23634, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Samuel Wanner, O33116, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Babington Macaulay, O23549, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Lewis Oliver, O33118, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Nicholas Edward Sloan, O33117, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Robert Smith, Jr., O33119, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Gilkey Gunning, O52669, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold George Creyts, O44662, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harris Toney Mitchell, O52670, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wilbur Oscar Miller, Jr., O33126, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Alfred Rasmussen, O40502, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Napier Butchart, O44664, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Randlett Irving, O33127, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Aloysius Murphy, O44667, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Eugene Merithew Freeman, O40503, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. William Roger McLean, O33136, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John William Hopkins, Jr., O40504, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Harold Hughett, O44674, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Patterson Dailey, O52682, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stephen Nicholas Zarpas, O40505, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Lobdell Brown, O40506, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Herbert Austin Johnson, Jr., O33140, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Joseph Higgins, Jr., O33141, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. John Henry Scanlon, O33142, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Edwin Englehardt, O33143, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Dan Adams, O33147, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Chandler Fairbanks 3d, O33145, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Boulton Bainbridge Miller, O33148, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Eugene Moore, O33149, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Carl Frederick Dietrich, O39043, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Melvin Russell Blair, O33150, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Curtis Clarence Batson, O33152, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Herbert Ulleao Sieben, O33153, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Lee Woolfolk 3d, O52687, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Howard Kinney Welch, O33155, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Benjamin Gray Moore, O33158, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Jacques DeMers, O33159, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Denmark C. Jensen, O44694, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Norman Edward Meyer, O40511, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Raymond James Wardrop, O44698, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Arthur William Delaney, O44697, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Edward Bobo, Jr., O33164, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Herman Carlyle Park, O33163, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donal Irvin Medley, O33165, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Milton Adolph Pullman, O33166, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Carl Johnstone, O44702, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Karl Amos Zipf, O39044, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Judson Locke, O40512, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Edward Tistadt, O44706, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John William Lundberg, Jr., O33170, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Francis Smith, O33169, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Smalley Greene, O40514, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jefferson Melvin Fairley, O52699, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Hoover Calahan, O40515, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Heard Carter, O33174, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wyatte Gristie Trainer, O40516, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jesse Foss Wheeler, Jr., O44719, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Samuel Walston Scarburgh, O44723, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Frank August Sandholm, O33178, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Pearson Buckley Yeager, O33176, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert William Schafer, O39045, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Truman Frederick Cook, O44727, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Keith Lincoln Ware, O33181, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Wesley McAlhany, O40517, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Eugene Goldoni, O33182, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Charles Ware Youngman, O33183, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Levene John Weigel, O33187, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lewis Jordan Strait, Jr., O44735, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Thomas White, O52708, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Howard Walton, O44746, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harold Van Lear Hawes, O52711, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frank Argyle Williams, O44750, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Philip Allen Hutchinson, O33200, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Everett Porteous, O33203, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Kenji Hino, O44753, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Joseph Gravel, O33206, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Byrd Sergent, O52717, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Nicholas Schoming, O44755, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Edmond Reichmuth, Jr., O33209, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Edwin Bowman, O33211, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Richard Duddy, O33214, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Robert Obermeyer, O44759, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Army).

Capt. Andrew Harold Prudhomme, O33213, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Eugene David Manary, O33216, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Moorman Gardner, O40522, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Boyd Lightfoot Brown, O33215, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Bobby Boyd Larsen, O52722, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Warren Wright, Jr., O33217, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Uel Wilford French, O33218, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Joseph Guy, O33219, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred William Scott, O44765, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Craig Anderson, O44768, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ivey Oscar Drewry, Jr., O33224, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Arthur White, O40524, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Howard Norvi Zeigler, Jr., O44773, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Turner Merrill, O33225, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Murel Sayre, O33220, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Willard Andrew Muir, O44774, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Duncan Shi, Jr., O33230, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Clare Sherrets, O44781, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Eber Hilliard Thomas, Jr., O44780, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Leroy Clancy, O52733, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joe Flake, O40526, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Bruce McRae, O33236, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lemuel Chafin Downs, O40527, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Noel Dahlstrom, O33238, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ralph Edward DeKemper, O33240, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Robert Creel, Jr., O33241, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lee Hamilton Hilliard, O33246, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Clarke Archer, O44792, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur William Ritchings, O52739, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Murray Edward Manley, O52740, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Warren Pruden Davis, O33245, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Powell Venable, O33247, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Eugene Brewer, O52741, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Samuel Respess Arnold, O32664, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cesides Victor Barberis, O33249, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Henry Hiser, O44795, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jerome Anthony Ingerski, O40531, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Henry Herbert Sablitz, O40532, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Masao Kobayashi, O52745, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lanier Dunn Buford, O39046, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Spartan Ferrari, O44810, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Donald Crow, O52746, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edison Eugene Yates, O39047, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Dodge Servis, O52747, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Gillis Metcalfe, O52749, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Charles Costabile, O44814, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Anthony Joseph Wlikowski, Jr., O52748, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Harris Wiltamuth, O44817, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gerard Conery Adams, O44819, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Chester Allan Richardson, O33259, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Gregory Sisak, O52751, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack David Smith, O33260, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Owen Davidson, O33262, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David McVicker Kyle, O33263, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Frank Freeman, O44823, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gilbert Charles Russi, O53264, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Page Jones, Jr., O44826, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Loyd Wilson, Jr., O33268, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lehman Holson Johnson, Jr., O44831, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carlyle Fredrick McDannel, O33271, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Edward Harbert, O44833, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Kenneth Edward Nelson, O52756, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Arlo Albert Miller, O44835, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Waldo Jones, O40530, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Thomas Hanna, O52758, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marion Gibson Williams, O44841, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Charles Ulrich, O44842, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S Army).

Lt. Col. Hartsell Hamilton Northington, O33275, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Chandler Conroy, O33276, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Peter Vail Converse, O39050, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Pryse Alcorn, O44844, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Chester Dale Nielson, O33280, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Conway Lyman Ellers, O39051, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Francis Bradshaw, O44846, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Glenn David Walker, O33282, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Perry Ewing, O33284, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Clinton Tarkenton, Jr., O33283, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stanley Joseph Paciorek, O33285, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Francis Sylvester Donnell, O33295, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Charles McGuire, O33293, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Washington Simon Kuhn, Jr., O44862, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Carroll Kelly, O44863, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joel Wayne Lawson, O33298, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Rufus James Cleghorn, O52767, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Glenn Marvin Vinquist, O44867, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald Tracy, O44869, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Alford Clifford Shellum, O33299, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Duda, O52768, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel Webster Prewitt, O33301, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Bickley Stevens, O44872, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Julian Meeker, O33304, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Wakeley Patchin, O40537, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert William McCartney, O39052, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Maltbie Alexander, O33305, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sterling Evans Purnell, O44875, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Raymond Cay Nelson, O52775, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Albert Troup, Jr., O33306, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Lewis Duckwall, O39053, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Rodney Dean, O44877, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Benedict Andrew Karnosky, O44878, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert David Harback, O44880, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Franklin Andrew Werner, O33307, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald O'Connor Vaught, O33308, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Howard Gustave Schade, O33311, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Julius Holmes, O33317, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Davis Pryor, Jr., O33316, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Postford Arthur Loiselle, O33321, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John McCoy Goodman, O33323, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bernie Francis Morgan, O44899, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Richard Thomas Neumann, O39054, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Luther Gates, O40539, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert John Beauchamp, O44907, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Alexander Riegle, O33325, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Charles Troescher, O39055, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hubert Jerome Arsenault, O44917, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jonathan Monroe Kight, O44919, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Allan Preston Nesbitt, O52782, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Phillip Walter Ryan, O33328, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Joseph King, Jr., O33329, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Collin Bushway, O33330, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Gail Bruce Lee, O33332, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Jackson Bowen, O33333, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earl Robert Gooding, O33334, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Andrew Cumbie, O40542, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Harrison Costigan, O33336, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wade Hampton Arrington, O40543, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Philip Henry Bramble, O33341), Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Lowell Sims, O33345, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Marion Elmer McDaniel, O33346, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jim Hillery McCoy, O52796, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Alexander Vitarius, O40544, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edmund Paul Flynn, O33350, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stuart Joseph Palos, O52797, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lloyd Albert Ramsey, O33352, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Leo Delmar Leavengood, O44938, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Waugh Keyser, O33355, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Webb Foster, O52802, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Laurence Joseph Corley, O33360, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward William Quinlan, Jr., O33359, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Merle Edison Hamner, O52805, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Benjamin Krainik, O33367, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Carl Girtman, Jr., O44951, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Patrick William Harrington, O33372, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Wesley Duke, O33373, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Kyle Terry, O33375, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Dominick Charles Dennis, O44953, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Roger Longacre, Jr., O33378, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. J. Elmore Swenson, O33380, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Henry Heldreth, O33382, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Frank Garbacz, O40548, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kemuel Kenyon Blacker, O44956, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vern Eskil Johnson, O44959, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wallace Murdock Hanes, O33384, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Howell Barrett Thompson, O33385, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Elwin Coulter, O33386, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Holton Eugene Blomgren, O44964, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James William Johnson, O33387, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Raymond Cole, O33392, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Flint, O44970, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Alvin Gottlieb, O44972, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army)

Maj. David Gage Cogswell, O33393, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wesley Oliver Moberg, O44973, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Claire Stillwell Curtis, O33394, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Phillip John Linn, O33395, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Bernard Bennett, O44977, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arlo Reed Gill, O44983, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl C. Edmondson, O44982, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Harvey Robinson, O44984, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Joseph Corbin, O33399, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Angelo Enrico Pilla, O44989, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hamilton Smoot Rebentisch, O44991, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William McKinney Mantz, O33403, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Willard Henry Elohm, O44994, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ottis Audrey Davis, Sr., O40553, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert Milton Denny, O33406, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Nathan Martasin, O44997, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Donald Charles Felton, O39058, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Franklin Coffey, Jr., O44998, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jerome Ferris Lieblich, O33409, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Raleigh Evans Coleman O52823, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Dale Howard Shick, O33412, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Henry Ford, Jr., O33411, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Sidney Dodds Hilton, O33413, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard Hamilton Schuler, O33414, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Warren George Duemmel, O45004, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Gerald Bethune Little, O40554, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Franklin Hancock, O45013, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Sayle Smith, O33424, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Maurice Albert Rogers, O40555, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fred Wilbur Collins, O33425, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Martin Frank Massoglia, O52831, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dan William Johnson, O33426, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ray Ralph Liedike, O39060, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Harlan Palmatary, O45026, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Michael Joseph Strok, O52838, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Anthony Joseph Vinci, O45029, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Gibson Cooper, O33430, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Edward Burner, O33434, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Burton Seeley, O33436, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edgar Sleadd Waugh, O33439, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard Edward Eggleton, Jr., O52844, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Trevett Williams, O52845, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Cecil Floyd Hunnicutt, O33442, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Claude Hathaway Stewart, O33441, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Peyton Royston Lucas, O33445, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Robert Murphy, O52847, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Joseph Hejna, O45033, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard Grant Freeman, O33450, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Frank Butler Greer, O33447, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ferris Adam Kercher, O33456, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Albert Reynolds, O52852, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Eugene Davidoff, O33460, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Joseph Cooke, O45043, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clifford Alvin Curtis, O33462, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. James Hubert Tirey, O33464, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Max Richard Machnicke, O33465, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Atwood Herod, O52859, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Morris Allen Lent, O33469, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jack Rawson Melton, O33470, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Melvin Zais, O33471, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Johnnie Derrick Duffie, O33474, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Newell Jenkins, O40561, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Daniel Anders, O33475, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Paul Bernard Schaefer, O40562, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Richard Aguglia, O33477, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elon Lee Hiller, O45059, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Douglas Davis Pearis, O33479, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roland Savilla, O40563, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Anthony Martin Kamp, Jr., O33482, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vincent Farnsworth Goodsell, O33483, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Max Verlyn Kirkbride, O33485, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vernon Nelson Simmons, Jr., O39063, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ralph Edward Konkol, O52868, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Mills Brown, O33487, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert William Jones, O33488, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Heinz Peter Rand, O33490, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Whitson Kane, O33492, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Duane Wright Ackerson, O45068, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leslie Otis Doane, O33493, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry George Mathos, O45077, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Monsey Thomas Gresham, Jr., O45076, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Victor Boyd Shemwell, O44395, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Herbert Henry Landers, Jr., O39064, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Chilton Holbrook, O33501, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Joseph Killian, O33502, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Theodore Frederick Schweitzer, O52875, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Willis Smith Riddick, Jr., O40570, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Hain Mengel 2d, O33504, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Jacob Howard, O33508, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Homer Humphrey Hammond, O33507, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clair Gillespie Henline, O45087, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Mertan Smith Coe, O52876, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Arnold William Alexander, O45089, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Oscar Franson, Jr., O39065, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Rocco Francis Meconi, O33516, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Henry Edwards Mecredy, Jr., O45091, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Norman Lunsford, Jr., O33518, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Albert Clark Standish, O39066, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Martin Luther Denlinger, O33519, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Z. Helber, O45094, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Jefferson Hatch, O45096, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Hugh Agnew, O45102, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Conrad Rudolph Underdahl, O33523, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wilbert Denning Meeks, O45109, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alex Noble Nelson, O33528, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Llewellyn Sobke, O33529, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Brian Detchemendy, O45117, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Raymond Ebbs, O45116, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Walrath Burns, O52887, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alfred Judson Force Moody, O23685, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elmer Parker Yates, O23686, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Clifford Hodges Lee, Jr., O23688, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Lloyd Powell, Jr., O23689, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Roy Oswalt, Jr., O23690, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Allen Jensen, O23692, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Ira Schnittke, O23693, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vincent Paul Carlson, O23694, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Charles Gribble, Jr., O23695, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Curtis Wheaton Chapman, Jr., O23696, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sears Yates Coker, O23697, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Warren Clark, O23698, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Austin Gerig, Jr., O23701, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Skiles Kelley, O23703, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Wyman Ramee, O23704, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jess Paul Unger, O23706, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Henry Schilling, O23707, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Edward Schremp, O23709, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. John Field Michel, O23710, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Delaney, O23711, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Mack Tarbox, O23715, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Kenneth Wade Kennedy, O23716, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lynn Cyrus Lee, O23717, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James William Strain, O23719, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Graham Waitt, O23720, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Campbell Clendening, O23721, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Henry Carroll, O23722, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Van Horn Ellis, Jr., O23724, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Charles Besancon, O23725, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stanley Meriwether Ramey, O23726, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Miles Linton, O23728, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Sealey Kramer, O23729, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harrington Willson Cochran, Jr., O23731, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick John Baker, O23732, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Ingram Gurfein, O23734, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Stanley Grygiel, O23737, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Philip Seneff, Jr., O23738, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Webb VanHoy, Jr., O23739, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Mills Carson Hatfield, O23741, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Leon Rowny, O23744, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Herbert Richardson, Jr., O23748, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Edward Mather, O23749, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Walter Samz, O23750, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cecil Leo Smith, O23751, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Dorsey Maynard, O23754, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Holmes Camp, O23758, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Burnside Elijah Huffman, Jr., O23759, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Denis Blundell Grace, O23760, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James William Roy, O23762, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John William Burtchaell, O23764, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Edward Kuzell, O23766, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James William Stigers, O23767, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Francis Thomas Murray, O23768, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Allan George Woodrow Johnson, O23769, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard John Rastetter, O23770 Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Stephen Thaddeus Kosiorek, O23772, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. George Lawrence Slocum, O23773, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Roy J. Clinton, O23774, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lee Bradley Ledford, Jr., O23775, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Millikin, Jr., O23781, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Vaughan Elsberry, O23783, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Andrew McCulloch, Jr., O23786, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Pressly Scott, O23787, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hyman Bodzin, O23788, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Gabriel Gauvreau, O23789, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Harleston deSaussure, Jr., O23790, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Leroy McMillan, O23791, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Glenn Alfred Lee, O23792, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Jeunet Whitaker, O23793, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Malcolm Corwin Johnson, O23794, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter James Woolwine, Jr., O23795, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Robert Salisbury, O23797, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Gabriel Redmon, O23802, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Joseph Geldermann, O23803, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Bissland Moore, O23804, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Roopen Adjemian, O23806, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Mortimer Buell Birdseye, Jr., O23807, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Max Campbell Tyler, O23809, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wallace Michael Lauterbach, O23810, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gregg LaRoix McKee, O23811, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick Clinton Stanford, O23812, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Stanley Reilly, O23813, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roger Stevens Neumeister, O23815, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Gerard Healy, O23816, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul George Skowronek, O23822, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wilson Russell Reed, O23824, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Duward Lowery Crow, O23825, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Edward Panke, O23831, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Duncan Brown, Jr., O23832, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jonathan Edward Adams, Jr., O23833, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Arthur Cannon, Jr., O23835, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hugh Franklin Foster, Jr., O23837, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles William Fletcher, O23839, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George William McIntyre, O23841, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Frank Starr, O23843, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Lawrence Theisen, O23846, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Benjamin Manley, Jr., O23847, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Knighton Harris, O23848, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Oscar Green 3d, O23850, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roger Longstreet Lawson, O23852, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Eugene Clifford, O23853, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Waggener Couch, O23855, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Moore Christensen, Jr., O23856, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army.

Maj. Walter Francis Molesky, O23857, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Norton, O23858, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Cooper, O23860, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Potter Campbell, Jr., O23861, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Malcolm Graham Troup, O23862, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Oscar Charles Tonetti, O23864, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Joseph Canella, O23865, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Chester Day, O23866, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Tom Depher Collison, O23868, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Lippincott Knowlton, O23869, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lyman Saunders Faulkner, O23870, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Lloyd Meyer, O23871, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Vivans Greene, O23872, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Samuel Bertron Magruder, O23874, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Matthew Clarence Harrison, O23875, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul von Santen Liles, O23876, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Miroslav Frank Moucha, O23877, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Morton McDonald Jones, Jr., O23879, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Patrick Ahern, O23881, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jacob Heffner Towers, O23883, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. James Henry King, O23884, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Leo Charles Henzl, O23885, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Horace Maynard Brown, Jr., O23886, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Michael Joseph Lenihan Greene, O23887, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Putnam Detwiler, O23892, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Fuller McKinley, Jr., O23893, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Morris Hoge, Jr., O23894, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Michael Frank Aliotta, O23895, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Edward Lanigan, O23896, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roy Leighton Atteberry, Jr., O23899, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Hunter Woodward, O23900, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harley Truman Marsh, Jr., O23901, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Winston Curley, O23904, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George William Cooper, O23905, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Auburon Paul Hauser, O23908, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Evarts Clark, O23911, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Benjamin McCaffery, Jr., O23912, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Boswell, Jr., O23913, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maurice Guthrie Miller, O23914, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Patrick Henry Tansey, Jr., O23915, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Edward McElroy, O23917, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Alexander Tidmarsh, O23918, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert John Coakley, O23919, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Huff Edger, O23921, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Channing Borman, O23922, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Paul Johnson, O23926, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Cornelius Fitzpatrick, O23927, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Matthew Gordon Harper, Jr., O23928, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Leonard Robinson, O23929, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arnold Jacob Hoebeke, O23930, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Abbott Hume, O23931, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Bibb Pickett, Jr., O23932, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Berry Kercheval, O23933, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Merritt Lambert Hewitt, O23934, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Gray, Jr., O23935, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gibson Niles, O23938, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Moody Elmo Layfield, Jr., O23939, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Reynolds Robert Keleher, O23941, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Raine Laney, Jr., O23942, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, United States Army).

Maj. Dick Stanley Von Schrilitz, O23944, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arnold Ray Thomas, O23947, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Manly Busbee, Jr., O23953, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wendell Pollitt Knowles, O23953, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Felix John Gerace, O23954, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Peter Kirkbride Dilts, O23955, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Thomas Gleason, O23956, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Irving Stern, O23957, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Howard Ellis, O23958, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Benton Mowre, O23960, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Faye Roton, O23961, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Coles Barney, Jr., O23963, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edwin Boynton Buttery, O23966, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Linton Sinclair Boatwright, O23968, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Tuck Brown, O23969, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Willoughby Garrett, O23971, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Augustus Purdy, O23973, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Harold Gurnee, Jr., O23974, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Victor Woodrow Campana, O23975, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Carl McIntyre, O23976, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William John Dooley Vaughan, O23978, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Crawford Root, Jr., O23979, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard Mar Levy, Jr., O23980, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Wilson Sharkey, O23981, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Charles Kistel, O23984, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Walter Raleigh Mullane, O23987, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Ward Maxwell, O23988, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Edgar Pigue, O23990, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maynard George Moyer, O23991, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Richardson, O23993, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Courtenay O'Connell, O23994, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Nelson Paul Monson, O23996, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carroll Freemont Danforth, O23997, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas James Cleary, Jr., O23998, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Peer de Silva, O24000, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Niles Rising, Jr., O24002, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Daniel Fowler, O24003, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Llewellyn Flanders, Jr., O24006, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alexander Frank Muzyk, O24010, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Ellis Rossell, Jr., O24011, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel Salinas, O24012, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald Lyons Driscoll, O24018, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Richard Kemp, O24019, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ernest Franklin Poff, O24020, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Benjamin Alvord Spiller, O24023, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Mercer Presley Longino, O24024, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Joseph McGrane, Jr., O24027, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harwell Leon Adams, O24028, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leroy Pierce Collins, Jr., O24031, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Angelo Augustine Laudani, O24033, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Toombs Dixon, O24035, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Albert Samuel Dalby, O24036, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Truman Eugene Deyo, O24037, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Paul Forsyth, O24038, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Breed Deane, O24040, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Lawrence Feichtin, O24041, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stanton Claude Hutson, O24042, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Martin Andrew Shadday, O24043, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Earl Vincent Brown, O24044, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leslie Wilmer Bailey, O24045, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Rayford Sykes, O24046, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Henry Zott, Jr., O24048, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bradish Johnson Smith, O24049, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Stephen Kellogg Plume, Jr., O24054, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sam Hardy Barrow, O24055, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Reed Upton, O24063, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Wetherby Graham, O24064, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Theodore Bernarr Celmer, O24066, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Peter Schuyler Tanous, O24067, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Bernard Keagy, O24072, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Francis Joseph Myers, Jr., O24073, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clinton Earl Male, O24076, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Doyle Pratt, O24079, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earl K. Buchanan, O24080, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Wilson Callaway, O24081, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Lawrence Kaiser, O24085, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Hollenback Welles, O24086, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Thomas McDaniel, O24088, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Holroyd Linnell, O24089, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Roy George Hendrickson, O24093, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Benedict Zarembo, O24094, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Vincent D'Esposito, O24095, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clare Hibbs Armstrong, Jr., O24098, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard James O'Neill, O33536, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Theodore Knox White, O34102, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Gerard McBride, O33539, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sydney Fletcher Frazier, O33540, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Alfred Coulter, O33541, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert James Miller, O33542, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Fred F. Lash, O40574, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Wilson Williams, O45122, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald Eugene McArthur, O52892, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Raymond Donald Pearsall, O33548, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Berry Galbreaith, O33549, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Wood Audet, O52899, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Garrison Hopkins, Jr., O33551, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Matthew Rankin Collins, Jr., O33550, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Luther Griffin Jones, Jr., O40575, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Carlton Brown, O33556, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Roger Willard Spigelmoyer, O52903, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ambrose Claibourn Arthur, O52904, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frank Noel Ritter, O33558, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Leo Victor Thierie, O33561, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Wallace Peyton, Jr., O45136, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frederic Francis Ahlgren, O33566, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Copeland O'Byrne, O52910, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lewis Gillette Wetherell, O45147, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Harry Kendall Bagshaw, O24008, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Alexander Bell, O33577, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Archie Stanley Walker, O52915, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Glenn Smith Finley, Jr., O24117, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Philip Wendell Constance, O24118, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Erwin Drewes, O24122, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Collins Bagg, O24132, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Willard Guest, O24133, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harold Broudy, O24134, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Allan Gardner Pixton, O24137, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Ruane McGuire, O24138, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles McDonald Parkin, Jr., O24150, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Keith Philip Fabianich, O24151, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Alexis Michael Gagarine, O24153, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harland Glen Wood, O24154, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. John Carl Sparrow, O24155, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur McMurrough Murphy, O24156, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Heck, O24157, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albin Felix Irzyk, O24158, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard James Darnell, O24159, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lewis Warner Fogg 3d, O24160, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gordon Lowell Chambers Scott, O24161, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Peter Leon Urban, O24163, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Eldon Phelps, O24165, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Morris Cowan Stout, O24166, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Glen Carl Long, O24170, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alvin Ethelbert Cowan, O24171, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred Allan Pierce, Jr., O24172, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jeff William Boucher, O24173, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerald Elbert Gowell, O24174, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Miller Hustead 2d, O24175, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Zebulon LaFayette Strickland, Jr., O24176, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilburt James Irwin, O24179, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Arnold Martin, O24180, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas John Sharpe, O24181, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joe Vandiver Langston, O24182, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Reuben Eugene Wheelis, O24184, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Herbert Savage, O24186, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Rawlins Murrell Colquitt, Jr., O24189, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Edward Tennesson, Jr., O24190, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lloyd LeRoy Hanes, O24191, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jules Maurice DuParc, O24192, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Bernard Pohlman, Jr., O24193, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leon Francis Kosmacki, O24194, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Alexander Clayton, O24196, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Boyd Bullock, O24198, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John William Paxton, O24199, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Warren Earl Walters, O24200, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Rudolph Kermit Brunsvold, O24201, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James William Sutherland, Jr., O24202, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Arthur Benner, O24203, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Franklin LaHatte, O24206, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Kelly Thomson, O24207, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Donald Ward, O24208, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Ira Taylor, O24209, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Vaughn Beck, O24210, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Chester Henry Bigger, O24212, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Victor Sanden, O24213, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Lester Ballard, Jr., O24215, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Henry Janz, O24217, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Selden Holcombe, O24218, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Burt Lunney Mitchell, Jr., O24219, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Fredrick Cathrae, O24220, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Van Middleworth, O24226, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Penquite Mulcahy, O24227, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elmer Hugo Almquist, Jr., O24228, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Logan Schutz, O24229, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Owen Beall Knight, O24231, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Price Tucker, O24232, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wilson Freeman, O24234, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Neville Sloan, Jr., O24235, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Andrew Peach Rollins, Jr., O24237, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Gordon B. Cauble, O24239, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Wendell Gunn, O24241, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Elwood Kennedy, O24242, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William E. Feeman, O24243, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James William Haley, O24244, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Major Robert Charles Barthle, O24246, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Theodore McQuaide, O24247, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Burton Bryant Chandler, O24250, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Bernard Jennings, O24251, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Otho Eugene Holmes, O24252, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Loring Douglass, O24254, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leo Bond Jones, O24255, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maxwell Bryant Thurmond, O24256, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Byron Mark Kirkpatrick, O24257, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albro Lefils Parsons, Jr., O24259, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Samusson, Jr., O24260, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj William Barker Wootton, Jr., O24261, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Robertson Desobry, O24262, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hubert Walter Gillespie, Jr., O24264, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edmund Louis DuBois, O24265, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Albert Becker, O24267, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Frederick Ostner, O24271, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Blaine Wells, O24275, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Lindsay Disharoon, Jr., O34277, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Michener Wilson, O24280, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Taylor Newman, O24281, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Eugene Watson, Jr., O24283, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Dean Dunlop, O24284, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Gorrell Kearfott Miller, Jr., O24285, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Douglas Mitchell, O24286, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Warren Adcock, O24287, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Madison Atkins, O52916, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Paul Berger, O33579, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Dean Holle, O33580, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Cowles West, Jr., O45153, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Franklin Wright, Jr., O40580, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Francis Vogel, O33585, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Wesley Strunk, O40581, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Michael Holland, O45157, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hugh Everett Wandel, O45160, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick Vivian Harris, O33595, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph William Bergman, O45174, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Douglas Gardiner, O45175, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Lee Erickson, O33597, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carroll Brice Smith, O45178, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Norval Milner Locke, O33601, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Rolf Erling Mickelson, O45184, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Gordon John Hartzler, O33603, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Bennett Mechling, O24333, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Willard Roper, O32605, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Allen Webb, Jr., O40585, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin George Schuck, O33606, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Oscar Manasco, O33608, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Henry Horton, O33609, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leonard Frederick Olliver, O40586, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Tate Poffenberger, O45197, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Pauly Field, O45196, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Bright Jaccard, O45195, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jurgen George Pohly, O52934, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Warren Arthur Minton, O45199, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Morgan Alexander Brakonecke, O33616, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Brice James Martin, O33620, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Leo Donnell Van de Voort, O39071, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lester Robert Patrick, O45212, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maurice Jacob Halper, O39072, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Champlain Shaw, O33626, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S Army).

Maj. Charles Thomas Krampitz, O33630, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Eldon Woerner Schmid, O33627, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Layton Carlos Tyner, O33640, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Lewis Wells, O33641, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Edward Blount, O45217, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Dominick Klunder, O52947, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Robertson Ward, O33646, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Marion Karl Bandley, O45222, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Winant Sidle, O33651, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald Robert Redden, O33657, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Julius Lind, O45230, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Claude Darrell Barton, O33663, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Jack Wayne Duke, O33662, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Glenn Harris Gardner, O33665, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Peter Joseph Lacey, Jr., O33668, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Francis Austin, O45239, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army)

Maj. Neil Geiger Stewart, O33670, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. French Greig Lewis, O33676, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Albert Scott Madding, O33680, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Gaspard Wall, O33023, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Maxwell Conover, O33685, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore Henderson Andrews, O33688, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Presbury Patterson, O33687, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Worthy Millard Cunningham, O45258, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thompson McCrea Colkitt, O33690, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frederick Walter Coykendall, O33694, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ralph Leon Todd, O33696, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gordon Dare Gray, O40596, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alden Peverley Shipley, O33699, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ancher Emil Christensen, Jr., O45271, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Cleveland Hicks, Jr., O40598, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Julius Albert Sakas, O33709, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Eugene Walters, O33710, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Truman Holt Setliffe, O24350, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maurice Dowling Hiers, O33715, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Shannon Tabb, O33721, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Elmer Booth Lagerman, O52980, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Benjamin Reese Bierer, O33722, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Wise Riley, Jr., O33658, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Albert Mayse Nash, O33727, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frederic Emile Hansard, O45303, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Troy Edwin Whiting, O33729, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. J. T. Smyrl, O33732, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Dunwody Blackburn, O33734, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Menon Walker Whitsitt, O31384, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Claude Edwin Taylor, O45316, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Carlton Weyand, O33736, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Farr, O33737, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Jerome Anderson, O33741, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Robert Lewitz, O45325, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Thomas Prendergast, O45327, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Donald Prendergast O40599, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Theodore Schrader, O33747, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Leo Rush, O39076, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John James Carroll, O52996, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Kent Harris, O40600, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Hubert Cox, O33751, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stanley Arthur Warren, O45337, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard Eli Bozeman, O45339, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Edward Muir, Jr., O33754, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Thomas Joseph, O33756, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hugh Merton Wendle, O33764, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Hallowell Holcombe, O45349, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Worth Marlow Curtiss, O53005, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Paul Balkman, O33766, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Temple Quick, O53006, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Alexander Bailey, Jr., O40602, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Thomas Petersen, O33771, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Nelson Whitney Tobey, O33778, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Welsey Dalton Harris, O45371, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. LeRoy Charles Brown, O33782, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. David Penson, O33787, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John George Montgomery, O33788, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Forbes Antrim, O33793, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Willard Donald Richardson, O45380, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Pearce Youens, O40605, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elliott Taylor Katherman, O53023, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Denton Carl Rountree, O33797, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Donald Iseman, O33798, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Henry Dyson, O33799, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Earl Lerch Ditamore, O33800, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Kazmir Wojcik, O33802, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. LeRoy David Brummitt, O44087, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Joseph Gavin, O33807, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Thomas Caprino, O33808, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Glenn Edward Muggelberg, O33812, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Grover Marks, Jr., O45395, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Hollister Scott-Smith, Jr., O33817, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Allen Wilson, O33818, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jack Caldwell Knox, O45402, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Merwin Hinman, O33822, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Manford Ray Murphy, O45403, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Franklin Roberts, O33825, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Chris McCullough, O40611, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Joseph Parziale, O33829, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Edward Dougherty, O53037, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Carl William Kappel, O33833, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roy Alexander Kane, Jr., O34140, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Ragsdale Howton, O40613, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joshua LeRoy Holley, Jr., O40612, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Ellis LeRoy, O33835, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Parkhurst Cloud Hough, O33836, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clarence Edward Davis, Jr., O53041, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Alois Neibert, O45411, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Henry Stein, O33837, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Balis Dexter, O33838, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vincent White Rasper, O40615, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Otto Fischer, O45412, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Henry Brakebill, Jr., O33840, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William George Skinner, Jr., O53044, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stephen Louis Garay, O45416, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Woodrow Wilson Morse, O53048, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bob Eugene Edwards, O33844, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. John Wellington Campbell, O33151, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Warren Herbert Karstedt, O33849, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Arnold Mandigo Bloss, O45424, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stuart Arthur Mackenzie, O40618, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Kirk Hamilton, O45425, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Madison Tolliver, O33856, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Thomas Webster, O33858, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Charles Copenhaver Webb, O40620, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Matthias Frassrand, O40621, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Joseph Byrne, O45428, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Arsene Peter Bonifas, O45437, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Francis Philp, O53061, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Herbert Lundy Garris, O33872, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roderick Joseph MacEachen, O53064, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wythe Parks Brookes, O45447, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Cohee Blossom, Jr., O45451, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Albert Alexander Todd, O33878, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clark Richard McCauley, O40623, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Gregg Newhall Jennings, O45454, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gerald Wayne Davis, O33883, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert John Davis, O33886, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hoyt Edward White, O33889, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Maxey Silvey, O33887, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Theodore Kramers, O33890, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Bogner, O33892, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Kennedy Smith, Jr., O45463, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald George McNamara, O39085, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Melvin Martin Lawson, O45475, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Dan Ralph Davis, O40629, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alfred Franklin Moffitt, Jr., O40630, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wilbur John Lage, O33911, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lamar Asbury Welch, O24391, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Ernest Conine, O24393, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Jones Williams, O24394, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Edmund Hand, O24395, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Verle Douglas Miller, O24396, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Henry Stone, O24397, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Meyer Lipton, O24398, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt Col Lucien Fairfax Keller, O24399, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur James DeLuca, O24400, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Thomas Carlton Reddington, O24401, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Julian Maline, O24402, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Farwell Mitchell, O24405, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Norman Cameron, O24408, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gene Richard Welch, O24409, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Charles Liggett, O24410, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Dorsey Hulsey, O24411, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Clifford Healy, O24412, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hunter Marion Brumfield, O24413, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Irvin Marshall Rice, O24414, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Mace Gonseth, O24417, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt Col. George Marcel Cummins, O24418, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Claude Esmond Bailey, Jr., O24420, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Parsons Clark, Jr., O24423, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Waldorf Barnes, O24425, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Xavier Leary, O24427, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Almon Louis Hugins, Jr., O24428, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Tom Billie Strother, O24429, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Numsen Lucke, O24430, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Calvin Aldrich Heath, O24431, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Clark Storey, O24433, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Webster Hodges, O24437, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Corson Landrum Hilton, Jr., O24438, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Vincent Maixner, O24439, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Oliver Gordon, O24440, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Emery Ellis Bellonby, O24441, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Phillip Haines Baker, O24442, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Robert Tuck, O24444, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Abbott Lucey, O24446, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Carl Maldonado, O24447, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jay Byron Mowbray, O24450, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Leslie Bereuter, O24451, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl William Pitt, O24452, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Arthur Martin, O24453, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter John Rankin, O24455, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Leo Dooley, O24456, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Elliott Arthur, Jr., O24457, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wiley Freeman Shaver, Jr., O24459, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilbur Craig Boyce, Jr., O24460, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clarence Frank Sills, O24463, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Glen Ferguson, O24464, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Niels Marius Dahl, O24466, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel Francis Munster, O24467, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wayne Harold Lee, O24469, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Joshua Logan, O24470, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fredrick Kenneth Hughes, O24471, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leonard James Goodsell, O24472, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marshall Owen Becker, O24473, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Walter Erickson, O24474, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Michael Williamson, O24476, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Albert Olle, O24477, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Szabo, O24480, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Harrison Zimmerman, O24481, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Francis Dunn, O24482, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Willard Olcott Foster, Jr., O24483, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Nicholas Wellems, O24484, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert McDonald Shannon, Jr., O24486, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Easton Nelson, O24487, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vitaly Kovalevsky, O24488, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gordon Buford Patton, O24489, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Beal Kelly, O24490, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Franklin Milton Davis, Jr., O24491, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Eugene Burrell, O24492, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Louis Sweeney, Jr., O24494, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Leroy Miller, Jr., O24495, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Arthur Ford, O24497, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Maurice Johnson, O24498, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Alva Ogle, O24500, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clinton Fort Matthews, O24503, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Fairfield Carr, O24504, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Howard Schofield, O24505, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Thomas Larson, O24506, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Peden Croninger, O24507, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry John Muller, Jr., O24508, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George I. Forsythe, O24510, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Charles Forbes, O24511, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edmund Francis Driscoll, O24512, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Charles McInnis, Jr., O24516, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maynard Clayton Raney, O24517, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Arthur Hebbeler, O24518, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Elmer Simmons, O24521, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John William Jennings, Jr., O24522, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vincent Louis Ruwet, O24524, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Myron Thorne Johnston, O24525, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Louie Coleman, O24527, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Millman Morrill, O24528, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Paul Frederick Lawson, O24529, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hugh Porter Stubbs, Jr., O24530, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elmer Schmierer, O24531, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Ovid Hamilton, O24532, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maurice Clavelle Holden, O24534, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Thielens Peeples, O24537, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul V. Hannah, O24539, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Friedman, O24540, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jesse Melvin Charlton, Jr., O24543, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Morrison Allen, Jr., O24550, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Woodrow Cozad, O24552, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Herbert De Chow, O24553, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John McAdams, O24555, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George William Carter, O24556, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Furman Spencer, O24559, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Walter Sedr, O24561, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Palmer Boyer, Jr., O24563, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dayton Willis Eddy, O24565, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Gilliland Renfro, O24567, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Viron Edward Bird, O24568, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leo Martin Kane, O24569, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Kearns Muller, O24570, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Grover Holland, Jr., O24572, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jose Antonio Andino, O24575, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Koepcke, Jr., O24581, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Jack Helm Remele, O24585, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Elwood Kimball, O24586, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Edward McBride, O24587, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arden Wirth Dow, O24591, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herman Martin Volheim, O24593, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Walter Harvey, Jr., O24598, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Edward Hammer, O24599, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Victor Lee Cary, O24600, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clare Norton Lyke, O24601, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Allen William Rodeheffer, O24602, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas James Camp, Jr., O24603, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Raymond Graham, O24605, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stuart Campbell Williams, O24609, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Raymond Cross, O24610, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Rorbach Fisk, O24614, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ben Lamar Anderson, O24616, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Orwin Clark Talbott, O24617, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Woodburn Matheny, Jr., O24619, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Mayer Hamilton, O24621, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elbridge Lee Snapp, O24622, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leonard Charles Miller, O24623, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Killilae, O25017, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Richard Burkhart, O25018, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Joseph Richardson, O25019, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Curtis Jeffries, Jr., O25020, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dale Taylor Elliott, O25022, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Freese Kernan, O25023, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Herbert Brown, O25024, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Clement Moran, O25027, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Elmer Pershing Curtis, O25028, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Darrel Leon Syron, O25034, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerald Johnson, Jr., O25035, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Max Snyder, O25036, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Brittain Kreutzer, O25037, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Joseph Stillman, O25038, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Richard Hull Verheul, O25039, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Irving Heymont, O25040, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Orville Kenneth Knight, O25043, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Major Harold Vernon Mackey, O25046, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Rhodes Thompson, O25047, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clayton Arthur Bird, O25048, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jerry Marion Wimberley, O25049, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Blakely Todd, O25051, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Harry Mobley, O25053, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Dulaney Schutz, O25054, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Parker Osborne Stuart, O25055, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Pershing Traylor, O25060, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Joseph Daly, O25061, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Overton Golladay, O25062, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Reuben Wallis Mundy, O25063, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Will Gillespie Atwood, Jr., O25067, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Weamer Elder, O25068, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Harry Bowen, O25069, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Marshall Woods, O25071, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Leroy Ramsey, O25072, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Wilbur Best, Jr., O25074, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Benjamin Apthorp Gould Fuller, 2d, O25075, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Warren Edgar Nossaman, O25079, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roger Jerald Culhane, O25083, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leroy Cosby Land, O25084, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bradford Lee Smith, O25086, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl William Schaad, O25087, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Karl Heinrich Zornig, O25089, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Fred Poppenburg, O25090, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Bayard Sessoms, Jr., O25092, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert James Welsh, O25096, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Emil William Delu, O25097, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William John Durrenberger, O25099, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Latimer Whittle MacMillan, Jr., O25100, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Hall Woods, O25101, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gordon Francis Tyrrell, Jr., O25102, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Neil Grove, O25104, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Ellis Cox, O25105, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leroy Buckman Wilson, O25106, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Franklin Charlton, O25107, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Edward Reid, C25108, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William McKinley Shepard, O25110, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Norman Murchison Grusky Locksley, O25111, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Alfred Higgins, O25112, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roy Edgar Rayle, Jr., O25113, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Charles Hughes, O25114, Army of the United States (first lieutenant U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Stephen Rice, O25119, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Stuart Cumings, O25120, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Bernard Via, O25121, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles William Flynn, Jr., O25122, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lowell Reginald Eklund, O25123, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gaynor William Hathaway, O25124, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Wilson Starkey, O25126, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Moyer Delos Harris, O25129, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Philip Leber, O25130, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Philip Geise, O25131, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Lindsay Koob, Jr., O25132, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Earl Simons, O25136, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Chester Thomas Harvie, O25138, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Laverne Hoff, O25140, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Edwin Pinard, O25173, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Elmer Gould, O25174, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roland Leo Kolb, O25184, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cleveland Charles MacLane, Jr., O25185, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Henry Dale Weston, O25186, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Frederick Crecelius, O25187, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donn Royce Pepke, O25188, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Yates McCachern, O25190, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Edwin Allison Nichols, O25192, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Benedict Cullison, O25193, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Paul Burns, O25194, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Casper Wittmann, O25195, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Athel Bangert, O25202, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alexander Hume Lucas, Jr. O25204, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Lewis William Leeney, O25206, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Edward Doherty, O25212, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gordon Ames Moon 2d, O25214, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walton Orville Threadgill, O25215, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Joseph Ptak, O25216, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Clendenen Davis, O25218, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Condy, O25220, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles William Carr, O25222, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Leonard Anderson, O25223, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Edmondston Coffin, O25234, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gerald Michael Dailey, O25249, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Allen Carroll, O25250, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vernon Cline Irby, O25251, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lowell Edgar Thompson, O25252, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Simeon Moore, O25253, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Boyd Lee Branson, O25254, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George William McCaffrey, O25256, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clayton Charles Craig, O25262, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Melvin Armand Goers, O25265, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Bansley Falks, O25266, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Samuel Beatty, Jr., O25268, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Arthur Lorenzo West, Jr., O25269, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Clinton Taber, O25270, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Brent Vivian, O25272, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Ray Spurrier, O25273, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Arthur Nilsson, O25274, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Wyman Healy, O25275, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph William Albert Whitehorne 3d, O25277, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Potvin Barry, O25283, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Thomas Berry, O25284, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Hancock Hay, Jr., O25290, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Scott Pollard, Jr., O25291, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Andy Walter Pribnow, O25292, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fred Hilton Cantrell, O25295, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Willard Webster Morris, O25297, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earl Jay Holliman, O25298, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Lawrence Sullivan, Jr., O25299, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Wright MacFeeters, O25300, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Adelion Franck Hanson, O25301, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert H. Schulz, O25303, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Allen Wightman Sanders, Jr., O25305, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Barton Lamond, O25309, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ernest Thornton George, Jr., O25319, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Pierce Gillespie, O25320, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William FitzGerald Brand, Jr., O25323, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Paul Hamill, O25324, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jerome Bailey York, O25327, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert William Dalrymple, O25329, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Floyd Bayless Mitman, Jr., O25330, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Douglas Yelverton Ostrom, Jr., O25331, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Martin Fannon Sullivan, O25332, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stanley Michael Smolensky, O25333, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Duane Seaman Cason, O25334, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Floyd Lester Johnson, O25336, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Emerson Vandervort, Jr., O25337, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Bernard Ellis, O25338, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Haakon Lindjord, O25340, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Edmund Dwan 2d, O25354, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Joseph Gibbons, Jr., O25355, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Norton Hathaway, O25366, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Paul Alexander Simpson, O25368, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Jack St. Clair, O25369, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Nathaniel Acuff, Jr., O40637, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Guy O'Neil De Young, Jr., O33925, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maurice Jean Palizza, O33924, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jacob Lewis Riley, Jr., O53161, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Sidney Benson, O33954, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carleton Preer, Jr., O45567, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cecil Marcus Sanders, O33923, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Willis Grady, O33940, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cornelius Wesley Coghill, Jr., O33928, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Merrill Grover Hatch, O33918, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herman Roscoe Smith, Jr., O33922, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Frederick Kreager, O33919, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Henry Blakefield, O33927, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Alfred Feyereisen, O33939, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Joseph Lavin, O45613, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald White Glenn, O33931, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Howard Neill, O33930, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Edward Connor, Jr., O33933, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Lewis Culp, O45508, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Joseph Miller, O45642, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Jack Aloysius Boulger, O33935, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Beverly Norton Skardon, O33939, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Ainsworth Clark, Jr., O33937, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Garrett Leroy Hill, O33941, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Herbert Birdsong, Jr., O33945, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Elihue Ball, O33944, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ritchie Herbert Clarke, O35173, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Dwight David Bonham, O33949, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Terrill Barco, Jr., O33938, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dale Leon Vincent, O33948, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Lamar Sallee, O33951, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wilfred Francis Farrell, O33950, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Leonard Carlton Turner, O33952, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alfred Edwin Coffey, O53220, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Stephen Kelly, O45513, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Floyd Wayne Townsley, O33953, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Elwood Glassen, O33932, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Francis Hughes, Jr., O33956, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wilson Sifford, O33920, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Kent Shaffer, O40639, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Snedecor Maxwell, O53163, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arnold Edward Rice, O45730, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Edward Connor, O33960, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Core Covington, Jr., O53151, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Allison Morgan, Jr., O45520, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred DeMasse Clarke, Jr., O45673, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alvin Thorwald Netterblad, Jr., O33971, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William B. Askren, O45507, Army of the United States (first lieutenant U. S. Army).

Maj. Elmer Pearce Fleming, Jr., O33975, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jackson Evert Shirley, O33977, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jess Edward Newland, O45793, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Curtis Leland Hankins, O35190, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Evans Hoffmeister, O33942, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Victor Manson Wallace, O53124, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ross Franklin Powell, O33980, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Joe Seitz, O33979, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Van Scoten Lanterman, O33963, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Dozier Crosby, O33981, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Burg Dyer, O53095, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick James Bailey, Jr., O33982, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James William Cocke, O35168, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Milton Joel Mastalir, O33992, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John George Georgelas, O33978, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Glenn Pierce Elliott, O40658, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Louis Brown O33987, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Jones Pierce, O33989, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert John Faust, O40641, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Cropper Williams, O33974, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Spencer Penrose Edwards, Jr., O33990, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Joseph Gendron, O45776, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kary Cadmus Emerson, O33991, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Stanley Lancey, O33997, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Otto Reed, O53102, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Rudolph Corey, O34006, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lewis Clark Taynton, O34007, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Judson Bestor, O33972, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert William Bennett, O45675, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Warren Love, O34026, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Emitt Cleveland Witt, Jr., O34027, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sterling Kenwood Eisminger, O40651, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Leo Schreiber, O34043, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Brown Sewell, O45491, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Snow Griffin, O53096, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Lawrence Woodard, O34031, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Henry Hislop, O34034, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Gerald Sullivan, O39097, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Olinto Mark Barsanti, O34037, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Kenneth Chenault, O45678, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ashley Anthony Blinn, O35322, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George James Hell, Jr., O39109, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Marvin Smith, O34041, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Austin Triplett, Jr., O34030, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leo Joseph Nawn, O53200, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Patrick Downing, O33917, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Riley Chapman, O40711, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Hamman Smith, Jr., O34044, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Willard Elder, Jr., O34033, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marvin William Flora, O34083, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore Christopher Mataxis, O34035, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Rhinehart Washington, O34042, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Thomas Pitts, Jr., O34036, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Grant Ellsworth Jones, O40649, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Willis Davis, O34046, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William John Yamber, O40656, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Preston Baldwin Cannady, O34101, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Ovid Morgan, O34049, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Owen Jones, O34059, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Joseph Kron, O45822, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Joseph Lang, O40705, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Harold Harper, O40735, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Edgar Charles Wood, O34051, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sam Efnor, Jr., O34054, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Lafayette Mabry, Jr., O34047, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Pershing Muir, O39105, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herman Beverly Boyle, Jr., O34090, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vincent Charles Guerin, O34052, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Hamlet Cooper, O45975, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Francis Unger, O34056, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Rex Russel Sage, O34061, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Lee Farrar, O34053, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Archey Dean, O46007, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Asa Parker Gray, Jr., O34096, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Joseph Raffaeli, O53170, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Victor Bottomly, Jr., O34071, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Charles Ohl, O34078, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Elwood Murphy, O34080, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Herbert Anderson Smith, Jr., O34081, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Lowndes Davis, Jr., O34079, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Gale Peabody, O39098, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Hayward Hubbard, O34111, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dale Douglas Hogoboom, Jr., O34065, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Danield Thornton Chapman, O34086, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Levant Strong, O34068, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Edwin Webb, O34092, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ellis Earl Pickering, O53113, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Allen Loop, O45735, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Emmett McGraw, O39107, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earl Marine Carpenter, O34098, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Cole Jeffries, O34093, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Johnny Mac Rice, O34094, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Joseph Munch, O45546, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harley Lester Moore, Jr., O40729, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Linus Patrick Ward, O53191, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Lester Inman, O34102, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harold Ray Kent, O34103, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred Cary Allen, O34104, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Norvel Harold Barnhart, O34105, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Milton Jacob Weber, Jr., O53319, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lynnwood Murat Johnson, Jr., O35199, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Coleman Parker, O34123, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Worth Williams, O34107, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Hill Stewart 3d, O35205, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Madison Farnell, O34108, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Wilbur Chapman, O40704, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hugh Emert Howard, O45529, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Jack Girard, O34110, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ira Cornelius Redfern, Jr., O34109, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Don Davis, O45687, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Augustus Edwards, Jr., O34116, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Rafael Negron, O34115, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ronald William Van Orne, O40725, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter James Davies, O53328, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jay William Herrington, O34121, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Reinhold Carl Riede, O45810, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Charles Glover, O34122, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dantes Alto York, O45549, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Glenn Thomson Pillsbury, O34125, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Julian Caldwell Propst, O45943, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alexander Lawson Ransone, O34142, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Crosby Park Miller, O34151, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Whitaker Alexander, O34143, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Brilsford Pease Flint, Jr., O34146, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard George Ciccolella, O34117, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Charles Bryan, O34150, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Harold Pelter, O53216, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Blanding Jones, O34152, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Louis Rall, O40632, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Jones Davis, Jr., O34154, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Francis Hollingsworth, O34155, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John William Irving, O53276, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Nathan Anderson Roane, Jr., O34156, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Neal Charles Galloway, O34158, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Verde Weaver Bennett, O34157, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph William Long, O34180, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lee L. Stewart, O34184, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marvin Nagel Stanford, O35182, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Wallace Witcover, O45522, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Barton Pratt, O34185, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Phillip Howe, O45555, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert John Speaks, O34196, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Leverne Jenkins, O45935, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lewis Lee Treadwell, O53121, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earl McQuillis Cooper, O34191, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Coke Whitworth, Jr., O35231, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hilary Eugene DuVal, O53137, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Willis Jones Adams, O34197, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Wilson McGregor, O39096, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Glenn Walburn Zarger, O45568, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. James Owen Murphy, O34193, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Scott Saunders, O34205, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard LaVerne Cornutt, O45892, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Randolph Dudley, O45497, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roland Paul West, O34208, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Robert Bush, O53342, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Ellis Snetzer, O35458, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Miller Boggs, O34087, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Paul Ludwikosky, O34228, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Elliott Lang, O45626, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Sidney Andrew, Jr., O34235, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Emil Victor Benard Edmond, O34234, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ottis Mazel Plant, O40714, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Hermanson Courtney, O35196, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joy Kaufman Vallery, O34241, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Louis Schaf, Jr., O45860, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Freeman Harris, Jr., O34242, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Harland Walker, Jr., O34243, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Raymond Dunn, O34084, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Robert Borns, O34245, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dan Kistler Dukes, Jr., O34283, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Marvin Callahan, O34055, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Oxley Quirey, O39102, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Aubrey Parkerson Nathan, O34270, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Bowden Street, O34272, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Floyd Dewitt Gattis, O34269, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Russell Earl Whetstone, O53212, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Ray Lynch, Jr., O34268, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Scarborough Hughes, O34271, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Gordon Morris, O45665, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sammie Newell Homan, O34279, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bruce DesBrisay Jones, O34238, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Marvin Browning, O35220, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Stuart Terrell, Jr., O53118, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ned Royal Dickson, O34091, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leon Smith Lawrence, O34286, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edmund Louis Mueller, O34292, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Weldon Emanual Laiche, O34295, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Walter Heatwole, O35215, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herron Nichols Maples, O45920, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jack Lewis Smith, O33515, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Allen Thomas Smith, O34320, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Emro Joseph Quashnock, O34321, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hezekia Jacob Ross, Jr., O34112, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Edwin McDowell, O40674, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Scott Housman, O53308, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bruce Barton Jones, O34239, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Willis Howard Davis, O34325, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald Elmer Kjeldsen, O34326, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Austin Grinnell, O53260, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Morrell Ray Sexton, O34057, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Henry Frazier, Jr., O39094, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack LeRoy Marinelli, O34331, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Walter Green, O34332, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roger Allen Eicher, O40665, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Clinton Lindley, O45614, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leo Henry Schweiter, O34334, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Grant Chesley, O53265, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Alexander McWatters, O34336, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Delbert Leroy Bristol, O34340, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jerry French Dunn, O34342, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Theodore Leonard, O34124, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Mont Sandels Johnston, O53169, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Carl Roth, O39095, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert William Larson, O45964, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Norvell McVeigh Walker, O34375, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Christian Hansen, O34333, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Gifford Carson, O53255, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Graham Edward Schmidt, O34348, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Earl McBride, Jr., O34347, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Chester Biggs, O45688, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Donald Kight, O56904, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Gloyd Shettle, O40706, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roland Edward Denby, O34192, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William John Donnelly, Jr., O34359, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roy Ernest Creek, O39099, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Tobias Raphael Philbin, Jr., O34406, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Carroll Wayne Andresen, O34388, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Marvin Leo Lindmark, O34393, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Hiram Darwin, O33779, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Woodrow John Steichen, O34392, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Emmett Vollendorff, O34398, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stanley Wilbert White, O32250, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clifton Henry Chamberlain, Jr., O56907, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Paul DeCamara, O34399, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph John Prusaitis, O34402, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Thurmond Gordon, O34397, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Luther Seale Crawford, O34297, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Calvin Cross, O39092, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Terrance Charles Fitzgerald, O45700, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Woodrow Wild, O39142, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sidney Thomas Mixon, O34281, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Morris James Lucree, O33401, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Ralph Gates, O53457, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wesley Charles Franklin, O45565, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wayne Moser Winder, O34420, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Delmar Lewis Oaks, Jr., O34419, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Louis Regnault Fausset, O34421, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Woods Bengel, O34423, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Ira Fernandes, O53128, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Clement Burn, O34426, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Parlier Hinkley, O40675, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Lawrence Havel, O53180, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Eugene Porter, O34480, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Paul Alexander, Jr., O34481, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward LeRoy Nicely, O53251, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cecil Edward Roberts, O35232, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ellis Warner Williamson, O34484, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Melvin Cook, O34294, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest LeRoy Perry, O53324, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Patrick Sweeney, O34485, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army.)

Maj. Peter Louis DalPonte, O34486, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick Henry Gerfen, O53165, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Delaney McDowell, O35204, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Lynton Dalton, O34488, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Jackson Hawkins, Jr., O45759, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Gust Edwin Olson, O46079, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leonard Edwin Garrett, O35307, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joachin Joseph Speciale, O45946, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Joseph Edward McKinney, O39090, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Edwin Divine, O54423, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frederic Calvin Thompson, O35255, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cader Cothren Terrell, O34555, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vern Louis Joseph, O53375, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lysle Iver Abbott, O34559, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Hodo Boykin, O45838, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hubert Lester Nolan, O39111, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Winfred Clayton Naseiroad, O35259, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Guysbert Bogart Vroom, Jr., O46019, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William David Brodbeck, O34565, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Woodrow Wilson Marriott, O33486, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Britton Mayo, O46024, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Philip Hunter McCorkle, O45867, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Albert Harris, O53117, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Adelbert Dale Boggs, O34569, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Clark Rubottom, O35286, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Henry Langendorf, O45551, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marcus Lindley Parsons, O45699, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Jay Dee Vanderpool, O34570, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Alan Rogers, O34572, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Earl Lloyd Harper, O35272, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Tobias Burke, O34575, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Samuel Rocky Ross, O34278, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harold Frederick Via, O34635, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John William Chesley, Jr., O53264, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Howard Harvey Featherston, O34339, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Willard Adelbert Smith, O34637, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dean Warren Barnes, O40745, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Louis Leonard DeNoya, O53352, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Andrew Dee Pickard, O34639, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack G. Hines, O46117, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Bernie Jordan, O34644, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leo Clifford Cooksey, O34571, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Henry Deason, O35323, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Irving Ressegule, O53240, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George William Dickerson, O34189, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Miller Duncan, O34647, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Archie Tom Madsen, O45806, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Robert Lindner, O34650, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Floyd David Williams, O39139, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Levens Metcalf, Jr., O53179, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Worth Linn, O34653, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Reeves Howell, Jr., O46248, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Teir, O40701, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Roy Little, O53090, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Billy Harland Kerr, O34655, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Johnnie Clites Brink, O34658, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Newton, O40742, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Rhodes Kugler, O34663, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donn Warrington Yoder, O34664, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jean Lindley Wood, O34660, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harley Nelvell Miller, O53155, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Louis Cornelius DeGooyer, O45562, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earle Warren Aldrich, O34667, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Malone Hall, O40692, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Austin Joseph McDermott, Jr., O40754, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel Joseph Carney, O34672, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Martin Piper, O34674, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter John Angers, Jr., O34677, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald Leon Geer, O34675, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Robertson Kent, O34678, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jim Dan Keirsey, O34681, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cecil Caryl Helena, O53271, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Oscar Esko Davis, O39136, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Lawrence Keeth, O34637, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald William Bunte, O39122, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cecil Calvert Snoddy, Jr., O34690, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Art Harvey Davis, O34693, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Martin Flynn, O39133, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Joseph Waszak, O35415, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Arthur Hicks, Jr., O53246, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Burns Crayton, O34682, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Ralph Richmond, O46217, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph William Nelson, O34692, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clovis Dee Heard, O34680, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Fred Dennis Chesnut, O45795, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Nelson Harris, O40659, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Houck Spencer, O34719, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Donald McLanachan, O46037, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles William Spann, O34695, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marshall Hawthorne Armor, Jr., O45590, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army.

Capt. James John Cortez, O53277, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Lynn Balthis, O34706, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Raymond Holt Hitchcock, O34708, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Cooper, Swearingen, O34711, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Henry Jordan Fee, O34705, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Joseph Hoffman, O34709, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arndt Lewis Mueller, O34700, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Eugene DePuy, 034710, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Paul Arntz, 039126, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Newton Stewart, 034712, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Clayton Novin Gompf, 034716, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Gilchrist, 045818, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Edgar Hiatt, 034717, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Mair Muller, 034715, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Harold Gold, 034862, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Randolph Thomas, Jr., 045667, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles LaForrester Cudlipp, 035265, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Beverly Matthews, 034721, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel Chambers Bird, 035264, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Felton Hatcher Moore, 034724, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Walter Urban, 034722, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. John Joseph Morgan, 035260, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roy Michael Kessler, 034723, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hugh Anthony Richeson, 034725, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Philip Zeigler, 034726, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Boswell Ayres, 034732, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Leroy Gunn, 034734, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Howell Moore, 034735, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Alexander Murray, Jr., 034739, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Keith Merrill Schmedemann, 034742, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Clark Maling, 034745, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Foster Franklin Flegeal, 039118, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Key Walker, Jr., 034744, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Keith Angwin, 034741, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Joseph Vidlak, 046142, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Glenn Morris Harvey, 046210, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Welch Stone, Jr., 040712, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Franklin Herrington, 034756, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frank Brad Wilson, 035162, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stuart Manly Seaton, 034760, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Glenn Appel, 040700, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Francis Buerschinger, 046015, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Alexander Noseck, 045845, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Louis Packman, 034761, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ray Clinton Lewis, 053181, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Hayes, 053457, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Russell Meacham, 053374, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Winston Earl Wallace, 034766, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Francis Hart, Jr., 045792, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Blodgett Avery, 045706, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Harold Bingham, 034828, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert John Ryan, 040631, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Erling Jerome Foss, 039127, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ray Harry Hurst, 045720, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Cassin Langley, 040691, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Abb Chrietzberg, 034838, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gibson Reynolds Finley, 034837, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John William Oswalt, 046071, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wilfred Christian Becker, 034830, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederic Harold Palmblad, 034845, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Mahan Brooks, 053449, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joe Rex Golston, Jr., 040657, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lewis Edward Maness, 039135, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Webster Downer, 034854, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Elliott Moran, 039108, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Howard Elder, Jr., 053453, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Bowlby, 045718, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Alfred Robert Bauch, 034401, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Martin Edward Nolan, 053275, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Raymond Leroy Victor Pearson, 034869, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Albert Frierson Burgess, Jr., 035290, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack George Condon, 045812, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles John Rahaeuser, 034873, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald Eggleston Eastlake, Jr., 034870, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Gerald Hugh Shea, 034862, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Serlo Isenson, 034884, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Johnson Grimsley, 039119, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Rex Harry White, Jr., 045595, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marcus Lundy Powell, Jr., 034558, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Powell Alexander Fraser, 034880, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Mahlon Brown, 039120, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Beverly Money Read, 046120, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Burr Johnstone Randall, Jr., 035611, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Stanley Barrett, 034939, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Mark Joseph Gill, 045784, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Monroe Kemp, 039146, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Rodney Middleton Covert, 045998, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert William Franz, 053425, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Earl Holmes, 046227, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin I. Donley, 034887, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Louis Alfred Shuford, 045876, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Harold Craze, 053279, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Warren Cobb, 045651, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Sheldon Harley Wheeler, 034949, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Edward Parker, 034951, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel Elmer Westervelt, 045723, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Anderson McIntosh, Jr., 045816, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Hamilton Franklin, 035175, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Samuel Marion Burney, 034956, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Karl William Gustafson, 045560, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Stewart Stafford, 034556, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James William Lane, 053091, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Oliver Edward Orlest, 034573, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Lynn Nungesser, 053150, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elmer Joseph Neary, 034964, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Irvin Francis Carpenter, 039112, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Francis Sylvester Conaty, Jr., 034965, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dale Leroy Morgan, 045796, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Douglas Carter France, Jr., 034967, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Irvine Furman Beiser, Jr., 053122, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hudson Rupert Hurst, 053242, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Winston George Whall, 034970, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Luther Leonard Sexton, 045778, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Gordon Fowler, 053218, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Eberhart Griscti, 034066, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Magnus Leo Smith, 040698, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army.)

×Maj. John Harold Harden, 034977, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Douglas Haig Patterson, 034979, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Taylor Agee, 045709, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henri Frederik Frank, 046187, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Vinson Milano, 046052, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Andrew Fisher, 053311, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward John Kloos, 053291, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Louis Hanitch Johnson, 046097, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Nicholas Samuel Strider, 045589, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. D. L. Benton, Jr., 035022, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Irving Darris Warden, 053379, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Richard Couch, 053462, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Randall Harris Wise, 053315, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Mitchell Smith, Jr., 040724, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George James Holly, Jr., 046075, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Aley Leonard Smith, 035044, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Franklyn Jenkins, 053169, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Lee Burke, 035047, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Thomas Bernard, 045997, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stanley Peter Hidalgo, 035049, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Roger Carpenter, 053450, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Arch Van Sandt, 040763, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John James Mann, Jr., 040662, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Francis Pope, 040672, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Benjamin Silman, 035048 Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Louis Howard Mehaffe, 040761, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Elden Sharp, 035046, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Bryant Pridgen, 053197, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Henry Phipps, Jr., 039087, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Russell Norman Fairbanks, 040747, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edmund Castle, 035299, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Norman Lee Hall, 046208, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Claudius Miller Easley, Jr., 035056, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Kebbe Anderson, 035057, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Leo Henry Eberhardt, 053435, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Michael Puetz, 034654, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Erwin Montgomery Graham, Jr., 053182, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William McKinley Copley, Jr., 039114, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Joseph DeWight Kooken, 034743, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Lee Smith, 034746, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Herman Henderson, Jr., 045534, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Perry Michael, 040689, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Allen Ward, 034415, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Kent Miller, Jr., 053428, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Helmuth Otto Frosschle, 035070, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Lee Waters, 034720, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Walter Markey, 035143, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Harold Greeley, 035144, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Guy Humphrey Drewry, Jr., 035074, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Edwin Howell, 039149, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Lee Newell, 035145, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul LaVern McCrillis, 045769, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Stuart King, 035147, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bruce Merritt, 046290, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Edward Marfing, 034719, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Robert Franks, 053431, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hugo Wagner Heffelfinger, 046149, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Claude Hazen Purkitt, 035152, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Yancey Henry Knowles, 035153, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lawrence Roy Ligon, 035154, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Sampson Wiley, Jr., 045927, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Glenn Crane, 046186, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Philip George Walker, 046287, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Raymond LaVerne Latimer, 034833, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Granville Attaway Sharpe, 034966, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Henry Homburg, Jr., 035159, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Adams Smoak, 046267, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Samuel LaFayette Reid, 035160, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Beatty Meanor, Jr., 034981, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Cameron Johnson, 034950, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Louis Gundlach, 035163, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Dixon Tummons, 046124, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Emery Branigin, 053419, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Bill Gene Smith, O53387, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Bruce Smith, O46941, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Olaf Gunnir Miller, O53184, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Joseph Gildee, Jr., O35303, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ellsworth Cundiff, O34847, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Bautz, Jr., O34750, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Vernon Wilbur Morgan, O45837, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Antonio Villarreal Reyes, O35292, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Isaac Williams, O34960, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Arthur Dwight, O35305, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Charles Beaumont, O35059, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Claire Benjamin Penzkofer, O46282, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Lloyd Osgard, O35315, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Chadwick Blazzard, O35453, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Matthew Hart, O34665, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Siegfried Henry Spillner, O35300, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Ray Dingeman, O53468, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jerry M. Sage, O35326, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Nelson Crawford, O35353, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Washington Coss Carter, O35390, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Douglas Pemberton Frazier, O46344, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marvin Edward Williams, O35386, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Brown Thompson, O36635, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Donovan Ziler, O35412, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harley Willard Ladd, O53512, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Wilson Dean, Jr., O35420, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Thomas Knowles, O35418, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Harwell Barfield, O35425, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Walton Greer, O35426, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Russell Solomon Bieber, O35424, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Haskell Lee, O35428, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Sims, O35435, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Phillip Randall Smith, O35445, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Daniel Kennedy, Jr., O35444, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ben Wilson Perry, O35447, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Laurence William Jones, O45646, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clayton Albert Shaw, O35451, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gordon Wilbur Cook, O35454, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hugh Edward Quigley, O46420, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ned Ike Looney, O40776, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marshall Leigh Fallwell, O35463, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alan A. Sawyer, O35464, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Sabolyk, O35475, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Newton Jack Heuberger, O35476, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Lee Meggs, O35474, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Randolph Lacy Jones, O35477, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Percy Franklin Lisk, Jr., O53540, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cary Andrew Kennedy, Jr., O40779, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John McEachron Gaustad, O39164, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Herschel Henry Hutsinpiller, O35487, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hollis Dakin, O40780, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earl Gage Kline, O46466, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joyce Bailey James, O53547, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Stanley Feller Parr, O35524, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Samuel Fred Clarke, Jr., O46484, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Ottis Quimby, Jr., O35534, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hoyt Leslie Fulmer, Jr., O35535, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Carl Robert Rotz, O46505, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Roy Reed Van Dusen, Jr., O35538, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joffre Haig Boston, O35537, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earl Staten Browning, Jr., O35536, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Pickering Waters, Jr., O35543, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Joseph Cronin, O35545, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lester Earl Barlow, O35544, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Joseph McCabe, Jr., O39167, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Daniel McLaughlin, O46520, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard McGowan Lee, O35551, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Londy Bailey, O35552, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Samuel Herbert Roberts, O35553, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Malcolm Kullmar, O35555, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Winfield Scott Williams, O40789, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Herbert Solomon Lowe, O35561, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Leverne Doupe, O35562, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur James Thomas, O35564, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred Robert Ulrich, O35566, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Richard Kennedy, O46534, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Arthur Godding, O40790, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Paul Keleher, O35568, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert William McEvoy, O35570, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Woodson Barnett, Jr., O46540, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Robinson Sheffield, O35569, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Bartley Kitchens, Jr., O40791, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edgar Ray Jackson, Jr., O46542, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Owen Edward Woodruff, Jr., O36172, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Carroll Kendrick, O46545, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Hutchinson O'Connell, O35575, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Michael Edward Leeper, O46552, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Geyer Jones, O24576, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Knut Harold Raudstein, O53611, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Madison Ramsey, O53610, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Jack Jennings Wagstaff, O35585, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Vincient Roberts, O35584, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Peter Mahon, O40792, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert James MacDonald, O39172, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Dreiss, O35589, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hal LeRoy Schroeder, O25597, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Junior Newton Cox, O46561, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Henry Hoye, O46570, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Oren Clifford Wingfield, O39173, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Farlss Hardin, O35600, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Billie McKemie, O46573, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arnold Alvord Berglund, O35599, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Russell Cornwell Geist, Jr., O46585, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Joseph Gettings, Jr., O46600, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Martin Lloyd Raines, O35621, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Foster Barto Watson, O35665, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Sammet, Jr., O35624, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John DeHart Foulk, O35629, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Marshall Milford Motes, O46627, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Benjamin McDivitt, O53661, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jesse Ulin Overall 3d, O46630, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Walter Vail, O35647, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Alden Burke, O46646, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel Binkley Williams, O35669, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Eyre Redheffer, O35672, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bruce Elmer Holmgrain, O46656, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Charles Aycock, O46664, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Darrell Bowen, O46668, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Edwin Harris, O46675, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert John Daniels, O53682, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Franklin Bradley Simmons, Jr., O53683, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Basil Wilcox Henderson, O46671, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Don Carlos Faith, Jr., O46673, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Peter William Mirras, O53684, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Warren Kennedy Bennett, O35691, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marvin Minter Parr, O53681, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Sam Floyd Warren, O34289, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ed Vardo Hendren, Jr., O46682, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Michael Gussie, O35697, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Frederick Gay, O40804, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wilford Dennis Gower, O35699, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Swaim, O46685, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Samuel Chester McAdams, O39177, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Smith Coleman, O35710, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Earl Durham, O35709, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wesley Jarrell Simmons, O35713, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Chason Walker, O35719, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Febrey Arnold, O46714, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Harry Cowles, O35735, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Lockhart Horn, Jr., O53717, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Roger Barclay, O46727, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harris Whitton Hollis, O53724, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Emerson Ford, O35741, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wayland Jones, Jr., O35763, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Philip Fredric Dean, O35768, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Delard Goudreau, O46744, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Wallace Moore, O53733, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Morris Zimmerman, O53738, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Anthony Robbins, O35780, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Charles Crawford, O35784, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Marion Steele Bell, O35787, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Brooks Ogden Norman, O35793, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Daniel McNally, O35796, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Curtis Bone, O35792, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clarence Clark DeRaus, O35790, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elmer Gordon Owens, O39181, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wilburn Elihue Grant, O35789, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Elden Cornelius Campbell, O40817, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Lenier Anderson, O35797, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Carl Schrader, O40820, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Adolph Herman Phillips, O35583, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Thomas Killip, O40829, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Patrick McEvoy, O40774, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Emil Stielau, O35815, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Lee Waddell, Jr., O25371, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Joseph Dougherty, O35817, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Bayard Hansen, O35819, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bernard Augustine Dever, O40827, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lewis Minor Stewart, O46789, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elvin Vernon Vestal, O40828, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jerome William Schrader, O35821, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Freeman Beaver, O46800, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Cud Thomas Baird 3d, O46804, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert James Bigart, O35831, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Waldron John Winter, O35832, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Stephan Lekson, O35837, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edmond Ragland Urquhart, O40831, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Cook White, O46808, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Manford Milton Canary, O35841, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Wylie Ben Walters, O35840, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Forrest Boomer, O35846, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl William Kruger, O35845, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Lloyd George Smith, O38024, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Rathbone Mumma, O46819, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Zakel, Jr., O35849, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Andrew Seitzer, O46818, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jack Wilson Hemingway, O35854, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joel Phillip Holcomb, O46829, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clarence William Patten, O35859, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert James Bennett, O46832, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred George Steiner, O35860, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Durning Harlan, O35861, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Arthur Gleason, Jr., O35862, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Woodrow Reed, O35864, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward John Chrysler, O53809, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Donald Denchfield, O35886, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wallace Raymond Elliott, O40837, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Earl Holzbach, Jr., O46861, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard LaVerne Nispel, O53810, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Vincent Henry Ellis, O53814, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Kenneth Theodore Macek, O46866, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Jessie Ellison, O40846, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Oliver Herman Bruce, O46936, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Lewis Long, O46931, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Morrison Click, O39188, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Dale Reid, O35712, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jeremiah Bryant Monk, Jr., O46946, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alfred Herman Parthum, Jr., O35939, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Ardery Campbell, O25400, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kermit Reginald Mason, O46951, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Louie Neil Rodgers, O35941, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Tyron Earl Tisdale, O46953, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Jackson Allen, O46952, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Ocland Denham, O35948, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Radford Donald Hyde, O35949, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clifford Earl Roberts, O46969, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Brandon Brantwood Trussell, Jr., O39190, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Isaac Edward Whisnant, O46963, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Henry Hill, Jr., O39191, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edgar Robert Poole, O35959, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Alvah McKean, O35958, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Paul Tallon, Jr., O35965, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Norfleet Chavis, O39193, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Theodore Stanley Staiger, O53879, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Walton Fickessen, O35973, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Truett Cooper, O35983, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard John Titley, O35982, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bryan Cowan, O40850, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Vocqsal Doss Wood, Jr., O47003, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Walter MacIndoe, O25407, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Dods Beard, O47010, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Franklin Johnston, O35987, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Edward Milotta, O35989, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Davis Morgan, Jr., O47012, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Locke Lyons, O35997, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Don Rue Hickman, O35996, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Purcell Ludington, O47015, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Esler Whitmore, O35993, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Hugh Wear, O47014, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Marlin Watson Camp, O35999, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Truman Alexander Hopkins, O36057, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Laurence Sylvester Browne, O47086, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Braddock Babbs, O39203, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Eugene Adams, O39202, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Tomlinson Eichnor, O53927, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Franklin Davis Bush, O47101, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Peter Keiser, Jr., O36066, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William James Harris, O47105, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Ellsworth Dunlap, O40862, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Martin Wright, O53931, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Albert Broadus Dillard, Jr., O53930, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Morton Young, Jr., O47107, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Cecil Vogelsang, O36078, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lester DeWayne Royalty, O36081, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Washington Putnam, Jr., O39206, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vernon Trampe Loesing, O36090, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Hart Hottenroth, O24645, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Henry Hayes, O24646, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Preston Halsell, O24647, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sam Ellsworth Cumpston, O24650, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Edward Hesselbacher, Jr., O24651, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Paul Young, O24652, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Bryan Newman 3d, O24654, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Reiley Finney, O24655, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Irving Rock Obenchain, Jr., O24658, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Willard Vogel, O24661, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Winthrop Barnes, O24663, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Ward Watkin, Jr., O24664, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leon Joseph Hamerly, O24665, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Ambrose Martell, O24666, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Paul Kolsch, O24669, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel Arthur Raymond, O24670, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jerrold Duster Snow, O24671, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph John Schmidt, Jr., O24672, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eric Castlereigh Orme, O24673, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Robert Cerar, O24674, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alvin Dumond Wilder, Jr., O24676, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Philip George Krueger, O24677, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Tuttle Hamilton, Jr., O24678, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Miles Lowell Wachendorf, O24679, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Peyton Tabb, Jr., O24680, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Charles Roecker, Jr., O24681, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred Edgar Rosell, Jr., O24682, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Clement Mattina, O24683, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Mahlon Eugene Gates, O24685, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Louis Hennessy, O24690, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roger Alley Barnes, O24694, Army of the United States (first lieutenant U. S. Army).

Maj. Seymour Rubenstein, O24695, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edmond Harrison Leavey, Jr., O24698, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Eugene Voegeli, O24699, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Eugene Leland Weeks, O24700, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Preston Sheffey 3d, O24701, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Baker, O24704, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clyde Raymond Eisenschmidt, Jr., O24706, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wayne Leonard Bart, O24707, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Russell Peter Bonasso, O24714, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Matthew Rienzi, O24715, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Fred Shutrump 2d, O24718, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Rollin Thomas Steinmetz, Jr., O24720, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Russell Kraft, Jr., O24726, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Patrick Murphy, O24729, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Lawrence Lambert, O24731, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Garrard Foster, O24732, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Garth Stevens, O24735, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Davis Terry, O24739, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Walter Fritz, O24744, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Edward Corley, Jr., O24746, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army)

Maj. John Randle Watson, O24748, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Alfred Vivian, O24751, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Philip Henry Riedel, Jr., O24756, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dale Eldon Buchanan, O24759, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George R. Allin, Jr., O24760, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Lahm, O24761, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leonard John Pasciak, O24765, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Raybourn O'Neal, O24772, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Hilary Connolly, Jr., O24783, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Dean Short, O24789, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joel John Dilworth, O24790, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Rogers Seip, O24792, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edgar Allan Rickman, O24796, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Samuel Hubbard Hays, O24797, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Windsor Rice, O24800, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Horatio Clagett, Jr., O24803, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jesse Lee Lewis, O24809, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Severino Martinez, Jr., O24811, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Joseph Short, O24812, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert William Carpenter, Jr., O24816, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cecil Kenneth Charbonneau, Jr., O24817, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Dennis Sitterson, Jr., O24818, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Joseph Roberts, O24820, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Albert Nicholas Thompson, O24823, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Mark Howard Terrel, O24826, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Russell Deane, Jr., O24835, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Boone Bartholomees, O24839, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Harmeling, Jr., O24843, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roy Stanley Geiger, Jr., O24845, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Peter Iulucci, O24846, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Henry Ivey, O24849, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Harvey Tarver, O24851, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Philip Alfred Wyman, O24854, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Hilton Offley, Jr., O24871, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Marmaduke Grimshaw, O24872, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel William Koster, Jr., O24873, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Linwood Fogg Jordan, O24879, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Henry Crosson, Jr., O24880, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ulysses Grant Jones, Jr., O24882, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert Houston Townsend, O24890, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Willis Dale Crittenberger, Jr., O24893, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Haley Caruthers, Jr., O24896, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joe Dean Hennessee, O24897, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Edward Hunter, O24898, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Douglas Cunningham Murray, O24899, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Richard Pendergrast, O24905, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joel Beck Stephens, O24913, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Griffin Clapp, Jr., O24914, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert MacDougall Bringham, O24925, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Hall Marks, Jr., O24936, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Butner Clay, O24937, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Alfred Divers, O24945, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Peter Talbot Russell, O24947, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Fuller Davis, Jr., O24948, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Wolcott Ryder, Jr., O24951, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert Burnett Spilman, O24955, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel Edward Halpin, O24957, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry William Urrutia, O24966, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Ray Rogers, O24967, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Edgar Shedd 3d, O24971, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joe Virgil Morey, O24975, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Lawrence Eckert, O24976, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jesse Richard Miles, Jr., O24979, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donnelly Paul Bolton, O24982, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charlie Calhoun Coleman, O24987, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Simmons Timothy, O24992, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Edward Seifert, O24993, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Boyd Freeze Walker, O24998, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Joseph Alleo, O25000, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Doan Rehkopf, O25004, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert George Brugh, Jr., O25009, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Denis Crowley, Jr., O25016, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Walter Anderson, O25383, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Earl Parsons, Jr., O36095, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Neil Hickok, O36096, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Pedro Roxas Flor Cruz, O47122, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bruce Vincent Silvis, O36098, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Christian Beachler, O36099, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles William Schudt, O53939, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Andrew Meads, Jr., O36108, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Andrew Wiley, O47130, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ned Rowland Bethea, O47132, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Claude Arther Hays, O47134, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Augustine Kerley, O47139, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gerald William Homann, O25362, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Orville Theodore Lowe, O36111, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Marshall Whitenton, O36114, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Albert Guenthner, O47146, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Ignatius Ciraldo, O36117, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bruce Thomas Falls, O47145, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Barr Nixdorff, O40867, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald King Stevens, O36118, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Hughes Hard, O36120, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Pershing Bane, O36121, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Nathaniel Andrew Gage, Jr., O47155, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Blount Harding, Jr., O53966, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Louis Adams Wilson, O36129, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Leslie Crawley, Jr., O53963, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Bartley Cagle, Jr., O36131, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald Thomas Paul, O36142, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Felix Wilhm, O47170, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Lane Gude, O36138, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Simuel Henderson, O25412, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Reece Sedberry, Jr., O25415, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Russell Alexander Duke, O40873, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Artha Darby Williams, Jr., O40871, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Warren Harding Stutler, O36148, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Heacock McBride, O47172, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Richard Miller, O53967, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Jean Dennis, O36151, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Ivan King, O36153, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Wilbur Gilman, O25394, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Ralsey Stevens 3d, O39215, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Erwin Bailey Jones, O36168, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Leo Farrell, Jr., O36160, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Eschman Curran, Jr., O36163, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Max Adams Morris, O25379, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Verne Church, O36171, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Clifton Honea, Jr., O36175, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Clayton Butsch, O47199, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Woodrow Kegstad, O36176, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Andrew Guntharp, O36178, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Griffith Hays, Jr., O25390, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Leroy Harrison, O25373, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Andrew Spencer, O36076, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lloyd Lorenzo Leech, Jr., O35386, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Benjamin Thomas, O25411, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Carter Fuson, O36184, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Major William Evans-Smith, O53988, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Mitchell Hill, O36185, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Francis Ahern, O36187, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Henry Hamilton McKee, O36190, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles John Anderson, O25376, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Berrisford Harlan Walker, O36195, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hugh Forrest Richardson, O36193, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Carroll Fordyce, O53996, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Louis Paul Testa, O40877, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dow Seigel Grones, O47225, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Marion Seignious, O47226, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Theodore Lunger, O25388, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edmund Wendel, Jr., O36220, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick Eugene Williams, Jr., O36227, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. James Dewey Ramsey, O36228, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Derwood Cann, Jr., O36230, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eric Roland Mills, Jr., O47272, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Virgil Parker Foster, Jr., O36229, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Patrick Barry Ward, O36239, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Kenneth Reynolds, O39218, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Earle Pinckney, O47275, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kimball Russ Richmond, O47281, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hall Breaden McElree, O36252, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Salve Hugo Matheson, O36253, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dallas Andrew Pilliod, O36257, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Linwood Arthur Carleton, O36260, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Warren Newton Levick, O47292, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Leslie Field, Jr., O40890, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Kenneth Lawson Johnson, O36285, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alfred Vitold Weiss, O36287, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Clifford Neve, O40893, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Arthur Norman Whitley, O47359, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Edwin Mead, O36314, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Cyril Dorn, O36316, Army of the United States (first lieutenant), U. S. Army).

Maj. William Treloar Russell, O25410, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Edward Campbell, O47367, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army.)

Maj. Harold Paul Baker, O40895, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel Gregory Gust, O36330, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Louis Klingenhagen, O39223, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hugh Franklin Young, O36327, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clyde Hudgins Baden, Jr., O36333, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frank Joseph Nemethy, O36332, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Edmund Neidner, O47361, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard George Foelsch, O36337, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Niram LeRoy Sauls, O47366, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elton David Vaughan, O47395, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Charles Golladay, O40897, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Elwood Shiflet, O47394, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James William Gunn, O40896, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel Basile, O40900, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Stanley Kimmitt, O36343, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Benjamin Dowell Capshaw, Jr., O36345, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Jermiah O'Leary, O36344, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Bee McFadden, Jr., O54063, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Louis Gelling, O36353, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sumner Freedland, O47401, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Willard Young, O36350, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Marshall Bragg Garth, O36357, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Edward Cunningham, O36361, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Charles Young, O36362, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Attison Luttrell, O36363, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Petruzel, O36364, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Cleveland Armentrout, O47412, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edwin Harry Patterson, O54094, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Edward Condon, O36373, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Anthony McCloskey, O36372, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Molloy Clark Vaughn, Jr., O25393, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Morgan Agustus Whitfield, O36389, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Daniel Webber, Jr., O36393, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Calvin Pinson, O36408, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Edwin Temple, O47459, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Thomas Murphy, O36776, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert L. Duncan, O39230, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Eugene Napper, O36416, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Urban Schmidt, O36425, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Gayle Whitsitt McFadden, O54135, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Dan Anthony Mobley, O54145, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Rufus Eugene Hallmark, O47516, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Herald Bud Gallinger, O36481, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jack Pershing Brubaker, O36484, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Stephen Edward Cavanaugh, Jr., O36485, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Curtis Franklin, O47521, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Briggs Lathrop, O36402, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Oats A. Pynes, Jr., O36491, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Paul Leary Peterson, O36496, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army.)

Capt. Charles Irvan Olsen, O47541, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Albert McMahon, O54182, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Pickford Clarke, Jr., O36505, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wayne Elbert Ligon, O36510, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Kroner Ency, O36514, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Carl Crimson, O35320, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joe Hillsman Underwood, O36521, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marshall Prescott Kean, Jr., O40927, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Merrill Brizzard, O54027, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Darrell George Wood, O54196, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred Orr Jackson, O47577, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Cornelius John Shaffer, O47584, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William John Boehmer, O36550, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Leslie Davis Smith, O35042, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jerome Belsky, O40932, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Francis Rey, O47633, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jesse Lee Morrow, Jr., O36564, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John William Edwards, O54229, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Whitson Marr, O36567, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Raymond Restani, O36568, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Theodore William Peterson, O47644, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Howard Chapin, O47651, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Carlton Bender, O47706, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Oscar Ernest Schlamersdorf, O39248, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Eldridge Clair Dudley, O54260, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Alexander Pashley, Jr., O40942, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward O'Neal Logan, O36610, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Henry Herndon, O36636, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William John Regner, O25395, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Saunders Parkins, Jr., O47716, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Ross Bond, O36618, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Eliza Reafleng, O36620, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Spencer Webster, O36621, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Charles Finneran, O36643, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jasper Stuart Moore, O47770, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Ransom Olcott, O54292, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Beall Harvey, O47776, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Anthony Joseph DeAngelis, O39253, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hugh King Boyd, O36658, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Fredrick Robens, O36665, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ernest Lester Knoll, O54304, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Louis Scott Torgeson, O25421, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Laney Gordon, O36662, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carroll McFalls, Jr., O47800, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Michael Hudak, O47803, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Howell Mathias, O47844, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Frederick Monsarrat, O36698, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Eugene Gibb, O47853, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Council Braxton, O36703, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Howard Irvine, O36705, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawson William Magruder, Jr., O36711, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Richard Burdick, O36760, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Eldon Robert Davis, O36771, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vincent Anthony Abrignani, O40966, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Warren Johnson, O36315, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Randolph Mathews, Jr., O47934, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Adrain Raichlen, O54419, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph William Scanlan, O47971, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vincent Louis Corrado, O54417, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Alvin Clendenning Metcalfe, O36609, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur James Sutton, O36816, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Paul Biggio, Jr., O36821, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Edward Potts, O54461, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Hugh McGovern, O36851, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Herman Lamar West, O48031, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Austin Donald McQuinn, O48053, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Franklin Parkins, O36653, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Byrne Allen Evans, O36859, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Paul Bernard McCain, O48072, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Tetley Omenhiser, Jr., O54483, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Leon Baldwin, O36864, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Forrest Ithamar Rettgers, O36414, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Maurice Waldo Dunn, O40985, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jesse Garcia Uglade, O36354, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Ernest Milloy, O35289, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Oswald C. Smith, O54531, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Edward Pieklik, O38942, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Reiley Guthrie, O36240, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Edward Maertens, O48227, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Laddie L. Stahl, O36988, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Crawford Sheldon, O48236, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Grady Francis Lilly, O36990, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Edward O'Leary, O37002, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Kirk Singlaub, O37040, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Allen Knowlton, O25436, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. DeWitt Clinton Armstrong 3d, O25441, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Anthony Rebh, O25444, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Ambler Camm, O25448, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Douglas King Blue, O25453, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Roscoe Ellis, O25455, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John McClure, Jr., O25456, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Creel Marshall, O25467, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Johnson Talbott, O25468, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Darrie Hewitt Richards, O25458, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Emmanuel Saari, O25470, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Cecil George Young, Jr., O25472, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Love Starnes, Jr., O25475, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Guthrie Hillman, O25477, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Emmett Robinson Reynolds, O25489, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Stuart MacVeigh, O25496, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter William Hogrefe, O25518, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Foster Stephens, O25539, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Robert Nickel, O25553, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stewart Canfield Meyer, O25560, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Edward Andrepont, O25570, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lawrence Philip Bischoff, Jr., O25571, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Gray Wheelock 3d, O25572, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lowell Lyndon Wilkes, Jr., O25575, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. McGlachlin Hatch, O25578, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vasco John Fenili, O25579, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Merle Landry Carey, O25586, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Alfred Lukacs Toth, O25587, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Jacob Luther, Jr., O25597, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Eugene Wilbourn, O25606, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Robert Michael, O25609, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Edward Kelleher, O25611, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hugh Mease, Jr., O25614, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Alden Hine, Jr., O25617, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jesse Benjamin Hollis, Jr., O25651, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clarence Maude Davenport, Jr., O25656, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Norman David Greenberg, O25605, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Kamell Maertens, O25698, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Michael Flanagan, Jr., O26710, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Alvin Wirt, O25725, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Hamlin Schofield, Jr., O25754, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Daniel Moore, O25760, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Wilson Brown, O25769, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Hiram Pietsch, Jr., O25773, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elvy Benton Roberts, O25761, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Boone Seegers, O25789, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Everett Edward Lowry, Jr., O25799, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Henderson Farnsworth, O25800, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Arthur Mesereau, O25822, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Carlton Clyde Thornblom, O33750, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion:

To be first lieutenants

First Lt. Raimon William Lehman, O56586, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 2, 1948.

First Lt. John Paul Vann, O38485, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 2, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Anthony Ryan, O56587, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 3, 1948.

First Lt. Melvin Jordan Sowards, O39473, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 5, 1948.

First Lt. Walter Parks Blanton, O39474, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Neal Kennedy, O50425, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Herman Siegrist, O39475, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 5, 1948.

First Lt. Louis George Selig, Jr., O50427, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 6, 1948.

First Lt. Winfred Bullard Senior, O56588, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 6, 1948.

First Lt. John Hilary McAuliffe, O56594, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 7, 1948.

First Lt. Otto Paul Scharth, O41337, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 14, 1948.

First Lt. Gordon Sumner, Jr., O33469, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 26, 1948.

Second Lt. Charles Liston Gambill, O50435, United States Army, with rank from July 26, 1948.

Capt. Charles Raymond Smith, O50437, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 29, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Louis Pomerene, O50436, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 30, 1948.

First Lt. Richard Lee Moriarty, O50440, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from August 4, 1948.

First Lt. Richard Bruce Elliott, O50442, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from August 5, 1948.

First Lt. Loren Ralph Keefer, O38492, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from August 7, 1948.

First Lt. Victor David Green, O50445, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from August 11, 1948.

First Lt. Edward Bertram Ledford, O38496, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from August 13, 1948.

First Lt. William Joseph Farrell, O38488, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from August 14, 1948.

First Lt. Jefferson DeRosenroll Cappe, O50447, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from August 15, 1948.

First Lt. Ernest Mahlon Monroe, Jr., O38497, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army) with rank from August 15, 1948.

First Lt. Joseph Francis Gice, O56619, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from August 16, 1948.

First Lt. Raymond Godfrey Lehman, Jr., O56621, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from August 17, 1948.

First Lt. Donald Cary Schaffer, O38231, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from August 26, 1948.

Capt. Charles Lenton Stark, O50451, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from August 29, 1948.

First Lt. Clyde Othnell Clark, O56632, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from September 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Raymond Healey, O50456, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from September 6, 1948.

First Lt. John Frederick Bates, O56633, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from September 7, 1948.

First Lt. Mac Cyril Eversole, O36634, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from September 8, 1948.

First Lt. William Allin Herring, O41340, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from September 14, 1948.

First Lt. James Arthur Driscoll, O50467, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from September 14, 1948.

First Lt. Joseph Leon Strelecki, Jr., O50468, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from September 15, 1948.

Second Lt. Fernand Mitchell Achee, O50470, United States Army, with rank from September 17, 1948.

×First Lt. Robert Milton Prater, O38507, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from September 18, 1948.

First Lt. Randolph Goodwin, O56641, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from September 19, 1948.

Capt. Julius Hoesterey Braun, O50472, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from September 21, 1948.

First Lt. William Scott Smith, O36509, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from September 24, 1948.

First Lt. Walter Allen Jacobson, O50473, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from September 24, 1948.

×First Lt. Thomas Meredith Waitt, O50476, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from September 26, 1948.

First Lt. Don Smith Fletcher, O50476, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from September 26, 1948.

First Lt. Allen Driscoll Rooke, Jr., O38511, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from October 5, 1948.

First Lt. Hobart E. Dewey, O36479, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from October 20, 1948.

Capt. Chester Carlton Westfall, Jr., O50489, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from October 24, 1948.

First Lt. Charles Coolidge Ross, O56661, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from November 6, 1948.

First Lt. Matthew William Reiss, O36859, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from November 6, 1948.

First Lt. George Samuel Blankenbaker, O50494, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from November 8, 1948.

First Lt. George Robert Allen, Jr., O50495, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from November 9, 1948.

First Lt. George Catron Viney, O38516, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from November 10, 1948.

First Lt. Francis Joseph Quinn, O36664, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from November 16, 1948.

First Lt. Paul Mulford Wakeman, Jr., O50500, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from November 20, 1948.

First Lt. John David Zaficek Kinsey, O38517, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from November 27, 1948.

Second Lt. John Lynch Davis 3d, O39480, United States Army, with rank from November 27, 1948.

First Lt. Albert Henry Conyne, O50505, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from December 1, 1948.

Capt. Judson Frederick Miller, O38518, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from December 5, 1948.

First Lt. Olva Barland Butler, O50507, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from December 13, 1948.

First Lt. Gene Albert Roberts, O41349, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from December 15, 1948.

First Lt. Hampton Rowland, Jr., O38512, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from December 20, 1948.

First Lt. Thomas Laverne Stovall, O50512, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from December 21, 1948.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

First Lt. Thomas Ross Ostrom, O50576, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from July 7, 1948.

Second Lt. James Rock Walpole, O38579, Medical Service Corps, United States Army, with rank from August 3, 1948.

First Lt. George Raymond Krough, O38580, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from August 22, 1948.

First Lt. Ralph Edwin Craycraft, O38582, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from October 10, 1948.

First Lt. Conrad Stenset Braaten, O38581, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from October 16, 1948.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947:

To be lieutenant colonels, Army Nurse Corps, with rank from August 31, 1948

Maj. Dora Annie Noble, N25, Army Nurse Corps, United States Army.

Maj. Bernice Watson Chambers, N20, Army Nurse Corps, United States Army.

Maj. Frances Charlotte Henchey, N23, Army Nurse Corps, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Augusta Lee Short, N24, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (major, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elizabeth Beatrice Mahoney, N499, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (major, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alta Berninger, N504, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (major, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army).

To be majors, Army Nurse Corps, with rank from August 31, 1948

Capt. Marie Louise Pace, N66, Army Nurse Corps, United States Army.

Maj. Cora Elva Collison, N517, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alice Josephine Johnson, N518, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Blanche Hazel Eager, N38, Army Nurse Corps, United States Army.

Maj. Anne Katherine Pilegard, N520, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Theresa Anna Wilson, N521, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Alvine Louise Schmidt, N39, Army Nurse Corps, United States Army.

Maj. Josephine Helen Balestra, N522, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ella Vendeline Shorney, N523, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Welma Grace Wiehe, N525, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Myrtle C. Huhner, N42, Army Nurse Corps, United States Army.

To be first lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

First Lt. Catherine Nelda Cotsones, N1506, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from April 26, 1948.

First Lt. Amalia Rita Lazaro, N1519, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States, (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from July 1, 1948.

Second Lt. Patricia Anne Donaldson, N1709, Army Nurse Corps, United States Army, with rank from July 1, 1948.

First Lt. Rosemary Witt, N1520, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from July 1, 1948.

First Lt. Joan Martha Wissing, N1710, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from July 3, 1948.

First Lt. Ellen Marie McDonald, N1187, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from July 6, 1948.

First Lt. Marie Josephine Schmahl, N1521, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from July 13, 1948.

First Lt. Nancy Bolt Power, N1626, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from July 14, 1948.

First Lt. Gladys Irene Breault, N1522, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from July 16, 1948.

First Lt. Margaret Maria Kish, N1523, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from August 1, 1948.

To be majors, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, with rank from July 19, 1948

Capt. Elsie Kuraner, M10033, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Edna Lura, M10034, Assistant Chief of the Women's Medical Specialist Corps and Chief of the Physical Therapist Section (captain, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harriet Shannon Lee, M10001, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

Capt. Felie Woodrow Clark, M10002, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

Capt. Brunetta Avis Kuehlthau, M10019, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Eleanor Lois Mitchell, R10035, Assistant Chief of the Women's Medical Specialist Corps and Chief of the Dietitian Section (captain, Dietitian Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hilda Muse Lovett, R10061, Dietitian Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

Capt. Neil Wickliffe, R10036, Dietitian Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

Capt. Grace Smith, R10001, Dietitian Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

Capt. Helen Alice Dautrich, R10002, Dietitian Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

Capt. Ethel May Theilmann, M10055, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

Capt. Myrtle Aldrich, R10003, Dietitian Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

Capt. Agnes Patterson Snyder, M10003, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

Capt. Helen Morris Davis, R10004, Dietitian Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

To be major, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, with rank from November 10, 1948

Capt. Miriam Esther Perry, R10005, Dietitian Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

To be first lieutenants, Women's Medical Specialist Corps

First Lt. Harriet Louise Wood, M10066, Physical Therapy Aide, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from July 2, 1948.

First Lt. Betty Ann Harlan, M10016, Physical Therapy Aide, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from July 10, 1948.

First Lt. Frances Jane Johnson, M10031, Physical Therapy Aide, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from July 10, 1948.

First Lt. Margaret Eileen Mahoney, M10017, Physical Therapy Aide, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from August 9, 1948.

Second Lt. Barbara E. Bangs, J20, Occupational Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army, with rank from August 27, 1948.

First Lt. Edith Allene Hill, R10057, Dietitian, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Dietitian Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army), with rank from September 1, 1948.

Second Lt. Mildred V. Bond, J21, Occupational Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army, with rank from September 27, 1948.

Second Lt. Ellen M. Lund, J2, Occupational Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army, with rank from October 15, 1948.

First Lt. Rosamond Ella Hughes, R10029, Dietitian, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Dietitian Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from October 31, 1948.

First Lt. Mary Ann Perta, M10048, Physical Therapy Aide, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army), with rank from November 1, 1948.

First Lt. Dorothy Edith Fisher, R10058, Dietitian, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Dietitian Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from November 6, 1948.

FOOTNOTE.—All of the above-named officers were promoted during the recess of the Senate.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate January 17, 1949:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Hon. Carl A. Hatch, of New Mexico, to be United States district judge for the district of New Mexico.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 17, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Jacob S. Payton, D. D., of Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, we acknowledge with gratitude Thy innumerable mercies. Here on the threshold of another week we would dedicate ourselves only to such objectives as have Thy approval. Illumine the minds of these Thy servants that they may oppose real rather than fictitious evils. May the moral obligations that unite them have priority over all prejudices that may seek to divide them. So this day may those who labor within these walls, strive to make America strong through the might that comes through justice, and durable through

Thy truth that cannot be shaken. This we pray in the name of Jesus Christ our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 13, 1949, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill and joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 103. An act to increase rates of compensation of the President, Vice President, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and

S. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution making January 20 and 21, 1949, holidays for Federal employees and employees of the District of Columbia in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 26):

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committees of Congress:

Joint Committee on Printing: Mr. Hayden, of Arizona; Mr. Hunt, of Wyoming; Mr. Jenner, of Indiana.

Joint Committee of Congress on the Library: Mr. Hayden, of Arizona; Mr. Green, of Rhode Island; Mr. Long, of Louisiana; Mr. Ives, of New York; Mr. Lodge, of Massachusetts.

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN JAMES

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, today marks the anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin, one of the greatest men that ever lived. We, in Pennsylvania, delight to do him honor. As a Governor of our great Commonwealth, and a signer of the Declaration of Independence, and as a member of the Constitutional Convention, we are proud of this great man who did so much for America and for all the world.

Mr. Speaker, we are honored today in that we have in our Pennsylvania Republican delegation the man who has succeeded him as president of the Franklin Printing Co., the Honorable BENJAMIN FRANKLIN JAMES, of Pennsylvania.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

ONE-MINUTE SPEECHES

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make an announcement.

It has been the policy for some years now that when there is a legislative program for the day the so-called 1-minute speeches that contain more than 300 words will be put in the RECORD after the business of the day or in the Appendix of the RECORD. The Chair trusts that Members will regard this agreement that we have had for quite a while.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BURDICK addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH and Mr. HÉBERT asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two particulars and include in each an editorial.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include certain excerpts.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include a speech by the Secretary of Labor, Hon. Maurice Tobin.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one an editorial that appeared in yesterday's Sunday Post and in the other a radio address he delivered over Station WMEX.

WASHINGTON HOTEL RATES

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, an article appearing in the Evening Star of Friday, the 14th, states that while certain hotels in Washington have increased their rates to double or more for the period of the inauguration that at least three in the strategic downtown area have not increased their rates at all. These are the Mayflower, the Carlton, and the Occidental—there may be others. The managers of these fine hotels are to be commended for their spirit of fairness and hospitality.

I am sorry to note that some of the hotels have refused to reveal their rates to newspaper reporters. All the Washington hotels should fully disclose to the public through the press what their rates are for the period of the inauguration. And if they feel such rates are justified they should state their reasons.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include some extraneous material.

IMMIGRATION FROM ITALY

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, today I have reintroduced a bill similar to one which I introduced during the Eightieth Congress. This bill provides that the annual immigration quotas for Italy for the fiscal years 1950 and 1951 shall be increased by an amount equal to the unused Italian quotas for the past 10 years. If this bill becomes law, the number of Italians who would be admitted to this country during the next 2 years would be 36,709.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has sought to help Italy to recover from the ravages and devastation of war. The United States has, since the end of the war, spent upwards of $2,000,000,000 to rehabilitate Italy.

We know that the course of events in Italy has a sharp and significant impact upon the economy and national security of the United States and upon the peace of the world. We know that had the Communists obtained power in the Italian elections on April 18, 1948, western Europe would probably have fallen under the Communist boot and we should have had to convert our Nation into an armed camp.

Mr. Speaker, the Marshall plan, while necessary to the recovery of Italy, does not deal with Italy's major problem which is overpopulation. The optimum population for Italy is approximately 38,000,000 people. Yet today, Italy has a population of between forty-six and forty-seven million and her population is increasing at the rate of some 450,000 a year. Approximately 200,000 additional workers are made available each year.

The problem of overpopulation in Italy is one with which Premier De Gasperi and his government cannot deal with unassisted.

I wrote to the President last August urging him to take the position that Italy's pre-Fascist colonies should be returned to her. These territories could absorb at least a few of Italy's surplus people. In that same letter I urged the President to instruct his representatives to the United Nations to present Italy's demographic problem to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations in order that that body, as well as the

International Labor Organization, should help toward its solution.

The passage of this bill is, in my opinion, the very least we can do to help Italy in her time of trial.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HINSHAW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mr. John Baer.

Mr. D'EWART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include two editorials.

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Buffalo Evening News of Wednesday, January 12, 1949, in relation to the President's budget message to the Congress.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, following the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

THE LATE HONORABLE EDWARD L. O'NEILL

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ADDONIZIO]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is with genuine sorrow that I inform the House of the death of a former Member of Congress from New Jersey, Edward L. O'Neill, of Newark, on Sunday, December 12 last. Mr. O'Neill died several hours after suffering a heart attack at his home. He was 45 years old.

Mr. O'Neill, a Democrat, represented the Eleventh District of New Jersey from 1936 to 1938, and earned a reputation as a hard-working and conscientious Member. He was named to five House committees, more than any other first-term Member, eventually serving on the Committees on Appropriations, Ways and Means, Rules, Foreign Affairs, and Veterans' Affairs. He was a member of the Democratic National Committee from 1940 to 1944.

Mr. O'Neill's death was the result of a long illness. He was a victim of a rare form of cancer. He was a man of great courage and his fellow Members will long remember his cheerful and courageous attitude during his long illness. He was a man of great ability and his death is a great loss to his State and to the Nation.

Mr. O'Neill was a man of great ability and his death is a great loss to his State and to the Nation. He was a man of great ability and his death is a great loss to his State and to the Nation. He was a man of great ability and his death is a great loss to his State and to the Nation. He

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks and include an article entitled "Political Medicine."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WOODRUFF addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

APPOINTMENT OF HON. FRANK PACE, JR.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the appointment by President Truman of Mr. Frank Pace, Jr., of Little Rock, Ark., is most commendable. That appointment deserves the plaudits of the American people. Here is a man who came from the bottom to the very top rung of the ladder, by virtue of his tireless energy, ability, and devotion to duty. The President recognized the fine qualities with which he is endued. Arkansas is proud of her native son, Frank Pace, Jr., who joins other Arkansans who occupy high positions of trust and responsibility.

I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, and to include an article by Sam Stavisky entitled "Pace Appointment to Budget Bureau Post Fulfills Predictions of Many About Him."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of January 8, 1949]

PEOPLE IN THE NEWS

(By Sam Stavisky)

PACE APPOINTMENT TO BUDGET BUREAU POST FULFILLS PREDICTIONS OF MANY ABOUT HIM

The fast pace and friendly face of Frank Pace, Jr., new Director of the Budget Bureau, yesterday carried the 36-year-old Ozarks boy high up on the ladder of Government service—onto a rung near the very top. The lank, limber Arkansan has been marked as a "bright young man" ever since he came to Washington during the war while serving with the Air Transport Command. Folk who met the personable attorney told one another that there was a young man definitely going places. President Truman yesterday made the collective prediction come true.

Back home in Little Rock, big things were long ago prophesied for the 6-foot son of Frank Pace, Sr., prominent Arkansas attorney, one-time law partner of the famed Governor and Senator, Jeff Davis.

The rugged son of mountain pioneers finished high school at 14, polished up at a prep, whizzed through Princeton, strolled through Harvard Law, and came home with his degrees in '36. During the next 6 years Frank served a sort of apprenticeship—in the district attorney's office, in the State revenue department, and in private practice with his dad. The junior Pace spent 4 years in uniform, returning to civilian life in '46 as a major.

Caught Hannegan's eye

Frank went to work with the United States Attorney General's Office as a special assistant, but not for long. His vivacious personality, genial chuckle, and real ability had caught the eye of Postmaster General Frank Hannegan, who appointed the "Arkansawyer" as his executive assistant.

Two years later—January of 1948—Pace stepped up a pace as Assistant Director of the Budget under Jim Webb, another young blood. In the 12 succeeding months, Frank Pace gave up to a large extent two of his great affections, people and golf.

It's been said that Pace, the younger, knows every person in Washington claiming Arkansas as his home or birthplace. He likes people and people like him. He makes friends easily, often influential friends, like Secretary of Treasury John Snyder, Presidential assistant John Steelman, Presidential confidant Les Biffle, to name a few who happen to be from the Ozark country.

As to golf, Pace was a pacesetter who could make 18 holes in the low seventies. The past 2 years in a row he captured the National Press Club crown. He was awarded an Oscar last year for his low score in the national celebrities' golf tournament, sponsored by the Washington Post.

Burned midnight candle

Frank Pace never did lose that easy-breaking smile of his, but he did virtually give up making new friends and influencing new golf balls in his last year with the Budget Bureau. The Arkansas lawyer burned the candle many a night mastering the million and one details that go in preparing the proposed spending of Uncle Sam's billions.

At Princeton, Frank was kind of puny—he stretched out to 6 foot—later. He liked sports, but failed to make a first team. He loved a blonde Pennsylvania beauty named Peggy Jane. He made first team with her. Today they live in a brick house at 5126 Albemarle Street NW., with two young daughters, one flaxen haired like her mother, one dark haired like her father.

Three weeks ago, while working late into the night on the budget the President will send to Congress Monday, Frank felt a sharp pain in his abdomen. He went home feeling bad. By morning he felt worse. He was rushed to the hospital and underwent an emergency operation for acute appendicitis.

So now Pace has to slow up his pace for a while. Looks like he'll have to go back to the 8-hour day.

AMENDMENT TO RULES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a resolution which I am introducing today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, America has never been in more danger from within than she is today.

In my opinion, the House of Representatives made a terrible blunder the other day when it virtually abolished the Rules Committee.

If there ever was a time when we needed that committee functioning as a real Rules Committee, as it was set up by some of the wisest men who ever served in Congress, that time is now.

In order to protect the House, and the country, from a barrage of unwholesome, unnecessary, unreasonable, and unstable legislation, at a time when every effort is being made by the enemies within our gates to take advantage of the opportunity to undermine and destroy this country and to discredit it abroad, we need to keep the Rules Committee intact, and not try to weaken or destroy it.

In order to correct the terrible mistake the House made the other day in adopting a rule that virtually abolished the Rules Committee, I am introducing a resolution to correct that mistake by amending the rules of the House to conform with the rules of the Eightieth Congress in order that we may avoid the disasters which might result if this mistake is not corrected at once.

The resolution referred to follows:

Resolution to amend paragraph (2) (c) of rule XI of the Rules of the House (relating to the Committee on Rules) to read as it read during the Eightieth Congress

Resolved, etc., That paragraph (2) (c) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) The Committee on Rules shall present to the House reports concerning rules, joint rules, and order of business, within three legislative days of the time when ordered reported by the committee. If such rule or order is not considered immediately, it shall be referred to the calendar and, if not called up by the Member making the report within seven legislative days thereafter, any member of the Rules Committee may call it up as a question of privilege and the Speaker shall recognize any member of the Rules Committee seeking recognition for that purpose. If the Committee on Rules shall make an adverse report on any resolution pending before the committee, providing for an order of business for the consideration by the House of any public bill or joint resolution, on days when it shall be in order to call up motions to discharge committees it shall be in order for any Member of the House to call up for consideration by the House any such adverse report, and it shall be in order to move the adoption by the House of said resolution adversely reported notwithstanding the adverse report of the Committee on Rules, and the Speaker shall recognize the Member seeking recognition for that purpose as a question of the highest privilege."

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that the Republican conference has unanimously appointed LES ARENDS as Republican whip.

EXEMPTION OF ADMISSION TICKETS FOR CERTAIN INAUGURAL EVENTS FROM THE ADMISSIONS TAX

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 85 to exempt from the tax on admissions amounts paid for admission tickets sold by authority of the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1949.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. REED of New York. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the resolution (H. J. Res. 85) to exempt from the tax on admissions amounts paid for admission tickets sold by authority of the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1949.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That all amounts paid (whether paid on, before, or after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution) for admission tickets sold by authority of the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1949 shall be exempt from the tax on admissions imposed by section 1700 of the Internal Revenue Code, all the net proceeds from the sale of such tickets to be donated by such committee to charity.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this resolution is to exempt from taxation under section 1700 of the Internal Revenue Code only those tickets sold by authority of the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect on January 20. It is understood that the exemption will only apply to tickets sold to the grandstand to view the inaugural parade, to the inaugural ball, and to the gala concert.

Precedent for this action is the legislation enacted for the inauguration in 1941 as the result of the election of 1940. Similar legislation was enacted as the result of the inauguration in 1933 for the 1932 election, and in 1937 for the 1936 election, and in 1941 for the 1940 election. It was not done in 1945, because of the war, when the inauguration ceremony took place at the White House. There was no exemption at that time because there were no such tickets issued or sold.

It is definitely understood that no one is to profit by this legislation. If there is any profit whatever after expenses incurred by the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies, then that will go to charity. In view of the precedent for such action in every inauguration except 1945, I am surprised that there is objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. Who makes the decision as to which charity the net profit, if any, goes?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Why, the same authority that has made such determinations in the past, as I understand it, the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. It is understood that any surplus above expenses goes to charity and is paid over to the Community Chest which, as you know, includes the Boy Scouts, the Girl Scouts, and various organizations covered under the Community Chest in the city of Washington.

Mr. DOUGHTON. A lot of these tickets have been sold, but the taxes have not been collected, in the expectation of the enactment of legislation following the precedent of similar action taken for every inauguration since 1933. No one will make any profit out of this. It is appropriate that this legislation be enacted.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Is it the purpose, if this legislation goes through, to cut the price of the tickets to the people who buy them by the amount of the tax, or to collect the full amount and give it all to the community fund here in Washington?

Mr. DOUGHTON. The tax will just not be collected.

Mr. VORYS. Part of it has been collected; is not that true?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. The tickets that have been sold have been sold without the collection of the tax. None of the money from this will inure to the benefit of any individual. May I say further that the members of the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies will themselves have to buy and pay for their own tickets.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. May I ask the gentleman from Tennessee if it is not true that the only way they could get this tax now would be to pay it out of the money that has been received for the tickets? It would be impossible to go back to the ticket purchasers and tax them for it, because who knows who has the tickets?

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is absolutely correct. If you do not pass this resolution, it simply means that an amount of money will have to be taken out of this expense fund, any balance of which goes to charity, to pay for the taxes on the tickets already sold.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the chairman is quite correct that in connection with former inaugurations, from 1933 down to the present time, resolutions identical to this one have been passed with reference to these excise taxes. Of course, during Republican administrations there were no such taxes to be collected. In the first place, taxes had been reduced each year during Republican administrations until less than 2 percent of the people were paying income taxes alone, to say nothing about nonexistent excise taxes. But here we come along with this House Joint Resolution 85, which clearly states its purpose. The statements that have been made with reference to it have been accurate.

Conditions have changed throughout the country since Presidents prior to 1933 were inaugurated. Television was not in operation then. Television now is in operation all over the United States. The result will probably be that the people back home may want to collect money for charity, but admissions will be taxed and not go to charity. They will go to these television shows and it will be a commercial matter, and the home folk will have to pay these taxes.

When this resolution was first brought up here today I objected and asked for a "second" in order to get time for some discussion of this matter. Personally, I do not want to be small about this proposal. I have voted against every kind of tax I possibly could, for the benefit of the people back home, both excise taxes and income taxes. This is a small matter, but what happens? Every time you bring in legislation to pour two or three billion dollars into some rat hole or some boondoggling project, everybody votes for it and thinks nothing of it.

So as I say, I do not want to be small about it, but we were not faced with this situation during our administrations. I wonder what the people back home, the people who collect and administer funds for crippled children, and other people who are raising money for charity by selling tickets for benefits which are taxed—I wonder what they are going to say in the face of the high taxes that now exist when they see this Congress relieving people from admission taxes who are able to travel all the way to Washington to fill inaugural grandstands to see an imperial parade.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, we have before us a question involving the waiving of the admission taxes on the entertainment in connection with the inauguration.

May I say, at the outset, that President Harry S. Truman is the President for all the people of the United States, and as such he is entitled to an inauguration in keeping with the best American traditions. He is the winner in the eyes of all the people. However, neither President Truman nor partisan politics is an issue in this tax matter before us today.

The issue is, Shall the individuals, many of whom are of wealth and political influence, who buy the tickets for the inaugural parade, the inaugural gala, and the inaugural ball pay the same admission tax as everyone else back home pays for their entertainment? It should not involve the Inaugural Committee. The purchasers of the tickets should pay these taxes.

Equality before the law is not just a slogan, it is one of the things that makes up America. If the people back home go to a theater and see a newsreel of these inaugural festivities they will have to pay the regular admission tax. We should keep in mind that movies are the poor peoples' entertainment.

Every 4-H Club fair in America, even though they operate basically for educational purposes, has to deal with this tax. Charitable organizations selling tickets of admission must collect and pay this tax, even though their proceeds go to the most worthy causes.

It is contended that this tax on the inaugural entertainments ought to be waived because the net proceeds will go

to some charity. That is not the rule with respect to any other activity or any other community. Admission taxes have to be paid by all other groups, even if there are no net proceeds or in the case where all of their proceeds are given to charity.

This admission tax is high. It is part of our wartime tax system that has not been taken off the people throughout the country. Families who must live on a small income seldom make a long-distance call or send a telegram unless it is absolutely necessary, yet, when they do, they must pay the Federal Treasury a high wartime tax of 25 percent.

The women of America must still pay these high wartime excise taxes on cosmetics and many of the articles they buy in the drug store for the care of their children. There is still a tax on handbags and countless other articles. These taxes are burdensome to the consumer and are exceedingly burdensome to the small businessman involved. The barber and the beautician must still pay an excise tax on the cosmetics they use on their customers. This is a tax on the tools of their trade.

Mr. Speaker, time will not permit me to enumerate all of the burdensome wartime taxes that are still thrust upon the people of the country who do the work of the world and pay the taxes to keep the city of Washington going. This Congress could well be considering ways to cut down the expenses of Government and relieve the tax burden of these people.

Instead or doing something for all the people, we are today asked to waive the tax for a privileged group. My answer to that is a positive no. It should not be done.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, legislation to exempt admission tickets sold on account of inaugural festivities is absurd. This includes tickets to the inaugural ball that are sold at not less than $10 and to only those who are invited. Also tickets to the big gala show by Hollywood actors and musicians the night before the inauguration that cost from $5 to $10, and special seats that cost from $3 to $10 or more, to view the parade.

There is no good reason why people who buy tickets to these activities should not be required to pay taxes. These activities are not really a part of the inaugural ceremonies on Capitol Hill except that the parade to the Capitol does pass in front of reserved seats for which charges are made.

Do not forget the ordinary government worker has no chance to participate in these festivities. They are exclusive except the parade seats, for which, if he wants one, he would have to pay from $3 to $10.

It is estimated the proceeds from these events will amount to more than $250,000, so the Government will lose $50,000 in taxes. People who can pay $10 admission certainly can pay the tax. To say the least, this resolution is discriminatory against a number of nonprofit organizations who are required under the law to pay taxes on entertainment programs sponsored by them, such as the Red Cross, community chest, boys' clubs, and others.

It is pretty difficult to justify the approval of special legislation to exempt tickets costing $5 and $10 each to the big gala show where big Hollywood actors perform, and then charge 20-percent tax admission for the average family to attend a picture show at the local theater, or to attend a concert in his community.

I do not believe the Federal Treasury should be used in this manner to finance these extra events. In my judgment taxes ought to be charged for these dances and shows as the law now provides.

Furthermore, in view of the administration's demand for additional taxes, it it pretty poor precedent that the first tax legislation submitted to this Congress should be to exempt from taxation admission to Hollywood's gala shows, dances, and parades, costing from $5 to $10 per person. I remind you again these are charges for admission to what are termed "extra events" where high prices are charged. This is not good legislation. About the only excuse for this bill is that a precedent was established in 1932. If so, the precedent is not good and ought not, under the circumstances, to be followed by any administration.

I understand that one of the excuses given for this extra legislation is that some of the businessmen in Washington have advanced funds to finance these expensive shows and events to the extent of $200,000, and they want to make sure they get their money back. Of course, there is no objection, except whatever funds are returned should be subject to taxes.

Most of these funds are advanced by hotels, eating houses, and others who will get more than their money back in profits by reason of the tremendous crowds that come to Washington this week. They will also be refunded, as they should be, from the proceeds of the sale of these tickets, so no one is going to lose except the taxpayers to the extent of some $50,000.

It is estimated more than $30,000,000 of extra money will be spent in Washington during the next few days. Why not do the fair thing, the wholesome thing, and let everybody pay a fair share of taxes and not exempt anyone from the provisions of the law.

It will be said if any funds are left over they go to charity. This is not a charity event. My only criticism is that those who are in control of these festivities have seen fit to charge high admissions for the entertainment. Then they ought to pay the regular tax the same as anyone else.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we have elected a President of the United States, and we must all assume responsibility for the things that are going to happen from now on in our country. I want to assist him if I can, in making our country the best place we can to live.

I have been a Member of this House for many years. During the last 15 years I have sat here when the Democratic administration has increased taxes at least 15 times to try to keep up with the amount of money we were spending. I voted for most of those tax measures. It was necessary to keep solvent. I can see no good reason why we should exempt the festivities on this occasion from taxes. It does not make sense to me. I would say the same thing if it were Republican or Democratic President being inaugurated.

I can see that they are going to need every dollar we can raise in taxes to defray the expenses of government. Here we are asking exorbitant prices for the festivities. It is said here, and rightfully so, that most of the people who attend them will come as a result of invitation to a ball at $10 a ticket. Well, if a fellow is able to pay $10 a ticket to go to a ball he is able to pay the tax on it. Back home the fellow who buys a ticket, even though it be for only a dollar, to go to a ball or anything else has to pay a tax on that dollar. Surely those who can afford to go to the President's ball at $10 a throw can afford to pay the tax.

These stands that have been erected all along the parade route are going to cost the Government money. In the end, we have got to foot the bill. The prices range from $3 to $10 a seat. Anyone who buys a seat can afford to pay the tax. A person going to a movie pays 50 cents for a ticket and pays a tax.

The President has already suggested that we devise additional taxes, additional taxes for everything he wants in order to fulfill the requirements of this budget he has suggested to the tune of $41,800,000,000 when he knows we are going to have an income of only $40,980,000,000.

We are going to have a deficit of $873,000,000. The President says nothing of economy. We are inviting a wreck of our Government. He wants you to raise money to take care of that deficit the President has in his budget—here is where you can get the money. Then, why not continue the tax laws we have instead of trying to rebate some of them? I do not follow the philosophy of tax reduction or exemption from taxation. The President's message also showed that in the next year, 1952, he is going to ask for a budget that will be $2,900,000,000 more than he is asking for 1951. That shows that he is going to spend, and spend, and spend to the point that I question very much whether the American people are going to be able to carry on with the great load that will come to them from this spending. Why does not the President talk some of Government economy?

I do not think this is a tax that should be eliminated. This resolution should not pass.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, this proposal to exempt inaugural parade and inaugural ball tickets from taxation is outrageous.

Anyone who can afford to put up $10 for an inaugural ball ticket or from $3 to $10 for an inaugural parade ticket can also well afford to pay the same admissions tax which our people are required to pay when they pass 50 cents or a dollar through the window for a ticket to the movies.

If there ever were a genuine rich man's tax bill, this is it. I would be extremely sympathetic to a legislative suggestion to wipe out altogether the admissions tax on tickets which cost less than $1. Those who can least afford to contribute to the expense of running the Government would thereby be relieved. The effect of the present bill, however, is to give preferred treatment to the very ones who least need it.

The argument is now made that these $10 tickets have already been sold in large numbers without consideration of the fact that an admissions tax had to be paid. My answer to that is: Let the committee or group arranging these festivities pay the admissions' tax out of the proceeds of the take, thereby cutting down the prospective profit, in just exactly the same way which any private group would be required to do if they had committed this same error.

There is considerable irony in the fact that the first three issues to be brought before this Congress are, first, to raise the salaries and expense accounts of the President, Vice President, and Speaker; second, to give Federal employees in Washington a holiday to enjoy the circus atmosphere of the inauguration; and, third, the most brazen of all, to exempt the politicians and comfortably situated citizens, who are this week flocking into Washington, from paying the same tax on the festivities here which everyone else throughout this country pays for their own entertainment. I do not recall that any such issues were presented to the people by the majority in the recent campaign.

There is no justification for this legislation. It should be defeated.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD.]

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, first let me say that I concur in the remarks of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]. He made able argument on behalf of the defeat of this particular measure.

The presence of this measure before us today brings to mind a situation that occurred in my home town not too long ago when some people who were trying to aid a very excellent charity went ahead and sold tickets without full knowledge of the consequences so far as the excise taxes were concerned. I do not recall that particular charity getting through any resolution or action by Congress. It seems to me that if we pass a resolution of this sort we are not playing fair with the very many worth-while charities and organizations in your district and in mine that put on events for the benefit of the children of our respective communities. If we do something of this sort we are selling them and others like them down the river.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR].

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I think the people should know the type of legislation that the new Democrat-controlled Congress is passing. May I reminisce and call to your attention the many speeches that were made by many Democrat candidates for Congress and the Democrat candidate for President, appealing to the American people that the Democrat Party was a party of the common people, and was against those of great wealth. They also charged the Republican Party and the Republican candidates were those who yielded to the demands of special groups, and those of great wealth.

Congress has been in session since January 3 and under the complete domination and control of a Democrat majority, and let us see what constitutes the first three bills presented to us for consideration.

The first bill we have for consideration today is House Joint Resolution 85, to exempt from taxation admissions for inauguration tickets. This legislation would exempt from taxation those who purchase the $10 tickets for the inaugural ball, and also would exempt from tax the $10, and less, tickets to witness the parade. This legislation will exempt from payment of tax the individuals who can afford the expenditure of hundreds of dollars to come to Washington, who can afford to pay $35 for hotel rooms, and can afford to pay $10 for inaugural ball tickets. Yet Mrs. John Doe, who lives in the Seventeenth District of Ohio, or any other district of the United States, who works and sacrifices in order to buy a ticket for a movie once a week, has to pay her tax. This applies to the different school groups who put on plays, that they might purchase uniforms for high-school bands, or to earn money to finance a trip to the great Capital City of the United States for their graduating classes. My friends, those people are not exempt and have to pay tax, yet the first bill passed by the Democrat-controlled Congress is one for the wealthy people who can afford to come to Washington and see their President inaugurated.

The second bill that is coming up today is S. 103, a bill to increase the compensation of the President, whose present salary is $75,000, and which bill would increase the salary to $100,000 a year and would give him $40,000 tax-free expense account, which he does not have to make an accounting for whatsoever.

The third bill, if you please, is Senate Joint Resolution 16, holidays for Federal employees, granting a 4-day holiday to Federal employees in the District of Columbia, including the bureaucrats. A conservative estimate of this cost alone will near several million dollars.

May I call to your attention, Mr. Speaker, all of these bills are brought up under the suspension of the rule, because they are considered so important by the Democrat-controlled Congress that no hearings are held, and all rules must be suspended in order to secure immediate passage.

I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, what some of the Members of this Congress will say to their constituents after they have voted for this "class" legislation, as I know that many of them made statements during the campaign that they were definitely against class legislation, and all people should be given consideration, whether rich or poor.

Remembering the campaign promises made by the Democrat candidates, and comparing them with the actions of the Democrat-controlled Congress today, I feel certain these activities can be adequately described by an old axiom: "Sometimes people's actions speak so loud we cannot hear the words they say."

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, may I ask my friend from Tennessee a question? He says that the tax has not yet been paid. I understand that the tickets have all been sold, according to the papers, and as the law stands now the tax is payable from those who collected for the tickets. So the tax has already been paid and has been included in the purchase price in every instance. Is that not correct?

Mr. COOPER. That point is covered right on the face of the bill.

Mr. VORYS. If you pay $10 for a ticket, the tax has been included in that payment. If a change in the tax law is made the saving will go to the person who bought the ticket, is that correct?

Mr. COOPER. I do not think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. VORYS. Then this bill does not reduce the price to the purchaser at all. I think 10 percent of the amount collected is now due as tax, and by this bill local charities get this 10 percent instead of the Government. I do not think we should support local charities or inaugural shows in this way. The inaugural ceremony at the Capitol is free and open to the public. This was provided by the Eightieth Congress. The elaborate shows, the parade, the gala, the ball, which have been planned to entertain the inaugural crowd, will only be seen by those who can buy tickets; no exception should be made in our tax laws for such shows.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think any of these three bills should be passed today under suspension of the rules. This postelection band-wagon rush, resulting in the inflated inaugural plans now under way, is getting out of hand. We Republicans owe it to the administration and to the country to attempt to keep it within bounds. This is an unpopular task here in Washington this week. Unless we condone poor taste and help to create bad precedents, we will be called poor sports. After all, we are told, this is emergency legislation and involves only a few million dollars. I think some fundamental principles and precedents are involved in this hasty consideration of these three bills. I do not think there should be bipartisan unity on this first emergency program of the Eighty-first Congress.

Next will come the 4-day holiday bill. Remember, it is this bill making the day after the inauguration a holiday which will result in a 4-day holiday this week. The Attorney General has ruled that the President has power to close departments and bureaus whenever he deems proper in the interest of the public

service. Obviously, this Friday holiday is not in the interest of the public service. It was described in the Senate as desirable after the night before. I do not think we should authorize a hang-over holiday. The thousands of people coming to the inaugural may want to do business in public offices on Friday; it would be a healthy thing for them to see the departments working instead of loafing. The public business all over the United States should not be subjected by law to a 4-day departmental delay. The thousands of Federal employees who work in my district are not getting such a holiday, but in thousands of instances, their operations will be delayed because they cannot get word from Washington for 4 days. Washington should set an example of working at least 1 day in 4 at the end of this week.

After that will come the salary bill. It may be that the President's expense account should be increased, it may be that we ought to pay our Presidents more in the future. We will have time to take this up and debate it before Thursday. We do not need to rush it through under a gag today. We may be in danger of losing Cabinet officers and bureau chiefs because of low pay. The fact remains that the minority who elected President Truman in November thought they were electing a $75,000 President who wanted the job, not a $150,000 President, with $50,000 exempt from taxes or accounting. When we raised congressional salaries and expenses, we upgraded the office and then ran for it. The people knew they were electing $15,000 Congressmen. We have time before Thursday to deliberate on whether the President, Vice President, and Speaker need more money. There is utterly no danger of our losing these officials because of their pay and expense allowances.

We have all received broad, loud hints that it is poor taste to object to any of these three demands today. Someone ought to remind someone that it may be poor taste to make these demands. The precedents we establish today may make trouble in the future.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, to say that I am amazed at some of the remarks made by certain of my Republican colleagues on this resolution is expressing myself very mildly. The position taken by my friend from New York [Mr. REED] is a very proper one. As I understand it, while he is not opposed to this bill, he is opposed to the principle in it. The other speeches which have been made by Members on the other side are rather farfetched and savor very strongly of poor sportsmanship.

Mr. Speaker, we must remember that all hotel rooms were reserved before November 3 by the Republicans in anticipation of the election of Governor Dewey. We must also remember that the local inaugural committee could not be appointed by either Governor Dewey or President Truman until it was ascertained which one would be elected, despite the fact that the distinguished Governor from New York was very confident of his election. However, the people decided otherwise.

We are therefore faced with a situation where it was impossible for the Congress and the leadership under the stress of business in both the regular and special sessions to pass such a resolution. Probably the better course would have been to have passed a resolution before the election, while the Congress was in session, and have that matter determined. But, it was not passed.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly.

Mr. HALLECK. I wonder if the gentleman would indulge me the right to inquire, if the Eightieth Congress had brought in such a resolution as this last summer before we adjourned, whether or not the gentleman then would have favored it.

Mr. McCORMACK. I certainly would. I said the leadership on both sides. I was not criticizing the leadership of the Eightieth Congress for failure to do this, and I suggest that probably the leadership on both sides overlooked it, and probably it would have been better if we had passed it, but the fact is, we did not.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. Well, I think if our side had won, we would not have had the resolution in here.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will say this much, if your side had won there would have been a resolution in here, and if any Democrat had opposed it, I would personally think that it would have been a small, mean thing to do, and that is my opinion.

Now, what is the situation? The civic-minded businessmen and organizations in Washington have subscribed a $200,000 fund to guarantee the payment of costs in connection with the inaugural ceremonies. When national conventions take place, businessmen and associations do that, whether Democratic or Republican, and in connection with the inaugural ceremonies here the businessmen have done it. The same thing would have been done if Governor Dewey had been elected. Now, they make no gain; there is no profit in it for them. If there is any profit, as I understand, it goes to the Community Chest Federation to be used for charitable purposes. That is my understanding.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I wanted to find out as a matter of information whether it is not true that the congressional appropriation all goes for the arrangements out in front of the Capitol for the inaugural ceremonies, and the $250,000 is to be used for stands down on Pennsylvania Avenue; is that right?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is my understanding that the congressional appropriation is confined to the activities here at the Capitol and in connection with the building of stands outside, and that the activities which are performed by the Official Inaugural Committee is a District affair. A joint congressional committee takes care of the activities at the Capitol.

Mr. VORYS. But there is no charge for the use of any of the arrangements provided by the congressional committee; is that correct?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; of course not. Now, I cannot believe that there are many of my Republican friends who are going to vote against this resolution. I am not going to make any political observations except this, that if on election day the fortunes of the political contest had gone the other way, and if a resolution had been offered by the Republican leadership, and if I knew of any Democrat who was going to speak against it, other than in principle, which is a different proposition, because we recognize this is a rare exception, I would do everything within my power to try and persuade the Democratic Member not to do so. I would consider it poor sportsmanship if any Democrat were to oppose the resolution if Governor Dewey had been elected; a resolution offered for the same purpose as this resolution has been offered. I would consider it small on his part to try and make politics out of a resolution of this kind. I am choosing my words very carefully, because I do not want to say anything that would offend the sensibilities of the great majority of the Republican Members who, I am confident, are not going to vote against this resolution.

The observation I am now about to make was contributed to me by my distinguished friend the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] while we were sitting alongside each other, and I want him to get the credit for it, because it is so pertinent and so sound. The gentleman from Tennessee said to me, "Everyone knows that if a Republican had been elected in November there would not have been a voice raised against such a resolution on the Republican side." I agree with that, and that is the way it should be.

I am amazed at the attempts of some of the Republicans—note that I say "some"—to try to create emotionalism and misunderstanding in the minds of some throughout the country on a resolution of this kind. I am constrained to label vigorously such efforts as awfully small and constituting very poor sportsmanship.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution?

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the House divided, and there were—ayes 199, noes 49.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAKING JANUARY 20 AND 21, 1949, HOLIDAYS FOR CERTAIN EMPLOYEES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass Senate Joint Resolution 16.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the several executive departments, independent establishments, and other governmental agencies of the United States, including the legislative and judicial branches, and of the District of Columbia, in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia shall be closed all day on Thursday, January 20, 1949, Inauguration Day, and on the succeeding day, Friday, January 21, 1949. All employees of such departments, establishments, and agencies and of the District of Columbia in such area, except those who may for special public reasons be required to be on duty on such days by the heads of their respective departments, establishments, or agencies, shall be excused from duty on those days; and such days shall be considered holidays for the purpose of all statutes relating to the compensation and leave of employees of the United States, and of the District of Columbia, employed in such area. For the purposes of this resolution, the term "metropolitan area of the District of Columbia" shall include, in addition to the District of Columbia, Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties, Md.; Arlington and Fairfax Counties, Va.; and the city of Alexandria, Va.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that the majority leadership will not on this occasion charge me with petty partisan politics in an attempt, at least, to protect the record in this particular legislation. Mr. Speaker, I call your attention to the fact that this legislation which involves the pay of some 250,000 Federal employees has not been referred to a committee of this House. If you want to talk of steamroller tactics, or of putting legislation through without any hearings of any kind, here is a fair example:

The first bill that came before the House is to exempt certain groups from the payment of taxes. No. 2 deals with the question of Government employment and the bill was not even referred to a committee, which should have been done. Of course, the answer by the majority is, "We do not have time. We have to hurry this thing through."

There is no good reason why you could not have the members of your committee appointed and have them consider this legislation tomorrow, thus permitting the Committee on Civil Service and Post Office to do what it has a right to do, and that is to go over the bill and hold hearings, if necessary, before it comes to the floor of the House for consideration by this body. Members of the House are entitled, at least, to the benefit of hearings by our committee.

Now, what are you doing? You talk about this great 4-day holiday. Certainly I have no objection to permitting Government employees in this area to attend the inaugural ceremonies, if they have a chance to do so. They should get to attend. But I call your attention to the fact, however, that if they want to go to the gala show they have to pay $5 and $10 a throw and have to be invited besides. Comparatively few will get to attend.

You cannot go to the big dance, because, unless you are invited and have a top place in Government, you will not get to go there. They cannot see the parade unless they can see it from around a corner and other out-of-the-way places because you have already sold the tickets for the good seats for $2.50 to $10 each. They cannot even look at the parade from the Federal buildings along the way unless they are invited to do so by those in charge of those buildings.

Do you think that they are going to be able to watch the parade as they ought to be able to do? Not at all. They go to those buildings by invitation only. They have been so informed. Anyhow, in some way if they have a chance, they may be able to see the parade. From afar off, they might get to look at the inaugural ceremonies. It appears it is the best that could be done by the management. Now then, on top of that you are going to permit them to have this extra holiday and you are going to quit business from Wednesday until the following Monday. Do you know its cost—or is that important? But, anyway, it might interest you at least to know that you have, as I said a moment ago, something over 200,000 employees and it is going to cost this Government over $2,000,000 for that extra day, because these people will be drawing their pay on Friday and will not be working, except those who are going to be required to carry on necessary duties, including the postal employees and some others who are going to stay on the job.

Let me repeat that I do not want to be misunderstood. I think the Inauguration Day should be a holiday. I think every person who can get to Washington ought to be permitted to attend, and I think, too, it is extremely important that Government employees, those so closely associated with the affairs of our Government, ought to have a chance to attend all ceremonies they can and ought especially to have a chance to witness the inauguration of the President.

My contention is that to allow the additional day, being the following day, as a holiday is unnecessary and uncalled for. It results in a closing down of all operations of Government in Washington from Wednesday evening until the following Monday morning.

Now, while you are putting on a 1-day celebration you make 4 days out of it, yet we do not give these folks a chance to do anything except perhaps witness the parade or the ceremonies from some far-distant point.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. I understand the Attorney General has ruled that the President has the power to close departments and bureaus "whenever he deems proper in the interest of the public service." Therefore, it would seem that this request for legislation indicates that the President does not deem it in the interest of the public service to close all Government departments.

Mr. REES. Of course not. If they were to have only 1 day, the President would ask for 1 day, and, of course, it would be granted. There would not be any question about that. But why throw in the extra day? Why close all Government bureaus for 4 days in a row? It is going pretty far, especially when it is not necessary.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Is it not a fact that Government employees have 30 days' vacation with pay?

Mr. REES. Oh, yes; but that is something else.

Mr. RICH. I am willing to give them this time off, and I think they should have it if we can afford to do it. But if they get 30 days' vacation, why not charge this day up to one of their 30 days so that the taxpayers back home who never get more than a week or two vacation will not have to pay the bill for these fellows to have extra holidays?

Mr. REES. As the distinguished gentleman from New York said, while it seems rather small to talk about it, it is the principle of the thing that I am thinking about. It does not look good. The way money is being spent, of course, $2,000,000 does not seem to amount to very much. This would be a lot of money in my State. The principle of the thing makes the situation worse. Furthermore, I have been informed by a number of employees they would rather work on Friday than to take the extra holiday. I do not see any justification for it, and no case has been made for it.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield.

Mr. KUNKEL. I am not opposed to this bill, but it strikes me it is highly discriminatory. This bill would give every employee in the District of Columbia 4 days off with pay. Why should not other people who are working for the Government throughout the United States in all the various installations and field services be given the same benefits as those who are located in the District of Columbia?

Mr. REES. The only reason is because they do not live in this area.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). The gentleman from Kansas has consumed 7 minutes.

Mr. REES. I yield myself one additional minute, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. In cold dollars and cents what will this proposed holiday cost the taxpayers of this country?

Mr. REES. Oh, I do not know but it will be a lot of money. I am just talking about this 1 day off for Federal workers. The extra holiday will cost more than $2,000,000. I do not know what the whole celebration will cost.

Mr. JENNINGS. Would it run into as much as a million dollars?

Mr. REES. Oh, yes; considerably more. The extra day under this bill will cost more than $2,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and I now yield 2 minutes to

the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH].

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, in 2 minutes I cannot do justice to this subject.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to register my opposition to the pending resolution which provides for a holiday next Thursday and Friday for the Government employees in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia. I have yet to hear a sound reason as to why the Government employees should be relieved of their duties for an extra day simply because of an inauguration.

It is agreeable with me that the various Government agencies be closed on Thursday, the day of the inauguration. But there is no reason, none whatsoever, for the following day also being made a holiday. Such a privilege is not being granted those who work in the stores, in private offices, and other enterprises. In this, as in everything else, the administration looks upon Government employees as the favored, privileged group. This is bureaucracy.

As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I hear again and again from the various officials of the Government who appear before our committee as to how much of a work load their particular bureau or agency must handle. They invariably appeal to us for more funds to meet the need for additional employees to carry the load. Yet it is proposed by this resolution to grant two complete holidays while all the work of the Government supposed to be serving the people stops.

We are living in very serious times. We are faced with many grave problems. There is much to be done. But, judging from all the arrangements that are being made in connection with the inauguration and all the money being spent for it, this is a gala occasion to be known in history as the inaugural circus. Everyone is to have fun at the expense of the taxpayers.

When one thinks about it, the kind of inauguration celebration being prepared by the administration supporters is quite in keeping with the kind of administration we are to have. No one is to care about the costs involved. No one is to care about the work left undone, or the waste involved in an elaborate parade and extravagant parties. To be sure, this inauguration is a gala day for the millions of bureaucrats on the Government pay roll. The President has already indicated by the size of his budget for the next fiscal year that they are secure in their soft jobs and more jobs are to be created. By this bill the administration proposes to give them an extra day to celebrate.

It is perfectly clear that Thursday, January 20, is to be a happy one, calling for 4 days of celebration, for the bureaucrats; but it is a sad day for the taxpayers of the United States. They will realize this more and more in the coming weeks.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the gentleman from Massachusetts use some of his time.

Mr. McCORMACK. We have only one speaker. Under such circumstances I think the gentleman from Kansas should exhaust his time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has the right to open and close the debate.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, we reserve the balance of our time. Is the gentleman from Massachusetts going to close the debate?

Mr. McCORMACK. We have only one speaker. He will close the debate; yes.

Mr. REES. Then I suggest that the gentleman use his time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] such of the 20 minutes as he may need.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] made the admission that he had no objection to giving public employees in the city of Washington Thursday off to see and participate in the inaugural ceremonies. I am certain that he agrees with me that the public employees in this city have done a great job; that all during the war they worked overtime long hours and now this is some little modicum of reward to them.

Someone has tried to confuse the issue a little by talking about 4 days off. As a matter of fact and as a matter of right, Saturday and Sunday are not work days in the District of Columbia. Thursday is Inauguration Day, and I am glad he admits that that day should be given to these people. So it leaves the intervening day, Friday, as the only day, the only concession we are actually giving the Federal employees in this city. As a practical matter, when you try to call people back during the midst of any season of celebration, especially when the following day is the regular day off, you are not going to get very much work out of them and there is not going to be a great efficiency in their work.

Lots of people are coming to Washington from all over the country to see this inaugural, and I am happy that they are coming to see Mr. Truman inaugurated. Many people are coming in here who are the relatives and friends of these employees and they want to entertain them and show them the sights of Washington. So I do not see any great harm in what is being done. It is, in fact, a morale builder.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I quite agree with the gentleman that we ought to give them Thursday off. My objection is that the Government employees are getting 30 days' annual leave and 15 days' sick leave, something no other individual I know of in the country enjoys—the two days, Thursday and Friday, should be charged to the 30 days' annual leave. I think that is the sensible thing to do.

Mr. MILLER of California. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that all Government employees do not get that liberal vacation and sick-leave allowance. The people in the postal service only get 15 days' annual leave, but we are going to try to correct that at this session of the Congress.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I cannot see why we are raising such a lot of fuss about this extra day, because I am quite sure that the country would be better off if we gave the American people a 6 months' breathing spell by letting all the Federal employees take a vacation, from the President on down. I think that would be good for the country.

Mr. MILLER of California. I know that the gentleman has advocated that philosophy when it comes to certain functions of government.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think everyone will agree that if the employees were not given permission to be off Thursday they could not get to their place of employment in the District. At least, very few could. As a matter of fact, automobile traffic will be prohibited to a great extent in the city on Thursday and that of necessity, because of the inaugural ceremonies and the inaugural parade. So from the practical standpoint, if we did nothing, how are they going to get to their work? A few might get through, but it will be impossible for the great majority of them to get through. Therefore, something has to be done on Thursday. Everyone will concede that.

Now, the only question is, Saturday and Sunday being off days, should we in the light of all the circumstances give the employees Friday off? I recognize that Members may honestly disagree as to that. Thursday would be a day on which they would have to stay out of their employment anyway. That is forced upon them because of the conditions that will prevail in the District due to the inaugural and to their inability to get to the various offices and agencies or Departments they are employed in. Saturday and Sunday are holidays. They do not work on those days anyway. So when it is stated that this is a 4-day holiday, it is not a correct statement. In fact, it is only a 1-day holiday. It is simply a matter for the judgment of the various Members.

Mr. RICH. It is two days.

Mr. McCORMACK. On Thursday they could not get to their various departments.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I agree with the gentleman so far as one holiday is concerned. I am for that. But does not the gentleman think that where we allow such a great length of time to Government employees, giving them from 15 to 30 days annually, and our people back home have to pay for this time, we ought to charge this up to that vacation period which they get annually, especially those with 30 days off every year?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is not a holiday. Let us suppose we do nothing.

Mr. RICH. Oh, well, let us do something.

Mr. McCORMACK. The great majority of the employees could not get to their agencies, yet they would have to charge that up against their annual leave when, so far as they are concerned, they would report if they could get through. They cannot get through because of the parade and the other inaugural ceremonies on the streets. The streets will be barricaded to automobile traffic, except to those who have a tag on their automobile. There are very few who have those tags. We do, because we have to have them as Members of the Congress, and there are a few others. So, without regard to any other consideration, we would have to give them Thursday off, otherwise, we would be making them take a day off their annual leave when they would report for duty if they could do so but they cannot report for duty because of the conditions prevailing on that day. They could not get to their agencies. The only matter to be considered is should we give them Friday off, Saturday and Sunday being regular days off?

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES. May I say to the gentleman that there is no question about Thursday. That is Inauguration Day. The matter has been stated correctly in that regard. Thursday ought to be a holiday because it is Inauguration Day for the President of the United States. That is understood. We are talking about Friday and that is all there is to it. But it does have to cover 3 days. I am not talking about a 4-day holiday, excepting as it is described in the newspapers. But, that is the way it works out.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is simply a question whether under the circumstances they should be given this day off.

Mr. REES. Friday I am talking about.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand. It is a question whether there will not be a holiday unless we pass this resolution.

Mr. REES. Except the President could, if he wanted to, by Presidential order, set Thursday as a holiday.

Mr. McCORMACK. That might be so. But, the only question is, whether with Saturday and Sunday off, as they will be off, and Thursday, if you are going to give the Friday off. That is the question involved. As far as I am concerned, it is the proper thing to do under the circumstances, and I think this way, no matter who would have been elected. If the nominee of your party had been elected, I would feel identically the same way.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a measure for Federal aid to education. It is certainly a cherished principle and tradition of our American democracy that every child in our Nation have an opportunity for an education that meets commonly accepted standards of adequacy. In a land now blessed with abundance of wealth, with unprecedented prosperity, and with grand possibilities for even greater good fortune, there can be no reasonable excuse for depriving any American child of his right to go to school for at least 180 days a year in a safe and clean schoolhouse and to classes staffed by properly accredited and certified teachers. But the fact is that for several million American children the opportunity for a decent education simply does not exist. This is the basic reason for Federal aid to education.

One may ask immediately, "Why do not the States appropriate enough money for their schools?" The answer is well known.

Some States simply do not have enough taxable resources to produce sufficient revenue for their schools. Most of these States actually are expending for education a relatively larger percentage of their income than are States which with a minimum of effort manage to spend far more than the national average for every child in school. From the statistics on the Federal-aid question, I gather that some States, even though they were to double their expenditures for education, would still fail to provide enough money for the kind of education to which every American child is entitled. Federal aid, therefore, seems to be the only method by which we may correct this situation.

While I am convinced that Federal aid is necessary, I do not want Federal funds to replace State funds in educational finance. Consequently, the measure which I have introduced explicitly stipulates that no State may reduce its present expenditures for education or may it reduce teachers' salaries or may it in any other way shift its responsibility to the Federal Government. Moreover the bill provides that a floor on educational expenditures will be established whereby every child will be assured that a minimum of $50 from local, State, and Federal funds will be available for his education, regardless of the State in which he lives or where he lives in a particular State. I cannot stress too emphatically my conviction that my only reason for advocating Federal aid to education is my interest in every American child.

It is this conviction that has led me to incorporate into my bill a provision often overlooked in other Federal-aid measures. I refer to the provision for services for public- and non-public-school pupils. In my opinion, the Federal Government should be concerned with the welfare of all American children in every American school, public and nonpublic. For this reason my bill carries an appropriation to provide essential school services for public- and non-public-school pupils. The amount is modest—10 percent of the total appropriation of $325,000,000.

It seems to me that this appropriation for services will encourage the States to improve their transportation services, to expand their free textbook programs, and to broaden their school-health services. It is very distressing to find that many school children, forced to walk long distances to school along open highways, are in frequent danger of serious accident as autos and trucks speed past them. It is equally distressing to learn that thousands of children do not derive full benefit from their education simply because they do not have essential supplies and textbooks. In the field of health services, doctors report that children are absent from school frequently because many schools do not have adequate clinical facilities. These are situations which would be corrected at least in part through the proposed bill's appropriation for services.

It should be noted that these services pertain to the welfare of children in both public and nonpublic schools. Regardless of one's convictions about the relative merits of public and nonpublic education, no person reasonably would want to subject any child to traffic hazards, or to deprive him of essential textbooks and health services simply because he happened to attend the nonpublic school of his parents' choice. For this reason, the funds for services are not restricted to public-school children only.

It is important to note that 90 percent of the appropriation will be available exclusively to improve public schools as such; not one penny of this amount will be used for direct or indirect aid to any nonpublic school. Ten percent of the appropriation—approximately $32,000,000—will be available for services. Of this amount approximately 10 percent—about $3,000,000—would be used for non-public-school pupils.

Three million dollars is a very small amount when compared with the savings to the Nation's taxpayers from the operation of nonpublic schools, which is in excess of $400,000,000 every year. In other words, if the two and a half million pupils now enrolled in nonpublic schools were suddenly transferred into the public-school system, the total increase to the taxpayers would amount to over $400,000,000, a sum in excess of the total amount authorized in this bill. Moreover, it should be noted that the supporters of the nonpublic school spend well over $200,000,000 a year for their schools. Finally, the replacement value of non-public-school buildings is in excess of $1,000,000,000. In view of these statistics, it would be absurd to say that my bill in any way constitutes a measure to secure suoport for nonpublic schools.

I do anticipate, however, a number of objections to this measure on the score that aid to non-public-school pupils, particularly those in parochial schools, constitutes a violation of the principle of separation of church and state, that it is a threat to our Nation's public-school system and it is the use of public money for a private purpose. On the first charge the Supreme Court of the United States has rendered a very clear opinion. In the Cochran case involving a Louisiana law authorizing free textbooks for both public- and non-public-school pupils, the Court, in a unanimous decision,

declared the law constitutional. In the Everson case decision involving a New Jersey transportation law, the Court declared the statute constitutional. Rendering a majority opinion, Mr. Justice Black said that "It was not the purpose of the first amendment to cut off church schools from services separate and indisputably marked off from the religious function." To my knowledge nobody has challenged the constitutionality of State laws to provide school health services for non-public-school pupils.

The argument that any form of aid to non-public-school pupils is a threat to the American public-school system simply raises the question: Are nonpublic schools really a part of the Nation's school system? In my opinion, they are. Public schools and non-public schools are partners—not competitors—in American education. In full compliance with compulsory education laws parents may send their children to either a public or non-public school. Graduates of both schools are qualified for public office and are subject to military service. I think, therefore, that persons who generally support non-public schools have a perfect right to resent any implication that their schools are un-American or less American than public schools. And this definitely is the implication in the argument that Federal aid for school services to children in such schools is a threat to the American public-school system.

It is also alleged that such aid is the use of public money for a private purpose. I fail to see how the protection of a child's health and welfare can be construed as a private purpose. On the contrary, the State has a duty to afford this protection. To perform this duty public funds must be available for health and welfare services for children in both public and nonpublic schools.

I should not like to see the day when the public schools would have a monopoly of education in the United States. We need both public and nonpublic schools. If we really believe that parents have the right to select one or the other, we should not penalize those parents who choose the nonpublic school.

Yet this is exactly what the State does when it refuses non-public-school pupils bus rides, textbooks, and health services. I do not want the Federal Government to impose a similar penalty. In terms of Federal aid, every child is a citizen of these United States—not just of one State or another. I for one have no intention of relegating non-public-school pupils to a status of second-class citizens.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. I just want to inquire, if we pass this resolution, whether there will be any mail delivery at all in that 4-day period?

Mr. MILLER of California. I could not answer that. I believe there will be mail delivery.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. As far as I am personally concerned, I do not think it is a question of who is elected President, nor do I think it is a simple question of creating a 4-day holiday. I think the basic question is whether or not in the interest of public service we can give another day off from the regular duties of these offices. A few days ago I happened to call up one department asking about the progress of a certain program, and they told me that they had a backlog of 2 years in their work, and they gave that as an excuse for not having progressed any further. It occurs to me that the real merit of this proposition is whether or not the public business demands that these people be at their positions on Friday, or if they are not there, charge up the date to their annual leave. They have 26 days annual leave, except those in the Post Office Department. I presume the postal workers will have to work just the same, they will not get this day off, thereby increasing the disparity between them and the other civil employees of the Government. As far as I am personally concerned I feel it is purely a matter of the public welfare. If the work of the different departments is such that they can be spared, well and good, but if not, the employees ought to be at their positions or take the extra day, Friday, out of their annual leave.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the resolution.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASING RATES OF COMPENSATION OF THE PRESIDENT, VICE PRESIDENT, AND SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 103) to increase rates of compensation of the President, Vice President, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 102 of title 3 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"COMPENSATION OF THE PRESIDENT

"SEC. 102. The President shall receive in full for his services during the term for which he shall have been elected compensation in the aggregate amount of $100,000 a year, to be paid monthly, and in addition an expense allowance of $50,000 to assist in defraying expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, for which expense allowance no tax liability shall accrue and for which no accounting shall be made by him. He shall be entitled also to the use of the furniture and other effects belonging to the United States and kept in the Executive Mansion."

(b) Section 104 of title 3 of the United States Code (relating to salary of the Vice President) is amended by striking out "$20,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$30,000".

(c) Chapter 2 of title 3 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"EXPENSE ALLOWANCE OF VICE PRESIDENT

"SEC. 111. There shall be paid to the Vice President in equal monthly installments an expense allowance of $10,000 per annum to assist in defraying expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, for which no tax liability shall occur or accounting be made by him."

(d) The matter following the semicolon in section 601 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "and the compensation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall be at the rate of $30,000 per annum."

(e) There shall be paid to the Speaker of the House of Representatives in equal monthly installments an expense allowance of $10,000 per annum (which shall be in lieu of the allowance provided by section 601 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended) to assist in defraying expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, for which no tax liability shall occur or accounting be made by him.

(f) The allowance for clerical assistance to the Vice President contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1949, at rates of compensation to be fixed by him in multiples of $5 per month, hereby is increased from $32,385 per annum to $45,000 per annum.

SEC. 2. In computing the amount to be deducted from the compensation of any official whose salary is increased under this act for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and in computing the amount of any annuity under such act, any increase in compensation provided by this act shall be disregarded until further act of Congress.

SEC. 3. The provisions of this act shall take effect at noon on January 20, 1949.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Is a second demanded?

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill increases the President's salary from $75,000 to $100,000 and gives him $50,000 for expenses. The last time the President's salary was increased was about 40 years ago. There has been no increase in the Presidential salary for close to 40 years. I think that 1909 was the last time that the salary of the President was increased. The President receives by law the use of the White House and its furnishings. He also by basic law is authorized the use of not more than $40,000 annually for travel expenses of the President.

We all know the household expenses of the President are very large by reason of his position as President, no matter who is President, and he should not be expected to maintain those expenses. As I understand, no money is appropriated for the President's household or living expenses. There may be an appropriation to defray the cost of official dinners, but there are many activities in

which the President must engage that cannot be charged to such an appropriation, and he has to pay the cost of such activities out of his salary. There is tremendous expense laid upon any man who is President of the United States that arises out of the fact that he is President, and he must pay the cost of such activities out of his own salary.

That, briefly, is the story. This bill increases the President's salary by $25,000 and gives him an expense allowance of $50,000, just as we receive an expense allowance of $2,500. He has to certify for income-tax purposes that he has used it, just as we have to certify that we have incurred $2,500 or more of expenses in connection with our official work in Washington. The President will have to make the same kind of return we do in relation to the amount he will receive as an expense allowance if this bill is passed.

This seems to me to be only a fair proposition. The most pleasing thing about it is that this suggestion of an increase in salary came from a Republican source, from former President Herbert Hoover, not from President Truman himself. To me that is most refreshing. Certainly it is wholesome, and certainly it comes from a man who has undergone himself the experience of living in the White House and knows through actual experience just what are the financial difficulties and the financial responsibilities of the occupant of the White House, the Chief Executive, when he undertakes to carry on the activities of the White House as they should be handled. He is compelled to pay a considerable sum of money out of his own salary and his own personal income.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman permit me to say that while I supported the two resolutions that have just been acted upon by the House, I was not too enthusiastic about them because I think the sooner we can get away from the practice of extending special favors to Federal workers living within the Washington area the better for us. As far as the latter resolution is concerned, I fear that we will in the future be called upon in the interest of uniformity of treatment to do something for the other Federal workers living in the outer areas of the country.

As to the pending resolution, I find myself very strongly in favor of its adoption.

The office of the President is the most important station in the world. That of the Vice Presidency and the Speakership approach it in importance. I feel that the Congress should provide salaries and expense accounts which would enable them to carry on in the fashion that the people of the entire country expect of them. In other words, the Congress in its treatment of this whole question ought to guard the right and to make it possible for a person of moderate means to occupy these high stations.

I hope there will not be a single Member of the House who will oppose the adoption of this resolution. The resolution should be unanimously adopted.

Mr. McCORMACK. Might I say in closing that the argument that the bill should have come out of the committee is a very sound one. I want my friend, the gentleman from Kansas, to understand that. But in the light of present circumstances, where the House is not completely organized, that is impossible. We meet in caucus this afternoon when our committee on committees will make its report to our caucus. Your committee on committees, I understand, have made their report. We have to wait until tomorrow before the members are officially appointed in the House. That is the only time that the committees are officially appointed, so that they could proceed to the consideration of any business. We have to act on this before Thursday. So I recognize thoroughly the weight of the argument made by my friend, and I can assure the gentleman from Kansas, that the leadership on both sides during my years of experience here have given full recognition to it.

But I believe, when I say we have an emergency situation here, where the matter has to be acted on, and the committees could not possibly consider it, that Members will realize the urgency of the situation.

With reference to the first resolution that was adopted this morning, the Committee on Ways and Means was organized and the committee did consider it. It was formally reported out of the committee. But on the last resolution and on this bill we cannot have official action by a committee, because the committees are not in existence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, let me say at the outset that I do not want to be misunderstood with respect to this legislation. I realize, as has been suggested by other Members that the President is entitled to a fair and adequate salary and is entitled to a fair and reasonable allowance to take care of necessary expenses for running the White House. The Vice President is entitled to sufficient pay to take care of his living and his expenses. The Speaker of the House I know does have expenses in addition to the ordinary expenses of Members of Congress and he is entitled to consideration in that respect.

I do feel, and by the way I am speaking as ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House, that you are rushing through a piece of legislation without giving it the consideration to which it is really entitled. Here you are today, after having been in session since the 3d of January, unable to refer legislation to a committee, so that that legislation could have the fair consideration to which it is entitled.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Georgia.

Mr. COX. In fairness, does not the gentleman consider the fact that organization of the House has not yet been perfected and that these committees have not as yet been created; and is that not a circumstance that gives justification to this unusual procedure, necessary to effectuate a result that is highly desirable?

Mr. REES. I will tell the gentleman that the whole procedure thus far today to say the least has been very unusual.

Mr. COX. I agree with that. I am not combating the proposition of the gentleman. I say that ordinarily matters of this kind should go to appropriate legislative committees of this House for the consideration and report of those committees, but the pending circumstances are such that would seem to me to justify this unusual and extraordinary procedure which, if the object aimed at is to be attained, must be resorted to.

Mr. REES. I agree with the gentleman from Georgia that in view of the fact that the majority leadership has not yet selected committee members, or at least has not announced them, it is impossible to refer this bill to the committee where it belongs. Of course, you have had 2 weeks during which to select members of the committee. Committee members could be appointed and the bill be considered by the committee tomorrow. Of course, to get the legislation through today, the only thing that can be done is to follow the procedure at hand. I think this procedure is quite unusual, to say the least, and if you keep it up, it could cause a considerable amount of trouble. It is simply a matter of streamlining the legislation that you want to get through right away. The procedure you have followed on these three bills is one that allows, as you know, only 20 minutes discussion from each side on each bill, and the only way by which we can talk about any of these bills for as much as 20 minutes is to demand a second.

I am not objecting to the consideration of this particular piece of legislation. If I had a chance to do so, I would offer to modify it by amendments, but under the rule, I am not in position to do so.

I am not opposed to allowing the President adequate salary and a reasonable expense account. I call your attention, however, to the fact that if the President did not have the exemptions in this bill, it would be necessary to pay him a salary of between $300,000 and $400,000 in order that he might have as much left as provided in this bill.

Going one step further, if we do what the President requested, that is, do away with the community property amendment passed in the last session, you would have to pay him a salary of approximately $500,000 a year. That is, in order to provide a similar income as we have in this legislation. As the distinguished majority leader of the House has said, the President is entitled to a fair salary. I would not be misunderstood on that point for anything in the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

The President has a terrific job, and it is impossible to pay him the money that the position is worth. It is not done that way. We allow a certain amount. The work cannot be measured in terms of dollars and cents. We all understand that. But I do think that since you are allowing an additional $50,000—and I know we must trust the President—but it is a lot of money not to have any accounting for and entirely free from taxation. I believe the administration should have been more moderate in its demands. It just does not look too good to exempt half of the income entirely from taxation. I am not objecting to it, but it is just a lot of money.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. Not at this time.

The answer of course is that if you cannot trust the President to spend the money any more than a Member of Congress, it ought not to be done. I realize that. I do not know how much it takes to run the White House, of course, and neither does the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]. But I know the President cannot get rich on his salary or on the allowances. There is no doubt about that.

Attention is called to a statement by former President Hoover as an authority for this legislation. Here is what former President Hoover said, and I quote:

> I looked into the income taxes, State and Federal, and I note the salary of $75,000 for the President, after deduction of State and Federal income taxes, leaves about $43,000, whereas if you put his salary up to $150,000 he would have about $68,000 left.

I do not remember that he said anything about allowing him this additional $50,000 expense account, making a total of $90,000 free from taxes. I mention this only because the ex-President has been quoted. We are paying the President of the United States a fair salary and allowing him this extra income, yet the President says we ought to increase taxes on everybody who receives more than $6,000 a year income. It is rather interesting at least.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH].

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, it is significant, in the nature of a forewarning, that one of the very first bills to be called up in this new Democratic Congress is one to increase the cost of Government, and it is called up, without hearing in committee, and under suspension of the rules which limits debate to 40 minutes and precludes any amendments.

The bill before us, S. 103, provides for a salary increase for the President of the United States, the Vice President and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. It is admitted that this bill is the forerunner of legislation to increase the salary of practically all the top officials of the Government.

I recognize that the President, the Vice President and the Speaker of this House are the three most responsible offices in our Government. In many respects they are the three most important positions in the world. Those who occupy these positions should be paid a salary in some measure commensurate with their heavy duties and responsibilities. I would have no objection whatever to a bill providing for a proper increase in the salary for these three offices if it provided for such increase in a proper manner and in the proper amount.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a fraud on the taxpayers of the United States. This bill is so designed as to lead the people to believe that the increase in compensation is merely nominal, whereas in fact the increase is very, very substantial.

Under the terms of the bill the President's salary is increased from $75,000 to $100,000. and he is given a tax-exempt expense account of $50,000. The taxpayers are thus led to believe that the increase in compensation is only $35,000, and that the total compensation for the President is but $150,000.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that under the terms of this bill a salary of around $300,000 is in effect granted the President. You will note that this is an increase of about 400 percent over his present salary of $75,000.

The sponsors of this legislation have disguised the actual salary increase provided by the bill by setting up a tax-exempt expense account of $50,000. They wish to give the President a salary of around $93,000, after taxes, but instead of making a direct approach to the objective, the disguise of a tax-exempt expense account is used. They are afraid of the public reaction to a bill which would simply increase the salary to $300,000.

Mr. Speaker, I am definitely opposed to the principle of granting tax-exempt compensation to officials of our Government. As Members of Congress we receive a $2,500 tax-exempt expense account. I opposed this measure when it came before the Congress. I am still opposed to it, and I think legislation should be enacted for its repeal.

It is true that as Members of Congress we have extraordinary expenses in connection with our work. We must maintain two homes. We have the expense of traveling back and forth to our respective districts. We sometimes have the expense of extra clerical assistance. We have the expense of election campaigns.

But the policy of providing a tax-exempt expense account is definitely wrong. It is a fraud on the people we represent. They are deceived as to what they actually pay their Government officials.

If we are to provide the President, the Vice President, and the Speaker an increase in salary, it should be on a flat basis, and they should be obliged to pay all the taxes on the salary as all other individuals in this country.

It is perfectly evident that somehow we must bring forcibly home to those who are in charge of the fiscal policy of our Government that taxes represent a heavy burden on our people, and in some cases reach the point of confiscation. If the President were obliged to pay $207,000 in taxes on a $300,000 salary, leaving him take-home pay of only $93,000, he would perhaps have some realization of what existing taxes amount to. Each year, when he files his income-tax return, he would have a gentle reminder that taxes destroy incentive and initiative, and retard progress. He would have a reminder of the heavy load of the cost of government which the American people are obliged to carry.

Mr. Speaker, we are today faced with a national debt of over $250,000,000,000. The President has recently submitted to us the record peacetime budget of almost $42,000,000,000. He, and every other official of this Government, including us as Members of Congress, should be required to help support this great debt and expense of Government. It is wrong to set aside a certain group of Government officials and allow them an income which is not subject to taxes.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, this bill is a fraud on the taxpayers of the United States. I want the people I represent to know that under the terms of this bill the President of the United States is actually being given a salary of around $300,000. The increase in compensation is being provided under the guise of a tax-exempt expense account. I also want my people to know that insofar as the tax-exempt expense account is concerned there is no provision in the bill for any accounting or certification.

What I have said here with respect to the salary or compensation increase provided for the President by this bill applies also to that provided for the Vice President and the Speaker. I am opposed to providing for any tax-exempt payments, just as I opposed the expense account provided for Members of Congress, although it was nominal in amount considering the expenses which we must necessarily incur. This is not a question of personalities. This is a question of principle.

There is also a constitutional principle involved in connection with this bill. In order to protect the people our founding fathers provided that salaries of their elected officials could not be increased during their term of office. This was done to give the people themselves opportunity to pass upon the question as to what their officials should receive. Today, after the election but before the term of the President and Vice President actually begins, we are raising their salary. By rushing this bill through in this manner we are acting contrary to the very spirit of the Constitution. If this measure had been acted on by the Congress prior to the election, it would be an altogether different matter, for the people would then know the salary they would pay to the man selected by them for the office.

We are being pressed to do today that which we will not be able to do next Friday. I must register my protest against both the manner in which this bill is drawn and the manner in which it is being rushed through Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAVALCANTE].

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Speaker, in support of this resolution, I am wondering whether the gentlemen who oppose it know that under American supervision, Hirohito of Japan receives yearly 20,000,000 yen, the equivalent of 74,000 American dollars, tax-free, with living quarters, food, servants and other expenses.

Franco of Spain received in 1948 the sum of 2,986,000 pesetas, the equivalent of 271,455 American dollars for salary, receptions and other expenses, tax-free, together with living quarters.

The King of England receives £410,000 or the equivalent of 1,722,000 American dollars, tax-free, with living quarters and other expenses.

Peron of Argentina receives 144,000 pesos.

The Governor General of India receives 250,000 rupees, and the President of Chile receives 500,000 pesos. All three salaries are tax-free, with living quarters, food, servants and all traveling and other expenses.

The Congress of these United States is the only law-making body on earth that votes a salary to the Chief of State and then with another vote snatches back approximately 50 percent of it as income tax.

We proud Americans should pay our President $200,000 per year, tax-free, with living quarters, food, servants and all necessary traveling and other expenses.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would like to observe that this question is merely one of whether or not we shall pay the President of the United States a sufficient salary so that he does not have to go into his own pocket to make up the deficit. I did not vote for the first resolution before the House, although some of the arguments, trivial and petty arguments I might say, from the other side almost convinced me that I should. I did not vote for that resolution because I am opposed to the principle involved.

Why, Mr. Speaker, should we have a lot of irrelevant discussion about a matter upon which there is general agreement? This debate has resolved itself into a series of petty arguments, if you please. Out in Ohio in one of our great farm areas, which unfortunately is not in my district, and I refer to Wayne County, where they grow a tremendous crop of potatoes, there is an old saying that they put all the small potatoes into cans. I suggest that would be a good procedure to follow here with the arguments which have no bearing except for petty political references in the next campaign. As has been said before, I doubt if such vociferous objections to giving the President a raise for the first time in 40 years would have been heard if the gentleman from New York had won the recent election.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Pennsylvania gave a list of the heads of various countries who receive greater salaries than the President of the United States. I wonder if the gentleman realizes that the amount we are paying to the King of England and the princesses over there, over a million dollars, is all being paid by the taxpayers of America under ERP. If we do not stop that, ours will get nothing.

Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of increasing the salary of the President of the United States. I would give him $250,000 a year under this bill, if I were doing it, but I do not like the feature in the bill which grants a $50,000 tax-free bonus to him. I do not like these tax-free type of salaries to anybody. It is un-American—what is good for one is good for all.

I want to insert in the RECORD as part of my remarks a statement from Mr. Stam, Chief of Staff, Internal Revenue Department, showing just what the taxes would be on salaries of $75,000, $100,000, $150,000, $200,000, and $250,000.

JANUARY 14, 1949.

Hon. ROBERT F. RICH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RICH: The attached data are furnished in reply to your request of January 13, 1949.

You also asked what gross salary would have to be paid the President of the United States so that he would have after income taxes $50,000 more than he does at present. His salary would have to be approximately $201,567. At present he has left after taxes $48,275. The increase in salary from $75,000 to $201,567 would increase his salary after taxes by $50,000 or to $98,275.

Respectfully yours,
COLIN F. STAM,
Chief of Staff.

Individual income tax under the present law for married couples with selected salaries

NO DEPENDENTS

Total salary	Tax [1]	Total salary after tax
$75,000	$26,725	$48,275
100,000	40,077	59,923
150,000	69,636	80,364
200,000	102,244	97,756
250,000	137,083	112,917

[1] Assumes taxpayer has no other income other than his salary—assumes that taxpayer has personal deductions such as charitable contributions, medical and dental expenses, etc., that amount to 10 percent of his salary.

Now, I think we should give the President sufficient money to carry on the affairs of his office, but when you start in to make these tax-free gratuities, you are doing something you should not do. Let the President of the United States get a salary sufficient to carry on his office, but let him pay the taxes the same as every other taxpayer in this country, and let him feel the pinch of taxes. He says that people receiving $5,000 and over should pay more taxes. Let him pay his share of taxes. If that is right, let him pay the same in proportion to others with like salaries. Now he is getting a $40,000 free gratuity. Why, he only spent $32,039 of that $40,000 in 1948, so why then continue to increase that gratuity when he gets his house for nothing? He does not have any expense there in the White House with reference to the running of his house; the Government pays for that. The Government pays for his chauffeur. It gives him a private plane, and a private train, and a private yacht. All those things are being paid for by the Government, and he certainly can get along if we give him $250,000. But let him pay his taxes. It cost the Government $260,400 last year to keep up the White House and grounds; for butlers, servants, yardmen, household furnishings, so the President does not even have rent to pay like the Members of Congress. He has a fleet of limousines and chauffeurs. Let the President practice economy—has he no regard at all for taxpayers? He could not run his own business, now he will break up everybody that now remains in business, then he will find cut that foreign countries will not pay his salary.

In the name of all that is good "be wise and economize." I will vote against this bill if the $40,000 tax-free feature is not stricken from the bill.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and include an article by David Lawrence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is with some hesitancy that I ask for this time. It is purely a matter of principle. A few years back when one worked for the State he did not have to pay any Federal-income tax. That practice has been corrected, and it was a step in the right direction, because if a man worked for the State I often wondered why it was that he should be relieved of paying Federal-income taxes just because he had a job with a State government. Now then, we drifted along. The next thing we did in the Seventy-ninth Congress was to provide that the people who worked for the United Nations were excluded from paying any Federal-income tax. They probably tell everyone all over the world that they are Americans, but they do not tell them that they do not help to keep the old machinery going. Now we appear to be ready for the next step. I surely cannot ask anyone here to take my judgment as to what the President needs to carry on his office. I do say, however, that as a principle—and I found out in life that you never get in trouble for sticking up for the things one believes in, even if some people call you small potatoes, but sometimes when they get older they will find out that the potatoes are a good deal larger than they think they are—it is unwise to continue on the road of tax exemption. I say to every Member here today that we are going down the wrong road. I do not care who he is, no one is compelled to be a candidate for office if he does not want to, and any time we provide tax exemptions, regardless for whom it is, we are going down the wrong road. It is surely a great start for the Eighty-first Congress; more for the few less for the many.

Mr. Speaker, the article I refer to is as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star]

LITTLE PEOPLE TO BEAR COSTS OF PAY RAISES PROPOSED FOR OFFICIALS—PLAN SEEN GIVING TRUMAN AN INCOME EQUIVALENT TO $240,000 BEFORE TAXES

(By David Lawrence)

This is the administration of the "little fellows"—the one, it will be recalled, that the "little people" everywhere elected last November. And yet about the first thing the Democrats are doing in the new session of Congress is to vote on a proposal to raise the pay of President Truman to an income equivalent to about $240,000 before taxes.

Various devices are suggested to give Mr. Truman $50,000 expense money which he would not have to account for to anybody and which would be free from taxation, and, in addition, a raise in salary.

There is a general move on to raise salaries in the Government and the principal reason cited for it is that it is hard to attract executives of ability into the Government service at present salary rates. But it would appear that there are plenty of men with executive ability—some of them even in Congress—who would be glad to serve as President at the present salary rate of $75,000 a year and only $40,000 instead of $90,000 for expenses. Some of them are Democrats, too, and they are not at all men of independent means. Perhaps it would be embarrassing to mention them, but sometime between now and the national conventions of 1952 their names doubtless will be revealed to the public.

HIS SIGNATURE REQUIRED

The idea of raising the President's pay is presumably something which Mr. Truman himself didn't start. A commission headed by Herbert Hoover has been studying Government salaries and has recommended more pay for the President, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, Cabinet members, and so on. All this is unquestionably due to the devaluation of the purchasing power of the dollar.

But it has been supposed for years that men who entered the public service did not do so for materialistic reasons. Only people influenced by the profit motive in business were presumed to be materialistic in their attitudes.

Mr. Truman may feel that this is something from which he can remain aloof. But his signature will be required to make the bill into a law. By approving the measure he will be raising his own pay in almost the first legislative act since he was elected.

It would not appear in such bad taste if it were not for the fact Mr. Truman is announcing that he wants everybody in America with an income over $6,000 a year to pay increased taxes. The theory that certain citizens in effect shall be tax exempt and others shall bear the added costs of Government implies that only a few shall be privileged to pay these higher taxes. There was a time when the American theory of good citizenship included the right of every citizen to be permitted to share in the obligations of government. Certainly it would be odd if all labor unions, for example, decided to exempt from the payment of dues those who earned less than a certain amount per week. The idea always has been that those who share the benefits should always pay part of the cost.

MANDATE QUESTIONED

Mr. Truman is asking that an additional $4,000,000,000 in taxes be imposed on both business and individual incomes, and that a $2,000,000,000 increase in social security taxes be deducted from pay rolls each week.

It might be questioned by the voters—including many who voted for a Democratic Congress, as did this correspondent—whether the people gave a "mandate" to increase taxes for everybody over $6,000 and to exempt everybody else from the increase, and whether the people voted to give more pay to the officials of Government, at least in such sums as are being mentioned.

If the budget has to be balanced, the first step is to reduce expenses. If it remains unbalanced even then, the next step is to spread the burdens of taxes equitably so that all citizens pay a fair share of the cost of maintaining Government, a fair share of the expense of feeding Europe and the money needed to prepare the Army, Navy, and Air Forces to give America military security. Certainly many citizens on reflection will want to pay something more at least toward the additional costs of armament. It doesn't look, moreover, as if this is the time to raise by huge sums the pay of those officials who went up and down the country denouncing the Republicans as men who would enrich themselves at the expense of the Government. The "little fellows" may not like it.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM].

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, just a few years ago the gentleman who then occupied the White House took the position that the top salary for anyone should not exceed $25,000 after taxes.

I remember quite distinctly the conversation of some of those individuals who insisted that I should go along with a Presidential directive fixing this salary as the maximum which anyone could earn. Of course, the question before the House at that time was not one of determining whether a specific amount should be the top salary which a person could earn, but rather should the President of the United States be permitted by Presidential directive to limit one's income to a certain figure, which in this case was $25,000.

To my way of thinking it is inconceivable to put a limit on anyone's ability to produce or earn. If such a directive had been in existence at the time the Pilgrims came to America we would not have made the progress which stamps us as the foremost nation of the world.

What I started to say Mr. Speaker was that the passage of this resolution increasing the President's salary and expense account should put an end for all time to the talk of limiting a man's income to $25,000 after taxes. I notice that some of those who are now apparently 100 percent in agreement with granting this increase, are the same individuals who condemned some of us a few years ago for not giving the President authority to limit salaries to $25,000 after taxes.

I am convinced that some of those who are evidently planning to change our form of government, are even now building up propaganda to put the blame on so-called big business or the profit incentive. These same individuals are not only advocating and pursuing a program which if carried to its ultimate conclusion is bound to result in bankruptcy for our country, but are already softening up the people into believing that it would be the results of the profit system which produced it. The most sure and quickest way to ruin an individual is to get him hopelessly involved in debt. It is also the most sure and quickest way to ruin a nation.

I trust that from here on this Congress may have the wisdom to separate the chaff from the grain, and I sincerely trust that all this talk against limiting a man's ability to earn, produce, and invest for the good of future generations will be considered chaff and dealt with accordingly.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the Congress is asked to rush through this salary-raise bill for the President, Vice President, and the Speaker. It has been brought before the Congress with a time limit so short that it cannot, in fact, be given careful and proper consideration. This legislation should have been brought before one of the sessions of the Eightieth Congress last year when it could have been given careful study and thought before the Members were asked to vote on the legislation.

All of us want to deal generously in fixing entirely adequate salaries for the President, Vice President, and Speaker of the House. We honor and respect these high offices and their incumbents. We want them to have salary schedules compatible with the responsibilities of their offices, and the high dignity of the positions they hold in helping to direct the affairs of our Nation.

Had this matter been considered in the previous Congress, it could have been handled with a great deal less embarrassment to any of the Members of the Congress. None of us, even for good and sufficient reasons, like to oppose the measure now before us.

This bill, as I understand it, would increase the salary of the President from $75,000 to $100,000 annually, and in addition would provide the Chief Executive a tax-free expense account of $90,000. In addition, it would increase the salary for the Vice-President and Speaker of the House to $30,000 a year and would also give each of them $10,000 tax free in expenses. They now get $20,000 and $15,000, respectively, with no expense money.

I regret I cannot support the measure because of the tax-free expense accounts provided in the bill. I would rather raise the President's salary to $150,000 or more; also raise the salaries of the Vice President and Speaker of the House, and eliminate the tax-free provisions of this bill.

I believe it sets a very bad example and a bad precedent. I regret exceedingly I must take this position.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as I understand the legislation before us, sections 2, 3, 4, and 5 have been stricken from the measure, so that it now applies only to the salaries and the expense accounts of the three most important officials in the United States—the President, the Vice President, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

By direction of this House I have been serving for the last year and a half on the Commission established by a unanimous vote of Congress—the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. It is perhaps better known in most circles as the Hoover Commission because it is headed by the distinguished former President of the United States—may I say the only living ex-President of the United States—Herbert Hoover.

The Commission has been making a very careful study of all of the various agencies and departments and divisions of the executive branch of the Government. We have used task forces and subcommittees, some 28 task forces and some 30 subcommittees, in these studies. Mr. Hoover has himself served as the chairman of the subcommittee which has studied the President's Office, and, as a result of a report of that subcommittee, it has been the unanimous opinion of the Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government that an increase in compensation should be granted to the President of the United States, the Vice President, and the Speaker of the House, and, I might also add, to other top officials in the executive branch of the Government, also.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very sorry you overlooked the majority leader this time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think both our majority and minority leaders are entitled to some additional consideration because they most certainly do carry a heavy burden of work.

While the Commission has not yet made its full report to the Congress and the Commission did not fix the salaries they believe would be the right amounts for these various officials, I think I can say to you that it was the original opinion of the subcommittee that the President's salary should be fixed at $150,000 per year.

The Commission did not consider the expense-allowance features, which I see are included in this measure, but those of you who have served some time in the House know what my position is on that particular matter. I feel very firmly that any public official, even though he should be the President or just a humble Member of Congress, is entitled to reimbursement for the expenses which he may incur in connection with the conduct of his official duties. I do not believe it wise to hold down the salary of the President of the United States, or the Vice President or the Speaker of the House, to the point where only rich men can afford to serve in such positions.

Therefore, I am supporting the small salary increases proposed in this measure.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks on this particular measure at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]?

There was no objection.

NEED SALARY INCREASE, TOO

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, high taxes and high costs unquestionably have made the President's present-day salary too low and it should be raised.

The same high taxes and high costs have made the salaries and expense accounts of other top officials of the Government too low, and, no doubt, these should be raised.

But these are not the only public employees who are suffering from the high cost of living and high taxes. There are thousands of other public employees whose wages are so low or whose expense accounts, so inadequate, that they, too, even as much as the President and topmost officials, are feeling the pinch. They, too, need relief and should have it.

Now, while we are proceeding to raise the salaries and expense accounts of the topmost employees, it seems to me, is an appropriate time to call attention to those Federal employees in the lower brackets of income, in the hope that Congress will give their problem speedy and fair treatment.

In the office buildings of the Congress there are numerous elevator operators whose salaries are only $155 a month. For this wage, these elevator operators work a 7-day week of 7½ hours each day. They get only 1 day off every 2 weeks. In short, 1 week they work 52½ hours and the next 45 hours. If absent because of illness or other reason their pay is docked. Their average wage is barely 80 cents an hour. After deducting their transportation costs for going to and from work 7 days a week, and after withholding taxes, there is not much carry-home pay left.

They, as well as the topmost officials, are entitled to more adequate pay and to some easing of the long-hour week they now work. There is not much fun in life for the man who must, to live, work 7 days a week.

In the Pentagon Building, within the past fortnight, I saw Government employees operating what are known as offset presses. I asked what wage they received and was told $2,100 a year, before taxes.

I have for some years operated a printing establishment. We have presses of the same type as those in the Pentagon Building. The operators of these presses in my shop are paid about $85 a week. I believe that is about the average wage paid by private industry for this work, yet Government workers employed at the same work, I was told, receive only about $40 a week, only half of that paid similar workers employed in private industry.

There are in the Federal service tens of thousands of employees, especially those in the lower brackets, who get wages so low that after taxes, these are adequate only for the lowest scale of living. These workers, as well as those in the topmost brackets, are entitled to a raise.

We want the best employees we can get in Government. That rule should apply to the employees in the lowest brackets as well as those in the highest brackets.

Wars are won as much by the zeal, courage, and loyalty of the private and noncom in the ranks as by the ability of generals, and similarly an efficient, productive Government organization depends on a satisfied personnel, paid adequate enough salaries to prevent a rapid turn-over. A turn-over of thousands in the low classifications of Government is just as costly to governmental efficiency as the occasional retirement of a topmost official.

These low-paid workers need a raise.

In expense accounts, high taxes and the high cost of living have worked just as great, or even greater, hardship on the low-wage Government employee as upon those in the topmost rungs of the salary scale.

For example, Government employees who by the nature of their work are compelled to travel a good deal now are allowed $6 a day for subsistence while traveling on Government business.

This $6 is supposed to pay their hotel lodging bill and for three meals a day while they are on the road. Surely, no Member of Congress believes this $6 is adequate to buy a night's lodging and three meals in any large city of this country. The $6 would not buy that in any second- or third-class hotel. The sustenance allowance of these workers who, to hold their jobs, must travel on Government business should be raised to $8 a day.

Recently, I talked to a Government worker who, from the nature of his job, must travel a good deal of the time. He told me he had kept figures on his cost of living on the road while traveling on Government business. At the end of the year, he found, he said, that he had spent $900 more than he had received from the $6-a-day subsistence allowance. He was wondering if he should deduct this $900 from his income tax and thereby save part of it. The Government should not expect its employees to make such sacrifices in order for them to keep their jobs.

To compel them to do so will, in the long run, prove penny-wise and pound-foolish, for the continuation of this situation will compel many employees to leave the Government service. The Government then will have to employ new persons to fill their places and go through the expensive and often wasteful cost of training untried and inexperienced personnel to fill their places.

The present law allows internal revenue collectors and other Federal employees who use their own automobiles when traveling on official Government business only 4 cents a mile when traveling within their post of duty and 5 cents a mile when traveling outside their post.

This 4- and 5-cents-a-mile allowance for use of a car is substantially below that allowed by most private businesses. It is totally inadequate to meet the cost of car insurance, gas and oil, storage and upkeep, to say nothing of depreciation. The Government should

not expect its employees to be out of pocket in order to keep their jobs.

If I had my way I would much prefer that the inadequate salary and expense account situation of those in the lower brackets be taken care of first and that of those in the topmost brackets later. But this, unfortunately, is not to be the procedure.

Let us cherish the hope that the Congress, after taking care of the Government's topmost men, first, will then not forget and neglect those who are in greater need of a fair deal, those employees in the lower brackets.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, if this bill goes through to give the President a $100,000 salary and a $90,000 tax-free expense account, I am informed by the Legislative Reference Service that it will be the equivalent of approximately a $530,000 a year salary. It is important that the issue before us be clarified.

He now is paid a salary of $75,000 and has a tax-free expense account of $40,000. The effect of the twofold proposal in this measure is to increase his salary, not from $75,000 to $100,000, but from $75,000 to over $300,000.

Although a modest increase in his salary from $75,000 to $100,000 a year may be justified, I am opposed to the subterfuge involved in the proposal now before us.

The bill provides that he shall not be required to make any accounting as to the way he spends this extra $50,000, nor, indeed, is he even required to certify that it is actually expended. We all know that it is simply an attempt on the part of the majority to increase his compensation substantially without incurring the opposition which would be Nation-wide if the people were given the facts.

We have no right to be parties to bamboozling the public in this fashion. If we propose to make this move we should do it in a forthright fashion by increasing his salary to $300,000. The very statement of that proposal gives one pause. While ample provision should be made for the Chief Executive of the land, we should not convert the office into one which will be sought by those who have only a financial motive.

Furthermore, it is well for the President, as well as other high-salaried officials, including Members of Congress, to realize that their compensation is subject to tax. A case could be put up for everyone in the country, high-salaried executives and working men and women alike, to be allowed a tax-free sum for expenses. Everyone incurs such expenses in connection with his work, for which he is denied any tax exemption. A simple illustration is the bus fare or streetcar fare or automobile expense which almost everyone incurs in going to and from his work. The President already has this large tax-free fund of $40,000 completely exempt from taxes.

He was not elected on a platform or with the expectation that he should be paid the equivalent of a $530,000 a year salary.

This resolution should be defeated.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I will vote to support the resolution to increase the President's salary and allow an adequate expense account. It is just and fair to do so.

The dignity and importance of the high office of President of the United States entitles the occupant of that office to compensation that is commensurate with the duties he performs. As the highest officer of our Government the responsibilities that he is called upon to carry are enormous. They are not equaled by any ruler in any nation of the world. Yet, many of these in nations far smaller than our own are receiving compensation far beyond that which we contemplate paying the President under the resolution now before the House.

Furthermore, beyond the tremendous physical strain his duties place upon him, there is a heavy financial drain upon his own resources to keep up with what the American people expect of their President. To do this, it should not be necessary for the President to depend upon his own personal financial resources.

To withhold adequate compensation may preclude a man of limited means, such as Mr. Truman, from being a candidate to the office of President. We don't want to ever let it be said that you must be a rich man to be President of the United States.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, in considering S. 103, I believe it to be important to keep in mind the tendency, which seems to be growing, for the Congress to pass legislation which exempts from the provisions of the income-tax law certain emoluments which come to Federal officials which are really compensation for their services. This bill as originally drawn provided that the President should receive compensation in the aggregate sum of $150,000. The bill was modified in the other body so as to make it appear that only $100,000 of that sum is salary and $50,000 was designated as expense allowance and this sum is not subject to tax liability and no accounting shall be made by the President with respect to it.

Apparently in reality it is compensation. When the legislation was presented in the House increasing our own salaries and providing for a tax-free expense account I voted against it for that reason. I believe it is sound from a legislative standpoint, and equitable, to provide adequate compensation not only for our officials who occupy high positions but also for all Federal employees in low-income brackets. Certainly I believe it proper and just to provide adequate salaries for the President and Vice President and the Speaker of the House. I do believe that it is a mistake to provide tax-exempt compensation for these officials or any other officials.

I include as a part of my remarks a statement from the issue of January 21, 1949, United States News and World Report, page 5, which sets forth in detail the compensation and expense allowances for the President and his office:

NEWSCRAM

The country plans to do quite well by its President in 1949 and years to come. Mr. Truman, taking up the job, is to find it not a bad one at all.

Pay is being raised. It's planned to be $100,000, subject to tax, plus $50,000 in tax-free expense account. It has been $75,000 with no expense account. Mr. Truman last year couldn't quite make out on $48,000 left after taxes.

Take-home pay, after taxes, it has been decided, should be at least $100,000. That's what the job is supposed to be worth annually. Mr. Truman is scheduled to get around $110,000 after taxes with the raise and the expense account. He could do what he wants with the expense account, spend it or save it.

Tax-free pay isn't available to the ordinary citizen. To have $110,000 left over, after taxes, a person would need at least $240,000 of taxable income. That's before any new tax increase. Not many people make that much.

What is happening is that Congress is deciding that a person can't really make what he is worth under the present rate of taxes. To enable the President to have pay that is supposed to be adequate, it is proving to be necessary to dodge the tax laws by setting up a tax-free expense account. A straight pay raise to $240,000 seemed to Congress to be too much.

Mr. Truman favors a tax increase for persons with net income above $6,000.

The President's job, if you can get it, offers other things, too.

A house goes with the job. It's a big white house and expensive to run. Upkeep is to cost taxpayers $260,400 in the year ahead. That's for butlers, other servants, yardmen, household furnishings, and other things.

The house itself is run down. It's to be fixed up at a cost of at least $4,000,000. The house sits in a 16-acre wooded estate. Rent is free.

A private airplane is provided, too. It's four-engined and de luxe.

There's a yacht, a big seagoing yacht. The Navy maintains that, and it is always ready when wanted, with full crew. A private railroad car always is ready. There is a fleet of limousines with chauffeurs.

Travel allowance is $40,000 a year. That's for private transportation. It doesn't pay for airplane, yacht, and limousines. It must be accounted for.

The $110,000 net in take-home pay, after taxes, doesn't have to be used to pay for these things. But the President must entertain often at his private expense. He gets reimbursed for official receptions and that's all. The job in some years cost the late Mr. Roosevelt money and it has cost Mr. Truman some money, too. Mr. Roosevelt was the first President who paid an income tax. In pre-New Deal days, when prices were lower and the President paid no tax on his income, many Presidents saved quite a bit of money out of their pay.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, to me this matter seems simple. We are allowing the President the sum of $50,000 annually to take care of expenses he incurs because he is President. If we think he is entitled to an expense account—and I think he is—then we should not give him an amount and then proceed to whittle it down by taking part of it back as taxes.

The logic of some of those that object to this allowance may be sound. But there is another approach to this particular problem than the logic of the situation. It is that the man who was elected President should have an expense account that will help him pay for the necessary entertainment that falls to him as our Chief Executive. In many cities and in my home city we do this for our mayor. We ask no accounting of him

and we do not subject this allowance to any taxation. We give him the money and say in effect, "Take this and spend it as you wish to build up the good will of our city and us by being a good host. You represent us by virtue of your election and we will take pride in anything you may do in the way of entertaining people as we know it will reflect credit on you and us as well." We should have that same feeling with respect to our President and for this reason I am in favor of granting this allowance, tax free.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, in order to keep the record straight in this matter, I would like to say that it comes before the House at this time because of the urgency of the situation.

If this legislation does not become law before the 20th of this month, then President Truman will not have the benefit of it under the provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

I would like to go further and tell you that early in December, from December 13 to December 15, a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service held extensive hearings on this subject. They had before them a bill introduced by Senator FLANDERS, then the chairman of that subcommittee. That bill increased the salary of the President, the Vice President, and the Speaker, and some 223 heads of departments and under secretaries.

That bill was the original bill, S. 103. But because the Senate Committee of this Congress did not have time to hold hearings on it, it comes before us now in this abbreviated form, taking care of only the President, the Vice President, and the Speaker of the House.

The last time the salary of the President of the United States was raised was in 1909. A great deal of water has gone over the dam since that time. There have been many changes. It is beyond the memory of some of the people here and some of the younger Members were not then even born. Yet, we continue to evaluate this high office, the greatest office of public trust in the world, in terms of 1909.

There have only been three adjustments in the salary of the President of the United States during the history of the Republic. The salary was first fixed in 1789 at $25,000 a year. In 1873 it was raised to $50,000 a year. In 1909 it was raised to $75,000. Now we propose to make it $100,000.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. MILLER of California. Yes; I yield for a correction.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman from Massachusetts a while ago mentioned that there had not been a raise in salary for 40 years, but that the expense account was raised in recent years from $25,000 to $40,000.

Mr. MILLER of California. I will come to that in a minute. But I fail to see where the statement of the gentleman constitutes a correction, because the last time the salary of the President was raised was in 1909 and this being the year 1949, it was 40 years ago. So the gentleman from Massachusetts was correct in making that statement. The expense account that has been spoken of here is not a general expense account. The money that has been referred to is a travel allowance, which, by law, may be fixed at not to exceed $40,000. But it is limited as a travel allowance. Last year the President only used $32,000, so the surplus there cannot be charged against the general expenses of running the White House.

There is currently running in one of the newspapers a series of articles by the housekeeper who entered the White House with President Roosevelt in 1932. I commend this series of articles to you for reading. You will see that they did not have money enough to properly run the White House, and that they had to get the money out of certain of the food allowances, in order to rebuild the kitchen.

That series of articles will tell you some startling things in connection with the operation of the Executive Mansion, the home of the President of the United States. Former President Hoover appeared before the Flanders subcommittee. I happen to have been the only member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service then in Washington, and I was invited, as a courtesy by Senator FLANDERS, to sit with that committee, and I sat with him during the hearings.

I want to say that former President Hoover was referring to the salary proposed by a bill then before it by Senator FLANDERS which fixed the President's salary at $150,000 a year. Frankly, if you go into the record, you will see where former President Hoover suggested that perhaps fixing the salary at a lower figure and giving a tax-free allowance might be the better way to approach this subject.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. Is it not a fact that in our State it is the common practice in cities and municipalities to allow the mayor to have a similar fund?

Mr. MILLER of California. Yes. I thank the gentleman for that contribution.

Former President Hoover said:

I should think the American people would be perfectly willing and glad to see the Government give board and lodging to its President. He does not get it now, for he must pay his own board and that of numerous other people.

Then he goes on. The matter appears in the transcript of the hearing.

The so-called task force from the Committee on Reorganization in Executive Departments appeared before the Flanders committee in the person of former President Hoover, Mr. John A. Stevenson, president of the Penn Mutual Life Insurance Co.; Mr. Arthur Flemming, president of Ohio Wesleyan University; and Hon. Robert Ramspeck, our former colleague, all urging that this matter be given immediate consideration by the Congress and that the dignity of the office of President be recognized by fixing his salary on a basis comparable with that office.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is, Shall the rules be suspended and the resolution passed?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Eleven Members have arisen; not a sufficient number.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SIGNING OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House today, the Speaker be authorized to sign any bills or joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 51) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That during the Eighty-first Congress the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall be composed of 28 members.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. RICH. May I ask why the membership of this committee is reduced below what it was in the Eightieth Congress? I notice that on a great number of committees the membership was cut down on this side much more than it was in the last Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sure the gentleman will not find that to be true. That is a matter that the leadership on both sides very carefully discussed.

I can assure my friend that there is no discord among the leadership on that question.

Mr. RICH. I looked over the list and found that in some of the committees—not all, but in some—there are fewer Republicans this year than there were Democrats in the last Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. In the last Congress 56 percent plus of the membership of committees were Republican. In this one 60 percent plus are Democrats. I

can assure my friend that on the 15 elective committees there is perfect accord amongst the leadership on both sides.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not know whether the minority leader is on the floor at the moment or not, but the matter had not been called to my attention previously. I have just been informed by the ranking member of the committee that he is not familiar with the proposal. I wonder if the gentleman from Massachusetts would withdraw his request until such time as we might have an opportunity to make some determination about it?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts withdraws the resolution.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY (at the request of Mr. KEATING) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. PATTERSON (at the request of Mr. LODGE) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an address by National Commander Frackman, of the Regular Veterans' Association, at a State meeting of the Regular Veterans' Association.

Mr. FERNANDEZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a sermon delivered at the red Mass on yesterday.

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD with regard to the power shortage in the Pacific Northwest and legislation he has introduced regarding it.

Mr. BLATNIK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

PUTTING ALL OUR SECURITY EGGS IN EUROPEAN BASKET: A RECKLESS GAMBLE

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, for a long time millions of thoughtful Americans have been properly disturbed by the administration's policy of making every possible effort to help the existing governments of western Europe resist further expansion of Communist control, and no real effort in the last 3 years to help the Chinese Government resist Communist expansion. It has been generally supposed that those responsible for the policy of concentrating on Europe justified it on the thesis that there can be no peace or security until the Soviet Union is forced to retreat within its own boundaries in Europe, and, in fact, until the present tyranny in the Kremlin is overthrown.

I agree with that thesis completely. But it does not follow that in order to save Europe it is or ever was necessary to abandon China to the Communists, except for a few feeble gestures and some relief measures to keep the American people, and perchance the Chinese people, from realizing that since December 1945 our policy in Asia, in fact if not in words, has been one of abandonment of the Chinese Government, accepting and in reality making certain its destruction, though it is an official and loyal ally.

On the contrary, the stupendous victories, both strategic and psychological, which world communism is winning in Asia, make enormously more difficult our efforts to hold and defeat it in Europe. Can it be either necessary or wise for us to put all our chips on the European front? Even though we should win there, it would not be fatal or even too serious for the Soviet regime if it has most of Asia into which to retire and wait while the western nations bleed themselves to death with expanding budgets and diminishing resources. When will we wake up to the magnitude of the disaster befalling us in the Far East and its menace to the success of our policies in Europe?

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer making public the policy which has long existed and discussing the enormous risk we are taking by gambling everything on getting victory on the European front:

The United States is now firmly committed to gambling the fate of the world upon its success in beating Russia to the punch during the next 2 years.

That statement is based upon unimpeachable information whose source I am compelled to withhold. What it means is that beneath the misleading surface maneuvers of President Truman's administration, there is a basic foreign policy that is clear and coherent, and one of the most decisive in American history.

If this has not been generally recognized, it is because the Government's true foreign policy, so far as I know, has never been publicly stated; and it has not been stated because it is so audacious as to appear reckless.

Many American students of world affairs are deeply worried by what appear to be profound inconsistencies in American foreign policy since Truman, Marshall, and Lovett began revamping it in January 1947. The inconsistency, if not the worry, vanishes when we know what the President and his assistants actually have in view.

Only this revelation which I am privileged to make explains President Truman's apparent negligence in permitting the Communists to take over China, and his seeming indifference to the danger of a resurgent, brutally expansive Germany. Both of these are part of a reasoned scheme.

Under Harry S. Truman, exactly as he promised me back in September 1945, the United States now has a foreign policy extending all over the world. It is definite, it is consistent, and it means business. It is also dangerous. I can sum it up best in the language of bridge and chess:

"West to play and checkmate East in 2 to 3 years."

BASIC UNITED STATES POLICY

West is obviously the United States, with such like-minded peoples as are willing to follow our lead; East is the Soviet Union with its satellite states and its world-wide network of Communist stooges.

Briefly summarized, American foreign policy is frontal pressure upon the adversary along a relatively narrow front, namely western Europe, the Mediterranean, and the Middle East as far as Iran. This pressure is being exerted, and is to be further exerted, by all possible means short of war. It is to be backed by what American leaders believe is the irresistible air-and-atom power of the United States, by the world's greatest fleet, and ultimately by well-armed European holding forces along the area to discourage any sudden sneak attack.

The key to this policy is concentration—squeezing the Soviet Union to compel it first to stop and then to retreat from its illicitly acquired conquests in eastern Europe. The Soviet Union is to be forced into honoring the Yalta and the Potsdam agreements.

All means are being concentrated to this single purpose. Since Germany is to be rescued, German good will is necessary. Therefore the Germans are being babied beyond their deserts. There is—as the planners see it—no risk of a strong Germany involved, since success in stopping Russia will be prompt, after which the policy of favoring the Germans can be reversed if necessary.

EXPEDIENCY VERSUS LONG-TERM AIMS

Ideologies also become temporarily negligible. The United States leaders will gladly accept the assistance, unless harmful to the plan, of any country—reactionary Greece or Communist Yugoslavia—just as they accepted the help of Communist Russia against Hitler during World War II. Since time is short, United States leaders do not feel compelled to make Greece reform or the nations of western Europe unite. Such aims are long-run objectives and Washington is concentrating on the short run.

Furthermore, since even America's means are limited and the real conquest of China by the Communists will (allegedly) take a long time, China can safely be neglected. For, if the policy in Europe is successful, it will lead to a world-wide arrangement with the Russians that will liberate China.

This policy is not the "containment" of Russia advocated a year or two ago by George F. Kennan, of the State Department; it is obviously not "containing" Russia in Asia. This is a policy of direct pressure on one area with all the concentrated peacetime strength of mighty America.

Clearly, too, it rests upon the belief that under such pressure the men in the Kremlin must yield. The argument seems to be that the Soviet Union, like Hitlerite Germany, is a bicycle-like body that can stand up only when advancing at a rapid pace. Make it stand still and it will fall over. American students of Soviet affairs purport to see in the recent hysterical Soviet purges of economics, literature, music, biology, and physics, signs of the first weakening within the country. Therefore, they argue, we must keep up the heat, maintain the Berlin airlift regardless of cost—and victory and lasting peace will soon be ours.

Such a policy is coherent even in its neglect of the United Nations. It neglects literally everything that does not immediately contribute to its success. One can even argue that since it needs the speed, concentration, and resolution of a military campaign, its execution is properly being entrusted to military men.

Its weakness lies in the immensity of the risk it entails. It is entirely postulated on the belief that Russian imperialism can be brought to bay quickly. If it fails, it will leave the United States and the like-minded

nations in a desperate position: The European recovery money gone and no European unity to show for it; Germany relatively powerful and likely to ally itself with the Soviets, the greater part of Asia communized, and our Pacific outposts in jeopardy.

That is the gamble taken by President Truman. It is a gamble that has never been authorized or even understood by the American Congress or the American people. It is a gamble even greater than President Roosevelt took during World War II when he banked on his ability to tame the Soviet Union—and failed.

The SPEAKER. Under the special order of the House heretofore entered the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

JUDICIAL USURPATION IN THE CEMENT CASE

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned over the Supreme Court's decision in the so-called Cement case. My home town, Oglesby, Ill., is a city of 4,000 people, most of whom depend upon our two cement mills for a living. The pay rolls of these two cement mills constitute the major part of the financial lifeblood of our community. No wonder I am interested in the Cement case.

I bring this Cement-case decision to the attention of the Members of Congress because unless some remedial legislation is passed at this session to remove the Nation-wide confusion and uncertainty that now obtains throughout American industry, as a result of the order of the Federal Trade Commission and the supporting decision of the Supreme Court, irreparable harm will be done to our American economic system.

Mr. Speaker, for half a century it has been the practice of heavy industry in America—cement, steel, building materials, lumber, newsprint, corn products, and furniture—to quote delivered prices to the buyers of their products. This method of pricing is also used by makers of cigarettes, cough drops, and thousands of other articles that have a Nation-wide sale. The Commission's order has produced chaos and uncertainty in all lines of American industry, and threatens to dislocate and wreck our economic system. At a conservative estimate the various industries affected by the decision in the Cement case represent an aggregate of $50,000,000,000 of American investment, and employ approximately 16,000,000 American workers, with factories located in every State in the Union. Literally millions of workers in industries, such as iron and steel and their fabricating industries, rubber, tobacco, and food products, have been placed in jeopardy by this decision. On the proper solution of this pricing problem by the Congress rests the future development of thousands of cities and towns in which the savings of our citizens have been invested in plant facilities. What affects these industries will affect the workers in them—their jobs, their accumulated technical experience, their homes, their families, and the communities in which they live. One can readily see, therefore, that this pricing problem has Nation-wide ramifications that affect the lives of the majority of our American people. It is safe to say that there is not one congressional district in the United States that is not adversely affected by this attack upon our established pricing practices.

THE CEMENT CASE

Mr. Speaker, the history of the Cement case, briefly stated, is as follows:

A. The Federal Trade Commission charged the cement manufacturers with maintaining a combination to restrain competition among themselves in the prices which they charged for portland cement. The complaint alleged an industry-wide agreement to use, and the actual use of, what is known as a multiple basing-point system of pricing, pursuant to which all cement is sold only at delivered prices, which at any given time and place, are invariably identical as to all defendants offering cement for sale. The primary charge was that the combination in restraint of trade constituted an unfair method of competition within the prohibition of the Federal Trade Commission Act. The secondary charge was that, as a result of the combination, prices charged by each defendant to its customers were discriminatory and therefore violated the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act.

B. The Trade Commission issued an order against the cement companies, restraining them from continuing the alleged combination and from using certain specified methods of pricing and marketing cement in connection with any combination or agreement.

C. The issue was then taken to the courts by the defendant cement companies. After a full and complete hearing the Circuit Court of Appeals, Seventh Judicial Circuit, set aside the Trade Commission's order on the ground that there was insufficient evidence to sustain the charge of combination and conspiracy.

D. The Federal Trade Commission then took the case to the Supreme Court of the United States, which, on April 26, 1948, reversed the order of the court of appeals and directed it to enforce the Trade Commission's order. In doing so, the Supreme Court sustained the Trade Commission's contentions as to jurisdiction; and, in the language of the opinion, the Trade Commission's administrative interpretations were approved. Going beyond the necessary decision of the contested issues, the opinion of the Supreme Court contained a general discussion of the economic theories advanced by the Federal Trade Commission in its argument before the Court. The effect of this discussion, which lawyers commonly call "dicta," was to create confusion throughout American industry as to the extent of the meaning and application of the Court's opinion.

WILL RESTRICT BUSINESS

Mr. Speaker, the results of extended and reliable inquiries show that if the Trade Commission's position is not corrected by the Congress, delivered pricing methods and practices, not only in the cement industry, but in many other industries, that have been established for more than half a century, must be abandoned; manufacturers will be compelled to substitute uniform f. o. b. plant pricing; buyers will have to contend with the complications of freight rates and routings, which many of them are not equipped to handle; sellers will be confined to sales areas in which they have a freight cost advantage over their competitors, and they will be shut out of many markets where they have heretofore been able to offer their goods for sale in competition with manufacturers who have a delivery cost advantage. Many long-established business enterprises will be compelled to restrict their operations and in some cases close down or move from their present location closer to sources of supply of manufactured materials which they reprocess.

As a concrete example of what will happen all over the United States, I cite the two cities of La Salle and Oglesby, my home community, where three cement plants were located many years ago. These three plants produced most of the cement manufactured in Illinois. They served the Chicago area market before the United States Steel Corp. plants in Lake County, Ind., were established. When the steel corporation built these new plants within the Chicago switching district, they acquired a freight cost advantage in delivered cement to the Chicago market. Thereafter, the Oglesby and La Salle plants had to make delivered prices in the Chicago area, such prices reduced to meet the lower delivered price which the steel company was able to make by reason of its delivery cost advantage. As a result, cement buyers in Chicago were able to take advantage of this competition, have their choice between the products of a number of cement manufacturers, and compete with one another on the basis of equality in the price which they pay for cement.

Enforced f. o. b. plant pricing, which the Trade Commission advocates, will drive the La Salle and Oglesby plants from the Chicago area market. In normal times cement consumption outside the Chicago market area would be insufficient to keep even the smallest of the three plants in full operation. Under those conditions whatever cement the plants produced would have to be sold at higher prices because production costs would be higher as a result of the reduced rate of operation. My home town of Oglesby would then take on the semblance of a ghost town, and the workers and the small-town merchants dependent upon the employees of the cement plants would be in the same condition as displaced persons.

Mr. Speaker, I attended Senator CAPEHART's committee hearings on this Nation-wide pricing problem and listened with a great deal of interest to the testimony presented. I concur fully with the statement of Mr. William Schoenberg, general president of the United Cement, Lime, and Gypsum Workers International Union, when he said:

There is a genuine danger confronting every cement worker as a result of the Supreme Court's decision in the Cement case.

Concerning this genuine danger Mr. Schoenberg testified as follows:

Cement plants are located mostly in small communities that have grown up around the cement plants. As these cement plants grew up, the workers in them built homes for their families, schools for their children, and churches for worship, which represent all their savings and in which their entire equity in life is tied up. The moving or closing of any of these large cement plants, or placing them upon a part-time production basis, would seriously affect these workers, and would create ghost towns all over America.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Trade Commission has been crusading for many years against these long-established pricing practices, practices in which the producer absorbs the freight. The Commission proposes to substitute f. o. b. plant prices for the delivered prices. Twice the Commission has attempted to persuade Congress to pass legislation to bring about this change, but Congress has refused to do so because the Commission has failed to prove that such a change in pricing practices would be an over-all benefit to the American people. In 1936, when such proposed legislation was before a Senate committee headed by Senator Burton K. Wheeler, the Senator said:

I hope I am not foolish enough to think that I can confine the industries of this country to the particular radius of the locality in which they operate. That is preposterous on its face.

The Commission has now succeeded in getting the Supreme Court to render a decision which, in substance, does what the Congress has twice refused to do. This tendency on the part of the courts of today to usurp the functions of the Congress was very aptly put by the judge in the case of the Aetna Portland Cement Co. against Federal Trade Commission, supra, at page 573, when he said:

In our judgment, the question as to whether the basing-point price system should be declared illegal rests clearly within the legislative domain. We know of no criticism so often and so forcibly directed at courts, particularly Federal courts, as their propensity for usurping the functions of Congress. If this pricing system which Congress has over the years steadfastly refused to declare illegal, although vigorously urged to do so, is now to be outlawed by the courts, it will mark the high tide in judicial usurpation.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the facts presented at the hearings before the Senate committee, facts that I have tried to present in condensed form, in view of the Nation-wide effect that the Supreme Court's decision in the Cement case has had and will have upon half of the Nation's industrial life; in view of the adverse effect the decision is bound to have upon some 16,000,000 American workers; in view of the chaos and confusion that is present today in American industry as a result of this Cement case decision, and in view of the fears that beset American industrial plants and their employees today, as a result of the Federal Trade Commission's order and the Supreme Court's decision upholding the legality of that order, I urge this Congress to take immediate action to clear up and remove the chaos, the confusion, and the fear that is now prevalent throughout American industry as a result of the Supreme Court's decision in the Cement case.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 51) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That during the Eighty-first Congress, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall be composed of 28 members.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

CONSPIRACY TO CORRUPT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I have arisen at this time and in this manner in order to address the House on what is really a question of personal privilege. However, my remarks will be devoted to a proceeding which occurred during another Congress, and I am informed that under a technical interpretation of parliamentary procedure I am not entitled now to invoke the right of personal privilege.

On October 22 last, less than 2 weeks before the 1948 national elections, a subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor held a hearing in my congressional district in San Francisco. The members of the subcommittee present were former Congressman Charles J. Kersten, of Wisconsin, who presided as chairman, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

The announced purpose of this subcommittee hearing was to investigate Communist infiltration into labor unions which serve the industries of the United States. During the hearing a witness, William Patrick Brandhove, accused various labor union officials of being members of the Communist Party. Toward the end of his testimony, Brandhove introduced my name into the record by making the following statement:

We have traced $180,000 of the union's funds that have been spent by the Communist Party for numerous front organizations and in assisting the political campaigns of such individuals as FRANCK R. HAVENNER when he was friendly with them; Oleta O'Conner Yates, county chairman of the Communist Party; Scottie Sneddon, who ran for the legislature in Portland; the National Negro Congress, and organizations too numerous to mention.

Soon after Brandhove completed his testimony, the meeting was adjourned. A few minutes later I learned that my name had been used, and I tried vainly to get in touch with the members of the subcommittee in order to demand that I be given an opportunity to be heard. I was informed that the committee members had left San Francisco, and that no further hearings would be held until after the elections. As a matter of fact, so far as I am aware, no more meetings of this subcommittee were held in San Francisco.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not so much concerned about this clumsy attempt to smear me — because it failed of its purpose at the polls — as I am about the obvious fact that certain unscrupulous politicians in my district have been able repeatedly to use committees of the Congress of the United States as tools in a political conspiracy to besmirch the reputation of a Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I never received any notice that a meeting of this subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor was to be held in the congressional district which I have been five times elected to represent in this House. Even if this had been due merely to an oversight, it would have been a breach of one of the basic rules of congressional courtesy. But, Mr. Speaker, there are abundant reasons to believe that the failure to invite me to attend this subcommittee hearing was far from being an oversight; that, on the contrary, there was a deliberate purpose to keep me in ignorance of the meeting until it was over, so that I would have no opportunity to refute any slanderous testimony against me or indeed to have any reason to suspect that any such slanderous testimony might be given. I might describe this whole proceeding as a deliberate hit and run operation.

Mr. Speaker, I shall now proceed to show that the campaign manager of my opponent for Congress in the recent election knew all about the fact that this congressional subcommittee would hold a hearing in my congressional district shortly before election day, and that he offered financial inducements to William Patrick Brandhove to appear as a witness at this committee hearing, and to give testimony which would link my name with alleged Communists and with organizations which were alleged to be subversive.

I shall also show that the witness William Patrick Brandhove was notified to attend and did attend a conference with the chairman of the subcommittee, former Representative Kersten, of Wisconsin, and certain other individuals, in a San Francisco hotel on the night prior to the subcommittee hearing and that he did then and there discuss in advance with Kersten and the others the program for the hearing.

I now read a copy of an affidavit, dated October 24, 1948, made before a notary public in San Francisco in the presence of witnesses, by William Patrick Brandhove:

OCTOBER 24, 1948.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
City and County of San Francisco, October 24, 1948:

In March 1948, I was approached by Warnock Walsh, San Francisco police commissioner, who suggested that I go to see William Mailliard, now a candidate for Congress on the Republican ticket from the Fourth (San Francisco) District. Walsh saw me in person at the E. F. Hutton Co. in San Francisco. At his suggestion, I went to see Mailliard at the office of Mailliard's father, Mailliard and Schmiedell, 320 California Street.

Mailliard suggested that I run for Congress. His reason was so I could tag FRANCK R. HAVENNER, Congressman from the Fourth Congressional District, as a Communist. He wanted me to do this in the same way that I tagged HAVENNER a Communist during the campaign for mayor in San Francisco in 1947 when I ran for the board of supervisors. Mailliard's plan was that when we had thoroughly tagged HAVENNER as a Communist then

I would withdraw in Mailliard's favor and Mailliard would become the candidate. In this way, HAVENNER might be defeated in the primary, leaving the field to Mailliard.

Mailliard suggested I see Don Nicholson, now campaign manager for William Mailliard. I met Nicholson about 2 days after my meeting with Mailliard. Nicholson told me that, in his opinion, it would be foolish for me to run for Congress and suggested I wait until the general election so that I could assist the Mailliard campaign by labeling HAVENNER a red.

After a trip to sea aboard the *Kelso Victory* which lasted approximately 3 months, I returned to San Francisco on June 15, 1948.

WM. PATRICK BRANDHOVE.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 24th day of October 1948:

R. M. SPILLANE,
Notary Public in and for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California.
My commission expires July 17, 1951.

At this time I shall read a copy of another affidavit, also dated October 24, 1948, made by William Patrick Brandhove before a notary public in San Francisco:

In early July, I went to Mailliard's office. We discussed the issue of labeling HAVENNER as a red. Mailliard wanted me to commence working during the month of October for his campaign committee. Mailliard suggested I see Nicholson about this plan.

The next day I saw Nicholson. Nicholson told me to contact him the first of October. Nicholson said the job would be to label HAVENNER as a red. I left the mechanics to him.

I called Don Nicholson in the first week of October. Nicholson said that in his opinion the best thing to do would be to go after HAVENNER in the last week of the campaign.

Nicholson said that if the occasion arose, and I had the opportunity to do it, that I should trace funds of the marine cooks and stewards union to a campaign of HAVENNER—that I should make the charge that marine cooks and stewards funds were used for some HAVENNER campaign.

At that time Nicholson told me the opportunity would arise to tag HAVENNER. He told me the Kersten committee would come here. I knew that. We talked about what the committee was coming for and I told Nicholson that I would take advantage of that opportunity to smear HAVENNER.

On Tuesday, October 19, I had another meeting with Nicholson and he told me that he would provide me with a sound car, which ostensibly would be used to campaign for an assembly candidate and that I should tag Assemblyman George Collins and Congressman HAVENNER as reds in a tour around the city. The sound truck was to be made available on Monday, October 25. Nicholson said he would give me some operating money on October 25 and after the campaign he would give me $1,000.

Nicholson told me that the committee hearing—the Kersten committee—would be my opportunity to take care of HAVENNER in the manner we had discussed.

During my testimony on Friday, October 22, before the Kersten committee at the post-office building at Seventh and Mission Streets in San Francisco, the opportunity presented itself to follow out Nicholson's suggestion. I stated that the Communist Party leadership of the marine cooks' and stewards' union had donated moneys to a Havenner campaign.

By tying Congressman HAVENNER's name to the Communist leadership of the marine cooks and stewards and Oleta O'Conner Yates, a known Communist, I felt that I was doing the job that Nicholson required of me.

But I know that FRANCK HAVENNER is not a Communist and I know that he is opposed to communism. Furthermore, I know that the Communist Party is opposed to the election of FRANCK R. HAVENNER.

Immediately after the hearing at the post office, I telephoned Nicholson. I told him what happened at the hearing. He said I did a good job.

In that conversation I asked him what the next step would be. He said to come in Monday about the sound car and that he planned to use this stuff toward the close of the campaign.

This statement was given by me voluntarily, without any promise of remuneration, and is, to my own knowledge, true and correct.

WM. PATRICK BRANDHOVE.

OCTOBER 24, 1948.

Subscribed and sworn to before me, a notary public in and for the city and county of San Francisco, State of California.

R. M. SPILLANE,
Notary Public in and for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California.
My commission expires July 17, 1951.

In a supplementary affidavit, also dated October 24, 1948, and sworn to before a notary public in San Francisco, Brandhove described a conference which he had with Congressman Kersten, chairman of the congressional subcommittee; Howard Rushmore, an employee of the Hearst newspapers; and others, at the Mark Hopkins Hotel, San Francisco, on Thursday evening, October 21, the night before the congressional subcommittee hearing was held in San Francisco:

OCTOBER 24, 1948.

I wish to give the details of my meeting at the Mark Hopkins Hotel, San Francisco, with Congressman Kersten and others on Thursday, October 21.

Martin Kaplan telephoned Congressman Kersten at 4:30 p. m. Thursday, October 21, and arranged for myself, Alex Harris, and W. H. Handelsman to meet with Congressman Kersten's committee that evening at 9 p. m. at the Mark Hopkins Hotel. Kaplan told us about these arrangements, then he left for Los Angeles.

The three of us went together to the hotel—myself, Harris, and Handelsman. When I walked into the room on the sixth floor, I was surprised to see Howard Rushmore. I had known him before. Also present were Harper Knowles, Congressman Kersten, and the three of us.

We had been there about 10 minutes when the phone rang. Howard Rushmore answered. He said it was Harry Lundeberg. In a few minutes, Lundeberg came up but Lundeberg was let into an adjoining room by Rushmore.

We carried on a conversation for fully a half hour. The conversation was strictly political. I thought I was to talk over testimony with both Members of Congress. But the Democratic Member was not present.

Kersten started off with a statement about how terrible the waterfront situation was on the west coast. He said if the Republican Party got elected, they'd remedy this situation. Kersten talked about what a good man Dewey was and what he proposed to do about Communists. He came right out and said these committee hearings received Nation-wide publicity and showed the American people that the committees of Congress do something about the Communists. I asked him where the Democratic member of the committee was and Kersten said he was out with some friends. Kersten made no bones about the fact that the committee hearings would help the Republican Party in winning this election in November.

WM. PATRICK BRANDHOVE.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 24th day of October 1948:

R. M. SPILLANE,
Notary Public in and for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California.
My commission expires July 17, 1951.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time during my service as a Member of Congress that a congressional subcommittee has been used for the purpose of making a surreptitious political smear attack upon my reputation. It was only last June that the House Committee on Un-American Activities, by unanimous vote of all the members present, expunged from the records of that committee all of the perjured testimony concerning me which was taken at a secret meeting of a subcommittee of the old Dies committee, held down in Beaumont, Tex., in July 1940. For a detailed account of this amazing proceeding I shall now read a statement placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 18, 1948, by Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, the former and present majority leader of this House:

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to announce that a black blot upon the records of a former committee of the House of Representatives has been officially erased during the present session of Congress. On June 15 the Committee on Un-American Activities, by unanimous vote, ordered that testimony attacking the reputation of Representative FRANCK R. HAVENNER, of California, which was given at a secret meeting of a subcommittee of the old Dies committee, held in Beaumont, Tex., on July 16, 1940, be expunged from the records of the committee.

Thus a regrettable chapter in the history of the so-called Dies committee has been obliterated by official action.

During the summer of 1940, while the Seventy-sixth Congress was in session and while Representative HAVENNER, a Member of that Congress, was at his post of duty here in the National Capital, he received information that an attempt would be made to give certain derogatory testimony concerning him before the Dies committee. Mr. HAVENNER informs me that he went to see the chairman of the committee, Representative Dies of Texas, and inquired whether there was any truth in this report. Mr. Dies replied that he had heard nothing about it. Mr. HAVENNER then requested Chairman Dies to notify him if anyone attempted to give any testimony concerning him before the committee, in order that he might appear before the committee and exercise his right as a Member of Congress to testify in his own behalf. Dies assured him that this would be done.

After talking to the chairman, Mr. HAVENNER visited Representative Dempsey of New Mexico, the ranking member of the Dies committee, and Representative Voorhis of California, also a member of the committee, and made the same request of them. Both also assured Representative HAVENNER that they would notify him immediately if they learned that any testimony concerning him was to be heard by the committee.

Now comes the most amazing feature of this regrettable episode in congressional history.

Not until more than 4 years had elapsed did Representative HAVENNER learn that, shortly after his conversation with Chairman Dies, a meeting of a subcommittee of the Dies committee, which was not public,

was held in Beaumont, Tex. At that meeting, which was attended, as Mr. HAVENNER states, only by one member of the committee, the secretary of the committee, Robert E. Stripling, and the then investigator for the committee, James H. Stedman, a witness named John L. Leech testified under oath that it was his understanding that Representative HAVENNER had been and was at that time a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. Speaker, this is not in Mr. MCCORMACK's remarks, but the RECORD shows that the Member who attended that secret subcommittee meeting in Beaumont, Tex., was Mr. Dies himself.

I resume quoting from Mr. MCCORMACK's remarks:

The first time that Congressman HAVENNER knew that this meeting had been held on July 16, 1940, and that damaging testimony concerning him had been taken under oath, was when political advertisements, containing excerpts from the testimony given by the witness Leech were printed in San Francisco newspapers in October 1944, during Mr. HAVENNER's campaign for reelection to Congress.

Mr. HAVENNER never received any notification from Mr. Dies or from any other member or employee of the committee, or from anyone else, that this meeting was to be held in Beaumont, Tex., on July 16, 1940, and he was never given any opportunity to appear before the committee to refute this damaging testimony.

The record of the subcommittee hearing, which was not a public meeting, held in Beaumont, Tex., on July 16, 1940, was kept on the secret file of the committee for more than 4 years, and was never officially released by the Dies committee for publication.

Just how the supporters of Mr. HAVENNER's opponent in the 1944 campaign for Congress learned about the secret subcommittee meeting and obtained the record of its proceedings for publication has never been officially disclosed.

When Mr. HAVENNER was returned to Congress in January 1945 he took the floor of the House of Representatives and denounced the testimony of the witness Leech as perjury in its entirety. On that occasion every member of the old Dies committee who was present arose and stated that they had never heard of the secret subcommittee meeting held in Beaumont, Tex., on July 16, 1940, and had never known anything about the testimony concerning Mr. HAVENNER until he made his speech on the floor of the House.

When Mr. HAVENNER had concluded his statement many Members of the House of Representatives voluntarily arose and expressed their confidence in Mr. HAVENNER's patriotism and integrity.

Not a single Member of the House attempted to condone this testimony given in an attempt to smear their fellow Member, and many Members denounced it as an outrageous proceeding.

I participated in the discussion on the floor of the House on that occasion, and in the course of my remarks I said:

"There should be an investigation of the conspiracy to smear a gentleman who was a former Member of Congress and who is a Member of Congress today. The gentleman from California is the one who happened to be in that position today, but it might have been any other Member of this House.

"If that testimony was false it means that there was a conspiracy among certain individuals in California to smear the gentleman for a particular purpose. It seems to me to be a matter of interest to each and every Member of the House and I think, speaking as an individual, if anything is done, that the committee should go further and if they do find falsehoods, look into them. They will find falsehoods, for the gentleman has denied that the statements were true. They should investigate the conspiracy because it concerns every Member of this body.

"As far as the gentleman himself is concerned, I have served with him, and I believe I speak the sentiments of every Member of this body. The gentleman may differ with me on this or that question, or differ with some of us who serve with him, but because we differ on public questions does not mean that we are not good Americans; it means simply a difference in our individual conscience and our individual judgment as to the best interests of the country. We may disagree as to judgment, but every man here has a love of America and is actuated by the same high patriotic motives as the gentleman from California, who enjoys the confidence of every Member on each side of the aisle, as far as I know, who serves with him. I rise particularly to make this contribution because the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] enjoys our respect and confidence and because we recognize that he is both honorable and trustworthy."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yeld?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. As I understand, this meeting in Texas was a secret or executive meeting. There was no official release of the testimony. Has the gentleman information as to how it got out?

Mr. HAVENNER. I stated in my statement on the House floor 4 years ago, which appears in the RECORD at that time, that I had never been able to find out how it was released.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will say the gentleman is entitled to know how it got out all right.

Mr. HAVENNER. I thank the gentleman.

The conviction which I expressed in these remarks back in 1945 that this whole unsavory affair indicated that there had been a conspiracy to misuse the privileged authority of a congressional committee in order to defame a Member of Congress is strengthened by certain information which Representative HAVENNER has recently given me. He states that with the permission of Chairman THOMAS he talked with the clerk of the Committee on Un-American Activities, Mr. Stripling, who was present at the secret subcommittee meeting of the Dies committee down in Beaumont, Tex., on July 16, 1940.

Mr. HAVENNER asked the clerk of the committee who had arranged to bring the witness, Leech, whose home was in Los Angeles, out to this secret meeting in Beaumont, Tex., to give perjured testimony against a Member of Congress. The clerk, Mr. Stripling, replied that it was the duty of the investigator, James H. Stedman, to produce witnesses for the committee hearings. When Mr. HAVENNER asked to see Stedman, he was informed that the former investigator had not been employed by the committee for several years. Congressman HAVENNER inquired where Stedman was located, and was informed that after he left the committee he was employed by the Honolulu Oil Co., in Los Angeles, and was still in the employ of that company.

The president of the Honolulu Oil Co. is Mr. Albert C. Mattei, a gentleman who has been very active in Republican politics in northern California for many years. Congressman HAVENNER states that Mr. Mattei has been the chief financial and political supporter of every Republican candidate for Congress who has run against HAVENNER since our colleague was first elected to this House back in 1936. Mr. Mattei was the chief financial and political backer of Mr. HAVENNER's Republican opponent for the Congress in 1940, when the secret subcommittee meeting of the Dies committee was held down in Beaumont, Tex. Mr. Mattei was again the chief financial and political backer of Mr. HAVENNER's opponent for Congress in 1944, when the defamatory perjured testimony taken at the secret subcommittee down in Beaumont, Tex., first saw the light of day in a political advertisement designed to defeat Mr. HAVENNER as a candidate for Congress.

And now it develops that when former Investigator Stedman, who is reported by the clerk of the Committee on Un-American Activities to have produced the witness who gave the defamatory perjured testimony against Congressman HAVENNER at the secret subcommittee meeting down in Beaumont, Tex., severed his connection with that committee, he was employed by the Honolulu Oil Co., of which Mr. Mattei is the president.

I leave this astounding sequence of facts to the judgment of Congress and the American people.

Congressman HAVENNER is one of the ablest Members of the Congress. Sincere, courageous, a fighter for the people, and loyal to the best interests of the people, he is a credit to the people of his district. Congressman HAVENNER is a great American.

It is an interesting and significant fact, Mr. Speaker, that the campaign manager for my opponent in the congressional campaign of 1940, when the perjured testimony against me was taken without my knowledge at a secret meeting of a subcommittee of the old Dies committee down in Beaumont, Tex., was the selfsame Don Nicholson, who managed the campaign of my Republican opponent for Congress last year. Nicholson also managed the campaign of my Republican opponent in 1944, when the perjured testimony taken by the Dies subcommittee in 1940 was mysteriously made public for the first time in newspaper advertisements published in San Francisco just before the election of 1944. Prior to that time I had no knowledge that any such testimony had ever been given concerning me, but obviously my opponent's campaign advisers knew all about it and were able to procure its release from the secret files of the Dies committee for use in political advertisements. Now Mr. Nicholson is accused by the witness, William Patrick Brandhove, of having offered him financial inducements to give smearing testimony against me before the Kersten labor subcommittee last October.

Mr. Speaker, on January 11, 1945, I stood in the well of this House and recited, in detail, the astounding story of the secret meeting of the Dies subcommittee held down in Beaumont, Tex., more than 4 years before, when perjury was permitted to be perpetrated against me.

On that occasion, after I had concluded my statement, Members of the House from many sections of the country arose and voluntarily expressed their confidence in my patriotism and loyalty to our Government. All of them declared their abhorrence of the idea that a congressional subcommittee, in secret session, should receive defamatory testimony against a Member of Congress without ever letting him know that he had been attacked or giving him any chance to appear and testify in his own behalf. Among other speakers at that time, the gentleman from Massachusetts,

the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, majority leader of the House, made the following statement:

There should be an investigation of the conspiracy to smear a gentleman who was a former Member of Congress, and who is a Member of Congress today. The gentleman from California is the one who happens to be in that position today, but it might have been any other Member of this House.

Four years have elapsed since I arose to a question of personal privilege on the floor of this House and denounced the use of a congressional subcommittee to receive defamatory and perjured testimony against a Member of Congress, who happened to be myself, and permit that vicious testimony to become part of the official committee record, without letting the Member know that he had been attacked or allowing him to appear in his own behalf.

Now I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the facts which I have presented here today clearly show that I have again been made the target of a political smear attack through the medium of a congressional subcommittee hearing held in my congressional district just prior to the last national elections. I was not notified by the members of the subcommittee that any defamatory testimony had been given concerning me, nor was I extended the opportunity, which is the right of every Member of Congress under similar circumstances, to appear before the subcommittee in my own behalf and endeavor to refute the smear.

So it becomes apparent, Mr. Speaker, that there must be among my political enemies in California and elsewhere certain individuals who have repeatedly conspired to have false and defamatory testimony given before congressional subcommittees concerning a Member of Congress, in this instance myself.

In this connection, the following matters would appear to be worthy of investigation:

First. The former investigator for the Dies committee, James H. Stedman, was, according to Mr. Stripling, the clerk of the Dies committee, responsible for bringing the witness who gave the perjured testimony against me to the secret meeting of the Dies subcommittee in Beaumont, Tex., in 1940. After Investigator Stedman left the Dies committee he was employed by the Honolulu Oil Co., of which Albert C. Mattei is president.

Albert C. Mattei was head of the finance committee for my opponent for Congress in 1940, when the secret Dies subcommittee meeting was held in Beaumont, Tex. Mattei was then and has ever since been closely associated in politics with Don Nicholson, who was the campaign manager for my opponent for Congress in 1940. Mattei has been the chief financial backer and Nicholson the campaign manager for all of my opponents for Congress at general elections in recent years.

Second. The sworn statement by William Patrick Brandhove, the witness who linked my name with the names of alleged Communists at the meeting of the Kersten labor subcommittee in San Francisco, that Don Nicholson promised to pay him $1,000 if he would tag me as a Red during the recent congressional campaign, and that Nicholson repeatedly told him that a hearing of the Kersten subcommittee would provide the opportunity to do this.

Third. The presence of Howard Rushmore, an employee of the Hearst newspapers, at the conference which Brandhove and other prospective witnesses had with Chairman KERSTEN and others on the evening before the congressional subcommittee hearing was held in San Francisco. At about this time and, indeed, on numerous occasions during my campaign for reelection to Congress last year, the San Francisco Examiner, a Hearst newspaper, published various editorial attacks upon me, one of which contained the following statement:

A vote for Havenner is a vote for Bridges and the Kremlin.

It was not until after the election was over that the Examiner published a front page retraction of this editorial. I have filed suit for libel against the San Francisco Examiner, and intend to press that suit to a final conclusion.

It may have been only a coincidence, but certainly a very peculiar one, that the first knowledge I ever had of the perjured testimony which was given against me at the secret Dies subcommittee hearing held in Beaumont, Tex., in 1940, was received when I read a political advertisement, containing excerpts from that perjured testimony, in the San Francisco Examiner during the latter part of October 1944, just prior to the congressional elections of that year.

Mr. Speaker, the law enforcement agencies in various parts of this Nation have been extremely vigilant in recent years to protect the integrity of basketball, football, and baseball games, boxing bouts, and other sporting events against corruption by gambling interests. Heavy penalties have been imposed upon individuals who offered bribes to players who participated in those games. It would seem that the integrity of congressional procedure ought to be just as important to the American people as the integrity of professional sporting events, and that an offer of a bribe to a witness to give defamatory testimony before a committee of Congress should rank, in the eyes of the law, as of at least equal importance with an attempt to corrupt a professional athlete.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that I have not occupied the time of this House today for the purpose of seeking personal vindication through any action that this body may see fit to take. The voters of my district have demonstrated their contempt for the cowardly smear attacks that have been made upon me, and have expressed their confidence in me by repeatedly reelecting me to represent them in the Congress of the United States.

But, Mr. Speaker, the evidence and the record which I have placed before you today make it unmistakably apparent that there has been a continuing conspiracy among my political enemies to corrupt the integrity of congressional committees through the use of bribery and perjury. The attacks which have been made upon me by these vile methods, and which were designed to besmirch my name, to destroy my reputation, and to bring humiliation and shame upon my loved ones could have been made upon any other elective public official. What has happened to me, my colleagues, might happen to any one of you if you had the misfortune to incur the political enmity of individuals so devoid of human honor and decency as the authors of these foul attacks.

I am not a revengeful person. While I abhor the conduct of these conspirators, I might be content to leave them alone with their guilty consciences, but for the fact that over a period of nearly a decade these same persons have repeatedly plotted to undermine and break down a thing which ought to be sacred and inviolate—the integrity of the Congress of the United States.

Men have been imprisoned for contempt of Congress because they refused to answer questions put to them in committee hearings. Surely the measure of contempt is vastly greater when men bribe witnesses to give false, slanderous, and perjured testimony before congressional committees.

Having been the victim on several occasions of testimony of this nature, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully urge that a select committee be appointed, or that a standing committee of the House be authorized, to investigate this conspiracy to produce false, slanderous, and perjured testimony at hearings of congressional committees or subcommittees, and to report to the House its recommendations for legislative or other action to prevent similar corruption of committee proceedings in the future.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I agree with the gentleman about the appointment of the committee to investigate attempts to corrupt committees of Congress. I ask whether the gentleman agrees with me that when one Member of Congress goes out publicly and charges another Member with treason, whether he ought to be investigated on that, or is it just when my ox is gored?

Mr. HAVENNER. I would say to the gentleman that in my opinion, the editorial which I quoted from the San Francisco Examiner by inference and by direct implication accused me of treason.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman has not yet answered my question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HAVENNER. I am seeking a remedy for any attacks of this kind.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is attacks on the Congress?

Mr. HAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Or on Members of Congress?

Mr. HAVENNER. I am not seeking personal vindication.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I understand that.

Mr. HAVENNER. I would like to see the rules amended so that we may be protected against this sort of thing in the future.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I understand, the gentleman is taking care of his part of it. You are talking about Congress generally.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield.

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman has mentioned my name as a member of the subcommittee. I would like to say to the gentleman that until this morning I did not know his name had been mentioned in the hearings. I recall the testimony of the witness Brandhove, but the reference to the gentleman who is now addressing the House did not catch my attention and I did not know until this morning that he had been referred to.

With regard to the San Francisco hearings, I point out that those hearings were held by the subcommittee after hearings had been held in Alaska during the west coast shipping strike, with which the gentleman is familiar. Alaska was paralyzed from the strike, and the subcommittee had strong evidence indicating that it was a Communist-inspired strike, directed by Harry Bridges. It was, therefore, very proper and pertinent to our inquiry that hearings be held in San Francisco.

The gentleman has seen fit to refer to my colleague Mr. Kersten, of Wisconsin, who is not here to answer the charges that are being directed at him. I want to make it plain that it was my idea, not his, that we stop over in San Francisco for those hearings. The hearing there was highly necessary and as the record will disclose was conducted fairly and in accordance with the best rules of procedure. It was objected to, of course, by the Communists, and they picketed the courthouse 700 strong during the brief hearings.

The reason why the hearing was concluded rather suddenly, as the gentleman has pointed out, was because of the absence of witnesses. Subpenas were issued for 16 witnesses, including Bridges, but they went into hiding, all but three, and could not be found by the United States marshal's office. I am certain that if the gentleman had gotten in touch with either Mr. Kersten or myself, or had gotten word to us, the hearings would have been reopened and the gentleman would have been heard. We were there at the hotel overnight after the hearings were concluded, and up to noon the following day, but the gentleman did not contact us.

I will say further to the gentleman, since he has made a rather severe attack upon Mr. Kersten, who is not here to answer for himself, that my dealings with Mr. Kersten on that subcommittee convinced me that he is eminently fair and that he is not the type of man who would engage in any conspiracy to smear any man.

Mr. HAVENNER. I would like to say to the gentleman that I tried to make it plain that his name has not been used in this affidavit in any way, except that he was present at the meeting of the subcommittee, but did not attend this conference which Mr. Kersten did attend on the evening prior to the meeting.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield.

Mr. LESINSKI. The gentleman must realize that the Committee on Education and Labor in the last session of the Congress had $75,000 and the gentleman remembers how some of the Members rose on this floor and said, "Where are we going to get the money? Where are we going to get the money?" Yet they were able to cover this country from coast to coast, from east to west, from north to south, doing one-man grand jury investigations. We in Michigan are used to that. When a judge is on the other side of the fence he can force a witness to say "Yes," and when he says "No," he gives him 30 days for perjury.

Mr. HAVENNER. I will say to the gentleman that the continuing experience I have had with smear attacks of this same nature, some in the past even more severe and more damaging than this, have convinced me that there is a conspiracy to corrupt congressional committees, in my part of the country, at least. I would like to see an investigation made to find out who is responsible for this corruption. I repeat I am not seeking any personal vindication here.

Mr. LESINSKI. Does the gentleman remember this great Hollywood investigation? It cost a good many thousands of dollars. Has a report been made on it yet? I made that trip at my own expense, and it was a fluke, the same as many investigations.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. Gladly.

Mr. BIEMILLER. I regret very much that the former Representative from the Fifth District of Wisconsin was responsible for this latest attempt to smear the very distinguished gentleman from California, but I am not surprised that it happened.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker; a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If the gentleman is going to attack a former Member of the House who is not here, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am well acquainted with the situation that confronts the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER]. It is one that every one of us should feel keenly about. The gentleman from California is one of the most honorable Members of this House. We do not have to call one another names because we do not agree. I never impugn the honesty of any of my colleagues. I may disagree with their judgment, that is a right I have, but I do not impugn the honesty of their motives. The gentleman from California has been subjected locally in California to most unfortunate situations. Several years ago it was with local individuals, and last fall again with local individuals.

The very fact he was reelected on both occasions shows the confidence the people have in him. I know how I would feel if in my district someone or a group entered into continual conspiracies in an effort to destroy me through undermining my character and smearing my reputation. The gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] is completely justified in giving to the House the affidavit that he has received, which is convincing evidence that locally in his city and district there are some individuals who engage in a continuing conspiracy against him.

A group of men trying to beat a candidate is one thing, that is all right, but to smear and destroy the reputation of someone is something entirely different.

I am glad to testify today, whatever consolation it might bring to the gentleman from California, although it is not necessary, and to his dear ones who are the people who keenly suffer, and to the people of his constituency, that the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] is one of the most sincere Members of the House of Representatives, keenly devoted to his duty and loyal to his people. He is one of the finest Americans that I have ever met.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks I might insert two resolutions I have presented, and also a letter I have mailed to the chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is in the resolution? May we see them first?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I will be glad to answer the gentleman. The first one is to appoint a select committee and the second resolution is for the purpose of outlining investigating committee procedure, aimed at no particular committee. It has nothing directly to do with Mr. HAVENNER's case that was just presented. The resolution outlines a code of procedure which I think would be well for any committee to use and which most committees do use in the conduct of their hearings and in the investigation of their witnesses.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman is not asking for a vote on that today?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

A SELECT COMMITTEE SHOULD BE FORMED FOR THE PURPOSE OF STUDYING COMMITTEE PROCEDURE

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House have just listened to a carefully prepared and well-documented speech by my colleague from California, the Honorable FRANCK HAVENNER. There is an old saying which tells us that lightning never strikes twice in the same place, but the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] has proved to

this House that political lightning does not follow the afore-mentioned rule.

The gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] has been the victim of the abusive, vicious, and irresponsible use of the power of a congressional committee twice.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not in order in attacking the action of committees of the House. If I get the statement correctly that is what he is doing.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that the gentleman would be going quite far afield if he said a Member of the House would not have the right to criticize the actions of a committee of the House. The gentleman from California will proceed in order.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the first abuse was committed by the former chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, Mr. Martin Dies, of Texas. Ex-Congressman Dies was a Democrat, and this is important because our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER], was and is a Democrat. Being a Democrat during the regime of a Democratic administration did not protect the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] from the abuse of power by a congressional committee.

In the first instance, an irresponsible statement made before a one-man subcommittee was released at the opportune time to Mr. HAVENNER's political opponent and to an antagonistic newspaper for the sole purpose of smearing the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] and causing his political defeat.

It is very interesting to note how the same pattern was followed in the second instance of abuse. Once again we see a subcommittee which ostensibly had two members, former Congressman Charles J. Kersten, the Republican chairman of the subcommittee, and a present Congressman, our colleague, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. O. C. FISHER, a Democrat. The evidence presented by the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] shows, I understand, that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] was not present at the hearings of the subcommittee when the irresponsible and libelous testimony of Mr. Brandhove was given. So for all practical functioning purposes, we have a one-man subcommittee operating again.

We also have the same pattern followed by the release to the antagonistic newspaper, and undoubtedly to Mr. HAVENNER's political opponent, of the character-assassinating, libelous testimony of a confessed professional witness. This release occurred just before election day at a time when it was planned, as the testimony shows, it would be the most damaging to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER].

I point out again that this pattern of abuse by a congressional committee or subcommittee does not depend on political or partisan affiliation. It has no allegiance to party. It is something completely segregated from the struggle for party advantage, although it can and has been used occasionally in a partisan manner.

The abuse of committee power goes far deeper than partisanship, both in its methods and in its results. It has not been confined to a single committee or subcommittee either. Various committees and subcommittees have abused the tremendous power which of necessity must be deposited in the legislative body. I am not today concerned with the academic question—although it is important—of reducing the investigative powers of a committee of Congress. I realize that great responsibility is placed in the Congress, and that great power is necessary to discharge that responsibility.

But, we, as Members of Congress, cannot escape our responsibility as representatives of the American electorate, by condoning, excusing, or ignoring flagrant abuses of this great power. The American people are judging the institution of Congress, I am sorry to say, not by our constructive accomplishments, but by the abusive procedures of certain congressional committees and by the reprehensible conduct of certain individuals who too often, in my opinion, hunt the headlines of the sensational press.

In this period of world chaos, when the democratic processes are on trial throughout the world, we cannot afford the luxury of indifference to public opinion. Public opinion is powerful. If the public loses confidence in Congress as a democratic institution, it will be but a matter of time until the institution itself will fall. Therefore, when we find thoughtful people, great national periodicals, great nationally distributed newspapers, and even Presidents of the United States condemning the procedures of certain congressional committees, it is time for us to scrutinize carefully the cause of such criticism.

Have we been criticized without cause?

Has the conduct of our committees been fair and in accordance with recognized principles of American fair play and justice?

Have congressional committees conducted their investigations and hearings in conformity with the recognized principles of American jurisprudence?

Have our congressional committees practiced in their hearings the democratic processes guaranteed to our citizens by the Bill of Rights?

I believe the answer to these questions is very important. I believe that it goes beyond the personalities of those who have been guilty of abuse of power, and beyond the personal fortunes of those who have been victims of the abuse.

I share with my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER], the indignation which he rightfully feels at being the target for abuse by a congressional subcommittee, not once, but twice. I know that he will be vindicated for the second time by proper action on the part of his colleagues in Congress. The gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] is one of our most respected and valuable Members. The California congressional delegation is proud of his record of patriotic service to the people of California during a long life of valuable public service. The people of San Francisco have expressed their confidence in him by electing him five times to the Congress of the United States. He also served his State many years on the highly important California railroad commission.

The gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] is highly capable of fighting his own battles and his colleagues who rise with him today in protest do so voluntarily because we share his indignation, not because he needs our assistance.

But, as I said before, the abuse of congressional committee power goes beyond the personality of the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER], Mr. Kersten, or any other individual.

And at this point I want to say a word for the unnumbered American citizens, prominent and obscure, who do not have the congressional rostrum to present their defense against the abuses they have suffered. Abuses they have suffered at the hands of men who thought more of tomorrow's headlines than they did of today's civil rights.

These are the people who have felt the whiplash of vicious newspaper releases. These are the victims of unfounded and irresponsible testimony, yes, and even printed committee reports, all of which tended to degrade and humiliate them in the eyes of their professional colleagues, their friends, and their loved ones.

Many of these people suffered character assassination without recourse. Safe behind congressional immunity, which is granted Members of Congress and witnesses before congressional committees, these people read with a feeling of horror that their patriotism, their loyalty to their Nation, their integrity as citizens had been attacked. Many of them tried to fight back. They asked for the right to answer the malicious charges. They asked for the right to refute the derogatory testimony. They wanted the opportunity to expose their accusers by cross-questioning. But these people were denied the simple American rights we give a chicken thief before a police court. They cannot rise on the floor of the House of Representatives as the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] has done and defend their good name.

That is why I arise today, as I have arisen many times before, to plead for those who have been denied the opportunity of pleading for themselves.

Not only do I plead the cause of the victims of congressional committee procedure abuse but I plead the cause of the Congress of the United States before the bar of public opinion. I plead the cause of democracy, which is on trial throughout our beloved country and the world.

Let us prove to American citizens that their rights are God-given and irrevocable, that their rights as witnesses before congressional committees are just as sacred as they are before a police-court judge.

Let us prove to them that the Congress of the United States can correct its

own procedures. Let us prove to them that the dignity and respect which most of the committees of Congress enjoy and deserve shall not be lost because of certain abuses which have been practiced by a very few.

How can we do this?

I believe the subject needs careful study. I know that long-standing precedents and procedures deserve careful consideration before alteration. I do not believe drastic procedural change or curtailment of useful powers is necessary. I do believe that fair procedures which are now used voluntarily by the great majority of congressional committees should be made obligatory on all committees.

Certainly we can require in the interest of the dignity and reputation of Congress before the American bar of public opinion that decent, fair procedures shall be the rule for all committees. A rule now followed by the majority of the congressional committees voluntarily because of its innate decency and justice cannot be objectionable if it be made obligatory on those individuals, committees, or subcommittees which have failed to act wisely and according to the best traditions of American jurisprudence.

Many of my colleagues have joined me by introducing resolutions for the purpose of setting up fair rules for conduct of committee hearings and examination of witnesses. Our majority leader, Mr. McCORMACK; Mrs. DOUGLAS, of California; Mr. CARROLL, of Colorado; Mr. BIEMILLER, of Wisconsin; and others have shown their concern by introducing resolutions on this subject.

I have introduced three resolutions outlining different approaches to the committee procedure problem. Their numbers are H. R. 74, H. R. 191, and House Concurrent Resolution 4. They are similar to the resolutions introduced by my afore-mentioned colleagues, and also similar in some instances to resolutions introduced for the same purpose in the other body.

As it is obvious that there are several approaches to this timely and important problem, I introduced on opening day, January 3, 1949, a resolution, House Resolution 16, which seeks to create a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of committee procedure as used by committees of the House of Representatives. This select committee would be empowered to hold hearings and recommend by an early date a code of fair conduct under which all committees of the House would proceed.

Upon the completion of the committee's hearings and upon receipt of its recommendations, the House would have the opportunity to evaluate its report and could subsequently take such action as it might deem advisable.

I believe this is the right way to solve this problem. Such action would, in my opinion, mean a great and cleansing step forward in the eyes of our people and in the eyes of the world.

I have written a letter to the great Committee on Rules asking for the privilege of presenting my case for a rule.

I sincerely hope that I shall have the support of every Member of this House, both Republicans and Democrats.

Democracy is challenged in many places, and wherever democracy can be strengthened, that is where we should stand and fight without partisanship, whether it be on the battlefield or in the legislative Halls of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 15, 1949.

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
Chairman of the Committee on Rules, Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: On opening day I introduced House Resolution 16 which seeks to create a select committee for the purpose of studying House committee procedure and recommending to the House a code of fair conduct to be observed by all committees.

I respectfully request that I be given an opportunity to appear before your committee for the purpose of requesting a rule for the consideration of House Resolution 16.

Sincerely yours,

CHET HOLIFIELD,
Member of Congress.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I agree with the gentleman that it is necessary to have these rules, all right, but it does seem to me that the majority of the Members of Congress or all the Members of Congress ought to be able and ought to have good sense enough to hold hearings that are in accord with fair play.

You speak about smearing. What about these people on the outside—columnists, and radio commentators, and newspapers? I recall very distinctly that I introduced a bill 2 years ago, when the gentleman's party was in power, trying to give the right to those who were slandered to bring suit in the Federal district where they lived. I could not get that through.

Now you are talking about smearing. What about this attack being made today on Mr. Kersten, a former Member, who is not here. Is that smearing, or is it not?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I realize that the gentleman has already had time—1 hour—on a question of personal privilege, I believe, on this particular matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will get another one next week.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. And I know that the gentleman can take care of his own fortunes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You have no fault to find with our committee; have you?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half minute.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we have been waiting here for an hour or two for a Democratic caucus. If we are going to carry on speeches of this kind indefinitely, we ought to know it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. There are other special orders.

Mr. RANKIN. We have more special orders, and if we are going to keep this up, perhaps we ought to call off the caucus, and hold it tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. There are two more special orders.

Mr. RANKIN. I have no objection to the request of the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the courtesy of the gentleman from Mississippi, as well as the courtesy of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], in bringing these matters up. I do not intend to take the time of the House unduly. I would say that my concern today is to bring before the House a method of controlling its own procedures. We have no direct control over outside agencies, such as newspapers and other people. But we do have control of the procedure of committees of the House of Representatives, and my attempt is to bring before a properly constituted select committee a study so that judicious determination might be made as to whether committee procedure rules would be advantageous to the House in establishing and maintaining the dignity of the House of Representatives. We should not proceed as we have in the past with certain individuals, certain subcommittees and committees using measures which, in my opinion, have brought disrepute and loss of dignity to the Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. WALSH (at the request of Mr. MADDEN), for 3 days, on account of sickness in family.

To Mr. LEFEVRE (at the request of Mr. COLE of New York), for January 17, on account of absence from city on official business.

To Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. MULTER), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. SHORT (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), on account of attending funeral in district.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 103. An act to increase rates of compensation of the President, Vice President, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and

S. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution making January 20 and 21, 1949, holidays for Federal employees and employees of the District of Columbia in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under special order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is no quorum present. If we are going to have to listen to this for 30 minutes more, the other Members ought to come here and share this with us.

Mr. MULTER. If the gentleman will withdraw his point of order, I assure him I will keep my remarks within 12 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. No. I am not going to withdraw the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] There is no quorum present.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 18, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

72. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting a report of the United States Maritime Commission on the activities and transactions of the Maritime Commission under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, October 1 through December 31, 1948; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

73. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive Office of the President, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to repeal a provision of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 requiring certain expenditures in the fiscal year 1949 to be considered as expended during the fiscal year 1948; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

74. A letter from the Postmaster General of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of certain postal employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

75. A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill relating to the internal security of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

76. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting lists or schedules of records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

77. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report of Secretary of the Treasury on the state of the finances, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (H. Doc. No. 3); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

78. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Defense Homes Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (H. Doc. No. 41); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

79. A letter from the Administrator, United States Department of Labor, Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Division, transmitting the annual report of the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Division of the United States Department of Labor, for the year ended June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

80. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va.," approved June 29, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

81. A letter from the vice president and comptroller, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting the annual report of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. to the Congress of the United States for the year 1948; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

82. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a bill for the relief of Edwin B. Anderson, a city letter carrier in the post office at Newton, Iowa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

83. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a letter by the Acting Secretary of the Navy recommending the enactment of a proposed draft of a bill to amend section 19 of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), so as to remove the upper age limit for appointment to commissioned grade in the Supply Corps of the Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

84. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Rachel D. Gattegno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

85. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the more economical operation of the general supply fund of the Bureau of Federal Supply, Department of the Treasury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

86. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the establishment of a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

87. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the dissemination of technological, scientific, and engineering information to American business and industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. House Joint Resolution 85. A joint resolution to exempt from the tax on admissions amounts paid for admission tickets sold by authority of the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1949; without amendment (Rept. No. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 1511. A bill to broaden the cooperative extension system as established in the act of May 8, 1914, and acts supplemental thereto, by providing for cooperative extension work between colleges receiving the benefits of this act and the acts of July 2, 1862, and August 30, 1890, and other qualified colleges, universities, and research agencies, and the United States Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HUBER (by request):

H. R. 1512. A bill to authorize the appointment of doctors of chiropractic in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 1513. A bill to repeal the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, Public Law 101, Eightieth Congress, chapter 120, first session, commonly known as the Taft-Hartley law; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 1514. A bill to authorize the construction of a research laboratory for the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, at or in the vicinity of Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 1515. A bill to provide for the gradual elimination of salmon traps in the waters of Alaska; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 1516. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, so as to provide annual automatic within-grade promotions for hourly employees of the custodial service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 1517. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Gulf coast and creating the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BREHM:

H. R. 1518. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to authorize payment of benefits in certain cases to individuals otherwise entitled to such benefits who have failed to apply therefor within the prescribed time limits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 1519. A bill to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 1520. A bill to amend section 2800 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 1521. A bill to provide a voluntary participation annuity plan for widows, minor children, and certain named beneficiaries of members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1522. A bill to amend the act of August 29, 1916, as amended, so as to require the lessee of certain public property to pay State, Territorial, county, municipal, or local taxes thereon; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1523. A bill to provide dental treatment for dependents of naval and Marine Corps personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 1524. A bill to amend section 25 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1525. A bill for the erection of a public building at Adel, Iowa, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1526. A bill to increase the amount of wages that may be earned by individuals entitled to old-age and survivors insurance benefit payments under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1527. A bill to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (GI bill of rights), pertaining to loans for the purchase or construction of homes, farms, and business property, so as to provide more adequate and effective farm-loan benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1528. A bill for the erection of a public building at Ames (College Station), Iowa, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1529. A bill for the erection of a public building at West Des Moines, Iowa, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1530. A bill to grant retirement with pay to certain emergency officers of World War I seriously disabled from gunshot wounds incurred in combat; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1531. A bill for the erection of a public building at Story City, Iowa, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1532. A bill for the erection of a public building at Indianola, Iowa, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1533. A bill to authorize the incorporation of National Association, Rainbow Division Veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1534. A bill to relieve persons in the military service from refunding to the United States the amount of life-insurance premiums, and interest thereon, guaranteed under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1535. A bill to appropriate $800,000 for the construction of a building at Knoxville, Iowa; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 1536. A bill for the erection of a public building at Woodward, Iowa, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 1537. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the several States over offenses committed by or against Indians within Indian country; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 1538. A bill to prohibit utilization of the facilities of interstate or foreign commerce in connection with desertion or abandonment of minor children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 1539. A bill to extend the benefits of section 1 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to employees who were involuntarily separated during the period from July 1, 1945, to July 1, 1947, after having rendered 25 years of service but prior to attainment of age 55; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1540. A bill to repeal the tax on gasoline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 1541. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and preparation of plans and specifications for a new postal building to house the Wicker Park postal station in Chicago, Ill., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. R. 1542. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Gulf coast and creating the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 1543. A bill relating to assignments of claims against the United States for consideration for performance of personal services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 1544. A bill to amend section 251 (a) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt from taxation certain income earned by employees at naval and air bases leased from foreign countries for periods of 25 years or more; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1545. A bill to provide that the Commissioner of Internal Revenue may by regulation eliminate the requirement that certain tax and information returns shall be made under oath; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 1546. A bill to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of the Bowne house, located in Flushing, Queens County, N. Y., which Bowne house was dedicated as a national shrine to religious freedom and tolerance on October 10, 1945; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 1547. A bill to exempt posts or organizations of war veterans from the tax imposed on billiard and pool tables; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1548. A bill to provide for equitable adjustment of the insurance status of certain members of the armed forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 1549. A bill to provide for the settlement of certain parts of Alaska by war veterans; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LODGE:

H. R. 1550. A bill increasing the immigration quotas for Italy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H. R. 1551. A bill to authorize the making of grants and loans to the States to assist in providing adequate public elementary and secondary school facilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 1552. A bill relating to the authority of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to impose consumer-credit controls with respect to automobiles; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 1553. A bill providing tax incentive for the creation of additional farm storage facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 1554. A bill making the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November in every even-numbered year a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

H. R. 1555. A bill to authorize the shipment of grade A milk into the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 1556. A bill to extend the educational benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to the eldest children of veterans of World War II where the veterans have received no educational benefits under such act; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER:

H. R. 1557. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, Public Law 101, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 1558. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their system of public education and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and public secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 1559. A bill to amend section 23 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1560. A bill to establish and maintain in the Bureau of Land Management a record of title to all lands held by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 1561. A bill to amend the act creating the Federal Trade Commission, to define its powers and duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 1562. A bill to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 1563. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the northern and southern districts of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEFAN:

H. R. 1564. A bill to repeal the tax on transportation of persons and the tax on transportation of property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 1565. A bill relating to the authority of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to impose consumer-credit controls with respect to automobiles; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 1566. A bill to protect the public with respect to practitioners before administrative agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 1567. A bill to provide for an appropriation of $150,000 with which to continue the survey of the old Indian trail known as the Natchez Trace through Louisiana and Texas, with a view of constructing a national road on this route to be known as the Natchez Trace Parkway; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 1568. A bill to amend section 118 of Public Law 472 of the Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. R. 1569. A bill to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 1570. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through elementary and secondary schools, for the national security and general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 1571. A bill providing for compensation at the rate of $5 per day for members of local boards under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 1572. A bill to provide compensation for excess hours of work by certain employees of the United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 1573. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis and related neurological diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1574. A bill to grant permanent and total disability ratings to veterans suffering from severe industrial inadaptability as a result of war service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 1575. A bill to provide for the continuance of the farm-labor supply program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 1576. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Rayne, La., a post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 1577. A bill to authorize the construction of a research laborator, for the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, at or in the vicinity of Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. R. 1578. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1579. A bill to amend the Printing Act of January 12, 1895, as amended, with respect to the printing of extra copies of congressional hearings and other documents; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 1580. A bill to extend the time for filing valid application for disabled emergency officers' retirement benefits, to grant retirement pay to World War emergency officers who now have or who may later establish a 30 percent or more service-connected permanent disability for this and/or other purpose; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 1581. A bill for the acquisition of a site and erection of a post office at Roodhouse, Ill., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 1582. A bill to authorize transfer of a percentage of tax collections from individual and corporate income taxes to the States and Territories for use for educational purposes only, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 1583. A bill for the acquisition of a site and the erection of a post office at Winchester, Ill., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. WOODHOUSE:

H. R. 1584. A bill providing equal pay for equal work for women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. J. Res. 92. Joint resolution to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. J. Res. 93. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special commemorative stamp to mark the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Dr. Edward Livingston Trudeau; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. J. Res. 94. Joint resolution making provisions for the refund of the processing tax on hogs marketed for slaughter by the raisers and producers who in fact bore all or part of the burden of such tax; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. J. Res. 95. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. J. Res. 96. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. J. Res. 97. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. Con. Res. 15. Concurrent resolution to call a conference for the revision and strengthening of the United Nations Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. Con. Res. 16. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint committee to investigate Federal Government competition with private business; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Con. Res. 17. Concurrent resolution to amend section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, relative to the legislative budget; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio:

H. Con. Res. 18. Concurrent resolution authorizing a reprint of supplement III (country studies A, B, and C) of the report of the Subcommittee on National and International Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, entitled "The Strategy and Tactics of World Communism," for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. Res. 52. Resolution to amend paragraph (q) of rule XI of the rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 53. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Rules to investigate a contract entered into and a manuscript prepared by Robert E. Stripling; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. Res. 54. Resolution to amend paragraph (2) (c) of rule XI of the rules of the House (relating to the Committee on Rules) to read as it read during the Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, calling attention to Assembly Joint Resolution 4, relative to shipbuilding on the Pacific coast; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with respect to a national compulsory sickness insurance program; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 1585. A bill for the relief of Lellah begum Alaoul Mullin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 1586. A bill for the relief of Harold E. Trautwein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1587. A bill for the relief of Abel V. Del Vecchio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 1588. A bill for the relief of Istvan Kovacs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1589. A bill to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia to Abraham J. Ehrlich; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 1590. A bill for the relief of Joe Tortolini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 1591. A bill for the relief of Bram B. Tellekamp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. R. 1592. A bill for the relief of Howard R. Amundsen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 1593. A bill for the relief of 84 Estonians; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 1594. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Homer G. Hamilton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1595. A bill for the relief of Alma Wharff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1596. A bill providing for the payment of the findings reported by the Court of Claims in favor of certain engineers, firemen, mechanics, and laborers for extra time; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 1597. A bill for the relief of Hal W. Cline; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 1598. A bill for the relief of D. A. Sullivan & Sons, Inc., and Thomas F. Harney, Jr., doing business as Harney Engineering Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 1599. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary T. Maloney Preece; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 1600. A bill for the relief of Gustav Schilbred; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALLECK:

H. R. 1601. A bill for the relief of the Lafayette Brewery, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 1602. A bill for the relief of Ben Grunstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1603. A bill for the relief of Walter P. Gardner, sole surviving trustee of the property of the Central Railroad Co. of New Jersey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1604. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Breinig Bros., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART (by request):

H. R. 1605. A bill for the relief of Universal Steamship Co. for losses sustained due to the interruption of a voyage of the American schooner *Ninette M. Porcelle*, by reason of a Presidential proclamation, effective September 28, 1917, forbidding sailing vessels from entering the war zone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1606. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., and certain of its subcontractors against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1607. A bill for the relief of S. H. Brown and M. Brown, also known as the Universal Steamship Co., a Georgia corporation, to cover the loss of their bark *Brown Brothers*, destroyed by a German raider during the World War; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 1608. A bill for the relief of Clinton Construction Co. and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 1609. A bill for the relief of Arne Gordon Westly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1610. A bill for the relief of Nicholas DeWitt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1611. A bill for the relief of Walter E. Miller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1612. A bill for the relief of Manley O. Hudson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1613. A bill for the relief of Nicolae N. Ionnitiu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1614. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria N. Laborde; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1615. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Zumrut Zeiveian, Haig Zeiveian, and Mary Zeiveian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1616. A bill for the relief of S. L. Ayres & Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1617. A bill for the relief of Howard Samuel Warnock; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1618. A bill for the relief of Kenneth J. MacKenzie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 1619. A bill for the relief of St. Elizabeth Hospital, Yakima, Wash., and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 1620. A bill for the relief of Robert E. Bridge and Leslie E. Ensign; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 1621. A bill for the relief of Erzsebet Vizer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1622. A bill for the relief of Peter Pal Vizer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1623. A bill for the relief of Jozsef Vizer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 1624. A bill for the relief of Harris A. Bakken; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1625. A bill for the relief of Christine Kono; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 1626. A bill for the relief of Mrs. A. H. Hill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 1627. A bill for the relief of Filip Nicola Lazarovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. R. 1628. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Winfred DeCoteau a patent in fee to certain land; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H. R. 1629. A bill for the relief of Kira and Nina Grigorieff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 1630. A bill for the relief of George Scheer and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 1631. A bill for the relief of John J. O'Mara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1632. A bill for the relief of Rita V. L. Flaherty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H. R. 1633. A bill for the relief of Arthur J. McGurn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 1634. A bill for the relief of Joaquim Madiera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 1635. A bill for the relief of Stephan Karpatjian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. R. 1636. A bill for the relief of Gaetanina Lombardo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.:

H. R. 1637. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dora Truman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 1638. A bill to pay Warren P. Hoover for services rendered the Army of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6. By Mr. HART: Petition of New Jersey Horticultural Society, urging reversal of the decision of the Interstate Commerce Commission in the Harwood case and the maximum amount of exemption for agricultural commodities under section 203 (B) (6) of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7. Also, petition of North Hudson Chapter, No. 1, of the American Veterans Committee, West New York, N. J., urging the withholding of full recognition to Franco Spain and denying it membership in the United Nations, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8. By the SPEAKER: Petition of James B. Pettit, mayor, Pomona, Calif., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to financial aid and assistance for agriculturists due to the freeze which has caused great destruction and placed them in a serious position financially; to the Committee on Agriculture.

9. Also, petition of James H. Schaffner, through his attorney, Jay T. Barnsdall, Jr., Buffalo, N. Y., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to redress of a grievance; asking for the investigation of the conditions of all prison camps; investigation of the general court martial; complete and public investigation of all illegal and unlawful sentences of all courts martial held against members of the armed forces during World War II; that proper and immediate medical attendance be provided for James H. Schaffner, petitioner, and all other persons suffering from the effects of illegal imprisonment and starvation by the United States Army; that suitable provision be made for the support of the petitioner and the members of his family, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10. Also, petition of parent-teachers association, rural zone, Aguadilla, P. R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of legislation to provide Federal aid to education for Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

11. Also, petition of president, the National Defense League of America, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to the national defense of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 18, 1949

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, once again we offer unto Thee our grateful thanks for Thy mercy that cared for us during the night and brought us safely to this hour.

Today is the tomorrow we worried about yesterday, and we see how foolish our anxiety was.

Teach us to trust Thee more completely and to seek Thy help in all that we have to do, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 17, 1949, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think that we should have a quorum, and I therefore suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Miller
Anderson	Hill	Millikin
Baldwin	Hoey	Morse
Barkley	Holland	Mundt
Brewster	Humphrey	Murray
Bricker	Hunt	Myers
Bridges	Ives	Neely
Broughton	Jenner	O'Conor
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Reed
Capehart	Kefauver	Robertson
Chapman	Kem	Russell
Chavez	Kerr	Saltonstall
Connally	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Cordon	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Donnell	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Lodge	Sparkman
Downey	Long	Stennis
Eastland	Lucas	Taft
Ecton	McCarran	Taylor
Ellender	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Flanders	McFarland	Thye
Fulbright	McGrath	Tobey
George	McKellar	Vandenberg
Gillette	McMahon	Watkins
Green	Magnuson	Wherry
Gurney	Malone	Wiley
Hayden	Martin	Williams
Hendrickson	Maybank	Young

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is attending the ceremonies incident to the inauguration of Hon. Elbert N. Carvel as Governor of the State of Delaware, and the Honorable Alexis I. Dupont Bayard, as Lieutenant Governor of the State of Delaware, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is absent because of illness.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The Chair desires to make an announcement. Under the rules of the Senate speeches can be made during the consideration of the morning business only by unanimous consent. The Chair hopes Senators will remember the rule and adhere to it.

RESIGNATION BY SENATOR BARKLEY AS A SENATOR OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a copy of a letter written by me to the Governor of Kentucky, which I ask that the clerk may read for the information of the Senate and for the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

JANUARY 7, 1949.

Hon. EARLE C. CLEMENTS,
Governor of Kentucky,
Frankfort, Ky.

MY DEAR GOVERNOR: In view of my election as Vice President of the United States for the term beginning January 20, 1949, I hereby tender my resignation as Senator of the United States from the Commonwealth of Kentucky, to take effect at midnight on January 19, 1949.

Very sincerely yours,
ALBEN W. BARKLEY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The communication will lie on the table.

BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF ROBERT E. LEE

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, to those of us who live in Lexington, Va., January 19 is an important anniversary. It is the birthday of that great, stalwart educator, civic leader, and Christian gentleman, Robert E. Lee.

In commemoration of the one hundred and forty-second anniversary of the birthday of Gen. Robert E. Lee, the District of Columbia Chapter of the United Daughters of the Confederacy will hold a memorial service at the statue of General Lee in Statuary Hall tomorrow forenoon, January 19, at 11 o'clock. Mrs. Ferguson Cary, of Alexandria, Va., the national historian general, will make the presentation of the wreath in behalf of the United Daughters of the Confederacy. Other wreaths will be presented by the Virginia State Society and the Sons of Confederate Veterans. Miss Liza Ellen Carpenter, president of the District of Columbia Chapter of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, will preside.

All Members of the Senate are invited to be present. There will be no speeches.

MESSAGE FROM HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 17th instant,

The Secretary of the Senate received the following message from the House of Representatives:

That the House had passed, without amendment, the following bill and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 103. An act to increase rates of compensation of the President, Vice President, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and

S. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution making January 20 and 21, 1949, holidays for Federal employees and employees of the District of Columbia in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia.

That the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 85) to exempt from the tax on admissions amounts paid for admission tickets sold by authority of the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1949, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 103. An act to increase rates of compensation of the President, Vice President, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and

S. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution making January 20 and 21, 1949, holidays for Federal employees and employees of the District of Columbia in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on January 17, 1949, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

S. 103. An act to increase rates of compensation of the President, Vice President, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and

S. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution making January 20 and 21, 1949, holidays for Federal employees and employees of the District of Columbia in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY STATE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Under Secretary of State, reporting, pursuant to law, on tort claims paid by the Department of State under the Federal Tort Claims Act for the calendar year 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN FORMER EMPLOYEES OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of certain consultants formerly employed by the Technical Industrial Intelligence Committee of the Foreign Economic Administration, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON OPERATION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a summary (designated as pt. I) of the first annual report of that Commission on the operation of the trade agreements program for the period June 1934 to April 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON CLAIMS PAID BY MARITIME COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, reporting, pursuant to law, that no relief was granted claimants under the provisions of Public Law 657 during the quarter ended December 31, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RATIFICATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TERM OF OFFICE OF PRESIDENT

Mr. LANGER presented a concurrent resolution of the legislative assembly of the State of North Dakota pertaining to the ratification of a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution A

Ratification proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President

Whereas the Eightieth Congress of the United States of America, at the first session, begun and held at the city of Washington on Friday the 3d day of January 1947, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds thereof, made and passed a proposal to amend the Constitution of the United States of America, which joint resolution was duly ratified by Congress and approved by the President of the United States, to wit:

"Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SEC. 1. No person shall be elected to the office of the President more than twice, and no person who has held the office of President, or acted as President, for more than 2 years of a term to which some other person was elected President shall be elected to the office of President more than once. But this article shall not apply to any person holding the office of President when this article was proposed by the Congress, and shall not prevent any person who may be holding the office of President, or acting as President, during the term within which this article becomes operative from holding the office of President or acting as President during the remainder of such term.

"SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress": Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the house of representatives concurring therein), That the said foregoing proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be, and the same is, hereby ratified by the legislative assembly of the State of North Dakota; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this Concurrent Resolution be forwarded by the Governor of this State to the Secretary of State for the United States of America at Washington, D. C., and to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the National Congress.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. LODGE (for himself and Mr. McMAHON) introduced Senate bill 546, to require certain contractors with the Government to guarantee an annual wage for their employees, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. MAYBANK introduced Senate bill 547, to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. MAYBANK also introduced Senate bill 548, to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 549. A bill to amend section 611 (b) of title 5, United States Code, by adding a new subsection, to be cited as subsection (c); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 550. A bill increasing the fees of witnesses and jurors in United States courts;

S. 551. A bill to extend the time within which suit may be filed under the Federal Tort Claims Act on the claim of Lela Elizabeth Spencer Brown;

S. 552. A bill for the relief of Eleni Saclarides;

S. 553. A bill for the relief of Leon Anderson;

S. 554. A bill to provide for the admission into the United States of persons of the Korean race, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes; and

S. 555. A bill for the relief of Iiko Nakamura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND):

S. 556. A bill to provide for the sale of a part of war-housing project No. Fla-8252-1 to the Department of Public Safety of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 557. A bill for the relief of the McCormick Engineering Co. and John E. Price, an individual doing business as the Okeechobee Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. LANGER, Mr. O'CONOR, and Mr. BALDWIN):

S. 558. A bill to provide for salary increases for employees of the field service of the Post Office Department; and

S. 559. A bill to provide for salary increases for each officer and employee of the Federal Government, and each officer and employee of the District of Columbia Municipal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 560. A bill for the relief of Wilhelm Engelbert;

S. 561. A bill for the relief of Wilhelm Froehlich; and

S. 562. A bill for the relief of Walter Engelbert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHERRY:

S. 563. A bill for the relief of the P. S. Cook Co.; and

S. 564. A bill for the relief of Rita Berliner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. WILEY introduced Senate bill 565, to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 566. A bill to fix the salaries of certain justices and judges of the Territory of Hawaii;

S. 567. A bill to provide for the retirement of the justices of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, the judges of the circuit courts of the Territory of Hawaii, and the judges of the United States District Court for the Territory of Hawaii;

S. 568. A bill to provide for the tenure of office and retirement of the justices of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, the judges of the circuit courts of the Territory of Hawaii, and the judges of the United States District Court for the Territory of Hawaii;

S. 569. A bill for the relief of Anna Netty Gordzialkowska Konopka and her daughter Bernadette Marie Konopka; and

S. 570. A bill for the relief of Donald Francis Wierda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. 571. A bill to prohibit interstate common-carrier pipe lines from transporting commodities in which such carriers have any interest;

S. 572. A bill to divorce the business of producing, refining, and transporting of petroleum products from that of marketing petroleum products; and

S. 573. A bill to prohibit producers, refiners, and marketers of petroleum products from operating tankers and barges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 574. A bill for the relief of Walter H. Berry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 575. A bill to authorize the construction of a new post office, courthouse, and customhouse building at Evansville, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 576. A bill to authorize the sale of certain Indian lands situated in Duchesne and Randlett, Utah, and in and adjacent to Myton, Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McFARLAND:

S. 577. A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 578. A bill to provide for service connection of disabilities aggravated by active military or naval service; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 579. A bill to incorporate the Retired Officers Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 580. A bill for the relief of Miltiadis Dionysious Siadimas; and

S. 581. A bill for the relief of Sherman White; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 582. A bill to authorize the sale of certain Indian lands situated in Duchesne and Randlett, Utah, and in and adjacent to Myton, Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 583. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the estate of Archangelo Straneri;

S. 584. A bill for the relief of Rudolf A. V. Raff;

S. 585. A bill for the relief of Peter Drozd;

S. 586. A bill for the relief of G. Brinton Fagen;

S. 587. A bill for the relief of Sister Stefania Cuprys; and

S. 588. A bill to repeal section 404 (c) of the Nationality Act of 1940 and to provide that no person shall have lost his nationality thereunder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 589. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Wadlow; and

S. 590. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal," approved May 29, 1944; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. O'CONOR) introduced Senate bill 591, to provide for United States flag shipping participation in Government financed cargoes, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 592. A bill for the relief of Edwin B. Anderson;

S. 593. A bill for the relief of certain postal employees; and

S. 594. A bill for the relief of John I. Malarin, former Army mail clerk at APO 932, a branch of the San Francisco, Calif., post office relative to a shortage in his fixed credit account; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. McCARRAN also introduced Senate bill 595, relating to the internal security of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McFARLAND (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado):

S. 596. A bill to provide pensions for veterans of World War I and World War II based on non-service-connected disability and attained age; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. BRIDGES):

S. J. Res. 35. Joint resolution designating the week of February 14 in each year as National Heart Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GUARANTEED ANNUAL WAGE FOR WORKERS IN INDUSTRIES HAVING GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill providing for a guaranteed annual wage for all workers in industries having Government contracts.

This bill would amend the Walsh-Healey Act so as to add the provision that in any contract made by the Federal Government for the manufacture or furnishing of materials, supplies, articles, and equipment in any amount exceeding $10,000 there be included a stipulation that the employee be employed on an annual basis.

The bill (S. 546) to require certain contractors with the Government to guarantee an annual wage for their employees, introduced by Mr. LODGE (for himself and Mr. McMAHON), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD a statement descriptive of this proposal.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LODGE

We commonly speak of hours, wages, and working conditions as summing up the factors on which the well-being of the everyday citizen depends; and indeed it is true that if these are not right, our life cannot be right.

But hours, wages, and working conditions, while they take care of our day-to-day existence, do not take into account that need for security which is felt by all of us as we travel on life's uncertain voyage. No matter how adequate our hours, wages, and working conditions may be, we cannot be happy or successful or productive if we are constantly haunted by the worry as to where we'll be or how we'll be living by the end of the year.

Man wants to make his plans by the year. The education of children, the acquiring of a real home, the planning of recreation and vacation—all the things which give life meaning and make for permanence and dependability involve the ability to plan by the year.

In order to meet this need for security, government has developed old-age payments and unemployment insurance. For Federal workers there are pensions, retirement plans, and other security measures. Meritorious legislation to provide aid for medical purposes and for housing are proposed. These plans all fill real needs and are all right as far as they go. But it is assuredly far better to earn the money which comes from full employment rather than to look forward either to some slender pittance because regular employment has ceased or to depend on Government aid for services which, in our free society, could come from regular employment.

The real way to meet this need for security is for all industries which are able to do so to say to their employees: "We know that we want to hire you by the year. Therefore we are going to guarantee you your wages for a year. You can count on it." The employee who receives this assurance then knows where he stands. He can plan his life and that of his family; he can make commitments for the education of his children, for necessary dental or medical work, for payments on his house, and for the other things which raise his standard of living. Unless he receives a guarantee that his wages would be paid for a year he cannot make these commitments. Even though he might by the end of the year have earned as much money, the fact that he had had no assurance of it would have required him to live virtually a hand-to-mouth existence.

There are already companies in the United States which have followed this guaranteed wage policy with wonderful results. But it is not a policy which most firms can adopt without some sort of legal encouragement, because one firm cannot afford such a policy if his competitor refuses to do it also.

In order to give encouragement to industries to pay wages on a guaranteed annual basis we are introducing a bill which amends the so-called Walsh-Healey Act so as to provide that in any contract made by the Federal Government for the manufacture or furnishing of materials, supplies, etc., in any amount over $10,000 there be included a stipulation by the contractor that his employees be employed on an annual basis.

The Walsh-Healey Act already contains provisions for minimum wages, a 40-hour week, 8-hour day, safe and sanitary working conditions, and a ban on child or convict labor. To these stipulations our bill would add the guaranteed annual wage.

The bill consists of two parts. The first part, containing the heart of the bill, is modeled on language used in the Federal Social Security Act which has stood the test of more than 13 years' experience. The second part is based on existing provisions of the Walsh-Healey Act, and, for the sake of necessary flexibility, authorizes the President to make modifications so as to enable the Government under all conditions to receive the services which it might need. The bill also contains a provision for revision of the wage guaranties when this becomes necessary, due to increases in the cost of living.

This idea of a guaranteed annual wage is not only referred to and defined in two existing statutes—the Federal Social Security Act and the Fair Labor Standards Act; it is also endorsed by the leaders of our great labor organizations.

The sponsorship of this measure is bipartisan. If enacted into law, it will provide guaranteed annual wages for all who work for firms having Government contracts—surely a very large number of persons. It should set an example for other industries to follow and thus spread the guaranteed wage to all parts of the country. Due to the world situation, our Government is embarked on an immense purchasing program; surely none will deny it the right to prescribe conditions for conducting this program which will promote better living and better citizenship. By avoiding the costs which unemployment and insecurity cause, this scheme will save money. It will certainly involve no cost to the taxpayer. In fact, the cost will not be in dollars; but in headwork and good planning.

This annual wage bill should also have many far-reaching results which it is now difficult to estimate. The greater sense of security which all these families will possess will lead to better living, better education, better medical care, and better community life generally. This will have incalculable effects on the buying power, economic habits, and labor relations of the beneficiaries of this scheme.

This bill is in essence an attempt to induce our free system to yield all the benefits which it is capable of yielding. If the free system does not do all the good of which it is capable, increased governmental services are inevitable. In fact, this bill may well mark a parting of the ways; either we make the most of our present system and develop all its latent strength—or we can expect a succession of policies which will progressively sap its vigor and thus eventually make lower living standards for everyone.

Finally, this proposal will also have a real effect on the faith and enthusiasm which people have in the soundness of our country's institutions. The more completely people share in the blessings and benefits of our way of life the more they believe in it. The more people believe in our way of life, the richer and more productive it becomes. The measure which we propose should still further make of the United States a land where freemen can grow and flourish in ever-increasing numbers.

TEXT OF SECTION 1 OF THE WALSH-HEALEY ACT, FOLLOWED BY NEW SUBSECTION AS PROPOSED IN THE LODGE-M'MAHON AMENDMENT

(1) In any contract made and entered into by any executive department, independent establishment, or other agency or instrumentality of the United States, or by the District of Columbia, or by any corporation all the stock of which is beneficially owned by the United States (all the foregoing being hereinafter designated as agencies of the United States) for the manufacture or furnishing of materials, supplies, articles, and equipment in any amount exceeding $10,000, there shall be included the following representations and stipulations:

"(f) That the contractor has guaranteed in advance 30 hours of wages for each 40 calendar weeks (or more, with 1 weekly hour deducted for each added week guaranteed) in 12 months, to all the individuals in his employ in one or more distinct establishments, except that any such individual's guaranty may commence after a probationary period (included within 12 or less consecutive calendar weeks); in the event, however, that the cost-of-living index as established by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, known as the Consumer's Price Index, should, at any time during the term of such guaranty, show a rise of 10 or more points by comparison with the index on the date upon which such guaranty became effective, appropriate modification of such guaranty may be made between the contractor and his employees: *Provided*, That whenever in his judgment inclusion in the proposal or contract of the representations or stipulations set forth in this subsection will seriously impair the conduct of Government business and will not serve the public interest, the President is authorized to modify or suspend any or all of the representations and stipulations contained in this subsection."

CONTINUATION OF LAW RELATING TO VOLUNTARY AGREEMENTS AND PLANS

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement prepared by me of the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and, without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from South Carolina will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 547) to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans, introduced by Mr. MAYBANK, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The statement presented by Mr. MAYBANK was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAYBANK OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO CONTINUE THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 1949, CERTAIN AUTHORITY CONFERRED ON THE PRESIDENT BY SECTION 2 OF PUBLIC LAW 395, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, REGARDING VOLUNTARY AGREEMENTS AND PLANS

The purpose of the proposed legislation is the temporary extension, to September 30, 1949, of the authority of the President to approve voluntary agreements and plans under section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress (act of December 30, 1947; 61 Stat. 945). The present authority terminates on March 1, 1949, subject to a 6-month wind-up period of limited effectiveness for agreements then in effect. The proposed temporary extension through September 30, 1949 (with no wind-up period thereafter) will make it possible to keep the program going pending congressional consideration of more comprehensive stabilization proposals.

On the basis of its experience in carrying out the administration of the act, the Department of Commerce is of the opinion that the program has been successful, within the limitations inherent in any voluntary program, in overcoming some of the problems arising from shortages of goods and facilities. In so doing the program has contributed on a voluntary basis to meeting certain essential requirements of our domestic economy as a whole, and also to meeting the steel requirements of the armed forces and the Atomic Energy Commission, these military requirements being also covered by the mandatory-order provision of section 18 of the Selective Service Act of 1948 (Public Law 759, 80th Cong.).

An immediate interim extension of the present authority through September 30, 1949, is necessary in order to preserve the full benefits of the voluntary agreements in effect on March 1, 1949, and to permit entering into such new agreements as might provide substantial benefits before September 30, 1949, pending consideration of a general stabilization program. While these voluntary agreements in effect on March 1 could continue to provide limited benefits after that date, their full effectiveness and the realization of any benefits whatever from new agreements would be lost if the continuity of the program were interrupted or stopped.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR REGULATION OF EXPORTS

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement prepared by me may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from South Carolina will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 548) to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAYBANK, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The statement presented by Mr. MAYBANK is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAYBANK OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE FOR CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR THE REGULATION OF EXPORTS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The proposed bill would provide for continuance of existing export-control powers through June 30, 1951, subject to termination at an earlier date by the President or the Congress. The present law authorizing control over exports, section 3 of Public Law 395 of the Eightieth Congress, expires February 28, 1949.

Through export controls the Department of Commerce is able to limit the quantity of shipments abroad and thus lessen the inflationary impact of foreign demand. Of even greater importance at the present time are the measures which are being taken thereunder to channel critically needed commodities to those areas where they will be used to promote world recovery and also to control certain exports in the interest of national security. The extension of this law is clearly necessary and should be authorized as soon as possible for reasons of administrative continuity and so that there may be adequate notice to the trade community of the continuance of these controls.

Section 1 of the proposed bill would provide the factual justification for extending these powers and section 2 sets forth the policies which shall govern their exercise.

Under existing law the authority to issue purely enforcement regulations is implied from the general authority granted to issue all necessary rules and regulations. However, in the light of recent developments indicating the need for a broader and stronger enforcement program, it is considered desirable to obtain specific authority for undertaking all necessary enforcement measures. Such authority would be established by section 3. For the same reason provision is made in section 6 for necessary investigatory powers.

Section 4 (a) would provide for interdepartmental consultation as to specific items to be controlled and the extent of the control. Section 4 (b) would provide for consultation with representatives of the export trade concerning licensing criteria and related matters. Under existing law, consultation on this matter is entirely discretionary. These provisions describe and would require the continuation of current operating policies and at the same time permit the administrative flexibility which experience of several years has demonstrated to be essential.

Section 5 would continue existing penalties for violations except that the maximum prison penalty has been reduced from 2 years to 1, in order to permit the institution of prosecution by way of information rather than formal indictment and to that extent enable prosecution of violators of the law to be expedited. Moreover, in the few criminal cases that have thus far been prosecuted under the Export Control Act, penalties of much less than 1 year have been imposed.

In accordance with the policy for temporary legislation set forth in section 2 of the Administrative Procedure Act, section 7 would provide an exemption from all provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act except the public information requirement of section 3 of that act. Section 8 would continue the present reporting requirement, except that it provides for the submission of reports within 45 rather than within 30 days after each quarter for administrative convenience and so that the reports may contain more current information and statistical data.

Section 10 would provide that the export licensing of tin-plate scrap, now controlled by the Department of State, would be handled under this act. No changes are proposed, however, in the existing special arrangements with respect to the control of exports of helium, gold, munitions of war, or atomic energy materials.

Section 12 would establish June 30, 1951, as the termination date for this control activity. This section also provides expressly for earlier termination by the President or the Congress. Exercise of control over the exportation of specific articles, materials, or supplies would, of course, be adjusted by the procedure set out in section 4 (a) and in accordance with policy delcared in section 2.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended. It is identical with Senate bill 1403 of the Eightieth Congress.

The purpose of the bill is to double the present limitation on outside earnings of widows receiving social-security payments without depriving them of their survivor's insurance or the aid which they get for dependent children. At present the limitation is $14.99 per month on these outside earnings, and my proposal, in line with suggestions to me from the Social Security Board, would double this limitation to $30. This is obviously not a large sum to permit these folks to earn on their own initiative; it is clear, however, that the sum cannot be made too large so that, as the Social Security Board states, it would become unnecessary to give the individuals survivor's aid. The Board, therefore, recommended either $25 or $30 as a limitation, and I have, therefore, used the latter figure.

I am hoping for early action on this bill by the Senate Finance Committee and upon legislation in the entire field of social security.

The bill (S. 565) to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

TRANSPORTATION OF GOODS IN AMERICAN SHIPS UNDER THE ECONOMIC RECOVERY PROGRAM

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at the last session of Congress the Senate placed an amendment in the measure providing for the economic recovery program which provided that 50 percent of the goods, in bulk or otherwise, to be shipped to Europe under the program, be transported in American bottoms, the American merchant marine. The Director of the Economic Recovery Program, Mr. Paul Hoffman, announced approximately a month ago that the language in which the Senate and House made this mandatory was somewhat ambiguous, and that his directive on the matter should, therefore, be reviewed by his legal department, which was done. In line with that Mr. Hoffman announced that probably his organization would not have to follow that formula.

Several of us are very much interested in this matter, because of our interest in the future of the American merchant marine and the part it might play in economic recovery and world trade. We had a meeting this morning with Mr. Hoffman, attended by representatives of all the principal shipping interests, by representatives of the labor groups involved, and by representatives of both the House and the Senate. It was agreed to postpone the order until the Congress could make a determination as to just what it desired in regard to participation by the American merchant marine in our economic recovery program for Europe.

In order to make that clear, the chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Mr. BLAND, of Virginia, has introduced a measure in the House, and I now introduce a similar bill, making clear the congressional intent in this matter.

The bill (S. 591) to provide for United States flag shipping participation in Government-financed cargoes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. O'CONOR), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by me regarding the purpose of the bill, together with three editorials.

There being no objection, the statement and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON; INTRODUCTION OF MERCHANT MARINE POLICY BILL

On behalf of myself and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] I am today sending a bill to the desk for appropriate reference which, if enacted, will establish a national policy with reference to transportation of cargoes financed by American funds—whether they be grants-in-aid, direct loans, or credits for the procurement of commodities in this country by other nations. The bill proposes that American-flag ships shall carry at least 50 percent of all Government-financed cargoes.

This provision applies to all Government agencies and departments. The only exception to this basic principle would occur when and if the United States Maritime Commission certifies to the agency or department concerned that United States flag ships are not available in sufficient number to do the job.

Most Members of this Senate, I am sure, realize the serious situation currently confronted by the United States merchant marine. In the last 17 months over 1,200 United States ships have gone into the inactive fleet. In truth, the American flag is rapidly disappearing from the seas. All of us know the vital role the merchant marine and the shore installations necessary to maintain it, played during World War II. In my judgment, it is absolutely essential to national security and to our national economy that the Congress promote maritime policies aimed at maintaining a minimum but adequate fleet of merchant vessels flying the American flag.

One step in this direction is to establish a national policy governing shipments of United States financed cargoes—a policy such as I am proposing in this bill.

For over 2 weeks in March of last year, the Senate debated problems in connection with the so-called Marshall plan. One of the items of deep concern to all of us was the proposal contained in the original draft for sale and charter of American ships to foreign nations. The senior Senators of Maine, Connecticut, Michigan, and Kentucky, and the junior Senator from California were among those instrumental in deleting this provision in the final draft of the bill. These Senators and others joined with me in insisting also that a provision be written into the act requiring the Administrator to move at least 50 percent of the commodities purchased in the United States for participating countries in American bottoms.

An amendment submitted by the junior Senator from California became section 111 (a) (2) of the act. That section reads:

"The Administrator shall, in providing for the procurement of commodities under authority of this title, take such steps as may be necessary to assure, so far as is practicable, that at least 50 percent of the gross tonnage of commodities, procured within the United States out of funds made available under this title and transported abroad on ocean vessels, is so transported on United States flag vessels to the extent such vessels are available at market rates."

All of us vitally interested in the problem thought this language and its legislative history sufficiently strong to clearly indicate to the Administrator congressional intent on the subject.

On December 1, 1948, however, the Administrator announced that after December 31, 1948, ECA would no longer consider itself bound by the 50 percent provision. Subsequently, the effective date of the Administrator's decision was deferred to January 31, 1949. I and other Senators have protested to the Administrator this change of policy.

I believe the Congress can avoid such difficulties in the future by establishing a national policy along the lines I am suggesting in the bill. Had such a policy existed at the time ECA legislation was under consideration, the executive departments would have tailored their recommendations in the light of principles clearly set forth by the Congress.

Within the next few days, I will propose to the Senate that a full-dress study of maritime problems be inaugurated by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. The bill I am introducing today is one facet of that study. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Seafarers Log, from the Marine Digest, and from the Seattle Post-Intelligencer be incorporated as a part of my remarks.

[From the Seafarers Log of January 7, 1949]

"THE FACTS, MR. HOFFMAN

"In a letter to Senator STYLES BRIDGES, former chairman of the congressional watchdog committee on the Marshall plan, ECA Administrator Paul G. Hoffman tried to justify his infamous proposal to move all bulk Marshall plan cargoes in foreign vessels by a statement that simply does not fit the facts.

"He declared that the cost of shipping a ton of coal from the United States to France is sometimes as much as $4.50 less on a foreign ship than on an American ship. He strongly implies that this big differential was the rule rather than the exception, and he forgot to note that it was an exception that was no longer happening on December 3 when he wrote the letter.

"The facts are these: The American rate for carrying coal from the east coast to France is $10.85 a ton. This rate is set by the Maritime Commission. On foreign ships the rate ranges from $8.50 a ton to about $9. This week, in an effort to get at the truth, a shipping official called three operators of foreign-flag vessels to inquire about the coal rate. Two of the operators quoted $8.50. The third wouldn't talk about any rate below $9 and seemed to prefer a higher one.

"Thus, the actual differential about which Hoffman has been bleating turns out to be no more than $2.35 a ton at the most and only $1.85 or less in some cases. And the story doesn't end there, because the differential is just about wiped out later so far as American taxpayers are concerned. Coal is not the only bulk cargo, but the coal rate continues to be the root of the controversy.

"Another facet of the Marshall plan shipping situation has been overlooked completely by Hoffman and his executive assistants. At least, they have not mentioned it in their public statements. Whether Hoffman knows it or not, foreign operators are getting away with a scheme so obvious that one can only conclude that Hoffman is a very gullible gent.

"It is no secret that representatives of French shipping interests recently told a member of the Maritime Commission that they deliberately depressed their rates in a maneuver to get a bigger slice of the melon. Later on, the Frenchmen continued, up would go the rates. The Americans would be hoodwinked.

"Shipping men of other nations participating in the Marshall plan are reported to have said substantially the same thing, although they said it less bluntly than the Frenchmen. Foreign rates already are rising as the foreign operators smack their lips in anticipation.

"Foreign operators haven't been worrying about making or losing money for the present period. If they lose money they expect to be reimbursed directly or indirectly through the Marshall plan. This would mean American subsidization of European merchant fleets with low labor standards. And if they get the extra cargoes and raise the rates, too, their chances of losing money are very slight. Yet Hoffman, in his letter to Bridges, wailed that to pay the American rates was to subsidize the American merchant marine, and copies of that letter were sent to many trade-unionists, Senators, and Congressmen who have taken up the cudgels in the SIU's fight to have the Hoffman order rescinded. In the early days of the battle, Hoffman and his assistants apparently believed that this letter was enough to fool everybody. Actually, it fooled nobody.

"What of the rate differential that remains? Is it as devastating as Hoffman would have it sound? The answer is a resounding 'No,' after some of the elements in steamship financing are examined.

"If a minimum of half of the bulk cargoes are to be carried under the American flag as the law now provides, despite Hoffman's peculiar interpretation, they will go for the most part in Libertys under bare-boat charter from the Maritime Commission.

"When a company charters a Liberty from the Commission, it pays $7,500 a month in rent. If 150 Libertys should fail to operate because of the Hoffman order, it would mean a dead loss in revenue to the Government of $1,125,000 a month. The charter hire for Victory ships is $10,000 a month, and if any Victory should fail to operate because of the order the loss of revenue would be correspondingly greater.

"Maritime Commission spokesmen point out that the money from chartering a ship is almost entirely profit to the Government. The loss to the Government is even greater, however, for a ship in the boneyard costs the Commission about $10,000 a year to maintain.

"Then there is the matter of taxes. If a company charters a Liberty, the first 10 percent in gross profit on the capital invested in the operation of that ship is subject to normal corporate income taxes. When the profits go higher, the taxes spiral. After the 10 percent has been taxed separately, the Government divides additional gross profits by the number of days the company actually operated the ship.

"The company is then taxed 50 percent of the first $100-a-day profit, 75 percent of profit between $100 and $300 a day, and 90 percent of any profit above $300 a day. The steamship companies still pay substantial dividends while the Government gets millions and millions in taxes.

"In short, if the Maritime Commission ships are in the boneyard, the Government loses: (1) Millions of dollars in charter hire; (2) millions of dollars in maintenance charges; (3) millions of dollars in corporate taxes; (4) millions of dollars in unemployment benefits paid to seamen and others in the maritime industry.

"Hoffman maintains that if all the bulk cargoes go on foreign-flag ships this country will be able to ship more goods to Europe. This is a dubious argument at best, since shipping costs are only one item in the Marshall plan.

"However, he might better insist that 60 or 70 or even 100 percent of the bulk cargoes go in American ships, and he might ask that the extra taxes collected by the Government from the shipping industry be appropriated to purchase the goods that the people of the war-ravaged nations of Europe must have, despite chiseling in shipping and other matters by some of their businessmen.

"The SIU will carry on its fight to have the Hoffman proposal defeated. This battle is far from over, but each day we gain new allies in the labor movement and Congress. The SIU never has lost a beef and will not lose this one."

[From the Marine Digest]

"ECA RULING SERIOUS BLOW TO UNITED STATES SHIPS

"A newly disclosed ruling by Economic Cooperation Administrator Paul G. Hoffman to stop giving a 50-50 share of Marshall plan 'bulk' cargoes to American ships has resulted in a major Government controversy in Washington, D. C.

"In another development on Capitol Hill this week the foreign-aid program came under fire with charges that a few giant companies' get the lion's share of exports, while small firms 'go hungry' for freight shipped abroad.

"RULING 'FANTASTIC'

"Maritime Commissioner Granville Meller described the ruling of Hoffman as 'fantastic' and summoned his fellow Commissioners to a special session to consider the move order to go into effect January 1. Hoffman said he based his action on the ground that the use of higher-cost American shipping for transportation of grain and coal is cutting into funds meant for European recovery.

"Coal shipments to France, he said, cost $4.50 a ton more in American ships than in foreign bottoms. The decision means that no United States shipping will be used to transport American coal, grain, and petroleum products.

"The Foreign Aid Act, passed last April, directed Hoffman to see that American-flag vessels carry at least 50 percent of all United States cargoes financed by ECA, but it added that Hoffman should do so 'as far as practicable,' and to the extent that such vessels are available at market rates—that is, at competitive world freight rates.

"In discussing the situation, Hoffman said:

"'Any ruling by me that the 50-50 provision should be observed when rates are higher for American ships would be a subsidy to American shipping out of dollar appropriations for European recovery.'

"LION'S SHARE

"The charge that a few giant companies get the lion's share of exports came from Representative Ploeser, Republican, of Missouri, chairman of the House Small Business Committee. Ploeser said that the European-aid program is injuring small United States firms by reducing the supply of strategic and critically short materials in this country. Citing the August report of ECA, on cotton exports, Ploeser said one firm, Anderson, Clayton & Co., and its subsidiaries, received 71.2 percent of August cotton procurement

authorizations under the ECA program. Will Clayton, former Assistant Secretary of State, has a large interest in the firm. During the same month, 296 firms obtained all the foreign-aid business of ECA."

[From the Marine Digest]

"A SUGGESTION FOR MR. HOFFMAN

"What is the matter with ECA Administrator Paul Hoffman?

"Instead of busying himself with cutting down the portion of bulk cargo carried in United States bottoms under the Marshall plan, he would be better occupied with making sure that the cargo is put to its proper use in the countries to which it goes.

"While Mr. Hoffman is busying himself with saving a few dollars at the expense of the United States merchant marine, which is justly entitled to 50 percent of the trade, we learn that Great Britain, Belgium, and Holland have resold to American business nearly 20,000 tons of aluminum and lead scrap they bought with Marshall plan dollars.

"Are we to believe that this is a sole and solitary instance or are there further similar disclosures to follow?

"If we were ECA Administrator Paul Hoffman, we would spend more future time checking on the proper use of Marshall plan dollars instead of figuring out a pinch-penny program which may well wreck our already dwindling United States merchant marine.

"Congress issued a direct mandate that no less than half of ECA's cargo should be carried in American ships and it is not within Mr. Hoffman's province to decide otherwise, without the consent of Congress.

"The question, as United States Maritime Commissioner Mellon has already noted, is not only one of getting the lowest possible rates for ECA bulk cargoes, but of preserving the American merchant marine."

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Post-Intelligencer of July 19, 1948]

"OUR MARITIME DECLINE

"A striking example of the manner in which the American merchant marine is being permitted to decline, just as it did after World War I, is provided by the experience of a pioneer Pacific Northwest shipping company.

"The company—Pope & Talbot, which has been doing business in Puget Sound for just 2 years short of a century—recently paid the Maritime Commission $5,000,000 for four C-3 vessels to operate a freight and passenger service to the east coast of South America.

"To be able to compete with foreign lines—which, incidentally, are using American-built ships obtained from the Maritime Commission—the company must have a subsidy to compensate it for the difference between its high operating costs and the low costs of its competitors.

"The company therefore applied to the Maritime Commission for a subsidy on exactly the same terms as one now being paid to another American company operating over the same route.

"Its application has the backing of every chamber of commerce on the Pacific coast, as the discontinuance of the service would mean the loss of an excellent market for American raw materials—but nothing has happened to date.

"And unless the subsidy is granted, the line will be abandoned.

"There is also the case of the American President Lines, recently and for the second time since the war confronted by the collapse of a replacement program designed to restore it to prewar status.

"This company, which had seven passenger liners in round-the-world service before the war, now has only two. Moreover, of its 20 combination passenger-cargo vessels utilized for war service, only 3 returned.

"Yet the essential measures of Federal cooperation are utterly lacking, which is the explanation of the failure of the company's program of restoration—and of the continuing decline of the whole structure of American maritime enterprise.

"Legislation proposed in the last session of Congress to continue our war-won maritime supremacy was one of many vital measures of national interest which failed of passage.

"In the light of such experiences is it any wonder that foreign maritime enterprise is rapidly outstripping ours?

"While we are stifling our own merchant marine, our alert and progressive maritime competitors—and especially the British—are steadily and surely winning back the position and prestige which they enjoyed before the war.

"Thus, the overseas edition of the London Daily Mail was recently able to point out that 'one in every four merchant ships at work today' flies the British flag, as compared with 'one in every three' before the war.

"And it suggests that Great Britain can look forward with confidence to the reestablishment of its traditional supremacy in ocean commerce at a fairly early date.

"While the British merchant fleet lost 2,000 ships during the war out of a total of 3,400 in service at the start, wartime replacements and postwar construction have made a total of 3,100 vessels available today—while new ship construction in this country is at a virtually complete standstill and a major part of our existing tonnage is on the inactive list.

"It is with sound reasoning and laudable purpose that the London Daily Mail comments:

"'Postwar shipping needs are greater, and will continue greater, than prewar.

"'We are aiming at a larger merchant navy to secure as much of that increased trade as we can.'

"And it is with good reason that the British newspaper also says:

"'The British merchant navy's recovery has been magnificent. * * *

"'Britain will win back the trident she lost to the United States.'"

INTERNAL SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which was sent to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary from the Department of Justice. It is entitled, "Relating to the Internal Security of the United States."

I ask unanimous consent that the bill, because of its particular significance, be printed in full in the body of the RECORD, and that an explanation furnished me by way of a letter from the Attorney General be printed in the RECORD following the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 595) relating to the internal security of the United States, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title 18, United States Code, section 793, be and the same is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) Whoever, for the purpose of obtaining information respecting the national defense with intent or reason to believe that the information is to be used to the injury of the United States, or to the advantage of any foreign nation, goes upon, enters, flies over, or otherwise obtains information concerning any vessel, aircraft, work of defense, navy yard, naval station, submarine base, fueling station, fort, battery, torpedo station, dockyard, canal, railroad, arsenal, camp, factory, mine, telegraph, telephone, wireless, or signal station, building, office, or other place connected with the national defense, owned or constructed, or in progress of construction, by the United States or under the control of the United States, or of any of its officers, departments, or agencies, or within the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States, or any place in which any vessel, aircraft, arms, munitions, or other materials or instruments for use in time of war are being made, prepared, repaired, or stored, under any contract or agreement with the United States, or any department or agency thereof, or with any person on behalf of the United States, or otherwise on behalf of the United States, or any other prohibited place so designated by the President by proclamation in time of war or in case of national emergency in which anything for the use of the Army or Navy is being prepared or constructed or stored, information as to which the President has determined would be prejudicial to the national defense; or

"(b) Whoever, for the purpose aforesaid, and with like intent or reason to believe, copies, takes, makes, or obtains, or attempts, to copy, take, make, or obtain, any sketch, photograph, photographic negative, blueprint, plan, map, model, instrument, appliance, document, writing, or note of anything connected with the national defense; or

"(c) Whoever, for the purpose aforesaid, receives or obtains or agrees or attempts to receive or obtain from any person, or from any source whatever, any document, writing, code book, signal book, sketch, photograph, photographic negative, blueprint, plan, map, model, instrument, appliance, or note, of anything connected with the national defense, knowing or having reason to believe, at the time he receives or obtains, or agrees or attempts to receive or obtain it, that it has been or will be obtained, taken, made, or disposed of by any person contrary to the provisions of this chapter; or

"(d) Whoever, lawfully having possession of, access to, control over, or being entrusted with any document, writing, code book, signal book, sketch, photograph, photographic negative, blueprint, plan, map, model, instrument, appliance, or note relating to the national defense, or information relating to the national defense which could be used to the injury of the United States or to the advantage of any foreign nation, willfully communicates or transmits or attempts to communicate or transmit the same to any person not entitled to receive it, or willfully retains the same and fails to deliver it on demand to the officer or employee of the United States entitled to receive it; or

"(e) Whoever having unauthorized possession of, access to, or control over any document, writing, code book, signal book, sketch, photograph, photographic negative, blueprint, plan, map, model, instrument, appliance, or note relating to the national defense, or information relating to the national defense which could be used to the injury of the United States or to the advantage of any foreign nation, willfully communicates or transmits or attempts to communicate or transmit the same to any person not entitled to receive it, or willfully retains the same and fails to deliver it to the officer or employee of the United States entitled to receive it; or

"(f) Whoever, being entrusted with or having lawful possession or control of any document, writing, code book, signal book, sketch, photograph, photographic negative, blueprint, plan, map, model, note, or information, relating to the national defense, (1)

through gross negligence permits the same to be removed from its proper place of custody or delivered to anyone in violation of his trust, or to be lost, stolen, abstracted, or destroyed, or (2) having knowledge that the same has been illegally removed from its proper place of custody or delivered to anyone in violation of his trust, or actually lost, or stolen, abstracted, or destroyed, and fails to make prompt report thereof to his superior officer—

"Shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

"(g) If two or more persons conspire to violate the provisions of this section, and one or more of such persons do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each of the parties to such conspiracy shall be subject to the punishment provided for the offense which is the object of such conspiracy."

SEC. 2. No prosecution shall be brought under title 18, United States Code, section 792, 793, or 794 except upon the express direction of the Attorney General of the United States.

SEC. 3. An indictment for any violation of title 18, United States Code, section 792, 793 or 794 may be found at any time without regard to any statute of limitations. This section shall not authorize prosecution, trial, or punishment for any offense now barred by the provisions of existing law.

SEC. 4. The act of June 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 631; 22 U. S. C. 611-621), entitled "An act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes," as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

(a) Strike out the word "and" at the end of section 1 (c) (3), insert the word "and" at the end of section 1 (c) (4), and add the following subsection immediately after section 1 (c) (4):

"(5) any person who has knowledge of or has received instruction in the espionage, counterespionage, or sabotage service or tactics of a government of a foreign country or a foreign political party, unless such knowledge or instruction has been acquired by reason of civilian or military service with the United States Government;"

(b) Add the following subsection immediately after section 8 (d):

"(e) Failure to file a registration statement or supplements thereto as required by section 2 (a) and section 2 (b) shall be considered a continuing offense for as long as such failure exists, notwithstanding any statute of limitation or other statute to the contrary."

SEC. 5. (a) The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, the Director of the Military Intelligence Division of the Department of the Army, the Director of Intelligence, United States Air Force, and the Chief of the Office of Naval Intelligence of the Navy Department are authorized under rules and regulations as prescribed by the Attorney General, in the conduct of investigations to ascertain, prevent, or frustrate any interference or any attempts or plans for interference with the national security and defense by treason, sabotage, espionage, seditious conspiracy, violations of neutrality laws, violations of the act requiring the registration of agents of foreign principals (act of June 8, 1938, as amended (52 Stat. 631)), violations of the act requiring the registration of organizations carrying on certain activities within the United States (act of October 17, 1940 (54 Stat. 1201)), or in any other manner, to require that telegrams, cablegrams, radiograms, or other wire or radio communications and copies or records thereof, or, upon the express written approval of the Attorney General, that any information obtained by means of intercepting, listening in on, or recording telephone, telegraph, cable, radio, or any other similar messages or communications, be disclosed and delivered to any authorized agent of any one of said investigatorial agencies, without regard to the limitations contained in section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1103). The information thus obtained shall be admissible in evidence, but only when such evidence is offered in a criminal or civil proceeding in which the Government is a party.

(b) No person shall fail to comply forthwith with the request of any duly authorized person, pursuant to this section, for the disclosure and surrender of any telegram, cablegram, radiogram, or other wire or radio communication, or copies or records thereof in his possession or under his control.

(c) No person shall divulge, publish, or use the existence, contents, substance, purport, or meaning of any information obtained pursuant to the provisions of this section otherwise than for the purposes hereinbefore enumerated.

(d) Any person who willfully and knowingly violates any provision of this section shall be guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both.

(e) If any provision of this section or the application of such provision to any circumstance shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this section and the applicability of such provision to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

(f) For purposes of this section the term "person" shall include any individual, partnership, association, business trust, corporation, or any organized group of persons, whether incorporated or not.

(g) The Attorney General is hereby authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

SEC. 6. (a) Whoever willfully shall violate any regulation or order promulgated or approved by the Secretary of the Navy pursuant to lawful authority for the protection or security of vessels, harbors, ports, or water-front facilities, relating to fire hazards, fire protection, lighting, machinery, guard service, disrepair, disuse, or other unsatisfactory conditions thereon, or the ingress thereto, or egress or removal of persons therefrom, or otherwise providing for safeguarding the same against destruction, loss, or injury by accident, or by enemy action, sabotage, or other subversive acts, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be liable to a fine of not to exceed $5,000 or to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

(b) If any provision of this section or the application of such provision to any circumstance shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this section and the application of such provision to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 7. (a) Whoever willfully shall violate any regulation or order promulgated or approved by the Secretary of Defense, or by any military commander designated by the Secretary of Defense, pursuant to lawful authority for the protection or security of aircraft, airports, or airport facilities, relating to fire hazards, fire protection, lighting, machinery, guard service, disrepair, disuse, or other unsatisfactory conditions thereon, or the ingress thereto or egress or removal of persons therefrom, or otherwise providing for safeguarding the same against destruction, loss, or injury by accident or by enemy action, sabotage, or other subversive actions, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be liable to a fine of not to exceed $5,000 or to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

(b) If any provision of this section or the application of such provision to any circumstance shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this section and the application of such provision to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 8. Nothing in this act shall be construed to require or establish military or civilian censorship or in any way to limit or infringe upon freedom of the press as guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States.

The letter presented by Mr. McCARRAN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., January 14, 1949.

Hon. PAT McCARRAN,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill relating to the internal security of the United States.

The proposal has been drafted to carry out the recommendations of the Interdepartmental Intelligence Committee, composed of representatives of the Military Intelligence Division of the Department of the Army, the Office of Naval Intelligence of the Navy Department, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation of this Department. The recommendations reflect conclusions which were unanimously reached by the Committee, after a thorough study of the provisions and inadequacies of existing law, beginning in 1945, and are based on the needs and experiences of the three agencies during both World War II and peacetime.

The first section of the proposed legislation would amend the fourth paragraph of title 18, United States Code, section 793 (subsec. (d) under proposed amendment), to provide that only those who have lawful possession of the items relating to national defense enumerated therein shall be subject to its provisions. This is proposed in view of the fact that a refusal to deliver such items in response to a proper demand therefor is an element of an offense under the subsection, whereas it is deemed advisable that those who have unauthorized possession of such items should be subject to the provisions of a separate subsection, as hereinafter explained, and required to surrender them to the proper authorities regardless of the demand therefor.

The first section of the proposed legislation would also amend the fourth paragraph of title 18, United States Code, section 793 (subsec. (d) under the proposed amendment), to include "information relating to the national defense which could be used to the injury of the United States or to the advantage of any foreign nation" among the items of which the unauthorized transmission or retention would be unlawful. The phrase "which could be used to the injury of the United States or to the advantage of any foreign nation" would modify only "information relating to the national defense" and not the other items enumerated in the subsection. It is deemed advisable to broaden the provision to include such information, in order to render the law more effective against unauthorized transmissions and retentions which may not come within the existing specifically enumerated items but which are considered nonetheless dangerous to the national security.

The first section of the proposed legislation would amend title 18, United States Code, section 793, to provide (subsec. (e) under proposed amendment) that those who have unauthorized possession of the items enumerated therein must surrender possession thereof to the proper authorities regardless of a demand therefor. Existing law provides no penalty for the unauthorized possession of such items unless a demand for them is made by the person entitled to receive them. The dangers attending the unauthorized possession of the items enumerated in this

statute are self-evident, and it is deemed advisable to require their surrender in such a case, regardless of demand, especially since their unauthorized possession may be unknown to the authorities who would otherwise make the demand. In summary, the only difference between subsection (d) and subsection (e) of title 18, United States Code, section 793, if amended as proposed, would be that a demand by the person entitled to receive the items would be a necessary element of an offense under subsection (d) where the possession is lawful, whereas such a demand would not be a necessary element of an offense under subsection (e) where the possession is unauthorized.

The first section of the proposed legislation would amend title 18, United States Code, section 793, by adding a provision (subsec. (f) (2)) to provide for the punishment of those who are entrusted with the items relating to national defense enumerated therein and who have knowledge of, but fail to report, the loss, theft, abstraction, destruction, or unlawful transmission of such items. The danger of such an item, e. g., a code book or plan of operation, being lost, stolen, or compromised by the enemy or prospective enemy, needs no emphasis. As an illustration, it is now common knowledge that our compromise of an enemy coding system was an important factor in our defense and operations against the enemy in the early and vital stages of the recent war. It is not unreasonable to assume that the advantage would be reversed should an enemy compromise a coding system of the United States. The existing law provides no penalty for the failure to report such knowledge by those entrusted with the above items.

The first section of the proposed legislation (subsec. (g) under proposed amendment) would amend title 18, United States Code, section 793, to provide a penalty for a conspiracy to violate the section. Section 794 presently includes a conspiracy provision, and there appears to be no reason why a conspiracy to violate section 793 should not be similarly punishable.

The first section of the proposed legislation would designate the several paragraphs of title 18, United States Code, section 793, as subsections (a) through (g) for purposes of convenient reference.

Section 2 of the proposed legislation would provide that no prosecution could be brought under title 18, United States Code, section 792, 793, or 794 except upon the express direction of the Attorney General.

Section 3 of the proposed legislation would provide that an indictment for the violation of section 792, 793, or 794 of title 18, United States Code, could be found at any time without regard to any statute of limitations. Under existing law (18 U. S. C. 3282), the statute of limitations with respect to a violation of section 792, 793, or 794 in peacetime is only 3 years. A violation of subsection 794 (b) or (c) during war constitutes a capital offense and is therefore not subject to the statute of limitations (18 U. S. C. 3282). In view of the fact that a violation of section 792, 793, or 794 during either peace or war may not be detected, or the identity of the violator discovered until more than 3 years after the violation was committed, e. g., until hostilities cease and the records of the enemy are accessible, it is considered advisable to amend the law so that the prosecution of an espionage violation may be instituted at any time. Such an amendment would also permit the prosecution and consequent public disclosures of such offenses to be held in abeyance, for strategical purposes, pending the detection and apprehension of other offenders who may also be involved in the same or affiliated espionage ring. The amendment, of course, because of the constitutional bar against ex post facto criminal laws, would not authorize the prosecution or punishment of an offense which is already barred by existing law.

Section 4 (a) of the proposed legislation would amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of June 8, 1938, as amended (22 U. S. C. 611–621), by adding a subsection 1 (c) (5) immediately after subsection 1 (c) (4) (22 U. S. C. 611 (c) (4)) to require the registration of persons who have knowledge of, or have received instruction in, the espionage, counter espionage, or sabotage service or tactics, of a foreign government or a foreign political party, unless such knowledge or instruction has been acquired by reason of civilian or military service with the United States Government. Under existing law, a person trained by a foreign government for purposes of espionage and sabotage is immune from prosecution provided there is no substantial evidence of his having violated the Espionage Act, and he is in no way obliged to divulge either his intentions or the very useful information which is peculiarly within his knowledge, information which if acquired by our counter-intelligence agencies could spell the difference between success and catastrophe in counteracting the plans and tactics of an enemy. Examples of those who would come within this category are those whose operations may defy detection and those who may be dispatched to this country for purposes of espionage or sabotage and who either postpone their operations until an opportune time or, for fear of apprehension or other reason, abandoned their mission. The amendment is proposed for a threefold purpose, namely, to discourage further the unknown presence of potential spies and saboteurs; to provide a basis for the prosecution of unregistered potential spies and saboteurs before they commit an act of espionage or sabotage; and to assist this Government in its counter-intelligence work by acquiring the information regarding foreign espionage and sabotage systems and tactics that would be disclosed by those who elected to register rather than run the risk of prosecution for not so registering.

Section 4 (b) of the proposed legislation would amend the Foreign Agents' Registration Act by adding a subsection 8 (e) immediately after subsection 8 (d) (22 U. S. C. 618 (d)) to provide that a failure to file a registration statement or supplements thereto as required by sections 2 (a) and (b) (22 U. S. C. 612 (a) (b)) shall be considered a continuing offense for as long as such failure exists, notwithstanding any statute of limitations or other statute to the contrary. The purpose of this proposed amendment is to permit the prosecution of an offender at any time during the period he continues to disregard the statute and not merely within a 3-year period from the time that he first became subject to the law and should have registered but failed to do so.

Section 5 of the proposed legislation would authorize, under rules and regulations as prescribed by the Attorney General, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Director of the Military Intelligence Division of the Department of the Army, the Director of Intelligence, United States Air Force, and the Chief of the Office of Naval Intelligence of the Navy Department, in the conduct of investigations involving the national security and the registration of foreign agents and organizations, to require that radio, telegraph, and telephone communications be disclosed and delivered to the authorized agents of the foregoing investigatorial agencies. The obtaining of information by interception of communications would be authorized only upon the express written approval of the Attorney General. Information thus obtained would be admissible in evidence, but only when such evidence is offered in a criminal or civil proceeding in which the United States Government is a party. It would be unlawful for any of the information to be divulged except for the specifically enumerated purposes of this section. A violation of the proposed statute would constitute a felony and would be punishable by a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both. Section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U. S. C. 605) permits the disclosure of such information only in response to a subpena issued by a court of competent jurisdiction or on demand of other lawful authority. The proposed statute would provide the necessary lawful authority to the above investigatorial agencies and assist them considerably in the performance of their duties. It seems incongruous that the existing law should protect our enemies and hamper our protectors in such matters, and it is proposed that the anomaly be corrected as suggested by this section.

Section 6 of the proposed legislation would reenact as permanent legislation the act that provided a maximum penalty of a $5,000 fine and 1 year imprisonment for the willful violation of regulations or orders promulgated by the Secretary of the Navy respecting the protection or security of vessels, harbors, ports, or water-front facilities, approved July 9, 1943 (50 App. U. S. C. 1312), the expiration date of which was June 30, 1947. This is deemed advisable in order to continue the additional protection from both accidental and deliberate danger which the statute afforded such vital facilities. As we have so tragically observed during the war, e. g., the burning of the *Normandie*, the Port Chicago, Calif., disaster, and later the devastation in Texas City, Tex., there is a need to strengthen, rather than relax, the law relating to the safety of maritime and water-front facilities.

Section 7 of the proposed legislation would provide a maximum penalty of a $5,000 fine and imprisonment for 1 year for the willful violation of any regulation or order promulgated or approved by the Secretary of Defense for the protection of aircraft and aircraft facilities. This section is similar to section 6 of this proposal for the protection of maritime facilities, and its purpose is self-evident.

The entire proposed bill has been drafted to serve the needs of the Departments of the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, and Justice in the successful discharge of their responsibility to protect and improve the internal security of the Nation. The swift and more devastating weapons of modern warfare, coupled with the treacherous operations of those who would weaken our country internally, preliminary to and in conjunction with external attack, have made it imperative that we strengthen and maintain an alert and effective peacetime vigilance.

The enclosed proposed legislation is transmitted herewith for your consideration and such action as you may deem appropriate.

Sincerely,

TOM C. CLARK,
Attorney General.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill is of unusual importance. Going to the Committee of the Judiciary, as it will, it will be submitted to a subcommittee for study. The bill touches upon many things which heretofore we have regarded as exceedingly sacred to the individual; for instance, the right to be protected from wire tapping, and other rights, which are affected by powers given to the Department of Justice. In my judgment the bill should receive careful consideration, because those weapons which we afford for national protection and defense might be turned to the destruction or impairment of individual human rights. Therefore the bill should

have the study and consideration of every Member of the Senate, as well as of the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRINTING OF DOCUMENT ENTITLED "FINAL REPORT OF THE UNITED STATES DE SOTO EXPEDITION COMMISSION"

Mr. PEPPER submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 6), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 1,000 copies of the Final Report of the United States De Soto Expedition Commission (H. Doc. 71, 76th Cong.) for the use of the Senate document room.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution to establish the joint committee on social security, to be composed of members of the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee. It is identical with Senate Concurrent Resolution 13 of the Eightieth Congress.

The purpose of this joint committee would be to prepare a thorough evaluation of our present obsolete social-security system, and to formulate recommendations to the Congress on a comprehensive security plan for the Nation. It is obvious that the problem of security for our elderly folks represents one of the greatest challenges of modern times to our country or any other land. It seems incongruous that the Congress should have an efficient Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and yet should lack such a committee when it comes to the field of social security, which it seems to me, is just as important as taxing our people. I well recognize that there have been countless studies in the field of social security, and the purposes of this joint committee would not be to delay action upon the various plans presented as a result of these studies. On the contrary, through such a committee, we could secure a comprehensive analysis of the President's suggestions for social-security revision, and of the many suggestions which have come from outside—from labor unions, industry, and so forth.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 7) was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby established a Joint Committee on Social Security (hereinafter referred to as the joint committee) to be composed of eight members of the Committee on Finance of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and six members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the joint committee to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the need for and advisability of modification or enlargement of the present social-security program, and to consider any proposals submitted to the Congress in connection therewith. The joint committee shall report, from time to time, to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, or, in its discretion, to the Senate or the House of Representatives, or both, the results of its studies and investigations together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

SEC. 3. The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-first Congress, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

SEC. 4. (a) The joint committee shall have power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties. The joint committee is authorized to request the use of the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

(b) The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid out of the contingent funds of the Senate and House of Representatives, one-half to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate and one-half to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

INVESTIGATION OF CONTRACTS WITH RAILROADS FOR CARRYING UNITED STATES MAILS

Mr. LANGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 34), which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is authorized and directed (1) to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to contracts with railroads for carrying United States mail with a view to ascertaining whether, in the light of changes in the volume of mail carried, any change in the rates charged for such service is necessary or advisable, and (2) to report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation together with such recommendations for necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF SAMUEL HAMILTON KAUFMAN TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, January 25, 1949, at 11 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. Samuel Hamilton Kaufman, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York. Mr. Kaufman is now serving under a recess appointment. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF PAUL P. RAO TO BE JUDGE, UNITED STATES CUSTOMS COURT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, January 25, 1949, at 11 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. Paul P. Rao, of New York, to be judge of the United States Customs Court. Mr. Rao is now serving under a recess appointment. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JAMES T. FOLEY TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, January 25, 1949, at 11 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of James T. Foley, of New York, to be United States district judge for the northern district of New York, vice Hon. Edward S. Kampf, resigned. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman; the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]; and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

NATIONAL HOUSING LEGISLATION—STATEMENT BY SPONSORS

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement regarding the proposed national-housing bill, issued to the press by several Senators, which appears in the Appendix.]

HEALTH CARE FOR AMERICANS—ARTICLE BY SENATOR PEPPER

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Need To Provide Good Health Care for Every American," written by him and published in the Alexandria, Va., Gazette of January 17, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD statements and data relating to possible election of President and Vice President by the House of Representatives, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE VOICE OF AMERICA—ARTICLE BY HON. GEORGE ALLEN

[Mr. MUNDT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article prepared by Hon. George Allen, Assistant Secretary of State, dealing with the Voice of America, which appears in the Appendix.]

SECOND ANNUAL MESSAGE BY GOVERNOR DRISCOLL OF NEW JERSEY

[Mr. HENDRICKSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the second annual message delivered by Governor Alfred E. Driscoll, Governor of New Jersey, to the legislature on January 11, 1949, and editorial comment thereon, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOREIGN AIR BASES—EDITORIAL FROM MILWAUKEE JOURNAL

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled, "Air Bases Vital to Peace" recently published in the Milwaukee Journal which appears in the Appendix.]

MANCHURIA, THE TINDERBOX OF ASIA—ARTICLE BY GEORGE MOORAD

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Manchuria Still the Tinderbox of Asia," written by George Moorad and published in the January 9, 1949, issue of the Sunday Oregonian of Portland, Oreg., which appears in the Appendix.]

INCREASED SALARY AND EXPENSE ALLOWANCE OF THE PRESIDENT—ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

[Mr. WATKINS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by David Lawrence, entitled, "Tax-Free Allowance Voted by Senate Seen Problem for Truman," published in the Washington, D. C., Star of January 17, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

RIGHTS OF ALASKAN INDIANS—EDITORIAL FROM THE ALASKA WEEKLY

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Saving the Indians," from the Alaska Weekly of January 7, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The routine morning business is closed.

THE FREEDOM TRAIN

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, the Freedom Train is now in Washington.

This is most appropriate at a time when the attention of every American is centered upon the inauguration of our President.

Since it was dedicated in Philadelphia—on Constitution Day, September 17, 1947—the Freedom Train has made a journey of patriotic inspiration covering 33,500 miles.

More than three and a half million men, women, and children have visited the train in 325 cities throughout the United States.

The American people are deeply indebted to Attorney General Tom Clark who brilliantly conceived the idea from which the Freedom Train was developed.

Also deserving of high praise is the American Heritage Foundation, headed by Winthrop W. Aldrich, of New York, under whose able direction the Freedom Train pilgrimage was conducted.

The Freedom Train carries 127 of the most precious documents of American history. On the train are found the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, Lincoln's Gettysburg Address and many other papers dear to the hearts of men and women all over the world who love individual freedom.

I had the honor of taking part in the dedication ceremonies held at Philadelphia, September 17, 1947.

The program was presided over by Arthur C. Kaufmann, now president of the Chamber of Commerce of that city. The train was christened by Mrs. Kaufmann.

Mr. Aldrich was present and explained the plan of the American Heritage Foundation.

The principal address on that occasion was made by Attorney General Tom Clark, and I now ask unanimous consent to have his address printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF HON. TOM C. CLARK, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES, UPON THE OCCASION OF DEDICATION OF THE FREEDOM TRAIN, PHILADELPHIA, PA., SEPTEMBER 17, 1947

Mr. Aldrich, trustees and officers of the foundation, and guests, this is a magnificent occasion. I know that all of us here have a feeling of deep gratitude to the officers and trustees of the American Heritage Foundation, to the Librarian of Congress, and to the Archivist of the United States, who have played so big a part, and to the many others who have made documents available, or have helped in many, many other ways. They cannot all be publicly acknowledged, but surely their work is rewarded by the feeling of pride in our past, and the determination that our future shall at least equal that past, which comes to every man who walks through this fine train and, as a distinguished American used to say, "Look at the record."

It is a good record. There is none other in the world that can match it. And it was made by men. Indeed, the inspiring pageant of freedom which is dramatized by the great historic documents aboard this Freedom Train is a reminder to all of us, and to each of us, that men are the architects of their own liberty. If men are to have freedom they must build it for themselves. No one man, no little group of men can fashion freedom to suit their own ends and give it in return for subservience, or withhold it to obtain conformity. That is not freedom at all.

None of these landmarks in our history which are aboard this train was wrought singly by any one man. Each was born of the labors of many men, in their turn representing many others. So it is with freedom. No man can have it for himself alone and deny it to others. No man can have freedom for himself at all unless he is willing to share it with every other man without regard to his brother's color, or his race, or his creed. And exactly in the degree that we deny freedom and the realistic blessings of liberty to any man, exactly in that degree do we make prisoners of ourselves. All must be free, or none of us is wholly free.

The faint heart, the grudging, unwilling heart, those who think of freedom as something for a few, will make prisoners of us all. And if we so foolishly make prisoners of ourselves, in our own good home, what chance can there be for freedom elsewhere in the world? Let us have no second-class citizens in America, for whatever ugly reason, and in time men can walk in the sunshine of freedom every place in the world. Unless we Americans share our freedom with our neighbors and with the world, in the end we shall have none for ourselves.

Equality before the law and in the sight of God for every man. That is the ideal of freedom which the American way of life has to offer to humanity. It is a goal yet to be completely achieved in our own fair land and in the broad reaches of the world. Surely, these magnificent documents show us the way.

Mr. Aldrich, I would be less than candid if I did not tell you that this colorful Freedom Train and the program of the American Heritage Foundation have far exceeded the modest conception in my mind at the outset. It is a demonstration, in the field of the concrete political principles to which this Nation is enduringly attached, of the vigor and vitality by which the American people beat down the threat of fascism and communism. Into this program of rededication, of which this Freedom Train is the climax, has gone the work and the enthusiasm and the thinking of a fine group of representative Americans. I say representative because they are of all faiths, races, and many shades of political belief. They have united together in firm faith in the integrity and humanity of American principles. I know, as all of us here today know, that the American people will be deeply stirred by the illumination of our future which this look into our past gives to all of us.

As the chief law-enforcement officer of the Federal Government, my concern over the growing disrespect for the rights of individual citizens has been no secret. It is my belief that the American Heritage Foundation program will do much to correct and abate this great evil. Thus, as the sponsoring official, with gratitude for the tremendous task which the foundation has performed so far, and with pride in the program which you propose, I am happy to deliver the Freedom Train and its priceless documents into your safekeeping. I know it is in good hands.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I also had the honor of speaking on that occasion, and I ask unanimous consent to have my address printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF UNITED STATES SENATOR EDWARD MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE DEDICATION OF FREEDOM TRAIN, PHILADELPHIA, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1947

What is happening in Philadelphia today is good for America and for Americans. We are starting Freedom Train on its year-long journey about the United States. We are sending to the people the documented story of our Nation's proudest heritage. By means of this train Americans everywhere—old Americans and new Americans, no matter what color and no matter what creed—will be brought closely and vividly into contact with the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, the Declaration of Independence, William Penn's Charter of Privileges to the colonists of Pennsylvania, and many other immortal documents.

That cannot fail to make better citizens of us all by reminding us whence we came and how it is we enjoy inalienable rights which the citizens of most other countries would regard as rare privileges.

Too much credit cannot be given Attorney General Tom Clark for having brilliantly conceived and developed this idea. Too much credit cannot be given those patriotic Americans who formed themselves into the American Heritage Foundation to carry forward the program and who have privately financed it.

It is particularly appropriate that this train should be christened and should commence its journey in the city of Philadelphia, the birthplace of American independence, on Constitution Day. I suppose, however, any day would be the right day for Freedom Train to bring its priceless cargo to the city which is so closely interwoven with so many of the documents carried on this train.

I need not remind a Philadelphia audience that it was here, just a few blocks from where we stand, that the Articles of Confederation were signed, the Declaration of Independence proclaimed, and the American Constitution adopted to become the basic law of our land.

I don't need to remind Philadelphians that this is the city of Independence Hall, the cradle of liberty, whose walls echoed the stirring words that "these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent states."

Here reposes the Liberty Bell, sacred symbol of freedom "throughout all the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof." Here stands Carpenters' Hall, meeting place of the First Continental Congress, and you have the little house on Arch Street where Betsy Ross made the first flag. It was here, at Old Christ Church, that Washington and other patriots whose memory we revere prayed for divine guidance in their conduct of the affairs of the infant Republic.

Not many miles from here is Valley Forge where General Washington's ragged forces, who were later to be trained into a victorious army, suffered in the terrible winter of 1777–78. Not far away is Washington's Crossing where, the winter before, General Washington ferried these men to New Jersey to win the battles of Trenton and Princeton, the first victories of the infant American forces.

This is the city in which George Washington's magnificent Farewell Address first appeared, printed in the Philadelphia Daily American Advertiser, in 1796. That document is on Freedom Train and its anniversary is only two days off, on September 19, when this train will still be here.

These are just a few reasons why it would have been inconceivable for Freedom Train to begin its journey elsewhere than in Philadelphia. For it was here, more than a century and a half ago, that the original Train of Freedom began its journey through history to undying greatness and creation of a country which, like its first President, stands today first in war and first in peace.

I like what has been said of our Republic that it is "the last best hope on earth."

I like, too, the story of that first Constitution Day whose anniversary we are celebrating. When the document had been ratified, Philadelphia's own Benjamin Franklin stepped from Independence Hall into the street where a multitude of citizens was waiting.

"What kind of a government have you given us?," they asked. Franklin replied: "We have given you a Republic—if you can keep it."

Fellow Americans—this is a good time and a good place to assure Ben Franklin across the years:

"We have kept it. Thousands of heroes have shed their blood to defend it in the 160 years since that day in 1787. We still cleave to that Republic and that Constitution."

Today let us rededicate ourselves to American freedom and to that Constitution. Under it we have enjoyed the greatest blessings ever given to a people—freedom of religion, wide civil liberties, and freedom of expression—the press, the radio, the motion pictures. All three have served the country well in war and in peace.

The film industry has produced motion pictures of patriotism in the same tradition as Freedom Train. Many patriotic messages have gone over the air by radio.

We cannot praise too highly the leadership of the free American press in patriotic inspiration for our people. Throughout our history the newspapers have served as beacons of light, guiding all of us to a greater appreciation of our liberties and reminding us of the responsibilities which these liberties impose upon every citizen.

Within the past few days the press demonstrated anew how it serves by uncovering a Communist plot to discredit Freedom Train. The plot was to deceive the people into believing that all of this—this train, these great documents, and what they stand for, is merely a propaganda plant by reactionaries and big business. The Communists called it "Wall Street imperialism." This falls of its own weight of course, by the fact that William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, and Philip Murray, president of the CIO, are vice chairmen of the American Heritage Foundation, sponsoring Freedom Train. Other leading Americans are associated with this great patriotic movement.

I don't know if there are any Communists within the sound of my voice. If there are, let me assure them, as well as all others, this time they have left themselves and their motives naked. Even the most gullible cannot fail to understand that here is the kind of movement against which Benjamin Franklin was warning when he told those early Philadelphians to keep the Republic.

There is an impressive sermon in this for all good Americans. If anyone in Russia had planned deliberately to warp and distort the meaning of a similar train there—not a Freedom Train, but a Totalitarian Train—you know what would have happened to him.

But we are different here. We have a Constitution and a Bill of Rights. We have our civil liberties. If people here talk dangerous foolishness, we guard against it not with slave camps or firing squads, but with intelligent education, with our great channels of free expression, and with even-handed laws.

One of the great messages Freedom Train can carry to the whole Nation is this:

Guard those precious civil liberties for all. If we permit them to be wiped out for some minorities—political or racial or religious—then we shall lose them for all the people. The majority, too, will wake up one morning to find that its civil liberties are gone. These things are indivisible. All the people must share in them, or none can possess them long.

That is important to remember in these days when we are threatened by a philosophy which gives the individual no civil rights at all. In that system the people are completely subordinate to the state, which, in turn, is a tool in the hands of a few willful men subject to no law but themselves. I say we can fight that system and win without stooping to its tactics.

Freedom Train is the time-tested proof. Walk along its corridors and what do you find—the Magna Carta, the English Bill of Rights of 1689, the Pennsylvania Charter of Privileges of 1701, the various early laws for religious freedom, America's Constitution and Bill of Rights, the Emancipation Proclamation of 1863, yes, the nineteenth amendment granting women suffrage and last year's Proclamation of Independence for the Philippine Islands.

There is the main stream of human progress for 1,000 years—broad, deep, calm, and powerful. Each document is a rung in the ladder of greater spiritual and temporal freedom for the individual. Each carries man upward in human dignity and in civil liberties.

By such steps and such tradition has America grown and prospered.

Certainly it will profit us nothing to recede down the ladder. We do not want to retrace our steps toward serfdom, in fear of unwarranted search and arrest, and fear of the heavy hand of government upon the shoulder of every citizen.

I feel strongly about the dangerous crackpots and fractional Americans who take their orders from Moscow. But I am equally strong in opposition to hooded men who take the law into their own hands, and against vigilantes who supersede the good laws of our country.

There are rumbles here and there by some who would violate the civil liberties of persons they merely suspect. There are hotheaded groups branding all foreign born in our land as subversive. Many of our most loyal and best citizens were born across the water. All of us are descendants of foreign born who immigrated to the New World. In every branch of our armed forces foreign born and their sons died wearing the American uniform in the recent war.

If we permit bands of vigilantes to determine who may have civil liberties and who may not; who may work in peace and who shall be persecuted, the result will be exactly the opposite from what the Constitution provided. We will not beat communism that way. We will feed its fires. Persecuted people will turn in bitterness from Americanism to communism. Inadvertently, we shall be building a fifth column within our gates.

I am not talking appeasement. I am talking for equal justice as set forth in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

I am talking against doing in this country what Hitler did in Germany and Stalin does in Russia today. Those misguided Americans who have set themselves up as a drumhead court over their fellow citizens should remember that our ancestors came here to escape religious, racial, or economic intolerance in the old country. They fled from places where they had no civil liberties to a land where they could enjoy such rights. Those who have come in recent times have turned to America for the same reasons.

Let us not merely talk the Golden Rule. Let us practice it. One way is to give to others the same protection under the Constitution and the Bill of Rights which we claim for ourselves. In exercising our rights we must not forget the obligations of American citizenship.

Let Freedom Train carry this message to the Nation.

I wish that when it has finished its tour of the United States, a year from now, it could be sent across the oceans to other lands so that the whole world could see it and learn from it and absorb the rich and great spirit of America's heritage.

Godspeed this caravan of Americanism.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, further ceremonies were held in Philadelphia on January 9 of this year, when the Freedom Train returned to that city.

Again Attorney General Clark was the speaker of the day. I now ask unanimous consent to have his address on that occasion printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF HON. TOM C. CLARK, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES, AT THE FREEDOM TRAIN EXERCISES UNDER THE AUSPICES OF FORCES UNITED FOR INTELLIGENT CITIZENSHIP, ACADEMY OF MUSIC, PHILADELPHIA, PA., JANUARY 9, 1949

It is most fitting that the Freedom Train, in its final days of travel under the auspices of the American Heritage Foundation, should return to the City of Brotherly Love. Here, 16 months ago, on September 17, 1947, it began its history-making tour in celebration of the one hundred and seventieth anniversary of Constitution Day—probably the most important day in the Nation's calendar, since it marks the beginning of the United States of America.

This brilliant and inspirational journey will come to an end in a few days during the panoramic demonstration marking the inauguration of the President of the United States. This climax, too, is fitting, as it symbolizes the right of a free people to govern themselves and is a tribute to the President who gave the project his blessing.

We are not assembled here to deliver or hear eulogies on the expiration of this shrine on wheels. This is a joyous occasion. We are here to honor and pay glowing tribute to

the public-spirited officers of the American Heritage Foundation, and its efficient staff.

We also laud the thousands of citizens of the 320 cities in every State of the Union who so happily cooperated in making it possible for the train to travel 35,000 miles, be visited by over four and a half million people and enabled millions of others to participate in patriotic exercises that were spearheaded by the coming and going of the train.

While the train has run its present course, the spirit continues on and will continue on as long as freemen live to carry out the spirit of the sacred documents that it carried. Some may ask, Is it enduring?

Yes, it is enduring. The good that is done is not measured as we measure potatoes in a bushel, or cold statistics on a chart, or cloth by the yardstick. You can't estimate the spirit and influence of the train in that manner.

Some of that influence is very apparent before us here at this hour.

Your Philadelphia organization—Forces United for Intelligent Citizenship—which sponsors this memorable patriotic event today, is a direct outgrowth of the Freedom Train's first visit to this community. Your movement is an educational program for better citizenship on the grass-roots level, your members shouldering responsibilities inherent in a free society. That is an excellent way to keep the wheels of democracy turning in the right direction.

Forces United promotes happiness and harmony among men when it serves as a meeting ground for uniting persons and organizations interested in furthering the brotherhood of man and emphasizing the supreme worth of the individual.

Another cheering part of this wonderful program is the presence of these newly naturalized citizens who come from many different lands. They have received the most precious possession this country has to offer—that of United States citizenship.

Since the beginning of our Republic millions of others from all races and all places have come here to share in our heritage and have contributed their part in building and enriching America.

Surely, the train's mission, that of spreading the gospel of freedom, will endure. The hundreds of thousands of children from the quiet, small towns and teeming centers, often braving the fury of the elements to view the immortal papers, will remember and cherish all through life what they saw and read and heard. Beyond that, what they learned will be passed on to their children and their children's children.

The Freedom Train has not ended. It is the endless story of the United States—the story of you and me, of free enterprise—that democratic principle and way that has made our Nation the inspiration of freedom-loving people everywhere.

The unity of purpose—the cooperation—which brought together educators, labor and religious leaders, captains of industry, financiers, members of the press and radio, is strikingly illustrative of how America rallies to a noble cause.

I, too, like other Americans, have gained much from this experience. The Freedom Train has proved a moving witness of the people's impregnable faith in America and of the devout love and the deep reverence they hold in their hearts for its institutions.

The fervent and loyal reception accorded this carrier of our precious documents of liberty is a thundering answer to the enemies of our cherished way of life. No wicked ideology will find a hiding place in the hearts of such Americans.

With an alert America and God's help, we will keep it that way.

EXEMPTION FROM ADMISSIONS TAX OF CERTAIN TICKETS TO INAUGURAL CEREMONIES

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate House Joint Resolution 85, a joint resolution which was passed yesterday by the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate House Joint Resolution 85, which will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, does the Senator from Georgia ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. GEORGE. I ask that it be laid before the Senate. I am about to move that the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 85) to exempt from the tax on admissions amounts paid for admission tickets sold by authority of the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1949.

The joint resolution was read the second time by title.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. BALDWIN. I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. As I understand, unanimous consent is required for the consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection, but I want to be sure that we understand the procedure. This is a unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair asked if there was objection, and the Chair heard none.

Is there objection to the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 85?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to make a preliminary statement. I have conferred with all members of the Senate Committee on Finance on both sides, and all have agreed that the joint resolution might come up for consideration without reference to a committee. Members thus agreeing do not necessarily bind themselves to support the joint resolution, but they all agree that it may be considered without reference to a committee. I now ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Unanimous consent has already been granted.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, this joint resolution is the same resolution which has heretofore been passed at all times, so far as I know, when we had an admission tax which covered the sale of seats on Pennsylvania Avenue and tickets to certain functions incident to the inaugural ceremonies. In 1940 a resolution almost in the same terms as the present joint resolution, was passed by the Congress and approved by the President on October 9, 1940. That resolution provided for the appointment of the Inaugural Committee, but since the Inaugural Committee has already been functioning, the present resolution merely exempts the tickets which are sold by or on the authority of the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies from the tax imposed by section 1700 of the Internal Revenue Code, being the admissions tax.

It is understood, of course, that actually the only tickets which will be sold by the Inaugural Committee are tickets to the grandstand seats for the inaugural parade, tickets to the inaugural ball, and tickets to the inaugural gala concert. Of course, all tickets sold by individuals, partnerships, or corporations are subject to the tax. Only tickets sold under the direct authority of the Inaugural Committee or by the committee itself are to be exempted from the tax.

It is also understood that it is the purpose of the Inaugural Committee to pay to general charities a certain percentage of the receipts if the receipts exceed the expenditures in preparing for the inaugural exercises. I therefore ask that the Senate approve the joint resolution in order that it may go to the President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution is open to amendment.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the joint resolution it is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 541 (b) of the Revenue Act of 1941 (terminating certain exemptions from admissions tax), section 1701 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code shall apply with respect to amounts paid on or after the first day of the first calendar month which begins after the date of enactment of this joint resolution, for admission.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to exempt from the admission tax the admission fees charged to agricultural fairs. In the first session of the Eightieth Congress the House passed a bill which would exempt the admission fees to agricultural fairs from the imposition of this tax. That bill came to the Senate and was referred to the Committee on Finance. Because at that particular time, as I understand, the Finance Committee was considering a general over-all amendment to the excise-tax measures, the bill was not reported.

It seems to me that if we are to exempt from the admissions tax admissions to the different ceremonies mentioned in this particular measure, it is only fair

and just that admissions to agricultural fairs should also be exempted.

Agricultural fairs are one of the oldest institutions in the United States. For many years they furnished a great source of encouragement to agriculture. They afford opportunity for the farmer to learn new things, and at the same time display the results of his own energy and ability. They are conducted primarily and essentially in the public interest and in the interest of agriculture. I believe that they merit far more serious and sympathetic consideration than do the exemptions asked for in this joint resolution.

At the time this question was previously before the Senate, as I stated a moment ago, the Committee on Finance was concerned with the general question of excise-tax legislation, and it did not have time to consider the question here involved. This offers us a good opportunity to take action similar to that taken in the House in the last Congress, and exempt agricultural fairs from the imposition of admission taxes.

Mr. President, I urge the adoption of this amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senator from Connecticut, as well as the Senator from Georgia, the adoption of this amendment would make it necessary for the joint resolution to go back to the House. I do not know how complicated the result would be. The result might possibly be no legislation whatever on this subject. That might result in having the inaugural committee ask Congress to appropriate money to pay a deficit which might be incurred in the expenses.

We understand that all the expenses for all these functions, outside of the expense involved in the erection of the platform on the east front of the Capitol Building and the expenses incurred by the joint congressional committee, are not paid out of the Treasury, but are paid by a sum of money raised in the District of Columbia by private subscription, and the sale of the tickets is to enable the inaugural committee to reimburse itself for the outlay here in the District of Columbia.

If we pass no joint resolution at all exempting these tickets from taxation—and such action might in some way retard the sale of the tickets and might result in a deficit on the part of the inaugural committee in connection with these expenses—I wonder whether we would be encouraging the presentation to Congress of some sort of resolution providing for reimbursement of the local inaugural committee for expenses incurred in connection with the inauguration. Has the Senator any view or opinion on that phase of this matter?

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I should say that as I have ridden up and down Constitution Avenue and Pennsylvania Avenue, I have seen signs on most of the groups of bleachers and seats indicating that all have been sold.

So far as causing a delay in the action of the House of Representatives is concerned, let me say that at the first session of the Eightieth Congress a bill exempting from taxation admissions to agricultural fairs was passed by the House of Representatives. Of course, we do not know that the House will do the same thing this time, but at least once in recent months it has gone on record in favor of this particular exemption.

It does not seem to me that it would cause undue delay if we were to adopt this amendment and send the measure back to the House of Representatives. This amendment is in the interest of agriculture and in the interest of the farmers and in the interest generally of the people who attend agricultural fairs, which are nonprofit functions and are designed to promote agriculture and the public interest in agriculture generally. It seems to me that inasmuch as the House of Representatives has once indicated its interest in support of a measure such as this, we shall not cause any undue delay by giving the House an opportunity again to register its approval or disapproval, if that be the case.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am sympathetic with the objective the Senator from Connecticut has in mind with regard to agricultural fairs, and I have previously expressed my sympathy toward that objective. However, it has no relationship to the object of the particular joint resolution which is now pending.

I am somewhat concerned in my own mind as to whether an extraneous matter, however meritorious it may be, should be added to this joint resolution, which is purely for local purposes. I should like to have the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] give his view about the matter, if he can enlighten us on it.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, obviously I would have to oppose the amendment.

In the first place, no agricultural fairs are to be held right away. Before the people get around to holding agricultural fairs again the Congress will have ample opportunity to consider the whole subject of excise taxes, including admission taxes, in some general tax measure which will come to the Senate from the House of Representatives.

Obviously also the House committee would reject the joint resolution if we were to attach this amendment to it, because we would be asking the House to pass upon a matter to which that committee has not, at least in the Eighty-first Congress, given the slightest consideration.

I think it would be most unfortunate if the Senator from Connecticut were to press for the adoption of his amendment now. There are many persons in this country who wish to have the fur tax removed, and there are many persons who wish to have the jewelry tax removed. In the past the House of Representatives has passed some joint resolutions to that effect. There are many persons who wish to have the transportation tax removed. Now, to single out agricultural fairs, which probably will not commence to exhibit until next September or October, before which time we shall have practically an entire year during which to consider this matter, would, I think, be unwise.

It seems to me that the Senator takes, at least, a very inconsistent position in offering this amendment to the joint resolution. Certainly, if the Inaugural Committee sustains a deficit, the Committee will come to the Congress and ask that it be reimbursed, and probably that will follow, because if this tax were paid, in most instances now it would be paid by the Inaugural Committee. The Inaugural Committee never thought that Congress would do otherwise than it has done heretofore. In fact, if the Inaugural Committee had read the joint resolution which was adopted in October 1940, it would have been assured that Congress would not deny the privilege of this exemption on the tickets for this particular occasion, which does not recur within the next 4 years.

I can assure the Senator that during the consideration of any tax measure ample opportunity will be afforded to consider all the excise taxes; but I would not want to be bludgeoned into accepting an amendment offered on the floor without an opportunity on the part of the committee to consider it, and I would not wish to ask the House of Representatives to accept an amendment of that sort to a measure of this kind. So I hope the Senator from Connecticut will not press for the adoption of his amendment.

If the Senator does press for its adoption, I can assure him that, if it prevails, its only effect will be to kill this particular joint resolution, and then the Inaugural Committee will come to the Congress and request an appropriation, of course.

I can also assure the Senator that a great many of these tickets—in fact, the larger portion of them—have been sold less the tax, on the assumption that Congress would do precisely what it has done in the past, namely, exempt these admissions from the tax.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I must confess that I find myself somewhat unhappy to be opposing the position the distinguished Senator from Georgia has taken, for I have the highest admiration for him, not only as a man, but as a statesman.

In the first session of the Eightieth Congress I introduced a bill or an amendment which would have taken care of this particular situation. However, that measure did not get to a vote.

Mr. President, this is a revenue measure; and the Senate cannot originate any revenue measure, of course. The only opportunity the Senate has to pass upon a matter pertaining to revenue and taxation is when some bill or other measure on the subject comes to the Senate from the House of Representatives. So it seems to me that it is appropriate to discuss this particular tax at this time.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia has mentioned other excise taxes. He has mentioned, for example, the tax on transportation, the tax on furs, and other matters of that kind. Those are excise taxes, but they are not admission taxes. The field of admission taxes is a very limited one, and the amendment deals exclusively with an admission tax. That is the matter now before the Senate: Shall we grant an exemption from taxation on admissions to the various ceremonies here in Washington?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. As I understand the Senator's amendment, he proposes to relieve county and public agricultural fairs from amusement taxes.

Mr. BALDWIN. That is the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the Senator propose to include in the exemption commercial excise taxes in connection with fairs or commercial ventures?

Mr. BALDWIN. No. The amendment, I may say to my distinguished friend from Iowa, is concerned exclusively with taxes on admissions to agricultural fairs.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I may say to the Senator that in my State the question of the amusement tax on county and State agricultural fairs has been a very troublesome thing for a long time. The State legislature and boards of supervisors from time to time appropriate as a rule a specific amount of money to each county fair, and a specific amount of money to the State fair, and in case of a deficit, they appropriate moneys to make up the deficit. It would seem to me that, under such circumstances, the county agricultural fairs and the State fair, as educational, and importantly educational, institutions in the agricultural areas, are every bit as much entitled to tax exemption as are the ceremonies of day after tomorrow and of the days following.

I have no objection to exempting the inaugural ceremonies from amusement taxes. I do not know whether or not those ceremonies will be considered by some people as amusements, but I had just as soon exempt them, except that I believe, in the same category the county agricultural fairs in my State and the State fair, which bring great benefits and progressive development and information to the farmers, and other people all over the State, should equally enjoy freedom from a tax on something that is not an amusement but is a public educational institution. I think the Senator's amendment is well filed. I think it merits consideration at this time.

The Senator pointed out a while ago that the question of exempting agricultural fairs from the tax has been acted on heretofore by the House. It is not at all a new subject. It is a subject well known to every Member of the Senate, and it has had formal approval by the House of Representatives. The agricultural fair is a public institution and it is a nonprofit venture. I am in hearty accord with the Senator. In fact, had I known the Senator was to file his amendment this morning, I should have asked permission to join with him as sponsor of it.

Mr. BALDWIN. I may say to the Senator I should have been very happy to have him as a sponsor of the amendment. In fact, I should be very glad to have him join in it now, if he would like to do so.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should feel it a great privilege, if the Senator will permit my name to go on the amendment.

Mr. BALDWIN. I shall be happy to do that.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I see no reason why the amendment should not be agreed to. There is no question of profit. The amount of taxes taken from agricultural fairs is infinitesimal, the microfraction of a percent of the amount of taxes that come in from other commercial amusements throughout the country. The fairs are educational in effect. I think the Senator's amendment is perfectly in order. I am delighted to join with the Senator as a sponsor of the amendment. If I may I should like to ask the Senator a question; it runs in my mind that the tax, for instance, is imposed in the case of church and religious bazars that are held specifically and solely for the purpose of raising money for charitable purposes. Can the Senator enlighten me on that point?

Mr. BALDWIN. I think that is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That, I think, is a matter that should have some little attention in the future. But, inasmuch as the particular amendment is now before the Senate, I am delighted to join with the Senator in advocating it. I hope the amendment will prevail.

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Iowa for his remarks and for his support. I subscribe most heartily and cordially to all he has said.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. I should appreciate it if the Senator from Connecticut will shed some light on several questions which come to one's mind as he reads the joint resolution. Can the Senator state to the Senate which charity has been selected, to which all the net proceeds will be given? If so, can he also give an approximation of the net profits expected to result from the inaugural activities?

Mr. BALDWIN. I am sorry to say that I cannot, because I am not familiar with that particular phase of the matter. I do not know.

Mr. CAIN. Will the Senator permit me to ask that question of the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]?

Mr. BALDWIN. I shall be very glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. GEORGE. I am not familiar with that aspect of the matter. I know nothing of the inaugural committee, in fact, except that I have been asked to present the resolution when and if passed by the House. My general understanding is that the community chests would be the beneficiaries of the total of any receipts over and above the expenditures made by the inaugural committee in Washington, but I apprehend that perhaps there may not be any net receipts over and above expenditures. So far as I am advised, there will not be.

Mr. CAIN. Will the Senator perhaps agree that if a charity is designated as beneficiary, the name of such charity should be mentioned in the resolution, in order that all other charities that are not to benefit from it may know ahead of time that they need not line up on the right?

Mr. GEORGE. No, I would not offer such an amendment. If some of my distinguished friends on the other side wish to encumber this simple resolution with that sort of amendment, they are quite free to do so, but I have no desire to do that. I should like, however, to call attention to the fact that all agricultural fairs are not conducted by nonprofit organizations. I know of some that are not. Moreover, I call attention to the fact that we are now taxing even church entertainments and fairs. This of course was a wartime tax. There are other admission taxes which should be considered when we have the opportunity to consider this particular excise tax. We certainly would not want to exempt county fairs and leave a tax on charitable and church and religious exhibitions and displays which are held only and solely for the purpose of raising money for the church or for church purposes. I am hopeful at least that if the Senator presses his amendment, it may be rejected, so that we may proceed with the vote on the joint resolution, which otherwise of course will die, because I would not want to go back to the House and ask them to consider relief from a particular admission tax when there are so many excise taxes that need reexamination.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. As I may make a few comments on the joint resolution, with the consent of the Senator from Connecticut, I should like to say to my good friend from Georgia that if there is anything which would help kill the resolution, I certainly should support it, because there is a great deal of truth in the old adage that haste makes waste. Certainly the attempt of the Congress to pass this type of legislation will not only be productive of waste but productive also, in my judgment, of an exceedingly bad precedent. The Senator from Georgia in his comments said in effect that if we do not pass the joint resolution today, we shall simply be confronted in the future with the inaugural committee coming before the Congress and asking for an appropriation to make up a deficit. My answer to that prediction of the Senator from Georgia is "So what?" Let them come. Then I think the answer of the Congress of the United States should be, "No appropriation, gentlemen." If a deficit occurs, then the committee should be required to fall back upon the people who are responsible for the situation in which we find ourselves today. If I am correctly informed, the social functions of the inaugural have been underwritten by certain sponsors, particularly business concerns. A typical safeguard has been followed which many of us, in connection with community programs, have followed in our home States, of securing an underwriting of the program in advance. These gala social events of the inaugural have a commercial value and basis, too. The merchants, hotels, and other business establishments will make great profits out of this affair. Hence, as I understand it, many business concerns have agreed to pay any losses that the inaugural committee may suffer. I think it is good business for them to pay such losses, if any, and they and not the taxpayers of the country should be made to pay any deficit.

Thus I repeat my understanding, Mr. President, that the merchants who are somewhat "out on a limb" this morning, because they want to get this tax-exemption resolution agreed to for their own financial benefit, have, in effect, guaranteed the expenses of the inaugural ceremonies so far as the social functions are concerned. I have been associated with some rather large community amusement programs, pageants, and what not, and we have always gone about getting some insurance against possible deficits by way of an underwriting program, so that if a deficit should occur the underwriters would make it up. I see no reason in this instance for relieving the business concerns and other sponsors of these social functions from their underwriting obligations.

I certainly am not one who shares at all the view of the Senator from Georgia, that if a deficit results in this instance, then the Congress of the United States should make it up. Let the underwriters make it up. That is the purpose of having underwriters. They know the risk they run when they underwrite any amusement undertaking. Let us not make it only a form for the underwriters.

Mr. President, I have noticed the prices on some of the tickets issued. They are exorbitant, to put it mildly; they are clearly exorbitant—$10 for a seat with not even a back against which to lean while the circus goes by.

In times past I have introduced proposed legislation, such as Senate bill 2096, in regard to amusement taxes on school functions. In this instance I think some very important values were involved in my bill proposing to allow grade-school and high-school students to obtain some tax relief for their school programs. I see no important value—and I say this quite kindly, Mr. President, in connection with the social features of the inaugural program for which this tax exemption is sought. My remark has nothing to do with the President of the United States; it has to do only with the extravaganza which has developed in connection with the inaugural ceremonies. I see no important value in connection with the social functions of the inaugural celebration which justify our exempting the tickets from taxes. No man on the floor of the Senate has a higher respect for either the President or the Presidency than has the junior Senator from Oregon. But simply because this extravaganza of amusement is connected with the inauguration of the President I do not propose to sit here and vote for the type of resolution which has been offered by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. President, in a previous Congress I introduced Senate bill 2096. I introduced it because of some practical experience. I introduced it as president of a parent-teacher association in the District of Columbia. I was president of that association last year, and I am president of it again this year. It is the Alice Deal Junior High School Home and School Association. As a result of my experience, as president of that parent-teacher association, I have some understanding, as other parents in this body have, as to the type of problem with which we are confronted in putting on grade-school and high-school entertainments. For example, in our school if we wish to put on a little parent-teacher entertainment in order to raise some money to repair the violins and other instruments used in the little school orchestra or to buy some instruments for children who come from homes which cannot afford to give the children the instruments they need if they are to receive the musical education their talents indicate they are capable of absorbing we must pay a Federal tax on the admission tickets.

I have not been able to receive a hearing on my bill which embodies a fine and sound principle. However, when it comes to the great inaugural celebration Roman circus to be held in Washington, D. C., the assumption appears to be that a resolution can be jammed through the Congress because one side of the aisle thinks it has the votes to exempt from amusement taxes the tickets for that circus.

Now that I have the floor, I wish, at least, to read into the RECORD the substance of my school bill, which I think the parents and the teachers throughout the country will understand involves a great principle of justice and fairness to the children of America. I would that I could elicit at least as much interest in exempting little school programs from amusement taxes as the Senator from Georgia has been able to arouse with great haste in order to protect, apparently, some businessmen who have underwritten this inaugural extravaganza of theirs. Business sponsors who fear they might wake up to the fact that unless they secure the passage of this joint resolution they will have to absorb some taxes and pay a deficit on the social amusements of the inaugural.

My bill provides as follows:

That (a) subchapter (A) of chapter 10 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 1705. Exemption from tax.

"(a) No tax shall be levied under this subchapter with respect to the first $100 in aggregate amount collected in any calendar year from the sale of admissions the proceeds of which inure exclusively to the benefit of any high school or elementary school.

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to amounts collected, on or after January 1, 1949, for admission."

Mr. President, I serve notice, and I hope my good friends on the Democratic side of the aisle will please take note of it, that I shall reintroduce this school bill in this session of Congress. I hope I can get as much enthusiastic support for the effort to do something to help the boys and girls in grade schools and high schools who find themselves handicapped by the type of amusement tax which the bill seeks to rectify, as is now given to the resolution offered by the Senator from Georgia to exempt the dances, shows, parades, and other amusements of the inaugural from amusement taxes.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, it is my understanding that there is a fund of $52,000 available for the inauguration ceremonies. Yesterday a friend of mine, from the West, a good Democrat, telephoned me and said he wanted me to get him a box at the ball. It seems that there will be a ball of some kind in connection with the inaugural ceremonies. I telephoned to those in charge and was told that there was no box available. A little later I was called back and told that because of the fact that I was a Senator they had finally found a box, the cost of which was $250. So I wrote out my check for my good friend and sent it over. It seems to me, Mr. President, that with all the boxes sold at $250 apiece, there should be a surplus rather than deficit, and, therefore, in my opinion certainly this measure should not pass.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, the question has been raised by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] as to whether my amendment would exempt from tax admissions to country fairs which are run on a profit basis. In answer to that inquiry I will say that the purpose of my amendment is to restore a provision in an earlier act, which reads as follows:

Any admissions to agricultural fairs if no part of the net earnings thereof inures to the benefit of any stockholders or members of the association conducting the same, or admissions to any exhibit, entertainment, or other pay feature conducted by such association as part of any such fair—if the proceeds therefrom are used exclusively for the improvement, maintenance, and operation of such agricultural fairs.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. If I may make just one statement, then I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. President, my amendment deals with what are absolutely and completely nonprofit institutions, none of whose net earnings accrue to the benefit of any individual or group. I do not think, Mr. President, that can altogether be said regarding the money collected for the inaugural ceremonies in Washington.

It is perfectly proper that the commercial interests of this city, the hotels, the theaters, and the stores—and they are well within their rights in doing so—should make, as I understand they have made, large contributions to the inaugural fund, because they wanted to encourage people to come to Washington.

It is a perfectly natural action for any community to take, because with the great number of people coming into the community, naturally business will be improved, and I am glad to see it improved. Therefore I submit that it cannot be said that so far as the exemptions proposed to be granted are concerned, they are going to inure to people or organizations not interested in the celebration on a profit basis.

However, Mr. President, so far as the amendment is concerned, it deals only with country fairs and State fairs. When a similar measure was before the Senate on another occasion, I received a letter from my distinguished friend, the Senator from Texas, who asked me if I would not broaden my bill so that it would include the State fair of Texas. The amendment is carefully so framed as to include the State fair of Texas, as it will include all the State fairs in the United States, and the little county fairs and the little town fairs, which are so important in the agricultural sections.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I find myself in sympathy with the motive and purpose of the Senator from Connecticut. I am also heartily in sympathy with the suggestion made by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I propound an inquiry to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut. Would it not be more inclusive and more helpful, rather than singling out any special objective for release from the tax, to offer an amendment to remove from the application of the excise taxes all gatherings and all meetings sponsored and promoted by nonprofit organizations, and stop there? That would include the agricultural fairs, the parent-teachers associations, it would include church gatherings, and the like. The principle is sound, but it should be applied all along the line to nonprofit gatherings, in my judgment. Does the Senator concur?

Mr. BALDWIN. I do concur; yes. My reason for making it applicable merely to county fairs is that it is in line with the bill I originally introduced, and in which I was particularly interested. It affects many local, county, and other fairs; but if the Senator would offer such an amendment, I would support it, because I think the principle is just as applicable to the gatherings he has in mind as to the county fair.

Mr. TOBEY. It would be more inclusive and spread the mantle of justice in a more over-all manner.

Mr. BALDWIN. That is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Toward the end of last year someone connected with the proposed plans telephoned me and asked what would be the attitude of the Senate Committee on Finance as to an exemption from taxation on these tickets. There were no members of the Committee on Finance in the city except myself, so I asked two questions. First: "Is there a precedent for it?"

I was assured there was. Second, I asked: "Is the enterprise one for profit?"

I was assured that it was not. Whereupon I stated that, speaking only for myself, I would support the legislation necessary; and I shall do so.

I am very much embarrassed in having to speak against the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut. I remember very well his zeal last year to have admissions to county fairs excluded from the admissions tax. At that time, when this side of the aisle was in the majority, we took the position that we should not consider these excise taxes piecemeal.

The suggestion of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire emphasizes the necessity for a more orderly approach to excise taxes, and all kinds of taxes that can be had on the floor of the Senate. The Senator would propose an enlargement of this subject to cover all profitless operations. That ramifies in a dozen different directions, and unless we desired to spend a week's time here having a hearing, which should be conducted by the Senate Committee on Finance, we could not possibly reach a sensible conclusion.

Personally, I am in favor of taking the tax off profit-free county fairs, and when the issue is raised in an orderly fashion I shall vote that way. I think I have already assured the Senator from Connecticut, in connection with other remarks, that I would do so. I thought last year, and so expressed myself, that we should approach our taxes on an orderly basis. I thought last year that we should not approach excise taxes on a piecemeal basis. I still feel the same way, and most reluctantly I shall vote against the amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield so that I may ask the Senator from Colorado a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. As to the last statement the Senator from Colorado made, I think he will recall that the Democratic members of the Committee on Finance at that time were in hearty accord and agreement with the position the Senator took with respect to piecemeal legislation regarding excise taxes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should have said that when I was speaking before, The Senate Committee on Finance, regardless of the political potencies which might be involved in piecemeal approaches, stood solid on that proposition. I think it is a sound way to proceed. I thought so then, and I think so now, and I say with the greatest reluctance that I shall vote against the amendment, but I shall vote for such an amendment when we can reach it in an orderly fashion.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, the particular resolution now offered in and of itself is piecemeal legislation, and my reason for suggesting the amendment is that if we are to have piecemeal legislation, let us make the piece big enough to be worth while, let us make it apply to many other people, who are more entitled to the exemption, in justice and equity, than those exempted in the particular resolution we are discussing.

I stand with the Senator on the question of piecemeal legislation, but I submit we are in that field now. The resolution itself is piecemeal legislation. Let us proceed to enlarge it, and spread the benefits of this piecemeal legislation to people who, I submit, are more entitled to it than are those who will be covered by the resolution.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think there is a very distinct difference between what is embodied in the main resolution and what is embodied in the Senator's amendment. That which is embodied in the main resolution is obviously of an emergent character. As the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia has pointed out, county fairs and their admissions are not yet emergent. They will become so later in the year, and I am quite sure we will be getting at some kind of tax legislation prior to that time. So far as I know, there are not any county fairs in operation at the present time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to make an inquiry of the distinguished Senator from Colorado: Is the tax on these admissions due at this time, or will there be more time to consider the proposed legislation? I have read somewhere that the actual tax returns will not be filed until the end of the year. If that be so, then would it not be possible to let this legislation take a more leisurely process, so that it would not affect these other important matters? Or is it like the President's pay bill, in which we were working against a deadline on January 20?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Obviously, an admission tax either is or is not paid. The time when the question is most relevant is in connection with the current sale of the tickets. It might be that if the tax were not now collected there would be later accountability, but of course the purpose of the proposal is to make the whole subject clear. As I said before, I think this subject deserves a good deal of discussion, and I think it should be considered specifically in connection with our next tax bill. I do not believe that in the future we should approach it on an emergency basis. But, as I have said, the junior Senator from Colorado made inquiry to ascertain whether there was precedent for handling the matter in the way suggested, and whether it was a profitless operation, and he was informed that there was precedent, and it was not intended to be profitable, and that if there were profit it would go to charity. That is why I am supporting the joint resolution.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not true that the tickets have been sold, so that it is

now only a question of accounting for tax? They were sold tax-free, were they not?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. And it would be a question of accounting for the tax. Therefore the Senate would have considerable time, if not the whole session, to consider this question and the other questions involved?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I would reply to that, that under the circumstances, where there are individuals here who are working gratuitously for this ceremony, it would be grossly unfair to suspend a possible liability against them until some future undetermined time, when we might get around to considering the matter, with our judgment then in doubt.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, in response to what my distinguished friend from Colorado has just said, I always have assumed that it was a very fundamental principle of jurisprudence in this land of ours that people are presumed to know the law. They act with that presumption in mind, and we cannot proceed in any orderly fashion on any other basis. When these admissions were fixed and when the whole affair was planned, it must be presumed that the people who were planning it knew that the tickets might be subjected to an admission tax just like the tickets of admission to plays presented by parent-teachers associations, or to the little county and town fairs throughout the land. It does not seem to me that now they can properly come forward and say, "We did not know anything about this tax. It works a great injustice upon us." They should have laid their plans with this particular fact in mind.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The people who are promoting this ceremony had a decision to make: Either to make or not to make their tickets bear taxes. Under past precedent they did not bear taxes. The enterprise is not one for profit. I think they had a fair right to believe that under the past precedents there would be an exemption. In any event they had to make a decision.

The basic question is whether those tickets should be tax free. If they should be tax free then we should not be suspending or deferring possible liabilities. The thing should be decided before the event is over. In view of the past precedents, in view of the fact it is nonprofit enterprise, in view of the fact that if any profit results it goes to charity, I believe we are well justified in granting an exemption here and now.

I also believe that the matter should be more carefully examined in the future so that no one attempting to promote an event of this kind will be apt to get himself into jeopardies which he is not intending to assume.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Are we talking now about amusement taxes?

Mr. BALDWIN. Taxes on county and State fairs.

Mr. CAPEHART. Such taxes come under the heading of amusement taxes, do they not?

Mr. BALDWIN. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. I wonder if we are not acting possibly on the wrong premise here, because my observation is that half of the people of the United States are not going to be particularly amused or get any enjoyment out of this so-called parade, and maybe for that reason they do not even owe a tax, since to them it would be no amusement.

Mr. BALDWIN. Whether it is amusement or not, I am going to enjoy it, within limitations. I plan to go to the inaugural ball. I plan to see the inaugural parade. After all, this is an American institution. We are inaugurating a President of the United States, who is our President, and I am going to join in the fun. I will admit that under different circumstances there might have been a little more hilarity on my part [laughter], but nevertheless I think that we ought to take part in it, and we ought to enjoy it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Then the Senator does think it comes under the category of amusement?

Mr. BALDWIN. It is a great American institution.

Mr. CAPEHART. If it does not come under the category of amusement, then those who take part possibly do not owe a tax under the law. I am not so certain about that. I think we might forget the whole thing and say that it does not come under the heading of amusement, and then those who buy tickets will not have to pay a tax.

Mr. MORSE rose.

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized and has the floor.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I have had the floor right along.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut surrendered the floor to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. I had no intention of doing so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. BALDWIN. I appeal from the ruling of the Chair. I had no intention of yielding the floor to the Senator from Colorado, Mr. President. I was standing in my place all the time, and had yielded to different Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say that the Senator did not yield to the Senator from Colorado. The Senator from Colorado asked the Chair for recognition and received it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Oregon may be permitted to waive his right to the floor and defer to our distinguished colleague from Connecticut. The Senator from Oregon can gain the floor almost any time he wants to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I was going to say that I will be very happy to yield the floor, or yield to the Senator from Connecticut, whichever meets his desire.

Mr. BALDWIN. I do not ask anyone to yield the floor. I claim it in my own right.

Mr. MORSE. I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair may say for the information of the Senate that under the rules of the Senate no Senator can take the floor and parcel out the time of the Senate to other Members of the body. The rules require that that task be performed by the Chair.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is recognized.

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, addressing myself again to the idea of piecemeal legislation, I agree with what my distinguished friend the Senator from Colorado says that we ought not to have piecemeal legislation in this matter. But I repeat that this is a revenue measure, and the only way I can see to get before the Senate my proposition of exempting from tax, tickets of admission to country fairs or State fairs and local fairs, is to take it up in connection with some revenue bill that comes over from the House, or a bill concerning revenue, such as the pending measure indeed is. Time and time again in the brief period I have been a Member of the Senate, I have seen amendments of this kind tacked onto other revenue measures, and it seemed to me that it was especially appropriate to offer an amendment dealing with the tax on admissions to agricultural fairs to this particular revenue measure.

Mr. President, addressing myself to piecemeal legislation. I agree that matters of this kind should not be dealt with piecemeal, but I submit that the measure before the Senate itself is one dealing with a matter piecemeal. I say again that if we are going into this subject, let us make the piece big enough to be worth while.

On this point, Mr. President, I should like to read to the Senate what the Acting Secretary of the Treasury said in 1947 concerning proposals dealing with exemptions on a piecemeal basis. He said:

> Experience has shown that any exemptions from the admissions tax greatly increase the work of the administrative officers of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, give rise to difficult administrative problems, and are expensive to administer. Prior to the general elimination of the exemptions in 1941, collectors' offices were constantly deluged with claims, and the clerical and investigating work incident thereto was tremendous. A substantial number of these claims were found to be unjustified and accordingly denied, with resultant dissatisfaction and ill-feeling. In administering the law, as it existed prior to 1941, the Bureau found it necessary to obtain increasingly detailed information from organizations claiming exemption in order to cope with a constantly growing number of flagrant abuses. Furthermore, it is difficult, if not impossible, to provide any exemptions from the admissions tax which will operate equitably and without undue controversy. Enactment of the proposed bills would be a discrimination against, and lead to demands for exemptions

by other institutions and organizations having equally meritorious claims to preferential treatment.

Mr. President, all of that statement applies to this particular measure. If we adopt it, it will do everything that the Acting Secretary, Mr. Wiggins, in 1947, said it would do. But if we are going to get into that field, let us make it a broad field, let us deal with other exemptions, which, as I have said before, are more equitable and deserving than I consider to be the particular one provided for in the pending measure.

I read further, Mr. President, from the opinion of the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Wiggins:

> Under these circumstances the Treasury Department would view as undesirable, the enactment of any legislation granting exemptions from the admissions tax. The position of this Department is in harmony with the conclusion reached by the Congress in 1941 when, after a study of the specific problem, it eliminated all such exemptions. It is to be noted that this congressional decision to deny exemptions has been consistently followed since 1941 on the several occasions that the question has been raised.

Mr. President, in this resolution we propose to abandon that point of view. We propose to go ahead on another basis. If we are going to abandon it, if we are going to give it up, if we are going ahead on another basis, why not include this exemption for agricultural fairs?

I know of no more wholesome thing in our whole land than a county fair. Women work for weeks, and bring the results of their arts, which they have dedeveloped in the kitchen, to the fair. The 4-H Clubs and all other organizations concerned with agriculture bring to the exhibitions their cattle, poultry, dresses, and other things which they have to exhibit. They look forward to it for weeks and months, and work long after dark to accomplish results.

Consider the admissions to the inaugural ball alone. Assume that 10,000 people attended that affair. Twenty thousand dollars would go into the Federal Treasury. Think how much detail there is in collecting the small pittance involved in the admission tax on county fairs and local and State fairs across the land. It seems to me that equity and justice cry out for the adoption of this amendment to the joint resolution.

I submit again that if in the Senate we are going into the field of exemptions now is the time to adopt this amendment exempting county fairs, while we are passing this joint resolution, if indeed it is to be passed. In the Senate we have an opportunity to act on revenue measures only as they come over from the House.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the first place, let me say that the position of the junior Senator from Oregon would not be one whit different if a Republican President were being inaugurated and the same request from tax exemptions of inaugural dances and shows were being made from the Republican side of the aisle.

We are dealing with a resolution which cannot be justified in principle. I point out that the report on the inauguration in 1932 shows that—

> A high light in the Inaugural Committee work was the handsome profit of slightly more than $60,000 over outlay.

The committee made money on the inauguration in 1932. It certainly should make money at the one this year and still pay amusement taxes on the purely entertainment features of the affair.

Mr. President, it is almost impossible to buy an inaugural ticket today. This resolution is an attempt to give the businessmen of this area complete assurance of relief from their responsibility of underwriting the amusement features of it. If the project should run into a deficit, then let us cross that bridge when we come to it. Let us go into the facts surrounding the deficit at that time. Let us find out why a deficit was incurred. I see no reason why we should stand here today and in behalf of the taxpayers of the United States pass a tax-exemption resolution which, in the last analysis, would help certain commercial interests so as to give them all the commercial gravy from the inauguration, and remove any risk that they run in collecting that gravy.

Mr. President, the argument of the Senator from Colorado does not have much force with me when he talks about the fact that we are confronted with an emergent situation. He argues, therefore, that we ought to act in this emergent situation now by passing the resolution offered by the Senator from Colorado. He argues further that later during the session we should take up through the Committee on Finance, questions of tax exemption involved in county fairs, parent-teachers' associations, schoolhouse amusements, and excise taxes generally. For 2 years he was chairman of the Committee on Finance, when there was an opportunity to come forward with a real tax-revision program. During that 2-year period there were emergencies connected with each one of the groups interested in protection from some of the exorbitant and unjust excise taxes. Where was the argument of emergency then? Why was there not a tax-revision program coming through from this side of the aisle? Why did not the Senator from Colorado argue, then, in support of meeting the emergency situation created by unfair excise taxes? No; we dealt primarily with a tax-reduction program and not an overhauling of the tax structure to eliminate inequities which need to be eliminated if we are to give encouragement to venture dollars so that we can increase our production. We had 2 years to offer revision of unfair amusement and excise taxes, but we did not do it as a party on this side of the aisle.

I am not moved by the argument of the Senator from Colorado that in connection with this resolution we are dealing with what he considers to be an emergency. For 2 years past we ought to have been dealing with the emergency of a complete overhauling of the tax structure of the country.

I think the time has come to stop giving the kind of emergent treatment proposed by the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Colorado in this resolution especially when we recognize that, after all, it is bottomed pretty much on the basis of political pressure. Mr. President, I believe that the joint resolution should be defeated and that we ought to send the whole problem back to to the Committee on Finance to come forward with a complete overhauling of the entire tax structure.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I have been very much impressed, contrary to the views of my distinguished friend from Oregon, with the suggestion made by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. I am wholeheartedly in favor of the general proposition of exempting county fairs and organizations of that kind from the tax to which reference is made. However, at this moment we have very little opportunity for real consideration. Many new Members of this body were not in the Eightieth Congress. It seems to me decidedly unwise at this time to step forward with hasty action with respect to the exemption of county fairs. I am impressed with the idea that while we should consider the question, it should be done in an orderly fashion, at a proper time. I concur with the Senator from Colorado in that respect.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. This is a revenue measure coming over from the House of Representatives. How can we be assured that this question can ever be considered on the floor of the Senate? It was not considered in the past 2 years, and I think perhaps for a very good reason. I know how the distinguished Senator from Colorado, as chairman of the Finance Committee, worked. This is the one opportunity that I, as a Senator from Connecticut, have to submit a proposal of this kind. I originally introduced a bill covering the particular objective. This is the one opportunity of which I can be assured that the question will be considered on the floor of the Senate. That is why I am urging my amendment.

Is not the amendment perfectly consistent with the pending measure? In the joint resolution we are dealing with the question of exemptions. The amendment deals with the question of exemptions. In the joint resolution we are dealing with the question of exemptions from admission taxes. The amendment deals with an exemption from an admission tax. It seems to me that it is most appropriate for this amendment to be considered at this time. I do not like to find myself in disagreement with my distinguished friend from Missouri, but I think he is fundamentally mistaken.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I have not examined the law on the question whether or not it is possible in the Senate to propose an exemption from a revenue measure; but it seems to me that in all probability this body will have ample opportunity, in the consideration of various revenue proposals which will doubtless be made, for the consideration of this

particular question. The President of the United States has advocated that Congress increase revenues by approximately $4,000,000,000. No doubt a revenue proposal will in time be placed before the Senate. In view of the statement of the President of the United States in his state of the Union message, it is inconceivable to me that the subject of revenue will not come before the Congress many times. In all probability, regardless of whether an exemption measure can or cannot be originated in the Senate—and as to that I express no opinion at this moment—it is to be expected that the Senator from Connecticut will have opportunity to bring his proposal before the current session of Congress. It is almost inconceivable to me that such an opportunity will not be afforded.

Mr. President, to my mind, there is something in this question far more fundamental than anything that has been mentioned here today or, at any rate, anything I have heard. It seems to me that this proposal illustrates the fact that there are people—and, alas, I think there are probably too many of them—who undertake to take into their own hands matters which are already matters of law in the United States statutes. At the time when these ceremonies were promoted the gentlemen of the city of Washington who promoted them had the statute of the United States before them and they realized that there was a liability for the admissions tax to which reference has been made. With that in mind, realizing the fact that under the law the purchasers of those tickets were responsible for the payment of the tax, what did they do? The testimony we receive today from the distinguished Senator from Colorado is that instead of waiting until they found out whether legislative approval could be had they went to one eminent Member of the Senate, eminent lawyer that he is, chairman of the committee that he was—but, after all, he is but one Member of the United States Senate, out of the 531 Members of the United States Congress—to find out whether they might violate the law with impunity. It seems to me, Mr. President, that every Member of the Congress of the United States should wait until the law has been changed before he relies upon a change in the law in the future.

So it seems to me that when the distinguished Senator from Georgia and other Senators today advocate that now we give an exemption to these gentlemen for something as to which they knew they were violating the law, they should wait until the whole subject matter is presented to us.

Mr. President, so far as this particular matter is concerned, there is no special equity in connection with the question of violation of the law. Of course, there will be an inauguration ceremony, and I trust that it will be dignified and beautiful and will inspire in the people of our Nation greater admiration for our Government. I trust that the sentiments expressed on that occasion will not be ignoble ones. Indeed, Mr. President, let me take this opportunity to ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a very beautiful statement which appeared in the Washington Star of day before yesterday. The statement is by the former Chaplain of the Senate, the Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., Litt. D., and it is entitled "Making the Inauguration an Altar—Sees America Speaking to the World for Freedom While Presidential Induction Proceeds."

Mr. President, I quote only a few words from those eloquent remarks by Dr. Harris. He says:

> The open Bible and the solemn oath before God are the inaugural symbols that the liberties which we broadcast as our credo and of which we are but trustees is essentially and inherently a spiritual concept.

Further on he says:

> A free society can be kept only as it maintains its rootage in the religious soil from which it sprang, drawing its strength from spiritual springs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks the entire statement by Dr. Harris in Sunday's Washington Star be printed as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MYERS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I was about to elaborate somewhat on my statement that no special equity is involved in this matter.

In the first place, there is no equity, because of the fact that the citizens committee, laudable though their purpose may have been, proceeded in known violation of a law as spread upon the statute books.

In the second place, there is nothing particularly ennobling in some of the ceremonies, at any rate, which are to occur. I am not criticizing them; I do not say they are necessarily out of place. But certainly I do not wish this RECORD to go down to future generations without contradiction of the remark and recital of House Joint Resolution 85 that the amounts paid for admission tickets on the occasion of the inauguration of President-elect in January 1949 constitute payments for tickets which will enable people to hear the address of the President and to see the President take the solemn oath to which Dr. Harris has referred. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, so far as I know, there is no admission charge for seeing the inaugural ceremony, beautiful as I trust it will be, adjacent to where we are today. The charges are not to be made for the inaugural ceremony at all. The hundreds or perhaps thousands of persons who will be permitted to be within the sound of the President's voice on that occasion and who will see the beautiful inaugural ceremony are not the ones who will pay for the particular privileges to which reference has been made. So far as I know, the persons who are paying for tickets are divided into three classes. Of course there may be others as to whom I am not informed.

First, there is the great multitude of people who are to pay for the seats along the route of the parade. Mr. President, I have no objection to their having those seats. I have no objection to having the parade. There may be some question in the minds of some persons as to whether the parade will be of appropriate dignity, as to whether it will extend itself into some rather undignified features; but I am not basing my proposition upon that point.

I say that the first category of persons who are paying for these tickets is made up of persons who will look at the parade. They will not see the inaugural ceremonies. They will see the cavalcade go down the street, among which will be the float from my own State, and among which will be the calliope which I understand will bring up the rear of the procession. Those persons constitute the first class of the ones to whom this tax will apply.

The second class, as I understand, will be made up of the persons who will be present at the inaugural ball. I have no criticism of the inaugural ball; I think it is appropriate, and doubtless it will be most beautiful and will be an occasion to be long remembered by those who will be privileged to participate therein. But, after all, it is not a part of the solemn, beautiful ceremonies which will take place here at the Capitol, when the President will rededicate himself to the patriotic duty of his great office.

The third category, so far as I know, of persons who will buy admission tickets is made up of those who will buy tickets of admission to the other portion of the ceremony, so-called, and that is the so-called gala which is to take place on the night before the inauguration. I observe in this morning's Washington Post a picture of a young lady, and it is entitled "Movie Actress Jane Powell, in Washington, Runs Over the Songs She Will Sing at the Inaugural Gala Wednesday Evening."

Mr. President, I have read in the newspapers from day to day the list of artists who will perform on that stage the night of the gala enterprise. I have no criticism of it, but I do not want this RECORD to convey to future generations the idea that in acting on this matter we are passing solely on the question of the exemption from taxation of tickets of admission to the beautiful inaugural ceremony. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, these tickets are tickets to the parade and to the inaugural ball and to the gala which will take place on Wednesday night; and they have about them no particular solemnity which would entitle them to exemption from this particular tax under the law.

So, Mr. President, not that I am opposed to the matter on its merits, but because I think this is not a good time to bring it up, I am opposed to the amendment presented by my good friend the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], and likewise I am opposed to the joint resolution presented by the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. I am opposed because of the

fact that if the joint resolution were passed by the Congress, it would encourage people to take steps in defiance of law without having first secured the consent of the legislative body; and I am opposed, in the second place, because there is no special solemnity attaching to the ceremonies or events to which the tickets apply, such as would entitle the purchasers of those tickets to exemption from a law now on the statute books of the United States.

EXHIBIT A

[From the Washington Sunday Star of January 16, 1949]

SPIRES OF THE SPIRIT—MAKING THE INAUGURAL AN ALTAR—SEES AMERICA SPEAKING TO THE WORLD FOR FREEDOM WHILE PRESIDENTIAL INDUCTION PROCEEDS

(By the Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., Litt. D.)

All the world has tickets for the inaugural of the thirty-second President of the United States on this coming Thursday. All nations will be gathered before the canopied white stand in front of the dazzling dome, shrine of a people's devotion. On January 20 more people will hear the voice of one man than ever before in history.

To the kingdom of the spoken word there is now no frontier. In the commerce of the air waves, blocked with verbal traffic, the most potent voice resounding this day around a troubled world is the Voice of America. When one man out of 150,000,000 kisses the Holy Book and says: "I solemnly swear" he but lends his voice to a united Nation pledging undying devotion and eternal vigilance for all that America means at its best. Thank God that that stand so near the legislative halls of freedom is not a balcony where a dictator with clenched fists threatens and thunders. It is, rather, a pulpit where a servant of the Most High and of the people proclaims anew America's creed and bows in reverence before the Judge of all the Earth. As the silver trumpets of democracy are sounding, America will give utterance to its faith in the hearing of the greatest concourse earth has known. On this day when the world—a tragic part of it in physical or mental shackles—stops to listen, this is what it will hear the Voice of America saying:

"We believe God created man free and endowed him with certain inalienable rights and that no government has any right except that which is given it by the consent of the governed, and that the State is made for man, man the individual, and not man for the state. We believe that the future of our Nation and of the world depends on the spread of these ideas everywhere."

This is the authentic voice of earth's mightiest nation that desires nothing for herself that she does not covet for the whole world. It says to the emerging peoples of the east, yearning for freedom, "America understands your passion to be your own masters; America is on your side. We have forever renounced all desire to become the imperial ruler of subject peoples. We want you to see that our Revolution for Independence was a much more tremendous convulsion than the Russian revolution. We come to you not with the regimentation of Lenin, but with the emancipation of Lincoln."

The open Bible and the solemn oath before God are the inaugural symbols that the liberty which we broadcast as our credo and of which we are but trustees is essentially and inherently a spiritual concept. In our prayer for America there must ever be a petition: "Make me big enough to be an American; purge me from conceptions too narrow for freedom." But another petition must always be added: "Make me good enough for freedom."

Undisciplined people never can keep their freedom. Their very liberty will corrupt them. They become their own despots. Lust, liquor, and license will eat out the inner fiber of any nation. These vices threaten a free nation even more than they do a slave state where private lives are regulated by external tyranny. A free society can be kept only as it maintains its rootage in the religious soil from which it sprang, drawing its strength from spiritual springs.

This means that the Voice of America must not just be against something. It must be made crystal clear, so that stirring millions around the world will know that America is for something and take courage. We must broadcast to a bewildered world exactly what that something is. It is liberty that cannot be bartered for security. It is freedom that will not sell its crown jewels for some collectivist Utopia. It is strength that never bullies the weak. It is liberty under God.

Rededication to this will consecrate the inaugural platform as a national altar set up where the whole world may see an America conscious of the awe-inspiring role these fearful days are thrusting upon her, sanctifying her might, moral and material, to something bigger than her own destiny.

As an atom bomb-conscious humanity hangs breathless on what the next 4 years may hold for weal or woe, America will be called to give much. But may she be reminded, as with the rest of the world, she faces the blessing or the curse, life or death, that there is one supreme sacrifice God requires of those to whom much has been given:

"Still stands thine ancient sacrifice,
An humble and a contrite heart.
Lord God of hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget, lest we forget."

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the question of the adoption of my amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will count the number of Senators joining in the request for the yeas and nays. [After a pause.] The clerk reports that there is not a sufficient second.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Miller
Anderson	Hill	Millikin
Baldwin	Hoey	Morse
Barkley	Holland	Mundt
Brewster	Humphrey	Murray
Bricker	Hunt	Myers
Bridges	Ives	Neely
Broughton	Jenner	O'Conor
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Reed
Capehart	Kefauver	Robertson
Chapman	Kem	Russell
Chavez	Kerr	Saltonstall
Connally	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Cordon	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Donnell	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Lodge	Sparkman
Downey	Long	Stennis
Eastland	Lucas	Taft
Ecton	McCarran	Taylor
Ellender	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Flanders	McFarland	Thye
Fulbright	McGrath	Tobey
George	McKellar	Vandenberg
Gillette	McMahon	Watkins
Green	Magnuson	Wherry
Gurney	Malone	Wiley
Hayden	Martin	Williams
Hendrickson	Maybank	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BALDWIN and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, before the roll is called, I wish to have a word to say. Certain of the distinguished Senators on the other side of the aisle have referred to the joint resolution as having been introduced by myself. The truth is the resolution was introduced in the House of Representatives. It was referred to the House Ways and Means Committee. That committee recommended its passage. Yesterday it was passed by the House, and in order to expedite its consideration in the Senate, I merely asked the committee if there was objection to bringing it to the floor without reference to a committee. The joint resolution conforms to what has been done on other inaugural occasions, when there was an admission tax applicable to the sale of certain seats and to the admission to certain events in connection with inaugural ceremonies. I do not quarrel with anyone who objects to the tax on agricultural fairs or religious entertainments or shows put on by high schools and other schools. In fact, there are many excise taxes which undoubtedly ought to be lowered, and some of which ought to be entirely eliminated. But I think it is all out of place to offer an amendment to a joint resolution of this kind, which has taken its regular course, and for which I am not responsible. I want to assure my friend from Connecticut that I have no seat on the Avenue and do not expect to buy one; I am not going to the inaugural ball; and I am even going to skip the gala. Those are the only three things for which an admission tax is paid.

Let me assure my friends on the other side that the joint resolution is not a Democratic measure. One would think it was. I am a bit disturbed that Senators on the other side of the aisle are wasting their ammunition on a thing of this kind. I am a bit concerned that they do not wait until something more momentous arises and then go into action on it. The joint resolution is not a Democratic measure, it is not a partisan measure. The Inaugural Committee was set up when the distinguished Senator from Illinois, Mr. Brooks, whom we all remember with great affection, was chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration. He was chairman of the Inaugural Committee. There were two Republicans upon the committee and but one Democrat. Later, the events of November having transpired, there was a reorganization of the Senate and of the Committee on Rules and Administration. The distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] has become chairman of the Inaugural Committee. The committee of course necessarily has certain expenses. In the first place it relies primarily on appropriations made by the Congress to take care of those expenses. But there are numerous expenses incident to the carrying on of proper ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of a

President, so the Inaugural Committee does the best it can. Whether it secured a committee of businessmen here to underwrite the expenses in part or not, I care nothing about that. All I know is that the Inaugural Committee itself is asking for the exemption on the three particular tickets sold by it or under its authority, on which they desire to be relieved of the admission tax. Undoubtedly admissions to farm or agricultural fairs ought to be relieved; and undoubtedly admissions to religious and church entertainments ought to be relieved. I have no doubt they will be relieved. I can assure my distinguished friend from Connecticut and all other Senators that, before the year is out, there certainly will be an opportunity to consider such admission taxes as have been here discussed.

The joint resolution is not a proposal to repeal the law; it is not a proposal to enact permanent legislation. It is simply a proposal to exempt from admission taxes the sales made in the month of January for a particular and limited occasion; that is all. If it were a proposal to relieve for all time all sorts of tickets from the admission tax, there might, of course, be a good reason for amending the law permanently so as to take care of county fairs and agricultural fairs, and to take care of religious and school entertainments. I share all the noble sentiments of my friends on the other side of the aisle with respect to these great entertainments. I am anxious to see the tax on such admissions removed, but why not wait until we have the opportunity of doing that?

Lest I should lose a single vote, I repeat that the pending joint resolution is not mine. It is House Joint Resolution 85. I presume that perhaps the distinguished chairman of the House committee may have introduced it, but it has not been introduced in the Senate. It is simply here because it was passed by the House.

I am not opposed, certainly, to lifting many of the excise taxes. I am not opposed to reducing a great many of them, if it is possible to do so. Of course, it is a bit difficult, if we are called upon to raise an additional $4,000,000,000 from taxes, to begin exempting various things, but I am quite sure that that would not apply to a reconsideration of certain of the excise taxes, particularly excises of the kind here in question.

I ask my friends in the Senate to please bear in mind that the joint resolution is not an offer to repeal an existing law. It merely exempts from the payment of tax the particular admission tickets on a single, particular occasion; that is all. It is in conformity with precedent heretofore established. The House having passed the joint resolution, I thought I might with some degree of immunity at least bring it before the Senate and ask that it be acted upon without unnecessary delay. So, Mr. President, I express the hope that the Senate will reject the pending amendment or any other amendment that may be offered, however meritorious, to the end that the joint resolution may here be voted up or voted down, and let the House be advised.

I repeat that all my information is to the effect that the Inaugural Committee, mindful of the precedents heretofore set, advised the people who were selling the tickets that perhaps it would not be necessary to collect taxes because the Congress would certainly relieve them. But although that was unwarranted and may be subject to certain criticism, it nevertheless is the fact that tickets already sold and delivered, less the tax, will subject the Inaugural Committee itself to the payment of such tax as may be due the Treasury, unless Congress intervenes to relieve them of the tax.

So I hope, Mr. President, that the Senate will reject the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I have already taken considerable time of the Senate in order to debate this amendment, but I want to express my appreciation for the patience of my colleagues——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Chair how many times a Senator can speak on the same amendment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the rules, a Senator can speak twice on the same amendment on the same day.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I might add that I am a bit unhappy to find myself opposed to so distinguished a Senator as is the senior Senator from Georgia. I understand the situation in which he finds himself. The joint resolution came over from the House. It is not the Senator's resolution, but it relates to a matter which is in the purview of the Finance Committee, and it is the Senator's duty to support the resolution on the floor of the Senate.

Let me say, Mr. President, that I have not any particular quarrel with the joint resolution itself. I think I shall vote against it, but I do not feel so violently opposed, perhaps, as do some other Senators with regard to it. However, under the Constitution, we in the Senate have only very infrequent opportunities to consider revenue measures. We must wait for such a measure to come over from the House. In the first session of the Eightieth Congress I introduced a bill which would have exempted from the tax admissions to agricultural fairs. Unfortunately, the committee did not act upon it, and, I think, for good and sufficient reasons. There is now before the Senate the subject of exempting from the tax admission tickets in connection with the inaugural ceremonies. It happens that this particular matter concerns itself with the exemption of taxation on admissions to the various functions for which fees are charged in connection with the inaugural ceremonies.

As has been ably pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], there is no charge to be paid by persons who wish to view the administration of the Presidential oath, which is, after all, the only essential part of the entire ceremony. I think it is perhaps appropriate that, surrounding that ceremony, for a period of time, there should be other gala occasions. Those are essential occasions for the pleasure, amusement, and celebration of the people, and they are particularly appropriate to the tax. If they are to be exempted, then it seems to me, Mr. President, there are other exemptions which, in justness and fairness, should be granted. I can think of no single one which is more meritorious to receive an exemption from the tax than admissions to agricultural fairs. My amendment is very carefully drawn so that it deals exclusively with those fairs from which no one derives any profit, either monetary or otherwise, except the profit which is shared in common with every man, woman, and child interested in agriculture, which includes almost everyone in the State of Connecticut, and I think it is true of everyone in the other 47 States.

So I say, Mr. President, in the first place, that this amendment is an appropriate amendment, and that in justness and fairness it should be adopted. I urge that the Senate adopt my amendment.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia says that this is not a Democratic measure. If he says it is not, I am sure it is not. I think it is fair to say that it is part of the Democratic program in this Congress. That, Mr. President, leads me to say a few words regarding that program.

Last summer the President of the United States called the Republican Eightieth Congress back for an extra session and put before it a list of 29 measures, all of them far-reaching and highly controversial measures, involving fundamental changes in the American way of life and costs to taxpayers running into billions of dollars. In calling the Congress back the President said that it could pass all of the measures recommended within 15 days if it so desired.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks, at this point, a list of those 29 measures proposed by the President at that time.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. Reestablishment of an excess-profits tax.
2. Restoration of consumer credit control.
3. Greater authority for Federal Reserve Board to regulate bank credit.
4. Authority to regulate commodity exchange speculation.
5. Authority for allocation and inventory control of scarce commodities.
6. Strengthening of rent controls, and extra appropriations for enforcement.
7. Stand-by rationing authority.
8. Price control authority.
9. Wage control authority.
10. Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill.
11. Federal aid to education.
12. Increase of minimum wage to 75 cents an hour.
13. Fifty-percent increase in old-age pensions, lowering of eligibility age for women

from 65 to 60, extension of social security to all not covered now.

14. Amendment of Displaced Persons Act.
15. A United States Government loan for construction of United Nations headquarters.
16. Senate ratification of an international wheat agreement.
17. Extra appropriations for a TVA steam plant and other power projects and removal of certain limitations from the law.
18. Revision of Federal pay schedules.
19. Anti-poll-tax bill.
20. Antilynch bill.
21. FEPC bill.
22. Compulsory health insurance.
23. Repeal of the Taft-Hartley law, and its replacement with another Truman-endorsed labor-management relations law.
24. Additional farm legislation.
25. Additional reciprocal trade agreements legislation.
26. Additional antitrust legislation.
27. Universal military training.
28. A national science foundation.
29. Approval of the St. Lawrence waterway treaty.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I think it is interesting to recall what the President said at that time, because today happens to be the fifteenth day of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, which is under Democratic control. Here is the record of that Congress, in which those who like may take such pride as they feel.

First. A bill has been passed increasing the pay of the President, the Vice President, and the Speaker of the House, giving each of them a generous tax-free allowance.

Second. A bill has been passed giving Government employees a 4-day inaugural holiday.

Third. The House has made a change in its rules which is hailed by the Democrats as a liberal measure, but which, it seems to me, literally takes us back to Cannonism.

Fourth. The House has passed, and we in the Senate are now asked at once to pass, a bill exempting from the Federal admissions tax tickets for the inaugural functions.

Mr. President, that is all; that is the record of the Democrat leadership to date. Those four items of legislation have been brought to our attention by the leadership on the other side of the aisle.

I wish to make just a few observations, Mr. President, about the achievements of this leadership in the past 15 days.

The bill to raise the President's pay has a direct bearing on the late election campaign. In that campaign the President and others denounced the Republican tax reduction law because they said it favored the rich. Yet I notice that taxes on high incomes are so severe that in order to raise the President's salary it is necessary to adopt the subterfuge of a tax-free expense account. No private person of wealth of course has any such easy escape from taxation.

Another bill affecting taxes is also slated today by the Democratic leadership. It is this measure to exempt from the Federal admissions tax tickets to the inaugural parade, the inaugural ball, and the gala concert.

It is intimated by high authority that the purpose is to bail out the Inaugural Committee from a loss which they may otherwise take on account of having sold these tickets without including the tax.

Of course, Mr. President, no privately run festival, as has been several times said already, would escape such a loss even if the private operator went into bankruptcy. Community and charitable events throughout the Nation do not escape these Federal excise taxes, but the pending joint resolution, to exempt these particular tickets from taxes, illustrates the principle that whenever the Federal Government engages in an activity, a request is quickly made that the Government itself be relieved from the burden of taxes.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I should like to say that the first 15 days under the Democratic Eighty-first Congress achieved a magnificent record, a record of not passing the program which the President said the Republicans could have passed in a similar period, but simply passed bills raising taxes for Democratic officeholders, exempting Federal officials from the payment of taxes, and exempting a Democratic-controlled festivity from the payment of excise taxes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], who is absent on official business, would vote "nay," if present.

I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is attending the ceremonies incident to the inauguration of Hon. Elbert N. Carvel as Governor of the State of Delaware and Hon. Alexis I. Dupont Bayard as Lieutenant Governor of the State of Delaware, and is therefore necessarily absent. If present, the Senator from Delaware would vote "nay."

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent, would vote "nay," if present.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is absent because of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 54, as follows:

YEAS—38

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Reed
Baldwin	Ives	Schoeppel
Brewster	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Bricker	Kem	Taft
Bridges	Knowland	Thye
Butler	Langer	Tobey
Cain	Lodge	Vandenberg
Capehart	McCarthy	Watkins
Ecton	McMahon	Wherry
Ferguson	Malone	Wiley
Flanders	Martin	Williams
Gurney	Morse	Young
Hendrickson	Mundt	

NAYS—54

Anderson	Green	McCarran
Barkley	Hayden	McClellan
Broughton	Hill	McFarland
Byrd	Hoey	McGrath
Chapman	Holland	McKellar
Connally	Humphrey	Magnuson
Cordon	Hunt	Maybank
Donnell	Johnson, Colo.	Miller
Douglas	Johnson, Tex.	Millikin
Downey	Johnston, S. C.	Murray
Eastland	Kefauver	Myers
Ellender	Kerr	Neely
Fulbright	Kilgore	O'Conor
George	Long	O'Mahoney
Gillette	Lucas	Pepper
Robertson	Smith, N. J.	Taylor
Russell	Sparkman	Thomas, Okla.
Saltonstall	Stennis	Thomas, Utah

NOT VOTING—4

Chavez	Tydings	Wagner
Frear		

So Mr. BALDWIN's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution is still before the Senate and open to amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I send to the desk certain amendments which I now offer, and ask that reading of them be temporarily deferred, so that I may explain them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the reading of the amendments will be temporarily deferred.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, let me say that I heartily agree with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] when he says that it would be better if we would not amend the joint resolution, but could vote it up or down on its merits—and I do not think it has any merits in its unamended form.

However, the rules under which we operate make it impossible for a Senator to introduce tax legislation. For that reason the only method by which I can bring the matters I have in mind before the Senate is to offer them as amendments to tax legislation which comes from the House to the Senate. Such is the situation today. Were I not to introduce these two amendments today, it is entirely possible that the opportunity might not again arise during this session of the Congress. For that reason I feel I have no alternative but to offer my amendments to the joint resolution which is today before the Senate.

Mr. President, I do not intend to take much of the Senate's time today. I feel that a mere statement of the purpose of the amendments will be the best argument for them.

First, is my amendment to remove the tax on cooking stoves. At the present time a young couple who marries and buys a stove on which to cook their meals must pay a "luxury" tax on the stove. A 20-percent luxury tax on an item which is as necessary in every home as a cooking stove is ridiculous and should be removed.

My second amendment is to remove the tax on oils, creams, and powders that are necessarily used on babies. This, in my opinion, is the most preposterous of all so-called luxury taxes. Any doctor will say that the use of oil and powder on a baby is a necessity for the comfort and health of the baby—yet, these items are placed in the "luxury" class and taxed 20 percent.

In view of the Democrats' professed interest in a poor-man's tax bill, it seems to be unusual and out of line with this professed interest that the majority party should now sponsor a bill to exempt from tax the tickets to the inaugural ball and other inaugural activities. I cannot understand the attitude that going to the gala night or paying $20 for tickets to the inaugural ball is a necessity, but it is a luxury for a family to have a baby. While I am a bachelor and cannot speak with authority on the subject, I understand that a baby is not a luxury.

A vote against my amendment to exempt these toilet articles from the 20-percent luxury tax is, in effect, saying to the young mother who is at home taking care of her baby that she is being taxed for that luxury. I am sure the mother who is obliged to stay at home powdering and applying oil to her baby's bottom does not feel that it is any luxury and would never be able to understand why $20 tickets to attend a dance could be considered in the category of a necessity.

So I urge at this time, Mr. President, that the Senate adopt my amendments—one exempting from taxation the stoves which young married couples must buy on which to do their cooking; and the other exempting from taxation toilet articles which are used in the care of babies, on the theory that such products are necessary to the health and welfare of the people of this country, whereas tickets to the inaugural festivities are obviously luxuries.

Mr. President, on my amendments I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I should like to have the amendments read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the joint resolution it is proposed to add a new section as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) Section 2402 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to excise tax on toilet preparations) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: "The tax imposed by this section shall not be applicable with respect to any substance, article, or preparation which is used or applied, or intended to be used or applied, on babies."

(b) Section 3406 (a) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the excise tax imposed upon electric, gas, or oil appliances) is amended by striking out "electric, gas, or oil appliances of the type used for cooking, warming, or keeping warm food or beverages for consumption on the premises;".

(c) The amendments made by this section shall be effective on and after the first day of the first month following the date of enactment of this joint resolution.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I merely wanted to have the amendments read for the information and edification of the Senate and the country. I am ready for a vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll on the amendments of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY].

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is attending the ceremonies incident to the inauguration of Hon. Elbert N. Carvel as Governor of the State of Delaware and Hon. Alexis I. Dupont Bayard as Lieutenant Governor of the State of Delaware, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is absent because of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 63, as follows:

YEAS—28

Aiken	Ives	Schoeppel
Baldwin	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Bricker	Kem	Tobey
Bridges	Langer	Watkins
Butler	Lodge	Wherry
Cain	McCarthy	Wiley
Capehart	Malone	Williams
Ecton	Martin	Young
Flanders	Morse	
Hendrickson	Reed	

NAYS—63

Anderson	Hill	Maybank
Barkley	Hoey	Miller
Brewster	Holland	Millikin
Broughton	Humphrey	Mundt
Byrd	Hunt	Murray
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	Myers
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	O'Conor
Donnell	Kefauver	Pepper
Douglas	Kerr	Robertson
Downey	Kilgore	Russell
Eastland	Knowland	Saltonstall
Ellender	Long	Smith, N. J.
Ferguson	Lucas	Sparkman
Fulbright	McCarran	Stennis
George	McClellan	Taft
Gillette	McFarland	Taylor
Green	McGrath	Thomas, Okla.
Gurney	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Hayden	McMahon	Thye
Hickenlooper	Magnuson	Vandenberg

NOT VOTING—5

Chavez	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Frear	Tydings	

So Mr. McCARTHY's amendments were rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. MORSE and Mr. BALDWIN asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I should like to address myself briefly to the joint resolution itself.

We have just voted against the amendments offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], and I, like any other American, abide by the result. The majority must have its way.

However, it seems to me that in his argument he pointed out something pertaining to the amendments which is applicable to the joint resolution itself.

His amendments would exempt oils and creams used for the care of babies. They are now taxed as luxuries. We have defeated those amendments. The joint resolution would exempt from taxation as a luxury the admission charges to the gala occasions attendant upon the inauguration.

At this point I should like to read into the RECORD a letter from a young constituent of mine which I inserted in the RECORD last year, because it seems to me to be peculiarly appropriate. It has to do with the luxury tax on baby creams. This comes from a young mother in Connecticut.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., *June 1, 1948.*

The Honorable RAYMOND E. BALDWIN,
Senator from Connecticut,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The other day I went to the drug store to buy some baby cream for Louis, our year-old son, whose little bottom had gotten all red and irritated. I was charged 47 cents for a jar which holds about 2 ounces. That price is high enough to pay for this product but when I have to give 10 additional cents for a luxury tax for a baby item, that is when I get my dander up.

Since when has it been considered a luxury for the baby to have a sore bottom? It is hard enough trying to raise a family and give America the healthy future sons, daughters, and voters she needs without these additional burdens such as luxury taxes on essential baby items.

I realize that the Government is sustained through taxes and I am willing to give my share, but luxury tax on the essentials of a baby's well-being is going too far. I'm sure there must be many other sources from which this additional money can be obtained and which would feel the pinch much less than the already overburdened budget of today's young parents. What do you think?

Respectfully yours,
(Mrs.) LOUIS W. MINGIONE.

Mr. President, what do we think? First, let me ask myself, What do I think? I think that those who attend the inaugural ceremonies and functions, primarily for their pleasure—and they are perfectly proper functions—can much better afford to pay the tax which the law as it presently stands provides for than can young mothers afford to pay a luxury tax on baby creams and baby oils.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the final passage of the joint resolution. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is attending the ceremonies incident to the inauguration of Hon. Elbert N. Carvel as Governor of the State of Delaware and the Honorable Alexis I. Dupont Bayard as Lieutenant Governor of the State of Delaware, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is absent because of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 47, as follows:

YEAS—45

Anderson	Ellender	Hoey
Barkley	Fulbright	Holland
Broughton	George	Humphrey
Connally	Gillette	Hunt
Douglas	Green	Johnson, Tex.
Downey	Hayden	Johnston, S. C.
Eastland	Hill	Kefauver

Kerr	McMahon	O'Conor
Kilgore	Magnuson	O'Mahoney
Long	Maybank	Pepper
Lucas	Miller	Sparkman
McCarran	Millikin	Stennis
McFarland	Murray	Taylor
McGrath	Myers	Thomas, Okla.
McKellar	Neely	Thomas, Utah

NAYS—47

Aiken	Hendrickson	Robertson
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Russell
Brewster	Ives	Saltonstall
Bricker	Jenner	Schoeppel
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, Maine
Butler	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Byrd	Knowland	Taft
Cain	Langer	Thye
Capehart	Lodge	Tobey
Chapman	McCarthy	Vandenberg
Cordon	McClellan	Watkins
Donnell	Malone	Wherry
Ecton	Martin	Wiley
Ferguson	Morse	Williams
Flanders	Mundt	Young
Gurney	Reed	

NOT VOTING—4

Chavez	Tydings	Wagner
Frear		

So the joint resolution was not passed.

Mr. BREWSTER. I move to reconsider the vote just had on the joint resolution.

Mr. MORSE. I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider. That question is not debatable.

Mr. LUCAS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. IVES. Do I correctly understand that the vote about to be taken is on the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

The yeas and nays having been ordered, the Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is attending the ceremonies incident to the inauguration of Hon. Elbert N. Carvel as Governor of the State of Delaware and the Honorable Alexis I. Dupont Bayard as Lieutenant Governor of the State of Delaware, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is absent because of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 49, as follows:

YEAS—42

Aiken	Capehart	Hendrickson
Baldwin	Cordon	Hickenlooper
Brewster	Donnell	Ives
Bricker	Ecton	Jenner
Bridges	Ferguson	Johnson, Colo.
Butler	Flanders	Kem
Cain	Gurney	Knowland
Langer	Reed	Tobey
Lodge	Saltonstall	Vandenberg
McCarthy	Schoeppel	Watkins
Malone	Smith, Maine	Wherry
Martin	Smith, N. J.	Wiley
Morse	Taft	Williams
Mundt	Thye	Young

NAYS—49

Anderson	Hoey	Maybank
Barkley	Holland	Miller
Broughton	Humphrey	Millikin
Byrd	Hunt	Myers
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	O'Conor
Connally	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Douglas	Kerr	Pepper
Downey	Kilgore	Robertson
Eastland	Long	Russell
Ellender	Lucas	Sparkman
Fulbright	McClellan	Stennis
George	McFarland	Taylor
Gillette	McGrath	Thomas, Okla.
Green	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Hayden	McMahon	
Hill	Magnuson	

NOT VOTING—5

Frear	Murray	Wagner
McCarran	Tydings	

So the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now recurs on the motion to reconsider.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to ask whether it is permitted that I may withdraw the motion to reconsider?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Only by leave of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard. The question now recurs on the motion to reconsider.

Mr. BREWSTER and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is attending the ceremonies incident to the inauguration of Hon. Elbert N. Carvel as Governor of the State of Delaware and the Honorable Alexis I. Dupont Bayard as Lieutenant Governor of the State of Delaware, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is absent because of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 47, as follows:

YEAS—44

Anderson	Hoey	Magnuson
Barkley	Holland	Maybank
Broughton	Humphrey	Miller
Chavez	Hunt	Millikin
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Myers
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Downey	Kefauver	O'Conor
Eastland	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Ellender	Kilgore	Pepper
Fulbright	Long	Sparkman
George	Lucas	Stennis
Gillette	McFarland	Taylor
Green	McGrath	Thomas, Okla.
Hayden	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Hill	McMahon	

NAYS—47

Aiken	Hendrickson	Robertson
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Russell
Brewster	Ives	Saltonstall
Bricker	Jenner	Schoeppel
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, Maine
Butler	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Byrd	Knowland	Taft
Cain	Langer	Thye
Capehart	Lodge	Tobey
Chapman	McCarthy	Vandenberg
Cordon	McClellan	Watkins
Donnell	Malone	Wherry
Ecton	Martin	Wiley
Ferguson	Morse	Williams
Flanders	Mundt	Young
Gurney	Reed	

NOT VOTING—5

Frear	Murray	Wagner
McCarran	Tydings	

So the motion to reconsider was rejected.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Albert J. Loveland, of Iowa, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, reported favorably the nomination of Brig. Gen. Peter A. Feringa, Corps of Engineers, to be president and a member of the Mississippi River Commission, under the provisions of law, which was ordered to be placed on the Executive Calendar.

SECRETARY OF STATE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nomination on the calendar.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dean G. Acheson to be Secretary of State.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, in presenting the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations on the nomination of Mr. Acheson to be Secretary of State, I wish to pay tribute once more to the collective wisdom which characterized the deliberations and decisions of the Committee on Foreign Relations during my previous chairmanship. I was always pleased at the spirit of harmony and unity with which the committee performed its all-important tasks. During the past 2 years, under the able leadership of the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], this teamwork continued without a break. It is my hope that we shall carry on in the same way in the present Congress.

Mr. President, the Senate of the United States, in performing its function of confirmation or rejection of Presidential appointments, exercises a vital power in public affairs. The Constitution wisely provides that the President shall have

power "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, Judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for." This provision represents one of the checks and balances of the Constitution. It constitutes a limitation upon the power of the Executive to make appointments of high Government officers.

It lays a distinct responsibility upon the Senate. It imposes the duty of advising as well as consenting to Presidential nominations and to the making of treaties. The Senate must bring to the discharge of its duty thorough knowledge as to the qualifications of appointees and of their fitness to perform the duties of their offices. The Constitution lays upon the Senate a solemn obligation.

On January 3, 1949, a great American, George C. Marshall, tendered his resignation as Secretary of State. As Chief of Staff of the United States Army during World War II, he had played a decisive part in the victories in Europe and Japan. At the end of the war he forsook the retirement he so deeply desired and richly deserved to answer his country's call by entering upon the great office of Secretary of State.

When illness overtook him and forced him to resign, President Truman wrote to him as follows:

> Those of us who have had extensive experience in public affairs know full well that there are very few indispensable men. Happily for the continuity of government, there appears from time to time a man of outstanding ability, whose service in one post of responsibility gives him exceptional qualification to discharge other duties of equal moment in a quite different field of activity. You are the exemplification of the type of public servant I have in mind.

These words echoed the feelings of grateful millions of Americans throughout the United States. They felt a great sense of loss.

To fill the position of Secretary of State in these turbulent and troubled times President Truman felt the need of one with an intimate knowledge of the foreign relations of the United States, experienced in the conduct of our foreign policy, versed in the State Department organization, and able to carry on the excellent work of Secretary Marshall with unbroken continuity.

Today the Senate, in pursuance of its authority and in accordance with its judgment and convictions, is called upon to confirm or reject the nomination by President Truman of Mr. Dean Acheson to be Secretary of State of the United States. The office to which he has been nominated is one of lofty functions and high responsibility. The Secretary of State is the adviser to the President in the matter of the relations of the United States with foreign countries. The Constitution lays upon the President responsibility for the conduct of our foreign relations. The Secretary of State is therefore charged with the duty of keeping the President advised of transactions in the realm of foreign relations, which are of such vital concern to the Government of the United States.

The nomination of Mr. Dean Acheson was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the committee held a public hearing on January 13, 1949, and on the following day, January 14, held an executive session of the committee. No Senator made any request that any particular witness should be summoned or heard by the committee.

The fullest opportunity was given to members of the committee to interrogate the nominee, in both the public hearing and in the executive hearing, upon any matter touching on his experience and qualifications, or in anywise relating to the performance of his duties.

In the hearings there was no formal charge filed by anyone against Mr. Acheson's character, ability, or experience. However, in the press there were various statements by individuals of a critical nature. In the hearings, all of these matters were reviewed and investigated. At the end of the hearing, the committee of 13 members unanimously voted to approve the nomination and recommend that the Senate confirm Mr. Acheson as Secretary of State.

The action of the committee was thoroughly nonpartisan, both Republican and Democratic members having voted as a unit in his support.

As a result of the hearing, it was disclosed that Mr. Acheson is 55 years of age; that he is a graduate of Yale University and of the law department of Harvard University. For a period he was law secretary to Mr. Justice Brandeis. For some years he was a member of the law firm of Covington, Burling, Rublee, Acheson & Shorb.

In 1933, Mr. Acheson served as Under Secretary of the Treasury. Later he served, at the request of the Attorney General of the United States, as the chairman of the Attorney General's committee on administrative procedure, which made its report to Congress in 1940, which report was subsequently of use to the Congress in legislation on the subject of administrative procedure.

Mr. Acheson served as Assistant Secretary of State from 1941 until August 1945. Later he was appointed Under Secretary of State and served in that capacity until July 1947. During that 2-year period, Mr. Acheson was often called upon to fill the role of Acting Secretary of State during the frequent and extended absences of the Secretary from the country.

This fact is worthy of emphasis, Mr. President. The State Department is no new field for Mr. Acheson. Experience has demonstrated that he is thoroughly at home in the Secretary's office. This should be comforting, for we know of the terrible complexity of the many problems from Europe, Korea, Asia, Palestine, the Balkans, Indonesia, the atom bomb, and other problems, with which the Secretary must contend.

It is my belief that Mr. Acheson will make a distinguished record as Secretary of State. He is a man of splendid tact, is familiar with the practices of diplomacy, is the possessor of a virile and aggressive policy in carrying out his conviction of duty and responsibility to his country. He will maintain the foreign policy of the United States with firmness and skill.

Mr. Acheson is a man of unusual ability and his former service in the State Department has given him experience and knowledge of foreign relations which are superb. His nomination was endorsed by former Secretary Cordell Hull, by former Secretary Stettinius, and by former Secretary Byrnes. Mr. Hull said:

> As Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson will display the same type of outstanding ability that has characterized his previous service to the Nation.

Former Secretary of State Byrnes said he "deeply regrets General Marshall's resignation as Secretary of State," and added that Mr. Acheson "is well qualified to serve as Secretary."

Former Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius made favorable comment on Mr. Acheson. He personally appeared before the committee and said:

> I have found Mr. Acheson to be a man of unusual intellectual brilliance, of great personal integrity, forceful, and courageous in meeting problems. He is patient, a tireless worker, and he wins the confidence of those with whom he is associated. He is uniquely qualified for this post from the standpoint of natural endowment, age, temperament, and capacity, and his intimacy and familiarity with foreign affairs as a result of his long experience with such statesmen as Cordell Hull, James Byrnes, and George Marshall in the roles of Assistant Secretary of State, Under Secretary, and Acting Secretary of State.

That statement was made by Mr. Stettinius before the committee.

Former President Hoover made favorable comment on the nomination. He said that Mr. Acheson will bring outstanding ability to the State Department.

Mr. John Foster Dulles, a distinguished Republican, and reputed to have been the adviser of Governor Dewey on foreign relations, and a man who has served with great usefulness and distinction as a representative of the United States on a number of occasions in the United Nations, said:

> I deeply regret Mr. Marshall's resignation as Secretary of State. He contributed great prestige and wisdom in a spirit of loyal devotion to this country. Since his resignation had to be, I am glad that his successor will be one who, as former Under Secretary of State, has gained the experience and demonstrated the capacity to carry forward our foreign policy without interruption or vacillation that, in the present state of affairs, could be disastrous.

Mr. President, it is my view that the Senate should confirm Mr. Acheson by an overwhelming vote. The foreign relations of the United States are of the highest moment. The United States, by reason of its tremendous power in the economic field and its potential strength as a military power, cannot avoid its high responsibility as a world leader. Its efforts to maintain world peace must be maintained and strengthened and advanced. The conduct of its foreign relations calls for the strongest ability in the field of public affairs. Its conduct

must be handled with the greatest delicacy and yet with firmness and resolution. Secretary Acheson will firmly and consistently assert and support the foreign policy of the United States in the preservation of its rights and the rights of its citizens and in its determination to secure world peace and freedom from aggression. It is my belief that Mr. Acheson possesses the ability, the character, and the experience which eminently qualify him to perform the gigantic duties of Secretary of State of the United States and as the chief adviser of the President in these troublous and dangerous years.

The Senate should confirm his nomination by an overwhelming vote that will carry a message to the entire world that he has our confidence and support and that he will carry on the foreign policy of the United States with dignity and strength and upon a level above partisan or petty politics—an American policy, of lofty moral leadership in the cause of world peace.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the nomination of Mr. Dean Acheson to become Secretary of State has aroused some anxieties both in and out of the Senate. In view of those anxieties, and in contemplation of the committee action recommending his confirmation, I think the situation requires me to make a very frank statement about the problem which confronts us at the moment when the roll is called.

Mr. President, in discussing any change in State Department management at the present time I wish first to discharge an obligation. As chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee through the active tenure of Secretary Marshall and Under Secretary Lovett, I state for the record that they gave us the fullest possible measure of courtesy, confidence, consideration, and cooperation which could exist between the executive and legislative branches of the Government in respect to the tasks upon which we collaborated in the Eightieth Congress. I am sure this is the unanimous opinion of the committee. I regret to see them leave.

The Senate now faces the responsibility of passing judgment upon their successors. The immediate question before the Senate is the confirmation of Mr. Acheson.

I wish by way of approach, Mr. President, to say for myself that I look upon Presidential appointments to the Cabinet in a somewhat different light than I do other nominations. The reason is obviously inherent in the phrase "official family" by which the Cabinet is usually described. These are the President's intimate personal advisers. This is peculiarly true in respect to the Secretary of State, because this officer necessarily must be the President's sympathetic and responsive agent in the discharge of the President's unavoidable responsibility under the Constitution for the conduct of foreign affairs.

I do not suggest that the Senate's collateral responsibility of confirmation is a mere formality. It is not. But I do respectfully suggest that in the case of the President's official family, his own right of choice carries a strong presumption in its favor; and it is appropriately vetoed by the Senate only for preponderant reasons of ineligibility. I am frank to say that I have found it necessary upon at least one occasion in the past to exercise this veto. I have no quarrel with any Senator who uses such a veto today. I am simply stating for myself that I think the President's choice of an official family, and particularly a Secretary of State, is more his business than it is ours; that it is more his responsibility than it is ours; and, barring clear public policy to the contrary, I personally shall leave this preponderant responsibility where I believe it belongs, and where I can thereafter hold it to strict unpartisan accountability.

But this viewpoint by no means absolves the Senate from faithful examination of any Presidential nominee's credentials. In an unprecedented effort to make the record clear, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in the present instance ordered a public hearing, in which Mr. Dean Acheson, the nominee, was asked to face all the objections which had been raised against him. He did so with what I believe even his critics would concede was a complete and commendable candor. I urge a careful reading of this public hearing, the print of which is upon every Senator's desk. I urge it upon all Senators and citizens who have rightly asked that their objections be explored.

With these preliminary observations, I shall state in a few words the factors which bring me to my own personal conclusion in this matter.

Affirmatively—and I believe beyond dispute—it can be said that Mr. Acheson has had a long and distinguished career in the public service, and particularly in foreign affairs. As a result he perhaps has a greater and more reliable familiarity with all the vast detail of our utterly complex current diplomatic problems than any other new Secretary who could be taken either from private citizenship or from another department of the Government. This is so essential a qualification that, taken by itself, it could be conclusive.

Mr. Acheson also has had a large experience in his contacts with Congress, where I believe it will again be generally conceded that he has proved himself to be one of the ablest advocates ever to appear before committees of the Senate and the House. We all are familiar with his habit of complete mastery of subjects which he brings to our attention. My own personal testimony is that in many dealings with him in the State Department, though we have had many differences of opinion, I have always found him reliable, helpful, cooperative, and trustworthy.

During previous tenures in the State Department he has been personally associated with the development of most of the major foreign policies which we are now pursuing. Therefore his appointment as Secretary of State, if it predicts anything, predicts continuity in these national attitudes rather than otherwise. He has so indicated, so far as he personally can, in his testimony before our committee.

But, of course, Mr. President, it is impossible to ask him or any other nominee precisely what policies he will pursue, because he or any other nominee will pursue whatever policies are directed by the President of the United States. Only the President himself can answer that question; and the answer may sometimes be quite impromptu and unpredictable.

We cannot control foreign policy through our action on this or any other nominee. I want to make that plain. Therefore it should be made wholly obvious that we do not underwrite the results, in terms of foreign policy, which will flow from our confirmation of this or any other nominee. But let me significantly add at this point, Mr. President—and this is one of the things which I confess appeals to me—that Mr. Acheson has demonstrated his possession of a rugged character, in that he has demonstrated that if and when, in the course of his public work, he fundamentally disagrees with his President, he knows how to resign.

Let me with equal brevity turn to the arguments which we have heard against the confirmation of Mr. Acheson. In the Hiss matter he sharply discriminates between Alger Hiss, for whom he appears to have had absolutely no responsibility, and Mr. Donald Hiss, his law partner. I believe the records of the House Un-American Activities Committee, plus subsequently pending court actions, justify this discrimination. Nowhere in this connection are there any sinister implications involving Mr. Acheson in any degree that have reached my notice. I may add that the men are legion who held a high opinion of Alger Hiss before the disclosure of events which he admits, to say nothing of events which he denies.

I have asked Mr. Acheson if I might summarize his Hiss attitudes in the following single sentence, and he agrees:

> An assertion of personal friendship for the Hiss brothers; a stanch defense of Donald Hiss; a purpose to leave Alger Hiss to the courts; Total and aggressive hostility to subversion in the State Department.

It is to be noted in this connection that the one and only reason Mr. Acheson's name came into the Hiss discussions was a statement by former Assistant Secretary Adolf Berle regarding a difference of opinion between them long predating any Hiss disclosures. Mr. Acheson categorically denies the Berle thesis, and Mr. Berle voluntarily wired the committee that he thinks Mr. Acheson's nomination should be promptly approved.

This phase of the case inevitably involves collateral issues. I wish to touch upon three or four of the questions with which we have been approached by many persons during the past few days in regard to this problem.

What does Mr. Acheson think about communism? This is what he thinks. I quote his categorical statement to our committee in response to a direct question:

> It is my view that communism as a doctrine is economically fatal to a free society and to human rights and fundamental freedoms. Communism as an aggressive factor in world conquest is fatal to independent governments and to free peoples.

Will Mr. Acheson be a softy in dealing with communism?

Mr. Acheson says—I am quoting from the hearings on Senators' desks:

> The things I read about myself as an appeaser are so incredible that it is difficult for me to believe that even disinterested malevolence could think them up.

That may be an oblique answer. But it is susceptible of but one emphatic interpretation.

Will Mr. Acheson continue State Department house cleaning if and when disloyal personnel is uncovered? Specifically, many Senators who believe in Assistant Secretary John Peurifoy's work in this regard want to know whether he will be allowed freely to carry on, and wish to make sure that he will. The answer seems to be that Peurifoy will be one of the new Secretary's key men.

What does Mr. Acheson think of Moscow? Perhaps the best answer is to turn the question around: What does Moscow think of Mr. Acheson? Upon at least one historic occasion it has officially and violently protested his statements about Russia and complained bitterly of his attitudes.

So much for this phase. The other important, critical phase has related to Mr. Acheson's law-firm connections and its activities. I shall not dwell upon the details because they are completely available in the printed hearings on Senators' desks. Mr. Acheson has made a full disclosure of all his firm's foreign clients and their fees for these labors. In most instances the cases involve litigation in the jurisdiction of the courts and are unrelated to the jurisdiction of the State Department. The exception is the matter of the Polish loan. Mr. Acheson's law firm did legal work for the Polish Government in connection with a $90,000,000 loan when Mr. Acheson was in the State Department and out of the firm. In March of 1947, after President Truman had made sharp statements regarding the Polish Government, the law firm, from which Mr. Acheson had disassociated himself, canceled its connections with the Polish Supply Mission.

In all instances, Mr. Acheson withdrew from his firm, and from any of his firm's emoluments, when he entered upon any of his public tours of duty. Heretofore, however, his name has remained in the firm name. That could involve dubious implications. When I asked him, in the public hearing, whether this might invite misunderstanding, he promptly replied that he is asking his partners to remove his name from the firm name when he becomes Secretary of State. I do not know how we could ask him to do more.

Balancing up all these facts, Mr. President, and remembering the rule which I said I apply for myself in passing upon Cabinet nominees to the President's "official family," I am unable to find any such predominant ineligibility in Mr. Acheson as would warrant me in voting against his confirmation.

But, in fairness to Mr. Acheson, I do not wish to leave the matter in that somewhat negative climate. Regardless of the rule, I think that Mr. Acheson's record and the committee record combine to affirmatively recommend Mr. Acheson's confirmation.

There remains, Mr. President, just one final point to which I shall advert. I have been asked by some Senators whether I strongly opposed the suggested appointment of Mr. Acheson as Administrator for ECA, and, if so, why that same opposition does not persist in respect to the Secretaryship of State. That is a fair question. I am glad to answer.

I did vigorously oppose the suggested appointment of Mr. Acheson as ECA Administrator, for very specific reasons which were no reflection upon him and which have no remote application in the instant case. Senators will remember that in our long debates on ECA the Congress made it abundantly clear that it would insist upon separating rehabilitation economics from diplomatic statecraft in the management of this vast business enterprise. Congress recognized that the State Department would inevitably find itself deeply concerned from time to time with the impact of ECA decisions upon foreign policy, and it wanted to preserve the State Department's wholly legitimate right of consultation. Therefore, adopting a formula recommended by the famous Brookings Institution, it provided in the ECA legislation that the Secretary of State should have a right of consultation with the ECA Administrator whenever he might feel that foreign policy is involved, and that the President should umpire any dispute between them on this score. Having thus fully protected the interests of the State Department, Congress demanded—and was categorically promised by me and other sponsors of the legislation—that the paramount economic phases of ECA should be in the hands of an Administrator who was a proven success in large-scale business management, and who was not related to the State Department. Mr. Acheson was not a large-scale business operator, and he was substantially related to the State Department. Therefore, I did not believe he qualified as ECA Administrator under the particularly narrow and technical specifications which we had drawn for the job. No such specifications are involved in the Secretaryship of State, and that is my point. Indeed, Mr. Acheson's long and intimate connections and experience in the State Department actually become one of his assets in the present instance. His distinguished professional standing as a lawyer establishes a factor of eligibility to be Secretary of State, as Mr. Paul Hoffman's distinguished place in American business conclusively did for him to become Administrator for ECA.

I think the distinction is clear, Mr. President, why Mr. Acheson was not eligible to be appointed Administrator of ECA, but on the face of the record has ample credentials for the consideration of the President in making this personal choice of a Secretary of State.

That concludes what I have to say, Mr. President. I join in the unanimous recommendation of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in which five Republicans are counted with eight Democrats in voting that Mr. Acheson shall be confirmed.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I wish to say that it gives me, perhaps I should say, mild pleasure in preparing to vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Dean Acheson to be Secretary of State. Certainly I am happy to have a civilian as Secretary of State. I always had a high regard for General Marshall as a man and as a general; but I thought his background as a general qualified him for the job of Secretary of State in about the same way that a minister of the gospel is qualified to be Chief of Staff. So I am happy to see that we shall have a civilian Secretary of State again.

Mr. President, I feel very strongly about our foreign policy. There can be little doubt of that, because recently I jumped my party traces and ran for Vice President on the ticket with Henry Wallace, not because I was profoundly disturbed at domestic developments in our country, but because I felt sincerely and honestly that our foreign policy was leading us to disaster, to a world war which no one could win; I felt that we were spending fabulous sums of money only to buy enemies, really. That was the way I saw it, and that is the way I still see it.

I think it is a sad thing, indicative of the hysterical times in which we live, that Mr. Acheson was forced to undergo what amounted to a third degree, practically, before he was recommended for confirmation as Secretary of State. To my mind, it is deplorable that in the executive session of the committee, attention was called to one sentence or one paragraph in which Mr. Acheson took some rather severe blows at the Soviet Union. I say this inasmuch as it is the Soviet Union that we must get along with if we are to have world peace and if we are to avert a world-wide catastrophe. Certainly if I were sending an emissary to try to make peace between myself and a neighbor of mine, with whom I had not been on good terms, I should not deem it to be the best approach for the intermediary to issue a statement saying that he hated my neighbor even more than I did, probably, but nevertheless he would go and try to make peace with him. So I think that is a very bad handicap with which to start Mr. Acheson on a mission of trying to make peace in the world.

I am happy, as I say, to vote for the confirmation of Mr. Dean Acheson, and while I do not seriously expect that it means any fundamental change in our foreign policy, I may still hope; and I am convinced that the people of the country are becoming fed up with our foreign policy as it is presently constituted. Even the dumbest person must realize that we could have spent many times the millions of dollars we have spent on China, helping a corrupt dictator like Chiang Kai-shek, and still have come to the same sad end to which we have come in China.

The situation in Greece goes from bad to worse. I am proud that I opposed it from the beginning. I still oppose it. I read in the newspapers that the guerrillas are beginning to win minor victories

in Greece. That is bad, when we have taken the adamant stand over there that we have. I read in the press that there is great unrest in Turkey, that the government there has recently fallen, and that the people are dissatisfied.

Mr. President, all the money we have spent around the world has not won us a friend among the common people. We have set up a few cardboard governments here and there and have maintained them in power simply by the expenditure of vast sums of money for armaments. I cannot but recall that during the last session of Congress there had been in this country a growing sentiment for world government. I am happy to say that I was one of the first to get into and encourage the movement for a world republic. At the last session a resolution was presented on the floor ostensibly to encourage the world government forces, by reason of the pressure which was being put on the Congress to do something about it. The resolution was adopted, and it was made known immediately that the object in adopting it was not to facilitate our reaching agreements with all the nations of the world, but to facilitate our reaching agreements with enemies of Russia for military arrangements against Russia. I think this foreign policy is disastrous. I do not believe the people will permit its continuation much longer.

I have the fear that the American people are going to be forced once again into isolationism. They do not understand clearly what the word implies, but they are tired of spending billions of dollars and having their taxes increased in order to send money around the world—to Great Britain, for her imperialist ventures against the Jews in Palestine; to the Dutch, for their imperialist ventures against the Indonesians; and for all the sad things that are occurring throughout the world, and for which we are getting the blame, indirectly at least. So as I say, I am mildly happy to have an opportunity at least to vote for a civilian for Secretary of State. [Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, this is probably the last time I shall have an opportunity to utter a word from this chair before I retire from the membership of the Senate. I would not want the opportunity to pass without a word of commendation of Mr. Dean Acheson as Secretary of State, and a word of congratulation to the President for his appointment. I do not take even these few moments of the Senate's time with the expectation that anything I say may influence any vote, but I do wish to put myself on record as being extremely well pleased over the appointment of Mr. Dean Acheson as Secretary of State. I have over the years associated with him in the legislative way whenever there was any measure before a number of committees of the Senate of which I was a member and before whom he appeared, either in advocacy or in opposition. That includes the Committee on Banking and Currency, dealing with the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Monetary Fund, and the international economic problems with which Mr. Acheson was called upon to deal and which he was to expound before the committee; in this case, the Committee on Banking and Currency.

While he was associated with the State Department he had many occasions to appear before the Committee on Foreign Relations representing that Department. In all those instances, Mr. Acheson displayed a profound knowledge of the subject which he discussed. He displayed great courtesy, frequently under considerable provocation, in presenting his views to the committee. He displayed great firmness and tenacity in holding to the opinions which he expressed. He is a man of the highest education and culture. It seems to me that he fits the Secretaryship of State, by reason of his environment, his education, his tradition, his background, and his opinions, as well as any man who has been recently appointed to that high station.

I probably feel a very personal admiration for Mr. Acheson, and to that extent what I say in his behalf probably should be discounted, but my association with him, officially and personally, has given me a profound appreciation of his sincerity, his good faith, his unalterable Americanism, his belief in the traditions and the policies and in the Government of the United States, in what we have fought for in time of war and what we are fighting for in time of peace—not only peace in our generation but in all generations if possible; peace not only for our country but for all countries if possible, based upon justice, based upon the right of every people to self-determination and to the enjoyment of those principles of self-government in which we ourselves believe and which we for a century and a half have practiced and tried to perfect.

From all those standpoints, Mr. President, I have a profound feeling that Mr. Acheson will adorn the State Department. Therefore I am in favor of the confirmation of his nomination. From the standpoint of my personal confidence in his integrity, and in his refusal to dissimulate in regard to any profound question of fundamental doctrine related to our Government, I think he is entitled to confirmation; and I predict for him a brilliant record, if he shall be confirmed, as I have no doubt he will be, in the State Department, as the head of that arm of our Government in dealing with all the nations of the world with firmness, with courtesy, and with patience, in the hope that out of all the frustration, chaos, and turmoil which now beset mankind there may come permanent peace throughout the world, for which, in the providence of Almighty God, I hope we may in a large measure be responsible.

For those reasons, Mr. President, I am happy to vote for the confirmation of Mr. Acheson's nomination as Secretary of State.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have often wondered just how long the American people could put up with all the political shim-sham that is thrown at them.

For 16 years of the New Deal I waited for that saturation point. It never seemed to be reached.

For about 60 days before last November 2 I thought surely the cup would overflow. But it did not.

I was sure that either the ice would break after that state-of-the-Union message on January 7, or that some people might at least be fearful of venturing any farther out on the loaded limb. But I have been wrong.

Now, as we await the Nation's greatest spectacle in this great and beautiful city of Washington, we get a chance to witness another spectacle—of a far more private type, of course.

We now get a chance to see the central figure of the January 20 spectacle eat some of the words he so carelessly cast over the land prior to November 2.

He made a street in New York the scapegoat of his campaign for the Presidency of the United States. It was Wall Street.

On that street, so said the gentleman who will ride at the head of the parade on Thursday, were the wolves who would eat every Little Red Riding Hood in all this land.

There, he said, was where all the pain and misery were cooked up for America.

Dastards. That is what they were, those Wall Streeters. Mr. President, I think Mr. Truman was right. I have been hearing and reading about how the Claytons, the Hisses, the Achesons, and other world bankers, world brokers, and world lawyers have been dabbling in all these international affairs.

When so many of our fine people thought, as did our President, that those Wall Streeters were bad, I decided to find out if all of it were true.

Well, I found out, just as did Mr. Truman, that enough of it was true so that I am going to join right with him in his crusade to keep them out of our Government.

I shall follow the people and our President in voting right out of our Government this Wall Streeter who is a partner to loans to Communist-dominated countries, to Arabian oil interests, and to other international money-making enterprises.

Mr. President, accept my willingness to abide by the bipartisan effort of this Congress and the spirit of cooperation with our President by recording my vote against the confirmation of the nomination of Dean Acheson.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I cannot let this occasion pass without making a very brief comment on the remarks of the majority leader of this body. I refer to his statement that this is the last time his voice will be raised in this Chamber. I am consoled by the fact that he will not leave the Chamber and that we Senators, at least, shall have the benefit of his counsel, his wisdom, and his advice in the deliberations which are to take place in this body within the next 4 years.

I raise my voice, Mr. President, on behalf of Mr. Acheson because, first, I have confidence in him; secondly, he is my friend; thirdly, he was born, reared, and educated in my State. His father was a distinguished and beloved Episcopal bishop in Connecticut. We in Connecticut have naturally taken a special pride in his achievements in government

service. Those achievements have indicated a character and a disposition which have won him the admiration and affection of all members of the public who have had occasion to come into contact with him.

I am especially pleased that he seems to be opposed by what I would term the extreme left and the extreme right. He is a man who knows the middle of the road. He is a man who knows the value of adherence to principle, and he is a man who knows the art of diplomatic compliment.

Reference has been made to Mr. Acheson's achievements as Under Secretary of State, but there is one more achievement which I should like to point out for the record, because, in my opinion, the record which he shall make as Secretary of State, no matter how brilliant it may be, will contain no page which shines with greater distinction than does the one on which he took his part in writing the control policy for atomic energy in the State Department, which subsequently became the policy of the United Nations. That, Mr. President, is one of the achievements of diplomacy and statecraft in our time, and as the years go by its great value will continue to be recognized to the point where all men will agree with the truth of what I say.

Mr. Laski, an Englishman of great intellectuality, but with whose philosophy I certainly do not agree, recently made the remark that this achievement was probably the greatest one which has ever occurred in a free nation in diplomatic intercourse with other nations. That is, of course, only one of Mr. Acheson's achievements, but I thought it worth mentioning.

At any rate, Mr. President, the Senate will confirm the nomination of Mr. Acheson, I think, to the satisfaction of the people of the United States. I personally look forward to the opportunity of working with this friend and public servant in the effort which we here must make in the next 4 years in the forging of a permanent and lasting peace. That work has scarcely begun. There is much to do. I am very happy indeed that President Truman has sent to the Senate the nomination of a man for Secretary of State who, I am confident, will carry his share of the burden and will cooperate with the Senate in this great task.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the vote, but I do desire to associate myself with the sentiments expressed by the majority leader.

When I first came to the House of Representatives I was a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and Mr. Acheson was one of the first witnesses to come before that committee. Throughout the following years he has appeared before various committees, particularly the Committee on Banking and Currency. I do not believe there has ever been a witness from the executive department of the Government who appeared before committees with better information and more complete control of all the aspects of his subject. Most of the questions, it is true, dealt with economic affairs, such as were discussed at Breton Woods, and so forth. But he did a remarkable job and reported it to the Congress. I do not believe that any Secretary of State who has been nominated in the past 15 years has been better qualified by experience and by intellect to fill that position. While he has not had the top position in policy making, he has played an extremely important part in the implementation of the policy of the Government, and I, for one, take great heart and great encouragement in his appointment, and I am delighted to vote for the confirmation of his nomination.

Certainly, I do not mean by any implication at all to cast any reflection upon any other nomination of recent years, but I do think in all fairness no one can say that any man nominated equaled Mr. Acheson in experience for the position to which he has been appointed, which I believe indicates a very serious and forward step in the improvement of the foreign relations in the executive branch of the Government.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am very happy to vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Acheson to be Secretary of State.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the business before the Senate for consideration is the nomination of Mr. Acheson to become the Secretary of State. To me this is one of the most important nominations that will come before the Senate for confirmation in this session of the Congress, and I might add I think it may prove to be the most important in generations, for the man who is chosen and confirmed to be the next Secretary of State will hold the destiny of America and of the nations of the world in his hands. Mr. Acheson, or whoever may become Secretary of State, will be responsible for commitments affecting both our foreign and our domestic policy, because whatever commitments he makes internationally, as has already been demonstrated, will fashion our domestic policies at home. It just cannot be otherwise. So the confirmation of this nomination is a most serious responsibility. It is a matter for each individual Senator to settle for himself in his own mind and with his own conscience. It certainly is not a partisan matter in any sense of the word.

Mr. President, I am in complete accord with the observations made by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], about the provision that the President shall appoint his Cabinet members, with the advice and consent of the Senate, as he stated. Certainly, as he so forcefully said, the President has a right to choose whomever he pleases, because the administration is responsible, and if the administration is to assume responsibility, then the President should have the right to choose whom he wishes to carry out his administration policies. I think there can be no disagreement with those observations.

Mr. President, the Senate, too, has a duty and a responsibility, namely, to weigh and to exercise its best judgment in either acepting or rejecting a nomination. It is only in that light, as an individual Senator, that I make these very brief observations, in explanation only of the vote I intend to cast against the confirmation of Mr. Acheson's nomination.

Mr. President, when Mr. Acheson's nomination was announced I made this public statement:

> I was surprised at his nomination; my opinion of Mr. Acheson remains unchanged.

Later I made a further public statement, as follows:

> That any course of action I might take relative to the nomination would depend upon the report of the Foreign Relations Committee.

I have kept faith with that public statement, and I here and now wish to compliment the Committee on Foreign Relations for the manner in which they conducted the investigation, for the opportunity which they gave each and every person a chance for a public hearing to question Mr. Acheson, through the chairman. I personally wish to thank the chairman of the committee for taking action in the orderly fashion he has followed, having the nomination lie over 24 hours. No one could help having praise for the very admirable and fair way in which the nomination has been handled.

Mr. President, as I have said, the nomination of Mr. Acheson came as a complete surprise. It was a surprise to me because of his record. His influence has affected vital policies of the Government in many cases in recent years.

As the able majority leader has said, Mr. Acheson has appeared on Capitol Hill time after time representing the administration. He went to the Treasury Department early in 1933, and remained there until November. In 1941 he became Assistant Seeretary of State, and remained in the State Department until about a year ago. So he has had a long experience, and time after time he has come to the Capitol and appeared before committees, and has represented the administration on many important pieces of legislation.

It was Mr. Acheson who presented the UNRRA legislation to Congress. He helped to sell it to the Members of Congress. He, more than anyone else, in my opinion, was responsible for attempting to sell it to the American people. So what? it may be asked. It is easy to forget, but all of us know UNRRA turned out to be an international organization which helped to siphon food and goods to help Russia and her satellite countries, whom we sought to encourage, and whose friendship and cooperation we were then seeking, and do now seek.

UNRRA food was used for other purposes besides that. I shall never forget my experience when, on my own, I went to Europe to investigate. I found that Russia fed her armies off the food of the land in other countries, while UNRRA was used to feed the civilian population. So that in reality, as was found to be true in Russian-occupied Austria, we actually furnished the food to feed the Russian armies.

Mr. President, I am simply giving my own opinion, and all other Senators have the privilege of their own opinion, but

I would hold that if I voted for Dean Acheson today, it would mean that I condone UNRRA, an international organization which I did not and cannot now justify. As I said a moment ago, Senators can, of course, believe as they please; that is their privilege, but my conscience will not permit me to confirm the nomination of Dean Acheson to be Secretary of State, because I think that would mean that I condone that piece of legislation which he presented to the Congress and helped to sell to the American people.

During the period when Mr. Acheson was in the Department of State the administration executed many secret agreements. I do not say he was a party to them, but I do say the Department executed a great many secret agreements, such as the Yalta agreement, and agreements which provided that German industry be decentralized. I found that to be true when I was over there. The administration's plans provided for an extensive program of dismantling manufacturing plants in Germany, a program which I fought at every point along the road in the Senate. We are now replacing these plants with the money of the American taxpayer.

These secret agreements also provided for forcing the German people to make a living upon the land, to lead an utterly different kind of life, and to engage in an entirely different economy than many of them had theretofore known. I said then, and I say now, that this program has retarded the recovery of all Europe. It created a vacuum in which 100,000,000 people of Germany and the satellite countries were thrown into confusion. This program cost the American taxpayers $20,000,000,000. It completely failed. The administration admitted its failure, because the Marshall plan was drafted to take its place. So, once again, I say that a vote for Mr. Acheson would, to my mind, mean condoning the enforcement of the administration's program to destroy the German industry and keep her forever an agricultural state.

It may be asked what Mr. Acheson has to do about that? He has been in the administration all these years. He is a part and parcel of the complete program, and he was in the State Department many days functioning as the Acting Secretary when he was the Under Secretary, carrying out the provisions of this administration. My conscience will not permit me to vote to condone what has taken place. I simply cannot do that this afternoon.

Mr. Acheson attempted to force upon Japan the acceptance of a unified government in the administration of which Russia would have had a part. It is unnecessary to go into that now. This issue was debated on the Senate floor for nearly 2 days, when Mr. Acheson's appointment as Under Secretary of the Department of State was under consideration. Certainly his attempt to impose on the people of Japan what I call a coalition government, in which the Communists could play a role to advance their ideology, should be given every consideration today when we vote to confirm or reject the nomination of Mr. Acheson to be Secretary of State. The record speaks for itself, if Senators want to read it. Were I to vote to confirm the nomination of Dean Acheson at this time it would mean that I approved his attempt to impose upon Japan what he called a most liberal government.

He was a part of the State Department regime that has given us the shameful policy in China under which China now is being captured and controlled by Communists under the direction and the leadership of Moscow. With the loss of China our whole position in the Orient has been jeopardized.

This is the record as I see it. These are the reasons why I made public the statement that I was surprised Mr. Acheson was chosen by the President to become his Secretary of State. Because of this record I formed my opinion, and my opinion has remained unchanged; therefore I cannot vote to confirm him now.

Then I looked at the report of the subcommittee. I went through the report of the hearings of the Foreign Relations Committee to see whether any part of this record was cleared up, whether or not any defense was made, because during many months of this time, Mr. Acheson, the Under Secretary of State, as I have said, acted as the Acting Secretary of State to carry out these policies.

What does the report of the Foreign Relations Committee reveal? To sum it up all in one brief paragraph it is simply this, that in some speeches since the Marshall plan was put into effect, Mr. Acheson has said that he now endorses nothing in the nature of an appeasement policy toward Russia. But there is not anything to guide us respecting what we might expect from Mr. Acheson as Secretary of State in his relations toward Russia except the broad general statement that he now makes to the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. Adolf Berle, who was mentioned by the distinguished Senator from Michigan, formerly an Assistant Secretary of State, has corroborated my opinion of Mr. Acheson's record, in his testimony before the Committee on Un-American Activities, of the House of Representatives. Mr. Berle said then that Mr. Acheson was in the pro-Russian bloc of the State Department, along with the others the Senator mentioned.

After Mr. Acheson was nominated to be Secretary of State, Mr. Berle was quoted as saying that Mr. Acheson now has apparently had a change of heart toward Russia; that he has recanted his appease-Russia views, and is now O. K., thoroughly solid, in his position that Russia's dictators are trying to rule the world and cannot be appeased.

Mr. President and fellow Senators, as I have traveled around over the United States I have discovered a fact which cannot be denied, and I submit it to the Senate as I make this last observation relative to the confirmation of Mr. Acheson, that somehow it is common knowledge that Mr. Acheson has been an appeaser of Russia. This fact is proven also by the Foreign Relations Committee itself when it has allowed only one excerpt of Mr. Acheson's testimony taken in executive session to be made public. And what is it? Why, it is the excerpt that was quoted by the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment, Mr. President. When I have completed the statement, I shall be very glad to yield to the Senator from Texas. The excerpt in question is brief, and I will read it:

> It is my view that communism as a doctrine is economically fatal to a free society and to human rights and fundamental freedoms. Communism as an aggressive factor in world conquest is fatal to independent governments and to free peoples.

With that statement I have no disagreement whatsoever. I endorse it 1,000 percent.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator now yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator mind if I finished my statement?

Mr. CONNALLY. I thought the Senator had finished. I will defer my request.

Mr. WHERRY. I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I will wait until the Senator completes his statement.

Mr. WHERRY. No, Mr. President; I am glad to yield now.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator made some reference to the Foreign Relations Committee giving out only one little excerpt. As chairman of that committee I will say to the Senator that we have a complete copy of the executive hearing, and the Senator from Nebraska is at liberty to come down to the committee room and read the whole proceedings at any time he wants to.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. I have already commended the Senator from Texas upon the very fair treatment he has given to Senators.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not hunting compliments.

Mr. WHERRY. But the fact, if the Senator will permit me to state it, is that what I have said is common knowledge throughout the country, and I think my statement cannot be denied. If Senators will talk to the people in various sections of the country they will find it to be a matter of common knowledge that Mr. Acheson has, at least up to this time, been considered as one who has gone along in an appeasement policy toward Russia. He is a symbol of the administration, because he has been in it all these years.

The question may be asked: "What has UNRRA got to do with the matter? What has the Morgenthau plan got to do with it? What has Mr. Acheson's policy toward Japan to do with it?" It has this to do with the matter, that he has indelibly stamped himself among the people I know as one who has been in favor of appeasing Russia.

I say now that in order to defend him and in order to meet that criticism the Foreign Relations Committee evidently released this one excerpt. It is one of the finest statements I have ever heard of what it means to permit communism to come into an independent nation and

destroy its economy. I have already said that I endorsed it a thousand percent.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to yield again.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not seek to interrupt the Senator to argue with him. All I meant to say was that the committee will permit any Senator to examine the record of its executive hearings.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not trying to argue with the Senator about his main discussion.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. IVES. The question which I wish to raise with the able Senator from Nebraska is a very pertinent question. The Senator has accused the gentleman whose nomination we are now considering of pursuing an appeasement policy with respect to Soviet Russia. I should like to ask the Senator if he will be so kind as to state at least one instance which he considers to be pursuit of such policy. I should like to know what it is. I have not been present all the time during this discussion. The Senator may have cited such instances already.

Mr. WHERRY. The endorsement of the UNRRA plan, permitting Russia to feed her armies off the food of the land, using our food to feed the civilian population, resulted in helping Russia in her policy toward satellite countries. That we cannot condone.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to complete my statement. I shall be glad then to answer any questions, but I should like to have the statement intact in the RECORD. However, inasmuch as I am asked these questions, I shall be glad to answer them.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from New York has asked me a question, and I should like to answer it. I cannot answer it if he will not permit me to do so.

The second thing on which I base my statement of Mr. Acheson's policy of Russian appeasement is the fact that during the years from 1940 until the time he left the State Department in 1947, Mr. Acheson was a party to the so-called Morgenthau plan, which I maintain was an appeasement policy toward Russia. That plan included the dismantling of plants in Germany and forcing the German people to decentralize, which has resulted in the spread of communism. The opposite policy would have been the way to stop the advance of communism in the first place. That plan has cost the American taxpayers $20,000,000,000, and I maintain that putting that program into effect has been a proappeasement policy toward Russia.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to answer his question. I have another example.

In 1945, when the nomination of the Under Secretary was brought to the floor of the Senate, it was Mr. Acheson who made a public statement that he felt that there should be established in Japan a more liberal government, a government in the administration of which Russia would have a part.

I do not know how many more examples the Senator wants to show that Mr. Acheson has carried out an appeasement policy toward Russia. That is my answer to his question.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I should like to make a statement first.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator wishes to make a statement, I ask him to withhold it and make it at the conclusion of my remarks. I decline to yield until I finish this statement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska declines to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Getting back to the definition which has been given by Mr. Acheson, this expression means that there was doubt in the minds of members of the Committee on Foreign Relations. That is the way I feel about it. Certainly, if there was no doubt in their minds, there is a doubt in my mind that cannot be erased. There is still a grave doubt relative to Mr. Acheson's proappeasement policies with respect to Russia. In my judgment Mr. Acheson's record up to this moment is certainly in direct contradiction to the excerpt which has been released by the Foreign Relations Committee. My opinion is that only time will tell whether Mr. Acheson means what he says and says what he means.

Mr. President, I have nothing in the world personally against Mr. Acheson; but on the record itself it is impossible for me to vote for confirmation. However, I am most hopeful—and I should like to put this in blazing letters in the RECORD—that Mr. Acheson will carry out the work of Secretary of State in keeping with his most recent statement. So far as I am concerned, while I cannot vote for the confirmation of his nomination today, if he continues a firm policy toward Russia, as he has outlined in this statement to the committee, I want the President and every Member of the Senate to know that I shall do everything in my power to see that his policies receive my full support.

Mr. President, I shall be glad to answer any questions.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I do not wish to ask a question. I wish to make a statement.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I should like to say something about UNRRA, which has been dragged into the discussion of the question now before us. Perhaps the question of UNRRA and its political implications has affected me as much as it has affected any other Member of the Senate. It so happens that my opponent, when I ran for the Senate in 1946, had been the Director of UNRRA. I refer to former Governor Lehman, of New York State.

I wish to point out to Members of the Senate that the question of UNRRA, so far as its being a question of pro-Soviet or anti-Soviet relationship is concerned, had nothing to do with the issues in my campaign. I have never accused Governor Lehman—and I never shall—of being pro-Russian, unless something incredible happens after these remarks to cause me to change my attitude. I know that he is an intensely loyal American.

I do not believe that the question of UNRRA has anything to do with the question now before us. It was very pertinent in 1946; but at that time there were a great many loyal Americans who were strongly in favor of UNRRA and other aid of that kind. Some were very critical of the way in which it was being handled. Some were critical regarding the wisdom of the policy which was being followed. But I know of no one who was accusing anyone in high office of being pro-Russian in his attitude in that connection; and I do not believe that the question of UNRRA has the remotest thing to do with the subject now before us.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I did not intend to say anything at all on this subject, but I believe an explanation of how I intend to vote might be in order.

I realize that a man in public life today who believes as I do will be held up to ridicule and sarcasm, and will be driven from public office, although he is sincere to the bottom of his heart in his beliefs.

Mr. President, since I have been a Member of the Senate I have cast one bad vote, in my estimation. As a freshman Senator I voted for the Greek-Turkish loan. That was a vote, supposedly, to contain communism wherever it reared its ugly head. I was for that, and I believe America was for it. However, I watched the unfolding of the foreign policy. As the Senator from Nebraska has pointed out, for a while we went down the road of UNRRA and the Morgenthau plan, and then, suddenly, we completely changed our direction and became firm. We quit playing put-and-take with Uncle Joe, although, as one in high office says, he is not a bad fellow, and he likes him.

What happened to the Truman doctrine? I was told on the floor of the Senate that wherever communism reared its ugly head there the American Government would strike back, with force, if necessary, to contain it. I ask Senators who are my elders and who are experienced in these matters what happened to the Truman plan in China? This very day China is being overrun by Communists. Nothing save America will keep all of China and all of Asia from going communistic. When that happens 50 percent of the population of the entire world will be under communistic domination.

We started with a foreign policy over the past 4 or 5 years which would have required one with St. Vitus dance to follow. It has happened in this great country that a man who honestly believes that he should be for his country, and should try to make it strong and sound, is compared to a worm crawling on a rotten board in a wall. He is ridiculed and subjected to sarcasm if he dares say that he is for his country first. I am not ashamed of the stand I take. I think this foreign policy is absurd, and I think America is going to get ulcers

if the present program is continued. I have said that before on this very floor.

Here we are, Mr. President, faced in our own Nation with tremendous problems. I point out education, for example. Within 5 years from today, 6,000,000 children will need public schooling in the United States, and yet every school district in my State is up to the hilt in debt, and cannot provide for adequate education. Bills for national education will be introduced in the Congress, because the same problem of education exists in other States, and some Senators say the problem exists particularly in some of the Southern States.

Others talk about health. Of course America needs public health; but under our foreign policy we are paying for free medicine, socialized medicine if you please, in other countries. People in England are given free eyeglasses, free false teeth, free babies, free everything; and the American taxpayer is paying for all of it. Why on earth can we not have it for our own people, Mr. President?

So I could run through the list, and mention reclamation; the need for more power and greater production, and many other problems.

Mr. President, do you know what it will cost to provide properly for the public health of the people of America? The cost will run into the billions of dollars.

I simply say that I do not believe we can do all these things for our own people and all these things for people all over the world, and still remain a strong, free, economically sound Nation. I say to you, Mr. President, that we were the first to have the free-enterprise system, and under God's sun today we are the last Nation that has a free-enterprise system. I say to you that the hope of all other peoples and the hope of freedom all over the world will go down into the rat holes of time unless America remains strong. This year we shall spend at least $45,000,000,000 for government. With the proposed projects offered to our people and with the proposed projects for continuing the enormous foreign policy we have launched upon, we shall easily be spending from $60,000,000,000 to $70,000,000,000 in the next 2 or 3 years. Mr. President, today in the United States production is at an all-time peak, and we cannot take taxes of from $60,000,000,000 to $70,000,000,000 out of the American economy, and still remain a strong, economically sound Nation.

Mr. President, some may call me an isolationist, some may laugh at me, some may call me a reactionary, and some may call me a conservative; they may call me whatever they please; but I say to you that I stand here today as a liberal, because one who will preserve his country, this country of ours, and its freedoms, and will give liberty and justice to our people is the greatest liberal there can be.

So, Mr. President, on the basis that Mr. Acheson is willing to go along with UNRRA, and is willing to go along with a unified Japanese Government, and is willing to go along with the Morgenthau plan, by which we took factories from Germany and sent them to Uncle Joe, playing put and take—we put our money over there, and Uncle Joe takes—on that basis, on the basis that Mr. Acheson believes in the policy that our Government is pursuing today, I, in my deepest convictions, could not condone that or vote for confirmation of the nomination of a man who entertains such ideas.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. WHERRY. On this question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I shall take only 2 or 3 minutes of the time of the Senate in connection with the nomination of Mr. Acheson, but I believe in justice to my position I should make my record clear on this matter.

As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee I voted to recommend the confirmation of the appointment by the President of Dean Acheson to be Secretary of State. I shall vote to confirm this appointment by the Senate. In taking this position I am fully aware of certain factors which have caused controversy in connection with the appointment, and I have weighed all such factors in reaching a decision to vote for confirmation. It has long been accepted as fundamental that the President shall have the widest latitude in the selection of members of his official family, who make up his Cabinet and the Senate has exercised great restraint, from time to time, in opposing this very important right lodged in the President. The Secretary of State is the ranking officer in the President's Cabinet, the individual through whom the President exercises his constitutional obligations and functions in connection with foreign affairs. Because of the responsibility lodged in the President with respect to foreign affairs, he should be free to select his spokesman in this field, but in return for this freedom of selection he must also assume full responsibility for the management of foreign affairs by his Secretary of State. He must be, and is, answerable to the American people for the success or failure of this Department in the conduct of our foreign relations. I may remind you, Mr. President, that the people of the United States elected the President and charged him thereby with this responsibility.

In connection with the Senate's confirmation of such appointment it must be borne in mind that the Senate does not have the appointing power and has no choice of alternative selections.

It is always probable that any specific appointment to such an office by the President might be objected to by some because, in their opinion, another individual might be more acceptable or might be better able to do the job, but, again, the appointing power rests with the President and not with the Senate, and I have no choice except to vote for or against the President's appointment, in which latter case fairness would demand that I support my objection with most substantial reasons. I do not believe these reasons should be whimsical or nebulous.

So far as Mr. Acheson is concerned, there is not the slightest doubt in my mind as to his personal integrity. I believe it to be of an unusually high order. So far as his mental ability is concerned there is no question. I believe him to be a brilliant man. So far as his experience in international matters is concerned, he has had opportunity for unusual experience in the State Department and in other phases of government operation, during a period when matters vitally affecting future policy have been formulated. He therefore brings to the office personal integrity, high ability, and unusual experience.

Criticism has been directed at him, charging that he has had in the past a so-called soft policy toward Russia and a lack of perception of the destructive aims and purposes of communism so far as its objectives of infiltration and destruction of our form of government are concerned. These charges have not been substantiated, and in any event it is highly doubtful that he, as a subordinate official under the Secretary of State, made or was finally responsible for some of the ill-advised earlier foreign policies, the spawn of which now rise to plague us. So far as I am concerned he has fully and frankly discussed his views about the United States and our policy, and I am convinced that he is completely devoted to and is fully aware of the necessity of unswerving advancement of the principles upon which our Government lives, and that he will defend those principles for us and for the world.

Criticism has repeatedly been directed at the State Department because of the infiltration of a number of so-called fellow travelers in this vital Department, and suggestions have been made that Mr. Acheson, while never personally accused of being suspected as a fellow traveler, has, nevertheless, by a blind loyalty to certain associates and friends, shut his mind to the possibility of such infiltration in important and vital areas of our foreign department. There is every evidence that he has a strong and tenacious loyalty to those for whom he forms a friendship. It might be possible that this quality of loyalty to friends, which is not to be condemned as a general principle, on occasions might have compelled him, or might now compel him, to refuse to be suspicious where reasonable grounds for suspicion might exist. Nevertheless, I have confidence that he will differentiate between personal loyalties and personal friends, on the one hand, and vital public interests, on the other; that he will not let the first control his judgment or his actions, with regard to personnel in the State Department, in connection with inviolate safeguarding of public business vital to our security.

He is the choice of the President for this vital Cabinet post. His selection and future administration of the Department is the prerogative and also the responsibility of the President. I trust and believe that he will bring to the office a high degree of ability and perception, and I wish him, not only personally, but also in the interests of the recovery of a free world, every success.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD four editorials from the Greensboro (N. C.) Daily News, commenting on the qualifications of Mr. Dean Acheson for the position of Secretary of State and

Mr. James E. Webb for the position of Under Secretary of State. In my opinion, the careful analysis of the appointments and their effect on foreign policy contained in these editorials makes their preparation and publication a real public service, and I believe they merit the consideration of everyone interested in the foreign policy of the United States.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW SECRETARY OF STATE—I

Unlike Presidents Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt, President Truman will not be his own Secretary of State. Therefore his appointment of a new Secretary of State to succeed Secretary Marshall at this crucial period of world affairs is an event of importance to ourselves, and indeed the world, second only to the election of a new President.

It is not that our foreign policy will suffer a break in continuity but that, in a world which does move, changing circumstances alter cases and that new facts and personalities interact on each other to mold history inexorably for better or worse.

The appointment of Dean Acheson as Secretary of State and James E. Webb as Under Secretary is therefore a major event deserving the most thoughtful consideration at home. We may be sure it will receive it abroad.

North Carolinians naturally take pride in the Webb appointment. James Webb has a brilliant record in scholarship, business, war and government. That record tends to show that he has the brains, force, and character to meet successfully the exacting duties of the position to which he has been called.

But the literally awe-inspiring responsibility of guiding the foreign policy of the United States, with all that that means to each one of us and the civilization of which we are a part, has fallen on the shoulders of one man, Dean Acheson. This does not mean exactly that he is a solitary Atlas, for he will have the help of able men in his Department, in his Government, and indeed in other governments; but it does mean that the ultimate—or at least the penultimate—responsibility of directing our foreign policy in an extremely perplexing and perilous world is squarely his and that he will need the comprehending support of the people of the United States as badly as they will need his wise leadership.

It is natural then for the people to be asking questions about their new Secretary of State. What sort of man is he? What is his training? What is his experience? What is his basic philosophy? How does it apply to the world today? To the United States? To Russia? What are his ideas of short-term and long-term foreign policy? Of the way to attain durable peace?

NEW SECRETARY OF STATE—II

Dean Acheson, our new Secretary of State, was born in Connecticut 55 years ago, the son of an Episcopal bishop; got an A. B. degree at Yale in 1915 and graduated from Harvard Law School in 1918; served as an ensign in the United States Navy in World War I; acted as private secretary to Justice Brandeis of the United States Supreme Court; practiced law; served as Under Secretary of the United States Treasury for a short time in 1933, resigning because of a split with President Roosevelt over the devaluation of the dollar; practiced law again; returned to Government service as Assistant Secretary of State in 1941 and served as Assistant or Under Secretary of State from February 1941 to July 1947, that is to say, during the whole of World War II and then some.

So much for his training and experience which are excellent and extensive.

What are Secretary Acheson's basic philosophy and attitude toward world affairs?

Some light may be thrown on this by considering what he did as Under Secretary of State. In addition to his work during the war years, he had a leading part in formulating our program of aid to Greece and of Soviet containment and in originating and drafting the Marshall plan. He also directed as chairman the work of the Committee on Atomic Energy which resulted in the Acheson-Lilienthal Report on the International Control of Atomic Energy which formed the basis for the Baruch plan and which is probably the finest example of men thinking, and by that thinking reaching a possible solution for an almost insoluble problem which our period of history affords.

Further light may be thrown on the question not only by what he has done but also by what he has said.

It may be recalled that at a time when we were still speaking softly to the Soviet Union in order not to offend her sensibilities, he characterized the Russian policy (February 10, 1947) as an aggressive and expanding one.

But the fullest and clearest statement of Secretary Acheson's philosophy and conclusions on various phases of foreign affairs that we have seen is his speech at Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn., on June 18, 1947, a couple of weeks before his resignation as Under Secretary of State. It was a brilliant and illuminating speech, worthy of deep consideration and extended quotation.

In it he asked himself, "What is the fundamental tradition of the American people?" His answer was this: It is "insistence upon the liberty of the individual, the worth of the individual, the ultimate test of truth by reference to the individual. * * * It seems true in society as in nature that the greatest energy is created by releasing the power of the smallest unit. In one case, the individual; in the other case, the atom. History and philosophy gave us this doctrine. Geography and experience have confirmed it."

A corollary of our insistence on our own freedom is our desire to extend freedom to others. But "we have no desire to force our behavior and ideas on other people. If for reasons incomprehensible to us they want to act differently and—to us—quite misguidedly, that is their affair. But we don't like them to push other peoples around—particularly when those other peoples are trying to live as we think all decent people should live."

Yet he made it clear that in his thinking liberty was not something to be passed around like a box of candy. "It seems to me that liberty has come to those whose stout hearts and hard heads have won it. Here again we must conclude with Justice Holmes that the mode by which the inevitable comes to pass is effort."

NEW SECRETARY OF STATE—III

One very good reason why there will probably be no break in the continuity of our foreign policy is that our policy was in the main formulated by the very man who has now been appointed Secretary of State to carry it out. This policy in its short-term phase consists largely of containment of the Soviet Union and aid to countries attempting to keep themselves free of Soviet encroachment.

In a speech at Wesleyan University in Connecticut, made just 2 weeks before his resignation from the position of Under Secretary of State on July 1, 1947, Mr. Acheson spoke strongly and freely.

Part of his speech was in effect a bill of indictment against the Soviet Union for its postwar course of aggressive expansion. After noting the aid we had given the Soviet Union up to that time, amounting to some $12,000,000,000, and the series of acts we had engaged in with a view to securing international peace and individual freedom, he charged the Soviet Union with blocking those efforts, opposing international accord and recovery, using its military position in Eastern Europe to violate the Yalta agreements, and to fasten unwanted governments and economic arrangements on the peoples involved, fostering war in Greece, et cetera. Due to these acts, he said the United Nations had not been able to "apply the principles set forth in its charter but has instead had to furnish the forum for bitter, unprofitable and inconclusive dialectics."

From this and other sources it appears clear that Mr. Acheson, far from being too soft on the Soviet Union, is in the forefront of those who would halt its expansion.

Perhaps this is the central problem of our foreign policy. But bound up with it and no less perplexing is the problem of what we should do about conditions in various parts of the world which breed revolutions, and in which, indeed, revolutions are sometimes overdue, but which lend themselves all too easily to Communist exploitation.

On this general theme Mr. Acheson said:

"This country always has responded to people struggling to attain or maintain their freedom. We have done so because it is important to us that they shall succeed. Sometimes we can do much, sometimes little, but the response is always there. It was there in the case of Greece over a century ago and in the case of Hungary and Poland and Italy. It was there throughout the nineteenth century in the struggle of the Latin-American states to obtain and keep their freedom from the encroachments of European powers. It underlay our efforts for decades to help China in her struggle against foreign subjugation.

"So President Truman was acting and the Congress was acting in the truest and soundest American tradition. The case was an extreme one because Greece was near the abyss. But the principle was as old as our country."

Such a policy is clear enough in principle. But it is very difficult in its application. We want to give Europe back to the Europeans, but not to the Darlans and the Badoglios, the black marketeers and racketeers, the Fascists or the Communists. Our great tradition is for freedom, as Mr. Acheson so clearly sees, but our intervention has not brought freedom to Greece or China, the two countries where our policy has met its most open tests.

The trouble has been perhaps in the administration of that policy. If so, the new Secretary has a job on his hands of attaining that policy's aim through more effective methods. In some countries, as in China, the problem may be insoluble. In any case we think that Mr. Acheson will cope with it—and with Russia—as well as anyone the President could have chosen.

NEW SECRETARY OF STATE—IV

The Department of State needs thorough overhauling. For a long time the United States, protected by two oceans and the British Navy, could enjoy the luxury of a situation in which no foreign policy was better than any foreign policy. Those days are gone forever. What was left was buried in the blitz of London and the atomization of Hiroshima.

Now the State Department faces a world it never made, a world which is very badly out of joint and which, being radioactive, is entirely too close for comfort. The Department was not made to deal with anything like it, but must do something about it—and fast.

When Dean Acheson's appointment is confirmed, the United States will have had five Secretaries of State within a little more

than 4 years. That is quite a turn-over for a position which demands unlimited wisdom and experience. It has been our custom to appoint men as Secretaries of State with little experience in the field of foreign policy and to give them Under Secretaries who know what foreign policy is all about.

With Dean Acheson as Secretary and James E. Webb as Under Secretary this custom will be reversed. The stage is thus set for overhauling the Department. Acheson will not have to learn about foreign policy because he knows about it already. He will not even have to formulate it because he did that as Under Secretary. He will just have to keep it rolling and tend to the steering wheel.

He and James Webb, who is an excellent administrator, can thus concentrate for a time on bringing the Department up to date as a piece of governmental machinery. It may not be futuramic when they finish the overhauling, but it will at least be a 1949 model instead of a 1919 one.

Mr. Acheson has some ideas for modernizing the Department, as James Reston points out in the New York Times:

"It is known, for example, that he favors (1) placing the foreign service and the State Department under a single administration; (2) appointing two deputy Under Secretaries of State, one for policy and one for administration; (3) reorganizing the whole assistant secretary level in the Department so that there will be eight assistant secretaries; for public affairs (including the Voice of America), for international affairs (UN and conferences), for coordinating policy with other agencies, for congressional affairs, for Europe, for the near eastern and African affairs, for far eastern affairs, and for Latin-American affairs; (4) creating an intelligence evaluation committee to advise the Secretary and keep in contact with the Central Intelligence Agency."

These, we should think, are reforms which are necessary now.

But perhaps something more is needed, something more elusive but far more important, a long-term program for durable world peace, something which must be based not on containment or balance of power, but on world law enacted and enforced by the necessary government of the whole.

The State Department has neglected this essential defense, not only of our Nation but of our civilization.

It is easy enough to see why it has done so. With a mortality rate of approximately one Secretary of State a year, and with our secretaries kept so busy traveling, conferring, and arguing that they hardly ever had time to see more than one jump ahead, how could such a long-term policy have had a chance of conception, much less of birth?

We hope that Dean Acheson will be Secretary of State a long time, and that he will do something about it. The problem of world government, for that is what it is, is a most difficult one, since it involves the creation of a government which would not be more dangerous to the liberties of men than the present anarchy which it would supersede. Yet nations must admit to the rule of law if our civilization would live. The problems of world government and of the control of atomic energy are binary stars; they cannot be solved separately. The State Department found a board of distinguished consultants useful in reaching a possible solution for the latter problem; this solution contained at least the seeds of a world government. Why would it not prove profitable for the new Secretary to appoint a board of consultants on the control of national energy through law—manned by elder statesmen such as Stimson, Baruch, Byrnes, Grenville Clark, and Thomas K. Finletter—to work out a long-range program for what must be our fundamental foreign policy, the establishment of enduring peace?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Dean Acheson to be Secretary of State?

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who is absent because of illness, would vote "yea" if present.

I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is attending the ceremonies incident to the inauguration of Hon. Elbert N. Carvel as Governor of the State of Delaware, and the Honorable Alexis I. Dupont Bayard, as Lieutenant Governor of the State of Delaware, and is therefore necessarily absent. If present, the Senator from Delaware would vote "yea."

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who are necessarily absent, would vote "yea," if present.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who is absent because of illness, would vote "yea," if present.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is unavoidably detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 83, nays 6, as follows:

YEAS—83

Aiken	Hill	Millikin
Baldwin	Hoey	Morse
Barkley	Holland	Mundt
Brewster	Humphrey	Murray
Bricker	Hunt	Myers
Broughton	Ives	Neely
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Chapman	Kefauver	Reed
Chavez	Kem	Robertson
Connally	Kerr	Russell
Cordon	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Donnell	Lodge	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Long	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Lucas	Sparkman
Ecton	McCarran	Stennis
Ellender	McCarthy	Taft
Ferguson	McClellan	Taylor
Flanders	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Fulbright	McGrath	Thomas, Utah
George	McKellar	Thye
Gillette	McMahon	Tobey
Green	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Gurney	Malone	Wiley
Hayden	Martin	Williams
Hendrickson	Maybank	Young
Hickenlooper	Miller	

NAYS—6

Bridges	Jenner	Langer
Capehart	Knowland	Wherry

NOT VOTING—7

Anderson	Schoeppel	Watkins
Downey	Tydings	
Frear	Wagner	

So Mr. Acheson's nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of the confirmation.

ALBEN W. BARKLEY

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I shall take only a minute or two of the time of the Senate.

I think all of us could not fail to detect a little sadness not only in the voice of the speaker but in the sentiments manifested by Senators when our distinguished leader on this side of the aisle, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] said, rather hesitatingly, a few moments ago, that perhaps those were his last remarks as a Senator. Although the words to which I shall now refer were used by President Roosevelt in referring to another great American, I do not know of any other man who could more aptly be described in the way that Franklin D. Roosevelt described Al Smith when he nominated him to be Democratic candidate for President: The Happy Warrior. Certainly that is the proper description of ALBEN BARKLEY.

We have known him here, and he has been loved by us as few men have been loved. He has the greatest variety of talents that could almost be imagined. He can roar like a lion or coo with the gentleness of a wooing dove. With his ever-constant good humor, he could smooth over even exasperating disagreements.

Surely, Mr. President, unless he shall come back once more to our membership with even greater honors, we shall not again see the like of ALBEN BARKLEY.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I wish to add just a word to what has been said about our majority leader, who is leaving us.

I have had a very high regard for him ever since I came to the United States Senate. I think one of the best things about the way the recent election turned out is that I was defeated by ALBEN BARKLEY. [Laughter.]

ALBEN BARKLEY has always been very kind to me. I wish to say that in the recent election I was not running against him; I was looking for an opportunity to "cuss" our foreign policy. So there was nothing personal about that matter, and in the campaign I never once mentioned ALBEN BARKLEY's name. If anyone ever asked me privately about him, I always said he was a swell fellow, and I think he is and I know he is.

Mr. President, we shall hate to have him leave our midst; but it may be better to have him sitting on the rostrum before us, where we can look at his handsome face all the time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it is not easy for me to find the words which express the subtle mixture of my feelings today as I rise to add my voice to the chorus of other voices lifted in tribute to our beloved leader, ALBEN BARKLEY.

We rejoice with him that by the grace of the American people he leaves the Senate floor to assume another and higher office. And yet our joy is tempered by our own sense of irreplaceable loss. No longer will we hear this chamber ring with his persuasive speech. No longer will we smile at the gracious wit which so distinguishes his eloquence. The rough and tumble of debate within these historic walls will always be the poorer because by reason of his office he is cut off from partaking in it.

But for those of us on this side of the aisle, it means a much graver loss. By his elevation to the Vice Presidency we lose a man who has led us for nearly 12 years—years which thrust on the broad shoulders of the majority leader legislative problems more complex and more onerous than any faced by any other leader in our time.

How valiantly he discharged the responsibility of his office must be left to the judgment of history. But while we can, let us who have been with him in the battle give testimony of the stout heart and nimble brain which earned him the respect and affection of every man of whatever party who has served in the Senate since he came here more than a score of years ago.

And, because of our esteem, let us share his pleasure at the reward he has now received at the hands of the people. For it is not every man who, having stepped over the threshold of the biblical three score years and ten, goes not into seclusion but into more exalted office. To me there is a kind of happy fitness in the fact that his career in this body should culminate by his presiding over it, where his amazing fund of parliamentary learning will be put to its most important use.

Many great men have sat in the chair of the President of the Senate. I venture to suggest, however, that since John Adams presided over the first session of the Senate no man has ever been more suited to fulfill the duties of that office than the senior Senator from Kentucky.

We remember him best for our delight in his great poise and ready wit. And yet we miss the essential point if we fail to realize that this same wit, this same poise, concealed a man of towering stature, who some day will take his rightful place among the greatest statesmen who have graced American politics since Washington and Jefferson first led the young Republic into nationhood. But only those of us who have had the privilege of day-to-day association with him in debate, in conference, and in a common bond of fellowship, can really appreciate the sterling qualities of our friend.

His career has followed in all those classical traditions of America's great men. Like another great statesman and story teller, the immortal Abraham Lincoln, BARKLEY, too, was born in a log cabin in Kentucky. He possesses the same Lincolnian traits of tolerance and humanity. In his life's struggle to succeed, he experienced similar vicissitudes.

It is not for me, as one who has served with him for the brief space of only 10 years, to describe the brilliance of that congressional career. That I leave to others in this body, whose service runs in length of years much beyond mine. Let me say only that, for my part, I shall always treasure the hours without number we have spent together as political allies, united by the bond of a deep friendship. I look forward to many more such hours which his vigor and strength so amply promise. He is still ours, though he leaves his seat on the floor to ascend to the seat of the Presiding Officer. It is a comfort to know he will be there, ready, from his rich store of experience, to lend us the guidance and counsel we have learned to trust.

I know that I speak the mind of the 96 Members of this body and, indeed, of the American people, when I say that we wish for him everything in life he wishes for himself. No man ever deserved more for his patient, devoted, and brilliant service to the American people and the institutions that we represent.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I hasten to join in the observations made in tribute to the retiring majority leader. Much has been said along that line, and I wish to join in the sentiments expressed. If the remarks just made were the last speech the Senator from Kentucky is to make in the Senate, I rather acknowledge that with reluctance, because I know the Senator would desire to take part in legislation whenever he had the opportunity.

Besides being an outstanding leader, which has been listed as one of his qualities, one thing I would mention this afternoon is that after 6 years of association with him, I pay tribute to him for rising to the heights when it became necessary to pour oil on the troubled waters. He has watched the Senate explode, which it does at times, and then stepped in, and in masterly fashion sort of quieted us, and we got down to business and performed the work the Senate was supposed to do.

I shall never forget the tribute he paid some of us at the conclusion of a very hectic session in 1944 or 1945, when the OPA and price controls were under consideration. Several times during the debate the Senator from Kentucky and the junior Senator from Nebraska had had very serious issues presented to us, he on one side and I on the other, and finally, as he went around smoothing everything over, he came over to our side of the aisle and said, "There is the junior Senator from Nebraska. I love him. I love him more than any man with whom I have so often differed."

Mr. President, that illustrated the philosophy of the retiring majority leader, and after that speech, he had me feeling that he was one of the outstanding leaders we have had in the Senate of the United States.

I therefore assure the Senator that as he retires as majority leader, those on this side of the aisle will remember him and cherish the very pleasant memories we have of him, even of some occasions when we were under pressure and there was a great deal of heat. We will reflect with pleasure upon his actions in the days to come.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, some of us who were sitting here in the Senate a few minutes ago observed what I think is a very historic incident, that is, the preparation which the majority leader, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], was making at his desk for departure from the floor of the Senate. It causes many of us sadness to see him leave his place on the floor of the United States Senate, and that is true regardless of whether we are on one side of the aisle or the other.

I rose particularly at this moment, however, for the purpose of calling attention, for the record, to one historical fact of which I am sure the people of the great State of Missouri who know of it are, and those who do not know of it would be, very proud, namely, that the birthplace of the mother of our distinguished friend, Senator ALBEN BARKLEY, was Caruthersville, Pemiscot County, Mo. I realize that the influence of a mother upon a son or daughter can be, and usually is, of the highest value in the formation of character and in the development of the traits of manhood or womanhood.

So, this afternoon, Mr. President, as one who was born in Missouri, I take pleasure in expressing to the Senator from Kentucky our pride in the fact that his mother came from our great State.

I also take this opportunity to wish him Godspeed in his future undertakings.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to express my personal regret that the Senator from Kentucky is no longer to conduct, as leader, Democratic affairs on the floor of the Senate, that we are not to be able to engage in the very pleasant controversies like those which have characterized our relations for 10 years.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky and I have worked together for some 8 years while he was majority leader. We have labored together on the Committee on Banking and Currency in attempting to work out many of the problems which arose during and after the war. We had some very violent differences of opinion on the floor, but I do not think anyone has ever questioned that the Senator from Kentucky treated everyone in the Senate most fairly throughout the administration of his office as majority leader.

During the past 2 years the Senator has, in the most kindly way, cooperated in procedure to forward the business of the Senate. He has sometimes become very excited in debate, but I do not recall an occasion when 5 minutes later he did not have all the good humor which any man could possess. I do not recall the time when he was not willing to forget personal differences of opinion, and I certainly regret very much, from the point of view of our own pleasure here on the floor of the Senate in the conduct of orderly and friendly and determined debate, that he is to take the seat on the rostrum.

Mr. President, I recall that in the play, The State of the Union, the man who was asked to take the nomination for the Vice Presidency refused to do so because he thought his mother would not like it, and the answer to him was, "Oh, she will never know." [Laughter.] I hope very much that we never will really know that the senior Senator from Kentucky is removed from us as Vice President, and I trust that he will maintain the same personal relations with us here in the Senate which have characterized our friendship during the last 10 years. [Applause.]

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief comment on the very high esteem in which I hold the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. I should like to point out to the young people of America that if they will study the political record of the Senator from Kentucky they will study a record of statesmanship put to work. I wish here publicly to express my debt of gratitude to the Senator for the inspiration he was to me long before I came to the Senate of

the United States, and has been ever since I have been a Member of the Senate. He is a great liberal, and, after all, standing for the liberal principles of great human values knows no party. I submit his record as an example of liberalism in the highest sense, put to work for the benefit of the people of his country.

OBJECTION TO MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES DURING SENATE SESSIONS AND NOTICE OF OBJECTION TO CERTAIN UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the last comment I want to make is by way of an announcement so that—although I do not hope for agreement—there will be no misunderstanding as to two parliamentary positions I shall take during the Eighty-first Congress. I think the time to announce those positions is at the beginning of the Congress.

Last Thursday afternoon, while the Senate was in session, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare held a very important meeting. It was a meeting I would have liked to attend had it not been for the fact that I felt that my first duty was on the floor of the Senate, and for the further fact that I was engaged in a running debate during most of Thursday afternoon. However, Mr. President, I have before expressed my conviction that the Senate sessions should be attended by Members of the Senate and that I do not think that at the time Senate sessions are being held Senate committee meetings should be held. Certainly that is not only the spirit and the intent, but it is also the letter of the law. I read the following provisions from the Reorganization Act of 1946:

> No standing committee of the Senate or the House, except the Committee on Rules of the House, shall sit, without special leave, while the Senate or the House, as the case may be, is in session.

This morning, Mr. President, we had another meeting of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and I was advised at that meeting that the committee last Thursday afternoon had decided to hold its regular meetings on Thursday afternoons. At the meeting this morning I protested and said that the junior Senator from Oregon, within his rights as a Senator, would always object on the floor of the Senate to any meeting of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare being called on Thursday afternoon, if the Senate were in session, unless some exceptional circumstances would justify departure from what I think clearly was intended by the provision I have read from the Reorganization Act.

Mr. President, the holding of Senate committee meetings when the Senate is in session has become the practice of the Senate and not the exception. Therefore I serve notice, Mr. President, that, insofar as any Senate committee of which I am a member is concerned, it will be my parliamentary practice to object to any meeting being held while the Senate is in session. If that is not the desire of the Senate, then let the Senate change the Reorganization Act. I submit, Mr. President, that if enough Members of this body would follow that practice in connection with committees of which they are members, we soon would bring about a change in our procedure which is much to be desired, namely, a modification of our rules whereby the Senate would meet on certain specific days, such as, for example, Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, leaving the other days for committee meetings. But I do not think that it is consonant with orderly procedure in the Senate and with deliberate consideration of the people's business to have this body in session and at the same time have a series of committee meetings being held around the Capitol which take the membership of the Senate off the floor.

Mr. President, the second notice I want to serve is that it will be my practice, as a general rule, to object to any unanimous-consent agreements to fix voting time as of a specific hour, with a proviso that a certain amount of time shall be divided up at the discretion of the leaders on the two sides of a bill prior to the vote. As a general practice, again subject only to exception when it can be demonstrated to me that it is an exception, that it is desirable, or recognized, the junior Senator from Oregon will object to all unanimous-consent requests to vote as of a certain time. Although I have no right to it I shall request, and at this time wish to make the request, that I be allowed the courtesy of a quorum call before any such unanimous-consent request is made during the Eighty-first Congress.

THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, this seems an appropriate time to refer on the Senate floor to the mixed situation in the Middle East. Today in the United States the Senate just now has confirmed the nomination of a new Secretary of State, and today in Parliament Winston Churchill and others are challenging Britain's Palestine policy. It is reported that Foreign Secretary Bevin will be asked for a statement on the Holy Land. I understand also that at least three Cabinet Members of His Majesty's Government are against Mr. Bevin's policy.

A number of Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives have mentioned the distressing subject of one-sided action by the British in the Middle East. I should like to join them in deploring this unfortunate position.

To see a great power bullying a small and weak neighbor is never a pretty spectacle. If the small and weak country shows a lot of courage and fighting spirit, and is willing to defend itself to the death against invasion, this does not change the fact that it is still small and weak.

The new Jewish State of Israel has shown just that spirit. It has shown courage and fighting spirit, and has successfully defended itself against invasion and attempts to destroy it by the six neighboring governments which ganged up on it. As a result, our respect for its people has grown rather than diminished. They have certainly earned the right to be left alone, especially now when these same neighbors seem ready to talk peace.

What the British are doing in the Middle East does not make nice reading. Everybody realizes what the British under the direction of Foreign Secretary Bevin are up to. They are after that part of the Jewish state which is known as the Negev and to some extent they are moved by wounded pride and anger against the Jews. Neither is a sentiment worthy of a great nation. If it is true, as our English friends say in public, that the Negev is an empty desert, it is not worthy of a great empire to begrudge a tiny nation the possession of a small desert. If it is true, as the Jews assert publicly and our English friends whisper in confidential tones, that the Negev has oil and other riches, Britain, which controls so much oil and so many riches, does not play a very noble role in trying to grasp for itself the one possible source of mineral wealth of that tiny new state; and if the main reason for this intrigue is unadulterated frustration and sheer bitterness of the British Foreign Secretary, Mr. Bevin, and some other British officials, this certainly will not contribute to our esteem of British policy.

But the worst feature of all, in my opinion, is the devious search for alibis and the succession of lame excuses with which the British Government tries to cover up and to justify its course of action. Anything, even the brutal and crude admission that Britain wants to grab the Negev because it wants it, because it is strong enough to get it, and because it is annoyed at the Jews for having thrown her out of Palestine, would be better than such a show of hypocrisy.

At first, I understand, they pretended that they were coming to the aid of the Egyptians because Egypt asked them to—until it was shown that the Egyptians had not asked them at all. Then it was asserted that British planes were conducting their reconnaissance flight over Egyptian territory only—until it was proved that they were outside of Egypt and inside Palestine. Still later, British spokesmen explained that their planes went up at the request of the observers sent to the Middle East by the United Nations—until those observers denied ever having made such a request. Having run out of other excuses, they have even tried to involve the United States in these machinations by implying that the planes were sent up as a result of consultations with the United States Government—until our own Government vehemently denied it.

The latest British formula, I understand, while admitting that they sent the planes up on their own responsibility, is to hint that in some way they did it in order to do us a favor and to supply us with information which we allegedly wanted to obtain.

Let me say to our English friends that they will not achieve anything by that kind of tactics. They and we are united to keep the world as free, as peaceful, and as prosperous as possible. We hope that as a result of our united efforts the world will find that peace which men of good will everywhere seek. If a fight cannot be avoided, let us pick on someone our own size. The alliance between our country and Britain was not made in order to grab pennies from infants, nor to grab the Negev from the State of Israel, which is smaller than the State of Maryland. But if the British have to do it, let them come out in the open and admit that greed or frustration or whatever it is that induces them to pick a quarrel which might lead to another world war. Let them stop pretending to be noble while carrying on an act of petty imperialism, since no one will believe them anyway.

PROGRAM OF THE SENATE FOR REMAINDER OF THE WEEK

On motion of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, it was—

Ordered, That at the conclusion of its business today the Senate adjourn until Thursday, January 20, at 11:45 a. m.; that upon reconvening it proceed in a body to the east front of the Capitol for the ceremonies attending the inauguration of the President and Vice President of the United States; and that at the conclusion of said ceremonies the Senate stand adjourned until Monday next.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, under the order just entered, I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate, under the order previously entered, adjourned until Thursday, January 20, 1949, at 11:45 a. m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate January 18, 1949:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Albert J. Loveland, of Iowa, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate January 18, 1949:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Dean G. Acheson, to be Secretary of State.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 18, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, as we meet today, help the Congress to walk in honor, avoiding anything that would dim the glory of free government.

O for a world of strife shut out and a world of good will and patience shut in. More and more give us courage to resist the allurements which so often are the fruits of success; more and more give us strength to fulfill our mission with patriotic zeal. Steady our hearts; guide us with Thine eye and keep us this day without sin. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SPECIAL ORDER VACATED

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted to me by the House for today be vacated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, upon the conclusion of the legislative business of the day and the special orders heretofore entered for that day, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on two subjects and to include newspaper articles.

Mr. GRAHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech made by a colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. BENJAMIN FRANKLIN JAMES, at the Franklin Memorial yesterday.

Mr. HARRISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include sundry newspaper articles.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix in two separate instances, in one to include a statement from the Worldgram and in the other an address by Dr. Alexander Brin.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the State Legislature of South Carolina.

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. HOLIFIELD) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain extraneous material.

HOTEL RATES IN WASHINGTON

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, so far as I know a number of the hotels in Washington have not seen fit to take the public into their confidence by giving to the press a statement of their rates for the period of the inauguration. I, therefore, suggest that we cooperate in Congress by requesting our friends who are visiting Washington at this time to demand receipted bills when they make payment for their rooms and that they write on the back of the bill the type of accommodations they had. If we Members will accumulate this kind of evidence from our visitors we will have all the evidence we will need. In the meantime as to such hotel managers as are unwilling to reveal their rates, I recommend they read at least the last half of verse 19, chapter 3, of the Gospel of St. John.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include certain statements and excerpts.

Mr. HEFFERNAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein a tribute to Max Abelman, secretary to the board of directors of the Jewish Hospital, of Brooklyn.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

THE STEEL SHORTAGE

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, you have listened with patience many times during the past year to comments I have had to make on this floor as to the necessity of bringing steel scrap from the German Ruhr to augment our scanty supplies of this vitally important ingredient to the manufacture of steel. Despite the fact that there has been no lessening of demand for finished steel, many of you may have noticed in the current press that the market for scrap steel has broken, and this must, at least in part, be attributed to the shipments that have been coming over from western Europe in our relief ships, which for the most part are returning empty. Whatever return of this scrap steel has been induced has been helpful, but I want to say to you that this has only been a mere trickle of what it should have been or what it should still be to reinforce our economy, not only for our domestic needs but to meet our commitments abroad. In other words, instead of 100,000 tons a month, we should be bringing back several times that amount to safeguard our position, and any idea that this could impair steel production abroad, which is steadily on the increase, cannot be supported by competent authority.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, at the conclusion of the address by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], I may be permitted to proceed for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND THE SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Thursday next, the Clerk of the House be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills or joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE UNTIL JANUARY 20 AND FROM JANUARY 20 TO JANUARY 24, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 55) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That when the House adjourns on Tuesday, January 18, 1949, it stand adjourned until 11:30 a. m. Thursday, January 20, 1949; that upon convening at that hour the House proceed to the east front of the Capitol for the purpose of attending the inaugural ceremonies of the President and Vice President of the United States; and that upon the conclusion of the ceremonies the House stand adjourned until Monday, January 24, 1949.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make the following announcement:

The Joint Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies was appointed during the last session of Congress. The Chair has had many inquiries by Members with reference to the proceedings on Thursday. The Chair has been requested to announce to the House that all Members who expect to go out on the official platform will assemble here in the Chamber of the House at 11:30 o'clock Thursday morning. I have been requested to state that in order to get by the police, including the marines, it will be absolutely necessary for each Member to display the official ticket in order to get his seat on the Presidential platform. The committee feels that this is an entirely reasonable regulation.

If a Member does not have his ticket, it will be impossible for him to get his seat, for there will be no opportunity to join the procession after it leaves the House. There are no tickets available to ex-Members for this platform, inasmuch as the seating capacity is limited.

The Chair is further requested to announce that no children will be allowed upon the platform, and there will be no seats except for Members actually holding tickets for their own seats.

That, the Chair thinks, covers the announcement that he was requested to make.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution, House Resolution 56, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Agriculture: Harold D. Cooley (chairman), North Carolina; Stephen Pace, Georgia; W. R. Poage, Texas; George M. Grant, Alabama; Walter K. Granger, Utah; E. C. Gathings, Arkansas; John L. McMillan, South Carolina; Eugene Worley, Texas; Thomas G. Abernethy, Mississippi; Carl Albert, Oklahoma; Watkins M. Abbitt, Virginia; James G. Polk, Ohio; Pat Sutton, Tennessee; Eugene D. O'Sullivan, Nebraska; John C. Davies, New York; Cecil F. White, California; James F. Lind, Pennsylvania; E. L. Bartlett, Alaska; A. Fernós-Isern, Puerto Rico.

Committee on Appropriations: Clarence Cannon (chairman), Missouri; John H. Kerr, North Carolina; George H. Mahon, Texas; Harry R. Sheppard, California; Albert Thomas, Texas; Michael J. Kirwan, Ohio; W. F. Norrell, Arkansas; Albert Gore, Tennessee; Jamie L. Whitten, Mississippi; George W. Andrews, Alabama; John J. Rooney, New York; J. Vaughan Gary, Virginia; Joe B. Bates, Kentucky; John E. Fogarty, Rhode Island; Henry M. Jackson, Washington; Robert L. F. Sikes, Florida; Antonio M. Fernandez, New Mexico; William C. Stigler, Oklahoma; E. H. Hedrick, West Virginia; Prince H. Preston, Jr., Georgia; Otto E. Passman, Louisiana; Louis C. Rabaut, Michigan; Daniel J. Flood, Pennsylvania; Christopher C. McGrath, New York; Sidney R. Yates, Illinois; Foster Furcolo, Massachusetts; Edward H. Kruse, Jr., Indiana.

Committee on Armed Services: Carl Vinson (chairman), Georgia; Overton Brooks, Louisiana; Paul J. Kilday, Texas; Carl T. Durham, North Carolina; Lansdale G. Sasscer, Maryland; James J. Heffernan, New York; L. Mendel Rivers, South Carolina; Philip J. Philbin, Massachusetts; F. Edward Hébert, Louisiana; Arthur Winstead, Mississippi; Franck R. Havenner, California; Melvin Price, Illinois; O. C. Fisher, Texas; Porter Hardy, Jr., Virginia; William J. Green, Jr., Pennsylvania; Clyde Doyle, California; Edward deGraffenried, Alabama; John R. Walsh, Indiana; L. Gary Clemente, New York; E. L. Bartlett, Alaska; A. Fernós-Isern, Puerto Rico.

Committee on the Judiciary: Emanuel Celler (chairman), New York; Francis E. Walter, Pennsylvania; Sam Hobbs, Alabama; William T. Byrne, New York; Joseph R. Bryson, South Carolina; Thomas J. Lane, Massachusetts; Martin Gorski, Illinois; Michael A. Feighan, Ohio; Frank L. Chelf, Kentucky; Ed Gossett, Texas; J. Frank Wilson, Texas; Robert L. Ramsay, West Virginia; Dixie Gilmer, Oklahoma; Boyd Tackett, Arkansas; Edwin E. Willis, Louisiana; Winfield K. Denton, Indiana; James B. Frazier, Jr., Tennessee.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Schuyler Otis Bland (chairman), Virginia; Edward J. Hart, New Jersey; Herbert C. Bonner, North Carolina; Donald L. O'Toole, New York; Clark W. Thompson, Texas; Frank W. Boykin, Alabama; Edward A. Garmatz, Maryland; Victor Wickersham, Oklahoma; William A. Barrett, Pennsylvania; James B. Hare, South Carolina; Charles E. Bennett, Florida; Phil J. Welch, Missouri; Edward Breen, Ohio; James J. Murphy, New York; Tom B. Fugate, Virginia.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Tom Murray (chairman), Tennessee; James H. Morrison, Louisiana; George P. Miller, California; James C. Davis, Georgia; John Bell Williams, Mississippi; John A. Whitaker, Kentucky; Thurman C. Crook, Indiana; Raymond W. Karst, Missouri; Homer Thornberry, Texas; James V. Buckley, Illinois; F. Ertel Carlyle, North Carolina; Eugene J. McCarthy, Minnesota; A. S. Herlong, Jr., Florida; Chester C. Gorski, New York; George M. Rhodes, Pennsylvania.

Committee on Public Lands: Andrew L. Somers (chairman), New York; J. Hardin Peterson, Florida; John R. Murdock, Arizona; Clair Engle, California; Monroe M. Redden, North Carolina; Tobey Morris, Oklahoma; Ken Regan, Texas; Lloyd M. Bentsen, Jr., Texas; Compton I. White, Idaho; Walter S. Baring, Nevada; Reva Beck Bosone, Utah; Fred Marshall, Minnesota; Harry P. O'Neill, Pennsylvania; Wayne N. Aspinall, Colorado; John E. Miles, New Mexico; E. L. Bartlett, Alaska; A. Fernós-Isern, Puerto Rico.

Committee on Public Works: William M. Whittington (chairman), Mississippi; Charles A. Buckley, New York; Henry D. Larcade, Jr., Louisiana; George H. Fallon, Maryland; Clifford Davis, Tennessee; James W. Trimble, Arkansas; John A. Blatnik, Minnesota; Tom Pickett, Texas; Robert E. Jones, Jr., Alabama; Henderson Lanham, Georgia; Robert T. Secrest, Ohio; Harry J. Davenport, Pennsylvania; T. Vincent Quinn, New York; Morgan M. Moulder, Missouri; John H. Marsalis, Colorado; Chester A. Chesney, Illinois.

Committee on Rules: Adolph J. Sabath (chairman), Illinois; E. E. Cox, Georgia; Howard W. Smith, Virginia; William M. Colmer, Mississippi; Ray J. Madden, Indiana; John E. Lyle, Jr., Texas; John McSweeney, Ohio; James J. Delaney, New York.

Committee on Un-American Activities: John S. Wood (chairman), Georgia; Francis E. Walter, Pennsylvania; Burr P. Harrison, Virginia; John McSweeney, Ohio; Morgan M. Moulder, Missouri.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: John E. Rankin (chairman), Mississippi; A. Leonard Allen, Louisiana; Walter B. Huber, Ohio; Olin E. Teague, Texas; Joe L. Evins, Tennessee; W. M. (Don) Wheeler, Georgia; Hamilton C. Jones, North Carolina; Harold D. Donohue, Massachusetts; Clarence G. Burton, Virginia; Peter F. Mack, Jr., Illinois; Clare Magee, Missouri; Earl Chudoff, Pennsylvania; Harley O. Staggers, West Virginia; Peter W. Rodino, Jr., New Jersey; James E. Noland, Indiana; Carl Elliott, Alabama; Harold A. Patten, Arizona.

Committee on Banking and Currency: Brent Spence (chairman), Kentucky; Paul Brown, Georgia; Wright Patman, Texas; A. S. Mike Monroney, Oklahoma; Brooks Hays, Arkansas; Albert Rains, Alabama; Frank Buchanan, Pennsylvania; Abraham J. Multer, New York; Charles B. Deane, North Carolina; George D. O'Brien, Michigan; Chase Going Woodhouse, Connecticut; Clinton D. McKinnon, California; Hugh J. Addonizio, New Jersey; Isidore Dollinger, New York; Hugh B. Mitchell, Washington; Barratt O'Hara, Illinois.

Committee on the District of Columbia: John L. McMillan (chairman), South Carolina; Oren Harris, Arkansas; Thomas G. Abernethy, Mississippi; Howard W. Smith, Virginia; Arthur G. Klein, New York; Olin E. Teague, Texas; John F. Kennedy, Massachusetts; Robert E. Jones, Jr., Alabama; James C. Davis, Georgia; Walter K. Granger, Utah; James H. Morrison, Louisiana; George P. Miller, California; Frank Buchanan, Pennsylvania; Monroe M. Redden, North Carolina; Paul C. Jones, Missouri.

Committee on Education and Labor: John Lesinski (chairman), Michigan; Graham A. Barden, North Carolina; Augustine B. Kelley, Pennsylvania; Adam C. Powell, Jr., New York; John S. Wood, Georgia; John F. Kennedy, Massachusetts; Wingate H. Lucas, Texas; Cleveland M. Bailey, West Virginia; Leonard Irving, Missouri; Carl D. Perkins, Kentucky; Charles R. Howell, New Jersey; Hugo S. Sims,

South Carolina; Andrew Jacobs, Indiana; Thomas H. Burke, Ohio; Tom Steed, Oklahoma; Roy W. Wier, Minnesota.

Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments: William L. Dawson (chairman), Illinois; Chet Holifield, California; Henderson Lanham, Georgia; Porter Hardy, Jr., Virginia; Frank M. Karsten, Missouri; John W. McCormack, Massachusetts; Herbert C. Bonner, North Carolina; George G. Sadowski, Michigan; Walter B. Huber, Ohio; John A. Blatnik, Minnesota; Harold D. Donohue, Massachusetts; Earl T. Wagner, Ohio; Robert L. Coffey, Jr., Pennsylvania; William P. Bolton, Maryland; M. G. Burnside, West Virginia; Richard Bolling, Missouri; Anthony F. Tauriello, New York.

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Sol Bloom (chairman), New York; John Kee, West Virginia; James P. Richards, South Carolina; Joseph L. Pfeifer, New York; Thomas S. Gordon, Illinois; Helen Gahagan Douglas, California; Mike Mansfield, Montana; Thomas E. Morgan, Pennsylvania; Laurie C. Battle, Alabama; George A. Smathers, Florida; A. S. J. Carnahan, Missouri; Thurmond Chatham, North Carolina; Clement J. Zablocki, Wisconsin; Abraham A. Ribicoff, Connecticut.

Committee on House Administration: Mary T. Norton (chairman), New Jersey; Thomas B. Stanley, Virginia; Burr P. Harrison, Virginia; Omar Burleson, Texas; George A. Smathers, Florida; Charles B. Deane, North Carolina; Edward A. Garmatz, Maryland; Ken Regan, Texas; James W. Trimble, Arkansas; Carl Albert, Oklahoma; W. M. (Don) Wheeler, Georgia; Paul C. Jones, Missouri; Wayne L. Hays, Ohio; Anthony Cavalcante, Pennsylvania; George H. Christopher, Missouri; Vito Marcantonio, New York.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Robert Crosser (chairman), Ohio; Alfred L. Bulwinkle, North Carolina; Lindley Beckworth, Texas; J. Percy Priest, Tennessee; Oren Harris, Arkansas; George G. Sadowski, Michigan; Dwight L. Rogers, Florida; Eugene J. Keogh, New York; Arthur G. Klein, New York; Thomas B. Stanley, Virginia; John B. Sullivan, Missouri; William T. Granahan, Pennsylvania; Andrew J. Biemiller, Wisconsin; John A. McGuire, Connecticut; George H. Wilson, Oklahoma; Neil J. Linehan, Illinois; Thomas R. Underwood, Kentucky.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 57) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Agriculture: Clifford R. Hope, Kansas; August H. Andresen, Minnesota; Reid F. Murray, Wisconsin; Edwin Arthur Hall, New York; William S. Hill, Colorado; Charles B. Hoeven, Iowa; Sid Simpson, Illinois; Ernest K. Bramblett, California; Paul B. Dague, Pennsylvania; Norris Cotton, New Hampshire; Joseph R. Farrington, Hawaii.

Committee on Appropriations: John Taber, New York; Richard B. Wigglesworth, Massachusetts; Charles A. Plumley, Vermont; Albert J. Engel, Michigan; Karl Stefan, Nebraska; Francis Case, South Dakota; Frank B. Keefe, Wisconsin; Ben F. Jensen, Iowa; H. Carl Andersen, Minnesota; Walt Horan, Washington; Gordon Canfield, New Jersey; Ivor D. Fenton, Pennsylvania; Ralph E. Church, Illinois; Lowell Stockman, Oregon; John Phillips, California; Errett P. Scrivner, Kansas; Frederic R. Coudert, Jr., New York; Cliff Clevenger, Ohio.

Committee on Armed Services: Dewey Short, Missouri; Leslie C. Arends, Illinois; W. Sterling Cole, New York; J. Parnell Thomas, New Jersey; George J. Bates, Massachusetts; Paul W. Shafer, Michigan; Charles H. Elston, Ohio; Jack Z. Anderson, California; William W. Blackney, Michigan; Leroy Johnson, California; Harry L. Towe, New Jersey; Leon H. Gavin, Pennsylvania; Walter Norblad, Oregon; James E. Van Zandt, Pennsylvania; Joseph R. Farrington, Hawaii.

Committee on Banking and Currency: Jesse P. Wolcott, Michigan; Ralph A. Gamble, New York; Frederick C. Smith, Ohio; John C. Kunkel, Pennsylvania; Henry O. Talle, Iowa; Rolla C. McMillen, Illinois; Clarence E. Kilburn, New York; Albert M. Cole, Kansas; Merlin Hull, Wisconsin; Hardie Scott, Pennsylvania; Donald W. Nicholson, Massachusetts.

Committee on the District of Columbia: George J. Bates, Massachusetts; Sid Simpson, Illinois; J. Glenn Beall, Maryland; Joseph P. O'Hara, Minnesota; Henry O. Talle, Iowa; A. L. Miller, Nebraska; James C. Auchincloss, New Jersey; John J. Allen, Jr., California; Benjamin F. James, Pennsylvania.

Committee on Education and Labor: Samuel K. McConnell, Jr., Pennsylvania, Ralph W. Gwinn, New York; Walter E. Brehm, Ohio; Wint Smith, Kansas; Carroll D. Kearns, Pennsylvania; Richard M. Nixon, California; Thruston Ballard Morton, Kentucky; Thomas H. Werdel, California; Harold H. Velde, Illinois.

Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments: Clare E. Hoffman, Michigan; Robert F. Rich, Pennsylvania; R. Walter Riehlman, New York; Ralph Harvey, Indiana; Charles A. Halleck, Indiana; Harold O. Lovre, South Dakota; William L. Pfeiffer, New York.

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Charles A. Eaton, New Jersey; Robert B. Chiperfield, Illinois; John M. Vorys, Ohio; Frances P. Bolton, Ohio; Lawrence H. Smith, Wisconsin; Chester E. Merrow, New Hampshire; Walter H. Judd, Minnesota; James G. Fulton, Pennsylvania; Jacob K. Javits, New York; John Davis Lodge, Connecticut; Donald L. Jackson, California.

Committee on House Administration: Karl M. LeCompte, Iowa; C. W. (Runt) Bishop, Illinois; Earl Wilson, Indiana; Benjamin F. James, Pennsylvania.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Charles A. Wolverton, New Jersey; Carl Hinshaw, California; Leonard W. Hall, New York; Joseph P. O'Hara, Minnesota; Wilson D. Gillette, Pennsylvania; Robert Hale, Maine; Harris Ellsworth, Oregon; James I. Dolliver, Iowa; John W. Heselton, Massachusetts; Hugh D. Scott, Jr., Pennsylvania; John B. Bennett, Michigan.

Committee on the Judiciary: Earl C. Michener, Michigan; Chauncey W. Reed, Illinois; Louis E. Graham, Pennsylvania; Frank Fellows, Maine; John Jennings, Jr., Tennessee; Clifford P. Case, New Jersey; Kenneth B. Keating, New York; William M. McCulloch, Ohio; J. Caleb Boggs, Delaware; Angier L. Goodwin, Massachusetts.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Alvin F. Weichel, Ohio; T. Millet Hand, New Jersey; Henry J. Latham, New York; Thor C. Tollefson, Washington; John J. Allen, Jr., California; Edward T. Miller, Maryland; Charles E. Potter, Michigan; Franklin H. Lichtenwalter, Pennsylvania; Edgar A. Jonas, Illinois; Charles P. Nelson, Maine.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Edward H. Rees, Kansas; Harold C. Hagen, Minnesota; Robert J. Corbett, Pennsylvania; Katharine St. George, New York; Antoni N. Sadlak, Connecticut; Edward H. Jenison, Illinois; Usher L. Burdick, North Dakota; Gardner R. Withrow, Wisconsin; H. R. Gross, Iowa; James S. Golden, Kentucky.

Committee on Public Lands: Richard J. Welch, California; Fred L. Crawford, Michigan; William Lemke, North Dakota; Frank A. Barrett, Wyoming; Dean P. Taylor, New York; Jay LePevre, New York; A. L. Miller, Nebraska; Wesley A. D'Ewart, Montana; Norris Poulson, California; John Sanborn, Idaho; Joseph R. Farrington, Hawaii.

Committee on Public Works: George A. Dondero, Michigan; Homer D. Angell, Oregon; J. Harry McGregor, Ohio; Paul Cunningham, Iowa; James C. Auchincloss, New Jersey; J. Glenn Beall, Maryland; Gordon L. McDonough, California; W. Kingsland Macy, New York; Russell V. Mack, Washington; Charles W. Vursell, Illinois; Gerald R. Ford, Michigan.

Committee on Rules: Leo E. Allen, Illinois; Clarence J. Brown, Ohio; James W. Wadsworth, New York; Christian A. Herter, Massachusetts.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Edith Nourse Rogers, Massachusetts; Bernard W. (Pat) Kearney, New York; Alvin E. O'Konski, Wisconsin; Herbert A. Meyer, Kansas; James T. Patterson, Connecticut; Dayton E. Phillips, Tennessee; Glenn R. Davis, Wisconsin; Hubert B. Scudder, California; Cecil M. Harden, Indiana; Richard W. Hoffman, Illinois.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARDY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Woodrow Wilson.

BEVIN BLOCKS PEACE

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, the entire world could be at peace today but for one person—Ernest Bevin. His shameful, disgraceful behavior is causing us much concern.

It is clear that after the Arabs refused to continue their war against the Israeli Government with the use of British arms, the British Government, under Bevin, continued the undeclared war with its own manpower.

It is obvious today that, left alone, the Arabs and Israelis could negotiate a peaceful settlement of their differences. However, Bevin will not permit it to happen. Britain's official policy toward Palestine and Israel has been almost solely dictated by Bevin. This policy, which will be tested in full-dress debate in Parliament today, is one of nonrecognition of Israel and blocking Israel's entry into the United Nations and of restricting the new state in order to obtain and control the Negev and destroy the new nation of Israel.

Not only has Britain but the Netherlands as well have deliberately gone out of their way to break down the effectiveness of the United Nations. We will not permit them to make the United Nations another League of Nations. This is our last chance of world peace—another war will wipe out civilization.

We want peace and will exert all our efforts in that direction. If we are to have peace, we must recognize the sovereignty of other nations; we must certainly recognize Israel. Of course, ways

must be found to bring unruly and obstreperous nations into line. We must hit them where it hurts them the most; not by declaration of war, but by withholding assistance.

The Marshall plan was never put into being to permit nations to use the funds for war. Are we to continue to give these nations help so that they in turn can continue their undeclared wars? It is our job to take the most effective means at our disposal to put a stop to all this blundering. The most effective action which we can take unilaterally is to lift the arms embargo to Israel, cement our friendship by extending de jure recognition, and approve the economic loans already being negotiated. This we must do at once. But we can and should go a large step further. We should make it clear at once that our European recovery funds will be shut off immediately to any nation, including Great Britain, which persists in financing a war of aggression.

We have been, in fact, nearly that firm with the Netherlands on Indonesia. We must be very firm with both these nations now, since if we falter at this time, the peace in Israel and the hope of peace in the world will be sacrificed to Ernest Bevin's hatred of Israel and his covetousness of the oil and land of the Negev.

The American people do not intend to finance any wars. We can best prove to the world that we want peace by withholding all Marshall-plan aid from any country which directly or indirectly participates in any acts of aggression. We must act at once. Any delay on our part at this time will be disastrous to world peace.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEEFE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one an address he delivered before the Alexander Hamilton Club of Tulsa, Okla., on the evening of January 15, and in the other an editorial published in the Tulsa Tribune of January 15.

Mr. SCRIVNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article showing that Kansas needs a second Federal judge.

Mr. PETERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Representative WELCH of California.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a series of four articles from the New York Times as to how displaced persons have fared in the United States, notwithstanding the additional expense, which is estimated by the Government Printing Office at $177.50.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, this will be perhaps the last opportunity this week to make an announcement in relation to the program for next week.

The committees have been officially organized, and many of them are going to start functioning next Monday. I am unable to state to the House at this time any program for next week. It is all dependent upon what action is taken by any of the committees. For example, if the minimum-wage law is reported out, I would make every effort to bring it up next week. I say this to illustrate my state of mind and my intentions. I cannot see that many bills would be reported out next week that could be called up, but there might be one or two which, if they are reported out of committee, I shall make every effort to bring up. I cannot give the House any kind of definite information as to the program for next week. I am sorry I am in this position, but there is no other statement I can make to the House at this time.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman kindly tell us what the one or two bills are that may be brought up?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable to state that, except that I referred to bringing up the legislation regarding increasing the minimum wage, if that is reported out of committee. I hope they will not have more than 1 day of hearings on that. It has been heard and reheard so many times that everybody knows his mind on that subject. I am very hopeful that the Committee on Education and Labor will hold hearings on that matter next Monday. I do not know whether they will or not, but I hope they will, and report out the bill. If so, I shall make every effort to bring it up.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman would expect, of course, that on a bill of such great magnitude and importance to the American economy as a minimum-wage bill, that there would be at least 1 day of hearing and consideration in committee, would he not?

Mr. McCORMACK. I said 1 day. Of course, that is up to the committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. But he would expect that it would be given at least 1 day's consideration?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is up to the committee. Of course, my personal opinion is that it has been heard and reheard many times. There have been many hearings on it in past years.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. But the gentleman realizes, of course, that there are a good many new Members in the House of Representatives and on the committee and they might like to know about it, too.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, it is a matter of great import and favorable to the national economy of our country. I am sure that is what my friend had in mind.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I am referring to orderly procedure in the House and the orderly procedure of the work of legislating.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, if a bill is reported out, I want to advise the House that I naturally shall make every effort possible to bring it up next week. Whether or not it will be reported out, I cannot say. I hope it will be reported out, and, if it is, I shall make every effort to bring it up.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. Has the Committee on House Administration on your side been completed?

Mr. McCORMACK. I believe so. I believe there are one or two vacancies, but it has been completed.

Mr. REED of New York. The reason I ask is that I am very anxious, if possible, to have the bill which I introduced to amend the Reorganization Act, to benefit about 14 or 15 employees who are completely out of employment, and will be for 1 year, unless we can get that bill out.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sure, if my friend will take that matter up with the chairman of the committee, he will find a very responsive state of mind to hearings on that. I am in agreement with the gentleman, as I stated when he made his 1-minute speech several days ago.

Mr. REED of New York. I was looking over the Chamber and I believe the chairman of the committee is not present on the floor. I wondered whether the committee had been completed.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It is a rather difficult one, but knowing the competency of the gentleman, I venture to put it. Is it your policy or your purpose to get around so that we adjourn sometime in July early?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course the gentleman is looking many months ahead.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I know the gentleman has a program and I know his efficiency. I wonder if we are going to get it through, because some of us want to make our plans.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am naturally human enough to be pleased with the gentleman's flattery. I can assure the gentleman we will expedite matters as quickly as possible and I am hopeful, without committing myself and looking months ahead, as I say, that we will be through at least by the early part of July.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I want to say to the gentleman that it was not flattery, but just a statement of fact.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is awfully nice of the gentleman.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 24 minutes, p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, January 20, 1949, at 11:30 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

88. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Thirty-fourth Annual Report of the Federal Trade Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

89. A letter from the Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, transmitting a copy of the summary (designated as pt. 1) of the First Annual Report of the Tariff Commission on the Operation of the Trade Agreements Program, through June 1934 to April 1948; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 1639. A bill making additional appropriations for the welfare of Indians in the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 1640. A bill to authorize the construction of a new post office, courthouse, and customhouse building at Evansville, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 1641. A bill to provide that Federal funds shall not be used for loans, grants, or other financial assistance to provide housing with respect to which there is any discrimination against occupancy on account of race, religion, color, ancestry, or national origin; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1642. A bill to withhold Federal aid from schools which discriminate between students by reason of their race, color, religion, ancestry, or national origin; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1643. A bill to amend section 118 of Public Law 472 of the Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 1644. A bill to provide for the preservation of the frigate *Constellation*; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 1645. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 1646. A bill to provide retirement annuities for retired fourth-class postmasters with 30 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 1647. A bill to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act with reference to the general powers of Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 1648. A bill to correct the inequities of Public Law 317 and to provide credit for faithful service to all substitute employees of the postal service when appointed to regular positions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 1649. A bill to repeal section 342 (h) of the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1650. A bill to amend the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act of 1934; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 1651. A bill designating building guards employed in public buildings in the departmental and field service as United States Building Police, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 1652. A bill to extend pension benefits under the laws reenacted by Public Law 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, August 13, 1935, as now or hereafter amended to certain persons who served with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, after July 4, 1902, and prior to January 1, 1914, and to their unremarried widows, child, or children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 1653. A bill for the erection of a public building at Hemingway, S. C., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 1654. A bill to extend pension benefits under the laws reenacted by Public Law 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, August 13, 1935, as now or hereafter amended, to certain persons who served with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, after July 4, 1902, and prior to January 1, 1914, and to their unremarried widows, child, or children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1655. A bill to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the acquisition and development of systems of State parks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 1656. A bill to require that one member of the Interstate Commerce Commission be from the New England States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POLK:

H. R. 1657. A bill to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 1658. A bill to equalize the purchasing power of the American dollar and currencies of the United States when the same come into competition with foreign moneys in the purchase of goods and merchandise of all kinds not on the free list that are bought for transportation and importation into the United States of America from foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. R. 1659. A bill to exempt retirement annuities of governmental employees from income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 1660. A bill to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1661. A bill to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 1662. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to acquire on behalf of the United States Government all property and facilities of the Rainier National Park Co.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WELCH of Missouri:

H. R. 1663. A bill to make permanent the judgeship provided for by the act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri," approved December 24, 1942; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. J. Res. 98. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. Con. Res. 19. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress with respect to the arrest and imprisonment of Archbishop Stepinatz, of Yugoslavia, and Cardinal Mindszenty, of Hungary; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 1664. A bill for the relief of Joseph A. Polvere, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 1665. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vasilia Parsellos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 1666. A bill for the relief of Maurice J. Symms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 1667. A bill for the relief of Harold W. Britton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1668. A bill for the relief of Walter F. Zagrodny; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 1669. A bill for the relief of Tibor Stephen Laszlo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LeCOMPTE:

H. R. 1670. A bill for the relief of Smith Distributing Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1671. A bill for the relief of Kostas Kallinikos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 1672. A bill for the relief of Jack Phillips; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 1673. A bill for the relief of Ellen F. Barbee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. R. 1674. A bill for the relief of Johann Otto Hermann Polle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1675. A bill for the relief of Joseph Bernstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 1676. A bill for the relief of Thomas M. Bates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1677. A bill for the relief of Marciano Pugliese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1678. A bill for the relief of Carl Piowaty and W. J. Piowaty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 1679. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Skio Takayama Hull; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 1680. A bill for the relief of Myron Kolodziejczak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1681. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rose Katchics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

12. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Joseph Geiger, Milwaukee, Wis., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to national defense, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 20, 1949

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers, in whom we trust, and by whose guidance and grace this Nation was born, bless the Senators of these United States at this important time in history and give them all things needful to the faithful discharge of their responsibilities.

We pray especially today for our President, and also for him who will preside over this Chamber.

Give to them good health for the physical strains of their office, good judgment for the decisions they must make, wisdom beyond their own, and clear understanding for the problems of this difficult hour.

We thank Thee for their humble reliance upon Thee. May they go often to the throne of grace, as we commend them both to Thy loving care and Thy guiding hand. Through Jesus Christ our Saviour. Amen.

SENATOR FROM KENTUCKY

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present the credentials of the Senator-designate from Kentucky, Hon. GARRETT L. WITHERS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The credentials will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follow:

CERTIFICATE OF APPOINTMENT

FRANKFORT, KY., *January 17, 1949.*

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

This is to certify that pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, I, Earle C. Clements, Governor of said Commonwealth, do hereby appoint Hon. GARRETT L. WITHERS a Senator from said Commonwealth to represent the State of Kentucky in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein caused by the resignation of Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY is filled by election as provided by law—said appointment to become effective January 20, 1949.

Witness His Excellency, our Governor, Earle C. Clements, and our seal hereto affixed at Frankfort, Ky., this 17th day of January, in the year of our Lord 1949.

Given under my hand and seal as Governor of the Commonwealth of Kentucky this the 17th day of January in the year of our Lord 1949 and in the one hundred and fifty-seventh year of the Commonwealth.

EARLE C. CLEMENTS,
Governor, Commonwealth of Kentucky.

Attest:
[SEAL] GEORGE GLENN HATCHER,
Secretary of State.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The credentials will be placed on file.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. President, the Senator-designate is present and ready to take the oath.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Senator-designate from Kentucky will present himself at the desk, the oath of office will be administered to him.

Mr. WITHERS, escorted by Mr. CHAPMAN, advanced to the desk, and the oath prescribed by law was administered to him by the President pro tempore.

INAUGURATION OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of Tuesday last, the Senate will now proceed to the east front of the Capitol for the inaugural ceremonies, at the conclusion of which it will stand adjourned until Monday next.

At 11 o'clock and 50 minutes a. m., the Senate, headed by the President pro tempore (KENNETH MCKELLAR, a Senator from the State of Tennessee) and the Secretary (Leslie L. Biffle), proceeded to the inaugural platform at the east front of the Capitol and took the spaces assigned to them on the left of the place reserved for the President-elect.

The House of Representatives, headed by the Speaker (SAM RAYBURN, a Representative from the State of Texas) and the Clerk (Ralph R. Roberts) had preceded the Senate to the platform and taken the spaces assigned them on the right of the place reserved for the President-elect.

The governors of the States were escorted to the places assigned them on the right of the inaugural platform.

The Chief of Staff to the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, and the Commandant of the Coast Guard, with their aides, were escorted to the places assigned them on the right of the inaugural platform.

The diplomatic corps were escorted to the places assigned them on the left of the inaugural platform.

The members of the President's Cabinet were escorted to the places assigned them on the left of the inaugural platform.

The Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, headed by the Marshal, Thomas E. Waggaman, and the Clerk, Charles Elmore Cropley, were escorted to the inaugural platform and took the places assigned them, the Chief Justice being seated immediately to the right and the Associate Justices being seated to the left of the place reserved for the President-elect.

The President-elect of the United States, Harry S. Truman, of Missouri, and the Vice-President-elect of the United States, Alben W. Barkley, of Kentucky, were escorted to the inaugural platform by the Secretary of the Senate, and the Joint Committee on Arrangements, consisting of Senator Carl Hayden, chairman; Senator J. Howard McGrath, Senator Kenneth S. Wherry, Representative John McCormack, Representative Harry R. Sheppard, and Representative Charles A. Halleck, the joint committee being headed by the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, Joseph C. Duke, and the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, Joseph H. Callahan.

The Vice-President-elect was seated immediately to the left of the place reserved for the President-elect.

Mrs. Harry S. Truman and Miss Margaret Truman, wife and daughter of the President-elect, with Mrs. Max O. Truitt and David M. Barkley, daughter and son of the Vice-President-elect, and other members of the respective families, were escorted to the places assigned to them on the platform.

PRAYER

Rev. Edward Hughes Pruden, minister, First Baptist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

God of the nations, in whom we live and move and have our being, and from whom cometh every good and perfect gift, we pause at the beginning of this day's historic proceedings to invoke Thy blessing upon this beloved country of ours, and upon all who serve her highest interests.

Grant to Thy servant, the President of the United States, all needed wisdom, health, and strength as he rededicates himself anew today to the high office to which he has been called. May he continue to lead us as he is led by Thee, in the ways that make for domestic tranquillity and international accord.

Bestow upon us, Our Father, the happiness which is reserved for that nation whose God is the Lord. Through Jesus Christ, Our Redeemer, we pray. Amen.

SINGING OF NATIONAL ANTHEM

Mr. Phil Regan, of Brooklyn, N. Y., sang the Star-Spangled Banner, accompanied by the United States Marine Band, led by Maj. William F. Santelmann.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH TO THE VICE-PRESIDENT-ELECT

Stanley F. Reed, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, administered to the Vice-President-elect the oath of office prescribed by law, which he repeated, as follows:

I, ALBEN W. BARKLEY, solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter, so help me God.

PRAYER

Rabbi Samuel Thurman, of the United Hebrew Temple, St. Louis, offered the following prayer:

Lord God of all the nations: The hearts and minds of this Nation turn to Thee in this solemn moment in prayer and in gratitude. This Nation, blessed by Thee and dedicated to the holiest conception of Thee as the Father of all mankind, is now being reconsecrated and rededicated in the person of its first citizen, the President of these United States of America. A son of the people, champion of social justice and civic righteousness, he is about to take the oath of his high office.

We pray Thy blessing upon him and his dear ones. Chosen by the people to be their Chief Magistrate, may the people's confidence in him never wane. May he continue to hold the high convictions of righteousness and justice, of truth and peace, which have won for him the people's faith and admiration. Touch him with Thy divine wisdom that he may, with humility, yet also with strength and courage, pursue the high purposes and noble ideals which have moved him to seek and to win the leadership of this Nation. May Thy hand lead and guide him through the many and tortuous paths through which this Nation and all the nations of the world must pass in the years ahead. Keep his heart steadfast and his mind single in the performance of the tasks and duties of his great office, and may this Nation, under his leadership, hold fast to its traditional ideals of freedom and justice for all men. Thus, blessed by Thee and devoted to the holy purposes of Thy will, our Nation shall go forward with unabated strength and unceasing labor in the service of Thee and of humanity, spreading light and liberty to those peoples that walk in darkness and dwell in servitude. By Thy bounty we have become rich and mighty among the nations of the world. O Lord, make us more worthy of all Thy blessings, to the end that both leader and people may continue to find favor in Thine eyes, and so live and serve that Thy glory, Thy majesty, and Thy power may abide with us forever. Amen.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH TO THE PRESIDENT-ELECT

The Chief Justice of the United States, Fred M. Vinson, administered to the President-elect the oath of office prescribed by the Constitution, which he repeated, as follows:

I, Harry S. Truman, do solemnly swear that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, so help me God.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT (S. DOC. NO. 5)

Thereupon the President of the United States delivered the following inaugural address:

Mr. Vice President, Mr. Chief Justice, and fellow citizens, I accept with humility the honor which the American people have conferred upon me. I accept it with a resolve to do all that I can for the welfare of this Nation and for the peace of the world.

In performing the duties of my office, I need the help and prayers of every one of you. I ask for your encouragement and for your support. The tasks we face are difficult. We can accomplish them only if we work together.

Each period of our national history has had its special challenges. Those that confront us now are as momentous as any in the past. Today marks the beginning not only of a new administration, but of a period that will be eventful, perhaps decisive, for us and for the world.

It may be our lot to experience, and in a large measure bring about, a major turning point in the long history of the human race. The first half of this century has been marked by unprecedented and brutal attacks on the rights of man, and by the two most frightful wars in history. The supreme need of our time is for men to learn to live together in peace and harmony.

The peoples of the earth face the future with grave uncertainty, composed almost equally of great hopes and great fears. In this time of doubt, they look to the United States as never before for good will, strength, and wise leadership.

It is fitting, therefore, that we take this occasion to proclaim to the world the essential principles of the faith by which we live, and to declare our aims to all peoples.

The American people stand firm in the faith which has inspired this Nation from the beginning. We believe that all men have a right to equal justice under law and equal opportunity to share in the common good. We believe that all men have the right to freedom of thought and expression. We believe that all men are created equal because they are created in the image of God.

From this faith we will not be moved. [Applause.]

The American people desire, and are determined to work for, a world in which all nations and all peoples are free to govern themselves as they see fit and to achieve a decent and satisfying life. Above all else, our people desire, and are determined to work for, peace on earth—a just and lasting peace—based on genuine agreement freely arrived at by equals. [Applause.]

In the pursuant of these aims, the United States and other like-minded nations find themselves directly opposed by a regime with contrary aims and a totally different concept of life.

That regime adheres to a false philosophy which purports to offer freedom, security, and greater opportunity to mankind. Misled by that philosophy, many peoples have sacrificed their liberties only to learn to their sorrow that deceit and mockery, poverty and tyranny, are their reward.

That false philosophy is communism.

Communism is based on the belief that man is so weak and inadequate that he is unable to govern himself, and therefore requires the rule of strong masters.

Democracy is based on the conviction that man has the moral and intellectual capacity, as well as the inalienable right, to govern himself with reason and justice. [Applause.]

Communism subjects the individual to arrest without lawful cause, punishment without trial, and forced labor as a chattel of the state. It decrees what information he shall receive, what art he shall produce, what leaders he shall follow, and what thoughts he shall think.

Democracy maintains that government is established for the benefit of the individual, and is charged with the responsibility of protecting the rights of the individual and his freedom in the exercise of his abilities.

Communism maintains that social wrongs can be corrected only by violence.

Democracy has proved that social justice can be achieved through peaceful change. [Applause.]

Communism holds that the world is so widely divided into opposing classes that war is inevitable.

Democracy holds that free nations can settle differences justly and maintain a lasting peace.

The differences between communism and democracy do not concern the United States alone. People everywhere are coming to realize that what is involved is material well-being, human dignity, and the right to believe in and worship God.

I state these differences, not to draw issues of belief as such, but because the actions resulting from the Communist philosophy are a threat to the efforts of free nations to bring about world recovery and lasting peace.

Since the end of hostilities, the United States has invested its substance and its energy in a great constructive effort to restore peace, stability, and freedom to the world.

We have sought no territory; we have imposed our will on none. We have asked for no privileges we would not extend to others.

We have constantly and vigorously supported the United Nations and related agencies as a means of applying democratic principles to international relations. We have consistently advocated and relied upon peaceful settlement of disputes among nations.

We have made every effort to secure agreement on effective international control of our most powerful weapon, and we have worked steadily for the limitation and control of all armaments.

We have encouraged, by precept and example, the expansion of world trade on a sound and a fair basis.

Almost a year ago, in company with 16 free nations of Europe, we launched the greatest cooperative economic program in history. The purpose of that unprecedented effort is to invigorate and strengthen democracy in Europe, so that the free people of that continent can resume their rightful place in the forefront of civilization and can contribute once more to the security and welfare of the world.

Our efforts have brought new hope to all mankind. We have beaten back despair and defeatism. We have saved a number of countries from losing their liberty. Hundreds of millions of people all over the world now agree with us that we need not have war—that we can have peace. [Applause.]

The initiative is ours.

We are moving on with other nations to build an even stronger structure of international order and justice. We shall have as our partners countries which, no longer solely concerned with the problem of national survival, are now working to improve the standards of living of all their people. We are ready to undertake new projects to strengthen a free world.

In the coming years, our program for peace and freedom will emphasize four major courses of action.

First, we will continue to give unfaltering support to the United Nations and related agencies, and we will continue to search for ways to strengthen

their authority and increase their effectiveness. We believe that the United Nations will be strengthened by the new nations which are being formed in lands now advancing toward self-government under democratic principles.

Second, we will continue our programs for world economic recovery.

This means, first of all, that we must keep our full weight behind the European recovery program. We are confident of the success of this major venture in world recovery. We believe that our partners in this effort will achieve the status of self-supporting nations once again.

In addition, we must carry out our plans for reducing the barriers to world trade and increasing its volume. Economic recovery and peace itself depend on increased world trade.

Third, we will strengthen freedom-loving nations against the dangers of aggression.

We are working out with a number of countries a joint agreement designed to strengthen the security of the North Atlantic area. Such an agreement would take the form of a collective defense arrangement within the terms of the United Nations Charter.

We have already established such a defense pact for the Western Hemisphere by the Treaty of Rio de Janeiro.

The primary purpose of these agreements is to provide unmistakable proof of the joint determination of the free countries to resist armed attack from any quarter. Every country participating in these arrangements must contribute all it can to the common defense.

If we can make it sufficiently clear, in advance, that any armed attack affecting our national security will be met with overwhelming force, the armed attack may never occur. [Applause.]

I hope soon to send to the Senate a treaty respecting the North Atlantic security plan.

In addition, we will provide military advice and equipment to free nations which will cooperate with us in the maintenance of peace and security.

Fourth, we must embark on a bold new program for making the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas.

More than half the people of the world are living in conditions approaching misery. Their food is inadequate. They are victims of disease. Their economic life is primitive and stagnant. Their poverty is a handicap and a threat both to them and to more prosperous areas.

For the first time in history, humanity possesses the knowledge and skill to relieve the suffering of these people.

The United States is preeminent among the nations in the development of industrial and scientific techniques. The material resources which we can afford to use for the assistance of other peoples are limited. But our imponderable resources in technical knowledge are constantly growing and are inexhaustible.

I believe that we should make available to peace-loving peoples the benefits of our store of technical knowledge in order to help them realize their aspirations for a better life. And, in cooperation with other nations, we should foster capital investment in areas needing development.

Our aim should be to help the free peoples of the world, through their own efforts, to produce more food, more clothing, more materials for housing, and more mechanical power to lighten their burdens.

We invite other countries to pool their technological resources in this undertaking. Their contributions will be warmly welcomed. This should be a cooperative enterprise in which all nations work together through the United Nations and its specialized agencies whenever practicable. It must be a world-wide effort for the achievement of peace, plenty, and freedom. [Applause.]

With the cooperation of business, private capital, agriculture, and labor in this country, this program can greatly increase the industrial activity in other nations and can raise substantially their standards of living.

Such new economic developments must be devised and controlled to benefit the peoples of the areas in which they are established. Guaranties to the investor must be balanced by guaranties in the interest of the people whose resources and whose labor go into these developments. [Applause.]

The old imperialism—exploitation for foreign profit—has no place in our plans. What we envisage is a program of development based on the concepts of democratic fair-dealing.

All countries, including our own, will greatly benefit from a constructive program for the better use of the world's human and natural resources. Experience shows that our commerce with other countries expands as they progress industrially and economically.

Greater production is the key to prosperity and peace. And the key to greater production is a wider and more vigorous application of modern scientific and technical knowledge.

Only by helping the least fortunate of its members to help themselves can the human family achieve the decent, satisfying life that is the right of all people.

Democracy alone can supply the vitalizing force to stir the peoples of the world into triumphant action, not only against their human oppressors, but also against their ancient enemies—hunger, misery, and despair.

On the basis of these four major courses of action we hope to help create the conditions that will lead eventually to personal freedom and happiness for all mankind. [Applause.]

If we are to be successful in carrying out these policies, it is clear that we must have continued prosperity in this country and we must keep ourselves strong. [Applause.]

Slowly but surely we are weaving a world fabric of international security and growing prosperity.

We are aided by all who wish to live in freedom from fear—even by those who live today in fear under their own governments.

We are aided by all who want relief from the lies of propaganda—who desire truth and sincerity.

We are aided by all who desire self-government and a voice in deciding their own affairs.

We are aided by all who long for economic security—for the security and abundance that men in free societies can enjoy.

We are aided by all who desire freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and freedom to live their own lives for useful ends.

Our allies are the millions who hunger and thirst after righteousness.

In due time, as our stability becomes manifest, as more and more nations come to know the benefits of democracy and to participate in growing abundance, I believe that those countries which now oppose us will abandon their delusions and join with the free nations of the world in a just settlement of international differences. [Applause.]

Events have brought our American democracy to new influence and new responsibilities. They will test our courage, our devotion to duty, and our concept of liberty.

But I say to all men, what we have achieved in liberty, we will surpass in greater liberty.

Steadfast in our faith in the Almighty, we will advance toward a world where man's freedom is secure.

To that end we will devote our strength, our resources, and our firmness of resolve. With God's help, the future of mankind will be assured in a world of justice, harmony, and peace. [Applause.]

BENEDICTION

Most Rev. Patrick A. O'Boyle, Archbishop of Washington, pronounced the following benediction:

Blessed art Thou, Lord God of our fathers, and worthy to be praised and glorified forever.

Stretch forth Thy hand, O Lord, in fruitful blessing upon our President, our Vice President, the Members of our Congress, our judges and magistrates, and all those who, by our will, are entrusted with the well-being and security of our country, so that by Thy aid they may be able to discharge their duties of office with wisdom and prudence and justice.

Great indeed are our faults and numberless our needs, but complete is our trust in Thee, the God of all consolation, into whose hands we commit ourselves with faith and docility. Bless the people of our country that they may be governed by Thy law and walk in the ways of Thy commandments. Endow them with grace to bear one another's burdens in that generous spirit which befits men in true brotherhood under Thee, the common Father of all men.

Send forth Thy Holy Spirit in the fullness of His gifts to bless us with wisdom to perceive the ways of Thy holy will; with understanding to enlighten the darkness of our minds; with counsel to guide us unfailingly in the path of rectitude; with fortitude to sustain and strengthen us; with knowledge to instruct our ignorance; with piety to fructify in good works; and with reverent fear to deliver us from evil.

Multiply, O Lord, upon this Nation the manifold marks of Thy divine approval and benediction, set up, as it is, like a sign and symbol among the nations of the earth. Bless the land with fertile soil to bring forth the harvests that nourish us and feed the hungry mouths of the unfortunate who look to us for the necessities of life. Enkindle in our people the spirit of charity for the many whom poverty and misery have reduced to conditions unworthy of the dignity of man. Awaken in the souls of all who call Thee Father a hunger and thirst after social justice and fraternal charity.

Grant, O Lord, peace in our days, peace in our land, and peace among the nations, to the end that the rainbow of peace and reconciliation may enfold under its serene light all peoples of the earth with the graces and blessings of tranquillity. Amen.

At 12 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m. the President and Vice President of the United States, escorted by the Joint Committee on Arrangements, retired from the platform, followed by the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, and the other distinguished guests who had been invited to witness the ceremonies.

ADJOURNMENT

After the conclusion of the inaugural ceremonies (at 1 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate, without returning to its Chamber, under the order entered on January 18 instant, stood in adjournment until Monday, January 24, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 20, 1949

The House met at 11:30 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers, we praise Thee for the marvelous history of our Nation and for those institutions which are the glory of our democracy.

In this historic moment, we seek Thy divine guidance to direct our President and Vice President. Preserve their health in the days to come; with increasing faith in the right, may they be fully prepared to enter upon their labors. We ask in Thy holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 18, 1949, was read and approved.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make a brief announcement for the benefit of all Members. The Chair announces to the House that we will leave here in a body to go out on the official platform for the inaugural ceremonies. In order to get by the police and the marines it will be necessary for each Member to display the official ticket in order to secure his seat on the platform. The seats to be occupied by Members of the Senate and House of Representatives have no cover and it is advisable for Members to take with them their overcoats and hats.

The Chair also desires to state that pursuant to House Resolution 55, at the conclusion of the ceremonies at the east front of the Capitol, the House will stand adjourned until noon on Monday next. The Speaker, preceded by the Clerk, will head the procession, and the Members of the House will form in double column following them.

Thereupon, at 11:35 o'clock a. m., the Members of the House, preceded by the Speaker and the Clerk, proceeded to the east front of the Capitol.

ADJOURNMENT

At the conclusion of the inaugural ceremonies (at 12 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the House, without returning to its Chamber, pursuant to House Resolution 55 stood in adjournment until Monday, January 24, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 1682. A bill providing for the creation of the Curtiss Memorial Commission; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 1683. A bill relating to the status quo of coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1684. A bill to provide that certain loans secured by realty taken for a public use shall not be counted in computing the aggregate amount of loans that may be guaranteed for any veteran under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 1685. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Kinder, La., a post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 1686. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in agricultural products; to prevent unfair competition; to provide for the orderly marketing of such products; to promote the general welfare by assuring an abundant and permanent supply of such products by securing to the producers a minimum price of not less than cost of production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1687. A bill to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act approved July 16, 1916, and acts amendatory thereto and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 1688. A bill to provide for a decennial census of housing; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1689. A bill to increase rates of compensation of the heads and assistant heads of executive departments and independent agencies; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 1690. A bill to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, to create a National Labor Relations Board, to repeal certain provisions of law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1691. A bill to exempt persons who served in the merchant marine of the United States between September 16, 1940, and June 24, 1948, from induction or service under the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 1692. A bill to provide pensions for veterans of World War I and World War II based on non-service-connected disability and attained age; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 1693. A bill to provide pensions for veterans of World War I and World War II based on non-service-connected disability and attained age; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REGAN:

H. R. 1694. A bill to provide for the return of rehabilitation and betterment of costs of Federal reclamation projects; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 1695. A bill providing for the conveyance to the State of South Carolina of that portion of the Fort Moultrie Military Reservation by the War Assets Administration determined to be surplus to the needs of the United States Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 1696. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of Public Buildings to convey to the Temple Methodist Church, a nonprofit corporation of San Francisco, Calif., a portion of the federally owned building known as 100 McAllister Street, San Francisco, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. J. Res. 99. Joint resolution to give full recognition to the State of Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. Res. 58. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation with respect to debts owed to American citizens by foreign governments, municipalities, and corporations; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 1697. A bill for the relief of Mildred Smith Butler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1698. A bill for the relief of Hans Oscar Hansen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 1699. A bill for the relief of the estate of William Kraus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1700. A bill for the relief of Ezra Butler Eddy, Jr., and wife, Marie Claire Lord Eddy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 1701. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vesta Meinn and Mrs. Edna Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 1702. A bill for the relief of Marco Buono; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 24, 1949

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Today, O Lord, as the Members of the Senate pause in this moment of prayer, we unite our petitions for Thy blessing upon Thy servant who, in his new capacity, presides over this body. We thank Thee for his long years of devoted public service, for the testimony of his life and the inspiration of his example.

May he never feel lonely in this chair, but always be aware of Thy hand upon him and Thy spirit with him.

When differences arise, as they will, may Thy servants be not disturbed at being misunderstood, but rather be disturbed at not understanding.

May Thy will be done here, and may Thy program be carried out, above party and personality, beyond time and circumstance, for the good of America and the peace of the world. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 18, and Thursday, January 20, 1949, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT (ALBEN W. BARKLEY, of Kentucky). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	Morse
Anderson	Hoey	Murray
Baldwin	Holland	Myers
Brewster	Humphrey	Neely
Bricker	Hunt	O'Conor
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Broughton	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Reed
Cain	Kefauver	Robertson
Capehart	Kem	Russell
Chapman	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Chavez	Knowland	Schoeppel
Connally	Langer	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Lodge	Smith, N. J.
Donnell	Long	Sparkman
Douglas	Lucas	Stennis
Downey	McCarran	Taft
Eastland	McCarthy	Taylor
Ecton	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Frear	McGrath	Thye
Fulbright	McKellar	Tobey
George	McMahon	Tydings
Gillette	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Green	Malone	Watkins
Gurney	Martin	Wiley
Hayden	Maybank	Williams
Hendrickson	Miller	Withers
Hickenlooper	Millikin	Young

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained consent that his colleague [Mr. KERR] be excused from attendance in the Senate today because of his inability to return to Washington from Oklahoma, due to bad weather.

Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to be absent from the Senate until Friday of the present week.

REMARKS OF THE VICE PRESIDENT ON ASSUMING THE CHAIR

The VICE PRESIDENT. Before the Senate begins the transaction of business, I ask its indulgence for a few moments to respond to the very gracious remarks made by Members of the Senate on last Tuesday from both sides of the aisle upon the occasion of my retirement as a Member. I could not trust myself on that day to respond appropriately, because, as I have said frequently, I did not abandon, without regret, that seat upon the aisle in the front row after occupying it for 12 years. But I do appreciate the very generous remarks, not only made by Members of the Senate in public, but similar remarks that have been made to me in private upon the occasion of my departure from the Senate as a Member, and the assumption of my duties as its Presiding Officer.

I recall that in 1913, when Vice President Marshall from this very rostrum took the oath of office, as was then the custom, he made a little speech, after announcing that his reason for it was that he was entering upon a 4-year period of silence. I do not put myself precisely in that position, because I shall probably have to adjust myself gradually to the fact that I am not a Member of the Senate, and it might not surprise the Senate if some day I should thoughtlessly walk down from the rostrum and begin to debate some problem, upon which occasion I would expect to be called promptly to order. But I do appreciate, of course, the magnitude and the unanimity of the courtesies which have been extended to me as a Member of the Senate of the United States by all Members, regardless of their party and regardless of their States.

I have often doubted, and I do not hesitate to say that I doubt yet, whether there is any promotion to a higher office than a United States Senator that can be regarded as such, or to a role that can be regarded as more important than the role played by a Member of the United States Senate. We frequently refer to the Senate as the greatest deliberative body in the world. I have sometimes, in my impatience at what may have seemed to be too lengthy debate, referred to it as the most deliberative body in the world. But be that as it may, I believe that the United States Senate—and I say it with due apologies to any other legislative body—is the greatest deliberative body, because there is deliberation here, there is the right to speak; there is the right to be represented; there is the right to express one's views, however much they may disagree with the views of other Members of the Senate or with the people outside the Senate. So that to me membership in the Senate constitutes one of the supreme honors that the American people, through any State, can confer upon one of their citizens.

While it is true that every Senator represents the State which has chosen him, and in the very nature of things is interested in the problems which affect his State, in a real and a broader sense every Senator is a Senator of the United States. Though chosen by a single State, every vote he casts here for or against legislation which is general in its scope affects the people of every other State, as well as the people of his own State. So that it is a great thing not only to be chosen by a State as its ambassador to this great body, but it is a great thing to feel that while in that capacity we are Members here, we are also Members of the United States Senate for the country at large. So I experienced considerable regret in dissociating myself from this body as a Member.

I will be hanging around for 4 years, and I wish not only to welcome the cooperation of every Member of the Senate, but I invite the cooperation and the sympathetic good will of every Member of this body, regardless of politics. I can assure you that not only personally but officially I will accord to every Member of the Senate, regardless of the State from which he comes, and regardless of his political inclinations, that same degree of good will and cooperation which I hope to receive from you.

I wish also to say not only to the new Members who are just coming into this body, but to the older Members also, that if in my capacity of Presiding Officer of the Senate I can be of service to you in a legislative way, in helping you to solve your problems, I shall be most happy to do so.

While I am on that phase of what I am saying I wish also to say that, while the Constitution prescribes only one duty for the Vice President of the United States, and that is to be the Presiding Officer of the Senate, I should like the Senate to know, and the Congress to know, and the administration and the Government to know, and the people to know, that if at any time I may be of service to the Congress, to the administration, of course, and to the Government and to the American people beyond the mere technical duties of presiding over the Senate, I shall be happy to be available for any such service as any branch of the Government, or both branches of the Congress, may feel I can render.

So let me again thank all the Members who are here today, and all those who have been here while I have been a Member of this body, for the unanimous courtesy and consideration of which I have been the object. You have been tolerant of my mistakes, you have been patient with my shortcomings, and I look forward to a season of cooperation, of sympathetic understanding and work, nonpartisan work in most instances, I am sure, because most of our problems here are not partisan, unless we seek to make them so. I look forward to 4 years of happy, cooperative, understanding service to the American people, and I wish for each one of you that same degree of success and the contentment and satisfaction with your work that I hope to receive from my own. [Applause, Senators rising.]

MEMBER OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

The VICE PRESIDENT. Due to the shift in the representation of the majority and minority on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, there is a vacancy, to which the Chair appoints the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS].

MEMBER OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC REPORT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair wishes to announce the appointment of the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to the vacancy on the Joint Committee on the Economic Report caused by the retirement of former Senator Ball, of Minnesota.

ASCERTAINMENT OF ELECTORS FOR PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, certified copies of the final ascertainment of the electors for President and Vice President of the United States from the States of Florida, New York, and Wisconsin, which, with the accompanying papers, was ordered to lie on the table.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred, as indicated:

REPORT ON PERSHING HALL MEMORIAL FUND

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering transactions for account of the Pershing Hall Memorial Fund, fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

WITHDRAWAL OF REQUEST FOR COMPLIANCE UNDER ALLOCATION OF CERTAIN STEEL PRODUCTS

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a letter from the Secretary of Commerce, withdrawing his request for compliance to the Maridon Manufacturing Co., Inc., of New York, under the voluntary plan for the allocation of steel products for warm air heating equipment for residential housing (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

EXTENSION TO COMMISSIONED OFFICERS OF THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY OF PROVISIONS OF ARMED FORCES LEAVE ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend to commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey the provisions of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON VALUATION OF PROPERTIES OF SHELL OIL CO., INC., PRODUCTS PIPE-LINE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the final valuation of properties of the Shell Oil Co., Inc., Products Pipe-line Department, Valuation Docket No. 1283 (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the sixty-second annual report of that Commission, for the period November 1, 1947, to October 31, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED BY NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

A letter from the executive secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contracts negotiated by that Committee, for the period July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ORDER OF BUSINESS DURING MORNING HOUR

The VICE PRESIDENT. Before the Senate embarks on the routine morning business, the Chair wishes to make an announcement, and he wishes to make it now, in advance, so that no Senator can possibly construe the announcement or the ruling as being applicable only to him.

In the routine business of the Senate, almost from time immemorial, there has been what is known as the morning hour. The morning hour comes only following an adjournment of the Senate. It does not come following a recess of the Senate, because under immemorial custom a recess of the Senate is different from an adjournment, in that when the Senate reassembles after a recess it is still operating in the same legislative day in which it recessed. Therefore there is no morning hour after a recess, but only after an adjournment.

In order that the routine business of the morning hour may be accomplished with dispatch and promptness, a certain order has been laid down in the rules for the transaction of such business. The first order of business is the presentation of petitions and memorials; next come reports of committees; then the introduction of bills and joint resolutions, followed by the submission of concurrent and other resolutions.

Ordinarily it does not take very long to go through the morning business. Because of the fact that many Senators come to the Chamber for the purpose of presenting petitions and memorials, submitting reports, or introducing bills and joint resolutions, or other resolutions, the rules provide that there shall be no debate and no speeches on any subject during the consideration of morning business. Of course, after the morning business is concluded, so long as there remains a part of the morning hour, debate is permissible. The Chair is sure that all Senators will realize that it is not quite fair to Senators who have come to the Chamber in order to take part in the transaction of morning business to be required to wait until speeches are made, either on a subject which may be before the Senate or on any other subject.

Therefore the Chair desires to announce that, without any Senator making a point of order to that effect, the Chair expects to enforce the rule against the making of speeches of any kind by any Senator during transaction of morning business, in order that the routine business of the Senate may be promptly dispatched.

Furthermore, the Chair points out that it has become a habit, during the part of the morning hour set aside for the presentation of petitions and memorials, for Senators to rise and ask unanimous consent, out of order, to introduce bills or submit resolutions. Ordinarily it requires only 5 or 10 minutes to reach the order for the introduction of bills and joint resolutions. Therefore the Chair feels that it would be in the interest of orderly procedure for Members of the Senate not to ask to introduce bills out of order during the order of business for the presentation of petitions and memorials, but to wait until the Senate reaches that part of the morning hour set aside for the introduction of bills and joint resolutions.

With that brief comment upon what the Chair hopes will be a cooperative effort to observe the rules of the Senate for the benefit of all Senators, the Senate will now enter upon the morning business. Before that is done, the Chair would like to urge new Senators—and some old ones—to study the rules of the Senate. They should take the Senate Manual home with them and study it. It has been frequently said that the Senate has no rules. It does have rules. It has specific rules set out in the book of rules. It has other rules which have come down by interpretation, tradition, and custom. It is almost as difficult to master all the rules as to master the decisions of the supreme court of any State. A Senator must work his way into them by daily attendance upon the sessions and by observation. It will be helpful to new Senators to study the book of rules carefully so that they will know what their rights are, and what the rights of other Senators are.

The first order of business is the presentation of petitions and memorials.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A letter in the nature of a petition from Josef Geiger, of Milwaukee, Wis., relating to the atomic bomb (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Mary I. Riley, of the United States, relating to rent control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from Gordon Griswold, president, National Advisory Board Council on Grazing, Salt Lake City, Utah, favoring the enactment of emergency legislation for the relief of the storm-ridden States in the West; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Percy Bohlen Gifford, of Los Angeles, Calif., relating to rent control (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from Omar Brown, supervisor, St. Thomas, V. I., relating to the election of Resident Commissioner of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter in the nature of a petition from W. J. Fiddy, of Norfolk, Va., relating to the registration of lobbyists; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INVESTIGATION OF LOBBYING

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of a resolution urging a congressional investigation of lobbying, adopted by the executive council of the International Association of Machinists. Following this resolution, I ask that there be printed a letter sent by President Truman to the International Association of Machinists, commending the resolution and affirming the desirability of such an investigation.

There being no objection, the resolution and letter were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY BY EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS, IN REGULAR SESSION, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Whereas certain special interests used their tremendous resources to finance high-powered lobbying activities which confused the Members of the Eightieth Congress and deceived them as to the attitude of the majority of the citizens of this country; and

Whereas there is ample evidence already that these same groups are preparing an even larger assault on the Eighty-first Congress in a last desperate effort to thwart the will of the majority and to block President Truman's legislative program; and

Whereas charges were made on the floor of the Eightieth Congress that manufacturers spent $100,000,000 to put over the Taft-Hartley bill, and that charge never has been refuted; and

Whereas the people of this country, as well as the Members of the Eighty-first Congress, are entitled to the full facts concerning the lobbying objectives, the identity and interests of individual contributors, and lobbying methods of the National Association of Manufacturers, the Committee for Constitutional Government, the National Physicians Committee, the National Association of Electric Companies, the National Association of Home Builders, the National Association of Real Estate Boards, the Association of American Railroads, and other lobbies, which while less widely publicized are working no less assiduously for special favors for their special interests from the Congress; and

Whereas a thorough investigation of such activity by a joint congressional committee would build a foundation of information from which adequate regulatory legislation could be framed and at the same time acquaint the people of this country with some of the pressures to which their elected representatives in Congress are subjected; and

Whereas the spotlight of publicity on these lobbies will not harm any legitimate representation of any group in Washington: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the executive council of the International Association of Machinists respectfully urges that a thorough investigation of all lobbying activities be initiated by a joint congressional committee as the first order of business by the Eighty-first Congress after it has organized; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this request be transmitted to President Truman and to leaders of the Eighty-first Congress, including Vice-President-elect ALBEN BARKLEY, and Senators JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, SCOTT LUCAS, and FRANCIS J. MYERS, and Representatives SAM RAYBURN and JOHN MCCORMACK.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, November 30, 1948.

Mr. ELIC PETERSON,
General Secretary-Treasurer, International Association of Machinists, Ninth Street and Mount Vernon Place NW., Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PETERSON: Thank you for your telegram of November 20 transmitting the text of the resolution adopted by your executive council urging a congressional investigation of lobbying activities during the Eightieth Congress.

I think your organization has rendered a distinct public service in taking a stand on this matter.

While it is up to the Congress to determine the subjects which it will investigate, I feel sure that a thorough investigation of lobbying activities would have a very salutary effect, and I would be glad to see such an investigation undertaken.

Sincerely,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

RESOLUTIONS OF WISCONSIN STATE GRANGE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received today a copy of several resolutions adopted by the annual convention of the Wisconsin State Grange. Representing as it does the views of many farmers in my own and other States, I feel that these Grange resolutions should be given the most careful attention.

I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the text of these resolutions presented to me by Mr. William E. Seffern, master of the Wisconsin State Grange, be appropriately referred and printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, they will be printed in the RECORD.

To the Committee on Finance:

"Whereas there is a widespread misunderstanding among business and commercial groups in regard to the activities of cooperatives and their place in our economic system. Cooperatives should and do operate within the framework of the competitive system; they do not and are not designed to replace private enterprise. Their principal difference from other types of private enterprise is the distribution of earnings or losses. We hold that the self-help cooperative way of doing business should continue to be recognized as a contractual arrangement wherein the net earnings or losses of the business legally belong to the cooperative member and therefore be taxed in his hands only.

"We, therefore, insist that the present tax status of cooperatives be preserved. We will oppose any effort, State or National, which would tend to destroy this position through legislation or otherwise."

"PROTECTION OF CONSUMERS AGAINST OLEOMARGARINE DECEPTION

"Consumers have a right to buy either oleomargarine or butter; consumers also have a right, by using their God-given sense of sight, to know at all times and in all places which product they are getting.

"We insist that until such time as the oleomargarine industry ceases its present practice of consumer confusion and deception, that until such time as oleomargarine is offered for sale and consumption in some distinctive color other than yellow, we will emphatically oppose any change in present oleomargarine legislation."

To the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"Whereas the R. F. D. is still carried on as in the horse and buggy days when it was necessary to limit mileage; and

"Whereas farmers today are operating with a shortage of help and it is a handicap to make several trips a day to a mail box located at a distance from the farm; and

"Whereas all are paying their proportionate share of the tax and are entitled to the same service: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the State and National Grange go on record favoring rural free delivery to every farm gateway, and do all in their power to get action to that effect. And we further recommend that the rates on second-class mail be increased."

To the Committee on Appropriations:

"Whereas the REA has been of vital service to our rural people; and

"Whereas there is still a great need of extended service of the REA: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Wisconsin State Grange support legislation for adequate authority, appropriations, and loan funds for REA in order that unmet needs be fulfilled as fast as practical."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 130. A bill to provide for the demonstration of public library service in areas without such service or with inadequate library facilities; without amendment (Rept. No. 6).

By Mr. MCCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 15. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to prevent purchase and sale of public office", approved December 11, 1926; without amendment (Rept. No. 7);

S. 26. A bill for the relief of Jose Babace; without amendment (Rept. No. 8);

S. 27. A bill for the relief of certain Basque aliens; with amendments (Rept. No. 9);

S. 29. A bill to authorize payment of claims based on loss of or damage to property deposited by alien enemies; with amendments (Rept. No. 10);

S. 32. A bill for the relief of Milo Jurisevic, Mrs. Jelena Jurisevic, Svetozar Jurisevic, and Radmila Jurisevic; without amendment (Rept. No. 11); and

S. 90. A bill to provide for the naturalization of Richard Kim; with an amendment (Rept. No. 12).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PERSONNEL AND FUNDS

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, the following reports were received by the Secretary of the Senate:

JANUARY 11, 1949.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
James M. Kendall, clerk	$7,405.06	$3,702.53
Joycette K. Jones, clerk	6,356.72	3,178.36

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$10,000.00
Amount expended	790.70
Amount expended as of June 30, 1948	5,268.41
Balance unexpended	3,940.89

ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman.

JANUARY 11, 1949.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY—SUBCOMMITTEE TO MAKE STUDY OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE, PURSUANT TO SENATE RESOLUTION 223, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$8,000.00
Amount expended	209.83
Balance unexpended	5,790.17

ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman.

JANUARY 11, 1949.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY—SUBCOMMITTEE ON LONG-RANGE FARM PROGRAM, PURSUANT TO SENATE RESOLUTION 147, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$15,000.00
Amount expended	622.22
Amount expended as of June 30, 1948	7,823.34
Balance unexpended	6,554.44

ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman.

JANUARY 3, 1949.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Everard H. Smith, chief clerk	$10,330.00	$5,164.98
Cecil H. Tolbert, assistant chief clerk	9,854.13	4,927.02
Thomas J. Graves, professional staff member	10,330.00	5,164.98
Thomas J. Scott, assistant clerk	8,827.10	4,413.54
Earl W. Cooper, professional staff member	8,353.09	4,176.54
Francis S. Hewitt, professional staff member	8,353.09	4,176.54
Harold E. Merrick, professional staff member	8,353.09	4,176.54
Robert H. Montgomery, professional staff member	8,353.09	4,176.54
John Pillsbury, professional staff member	8,353.09	4,176.54
Kimball Sanborn, professional staff member	8,353.09	4,176.54
Edmund T. King, professional staff member	8,353.09	4,176.54
Adelbert F. Teague, assistant clerk	8,353.09	4,176.54
Lawrence H. Wendrich, assistant clerk	6,852.05	3,426.00
Herman E. Downey:		
July 1-Nov. 15, assistant clerk	6,770.54	2,538.94
Nov. 16-Dec. 31, assistant clerk	7,879.08	984.88
Marie Jeneau:		
July 1-Oct. 11, clerical assistant	3,791.04	1,052.50
Nov. 6-Dec. 31, clerical assistant	3,791.04	579.13
Bernadine Wassam, clerical assistant	3,542.74	1,771.32
Mary K. Yanick, clerical assistant	3,542.74	1,771.32
Yvonne A. Beaudry, July 1-15, clerical assistant	3,377.22	140.71
Margaret Meehling, July 16-Dec. 24, clerical assistant	3,377.22	1,491.57
Regina H. Simons, July 1-31, clerical assistant	3,377.22	281.43
Richard C. Venne, Sept. 15-Dec. 31, clerical assistant	4,204.86	1,238.08

STYLES BRIDGES,
Chairman.

JANUARY 3, 1949.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
EMPLOYED TEMPORARILY		
Claire A. Christiansen, Aug. 1-Nov. 15, clerical assistant	$2,880.02	$340.17
Ralph Hanson, Nov. 8-22, consultant	[1] 21.86	328.29

[1] Per diem.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$20,000.00
Amount expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948	1,168.40
Balance unexpended	18,831.64

STYLES BRIDGES,
Chairman.

JANUARY 3, 1949.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report in addition to the statement showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Miscellaneous expenses

Unexpended balance of funds authorized by Reorganization Act and S. Res. 130, as of Jan. 1, 1948, plus additional authorizations in S. Res. 201 and 293		$38,875.37
Amount expended Jan. 1 to June 30, 1948	$13,867.97	
Amount expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948	5,120.84	
		18,718.81
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948		7,156.56
Unexpended balance of amount authorized by S. Res. 129, June 26, 1947, as of Jan. 1, 1948		43,158.89
Amount expended Jan. 1 to June 30, 1948	$5,031.91	
Amount expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948	741.35	
		5,773.26
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948		37,385.63

STYLES BRIDGES,
Chairman.

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
John G. Adams, chief clerk	$10,330.00	$5,165.00
Justice M. Chambers, staff adviser	10,330.00	5,165.00
Mark H. Galusha, staff adviser	10,330.00	5,165.00
Verne D. Mudge, staff adviser	10,330.00	5,165.00
Herbert S. Atkinson, assistant chief clerk	6,770.54	3,385.27
Georgia P. Early, clerical assistant	3,956.56	1,978.28
Irene P. Gray, clerical assistant	3,956.56	1,978.28
Roberta Van Beek, clerical assistant	3,956.56	1,978.28

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 80th Cong.	$15,000.00
Amount expended Jan. 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948	11,284.66
Balance unexpended July 1, 1948	3,715.34
Amount expended July 1, 1948, to Dec. 31, 1948	3,046.19
Balance unexpended Dec. 31, 1948	717.15
Funds authorized by S. Res. 238, June 19, 1948	25,000.00
Total balance unexpended	25,717.15

CHAN GURNEY,
Chairman.

JANUARY 7, 1949.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Robert D. L'Heureux, professional staff member	$10,330.00	$5,164.98
William F. McKenna, professional staff member	10,330.00	5,164.98
Joseph P. McMurray, professional staff member	10,330.00	5,164.98
Charles T. Andrews, professional staff member	10,330.00	5,164.98
Raimond Bowles, chief clerk	10,330.00	5,164.98
Eunice V. Avery, clerical assistant	5,611.84	2,805.90
Caro Pugh, clerical assistant	3,873.80	1,936.86
Pauline C. Beam, clerical assistant	3,873.80	1,936.86
Edna A. Stewart, clerical assistant	3,873.80	1,936.86

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure—Balance remaining July 1, 1948 ..... $4,993.56
Amount expended 1,080.65
Balance unexpended 3,912.91

CHAS. W. TOBEY,
Chairman.

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
J. George Stewart, chief clerk	$8,353.09	$4,176.54
James R. Kirkland, chief counsel	9,301.11	4,650.54
Thomas S. Henderson, assistant counsel	7,879.06	3,939.54
Edna L. Ward, assistant clerk	3,956.56	1,978.26
Ruth Wallace, assistant clerk	3,625.51	1,812.72

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure $10,000.00
Amount expended 4,442.22
Balance unexpended 5,557.78

C. D. BUCK,
Chairman.

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
J. H. Macomber, Jr., chief clerk	$10,330.00	$5,164.98
Glenn K. Shriver, assistant chief clerk	7,958.06	3,979.02
E. B. Van Horn, staff director [1]	10,330.00	1,922.52
Walter L. Reynolds, staff member	9,064.11	4,532.04
Philip C. Ward, staff member	9,854.13	4,927.02
Gordon R. Ewing, staff member	10,330.00	5,164.98
Ann M. Gricks, clerk-secretary	5,446.32	2,723.16
Emily I. Tennyson (Mrs.), clerk-stenographer	3,791.04	1,895.52
Marie C. Tyler, clerk-stenographer	3,956.56	1,164.97
Velta Blanche Holder, clerk-stenographer	3,342.74	1,771.32

[1] Terminated Sept. 6, 1948.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 80th Cong $10,000.00
Amount expended 4,491.75
Balance unexpended 5,508.25

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 3, 1949.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS—SUBCOMMITTEE ON FUNDS AUTHORIZED AND EXPENDED UNDER SENATE RESOLUTION 152 AND SENATE RESOLUTION 259

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Eli E. Nobleman, counsel, Subcommittee on Relations With International Organizations (S. Res. 152)	$7,563.07	$3,781.50
Paul H. Menk, Jr., administrative analyst, Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments (S. Res. 259)	7,168.06	3,868.89

Funds authorized or appropriated for expenditure under S. Res. 152, 80th Cong $30,000.00
Amount expended:
Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations $5,517.02
Subcommittee on Relations With International Organizations 8,624.13
Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments 4,813.43
Balance on statutory receipt 479.67
..... 19,434.25
Balance unexpended 10,565.75

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 1, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS—SENATE INVESTIGATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from June 30, 1948, to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Adlerman, Jerome S., assistant counsel	$7,563.07	$3,597.18
Bellino, Carmine S., accounting consultant	8,906.10	4,453.02
Boos, George F., chief investigator	8,037.08	1,384.15
Brosnan, Robert E., assistant counsel	8,906.10	4,453.02
Coughlin, Frederick M., assistant counsel	6,770.54	3,281.79
Cousins, Mary G., assistant clerk	3,708.27	1,854.12
Flanagan, Francis D., chief assistant counsel	10,328.14	5,164.02
Leadbetter, John D., messenger	2,552.00	453.67
Lee, Lydia, record clerk	5,363.55	2,681.76
McCahill, Myles C., investigator	6,025.66	3,012.78
McCarthy, Mollie Jo, assistant clerk	3,459.98	1,729.98
McElroy, Robert J., assistant clerk	3,542.74	1,771.32
Minor, Robert W., assistant counsel	4,701.44	1,862.36
Montler, Gladys E., assistant clerk	$3,956.56	$1,978.26
Morris, Constance L., assistant clerk	3,459.98	1,729.98
Oliver, Betty F., assistant clerk	3,046.16	1,523.04
Piper, Robert L., assistant counsel	6,025.66	1,422.70
Rogers, William P., chief counsel	10,330.00	5,164.98
Shepherd, Mary Lou, assistant clerk	3,459.98	1,441.65
Sheridan, James F., investigator	6,025.66	3,012.78
Young, Ruth M., clerk	4,122.09	2,061.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure $120,802.41
Amount expended 59,375.38
Balance unexpended 61,427.03

HOMER FERGUSON,
Chairman, Subcommittee.

JANUARY 3, 1949.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1948, to January 1, 1949, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Sherwood B. Stanley, chief clerk (deceased Dec. 3, 1948)	$9,222.11	$3,893.73
Elizabeth B. Springer, assistant chief clerk	5,960.14	2,980.07
Fred R. Peel, research clerk (resigned Nov. 1, 1948)	5,641.84	1,870.60
Bernice M. Crouze, stenographer	4,370.38	2,185.19
Janice Everly, stenographer	4,370.38	2,185.19
Jesse R. Nichols, document clerk	3,625.51	1,812.75

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure $10,000.00
Amount expended Jan. 1, 1947, through June 30, 1948 (previously reported) 7,520.66
Amount expended July 1, 1948, through Dec. 31, 1948 ..... 373.77
Total expended 7,894.43
Balance unexpended 2,105.57

EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 3, 1949.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Francis O. Wilcox, chief of staff	$10,330.00	$5,164.98
Richard H. Heindel, professional staff	10,330.00	5,164.98
Thorsten V. Kalijarvi, professional staff	[1] 10,330.00	8,070.29
C. C. O'Day, clerk	8,906.10	4,453.02
Emmett M. O'Grady, assistant clerk (to Nov. 8, 1948)	4,860.97	1,730.47

[1] Rate effective Aug. 1, 1948.

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Isabel M. Smith, assistant clerk	$4,370.38	$2,185.14
Morella R. Hansen, assistant clerk	4,039.33	2,019.66
Eilene Marie Galloway, assistant clerk (to Aug. 1, 1948)	5,611.84	483.23

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, $20,000—balance July 1, 1948 ..... $8,871.16
Amount expended, July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948 ..... 965.84
Balance unexpended, Dec. 31, 1948 ..... 7,905.32

A. H. VANDENBERG,
Chairman.

JANUARY 7, 1949.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Hugh R. Brown, chief clerk	$10,330	$5,165
Nellie D. Mesberry, assistant chief clerk	7,405	3,702
Albert A. Grorud, professional staff	8,037	4,018
Elmer K. Nelson, professional staff	8,037	4,018
Oscar G. Iden, professional staff	7,563	3,781
Wallace Barlow, professional staff	7,405	3,620
Orville Watkins, clerical staff	5,116	2,558
Charlotte Mickle, clerical staff	3,542	1,771
Elizabeth Magill, clerical staff	3,294	1,509
Estelle Bedsworth, clerical staff [1]	3,873	1,291

[1] Terminated Nov. 1, 1948.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure $32,396.36
Amount expended 10,822.86
Balance unexpended 21,573.50

HUGH BUTLER,
Chairman.

JANUARY 11, 1949.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Vera Burgess, clerical assistant	$4,949.73	$2,474.87
Edward Cooper, professional staff member	10,330.00	5,165.00
Halford G. Davis, professional staff member	10,330.00	5,165.00
Harriet Gray, clerical assistant	3,956.56	1,978.28
Edward Jarrett, clerk	10,330.00	5,165.00
Dorothy Prout, clerical assistant	3,956.56	1,978.28
Martha Shaffer, clerical assistant (temporary)	3,956.56	1,978.28
Charles W. Tobey, Jr., professional staff member (temporary)	7,405.06	1,768.96
Atlee F. Zellers, professional staff member	7,405.06	1,768.96

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure $19,372.45
Amount expended 6,975.19
Balance unexpended 12,397.26

ED. C. JOHNSON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 11, 1949.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE—SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRADE POLICIES (PURSUANT TO S. RES. 241, 80TH CONG.)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
William P. Bolles, chief clerk	$5,604.61	$2,625.84
Eileen R. Browne, clerical assistant	3,459.98	1,276.78
Fred E. Clark, economist	10,012.13	2,454.62
Cecelia M. Cook, clerical assistant	3,459.98	1,153.32
Edith W. Dallas, clerical assistant	2,109.80	375.13
Elizabeth J. Gergely, clerical assistant	3,459.98	701.64
Frank W. Schatzschneider, assistant counsel	5,198.02	1,848.15
William Simon, counsel	10,012.13	4,171.70
L. Evelyn Spicer, clerical assistant	4,370.38	2,185.14
Willard B. Van Horne, Jr., assistant general counsel	8,660.10	3,250.89

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure $50,000.00
Amount expended 27,779.35
Balance unexpended 22,220.65

ED. C. JOHNSON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1949.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Richard Arens, professional staff (legal)	$8,274.09	$4,137.05
Maurice Coveri, professional staff (legal)	8,274.09	4,137.05
Joseph A. Davis, assistant clerk	8,274.09	4,137.05
Miriam O. Fox, stenographer	4,370.38	2,185.19
Helen Ganss, stenographer	3,791.04	1,895.52
Margaret Holland, stenographer	3,791.04	1,895.52
Mary Rogers, stenographer	4,370.38	2,185.19
J. Carlisle Ruddy, professional staff (legal)	8,274.09	4,137.05
Charles A. Webb, professional staff (legal)	7,405.06	2,591.73
Robert B. Young, clerk of committee	8,985.10	4,422.55
TEMPORARY EMPLOYEE UNDER S. RES. 120		
Lelia Lively, clerk-typist	3,791.04	1,895.52

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure $16,173.65
Amount expended 7,178.81
Balance unexpended 8,994.84

PAT MCCARRAN,
Chairman.

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY—SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION (PURSUANT TO SENATE RESOLUTION 137 AND SENATE RESOLUTION 236, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Thomas J. Davis, investigator	$6,931.05	$3,466.48
Otto J. Dekom, investigator	6,931.05	966.37
John A. Loftus, investigator	6,931.05	3,465.48
Guy M. Massey, investigator	6,931.05	2,214.06
Fred M. Mesmer, investigator	6,931.05	3,465.48
James C. Mesersmith, clerk	6,931.05	3,465.48
Margaret P. Hogan, stenographer	3,956.56	24.95
Ethel Johnson, stenographer	3,956.56	1,813.40
Stephanie Lojewski, stenographer	3,956.56	1,262.89
Lois C. Odham, stenographer	3,956.56	1,978.26

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure $64,806.89
Amount expended 29,792.77
Balance unexpended 35,013.12

CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,
Chairman.

JANUARY 2, 1949.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Philip R. Rodgers, clerk	$10,012.13	$5,006.04
Earl B. Wixey, assistant clerk	8,511.09	4,255.50
Paul Sample, clerical assistant	5,032.50	2,516.22
Crawford C. Heerlein, clerical assistant	4,453.15	2,226.54
Vivien Harman, clerical assistant	3,542.74	1,771.32
Dorothy Murphy, clerical assistant	3,294.45	1,647.18
Melvin W. Sneed, professional staff member	8,353.09	4,176.54

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure:
Jan. 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948 ..... $10,000.00
July 1, 1948, to Dec. 31, 1948 ..... 8,000.00
..... $18,000.00
Amount expended:
Jan. 1 to June 30, 1947 ..... $3,660.00
July 1 to Dec. 31, 1947 ..... 2,533.35
Jan. 1 to June 30, 1948 ..... 7,342.28
July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948 ..... 25.65
..... 14,560.98
Balance unexpended 3,432.02

Funds authorized or appropriated for Subcommittee on Health expenditure, July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948 ..... $10,000.00
Amount expended, July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948 ..... None
Balance unexpended $10,000.00

ROBERT A. TAFT,
Chairman.

JANUARY 3, 1949.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Bass, Anna, clerical (1 month)	$4,287.02	$357.31
Betsch, Lenora, clerical	4,287.02	3,143.81
Burnett, Frank, staff member	8,300.00	4,293.04
Chrisne, Costas D., reporter	5,303.33	2,081.77
Fox, Thomas F., assistant chief clerk (Nov. 21-Dec. 31)	8,860.14	602.29
Gayden, Mrs. Doris, clerical (Nov. 23-Dec. 31)	3,377.22	336.47
Homan, Colette, chief clerk	7,010.03	3,360.02
Irwin, Mary, clerical (1½ months)	5,032.50	629.06
Lynch, Dorothy, clerical	4,287.02	3,143.81
Pheih, John D., statistician	10,330.00	5,165.00
Riley, George D., staff director	10,330.00	5,165.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure $12,500.00
Amount expended 9,660.20

Balance unexpended 2,839.80

WILLIAM LANGER,
Chairman.

JANUARY 3, 1949.

REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE—SUBCOMMITTEE OPERATING UNDER SENATE RESOLUTION 81—LAST RESOLUTION AGREED TO RESOLUTION 384, JUNE 20, 1948

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1 to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

No staff employed since last report—only expenditure of funds was one field trip made by Senator LANGER.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure $35,000.00
Amount expended 34,170.60

Balance unexpended 829.40

WILLIAM LANGER,
Chairman.

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
E. W. Bassett, professional staff	$10,330.00	$5,165.00
Ronald Motz, professional staff	10,330.00	5,165.00
William A. Stevens, professional staff	10,330.00	5,165.00
Theo W. Sneed, professional staff	$8,300.00	$4,206.00
Orren L. Jones, clerical staff	10,330.00	5,165.00
Eloise Porter, clerical staff	5,611.84	2,805.92
Priscilla E. Cordova, clerical staff	5,611.84	2,805.92
Frances A. Sinvall, clerical staff	4,949.73	2,474.86
Mary Batalo, clerical staff	3,625.51	1,812.75
Dorothy Kramer, clerical staff	3,701.04	805.72

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, original appropriation and S. Res. 247 ..... $13,000.00
Amount expended 7,181.17

Balance unexpended 5,818.83

CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,
Chairman.

JANUARY 10, 1949.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it for the period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Albert L. Seidel, chief clerk	$10,329.96	$5,164.98
Nelson Deranian, professional staff (counsel)	10,329.96	5,164.98
George J. Niles, assistant clerk	6,852.05	3,426.00
Laura Vogt, clerk (secretarial)	3,377.22	1,688.58
Myrtle Paynter, clerk (stenographic)	3,294.45	1,647.18
B. Floye Gavin, clerk (research)	5,198.02	2,598.96

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure remaining July 1, 1948 ..... $9,127.17
Amount expended July 1 through Dec. 31, 1948 ..... 17.10

Balance unexpended 9,110.07

CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 3, 1949.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION—SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Arthur R. Breor, Jr., chief investigator	$6,687.78	$3,343.86
Betty J. B. Du Jack, secretary	4,122.09	2,061.00
Kelso Elliott, assistant counsel	8,669.10	4,334.52
Mary L. Green, administrative clerk	4,122.09	2,061.00
Grace E. Johnson, clerk	6,687.78	3,343.86
Henry F. Kiley, investigator	6,025.66	3,012.78
Joseph F. Langan, investigator	6,025.66	3,012.78
Robert K. Lyle, investigator	4,288.68	769.78
Joseph V. McCann, investigator	6,025.66	3,012.78
Lena Orme, secretary	3,542.74	1,771.32
Jack M. Poorbaugh, investigator	5,446.32	2,723.16
William P. Reed, investigator	5,529.08	2,764.50
Samuel H. Still, Jr., assistant counsel and investigator	4,949.73	2,474.82
Gerald W. Ohrn, investigator	5,280.79	2,640.36
Bauer, Virginia Lee, file clerk	$2,964.40	$1,486.70
Beveridge, Albion P., research consultant	6,932.05	2,853.00
Dickey, Raymond R., chief counsel	9,366.11	4,683.03
Guyon, Catherine L., consultant	8,195.08	3,049.84
Holshauser, Dorothy N., editorial secretary	4,122.09	2,061.04
Loveland, Allene J., secretary	4,122.09	2,061.04
McNamara, Catherine G., secretary	3,791.04	1,895.52
Meredith, George F., executive director	10,330.00	5,165.00
Nichols, Pearl Mae, secretary	4,122.09	2,061.04
Welken, Albert J., chief investigator	8,748.10	4,374.05
Wynes, Gene, clerk-messenger	2,713.10	1,244.41
Youse, Alma N., secretary	3,791.04	1,895.52
Dodd, Alice M., secretary	3,791.04	631.84
Charlotte Van Rensselaer, secretary	3,791.04	1,737.56
Morin, Avis, stenographer	2,280.00	109.70
Johnson, Albert E., special counsel	[1] 7,201.92	3,600.96
Dickey, Maxwell, special investigator	[1] 7,201.92	3,600.96
Zopf, Homer, special investigator	[1] 7,201.92	3,600.96
Broadcate, William, special counsel	(1)	1,658.85
Hadlick, Paul, special counsel	(1)	695.25
Casey, William J., special counsel	(1)	373.03
Graham, Earl, special counsel	(1)	2,925.82
Jack Baggett, clerk-messenger	1,620.00	226.24
Taylor, Nita O., stenographer	2,280.00	63.18

[1] Per diem, $25.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure $215,000.00
Amount expended 212,380.41

Balance unexpended 2,619.59

KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Chairman.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Miles N. Pike, of Nevada, to be United States attorney for the district of Nevada;

William Marvel, of Delaware, to be United States attorney for the district of Delaware;

Gilmore S. Haynie, of Indiana, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Indiana, vice Alexander M. Campbell, resigned;

Jack R. Caufield, of Oregon, to be United States marshal for the district of Oregon;

Paul B. Messick, of Delaware, to be United States marshal for the district of Delaware; and

Thomas N. Curran, of Maine, to be United State. marshal for the district of Maine.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Albert J. Loveland, of Iowa, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS TO FILE A REPORT

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senate will not be in session tomorrow or Wednesday, not until Thursday, and then will adjourn over until the following Monday, I wish to ask that the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, which will meet tomorrow, may be permitted to file a report during the recess on the nomination of Mr. James E. Webb to be Under Secretary of State, so that the nomination may go to the Executive Calendar and be considered at the Thursday session of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 597. A bill for the more economical operation of the general supply fund of the Bureau of Federal Supply, Department of the Treasury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

S. 598. A bill to advance knowledge on the history and culture of the American Indian through the acquisition and preservation of irreplaceable artifacts and relics; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 599. A bill authorizing the construction of certain works of improvement at Lewiston, Idaho, in the interest of flood control and allied purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(Mr. MAYBANK introduced Senate bill 600, to extend certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WATKINS (for himself and Mr. TAYLOR):

S. 601. A bill to provide for the establishment of a reservoir on Bear River, Utah, for the maintenance of water levels in the Bear River Migratory Bird Refuge, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 602. A bill for the relief of John B. H. Waring; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TAFT (for himself and Mr. McGRATH):

S. 603. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 604. A bill for the relief of Wilhelm Fritz Rathjens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 605. A bill to authorize the appropriation of sums of money needed for the relief and rehabilitation of persons of German ethnic origin, who, pursuant to the Potsdam agreement of August 1, 1945, have been expelled from countries of eastern Europe and forced into Germany and Austria; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 606. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Wesley Berk (formerly Mrs. Ruth Cameron);

S. 607. A bill for the relief of Eva Andresen;

S. 608. A bill for the relief of Doctor Ilan Zac;

S. 609. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bertie Grace Chan Leong; and

S. 610. A bill for the relief of Man Hee Fong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 611. A bill to authorize additional appropriations for the Willamette River Basin project; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CONNALLY:

S. 612. A bill to provide for the payment of a sum not to exceed $10,007,000 to the Swiss Government as partial compensation for damage inflicted on Swiss territory during World War II by United States armed forces in violation of neutral rights, and authorizing appropriations therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 613. A bill for the relief of John D. Garrard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. TAFT, Mr. FLANDERS, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey) introduced Senate bill 614, to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act (Title VI of the Public Health Service Act) to extend its duration and provide greater financial assistance in the construction of hospitals, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. HILL):

S. 615. A bill for the relief of James Greenwood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah (by request):

S. 616. A bill to assist veterans to borrow funds from established lending institutions for the acquisition of homes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 617. A bill for the relief of Francesco Alvino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. 618. A bill to credit to active and retired officers of the Medical Department of the Army all service performed as interns in Army hospitals on a civilian-employee status; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 619. A bill for the relief of the Spicer Ice & Coal Co.;

S. 620. A bill for the relief of the East Coast Ship & Yacht Corp.;

S. 621. A bill for the relief of Horace J. Fenton; and

S. 622. A bill for the relief of Isaiah Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 623. A bill for the relief of George Krinopolis; and

S. 624. A bill for the relief of Herman A. Bennink; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 625. A bill to authorize the construction of flood-control works at and in the vicinity of Bradford, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 626. A bill authorizing the naturalization of Antoine Ganda and Leopoldine Ganda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 627. A bill for the relief of Leon Moore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 628. A bill to authorize the establishment of a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles, and for other purposes;

S. 629. A bill to authorize the disposition of certain lost, abandoned, or unclaimed personal property coming into the possession of the Treasury Department, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force, and for other purposes;

S. 630. A bill to amend section 19 of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), so as to remove the upper age limit for appointment to commissioned grade in the Supply Corps of the Navy;

S. 631. A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, so as to equalize credits for service in the armed forces for pay and longevity purposes; and

S. 632. A bill to authorize certain personnel and former personnel of the Naval Establishment to accept certain gifts and a foreign decoration tendered by foreign governments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 633. A bill for the relief of Rachel D. Gattegno; and

S. 634. A bill to authorize payment of certain claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property and personal injury arising from activities of the Army; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 635. A bill to increase the fees of witnesses in the United States courts and before United States commissioners and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. McCARRAN also introduced Senate bill 636, to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for the regulation of noncertificated air carriers and contract air carriers, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. McCARRAN also introduced Senate bill 637, to increase the salaries of judges of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. McCARRAN (by request) also introduced Senate bill 638, to amend title 28, United States Code, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By McCARRAN (for himself and Mr. CAIN):

S. 639. A bill to encourage the development of new domestic sources of zinc ores by amending the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 640. A bill to provide for the distribution of motor-vehicle tires, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 641. A bill for the relief of James Thomas Powers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMAHON (for himself and Mr. BALDWIN):

S. 642. A bill for the relief of R. Wallace & Sons Manufacturing Co.; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

S. 643. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to exclude from the tax on transportation of persons amounts paid for transportation to places outside the continental limits of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 644 (by request). A bill to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation and to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(Mr. WILEY introduced the following bills, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appear under a separate heading:

S. 645. A bill to amend Public Law 663, Seventy-sixth Congress, so as to protect the badge, medal, emblem, or other insignia of auxiliaries to veterans' organizations;

S. 646. A bill granting a renewal of patent No. 54296 relating to the badge of the American Legion;

S. 647. A bill granting a renewal of patent No. 55398 relating to the badge of the American Legion Auxiliary; and

S. 648. A bill to amend title 18, U. S. C., section 705, to protect the badge, medal, emblem, and other insignia of auxiliaries to veterans' organizations and for other purposes.)

By Mr. CONNALLY:

S. J. Res. 36. Joint resolution for the authorization of a special contribution by the United States to the United Nations for the relief of Palestine refugees; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. J. Res. 37. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the 150th anniversary of the establishment of Fort Stoddert, Alabama; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WATKINS (for himself, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MALONE, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. HUNT, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. ECTON):

S. J. Res. 38. Joint resolution to authorize the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Reclamation, and other agencies of the Government, to break through snowbound areas in the Western Range States, and to take other necessary action to move in supplemental feed and otherwise care for livestock isolated by storms which have created an emergency; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RENT CONTROL

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to extend certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me, together with a summary of the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement, together with the summary, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 600) to extend certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAYBANK, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The statement and summary presented by Mr. MAYBANK was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAYBANK

This bill extends rent control for 2 years beyond the March 31, 1949, termination date of the present act. In addition to extending the period of rent control, it extends coverage to several types of accommodations not now under rent control and corrects weaknesses in the present act. It also gives the Housing Expediter authority to recontrol areas previously decontrolled.

Brought back under rent control under this bill are the following:

1. Hotel accommodations not rented for transient occupancy on June 30, 1947. This will bring back under rent control some 500,000 hotel apartments rented to permanent guests as distinguished from transients.

2. Rental units covered by 15-percent voluntary leases. The bill provides that housing accommodations with present 15-percent leases shall be under rent control and it recontrols housing accommodations on which such leases were previously terminated, but at the lease rent. The right to enter into such leases is not renewed.

3. Accommodations which were not rented for 24 months during the period from February 1, 1945, to March 30, 1948. Such units are exempt from rent control under the present act. This bill brings them under control.

Under this bill, conversions are no longer automatically decontrolled, as in the present act. Converted housing accommodations remain under control until the Housing Expediter finds that the conversion resulted in additional, self-contained family units.

The bill authorizes the Housing Expediter to bring back under rent control areas previously decontrolled.

Provisions in the bill for strengthening rent control include the following:

1. The right of the Expediter to sue for treble damages for overcharges on failure of the tenant to do so. At present only a tenant has such right. In practice, few tenants have exercised their right from fear of being evicted.

2. Control over evictions is restored to the Housing Expediter. Under the present act, a tenant is compelled to go into court to protect his rights if he believes the eviction to be illegal. Under this bill, the Housing Expediter would be better able to prevent illegal evictions.

3. Criminal sanctions and use of the administrative subpena by the Housing Expediter. Criminal sanctions are intended for use against repeated and willful violators who apparently have little respect for civil penalties. By use of administrative subpena, the Expediter will be able to obtain additional information essential for better enforcement of the act and regulations.

This bill continues in effect the local advisory boards and their powers to make recommendations to the Housing Expediter, but it provides that if the Housing Expediter disapproves a board recommendation, appeal may be taken through complaint filed by the board in the Emergency Court of Appeals. Under the present act, such appeal is automatic.

While the bill extends rent control to the close of March 31, 1951, it authorizes termination of the act by Presidential proclamation or congressional concurrent resolution if the emergency is declared over prior to that date.

Veterans' preference is also continued to March 31, 1951. As before, it provides that veterans of World War II are to be given first opportunity to rent or purchase new houses or apartments not built for owner-occupancy.

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED BILL TO EXTEND RENT CONTROL TO THE CLOSE OF MARCH 31, 1951

Section 1 provides that the act may be cited as the Housing and Rent Act of 1949.

Section 2 provides for the continuance to the close of March 31, 1951, of veterans' preference for the sale and rental of housing accommodations.

Section 201 (a) limits decontrol of hotel accommodations to those used exclusively on June 30, 1947, for transient occupancy.

Section 201 (b) provides for the decontrol of future conversions only on order of the Housing Expediter and recontrols housing accommodations which for 24 months during the period from February 1, 1945, to the enactment of the Housing and Rent Act of 1948 were not rented.

Section 202 provides for the transfer without reimbursement of the cabinets containing rent-control records as well as the records themselves to local officials on the termination of national rent control.

Section 203 (a) extends the Office of the Housing Expediter to the close of March 31, 1951.

Section 203 (b) provides that housing accommodations with present 15-percent leases shall be under rent control and recontrols housing accommodations on which 15-percent leases were previously terminated.

Section 203 (c) provides that the Housing Expediter furnish local boards with reporting services for public hearings.

Section 203 (d) provides for review of nonapproved local board recommendations by complaint filed in the emergency court of appeals by the local board.

Section 203 (e) eliminates cost ceilings for reporting services.

Section 203 (f) extends the provisions of title II to the close of March 31, 1951, but authorizes the termination of the act by Presidential proclamation or congressional concurrent resolution if the emergency is declared over.

Section 203 (g) provides maximum rent standards for recontrolled units.

Section 204 provides for treble-damage suits to be instituted by the Housing Expediter on failure of the tenant to do so.

Section 205 provides for criminal sanctions and the use of the administrative subpena by the Housing Expediter.

Section 206 provides for the regulation of evictions by the Housing Expediter.

Section 301 provides that no person shall be required to offer any housing accommodations for rent.

Section 302 provides for the reestablishment of maximum rents.

Section 303 is the separability clause.

Section 304 provides for the act to become effective on the first day of the first calendar month following the month in which it is enacted.

AMENDMENT OF HOSPITAL AND HEALTH CENTER CONSTRUCTION ACT

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Hospital and Health Center Construction Act, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement prepared by me may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from Alabama will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 614) to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act (title VI of the Public Health Service Act) to extend its duration and provide greater financial assistance in the construction of hospitals, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. TAFT, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey) was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement presented by Mr. HILL was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HILL

The bill would amend the Hospital and Health Center Construction Act as follows:

First, increase the amount of Federal aid from $75,000,000 a year to $150,000,000 a year.

Second, extend the time for the operation of the act an additional 5 years or making a total of at least 8 years.

Third, place the Federal allotment for the individual hospital or health center project on the same variable need basis as the over-all allotment to the particular State. Under the act the individual project today receives 33⅓ percent of the cost from Federal funds. Under the amendment the 33⅓ percent would be increased in communities of low income and the Federal contribution to individual projects would vary between 33⅓ percent and 70 percent. There would be no increase in the over-all allotment to the particular State. The provision in the amendment for the increase of Federal allocation to the

individual State is the same as it was when the original act was passed by the Senate.

Fourth, provide $1,200,000 in Federal funds for aid to States, political subdivisions, universities, hospitals, and other public and private nonprofit institutions or organizations for projects for the conduct of research, experiments, or demonstrations relating to the development, utilization, and coordination of hospital services, facilities, and resources.

Fifth, provide Federal funds to aid States in the administration of the State plan for hospitals and health centers.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and so forth.

By way of explanation in connection with the bill I send forward copy of a letter I have addressed to the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, and I ask that this letter and the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill, together with the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 626) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for the regulation of noncertificated air carriers and contract air carriers, and for other puposes, introduced by Mr. MCCARRAN, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting after paragraph (25) thereof the following:

"(25A) 'Noncertificated air carrier' means any air carrier other than an air carrier holding a certificate of public convenience and necessity issued under the provisions of this chapter."

SEC. 2. Section 401 (a) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting immediately preceding the first sentence thereof the following:

"Except as provided in section 417 of this title."

SEC. 3. Title IV of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting after section 416 thereof the following new section:

"417. (a) No person shall engage in air transportation as a noncertificated air carrier unless there is in force a license issued by the Board authorizing such noncertificated air carrier to engage in such transportation: *Provided*, That if a noncertificated air carrier is engaged in air transportation under a letter of registration or exemption issued to such noncertificated air carrier under the provisions of this chapter, or any order, rule, or regulation thereunder, on January 1, 1949, such noncertificated air carrier may continue so to engage in air transportation for 120 days after said date, and thereafter until such time as the board shall pass upon an application for a license for such transportation if within said 120 days such noncertificated air carrier files such application as provided herein.

"(b) Application for a license shall be made in writing to the board and shall be so verified, shall be in such form and contain such information, and shall be accompanied by such proof of service upon such interested persons, as the Board shall by regulation require.

"(c) Upon the filing of any such application, the board shall give due notice thereof to the public by posting a notice of such application in the office of the Secretary of the Board and to such other persons as the board by regulation may determine. Any interested person may file with the Board a protest or memorandum of opposition to or in support of the issuance of a license. Such application shall be set for public hearing, and the Board shall dispose of such application as speedily as possible.

"(d) The Board shall issue a license authorizing the whole or any part of the transportation covered by the application, if it finds that the applicant is fit, willing, and able to properly perform such transportation, otherwise such application shall be denied. The Board may issue a license to a noncertificated air carrier with reasonable limitations of duration if it finds that such limitations are required by the public convenience and necessity; but where the application was made for a license of unlimited duration the applicant may reject such limited license if such right of rejection is exercised within such reasonable time as the Board may by regulation determine.

"(e) If any applicant who makes application for a licence within 120 days after the effective date of this section shall show that, from January 1, 1948, until the effective date of this section, it, or its predecessor in interest, was a noncertificated air carrier holding a letter of registration hereunder, the Board, upon proof of such fact only, shall issue a license to such applicant. Such license shall be limited to the operations shown to have been conducted by the applicant between said dates, and such license may be further limited to the types of service, classes of traffic, and the commodity or commodities carried by the applicant while so operating.

"(f) Each license issued under this section shall specify the points between which operation as a noncertificated air carrier is to be authorized, the nature of the traffic and scope of the business to be authorized thereby. There shall be attached to the exercise of the privileges granted by such license, or amendment thereto, such reasonable terms, conditions, and limitations as the public interest may require, except that no term, condition, or limitation shall restrict the right of the noncertificated air carrier to change or add to its equipment or facilities for performing the authorized transportation as the development of the business and the demands of the public may require: *Provided*, That no license issued under this section shall authorize the holder thereof to operate or to hold out, directly or indirectly, that it operates: (1) More than three round-trip flights per week between the same two points or more than four one-way flights per week between the same two points; (2) more than a total of four one-way flights and round-trip flights per week between the same two points; (3) in scheduled air transportation.

"(g) Each license shall be effective from the date specified therein, and shall continue in effect until suspended or revoked as hereinafter provided, or until the Board shall certify that operation thereunder has ceased, or if issued for a limited period of time under subsection (d) of this section, shall continue in effect until the expiration thereof, unless prior to the date of expiration, such license shall be suspended or revoked as provided herein, or the Board shall certify that operations thereunder have ceased: *Provided*, That if any service authorized by a license is not inaugurated within such period, not less than 30 days, after the date of the authorization as shall be fixed by the Board, or if, for a period of 90 days or such other period as may be designated by the Board, any such service is not operated, the Board may by order, entered after notice and hearing, direct that such license shall thereupon cease to be effective to the extent of such service.

"(h) The Board, upon petition or complaint or upon its own initiative, after notice and hearing, may alter, amend, modify, or suspend any such licence, in whole or in part, if the public convenience and necessity so require, or may revoke any such license, in whole or in part, for intentional failure to comply with any provision of this subchapter or any order, rule, or regulation issued hereunder, or any term, condition, or limitation of such license: *Provided*, That no such license shall be revoked unless the holder thereof fails to comply, within a reasonable time to be fixed by the Board, with an order of the Board commanding obedience to the provision, or to the order (other than an order issued in accordance with this proviso), rule, regulation, term, condition, or limitation found by the Board to have been violated. Any interested person may file with the Board a protest or memorandum in support of or in opposition to the alteration, amendment, modification, suspension, or revocation of a license.

"(i) No license may be transferred unless such transfer is approved by the Board as being consistent with the public interest.

"(j) No license shall confer any proprietary, property, or exclusive right in the use of any air space, civil airway, landing area, or air-navigation facility."

The letter presented by Mr. MCCARRAN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 24, 1949.

Mr. JOSEPH J. O'CONNELL, JR.,
Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board,
Commerce Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The notice of the Civil Aeronautics Board dated December 18, 1948, with reference to its proposed amendment and partial repeal of section 292.1 of its economic regulations governing small and large irregular air carriers has been called to my attention. I am submitting herewith for your consideration my views with respect to the legality of the proposed regulation, and certain questions of policy involved therein.

First of all, permit me to point out that on August 30, 1946, prior to the promulgation of the existing section 292.1, I addressed a communication to Mr. James M. Landis, the then Chairman of the Board, in which I stated as follows:

"Being the principal author of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as well as its sponsor throughout its whole legislative history, I may be presumed to have a clear idea of the legislative intent of Congress in enacting the law.

"I wish to state unequivocally and unalterably that the act never, at any time in its history, contemplated the economic regulation of nonscheduled or fixed base operators. No representatives of such persons appeared at any of the hearings either in favor of or in opposition to the bill nor were they requested to do so. Moreover, there is not to be found a single reference to such operators in the whole legislative history of the act. The only mention of nonscheduled operations in the entire act is in section 416 (b) (2), and that provision was inserted solely to assist the small operators who continuously held themselves out as scheduled operators but because of financial or other difficulties were often unable to meet their scheduled commitments. It was in no sense intended to bring the nonscheduled operators within the purview of the statute (82 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 7079).

"Admittedly, all airmen and all aircraft are subject to the safety requirements but no parallel provision is made in the so-called economic sections of the act. Rather, the

act applies its economic sections only to carriers engaged in air transportation, which term, by a series of definitions in the act, means the carriage by aircraft of persons or property as a common carrier for compensation or hire or the carriage of mail in interstate commerce. The use of the words 'common carrier' in section 1 (21) without further definition is sufficient demonstration that the economic regulations promulgated by the Board do not, and cannot, extend to private and contract carriers by aircraft as long as they are operating on a nonscheduled basis, regardless of whether or not such carriers engaged in interstate, overseas, or foreign commerce.

"It has often been charged that the Board is 'air-line minded' and if this is true I wish to compliment the members sincerely because there is no doubt in my mind that the intent of the act was to provide regulation of the air lines and the Board is to be congratulated for recognizing and accepting its proper sphere of activity. On the other hand, if the Board now seeks to enlarge its activity without legislative authority, I will condemn it and oppose any such assumption with all the force at my command."

Notwithstanding my communication and the clearly expressed intent of the Congress to cover only scheduled air lines in the legislation encompassed within the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, the Board proceeded to promulgate regulations to cover and govern the nonscheduled air carrier industry.

I have not been unaware of the tremendous development of the nonscheduled air carrier industry in this country since World War II. I am aware that there are approximately 5,000 such nonscheduled operators, and I am further aware that they have developed a large and substantial business. Many of these operators received their initial training in the pilot training programs which I sponsored.

It is my belief that if civil aviation in this country is to grow and fill the needs of our people, nonscheduled operators must be encouraged to develop and expand their business in a safe and proper manner. The nonscheduled industry of this country represents civil aviation's greatest potential growth; but that growth must be properly regulated in the public interest.

I have already introduced my bill to revise and rewrite the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 and bring it up to date. In addition to the contract carrier provisions of that bill I have been for some time considering a draft of an amendment specifically covering all noncertificated air carriers. This amendment I propose to introduce within a few days, though I am not sure I have solved certain technical problems of draftsmanship which are involved. My bill S. 1 and this proposed amendment will, for the first time, provide legislative authority for the Civil Aeronautics Board to regulate the nonscheduled aviation industry of this country. I do think that the Civil Aeronautics Board should, in the meantime, stay its hand and give the Congress, the only body legally authorized to speak, an opportunity to act on this subject. The reason I did not include the full amendment covering all nonscheduled operations in my original bill was that I have not heretofore felt that such legislation was necessary, as I believed for some time that the noncontract phases of nonscheduled operation should be allowed a free and unfettered opportunity to develop. But I now believe that the Congress should fully cover the complete air carrier field and express its policies on the subject, so my proposed amendment is designed to take care of this situation.

The latest draft of my proposed amendment is enclosed. I shall appreciate any comments or suggestions which the Board would like to make; and I hope the Board will come before the committee when hearings are scheduled and express its views fully. To cover such a varied industry as the nonscheduled air carriers of this country in broad language is quite difficult. You will note that my proposed amendment sets up a licensing system and that it vests rather broad authority in the Board. The full mechanics of what I have in mind may require a much more detailed bill.

In view of my position on the need for new legislation to cover the nonscheduled air carriers, I will not comment in detail on the provisions of the proposed regulation. As author of the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946, I do point out that the failure to continue the use of the "letters of registration" now used by the existing regulation appears to be an attempt to get away from the provisions and protections of that act. I do not believe the Board would intend such a result.

I believe that all possible action should be taken to assure safe operations by nonscheduled air carriers. This means sound economic regulations as well as proper safety regulations. Since the Congress in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 covered only safety regulations in a comprehensive way, the Congress should now fill in the void which exists in the economic regulations for nonscheduled air carriers.

Kindest regards and all good wishes.

Sincerely,

PAT MCCARRAN.

INCREASE IN SALARIES OF CERTAIN JUDGES

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to increase the salaries of certain judges of the United States. In connection with this bill I ask that an attached memorandum, with footnotes, may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 637) to increase the salaries of judges of the United States, introduced by Mr. MCCARRAN, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The memorandum presented by Mr. MCCARRAN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM AS TO THE NECESSITY FOR INCREASE IN THE SALARIES OF UNITED STATES JUDGES

The purpose and effect of the proposed legislation is to provide for a $5,000 increase in the annual salary of each member of the Federal judiciary, except in respect to that of the Chief Justice of the United States for whom is proposed an increase of $9,500. The proposed legislation applies in both terms and effect to the salaries of the Chief Justice and of the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court, of the judges of the United States courts of appeals, of the judges of the United States Court of Claims, of the judges of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, of the judges of the United States district courts, of the judges of the United States Customs Court, of the judges of the district courts of the Virgin Islands and of Alaska, and of the judges of the Tax Court of the United States. The proposed legislation applies in effect, although not in terms, to the salary of the judge of the District Court of the Canal Zone for the reason that the statutes provide that the judge of that court shall receive "the same salary as is allowed to United States district judges.[1] The present salaries, which the proposed legislation would supersede, were established by the act of July 31, 1946 (60 Stat. 716). The salaries fixed by that act and the salaries to be established by the proposed legislation compare as follows:

	Present salaries	Proposed salaries
Chief Justice of the United States	$25,500	$35,000
Associate Justices of the Supreme Court	25,000	30,000
Judges of the United States courts of appeals	17,500	22,500
Judges of the United States Court of Claims	17,500	22,500
Judges of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals	17,500	22,500
Judges of the United States district courts	15,000	20,000
Chief judge of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia	15,500	20,500
Judges of the United States Customs Court	15,000	20,000
Judges of the district courts of the Virgin Islands, Alaska, and the Canal Zone	15,000	20,000
Judges of the Tax Court of the United States	15,000	20,000

HISTORY OF FEDERAL JUDICIAL SALARIES

The history of Federal judicial salaries has been as follows: Prior to 1911 the salary of the Chief Justice of the United States was $13,000;[2] in that year it was raised to $15,000; in the same year the salaries of the Associate Justices were raised from $12,500 to $14,500.[3] In 1926 the salary of the Chief Justice was raised to $20,500 and the salaries of the Associate Justices to $20,000.[4] Until 1891 the salaries of the District judges varied in the several districts.[5] In that year a uniform salary of $5,000 was fixed.[6] This was increased in 1903 to $6,000[7] and in 1919 to $7,500.[8] In 1891 the salary of the judges of the circuit courts of appeals was fixed at $6,000.[9] This was increased in 1903 to $7,000[10] and in 1919 to $8,500.[11] In 1926 the salaries of the judges of the United States circuit courts of appeals, including the justices of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, were fixed at $12,500;[12] those of the judges of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals and of the Court of Claims, at $12,500;[13] those of the judges of the United States district courts, including the district court of the United States for the District of Columbia, at $10,000, except that of the chief justice of the district court of the United States for the District of Columbia which was fixed at $10,500;[14] the salaries of the judges of the United States Customs Court were fixed at $10,000.[15] The salaries of the judges of the district courts of Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and Alaska were fixed by amendments to the respective organic acts at $10,000 in 1926,[16] and in 1946 at $15,000.[17] The salary of the judge of the District Court of the Virgin Islands was fixed in 1928 at $7,500;[18] in 1940 at $10,000;[19] and in 1946 at $15,000.[20] In 1946 the salaries of the judges of all the other lower Federal courts as well as the salaries of the Chief Justice and of the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court were fixed as set forth in the compilation printed at the beginning of this memorandum.[21] As stated the salary of the judge of the District Court of the Canal Zone is fixed by the statutes referred to in note 1, supra, which are still in effect, at the same rate as that paid to judges of the United States district courts generally. The salaries of the judges of the Tax Court of the United States were fixed in 1924 at $7,500.[22] This was increased in 1939 to $10,000[23] and in 1946 to $15,000.[24]

PRESENT FEDERAL JUDICIAL SALARIES COMPARED WITH THOSE IN OTHER COURT SYSTEMS

In England, the Lord Chancelor, who is the highest judicial officer, receives an annual salary of £10,000 (approximately $40,000 at the present depreciated rate of exchange). The presiding judge of the Supreme Court of New York, appellate division, first and second departments, receives an annual salary of $31,500; the associate judges receive salaries of $30,000. The chief judge of the Court of Appeals of New York receives $25,500 plus $3,000 expenses, and the associate judges receive $25,000 plus $3,000 expenses. The justices of the Supreme Court of New York, the trial court of general civil judisdiction, in the large metropolitan areas, including New York County, receive salaries of $26,000 a year. The judges of the court of general sessions of New York, the trial court of general criminal jurisdiction, receive $26,000 a year in the large metropolitan areas, including New York County. The chief justice of the Supreme Court of New Jersey receives $25,000 a year and the associate justices of that court receive $24,000 a year. The judges of the superior court, the trial court of general jurisdiction, receive $20,000 a year. The chief justice of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania receives $23,500 a year, while the associate justices receive $23,000. The judges of the court of common pleas of the State of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia and Allegheny Counties, a trial court of general civil jurisdiction, receive salaries of $16,500 a year.

ECONOMIC CHANGE SINCE ESTABLISHMENT IN 1946 OF THE PRESENT SALARY SCALE

An important factor in favor of an increase in judicial salaries is that fixed salaries have over a long period of years been diminishing salaries so far as purchasing power is concerned. According to figures made available by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Consumers' Price Index for moderate income families in large cities as of December 15, 1937, stood at 103; as of December 15, 1946 (the year in which the latest legislation for increase of judicial salaries was passed), the index stood at 158.3; as of November 15, 1948, the index stood at 173.2.

THE EFFECT OF TAXES UPON JUDICIAL SALARIES

Judicial salaries have declined in adequacy in part because of taxes. The figures set out below, which are computed under the Revenue Act of 1948 and on the assumptions set out in footnote 22, show the amount of taxes to be paid by the judges at present salaries and at the salaries proposed:

	Present salary	Tax	Proposed salary	Tax
Chief Justice of the United States	$25,500	$5,769.12	$35,000	$9,484.00
Associate Justices of the Supreme Court	25,000	5,542.72	30,000	7,381.92
Circuit judges	17,500	3,224.80	22,500	4,768.72
District judges and judges of the Tax Court	15,000	2,564.80	20,000	3,968.16

Using a circuit judge's salary as an example, on January 1, 1937, the salary was not taxable by either the Federal Government or a State government. The salary was $12,500 net to the judge. While the 1946 act increased the salary to $17,500, this salary was subject to a Federal income tax of $3,234 in 1948, leaving $14,276. The net gain to the judge over his 1937 salary was only $1,776. The cost of living, according to the figures given under the previous heading, increased from 103 in 1937 to 172.2 in 1948. If the proposed increase be granted by Congress the net to the judge, deducting a tax of $4,706 from $22,500, the amount of the proposed salary, will be $17,794—a gain of $5,294 over his 1937 salary. This will be of aid in overcoming the increased cost of living.

RELATION BETWEEN JUDICIAL SALARIES AND SALARIES OF OFFICERS OF THE EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENTS OF THE GOVERNMENT

There has been a definite relation between the salaries of the United States judges and those of officers of the executive department of the Government. Since 1925, except for dislocation arising from recent legislation, the salaries of Cabinet officers have been maintained at a level of $2,500 above that of circuit judges. For example, in 1936 the compensation of Cabinet officers was $15,000 while that of circuit judges was $12,500. The salaries of the Chief Justice of the United States and of the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court were fixed in amounts of $5,000 in excess of those of Cabinet officers. The salaries of the judges of the United States district courts were fixed in an amount of $5,000 less than those of Cabinet officers and $2,500 less than those of circuit judges. The proposed legislation will reestablish and maintain the historic relationship between the salaries of the judiciary and the Cabinet officers.

The salaries of the Vice President, of the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and of the Chief Justice of the United States have been on a substantial parity except for the increase effected in the latter's salary in 1946. Legislation enacted by the Eighty-first Congress, first session (S. 186, Public Law No. 2, 81st Cong.), provides that the Vice President and the Speaker shall receive salaries of $30,000 each, plus $10,000 each as an expense allowance. The salary of the Chief Justice should be increased to $35,000 because of this as well as on account of his numerous onerous administrative duties.[25]

COST OF THE PROPOSED INCREASE OF JUDICIAL SALARIES

The proposed salary increases involve 267 judgeships. The additional annual gross expenditure would amount to $1,669,500. But as noted above a substantial portion of this will go back to the Treasury in the form of taxes.

GENERAL COST OF THE FEDERAL JUDICIAL SYSTEM

It is appropriate to point out that the appropriation for the Federal judiciary is less than one-nineteenth of 1 percent of the total appropriation for the Government.[26]

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE RELATING TO COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I by request introduce for appropriate reference a bill having to do with proposed changes respecting the United States Court of Claims.

This proposed legislation was submitted to me by the Honorable Marvin Jones, chief justice of the Court of Claims; and I introduce it by request, and so that it may have proper study and consideration in the Committee on the Judiciary, where it will be referred to the standing Subcommittee on Improvements in Judiciary Machinery.

So that my own position with regard to this matter may be clear, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a copy of a letter which I addressed to Judge Jones, under date of January 13, having to do with the legislative proposals embodied in the bill which I have just introduced, together with the text of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the letter presented by the Senator from Nevada will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 638) to amend title 28, United States Code, introduced by Mr. MCCARRAN (by request), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The letter presented by Mr. MCCARRAN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 13, 1949.

Hon. MARVIN JONES,
United States Court of Claims,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR JUDGE: In answering your letter of December 7, I promised to write to you again after the new Congress got under way.

As you know, Public Law 770 of the Eightieth Congress was a comprehensive act codifying the entire title 28 of the United States Code. Even though great care had been taken in the preparation of the bill, by reason of its size and complexity, it was anticipated that there would probably be numerous typographical errors and matters of a similar nature that would need to be corrected by a subsequent bill. As fast as these errors or other defects appear, or are brought to light, they are being assembled, all to be included in a single corrective bill.

However, it is planned that this bill will include no substantive changes in the law as it was prior to June 1948, and as it was

[1] 47 Stat. 816 (1933); 42 Stat. 1065 (1922); 37 Stat. 565 (1912).

[2] For salaries prevailing from 1903 to 1911, see 32 Stat. 825 (1903).

[3] 36 Stat. 1152 (1911).

[4] 44 Stat. 919 (1926).

[5] Rev. Stat. § 554 (1878).

[6] 26 Stat. 783 (1891).

Since the establishment in 1891 of uniform salaries for district judges, it has been recognized "that it is impossible to make and pass a bill fixing graduated salaries and paying different compensations to judges of the same class because of geographical or other reasons.

"The mind of the bar association and that of all persons interested in the present bill recognizes the fact that a flat advance is all that can be accomplished. This is justified because today, under the law governing the appointment and assignment of judges to different localities and districts, judges of our Federal courts are like a mobile army that can be moved here and there and assigned to work distances probably [far] from their home district. All this favors the creation of a flat increase that shall be the same in every district throughout the United States." The quotation is from page 3 of H. Rept. No. 232, 69th Cong., 1st sess. (1926).

[7] 32 Stat. 825 (1903).

[8] 40 Stat. 1156 (1919).

[9] 26 Stat. 826 (1891). This was the compensation of the then circuit judges proper, which was fixed at $6,000 in 1871, 16 Stat. 494. The circuit courts were abolished in 1911, Judicial Code, ch. 13, § 289, 36 Stat. 1167.

[10] 32 Stat. 825 (1903).

[11] 40 Stat. 1157 (1919).

[12] 44 Stat. 919 (1926).

[13] 44 Stat. 919 (1926).

[14] 60 Stat. 716 (1946).

[15] 45 Stat. 997 (1928).

[16] 54 Stat. 220 (1940).

[17] 60 Stat. 716 (1946).

[18] 60 Stat. 716 (1946).

[19] 43 Stat. 337 (1924).

[20] 53 Stat. 159 (1939).

[21] 60 Stat. 716 (1946).

[22] The computation is based upon the assumptions that: (1) the judicial salary is the only income of the judge; (2) the judge is married; (3) his wife has no income; (4) standard deduction is taken; and (5) the tax is computed by the use of the split-income method.

[23] For example, the Chief Justice is chairman of the Judicial Conference of the United States.

[24] The appropriation for the Federal judiciary for the present fiscal year (1949) is $21,021,611; the total appropriation for the Government is $40,159,017,813.

intended to be enacted, but only such changes as are necessary to make it typographically or grammatically correct.

Numerous substantive changes have been proposed from time to time, some of which were included in Public Law 773, and others of which were included in the original bill (H. R. 3214, 80th Cong.) as introduced, but which were dropped out before final passage and approval.

The changes proposed in your letter of December 7 are substantive in nature and therefore, in my opinion, should not be included in the corrective bill; but, rather, should be considered on their individual merits, there being sound arguments, both pro and con, on these proposals.

Your first proposal is controversial in that it provides for interchange of judges between the Court of Claims (and the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals) and the regular United States district courts. The immediate question is raised as to the constitutionality of this proposal, since it provides for the judge of a legislative court to exercise the functions of a judge of a constitutional court. In my opinion, this proposal merits thorough and careful study from this angle, as well as from the angle of necessity.

Your second proposal would enlarge the judicial conference by the inclusion of the chief judge of the Court of Claims (and of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals) as members. At present the United States district judges are not represented (except by their senior circuit judge) and many of them now feel they should be represented on said conference. Should an individual legislative court be so represented, much argument would be presented for its further enlargement to include a direct representative of the district judges. While this proposal appears to have some merit, I believe it should be carefully studied for its possible implications.

Your third proposal, to grant Court of Claims commissioners a travel allowance of $10 per day (in lieu of the present maximum of $7) unquestionably is sound and should be enacted.

In this connection, I call your attention to my bill, S. 48, a copy of which is enclosed.

Your fourth and fifth proposals, respectively, to grant additional powers to the court to issue mandamus and similar writs, and to repeal existing provisions of law authorizing the court to receive cases from Government departments for a report on the facts and law, under its rules, both appear to have merit, but neither should be enacted hastily, as part of an omnibus bill, and without considering the arguments both for and against.

Your sixth proposal, to permit appeals under the Tort Claims Act from district courts to the Court of Claims, without agreement of both parties (as now required by law), also is a substantive change, obviously having much merit; but, also, too important, in my opinion, to be rammed through in an omnibus bill.

These are preliminary thoughts only, and not final conclusions; but I wonder if you may not feel, upon reflection, it would be better to include your proposals in a separate bill (or perhaps two or more separate bills) rather than trying to tack them onto the proposed corrective measure for title 28.

I shall be happy to have your further views in this matter.

Kindest regards and all good wishes.

Sincerely,

PAT MCCARRAN.

PROTECTION OF BADGES, ETC., OF AUXILIARIES OF VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce four bills which I feel are vitally necessary in order to protect the badges, medals, emblems, and other insignia of auxiliaries of veterans' organizations and in addition, to renew certain patents on the badges of the American Legion and its auxiliaries. These bills have been kindly suggested by the able director of the national legislative commission of the American Legion, Gen. John Thomas Taylor.

The first of the bills is identical to a bill which I introduced in the Eightieth Congress, S. 2239, in order to protect the badges, medals, emblems, and other insignia of auxiliaries of the veterans' organizations. The American Legion has furnished me with a list indicating unmistakably that these veterans' emblems have been infringed upon in several cases filed with the FBI by various commercial organizations. Such commercial infringement for private purposes should, of course, be stopped. Obviously, we owe it to our ex-service men and women, to their widows and sons, to make sure that their official badges and medals are used only for the public-spirited purposes of these fine veterans' organizations.

The other three bills are designed to extend the patents on the badges of the Legion, the Legion auxiliaries, and the badge of the Sons of the American Legion. During the Seventy-fourth Congress, we enacted Public Laws 230 and 231, extending the 14-year patent period of the Legion badge and the Auxiliary badge. Such patent extension is called for in the public interest and I feel that it should be promptly approved by the Congress.

In addition, I should like to point out with relation to bill No. 4 that the patent on the badge of the Sons of the American Legion expires on May 8, 1949, and, therefore, it is essential that this patent be extended, too.

I am hoping that the Senate Judiciary Committee will be able to take prompt action on all of the four measures. In so doing, it will prove (just as I am sure the Congress will prove) its deep interest in the magnificent work done by these organizations which is entitled to appropriate recognition.

The bills introduced by Mr. WILEY, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. 645. A bill to amend Public Law 663, Seventy-sixth Congress, so as to protect the badge, medal, emblem, or other insignia of auxiliaries to veterans' organizations;

S. 646. A bill granting a renewal of patent No. 54,296 relating to the badge of the American Legion;

S. 647. A bill granting a renewal of patent No. 55,398 relating to the badge of the American Legion Auxiliary; and

S. 648. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, section 705, to protect the badge, medal, emblem, and other insignia of auxiliaries to veterans' organizations; and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT OF ACT CREATING INLAND WATERWAYS CORPORATION—AMENDMENT

Mr. HILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 211) to amend the act entitled "An act to create the Inland Waterways Corporation for the purpose of carrying out the mandate and purpose of Congress as expressed in sections 201 and 500 of the Transportation Act, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1924, as amended, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

STUDY OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, in connection with an article entitled "Language Is Ordnance" by Max Sherover, from the magazine Armed Force, which I have presented for printing in the Appendix, I submit a concurrent resolution for appropriate reference.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 8) was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

Whereas the present position of the United States of America in world affairs necessitates greater contact between citizens of the United States of America and other nationals; and

Whereas a knowledge of foreign languages by American citizens is deemed by this Congress to facilitate the success of American peacetime policy; and

Whereas, in the event of hostilities, mastery of foreign languages on the part of military personnel is deemed of great value to the United States of America; and

Whereas the ability of Americans to communicate in foreign languages will contribute to greater cooperation with the United Nations: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That it shall be the policy of the Government of the United States and its official agencies to encourage the study of foreign languages by American citizens; and be it further

Resolved, That no Government agency shall in any way discourage the study of foreign languages on the part of any citizen eligible for schooling or training under its facilities or sponsorship; and be it yet further

Resolved, That members of the armed forces of the United States and veterans of the armed forces shall be given every opportunity and encouragement to take advantage of training facilities in foreign languages which are available to them, and that the specific agencies of the United States Government shall be responsible for encouraging the study of foreign languages among those falling under their jurisdiction and are specifically instructed to place no hindrance to, nor in any way inhibit, such study; and be it still further

Resolved, That the Veterans' Administration of the United States Government shall not refuse to authorize enrollment in language courses under its sponsorship to any veteran who has educational entitlement under Public Law 346 or Public Law 16 provided only that he has the educational qualifications to pursue such course and regardless of his present or contemplated vocation.

PRINTING OF PRESIDENT'S INAUGURATION ADDRESS (S. DOC. NO. 5)

On motion of Mr. HAYDEN, and by unanimous consent, it was—

Ordered, That the inauguration address of the President on January 20, 1949, be printed as a Senate document.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] be assigned to service on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BUSINESS CONDITIONS IN THE UNITED STATES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address regarding business conditions, delivered by him in Philadelphia, January 11, 1949, at the annual dinner meeting of the Tacony Manufacturers' Association, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING—ARTICLE BY SENATOR BRIDGES

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relating to extravagance in Government spending, entitled "Where To Swing the Ax," written by him and published in the December issue of the American magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

SENATOR HILL—MAN OF THE YEAR IN SERVICE TO SOUTHERN AGRICULTURE

[Mr. SPARKMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the announcement in the Progressive Farmer magazine of January 1949, of its selection of Senator HILL as "Man of the year in service to southern agriculture," together with press comment, which appear in the Appendix.]

COUNT OF ELECTORAL VOTES

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the text of Senate Joint Resolution 2, together with a letter from the Brookings Institution, and newspaper comment, which appear in the Appendix.]

A BLUEPRINT FOR 1949–52—ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "A Blueprint for 1949–52," from the Washington Post, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SITUATION IN CHINA—RETIREMENT OF CHIANG KAI-SHEK

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial relating to conditions in China, entitled "We Let Down a Friend," published in the Washington News of January 22, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

LANGUAGE IS ORDNANCE—ARTICLE BY MAX SHEROVER

[Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Language Is Ordnance," by Max Sherover, from the magazine Armed Force for December 25, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there are no further concurrent or other resolutions, or other routine matters, morning business is closed.

CONSIDERATION OF LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief announcement. I have noticed that over the week end there has been some newspaper discussion in regard to the position taken by the junior Senator from Oregon as to the time table for the consideration of labor legislation. Apparently there has been something more than newspaper discussion over the week end, because someone apparently has been at work, judging by communications I am receiving from various labor groups, seeking to give the impression that the junior Senator from Oregon is attempting to stall action on labor legislation.

Mr. President, I am very glad to reply to labor from my seat here today, because I think it is time for American labor to face some legislative realities and to recognize, before it is too late, the difference between political gestures and a sincere attempt on the part of some of us to work for a revision of labor legislation which will protect the legitimate rights of labor, as well as of employers.

Certainly, Mr. President, if I wished to make political capital out of the labor legislation problem which confronts us I could say to American labor, "I shall support an immediate repeal of the Taft-Hartley law and immediate repassage of the Wagner Act." But I am not going to mislead American labor; so I am asking, in reply to the communications I have received from American labor, "What do you want? Do you want careful, thorough consideration of labor legislation by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or do you want a labor bill written on the floor of the United States Senate?"

Mr. President, I wish to say that any attempt to immediately repeal the Taft-Hartley law and repass the Wagner Act without change will only result in a host of amendments to any such proposal on the floor of the United States Senate. I do not intend, as one who can really stand on his record for protecting the legitimate rights of labor, to be a party to any such political gesture or strategy.

I want fair legislation, and I am going to fight in the Labor Committee for fair legislation; but the enactment of fair legislation calls for considered judgment. It calls for hearings—open hearings, fair hearings, hearings in which all points of view will have an opportunity to present their case in support of their contentions.

Mr. President, it is true that at the last meeting of the Committee on Labor, I offered a motion. In effect, the motion was that the committee should seek to attempt to convene hearings on labor legislation this week. In fact, I think I said in committee that I hoped our first hearing could be not later than Thursday of this week. I urged further that we should seek to make our goal the ending of the hearings by March 1, and that we should seek then, on the basis of the record made at the hearings and the records already on file with the committee, complete drafting of the bill by the first part of April. I urged that at least sometime during the first 2 weeks of April we should bring to the floor of the Senate the best piece of legislation which the composite viewpoints of the committee can present.

Mr. President, I see no chance, I do not see it as being within the realm of possibility, to complete the hearings on labor legislation within less than a month. So I am not going to say to American labor that I think we can rush through hearings within less than a month. If future events show, as the committee goes to work, that we can finish the hearings before March 1, the junior Senator from Oregon will not be a party to forcing the hearings to be continued to March 1 because of any particular date which may have been set. If, on the other hand, let me say to labor here and now, future events show that we cannot complete the hearings by March 1, and that a few days thereafter may be needed, the junior Senator from Oregon will vote for an extension of the hearings.

As for the rest of the timetable, Mr. President, if during the month of April we in the committee can complete committee action in less than a month, certainly the junior Senator from Oregon will do everything within his power to speed up the consideration in the executive sessions of the committee—but only insofar as such a course is consonant with due deliberation on the evidence before us.

It is not in the interests of American labor, Mr. President—and I want American labor to take it from me now—for them to attempt to push through the Senate of the United States within a few short days or two or three short weeks labor legislation which is to their liking and which they think must be passed. I am satisfied that the rank and file of American workers want fair legislation, and nothing more. I am satisfied that, upon reflection, all labor leaders in America will recognize that their best interests will be served only by the passage of fair labor legislation.

It happens to be the judgment of the junior Senator from Oregon that in the Taft-Hartley bill, against which I voted, the Congress went to an extreme position in passing legislation which transgressed upon the fair, legitimate rights of labor. Therefore I have said all over the country that I think the Taft-Hartley law should be repealed. I also think it should be repealed—speaking partisanly for a moment, Mr. President—so as to get a Republican label off of it. But I think it should be repealed on its demerits, and that we should pass legislation which is fair to all parties concerned, including the American public. But I also say to American labor today, from this desk, that the repassage of the Wagner Act without change would not be fair to the legitimate rights of American employers, for reasons which I have expressed at length, both in committee and on this floor, time and time again.

Thus, I hope that it will be clear to American labor that the junior Senator from Oregon is going to oppose any steam-roller tactics on the part of American labor. I shall always stand up to be counted against the steam-roller tactics of any other group in this country.

When the debate on this subject is over, Mr. President, it will be found that I shall have made a record on it, and it will be a record for fair legislation—fair to employers, fair to labor, and fair to the American public. Therefore I serve notice that I am not going to be rushed into any quick action on labor legislation.

I think a timetable which seeks to have labor legislation brought on the floor of the Senate not later than the first 10 days of April is a perfectly fair timetable. I say now to labor—because I

want labor to know now what I shall do in executive session of the committee—it is a timetable for which I shall vote this afternoon when the Labor Committee reconvenes.

AUTHORIZATION TO REPORT SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 31

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have been informed that it is anticipated that after the Senate adjourns today, it probably will reconvene on Thursday.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If that be so, I should like to obtain consent to report Senate Joint Resolution 31, relating to the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train during the adjournment, provided my committee finishes with it in the meantime, as if the Senate were in session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE STATE OF ISRAEL

Mr O'CONOR. Mr. President, tomorrow the free people of Israel are to conduct elections, thus giving evidence of their readiness and eagerness to adopt the practices of democratic and freedom-loving people. This is the first time in recorded history that such elections have been held in that part of the world, proving conclusively Israel's good faith in upholding the ideals of democracy.

It seems timely, therefore, for us, who have been sympathetic with the efforts of the Jewish people to establish a homeland in Israel, to bespeak the utmost cooperation of our State Department and our Government in furtherance of the effort to attain a peaceful settlement of the issues in that troubled area.

It seems obvious that, since the establishment of the independent State of Israel, its leaders and its people have given to the world the most convincing evidence, first, of their unshakable devotion to the idea of a homeland that would provide a refuge to members of their race throughout the world, and, secondly, of their ability to govern themselves successfully and defend themselves against attacks from without or within.

Israel has amazed the world not only by its military successes but by its ability to cope with any of the emergencies that have developed. By their own indomitable courage and tenacity its people have brought stability to their national economy. Most important of all, they have won the respect of the neighboring Arab states to such an extent that negotiations looking to a peaceful settlement of the controversial issues are now under way or pending with three of their erstwhile opponents.

In the unsettled state of the world today, and with the Middle East a potential source of world conflagration, there is cause for satisfaction in the direct negotiations now being conducted on the island of Rhodes between representatives of Israel and Egypt.

Reports of preliminary discussions between representatives of Israel and of both Lebanon and Transjordan give increased significance to the advance that has been made by the Israel Government in its efforts to reach peaceful settlement of the boundary question and other issues.

With such indications of coming peaceful arrangement of the affairs of Israel it would be most fruitful of good if our State Department would lend the good offices of this country toward the avoidance of any possible unfortunate intervention by any country at this time.

In view of the truce achieved between Arab powers, represented by King Abdullah of Transjordan, and Israel, it would seem a most unfortunate moment for any action which would tend to disrupt the current conference.

Israel has placed itself in the hands of the United Nations. The United States, as has been indicated in the commendable utterances of President Truman, has given recognition to the new government. But it is to be hoped that the United States will recognize Israel de jure as well as de facto.

Our country should, at this moment, use every means at its command to convince the world that amicable adjustment of difficulties should be encouraged and not thwarted. Let us hasten the day when the people of Israel, with their background of culture and rich tradition, shall have their place in the sun.

HAND-PICKING JURORS IN FEDERAL COURTS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, with the confident expectation that I shall have practically the unanimous support of the Members of this body, I bring to the attention of the Senate once more the flagrant, un-American, and totally inexcusable situation that exists in some of our Federal courts today, namely, the power that some Federal judges have seized, to hand-pick juries.

On Saturday last, according to the Associated Press, Federal Judge John C. Knox, of New York, appeared before the Fayette County Bar Association at Uniontown, Pa., and reiterated what he had previously stated in executive session before a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, of which subcommittee I was chairman, when we were considering Senate bills 17 and 18, dealing with uniform qualifications of jurors in Federal courts, and for other purposes.

Judge Knox, according to the Associated Press, said:

> That he had been told repeatedly that selection of jurors in his district was a hand-picked process. "If this be a valid indictment of my conduct, I cannot do otherwise than admit my guilt," the jurist said. "Nevertheless, unless restrained by an authority that I cannot resist, jurors in my district will continue to be hand-picked."

Here, Mr. President, we find a Federal judge boasting that he has already hand-picked jurors in his court, and saying that he is going to continue to hand-pick them.

What does the Constitution of our country say about trial by jury? Article III, section 2, provides:

> The trial of all crimes, except in cases of impeachment, shall be by jury.

Not by a judge who hand-picks them, but by a jury.

Later, by section 1 of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution, it is provided:

> No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Judge Knox, of course, in mitigation, in what I cannot help but characterize as an outrageous, reprehensible action by a Federal judge, says that—

> those (jurors) chosen should possess as high a degree of intelligence, morality, integrity, and common sense as can be found by those who make the selection.

Mr. President, I wish to make it emphatically, unequivocally, and straightforwardly clear that I am first, last, and all the time opposed to any Federal judge hand-picking any jurors in any case whatever, civil or criminal. I care not whether the men to be tried are murderers, bank robbers, or smugglers, or whether they are Democrats, Republicans, or Communists. Under the Constitution, a defendant in any criminal case is entitled to a fair trial by his peers; and that, in my judgment, does not mean that a Federal judge, who beforehand has made up his mind that someone is guilty of a crime, should be allowed, either directly or indirectly, either through the clerk of court, or court commissioner, or otherwise, to select the 12 men who are going to try that defendant.

Judge Knox's position is not new. On the contrary, it is as old as the hills. There is not an informed lawyer in this body who does not know that approximately 100 years ago, namely, in March 1851, a Member of Congress described the wild country then known as Indian Territory, and the territory west of the Arkansas border, by declaring there was "no God west of Fort Smith."

Thus, in March, 1851, Congress cut the judicial district in two, the eastern section taking in all of Arkansas with the exception of nine counties in the northern part of the State, the western section embracing those nine counties and all the vast area east of Texas and Colorado and what was then called "No Man's Land," the unexplored country beyond the Indian territory.

The site of the first court seat was Van Buren, Ark. Its first presiding judge was Daniel Ringo. However, in 1865, 14 years later, by congressional act, the court's location was moved 5 miles down the Arkansas River to Fort Smith. In that same year, Henry Caldwell was appointed as the first judge to govern exclusively the western jurisdiction, which at that time covered the largest judicial district in the world. His authority was absolute and final. It represented the only legal authority west of Fort Smith, where a Member of Congress had declared there was no God.

In 1872, Judge Caldwell was replaced on the bench by a young lawyer named William Story. I particularly call attention to this Judge Story because it was alleged that he was able to smell money

farther than any other judge of his time. Court costs during his 14 months' tenure as judge ran into the fabulous sum of $400,000. He was charged with corruption, incompetency, and bribery. In July 1874, in order to avoid impeachment proceedings in Congress, he resigned.

President Grant immediately thereafter appointed Isaac Charles Parker as judge. To give some idea as to what this judge was like, it will suffice to say that the judge scorned having but one rope, demanding 12, in order that 12 men might be suspended from a single ridge pole. Twelve trap doors were so set that they could be dropped separately or simultaneously.

For 14 years, from the day he stepped on the bench, no appeal could be taken from his decisions. Here in America, a judge's decision was final. No appeal could be taken from his pronouncements of death. He could sentence a man to death, without the possibility of an appeal—a power with which no other judge in America has ever been invested since his day. So what Judge Knox is talking about is not new. The decisions of the judge to whom I referred were absolute and final. He sentenced 168 men to die on the scaffold, of whom 88 were actually hanged. He thus earned for himself the title of "the judge who hanged 88 men." What happened to the rest of the men whom the judge sentenced to death?

I listened to the testimony given by Judge Knox. I heard him tell about the fine character possessed by Federal judges in the United States. I agree that the overwhelming number of them are fine, honest, straightforward men, and that they are good judges.

Every Member of this body has knowledge of several corrupt judges in England, whose records are still a blot on Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence. In this country we have also had some Federal judges whose records have been bad, or else they would not have been tried through impeachment proceedings by this very body.

What happened to the 80 remaining convicted men who were sentenced to death by this judge, with all his power? Of the 80 remaining convicted men, 43 had their sentences commuted by the President. Then suddenly Congress provided that after May 1, 1889, the right to appeal to the United States Supreme Court would lie in all cases where the punishment was death. Twenty-three of the 80 appealed and were convicted of lesser crimes, five died in prison, four were granted new trials, one was killed while attempting to escape, two were pardoned, one was declared insane, and another was bonded and never recaptured.

I want the Members of the Senate to pay particular attention to this statement:

While Judge Parker had this enormous responsibility, so fearful were the defense attorneys of incurring Judge Parker's wrath that it was not until 10 men had been sentenced to hang that a defense attorney dared exercise his right in behalf of his client, though the law had been established on May 1, 1889. The attorney who dared appeal the case was Attorney J. Warren Reed, a newcomer to the Fort Smith bar.

What was the record when this first appeal was taken? The appellant was Henry Starr, a professional bank robber whom Judge Parker had sentenced to the scaffold for the slaying of Deputy Floyd Wilson. The Supreme Court reversed his decision and remanded the case under the mitigating circumstance that Starr killed Wilson in an open fight after he had told the deputy to go for his gun. Again Starr went on trial and was sentenced to hang.

Again Reed braved Judge Parker's wrath and appealed. Within 16 months Starr was again granted a new hearing.

Judge Parker could no longer stand the vexation of having his opinions overruled. In his dispute with the United States Supreme Court, he declared that he was more familiar with criminal procedure and criminal law than were the justices of the country's highest Court, whose work was limited almost exclusively to reviewing civil cases.

Newspapers headlined his controversy with Supreme Court Justice Edward D. White, who later became Chief Justice. The Justice accused Parker of being opposed to the right of appeal, and Judge Parker accused the Justice of lack of knowledge of the law.

It was on this score that Judge Parker got into trouble.

Friends of the offended judge of the high court got the ear of Congress. Lawyers who had lost numerous cases before the hanging judge saw a chance to vindicate themselves and damned the court for its cruelties and inhumanity. Considering only the words "he hanged 88 men," others condemned him as being harsh and tyrannical. And in Washington, Senator John Vest, of Missouri, took the floor to declare the Fort Smith hall of justice "a shambles, a butcher's domain, a stench, and a disgrace to civilization."

Almost immediately Congress stripped him of his powers and later abolished his court.

What I wish to call to the attention of the Senate today is that while the Constitution granted the right of trial by jury, the jurors in this court were selected under his personal supervision, with the disastrous result which I have outlined.

What is the present situation in America? Perhaps no one is better qualified to testify as to our jury system than is the Honorable Joseph B. Keenan, practicing attorney in Washington, D. C., and who was head of the Criminal Division and Assistant Attorney General from October 1933 to January 1936, and Assistant to the Attorney General from then until February 1939. For almost 6 years he was the chief prosecutor in this country. He made a record so fine that he was selected by President Truman to take charge of the prosecution of Tojo and other Japanese criminals.

What did Mr. Keenan say when he testified in April 1947, on Senate bills 17 and 18, dealing chiefly with the intention to establish uniform qualifications of jurors in Federal courts?

What he said, Mr. President, is worth reading by every Senator; and I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the testimony of Joseph B. Keenan, the prosecutor of Tojo and his associates in Japan.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH B. KEENAN, ATTORNEY, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. KEENAN. I am Joseph B. Keenan. I have been head of the Criminal Division and Assistant Attorney General from October 1933 to January 1936 and assistant to the Attorney General from then until February 1939.

I would like to present a brief general statement, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to give my notions as a result of my experience with reference generally to the Federal judiciary.

I think that when you take the statistics as to the number of Federal judges and the instances where there have been difficulties with their character, the percentage of high-caliber and satisfactory judges is very remarkable and has been for a long period of time.

I do feel this way, however: That in the administration of justice in Federal courts there is a tendency to bring about what I can no better describe than "blue-ribbon juries."

I think that in turn leads to the jury as a group, perhaps involuntarily, surrendering some of its duties—I won't say privileges alone—to conform to what they may feel the Federal judiciary believes to be the truth, particularly in criminal cases.

Naturally, any such tendency cannot be corrected by any single act or piece of legislation, in my humble opinion. And I do not believe that, except in very rare instances, Federal court judges have any desire to exercise improperly their prerogatives of the bench. Yet I have known of many instances, where it has seemed that the Federal judge might himself undertake the job of making a determination of cases that do not belong to a jury, but that is a different subject matter.

But I feel from experience which is entirely impersonal that if there could be a measure devised for selection of the judiciary that would be practical, which measure would give the jury a feeling of independence, a feeling of being free from any obligation or influence in their method of selection, it would be a decided improvement in the administration of justice universally.

Now, I have heard the discussion this morning about too many farmers being excluded from the judiciary.

In Cleveland, where I practiced law, we noticed that almost all of the jurors came from outside the city of Cleveland. The city at that time was approximately 900,000.

But in the county, which had a population of about 1,200,000, we found that almost all of the jurors came from the outlying districts.

And while at that time I had no criminal practice in Cleveland, it was notable to the lawyers that we never found any municipal or city representatives on the jury.

I ascribed that, as did other lawyers in the time that I was there, to the fact that the system of selecting jurors was to blame; that if there had been some method by which jurors could have been selected by lots, you would have had less of the rural percentage and more of the urban, which would have been, in the opinion of most lawyers that I talked to, or knew of, a decided improvement in the administration of justice in criminal cases.

From the standpoint of the fairness of judges, I think that always the character of the men that are on the bench will determine that. And whether or not our system, which follows the British system, which gives the Federal judges the right to comment to a limited extent upon the evidence, is a wiser system than that prevailing in many State jurisdictions, where those rights are sharply curtailed, and even forbidden, is another subject matter which has caused, I suppose, a great deal of controversy in years back.

I have read this bill that is submitted here, and I see no particular improvement from the standpoint that I am talking of, in taking 150 or 300 names and putting them in a wheel and then drawing those out by lots.

There is some improvement in it, but it does seem to me that a system of justice where the jury is selected by lot brings a different cross section.

I do not mean from the standpoint of politics at all; it is not that. I would prefer to see every criminal case in the land decided by jurors of the average intellect.

I might recall one instance that is illustrative of that. It was a rather well-known case, tried in the Northwest, involving very serious crime.

There were, I think, four defendants. The Federal court judge was both learned and extremely conscientious, and he discussed the matter of whether or not he would use his prerogative of summing up the evidence, or in any manner tending to any extent to give his views as to the truthfulness of one witness or another.

He said that he had felt when he accepted his position on the bench that he never wanted to do that. But he was positive that these four accused were guilty.

We, who were representing the prosecution, had some doubt, but it was quite a confusing case. There was much evidence pointing to guilt. It had to do mostly with identification.

The court, however, refrained from making any comment, and it left the matter to the jury, which was a jury picked from the rural and the urban populace, about evenly divided.

The jury was out 7 or 8 hours and came back with a verdict of not guilty.

One year later, we brought in four other men, one of whom pleaded guilty to the offense. In other words, we had the wrong men. And with all due respect to the utmost sincerity of this judge and the care with which he followed the case and every detail of it, it confirmed the view that I had.

It is only one instance, it is true, but that confirmed the view that I had, that a jury of men and women distributed from different groups in life, from the rural and urban population, ordinary artisans, are the people that I am convinced, from my experience, I would like to have the matter left to, both from the standpoint of the Government and from the standpoint of the rights of the individual, where they clash with the Government.

So I am here, Mr. Chairman, naturally with no other motive in mind than to give my humble expression, from very limited experience, that any change that could be made in the selection of the Federal jurors that would bring about the conclusion in their mind, "Well, we are here because we have a right to be here. We are performing our functions as citizens of the United States. We are not beholden to any Federal judge or any Federal clerk or any Federal jury commissioner that is appointed by any Federal judge. Our function is just as separate as though we were one of the other three branches of Government, Members of Congress, or members of the legislative branch," would be a decided advance.

There might be considerable difficulty in working it out practically, but I am sure I have never met a Federal judge who had anything else but a desire to get the very best jury that he could get.

I do think, though, that though it is not anything personal as to any particular judge or any jury at any time, it is one of the weak spots in the administration of justice in which improvement could be made, if it were practical—I am sure it could be done—to have the law changed in such a fashion as to permit a wider variance of the type of people involved.

I think there is too strong a conviction that if you get professional men or bank clerks, or men of high education, they are going to be able to determine the facts of a case better than the man who works in the machine shop, or on the farm, or in the corner grocery store—if there are any left. That type of composite jury of 12 people, I think, goes further toward insuring the intelligent and faithful administration of justice than the present system which we have.

The nearer we could go toward that, the greater the improvement which could be achieved.

* * * * *

Senator LANGER. I would like to have your comment on what Mr. Keenan said about getting these jurors by lot in some manner.

Judge KNOX. We have had this selection of jurors under the present system since the Judiciary Act of 1789; being bound, as I have already said, by the State statutes. And I do not know how, outside of what is proposed in this bill, you are going to improve the method.

Now, you get into a political situation all over the country, where people have been asked to select names, county chairmen, for example, and they send in the names of persons who are on their voting lists, or something of that kind. That is the easiest way in the world to pack a jury, if one wants it to be packed.

What I am trying to do there is to broaden the scope of the jury commission, so that it may, under the direction of the judge, get a cross section of the entire community, and have them serve as jurors.

You had a selective draft during the war. You got the men who were capable of entering into the armed services. All we are asking here is to have a jury selection, and to get good people, people with brains, people with experience, people who have a stake in the country, onto our juries.

Senator LANGER. I cannot see—can you, Mr. Burdick—how you could pack a jury with names chosen a year in advance, chosen by various city councils and county commissioners.

Mr. BURDICK. Absolutely no chance. Because the case would not be in existence at the time they are drawn.

Judge KNOX. A great many are in existence, as a matter of fact, because they went over substantial lengths of time. And you have got to change your jurors' names in the wheel ever so often under the statute.

Anybody can pack a jury—I will grant you that—if you have someone who is dishonest.

Mr. CLARK. Another thing: You would have deaths. People would move away. And there would be exigencies that would destroy your system.

Judge KNOX. There would be a thousand and one things.

Mr. CLARK. I would like to ask Mr. Keenan: Do you think that under this system you would get a higher class of jurymen than you would by just picking them at random? Do you think you would get people who are more highly educated and people who would have a higher sense of values?

Mr. KEENAN. I think you would get better educated people, but, though it may be an idiosyncrasy of mine, I just feel that when you take the common man from the shop and do not lay so much stress on the education, you get a pretty good result from your jury. It may be that they will be fooled a little bit more easily, but I doubt it.

Mr. CLARK. That may be true in many cases, but many cases are very highly complicated. Do you not think, from your experience with the Federal courts, that they get a pretty good jury?

Mr. KEENAN. In Federal courts? Yes; I think you do.

To go back again—and this is surely without any reference to any individuals or any judges—I do think that there is a necessity for having a jury system as independent as it possibly can be. I do not care who the judge is. They look up to him. They look up to a State court judge, but particularly to a Federal court judge, who is appointed for life.

I think the intelligence is there, of course.

Mr. CLARK. You do not mean to say they would be influenced by the time for which they would be selected by a commissioner?

Mr. KEENAN. I remember a case that I can tell you of, out in Cleveland, that did not take more than 2 hours to try. I do not know the name of the man, and never did know what it was, but he was tried in the morning and convicted and sentenced, and I sat there waiting for a motion. I was just curious, because I could not, as a lawyer, find much if any evidence of the man's guilt. I talked to the foreman of the jury after they had voted for the conviction. He was one of the best-known men in Cleveland, the head of a large enterprise that had to do with a publishing company.

He said, "Why, of course there was no evidence in the case; none at all."

"Well," I said, "the judge charged you that unless you found these men to be guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, they should be acquitted."

"Well," he said, "we just made up our minds that" so and so—naming the assistant district attorney—this was several years ago—"probably brought in the wrong brief case."

"But," he said, "do you mean to say that the judge, whom you know, on that bench, would permit an innocent man to go to the penitentiary? Why, certainly not. The Federal agency that did the investigating knew the man was guilty. This judge, who has practiced law, has a long and honored record in the city of Cleveland, and he would not permit an injustice."

But I am telling you that he was the type of citizen that I am talking about; one whom you would select if you were picking out a "blue ribbon jury." I use that expression without intending offense to anyone. He would be the sort of man you would pick out.

Mr. CLARK. The same thing might occur in the selection of a jury at random.

Mr. KEENAN. It could, but my honest opinion is that the independent juror would be more likely to say, "Well, I do not care who the judge is. I did not try to get this job."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Keenan, do you not think that the average person picked at random would have a much higher respect for and confidence in a judge, and in fact would be afraid not to follow his instructions, to a greater extent than would a person such as you describe?

Mr. KEENAN. It could be, Mr. Attorney General. Nevertheless, when the man comes from the lower strata, the workingman, the farmer, he is more apt, I think, to say, "Well, this is my job," and have a little bit more pride in the job as juror than the well-educated man. But that is just a viewpoint.

Mr. BURDICK. I would like to ask Mr. Keenan a question.

Senator LANGER. Go right ahead.

Mr. BURDICK. Intelligence is not necessarily measured by education, is it?

Mr. KEENAN. I think not.

Mr. BURDICK. Then, even though a man worked on a farm or was a stone mason or a clerk in a store, he might have just as keen intelligence to determine a case as a graduate of Yale or Harvard; is that not true?

Mr. KEENAN. I feel you are undoubtedly correct about that.

Mr. BURDICK. This matter of education does not change anyone's intelligence.

Mr. CLARK. I did not mean we should have only college graduates on a jury. I meant that there are many cases where one who has had some experience in business life would be able to pass on it much better.

Mr. BURDICK. Well, two and two make four, and that is what a common jury looks at. My experience has been exactly as Mr. Keenan's has been with juries. I have had lots of them. I tried more jury cases before I came to Congress than anybody who ever came here. And I find that the cross-section of the people, no matter what they are doing, is the best kind of a jury you can have, men and women both.

Senator MOORE. That does not mean, Mr. Chairman, that under this proposal we are confining the selection of jurors to any particular section of society. It is a cross-section of the country.

Mr. BURDICK. That is right.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, at about the same time there was testimony given by USHER L. BURDICK, who is now a Representative from the State of North Dakota. He was assistant United States attorney in North Dakota. I ask unanimous consent to have certain portions of his testimony printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. USHER L. BURDICK, FORMER REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA, WILLISTON, N. DAK.

Mr. BURDICK. I am USHER L. BURDICK, of Williston, N. Dak.

* * * * *

Well, I have been a member of the legislature, speaker of the house, lieutenant governor, State's attorney, and Member of Congress.

Senator LANGER. You were a Member of Congress for how long?

Mr. BURDICK. Ten years. I also was assistant United States district attorney for North Dakota.

Senator LANGER. How long were you assistant United States district attorney?

Mr. BURDICK. Three and a half years.

Senator LANGER. You are familiar with the jury system in the Federal court, are you not?

Mr. BURDICK. I am.

Senator LANGER. Will you just state your experience, in view of the questions that I have asked the Attorney General, as to what your experience has been in connection with the Federal courts, Mr. BURDICK?

Mr. BURDICK. Well, as I understand the situation here now, you are trying to devise a plan that will produce fair and just juries. That is the aim; is it not?

Senator LANGER. That is right.

Mr. BURDICK. Well, under the present system, as it operates, that may be done; or the converse of that may be done.

Under the present system, if I am a district judge and determined to convict someone, I will guarantee that he will be convicted. And it all arises from the fact that these jury boxes are filled with names that are presented either to the clerk of the district court or the judge or the commissioner by interested parties.

After the box is filled, the drawing is just and legal. But the point is: Whose name gets into that box?

Now, we have had several experiences in that connection in North Dakota. I can put any name in that box that I want to, if I am a United States district attorney. I have been requested time and time again to help fill the box with names.

Mr. CLARK. That would be a violation of the statute. You ought to report it.

Mr. BURDICK. No; that would not mean any violation. If the commissioner says, "Now, Mr. BURDICK, are there some good jurors in your county, good intelligent, well-educated men, or businessmen? If there are, give me their names"—that is not a violation of law.

Mr. CLARK. That is just making a suggestion. That is not putting them in the box.

Mr. BURDICK. Well, I don't think it would be a very difficult legal problem to take all of the various districts in the United States and lay them out on the table and then devise a law that would cover them all at one time. That can be done.

Mr. CLARK. That is what the judges and the various people that have worked on this bill have tried to do.

You see, you must remember that this bill applies to 48 States. There are a lot of differences in the various districts, so you have to get a system that would be workable in each district, regardless of the population, whether it is a thickly populated area or a State where the population is not so thickly distributed.

Mr. BURDICK. Well, No. 4 is that the choice of specified sources from which names of prospective jurors are selected must be entrusted to the good faith of the clerk or the jury commissioner, acting under the direction of the district judge.

Now, then, if you have a district judge who is determined to convict somebody, then your system goes right back to where it was before.

For example, take the case of this particular judge. He is not a judge now; he is retired. Here is the way he would show his leanings in a lawsuit.

I have tried a great many cases before this judge, and those he wanted to convict he embarrassed me by making it too easy, and those he wanted to let loose it was almost impossible to do anything about.

Now, here is the way to do it:

He is instructing the jury:

"Now, gentlemen," he said, "if you find from the evidence submitted in this case that the defendant is not guilty, it is your duty to acquit him. But, on the other hand, if you are convinced from the evidence that he is guilty, it is your duty to convict."

Mr. CLARK. He could say that under your system, could he not, just as easily as under mine?

Mr. BURDICK. No; he would not have the same school to address.

Mr. CLARK. Those are the instructions to the jury.

Mr. BURDICK. He would have a jury right from the grass roots.

Mr. CLARK. He could still address them, though.

Mr. BURDICK. No. But we have a way of paying no attention to some fellows.

Mr. CLARK. If he wanted to be crooked, he could discharge them. We are assuming we are dealing with a crooked judge.

Now, there are many ways in which he could throw a case out rather than try to go to the trouble of selecting a jury and putting them in a box. He could dismiss the jury—dismiss the case. Hold that there was not enough evidence. There are plenty of ways—if you are assuming that there is a crooked judge. I think that is an improper assumption.

I think we prosecuted one case from Pennsylvania in the last few months, and I think there has only been one other such prosecution in the history of the United States.

Mr. BURDICK. Of what?

Mr. CLARK. Of a district judge, or any judge.

Mr. BURDICK. I was not here very long, but we removed one while I was a Member of Congress.

Mr. CLARK. Several resigned, of course.

Senator LANGER. Of course, it would not do any good to dismiss that case because the next jury would be drawn out of the same box containing the same kind of men. The judge would not gain anything.

Mr. BURDICK. I am not finding fault with the way the names are drawn out of the box, but the way those names get in the box in the first place.

Mr. CLARK. You see, your example breaks down. The judge could say the same thing to those jurors that you picked under your system as to those who were picked under this proposal.

Mr. BURDICK. He could, but he would be saying it to a different crowd of people.

Mr. CLARK. And if he just had this impelling force—this crooked mind that you spoke of—he would not have to do that. He would just say, "Gentlemen of the jury, the evidence is not sufficient. The case is closed. The court is out of session." And he would walk off the bench.

Mr. BURDICK. How would it work the other way? He would not say, "The case is dismissed and we shall go home," if he wanted to convict.

Mr. CLARK. Then he would make them a speech, under the example you give. He would make them a speech about how guilty this person was. Then, if they found him not guilty, of course, he would not be able to control that.

But if the district judge makes his mind up along the lines you have indicated, he could certainly say the same things to a jury picked under your system as he could to a jury picked under this system.

Mr. BURDICK. I am perfectly willing to trust a jury, no matter what the judge says, if a jury comes in just like ordinary juries do.

But when a judge also selects a jury and makes a speech to them, I am saying right now that that is unfair and unjust.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I do not know one of the 11 defendants who are on trial in New York today. I do not know a Communist in New York City. I have not communicated with any of them, directly or indirectly. But I will say that in America a murderer, a Communist, a Democrat or a Republican, a smuggler or a bank robber, under the Constitution of the United States is entitled to a square deal when he goes into court; he is entitled to a fair and impartial jury.

I read in the newspapers of yesterday and several days previously what was transpiring in a so-called court of justice, and I conceived it to be my simple duty as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and as a United States Senator to bring to the attention of this body and to the people of the entire country the fact that, in my judgment, the lawyers who are appearing for the Communists have a right, first of all, to show that the jurors are not impartial, because they are not picked from the community at large, but, on the contrary, are, perhaps, as they are alleged to be, members of a jury composed of persons who will not give the defendants a fair trial because of their previous economic condition or their present economic condition, or because of their views on public matters.

Finally, I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the law provides that

the jurors shall be selected by the clerk of the court and the jury commissioner. What good does it do if the clerk of the court and the jury commissioner are under the influence of a judge who says, "I am going to continue to hand-pick juries"?

PROBLEMS AND FUNCTIONS OF THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT—NOTICE OF HEARING

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has announced a public hearing to take place beginning on January 31, at which Secretary J. A. Krug, of the Department of the Interior, his assistant secretaries, and the bureau chiefs, will lay before the committee their point of view with respect to the problems and functions of the Department of the Interior. In announcing this public hearing, the committee did so in the hope that Members of the Senate and of the Congress, generally, particularly members of the Committee on Public Lands of the House of Representatives, might find it possible to attend.

The development of a sound national policy for the conservation and utilization of the natural resources of the United States will be one of the primary duties of the Eighty-first Congress. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has jurisdiction over matters dealing with the natural resources of the United States. The Bureau of Mines, for example, which deals with the problems of mining throughout the United States, is under the jurisdiction of this committee. The Geological Survey, the studies of which cover the entire country, is also within the jurisdiction of the committee.

The development of the natural resources of the United States becomes a most important problem at this juncture in the national affairs of the country, because the conservation and the utilization of our natural resources must be the foundation upon which will be built our own contribution to world peace and to economic rehabilitation.

The committee is inviting the attention of the public authorities of the various States and the private organizations which deal with water power, mines, and mining, and various other natural resources of water within its jurisdiction.

This will be only the beginning of the broad study contemplated by the committee. Public and private organizations will be invited to submit their suggestions. State bureaus of conservation and of mineral development will be asked to contribute to the study, as well as other Federal agencies like the National Security Resources Board of which Dr. John Steelman of President Truman's staff is the acting chairman.

Announcement was made this week by Edward V. Hickey, Acting Director of the Office of Production of the National Security Resources Board, that complete mobilization plans for all industries for quick expansion and conversion in the event of war are in the process of preparation. More than this is needed if a firm basis for permanent peace is to be established.

Modern war, as the last conflict proved, is an industrial effort as much as it is a military effort. The best preventive of conflict, therefore, is to mobilize our resources for peace before war comes, and thereby demonstrate to the world that the constructive efforts of a peaceful people can win far more for humanity than when natural resources are diverted to destructive purposes.

If we wait for war to mobilize our resources, it will necessarily be done in a totalitarian manner. If we mobilize them for peace now, it can be done in a democratic manner.

The objective of the study now being launched by the Interior Committee will be to find the ways and means by which private capital can be invested for the most effective utilization of the raw materials and the scientific knowledge now available to mankind.

The people of the United States committed themselves to the economic rehabilitation of Europe as an antidote for war. This policy can be successful only if we maintain a sound economy here. That in turn means that we must have, first, a thorough survey of our resources, and, secondly, a policy for their utilization in a manner which will keep the United States economically strong and keep the door of opportunity open for all people to utilize the resources nature has provided.

The United States gained its industrial leadership and its economic strength by reason of the rich endowment of raw materials with which it was blessed. Science is constantly revealing new uses for old materials, and is providing substitutes for those raw materials which are not in as plentiful supply. The coal and oil-shale beds of the United States, for example, provide sources of liquid fuel greater by far than all that is available from petroleum. It has already been demonstrated by the studies of the Bureau of Mines that the reserves of all the oil shale found in the United States alone exceed the total petroleum reserves of the Middle East.

Light metals and plastics are performing old and new tasks for the people. In our Western States we have vast deposits of alumina clay sufficient to make the United States independent of any foreign supplies.

It is not exactly intelligent to wait for a new war before we undertake the full utilization of these vast possibilities, just as it is not intelligent to await a new depression before we work for economic stabilization. That is the expensive way to do the job. For example, after the surrender of Japan, bringing the fighting to a close in World War II, Congress repealed more than $70,000,000,000 of appropriations. We were ready to spend that money to continue the war. A small fraction of it will prevent another war if expended in searching for the ways and means for the full utilization of our natural and scientific and our human resources in a free social and political structure.

Back in 1941, during the Seventy-seventh Congress, I introduced a Senate resolution for a study of the development of mineral resources on the public lands "with a view toward, first, providing for more effective development and utilization of such resources for the purposes of national defense; second, fostering free competitive enterprise and the investment of private capital in the development of the mining industry and the production of essential and useful minerals; and, third, conserving such mineral resources to the fullest extent which is consistent with their proper development and utilization."

One result of these studies was to reveal new opportunities for mineral production later developed through the RFC during the war.

Later a select committee of the Senate was appointed to investigate petroleum resources and to recommend a national policy. I submitted the report of that committee to the Senate on January 31, 1947. Copies are still available.

During the Eightieth Congress Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, of Nevada, was chairman of a Special National Resources Economic Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. This committee carried on extensive research.

From these beginnings under both Democratic and Republican auspices, it is to be hoped that a national policy may be made effective which will preserve a sound economy in the United States without which peace itself will be impossible.

I make this announcement, Mr. President, in order that the Members of Congress and the public may be aware of the hearing.

I ask unanimous consent that the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as set forth in Public Law 601 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. Public lands generally, including entry, easements, and grazing thereon.
2. Mineral resources of the public lands.
3. Forfeiture of land grants and alien ownership, including alien ownership of mineral lands.
4. Forest reserves and national parks created from the public domain.
5. Military parks and battlefields, and national cemeteries.
6. Preservation of prehistoric ruins and objects of interest on the public domain.
7. Measures relating generally to Hawaii, Alaska, and the insular possessions of the United States, except those affecting their revenue and appropriations.
8. Irrigation and reclamation, including water supply for reclamation projects, and easements of public lands for irrigation projects.
9. Interstate compacts relating to apportionment of waters for irrigation purposes.
10. Mining interests generally.
11. Mineral land laws and claims and entries thereunder.
12. Geological survey.
13. Mining schools and experimental stations.
14. Petroleum conservation and conservation of the radium supply in the United States.
15. Relations of the United States with the Indians and the Indian tribes.

16. Measures relating to the care, education, and management of Indians, including the care and allotment of Indian lands and general and special measures relating to claims which are paid out of Indian funds.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION—NOMINATION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, there is on the Executive Calendar one nomination, that of Brig. Gen. Peter A. Feringa, Corps of Engineers, to be president and member of the Mississippi River Commission. As in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be confirmed, and the President notified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and without objection, as in executive session, the nomination is confirmed, and the President will be notified.

PROGRAM FOR THURSDAY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I now move——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois if he knows what is to be taken up when the Senate meets on Thursday?

Mr. LUCAS. When the Senate meets on Thursday there is nothing of any major importance to be considered by the Senate. We hope that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will report the joint resolution introduced by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and myself continuing the Freedom Train for a period of 2 years. It is a nonpartisan measure. A similar measure was introduced in the House by Representatives MCCORMACK and MARTIN of Massachusetts. I doubt if there will be any objection to it. We will take it up for consideration on Thursday next, if meanwhile it is reported favorably by the committee.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think perhaps the Senator from Illinois should add for the information of the Senate that it is the hope of the Committee on Foreign Relations that the nomination of Mr. Webb to be Under Secretary of State will be reported favorably by the committee and will be available for consideration by the Senate on Thursday.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Michigan is correct. The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, made a request relating to that nomination a few moments ago, and that nomination will be considered by the Senate on Thursday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be permitted to report the Freedom Train measure during the adjournment of the Senate?

Mr. LUCAS. Let me say to the distinguished Vice President that such consent has been obtained, on request made by the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. I am sure that that order was entered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Very well.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move that the Senate adjourn until Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, January 27, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 24, 1949:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Louis F. Blanchard, of New Mexico.

Louis B. Mazzeo, of the District of Columbia.

Robert C. Brewster, of Nebraska, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 6, a vice consul of career, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion.

To be lieutenant colonels

Leland Francis Adair, O41473.
Frank Adams, O51189.
Eugene Thomas Adler, O29549.
John Burton Albin, O51296.
Frederick Beasley Alexander, Jr., O41949.
Robert Francis Alexander, O41912.
Frank Clarence Alfred, O41503.
Daniel Wayne Allison, O29071.
Donald Knox Armstrong, O18578.
George Lloyd Atwood, O39750.
Robert Marshall Bacher, O51045.
George Arlan Bachman, O51186.
Richard Lee Baldwin, O29113.
Aaron Bank, O28959.
James Theodore Barber, O17551.
Keith Harry Barber, O39606.
Frederick McCreary Barberie, O51050.
Gordon Lanier Barclay, O29691.
Thomas Ralph Barner, O41820.
Edwin William Baron, O42012.
Frank Edgar Bartlett, O41614.
Wyatt Garner Batton, O38696.
×Harry Kyle Bayless, O29104.
Charlie G. Beckenbach, O29031.
Cletos Otho Bennett, O28966.
Curtis Hargrave Bennett, O41821.
Joseph Edward Benoit, O51070.
Donald Bernard Berrigan, O28960.
Robert Huson Betts, O50956.
James Lee Beynon, O17605.
George Walter Frank Biles, O39590.
Frank Lee Blue, Jr., O17496.
Thomas Greenleaf Boardman, O38665.
Lewis Alexander Bonifay, O29040.
Richard Nicholas Borgfeldt, O42019.
David Wainewright Bowman, O39711.
Thomas Joseph Brascher, O39749.
Fred Brasted, O41854.
Guilbert Guion Brinckerhoff, Jr., O41686.
Arthur DeWitt Brittingham, Jr., O39577.
Wendell Mark Broadus, O29690.
Kirk Patrick Brock, O41650.
Irving Wilson Brooks, O39783.
James Madison Brocks, O39736.
Francis Joseph Brophy, O39723.
Louis Fisher Brossard, O28965.
Lobdell Percy Brown, O39757.
Richard Owen Brown, O39751.
Laurance Hilliard Brownlee, O17583.
Sewell Marion Brumby, O18546.
Clarence O. Brunner, O29456.
Angel Francisco Bruno, O39632.
Fred Lafayette Bryson, O41969.
Roy Thomas Bucy, O51188.
Vernon Morgan Budge, O42017.
R. Beverly Caldwell, O51185.
Ross Rowland Caldwell, O51111.
Peter Duryea Calyer, O17116.
William Wesley Campbell, O39755.
Kenneth Anthony Carson, O42030.
Charles Edward Case, O51260.
William Turner Cathcart, O41521.
Paul Eugene Chappell, O41968.
Robert Moorman Cheal, O18513.
Arthur Clark Cheyne, O29512.
Carl Francis Chirico, O29598.
Harry Cousins Chuck, O51032.
Carey Alexander Clark, O51315.
Jeff Clay 3d, O29657.
Robert Anthony Cliffe, O29515.
Theodore Philip Coates, O41490.
William Miles Coeyman, O51316.
William Norman Cogswell, O41945.
Sidney Oliver Cohen, O51065.
Howard Coleman, O29457.
King David Colson, Jr., O29668.
Reed Nelson Colvin, O51190.
James Walker Connor, O29479.
Jewell Howard Cook, O39595.
Herbert Walter Cooley, O39773.
Harry Bryant Cooper, Jr., O18469.
Marcus Edward Cooper, O51327.
Russell Burton Cooper, O28938.
Frederick Leon Coots, O50995.
Thomas Joseph Counihan, O17183.
John Francis Cox, O41534.
Ray Joseph Cox, O29571.
Gerard Beekman Crook, O39713.
Joseph Franklin Crosby, O51023.
×Edward Edgecombe Cruise, O17738.
John Howard Cunningham, O51325.
Ronald Bryce Currens, O41816.
James Chase Damron, O41793.
Madison Amos Daniels, O51019.
William George Davidson, Jr., O18862.
Edward Shelton Davis, O51121.
Harry Richard Davis, O41894.
Thomas Charles Davis, O41981.
Wallace Harvey Dawson, Jr., O39712.
James Mitchell DeBardeleben, O51266.
Earl Lester Denton, O41561.
William Brown Derrickson, Jr., O51282.
Frederick William Dies, O51067.
George Edwin Dietz, O18500.
Thomas Venson Dixon, O51277.
Abbott Edward Dodge, O51326.
Robert Edward Doe, O42066.
Francis Gerard Donahue, O29001.
George William Dorn, O41979.
George Raymond Dougherty, O51055.
Frank Hupman Drake, O41887.
Clarence Raphael Dunlap, O29975.
Edward Duvall, O41921.
Lee Llewellyn Dymock, O29768.
Aldean Aaron Eakin, O41994.
John Kenneth Eakin, O51222.
Hiram William Earle, O28958.
Kenneth Alfred Eddy, O29014.
LaRue Maxwell Edelen, O29445.
Frederic Nelson Eichorn, O39636.
Horace Napoleon Elkins, Jr., O39770.
Marvin Columbus Ellison, O41494.
John Ascalon Eterich, O29696.
C. A. Holmes Eubanks, O42014.
William Arthur Evans, O42060.
Eugene Paul Fahringer, O41930.
Herbert Fred Farmer, O39704.
Louis Joseph Fenny, O50979.
Arthur Albert Fiedler, O38719.
Eugene Joseph Field, O29830.
William Raymond Fields, O51288.
Herbert Morton Fitzgerald, O29022.
William Cullen Fitzhugh, O51047.
×David Franklin Foster, O29478.
William Floyd Foster, O51016.

Clarence T. Foust, O41860.
Charles Kerwin Fox, O41545.
John Rudolph Fox, O42034.
Dale Raymond French, O17570.
Edwin George Fritz, O51063.
George Wellington Gage, O41590.
Robert Earl Gambrill, O39716.
Robert Sherlock Garner, O29640.
Edward Lane Gibson, O42049.
Emery Menzo Gibson, O41604.
George F. Glass, O41790.
Francis John Goatley, O51256.
Herman Philip Goebel, Jr., O41475.
Mandel Nathaniel Goldstein, O29711.
Frank Edward Golembieski, O41486.
John Taylor Goodley, O29566.
Walter Parks Goodwin, O18733.
Arthur Deane Gough, O18413.
Ira Wellington Grande, O29503.
William Ewing Grubbs, O18146.
Paul Dickson Guernsey, O41810.
Clarence Harvey Gunderson, O18041.
William Arthur Hagerty, O41883.
Lawson Edmond Hahn, O29650.
Clebert Leon Hall, O17779.
Robert Guy Haines, O29480.
Earl Walter Hall, O38698.
Andrew William Hamilton 3d, O29767.
Harold Louis Hamilton, O28903.
Oscar Theodore Hammerness, O39752.
Benjamin James Handwerker, O29671.
Kenneth Kalmar Hansen, O29481.
William Virgil Harber, O39578.
Byron Edgar Hargrove, O51202.
Basil Aldine Harkins, O51015.
Harley Douglas Harpold, O41831.
Carroll Henry Harrison, O51252.
James Albemarle Harron, O41619.
Ralph Henry Hatfield, O39755.
Kenneth Clair Haycraft, O29704.
Paul Hayne, Jr., O39619.
Marvin Hays, O41826.
Harold Sinclair Hayward, O51213.
Max Webster Hazlehurst, O36723.
John Joseph Healy, O39707.
Ernest Fred Heidland, O17686.
Edward Blackburn Hempstead, O17649.
Alfred Dean Henderson, O41647.
Fred Robert Henderson, O41540.
Lyle Kenneth Henry, O41605.
Lowe Herman Herndon, O51223.
Charles Raymond Herrmann, O39779.
Kurt Norman Heyne, O39756.
Terrence Robert Joseph Hickey, O18567.
Frank Leonidas Hickisch, O39686.
James Wallace Higgins, Jr., O29542.
Alton Arrington Hill, O29394.
Richard Frank Hill, O39625.
Samuel Thomas Hill, O41630.
Eugene Goliday Hite, O29756.
Glen Ellis Hofto, O41585.
×Arthur Hamilton Hogan, O18551.
×Frank Leslie Holmes, O29076.
Harry Ernest Hornecker, O29082.
Frank Musser Hosterman, O38631.
Francis Eugene Houghton, O39742.
Charles Shircliffe Hoult, O42047.
Clyde Aylmer Houltry, O51224.
John Marquis House, Jr., O29729.
William Hand Browne Howard, O39613.
Jerome Hubbard, O41814.
Clarence George Hubbart, O29718.
William Calvin Huber, O42052.
William Russell Huber, O18797.
Robert Gwynne Humphrey, O29646.
Kenneth Marion Hurst, O41947.
Charles William Hutchins, O29714.
George Wilfred Hutchinson, O29744.
Sydney Frank Hyde, O29035.
Joseph Jacob Imhoff, O51009.
Forney Hurst Ingram, O29698.
Rupert Ingram, O51103.
Thomas Robertson Ireland, O51004.
William Harris Isbell, Jr., O18474.
Edward Bedell James, O41549.
Maximiano Saqui Janeiro, O18098.
Wayne Otto Jefferson, O29766.
Horace Lester Jennerson, O39620.
Clarence Melvin Jennings, O41643.
Burchard Mount Johnson, O29051.
Folkey Lauretz Johnson, O29431.
Gordon McTavish Johnson, O29406.
Richard Woodmansie Jones, Jr., O51000.
Robert James Jones, O28970.
William Sewall Jones, O29402.
Walter Edwin Jordan, O41910.
Johnathon Thomas Kaigler, O29721.
Harry Carl Kalt, O29532.
William Elton Kaley, O41818.
Andrew Donald Kane, O42073.
O'Neill Keren Kane, O18150.
Alfred Emil Kardos, O39705.
William Michael Keane, O38702.
Elmer Andrew Kell, Jr., O33639.
Henry Alexander Keller, O39637.
Theodore Douglas Kern, O51309.
Hugh William Kevin, O41583.
Willard Harper Kilpatrick, O41895.
Arthur Thomas Kirley, O28979.
Robert Patterson Kline, O39780.
Ernest Clair Knapp, O38624.
Lawrence McAllister Knapp, O41942.
William Watson Knox, O41558.
Elmer Lee Koup, O41999.
Stanley Adolph Kretlow, O39708.
×Tewes Kundel, O29037.
Joseph Ronaldo Lachance, O41500.
John Christopher Lackas, O29366.
Lawrence Donald Lally, O41674.
Percy Harold Laming, O42000.
Alexander Eugene Lancaster, O41875.
Thomas Francis Lancer, O51317.
Harley Arnold Lanning, O39720.
Carl Henry Larson, O42048.
Charles Pirie Law, O41684.
Charles Wyman Lawrence, Jr., O41613.
Aaron Meyer Lazar, O18738.
McWesley Ledbetter, O51096.
Stewart Henry Legendre, O42004.
Kenneth Llewellyn Leiby, O51286.
Benjamin Albert Lentz, O29401.
Frederick Joseph LePenske, Jr., O39774.
Maynard Norwood Levenick, O18514.
×Berkley Read Lewis, O29065.
Clarence Shirley Lewis, O29039.
James Franklin Lewis, O41915.
Lehman Jerome Lewis, O29537.
John Cook Light, O39611.
Herbert Frederick Lindal, O51243.
Julian Brester Lindsey, O17772.
Harold Matheson Lindstrom, O28932.
Laurence Wheeler Lougee, O41933.
Winton Henry Loveless, O39643.
Sidney Lowenstern, O51285.
Fred William Ludecke, O41898.
John Joseph MacFarland, O18100.
William Erwell Mackintosh, O51221.
Paul Elliott MacLaughlin, O17332.
John William Mac Leod, O41919.
Thomas Henry Magness, Jr., O51199.
William James Mahoney, O18616.
John Bradford Mallon, O51123.
James Edward Maloney, Jr., O18610.
Mervin Emil Mansager, O41878.
Donald Oran Markham, O29705.
Joseph Clayton Marphis, O51003.
Leon Deane Marsh, O39739.
John Taylor Marshall, O51041.
Frank Henry Mathews, O39560.
Peter Ulys Maxey, O51314.
Luie William Mayfield, O42025.
Walter Danley McCahan, O28936.
Gerald Patrick McCarthy, O41617.
Joseph Maney McCarthy, O29043.
Veon Maurice McConnell, O51333.
Charles John McCormick, O51083.
Robert Joseph McDuff, O28976.
Upton Albert McGill, O41659.
James Edward McHugh, O39745.
Basye Clay McKee, O29041.
Alton Oscar McLane, O38658.
Donald Winthrop McRell, O29606.
Benjamin Earle Meadows, O41637.
William Elwood Means, O18901.
John Arthur Meek, O51261.
×John Abner Meeks, O18735.
×William Menoher, O18690.
Michael Theodore Metz, O42071.
Harry Theodore Meyers, O41608.
Edward Gibson Miller, O41633.
Melvin Miller, O41783.
Whiteside Miller, O17790.
Harold William Miner, O51102.
Edgar Ray Minnich, O51197.
George Gordon Moore, Jr., O38626.
John Virgil Moore, O29098.
Robert Beasley Moore, O51294.
Robert Folkes Moore, O18781.
Thomas Joseph Moran, O17366.
Montescue Theodore Moree, O41834.
Wayne Williamson Morris, O50999.
Charles Adam Mount, O41934.
Sam Francis Muffie, O51201.
×Ralph Thomas Mulvanity, O29674.
Clarence Joseph Murphy, O39647.
Edward James Murphy, Jr., O42061.
Walter Harold Murray, O38698.
Charles Anthony Nebel, O42040.
Ruel Raymond Neiger, O39576.
Andrew Carpenter Nelson, O36676.
Godfrey B. Nemec, O28967.
Vardell Edwards Nesmith, O39669.
Henry Smith Newhall, O29717.
Harwood Sterling Nichols, Jr., O51219.
Stephen Laird Nichols, O28844.
×Svend Wright Nielsen, O39753.
James Lawrence Nolan, O38689.
John Earl Norman, O51279.
Richard Anderson Norton, O41984.
Royal Oscar Nunamaker, O29391.
Charles William Nussbaum, O51281.
Max Obler, O51237.
Charles Joseph Odenweller, Jr., O18135.
Charles Mason O'Donnell, O29010.
James Dupree Ogletree, O29492.
Edward Julian Ormiston, O29015.
John Upshur Dennis Page, O29085.
Nolan Page, O51101.
Richard Cloyd Parker, O18230.
Samuel Walter Parnelle, Jr., O29501.
Wayland Henry Parr, O17565.
Walter Herbert Parsons, Jr., O39782.
Kenneth Clarence Paterson, O51022.
Carl Mitchell Patterson, O39567.
Charles Seawell Paulin, O29443.
×Lawrence George Paulus, O39019.
George Denver Paxson, O29633.
Ralph Emerson Pearson, O51077.
Maurice Anthony Peerenboom, O39684.
Edward William Pennington, O29496.
Wendell Woody Perham, O28999.
Harold Tuft Perkins, O51284.
Ernest Clyde Peters, O18603.
Arthur Julius Peterson, O29881.
Joseph Anthony Petrolino, O29712.
Henry Lemle Phillips, O51249.
Herbert Lloyd Phyfe, O29390.
Milton Owen Picknell, O41952.
Robert Prescott Pike, O42023.
Lunsford Clay Pittman, O39586.
Arthur Joseph Pollard, O42029.
Alfred Prahinski, O41620.
William Clemens Pritchard, O29455.
Carroll Huston Prunty, O17281.
Pyueng Son Pyuen, O41976.
Harry Cellstine Quartier, O18879.
Maurice Myrlen Radcliffe, O30787.
William Thomas Ramsay, O56778.
Raymond Russell Ramsey, O29470.
Delphine Delmas Rasco, O41973.
Clarence Edward Read, O39602.
Harrell Reagan, O51060.
Herman Hughes Reed, O29081.
Melvin Wilson Reed, O29553.
Frederick W. W. Reese, O39660.
Richard Francis Reidy, O18557.
Cornelius Michael Reing, O29637.
Barclay Thurston Resler, O42068.
Harry Brownwell Reubel, O29050.
McDonald Rigdon, O28997.
William Pitt Ring, Jr., O29467.
James Franklin Ritter, O41578.
James Harry Ritts, O38720.
Elvyn Ambrose Robb, O42006.
Willis George Robbins, O51031.
William Ray Robinette, O29539.
Karl Robinson, O41857.
George Fisk Rogers, O29544.
John Edward Rogers, O41505.
Harry George Roller, O18597.
Leo Orrin Rostenberg, O29119.
Harold Carlos Rowe, O29413.
Walter Allen Rude, O18732.
×Karl Leonard Rudser, O29110.

John Carl Ruggaber, O28943.
Charles Frederick Russe, O50967.
Lee Johnson Rutz, O51276.
Ernest Allen Sallee, O41523.
Gerald Allison Sams, O41931.
Thomas Eason Sams, O28989.
Kenneth Otto Schellberg, O39743.
Karl Laurance Scherer, O18784.
George Joseph Schill, O51229.
William Otto Schlotter, O41495.
Russell Whitney Schmelz, O29353.
Glen Lawrence Schmidt, O28935.
Howard Ignatius Schmitt, O50987.
Carl Peter Schneider, O39688.
Ernest Corwin Seaman, O29607.
Arthur Lloyd Selby, O38669.
William Clarence Shakel, O39612.
Leland Claypool Shannon, O29346.
Joseph Sharove, O42021.
×William Summers Shoemaker, O39694.
Verne Richard Silbaugh, O41489.
Clyde Causty Simkus, O50996.
Kenneth Lovell Sipes, O41989.
Edwin Cooper Skinner, O50985.
Ernest Entler Smith, O29418.
George Waite Smith, O29013.
William Ruthven Smith, Jr., O18661.
Morton Solomon, O51002.
William Horace Spicer, O29719.
Lynn Spillman, O50981.
Harold Edwin Sprague, O41940.
Ralph Parker St. John, O39706.
John Melvin Stark, O39622.
Roy Hesten Steele, O41847.
William Alvin Stephens, O39768.
Ernest La Verne Stockton, O39560.
Frank Rockwell Swoger, O29429.
Kenneth Hensley Tando, O39695.
Fred Carlton Taylor, O39761.
Harold Lee Taylor, O29694.
William Lee Taylor, O41939.
Edward Frank Thelen, O29649.
×Bernard Thielen, O18782.
Wyan Elliott Thiessen, O51087.
Homer Downing Thomas, O41621.
Willie Nussum Thomas, O29644.
Hundley Thompson, O41663.
×Millard Thompson, O28951.
Samuel Wesley Thompson, O41690.
Milton Peter Thomson, O51211.
Kenneth Edward Tiffany, O18822.
Reed Muriel Titus, O41879.
James Carter Todd, O41972.
John Day Tolman, O51191.
John Allen Townley, O41819.
Admiral Brinkley Trammell, O41501.
Theodore Burton Tufte, O39732.
Joseph Henry Twyman, Jr., O18116.
James Christopher Ulmer, O41792.
Robert Glenn Van Ness, O39646.
Hugh Anderson Vest, O39692.
Luster Azil Vickrey, O17592.
Lewis Volers, O39763.
Homer Reamer Wallar, O51196.
Leon Wendell Walton, O29062.
Lynn Smith Waters, O41950.
William Alfred Watkins, O51237.
Ernest Chisolm Watson, O29652.
Travis Karl Watterson, O51008.
Thomas A. Weadock, O39748.
George Daland Webb, O41916.
Frederick Reginia Weber, O18148.
George Winship Weego, O41484.
Awtry Porter Wehrle, O51017.
Julian Earle Weisler, O42028.
Francis Louis Wellenreiter, O28987.
Harold Baker Wetherbie, O41823.
Richard Fisher Whitcomb, O41531.
Edmund David White, O29077.
Edward Ceasar White, O39766.
Eli Edward White, O41951.
George William White, O51200.
Hiram Brown White, O41849.
Ralph Wallace White, O39717.
Elmer Lloyd Whitman, O29569.
Howard Raymond Whittaker, O29408.
Thomas Hale Wick, O41689.
Homer Widmann, O29032.
Harry Elsworth Wilbert, O41539.
Frank Forest Wilkins, O39731.
Paul Sawyer Willard, O29541.
George Clinton Willette, O17289.
Alex Norman Williams, O41628.
Basil Emerson Williams, O51025.
Zack Maroney Williams, O50966.
William Edward Williamson, O50970.
John Lea Wilson, Jr., O39587.
Minor Keith Wilson, O41626.
Robert Beryl Wilson, O39685.
Robert Fitzpatrick Wilson, O39687.
Wesley Carlton Wilson, O17725.
Leonard Wilton Winget, O41396.
Roy Harold Winters, O39580.
Samuel Stanford Wolf, O38674.
Julian Cook Wood, O41651.
Thomas Wood, Jr., O29563.
Wayne Lorrain Wood, O51250.
Raymond Carlyle Woodes, O29067.
George Edward Woods, Jr., O41840.
×Daniel Turner Workizer, O18608.
Herbert William Wurtzler, O39596.
×Leslie Haynes Wyman, O17749.
Ben Milton Young, O51255.
Robert Goodwin Youngblood, O29423.
James O. Younts, Jr., O29552.
John Todd Yule, O29627.

To be major

John Charles Abercrombie, O31386.
Gilbert Gordon Ackroyd, O31813.
Lloyd Phelps Acton, O42467.
William Adams, O42631.
Francis Joseph Aerni, O31920.
Andrew Adolphe Aines, O43463.
Norman Ernest Akers, O51673.
Edward John Albertie, O40007.
Albert William Albrecht, O31558.
John Nelson Albro, O40217.
Lawrence Hanower Alexander, O51731.
Robert William Alexander, O40280.
Rowan Pearce Alexander, O42979.
John Calhoun Alford, O38838.
Edward Gerald Allen, O31678.
Hugh Edward Allen, O43348.
Robert Mach Allgeier, O42822.
Robert Harold Ammerman, O30546.
Berry Kenneth Anderson, O30384.
George Lester Anderson, O31762.
Robert Nendel Anderson, O21430.
Roland Anderson, O31790.
Truett Carroll Anderson, O38804.
Woodrow Wilson Anderson, O40220.
William Earl Anglin, O31464.
William Olmsted Antozzi, O43307.
Carlyle Whitton Arey, O30642.
Elbert Armstrong, O51677.
James Hale Ashcraft, O51658.
Neill Stewart Atkins, Jr., O42815.
Woodrow Wilson Atkins, O43292.
Reynold Atlas, O31894.
Edward Wallace Austin, O51789.
Frank Jesse Austin, Jr., O40207.
Charles Spencer Babcock, O30668.
David Albert Baker, O39971.
Marshall William Baker, O43558.
Paul Stefan Balas, O40234.
Coy Wilson Baldwin, O31924.
Austin Frederick Balkman, O32285.
Raymond Compton Ball, O52184.
Calvin Byron Banigan, O30376.
Henry Halton Banke, O51832.
Richard Griffin Banks, O43407.
Harold Dean Banning, O42760.
Reginald Collinson Barber, O42560.
Wilfred Pinley Barber, O31653.
Charlie Gordon Bare, O43050.
William Carter Barefield, O42763.
Leonard Carl Barker, O40213.
Stockbridge Howland Barker, O38949.
John Barn, O40148.
Luther Richard Barth, O43418.
Howard Lehman Bartholomew, O43524.
William Tyler Bartlett, O42468.
Harold Enloe Beaty, O38930.
Donald Carl Beck, O31329.
Henry Charles Becker, O31944.
John Landes Beebe, O39970.
Howard Olsen Beeth, O42489.
Urcel La Rue Bell, O31731.
Walter Thomas Belland, O43450.
Byron Graham Belote, O42851.
Harold Boyd Benedict, O31566.
James Alton Benford, O51676.
Harry Gantcliffe Benion, O20872.
Don Carlos Benjamin, O43070.
Dayton Ernest Bennett, O40212.
William Euclid Bennett, O31754.
Herbert William Berendt, O31661.
Gerald Aloysius Bergin, O51722.
John Ernest Berry, Jr., O31707.
Warren Eugene Besse, O39088.
Carlos Betances-Ramirez, O30524.
Richard Lewis Bettien, O43528.
John Mason Bigelow, O31579.
David Dodge Billing, O42820.
Edward Russell Billings, O39945.
Peter Thaddus Leland Black, O31900.
William Herbert Blackmarr, O42886.
William Lawrence Blake, O30751.
John Franklin Blakistone, O42586.
Philippe Pierre Boas, O39990.
Vic Fayette Bodner, O51551.
William Baines Bogue, O30470.
Jean Herman Boling, O31817.
Virgil William Bond, O42678.
Dow Lincoln Bonnell, Jr., O40088.
Alfred Eugene Bonniwell, O42981.
Robert Middleton Booth, O19984.
Gordon Bruce Borin, O42621.
Joseph Henry Botts, O31514.
James Robert Bower, O42768.
Clifford Albert Bowman, O30728.
Ernest Michael Bozak, O43486.
Joseph Louis Brack, O51746.
Glenn Milton Bradley, O51766.
Lawrence Wallace Brady, O30703.
Kerlin Joseph Brandon, O42766.
Thomas Ray Bragg, O51732.
Arnold Nicohlus Brandt, O31955.
Herbert Pendleton Brann, O30686.
Joseph William Brantley, O30440.
Buck Bratcher, O43409.
Garland Edward Brenneman, O42576.
John Yeomans Brightman, O31366.
×Joseph Shields Brinkley, Jr., O31444.
John Allen Brock, O42914.
Howard Freeman Brook, O42907.
William Fout Brott, O42966.
David Henry Brown, O20820.
Ernest E. Brown, O51928.
John Marion Brown, Jr., O31897.
Robert Edward Brown, O32098.
William McAmis Brown, O31585.
John Theodore Browne, O40092.
James Lewis Bryan, O42869.
Floyd Herman Buch, O42500.
Louis Walter Buckalew, Jr., O43462.
Thomas Warner Burke, O31506.
Lyman Dean Burkett, O30428.
Walter Lamon Burt, O43098.
Allen Samuel Butler, O30422.
Stephen Ernest Butterfield, O42839.
Jerome Stanley Byrne, O21404.
Robert Edward Byrne, O43281.
Walter Joseph Cagney, O51613.
George Isaac Calvert, O30521.
George Nevil Calvert, O43053.
Thomas Joseph Cameron, O42804.
Clarence Stenson Campbell, O40163.
Kermit Winston Campbell, O30690.
William Edward Campbell, Jr., O43316.
William Reginald Campbell, Jr., O40267.
Raymond Thomas Caraballo, O31362.
Stanley Kenneth Carlson, O52534.
John Joseph Carmody, O51659.
Taylor Elliott Carney, Jr., O40264.
James Marsh Carson, O51626.
Stanley Karl Carter, O42952.
John Joseph Carusone, O21295.
Richard King Carver, O40039.
Lawson Bernice Caskey, O42828.
Lloyd Woodrow Cassell, O31596.
George Frederick Cassill, O30464.
Shirley Mattison Castle, O51850.
Thomas David Caulfield, O30732.
John Phillips Cavanagh, Jr., O51610.
Joseph Lee Chalk, O52112.
John Harlan Chambers, O21323.
Edward Vernon Chandler, O51931.
Clayton Lawrence Chaput, O43314.
Arthur Burton Chatham, O31480.
Raymond Clayton Cheal, O20845.
Joe Elbert Childers, O31936.
Albert Oliver Chittenden, O31574.
Henry Morris Clanton, O30771.
Charles Taliaferro Clark, O40070.

James Brewer Clark, 031723.
Lester Howard Clark, 042945.
Theodore Stanley Clark, 039998.
James Odin Clay, 042666.
Thomas Howard Clements, 031735.
Robert William Clirehugh, 031633.
Archie Lee Cochran, 043343.
Byers Hearsman Coleman, 043342.
Irving Merton Coleman, 031716.
Leonard Frank Colwell, 031358.
Russell Mervan Colwell, 039839.
Harold Eugene Cone, 043100.
William Harold Conley, 030623.
John Ora Cook, Jr., 051562.
Edwin Remick Cooley, 051770.
Joseph Edgar Cooper, 043285.
John Francis Coote, 031506.
Kenneth William Copeland, 040177.
George Harlan Cornish, 040038.
Charles Droege Corwin, 038934.
Robert Lee Coughlin, 040284.
Everett Paul Courson, Jr., 039943.
James Terry Craig, 021248.
Warren Ellsworth Crane, 042608.
Harold James Crise, Jr., 031771.
Joseph John Crimmins, 043265.
Clifford Eugene Cross, 051733.
Frederick James Crossett, 039963.
Robert Edward Cullis, 031942.
Isaac Wesley Cundiff, 043096.
Martin Cunningham, 040069.
Roger Melvin Currier, 030522.
William Costello Curry, 031677.
Christopher Berry Cushing, Jr., 031836.
Irwin Alphy Dahl, 043356.
Leonard Melvin Dahl, 042935.
James Joseph Dalton, 040171.
George Elmer Danald, 031402.
Howard Wilson Darrow, 031468.
William Walter Davenport, 043077.
Albert Charles Davies, 038916.
John Davis, 042012.
John Hewitt Davis, 040036.
John M Davis, 031761.
Thomas Ryall Davis, 020380.
Wilbur Emmet Davis, 020716.
Albert Daykin, 042762.
Oak Egan de Berg, 042974.
Michael Richard De Carlo, 042445.
Arthur Dow Decker, 030583.
Jacob Roy Degenhardt, 030391.
Louis Frederick de Lesdernier, 020275.
Norman Thomas Dennis, 043547.
René Edward de Russy, Jr., 040164.
Harry Clifford Detlie, 039996.
Edward Thomas Devlin, 051680.
Herbert Roland Dichtenmueller, 051706.
Marshall William Dickson, 042930.
Mackin Robert Dillon, 030602.
Holston Taylor Dixon, 051766.
Matt Peter Dobrinic, 042985.
Oscar Maynard Doerflinger, 031972.
Adam Edward Dogan, 030413.
Chester Dombrowski, 031353.
Joseph Richard Donahue, 043294.
Harold Lee Dorsett, 040194.
John Henry Dougherty, Jr., 031582.
Joy Dow, Jr., 038602.
William Gerald Downey, Jr., 043273.
Edward Jackson Downing, 042655.
John Joseph Slevin Doyle, 042617.
William Leo Drennen, Jr., 031890.
Reno Earl Drews, 043420.
Virgil Homer Drissel, 040010.
Burleigh Brammer Drummond, 051771.
Edgar DuBois, 031606.
Sam Kendrick Dudderar, Jr., 031764.
Gerald Hermann Duin, 030145.
Kenneth Stephen DuMond, 030749.
Leland Rockwood Dunham, 031469.
Deane Allison Dunloy, 038825.
James Sylvester Dunn, 040173.
Paul James Durbin, 052110.
William Ainsworth Eadie, Jr., 042554.
Andrew Jack Eaken, 040090.
Truman Dennis Eckola, 043078.
John Hilton Edgerly, 051684.
Bertram Junior Ellis, 040244.
Jack Ridge Emery, 040276.
Nickolaus Marion Emig, 040005.
George Boyd Emory, 031903.
Robert Oscar English, Jr., 031871.
Richard Raphael Entwhistle, 040196.
Bill Alward Evans, 030714.
Gustavus Warfield Evans, 030444.
John David Evans, Jr., 040056.
Robert Hugh Evans, 031628.
Ben Maxwell Faribault, 030601.
Julius Blaine Farley, 040226.
Jack Martin Faulds, 042581.
Charles Edmund Fay, Jr., 040231.
John Patrick Feehan, 030647.
Marion Francis Feit, 042810.
William McCague Ferguson, 042665.
William Helm Fickes, 043279.
Harry Carpenter Fields, Jr., 043592.
Frank Anthony Filippi, 030701.
Arthur Clarence Fillbrandt, 030520.
John E Finch, 031797.
Caesar Frank Fiore, 019697.
Grosvenor Wardwell Fish, 042932.
Joe Fishback, 042492.
Clarence Arthur Fleming, 051941.
Joseph Mathias Flesch, 031800.
Fred James Flette, 030594.
Clifford Gustav Folen, 040255.
George Matthew Folley, 051541.
Peter Raymond Forame, 042866.
Emory Hill Fordham, 030340.
Embert Aaron Fossum, 040210.
James Wilburn Foster, 039965.
Ira Hon Fowler, 030531.
Vincent William Fox, 051871.
Joseph Benjamin Franklin, 043304.
William Alden Franks, 043301.
George Marvin Frasor, 031594.
Henry McCall Freeman, 051926.
×Robert Edward Frith, 019881.
Melford Palmer Fritsvold, 043473.
John Archibald Frye, 030509.
John William Fueg, 040289.
Cecil Hudson Fuller, 040158.
LeRoy Robert Fullerton, 031690.
William Sewell Fultz, 031439.
Lawrence Michael Furey, 051674.
John Austin Gahr, 051947.
Frank Eugene Garden, 031742.
Lyman Spencer Gardner, 040205.
Paul Edward Gardner, 038951.
×Earl James Gebbie, 031361.
Claude Delos George, Jr., 031788.
Comet Gibson, 030497.
Cortland Ivan Gillett, 043027.
Turner Wright Gilman, 031831.
William Hendrick Gilmore, 043414.
Joseph Bernard Giordano, 030381.
Melvin William Godshall, 040184.
John Philip Goettl, 031682.
Howard Fulton, Goldsmith, Jr., 031946.
James Lawrence Goodnow, 031363.
Albert John Goodwin, 042588.
Frank Wimberley Gorham, 042461.
Gordon Andrew Goss, 042668.
Wesley Gough, 043474.
Gilvary Preston Grant, 051775.
Walter Arthur Gray, 038939.
Warren James Green, 042898.
Clyde Gregory, 043044.
Robert Emil Greiner, 038925.
Robert Jackson Griffin, 043005.
Martin Carl Grigg, 030711.
Robert Austin Grimes, 042869.
Carl Erwin Grimsley, 042568.
Francis Joseph Grogan, 042949.
John Frederick Grogan, 042637.
Leslie M. Gross, 038938.
Helmer Marvin Grotte, 031322.
Walter Nicholas Guletsky, 021309.
×James O. Guthrie, 031470.
Theadore Rees Gwillim, 042946.
Perry Bradbury Hackett, 031443.
Leo Leavitt Hadley, 042461.
John Finzer Hagan, Jr., 042438.
Martin Allan Hagerstrand, 042957.
Robert Leander Haines, 039994.
Thurman Allen Hale, 030275.
Carl Clayton Hall, 030722.
Robert John Hall, 031882.
Wilbur Thomas Hall, 042906.
Edward Griffith Halligan, 040201.
George Bruce Hamilton, 042737.
Charles Marion Hand, 051669.
John William Hanger, 039975.
James Kenneth Hanks, 042473.
William Bradley Hardin, 030581.
John Edward Harding, 031627.
Lowell Upton Hargus, 030315.
Dana Lloyd Harkleroad, 051596.
Lawrence Rust Harkness, 040066.
Allen Henry Harnar, 042470.
Thomas Logan Harrigan, 043538.
Arthur Charles Harris, Jr., 020874.
Glenn John Harris, 039985.
Robert Lord Harrison, 040275.
John Joseph Hart, 051618.
Murray Lynn Harvey, 038833.
Theodore Sebastian Hatzfeld, Jr., 031773.
×Boyce Victor Hawkins, 040233.
Taylor Coker Tyler Hayes, 043542.
James Phillip Healey, Jr., 042906.
Charles Franklin Heiderman, Jr., 031716.
James Elliott Heigestad, 040003.
John Henry Hempel, 042457.
Allen Robert Henderson, 051708.
Joseph Patrick Henry, 040241.
Wesley George Henshaw, 043355.
Gustin Anthony Hess, 040180.
Carroll Philip Hickman, 042564.
Fred Arthur Hicks, 031948.
Samuel Nathan Highsmith, 051694.
×Clifford B Hill, 040055.
Jesse Nicholas Hill, 030702.
Kenneth Rolfe Hill, 031898.
Philip Henderson Hill, 042605.
Alvin Ralph Hillebrand, 030786.
Carter Lavelle Hilsabeck, 031389.
Edward Hamilton Hilsman, 049021.
John Charles Hinchie, 031537.
Oliver Martin Hirsch, 040060.
Lloyd Eugene Hirschhorn, 043433.
Morris Fritz Hobbs, 031416.
Willard Jefferson Hodges, Jr., 021401.
Kenneth Joe Hodson, 043268.
Arthur Julius Hoeman, 042465.
James Carlton Hogle, 042901.
Walter Henry Holdridge, 051895.
John Curtis Hollinger, 030148.
Albert Emanuel Holtz, 040285.
Francis Miller Hope, 030541.
John William Horstmann, 042566.
Russell Truman Houghton, 030430.
Benjamin Zacharia Houston, Jr., 031979.
Charles Edward Howard, 030605.
Harold Francis Howard, 030643.
William Robert Howard, 051629.
Harmon Martin Howdeshell, 039973.
Clifford Weldon Howell, 031462.
James Anderson Hudson, 052137.
J P Hughes, 042745.
John Frederick Hummel, 042712.
Russell Wallace Humphreys, 031910.
James William Hungate, Jr., 039951.
William Anderson Hunt, Jr., 051866.
Thomas Benjamin Hunter, 028791.
William Hupalo, 040269.
Wesley Charles Hurley, 043319.
Howard Overholt Husband, 052093.
Ralph Newhall Huse, 030819.
Robert Maxe Huston, 028943.
Edward Inglis, 031964.
Fred Bailey Irby, 042633.
Samuel Loyd Irwin, 031346.
Donald Frederick Isaacson, 031965.
Michael David Isrin, 030756.
Eugene Stephen Iwasko, 042831.
James Harold Jackson, 031580.
Marion Hubert Jackson, 031629.
Norton Jackson, 040054.
Gerald Otto Jacobs, 031548.
George David Jacobson, 031703.
Morton Selig Jaffe, 052105.
Joseph Willard Jarvis, 031530.
Charles Edwin Jeffries, 040208.
Cleveland Hall Jennings, 030480.
Carl Clifford Jensen, 038904.
Dovre Christian Jensen, 052166.
Raymond Eugene Jessen, 051590.
David Brownell Jodrey, 043590.
Dwight Edwin Johnson, 039932.
Edward Christopher Johnson, 030753.
Elmer Johnson, Jr., 038799.
Ernest Edward Johnson, 040043.
John Gideon Johnson, Jr., 043557.
Leonard Hazlett Johnson, 040227.

Bertil Vernon Jones, 031968.
Dean Hughes Jones, 030724.
George Washington Jones, 031521.
Harold LaRoy Jones, 043337.
John Thomas Jones, 030687.
Sherbert B Jones, 042968.
Virlyn Young Jones, 030739.
Winston Irving Jones, 051954.
Harry Frederick Jost, 040292.
William Gottlieb Kaeser, Jr., 042685.
Charles Ferdinand Kane, 043046.
Michael Kane, Jr., 031476.
Charles Hope Kederich, Jr., 043556.
Frank Muir Kehoe, 043360.
Robert Raymond Kemm, 052139.
Robert Bowers Kemp, 040040.
Robert Kenneth Kemp, 031364.
Robert Sorrel Kennedy, 020780.
Charles Mathew Keranen, 051578.
Leonard Calvin Kincaid, 031732.
Francis Joseph King, 040265.
John Lucien King, Jr., 031491.
Warren Jack King, 042850.
Harry Frank Kinsella, 031424.
Albert Victor Kinslow, 030808.
Simon Kinsman, 039942.
John Klonka, 051642.
William Edward Kish, 056818.
Waldemar John Klasing, 031478.
Edmund Leo Klint, 042070.
Raymond H. Knapp, 042546.
William Ferdinand Knoll, 043535.
Joseph Wiley Knott, 031350.
Ohio Knox, 030572.
Paul Mathew Koerner, 040263.
Lee Henry Kostora, 031598.
Leslie Belier Kovacs, 051697.
Edward Klement Kremi, 039926.
Harold Kenneth Krohn, 042702.
Paul William Lackro, Jr., 030325.
Amos Edward La Faver, 042447.
Benjamin Ives LaFlare, 052159.
Arthur Joseph Laib, Jr., 043107.
Donald Clell Landon, 030402.
Ernest Scharpe Landry, 051932.
Rollin Albert Lanpher, Jr., 030636.
George Edward Larsen, 031550.
Charles Cleveland Lathan, Jr., 039950.
Patrick William Laurie, 040222.
Louis Thomas Lazzarini, 043425.
Paul Joseph Leahy, 043267.
Wilson Van Doorn Ledley, 043579.
Ray Marion Lee, 031974.
Robert Clendenin Leech, 040183.
Richard Leffers, Jr., 031843.
Frank Browne Leggette, 043503.
Roland Adalor LeMay, 039987.
Warren Arthur Le Van, 042514.
Evan Hughes Lewis, 040239.
Paul Stanley Lindberg, 052194.
×La Von Parker Linn, 030757.
Francis Donald Linse, 031858.
Robert Thomas Lisk, 039957.
James Vincent Loftus, 042451.
Harlan James Long, 042994.
Roy West Lonsinger, 052192.
James Lauritz Low, 030585.
Robert Lawrence Lowe, 042913.
Irvin Lionel Luthi, 038830.
John William Lynch, 042984.
×William Frederick Lynch, 040182.
Carl Freeman Lyons, Jr., 020824.
Thomas MacConnell 3d, 040286.
George Angus MacEachern, 038806.
Mario Arthur Maffeo, 043264.
John James Maher, Jr., 042756.
Edward Maurice Majors, 031971.
Anthony John Malankowski, 030500.
Oscar Austin Mall, 031796.
Duane Williams Malone, 031479.
Earl Vernon Manning, 039941.
Charles Frank Manov, 051840.
Harry Margolies, 040235.
Harry Joseph Marker, 051688.
Michael Charles Markham, 042986.
Norman Elliott Martin, 051831.
Don Alva Mason, 031694.
Joseph Peter Mastrucci, 031768.
Orval Quincy Matteson, 043509.
Albert Ambrose Matyas, 019928.
Royall Richardson Mauzy, 039984.
Thomas Hermon Mayers, 030439.
Edward Raynesford Warner McCabe, Jr., 040262.
Walter Louis McCaddon, 040239.
Charles Falconer McCallum, 051952.
Willie Harrison McCann, 042603.
Glenn Lowery McConagha, 042623.
James Glenn McConaughy, 043272.
Waynes Dallas McConnell, 043457.
Samuel James McCune, 051668.
Howard Steele McCutcheon, 051703.
Lloyd Leslie McDaniel, 030513.
Willis Olin McDaniel, 051900.
Daniel Edwin McDonald, 042884.
Lee Roy McDonald, 052133.
Robert Joseph McDonough, 043591.
Joseph Patrick McElligott, 031482.
Harper Lee McGrady, 030450.
Horace Sherman McIlroy, 030460.
John Burton McKean, 042502.
Robert Aloysius McKenna, 051907.
Edward Jennings McKillips, 040175.
Edward Wallace McLain, 020888.
Gregg Clarke McLeod, 030674.
Ralph Michael McMahon, 030526.
×Stephen Robert McNabb, 039959.
James David McNally, 043317.
Evan Arthur McNear, 031774.
Wesley Franklin McPherson, 030794.
Robert James McSheehy, 030750.
Everett Virgil Mead, 030317.
×Stephen Johnson Meade, 031834.
Patrick Henry Meehan, 051889.
Robert Gaitskill Meguiar, 040314.
Walter Meigs Meier, 030443.
William Herbert Melhorn, 051557.
Clinton Gadekan Merrill, 031549.
George Metcalfe, 051637.
George Francis Meyer, Jr., 031584.
×William Russell Middleton, Jr., 030338.
Edward Milton Miller, Jr., 040167.
Samuel Theodore Miller, 031377.
Sidney Asa Miller, 052154.
James Roy Mills, Jr., 030624.
Joseph Phillip Minecci, 038823.
Harold Edson Miner, 043019.
George Washington Misevic, 051782.
Allan Wilcox Mitchell, 031704.
James Gordon Moak, 043454.
Kirk Brasfield Moberley, 051758.
Frank Glover Moffett, Jr., 042606.
Gilbert Alden Monti, 051641.
Otho Anthony Moomaw, 020905.
William Perrow Moon, Jr., 031589.
Harold Theodore Mooney, 042918.
Charles Franklin Moore, 051837.
Henry Hays Moore, Jr., 051847.
Lister Russell Moore, 039947.
Lowell Gideon Moore, 043539.
Orven Donald Moore, 043581.
John Joseph Moran, 040004.
Patrick Joseph Moran, 042699.
Otis Samford Moreman, Jr., 051856.
Leonard Stuart Morgan, 031814.
Clinton Orlando Morton, 051729.
Edwin Loui Peter Mueller, 052181.
Vincent DePaul Murphy, 042872.
William Franklyn Murphy, 031441.
Gordon Charles Murray, 031644.
Lawrence Astor Musick, 031811.
Marshall Woodrow Myers, 052188.
Carlos Antonio Nadal, 020670.
Edward Van Rensselaer Needels, 030537.
James Edward Neely, Jr., 040093.
Henry Helge Nelson, 031916.
James Edward Nelson, 052090.
James Harold New, 043435.
Richard Ivan Newcomb, 042844.
Raymond Francis Newkirk, 051876.
Marion Eugene Newsom, Jr., 043378.
Thomas J. Newton, 042563.
George Bogart Niblock, Jr., 042917.
×Andrew Barry Crook Nicholls, 031957.
Erwin Gilbert Nilsson, 031593.
Joseph Edward Noble, Jr., 031973.
John Calhoun Noel, Jr., 031404.
Russell Leroy Norgordt, 043589.
Clovis Byron Norris, 051861.
Harris Joaquin North, 052158.
×Edward Danby Northrop, 040282.
Jonathan Oscar Nottingham, 030482.
James Loys Oakes, 051643.
Francis John O'Connell, 030667.
John Joseph O'Connor, 052160.
Ernst Carl Oeding, 043269.
Francis Zavier O'Leary, 040214.
James Norman Olhausen, 040094.
×Harold Oscar Olsen, 031726.
Harry Charles Olson, 031399.
Robert Hermann Oppelt, 042969.
Melvin William Ormes, 030549.
Robert John Ormond, 040192.
Edward Herbert Oswald, 043330.
William Jereslaw Owen, 043536.
George Draughon Pace, 031531.
Henry Morrison Page, 042744.
Francis James Pallister, 043476.
Ira Arterburn Palm, 040246.
John Russell Palmer, 042758.
Leslie Firm Palmer, 043531.
Christopher Louis Pappas, 031724.
Clifford Edward Parr, 051686.
Thomas Leake Parsons, 038949.
William Edward Patrick, Jr., 030810.
Leroy Patterson, 031421.
Robert Allen Patterson, Jr., 042899.
William Robert Patterson, 019885.
Harvey Lee Patteson, 043468.
Gilbert Michael Payne, 031713.
Laurance Brown Payne, 031898.
Walter Orville Peale, Jr., 030948.
Maynard Denzil Pederson, 019942.
Robert William Pedersen, 038880.
Harvey Johnson Pence, 040011.
William Kennon Perrin, 030360.
Theodore Dale Perry, 031726.
Frank D. Person, 051807.
Milfred John Peters, 042866.
Byron Noel Petersen, 042724.
Charles David Peterson, 031698.
Kenneth Howard Peterson, 040066.
Ted William Peterson, 031709.
Kenneth Raymond Philbrick, 031649.
Henry Joseph Phillips, 031899.
John DeWitt Phillips, Jr., 031927.
Hurlbert Robert Piburn, 042500.
Lowell Brower Pickett, 031386.
Bruce Pierce, 040200.
James Eugene Pinney, 042806.
Harmon Luther Pippin, Jr., 040088.
Henry Edmund Pizzati, Jr., 031679.
Paul Vincent Plapp, 043362.
Frank Jacob Frederick Politka, 031943.
Richard Joseph Pollard, 042845.
Fred Albert Polumbo, 042869.
William Harry Pople, 040525.
Charles Alexander Post, 031524.
Maurice Glynn Powell, 040229.
Eames Asbury Powers, 040075.
Marshall Caldwell Preston, 038898.
Neill Franklin Price, 051841.
William Portwood Price, 038760.
Herman Elbert Pringle, 039477.
John Robert Pritchard, 031111.
Thomas Arden Pugh, 042526.
Anthony Jackson Race, 052163.
Angus Norman Rackleff, 030498.
Robert Merrill Rader, 031553.
Thomas Augustus Rafferty, 031793.
Tony John Raibi, 051799.
James Max Railing, 030508.
Howard Lee Ralls, Jr., 040186.
Stephen Vann Ralph, 040098.
Thurman Francis Ramsey, 051571.
Frank Joseph Randall, 038842.
×John Bruce Rankin, 040209.
Clarence Edward Ransick, 040147.
Daniel Arthur Rauenzahn, 042528.
Woodrow Wilson Reagan, 043351.
Elmer Cecil Reagor, 030639.
Lemuel Burton Redd, 043069.
Roger Stanton Rees, 031652.
Joseph Bunyan Regan, 043105.
George William Reitz, 039510.
Curt Alden Remfrey, 040169.
Lawrence Samuel Reynolds, 042862.
Robert Wesley Reynolds, 042838.
Desn Augustus Rhody, 030270.
Edward James Ribbs, 051713.
Cecil Percy Rice, 042891.
James Alexander Richardson, 031996.
Budd Walter Richmond, 039858.
Charlie LeRoy Ricks, 043298.
Joel McFall Ridgell, Jr., 030769.
George Andrew Rigaly, 040294.

Elwyn Arthur Riley, O40023.
Clifford Thomas Riordan, O21318.
Lyman Hodges Ripley, O20891.
Andrew William Ritchey, O31934.
Charles Arthur Robbins, Jr., O30611.
Jack Albert Robbins, O43543.
Lawrence Andrew Robbins, O51652.
William Wilson Roberts, O30264.
Charles Emory Robertson, Jr., O51756.
Joda Lee Robinson, O51857.
John Scott Robinson, O38948.
John Wylie Rodgers, O42764.
William Clark Rogers, O31602.
John William Rood, O52092.
David Nelson Roper, O31507.
Ming Rose, O42973.
Fred Lucian Ross, O30760.
Thomas Prince Ross, O40082.
Carmen Aldo Rossi, O52165.
Frank Pete Rosso, O38820.
Samuel Benton Rotharmel, O51929.
Thomas Harrison Rousseau, Jr., O52148.
Charles Arthur Rowan, O42619.
Donald Tregarthen Ruby, O40151.
Choice Randall Rucker, O31610.
Albert Martin Ruemmele, O31824.
George Burton Russell, O51913.
Roland Joseph Rutte, O19977.
Edward Anthony Ryan, O42795.
Thomas Aquinas Ryan, Jr., O51795.
James L. Ryburn, O51644.
Howard Graves Salisbury, O43510.
Joseph Louis Salonick, O40265.
Leo Benjiman Santerre, O39638.
Bert Santora, O51758.
Stanley Joseph Sawicki, O40215.
Chester Chris Schaefer, O42643.
Elmer Martin Schaudt, O51664.
Howard Paul Schaudt, O31673.
Arthur Mills Scheid, O42812.
Bernard Joseph Scherer, O52147.
Frank William Scheurlein, O31810.
Cornelius Michael Schmelzle, O31547.
Milton George Schneider, O51639.
Mathias Joseph Schon, Jr., O42533.
Kermit Richard Schweidel, O19862.
Dale Jarvis Schweinler, O51930.
Enofio Edward Sclafani, O52[illegible]7.
Clifford LaRoy Scott, O51835.
Eccles Hinkle Scott, O30505.
Marvin Robert Scott, Jr., O38898.
Dudley Byrd Selden, O51815.
Russell Biglow Sell, O39918.
Richard Martin Sengle, O51839.
Charles Edward Septfonds, Jr., O31837.
Joseph Hayward Sevier, O43464.
George Hugh Sewell, O51595.
Lewis Newell Shaffer, O31541.
Walter Charles Sharp, Jr., O31403.
James Jerome Shaug, O51645.
Norris Shealy, O43088.
Calvert Probasco Shelton, O51783.
John Pearson Sherden, Jr., O19901.
William Tecumseh Sherman, O42667.
Burrell Porte Shirey, O39969.
Joseph Adelbert Shoemaker, O42993.
Arthur Melvin Shomion, O40094.
×Anthony Harry Shookus, O31772.
Allen Cromer Shuler, Jr., O31970.
Hubert Woodrow Shurtz, O42967.
Chadwick Perle Simmons, O42924.
Edward Holbrooke Simpson, O30418.
Eugene Sites, O43526.
×William Grauer Sitnek, O40142.
Nicholas Joseph Sloane, O43562.
Dan Laws Smith 2d, O40156.
Emmitt D. Smith, O42788.
Harold Alvin Smith, O31615.
Leo Alfred Smith, O30478.
Myron Douglas Smith, O31860.
Robert Quin Smith, Jr., O31636.
Stanley Wise Smith, O43042.
Marion Hartzog Smoak, O43288.
Emanuel Philip Snyder, O43286.
Frank Lawerence Snyder, O43081.
Richard Frank Snyder, O[illegible]97.
William David Sommers, Jr., O43270.
Martin Oliver Sorensen, O31794.
Morris Elmer Sorenson, O31977.
Roy Willie Sorrell, O30387.
William Howard Sparrow, O42689.
Walter Lincoln Spaulding, O31915.
Frank Wheeler Speir, O42671.
Richard George Spreng, O51594.
Raymond Louis Springer, O31961.
Frederick Edson St. John, Jr., O31394.
Richard Clarke St. John, O43530.
Robert Carlton Stack, O32098.
Robert Sherman Stacy, O31905.
John Philip Stafford, Jr., O30827.
Harry Carlyle Stakes, O30775.
Robert Bertel Staley, O43331.
Gilbert John Stark, O42791.
Carl August Steidtmann, O38896.
Thomas Fettyplace Stein, Jr., O31411.
Albert Martin Steinkrauss, O51843.
×John Joseph Stephens, O31844.
Jerome Morgan Stevenson, O51897.
Arthur Anthony Stiefel, O38934.
Loren Frederick Stone, O31504.
Joseph Edward Stopp, O31693.
×Luther Gragg Strange, O40268.
John Tapp Strawbridge, O40297.
Robert Patton Strickland, O30749.
Simon Albert Stricklen, O52136.
Homer Alton Sturerud, O43523.
John Michael Sullivan, O30698.
Joseph Winston Sullivan, O43260.
Thomas Howard Swan, O31471.
×Samuel McGraw Swearingen, O21381.
Jack Giles Sweek, O30633.
James Leonard Sweeney, O31457.
Arthur Otis Swisher, O51611.
Louis Byron Swortwood, O31672.
William Rhett Taber, O51927.
Owen Hurford Taggart, O51696.
Albert Lewis Tait, O31568.
John Paul Tawes, O31357.
Carlisle Copeland Taylor, O40150.
Russell Miller Tegnell, O42577.
John Ware Thames, O30768.
Virgil Henry Thornton, O31503.
George Martin Thorpe, O40031.
Estill Stanley Thurston, O43469.
Marion Foster Thurston, Jr., O52088.
Erland Alfred Tillman, O20941.
George Edward Tilson, O51839.
Emanuel August Timm, O30619.
Edward Wendell Tippett, O42570.
Lear Pierre Titard, O43001.
Ralph Reid Todd, O40242.
Robert John Tolly, O31551.
Owen Olaf Tonstad, O43560.
Clyde Fischer Townsend, O31526.
Wilbur Ole Townsend, O42562.
Orrin Ardeen Tracy, O31645.
John Frederick Troll, O43029.
John Covert Troutman, O31841.
LaMonte Adair Tucker, O42610.
Harry Raymond Tuebner, O31624.
James Robert Tully, O31352.
Cecil Loren Tune, O51793.
Elmer Ellsworth Twining, O30662.
Willoughby Bartlett Tyler, O31699.
Clarence Roy Underwood, O31911.
Edward Nicalos Usnick, O42525.
James Wells Utterback, O40174.
Leo Francis Valiante, O31643.
Louis duRest van de Velde, O31895.
Daniel Francis VanGundy, O31938.
Paul William Van Sicun, O51761.
Francis Merle Vaughn, O31567.
Earle Edgington Veirs, Jr., O42958.
Ben N. Velasquez, O31779.
Joe Verde, O40218.
Homer Jerome Victory, O31826.
Edward Joseph Vincent, O38910.
Joseph Bateman Vincent, O42846.
William Rhoads Vivian, O31347.
Ralph Burns Vote, Jr., O51818.
Paul A. Voystasis, O31499.
Edward Franklin Waggoner, O42794.
William Henry Walkart, O30504.
Ward Barnette Waits, O40051.
John Hale Walker, Jr., O42857.
Norman Maurice Walker, O31925.
Robert Maxwell Walker, O31740.
Stephen Morrison Walker, O30561
Charlton Ormsby Wallace, O42961.
Aloysius John Walsh, O51792.
Edward Cockerill Walter, O31578.
Harry Francis Walterhouse, O51662.
William Randolph Ward, O43262.
Martin Joseph Waters, Jr., O31939.
William Edward Watts, O40291.
Henderson Oscar Webb, Jr., O42527.
Ira Bolt Webber, O43375.
Ralph Henry Wells, O40014.
John Beresford Welsh, O30544.
Kenneth Robert Welton, O42929.
Matt William Werve, O31832.
John Townsend West, Jr., O38825.
William Floyd West, O30484.
George Frederick Westerman, O52106.
Eugene Bissell Whalen, O52150.
Clyde Hart Wherley, O30675.
Edwin Hudson Whitaker, Jr., O42703.
Jack Chester White, O40000.
John Winthrop White, O21319.
Victor Wendell White, O43479.
×Hayden Bryant Whitehouse, O38798.
Clyde Clarence Whiteside, O43010.
Jack Riley Whitley, O42705.
William Layton Whitsett, O51892.
Howard William Wickey, O30458.
Judson Dwight Wilcox, O3[illegible]18.
Ernest Beverly Wilder, O40271.
Friedrich August Otto Wildforster, O30346.
Charles Woodrow Wilkinson, O43280.
Arthur Henry Williams, Jr., O43436.
Donald Burns Williams, O38901.
John Rodger Williams, O42996.
Lewis Cass Williams, Jr., O40061.
Sam S. Williams, O389[illegible].
Timothy Cornelius Williams, Jr., O30791
Samuel David Williamson, O39989.
James Mitchell Wilson, O40224.
John Samuel Wilson, O43271.
Lynnford Samuel Wilson, O51886.
James Ernest Windham, O30651.
Daniel Atherton Winterbottom, O30710.
William Henderson Witt, O39925.
Raymond Christian Wittmayer, O31631.
William Johnstone Wolcott, O30496.
Harold Kannan Wolfe, O31[illegible]29.
Thomas George Worley, O31494.
Charles Elmer Wright, O31564.
Charles Roy Wright, Jr., O31388.
Jay William Wright, O51916.
Robert Morris Wygant, O31926.
Henry Jewell Wylie, O40071.
John Rudolph Yakshe, O31820.
Charles Glen Young, O20739.
Claude Clayton Young, O31935.
William Hilbourn Young, O42753.
Harry Franklin Yuill, O43571.
Alarich L. E. Zacherle, O42817.
Herbert Andrew Ziegler, O30347.

To be captains

Harold Robert Aaron, O26207.
Charles Richard Abel, O26358.
William Crawford Abernathy, O37308.
Dwight Lee Adams, O36323.
Harold Donald Adams, O37281.
John Robert Adie, O47624.
Robert Due Agers, O40905.
John Park Agnew, Jr., O53985.
Barry Edward Allright, O47947.
Charles Richard Albright, O36502.
Jack Alvin Albright, O40870.
Shannon Dowdy Albright, O40757.
James Anthony Aleveras, O25835.
George Louis Alexander, O26021.
Charles Francis Alfano, O25640.
Grant William Allison, O25293.
Jack Phillips Ancker, O37217.
×Charles Thomas Anders, O36679.
Eldon Buryl Andersen, O35691.
Andrew Cecil Anderson, O36146.
Brooks Doran Anderson, O35664.
Edward Gustav Anderson, Jr., O36391.
Gordon Vincent Anderson, O47345.
John Victor Anderson, O36964.
×Jonathan Waverly Anderson, Jr., O25620.
Ralph Clinton Anderson, O54269.
Ralph Westley Anderson, O35305.
John Taylor Andrews, Jr., O33908.
Stephen Elwood Andrews, Jr., O33976.
Theodore Antonelli, O46189.
Virginio Lorenzo Antonioli, O25863.
Irvine Appleton, O34867.
Raymond Francis Aquilina, O36782.
Theodore W. Archer, O48383.

×Edward Rice Ardery, O25503.
×Thomas Seelye Arms, Jr., O24996.
John Winthrop Armstrong, O25686.
Robert Martin Arn, O48366.
×William Bruce Arnold, O26359.
William Earl Arnold, Jr., O36386.
Richard William Aronson, O39073.
Robert Edward Arthur, O40968.
Barney Brooks Asbury, O46788.
Laurence Whitaker Ash, O54165.
Robert Francis Askey, O47707.
Byron Demitrois Athan, O53273.
Quintus C. Atkinson 5th, O26317.
Samuel Aurit, O47925.
Benton McDonald Austin, O35161.
George Arthur Austin, Jr., O25420.
John Dutcher Austin, O46516.
Paul Autrey, O46504.
Philip Shuford Avery, O36241.
William Benjamin Aycock, O35051.
Franklin Alvin Ayer, O34199.
Albert Wesley Aykroyd, O35069.
David Carl Baatz, O41048.
Ben Lee Baber, O25567.
George William Baccus, O35670.
Robert Eugene Baden, O25671.
Spencer Roe Baen, O27005.
Edward Jay Bagwell, O47269.
Charles Irwin Balcer, O36519.
×Clarke Tileston Baldwin, Jr., O26037.
Paul Anthony Baltes, O39285.
Wyndham Harry Bammer, O36903.
Henry Anson Barber 3d, O25563.
Robert Kennard Barber, O36738.
Robert John Barickman, O25932.
Anthony Barkovich, O54530.
John Harold Barner, O36700.
Carroll Eric Barnes, O37064.
John William Barnes, O25763.
Frank H. Barnhart, Jr., O36516.
Richard Vernon Barnum, O36167.
Donald Fredrick Barraclough, O36996.
Laurence Overton Barrett, O36652.
×Willie Wilson Joseph Barrios, O36748.
Thomas Augustine Barrow, O35636.
Frank Albert Bartell, O37206.
George Lloyd Barton 3d, O46382.
Glenn Lee Bass, O40818.
Koy McLaurine Bass, Jr., O39125.
Roy Hilsman Bass, Jr., O39311.
Frank Alexander Bates, Jr., O53290.
James Madison Bates, O36565.
Richard Traber Batson, O25434.
Claude Glenn Baughman, O37173.
John Blair Beach, O25978.
Horace Edward Beaman, O35583.
Samuel Martin Beem, O54685.
John Pierce Beeson, O24686.
Robert Sprague Beightler, Jr., O25642.
Benjamin Calvin Bell, O46708.
Carl Hamilton Bell, Jr., O35743.
John Calvin Bell, Jr., O25937.
Theodore Spear Bell, O36122.
Joe Oronzo Bellino, Jr., O41047.
Edward Elmer Bennett, O25463.
Ralph Owen Bennett, O36860.
Robert Austin Bennett, O40864.
Charles Edward Benson, O26263.
Joseph William Benson, O25601.
Walter Robert Benson, Jr., O39180.
Deward Elzie Benton, O33761.
Marvin Jay Berenzweig, O25811.
Casper Berger, O41052.
George Alvin Berlin, O36858.
Samuel Christopher Berte, O48711.
Roger Alexander Bertram, O25508.
George Betts, O26204.
James Allen Betts, O25691.
Donald Arnim Beyer, O40751.
William Lawrence Bibby, O26276.
×Edward Joseph Bielecki, O25465.
Linwood Wilson Billings, O34831.
Carroll Davis Billmyer, Jr., O34676.
David Andreas Bisset, Jr., O47274.
×Myron Richard Bittikofer, O25041.
Willis Walter Bixby, O36104.
Don William Black, O36126.
Garland Cusorte Black, Jr., O36106.
Joseph Elliott Black, O39268.
William Wharton Blackburn, O34244.
John Lee Blackwell, O36379.
John Roy Blackwell, O53789.
John Davis Blair 3d, O37272.
×Robert Morris Blair, O34934.
Robert Tompkins Blake, O25837.
William Robert Blake, O36162.
Larry Ader Blakely, O36426.
Leo Mose Blanchett, Jr., O25585.
Kermit Blose Blaney, O35591.
Raymond Carlton Blatt, Jr., O26186.
Arthur McCabe Bliss, O36852.
Leonard John Bilsenbach, O24938.
Victor Bloecker, Jr., O41058.
LeVerne Edwin Blount, O25939.
Charles Kenneth Blum, O36896.
Robert Frank Blume, O37024.
Dumas Howard Boardman, Jr., O34963.
Mark Mayo Boatner 3d, O26248.
Frederic Thomas Bockoven, O37354.
Rudolph Robert Bodd, O47137.
Lucian Dalton Bogan, Jr., O25610.
Alexander Patton Bolding, Jr., O46764.
Fletcher Wilson Boles, O46985.
John Arnold Bollard, O39241.
Quellen Denis Boller, O26050.
Alexander Russell Bolling, Jr., O26066.
John Buchanan Bond, O26077.
John Russel Fulton Bond, O35986.
Anthony Pierre Bonnaffon, O24608.
James Cecil Bonta, O34731.
Herschel Albert Booth, O36985.
Jack Boswell, O25080.
Luther Billy Botts, O36752.
Henry Cleveland Bowden, Jr., O47536.
William Harvey Boyd, O37205.
Gerald Edward Boyea, O37258.
Richard John Boyer, O37202.
Harry Francis Boyle, O39258.
Joseph Francis Boyle, O26347.
×Thaddeus Aloysius Boyle, O35791.
Kimberly Brabson, O35465.
William Harold Brabson, Jr., O26069.
John Stanley Brady, O26064.
Alfred Anthony Bragolone, O36080.
Ralph Wilson Brake, O35708.
Matthew Douglas Branch, O35799.
Thurman McCord Brandon, O24754.
LeRoy James Brandt, O54518.
Roland Alfred Brandt, O25901.
Roy Edward Branson, O37149.
Harold Matthew Branton, O37345.
Edward Bray, O48259.
Frank Peter Breitenbach, O26365.
Howard E. Bressler, O40967.
James Alexander Brice, O26101.
John Klotz Brier, O26185.
Richard Frost Briggs, O36632.
Robert Lewis Brigham, O37326.
Charles William Bright, O37159.
Heber Cowan Brill, O26162.
Arthur Frederick Brindley, O36504.
Arthur Brinson, O47740.
William Thompson Briscoe, O54688.
Robert Clarence Britt, O54425.
Frank Roy Brockschink, Jr., O47741.
Wade Young Brookreson, O35588.
Engle Redic Brooks, Jr., O34764.
Waldo Walker Brooks, Jr., O54679.
Jewel Richard Browder, O45583.
George Horace Brown, O48340.
Harold William Brown, O47807.
Luther Edward Brown, O27054.
Percy Daniel Brown, Jr., O37255.
Stephen Oliver Brown, O26105.
Lee Byron Brownfield 2d, O36135.
Edward August Browning, O53019.
Newton Francis Browning, O46964.
Fred Roy Brownyard, O35279.
Edward Cooper Bruce, O25404.
Henry Louis Bruley, O35457.
Harold Francis Bryant, O36886.
Robert Edman Bryant, O54484.
Ernest Dale Bryson, O47151.
Earl William Buchanan, O36352.
Russell Bennett Buchanan, Jr., O37291.
Stephen Charles Buchanan, O39182.
Charles Adelbert Buck, O34641.
Vernon Maughan Buehler, O53373.
Kenneth Ecklund Buell, O25772.
Wallace Richard Buelow, O36319.
George Gordon Bugg, O36175.
Daniel Sargent Buhler, O47799.
Richard Terry Bull, O53964.
Robert Lee Bullard 3d, O25774.
Jack Pershing Burch, O45948.
Allen Mitchell Burdett, Jr., O26048.
Francis Xavier Burgasser, O37061.
Charles Augustus Burgess, Jr., O53513.
Frank Edwin Burgher, O36180.
Robert Belleau Burlin, O25484.
×Philip Duane Burnes, O34153.
Charles Herbert Burr, Jr., O25758.
Edward Burr 2d, O26009.
Lynn Stewart Burr, O53786.
Robert Emmet Burrows, Jr., O25918.
William Andress Burt, O36040.
Jonathan Rowell Burton, O36196.
Lewis Robert Burton, O34567.
William Henry Buth, O54312.
Ernest Cornish Butler, O35578.
Farley Porter Butler, Sr., O38321.
James Wahl Butler, O54157.
John Lawrence Butler, O40980.
John Locke Butterfield, O26194.
John Francis Buyers, O25862.
Ernest Arthur Buzalski, O25606.
Robert Guy Byrne, O36854.
Laurence George Byrnes, O54163.
Beverly Marcelle Bzdek, O39269.
Jaime Leopoldo Cabezas, O48569.
Ralph Lincoln Cadwallader, O25509.
×Joseph Metcalf Caffall, O37029.
Lee Emir Cage, O24909.
Harold Eugene Cahill, O36331.
×James Webster Cain, O26206.
James Marshall Cake, Jr., O25372.
Henry London Calder, Jr., O34671.
James Alexander Caldwell, O25315.
William Michael Calnan, O26120.
George Morgan Calvert, O36061.
Ross Hamilton Calvert, O47933.
Ernest Vance Cameron, O40676.
Eugene Clark Camp, O37072.
Gay Campbell, O35586.
George Thomas Campbell, Jr., O26084.
Joseph Lewis Campbell, O47277.
Robert Boyle Campbell, O33868.
Robert Hansen Campbell, O28074.
Robert Jacob Canfield, O34881.
Austin James Canning, Jr., O36277.
Joseph Morgan Cannon, Jr., O24930.
George Gordon Cantlay, Jr., O25979.
Dayton Francis Caple, O49054.
Edmund James Carberry, O25565.
Robert Ellis Carey, O47519.
Raymond Willard Carraher, O45292.
Benjamin Lafayette Carroll, O37321.
Thomas Moore Carson, O32918.
Hamlet Robinson Carter, Jr., O26134.
William Cowan Carter, O54761.
William Clarence Carter, Jr., O37290.
William Maurice Casart, O35848.
Edgar Lawrence Casey, O36324.
William Prager Cassedy, O25044.
Cecil Hill Cates, Jr., O33600.
James Woodfin Cavender, O46443.
James Harley Cawthra, O36981.
Henry George Challen, O40902.
David Smith Chamberlain, O25671.
John Sherman Chambers, Jr., O35357.
Milton Pierre Champlin, Jr., O37313.
Francis Alexander Chance, Jr., O36784.
James S. Changaris, O25619.
Neil McKay Chapin, O55006.
David Marston Chase, O36212.
James Edward Chase, O47842.
Joseph Vincent Chautty, O25969.
John Locke Cheney, O24604.
John Stewart Chesebro, O47234.
Michael Chesnoe, O46968.
Ernest Childers, O48416.
Samuel Jack Chilk, O53777.
Paul Chmar, O37640.
James Chrietsberg, Jr., O39129.
Max Stanton Christol, O34943.
James Vincent Christy, O25969.
Alvin McLean Churchwell, O41055.
David Clark Clagett, O34952.
Gerald Harley Clark, O47206.
Howard Laverne Clark, O40928.
James Thomas Clark, O33773.
Lyman Hyde Clark, O37019.
×Robert W. Clark, O26032.
William Kueven Clark, O41001.

Edward Ryan Cleary, 026304.
Louis Xavier Cleary, 054965.
Robert Eugene Cleveland, 036664.
Richard Warren Clifford, 036761.
Charles Lee Cline, 036543.
Gordon Frank Clyde, 017271.
Gerald Gordon Coady, 054223.
Harry Reynolds Coates, 036067.
James Justus Cobb, 025629.
John Riley Cobb, Jr., 026233.
Earl Junior Cobey, 054909.
Collins Leslie Cochran, 040964.
John Henry Cochran, Jr., 026115.
John Howard Cochran, Jr., 054787.
Walter Bingham Cochran, Jr., 053411.
James Knox Cockrell, Jr., 024805.
John Clinton Cockrill, Jr., 024730.
Howard Beverly Coffman, Jr., 025941.
Caleb Allen Cole, 026171.
Charles Baker Cole, Jr., 039304.
×John Leonard Cole, Jr., 036092.
Fred Allen Coley, 040851.
Edgar Bergman Colladay, Jr., 024963.
John Walter Collins 3d, 026079.
David Baldwin Conard, 025855.
Roger Lean Conarty, 026067.
×Joseph Bartholomew Conmy, Jr., 025645.
George Ignatius Connolly, Jr., 036666.
Eugene Blair Conrad, 054204.
Lewis Ward Conway, 037021.
Benjamin Thomas Cook, 047175.
Charles Henry Cook, 034201.
Charles William Cook, 035737.
George Lester Cook, 035450.
James Harry Cook, Jr., 035298.
×Marshall Avert Cook, 046361.
Robert Morehead Cook, 025690.
Walter Hugh Cook, Jr., 025466.
William Chipps Cool, 034109.
William James Coonly, Jr., 036724.
Jacob Baer Cooperhouse, 024840.
Chester Jules Copmann, Jr., 040636.
William Robert Cory, 036060.
Gerard Vincent Cosgrove, 035683.
Buford James Couch, 036969.
John Allen Coulter, 024454.
Thomas Nugent Courvoisie, 024649.
William Worthington Cover, 026367.
Charles Thomas Cox, 036699.
Emmett Willard Cox, Jr., 037200.
Richard French Cox, 024541.
John Charles Coyne, 046806.
John Edward Craig, 024784.
Charles Leonard Crane, Jr., 026059.
Hal Parsons Crane, Jr., 054794.
Virgil Eugene Craven, 034824.
William Douglas Craven, 035969.
Gerald McAdoo Cravens, 035188.
James Robert Creighton, 036498.
Eugene Stephen Cronin, 039070.
Patrick Martin Cronin, 040786.
Arvid Paul Croonquist, Jr., 025639.
Kenneth William Cross, 035852.
Clyde Clair Crosswhite, 040750.
Horace Johnston Crouch, Jr., 046131.
Robert Emmett Crowe, 047205.
William Samuel Crumlish, 045536.
Belmonte Pasquale Cucolo, 025834.
Daniel Bernard Cullinane, Jr., 026145.
Walter Phillip Cumbie, 054718.
×Donald Haffly Cunningham, 036799.
Hubert Summers Cunningham, 039303.
×Robert Ruhlman Cunningham, 037120.
Donald Arthur Curry, 046211.
James Arthur Curry, Jr., 054865.
Eugene Roland Curtan, 040814.
Paul Joseph Curtin, 026361.
Elbert Raymond Curtis, 036547.
Wesley James Curtis, 035792.
Elliott Carr Cutler, Jr., 024449.
Michael Lowell Czajkowski, 041004.
John Titus Dabinett, 047114.
Chester Edwin Dadisman, 036497.
Leonard Raymond Daems, Jr., 047270.
Howard Miller Dailey, 034702.
Myron Haines Dakin, 035733.
Joseph Wilkerson Dale, Jr., 036144.
Edward Joseph Daley, 036418.
Robert Curtis Dalrymple, 039100.
Robert Douglas Danforth, 026081.
Emile Wright Daniel, Jr., 034871.
Earl Everett Danley, 047130.
Donald Dan Dannenberg, 040798.
James Dennard Danner, 053384.
James Richard Darden, 026142.
×Arthur Robert Datnoff, 035053.
Eugene Bernard Datres, 035166.
Robert James Davenport, 026089.
Paul Ward Davidson, 054119.
Shirley Davidson, 037122.
×George Alfred Davies, 041010.
John Myrddin Davies 3d, 025010.
×Claiborne Watkins Davis, Jr., 037001.
Ernest Homer Davis, 034740.
Mike Bedwell Davis, 026183.
Paul Alonzo Davis, Jr., 036887.
Paul Wood Davis, 036375.
Robert LeVerne Davis, 025661.
Young Joel Davis, 047572.
Frederic Ellis Davison, 045682.
William H. Deadwyler, Jr., 036298.
James Franklin Deatherage, 025892.
John Quentin Deaver, 054765.
Duane Leonard DeBow, 040970.
William Paul DeBrocke, 025986.
John Taylor deCamp, Jr., 026040.
William Cleveland Deekle, Jr., 026310.
Joseph Ignatius Degiovanni, 036866.
Vernon Elsworth Dehner, 037147.
Donald James Delaney, 034852.
William Fay Dellinger, Jr., 053658.
Roger Arthur Del Zoppo, 039243.
Robert Henry Dempsey, 055030.
Russell Burnham Denham, 053714.
Richard Francis Dennison, 034040.
Robert Cushing Dennison, Jr., 049010.
Robert Werner Des Jarlais, 047377.
Henry George Dettmar, 037117.
Ralph William Deuster, 037009.
Thomas Diamantes, 035694.
Robert Leon Dickenson, 033199.
Charles Wendell Dickinson, 026033.
Jean Howard Dickson, 036606.
Allan Grant Dingwall, Jr., 037049.
Francis John Dirkes, 035867.
×Eugene Alexander Doerfler, 037211.
Sam Frank Doering, 035088.
Edmund John Dollard, 047069.
Franklyn William Donahue, 041071.
George Peter Donaldson, Jr., 054600.
Thomas Quinton Donaldson 4th, 035460.
Ross Isaac Donnelly, 036533.
Charles Woodrow Donovan, 036500.
Edward Allen Doran, 036792.
Charles Henry Dornacker, 026370.
Richard Wesley Dowell, 039225.
William Victor Downer, Jr., 024931.
Pierce Anthony Doyle, Jr., 024891.
William Thornton Dozier, 048008.
×Harry Vaughan Drinkard, 040898.
Vernon Burge Drum, 039318.
Donald Leo Ducey, 035811.
Robert Lawrance Dudley, 033746.
David Arthur Duffy, 034662.
Jack Willis Duffy, 037349.
Robert Calhoun Duke, 036697.
Thomas Arthur Duke, Jr., 037062.
James Edward Dunn, 036137.
Henry Vaughan Dunstan, 040963.
Harold Halsey Dunwoody, 026197.
×Roy Calvin Durbon, 037219.
Elton Woodrow Duren, 035087.
Clifton Otis Duty, 035981.
Clifford Perry Duvall, 039270.
Robert Daspit Dwan, 026052.
John Leopold Dworak, 025757.
Harold Howard Dyke, Jr., 053934.
William Clarence Dysinger, 054976.
George Eager, Jr., 036706.
Clyde Tenor Earnest, 035923.
Warren Conrade Eastham, 037026.
Joseph Harry Eastmead, 036207.
Henry John Ebrey, Jr., 035627.
×Kenneth Russel Eckert, 035166.
George Gage Eddy, Jr., 054901.
×William Custer Edler, 035738.
James Mason Edmunds, 035174.
Bethell Eirlington, Jr., 036339.
Walter John Eisler, 036019.
Thomas McGahey Elgin, 036090.
James Burton Ellingsworth, Jr., 047799.
Howard Deane Elliott, 035445.
Mayo Jack Elliott, 026179.
Albert Murray Ellis, 036939.
Arthur Phelps Ellis, Jr., 036150.
Clarence Heyward Ellis, Jr., 034762.
Rodney Charles Ellis, 034873.
William Henry Napier Ellis, 053993.
×John Ashton Ely, 024807.
George William Erdman, 037350.
Russell Wilbur Ernst, 037256.
Jasper Newton Erskine, 036768.
John Willard Ervin, 039216.
Thomas William Essen, 025974.
Edward Jack Evans, 037374.
Frank Joseph Evans, 053630.
Gerald Wayne Evans, 046758.
Thomas Horace Evans, Jr., 039179.
William Ewald, 036949.
William Daniel Falck, 025693.
Reginald King Fansler, 040608.
Clare Francis Farley, 025915.
Jack Howard Farley, 055829.
Frank Arnold Farnsworth, 037216.
Brock Hiram Faulkner, 045844.
Edmond Lawrence Faust, Jr., 025450.
Lawrence William Fawcett, 045319.
Vincent Felix Fazio, 046917.
Robert Henry Fechtman, 016252.
Allen Ellsworth Ferguson, 045765.
Charles Marshall Fergusson, Jr., 024709.
Robert Morrison Ferrell, 032808.
Allan Barton Ferry, 035253.
Harold Irving Fiedler, 036177.
Kenneth Stanley Field, 036932.
Richard Stockton Field, Jr., 025012.
Jesse Willard Fielder, 033812.
Vernon Files, 037066.
Harold Crum Finlayson, 041038.
Perry Seale Finney, Jr., 042263.
Harold Sidney Fischgrund, 037183.
Rue Dana Fish, Jr., 046539.
Jesse LeRoy Fishback, 025859.
Archibald Donald Fisken, Jr., 024869.
Robert Emil Fiss, 035511.
George Woodrow Flager, 053081.
John Joseph Flanagan, 047731.
Thomas Walsh Flatley, 035838.
Raymond Edward Fleig, 047197.
Vernon Gail Fleury, 048240.
James Harrison Flint, 035358.
Robert Presley Flint, 040931.
Charles David Folsom, 046051.
Rudolf Herman Folts, 040734.
×Wilfred Craig Ford, 025008.
Russ Charles Foss, 046767.
Randolph Vaughan Foster, 045728.
Robert William Foster, Jr., 025360.
Clifton Cliste Fox, 047142.
George Ferry Fox, 036234.
Ogden Randolph Fox, 047043.
James Joseph Fragala, 040383.
Charles Samuel Fraleigh, Jr., 036662.
Ernest Harris Francis, 040758.
×Louis Sterling Francisco, 026330.
Fred James Frank, 054078.
Gustav Henry Franke, Jr., 052959.
Leonard S Frankenstein, 054172.
Victor Arnold Franklin, 025658.
Bruce Howard Fraser, 037376.
Joseph Jerome Fraser, Jr., 053293.
Walter Gordon Frauenheim, Jr., 048978.
Frank Walter Frazier, 037065.
Floyd Frederick, 036243.
Edgar Jesse Fredericks, 026302.
John Leonard Fredericks, 047721.
Graydon Francis Fredrikson, 035700.
Arthur Leslie Freer, 025451.
James Edward Freestone, 036937.
Jack Smith French, 048360.
Billy Elmer Fritts, 039276.
John Edward Fritz, 025091.
William Hayes Fritz, 035620.
Robert Joseph Fromme, 039246.
Ernest Michael Fry, 048603.
Charles Robert Fulbrugr, 034190.
Ella LeRoy Fuller, 037366.
Hiram Garrett Fuller, 025986.
John Milton Fulmer, 047846.
Richard Proctor Fulmer, 039130.
William Bennison Fulton, 035368.
Thomas Patrick Furey, 038876.
Walter Edward Gaby, Jr., 034656.
Robert Galbreath Gadd, 036303.
John Mac Galbraith, Jr., 035957.
Ralph Vincent Gardner, 036236.

George Howell Garnhart, 025267.
Melvin Garten, 048960.
Wayne John Gaynor, Jr., 032222.
Kirby Alexander Gean, 025588.
Edward Joseph Geaney, Jr., 026328.
William Robert Geelan, 040063.
Billy Burris Geery, 034877.
Frederick Richard Gehring, 036462.
Edward Harry Geiger, 046621.
Charles Curtis George, 024770.
Wilmah Melvin Getchell, 030737.
Edward Franklin Gibb, Jr., 045769.
Murray Francis Gibbons, Jr., 054398.
Wells Herbert Gibbs, 034661.
Raymond Francis Gibney, 036068.
James McKinley Gibson, 048730.
John Stewart Gibson, 053145.
Thomas Alvin Gibson, Jr., 035478.
Stewart Shepherd Giffin, Jr., 026342.
Harold Napoleon Gilbert, Jr., 037307.
Stanley Keith Gilbert, 047926.
Warren Ambrose Giles, 037874.
Harold Warren Gingrich, 026076.
Arthur Junior Glasebrook, 045192.
William Mitchel Glasgow, Jr., 025905.
James Keith Glendening, 026176.
John Russell Glick, 048877.
Solomon Platt Glickson, 054079.
Roy Glisson, Jr., 037078.
Edgar Nicholas Glotzbach, 027011.
Garland Denzil Godby, 036189.
Norman Alexander Godwin, 046291.
Robert Goggans, 049051.
Roland Lee Gohmert, 035402.
Mitchel Goldenthal, 035489.
John Garth Goodlett, Jr., 054600.
Glenn Winfield Goodman, 034171.
Jess Lewis Goodman, 047795.
×Frederick Churchill Goodwin, 034333.
James William Goodwin, Jr., 053694.
William Duke Gooley, 037743.
Herschell Gaines Gordon, 040943.
James Louis Gordon, 039213.
Preston O. Gordon, 036828.
Stephen Ellison Gordy, 026185.
Vincent Joseph Gorman, 041018.
Henry Martin Gossett, 036941.
Richard Eburn Gottlebsen, 046309.
George Henry Gould, 035058.
Arthur Beardsley Grace, Jr., 035498.
Ronan Callstus Grady, Jr., 023985.
Ralph Wayne Graham, 045995.
×Andrew Robert Grant, 035045.
Francis Alfred Grant, 040643.
Jonathan Masten Grant, 036083.
Joseph Hamilton Grant, Jr., 035384.
Belfrad Hampton Gray, Jr., 033660.
Thomas Edward Gray, 047851.
George Eugene Green, 040933.
James Franklin Greene, Jr., 025900.
Dale Robert Greenlief, 036476.
William James Greenwalt, 025998.
Robert John Greiner, 054034.
×Raymond Charles Greis, 033880.
Thorpe Coalson Grice, 026326.
Wilson Albert Griesbeck, 040604.
Thomas Everett Griess, 025533.
Bobbie Allen Griffin, 025908.
Jack David Griffiths, 036376.
William Lawrence Grimes, 035598.
Henry Frederick Grimm, Jr., 025519.
Thomas Cecil Grissom, Jr., 046263.
Kenneth George Groom, 054786.
Bernard Grossman, 041018.
Nicholas John Grunzweig, 047845.
Joffre Louis Gueymard, 046963.
Thomas Francis Guidera, 047165.
Arthur Wellesley Hackwood, Jr., 036109.
William Reed Hahn, 025566.
Robert Wesley Hakala, 048852.
Wendell Eli Hakala, 033672.
×William Calleson Hale, 036124.
Norman Ray Haley, 036011.
Alphus Waldo Hall, 054400.
Chester Allen Hall, Jr., 048018.
Claude Harrison Hall, 047794.
Frederick Walker Hall, 047374.
Harold Moore Hall, 047123.
Richard Reid Hallock, 037367.
Archelaus Lewis Hamblen, Jr., 026187.
Harry Bulkley Hamblen, Jr., 040670.
James Maurice Hamblin, 025127.
George Felix Hamel, 046167.
Stuart Adams Hamilton, Jr., 036152.
William Mason Hamilton, 053618.
Robert Webster Hamlin, 054941.
Rex Herbert Hampton, 047211.
Charles Wesley Hanchey, 036889.
Daniel Ward Hancock, 035281.
Robert Hand, 036415.
×George Edward Handley, Jr., 037294.
Thomas Joseph Hanifen, 040926.
Grat Bandy Hankins, 035257.
Loyd George Hanna, 035843.
×Leslie Buckingham Harding, 025512.
Leslie Boone Hardy, 026003.
Lorne T. Hargis, 053866.
John Husband Harkins, 033724.
×Edwin Freeland Harlan, 025943.
Joseph Fable Harpe, 053692.
William Francis Harrigan, 036438.
Elva Harris, 036714.
James Holford Harrison, 046389.
John Franklin Harth, 035997.
Ben Harvey, Jr., 040628.
William Alex Hash, 036625.
William Langhorne Hastie, 054089.
Robert Fleming Hatch, 054234.
Robert Preston Hatcher, Jr., 053259.
William Timothy Hatter, 034468.
Richard Earl Haughton, 046266.
Walace Euel Hawkins, 040869.
Frank Hawthorne, Jr., 054194.
Roy Arthur Hayden, 046891.
Leo Victor Hayes, 036213.
×Robert Lester Hayes, 041016.
Thomas Franklin Hayes, 037738.
Charles Edward Hazel, 039260.
Harold Sears Head, 036272.
John Dennis Healy, Jr., 035718.
Richard David Healy, 036093.
John Wilkinson Heard, 024963.
Warren Robert Hecker, 026292.
Gerard Heimer, 033907.
Kenneth Richardson Helms, 037088.
×Llewellyn Sherwood Helsley, 036800.
Charles Lester Heltzel, 037746.
Harold Baller Henderly, 036065.
Chester Thomas Henderson, 039274.
Tony Sinclair Henderson, 039279.
Jack James Henley, 036909.
Charles Arthur Henne, 046258.
Albert Clifford Henry, 034497.
Gregg Henry, 025576.
William Ernest Hensel, 025531.
Philip Brown Henshaw, Jr., 034856.
Emery Madison Hensley, 035720.
Ira Clifton Henson, Jr., 036423.
John William Herold, 036548.
Fred Willard Herres, Jr., 025906.
Harry Leo Herres, 041049.
Charles Goldsborough Hershey, Jr., 037364.
Jack McKinley Hertzog, 040656.
Richard Frank Heske, 035641.
James William Hevener, 037121.
Charles Robert Hiatt, 037099.
Charles Taylor Hickman, Jr., 047948.
David Hickman, 033966.
Joseph Criswell Hiett, 034657.
Hugh Richard Higgins, 036183.
James Leonard Higgins, 036306.
Joseph Peter Higgins, 048665.
Norman Hilditch, 040617.
Benjamin Ira Hill, 024791.
Charles Russell Hill, 024940.
David Arthur Hill, Jr., 054124.
Harry Green Hill, 034106.
Ralph Julian Hill, 026127.
Roger Hilsman, Jr., 035899.
Frederick Morris Irving Hjertberg, 037206.
Charles Edwin Hoagland, 034645.
Alfred Paul Hobrecht, 049028.
Michael Frederick Hochella, 036490.
John Hodges, 034393.
Ralph Warren Hoffman, 036786.
Ralph Milla Hofmann, 025495.
James Henry Hogan, 037144.
Charles Kenneth Hokenson, 035618.
William Lewis Holcomb, 053160.
Leonard Donald Holder, 037267.
William Euless Holland, Jr., 046873.
Jean Wilson Hollstein, 033559.
Jefferson Thomas Holman, 036967.
Henry Benjamin Holmes 3d, 025848.
Robert Milton Holmes, 026110.
John Broadus Holt, Jr., 048996.
Burton Francis Hood, Jr., 025729.
Herman Peter Hoplin, 036975.
Richard Carter Horne 3d, 040863.
Paul Nelson Horton, 036254.
Charles Edward Howard, 039153.
Herbert Henry Howard, 046059.
Robert Curtis Howard, 053368.
DeWitt Clinton Howell, 045037.
Maurice Wilbur Howell, 035880.
Samuel Withers Howell, Jr., 034069.
Edward Brandes Hrdlicka, 036985.
Enrique Jerald Hubert, 036518.
Terence William Huck, 036513.
Harlow Maxwell Huckabee, 047121.
James McClain Huddleston, 025554.
Lloyd Gordon Huggins, 034139.
Algin James Hughes, 025690.
Clyde Edward Hughes, 048861.
John Patrick-Michael Hughes, 047232.
×Paul Ancil Hughes, 037157.
Thomas Kleberg Hughes, 024449.
William Robert Hughes, 034602.
Charles Van-Buren Humphrey, 040945.
John Osborne Hunnicutt, Jr., 036860.
George Thomas Hunt, 036777.
Herman Turner Hunt, Jr., 036058.
William Patrick Hunt, Jr., 036192.
William Lew Hunter, 039016.
Frederick Joseph Hurley, 046694.
Walter James Hutchin, 035816.
Robert Cliff Hutchinson, Jr., 039439.
Mortimer James Hutchison, 034727.
Russell James Hutchison, 048681.
John Francis Hyde, 036908.
Archie Richard Hyle, 037271.
Charles Sutherland Hymers, 048838.
Paul Thomas Ingle, 037559.
Glenn Paul Ingwersen, 036668.
Lloyd Joshua Inman, 036274.
Charles Joseph Ippolito, 037306.
Pierce Butler Irby, Jr., 024869.
Thornton Emmells Ireland, 037388.
Richard Irvin, Jr., 035118.
John Hamilton Irving, Jr., 037004.
Alvin Curtely Isaacs, 046814.
George Drexel Ish, 036103.
Alvis Emmit Isner, 046686.
Gabriel Alexander Ivan, 035885.
Burwell Bright Jackson, 036460.
Gordon Everett Jackson, 046960.
Harry Ross Jackson, 036097.
Joseph James Jackson, 039255.
Kenneth Eugene Jackson, 036849.
Page Spencer Jackson, 036042.
Robert Lee Jackson, Jr., 053104.
Donald Joseph Jalbert, 036809.
×Walker Jamar, Jr., 025664.
Lee Boyer James, 025619.
Stanley Livingston James, Jr., 035683.
Neal Fontaine Janousek, 036127.
Clarence Edwin Jeffress, 025255.
John Harrison Jeffries, 036427.
Arthur Haddon Jemmott, Jr., 037043.
James Raymond Jenkins, 035054.
Samuel Wright Jenkins, 036190.
Raymond Jasper Jennings, 034120.
Melvin Merlin Jensen, 045771.
Roland Harry Jensen, 055300.
Benjamin Edwin Johnson, Jr., 040646.
×Donald Lesley Johnson, 035686.
Earle Albie Johnson, Jr., 024211.
Fredric Eskil Johnson, 035865.
Hugh Woodrow Johnson, 038873.
James Morgan Johnson, 054002.
John Frank Johnson, 037538.
Leonard Louis Johnson, 035641.
Thomas Matkins Johnston, 036942.
William Russell Johnston, 047368.
Alan Walter Jones, Jr., 036469.
Charles Albert Jones, Jr., 034588.
Charles Myers Jones, Jr., 035880.
Dearl Forest Jones, 048438.
Frank Williams Jones, Jr., 036178.
Harry Lee Jones, Jr., 048397.
Kenneth Miley Jones, 040839.
Lee Clasier Jones, 034737.
×Lloyd Edmonstone Jones, Jr., 035996.
Ralph Kilbreth Jones, 026129.

Russell Gene Jones, 037213.
William Mallory Jones, 037209.
Wyly King Jones, 046743.
Edward Eugene Jordan, 054028.
Stanton Wayne Josephson, 024745.
Archie Bewing Joyner, Jr., 054001.
Edgar Russell Kadel, Jr., 035801.
Francis Casimir Kajencki, 025582.
×Edwin Cyril Kalina, 033604.
Ronald Augustine Kapp, 037070.
Howard Lyon Karnes, 036515.
Samuel Nairn Karrick, Jr., 025446.
Charles Lee Kasler, 034599.
Harold Wesley Kasserman, 048070.
Robert Clark Kates, 024787.
Sidney Katz, 036327.
Eldeen Henry Kauffman, 039257.
Paul Roy Kaufmann, 036377.
William Joseph Keating, 036503.
Jerry Vincent Keaveny, 053772.
Leonard Leslie Keene, Jr., 036529.
Thomas Edwin Kelley, 037155.
Dimitri Alexander Kellogg, 025433.
John Joseph Kelly, Jr., 025869.
Randall Kelly, 047876.
Herbert Eugene Kemp, 025742.
Maurice Wesley Kendall, 027003.
Lansford Franklin Kengle, Jr., 025975.
Arthur Hobbs Kennedy, 039300.
Clarence Newton Kennedy, 053230.
Paul Richard Kennedy, 035563.
Richard Thomas Kennedy, 048390.
Stanley Young Kennedy, Jr., 037179.
William Michael Kennedy, 036640.
William Thomas Keogh, 033742.
James LeRoy Keown, 036528.
Gerald Lee Kerr, Jr., 041033.
James Wilson Kerr 3d, 025417.
Herbert Lee Key, Jr., 054858.
William Theodore Kidd, 048216.
James Donald Kidder, 026227.
Morton William Kimball, 047178.
Glennis Lamar King, 033661.
James Bacon King, 046196.
William Werner KinKead, 040638.
Ralph Kinnes, 036300.
Howard Dreher Kinney, Jr., 034697.
Alfred William Kirchner, 036559.
Leonard Monroe Kirk, 036130.
Richard Varick Kissam, Jr., 036339.
Darwin Jack Kitch, 025748.
William Spedden Kittrell, 049082.
×Donald Aloyse Klein, 036668.
Louis John Klekas, 054883.
William Rudolph Arthur Kleysteuber, 053062.
Harry Keating Klie, 047792.
Sidney Alvin Knutson, 026199.
Bruce Carlton Koch, 025947.
William Adam Koenig, Jr., 040606.
Conrad Epping Koerper, Jr., 025500.
Joseph Wilson Kohnstamm, 040645.
James Talbot Kolb, 047708.
Armand Michael Kolesar, 036783.
John Bernard Kopf, 040612.
Irving Koss, 040665.
Robert Theodore Krane, 036667.
Edward Anthony Kreml, 026283.
Harold Robert Kressin, 045387.
Mervin Krieger, 049000.
Herbert William Krueger, 039207.
Richard Oscar Kruger, 036575.
John Erwin Kuffner, 025602.
J. W. Kuykendall, Jr., 035836.
Jack Verne LaBounty, 034422.
Charles Emil La Chaussee, 037164.
Arthur Joseph Lacouture, Jr., 026240.
Thomas Michael La Patka, 036646.
Gerard Joseph Ladner, 037143.
Paul Glenn Laird, 045696.
Jack Francis Lake, 054391.
Eugene Manuel Landrum, Jr., 055032.
William Joseph Lanen, 036007.
Lawrence Quentin Langland, 039238.
Charles Francis Langley, 040834.
Warren Granville Langley, 055029.
James Douglas Langstaff, Jr., 036314.
Alex Thomas Langston, Jr., 053069.
Royce Parry Larned, 055106.
William Edmund Larned, Jr., 025636.
Gerald Ewald Larsen, 036693.
Virgil Venable Laughlin, 041039.
James Herbert Leach, 048716.
Ross Eugene Leach, 054970.
Charles Scott Leavitt, 040830.
Oscar William Lee, Jr., 036670.
Henry Emile LeFebvre, 036358.
Albert Francis Leister, Jr., 036201.
Richard Martin Leonard, 053957.
Armand Rosaire Levasseur, 047280.
William Baldwin Levin, 053865.
Charles Andrew Lewis, 053421.
Herbert Suddath Lewis, 025734.
Hollis Clinton Lewis, 025205.
Norman Francis Lewis, Jr., 048701.
Morgan Cornwell Light, 036773.
Morris Louree Lindsey, 040935.
William James Lingan, 018851.
Frederick Alvin Lingner, 036387.
William Clyde Linton, Jr., 026140.
Ralph Edward Lipscomb, 036409.
Augustine Brabson Littleton, 046066.
John Russell Lloyd, Jr., 026296.
Wilmer Rufus Lochrie, 036936.
Thomas William Locke, 053105.
William Lindsey Lockett, 035708.
×Richard Jose Lombard, 033904.
Harry Longerich, 053791.
Horace Christopher Lorck, 036359.
Nicholas Akin Lord, 046045.
Steven Wayne Losten, 048412.
James Norris Lothrop, Jr., 026057.
Jack Patrick Loughman, 026282.
Joseph Patrick Loughran, 037167.
Richard Meredith Lovelace, 039079.
Herbert Ramsey Lovell, 039253.
Elward Wiley Lowe, 054717.
Henry Augustus Lowe, 034748.
Horace Alvin Lowe, Jr., 036857.
John Porter Lucas, Jr., 026159.
Alphonse Francis Lucier, Jr., 034832.
William John Lueck, Jr., 036716.
William Luk, 040642.
Howard Ivan Lukens, 053619.
Claude Cleo Lumpkin, Jr., 024941.
George Bradley Lundberg, 025679.
Maurice Williams Lundellus, 054864.
×Irvin Merl Lundy, 041000.
Edwin Martyn Lutz, 036755.
George Arthur Lutz, 037296.
William David Lutz, 026018.
Robert Lee Lybarger, 047360.
Joseph Patrick Lydon, 033853.
James William Lyle, 035484.
William John Lynch, 053175.
David Reed Lyon, 038594.
James Rholon Lytle, 048021.
Ned Bowen Mabry, 053148.
John Eric MacArthur, 040885.
Augustine Gregory MacDonald, 036989.
William Gordon MacFarlane, 036948.
Lawrence Prince Mac Queen, 035614.
Francis John Madden, 046258.
Wallace Clifton Magathan, Jr., 025861.
James John Mahan, Jr., 048988.
Thomas Bradford Mahone, Jr., 046521.
George Cunningham Major, 046041.
Barton James Mallory, 025764.
William Francis Malone, 026044.
Martin Jack Manhoff, 024538.
Sabatine Robert Marconi, 036128.
Sidney Michael Marks, 036977.
William Leon Marks, 039275.
×James Robert Marland, 039145.
John Marrero, 054297.
Clyde John Martak, 054719.
Allen Clinton Martin, 034231.
James Frederic Martin, 047908.
L. D. Kirkwood Martin, 037177.
Lawrence Emanuel Martin, Jr., 047622.
Harry Hudson Marts, 037180.
Robert Christopher Masengs, 054101.
Hale Mason, Jr., 025345.
James Horace Massingill, 034274.
×Joseph Theodore Materi, 024330.
Robert Edward Mathe, 025876.
Lawrence Glenn Mathews, 025402.
Milton Alexander Matthews, 056906.
Robert Arthur Matthews, 046599.
Robert Hamilton Mattox, Jr., 036816.
David Darwin May, 024946.
Marion Hopkins May, 025576.
Rene Emile Maysonave, 045650.
Reno Augustus Mazzucchi, 036208.
William Stein McArtor, 047849.
Jack Albert McAuley, 036706.
Robert Benjamin McBane, 048890.
Robert Bruce McBride 3d, 037277.
Edward Francis McCabe, 025926.
John Terrence McCabe, 051126.
Ray Nolan McCall, 037381.
Robert Louis McCanna, 026047.
Max Reynolds McCarthy, 036249.
Paul Norton McCarthy, 033646.
John Edward McCarty, Jr., 046713.
Stuart McCash, 036824.
Mack Junior McCaughey, 036196.
Robert Hugh McCauley, 036756.
Ralph Edward McClain, 036661.
Paul Jones McClure, Jr., 035640.
Richard McClure, 035064.
John Douglas McCormick, 036236.
×Richard Locke McCoy, 036950.
Robert Gerald McCoy, 041003.
Raymond John McCrory, Jr., 037146.
Louis Phillip McCuller, 034636.
Roy Marsh McCutchen, Jr., 054575.
William John McDermott, Jr., 048180.
Charles Taylor McDowell, 037309.
Robert Bruce McDowell, 025980.
Frank Dixon McElwee, 025409.
James Doyle McFarland, 053149.
Wallace Beman McFarland, 048721.
Dale Fletcher McGee, Jr., 026253.
Norris Dale McGinnis, 037282.
×John Daniel McGowan, 025759.
William John McGuigan, 036993.
Paul Melville McGuire, 035705.
Donald Joseph McGurk, 048078.
John Joseph McKenna, 033704.
William Hill McKenzie 3d, 025929.
Hugh Lee McKinney, 036986.
Howard McMillen McLain, 054984.
Charles Michael McLaughlin, Jr., 037128.
George Pilcher McLendon, 037133.
Bill Gene McLeod, 036374.
Charles Alexander McLeod, 027047.
Eldon Lowell McLeod, 035688.
Jack Emmet McMahan, 037300.
Vincent Joseph McManus, 036334.
William Cowie McMillan, 054971.
Gail Borden McMurtrey, 046748.
Donald Carl McNair, 033791.
Harry McNamara, Jr., 035795.
John Gilmore McNamara, 025677.
Quentin Lowry McNary, 037212.
William Daniels Meara, 035823.
Walter Erwin Mehlinger, 036149.
Donald John Mehrtens, 025877.
Arthur Clayton Meier, 035560.
Clarence Richard Meltesen, 040616.
Earle Cooper Merkl, 053306.
Thomas Leslie Merrick, 037132.
Spurgeon Arthur Messner, 053753.
Albert Caswell Metts, Jr., 026091.
Charles Thomas Mewshaw, 040632.
Richard Hemmig Meyer, 025872.
Franklyn Jack Michaelson, 048532.
Anthony John Miketinac, 045671.
Arthur Woldemar Milberg, 035642.
Earl Beckwith Milburn, 048727.
Richard Cutler Miles, 024939.
William Maynadier Miley, Jr., 037077.
James Cleveland Miller, Jr., 025961.
Millard Joseph Miller, 047804.
Ralph Ben Miller, 037302.
Robert Earl Miller, 054264.
Robert Ernest Miller, 037856.
Winthrop Grant Miller, 045057.
Felix George Millhouse, 036609.
Jack Augustus Milligan, 054566.
William Seth Milliken, 041017.
Charles William Milmore, 026045.
Ronald Augustus Milton, 054057.
Howard Gray Minch, 034945.
Rex David Minckler, 025551.
Roscoe Thomas Minson, 048568.
Gene Lewis Mitcham, 033422.
Henry Gaston Mitchel 3d, 024461.
Arthur Frank Mitchell, 036489.
John Riley Mitchell, 038615.
Joseph Al Mitchell, Jr., 048753.
Joseph Wyatt Mitchell, Jr., 036351.
Walter George Mitchell, Jr., 026075.
Michael Peter Mitro, 054669.

Charles Malcom Mizell, 024728.
George Robert Moe, 026022.
Joseph Alexander Moneyhun, 046065.
Melvin Candee Monroe, 034552.
Percy Alpha Monty, 053945.
Clayton Henry Moore, Jr., 049625.
Clayton Homer Moore, Jr., 035178.
Howard Everett Moore, 025816.
Robert Daniel Moore, 036329.
Robert Franklin Moore, 036304.
Roy Moore, Jr., 037063.
Thomas Nall Moore, 037295.
John Moran, 053964.
Henry Grady Morgan, Jr., 026305.
Reuben Thomas Morgan, 036154.
William Harold Morgan, 024660.
Harry Clair Morley, 037341.
Jack Wirt Morris, 045540.
John Woodland Morris, 025992.
Woodford Tanner Moseley, 035858.
James Russell Moses, 041035.
John George Moses, Jr., 025526.
John Willis Moses, 026170.
Vaughn Roberts Moss, 034144.
Roule Cole Mozingo, 026274.
William Mulheron, Jr., 047280.
James John Mullen, 036191.
Tracy Elsworth Mulligan, Jr., 054309.
David Francis Mulliken, 034948.
Frank Ainsworth Mulroney, 035833.
William Hudson Mundhenk, 036155.
Charles Patrick Murray, Jr., 041057.
Edward Henry Murray, 025730.
Jack Henry Murray, Jr., 035974.
Paul Murray, Jr., 036982.
Hampden Joseph Murrell, 053641.
Albert Farley Myers, 035239.
Frederick William Myers, Jr., 054959.
William Robert Myers, 025513.
Woodrow Horace Myers, 053886.
Grover Elwin Nash, Jr., 036162.
James Herschell Nash, 026153.
Holady Cornelius Neafus, Jr., 054544.
William Douaire Neale, 025755.
William Robert Nealson, 034407.
William George Nechanicky, 033910.
Walter Francis Nechey, 047231.
Christopher Columbus Needham, Jr., 037261.
William Warren Neely, 024332.
R. Wilson Neff, 053439.
Dennis William Neill, 046137.
Harold Alexander Neill, 026271.
Carlton Nelson, 047373.
Oliver Wesley Nelson, 037084.
Donald Maxwell Nethery, 054968.
Joseph Edward Nett, 025804.
Robert Burton Nett, 041070.
William Cornelius Neubauer, 035572.
×James Denton Neumann, 035956.
Robert Harvey Newberry, 039232.
×Gilbert Ubertas Newby, 040858.
George Newlands, 046006.
George Edward Newman, 026015.
George Woodrow Nichols, 054033.
John Sherman Nickell, 035794.
Edward Louis Nielsen, 040868.
William Hoskins Niland, 045456.
Richard Hobart Niles, 035853.
Victor Merle Nixon, 047617.
Lloyd Elmer Nobles, 036965.
Marvin Charles Otto Nolte, 036763.
John Jacob Norris, 025713.
Thadeus Pierce Northcutt, 040677.
Allen Hale Nottingham, 036157.
Jack Graham Null, 036302.
Walter Edwin Nygard, 025669.
Joseph Francis O'Connor, 036411.
Joseph Patrick O'Connor, Jr., 040648.
William Schwab O'Connor, 054316.
James Jerome O'Donnell, 047982.
Warren Martin O'Gara, 034616.
John Thomas O'Halloran, 055106.
John Thomas O'Hea, 035486.
Arthur Arvid Olson, 036174.
John Francis O'Malley, 046050.
Beverly Foreman O'Neal, Jr., 046939.
John Sergeant Oppenhimer, 036490.
Donald Charles O'Rourke, 036611.
Richard Cameron Orphan, 036039.
Uriah Newton Orr, 053877.
Francis James Orsi, 036238.
Michael Noel O'Sullivan, 037162.
Allen Monroe Otis, 024990.
Edward Stanley Ott, Jr., 025860.
Edwin Bradstreet Owen, 047079.
Cecil Wray Page, Jr., 025723.
Eugene William Palm, 035643.
Wallace Davidson Pardue, 036413.
Harold Robert Parfitt, 025914.
Douglas Francis Parham, 026226.
Lester Leonidas Parker, 036638.
Nicholson Parker, 026193.
Reuben Dale Parker, 047214.
Charles Patrick Parrish, 053213.
Merlin Harry Parson, 036084.
Melvin James Pasta, 036713.
Fred Patterson, 035446.
James Albert Patterson, 036549.
×Richard Irving Paul, 036814.
Pete Daniel Pavick, 025699.
Laurent Dupre Pavy, 026088.
Irving Philip Payne, 053878.
Otho Clair Payne, 054764.
Howard Wallace Peak, 047981.
William Oliver Peak 3d, 026025.
Helge Enock Pearson, 045958.
Robert McNeely Peden, 025798.
Russell Cone Peeples, Jr., 036558.
Norman Erland Pehrson, 025912.
James Naduro Peixotto, 047628.
Victor Bryan Penuel, Jr., 046015.
Del Sullivan Perkins, 026016.
Robert Laurence Perley, 046454.
Arthur Gordon Perry, 032985.
Benjamin Ernest Perry, 037328.
Emanuel Paul Peters, 041006.
Gustov William Peters, 035421.
Kenneth Arthur Peters, 047220.
Ralph Douglas Peters, 046228.
Eugene Iver Peterson, 036085.
Peter Rust Peterson, Jr., 047806.
Glen Earl Petrie, 036827.
Morris Winham Pettit, 034100.
Gustave Adolph Peyer, Jr., 037207.
Joseph Warren Pezdirtz, 036779.
Joseph Morris Pfeffer, 034836.
×Phil Roy Phelps, Jr., 026251.
Henry Gerard Phillips, 036383.
James Walter Phillips, 026236.
Steve Franklin Phillips, Jr., 036624.
William Joseph Phillips, 046987.
Wayne Fredrick Pickell, 046670.
Milton Keith Pigg, 026004.
×Edwin Graham Pike, 040720.
Samuel Williams Pinnell, 025880.
Carl Eugene Pister, 053390.
Conrad Ben Pitcher, 036642.
Charles Hall Pitney, 047798.
Thomas Bentley Pitts, 053951.
James C. Pleasant, 036059.
Robert Peter Pleitz, 053378.
Robert Ernest Plett, 025924.
Frank Plichta, 046894.
Hubbard Thomas Plunkett, Jr., 036991.
Francis Joseph Popovich, 040803.
Clark Wesley Porter, 046162.
Donald Franklin Powell, 025762.
Herb Duane Prather, 036258.
James Martin Pratt, 025135.
Charles Victor Pregaldin, Jr., 034425.
Vernon Franklin Pressentin, 035391.
Altus Emory Prince, 025714.
×Harry Hall Pritchett, Jr., 025705.
Fred Beaver Proctor, 025990.
Lamar McFadden Prosser, 036317.
George Jackson Pruett, 037054.
Lloyd Otho Pruett, 039309.
George Shipley Prugh, Jr., 054092.
Charles De Puckett, 026210.
Frank Best Puckett, 043137.
×William Earnest Pulos, 026225.
William Gus Pursley, 046780.
George David Putnam, 036328.
Ray Buryl Quinn, 036604.
John Carpenter Raaen, Jr., 035486.
Robert James Rader, 025676.
Vernon Charles Ramberg, 053063.
Robert Hoagland Ramsay, 035494.
Arthur James Ramsel, 035616.
Thomas Edward Ramsey, 025716.
Arthur Henry Rasper, Jr., 036121.
Stanley Carle Raub, 036200.
Ernest Charles Raulin, Jr., 025793.
Robert Maurice Rawls, 024675.
Roger Ray, 026035.
William Johnson Ray, 026139.
Ellis Avery Ream, 036165.
Gerald Vernon Reberry, 037359.
Thomas Lester Redd, Jr., 035506.
Charles Sumner Reed, Jr., 025944.
John Palmer Reed, 035839.
Harry Langdon Reeder, Jr., 026214.
James Beard Rees, 035539.
Frellsen Reese, 053349.
Albert Charles Reinert, 024936.
Richard Henry Reitmann, 025875.
Charles Edward Remick, 034406.
Robert Bruce Reppa, 034978.
Frank William Rhea, 025876.
Edwin Milton Rhoads, 025956.
William Arthur Rhodey, 053943.
Joseph Anthony Riccio, 025737.
Robert Howard Richards, 047545.
Donald Howard Richardson, 037160.
Howard Begg Richardson, 036934.
James Randolph Richardson, 025491.
Warren Lincoln Richardson, 048271.
James Lucas Riffe, 054861.
William Lafaette Riles, 036221.
Donald Ector Rivette, 034757.
Harold Kilburn Roach, 025626.
Henry Grady Roberts, 033733.
John Linton Robinson, 036134.
Reaford Leroy Robinson, 036774.
Charles Ainsworth Rockwood, 037293.
Walter Leo Roe, 026344.
Bernard William Rogers, 025867.
Charles Irvin Rogers, 036778.
Warren Rogers, 025913.
Bruno John Rolak, 046725.
Henry Romanek, 025911.
Warren Ladd Romans, 039150.
Gerhart Otto Romstedt, 055056.
Robert Lee Rooker, 036155.
William Bahney Roop, 054199.
William Fredrick Roos, 025662.
Frank Ulric Roquemore, Jr., 036712.
Charles Edward Rose, 035066.
James Thomas Ross, Jr., 036931.
John Roy Ross, Jr., 025698.
Raymond Harvey Ross, 036412.
Leonard Rothbard, 054051.
Vernon Ray Rottstedt, 053185.
Tom J Rounsaville, 036259.
Councill Powell Rountree, 054050.
John Vincent Rowan, Jr., 047374.
Gerald William Rowe, 033610.
Jack Wildey Ruby, 045871.
Nicholas Demitri Rudziak, 047988.
Harry Erwin Ruhsam, 047135.
Edward Joseph Rumpf, 026180.
Walter Gerard Runte, 036526.
Roger Samuel Rush, 047718.
×Cecil Robert Russell, 036030.
John Thomas Russell, Jr., 025721.
Roger Lee Russell, Jr., 034039.
Robert Dorney Rutherford, 034355.
Raymond Francis Ruyffelaere, 025814.
Peter John Ryan, 026205.
Lawrence Theodore Ryhlick, 048716.
Robert Eugene Sadler, 036522.
Harold Jacob Saine, 026291.
Max Donald Salter, 037037.
Everett Guy Salyer, 036107.
Lewis Frew Samuson, 036147.
Paul Fredric Sanders, 053770.
Roy Alexander Sanders, 025612.
Vernon Keith Sanders, 025476.
William Bruce Sandlin, Jr., 036406.
Frank Harold Sargent, 048462.
David Bealey Savage, 046184.
George Frederick Sawyer, 025083.
Kenneth Trevor Sawyer, 039057.
Henry William Scharf, 040688.
John Patrick Schatz, 036224.
Frederick Scherberger 3d, 053918.
James Byron Scherer, 024415.
Thomas Augustine Schintz, 039074.
George Ardell Schnebli, 036899.
Gerald Clement Schneider, 036785.
Robert Bertrand Schoos, 037878.
John Lawrence Schott, Jr., 048861.
Gordon Albert Schraeder, 025896.
John Whiting Schreiner, Jr., 047422.

Henry John Schroeder, Jr., O26028.
Leonard Treherne Schroeder, Jr., O45879.
Martin Frank Schroeder, O35548.
Fred William Schumacher, O33869.
Thomas Chadderdon Schumacher, O54290.
John Melborn Schwalje, O36430.
Robert John Schwind, O33900.
James Mack Scott, O37201.
Russell Faux Scott, Jr., O26325.
Samuel Blake Scott, Jr., O36312.
Elmer Bermon Scovill, O35851.
William Birnnie Scruggs, Jr., O45775.
Allan Richard Scullen, O24984.
James Augustus Seab, O46596.
George Washington Seabrock 3d, O48225.
Harold Duncan Seaman, O36616.
Frank Sheldon Sears, O45378.
Arthur Joseph Sebesta, O25644.
Paul Seibel, O36861.
Clarence Kimbrough Sells, O53600.
Leon Sembach, O26007.
Clifton Paul Semmens, O34857.
William Gee Senior, O46632.
Joseph Beck Sestito, O45893.
William Edward Sexton, O48110.
William James Shadle, Jr., O37262.
Edward Fondren Shaffer, Jr., O26343.
×Adolph Lawrence Shaima, O36677.
James George Shanahan, O36322.
Neil John Sharkey, O37299.
Hunter Lewis Sharp, O36323.
John Daniel Sharp, Jr., O46693.
Sam Houston Sharp, O54958.
George Frederick Sharra, O36691.
Charles Robert Shaw, O47789.
Franklin Prague Shaw, Jr., O25492.
William Guillian Shaw 3d, O53248.
Frank White Shelton, O33612.
Frank Landis Shenk, O37193.
Robert G Shepherd, O52951.
×Francis Philip Sheridan, O36170.
Keith Sherman, O53812.
×Joseph Holmes Sherrard 4th, O40597.
Frank George Sheviak, Jr., O40878.
Harry Hobart Shields, Jr., O54994.
Robert Edward Shipp, O36119.
Alton Martin Shipstead, O26345.
Joseph Alvin Shirley, O25065.
John Ogden Shoemaker, O54351.
David Sanford Short, O36603.
×James Harvey Short, O26242.
John Laurence Shortall, Jr., O25544.
James Clark Shoultz, O46792.
×John Jacob Shultz, Jr., O25550.
Robert Leroy Sickler, O37231.
Paul Otto Siebeneichen, O34729.
Harry Fritchel Sieber, Jr., O54161.
Lionel Carlton Simmons, O40797.
Donald Eugene Simon, O24776.
George Herbert Simpson, O34704.
Joe Richard Simpson, O46190.
Leonard Densmore Simpson, O46128.
Alexander Skorina, O52984.
Eugene Jeremy Small, O47190.
Robert Frederick Smiley, O48683.
Anderson Quillian Smith, O34187.
Bowen Neal Smith, O53523.
Chester Mervin Smith, O40993.
Dale Lafeen Smith, O54616.
Daugherty Mason Smith, O25717.
×Edward Ellis Smith, O27016.
Edward Walter Smith, Jr., O45568.
Ellsworth Walter Smith, O48540.
Frank Bertram Smith, O25888.
×Frederick Mark Smith, O25497.
Gordon Lord Smith, O26029.
Horrell Holcomb Smith, O36562.
James Fletcher Smith, O37046.
James Luke Smith, Jr., O25059.
Norvin Eckert Smith, Jr., O34604.
Orvil Taft Smith, O37353.
Roy E. Smith, O35777.
Vincent Pershing Smith, O36499.
William Elmer Smith, O34859.
William Jacob Smith, O36830.
Neil Norman Snyder, Jr., O34319.
Edunrdo Miguel Soler, O36030.
×Robert Daniel Sonstelie, O36141.
Rosario Sorbello, O25066.
William Joseph Spahr, O26177.
Basil Dennis Spalding, Jr., O36341.
Frederick Clayton Spann, O25561.
James Hamilton Spann, O45979.
James Hinton Spears, O33815.
John Hugh Spears, O46027.
Harry Speight, O48882.
Ronald Charles Speirs, O35820.
Donald Calhoun Spiece, O25969.
Frank Joseph Spiegelberg, O54373.
Robert Claude Spiker, O35972.
William Herbert Sprigg, O36316.
Adrian St. John, Jr., O25583.
Joseph Peeler Stabler, O25647.
Warwick Brooke Stabler, O34322.
Frederick Dana Standish 2d, O24981.
Leslie Everett Stanford, O54587.
Felix Weir Stanley, O36428.
LeRoy Samie Stanley, O36112.
John Tillinghart Stansill, O40738.
Marshall Wolcott Stark, O25294.
Norman Baxter Starr, O36922.
Stanley Marcell Staszak, O25060.
Charles Jacob Stauffer, O33757.
Glenn Allan Steckel, O46036.
Louis John Stefani, O40707.
Herbert Allen Steil, O48092.
Alois Louis Steinbach, O48109.
Milton Ernst Steinbring, O25946.
Harry Joseph Stempin, O45786.
×John Martin Stephens, Jr., O34689.
Edward Arthur Sterling 3d, O53884.
×Burrowes Goldthwaite Stevens, Jr., O25950.
Kenneth Theadore Stevens, O36203.
Milton Ernst Stevens, O25471.
Wilmer Burton Stevens, O37079.
Don Winward Stevenson, O34868.
Claude C. Stewart, O47006.
Dana Lee Stewart, O25608.
Edward Ward Stewart, O46148.
Willard Cornelius Stewart, O53433.
Robert Bruce Stiles, O27000.
John Buchanan Stockton, O26152.
George Isadore Stoeckert, O36757.
Lloyd Eugene Stone, O37128.
Stephen Grant Stone, Jr., O47960.
Charles Senour Stough, Jr., O35187.
Everette Arthur Stoutner, O36105.
Robert Walter Stowbridge, O36501.
William Roland Strantz, O54512.
Donn Pere Strausbaugh, O45681.
James Morgan Sessions Strickland, O35184.
Roger Arthur Stroede, O49045.
LeRoy Strong, O49417.
Ray Bernard Stroup, O34267.
Walter Chalmond Stubbs, Jr., O41039.
George Delp Styer, O36031.
Alden Patrick Sullivan, O41069.
James Kirwin Sullivan, O36916.
Leo Joseph Sullivan, O37027.
Lloyd Stilwell Sullivan, O53326.
Robert Edward Summerall, O39314.
Norman Robert Sumner, O33854.
Robert Stanley Sumner, O36967.
Arthur Thurston Surkamp, O25935.
Henry Surum, O36478.
×George Mills Sutton, O35970.
Alva William Swartz, O25077.
William Rector Swearngan, O36143.
Arthur Hamilton Sweeney, Jr., O40865.
William James Sweet, Jr., O35814.
Wilbur Eric Swenson, Jr., O36060.
John Donald Swensson, O46859.
James Lee Swofford, O53451.
Eugene Dudley Taber, O47959.
Max Verne Talbot, Jr., O26322.
Jack Tallerday, O36346.
John Lewis Tanner, O33683.
Thomas Kelly Tannler, O26158.
Hubert Edward Tansey, O26031.
×William Davis Tatsch, O24822.
Bernard Lloyd Tauber, O36715.
Cloyd Veron Taylor, O47850.
×Dale William Taylor, O36935.
Noble Everette Taylor, O40934.
Richard Ingrig Taylor, Jr., O36676.
Warren Leigh Taylor, O26068.
Jack Teague, O36354.
×Eugene Joseph Temme, O34553.
×Duane Paul Tenney, O26000.
George William Terry, O37101.
John Wade Therrell, O40869.
George Thomas, O37081.
Jesse Thomas, Jr., O24593.
Jesse Reamer Thomas, O36320.
Lorres Charles Thomas, O25930.
William Fred Thomas, O45885.
William George Thomas 3d, O53386.
Howard Mitchell Thompson, O47399.
Shelden Leslie Thompson, O35687.
Frank Lamont Thomsen, O54615.
Arington Calaway Thomson, Jr., O54322.
Donald Edward Thomson, O35490.
John Holden Thorne, O36166.
Warren George Thornton, O46663.
Willard Davis Tiffany, O34230.
×George Gordon Tillery, O39267.
James Lewis Tilly, O36970.
Forrest Blaine Tilson, O47769.
Max Eugene Timmons, O53965.
Charles Franklin Tisdale, O45925.
William Holmes Tomlinson, O26333.
Jack Winford Tooley, O46660.
Harold Kimball Toomer, O40849.
Alphonso Axel Topp, Jr., O25408.
Maxwell Stephen Torgersen, O37083.
Anthony Joseph Touart, Jr., O25377.
Delbert Leroy Townsend, O41062.
James Munroe Townsend, O36069.
Lester Boyette Townsend, Jr., O53798.
Robert Turrentine Townsend, O45913.
Charles Stuart Townshend, Jr., O40833.
Alfred Thomas Trainor, O33767.
Paul Alonzo Trees, O45254.
Joseph Anthony Tringali, O39152.
Ralph Joseph Truex, O25558.
Fred Cutting Tucker, O24865.
Walter Ferson Tucker, O24548.
William Owen Tucker, Jr., O48880.
Harry Nathaniel Tufts, O40679.
Henry Harold Tufts, O54270.
Julian Turner, O40697.
Edward Arnold Turrou, O48222.
Frederick Charles Uhler, O25003.
Carl Comer Ulsaker, O24815.
Louis Blanton Umlauf, Jr., O26338.
Charles Calvin Underwood, O34337.
Vernon Warren Underwood, O36204.
John Jones Upchurch 3d, O25435.
Wendell Grant VanAuken, Jr., O26269.
George Van Laethem, O36342.
Arthur William VanSchoick, Jr., O26017.
Frederick Edward Van Tassell, O36087.
Clarke Steady Vaughn, O48868.
Fletcher Read Veach, Jr., O26301.
×Edgar Leigh Venzke, O40979.
Jack Howard Vess, O46639.
Felipe Vias, O36110.
Oscar Clarence Vigen, O48256.
Donato Nicolas Vincent, O36674.
Albert Henry Voegell, O56909.
Alden Edward Vognild, O37080.
Blaine Owen Vogt, O54690.
Karl William Volk, Jr., O54596.
Friedrich Abercrombie Von Brincken, O53933.
Robert Henry Von Burg, O35449.
Jonathan Sawyer Vordermark, O25917.
Edward Joseph Voso, O54117.
Arthur Pearson Wade, O25666.
James Kuykendall Wade, O26348.
Mitchell T. H. Wadkins, O46063.
Paul R. Wagner, O53850.
Lewis Carroll Wald, O54314.
John Henry Walbridge, O54767.
James Robert Waldie, O36347.
Charles Stanley Walker, O48299.
Frank Edwin Walker, Jr., O34691.
Harold Staats Walker, Jr., O25635.
J. LeRoy Walker, O37248.
Mansell Archie Walker, O54889.
William James Walker, O36551.
George Russell Wall, O40836.
Marshall Waller, O34758.
William Louis Wallschleger, O48250.
Charles Frederick Walrath, O36207.
John Eugene Walsh, O33794.
Louis Arthur Waple, O24584.
Robert John Ward, O35689.
Patrick Gerald Wardell, O25628.
Edgar Bourke Warner, Jr., O33206.
VanCleave Parrott Warren, O24856.
William Charles Warren, O24852.
Wilfred Carlyle Washcoe, O36554.

×Fred Brenning Waters, Jr., O25449.
James Henry Waters, O37327.
William Edwin Waters, O25719.
George William Watkins, O34638.
Douglas Henry Watson, O45908.
George Harvey Watson, O25740.
Richard Reasoner Watson, O34354.
×Thomas Robert Watson, O25718.
James Henry Watts, O36348.
Hugh Weyman Webb, O47228.
Robert Mason Webb, O35571.
Travis Eugene Webb, O36509.
Benn Louis Wechsler, O54528.
Raymond Warren Weeks, O36173.
Miner Lile Weems, O40999.
Howard Franklin Wehrle 3d, O25454.
Alton James Weigley, O45241.
Joseph Conrad Wein, O46294.
Irwin VanAlstyne Weller, O36764.
Forest O. Wells, O46515.
Jack Dale Wells, O48257.
John Armstrong Wells, O36205.
Sidney Lawrence Wells, O36810.
William John Welsh, Jr., O26339.
John Joseph Wessmiller, Jr., O54052.
Thomas Euel Wesson, O37280.
Clyde Hoxie Westbrook, Jr., O47007.
Robert Lane Westbrook, O37049.
Clarence Richard Westfall, O26024.
Raymond Milton Westmoreland, O36607.
×Joseph William Weyrick, O26294.
John Parsons Wheeler, Jr., O25824.
Robert Farrell Wheeler, O40872.
Arthur Bain White, O54886.
John Franklin White, O25507.
Lee Allen White, O41061.
Willis John Whitesell, O39169.
Harold Neal Whitfield, O41032.
Charles Goodwin Whitmire, O25257.
Mancil Ray Whitworth, O36563.
×Howard Tilghman Wickert, Jr., O26312.
Edward Gray Wiggins, O36457.
Walter William Wiman, O36512.
Thomas Wildes, O40779.
Harlon Raymond Wiley, O37062.
Leland Frederick Wilhelm, O48723.
John Francis Wilhelmy, Jr., O37233.
Robert George Wilke, O47406.
Reading Wilkinson, Jr., O26257.
Edwin James, O25594.
Albert Sidney Williams, Jr., O25374.
Frank Savage Williams, O34649.
Harry Orval Williams, O37184.
James Eugene Williams, O48104.
Louis Albert Williams, O36161.
Norman Lewis Williams, O36173.
Paul Robertson Williams, O36707.
Richard Walter Williams, Jr., O47344.
×James Barnett Williamson, O35648.
Robert Hubbard Williamson, Jr., O34560.
Lester George Willig, O47419.
Jean Paul Willis, O37283.
Charles Allan Wilson, Jr., O25907.
Francis Howard Wilson, Jr., O53452.
Gerald Robert Wilson, O36338.
John Miller Wilson, O25556.
Lloyd George Wilson, O34685.
Roy Robertson Wilson, O25827.
Russell Jordan Wilson, O40848.
Stanley Livingston Wilson, Jr., O26168.
Victor Owen Wilson, O25387.
William Mims Wilson, O47616.
Paul Millard Wimert, Jr., O48914.
Thomas Bates Windsor, O25670.
Richard Marshall Winfield, Jr., O26117.
Albert Gresham Wing, Jr., O46100.
Andrew William Winiarczyk, O47278.
Jack Coleman Winn, Jr., O36049.
Candler Roy Wiselogle, O39271.
Carlyle Philip Woelfer, O25350.
Karl Everett Wolf, O26202.
Morton Wolfson, O48975.
Richard Earl Womer, O36623.
Franklin Wood, O26104.
John Shirley Wood, Jr., O25655.
John Duncan Woodman, O40662.
Stanley Williams Woodruff, O36530.
James Robert Woods, O35812.
Kenneth Joseph Woods, O53413.
Joseph Garland Woodward, O39101.
George Burdette Woodworth, O35995.
John Henry Wooten, O53968.
Niel Marne Wreidt, O34753.
David Bryan Wright, O54276.
Edward McWayne Wright, O24693.
Elam William Wright, Jr., O37214.
Ernest Charles Wright, O53926.
Lucius Featherstone Wright, Jr., O25966.
Raymond Jay Wright, O36760.
Charles Henry Wuest, O39280.
Ray James Yantis, O47002.
Quentin E. Yoder, O48994.
Crawford Young, O25984.
Curtis Field Young, O37305.
George Haywood Young, Jr., O36242.
James Rader Young, O37365.
Maurice Lee Young, O36794.
Ralph Edgar Young, O36831.
Sidney Hooper Young, Jr., O24942.
Douglas Gordon Younger, O36945.
Harold Wallace Yount, O54875.
×Vincent Raymond Zdanzukas, O34971.
Albert Earl Zellefrow, O40982.
Irving Zuckerbrot, O36901.

To be lieutenant colonels, Corps of Chaplains

Elmer Pettiford Gibson, O29145.
Henry Lawson Gillenwaters, O41702.
Ralph Augustine Hill, O29151.
John Ignatius Koch, O29138.

To be majors, Corps of Chaplains

Palmer Phillippi Pierce, O40102.

To be lieutenant colonels, Medical Corps

Francis Joseph Aldwin, O39653.
Saul Leighton Avner, O41701.
William Earl Barry, O19682.
Robert Joseph Benford, O20513.
Jack Harvey Bristow, O29189.
Joseph Maxwell Cameron, O29180.
George Robert Carpenter, O51147.
×Elven Ross Cooper, O29171.
Lester Orville Crago, O20498.
Carl Robert Darnall, O19339.
Ernst Dehne, O56790.
Albert Julius Glass, O29247.
James Harrison Gordon, O29227.
Lawrence Benton Hanson, O56783.
Robert Paul Hargreaves, O29216.
Joseph William Iseman, O39651.
Harold Stewart McBurney, O29248.
×George Darsie McGrew, O18942.
Max Nalmark, O19303.
×Alvin Winfred Paulson, O51159.
Charles Bateman Perkins, O30389.
William Joseph Power, O19814.
Weldon Kenneth Ruth, O20530.
×Alton Herbert Saxer, O22368.
Eldridge Cook Simmons, O56798.
Wilson Theodore Smith, O19306.
Russell Dean Steele, O56890.
Robert Lee Whitfield, Jr., O29177.

To be majors, Medical Corps

Frank Louis Bauer, O26430.
Harold Frederick Bertram, O31019.
Savino Walter Cavender, O31005.
Charles Sidney Christianson, O56824.
Joseph Carlos Denslow, Jr., O43122.
Alan Bayliss Eaker, O43146.
Walton Merideth Edwards, O24377.
Julius Abraham Goldberg, A43143.
×Michael Joseph Hitchko, A24390.
Hugh Beals Hoeffler, O51983.
×Archie Arthur Hoffman, O31006.
John C. Holliday, O51972.
Harold Mendes Jesurun, O26439.
Robert Richard Jones, O26984.
George Edward Lathrop, O56827.
Raymond Arnold Lawn, O23656.
Joseph Francis McDonough, O31008.
Hubert Wainright Miller, O31013.
Donald Eugene Reiner, O22281.
×John Rizzolo, O40108.
Max Laurel Smith, O38853.
Helmuth Sprinz, O30919.
Henry Fred Steinbock, O51968.
LeRoy Otten Travis, O24368.
Walter Cecil Twineham, O24835.
Edward Jenner Whiteley, O24627.
Jack Odell Yeager, O56823.

To be lieutenant colonels, Dental Corps

×Donald Patrick Kettrick, O29232.
George Stanley Moore, O51158.
×Carl William Pfanner, O29346.

To be majors, Dental Corps

Stacy Wendell Clapp, Jr., O30990.
×Thomas Benton Connell, O30998.
Robert Lincoln Coombs, O23611.
Winston Vance Cruzan, O30981.
Kenneth Cheney DeGon, O23676.
Maurice Fred Ekstrom, O51964.
×Kenneth Ray Elwell, O23340.
Pierre Oscar Evans, O23351.
Clement Andrade Farrell, O30988.
Henry Amos Goodall, O30977.
Thomas Roosevelt Haddock, O23350.
William Madison Harley, Jr., O30964.
Harold Preston Hoskins, O23347.
John William Helton, O23337.
Frederick Robert Krug, O29613.
John Robert Law, O23345.
George Andrew Long, O23346.
John Robert McEvoy, O29606.
Lowell Edison McKelvey, O30967.
James Maxwell Murphy, O30959.
Merle Wayne Ogle, O22361.
William Orville Orsinger, O23343.
×Ewalt McCune Osborn, O30986.
Raymond Joseph Talbot, O23608.
Harold Wilennick, O23342.
Karl Otto Zieger, O38855.

To be lieutenant colonels, Veterinary Corps

Philip Ray Carter, O29159.
Harvie Russell Ellis, O17791.
Ralph William Mohri, O17986.
Edgerton Lynn Watson, O18968.

To be lieutenant colonels, Medical Service Corps

Edgar Allan Blair, O56908.
Franklin Sylvester Blanton, O39234.
Robert Mark Bynum, Jr., O39249.
Charles Lawrence Driscoll, O17296.
Joseph Orr Winterstein, O51168.
Paul Estabrooke Zuver, O17378.

To be majors, Medical Service Corps

Ardis Tillman Cox, O56898.
Carl James Koehn, O53048.
John Foster Pierce, O56872.
Elon Bramble Tucker, O53049.
Edward Wilhoit, O51166.

To be captains, Medical Service Corps

Edward Stephens Adams, O56880.
James Franklin Allen, O49955.
Stephen Justin Beaudry, O37503.
Byron Winfield Brown, O39944.
Jesse Nichols Butler, O26983.
Melbourne Caldwell Chandler, O37486.
George Travis Collier, O30898.
Raymond Joseph Creamer, O37472.
Melvin Francis Cunningham, O41146.
George John DeGraff, O49935.
Joseph Robert DeVine, O37320.
William Thomas Doidge, O37491.
Findlay Freeman Flatter, O49941.
Ronald Clarence Force, O56934.
Howard Jewell Funston, O41136.
Robert Lee Gaines, O49957.
John Maurice Geary, O56890.
Bernard Williamson Hammaker, O37492.
William George Handorf, O49954.
James Anderson Hazelrigg, O39345.
×Howard Crawford Henley, Jr., O41147.
Claude L. Hooker, O37482.
Otto George Hrdlicka, O37512.
James Vernon Huffman, O37507.
Dean Melvern Jewell, O49924.
Wayne Horace Jonson, O37484.
Hugh Lawrence Keegan, O49928.
Grover Cleveland Kistler, O49958.
Douglas Venable Lord, O41149.
William Clifford Luehrs, O37521.
Francis Timothy Lynch, O56217.
Bruce Stewart Markel, Jr., O49922.
×Robert Edward Maybell, O37446.
Jeff Roger McLeland, O56215.
Robert Joseph O'Malley, O49923.
Harry Charles Powell, O39336.

Norman Reich, O37516.
Walter Frank Robbins, O56929.
Henry Jacob Rockstroh, O56942.
Joseph Patrick Rossi, O37508.
Anthony Scarpitta, O37519.
Clayton Lee Shedivetz, O37514.
Lloyd Books Shepler, O37445.
James Harvie Snelling, O49927.
William McLeroy Sorrells, O37494.
Fred Hans Swanson, O37471.
×Hughie Conroe Thomas, O37462.
Elmer Leroy Thompson, O37513.
Jerry Vincent Thompson, O37481.
Robert Moir Van Horn, O56219.
Alonzo Richard Williams, O41140.
Nathan Richard Wisser, O37522.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947:

To be lieutenant colonels, Army Nurse Corps

Rosalie Dudley Colhoun, N29.
Elizabeth Fitch, N30.
Louise Miller Fitzgerald, N318.
Pauline Kirby, N35.
Cora Jane Maxton, N309.
Doris E. Medlin, N310.
Mary Jo Miller, N27.
Helen Harriet Patton, N314.
Amy Rose Pendergraft, N36.
Mary Genevieve Phillips, N312.
Alice Chauncey Wickward, N33.
Sarah E. Williams, N306.

To be majors, Army Nurse Corps

Vivian L. Allmendinger, N52.
Ethel Marie Anderson, N548.
Eleanor R. Asleson, N56.
Margaret Marie Bitzel, N531.
Monta Rey Boswell, N43.
Kilie E. Bridger, N64.
Ruby Picklin Bryant, N79.
Hazel Irene Burford, N549.
Nora P. Capps, N71.
Florence A. Dressell, N541.
Bertha Eisner, N542.
Sylvia M. Evans, N536.
Martha Fulwood, N44.
Laura E. Goodale, N68.
Inez Haynes, N88.
Mary E. Haynes, N532.
Edna Dora Hess, N74.
Bernice Mary Hill, N75.
Naomi Jane Jensen, N80.
Katharine Virginia Joliffe, N77.
Helen Johanna Jurash, N526.
Laura Clapp Kelley, N78.
Ethel A. Lamansky, N41.
Irene L. Miller, N547.
Louise Miller, N544.
Elizabeth G. Mixson, N533.
Margaret Mary Moss, N54.
Ruth Payne, N529.
Mary Frances Prucha, N72.
Grace Henrietta Rickert, N545.
Alice Junice Robbe, N55.
Nila Pearl Rutherman, N538.
Olive P. Shadle, N527.
Ada Miriam Simpson, N76.
Genevieve Marion Smith, N530.
Faye Gracia Still, N539.
Mabel G. Stott, N73.
Cathern M. Ullom, N67.
Kathryn Grace Witter, N83.
Marian York, N81.

NOTE.—All of the above-named officers were promoted during the recess of the Senate.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate January 24, 1949:

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSIONER

Brig. Gen. Peter A. Feringa, Corps of Engineers, to be president and a member of the Mississippi River Commission.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 24, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, in whose strength alone we are made strong, purge our minds of prejudice and help us to withstand any conflicts of this hour. As we face the obligations of our high office enable us to measure up to our urgent duty, sweeping aside every obstacle that doth beset us.

To these ends bless abundantly our Speaker and the Congress; help us that we abuse not our privileges; vouchsafe unto us new light and new guidance that we may serve Thee as Thou deservest, and labor for our country with understanding. In the holy name of our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 20, 1949, was read and approved.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore granted, I may be permitted to address the House today for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] may have permission to address the House for 30 minutes on February 2, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KILBURN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution passed by the New York State Legislature.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial.

Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include certain resolutions.

Mr. REES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a letter from the Western States Meat Packing Association and in the other to include a statement by Mr. Samuel Moment, of the Bonneville Power Administration.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. RAINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article by Generoso Pope.

Mr. McGUIRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Mr. Jesse Randell, president of the Travelers Insurance Co., at the Hartford Rotary Club, Hartford, Conn.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech delivered by Mr. Justice William O. Douglas. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $165, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech which he delivered at a Jackson Day dinner held in East St. Louis, Ill.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech he delivered to the Daughters of the American Revolution at Fredericksburg, Va.

THE LATE LINDLEY HOAG HADLEY

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I regret to announce the death of a distinguished former Member of this body. Lindley H. Hadley passed away on November 1, 1948, in the State of Connecticut. He is survived by two daughters who now reside in that State.

Lindley Hoag Hadley was born of Quaker parentage in Sylvania, Ind., on June 19, 1861. He attended Wesleyan University at Bloomington, Ill. For a number of years he followed the teaching profession in the State of Indiana. During this time, he studied law and was admitted to the bar. In September 1890 he moved to New Whatcom, now Bellingham, Wash., to engage in the practice of law with his brother Hiram, who later became a judge of the State Supreme Court of Washington. He was long active in civic and political affairs in Whatcom County.

In 1914 he was elected to Congress from the Second Congressional District of the State of Washington on the Republican ticket and served continuously in this body until 1933. During his long service in the House of Representatives, he was a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries from 1915 to 1919 and the Committee on Ways and Means from 1919 until 1933. During his service on the Committee on Ways and Means, he specialized on various tariff problems.

Lin Hadley was an outstanding and respected leader of his party. He was conscientious and devoted to those principles of government that he thought were best for his country.

I join with Members of this body in expressing our deepest sympathy to his family.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I served with Mr. Hadley for many years. We lived in the same hotel, Congress Hall. I certainly subscribe to everything the gentleman from Washington has said about him.

I never met a finer, more patriotic, conscientious Representative since I have been a Member of Congress than Mr. Hadley.

Mrs. Hadley was one of the finest ladies I have ever known, and those charming daughters were loved and admired by every one who knew them.

Our hearts go out to them in their great bereavement.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include in each extraneous matter.

Mr. HUBER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

GOVERNMENT SERVICE UNIVERSITY

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to establish a Government Service University.

The purpose of this bill is to provide our Government with more qualified men and women in administrative, diplomatic, economic, and other fields of Government work. During the last month or so before I came to Congress I had what I called national affairs forums. At these meetings I suggested various pieces of legislation that I hoped the people would give their opinions upon. On this particular piece of legislation there was a unanimous feeling of approval on the part of my constituents. There are many young people in this country today who are able and qualified for Government service and who would like to make a career of such service, but who do not have the opportunity. Students would be chosen by competitive examinations given by the Civil Service Commission. Tuition and basic living costs would be provided to the Government. Students would agree to work for the Government for a minimum of 10 years after graduation. I hope that you gentlemen will support this bill and thereby help to improve the quality of Government service in your country, which is good, but can yet stand improvement.

THE AUSTRIAN PEACE TREATY

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, according to press reports, conversations regarding an Austrian peace treaty are to be resumed on February 7.

I have been reliably informed that the Russian Foreign Office has been working hard for many months in an effort to devise a plan which would induce us to withdraw our troops from Austria.

It appears that the Kremlin is no longer anxious to obtain Carinthia for the fractious Yugoslavs.

It is quite likely that a compromise regarding German assets in Austria will be arrived at. Our conditions may well be met; an Austrian peace treaty is perhaps in the offing.

Mr. Speaker, I need hardly point out the critical value to the western world strategically, economically, and politically of maintaining freedom in Austria. In Austria, freedom's forces thrust some 135 miles behind the iron curtain. The manifold advantages of this position are abundantly clear.

In view of the events of the last few years, particularly in eastern Europe, it seems obvious that once the British, French, and American troops have been withdrawn from Austria, the freedom and independence of that country become precarious indeed.

Were Austria drawn behind the iron curtain the Kremlin would have a common boundary with Italy and would be able to exert tremendous and perhaps fatal pressure upon that country, with consequences which could not fail to affect American national security.

I express the fervent hope that our desire for peace does not lead us into a step which would only weaken our position and thereby multiply the hazards of war.

Surely it is better not to reach an agreement than to agree to a treaty which would render Austria a hostage to a Communist tyranny.

We must think steadfastly in terms of constructive alternatives.

Preponderant evidence points to this present choice: either we remain in Austria with all the unpleasantness and sense of frustration which this involves or we withdraw, thereby ceding vital territory to Russian imperialism and sacrificing more freedom-loving people on the altar of wishful thinking.

The loss of Austria as a bastion of freedom would be a major defeat in our cold conflict with communism.

Let us think carefully before we undertake to nullify still further the tragic cost of the recent war.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star]

THIS CHANGING WORLD—WESTERN ALLIES AND RUSSIA EXPECTED TO SIGN AUSTRIAN PEACE TREATY SOON

(By Constantine Brown)

A peace treaty for Austria is expected to be signed near the end of February by the United States, Britain, France, and Russia.

The main outlines of the treaty were agreed on by the Big Four Foreign Ministers in their London meeting in 1948. But final agreement was prevented by Yugoslavia's territorial demands and the question of payments to Russia for Nazi assets in Austria.

At that time Marshal Tito was Moscow's fair-haired boy. He insisted, and was strongly supported by Foreign Minister Molotov, that Austria yield to Yugoslavia the rich province of Carinthia, which the Balkan dictator claimed should be part and parcel of Yugoslav territory. The Austrians, backed by the western powers, opposed this demand because it lacked any real justification. The matter since has been in abeyance.

DEMANDED $200,000,000

The Russians also demanded about $200,000,000, which they said represented Nazi assets in Austria. The American representatives opposed this demand because they knew that eventually it would have to come out of the pockets of American taxpayers.

The United States suggested that the Soviet delegates be satisfied with $125,000,000. Foreign Minister Molotov turned down this offer for political rather than financial reasons. He insisted that no bargaining was possible until we accepted Tito's territorial claims.

Now that relations between the Yugoslav dictator and the Cominform are strained, Moscow has no interest in furthering the demands of its former puppet, and has indicated indirectly that it is willing to sit at the diplomatic table with the western representatives and the Austrian delegates to discuss the peace treaty on the basis that Carinthia remain Austrian.

As for the Austrian payment for Nazi assets—in cash, goods, and services—it is understood that Moscow is ready to meet us halfway, by accepting $150,000,000.

The prospective signing of a peace treaty between Austria and Hitler's conquerors will be hailed as the first indication in 3 years that, given good will and patience, it is possible to get along with the Russians. This type of publicity is necessary for the morale of the western nations, which have been accustomed for so long to a negative attitude in the Kremlin on all international matters.

But careful analysis of the situation shows that the signature of such a peace treaty is no more indicative of a change of mood on the part of Russia than the agreement on Italy was.

In November 1943, when Secretary of State Hull made a good will trip to Moscow, the Soviet government agreed to consider Austria as outside the Axis circle, provided that the Austrian people show willingness to rid themselves of the Nazis. A declaration to that effect was signed by Mr. Hull, British Foreign Secretary Eden, and Mr. Molotov. Our position in that matter was particularly easy, since we, unlike the Russians, had never

recognized the annexation of Austria by Hitler in March 1939.

STRIPPED OF ASSETS

Although the Austrians cooperated with the Allies as soon as it was possible for them to do so, and lived up to our expectations, the Moscow agreement was a dead letter. The Russians insisted on treating Austria as an enemy country, and under the excuse that the Nazis had large assets in the country they stripped the Austrians of some of their most important industrial establishments. But after this was done there was no further reason for the Russians to refuse to sign a peace treaty with Austria which, unlike Germany, had a legal constitutional government.

The treaty which is expected to be signed next month will provide for the evacuation of Austrian territory by the Allied occupation forces. This will mean that we will withdraw our troops—about 8,000 strong—several thousand miles from Austria, while the Russians will withdraw their divisions less than 100 miles.

During the years of occupation Russia has organized, not only in its own sector but also in the western areas, Communist cells which are expected to become active as soon as the treaty has been confirmed by the United States Senate and the other signatories. Unless our observers are unduly pessimistic, it will be difficult for that small Republic to maintain its democratic form of government when all her neighbors are under Communist domination.

These observers predict that within a short time after the Allied forces have left Austria there will be a repetition of the coups we witnessed in Czechoslovakia and Hungary.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two short speeches delivered before the Commonwealth Club, of San Francisco.

Mr. HOEVEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include two editorials from the Sioux City Journal.

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from Time magazine.

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Pennsylvania Grange about Hawaii.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a consolidation of certain testimony before a congressional committee.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from Hoard's Dairyman.

Mr. REED of New York (at the request of Mr. WOODRUFF) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short radio address, and further to extend his remarks and include a clipping from the New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include articles by former Representative Pettengill.

NATIONAL THEATER, OPERA, AND BALLET

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to provide for a national theater and for a national opera and ballet. The United States almost alone among the great powers does not advance these arts as an official Government activity. For example despite very serious economic problems Great Britain has just found $4,000,000 for its arts council to support a national theater. Great areas of our country are denied the benefit and pleasure of first-rate theater and music because it is no longer economically feasible on a straight profit basis to bring to them these arts and the leading artists. I realize full well the dangers of the paralyzing hand of Government control of the arts, and of the use which can be made of them to control thought, hence my bill provides for a constitutional convention to be called by the President representative of all branches of the theater, opera, and ballet—performers, workers, writers, and audience—to draft and propose plans—but not WPA schemes for unemployment relief—which will deserve Government support while providing for the democratic control of a national theater and a national opera and ballet by the constituent elements so called together. In this way America's riches in dramatic and musical talent may best be developed and our democratic culture served and advanced. The approach taken by this bill has the support of Clarence Derwend, president of Actors Equity Association, Vinton Freedley, president, and C. Lawton Campbell, chairman of the board, of the American National Theater and Academy—ANTA—organized under Federal charter and has also been fully discussed with Lawrence Tibbett, president of the American Guild of Musical Artists.

The bill will be introduced this week in the Senate by Senator IVES, of New York. It is my hope that other Members and Senators will join in supporting it and that it will, as it should, be a bipartisan measure.

"OPERATION HAY"

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a review of "operation hay" as it has been carried on in my district during the last 2 weeks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, in these days when we talk about providing funds to establish a national ballet and international programs for the sharing of knowledge, I urge that the House of Representatives and the Congress expedite action to make adequate funds available to meet catastrophic conditions which are taking place in the Western States.

Literally millions of cattle are facing starvation. Literally hundreds and thousands of ranchers are isolated by drifts of snow so that it is impossible for them either to communicate their distress or to get their livestock water or feed. Old-timers say they have never seen anything like this January before.

In this extremity we have been receiving emergency aid from the Air Force and the Army and the Farmers Home Administration as well as the Red Cross. We are also receiving cooperation from the Federal executive branch so as to make some of the President's disaster funds available, but more will be needed as the snow continues to pile up and low temperatures prevail.

In order that the Members of the House may know how emergency feeding operations have been carried on, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a transcript of a radio interview describing "operation hay."

There was no objection.

AID TO STORM-RIDDEN STATES

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most devastating and unprecedented snowstorms has covered the Western States practically since the 1st of January. It has been snowing intermittently until hundreds of thousands of head of cattle and sheep ar marooned. Losses will be tremendous. I am introducing a resolution today to authorize an appropriation sufficient to lend every assistance possible to all the States that are now in this desperate condition. The Governor of my own State has declared a state of emergency, and all the machinery and manpower necessary is being utilized to meet this situation. I hope the Committee on Appropriations will act expeditiously and make an appropriation available to help these States.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

THE STATE OF GEORGIA AND THE INAUGURAL PARADE

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be misunderstood in the remarks that I am going to make. I feel that the great State of Georgia should have had a float in the inaugural parade. I am also quite certain that the great State of Georgia will pay any obligation which she may owe.

However, an article in yesterday's paper has caused some confusion. It states that the Warm Springs Foundation ordered the float and that the builder of the float expected the foundation to

pay for it. We are now in the midst of the March of Dimes campaign to help polio victims. That campaign might be hurt if people thought that the Georgia float was paid for out of polio funds, especially since the float was declared to have been a monstrosity. I trust that this point will be cleared up so that it will not interfere with the worthy cause of raising money for the polio funds.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

EMPLOYMENT OF PROFESSIONAL AND CLERICAL STAFFS ON COMMITTEES

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, Public Law 601, passed by the Seventy-ninth Congress, was an act to provide for an increased efficiency in the legislative branch of the Government. Section 202 (a) and (c) reads as follows:

SEC. 202. (a) Each standing committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives (other than the Appropriations Committees) is authorized to appoint by a majority vote of the committee not more than four professional staff members, in addition to the clerical staffs, on a permanent basis without regard to political affiliations and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the office and said staff members shall be assigned to the chairman and ranking minority member of such committee as the committee may deem advisable. Each such committee is further authorized to terminate the services by a majority vote of the committee of any such professional staff member as it may see fit. Professional staff members shall not engage in any work other than committee business and no other duties may be assigned to them.

(c) The clerical staff of each standing committee, which shall be appointed by a majority vote of the committee, shall consist of not more than six clerks, to be attached to the office of the chairman, to the ranking minority member, and to the professional staff, as the committee may deem advisable; and the position of committee janitor is hereby abolished. The clerical staff shall handle the committee correspondence and stenographic work, both for the committee staff and for the chairman and ranking minority member on matters related to committee work.

It has come to my attention that the Democratic leadership in the House is violating not only the word but the spirit of the law. This morning the committee of which I am a member—Public Lands—with its Democratic majority passed a resolution permitting the chairman of the committee and the subcommittee chairmen to appoint the professional and clerical staff without the approval of the majority vote of the full committee. I am quite sure that some of the professional staff will be engaged in work other than committee business. It seems certain that instead of employing individuals "without regard to political affiliation and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of office," that this phrase should be replaced by the words "only for deserving Democrats."

I understand that the professional and well-trained personnel of other standing committees in the House are being fired by the Democratic leadership. It is unfortunate indeed that the law passed by the Seventy-ninth Congress is being violated openly and without embarrassment by those in the majority. It is quite apparent that the reorganization bill and law is just so many words and is being twisted and perverted by the Democratic majority in the Eighty-first Congress to fit their own particular needs. I am certain that the people of the country will be the ones who will suffer and the cause of good government will be relegated to the ash can.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances.

BASING POINT SYSTEM

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill which will clarify present uncertainty and confusion concerning the basing point system, which many believe was outlawed by recent decisions of the courts. The proposed bill contains absolute safeguards against illegal conspiracies, combinations, and agreements in restraint of trade, monopoly, and unfair trade practices and competition.

This matter is of utmost importance to New England and particularly to industrial Massachusetts. For many years our industries have purchased raw materials and other products under the basing point system, which in general permits freight absorption by sellers and shippers and insures relatively equal competitive advantages for all regions and sections in the national market. The basing point question is bound up with long-established railroad rate differentials, trade customs and practices, and the entire matter is exceedingly complicated. It may have most serious implications for our various transportation systems.

Most New England business, in fact business throughout the Nation, is very apprehensive that departure from the basing point system will bring distinct and substantial competitive disadvantages which cannot possibly be overcome even by the efficiency of production and very high skill of labor and management. It is asserted by business groups, economists, and experts who have studied the broad intricate ramifications of this question that irreparable damage will be done to our industry, that widespread unemployment will directly ensue, unless our New England industries are able to compete on an equal price basis with competitors in the national field. The available evidence indicates that with basing points eliminated freight costs will increase, industries will be crippled and liquidated or required to move to other localities. Our section depends upon other sections for raw materials and markets. If price basing is eliminated many industries will be unable to survive or will be forced to curtail production and employees so it is believed.

Let me emphasize that I am opposed to monopolies, conspiracies to restrain or impede trade and commerce, cutthroat and unfair competitive methods and, therefore, this bill contains language which will militate against such undesirable and baneful practices. It aims to provide for New England industries a fair and reasonable chance to sell their products in competition with other industries. If this or some similar legislation is not enacted by the Congress and we are forced to conduct business under tortured concepts of various wholly desirable trade regulatory laws, it is stated that we will face economic collapse. I hope that not only our industries and labor but every other class of our people as well will support these efforts to clarify, and if necessary rectify, possible punitive economic pressure against our section, which many believe will affect adversely the prosperity of our industrial, mercantile, agricultural, and laboring people.

I hope it will be possible for various organizations concerned with the welfare of New England—labor, management, governmental, and others—to appear before committees of the Congress to urge a careful study and every prompt remedial action necessary in a situation which could have such dire consequences to New England. I am also urging the executive department of the Government to collaborate in efforts to achieve the objectives of the bill.

The question has been exhaustively studied by the Capehart committee of the other body, which, under the leadership of the able Senator from Indiana, held lengthy hearings and presented certain recommendations.

The capable and distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] has already introduced similar legislation in the other body.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on three subjects and include certain statements and excerpts.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement promulgated by the National Grange with reference to agricultural policy and program recommendations. I have an estimate from the Public Printer that this will cost $301. I ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the RECORD notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding and without objection, it may be inserted in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. JUDD asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may sit during the sessions of the House during this Congress when found necessary.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES AND THE INAUGURAL BALL

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, probably I should have arisen to a question of personal privilege to answer some of the scathing abuses that have been heaped upon me over the radio and through the press during the last few days.

The President of the United States in his inaugural address had a great deal to say about the dangers of communism abroad. I agree with what he said on that point.

But our country is in more danger from the Reds at home than she is from the ones abroad.

The action of the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee, the way they went about changing the membership of the Committee on Un-American Activities, was silly, if not stupid. It looks like the hand of Esau and the voice of Jacob. Neither Benjamin Franklin, George Washington, General Grant, Robert E. Lee, Jefferson Davis, or Herbert Hoover could have served on that committee under these rulings.

I have no apology for my fight to protect my country against these enemies within our gates. They are here now busy as bees, and were all during the war.

The Committee on Un-American Activities exposed the greatest spy ring in history. It was not a red herring. It was a Red ring of misrepresentatives of the American people in the State Department.

As long as I am a Member of this Congress, I will fight to expose such treason and demand investigations and prosecution of these enemies within our gates.

These Reds won a great victory when they were permitted to conduct the inaugural ball, and force hundreds of Negroes onto the floor of that ball for the first time in history.

This was the greatest insult ever perpetrated against the white girls of Washington, and the whole country, as for that matter.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 5, Public Law 304, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report the following members on the part of the House: Mr. HART, New Jersey; Mr. PATMAN, Texas; Mr. HUBER, Ohio; Mr. BUCHANAN, Pennsylvania; Mr. WOLCOTT, Michigan; Mr. HERTER, Massachusetts; Mr. RICH, Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

BUTTER VERSUS YELLOW OLEOMARGARINE, H. R. 1703

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain extracts and extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, the dairy farmers of the Nation who swung their political strength to Harry S. Truman on November 2, thus assuring his election, will be poorly repaid if repeal of all restrictions on yellow oleomargarine is foisted on them.

The President's Economic Report to Congress is being twisted to threaten a death blow to 2,500,000 dairy farm families who supply the Nation with vital livestock products. The suggestion that oleo taxes and license fees be repealed, with which leading dairy and farm organizations agree, is now being interpreted to mean the repeal of all restrictions on the manufacture and sale of yellow oleomargarine. This threat to the existence of the dairy industry is sponsored and financed by only 28 oleomargarine manufacturers, which industrial group seeks to remove all legislative restrictions on the sale of oleomargarine colored yellow in imitation of butter.

Oleo manufacturers want the unrestricted right to sell oleo colored yellow to imitate butter and thus monopolize the table spread market. With butter and dairy prices already declining and pushing down dairymen's income, an additional loss of $250,000,000 a year will mean outright disaster to dairy farmers and their families and to 40,000 small dairy plants and their employees.

Farmers will be forced to slaughter millions of milk cows—an economic body blow to consumers who are dependent on dairy herds for 40 percent of their beef and veal and all of their milk. This can only result in scarcities and high prices for meat, milk and other dairy products. It will also bring to an end the historic soil conservation program practiced on every dairy farm without Government subsidy.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill based on a policy that is fair to consumers, fair to retailers and distributors, and fair to the oleo industry. It will protect the vital dairy industry against a complete loss of its crucial butter market to a product using a deceptive coloration to gain economic advantage.

My bill will prohibit the imitation of butter through the manufacture and sale of oleo colored yellow in semblance of butter, but will remove all taxes and license fees on oleo itself. Under my bill every housewife can obtain all the oleo she wants without the payment of any taxes whatever, but the product will be sold for what it is, and not as an imitator of butter. The passage of my bill will protect the consumer against this kind of fraud and deception. The bill is H. R. 1703.

Competent economists estimate that the complete legalization of yellow oleo would take away an additional 600,000,000 pounds a year in butter sales. A loss of this size could cost the farmers of this country immediately a quarter of a billion dollars in annual cash income. The result would be liquidation of dairy herds on a scale never before seen, since small farmers would simply be unable to operate any longer.

Decline in dairy cow numbers as a result of lost butter markets would be heaviest in States depending most on butter as a source of income. For example, there are 18 surplus-milk-producing States where sales of farm-separated cream, largely destined for butter, amount to one-fifth or more of total sales of milk in all forms. Nearly 27 percent of all milk produced in the country normally is churned into butter.

This is what is meant when it is said that butter is the balance wheel of the entire dairy industry. It is dangerous to the economy of the country to jeopardize the existence of all dairy farmers by legalizing the unrestricted sale of oleomargarine colored yellow to imitate butter.

I recognize that it is not popular to oppose any part of Truman's fair-deal program, but when it comes to taking a position on the welfare of 2,500,000 dairy-farm families as against 28 large oleomargarine manufacturers, I take my stand with the dairy farmers of the United States. They are a vital part of our American economy. They pay substantial taxes into the Federal Treasury, and also provide the Nation with vital and nutritious food.

The fight between oleo and butter is an economic battle. It will be argued that dairy farmers must yield to scientific progress. We must all yield to honest scientific progress, but when 28 oleomargarine manufacturers attempt to steal the historic butter color for their synthetic product, I cannot go along on the scientific argument. I want the synthetic product called oleomargarine to be sold for what it is and not as an imitator of butter. The fight this year is over the color yellow. Last year it was over the tax. My bill removes the tax but prohibits the sale of yellow-colored oleomargarine.

The oleo industry is using the housewives of the country to sponsor its program so that it can put out a synthetic product, make it look and taste like butter, and thereby steal the butter market from the dairy farmers of the United States.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. The gentleman, as I understand it, is not opposed to the removal of the tax on oleomargarine?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. My bill provides for the removal of all taxes and fees.

Mr. GRANGER. As a compromise, that is what the gentleman is offering. As I read the Democratic platform and the statements of the President of the United States, I do not see anything in either that is not in harmony with what the gentleman says. The Democratic platform said it was going to remove the tax on oleomargarine. The gentleman proposes to do that. The President has said he wants the tax removed. So there is complete harmony, it seems to me, with the declaration of the President and the Democratic platform.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am very glad to have the gentleman's interpretation of the Democratic platform, because he is one of the distinguished leaders on the Democratic side, and he is with the majority. I know when he speaks he speaks with authority.

Mr. GRANGER. I thank the gentleman. One more observation, however. I think the gentleman knows that the oleo interests are today in the chain stores of the country getting individuals to sign post cards to indicate that there is a great grass-roots movement to repeal the tax. I think all of us should be apprised of what is going on, the same tactics that were used last year through the expenditure of millions of dollars to repeal this tax.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad the gentleman brought that matter up. I have a newspaper clipping here from Indianapolis, Ind., showing where the oleo interests not only wrote the letter, but they are also furnishing the letterhead, the envelope, and the postage. The industry is writing and mailing letters for these individual consumers whom they are using as a front to make more money for the oleo industry.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. I want to get it clear whether the gentleman's concern is to prevent fraud, to prevent deception, and to prevent any possibility that one might buy oleomargarine in the belief he is buying butter, or whether his concern is to prevent competition fo: a market, where the public would know what they are buying and where the public made a free choice of colored margarine as against colored butter. Which is the matter of concern with the gentleman?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad the gentleman asked that question because my concern is identical with his concern. He is concerned about the welfare of the cotton farmers of the South. He wants them to secure more money for their cottonseed oil; therefore he proposes in his bill that oleomargarine be colored yellow, after elimination of the tax, so that oleomargarine manufacturers will buy more cottonseed oil at a higher price and sell it to the American people in the form of oleo colored yellow to imitate butter. In other words, my interests are identical with the gentleman's. He is trying to protect the cotton farmers and I have repeatedly assisted him in doing that and I will do it in the future; but when it comes to his misguided effort to try to take away the principal market for the dairy farmers of the country, why, then, we have come to the crossroads of mutual assistance.

Mr. POAGE. Will the gentleman yield further since he has discussed my philosophy?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If the gentleman will pardon me, I want to make some further remarks.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman has discussed what I believe. Now will he not yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I will yield after making this next statement.

I think that the gentlemen from the Southern Cotton States are making a big mistake. They are making a big mistake in that they do not realize that the northern dairy farmers are their best buyers for cottonseed meal and the products of cotton. Now, the average family uses about 12 or 14 pounds of butter a year, and to have a little more cottonseed oil used in oleomargarine and sold to the people would not mean a great deal more money, if any, to the cotton farmers for their cottonseed oil.

What has happened to cottonseed-oil prices during these past years? There are 28 large oleomargarine manufacturers. I could easily name them, but time will not permit. I do not hold anything against them, because they are out trying to increase their business. But, what is happening to the price of cottonseed oil in connection with the farmers of the South? When they have cottonseed or cottonseed oil to sell, the oleo and the soap interests go out of the market and let the price go down, where it is today, around 16 cents a pound for the cottonseed oil, and after they have bought it all, then they up the price, so the price range may be 10 cents higher, and they are the ones that make the money out of it, and not the cotton farmers of this country. You can look at the market records year after year and you will find that the 28 oleomargarine manufacturers and the crushers of cottonseed set the market price, and the price goes down at the time the farmer has his cottonseed to sell. The cottonseed-oil industry makes the money on oil and not the cotton farmer.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would like to ask the gentleman if it has not been demonstrated that a lot of false information has gone out by pseudo scientists, but it has never been proven yet that vegetable oil is equal to animal fat; is that not right?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is right. I think that Dr. Carlson is one of them.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Not mentioning any names, but it has never been proven yet, and the only experiment that they have conducted has been based on where two dairy products were used in the experiment to try to prove that the vegetable oil is equal to the animal fat.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is right.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. If they can throw the dairy industry to the vegetable-oil wolves altogether, it is just the first step, is it not? The next will be the filled ice cream, filled evaporated milk, and filled cream. I would like to have the gentleman discuss that possibility, because a lot of our fluid-milk boys have been going around rather smug and saying it does not make any difference whether you eat oleo or not, but how about this magic mix that is appearing on the market.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That will be the next step, with our dairy cattle, in part, liquidated. The next step will be a synthetic milk, made out of cottonseed oil and skimmed milk.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? The genteman found time now to yield to the opponents of this measure. Can he not yield to me?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I will in just a moment. I will say to the gentleman from Texas, the South is going extensively into the dairy business.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman has already said a good deal, and he yielded for a few questions from the opponents. Will he yield to me?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I will yield for a question.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman has already said as I understand it—and I want him to correct me if I am wrong—that his interest in this was to protect the market for the dairy people of the United States.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is what the gentleman said. I did not say that.

Mr. POAGE. All right. That is the gentleman's interest then.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman want me to restate it?

Mr. POAGE. I heard what the gentleman said, and I could not understand it. I thought that is what you meant, and I wanted to get it clear so the Membership of this House could understand whether you were interested in the dairy people or the consumers.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I decline to yield further. I did not yield for a speech, I yielded for a question.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman has not yet stated what his interest is.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I would be delighted to let the gentleman know. He knows already that my interest is the same as his. No. 1, I want to protect the consumers of the United States from the fraud and deception that can be practiced as a result of legislation he has offered. No. 2, I want to protect the integrity of the greatest group in American agriculture, two and one-half million dairy farm families who are furnishing the milk, meat, and dairy products for the people of the United States at reasonable prices.

Mr. POAGE. Will the gentleman explain how the consumer is not protected when we offer legislation here that requires a printed notice with every serving of margarine that it is margarine?

Will the gentleman explain how that fails to protect the public from fraud and deception?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman's bill is much better than the Rivers bill that was introduced last year, but we can see the objective back of it. The fight again is over the color yellow. It was last year, it was in the Seventy-ninth Congress, and so on, every time it has come up. It is the color, yellow, because the oleomargarine industry wants to steal the historic color away from butter for oleo.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Do I understand it to be the gentleman's proposal that the tax be taken off oleomargarine?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Entirely removed.

Mr. COX. But that the manufacturers be denied the right to color it?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is right.

Mr. COX. Do the butter people color their product?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The butter people at certain times of the year do, but it is not done to deceive the people.

Mr. COX. It is put in simply to make it a more attractive product?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It is put in to make the butter uniform throughout the year.

Mr. COX. Would the gentleman be willing to apply the same rule that he now proposes shall apply to the manufacturers of oleomargarine to the dairy people, that is, deny the dairy people the right to color their product, the same as the manufacturers of margarine?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If the gentleman is making that proposal on behalf of the Members on his side, I say yes, I will agree to it for myself.

Mr. COX. What can there be wrong about that?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is all right with me. I am glad to hear that offer come from the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I agree with the gentleman that people producing one product should not be permitted to deceive the consumers into thinking they are getting an entirely different product.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There is a possibility of that. I recognize that my friend from Texas has tried in his bill to correct that, but people do not generally follow the law, or a good many of them. We have restaurants and hotels in the United States that serve 65,000,000 meals a day in public eating places. Generally the people go in there and pay for butter and they expect to get it, but they may be served with yellow oleo despite the notice my friend from Texas requires when yellow oleo is served.

Mr. COX. How can the gentleman justify permitting the dairy people to color their product and denying that right to the manufacturers of margarine?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am willing to concede that.

Mr. COX. In other words, the gentleman wants to outlaw a practice which deceives the public.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Butter is not colored to deceive anyone, while the purpose of coloring oleo yellow is to make it look like butter, to imitate butter, so that it fools the public.

Mr. COX. I am disposed to agree with the gentleman in the accuracy of the statement he has just made, that the butter people probably use coloring to make a more attractive product.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No, to make it uniform throughout the year. There are certain times of the year, as in June, when the cattle are out on grass, hence the color is more yellow.

Mr. COX. Why should the dairy people be permitted to use coloring and others be denied that right?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. They can make oleomargarine out of coal, pulpwood, and petroleum products; they can make it out of most anything. Science is wonderful. The gentleman would not advocate that they should do that or permit that to be colored yellow, would he?

Mr. COX. I certainly would not advocate imposing a tax upon a domestic product and denying it the right to compete with a different product.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman want to injure the dairy business of the country?

Mr. COX. No; I do not want to injure the dairy people. I want to see the dairy people prosperous.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Good. And you want the dairy business to increase in the State of Georgia, do you not?

Mr. COX. Yes; I do.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And it is going to. There are farmers from your State and from nearly every Southern State, who are in favor of the legislation that I am offering. You are trying to build up the dairy industry in the South. If the gentleman was on our Committee on Agriculture today he would find out about the disastrous situation facing cotton. You must get into diversification.

Mr. COX. I would go along with the gentleman, were he to advocate a measure taking the tax off oleomargarine and denying both the manufacturers of oleomargarine and butter the use of coloring with a view of creating a false impression.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman think that having butter look the same throughout the entire year creates a false impression?

Mr. COX. Is it not put in for the purpose of engendering the idea that it is a product of a richer and more desirable character?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No; it is only put in during the winter months.

Mr. COX. Why is it put in then?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It is put in during the winter months when the cattle are off the pasture, so as to give the butter a uniform color throughout the year, and that is the truth.

I yield to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

Mr. GRANGER. There is a tremendous distress among the people who milk cows; and in the great dairy States they are wondering what they can do to help some of these poor dairymen out of the situation that they are in. Imagine, hay is now $80 a ton and cottonseed cake is from $80 to $100 a ton, and here we are proposing today to make it more difficult for these people to get anywhere. It seems to me that the time is absolutely inopportune to place a greater burden on the dairy people. I am speaking about the fellow who milks the cows. They are the people after all, they are the ones out in the hinterlands in every congressional district in the country, who build the country roads and maintain the schools.

Why anybody would want to do anything to make their burden heavier, I am unable to understand.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I agree with the gentleman and thank him for his statement, because after all it demonstrates that in the United States we are coming to the proposition where there is an economic fight going on between two groups of American citizens, which should not exist at all in this country. I have been on the Committee on Agriculture for over 22 years. During all of my service on that committee we have worked together as a unit and there has been no political dividing line and never was until this proposal came up.

The South against the North—it should not be, because you need our help and we need your help to maintain a strong economy for agriculture in the United States.

If agriculture goes down in this country, then the entire country will go down.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief comment?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. COX. It would appear to me that the gentleman in the proposal that he now offers is at least approaching a fair solution of this controversial question.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think it is a fair solution. It gets down to the crux of the problem and that is the color of the product. The oleo industry wants to color their product yellow, to make it look like butter, and that affords the possibility of fraud and deception. The primary objective of the oleo industry is to make more money by taking the spread market from the dairy farmers of the United States.

That, my friends, will bring ruin and disaster, not only to the dairy farmers, but also to the entire country, because our dairy farmers use 27 percent of their milk to make butter. If they do not have that outlet, they will have to liquidate their dairy herds and go into other types of production like soybeans and other crops. It will ruin their soil-conservation program, which has been historic on every dairy farm, and it will not only mean the liquidation of the livestock, but in the end it will mean higher prices for milk and meat to the American consumers, because the dairy farmers of today supply 40 percent and more of the meat that is used in the United States

and all dairy products. If you liquidate a great portion of our milk-cow population—we have lost over 3,000,000 head in the last 3 or 4 years—in the end the consumer will pay dollars and dollars more where they might be saving a few cents because they can buy yellow-colored oleomargarine.

So the issue is far greater than just the coloring of yellow oleomargarine. The issue extends to the economy of the entire country. I say this because 25 percent of the diet of the people comes from dairy products and livestock. Therefore we should try to carry out what the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, has said; farmers should produce more milk cows, more beef cattle and hogs. But if you put through something like the legislation proposed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] that permits the coloring of oleomargarine to make it look like butter, you destroy the very industry that should be built up in the United States to consume the corn and the feed that is produced in abundance. It will also stop the expansion of the dairy industry in the South, where you need it so much in order to replace cotton production.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I was interested in the interpretation which the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] placed on the Democratic platform, in view of the fact that he, among the Democratic members of the Committee on Agriculture, stood alone on that committee last year, and the way in which nearly all Members voted on this question when it came before the House. Does their action in the past seem consistent with the interpretation which the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] has placed on that platform?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I was glad to get that interpretation from him. I hope that is the correct interpretation, because, if it is, then the President would veto any bill that would come to him to permit oleomargarine to be colored to make it look like butter.

Furthermore, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] is a man who thinks about the entire economy of the country—the economy of agriculture. He tries to figure out how the different components of agriculture fit into the picture. He recognizes the importance of the dairy industry in this country and the nutritious value of the vital products that come from the dairy cow. Of course, there are some who would give a quart of milk to every person in the world. Well, it cannot be done from the United States. We have 3,000,000 less milk cows now than we had in 1944. Milk-cow population is going down and the human population is increasing by leaps and bounds. If you want to drive the little dairy farmers of the country out of business, all you have to do is to pass legislation that will permit 28 oleomargarine manufacturers to color their product yellow, to make it look like butter. That is the only reason they want that law passed, in order to make more money. I think the time has come for the House to take a stand on this proposition, whether or not you are for 2,500,000 dairy farmers in this country who are providing the vital dairy products for the people, or for the oleo industry, that only desires to make more money. If the oleo manufacturers succeed with their scheme it will wreck the dairy industry and our American economy.

I have before me an advertisement which appeared in the Memphis Press-Scimitar of December 13, 1948, and the Memphis Commercial Appeal on December 14, 1948, signed by 29 farm and dairy organizations in the South itself. It well states the position of small-business men and farmers in regard to the butter-oleomargarine controversy.

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Press-Scimitar and Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal of December 13–14, 1948]

BUTTER AND THE SOUTH

Widespread fraudulent substitution of yellow oleomargarine for butter must be prevented. This can be done by a flat ban on the imitation of butter through the commercial manufacture or sale of yellow oleomargarine.

Such a ban would enable Congress and the State legislatures to remove all taxes and license fees now imposed on the butter substitute and still protect consumers.

The commercial-yellow ban would permit housewives to obtain all the oleomargarine they want for home use in its most economical uncolored form, without payment of any taxes whatsoever.

A policy to this effect was proposed by representatives of three leading dairy organizations on October 26, 1948. This policy has since been ratified separately by members of the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, the American Butter Institute, and the National Creameries Association. The National Grange has expressed its agreement in principle. These organizations represent virtually all dairy farmers who produce milk or cream for sale in commercial channels. They total 25 percent of all the farmers in America.

This policy would abolish all fees and reporting requirements for oleo retailers, wholesalers, and manufacturers. Hospitals and other institutions could buy uncolored oleo without license or tax.

At the same time, a ban on imitation butter would curb unfair competition for the butter market, so vital to successful dairying in the South as elsewhere.

The Food and Drug Administration has opposed the addition of artificial colors, as well as spices and other substances, which result in giving food a deceptive appearance.

BUTTER IS VITAL TO THE SOUTH

The dairy industry is more important to the southern farmer—and to the southern consumer—than all the oleomargarine ever manufactured. It supplies all of our milk, half of our beef and veal, and one-fourth of our total food consumption.

The dairy farmer does not seek to deprive anyone of butter substitutes. But the manufacture and sale of oleo colored yellow in imitation of butter leads to "butterlegging"—the passing off of oleo as butter, at butter prices. This reduces the income of the southern farmer and businessman, and hurts the consumer.

Only one-third of 1 percent of the farmers' cash income in leading cotton States can be traced to oleomargarine. On the other hand, oleomargarine is a definite threat to southern markets for dairy products, lard, vegetable shortening (with which oleo competes), and cottonseed meal sold as feed for dairy cattle. To the Cotton Belt farmer, these markets are 28 times as important as the oleo market, as shown by the following table:

Cash income to farmers in 1946

State	From oleomargarine	From products competing with oleomargarine
Alabama	$1,919,000	$30,008,000
Arkansas	2,263,000	36,891,000
Georgia	1,818,000	35,949,000
Louisiana	765,000	22,277,000
Mississippi	2,035,000	30,998,000
North Carolina	1,244,000	37,399,000
Oklahoma	638,000	63,902,000
South Carolina	1,080,000	19,294,000
Tennessee	898,000	65,705,000
Texas	8,891,000	126,051,000
Total, 10 cotton States	17,699,000	478,809,000

Help your farm neighbors and protect your own pocketbook as well. Support the ban on the imitation of butter by oleomargarine colored yellow in semblance of butter. Let butter substitutes sell on their own merits, without butter's naturally yellow color.

Dairy farm organizations of the South, representing farmer members in the States of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Oklahoma, North Carolina, Virginia, Tennessee, and Texas: Chattanooga Area Milk Producers Association, Chattanooga, Tenn.; Coastal Bend Milk Producers Association, Corpus Christi, Tex.; Consolidated Dairies, Birmingham, Ala.; Dairy Farmers Cooperative Association, Inc., Kentwood, La.; Dairy Producers, Inc., Montgomery, Ala.; Enid Cooperative Creamery Association, Enid, Okla.; Falls Cities Cooperative Milk Producers Association, Louisville, Ky.; Farm Bureau Milk Producers Association, Fort Smith, Ark.; Georgia Association of Cooperative Dairies, Atlanta, Ga.; Hale County Dairy Association, Greensboro, Ala.; Knoxville Milk Producers Association, Knoxville, Tenn.; Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association, Washington, D. C.; Maryland Cooperative Milk Producers, Inc., Baltimore, Md.; Miami Home Milk Producers Association, Miami, Fla.; Mid-South Milk Producers Association, Memphis, Tenn.; Nashville Milk Producers, Inc., Nashville, Tenn.; Nolensville Cooperative Creamery, Nolensville, Tenn.; North Carolina Milk Producers Federation, Greensboro, N. C.; Paducah Graded Milk Producers Association, Inc., Paducah, Ky.; Plains Cooperative, Inc., Plainview, Tex.; Richmond Cooperative Milk Producers Association, Richmond, Va.; Roanoke Cooperative Milk Producers Association, Roanoke, Va.; Rutherford County Cooperative Creamery, Inc., Murfreesboro, Tenn.; South Texas Producers Association, Inc., Houston, Tex.; Sumner County Cooperative Creamery, Inc., Gallatin, Tenn.; Valley of Virginia; Cooperative Milk Producers Association, Harrisonburg, Va.; Mississippi Jersey Cattle Club; Southern Region, American Guernsey Cattle Club; Southern Region, Holstein-Friesian Association of America.

It must be remembered that this controversy is, in part, a struggle between small business and big business. The 40,000 dairy plants and the 2,500,000 dairy farmers in this country, many of them situated in the South as elsewhere, are essentially small business organizations. The cottonseed oil and oleomargarine interests, by contrast,

are very big business, indeed. Much of their ownership is closely held by absentee capital operating in the East and Middle West, and even from abroad.

This advertisement shows, moreover, that the aggregate income to small-business men and farmers in the South from dairy products competing with oleomargarine is far above and beyond the comparatively small returns from the butter substitutes.

BUTTER IS VITAL TO THE SOUTH

Only one-third of 1 percent of the farmers' cash income in leading cotton States can be traced to oleomargarine. On the other hand, oleomargarine is a definite threat to southern markets for dairy products, lard, salad oils, and vegetable shortening, with which oleo competes, and cottonseed meal sold as feed for dairy cattle everywhere. To the Cotton Belt farmer these markets are 28 times as important as the oleo market.

The dairy industry is more important to the southern farmer—and to the southern consumer—than all the oleomargarine ever manufactured. It supplies the Nation with all of its milk, 40 percent of its beef and veal, and provides the second largest source of farm income to the South. The dairy farmer, in addition, is one of the best customers of the cotton farmer, who gets half again as much for his cottonseed meal when sold for dairy cattle feed as he gets for the cottonseed oil he sells to oleomargarine manufacturers. Soybean growers get 2½ times as much income from soybean meal sold for dairy-cattle feed as they get from the soybean oil sold for oleomargarine. In the face of these figures, it is hard to understand why the southern farmer should want to cut his own throat for the benefit of the absentee ownership that controls the oleomargarine industry in this country.

A certain element of southern business wants increased markets and increased prices for its cottonseed oil. It believes that the oleomargarine market promises to offer those increases. To foster the oleo market, that element is willing to encourage the possibility of fraud and deception against the American consumer by demanding the right to color oleomargarine yellow in imitation of butter.

OLEOMARGARINE OPENS THE DOOR TO FOREIGN IMPORTS

The oleomargarine manufacturers are willing to go still further. They are willing to sacrifice cotton growers, who derive benefit from the dairy industry, without in any way helping them. The facts are that for three decades there has been a market for every pound of edible oil in the manufacture of shortening and salad dressing. In fact, in each of the years 1935–37, it was necessary to import as much as 100,000,000 pounds of edible cottonseed oil from outside the country to satisfy these needs.

Much cottonseed oil is now being diverted to oleomargarine, leaving an increased vacuum to be filled by other low-priced imported vegetable oils for other products. There is little difference between the formula for vegetable shortenings and the formula for oleomargarine. A difference of only one-fourth of a cent a pound is enough to divert oil from one product to another and, to the modern chemist, it is a simple problem to use such oils interchangeably.

In case some of the gentlemen in this House may not understand why I raise this point, may I digress long enough to explain the essential difference in pricing dairy products as against commercial oils and fats. Over the years the dairy farmer, to obtain full value from his milk, has learned to sell on a classified basis. Fluid milk brings in the highest price, then cream, then evaporated milk, then butter and cheese. There are many variants of the system by which he obtains the maximum return from his product, but classification is the heart of all of them.

The benefits of such classification have not been made available to producers of cottonseed oil, though the peanut growers have used the method to advantage. For example, there is one price to peanut shellers and another to crushers, irrespective of grade. The producer of cottonseed gets no such classified price, and neither does the crusher. The cotton oil mill still sells crude oil on a blind-broker basis. The manager of such a mill does not know and may not care what his oil is used for, even though the profits of their eventual conversion may be greater for one product or another, depending on the season and its circumstance.

Nor does the independent mill owner know whether the price of the tank of oil he is selling is being bid down by another mill operating as part of a chain. The syndicate mill can absorb losses in the added profits it makes by taking the conversion market away from the independents. Any loss shown by the mill is merely a bookkeeping item in that case.

So, out of a tank of oil produced perhaps in the district represented by my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], a part may be used for vegetable shortening after it reaches its northern destination, and a part may go into salad oil, and the remainder may be used for oleomargarine. The grower has no way of knowing what becomes of it or how much its eventual use may bring. He gets the same low price under every circumstance. With a constant shortage of cottonseed oil for edible purposes, it is not possible for any current or expanded sale of oleomargarine to put a single extra penny into the pockets of the American cottonseed oil producers. The same thing applies to the producers of domestic soybean oil.

MONEY TALKS

It is true that for the year 1947 the oleomargarine industry, as represented by only 28 major manufacturers, is known to have spent $6,600,000 for advertising directed in part toward the repeal of oleo restrictions according to Tide magazine. It is true that in 1948, when they thought their battle was all but won, they nevertheless spent an additional $5,400,000 to mislead American housewives on the question of yellow oleomargarine, according to the same publication. It is true that the impact of these millions of dollars of advertising revenue has been reflected by columns of favorable news and editorial comment in return

It is true that Congressmen have been subjected to a barrage of synthetic mail signed by employees of oleomargarine manufacturing concerns, who received suggestions as to what sort of letters their employers wanted them to write. It is true that oleo companies have furnished the stationery for such letters, addressed the envelopes, stamped them, and mailed them in great quantities. It is true that State legislatures have been swamped with petitions for oleo-tax repeal for which, in Ohio at least, the persons who circulated them received 10 cents a name. Many such petitions were circulated by newsboys on their paper routes, and it is possible that the housewives who signed them were merely being charitable.

Money talks; yes. But no oleo money talks loud enough to drown out the fact that milk and its products constitute the largest single source of farm income. And no amount of paid propaganda can conceal the fact that 26.9 percent of all milk in commerce is consumed in the form of butter. Without adequate butter outlets, it is impossible for the Nation to maintain a stable and profitable dairy industry. No advertising expenditure in the world can explain to the American housewife the scarcities and high prices for milk and meat that would result from an oleo monopoly of the market for spreads.

More than 25 percent of all the food consumed annually in this country is produced by the dairy industry. The dislocation of that industry through unfair competition from imitation butter would cost the consumer millions. Mr. Speaker, I say again that this would be too great a price to pay for cheaper oleo—even if the unrestricted use of yellow coloring were to lower the price of oleomargarine, which it would not.

Oleomargarine propaganda does not mention that 24 States have on their statute books legislation restricting the sale of colored products, and that repeal of the Federal restrictions on yellow oleo would not affect States' rights in this matter. These States have heavy concentrations of industrial population and are natural targets for the 28 big oleomargarine manufacturers, who produce and distribute the bulk of this product. As the oleomargarine lobby itself say, "So long as Federal restrictions upon the manufacture and sale of margarine are continued in effect, State restrictive laws are more difficult to remove."

Repeal of Federal restrictions on oleo, therefore, may be considered as an initial attack on the State laws of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Connecticut, Delaware, Pennsylvania, New York, Maryland, Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, Idaho, Washington, Oregon, California, Alabama, Florida, and Missouri.

However, in certain of these States circumstances have developed that give rise to a question as to the effectiveness of several of these statutes, for example:

In Alabama the attorney general of that State, in an opinion given in 1944, stated that the Alabama code did not prevent the sale of colored oleo in that State.

In Florida the State supreme court held in an opinion rendered December 8, 1944, that where oleo was sold under the original natural color of the oil used as a base—even though the oil had bleached out during the refining process and annoto had to be added to restore color—it was not within the statute prohibiting the sale of any spurious preparation purporting to be butter.

In Maine the attorney general of that State, in an opinion given June 1, 1948, stated that yellow oleo could be sold in Maine if properly labeled and identified.

In Missouri the attorney general of that State, in an opinion given June 29, 1948, stated that yellow oleo could be sold in Missouri if the containers or cartons had printed thereon the word "oleomargarine."

In Maryland dealers are selling colored oleo on advice received from their State health department, food and drug division, that oleo is not a substitute made or colored to resemble natural butter as prohibited by the Maryland law. The State's attorney of Montgomery County has a test case under advisement at this writing.

MISLEADING PROPAGANDA AS TO COLOR

Oleomargarine manufacturers are further guilty of leading the public to believe that their product is naturally yellow in color. They infer that Federal restrictions force the removal of this color by bleaching, and that the housewife is unfairly required to restore it. Butter, they say, is colored with the same dyes with which oleo is colored; and restraints on their use of the yellow color is unjustified discrimination.

The facts are that it is impossible to make a naturally yellow oleomargarine out of domestic oils. The Armour Research Foundation of the Illinois Institute of Technology has revealed the results of scientific tests in this respect. When cottonseed oils are turned into fat they become tattle-tale gray. When soybean oils are turned into fat they become a murky green. They are then bleached, not because of the Federal laws, but to remove undesirable odors, flavors, and colors.

Laboratory analyses of hydrogenated soybean or cottonseed oils, the domestic oils generally utilized in commercial production of oleomargarine, indicate that, regardless of whatever other qualities oleo may or may not have, it does not in the least resemble natural butter in its original state as far as color is concerned.

A small percentage of winter butter is colored, of course. However, when color is added to butter, it is for purposes of uniformity and not with the idea of deception and fraud in trying to make butter look like something which it is not. Would the oleo manufacturers want to color their product yellow if butter was naturally pink?

Certainly not. Their demand for yellow is based solely on a desire to imitate butter's naturally yellow color.

OLEOMARGARINE IS A SYNTHETIC PRODUCT

We must remember that oleomargarine is a contrived product of uncertain ancestry. It can be and has been made of fish oil, animal fats, tallow, waste packing-house byproducts, and vegetable oils both domestic and imported. To say that oleo is the nutritional equivalent of butter is to say that horsemeat is the nutritional equivalent of prime roast beef. The statement might be technically true, but it is morally dubious.

Foreign chemists have made oleo successfully from wood pulp and even from coal. Already we are witnessing a return of imported oils, such as coconut and palm-kernel oils. These imports will increase if price advantages warrant. There is no assurance whatever that American oleo will continue to be made from cottonseed and soybean oils. It is fun to be fooled, but not at the expense of diet or health.

In any case, the processing of oleo requires the deodorizing of some oils, the removal of unpleasant off-tastes from others, and bleaching to give a uniform white base for the addition of color. Diacetyl must be added to imitate butter's taste. Vitamin A, which is extracted from shark livers, must be added to imitate butter's nutrition. Milk must be added to oleo to imitate butter's texture. The use of yellow would be the final step toward fraud and deceit by imitating butter's color.

The repeal of the Federal restrictions on yellow oleomargarine would lay the consumer open to substitution on every hand. The markets would be wide open to adulterations and imitations of every kind. Many outlets for butter as a quality product would be destroyed—and that is exactly what the oleomargarine manufacturers want. They want, not part of the market for spreads used on bread, nor most of that market, but all of the market. In other words, they want to destroy the dairy industry and secure a monopoly for their synthetic product.

DAIRY HERDS ENDANGERED

If the Congress takes action to permit the manufacture and sale of oleo colored yellow to look like butter, what will be the effect on the dairy farmers? The lost butter market will be felt first by two and one-half million farmers, many of whom only milk from three to six cows. These farmers and their families depend upon widely distributed local creameries, cheese plants, condensers, and milk plants, totaling more than 40,000 establishments, for almost their only weekly cash income.

During the flush season, cows produce about 50 percent more milk than in winter, while consumption remains about the same. A large percentage of this surplus must go into butter. Indeed, almost 27 percent of all milk produced in this country is thus used, as I have said. Without butter outlets for surplus milk, the small dairy farmers will have no alternative but to reduce their herds, with far-reaching results.

If Federal controls over yellow oleo are repealed, I foresee that the reduction of dairy herds within the next 3 years will have a disastrous effect on the agricultural economy. We lost nearly a million dairy cows between January 1, 1947, and January 1, 1948. This was the sharpest decline in dairy-cow numbers ever recorded in a single year, according to the United States Department of Agriculture.

This drop in milk-cow population will soon be severely felt in those cities which now depend upon abundant supplies of fluid milk and will hurt the very consumers to whom the oleo manufacturers now appeal. Any possibility of savings from cheaper oleo will be reflected many times over in the consumer's increased milk bill. Surplus milk which finds no outlet in butter will be cheap for a while, then farmers will sell their cows and turn to other types of production or even to other occupations.

With increased population and increased demands for milk, a further reduction in dairy herds will produce milk shortages. Higher prices for milk will be inevitable. Higher prices for meat will be equally inevitable, since about 40 percent of our meat supply comes from dairy herds. If this vicious trend is to be continued, we can easily be reduced from our traditional American meat and milk products diet to a subsistence diet of grain and synthetic foods.

Filled milk, filled cheese, and other filled dairy products using cottonseed oil instead of milk fat would follow as a matter of course. In Mexico, a synthetic product consisting of skim milk and cottonseed oil is already being made and sold in bottles. Filled condensed milk has been canned in Indiana, Illinois, and Missouri. Do we want a peon diet for our own children? In Texas certain manufacturers are already substituting cottonseed oil for butterfat in ice cream, and a move is under way to make this deception legal. Where does that leave the dairy farmer?

A shift in production to soybean and other soil-depleting crops would be unavoidable. This, in turn, would mean larger appropriations from Congress to meet our increasing soil-conservation needs and to match the job once taken over without subsidy by our Nation's dairy farmers. The end would be disastrous for farmers and city folk alike, and would endanger the economy of our country.

DAIRY FARMERS ARE NOT PROFITEERS

Yet dairy farming is the backbone of diversified modern agriculture. Manufactured dairy products are a necessary outlet for milk which cannot be sold in bottles, and butter continues to be a product upon which the dairy farmer relies for his livelihood. It is a product which both farmer and consumer must be able to count upon—a quality product which is both a food and a flavor.

From the consumers' standpoint, the law must give protection against fraud and misrepresentation in the substitution of colored oleomargarine for butter. The oleo manufacturers will tell you that there is no other parallel in our laws of one food product being protected against another food product. The answer is that no other type of merchandise affords even a close parallel for comparison.

The monetary incentive to sell colored oleo at the price of and in the guise of butter is absolutely unique. With the quantities of butter sold so huge and a price spread between oleo and butter, there would be tremendous incentive for substitution and fraud if the unrestricted sale of yellow oleomargarine were permitted.

THE NEW DAIRY POLICY

Widespread fraudulent substitution of yellow oleomargarine for butter must be prevented. This can be done by a flat ban on the imitation of butter through the commercial manufacture or sale of yellow oleomargarine. Such a ban would enable Congress and the State legislatures to remove all taxes and license fees now imposed on the butter substitute and still protect consumers.

Such a ban would permit housewives to obtain all the oleomargarine they want for home use in its most economical uncolored form, without payment of any taxes whatsoever. At the same time, a ban on imitation butter would curb unfair competition for the butter market, so vital to successful dairying in the South as elsewhere.

A policy to this effect was proposed by representatives of three leading dairy organizations on October 26, 1948. This policy has since been ratified separately by members of the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation, the American Butter Institute, and the National Creameries Association, and the major national dairy-cattle breeders' associations. The National Grange has expressed its agreement in principle, as have many State farm bureaus. I can say with confidence that a majority of all organized farmers in America are behind this policy.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill which provides for those objectives and which, I believe, will receive the approval of every fair-minded Member of this House. It is fair to consumers, because it allows the removal of all taxes and sales restrictions on oleomargarine. It is fair to oleo retailers and wholesalers, because it permits the elimination of all license fees and reporting requirements. Finally it is fair to the dairy farmer. This bill urges a ban on the unfair commercial imitation of butter to insure fair competition for an industry that is vital to national employment, national income, and our national standard of living.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Star]

BUTTER INDUSTRY'S VIEWS ON OLEO

TO THE EDITOR OF THE STAR:

Your editorial of January 13, Yellow as Butter, seems to favor repeal of the internal revenue laws which effectively have regulated the manufacture and sale of yellow oleomargarine but does not advocate any effective means of protecting consumers from fraud and deception, if these are repealed.

Naiveté does not generally characterize your editorials but your statement, "All oleomargarine, no matter where or how sold, should be labeled as such" achieves a new high for ingenuousness.

It is a fact well known by food enforcement officials that there are certain basic deceptions which are sometimes employed in the preparation of foods which are not correctible by any form of label statement. The use of artificial color for the purpose of simulating a valuable food probably is the foremost example of this type of deception.

Item 1. The Food and Drug Administration throughout its rulings has been sensitive to the deception caused by the use of artificial yellow color in foods which makes them appear to contain eggs. The use of yellow color is forbidden in such foods as macaroni and noodle products, mayonnaise and salad dressings.

Item 2. The circuit court of appeals has upheld the Food and Drug Administration in its contention that white poppy seeds artificially colored to resemble more valuable Dutch blue and Turkish grey poppy seeds, are adulterated.

Item 3. In a 1940 opinion (still valid) the Food and Drug Administration said, "Bakery products, or any other food containing pumpkin, which gives the appearance of having an egg content when no eggs are present, or a greater egg content than is the case, would be an adulterated article under any form of labeling."

A truthful label statement that artificial color had been added would not be a successful defense to a charge of adulteration in any of the above illustrations. Yet, inadequate regulation of yellow oleo would relegate any of the above adulterated foods to the chicken-feed class as a source of booty to the unscrupulous because of the large margin of profit involved and the closeness of the resemblance of yellow oleo and butter in appearance and taste.

Your statement that some butter is artificially colored is a yellow herring. Butter never is colored to make consumers believe it is oleo.

The sound principle upon which the dairy industry's new policy is based was once expressed by a Food and Drug official who after 30 years' experience in protecting consumers from deleterious foods and economic fraud said, "It is our experience in law enforcement that the purchaser is guided many, many times in the identity of a product, by its flavor, its appearance, its physical properties, regardless of what statements are made on the label, with respect to artificiality or coloring, as the case may be; and it is one of the fundamentals of law-enforcement procedure that such effects, resulting from appearances and flavors, when they are deceptive are not correctible by label declaration."

Do not minimize the fraud potential inherent in removing the effective protection which has been afforded housewives by the revenue laws. It grieves me to see the Star running with the pack on this issue. It would seem your really great newspaper should be in the van, endorsing legislation which will give consumers a decent measure of protection, if the tax on yellow oleo is to be removed.

CHARLES M. FISTERE,
Counsel, American Butter Institute.

[From the Soybean Digest of January 1949]

SOYBEAN OIL IS LOSING MARGARINE MARKET

Soybean oil stands second in quantity among oils used in margarine the first three quarters of 1948. This, of course, is not news. Soybean oil has been second on the list of margarine oils for a number of years. The news is that the quantity gap between soybean oil and cottonseed oil, in first place, is widening.

Some years during the war soybeans supplied almost as much oil to the margarine industry as did cottonseed. But the first 9 months of last year soybean oil constituted only 35.5 percent of the oils going into margarine. Cottonseed furnished 50.8 percent.

Part of the reason for the shift away from soybean oil in the margarine market is the greater availability of all vegetable oils. Buyers are in position to be more choosy. So while soybean oil is finding a wider field among industrial users, it is losing ground relatively as an ingredient of a higher-value product—margarine.

This development gives point to the need for pushing ahead with basic research on the cause and cure of soybean-oil reversion, which is its chief handicap with margarine. We have mentioned this need here many times before. If soybean oil is to compete on equal terms in the high-value field, its weaknesses need to be known and corrected. Such action cannot wait.

The high-value markets are the ones that will support a good price for soybean oil—and soybeans. Once lost, they will be much more difficult to regain.

[From the St. Cloud (Minn.) Times]

THE FIGHT ON OLEO

Early in the Eightieth Republican-controlled session of Congress a few oleo manufacturers launched a multi-million-dollar attack against the dairy farmers of the United States.

The Republican Congress had expressed its displeasure with such things as the Democratic farm program and reciprocal trade agreements, so the oleo manufacturers probably thought that the chances were good to put a law through so that they might distribute and actually sell oleo in a color that would look like butter. Their sole objective was to remove the 10 cents a pound Federal tax on oleo colored yellow to masquerade as butter. The sheer force which came near to brutality of oleo's onslaught kept the dairy farmers on the defensive throughout the session. If Congress had not adjourned without finishing a lot of its work, the oleo people might have won out.

As Hoard's Dairyman says, some newspaper editors and other oleo fellow travelers have either innocently or intentionally misinterpreted the new dairy stand. They have surreptitiously played up the portion of the stand that agrees to the removal of all Federal taxes, licenses, and license fees, and have purposely overlooked the fact that the removal of these levies will not be agreed to until yellow oleo has been wiped from the map of the United States. The first action must be absolute abolition and prohibition of the sale and manufacture of fraudulent yellow oleo. When this has been accomplished and enacted into law then, and only then, will the dairy farmers be ready to remove the long-standing Federal levies. This is as it should be. Many States have been following this procedure for several years. They have within their boundaries prohibited the sale and manufacture of fraudulent yellow oleo.

Now the substance of all this is that the oleo industry will not sell its product in its color and on its own merits unless forced to do so by legislation. Enactment of such legislation is the intention of the dairy industry during the 1949 session of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATMAN). The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] has expired.

WILLIAM A. JUMP

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I announce with the deepest regret the death of Mr. William A. Jump, one of the most efficient officials of the Government and one of the Nation's greatest public servants.

During his long and faithful service with the Department, Mr. Jump served under 11 Secretaries of Agriculture. In 1947 he received the Department's distinguished service award for outstanding service and leadership in the advancement of public administration.

For several years he served as the United States representative on the Subcommittee on Finance of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

Mr. Jump began his career in the Bureau of Animal Industry, and was promoted regularly, becoming personal secretary in 1921 to the then Secretary of

Agriculture, Henry C. Wallace. In 1922, during the Harding administration, Mr. Jump was appointed budget officer for the Department, a post which he held continuously thereafter.

Widely known both inside and outside the Federal Government as an outstanding leader in the advancement of public administration, Mr. Jump was a prominent advocate of many improvements in the Federal budgetary and management practices.

Throughout his career as the Department's liaison officer, Mr. Jump was in close contact with Members of the Congress, earning praise for his able handling of the agency's budget matters.

I recall that some years ago when Mr. Jump had rendered particularly valuable service to my subcommittee we voted to increase his salary. He declined, saying such an increase would be disproportionate to the other salaries paid in his department. It is the only instance within my knowledge when an employee of the Government declined an increase in compensation.

On his recent retirement I wrote to him expressing regret at his leaving the Department and my deep appreciation of the great service he had rendered the committee and the Congress and the Nation. In reply he wrote just a day or two before his death:

JANUARY 17, 1949.

Hon. CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman, House Committee on Appropriations.

Dear Mr. CANNON: I cannot tell in the brief space of a note how much your letter of December 22, 1948, meant to me. You probably did not know at the time your letter was written that my retirement from Government service was due to critical illness. I have known since June that I had cancer of the liver, but the suddenness with which I became completely disabled was a surprise.

There has been nothing in my lifetime that has made a deeper impression on me than my frequent and close contact with the congressional appropriations committees of Congress. During the 30 years I have appeared before these committees I have learned to have an entirely different viewpoint on the quality and functioning of the Congress from that which, it seems to me, is most unfortunately held by the general public. I have found Congress to be not weak as the public sometimes seems to believe nor muddle-headed as is the viewpoint often expressed by segments of the public. On the contrary, I have found that Congress is generally strong and generally sound, and working upon a final discovery in the best public interest of a solution of the great pending questions of the day. Their success in finding these solutions, when you consider the enormous ramifications of current times when things legislative have grown and moved away from simplicity and assumed overwhelming complexity, is truly remarkable. The Congress is not perfect any more than other parts of the American scene are perfect, but it is so much better than the American people either believe it to be that it is a shame that this disparity between fact and theory prevails. I say this not in defense of Congress as an institution but as a commendation and urgent need for the general public to find its greatest dependability in the execution of legislative affairs. It is the public itself that is the loser in its inability to grasp the significance of Congress in the whole scheme of economics, continuation of liberty and proper execution of a number of the most important constitutional requirements under our American system. The public seems to be awake on this point and indeed I believe they are making progress on grasping what things are all about. My 30 years before Congress has led me to believe that there is not a single thing of such fundamental importance as for the people to grasp fully their great dependence on the legislative system.

I have tremendously enjoyed my congressional relationships. If I had my time to go over I would try to make them even more useful and effective. I have also enjoyed and place the highest value on the confidence which has been shown me over the years by the Committee on Appropriations.

My best wishes for the future go out to both the House and Senate committees, and I hope the problems that now seem to be unsoluble will quickly turn out to be an enigma of the past, and that the American people will come to the highest general appreciation of these great instruments of government for which our Constitution provides.

With personal good wishes to all of the members of the committees and subcommittees with which I have dealt, and especially my personal good wishes to you and the other chairmen involved, I remain,

Sincerely,

W. A. JUMP.

Active for many years in his professional field, he was a member of the organization committee which led to the establishment of the American Society for Public Administration. He also worked on a committee of the American Political Science Association, a unit promoting closer relations between members of the association and Federal, State, and local government public officials.

Mr. Jump was widely recognized for his professional abilities and was frequently asked to give lectures and special courses at various universities and colleges, including Harvard, Princeton, University of North Carolina, Mount Holyoke College, and American University.

A short time before his death, Mr. Jump, in response to many messages and tributes from his colleagues, wrote a farewell message to his associates in the Department of Agriculture, in which he said:

There is no finer place in America than the Department of Agriculture in which to grow up and spend a lifetime, as I have done. I feel that I have been most fortunate in having had that privilege.

Not a week passes that I am not stimulated by some fresh evidence of the spirit of true public service that is the strong foundation of the Department. Somehow and in some way the fact that from the beginning the Department has existed for the sole purpose of making life in America a better, richer, and fuller experience has resulted in an honest, vigorous, and intensely realistic public-service concept on the part of the staff of the Department, high and low, that is truly remarkable.

This makes the Department a most stimulating and inspiring place to work. A member of the Department does not have the feeling that he is just helping to turn the wheels that make a large organization work; he feels he is a partner in a great enterprise.

This institutional appreciation is a priceless asset. It could not be created by the use of money or by any of the modern methods of building a so-called esprit de corps, as important and desirable as that may be.

I would be the first one to admit or even assert that the Department is not perfect. There is no danger of this, but if it ever gets to be perfect it will become so self-centered as to be of little use as a public-service institution. For many years my work has involved extensive and varied external relationships, both public and private. I have kept my eyes and ears open. The net result is that I am more deeply convinced than ever that in the USDA we have something quite unusual, whether measured by public or private standards.

We have become so accustomed to all this that sometimes it appears that we just take it for granted. But, as everyone knows, traditions have to be kept alive and passed forward. We are not static, which I think is very good, since nothing would be more objectionable than an insulated or too highly inbred bureaucracy.

Heads of the Department, bureau heads, and the personnel at large come and go. Even bureaus come and go as the cycle of organization and reorganization keeps in motion. It is noteworthy that regardless of the scope and degree of such changes and the strain they sometimes impose, the traditions and ideals of the Department are kept alive by recognition by the officers and personnel generally of these great intangibles among our institutional assets and determination and eternal vigilance to keep it so from generation to generation.

That is why I feel compelled to mention the traditions and public-service ideals of the Department as one of the outstanding impressions I have at the close of a lifetime of sharing in this good and wholesome atmosphere.

In like spirit he wrote in his last days to Secretary Brannan:

Hon. CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary of Agriculture.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: When I last mentioned the subject of my retirement I had hoped to be able to remain on the job until after the first of the new year. During recent weeks, however, my physical condition has grown worse so rapidly that I now have no choice but to apply at once for disability retirement.

After spending nearly 48 years in the Department I regret very much the necessity for leaving in such summary fashion. I had expected to retire at 60, about 3 years hence, and always took it for granted that when that time came I would have the usual opportunity to say good-by, individually and in person, to my many friends and associates in the Department. Since that is not now possible, I should like to take this opportunity, through you as the head of the Department, to say good-by and to thank each and every one for their kindness and cooperation over the years. There are no finer folks anywhere than those who comprise the Department of Agriculture. I have the deepest personal affection for them and I am going to miss them very much indeed.

Among many other things that I should like to say at this time there is one more that I feel I must say. I would be either the most ungrateful, or the least discerning, person in the world if I left without saying it. And that is that there is no finer place in America than the Department of Agriculture in which to grow up and spend a lifetime, as I have done. I feel that I have been most fortunate in having had that privilege.

Not a week passes, even after all these years, that I am not stimulated by some new and fresh evidence of the spirit of true public service that is the strong foundation of the Department of Agriculture. Somehow, and in some way, the fact that from the beginning the Department has existed for the sole purpose of making life in America a better, richer, and fuller experience, has resulted in an honest, vigorous, and intensely realistic public-service concept on the part of the staff of the Department, high and low, that is truly remarkable. This makes the Department a most stimulating and inspiring place in

which to work. A member of the Department of Agriculture does not have the feeling that he is just helping to turn the wheels that make a large organization work; he feels he is a partner in a great enterprise. That has been my experience for 42 years. I know it is the experience of countless others in the Department who could not be tempted to work anywhere else. This institutional appreciation is a priceless asset. It could not be created by the use of money or by any of the modern methods of building a so-called esprit de corps, as important and desirable as that may be.

Of course, some will say that these are merely the enthusiastic, or overenthusiastic, observations of a person who has spent his lifetime within the walls of the USDA. I admit to some vulnerability on that score and have tried all the more, therefore, to be objective about the Department. I would be the first one to admit or even assert that the Department is not perfect. There is no danger of this, but if it ever gets to be perfect it will become so self-centered as to be of little use as a public-service institution. For many years my work has involved extensive and varied external relationships, both public and private. I have kept my eyes and ears open. The net result is that I am more deeply convinced than ever that in the USDA we have something quite unusual, whether measured by public or private standards.

We have become so accustomed to all this that sometimes it appears that we just take it for granted. But, as everyone knows, traditions have to be kept alive and passed forward. We are not static, which I think is very good since nothing would be more objectionable than an insulated or too highly inbred bureaucracy. Heads of the Department, bureau heads, and the personnel at large come and go. Even bureaus come and go as the cycle of organization and reorganization keeps in motion. It is noteworthy that regardless of the scope and degree of such changes and the strain they sometimes impose the traditions and ideals of the Department at large are kept alive by recognition by the officers and personnel generally of these great intangibles among our institutional assets and determination and eternal vigilance to keep it so from generation to generation. That is why I feel impelled to mention the traditions and public-service ideals of the Department as one of the outstanding impressions I have at the close of a lifetime of sharing in this good and wholesome atmosphere.

In building such a valuable institutional tradition over the years the Department has had great help from the existence of certain characteristics or factors that have a bearing on all that it does. The relative virtue we have attained, it seems to me, has been tremendously influenced by some of these. No two people would agree on a list of such factors but some that I have seemed to see quite clearly are:

The impact of research on the character of the Department. The existence from the beginning of research and experimentation as the basic function of the Department has instilled a general respect for the eternal quest for the truth and a corresponding skepticism and scorn for sham, half-truth, conclusions not supported by facts, and so on.

The practice of maintaining the closest possible contact with the people themselves and their elected Representatives in Congress in determining what constitutes sound policy and program at any given time. This has resulted in the desirable situation where there is no such thing in fact as a Department of Agriculture program. For convenience, we refer to USDA programs, but over the years I sense that we have learned that the people's programs are the only ones that have a sound and lasting place in a democracy. Occasionally, the Department pushes forward more rapidly than some people believe justified. This is desirable evidence of dynamic and progressive leadership arising out of our public-service concept. When the shake-down occurs we know the actual programs will and must be those the people want and support.

The collaborative and cooperative process: The great connectionalism (I know about the word "nexus" but it's too simple a word to do justice to agricultural organization in the United States) in which the Department is involved with the land-grant colleges and other State agricultural departments and institutions, the farm organizations, the farmer committee systems, the cooperatives, the agricultural credit agencies, the industry and trade groups, the congressional committees, and so on, has developed a philosophy of collaboration and cooperation that has made an imprint on the Department and its methods of thought and action that is unique in Government. While fulfilling the obligations of this vast and intricate pattern of relationships is burdensome at times, the results have made the United States the envy of the world where food and agriculture are concerned. A byproduct is that the Department has been saved from becoming arrogant, self-sufficient, smug and too satisfied with itself. These are alleged to be common sins of bureaucracy. I say "alleged" because they are not nearly so prevalent as some would have the public believe and personally I don't believe they exist in Government in as great degree as in private enterprise. While some, of course, say we have these sins (and doubtless we do, in spots, for temporary periods) I believe we have largely avoided the pattern of officialdom they suggest because we are, and must be, a part of this vast agricultural connectionalism.

The democratic process in internal administration, arising, I believe, out of some of the factors mentioned above, the Department is distinctive in its practice of collaboration and cooperation in the development of policies and methods of internal administration and operation. This contributes tremendously to making the Department a wonderful place in which to work. I do not know of any place in the world where an arbitrary or unsound adminstrative policy or practice has less chance of survival than in the Department of Agriculture.

The Department also has been blessed throughout its history by high-grade leadership at the top. I have worked under 11 Secretaries of Agriculture, including the present Secretary, and every one of them has dedicated himself to the highest possible standards of public service. For years I have advanced the theory that God looks out for the Department of Agriculture in this respect. Whatever the reason, the fact remains that we have never had other than able men who understood and believed in the public-service concept as Secretaries of Agriculture. That has been a big factor in maintaining the high character of the Department, both externally and internally.

It is a source of deep regret to me that I will not have the privilege of serving with you personally in the years ahead. I have always enjoyed working with you. Particularly, I have admired your courage and vigorous and consistent championing of the principles of public welfare, fairness, and justice as applied to Government policies and programs. I wish you happiness and every success in your leadership in American agriculture as well as in the Department internally and I have no doubt you are going to continue to have an interesting and satisfying experience.

I appreciate all of the consideration which has been shown to me and will always be tremendously interested in what you and the Department of Agriculture are doing.

With warm personal regards,

Sincerely,

W. A. JUMP,
Director of Finance.

Perhaps the best summation of Mr. Jump's long and distinguished public career was written by President Truman when, on learning of his resignation as Director of the Department's Office of Budget and Finance, he wrote:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, December 21, 1948.

MY DEAR MR. JUMP: I have received with a sense of deep loss the word that you are retiring from the Government service. Few public servants have earned a rest as much as you have, and I send you every good wish as you relinquish your duties as Director of Finance and budget officer of the Department of Agriculture. In addition to my personal relationship with you, for which I shall always be grateful, I know that I speak for hundreds of others when I say that your retirement will create a void which will be hard to fill.

However, you have become a symbol of such a high standard of public service that we cannot think of your retirement as ending your career. Your example of selfless effort to improve public administration has blazed a wide and clear trail which is already being followed by many of your associates and will be followed by many others for a long time.

You carry with you the good wishes of your coworkers. It is a privilege and a pleasure to extend to you the thanks of the Government which you have served through more than four decades with such self-sacrificing devotion and fidelity.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARRIS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in both to include extraneous matter.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes tomorrow following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered for the day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT BUREAUS AND DEPARTMENTS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments this morning began hearings on H. R. 1569, a bill to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies and for other purposes.

The bill is somewhat similar to previous legislation, but, as in previous legislation, it carries a provision in section 6 of title I which makes it subject to the objection that it is unconstitutional.

Permit me to state that I agree with the overwhelming majority of the Congress that there should be a reorganization of the executive departments which will give greater efficiency at less cost.

Nothing is sought to be accomplished by this bill which cannot be accomplished through legislative procedure.

The argument that no previous Congress has attempted a general reorganization of the executive departments is not an answer to the fact that this Congress has authority to do that job if it so desires.

We have a Democratic President and we have a Democratic majority in the Senate and in the House. Presumably, that Democratic majority in each House is working with the President. Nor is there any reason to believe that the Republican membership in both Senate and House will not go along with the President on any reasonable, valid plan which promises greater efficiency and economy.

There is at this time no excuse for evading or ignoring constitutional provisions.

Say what you will, our procedure and progress under the Constitution have demonstrated that it is still the form of government which gives to the citizen the greatest freedom and prosperity, to the Nation the greatest degree of security. Having the best, why should we scrap it or disregard its essential provisions?

To attain a desired objective, should we disregard fundamental principles and procedure incorporated in the instrument which has protected the liberty of the citizen, guaranteed the safety of our Nation? The answer is obvious.

Unfortunately, this bill (H. R. 1569) as written, seeks to reverse the constitutional legislative processes.

Section 1 of article I of the Constitution provides that—

> All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

The second paragraph of section 7 provides that—

> Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate shall before it becomes a law be presented to the President of the United States.

Now it is true that section 3 of article II provides that the President "shall from time to time give to the Congress information of the state of the Union and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient."

But nowhere in the Constitution nor in the amendments to it, so far as I have been able to find, is there a sentence or a word which authorizes the President of the United States and one branch of the Congress to enact legislation.

H. R. 1569, construed as a whole, authorizes the President to send down reorganization plans, and it expressly states that, unless within 60 legislative days, both the Senate and the House disapprove of those plans as written, they shall be the law of the land.

This reorganization bill ignores the constitutional provisions that the legislative power shall be vested in the Congress of the United States, which, according to the Constitution, "shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives."

Under the Constitution, as every Member of this House and every schoolboy knows, before a bill or a resolution can become the law of the land it must receive the approval of a majority of the Members of the Senate and the House. Then, if the President vetoes the bill or resolution, it must before it becomes law, receive the approval of two-thirds of the Members of each House.

Under the reorganization bill as written and as now being considered by the committee, the procedure would be changed, and a bill or resolution or plan, whatever you prefer to call it, submitted by the President would, if it was approved by either the House or the Senate and disapproved by the other, nevertheless become the law of the land.

Stated in another way, the proposed reorganization plan would give to the President and to one branch of Congress the authority to enact legislation having to do with the reorganization of the executive department.

Or if the President sent down a bill and neither House acted adversely within 60 legislative days, the President's plan would become the law of the land. To state that somewhat differently, the President, under this bill, can "introduce" a bill and that bill becomes a law without the action of either House.

Under the Constitution, although a majority of the Senate and the House pass a bill, the President has the authority to veto it. Unless that veto is disapproved by two-thirds of each House, the bill or resolution does not become a law.

Under the reorganization plan, a bill or resolution or plan proposed by the President becomes the law of the land unless it is vetoed within 60 legislative days by both branches of the Congress.

Such a departure from constitutional provisions is so apparent, so radical, that I cannot support it.

Believing as I do in the purpose of the bill, I shall, in committee, and if unsuccessful there, later on the floor, if the rules permit, offer an amendment striking out section 6 and providing in a general way that when any such plan is suggested by the President, it shall, by the proper officer of either body, be referred to the proper committee for action in the customary manner.

Such an amendment will also require the Congress to act upon the plan so submitted within a fixed period of time.

One or two other amendments will be offered to the bill at the proper time, but none will be so drafted as to in any way interfere with a speedy and complete reorganization of executive departments in the manner indicated by the President if the Congress so desires.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. It is true that there is legislative precedent for this, is there not? Even prior to the war we passed legislation which did just that?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. There may be legislative precedent, but what has that to do with the legality of the procedure? The gentleman does not claim we are bound by the actions of a previous Congress, does he? There are many bad precedents. The United States Supreme Court has recently overruled some of its own decisions. I recall the precedent established by the United States Supreme Court back in March of 1942 when it decided under the law that then existed certain organizations had the right, in the words of Chief Justice Stone, to practice highway robbery. But we fixed that. The fact that some other Congress, a rubber-stamp Congress, if you please, has dodged its duty, shirked its responsibility, or made a mistake is no reason why the objections which I raise, if they are valid, should not now be acted upon favorably. May I ask the gentleman, the fact there is legislative precedent for it would not standing alone justify us in passing this bill, would it?

Mr. GRANGER. In answer to that I would say "No," but I did want the gentleman to know this is not an absolutely new thing. It has been done before.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is right. I would say it has been done two or three times, but that does not make it right. That is no reason why we should now shirk our responsibility, dodge our responsibility, if you want to put it that way, and turn over this power to the President and to one House of Congress, or more accurately, if both Houses fail to act, to the President.

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. Is it not a fact that the courts have not ruled on the legality of this proposed legislation?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Not so far as I know. Of course, that may be due to the fact no one has brought it up. It has not been tested. But the Constitution is so clear, the provisions as to how legislation shall be enacted are so plain, that I cannot see how there can be any difference of opinion as to what the Constitution provides. If there is no difference of opinion as to that, why should we attempt in this way to circumvent, dodge, or repeal the provisions of the Constitution?

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. GOLDEN. From the gentleman's study of this bill, does he think it will really accomplish great economy for the people of the United States?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, I cannot tell about that. We had the unification bill up for consideration. We were told in the beginning that it would bring about economy through unification of the armed services, but before the hearings were over the witnesses did not know whether there would be economy or not. We all know that there is plenty of room for economy. We should have it. We hope this bill will bring that about.

Certainly, I would say that if former President Hoover and the Commission

which has given so much study cannot devise a plan to give us greater efficiency and economy, I do not know of any commission that can.

Mr. GOLDEN. That was my hope, that we would accomplish a great, needed economy for our people that are already overburdened.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I agree with that. I am in agreement that we should take this plan in the main, but I would like to change that particular provision as to when it shall become a law and how it shall become a law. One other thing in the bill: There is no limitation in the bill as to the time in which the President must submit his reorganization plan. I think there should be. I do not care whether you make it 60 days or 90 days after the convening of Congress, but there should be a limit. For this reason, that if the Congress must act—that is, both Houses of Congress—within 60 legislative days from the time the bill is submitted, and if the President should wait until 61 days before adjournment date—and adjournment is fixed by the Reorganization Act—then, as we all know, there is a flood of bills before the Congress, a great deal of business before the Congress, and we would not be able, no matter how much we desired, to give that reorganization plan the consideration that it ought to have.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true that the Commission does not recommend a Cabinet position for the Veterans' Administration? It leaves it as an independent office. I have always felt that anything so important as the Veterans' Administration should be a department, with the head of it having Cabinet rank. The head of the Veterans' Administration has a great responsibility.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I understand the gentlewoman's consideration for the veterans. I do not believe there is an hour of any day that she is not thinking of the veterans. But, I do not see why we should establish a separate department.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think that it makes for efficiency, as well as a benefit to the veterans. The Veterans' Administration has the welfare of some 18,000,000 persons under its jurisdiction with an increasing load. It has, also, a very far-reaching effect on the economy of the United States.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STAGGERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by his colleague the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Columbia Basin Commission.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include newspaper comments.

Mr. FELLOWS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. NORBLAD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

FEDERAL AID TO SCHOOLS

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to state to my colleagues in the House of Representatives that early in the present session I introduced for your consideration a bill providing for Federal aid to our elementary and secondary schools.

Under the Federal Constitution of the United States, this Government has the right to appropriate Federal funds to improve the general welfare of our people. Conditions have arisen in the United States over the past few years that make it imperatively necessary for our Central Government to aid our various State governments in financing the schools of this great free country. There is, in my opinion, no bill pending before the Congress of the United States, of a domestic nature, of more vital importance to our people than this bill. Since the inception of our country, one of the greatest privileges of America has been the opportunities given to our school children for a free education.

With a very large number of the States of this Union having already reached the ceiling and limit of their ability to tax their people and raise funds for school purposes locally, we are confronted with a national emergency that, in my sincere opinion, requires the Federal Government to supplement the State funds to prevent our educational system from deteriorating to such an extent that it would permanently injure the welfare of our people for several decades to come.

Under our republican form of government, where the people themselves have the free right to vote for measures and men in order that our people may maintain their liberty and the blessings of this country, we must have an educated electorate, and we must keep and maintain high educational standards so that communism and other destructive ideologies cannot and will not take root in America to destroy us.

Furthermore, if we educate our youth they will not only be better able to maintain themselves, and to contribute greatly to our national income by their increased capacity to produce, but will also be able to remove themselves from the classes of people who are often dependent and who call upon our National Government for various kinds of support, and will thereby again greatly strengthen the entire people of America, and contribute directly to our national welfare.

In this dawn of the atomic age, or better stated, the dawn of scientific age, if we do not improve our educational standards in America, the doors of opportunity will be slammed in the faces of millions of our boys and girls. America has definitely assumed world leadership, and never before in the history of our country has it been so vitally important for us to educate our youth.

It is apparent to all thoughtful men and women who believe in the freedom and dignity of the individual and believe devoutly in Christianity—that the entire peoples of the world are now in a mortal struggle where the forces of evil, slavery, communism, and dictatorship are arrayed against the American way of life. This terrible struggle will go on for years.

We are in a righteous crusade, endeavoring to hold aloft the torch of Christianity and freedom in order that mankind everywhere may have the blessings of freedom. We cannot maintain this great leadership, neither can we win this great struggle, unless we continue to educate the boys and girls of America. We must greatly increase their educational opportunities. I think we have a tremendous obligation to provide equality of opportunity to the children of the United States. No child can have equality of opportunity, in my opinion, unless to start with he has a basic minimum education. There are many children who may have the mental capacity or the mental brilliance to rise above the handicap, and there are many who will likely educate themselves, but I think they comprise a very small proportion of the total. The ordinary child who receives no education is, in effect, condemned to a life of poverty, a life on the basis of a low standard of living, a life of little interest, and a life which is of little value to the people of the United States.

During World War II over 1,200,000 men, representing 8 percent of all those examined for selective service, were rejected because of deficiencies. I am advised that a very large percentage of this great army of rejected young men came from States that were unable to properly educate their youth. This threw an additional burden upon the few States who had maintained higher educational standards for their children.

The Federal census of 1940 disclosed that 10,000,000 adult Americans had less than 5 years of schooling. The census of 1945 disclosed that 4,000,000 children between the ages of 5 to 17, inclusive, and 2,000,000 children in the usual school brackets of 6 to 17, inclusive, did not attend any school. In proportion to population, the largest number of adults and children of school age in these groups reside in low-income States.

This is a Nation-wide problem. We should not look at it from a local or State viewpoint. We should have as nearly as possible in America an equalization of educational opportunities for all of the youth of this great country. This necessary equalization cannot be had unless we obtain Federal aid to supplement State funds for schools.

Over the past recent years, with the purchasing power of the dollar greatly descending, tens of thousands of our school teachers and educators have worked in their vital profession for salaries and compensation far below the requirements of a decent living, and our

teachers have for years made personal sacrifices to continue in their chosen profession—at great personal loss to themselves. In addition to this, many of our great educators and splendid school teachers have been forced to retire from the field of education and seek employment in other lines that pay a great deal more. As a consequence of these trends our schools are in a deplorable condition. Thousands of young teachers, with inadequate training, and with only emergency and temporary certificates, have been required to assume the great responsibility of training and teaching our children. However, great credit must be given to emergency teachers who have kept open schools that might otherwise have closed, but their unselfish service does not excuse the failure to pay salaries that will hold qualified teachers, and give incentive to emergency teachers to qualify themselves, and advance the standards of teaching.

There is something wrong with an economic and social system which makes better provision for men and women in labor, industry, or other professions, than for those who have made great sacrifice in time and money to prepare themselves to teach the youth of the Nation. There is no prospect of this deplorable situation getting any better without Federal Aid, and without such aid it will rapidly get much worse.

During the year 1943, more than 1,000,000 new Americans were born in the United States. In the year 1947, 1,300,000 American children were born in the United States. This is far more than usual. The children born 5 and 6 years ago are now entering school, trying to get in schools that are already understaffed with teachers and overcrowded with pupils.

Any American boy or girl, if given a preliminary education in this great free country of ours will have unlimited opportunities spread before them throughout life. If they have no education, they will likely be a constant expense and drain on the rest of our people.

If we tackle this problem now and keep our educational standards high, and greatly improve them, we will not only see many of our young American men and women rise to eminence and statesmanship, and fill the great offices of our country, but there will be tens of thousands of essential places in our society that educated young men and women can and will fill. We must remember that besides the exceptionally few brilliant successes that come from our schools, the ordinary men and women of tomorrow march out from the school doors of our beloved land unprepared and not ready to meet and master the complexities of our modern civilization.

There should be no State boundary lines considered while this bill is pending before the House of Representatives, and there certainly is no political issue involved. It simply presents a great emergency that demands the thoughtful and early consideration of every Member of Congress in order that we may keep this great country free and secure.

It will take two-thirds of all the women graduates from all our colleges and universities going into the field of education to supply new and qualified teachers in order to meet the bare needs that now exist. It takes money and a lot of it in order to furnish only a reasonable staff of American teachers. We must have a million teachers in order to enable our boys and girls to receive the education and training they are entitled to.

While this Government has been generous and helpful to many of the peoples of the world, it is my belief that we should now first give consideration to our own people, our boys and girls, and the $300,000,000 per annum provided for in my bill is a small sum indeed as compared to other appropriations that have been and will likely be made to aid millions of people in other countries.

My bill is H. R. 1144. I think it embraces all the good features necessary to enable our children to receive a higher standard of education. In 1944 there were approximately 29,000,000 school children ranging in age from 5 to 17 in in the United States. This number is increasing rapidly. There are approximately 867,248 elementary and secondary teachers. This bill will directly benefit both these large groups of our people. Last week the United States loaned $100,000,000 to the Government of Israel. Why not use some of our national fund for our own people who deserve and need it most? To do so will strengthen this great Nation of ours.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATMAN.) Under previous order of the House the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, since this Congress is committed to enlarge the scope of old-age security, and aid to crippled and the blind, it will not be out of place to state to this Congress just how the matter operates today under our present law. Under the present law the Federal Government pays a maximum of $45 per month for each person certified on the relief rolls. On the first $15 the Federal Government pays two-thirds and then one-half of the remaining allowance up to the maximum of $45. Specifically, it would work out as follows:

First $15:	
Government's share	$10
State's share	5
Next $30:	
Government's share	15
State's share	15

In other words, on a $45 basis the Government would pay $25 and the States, $20.

It is unnecessary to point out to this House the inadequacy of this $45 in times where the cost of living, the cost of clothing, the cost of everything a poor man has to buy has pyramided to new heights. Congress must realize this, for it was not long ago that the Congress increased the salaries of Congressmen to $12,500 and added an extra untaxable expense account of $2,500.

Just think this over. What could you do in times like these if all you had to spend was $45 per month? That is not the worst of the situation. Under North Dakota law the welfare boards are authorized and do file liens against any property old people own, and of course, this is a superior lien to anything but taxes and a first mortgage. When the old person dies up comes this lien and if the property is worth the amount of the money advanced, the property is sold for that purpose unless the heirs decide to redeem the property and pay the money back which the aged received for old-age assistance. There have been instances where jewelry or silverware, long in the family, have had to be disposed of.

In other words, as this law operates, we make the aged of the country abject paupers before they can draw a dime from the welfare boards. Is that what is called an old-age pension? The aged should draw the annual payments as a matter of right and retain their self-respect. We do not do it that way. We help an aged person only when he is down and completely out, and if he still clings to a little property that sustains his self-respect, we take that away. The first thing we do is to make sure that he is a pauper and an alms beggar. If he is not down and out, we make him so.

In the State of North Dakota the sales tax is divided and set aside for two purposes: One is to support the schools of the State and the other to take care of the aged, blind, and crippled. Three-fifths of this tax goes to schools and two-fifths to the other purposes. North Dakota is now collecting about $11,500,000 in sales taxes and is able to match Federal funds without changing the ratio of the division of the tax, and without any extra appropriation from the legislature.

If this Congress would change the present formula to match funds on a basis of $90 per month, there is no question but what North Dakota could match Government funds.

The Social Security Act should be amended with a provision that funds shall be paid to recipients as a matter of right and not as an alms gift; that any property owned by an applicant shall not be subject to a lien as a condition precedent to participation in the social-security fund. No State welfare set-up should be approved that has this abject-pauper clause in it.

This Congress wants also to remember that before the Townsend movement swept the country we were doing nothing for the aged. That scheme was labeled fantastic and visionary, and Dr. Townsend was described as a bad character. We even put him in jail here in Washington because he was outspoken in his demand for old-age assistance. That movement, nevertheless, no matter how roundly criticized, was the mother of the present Social Security Act. It was a start, but, as little as it was, credit for the start must be given to those thousands who put in their dimes and nickels to support a great humanitarian movement.

This agitation will go on—no one can stop it—until the aged in the United States have adequate old-age assistance that is honorable and which comes to them as a matter of right.

The majority of this Congress and the President himself are bound by their campaign pledges to come to the relief

of the aged men and women of the United States. I am bound by that pledge; and, as a Republican Member of this Congress, I will make available to the aged of the United States my time and whatever ability I have, to bring a little more sunshine into their lives—the lives of our pioneers.

Not all of our citizens over the age of 65 years ever make an application for old-age assistance. In the United States today there are approximately 11,000,000 who have reached the age of 65 years. As the social-security administration has functioned, only 2,482,350 have filed applications for assistance.

In North Dakota in 1948 there were 46,114 persons who had reached the age of 65 years, but the number asking for assistance was approximately 8,713, or about 13.9 percent of the total number of aged persons.

If the Federal yardstick or limit of assistance was raised to $90 per month instead of $45, the Government would pay approximately $4,860,000 annually and the State of North Dakota a like amount. Can the State of North Dakota match this fund? The answer is "Yes." The sales tax brings in $11,000,000 annually and two-fifths of this or $5,000,000 is earmarked for the aged, blind, and crippled.

For the aged in the entire United States who apply for old-age assistance to get $90 per month would require a fund of approximately $990,000,000, of which the Federal Government would pay one-half, or $495,000,000. The various States would pay a like amount.

This seems like a huge sum, but let us stop for a moment and see what a billion means to Congress.

World War I cost us with outstanding commitments, $80,000,000,000, and World War II, $450,000,000,000, and since the shooting stopped we have extended aid to foreign countries in the approximate sum of $63,000,000,000. We dumped three billion into China and bet on the wrong horse, and our aid to Greece and Czechoslovakia will probably end in total losses. I will present in the RECORD, as soon as I get the information from the Treasury Department, a full statement of loans to foreign countries, or gifts, as these loans in the most part will be gifts when payment time comes. England owed thirty-four billion and we canceled that in full if they would pay the interest. They did not have the interest so we loaned them enough more to pay the interest. Does anyone think we will collect this? Why not be plain about it and say that we canceled the thirty-four billion of England's indebtedness to us completely.

There are a great many people in the United States fearful that communism will gain a foothold here, hence we are out to stop its spread before its gets to this country. That is the whole sentiment behind the Marshall plan. We are not making much headway in this matter as in country after country we have spent our money in vain.

Did anyone in the State Department understand that to loan money and send materials to the Chiang Kai-shek Government of China would stop the Communists? Chiang is probably the richest potentate on the face of the globe and has presided over more starving millions than anyone in history.

Let us determine in what kind of soil communism grows. Does it grow and spread anywhere in the world where there is no hunger, distress, and suffering? No, it requires the soil of starvation and want. As long as we here in the United States or in the governments of any country keep this burden off the backs of the people, there will be no communism. If we preserve and enforce the guaranties of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights, there will be no flocking of the people to communism.

We have neglected our own people while we have been attempting to bring the four freedoms to all corners of the earth. Are we not now neglecting the aged of this country? Can we expect them to live on a $45 per month allowance in times of pyramided prices? They are suffering now—we are keeping them in distress. And, by the way, are we protecting our own people when we have half-starved and half-naked Indians tramping through the snow to hunt something to eat?

I do not say that we should not help starving people in other countries, but we should not pour out the billions for that purpose without a whimper while our own people are in want. Let us keep the United States sound and committed always to a people's government, where all the people shall have the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We should never allow conditions to develop here where want, suffering, and distress overtake the people. We should be too proud as a Nation—a Nation that has the opportunity to give hope to distressed people everywhere—to permit our aged people and our citizen Indians to beg for something to eat. Let us as Congressmen resolve right now that hungry Indians shall be fed and that the old pioneers of America shall not have to stand in a beggars' line.

In their last days, let the aged of America know that a great Government, one which they helped to build by their years of toil, is the kind of a government that does not forget them.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am very glad the gentleman has so early in this session brought this question before the House. I sincerely hope that many of us in the House will follow him and try to do something about this problem.

Mr. BURDICK. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 15 minutes.

LET US GET THE FORESTRY JOB DONE

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, just a year ago on December 11, 1947, in the Eightieth Congress, I made a speech entitled "Starting the Forestry Job Now." I quoted from a magazine article which stated that other countries were developing their forest resources on a huge scale. I urged as strongly as I knew how that we in this great Nation get started on an adequate program for the restoration and development of our own forest resources.

In the same Eightieth Congress, I and several of my distinguished colleagues, including Senator Russell, Senator Ellender, Congressmen Pickett of Texas, Allen of Louisiana, and Riley of South Carolina, introduced bills which would have given our Nation some of the stimulus needed to produce timber for war or peace, for soil and game conservation, and for flood-control problems.

Furthermore, in the Eightieth Congress some 124 Congressmen, a number of representative small-woodland owners, and many other interested persons appeared before congressional committees and pleaded for an adequate start now in building up our forest resources. Yet all of you know that but little resulted from the efforts for forestry in the Eightieth Congress.

In 1947 the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, headed by our distinguished former colleague, Representative Everett Dirksen, of Illinois, stated in its report:

> Farm and other private forestry cooperation. * * * This is another item which stands high in the esteem of the committee. It is carrying the work direct to the farm and is resulting in additional dollars in the farmer's pocket as well as improvement in the conservation of the soils of the farms.

Here is a great Republican leader speaking when the Republicans were in the majority and speaking in favor of a forestry item. But look at the record and you will find that nothing in the way of an expanded-action program was started. These wise words are just as significant today because forest-resource development—and, gentlemen, this is most important—forest-resource development is and must be a nonpartisan opportunity. And it is in this same nonpartisan spirit that I address you today.

The title I used last year—"Starting the Forestry Job Now"—is still appropriate and I use it again. This time, however, I shall emphasize two forestry items of outstanding importance—fire protection and tree planting.

As I said before, each year we delay makes the reconstruction of our forests more difficult and more costly. Another year has slipped past. During that year we suffered losses of tree growth through forest fires on 20,000,000 acres. The area needing planting was increased by probably several hundred thousand acres. The two items to which I give particular attention today—fire protection and planting—are both basic forestry measures. We must protect what we plant and we must plant areas where we have failed in our protection job.

I will not take your time in pointing out the absolute necessity of protecting and conserving our forest resources. I take it for granted that you appreciate how essential an adequate forest resource is to our peacetime economy and how vital it is in times of national emergencies. A few days ago President Truman, in his message on the state of the Union, stressed the need for putting all our forest lands on a sustained-yield basis.

Obviously adequate protection from fire is the first essential step in that direction.

The forest-fire-protection problem in this country centers mainly on privately owned forest lands. By and large, these privately owned lands are the more accessible and productive three-quarters of our total forest-land resource. The great bulk of our lumber and other wood products now and in the future must come from these areas. Largely as a result of Federal aid extended under the Clarke-McNary Act, we now have organized fire protection on 328,000,000 acres of these lands. But 111,000,000 acres—an area nearly four times as large as the State of Pennsylvania—is as yet without any form of organized forest-fire control. Most of these unprotected areas are in the Southeastern States; but, wherever they may be, it is on these unprotected forest lands that the greatest damages from uncontrolled fire occur.

As a Member of the Congress I must look at this problem from the standpoint of our entire country. But protection from forest fires does strike very close home with me. In my own State of Florida we have 21,500,000 acres of forest lands, two-thirds of which are urgently in need of organized forest-fire control but do not get it now mainly because of lack of funds. I hope I appreciate the need for economizing in public expenditures whenever and wherever it is prudent to do so, but I feel very strongly that to prevent, as far as possible, the needless destruction of essential natural resources is a sound public investment. I believe that failure to do so is false economy.

This Congress should increase the present authorization of section 3 of the Clarke-McNary Act in order that the Federal Government may meet its obligation to the States and complete the cooperative forest-fire-control program contemplated by that act. The present authorization of $9,000,000 is based on the low prewar costs of 1937. I am informed that to do a minimum country-wide fire-control job will now cost at least $40,000,000 a year. On a matching basis the Federal share would be $20,000,000 as compared to the current limitation of less than half that amount. The States and cooperating private landowners already are spending about $16,000,000 a year. They feel that the National Government is lagging behind in carrying its share of the load.

Now I want to talk briefly on tree planting. As I stated last year there are something like 75,000,000 acres of forest land so heavily cut, burned, or otherwise stripped of productive cover that they must be artificially replanted. At the rate we are doing this job now it would take several hundred years to replant this enormous acreage even if no additional lands are denuded. We cannot afford to wait so long.

Most of this land is privately owned. What can the Federal Government do to encourage tree planting on privately owned forest land? One of the easiest and most effective steps which can be taken is to provide low-cost planting stock to small landowners. This can be done very easily and very quickly simply by expanding the Federal-State forest tree nurseries now operating on a small scale under the authority of the Clarke-McNary and Norris-Doxey Acts.

During the war some of these nurseries were abandoned or plowed up and planted to food crops. As a result, in 1947 they produced only 42,000,000 trees. Since then, the States have been struggling to increase production but the supply of trees is still far short of the demand. For example, farm plans made by soil-conservation districts alone call for 490,000,000 trees more than are now available.

I emphasize again, because I cannot repeat too often, the tremendous size of this job and its vital importance to our Nation's peacetime welfare and wartime security. You will be shocked to learn, as I was shocked to learn, that the total Federal expenditures for this vital cooperative program amount to only $124,600 a year. The States spend in addition somewhat more than this but it should be clearly evident that separately or together the effort is ridiculously inadequate.

Let us not discourage ourselves or others with the fallacious belief that trees planted now will take so long to produce useful crops that they will not bear dividends in our lifetimes. We have many examples in my State and elsewhere which prove that the benefits of tree planting begin to show up in a relatively short period of time. Let me tell you a little story to illustrate this point.

When she was 56 years old in 1930, Mrs. A. M. E. Brown, of Columbia County, Fla., planted her first pine trees. The county agent suggested she try a tree crop and the forester from the State forester's office recommended slash pine, native to her farm. The pine seedlings were planted on a 42-acre field which had failed repeatedly when planted to the usual crops of cotton and corn. When the trees were 14 years old Mrs. Brown, then at the age of 70, had one-third of them cut for pulpwood. Receipts from the sale of pulpwood gave her a return of $900 over and above all costs. This forest is now ready for a second thinning and there will be even greater yields in years to come.

I think the significant part of this story is that although 56 years old Mrs. Brown had faith in the future. The 14 years required on her land to produce a tree crop was not discouraging to her. Fourteen years or 20 years or 40 years are all brief periods in the life of a nation. But a beginning must be made. If we want to get, within a reasonable time, the benefits of planted forests or of natural growth in the form of jobs, timber, flood control, soil and game conservation, windbreaks, and recreational opportunities we must start now.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 16 minutes, p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 25, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

90. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a copy of a proposed draft of legislation to authorize the disposition of certain lost, abandoned, or unclaimed personal property coming into the posession of the Treasury Department, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

91. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a copy of the notice of the withdrawal of his request for compliance from the Secretary of Commerce to the Maridon Manufacturing Co., Inc., of New York, under the voluntary plan for the allocation of steel products for warm-air heating equipment for residential housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

92. A letter from the Under Secretary of State transmitting certificates of final ascertainment of the electors of President and Vice President of the United States chosen in the respective States on November 2, 1948, copies of certificates from the States of Florida, New York, and Wisconsin received subsequently to formal transmittal dates of December 30, 1948 and January 6, 1949; to the Committee on House Administration.

93. A letter from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting a copy of the following final valuation of properties of this carrier subject to the act: Valuation Docket No. 1283—Shell Oil Co., Inc., Products Pipe Line Department; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

94. A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting a report under the date of November 8, 1948, that as of September 30, 1948, relief had been granted to one claimant, Clinton E. Smith and Douglas Corgey, doing business as the Corpus Christi Shipbuilding Corp., at Corpus Christi, Tex.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

95. A letter from the assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill relating to stowaways; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

96. A letter from the assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill relating to fees of witnesses and travel allowance of witnesses attending in United States courts or before United States commissioners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

97. A letter from the assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill relating to perjury; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

98. A letter from the assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill relating to mental-disease cases in the nearby Maryland and Virginia districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

99. A letter from the assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill relating to the transportation of obscene literature in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

100. A letter from the assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill relating to naturalization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

101. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill relating to the relief of certain consultants formerly employed by the Foreign Economic Administration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

102. A letter from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting the first annual report

of claims paid by the Department under the Tort Claims Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

103. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 21, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Charlevoix Harbor, Mich., with a view to constructing a breakwater, requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on May 10, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

104. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 22, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Shelldrake Harbor, Mich., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

105. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 5, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Salem River, Salem County, N. J., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

106. A letter from the assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

107. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize certain personnel and former personnel of the Naval Establishment to accept certain gifts and a foreign decoration tendered by foreign governments; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

108. A letter from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting the sixty-second annual report of the Interstate Commerce Commission to the Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 1703. A bill to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 1704. A bill to increase the compensation of new employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 1705. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Gulf coast and creating the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 1706. A bill to increase the salaries of judges of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 1707. A bill to provide for the promotion of moral, temperance, and character education; to provide for cooperation with the States in the promotion of such education; and to provide for cooperation with the States in preparation of teachers of moral, temperance, character, and good-citizenship subjects; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 1708. A bill to provide financial assistance to urban communities of the United States for the acquisition, assembly, revaluation, financing, and disposal of areas for urban redevelopment, and as a part of such redevelopment for the construction by local agencies in such areas, or elsewhere, of low-rent public-housing projects for families of low income; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 1709. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide limitations on the time within which actions may be brought for the recovery of undercharges and overcharges by or against common carriers by motor vehicle, common carriers by water, and freight forwarders; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1710. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1711. A bill to provide for the dissemination of technological, scientific, and engineering information to American business and industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 1712. A bill to amend section 2402 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and to repeal section 2402 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1713. A bill to provide for the deduction from gross income for income-tax purposes of expenses incurred by farmers for the purpose of soil and water conservation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 1714. A bill making the 14th day of August in each year a legal holiday, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1715. A bill to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 1716. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to permit an adopted child of a deceased individual to receive benefits thereunder without regard to the period during which he shall have occupied such status; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 1717. A bill to release reversionary rights of the United States to certain property in Stockton, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 1718. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Lake Arthur, La., a post office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1719. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Gulf coast and creating the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 1720. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain land in Missoula County, Mont., to the State of Montana for the use and benefit of Montana State University; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 1721. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the payment of prior construction costs of certain hospitals approved as projects under such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 1722. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide certain benefits for annuitants who retired prior to April 1, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1723. A bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to complete the requirements for the positive identification of yellow oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 1724. A bill to terminate certain wartime and other excise-tax rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 1725. A bill to amend the act of July 24, 1946, with respect to the multiple purpose plan of improvement for the Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1726. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the city of Hot Springs National Park, Ark., a perpetual easement for the construction and operation of a water-main pipe line; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER:

H. R. 1727. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1728. A bill to admit to the United States as nonquota immigrants certain displaced Polish citizens who have rendered service to the United States Army; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 1729. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of cerebral palsy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1730. A bill to require motor vehicles to be provided with suitable illuminated license plates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 1731. A bill to extend certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1732. A bill to amend the National Housing Act and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 1733. A bill relating to overpayments of the surtax on undistributed profits imposed by the Revenue Act of 1936; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1734. A bill to terminate the war-tax rates on certain miscellaneous excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1735. A bill to repeal the retailers' excise tax on luggage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 1736. A bill to promote the general welfare of the people of the United States by establishing a publicly supported labor extension program for wage and salary earners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 1737. A bill to amend the income limitation governing the granting of pension to veterans and death-pension benefits to widows and children of veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 1738. A bill to authorize the American River Basin development, California, for irrigation and reclamation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 1739. A bill to establish the Government Service University; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 1740. A bill to raise the minimum-wage standards of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 1741. A bill to authorize the establishment of a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 1742. A bill to provide for one national cemetery in every State and Territory and such other national cemeteries in the States, Territories, and possessions as may be needed for the burial of members of the armed forces of the United States dying in the service or former members whose last discharge therefrom was honorable, and certain other persons as provided for in title 24, section 281, United States Code, as amended; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. COLE of Kansas:

H. R. 1743. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1744. A bill to reimburse certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons of the Department of Justice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. R. 1745. A bill for the more economical operation of the general supply fund of the Bureau of Federal Supply, Department of the Treasury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 1746. A bill to provide that the United States shall aid the States in fish restoration and management projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 1747. A bill to repeal the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and to revive the National Labor Relations Act (the Wagner Act); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 1748. A bill to amend section 19 of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), so as to remove the upper age limit for appointment to commissioned grade in the Supply Corps of the Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FELLOWS:

H. R. 1749. A bill for the relief of the town of Mount Desert, Maine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 1750. A bill to amend section 2402 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and to repeal section 2402 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOLDEN:

H. R. 1751. A bill to provide for the transfer of certain educational benefits not used by veterans of World War II to the children of such veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1752. A bill to extend pension benefits under the laws reenacted by Public Law 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, August 13, 1935, as now or hereafter amended to certain persons who served with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, after July 4, 1902, and prior to January 1, 1914, and to their unremarried widows, child, or children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 1753. A bill to authorize the sale of certain Indian lands situated in Duchesne and Randlett, Utah, and in and adjacent to Myton, Utah; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1754. A bill providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 1755. A bill to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 1756. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the eightieth anniversary of the birth of Booth Tarkington; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 1757. A bill to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1758. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act approved June 21, 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H. R. 1759. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code with reference to the running of any statute of limitations applicable to any offense committed by an officer, agent, or employee of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 1760. A bill to authorize the expenditure of public funds for the assistance of State, municipal, and other nonprofit youth projects; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 1761. A bill to prevent retroactive checkage of payments erroneously made to certain retired officers of the Naval Reserve and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 1762. A bill to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. R. 1763. A bill to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act with reference to the general powers of Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 1764. A bill providing for the incorporation of the United American Veterans of the United States of America, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1765. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in furtherance of national safety against traffic and other accident hazards; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1766. A bill to provide Federal funds to assist the States in the acquisition and construction of plant facilities for public schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 1767. A bill to repeal the retailers' excise tax on toilet preparations and on luggage, purses, and similar articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 1768. A bill to provide price support for honey; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 1769. A bill to amend section 118 of Public Law 472 of the Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 1770. A bill to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 1771. A bill relating to loans by Federal agencies for the construction of certain public works; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1772. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1773. A bill to provide compensation for sheriffs or other law-enforcement officers who transport mentally incompetent veterans to a Veterans' Administration hospital or home; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1774. A bill to amend Public Law 289, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 1775. A bill providing for the insurance, by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, of membership share balances in Federal credit unions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 1776. A bill to deny apportionment of compensation, pension, or emergency officers' retirement in certain cases; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1777. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of the town of Watertown, Mass., for the loss of taxes on certain property in such town acquired by the United States for use for military purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SECREST:

H. R. 1778. A bill to incorporate the National Guard Auxiliary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 1779. A bill to provide for medical education assistance; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 1780. A bill to provide a correctional system for youth offenders convicted in the courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 1781. A bill to amend the Social Security Act with reference to deductions from old-age assistance payments to States based upon amounts recovered from the estates of deceased recipients; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. J. Res. 100. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. J. Res. 101. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to take action to relieve distress among persons and animals isolated by storms which have created an emergency; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. J. Res. 102. Joint resolution to authorize funds to start construction of flood walls on the Susquehanna River in the Endicott-Vestal-Johnson City, N. Y., area; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. J. Res. 103. Joint resolution designating the week of February 14 in each year as National Heart Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 104. Joint resolution to provide for a national theater and a national opera and ballet; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. J. Res. 105. Joint resolution designating the week of February 14 in each year as National Heart Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. J. Res. 106. Joint resolution designating the week of February 14 in each year as National Heart Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 59. Resolution providing for compensation for one special messenger for the House Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact a bill to aid the State in the enforcement of the cigarette tax now evaded by use of the United States mails; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER:

H. R. 1782. A bill for the relief of the estate of Elwood Grissinger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 1783. A bill for the relief of Mickey Baine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 1784. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Frances B. Bynum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1785. A bill for the relief of Loul Usry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 1786. A bill for the relief of Gabriele Gildo Falbo Citrigno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1787. A bill for the relief of Serafim Antonio Furtado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 1788. A bill for the relief of Edward Kimoktoak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1789. A bill for the relief of the Shelby Shoe Co., of Salem, Mass.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 1790. A bill to restore certain land in Alaska to the public domain and to authorize its sale to Ford J. Dale, of Fairbanks, Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 1791. A bill for the relief of Raleigh B. Diamond; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHATHAM:

H. R. 1792. A bill for the relief of Charles E. Ader; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 1793. A bill to authorize the advance on the retired list of Lt. John T. McDermott, United States Navy (retired), to the grade of Lieutenant Commander; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 1794. A bill for the relief of Cohen, Goldman & Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1795. A bill for the relief of Lewyt Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1796. A bill for the relief of Robert Turell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H. R. 1797. A bill for the relief of Constance Jenkins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 1798. A bill for the relief of Giles Kavanagh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 1799. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jacob Ornstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 1800. A bill for the relief of Howard E. Giroux; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1801. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sylvia Laquidara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 1802. A bill for the relief of Walter Wettschreck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 1803. A bill to permit John E. Harris to prosecute claims against the United States, notwithstanding section 190 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 1804. A bill for the relief of Charles Kokinos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 1805. A bill for the relief of Edward J. Lank; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 1806. A bill for the relief of Dr. Oskar Klinger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1807. A bill for the relief of Zoltan Maholanyi and Katalin Moscovics Maholanyi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1808. A bill for the relief of Miklos Felkai, Magdalena Eichenbaum Felkai, and Julia Agnes Felkai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1809. A bill for the relief of Steven Kaiman Tordai, Maria Margaret Tordai, and Janos Steven Tordai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1810. A bill for the relief of Eugene Nemes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 1811. A bill for the relief of Rosario Varacalli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 1812. A bill for the relief of 84 Estonians who crossed the Atlantic in two small sloops and sought admission to the United States without documents or other evidence entitling them to admission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1813. A bill for the relief of Edward Woolf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 1814. A bill for the relief of Caroline M. Newmark and Melville Moritz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER:

H. R. 1815. A bill for the relief of Zina Della Mura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1816. A bill for the relief of Ernesto Smimmo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1817. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rose A. Mongrain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 1818. A bill for the relief of Howard S. Lawson; Winifred G. Lawson, his wife; Walter P. Lawson; and Nita R. Lawson, his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

13. By Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER: Resolution adopted by the Assembly of the State of New York in protest against the arrest and imprisonment of His Eminence Josef Cardinal Mindszenty by the Communist government of Hungary; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

14. Also, petition of Albert J. Zak, city clerk, Hamtramck, Mich., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to the General Pulaski Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

15. Also, petition of Charles C. Swanson, city clerk, Minneapolis, Minn., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to the General Pulaski Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

16. By Mr. WELCH: Assembly Joint Resolution 4 of the California Legislature, relative to shipbuilding on the Pacific coast; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

17. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Juan B. Garcia, president of the International Longshoremens' Association, local No. 1740, San Juan, P. R., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to extending to Puerto Rico the Fair Labor Standards Act and social-security legislation in equal condition as to the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 25, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Harold W. Peterson, of Melvin, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, creator of all men, we meet today as free men in a world besieged by numberless fears and overtaken by hesitancy that is born of perplexity.

In the knowledge of the fact of our freedom, we thank Thee for the unlimited power man has succeeded in exerting for good when he has worked for Thee as in Thy sight.

Bless us with wisdom, courage, and a lively sense of conscience as we freely labor, that we may find blessing for ourselves and all mankind.

We pray for Thy presence in this place and for Thy continued guidance of our people, that peace may come through our efforts, and that a spirit of good will may be the heritage we leave for those who shall follow us. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

OUR FOREIGN POLICY IN CONNECTION WITH CHINA

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, over this week end we have learned the extent of the disaster that has befallen China and the United States. The responsibility for the failure of our foreign policy in the Far East rests squarely with the White House and the Department of State.

The continued insistence that aid would not be forthcoming, unless a coalition government with the Communists

was formed, was a crippling blow to the National Government.

So concerned were our diplomats and their advisers, the Lattimores and the Fairbanks, with the imperfection of the democratic system in China after 20 years of war and the tales of corruption in high places that they lost sight of our tremendous stake in a non-Communist China.

Our policy, in the words of the Premier of the National Government, Sun Fo, of vacillation, uncertainty, and confusion has reaped the whirlwind.

This House must now assume the responsibility of preventing the onrushing tide of communism from engulfing all of Asia.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include an interesting item appearing in a Lynn paper; secondly, an address by a very revcrend clergyman; and, third, an editorial appearing in the Washington Evening Star.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and include certain statements and excerpts.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, after the regular order of business, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

HIGHER EDUCATION FOR HIGH-SCHOOL STUDENTS

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Members of the Congress to legislation I am preparing in connection with a plan that I am outlining in detail in extending my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

It should be of interest to any Members who are concerned with enabling qualified high-school students to complete a higher education when they are financially unable to do so. I do not want to take the time of the Members today to outline the plan in detail, but I do wish to call attention to it so that those who are interested may read about it in the Appendix tomorrow.

The plan is intended to enable approximately 5,000 high-school students a year to have a complete 4-year college course; and approximately 500 college students a year a complete 4-year postgraduate course at no actual cost to the Federal Government. It is open only to students who want to continue their education but are financially unable to pay for higher education. The Federal Government makes the plan possible but at no actual cost to the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD to outline the plan in detail and to include therein a chart of figures.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. RIVERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter to the Department of the Army on the progress of graves registration in Europe.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two separate subjects.

Mr. HERLONG asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial entitled "Florida Likes Margarine," which appeared in the Orlando Morning Sentinel of January 23.

REREFERENCE OF BILL

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, by inadvertence the bill (H. R. 1551) to authorize the making of grants and loans to the States to assist in providing adequate public elementary- and secondary-school facilities was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A similar bill in the last session was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. I understand a bill substantially similar was referred to that committee in this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be discharged from the further consideration of the bill H. R. 1551 and that the bill be rereferred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, with reference to what the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOMERS] has just said, permit me to state a few facts which I think will clarify the remarks of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER], another member of the Public Lands Committee.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] said yesterday:

It has come to my attention that the Democratic leadership in the House is violating not only the word but the spirit of the law.

He laments the fact that the committee passed a resolution authorizing the chairman of the committee and the chairmen of the respective subcommittees to employ the clerks and other personnel of the committee. I wish to call to the attention of the House the fact that a similar resolution was passed under the chairmanship of the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH]. It reads as follows:

The chairman presented the name of Ernest A. Grant to be clerk of the committee and asked authority of the committee to appoint him and to fill the remaining positions of the clerical staff with such persons and at such times as he deemed advisable. Upon motion of Mr. ENGLE, seconded by Mr. MURDOCK, unanimous approval of the committee was given.

By virtue of this resolution the following were added:

1. Mr. Reeve.
2. Mrs. Arnold.
3. Mrs. O'Brien.
4. Mr. Regan.
5. Mrs. Curtiss.
6. Mr. Soule.

These appointments were without any knowledge or further consent on the part of any member of the committee so far as I know. That authority was delegated to the chairman and we were happy for him to exercise it.

I can tell you that up to this date there has been only one member of the committee personnel who was not employed by the chairman who preceded me. That was Mr. Grant and it was not for any reason I was advised of but for reasons satisfactory to the chairman. All the members and clerks of the Public Lands Committee, regardless of their political affiliation—I can say all but one was a Republican—were employed by the chairman and members of the subcommittee who had been delegated this authority, if they were with the committee when it was organized.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] says that the phrase should be replaced by the words "only for deserving Democrats." He intends to say that the chairman of the committee is only employing deserving Democrats. I can say to you that he has retained all of the Republicans except one and I hope that we may find a deserving Democrat a job or two on this committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HÉBERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mr. David Lawrence.

COMMUNISM IN AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute and to salute the president of a great American university, the president of one of our great State universities on the far-West coast,

the University of Washington. The president of the University of Washington and his board of trustees as well as those individuals responsible for accepting the challenge of communism in our institutions in this country by firing three professors, who are purported to have been members of the Communist Party, are to be congratulated.

I hope that the president of the University of Washington and the university itself have set the beacon light upon the highways of this country to pursue further the intrigues and the infiltration of communism into the universities of America.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Committee on Un-American Activities will take due cognizance of this action in the far West and proceed immediately to ferret out and find out to what extent our boys and girls are being led down the path of communism in this country by educators who are supposed to protect our American way of life.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOEVEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a brief report of my European trip.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject of volunteer fire associations.

Mr. BREHM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by one of his constituents.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mr. Marshall Andrews appearing in the Washington Post of last Sunday.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article.

TEN THINGS YOU CANNOT DO

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, certain that it never comes amiss for us to refresh our memories and perhaps clarify our thinking by recalling words once spoken by such men as Abraham Lincoln, may I read a few lines:

1. You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift.

2. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong.

3. You cannot help strong men by tearing down big men.

4. You cannot help the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer.

5. You cannot further the brotherhood of man by encouraging class hatred.

6. You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich.

7. You cannot ertablish sound security on borrowed money.

8. You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than you earn.

9. You cannot build character and courage by taking away man's initiative and independence.

10. You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JACKSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL (at the request of Mr. JENNINGS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a poem.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram from the Governor of Nebraska.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include the inaugural address by His Excellency the Governor of the State of Connecticut, Chester Bowles. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $243.50, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE PERSONNEL

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOMERS] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. REDDEN] seem to be disturbed about my attack yesterday on methods being employed in the committee for appointment of professional and clerical personnel. If the Members of the House will refer to page 515 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD they will find that I merely cited the provisions of the reorganization bill which requires that—

Each standing committee of the Senate and House of Representatives is authorized to appoint, by majority vote of the committee, not more than four professional staff members, in addition to the clerical staff, on a permanent basis without regard to political affiliation and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the office—professional staff members shall not engage in any work other than committee business and no other duties may be assigned to them.

The Public Lands Committee on January 24 passed a resolution permitting the chairman and the subcommittee chairmen to hire the professional and clerical staff without the approval of the full committee. I maintain that this is a violation of the Reorganization Act which was passed by the Seventy-ninth Congress. I defy any Member on the majority side of this House to justify a resolution which bypasses the full committee.

I think the gentleman from New York is a little sensitive because he comes from Brooklyn, and under the seniority rule, he is to be chairman of the Public Lands Committee which deals with problems of irrigation, reclamation, public lands, mines and mining, Indian affairs, and Territories. He has, under the rules of the House, a perfect right to this chairmanship. The gentleman from New York, if my memory serves me right, attended but one meeting of the full committee during the last 2 years, and yet he is to be chairman of the same committee during the Eighty-first Congress. I cannot believe that he will fully understand many of the complicated problems of the Western States which come before the full committee. I am also apprehensive that unless the full committee has the right to pass upon the professional and clerical staff that individuals from the East who have no knowledge of the problems of the West will be serving as supposed experts.

I shall watch with a great deal of interest the individuals selected as our experts. I hope I have no further occasion to call your attention to the provisions of the Reorganization Act that are apparently to be disregarded.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next. There will be no business on Thursday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SNOWSTORM DAMAGE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] will place in the RECORD a telegram from the Governor of Nebraska. It relates to the damage being suffered by reason of the snowstorm. It will point out that in many places the snow is measuring on the level from 40 to 60 inches in depth. A continuous series of high winds and blizzards extending over several weeks have caused intense human suffering, loss of life and loss of property, and perhaps the livestock losses will run one-half of the total. It will further point out that the local communities are stretching themselves to the utmost degree to render adequate aid to remove

the snow and relieve the suffering. All the agencies of the Federal Government are desperately needed in the storm territory, and needed now.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that every Federal agency extend to the stricken areas all possible aid. I shall support every measure that may bring help.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to make the announcement that the Committee on Education and Labor will meet in full committee tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock on the matter of reorganization.

I also wish to announce that we are ready to go ahead with the minimum-wage bill. I shall also put up to the committee tomorrow the matter of the pressure for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and the reinstatement of the Wagner Act. These matters will be discussed within the committee tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House providing there are not matters on the floor during whose consideration the Speaker will not permit us to sit; in other words, that the committee may sit when the House is not in session in the afternoons or when there is general debate on the floor.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman asking for this right for 1 day, or for 1 week, or is he asking for it indefinitely during the session?

Mr. LESINSKI. I should like to have it indefinitely during the session, so we can go ahead with a few other bills we want to report out.

The SPEAKER. The Chair stated to the gentleman from Michigan that he would not recognize him to request permission for the committee to sit during any time that a bill was being read for amendment. Under the gentleman's speakership, committees have been allowed to sit when the House was considering bills in general debate, but the Chair will not recognize anyone to request permission for a committee to sit while the House is reading a bill for amendment. I think that is the policy the gentleman from Massachusetts has followed.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. May I inquire if this is to be a precedent for the year? I do not know that in the past we ever gave such a consent for the whole session. We have given it from week to week, and I would not object to that, but I do want to know if this is to be a precedent so that any committee could get this permission covering an entire session.

The SPEAKER. The Chair simply puts the request. The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means yesterday received that permission for the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Committee on Appropriations also has it. The question is whether or not the House wants to grant this privilege to other committees.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does the distinguished gentleman who occupies the Chair think we should give this privilege to all the committees, or should we do as we have in the past?

The SPEAKER. The only thing the present occupant of the chair is charged with now is putting the request.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LESINSKI. During the last session of the Eightieth Congress we sat in the afternoons for 2 or 3 or 4 weeks.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is quite true.

Mr. LESINSKI. We should like the same opportunity now, so we may go ahead with our legislation.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If I may make my position clear, I am not objecting to expediting business, I am trying to maintain the integrity of the rules and procedure of the House. I have no objection to the gentleman's getting permission for his committee to sit next week or the week after, but I do think we ought to keep within the jurisdiction of the House the procedure; that is all. That is the reason I am making this inquiry, to see if the Speaker of the House is going to join in maintaining the rules as in the past.

The SPEAKER. The present occupant of the chair has been diligent for over 36 years in maintaining the procedure of the House.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I appreciate that fact. For that reason, I wanted to call his attention to what was going on.

The SPEAKER. The Chair never knows at all times what unanimous-consent request a gentleman is going to submit. The Chair would not want to enter an objection to a unanimous-consent request when there were many Members on either side of the House listening to the request, and has done so only once.

Mr. RANKIN. If we are going to retain the rules and procedures of the House of Representatives, I am of the opinion that no committee should be given the right to sit during the sessions of the House for more than 1 week at a time. If the gentleman will confine his request to the balance of this week, I will not object; but I am not going to agree that any committee from now on shall sit during the sessions of the House for the rest of the session, unless that permission is granted to all committees.

If the gentleman from Michigan wants to amend his request to cover this week only, that will be all right. And next week he can ask for that permission again.

Mr. LESINSKI. This is only a question of 1 day, then.

Mr. RANKIN. It is more than 1 day.

Mr. LESINSKI. I would not like to make the request for 1 day only. I amend my request then to cover the balance of this week and to include the following week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is perfectly agreeable to me.

Mr. RANKIN. I will not object to that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the modified request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI]?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 45) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 1, 1949, until otherwise provided by law, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives compensation, to be paid monthly, to three messengers to the Committee on Ways and Means to be appointed by the chairman thereof, as follows:

One messenger at a basic salary of $1,500 per annum;

One messenger at a basic salary of $1,620 per annum;

One messenger (Harry Parker) at the rate of $1,560 per annum; but the authority contained herein for the last-named position of messenger shall terminate whenever a vacancy occurs therein after the first appointment.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BEATRICE KELLY

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 23) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Beatrice Kelly, widow of John Joseph Kelly, late an employee of the House of Representatives, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death, and an additional amount not to exceed $250 toward defraying the funeral expenses of said John Joseph Kelly.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANCES HANCOCK

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 42) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Frances Hancock, widow of A. C. Hancock, late an employee of the House of Representatives, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death and an additional amount not to exceed $250 toward defraying the funeral expenses of said A. C. Hancock.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill

(H. R. 1252) to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, with respect to the eligibility for appointment in the executive branch of government of former professional staff members of committees of the Senate and House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], who is author of the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, may we have the bill read? We would like to know what is in it

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the bill will be read.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 202 (g) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (prohibiting the employment in the executive branch of the Government of any former professional staff member of a committee of the Senate or the House of Representatives for a period of 1 year after he ceases to be such a member), is hereby repealed.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H. R. 1252 in order that this Congress may do justice to some of the fine young men who are expected to remain as career men on the professional staffs of committees.

It so happened that quite a number of these fine young men, some from the executive departments downtown and some from outside the District of Columbia, came here with the expectation of being career men, but as the administration has changed there seems to have been a change of heart on the part of some of the committees with reference to their professional people, and under subtitle (h), now that they are off these committees as professional men or career men, they cannot go back to a position in the executive departments for 1 year. Some of them have gone out to industry looking for jobs. I know some who have gone to Philadelphia and some who have gone to New York. They tell their story to industry, but the heads of industry are not too familiar with political situations such as this and they say, "Well, your story sounds well but, after all, there must have been some reason why they let you go," indicating that they thought the career men were relieved of their position because of inefficiency or that there was something wrong with their character.

Some of these boys have come back very discouraged. Some of them could be taken back into the executive departments downtown were it not for the provision (h) of section 202 of the Reorganization Act. They have families; they have children; and it has worked out as a most unjust provision of the act.

I have consulted with the Speaker and with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], the majority leader, and the leaders on this side, and as far as possible among other Members, and I have yet to find any objection to this resolution. I hope it will be passed unanimously.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say I can see no objection whatever to it.

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I might say to the gentleman from New York that one of the principal purposes of this section which the gentleman is now seeking to repeal was to prevent the professional staffs of the committees of Congress from being offered jobs by the executive departments downtown. We have not yet succeeded in creating a career service for the congressional staffs, unfortunately. Therefore, there will probably be a year or 2 years or 3 years in which we will go through a period of trial and error and experimentation. Many of the men who had a lifetime of service downtown, who were trained in these committee jobs, will in the present change be suffering a great handicap economically. I certainly think at this time it would be wise to permit the repeal of this section and then if the legislative staffs are threatened by jobs offered by executive departments, I am sure that Congress will reenact this section if that threat occurs.

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I may say that the committee of which the distinguished gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON] is chairman felt that this legislation should be passed at an early date because of the fact that there are a number of persons who are apparently going to be out of employment and are not going to be able to go back to the departments from which they were drawn for professional services. We thought this legislation was important.

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the gentleman very much.

I wish to take this occasion to thank the lady from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON] for her fine cooperation and the promptness with which this bill was reported out by her committee.

Mrs. NORTON. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDRESS BY HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], a very outstanding Member of this body, has 20 minutes reserved today to discuss the rules of the House. His discussion will be completely nonpartisan. I want to make this announcement and urge the membership to remain upon the floor and hear the gentleman from Michigan, particularly those who have recently joined us, because I think I am safe in assuring them that they will find very profitable what the gentleman from Michigan has to say.

COMMUNISM IN UNIVERSITY FACULTIES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to add my voice to the statement made by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] congratulating the president of the University of Washington for beginning a house cleaning—getting Communists out of the faculty of that great institution. That house cleaning is long overdue, not only in the University of Washington, but in many other of the leading universities and colleges throughout the country.

You have heard all this criticism of the Committee on Un-American Activities. A great deal of it has come from these subsidized professors such as Harlow Shapley, of Harvard, who belongs or did belong to a half dozen or dozen Communist-front organizations.

I see where they have organized a Communist cell in the student body of the University of North Carolina. It may be going on in my State, but I want to tell you now that one of our gravest menaces is this attempt to poison the minds of the youth of this Nation, using everything from the crossword puzzles to motion pictures, from the radio to the local press, anything into which they can get their insidious propaganda. They are using every effort to poison the minds of the youth of this Nation, to undermine and wreck this Government and to destroy the American way of life.

I congratulate the University of Washington on its efforts to clean these Communists out of its faculty and help to save America for Americans.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE of Idaho asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ELSTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from the Cincinnati Times-Star of January 14.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JONES of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 20 minutes.

ORDER IN THE HOUSE

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, in that matchless volume of Hebrew literature, the Bible, the following passage appears:

Set thine house in order. (Isaiah 38: 1.)

When our constituents come to Washington to visit their Nation's Capital, it is almost certain that they will visit this Capitol Building. Their presence is noticed daily when they occupy these balconies, especially when Congress is in session.

I doubt if there is a Member in this body, who has served any length of time, who has not heard with chagrin and embarrassment the unfavorable comment and harsh criticism leveled at our lack of dignity and decorum in this historic Chamber.

Information from officials of the House indicates that hardly a week passes without complaints regarding our habits and conduct on the floor.

Here in the House of Representatives the people speak and here their voice is heard. This is their forum, established by our forefathers. From them come the noble and distinct character of American institutions.

The very walls of this Chamber echo with the voices of our great and our past. It is rich in the traditions of our Nation. Many whose names adorn the pages of history labored in this room to serve the cause of freedom and self-government. They were the torch bearers of humanity's forward march.

May God help us to preserve their influence and labors by reverence for this notable place and forbid that we should ever be irreverent toward it and the memory of those who made our day possible.

Our position as Members of Congress is one of great responsibility. If a proper attitude and proper conduct toward the position to which we have been elevated is wanting, we deface and impoverish our position in the eyes of those who pass this way.

Whether in the game of life or in a game of football, infraction of the rules brings punishment and penalty. The penalty we pay individually and collectively is the loss of respect, the loss of prestige, the loss of faith and confidence, and a gradual breaking down of self-government by a free people.

This House of Representatives is governed by rules, some as old as the Government itself. They were designed to govern the conduct of Members on this floor and the orderly procedure of our legislative work.

Not one of us here is entirely blameless for breaking the rules of the House. In a thoughtless moment, and unconsciously, we all have broken the written and long-established code of conduct for this floor. Many of the older Members, knowingly, and many of the newer Members, unknowingly, because of unfamiliarity with the rules, have allowed certain habits to violate the proprieties of this body.

For the benefit of the many new Members, and to refresh the memories of the older Members, including myself, the observations I am about to make are confined solely to the rules governing our conduct on this floor. My remarks are wholly impersonal and are not intended as a scolding of any Member individually or of the House collectively.

I now come to the rules violated daily in this forum. How should a Member address our Presiding Officer? At public gatherings throughout the country it is customary and in good taste to say, "Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen," and so forth. In this Hall such a salutation is improper and a distinct breach of the rule. The rule requires a Member to address himself to "Mr. Speaker" or, if the House is in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, to "Mr. Chairman." To add more is a slight upon the Speaker who represents the House in its organization. When we address the Chair, we address the entire membership of the House.

It is a violation of precedent, and bad form, to conclude an address by adding the words, "I thank you." There is no necessity for any Member to thank anyone. We speak as a matter of right.

Express provision is made for the manner in which a Member may address the House. Rule XIV, clause 1, reads:

When any Member desires to speak or deliver any matter to the House, he shall rise and respectfully address himself to "Mr. Speaker," and, on being recognized, may address the House from any place on the floor, or from the Clerk's desk.

Committees of the House should not be designated as: "The Rules Committee," "the Appropriations Committee," and so forth. The proper way to designate any committee of the House is to say: "The Committee on Rules," "the Committee on Appropriations," and so forth.

Another rule violated daily is rule XIV, clause 7, which provides:

While the Speaker is putting a question or addressing the House no Member shall walk out of or across the hall, nor, when a Member is speaking, pass between him and the Chair.

It has become a custom for Members to walk in front of a Member while he is addressing the House from the lecterns here in the well of the House. Such practices are a violation of a long-established rule of this body and are a contributing cause to the confusion and distraction evidenced on this floor from day to day. To walk in front of a Member who is speaking is objectionable and discourteous.

Another part of clause 7, rule XIV, grossly violated by many Members, reads as follows:

During the session of the House no Member * * * shall smoke upon the floor of the House; and the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper are charged with the strict enforcement of this clause. Neither shall any person be allowed to smoke upon the floor of the House at any time.

What constitutes the floor of the House? The space behind the rail is the floor of the House as much as the space in front of the Speaker's rostrum. Smoking behind the rail is smoking on the floor of the House and equally an infraction of the rule; it is most obnoxious to our visitors in the galleries. Walking into the Chamber with a cigar or pipe held in the mouth, whether lighted or not, is an invitation for caustic criticism and disparaging remarks on the part of the public who come to visit our sessions.

A practice as defenseless as it is objectionable is the habit of placing one's feet against or on top of the seat in front of one. This habit, a clear and distinct breach of the rules of decorum of this House, is most noticeable from the galleries and draws the sharpest criticism and adverse comment from those who come to visit this legislative body in action.

Reading newspapers on this floor when the House is in session may not fall within the text of any definite rule, but such a habit conveys to the public, and to the Members of the House, an impression of the want of interest, indifference to legislative duty, and failure of attention to the matter under discussion on the floor.

A practice that has grown to be a habit is that of referring to a Member in the second person as "you" or "your." Some distinguished Members, with long service here, have designated their colleagues by their given names, such as "John" and "Jim." We all know better. These are plain violations of ordinary parliamentary procedure. Each one of us can make his contribution in preserving dignity and orderly conduct during our sessions by observing and obeying the rules of the House. The proper way to address a colleague is "the gentleman or gentlewoman from Maine," or whichever State the Member represents.

Dignity and decorum commensurate with the greatness of this body, and the power we possess, should prevail at all times in the discharge of our duty to the Nation. These matters may seem small, unimportant, and of no serious consequence in themselves, but upon the whole they are destructive of the respect and confidence of the people. Let every Member constitute himself a committee of one to see to it that the rules are respected and obeyed.

By reason of our membership here, each Member is clothed with tremendous power over the lives and destiny of a mighty people. With that power goes a corresponding responsibility to discharge the trust reposed in us by the people. Every word we speak, every decision we render, is weighed with the position we hold. The confidence and faith of the

people in the legislative branch of their Government must be preserved if the Republic of the United States is to survive. May we be worthy of the high honor conferred upon us as Members of Congress by discharging our responsibility to the Nation with that dignity and decorum which the people have a right to expect from us.

May the visitor to these galleries observe in us a genuine respect for this House of Commons of the American people, and leave with greater love for our Republic and greater pride in his American citizenship.

Holy Scripture again reminds us:

Let all things be done decently and in order. (I Corinthians 14: 40.)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one an editorial letter and in the other a magazine article.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor indicated that there would be hearings held by that committee this week, I presume on the wage-hour law. I understand, however, that the question of the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act is coming up very soon. So that we may be advised as to the reasons for repeal, I ask those who are asking for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act to some time, either from the well of the House or by extension of remarks in the RECORD, point specifically to those provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act which they think are wrong.

I am familiar with the general broad statement that it is a slave-labor bill, but if there are provisions of the act to which there is specific objection I should like to know what they are.

I am moved to make this request because of what was said in a debate last night and on previous occasions when I have heard the attorneys for the CIO condemn the act as a whole. But when specific questions are put to them as, for example, last night I heard a former member of the Committee on Labor endorse, as I remember, six or seven provisions of that act. So I make this request sincerely and, in all kindness, so that those of us who expect to vote to continue that act may have the objections and we may change our minds and go along with the administration, which is now demanding the complete repeal of the act, if the reasons given are sound.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER] is recognized

OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk to you for a few minutes, perhaps not the whole 15, regarding the proposed repeal of all taxes on margarine that is colored yellow.

I do not come before you this evening with theories, I come before you with first-hand information. All my life I have been a farmer. I began milking cows when I was 10 years old, and that was 50 years ago. I have milked cows with my hands since the vote was counted the 2d day of November in the year 1948. I am not only not ashamed of that fact, I am proud of it.

All my life I have been helping to produce the beef, the pork, the milk, the eggs, and the wheat that has helped to make this Nation great, that has helped us to win the wars in which we have engaged, not because we wish strife, because we never did, but because those wars were thrust upon us. Through two wars I have been asked by my Government to expand and increase the production of food on my farm.

I have always heeded that call to the very best of my ability. I am proud of that fact. I stand before you this afternoon representing the greatest agricultural district in the State of Missouri, if not the greatest agricultural district in the Nation—a place where we practice diversified farming, a place where we trust the dairy cow to help us with our soil-conservation measures, where we trust the dairy cow to help us to keep our hills and our sloping land tied down in grass so that the remainder of our soil fertility will not drift down the Mississippi River out into the Gulf of Mexico. Recently I drove an automobile from Butler, Mo., to St. Louis, Vincennes, Ind., Louisville, Ky., Parkersburg, W. Va., and on to Washington, D. C. I watched as I drove along. I saw thousands of fields with 70 percent to 90 percent of their topsoil gone. There were rows of corn stubs up and down the slopes, and tobacco stubs. The slopes would run as high as 20 percent. There were little piles of corn fodder by the barns and little stacks of broom sage stacked up around a pole, about 1 ton in a place, that no animal in the world would eat except to keep life in its body. There was no alfalfa. There was no red clover. There was no sweetclover. There were no terraces. I will tell you gentlemen without fear of contradiction that the destruction of the topsoil in the United States of America is a greater menace to our Nation today than communism or Russia or anything else; and unless we conserve our soil, this Nation is headed for destruction, war or no war.

Our topsoil is now half gone. In the interests of soil conservation, I want to see the dairy cow and the dairy farmer protected. It has been thrown in my face since I have come to Washington that I am dominated by the dairy lobby. I have no first-hand information as to what a dairy lobbyist looks like. Up to this minute I have never seen one, and neither have I seen a lobbyist for the margarine industry. As far as I know, there are none of them. But I do represent my dairy farmers, and I am irrevocably opposed to oleomargarine being sold in the markets of the United States colored yellow. What is yellow margarine? It is imitation butter. Whoever saw an imitation of anything as good as the thing it sought to imitate? I never have.

I am ready to vote for the repeal of all taxes on oleomargarine, if they will color it red, or color it green, or color it purple, or leave it white. But I do think that if the American dairy farmer does not have a copyright on the yellow color that God and nature gave to butter, then he ought to have that copyright.

How many of you gentlemen ever stepped out of your door some morning in a 40-mile wind full of ice, when the thermometer registered 10 below zero, and made your way to an unheated barn and milked 25 cows? I have done it many a time—not 1 day a week, not 5 days a week, but 7 days a week, 365 days in the year. No 5-day week for the dairy farmer; no 8-hour day. The milk truck calls at my place at 6:30 in the morning. My boys are out there now with snow a foot deep in zero temperature, starting to milk at 5 o'clock in the morning. How would you like it? There is no theory about this. You milk twice a day. Christmas Day, Washington's Birthday, Fourth of July, Sunday. There is no dairy farmer who does not milk every day. I do not want to see a synthetic imitation butter ruin and destroy our market.

I realize that perhaps there are people whose incomes are so low that it may be necessary for them to eat oleomargarine instead of butter. But I do not want them to be deceived by the yellow color into thinking they are buying and eating butter.

There is another thing I want to talk about for a minute. Occasionally I meet a man who says, "Oh, it doesn't make any difference. You sell your whole milk." I am not selling butter. Our milk goes to Kansas City. Let me tell you what the Federal Market Administrator bases the price of milk on in the Kansas City area. He bases it on the market price of 92-score butter in Chicago. Anything that ruins the price of the 92-score butter in Chicago ruins the price of my milk in Kansas City.

I live a hard life, and my boys and my neighbors, to keep our part of the country in beef and butter and milk and cheese. I and my neighbors are entitled to the protection of the yellow color that God gave to butter.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution calling for the investigation of the handpicking of juries in the United States District Court, Southern District of New York.

I shall press my resolution. I am confident that I shall obtain a hearing on it. The brazen admission by Judge Knox, of the United States District Court, Southern District of New York, that he is responsible for the hand-picking of juries is a challenge to the American people and cannot be ignored. This corruption of our jury system warrants a thorough investigation and the removal of those responsible for it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMATHERS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech by Senator KEFAUVER.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, January 27, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

109. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to extend to commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey the provisions of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

110. A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting a report covering the contracts negotiated by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics during the period July 1 to December 31, 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

111. A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting a report relative to the adjudication of certain claims resulting from the evacuation of certain persons of Japanese ancestry under military orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

112. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for fiscal years 1949 and 1950 in the amount of $37,937.52 and $125,115, respectively (H. Doc. No. 40); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

113. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 in the amount of $480,702,340, together with certain proposed provisions and increases in limitations pertaining to existing appropriation (H. Doc. No. 44); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 45. A resolution providing for compensation for three special messengers for the House Ways and Means Committee, effective January 1, 1949; without amendment (Rept. No. 2). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. H. R. 1252. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 with respect to eligibility for appointment in the executive branch of the Government of former professional staff members of committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 5). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 23. A resolution for the relief of Beatrice Kelly; without amendment (Rept. No. 3). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 42. A resolution providing for the payment of 6 months' gratuity and $250 funeral expenses to Mrs. Frances Hancock, widow of A. C. Hancock, late an employee of the House; without amendment (Rept. No. 4). Referred to the House Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, the Committee on Banking and Currency was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1551) to authorize the making of grants and loans to the States to assist in providing adequate public elementary- and secondary-school facilities, and the same was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 1819. A bill to amend the act creating the Federal Trade Commisison, to define its powers and duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 1820. A bill to grant increased retired pay to certain disabled enlisted men of the Regular Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BARING:

H. R. 1821. A bill to authorize the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Reclamation, and other agencies of the Government, to break through snow-bound areas in the western range States, and to take other necessary actions to move supplemental feed and otherwise care for livestock isolated by storms which have created an emergency; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 1822. A bill to allow a deduction, for income-tax purposes, of contributions or gifts to volunteer fire companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 1823. A bill to amend the act of February 19, 1941, as amended, so as to establish a Women's Reserve as a branch of the Coast Guard Reserve; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 1824. A bill to amend the act of July 23, 1947 (61 Stat. 409); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 1825. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Gulf coast and creating the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 1826. A bill to authorize the appointment of four additional district judges for the southern district of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 1827. A bill to clarify and formulate a consistent and coordinated national policy with respect to transportation costs in interstate commerce, to strengthen the antitrust laws of the United States and to provide for their more effective enforcement, and to promote competition by permitting sellers to have access to distant markets; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 1828. A bill to incorporate the Army and Navy Union; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 1829. A bill to provide that pianos shall not be subject to the excise tax on musical instruments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 1830. A bill to amend the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 1831. A bill to provide for a simplified manner of authenticating records of any public office of any State, Territory, or possession of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1832. A bill to provide that the tax on the transportation of persons shall not apply to transportation on boats for fishing purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 1833. A bill for the relief of the city and county of San Francisco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1834. A bill relating to the immigration status of the lawful wives and children of treaty merchants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 1835. A bill to convey to the Washington State Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, certain lands in Kittitas County, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 1836. A bill to permit certain displaced persons under 16 years of age orphaned as a result of World War II to enter the United States as nonquota immigrants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 1837. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 1838. A bill to establish a Commission on Tax Coordination in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 1839. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1840. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Welsh, La., a post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 1841. A bill to limit the pool elevation and the size of dikes for the Garrison, N. Dak., reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 1842. A bill to provide an equitable basis for determining dependency of parents under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RICHARDS:

H. R. 1843. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to provide

that safety standards shall require air carriers to equip their airplanes with parachutes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1844. A bill to establish a Department of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 1845. A bill to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 1846. A bill to authorize the appointment of additional circuit and district judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 1847. A bill to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1848. A bill to amend section 32 (a) (2) of the Trading With the Enemy Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1849. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOOD:

H. R. 1850. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 1851. A bill to extend rent control until April 30, 1951, to reestablish rent controls for housing accommodations used for permanent occupancy in hotels and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WOOD:

H. R. 1852. A bill to repeal the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. J. Res. 107. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. J. Res. 108. Joint resolution relating to Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress, and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and providing for the refund of all penalty taxes collected and for the cancellation of all uncollected penalty taxes on so-called excess wheat for the years 1941 and 1942; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. J. Res. 109. Joint resolution providing for the payment of a 30-cent bonus per bushel on all wheat and corn harvested and sold between June 1, 1945, and April 18, 1946; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. J. Res. 110. Joint resolution approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof; expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the negotiation of certain treaties; providing for making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. J. Res. 111. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. Res. 60. Resolution to investigate the hand-picking of juries in the United States District Court, Southern District of New York; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SOMERS:

H. Res. 61. Resolution expressing the sense of the House that the President should direct the Export-Import Bank of Washington to lend $300,000,000 to Israel; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1853. A bill to provide for the reappointment to the retired list of officers of the Navy of Henry Eastin Rossell, former commander, Construction Corps, United States Navy, retired; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 1854. A bill for the relief of Kenneth Everard Hadfield; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio:

H. R. 1855. A bill for the relief of Louis Nadasdi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY of New York:

H. R. 1856. A bill for the relief of Erwin Stern; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 1857. A bill for the relief of the estate of Josephine Pereira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1858. A bill for the relief of John Waipa Wilson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1859. A bill for the relief of Chin Hien Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1860. A bill for the relief of Kenji Takumi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1861. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth and Lawrence Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1862. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Walter K. Miyamoto (formerly Miyoko Takahashi); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1863. A bill for the relief of Frederick C. Cowell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1864. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Mitsuo Higa, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1865. A bill for the relief of Mitsuo Arita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 1866. A bill for the relief of Honorio Canciller Evangelista; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 1867. A bill for the relief of Agnes Poulson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of California:

H. R. 1868. A bill for the relief of John A. Hogg and Mrs. Leona Pearl Hogg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1869. A bill for the relief of Nevin Hurren Nisli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 1870. A bill for the relief of Doris Marie Richard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 1871. A bill for the relief of Hilde Flint; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1872. A bill for the relief of Gunnel Degerlund; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H. R. 1873. A bill for the relief of Domenico Marrazzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1874. A bill for the relief of John W. Mahoney, Charles Sorenson, Charles A. Stewart, and Stanley Thiffault; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1875. A bill for the relief of Peter E. Kolesnikoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 1876. A bill for the relief of Ralph Martin Elzingre, also known as Ralph Seawell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 1877. A bill for the relief of Felice Monti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

H. R. 1878. A bill for the relief of Ben Luke Pond, Mrs. Shao Hung Pond, and their son David Yat Wei Pond, aged 11 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

18. By the SPEAKER: Petition of chairman, Rusk County Agricultural Conservation Association, Ladysmith, Wis., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to support price on butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

19. Also, petition of chairman, Washburn Agricultural Conservation Association, Spooner, Wis., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to support price on butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

20. Also, petition of city clerk, Bayonne, N. J., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to the passage of legislation to establish a day in honor of General Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

21. Also, petition of secretary-treasurer, Local 154, United Construction Workers, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

22. Also, petition of city clerk, St. Paul, Minn., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to the passage and approval of the General Pulaski's memorial day resolution now pending in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

23. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolutions adopted at the annual convention of the Wisconsin State Grange, held last December, showing their position on the major questions of agricultural policy; to the Committee on Agriculture.

24. By Mr. LANE: Petition of the merchant marine Gold Star Mothers and merchant marine widows, of Lynn, Mass.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

25. By Mr. LeCOMPTE: Petition for civil tax fund from students and faculty of William Penn College, Oskaloosa, Iowa; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

26. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Charles H. Nutting, Daytona Beach, Fla., petitioning consideration of his resolution asking Congress to work for the passage of Townsend bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

27. Also, petition of Nicholas J. Curtus, of Trenton, N. J., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to claims against the Greek Railway Express Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 27, 1949

The VICE PRESIDENT. Prayer will be offered by Dr. Clarence W. Cranford, minister, Calvary Baptist Church, of Washington, D. C.

Dr. CRANFORD. The prayer I shall offer this morning was written for this session by Dr. Peter Marshall, as one of the last things he did before he died.

PRAYER

Deliver us, our Father, from futile hopes and from clinging to lost causes, that we may move into ever-growing calm and ever-widening horizons.

Where we cannot convince, let us be willing to persuade, for small deeds done are better than great deeds planned.

We know that we cannot do everything. But help us to do something. For Jesus' sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 24, 1949, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE FILED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 24th instant,

Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, on January 25, 1949, reported favorably the nomination of James E. Webb, of North Carolina, to be Under Secretary of State, and submitted a report (Ex. Rept. No. 2) thereon.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1252. An act to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 with respect to the eligibility for appointment in the executive branch of the Government of former professional staff members of committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives; and

H. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes.

RELIEF OF PALESTINE REFUGEES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the enclosed letter from the Acting Secretary of State and the accompanying draft legislation to authorize an appropriation for a special contribution by the United States to the United Nations for the relief of Palestine refugees. In submitting this proposed legislation, I wish to invite attention to the provisions of the resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations emphasizing the critical situation of these refugees and urging all states members of the United Nations to make voluntary contributions as soon as possible to meet their needs.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 27, 1949.*

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, on this particular matter I desire to say that the Committee on Foreign Relations has voted favorably to report a resolution carrying out the President's requests, but it has not formally been reported to the Senate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred, as indicated:

RESERVATION OF CERTAIN INDIAN LANDS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that no reservations were made during the calendar year 1948 of lands within Indian reservations valuable for power or reservoir sites or necessary for use in connection with irrigation projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DONATIONS BY NAVY DEPARTMENT TO NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, a list of institutions and organizations, all nonprofit and eligible, which have requested donations from the Navy Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN LANDS FOR RECREATIONAL PURPOSES

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that no exchanges of lands classified chiefly valuable for recreational purposes for lands of equal value or equal quantity, had been consummated during the calendar year 1948; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON ADJUDICATION OF CERTAIN CLAIMS OF PERSONS OF JAPANESE ANCESTRY

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the adjudication of certain claims resulting from the evacuation of certain persons of Japanese ancestry under military orders (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON AGREEMENTS AND PURCHASES AND CONDEMNATION PROCEEDINGS RELATING TO NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES

A letter from the Director, Naval Petroleum Reserves, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on all agreements, and all purchases and condemnation proceedings entered into under the act of June 30, 1938 (52 Stat. 1252), as amended by the act approved June 17, 1944 (58 Stat. 280) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON LAND ACQUISITIONS

A letter from the Chairman of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on land acquisitions by that Commission, for the fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, advising the Senate of the appointment, pursuant to the act of July 15, 1939, of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], as members of that committee to the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy.

BOARD OF VISITORS, UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I desire to announce that, pursuant to Public Law 301, Seventy-eighth Congress, I have appointed to the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

Resolutions adopted by the Townsend District Council of the Fifth Congressional District, Orlando, Fla., favoring the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan, to provide old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

A memorial of several citizens of the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the seating of Senator FERGUSON; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a message forwarded via the Governor of Guam, extending greetings and best wishes for a successful and prosperous New Year; ordered to lie on the table.

IMPRISONMENT OF ARCHBISHOP STEPINAC AND CARDINAL MINDSZENTY—RESOLUTIONS OF NEW YORK LEGISLATURE

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, the arrest and imprisonment of Archbishop Stepinac, of Yugoslavia, during the fall of 1946 and the recent arrest, in last December, of Cardinal Mindszenty, of Hungary, are two bitter current examples of authoritarian deprivation of civil and religious liberty. As a liberty-loving people, we are distressed over both such oppression and the implications of such oppression.

I have received two resolutions condemning this action by the Hungarian Government and calling upon our Federal Government to exercise every legitimate force to bring about the immediate release of Cardinal Mindszenty. These two resolutions are not identical, but come from each house of the New York State Legislature, and I request that they be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The resolutions were received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEW YORK, IN SENATE,
Albany, January 10, 1949.

(By Mr. Feinberg)

Whereas the whole civilized world and all individuals who believe in God, regardless of race, creed, or denomination, have been profoundly shocked by the arrest and imprisonment of His Eminence Josef Cardinal Mindszenty by the Communist government of Hungary; and

Whereas it appears that there is no justification for this arrest and imprisonment but that it is actuated solely by the desire to destroy religious freedom and freedom of worship; and

Whereas every right-minded person in this country must desire with all his heart to do something to bring about the release of this great churchman. Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the State of New York express its utter condemnation of the act of the Hungarian Government; and be it *further resolved*, That the President of the United States and the Secretary of State and the Members of the Congress from this State be urged to do everything in their power and to use every legitimate force to bring about the immediate release of Cardinal Mindszenty; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the United States Senators and the Members of Congress from New York State and to the Hungarian Legation in Washington.

By order of the senate.

WILLIAM S. KING,
Clerk.

STATE OF NEW YORK, IN ASSEMBLY,
Albany, January 10, 1949.
(By Mr. Douglas)

Whereas the whole civilized world and all individuals who believe in God regardless of race, creed, or denomination, have been profoundly shocked by the arrest and imprisonment of His Eminence Josef Cardinal Mindszenty by the Communist government of Hungary; and

Whereas it appears that there is no justification for this arrest and imprisonment but that it is actuated solely by the desire to destroy religious freedom and freedom of worship; and

Whereas every right-minded person in this country must desire with all his heart to do something to bring about the release of this great churchman: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Assembly of the State of New York express its utter condemnation of the act of the Hungarian Government; and be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States and the Secretary of State and the Members of the Congress from this State be urged to do everything in their power and to use every legitimate force to bring about the immediate release of Cardinal Mindszenty; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the United States Senators and the Members of Congress from New York State and to the Hungarian Legation in Washington.

By order of the assembly:

ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and myself I ask unanimous consent to submit a concurrent resolution stating that it is the sense of the Congress that the action of the Yugoslavian and Hungarian Governments constitutes persecution for political and religious beliefs and violates the Charter of the United Nations. The resolution further declares that, as a member nation, the United States should submit to the next General Assembly of the United Nations the issues raised by these deplorable incidents.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator can submit the concurrent resolution only by unanimous consent at this time. The Chair suggests that the Senator defer submitting the resolution until we reach that order of business.

Mr. IVES. The reason I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the concurrent resolution, which is very brief, to be inserted at this particular point in my remarks is that it is in connection with the two previous resolutions I have submitted and asked to have printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 9), submitted by Mr. IVES (for himself and Mr. WAGNER), was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas on September 18, 1946, Archbishop Aloysius Stepinac, Roman Catholic primate of Yugoslavia, was arrested on charges of committing "crimes against the people" and of "being the center of terrorist opposition" to the Government of Yugoslavia; and

Whereas on October 11, 1946, the said Archbishop Stepinac was sentenced to imprisonment for a term of 16 years and deprived of his civil rights for 5 years; and

Whereas the conduct of the trial of the said Archbishop Stepinac which resulted in such sentence was a travesty on justice and a violation of the fundamental rights of man; and

Whereas on December 26, 1948, Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, Roman Catholic primate of Hungary, was arrested on "suspicion of treason, attempting to overthrow the democratic regime, espionage, and foreign-currency abuses" and has been held incommunicado since such date; and

Whereas the charges upon which the said Cardinal Mindszenty was arrested constitute distortions of truth and justice: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the arrest and imprisonment of the two eminent Roman Catholic primates, Archbishop Stepinac of Yugoslavia and Cardinal Mindszenty of Hungary, (a) constitute persecution on account of political and religious beliefs, (b) violate the declaration in the preamble to the Charter of the United Nations, namely: "to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men * * *," and (c) violate the third purpose stated in article I of the Charter of the United Nations, namely: "To achieve international cooperation * * * in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion." It is further the sense of the Congress that the issues raised by such violations should be submitted by the United States to the United Nations at the next meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

RESOLUTION OF NOTRE DAME CLUB OF LA CROSSE, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a resolution which I have received from Mr. August Grams, Jr., Secretary of the Notre Dame Club of La Crosse.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it resolved, That the Notre Dame Club of La Crosse, Wis., in the belief that the Government of the United States recognizes the existence of a divine being, hereby vigorously protests the action of the representatives of the United States at the United Nations Conference for their failure to support this belief and prevent the withdrawal from the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights, the clause that all human beings "are created in the image and likeness of God," and urges that such action be taken as necessary to include in the Declaration of Human Rights recognition of God from whom all human rights are derived.

ACTING POSTMASTER AT CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA—RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN LEGION POST

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, in my home town of Cedar Rapids there has been a considerable dispute over the selection of a postmaster to fill the vacancy which now exists. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in my remarks a letter from R. D. Spooner, commander of Hanford Post, No. 5, of the American Legion, together with a resolution officially adopted in connection with this matter by that post.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HANFORD POST NO. 5,
THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Cedar Rapids, Iowa, January 19, 1949.

BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER,
Senator from Iowa, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR BICK: I am enclosing with this letter copy of an important resolution adopted at a meeting of Hanford Post in Cedar Rapids at a post meeting January 19, 1949.

This resolution was the result of a very unfortunate appointment by the Democratic State Central Committee which, in filling the position of acting postmaster in Cedar Rapids, chose a nonveteran over a qualified veteran. That veteran was John E. Greenlee.

The nonveteran chosen for the position is 36 years old. John E. Greenlee is 37 years old and is a veteran of World War II who served in the Navy as chief turret gun captain aboard the cruiser *Houston*. The *Houston* was torpedoed by the Japanese during the first battle of the Philippine Sea. Mr. Greenlee received a personal commendation from Adm. William F. Halsey for heroic action in that engagement. He also received the Purple Heart Medal for shell fragments in his head and legs.

Greenlee is a successful businessman and is an active civic leader, as you know. He was the first World War II commander of this American Legion Post of 3,099 members.

This resolution was adopted by the executive committee on January 11 and by the post membership January 18. Both adoptions were by unanimous vote.

Yours very truly,
HANFORD POST NO. 5,
R. D. SPOONER, *Commander.*

Whereas it has come to the attention of the executive committee of Hanford Post, No. 5, American Legion, Department of Iowa, that the Democratic State Central Committee of the State of Iowa has seen fit to recommend the appointment of a nonveteran of military age during World War II as the appointee to the position of acting postmaster of Cedar Rapids, Iowa; and

Whereas this appointment involved the choice of this nonveteran over a qualified veteran; and

Whereas this choice was contrary to community and national sentiment and policy: Now be it

Resolved, That this executive committee does hereby recommend that Hanford Post No. 5, adopt unanimously the following resolution:

"*Be it resolved by Hanford Post, No. 5, American Legion, Department of Iowa*, That inasmuch as the principle of veterans' preference has been long established at all governmental levels and has become an integral part of our community and national policy, that we hereby urge that this policy be adhered to strictly in all recommendations and appointments; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the chairman of all political parties—national, State, and county—and to our elected representatives."

Adopted unanimously by post executive committee January 11, 1949.

Attest:

R. D. SPOONER,
Commander.

Adopted unanimously by membership of Hanford Post January 18, 1949.

Attest:

R. D. SPOONER,
Commander.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 278. A bill to prevent retroactive checkage of payments erroneously made to certain retired officers of the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 21); and

S. 279. A bill to authorize the advance on the retired list of Lieut. John T. McDermott, United States Navy (retired), to the grade of lieutenant commander; without amendment (Rept. No. 22).

By Mr. MCCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 307. A bill for the relief of Engebert Azer; without amendment (Rept. No. 15);

S. 315. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chung Kwai Lui; without amendment (Rept. No. 16);

S. 331. A bill for the relief of Ghetel Pollak Kahan, Magdalena Linda Kahan (wife), and Susanna Kahan (daughter, 12 years old); without amendment (Rept. No. 17);

S. 335. A bill for the relief of Claris U. Yeadon; without amendment (Rept. No. 18); and

S. 485. A bill for the relief of Joyce Violet Angel; without amendment (Rept. No. 19).

By Mr. O'CONOR, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. J. Res. 22. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the three hundredth anniversary of Annapolis, Md.; without amendment (Rept. No. 20).

By Mr. MAYBANK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 547. A bill to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans; without amendment (Rept. No. 23); and

S. Res. 33. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to make certain expenditures and employ temporary assistants and providing for the transfer of certain records; with an amendment (Rept. No. 14), and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY SPECIAL SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, by direction of the Committee on Rules and Administration I report favorably Senate Resolution 28, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 28), as follows:

Resolved, That the Special Committee to Study the Problems of American Small Business Enterprises, created by Senate Resolution 20, Eightieth Congress, agreed to January 24, 1947, and extended by Senate Resolution 153, Eightieth Congress, agreed to July 26, 1947, and Senate Resolution 191, Eightieth Congress, agreed to March 18, 1948, and Senate Resolution 260, Eightieth Congress, agreed to December 31, 1948, is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate $12,698.34 in addition to the amounts heretofore authorized for the same purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I ask the Senator from Arizona if the resolution continues or extends the authority of the Small Business Committee beyond February 1, 1949, the date on which it is supposed to expire?

Mr. HAYDEN. No, it does not. There was submitted to the Committee on Rules and Administration a budget which shows that there was a balance of some $4,000 available after the first of January, which, with the additional sum provided by the resolution would enable the Committee to wind up its affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

VOLUNTARY AGREEMENTS IN INDUSTRY, ETC.—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably without amendment the bill (S. 547) to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans, and I submit a report (No. 23) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It can be done only by unanimous consent.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is what I asked.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business will be concluded in a moment. The Chair suggests to the Senator that he await the disposition of the morning business.

COMMUNICATIONS STUDY—REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a brief report filed this week by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, dealing with a study of various communication matters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is an interim report by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which was appointed by Chairman Wallace H. White, Jr., on June 19, 1948, to study certain communications problems. The subcommittee originally consisted of Senators White, Tobey, and McFarland; on July 30, 1948, Senator White resigned and appointed in his stead Senator Hawkes. The subcommittee on August 3, 1948, adopted an agenda (which is printed herewith as an appendix) and began inquiry and the assembling of data. However, Senator Hawkes was unable to participate actively in the work of the subcommittee and this interim report is submitted by Senators TOBEY and MCFARLAND.

It will be noted that the agenda adopted by the subcommittee outlines an extremely broad study involving practically every phase of communications. Obviously, in the period thus far available to the subcommittee, only a few of the agenda items could be surveyed. The subcommittee, therefore, limited itself to a consideration of what it regarded as the more pressing matters from a time standpoint. In making this report, and such recommendations as it deems pertinent, the subcommittee believes it important to emphasize that a communications study of the scope outlined in the agenda should be continued and carried to a conclusion in the interest of a sound national and international communications industry, the national defense, and the general public interest.

1. Organization of Commission and administrative problems: Basically, a major problem in the communications field relates to the regulatory agency itself. It has been well said by an experienced legislator that "good administrators make a bad law work but bad administrators can vitiate even the best law." No independent agency in our Government over the years has been the subject of more criticism and legislative investigation, much of it earned, than has the Federal Communications Commission.

We are of the opinion that the administrative faults, which still exist, are due basically to an archaic and clumsy organization of its administrative machinery. We are aware that the Commission, even today, frequently ignores and bypasses its own rules in arriving at decisions; that it continues the extra-legal conduct of judicial lawmaking which is repugnant to sound regulation; and that on occasion it arrogates to itself powers and authority which we fail to perceive in the basic act.

Our survey of Commission operations and our consultations with Commissioners themselves convince us that a great deal of the very valid criticism made against the Commission could be eliminated, or at least modified, by an internal reorganization.

We are informed that the Commission has prepared and tentatively approved the draft of an order modifying its internal organization. We are, in a general way, familiar with the broad outlines of that plan. Without approving or rejecting its plan, we offer the following observations and recommendations.

The Administrative Procedures Act and the Commission's own policy provides for the use of hearing examiners in all contested cases. Such hearing examiners, under present procedure, hear evidence and prepare what is known as a proposed decision. That decision may, or may not, become the final decision of the Commission as a whole. During the past 10 years or more, as a result of conferences and recommendations made by bar associations, administrative bodies, and the judiciary generally there has been general recognition and approval of the hearing examiner system in order to speed up procedures in administrative bodies. There also has been frequent reference to the creation of divisions or panels within commissions to divide the work and thus expedite final decisions in contested cases. This background

was undoubtedly one of the factors that motivated Senator WHITE in proposing a panel system for the Federal Communications Commission in his bill of the Eightieth Congress and may have actuated the Commission itself in drafting its proposed plan.

We must observe that the panel system has its weaknesses. We believe it is one of the axioms of judicial procedure that the body created to render decisions is expected to render those decisions as a whole. Litigants have a right to expect that a decision which may vitally affect them has been passed upon by the entire Commission created to make such adjudications. Many Members of Congress feel, and we believe rightly, that creation of a panel system may result in bypassing of the Commission as a whole with contested decisions being left to three Commissioners, which could mean under certain circumstances that one Commissioner finally decides the issue. On the other hand, we are aware that the Commission must find a method of speeding up its work and reducing the current backlog of cases, which we are informed represents as much as 15 months' work.

It is our view, however, that adoption of the panel system without enactment of legislation specifically dealing with the subject is not contemplated by the existing law which contemplates that all decisions must be made by the whole Commission. We are of the opinion that any attempt to make decisions by less than the whole Commission would not be in accord with the Communications Act. But we believe that the work of the Commission would be expedited by following a procedure somewhat similar to that of our appellate courts. We therefore suggest the following.

With respect to contested cases, in which two or more private litigants, or the Commission and a private litigant, are involved, we firmly believe that the decision should be that of the whole Commission. We are of the opinion, however, that even these cases can be handled more expeditiously with full protection to the rights of litigants by assigning the case to a group or subcommittee of the Commission for writing of the final decision. However, the same group or subcommittee of Commissioners should not be assigned to every case or type of case; it is essential that all Commissioners participate actively in all phases of operation of the Commission. This permits the fullest consideration of contested cases by all of the Commissioners and permits those who dissent from the majority view to prepare a dissent.

In this connection, we deem it important to emphasize that in the preparation of such final decisions by the Commission as a whole, it should have the legal aid of personnel who are not a part of the legal staff who prosecuted or represented the Commission during the hearing or rehearing procedure. The present system in which members of the Legal Division who prepared the case in the first instance and who prosecuted it, or represented the Commission viewpoint during the hearings, also aid in the preparation of the final decision is not conducive to production of a fair and unbiased decision, we believe. We do not suggest that the staff of the Legal Department would wittingly twist the law. We do suggest that they are human and that having been advocates of one view during the proceedings it is only natural that they will attempt to carry that view through in the final decision. We believe the Commission can obviate many of the criticisms that have been made on this score by the creation of a legal review board, not subject to the jurisdiction of the Law Department, whose sole duty would be to aid the Commission itself in the legal review of the hearing examiner's proposed decision and the preparation of the Commission's final decision.

A somewhat similar procedure to that outlined above for contested cases also could be followed with respect to uncontested cases. The decision prepared by the group or subcommittee of Commissioners to which each such case was assigned would naturally become the final decision of the whole Commission unless objected to by the majority.

This leads to consideration of a further point with respect to the present organization of the Law, Engineering, and Accounting Departments of the Commission. Our observation is the present structure is not the most efficient, does not make the best use of the personnel, and that it does not square with current problems of the Commission. We are of the opinion that the Commission should be organized along the lines of its work load—i. e., broadcast, common carrier, and safety and special services—and that the Law, Engineering, and Accounting Departments be made functioning units in such a divisional set-up, with the general counsel, the chief accountant, and the chief engineer directly under the Commission itself. It would appear that such a functional organization would permit far more rapid consideration of applications and cases, and at the same time free the responsible heads for consideration of over-all administration.

We think it important to emphasize that the rule-making function must, of course, remain as it is today, the duty and responsibility of the Commission as a whole. This and other specific duties placed upon the whole Commission by law should and must remain the responsibility of the whole Commission.

We are informed that the Commission's proposed plan for modification of its organization contemplates that the chairman shall not be a member of any of the panels, except as a substitute for a member not present, and shall devote his principal efforts to being the chief administrative officer of the agency. While we agree that there is considerable merit in this proposal and that some of the broader problems of communications dealing with frequency allocations and revisions of rules require closer attention than they have received, we believe that a note of caution is necessary here. The chairman is the responsible head of the agency and it cannot, by its own rules, lift from him the responsibility that the law lays upon him. We already have made clear our opinion in regard to the adoption of a panel system without a change in the present law. However, the procedure suggested by your subcommittee would permit the chairman to spend more time on administrative duties.

2. Cease-and-desist orders: Our conferences with Commissioners and a study of decisions and actions of the Commission lead us to the conclusion that early attention should be given to improving that section of the Communications Act dealing with revocation of licenses (sec. 312). The present law provides that a station license may be revoked for false statements either in the application, or in the statement of fact which may be required from time to time, which would have warranted the Commission to refuse the license on an original application; or for failure to operate substantially as set forth in the license; or for violation or failure to observe any of the restrictions or conditions of the act or of the regulations of the Commission authorized by the act or a treaty ratified by the United States. This makes obvious, therefore, that revocation is the only administrative penalty for violations ranging from the most serious to the most minor, including even innocent violation of technical regulations.

We do not believe that such a situation makes for fair and efficient administration. Obviously the Commission would be reluctant to revoke a license for a minor offense and therefore minor offenses may be committed almost with impunity. Moreover, there is no distinction between the gravity of offenses; it is as if the penalty were the same for murder and for illegal parking of an automobile. It is our opinion that numerous actions which deserve censure and action thereby escape while at the same time the licensee has hanging over his head the final penalty of losing his license for a minor offense.

Your subcommittee recommends, therefore, the enactment of a section which would authorize the issuance of cease-and-desist orders for less serious violations. The revocation penalty would remain in effect for two classes of violations: (1) for cases in which the Commission learns of facts or conditions after the granting of a license which would have warranted it to refuse a license originally had it known those facts; (2) for violation of a cease-and-desist order. Both the revocation and cease-and-desist procedure would remain, of course, subject to judicial appeal.

Such a provision was a part of the White bill (sec. 12 of S. 1333, 80th Cong.) and had the general support of the Commission, the industry, and members of the bar who practice before the Commission. The cease-and-desist-order procedure has had considerable trial in other administrative agencies and has proved generally satisfactory.

3. Radio and wire communications frauds: Your subcommittee recommends the enactment, either as part of the Communications Act or as part of the general criminal code, of a fraud statute similar to the postal fraud statute (18 U. S. C. 338) which would make it a Federal offense to use wire or radio communications to defraud.

We are informed that the Commission from time to time has had called to its attention situations in which persons have used radio facilities for the perpetration or attempted perpetration of obvious frauds. In most of these cases, the station licensee is not a party to the fraud or culpable but rather is himself a victim of the fraud. In such cases, there is no basis for proceeding against the licensee. And unless the fraud scheme also involves use of the mails, there is at present no means of reaching perpetrators of such schemes. While the Federal Trade Commission has certain powers dealing with unfair methods of competition these have not proved to be fully effective in deterring such frauds.

4. Clear channels and superpower in AM broadcasting: The subcommittee believes that the most important question from a policy standpoint in the field of AM radio broadcasting is that involving so-called clear channels and the amount of power with which such stations should operate.

The subcommittee is of the opinion that a brief review of the background of this question would be helpful. There were in the United States (as of January 1, 1948) a total of 1,962 AM radio broadcast stations. These operate on 106 channels, i. e., paths through the ether. Obviously, there must be many more than a single station on one channel. To facilitate allocation the channels were divided into three classes: local, regional, and clear. There are 6 local channels which must be shared by 1,032 stations; there are 41 regional channels which must be shared by 804 stations; but there are 24 clear channels which during nighttime hours are each occupied by only 1 station through the United States. (A technicality in allocation has assigned one additional station to one of the clear channels but a class 1-B channel is maintained without duplication.) Originally, in the earlier days of broadcasting in this country, there was upward of 50 clear channels but as need for more and more stations grew, the regulatory agency began to duplicate stations on some of these channels. In short, even then the problem was whether channels should be reserved exclusively as clear or whether the country should receive more and improved

radio service. The regulatory agency decided in favor of the public interest and duplicated assignments. We regard this as an important precedent and we do not understand why the Commission suddenly halted such assignments.

However, despite ever-increasing demands for more radio stations and for improved service, 24 channels remain to this day reserved for exclusive nighttime use by stations. Because the assignments on these clear channels were made in the early days of radio broadcasting, the clear-channel stations are in the best part of the radio spectrum, and have become the rich, powerful stations located in the largest and most lucrative markets. Their collective power and position is a factor in their successful resistance to any attempt to duplicate the channels they presently occupy. We cannot refrain from drawing the analogy to the dog in the manger story; radio frequencies are a scarce natural resource; additional stations are needed in many parts of the country and yet these 24 channels which would allow assignment of 75 to several hundred additional stations are reserved without duplication.

But exclusive use of a channel is only half of the story. Equally important to the fact that 24 stations have exclusive nighttime channels, is the amount of electric power with which they are authorized to broadcast. These stations broadcast with a power of 50,000 watts. The significance of this power may be realized when it is understood that a local station generally operates with a power of 250 watts and has a coverage of perhaps 10 miles in radius; regional stations operate with power varying from 1,000 to 10,000 watts and cover a radius on the average of 50 to 75 miles. Clear-channel stations, however, use power ranging from 5 to 250 times as much as any other radio station and cover an area of 175 to 200 miles in radius, although their signal may be heard under ordinary favorable conditions for upward of 500 miles. In act, the total power used by 24 clear channels is greater than the power used by all the remainder of the radio stations in the United States combined.

Thus, it may be readily understood why these clear-channel stations already provide a type of competition against which the smaller local stations experience difficulty. They attract the large national advertisers, exercise tremendous influence over vast areas far removed from the source of the transmitter, and have made fantastic returns on their investment. Only a few years ago examples of annual returns of 100 percent to 200 percent on the investment were not uncommon in radio-station operation.

Some 10 years ago a majority of these clear-channel stations formed an organization with the express purpose of securing Federal Communications Commission authority for a 10- to fifteen fold increase in power for clear-channel stations. They sought 500,000 watts to 750,000 watts instead of the 50,000 watts then and now assigned to them. Even prior to that time (in 1934) one of their number (WLW in Cincinnati) had been granted a temporary experimental license to operate with 500,000 watts. That operation brought such opposition from so many smaller stations in the Midwest which complained of monopoly and unfair competition that the Senate approved a resolution (S. Res. 294, 75th Cong.) on June 13, 1938, asserting that it was the sense of the Senate that no AM broadcast radio station in this country should be operated with power in excess of 50,000 watts. We concur in that view today, and in the absence of affirmative legislation authorizing power in excess of 50,000 watts we doubt the Commission's legal authority to grant power in excess of 50,000 watts.

A few months after the passage of the Senate resolution the Federal Communications Commission withdrew the experimental license for superpower it had granted the Cincinnati station. Since that time (1939) no radio station has operated with more than 50,000 watts. But the organization of clear-channel stations seeking superpower continued its fight both in and out of the Commission for its demands. It lobbied Members of Congress, filed petitions before the Commission, and participated in additional hearings. The advent of World War II put a temporary damper on its activities. But immediately after the war, it renewed its efforts. The Commission thereupon again conducted another hearing on the question during 1946 and 1947. By the spring of 1948, it had become an open secret in the radio industry that a decision in the clear-channel case, as the issue had come to be known, could be expected later that year. But more important, so publicly confident were members of the clear-channel association of the outcome that hundreds of smaller radio-station operators throughout the Nation became alarmed and began imploring Members of Congress to do something to prevent creation of a monopoly situation which they said would put them out of business. Educators and public figures wrote members of this committee that domination of the Nation's airways by a few high power stations (owned by 15 corporations) would be dangerous to freedom of speech.

Concerned with the situation, Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON of Colorado introduced on February 26, 1948, a bill (S. 2281, 80th Cong.) which would provide for duplication on clear channels and limit their power to 50,000 watts. The Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce the following day (February 27) instructed its acting chairman (Senator TOBEY) to write the Federal Communications Commission requesting that it defer any final action in the clear channel case until the committee had come to some conclusion on the bill. On March 5, Chairman Wayne Coy of the Commission replied to this committee advising that no action would be taken in the case pending Senate committee action.

Hearings on the Johnson bill began on the following April 5, and continued for 10 days through April 23, 1948. Seventy witnesses made personal oral statements; nearly 1,100 additional persons and companies, a substantial majority of which spoke for hundreds of radio stations, sent in statements or letters expressing their views; the final printed hearing covered nearly 1,600 pages. Members of this subcommittee attended a substantial part of the hearings and have examined the record rather closely. The subcommittee believes this hearing was one of the largest, best attended, and comprehensive held during their personal experience in the Senate.

We have cited this brief history of the clear-channel superpower question so that our summary and recommendations will be more readily understood. One other fact should be noted. In discussions of the clear-channel superpower question, reference has been made frequently to the provisions of the North American regional broadcast agreement. This is a radio treaty governing use of radio frequencies in North America to which Canada, Newfoundland, Mexico, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, the Bahamas, and the United States are signatories. It sets standards of operation and practice for radio stations in these countries. One of its provisions is that clear-channel stations should use a minimum power of 50,000 watts. Members of the clear-channel organization who advocate superpower assert that if the United States does not authorize higher power our present clear channels will be duplicated in the other signatory countries and we will lose our clear channels. A further corollary argument is made that because a North American regional broadcast conference is to be held next September in Quebec and because the position of our Government at that conference must be circulated very shortly among the other signatories, it is necessary that the Federal Communications Commission make an immediate decision in the clear-channel superpower case. Of course, when these two arguments by the advocates of superpower are coupled, it becomes obvious that they mean that the Commission should authorize operation of clear-channel stations with power of 500,000 to 750,000 watts.

We believe that these contentions centering around the North American regional broadcasting agreement should be disposed of first. In the first place, we are firmly of the opinion that adherence to the present agreement does not require radio stations within the United States to operate with power in excess of 50,000 watts. We have studied the agreement and we assert that with respect to this point it is clear that the only requirement is that the clear channels of signatory governments operate with a minimum of 50,000 watts. That is the practice and policy within the United States today. It is implicit from the agreement that the signatory countries bind themselves by adherence to certain standards not to interfere with the signals of radio stations located in the other countries. It would be, in our opinion, an unwise policy, indeed, for this country to have agreed to a policy of radio broadcasting which is injurious to American broadcasting generally and which would not serve the general public interest. Obviously, we did not subscribe to any such policy in the existing agreement.

Secondly, we reject completely the argument that the Federal Communications Commission should render a decision forthwith in the clear-channel case so that United States policy on this question would be established for the purpose of informing the other countries now of what our position is to be at the forthcoming conference. It would be a new departure in Government, in our experience, for a regulatory agency decision involving private litigants to become binding as formulating what this country's policy should be in an international treaty. We would deplore the rendering of such a decision prior to the conference meeting as—

(1) An action designed to bypass the Congress on a basic-policy question;

(2) An action designed to bind this country's hands in advance of an international conference; and

(3) An action productive of suspicion and resentment on the part of the other signatories.

We know from conferences held with a number of representatives of other signatories that their countries do not look with favor on operation of United States radio stations with power of 500,000 to 750,000 watts. And, for our own good, we should oppose the operation of clear channels in the other countries with excessive power as being injurious to many of our own stations. Such high-power operation in Mexico at the present time already provides serious interference with stations ranging from Florida to California. We believe the United States should enter into the forthcoming conference in good faith, bound by only one basic consideration: to stand for a general policy of operation of domestic radio stations with such limited power as not to interfere with radio stations in neighboring countries. We believe that this means that the upper limit should be 50,000 watts and we are firmly of the opinion that all of the signatories would be better served by an agreement that no clear-channel station should operate with more than 50,000 watts.

If it is necessary that we should now make known to the other signatories what this country's position with respect to clear channels and superpower is to be at the Quebec

Conference, we believe they should be informed that this country's basic law does not permit operation of AM radio stations with power in excess of 50,000 watts and that in the absence of a specific statute authorizing such operation the United States proposes to operate its domestic radio stations with not more than 50,000 watts of power, that this is best suited to our internal needs and the general public interest, that such a policy will not interfere with radio-station operation by any other signatory, and that we will advocate that policy for all signatories.

Now with respect to the question of a decision by the Federal Communications Commission in the clear-channel superpower case: We are well aware of the contention that has been made, by advocates of superpower, that this case involves an engineering equation and that the regulatory body is the only proper authority to make such a decision. We reject that contention as unrealistic, bureaucratic, and not in accord with the formulation of the Communications Act and the legal precedents thereunder.

We believe that the clear-channel superpower question is a fundamental policy issue of tremendous national import to be determined by the lawmaking body and not a technical engineering problem to be decided by a regulatory agency. It must be clear, even to a layman, that were clear-channel stations authorized to broadcast with power of a half million to three-quarters of a million watts, a few stations located in large metropolitan cities would dominate radio broadcasting in this country. Not only would the overwhelming majority of smaller stations find it economically impossible to exist, but more important, radio would no longer serve local needs or have local responsibility. It has been asserted that such superpower stations are necessary to give diversified radio coverage to small, isolated communities located in the Rocky Mountains and southwestern parts of the United States which are covered by only one or two stations at present. We have heard much of these so-called white areas alleged to have little or no radio coverage. But we have yet to be convinced by a factual survey of such areas that they do not, in fact, get adequate radio coverage. The major evidence on this subject presented to the committee during the hearings on the Johnson bill were engineering diagrams and curves which purported to show by mathematical calculation that there are areas without adequate coverage. What we should like to see, and we believe that the Federal Communications Commission should want to have, is a careful, on-the-spot survey of these alleged areas to learn from radio listeners themselves what kind of radio service they receive.

We deem it essential to point out here that the most effective and available means of bringing additional AM radio service to such underserved areas is to duplicate in those areas the present clear-channel stations. There is no sound reason, either from an engineering or policy standpoint, why the same channel now occupied by a New York or Chicago or Louisville station could not also be assigned to a station located in Texas, or Arizona, or Utah, or Colorado, or Idaho, or eastern Washington to provide additional radio service to those areas. Certainly there would be no possibility of interference to the New York or other midwestern stations and greater service to more people would be brought about by a more efficient and economical distribution of frequencies and the so-called white areas would be eliminated. In fact, we suggest that under the Communications Act the Commission has a duty under the fair-and-equitable-distribution-of-facilities section to make a better and fairer assignment of frequencies than now exists; we do not believe that exclusive use of a frequency by a single licensee is in accord with the clear meaning of the law.

The important question here, however, is not so much the allegation that there are such unserved radio areas as the larger and far more vital question of what would happen to radio in the United States generally if a few already privileged stations were to be granted superpower. We believe, and we assert, that there is ample evidence that the basic objective of the Communications Act of 1934 would be subverted if a small number of stations were to secure authority to operate with more power than now authorized. The basic purpose of the law is that radio should serve the public interest and that the regulatory agency should promote a policy of competition in radio broadcasting. In our view, the language of the act with respect to the granting of licenses in the public interest, the promotion of competition in radio broadcasting, and the equitable distribution of radio frequencies is so clear that the Federal regulatory agency should (a) have continued to carry out the policy it began years ago of duplicating so-called clear channels in the interest of better use of scarce radio frequencies and not have retained pristine the 24 clear channels that remain today; and (b) have summarily rejected any application for operation of AM broadcast stations with power above 50,000 watts as one which not only would foster monopoly but which, if granted, would be in fact contrary to the clear intent of the law itself.

Your subcommittee, therefore, makes the following recommendations with respect to the clear-channel superpower question:

(a) That since the question of increasing power for operation of AM radio stations above the present limit of 50,000 watts involves a basic, fundamental policy of the highest national importance concerned with the economic and political health of the United States, it is a question which can legally be determined only by the Congress through the enactment of legislation (the Commission obviously has reversed its interpretation of the law and has abandoned its own precedents of duplicating clear channels); that such legislation should not be considered until after the North American Regional Broadcasting Conference is held; thereafter the Commission be invited to make recommendations for such legislative changes as it deems advisable with respect to these matters; and

(b) That if it is deemed essential to circulate this country's views on the clear-channel superpower question among the other signatories to the North American regional broadcast agreement prior to said Conference, the United States should declare that since the Congress has never authorized operation of domestic AM radio stations with power in excess of 50,000 watts in this country, the United States will advocate such 50,000-watt power limitation for all signatories (with each signatory having the authority to prescribe such use of its own clear channels as best serves its own listeners and the country's public interest but no signatory shall share or duplicate the clear channels heretofore assigned to any other signatory); and

(c) That the Federal Communications Commission be promptly advised of these recommendations.

5. Frequency allocation—FM radio: The problem of allocation of frequency space in the spectrum is a fundamental one. It is an authority fraught with so many consequences to development of the whole communications art that it is a pity that it is not better understood and its consequences more sharply realized.

Unfortunately, because it involves decisions based on highly technical knowledge of electronics and the application of such knowledge, the average citizen—and this includes Members of the Congress—knows little about it. Nevertheless, these so-called engineering decisions directly affect and actually control long-range policy determinations which decide not only who shall be licensees in the operation of AM radio broadcast stations, FM broadcast stations, television stations, radiotelegraph and wire telegraph common carriers, but more important, in what parts of the spectrum these various services shall operate.

Decisions of this latter kind have an important bearing on which types of service shall move ahead and which shall be retarded; in fact, which shall live and which shall die. For example, a decision in which part of the spectrum television shall operate has the effect of determining (a) that television service shall be available only to limited parts of the United States and to a limited number of people; (b) that television service will be only in black and white and not in color; (c) that developer and patent holder X shall have a preferred position over developer and patent holder Y or Z. Or, for example, a decision that certain frequencies are more suitable for television than for FM radio becomes determinative in so retarding the development of FM radio that this latter service is denied a wide use and application throughout the country.

It may be asserted that the results which flow from such decisions may not have been considered in arriving at the original decision. It is claimed that the original decision was made in good faith, based on engineering information and knowledge then available. But it is just because such decisions are based on engineering knowledge at the time, and because like all other experts, engineers may differ with respect to their findings and conclusions as well as with respect to the projection of their findings on the ultimate situation, that it is important to evaluate to what degree so-called engineering decisions should be the sine qua non of a basic determination.

Your subcommittee calls attention to a hearing held by a subcommittee of this committee in the last Congress, generally titled "Progress of FM Radio." This hearing, held during March, April, and May of 1948, sought to develop to what extent certain commercial interests in the radio industry affected and controlled engineering decisions which resulted in basic policy determinations. The hearing brought out, in the opinion of your subcommittee, that electronics is a rapidly developing and changing art; that despite the fact it is based on such exact sciences as physics and mathematics, it is still far from being an exact and positively predictable art; that reliable and able engineers differ widely; that some engineers whose opinions have been of influence in making decisions of great magnitude are not always abreast of all developments and facts in the art; that the regulatory agency has had to and does still rely on the testimony and experiences and experiments of engineers who are the employees of major commercial interests in the industry; that the regulatory agency appears to be overawed and too much impressed by such engineering views and does not always balance these views against the broad public policy of what is best for the general interest of the people of the United States.

We have made this condensed and brief summary merely to point up the basis of one of the many criticisms made of the Federal Communications Commission. We think that such censure has been deserved in the past; we trust that the procedure and approach that earned it will be removed in the future.

Meanwhile, we earnestly recommend that this committee continue its investigation into this phase of Commission and industry operations with the purpose of a complete exploration of every influence that has been exerted to bring about various decisions.

We recommend this course because only by such pitiless exposures can we hope to make certain that yet-to-be-made decisions of the greatest and most paramount importance to the American people in the field of electronics generally and radio television specifically will be really in the general public interest and not for the benefit of vested interests.

6. Censorship of radio programs: Your subcommittee deems it wise to make some reference in this report to the frequently discussed so-called censorship question. We had thought that the views of this committee, as a whole, were firmly and cogently expressed in the report on the White bill (S. Rept. 1567, 80th Cong.). There has been, however, repeated reference to Commission interpretations of the act as limiting free speech or imposing censorship on radio licensees. It is apparent to your subcommittee that a planned propaganda effort is being carried on among well-meaning but uninformed persons to secure congressional revision of the act with respect to the so-called censorship question.

It should be pointed out that the act itself contains a "no censorship" section (sec. 326) which makes clear that there can be no censorship of radio programs. The language itself is brief. It states plainly that the Commission does not have the power of censorship over radio communications and that it shall not make any rule or condition which shall interfere with the right of free speech by radio. There are no "if's," "and's," or "but's," no weasel words or hidden clauses. What has provoked certain radio interests is Commission interpretation of its licensing and licensing-renewal power (sec. 309) which declares that the Commission must determine that the granting of a license or renewal is in the public interest, convenience, and necessity. The Commission has, from time to time, exercised this latter authority by withholding or denying renewals until it determined that the licensee had operated in the public interest.

Probably no other provision of the law has been attacked in the courts more frequently and by more able legal counsel. Probably no other section of the law has been subject to more searching scrutiny by the courts, including the Supreme Court of the United States. Uniformly and without exception, the final decision has upheld the Commission's authority to determine whether or not a licensee's operation has been in the public interest. Moreover, the court decisions have held that such exercise of authority by the Commission does not invade or vitiate the "no censorship" provision of the law. When the courts have on more than one occasion spoken clearly that the Commission has the right and duty under the law to determine whether the public interest is being served and that in so doing there is no violation of free speech, we believe the final judicial interpretation has been made.

We concur, of course, completely and fully with the line of judicial decisions on this point. To us it appears ridiculous to hold that a person operating under a Federal license shall not be answerable to a constituted authority for his performance under that license. To hold otherwise would be to set at naught the license system, to make the license in fact a perpetual grant. So long as radio frequencies are scarce national resources, the Government has a right to expect and demand proper use of them.

In view of the repeated court decisions which confirm our interpretation of the act, we see no need for and recommend no legislative changes in the act in this respect.

7. Common carriers, domestic and international: Your subcommittee is seriously concerned with the problems of communications common carriers, operating both in the domestic and international fields. Since the end of the war, their revenues have suffered serious decline. The domestic wire carrier, Western Union, is engaged in a large program of modernization designed eventually to reduce operating overhead, but meanwhile faces financial difficulties. It has sought and obtained rate increases, but these do not solve the problem because they have the effect of reducing business. In addition, Western Union is in a position where it cannot exploit its cable facilities because of a provision of law which requires the company to divest itself of international operations. The international carriers are only slightly better off, financially speaking. Moreover, the international carriers must compete, not alone between themselves for business and frequencies but against Government-owned foreign communications monopolies which continue to play off United States carriers against each other for more favorable contract arrangements.

Efforts to meet some of these problems were undertaken by this committee before the war. An investigation was held, hearings and conferences undertaken; an effort to formulate a national policy was pushed. The war intervened. However, these earlier actions were not wholly fruitless. In the past year a great deal of attention has been given to the formulation of a national communications policy which would be based on substantive legislation. Representatives of the State Department, the Federal Communications Commission, the various military services, and other Government users of communications are giving serious and continuing attention to this entire situation.

We recommend that this committee continue the study of telecommunications common carriers in the Eighty-first Congress with the purpose of formulating legislative proposals to cope with the problem.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I also want to take this opportunity, as the chairman of the committee, to commend the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], members of the subcommittee, for their excellent work. I am very much interested in one of the points raised by the subcommittee, the issue of superpower and clear-channel broadcasting. It is a subject on which extensive hearings were held in the last Congress. I hope every Member of the Senate will read the report carefully because it deals realistically not only with the question of monopoly control of the physical broadcasting plant of America, but with the much more important issue—the centralization of power in a few hands to sway public opinion.

Furthermore, the committee report raises the important legal question of whether a fundamental policy matter which directly concerns and affects all the people of the United States shall be decided by an administrative regulatory agency created by Congress for that function or whether such a paramount question of important national policy should be determined by the Congress itself. I believe, and I am sure all Senators believe, that basic, fundamental policy questions must be determined by the lawmaking body.

We are all aware that the trend during recent years has been for the regulatory agencies to arrogate more and more power to themselves; to interpret language of the laws under which they operate so broadly as to give them authority never contemplated by the Congress. I, for one, am opposed to this practice and intend to oppose it as vigorously as I know how.

The report, which I believe should be in the RECORD so that all Members may read it, asserts unequivocally that the Federal Communications Commission does not have the legal authority under the Communications Act of 1934, to grant licenses for the operation of superpower radio stations because such operation would be contrary to the clear intent of the law which says that station licenses may be granted only in the public interest and that the regulatory agency must promote competition in broadcasting.

It is not my purpose here to quote from the report but I want it distinctly understood that I personally commend fully and endorse completely the viewpoint expressed by the subcommittee with respect to superpower and clear-channel operation of radio stations.

REPORT ON PROGRESS OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION (S. REPT. NO. 13)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the chairman of the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation, which was ordered to be printed.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation, I should like to say just a word about the committee's Report on Progress of the Economic Cooperation Administration, which I have just submitted.

This committee was established last April by section 124 of Public Law 472—the law which set up the Economic Cooperation Administration. The committee's duties were set forth in section 124, as follows:

It shall be the function of the committee to make a continuous study of the programs of United States economic assistance to foreign countries and to review the progress achieved in the execution and administration of such programs * * * and it shall make a report to the Senate and the House of Representatives, from time to time, concerning the results of its studies, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

Throughout its 10 months of existence, this committee, assisted by a well-qualified staff, has endeavored to act in close accordance with both the letter and spirit of the section I have just quoted. That is, we have directed our efforts toward determining facts, and from those facts we have analyzed the working out of the foreign-aid programs.

Under the direction of the committee, the staff has maintained close daily contact with officials of the Economic Cooperation Administration here in Washington. In addition, several members of both the committee and its staff have made trips to Europe and China to see at first hand how the program is going in the participating nations.

This report, then, is one of the results of 10 months of continuous study and analysis of this country's foreign-aid

programs—and I think that the adoption of the report by unanimous vote of the committee is a good indication of the success we have had in carrying out the job in the manner in which the Congress intended we should when it set up the committee last April.

Now a word about the report itself. First, I would like to remind you that this Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation is not a legislative committee—it is a watchdog committee, and, in fact, that is the name by which it is popularly known. Therefore, you will not find in the report any firm recommendations as to what should or should not be done by Congress in connection with forthcoming legislation on United States foreign-aid programs. In fact, most of the report consists of a section called a checklist, which gives pertinent information on what has been done by the Economic Cooperation Administration and the participating nations to implement and comply with Public Laws 472 and 793.

However, as a result of its studies, the committee believes that there are certain portions of our foreign-aid programs which need either clarification or strengthening and, in addition, that certain problems are sure to arise which would cause serious trouble if we did not anticipate them now. For that reason, I would like to invite special attention to the first section of our report. This section is entitled "Problems Requiring Consideration by Congress." It outlines 10 different problems and briefly discusses the pros and cons of various possible solutions to those problems. For example, this first section of the report discusses the following:

First. German reparations—whether or not it would be desirable to require that participating nations agree, as a condition for receiving further United States aid, to reduce the number of German plants that are to be dismantled.

Second. Strategic materials—whether or not ECA should be given increased responsibility for arranging with participating nations for development and future delivery to the United States of strategic materials needed by this country.

Third. Grants versus loans—whether or not it would be better to provide all further aid on a grant basis until participating nations become reasonable credit risks.

Fourth. Shipping—whether or not Congress should require unequivocably that at least one-half of the gross tonnage of goods sent to participating nations from the United States be transported on United States flag vessels.

Finally, I wish to commend this report to Members of the Congress as a valuable source of information and guidance in connection with the forthcoming hearings and floor discussion concerning United States economic aid to foreign nations. It is the labor of a committee which has functioned well and harmoniously, and I believe that as long as the Congress has a watchdog of this type it can rest easier concerning the operation and administration of whatever foreign aid it continues to make available.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing a nomination, which nominations were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

James M. Mitchell, of Illinois, to be a Civil Service Commissioner.

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Paul P. Rao, of New York, to be judge of the United States Customs Court;

James T. Foley, of New York, to be United States district judge for the northern district of New York, vice Edward S. Kampf;

Samuel Hamilton Kaufman, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York;

William T. McCarthy, of Massachusetts, to be United States district judge for the district of Massachusetts, vice Arthur D. Healey;

Angel R. de Jesus, of Puerto Rico, to be chief justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico;

Luis Negron Fernandez, of Puerto Rico, to be an associate justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico;

Gerald A. Gleeson, of Pennsylvania, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Pennsylvania;

Cleon A. Summers, of Oklahoma, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Oklahoma;

John B. Tansil, of Montana, to be United States attorney for the district of Montana;

Carl H. Fleckenstine, of Pennsylvania, to be United States marshal for the middle district of Pennsylvania;

Harold K. Claypool, of Ohio, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Ohio; and

Frederick Elliott Biermann, of Iowa, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Iowa.

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Hon. F. Ryan Duffy, of Wisconsin, to be circuit judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, vice Evan A. Evans, deceased.

By Mr. BROUGHTON, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Wilson Warlick, of North Carolina, to be United States district judge for the western district of North Carolina, vice Edwin Y. Webb, retired.

By Mr. DONNELL, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Roy W. Harper, of Missouri, to be United States district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri.

By Mr. FERGUSON, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Thomas Patrick Thornton, of Michigan, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Michigan, vice Ernest A. O'Brien, deceased;

Joseph P. Deeb, of Michigan, to be United States attorney for the western district of Michigan; and

Edwin D. Bolger, of Michigan, to be United States marshal for the western district of Michigan.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Maurice J. Tobin, of Massachusetts, to be Secretary of Labor, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

Ralph Wright, of New York, as Assistant Secretary of Labor, United States Department of Labor;

Frank P. Douglass, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the term expiring February 1, 1952 (reappointment);

John M. Houston, of Kansas, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of 5 years from August 27, 1948, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate (reappointment);

Reuben F. Reider, and sundry other candidates for promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service;

Abraham Walfthal, and sundry other candidates for appointment and promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service; and

Charles L. Newberry, and sundry other candidates for appointment and promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service.

NOMINATION OF WILLIAM E. WILLETT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask to have placed on the calendar the report of the Committee on Banking and Currency reporting favorably the nomination of William E. Willett, of Maryland, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for a term expiring June 30, 1950, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

I should add that the nomination was unanimously reported out by the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

NOMINATION OF PRESTON DELANO

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I have the honor to report the nomination of Mr. Preston Delano to be Comptroller of the Currency. I ask that the nomination, which has been favorably acted upon by the committee, be confirmed by the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia has submitted a report on a nomination from the Committee on Banking and Currency. Does the Senator ask for the present consideration of the nomination, or does he submit the report for the calendar?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I should prefer to ask for the present consideration of the report, if it is in order to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia asks unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the nomination just reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency be considered by the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator from Virginia state his request again? I could not clearly hear what the Senator said. What is the nomination the Senator referred to, with respect to which he asks action by the Senate?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Preston Delano, who for 10 years has most acceptably served as Comptroller of the Currency, has now been nominated for a new term of 5 years. The nomination has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency, and I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now consider the nomination, and that it be confirmed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator state why it is necessary to suspend the rules and proceed by unanimous consent? Why could not the nomination be properly acted upon at the next session of the Senate, in order that we might maintain the regularity of procedure with respect to action upon nominations?

Mr. ROBERTSON. If there is any objection, Mr. President, I shall withdraw my request. I did not think the nomination would be contested or debated. Mr. Delano is serving an interim term. It is not a material point, however, and if there is objection——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I know of no objection, but, as a question of policy, I believe it would be better to let the nomination go over.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I withdraw my request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia withdraws his request. The nomination will go to the calendar.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 649. A bill to increase the mileage allowances of civilian officers and employees for use of privately owned vehicles and to increase the per diem allowances of civilian officers and employees while traveling on official business; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 650. A bill for the relief of Toshiko Ozawa;

S. 651. A bill for the relief of the Fisher Brewing Company, Salt Lake City, Utah; and

S. 652. A bill for the relief of Sadae Aoki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. THOMAS of Utah also introduced Senate bill 653, to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 654. A bill for the relief of Klara Ungar Klajn; and

S. 655. A bill for the relief of Carl Nygren; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 656. A bill to coordinate the educational functions of the Federal Government in a single agency; to define its organization, powers, and duties; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 657. A bill to extend the period of validity of the act to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States; and

S. 658. A bill for the relief of Adolf Max Schmitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 659. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation as to the cause, prevention, treatment, and possible cure of epilepsy; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 660. A bill to amend the act of June 27, 1944, Public Law 359, and to preserve the equities of permanent classified civil-service employees of the United States; and

S. 661. A bill for postal employees' longevity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 662. A bill authorizing the Wyandotte Tribe of Oklahoma to sell tribal cemetery; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma also introduced Senate bill 663, to provide for an adequate national reserve of agricultural commodities and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 664. A bill for the relief of Kihei Matsuo; and

S. 665. A bill for the relief of Margaret D. Scott and Lydia M. Scott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. KNOWLAND also introduced Senate bill 666, to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 to provide for the admission into the United States of certain persons of Russian origin residing in China, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 667. A bill for the relief of the Shelby Shoe Co., of Salem, Mass.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 668. A bill for the relief of Giovanna Parisi, Michelina Valletta, Yolanda Altieri, Generosa Tamburi, Carolina Picciano, and Giovanna Turtur;

S. 669. A bill to permit certain displaced persons under 16 years of age orphaned as a result of World War II to enter the United States as nonquota immigrants; and

S. 670. A bill to incorporate the Gold Star Society of American War Widows and Orphans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES (for himself and Mr. WAGNER):

S. 671. A bill to authorize the conveyance of a portion of the United States military reservation at Fort Schuyler, N. Y., to the State of New York for use as a maritime school, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mr. HENDRICKSON introduced Senate bill 672, to amend part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) so as to provide entitlement to educational benefits for those individuals who enlisted or reenlisted prior to October 6, 1945, on a same basis as for those individuals who enlisted or reenlisted within 1 year after October 6, 1945, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 673. A bill relating to the pay and allowances of officers of the Naval Reserve performing active duty in the grade of rear admiral, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 674. A bill to incorporate the Twenty-ninth Division Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN (by request):

S. 675. A bill for the relief of certain consultants formerly employed by the Technical Industrial Intelligence Committee of the Foreign Economic Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 676. A bill granting a renewal of patent No. 92,187 relating to the badge of the Sons of the American Legion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. WILEY also introduced Senate bill 677, to encourage employment of veterans with pensionable or compensable service-connected disabilities through Federal reimbursement to any employer, insurer, or fund, of amounts of workmen's compensation paid on account of disability or death arising out of such employment, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 678 (by request). A bill to extend to commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey the provisions of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 679. A bill to establish a Bureau of Coal Mines Inspection in the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 680. A bill for the relief of James E. Dick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 681. A bill to amend an act entitled "An Act to Provide a Government for the Territory of Hawaii," approved April 30, 1900, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 682. A bill for the relief of John B. Boyle; and

S. 683. A bill to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments.

(Mr. McCARRAN also introduced Senate bill 684, to improve the administration of justice by the creation of an Administrative Court of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. SPARKMAN introduced Senate bill 685, to provide assistance to farmers in securing farm housing and other farm buildings, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. SPARKMAN also introduced Senate bill 686, to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, in order to assure the availability of low-cost financing on liberal terms to World War II veterans who need homes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. MAYBANK):

S. 687. A bill to establish a Cowpens Battleground National Military Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

S. 688. A bill to provide for a decennial census of housing; and

S. 689. A bill to permit certain postal employees or substitute postal employees to receive credit for military service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McFARLAND (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN):

S. 690. A bill to authorize the furnishing of water to the Yuma auxiliary project, Arizona, through the works of the Gila project, Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McFARLAND (for himself, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. CHAVEZ, and Mr. ANDERSON):

S. 691. A bill relating to the amount of Federal payments to the States under the Social Security Act with respect to State payments to Indian wards of the United States of old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the blind; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. 692. A bill to provide for a grant to the Prisoners Relief Society for use in the rehabilitation of chronic alcoholics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 693. A bill to authorize Sacramento Valley irrigation canals, Central Valley project, California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

By Mr. TAYLOR:

S. 694. A bill to repeal the Philippine Trade Act of 1946; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 695. A bill authorizing the construction of certain works of improvement near Kooskia, Idaho, in the interest of flood control and allied purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 696. A bill to provide additional compensation in lieu of allowances for retired enlisted personnel of the armed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 697. A bill for the relief of Grover Crosbie; and

S. 698. A bill for the relief of Rhode Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 699. A bill to provide for the restoration of certain lands occupied by the United States under war powers to the owners thereof; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 700. A bill to authorize the issuance of a license to practice osteopathy in the District of Columbia to Maria G. Waksmundzha; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 701. A bill to increase the mileage allowances of civilian officers and employees for use of privately owned vehicles; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 702. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide for crediting certain service performed in the employ of carriers under Federal control during World War I; and

S. 703. A bill to permit the mailing of correspondence course lessons at the rates of third- and fourth-class matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(Mr. PEPPER also introduced Senate bill 704, to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the leprosy situation in the United States, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 705. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to support research and training in diseases of arthritis and rheumatism, and to aid the States in the development of community programs for the control of these diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 706. A bill providing equal pay for equal work for women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. GREEN):

S. 707. A bill to provide for the advance planning of public works; to the Committee on Public Works.

(Mr. RUSSELL introduced Senate bill 708, to establish a Voluntary Racial Relocation Commission, and to prescribe its authority which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. BALDWIN (for himself, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. TAFT, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MORSE, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. LODGE, Mr. THYE, Mr. IVES, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. SCHOEPPEL) introduced Senate bill 709, to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 710. A bill to vest title to the Laguna project lands in the pueblo of Laguna of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 711. A bill to incorporate the Army and Navy Union; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. MAYBANK (for himself, Mr. WAGNER, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. MYERS, Mr. HILL, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. LONG) introduced Senate bill 712, to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. TAYLOR introduced Senate Joint Resolution 39, to repeal all except certain provisions of title I of the Selective Service Act of 1948, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. IVES (for himself and Mr. THOMAS of Utah):

S. J. Res. 40. Joint resolution to provide for a national theater and a national opera and ballet; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(Mr. O'CONOR introduced Senate Joint Resolution 41, to establish a commission to study intergovernmental fiscal relationships, which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. HILL, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. LONG, Mr. EASTLAND, and Mr. STENNIS):

S. J. Res. 42. Joint resolution granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Gulf coast and creating the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bill and joint resolution of the House of Representatives were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 1252. An act to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 with respect to the eligibility for appointment in the executive branch of the Government of former professional staff members of committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

H. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

AMENDMENT OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me, together with a comparison of the bill with a former bill, and a sectional analysis thereof be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement, together with the summary and the analysis, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 653) to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. THOMAS of Utah, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement, summary, and analysis of the bill were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

I have today introduced a bill to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes. During the present session of the Congress I have introduced two bills which would provide amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act. The first bill, S. 248, was introduced on behalf of myself, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MYERS, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. WAGNER and was identical with a bill introduced during the Eightieth Congress, on which hearings were held by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, S. 2062. I also introduced this year S. 336, which would clarify the overtime compensation provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act as applied in the stevedoring and building-construction industries. I am now introducing a bill which provides a general revision of the Fair Labor Standards Act. This bill includes substantially all of the amendments which were contained in S. 2062, Eightieth Congress, as reintroduced as S. 248 of this Congress as well as the provisions of S. 336. In addition, however, it includes a number of other amendments and improvements of the law which have been recommended by the President in his state of the Union message and by the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division in his annual report to the Congress.

I have had prepared a comparison between the Thomas bill (S. 2062, 80th Cong.; S. 248, 81st Cong.) and the bill which I am introducing today. I have asked unanimous consent that this comparison be printed in the body of the RECORD immediately following my remarks. I have also had prepared a sectional analysis of the bill which I am introducing today. I have asked unanimous consent that this sectional analysis be printed in the body of the RECORD immediately following the comparison referred to above.

It is my intention that the various bills on this subject, including the bill I have introduced today, shall receive early consideration by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE THOMAS BILL (S. 2062, 80TH CONG.; S. 248, 81ST CONG.) AND BILL TO REVISE THE WAGE AND HOUR LAW

Comparison between the Thomas bill (S. 2062, 80th Cong.; S. 248, 81st Cong.) and the attached draft is as follows:

COVERAGE

Both the Thomas bill and the attached draft expand coverage by bringing within the scope of the minimum wage and overtime provisions of the act employees engaged in or about an enterprise affecting commerce.

The Thomas bill strengthens the child-labor provisions by imposing a direct prohibition on the employment of oppressive child labor in or about any establishment where an employer is engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce. The attached draft contains stronger provisions by directly prohibiting the employment of child labor (1) in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and (2) in or about an enterprise affecting commerce.

MINIMUM WAGES

Both the Thomas bill and the attached draft raise the minimum hourly rate to 75 cents an hour. This may be raised up to $1 by the industry committee procedure. The attached draft would also permit rates to be lowered, but not below 75 cents an hour, where necessary to prevent substantial

curtailment of employment due to a general business recession.

MAXIMUM HOURS

Both the Thomas bill and the attached draft provide for payment of time and one-half the regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of 40 per week. The attached draft also defines the term "regular rate," which is not defined in the Thomas bill.

EXEMPTIONS FROM BOTH WAGE AND HOUR PROVISIONS

Both the Thomas bill and the attached draft continue the complete wage and hour exemption with respect to any employee engaged in an executive, professional, administrative, or outside salesman capacity and for retail or servicing establishments. In both bills the 50-percent interstate commerce test as to retail or service establishments has been dropped and chain stores and large department stores are placed outside the exemption.

Both the Thomas bill and the attached draft continue the complete wage and hour exemption as to employees employed as fishermen but eliminate this exemption as to employees engaged in fish processing. The attached draft, however, would provide a 14-week seasonal exemption, where justified, for the fish-processing industry.

The attached draft continues the complete wage and hour exemption as to employees engaged in agriculture. The Thomas bill limits this exemption to nonindustrialized farms.

The attached draft retains the complete exemption from the wage and hour provisions of the act as to certain classes of switchboard operators. The Thomas bill eliminates this exemption.

Both the Thomas bill and the attached draft eliminate the complete wage and hour exemption with respect to employees engaged in processing agricultural commodities. Under the attached draft, however, agricultural processing may be given a 14-workweek seasonal exemption, where justified.

EXEMPTIONS FROM OVERTIME

Both the Thomas bill and the attached draft narrow the present overtime exemption as to certain classes of motor-carrier employees. The attached draft would, however, more narrowly restrict the exemption so that it would only apply to drivers and drivers' helpers in over-the-road transport operations.

The Thomas bill continues the complete exemption from the overtime provision of the act with respect to railroad employees. The attached draft, however, limits this exemption to employees who travel with the train between terminal points.

The Thomas bill continues the complete exemption from the overtime provisions of the act of all employees of air lines. The attached draft limits the exemption to flight personnel.

The Thomas bill eliminates the minimum wage and overtime exemptions as to seamen. The attached draft continues the overtime exemption as to seamen but would apply the minimum wage provisions.

CHILD-LABOR EXEMPTIONS

The attached draft exempts from the child-labor provisions children employed in retail or service establishments other than chain stores and large department stores. The child-labor provisions are also made inapplicable to employees engaged in agriculture outside of school hours as well as to newsboys. The Thomas bill, which covered child labor less broadly, did not contain either the retail or service establishment exemption or the exemption for newsboys. It does contain the agriculture exemption "while not legally required to attend school," as in the present act.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

1. Secretary of Labor made responsible for administration: The attached draft would place administration of all provisions of the act under the Secretary of Labor, at the same time preserving the Administrator as an officer of the Department of Labor appointed by the President. The Thomas bill makes no provision of this nature.

2. Rule-making power: The attached draft authorizes the Secretary of Labor to make regulations necessary to carry out the purposes of the act whereas the Thomas bill contains no similar provision.

3. Restitution of back wages: The attached draft provides for collection by the Secretary of Labor of back wages and overtime pay due employees and enables suits for this purpose, whereas the Thomas bill contains no similar provision.

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS OF BILL TO REVISE WAGE AND HOUR LAW

Section 1.—Contains the enacting clause and short title.

Section 2.—Amends the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 as follows:

Section 1. Changes title of act to Fair Labor Standards Act of 1949.

Section 2 (a). Broadens findings in original act to make them applicable to industries engaged in activities affecting commerce, in addition to industries engaged in commerce or in production of goods for commerce.

Section 2 (b). Clarifies policy section of original act by referring to the exercise of congressional power over commerce with foreign nations as well as among the several States. This is appropriate in connection with the extension of the minimum-wage provisions to American seamen.

Section 3 (a). Definition of "person." No change.

Section 3 (b). Definition of "commerce." Amended to cover incoming in-bound in addition to out-bound foreign commerce. This makes possible full minimum wage coverage of American seamen.

Section 3 (c). Definition of "State." No change.

Section 3 (d). Definition of "employer." No change.

Section 3 (e). Definition of "employee." No change.

Section 3 (f). Definition of "agriculture." No change.

Section 3 (g). Definition of "employ." No change.

Section 3 (h). Definition of "industry." No change.

Section 3 (i). Definition of "goods." No change.

Section 3 (j). Definition of "produced." No change.

Section 3 (k). Definition of "sale." No change.

Section 3 (l). Definition of "oppressive child labor." Amended to close loophole in present act under which a parent may employ a child under 16 in a hazardous occupation although he could not employ the child in the same occupation if the child was 16 or 17 years of age.

Section 3 (m). Definition of "wage." Amended to provide minimum wages free and clear for seamen and for meal-service employees on common carriers, without deductions for board, lodging, or other facilities.

Section 3 (n). New subsection defining "activities affecting commerce."

Section 4 (a). Amends existing law to place administration of the act under the direction and control of the Secretary of Labor, and provides for continuation of the Wage and Hour Division as the Bureau of Wages and Hours, headed by an Administrator appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Section 4 (b). Technical changes made in existing provisions regarding agency personnel in order to conform to revised provisions of section 4 (a).

Section 4 (c). New subsection. Gives Secretary of Labor power to define terms and make other regulations or orders necessary to effective administration of the act. Provides protection from liability for employers conforming in good faith to such regulations or orders.

Section 4 (d). Conforms section 4 (c) of the present law (relating to place of exercise of agency powers) to amended language in section 4 (a).

Section 4 (e). Transfers the duty of making an annual report to Congress from the Administrator to the Secretary of Labor.

Section 5 (a)–(e). Amends existing law regarding the appointment and functions of industry committees to reflect the extension of coverage to industries affecting commerce. Technical changes made to conform the section to the amendments placing responsibility in the Secretary of Labor. Last paragraph of subsection (e) of the present act deleted as obsolete.

Section 6 (a)–(c). Amended to increase minimum wage to $0.75 an hour (and up to $1 an hour on recommendation of industry committees), and to extend coverage to employees of employers engaged in activities affecting commerce. Provision relating to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands amended to preserve existing wage orders in these islands until superseded, and to adapt the coverage of such orders to the broadened coverage provided by the amendments. Paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) of subsection (a) and subsection (b) deleted as obsolete. Paragraph (5) of the present subsection (a) reenacted as paragraph (2) of that subsection; unchanged except by substitution of the Secretary of Labor for the Administrator.

Section 7 (a). Amended to extend coverage of the overtime provisions to employees of employers engaged in activities affecting commerce. Obsolete provisions of subsections (1) and (2) deleted.

Section 7 (b). Partial exemptions from overtime provisions made applicable up to 10 hours (instead of 12) in any workday or 50 hours (instead of 56) in any workweek. The specific exemptions in this subsection are amended as follows:

Paragraph (1). Exemption unchanged except for substitution of 1,040 hours for 1,000 hours as the contract period.

Paragraph (2). Provisions of existing law modified to encourage greater use of guaranteed annual employment premiums.

Paragraph (3). Exemption for seasonal industries expanded to care for peak-load overtime needs of industries for which exemptions now contained in sections 7 (c), 13 (a) (5), and 13 (a) (10) are eliminated.

Section 7 (c). Present exemption provision deleted (see sec. 7 (b) (3) above) and new subsection substituted. The new subsection (c) prevents evasion of the overtime requirements by use of so-called guaranty or Belo plans which fail to provide a genuine increase in compensation for an employee who works overtime, in accordance with the number of overtime hours worked.

Section 7 (d). Present subsection deleted as obsolete and new subsection defining and delimiting the term "regular rate" substituted. Makes clear that sums which are not compensation for hours worked and sums paid as overtime compensation are excluded from the regular rate. Meets the so-called overtime on overtime problem.

Section 7 (e). New provision. Permits overtime payments at time and one-half the applicable piece or job rate under appropriate safeguards.

Section 7 (f). New provision. Provides that certain premium compensation for overtime work pursuant to contract or practice may

be credited toward statutory overtime compensation due.

Section 8. Subsection (e) deleted as obsolete and remaining provisions relating to wage orders revised to provide for establishment of minimum wage rates between 75 cents and $1 per hour through the action of industry committees and the Secretary of Labor. Wage order coverage expanded to include industries engaged in activities affecting commerce. A new subsection (f) provides for reduction of minimum wage rates set by wage orders down to, but not below, the statutory minimum of 75 cents per hour, when necessary to prevent substantial curtailment of employment in the industry due to a general recession of business activities.

Section 9. Attendance of witnesses. No change except substitution of the Secretary of Labor for the Administrator.

Section 10. Court review. No change except for substitution of the Secretary of Labor for the Administrator.

Section 11 (a). Investigations. Amended. Substitutes Secretary of Labor for Administrator. Authorizes Secretary of Labor to make investigations of employment of minors. Eliminates provision authorizing Administrator to utilize the bureaus and divisions of the Department of Labor for investigations. This provision unnecessary.

Section 11 (b)-(c). No change except substitution of Secretary of Labor for Administrator.

Section 12 (a). Child-labor provisions. Technical change with respect to effective date.

Section 12 (b). New subsection. Prohibits employment of oppressive child labor in commerce, in the production of goods for commerce, and in or about an enterprise affecting commerce. Present subsection authorizing Secretary of Labor to make investigations with respect to employment of minors deleted as such authority is now contained in section 11 (a).

Section 13 (a). New subsection. This subsection supplants the present subsection 13 (a) (2) which exempts from the minimum wage and overtime provisions of the act any employee employed in any retail or service establishment the greater part of whose selling or servicing is in intrastate commerce. The new subsection exempts from the minimum wage, overtime, and child-labor provisions of the act any employee of an employer operating a retail or service establishment which derives 75 percent or more of its receipts from "retail selling or service" as such phrase is defined in this subsection, provided that the employer has neither more than four such establishments nor a total annual volume of sales or servicing of more than $500,000. Sales to farmers for ordinary farming use would generally meet the definition of "retail selling or servicing" as more specifically defined in this subsection.

Section 13 (b). Amends section 13 (a) and continues the present minimum wage and overtime exemptions with respect to certain classes of employees but with some exceptions and modifications, namely:

Paragraph (1). Amends subsection 13 (a) (1) by deleting words "local retailing." The exemption with respect to employees employed in bona fide executive, administrative, or professional capacities is continued.

Present subsection 13 (a) (2) is deleted, being superseded by subsection 13 (a), supra.

Present subsection 13 (a) (3) with respect to seamen is deleted. A new subsection exempts seamen from the overtime provisions only. (Sec. 13 (c) (4), infra.)

Present subsection 13 (a) (4) exemption with respect to employees of carriers by air is deleted. A new subsection exempts flight personnel employed on an aircraft from the overtime provisions only. (Sec. 13 (c) (a), infra.)

Paragraph (2). Amends subsection 13 (a) (5)—catching, harvesting, etc., of various aquatic forms of animal and vegetable life—by incorporating certain technical changes and by deleting that portion of this subsection which extends the exemption to processing and other on-shore occupations.

Paragraph (3). Exemption for any employee employed in agriculture. No change from subsection 13 (a) (6).

Paragraph (4). Exemption for employees affected by regulations or orders of the Secretary of Labor issued under section 14. No change from present subsection 13 (a) (7) except substitution of Secretary of Labor for Administrator.

Paragraph (5). Exemption for employee employed on certain weekly and semiweekly papers. No change from present subsection 13 (a) (8).

Paragraph (6). Exemption for employees of local trolley and motor-bus carriers and other metropolitan carriers. No change from present subsection 13 (a) (9).

Present subsection 13 (a) (10)—"area of production" exception with respect to certain operations on agricultural products—is deleted. Exemption for seasonal industries expanded to take care of peak-load overtime needs now contained in subsection 7 (b) (3), supra.

Paragraph (7). New subsection. Present provision with respect to switchboard operators (sec. 13 (a) (11)) deleted. Exemption for switchboard operators provided for exchanges having only one operator on duty at a time.

Paragraph (8). New subsection. Exempts employees of employers engaged in business of operating taxicabs.

Section 13 (c). Amends present subsection 13 (b). Exempts from the overtime provisions of the act the following classes of employees.

Paragraph (1). New subsection. Narrows overtime exemption to drivers and helpers who spend greater part of the workweek in over-the-road transport operations. Present subsection 13 (b) (1) deleted.

Paragraph (2). New subsection. Narrows overtime exemption with respect to railroad employees to employees employed on line-of-road trains. Present subsection 13 (b) (2) deleted.

Paragraph (3). New subsection. Grants overtime exemption for air carrier employees if employed on an aircraft. Supersedes the present minimum wage and overtime exemption with respect to any employee of a carrier by air. (Subsec. 13 (a) (4), supra.)

Paragraph (4). New subsection. Grants overtime exemption to any employee as seaman. Supersedes the present minimum wage and overtime exemption for seamen. (Subsecs. 13 (a) (3), supra.)

Section 13 (d). Amends present subsection 13 (b) (3). Makes child-labor provisions inapplicable to newsboys. Incorporates clarifying language permitting employment, outside of school hours, of children employed in agriculture.

Section 14. Learners. No change except substitution of Secretary of Labor for Administrator.

Section 15 (a). Prohibited acts. Technical change with respect to effective date. Substitution of Secretary of Labor for Administrator. Amendment to section prohibits violation of rules and regulations issued by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to section 4 (c).

Section 15 (b). No change.

Section 16 (a). Penalties. No change.

Section 16 (b). No change.

Section 16 (c). New subsection. Authorizes Secretary of Labor to collect unpaid wages on behalf of employees which, if accepted by employee, constitute a waiver of his right to sue for such back wages, liquidated damages, court costs, and attorneys' fees. Upon request by and with the consent of the employee, the Secretary of Labor is authorized to sue to recover on behalf of the employee the actual amount of back wages due him, the right to liquidated damages being likewise waived. This subsection is in no way to affect or limit the right with respect to injunctive actions.

Section 17. Injunctive proceedings. Technical change only.

Section 18. Relation to other laws. No change.

Section 19. Separability of provisions. No change.

Section 3.—Amends the Portal to Portal Act of 1947 as follows:

Section 3 (a). Amends sections 6 (a) and 6 (b) by substituting a 4-year statute of limitations for the present 2-year period.

Section 3 (b). Transfers the present functions and duties vested in the Administrator by section 10—reliance on regulations, orders, rulings, etc.—from the Administrator to the Secretary of Labor.

Section 4.—Effective date of certain changes.

Section 4 (a). Act is to become effective 120 days after its enactment except that the Secretary of Labor may immediately exercise the functions vested in him and except that the overtime provisions of the act become effective immediately after the date of enactment.

Section 4 (b). The orders, rulings, and interpretations of the Administrator are to remain effective until amended, modified, or rescinded by the Secretary of Labor.

Section 4 (c). Provides a limitation of 4 years for claims accruing prior to enactment of this act.

NATIONAL RESERVE OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide an adequate national reserve of agricultural products, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an explanatory statement thereof prepared by me be printed in the RECORD, immediately following the text of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and explanatory statement presented by the Senator from Oklahoma, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 663) to provide for an adequate national reserve of agricultural commodities and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Farm Commodity Reserve Act."

TITLE I—STORAGE FACILITIES

SURVEY OF EXISTING FACILITIES AND REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 101. The Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter called the Secretary) shall, through the Commodity Credit Corporation and other means available to him, as expeditiously as may be possible, make a complete survey of (1) warehouses, elevators, and other facilities available in the United States for the storage of agricultural commodities and their products, including surplus storage facilities located at any Army or Navy camp, airfield, depot, or manufacturing plant; and (2) the requirements of the various areas of the United States for additional facilities for such storage. Upon completion of such survey the Secretary shall report his findings and recommendations to Congress, specifying the areas in which such storage facilities are inadequate and the kind and quantity of storage facilities required.

CONSTRUCTION OF STORAGE FACILITIES

SEC. 102. The Secretary is authorized, through the Commodity Credit Corporation and other means available to him, upon completion of the survey and report provided for by this Act, to make additional facilities for the storage of agricultural commodities and their products available in such areas of the United States as he may deem advisable by (1) encouraging, through loans, subsidies, lease-agreements, guaranties, or otherwise, the construction or operation of such facilities by producers, cooperatives, or others; or (2) constructing or operating such facilities where suitable arrangements for their construction or operation by others cannot be made. Storage facilities constructed or operated with assistance provided for by this section shall be maintained and operated pursuant to such rules and regulations as may be issued by the Secretary from time to time; but no such rule or regulation shall become effective until after sixty days' public notice.

ACQUISITION OF STORAGE FACILITIES BY COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

SEC. 103. Section 4 (h) of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act is amended by deleting the second sentence thereof and inserting in its place the following: "The Corporation shall have power to acquire personal property necessary to the conduct of its business; but shall not have power to acquire real property or any interest therein, except that it may (a) rent or lease office space necessary for the conduct of its business, and (b) acquire real property or any interest therein for the purpose of providing storage adequate to carry out effectively and efficiently any of the Corporation's programs, or of securing or discharging obligations owing to the Corporation, or of otherwise protecting the financial interest of the Corporation."

TITLE II—FARM COMMODITY RESERVES

RESERVES

SEC. 201. The Commodity Credit Corporation shall, through its price-support operations, acquire a reserve of corn in the amount of six hundred million bushels, a reserve of wheat in the amount of four hundred million bushels, and a reserve of cotton in the amount of four million five hundred thousand running bales. The Corporation shall not sell or dispose of any corn, wheat, or cotton acquired through its price-support operations if, after such sale, the reserve of such commodity will be lower than the amount specified for such commodity in this section, except that—

(1) if the Secretary determines that the national security or welfare so require, the Corporation shall sell such commodity at the lesser of (A) a price determined on a pricing basis for its stocks of such commodity on hand, which makes due allowance for grade, type, quality, location, and other factors and which is reasonably calculated to reimburse it for costs incurred by it with respect to such stocks, or (B) the parity price of such commodity;

(2) the Corporation may sell or otherwise dispose of any such commodity which has substantially deteriorated in quality, but shall immediately thereafter acquire an equal quantity of such commodity; and

(3) the Corporation may exchange any such commodity pursuant to the Act entitled "An act to facilitate the execution of arrangements for the exchange of surplus agricultural commodities produced in the United States for reserve stocks of strategic and critical materials produced abroad", approved August 11, 1939.

The amount of corn, wheat, and cotton in the reserves provided for by this section shall not be considered in the computation of "total supply" for the purposes of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, or any other computation or determination with respect to acreage allotments, marketing quotas, or price-support levels.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

QUOTAS—1949 ACREAGE

SEC. 301. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, or of any other law, State, county, and farm acreage allotments for corn, wheat, cotton, and rice for any year after 1949 shall be computed and apportioned without regard to acreage planted, or to yields, in 1949. The acreage planted, and yields for the year next preceding the earliest year which, but for this section, would be used in such computation or apportionment shall be used in lieu of the acreage planted and yields in 1949 in such computation or apportionment.

PROHIBITION ON PRICE SUPPORT AFTER ADVERSE REFERENDUM

SEC. 302. Section 302 (b) (3) (B) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (as amended by the Agricultural Act of 1948, to be effective January 1, 1950) is amended to read as follows:

"(B) no price support shall be required to be made available for any basic agricultural commodity normally marketed in any marketing year with respect to which marketing quotas for such commodity have been disapproved by producers."

EXCHANGE OF SURPLUS AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES FOR STRATEGIC MATERIALS

SEC. 303. The act entitled "An act to facilitate the execution of arrangements for the exchange of surplus agricultural commodities produced in the United States for reserve stocks of strategic and critical materials produced abroad," approved August 11, 1939, is amended to read as follows: "That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized, upon terms and conditions prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture, to accept strategic and critical materials produced abroad in exchange for agricultural commodities in its reserves; and for the purpose of such exchange the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force, acting jointly through the agency of the Munitions Board in the National Defense Establishment and in cooperation with the Secretary of the Interior and other departments and agencies shall determine which materials are strategic and critical and the quantity and quality of such materials to be accepted. In order to carry out the provisions of this act, the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized, upon terms and conditions prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture, to procure, convey, transport, handle, store, maintain, or rotate such reserve stocks of strategic and critical materials, as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this act.

"Such reserve stocks of strategic and critical materials shall be stored on military or naval reservations or in other locations approved by the Secretary of Defense. The Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized to transfer such reserve stocks of strategic and critical materials, upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture shall approve, to any other governmental agency. When necessary to prevent deterioration, the Commodity Credit Corporation or other governmental agency is authorized to replace those quantities of the reserve stocks of such strategic and critical materials subject to deterioration with equivalent quantities of the same materials. The funds now or hereafter made available to the Commodity Credit Corporation are hereby made available to carry out the purposes of this act. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional sums as may be required to carry out the provisions of this act. All funds for carrying out the provisions of this act shall be available for allotment to bureaus and offices of the Department of Agriculture, and for transfer to such other agencies of the Federal Government as the Secretary of Agriculture may request to cooperate or assist in carrying out the provisions of this act."

The statement presented by Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THOMAS OF OKLAHOMA

I am introducing a bill to provide for an adequate national reserve of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes. The bill, if enacted into law, is to be known as the Farm Commodity Reserve Act.

The first section of the bill proposes to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make a Nation-wide survey to ascertain the extent to which storage space is available for warehousing farm commodities.

The second section provides that after full information is had as to what we have in the way of storage space the Secretary is authorized to procure additional storage space, if necessary to carry into effect the provisions of the act, at points where acceptable storage space does not exist.

Such additional storage for farm commodities is to be secured through loans, subsidies, lease agreements, guaranties, or otherwise, to the end that farmers may have the opportunity of placing their surplus crops in acceptable storage in connection with their applications for loans upon such commodities.

Section 3 of the bill proposes to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation charter by eliminating certain restrictions from the present law.

Section 4 of the bill proposes to set forth goals for permanent reserves of certain farm commodities. The permanent reserve of wheat is fixed in the amount of 400,000,000 bushels, the permanent reserve of corn is fixed in the amount of 600,000,000 bushels, and the permanent reserve of cotton is fixed in the amount of 4,500,000 running bales.

The bill provides for the acquisition of the reserves through the support-price-loan system.

Commodities placed under loan and thereafter unredeemed should be taken over by the Secretary and made a part of the permanent reserves of such commodities.

The section further provides that all commodities placed in such permanent reserves shall not be considered in the computation of total supply for the purpose of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and shall not be taken into consideration in determining acreage allotments, marketing quotas, or price-support levels as provided by existing law.

Section 5 provides that acreage planted to wheat and cotton for the crop year of 1949 shall not be taken into consideration, in consideration of future allocation of acreage where quotas are imposed.

Section 6 provides that in the event the reserves as specified in the act shall be built up to the full amount, then the Secretary shall be authorized to propose production and marketing quotas for the next year's crop, and in the event such quotas are not approved by the producers of any given commodity, then the Secretary is authorized to discontinue support prices for such commodity.

Section 7 of the act provides that the Secretary of Agriculture shall confer with other Federal agencies with respect to the exchange of reserve stocks of farm commodities for strategic and critical materials produced abroad and needed for stock piling in the States of such materials.

The ends to be attained through the enactment of the suggested legislation are as follows: First, to protect producers of farm commodities in providing for them

support prices; second, to protect consumers in providing a substantial stock pile of basic farm commodities for use in case of emergencies such as drought or war; and, third, to provide a plan for stabilizing the price of farm commodities at or near the full parity price of such commodities.

New provisions, changes in or amendments to the existing agricultural program are now being proposed.

One of the important new provisions will be the vitalization of the concept of a Nation-wide ever-normal granary system to be used first to embrace all kinds of storage such as warehouses and elevators and other forms of acceptable storage for farm products and, second, the amount of each of the approved commodities which may be fixed as a goal to be and constitute the quantity of such granary or reserve.

The plan or bill being proposed provides that the Secretary of Agriculture shall cause a survey to be made to determine what storage facilities are now available and the information secured will advise the Congress and the country of the points, or areas, where satisfactory storage is nonexistent. In addition to the information with respect to the points where storage should be provided the Secretary will be authorized to advise the Congress where storage should be provided and the kind of such storage recommended. It is not contemplated that competitive storage of any kind or character shall be either authorized or constructed. In other words, no additional storage of any kind shall be provided or even considered at points or in areas where storage is already in existence. The plan under consideration provides for a permanent system of support prices at a certain percent of the parity price of any given farm product. If and when loans are made the products pledged as security will be placed in Government approved and supervised warehouses. Thereafter, if the loan is not paid and the farm product redeemed then the commodity pledged will be retained by the Secretary and converted into what is termed a national stock pile of the commodity mentioned.

The plan will set forth the amount of the various commodities to be stock-piled. If and when the stock pile of any given farm product is built up to the point to be fixed by law, then the Secretary of Agriculture will be authorized and directed to call a referendum by the producers of any such commodity on the issue of whether or not quotas shall be authorized and provided for the next year's crop.

In the event the producers shall fail and refuse to approve of quotas for any commodity and the stock pile continues to expand, then the Secretary of Agriculture shall be authorized to withhold support prices for any such product until such time as the said stock pile is reduced to such an amount as to make it feasible and sound to resume the program of stock-piling. The program of warehousing and stock-piling of farm commodities is being considered as a major agriculture policy.

The policy is being presented and developed as a plan to stabilize the price of farm products at or near the full parity price of any such product. The plan will provide, first, a price floor for farm products and in so doing will enable farmers to plan their crop production accordingly and, second, the plan will provide against runaway prices to consumers. When the stock pile is developed and thereafter, in an emergency, such as a war or draft, then the Secretary will be authorized and directed to sell from such stock pile commodities in short supply and spiraling in price first, to farmers for seed and, second to mills for processing and distributing such products at prices to cover the cost of the loan and incidental expenses, per unit, or the full parity price, whichever is the lower.

If the present law respecting support prices in the form of loans, remains unchanged, then support prices will fluctuate from time to time between 60 and 90 percent of the parity price of any mentioned farm product. Speaking for myself, and not as the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, I favor a fixed support price of basic agricultural products at 90 percent of the parity price of such products.

The full parity price of any farm commodity is intended to give the producers enough money for such product to enable them to purchase the products of industry which they need in carrying on their businesses.

This concept set up a 100-percent standard of living for farmers. It is obvious to me that a 90-percent support price will reduce the farm standard of living from 100- to a 90-percent standard of living. If the support price is reduced as low as 60 percent of parity, as now provided by law, effective January 1, 1950, then the plan provides for a 60-percent standard of living for farmers and such a plan or program is entirely foreign to my way of thinking.

AMENDMENT OF DISPLACED PERSONS ACT

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 to provide for the admission to the United States of certain persons of Russian origin residing in China. These are the displaced persons who were displaced by the Russian revolutions, both under the Kerensky regime and under prior regimes.

The bill (S. 666) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 to provide for the admission into the United States of certain persons of Russian origin residing in China, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS OF CERTAIN VETERANS

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1, and I ask unanimous consent that a very brief explanatory statement may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from New Jersey will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 672) to amend part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) so as to provide entitlement to educational benefits for those individuals who enlisted or reenlisted prior to October 6, 1945, on a same basis as for those individuals who enlisted or reenlisted within 1 year after October 6, 1945, introduced by Mr. HENDRICKSON, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement presented by Mr. HENDRICKSON was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HENDRICKSON

This is a "tidying-up" bill which will insure equal treatment to all men who enlisted in armed forces up through October 6, 1945. As matters now stand, all who joined armed forces before October 6, 1945, have their educational benefits cease accumulating as of July 25, 1947, the end of the war powers acts. But Public Law 190 was passed in October 1945 in an attempt to encourage and stimulate enlistments and said that those who enlisted between October 6, 1945, and October 5, 1946, were entitled to the maximum benefits under the GI bill of rights laws as passed by Congress.

For example, two boys enlist, one on October 1, 1945, serves until October 1, 1948, his benefits under Public Law 346 ceased accumulating on July 25, 1947. Second boy enlisted October 7, 1945, serves until October 7, 1947, his benefits continue accumulating straight through and he gets more schooling under GI than did a man (No. 1) who served a year longer.

EMPLOYMENT OF HANDICAPPED VETERANS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, at the kind suggestion of the Disabled American Veterans of the United States, I am glad to reintroduce a bill previously identified as S. 1325, of the Eightieth Congress.

The purpose of this bill is to encourage the employment of handicapped veterans.

The bill (S. 677) to encourage employment of veterans with pensionable or compensable service-connected disabilities through Federal reimbursement to any employer, insurer, or fund, of amounts of workmen's compensation paid on account of disability or death arising out of such employment, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ADMINISTRATIVE COURT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to improve the administration of justice by the creation of an administrative court of the United States. In view of the fact that the bill is brief, I ask that it be printed in full in the body of the RECORD, and that a statement explanatory of the bill be printed in the body of the RECORD immediately following the text of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and the explanatory statement presented by the Senator from Nevada, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 684) to improve the administration of justice by the creation of an Administrative Court of the United States, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there shall be a court of record known as the Administrative Court of the United States. By and with the advice and consent of the Senate the President shall appoint a chief judge and four associate judges for the court, who shall be learned and experienced in both the general and administrative law of the United States but shall not, within 5 years of such appointment, have served as an officer or employee in the executive branch of the Government of the United States. No more than three of the judges of the court shall be appointed from the same political party. It shall be organized and begin to function as soon as its chief judge and two of its associate judges shall have been appointed and qualify. Each judge shall hold office during good behavior and receive a salary equal to that of a circuit judge. On the request of the court any active or retired

judge of the United States may on his consent be assigned, by the chief judge of his court or the Chief Justice of the United States, to duty as a judge of the court for a temporary period or for participation in specified cases there pending. The chief judge shall have precedence and preside at any session of the court which he attends. Whenever the chief judge is not present, is unable to perform the duties of his office, or the office is vacant, his duties shall devolve pro tem upon the associate judge in active service who is next in precedence. The associate judges shall have precedence according to the seniority of their commissions but, if commissions bear the same date, precedence shall be determined according to seniority in age.

JURISDICTION AND POWERS

SEC. 2. To provide an effective remedy for every wrong to any person as well as to provide for the just enforcement of public policy except (1) with respect to cases otherwise cognizable in the Court of Claims, the Customs Court, the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, or the Tax Court or (2) so far as a money judgment is sought, an issue of tax liability is presented, or the grant or denial of a patent is questioned.

(a) The court shall have exclusive jurisdiction of all cases which, except for this act, would be within the jurisdiction of any court of the District of Columbia (1) for the judicial review of agency action or (2) for the civil enforcement of the rules, orders, or investigative demands of any agency.

(b) The court may take jurisdiction in any case involving the judicial review of agency action, otherwise cognizable or pending in any court of the United States other than the Supreme Court, at the request of any person who (1) desires to bring such an action or (2) has brought it elsewhere but seeks to transfer it to the court before trial, argument, or submittal for decision.

(c) The court may take jurisdiction in any case involving the civil enforcement of the rules, orders, or investigative demands of any agency, otherwise cognizable or pending in any court of the United States other than the Supreme Court, at the request of any person against whom such an action has been brought but has not been tried, argued, or submitted for decision.

(d) With the permission of the court any agency may institute in the court an original action for the suspension or revocation of the whole or part of any license otherwise subject to revocation by the agency.

(e) In any case in which jurisdiction is conferred by this section the court shall have all the powers of any court which has, or but for this act would have, jurisdiction. In addition, in connection with any case in which jurisdiction is conferred upon the court by this section or in any case which may be instituted in the court for the purpose by any person or agency, the court shall have authority (1) to declare in any dispute the rights, privileges, immunities, and legal relations of any person or agency with respect to agency action or powers and (2) to direct, compel, or otherwise provide for the taking of agency action wrongfully withheld or erroneously applied. For all purposes the court shall be deemed an independent, specialized, and superior tribunal with respect to the subject matter and issues of fact or legislation before it, endowed with primary jurisdiction and final authority, and created to assure protection of all persons, conformity with legislative policy, and uniformity in the interpretation and administration of law.

OPERATION AND PROCEDURE

SEC. 3. The official station of the judges of the court shall be the District of Columbia. Not less than three judges shall constitute the court in any case of a type which, except for this act or if brought in another court, would require a court of more than one judge. Otherwise any one or more of the judges of the court, including judges temporarily assigned thereto, shall suffice as provided by the rules of the court. Where more than one judge sits, a majority of the judges of the court for the case shall constitute a quorum. The court shall hold an annual term at the seat of government but may hear or decide cases at general, special, or adjourned terms or sessions at any place within the jurisdiction of the United States. In any case in which the permission of the court is required it may be sought by ex parte petition or otherwise as the court may provide by rule or instruction. A written opinion shall be filed as a part of the record in each case, certified to each of the named parties therein, and published in compilations issued by the court from time to time. Save as modified by the court, general rules of procedure in the district courts of the United States shall govern. So far as pertinent, the general provisions of the Judicial Code (28 U. S. C., part V) and the provisions thereof respecting procedure in the Court of Claims (28 U. S. C., ch. 165) shall apply. The court, and each judge or commissioner thereof, shall possess all the powers of a district court of the United States for preserving order, compelling the attendance of witnesses, requiring the production of evidence, and achieving the execution of process.

JUDGMENTS AND REVIEW

SEC. 4. To assure in every case both that full justice shall have been done to each person and that public policy shall be fairly and equitably executed—

(a) In any case determined by one judge of the court, the judgment shall become final at the expiration of 30 days unless within that time (1) the parties waive rehearing and review by the court, in which case it shall become final upon such waiver, (2) it is modified or suspended by the judge who entered it, in which case the time shall begin to run again after such modification or the reentry of the judgment, or (3) any party thereto petitions for a review by three or more judges of the court sitting as an appellate division pursuant to the rules of the court. If such a petition is filed and denied, the judgment shall thereupon be final. If such review is granted, the judgment shall become final when and as affirmed, modified, or reversed by the appellate division of the court after opportunity for rehearing.

(b) In any case determined originally in the court by more than one judge, the judgment shall be final after opportunity for rehearing.

(c) Any final judgment of the court shall be reviewable only by the Supreme Court on writ of certiorari granted at the petition of any party, or on appeal if such would be available but for this act, (1) to the extent that such review may be required by the Constitution or (2) so far as the court may have failed in any case to afford full and equal protection to private and public rights, powers, privileges, or immunities. The court may also certify to the Supreme Court any question of law in any case as to which instructions are desired, and upon such certification the Supreme Court may give binding instructions on such questions.

MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 5. For the purposes of this act—

(a) The definitions stated in the Judicial Code (28 U. S. C. sec. 451) and the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U. S. C. sec. 1001) shall be applicable to the same terms used in this act.

(b) The court and the judges thereof shall be subject to the pertinent general provisions of the Judicial Code (28 U. S. C. ch. 21). The budget of the court shall be handled in the same manner as that of the Court of Claims (28 U. S. C. sec. 605). Judges of the court may retire for disability in the same manner as judges of the Court of Claims (28 U. S. C. sec. 372).

(c) The officers and employees of the court shall be the same, and be governed by the same provisions of law so far as relevant, as those of the courts of appeals (28 U. S. C. ch. 47) and the Court of Claims (28 U. S. C. ch. 51). They shall also be subject to the general provisions of the Judicial Code applicable to officers and employees of other courts of the United States (28 U. S. C. ch. 57).

(d) The court shall at any time report to Congress the need for additional judges or for legislation in its field of special competence or jurisdiction.

The statement presented by Mr. McCARRAN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR McCARRAN

I am today introducing a bill "to improve the administration of justice by the creation of an Administrative Court of the United States." The subject is not new. The condition it is designed to meet is not new. I should like to say a few words about both.

I

The need for a measure such as this is something we all know about generally. We know that government is growing larger in size. The complexity of the modern administrative machine of state increases daily. Its impact upon our people grows more intense. Its interests flow beyond the seas.

Now, with world leadership forced upon us, we must be even more vigilant that our domestic concerns and our institutions at home retain the vigor which has brought us this far along the road of history. We must avoid the regrettable chronicle of empires which, while extending their interests over the globe, neglected to make sure that there was commensurate progress at home.

But even on this continent times change and our institutions must be adjusted accordingly. In the field of government, the greatest development of the twentieth century has been the growth of administrative agencies and bureaus to do what Congress and the courts previously did. Nowadays more laws are made by administrative agencies than by Congress, except that we call those laws regulations instead of statutes. We spend hundreds of thousands of dollars every year merely publishing those regulations, in the Federal Register and the Code of Federal Regulations. Similarly, bureaus and commissions decide far more specific cases than the courts, except that we call those decisions orders instead of judgments. Some are published in vast sets of law books, but the greater part of them never see the light of publicity.

Faced with this condition, we have taken various precautions to continue a government of divided powers. Congress still retains its authority to empower and to guide, by the instructions it writes into the public statutes or the appropriation acts. But those instructions have necessarily become more and more general. The inevitable consequence has been that administrative agencies have greater and greater latitude to interpret the statutes we write.

Similarly, we still have a system of courts. During the last 15 years many things have been done to strengthen them in numbers and in method. We have provided for more and more judges. The bar of the country has given its best efforts to modernize judicial procedure. The judicial system as such has been developed by a series of notable statutes. But still the courts, though augmented in numbers and facilities, are no longer the tribunals of primary resort in the matters which we have committed to administrative agencies. The latter make the rules and decide the cases in the first instance. In great part the courts serve merely

as appellate agencies designed, or deeming themselves designed, to exercise their powers only to correct abuses of the grossest nature.

II

In one respect I believe we have been unfair to our judicial system in recent years. We have heaped upon it new tasks in connection with new legislation of a social nature, not realizing that in the growth of the country their old functions have also grown in magnitude. In an age of specialization, we have also failed to afford them an opportunity to specialize. We have demanded that their jurisdiction embrace both old and new functions. And the new functions of the last 15 years, as we all know, are matters of utmost intricacy.

Of course, we have allowed this situation to continue because we respect our judicial institutions. We also desire to continue their general jurisdiction unimpaired so that they may bring our Federal justice to every district of the country where they sit. I should be the last person to say that we should abandon our ideal of one system of courts, one bar, and one law.

Yet our history demonstrates that we have had to depart from that ideal very often. In a sense, we have abandoned it most markedly in setting up numerous boards and commissions to do what our courts would have done in an earlier day. We also departed from the ideal when we created the Court of Claims, the customs and patent courts, and the Tax Court.

But those specialized courts were set up not in derogation of our legal system, but in recognition that there were some specialties which required special courts to protect and foster—rather than to impair—our system of government under law. They are special courts only in the sense that they confine their attention to special subjects. Otherwise their methods and their judges are like those of other courts.

These special courts have been successful. I know of no real complaint about the special court system. It is therefore surprising that, despite the great expansion of Government and judicature in the last 15 years, no new specialized courts have been created for a generation or more. The reason, presumably, lies in the fact that we had previously and generously taken care of the several special fields of our law so that there was no great need for more of them.

III

But a dozen years ago it was widely proposed that there be established an administrative court. The proposal was endorsed and publicized by the American Bar Association. The idea appears to have perished for two reasons. First was the fact that, perhaps unwisely, it was proposed to abolish the specialized courts I have mentioned and merge them in the administrative court. Second was the fact that the legal profession turned its attention to more immediate problems such as the formulation of uniform rules of procedure and regulation of administrative procedure.

In considering remedies for some of the legal problems we have today, it has occurred to me that a properly constituted administrative court may contribute greatly to the improvement of the administration of justice. It may do so by contributing specialization where specialization is sorely needed, by relieving the regular courts of part of their burdens, and by aiding both Government and private interests through expert handling of the complex problems of administrative law.

It is an anachronism for us to accept specialization as a necessity in administrative law at the administrative level, but to assume that generalization is sufficient at the judicial level of the same subject. If—as we are told—it requires specialists to regulate securities for example, why is not some specialization at least desirable in courts dealing with security regulation cases? Of course the specialization is desirable. We have admitted it in our legislation in recent years. During the war we created an Emergency Court of Appeals to assure specialization and uniformity in the judicial review of price-control regulations. More recently we have created a tax court out of what was previously a board, in order to achieve a judicial specialization in the field of taxation.

There would certainly be no harm in relieving our regular courts of some of their duties in administrative-law cases. Such proceedings are extensive. The record in a single case may be many volumes of print. The issues are complex. The courts must, therefore, devote to them precious time during which litigants in regular cases must suffer delays.

On the other hand, an administrative court could bring to its task a degree of familiarity, expertness, and dispatch which would improve the over-all administration of justice greatly in administrative-law cases. For the lack of those things both Government and people suffer in this field. The Government is injured every time a court fails to understand the special problems in one of these cases. People seeking justice are injured every time a court, for lack of understanding, denies them their full rights or delays decision.

It should not be necessary to expand on these reasons. Obviously specialization is a matter of national policy, even in the judiciary, and we resort to it from time to time as need requires. Plainly the regular courts would be aided by relief from their present burdens. Manifestly expertness is needed at the judicial level for the adequate determination of intricate administrative-law cases.

IV

Believing as I do about these things, and with some familiarity as to legislative needs and judicial methods of our court system, I have sought to devise an Administrative Court which would be adequate to the problem but would not trench unduly upon either our regular or specialized courts in their essential functions. It has been necessary to determine (1) the type of court, (2) its jurisdiction, (3) its operational procedure, and (4) its setting in our appellate system. I should like to close this statement with a few words about each of these matters.

(1) We shall need an Administrative Court of several judges. I have proposed that there be five judges. They would be appointed in the usual fashion except that, because of the nature and purpose of the court, the appointees should have the special qualification of training and experience in administrative as well as other law. At the same time, however, it is essential that the court should not be made up of personnel drawn immediately from the executive branch because, among other things, appointments so made would require such judges to disqualify themselves in many cases and would also lead people to feel that such a court would be unduly partial to Government agencies. Of course the court will measure up to its purpose only to the extent that its judges measure up to the necessary qualifications.

(2) In the matter of the jurisdiction of the court, it seems to me that a simple system will not only suffice for immediate purposes but will permit growth and adaptation over the coming years. I have therefore proposed that the court have (a) exclusive jurisdiction over all administrative law cases instituted in the District of Columbia and (b) permissive jurisdiction, at the instance of the private parties involved, with respect to such cases instituted elsewhere. But in neither situation would the court supersede the Court of Claims, the customs and patent courts, or the Tax Court.

(3) The procedure of the court would be of two kinds and, for each kind, it would be similar to that with which we are all familiar. When the court sits as a trial court, it would operate like other trial courts—with one or more judges, etc. It would also be a reviewing or appellate court in the same fashion as other courts—with three or more judges sitting in a case. In other words, there would be nothing unusual about the method and procedure in the court. It might operate anywhere in the country, however, depending upon the needs of its business as time goes on.

(4) In appropriate cases as required by the Constitution, and in any case in which the court should fail to afford equal protection to the parties before it, appeals could be taken to the Supreme Court in the same fashion as in other cases in other courts.

These are the essentials of my proposal. The provisions of the bill I have introduced are quite simple. Any member of Congress and any lawyer can understand them. For the problem it is designed to reach, this proposal is in fact much more direct and simple than many of the schemes laid before us.

In closing I should like to say again, as I have on other occasions, that we have a duty here to keep our governmental machine attuned to the needs of today and tomorrow and the years to come. What we do here in the way of substantive legislation will not long endure if we do not also make sure that we have a governmental machine that can handle it. At the same time we must maintain unbroken contact with our democratic tradition of a government of divided powers under law. The proposal I have made, for an Administrative Court of the United States, should aid us in performing that duty and achieving that purpose.

RURAL HOUSING

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill relating to rural housing, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory analysis of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory analysis of the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 685) to provide assistance to farmers in securing farm housing and other farm buildings, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The analysis presented by Mr. SPARKMAN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANALYSIS OF THE FARM HOUSING ACT OF 1949

The Farm Housing Act of 1949, which I have today introduced, would provide authority for Federal assistance toward the construction and improvement of farm homes and other farm buildings. It would make available to farm residents a means, equally effective with those available to urban residents, of securing adequate, safe, and sanitary homes. The bill contemplates the extension of financial assistance through existing Federal agencies to the owners of farms without decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings and adequate other farm buildings, who are unable to finance such improvements through credit from other sources upon terms and conditions suitable for such purposes. Such financial assistance in the form of limited grants would also be extended to eliminate hazards to health and safety to the

occupants of the buildings and to the community which cannot otherwise be improved. The bill also contemplates an extensive program of research and technical studies for the purposes of stimulating the construction of farm buildings, approving architectural design and utility of buildings, utilizing new and native materials, effecting economies in materials and construction methods and other phases of farm buildings with a view of reducing the cost and adapting farm buildings to more efficient and economical farm use. Technical services, including furnishing of building plans and specifications and supervision and inspection of construction, is another type of service authorized by the bill.

It is proposed to inaugurate the program by authorizing loans not exceeding $25,000,000 on and after the beginning of the first fiscal year after the enactment of the bill and additional amounts of loans on and after the beginning of the second, third, and fourth year after the enactment of the act of $50,000,000, $75,000,000, and $100,000,000, respectively.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

The bill, in section 2, would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture, through the Farmers Home Administration, to extend financial assistance to the owners of farms to enable them to construct, improve, alter, repair, or replace dwellings or other farm buildings so as to provide the applicants, their tenants, sharecroppers, and laborers with decent, safe, and sanitary living conditions and adequate improvements. For the purposes of this act, a farm is defined as one or more parcels of land operated as a single unit which is used for the production of agricultural commodities and customarily produces, or is capable of producing, for sale and home use agricultural commodities of a gross value equal to a value of $400 in 1944. Many rural tracts classified as farms in the census definition would not be eligible for assistance under this definition, but for the most part the units which would not be eligible are more accurately described as rural residences, the occupants of which are engaged primarily in pursuits other than agricultural, and the agricultural production from which is merely incidental.

Financial assistance under the bill would not be extended to the owners of farms now having adequate farm dwellings or other farm buildings or who are able to secure the necessary improvements through their own resources or from other credit sources on terms and conditions suitable for the purposes of the loan.

Section 3 would authorize loans for the period of 33 years at 4 percent interest on farms having income and earning capacity sufficient to repay the full sum loaned. Section 4 would authorize loans on farms having adequate agricultural or other income to support adequate housing and other buildings only in connection with the undertaking of the owner of the farm to enlarge or otherwise develop its agricultural income, so that within a period of 10 years the full obligation of the owner with respect to such loan could be met. During the intervening period, installments due on the loan would be credited as paid in amounts not exceeding the annual installment of interest and 50 percent of the accrued principal installments in any year to the extent only that the borrower's income is, in fact, insufficient to enable the borrower to make such payments on schedule. The credits on the loan would inure only to the benefit of the owner of the farm at the time of the loan, except that, with the consent of the Secretary of Agriculture, such credits might continue to be extended to some other eligible person who acquires the farm after such a loan is made.

Some farming units coming within the definition of the farm in the bill are so situated or are so nonproductive that there is little possibility of enlarging or developing them into self-sustaining units. Dwellings and other buildings on such units often constitute severe hazards to the safety and health of the occupant, his family, and the community. Section 5 would authorize the Secretary to make grants or combinations of loans and grants with respect to such farms to cover the costs of improvements or additions such as structural supports, repairing roofs, providing toilet facilities, convenient and sanitary water supply, screens or other similar repairs or improvements. The amount of financial assistance on such farming unit would be limited to $1,000 on farms having a single dwelling or a total of $2,000 to any one owner. The grant portion of the assistance with respect to such farms would be limited to $500 for any one farming unit or dwelling.

Loans under sections 3, 4, and 5 of the bill would be secured by the applicant's equity in the farm and such additional security or collateral as may be necessary to reasonably assure repayment of the indebtedness. When the borrower is able to refinance such loans through cooperative or other private lending sources, he will be required to do so.

TECHNICAL SERVICES AND RESEARCH

Section 6 of the bill would require that all buildings constructed or improved by means of financial assistance under the bill should be substantially constructed and in accordance with such building plans and specifications as the Secretary might require. The construction and repair of such buildings so financed would be supervised and inspected to the extent required by the Secretary. In addition to such services to borrowers under this authority, the Secretary would also be authorized to furnish to other persons, with or without charge, building plans, specifications, and construction supervision and inspection regarding farm dwellings and other farm buildings. Section 6 also would authorize the Secretary to conduct research and technical studies in the field of farm housing and other buildings, including the development, demonstration, and promotion of construction of adequate farm dwellings and other buildings; and other research studies designed to reduce the cost of, and adapt, farm buildings, fixtures, and appurtenances for more efficient farm use.

ADMINISTRATION

The bill would be administered by the Secretary through existing agencies. The Farmers Home Administration, now administering the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, is adequately organized to perform the functions of the Secretary with respect to financial assistance. Existing committees appointed under prior authority, composed primarily of local farmers, would be required to approve the application for financial assistance and to recommend the values of farms for security purposes. The research and technical services can be adequately performed under the direction of existing agencies in the Department of Agriculture.

Under section 7 of the bill, veterans and families of deceased servicemen would be given preference as between eligible applicants seeking assistance.

In section 9, the Secretary would be authorized to establish the standards for adequate housing and other farm buildings by farms or localities, taking into consideration the type of housing, meeting the needs of the family using the housing, the type and character of the farming operations, and the size of the farm and its earning capacity. The recipient of a loan or grant would be required not to change the terms of any lease or other agreement with the occupants of the farm by reason of the improvements constructed with financial assistance under the act.

Section 10 provides the necessary power to the Secretary to service loans of this type. The authority of the Secretary in this respect is similar to the authority now vested in him with respect to loans under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

COST OF THE PROGRAM

With respect to loans under sections 3, 4, and 5 of the bill, the Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized to borrow from the Secretary of the Treasury such sums as the Congress might from time to time determine. The initial borrowings which would be available until expended would be limited to $25,000,000. At the beginning of the second year after the enactment of the act, the Secretary could borrow for the purpose of making loans an additional $50,000,000, and during the third and fourth years after the enactment of the act, could borrow $75,000,000 and $100,000,000, respectively. The terms and conditions of such borrowings would be those agreed upon by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Treasury with interest determined in relation to the current average rate of outstanding marketable obligations of the United States at the end of the month preceding the issuance of the obligations by the Secretary. The Secretary of the Treasury would be authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act for the purpose of advancing funds to the Secretary of Agriculture.

With respect to loans under section 4 on potentially adequate farms, the Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized to make commitments for credit contributions aggregating $500,000 per annum for not more than 10 years in connection with loans made on and after the beginning of the first fiscal year after the enactment of this bill. On and after the beginning of the next three fiscal years, the aggregate of these commitments would be limited to $1,000,000, $1,500,000, and $2,000,000 per annum, respectively.

Under section 13, it is contemplated that direct appropriations would be made whenever necessary to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to repay his obligations to the Secretary of the Treasury to the extent of the actual contributions of credits made by the Secretary on the principal due from borrowers under section 4, and the interest on a similar sum due on the notes and obligations of the Secretary of Agriculture to the Secretary of the Treasury. The amount of money needed for grants under section 5 would also be appropriated, but not to exceed $1,000,000 on and after the beginning of the first fiscal year after the enactment of this act and additional sums of $2,500,000, $4,000,000, and $5,000,000, respectively, for the next three fiscal years.

Authorization is also provided for such further sums as may be necessary for the Secretary to carry out the provisions of the act, including administrative expenses in connection with loans and technical services, research and the distribution of the results thereof.

COMPARISON WITH OTHER AUTHORITY

Title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, by the Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946, authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to make and insure loans for terms of not to exceed 40 years at 4 percent interest for the acquisition and improvement of efficient family type farms. Such loans are required to be secured by a first lien and limited funds available under this authority are required to be allocated

between the States on the basis of population and the prevalence of farm tenancy.

The prime purpose of this authority is to provide the opportunity for capable farm tenants, sharecroppers, and laborers to become farm owners. In connection with this purpose, of course, adequate farm dwellings and other buildings are essential. However, the assistance which might be rendered under existing authority is limited by the requirement of a first lien, by the distribution of funds, and by the limitation of the assistance to family-type farms not greater than average value. The proposed legislation would expand the scope of assistance, without these limitations, to the present owners of farms who cannot qualify for assistance under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act but who nevertheless are without adequate housing or farm buildings and without adequate credit. The minimum security requirements of Federal land bank loans eliminate the many farm owners who are in need of adequate farm homes and farm buildings and who are without sufficient credit base to be eligible for a Federal land bank loan. The proposed legislation makes no minimum security requirements other than that reasonable security be taken for the loan. Similarly, the programs authorized by the National Housing Act, the Housing Act of 1948, and the United States Housing Act of 1937, although including some authority for assistance in rural areas are designed primarily to meet the needs of urban residents. The loan terms and conditions, the security requirements and the administrative organizations under these statutes are not designed to meet the need of credit for the farm owner for the construction of his dwelling or other farm buildings.

The provisions of the various general housing bills that have been introduced in this Congress are inadequate to meet the farm needs, primarily because the authority for financial assistance is limited to loans for farm housing and facilities incident to family living. This would preclude the making of loans for the construction or repair of buildings the farmer must have in order to increase his farm income sufficiently to support a decent, safe, and sanitary dwelling he might secure by means of assistance under such legislation. The Farm Housing Act of 1949, on the other hand, would authorize financial assistance for both the dwelling and other farm buildings, so that the farm operation could be made more efficient and thus increase the probability of repayment on many of the loans, reduce the number of loans which would qualify only under the provisions of section 4 relating to credits because of insufficient farm income, and should have a significant and beneficial influence upon the agricultural pattern and agricultural production of the Nation.

HOUSING FOR VETERANS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill relating to housing for veterans, and I ask unanimous consent that a brief analysis of the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 686) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, in order to assure the availability of low-cost financing on liberal terms to World War II veterans who need homes, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The explanatory analysis of the bill presented by Mr. SPARKMAN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPOSED BILL TO AMEND THE GI BILL IN ORDER TO ASSURE LOW-COST FINANCING ON LIBERAL TERMS TO WORLD WAR II VETERANS WHO NEED HOMES

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY OF BILL

Section 512: This section provides an adequate secondary market for GI 4-percent home loans. To encourage lenders to make new 4-percent GI loans available to veterans, the bill requires that lenders who sell to the market shall certify that they will reinvest an equivalent amount in new GI loans carrying an interest rate not in excess of 4 percent. The authority to purchase loans would expire June 30, 1952.

Section 513: This section seeks to assure the opportunity to obtain a 4-percent GI home loan for any credit-worthy veteran who is unable to obtain one from a private lender. The Administrator of Veterans Affairs is authorized to make such loans (with a $10,000 limit on individual loans) if he is satisfied that the veteran can afford the loan and is unable to get a GI loan through private channels. The Administrator's authority to make direct loans would run until June 30, 1951.

Section 514: This section directs the Secretary of Treasury to provide the necessary funds (up to $800,000,000 for the secondary market, and up to $500,000,000 for direct loans, with specified fiscal year limits) out of the proceeds from the sale of securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended. The Treasury will receive interest at the going rate (to the Treasury) on funds thus made available to the Administrator of Veterans Affairs.

Section 515: This section terminates the guaranty of second mortgage loans under section 505a of the GI bill. The present second mortgage type of home purchase plan raises financing costs to the veteran at least 10 percent above the costs of a straight 4-percent first-mortgage GI loan. This is true because of the higher rate of interest (4½ percent) and insurance premium (one-half of 1 percent) charged for the underlying FHA-insured first mortgage, because of duplication of costs, and because of brokerage and other charges permitted on FHA-insured loans which are not allowable on GI loans guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration.

Section 516: This is a separability clause for the loan guaranty provisions of the GI bill.

Section 2: This section amends the National Housing Act and removes from the Federal National Mortgage Association the authority to purchase GI loans, except for previous commitments.

To encourage lender support of low-interest mortgage loans, this section also removes FNMA authority to purchase any mortgage loan which carries an interest rate higher than 4 percent, except for previous commitments.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT RELATING TO LEPROSY

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the leprosy situation in the United States, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a letter from the president of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Washington, D. C., together with a petition signed by sundry patients at the Carville (La.) National Leprosarium, several of whom are residents of the State of Florida.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill, together with the letter and petition, will be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached to the petition.

The bill (S. 704) to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the leprosy situation in the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. PEPPER, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "National Leprosy Act."

TITLE I—DISSEMINATION OF PERTINENT FACTS CONCERNING LEPROSY

SEC. 101. (a) It shall be one of the purposes of this act to promote an enlightened public opinion, a new and more accurate understanding on the part of the American public upon the subject of leprosy as one of the major requirements in the national plan to effect control and the elimination of leprosy in the United States, by disseminating to Federal and State health agencies, including Federal and State medical colleges; private medical colleges and nurse-training schools, and other private agencies that are in any way concerned with the diagnosis and/or treatment of communicable disease; the medical profession of the United States, and to the general public, the pertinent facts essential to each group and agency listed above, concerning leprosy, including information upon the latest improved medicine and methods for treating this disease, and including a statement of the procedure to be followed to obtain proper treatment.

(b) The leprosy health problem in the United States being a national responsibility, the Public Health Service, as an agency of the Federal Government, is hereby charged with the duty of preparing and disseminating the information outlined in section 101 (a) of this title.

(c) In carrying out the provisions of this title, it shall be the duty of the Public Health Service to promote the welfare of the people of the United States by aiding and fostering a spirit of tolerance and understanding upon the part of the public, in the interests of persons who have, or who may in the future contract leprosy, as an initial step in the national fight against this disease, and by showing the injustice of the leprosy stigma for the purpose of allaying the unreasonable fear of this disease in the public mind.

(d) The word "leper" shall not be used in any statement, lecture, data, report, or other material prepared by the Public Health Service subsequent to the passage of this act.

SEC. 102. In carrying out the provisions of this title, the Public Health Service shall—

(a) advise and cooperate with other agencies and departments of the Federal Government, with State governments and agencies, and with private agencies functioning in the field of health;

(b) collect and analyze statistics and make studies, investigations, and reports on conditions, problems, and needs in the leprosy field in the United States and in other countries, and disseminate to the people of the United States pertinent information thus obtained.

SEC. 103. The Surgeon General, Public Health Service, is authorized to make such expenditures (including expenditures for personal services and rent at the seat of government and elsewhere, for books of reference and periodicals, and for printing and binding) as may be necessary to carry out the

provisions of this title and as may be provided by the Congress from time to time.

SEC. 104. There is authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise obligated, for such additional administrative expenses of the Public Health Service as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, including such expenses as are described in section 103 of this title, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and each year thereafter, the sum necessary for such purposes.

TITLE II—TREATMENT OF LEPROSY PATIENTS

SEC. 201. In order to encourage persons afflicted with leprosy to apply for treatment, the Public Health Service is hereby authorized and directed to provide suitable methods and facilities for treatment purposes generally more accessible to leprosy patients, as outlined in this title, and to establish leprosy-treatment principles, methods, and regulations for administering leprosy treatments more in harmony with the customs of society as applied to the care and treatment of persons afflicted with other diseases.

SEC. 202. In carrying out the provisions of this title the Surgeon General is authorized and directed to—

(a) arrange and provide for administering treatment to certain veteran patients in Veterans' Administration hospitals; certain other patients in State, county, and city hospitals; and in leprosy-treatment centers other than and in addition to the present national leprosarium; certain others as out-patients, and to have treatment administered to certain patients in their homes.

(b) to supply or pay for the medical treatment which, in his opinion, is most suitable for use in each case treated outside of Public Health Service hospitals, and to supply printed instructions covering the use of such treatment: *Provided*, That payment for medicines administered to veteran patients by the Veterans' Administration hospitals will be made by the Veterans' Administration;

(c) base the decision, as to the locality at which treatment is to be administered, upon the type of the disease contracted in each case, the degree of communicability of the disease when the case is examined by the Public Health Service; the proximity of the patient's home or place of residence to the nearest available hospital or treatment center, and the feasibility of treating the patient as an out-patient, or of administering treatment in the patient's home.

(d) establish such regulations governing treatment of leprosy patients at leprosy-treatment centers, at other hospitals, as out-patients treated at such centers and hospitals, or as home patients, as will be conducive to and encourage the voluntary application for treatment upon the part of persons afflicted with leprosy.

(e) utilize the services and facilities of any executive department or agency of the Federal Government, as needed to carry out the provisions of this act, in accordance with an agreement with the head thereof. Payment for such services and for the use of such facilities shall be made as may be agreed upon between the Surgeon General and the head of the department or agency furnishing them.

SEC. 203. In carrying out the provisions of sections 201 and 202 of this title the Surgeon General is authorized and directed to arrange with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs for the admission and treatment of veterans of the armed forces afflicted with a noncommunicable type of leprosy, for hospitalization or out-patient treatment; and for admission and treatment of veterans with a communicable type of the disease who have made sufficient progress toward its arrestment to justify their transfer to a Veterans' Administration hospital for the remainder of the treatment; and for the admission and treatment of such other veteran patients as may be approved by the Surgeon General for treatment in a Veterans' Administration hospital.

SEC. 204. The Surgeon General will arrange with the director of State health departments, in appropriate cases, or with the responsible head of State, county, and city hospitals for the admission and treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy of a noncommunicable type as hospitalized, or as out-patient cases; and persons with a communicable type of the disease who, in the opinion of the Surgeon General, have made sufficient progress toward its arrestment to justify receiving the remainder of the treatment in or from an approved hospital other than the national leprosarium.

SEC. 205. (a) The Surgeon General is hereby authorized to arrange with any qualified physician in the United States to treat persons having leprosy in the patient's home.

(b) The Surgeon General will determine the qualifications of physicians to administer treatment to leprosy patients prior to authorizing the home treatment provided by this section.

SEC. 206. As a prerequisite to a patient being authorized to receive treatment for leprosy other than as a hospitalized patient in a United States marine hospital, or other treatment center operated by the Public Health Service, the Surgeon General is authorized to require a written agreement that the patient will follow the treatment instructions specified by the Public Health Service, until the disease is arrested and the official discharge from treatment requirements is received by the patient; and that, thereafter, the patient will regularly and promptly present himself for periodical physical check-up over the period designated by the Surgeon General. Failure upon the part of the patient to comply with such agreement will authorize the Surgeon General to transfer the patient to a suitable Public Health Service hospital for treatment.

SEC. 207. The Public Health Service shall receive into any hospital or treatment center operated by that service, and not set aside and reserved for treating mental patients, or designated as a tuberculosis hospital, any person afflicted with leprosy who presents himself for care and treatment, and to send for any person reported by the proper health authority of any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia to be afflicted with leprosy, and to convey such person to the nearest suitable hospital or treatment center, if necessary, for an examination to determine the type of the disease contracted, and the place where the patient is to receive treatment in accordance with the provisions of this title.

SEC. 208. All cases determined by the Public Health Service to be of a communicable type of leprosy which, in the opinion of the examining officer, cannot be satisfactorily treated except at a marine hospital or other treatment center operated by the Public Health Service, will be transferred by the Surgeon General to the United States marine hospital, not set aside for mental, or tuberculosis patients, nearest the patient's home, or to such hospital in a nonendemic State as may be desired by the patient concerned, or by the parents, or guardian, if the patient is a minor: *Provided*, That patients having a communicable type of the disease who reside in a nonendemic State will be sent to a United States marine hospital in a nonendemic State for treatment.

SEC. 209. Release of patients from treatment requirements, regardless of where the treatment is administered, will be by the authority of the Surgeon General or his designated representative in each case.

SEC. 210. Transportation of patients, except those being treated as out-patients, from their place of residence to hospitals and treatment centers and return to their homes within the United States and its Territories, when discharged, shall be met with funds available for the maintenance of hospitals of the Public Health Service, except in those cases where another Federal agency is authorized or required to pay for such transportation.

SEC. 211. The Surgeon General is authorized to make such expenditures (including expenditures for personal services) as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, and as may be provided by Congress, from time to time.

SEC. 212. There is authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise obligated, for such additional administration expenses of the Public Health Service in carrying out the provisions of sections 201 to 211, inclusive, of this title, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and each year thereafter, the sum necessary for such purposes.

SEC. 213. Except as specifically provided herein, nothing in this title shall be construed as conferring on any Federal officer or employee, or any other person, the right to exercise supervision or control over the leprosy-treatment methods and policies established by the Public Health Service.

SEC. 214. In order to carry out the provisions of this title with respect to the establishment of such additional leprosy-treatment centers as may be found necessary, the Administrator, Federal Security Administration, is authorized to acquire by purchase, condemnation, donation, or otherwise, a site in each of the four endemic States of California, Florida, Louisiana, and Texas, and one site in a nonendemic State having a climate approximately described as cool and dry and not subject to extremely low temperatures in winter, and to erect thereon, furnish and equip such buildings and facilities, or to acquire by purchase or donation such site and installations as may be available and suitable, and to provide such personnel as are needed to establish and operate leprosy-treatment centers, as funds are made available therefor. When established, these treatment centers are to be known as "United States marine hospitals."

SEC. 215. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise obligated, a sum not to exceed $1,500,000 for the acquisition of a site and the establishment thereon of a leprosy-treatment center in a nonendemic State having a suitable climate as described in section 214 of this title, to provide facilities for administering leprosy treatment to approximately 200 patients at a time, in such a climate in comparison with the same treatment administered at the present national leprosarium.

(b) The amount authorized in this section to be appropriated shall include the cost of preparation of drawings and specifications, and supervision of construction, and other administrative expenses incident to the work.

TITLE III—THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON LEPROSY

SEC. 301. (a) There is hereby created the National Advisory Council on Leprosy, to consist of the Surgeon General ex officio, who shall be Chairman, and 11 additional members to be appointed without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, by the Surgeon General with the approval of the Administrator, Federal Security Administration.

(b) Six of the appointed members shall be selected from leading medical authorities not otherwise in the employ of the Federal Government, who are outstanding in the study, diagnosis, or treatment of leprosy and thoroughly familiar with leprosy conditions and problems in the United States. One of the appointed members shall be selected from a national press organization, and one

from a national veteran organization. One of the appointed members shall be a discharged leprosy patient whose disease has been arrested by treatment administered at the Carville (La.) National Leprosarium. Two of the appointed members shall be representatives of bona fide labor organizations.

(c) The five nonmedical members of the Council are authorized to vote on all matters considered by the Council except purely medical or technical matters pertaining to leprosy research and medical treatment administered to leprosy patients.

(d) Each appointed member shall be appointed for a term of 3 years, except that any person appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and except that the first term for the originally appointed members shall expire, as designated by the Surgeon General at the time of the appointment, four at the end of 1 year, four at the end of 2 years, and three at the end of 3 years after the date of appointment. All appointed members shall be eligible for reappointment at the discretion of the Surgeon General.

SEC. 302. Each appointed member of the Council while attending conferences or meetings of such Council, or while otherwise serving at the request of the Surgeon General pursuant to this title, shall be entitled to receive compensation at the rate fixed by the Surgeon General, the rate of compensation to be the same for all members of the Council, but not to exceed $75 per diem, and shall also be entitled to receive an allowance for actual and necessary traveling expenses, including subsistence expenses, while so serving away from his place of residence.

SEC. 303. The Council shall meet as frequently as the Surgeon General deems necessary, but not less than once every 6 months. Upon the request by three or more members, it shall be the duty of the Surgeon General to call a meeting of the Council.

SEC. 304. It shall be the duty of the members of the Council to advise and consult with the Surgeon General upon any and all matters relating to the titles of this act, and upon other matters pertaining to leprosy conditions and problems in the United States, at the request of the Surgeon General, and to initiate recommendations as a council, or as individual members thereof, which they jointly or individually deem advisable and necessary to bring to the attention of the Surgeon General in order to accomplish the purposes of this act, and otherwise to improve the leprosy situation in the United States. The recommendations and reports of the National Advisory Council on Leprosy shall be printed as public documents.

SEC. 305. The Surgeon General is authorized to make such expenditures (including expenditures for personal services and for printing and binding) as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, and as may be provided for by Congress from time to time.

SEC. 306. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise obligated, for administration expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, including such expenses as are described in section 305 of this title, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and each year thereafter, the sum necessary for such purpose.

TITLE IV—REHABILITATION AND REEMPLOYMENT OF LEPROSY PATIENTS

SEC. 401. In order to assist leprosy patients to prepare themselves for remunerative employment following the arrestment of the disease, the Surgeon General shall establish a rehabilitation and reemployment program for such patients who are treated at the national leprosarium or other leprosy-treatment center. This program shall—

(a) be designed to restore by education and training the skills and abilities in the patient's previous occupation, or provide in another more suitable occupation the requisite skills and abilities for self-support, and a reasonable degree of economic security for himself and family;

(b) be available for such patients as, in the opinion of the Surgeon General, or his representative, are physically able to study or take training, and who are expected to be employable, or capable of self-employment, at the termination of their treatment period;

(c) be available for any employable discharged leprosy patient treated by the Public Health Service or by the authority of that Service;

(d) include plans to obtain the cooperation of Federal, State, and other employment agencies, corporations, and businesses in placement of employable discharged leprosy patients.

SEC. 402. Educational and/or vocational training as may be needed and desired by the patient will be made available for hospitalized patients at any time during their treatment period when, in the opinion of the Surgeon General or his representative, such activities will not retard their recovery, or interfere materially with their treatment. Such instruction and/or training will be continued during their stay at the hospital or treatment center as needed to complete the training objective.

SEC. 403. Employable discharged patients shall be given preference, without regard to the provisions of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, in filling employee vacancies in the Public Health Service hospitals and treatment centers for which they are or can be qualified by on-the-job training.

SEC. 404. On-the-job training at the leprosarium and treatment centers will be used as fully as practicable for vocational-training purposes under such supervision and methodical step-by-step guidance as will fit the patient, when discharged, to enter and satisfactorily fill the job for which he or she is being trained.

SEC. 405. Educational and vocational training will not be limited to that necessary to engage in the occupations available at the Public Health Service hospitals and treatment centers, but will be based as fully as practicable upon the needs and desires of the individual patient.

SEC. 406. The rehabilitation and reemployment program will be under the general supervision and control of the medical officer in charge of the hospital or treatment center. The active supervision of educational and training activities will be conducted by a licensed occupational therapist and such assistants as, in the opinion of the medical officer in charge, are necessary. The employment of this supervisory personnel, and the purchase of the minimum requirements in training equipment and supplies for the actual and exclusive use of this program, are hereby authorized.

SEC. 407. Work satisfactorily performed, including scholastic and training programs satisfactorily carried out by patients, or by discharged patients, shall be compensated at such hourly, daily, or monthly rates as, in the opinion of the Surgeon General or his representative, are most suitable for the kind of work or scholastic effort concerned, but which shall not exceed $50 per month, while the patient or discharged patient is in training.

SEC. 408. Upon the completion of the training period, or periods, patients who have qualified for regular employment and who, in the opinion of the Surgeon General or his representative, are physically able to carry on the work in the leprosarium or treatment center for which they have been trained, and in which occupation a vacancy exists to which the patient can be and is appointed, the compensation for such patient will be 75 percent of the rate paid by the Public Health Service to nonpatient employees engaged in such work.

SEC. 409. Employable discharged patients who return to the leprosarium or treatment center for reasons other than for additional treatment, when employed at these institutions, shall be compensated at the same rates, and be employed under the same conditions as are applicable to other nonpatient employees.

SEC. 410. The Surgeon General is authorized to make such expenditures (including expenditures for personal services and for printing and binding, training equipment, and supplies) as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, and as may be provided by Congress from time to time.

SEC. 411. There is authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise obligated, for the administration expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, including such expenses as are described in section 410 of this title, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and each year thereafter, the sum necessary for such purpose.

SEC. 412. The Surgeon General shall establish the necessary regulations for carrying out the provisions of this title.

TITLE V—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR LEPROSY PATIENTS AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

SEC. 501. There shall be included in the annual appropriations for the administration of the National Leprosarium and leprosy-treatment centers, provision for a fund to be known as the patient's welfare fund, from which patients taking treatment in these institutions who do not have an income equal in amount to $10 per month, who are not physically able to engage in such compensated tasks as are available, or for whom no such task is available for which they are qualified, or who are physically unable to take educational or vocational training, shall receive the sum of $10 per month to defray incidental expense common to the needs of all patients undergoing treatment over an extended period away from home.

SEC. 502. In order to carry out the provisions of section 501 of this title, there is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise obligated, a sum not to exceed $20,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and such sums thereafter as Congress may provide.

SEC. 503. The dependent or dependents of leprosy patients who are hospitalized for leprosy treatment shall be entitled to receive a monthly family allowance for the period during which the patient continues to take such treatment, plus 1 month following the patient's discharge from treatment requirements.

SEC. 504 (a) The dependents of hospitalized leprosy patients authorized to receive the family allowance shall include the wife; child or children under 18 years of age and unmarried, including stepchildren and adopted children; the patient's father, mother, father-in-law, and mother-in-law, who have received their chief support from the patient for a period of 6 months before the patient entered the hospital for treatment; the patient's brother and sister under 18 years of age and unmarried, or who are physically or mentally unable to support themselves and unmarried, who have received their chief support from the patient for a period of 6 months prior to the date the patient entered the hospital for leprosy treatment.

(b) Monthly family allowance authorized in this title shall apply to those cases where the patient is a parent or guardian who is the breadwinner or provider for the family. In cases where the patient is a wife who is not the family provider but who is living with her husband and children immediately prior to her entry into the hospital for

leprosy treatment under the supervision of the Public Health Service, the monthly family allowance will be 75 percent of the amount authorized in section 505 of this title.

(c) Dependents of such leprosy patients as are authorized by the Surgeon General to take treatment outside of Public Health Service hospitals shall be entitled to receive such portion of the family monthly allowance as are approved by the Surgeon General, based upon the actual need in each case for such family assistance, and the inability of the patient to continue to provide for his dependents without interfering with the leprosy treatment requirements, or his chances of recovery.

(d) Application for monthly family allowance shall be initiated by the patient. The medical officer or physician responsible for the patient's treatment will certify as to the correctness of the information furnished by the patient and forward the application to the Surgeon General, who, upon his approval of same, will forward the application to the Bureau of Public Assistance, Federal Security Agency, for payment.

SEC. 505. The monthly family allowance authorized for dependents of leprosy patients taking treatment under the supervision of, or by the authority of, the Public Health Service, are as follows:

(a) To a wife without children, $60; a wife and one child, $80; and an additional $20 for each additional child.

(b) To a child, but no wife, $42; with an additional $20 for each additional child.

(c) To one parent but no brother or sister, $50.

(d) To two parents but no brother or sister, $68.

(e) To one parent and one brother or sister, $68, with an additional $11 for each additional brother or sister.

(f) To two parents and one brother or sister, $79, with an additional $11 for each additional brother or sister.

(g) To a brother or sister but no parent, $42, with an additional $11 for each additional brother or sister.

SEC. 506. In the case of a wife living separate and apart from the patient under any temporary or permanent court order, or decree, in a divorce allowance, or legal-separation proceedings, or written agreement, the amount of the family allowance payable to such wife will not exceed the amount provided in such order, or decree in a divorce allowance, or legal-separation proceedings or written agreement to be paid to such wife, and if such order, decree, separation, proceeding, or agreement provides no amount to be paid such wife, no family allowance will be paid to her.

SEC. 507. In the case of a former wife divorced, the amount of the family allowance payable to such former wife divorced will not exceed the amount fixed in the court order or decree as the amount to be paid to such former wife divorced, and will not in any event, exceed the amount of $60 per month authorized in subparagraph (a) section 505, of this title.

SEC. 508. Changes in the status of a dependent which will terminate entitlement to a monthly family allowance include—

(a) Death of the dependent;

(b) Attainment of the age of 18 years by a brother, sister, or child, except when such dependent is physically or mentally incapable of self-support;

(c) The marriage of a brother, sister, or child;

(d) Marriage of a former wife divorced;

(e) Cessation of required degree of dependency of dependent fathers, mothers, brothers, or sisters;

(f) Divorce of wife without alimony, or a termination of alimony;

(g) Divorce of a husband from the patient will terminate entitlement of his dependents to any part of the family allowance paid under the provision for 75 percent of the total amount authorized, as provided in subparagraph (b) of section 504 of this title.

SEC. 509. Changes in the status of the patient which will terminate entitlement to monthly family allowance include:

(a) Death of patient;

(b) Discharge of patient from treatment requirements: *Provided*, That one additional monthly allowance shall be paid in case of the death or discharge of the patient;

(c) Unauthorized absence of the patient from the place of treatment designated by the Surgeon General, or unauthorized discontinuance by the patient of the treatment provided by, or by the authority of the Surgeon General, will authorize that authority to terminate entitlement to family allowance;

(d) The amounts of family allowance to be paid to dependents of native leprosy patients of Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, and the Canal Zone, who reside in those areas, shall be determined by the Surgeon General, United States Public Health Service, within the limits specified in section 205, title II of this act: *Provided*, That said payments shall not be less than 25 percent of the amounts so specified.

SEC. 510. The Surgeon General is authorized to make such expenditures (including expenditures for personal services and for printing and binding) as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title; and as may be provided by Congress from time to time.

SEC. 511. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise obligated, for administration expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, including such expenses as are described in section 510 of this title, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and each year thereafter, the sum necessary for such purposes.

SEC. 512. The Surgeon General will establish the necessary regulations for carrying out the provisions of this title.

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION FOR DISABILITY INCIDENT TO LEPROSY

SEC. 601 (a) Prior to the discharge of leprosy patients from treatment requirements, the medical board authorizing or recommending their discharge from Public Health Service hospitals, shall determine the degree of physical disability, if any, sustained by the patient due to leprosy and/or treatment therefor. Such disabilities sustained by patients treated in other hospitals, or as out-patients, or as home patients, will be determined by the physicians responsible for their treatment, who will forward their recommendations thereon to the Surgeon General.

(b) The Surgeon General or his designated representative will review the findings and recommendations in each case, and if they are approved, they will be certified and forwarded to the Bureau of Public Assistance, Federal Security Agency, for payment of the following compensation for physical disability incident to leprosy.

(c) To discharged patients who are classified as totally and permanently disabled, there shall be paid a sum, starting immediately following their discharge, in the amount of $125 per month.

(d) To discharged patients who have suffered total blindness incident to leprosy the compensation paid shall be $150 per month.

(e) Patients who are found to be physically disabled incident to leprosy in a degree less than total shall receive a portion of the compensation authorized in this title, the amount of which shall be graduated in accordance with the percentage of their physical disability. Disabilities determined to be less than 10 percent will not be certified for compensation payments.

SEC. 602. Compensation received under the provisions of this title shall not bar the discharged patients from further improving their economic situation.

SEC. 603. Unauthorized departure of the patient from hospitals and treatment centers, or unauthorized discontinuance by the patient of treatment provided or authorized by the Public Health Service under the provisions of this act, will authorize the Surgeon General to cancel the right of such patient to receive the benefits provided by this title.

SEC. 604. The Surgeon General is authorized to make such expenditures (including expenditures for personal services and for printing and binding) as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title and as may be provided by the Congress from time to time.

SEC. 605. There is authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise obligated for administration expenses, including such expenses as are described in section 604 of this title, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for each year thereafter, the sum necessary for such purposes.

TITLE VII—EXPANSION OF LEPROSY RESEARCH

SEC. 701. (a) It shall be one of the purposes of this act to provide for an immediate expansion of research to discover—

(1) the method or methods by which leprosy is contracted and transmitted;

(2) a method or means for detecting the leprosy bacillus during the incubation period;

(3) more effective and faster-acting remedies and techniques for the arrestment of all types of leprosy; and

(4) the possibilities of developing preventive medicines and techniques for combating this disease.

(b) The Public Health Service is hereby charged with the duty of conducting and supervising the national research effort as outlined in section 701 of this title.

SEC. 702. (a) In carrying out the purposes of this title, the Surgeon General will conduct, assist, and foster research, experiments, demonstrations, and studies relating to the cause, method of transmitting, treatment, prevention, control, and elimination of leprosy's ability to survive and spread in the United States.

(b) The Surgeon General will coordinate research activities in the leprosy field conducted by the Public Health Service and similar research conducted by private research agencies, organizations, and institutions and make grants-in-aid to public and private agencies, organizations, and institutions for conducting leprosy research as authorized in this title.

SEC. 703. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise obligated, to carry out research in the field of leprosy the following sums for the years and purposes indicated:

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, for leprosy research activities of the Public Health Service, or for grants-in-aid for leprosy research at the discretion of the Surgeon General, a sum not to exceed $100,000; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, for leprosy research activities of the Public Health Service, not to exceed $100,000, and for grants-in-aid for leprosy research not to exceed $100,000; and thereafter such sums as may be provided by Congress from time to time.

SEC. 704. Sums authorized for leprosy research for a fiscal year and remaining unencumbered at the end of such year shall remain available to the Public Health Service

for such purpose for the next fiscal year (and for such year only), in addition to the sums authorized for such next fiscal year.

TITLE VIII—MISCELLANEOUS

If any provisions of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of the act and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 802. It shall be the duty of the Surgeon General to insure that all laws passed by Congress and regulations established by the Public Health Service pertaining to the care, treatment, rehabilitation, and reemployment of leprosy patients are brought to the attention of patients undergoing treatment.

TITLE IX—AMENDMENTS

SEC. 901. Title III of the Public Health Service Act (Public Law 410, 78th Cong.) is amended by eliminating sections 331 and 332, part D, of that act, and by substituting therefor the provisions of title II, treatment of leprosy patients, of this, the National Leprosy Act.

SEC. 902. The provisions of this act supersede and invalidate the provisions of other national acts and instructions which are contrary to this act as applicable to the national plan for the control and elimination of leprosy in the United States.

SEC. 903. This act shall become effective 90 days after enactment.

The letter and petition, without the signatures attached, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED, INC.,
Washington, D. C., January 24, 1949.

Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CLAUDE: Herewith, we tender you a petition, signed by numerous patients at the Carville (La.) National Leprosarium, several of whom are residents of your State, Florida. This petition urges that you assume sponsorship of a bill to establish the National Leprosy Act, the original draft of which has already been tendered to you.

This bill, written by Col. George H. Rarey (U. S. Army, retired), who spent many years in the Orient and came into personal contact with many of the victims of Hansen's disease (leprosy), presents the most exhaustive and lengthy research into this field yet performed. Colonel Rarey has contacted eminent epidemiologists, specialists in treatment of this disease, the world over, and his findings represent an impartial picture of the great need of those afflicted by Hansen's disease, as well as their families, who are innocent victims of public ignorance, indifference, fear, and superstition.

The Patients' Federation, at Carville, as well as our own lodge there, which is headed by Mrs. Gertrude C. Hornbostel, whose signature is appended to the petition in question, and whose gripping and dramatic story, as the wife of heroic Maj. Hans Hornbostel (U. S. Army, retired), captured and held in a Jap prison camp at the outset of World War II, where she contracted Hansen's disease, is well known to the American public, and Stanley Stein, that great-hearted editor of The Star, the monthly publication put out by the patients, as they say, "to radiate the light of truth on Hansen's disease," and who, although himself a patient, and blinded more than 17 years by the disease, yet carries on a vigorous campaign for public enlightenment and justice for these afflicted—all these, and many more, fervently pray that you will use your best efforts to steer this bill through the Congress and thus afford needed relief to American citizens who are, today, incarcerated through no fault of their own, and whose requirements have not been adequately met by our great Government.

We pledge our cooperation, in every way possible, to speed this enactment.

Sincerely,

PAUL A. STRACHAN,
President.

UNITED STATES MARINE HOSPITAL,
POINT CLAIRE BRANCH POST OFFICE,
Carville, La., January 4, 1949.

Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The undersigned citizens of Florida and others request your kind consideration and support of H. R. 6653, the National Leprosy Act, which was introduced in the Eightieth Congress and will be reintroduced in the Eighty-first, probably under a different number.

We, who are patients at this hospital, and under treatment, realize since our arrival here, and since becoming better acquainted with the different aspects of the disease, that there are many more patients in Florida and elsewhere in endemic States who are not under treatment than those who actually are. For this we blame the present harsh laws, which demand segregation of all cases and types, regardless of whether they belong to a type which is transmissible or not.

From a humanitarian and from a public-health point of view, such laws are wrong and work in reverse, particularly now that drugs have been found which will arrest the disease the same as tuberculosis can be arrested, without, however, being as transmissible as tuberculosis.

Since H. R. 6653 contains the modern approach to the management and treatment of the disease and since Florida is one of the endemic States, we ask you, as Senator from Florida, to give this bill your kind consideration and support.

Sincerely,

(Signatures omitted.)

PUBLIC HOUSING

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill, and I also desire to make a statement in reference to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the Senator may proceed.

The bill (S. 709) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BALDWIN (for himself, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. TAFT, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MORSE, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. LODGE, Mr. THYE, Mr. IVES, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. HENDRICKSON, and Mr. SCHOEPPEL), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, this bill is a housing bill, and it seems appropriate, with the introduction of the bill, to give some word of explanation concerning its origin. At the last session of the Eightieth Congress, the Senate passed the so-called Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. At the opening of the Eighty-first Congress, however, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] introduced a bill somewhat similar to the TEW bill, without the Republican sponsorship which previous housing bills had had.

Knowing that housing was one of the vital issues facing the American people, it seemed to many of us on this side of the aisle that we, as Republicans, should propose housing legislation. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], who last year was a member of the Joint Committee on Housing, was particularly active in the preparation of this bill. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and myself began work on the measure several weeks ago. Because the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] had worked on housing legislation—and I may say by way of interpolation that I think the senior Senator from Ohio is probably the best-informed man on the Senate floor on matters of housing—we asked the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from New Hampshire to join with us. In fact, this measure contains many provisions of bills which the Senator from Ohio had previously cosponsored. It would have been most appropriate if the Senator from Vermont could have introduced this bill today, but, as he is necessarily absent, the task devolved upon me. So, Mr. President, I am introducing this bill on behalf of the Senator from Vermont, the Senator from New York, the Senator from Ohio, the Senator from New Hampshire, and a number of other Senators, including the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL].

The housing shortage is not news. The Democratic administration discovered it more than a decade ago. Until recently we had as many as 34 housing agencies dealing with the shortage. We have spent billions of dollars in alleged attempts to correct it. The shortage still exists. It seems to us that it is about time that we evolve a realistic, comprehensive approach.

Republicans recognize as well as anyone else that there is a housing shortage in the country and that some workable, feasible, understandable program is necessary to meet it. We believe that this bill does so most adequately. We have not attempted in this bill to outbid or outdo anybody. We have merely attempted to draft housing legislation designed to meet the American need.

In our deliberations over the provisions of the bill, we considered the matter of loans to veterans for housing and other private financing aids. This bill, Mr. President, is already 33 pages long, and it seemed to us the better part of wisdom not to incorporate in it provisions with reference to loans in aid of veterans and other private financing agencies, but to do that in a separate bill.

In this bill, Mr. President, we have opened the door for the widest kind of

cooperation on the state and local level. We have included those provisions which are designed to encourage private financing and private construction, believing as we do that the obligation of meeting the need for housing must continue to rest largely upon local enterprise and individual and private action. We recognize, however, that housing is required in some areas at a cost beyond the reach of individual initiative and financing. We believe that the provisions of this bill adequately meet this situation.

It provides for the construction of 600,000 units over a period of 6 years with a maximum annual contribution of $240,000,000. There is a clause, however, which permits considerable flexibility—authorizing the President, through the Housing Authority, to increase or decrease this number in any one year, cumulatively, upon a finding that the condition of the building industry makes an increase possible or a decrease necessary.

The slum clearance title of the bill permits loans and grants to cities for the purpose of clearing blighted areas.

The bill also contains provision for farm housing. We have approached this problem, however, on a realistic basis, making provision for loans and grants to adequate farms and potentially adequate farms. We believe it economically unsound to give either loans or grants to farms that are not adequate or potentially self-sustaining. For farms with an adequate income but unable to secure private financing, the Secretary of Agriculture could make direct loans. If marginal farms can be improved within a reasonable period of time to be self-supporting, the plan would provide a combination of loans and grants for a period of 10 years.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senators from Alabama [Mr. HILL and Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senators from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. LONG], the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and myself, I introduce a bill to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes.

In his state of the Union message, the President said:

> Most of the houses we need will have to be built by private enterprise, without public subsidy. By producing too few rental units and too large a proportion of high-priced houses, the building industry is rapidly pricing itself out of the market. * * * The Government is now engaged in a campaign to induce all segments of the building industry to concentrate on the production of lower-priced housing.

In urging the production of homes large enough for family life at prices wage earners can afford, the President called for additional legislation to encourage such production. Mr. President, I believe this bill will accomplish that purpose.

This bill will make the more liberal FHA insurance aids available only for the construction of lower-cost homes. To help in getting the production of such homes which are large enough for family life, it offers additional incentives for the production of lower-cost three- and four-bedroom homes.

It improves and extends the FHA insurance available for long-term loans to housing cooperatives, particularly with respect to coperatives whose membership consists primarily of veterans of World War II. It provides for a number of aids to veterans' housing cooperatives in which the national veterans' organizations have expressed a very great interest, particularly in respect to cooperatives building individual homes for purchase by their veteran members, and in specifically authorizing the FHA to furnish technical advice and assistance to housing cooperatives in their organization and in the planning, construction, and operation of their projects.

To further assist in the production of more rental-type housing and lower-cost sales housing which average wage earners can afford, the bill would exempt from the 50-percent limitation on the amount of loans which can be purchased from any one mortgagee by the Federal National Mortgage Association, mortgages on cooperative housing projects, rental housing projects, and lower-cost homes built for sale. It would also extend the present authority of the FHA to insure loans for large-scale rental housing projects to March 31, 1950.

It encourages large-scale construction of lower-cost homes by improving the provisions for the insurance by the FHA of construction advances on groups of 25 or more single-family homes being constructed on a single site. It does this by adjusting both the maximum mortgage amount and the percentage of value to levels which will permit maximum accomplishments under this form of insurance consistent with the production of adequate housing at more reasonable prices.

Also, to assure that adequate financing will be available for projects undertaken by housing cooperatives, particularly veterans' cooperatives, it provides for direct, long-term Government loans through the Federal National Mortgage Association, where necessary private financing cannot be obtained even with FHA insurance available.

Mr. President, I believe that this bill will do much to help get a more adequate production of good housing at lower prices and lower rentals.

So that the Senators may have more complete information as to the details of the bill, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD following my remarks a section-by-section summary of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the summary of the bill, presented by the Senator from South Carolina, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 712) to amend the National Housing Act and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAYBANK (for himself, Mr. WAGNER Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. MYERS, Mr. HILL, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. LONG), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The summary of the bill presented by Mr. MAYBANK was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF BILL TO AMEND THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

This proposed bill consists of various amendments to the National Housing Act which affect mortgage insurance programs administered by the Federal Housing Administration and the secondary market program of the Federal National Mortgage Association.

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY

Section 1

The present authorization under title I of the National Housing Act to insure lending institutions against losses they may sustain on home modernization and repair loans and small loans (not exceeding $4,500) to finance the construction of modest homes expires on July 1, 1949. This section would extend that authorization on a permanent basis and would increase the present amount of insurance authorization under title I.

Section 2

This section would increase the total insurance authorization under title II of the National Housing Act by $1,000,000,000. The use of this additional authorization would require the approval of the President.

Section 3

Subsection (a) of this section would amend section 203 (b) (2) of the National Housing Act (relating to the maximum obligations of mortgages insurable under section 203 of the act) to simplify the provisions therein and to provide for increased maximum amounts for low-cost dwellings with three or four bedrooms. Paragraph (D) would be amended to provide for a maximum mortgage amount not to exceed $6,650 and not to exceed 95 percent of the appraised value of a single-family dwelling approved for mortgage insurance prior to construction. Such dollar amount limitation could be increased by not exceeding $950, in the case of a three-bedroom house, or $1,900 in the case of a four-bedroom house, where prescribed findings are made by the Federal Housing Commissioner. As paragraph (B) would become obsolete, provision is made for its repeal. (Paragraph (B) now provides for a maximum mortgage amount not to exceed $6,300 and not to exceed 90 percent of appraised value, and paragraph (D) now provides for a maximum mortgage amount not to exceed $6,000 and not to exceed 90 percent of appraised value, or 95 percent where the Commissioner determines it would not contribute to substantial increases in costs.)

This subsection (a) would also amend paragraph (C) of section 203 (b) (2) of the National Housing Act to provide a maximum mortgage amount not to exceed $9,450 (as contrasted with the present $9,500) and not to exceed the sum of 95 percent of $7,000 of the appraised value plus 70 percent of such value in excess of $7,000 and not in excess of $11,000 (as contrasted with the present 90 percent and 80 percent of such values) of a single-family dwelling approved for mortgage insurance prior to construction. This would make increases in maximum mortgage amounts under paragraph (C) conform more closely to graduated levels of appraised values.

Subsection (b) of this section would provide that, notwithstanding the repeal of the above paragraph (B), applications already filed for insurance thereunder could be approved, and insured mortgages could be refinanced thereunder.

Section 4, 5, 6, and 7

These are technical amendments made necessary by section 10 which is summarized below.

Section 8

This section would amend section 211 of the National Housing Act to authorize the Federal Housing Commission, with respect to dwellings of not more than four families, to issue regulations permitting provisions in insured mortgages for the deferment of monthly payments in hardship cases beyond the control of the mortgagor. Such provisions could not extend the maturity of any mortgage for more than 3 years.

Section 9

This section would continue the present situation with respect to the applicability of the prevailing wage provisions of section 212 of the National Housing Act to cooperative housing projects and would bring under the prevailing wage provisions of section 212 the large-scale rental projects insured under the yield insurance title of the act.

Section 10

This section would add to the National Housing Act a new section 213 on cooperative housing mortgage insurance which would take the place of the provisions on this subject now contained in section 207 of the act. This new section would provide for insurance of 90 percent, 40-year, 4 percent interest loans on nonprofit cooperative ownership housing projects (as presently provided for under section 207) and of 100-percent, 40-year, 4 percent interest loans (as contrasted with the present 95-percent, 40-year, 4 percent interest loans) where at least 80 percent of the members of the cooperative are veterans of World War II. The maximum amount of the mortgage in the case of the 90-percent loan would remain at $8,100 per family dwelling or $1,800 per room, but in the case of the 100-percent loan provided for by this section, the maximum amount of the mortgage would be $9,000 per family dwelling or $2,000 per room. In the case of these ownership cooperatives the insurance would be based on current replacement costs.

This section would provide that the maximum principal obligation of an insured mortgage of a nonprofit cooperative corporation, organized for the purpose of constructing homes for transfer to its members, may equal the total of the principal obligations of mortgages for which such members could obtain insurance on the individual houses under section 203. This would be in lieu of the provisions now in section 207 limiting the principal obligation of an insured mortgage of such corporation to 90 percent of the value of the property and to $8,100 per family dwelling or $1,800 per room.

This section would also specifically authorize the FHA to furnish technical advice and assistance to housing cooperatives in the organization thereof and in the planning, construction, and operation of their projects.

Section 11

Section 301 of the National Housing Act, which authorizes the FNMA to purchase certain housing mortgages, now provides in effect that the aggregate amount of all such mortgages purchased by FNMA from one mortgagee may not exceed 50 percent of the amount of all mortgages made by such mortgagee which are otherwise eligible for purchase by FNMA. Section 11 of this bill would amend section 301 of the act to provide that in computing, for this purpose, the aggregate amount of mortgages purchased by FNMA from the mortgagee, there shall be excluded the amount of any such mortgages which are (1) insured under paragraph (D) of section 203 (b) (2) of the act (explained above), or (2) insured under section 207, section 213, or section 608 (including section 608 pursuant to section 610) of the act, or (3) guaranteed under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, if the amount of the mortgage does not exceed $7,000 per dwelling.

This section would also authorize the FNMA to make real estate loans which are accepted for insurance or insured under section 213 of the National Housing Act.

Section 12

This section would amend section 302 of the National Housing Act to increase (for the purposes of the above amendments to section 301) the aggregate amount of outstanding FNMA obligations.

Section 13

This section would amend section 305 of the National Housing Act to authorize FNMA to sell on terms or otherwise dispose of property acquired by it through foreclosure or other means. It may now dispose of such property only through cash sales.

Section 14

This section would amend section 4 (c) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act to increase the total amount of obligations which the RFC may purchase thereunder, so that it will have appropriate authority to purchase the additional FNMA obligations which would be authorized by the amendment to section 302 of the National Housing Act which is summarized above.

Section 15

This section would extend for 1 year (until March 31, 1950) the present authority of the FHA to insure mortgages on rental housing projects under section 608 of the National Housing Act.

Section 16

This section would amend section 610 of the National Housing Act (dealing with the insurance of mortgages on federally owned housing which is being sold) to raise the maximum permissible interest rate from 4 percent to 5 percent in the case of insured mortgages on 1- to 4-family dwellings.

Section 17

This section would amend section 611 of the National Housing Act (dealing with the insurance of mortgages, including construction advances, on groups of 25 or more single-family houses on a single site). It would permit the principal obligation of a mortgage insured under that section to be in an amount not exceeding 85 percent of the value of the completed project and not exceeding a sum computed on the individual dwellings as follows: $5,950, or 85 percent of the valuation, whichever is the lower amount, with respect to each dwelling, except that, in the case of a three- or four-bedroom unit, such dollar amount limitation could be increased in the same manner as the dollar amount limitation on a mortgage on such a unit insured under section 203 (b) (2) (D) explained in the above summary of section 3. Under the present provisions of section 611, the mortgage may not exceed 80 percent of the value of the completed project nor a sum computed on the basis of $6,000 per dwelling unit or 80 percent of the value of each dwelling unit, whichever is less.

Section 18

This section is a purely technical amendment. It reflects the change in title from Federal Housing Administrator to Federal Housing Commissioner, and the fact that the Commissioner is no longer appointed for a specified term of years (which changes were made by Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1947), and also reflects the fact that the basic rate of compensation of the Commissioner is now fixed by other law.

REPEAL OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to repeal all except provisions of title I of the Selective Service Act of 1948. I expect to address myself to that subject later.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 39) to repeal all except certain provisions of title I of the Selective Service Act of 1948, introduced by Mr. TAYLOR, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

COMMISSION TO STUDY INTERGOVERNMENTAL FISCAL RELATIONSHIPS

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to establish a commission to study intergovernmental fiscal relationships, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement prepared by me of the bill together with an editorial may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory statement and editorial presented by the Senator from Maryland will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 41) to establish a commission to study intergovernmental fiscal relationships, introduced by Mr. O'CONOR, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

The statement and editorial presented by Mr. O'CONOR were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONOR

Taxation is a matter uppermost in the minds of many of our people today. They are concerned—vitally concerned—with the octopuslike growth of the taxing systems of the Federal Government, the several States, and of the counties and municipalities. It has been well said that "the power to tax is the power to destroy." Some there are who fear that the current unplanned and undisciplined rush by government on all levels to discover and adopt new ways to attract tax dollars to their coffers may eventually destroy our form of government, unless it is checked.

On many sides today proposed budgets are at all-time highs. States and local governments throughout the land, hard-pressed for revenues to meet the mounting costs of governmental services, are reaching more and more into new tax fields. And the harassed taxpayer is becoming more and more bewildered by the increased assaults from every side on his ever-shrinking income residue.

The entire tax and fiscal situation is in urgent need of revamping. There is an evident lack of consistent planning, and a complete absence of coordination among the various levels of government. The result is widespread overlapping of tax sources, and resultant costly duplication of tax-collection methods and procedures.

All this is unbusinesslike in the extreme. More, it is a tragically serious matter to the millions of workers and businessmen who must pay the piper. With tax collectors from two, three, or sometimes more taxing agencies pulling and hauling at the same taxpayer, collection costs are higher than they ever should be, governmental employee totals are continually rising, and the percentage of the national income going into the Nation's tax coffers keeps ever growing.

It is no far-fetched statement to warn that such hit-and-miss taxation is the Achilles' heel that could bring about the downfall of our American form of government. Certainly it places an undue and exceedingly bitter burden upon the shoulders of every

single person in the Nation. Whether he be a resident of city or the most remote rural area, whether he pays his inordinate share of taxation directly or through the countless indirect forms of taxation which have been devised to hide the extent to which Government is reaching into the tills and the pockets of each and every one of us, the result is the same.

During the Eightieth Congress I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 90, to establish a commission to study intergovernmental fiscal relationships. It provided for a national group that would include representatives of the Federal Government, the council of State governments, the conference of mayors, and the American Municipal Association. Preliminary studies have been made of the matter in conjunction with the National Governors Conference, but definite action has not yet resulted.

It is becoming more and more urgent that something be done to correct the abuses of our multiple taxation form of government financing. An editorial from the New York Times of Sunday, January 23, which I ask to be printed in the RECORD as a supplement to my remarks, faces up to the problem squarely. "We shall not solve this problem" the editorial declares, "until it is approached on a national scale, through an official body on which the Federal Government, the States, and the cities are represented." "We urge," the editorial concludes, "that Congress embark on this long-range study by setting up a Commission for tax reform."

I submit herewith, for appropriate reference, a resolution which, in line with Senate Joint Resolution 90, would authorize a national study of intergovernmental fiscal relationships, looking toward the much-desired goal of lower over-all governmental costs.

[From the New York Times of Jan. 23, 1949]

FOR TAX REFORM

This is the time of year when government on all levels, Federal, State, and municipal, begins looking around for new ways to raise more money in taxes, and we hear faintly, here and there, renewed appeals for reform of the tax structure. Duplication of taxation, as between Federal Government and the States, is, of course, an old, old story. Lately, as cities found their financial lot increasingly difficult, duplication has given way to triplication and the end is not in sight. Within a few months last year the number of cities taxing incomes rose from 3 to 61, and this number has been steadily on the increase since.

The annual conference of governors has long recognized the problem of overlapping taxes. In July 1947, at Salt Lake City, there was an illuminating discussion of it, and general recognition of the grave difficulty of accomplishing reform. Governors Dewey and Driscoll both warned then against expecting an overnight miracle. Mr. Dewey remarked that one difficulty was that all taxing authorities, when confronted with the need of additional revenues, had sought out the goose that squawked the least as its feathers were being pulled.

This process of seeking out new geese to be plucked is now in full swing. Among the several States already mentioned in the news columns as searching for new revenues are California and New York. California's budget will pass the billion-dollar mark for the first time, and Governor Warren is suggesting a higher State sales tax, corporate and personal income taxes, and bank and corporation franchise taxes, as well as a 2-cent cigarette tax, an increased liquor tax, and a higher parimutuel race tax. California is feeling the financial burden of its greatly increased population, and its budget will be higher than any other State's. New York, moving toward a budget that will be nearly a billion dollars, is also going to need more taxes. Two New York legislators have just moved for a State commission study of the overlapping of Federal, State, and local taxes.

But the reservation to the several Government levels of certain fields of taxation, important as it is, is only one phase of the problem. Simplification in methods of collection, reduction of the infinite number of taxes, and relief from the complex, burdensome accounting labor saddled on business, industry, and the individual are equally important. The financial cost and the expenditure of human energy involved in the collection of a dozen different municipal taxes, a dozen State taxes, and on top of that the bewildering variety of Federal taxes are appalling, and they exert their harassing effect on the pay roll of both Government and the business community.

We shall not solve this problem until it is approached on a national scale, through an official body on which the Federal Government, the States, and the cities are represented. All will have to give and take, and if the task is pursued with wisdom a rewarding economy, an increase in productivity, and social gains can be the result. We urge that Congress embark on this long-range study at this session by setting up a commission for tax reform.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR JOINT COMMITTEE ON LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

Mr. MURRAY submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 10), which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations, created by title IV of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, is authorized after December 31, 1948, and through February 28, 1949, to incur expenses not to exceed $10,000, which shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives on vouchers signed by the chairman. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made.

INVESTIGATION OF THE LIFE-INSURANCE INDUSTRY

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a Senate concurrent resolution to provide for an investigation of the life-insurance industry of the United States.

Representative CELLER, chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, is today introducing an identical concurrent resolution.

Congressman CELLER and I have prepared a joint statement on this proposal, and I now ask unanimous consent that this statement, together with the text of the resolution, may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from Nevada will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be composed of three Members of the Senate who are members of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and three Members of the House of Representatives who are members of the House of Representatives Committee on the Judiciary to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a cochairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the joint committee (1) to make a full and complete study and investigation of the life insurance industry of the United States, with particular regard to the applicable antitrust laws and to the extent to which the operations of such industry comply with such laws, and (2) to report to the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than June 30, 1950, the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

SEC. 3. The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-first Congress, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

SEC. 4. (a) The joint committee shall have power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and other employees, including consultants or firms of consultants, as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties.

(b) The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman or cochairman. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made.

The statement presented by Mr. McCARRAN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR M'CARRAN AND REPRESENTATIVE EMANUEL CELLER INTRODUCE IDENTICAL SENATE AND HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS TO ESTABLISH A JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE LIFE INSURANCE COMPANIES

We are today introducing a joint resolution to provide for an investigation of the life insurance industry of the United States, with particular regard to the applicable antitrust laws and the extent to which the operations of such industry comply with such laws.

The purpose of this investigation is to find facts.

The sheer size of this industry, its dominant position in the world of finance, and the power which it wields and could wield in many fields of endeavor, coupled with the fact that detailed information concerning the operations of the industry is not only greatly lacking but apparently very difficult to secure, give ample ground for this investigation.

While it is contemplated that charges which have been made against the industry will be thoroughly investigated, if this resolution is approved, it is not the intent of the sponsors of the resolution to seek support for any predetermined conclusions. The sole objective is to gather the facts and all the facts, and from the study of those facts, to reach reasonable and fair conclusions. The investigation will be studiously objective and rights of witnesses will be properly and judicially protected.

In connection with this proposed investigation, it will undoubtedly be necessary to consider not only the impact of the Federal antitrust laws upon the life insurance industry, but also the question of the suitability and desirability of Public Law 15 with respect to its application to the life insurance industry, and the further question of whether Public Law 15 requires any modification or amendment. (Public Law 15 provides, among other things that "the business of insurance, and every person engaged therein, shall be subject to the laws of the several States which relate to the regulation or taxation of such business.")

It is contemplated the proposed investigation will be sufficiently broad to encompass an evaluation of State insurance legislation in this field.

A copy of the concurrent resolution follows:

"That there is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be composed of three Members of the Senate who are members of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and three Members of the House of Representatives who are members of the House of Representatives Committee on the Judiciary to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filed in the same manner as the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a cochairman from among its members.

"SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the joint committee (1) to make a full and complete study and investigation of the life-insurance industry of the United States, with particular regard to the applicable antitrust laws and to the extent to which the operations of such industry comply with such laws, and (2) to report to the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than June 30, 1950, the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

"SEC. 3. The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-first Congress, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

"SEC. 4. (a) The joint committee shall have power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and other employees, including consultants or firms of consultants, as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties.

"(b) The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman or cochairmen. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made."

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE DOCUMENT ENTITLED "RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SOCIAL SECURITY LEGISLATION"

Mr. GEORGE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 35), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on Finance 2,400 additional copies of Senate Document Numbered 208, Eightieth Congress, second session, entitled "Recommendations for Social Security Legislation."

INVESTIGATION OF PRODUCTION OF AGRICULTURAL CROPS

Mr. GILLETTE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 36), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the production, means of production, and plans for production of all types of agricultural crops, with particular reference to the fullest possible utilization of the Nation's food, feed, and fiber production, including studies of the construction, location, management, and use of industrial plants for the processing of various farm products. Also including studies in the field of the distribution of farm crops and the methods and costs of transferring the crops from the producer to the consumer. Also including special attention to new uses and the study and development of new uses and markets, both foreign and domestic, for farm crops including further studies in the production, means of production, and plans for production of industrial alcohol, synthetic alcohol, and synthetic rubber and the utilization of all natural materials for such purposes. Also including investigation of the organization or organizations now controlling or seeking to control for the future such alcohol and rubber production, together with the use of patents and processes used in such manufacture, whether developed or owned in whole or in part by foreign companies, corporations, individuals, or agents, and particularly to inquire into the plans and purposes and policies of our governmental agencies with reference to such utilization in the processing and production of industrial alcohol, synthetic alcohol, and synthetic rubber. And the subcommittee is specifically directed to make careful study in all fields of possible expanded use of farm production looking to the fullest possible utilization of farm crops to prevent as far as possible the adverse impact of recurrent surpluses of farm production on our agricultural economy and on the other segments of the Nation's economic structure. For the purpose of this investigation, farm crops include grains, canes, fruits, vegetables, livestock, and livestock products.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report to the Senate, as soon as practicable, the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-first Congress, to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable and, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of all agencies in the executive branch of the Government. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $12,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF WATER RESOURCES IN CERTAIN CALIFORNIA COUNTIES

Mr. DOWNEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 37), which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby requested to make a study and investigation of the water needs and resources of Santa Clara, Alameda, and Contra Costa Counties, Calif., with a view to ascertaining the most feasible means of relieving present shortages in the water supply of such areas for agricultural, industrial, domestic, and other purposes, and to report to the Senate the results of such study and investigation at the earliest practicable date.

INVESTIGATION OF FOREIGN OIL CONCESSIONS TO AMERICAN OIL COMPANIES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I submit a resolution authorizing and directing the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to conduct a full and complete study and investigation of the granting of oil rights and concessions to United States oil companies by foreign governments, and for other purposes.

The resolution (S. Res. 38) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed (1) to conduct a full and complete study and investigation of the granting of oil rights and concessions to United States oil companies by foreign governments and (2) to report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF MILITARY JUSTICE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I submit a resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to make a full and complete study of the administration of military justice by courts under the jurisdiction of the armed forces of the United States; and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement describing the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 39), was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the administration of military justice by courts under jurisdiction of the armed forces of the United States in occupied areas, with a view to ascertaining (1) whether the conduct of trials and the treatment of prisoners in cases involving civilians (both citizen and noncitizen) as

well as cases involving military personnel have been in accordance with American concepts of justice, and (2) whether any legislation is necessary or desirable for the purpose of improving the operations of such courts. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The statement presented by Mr. LANGER was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LANGER

The purpose of this resolution is to provide for an inquiry into the type of justice which is being administered by our forces overseas. There are now more than 100,000,000 people outside the United States and its territories who are liable to some sort of prosecution, trial and punishment under the American flag.

These people may be tried and are tried on charges of war crimes, crimes against humanity, and crimes against the occupation forces. All of these charges, in case of conviction, incur heavy penalties.

Yet these courts and courts systems are not subordinate, or have not been so far subordinate, to any regularly established court of the United States. The theater commander in practice has the last word.

As one might expect, in a system so far removed from popular constitution and control, many abuses have crept in. These abuses have been compounded by the hybrid rules of procedure. They combine American, Continental, and Russian rules. As a result their rulings are a far cry from what would be demanded by American standards.

One of the most glaring abuses now exists in Germany. At the American military government court, at Dachau, 1,672 persons were tried as of August 12, 1948; at the time of the latest figures reported by the Department of the Army, 1,416 had been convicted. Two hundred and ninety-seven death sentences were approved. Of these, according to subsequent newspaper reports, 217 have been executed. There remain 39 defendants still under death sentences.

(The Department of the Army reports only 29, and this number has been reduced to 14 by various commutations.)

This sounds like a record of justice done to the criminal members of a criminal conspiracy. But in fact it may well turn out to be, upon investigation, one of the most deplorable miscarriages of justice in history.

A two-man civilian board which made a survey of the trials at the request of Secretary Royall came back to the United States recently and reported.

They said the following methods were used to force confessions:

Beatings and brutal kickings.
Knocking out teeth and breaking jaws.
Mock trials.
Solitary confinement.
Torture with burning splinters.
Posturing as priests.
Very limited rations.
Spiritual deprivation.
Promises of acquittal.

Judge E. LeRoy van Roden, of Media, Pa., and Justice Gordon Simpson, of the Supreme Court of Texas, who composed the Board, recommended to Secretary Royall, after making these shocking discoveries, that a permanent clemency program be started for most of those convicted. They further recommended that 29 of those under death sentences be spared.

With what could be described as blindness or vengeance, but which we will attribute to callousness or negligence, the Army went ahead and hanged six of those for whom mercy had been recommended. Church leaders in Germany and in the United States are aroused about this.

Josef Cardinal Frings, of Cologne; Bishop Neuhaeusler, of Munich; and Bishop Wurm, of Stuttgart, led the protest. Cardinal Frings said the hangings would set back reconciliation between the nations for years.

The Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America has pleaded for justice for these people. Their delegation to Attorney General Tom Clark was told that the Department of Justice has no authority in this matter. The American Civil Liberties Union, which is concerned about the case, learned that the charge of using third-degree methods is evidently true and is seeking a way to do something about it.

The Christian Century says the evidence reported so far indicates that American justice as administered by the military is "a disgrace to the United States."

This resolution has been so framed that it could include within its scope cases like that of Mrs. Wilma Ybarbo. She was told by one of our judges in Germany, "When an American leaves the continental United States he leaves the United States Constitution behind." It could also include the case of the GI whose legs were frozen and then amputated after being detained in an Army prison. His case was reported in yesterday's newspapers.

We cannot have a double standard of justice, one brand for us at home and another for export. We must get to the bottom of this shocking deviation from American principle in American occupied areas and we must correct the situation.

INVESTIGATION OF IMMIGRATION LAWS

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a Senate resolution relating to an investigation of the immigration laws and the administration thereof, and I ask that the accompanying explanatory statement, together with the text of the resolution, may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from Nevada will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 40), submitted by Mr. MCCARRAN, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under Senate Resolution 137, of the Eightieth Congress, agreed to July 26, 1947 (providing for a full and complete investigation of our entire immigration system), is hereby continued during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-first Congress, and the limit of expenditures under such resolution is hereby increased by $135,000.00.

The statement presented by Mr. MCCARRAN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCCARRAN

Mr. President, I have sent to the desk a resolution extending the authority of the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct an investigation of our entire immigration system.

On January 5 of this year, there was presented to the Senate by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] a progress report (S. Doc. No. 3), which had been made to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary by the Subcommittee to Investigate Immigration and Naturalization pursuant to Senate Resolution 137 of the Eightieth Congress.

It is not my purpose at this time to restate the contents of that progress report, but I should like to comment briefly on the work which has been accomplished so far, and the importance of continuing this study and investigation to a final conclusion.

Right there, Mr. President, may I state that this study and investigation is not, in any sense, a "witch hunt," but on the contrary, is an objective, analytical appraisal of our entire immigration and naturalization system, with the end in view of a comprehensive report and over-all legislation designed to improve the pattern and administration of that system.

WORK THUS FAR ACCOMPLISHED

Pursuant to the direction of the Senate in Senate Resolution 137 of the Eightieth Congress, a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, together with a small staff, has been continuously engaged in assembling facts by means of extensive transcribed inquiries which have been held both in Washington and during the course of various field trips. Several thousand pages of transcribed inquiries have been taken not only from officials and employees of the Government who administer our immigration and naturalization laws but from representatives of a number of nongovernmental organizations that are interested in our immigration and naturalization system. In addition, there has been acquired a great volume of reports and other statistical data, and considerable independent research work has been completed by the subcommittee staff in the development of background material. Virtually all of this information has now been cataloged for reference in the preparation of a comprehensive report and proposed legislation, and the work of collating the information is now in progress.

The scope of this study includes a great many areas. It includes an apprisal of the operation of our immigration laws, which have been established by not only two comprehensive enactments which are still in effect, but by more than 200 additional laws. It includes a study of the organization and functions of the Visa Division of the Department of State, and of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. These are the two principal agencies dealing with our immigration and naturalization system.

The scope of the study further includes an analysis and appraisal of the various procedures for the admission, exclusion, and deportation of aliens. It includes consideration of the problems of enforcement, and questions relating to illegal entries and aliens who are in an illegal status in the United States. It includes study of the general situation in the United States with respect to the reception and assimilation of aliens.

Each of these areas of study and investigation has several facets, which have been set up as separate projects. Work has now begun on writing up the factual material on some 15 separate projects, and it is expected that the comprehensive report will embrace about 200 projects, which will be integrated in the over-all study.

PROSPECTIVE WORKLOAD AND PERSONNEL NEEDS

Since the war there has been a tremendous increase in the workload of the Standing Immigration and Naturalization Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, and in view of recent enactments by the Congress, this workload seems sure to be still further increased. As pointed out in the progress report, approximately 1,400 bills relating to immigration and naturalization were introduced in the Eightieth Congress. This was almost two and one-half times as many

such bills as were introduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress, and there were introduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress almost twice as many such bills as were introduced in the Seventy-eighth Congress. In addition, pursuant to Public Law 863 of the Eightieth Congress, it is anticipated that approximately 15,000 cases in which deportation has been suspended will be referred to the Immigration and Naturalization Subcommittee during the present Congress, for affirmative action in each case.

This constantly growing work load has necessitated the use of part of the time of the staff of the investigating subcommittee for processing the work of the standing Immigration and Naturalization Subcommittee. The present staff of the investigating subcommittee consists of 10 staff members and 4 stenographers. It is estimated that at least two staff members will be required to process the suspension of deportation cases and that one staff member will be required to process private and general immigration and naturalization bills. In addition, there is an appreciable work load of correspondence and referral items, which together with the general clerical work of the subcommittee staff, will account for the time of one other staff member. It is apparent, therefore, that during the Eighty-first Congress 4 of the 10 subcommittee staff members will be taken away from the study and investigation for the purpose of processing the routine work load of the standing Immigration and Naturalization Subcommittee.

The effect of the resolution which I have just introduced is to extend the authority of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary during the life of the Eighty-first Congress, and to authorize an appropriation for the continuation of the work for 1 year from March 1, 1949, the date upon which the present authorization expires.

The last general investigation of our immigration and naturalization system, Mr. President, was made beginning in 1907 and continuing until 1911. This investigation cost more than $800,000 and necessitated the employment of over 200 persons. It is, therefore, apparent that the terms of the resolution which I have just introduced are not only modest, but constitute a bare minimum provision for supporting this important study and investigation. I anticipate that with the addition of 5 or 6 more temporary staff members, the study and investigation, together with the comprehensive report and draft of an omnibus bill, can be completed in approximately 1 year.

AUTOMATIC RECORDING OF SENATE ROLL CALLS AND VOTES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am resubmitting today a resolution previously identified as Senate Resolution 171 of the Eightieth Congress, in which I suggested that the Senate Rules Committee study the possibility of the installation of an automatic voting system in the United States Senate, together with a study of changes in the rules which might be necessitated thereby.

The purpose of this resolution, Mr. President, is obvious. I feel that in view of the staggering work-load confronting this and previous Congresses, it is essential that we use every modern device consistent with good parliamentary government in order to husband our time, which means in effect husbanding the taxpayer's time.

Many of my colleagues come, as I do, from a State wherein one or both houses of the State legislature have automatic voting systems. It seems to me totally incongruous that we in the National Legislature in this atomic age should proceed in the present horse-and-buggy fashion of voting which consumes needless time that might be otherwise used for consideration of important issues of the day.

Of course, I believe that the problem is more serious in the House of Representatives—with its larger membership—than it is in the Senate. But if we attend to this problem of time on our side of Capitol Hill, I am sure that our colleagues in the House will do likewise.

The resolution (S. Res. 41), submitted by Mr. WILEY, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a study (1) of the desirability and feasibility of installing a mechancial or electrical device for automatically recording roll calls and votes of the Senate, and (2) if the installation of such a device is recommended by the committee, of any changes in the Rules of the Senate which might thereby be necessitated.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, the results of such study together with such recommendations as it deems desirable.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, Senate bill 210, which is a bill to retrocede to the State of New Mexico exclusive jurisdiction held by the United States over lands within the boundaries of the Los Alamos project of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, was referred by the President pro tempore of the Senate to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

I have discussed the matter with the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. The Senator from Wyoming has no objection to having the bill referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Therefore, I move that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico, the author of the bill, who is himself a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, has asked the chairman of the committee to grant consent to this change of reference. I may add that the lands affected were originally taken from the State of New Mexico for the atomic-energy project. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is completely familiar with all the facts and details, and can proceed with much more expedition than can the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. So I have no objection to the requested change of reference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 210, and it will be referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORTS ON SAVANNAH RIVER, GA. AND S. C.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to call a matter to the attention of the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from South Carolina.

On March 28, 1946, at the request of the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], a resolution was passed requesting certain information from the Army of the United States. On November 26 the Secretary of the Army submitted a report pertaining to a review of the Savannah River in Georgia and South Carolina. I should like to ask unanimous consent that the report be referred to the Committee on Public Works, and printed as a Senate document, with an illustration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR OVERTON

[Mr. ELLENDER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a tribute paid to the memory of the late Senator Overton of Louisiana by Judge Gaston L. Porterie of the United States District Court for the Western District of Louisiana, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE AMERICAN FORUM OF THE AIR—ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a brief address delivered by him in the weekly program of the American Forum of the Air, January 18, on the occasion of the twenty-first anniversary of that forum, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL AID TO HOUSING—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT

[Mr. BALDWIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Federal Aid to Housing," delivered by Senator TAFT before the Mortgage Bankers Association of America and the Graduate School of Business Administration of New York University at New York City on January 25, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

DOES THE REPUBLICAN PARTY HAVE A FUTURE?—ARTICLE BY SENATOR LODGE

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Does the Republican Party Have a Future?" written by Senator LODGE and published in the Saturday Evening Post of January 29, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROBLEMS FACING THE AMERICAN PEOPLE—ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

[Mr. GEORGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the problems facing the American people, delivered by Hon. James A. Farley at the twenty-first annual midwinter meeting of the New York State Bankers' Association at the Commodore Hotel, New York City, on January 24, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

CORRESPONDENCE RELATING TO THE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD correspondence

between him and Mr. George J. Burger relative to the recent action of the Banking and Currency Committee in creating a small business subcommittee, which appears in the Appendix.]

SIX FATAL BLUNDERS—ARTICLE BY WILLIAM H. CHAMBERLIN

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Six Fatal Blunders," written by William Henry Chamberlin and published in Human Events of the issue of January 19, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMPENSATION FOR AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "An Unjust Delay," relating to the payment of compensation to American citizens who were prisoners of enemy nations during World War II, published in the San Francisco Examiner of December 1, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

COUNT OF ELECTORAL VOTES

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD certain newspaper editorials and articles dealing with the constitutional amendment proposed by Senate Joint Resolution 2, which appear in the Appendix.]

MESSAGE OF PIUS XII TO SPANISH PEOPLE

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a dispatch by Arnaldo Cortesi, published in the New York Times on December 13, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE AMERICAN AMBASSADOR TO ARGENTINA

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled, "Dr. Lovelace acclaims United States Argentine Emissary," by Wayne L. Scott, published in the December 28, 1948, issue of the Albuquerque (N. Mex.) Journal, which appears in the Appendix.]

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. YOUNG asked and obtained consent to be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate until Wednesday next.

Mr. GREEN asked and obtained consent to be absent from the Senate on official business, beginning on February 2 and lasting for possibly a fortnight.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there further concurrent or other resolutions or routine matters?

If not, morning business is closed, and the Chair recognizes the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

VOLUNTARY RACIAL RELOCATION COMMISSION

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, out of order, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill, and ask for its appropriate reference; and I ask unanimous consent that the reading clerk may read the caption and the preamble.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

The bill (S. 708) to establish a Voluntary Racial Relocation Commission, and to prescribe its authority, introduced by Mr. RUSSELL, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading clerk may read the caption and the first section of the bill, explaining its purpose, which are very brief.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 708) to establish a Voluntary Racial Relocation Commission, and to prescribe its authority

Be it enacted, etc., That the purpose of this act is to reduce and eliminate racial tensions and improve the economic status of the American people by equitably distributing throughout the several States those citizens belonging to the two largest racial groups included in the population of the United States who of their own volition desire to change their place of residence. One of the primary objectives of the program provided for by this act shall be to improve the living standards, and the social, economic, and employment opportunities of all of those who may avail themselves of the provisions of this act, thereby assisting the less privileged and improving the standard of living and economic opportunities of all of the people of the United States.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill may be printed at this point in the RECORD, and then I desire to address myself briefly to the subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 708) is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the purpose of this act is to reduce and eliminate racial tensions and improve the economic status of the American people by equitably distributing through the several States those citizens belonging to the two largest racial groups included in the population of the United States who of their own volition desire to change their place of residence. One of the primary objectives of the program provided for by this act shall be to improve the living standards, and the social, economic, and employment opportunities of all of those who may avail themselves of the provisions of this act, thereby assisting the less privileged and improving the standard of living and economic opportunities of all of the people of the United States.

SEC. 2. There is hereby established an independent agency to be known as the Voluntary Racial Relocation Commission and to be composed of three members who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The President shall designate one of the members as chairman, who shall receive compensation at the rate of $17,500 per annum. The other two members shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum.

SEC. 3. On the basis of data furnished by the Bureau of the Census, the Commission shall—

(1) determine the two largest racial groups in the United States having separate and distinct racial characteristics, and

(2) from time to time determine the number of persons attributable to each of such groups per thousand population of each State, and per thousand population of the United States as a whole.

The number of persons attributable to either of such racial groups per thousand population of any State shall be considered to be below normal if less than 95 percent, or above normal if more than 105 percent of the number of persons attributable to such group per thousand population of the United States as a whole.

SEC. 4. The Commission shall formulate and effectuate a program to encourage and assist persons who are members of either of such racial groups and who desire to take advantage of the provisions of this act to move from States where members of their racial group are above normal and to relocate in States where members of their racial group are below normal. Insofar as may be possible, the Commission shall equalize the number assisted to move from, and the number assisted to move to, each State. Such program shall not be made applicable to any State which shall not have given its assent thereto. Such assent may be given either by action of the State legislature or in writing by the Governor of the State.

SEC. 5. In effectuating such program the Commission shall have the authority, within the limits of funds made available, to—

(a) make or insure loans for, or otherwise assist in financing, the transportation, subsistence, housing, establishment in business or occupations, acquisition of land, or other costs necessary to the relocation and reestablishment of the persons assisted. Such loans or financing shall be made at such interest rates and upon such security and terms and conditions as will best tend to effectuate such program and will afford a reasonable prospect of repayment;

(b) make arrangements for, and provide at reasonable rates, suitable transportation, subsistence, and housing for persons assisted;

(c) make grants, where necessary, for the transportation, subsistence, and temporary housing of persons assisted; and

(d) provide for the employment of persons assisted in agriculture, industry, commerce, public projects, or in any other business or occupation in which there is a fair likelihood of the person assisted achieving success.

The Commission shall endeavor to see that the housing and living facilities of any family which may be assisted to relocate are superior to those enjoyed by such family before it availed itself of such program, and that the employment or business opportunities of each person assisted are greater than those available to such person prior to relocation. The Commission is specifically empowered to make contracts with industrial enterprises and other persons, firms, and corporations affording employment to persons assisted, and is authorized to make loans to any such employer in an amount not exceeding $10,000 for each such person employed by such employer.

SEC. 6. The Commission is authorized to utilize the services of any agency of the Federal Government or of any State government which may assist in effectuating the purposes of this act, and to make such delegations of authority as the Commission may deem necessary and desirable. The Commission is further authorized to take all steps necessary or desirable to promote the effective execution of the program provided for by this act and to protect the health and promote the welfare of persons assisted under such program.

SEC. 7. The Commission may, within the limit of funds which may be made available, appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees in accordance with the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and make such expenditures (including expenditures for personal services and rent at the seat of government and elsewhere, for law books and books of reference, and for paper, printing, and binding), as it may deem necessary to

carry out the provisions of this act. In carrying out the provisions of this act, the Commission may sue and be sued in any court of competent jurisdiction, State or Federal.

SEC. 8. For carrying out the purposes of this act there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, the sum of $500,000,000, and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years the sum of $1,000,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the report of the President's Commission on Civil Rights and his subsequent endorsement of that report have made a national political issue of social, racial, and economic problems which have, for more than 80 years, unfairly burdened that section of the Nation generally called the South. The recommendations of the Commission and the legislation necessary to implement them are in the main admittedly directed at the Southern States. Taken altogether they propose to revolutionize the social and political relations between the whites and the Negroes in the 11 States of the South in order to make them conform to a national pattern.

The avowed objective of the program is to destroy the system of segregating the races which exists in the South. This system of segregation is the basis of a social order which has been painfully created through a process of trial and error—over a period of 83 years, by people of both races—at a time when they were beset by difficulties which are incomprehensible to those living in other sections of the Nation.

The term "civil rights," as used in the report of the Commission and in American political discussion today, means the question of Negro rights, racial relations, and the solution of a racial problem. The whole program of the Commission propounds and supports the theory that any form of segregation or any restraints upon the freest intermingling of the races in all of the relations of life is an illegal discrimination against our Negro citizens and a denial of their civil rights.

Many of the leaders who have inspired and promoted this program are frank enough to admit that striking down all segregation of the races in every form will have the eventual effect of solving the racial problem of the United States once and for all by bringing about the amalgamation and absorption of the minority Negro race by the more numerous white race. I do not see how any rational thinker can escape a similar conclusion.

The majority of the people of the South believe in their present social order based on segregation. They abhor the idea of solving the racial problem by amalgamation. They consider this to be the mongrelization of both races, and they are unalterably opposed to such a solution. They therefore have opposed and continue to oppose each and every piece of legislation which will contribute in any degree to that end. The rest of the Nation, constituting a majority of our people, appear to be either indifferent to the certain final result of the program or to favor it or to favor legislative action which will eventually bring about such results.

Mr. President, I have long been aware of the fact that an opinion of a person living in a community where from 1 to 5 percent of the population are Negroes as to what constitutes a proper pattern of relations between the white and Negro races is almost certain to be quite different from that held by a person living in a community where 40 to 50 or even 60 or 70 percent of the population are Negroes. The feeling on the question of segregating the races in separate schools—to use an illustration which is dramatized in the report of the Civil Rights Commission—varies in intensity in accordance with differences in the percentage of the members of each race living in the area affected. The degree of feeling varies even as between the Southern States, in accordance with the percentage of the population of the State that happens to be Negro. The bitterness engendered over the proposal to solve the racial problem of the country by fixing a Nation-wide pattern in Washington is much more acute in Mississippi, with 49 percent Negro population, and South Carolina, with 43 percent Negro population, than it is in North Carolina and Florida, with lower percentages of 27, respectively. It is more marked in Florida and North Carolina than in Texas, with 14 percent Negro population.

The 11 Southern States most acutely affected by the proposed civil-rights program have a total population, according to the last census, of 31,831,026. This is approximately 24 percent of the total population of the United States. It will be noted, however, that these same 11 States have more than 75 percent of all the Negroes living in the United States. Out of a total of 12,865,518 Negroes, according to the last census, 8,878,912 of them live in the 11 States of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, Tennessee, and Texas. It is true, Mr. President, that the war brought shifts in our population, as people of both races sought to better their economic lot by moving to areas where war industries were located and higher wages abounded, but the figures which I have given are the latest accurate ones available, and the proportions and percentages cited are very nearly accurate today. Not only do we have the greater part of the Negro population of the United States, but there are any number of counties and subdivisions of Government in the Southern States where the Negroes outnumber the whites.

To make clear the great impact the adoption of the program to destroy the system of segregation in the South will have upon the life of the people of that section, I offer for the record a table showing the number of counties and parishes in the 11 Southern States having a high percentage of Negro population. It will be noted that there are 182 counties in these States where the Negro population outnumbers the white. I ask that the table be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Table showing percentage distribution of Negro population by counties or parishes in southern States (beginning with counties or parishes having 30% or more Negroes)

State	Total number of counties	Number of counties having Negro population equal to or greater than the indicated percentage							
		30 percent	40 percent	50 percent	60 percent	70 percent	80 percent	90 percent	More than 50 percent
Alabama	67	12	6	8	...	7	3	...	18
Arkansas	75	9	6	5	4	1	...	...	9
Florida	67	19	8	2	1	...	...	...	3
Georgia	159	31	25	22	17	6	...	...	45
Louisiana	64	16	12	7	6	2	...	...	15
Mississippi	82	13	12	13	5	15	2	...	35
North Carolina	100	19	22	7	2	...	...	...	9
South Carolina	46	6	10	7	12	3	...	...	22
Tennessee	95	4	1	..	1	1	...	...	2
Texas	254	15	9	3	...	...	...	...	3
Virginia	124	17	17	11	6	1	...	...	18
Total	1,133	161	129	84	54	36	5	...	179

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the great unbalance in the number of Negroes in these 11 States, as compared with the rest of the Nation, as well as the threat to the system of segregation of the races which is an integral part of southern life, are facts which any fair-minded man should take into consideration if he would understand the grave concern which these proposals have caused the southern people.

This concern has engendered great bitterness, which might easily grow into racial strife. The campaign for what are euphemistically called civil rights is planting seeds of disunity when our Nation needs to be united. Whether rightly or wrongly, the people who live where the two races are most evenly divided in numbers are strongly opposed to having imposed upon them the racial pattern which the remainder of the Nation, constituting a large majority of our population, seems determined to fix for the entire Nation by Federal laws.

If the rest of the Nation is determined to force their views upon the southern people and use the Federal power to revolutionize the social and political relations between the races in the South, destroying the social order in which our people believe, common fairness would demand that they assist in equalizing our racial problem with that of the rest of the Nation. This will enable those who believe in the program to make a contribution to its success and fulfillment equal to that which they propose to require of us who oppose it. It would be manifestly unfair and un-American for the rest of the country to compel the white people of the South, by Federal fiat, to associate in the most intimate relations of life, with and perhaps eventually absorb, a much higher proportion of Negroes than they themselves will have an opportunity to accept and absorb.

The bill is presented in the belief that its enactment offers more hope for a permanent and peaceable solution of the

grave social and political issues growing out of the race problem than any other suggested. It proposes the creation of a commission whose duty it is to encourage and assist individuals and families who voluntarily desire to do so to relocate throughout the Nation in such a way as to accomplish an equitable distribution of the largest racial groups comprising our population.

This bill should strongly appeal to all social-minded people. It assures that in the process of bringing about an equitable distribution of the Negro and white races as between the States and sections of the Nation, it will at the same time lift the living standards and improve the economic and employment opportunities of several million American citizens who have heretofore been disadvantaged as compared with their fellow citizens. The Commission is charged with the duty of seeing, and I quote from the bill, "that the housing and living facilities of any family which may be assisted to relocate are superior to those enjoyed by such family before it availed itself of such program, and that the employment or business opportunities of each person assisted are greater than those available to such person prior to relocation."

The powers of the Commission to assist in obtaining employment extend to the authority to make loans in an amount not exceeding $10,000 for each person relocated who has secured a better job with the borrower than he enjoyed before his relocation. This provision of the bill not only will help equitably distribute the population, but will assist in a more general diffusion of the industry of the Nation. It will contribute to the establishment of plants in many States which now have little industry. If the purposes of the measure are finally accomplished and the work of the Commission created therein succeeds, Negroes who of their own accord desire to avail themselves of the benefits and opportunities of this bill will be distributed on a basis of approximately 10 percent in each State. In like manner, white people from the States now having an unbalance of white population will enjoy better economic opportunities if they desire to locate in the States from which the Negroes are moved, in the shift to equalize the population of these States.

It is, of course, impossible to give any data on the racial composition of the several States without knowing how many people of each race the Commission will be able to relocate. I do, however, offer for the RECORD a table which would show the distribution by States of those belonging to the white and Negro races if the population were already divided equitably. I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Table showing racial and total population of the States and 10 percent of total population (based on 1940 Federal census, Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census)

State	Total population	White population	Negro population	Other racial population	10 percent of total population	Shift of Negro population
Alabama	2,832,961	1,849,097	983,290	574	283,296	−699,994
Arizona	499,261	425,792	14,903	57,476	49,926	+34,933
Arkansas	1,949,387	1,466,084	482,578	725	194,938	−287,640
California	6,907,387	6,595,763	124,306	186,318	690,738	+566,432
Colorado	1,123,296	1,106,502	12,176	4,618	112,329	+100,153
Connecticut	1,709,242	1,675,407	32,902	843	170,242	+137,340
Delaware	266,505	230,528	35,876	101	26,650	−9,226
Florida	1,897,414	1,381,986	514,198	1,230	189,741	−324,457
Georgia	3,123,723	2,038,278	1,084,927	518	312,372	−772,555
Idaho	524,873	519,292	595	4,986	52,871	+52,278
Illinois	7,897,241	7,504,202	387,446	5,593	789,724	+402,278
Indiana	3,427,796	3,305,323	121,916	557	342,779	+220,863
Iowa	2,538,268	2,520,691	16,694	883	253,826	+237,132
Kansas	1,801,028	1,734,499	65,158	1,394	180,102	+114,944
Kentucky	2,845,627	2,631,425	214,031	171	284,562	+70,531
Louisiana	2,363,880	1,511,739	849,303	2,838	236,388	−612,915
Maine	847,226	844,543	1,304	1,379	84,722	+83,418
Maryland	1,821,244	1,518,481	301,931	832	182,124	−119,807
Massachusetts	4,316,721	4,257,596	55,391	3,734	431,672	+376,281
Michigan	5,256,106	5,039,643	208,345	8,118	525,610	+317,265
Minnesota	2,792,300	2,768,982	9,928	13,390	297,230	+299,302
Mississippi	2,183,796	1,106,327	1,074,578	2,891	218,379	−856,199
Missouri	3,784,664	3,539,187	244,386	1,091	378,466	+134,080
Montana	559,456	540,468	1,120	17,867	55,945	+54,825
Nebraska	1,315,834	1,297,624	14,171	4,039	131,583	+117,412
Nevada	110,247	104,650	664	5,933	11,034	+10,370
New Hampshire	491,524	490,989	414	121	49,152	+48,738
New Jersey	4,160,165	3,931,087	226,973	2,105	416,016	+189,043
New Mexico	531,818	492,312	4,672	34,834	53,181	+48,509
New York	13,479,142	12,879,546	571,221	28,375	1,347,914	+776,693
North Carolina	3,571,623	2,567,635	981,298	22,690	357,162	−624,136
North Dakota	641,935	631,464	291	10,270	64,193	+63,902
Ohio	6,907,612	6,566,531	339,461	1,620	690,761	+351,300
Oklahoma	2,336,434	2,104,228	168,849	65,357	233,643	+64,794
Oregon	1,089,684	1,075,731	2,565	11,388	108,968	+106,403
Pennsylvania	9,900,180	9,428,989	470,172	3,019	990,018	+519,846
Rhode Island	713,346	701,805	11,024	517	71,334	+60,310
South Carolina	1,899,804	1,084,308	814,164	1,332	189,980	−624,184
South Dakota	642,961	619,075	474	23,412	64,296	+63,822
Tennessee	2,915,841	2,408,906	505,736	199	291,584	−217,152
Texas	6,414,824	5,487,545	924,391	2,888	641,482	−282,909
Utah	550,310	542,920	1,235	6,155	55,031	+53,796
Vermont	359,231	358,806	384	41	35,923	+35,539
Virginia	2,677,773	2,015,583	661,449	741	267,777	−393,672
Washington	1,736,191	1,698,147	7,424	30,620	173,619	+166,195
West Virginia	1,901,974	1,784,102	117,754	118	190,197	+72,443
Wisconsin	3,137,587	3,112,752	12,158	12,677	313,758	+301,600
Wyoming	250,742	246,597	956	3,189	25,074	+24,018

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Georgia will yield, in view of the fact that I must leave the Chamber. I have a report that affects the Senator's State.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be through with my remarks in about 4 minutes, if the Senator will indulge me.

Mr. President, there has been a time when the plan envisaged by this bill would have been regarded as radical or revolutionary. Today when we look about the globe and see the gigantic scale on which the United States is using its wealth and resources to solve the problems of the people of the earth who live in foreign lands, this relocation of a million and a half American families becomes comparatively a minor matter. The cost is small compared to the great benefits which will accrue. When we consider that such a law will effect a permanent solution to a problem which divides the Nation, consumes the time and energies of the Members of Congress, creates bitterness and threatens strife, the cost is not at all significant.

We have appropriated stupendous sums of money to rehabilitate the peoples of Europe. We have assisted in the relocation of millions of people and are today engaged in bringing thousands of displaced persons to our country. At a small fraction of the cost and effort we are expending in our effort to straighten out the rest of the world, we can alleviate the gravest domestic issue which confronts and disturbs our people today, and at the same time greatly strengthen our economy.

When this movement to distribute the two races equally is once well started, it will almost operate itself. Other social measures which are pending in the Congress may be used to expedite the movement. For example, we are proposing legislation whereby the Federal Government is to assist in the construction of millions of new homes. Through an agreement between the Relocation Commission and the Housing Administration, a certain proportion of these new homes can be made available to those assisted by this bill. We are planning vast public works projects in every section of the Nation. Through agreements with the contractors on these projects we can assure employment for large numbers of people on the project and the Government can then give many of them jobs to operate the completed project. Industry and business are complaining today about the difficulties they encounter in borrowing money with which to expand and modernize their plants. The loans provided for could be secured from the Commission on agreement to employ those who have relocated residence under the terms of this proposed act.

Mr. President, one of the last measures introduced in the Senate before the distinguished Senator from Kentucky was translated into the Vice Presidency of the United States was a bill which he introduced, Senate bill 529, in conjunction with 18 other Senators, a bill to promote maximum employment, business opportunities, and careers in a free

competitive economy. The organization which this bill proposes to establish can be utilized to effect the objectives of the bill I offer.

In the very nature of things, those at the bottom of the economic ladder will be the first to avail themselves of the opportunities for improvement which this law will proffer them. We will be bettering the economic status of a million and a half or two million of the most underprivileged families of our land, white and Negro. We will strengthen America and take a long step toward the abolition of poverty from our national life.

If the Commission appointed by the President is reasonably prudent in its administration of this act, there is no reason why most of the moneys appropriated and loaned should not be repaid. There is no doubt in my mind that, in proportion, the money recaptured from these loans will be much greater than that collected from foreign nations on advances heretofore made or now in process.

The passage of this bill will be a great contribution to the preservation of the rights of the States and of our American form of government. Without impugning the motives of thousands of Americans who are supporting the civil rights program, we know that it has also been seized upon by subversive elements who seek to sow discord in the land and those who seek, by generating sympathy with what is regarded as a humanitarian cause, to establish state socialism in these United States.

Mr. President, I have no pride of authorship in this bill. I will gladly support legislation coming from any other source which will accomplish the desired purpose. I would that a Senator from some other section had offered this measure.

I hasten to assure the Senate that this bill cannot be construed as being a belated demand for a Marshall plan or an ECA to restore the ravages of civil war or to assist the Southern States to achieve their desire for readmission to economic equality with our sister States. It is offered in a sincere effort to assure domestic tranquility and national betterment. It will not help the underprivileged of the South, or the South as a section, any more than it will benefit the disadvantaged of other areas and the economy of the Nation as a whole. It will appeal to all fair-minded persons who believe in equality and justice.

In our expensive quest for peace and the happiness of men everywhere, let us not neglect measures necessary to assure the peace and happiness of the people of the United States. The plan proposed is workable. The monetary cost will be inconsequential. In the best American tradition it seizes upon the solution of a grave and perplexing problem as a means of moving forward and improving the status of the American people.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next order of business is the call of the calendar.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF JAMES E. WEBB TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I desire to move that, as in executive session, the Senate consider the nomination of Mr. James E. Webb to be Under Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the Senator moving that the Senate go into executive session?

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I am moving that the Senate consider the nomination as in executive session. I ask unanimous consent that that be done, if that is the way to proceed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas asks unanimous consent, as in executive session, that the Senate consider the nomination of James E. Webb, of North Carolina, to be Under Secretary of State. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and the clerk will state the nomination.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of James E. Webb to be Under Secretary of State.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, it is very necessary that Mr. Webb be confirmed at an early date because of the importance of the functions of the office of Under Secretary. Of course, he has not yet entered upon the duties of the office.

I beg to report that the Committee on Foreign Relations has had the nomination before it, and has given it thorough consideration, and the committee voted unanimously to recommend that the nomination be confirmed.

I ask unanimous consent that as a part of my remarks a biographical sketch of Mr. Webb which sets forth his experience and his training be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the sketch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

James Edwin Webb, Government official; born, Granville County, N. C., October 7, 1906; son of John Frederick and Sarah (Gorham) Webb; A. B., University of North Carolina, 1928; student, George Washington University Law School, 1933–36; married Patsy Aiken Douglas, May 14, 1938; children—Sarah Gorham, James Edwin, Jr. Employed in accounting department; and secretary to president, R. G. Lassiter & Co., Raleigh, N. C., 1924–25; secretary, Bureau of Educational Research, 1928–29; law clerk and stenographer, Parham & Lassiter, Oxford, N. C., 1929–30; secretary to Congressman Edward W. Pou, Fourth North Carolina District, 1932–34; in office of O. Max Gardner, lawyer, 1934–36; personnel director and assistant to president, Sperry Gyroscope Co., Inc., Brooklyn, N. Y., 1936–41; secretary and treasurer, 1941–43, vice president, Sperry Gyroscope Co., 1943–44; assistant secretary and assistant treasurer, Sperry Corp., 1943–44; with firm, Gardner, Morrison & Rogers, Washington, D. C., 1945–46; executive assistant to Under Secretary of Treasury, 1946; Director, Bureau of Budget, since 1946. Student naval aviator, Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Fla. (private first class, USMCR), 1930–31; second lieutenant, Fleet Marine Corps Reserve, active flying duty, Aircraft Squadron of East Coast Expeditionary Force, United States Marine Corps, Quantico, Va., 1931–32; served as major, Ninth Marine Aircraft Wing, United States Marine Corps; commanding officer, First Marine Air Warning Group, 1944–45. Member board of directors and executive committee, National Aeronautics Association (president, Greater New York chapter); member aviation advisory committee, New York World's Fair, 1939; secretary-treasurer, and member board of directors, United States Aviation Exhibit, Inc., New York World's Fair, 1939; member, board of directors, Private Flyers Association; member of advisory committee, to American section, International Technical Committee, Aerial Legal Experts, United States Department of State; member of advisory panel of Public Contracts Administration, Department of Labor; member of Airways Operation Advisory Committee, Department of Commerce; executive vice chairman, committee on reception to governors of States, third inaugural of Franklin D. Roosevelt; member of aviation committee, Commerce and Industry Association of New York; member of Institute of Aeronautical Sciences, North Carolina Business Foundation; Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association; American Society for Public Administration; American Political Science Association; Society for Advancement Management; American and District of Columbia Bar Associations; Phi Beta Kappa; Presbyterian, Democrat. Clubs: University (New York and Washington). Home: 3407 Rodman Street NW. Office: State Department Building, Washington, D. C.

Mr. CONNALLY. I also ask to have included in the RECORD a letter from the President in reply to one from Mr. Robert A. Lovett, who retired from the position of Under Secretary of State, together with Mr. Lovett's letter in the same connection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 7, 1949.

MY DEAR BOB: I have received with heartfelt regret your letter of January 3. Because of my familiarity with the personal considerations which prompt it, I have no recourse but to comply with its terms and accept your resignation as the Under Secretary of State, effective January 20, 1949.

In taking this action I need hardly assure you as you return to private pursuits that I heartily reciprocate the personal sentiments of friendship and respect which you express.

You have earned the gratitude of the Nation for outstanding service. As Special Assistant to the Secretary of War and as Assistant Secretary of War for Air, you had gained invaluable experience before I called you to assume the intricate responsibilities of the office of the Under Secretary of State.

The country has been fortunate in having the benefit of your expert abilities in peace as well as in war. You have been guided and inspired through all of your varied service by the highest intellectual integrity and you have brought to each task untiring industry, outstanding ability, and selfless devotion to the public interest.

Although you must now relinquish public office, I shall like to think that we can call upon you from time to time for the advice and counsel which you can give out of your rich experience.

With every good wish,

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

JANUARY 3, 1949.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: For personal reasons with which you are familiar, I respectfully submit my resignation as Under Secretary of State.

I thank you most sincerely for the confidence you have reposed in me and for your unfailing consideration and kindness.

With great respect and deep appreciation, I am,

Faithfully yours,

ROBERT A. LOVETT.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I wish to add a word of approval to the unanimous report of the Foreign Relations Committee in recommending the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. James E. Webb, as Under Secretary of State. Mr. Webb is a young man of broad experience, unusual capacity, and eminent qualifications for this important position. He is schooled in the best American traditions and ideas, and has a background of public service and experience in official and economic matters which will enable him to serve the State Department and the Nation.

Mr. Webb is the finest product of our civilization. North Carolina feels a peculiar pride in his record of achievements and accomplishments, and has the utmost confidence in his ability, courage, intelligence, and integrity, and his thorough and complete devotion and loyalty to his country under all circumstances.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of James E. Webb, of North Carolina, to be Under Secretary of State?

The nomination was confirmed.

NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as in executive session, for the Committee on Armed Services, I ask unanimous consent to report unanimously many routine promotions in the Army and Navy which have accumulated during the recess of the Congress. I think immediate action on the nominations is very desirable at this time because of our situation in Europe and in Asia, as well as at home.

I ask unanimous consent that I may report the nominations, and that they be considered immediately, that they be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be notified forthwith.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. May I ask the Senator from Maryland whether the nominations were all approved unanimously by the committee, and were considered carefully by the committee?

Mr. TYDINGS. They were.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And there is reason for putting them into effect immediately?

Mr. TYDINGS. There is. They are all provided for by law. They are purely routine.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the chairman of the committee know of any objection from any Senator about any nomination?

Mr. TYDINGS. Not a single objection to a single nomination was received by the committee as to any of the promotions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, as in executive session, the report of the nominations will be received, and without objection the nominations are confirmed en bloc, and the President will be notified at once.

VOLUNTARY AGREEMENTS IN INDUSTRY, ETC.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I renew my unanimous-consent request that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 547, which is the bill to extend the authority of the President regarding voluntary agreements.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am informed that one of the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency has an amendment to offer to the bill, and I should like to have an opportunity to have it printed. I shall have no objection to having the bill brought up on Monday, if the majority leader so indicates. I should most respectfully object to having the bill brought up at this time.

Mr. MAYBANK. I ask the majority leader if he would have any objection to making the bill the first order of business on Monday.

Mr. LUCAS. The majority leader has no objection to making the bill the first order of business on Monday next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to making the bill the unfinished business to be considered following the routine morning business on Monday next? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

RELIEF OF STORM-STRICKEN AREAS IN THE WEST

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am about to ask unanimous consent to submit a unanimous report from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and to request the immediate consideration of a bill to provide for relief for the snow-bound States of the West. I should like to state the supreme gravity of the problem to which we are addressing ourselves.

First, Mr. President, I send forward to the desk a unanimous report of the Committee on Interior on the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 38) introduced at the last session of the Congress by the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] on behalf of the Senators from Utah, Nevada, Colorado, Montana, and Wyoming, being Report No. 24. The joint resolution is designed to provide relief for the snow-bound States of the West. The unanimous report urgently recommends the passage of the resolution.

Since the introduction of the joint resolution conditions have become even more grave than they were then. The blizzard, of which we have all been reading in the press, extends from South Dakota and Nebraska to the Pacific coast. There has been an extraordinary fall of snow accompanied by subzero temperatures and high winds, resulting in the Rocky Mountain States in a disaster which exceeds anything within the memory of any living person.

The conditions were so bad, Mr. President, that the Department of the Interior, through the Bureau of Land Management and the Bureau of Reclamation, at the request of State authorities, has been making available to the States and the counties the road equipment owned by those agencies, in order to open and keep open the snow-covered areas so that feed might be taken to isolated herds of cattle and sheep. The Army, the United States Air Force, and other agencies have cooperated. This work was done with the consent and knowledge, indeed, I may say, by the order of the President, who out of his disaster fund allocated the sum of $100,000, part of it being allocated for the relief of Indians in the snow-bound States. An additional allocation was made yesterday.

Mr. President, the committee held a hearing, at which representatives of all the agencies which are cooperating were present, the Federal Works Agency, the Bureau of Public Roads, and the Bureau of Forestry, in the Department of Agriculture, and the armed services. The committee also consulted the Bureau of the Budget. I have here a letter from the executive assistant to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, which I shall submit later, together with letters from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior. In its present form the joint resolution authorizes the expenditure of $750,000.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be taken up for immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 38, which will be read by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 38) to authorize the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Reclamation, and other agencies of the Government to break through snow-bound areas in the western range States, and to take other necessary action to move in supplemental feed and otherwise care for livestock isolated by storms which have created an emergency.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, am I to understand that this joint resolution in substance authorizes and legalizes the expenditure of funds which have already been spent?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; it is to save these agencies from violation of the anti-deficiency law, on account of the utilization they have made of their machinery and their personnel, their gasoline and their oil, in fighting this terrific storm.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk may read a letter from Mr. Lawton expressing the approval of the Bureau of the Budget of the enactment of the joint resolution.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, before the letter is read at the desk, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be very happy to yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I should like to know if the measure has been coordinated with the action taken today by the House of Representatives. The Senator from Wyoming and all other Senators from the section of the country affected by the heavy snowstorms know that we must expedite whatever action we are going to take, because the help which is afforded next week or 2 weeks from now will not be anywhere near as good or effective as help given right now. I am informed that the House of Representatives has passed an appropriation measure, House Joint Resolution 112, giving to the President disaster relief funds in an additional amount of $500,000. That is almost as much as is authorized in the joint resolution which is now before the Senate. If we want to take quick action, I ask the Senator from Wyoming, would it not be wise to suggest to the Senate now that the fair thing to do would be to pass the appropriation measure which the House passed today? Then possibly we could later pass the joint resolution offered by the Senator from Wyoming, and reimburse the agencies of Government. I am sure the Senator from Wyoming is informed as to what action the House has taken.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, with whom I have recently had a conference, is, I understand, planning to hold a meeting of the Appropriations Committee this afternoon, at either 1:30 or 2 o'clock, to pass upon the appropriation measure referred to. But I may say that that appropriation is altogether separate and distinct from the action proposed by the joint resolution now before us. It is true that the President had to draw upon his disaster funds in order to meet a part of the distress occasioned by these snowstorms, and the measure passed by the House, and to be considered by the Senate Appropriations Committee this afternoon, is intended merely to reimburse the President's disaster fund.

I may say to the Senator from South Dakota that the Geological Survey, to which I addressed an inquiry this morning, has advised me that the fall of snow in the Columbia Basin, for example, is already much greater than that which caused the disaster of a year ago.

The two things are separate and distinct. The President's disaster fund may be used for any purpose. The small allocations of $200,000 or $300,000 for the Bureau of Public Works, for the Indians, for relief in connection with the western blizzard, has depleted the disaster fund which can be used for any disaster—flood, or snow, or earthquake, or fire, or any of the disasters with which we are all familiar. So I hope that the Senate will proceed to pass the joint resolution immediately, and then when the Senate Committee on Appropriations has acted upon the other measure, take that up.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I certainly hope that the request of the Senator from Wyoming will be granted, and the joint resolution passed. I do not want to delay its passage one single moment. But I want to present this fact. The question which has arisen today points up the need for permanent disaster relief legislation and permanent disaster relief funds. If we were not in session right now we would have exactly the same situation as to these areas which have been so terribly affected by the heavy and unprecedented fall of snow, that we had in my State a year and a half ago when a disastrous flood came on, and when, in the absence of a session of Congress at the time, we found ourselves rather powerless and hopeless insofar as finding any substantial funds that could be made available to relieve the distress, or any machinery to which we could turn.

And while I hope that this legislation will be immediately passed to bring relief to the areas where it is so badly needed, I do hope that the passage of this and similar measures from time to time to deal with any specific disaster should not obscure our minds from the consideration of the necessity for permanent disaster relief legislation and permanent disaster relief machinery, created to be ready and available to deal with the disasters wherever they arise, and whenever they arise, and without having to wait so that some regions months later can have their vital affairs come to the attention of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

I certainly recognize the fact that these terrible problems have no regional application, no political application, and that simply because of human distress and suffering the legislation will immediately be passed, but I hope that then we shall immediately proceed to do the long-time over-all job which has been so long necessary, to set up adequate machinery to deal with these recurring disasters.

BUDGET BUREAU VIEW

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I quite agree with what the Senator from Florida has said. I had sent to the desk a letter from Mr. Lawton, of the Bureau of the Budget, and if the Senator from Nevada will just withhold his statement for a moment, I think it will be well to have the letter brought before the Senate so that it may know that in presenting this joint resolution the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has secured the cooperation of the Bureau of the Budget and the agencies involved.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letter will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., January 27, 1949.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have reviewed Senate Joint Resolution 38 authorizing agencies of the Government to use existing funds to meet emergencies created by unprecedented weather conditions in the Western States and providing for reimbursement of funds spent on this account. Government agencies in the affected areas have, to the extent of their ability, furnished aid and assistance to the States and local communities to alleviate hardship and suffering caused by these storms and avert the loss of human life and the destruction of great numbers of livestock. This has, of course, put an unexpected drain on the funds available to the agencies and it is urgently necessary to make immediate authorization for restoration of those appropriations.

In addition, the President has today recommended a supplemental appropriation for $1,000,000 for his disaster relief fund. This fund will be used to directly aid States and local communities and in taking further steps toward meeting the present emergency. It is not a substitute for the provisions for Senate Joint Resolution 38, but represents aid and assistance to the States over and above that which is already being rendered by Federal agencies.

In order to permit agencies to continue to carry on the types of aid which they have been rendering in this emergency, it is necessary that they be given immediate assurance that funds will be made available to meet the expenditures that they have already incurred. Senate Joint Resolution 38 would do this.

Sincerely yours,

F. J. LAWTON,
Executive Assistant.

STATEMENT FROM INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Now, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter of this date, addressed to me, from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, may be printed at this point in the RECORD without reading.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, January 27, 1949.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: The blizzard disaster in the West is still developing in some sections and new information of critical conditions that have existed for several days is being received almost hourly. The storms that have swept the region repeatedly since December 22 are without precedent since the white man has penetrated the high plains and intermountain areas.

The Department of the Interior put all of its field services in the Nevada, Utah, Wyoming, Montana, Nebraska, South Dakota, North Dakota, and Colorado areas on an emergency basis nearly a week ago and in several localities the Bureau of Land Management had been working on an emergency basis since January 1. I have instructed all of our agencies to respond in real disaster areas with men and equipment, where they are available, on the request of the local disaster committees that have been set up. On most of these committees, representatives of our field forces serve as members.

It will be necessary later to submit to the Congress detailed reports and justifications for estimates to cover the extraordinary expenditures that we have made. The size of the expenditures to date in this work may exceed $500,000. There were still 25 towns of 50 to 200 population isolated in Utah yesterday, but generally the main roads were open in the areas of heaviest snowfall yesterday afternoon. However, reports this morning indicate that blowing snow has closed them in some of the winter-range areas and the work is to be done over again. Also, the 5-day forecast of the Weather Bureau

at Billings is for another general blizzard which may be expected at any time and which, if it follows the pattern of those that we have already experienced, may cover the entire storm-bound area.

Even if the remainder of the winter is no more severe than normal, the expenditures of this Department alone can be expected to reach several millions of dollars to meet the emergency that has already been created. I hesitate to anticipate what might be the requirement if the remainder of the winter, which by the calendar is still young, should be as severe as the month that has passed.

Real suffering is being recorded in several Indian reservation areas. A sudden recent storm deposited 40 inches on the western part of the Navajo Reservation. The extent of the disaster there still is not known. We have urgent demands for allocation of funds at Fort Berthold and Turtle Mountain in North Dakota with all funds exhausted, but are determined to meet these instances of dire need approaching catastrophe with diverted funds.

I sincerely hope that the Congress in its desire to assist in the rapidly moving and quickly developing emergency will not fix ceilings so low as to enforce curtailment of the activities of the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the Bureau of Reclamation which have prevented the disaster so far from wiping out herds and flocks and ranchers in several States. While I am not presuming to speak for other departments, I would like to point out that several agencies of the Department of Agriculture and the armed services have responded, as have our agencies, in the disaster areas and that their work undoubtedly has utilized funds that were programed for other regular activities. These expenditures should be calculated as well in any summation of the allotments to be covered by legislation. The President's emergency fund now has been virtually exhausted. Its use was designed primarily for other purposes, such as supplementing the resources of local communities that had exhausted their funds and facilities. The need of our Department should not be confused with the need for restoring and supplementing the emergency disaster fund.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM E. WARNE,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I wish to clarify the remarks which the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has just made. It will be remembered that last year the subject of a disaster fund for the President was debated on the floor of the Senate, and that the Columbia River disaster was the reason for the recommendation. The subcommittee of the Public Works Committee of which I was chairman, not only made money available for relief of those affected by the disaster on the Columbia River, but recommended a permanent fund of $500,000 for a revolving fund or a fund which was subject to allocation by the President in emergencies. The only debate on this floor was whether or not we should designate the agency which would expend the fund in case of disaster, or leave such designation to the President. It was decided to leave such designation to the President of the United States which agency would be in charge of expending the fund, and he has now designated the Public Works Administration in this case.

Mr. President, as chairman of the committee of western Senators chosen to follow through in coordinating the work of relief in the snow-bound areas of the six States of Idaho, Colorado, Nevada, Montana, Wyoming, and Utah, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point communications, including wires, letters, and memoranda received in that connection.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELY, NEV., *January 22, 1949.*

Hon. Senator GEORGE MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Eastern and central Nevada suffering from worst storm conditions in years. Livestock situation approaching disaster condition. Seventy thousand sheep in critical condition. These will have to be shipped out or stock will die. Over 100,000 sheep involved. Thirty-five thousand in critical condition; 50,000 jeopardized. Loss continuing daily. Will need feed and forage. Stockmen anticipate 50-percent loss, unless feed forthcoming at once. Deepest snow in years with high winds. All available snow-removal equipment, including large crawler tractors, unable to cope with the drifting snow on roads that have been open in last few days. Equipment has not been able to reach outlying stretches of county roads. Standard snow equipment cannot cope with situation. Need heavy tractors, trucks, and funds to break roads so that feed convoys can reach sheep and cattle herds. County commissioners, State highway and Government agency officials estimate future emergency needs if conditions get worse $100,000 to keep present equipment operating. County funds almost exhausted. All private and government agencies assisting with all means and equipment available, but lack funds for operation of equipment. Estimated cost for feed relief $200,000 in next 30 days. Five hundred thousand dollars estimated emergency funds needed by spring if present conditions continue. Some families and ranchers still isolated.

Emergency Relief Comittee, consisting of United Stockmen's Association, Nevada Woolgrowers' Association, United States Department of Agriculture Council, White Pine Soil Conservation District, Supervisors, Nevada Grazing Districts 4 and 5, Advisory Board, Nevada National Forest Advisory Committee, White Pine County Farm Bureau, Commissioners, White Pine County.

ELY NEV., *January 21, 1949.*

Hon. Senator GEORGE MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Concur in telegram to you from Emergency Relief Committee. Situation desperate; emergency relief needed badly. All assistance you can give us in obtaining relief in order to save our livestock will be greatly appreciated.

Daniel B. Clark, Alfred Ubalde, John Urrizigia, Bertrand Paris, Joe Laxague, B. H. Robison, J. P. Johansen, D. C. Robison, George N. Swallow, P. P. Hoover, Dee Heckethorn, R. A. Yelland, Gustav Henroil, George Eldrige, John Coonway, John P. Wright, George Nesbitt, Pete Delmue, Clair Whipple, Allen Whipple, Arthur Carter, Carl L. Peacock, Ernest Gubler, Charles Funk, Myron Adams, William Sellas, Clay Hendricks, Dearden Bros., K. A. Barton, E. A. Henroid, Lawrence Henroid, Melbourne Robison, Milo Smith, Warren Robison, Wallace Thorley, Frank Thorley, Douglas Clark, Lloyd Sorensen, Wade Perrish, Harold Parker.

RENO, NEV., *January 21, 1949.*

Senator GEORGE W. *Malone,*
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

George Swallow says there is going to be 50-percent loss of stock in White Pine, Lincoln, parts of Nye and Eureka and it will be even heavier if new storm comes. Gordon Griswold unreachable today, but our Elko correspondent says Elko County in fair shape. Ranchers there have been collecting hay and concentrates in expectation of such conditions.

Vernon Metcalfe says that entire country east of Eureka is going to be hit hard. Western part of State is in good shape but ranchers aren't taking any chances and are starting to bring stock off winter ranges and close to home ranches. Swallow says that unless feed is shipped in quick or stock shipped out fast, losses are going to be even heavier. Jack Fogliani at Caliente says situation is tough in Lincoln County. Cliff Jones as Acting Governor has declared emergency so that State Highway Department and other agencies and National Guard as well can use all their equipment and facilities without delay or red tape.

Tried another check late this afternoon but couldn't reach Swallow for latest outlook. Our Ely man says there is nothing encouraging in sight. Regards.

JOHN SANFORD.

Mr. GEORGE SWALLOW,
Ely, Nev.

Mr. VERNON METCALF,
Nevada Livestock Credit Association,
Reno, Nev.

Mr. GORDON GRISWOLD,
Elko, Nev.

Meeting with Senators today relative storm emergency intermountain area. I am chairman subcommittee to follow through on necessary emergency railroad rates, feed, and livestock and contacting western governors for information extent of emergency and preparing Senate resolution assuring deficiency appropriation, Bureau of Land Management, for specified assistance in breaking trails and other cooperation. Pittman here and met with us. Please wire any information you have on extent of emergency and necessary cooperation and assistance.

Regards,

GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator.

To Marvin E. Carter, editor, Boulder City News, Boulder City, Nev.; Arthur N. Suverkrup, Carson City Appeal, Carson City, Nev.; Chris H. Sheerin, editor, Elko Free Press, Elko, Nev.; Paul A. Leonard, editor, Ely Daily Times, Ely, Nev.; James H. Dooley, editor, Las Vegas, (Nev.) Courier, Las Vegas, Nev.; John F. Cahlan, editor, Las Vegas Review-Journal, Las Vegas, Nev.; Joseph F. McDonald, editor, Nevada State Journal, Reno, Nev.; Merrill S. Gaffney, editor, Reno Gazette, Reno, Nev.; William Friel, editor, Humboldt Star, Winnemucca, Nev.:

"WASHINGTON, D. C., January 21, 1949.—Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Nevada, today called together the Senators of the six intermountain States—Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Utah, Wyoming—on a definite plan of cooperation with the governors of their respective States in the storm emergency in moving feed and livestock in the area. A subcommittee including Senators GEORGE W. MALONE, Nevada, chairman; LESTER C. HUNT, Wyoming, and ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Utah, was chosen to follow through and contact the railroads serving the area in the matter of emergency rates in moving such feed and livestock; to enlist Government agency cooperation including the Army, Federal roads, and other agencies in furnishing manpower and equipment in clearing roads and trails; and to prepare resolution to be introduced in Senate Monday, January 24, to provide for a

deficiency appropriation for the Bureau of Land Management under the Secretary of the Interior for funds expended under certain conditions in clearing trails and transporting feed and livestock in the emergency area.

"The committee today wired the governors of the States in the mountain area for further particulars as to the extent of the emergency and for their definite recommendations.

"Gov. Vail Pittman, of Nevada, who is here attending the Presidential inauguration, was called into the meeting by Senator MALONE and explained in detail the situation in Nevada which is comparable with that in Utah and to a somewhat lesser degree in the other States.

"GEORGE W. MALONE,
"*United States Senator.*"

Hon. J. BRACKEN LEE,
Governor of Utah,
Salt Lake City, Utah.
Hon. JOHN W. BONNER,
Governor of Montana,
Helena, Mont.
Hon. W. LEE KNOUS,
Governor of Colorado,
Denver, Colo.
Hon. C. A. ROBINS,
Governor of Idaho,
Boise, Idaho.
Hon. A. G. CRANE,
Governor of Wyoming,
Cheyenne, Wyo.:

We understand that some of our western governors of snow-bound States intend to make formal request of railroads for emergency reduced rates for moving livestock and feed into and out of distressed areas. We want you to know that if such action is taken we will be glad to give our support and full cooperation. A subcommittee including Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, chairman, Nevada; Senator LESTER C. HUNT, Wyoming; and Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Utah, will follow through on emergency freight rates and other cooperation.

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
Chairman, Nevada.
Senators WATKINS and THOMAS,
Utah.
Senators ECTON and MURRAY,
Montana.
Senators MILLIKIN and JOHNSON,
Colorado.
Senators O'MAHONEY and HUNT,
Wyoming.
Senators MILLER and TAYLOR,
Idaho.

Mr. GEORGE ASHBY,
President, Union Pacific Railroad,
Las Vegas, Nev.:

Will call you 8:30 your time Saturday morning. Regards.

GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator.

Mr. A. T. MERCIER,
President, Southern Pacific Railroad,
San Francisco, Calif.:

Will call you 8 o'clock your time Saturday morning. Regards.

GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator.

JANUARY 24, 1949.

MEMORANDUM TO SENATOR GLEN H. TAYLOR, IDAHO; SENATOR BERT H. MILLER, IDAHO; SENATOR PATRICK M'CARRAN, NEVADA; SENATOR GEORGE W. MALONE, NEVADA; SENATOR ELBERT D. THOMAS, UTAH; SENATOR ARTHUR V. WATKINS, UTAH; SENATOR EDWIN C. JOHNSON, COLORADO; SENATOR EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, COLORADO; SENATOR JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, WYOMING; SENATOR LESTER C. HUNT, WYOMING; SENATOR JAMES E. MURRAY, MONTANA; SENATOR ZALES N. ECTON, MONTANA

The emergency conference of western Senators held in the Interior and Insular Committee room (224), called by Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, of Nevada, in response to urgent messages from the storm areas, for 2:30 p. m. on Friday, January 21, decided:

1. To introduce a Senate resolution to be prepared by Senators JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, and ARTHUR V. WATKINS, of Utah, authorizing the Bureau of Land Management, Bureau of Public Roads, and all other Government agencies to render whatever assistance possible in the transportation of feed and livestock and in clearing the roads and trails for such transportation, including the assurance of a deficiency appropriation for money expended within certain limits.

2. To contact the railroads serving the area and determine the possibility of securing emergency freight rates in the transportation of such feed and livestock—60 percent of the regular rate was discussed.

3. To wire each of the governors of the six States for further details as to the extent of the emergency and just what in their opinion would be necessary in the way of such emergency help and assistance.

4. To contact the Federal agencies in working out the details as to just what help can be rendered in this connection.

The subcommittee selected to follow through consisted of Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, of Nevada, chairman, Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS, of Utah, and Senator LESTER C. HUNT, of Wyoming.

The wires were sent to the governors on Saturday afternoon and as yet very little information has been secured, probably for the reason that the governors would not be able to do anything officially until this morning, Monday.

The presidents of the railroads serving the area were contacted. Some information has already been received and while not particularly favorable to date, they are working on the problem. The committee will meet with Mr. Edwin Martin, representative for the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad and Mr. Howard Blatchard, representative for the Union Pacific Railroad, today and further information will be forthcoming.

Emergency meetings are being held in the Department of Agriculture and other departments of the Government and we are to be kept advised.

We have been in communication with Mr. John Steelman at the White House who is working on the matter and will keep us advised.

The committee will keep you advised as the information comes in and progress is made.

All the Senators in the six States were notified of the conference and the following attended: Idaho: Mr. James H. Hawley, representing Senator BERT H. MILLER; Nevada: Senator GEORGE W. MALONE; Utah: Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS, Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS; Colorado: Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON; Senator EUGENE D. MILLIKIN; Wyoming: Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Senator LESTER C. HUNT; Montana: Senator ZALES N. ECTON.

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
Chairman.
Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS.
Senator LESTER C. HUNT.

Emergency meetings are being held in the Department of Agriculture and other departments of the Government and we are to be kept advised.

We have been in communication with Mr. John Steelman at the White House who is working on the matter and will keep us advised.

The committee will meet with Mr. Edwin Martin, representative for Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad, and Mr. Howard Blatchard, Union Pacific Railroad, today and further information will be forthcoming.

ST. PAUL, MINN., *January 24, 1949.*
GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senate:

Your telegram 22d regarding emergency conditions on livestock in western range territory. Department of Agriculture now have subject up with Chairman Dana of Western Traffic Executive Committee and Great Northern will collaborate fully in handling subject with Department of Agriculture.

P. J. GAVIN,
President, Great Northern Railway.

CHICAGO, ILL., *January 24, 1949.*
GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Your message 22d concerning relief rates on feed in the distressed areas and livestock out of such areas. Blizzard conditions caused us very heavy expense and with our high operating costs and comparative low rate levels we cannot afford to make reduced rates under present conditions because of situations of this kind. Furthermore our reports of our territory in Wyoming do not indicate that reduction in freight rates would alleviate the situation.

R. L. WILLIAMS,
Chicago & North Western Railway Co.

THREE FORKS, MONT., *January 4, 1949.*
Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Wire Saturday, have just been through our territory in Montana but do not find any distress conditions such you cite and have had no requests for distress rates from interests involved. The trouble is evidently south of us.

C. H. BUFORD.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *January 24, 1949.*
Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Missouri Pacific will cooperate with railroads that directly serve range areas referred to your telegram 22 in considering emergency freight rate on feed and livestock.

P. J. NEFF,
Missouri Pacific Railroad.

SPOKANE WASH., *January 24, 1949.*
Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senate:

Regarding your wire January 22, 1949: Spokane International Railroad will cooperate to fullest extent on any plan to help feed and transport livestock in critical areas. We will join with other railroads in making emergency rates. As our operating ratio is 80 percent feel rate should be minimum of 80 percent of normal.

F. C. RUMMEL,
President, Spokane International Railroad.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *January 24, 1949.*
Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator:

Request emergency reduction feed and livestock rates submitted by Charles B. Bowling, Department of Agriculture, Saturday, to Chairman Dana, Western Traffic Association, who is handling with western lines as emergency matter. Our Montana mileage limited but will join other lines in careful consideration of proposal.

H. C. GROUT,
President Soo Line.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *January 24, 1949.*
Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senate:

Your wire 22d about difficulty being encountered by Nevada livestock industry because of severe weather conditions. Southern Pacific fully appreciative of situation confronting Nevada cattle industry. However, as you know, railroad industry likewise facing critical situation because of failure of rates to meet mounting costs. We have already explained to Nevada Public Service Commission that we are not in position to grant requested reduction in rates on livestock or feed as existing rates are on extremely low basis.

Railroads are being constantly asked to reduce rates in similar situations, as, for example, in connection with severe drought which occurred in California last spring.

A. T. MERCIER,
President, Southern Pacific.

ST. PAUL, MINN., *January 24, 1949.*
Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Your wire 22d. No emergency exists in the territory in Montana served by the Northern Pacific. We will do everything necessary to provide service if an emergency develops, but are now operating at very heavy expense, due to extreme cold and snow, and will have little, if any, net income this month. Transportation at less than published rates cannot, in my opinion, be justified under these conditions.

C. E. DENNEY.

DENVER, COLO., *January 24, 1949.*
GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator from Nevada.

DEAR GEORGE: In reply to your telegram, January 22, your problem, as far as livestock is concerned, is not one of freight rates and I see no necessity of establishing emergency rates at this time. Your problem is to get feed to the sheep and cattle on the ranges.

As you well know, west of Ely and in this sheep country, sheep are located 100 to 150 miles from a railroad, and, as Senator WATKINS knows, this is equally true of southern and western Utah and the Utah sheep that range in Nevada.

The worst thing to try to do is to get them to a railroad. What is needed are bulldozers and equipment to clear the snow to get to the sheep and cattle so that hay and pellets can be brought in as quickly as possible and not too late. The worst thing that could happen would be to try to drive this stock to a railroad head unless, of course, tractors and snow plows are used to make a trail for them.

I know this picture because I was interested in a band of sheep which we wintered west of Ely and sheep, incidentally, are more seriously affected in this picture than cattle. Both, however, are in distress.

I agree with your first and second provisions.

Regards,

WILSON MCCARTHY,
President, Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad Co.

CHICAGO, ILL., *January 24, 1949.*
GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator, Nevada,
Chairman:

Conditions arising from storms mentioned in your telegram 22d include northwestern Nebraska. There has been a continuous battle in these States with snow conditions the past 3 or 4 weeks. Our main lines are now open and operations approaching normal with constant use of snow plows. Some branch lines still closed. We have been making every effort to restore service at all points. Our general solicitor, Eldon Martin, who is familiar with these conditions, is arriving in Washington today, and I am asking him to see you and others about the situation.

RALPH BUDD.

OMAHA, NEBR., *January 23, 1949.*
Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Acknowledging your telegram January 22, which reached me here at Salt Lake City today. I presume that in your consideration of questions presented someone must have recognized the fact that the railroads are being put to enormous expense, not only for maintaining service at all but also utterly out of the question to expect all concerned to recover losses sustained under conditions like this through reductions in freight rates which are already so low that adequate maintenance for future service has to be curtailed. My answer, therefore, to applications for emergency freight rates for feed, livestock, or anything else must be in the negative.

G. F. ASHBY,
President, Union Pacific Railroad Co.

ELKO, NEV., *January 22, 1949.*
Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
Washington, D. C.:

Emergency snow conditions existing throughout Nevada with most critical areas in Elko, White Pine, Lincoln, Nye, Eureka, and Humboldt Counties. Authorization from Congress to Bureau of Land Management, Forest Service, Army, and Navy to take any steps necessary to relieve emergency arising from winter storms with assurance of deficiency appropriation to cover of utmost importance. Lack of heavy snow-fighting equipment to stricken areas. Necessary action for emergency railroad rates on feed and livestock to and from critical areas should follow. Losses in both cattle and sheep are increasing daily with many sections still isolated and no reports available. Immediate action for relief is vital.

GORDON GRISWOLD,
President, National Advisory Board Council.

Mr. JOHN SANFORD,
The Reno Gazette, Reno, Nev.:

Have contacted President Truman availability disaster fund storm emergency. Will have information Monday.

Regards,

GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator.

The Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.:

Terrific emergency throughout range area of six Western States. Perhaps hardest hit Nevada and Utah. Understand possibility your disaster fund available such cases. All available machinery, State National Guard, Federal Roads Administration, being mobilized to clear highways and trails. Appreciate information as to availability of fund such cases. Will call you Monday morning.

Regards,

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
Chairman, Subcommittee, Western Senators.

Mr. A. T. MERCIER,
President, Southern Pacific Railroad,
San Francisco, Calif.
Mr. GEORGE ASHBY,
President, Union Pacific Railroad,
Las Vegas, Nev.:

Informed real emergency exists in certain range areas of the six States of Nevada, Utah, Montana, Colorado, Idaho, and Wyoming. I called the Senators of these States together yesterday to determine what could be done in response to emergency requests from the area. As a result I am chairman of a subcommittee including Senators LESTER C. HUNT, Wyoming, and ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Utah, to follow through to: First, mobilize all Federal agencies including the armed services, Bureau of Public Roads, etc., for the use of road- and trail-clearing facilities in order to get feed in to the stock and the livestock out of the dangerous areas; second, to prepare and introduce a Senate resolution on Monday, January 24, authorizing the Bureau of Land Management to make emergency expenditures from its regular appropriation and preparing the way for a deficiency appropriation to make up the amount so expended; and third, to contact the railroads direct serving the areas and determine their attitude toward an emergency freight rate for feed and livestock. The amount of 60 percent of the regular rate was discussed. Have tried to reach you on the telephone since yesterday noon and will call you Monday morning. In the meantime, however, could you let me have the benefit of your suggestions and reaction to the cooperation desired.

Regards,

GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator, Nevada.

To: President, Western Pacific Railroad Co., San Francisco, Calif.; President, Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad, Chicago, Ill.; Wilson McCarthy, President, Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad Co., Denver, Colo.; President, Northern Pacific Railway, St. Paul, Minn.; President, Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railroad, Chicago, Ill.; President, Colorado & Southern Railway, Denver, Colo.; President, The Great Northern Railway, St. Paul, Minn.; President, Chicago & North Western Railway Co., Chicago, Ill.; President, Colorado & Southern Railway Co., Denver, Colo.; President, Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad, Chicago, Ill.; President, Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railroad, Minneapolis, Minn.; President, Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railroad, Chicago, Ill.; President, Missouri Pacific Railway, St. Louis, Mo.; President, Spokane International Railway, Spokane, Wash.:

"Informed real emergency exists in certain range areas of the six States of Nevada, Utah, Montana, Colorado, Idaho, and Wyoming. I called the Senators of these States together yesterday to determine what could be done in response to emergency requests from the area. As a result I am chairman of a subcommittee, including Senators LESTER C. HUNT, Wyoming, and ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Utah, to follow through to, first, mobilize all Federal agencies including the Armed Services Bureau of Public Roads, etc., for the use of road and trail clearing facilities in order to get feed in to the stock and the livestock out of the dangerous areas; second, to prepare and introduce a Senate resolution on Monday, January 24, authorizing the Bureau of Land Management to make emergency expenditures from its regular appropriation and preparing the way for a deficiency appropriation to make up the amount so expended; and third, to contact the railroads direct serving the areas and determine their attitude toward an emergency freight rate for feed and livestock. The amount of 60 percent of the regular rate was discussed. Could you let me have the benefit of your suggestions and reaction to the cooperation desired.

"Regards,

"GEORGE W. MALONE,
"United States Senator, Nevada."

RENO, NEV., *January 25, 1949.*
Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Conditions are very bad many areas and cold continues. Distress spotted Army planes

flying hay from Fallon and Minden to Ely and dropping some in remote spots. Government agencies are exerting fully with reasonable success; losses surely severe even with feed supply now. Many can still be saved. Know efforts are appreciated. Best regards.

R. C. TURRITTIN.

CARSON CITY, NEV., *January 24, 1949.*

Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Office Building:

Wire just received; my information coincides with press reports; impossible to give specific details. All desert areas, White Pine, Nye, and Lincoln Counties, where winter feeding is not common practice are seriously affected. Heavy losses quite certain; every effort to relieve should be exerted.

R. C. TURRITTIN,
Nevada State Tax Commission,

JANUARY 25, 1949.

We have just been successful in getting $100,000 allocated from President's disaster fund to be used under supervision Public Works Department coordinating activities Government bureaus within area, $50,000 confined to Indian Bureau, $50,000 to Bureau of Land Management for movement of feed and livestock, clearing roads, trails, etc. Trying to get additional $150,000. Senate resolution introduced yesterday, committee hearings completed today, will be presented to Senate tomorrow for $750,000 limit reimburse Federal agencies for emergency expenditures. These agencies include Bureau of Public Roads, the armed services, Bureau of Land Management, Bureau of Reclamation, Forest Service, Soil Conservation Service, and all others available within the area.

Committee of western Senators, of which I am chairman, have contacted all railroads serving the affected areas and have received replies, some not favorable but mostly willing negotiate assistance freight rates.

One result is general assurance from all roads that necessary equipment for movement of feed and livestock will be made available through priority. I have contacted C. V. Isbell, contractors, Reno, and they are mobilizing all available private contractors' equipment, including D eights, D sevens, motor patrol equipment, and other machinery suitable for road and trail clearance, all of which if necessary could be obtained under the emergency bill now before the Senate and the President's disaster fund allocation, and they say can be moved into the Ely or Elko areas within 24 hours. The committee is following through, keeping in close touch with all departments. Field of Public Works is leaving for the storm area immediately. Am urging railroads send in representatives assist shipping.

Please wire progress being made, additional equipment and personnel necessary, and what more can be done here. Regards.

GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator, Nevada, Chairman, Committee of Western Senators.

ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
United States Senator, Utah.

LESTER C. HUNT,
United States Senator, Wyoming.

CHICAGO, ILL., *January 26, 1949.*

Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senate:

Thanks for your telegram last night. All carriers appreciate your cooperation and efforts move stock and feed areas affected by severe weather. As I am sure you have heard from many of the executives indicating special efforts they are making not only expediting movement stock and fed but in locating sources of supply of feed.

Assume your telegram last night was sent same executives you telegraphed few days ago and if so not necessary for me to repeat to them.

Regards,

W. H. DANA.

CHICAGO, ILL., *January 26, 1949.*

GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator, Nevada, Chairman:

Thank you for your night letter about relief to livestock in storm area. Burlington men are on the ground and will continue in intimate touch with situation.

RALPH BUDD.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 26, 1949.*

Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Office Building:

In line with your telegram 25th, glad to cooperate to best our ability in making equipment available to move feed and livestock in storm area.

F. G. GURLEY,
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe, Chicago, Ill.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 26, 1949.*

GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building:

Wire 25th. We are amply supplied with equipment to move both feed and livestock and are sending additional men into our territory to insure fullest measure of cooperation in emergency.

C. H. BUFORD,
Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad, Seattle.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 26, 1949.*

GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building:

Wire 25th. We are amply supplied with equipment to move both feed and livestock and are sending additional men into our territory to insure fullest measure of cooperation in emergency.

C. H. BUFORD,
Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co., Seattle.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *January 26, 1949.*

Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Your telegram January 25. Southern Pacific officers are in close touch and cooperating fully with associations and individuals in this critical matter. At request of Wool Growers Association on January 21 we immediately investigated supplies of hay, feed, etc., available along our lines, and have furnished this information, with quoted prices, to United Livestock Association, Ely. Our representative has been in Ely working closely with the association and will remain there throughout emergency. Necessary action has been taken to assure ample equipment supply to handle feedstuffs and livestock originating on our lines.

A. T. MERCIER,
President, Southern Pacific Co.

ST. PAUL, MINN., *January 26, 1949.*

Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Night letter of January 25. As far as we know, no emergency exists in the territory served by Great Northern, but our general livestock agent is now on the ground obtaining first-hand information on this situation.

P. J. GAVIN,
President, Great Northern Railway Co.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *January 26, 1949.*

Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator from Nevada:

Your wire 25th. This company will cooperate fully in relieving livestock emergency in our territory. Our representatives have been instructed to contact stockmen and shippers. Regards.

H. C. GROUT,
President, Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Co.

SPOKANE, WASH., *January 26, 1949.*

Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senate:

Re your wire of January 25. Our railroad serves panhandle of Idaho, Spokane to Coeur d'Alene to Eastport. Advise us by wire of any emergency area served by our railroad and we will have representative on job immediately. We will cooperate to our fullest ability.

F. C. RUMMEL,
President, Spokane International Railroad Co.

To: Ralph Budd, president, Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad, Chicago, Ill.; Wilson McCarthy, president, Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad Co., Denver, Colo.; C. E. Denny, president, Northern Pacific Railway, St. Paul, Minn.; F. J. Gavin, president, Great Northern Railway, St. Paul, Minn.; R. L. Williams, president, Chicago & North Western Railroad Co., Chicago, Ill.; P. J. Neff, president, Missouri Pacific Railway, St. Louis, Mo.; G. F. Ashby, president, Union Pacific Railroad Co., Omaha, Nebr.; A. T. Mercier, president, Southern Pacific Railroad, San Francisco, Calif.; H. C. Grout, president, Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railroad, Minneapolis, Minn.; F. C. Rummel, president, Spokane International Railway, Spokane, Wash.; president, Western Pacific Railroad, San Francisco, Calif.; president, Colorado & Southern Railway, Denver, Colo.; president, Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad, Chicago, Ill.; president, Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railroad, Chicago, Ill.; W. H. Dana, chairman, Transcontinental Freight Bureau, Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.:

"Preliminary wire to you from committee western Senators headed by myself was acquaint you situation let you know Senators and Governors storm area States alive situation, ready cooperate any way possible knowing you vitally interested survival livestock area served your road. One immediate and constructive result assured by your representatives priority equipment necessary move feed and livestock established areas where necessary. Other committee work includes allocation $100,000 from the President's disaster fund allocated $50,000 Indian Bureau and $50,000 Bureau Land Management other governmental organizations coordinated by Public Works Bureau. We are asking for $150,000 more since storm not abated. Situation more serious than first estimated. Today Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported out joint Senate resolution introduced yesterday. Will go Senate floor tomorrow assuring governmental organizations deficiency appropriation make up regular funds expended necessary work to extent of not more than $750,000. Recommend sending your representatives into emergency area to confer with stockmen and shippers on the ground. Appreciate your cooperation.

"Regards,

"GEORGE W. MALONE,
"*United States Senator.*"

JANUARY 25, 1949.

F. G. GURLEY,
President, Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railroad, Chicago, Ill.:

Preliminary wire to you from committee western Senators headed by myself was acquaint you situation let you know Senators and Governors storm area States alive situation ready cooperate any way possible knowing you vitally interested survival livestock area served your road. One immediate and constructive result assured by your representatives' priority equipment necessary move feed and livestock established areas where necessary. Other committee work includes allocation $100,000 from the President's disaster fund, allocated $50,000 Indian Bureau, and $50,000 Bureau Land Management, other governmental organizations coordinated by Public Works Bureau. We are asking for $150,000 more since storm not abated. Situation more serious than first estimated. Today Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported out joint Senate resolution introduced yesterday. Will go Senate floor tomorrow assuring governmental organizations deficiency appropriation make up regular funds expended necessary work to extent of not more than $750,000. Recommend sending your representatives into emergency area to confer with stockmen and shippers on the ground. Understand you are not in the emergency area as yet but recent information is that storm area is spreading. Appreciation your cooperation; thanks anyway.

Regards,

GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senate.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 25, 1949.*

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Office Building:

I presume you realize, as I am sure the livestock people in our territory realize, that the storm conditions mentioned in your telegram 22d did not affect our area nor the livestock interests in our territory. Kind regards.

F. G. GURLEY,
A. T. & S. F., Chicago, Ill.

CHICAGO, ILL., *January 25, 1949.*

SENATOR GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senate:

Your telegram reference emergency livestock relief six Western States. Railroads recognize seriousness of situation. Matter under consideration by interested lines.

J. DEFARRINGTON,
Rock Island Lines.

JANUARY 26, 1949.

ISBELL CONSTRUCTION CO.,
Reno, Nevada:

Regarding your telegram, the information on availability and costs of equipment has been put into the hands of Gen. Philip B. Fleming, Administrator, Public Works Administration where authority for expenditure President's disaster fund allocation has been placed. Also responsibility for coordinating other Government organizations. Said he would wire you immediately. Keep me advised.

Regards.

GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator.

RENO, NEV., *January 26, 1949.*

Hon. Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Equipment available for snow removal in eastern Nevada as follows: Eight D-8 and one D-7 caterpillar with dozers, four motor patrol graders at Reno; Three D-8 caterpillars with dozers and four motor patrols at Fallon. Rates per hour including equipment, Operator and fuel as follows: D-8, $15.50; motor patrols, $8. Contractors to be reimbursed for subsistence. Travel time and difference between straight time and overtime rates of operators and cost of repairs to equipment other than that due to ordinary wear and tear. Due to subzero weather conditions it will be necessary to cut holes in track plates to avoid packing of snow and resulting track breakage. This involves replacement of tracks later. Rates for truck transportation to move equipment to job site $12.50 per hour. Approximate moving time Reno to Ely 20 hours; Reno to Elko 12 hours. However, due to highway conditions trucks could easily be delayed. Can have first equipment on job within 24 hours after notice to proceed.

ISBELL CONSTRUCTION CO.

JANUARY 27, 1949.

WASHINGTON, D. C.—The Senate today approved a joint resolution authorizing the appropriation of $3,000,000 for the purpose of breaking trails through the snow-bound areas for feed and livestock, and a resolution reimbursing $500,000 to the President's disaster fund created last year, it was announced today by Senator MALONE. To date $300,000 has been allocated from the President's disaster fund to the Western States, including fifty-thousand designated for the Indian Bureau and today a further request is being made for an additional $500,000 for the same purpose.

The cooperative response from the Government bureaus has been 100 percent and the railroads have placed a priority on equipment for the transportation of feed and livestock and are sending their representatives into the areas, the Senator advised.

Also the heavy equipment mobilized by the committee in the State of Nevada and other areas is now in use.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I inquire what is the parliamentary situation?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The parliamentary situation is that the joint resolution is before the Senate.

Mr. WATKINS. Is it open to amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is a committee amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask that the committee amendment be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof, the following:

That (a) in order to transport sufficient feed and otherwise take care of livestock isolated by storms in the Western States, all agencies of the Government performing functions in the affected areas are authorized, upon request of the Governor of any such State and the approval of the coordinating agency, to break trails through snow-bound areas in such State and to take such other action as may be necessary temporarily to protect such livestock.

(b) Such agencies of the Government are also authorized to take action to provide emergency relief for Indians in areas isolated by such storms, if the coordinating agency certifies such action is necessary.

Sec. 2. The President shall designate an agency of the Government (herein called the "coordinating agency") to coordinate all activities of Government agencies performing functions under this joint resolution. Any Government agency performing such functions is authorized to cooperate with, or to use the personnel, supplies, facilities, and other resources of any other agency of the Federal Government and, with the consent of the head thereof, of any State, county, or local governmental agency.

Sec. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $750,000, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution. Any unexpended balance of funds appropriated for any purposes to any agency of the Government performing activities under this joint resolution are hereby made available to carry out such activities and deficiency appropriations as are hereby authorized, subject to the limitation specified in this section to reimburse in full the appropriation to such agency for any expenditures made hereunder. Sums appropriated pursuant to the authorization contained herein shall be available to reimburse in full the appropriation to any such agency for any expenditure made or obligation incurred, prior to the date of designation of the coordinating agency, if such expenditure or obligation is certified by the head of such agency to have been necessary in accomplishing the purposes of this joint resolution.

Sec. 4. Any agency performing activities under this joint resolution is authorized to employ additional personnel without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and to incur obligations on behalf of the United States, by contract or otherwise, for the acquisition, rental, or hire of equipment, services, materials, and supplies, for shipping, drayage, travel, and communication, and for the supervision and administration of its activities under this joint resolution. Such obligations may be incurred in excess of any appropriations available to such agency, but the aggregate amount of such obligations and any other expenses incurred pursuant to this joint resolution shall not exceed the amount authorized to be appropriated under section 3. Neither section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C., sec. 5) nor section 3679 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C., sec. 665) shall be applicable to any action taken pursuant to this joint resolution. The provisions of section 607 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, shall not be applicable to additional personnel employed hereunder.

Sec. 5. The authority conferred by this joint resolution shall not extend beyond April 15, 1949.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the committee amendment was agreed upon by the committee and the representative of the Bureau of the Budget.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The committee amendment is open to amendment.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I should like to offer an amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] has been recognized.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment, on page 4, section 3, line 17, to strike out the figures "$750,000" and insert "$3,000,000." I wish to speak briefly on the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Utah will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In section 3, on page 4, line 17, in the committee amendment, after the words "not to exceed", it is proposed to strike out "$750,000" and insert "$3,000,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah to the committee amendment.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the committee heard considerable evidence with respect to the amount of money which would be necessary to carry on the program already under way by the Federal agency. I now have figures before me for some of the States involved and some districts in the States, from a few of the services which have been active during this emergency. A note from one of the agencies gives me the information that in Utah, Colorado, and one grazing district in Nevada, the following governmental agencies—the Forest Service, the Soil Conservation Service, the Indian Service, and the Bureau of Land Management—have up to January 26 expended approximately $400,000 in storm relief. If the expenses continue as they have been running until February 5, the amount will be $570,000. This expenditure has amounted to approximately $170,000 a week. This note was just handed to me, having been received from the Bureau of Land Management, which has expended the larger portion of the sums named.

The storms began early in December in my State, and they have been continuous off and on ever since that time. We have had subzero temperatures much of the time, even when the storms were occurring. Sheep and cattle, and particularly sheep, are ranged on what is called winter range, on the western deserts of my State. The same condition exists also in Nevada and in other sections of the West where large flocks of sheep are ranged on summer range in the national forests, and are later taken to the western deserts, where they can get forage for the winter without being hand-fed.

The situation has developed to the point where, instead of having a normal supply of snow, which usually is barely enough to supply water for the sheep on the desert, it is now impossible for them to move more than a few yards from the camp where they usually come in for the night, and where they are bedded down. Because of this condition it will be necessary to feed for a long time.

Only about an hour and a half ago I received word that another snowstorm is raging in Utah and portions of Nevada, and other parts of the West. This means that the roads which have already been opened by the combined efforts of the counties, States, and Federal agencies involved will probably be filled with drifts in another 24 hours. It means that those agencies will have to use all their facilities day and night to keep the roads open, or these animals will perish. Even after the roads are opened and the storms cease for a time, there is so much snow on the ground that it will be impossible for the animals to forage for natural feed. The snow is entirely too deep, even for cattle to forage; and for sheep, of course, it is an utter impossibility. That means that they will have to be fed. It means that a constant patrol will be necessary to keep the roads open. As many of the sheep as can be moved to feed lots near the main highways will, of course, be moved; but there will be a continual expenditure.

One of the men from the Sheep Growers' Association in my State reported this morning that the probabilities are that relief will be needed for 60 days, in the normal course of a winter such as we usually have in the Mountain States. That does not mean that any abnormal condition will exist from now on, but even in the normal course of the weather, it will be necessary to have help for the next 60 days. The first 2 feet of snow which has fallen on the ground has become heavily saturated with water, and frozen, and it will be a long time before that snow melts. It may be even as late as the first of May before the sheep can get natural water and forage on the desert.

Mr. O'MAHONEY rose.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator from Wyoming wish me to yield to him?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to make a comment.

Mr. WATKINS. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I was about to say that the committee was desirous of holding the sum to be authorized down as close as possible to the need. I know that what the Senator from Utah has just said is true. I have also received official word today from the State of Wyoming that snow is again falling and the wind is blowing. The new snow and the old snow are drifting and closing the roads. So I have no way of estimating what the eventual cost of this operation will be. I do know that the State Legislature of Wyoming has already made an appropriation. So also has the Legislature of South Dakota. If I am correctly advised, the Legislature of the State of Nebraska has also acted.

In view of the fact that this bill will have to be considered in the House, I am wondering if the Senator would modify his amendment so as to make it $2,000,000 instead of $3,000,000.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I should like to point out to the Senator that yesterday the State of Utah appropriated $250,000 to aid in this relief work. I understand that the States which have not appropriated money are preparing to make appropriations.

I point out to the Senator that the Bureau of Land Management stated to me only today that unless a considerable sum is authorized it will be necessary for that agency to close down its work in probably less than a week. The funds they now have are not sufficient to carry on much longer. Having spent as much as they have spent in the districts and States to which I have referred, not to mention the other States which are involved, they will be out of money and will not be able to carry on. In my judgment, it would be much better to keep the amount high enough to take care of these emergencies as they are taking place, rather than to make the sum too small. My judgment is that even $3,000,000 will be inadequate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the bill must go to the House for consideration, I am not disposed to object to the Senator's amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] to the committee amendment on page 4, line 17.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I have had some correspondence and telephone calls from the governor of my State, and I find that the State legislature has appropriated $100,000 for quick relief. It did so a few days ago. The information coming to me is that feed for this livestock is in the area. What is needed is funds to augment the efforts of the State highway department. I fear that the language is not quite broad enough. If the Senator from Wyoming will look at line 25 on page 3, he will notice that the language authorizes these agencies to break trails. After the word "trails" I should like to add the words "open highways and farm-to-market roads." I offer that amendment on page 3, line 25, in the committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 25, in the committee amendment, after the word "trails", it is proposed to insert the words "open highways and farm-to-market roads."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I quite agree with the purpose of the amendment; and on behalf of the committee, I shall be very glad to accept it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment to the committee amendment is agreed to.

Are there further amendments to be offered to the committee amendment?

If not, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to, as follows:

That (a) in order to transport sufficient feed and otherwise take care of livestock isolated by storms in the Western States, all agencies of the Government performing functions in the affected areas are authorized, upon request of the Governor of any such State and the approval of the coordinating agency, to break trails and open highways and farm-to-market roads through snowbound areas in such State and to take such other action as may be necessary temporarily to protect such livestock.

(b) Such agencies of the Government are also authorized to take action to provide emergency relief for Indians in areas isolated by such storms, if the coordinating agency certifies such action is necessary.

SEC. 2. The President shall designate an agency of the Government (herein called the "coordinating agency") to coordinate all activities of Government agencies performing functions under this joint resolution. Any Government agency performing such functions is authorized to cooperate with, or to use the personnel, supplies, facilities, and other resources of any other agency of the Federal Government and, with the consent of the head thereof, of any State, county, or local governmental agency.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $3,000,000, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution. Any unexpended balance of funds appropriated for any purposes to any agency of the Government performing activities under this joint resolution are hereby made available to carry out such activities and deficiency appropriations are hereby authorized, subject to the limitation specified in this section, to reimburse in full the appropriation to such agency for any expenditures made hereunder. Sums appropriated pursuant to the authorization contained herein shall be available to reimburse in full the appropriation to any such agency for any expenditure made or obligation incurred, prior to the date of designation of the coordinating agency, if such expenditure or obligation is certified by the head of such agency to have been necessary in accomplishing the purposes of this joint resolution.

SEC. 4. Any agency performing activities under this joint resolution is authorized to employ additional personnel without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and to incur obligations on behalf of the United States, by contract or otherwise, for the acquisition, rental, or hire of equipment, services, materials and supplies, for shipping, drayage, travel, and communication, and for the supervision and administration of its activities under this joint resolution. Such obligations may be incurred in excess of any appropriations available to such agency, but the aggregate amount of such obligations and any other expenses incurred pursuant to this joint resolution shall not exceed the amount authorized to be appropriated under section 3. Neither section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C., sec. 5) nor section 3679 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C., sec. 665) shall be applicable to any action taken pursuant to this joint resolution. The provisions of section 607 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, shall not be applicable to additional personnel employed hereunder.

SEC. 5. The authority conferred by this joint resolution shall not extend beyond April 15, 1949.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority, I offer, and desire to have adopted, a preamble to the joint resolution.

The preamble was read and agreed to as follows:

Whereas the Bureau of Land Management and the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior and other agencies of the Government have made expenditures and incurred obligations in connection with the emergency resulting from the continuing unprecedented storms in the Western States; and

Whereas additional authority is necessary to reimburse the appropriations of such agencies for expenditures heretofore made and to provide for the continuation of relief in such areas until the emergency created by such storms has abated: Therefore be it

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution to authorize the United States to break through snow-bound areas in western range States, to take other necessary action to move in supplemental feed and otherwise care for livestock isolated by storms in such States, and to provide emergency relief for Indians in areas isolated by such storms."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the report of the committee be printed in full in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to whom was referred the resolution (S. J. Res. 38) to authorize the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Reclamation, and other agencies of the Government to break through snow-bound areas in the western range States, and to take other necessary action to move in supplemental feed and otherwise care for livestock isolated by storms which have created an emergency, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with the following amendment in the nature of a substitute, and recommend that the resolution, as amended, do pass.

The text of the resolution, as amended, is as follows:

"That (a) in order to transport sufficient feed and otherwise take care of livestock isolated by storms in the Western States, all agencies of the Government performing functions in the affected areas are authorized, upon request of the Governor of any such State and the approval of the coordinating agency, to break trails through snowbound areas in such State and to take such other action as may be necessary temporarily to protect such livestock.

"(b) Such agencies of the Government are also authorized to take action to provide emergency relief for Indians in areas isolated by such storms, if the coordinating agency certifies such action is necessary.

"SEC. 2. The President shall designate an agency of the Government (herein called the 'coordinating agency') to coordinate all activities of Government agencies performing functions under this joint resolution. Any Government agency performing such functions is authorized to cooperate with, or to use the personnel, supplies, facilities, and other resources of any other agency of the Federal Government and, with the consent of the head thereof, of any State, county, or local governmental agency.

"SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $750,000, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution. Any unexpended balance of funds appropriated for any purposes to any agency of the Government performing activities under this joint resolution are hereby made available to carry out such activities and deficiency appropriations are hereby authorized, subject to the limitation specified in this section, to reimburse in full the appropriation to such agency for any expenditures made hereunder. Sums appropriated pursuant to the authorization contained herein shall be available to reimburse in full the appropriation to any such agency for any expenditure made or obligation incurred, prior to the date of designation of the coordinating agency, if such expenditure or obligation is certified by the head of such agency to have been necessary in accomplishing the purposes of this joint resolution.

"SEC. 4. Any agency performing activities under this joint resolution is authorized to employ additional personnel without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and to incur obligations on behalf of the United States, by contract or otherwise, for the acquisition, rental, or hire of equipment, services, materials and supplies, for shipping, drayage, travel, and communication, and for the supervision and administration of its activities under this joint resolution. Such obligations may be incurred in excess of any appropriations available to such agency, but the aggregate amount of such obligations and any other expenses incurred pursuant to this joint resolution shall not exceed the amount authorized to be appropriated under section 3. Neither section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C., sec. 5) nor section 3679 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C., sec. 665) shall be applicable to any action taken pursuant to this joint resolution. The provisions of section 607 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, shall not be applicable to additional personnel employed hereunder.

"SEC. 5. The authority conferred by this joint resolution shall not extend beyond April 15, 1949."

Hearings were held by the committee on this resolution at which representatives of the Interior and Agriculture Departments, armed services, Forest Service, Public Roads Administration, and the American Red Cross were heard.

It was pointed out that the snowstorms and extremely cold weather which have occurred in certain Western States are without question worse than western winter conditions in the memory of any living man. The admitted dire results are impossible to estimate. Senators and Congressmen from all the snow-bound States have been receiving frantic telephonic and telegraphic requests for Government action and assistance.

The resolution aims to provide immediate emergency relief in the areas affected by the continuing serious winter storms by cooperating with the governors of the States to the fullest extent possible with the money authorized to be appropriated herein. Such cooperation will take the form of furnishing, among other things, road-breaking equipment to open and keep open the roads in the devastated areas so that livestock now isolated by the storms may be fed. The resolution also legalizes expenditures of, and provides for reimbursement to, Federal agencies which have already engaged in relief measures. It makes clear that any sums heretofore spent by such agencies are not a violation of the antideficiency law. The aggregate amount of money that may be spent for the purposes specified in the resolution (whether made on or before the date of enactment of the resolution) is $750,000. It is also provided that such money may be used for emergency relief for Indians in areas isolated by such storms. A coordinating agency, to be designated by the President, will coordinate all activities of Government agencies performing functions under the resolution so that duplication and overlapping of effort will be avoided.

Assistant Secretary of the Interior William E. Warne advised the committee that certain bureaus of his Department have been on an emergency operating basis for the past 10 days. The conditions are extremely bad in western Utah, eastern Nevada, Wyoming, and Montana. The main roads were opened at one time during the week in Utah and eastern Nevada, but they have been closed again by subsequent storms.

Secretary Warne said there is great distress among the Indians, particularly in certain sections of the Great Plains. He stated that in order to get the roads opened all the equipment available to the Bureau of Land Management and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and other agencies at the disposal of the regional disaster committee has been working vigorously, and that now the equipment available is breaking down as the result of continuous and trying operation.

Secretary Warne added that "we are now moving on a basis of dire emergency, and we will need—seriously need—the kind of authority that this resolution contains to back up the actions we have taken." He said the figure of $500,000 in the original resolution was much too low and asked that it be increased. While no accurate estimate can be given at this time, he believes, if the winter continues in only moderate severity, expenditures will be heavy, but, if it remains critical, they may greatly soar.

Representatives of the American Red Cross advised the committee that between thirty and thirty-five thousand dollars have already been spent by the organization for emergency type of assistance to meet human needs.

Their records show that 30 counties in North Dakota, South Dakota, and Nebraska alone are in disaster status.

Reports from Wyoming's statistician for the department of agriculture, in Cheyenne, show that 55,200 head of cattle and 100,000 head of sheep have already been lost. On Monday the temperature in Wyoming was as low as 40° below in one area, and we are advised that a consistent below-zero temperature, ranging from 12° to 80° below zero, persists in Montana.

A representative of the Federal Works Agency stated that, while the State highway departments and the county highway departments had had the resources to get the main roads cleared, these were fast becoming expended, and there seems to be a lack of authority and money to get from main roads into where the cattle are located.

The representative of the United States Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, stated that—

"In our judgment, we need to be financed to take care of about 15 complete outfits in the inner-mountain region at about $100 a day. That would be 15 to 20 outfits, with an additional number in the Rocky Mountain region, and then, if the situation develops in Arizona, as we, too, are getting rumors it might, we will need an additional amount down there. Altogether, for 30 days, it is our estimate that it would take us between $90,000 and $120,000 for equipment that we have available and wish to throw into this job."

The committee was also informed that in one particular area 75 bulldozers were available at a rental rate of $8 per hour with operators—at a cost for a 30-day period of $432,000.

In view of the action of the President in designating the Federal Works Agency (acting through the Bureau of Community Facilites) to enter into agreemnts with the governors of the respective States with regard to the funds he has made available, it was the opinion of the committee that this resolution should be accordingly amended.

It is also the view of the committee that the amount of $500,000 is inadequate for the existing emergency. The amount has been increased to $750,000.

The continued destruction of livestock is extremely serious and of great interest to the whole country. The estimate of loss at the present time is from 30 to 50 percent. It is of inestimable importance that the roads be opened at the earliest possible moment.

The Legislature of Wyoming has appropriated $200,000, the State of South Dakota $100,000, and the State of Nebraska is now considering an appropriation of $500,000 for assistance in those States.

DISASTER RELIEF APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations, I report favorably House Joint Resolution 112, making an additional appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes. This is similar to the Senate joint resolution which has just been passed by the Senate. The Senate joint resolution provided for larger appropriations. However, it seems to be very necessary to start this work at once. The House has already adjourned, and the only opportunity to start it at once is to act upon the House joint resolution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the House joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Without objection, the report will be received, and the joint resolution will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 112) making an additional appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MEMBERSHIP IN PROPOSED NORTH ATLANTIC PACT AGAINST AGGRESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, during the past week the representatives of the Scandinavian countries of Norway, Sweden, and Denmark have been meeting to discuss, among other things, whether they should or should not become members of the proposed North Atlantic pact against aggression.

Press reports both here and abroad indicate that Sweden wants to sit on the side lines, Norway wishes to ally herself with the Western World, and Denmark is trying to compose the different points of view.

At this point in my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article from the London Times of January 20, to be followed by an article from the New York Times of January 25.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the London Times of January 20, 1949]

SCANDINAVIA AND DEFENSE—AGREEMENT UNLIKELY

(From our diplomatic correspondent)

The Prime Ministers, Foreign Ministers, and military experts of Sweden, Norway, and Denmark, accompanied probably by six members of Parliament from each country, are to meet in Copenhagen on Saturday for further discussion of the question of mutual defense and the attitude of Scandinavia to the Atlantic Pact. There will be a final meeting in Oslo on January 29, but the Norwegian Prime Minister has given the opinion that a decision may be reached at Saturday's meeting.

It is understood that the Danish and Norwegian Governments were asked by Washington toward the end of the year whether they wished to be invited to the conference that will draft the Atlantic pact of mutual assistance. Discussions with Sweden were initiated, and the issue, now crystallized, has caused some heartburning. Briefly, it is the issue whether, as Sweden insists, the traditional Swedish policy of armed neutrality should be extended through the medium of an exclusively Scandinavian defense pact to cover Norway and Denmark, or whether, as Norway proposes, the Scandinavian countries, while cooperating between themselves, should also seek the security of the Atlantic pact.

DENMARK AS MEDIATOR

Denmark's role has been that of a mediator intent on holding the three countries together. One of its suggestions met Sweden's idea of a Scandinavian pact, but would have left the signatories free to associate themselves, if they wished, also with the Atlantic pact. Its final suggestion, mentioned by our Stockholm correspondent yesterday, was that the Western Powers be asked whether military support would be available to a Scandinavian bloc owing no obligations either to west or east. That was scotched by a State Department announcement, since confirmed by the American Ambassadors in the three capitals, that no military supplies or raw materials would be available to countries (other than a few to which America has specific obligations) not associated with the United States in collective defense arrangements.

Sweden's objections to joining the Atlantic pact can be understood. She has by her neutrality policy succeeded in staying out of two world wars. She suspects that, as an ally of the Western Powers, she would be immediately in the front line in the event of a conflict with the Soviet Union. In the meantime her strategic position would have been impaired if Scandinavia's adherence to the Atlantic pact were made the pretext by the Soviet Union for a tough policy toward Finland. Norway, whose experience is rather different, puts little value on neutrality once aggression has been unleashed anywhere, and argues that it is confusion and disunity among all the countries of the west, rather than their solidarity for defense, that is more likely to tempt a would-be aggressor.

SWEDEN'S RESOURCES

A Scandinavian defense pact is an advance in Swedish thinking, but the Norwegians are strengthened in their position by knowledge that Sweden lacks the resources—particularly raw materials such as oil—to sustain an adequate military establishment for Sweden, to say nothing of equipping and protecting Norway and Sweden as well. So much has been publicly admitted by the Chief of Staff of the Swedish armed forces, General Jung. Of course, the signatories of the Atlantic pact might find that there is not as much in the way of military supplies to go round as they could wish. That is not to say, however, as some Swedes do, that France or Britain would prefer Scandinavia to remain outside the Atlantic pact until French and British needs in military equipment have been met. The advantage of having Scandinavia associated with the continuous planning of the defense of the western world is regarded as outweighing by far the disadvantage that Scandinavia's needs in military equipment will reduce the amount available to other signatories.

Latest statements by Scandinavian political leaders, and opinions in the press, indicate that no agreement between the Three Powers is to be expected. Sweden, for the time being at any rate, is likely to go its isolationist way, and Denmark is likely to follow Norway into the Atlantic pact.

[From the New York Times of Jan. 25, 1949]

ACCORD NO NEARER ON NORDIC DEFENSE—TALKS IN COPENHAGEN HALT, BUT WILL BE RESUMED ON SATURDAY IN OSLO

(By George Axelsson)

COPENHAGEN, DENMARK, January 24.—The question of a Scandinavian mutual defense pact remained unsettled when the high-level talks between Norway, Sweden, and Denmark ended here tonight. The door has been left open for further talks in Oslo.

It proved impossible here to compose the differences between Sweden and Norway on an approach to the United States for arms for a Nordic defense union. The next try in Oslo this coming Saturday will not necessarily be the final one.

A well-nigh unbridgeable gap exists between Norway and Sweden. Norway seems determined to pledge membership in the Atlantic Union in return for arms from the United States while Sweden would make merely a noncommital request for such aid. If a formula can be found for a joint Scandinavian approach, the fate of the proposed Nordic defense union still will hinge on the answer by the United States.

Throughout the Copenhagen conference the Swedes have been playing for time, observers agree. Yesterday they moved to have the conference adjourned one week. The move is aimed at consulting parliamentary opinion at home more fully in view of the threatening break-down.

TO STUDY ATLANTIC PACT DRAFT

It was also reported that the Scandinavian ambassadors who were called home from Washington for consultation carried the draft of the proposed Atlantic pact, and the recess would afford a chance to study the document thoroughly. As it is, the Oslo conference scheduled for Friday was put off one day as a concession to Sweden.

The Scandinavian statesmen are consoling themselves over the lack of progress in Copenhagen by saying that at least all political parties in the respective countries are now fully informed on all the problems arising out of the proposed pact.

The Scandinavian premiers and foreign and defense ministers in a joint communiqué said that agreement had been reached on two points. These were:

First, to achieve under certain conditions a mutually binding but outwardly independent Scandinavian defense group within the framework of the United Nations Charter. This would mean coordination of staffs, military forces, war production, and standardization of equipment among the three countries.

Second, that it should be ascertained whether the countries participating in a Scandinavian alliance would be able to obtain the equipment needed for reconstruction of their defenses within a definite period and on certain well-defined economic terms.

PREMIERS MAKE COMMENTS

After the conference each of the three Scandinavian premiers issued statements on the situation to the correspondents of their countries. The gist of this comment was that the difficulties of reaching agreement proved greater than expected and that to cite the Swedish Premier, Tage Erlander, "In reality we have not achieved much more progress on Monday than we did Sunday."

Norwegian Premier Einar Gerhardsen, for the Norwegian delegation, expressed the opinion that there was little hope of agreement on a Nordic Alliance being reached at the coming week-end meeting in Oslo.

Norwegian delegates have hinted at the possibility of yet another conference, this time in Stockholm, shortly afterward, since none of the Scandinavian countries wishes to bear the responsibility before home opinion for breaking up the present negotiations.

The Danish representatives maintained throughout discussions that the United States ought to show more understanding for the difficulties of Scandinavia's geographical position vis-à-vis the Soviet Union. They also quoted the Swedes as being skeptical of United States ability to help Scandinavia materially, alliance or no alliance, in view of its present and ever-growing commitments. This was echoed in the highest Danish policy circles, where one recurring question is, "What will be Scandinavia's priority number with and without alliance? If we must trail the United States, Britain, France, Holland, and Belgium, maybe we are better off fending for ourselves."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, we have arrived at the place in history when we must face the fact that peace is indivisible. Aggression or the threat of aggression anywhere in the world is of vital concern to the law-abiding nations everywhere in the world.

The Scandinavian nations, as well as the United States of America, are members of the United Nations. If this organization for collective security means anything, it surely means that its members will not sit idly by while an aggressor power overtly attacks its neighbors.

Within the framework of the United Nations Charter there is provision for regional security pacts. Our Nation has already become a signatory to one embracing the Western Hemisphere. Both historic background and geographic proximity make the prospective North Atlantic pact of equal importance to this Nation.

With the degree of collective security such a pact will furnish, it may be possible for the free nations of western Europe, with ECA funds from this country, to move on to the constructive settlement of their economic problems. We can hardly expect a long-term recovery when the fear of aggression hangs over the Continent.

When the North Atlantic pact comes before the American Congress the American people are going to be called upon to reverse their historic policy. They can hardly be expected to do so with enthusiasm, Mr. President, when nations with a closer proximity to the seat of potential aggression think they can remain neutral. Of course, they can do no such thing. If Soviet Russia moves to invade western Germany and western Europe, the other members of the United Nations must immediately act in their common defense or the whole collective security idea will perish then and there. If the United States and the Western World should be defeated by Soviet Russia, do the Scandinavian countries think they could remain as a free island in a world totalitarian sea?

In a real sense there can be no neutrals in the struggle to establish a free world of free men whose peace will be assured under a collective-security system based on international law and justice. No member of the world community can "sit this one out." It is a common responsibility, and no nation has the moral right to be a drone while its neighbors take all the risks.

The Netherlands, Denmark, and Norway, all of which were able to be neutrals in World War I, found that the choice was not theirs to make in World War II. Others should take judicial notice of this fact.

In this age of the airplane and the atom there will be no neutrals should there be a world war III. The only real hope any nation has to keep out of war is to prevent war from breaking out. This can best be accomplished by making the collective-security system so strong that no potential aggressor nation will dare take the calculated risk of making an overt attack upon a neighbor.

A heavy responsibility rests upon the Governments and people of the Scandinavian countries. If they refuse to join the North Atlantic pact against aggression, we may assume that they would likewise refuse to fulfill their obligations under the United Nations Charter. If this be so, though I sincerely hope it is not, then we must make our plans for economic and military aid accordingly.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I send to the desk sundry amendments to Senate bill 249, and ask that they be printed and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the four amendments I submit are to the bill presented by the Senator from Utah (Mr. THOMAS), the purpose of which is to restore the Wagner Act and to repeal for the most part sections of the Taft-Hartley law. The effect of the amendments is to restore to the Wagner Act some 16 or 17 different provisions of the Taft-Hartley law. I may say that the committee has acted with such haste that revisions of these amendments may be necessary. We have made certain changes from the Taft-Hartley law, and I have made certain changes in presenting them. They are presented so that they may be before the committee in the hearings which are to begin on Friday and which are to continue until February 10.

Mr. President, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has adopted one of the most extraordinary procedures and one of the most extraordinary resolutions relating to procedure which I have seen in my experience in the Senate. I should like to read it to the Senate:

> It is hereby resolved by this committee that the Taft-Hartley law be repealed and that the National Labor Relations Act, known as the Wagner Act, be restored as it existed at the time of the enactment of the Taft-Hartley bill with the single amendment as it stands in the Thomas bill (S. 249), which continues the National Labor Relations Board as a five-man body, as it now exists; that hearings begin forthwith on amendments to the Wagner Act consistent with the proposals made by the President; that said hearings be closed not later than February 10, 1949, and that the bill for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law be then reported to the Senate with such amendment or amendments to the Wagner Act as the committee may deem wise.

Apparently the drafter of the resolution seems to have thought that the committee could repeal the Taft-Hartley law, could restore the Wagner Act, and could then hold hearings on the Wagner Act; which, of course, is an utterly fantastic proposal. The purpose of the resolution could have been accomplished simply by saying, "We are going to hold hearings on the Thomas bill (S. 249)"; but in order to give the impression that in some way the Taft-Hartley law was being repealed first, in order to give the impression that this was a two-package approach instead of a one-package approach, this extraordinary language was adopted. The impression is given that the Taft-Hartley law, instead of being amended, is being repealed.

Of course, the effect of the whole resolution is that the committee contemplates an amendment of the Taft-Hartley law, a drastic amendment perhaps, but still an amendment. Of course, the President himself proposes the same course. He recognizes many of the good things of the Taft-Hartley law, and proceeds to say that they should be enacted. He says in his message to the Congress:

> That act (the Taft-Hartley law) should be repealed.
>
> The Wagner Act should be reenacted. However, certain improvements, which I recommended to the Congress 2 years ago, are

needed. Jurisdictional strikes and unjustifiable secondary boycotts should be prohibited.

The Taft-Hartley law did prohibit both of those types of strike. There may be some question as to the definition of secondary boycotts, and it may be necessary to amend it in some regard, but the President has thereby endorsed that provision of the Taft-Hartley law.

The President then goes on to say:

The use of economic force to decide issues arising out of the interpretation of existing contracts should be prevented.

That is what the Taft-Hartley law does. The President is endorsing the retention of that feature of the law.

The President then says:

Without endangering our democratic freedoms—

In the way in which they were endangered by the bill which he proposed in the case of the railroad strike—

Means should be provided for settling or preventing strikes in vital industries which affect the public interest.

That is what the Taft-Hartley law did.

There were various amendments recommended by our committee last year, and various ways of improving the law, and the President is endorsing that provision of the law. Of course, the talk about repealing the Taft-Hartley law is for public consumption and for the benefit of the labor union leaders who are demanding its repeal, but the actual purpose is to amend the law.

The resolution, however, in other respects is unwise and harsh. The time allowed for hearings on a matter of this importance is wholly inadequate. The hearings are to begin on Friday and will run for a period of approximately 2 weeks, approximately 10 or 11 days of actual hearings.

Two years ago, when we considered labor legislation, we threw the hearings open to the entire country. We permitted everyone to come and testify. We gave them as much time as they desired. The hearings extended over a period of approximately 6 weeks. The single issue of what is the best method of preventing strikes against the national interest and strikes which affect the entire country is a serious and difficult problem. It alone requires the best possible advice we can obtain. We have had no testimony on how the law has operated within the last 2 years. We have had no testimony on the specific objections which have perhaps properly arisen to the operation of the law. As a matter of fact, I suspect that the reason the hearings are to be so short is in order that labor representatives may not be questioned in detail as to what is the matter with this provision, or what is the matter with that provision, and be forced to make specific criticisms instead of engaging in the general name calling and vociferous denunciation which has characterized their campaign up to this time. In effect, the shortness of the hearings chokes off the expression of public opinion on what is perhaps the most important question before the Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. President, as a matter of fact, the chairman of the committee has announced that he will present amendments such as the President has recommended. They are not yet prepared. We do not know what they are. The hearing will be begun, perhaps, without our knowing what the amendments are.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am a little surprised to hear the Senator from Ohio say that he does not have any general idea as to what the general scope of the President's proposals referred to in the resolution of Monday is. It was specifically stated in the resolution that the hearings would be upon amendments consistent with the President's proposals for the amendment of the Wagner Act. The President on more than one occasion has made specific recommendations to the Congress for amendment of the Wagner Act which are all a matter of record. So I am surprised that the Senator from Ohio, with his full knowledge of what goes on here, does not recall that the President set out the general subject of his proposals in his messages to the Congress, and that that is what the committee has reference to in its resolution of last Monday.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I regret that the Senator from Florida was not present when I read the President's proposals, one of which was that "Means should be provided for settling or preventing strikes in vital industries which affect the public interest." I suppose there are a dozen different ways in which that might be done. We do not know what the President's proposal is in that regard, or whether it is any different from the language of the Taft-Hartley law. So hearings are now being set, to be terminated on February 10, without our even knowing on what subject the hearings will be held.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not care to yield at this point.

Furthermore, Mr. President, it has been proposed to begin hearings forthwith on the proposals offered by the President. Apparently the men who wrote the bill intended to shut off hearings on any other amendments not consistent with the recommendations made by the President. Evidently the intention was to prevent hearings on various questions relating to the Taft-Hartley law. Apparently the effort of the committee is to limit hearings to amendments submitted by the President.

Of course, I do not think that can legally or otherwise be done, so I do not take the resolution very seriously. But it shows the arbitrary character of the majority of the members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in attempting to exclude public consideration of amendments.

I do not see how the chairman of the committee can refuse to hold hearings on amendments which are offered by other members of the committee or offered by other Senators. The subject, of course, is so complicated and involved that it is difficult to see how a witness who wishes to testify on one feature of the law can be excluded from testifying on some other feature. But, according to the resolution, that appears to be the intention of the majority of the members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Therefore, Mr. President, I wish to put on record my protest against the arbitrary action of the committee. During the 2 years of the Eightieth Congress, I know of no instance in which we did not give full and reasonable hearings; I know of no instance in which hearings were not given commensurate with the importance of the subject involved.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am afraid the Senator from Ohio overlooks the fact that there was an important public hearing on the Taft-Hartley bill in the United States of America on November 2. The Senator from Ohio would naturally like to discredit the hearing which was held on this subject on November 2. Naturally, if it were within the power of the Senator from Ohio, he would like to prevent the decision made on the Taft-Hartley law by the American people on November 2 from being implemented by this Congress. But I think, Mr. President, it is the disposition of the Democratic majority to keep the pledges of the Democratic platform and, of course, to keep the specific pledge made to the American people, namely, to secure the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law.

Mr. President, this is not a new subject to most of us; it is not a new subject to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. We have held extended, prolonged, and protracted hearings and discussions of the subject. I am informed that the record comprises more than 2,700 printed pages of testimony. So, Mr. President, the Democrats on the committee, after consultation and consideration of the subject, did not deem it necessary to go back and repeat all that voluminous testimony. We are not cutting off anyone. They have already been heard.

Several of us on the committee filed a minority report when the Taft-Hartley bill was before the committee in 1947. We knew then what the bill contained. We knew then we were opposed to it. The President was opposed to it. He vetoed the bill, and the Democratic platform pledged to the American people the unqualified repeal of the Taft-Hartley law. We did not say in that platform, Mr. President, that we advocated amendment of the Taft-Hartley law, as was implied, if not expressed, in the Republican platform. The American people knew that there was a sharp difference of opinion between the two major parties over the Taft-Hartley legislation; that it was one of the principal issues in the campaign settled by the election of November 2. They knew that if the Republicans were returned to the control of the Congress,

and if a Republican President were in the White House, the Taft-Hartley law, at best, would be amended only in minor and inconsequential and nonbasic particulars. But the Democratic platform, approaching the matter forthrightly and directly, as I believe that platform may be said to have done upon other important issues, pledged to the American people the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law.

Mr. President, what did that mean? It meant going back to the Wagner Act. It meant the reinstatement and the restoration of labor-management legislation as it existed when the iniquitous Taft-Hartley law was passed by the Congress, and made effective over the veto of the President of the United States.

Mr. President, let me read the resolution that was agreed to by eight, all the Democratic members, of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

It is hereby resolved by this committee that the Taft-Hartley law be repealed.

Is it not good ethics to keep one's pledged word to his constituency, the electorate of this country? That is what we are trying to do. We attempted it on Monday of this week.

And that the National Labor Relations Act, known as the Wagner Act, be restored as it existed at the time of the enactment of the Taft-Hartley bill with the single amendment as it stands in the Thomas bill (S. 249) which continues the National Labor Relations Board as a five-man body as it now exists.

I interpolate, it was a three-man board prior to the enactment of the Taft-Hartley law. We do make a single exception in repeal of the Taft-Hartley law. We recognize the amendment in S. 249 to continue the board as a five-man board instead of reducing it to a three-man board.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PEPPER. I shall be more generous than the Senator from Ohio was. I shall yield for more than one question.

Mr. BALDWIN. I may say to my distinguished friend that I have listened to his remarks as attentively as I could, and he is usually very clear in what he has to say, but I do not understand from its language whether or not it was the purpose of the resolution adopted by the majority of the committee to report a bill to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act flatly, in those terms. Is that what the committee is purporting to do? Or what did it purport to do?

Mr. PEPPER. I think I can answer that by continuing to read the resolution to its conclusion. If the resolution does not speak for itself, I shall answer directly. I continue to read:

That hearings to begin forthwith—

Incidentally, they are to begin tomorrow, according to the notice of the chairman. This resolution was adopted Monday, to tomorrow is "forthwith" from Monday, I would take it—

on amendments to the Wagner Act—

That is what we regard as what we are going to consider in the hearings.

on amendments to the Wagner Act consistent with the proposals made by the President.

Which are matters of record. The President has not spelled out the proposals in literal terms; he has not drawn amendments and sent them here, although I think that today the able chairman of the committee, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], as he advised the committee he would at the earliest possible opportunity, after consultation with the Secretary of Labor, has offered the specific amendment which would carry out the substance of the President's proposals, and I hold a copy of the amendments in my hand. I believe it has been offered in the Senate today by the Senator from Utah, therefore it is within the scrutiny of every Member of this honorable body or it will be shortly.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will permit me to finish the reading:

consistent with the proposals made by the President; that said hearings be closed not later than February 10, 1949—

Mr. President, the committee adjudged that that would afford time enough for public hearings. The committee felt that in that length of time, if the witnesses were properly organized and presented, the committee could hear all it felt necessary to add to the 2,700 printed pages of hearings already had by the committee on this general subject—

and that the bill for the repeal—

I call the attention of the Senator from Connecticut to this:

And that the bill for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law be then reported to the Senate—

That means upon the conclusion of the hearings on February 10 and after the committee in executive session has had an opportunity to consider whether any amendments would be added to the Wagner Act. I continue to quote:

With such amendment—

Of the bill for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law, which we resolved upon in the committee Monday afternoon by an 8-to-5 majority, that the bill repealing the Taft-Hartley law be reported to the Senate after the hearings concluded on February 10 and after consideration of the subject by the committee—

With such amendment or amendments to the Wagner Act as the committee may deem wise.

Mr. President, by a vote of 8 to 5 we resolved to remove from the neck of labor the galling yoke of the Taft-Hartley law, to consider the general area of amendments where the President had made proposals, and later, when the chairman has offered the specific proposals suggested by the Secretary of Labor, to consider them, and to consider any other amendment offered in that general area; and when the hearings are concluded February 10 to consider the testimony offered and the amendments proposed, then for the committee to add on to the bill repealing the Taft-Hartley law and restoring the Wagner Act such amendment or amendments, in the language of the resolution, "as the committee may deem wise."

Mr. President, it seems to me that is very clear and very forthright and very explicit, the keeping of a pledge by the Democratic majority in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, am I right in the assumption that it was apparently the intention of a majority of the committee to hold no hearings whatsoever upon the question of whether or not the Taft-Hartley Act should be repealed?

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is explicitly correct. We have already made up our minds to get rid of the Taft-Hartley law, and we do not need any additional testimony on that issue.

Mr. BALDWIN. What was intended was to deny to the American people any opportunity whatsoever to be heard with reference to the question of the repeal of this law?

Mr. PEPPER. The American people were heard from, from one end of this country to the other, on November 2, and we are attempting to implement the decision the American people made.

Mr. BALDWIN. I should like to remind my distinguished friend from Florida that in the East, which is a great industrial section, the candidate for President on the Republican ticket carried State after State. Did the Senator's party get a mandate from them?

Mr. PEPPER——

Mr. LUCAS. I rise to a point of order, Mr. President.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I think the Senator is overlooking the fact that this is the United States of America.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois is making a point of order. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. I make the point of order against the kind of debate now going on. If we are to have orderly debate, the Senator from Connecticut has no right to interrupt the Senator from Florida without getting permission to do so. I intend to try to insist, as majority leader, that that rule of the Senate be carried out, so far as it possibly can be, because without enforcement of that rule there will be no order in the Senate, so far as proper debate is concerned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Connecticut for a question?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am sure it is not necessary for me to suggest to the able Senator from Connecticut that the electoral process in this country contemplates the election of a President by a majority in the electoral college, and that the election of Members of Congress is in the respective States and districts of America. I do not need to give to the able Senator from Connecticut any lecture on political science as it pertains to the United States of America. All I wish to say is that this was an issue in the campaign; that our Democratic platform was unequivocal on that issue; that our President met it forthrightly; that our candidates for Congress, Senate and House, campaigned upon that platform, and met that issue squarely to the American people. We did not promise them an amendment to the Taft-Hartley law.

We did not promise them protracted reconsideration of the Taft-Hartley law. We said, "Give us the congressional power and we will repeal the Taft-Hartley law," which meant, of course, the restoration of the Wagner Act as it existed at the time the Taft-Hartley law was superimposed upon it over the veto of the President of the United States. And, Mr. President, it is a good example to the nations and peoples of the earth groping for democracy, to see the good democratic practice of the Democratic Party keeping its pledged word to the people of the United States.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Connecticut for a question?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. May I come back to my original question? Do I understand the purpose of the resolution to be that the people of the United States, who might be interested in the question of the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law, are going to be denied any opportunity whatsoever to be heard in the hearings before the congressional committee with reference to that matter?

Mr. PEPPER. If it means that they seek to continue——

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, may I have a categorical answer?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is within the jurisdiction of the Senator from Florida. It is not a matter for the Chair to determine.

Mr. PEPPER. I am sure the able Senator would not do me the injustice of supposing that I shall not presume to answer the question according to my own good judgment and in my own manner. If he would like me to answer the question in that way I should be very glad to do so. But I am not his witness on the stand, unfortunately, no doubt, for the Senator, because I am sure he would conduct a very grueling, no doubt a very effective cross examination, and no doubt bring great delight to his clients in such a case. But if the Senator wants a real answer to his question I will say that if the matter involved is the question of the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law, in the opinion of the Democratic majority of the committee that is a closed question, and if anybody wishes to come before the committee and appear as a witness and argue that the Taft-Hartley law should be continued the committee, in its wisdom, and out of its experience and knowledge with the subject, has adjudicated that it is not necessary to hear further testimony on that subject, just as a judge often says to counsel, "I thank counsel very much, but the court does not desire to hear further argument upon that phase of the case."

Now the committee did adjudge that the President's proposals occupied a field which was new, and where advocates and opponents and modifiers should have a right to be heard fully. The committee proposes to give that right, and if anyone has any amendment in the general area of the President's recommendations which he desires to propose, he can certainly depend upon a fair and a full and a courteous hearing before the committee. But the resolution has limited the scope of the hearing.

Mr. President, we all know that hearings have to come to an end sometime, although there are those in this body, perhaps, who would not like these hearings to come to an end; because the longer the hearings are protracted the longer will be the continuity of the Taft-Hartley law; the longer it will gall the neck of labor and discriminate against the working people of America. Having considered the matter, we do not propose to allow this thing to be dragged out and drawn out and protracted and delayed, to serve the purposes of those who want only to keep the Taft-Hartley law either in toto or almost as it is.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. Does not the Senator think it is only fair and just when a law was passed in the last Congress by such a substantial majority, and when such a substantial majority was present as to overrule the President's veto here in this very body, that as a matter of justice the people of this country and the Members of the Senate who desire to be heard with reference to the Taft-Hartley law should have an opportunity to be heard on the subject?

Mr. PEPPER. I can only say again, Mr. President, that there have been 2,700 printed pages of testimony already taken. There has been protracted debate in both Houses of Congress. It has been the subject of Presidential veto messages. It has been the subject of consideration by the two conventions of the two major political parties, and was especially provided for in the platforms of the two parties, and in the attitude of the respective parties. It was an issue bitterly contested in the campaign. Now, after all that, Mr. President, it does not seem at all unreasonable to the Democratic members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare—although I must say that all the Republican members seem to feel the other way about it—it does not seem at all unusual to the Democratic majority of that committee that we should fix February 10 as the time for the closing of these hearings, and that, as courts often do, we should narrow the scope of the hearings to the field and the area which is within the scope of the Presidential proposals on the subject.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question as a matter of information?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the able Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I want to ask the Senator merely one question. There is a provision of the Taft-Hartley law which requires union officers to make financial reports to members. That is not included in the President's proposal. So far as I know, there has been no objection to it. Do I understand that the Senator proposes to refuse to let anyone testify as to the merit of that provision of the Taft-Hartley law which the Senator is proposing to repeal?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, what may be the subject of the public hearings—that is, what subjects witnesses may be permitted to discuss—has generally been limited by the resolution adopted by a majority of the committee. But the Senator from Ohio well knows that there has been no limitation upon what committee members, or what any Senator might offer to the committee itself. Of course, the committee is going to consider any amendments that any Senator who is a member of the committee, or any other Senator, offers to the committee. No Senator is being shut off. But we are saying that when we come to the matter of public hearings we think the 2700 pages of testimony already taken, together with the additional testimony we will take beginning tomorrow and ending on February the 10th, will sufficiently advise the committee to permit it to act in executive session. So if the Senator from Ohio has any amendments he wishes to offer, that he wishes to submit to his colleagues on the committee, of course they will be respectfully heard and carefully considered. But we are limiting the time and the scope of the committee hearings in the interest of expediting this legislation, and because we think we have heard enough on the general field embodied in the Taft-Hartley law.

Mr. TAFT. But does the Senator think that the committee is prejudging when it says "that the bill for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law be then reported to the Senate with such amendment or amendments to the Wagner Act as the committee may deem wise"; and if any Senator should offer the Taft-Hartley law in whole or in part as an amendment or amendments to the Wagner Act, the committee then has not foreclosed the consideration of the Taft-Hartley law in that way? Is that the statement of the Senator?

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator from Ohio knows that his colleagues on the committee shall be considerate and courteous and attentive to any suggestions that he may make, and the committee will try to look him right in the eye and listen with a straight face just like a judge listens to a lawyer with whose arguments he does not agree. I would not want the Senator from Ohio to be sanguine in his confidence that he can expect any change of mind by the majority of the committee respecting the Taft-Hartley law, because he would not be likely to persuade the eight Democratic members of the committee to restore in whole or in part the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law as amendments to the Wagner Act.

Mr. TAFT. Even though there are things like the making of financial reports, to which there has been no objection so far as I know, from either labor or management.

Mr. PEPPER. What I have said is true in principle; and if there is an exception in detail, no doubt the exception proves the rule.

Mr. President, the committee wishes to be fair to itself, and, of course, to the Congress and the country. The committee felt that it should fix some time limit. If we do not fix some time limit to the hearings, they will run all

through this session of Congress. I am afraid that there are some who would like to see them run all through this session of Congress, so that the Taft-Hartley law would not be impaired in this session of Congress.

The majority feels that this subject should be considered with expedition. However, it is to be considered with care, and we are going to be just as considerate of any Senator's proposals or suggestions as we possibly can be.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to make a few comments on the very able political speech which the Senator from Florida has delivered. It is a speech which certainly would win loud applause in any labor temple of America. Certainly labor would be enthusiastic, so far as its first response is concerned, upon hearing the Senator from Florida say that steps have been taken to repeal the Taft-Hartley law.

But in fairness, the Senator's speech in any meeting of American labor ought to be supplemented by an explanation as to why the resolution which the Senator from Florida offered and sponsored before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is a clear disservice to American labor.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. PEPPER. In my colloquy a moment ago with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] I believe I stated that 2,700 printed pages of testimony had been taken on this subject. I now have the reports before me. I was in error. There have been only 2,424 pages, and not 2,700. However, I believe that an inspection of the volume of the testimony will indicate that the subject has already been adequately covered.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask the Senator from Florida a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield if I do not lose my rights.

Mr. BALDWIN. I should like to ask my distinguished friend from Florida, if he is going to foreclose any opportunity for hearings or testimony on the Taft-Hartley law, how he is going to rely upon the testimony to which he has referred for a repeal of the law, when that testimony resulted in the overwhelming passage of the law.

Mr. PEPPER. Perhaps it was a reading of the evidence wrongly, or seeing darkly through Republican eyes, which led to that unhappy result.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I had just made the statement, before the interruption, that in my opinion the resolution offered by the Senator from Florida and adopted by the Democrats on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare the other day constitutes a great disservice to American labor. I wish to express my reasons for holding that belief.

It is very interesting to hear the Senator from Florida say that the majority of the American people decided on November 2 that the Taft-Hartley law should be repealed. I say in all kindness to the Senator from Florida that any such deduction as that is one of the most glaring examples of a non sequitur that I have ever heard on the floor of the Senate. His claim about a mandate to repeal the Taft-Hartley law constitutes plain argumentative nonsense.

Mr. President, in my judgment, for the Senator from Florida to read into the Democratic victory on November 2 a mandate of the American people to repeal the Taft-Hartley law, along the lines of his resolution, is certainly beyond any possibility of establishment by proof. When we take into account the many issues involved in that campaign, and when we take into account the fact that one bloc of voters was interested in one issue, another bloc of voters in another issue, and other blocs of voters in other issues, the totality of which added up to a Democratic victory, it seems to me that for any Senator to stand on the floor of the Senate and say that the total vote constituted a mandate for a specific action on a specific subject is fallacious reasoning. It goes beyond my powers of credulity.

Let me say to the Senator from Florida, as I have said to labor audiences across the country, that today, if we were to put the Taft-Hartley law to a plebiscite of the American people, because of their lack of understanding of the facts about the weaknesses in the law, I am willing to venture the guess that a majority of the American people would vote to retain the law. I say that as one who is opposed to the law. I say that as one who voted against the bill, which the majority leader [Mr. LUCAS] did not do, although in recent days he has been very anxious to speed up hearings on the law, apparently so that the law can be repealed according to the Democratic schedule. But what was the position of the Senator from Illinois when the bill was on the floor of the Senate to be voted upon? He voted for it. He is now the Democratic majority leader. Oh yes; he voted to sustain the veto; but I think it will have to be admitted that I took the leading part in the veto fight to postpone the debate long enough so that we could get a calm consideration of the veto message. I did not receive any help from the Senator from Illinois, the majority leader, other than his final vote to sustain my position.

Of course, this subject is charged with partisan politics. We ought to lift it above the level of partisan politics. Labor has a tremendous job to do in regard to the Taft-Hartley law. Let me tell labor what that job is. It is to stop calling the law names, and tell the American people, on the basis of the evidence that labor can advance—because the evidence is there—why the Taft-Hartley law should be so drastically changed that in effect it would constitute a repeal of it. But why get into an argument as to whether we are repealing or revising it?

Our job, on the basis of our experience under the Taft-Hartley law, is to get out of the law those things that are unfair to labor and industry, by reasonable amendments and revisions, based upon what? Based upon evidence. How are we going to get that evidence, under our democratic legislative processes, without full, fair, open public hearings?

In reply to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Florida gives assurance that if the Senator from Ohio wishes to offer any amendments, they will be considered. But he forewarns the Senator from Ohio that the Senator from Ohio will stand in the position of a man before the bar pleading a case before a judge who has already in his own mind rendered his decision if he attempts to offer amendments in committee.

The discussion of the Senator from Florida on this floor today in regard to the attitude which the Democratic members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare are going to take in considering labor legislation is not consonant with the record of the Senator from Florida for fairness and open-mindedness. In effect, he stated on this floor today that the Democrats on the committee have prejudged the question of what amendments should be adopted. Mr. President, if one had sat in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare the other day and listened to the Democratic members when we tried to obtain consideration of my motion for a timetable which would assure fair hearings, he would have seen that the question had been prejudged by the Democrats on the committee. It was a matter of political strategy with them.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, of course, the Senator from Oregon is not failing to recall that the Senator from Florida, both in the committee and on the floor of the Senate, to the very limit of his ability fought against the enactment of the Taft-Hartley law, and branded it as legislation very inimical to the public interest.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Florida that in my judgment the arguments he made against the Taft-Hartley law at the time when the fight against the bill was occurring on the floor of the Senate, were sound. I joined with him then in those arguments. I join with him now in those arguments. But I say to the Senator from Florida that the way to get good legislation is not to follow the procedural course which the Senator from Florida is primarily responsible for in this matter. I say that because the Senator's procedure is going to result in a fight here on the floor of the Senate, resulting in an attempt to write a piece of labor legislation on the floor of the Senate. We cannot write good labor legislation here on the floor of the Senate, Mr. President. So I do not propose to let the Senator from Florida "get by," so far as American labor is concerned, with any representation that the committee procedure for which he up to this hour is chiefly responsible insofar as the handling of labor legislation in the Eighty-first Congress is concerned, meets the best interest of American labor. I say to American labor here and now that

the weeks immediately ahead will demonstrate that the course of action for which the Senator from Florida is responsible constitutes a great disservice to American labor. I hope we can persuade the Democrats in committee meetings to change the timetable they have adopted so that we can have fair hearings on this issue of labor legislation. Whether I am right or wrong depends on whether or not we are going to consider the problems, issue by issue, which must be taken up in order to have a fair piece of labor legislation passed by this Congress. Mr. President, we cannot possibly have fair consideration of the issues I wish to raise here this afternoon by any such timetable as that which the Senator from Florida has been able to get the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to adopt.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator from Oregon has for a long time had intimate and friendly relationships with organized labor in this country, and he is an unusually well-informed Senator and citizen. Will the Senator from Oregon question the fact that practically every labor organization in this country has come out by overwhelming resolution at every convention for the unqualified and simple repeal of the Taft-Hartley law?

Mr. MORSE. Of course the Senator from Florida is correct; but what am I supposed to do about that? Am I supposed to jump through a labor hoop? My job here on the floor of the Senate, Mr. President, is to take labor's demands and weigh them carefully on the evidence, and vote with them when the evidence supports them, and vote against them when they are wrong. On some proposals, labor happens to be wrong. I think we ought to hear labor's arguments on various amendments to the Taft-Hartley law; and when the evidence supports their position, I think we should vote with them; and when the evidence does not support their position, I think we should vote against them. That is all I am pleading for.

Let me say to the Senator from Florida that I am perfectly willing to be judged, when I stand for reelection in 1950, by my record in the field of labor relations. If the support of labor in my State depends upon my supporting the resolution of the Senator from Florida, then I do not want its support, because I am never going to stand for what I consider to be unfair procedure, for unfair procedure never serves the best interests of labor or any other group in this country.

Now, Mr. President, let us take an issue and apply the procedure of the Pepper resolution to it. Let us take the issue of emergency disputes, the so-called national paralysis cases. What are we going to do about them? What are we going to do about them under the so-called resolution of the Senator from Florida? I wish to tell you, Mr. President, that in my judgment if we are going to appraise properly the results in the field of emergency disputes, as the record will show them to be since the Taft-Hartley law was passed, if we are going to give careful, statesmanlike consideration to reforms in the law which ought to be passed if we are to have emergency disputes legislation which will meet the public interest, we cannot handle that one issue alone in less time than the total time provided for by the Senator from Florida in his resolution for the full consideration of all of the democratic proposals on labor legislation.

The first thing we ought to find out, Mr. President, is what have been the results of the emergency disputes sections of the Taft-Hartley law? I think by and large the record would show that the results have not been good ones, and that the emergency disputes sections of the Taft-Hartley law ought to be drastically rewritten. But the American people are entitled to know those facts. Labor should have been giving the American people, through a sound public-relations labor-education program, the evidence and the facts in regard to the operation of the Taft-Hartley law. Unfortunately labor has failed to inform the public as to the facts about the dangers inherent in the Taft-Hartley law but rather has followed the strategy for the most part of calling the bill names and crying "Repeal, Repeal." That is a political pressure approach, Mr. President; but we are never going to write sound legislation in any field if the legislation is going to be just the result of political pressure. It is not our job to write pressure-dictated legislation. Our job, Mr. President, as I see it, as Members of this body, is to make a studentlike approach to the evidence, pro and con, in respect to all the results which have already flowed from the passage of the Taft-Hartley law. The American people are entitled to know what the results have been and what the dangers in the law really are. I am so convinced that such public hearings as I have urged would leave no question as to the unsoundness of certain provisions of the Taft-Hartley law that I am sure the American people would back us up in the drastic revisions which I think that law needs. However, I am not going before the American people, Mr. President, as apparently the Senator from Florida and his Democratic colleagues are, and say, "I have reached the conclusion that the law should be repealed. My mind is made up. I will not listen to evidence to the contrary; or, if I do, I will listen to it with two tongues in one cheek." I think that is a just and fair description of the attitude of the Democrats on this matter. What they are saying in effect is, "If you want to bring in amendments, come on and bring them in. We shall listen to them; but we forewarn you that we know right now how we are going to vote on them."

Mr. President, that is not my conception of the way a Senate committee hearing should be conducted. That is not my idea of the purposes of hearings held by Senate committees. I thought that the purpose of Senate committee hearings was to find the facts. It takes time to find the facts. I do not want to spend a single hour longer than is necessary in conducting labor hearings at this session of Congress in order to get the facts. I think my Democratic friends know me well enough to know that if at any hearings conducted by the Labor Committee of the United States Senate we ever reach the point where there is any clear evidence that a member of the committee is seeking to stall those hearings for the purpose of preventing the committee from making a report in reasonable time for action in this session of Congress, the junior Senator from Oregon will oppose such stalling tactics.

But, I say to my Democratic friends, the unfairness in the procedure which they have adopted is that they do not give adequate time for a full, fair hearing on the facts. I was not married to my resolution. Mr. President, which sought to conduct hearings through the month of February, until on or about March 1. If we needed that amount of time I felt we ought to take it; if we need a few days more, I felt we ought to take it. I refused to commit myself to any specific date, but I said our goal and our objective ought to be to try to do this job by about March 1. Then, knowing from past experience the differences of opinion existing within the committee, I know that the chances would not be very good, if we did a thorough job of exchanging points of view among ourselves in the committee, of getting a bill out of committee much before about April 1.

What are we going to do now as a result of the Pepper resolution? I say as a gesture to labor, we are going to hold some hearings, up until February 10. We are going to restrict those hearings to certain very specific issues, and we, or at least the majority of the committee, are going to say, "Now, if you want to bring in any other issues, as a Senator, we will hear you"—apparently as a matter of senatorial courtesy, Mr. President—"but we want to forewarn you, our minds are pretty well made up." What kind of labor legislation is that procedure going to produce? Well, Mr. President, I will tell you. When the committee bill reaches the floor of the Senate a fight against it will start, because the committee will not be in any position to give assurance to both sides of the aisle that fair, full hearings have been given to the merits of all the issues involved in the type of labor legislation which ought to be passed by the Eighty-first Congress. That is where the disservice to American labor inherent in the Pepper resolution is clearly evident. The real helpful service to American labor would be for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to conduct hearings so fair that the evidence presented in them would leave no room for doubt on the part of the American voters as to the desirability of drastic changes in the Taft-Hartley law. With that record behind us, men could not stand up on the floor of the United States Senate and say they have no confidence in the report of the committee, as I predict they will say in criticism of any report which is the product of the procedure adopted by the Democrats in the Pepper resolution. They would not be able, under my proposal, to say it, or at least carry any weight or influence with the argument, because the record would show, if the procedure I recommended had been followed, that we gave to every person entitled to it his day in court, on the basis of the evidence that he could present.

So I say to American labor again—and do not forget, Mr. President, I am under tremendous criticism today from American labor—the Pepper resolution is a serious mistake. I understand there are people in the Democratic Party who are gleeful because I voted against the Pepper resolution, but I know not a one of them who can present to American labor a sounder position or record on labor policies than the junior Senator from Oregon. It is no new experience for me, Mr. President, to hear labor criticize me. I have had that experience before, when I rendered decisions which labor did not like, because in a given case in arbitration or before the War Labor Board labor failed to prove its case. I have had labor criticism in Oregon, Mr. President, when I refused on occasion to say that the Wagner Act was a magna carta for labor. It never was, because it never was a well-balanced act. It was an act that gave to labor some long overdue rights; and I support the rights which the act gave to labor, but it did not give to employers corresponding procedural rights and protection against the unfairness of labor. I want to say to those Democratic forces, who I understand think that the position I am taking on labor legislation in the Eighty-first Congress may help rejuvenate Democratic opposition to me in the State of Oregon, I will take my chances in 1950, even with the Democratic voters in the State of Oregon, so far as my record of impartiality and fairness on the evidence is concerned.

What position am I in as a member of the Labor Committee, in view of the speech made by the Senator from Florida this afternoon showing clearly the attitude the Democrats on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare are going to take? I understand, from the Senator from Florida, that as a Senator I shall have the right to offer some amendments, whether those amendments deal with the limited issues which the Senator from Florida refers to in his resolution or not. Why should I bother to offer any amendments? Why should I offer amendments before a committee whose spokesman, as far as the Democratic side is concerned, on the floor of the Senate, this afternoon, has in all honesty and frankness—and I respect him for his forthrightness—confessed that the issues as to what is to be in the new labor bill to be proposed by the committee are pretty well prejudged anyway?

I may change my mind, depending upon what transpires in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, in meetings starting tomorrow, but I want to say here and now, if the attitude of the Democrats on that committee is going to continue to be the attitude expressed by the Senator from Florida this afternoon, I shall offer no amendments in the committee, because I do not intend to be a party to any such farce as the Senator from Florida has outlined. I shall offer my amendments on the floor of the Senate in due course. And let me tell you, Mr. President, in my judgment, when I offer them, I shall back them up with argument and evidence which will make it rather difficult, in most instances, even for the Senator from Florida to vote against them. But that is not the way we ought to do it. That is not the way to write legislation on this important subject.

Mr. President, when you think of all the problems that face America, and when you think of the great resentment that exists today in the industrial life of America, I say it is a sad thing that at the very beginning of the Eighty-first Congress we have apparently gotten ourselves into a position where we are going to have to write labor legislation on the floor of the United States Senate. One of the things which America sorely needs is industrial harmony, and better understanding between employers and workers. I happen to believe that there are increasing numbers of employers all over America who have come to recognize that many of the amendments for which I fought on this floor during the historic debate of 1947 were much more in the best interests of American industry and labor and the public than provisions on the same subject which were incorporated in the Taft-Hartley law. We have a great opportunity in the Eighty-first Congress, Mr. President, to bring labor and management together before us in the Labor Committee, to let them present their points of view on the Taft-Hartley law; to strike those many provisions in the law which I think need to be struck out, revise some others, and to bring in a fair and workable bill I care not under what name. If the Democrats want a Democratic label on it, I shall be glad to vote to give them a Democratic label. I am interested only in the final result of the legislation. Mr. President, you are not going to get good legislation through the procedure advocated by the Senator from Florida.

I close, Mr. President, by saying to American labor leaders, "It is not too late for you gentlemen to reconsider the procedure which has been adopted, I think under your sponsorship, through the spokesmanship of the Senator from Florida. In the interests of the men and women who wear the working clothes in America the matter should be reconsidered. The steamroller tactics which are being used on the Eighty-first Congress in this instance will serve only to crush labor." It is not too late for a change in this labor strategy. So far as the junior Senator from Oregon is concerned, before this debate is concluded I shall give labor leaders an opportunity to tell the country what is wrong with the amendments which I propose to offer on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, when I was making my remarks this afternoon on labor problems, I intended to ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the body of the RECORD, at the end of my remarks, as a part of them, a very able speech by Prof. Edwin E. Witte, chairman of the Department of Economics, University of Wisconsin, on Recent Labor Legislation of Interest to Labor. I make that request now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Without objection, the speech will be printed as requested.

The matter referred to is as follows:

RECENT LABOR LEGISLATION OF INTEREST TO LABOR

The Taft-Hartley Act

The recent legislation in which labor is most interested is, undoubtedly, the Taft-Hartley Act. As Aaron has given you an excellent detailed analysis of that act—much better than I could do. To discuss the recent labor legislation of interest to labor without dealing with the Taft-Hartley Act, however, is like presenting Hamlet with the role of Hamlet omitted. So I shall deal with the Taft-Hartley Act in its broader aspects, skipping details as much as possible.

Giving you only general observations and making these in a summary manner, I have this to say about the Taft-Hartley Act:

1. The enforcement of the Taft-Hartley Act is still in an early stage:

(a) Important parts of the law are not as yet fully effective. The most important of these are the closed shop provisions. Closed shop contracts concluded before August 22, 1947, remain in full force and effect until their expiration date or until August 22, 1948, whichever is the earlier. A great many closed shop contracts were extended for 1 year immediately before August 22, 1947, and these contracts still have some weeks to run; others concluded before June 23, 1947, run until their expiration dates, which, in some cases, are several years from now.

(b) To date, the National Labor Relations Board has not decided even one unfair labor practices case which is premised upon the Taft-Hartley Act. The board has devoted its efforts mainly to disposing of cases which arose under the Wagner Act and were undecided when the new law took effect. It has adopted rules and procedures under the new law, which have been discussed by Mr. Aaron. It has decided important issues arising under the part of the law dealing with representation and election cases. But it still has to decide its first unfair labor practices case under the new law. In a speech delivered on June 11, Chairman Herzog said that 12 cases involving unfair labor practices charges against unions had reached the board, after examiner's hearings and reports, and that it would give these cases precedence. So we may expect board decisions ere long on some of the major issues raised by the new law, but these will be then, probably, appealed to the courts.

(c) District courts have passed upon some questions arising under the part of the act relating to unfair labor practices of unions, in injunction cases brought by the general counsel of the board, Mr. Denham. No decisions have come down from circuit courts of appeals and in the only two cases arising under the Taft-Tartley Act which have been decided by the Supreme Court—the National Maritime Union case, involving the Communist affidavits, and the Murray case, involving political expenditures by unions—the court did not decide the issues the unions presented.

In most respects, what the restrictions imposed by the Taft-Hartley Act upon unions means still has to be decided by the Board and the courts and will not be certainly known until the issues have been decided by the Supreme Court.

2. Thus far, the Taft-Hartley Act has proven more of an insult than an injury to the labor unions.

(a) It is clear that the law severely handicaps unions which fail to file the non-Communist affidavits and the financial reports which are prescribed as prerequisites the unions must satisfy to have any standing under the law. Three major companies—Remington-Rand, Caterpillar Tractor, Colt

Arms—which had contracts with left-wing unions have refused to have any further dealings with these unions and have gotten away with it. Noncomplying unions have lost two important strikes, the American Communications Association strike against the New York cable companies and the recent strike of the United Packing House Workers, CIO, against the major meat packers. No complying unions have sustained such reverses.

(b) Total union membership seems to have increased since passage of the Taft-Hartley Act. These gains have resulted principally from increased employment in plants which already were under union contracts. Unions have won a majority of the representation elections but a smaller percentage than prior to the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act. The southern organizing drive seems to have been slowed up to inching gains. The principal damage done to labor by the Taft-Hartley Act has resulted from a vague fear which it has produced among unorganized or, but recently, organized workers that there is something unlawful about what the unions are doing and that workers are liable to get into jail or be fined if they go along with the unions. To some extent, also, the interests of quite a few union leaders have been diverted from organizational efforts to the legal battles in the courts. But, thanks to nearly full employment, the injury to the unions from the Taft-Hartley Act to date has been a minimum.

3. While the Taft-Hartley Act has not damaged labor very greatly to date there are reasons to believe that it will prove more restrictive and injurious in the not very distant future. These reasons include:

(a) The restrictions upon union security will become fully effective in the near future. The National Labor Relations Board and the courts will before long decide many of the major questions raised by the act. That labor will win all of these cases is not in the cards.

(b) The interpretations of the Taft-Hartley Act given thus far by the National Labor Relations Board are far less restrictive than are the interpretations of Mr. Denham, the general counsel. The National Labor Relations Board has a 3 to 2 prolabor majority. The term of a member favorable to labor will be out and a new appointment will be made after the election. If the new appointee holds different views than does the present member, the law will be applied much more harshly than it has been to date. It should be noted also that Mr. Denham has fared much better in his extreme interpretations with the courts than with the trial examiners of the Board. Even if the Board renders decisions favorable to labor, there is a good chance of their being upset on appeal to the courts.

(c) The law has thus far functioned in a time of near full employment. Employers generally and particularly the large employers have thus far heeded, pretty well, the advice given them when the Taft-Hartley Act was passed, by Mr. Bunting, the then president of the American Manufacturers Association to go slow in their use of the new law. Whether they will adopt the same attitude when mass unemployment will give employers the upper hand in strikes remains to be seen, when the business cycle turns decidedly downward.

(d) This is an election year, in which many of those who were responsible for the enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act have been anxious to avoid further offense to labor. With an election coming up, the many proposals before Congress to place further restrictions upon labor were all allowed to die without being voted on.

(e) That the next Congress will enact new labor relations legislation seems almost certain. The Taft-Hartley Act itself provided for a joint congressional committee to study and report upon further needed legislation in this field. That committee, whose chairman is Senator Joe Ball, held extensive hearings on amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act in May and June and then decided to postpone its report on these proposals until the new Congress meets in January. Most of the proposals presented to the committee were for further restrictions upon labor. What the new legislation which the next Congress will enact will be will depend upon the composition of the new Congress.

4. The Taft-Hartley Act is not the most extreme antiunion law imaginable and the new legislation which the new Congress may enact may be much more restrictive. The Taft-Hartley Act does not make unions unlawful. It does not require anyone to work when he does not want to work. Most strikes remain lawful and most of the things that unions have been doing are still legal. But the next Congress may further restrict what unions may lawfully do.

5. Even as it now stands, I believe the new law to be unwise legislation. I hold this view because:

(a) The new law, in many respects, leaves labor in a worse position than it was in before the Wagner Act was enacted. As an illustration, the closed shop may be cited. The closed shop was legal in nearly all States before we had a Wagner Act. That act did not make the closed shop legal but restricted its legality, providing that only closed-shop contracts made with majority unions should enjoy the protection of the law. In the Taft-Hartley Act, the closed shop is completely outlawed, as it never was before. In this entire law there is not even one provision which confers additional rights upon unions, while there are dozens of new restrictions.

(b) The act does not treat employers and employees alike. It does not treat corporations and unions in the same manner. Many acts are declared to be unfair labor practices when done by unions which are not unfair labor practices for employers. Corporations can restrict production as they wish, but restrictive rules of unions limiting production are an unfair labor practice for unions. Large corporations can exert pressure upon suppliers and smaller companies not to give labor more favorable terms than they do, but sympathetic strikes and boycotts are an unfair labor practice for unions. No corporation official has to file a non-Communist affidavit to prove his loyalty, as union officers must do. It is not true, as has often been stated, that employers are still subject to same restrictions as they were under the Wagner Act. The list of unfair labor practices of employers is the same as under the Wagner Act, except for the change in the provisions relating to the closed shop. The procedural provisions, however, have been altered to greatly weaken the protection enjoyed by the employees. Unfair labor practices charges are now outlawed unless they are brought within 6 months after commission. In hearings, strict rules of evidence apply, and upon review by the courts the Board's decision is to be sustained, not, as heretofore, if supported by creditable evidence, but only if sustained by the weight of evidence, as viewed by the court. When it comes to enforcement, it is mandatory for the General Counsel to apply for an injunction, in advance of any hearing, whenever he is satisfied that a union has engaged in a sympathetic strike or boycott. He may optionally use injunctions against employers when guilty of unfair labor practices. But up to June 15 the record was that the General Counsel had sought injunctions in 17 cases against labor unions since passage of the Taft-Hartley Act, as against but one case in which he sought an injunction against an employer. The Taft-Hartley Act attempts to change the law of agency applicable to employers to relieve them of responsibility for acts of foremen and other supervisors, while it makes unions responsible, at least under Mr. Denham's interpretation, for all acts of members during strikes and even for those of complete strangers.

(c) The Taft-Hartley Act represents a great extension of governmental interference in labor-management relations. The Wagner Act brought the Government into the picture to the extent of protecting the worker's right to organize and to require an employer to bargain collectively with representatives of a majority of his employees when they so desired. It left entirely free from governmental control the procedures to be followed in collective bargaining and, also what labor and management might agree upon. The Taft-Hartley Act retains all the restrictions which were in the Wagner Act. To them it adds many requirements as to how collective bargaining is to be conducted. Representing an even more serious extension of governmental interference, it contains many restrictions regarding what labor and management may agree upon. These apply to union security, employer contributions to pension, health and welfare funds, production standards, and still other matters previously left entirely to agreement between the parties.

How much governmental interference in labor-management relations has been increased appears most clearly from the increase in the number of NLRB cases. When the Taft-Hartley Act became effective on August 22, 1947, the Board had on its dockets the largest number of undecided cases it had ever had—a total of 3,933 cases. Since then it has labored valiantly to clean up these old cases and to dispose as expeditiously as it can of the many elections it has to conduct under the new law. It has received greatly increased appropriations from Congress and has doubled or trebled its staff. From this point of view, it has also been fortunate in that many unions have not been able to bring cases before it, because many have complied with the requirements for the filing of non-Communist affidavits and financial reports only recently or still have not done so. As late as July 1, 13 AFL international unions and also 13 CIO internationals, as well as three-fourths of all local unions had not met these requirements. Yet, month after month, the backlog of NLRB cases has grown. On April 30, the number of undecided cases totaled 14,467, compared with 3,933, 8 months earlier when the Taft-Hartley Act became law. It is to be noted, moreover, that not only does this act increase the work and authority of the National Labor Relations Board but also that of the courts. The increased resort to injunctions to settle disputes between labor and management is one of the striking consequences of the Taft-Hartley Act to date.

(d) The act has unsettled stable labor-management relationships which have long prevailed in many industries. The building construction industry will serve as an illustration. The Wagner Act never was applied to the construction industry. In the hearings on the Taft-Hartley Act representatives of the leading contractors' association opposed the restrictions on what employers and employees may agree upon in relation to union security and in other respects. The Taft-Hartley Act, however, not only has brought the building construction industry under Federal control but imposed many restrictions upon both employers and unions, with the result that more unfair labor practices have been started against building trades unions than any others. The printing industry is another in which good relations have long prevailed between employers and unions in which the Taft-Hartley Act has produced confusion and serious labor troubles. While that law may be valuable to employers who want to get rid of unions,

it complicates the problems of employers who want to get along with unions.

5. The Taft-Hartley Act, while it remains the law of the land, must be enforced and observed. It is entirely proper for unions to challenge in court parts of the new law which they believe to be unconstitutional. It is also in complete harmony with our democratic way of life to work for the repeal or modification of this law and to vote against Members of Congress who were responsible for its passage. But defiance of the law or a deluge of strikes can only result in further restrictive legislation.

Other recent Federal legislation

Having discussed the Taft-Hartley Act at such length, I can only very briefly deal with other labor legislation. Summarizing other recent Federal legislation, the following seem to me to be the high points:

Fair Labor Standards Act: Congress in 1947 amended the Fair Labor Standards (Wages and Hours) Act by passage of the Portal-to-Portal Pay Act. This act set aside the decision of the Supreme Court holding that workers are entitled to count as working time all of the time spent in preparation for actual work and while they are on the employer's premises, it provided that thereafter workers could claim pay for preparation and wash-up time only if such pay was specifically provided for in the contract. This rule was made retroactive, and the courts were instructed to dismiss all of the pending suits for portal-to-portal pay. In addition, Congress in the Portal-to-Portal Act broadened the exemptions from the Fair Labor Standards Act and inserted a 2-year limitation for the recovery of back pay under this law. It also made the Wage and Hour Administration independent of any control by the Secretary of Labor, although it remained within the Department of Labor for budgetary purposes.

In the last session of Congress all proposals for further changes in the Fair Labor Standards Act died in committee without being allowed to come to a vote. These included, on the one hand, several bills to further broaden the exemptions and to increase the hours of labor before overtime must be paid from 40 to 44 and 48. The same fate also befell President Truman's recommendation for increasing the minimum rate of pay from 40 to 75 cents per hour. A Senate subcommittee, headed by Senator Ball, held extensive hearings on this proposal and at one time was reported to be ready to recommend an increase to 60 cents per hour. In the end, however, it did nothing, and the minimum wage rate for employees in interstate commerce remains 40 cents per hour.

Fair employment practices legislation: The story with reference to fair employment practices legislation is very similar. In 1946 Congress allowed the Fair Employment Practices Commission, which was established in wartime by President Roosevelt, to die, although President Truman recommended its continuance. The President renewed this recommendation in the last session and thereby brought down upon himself the wrath of the southern Democrats. The Republican-controlled Congress did nothing.

United States Department of Labor: In relation to the United States Department of Labor, the recent record is one, not merely of doing nothing, but of destroying what already existed. When the Department of Labor was established it was intended to have the same status as other cabinet departments, with responsibility for all functions of the Government concerned with labor and industrial relations. That concept was departed from in the subsequent establishment of special governmental machinery for railroad labor and the organization of the National Labor Relations Board as an independent agency. Then, still in the Roosevelt administration, Congress took the Immigration Service out of the Department of Labor and transferred this service to the Department of Justice. As a wartime measure the United States Employment Service was attached to the War Manpower Commission. This scattering of the governmental activities relating to labor was roundly condemned in the Republican national platform of 1944.

The last Congress—the first Republican-controlled Congress in 16 years—however, not only continued this process but made crippling cuts in the appropriations for the administration of all labor laws other than the Taft-Hartley Act. President Truman, by Executive order, returned the United States Employment Service to the Department of Labor. Congress disapproved of his action and attached the Employment Service to the Social Security Administration. The Children's Bureau was assigned to the same agency. The Wage and Hour Administration was made an independent agency, except for budgetary purposes, in the Portal-to-Portal Act. The Conciliation Service was made completely independent in the Taft-Hartley Act. Left within the Department of Labor are only the Bureau of Labor Statistics and a few smaller bureaus, whose functions are exclusively research. The appropriations to the Department of Labor have been reduced to $14,000,000 in round numbers compared with above $560,000,000 for the Department of Agriculture and $170,000,000 for the Department of Commerce.

Social security: In the field of social security, Congress made one change in the prior law which may result in broadened coverage and made two changes narrowing coverage. It also weakened the Social Security Administration through drastic cuts in its budget. It did nothing with the President's recommendation for a national health insurance system or with those of the Advisory Council on Social Security for broadening and liberalizing old-age insurance.

The one bit of social-security legislation which can be described as a forward step was an amendment to the Social Security Act making it possible for States to contract with the Federal Government to bring their employees and those of their political subdivisions under the Federal old-age insurance system, without disturbing existing State and local retirement systems. Potentially, this might bring 3,500,000 workers, not now covered by the Social Security Act, under that law. But none of them will actually be covered unless and until the several States so elect. It is to their advantage that they do so, but whether State and local government employees will actually get the benefit of this legislation will depend upon the action of the next State legislatures.

Offsetting this potential extension of the coverage of the Federal old-age insurance, were two measures passed by Congress which removed the protection of the act from some 700,000 workers. These were the newsboys and the commission salesmen, both of which Congress declared to be independent contractors, after the Supreme Court had ruled that they are employees entitled to all the benefits of the Social Security Act.

Equally destructive was the action of Congress in cutting the appropriations for the administration of the Social Security Act. The bill passed by the House taking control of unemployment insurance away from the Social Security Administration died in conference. But even the conference-committee bill, which was enacted into law, abolished the regional offices of the Social Security Administration and its research and informational services.

Early in the last session the prospects appeared to be very good that Congress would enact long overdue legislation extending and improving our social-security system. At the beginning of the session, President Truman renewed his recommendation, presented twice earlier, for the establishment of a national system of health insurance and the extension and liberalization of old-age insurance and old-age assistance. A little later the Advisory Council on Social Security, created last fall by the Republican Senate Committee on Finance, made its report, in which it recommended making the coverage of the Federal old-age insurance system well-nigh universal, liberalizing benefits, and inclusion of permanent total disability benefits with old-age retirement benefits. At the same time a subcommittee of the House Ways and Means Committee began hearings on needed changes in old-age insurance. In the end, however, the entire matter of providing more adequate social security and health protection for the American people was left to the next Congress.

Insuring a continued high level of employment: This also was what Congress did in relation to full employment. After bitter controversy, Congress in 1946 passed the Full Employment Act. This provided for continuous study of all factors affecting the general level of employment by the Board of Economic Advisers and an annual economic report by the President, for consideration by a special joint congressional committee and action by Congress. The Board of Economic Advisers by this time has made two annual and several special reports in which it has stressed that inflation is the great danger to a continued high level of employment. The President in his economic report has presented to Congress the recommendations for the control of inflation made by Board of Economic Advisers. The joint congressional committee has employed experts of its own and has conducted extensive hearings. But it has never made even a report and Congress has done precisely nothing about checking inflation.

State labor legislation

Restrictive State labor relations legislation: The story of the recent State labor legislation, like that of the recent Federal labor legislation, centers around restrictions upon unions. Restrictive State legislation preceded the Taft-Hartley Act by nearly a decade. As long ago as 1939, six States enacted restrictive State labor relations acts, several of them to replace "Little Wagner" acts. More antiunion measures were adopted by the State legislatures in 1941 and 1943. But none of the major industrial States enacted such legislation prior to 1947. None of early restrictive State laws, moreover, were enforced except that of Wisconsin. Even in Wisconsin the enforcement of the restrictions upon the closed shop was so indifferent that the 1945 legislature deemed it advisable to validate all closed contracts which had been in effect illegally since 1939.

In 1947 no less than 30 States enacted laws restricting labor unions and their activities, many of them more than one such law. Included among these were many of the leading industrial States. This antiunion legislation took many different forms: prohibition or restriction of union security provisions in labor-management contracts; right-to-work laws; antipicketing and antiboycott laws, prohibition of strikes without notice, jurisdictional strikes, strikes of public employees and still other strikes; requirements for union registration and financial reporting; compulsory arbitration on public utilities; and still other restrictions upon what workers may do collectively. None of these laws are as comprehensive as the Taft-Hartley Act, but individual provisions are more restrictive. Thus, about a dozen States prohibit all forms of union security and the Taft-Hartley Act has the peculiar provision that in any State which has more drastic restrictions the State law shall apply, but not where the State legislation is less restrictive.

How seriously this mass of new restrictive State labor legislation will harm the labor unions and make it more difficult for workers to get increases or otherwise improve their lot remains to be seen. As has been noted, the earlier restrictive State legislation was little enforced. In many States this legislation fared poorly in the courts, being held unconstitutional. Whether this will prove true also of the 1947 legislation is anybody's guess. The adverse climate of public opinion toward labor, reflected in the enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act and the mass of restrictive State labor legislation, seems likely also to result in more vigorous enforcement. It also may again prove true that the courts read the election returns, but here in California the courts have already invalidated the two antilabor laws enacted by the last legislature. Certain it is that the restrictive legislation which was enacted in 1947 was only a small part of the legislation of that character which was introduced in the State legislatures and failed of passage. Almost certainly, all this further restrictive legislation will again make its appearance in the 1949 sessions and whether it will pass will depend upon the composition of the State legislatures which will be elected this year.

Protective labor legislation: Until recently the term "labor legislation" was applied almost exclusively to protective labor legislation—legislation establishing minimum standards for the protection of the weakest among the workers. Such legislation did not directly benefit the organized workers but was always supported by the labor unions, as the champions not only of organized, but of all, labor. Now the very term means to most people legislation restricting labor unions and their activities, but protective labor legislation is still very important and very much in need of improvement. Since the war began we again have had a vast amount of child labor. Despite all progress made in accident prevention, more than 15,000 workers annually lose their lives in industrial accidents. The total man-days lost through strikes in 1946—the worst year we have ever had for strike losses—were 116,000,000, as reported by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, but the man-days lost because of industrial accidents in that year—not an abnormal one from a safety point of view—totaled 260,000,000 as estimated by the National Safety Council. Yet there is far more concern about strikes than about industrial accidents.

For 10 years now almost no progress has been made in protective labor legislation. The 1947 legislative sessions saw a few minor improvements in some States but no thoroughgoing revision of the protective labor laws anywhere. Such a revision is overdue. Many of the existing standards are now completely out of date. Child labor laws limiting the hours of labor of children to 48 per week, as do many of our present child labor laws, are of no protection to young child workers. Neither are minimum wage laws which fix even lower minimum wage rates than does the Fair Labor Standards Act. It is high time that thought be again given to protective labor legislation and not merely to restrictive legislation.

Social-security legislation in the States: In relation to social-security legislation, the record of the 1947 State legislatures was somewhat better. Many States liberalized their unemployment compensation benefits and there was also some improvement in the workmen's compensation laws. But the increase in unemployment or workmen's compensation benefits has not kept pace with the decreasing value of the dollar, so that today they represent a smaller percentage of normal wages than they did when enacted. No basic improvement has been made in our social-security legislation other than the enactment of the cash sickness compensation laws in Rhode Island, California, and New Jersey.

Concluding observations

Viewed in its entirety, the recent labor legislation is most disappointing. What labor should do about it is for your decision. Clearly, the Taft-Hartley Act and the restrictive State laws must be enforced and observed so long as they remain upon the statute books or until they are held unconstitutional. It is entirely proper for the labor unions to test in the courts all parts of the restrictive legislation which they believe to be unconstitutional. It is also in the democratic way of life for people who do not like what their representatives have done to seek to replace them by others who will be more responsive to the people's will. But defiance of law or indifference to public opinion will only lead to further restrictions.

The policy suggested is in accord with the traditions of American labor. Labor has ever been reluctant to engage in partisan politics. But there never has been a time when labor has not been interested in legislation affecting its interests. From its organization, the American Federation of Labor has maintained its headquarters in Washington and has favored and opposed measures pending in Congress. It has been always interested itself in protective labor legislation and, still more, in removing restrictions upon freedom of organization and action. In its early years it championed repeal of the conspiracy laws. Later it fought for legislation to curb the use of injunctions in labor disputes. It was instrumental in securing passage of the Clayton Act, the Norris-LaGuardia Act, and the State anti-injunction laws. Long ago, under the leadership of Samuel Gompers, it adopted the policy of reward your friends and punish your enemies in elections. It has always applied this policy in congressional elections and has also advised its members of the stand taken on measures of concern to labor in national platforms and by candidates for the Presidency. In now entering politics to secure the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and the restrictive State labor laws, but doing so cauticusly, labor is pursuing the same policy it has found successful in the past.

How badly the unions will be harmed by the recent restrictive legislation will depend, in large part, upon what they do and do not do from now on. On the one hand, labor needs to avoid further arousing hostile public opinion. It needs to tell its story to employers and the general public much better than it has done to date. It also needs to sell itself to the large number of workers among its own members now indifferent or hostile. Having attained maturity, it must act responsibly at all times. On the other hand, labor needs to continue its organizational efforts and its fight for improved conditions for its members and all workers, along with trying to get relief from the injustices of the recent labor legislation. Despite this legislation, it is lawful for workers to organize and they still enjoy governmental protection in doing so. Most everything that unions have done heretofore remains legal. Labor does not have to take it lying down and, if I correctly interpret its attitude, it is not yet licked, by a long shot. In fighting for its rights, it advances the welfare, not only of all working people, but of our great country and its democratic institutions.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I do not wish to prolong in any way the remarks which are being made with regard to the program of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which will begin its hearings tomorrow, but, in all fairness to everyone concerned, I think I should state that at the beginning of the hearings tomorrow we shall start with the testimony of the Secretary of Labor, and we hope to be able to accomplish certain things. What the committee did may be criticized, but the people of the whole country, from one end to the other, have been hearing much more than a political slogan in connection with the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. It is true that in every hamlet, in every county in the United States, Democratic speakers from one end of the country to the other promised repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. What the Republican speakers did I do not know.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I do not wish to yield at the present moment. There will be plenty of time later. I wish to explain exactly the position in which the committee finds itself.

Mr. President, it is easy to make a political slogan. It is easy to say, "We want to repeal the Taft-Hartley law." But everyone knows that the Taft-Hartley Act was an amendment to existing legislation, and that the Taft-Hartley provisions are so intertwined with the National Labor Relations Act that if we should attempt to go to the country on that simple slogan, we would wipe out the National Labor Relations Act, which is something that no one ever dreamed of doing, and we would have to start at the place where we began over a decade ago.

There are certain provisions in regard to the procedure which we undertook which could be settled readily by action of the committee. For example, there was no need of discussing the hearings, so far as the intent of the majority of the committee was concerned, having to do with the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act which are to be repealed. If we happen to set the stage in such a way that one political party takes one side of the controversy and the other political party takes the other, that cannot be helped. But if, as a result of the action taken, the political party which made the promise to the people of the country can better comply with that promise, that is fair, open, and above-board. Probably never in the history of the United States, after an election in which people spoke so plainly as they spoke in this instance, has a political party been more strongly pledged to go through with the whole program. But in adopting any program, a start must be made. That is all we have done. We have not tried to modify the rules of the Senate or of the Congress in regard to hearings, excepting to put a limitation on their length. The reason for that is that we have, by the first proposition, closed the door to any discussion as to whether in the minds of the members of the committee it is wise to attempt to repeal the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act which were passed a year ago. That is a question which has now been decided. We do not have to hold hearings on that question. On that point we can save very much time. If we do not save it, each witness could come before the committee and say, "You cannot repeal the Taft-Hartley Act without

destroying a whole decade of experience under the National Labor Relations Act."

Our next step is to restore, in theory and in spirit, the legislation as it existed before the Taft-Hartley law came into existence, and then to attempt to change it in such a manner as will implement the original act to the extent that the President of the United States has already made recommendations which the people of the United States have heard. It may be said that his speech was not political because it was made in a message to the Congress of the United States on the state of the Union.

I think the time has come in the United States when if any President who has made promises from one end of the country to the other, and has made recommendations to the Congress as specific as are those which President Truman has made, can reasonably expect that his recommendations will receive attention.

Mr. President, I do not know how well our committee will hold together in making decisions, but in my mind, and, I think, in the minds of all members of the committee—and I know, in the mind of the junior Senator from Oregon, who has just finished speaking—we shall write an honest, good labor act. I know that the junior Senator from Oregon wants to write an honest, good labor act which will take care of the interests of labor and the interests of industry, so that we may move forward toward industrial-labor stability and industrial-labor peace. That is what all of us want.

We can criticize until doomsday the method of procedure; but since the method has been adopted, I, for one, shall not criticize it. I would rather have it in some other form. But let us be frank about things. If we can unite a majority of a committee of the Senate of the United States on a given method of procedure, we have accomplished something in the Senate which does not always happen.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I refused to yield to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and I do not wish to yield to other Senators until my statement is concluded.

So far as I am concerned, I shall not try to cut off debate. I am ready to meet all the issues as they develop, and I want to meet them fairly and squarely, not with a slogan, not based on what someone thinks or what someone is talking about. We want to be able to report to the Senate a proper type of bill so that we can debate it and tell the Senate what we have attempted to accomplish.

We shall begin the hearings tomorrow. Whether we succeed depends upon the action of every Senator, but we shall try to do our level best to carry through the program which we have attempted.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to one or two minor facts regarding the so-called mandate. Far be it from me, being a Republican, to say what the Democratic Party has promised to do or what it has not promised to do. But there is something about this mandate to which I should like to call attention.

In the first place, of the Members now sitting in the House of Representatives a majority were elected who favored the Taft-Hartley law.

Of the 32 Senators who were elected to the Senate this year, 18 were in favor of the Taft-Hartley law and 13 were against it; the position of one Senator I do not know. How can that be construed to be a popular mandate for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law? So far as the actual figures are concerned, I know that in 17 industrial counties in the State of Ohio Mr. Dewey ran stronger than he ran 4 years ago. In 71 out of 73 rural counties he ran weaker than he ran 4 years ago. He lost 150,000 votes in the rural counties. The results are practically the same. Four years ago he won by 12,000, this year he lost by 6,000, in a population of 3,000,000. He gained in the industrial counties, and lost in the rural areas. We made the best showing in the city of Cleveland we ever made since I have been active in Ohio politics. These are just a few sidelights. There are no doubt many other arguments which will be made as we proceed in discussing this question, but if the figures I have given do not disprove that the American people, in voting for Senators, Representatives, and for President and Vice President, in any way gave anyone a mandate to repeal the Taft-Hartley law, I do not know what better evidence there could be.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah be kind enough to answer one or two inquiries I may propound with regard to his remarks?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I shall be happy to do so if I can. The Senator from Missouri generally is so erudite that he is over my head, and I simply cannot answer his questions; but I shall do the best I can.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator for that very direct response to my question. The first question I desire to ask the Senator is this: As bearing on the reasonableness of the length of time which is granted for the hearings, is it not a fact that the Senator from Utah himself, until the day on which the period up to February 10 was fixed, was himself in favor of a 30-day period of hearings?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I thank the Senator for asking that question. I actually argued against fixing any limitation, from a practical standpoint, because I have always found, in my experience that when one is imposed, it is hard to keep to it, and I am pretty sure we are going to have difficulty in keeping to the time; but the committee decided on it, and we are going to try our best to carry out its decision.

Mr. DONNELL. So the Senator from Utah voted in favor of the action taken by the committee, did he not?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. When the vote came, I voted with the other seven Democrats on the committee.

Mr. DONNELL. Prior to that meeting, however, the Senator from Utah, who is now on his feet, had favored a 30-day period for the hearings. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I favored no limitation.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator favored no limitation?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I should be very much happier now if we had done what we were trying to work out in our discussion, namely to aim toward a limitation, instead of prescribing it. But the limitation has been imposed by the majority of the committee.

Mr. DONNELL. In fact, by all of the Democratic members of the committee, including the Senator from Utah. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I voted with my colleagues, and I am happy to do the best I can now.

Mr. DONNELL. I ask the Senator, further, did he not give out a statement to the effect that he favored a period of 30 days being granted for hearings?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No, no statement that I know of. Undoubtedly, as every reporter asked after the meeting, when we were discussing the motion of the Senator from Oregon about attempting to stop on the 1st of March, I said that, judging from the discussion, it would probably take longer than the 1st of March.

Mr. DONNELL. That was because the Senator from Utah realized that the time fixed in the resolution presented by the Senator from Florida and adopted would expire on February 10. Is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true, and, as I said in my statement, whenever six of my colleagues, or seven of my colleagues, unite upon a program, it is not hard for the eight of the colleagues to go along, because that does not happen very often in our committees.

Mr. DONNELL. May I ask the Senator a question also in regard to the length of time which will be actually available for these hearings under the resolution adopted by the 8 to 5 vote? We are to begin, I understand, tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock. Is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. That is, on January 28. I have made a notation from which it appears that, excluding Sundays but including Saturdays, a series of hearings expiring February 10 will give us 12 days. Does the Senator agree with that?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I would not dispute the Senator's figures, because if I worked them out I think it would be found they were correct.

Mr. DONNELL. Is it not also true that it is provided in the LaFollette-Monroney Act namely, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, that "No standing committee of the Senate or the House, except the Committee on Rules of the House, shall sit, without special leave, while the Senate or the House, as the case may be, is in session." That is correct, is it not?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true. That has already cut down the meetings of our committee, and we had discussion of that very point.

Mr. DONNELL. We have thirteen members of the Senate on that committee. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Absolutely correct.

Mr. DONNELL. Does not the Senator anticipate that during the period between tomorrow morning at ten o'clock and the tenth day of February there will be sessions of the Senate, which, under this language, will preclude the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare from sitting except with special leave of the Senate? That is correct, is it not?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. All excepting the first part. I do not think there will be a meeting of the Senate between now and 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. DONNELL. I did not say that. I said between 10 o'clock tomorrow morning and February 10——

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The remainder of the Senator's statement is perfectly correct.

Mr. DONNELL. I did not say the first part of it as the Senator attributed it to me. I asked the Senator whether or not he anticipated——

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I understood the Senator to start counting right from now until tomorrow, the time the Senate will be in session, and I merely wished to correct him, if that was what he said, by stating that it was not correct.

Mr. DONNELL. In the first place, I submit that the Senate is in session at this moment, if the Senator desires to start from this instant, and, in the second place, that the hearings concerning which we were talking do not start until tomorrow morning. Therefore obviously I was not referring to any session this afternoon.

I wish to ask the Senator if he does not anticipate that at least several days during the period from January 28 until February 10 will be consumed, at least in part, in sessions of the United States Senate itself?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I assume quite a few hours will be consumed.

Mr. DONNELL. Is it not also a fact that during the period which will expire February 10 there will be several days when, the Senator reasonably anticipates, some of the Republican members, in order to fill engagements relative to Lincoln Day celebrations, and the like, will find it necessary to be absent from Washington, D. C.?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I thought that by stopping on February 10 we would provide for not interfering with any of the goings and comings in connection with the Lincoln Day celebration, but if I am mistaken in that, and the Republicans have to leave on the 10th, then probably we have unfairly treated them, and should allow a little bit more time so that those Republicans who have to leave will have a chance to return. I think that will be granted almost as a matter of course.

Mr. DONNELL. The bill introduced by the Senator from Utah, if I may ask him the question, provides among its terms for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, does it not?

Mr THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. DONNELL. And was not that bill referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for consideration by that committee?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. DONNELL. The only consideration the committee has given to it was at the executive session held the other day, without the taking of testimony. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I would say that no consideration has been given to that bill, and ordinarily in the practice of the Senate the committees do not consider a bill until after hearings are concluded. Therefore we are starting in the orderly process, so that we can get to the consideration, and until the hearings are completed we cannot go into consideration of the bill. That was one reason why the majority of the committee decided we must rush the hearings.

Mr. DONNELL. Consequently we have the situation in which the reference of a bill to our committee—a bill which by the very opening portion of its provisions provides for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act—is not to mean that we are to wait until after we have heard the testimony, but we are to decide, as we did the other day, in advance of any testimony whatsoever, contrary, as the Senator has said, to the usual custom, for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I had hoped, and I still hope, that so far as the question of the repeal of the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act is concerned, it does not have to be argued.

Mr. DONNELL. And the Senator, I believe, answered the other day in the committee meeting in response to a question, that he interprets the resolution adopted by the committee as providing that the only amendments which are to be considered by the committee in the public hearings are those which are consistent with the President's proposal. Is not that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think that is correct. I do not believe that generally speaking in hearings amendments offered by various Senators on the committee become part of the hearing process unless we are building up legislation. Everything has happened, Mr. President, in our hearings. We do not follow an absolute rule. But generally speaking the hearings are held on provisions which are before us, or which are promised to be before us. There is no attempt to stop any Senator from discussing questions in committee. There is no attempt to stop any Senator from debating on the floor of the Senate. There is no way I know of to cut off debate without agreement in the Senate. There is absolutely a right to offer amendments from now on as long as the Senate will stand for that sort of thing. We are not attempting to cut off any of those procedures. We are merely attempting to get started, and we found that that was a real struggle in our committee. We found it was a struggle in our country, because of the agitation in regard to the subject. We are starting, and we trust to the gods for the finish.

Mr. DONNELL. May I ask the Senator one or two concluding questions. I think the Senator from Utah heard the Senator from Florida——

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am sorry to say that I did not hear my colleague from Florida, so probably the Senator from Missouri had better ask him the questions about what he said.

Mr. DONNELL. I remember well what the Senator from Florida said. I wanted to get the idea of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I will have to say that, being a good Democrat, as the Senator from Florida is, while I did not hear what he said I can stand up and testify that all he said was absolutely true [laughter], because I know the man. That is as far as I can go. But I hate to be asked questions by a great Senate lawyer respecting what the Senator from Florida said, because I did not hear him speak. But I can imagine what the Senator from Florida said.

Mr. DONNELL. I understand that the Senator from Utah is perfectly willing to take on faith what was said by the Senator from Florida, and I am not disputing his right to do so.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I take on faith what was said by the Senator from Florida. I used to trust implicitly even the present Presiding Officer of the United States Senate [laughter]. That is going as far I think as a man can go.

Mr. DONNELL. I understood the Senator from Florida to say that it would be perfectly proper, after the hearings are closed and the committee is in executive session, for a member of the committee to present an amendment. But, said the Senator from Florida, not in the public hearings. Now I think that is correctly quoting the Senator from Florida, who is listening as I speak, and sitting at his desk.

May I ask the Senator from Utah whether or not he thinks it is within the fair range of possibilities that our committee might possibly derive some benefit from testimony of witnesses in public hearings on an amendment that might be presented by a Senator, and whether or not the Senator judges it to be advisable to confine discussion behind closed doors at an executive session, free from the interposition of the testimony of the public, of amendments which have been so sacredly and silently presented behind closed doors?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the Senator knows that amendments are sometimes suggested by a witness, sometimes suggested by a Senator, without being formally submitted, but which in fact we very often discuss as ideas long before they are in the form of amendments. There is no way of stopping that and there is no intention to stop it. The Senator also knows that the complementary amendments, or the amendments which are to complement or fulfill the President's program, are at the present time in the state of being written, and not yet perfected. So that those amendments will be submitted in the Senate and formally referred as soon as they are ready. I am ready to confess, and I admit it to the whole country, that

the adoption of the motion, for which I voted, has hurried us probably on to a place where we are not completely prepared. But by the time we get going I am sure we will be wholly prepared to act on the matters which are being discussed.

Mr. DONNELL. May I ask the Senator whether the amendments which are to be prepared, which he says are in process of preparation, on which we are to open hearings tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock, will be before our committee at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, or are they still unprepared?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. They may or may not be. They have not been perfected yet in time to submit them today. But they will be ready the first minute they become available.

Mr. DONNELL. So we are to proceed tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock to hear testimony on certain amendments, according to the Pepper resolution, as to the preparation and completion of which by 10 o'clock tomorrow morning the Senator from Utah cannot now give us assurance? Is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No. When the Senator comes into the hearings tomorrow morning, there will be before the committee a long bill providing for the repeal of the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. DONNELL. But, the Senator said, the committee is not going to hear any testimony on that. Is not that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No, we are not going to hear any testimony whether we will repeal it or not, but the bill will contain other provisions, and then there is the substitute, and in addition to that there is one provision which has to be decided, because there is a substitute for it. The bill carries an amendment, as the Senator from Missouri well knows, which is open to discussion, and which is something about which anyone may testify as to whether it is proper to continue the panelization, the 5-man board provided for in the present Labor Relations Act.

Everyone knows that when we call before a committtee a member of the President's Cabinet, the Secretary of Labor for illustration, we always give him a chance to do more than to make a simple statement and run away. If no member of the committee were to ask him any questions it would be the first time that has ever happened in my experience in the United States Senate. If such questions do not open up discussions, so that we can understand what the Secretary recommends to us, or the reasons why he makes the recommendations, I shall be very much surprised. I am pretty sure that there is enough material to keep—I was going to say even the Senator from Missouri going—but to keep all of us going tomorrow in the session we shall hold then. I say that because the Senator is asking me quite a number of questions, and I am hard put to answer every one, because I am the kind of fellow who is not used to answering questions.

Mr. DONNELL. I think the Senator from Utah is always very expert in answering questions, and is very clear in his answers.

As I understand, however, the Senator talks about taking testimony on the panelization, that is, whether or not the board shall consist of five men instead of three. That, according to the resolution adopted by the committee the other day, is a matter which is already decided.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No, Mr. President.

Mr. DONNELL. That is what the resolution provides, if I am not greatly mistaken.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No, that is not decided.

Mr. DONNELL. The resolution speaks for itself. At any rate the resolution provides that it is decided that the Taft-Hartley law shall be repealed. That is decided, is it not?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is decided, so far as the majority of the committee is concerned. I want the people of the country—every man, woman, and child who can read, listen to the radio, or watch television—to know that so far as Democratic Senators on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare are concerned, they are trying their best to fulfill what nearly all of them who campaigned promised. That is all.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. The resolution provides, does it not, that the Taft-Hartley law shall be repealed, except as to the point of panelization, to which the Senator refers?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. And the five-man board.

Mr. DONNELL. That is the panelization point.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The panelization question arose incidental to the five-man board. Panelization makes it possible for the board to divide up and hear several cases.

Mr. DONNELL. The action taken by our committee the other day, by a vote of 8 to 5, includes among its provisions the statement that the Taft-Hartley law shall be repealed, except as to the continuance of the five-man board.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. DONNELL. So we have already decided those issues in our committee by a vote of 8 to 5.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. DONNELL. We have also decided, by a vote of 8 to 5, that we are going to reenact the Wagner Act.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. DONNELL. So, according to the Senator's view, there is no occasion to have testimony on either the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law or the reenactment of the Wagner Act. Is not that true?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I need no testimony; and I believe that if that were all there were to it, we could report the bill without any hearings whatever. But the Senator from Missouri very well remembers that in his message to Congress the President of the United States made other proposals, and those proposals have been placed before us by the President. I deem it our duty to pay attention to them. At least 3 or 4 weeks ago I put the various legal authorities in our Government to work to try to draft amendments consistent with those proposals. Everyone knows that we cannot simply repeal and restore. That is what I said in my opening statement. But we shall have amendments which I think the Senator from Missouri would say at least satisfy the President's message.

Mr. DONNELL. The language of the resolution, as to what our hearings are to address themselves to, is this, is it not:

> That hearings begin forthwith on amendments to the Wagner Act consistent with the proposals made by the President.

That is a correct statement of what is in the resolution, is it not?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. DONNELL. Those amendments, so far as the Senator from Utah knows, have not actually been completed. Is that true?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. But I am pretty sure that the Secretary of Labor will talk about them, so that we shall at least have the theory. I am sorry that we have not the amendments now.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have heard a great deal of discussion here this afternoon to the effect that on the 10th of February it is planned by the committee to terminate the hearings and to report a bill from the committee.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Not to report a bill on February 10.

Mr. TYDINGS. But it is planned to terminate the hearings on February 10. In the event the committee, having set that date as a tentative target, should find on the 9th or the 10th that it is advisable to extend the hearings for two or three days or a week longer, is there anything in the Constitution of the United States, the laws of the Republic, the rules of the Senate, or the procedure of that committee, which would prevent it from doing so?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I know of nothing.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Even though it is true, of course, that we can extend the time, the language of the resolution adopted by a vote of 8 to 5 on January 24, I believe, is "That said hearings be closed not later than February 10, 1949." Is not that true?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is the aim.

Mr. DONNELL. That is the language, is it not?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Chairman of the Committee has appointed a subcommittee to direct the witnesses and to attempt to bring the hearings to a conclusion at that time.

Mr. DONNELL. The notice which the Senator from Utah has sent to various members of the committee states that the subcommittee is appointed to expedite the hearings. Is not that language used?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Congress can pass the Taft-Hartley law and then proceed shortly thereafter to repeal it or amend it, it seems to me that the committee, within its less confined authority, could change the date of the 10th either forward or backward. In that connection it could do anything it desired to do if it were supported by the majority of the committee.

So all this talk to the effect that the end of the world is coming on the 10th of February, and that if dire circumstances intervene to make it seem desirable the hearings cannot be prolonged for a week or a month, is just so much surplusage.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. We have got into such a maze of details that I think it should be pointed out to the Senate that we did not say February 10, 1949. So we can find a date which will be satisfactory to everyone when the time comes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I think it has been most fortunate that we have had this debate this afternoon, because we are now 1 day in advance of schedule so far as hearings on the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law are concerned. I compliment the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for setting a time limit on the hearings.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. LUCAS. No; I decline to yield at the moment. The Senator from Missouri has had a long day. After having heard the Senator from Missouri cross-examine the Senator from Utah, I am convinced that I shall be more strongly than ever in favor of eliminating filibusters.

Mr. President, I have heard my distinguished colleagues on the other side of the aisle grow rather vehement in attempting to convey to the public of America the idea that someone is going to be seriously injured because of the action of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in deciding that these hearings should be concluded by February 10.

If there is any one thing that the Congress of the United States needs in connection with hearings before committees, it is expedition and dispatch. If there is any one thing for which the Congress of the United States is consistently and properly criticized, it is the conducting of protracted hearings upon a subject with which every member of the committee is wholly familiar from beginning to end.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Does it not occur to the Senator from Illinois that it is rather ridiculous for some Members of this body to insist that the rule of cloture be reenforced so that debate can be brought to a close, and then, with just the opposite purpose, find fault with a situation in the committee which is considering this bill?

Mr. LUCAS. It is wholly inconsistent.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. LUCAS. I decline to yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I understood, Mr. President——

Mr. LUCAS. No, Mr. President; I decline to yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois declines to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if there is any one thing needed in the Congress of the United States, it is the expedition of hearings, so that the findings of a committee, in the nature of a report, can be brought to the floor of the Senate and the Senate may take action before the last week of the session. How many times has the distinguished Vice President sat in the seat I now occupy during the closing days of a session, when a great deal of pending legislation was piled high on the table before us, when we had to consider one bill after another, and yet not one Senator among 15 knew anything about the merits or demerits of the bills. At such times, Mr. President, we have had all-day sessions and all-night sessions, sessions beginning at 11 o'clock in the morning and continuing to midnight and on into the morning hours. However, Senators on the Republican side of the aisle now talk about attempts to cram something down the throat of the Congress, because of an attempt to expedite these hearings. Mr. President, everyone remembers last summer, the chaos and turmoil when we finally concluded our general session, with respect to the log jam of legislation which was here upon this desk. If I can do a single thing, as majority leader of the Senate, to expedite the hearings before our committees, I shall do so, the Senator from Oregon to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Illinois will recall very well that on the last day of the session, when our friends on the other side of the aisle were in control, the eminent and able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] virtually wrote the farm bill—with no hearings on it at all—with a pair of scissors, right there at the clerk's desk.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, to permit me to reply to such a ridiculous statement?

Mr. LUCAS. I am delighted to yield to my good friend the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I had nothing to do with writing the farm bill at any time. The farm bill was considered at length in the Committee on Agriculture. It was approved by both the Democratic and Republican members of the committee, and then came to the Senate.

The only thing we did the last night was to agree with the House of Representatives that we would not put it into effect until 1950. That was the only change made the last night. However, I had very little to do with that, although I was glad to make that concession to the House of Representatives and go along with the members of the Agricultural Committee, who were really completely in charge of the bill. That is all I had to do with the farm bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, let me say that it was the housing bill that the Senator from Ohio had at the desk and operated on with a pair of scissors. I remember very well seeing the eminent Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] with a pair of scissors clipping out the paragraphs and pasting them together—with no hearings at all, but asking the country to accept a bill written in that way, and carrying with it several millions of dollars of expense.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, in order to make the record clear, although the Senator from Maryland did correct himself, and subsequently said that it was the housing bill that he had reference to, nevertheless I wish to state that the Senate Committee on Agriculture held hearings all during the fall and summer of 1947, in preparation of the material which was written into the farm bill; and the Department of Agriculture had the farm bill before it time after time, and made recommendations to the committee as to what should be incorporated into the bill. That is how the farm bill was written. I wish to be sure the record is straightened out in that connection.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. It was the housing bill that I should have referred to originally. However, inasmuch as the farm bill has come up for discussion, let me say that it was passed on the last night of the session, I understand, after a very important telephone call from Philadelphia, whence word came, not from Senators, nor Members of the House of Representatives, that "If we do not have a farm bill to go before the country with in the next election, we might as well stay home."

Well, Mr. President, they were partly right, even without the farm bill. [Laughter.]

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. I dislike to be discourteous to my colleagues, Mr. President, so I yield once more. However, I do not care to say very much more about this matter.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I was on the conference committee, and I conferred closely with all the other members of the conference committee that last evening, and I know all that took place there. I wish to say to the able Senator from Maryland that so far as I was concerned, I was not "in" on the telephone conversation, if there was one.

Mr. LUCAS. That is understandable, inasmuch as the Senator is from Minnesota. [Laughter.]

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I only wish to say, in regard to the housing bill, that elaborate hearings were held on that bill over a long period of time. As the Senator knows, the trouble arose because of the difficulty in getting the House of Representatives to agree to various provisions and in enacting a bill at all. But so far as I know, we wrote in no provisions at

the last moment; and so far as I can recollect, every provision was given serious consideration by the committee.

As the Senator knows, at the last moment, in conferences between the House of Representatives and the Senate to try to eliminate differences, one does have to make concessions and does have to eliminate things which one would like to see included in the measure.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Illinois will further yield, let me say that is all very well, but my point is that we had 10 minutes of consideration of a conglomerated bill, and then passed that bill, on which no hearings were held.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I decline to yield further.

I wish to read for a moment what the Reorganization Act says in regard to the adjournment of the Congress. Every Senator knows this. Section 132 of the Reorganization Act is as follows:

> Except in time of war or during a national emergency proclaimed by the President, the two Houses shall adjourn sine die not later than the last day (Sundays excepted) in the month of July in each year unless otherwise provided by the Congress.

That is exactly what we have to do if we comply with the Reorganization Act. In view of all the legislation that is bound to come before the Congress, I ask now, from the floor of the Senate, each and every committee—not only the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, but every other committee—to do everything within its power to expedite its hearings; and if any Senator should object to having a Senate committee sit while the Senate itself is in session—which any Senator has a perfect right to do, of course—it is better now for the committees to work at night, rather than for the Senate of the United States to work day and night during the last 2 weeks of the session, for under those circumstances Senators will not know, half the time, what they are doing regarding important controversial issues and amendments which appear before the Members of the Senate for their determination.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. No, I cannot yield at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois declines to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not wish to be discourteous to my friend the Senator from California, but I should like to finish what I have to say. I shall be through in just a moment.

Mr. President, there is not a single member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, even including the new members on the Democratic side, who would need to take longer time to consider what legislation amendatory of the Wagner Act is needed. Of course, so far as the present minority is concerned, all of the former members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare still serve on that committee. In view of all the hearings the committee has held and all the information it has, how can anyone say that the committee must take more time to consider what must be done with respect to legislation amendatory of the Wagner Act?

I do not say the matter we have been discussing is the only matter they will consider. I am not in control of that committee, Mr. President. As the Senator from Ohio said a moment ago, in the case of some portion of the Taft-Hartley law as to which there is no question at all or no controversy as between labor and management—for instance, some portion of it that has worked effectively—of course it must be obvious to all that amendments based on such important matters would be given consideration.

But the Presidential proposals are the basic things they are going to consider; and so far as the majority are concerned they are not going to be led astray by any long, dilatory tactics, attempting to defeat by that method what ought to be done with respect to the platform pledge that the Democrats made in their Philadelphia convention. I want to congratulate again the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, so far as the Democrats are concerned, in doing exactly what they have done, because it means expedition, it means dispatch, it means that the Senate will have a better opportunity on the floor of debating the issue, by bringing it to the floor as soon as that can possibly be done, rather than waiting until the dying days of the eighty-first session.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, apropos of the remarks recently made by the able majority leader, the Senator from Illinois, I want to take this opportunity of commending him on urging at least reasonable dispatch of the public's business. I may say for the information of the majority leader, though no doubt he has been adequately informed already, that we are very hopeful the Committee on Rules, of which the able Senator from Arizona is chairman, will be able to terminate its hearings tomorrow on the cloture rule amendment, and will have it up on the floor of the Senate. I hope we may have the full cooperation of the able majority leader to expedite consideration of the cloture amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad the Senator brings up that question. I made the sweeping statement a moment ago with reference to the chairmen of all committees that I hope every committee will attempt to bring legislation that is acted upon favorably to the floor of the Senate as soon as possible.

I know how very much interested the able Senator from California has been in attempting to report an amendment to the cloture rule from the Committee on Rules and Administration. I have been following the subject in the newspapers, and I have seen the Senator from California make the headlines almost every day in demanding action, morning, afternoon, and night, and insisting that they bring something before the Senate. I wish the Senator had been as insistent on that position 2 years ago as he is now. He is a member of the committee, and as I recall the records show the committee after holding hearings on January 28, February 4, 11, and 18, finally on April 3, 1947, reported a resolution which was the same in character as the one now being considered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the able Senator from Illinois that I am perfectly willing to let the record speak for itself. The Senator from California, ever since he came to the Senate, and after he had an opportunity to observe the obstructionist tactics which can take place through the use of the filibuster, has consistently supported an amendment to the cloture rule of the Senate, and has been endeavoring to have it adopted just as rapidly as it could be done with the parliamentary situation facing us. I am willing to let the record speak for itself.

Mr. LUCAS. I think the Senator is probably correct, but he has never shown as much enthusiasm for it as he shows now. And I wonder why? The only Senator on his side of the aisle who ever demonstrated real enthusiasm, so far as I could find from the record, was the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. The Senator well knows that the rule which was reported by his committee in April 1947, 2 years ago, remained for 15 months on the calendar without the Senator from California ever raising his voice once to try to bring up the rule for debate before the Senate. Am I not correct about that?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the able Senator from Illinois that he is not correct in his statement. In the first place, let me remind the Senator from Illinois that the Senator from California proposed an amendment to the rules early in the session of the Eightieth Congress, and asked for early committee hearings. He did everything he could to secure action on the amendment we then had pending before the Senate, calling for majority cloture, a majority of the full membership of the Senate. The amendment was not reported favorably by the committee. A substitute amendment was brought to the floor of the Senate. At that time some of the Democratic members of the committee had indicated to the committee that if the more moderate resolution were reported, they thought there would be an opportunity of getting the support of Senators on their side of the aisle. So far as the Senator from California could discover, during that entire period of time, what he had at least hoped would be an indication of support never materialized.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not care anything about what the Senator believes about the support he was to receive from this side. The only thing I am talking about, I repeat, is that the Senator from California for some very unusual, peculiar reason, becomes overly excited about having brought to the floor the resolution now pending before the Committee on Rules and Administration. The Senator has been in the newspapers every day. He is demanding of the chairman of the Rules and Administration Committee

that hearings be held, morning, afternoon, and night. The Senator wants action. The Senator never showed such enthusiasm before. That is all right; I am not objecting to it. The only thing I am saying to the Senator from California is that today he is exhibiting for a cloture amendment an enthusiasm which he did not demonstrate 2 years ago, notwithstanding the fact that he was for it.

I do not want to be misunderstood upon this proposition, Mr. President. I hope and I know that the committee will act on this matter soon, and report it to the Senate, but I cannot control the actions of the committee. The Senator is on that committee, and he has something to do with it. When the committee reports the resolution, that will be the time to talk about it. But I am sure that if the Senator will just keep prodding he will finally get it to the floor of the Senate even though his position today is wholly inconsistent with his position when the Republicans were in power.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the able Senator from Illinois on that score that Members of the Senate, as do individuals elsewhere in the world, I think, learn a great deal through experience. The Senator from California in the 3 years he has been privileged to serve as a Member of this body has certainly learned that unless an amendment to the rules of this nature is brought before the Senate of the United States in the early days of the session, there is no opportunity of obtaining consideration for it. If the Senator from California seems to be a little aggressive along these lines, I can assure the Senator from Illinois that it is because of the experience I have gained in this honorable body, that action should be taken early in the session, and unless those who are advocating it are merely giving it lip service, they should join in getting early consideration by the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not think the Republican Party is fooling the country by the tremendous enthusiasm which some of its members are showing, because there was a proposed amendment to the cloture rule on the calendar for 15 months in the past 2 years, and I do not recall that the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee ever stood on the floor of the Senate and made a motion to have it considered so that some action could be taken with reference to it. That is the only point I am making. I do not want the Senators to become too discouraged about the matter. Do not push us and shove us too much, because I do not think the Senators are in a proper position to do that.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from Illinois that I support the statement of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. The proposed change in the rule was placed on the calendar in February 1947, early in the session, but at no time after that could there be any assurance of an opportunity to consider the question without a lengthy debate, two or three weeks or a month, because at all times other matters came forward which had to be acted on for the best interests of the country. The most persistent Senator that I know of, because it was my measure that was on the calendar, and he was constantly talking about it, was the Senator from California.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it is wonderful to see Massachusetts and California together.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 88) extending the time for free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 88) extending the time for free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

AUTHORIZATION FOR VICE PRESIDENT TO SIGN ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, not withstanding the adjournment of the Senate today, the Vice President be authorized to sign the enrolled House Joint Resolution 112 making an additional appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes. I understand that the joint resolution has been passed by the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMUTATION OF SENTENCES IN MALMEDY CASE

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, in a news article released, apparently, on January 6, and which appeared in the New York Times, it was announced that an Army commission, headed by Justice Gordon Simpson, of the Texas Supreme Court, recommended that death sentences be commuted to life imprisonment or less for 29 convicted Nazi war criminals, 12 of whom had taken part in the "Malmedy massacre" of American prisoners in 1944.

Under date of January 17 there appeared an article in Time magazine which is headed "War crimes," from which I should like to quote very briefly. The subheading of the article is "Clemency." I read as follows:

> The Malmedy massacre of captured United States soldiers, during the Battle of the Bulge in December 1944, was one of the most vicious atrocities committed by Germans in combat, during the war. By the testimony of one survivor (who escaped by feigning death after he was shot in the foot), some 160 United States soldiers were lined up in a snow-covered field, 8 deep and 20 abreast, and raked by machine-gun fire for 3 minutes.
>
> The survivor heard the "agonized screams" of wounded and dying comrades, and single pistol shots—coups de grace administered by Germans who walked among the fallen victims after the machine-gunning stopped.
>
> After war's end, the Germans responsible for the massacre fell into Allied hands. Among them were two S. S. big wigs, Gen. Josef ("Sepp") Dietrich, commander of the Sixth Armored Division, and Col. Joachim Peiper, of the 1st Armored Regiment (known as "Peiper's Task Force").

The article goes on to say that the matter was brought up for investigation and that, as a result of an investigation, the commutations of sentence were granted.

I was interested in the matter, Mr. President, because one of the men who took part in the prosecutions and in securing evidence for the prosecutions of the Germans who committed this most heinous offense is a young man in the State of Connecticut. I have known him for a long time. He was admitted to the bar in Connecticut and went into the Army as an enlisted man in the last war. He finally rose to the rank of an officer and was assigned to the Judge Advocate General's department and saw a great deal of overseas service. A part of his duty overseas was to work in the preparation of cases having to do with the prosecution of the Germans who perpetrated the Malmedy massacre.

The article from which I have quoted goes on to explain that the reason why the sentences were commuted, apparently, is because of the methods used by the prosecuting investigators and officers in securing confessions from the Germans who had taken part in this vicious massacre of unarmed troops who had surrendered and were entitled to be treated as prisoners of war under all the rules which have been in force for many years governing the conduct of warfare. The implication is that this young man used improper, illegal, and vicious methods to secure the testimony and handle the prosecutions.

Under date of July 13, 1948, this young man wrote me a letter from which I shall quote briefly. He says:

> There were 74 who were tried in this case—
>
> Meaning the case involving the Malmedy massacre—
>
> including the commanding general of the Sixth SS Panzer Army, Lt. Gen. "Sepp" Dietrich, and most of the subordinate commanders who were responsible for these atrocities against American prisoners of war and Belgian civilians. It is my recollection that there was only one acquittal. There were over 40 of the accused who were sentenced to be hanged. Quite a few were sentenced to life imprisonment. Some of those more remote in the chain of command were sentenced to relatively short terms.

I may say, Mr. President, it developed in the investigation of the matter that these commanding officers had been given orders by the German high command, and they had passed those orders down to their troops, that in this Battle of the Bulge not one single prisoner, military or civilian, was to be taken; that they were to be shot down ruthlessly, whether or not they offered to surrender, or whether they had surrendered.

Then the writer of the letter goes on to say:

> The trial took place two years ago. The officer who was appointed to defend the accused, a Colonel Everett, has been gaining a considerable amount of publicity through his efforts to discredit the investigation, prosecution, and trial of these murderers.

> He has been assisted in this endeavor by German lawyers retained by certain of the individual defendants who were wealthy enough or had connections in Germany influential enough, to procure and pay for their services. Their efforts in this regard culminated in the recent appeal of these convictions to the United States Supreme Court on the grounds that the trial court committed error in admitting into evidence confessions which it was claimed were improperly obtained. These confessions were the basis of most of the convictions.

I should like to say here, Mr. President, that this young man has already prepared affidavits under oath, as have many others who were concerned with the prosecution, denying any improper, unfair, or vicious tactics in securing the confessions.

I read further from the letter:

> The prosecution proved that orders were given by the commanding general of the German Army, which spearheaded this last desperate offensive and transmitted and elaborated upon by subordinate commanders, to the effect that prisoners of war would not be taken and that civilians would be given no quarter. It was also shown that subordinate commanders down to the last noncom transmitted these orders with their own embellishments and propaganda in order to incite their men to carry them out ruthlessly. The prosecution also showed that these orders resulted in the mass shooting of American prisoners of war and Belgian civilians. It was proved in this connection that in addition to the hundred or more American prisoners of war who were murdered at the crossroads in Malmedy, there were over 500 other American prisoners of war and Belgian civilians who were similarly dealt with by these fanatics.

Mr. President, when I received that letter I took the matter up with the Secretary of the Army, who assured me that it would be investigated. The Judge Simpson Commission had already been appointed and was in the process of looking into the case.

Meanwhile, this application for a writ of habeas corpus had been filed in the Supreme Court of the United States, accompanied by an affidavit setting forth what this young friend of mine tells me are utterly groundless charges as to the manner in which these confessions were procured. As a result of that the Secretary of War appointed another separate group to look specifically into the Malmedy situation.

Mr. President, what I ask for on behalf of these young officers, these Americans who had done the job of investigating the Malmedy massacre, and of preparing the prosecution and conducting the trials—and all that they asked me to urge in their behalf—is an opportunity to be heard before any final decisions are made in the reduction of these sentences. So far as I know some affidavits they sent were sent to the Simpson committee. Whether that committee paid any attention to them or not I do not know. I assume it did. But I do not believe that the commission which was specifically appointed to investigate the Malmedy phase of these prosecutions ever had opportunity to examine these affidavits. If it did, that commission and no other commission has ever had the opportunity personally to hear the testimony of these young officers, who have been charged, without an opportunity on their part to defend themselves, with conducting themselves in a vicious and highly improper manner.

Yet, Mr. President, as I understand, Colonel Everett who defended the Germans, and Mr. Lear, who I understand is a German lawyer, had on opportunity personally to appear before the commission and present their side of the case.

Mr. President, these men were in the performance of their duty, they were dealing with one war crime, which is the one in which our nationals were involved, our own soldiers, our own boys in uniform, men who now lie beneath the sod in France and Belgium, and have no one to speak in their behalf.

I think this matter should be thoroughly investigated. I should like to see a real survey and study made of the whole conduct of this situation. If these Germans were not fairly treated, if they were not treated as the fair conduct of war, according to its rules, requires, they are, of course, entitled to consideration. But in determining whether they were fairly treated or not the men who had charge of investigating their conduct, the men who had charge of prosecuting them, should themselves have an opportunity to appear and be heard in person to answer the charges, which I believe to be groundless, which were made against them in behalf of these convicted German war criminals.

So, Mr. President, if I may, I should like to secure unanimous consent to offer a resolution calling for such an investigation, and have it received and referred.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to advise the Senator that a similar resolution was submitted this morning. I offered one providing as follows:

> That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the administration of military justice by courts operated by the armed forces of the United States in occupied areas, with a view to ascertaining (1) whether the conduct of trials and the treatment of prisoners in cases involving civilians (both citizen and noncitizen) as well as cases involving military personnel have been in accordance with American concepts of justice, and (2) whether any legislation is necessary or desirable for the purpose of improving the operations of such courts. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations.

I might add that there is another side to what the distinguished Senator from Connecticut has said. The situation is that when I submitted the resolution I had a statement printed with it. I am not sure the distinguished Senator was present at the time. I presented this statement to be included with the resolution:

> The purpose of this resolution is to provide for an inquiry into the type of justice which is being administered by our forces overseas. There are now more than 160,000,000 people outside the United States and its territories who are liable to some sort of prosecution trial and punishment under the American flag.
>
> These people may be tried and are tried on charges of war crimes, crimes against humanity, and crimes against the occupation forces. All of these charges, in case of conviction, incur heavy penalties.
>
> Yet these courts and courts' systems are not subordinate, or have not been so far subordinate to any regularly established court of the United States. The theater commander in practice has the last word.
>
> As one might expect in a system so far removed from popular constitution and control many abuses have crept in. These abuses have been compounded by the hybrid rules of procedure. They combine American, Continental, and Russian rules. As a result their rulings are a far cry from what would be demanded by American standards.
>
> One of the most glaring abuses now exists in Germany. At the American Military Government Court at Dachau 1,672 persons were tried as of August 12, 1948, at the time of the latest figures reported by the Department of the Army, 1,416 had been convicted. Two hundred and ninety-seven death sentences were approved. Of these, according to subsequent newspaper reports, 217 have been executed. There remain 39 defendants still under death sentences.
>
> (The Department of the Army reports only 29 and this number has been reduced to 14 by various commutations.)
>
> This sounds like a record of justice done to the criminal members of a criminal conspiracy. But in fact it may well turn out to be, upon investigation, one of the most deplorable miscarriage of justice in history.

The distinguished Senator mentioned the Secretary of War, Kenneth Royall. Mr. Royall appointed a 2-man civilian board a long time ago, they made a survey of the trials at the request of Secretary Royall, and returned to the United States recently and reported. What did they report? These two men appointed by the Secretary of War said that the following methods were used to force confessions: Beatings and brutal kickings; knocking out teeth and breaking jaws; mock trials; solitary confinement; torture with burning splinters; posturing as priests; very limited rations; spiritual deprivation; promises of acquittal.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. LANGER. Just a moment. I do not know whether or not these statements are true.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota does not have the floor. The Senator from Connecticut has the floor. He yielded to the Senator from North Dakota. This whole proceeding is out of order unless it be regarded as being conducted by unanimous consent. The Senator can yield for a question, but not for a speech.

Mr. BALDWIN. I asked unanimous consent that I might submit the resolution, and the Senator from North Dakota is making a speech.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota reserved the right to object to the submission of the resolution.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under his reservation, I suppose he is entitled to proceed. The Senator from Connecticut still has the floor.

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the Chair.

that hearings be held, morning, afternoon, and night. The Senator wants action. The Senator never showed such enthusiasm before. That is all right; I am not objecting to it. The only thing I am saying to the Senator from California is that today he is exhibiting for a cloture amendment an enthusiasm which he did not demonstrate 2 years ago, notwithstanding the fact that he was for it.

I do not want to be misunderstood upon this proposition, Mr. President. I hope and I know that the committee will act on this matter soon, and report it to the Senate, but I cannot control the actions of the committee. The Senator is on that committee, and he has something to do with it. When the committee reports the resolution, that will be the time to talk about it. But I am sure that if the Senator will just keep prodding he will finally get it to the floor of the Senate even though his position today is wholly inconsistent with his position when the Republicans were in power.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the able Senator from Illinois on that score that Members of the Senate, as do individuals elsewhere in the world, I think, learn a great deal through experience. The Senator from California in the 3 years he has been privileged to serve as a Member of this body has certainly learned that unless an amendment to the rules of this nature is brought before the Senate of the United States in the early days of the session, there is no opportunity of obtaining consideration for it. If the Senator from California seems to be a little aggressive along these lines, I can assure the Senator from Illinois that it is because of the experience I have gained in this honorable body, that action should be taken early in the session, and unless those who are advocating it are merely giving it lip service, they should join in getting early consideration by the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not think the Republican Party is fooling the country by the tremendous enthusiasm which some of its members are showing, because there was a proposed amendment to the cloture rule on the calendar for 15 months in the past 2 years, and I do not recall that the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee ever stood on the floor of the Senate and made a motion to have it considered so that some action could be taken with reference to it. That is the only point I am making. I do not want the Senators to become too discouraged about the matter. Do not push us and shove us too much, because I do not think the Senators are in a proper position to do that.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from Illinois that I support the statement of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. The proposed change in the rule was placed on the calendar in February 1947, early in the session, but at no time after that could there be any assurance of an opportunity to consider the question without a lengthy debate, two or three weeks or a month, because at all times other matters came forward which had to be acted on for the best interests of the country. The most persistent Senator that I know of, because it was my measure that was on the calendar, and he was constantly talking about it, was the Senator from California.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it is wonderful to see Massachusetts and California together.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 88) extending the time for free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 88) extending the time for free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

AUTHORIZATION FOR VICE PRESIDENT TO SIGN ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, not withstanding the adjournment of the Senate today, the Vice President be authorized to sign the enrolled House Joint Resolution 112 making an additional appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes. I understand that the joint resolution has been passed by the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMUTATION OF SENTENCES IN MALMEDY CASE

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, in a news article released, apparently, on January 6, and which appeared in the New York Times, it was announced that an Army commission, headed by Justice Gordon Simpson, of the Texas Supreme Court, recommended that death sentences be commuted to life imprisonment or less for 29 convicted Nazi war criminals, 12 of whom had taken part in the "Malmedy massacre" of American prisoners in 1944.

Under date of January 17 there appeared an article in Time magazine which is headed "War crimes," from which I should like to quote very briefly. The subheading of the article is "Clemency." I read as follows:

The Malmedy massacre of captured United States soldiers, during the Battle of the Bulge in December 1944, was one of the most vicious atrocities committed by Germans in combat during the war. By the testimony of one survivor (who escaped by feigning death after he was shot in the foot), some 160 United States soldiers were lined up in a snow-covered field, 8 deep and 20 abreast, and raked by machine-gun fire for 3 minutes.

The survivor heard the "agonized screams" of wounded and dying comrades, and single pistol shots—coups de grace administered by Germans who walked among the fallen victims after the machine-gunning stopped.

After war's end, the Germans responsible for the massacre fell into Allied hands. Among them were two S. S. big wigs, Gen. Josef ("Sepp") Dietrich, commander of the Sixth Armored Division, and Col. Joachim Peiper, of the 1st Armored Regiment (known as "Peiper's Task Force").

The article goes on to say that the matter was brought up for investigation and that, as a result of an investigation, the commutations of sentence were granted.

I was interested in the matter, Mr. President, because one of the men who took part in the prosecutions and in securing evidence for the prosecutions of the Germans who committed this most heinous offense is a young man in the State of Connecticut. I have known him for a long time. He was admitted to the bar in Connecticut and went into the Army as an enlisted man in the last war. He finally rose to the rank of an officer and was assigned to the Judge Advocate General's department and saw a great deal of overseas service. A part of his duty overseas was to work in the preparation of cases having to do with the prosecution of the Germans who perpetrated the Malmedy massacre.

The article from which I have quoted goes on to explain that the reason why the sentences were commuted, apparently, is because of the methods used by the prosecuting investigators and officers in securing confessions from the Germans who had taken part in this vicious massacre of unarmed troops who had surrendered and were entitled to be treated as prisoners of war under all the rules which have been in force for many years governing the conduct of warfare. The implication is that this young man used improper, illegal, and vicious methods to secure the testimony and handle the prosecutions.

Under date of July 13, 1948, this young man wrote me a letter from which I shall quote briefly. He says:

There were 74 who were tried in this case—

Meaning the case involving the Malmedy massacre—

including the commanding general of the Sixth SS Panzer Army, Lt. Gen. "Sepp" Dietrich, and most of the subordinate commanders who were responsible for these atrocities against American prisoners of war and Belgian civilians. It is my recollection that there was only one acquittal. There were over 40 of the accused who were sentenced to be hanged. Quite a few were sentenced to life imprisonment. Some of those more remote in the chain of command were sentenced to relatively short terms.

I may say, Mr. President, it developed in the investigation of the matter that these commanding officers had been given orders by the German high command, and they had passed those orders down to their troops, that in this Battle of the Bulge not one single prisoner, military or civilian, was to be taken; that they were to be shot down ruthlessly, whether or not they offered to surrender, or whether they had surrendered.

Then the writer of the letter goes on to say:

The trial took place two years ago. The officer who was appointed to defend the accused, a Colonel Everett, has been gaining a considerable amount of publicity through his efforts to discredit the investigation, prosecution, and trial of these murderers.

He has been assisted in this endeavor by German lawyers retained by certain of the individual defendants who were wealthy enough or had connections in Germany influential enough, to procure and pay for their services. Their efforts in this regard culminated in the recent appeal of these convictions to the United States Supreme Court on the grounds that the trial court committed error in admitting into evidence confessions which it was claimed were improperly obtained. These confessions were the basis of most of the convictions.

I should like to say here, Mr. President, that this young man has already prepared affidavits under oath, as have many others who were concerned with the prosecution, denying any improper, unfair, or vicious tactics in securing the confessions.

I read further from the letter:

The prosecution proved that orders were given by the commanding general of the German Army, which spearheaded this last desperate offensive and transmitted and elaborated upon by subordinate commanders, to the effect that prisoners of war would not be taken and that civilians would be given no quarter. It was also shown that subordinate commanders down to the last noncom transmitted these orders with their own embellishments and propaganda in order to incite their men to carry them out ruthlessly. The prosecution also showed that these orders resulted in the mass shooting of American prisoners of war and Belgian civilians. It was proved in this connection that in addition to the hundred or more American prisoners of war who were murdered at the crossroads in Malmedy, there were over 500 other American prisoners of war and Belgian civilians who were similarly dealt with by these fanatics.

Mr. President, when I received that letter I took the matter up with the Secretary of the Army, who assured me that it would be investigated. The Judge Simpson Commission had already been appointed and was in the process of looking into the case.

Meanwhile, this application for a writ of habeas corpus had been filed in the Supreme Court of the United States, accompanied by an affidavit setting forth what this young friend of mine tells me are utterly groundless charges as to the manner in which these confessions were procured. As a result of that the Secretary of War appointed another separate group to look specifically into the Malmedy situation.

Mr. President, what I ask for on behalf of these young officers, these Americans who had done the job of investigating the Malmedy massacre, and of preparing the prosecution and conducting the trials—and all that they asked me to urge in their behalf—is an opportunity to be heard before any final decisions are made in the reduction of these sentences. So far as I know some affidavits they sent were sent to the Simpson committee. Whether that committee paid any attention to them or not I do not know. I assume it did. But I do not believe that the commission which was specifically appointed to investigate the Malmedy phase of these prosecutions ever had opportunity to examine these affidavits. If it did, that commission and no other commission has ever had the opportunity personally to hear the testimony of these young officers, who have been charged, without an opportunity on their part to defend themselves, with conducting themselves in a vicious and highly improper manner.

Yet, Mr. President, as I understand, Colonel Everett who defended the Germans, and Mr. Lear, who I understand is a German lawyer, had on opportunity personally to appear before the commission and present their side of the case.

Mr. President, these men were in the performance of their duty, they were dealing with one war crime, which is the one in which our nationals were involved, our own soldiers, our own boys in uniform, men who now lie beneath the sod in France and Belgium, and have no one to speak in their behalf.

I think this matter should be thoroughly investigated. I should like to see a real survey and study made of the whole conduct of this situation. If these Germans were not fairly treated, if they were not treated as the fair conduct of war, according to its rules, requires, they are, of course, entitled to consideration. But in determining whether they were fairly treated or not the men who had charge of investigating their conduct, the men who had charge of prosecuting them, should themselves have an opportunity to appear and be heard in person to answer the charges, which I believe to be groundless, which were made against them in behalf of these convicted German war criminals.

So, Mr. President, if I may, I should like to secure unanimous consent to offer a resolution calling for such an investigation, and have it received and referred.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to advise the Senator that a similar resolution was submitted this morning. I offered one providing as follows:

That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the administration of military justice by courts operated by the armed forces of the United States in occupied areas, with a view to ascertaining (1) whether the conduct of trials and the treatment of prisoners in cases involving civilians (both citizen and noncitizen) as well as cases involving military personnel have been in accordance with American concepts of justice, and (2) whether any legislation is necessary or desirable for the purpose of improving the operations of such courts. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations.

I might add that there is another side to what the distinguished Senator from Connecticut has said. The situation is that when I submitted the resolution I had a statement printed with it. I am not sure the distinguished Senator was present at the time. I presented this statement to be included with the resolution:

The purpose of this resolution is to provide for an inquiry into the type of justice which is being administered by our forces overseas. There are now more than 100,000,000 people outside the United States and its territories who are liable to some sort of prosecution trial and punishment under the American flag.

These people may be tried and are tried on charges of war crimes, crimes against humanity, and crimes against the occupation forces. All of these charges, in case of conviction, incur heavy penalties.

Yet these courts and courts' systems are not subordinate, or have not been so far subordinate to any regularly established court of the United States. The theater commander in practice has the last word.

As one might expect in a system so far removed from popular constitution and control many abuses have crept in. These abuses have been compounded by the hybrid rules of procedure. They combine American, Continental, and Russian rules. As a result their rulings are a far cry from what would be demanded by American standards.

One of the most glaring abuses now exists in Germany. At the American Military Government Court at Dachau 1,672 persons were tried as of August 12, 1948, at the time of the latest figures reported by the Department of the Army, 1,416 had been convicted. Two hundred and ninety-seven death sentences were approved. Of these, according to subsequent newspaper reports, 217 have been executed. There remain 39 defendants still under death sentences.

(The Department of the Army reports only 29 and this number has been reduced to 14 by various commutations.)

This sounds like a record of justice done to the criminal members of a criminal conspiracy. But in fact it may well turn out to be, upon investigation, one of the most deplorable miscarriage of justice in history.

The distinguished Senator mentioned the Secretary of War, Kenneth Royall. Mr. Royall appointed a 2-man civilian board a long time ago, they made a survey of the trials at the request of Secretary Royall, and returned to the United States recently and reported. What did they report? These two men appointed by the Secretary of War said that the following methods were used to force confessions: Beatings and brutal kickings; knocking out teeth and breaking jaws; mock trials; solitary confinement; torture with burning splinters; posturing as priests; very limited rations; spiritual deprivation; promises of acquittal.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. LANGER. Just a moment. I do not know whether or not these statements are true.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota does not have the floor. The Senator from Connecticut has the floor. He yielded to the Senator from North Dakota. This whole proceeding is out of order unless it be regarded as being conducted by unanimous consent. The Senator can yield for a question, but not for a speech.

Mr. BALDWIN. I asked unanimous consent that I might submit the resolution, and the Senator from North Dakota is making a speech.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota reserved the right to object to the submission of the resolution.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under his reservation, I suppose he is entitled to proceed. The Senator from Connecticut still has the floor.

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. LANGER. I assumed, when I reserved the right to object, that I had a right to say why.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair holds that the Senator may do so, within a reasonable limit.

Mr. LANGER. I merely wish to get the matter clearly before the Senate, because I do not think the Senator from Connecticut was present this morning when I submitted the resolution.

Mr. BALDWIN. Will the Senator yield so that I may say a word?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. Charges are made against these young American officers who conducted the prosecution.

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. BALDWIN. I have not had an opportunity to make clear the purpose of my resolution. It is to give these men an opportunity to refute those charges, an opportunity they have never had. I submit that if they are to be charged in the public press, and in a magazine as important and as widely read as Time, with such heinous offenses, they should have opportunity to appear before the Commission in person and have their side of the matter told.

I say, Mr. President, that so far as my knowledge of this young man, who denies these things, is concerned, I know him to be a young man of the highest integrity, whose word is unimpeachable. In my humble judgment he has never had his day in court to answer these particular charges.

Mr. LANGER. The purpose of the resolution submitted today is to give such men an opportunity to answer such charges. That is the very purpose of the resolution. It is simply a duplication of the other resolution, and I thought I would call it to the attention of the senior Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. I may say to the Senator from North Dakota that I am happy to have his collaboration in this matter, because if our troops use improper methods to secure convictions, I as an American citizen should like to know what they are, because I think it is important that we demonstrate to the world that in the administration of American justice we are fair, honest, and forthright. If the charges are not true, I should like to know that also, because I think these young officers are entitled to some consideration.

Mr. LANGER. I merely wanted to say that so far as these charges are concerned Judge E. LeRoy van Roden of Media, Pa., and Justice Gordon Simpson of the Supreme Court of Texas, who composed the board, recommended to Secretary Royall, after making these shocking discoveries, that a permanent clemency program be started for most of those convicted. They further recommended that 29 of those under death sentence be spared.

I wanted to mention the matter to the Senator so he might understand the purpose of the resolution I had submitted, and possibly we can combine our efforts in the matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota object to the submission of the resolution?

Mr. LANGER. I do not object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be received and properly referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 42) was received and referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Armed Services, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation of the action of the Army with respect to the trial of those persons responsible for the massacre of American soldiers which occurred during the Battle of the Bulge near Malmedy, Belgium, in December 1944, with particular reference to (1) the conduct of the investigation by the Army preliminary to the trial, (2) the conduct of the trial of the alleged perpetrators of the massacre, and (3) the action taken by Army officials subsequent to the trial, which has resulted in the commutations of the sentences of many of the defendants convicted at the trial.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CLOTURE RULE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in connection with the question of the amendment of the rules, some time ago a columnist made the statement that the rules were going to be amended because of what took place on the last night of the last session of Congress. He quoted particularly the speeches made by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] and the senior Senator from North Dakota. I want to state now that when the matter comes before the Senate again I expect to bring to the attention of the Senate just exactly what took place, so far as the senior Senator from North Dakota is concerned, upon that occasion.

Mr. President, I want to ask any Senator upon the floor if it is filibustering when a Senator rises on the floor respecting a matter so important as the drafting of our boys, after the Republican majority in the Eightieth Congress had for weeks and weeks adjourned the sessions of the Senate for a 3-day period, then for another 3-day period, then for a further 3-day period, and then still for another 3-day period, knowing all the while that the Philadelphia convention was going to take place in June.

Mr. President, 2 years before the junior Senator from California was a Member of this body I stood upon the floor of the Senate for 5 hours pleading that the draft law be not enacted. And yet when upon that occasion I asked the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] some questions, the RECORD shows that the Senator from California, then the majority leader temporarily, time after time proceeded to castigate the Senator from North Dakota and tell him what kind of questions he should ask.

I now ask the Senator from California or any other Senator whether it was filibustering when the Senator from North Dakota, or a Senator from any other State did what I did upon that occasion. I read upon the floor of the Senate letter after letter from the various churches of the State of North Dakota. I read letters from Methodist churches. Did they not have a right to protest? I read letters from Catholic churches. Did they not have a right to protest? I read letters from the Moravian church. Did its members not have a right to protest? I read letters from Baptist churches. Did they not have a right to protest? I read a letter from the Rotary Club of Devils Lake, N. Dak. Did not that club have a right to protest? I read letters from the Board of Higher Education of our State. Not one member of that board is a political friend of mine. The members of that board, representing every single institution of learning in North Dakota, unanimously adopted a resolution against the draft. I read that resolution upon the floor of the Senate. I resented then, and I resent now, the fact that the distinguished Senator from California rose on the floor of the Senate at the conclusion of my statement and said that Joe Stalin must be happy because the Senators had delayed fulfillment of action on the draft measure some few hours.

Mr. President, I am proud of the fact that I stood upon the floor of the Senate in opposition to that draft.

I read in a newspaper the other night that now a bipartisan group of Democrats and Republicans is getting a bill together which would repeal the draft. The article also said that what defeated the Republicans in the last election was the enactment of the draft.

Mr. President, when I spoke on that subject I did not speak in any political sense. Senators can go through my speech from one end to the other and they will find no political bias. There were no Bible quotations in it. I did not quote any poetry. I brought before the Senate the feelings of the various churches of the State of North Dakota, and of the Farmers Union and the various other farm organizations. That is a matter of record.

I want to say again that I resented the statements made at that time, and I continue to resent them. When the matter of change of the rules comes up in the Senate I am going to ascertain once for all whether there is going to be an attempt, by a change of the Senate rules, to keep a Senator from a small State from laying bare upon the floor of the Senate the feelings of the people of his State.

The late Senator Charles McNary said to me the very first time the question of cloture came up after I became a member, "I signed one cloture petition during the 22 years I have been here, and I never am going to sign another." He said "the only progressive legislation we have had was enacted because of the fact that Members of Congress who came from small States were able to get, perhaps not all they wanted, but were able to get a compromise. So, Mr. President, having made my position clear on that question, I wish to take up another matter.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. I had not intended to mention this matter, but inasmuch as the Senator from North Dakota has seen fit to bring it to the attention of the Senate, I might as well get my oar in here, inasmuch as I was the other party to the filibuster which seems to have caused so much discussion in the past few days.

One can call it a filibuster if he so desires. It lasted only overnight. I believe that the rules which it is planned to adopt would allow much greater discussion than that before the debate was called a filibuster.

The other day the press stated that the Senator from Oregon had intimated that the Senator from Idaho had endangered the national security by talking against the peacetime draft. I do not know why he did not include the Senator from North Dakota, because I am sure he was not ashamed of his part in fighting against the peacetime draft. I wish to say only that I hardly feel that it is endangering the national security when a Senator rises on the floor of the Senate and makes it plain, as I did at that time, that he has confidence in the patriotism of young Americans to serve their country without compulsion. I stated that if we were to increase the financial rewards attached to service in our armed forces we would get men without drafting them. I pointed out that it was a procedure absolutely foreign to all our traditions to have a peacetime draft. If that is endangering the national security, it is a strange definition. When it said that a Senator endangers the national security, the only inference that can be drawn, of course, is that that Senator is disloyal to his country. I certainly am not.

Mr. President, is it endangering the national security for a Senator to exercise foresight and to look ahead and evaluate the facts as they really are? At the time I stated that the peacetime draft was unnecessary.

I have before me an article from the Washington Post, in an Associated Press dispatch dated January 20. The heading is Figures Indicate That Draft Law Will Be Discarded. Did the Senator from North Dakota see that article?

Mr. LANGER. I saw it.

Mr. TAYLOR. It states that the armed forces have reached the goal set by President Truman of 1,616,000 men in uniform by June of 1950. They have already enlisted 1,621,000 men, more than were called for by 1950. So the use of the peacetime draft has been discontinued.

But, Mr. President, I notice that the military authorities do not say, "Let us get back to the good old American principles of voluntary service, get rid of involuntary service, and repeal the draft." No; they do not need it and they are not using it, but they intend to keep it. I disapprove of such a policy. If it is being disloyal to my country to want to see us continue in the paths set by our forefathers, being freemen and acting as freemen, then I shall have to say, like Patrick Henry, if that be treason or disloyalty, make the most of it.

Inasmuch as the peacetime draft is not being used, and apparently not needed, according to the admission of the military authorities, I have today introduced a bill to repeal the peacetime draft. Did I correctly understand the Senator from North Dakota to say that a bipartisan group of Senators was introducing such a measure?

Mr. LANGER. The other day the newspapers stated that a bipartisan group was introducing a bill to repeal the draft.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am glad to see that the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from Idaho now have allies who have come to realize that this is still a free country and should be kept that way.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator from Idaho imply that the Army has changed the rules, and that it now makes a man enlist for 3 years instead of 2?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes; I read today, I believe. They are making the men enlist for 3 years instead of 2. It seems that perhaps they want to revive the peacetime draft.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to say to the able Senator from North Dakota, who mentioned the fact that 2 or 3 years prior to my coming to the Senate he was also opposed to the draft, that that was during the time I was serving in the Army of the United States as an enlisted man and officer.

I invite the attention of the able Senator from North Dakota to the fact that if prior to the outbreak of World War II some of our colleagues had put the defenses of the country in proper order, there might be many young Americans living today who are now buried on the islands of the Pacific and in the cemeteries of Europe, and whose bodies are just now being returned home.

This gives me an opportunity to say to the able Senator from North Dakota that only the other day I wrote to the Department of the Air Force and asked the Department to supply me with a list of the names of young American soldiers who have died in supplying the air lift into Berlin, where a very cold war, which sometimes blows very hot, is even now going on. I want to say to the able Senator from North Dakota that I do not believe there is a man in this body who desires to have peace more than does the junior Senator from California. I do not believe that there is a person in the country who desires to have peace more than do the men who served in the armed services of the United States during the late war or during the First World War. But I do believe that the best way of preserving the peace of this country and the peace of the world is to keep America strong in the air, on the land, and on the sea, because in this age of the airplane and the atom, in which we now live, when there is a power loose in the world which recognizes nothing but force, we are not serving the cause of world peace and we are not serving the cause of the security of the Government of the United States and the free institutions which we have all taken an oath to uphold, by making America weak.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter from the Secretary of the Air Force giving a list of 26 American citizens, officers of the United States Air Force, who have given their lives in order to uphold world peace and international obligations.

There being no objection, the letter and list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, January 18, 1949.

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: Reference is made to a telephone conversation between Mr. Wilson of your office and a member of my staff, in which Mr. Wilson requested the names and addresses of personnel killed while performing duties on Operation Vittles.

Inclosed are the names and addresses of 26 personnel killed in Operation Vittles. This report is complete as of January 17, 1949.

If this directorate can be of any further assistance to you please do not hesitate to call upon us.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM T. SMITH,
Colonel, United States Air Force;
Executive, Directorate of Legislation and Liaison.

PERSONNEL KILLED ON OPERATION VITTLES, JULY 1948

Leland P. Williams, first lieutenant, AO-696203; killed, July 8, 1948; branch of service, United States Air Force. Next of kin: Mr. Otis Williams (father), 1229 South Sixth Street, Abilene, Tex. Mrs. Edith Williams (wife), 1229 South Sixth Street, Abilene, Tex. (wife in field).

George B. Smith, first lieutenant, AO-794711; killed, July 8, 1948; branch of service, United States Air Force. Next of kin: Mrs. Harriet W. G. Smith (wife), 87 Coverdale, Tuscaloosa, Ala.

Mr. Karl V. Hagen, DO79463; killed, July 8, 1948; branch of service, Department of the Army (civilian). Next of kin: Mrs. Yvonne F. Hagen (wife), 67 Pod Bielski, Allee, Berlin, Dahlem.

Charles H. King, first lieutenant, AO27801; killed, July 26, 1948; branch of service, United States Air Force. Next of kin: Mrs. Natalie R. King (wife), 230 Orient Way, Rutherford, N. J.

Robert W. Stuber, first lieutenant, AO56312; killed, July 26, 1948; branch of service, United States Air Force. Next of kin: Mrs. Maxine Stuber (wife), 137 West Malbern Avenue, Fullerton, Calif.

PERSONNEL KILLED ON OPERATION VITTLES, AUGUST 1948

Edwind C. Diltz, major, AO423920; killed, August 24, 1948. Next of kin: Mrs. Doris S. Diltz (wife), Fayetteville, Tex.

William R. Howard, captain, AO789573; killed, August 24, 1948. Next of kin: Mrs. Earlene C. Howard (mother), Gunnison, Miss. Mrs. Eleanor M. Howard (wife), 1615 North Patterson Street, Valdosta, Ga. (wife in field).

Joel M. DeVolentine, captain, AO53549; killed, August 24, 1948. Next of kin: Mrs. Edith E. DeVolentine (wife), 101 Northeast Forty-eighth Street, Miami, Fla. (wife in field). Mrs. Minnie DeVolentine (mother), 2326 Boulevard Drive, NE., Atlanta, Ga.

William T. Lucas, Jr., first lieutenant, AO715565; killed, August 24, 1948. Next of kin, Mrs. Sally B. Lucas (mother), 216 North Railroad, Wilson, N. C.

PERSONNEL KILLED ON OPERATION VITTLES, OCTOBER 1948

Johnnie T. Orms, private first class, RA37232718; killed, October 2, 1948; branch of service: Department of Army. Next of kin, Mrs. Gwendline V. Orms (wife), Mortimer's Lane, Foxton Near Rayton, Herts, England; Mrs. Nellie O. Orms (mother), 1106 Cedar Street, Coffeyville, Kans.

James A. Vaughan, captain, AO862309; killed, October 18, 1948; branch of service: USAF. Next of kin: Mrs. Helene M. Vaughan (wife), 82 Perkins Street, New Haven, Conn.

Eugene S. Erickson, first lieutenant, AO568053; killed, October 18, 1948; branch of service: USAF. Next of kin: Mrs. Margaret Erickson (wife), 1205 State Street, Collinsville, Ill.

Richard Winter, sergeant, AF39203365; killed, October 18, 1948; branch of service: USAF. Next of kin: Mr. and Mrs. Bert Winter, 1126 Twenty-third Avenue, Seattle, Wash.

PERSONNEL KILLED ON OPERATION VITTLES, DECEMBER 1948

Billy E. Phelps, captain, AO55141; killed, December 5, 1948. Next of kin: Mrs. Rubye Lee Phelps (wife), 3601 Gaviota Avenue, Long Beach, Calif.

Willy F. Hargis, first lieutenant, AO760457; killed, December 5, 1948. Next of kin: Mrs. Euzelia L. Hargis (mother), 112 Houston Street, Nacagdoches, Tex.

Lloyd George Wells, technical sergeant, AF-7060860; killed December 5, 1948. Next of kin: Mrs. Anna Lee Wells (wife), Route 467, North Kansas City, Kans.

Harry R. Crites, Jr., AD-3, 2945831; killed December 11, 1948; branch of service, Department of Navy. Next of kin: Mr. Harry Russell Crites, Sr. (father), 1119 North Ninth Street, Lafayette, Ind.

PERSONNEL KILLED ON OPERATION VITTLES, JANUARY 1949

Richard M. Wurgel, first lieutenant, AO-826341, killed January 7, 1949. Next of kin: Mrs. Richard M. Wurgel (wife), c/o Ramey AFB, San Juan, Puerto Rico; Dr. Rena Wurgel (father), 1614 Palisade Avenue, Union City, N. J.

Lowell A. Wheaton, first lieutenant, AO-677371; killed January 7, 1949. Next of kin: Mrs. Dorothy N. Wheaton (wife), 3146 Austin Avenue, Corpus Christi, Tex.

Norbert H. Theis, corporal, AF-17191076; killed January 7, 1949. Next of kin: Mr. Nicholas Theis (father), Box 134, Cunningham, Kans.

Bernard J. Watkins, sergeant, AF-15101399; killed January 7, 1949. Next of kin: Mr. Ralph H. Watkins (father), 1723 Elmwood Avenue, Lafayette, Ind.

William A. Rathgeber, captain, AO-561871; killed January 7, 1949. Next of kin: Mr. Albert W. Rathgeber (father), 6347 SE Eighty-fourth Street, Portland, Oreg.

Ronald A. Stone, private, first class, AF-15199071; killed January 7, 1949. Next of kin: Mrs. Mamie Stone (mother), 236 West Locust Street, Mount Sterling, Ky.

Ralph H. Boyd, first lieutenant, AO-691225; killed January 12, 1949. Next of kin: Mrs. Wanda Boyd (wife), 2626 Travis Street, Fort Worth, Tex.

Craig B. Ladd, first lieutenant, AO-687483; killed, January 12, 1949. Next of kin: Mrs. Eleanor Ladd (wife), 6845 Newton Avenue South, Minneapolis, Minn.

Charles L. Putman, technical sergeant, AF-17146457; killed, January 12, 1949. Next of kin: Mrs. Irene Putman (mother), 416 South Pejon Street, Colorado Springs, Colo.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in response to what the distinguished Senator from California has said, I simply appeal to the RECORD. The Senator from North Dakota is proud that he offered his life to defend this country; and it comes with ill grace from any Senator—from California or any other State—to impugn the motives of the Senator from Idaho or the Senator from North Dakota, and, after we had stood on this floor and protested against a peacetime draft, which we had a perfect right to do, to say that Joe Stalin must be happy. I want the distinguished Senator from California and every other Senator to know that I yield to no man in patriotism. I voted for the 70-group air force. I am proud of the record I have made in voting to make this Government strong.

That is entirely beside the point. The point is that the distinguished Senator from California took it upon himself to impugn the motives of the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from North Dakota. I want to tell my distinguished friend that the people of North Dakota are just as patriotic as are the people of the State of California. The majority were opposed then, and they are now opposed, to a peacetime draft. It is the tradition of America not to have a peacetime draft. We had none until a short time ago. Certainly a man is not disloyal, and is not helping Stalin, when he rises upon the floor of the Senate and does his duty in bringing to the attention of the Senate the feelings of the people of his State, and when he quotes church after church, Rotary Clubs, the Farmers Union, and boards of higher education, and does not consume a single minute of time in talking about something else, and does not do anything which even savors of a filibuster.

That is what I wanted to make plain here today, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, there are a number of nominations on the Executive Calendar. I do not think there is any objection to them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). If there are no reports of committees at this time, the Clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Albert J. Loveland, of Iowa, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William Marvel, to be United States attorney for the district of Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Gilmore S. Haynie, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Indiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Miles N. Pike, to be United States attorney for the district of Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas N. Curran, to be United States marshal for the district of Maine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Paul B. Massick, to be United States Marshal for the district of Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jack R. Caufield, to be United States marshal for the district of Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of all confirmations made today.

PETER MARSHALL

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the news of the sudden and untimely death of the Reverend Dr. Peter Marshall, Chaplain of the Senate, comes as a shock to all of the Members of the Senate, whose wholehearted affection and admiration he enjoyed.

In his capacity as Chaplain of the Senate, he exercised a spiritual influence and moral guidance felt by every Member here. While he had no voice in determining policy and had no vote on any measure that came before us, his prayers carried weight in our hearts and many times moved us in the right direction.

He was a man of great piety and great wit, a man with strength of soul and fine personal charm, whose memory will be bright in the recollections of every Senator for many years to come.

His beautiful and eloquent prayers for the Senate were often remarked upon by members of the press, and often noted by our friends and visitors here. He put the whole power of his spirit into his beseechings of Almighty God, and he carried all of us with him.

In his youth, in Scotland, he worked with his hands in the steel mills. Later he felt the call of a religious vocation; and entered the Presbyterian ministry. He came to our country as a young man, and became a citizen of our Nation to work among us as a man of God.

We honor him today as he goes to the final judgment of his Maker, to give an account of his life upon this earth as a great human being, a great minister, a great American. He takes his place in the long line of distinguished Chaplains who have served the Senate.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to offer the resolution which I send to the desk and ask to have read, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 43) was read, and the Senate proceeded to its consideration.

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and regret of the death of Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., late the Chaplain of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to say just a few words in

regard to the resolution offered by the majority leader.

The minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], is unfortunately not able to be present here today to express his personal feelings and the feelings all of us share at the loss of our Chaplain. Peter Marshall was Senator WHERRY's pastor. He officiated at the marriage of his daughter. I know he feels a great personal loss. So do we all.

Our Chaplain, Dr. Marshall, always opened our sessions with prayers that helped and inspired us all. They combined brevity with common sense. They always aptly expressed in religious terms the problems of the moment. Above all, they were inspired with deep spiritual feeling. I recall his words about the meaning of liberty:

> Teach us that liberty is not only to be loved but also to be lived. Liberty is too precious a thing to be buried in books. It costs too much to be hoarded. Make us to see that liberty is not the right to do as we please, but the opportunity to please to do what is right.

Never shall we forget the morsels of thought that were contained in his prayers. They were replete with earthy phrases—phrases which caught the attention and made meaningful his spiritual message.

Most of us came to know our Chaplain only two short years ago. We immediately felt the impact of his prayers, so we wanted to know him better. I always found him full of humor, a man of ready repartee, and intensely human. Why shouldn't he be? He was a man who knew how to toil with his hands. He knew what it was to work hard for an education, and he had what we need so much in the world today—the inspiration to be a spiritual leader. So, with hard work and much sacrifice, he became one. We have been the beneficiaries of his toil and his inspiration. All of us will miss his daily words of guidance to us. Most of us on the day on which President Truman was inaugurated heard Dr. Marshall's prayer. It will remain in our minds as typifying the spirit of the man who said these words:

> Give to them good health for the physical strains of their office, good judgment for the decisions they must make, wisdom beyond their own, and clear understanding for the problems of this difficult hour.
>
> We thank Thee for their humble reliance upon Thee. May they go often to the throne of grace, as we commend them both to Thy loving care and Thy guiding hand. Amen.

These words and the memory of the man who said them will remain long with us.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, at a time like this words are of little consequence. Peter Marshall has made his record and it is indeed a brilliant one. A man above politics, he bowed to the needs and desires of this body. Would that God give all of us here in the Senate the strength and courage to live up to his simple, provocative yet easily understood prayers.

Peter Marshall was not born in this great land of ours. He was a native of Scotland, a nation that has sent many of her sons to our shores, who have made a real contribution to our democratic way of life. Peter Marshall was indeed among that illustrious group.

His early life was not an easy one. Working with his fellow man in the everyday world before becoming a minister of the gospel, he pursued the same hard road that many others have taken. Yet he remained the same unaffected man he had always been. Upon attaining what many of us would call a highly successful status, but with which he would disagree, Peter Marshall did not forget those he might have met along the way. As a Scotsman, his creed might well be expressed in a verse from Robert Burns, of whom Peter Marshall was an ardent admirer:

> Then let us pray that come it may,
> As come it will for a' that,
> That sense and worth o'er a' the earth,
> Shall bear the gree[1] and a' that;
> For a' that and a' that,
> It's comin' yet for a' that,
> That man to man, the world o'er
> Shall brithers be for a' that.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I present a resolution adopted by the Republican minority conference today. This resolution was submitted to the conference by me on behalf of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Whereas Almighty God in His infinite wisdom has taken from the United States Senate its beloved Chaplain, the Reverend Peter Marshall; and
>
> Whereas he has rendered to the membership of the United States Senate through his daily prayers a spiritual service of great and lasting value; and
>
> Whereas he was our affectionate friend, ever ready to give of himself, of his efforts, and of his judgment for our guidance in the ways of righteousness and Christian living: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved*, That we, the Republican Members of the United States Senate, express our sense of loss at his passing; and be it further
>
> *Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to Mrs. Catherine Marshall, that she may be assured of our deep sympathy and condolences upon the passing of our friend, her husband.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two editorials, one from the Washington Post of January 26, 1949, and the other from the Washington Evening Star of January 26, 1949, paying deserved tribute to the late Chaplain of the Senate, Dr. Peter Marshall.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of January 26, 1949]

PETER MARSHALL

We deplore, as the Capital must, the untimely death of Dr. Peter Marshall, the 46-year-old Chaplain of the Senate who was also pastor of the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church. Till Dr. Marshall came to the Senate 2 years ago, the Senators had heard a more or less perfunctory sort of "grace" before they began their deliberations. The Presbyterian minister opened the ears of the bowed Senators to his words of prayer, and he put those words alongside their subsequent speeches. They were novel out of the mouth of a minister, pointed in their application to the business in hand, and charged with a hortatory spirit that carried conviction. His voice had a vibrancy, his words a Scot's tang, his presence a manliness, that enabled his allocution to linger in the senatorial memory. Only recently an American citizen, having been born in Scotland, he had a passion for America. His zest for life was as fresh and as real as his religion. He inspired the younger generation with sermons that, while without profundity, brought a living God into their lives. His is a loss that the Senate will not easily repair and that his growing congregation can ill spare.

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 26, 1949]

DR. PETER MARSHALL

Living and working in Washington only eleven years, the Reverend Dr. Peter Marshall nevertheless has left his mark upon the whole city. He was a man of a contagious spirit, eager and alert, quick to see opportunities of service and to meet their challenge. Within a few months after coming here he had made himself an influence throughout the entire community. Wherever he went, whatever he did, the result of his presence was constructive. In classic language, he was a builder of the Kingdom of God on this earth.

Perhaps one explanation of Dr. Marshall's power might be found in the fact that he was a son of the people and kept his touch with them even when he had risen to high station. Born and reared against a bleak and uncongenial background, he earned his bread as a laborer in his youth. His formal education was limited to a mechanical and mining college at Coatbridge in Scotland and the Columbia Seminary at Decatur in Georgia. Most of his scholarly achievement he owed to his own inquiring mind. The magic of his eloquence was a native gift which he shared with Burns and Carlyle, Hugh Miller, and John Buchan. But he was a great preacher because of an inner genius, a force of faith which demanded expression in human ministry.

His decade at the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church was a period of progress which soon will find fulfillment in a new religious center on the site long ago hallowed by the presence of Abraham Lincoln. Dr. Marshall will not see the building program finished, but his association with its start will be an asset always. He is certain of remembrance, too, at the Capitol. Able interpreters of the Word preceded him in the chaplaincy of the Senate, and he contributed notably to the tradition which they established. His final prayer for government "above party and personality, beyond time and circumstance, for the good of America and the peace of the world" was a masterful utterance which well may be regarded as his testament to the country he adopted and dearly loved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

CATHERINE MARSHALL

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit, out of order, Senate Resolution 44, for reference to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

[1] Have the prize.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 44) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Catherine Marshall, widow of Rev. Peter Marshall, late the Chaplain of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. LUCAS, Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Dr. Marshall, Chaplain of the Senate, I move that the Senate do now adjourn until Monday next.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 31, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 27, 1949:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

William McChesney Martin, Jr., of New York, N. Y., to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury to fill an existing vacancy.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD

Karl T. Compton, of Massachusetts, to be Chairman of the Research and Development Board, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

MUNITIONS BOARD

Donald F. Carpenter, of Connecticut, to be Chairman of the Munitions Board, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Hon. Joseph W. Kehoe, of Alaska, to be United States district judge for division No. 2, district of Alaska. Judge Kehoe is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired December 7, 1948.

Hon. Anthony J. Dimond, of Alaska, to be United States district judge, division No. 3, district of Alaska. Judge Dimond is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 10, 1948.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Frank C. Bingham, of Alaska, to be United States attorney for division No. 2, district of Alaska. Mr. Bingham is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 29, 1948.

Harry O. Arend, of Alaska, to be United States attorney for division No. 4, district of Alaska. Mr. Arend is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 9, 1948.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Kehoe C. Shannon, of Texas, to be United States marshal for the western district of Texas. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

TERRITORY OF ALASKA

Ernest Gruening, of Alaska, to be Governor of the Territory of Alaska. Reappointment.

Llewellyn M. Williams, of Alaska, to be Secretary of the Territory of Alaska. Reappointment.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following-named employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the position indicated:

TO BE ENSIGNS

Dewey G. Rushford, effective October 8, 1948.

Gordon D. Scott, effective October 21, 1948.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Frank A. Southard, Jr., of Ithaca, N. Y., to be United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund to fill an existing vacancy.

CONCILIATION COMMISSION FOR PALESTINE

Mark Foster Ethridge, of Kentucky, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Conciliation Commission for Palestine which was established by resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations December 11, 1948.

PROMOTIONS IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 518 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion.

To be major with rank from July 27, 1947

Hikel, Theodore Roosevelt, AO29782.

To be major with rank from August 22, 1947

Edenfield, Marshall Calder, AO29805.

To be majors with rank from July 1, 1948

Abbott, Henry Eugene, Jr., AO41868.
Abbott, Nathan Merrill, AO35170.
Abbott, Thomas Wood, Jr., AO40654.
Abbuhl, Charles, Jr., AO40732.
×Abernathy, Louis Madison, AO40721.
Ackerly, Robert Allan, AO46020.
Adair, Archie Samuel, AO34455.
Adamina, Robert Eggers, AO34777.
×Adams, Alan Frederick, AO35195.
Adams, Hubert, AO51337.
×Adams, Joseph Varner, Jr., AO44571.
×Adams, Louis Charles, Jr., AO22616.
Adams, Nathan Jasper, AO39137.
Adams, William Brownlow, AO32687.
Adams, William Carrolton, AO23507.
×Adkins, William Herbert, AO43013.
Aertgeerts, Jerome Edward, AO51647.
Agnell Peter Walfrid, AO51319.
Ainsworth, Donald Hoadley, AO45926.
Airmet, Elliot Seaton, Jr., AO44590.
Akers, Marion Jesse, AO34490.
×Akin, Leroy, AO31775.
Albaugh, Harry Mendenhall, AO45905.
×Albright, Clay, AO45738.
Alden, Victor William, AO30762.
Aldridge, George Thompson, AO34338.
Aldridge, Richards Abner, AO24025.
Alexander, David William, AO33130.
Alexander, Donald Martin, AO22830.
Alexander, Jerome Cecil, AO52840.
Alexander, William Brinan, AO41917.
×Alford, David Gaston, AO53135.
Alford, Ray Wilbur, AO51796.
Allson, John Charles, AO51335.
×Allard, Charles Arthur, AO45974.
Allen, Barnett Stanford, AO45049.
Allen, Charles Gilpin, AO35223.
×Allen, Harry Berkley, AO40592.
×Allen, John Eugene, AO30120.
Allen, Robert Hamel, AO39820.
Allen, William Chandler, AO46155.
×Almand, Alexander James, AO40501.
Almand, James Lee, AO43553.
Alsobrock, James Ellington, AO45056.
Alston, Jack Holt, AO25173.
Altman, James Earnest, AO32475.
Ambrose, Emer Elsworth, AO35224.
×Ambrose, Joseph Richard, AO23363.
Amen, Henry John, AO24139.
Amend, Frank Reid, AO53335.
Andersen, Milo Peter, AO48957.
Anderson, Colin Edward, AO45519.
Anderson, Dale Leroy, AO21644.
Anderson, Herbert, AO34612.
Anderson, Lynden Roland, AO44272.
Anderson, Nels Albert, AO35012.
Anderson, Wesley Alleyn, AO33963.
Andrews, Charles Comer, AO32498.
Andrus, Burton Curtis, Jr., AO24057.
Andry, Fernand Louis, AO30694.
×Anutta, Frederick Thomas, AO25180.
Ardis, Thomas Benjamin, AO43504.
Armold, Harold Arthur, AO43111.
Armstrong, Ben Kay, Jr., AO33984.
Armstrong, Frederick Martin, Jr., AO32841.
Armstrong, Jack Lawrence, AO30715.
Armstrong, Lorraine Farquhar, Jr., AO40736.
Arnett, Thomas Nelson, AO31703.
Arnold, James Carter, AO46239.
Arnold, Richard, Jr., AO22403.
Ascani, Fred John, AO23718.
Ashton, Thurlo Martin, AO32408.
Ashwick, Edwin William, AO29770.
×Asp, John Ellsworth, AO51298.
Atkins, Ernest Graves, AO41873.
Atkins, Henry Venton, AO56917.
Atkinson, Charles Walter Thomas, AO30592.
Atkinson, John Earl, AO24096.
Atwood, Robert Greene, AO43952.
Augustinus, Robert Herman, AO42431.
×Ault, John Willard, AO20403.
Ault, Richard Leroy, AO45630.
Austin, Oscar Eugene, AO34983.
Auten, Frank Caldwell, Jr., AO43941.
×Avery, Delwin Barton, AO33691.
×Avritt, Lester G., AO41867.
Babel, John Stanley, AO44503.
Baccus, Donald Arthur, AO33505.
×Back, Klair E., AO40317.
×Bacon, John William, AO51416.
Bacon, Lewis Harold, AO30591.
Bacon, William Corinth, AO24539.
Badger, Thomas, Jr., AO42630.
Baer, Charles Peyton, AO31401.
Bagby, Francis Key, AO53134.
×Bagwell, Ray Oscar, AO51764.
Baile, Kenneth Rex, AO33520.
Bailey, Bryson Robert, AO34303.
Bailey, Charles Ezekiel, AO45663.
Bailey, Edward Par, AO32027.
Bailey, Malcolm Archer, AO34795.
Bailey, William Bradford, AO34758.
Bailey, William Wallace, AO30523.
Baird, William Charles, AO51372.
Baker, Bazil Lee, AO33632.
×Baker, Francis Manly, AO42022.
Baker, Gordon Edwin, AO45819.
Baker, Lee Edward, AO43766.
Baker, Leonidas, AO53115.
Baker, Ralph Eugene, AO30321.
Baker, Robert Britton, Jr., AO20486.
Baker, Robert Norman, AO34648.
Baker, Warren Sears, Jr., AO33955.
Baldick, Carl Joseph, AO42282.
Ball, Alfred John, Jr., AO44598.
Ball, Clinton Field, AO23945.
Banbury, Richard Clair, AO34772.
Bane, Edwin Ronald, AO43993.
×Banks, John McMillan, AO22126.
Banks, William McGowan, AO33040.
Banks, Wilson Harper, AO33535.
×Barber, Charles Hill, AO41936.
Barber, Rex Theodore, AO33681.
Barlow, James Dudley, AO45413.
Barnard, Milton Carlton, 2d, AO23221.
Barnard, William Francis, Jr., AO53027.
Barnett, James Alex, AO33916.
Barnett, John Anderson, AO44111.
Barney, Robert Burns Smeaton, AO42042.
×Barney, Walter Perry, AO31803.
Barr, Bernice Stone, AO34074.
Barr, Sam Lacy, AO39077.
Barrere, Robert Andrew, AO44013.
Barrett, Henry Gordon, AO21411.
Barrett, Joseph Aloysius, Jr., AO34540.
Barrett, Richard Adrian, AO30014.
Barron, James Patrick, AO51382.
Barrow, Leonard James, Jr., AO33915.
Barrow, Robert Lee, AO51508.
Barrowclough, Robert Ivan, AO34519.
×Bartlett, John Donnington, AO51504.
Bartlett, William Lewis, AO42989.
Bartling, Wray Bacon, AO42226.
Bates, Paul E., AO43884.
Batten, Earl Edward, AO33125.
Battison, William James, Jr., AO34976.
Baugher, Phineas William, AO42177.
Baughn, Julius Henry, AO33322.
Bauley, James Edward, AO34389.
Baxter, Reuben Augustus, AO45632.
Beach, Rex Ward, AO43789.
Bean, Gerald Edward, AO30028.
Beard, Dearl Lee, AO34920.
×Bearly, James Henry, AO32947.
×Beasley, Henry Allen, AO52176.
Beattie, Aldridge Nelson, AO42636.

Beauchamp, Willard Augustus, AO44452.
Beaudry, Emil George, AO40594.
Beaver, Authney Wayne, AO43859.
Bechtel, Howard John, AO43094.
Beck, Howard Alfred, AO43537.
Beckham, Walter Carl, AO33480.
×Beckstrom, Kenneth Wellington, AO53314.
Beebe, James Allen, AO30070.
×Beeghly, Murray J., AO51378.
Beezley, Wilbur Barrett, AO33615.
Beightol, Willis Eugene, AO22607.
Bell, John Francis, AO53344.
Bell, John Howard, AO33639.
Bell, Leon Edwin, Jr., AO43400.
Bell, Maynard William, AO42152.
Bell, Raymond Lester, AO51602.
Belsma, Alfred Donald, AO34895.
Belville, Robert Edward, AO32291.
Bender, Frank Peter, AO33444.
Bender, Richard Carl, AO35013.
Benedict, Maurice Samuel, AO35185.
Benesh, Robert Horace, AO45711.
Benjamin, Walter Paul, AO52372.
×Benn, Robert Willallen, AO42295.
Bennett, James Whitt, AO33526.
Bennett, Thomas Marion, AO43820.
Bennett, William Albert, Jr., AO31655.
Bennett, William Thomas, AO30024.
Bennion, Karren Layne, AO34209.
Bentley, Jack Leith, AO23880.
Beran, Clayton Alfred, AO42137.
Berg, Gordon Howard, AO45373.
Berg, Russell Allen, AO25323.
Bergamyer, Roland Wilson, AO34376.
Berger, Jack Calvin, AO35040.
×Berger, Leon Herman, AO23845.
Berry, Austin Lutner, AO34073.
Berry, Maurice Antony, AO34011.
Berryhill, Earl John, AO30060.
Bertram, William Ellert, AO35290.
Best, Everett William, AO33570.
Bethune, Albert Henry, AO23324.
×Bettinger, Sterling Peter, AO33168.
Betts, Curtis Francis, AO23818.
Beumeler, Wayne Marcellus, AO33897.
Bexfield, Frank William, AO33896.
Bickell, George Ross, AO45151.
×Bieging, Glen Phillip, AO45783.
Bigelow, Edgar Daugherity, AO40607.
Bilger, Donald Earle, AO40756.
Binford, Everett Eugene, AO42944.
Bird, Joseph Warren, AO45661.
×Birdsall, Charles Dale, AO33902.
Bireley, William Paul, AO42466.
Bishop, Edwin, Jr., AO34222.
Bishop, Samuel Worth, AO52966.
Bivin, Verne, AO45971.
Bixby, Orin Mills, AO34628.
Bjornson, Wallace Erwin, AO24606.
Blachly, Ross Lindley, AO40568.
Black, Vance Eugene, AO33669.
Blackledge, Roscoe Burr, AO45556.
Blackstone, John Everett, AO42557.
×Blackstone, Kenneth Lloyd, AO51374.
×Blaha, Elmer Carl, AO20662.
Blair, Paul Kenneth, AO33338.
Bland, Edwin Allen, Jr., AO33267.
Blanton, William Smith, AO51208.
Blattau, Philip James, AO45912.
×Bledsoe, Hugh Harold, AO42708.
Blevins, Edwin, AO42644.
×Bleymaier, Joseph Sylvester, AO33252.
Blood, Gordon Fisk, AO46139.
Bloxsom, Clyde Harold, AO41987.
Blunda, Gaspare Frank, AO18405.
Bockman, Charles Eugene, Jr., AO39736.
×Bodenhamer, Ross Emsley, AO34223.
Bodine, Edmund John, AO32508.
Bodley, Harvey Hawley, AO41901.
×Boehme, Charles Stanley, AO51712.
Boger, Martin Kroninger, AO39744.
Bohan, Robert Emmett, Jr., AO32712.
×Bolender, Carroll Herdus, AO35145.
Bolt, William Thomas, AO34799.
Bonawitz, Norval C., AO32284.
Bond, Ralph Winston, AO31641.
Bonin, Dwight Edward, AO34328.
Booth, Leon, AO41886.
Borden, David Ben, Jr., AO42892.
×Borden, James Cochran, AO46158.
×Borowski, Edmund Joseph, AO31449.
Bosch, George Arthur, AO21114.
×Bostick, John AO41959.
Bostwick, George Eugene, AO24278.
Boucher, Paul, AO42038.
Bounds, Fred Howard, AO25238.
Bounds, R. G., Jr., AO45274.
Bourne, Evan Francis, Jr., AO33628.
Boutz, William Ray, AO21491.
Bowe, Hugh Heldy, Jr., AO34261.
Bowen, John Wesley, AO44782.
Bower, Robert Sharon, AO42056.
Bower, William Marsh, AO34210.
Bowers, Robert Dana, AO52549.
Bowie, William Allen, AO43946.
Bowman, Harry Guy, AO42234.
Bowman, Julian Holt, AO33629.
Boyd, James Moore, AO24168.
×Boyd, Raymond Gilbert, AO30659.
Boylan, George Sylvester, Jr., AO35269.
Braddock, Joel Quin, AO52306.
Bradley, Elbert J., Jr., AO42041.
Bradley, Theo Drake, AO33297.
Brady, Francis Thomas, AO45516.
Brady, Henry Grady, Jr., AO45095.
×Brady, James Franklin, AO34763.
Brady, Michael Joseph, AO44752.
Branch, George Harrison, AO44160.
Branch, Gerald Ellis, AO51615.
Brandeberry, Frank Elwood, Jr., AO52213.
Brandon, Hubert Arthur, AO25221.
Brandon, William Harold, AO34364.
×Brandt, Forrest Anthony, AO44733.
Branham, Ethel Bert, AO45636.
Brann, Ralph Austin, AO32131.
×Brannan, Rudolph, AO42629.
Brannock, Joseph Franklin, AO35186.
Bratton, Andrew Jackson, Jr., AO46219.
Bratton, Leslie Raymond, AO32859.
Brauer, Lloyd Walter, AO44948.
Brawner, Daniel Campbell, AO24545.
Brecht, Harold Marvin, AO46250.
×Breckenridge, John Preston, AO23376.
Brennan, Mortimer Campbell, AO44804.
Brett, Raymond Elliott, AO34440.
×Brewer, Joseph Cross, AO42740.
×Brewer, Samuel Martin, AO42032.
×Brewster, James Henry, Jr., AO29578.
Brickell, Harold Odell, AO40022.
Bridges, John DeGraff, AO22478.
Bridges, Lester, AO40569.
Brier, William Wallace 4th, AO23943.
Briggs, James Denison, AO34412.
×Briggs, Loran Dale, AO33995.
Briley, Joe Charles, AO33357.
Brill, Ray Samuel, AO42266.
Bringman, George Albert, AO51808.
Britt, Jimmie Weaver, AO32884.
Brock, Russell Keith, AO24128.
×Bronson, Fred Ford, AO33783.
Brooks, Allison Cochran, AO25258.
Brooks, Bascom Anthony, AO32339.
Brooks, Clyde Edward, AO44051.
Brooks, James McKinney, AO33327.
Brooks, John Adams 3d, AO23828.
Brooks, Nelson Sisson, AO32674.
Brown, Allen K., AO42185.
Brown, Bill Roe, AO30761.
Brown, Billy Ray, AO53198.
Brown, Bryan Wells, Jr., AO53455.
Brown, Charles Arthur, AO30453.
Brown, Edward Tompkins, AO42779.
Brown, Edwin Watson, AO23851.
Brown, George Evans, AO40709.
×Brown, George Scratchley, AO24021.
×Brown, Grover Cleveland, AO24141.
Brown, Harold Paul, AO43095.
Brown, Howard Eugene, AO34368.
×Brown, Isidore, AO51204.
Brown, Jack Orris, AO34456.
Brown, James Joseph, AO34959.
×Brown, Kenton Scott, AO42245.
Brown, Merle Clinton, AO33958.
×Brown, Norwood Joseph, AO53391.
×Brown, Paul Douglas, AO33961.
Brown, Preston, AO45930.
Brown, Robert Creswell, AO33467.
×Brown, Therman Deboise, AO23089.
Brown, Wilfred Elmer, AO29570.
Brownewell, John Landrum, AO52378.
Brownfield, Albert Warren, AO35172.
Bruce, Sidney Clyde, AO35288.
×Brumfield, Henry Anderson, AO30331.
Bryan, Calvin Mitchell, AO29579.
Bryant, Alexander Wilson, AO22495.
Bryant, James Basil, AO34576.
×Buchanan, Kenneth Wiley, AO56991.
×Buckey, Loren Elbert, AO33287.
Buckholts, Paul Omar, AO52664.
×Buckles, Galen Mills, AO43430.
×Buckley, Jack Lionel, AO45533.
Buckwalter, Raymond Earle, AO35077.
Budd, Hyme Allan, AO43759.
Beulow, Albert Gustav, AO42414.
Bugh, Leon Frank, AO43085.
Bulgin, Richard Gregory, Jr., AO46068.
Bull, Frederick Kemmerer, AO43838.
Bull, James Tryon, AO32731.
×Bunker, Theodore Chandler, AO31443.
Bunze, Harry Frank, AO23105.
Burbridge, Leo Miachael, AO33590.
Burden, Oliver Dudley, Jr., AO29774.
×Burge, Edward Longfellow, AO25248.
×Burhanna, Howard, Jr., AO32081.
Burke, Archie Maurice, AO34308.
Burke, Dracos Dimitry, AO46135.
×Burke, Leo Raymond, AO30533.
Burke, William, AO34736.
Burley, Charles Frederick, AO34864.
Burnett, John Coleman, AO33437.
Burns, Berton Harrell, AO34505.
Burns, Don Robert, AO41963.
Burns, Luther William, AO31612.
×Burns, Robert Theron, AO52653.
Burns, Robert Wiygul, AO24131.
Burnside, Barrie Charles, AO34834.
×Burnside, John Marion, AO42543.
Burrill, Wilson E., AO53353.
×Burris, Robert Francis, AO51389.
×Burroughs, Orval Neal, AO41859.
Busching, Richard Witt, AO34990.
×Bush, Eugene Edward, AO51790.
Bush, Joseph, AO32084.
Bush, Morris, AO39958.
Butler, Edward George, AO34276.
Butman, Paul Milton, AO53210.
Byerley, Sam John, AO34590.
Byerts, William Edward, Jr., AO25042.
Bynum, Richard Edward, Jr., AO40656.
Byrnes, George Goodrich, Jr., AO45367.
×Byrtus, Joe Robert, AO32663.
×Cage, Phil B., AO33157.
Cain, Clarence Cecil, AO30719.
Calderbank, John Jacob Birrell, AO52998.
Calhan, Robert James, AO34437.
Calhoun, Robert Thomas, AO33796.
×Cameron, Arthur Thomas, AO30267.
Camp, Kenneth Lee, AO43944.
Campbell, Arch Graham, Jr., AO21626.
×Campbell, Floyd Francis, AO44172.
Campbell, Francis Wilson, AO44379.
×Campbell, Ivan Earnest, AO42541.
Campbell, Murdoch William, AO39000.
Campbell, Roland Arthur, AO53172.
×Campbell, Thornton Wilson, AO33254.
×Campbell, William Haddock, AO45406.
Caple, Charles Edgar, Jr., AO33772.
Caples, James Stephen, AO42865.
Cardenas, Robert Leon, AO46224.
×Carey, Edwin Forrest, Jr., AO34001.
Carey, John Bernard, Jr., AO53338.
Carlberg, Lawrence Ferdinand, AO51514.
Carleton, Bert Maurice, AO45780.
Carlisle, Richard Thurman, AO33998.
Carlos, Bernard Cooper, AO30300.
×Carlson, Charles Lewis, AO30655.
Carlson, Francis Bernhard, AO22876.
Carlson, Thorgny Cedric, Jr., AO33973.
Carmack, Beverly Eugene, AO32182.
Carmichael, Walter Pendleton, Jr., AO45285.
Carnes, Sam Abbott, AO31455.
Carpenter, Clarence Coe, AO30114.
×Carpenter, Harold Gradey, AO42936.
Carpenter, Woodward Benoit, AO39132.
×Carr, John Kermit, AO22452.
×Carroll, Joel Allen, Jr., AO35073.
Carroll, Louis Orville, AO52225.
Carroll, William Brooks, AO25070.
Carson, Charles Edgar, AO31889.
Carson, James Harman, AO32524.
Carter, George Albert, AO33511.
×Carter, Robert Andrew, AO34404.
Carter, Sam Filson, AO43982.
Carter, Wendell Eugene, AO33173.
Carter, Wilbur Robert, AO51425.
Carter, William Alamath, AO42051.

Cartwright, Jack Arthur, AO46264.
Case, Harvey Lee, Jr., AO34810.
Casey, Edward Richard, AO32436.
Cassell, Raymond Walter, AO31510.
Cassity, Russell, AO34892.
Cate, Albert Murray, AO22551.
×Cathcart, Norman Ryan, AO42007.
×Cator, Bruce Campbell, AO24100.
Catt, Harold Jackson, AO34902.
×Catton, Jack Joseph, AO35249.
×Caviness, Roy Blair, AO34532.
Cello, Gove Clarke, Jr., AO34159.
Chaffin, Andrew Arrol, AO34277.
Chalek, William Dmitri, AO33243.
Chambers, William James Herbert, Jr., AO45290.
×Chambers, Walter Earle, AO33762.
Chaney, Louis Hasler, AO42814.
Chapman, James William, AO42043.
Chapman, John Ward, AO40669.
Chapman, Lloyd Douglas, AO34619.
Chapman, Wilson Alexander, AO32056.
Chappell, Frank Benjamin, AO34284.
×Charlton, George Randolph, AO51463.
Charron, Roland Bartholomew, AO42214.
Chase, George Humphrey, AO32401.
Chase, Kenneth Bryant, AO30321.
Chase, Linden, AO41336.
×Chatterton, David Henry, AO32067.
Cheever, Russell Elsworth, AO34620.
Chenette, Joseph Richards, AO42397.
Chisholm, Henry James, AO34578.
×Chitty, Charles Dean, Jr., AO26198.
Chontski, William John, AO33279.
Christ, Charles Milton, AO35109.
Christensen, John Albert, AO32266.
Christian, Shannon, AO34787.
×Christmas, Charles Horace, AO33540.
×Christopher, George William, AO42278.
Christy, Harrison Randolph, Jr., AO33624.
×Churchill, Randolph Emerson, AO51375.
Clark, Albert James, AO38748.
×Clark, Arthur Malcolm, AO31620.
Clark, Glen William, AO45333.
Clark, Jack Cameron, AO46136.
×Clark, James Walker, AO32179.
Clark, Joseph Thomas, AO51238.
Clark, Robert Myrl, AO45684.
×Clark, Theron Ogden, AO30142.
Clark, Thomas James, AO32781.
Clark, Walter Edwin, AO33374.
Clark, William Coombs, AO22475.
Clark, William Adam, AO33252.
Clarke, Leo George, Jr., AO45168.
Clarke, Owen Field, AO32463.
Clarke, Roy Laverne, AO41856.
Clarke, Worth Charles, AO43770.
Clausen, Leslie Conway, AO44008.
Cleary, Edward John, Jr., AO44661.
Cleven, Gale Winston, AO34258.
Clifford, Robert Lincoln, AO51868.
Clinkscales, Theodore Ross, AO22844.
Cloe, Keith DeLyle, AO45264.
×Close, Winton Ralph, AO25201.
Cloud, Howard Haines, Jr., AO34198.
Clough, William Rockwell, AO51417.
Cloyd, Virgil Mark, AO45750.
Cluxton, Donald Edwin, AO29685.
Coad, Hunter Sugg, AO45363.
Coate, Raymond LaMar, AO42535.
Coats, James Harold, AO44467.
Cobb, Elmon Redell, AO45069.
Cobb, Garth Cline, AO31849.
Cobb, James Opal, AO44784.
Cobb, Robert Hardin, AO33112.
Cochran, Lyle Horace, AO42906.
×Cody, Joseph Julius, Jr., AO43772.
Coen, Robert Brown, AO24145.
Cofer, Floyd Sturdevant, Jr., AO32220.
Cofield, Emory Woodfin, AO51586.
Cole, Clifford Elbert, AO32834.
Cole, James Lawrence, AO33904.
×Cole, Lawrence Elroy, AO29620.
Cole, Nester Evan, AO43848.
Cole, Richard Eugene, AO44501.
×Cole, Richard Herbert, AO33509.
Coleman, Charles William, AO33609.
Colligan, Robert Leonard, Jr., AO32095.
Collinson, William Samuel, AO33336.
Commenator, George O'Connell, AO45977.
×Compton, Joe W., Jr., AO33777.
Condron, John Eugene, AO42366.
Congleton, Boyd Ellis, AO34604.
Conlan, Douglas Mansfield, AO33363.
Conlin, Joseph Stanford, AO46218.
Connelly, Charles Hilton, AO33554.
Connors, Wayne Stephen, AO34932.
Conroy, Thomas Charles, AO24526.
Converse, William Winans, AO40572.
Cock, Bailey Cavenaugh, AO22570.
Cook, Earl Brown, AO22852.
×Cook, Eugene Glynn, AO29565.
×Cooke, Charles James, AO42915.
Coolidge, John Reid, AO30699.
Cooper, Edwin Eranan, AO51609.
Cooper, Paul Thomas, AO16036.
Cooper, Robert Neville, AO38781.
Cooper, William Charles, AO29526.
Corbin, Thomas Goldsborough, AO24075.
×Cormier, Lionel Joseph, AO33595.
Cornett, Billy, AO34622.
Cornwall, Paul Revere, AO21156.
Corwin, Alexander, AO29945.
Cory, Albert Arnold, AO22937.
×Cosgrove, Charles Patrick, AO44153.
×Coss, Walter Leroy, AO35192.
Costello, Maurice Joseph, AO29960.
Cotter, Harold Eugene, AO33272.
Couch, Gerald, AO40426.
Couch, John Pinkney, AO45660.
Counselman, Orville Lewis, AO35150.
Coupland, Leonard Temple, AO42871.
Courtney, James Hiram, AO12207.
×Covert, Charles Betts, AO32204.
Covington, Fredrick Sturdivant, AO51418.
Cowan, James Albertson, AO29019.
Coward, James Smith, AO34596.
Cowart, William Slater, Jr., AO35308.
Cox, Albert Lyman, Jr., AO42368.
Cox, Andrew Lacock, AO34422.
Cox, Arthur Cornell, AO29614.
Cox, Chester Charles, AO33461.
Cox, Homer Mead, AO30506.
×Cox, James Isaac, AO23982.
×Cox, Robert Bruce, AO45545.
Coyle, Gervais Gibson, AO33310.
Crabtree, Corbett David, AO51274.
Crabtree, Martin Perdue, AO22834.
Craft, Robert Patterson, AO42022.
Craft, Winfred Owens, AO34023.
Craig, Ellis Bunting, AO32018.
×Craig, Richard Marion, AO33823.
Crain, John Campbell, AO29602.
Crakes, Joe Henry, AO30390.
Crandall, George Barclay, AO40277.
Crawford, Jack Lafayette, Jr., AO40644.
Crawford, John, AO29647.
Crawford, Marshall James, AO51624.
×Creech, Robert Morris, AO33036.
Crehan, James Anthony, AO32391.
Cresswell, Arthur Stanley, AO34580.
Cribbs, Jerome Highland, AO32753.
Crisler, Herbert LeRoy, AO42934.
Crisp, Dennis, AO46011.
×Crist, George Harvey, AO54496.
Critchfield, Richard Earl, AO32917.
Crocker, John Powers, AO33144.
Cromer, Daniel Hagan, AO44334.
Cronan, Robert Albert, AO44224.
Crook, William Ralph, AO40340.
Cropper, Eugene Charles, AO29970.
Crosby, Stephen Harmon, Jr., AO45763.
Cross, Cecil Calvin, AO30187.
Crowley, John Ennis, AO40047.
Crowley, William Francis, AO35006.
Crowson, Delmar Lester, AO45348.
×Crum, William Bailey, AO23513.
Crumly, Harold Jesse, AO34387.
Culberson, Virgil Bryant, AO51940.
Culbertson, Kline Downing, AO45620.
Culler, Harry Hillus, AO42165.
Culpepper, Claude Anthony, AO32264.
Cumbaa, Noel Thomas, AO33780.
Cummins, Tristram James, Jr., AO39898.
Cummins, William Kneedler, AO34007.
×Cunningham, Jack Edward, AO25287.
Curl, Lester Clarence, AO51311.
Curnutt, James Lee Roy, AO34374.
×Curran, James Richard, AO33358.
×Curren, Wayne Bertch, AO46141.
Curry, William Floyd, AO44925.
×Curtice, Raymond Leavitt, AO22507.
Curtis, Frank Mitchell, Jr., AO32115.
Curtis, Gwynne Sutherland, Jr., AO24008.
Curtis, Richard, AO33360.
Curtis, Victor Norman, AO53138.
Cutcher, Solomon, AO33862.
×Da Rosa, Elmer Garcia, AO42952.
Dacey, Timothy John, Jr., AO45649.
Dade, Lucian Alexander, Jr., AO33575.
Dahlstrom, John Robert, AO41590.
Daigle, Lewellyn Clifford, AO25347.
Daily, Edwin Bruce, AO32910.
Dale, Jack Delmar, AO33623.
Dallam, Welwyn P., Jr., AO35618.
×Dalton, Charles D'Orr, AO44105.
Daly, William Thomas, AO33369.
Dame, Frederick Russell, AO32831.
×Daniel, David Edwin, AO33005.
Daniel, Joe Rowan, AO33059.
Daniel, William Allen, AO24103.
Daniels, Edward Linden, AO34954.
×Daniels, Robert Frederic, AO51818.
×Dannel, Abram Baugh, AO34568.
Darby, George Clifton, Jr., AO34170.
Dart, Roy Waltman, AO51516.
Dash, Lawrence Peck, AO29858.
×Daugherty, James Ferdinand, AO42504.
×Daugherty, Jean Hamilton, AO31110.
×Davania, Richard Walton, AO30113.
Davenport, Dean, AO35030.
×David, Robert George, AO45742.
Davidson, Collier Hutchins, AO34459.
Davidson, Roy Alvin, AO26604.
×Davie, Robert Nelson, AO40190.
×Davis, Albert F., AO42143.
Davis, Alpheus Mallette, Jr., AO32599.
Davis, Edward Glendaw, AO43693.
Davis, Emmett Smith, AO45094.
Davis, Everett, AO33012.
Davis, Frank Lent, AO31940.
×Davis, Howard Allan, AO33193.
Davis, Joseph, Jr., AO53192.
Davis, Mercer Patton, AO23232.
Davitt, William John, AO34441.
Davoll, James Edward, AO34860.
Dawson, Robert Harrison, AO40327.
×Day, Robert Stanley, AO51466.
de Cisneros, George Jimenez, AO42390.
Degoes, Louis, AO32339.
×Degroot, Edward Burton, Jr., AO41991.
Degroot, Peter, AO41974.
Dehart, Edward George, AO21305.
×DeJarnette, Thomas Davis, AO40726.
de Jonckheere, Eric Thomas, AO23636.
×De La Vigne, Ferdinand Andre, AO51383.
Delacey, William Howard, AO34178.
×DeLapp, John Robert, AO32713.
De St. Jeor, Wallace Bramwell, AO41861.
de Tolly, Nicholas Semigradov, AO42292.
Dean, Charles Emmet, AO32790.
×Dechaene, Andre Jacques, AO21582.
Deems, Paul Schroeder, AO23056.
DeFord, Deane Corwin, AO41890.
Dehle, Alfred Hugo, AO51367.
DeHorn, John Gerrit, AO29734.
Delaney, Francis Robert, AO42627.
Demick, Robert Leslie, AO32493.
Dempster, Kenneth Crawford, AO34301.
Denison, Jack Alden, AO51640.
Denson, Bender Dowdell, AO20857.
Denton, Ashley Newton, Jr., AO45538.
Deppe, Howard William, AO30617.
Derey, Cloyd Harold, AO35186.
Derr, Roger Thatcher, AO42317.
Dervage, Minar Murry, AO53017.
Dessert, Kenneth O'Reilly, AO23730.
×D'Ettore, William Nicholas, AO29030.
Daverall, George Grace, AO42107.
Dewey, George Gould, AO34536.
×Dibrell, Charles Frederick, AO46708.
Dick, Chester Arthur, Jr., AO51063.
Dick, William Houston, AO34421.
Dickerson, Robert William, AO44186.
Dickey, Robert Russell, Jr., AO41946.
×Dickson, Marion Leonard, AO44033.
Dickson, Raymond Lawrence, AO29933.
×Diehl, Conrad Henry, Jr., AO30763.
×Dieterle, William Howard, AO30691.
Dietze, Herman Verne, AO42046.

Dillingham, Maurice Stanley, AO29944.
Dillon, John Michael, AO44512.
Dillow, Joseph Clinton, AO32232.
Dimmock, Charles, AO43466.
Disher, Raymond James, AO35001.
×Dishuck, John Joseph, AO43593.
×Dix, Gerald Johnson, AO34909.
Dixon, Jacob Wylie, AO35004.
Doan, Oliver Colling, AO39143.
Doddridge, David Edward, AO52848.
Dolan, Paul Gerald, AO29743.
Dole, Charles Rollin, AO46067.
Donahue, Vincent Joseph, AO34129.
Donalson, I. B. Jack, AO32964.
Donics, William, AO45515.
×Donley, John Bland, AO52231.
Dooley, Franklin Wayne, AO30067.
Doolittle, Glenn Alden, AO34077.
Dorn, Wilfred Charles, AO34367.
Dorney, Paul Arthur, AO40703.
Dorsey, Robert Sears, AO45063.
D'Orsi, Albert, AO42614.
Dougan, Eric, AO20615.
Dougherty, Clifford Alonzo, AO44005.
Douglas, Richard Maginis, AO30530.
Douglass, Charles Reid, AO30555.
Dow, Leonard Ferrell, AO43953.
Dowd, Morris Robert, AO30130.
Downey, Clyde Jackson, AO33839.
Downey, William Gates, AO44394.
Downing, Harry Lee, AO34438.
Downing, Leighton Ford, AO33090.
×Downs, Bruce Charles, AO33562.
Downs, James Albright, AO52283.
Downs, Walter Wellman, AO51300.
×Dowtin, Rex, AO34498.
×Doyle, C. Ervin, AO41899.
Dreiman, Paul Edward, AO43406.
Dreyer, Louis Edward, AO30334.
Driscoll, John Joffre, AO32903.
Driver, James Edward, AO40096.
Drum, Robert Craven, AO44828.
Drysdale, Taylor, AO32194.
DuBose, James Rembert, Jr., AO21585.
Dufour, John Gullvert, AO30010.
×DuVal, Robert James, AO34469.
×Dudney, John Frederick, AO43445.
×Duganne, John Andrew, AO40727.
Dulevitz, Alexander, AO29943.
Duncan, Earl Dean, AO35094.
Duncan, Glenn Emile, AO34220.
Duncan, Oliver Lynwood, AO45581.
Duncan, William Fowler, AO32975.
Dundas, Donald Sears, AO28721.
Dunham, Earl Herbert, AO22627.
×Dunkin, Robert Joseph, AO41852.
Durrance, Virgil Hayes, AO32302.
×Dusenbury, James Albert, AO46119.
Dustin, Roland Lewis, AO51364.
Dutrack, Dean William, AO45572.
Dvorak, Edward August, Jr., AO44069.
Dyas, John Robert, AO34768.
Dysinger, Leonard Stark, AO34254.
Eairley, John James, AO34724.
Eakins, William Wynn, AO34544.
×Earl, Gerald Mercer, AO40364.
Earle, Wilton Haynsworth, Jr., AO32503.
×Earthman, Henry Bivins, AO32650.
Easley, Horace Penrod, AO45055.
Easton, John Jay, AO33785
Eaton, Dudley Paul, AO33692.
Eaton, Robert Reynolds, AO45188.
Ebbeler, Harold Ray, AO33364.
Eberle, Adolph William, AO30031.
Edmonds, Melvin Thornton, AO32331.
Edris, Gordon Lavern, AO34299.
Edwards, Charles William, AO29658.
Edwards, Edward Daniel, AO33030.
×Egan, John Clarence, AO33050.
Egge, George Vernon, AO42632.
Eggleston, Donald Erskine, AO35115.
×Ehlers, Melville Virgil, AO44460.
Ehlinger, William Joseph, AO45245.
Eichel, Henry Herbert, AO34221.
Ekstrand, Carl Vernon, AO32680.
×Elder, Clarence Lewis, AO23814.
Elder, Robert Alexander, AO34523.
Eldridge, George Brooks, AO31705.
Elker, Hadley Burres, AO44147.
×Ellert, Laurence John, AO20311.
×Elliott, Frank Bower, AO40636.
Elliott, Robert Douglas, AO31792.
Ellis, Clay Donald, AO30017.
×Ellis, Frank Wilby, AO34843.
Ellis, Herbert Sargent, AO43753.
Ellis, James Oldham, AO21543.
Ellis, Lewis Nathaniel, AO32928.
Ellis, Richard Nat, AO33491.
Ellis, Robert Rube, AO31495.
Elmore, Vernon Otis, AO44870.
×Elver, Carl Leonard, AO42005.
Ely, Lawrence Daniel, AO29659.
Emmens, Robert Gabel, AO24104.
Engelman, Elton Clarence, AO51318.
Engleman, Frederick Charles, AO40634.
England, James John, AO40428.
Engstrom, Melvin Verner, AO22058.
Ensley, William Tyrus, AO46195.
Enyart, Byron K., AO42016.
×Epperson, Elmer Harrison, AO32948.
Erb, Gilbert Elmer, AO34213.
Erb, Theodore Henry, AO46120.
Erdin, Robert Alexander, AO32246.
Ernst, Sol Eugene, AO32746.
Erwin, William Horace Bruce, AO32042.
Esau, Charles Gillies, AO23063.
Esmay, Carle Howard, AO52603.
Estrumse, Elmer Frank, AO44581.
Etchemendy, John Michael, AO34388.
Ettenger, Clayton Warner, AO51412.
Evans, Andrew Julius, Jr., AO33832.
Evans, Edwin Carlos, AO34215.
×Evans, Harry Lee, Jr., AO35230.
Evans, James A., Jr., AO32856.
Evans, John Lewis, AO32669.
Evans, Louis Edgar, Jr., AO44194.
Evers, John Clay, AO33067.
×Ewing, Clair Eugene, AO44614.
Exon, Arthur Ernest, AO33368.
Ezzard, Richard Francis, AO22840.
Fackler, Paul Henry, AO32828.
×Fahy, Albert Francis, Jr., AO33235.
Falletta, Charlie, AO34597.
Fandel, William Herbert, AO33675.
Fant, Murray Gibbes, AO46031.
Farber, Morris, AO30048.
×Faris, Julius Porter, Jr., AO22230.
Farnham, Sheldon Webster, AO35112.
×Farrell, Robert Howe, AO53215.
Farrior, William Owen, AO45683.
Faver, Dudley Ervin, AO33673.
Fawcett, Ralph Monroe, AO23386.
Fay, Fergus Cruse, AO35203.
Fazio, Frank Michael, AO32848.
Fee, Francis Raymond, AO38771.
Felknor, Robert Snoddy, AO30469.
Fellows, Paul DeWitt, AO42421.
Felton, George Boyd, AO32418.
×Fenn, Frank Lawrence, AO51777.
Fenske, Leslie Claude, AO51496.
Ferguson, Harvey Eugene, AO33700.
×Ferguson, Howard Eastin, AO52392.
Ferguson, Ivan Leonard, AO40710.
Ferguson, Marion Grey, Jr., AO29862.
Ferguson, Matthew Henry Taylor, AO45368.
Fernandez, Fernando Joseph, AO33225.
Ferrey, James Paisley, AO32596.
Ferrill, Harlan Benton, AO23313.
Ficke, Robert Hamilton, AO33847.
Fickling, William Arnold, AO45073.
Field, Eugene Hollister, AO42615.
Fielder, Leo Edwin, AO33545.
×Finan, Bernard Joseph, Jr., AO46023.
×Fincke, Robert Theodore, AO33017.
×Finnegan, Julian Pat, AO41967.
×Finney, Harris Edward, AO51310.
Fischer, John Joseph, AO43804.
Fischer, Milton, AO40141.
Fish, Robert William, AO34067.
Fisher, Charles Dillon, AO45812.
Fisher, John Logan, AO30416.
Fisher, Russell Fredrick, AO35354.
Fisher, Sydney Gilbert, AO23043.
Fisher, Thomas Legate 2d, AO23742.
Fite, Calvin Ward, Jr., AO39128.
Fitzgerald, Joseph Ordell, AO30705.
Fitzgerald, Maurice Joseph, AO52325.
Fitzsimmons, Joe, AO44845.
×Fizer, Elmer Parsons, AO43069.
Fjelstad, Kenneth Silas, AO46377.
Flanagan, James Lee, AO40731.
Flashman, James Derwent, AO43424.
×Fleming, Arch Charles, AO51306.
×Fleming, James Hilliard, AO43326.
×Fleming, John Daly, AO51212.
×Fletcher, Edward James, AO52278.
Fletcher, Joseph Otis, AO34659.
Fletcher, Thomas, Jr., AO22427.
Fling, Dean Arthur, AO53267.
Foerster, Frederick Henry, Jr., AO21859.
Foley, James Gleason, AO22650.
×Foley, Jesse Rush, Jr., AO52990.
×Follmer, Jacob, AO31804.
Ford, Edward Randall, AO22146.
Ford, John Taylor, AO39121.
Forrest, George, AO43799.
Forsyth, Allen Peter, AO32442.
×Foster, Byron Winton, AO34021.
Foster, Donald Calvin, AO25189.
Foster, George McKee, AO35017.
Foster, Neil Norman, AO43373.
Fountain, Willard Asa, AO22479.
Fouts, Thomas Allen, Jr., AO53146.
×Fowles, Charles Vernon, AO32470.
Fowles, J. Francis, Jr., AO40748.
Francis, Paul Hildreth, AO45092.
×Frandsen, Hugh Andrew, AO31662.
Franklin, Charles Francis, AO34175.
Franks, George Eben, AO43739.
Frans, Richard John, AO45575.
Franzen, Earl Leroy, AO32630.
Freeman, Edmund Frederick, AO52172.
×Freiburger, Paul Ignatius, AO42437.
French, John, AO35103.
Freshour, Beryl Harry, AO42448.
Friederichs, Gilbert Francis, AO32905.
Friedlander, Edward Allen, AO51573.
Friedman, Ivan Morton, AO52397.
Frisble, Curtis Lynn, AO33444.
Frizen, John Edward, AO35244.
Fry, Richard Jefferson, AO44903.
Fryer, Rex Donald, AO34891.
Fulcher, G. H., AO32935.
Fuller, Benton Franklin, Jr., AO42559.
Fuller, Roger Garfield, AO31338.
Fullerton, Donald Joseph, AO51271.
Fulton, Charles Everett, AO42072.
×Fulton, Oscar William, AO30784.
Fulton, Wayne Lewis, AO45859.
Furman, William Baker, AO34449.
Gabreski, Francis Stanley, AO46026.
Gadler, Steve Joseph, AO51270.
×Gaffney, John William, AO44165.
Gahan, Theodore Patrick, AO38686.
Gaitley, Edward Donald, Jr., AO32802.
Galbreath, Samuel Cairnes, AO34346.
Gallagher, Francis Bernard, AO21668.
Gallagher, Raymond Keith, AO33855.
Gallagher, Robert Emmett, AO19250.
×Galligan, Clarence Joseph, AO34475.
Gallo, Frank Paul, AO42003.
Gamber, Karl Solmon, AO45621.
Gandy, Raymond Eugene, AO34482.
Garber, James Franklin, Jr., AO42334.
Garland, Ben Allen, AO34340.
×Garner, Robert Frank, Jr., AO24546.
Garrett, John William, Jr., AO32421.
Garrett, Kenneth Lee, AO24485.
×Garrett, Louis Henry, AO34944.
Garrigan, Robert James, AO35123.
Garrison, Edwin Herbert, AO24342.
×Gary, Willis Jewett, AO38193.
Gauss, William Henry, AO32093.
Gavares, Nicholas John, AO43917.
Geary, George Kenneth, AO42580.
Gefell, John Charles, AO43429.
Gehrig, Raymond Miller, AO35193.
×Geismer, Oscar Henry, AO39962.
Gell, Thomas Wesley, AO45072.
Genetti, Frank Victor, AO34080.
×Gentry, Elbert Bailey, AO29812.
George, Walter Russell, AO44858.
Gerdau, Walter Henry, Jr., AO52161.
Gerzin, Walter John, AO33713.
Gesell, Robert Charles, AO32365.
Getz, George Glen, AO32372.
Gibbons, Robert Joseph, AO33448.
Gibbs, Asa Ben, AO31595.
Gibson, Harold Clayton, AO34524.
Gibson, William Louis, AO41943.

Gilbert, Huntington Kerr, AO22424.
Gilbert, Lawrence Gaylord, AO34992.
Gilbert, Olin Edward, AO34494.
Gill, Alfred Riley, AO34814.
Gillanders, Bruce William, AO40176.
Gillespie, Joe Gill, AO32742.
×Gillespie, William Gregory, AO43727.
Gilliland, Gilbert Linzy, AO32550.
×Gillis, Charles Francis, AO31760.
Gillum, Virgil Monroe, AO32211.
Gilman, Mark Hulings, AO45345.
×Giuliano, Albert, AO51303.
Ginsyer, Herbert Bernard, Jr., AO34492.
×Glaser, Goodlett John, AO43431.
Glass, Burl Elijah, Jr., AO35025.
×Glassburn, Kenneth Lemuel, AO45826.
×Glasser, Otto John, AO25304.
×Glassman, George Henry, AO42155.
×Glenn, Jack Phifer, AO45724.
Glenny, Gale Spencer, AO34381.
Glessner, Milton Fager, Jr., AO32411.
Glomb, Ferdinand Frederick, Jr., AO34424.
×Glover, Walter Parish, Jr., AO35137.
Godman, Henry Clay, AO21664.
Goerder, Robert Louis, AO34287.
Golden, Bob Irving, AO42326.
×Golden, Ellington Douglas, AO43465.
×Goldinger, Milton, AO39923.
Golledge, Kenneth Kingman, AO42396.
Gomez, Eliseo, AO51865.
Good, Donald Edward, AO35248.
Good, John Carter, AO31710.
Good, Robert Beattie, AO34581.
×Good, Robert Ogden, AO32973.
Goodell, Howard Clarke, AO23713.
Goodhart, Morgan, AO42031.
Goodloe, John Hill, AO42080.
Goodman, Gilbert Ernest, AO33289.
Goodwin, George Robert, AO45457.
×Goolsby, George Stokes, AO33199.
Gordon, Andrew Fraser, AO45014.
Gordon, Donald Millard, AO26318.
×Goree, Richard Day, AO45996.
Gorham, John Durham, Jr., AO35212.
Gorman, George William, AO43058.
Gorman, George Daniel, Jr., AO33066.
Gosewisch, Guy Neil, AO45842.
Goss, Edmund Robert, AO43840.
Gough, Jamie, AO34167.
Gould, David, AO45532.
Gould, Elmer Mervin, AO31674.
Gould, George, AO33846.
Gould, Gordon Thomas, Jr., AO23743.
Gould, Robert Austin, Jr., AO43782.
×Goyt, Gordon Franklin, AO45694.
Grable, Francis Lorenz, AO34370.
×Grable, John, Jr., AO35023.
Grady, Frank John, AO31872.
Graeser, Richard Gordon, AO29914.
Graham, Donald William, AO25247.
Graham, Floyd, AO39977.
×Graham, Marion Richmond, AO51353.
Graham, William Robert, AO30116.
Granholm, Axel Viggo, AO51653.
×Grant, Thomas Joseph, AO42533.
Grashlo, Samuel Charles, AO34516.
Graves, John Calvin, AO33659.
×Graves, Lewis Tolliver, AO30190.
Graves, Vincent Joseph, AO46060.
Gray, Guy Bryce, AO53103.
Graybeal, James Mathewson, AO46134.
Greco, Joseph Alfred Lowry, AO44302.
Greelis, Don Kay, AO41855.
Green, Donald James, AO33671.
Green, Eugene Wendell, AO31994.
Green, Robert Alan, AO43507.
Greene, Edward Chace, Jr., AO51342.
Gregory, William Lyte, AO43449.
Greiner, Paul Earl, AO35209.
Greiner, Reginald Romine, AO29915.
×Grek, Robert Marshall, AO42648.
Gremmler, Paul Edward, AO32759.
×Gribble, James Thomas, Jr., AO44431.
Griffin, Goodman Griffith, Jr., AO42824.
Griffin, Joseph Henry, AO35090.
Griffin, Louis Gray, AO33970.
Griffin, Richard Varney, AO34263.
Griffith, Stebbins West, AO40549.
×Grimes, Lyle Clark, AO29924.
Grogan, Charles Edgar, AO22355.
Gross, Clarence Henry, AO33417.
Gross, Edward David, AO43779.
×Gross, James Oakland, AO34522.
Grossmith, Louis Bertram, Jr., AO34008.
Grove, Philip Pike, AO40593.
×Growdon, Laurence Arlin, AO44167.
Grower, Mason Henry, Jr., AO42672.
Grubb, William Franklin, AO31022.
Gruber, George Lincoln, AO32227.
Grumbles, Wilbur John, AO34365.
Gudgel, Floyd J., AO31540.
Gudjunis, Wasco Edward, AO44647.
Gugliotta, Philip Anthony, AO32135.
×Guilbert, Edward August, AO46106.
Gullick, John McMullan, AO30669.
Gunderson, Robert Stephen, AO32913.
×Gunnison, Justin Cofran, AO33413.
×Gunther, Rodney Edward, AO32616.
Gurnett, Thomas Edward, AO22593.
Gustafson, Roy William, AO22321.
×Guthrey, Edison Dale, AO45036.
Guthrie, James William, AO24129.
Haas, Wilford Norman, AO42657.
Haase, Charles Hermann, AO42018.
Habeger, Joseph Edward, AO34813.
Hadfield, Edward Snuggs, AO44967.
Hadwin, Arthur James, AO44509.
Haesler, John Dietrich Walter, AO33702.
×Haggard, Van Buren, AO32438.
Hagins, Newton Doris, AO30451.
Hahn, Clarence William, AO31505.
Hahn, Delbert Henry, AO22549.
Haile, James Ernest, Jr., AO22674.
Haile, Roland Reed, AO42240.
Hairston, Francis Booth, AO42517.
×Halberstadt, Harry Julius, AO45211.
Halderson, Oliver Kenmore, AO45075.
Hale, Russell Dean, AO33011.
Hale, Samuel, AO34188.
Haley, Albert Lawrence, AO45862.
Hall, Byron Eugene, AO25176.
Hall, Conway Scott, AO33966.
×Hall, Haywood, AO43951.
Hall, James Heard, AO34848.
Hall, Leonard Roger, AO32934.
Hall, Max Woodrow, AO23608.
×Hall, Robert Turnbull, Jr., AO35245.
Hall, William Jarvis, AO31628.
Halley, Oscar Thomas, Jr., AO45704.
Hallock, Judson, AO45038.
Hamberg, Walter, Jr., AO34372.
Hamby, Henry Gordon, Jr., AO33266.
×Hamilton, Edwin John, AO32569.
Hamilton, Harry Starr, AO30078.
Hamilton, McHenry, Jr., AO22553.
Hammond, Mahlon Bray, AO35005.
Hamner, A. H., Jr., AO25342.
Hampton, John Alexander, AO30016.
Hampton, Thomas Kerns, AO21667.
Haney, George William, AO52191.
Haney, Otto Reed, AO33743.
Haney, Richard Paul, AO53371.
Hanford, Samuel Burton, AO40469.
Hanson, Bertil Everett, AO32353.
Harcos, Bela Alan, AO21617.
Harcos, Kermit Arpad, AO22450.
Hardesty, Wilmer Allen, AO31930.
Harding, Edwin Forrest, Jr., AO24097.
Harding, Frank Burkley, AO22819.
Harding, Richard Corrie, AO45439.
×Hardman, Charles Franklin, AO32637.
Hardwick, Walter Amile, AO42373.
Hardy, John Kay, AO45053.
Hardy, Otha Bennett, Jr., AO22524.
Hare, Robert Philip, 3d, AO42565.
Hargett, William Marion, AO33633.
Harlow, Henry Maynard, AO33572.
Harpole, Donald Clifford, AO42912.
Harrell, Irving Jackson, Jr., AO34866.
Harrell, William Sommerville, AO46228.
×Harris, Alexander Everette, AO52405.
×Harris, Bentley Hill, Jr., AO40752.
Harris, John Frederick, AO23691.
Harris, John Lanier, AO31434.
Harris, William Doyle, AO34579.
Harris, William Seth, AO43008.
Harrison, Ike Henry, AO39953.
Harrison, William Dean, AO51273.
Hart, Allen Gold, AO32729.
Hartman, Frank Althoff, AO42670.
Harty, William Edwin, AO32215.
Harvey, Clyde Lawrence, Jr., AO45670.
Harvey, Harry Canavan, AO24076.
Harwick, George Luerssen, AO45596.
Haskins, Charles Gregg, AO42319.
Hassler, Ira Edward, AO34509.
Hatch, Horace Eldredge, AO34352.
Hatfield, Douglas Hampton, AO35246.
Hatlem, John Carsten, AO51350.
Haveman, Allen Ernest, AO33552.
×Havey, James Halbert, AO44915.
Hawel, Leo, Jr., AO33770.
×Hawes, Ivan Ignatious, AO51415.
Hawkins, Gabe Coke, Jr., AO34400.
×Hawthorne, Harry James, AO33962.
Hayduk, Alfred George, AO23016.
Hayes, Jack William, Jr., AO34310.
Hayes, Thomas Lloyd, Jr., AO34362.
Haygood, John Calvin, AO45666.
Hazard, John Thomas, AO42947.
Head, Charles William, Jr., AO40660.
Healey, James Francis, AO35063.
Healy, John Patrick, AO22500.
Hearn, Bunn, Jr., AO52833.
×Hearn, John Vernon, Jr., AO24341.
Heath, Norval Kemp, AO34128.
Heatly, Ralph Orville, AO45918.
Heaton, Donald Haynes, AO23705.
×Heavner, William Stewart, AO30889.
×Heber, Malcolm McMillan, AO23370.
Hedleston, Robert Webb, AO30077.
Hedlund, Earl Clifford, AO33596.
×Heffner, Charles Ritchey, AO32164.
×Heinzel, Jack Herman, AO43680.
×Hemans, John Gullans, AO32111.
Henderson, David Louis, AO34668.
×Henderson, Harvey Earl, AO44473.
Henderson, Lykes Shelton, AO46013.
×Henderson, Richard Harrison, AO30058.
Hendrix, William Murray, AO23559.
×Henggeler, Francis Joseph, AO45483.
Henry, Fred Guyant, AO32222.
Henry, John Bailey, Jr., AO24107.
Henry, Stephen Wetherell, AO33292.
Henschke, John Miles, AO23780.
×Hensley, Harry Simpson, AO51909.
Herbes, Edward, AO25196.
Herbison, Robert, AO51573.
Herblin, William Leonard, AO43291.
×Herndon, John Minor, AO43707.
Herndon, Robert Elmore, Jr., AO33763.
Hernlund, Richard Thomas, AO45899.
Herrman, George Ross, AO32640.
Herron, Thomas Jackson, AO40941.
Hess, Ulysses Washington, AO40029.
Heuer, Henry James, AO31487.
Hibbert, Richard Blair, AO32183.
Hickey, Sanford Wayne, AO32678.
Hickman, Raymond Edward, AO45801.
Hicks, George Luther 3d, AO24053.
Hicks, William Benjamin, AO41735.
Hidden, Eugene Albert, AO41924.
High, James Russell, AO34603.
Hight, Fred Thomson, AO43661.
Hignett, Forest Edwin, AO33466.
×Hileman, Cecil Alpheus, AO51638.
Hill, Frank Ackerman, AO34261.
Hill, Joe Harry, AO52333.
Hill, Kenneth Everette, AO35038.
Hill, Lawrence Glenn, Jr., AO46090.
Hill, Preston Louis, AO45817.
Hilliard, Robert Christy, AO41889.
Hillman, Donald Edison, AO34611.
Hilpert, Arvis Laverne, AO46194.
×Hilt, William Myron, AO45872.
Hinch, Murrell Francis, AO42937.
Hines, James Payne, AO43839.
×Hinrichs, Clair Allen, AO51820.
Hinton, Bruce Houston, AO34182.
Hippler, William Paul, AO42393.
Hixson, Samuel Thurston, AO51431.
Hoerner, Le Roy Day, AO34450.
×Hoey, Charles Joseph, AO45666.
Hoffman, Arthur Elkin, AO33309.
Hoffman, Ward Gerald, AO31857.
Hogan, James Francis, AO53245.
Hogan, Patrick Joseph, AO42659.
Hogan, Raymond Eric, AO33110.
Hogg, James Arthur, AO32767.

Holbein, Fred William, AO51490.
×Holbert, Kenneth Warren, AO35084.
×Holbrook, Joseph Charles, Jr., AO34936.
Holden, Raymond Barnes, AO43075.
Holdiman, Thomas Alexander, AO20629.
Holland, Harold Laverne, AO29609.
Holland, Thomas Elbridge, AO51803.
Hollick, Thomas Charles, AO40345.
Hollingsworth, George Herbert, AO34019.
Holm, Florian A., AO32058.
×Holmes, Robert West, AO44711.
Holmquist, George William, AO45726.
Holsclaw, Gerald Reed, AO34246.
Holsey, Raymond Earl, AO34528.
Holst, John Bernt, AO38999.
Holstrom, Everett Wayne, AO33463.
Holt, Francis William, AO42238.
Holt, Harold Norman, AO52863.
Holt, James William, Jr., AO32817.
×Holt, John Franklin, AO52160.
Honeycutt, Dale Carter Lampkin, AO43489.
Hook, Fred G., Jr., AO33586.
×Hooker, George Brown, Jr., AO31341.
Hoover, Travis, AO34018.
×Hope, John Warren, AO30393.
Hopkins, David Linton, AO42303.
×Hopkins, James Irdell, AO34580.
Hopkins, Wallace Eugene, AO40694.
Hopper, William Falcon, Jr., AO43359.
Horgan, Maurice Chapman, AO43665.
Horn, Robert William, AO23689.
Hornby, David Alonzo, AO34014.
×Horner, Lawson Clifton, Jr., AO25225.
×Hornsby, Thomas William, AO33694.
×Hornsey, William C., AO38760.
Horras, Lawrence Edward, AO32904.
Horton, Franklin Wolfram, AO23263.
Hosken, Robert Thomas, AO40360.
Hotmann, William August, AO38766.
Houck, Colie, AO42856.
Houghton, Edwin Gordon, AO51896.
Howard, James Shuler, AO45092.
Howard, Rodger Lee, AO34928.
Howe, Everett Bo, AO34179.
Howell, John Douglas, AO30742.
Howell, Joseph Woodrow, AO34964.
Howell, Quincy Douglas, AO51439.
×Howell, Thomas Alexander, AO51407.
Hoy, William Astor, Jr., AO25368.
Hradel, Joseph Rudolph, AO42363.
Hreha, Joseph Albert, AO42701.
Hubbard, James Howard, AO33419.
Huber, Paul Martin, AO35287.
Hubler, George Oliver, AO46082.
Hudelson, James Lane, AO46255.
Huey, Sam Lee, AO35050.
Huff, Howard Chester, AO42964.
Hughes, Aquilla Ballard, Jr., AO23397.
Hughes, Harold Lee, AO44244.
×Hugos, Howard Francis, AO44737.
Hull, William Thomas, Jr., AO35075.
Humbrecht, George William, AO52480.
Humfeld, Harold Emmett, AO33190.
Humphreys, Lloyd Ronland, AO42987.
Humphreys, Robert Willis, AO42020.
Humphries, Bert Willis, AO33250.
×Hundt, George Raymond, AO45040.
Hunt, Edward Everhart, AO29754.
Hunt, Jack Stuart, AO42132.
Hunt, Leigh Hale, AO29620.
Huntington, Edward Marshall, AO44710.
Hunziker, Richard Overton, AO33588.
Hurley, Arthur Francis, AO29575.
Hurley, Charles, AO51390.
×Hurley, Robert B., AO51484.
Hussey, John Joseph, Jr., AO33514.
Hutchins, Frank Douglas Burlingame Greene, AO29742.
Hutchison, John Joseph, AO18743.
×Huthnance, Guy Thomas, AO51923.
Hydron, Clarence August, AO40595.
Hylton, John Thomas, Jr., AO32032.
Hynd, William Brown, AO42031.
×Ice, Thew Joseph, Jr., AO19505.
Imhof, Louis Patrick, AO43402.
×Imparato, Edward Thomas, AO45505.
Impson, Ivan Hurst, AO31678.
Inabinet, Clarence Jefferson, Jr., AO39021.
×Ingelido, Michael Joseph, AO33882.
Irby, Claude Hunter, AO40353.
Ireland, Loren Elsworth, AO33120.
Ireland, Russell Forrest, AO53092.
Irish, James Robert, AO53262.
Irish, Lynn Thornton, AO45328.
Irwin, Jesse Arthur, AO53393.
×Isbell, James Albert, Jr., AO32214.
Israel, Lawrence Joseph, AO51307.
Itz, Milford Felix, AO22866.
×Ivory, John Carroll, AO44099.
×Jack, Jean Albert, AO24178.
Jackson, Carl Edmund, AO44730.
Jackson, Clarence John, AO45669.
Jackson, Jerome William, AO43565.
Jackson, Willie Otto, Jr., AO34016.
Jacobs, Francis, AO52218.
Jacobs, John William, Jr., AO45836.
Jacobs, Kenneth Clarence, AO33745.
Jacobsen, Walter Vincent, AO29677.
Jacquet, Edward Milton, Jr., AO53284.
James, Albert William, AO33449.
Jamieson, Alex Cameron, AO32662.
Jamison, Marshall Verdine, AO33532.
Janney, Norman Douglas, AO31535.
Jantzen, Charles Donald, AO34790.
Jarek, Frank William, AO22425.
Jarnagin, James Leslie, AO32440.
Jarred, James Franklin, AO29558.
Jeep, Fred Thomas, AO32127.
Jeffries, Murrell Moore, AO42777.
Jenkins, Edward Lydick, AO32036.
×Jennings, Payne, Jr., AO33831.
×Jessie, Frank Saint, AO43453.
Jochim, LaVergne Claude, AO43540.
×Johannes, John Michael, AO33001.
Johnsen, Lester James, AO32769.
Johnson, Barney Lee, Jr., AO34869.
Johnson, Charles R., AO29769.
Johnson, Donald William, AO34434.
Johnson, Euchol Melvin, AO32180.
Johnson, Frederick Coolidge, AO51755.
×Johnson, Herbert Elroy, Jr., AO33231.
Johnson, James McLean, AO31929.
Johnson, James Kenneth, AO33510.
Johnson, Leo Holger, AO32485.
Johnson, Lorin Lavar, AO34064.
Johnson, Milton Wayne, AO34090.
Johnson, Morrell Shaver, AO43990.
Johnson, Oris Baker, AO34821.
Johnson, Oscar Graham, AO13622.
Johnson, Paul Adrian, AO29298.
Johnson, Roberts Poinsett, Jr., AO42833.
Johnson, Robert Dalton, AO44975.
×Johnston, Clifford Andersen, AO33081
×Johnston, Harry Cornealius, AO42781.
Johnston, Robert Reed, AO40080.
Johnston, Ronald Alexander, AO32263.
×Johnstone, Charles William, AO25224.
×Jones, Charles Oliver, AO35002.
Jones, Curran Littleton, AO34623.
Jones, Dailey Morgan, AO30463.
Jones, David James, AO34447.
Jones, Donald Theodore, AO42122.
Jones, Edelle Mason, AO45983.
Jones, Edward McWilliams, AO35079.
Jones, Edward Lindsey, AO35076.
Jones, George Lamar, AO25052.
Jones, Harry, AO42405.
Jones, Harry Henderson, AO41983.
×Jones, Jarvis Parnell, AO32652.
Jones, John Waldon, AO42034.
Jones, Osce Vernon, AO33649.
Jones, Paul Anson, AO35120.
Jones, Prentiss Charles, AO52298.
Jones, Richard, AO33423.
Jones, Robert Stewart, AO51244.
Jones, Robert Herrick, AO39048.
Jones, Wayne Emery, AO51458.
Jones, William Woodruff, AO34563.
Jones, William Anderson, AO34169.
Jones, William, AO32661.
Jones, Wilson Tolman, AO34003.
Jones, Wingate Brewer, AO45085.
×Jordan, Charles Edward, AO35026.
Jordan, John Alton, AO42149.
×Jowdy, William John, AO32152.
Judkins, William T., AO40005.
Juhasz, Andrew Anthony, AO44943.
Junkermann, Howard Calvin, AO34168.
Jurkens, Edward Albert, AO34413.
Justice, Arthur Edward, Jr., AO53466.
Kable, Max Sanford, AO34479.
Kalberer, Karl Hubert, AO51510.
Kalberer, Klem Franklin, AO32763.
×Kale, James Stewart, AO34527.
×Kauffman, George Roland, AO42072.
Keach, Thomas Carroll, AO30064.
Keating, Robert Edward, AO33672.
Keator, Randall Denison, AO34507.
Keefe, Don Robert, AO51241.
Keeler, Raymond Hager, AO30314.
Keeling, Gerald Fay, AO33132.
Keene, George Francis, Jr., AO29548.
×Keilman, Myron Harold, AO34767.
Keller, Charles Richard, Jr., AO34162.
×Keller, Frank Jacob, AO45494.
×Keller, Ralph Waldo, AO33232.
×Keller, William Dean, AO32666.
×Kellogg, Joseph Warner, AO42731.
×Kelly, Albert Sidney, AO34924.
×Kelly, Earle Wellington, AO45712.
×Kelly, John Harris, AO43352
×Kelsay, Clyde Bruce, AO34023.
Kelsey, Straughan Downing, AO23779.
Kemble, William Hudson, Jr., AO33726.
Kemp, James Dudley, AO41173.
×Kenny, Thomas Francis, Jr., AO34327.
×Kent, Glenn Altran, AO32562.
×Kerbel, Walter, AO39818.
Kesling, Earl William, AO33744.
×Key, George Alexander, AO43742.
×Kiefer, Paul Clifford, AO51354.
Kieling, Harry Joseph, AO30063.
Kiley, Leo Austin, Jr., AO30091.
Kilgore, James Louis, AO30826.
Killgore, Earl Henderson, AO30169.
Killian, Carl Louis, AO45746.
×Kimball, James Nathaniel, AO61846.
Kimbrel, Claude Roscoe, AO35016.
×Kincade, Norman Theodore, AO34493.
×Kincheloe, Charles M., AO24444.
×King, Hall, AO38731.
King, Herbert Thompson, AO42673.
King, Kenneth Wilson, AO52179.
×King, Norman Elliott, AO45685.
Kingen, Elmer Fred, AO32807.
Kingham, Arthur Raymond, AO41964.
×Kingsley, Earl Roster, AO44062.
Kirby, David Joseph, AO43570.
Kirchner, Hans Kraft, AO29759.
Kirk, Tyrus Howard, AO40507.
Kirkland, Sanford Holmes, Jr., AO31588.
Kirkpatrick, Harold Cope, AO45577.
Kirtley, Robert Eberle, AO45698.
×Kirton, Edwin Malcolm, AO30360.
×Kiser, Edgar Lee, AO44116.
Kittel, Louis Richard, AO44947.
×Kittel, Robert Stewart, AO45476.
×Kjeldseth, Clarion Jonason, AO34041.
Klein, Edward Colburn, AO30856.
Klein, Frederick William, AO51288.
Kleinjan, Lyle Vernon, AO42793.
Klemovich, Joseph Thomas, AO32572.
Kline, John William, AO34925.
Kline, Richard William, AO23906.
Klos, Lawrence Balfour, AO31851.
Kneen, George Henry, Jr., AO33512.
Knierim, Charles Frederick, AO52338.
Knight, Gordon Bennett, AO31648.
Knobloch, Richard August, AO34792.
Knox, Jonathan Horace, AO33598.
Knox, Robert Burns, AO34769.
×Knudson, Albert, AO44779.
Knudson, Cecil Cephas, AO43497.
Kodis, John William, AO45120.
Kohlrieser, Francis Louis, AO42069.
Kolb, Lewis Jackson, AO52367.
Konosky, John Martin, AO45752.
Kontak, Emil Walter, AO44066.
Koontz, Ray Wilson, Jr., AO33003.
Korges, Woodrow Wilson, AO22563.
×Kracman, Miles, AO42140.
Kresslov, Russell, AO43663.
Krieger, Andrew Edward, Jr., AO35233.
Krieger, George Hubert, AO42681.
Kroeber, Adolf, AO42034.
Kruzel, Joseph John, AO34305.
×Kugel, Richard Charles, AO30629.
Kuhl, Philip John, AO23390.
Kuhn, Robert Belden, AO21307.
×Kunce, Lee Roy, AO43994.
×Kundrat, Andrew, AO32870.
×Kunkel, David Ernest, Jr., AO23805.
Kunkel, John Howard, Jr., AO40582.

Kuntz, Bernard Romayne, AO45309.
Kutschera, Walter Felix, AO43477.
×Kyes, William Bush, AO34893.
×LaBarr, William, AO51675.
LaBudu, Joseph Edward, AO29713.
LaClare, Edward Francis, AO34458.
La Grippo, Antonio Natle, AO41997.
×LaPlante, Robert William, AO32816.
La Rocca, Gerard Anthony, AO23948.
Lackey, Archer Evans, AO33803.
Lackey, John Herbert, Jr., AO25197.
Lacy, Albert John, AO33061.
Ladd, Avery Jackson, AO29613.
Lafrenz, William Arthur, AO45902.
Laking, Percy Albert, AO42087.
Lambert, Blake Wallace, AO34225.
Lambert, Jean Koke, AO24392.
Lambert, John Lincoln, AO34478.
Lambert, Joseph S., AO51787.
Lambeth, Benjamin Shadarach, Jr., AO44490.
Lamek, William Jacob, AO30697.
Lampley, Harmon, Jr., AO21792.
Lancaster, Charles Eugene, Jr., AO22384.
Landall, Lincoln Wilson, AO43059.
Lane, William, Jr., AO22547.
Lanford, Horace Whaley, Jr., AO34314.
×Lange, Harry Alfred, AO41996.
×Lansdale, Edward Geary, AO42180.
×Larkey, Isaac Farrand, Jr., AO34439.
Larson, Harold Vernon, AO45841.
×Larson, Lloyd Robert, AO46153.
Larson, Robert Hillman, AO34224.
Larson, Robert Sherman, AO43959.
Lassiter, Olbert Ferring, AO39106.
Latham, James Colson, AO53299.
Latiolais, Stanley Paul, AO34812.
Latshaw, Joseph Bruce, Jr., AO46056.
Laubrich, Herman Allan, AO34811.
Laughlin, Joseph Lyle, AO35321.
Lavell, Walter Wellman, AO23032.
Lavelle, John Daniel, AO25244.
Laven, George, Jr., AO33459.
Law, Henry Leland, Jr., AO32438.
×Lawrence, Henry Wells, AO34535.
Lawrence, John Charles, AO43640.
Lawrence, Reesor Mott, AO22377.
Lawrence, Rollo Charles, Jr., AO33356.
Lawrence, Samuel Eugene, Jr., AO22591.
Lawson, John Kercheval, AO31428.
Lawson, LeRoy Franklin, AO40462.
Lawson, Robert Morris, AO34584.
Lawton, Thomas Oregon, Jr., AO33860.
Laybourn, John Eugene, AO45561.
×Layton, Robert Fulton, AO32471.
LeBell, Arnold, AO42327.
LeMaster, Douglas Ray, AO41881.
LeMay, Lloyd William, AO51521.
×Leach, William Hinman, AO30127.
×Learnard, Arthur Trowbridge, AO31634.
×Ledford, Jack Clarence, AO46279.
Ledoux, Elzia, AO34931.
×Lee, James Lyle, AO43456.
Lee, Jay Smith, AO53167.
Leen, Gerald Adrian, AO33404.
Leffingwell, Samuel Dennis, AO41902.
×Lehman, Ted R., AO42154.
Lehnhard, Donald Frank, AO32123.
Leimbacher, Robert James, AO33293.
×Leisy, Roland Henry, AO53343.
Lemmon, Cyrus Jackson, AO40295.
Lemmon, James Cookrey, AO34113.
Leocha, Adolph John, AO24436.
Lerche, Andrew Olaf, AO21438.
Lesh, Newton Doremus, AO51322.
Leslie, George Adalord, AO33968.
Levering, John Robert, AO42166.
×Lewis, Archie Robert, AO44559.
Lewis, Daniel Moody, AO32139.
Lewis, David Lowell, AO22446.
Lewis, Earl Westlake, AO51205.
Lewis, James Thomas, AO34126.
Lewis, Leon Guilford, AO34797.
Lewis, Robert Clayton, AO33269.
Lewis, Lawrence Lee, AO31349.
Liebman, David Israel, AO35038.
×Lightner, Lawrence Scott, AO35155.
×Likes, David Henry, AO43983.
Liles, Robert Lee, AO35291.
Lilley, Clarence Wellington, AO42803.
Linder, Kenneth Albert, AO34062.
Lindgren, Richard Wendell, AO31951.
Lindley, William Cecil, Jr., AO46166.
Lindley, William Carey, AO34776.
Lindsey, Howard William, AO31538.
Lindstrand, Carl Barber, AO31373.
Lindstrum, Herbert James, AO51234.
Linehan, John Royal, AO23466.
Lingamfelter, Charles Brown, Jr., AO34460.
Lingard, Aldro Immanuel, AO53133.
Linsley, Scott Ellsworth, AO42625.
Lipscomb, Woodrow Wilson, AO34583.
×Lipsker, Martin Sigmund, AO40335.
Lister, Ralph Brown, AO21343.
Lively, Richard Thomas, AO32114.
Livesay, Earl James, AO34136.
Livingston, John Waters, AO33789.
Ljunggren, Ernest Nils, AO25232.
Locke, John Langford, AO23747.
×Lockman, John Murk, AO42008.
×Loesch, Lawrence Frederic, AO45466.
Logan, Arthur Lawrence, AO29545.
Logan, James Charles, AO43792.
Loggins, Lloyd Burnett, AO39851.
Loisel, John Simon, AO35133.
Lollar, William Houston, AO42065.
Long, Charles James 3d, AO21852.
Long, David Winston, AO51623.
×Long, Lewis Rex, AO42314.
Longino, Houston Walker, Jr., AO22631.
Longridge, Emmett Francis, AO32476.
Loomis, Oliver Demond, AO31827.
Loomis, Richard, AO30308.
Loomis, Robert Gillis, AO46249.
Louden, Edward Kimball, AO53214.
Lounsbery, Arthur Heath, AO42230.
×Lovenbury, James William, AO40661.
Lowman, Richard Cook, AO51774.
Lowry, Leon Lloyd, AO32788.
×Lucas, Walter Yeates, AO35422.
Luehring, Dale Wilferd, AO34642.
Lumpkin, William Lawrence, AO45510.
Lumsden, Reid Radford, AO30683.
Lund, Harold Gold, AO34909.
Lundquist, Gustav Edward, AO34386.
Luschen, Frank Leslie, AO45963.
Lutz, Charles Jean, AO33009.
Lutz, Simon Michael, Jr., AO42595.
×Lyle, James Perkins, AO34546.
×Lyle, Lewis Elton, AO33557.
×Lynch, Donald Hugh, AO34880.
Lyon, Edsel Lonnie, AO53361.
Lyons, James Raymond, AO24124.
Lyster, David King., Jr., AO34010.
Macdonald, Henry Gordon, AO33749.
×MacDonald, Daniel Venn, AO34298.
MacDuff, Francis Henry, AO21483.
MacKenzie, Norman Dexter, AO42874.
MacNaughton, Franklin H., AO24105.
Mack, Ingham Gallinger, AO41925.
Magid, Louis Borris, Jr., AO30104.
Magness, Woodrow Wilson, AO32718.
×Magruder, Eugene Ross, AO33160.
Mahon, Herschel Daniel, AO33288.
Mahon, James Eli, AO32872.
×Mahoney, Hugh, AO45855.
Mahr, Victor Montague, AO40696.
Main, Philip, AO45524.
Mainor, Andrew, AO29998.
Mallory, Robert Frank, AO46025.
Malloy, Verne, Henry, AO32716.
Manchester, Richard Easley, AO45098.
Mandt, William Frederick 3d, AO34396.
Mangan, James Harrison, AO46085.
Manion, Thomas Francis, Jr., AO42332.
Manning, George Max, AO25314.
Manss, Robert William, AO42413.
Mantoux, Lopez, Joseph, Jr., AO52575.
Marble, Hugh Higman, Jr., AO33277.
Marchant, John Chesley, AO42358.
Mariska, Ben Felix, AO43564.
Markham, Peter John, AO44640.
Marley, Frederick Harold, AO40440.
×Maroni, Robert James, AO34564.
Marr, Jack Franklin, AO25245.
Marsh, Charles Stewart, AO42440.
Marshall, Charles Sylvester, AO39038.
Marshall, Raymond H., AO30295.
Marston, Morrill Elwood, AO23220.
Martensen, John Kieth, AO52409.
Martensen, William Burke, AO33555.
Martin, Charles Patrick, AO29757.
Martin, Clarence Allan, Jr., AO34382.
Martin, John Byrd, AO43484.
Martin, John Robert, AO33435.
Martin, Joseph McClinnon, AO45884.
Martin, Lonnie Elwyn, AO31573.
×Martin, Vernon Paul, AO44732.
Martin, William Arthur, AO42488.
Martinoli, Frank Louis, AO41982.
Martinson, John McClure, AO33172.
×Marts, Kenneth Elliot, AO34005.
Marvel, George Bertram, Jr., AO53289.
×Marvin, Reinold Heman, AO42536.
Mason, Albert Joseph, AO42477.
Mason, Lassiter Albert, AO19060.
Mason, Regnald Hoyt, AO34414.
Mason, Vincent Elmore, AO45767.
Massengale, William Marcues, Jr., AO35024.
Massey, Donnell, AO34646.
Massion, John Wendel, AO22503.
×Masters, Robert Eugene, AO44195.
Matheson, Charles Fuller, AO24061.
Matthews, Ira Van Diver, AO40744.
×Matthews, Joseph Walter, AO42310.
Matthews, Luther Bailey, AO30457.
Matthews, Robert Lee, AO22476.
Matthews, Stanley Eldred, AO25203.
Mattia, Hugh John, AO42381.
Maull, Harold Vincent, AO45664.
×Maxwell, Donald Ward, AO32584.
Maxwell, Ernest Beverly, AO21972.
Maxwell, Hugh Durwood, Jr., AO40566.
May, Richard Henry, AO34374.
Mayall, Broun Hunt, AO29907.
Mayer, William Henry, AO34431.
Mayo, Ben Isbel, Jr., AO23735.
McAdams, Clayton Aubrey, AO42307.
McAfee, Harry Edwin, AO34503.
McBrayer, Cornelius Evans, AO32235.
×McBrayer, James Roy, Jr., AO45090.
McBride, James Lloyd, Jr., AO21762.
×McBride, William Peter, AO33625.
McCabe, Jerome Joseph, AO44874.
×McCafferty, George O'Day, AO34361.
×McCaffery, Lawrence Florian, AO40160.
McCall, Jim, AO52332.
McCalla, John Herman, AO45657.
McCampbell, James Monroe, AO30755.
McCants, Leland Stanford, Jr., AO32494.
McCartan, Arthur Austin, AO23062.
×McCarter, Elmer Heath, AO32694.
McCarthy, Fred Morton, AO51215.
McCarthy, James Francis, Jr., AO24225.
McChristy, Albert Jordan, Jr., AO32891.
McClelland, Harold Moody, AO35122.
McClenahan, Edward Franklin, AO30466.
McClernon, Glen John, AO35108.
×McClure, Jack Curtright, Jr., AO23771.
McClure, William Horace, AO51324.
McCluskey, Jack Lawrence, AO44924.
×McCollum, Hugh Archie, AO42540.
×McColpin, Carrol Warren, AO32591.
McComas, Edward Otis, AO35275.
McConnahay, John Donald, AO30607.
McConnell, Landon Edward, AO32271.
McCool, Harry Clayton, AO45825.
McCorkle, John, AO43031.
×McCown, Dean Augustus, AO52735.
McCown, James Harlan, AO30452.
McCoy, Frederic Emerson, AO32730.
McCracken, Austin Ralph, AO44247.
McCrackin, Marion Riffle, AO32533.
×McCrary, Robert Ryan, AO33324.
McCredie, Darwin Cromwell, AO31989.
McCrery, Robert Riley, AO32419.
McCroskey, Sam Earl, AO43483.
McCutcheon, Robert Haynes, AO24149.
McDaniel, Hervey Allison, Jr., AO35217.
McDaniel, John Thomas, AO42783.
×McDaniell, Samuel Ray, Jr., AO45986.
×McDermott, Charles Michael, AO51331.
McDonald, Audley Clifford, AO30570.
McDonald, Everett Arthur, AO35234.
McDonald, James Goulding, AO52313.
McFadden, James Neil, AO34994.
×McFarland, Earl, Jr., AO22909.
McFarland, Jack Boaz, AO43470.
McFarland, Thomas Stuart, Jr., AO42320.
McGary, Alvin, AO42197.
McGehee, Thomas Kendrick, AO33107.
McGinnis, Edgar Max, AO33314.
×McGlinn, Richard Morden, AO39800.

McGrath, Thomas Joseph, AO51410.
McGuire, William Henry, AO39910.
McIntire, Howard Jay, AO34600.
McKaba, Edward, AO43865.
×McKee, Daniel Deupree, AO35116.
McKee, Seth Jefferson, AO33851.
McKelvey, William Robert, AO45465.
McKenna, Charles Francis, 3d, AO33843.
McKenzie, James Beecher, AO25057.
McKenzie, Melvin Almon, AO25239.
×McKesson, Elmer Earle, AO22568.
McKinnon, Samuel Rawley, AO32328.
McKnight, David Thomas, AO31482.
×McKnight, Thomas Lanier, AO23455.
McKnight, William Louis, AO30456.
McKoy, Edwin Anderson, AO52142.
McLaughlin, John Arthur, AO33195.
×McLean, Michael Turner, AO42247.
McLeod, Robert Merritt, AO44821.
McNabb, John Malcolm, AO40676.
×McNamara, Eugene Addis, Jr., AO51465.
McNeal, Thomas Carl, AO22368.
×McNeil, Joseph Leonard, AO29866.
McRay, Edward James, Jr., AO46064.
McSwain, Alex Tracey, AO32035.
×McWhirter, Horace Bee, AO53350.
McWhorter, William Hugh, Jr., AO52475.
McWhorter, William Arther, AO33537.
McWilliams, Martin Cadenhead, AO25030.
McAllister, Gerald Bennion, AO34291.
×McTaggart, Elmer Ernest, AO34589.
Meador, John William, AO24017.
Mears, James Frank, AO35176.
Meeks, John Andrew, Jr., AO42509.
Meglemre, George Elden, AO41927.
Mehess, Gus John, AO52784.
Melcher, John Nelson, AO33207.
×Melton, Robert Elwin, AO32464.
Meng, Lewis Bruno, AO22610.
Meng, William Jones, AO34164.
Mengel, Herbert Osmes, Jr., AO44683.
Mercier, Alonzo Philip, AO42760.
Merritt, Ralph LeRoy, Jr., AO22875.
Messenger, Lester Charles, AO34300.
Messerschmitt, Kermit Day, AO31995.
×Mestler, Louis Jean Batiste, Jr., AO53069.
Metcalf, John Kenneth, AO42201.
×Metz, Cecil Clyde, AO44751.
Meyer, John Charles, AO34138.
Meyer, William Joseph, AO51563.
Michaelis, Ralph Leslie, AO24146.
Michie, Robert Edward Lee, AO34526.
Mickley, William Bowen, AO43810.
Middleton, Willard Rufus, AO29728.
Mignola, Harold Edward, AO32205.
×Mikulak, Michael Nicholas, AO31798.
Miles, Joe Douglas, AO39062.
×Millberry, Robert Ingalls, AO31724.
Miller, Alsey Coleman, Jr., AO42432.
Miller, Austin Luther, AO32092.
×Miller, Blake Charles, AO30343.
Miller, Clark Lorenzo, AO30653.
Miller, David Kenneth, AO42170.
Miller, David Vern, AO53360.
×Miller, DeWolfe Hugo, AO29831.
Miller, Donald Vernon, AO45103.
×Miller, Fred W., AO32144.
Miller, John Edward, AO46188.
Miller, Oliver William, AO51612.
Miller, Richard Wilson, AO45932.
Miller, Victor Burton, AO43598.
Miller, Walter Arlo, AO40312.
Miller, Warren Mahlon, Jr., AO44500.
Miller, William Edward, AO34630.
Miller, William Brumfield, Jr., AO42342.
Milling, John Butler, AO34551.
Mills, Morris Hammond, AO42264.
Mills, Ray, AO51334.
Mills, Robert Eugene, AO44681.
×Milne, Jack Gillespie, AO24112.
Milner, Victor, Jr., AO34915.
Milroy, Charles Knox, AO42613.
Mitchell, John William, AO32930.
Mitchell, Richard Randolph, AO45262.
Mitchell, Samuel Andrew, AO45005.
Mitchell, William LeRoy, Jr., AO23840.
Mitchim, Kelly Word, AO44405.
×Mize, Seth Albert, AO34530.
Mobbs, George Dalton, AO46231.
×Mogford, Ronald, AO51589.
Mohr, Clifford Frandsen Luck, AO51268.
Moir, Charles Louis, AO45343.
Monahan, John Daniel, AO46214.
Monroe, Henry Scaroboro, AO43511.
Montgomery, Emery Harry, AO53274.
Montgomery, Lee Ward, AO42409.
Montgomery, Robert Pearson, AO33618.
Moody, Joe Lycle, AO34500.
×Moomaw, Lorris William, AO30364.
Moon, Robert Sell, AO53057.
Mooney, Joseph Francis, AO25279.
×Moore, Alan Douglas, AO35271.
Moore, Andrew Dale, AO42651.
×Moore, Charles Edwin, AO46116.
Moore, Harold Elwood, AO34252.
Moore, Henry Neville, AO43876.
Moore, Hugh Campbelle, AO34865.
Moore, Lloyd Ewing, AO33256.
Moore, Lynn Ross, AO34127.
Moore, Malcolm Arnot, AO25200.
Moore, Porter Brake, AO51828.
Moore, Walter Leon, Jr., AO23890.
Moore, William Evans, Jr., AO43858.
Moore, Wilson, AO45321.
Moores, Howard Oliver, Jr., AO52187.
Moorhead, Jesse Jefferson, AO33103.
Moran, James Joseph, AO51470.
Moreland, Hugh Harold, AO32952.
Morgan, Chester Harvey, AO32057.
×Morgan, Francis Bell, AO44062.
Morgan, MacPherson, AO23495.
Morneau, Chester Henry, AO31901.
Morrill, Harry Eugene, AO40427.
Morris, Harold Thomas, AO51700.
Morris, William Wallace, Jr., AO45370.
×Morrison, Albert Morris, AO51388.
Morrow, James Daniel, AO51852.
Morton, Charles William, AO33650.
Moseley, Cuthbert Livingston, Jr., AO34009.
Mosher, Rowland Orson, AO45874.
Moss, Henry James Yancy, AO51220.
Mosse, Charles Edward, AO24351.
Mottern, Elmer McDowell, AO45067.
Moyer, Robert Franklin, AO44503.
Moynihan, William Laurence, AO51449.
×Mueller, Alvin John Henry, Jr., AO38819.
Muhl, Fred Joseph, AO34275.
Muhlbach, Robert Prins, AO31896.
Muhlenberg, David Dorrington Kress, AO40364.
×Muldoon, Bernard Richard, AO46179.
×Mulholland, Mitchell Joseph Bernard, AO46003.
×Mullen, John Joseph, AO44174.
×Mulligan, Martin Doyle, AO52423.
Mullins, James Athal, AO46330.
Mullins, William Pearlie, AO44800.
Mumford, Harry Griffin, AO34515.
Mundee, John Alfred, AO52650.
×Mundorff, John LeRoy, AO46161.
Munroe, George Bakewell, Jr., AO45802.
Munson, David Jerome, AO43899.
×Muri, James Perry, AO45954.
Murphy, John Hogan, AO53111.
Murphy, Robert Joseph, Jr., AO39929.
Murray, Charles Edward, AO39020.
Murray, Henry Franklin, AO53432.
Murray, James Timothy, AO32181.
Murray, John Edward, AO43920.
×Murray, Robert Hugh, AO33067.
Murrell, Carrell Thurman, AO23381.
Musgrave, Philip Cebern, AO30709.
Musgrove, Albert Millard, Jr., AO51351.
×Mutschler, Gustave William, AO51254.
Myers, Eugene Ekander, AO32319.
Nalewaik, William Joseph, AO29920.
Nance, Donald Wesley, AO32193.
×Nanney, Stancill McRae, AO43689.
Nash, Clifford, AO32613.
Natt, Theodore Manfred, AO42609.
Naugle, Harry Charles, AO42773.
Nay, Paul Franklin, AO30068.
Neal, Bascome Lagrone, AO32073.
Neal, Van Edgar, AO34453.
Neeley, Richard Cox, AO34260.
×Neer, Francis Owen, AO42728.
Neff, Edward Rudolph, Jr., AO33297.
Nelson, Carl Morris, AO34633.
Nelson, Charles Kofoed, Jr., AO31333.
Nelson, Harlan McKendra, AO39772.
×Neslen, Alfred Jack, AO34237.
Netcher, Thomas George, AO40635.
×Neuberg, Gustav Adolph, AO31422.
×Neuendorf, Charles William, AO31883.
Neuman, Bernard Albert, AO44432.
×Nevins, Hugh Jean, AO32971.
Newbauer, John Alvin, AO52437.
Newman, Frank Moulton, AO34435.
×Newman, Neil Arnold, AO44715.
Newman, Ralph Forrest, AO35104.
Newman, Wilfred Bernet, AO42880.
Newsome, James Wyatt, AO24729.
Newton, Preston Carnall, AO33716.
Niccolini, Mario Edward, AO45088.
Nicholas, Jack Day, AO46339.
Nicholas, Judson Dye, Jr., AO46756.
Nichols, Cranz, Jr., AO46017.
Nichols, Franklin Allen, AO34518.
Nichols, Guy, AO51321.
Nichols, John Donaldson, Jr., AO33652.
×Nickerson, George, AO52129.
Nigro, Edward Henry, AO34005.
Nims, Frank Leslie, AO24143.
Nix, William Elgin, AO34917.
×Noel, Dana Ellsworth, AO33501.
Nold, Woodrow Vincent, AO31746.
×Noonan, Thomas Michael, AO42243.
Norman, Roscoe Lee, AO44030.
Norris, Carl Edward, AO31591.
Norris, William Albert, AO34863.
Northamer, Kenneth Walter, AO24111.
×Northington, L. J. Dean, AO31330.
Norton, Harold Wesly, AO23863.
Norton, Malcolm Eugene, AO34248.
Norton, Paul Weddell, AO42350.
Norwood, James Maurice, AO45272.
×Nowell, Robert Bolling, AO52655.
Nugent, Richard Steffens, AO52135.
Nutt, Sidney, Jr., AO43295.
Nuttall, Lloyd Roscoe, AO34602.
×O'Brien, Frank Leo, Jr., AO25276.
O'Brien, John George, AO44616.
Ochs, Henry John, Jr., AO30296.
O'Connell, James Francis Xavier, AO31893.
O'Connell, Joseph William, AO29525.
O'Connor, George Brendan, AO19969.
O'Connor, John Peterson, AO26900.
O'Connor, Leo Nicholas, AO44270.
O'Connor, Roderic Dhu, AO34652.
×Odell, William Charles, AO33045.
Odom, Archibald Douglas, AO33559.
Odom, William Elijah, Jr., AO33132.
×Ogas, Bernard Vivian, AO34174.
O'Hern, Clyde William, AO42769.
O'Keefe, Timothy Francis, AO34259.
Ola, George Joseph, AO22858.
O'Leary, John Arthur, AO42982.
Oliver, Frank Everell, AO33563.
Olson, Arvid Eldon, Jr., AO45414.
Olson, Clifford Butris, AO45747.
Olson, Donald Albert, AO42884.
Olson, Harry Armand, AO36580.
×Olson, Robert Alroy, AO24197.
Olson, Sylfest Lester, AO44335.
O'Neal, Julius Elliott, AO34537.
O'Neill, John William, AO24255.
Orban, Henry Albert, AO34591.
×Orr, Daniel Bell, AO35263.
Orr, Richard Lowman, AO34457.
Orr, Robert Hutchinson, AO34783.
×Orris, William Lester, AO45422.
Ort, Rudolph King, AO25182.
×Osander, Edward Mattis, AO34968.
Osborne, Thomas Fleet, AO25229.
Osgood, Richard Magee, AO23753.
Osher, Ernest Kermit, AO45806.
Ottinger, William Wolfe, AO25241.
×Overstreet, Charles Sylvester, Jr., AO33879.
Owens, Marcus Orlando, Jr., AO46381.
Packard, Walter Burt, AO43041.
Paden, Kenneth, William, AO51415.
Page, Harry Robert, AO32810.
Page, Roger William, AO34190.
Page, Thomas Ervin, AO45952.
×Paine, John Britton, AO34990.
×Palmer, Garnet Bruce, AO35135.
Palmer, Miles Russell, AO44939.
Pangburn, Clifton Walter, AO43200.
Panico, Fred Ralph, AO43071.
Pankey, Russell George, AO51634.
Pannis, William Walter, AO42966.
×Parham, Harry Crosswell, AO41943.
Parker, Ben LaRue, AO34312.

Parker, John Lowe, AO31600.
Parker, Rudolph Alvin, AO42301.
×Parkhill, William Henry, AO44762.
Parks, Oattis Elwyn, AO45887.
×Parks, Samuel Wilson, AO23964.
Parks, Wesley Holland, AO42121.
Parrot, Kent Kane, Jr., AO42838.
Parrott, Alonzo Wellington, AO33296.
Parsons, Albert Burchard, AO40693.
Parsons, Charles Erwin, Jr., AO43938.
×Parsons, Freeman Archie, AO53183.
Pascoe, Theodore Irvin, AO32331.
Pascoe, William Watson, AO29615.
×Patterson, James Theodore, AO33177.
×Patterson, Ralph Raymond, AO34257.
Patterson, Willard Adrin, AO34552.
Pattillo, James Louis, AO46269.
Pattison, John Barkley, Jr., AO21192.
×Paul, Joseph Herbert, AO23357.
×Paul, Leo Francis, AO33124.
Paulin, Harold David, Jr., AO32461.
Paulson, Gordon Leslie, AO40552.
×Paulson, Robert William, AO33227.
Paulson, William Dean, AO32432.
×Paxson, Charles Barger, AO46058.
Payne, Jack, AO29973.
Payne, John Daniel, AO51397.
×Payne, Joseph Ernest, AO45733.
Pearch, Lowell Dean, AO34160.
Pearson, Beverly Vernon, AO43392.
×Pearson, Ethan Roland, AO43434.
Pease, John Harold, AO34472.
Peck, Ben Jackson, AO30550.
×Peck, Gaillard Ray, AO33192.
Peck, Thornton Cecil, AO46230.
×Peddle, Joseph Scott, AO23049.
Pedersen, Gilbert Alexander, AO46260.
Pedrazzini, Harold Oliver, AO52501.
Peel, Robert Taggert, AO51685.
Pender, Preston Patton, AO21659.
×Penington, John Raymond, AO25134.
×Penn, Perry Harrison, AO40678.
Perego, Frank Smith, AO33546.
Perkins, Dale, AO32571.
Perkins, John Walter, AO32061.
Perna, Anthony Joseph, AO34307.
Perry, Arthur Clarke, AO24147.
Perry, Edward Allen, AO35142.
Perry, George Everett, AO43683.
×Perry, Gilbert Tracy, AO43515.
Perry, Leland Dale, AO33006.
×Perry, William Watson, AO32536.
Peters, Frederick Irving, AO42045.
Peters, Lester McCormick, AO32704.
Peters, Martin Fisher, AO44726.
Petersdorf, John Edwin, AO33522.
Petersen, Lawrence Albert, AO32555.
Peterson, Charles Oscar, AO32594.
Peterson, David Allen, AO43852.
Peterson, Lawrence Edwin, AO32486.
Peterson, Martin Francis, AO43754.
Petit, Robert Lindsay, AO53268.
Petrovich, John Robert, AO35117.
×Pettigrew, Paul Ales, AO45980.
Pfeiffer, George, Jr., AO40573.
Pfingst, William Kingsley, AO45410.
Phillips, Arnold Thielens, AO44480.
×Phillips, Charles Richard, AO34996.
Phillips, Eugene Wendell, AO44671.
×Phillips, Maurice Cossett, AO34135.
Phippen, Daniel Kirby, AO34844.
Pickens, William Hopkins, AO42427.
Pickering, Ralph Martin, AO45002.
Pickoff, Julius, AO34699.
×Pidgeon, Arthur Robert, Jr., AO38711.
Pidgeon, Sidney Sherrod, AO44834.
Pierce, Charles Howard, AO40757.
×Pike, Harry MacCulloch, AO24110.
Pike, Myron Hartley, AO31362.
×Pinnegar, Frederick George, AO42325.
Pinson, Ernest Alexander, AO31825.
Piper, Preston, AO44966.
Pirruccello, Joseph Salvatore, AO32896.
Pittman, George Henry, Jr., AO23920.
Pittsford, Jack Clement, AO31544.
×Plihal, Joseph Anton, AO51691.
×Ploetz, Frederick Ferdinand, AO32527.
Podolak, Stanislaw Joseph, AO45010.
Polking, Warren Anthony, AO45725.
×Ponder, Speers Gordon, AO41995.
Poole, Allan Eugene, AO43494.
Poole, Charles Robert, AO29585.
×Poole, Edgar Thornton, Jr., AO24065.
Poor, George Lovelace, AO30277.
Pope, Francis Joseph, AO33804.
Popovich, Taras Ted, AO35130.
Porter, Howard Joseph, AO53458.
Porter, Robert Arthur, AO34937.
Porterfield, Samuel Grisby, AO45656.
×Potter, Fred Olen, AO42146.
Potter, Henry Alpheus, AO45931.
Powell, Thomas Everett, AO20837.
Powell, William Kenneth, AO34875.
Powell, William Henry, Jr., AO35256.
Powers, Arthur Dennis, AO35036.
Prann, Bradley Foote, AO22027.
Prasse, Frederick Teseler, AO34265.
Pratt, Carlos Conrad, AO22601.
Prentiss, Vernon, AO45680.
×Presler, Sanford Dee, AO44123.
Preston, Benjamin Sidney, Jr., AO33861.
×Preston, Lloyd Warner, AO53273.
Pribble, Holton Houston, AO42339.
Price, Frederick Eugene, AO45834.
Price, Galen Barger, AO33253.
Price, Oran Oscar, AO44215.
×Pricer, Donald Calvin, AO35462.
Prim, Kent James, AO49684.
Pritchard, Charles Henderson, AO41955.
Pritchard, Wilbur Dixon, AO43080.
Prochazka, Theodore Vincent, AO51400.
Proctor, John Peebles, AO22350.
Prodanovich, George, AO32834.
Propst, John Robert, AO34424.
Pruett, Ernest Clinton, AO44404.
Pruitt, Harold Angus, AO35226.
×Pruyn, Franklin Goodwyn, Jr., AO40157.
Puckett, Robert Stephens, AO25317.
Purinton, William Robert, AO22635.
Pyle, Clifton, AO33574.
Quayle, John William, AO33645.
Quincy, Arthur Joseph, AO52280.
Quinn, Elwyn Farney, AO52287.
×Quinn, Robert James, Jr., AO20285.
Quinn, Robert Sidney, AO22531.
Rafferty, Patrick Hugh, AO45062.
Ragland, Richard Milner, AO31440.
Rakestraw, Bryan LaVerne, AO42719.
Ramputi, Frederick Renaldi, AO45599.
Ramsey, Joseph Bunn, Jr., AO53097.
Ramsey, Woodrow Wilson, AO39131.
Randall, Heman Ward, Jr., AO22492.
Randall, Robert Jahraus, AO29855.
Randall, Wilmer Ammons, AO44555.
Randolph, John Peyton, AO33433.
Randolph, Richard Louis, AO32878.
Rasmessen, Edward Bernard, AO33339.
Rasmussen, James Holland Stephen, AO-23157.
Rath, George Edward, AO34819.
Raudabaugh, Albert Snyder, AO42676.
Rawl, Robert Clifton, AO34506.
Rawlings, Phillip C., AO35936.
×Rawlinson, Bolling Hall, AO34825.
×Ray, Clyde Asa, AO25199.
Raynor, Spencer Winthrope, AO29805.
Read, Elkins, Jr., AO40485.
Read, Jackson Yulee, AO33607.
Rector, Edward Franklin, AO33765.
Rector, Roscoe Garnett, AO43370.
Redburn, Ralph Albert, AO29681.
×Redd, Denny Lee, AO30246.
Redington, William Morris, AO32138.
Redmond, Miles Augustine, AO30147.
Reed, Darrell Leonard, AO39815.
Reed, David Weaver, AO31866.
Reed, Elliott Hartley, AO21647.
×Reed, James Franklin, AO44093.
Reed, Talmadge DeWitt, AO46261.
Reeder, Horace Greeley, 2d, AO51749.
Reeve, Ralph Amos, AO23395.
×Reeve, Roy Lynn, AO33968.
Regan, Harvey Wade, AO29524.
Regan, Ralston Byrnes, AO42151.
×Reichley, Roydon Leo, AO29873.
×Reid, Archibald Campbell, Jr., AO51460.
Reid, Charles Albert, AO34804.
Reid, John, AO42260.
Renick, Charles Robert, AO34803.
Reynolds, Alden Cooley, AO42747.
Reynolds, William LaFayette, AO48877.
Rhea, Fred, AO41978.
×Rheberg, Steven Candler, AO43306.
Rhinehart, Wicliff Grady, AO51210.
×Rhodes, James Mauran, 3d, AO42484.
Rhynard, Wayne Edgar, AO23765.
Rice, Arthur T., AO35243.
Richard, Newton Mansel, Jr., AO30441.
Richard, Septime Severous, Jr., AO32254.
Richards, Edmund Burke, AO44535.
Richards, John Rose, AO23776.
Richards, Lynn Adelbert, AO43666.
Richards, Milburn Loring, AO31917.
Richardson, Elmer Winston, AO33571.
Richardson, Guy Brooks, Jr., AO41958.
Richardson, Harold William, AO35218.
Richardson, John, AO42081.
Richardson, Lester Elwood, AO34133.
×Richardson, Orin Shelby, AO42355.
Richer, Marcel Andre, AO42645.
×Richmond, Luther Henry, AO24113.
Richter, Eugene Paul, AO30110.
Riddle, Samuel Stuart, Jr., AO35052.
×Ridgway, Charles Zimmer, AO51817.
Ridings, Donald Ellis, AO21657.
Rieske, Forrest Otto, AO42110.
Riggin, Francis Darryl, AO35011.
Riggle, Glenn Blaine, AO46074.
Riha, Amos Frank, AO35227.
Riley, Daniel Edward, AO32608.
Riley, Edward Thompson, AO51214.
Riley, William Bryant, Jr., AO42050.
Rinehart, Howard Elon, AO51441.
Riordan, Robert Polk, AO33538.
Rippere, John Brockway, AO20898.
Risher, James Franklin, Jr., AO40560.
×Ritter, Frederick Otto, AO52206.
Ritterbush, Milton Frederick, AO40279.
Rizon, Robert Lewis, AO43346.
Roadman, Charles Harvey, AO32415.
Robb, Harry Wilson, AO34247.
Robbins, Jay Thorpe, AO34752.
Robbins, Richard Barclay, AO30225.
Robert, Wade Hampton, Jr., AO34785.
×Roberts, James Frank, Jr., AO32087.
Roberts, John Alva, Jr., AO33914.
Robie, John William, AO35129.
Robinson, Calvin Victor, AO43405.
Robinson, Edward William, AO46114.
Robinson, George Lexemuel, AO29703.
Robinson, Gerald Graham, AO33088.
Robinson, James Dallas Caswell, AO34344.
×Robinson, James Cregg, Jr., AO34022.
×Robinson, James, AO41880.
×Robinson, Raymond Edward, AO43443.
Robinson, Robert Thompson, AO33162.
×Robinson, William Wallace, AO51488.
Rochte, Lucian Sebastian, Jr., AO34987.
Roessell, Jack, AO34789.
Rogers, Frank Astor, Jr., AO51912.
Rogers, Leland Theodore, AO42039.
Rogers, Norman Elliott, Jr., AO42669.
Rogers, Thomas James, AO46244.
×Rohrbough, Leonard Muir, AO21631.
Rohrich, Joseph, Jr., AO43811.
Rohrs, Leonard John, AO30396.
Roman, Maxwell William, AO53186.
Romberg, Edgar Allen, AO23382.
Romine, Robert Talbot, Jr., AO42640.
Ronka, George Raphael, AO30212.
Rooks, John Girard, AO51301.
Rose, Orville Vern, AO30186.
×Rosenfield, Walter Allan, Jr., AO44680.
Ross, Finlay Fuller, Jr., AO35061.
Ross, George Lee, AO33805.
Ross, Orville Bergier, AO40460.
×Ross, William Emmett, AO34232.
Rossoff, Isidor, AO33921.
Roth, Floyd Earl, AO34669.
×Rowden, Burton Houston, AO31676.
Rowlett, Allen Benjamin, AO32534.
Rowley, John Waterbury, AO32974.
Roylance, John Gunter, AO42168.
Ruark, William Ernest, Jr., AO35294.
Ruebel, Joseph William, AO23154.
Rumsey, Herman, AO34172.
Rundquist, Douglas LeRoy, AO31675.
Runyon, Theodore Henry, AO34626.
Ruoff, Herman John, AO31637.
×Rupert, Claude Kimberly, AO42767.
Rush, Arthur Clement, AO34371.
×Russell, Edward Patrick, AO44914.
Russell, Joseph Decatur, AO42855.

Ryan, Lloyd Frederick, AO51725.
Saad, John Ispiridon, AO34264.
×Sadow, Peter Thomas, AO29534.
Safley, Don Louis, AO45790.
Sager, Harvid, AO30092.
×Salisbury, Arthur George, AO33730.
Saltsman, Ralph Henry, Jr., AO33909.
Salvatore, Alexander Ralph, AO53408.
×Sammons, James Nile, AO32561.
Sampson, Raymond Donavon, AO34251.
Sampson, Roy Paul, AO30505.
Sams, Burton Kresge, AO44608.
Sander, George Myron, AO30664.
×Sanders, Edward Austin, Jr., AO34217.
Sanders, Frederick Armstrong, AO46103.
Sanders, Marshall Eugene, AO53067.
×Sanders, Norton Winston, AO45576.
Sandifer, Virgil Everette, AO45539.
Sands, Harry James, Jr., AO24143.
×Sands, James Edward, AO51735.
Sartz, Jacob Peter, Jr., AO34585.
Sass, Edward John, Jr., AO32804.
Satterwhite, Robert Bennett, AO43853.
×Sauer, August Peter, AO52141.
Sault, William Edwin, AO45850.
Savage, Columbus, AO32541.
Savage, Frank Stephenson, AO35032.
Savage, Lawrence Brownlee, Jr., AO51603.
Savole, William Frank, AO24115.
Sawyer, Willis Bruner, AO23621.
Schaller, Ralph Howard, AO29750.
×Schee, Owen, AO45779.
Schenk, Peter Joseph, AO34682.
Scherrer, Arthur Burton, AO41980.
×Schilling, David Carl, AO34024.
×Schindler, Andrew Richard, AO34660.
Schinz, Albert William, AO34311.
×Schliecker, Charles Lenard, AO42430.
Schloss, Jeremy Karl, AO32773.
Schneider, George Elmer, AO45762.
Schoenfeldt, Paul John, AO30421.
Schoenfeldt, Verl Boyce, AO45557.
Schofield, Martin Benjamin, Jr., AO33748.
Schoggen, Elmer Guy, Jr., AO46163.
Schrank, Milton Arval, AO34670.
Schreiber, Harry Julius, AO43798.
Schrock, Ray Ebolin, AO30545.
Schroeck, Franklin Emmett, AO22441.
Schuck, Francis Joseph, AO34171.
×Schulze, Herbert Otto, AO39005.
Schwane, Henry Herman, AO38952.
Scollay, Loren Perry, AO29546.
Scott, Edward Walcot, Jr., AO33677.
Scott, Franklin Harold, AO34613.
Scott, John Joseph, AO43945.
Scott, Oliver McFarlane, AO44957.
Scott, Walter Graydon, AO51263.
Scott, Winfield Wolfe, AO42842.
Scruggs, Harold Woodrow, AO45278.
Seamans, Charles Sumner, 3d, AO23992.
Searles, Frederick Webster, AO32016.
Sears, Herbert Edward, AO42641.
Seashore, Malcolm David, AO30154.
Seawell, Charles Henderson, AO34919.
Seawell, William Thomas, AO23712.
Seeds, Dale Stimmel, AO35093.
Seeley, John Milton, AO31864.
Seiver, Frank Wilson, AO53029.
Selman, James Clarke, AO32999.
×Settles, Ben Hiestand, AO35114.
Sewart, Harold Yorke, AO43937.
Sexton, Robert Curtis, AO21553.
Shachtman, Hyman, AO42351.
Shaefer, Robert Rowland, AO35237.
×Shafer, Robert Earl, AO43856.
Shankle, Willard Mayes, AO33584.
Shapiro, Leonard, AO34065.
Sharp, Frank Allen, AO44044.
×Sharp, Frank Douglas, AO22537.
Sharp, John Ferrin, AO33993.
Shaw, Jay Bartley, AO51218.
Shaw, Leslie Burkett, AO39913.
Shayler, Walter Kenneth, AO44150.
Shead, Carleton Gregory, AO44333.
Shearer, Irvine Harrison, AO23292.
Sheehan, Larry Joseph, AO43514.
Sheeks, Robert Morrison, AO35369.
Sheldon, Benjamin Moe, AO52553.
Shepherd, Marshal Leroyce, AO42254.
Sheppard, William Alan, AO52815.
Sheridan, Alexander Paul, AO42960.
Sherrard, Wright Jacob, AO45573.
Sherrill, James Clement, AO34627.
Sherrod, Jesse Raymond, AO52604.
Shewmake, James Cranston, AO51763.
Shick, Robert Williams, AO35008.
×Shields, John Robert, AO34253.
Shingler, Herbert Ives, Jr., AO39156.
Shipley, George Wilbur, AO40346.
Shockley, Moir Lewis, AO30726.
Shofner, Emory Monroe, AO40202.
Shoop, Richard Raymond, AO35228.
Shoup, Harry Wesley, AO40669.
Shtogren, Anthony Thomas, AO34749.
Shuler, Cyril Ovierre, AO40216.
×Shulmistras, Joseph Andrew, AO52503.
Shultis, Donald Charles, AO34510.
Shy, William Malcolm, AO34290.
Shyer, George Joseph, AO42965.
Sidwell, Lowell Gene, AO34390.
Siebert, Fred William, AO42285.
Silk, Joseph Meryl, AO23757.
Silver, Richard Fordyce, AO30386.
Silvey, Owen Watson, AO33758.
Simeral, George Anthony, AO32453.
×Simmons, J. A. Jr., AO45496.
×Simmons, Mabry, AO40550.
Simons, William James, AO34805.
Simpson, Charles Cass, Jr., AO46096.
Simpson, Donald Pierson, AO46051.
Simpson, Harold Brown, AO35207.
Simpson, O'Wighton Delk, AO42905.
Sims, Harry Gay, AO43776.
×Sims, Jack Ahren, AO34802.
Singleton, Loy Alonzo, AO42094.
Sinton, Russell Luis, AO41850.
Sisk, Eugene Bounds, Jr., AO33703.
Skelton, John William, AO42192.
×Skinner, Eugene Elam, AO34853.
×Skinner, Gregory Jackson, AO24523.
Skinner, Leo Victor, AO51424.
×Skinner, Oramel Horace, Jr., AO45690.
Sladek, Robert Frederick, AO43043.
Slate, Melvin Howard, AO53100.
Sliney, Edgar Mathews, AO24084.
Sluga, Emil Lawrence, AO33109.
Smedley, Arthur Allan, Jr., AO33138.
Smedley, Robert Redmond, AO34139.
Smith, Alvin Lee, AO29738.
Smith, Arnold Livesey, AO42661.
×Smith, Arthur Edward, Jr., AO52625.
Smith, Calvin Hunter, AO45511.
Smith, Charles Henry, AO45584.
Smith, Clyde Allen, AO43954.
Smith, Cornelius Albert, AO32473.
×Smith, Derryfield Nathaniel, AO42222.
Smith, Donald Tharpe, AO52752.
×Smith, Douglas Richard, AO31552.
Smith, Eugene, AO32150.
Smith, Gilbert Glover, Jr., AO34923.
Smith, Hall Frank, AO43769.
Smith, Harry Russell, AO29625.
Smith, Herman Fount, AO35242.
Smith, Irvin Hardie, AO42704.
Smith, James Russell, AO52425.
Smith, John Joseph, Jr., AO23115.
×Smith, Joseph Columbus, AO44761.
Smith, Marion Charles, AO30320.
×Smith, Raleigh George, AO52414.
Smith, Robert Edward, AO32566.
Smith, Robert Nelson, AO33053.
Smith, Robert Radford, AO32496.
Smith, Vernon S., Jr., AO42164.
Smith, Walter Alvin, AO35019.
Smith, Weldon Halliwell, AO22363.
Smith, William Hightower, AO31529.
Smotherman, Robert Ellis, AO45798.
Smyser, Willis Michael, AO33101.
Snaith, William Gardner, AO52761.
Snell, Gale Elwood, AO35082.
×Snider, Albert Howell, AO23878.
Snyder, John Thorpe, AO34452.
Sogaard, Folmer Jensen, AO44391.
×Somers, Roes Aeron, AO52922.
Sonnkalb, Charles David, AO24121.
Soper, Ray Edgar, AO25179.
Sorensen, Blair M., AO45777.
Soukup, Reynold Anthony, AO33133.
Soulliere, Edward Joseph, AO31520.
Sowers, Louis Melvin, AO45804.
Sowie, Donald Edgar, AO44402.
Spahr, Paul Moses, AO41953.
Sparks, Harold Proctor, AO33169.
Spear, Robert Langdon, AO45909.
Spleth, Harry Edwin, Jr., AO32456.
Spitz, Charles Ernest, AO39906.
Spivey, Paulett, AO45564.
Splain, John Farley, AO24240.
Sponable, Edson Jay, Jr., AO45543.
Spratt, William Joseph, AO40454.
Spurgeon, Raymond Robert, AO52538.
Spurlock, Gerald Martin, AO42986.
St. John, Wilbert Elvin, AO45593.
×Stacey, Fred John, AO43459.
Stafford, Charles Leonard, AO33547.
Stafford, Robert Farrell, AO35247.
Staley, Harry Albert, AO53827.
Stalnaker, George Winfield, AO23784.
×Stambaugh, Edgar LeVan, AO31751.
Stansbury, Edgar Bryant, AO41909.
Stanton, LeRoy Moore, AO44961.
Stapleford, Zeb Vance, AO29679.
Stark, John Jacob, AO19383.
Stark, Smylie Cohn, AO34817.
Stark, William Reynolds, AO21670.
Starkey, James Fred, AO22439.
Steadman, Beverly Earl, AO33093.
Stears, Paul Aloysius, AO51461.
Stebbins, Luther Russell, AO51347.
Steele, Donald Dale, AO44269.
Steele, Kenneth Slusser, AO34219.
×Steely, Oscar Baker, AO20694.
Steeves, Jerome Irving, AO34442.
Stefansson, Ragner, AO51505.
Stefen, Le Roy Len, AO33913.
Steinemann, Frank Cable, AO45714.
Steiner, Wilfred Adolphus, AO29562.
Stemen, Roger Franklin, AO40669.
Stengele, Harry Everest, 3d, AO34737.
Stenglein, Joseph Arthur, AO33452.
×Stephens, Evans Grant, AO53397.
×Stephens, John Edward, AO45104.
Stepp, Richard DeWitt, AO44639.
Sterba, Richard, AO31954.
Stevens, Eugene Maurice, AO42818.
Stevens, Ronald Burdell, AO43344.
Stevenson, Ralph Lee, AO39155.
×Stevenson, Roger Armstrong, AO43550.
×Stewart, James Clifton, AO45276.
×Stewart, John Elkin, AO33850.
Stewart, Richard Reynolds, AO45652.
Stewart, Robert Wood, AO45672.
Stewart, Thomas Basil, AO51811.
Stiles, Joseph Ehrhart, AO34185.
Stillson, George Hamilton, Jr., AO23849.
Stimpson, Ritchie Pies, AO34502.
×Stoddard, Edward Forrest, AO35194.
Stogner, Ben T., AO29978.
×Stoliaroff, Nicholas Serge, AO40012.
Stoltz, Laroy Richard, AO42178.
×Stone, Maurice M., AO29692.
Stone, Rolle Edward, Jr., AO32907.
Storey, Thomas Barett, AO44187.
×Stoup, Hugh Clarence, AO42531.
×Stovall, Jack Neil, AO33506.
×Stover, George Edward, AO34606.
Stowell, Channing, Jr., AO23559.
Stradleigh, Norman Farrington, AO42572.
Strand, Wilbur Charles, AO21229.
×Stratton, Wilbur Harvey, AO20653.
Striplin, Charles Forrest, Jr., AO42592.
Stripling, Coleman, AO32985.
Strother, James French, AO46069.
Strozier, Buddy Alexander, AO34818.
Stuart, Robert Hartwell, AO45644.
Stubbs, Claude Maxwell, AO35197.
Stumpf, Carl John, AO43340.
Sturges, William Raymond, Jr., AO45688.
Sullenberger, Louis Edward, AO42887.
Sullens, James Alexander, AO46215.
Sullivan, Charles Edward, Jr., AO32667.
Sullivan, Charles Peter, AO32998.
Sullivan, Frank Edward, AO23477.
Sullivan, Harold Joseph, AO42523.
×Sullivan, Joseph Lewis, AO53173.
Sullivan, Robert Bernard, AO25321.
Summerfield, Ellison Saint Clair, AO42411.
×Summers, Paul Walter, AO41977.
×Summers, Thomas B., AO33161.
Sustrick, Edward Frank, AO53125.
Sutterlin, Howard Douglas, AO32454.

Sutton, George Ellsworth, AO45598.
Swan, Arthur Bernhardt, Jr., AO34233.
Swancutt, Woodrow Paul, AO32962.
Swett, Raymond Dailey, AO40450.
Swigart, John Kenneth, AO42583.
Sykes, Philip Avery, AO33191.
Sykes, Robert Brown, Jr., AO39144.
Symroski, Leonard Edward, AO23208.
Synnes, Roger Ansley, AO45236.
Syptak, Raymond Alfred, AO34684.
Szaniawski, Edward William, AO33062.
Taaffe, George Thomas, AO51420.
Taggart, Thomas Randolph, AO43263.
Talley, David Gordon, AO46098.
Tangen, Orville Clarence, AO42400.
Tarver, Benjamin Marcus, Jr., AO21081.
Tash, Earl Raymond, AO25240.
Tatum, Robert Philip, AO32501.
×Taute, August Franklin, AO45381.
Tavasti, Roy Emil, AO34313.
Taylor, Aubrey Delbert, AO44469.
Taylor, Charles Edward, AO35216.
Taylor, Charles Hendrie, AO42938.
Taylor, Frank Andrew, Jr., AO43767.
Taylor, Henry Sidney, AO25261.
Taylor, Henry Joe, AO51428.
Taylor, John Randolph, AO32379.
×Taylor, Kenneth Marlar, AO34533.
×Taylor, Peter Rutherford, AO34145.
Taylor, Powell Harrison, AO34149.
Taylor, Ray Ward, AO39862.
×Taylor, Roger William, AO44140.
Taylor, Tom Richards, AO34850.
×Taylor, William Barrett, 3d, AO46105.
Taylor, William Banks, AO46095.
Taylor, Willis Johnson, AO53131.
Teborek, Raymond George, AO45781.
Tedder, Irby Velle, AO45794.
Teed, Willard Golding, AO42275.
Templeman, Robert Berger, AO45145.
Templeton, Robert Frederick, AO43632.
Tempske, Paul Theodore, AO30556.
×Tenney, Frank Lee, AO33134.
Terhune, Charles Houston, Jr., AO22477.
Terry, Henry Warren, 3d, AO33824.
Tesch, William Arthur, AO46087.
Teschner, Charles George, AO33857.
×Tetiva, Ervin Joseph, AO40716.
Teusink, Philip J., AO31617.
Thackara, Paul Nelson, AO32313.
Thacker, John Marshall, AO34255.
Thacker, Robert Eli, AO35210.
×Thacker, Thomas Leonard, AO45807.
Thomas, Arthur DeCosta, AO34922.
Thomas, Gordon Frank, AO53385.
Thomas, Jay Paul, AO39049.
Thomas, William Jerome, AO29845.
Thompson, Arthur Calvin, AO43007.
Thompson, Clyde Arnold, AO23916.
Thompson, James Herman, AO33521.
×Thompson, John Archibald, AO51949.
×Thompson, Royal Seville, AO34511.
Thompson, Walter Alexander, Jr., AO42271.
Thomson, Robert Sidney, AO51291.
Thorington, William Patteson, AO45566.
×Thornhill, John James, AO44233.
Thornquest, Frank Purvis, AO25227.
Thornton, Robert Lee, AO34012.
Thorpe, George Wilson, AO45824.
Thorsen, James G., AO33389.
Thorson, Paul Anthony, AO44323.
×Thrift, John Childs, AO35251.
Thyng, Harrison Reed, AO33996.
Tice, Clay, Jr., AO34901.
×Tiede, Richard Edward, AO35267.
×Tillapaugh, Herbert James, Jr., AO22029.
×Tiller, Francis Eugene, AO45086.
Timlin, Francis Eugene, AO34369.
Timmons, Gordon David, AO35261.
Todd, Alfred Grady, AO44028.
×Todd, Thomas Marion, AO22870.
Todd, Walter Frantzen, AO34534.
Todd, William Edward, AO35169.
Todd, William Leroy, AO41884.
×Tolen, Adrian Woodrow, AO43274.
Tolliver, Raymond Frederick, AO32592.
Toomey, Frederick Walter, AO29078.
Tootle, Columbus Edwin, AO32384.
×Tope, William Arthur, AO33866.
Topping, Raymond James, AO44343.
Torresson, Thomas Samuel, Jr., AO45338.
×Tortora, Bernardino Ornorfio, AO44148.
Tower, Donald Oren, AO34499.
Towler, Harry Hunt, Jr., AO24126.
Townsend, James Watson, AO30090.
Trachsel, William Henry, AO33563.
Travis, Richard Van Pelt, AO23859.
Treacy, James John, AO42927.
Treacy, Norbert Corcoran, AO45701.
Trexler, Carl Edward, AO38869.
Triolo, Jerome Manuel, AO44969.
Trippet, William Alexander, AO45500.
Trotter, John Turner, AO43038.
×Trueblood, Wayne Fay, AO33194.
Tschepl, Arthur Leopold, AO45479.
Tucker, John McKiney, AO51234.
Tudor, David Beemer, AO33015.
Tudor, William Lewis, AO34972.
Tunstall, Francis Paul, AO45512.
Turner, John Landon, AO45743.
Turner, William Lloyd, AO34781.
×Turner, William Millard, AO30209.
Tuttle, Robert Merrill, AO23745.
Twilley, John Fougerousse, AO45458.
×Twitty, James Watson, AO30758.
×Tyler, Henry Samuel, Jr., AO25211.
Tyler, John, AO42433.
Tyler, Kermit Arthur, AO21499.
Urquhart, Lloyd Clarence Emerson, AO-51330
Vail, Carl Joseph, Jr., AO52382.
Valle, Calixto Cecilio, AO38707.
Van Ausdall, Robert Loren, AO34631.
×Van Benthuysen, Max Elliott, AO44873.
Van Blarcom, Earl Bruce, AO39936.
Van Buskirk, Alden Lothrop, AO43809.
Van Der Heyden, Edward Eugene, AO40467.
×Van Deusen, George Hanchett, AO35696.
Van Dyke, Edward Allen, AO35137.
Van Hoozer, Alfred Vance, AO45707.
Van Mullem, Louis David, AO25183.
Vande Hey, James M., AO33370.
Vandiver, Ray, AO44688.
Vaughn, Virgil Allen, AO42938.
Valebny, Samuel, Jr., AO43336.
Vereen, Lindsey Hartford, AO24119.
Verner, Edward, AO22974.
Vernon, Wesley Harold, AO30316.
Vetort, Francis John, AO33664.
×Villars, Paul Emile, AO33877.
Vinzant, Mark Harvey, Jr., AO46138.
Vinzant, Warren Elmer, AO35039.
×Virden, John Marion, AO30052.
Vitek, Richard Darius, AO33432.
Vogt, John Edward, AO33405.
×Von Arb, George William, Jr., AO34373.
×Von Tungeln, Herbert Adolph, AO36840.
×Voorhees, Burton Kennedy, AO22561.
Vos, Calvin Miller, AO42847.
Vosper, Stanley Richard, AO23388.
Waddell, James Marion, AO42940.
Waddleton, Thomas Renan, AO40653.
Wadsworth, Joseph Franklin, Jr., AO46223.
Waesche, Harry Lee, AO25208.
Wagner, Frank Benjamin, AO23298.
Wahlstrom, Norman Oliver, AO34304.
Walbora, George Shaffer, AO33002.
Waldecker, Charles Duane, AO38993.
×Waldron, Clarence Loring, AO42361.
Walker, Arthur James, AO22462.
×Walker, George Alexander, AO33965.
Walker, Leland Arthur, Jr., AO34333.
Walker, Paul Kenneth, AO44494.
Walker, Peter Saville, AO25311.
Walker, Richard Lee, AO44909.
×Walker, William George, Jr., AO56908.
×Walkowicz, Teddy Francis, AO45335.
Wall, Clement James, AO41932.
Wall, James William, AO32791.
Wall, Wallace, Jr., AO35278.
×Wallace, Albert Louis, Jr., AO34512.
Wallace, John Braxton, AO34004.
×Wallis, Howard George, AO51371.
Walls, John Hancock, Jr., AO31627.
Walsten, Carl John Edward, AO42190.
×Walter, George Clarage, Jr., AO42455.
Walters, Edison Kermit, AO24056.
Walters, Ernest Lee, AO32146.
Walters, Rudolph Breece, AO32344.
Walther, Dale Lorraine, AO32641.
×Walton, Victor Emanuel, AO39019.
×Walton, Wallace George, AO40759.
Wanderer, Ralph Matthew, Jr., AO34016.
Ward, Rufus King, AO51313.
Ward, William Henry, AO51537.
×Wardell, Michael Edward, AO25029.
Warden, Clifford Vincent, AO44654.
×Warden, Henry Edward, AO33242.
Ware, Rodney Bradford, Jr., AO41846.
Waring, Francis Malbone, AO42524.
Warner, Charles Artemus, AO42194.
Warner, Roger Martin, AO45537.
Warren, Benjamin Calvert, AO32660.
Warren, William, AO44269.
Washington, Dudley Sherrill, AO41965.
Waskow, Frank Howard, AO31058.
Watkins, George Frank, AO40564.
Watkins, Harvey Joseph, AO22544.
Watkins, James Albert, AO35041.
Watkins, James Carson, AO52439.
Watson, Harold Francis, AO52817.
Watson, John Charles, AO45527.
Watson, Leroy Hugh, Jr., AO23798.
Watson, Ralph James, AO33513.
×Watt, John William, Jr., AO21981.
Watters, Harold Jesse, AO52193.
×Waugh, Richard Gordon, AO51450.
Wear, John Francis, AO45627.
×Weatherly, Edison Carlyle, AO44644.
Weaver, Lester Clark, AO42126.
Weber, Henry Loy, AO34908.
Webster, Harry William, AO42442.
Webster, Howard Elwyn, AO19004.
Webster, James Lloyd, AO43009.
Weigold, Lewis Barton, AO45715.
Weitzenfeld, Richard William, AO34285.
Welch, George Albert, AO31734.
Welch, William Leslie, AO46125.
×Welchner, Carl Ernest, AO51833.
Weldon, Thomas Franklin, AO34408.
Weldon, William James, AO44420.
Wells, Bradford Hayes, AO42549.
Wells, Selmon Willard, AO33472.
Welsh, Albert Michael, AO33343.
Welter, William Theodore, AO29773.
×Wemple, Neil Waldron, AO34788.
Wergin, James Robert, AO21377.
Werner, Wesley, AO34249.
Wert, Jack Emmert, AO38783.
Wertenbaker, George Leftwich, AO45452.
Wessman, Everett Cornelius, AO32795.
Wesson, Frederick Jefferson, Jr., AO46278.
West, Alden Edgar, AO33832.
×West, Ben Marshall, AO23970.
West, Frank Thornton, AO30249.
West, Jack C., AO40740.
West, Shelton James, AO34763.
West, Willard Allen, AO43090.
×Whaley, Gerald Edward, AO42148.
×Wheeler, Clermont Edward, AO45492.
Wheeler, Fred John, AO29666.
Wheeler, Merwin Benton, AO42216.
Wheeler, Warren Sanford, AO22846.
Whelchel, Robert, AO29564.
Whidden, Jack Davis, AO45658.
Whipple, Robert Clarence, AO22082.
White, Alpheus Wray, Jr., AO23829.
White, Donald Bates, AO32932.
White, Grover Cleveland, Jr., AO44911.
×White, John Milton, Jr., AO33617.
White, Joseph Dent, AO34214.
×White, Maynard Earl, AO36295.
×White, William Joseph, AO52140.
White, William Berry, AO51304.
Whitehouse, Bernard Patrick, AO32796.
Whiteman, Harold Jennings, AO45526.
Whitfield, Fitzhugh Aills, AO33073.
Whitsitt, Samuel Joseph, AO32933.
×Wicker, Jamie Loran, AO51283.
Wickland, Daniel William, AO30033.
Widmann, Benjamin, AO46225.
Wigman, Edward William, AO30417.
Wignall, Paul Raysor, AO32686.
×Wikstrom, Floyd Edward, AO31302.
×Wilber, Stanley Roy, AO42806.
Wild, Hugh Eldon, AO34910.
×Wildes, Gordon Weber, AO42807.
Wildes, Thomas, AO19845.
Wilds, Harry, AO53811.
Wiley, James Reed, AO34453.
Wilging, Harold Arthur, AO45045.

Wilhite, Robert Theadore, AO42232.
Wilkerson, Steven Russell, AO33348.
Wilkins, Charles Howard, AO45518.
Wilkins, Sherman Warner, AO34938.
×Wilkinson, Robert Norman, AO33100.
Willard, Harry Edward, AO34451.
Willeford, Edward Owen, AO33441.
Willes, Charles Gleason, AO23873.
×Williams, Cecil Clinton, AO41965.
Williams, Francis Ward, AO41866.
Williams, Howard Wilson, AO34161.
Williams, James Robert, AO30218.
Williams, Joe Ross, AO32457.
Williams, Joseph Betha, AO44016.
Williams, Leon Flowers, AO29963.
Williams, Walter Ashley, AO34629.
Williams, Warren Cambler, AO39785.
×Williams, William Isaiah, AO35113.
Williamson, Hugh Lamar, AO44787.
Williamson, Walter Henry, AO33964.
Williamson, William Padgett, AO31950.
Williford, James Hobson, AO25210.
×Willis, Benjamin Grant, AO44652.
Willoughby, Earl, AO29731.
×Wills, Milton Eugene, Jr., AO32163.
Willson, Martin Eager, AO53227.
Wilmot, Woodrow Burton, AO43683.
Wilson, Charles Frederick, AO42204.
Wilson, Grover Lee, Jr., AO33080.
×Wilson, Harold Frederick, AO22883.
Wilson, Henry Brooks, AO21200.
×Wilson, Keith Stretter, AO22865.
Wilson, Olin Lloyd, AO32357.
Wilson, Thomas Norville, AO34405.
Wilson, Willard Wendell, AO32589.
Wimberly, Charles Leslie, AO34897.
×Windell, Albert Cecil, AO42726.
Winingham, Rollin Murray, AO23369.
×Winkle, Lewis Albert, AO42999.
×Winter, Hugh, AO43032.
×Winterbottom, James McIndoe, AO25031.
Wintermute, Ira Francis, AO39023.
Wiper, Thomas Luther, AO33531.
Wise, John Walter, AO34638.
Wise, Jowell Clark, AO35284.
Wisman, William Woodrow, AO34794.
Witham, Bertram High, Jr., AO34131.
Withers David McNeil, AO34969.
Withycombe, Howard James, AO33489.
Witsell, Benjamin Fishburn, AO29778.
Witt, Theodore John, AO34229.
Wittrock, Howard Henry, AO33647.
Witzenburger, Edwin Jacob, AO34547.
×Wogen, Joseph Glenn, AO32919.
Wojick, Kenneth Charles, AO34463.
Wolfe, Donald Alexander, AO31340.
Wolfe, Thomas William, AO43747.
Wolke, Gerard George, AO23529.
×Wolsiagel, Earl Woodall, AO43574.
×Wolters, Delevan Edward, AO42323.
×Wood, Allen Harry, AO33180.
Wood, Charles Norman, AO43800.
×Wood, Delmore Phillips, AO34529.
Wood, E. Garrison, AO32966.
Wood, Frank Preuit, AO33340.
×Wood, Harold Holloway, AO44704.
Wood, Harold Lee, AO44047.
Wood, Roy James, AO51386.
Wood, Wilson Roe, AO34176.
Woodard, Walter William, AO31345.
Woodbury, Willard Glenn, AO34607.
Woods, David Seavey, AO23708.
Woods, Robert Alfred, AO52663.
×Woodward, Lester Lee, AO31391.
Woodward, Wayne William, AO30405.
Woodyard, Donald H., AO51564.
Woodyard, William Truman, AO46070.
Wooley, Preston Bruce, AO35229.
Woolwine, Charles Carroll, AO43991.
Workman, Robert Herndon, AO40410.
Worley, Earl Wilson, AO25175.
Worley, Robert Franklin, AO34625.
Worrel, Albert Alfred, AO44249.
×Wright, Clifton Dukes, AO29888.
Wright, Donald McLarty, AO25213.
×Wright, Howard Thomas, AO23108.
Wright, Lewis James, AO34166.
Wright, Tilden Perkins, AO23026.
×Wursten, Ervin, AO45870.
Wyckoff, Elmer Rufus, AO51233.
Wyman, George Harvey, AO46046.
Wynn, Edward Henry, AO34114.
×Wynne, Edward Patrick, AO22965.
Wynne, John Douglas, AO33233.
Wys, Robert Andrew, AO33830.
Yarchin, Samuel, AO45761.
Yates, William James, AO34586.
Young, Donald Alexander, AO43048.
Youngblood, Lucian Nevelon, AO34791.
Yudkin, Richard Allen, AO46055.
Yurkanis, Paul John, AO22842.
Zaloudek, Charles Joseph, AO44307.
Zambon, Louis Basil, AO34378.
Zapponi, William Lawrence, AO44301.
Zimmerman, Legrand Otis, 29938.
Zoeckler, John Lewis, AO23510.
Zubko, Boris Michael, AO34076.
Zuerner, William Edward, AO43491.
Zumwalt, McLyle Gerald, AO34594.
Zwanzig, Samuel August, AO44058.

To be captain with rank from March 24, 1947

McElroy, Edgar Earl, AO32273.

To be captains with rank from July 1, 1948

Aaron, Thomas Richard, AO54612.
Abbott, Raymond J., AO35740.
Abbotts, Lloyd Ferdinand, AO53234.
Abdallah, William Paul, AO36435.
Abel, George LeRoy, AO40743.
Albellera, Thomas, AO47021.
Abercrombie, John Woodrow, AO44529.
Abington, Edward Gordon, AO44377.
Abney, Thomas Mitchell, AO33443.
×Abrams, James Simeon, AO45469.
Abramson, Charles Elmer, AO36056.
Accas, George Anthony, AO46660.
Acker, Halbert Hammond, AO32250.
Adair, Allan Percy, 3d, AO46910.
Adams, Albert Chester, Jr., AO35655.
Adams, Ben Millard, AO53295.
Adams, George Marvin, AO47537.
Adams, George William, Jr., AO47298.
Adams, Lawrence Augustus, Jr., AO24900.
Adams, Orville Glenn, AO39229.
×Adams, Peter Paul, AO47985.
Adams, William Alonzo, Jr., AO46909.
Adamson, Norman Francis, AO54441.
Adduci, Vincent James, AO36449.
Adkins, James Carl, AO40449.
Adelman, Julius J., AO44557.
Aenchbacher, Arthur Eugene, AO35388.
Agan, Charles Keith, AO47556.
Agin, Edward James, AO43892.
Agostinho, Robert Joseph, AO48986.
×Ahrens, William Carl, AO43741.
Aiken, Albert Shelton, AO35252.
Akins, Dudley Stephenson, AO44595.
Alba, Carmelo Vincent, AO36335.
Albritton, Jesse Tignor, AO46971.
Alder, Robert Trever, AO36968.
×Alexander, Andrew Jackson, AO47038.
Alexander, Donald, AO35703.
Alexander, Harry Strother, AO46381.
×Alexander, Lawrence Edward, AO33707.
Alexander, Robert Barlow, AO52536.
Alexander, Wiley Lee, AO35920.
Alford, James Strickler, AO44330.
×Allard, Charles Edward, AO32890.
Allbritton, John Leonard, AO36045.
Allen, Byron Donald, Jr., AO44577.
Allen, Clayton Forbes, AO53866.
×Allen, Ed Crow, AO52724.
Allen, Franklin Staples, Jr., AO34002.
Allen, John Thomas, AO44895.
Allen, Samuel Lawrence, AO32510.
Allen, Stanley Ernest, AO44481.
×Allenby, Donald Roscoe, AO48202.
Allensworth, Hubert Lasater, AO32556.
Allison, Royal Bertram, AO35675.
Allyn, Robert Howard, AO35674.
Alois, Frank James, AO46453.
×Althouse, Donald Irving, AO36592.
×Alton, Carol Wilson, Jr., AO33874.
Alworth, John William, AO47744.
×Amann, John Robert, AO53484.
Amos, Robert Farrish, AO47834.
Anderson, Homer Paul, AO44741.
×Anderson, Arlo Bell, AO43671.
Anderson, Arthur William, AO48116.
Anderson, Arvid Warren, AO33463.
Anderson, Bernard Elwood, AO52777.
Anderson, Bryant Yeck, AO40059.
Anderson, Clarence Emil, Jr., AO37030.
×Anderson, Delynn Edward, AO35336.
Anderson, Glenn Preston, Jr., AO21102.
Anderson, Holly Winfred, AO44227.
×Anderson, John Frederic, AO39263.
Anderson, John Munroe, AO24731.
×Anderson, John McLemore, Jr., AO44601.
×Anderson, Joseph William, Jr., AO46348.
Anderson, Leonard Ward, AO53497.
Anderson, Louis, Jr., AO48359.
Anderson, Millard Othello, AO36278.
Anderson, Milton Alphonso, AO47296.
Anderson, Oscar Shannon, Jr., AO47774.
Anderson, Rex Victor, AO145191.
Anderson, Truman Foster, AO45503.
Anderson, William Albert, AO46771.
Anderson, William Landis, AO47588.
Anderson, Windsor Temple, AO23891.
×Anderten, Irwin William, AO43546.
Andre, Louis Edward, Jr., AO47587.
Andreae, Andreas Arthur, AO46483.
Andres, Joseph Edward, AO36962.
Andrew, Stephen Wallace, AO32307.
Andrews, George Edward, AO45405.
Andrews, George Hamilton, AO37279.
Andrews, John Welker, AO36007.
Andrews, John Albert Cornelius, AO33175.
Andrews, Leon, AO36557.
×Andrews, Robert Louis, AO34543.
Andrews, Thomas Joseph, AO54209.
×Andridge, Herbert Wendell, AO52686.
×Angier, Frank Edward, AO45417.
Ansell, Norris Jacob, AO40855.
Anske, Ralph Dhelo, AO44440.
Anzelon, George Joseph, AO34962.
Appel, Charles Albert, AO36275.
Appold, Norman Carl, AO35673.
×Arakelian, Edward Jordan, AO54610.
Arbrogast, Thomas Joseph, AO35985.
×Arbuthnot, George Stanley, AO52904.
Archer, Oneal John Thomas, AO52230.
×Archibald, Thomas Gardner, AO52780.
Archuleta, Rubel Virgil, AO32506.
Arcuri, Michael Joseph, AO34170.
Ard, Roswell William, AO35414.
×Arduengo, Joseph Arnold, AO54742.
Ariano, Richard Angelo, AO35857.
×Armbrust, Carl William, AO35746.
Armstrong, George Harmon, Jr., AO45563.
×Armstrong, George Herbert, AO45177.
Armstrong, John Frank, AO40734.
Armstrong, Richard Elliott, AO43482.
Arnold, Carl, AO40839.
Arnold, Dixon Jay, AO33337.
Arnold, Richard Tribble, AO46736.
Arnold, Robert William, AO33318.
Arnold, Roy Addison, AO44277.
×Arnold, William Clyde, AO54682.
Artiglia, Aldo, AO35779.
Asch, Alfred, AO53605.
Ash, Allie Paul, AO44390.
Ash, Robert Preston, Sr., AO45021.
Ashley, Clower Franklin, AO36789.
Ashley, George Robert, AO33320.
×Asprey, William Palmer, AO40528.
Aszman, Burton Hughes, AO45423.
Atchison, Delmar Wallace, AO46580.
Atchison, Richard Bush, Jr., AO41025.
×Atkins, James Martin, AO44519.
Atkins, John Hugh, Jr., AO47964.
Atkinson, Paul Gregory, Jr., AO25973.
×Atkinson, William Joseph, AO46140.
Atterholt, Charles Wilson, AO52945.
Atwater, William E., AO40993.
Atwell, Lawrence Austin, AO43639.
Aubrey, Carl Lee, AO46165.
August, Jack William, AO48251.
Augustine, John Anthony 2d, AO45903.
×Austin, James Manning, AO52427.
×Austin, John Florea, AO33208.
×Austin, Orlo Lorraine, AO36540.
Avery, Edward Stephen, AO33418.
×Avery, Hamilton King, Jr., AO24032.
Avery, James Branham, AO46859.
Avery, Lyndall John, AO45866.
Avriett, Giles Croxton, AO45154.
Ayers, Jerry Houston, AO35904.
Ayles, Robert Lewis, AO36048.
Ayres, Langdon Ford, AO54411.
×Babb, Claude Andrew, AO43807.

Babb, Harold Thaddeus, AO22881.
×Bacalis, Paul Nicholas, AO47514.
Bachman, Lawrence Frederick, AO33351.
×Bachmann, Frederick Clemens, AO45731.
Bachtell, Robert Carithers, AO48401.
Baer, John Willard, AO25684.
Bagley, Ronald Dale, AO47095.
Bahler, George Paul, AO47872.
×Bailey, Don Warren, AO34487.
×Bailey, Harry Banks, AO22252.
Bailey, James Edmund, Jr., AO53402.
Bailey, John Robert, AO45705.
Bainer, John William, AO52551.
Baird, Julian Burton, AO53910.
×Baker, Ancil David, AO22471.
Baker, Carl Kraus, AO44694.
Baker, Charles Clare, AO47445.
Baker, Donald Ralph, AO44321.
Baker, Hollis Hershal, AO44808.
Baker, Merlin Wayne, AO54607.
Baker, Norman Nathan, AO47780.
×Baker, Roger Norman, AO45415.
Baker, Royal Newman, AO46473.
Balchunas, George Adam, AO47526.
Baldridge, William Holmes, AO52760.
Baldwin, Robert Percy, AO45693.
Balkum, Earl Thomas, AO45911.
Ball, Frank Putnam, AO26196.
Ball, Roger Clawson, AO26112.
×Ballard, Roy William, AO24798.
Ballard, Walter Paige, AO40556.
Ballew, John Marion, AO47868.
Balliet, William Edward, AO36974.
Bamburg, Horace Edvion, AO46893.
Banker, Robert Darrell, AO46768.
Banks, Jack Ralph, AO36049.
Banning, Richard Eldon, AO53673.
Barber, George Alva, AO33381.
Barber, James Luther, Jr., AO52694.
Barber, Zeneth O., AO52853.
Barbour, Walter Raymond, AO52837.
Barclay, Errol Dale, AO52794.
Barger, David Harvey, AO25794.
Barlie, Anthony Peter, AO55018.
Barker, Darold Kieth, AO47073.
Barker, Paul Bernard, AO43517.
Barker, William Hamblin, AO44985.
×Barnes, John Woodward, AO35927.
Barnes, Richard Ward, AO41030.
Barnes, Roy Ivan, AO35876.
Barnes, Truman Sheldon, AO47994.
Barnett, Clyde Haywood, Jr., AO52905.
Barnett, Wendell Hines, AO33720.
Barney, William Shores, AO36934.
Barnum, Robert Alexander, AO45753.
Baron, Oakley Walter, AO40550.
Barr, Jennings Monroe, AO52246.
Barraclough, Robert Arthur, AO46900.
Barrett, Alfred William, Jr., AO52659.
Barrett, John Patrick, AO44081.
×Barrow, David Crenshaw, AO37052.
Barrow, Tom Lee, AO31886.
Barry, Billie Jo, AO37226.
Barthel, Carl Coulbourn, AO35736.
Bartol, Dominic Anthony, Jr., AO47476.
Barton, James Robert, AO36226.
Barton, John Richard, AO45895.
Barton, Richard Everett, AO48504.
Barton, Terry Reed, AO35701.
Barton, William Gerald, AO47209.
Basel, George Phillip, AO36539.
Bass, Earl James, AO48204.
Bass, Feris Achile, Jr., AO33121.
Bass, Thomas Edwin, AO37292.
Bates, Elbridge Campbell, AO48358.
Battallo, Samuel Thomas, AO45084.
Battle, Clarence Leonard, Jr., AO44397.
×Baucom, George Elmer, Jr., AO33237.
×Bauer, Christian Schmid, AO43585.
Bauer, Maurice Hatter, AO34429.
Baugh, Howard Lee, AO48048.
Baumgardner, Bruce Kennedy, AO35225.
Bausser, William Jerome, AO34991.
Baxter, Clifford Frank, AO52556.
Baxter, Wyley, Lovelace, AO24857.
Bazan, Edward Theodore, AO43837.
×Beahan, Kermit King, AO35413.
Beale, William Henry, Jr., AO35139.
Beall, Arthur Wilcoxen, Jr., AO44847.
Beal, J. Mac, AO35563.
Beall, Lewis Sherode, AO35869.
Beam, Edgar Stowe, AO53836.
Beam, James Carroll, AO34448.
×Bean, James Otto, AO44649.
Bear, George Harold, AO44518.
Beard, William Alton, AO35654.
Beasley, David Cadwell, Jr., AO48741.
Beasley, William Dawson, AO33013.
×Beaty, Sherman Randolph, AO45390.
Bebout, LeRoy, Jr., AO46388.
Beck, Abe Jack, AO43902.
Beck, Charles Joseph, AO37376.
Beck, Richard William, AO36404.
Beckelman, Jack Dwain, AO34548.
Beckett, Thomas Archer, AO26246.
Beckett, Walter Rae, Jr., AO26184.
×Beckley, Raymond Elmer, AO36276.
×Becnel, Joseph Richard, AO52753.
Bedford, John Peter, AO40910.
×Beerli, Stanley William, AO48402.
Beers, Robert William AO24910.
×Beery, Harold Floyd, AO35241.
Beeson, Thomas Henry, AO25510.
Begg, Charles Forsyth Henry, AO35707.
Behn, Milton Albert, AO25505.
×Behnke, William Charles, AO49032.
Behrens, Elton August, AO47618.
×Behrens, George Herman, AO43931.
Belcher, Delbert Ray, AO45081.
Belfield, Douglas Findlay, AO46848.
×Belgard, John Robert, AO44527.
Bell, Charles Austin, AO53367.
×Bell, Homer Clark, Jr., AO48166.
Bellman, Arthur Burton, AO45143.
Belongia, Blair Gerald, AO35757.
Belser, Joseph Henry, AO48099.
Bench, Herbert George, AO36465.
Benedict, William Pershing, AO54578.
Benner, John George, AO46490.
Benner, Stephen Otto, AO25525.
Bennett, Herbert Hollinworth, AO31991.
Bennett, John Mark, AO54772.
Bennett, John Wray, AO47182.
Bennett, Robert Laster, AO47318.
×Bennett, Thomas Wiggin, Jr., AO55184.
Beno, Kenneth Richard, AO44198.
×Benson, Frank Tipton, AO32996.
×Bentley, Delwin Dale, AO46732.
×Benz, Walter Gottlieb, Jr., AO35896.
Beresford, Harry Edward, Jr., AO45054.
×Berg, Walter Warden, AO53088.
×Berg, William Wilson, AO37166.
Berge, Ralph Irving, AO46090.
Berger, Kenneth Stephen, AO52335.
Berger, Raymond John, AO40800.
Bergman, Harold Oscar, AO45121.
Bergmann, Charles Herman, Jr., AO53025.
×Bergum, Lester Norman, AO47605.
Berkow, Joseph Jeffrey, AO40719.
Berman, Robert Arnold, AO24912.
Bero, Francis, AO45039.
Berry, Edmund Burke 3d, AO45070.
Berry, Everett Ogden, Jr., AO35578.
×Berry, Frederick Dee, Jr., AO45448.
Berry, Gleneth Boyd, AO56903.
Berry, Kearie Lee, Jr., AO25736.
×Berry, Lon Bernard, AO52821.
×Bertling, Stephen Joseph, AO44857.
Bertsch, William Preston, AO33457.
Berube, Paul Gerard, AO48190.
×Best, Jack Raymond, AO46004.
Best, William McNeely, AO54534.
Bestervelt, Harold James, AO25545.
Beth, Elman John, AO33712.
Betts, Francis Arnold, AO43854.
Betts, Russell Wood, Jr., AO53249.
Betz, Albert Leslie, AO31953.
Bevan, Wendell Lowell, Jr., AO25535.
×Beville, Claude, Jr., AO44100.
Beyer, Johnson, AO32833.
Biberstein, Arthur Lester, AO35873.
Bickerstaff, Burt McCoy, AO41020.
×Bickford, Jack Cedric, AO46407.
Bickford, James Wendell, AO32803.
Bicknell, June E., Jr., AO45502.
Biddle, Maurice Francis, AO45289.
Biddlecome, Bruce Dutton, AO39104.
Bieck, Robert Barton, AO47343.
×Biggs, Bradley, AO36892.
Bilby, Bedford Bruce, AO53827.
Bills, Ralph Carmack, AO53913.
Birbeck, Richard Wellington, AO52700.
Bird, Charles H., AO53188.
Bird, Clement William, AO39159.
×Birdsong, George Purnell, Jr., AO40842.
Biretta, Algert Anthony, AO53976.
Biscayart, Jules Dominique, AO46584.
Bishop, Cleo Merton, AO25529.
Bishop, Edward Landes, AO37270.
Bjoring, Robert George, AO46277.
Black, Lee Charles, AO54674.
×Black, Shirley Norman, AO39078.
Black, Walter Edward, Jr., AO36471.
Black, William Morrison, AO35471.
Blackman, Richard Orchard, AO44679.
Blair, Alan Howard, AO53445.
Blair, Hubert Maynard, AO35892.
×Blair, Samuel Vernon, AO46337.
Blais, Lawrence Francis, AO46888.
Blake, Donald Frank, AO24870.
×Blake, Lynn Thompson, Jr., AO36482.
Blakely, Everett Ernest, AO35751.
Blakeslee, Donald James Matthew, AO36613.
Blalock, John Wilmer, AO32622.
×Blanco, Ira Joseph, AO45023.
Bland, Edward Cole, AO48055.
Bland, George Thomas, AO52618.
Bland, John William, AO46329.
Bland, Ruskin McArdle, AO45018.
Blank, Jonas LeMoyne, AO25994.
Blanton, Ernest Leroy, AO54261.
Blasingame, Benjamin Paul, AO24615.
Bless, Daniel Luther, AO45840.
Blatt, Seymour, AO53377.
Bledsoe, Joseph Vernon, AO45157.
Blehm, Harold Emanuel, AO53341.
Bliss, Charles Cushman, AO52478.
×Blitch, Harry Anthony, AO45488.
×Blood, Arlie James, AO44799.
Blood, Keneth Edward, AO52880.
Bloom, Edmund Stanley, AO53251.
Bloomer, Joseph Aloyslus, Jr., AO46890.
Blum, Edward Francis, AO53478.
Blume, Frederick Julius, AO44250.
×Boardman, Robert Laurence, AO45989.
Boatman, Beryl Leon, AO48247.
Boatright, Lloyd Alvin, AO52759.
×Boddie, James Warner, AO40509.
Bodine, Francis Stephen, AO46273.
Boedeker, Charles Wilson, AO35208.
Bogan, John Wayne, AO48797.
Bogard, Wayne Columbus, AO47835.
Bogda, Michael Philip, Jr., AO40584.
Boggs, Aaron Jere, AO53929.
Bogren, Stanley Edward, AO44806.
Bogue, Jay Dean, AO40431.
Bohman, Thomas Spare, AO33107.
Boles, Homer Clem, AO46458.
Bolt, Jones Edward, AO36511.
Bolton, Willard Lewis, AO36693.
Bondhus, John O., Jr., AO52588.
×Bonebrake, Robert Raymond, AO35083.
Bones, James Clinton, AO35405.
Bonifant, Bern Monroe, Jr., AO44455.
×Bonneaux, William Karl, Jr., AO36244.
Bonnett, Donald Eugene, AO44553.
Bonnot, Carlos Durand, AO48122.
Bonvicin, Emanuel Frank, AO44079.
Booker, Brooks William, Jr., AO46356.
Boone, Harry Franklin, AO24827.
Boone, Lewis Perkins, Jr., AO33063.
Booth, Elmer Ellsworth, AO45830.
×Booth, Joseph Lawrence, AO37386.
Booth, Lionel Robillard, AO49080.
Booth, Robert Edwin, AO52203.
Borellis, William Francis, AO48391.
Bores, Albert David, AO47043.
Boreske, Andrew, Jr., AO25999.
Borman, Robert Clayton, AO29219.
Boselli, Theodore John, AO44714.
Bossardet, Charles Walter, AO48111.
×Boswell, Irving Ward, AO39115.
Bottoms, Robert Leland, AO32375.
Bouknecht, Robert William, AO45142.
×Bounds, John Earl, AO47776.
Bourgault, Samuel Peter, AO52874.
Bowden, Theodore Watrous, AO25181.
Bowden, William Martin, AO43834.
×Bowen, Jarrette DeLeslie, AO52883.
Bowen, John Edward, AO46817.
Bowen, William Douglas, AO46855.
×Bower, Deward Edward, AO39185.

Bowers, Donald Moar, AO45288.
×Bowers, William Henry, AO37068.
×Bowley, Albert John, AO25903.
Bowlin, Roy Lindsay, Jr., AO25637.
Bowman, Frank Michael, AO33407.
Bowman, George Abraham, Jr., AO54769.
Bowman, John Sterling, AO54277.
Bowman, Richard Elsworthy, AO44134.
Bowman, Sam William, Jr., AO44945.
Boyd, Edwin Iwin, AO44954.
Boyd, Howard Ted, AO47760.
Boyle, John Harold, AO36628.
Bozarth, Theodore Walter, AO48728.
Brackley, William Lowell, AO36262.
×Bracy, Carroll Harlan, AO44790.
Bradburn, Gordon Ferris, AO36447.
×Braden, James Savage, AO46863.
×Bradford, Carl Walker, AO44686.
Bradford, Earl Morse, AO32690.
Bradford, James Warren, AO37333.
Bradford, James William, AO54015.
×Bradford, Oscar Arthur, Jr., AO33534.
×Bradley, Francis Trenholm, AO52295.
Bradley, Jack Tarleton, AO36537.
Bradley, Raymond Andrew, AO35717.
×Bradshaw, Marion Augustus, AO47330.
Brady, Edward Leo, AO46735.
Brady, William Diebold, AO25694.
Bragg, Russell Merle, AO35874.
Brainerd, Jackson Wright, AO35745.
Brandau, Otto Henry, AO52356.
Brandon, William Dale, AO40796.
×Brannon, Cullen Albert, Jr., AO26114.
Branstetter, Lyle Roy, AO40920.
×Brantley, Joseph Ray, AO34842.
Brantner, James Andrew, AO44931.
Brasier, Carl Oscar, AO52854.
Bratcher, Douglas Howard, AO45846.
Brauer, William Henery, AO48254.
×Braun, Vincent Augustine, AO40853.
Bray, Clifton Leon, AO36605.
Bray, Jack William, AO52620.
Brazier, Harold William, AO48550.
Breathwit, Carl Edward, AO32875.
Breeeze, William Hughes, AO46883.
×Breindel, George Joseph, AO52781.
Brendle, George Robert, AO54795.
×Brennan, Gerald William, AO55071.
×Brenner, George Paul, Jr., AO40974.
Brewer, Edwin, Henry, AO47361.
Brewer, James Edward, AO40445.
×Brewer, Lonnie Carl, AO37137.
Brewster, John Howard, AO47339.
Bridges, Dewey Rogers, AO40781.
Bridget, Henry Bernard, AO47695.
Briel, Karl Lombard, AO35968.
Brierty, William Paul, AO26080.
Briggs, Arthur Flem, 2d, AO46247.
×Briggs, Leon Arthur, AO23967.
Brigham, Jex Moulden, AO44197.
Bright, David Morgan, AO44092.
Brill, Norris, AO40319.
Brinson, Milton Wilkerson, AO44438.
Brinson, Robert Francis, AO47899.
Brinson, Sheldon Smith, AO39198.
Briscoe, Carroll Dayle, AO40311.
Britt, James Oliver, AO46346.
Brittain, Gerald Frederick, AO43607.
Brittingham, Raymond Cecil, Jr., AO25650.
Broach, Richard Howell, AO25600.
Broaddus, Donald Austin, AO36843.
Brock, John William, AO46954.
Brock, Richard Crawford, AO44912.
Brocklehurst, Robert Lewis, AO34999.
Brockway, Gerald Marion, AO44471.
×Brodie, George Fontaine, Jr., AO35472.
Broich, Lee August, AO45112.
Brooking, George Robert, AO53480.
Brooks, Charles Llewelyn, AO37094.
×Brooks, Leo Cooper, AO26156.
Brooks, Philip, AO36024.
×Brooks, Robert Jordan, AO36685.
Brooks, William King, AO49104.
Broome, William Bohler, Jr., AO53254.
×Brosnan, Cornelius Gerald, AO47703.
Brothers, James Terry, AO37273.
Brown, Albert Kenneth, AO44960.
Brown, Alston Law, AO26191.
×Brown, Dean Bill, AO36849.
Brown, Elwin Olliff, AO45396.
Brown, Gerald, AO48126.
Brown, Harold Lovelace, AO46387.
Brown, Harold Rowe, AO34634.
Brown, Harvey Neal, AO53263.
Brown, Jack R., AO35866.
Brown, John Henry, Jr., AO45894.
Brown, John Robert, Jr., AO54017.
×Brown, Kenneth Elmo, AO32711.
Brown, Mark Josiah, AO53329.
Brown, Meade Marsh, AO33568.
Brown, Ralph Lindsey, AO35727.
Brown, Raymond Sedgwick, AO40626.
Brown, Robert Bruce, AO45544.
Brown, Robert Dale, AO48888.
×Brown, Robert Lee, AO47254.
Brown, Samuel Bradford, 3d, AO54568.
Brown, Ted, AO43499.
Brown, Thomas Huntington, AO26261.
Brown, William Francis, AO46314.
Brown, Winfield Henry, AO46551.
Brownell, Gerald Simpson, AO33565.
×Browning, John Robert, AO44685.
Broyles, Enoch Ernest, AO36875.
Brubaker, Thomas Franklin, AO48786.
×Brubeck, Edwin Howard, AO52441.
Bruce, Leroy James, AO52569.
Bruce, Robert Eugene, AO47565.
×Bruch, George Daniel, AO54020.
Brueland, Lowell Kermit, AO47822.
Bruey, Thomas Joseph, AO45025.
Brundage, Theodore Thompson, AO46593.
×Brundrett, Warner Morris, AO45721.
Bruner, Donald Hepburn, AO25664.
Bruner, Frederick William, AO40470.
Bruno, Sam, AO45235.
Bruns, Roy Henry, AO35658.
Brunson, William Percy, AO44980.
×Bryan, William Elmer, Jr., AO37095.
×Bryan, William Tagg, AO44673.
Bryant, Marion Floyd, AO46850.
Bryant, Perry Killian, AO46099.
Bryson, William Curtis, AO34780.
Bryson, William Francis, AO33464.
Brzuska, Edmund Earl, AO40492.
Bucher, Oliver Boone, Jr., AO26096.
Buchmeier, George Thomas, AO44265.
Buck, Arthur Wilbur, AO32567.
Buck, George Thad, Jr., AO24857.
Buckey, George Rufus, AO46061.
Buckey, James Howard, AO47331.
Buckingham, George Edward, AO44949.
Buckley, John Alden, AO44346.
Buckley, Russell William, AO44852.
Buckley, William Arthur, AO53238.
Buckley, William Gene, AO46787.
Buckner, John Hugh, AO25439.
Buechner, William Austen, AO52693.
Buel, Joseph Giddens, AO36483.
×Buer, Glendon J., AO47830.
Buford, William Meadows, AO52883.
×Bullock, Joe Ragland, AO34384.
×Bundgaard, Robert Clausen, AO48118.
Bunker, Walter Irvin, AO44231.
Burcky, Max Calvin, AO34582.
Burdett, Edward Burke, AO26295.
Burdette, Carlyle Blaine, AO43575.
Burdick, James Roland, AO45233.
Burgy, Eldred John, AO31042.
Burke, Mark John, AO24927.
Burke, Sylvester Vernon, AO46338.
Burkett, Bernard Julius, AO44191.
Burkett, Reinhold Erwin, AO53677.
×Burnett, Melvin Max, AO53494.
Burnett, Robert Leon, AO44517.
Burnette, Walter Neal, Jr., AO26118.
Burnor, Richard Harold, AO47991.
Burns, Charles Timothy, AO52186.
Burns, Harmon Eugene, AO46898.
Burns, Harold William, AO35520.
×Burns, Jackson Ralph, AO40274.
Burns, Robert, AO44565.
×Burnstedt, Lloyd Ellis, AO53382.
Burr, Frank Robert, AO40955.
Burris, Howard Lay, AO24862.
Burrus, Donald Edward, AO53625.
Burson, Thomas Lee, AO47019.
Burt, Braxton Stanfield, AO32574.
Burt, Joseph Autry, AO44693.
Burton, Charles Richard, AO46738.
×Busby, Douglas Ray, AO46000.
Bush, Edwin Richard, AO47354.
Bush, William Kenneth, AO52671.
Bushue, Bernard John, AO35744.
Buskey, Paul Gordon, AO36488.
Bussey, Carver Thaxton, AO24116.
Busmey, Donald Glenn, AO36211.
Bussing, Henry George, AO54005.
Butcher, Chester John, AO25784.
Butcher, William Andrew, Jr., AO40559.
Butler, Clifton Lewis, Jr., AO25604.
Butler, Earl Howard, AO46416.
Butler, Henry Forde, AO48032.
Butler, Herbert Irving, AO53690.
Butler, Richard David, AO47589.
Butler, Robert Andrew, AO52897.
×Butterfield, William Howe, AO48100.
Buttmann, Oscar, AO43783.
Button, Ervine Jerold, AO45164.
Buttrill, Harlan Crawford, AO52462.
Butts, Clyde Irving, AO46053.
Butts, Earl Adolph, AO35776.
Butts, Elliott Wilson, Jr., AO54497.
Byerley, Howard Lafayette, AO47517.
Byerly, Herman Frederick, AO52798.
Byers, Edward Franklin, AO46425.
Byers, Vic L., Jr., AO36546.
Byrd, Bacchus Bright, Jr., AO44992.
×Byrd, Herman Earl, AO46004.
Byrne, Eugene Watson, AO35690.
Cabell, John Kennedy, AO52655.
×Cabral, William Mervyn, AO33202.
Cade, William Albert, Jr., AO52584.
Cadger, Edward James, AO36750.
Cady, William Francis, AO56901.
Cafarelli, John, AO36514.
Cain, Walter Frank, AO45065.
Caldwell, Herman Bert, Jr., AO33239.
×Calhoun, Philip Clare, AO24611.
×Calhoun, William Rodwell, Jr., AO35370.
Call, George William, AO34273.
Callahan, Charles Augustine, AO40866.
Callahan, Walter, AO35526.
Callaway, Leonard Clifton, AO47004.
Callaway, Richard Dowdy, AO22371.
Calloway, Roy Lavert, AO32965.
Calof, Donald Robert, AO44625.
Cameron, John Whaley, AO40881.
×Cameron, William Roderick, AO36403.
Cammack, Vernon Kinney, AO37312.
Camp, Clyde Henry, Jr., AO37198.
Camp, Joseph Benjamin, Jr., AO44579.
Campbell, Chester McDonald, Jr., AO34609.
Campbell, Dick Martin, AO 44889.
Campbell, Edward Everett, AO46886.
Campbell, Herbert Maxwell, AO33315.
Campbell, James Milton, AO46708.
Campbell, James Maxwell, AO47083.
Campbell, Paul Welphley, AO33811.
Campbell, William Ayers, AO35829.
×Campbell, William Joseph, AO33123.
×Campion, Norman Woodrow, AO44132.
Cannon, James, AO47590.
Cannon, John Hinkle, Jr., AO53241.
Cannon, Walter Gary, AO32862.
Cape, Rolf Douglas, AO46243.
Caples Robert Osgood, AO40557.
Cappelletti, Francis Ronald, AO45653.
Cappucci, Joseph John, AO32175.
Cardarella, Vincent Carl, AO35994.
×Carey, John Audobon, AO35372.
Carey, Robert Henry, AO33478.
Carhart, Thomas Merrit, AO34841.
×Carlos, Lloyd Pearson, AO52248.
Carlson, Elmer Gus, AO47492.
Carlson, Ragnar Lodbrok, AO44853.
Carlson, Robert Ellis, AO54057.
Carlton, Paul Kendall, AO35912.
Carlton, Robert Nichols, AO46348.
Carmack, John Edgar, AO22560.
Carmack, Morton Campbell, AO25803.
Carmody, Richard John, AO35126.
Carney, Arthur William, AO53221.
×Carney, John Kilker, AO52234.
×Carpenter, David Erwin, AO35396.
Carpenter, Donald Charles, AO43551.
Carpenter, Harvey Benjamin, AO34774.
×Carpenter, John Woolsey, AO44712.
Carpenter, Neal Holton, AO52151.
×Carr, Richard Pendleton, AO22323.
Carrigan, Thomas Michael, AO36443.
Carroll, James Vincent, AO43471.
Carroll, John William, AO35652.

Carroll, John Aylth, Jr., AO47013.
Carroll, Robert William, AO45554.
×Carruth, Francis Sumner, AO45421.
Carson, Charles William, Jr., AO25958.
×Carson, William James, AO43831.
×Carss, Walter Lee, Jr., AO36216.
Carstensen, Dale Lafayette, AO32984.
Carter, Charles Ray, AO48364.
Carter, Clifford Gordon, AO46357.
Carter, James Richard, AO36279.
×Carter, John Davis, AO35413.
×Carter, Roger Mills, Jr., AO40767.
Carter, William Parhan, AO36790.
×Cartwright, Everett Jackson, AO52726.
Cartwright, Philip Eugene, AO47026.
Carvalho, Henry Pacheco, AO47085.
×Carver, Charles Frank, Jr., AO52426.
Carwell, Ivan Leon, AO44465.
Cary Charles Muse, AO36725.
Casey, William Joseph, AO46979.
×Cassada, Randall Curtis, AO26467.
Cassady, Robert Ernest, AO47410.
Cassiday, Benjamin Buckles, Jr., AO26073.
×Castle, Vernon Henry, AO44734.
×Cathcart, Richard Earl, AO26069.
×Catington, James Douglas, AO46178.
Catledge, Richard Carroll, AO48593.
Catterlin, Richard Ryder, AO47162.
Caudill, Edwin Gene, AO54149.
Causey, Rufus Franklin, AO36653.
×Cavanagh, John Timothy, AO34808.
Cavender, Joe Judson, AO31931.
Cavender, John Proctor Knott, AO45639.
Ceely, William David, AO44489.
Ceulaers, George Ferdinand, AO43894.
Chadwick, Roscoe Lewis, AO33841.
Chairsell, William Spaulding, AO35730.
Chambers, Dale Richard, AO48154.
Champion, John Dixon, Jr., AO35915.
Champlain, Daniel Dolph, AO45194.
Chandler, George William, AO44770.
Chandler, John Seymoure, Jr., AO25910.
Chandler, William Fletcher, AO36522.
Chapman, Benjamin Frank, AO53142.
Chapman, Carl Joseph, AO36380.
×Charlesworth, William Robert, AO53932.
×Chatfield, Stanley Edward, AO48005.
Chatterley, Archie Warren, AO54391.
×Chauvet, Jack Sydney, AO44722.
Cheatwood, John Harold, AO21666.
Cheney, James Spiers, AO46537.
Cherbak, Victor Anthony, Jr., AO25818.
Cherota, Frederick William, AO53070.
Chessington, James Buell, Jr., AO52841.
×Chiarella, James Santo, AO52634.
Chick, Lewis William, Jr., AO22403.
Chilcote, Charles Arthur, AO43705.
Childress, Hubert Mason, AO34413.
Childress, Peter Mills, AO33610.
Childress, Raymond Keith, AO46488.
Childs, Marvin Edward, AO26300.
Chilstrom, Kenneth Oscar, AO36739.
Christensen, William Robert, AO44634.
Christensen, Richard Andrew, AO32651.
Christie, Charles Philip, AO43831.
Christman, Harry William, Jr., AO43410.
×Claggett, Elwood Tyler, AO34007.
Clark, Charles Henry, AO44247.
Clark, Delan Aubrey, AO46488.
Clark, Delbert McClain, AO32642.
Clark, Thorton Bartlett, AO36818.
Clark, James Dale, AO47169.
Clark, Robert Herman, AO38144.
×Clark, Thomas Matthews, AO41963.
Clarke, Clarence J., AO46194.
×Clarke, Thomas Thurman, AO[illegible].
×Clarke, Walter Campbell, AO44720.
×Clary, Lawson, Jr., AO45890.
×Clary, Ralph Leo, AO35[illegible]70.
×Classen, Thomas John, AO4[illegible]947
Clay, Lucius DuBigon, Jr., AO36001.
Clay, Marvin Jones, AO47180.
Clayton, Roy Frank, AO[illegible]
Clement, Edwin Gustave, AO53739.
Clementson, Gerhardt Christopher, AO-24713.
×Clendenin, Robert Antone, AO54126.
Clerici, Henry John, AO33281.
Click, Benjamin Arthur Lee, Jr., AO53824.
Clifford, Robert Ralph, AO44500.
Cline, Harold Frank, AO35634.
Clinger, Dallas Adellon, AO33517.
Clocksin, Albert Julius, AO47563.
Cloer, Gilmer Woodrow, AO52272.
Cloke, Marshall, AO23310.
Cloud, Carlton, Jr., AO37033.
×Coade, William Arthur, AO44868.
Cobb, James Bernhardt, AO25515.
Cobb, John Tyrus, AO36075.
Cobb, Melvin Burdette, AO53424.
×Cobb, Phillip Gray, AO45394.
Coburn, Blaine K., AO44537.
Cochran, Wharton Clayton, AO24601.
Cocke, Charles Edward, Jr., AO44876.
Cody, Howard Eugene, AO47046.
Coen, Oscar Hoffman, AO35955.
Coffey, John Donald, AO32578.
Coffield, Peter Lewis, AO47417.
×Cofield, Gene, AO52153.
×Cogswell, James Stines, AO45619.
Coke, John Dunlavy, AO48767.
Coker, Elmo Ace, AO44313.
×Cole, Benjamin Harold, AO52738.
Cole, Charles Harold, Jr., AO53915.
×Cole, Edward Lee, AO33105.
Cole, Frederick John, AO34874.
×Cole, George Peyton, AO46304.
Cole, Heston Charles, AO26319.
Cole, Louis Eiddle, AO54150.
Coleman, Harry Southside, Jr., AO31952.
×Coleman, Kenneth Donald, AO46280.
Coleson, Roger David, AO36010.
×Colgan, William Buchana, AO54637.
Collett, Charles Elisworth, AO37106.
Collier, Ben Franklin, AO54130.
Collins, Donald Edward, AO52843.
Collins, Frank, Jr., AO36579
Collins, Harold Colbert, AO52581.
Collins, Harold Douglass, AO40825.
Collins, Thomas Edward, Jr., AO36913.
Collinsworth, J. D., AO56910.
Collis, Edwin Martin, Jr., AO53177.
Colson, William Benton, AO34894.
Cometh, Lawrence, AO40854
×Commens, Enos Larrance, Jr., AO43603.
Conipton, Gorden Bryan, AO46743.
×Comstock, Harold Elwood, AO54059.
Condon, Joseph Francis, AO44219.
×Conklin, Howard Elmer, AO46361.
Conklin, Joseph Edward, AO41002.
Conkling, Emmett Virgil, AO43648.
Conlee, R. C., Jr., AO52462.
Conley, David Morrow, AO34446.
Conn, John Frank, AO55113.
×Connell, James Spalding, AO43528.
Connell, Leonard Tilly, AO45261.
Conner, Alva Lewis, AO44436.
Conner, Hal Chaney, AO45871.
×Conner, William Fred, AO44793.
Connor, Edward Hanson, 3d, AO26160.
×Conques, Lawrence, AO47076.
Conrad, Chester Melvin, AO45323.
Conrad, John Hill, AO45869
×Conway, Victor Cornelius, AO40770
Cook, Edmund George, Jr., AO45087
Cook, Emery Allan, AO45895
Cook, Harry Dean, AO37388
×Cook, James Hawdon, AO46478
Cook, Leo Winford, AO45527
Cook, Richard Henry, AO46311
Cook, Thomas Roland, Jr., AO43660
Cook, Walter Vaughn, AO45477
Cook, William Joseph, AO36776
Cooke, Guy, Jr., AO46604
Cooke, Sherman Cecil, AO33409.
×Cool, Paul Edward, AO44060
Coonan, Daniel Joseph, Jr., AO35488.
Coons, Walter Harold, AO32660.
Cooper, Harold Dalrymple, AO33715.
Cooper, James Howard, AO33428.
Cooper, Talmage Dewitt, Jr., AO43042.
Cooper, Theodore Louis, AO48221.
Cope, Stephen Jackson, AO34382.
Cope, William Samuel, AO43645.
Copeland, Lewis Anderson, AO43605.
×Corbin, Joseph Haymond, AO40810.
Cormany, William Franklin, Jr., AO48261.
Correll, Victor Crosby, AO43504.
Corrie, Wirt Haley, AO35042.
Costello, Edward Michael, AO25488.
Cotton, Jesse Francis, Jr., AO46191.
Cotton, Joseph Frederick, AO41074.
Couch, Alexander Pritchard, AO22373.
Couch, Benjamin John, AO44205.
Couch, Paul Frederick, AO49069.
Coursey, Richard Ray, Jr., AO25991.
Courtney, John Joseph, Jr., AO25584.
×Couser, Walter John, Jr., AO40722.
Cousins, Otie Columbus, AO44791.
Couts, Richard Lee, AO46491.
×Coverley, Edwin Dudley, AO45183.
Cowan, James Hill, AO44362.
Cowan, Marion Glenn, AO32412.
Cowdery, Burnham Webster, AO45323.
Cox, Edward Luther, Jr., AO39068.
×Cox, Eugene Wesley, AO45923.
Cox, Lucien Kozak, AO45585.
Cox, Richard Gordon, AO47559.
Cox, Robert Lewis, AO32520.
Crabtree, Frank Ray, AO46122.
Crabtree, Jean Ernest, AO47504.
Craddock, Reynold Cawaine, AO47561.
Cragg, Ernest Thorpe, AO26144.
×Crahan, James Edward, AO47863.
Crahen, Eugene James, AO48597.
Craig, Joe Congdon, AO43970.
Craig, Warren George, AO52884.
Cram, Reginald Maurice, AO52305.
Crandall, Thomas Oakey, AO53400.
Crandell, John Abner, Jr., AO34614.
×Crane, Russell Dale, AO48248.
Crane, Vincent Mercer, AO24306.
Cranfill, Niven Kendall, AO35407.
×Crary, Gerald Demarest, Jr., AO40633.
Cravey, John Thomas, AO44364.
×Crawford, Ben, AO54929.
Crawford, William, AO45617.
Crawford, William Adair, AO48746.
Creo, Andrew Bartholomew, AO33037.
Crick, James Monroe, Jr., AO48326.
×Crim, Harry Clay, Jr., AO46889.
×Crisi, Alfred Renato, AO46619.
Crispen, Marshall Freeman, AO54120.
Criss, George William, Jr., AO25672.
Cristadoro, Maurice Anthony, Jr., AO35131.
Crocker, Gage Houston, AO46973.
Cromie, Charles Codman, AO40960.
Crompton, Roy Clifton, AO53896.
Cronin, James Joseph, AO46686.
Cronin, William Russ, AO54225.
Crosby, James Erwin, Jr., AO24164.
Crosland, Roy Truett, AO35409.
Cross, Adelbert de Hart, AO39103.
Cross, Robert Douglas, AO52567.
Cross, Walter Winfred, AO22818.
Crossey, James Leo, AO46876.
Crossman, William Vaughton, AO43737.
Crosson, Norman Robert, AO33027.
×Crouchley, Edward Alfred, AO53628.
Crowder, Harlan Burrell, AO52861.
Crowder, Robert Graham, AO44843.
Crowell, Dick Merril, AO33753.
Crown, Richard Keith, AO36015.
Cruikshank, Arthur Waur, Jr., AO35383.
Crumley, James Perry, AO39190.
Crumm, William Joseph, AO35922.
Crutcher, Richard Lawrence, Jr., AO47065.
Crutchfield, James Oscar, AO40519.
Crutchfield, Wilfred Benjamin, AO37135.
Cruver, Harry Franklin, AO36455.
Cryer, Elmer Harold, AO47766.
×Cryer, James Magill, Jr., AO34798.
Culbertson, Omar William, AO44708.
Cullum, Fielder Wilson, AO45809.
Culp, Chester Harold, AO44740.
Culp, Merle Hellman, AO36473.
Cumisker, William Temple, AO40879.
Cummings, Earl William, AO30535.
Cummings, Louis Henry, AO37051.
Cunliffe, Richard King, AO39208.
Cunniff, Paul Joseph, AO45152.
Curlee, Robert Burnette, AO32846.
Curran, Emmett Eugene, AO46845.
Curran, John Hugh, AO44038.
Curry, James Hyter, AO35913.
Curtis, Ford John, AO53376.
Curtis, Gilbert Lewis, AO34216.
Curtis, Jack Harry, AO40250.
×Curtis, Robert David, AO53417.
Curtiss, Philip Hildreth, AO52286.
Cushing, Arthur Leavitt, AO45257.
Cutler, Edward Wellage, AO26296.
Cutler, John Milton, AO25787.

Dacko, William, AO44609.
d'Acosta Uriel Pereira, AO40272.
Dacus, John Howard, AO47474.
×Dailey, Herbert Richard, AO45294.
Dale, Hugh Walter, AO37174.
Dale, James Roy, Jr., AO53519.
Dalto, John, AO43975.
Dalton, Bernard Vincent, AO52345.
Daly, Arnold Joseph, AO44373.
Dames, William Herman, AO34227.
Damico, Robert Howard, AO37038.
Daner, William Joseph, AO26215.
Daniel, Heston Charles, AO52963.
Daniell, Gerald, AO53261.
D'Annibale, Vincent James, AO44106.
Darby, James Addison, AO35696.
Darnold, Charles Reese, AO44110.
×Dascombe, Charles Burr, AO33848.
×Dattan, Howard Steinwinter, AO47100.
×Daubard, Weldon Stanley, AO44816.
Daughton, Glenn B., AO24574.
×Daughtrey, Buddy Rex, AO37196.
Daunt, John Joseph, Jr., AO46468.
Dauphin, Ray, AO35698.
Davenport, Ellie Everett, AO37644.
Davey, Kenneth William, AO43989.
Davidson, William Herman, AO35015.
Davies, Jack Talmadge, AO26108.
Davies, James Werner, AO44170.
Davies, William Velasko, AO43472.
Davis, Charles Larramore, AO26136.
Davis, Dale D., AO40763.
Davis, Edward Geurs, AO44356.
×Davis, Glendon Valley, AO46405.
Davis, Glenn Elmore, AO44473.
Davis, Green Robinson, Jr., AO34417.
Davis, Harvey Milton, AO46238.
Davis, Henry Pierce, Jr., AO35527.
Davis, Ira Robert, AO52952.
Davis, Jack Talmage, AO26108.
Davis, James Werner, AO44170.
Davis, Jerome Nicholson, AO45071.
Davis, Jesse Charles, Jr., AO52621.
Davis, John, Jr., AO48274.
Davis, John Kenneth, AO33524.
Davis, Joseph Franklin, AO47853.
Davis, Thomas Aubry, AO47939.
×Davis, Thomas Julian, AO45464.
Davis, Thomas Jeffrey, Jr., AO47030.
Davis, Thomas Martin, AO45268.
Davis, William McClure, AO36025.
Davis, William Osborne, AO53469.
Davitt, Ralph Gregory, AO45069.
Dawson, Harold Cleveland, AO31904.
Dawson, Peter Paul, AO35140.
Dawson, William Stone, AO53778.
Daye, John Frederick, Jr., AO25700.
de Bourbon-Condé, Bruce Alfonso, AO43716.
De Dera, Joseph Edward, AO36744.
DeCruchy, Oliver Williams, Jr., AO25652.
×DeMal, Nicholas, Jr., AO53394.
DeMelik, Andrew Arthur, AO45001.
DeMun, Earl Edward, AO44066.
DeVar, Nicholas, Jr., AO43603.
Deal, Douglas Lipp, AO35894.
×Dean, David Kennedy, AO44709.
Dean, Richard, AO45090.
×Deane, William Boyd, AO44760.
Deans, Edwin Gray, AO44773.
Drake, George Carl, AO36794.
Debona, Anthony, AO34410.
DeBelyn, Raymond Joseph, AO53725.
Deck, Robert Wagner, AO33685.
×Deck, H. A., AO34820.
×Deck, Leland Paul, AO44747.
Deek, William Lee, AO26874.
Decker, Lathe Elsworth, AO37018.
Decker, Robert Young, AO48790.
Dedrickson, Lorin Ross, AO45647.
Deegan, Leo Francis, AO36310.
Deets, Jack Lester, AO47293.
Deffke, Donald Eugene, AO24970.
Dehner, Joseph Harvey, AO32691.
Del Missier, Bruno Carl, AO44046.
Delbridge, Thomas Edward, AO39245.
Delia, Andrew, AO25243.
Dell, Angelo John Andrew, AO44554.
×Dell, John William, AO33858.
Dempsey, Jack Donald, AO40416.
Dempsey, James Raymon, AO25452.
Dennis, Charles Gardner, AO52632.
Dennis, Harry Stutphen, Jr., AO47640.
Dennis, Larry Denton, AO44701.
Denson, Harvey Thomas, AO53383.
Denton, Harris Leonard, AO45078.
Denton, John Hartig, AO33004.
Deppe, Ralph Williams, AO44589.
Deppen, William Christian, Jr., AO32976.
×Dereskevich, Algert Stanley, AO44840.
Dern, Arthur William AO45606.
Derr, Herbert Odell, AO46369.
Der, Howard Stanley, AO53333.
×Derussy, Rene Amedee, AO52982.
Des Portes, John Augustus, AO35443.
×Des Georges, Herbert Etienne, AO43681.
Desmond, Arthur Peter, AO52486.
Desper, Dale David, AO33946.
Deterding, Floyd Milton, AO33205.
Dettre Rexford Herbert, Jr., AO25514.
×Detwiler, Donald Alburtus, AO26054.
Devine, John Emmet, AO33499.
Dewey, Willis Alonzo, AO43597.
×Dice, Evan Adams, AO44077.
Dick, Robert Marcus, AO43488.
Dickens, Thomas Nolan, AO44498.
Dickinson, Jacob McGavock, 3d, AO53842.
Dickson, Lon Russell, AO33698.
Diefflenderfer, James Clark, AO35439.
Diekmann, Paul John, AO44435.
×Dienz, John Edmund, AO47478.
Dieterich, Virgin Conrad, AO36077.
Dieterle, Jack Woodrow, AO36082.
Dietrich, Calvin George, AO47156.
×Dillon, Stephen Patrick, AO46400.
Dillon, Walter Walton, AO24832.
×Dilly, Vincent Sylvester, AO53502.
Diltz, Theo Roy, AO46207.
Dimel, James Joseph, AO35940.
Dinker, William Richard, AO36434.
Dinsmore, Dwight Reginald, AO43923.
Dinwiddie, Robert Eddy, AO52500.
Disana, Joe Vincent, AO52201.
Disbrow, Bill Louis, AO52645.
Dixon, Brendan, AO46097.
Dobbs, Ross Ebbie, AO45141.
Dobney, Harold William, AO44411.
Dockstader, Daniel B., AO44901.
Dodd, Aulevian Minyard, Jr., AO33643.
Dodds, William Clarence, AO44268.
×Dodge, James David, AO48135.
Dodge, John Alfred, AO53116.
Doert, George Robert, AO45118.
Doersch, George Albert, AO36845.
Dolan, Vincent William, AO53853.
Dolby, William Frederick, AO25805.
Dolk, Carl Edward, AO37090.
Dolph, Herbert Arden, AO40439.
Donnelly, William Allan, Jr., AO44341.
Donohue, Elwood Paul, AO21960.
×Donohue, Timothy Willard, AO53143.
Donovan, Joseph Nichols, AO26847.
Dooley, Benedict James, AO44287.
Doornbos, Philip Ceden, AO43775.
Dorff, Richard Woodrow, AO48374.
Dorondo, John Frank, AO52510.
Dougal, Robert Elliot, AO43766.
Dougherty, Russell Elliott, AO41048.
Douglas, Gene LeRoy, AO44836.
Douglas, Paul Page, Jr., AO[illegible]867.
Douma, Cyril Raymond, AO[illegible]
Douthett, Elwood Moser, AO44[illegible]
×Douthwaite, William Thomas, Jr., AO37169.
Dowling, James Riend, AO[illegible]
Downie, Archibald, Jr., AO[illegible]
Downing, Harry L., Jr., AO[illegible]
Doyswell, John Hayden, AO46377.
Doyle, James Leslie, AO25607.
Doyle, Thomas Francis, Jr., AO46097.
Drafts, Lucius Griffith, AO25856.
×Draper, Frederick Arthur, Jr., AO40937.
Dress, Fred William, Jr., AO33779.
Dregne, Irwin Hendrick, AO36328.
×Dreier, Charles Neal, AO47732.
Dresser, Cornelius Sheldon, AO40538.
Dressler, Gordon Albert, AO45828.
Drew, Troy, AO52617.
×Driessel, Sylvester John, Jr., AO46570.
Driver, John James, AO52637.
Druhe, Hubert Kenneth, AO39004.
DuBose, Edward Ervin, Jr., AO35038.
DuBose, Robert Lee, AO33945.
DuMont, Harold Joseph, AO45095.
Duch, Walter Francis, AO36959.
Ducote, Marc Marmaduke, Jr., AO46485.
Dudley, William Bradford, AO26252.
Duff, David Dryden, AO36011.
Duff, Elmer Hayden, AO40546.
Duffie, Claire Alfred Pelton, AO24884.
Dufour, Jerome Pierre, AO35994.
Duich, Paul Anthony, AO52801.
×Duin, Robert, AO46821.
Duke, Claude Lavert, Jr., AO40808.
Duke, William Francis, AO52633.
×Dula, Mason Aurelius, AO45636.
Duncan, Charles Henry, AO24782.
Duncan, Edward Keytron, AO23631.
×Duncan, George Harlan, AO48119.
Duncan, Ivan Merwin, AO44932.
Duncan, Roy Roscoe, AO45629.
Dunham, William Douglas, AO35376.
Dunkelberger, Vance Eaton, AO45128.
×Dunken, Allen Grambling, AO53239.
Dunlap, Robert Richard, AO46022.
Dunmore, George Perry, AO47952.
Dunn, Bruce Collins, AO36012.
Dunn, Lamar Jackson, AO35642.
Dunn, Raymond Bennett, AO45736.
Dunphy, Earl Francis, AO46415.
Durbeck, Arthur George, AO35362.
×Durham, Benjamin Jasper, Jr., AO52369.
Durner, Dwight Edward, AO46434.
Dutcher, Richard Fields, AO52435.
Duty, William Burkett, AO52229.
Dwyer, Harry Robert, AO48079.
Dyer, Frederick Wolfin, Jr., AO46813.
Dyer, Richard Willerton, AO32776.
Dyser, Francis Edward, AO43629.
Eade, George James, AO47949.
Eagleston, Glenn Todd, AO47840.
×Eakes, Raymond Timothy, AO34063.
Early, Charles Law, AO52995.
Easley, Samuel James, AO52469.
Easters, Robert Douglas, AO37268.
Ebert, Rembert Albert, AO46517.
Eberts, Major David, AO53355.
Eby, Robert Roy, AO44415.
×Echols, George Blakey, Jr., AO33291.
Eck, Anthony Ignatious, AO45622.
Eckert, Clarence August, AO46650.
Eckert, Jacob Clayton, AO32504.
Eddy, Ernest Chauncey, AO24218.
Eddy, Leonard Arthur, AO26000.
×Edelen, Henry Hill, Jr., AO44655.
Edenbo, John William, AO45135.
Edgerton, Bruce Wilds Postlethwaite, AO26080.
×Edmisten, Herbert Wilbert, AO44179.
Edner, Selden Raymond, AO36629.
×Edney, James Sidney, AO46105.
Edwards, Allen, AO53368.
×Edwards, Edmund Barber, AO25555.
×Edwards, James Thomas, AO53715.
×Edwards, Kenneth Rhea, AO44675.
Edwards, Richard Gordon, AO47944.
Edwards, Robert Bruce, AO40269.
Edwards, Wilbur Hugh, AO40749.
Edwards, Wilson Victor, AO26860.
Ellis, Irving Carl, AO35879.
×Egan, John Lloyd, AO34070.
Egan, Paul Francis Graham AO44934.
Eastland, Arnold Victor, AO31976.
Eidinger, Joseph Thomas, AO32419.
Eichhorn, Jerome Charles, AO33198.
×Eichorn, John Dunn, AO[illegible]
Eickemeyer, Karl Frederick, AO46884.
×Eisenmann, John Christian, AO38141.
Eisenbrown, Walter Thomas, AO10833.
Ekster, Friedrich, AO44144.
Elam, Rhodes Malsin, AO48097.
Elder, Harold Wyatte, Jr., AO33800.
Eldridge, Arthur Clarence, AO32744.
×Eldridge, Sheldon Flemming, AO14670.
Elinsen, Arnold Clarence, AO43801.
Eiling, Milfred Otto, AO47615.
×Ellington, Edward Hamlet, AO46339.
Elliott, Charles Robert, AO41641.
×Elliott, Elmo Adams, AO36687.
×Elliott, William Wayne, AO46330.
Ellis, Bythel Laurence, AO44496.
Ellis, Frank Terry, AO25097.
Ellis, Jerome Pershing, AO21995.
Ellis, Joseph Woodrow, AO47355.
Ellis, Ollie McLaurin, AO52631.

Ellis, Robert Giles, AO46043.
Ellison, Lawrence Albert, AO47974.
×Ellsaesser, Hugh Walter, AO54979.
×Elsten, Ernest Woodrow, AO44650.
Elvin, Malcolm Peter, AO45886.
×Elwell, Robert Lowell, AO45729.
Embrey, Leland E., AO47129.
Embrey, Ralph Curtis, AO36647.
×Emison, Ernest Egbert, AO41063.
Emmert, Benjamin Harrison, Jr., AO46354.
×Emmerts, Roger Nelson, AO43498.
Emory, Frank Norman, AO47302.
Engels, Anthony Mathias, AO45043.
Engle, Robert Thomas, AO53224.
English, Peter Franklin, AO54212.
Erben, James Betros, AO47543.
Erickson, Earl Monroe, AO54356.
Erlenbusch, William Christian, AO45528.
Estes, Chandler Bayard, AO46395.
Evans, Calvin Edmond, AO45827.
Evans, Clayton Edgar, AO46652.
Evans, David L., 3d, AO36619.
Evans, John Arthur, AO49029.
Evans, Philip Gordon, AO44200.
Evans, Raymond Eugene, AO48815.
Evans, Robert Ramsey, AO24908.
Evdokimoff, Dmitri, AO48463.
Everest, Frank Kendall, Jr., AO47299.
Everly, Delmer Dale, AO52676.
Ewbank, William Lancelot, AO48152.
Ewing, Donald Edwin, AO44071.
Ewing, Donald Walker, AO46472.
Eyres, William Gordon, AO44491.
Fackler, Robert Frederick, AO35006.
×Fahey, James Martin, AO46347.
×Fahlstedt, Alfred Arthur, AO44798.
Fahringer, John Conrad, AO36004.
Fain, Robert Snead, AO46410.
Fallon, Edward, AO52766.
Fallows, Albert Dunn, AO32002.
Falzgraf, Bryan George, AO32565.
Farley, James Vincent, AO45145.
Farley, Orville Boyd, AO34017.
Farnell, Leland Borden, Jr., AO34338.
Farnell, William Robert, Jr., AO52461.
Farr, Hugh Manson, AO45295.
Farrar, John Wynn, AO35535.
Farrell, Frank Joseph, AO54877.
×Farrell, Frederick Bernard, AO39069.
Farry, Albert Barrett, AO33682.
Farwell, Robert Harvey, AO46169.
Fatzinger, Charles William, Jr., AO33708.
Faught, Courtney LeMar, AO47025.
Faulk, Melvin Wilson, AO44815.
Fava, James Archie, AO53354.
Fawcett, Willard Ellis, AO32710.
Feallock, William John, 2d, AO22358.
Fears, James William, AO46440.
×Feeley, John MacGregor, Jr., AO53054.
×Felle, Clarence William, AO52580.
Feist, Robert Douglas, AO34593.
Fellenbaum, William Ramler, AO54334.
Feller, Frederick John, AO44448.
×Fellows, Walter Scott, Jr., AO45934.
Fenlon, James Wharton, AO40976.
Ferebee, Thomas Wilson, AO40816.
Ferguson, Clay Van Dalesem, AO34974.
×Ferguson, John Jacob, AO46296.
Ferguson, Robert Irving, AO35119.
Ferguson, Robert Munro, AO35355.
Ferran, Charles Gordon, AO45873.
Ferrel, Frank Ellington, AO33046.
×Ferrelle, Charles Harvey, Jr., AO52778.
Ferriss, Lester Ruthven, Jr., AO48060.
×Fertig, Norman, AO52824.
Fetters, Rolland Francis, AO37104.
×Fidrocki, Alfred Vincent, AO54476.
Field, Alexander Caldwell, Jr., AO40540.
Fields, Melvin Edwin, AO46495.
Filippone, Jack Carl, AO44463.
Filley, Oliver Dwight, Jr., AO37136.
Finan, George Keith, AO45125.
Fincher, William Walter, AO52678.
Findley, Harry Wilson, AO34003.
Finley, William H., AO36977.
×Finney, Drayton Kerr, AO44006.
Finney, William Leland, AO45592.
Fischer, Clarence Eugene, AO44006.
Fischer, Henry Arthur, Jr., AO35521.
Fisher, Irvin Arthur, AO54515.
×Fischer, Jerome Jerry, AO54377.
Fish, Vinton Alfred, AO44837.
Fishburn, James Butterfield, AO33587.
×Fishburn, Thomas William, AO25094.
Fishburne, Charles Carroll, Jr., AO24972.
Fishburne, Paul Lee, AO46245.
×Fishel, Robert Ralph, AO25459.
Fisher, Carl Byrd, AO45919.
Fisher, Franklin Lee, AO46715.
Fisher, Jack Charles, Jr., AO54066.
Fisher, Lowell Boyd, AO25483.
×Fisher, Philip Fitzgerald, AO44129.
Fisk, Harry Edward, AO47828.
Fiss, Robert Wendell, AO43897.
Fitch, Charles Root, AO46120.
Fitter, Philip Augustine, AO46106.
×Fitzgerald, John Edward, Jr., AO34015.
Fitzgerald, Raymond Leo, AO49035.
Fitzgerald, Vernerd, AO36064.
Fitzsimmons, Robert James, AO36673.
Flanagan, Richard William, AO49367.
Flannigan, Ralph Eugene, AO44920.
Flavin, Kenneth Arthur, AO48174.
Fleming, George Thomas, AO45374.
Fleming, Patrick Dawson, AO45754.
Fletcher, Arthur Amos, Jr., AO46033.
Flint, Raymond Leon, AO45190.
Flower, Frank Augustus, AO34489.
Flummer, George Allen, AO52891.
×Fly, Hugh Garrette, Jr., AO36729.
×Flynn, Charles James, Jr., AO54701.
Fogle, Melvin Woodrow, AO32553.
Foley, Robert Langdon, AO34235.
Foley, Robert Patrick, AO46383.
×Foley, Thomas Francis, AO45495.
Folts, John Lloyd, AO25181.
×Fontana, Robert Edward, AO33185.
Foote, Edward Potter, AO25603.
Forbes, Alexander Allison, AO52607.
Ford, Claud Edward, AO36650.
Ford, Louis William, AO34621.
Ford, Ross Clifford, AO48654.
×Ford, Wilson, AO33788.
×Forest, Stuart Vickery, AO53653.
×Fornal, Joseph John, AO52885.
Forrest, Edward Lester, AO52383.
×Forrester, James Randolph, AO44439.
Forsblade, Kenneth Dave, AO44556.
Forster, Bernard Francis, AO46351.
×Forster, Joseph Morelle, AO49025.
Forward, Ronald Bradley, AO53610.
Foster, Gilbert, AO32332.
Foster, Herbert Moffatt, AO31880.
×Foster, James Harry, Jr., AO46645.
Foster, James Oliver, Jr., AO47255.
Foster, James William, AO47753.
Foster, John William, AO44820.
Foster, Ross Johnson, AO43492.
Foster, William Wallace, Jr., AO35198.
Foulk, Tom Bond, Jr., AO26273.
Founds, Joseph William, AO55098.
Fouts, John Elijah, Jr., AO33303.
Fowell, Byron Ronald, AO32354.
×Fowler, Thomas R., AO46152.
Fox, James Henry, AO47117.
Fox, John Edward, AO43522.
×Fox, Robert Winston, AO46521.
×Foy, John Patrick, AO53614.
Frakes, James Fisher, AO25689.
Francis, Howard Champney, AO52666.
×Francis, Roderick Leland, AO46637.
Francis, Tim Benton, AO44757.
Frank, Donald Henry, AO36448.
Frank, Milton, Jr., AO46595.
Frank, Wallace Biddle, AO24922.
Frankosky, James Oliver, AO25460.
Frankovich, Joseph, Jr., AO47779.
Franz, Fred John, AO35329.
Franzel, Robert Thomas, AO47049.
Frarie, Wayne Merill, Jr., AO47333.
Frazier, Edwin Becton, AO46493.
Freeman, David Lloyd, AO36576.
Freese, Ralph Earl, AO23989.
×French, Russell Leroy, AO32991.
Freund, Albert Joseph, AO53446.
Frey, Robert William, AO45050.
×Frick, William Frederick, AO52557.
Fricks, Robert Owen, AO54463.
Friley, Kenneth Owen, AO53508.
Frink, Horace Everett, Jr., AO37009.
Frisbee, John Lee, AO53085.
Froman, Howard William, AO36795.
Frost, Joseph Harold, AO21705.
×Frost, Lyle Gooden, AO52668.
Fry, Howard Jackson, AO54740.
Fry, Robert MacDonald, AO37051.
Fryer, Milton, AO45967.
Fuchs, Marion Julion, AO53382.
Fuhrmeister, Ralph Stream, Jr., AO46331.
Fulcher, Kenneth Marks, AO37140.
Fulcher, Stanley Albert, AO46371.
Fuller, Edwin Wiley, AO36586.
×Fuller, Herbert Kaufman, AO45861.
Fulmer, Harold Glenn, AO36722.
Fulton, Raymond Andy, AO36363.
Funderburk, William Osler, AO52880.
×Funk, Carl Franklin, AO44628.
Furchner, Fred Thomas, AO35074.
×Fussell, James Glen, AO33212.
Futch, Kenneth Harlan, AO47112.
Gaddis, Albert Crawford, AO40399.
Gaff, John Wilson, Jr., AO34907.
Gaffney, George Preston, AO32009.
Gainer, Hubert William, AO44046.
Gaines, Robert Usher, Jr., AO24353.
×Gall, Elmer Charles, Jr., AO45051.
×Gallagher, John Vincent, AO43468.
Gallia, Jay Robert, AO48134.
×Gallup, Edward Francis, Jr., AO44440.
Galt, George Teasley, AO40826.
Gamage, Leonard Alfred, AO52795.
Gammon, Edgar Graham, Jr., AO32943.
Gammon, William John, AO40803.
×Gammon, Wilson Campbell, AO44220.
Gandy, Hilliard Leon, AO46363.
Gardiner, Paul Eugene, AO38460.
×Gardner, Laurence Ernest, AO32533.
Garland, Lloyd Hundley, Jr., AO32772.
Garland, William Carroll, AO24693.
Garland, William James, AO52783.
Garner, Gordon, Jr., AO37056.
Garner, Merritt Gerald, AO37129.
×Garrett, Leslie Fraser, AO33226.
Garrett, Skidmore Neale, AO22372.
Garrett, Thomas Simons 3d, AO26340.
×Garrison, Eskelle Victor, AO43698.
Garvin, Charles Howard, AO24794.
×Garvin, Earl John, AO54106.
×Garvin, Lloyd Clinton, AO37363.
Gaslin, Harold Earl, AO46945.
Gaston, Allen Berry, AO36402.
Gaston, Charles Crain, AO44474.
×Gates, Robert Woodrow, AO46887.
Gatewood, Moses Joseph, Jr. AO25613.
×Gattis, Robert Houston, AO34903.
Gatto, Victor Emmanuel, AO52585.
Gaudiani, Vincent Augustus, Jr., AO26011.
Gault, Charles Edward, AO45364.
Gaumond, Harry Joseph, Jr., AO52343.
Gay, Alex Henry, Jr., AO34465.
×Gaylor, Don Gordon, AO44718.
Gaylord, Donald Andrew, AO37227.
Gaylord, Lester Louis, AO44450.
Gaylord, Maurice Bailey, AO44408.
Gaynos, Nicholaus, AO47390.
Gazzaniga, Louis Anthony, AO54997.
Geanetos, George Stephen, AO44031.
×Geary, Leo Paul, AO35336.
Gebhart, Harold John, AO46979.
Gee, Howard Sherwin, AO47212.
Geer, John Henry, AO33358.
×Geer, Virgil Clyde, AO45632.
×Gelwix, Joe M., AO54963.
Genez, Victor Maurice, AO53637.
×Gentile, Don Salvadore, AO56912.
Gentry, Ralph Patrick, AO33636.
×George, John Louis, AO43706.
×Gerhart, Quinter Paul, AO24130.
Gernert, William Edgar, AO24906.
Ghram, Elmer Floyd, AO46358.
Gibbons, John Phillip, AO37335.
×Gibbons, William Lacey, AO48954.
Giblin, Richard Thomas, AO48037.
Gibson, Dick Finley, AO52807.
×Gibson, Richard Cushing, AO35944.
Gibson, Robert Duane, AO33131.
Gibson, William Herf, AO43973.
Giere, Henry Julian, AO37102.
Giffin, Charles Wallace, Jr., AO47088.
Gifford, George Donald, AO48516.
×Gilbert, John Holman, Jr., AO44552.
Gilbert, Raymond Arthur, AO35461.

Gilbert, Willard Russell, AO23697.
Gilbertson, Merle Jerome, AO36689.
×Gilchrist, William Thomas, AO48460.
Giles, Melvin Curry, AO33423.
Gill, John Edwards, AO43569.
Giller, Edward Bonfoy, AO53825.
×Gillesby, Fred Gearld, AO52907.
Gillespie, Calvin Eugene, AO33906.
×Gillespie, James Woodrow, AO32576.
Gillespie, John Paul, AO34200.
Gillmore, Lawrence John, AO48360.
Gilmore, Byron Harold, AO34820.
×Gilmore, George Washington, Jr., AO52266.
Gilmore, James David, AO53469.
×Gilmore, John Thomas, AO33589.
Gipson, Charles Hoover, AO39265.
Gire, Henry Lewis, AO44267.
Gisenzer, Charles F., AO52237.
Glaser, Leonard Tulare, AO35438.
Gleed, Edward Creston, AO53055.
Glenn, Charles Swyers, AO52791.
Glover, Donald Sheldon, AO35753.
Goddard, Guy Harold, AO23714.
Goddard, Lowell Wesley, AO46857.
Godfrey, Eugene Oakes, AO53804.
Godfrey, Stephen Mellotte, AO46120.
Godley, Lawrence Ely, AO36506.
Godwin, Jasper Lucas, Jr., AO53774.
Goetzke, Kenneth Herman, AO43911.
Goewey, Donald Charles, AO35419.
Goldner, Irving Abraham, AO47750.
×Gonye, Leonard Francis, AO36967.
Gonzalez, Horace Roger, AO34966.
Gooch, Ritchie Belton, AO45030.
Goodell, John Carleton, AO52236.
Goodfleisch, Don Marion, AO33634.
×Goodmanson, Murel Matthew, AO40303.
Goodrich, Earle Arthur, AO35010.
Goodwin, Howard Elton, AO47360.
Goodwin, Vaughn Kirk, AO43855.
Gordon, William Price, Jr., AO32240.
Gorman, John Jay, AO25015.
Gosling, Kenneth Reginald, AO43573.
Goss, Quentin James, AO25527.
Goss, Ralph Russell, AO53404.
Goss, Richard Royston, AO36925.
×Gossett, Ernest Eugene, AO46738.
Gossick, Lee Van, AO40843.
Gotchey, Robert Emett, AO44860.
×Gourley, Harold Harding, AO36634.
Gourley, Theodore Joseph, AO37360.
Govan, Claude Benjamin, AO52657.
Gover, Leroy, AO43882.
×Govocek, Joseph Glenn, AO33398.
Grace, James Dee, AO35953.
Gradwell, Burgess, AO48981.
Grady, William Robert, AO46785.
Graham, Charles Samuel, AO44705.
Graham, Edward, AO44178.
Graham, Gordon Marion, AO34907.
Graham, James Edward, AO43501.
×Graham, John Kessler, AO46396.
×Graham, Marshall Roberts, AO47287.
Gramm, Raymond Norris, AO52900.
Grashoff, William Henry, AO43477.
Grass, William Ellis, AO46035.
Graves, Irwin Lester, AO52890.
×Graves, Needham Warren, AO48234.
×Gravin, Irving Henry, AO43554.
Gravitt, Frank William, AO32631.
Gray, Jay Olin, AO54405.
Gray, Leon Walton, AO44655.
Gray, Lewis Howard, AO54920.
Gray, Russell Earl, AO52250.
×Greathouse, Harry Smith, AO46403.
Green, Charles Haunest, AO44424.
Green, Franklyn Thomas, AO22496.
×Green, Herschel Harper, AO35907.
Green, Louis Alpheus, AO47879.
Green, Norman Edon, AO36524.
Green, Paul Douglas, AO47664.
Greene, Benjamin Olin, Jr., AO43939.
Greene, Grover Young, AO44921.
Greene, James Barrow, AO53518.
Greene, Russell John, AO44175.
Greene, William James, AO36092.
×Greenslides, Lawrence Aubry, AO46820.
Greffet, Charles Vincent, AO47340.
Greger, Jack Joseph, AO52451.
Gregg, William Eugene, AO52464.
Gregory, James Madison, Jr., AO53360.
×Gregory, John Lewis, Jr., AO47044.
Grending, Carl Nelson, AO44744.
Gresham, Walter Vernon, Jr., AO36976.
×Greuter, Herbert Edgar, AO44324.
Grierson, Walter Hayden, AO33821.
Griffin, Charles Webster, AO43566.
×Griffin, Donald Ernest, AO25766.
×Griffin, Edmund Dorr, Jr., AO36063.
Griffin, Harry Norval, AO43066.
Griffin, Julious Columbus, AO43724.
×Griffin, Loyd Dean, AO34443.
Griffith, Frank Todd, AO44018.
Griffith, Frank John, AO47032.
Griffith, Hugh Albert, Jr., AO21707.
Griffith, Ole Curtis, Jr., AO39201.
Griffith, Richard Stanley, AO54240.
×Griffiths, Vincent Edward, Sr., AO40622.
×Grimm, Charles Burton, AO44123.
Grimmer, Philip William, AO33627.
Gromak, Anthony Edward, AO52243.
Grove, James Chisholm, AO52470.
Grow, Clyde L., AO53954.
Grubaugh, Boyd Lee, AO35099.
Grubaugh, Glover Porter, AO46916.
Grubbs, Wallace Elmer, AO36601.
Gruendyke, Richard Nelson, AO45433.
Gruetzemacher, Robert Oliver, AO35620.
Guerin, Merrill Robert, AO47171.
Gueydan, James Edmond, AO33718.
Guider, Herbert Neal, AO44510.
×Guilfoyle, Frank Joseph, AO46933.
Guilino, Vasco Edward, AO34780.
Gullette, Jesse Marcellus, AO44285.
Gunn, James Henry, AO40911.
×Gunn, Raymond Davis, AO54396.
Gustafson, Wayne Albert, AO44962.
Gustaves, Selmer, AO24764.
Gutierrez, Joseph S., AO47671.
Guyton, John Alexander, AO53508.
Guzak, Francis Watson, AO48389.
×Gwinn, John Wesley, Sr., AO44139.
Gwynn, Philip Simms, AO34851.
Haaf, Arthur Herschel, AO45060.
Haar, Chester Roy, AO44000.
Habeck, Carl William, AO44584.
Hackett, James Edward, AO52878.
Hackleman, John Leslie, AO36070.
Hackler, James Franklin, Jr., AO23767.
Hadley, James Alvin, AO47623.
Hadley, John Carl, AO45849.
Hager, Alfred Dale, AO26105.
Hagin, William Van, AO45955.
Hagreen, Robert John, AO46316.
Hahn, Albert Peter, Jr., AO45156.
Haist, Glade F., AO52554.
Hajek, Raymond Rowland, AO52375.
Hale, Blair, AO36876.
Hale, Frederick Norman, AO48321.
Hale, Richard Eugene, AO45509.
×Hale, William Spencer, AO48160.
Hall, Charles E., AO44362.
×Hall, Charles Edward, AO52357.
Hall, James Newton, AO53069.
Hall, Joseph Andrew, AO40474.
×Hall, Mark Beardsley, AO53359.
Hall, Paul Morgen, AO37304.
Hall, Robert William, AO46059.
Hall, Thomas William, AO40525.
Hall, William Louis, AO40951.
Hallam, Louis Carlyle, AO43692.
×Hallam, Philip Glendon, AO46880.
Hallenbeck, Ralph, Jr., AO26219.
Haller, Roscoe Richard, AO36433.
×Hallmark, John Milton, AO45220.
Halloran, Robert Patrick, AO35337.
Halsey, Fryer Preston, AO33261.
Haltom, Charles Cleveland, AO53658.
Halton, William Timothy, AO35732.
Ham, Stephen Paddock, AO45473.
Hambleton, Bertram Leslie, Jr., AO48377.
Hamel, Albert George, AO48411.
Hamilton, Frank Alexander, AO44561.
Hamilton, George Burton, AO45302.
Hamilton, Herbert Orton, AO44427.
Hamilton, Joseph Coursin, Jr., AO46469.
Hamilton, Joseph Louie, AO25516.
Hamilton, Samuel Davis, Jr., AO33226.
Hamilton, William Merwin, AO48531.
Hamlyn, Raymond Emmett, AO54806.
Hammer, Elmer Heath, Jr., AO46014.
Hammett, George Francis, Jr., AO53956.
Hammond, William, AO52835.
Hancock, James Herman, AO53622.
Haning, William Frees, Jr., AO52862.
Hankin, Abraham, Louis, AO53430.
Hanley, Thomas James 3d, AO24810.
Hannah, George Lafayette, Jr., AO36536.
Hannah, Raymond Clifford, AO46165.
Hanningan, John Francis, AO36704.
Hanniey, Vincent Paul, AO44864.
Hansen, Robert Peter, AO43625.
×Hansen, Robert Murdock, AO45601.
×Hanstinger, Michael John, AO54450.
Hansley, Frank Woodrow, AO35838.
×Hanson, Robert Wallin, AO47481.
Hanzel, Thomas Charles, AO45165.
Harbour, David Frank, AO34934.
Hardaway, Ben Franklin, Jr., AO24725.
Hardee, Walter Robert, Jr., AO47040.
×Hardin, Ernest Charles, Jr., AO35448.
×Harding, John Barlow, AO33682.
Hardy, Arthur Jackson, Jr., AO47763.
Hardy, Kermit Wayne, AO44859.
×Hardy, William Lamar, AO25650.
Hardzog, Walter Aftin, Jr., AO40886.
Hare, James Clark, AO44920.
Hargrove, Clifford White, AO46820.
Harker, Chester Vernon, AO40973.
Harlow, Harold Frank, AO54867.
Harlow, Paul Norman, AO31590.
Harmon, David Noah, AO34718.
Harper, Harmon Hicks, AO44648.
Harrell, Hunter Hugh, AO52956.
Harrell, John William, Jr., AO24722.
Harrell, Mason Douglas, AO44441.
Harrell, William Hasel, AO44136.
×Harriger, Robert Lee, AO34806.
Harrington, Archibald Allan, AO48919.
Harrington, George Elliott, AO44024.
Harrington, John Daniel, AO44256.
Harrington, Ralph Herman, AO53781.
Harrington, Robert Edward, AO25681.
×Harris, Bert Samuel, AO54762.
Harris, Ernest Arnold, AO35080.
Harris, George Thomas, AO47746.
Harris, Glynn Lovette, AO30037.
Harris, Jesse LeRoy, AO40577.
Harris, Joe Leslie, AO39061.
Harris, Louis Eugene, AO36386.
×Harris, Richard Conant, AO47733.
Harris, Richard Clayton, Jr., AO52565.
Harris, Schuyler Spottswood, AO44253.
×Harris, Shelby Jackson, AO54468.
×Harris, Teague Gray, Jr., AO26132.
Harris, William Fortna, AO36421.
×Harris, William Bruce, AO46305.
Harrison, Morgan Randolph, AO45608.
Harrison, Thomas Daniel, AO25462.
×Harrison, William Franklin, AO46168.
Harrold, Frank James, Jr., AO25934.
×Harshbarger, Elmer Thomas, AO45486.
Hart, Edward John, AO48615.
Hart, Fred Lawrence, AO36915.
×Hart, Malcolm Detraz, AO44592.
Hartbrodt, Frederick Alexander Vincent, AO52326.
Hartless, William Elbert, AO44183.
Hartman, Herbert Arthur, AO46592.
Hartson, Stanley Wallace, AO46351.
×Hartwig, Robert Louis, AO52689.
Harvey, John Francis, AO40888.
Harvey, Julian Arthur, AO35698.
Harwell, James Armour, Jr., AO48188.
×Haselby, Johnnie Vernon, AO46892.
Hass, John A., AO44475.
Hassemer, David Warren, AO24144.
×Hassenmiller, Marshall Griffith, AO44822.
Hasson, Albert Nolan, AO33739.
Hastey, Raymond Lester, AO31966.
Hastings, Vernon Leroy, AO47473.
Hatch, Lewis Marvin, AO46456.
Hatcher, Nolan Creamer, AO46836.
×Hathaway, William Horton, Jr., AO40459.
Hatten, Frank, AO53000.
Hause, Milton Maynard, AO45127.
Hauser, Elmer Fred, AO36273.

×Hawes, Emil Franklin, AO33540.
Hawk, Keith Calvin, AO33899.
Hawkens, Edward Albert, AO44693.
×Hawkins, Larry Lowell, AO35297.
Hawkins, Steedly Pittman, AO34567.
Hawkins, William Brevard, Jr., AO35387.
Hay, Frank Olmsted, AO32655.
Hayden, James Hilary, AO47482.
Haydon, Edward Ross, AO48056.
Hayes, James Marvin, Jr., AO36018.
×Hayes, William Donn, Jr., AO25312.
Haynes, Nathan Clifford, Jr., AO35599.
Haynie, Frank Marion, AO37340.
Hays, John Bennett, AO43771.
Hays, Nathan Bourne, AO34127.
Hays, Norman Pershing, AO40626.
Hays, Reginald Lee, AO36210.
Haywood, Floyd Harold, Jr., AO54561.
Heaberg, James Hugh, AO47288.
Head, Willie Chester, Jr., AO36028.
×Heald, Edgar Henry, AO44155.
Heard, Wade Coleman, AO44912.
Hearn, James Andrew, AO48671.
×Heck, Frederick Brockway, AO40628.
Heck, Joseph Denis, Jr., AO45255.
Hedlund, Bryce Albin, AO46716.
Hedrick, Walter Russell, Jr., AO40941.
Hedrick, Wyatt Smith, AO52460.
Heene, Fred Lewis, AO44035.
Hefling, Robert James, AO40483.
Hegenberger, Albert Carl, AO26293.
×Hegseth, Orville Donald, AO47221.
×Heggessy, Harold Maurice, Jr., AO47213.
Hehn, Earl LeRoy, Jr., AO25532.
Heikkinen, Risto Mikael, AO33578.
×Heino, Alfred Veikko, AO45137.
×Heiser, Sherwood Watkins, AO46553.
Heisler, William Foster, AO35145.
×Helfort, Albert Francis, AO44040.
Heller, Edwin Lewis, AO37105.
Hellriegel, William Charles, AO46372.
Helmantoler, Willis Lyndell, AO47993.
Helmick, George Herbert, 2d, AO46949.
Hemminger, George Carl, AO33331.
×Hemphill, Robert Frederick, AO36038.
Hemsley, Richard Tilghman, 3d, AO25859.
×Hench, Ralph Vale, AO35258.
Henderson, Walton Broniowe, AO52818.
Henderson, William Dalton, AO44279.
Hendry, Augustus Mallory, Jr., AO46874
×Henington, Henry Morell, AO48240.
Hennessy, Robert John, AO43985.
Henney, Max William, AO47493.
Hennigan, James Edward, AO45126.
×Henry, John Gilbert, AO48488.
×Henslee, Lem Paul, AO54420.
Hensler, John Anthony, AO33678.
Hensley, Gaston Means, AO53797.
×Hensley, Joseph Woodrow, AO32121.
Hensz, Arthur Charles, Jr., AO40405.
×Heran, Paul James, AO44120.
Herbert, John James, Jr., AO54897.
Hereford, Joseph Pierce, AO45385.
Hergert, Thomas Malcolm, AO33871.
Herman, Boyd Francis, AO35690.
Herrick, Harold James, AO46417.
×Herring, John Henry, Jr., AO36019.
×Herring, Wilber Gunton, AO43901.
×Herrington, John Athol, AO52714.
Herrington, Russel McKee, Jr., AO25589.
×Hershenow, William John, Jr., AO24069.
Hertel, Edward Jerome, AO26230.
Herway, Loren Worrell, AO36237.
Hesler, Robert Austin, AO32992.
Hess, Frederick William, AO45119.
Hester, Thomas Jefferson, AO46772.
Hetzel, Robert Lewis, AO52496.
Hewett, Henry Baker, AO35915.
Hewitt, John Arnot, AO34667.
×Hey, Winston Snowden, AO35437.
Heydon, Thomas Aloystus, AO45131.
Hibbits, Francis Leonard, AO52236.
×Hibner, Edwin Lee, AO47327.
Hickey, John Joseph, AO40652.
Hickman, David Elwyn, Jr., AO44133.
×Hicks, Jefferson Pascal, AO32673.
Hicks, Roger Lee, Jr., AO36053.
Higginbotham, Harold Kenneth, AO52612.
Higgins, Donald Hugh, Jr. AO36850.
×Higgs, Richard Ellis, AO52732.
Highley, John Norgrove, AO40739.
Hight, James Lester, AO52649.
Hill, Albert Ray, AO44202.
Hill, Alvin James, AO53644.
Hill, Charles Henry, AO44976.
Hill, Clayton Craig, AO46996.
Hill, Jesse Gorham, AO31998.
×Hill, John Michiel, AO35071.
Hill, John Theodore, AO44763.
Hill, Landon Prescott, AO46548.
Hill, Robert John, AO45298.
Hill, William Campbell, AO47483.
Hill, Yates Michel, AO24668.
×Hiller, Martin William, AO32170.
Hillery, Edward Gerald, AO21615.
Hilley, William Allen, AO43622.
Hills, Kenneth Bruce, AO42633.
Hillstrom, Carl Milton, AO40908.
Hillyer, Roy Noyes, Jr., AO34462.
Hilton, James Bryce, AO54481.
Hinchee, Robert Lee, AO40753.
×Hinchliff, Edward Everette AO44331.
×Hinckley, Robert Henry, Jr. AO24889.
×Hinds, Ernest, AO26191.
Hines, Wilfred Edward, AO54129.
Hinkel, George Marne, AO47771.
Hinkle, Carl Columbus, Jr., AO24829.
Hinkle, Wayne Keith, AO47309.
×Hinton, Joe Kinney, AO45906.
Hippenstiel, Charles Robin, AO45003.
×Hively, Howard Davis, AO33270.
Hnatio, Myron Mack, AO47896.
Hobaugh, John Henry, AO47334.
Hobbs, Gregory James, AO44251.
Hochstetter, Herman Eugene, AO54342.
Hodge, Dexter Lawrence, AO35432.
Hodges, Charles Grady, Jr., AO44350.
Hodges, Kenneth Sherrill, AO35030.
×Hodges, Lester Hall, AO32673.
Hoefler, George Edward, AO47238.
Hoeper, Paul Edward, AO46891.
Hoermann, Francis James, AO35538.
Hoewing, Ralph Clair, AO33582.
Hofmann, Thomas Charles, AO39272.
×Hoffman, George Pat, AO43726.
Hoffman, Harold Jefferson, AO40534.
Hoffman, John Matternas, AO35770.
Hoffman, Robert William, AO26026.
Hoffman, Theodore Caldwell, AO24445.
Hoffman, Carl David, AO46034.
Hoffmann, Robert Munroe, AO46679.
Hoffson, Wilbraham Arthur, AO44309.
Hofmann, Thomas Charles, AO39272.
Hogan, Henry Leon 3d, AO26143.
Hogg, Robert, AO43634.
Hoggatt, James Laure, AO36271.
Hohlaus, Kenneth Herman, AO45136.
×Hoks, Robert Leo, AO52290.
×Holt, Zane Moses, AO44724.
Hoke, Peter Joseph, AO44550.
Holbury, Robert J., AO48443.
Holcombe, Richard Eugene, AO53492.
×Holden, Paul Cole, AO43636.
Holdernesa, Arthur William, Jr., AO25863.
Holdredge, Fred Ernest, Jr., AO24763.
Holland, Chaz Max, AO47484.
Hollier, Frederick Frank, Jr., AO44043.
Holman, Alvin Russell, AO43839.
Holmes, Capers Andrews, Jr., AO45525.
Holmes, Francis Sieg, Jr., AO84730.
Holmes, Merrill Dennis, AO43762.
×Holmes, Robert Greenwood, AO52422.
Holub, Richard Cecil-Adolph, AO48779.
×Hood, John Robinson, Jr., AO34958.
Hook, Leo, AO53377.
Hoover, Edward Franklin, Jr., AO23274.
Hoover, John Ralph, AO48001.
×Horne, Claude Gideon, AO54072.
Horne, John Erwin, AO46175.
Hornsby, Joseph D., AO47024.
Horridge, Richard Malcolm, AO24657.
Horton, Charles Wesley, Jr., AO31957.
Horvath, John, AO40370.
Hosman, Richard Sutton, AO34673.
Hostler, Charles Warren, AO53722.
Hotte, Eugene Theodore, AO45633.
Hough, Luther Walker, Jr., AO26307.
×Hounshell, Claude Eugene, AO52390.
×House, A. T., Jr., AO35394.
House, Richard Arthur, AO24786.
Houston, William Marshall, AO45875.
Hovatter, Elbert Troy, AO37009.
Hovde, William Johnston, AO23753.
Hovik, Clifford Selmer, AO34351.
Howard, Homer Bruce, AO33750.
Howard, James Paul, AO48135.
×Howat, Kenneth Walter, AO32973.
Howe, Charles William, AO39228.
Howe, Everitt Weir, AO52779.
×Howell, Ernest Melville, AO33251.
Howell, Henry Randolph, Jr., AO39163.
Howell, John Richard, AO45133.
Howell, Sylvanus Thaddeus, Jr., AO39298.
Howell, Winfred Dennis, AO46317.
Howenstine, Kenneth K., AO34181.
Howes, Francis Bradford, Jr., AO35468.
Howie, Loren Donald, AO45858.
Howland, Clark Boyden, AO32245.
Howle, Robert Paul, Jr., AO46923.
Howton, Harry Gwin, AO54032.
Hoyt, Robert Franklin, AO48751.
Hozier, George Chambers, AO24862.
Huau, Joseph Hipolito, Jr., AO26099.
×Hubbard, Edwin William, AO45501.
Hubbard, Raymond Marvin, AO40248.
×Hudson, Jere Howard, AO48678.
Hudson, John Bell, AO28237.
Hudson, John Henry, AO43950.
Hudson, Roland Lee, AO46898.
Hudson, Ullin Lee, AO25985.
Hudson, William Lee, AO45101.
Hueners, George William, AO47050.
Huey, Stanley George, AO25313.
Huffaker, Kenneth Ellsworth, AO32768.
×Huffman, Roy Edward, AO46172.
×Huggins, Charles Augustus, AO40458.
Hughel, George Kinley, AO35734.
Hughes, Arden Boyd, AO47831.
Hughes, Charles Edwin, AO47498.
Hughes, George Denny, AO24828.
×Hughes, Herschel Dement, AO26216.
Hughes, Maurice Laudelle, AO36808.
Hughes, Robert Bernard, AO45883.
Hule, Perry Len, AO36133.
×Hull, Arnold Robert, AO46814.
Hull, George Roswell, AO36649.
×Hull, James Jacob, AO44769.
Hull, Robert Richard, AO46394.
Humphres, Earl Cranston, AO45186.
Humphries, Donald Harrison, AO34495.
Hunn, Spencer Simmons, AO47807.
×Hunner, Paul Charles, AO45565.
Hunsaker, Ben Wightman, AO33637.
Hunt, Earl Gilbert, AO32697.
Hunt, Edward Herman, AO43529.
Hunt, Gilbert Wayne, AO44207.
Hunt, Marvin Louis, AO45987.
×Hunt, Robert Fletcher, Jr., AO43623.
×Hunt, Seaborn McDonald, AO44642.
×Hunter, Floyd Williams, Jr., AO35496.
Hunter, James Heggie, AO44829.
Hunter, James DeCourcy, AO47759.
×Hunter, Russell Bruce, AO52270.
Hunter, William Campbell, AO52196.
Hunter, William Austin, AO35867.
×Huntley, James Creelman, AO26802.
Huntley, William Henry, Jr., AO46391.
Hurd, Harlan Francis, AO44127.
Hurley, Edward Phillip, AO44216.
Hurley, Paul Joseph, AO26290.
Hurr, Arthur Pershing, AO35790.
Hurt, Wilbur Wellington, AO46021.
Huskey, Homer A., AO44893.
Huston, Laverne Francis, Jr., AO35747.
Huston, Sherman Leroy, AO44055.
Hustek, William Stephen, AO44637.
Hutchens, David Dale, AO87098.
Hutcheson, George Washington, Jr., AO49020.
Hutcheson, Jack, AO44398.
Hutchinson, Leonard Hugh, AO45624.
×Hutchison, Jacob Anderson, AO35397.
Hutchison, Leroy Clifford, AO33519.
Hutton, Leonard Jackson, AO34811.
Hutton, Terry George, AO52905.
Hyde, Frederick Weston, AO24923.
Hyde, Thomas Cecil, AO46977.
Hyder, Ralph Charles, AO53042.
×Hynes, Richard Joseph, AO25596.
×Hyslop, William Arthur, AO44387.
Imig, Paul Jacob, AO32635.
Ingham, George Howard, AO25954.
×Ingram, James Woodrow, AO45719.

Irby, John Jackson, AO34032.
Ireland, Clare Thompson, Jr., AO26006.
Ireland, Melvin J., AO44655.
Irons, Stanley Wilson, AO48288.
Irwin, Robert Bigelow, AO34315.
Isaacson, Clayton Merlin, AO36426.
Iverson, Leroy Cook, AO46654.
Iverson, Richard Junius, AO36532.
×Ivey, Maurey Herbert, AO44754.
Ivey, William Glenn, AO34632.
Ivey, William Holder, AO46206.
Jablecki, Leon Stanyslaw, AO45140.
Jack, Chester Arthur, AO35547.
Jack, William Alexander, AO37318.
Jackson, Arthur Copeland, Jr., AO47655.
Jackson, Arthur Vincent, AO25678.
Jackson, Elwin Henry, AO46018.
Jackson, Frank Dale, AO47847.
Jackson, Howard Edward, AO35429.
Jackson, Loren Elwood, AO53039.
Jackson, Melvin Thomas, AO54465.
×Jackson, William Cole, AO47449.
Jacobs, Herbert Milton, AO44788.
Jacobsen, Otto Frederick, AO39123.
Jacobsen, William Lee, AO48456.
Jacobson, Alden Dale, AO39067.
×Jacobson, James Louis, AO39040.
Jaegers, Alphonse William, AO52679.
James, Harold Clinton, AO44978.
×James, Newton Elder, AO22153.
×Jamison, Donald Calvin, AO53126.
Jamison, Eldon Maxwell, AO48449.
Jarman, James Theodore, AO45950.
×Jarratt, Jerry Devereux, AO48142.
×Jarrell, Robert Edward, AO44703.
×Jarvie, William John, AO53196.
×Jaynes, Jay, AO24813.
Jaynes, Roy Arnold, AO10582.
Jefferson, Harold Dakan, AO53505.
Jeffrey, Arthur Ferdinand, AO35893.
Jella, Leonard L., AO33859.
Jemmott, Herbert Kitchner Burton, AO32960.
Jenkins, Everett Kelley, Jr., AO40768.
Jenkins, Leaton Elbert, AO32184.
Jenkins, Ralph Clark, AO46734.
Jenkins, Robert Maxwell, Jr., AO52909.
×Jennings, Clifton Victor, AO44999.
×Jennings, Elton Jordan, AO33223.
Jens, Henry Paul, AO55062.
×Jensen, Dale Henry, AO45330.
Jensen, Ralph Soren, AO43635.
×Jensen, Ralph Albert, AO53179.
Jernigan, William Le Roy, AO46384.
Jespersen, Glenn Edward, AO36841.
Jindrich, Leonard Joseph, AO34550.
Jobanek, Wilbur Lewis, AO46513.
Jobe, Robert Cleveland, AO47685.
Johansen, Ernest Wortman, AO52786.
John, Ernest Falcon, AO41065.
Johns, Howard George, AO39284.
×Johns, Robert Gordon, AO32132.
Johnson, Andrew Everett, AO33500.
Johnson, Arnold Rudolph, AO44209.
Johnson, Clarence Trevitt, Jr., AO46359.
Johnson, Charles William, AO35382.
Johnson, Charles Wilburn, Jr., AO46835.
Johnson, Darwin Allen, AO44141.
Johnson, Frank Edward, AO46005.
Johnson, George Edward, AO32912.
Johnson, George Marvin, Jr., AO47029.
Johnson, Gerald Walter, AO35839.
Johnson, Grove Charles, AO53856.
Johnson, Howard, AO52440.
Johnson, James Robert, AO52825.
Johnson, James Troy, AO36295.
Johnson, Joseph Glen, Jr., AO48236.
Johnson, Leland Warren, AO34000.
Johnson, Lester Vernon, Jr., AO46101.
Johnson, Lycurgus Waldemar, AO44633.
Johnson, Merle, AO48622.
Johnson, Neil Richard, AO35514.
Johnson, Paul Esrom, Jr., AO46470.
×Johnson, Ralph Albert, AO48372.
Johnson, Ralph Arthur, AO36280.
Johnson, Richard Lee, AO36651.
Johnson, Robert Harland, AO36738.
Johnson, Robert Jay David, AO37150.
Johnson, Timothy Robert, AO36008.
×Johnson, William Melbourne, AO40493.
Johnston, Charles Harvey, AO44499.
Johnston, George Henry, AO35502.
Johnston, Henry Randolph, AO44337.
Johnston, James Eston, AO44879.
Johnston, Robert Donald, AO35610.
×Johnston, Robert Edward, AO44767.
Johnston, Robert Rex, AO47567.
Johnston, Warren Montgomery, AO32625.
×Johnston, William Edward, AO32243.
Joiner, Reese William, AO32699.
Jolissaint, John Mire, AO34850.
×Jolly, David Chester, AO35517.
Jolly, Hoyt Avery, Jr., AO45148.
×Jones, Allen Newton, Jr., AO43935.
×Jones, David Charles, AO48454.
Jones, David Reese, AO53479.
Jones, Dorrie Edwin, AO35938.
Jones, Felix Henley, Jr., AO34240.
Jones, Frank George, AO34165.
Jones, George Robbins, AO43948.
Jones, Grafton Kenneth, AO44965.
Jones, Hubert, Ledyard, AO44611.
Jones, Jack Jean, AO25481.
Jones, James Marion, AO52769.
Jones, John, Jr., AO44541.
×Jones, Joseph Anthony, AO44615.
×Jones, Lyle Merritt, AO46159.
Jones, Oval Wilbert, AO36627.
Jones, Richard Gordon, AO33366.
Jones, Russell Park, AO25068.
Jones, Thomas Qualte, Jr., AO45679.
Jones, Waldo Brigham, AO50465.
Jones, William Dibrell, AO45105.
Jones, William Joseph, AO35931.
Jones, William Orville, AO46119.
Jones, William Thomas, AO48049.
×Joos, Walter James, AO33186.
Joram, Louis Henry, AO47723.
Jordan, Hugh Fagan, AO25771.
Jordan, James Emmette, Jr., AO44351.
Jordan, Ralph Schaffer, AO32341.
Jordan, Sam Peal, AO34679.
Jordan, Wallace Robert, AO33819.
Jorgensen, Gerald Richard, AO47033.
×Jory, Jesse Frederick, AO46567.
Jose, Elmer Howard, Jr., AO53477.
Joseph, Franklin Arthur, AO52364.
Joyal, Philip Eugene, AO46354.
Joyce, Thomas Byron, AO53609.
Judy, James Donald, AO48448.
Kafer, Ernest Emanuel, AO52718.
Kalinski, Felix Andrew, AO26070.
Kandel, Alfred, AO35543.
×Kandel, Edward Robert, AO52195.
×Kane, Francis Xavier, AO25524.
Kane, Harold Edwin, AO47571.
Kane, Raymond Joseph, Jr., AO47080.
Kappeler, Frank Albert, AO43749.
Karably, Louis Stephen, AO33335.
×Karas, Christopher James, AO33402.
Karlin, Francis Joseph, AO46048.
Karsokas, Benjamin Anthony, AO25289.
Kaspereen, Frank Robert, AO53755.
×Kaufman, Alfred, AO46439.
Kaufman, John Eugene, AO44300.
×Kaufmann, Leonard, Jr., AO36446.
Kay, Charles Woodford, AO43521.
Kay, Kenneth Edmond, AO52458.
Kay, Marvin Edwards, AO35803.
Keating, Philip James, AO48478.
Keck, James Moulton, AO26002.
Keefe, Thomas William, Jr., AO35042.
Keefer, Norman Jay, Jr., AO26332.
Keefer, William Edward, AO35607.
Keeling, Gerald Grahm, AO53766.
×Keene, John Hardtner, AO36458.
Kegeles, Sidney Albert, AO44359.
Kehrer, Kenneth, AO43967.
Keim, Robert Phillip, AO48375.
Keithley, George James, AO33265.
Kelakos, Charles George, AO52555.
×Kell, John William, AO44797.
Kellams, Clinton Moore, AO32780.
Keller, John Crawford, Jr., AO47510.
Keller, Robert Weidman, AO36286.
Keller, Stevens, AO52514.
×Kellerman, Jack Hickman, AO52710.
Kelley, Edward Gaylor, AO46287.
Kelley, Glenn Davis, AO52476.
×Kelley, Gordon Milford, AO46029.
Kelley, Keith Patrick, AO53394.
×Kelley, Vernon Bradley, Jr., AO48777.
Kelley, Wendell James, AO46200.
Kellis, James George Loisos, AO47365.
Kellogg, David Neel, AO46008.
Kellum, George Glenn, Jr., AO43851.
×Kelly, Clyde Raymond, AO46977.
Kelly, Converse Beach, AO35350.
Kelly, Dennis Peter, Jr., AO45254.
×Kelly, Patrick Ledoux, AO54619.
×Kelly, Robert Lorenzo, AO36284.
Kelly, Thomas Clyde, AO34663.
Kelly, Walter Earle, AO53668.
Kelso, Charles Wayne, AO44378.
Kendall, Jimmie Winstead, AO45019.
Kendall, Paul Cross, AO46297.
×Kendig, Robert Elwood, AO35916.
×Kendrick, Bobbie Fae, AO47102.
Kendrick, Donald, AO44838.
Kendrick, James Bain, AO46088.
×Kennedy, Elmore McIntosh, Jr., AO44699.
Kennedy, William John, AO24106.
Kenney, Paul Harrington, AO39227.
Kent, Herbert William, AO34829.
×Kenworthy, Charles Clifford, Jr., AO46150.
×Keppler, Charles Nelson, AO46306.
Kerig, John Arthur, Jr., AO25551.
×Kerner, Robert Francis, AO43909.
Kernan, Robert Mills, AO52594.
Kerr, Ernest Lee, AO32739.
Kerr, Jean Louth, Jr., AO40488.
Kerr, Kenneth James, AO39229.
Key, William David, AO35557.
Keyes, Lawrence James, AO52755.
×Keyser, William Russell, AO52239.
Kiechel, Walter, Jr., AO46272.
×Kiegel, Albert Charles, AO44783.
Kilgore, Bishop Marvin, AO48259.
Killen, Leo William, AO33379.
Kilpatrick, William Joseph, Jr., AO25940.
Kimball, Clarke Charles, AO47494.
Kimbell, Earl Shadden, AO35317.
Kimsey, James Wayne, AO26909.
Kinard, Clinton Roy, AO47749.
Kincannon, Francis Chase, AO40695.
Kinder, Albert Earl, Jr., AO25739.
Kindig, Roger Edward, AO40692.
×King, Benjamin Hardin, AO48046.
King, Donald Harrison, AO35731.
King, Edward Calvin, Jr., AO36828.
King, James Porter, AO33365.
King, James William, AO36297.
King, John Rene, AO47233.
King, Walter Syler, AO37338.
×King, William Gregg, Jr., AO53631.
Kinney, George Romanta, AO25779.
Kinney, George Warren, AO35055.
×Kirby, Burton Moore, AO48624.
×Kirby, Edward Frank, AO40498.
×Kirby, Henry Hodgen, Jr., AO25735.
Kirby, Robert Leslie, AO46109.
Kirkendall, James Frederick, AO36294.
×Kirkpatrick, Charles Eugene, AO47257.
Kirkpatrick, Marshall Armine, AO32430.
Kiser, Ralph Wilson, AO48211.
×Kissick, Luther Cleveland, Jr., AO48149.
Klam, Louis Bernard, AO40944.
Klein, Raymond Paul, AO35367.
Klette, Immanuel John, AO36719.
×Klingbiel, Sherman Fredrick, AO40558.
×Klopfenstein, Alba Berten, AO44206.
Kluever, Arnold Frederick Adolph, AO22413.
Knabel, Lewis Julius, AO44587.
Knapp, Joseph Martin, AO45747.
Knapp, Robert Harold, AO42266.
×Knaus, John Vincent, AO36381.
Knepper, Frank Bernard, Jr., AO46229.
Knight, Archie Joyce, AO32236.
Knight, John Richard, AO23321.
×Knight, Perry Leroy, AO44575.
×Knoll, Jasper George, AO32482.
Knowles, Kenyon Leroy, AO52404.
×Knox, George Levi, AO35427.
Knox, Glen Edward, AO47732.
Koch, Harry Eugene, AO35951.
Kochel, Michael Joseph, AO44940.
Koehler, Leonard Frederick, AO48242.
Koehne, George Henry, Jr., AO45852.
×Koenig, Perier Arnold, AO43734.
Koenig, Sebastian Bernard, AO37264.
Koger, Harlis Raymond, AO44493.

Kohnert, Harold Alfred, AO47423.
×Kolander, Conrad Carl, Jr., AO46181.
×Kolodziejczyk, Walter John, AO54468.
×Kolpin, Shirley Andrew, AO32685.
Kolstad, Robert Francis, AO36303.
Koremers, William Westover, AO32590.
×Konin, David Harry, AO44777.
×Konopacki, Hubert John, AO22471.
Koontz, Thomas Gale, AO52288.
×Kortemeyer, Henry Alvin, AO47827.
×Koser, Jack Donald, AO34385.
Koszarek, Frank Andrew, AO52773.
Koval, Andrew Edward, AO47952.
Kowtko, Nicholas, AO44944.
×Krafka, Edward, AO52754.
Kraft, Eugene John, AO52619.
Kramer, Robert Herman, AO46782.
×Kramp, Joseph John, AO33135.
Kraus, Glenn Richard, AO47928.
Kraus, James Christian, AO48541.
×Kraus, Russell Bernhardt, AO44796.
Krause, George Joseph, AO54231.
Krause, Harris F., AO44687.
Krause, Lester Livingstone, Jr., AO35331.
Krebs, Laurence Francis, AO45170.
Kreidler, Howard Everett, AO36405.
×Kremer, Emil Albert, AO47453.
Kremer, Harry Darwin, Jr., AO52680.
Krogh, Laurence Bertram, AO43866.
Kronauer, Clifford John, Jr., AO40764.
Kruge, William Arthur, AO52730.
Kucheman, Henry Bernard, Jr., AO35596.
Kullman, John Roger, AO36220.
Kuntz, Chester Harlan, AO45361.
Kurowski, Walter Chester, AO52793.
Kursar, August, AO33569.
Kurz, Albert Adam, AO53543.
Kyer, Fred Earl, AO46126.
Kyle, William Donald, Jr., AO25780.
Kyser, David Arthur, AO46518.
LaBarre, Louis Jay, AO33765.
LaCroix, Lucius George, AO53834.
Lamarre, Francis Harold, AO52547.
×Lavier, Eugene Clark, AO33243.
Lack, Wendell Douglas, AO52881.
Lacombe, Raymond Joseph, AO44243.
Lacy, Robert Ernest, AO25632.
Ladd, Chester Reed, AO24821.
Lafko, John William, AO36123.
Laitos, Jan Milan, AO40455.
Lamb, Hal William, AO47690.
Lamback, Charles Hett, AO44241.
Lambert, Floyd Aubrey, AO32129.
Lame, Roland Clayton, AO46597.
Lamm, Louis Joseph, AO40819.
Lamontagne, Ralph Stuart, AO48301.
Lancaster, Hartwell Charles, AO53835.
Lancaster, James William, AO34541.
Land, William Mordecai, Jr., AO45755.
Landry, Matthew Andrew, AO44308.
Landwehr, Virgil Henry, AO44695.
Lane, Albert Lossen, Jr., AO25724.
Lane, James Russell, AO53219.
Lanford, William Archibald, AO25178.
Langdale, Robert Hammel, AO34021.
×Langford, Karl Albert, AO44108.
×Langford, Robert Irving, AO53418.
Langley, Julius Roger, AO47276.
Langley, Samuel Firth, AO31906.
Lanning, George Richard, AO44514.
×Lanzoni, Silvio Disidero, AO46611.
Larkin, Robert Thomas, AO48170.
Larowe, John Simon, AO40472.
×Larrabee, Vance Henry, AO53313.
Larrick, Percie James, AO46462.
Larsen, William Arthur, AO36725.
Larson, Edwin Cecil, AO43871.
Larson, Harold Bert, AO35824.
Larson, Harold Jacobson, AO35423.
Larson, James Russell, AO18792.
Lash, Robert Louis, AO43467.
Lasly, Walter D., AO33019.
Latane, David Eaton, AO33990.
Latham, William Roberts, Jr., AO52729.
Latham, Allan Adale, AO53270.
Lathan, Noel Olin Elder, AO44495.
Lathrop, Neil Hill, AO46847.
Latson, Harvey Haroldson, Jr., AO25953.
×Laun, Wirt Adams, Jr., AO40913.
Laurenta, Robert Blackburn, AO47258.
×Lavens, William Louis, AO35775.
Lawler, John Dean, AO47969.
Lawler, John Francis, AO52849.
Lawley, William Robert, Jr., AO37247.
Lawrence, Preston Herbert, AO48698.
Lawson, George Asbury, AO46605.
Lawton, Kenneth, AO44523.
Layhee, Harold Franklin, AO36469.
×Lazenby, James Elmer, AO40624.
LePetre, Frederick Herman, AO36282.
Leach, George, AO33371.
Leaf, Charles Clay, AO54606.
Leahy, Edward David, AO46146.
Leary, Richard Edwin, AO35767.
Leaverton, George Buehler, AO35668.
Leavitt, William Job, AO43788.
Lebetter, Henry Franklin, Jr., AO34858.
Ledford, Otto Clarence, AO40713.
Lee, Carl Cris, AO46374.
Lee, Donald Edgar, AO56900.
Lee, Harold George, AO52885.
Lee, Orville Imonial, AO44406.
×Lee, William Wilson, AO47736.
Leet, Jonathan, AO32445.
Leetch, Donald Gordon, AO45139.
×Legg, Oliver Morton, AO25109.
×Legg, Paul Ashton, AO45659.
Lemley, Samuel Arthur, AO36058.
Lemme, William Philip, AO46204.
Lemming, Joseph Lawrence, Jr., AO37153.
Lemons, Joseph Pascal, AO52977.
Lenfest, Charles William, AO25478.
Lennox, Weston Monroe, AO39147.
Leverette, William Lawrence, AO38962
Levy, Robert Maurice, AO46989.
×Lewellen, Roger Merton, AO44515.
×Lewis, Armit William, AO46719.
Lewis, Charles Daniel, AO34807.
Lewis, Dwight Francis, AO43549.
Lewis, Glen, Jr., AO45968.
Lewis, Leo Coxwell, AO48509.
×Lewis, Richard Calvin, AO46367.
Lewis, Samuel Henry, AO32359.
Lewis, William Charles, AO46373.
Lewis, William Eugene, AO25728.
×Libbert, John Edward, AO47467.
Libbey, Richard Bell, AO46587.
Lichter, Carl Jerome, AO43878.
Lillard, James Warren, Jr., AO34316.
Lilley, Earl Ainzi, AO49070.
Lilliedoll, Jarrold Donath, AO37151.
×Lind, Harold August, AO44114.
Lind, Marcel, AO32280.
Lindberg, Carl Donald, AO48547.
Lindberg, James Oscar, AO35752.
Lindell, Keith Gordon, AO25442.
Lindenmeyer, John Henry, AO44264.
Lindsay, Andrew Gowen, AO44689.
Lingo, Jack Wood, AO35644.
Linko, George Andrew, AO40513.
Linkous, William Lafayette, AO44339.
Linton, John Harvey, AO25828.
Lipp, James Pershing, AO46073.
×Lippard, John Albert, AO45764.
Lisack, John P., AO36601.
Lisecki, John Richard, AO44257.
×Liston, Walter Fillmore, AO52424.
×Little, Edward Leo, AO52931.
×Little, Edwin Loren, AO37191.
Little, James Walter, AO35378.
Little, John Preston, AO44470.
Livingston, Robert Paul, AO35966.
Locher, James Rend, Jr., AO33814.
Lockard, Chancy Hoyt, AO36041.
Lockhart, Russell Durward, AO44886.
Lockman, Daniel Barkley, AO43791.
Loftus, Joseph Francis, AO45031.
Lollar, Clarence La Verne, AO35102.
Long, Alan Guy, AO44573.
Long, Albert Ray, AO35403.
Long, Benjamin Franklin, AO35908.
Long, George Edward, AO47239.
Long, Joseph Edward, AO46422.
Long, Maurice George, AO36683.
Longino, Dick Randolph, Jr., AO43938
×Loomis, Richard Edward, AO33204.
Loughran, Harold Ray, AO45041.
Loughry, Robert Johnson, AO33536.
×Love, Thomas McAdoo, AO26051.
Lovell, Carl Erwin, AO49086.
×Lovett, John Rossignol, AO25788.
×Lovette, James Kimble, AO44185.
Loving, Lee Wall, AO52431.
Low, Andrew Stevenson, Jr., AO24734.
×Lowe, Jessup David, AO25649.
Lowell, Marlan Erwin, AO47608.
Lown, Franklin David, Jr., AO35666.
×Lozito, Vincent James, AO48764.
Lube, Harold Arthur, AO45541.
Lucas, Anthony Dean, AO47078.
Lucas, George Garland, AO44254.
Lucas, Henry Edward, AO35580.
Lucas, Lee Ronald, AO37316.
Lucas, Noel Alex, AO44468.
×Lucia, Raymond William, AO53076.
×Lucich, Stanley, AO36899.
Luck, Ellis Chester, AO52173.
Luckey, Michael Arthur, AO47036.
Ludwig, George Henry, AO45643.
×Luehring, Verl Dean, AO46113.
×Lueke, Kenneth Lincoln, AO44890.
Lulejian, Norair Melkon, AO43481.
Lumley, Jack Toupain, AO47675.
Lumpkin, William Hiram, AO44574.
Lunceford, Sigmon Austin, AO34985.
×Lund, Theodore Karl, AO52197.
Lundak, Edward Everett, AO32722.
Lundby, Roland Odell, AO46332.
Lundin, Robert Lloyd, AO45043.
Lupear, Cornell John, AO46427.
Lusby, Perry Minor, AO54728.
Lutman, Charles Carroll, AO36006.
Luts, John, AO52530.
Lutton, Lyle David, Jr., AO52490.
Lyman, Lawrence Roger, AO47941.
Lynch, Robert James, AO25114.
Lynde, Glyndon Lloyd, AO44384.
Lynn, Roland Raleigh, AO47766.
Lyon, Arthur Benjamin, Jr., AO46107.
×Lyon, Aubrey Glenn, AO36762.
Lyons, Charles Maxwell, AO43907.
×Lyons, James Thompson, AO52543.
×Lyons, Ralph, AO44811.
Maas, Charles Fundin, AO43999.
MacDonald, James William, AO44807.
×MacDonald, William Rees, AO46773.
MacGregor, Wallace Fletcher, AO44582.
MacKay, Neill Camp, AO35498.
MacNeill, Edward Henry, AO48739.
MacTaggart, Irving Paul, AO52448.
Macey, William Henry, AO32938.
×Machosek, John Joseph, AO52908.
Mackiin, John DeWalt, Jr., AO40860.
Madeley, Arthur Claude, Jr., AO47059.
×Madison, Gayle Eugene, AO26151.
Madsen, Frank Martin, Jr., AO48717.
×Madsen, George Wessell, AO44766.
Maffry, Richard Wood, AO24799.
Magee, Ernest Maurice, AO44107.
Magee, William Francis, AO49099.
×Maggart, Robert Edward, AO36444.
Magrill, Arthur Edwin, AO44513.
Maher, William LeRoy, AO46365.
Mahon, August Charles, AO52865.
Mahone, John Rudd, Jr., AO41034.
×Mahurin, Walker Melville, AO35900.
Maiersperger, Walter Paul, AO45079.
×Malitz, Charles Clarence, Jr., AO54010.
Mallett, John Homer, AO53871.
Malone, Frank Cletis, AO46039.
Maloney, Edward James, AO44905.
Maloney, William Ralph, AO37003.
Maloney, Robert Seton, Jr., AO25521.
Manbeck, Lester Ernest, AO36336.
Manda, Francis Stewart, AO36595.
×Manes, Maurice Edward, AO44691.
Mangerich, Walter Edward, AO36125.
Manicom, William Caldwell, AO44380.
Mankin, Jack Cyril, AO36164.
Mann, Edward Milton, AO52297.
Mann, Herbert Raymond, AO46981.
Mannon, Willard Beattie, AO44081.
Mansell, Morris Enoch, Jr., AO34701.
Mansfield, Richard Miner, AO35531.
Manthos, Atlee George AO43984.
Manuel, Earl H., AO52636.
×Maples, Clyde Alexander, AO32953.
Mara, Thomas Dillon, AO47761.
Marchesi, William, AO35716.
Marek, Frank Edward, AO46649.
×Maritzen, Lyle Carl, AO44326.
Markham, Theon Edward, AO47440.

Markley, William Clyde, Jr., AO37222.
Markovich, George Michael, AO32426.
Marks, Leonard Peter, AO35375.
Marks, Mortimer David, AO53298.
Marks, Robert Joseph, AO52869.
×Marks, Russell Herbert, AO52394.
Marler, Maurice Edwards, AO46930.
×Marschner, Bernard Walter, AO54065.
Marsh, Frederick Hamilton, AO46847.
Marsh, Robert Allen, AO39266.
×Marshall, Leonard Samuel, AO24977.
Marshall, Prevost, AO45862.
Marshall, Tom Lee, AO46091.
Marshall, Winton Whittier, AO39308.
Marthens, George Walter, 2d, AO31928.
Martin, Bill H., AO40815.
×Martin, Cecil Stanford, AO49061.
Martin, Charles Abramson, AO33408.
Martin, Clyde James, AO52914.
Martin, Fred Arnett, AO35410.
×Martin, Gene Ivan, AO35035.
Martin, James Timmons, AO35277.
×Martin, John Landrum, Jr., AO34471.
Martin, Lloyd, Jr., AO35511.
Martin, Maurice Langhorne, AO26161.
Martin, Meredith Tansil, AO44297.
Martin, Metro, AO47196.
Martin, Patrick James, AO44942.
Martin, Ralph Gilbert, AO44866.
Martin, Rawley White, AO45388.
Martin, Robert Lynn, AO52499.
Martin, Sherman Fielder, AO48621.
×Martin, Stanley Everette, AO52589.
Martin, Thomas Edward, AO52898.
Martin, Urban William, AO54524.
×Martin, Wallace Steele, Jr., AO34587.
Martindale, Ward Wendell, AO36014.
Marvel, Alden Leroy, AO53695.
Mason, William Herman, AO48802.
Massengale, Herbert Williams, AO35726.
Masters, Elmer LaWayne, AO48433.
Mather, William Allen, AO33596.
Mathewson, Philip Lambeth, AO22578.
Mathison, Charles Glenn, AO49044.
Matsko, George, AO52869.
Matso, Wayne, AO35863.
Matthews, Donald Edward, AO46698.
Matthews, Edward Everett, AO45209.
Mattle, John Duane, AO52587.
Mattison, Robert Martin, AO32416.
Mattison, William Theodious, AO44072.
Mau, Fredric Eugene, AO47855.
Mauck, Fred George Douglas, AO47783.
Maul, Dwight Edward, AO47316.
Maupin, Jere Washington, AO24750.
Maurel, Anthony John, AO33613.
Maxwell, Jewell Clinton, AO46604.
×May, Britt Stanaland, AO25777.
May, Lomax Louis, AO45176.
May, Lowell Earl, AO47677.
Mayberry, Samuel Waller, Jr., AO16326.
Maynard, Ray Smith, AO45124.
Mays, Ivan Kenneth, AO53120.
×Mazur, Henry Joseph, AO25703.
×McAbee, William Howard, AO35411.
McAdam, Theodore James, AO24716.
McAdams, William Benton, AO36726.
McAllister, James Benedict, AO44453.
McAllister, Walter Lynch, AO40809.
McAndrews, Francis Corwin, AO52220.
McBee, Shannon Cleo, AO48475.
McBride, William Vincent, AO48936.
McCabe, Thomas Eugene, AO26315.
McCarthy, Eugene John, AO45864.
McCarthy, John Francis, Jr., AO32447.
McCarthy, John Francis, Jr., AO32344.
×McCarthy, Michael Christopher, AO48294.
McCarthy, Wayne George, AO24808.
McCarty, Billy Stewart, AO36046.
McCash, Donald Kendall, AO43964.
McCauley, Clarence Vernon, AO22401.
×McClain, Howard Powers, AO39293.
McClanahan, William Arlatal, AO47210.
McClatchy, Howard Lee, AO53493.
×McCleary, George Clifford, AO32896.
McCleary, Robert Joseph, AO46520.
McCleary, William James, AO46651.
McClellan, Howard William, AO34914.
McClellan, John Barclay, AO34943.
McClelland, Jack, AO46781.
×McCloskey, Richard Calvin, AO54311.
×McCloy, Edward, AO53749.
McClughan, George Walter, AO45602.
×McClung, Ray Swinfield, AO46709.
McClure, John Crile, AO46340.
McCollom, Francis Norman, AO44485.
McComb, William John, AO46298.
McCombs, Harold Kelly, AO43710.
McComsey, Robert Marvin, AO38995.
McConnell, Charles Henry, AO47055.
McConnell, Lhatt Ashley, AO43580.
×McConnell, William Scott, Jr., AO53162.
McCord, George Edward, AO35909.
McCord, Louis Broughton, AO34779.
McCord, Robert Ralph, AO35101.
×McCorkle, Howell Pinkard, AO35622.
×McCormack, Ballor Daniel, AO44707.
×McCormack, Lemuel Houston, Jr., AO48662.
McCoskrie, Roland Kenneth, AO47978.
McCoy, Charles Edwin, Jr., AO44409.
McCoy, Paul Leslie, AO53168.
×McCracken, Delmar Isaac, AO40880.
McCracken, Rufus LeRoy, AO43874.
McCredie, Cassius Milburn, AO44850.
McCroskey, Joseph Lee, AO23186.
McCulloch, Franklin Howard, AO52497.
McCulloch, Robert Clyde, AO37055.
McCullough, John Hiram, AO36267.
McCullough, William Edward, AO31999.
McCurdy, John William, AO45047.
McDaniel, Armour Green, AO33592.
×McDaris, Robert Akin, AO46968.
McDavid, Andrew Eugene, AO44229.
×McDermott, Joseph William, AO36072.
McDermott, Robert Francis, AO25540.
McDonald, Claud Wayne, AO31968.
McDonald, John Rudolph, AO35679.
McDonald, William Gerald, AO36929.
McDonnell, Heston, AO33031.
McDouall, Bradford Houghton, AO43584.
×McDowell, Glenwood, AO44551.
McDowell, Rex Wampler, AO52647.
McElhanon, William Edwin, AO47464.
McElhone, James Thomas, AO53452.
×McElrath, John Adam, AO53524.
×McElroy, Mansell Barrymore, AO52890.
McEvoy, Edwin Walter, AO33044.
McFall, Dana Floyd, Jr., AO48616.
×McFall, Silver Ray, AO45163.
McFarlan, Frank August, AO44583.
McFarland, Hugh, AO53174.
McFarlane, John Durell, AO48820.
×McFatridge, James Morgan, AO52406.
×McGarity, William Vernon, AO54017.
×McGarry, James Michiel, Jr., AO52377.
McGee, Donald Charles, AO35384.
McGee, Joseph Burgess, AO45011.
McGibeny, Arthur David, AO31932.
×McGinn, John Leon, AO45739.
×McGinnis, Paul Benedict, AO32590.
McGiverin, Francis, AO53624.
×McGlasson, Robert Bruce, AO52716.
McGlynn, Francis John, AO36248.
McGonnell, Owen John, AO55041.
McGough, Edward Alexander, 3d, AO25682.
McGovern, Marshall, AO52950.
×McGregor, Oris Eugene, Jr., AO33369.
×McGuigan, Thomas Harris, AO52734.
McGuire, Lawrence Francis, AO24820.
McGuire, Thomas Charles, AO44971.
McGuire, Troy B., AO35517.
McHale, Joseph Patrick, AO40934.
×McHale, Robert Vincent, AO33674.
×McIlroy, James Garfield, Jr., AO32525.
McIntire, Francis Percival, Jr., AO36366.
×McIntire, Ralph Oliver, AO52358.
McIntosh, Wayne Wesley, AO45053.
McIntyre, Clarence Edward, AO39154.
McIntyre, Joseph Douglas, AO44933.
×McKay, Chester Earl, AO48226.
McKean, Harold Louis, AO34545.
McKee, Jack Erwin, AO40996.
McKee, James Thomas, AO25230.
McKee, Ralph Dale, AO36648.
McKenzie, Harry Crane, AO45224.
McKinney, James Alfred, AO25536.
×McKinnis, Burdette Jones, AO35092.
McKinnon, Duncan, James, AO40949.
McLachlan, Joseph Julian, AO47889.
McLain, Damon Isaac, AO52293.
×McLaren, William Alden, AO44672.
×McLaughlin, George William, AO36026.
McLaughlin, William Carr, AO53436.
McLean, Daniel Putnam, AO46697.
×McLean, Edward Ridley, AO39294.
×McMillan, Shubal King, Jr., AO40571.
McNally, Joseph Edward, AO52374.
McNally, Lawrence Mathew, AO36470.
McNamara, James Frederic, AO52911.
McNelly, Harold Lee, AO53406.
McNess, Richard Arden, AO36802.
×McNeese, Harold Graham, AO47240.
McNeely, Fred Wright, AO22878.
McPherson, Donald George, AO44340.
McPherson, William Ransom, Jr., AO36553.
McRae, Roland Lacy, AO36961.
×McRaven, Claude Coy, AO46467.
×McReynolds, Zachariah Aycok, AO54152.
×McWalters, Frank William, AO45253.
McWhirter, Darein Auburn, Jr., AO45313.
McWilliam, Calvin Edward, AO46881.
Mead, Henry Lowell, AO53288.
Meadville, Harry William, AO37004.
Mears, Forrest Eugene, AO52822.
Mecke, Harold Joseph, AO36508.
Medvedeff, Harold Cyril, AO35236.
×Meek, Arthur Morton, AO47923.
Meeker, Everett Roscoe, AO46423.
Mehaffey, Nathan Gene, AO34927.
×Mehalko, George Thomas, AO24458.
×Mellinger, Robert Thomas, AO32105.
×Mellor, Alfred Lionel, AO52263.
Melvin, Charles Warren, AO44320.
Mendelsohn, Irving Philip, AO44339.
Mennell, Robert Charles, AO45907.
Menth, Elaine Berlin, AO44883.
Meranda, Mark Donald, AO37714.
Merchant, Frank Barnes, AO53701.
Merkel, Ellsworth Leidy, AO47754.
Meroney, Virgil Kersh, AO36835.
Merrill, Charles Thomas, AO35151.
Merrill, Woodrow Taylor, AO52605.
Merten, Donald Herman, AO46183.
×Messman, Howard Arthur, AO45493.
Mestemaker, Joseph Earl, AO43948.
Metcalfe, Lee Edward, AO35085.
Metz, Robert Carter, AO52750.
Meyer, Charles Robert, AO45648.
Meyer, Robert Jeane, AO53831.
×Meyers, Charles Raymond, Jr., AO47321.
Michael, Pierce Baynard, AO43567.
Michel, Frederick Hayward, AO33876.
Michel, Theodore James, AO24696.
Middlebrook, Paul Louis, AO52652.
Middlekauff, Darwin Clyde, AO48016.
Middleton, Arthur John, AO47063.
Midkiff, Richard Lee, Jr., AO35891.
Mikolowski, Edward, AO54695.
Milburn, Walter Boothry, Jr., AO36302.
Milch, Lawrence Jacques, AO53285.
Miles, Charles Clinton, AO33016.
Miles, Frederick Earl, AO45697.
Miles, George William, AO32754.
Miles, Lee Ewing, AO46341.
×Milholland, George William, AO33075.
Milledge, Henry Lee, AO33929.
Miller, Burdsall Dunham, AO48334.
Miller, Carl Lee, AO33543.
Miller, Charles Lynn, AO36842.
Miller, Danforth Parker, Jr., AO33354.
Miller, Earl Charles, AO54540.
Miller, Edward Louis, AO36593.
Miller, Edwin Martin, AO44302.
Miller, Eugene Francis, AO46426.
×Miller, George Lyon, AO45339.
×Miller, Hubert Edward, AO45114.
Miller, Jean Baptist, Jr., AO36730.
Miller, Jerry Devroe, AO35678.
Miller, Jesse Mathew, AO37041.
Miller, Kenneth Robert, AO40482.
Miller, Lester Fred, AO47219.
×Miller, Lynus Parker, Jr., AO44743.
Miller, Paul Burwell, AO35600.
Miller, Robert AO35019.
Miller, Sidney Leonard, AO44211.
Miller, Thomas Aldred, AO43844.
Miller, Thomas Benton, AO37260.
Miller, Vaughan, Jr., AO48424.
Miller, Verlin Arthur, AO45182.
Miller, Walter Frederick, AO43962.
Miller, William Clinton, AO39151.
×Millin, John Andrew, Jr., AO35937.
Mills, Eugene Spencer, Jr., AO43784.

Mills, Thomas Harris, AO33056.
Millson, Edwin Harry, AO49011.
×Milowski, Walter John, AO54042.
Minahan, John Carroll, AO52321.
Mineur, George Edward, Jr., AO14908.
Minkler, Henry Charles, AO52851.
×Minnehan, Bernard Aloysius, AO47261.
×Minor, Marion Edward, Jr., AO46073.
Mirock, George Casimer, AO47546.
Mistrot, Joseph Frank, AO47777.
Mitchell, Harry Leonard, AO45137.
Mitchell, John Thomas, Jr., AO43647.
Mitchell, Mack Ashton, AO35363.
×Mitchell, Robert Herald, AO47303.
Mitchell, Ross Lynn, AO44344.
Mitterling, Robert Ostrem, AO36669.
Mixon, Carmel Astor, AO44230.
Mixson, Marion Clarke, AO42546.
Moberly, Caleb Powers, AO33843.
×Mocquot, Charles Marie, AO44054.
×Moe, John Gillette, AO44764.
Moffitt, Franklyn, Elwood, AO52476.
Moist, Robert Ercse, AO45627.
Molander, Stanley Vernon, AO54131.
Moler, John Edward, AO37239.
Moley, Charles Anthony, AO52217.
Moll, Robert Gustavus, AO34226.
Molland, Leland Phillips, AO36835.
Molyneaux, Silas Robarre, AO52529.
×Mona, Reuben Edward, AO44771.
Monaco, John, Jr., AO45024.
×Monroe, Shelton Wilson, AO52720.
Monroe, Thomas Guy, Jr., AO49071.
×Monsell, Charles Frederick, Jr., AO44760.
Montgomery, David F., AO45113.
Montgomery, Douglas Murray, AO39088.
Montgomery, Guilford Roland, AO22397.
Moody, David Bloom, AO34886.
Moody, Peter Richard, AO24710.
Moon, Leo Claire, AO45900.
Moon, Richard Hartley, AO32770.
Moon, Ryan Michael, AO40359.
Moore, Albert Kidd, AO52576.
×Moore, Clifford James, Jr., AO25593.
×Moore, George Brownell, AO54829.
Moore, George Eugene, AO44607.
Moore, Jack Edwin, AO34827.
Moore, John Alton, AO52935.
Moore, Robert Browne, AO54538.
×Moore, William Clarence, AO28614.
Moore, William Harold, AO34476.
Moore, William Hudson, AO53637.
Moore, William Paul, AO46349.
Moore, William Weatherly, AO44568.
Moore, William Wylie, AO44683.
Morales, Carl Henry, AO53634.
Morat, Charles David, Jr., AO32999.
Morehead, James Bruce, AO45242.
×Moreland, Charles Thaddeus, Jr., AO47075.
Morgan, Earl Adams, AO44447.
Morgan, Fred Arthur, AO52583.
Morgan, Roy, AO35063.
×Morgan, Russell Dodson, AO44758.
Morganti, Clyde Joseph, AO36451.
×Moritz, Gene Phillip, AO 40392.
Morris, Frederick Eugene, Jr., AO47438.
Morris, James Madison, AO39255.
Morris, Robert Carlock, Jr., AO35532.
Morris, Robert John, AO44274.
×Morris, Wesley Donald, AO33893.
Morrison, Bruce Lamont, AO53832.
Morrison, Harry James, AO43795.
Morrison, John Ellsworth, Jr., AO35693.
×Morse, Donald MacMillan, AO46307.
×Mortensen, Fred Neil, AO55117.
Moser, Alfred Leslie, AO46343.
Mosman, Ormond John, AO22341.
Mothersbaugh, James Forest, AO52522.
Mourer, Lester Charles, AO36734.
Moyer, Morgan Bernard, AO40451.
Muhl, James Howard, AO36696.
Mulcahy, Donald Max, AO48551.
Muldrow, Robert, AO25557.
Mullen, Peter Vincent, AO52384.
×Mullenniex, Thomas Eugene, AO40091.
Muller, James LeRoy, AO34933.
Mulligan, Robert Alexander, AO47169.
Mulligan, Walter Francis, Jr., AO52446.
Mulling, Eugene, Gregory, Jr., AO36132.
Mullis, Roy Winston, AO53205.
×Mulloney, Daniel Clifford, AO40625.
Munch, Christopher Henry, AO25988.
Munns, Edward Allan, AO24788.
×Munsey, Charles Wayne, AO45820.
Munsey, Ned Gaines, AO46256.
Munson, Charles Bright, AO47522.
×Murden, Charles Holt, Jr., AO44736.
×Murphy, Benjamin Styles, AO36675.
×Murphy, Bruce Crittenden, AO44955.
Murphy, Edward Aloysius, Jr., AO23286.
Murphy, James Herbert, AO34329.
Murphy, John Richord, AO24928.
×Murphy, Maurice Edward, AO45710.
Murphy, Paul Cashman, AO32766.
×Murphy, Robert Emmett, AO32858.
Murphy, Robert Marshall, Jr., AO52703.
Murrah, Idas Tolbert, AO45017.
Murray, David Hugh, AO34796.
Murray, James Edmund, AO36217.
Murray, James Lore, AO40730.
Murray, Norman Leroy, AO52631.
Murrey, John Stephen, AO44321.
×Murtha, Joseph William, AO54972.
Mustain, Ivan Farris, AO48564.
×Myers, Earle Russell, AO43748.
Myers, Henry Vernon, AO40775.
×Myers, Joseph, AO35894.
Myers, Joseph Robert, AO48722.
Myers, Lansing Heald, AO45350.
Myers, Lawrence Talbot, AO43617.
Myers, Raymond Bell, AO35564.
×Myers, Thornton Kise, AO21399.
Nacy, William Peter, AO36690.
Nading, William Donald, AO39200.
Naffke, John Henry, AO33139.
Nance, Nicholas Haywood, AO34947.
Napier, John Gilbert, AO46326.
Nash, Russell James, AO44813.
Nathe, Leonard Herman, AO47745.
Neafus, Paul Benjamin, AO48590.
Neal, John Robert, AO47544.
×Neal, Philip Andrew, AO45370.
Neece, Richard Davis, Jr., AO35400.
Neely, Russell Wayne, AO32542.
Neff, Charles Laban, AO32600.
Neffinger, George Gail, AO53325.
Neighbors, Lloyd Walsh, AO32741.
Nell, Charles Verne, AO35495.
Neill, Dennis Virgil, AO47385.
Nelander, Frederick James, AO34935.
Nelson, Arthur Lewis, AO40690.
Nelson, Conrad Nathaniel, AO35262.
Nelson, Gene Allen, AO54141.
Nelson, John Amos, Jr., AO33527.
×Nelson, Marshall Edwin, AO45961.
Nelson, Neelian Omar, AO33234.
Nelson, Raymond Edward, AO45655.
Nendell, Jack Arista, AO32312.
Nesmith, Joseph Frederick, AO45578.
Nesselbush, Louis Konrad, AO26063.
Nestor, Joseph Emmet, AO52763.
Nestor, Vergil Nick, AO35492.
Nettles, Jesse Eugene, AO43596.
Neuer, John Jacob, AO25897.
×Nevling, Gilbert, AO52702.
Newbury, Edward Stenart Elder, AO46313.
Newby, Richard Eugene, AO54428.
Newell, Edward Wilson, AO44967.
Newland, Martin Kenneth, AO46474.
Newman, Fred Haynes, AO46878.
Newman, Ralph Anderson, AO46270.
×Newsom, William Wheeler, Jr., AO53776.
×Newton, Everette Charles, AO44176.
×Newton, George Lucius, Jr., AO34660.
Nichols, Edward McIntyre, Jr., AO53444.
Nichols, Frederick Kenneth, AO35671.
Nichols, Philip Charles, AO46978.
Nichols, Steward Howell, AO36235.
Nichols, Thomas Brooks, AO40411.
Nichols, Willard Albert, AO47550.
Nichols, William Carl, AO36632.
Nickels, Loren Smith, AO40348.
Nickodem, Lowell Stanley, AO24703.
Nied, George John, AO31859.
Nielsen, Leonard Emery, AO33558.
Nielsen, Melvin Jesse, AO46121.
Nielsen, William Charles, AO46579.
Nielsen, Woodrow Everette, AO44462.
Nigra, Le Roy, AO36268.
Nixon, Robert Lee, AO46460.
Njus, Olav, AO44204.
Noel, William Honree, AO36051.
Nolan, John Aloysius, AO39221.
Nolan, Robert John, AO35602.
Nold, Ewell Kay, Jr., AO39113.
×Nollkamper, James Louis, AO36534.
Noonan, Robert Matthews, AO53636.
Noonan, Stephen Frederick, AO52573.
Norcia, Benjamin, AO43667.
Noriega, Virgil, AO46149.
Norley, Louis Herman, AO48652.
×Norman, William Roy, AO43726.
×Northup, Robert Lowell, AO45144.
Norton, Carl Ray, AO47670.
Norton, William Joseph, AO37234.
Norton, William Nicolson, AO52597.
Nothstein, Charles Lewis, AO22688.
×Nowark, Charles Glen, AO44827.
Nudell, Fred Wellington, AO52241.
Nugent, Paul Raymond, AO45468.
×Nunn, John Walter, AO35480.
Nunziato, Ralph Joseph, AO46992.
Nuthall, Alfred Jack, AO44979.
Nyblade, Walter Frederick, AO43877.
Nye, Francis Walter, AO35650.
×Nye, Richard Sadler, AO33128.
Nye, Robert Millard, AO53483.
Oakley, Harry Robert, AO52977.
×O'Bert, John James, AO44564.
×O'Brien, Frank Edwin, AO44166.
O'Brien, Raymond Ransom, AO52143.
O'Connell, John Francis, AO48361.
O'Connor, Denis Patrick, AO47061.
O'Connor, Edmund Francis, AO26340.
O'Connor, Frank Quinn, AO46700.
O'Connor, Squire Timothy, AO47307.
O'Connor, Virgil John, AO52566.
×Oder, Frederic Carl Emil, AO53405.
×Odom, John William, AO47874.
O'Donnell, John Thomas, AO44709.
O'Donnell, John Curran, AO34466.
Odren, Harry Melvin, AO35728.
Ofner, David Bernhard, AO52667.
Ogden, Harold Archer, AO24705.
Ogiba, Henry Stanley, AO47731.
Oglesby, Herbert Willis, AO36542.
Oglesby, Sam Russell, Jr., AO35289.
Oglesby, Stuart Rosece 3d, AO40774.
Ogletree, Robert Clyde, Jr., AO37197.
O'Hara, Richard Kiernan, AO45118.
O'Hara, Robert Cannon, AO48215.
×O'Hern, Luther, AO33153.
Oholendt, Gene Frederick, AO54983.
Oldershaw, Douglas C., AO14472.
Olds, Robin, AO26046.
Oliver, Ralph Lorimer, AO25217.
Oliver, Robert Russell, AO32517.
Olmstead, Earl Oren, Jr., AO26107.
Olmsted, Charles Thaddeus, AO22502.
Olney, Richard Bartlett, AO34206.
Olsen, Sumner Merton, AO47486.
Olson, Royce Glenmore, AO34771.
Olson, Walter Ive, AO48831.
Olsson, John Shepherd, AO45674.
Omohundro, Thomas Tipton, AO35347.
Omsted, Kenneth Arnold, AO36250.
Ondo, Michael, AO44623.
O'Neale, Malcolm Lindsay, AO44182.
O'Neil, George Keith, AO53201.
O'Neil, Raymond Francis, AO45516.
O'Neill, James Leo, AO39022.
Opper, Clifford Raymond, AO36803.
Oppy, Paul Francis, AO53176.
O'Reagan, John Patrick, AO48507.
O'Rourke, John Bernard, AO45040.
Orr, George William, AO36735.
Orwat, Norman Stanley, AO39261.
Osborne, Earle Leon, AO37014.
Osgood, Lyndon Timson, AO35819.
Oskamp, Garry, AO44382.
×Oss, Louis Hinebaugh, AO45123.
×Oswald, Norbert Joseph, AO26131.
Ott, Walter Wesley, AO53632.
Otten, Leonard John, Jr., AO35206.
Otto, Robert Cushman, AO46104.
Otto, Stanford Joseph, AO35826.
Overbey, George Douglas, AO37382.
×Overdorff, Willard Boyd, AO52662.
Owen, James Calvin, AO36626.
Owens, Harris Richard, AO44217.
Owens, Verner Alva, AO44376.
Oyler, George Clinton, AO33303.
Pace, Stanley Carter, AO35874.

×Pace, William Norris, Jr., AO53821.
Packard, Peter L. M., AO34177.
×Paddock, Kenneth Quentin, AO44749.
Padgett, Cadman Vinton, AO45307.
×Paffel, Donald Westover, AO47306.
Paige, Ronald Albert, AO45521.
Pakenham, Thomas Francis, AO46777.
Palfrey, Campbell, Jr., AO24738.
Panko, Albert Robert, AO45108.
Papania, Ralph, Jr., AO35504.
Papik, Corwin Joseph, AO45301.
Pardee, Elliott Thomas, AO22498.
Parham, Bernard Francis, AO52398.
Parker, Clarence Shaffer, AO47692.
Parker, Dan Morey, AO25534.
Parker, Julian Wilsey, AO53572.
Parker, Stanley Elston, AO45150.
×Parker, Van Robison, AO44756.
Parkins, William Howard, AO43563.
Parks, Bernard Grant, AO52696.
Parks, Richard Watson, AO52864.
×Parmelee, David Burtis, AO45072.
Parr, Albert Thomas, AO43808.
Parris, Harry Neil, AO47897.
Parris, Howard Lindsey, AO35167.
Parsley, Wayne Mitchell, AO47023.
×Parsons, Herman Oscar, AO46973.
Parsons, Hershell Echoll, AO46870.
Parsons, Irvin Millard, AO46383.
×Parsons, James Wellington, AO46334.
Parsons, Samuel Polk, AO35442.
Partridge, Lewis Joy, AO33813.
Paschall, Benjamin Franklin, 3d, AO34849.
Pasero, Bernard Ben, AO47614.
Pash, Robert Norman, AO44525.
Paskvan, Paul Ronald, Jr., AO45149.
Past, Sheldon Joseph, AO54181.
Patch, Dwight Dresser, AO44934.
Patch, Horace Wendell, AO34477.
Patterson, George Arnott, AO44937.
Patterson, Warren Shaw, Jr., AO44696.
Pattillo, Leslie Gray, Jr., AO48833.
Patton, James D., AO36015.
Patton, John Murcer, AO47735.
Patton, Phil Manson, AO36952.
Patton, William Wayne, AO35322.
Paukert, Robert Shirley, AO42009.
Paulsen, Daniel Henry, AO53905.
Paulson, Myhre Elroy, AO35530.
Pavlick, Charles Raleigh, AO34195.
Pawlowski, Harold I, AO53891.
Paxton, Heyward Ainsworth, Jr., AO48673.
Payne, Carl Goolshee, AO46471.
Payne, Carl Wilson, AO35526.
×Payne, Carroll Herndon, AO32655.
Payne, Dolford Franklin, AO39027.
Payne, Gordon Lee, Jr., AO35763.
Payne, James Osborn, AO34345.
×Payne, Kenneth John, AO36797.
Payton, Theodore Franklin, AO44045.
Peabody, Prentice Bayan, AO52765.
Peake, William Kilbourne, AO40243.
Pearsall, David Williams, AO45904.
Pearson, Harvey Albert, AO45006.
Pearson, Ralph Jones, AO48966.
Peaslee, Jesse Clair, AO46049.
Peck, Douglas Montgomery, AO45609.
Peck, Fred Ross, Jr., AO35499.
Peck, George Stanley, AO47573.
Peck, John Clarence, AO24830.
Pedersen, Carl Emil, AO32280.
Pedersen, James Clinton, AO35758.
Pedone, Vito Santo, AO36301.
Pendergrast, Donald Waldean, AO46853.
×Pengue, Marcy Louis, AO52723.
Penn, Kirby Clement, AO46562.
Pennywitt, Glen Edward, AO44456.
Pepitone, Byron Vincent, AO47262.
Perkin, Irving Richard, AO23985.
Perkins, Lytle Ray, AO47535.
Perkins, Willis Howard, AO44218.
×Perlberg, Norman Nathaniel, AO53750.
Perron, Gregory Harris, AO48637.
Perry, Bruce Lee, AO35554.
Perry, Henry Buford, AO40939.
Perry, Horace Edward, AO40383.
Perry, Joseph Heinlein, AO48743.
Perry, Lucius Alvin, Jr., AO33792.
Perry, Robert Raymond, AO45218.
Persinger, Thomas Earl, AO33094.
Personett, Thomas Alvin, AO36833.
Personeus, Lester, Jr., AO47455.
Peters, Charles Kesmodel, AO41063.
Peters, Gilbert Arthur, AO48191.
Petersen, Tracy James, AO46972.
Peterson, Arthur Hews, AO36281.
×Peterson, Chesley Gordon, AO36633.
Peterson, Harry Graham, AO46335.
Peterson, Kenneth Dwight, AO45028.
Peterson, Lee Lieske, AO33589.
Peterson, Lyle Everett, AO22033.
Peterson, Marshall Ruth, Jr., AO56397.
Peterson, Martin Eugene, AO44996.
Petri, Fred Louis, AO40447.
×Petitt, Weldon Monroe, AO52227.
×Petty, Morris Edgar, AO36788.
Pezda, Edwin Felix, AO24724.
Phaneuf, Eugene Oscar, AO44370.
×Philippe, Hilbert Wayne, AO52672.
Phillips, Herbert Leslie, AO39160.
Phillips, John Thomas, AO32784.
Phillips, John Ernest, AO47487.
Phillips, Lewis Thomas, AO52936.
×Phillips, Robert Ernest, AO53195.
Phillips, Samuel Cochran, AO25413.
Phillips, Wayne Austin, AO47990.
Phillips, William Mack, AO54459.
×Pickett, Joe Williams, AO47918.
Pickett, Lawrence Jackson, AO46336.
Pigue, Munce Meadows, AO44396.
Pike, Robert Francis, AO44112.
Pilkington, Thomas Milford, AO44951.
Pinkerton, Charles Clifford, Jr., AO25499.
Pittman, Bernard Merrill, AO43860.
Pitts, Arthur Simmons, 2d, AO45093.
Pitts, Romaine William, AO45046.
Pitts, William Frederick, AO25593.
×Pitts, Younger Arnold, Jr., AO25633.
Plate, Stanley William, AO44283.
Player, George Carlton, Jr., AO45703.
×Pletcher, Gaylord Lorenzo, AO39251.
Plott, William Cloyd, AO24878.
Plourd, Webster William, AO44839.
Plumer, William Bowdin, AO52940.
Poe, John Everette, AO33196.
×Poland, Marvin Elmer, AO33769.
×Polivka, Emil Walter, AO44990.
Pollock, Keith Kermit, AO40375.
Pomeroy, Don Allen, Jr., AO22814.
Poncik, Victor Jerome, AO34501.
Ponder, Paul Holloway, Jr., AO34942.
Poole, George Irvin, Jr., AO44660.
×Poore, Green Berry, AO54403.
Popek, Albert Benedict, AO44286.
Popek, Edward Stanley, AO47880.
Poppell, James Marvin, AO52639.
×Porter, Clarence Woodrow, AO53317.
Porter, George William, AO25592.
×Porter, Lester William, AO33183.
Posey, John Cabell, AO44461.
×Potebnya, Orr Yurievich, AO54508.
Potter, Thomas Kennedy, Jr., AO54529.
Potter, Waldo Franklin, AO26203.
Poulson, Ernest Lester, AO37153.
Pournaras, Stephen William, AO48121.
Powell, Joseph Harlee, AO44014.
Powell, Russell, AO35761.
Powell, Sherrill Lee, Jr., AO48230.
Powers, Harold Milledge, AO54738.
Powers, John Francis, Jr., AO45634.
×Powers, John Joseph, AO47183.
Powers, Kenneth Henry, AO34929.
×Powers, Robert Bruce, AO45702.
Pozerycki, John Joseph, Jr., AO44289.
×Prather, Philip Bailey, AO54945.
×Pratt, Jean Gardner, AO52901.
Pratt, Leonard Edward, AO47781.
×Pratt, Ogden Nelson, AO23364.
Pratt, William Charles, AO48306.
Praul, Charles Lynville, AO44467.
Prenoveau, Emil Edward, AO52529.
Prevatte, James Osborne, AO44586.
Prewitt, Jack Kenneth, AO52348.
Price, Andrew Henry, AO44658.
Price, Jack Clayton, AO45888.
×Price, Robert Franklin, AO46327.
Price, Thomas Jefferson, AO35634.
Price, Thomas Llewellyn, AO52660.
×Price, Weston Hugh, AO47446.
Price, William Alec, AO46724.
Price, William Gray, 3d, AO46242.
Prickett, Donald Irwin, AO36437.
Prior, George Thomas, AO25785.
Proctor, Charles Nelson, AO44365.
Prodgers, John David, AO53269.
×Proudlove, Lloyd Earl, AO37048.
Prouty, Leroy Fletcher, Jr., AO34635.
Pryor, Charles Donald, AO43733.
Pryor, Daniel Franklin, AO33222.
Puellowski, George Andrew, AO52411.
Pugh, William, AO44418.
Purcell, Charles Joseph, AO32377.
Purpus, Walter Ray, AO47961.
Puskar, Steven, Jr., AO37235.
Quattlander, Frank Paul, AO33184.
Query, Jack DeWitt, AO32406.
Quesada, Anthony, AO45053.
Quillen, Monroe Carl, AO46336.
Quillman, Earl William, AO44266.
Quinlan, Francis Emmet, AO43616.
Quinn, Robert Francis, AO53426.
Quirk, Michael Joseph, AO47337.
Raaz, Dean John, AO44156.
Radetsky, Harold Arnold, AO35346.
Raebel, James Bernard, AO47235.
×Ragon, Dale Ambrose, AO33221.
Rahn, Gilbert Frank, AO40769.
Raley, Claude Mason, AO43827.
Raley, James Andrew, AO40568.
Ralston, Wilson, AO45821.
Ramme, Ernest Lester, AO23421.
Ramsaur, Robert Tully, AO36812.
Ramsey, Glyn Wiburn, AO35371.
×Ramsey, J. W., AO37344.
Ramsey, Robert Lipscomb, AO36369.
Ranck, Nathan Hoover, AO22622.
Randall, Robert Duncan MacGregor, AO26267.
×Rankin, Robert James, AO48736.
Rankin, Warner Frank, Jr., AO35519.
Rahsler, Harry DeLosse, AO45057.
Rappaport, Jerome Melvin, AO52526.
Rasberry, Dayle Howard, AO52506.
Rash, John Frederick, AO36441.
Rasmussen, Darwin Elmer, AO46934.
Rasmussen, Philip Martin, AO34521.
Rasor, Frank James Pierce, AO35095.
Rathbun, Edward Lyon, AO35352.
Rawlings, John William, Jr., AO26223.
×Rawls, Charles Alva, AO52764.
Ray, Robert Homer, AO43676.
Ray, Wilbur Richard, AO44482.
Raymond, William Henry, Jr., AO52614.
Raynolds, Ted Eugene, AO44928.
Reardon, John Charles, AO46092.
Reber, Carl Joseph, AO36793.
Reber, Marlen Elmer, AO35677.
Rector, Walter Stokes, AO33313.
×Reddell, William Harold, AO36088.
Redman, Russell Lee, AO34912.
Reece, Robert Carl, AO44290.
Reecher, Kenneth Aaron, AO35925.
Reed, Edward Blakslee, AO40547.
Reed, Everett, Gilmer, AO44930.
Reed, Henry Clay, AO46310.
Reed, Henry George, AO44560.
Reed, Jack Lester, AO33698.
Reed, Vincent Raymond, AO44809.
Reeder, D. M., AO52613.
Reeder, Vendor Harvard, AO52603.
Reese, James West, AO44562.
×Reeves, Elmo, AO52249.
Reeves, Ernest Arthur, AO40389.
Reeves, Vernon Houston, AO44401.
Regan, John Morgan, AO35748.
×Rehrer, Harvey Eugene, AO35072.
Reiber, Jack Burt, AO44163.
Reichal, Joseph C., AO33544.
Reichardt, Leslie Lee, AO47992.
Reichert, Earl Theodore, AO32679.
Reid, John Douglas, AO24773.
Reid, Michael Taylor, AO40978.
Reid, Robert Jesse, Jr., AO33553.
Reifsteck, Calvin David, AO45097.
Reinbold, Richard David, AO24875.
Reinburg, George Everett Adam, Jr., AO40799.
Reineck, Rollin Clark, AO47192.
×Reinhardt, Herbert Wilton, AO44748.
×Reising, Albert John, AO43730.
Reife, Robert Wylie, AO35501.
Remaklus, John Phil, Jr., AO53213.
Remillard, David Harold, AO46240.

Renaud, Louis Clement, AO47513.
×Reney, Everett Ralph, AO52402.
Renfro, William Glen, AO45215.
Rennels, Fred Logan, Jr., AO53657.
Renwick, Donald Dean, AO53365.
Reppert, Leonard Brooks, AO36808.
Rethman, Vincent Carl, AO44910.
Retzer, Karl Nelson, AO24841.
Rew, George Robert, AO24694.
Rex, Edward Martin, AO46917.
Rex, John Leo, Jr., AO35917.
Rexroat, Larue David, AO48825.
Reynolds, Andrew Jackson, AO34778.
Reynolds, Harry Martin, AO44394.
Rhees, Gilbert Neal, AO53322.
Rhoads, Frank Hayden, AO45962.
Rhodarmer, Roger Kims, AO48472.
Rhode, Storm Charles, Jr., AO44621.
Rhodes, Arthur Douglas, AO31875.
Rhodes, Hugh Egbert, AO34566.
Rhodes, William John, AO35905.
×Rice, Carl Everett, AO45482.
Richard, Anthony Henry, Jr., AO26351.
Richard, Delos E., AO32879.
Richardson, David McCoy, AO52558.
×Richardson, Paul Ames, AO52474.
Richens, Kent J., AO45745.
Richey, Robert Harry, AO36612.
Richmond, George Mount, AO35918.
Rickert, Walter Kellner, AO47910.
Ricks, Carlyle, AO46047.
Ricks, Thomas Jesse, Jr., AO46112.
×Riddick, James Walter, AO44717.
Riddle, Charles Lewis, AO44503.
Riddle, Edmund Ross, Jr., AO52832.
×Riddle, Richard DeKalb, AO47502.
Rider, William Benjamin, AO41053.
Ridgell, James McLaurin, Jr., AO23197.
×Ridings, Charles Albert, AO45865.
Riepe, Quenten Albert, AO37691.
Rife, Raymond S., AO48012.
×Riggs, Carl Nelson, AO52664.
×Riggs, William Earle, AO46710.
×Rigney, Charles Edward, AO52258.
Riley, Earl Vaughn, AO46040.
×Riley, Joseph Richmond, AO52304.
Riley, Lewis Robert, AO45553.
Rinn, Frank Burton, AO44225.
Ripko, Joseph U., AO54025.
Rippin, James Alfred, AO25707.
Risher, John Randall, AO52601.
Ritchie, William Dee, AO35358.
Ritter, Herbert Waldemar, AO33201.
Ritter, James Harry, AO52504.
Ritter, Lattie Alonzo, Jr., AO35718.
×Riva, Daniel Francis, AO33351.
Rivers, William James, AO45201.
×Roache, Clarence Edward, Jr., AO53020.
Roath, Dean Gilbert, AO53685.
Robb, Stewart Wilsey, AO34520.
×Robbins, Carl William, Jr., AO44168.
Robbins, Harold Wendell, AO52813.
Robbs, Charles Eugene, AO24877.
Roberton, Eddie Joseph, Jr., AO46328.
Roberts, Allyn Edward, AO36590.
×Roberts, Ben H., AO35549.
Roberts, David Langston, AO45444.
Roberts, Donald Wilmarth, AO46610.
Roberts, Frederick Charles, Jr., AO35214.
Roberts, George Spencer, AO46696.
Roberts, Gore Frederick, AO32208.
Roberts, James Robert, AO44414.
Roberts, Joe Edward, AO52622.
Roberts, Sam Alfred, AO35509.
×Roberts, William Kennard, AO46633.
Robertson, Bennett Eugene, AO46618.
×Robertson, Edward Harold, AO54039.
Robertson, Gavan Carson, Jr., AO35593.
Robertson, John Aaron, AO46578.
Robertson, Lawrence Russell, AO47027.
×Robertson, Philip Owen, AO46692.
Robertson, Raynor Easterling, AO35399.
Robins, Nathaniel Bowman, AO35932.
Robinson, Donald Allister, Jr., AO34595.
×Robinson, Edgar Abram, AO46345.
Robinson, Floyd Irvin, AO24769.
Robinson, John Henry, AO44721.
Robinson, John William, AO35656.
Robinson, John Sidney, AO46375.
Robinson, Leo Hudson, AO33655.
×Robinson, Michel Andre George AO25523.
Robinson, Norman, AO44358.
×Robinson, William Bryan, AO36232.
Robinson, William Cyrus, AO39116.
Roby, Albert Wilson, Jr., AO53474.
Roche, Jean Rene, AO47518.
Rochez, Louis Arthur, 3d, AO36679.
Roddy, Edward Francis, AO35360.
Roderick, Walter Henry, AO33376.
Rodewald, Donald Lenore, AO36307.
×Rodzankas, John Frank, AO44151.
Roesch, John Edward, AO34293.
Rogers, Carleton Wayne, AO45111.
×Rogers, Dale Edward, AO44778.
Rogers, Daniel Townsend, AO44386.
Rogers, Felix Michael, AO37303.
Rogers, Glenn Elza, AO47979.
Rogers, Herbert Joseph, AO53552.
Rogers, Jack Mabry, AO44865.
Rogers, Robert Conant, AO35395.
Rogers, Thomas Eugene, AO36599.
Rogers, Woods White, Jr., AO44952.
Rohr, Loudin LaHugh, AO45012.
×Rohr, Louis William, AO45981.
×Romaine, Owen Wallace, AO44684.
Romstad, Rolf Norman, AO53331.
Root, George Raymond, AO44429.
Roper, Frank Adams, AO40950.
Rose, Howard Charles, AO46766.
Rose, James Leroy, AO46705.
Rose, John Bourslquot, Jr., AO24960.
×Rose, Ralph John, AO47906.
Rosebush, Kenneth Earl, AO26395.
Rosenbaum, Bert Stanford, AO24052.
Rosenthal, Herbert, AO34211.
Rosness, Joseph Henry, AO26306.
Rosno, Raymond Joseph, AO43621.
Ross, Amos Hodges, Jr., AO48784.
Ross, James Spillman, AO52960.
Ross, John Samuel, AO43821.
Ross, William Osmond, AO52520.
×Roth, John Y. Crawford, AO35349.
Rotkis, Walter Anton, AO43961.
Roubal, Joseph William, AO52542.
Roughton, Aurelian Ernest, Jr., AO47751.
Rowan, M. C., Jr., AO44089.
×Rowe, Everett Calvin, AO34029.
Rowe, William Matthew, AO53237.
Rowland, Thomas Jefferson, Jr., AO54376.
Royalty, William Saufley, Jr., AO45892.
Royce, Clare Howard, AO44505.
Ruby, Ishmael Elmo, AO44295.
Ruckman, Thomas Mayfield, AO53075.
Ruddell, George Inkerman, AO36054.
Rudolph, Bestow Reinhold, AO46941.
Rudolph, Ray Harding, AO44617.
Ruettgers, John Joseph, AO53447.
Rule, Richard Inman, AO37339.
Rundell, Francis Earle, 2d, AO25965.
Runyan, Samuel Harold, AO37031.
Rush, Donald Wesley, AO52202.
Rushforth, Robert George, AO46672.
Russell, Harold Gilmore, AO54364.
Russell, Leroy George, AO26043.
Russell, Roy Davis, AO34615.
Ryan, John Leonard, AO46299.
Ryan, Lloyd Murlin, AO36266.
Ryan, Paul Thomas, AO45189.
Ryan, Richard Eugene, AO34793.
Ryan, Thomas Stone, AO39174.
×Ryan, William George, AO54447.
Ryden, Donald Anderson, AO46311.
Rydstrom, Jean Frederic, AO35091.
Sabin, Flavel Provine, AO35500.
Sacknoff, David Arnold, AO54049.
Saehlenou, Hadley Vincent, AO22574.
×Sagebiel, Louis Walter, AO32887.
Sagert, Stanley Adolph, AO37301.
Salisbury, George Robert, AO32483.
Salisbury, Stanley Gordon, AO52648.
Salome, Richard Arlan, AO43963.
Salter, Richard D., AO34430.
×Salzarulo, Robert Louis, AO46159.
Sampson, Victor, Jr., AO40668.
Sams, Monroe Seabrook, AO37044.
Sams, Walter Birt, AO46280.
Sanborn, Bert Sumner, AO44801.
Sanctuary, Robert Harrison, AO48813.
×Sanders, Francis Arnold, AO53783.
×Sanders, Harry Glenn, AO39165.
Sanders, Roger Lowell, AO52483.
×Sanders, Roy Clifton, AO33059.
Sanders, William Breeding, AO45552.
Sandifer, John Douglas, AO52870.
×Sandman, George King, AO46265.
Sands, Warran Hyde, AO36885.
Sansone, Philip, AO37139.
×Sansone, Rocco, AO52366.
Sapp, James Franklin, AO34926.
Sargent, Hubert Eugene, Jr., AO48343.
×Saroey, John Andrew, AO54135.
Sarte, Victor Joseph, AO44325.
Sartor, Samuel Oscar, AO36224.
Sather, Harley, AO35235.
Sather, Roy Oscar, AO53721.
Satterwhite, Albert White, AO36382.
Sauer, Robert Raymond, AO53481.
Saunders, Clason Bastablea, AO46707.
Saunders, Johnson Rawlett, Jr., AO44898.
Saunders, Patrick Henry, AO36938.
Savage, Cary Linthicum, AO37114.
Savage, Rollin Richard, AO52866.
×Saville, Wesley Thomas, AO52692.
Sawrie, William Ernest, AO43922.
×Sawyer, Charles Wesley, AO36365.
×Sawyer, Charles Willard, AO45490.
×Sayler, Henry Benton, Jr., AO25796.
Saylor, Henry Stephen, AO33656.
Scales, John Cayme, AO44896.
×Scarbrough, Ben Allen, AO35221.
Scepansky, Joe Thomas, AO34906.
Schaal, William Richard, AO40777.
Schaefer, Chris John Henry, Jr., AO48670.
Schaffer, Louis, AO37330.
Schaffner, William Joseph, AO40405.
Scheible, Wilbur Roy, AO52930.
Schenk, Norbert Rieder, AO52816.
Schenkein, George, AO48151.
Scherer, John Joseph, AO52862.
Schilke, James Frederick, AO37203.
Schillereff, Raymond Edward, AO33576.
×Schindler, John David, Jr., AO45790.
Schindler, Wilbur James, AO44927.
Schleeh, Russell Ellsworth, AO46640.
Schlie, Walter, AO47429.
×Schlosberg, Richard Turner, Jr., AO25675.
×Schlukbier, Alvin George, AO52804.
Schlupp, John Alexander, AO48524.
Schmidt, Ferdinand Rudolph, AO35604.
×Schmidt, Fred Carl, Jr., AO44794.
Schmidt, Herman James, AO53536.
×Schmidt, John Max, AO44152.
Schmoldt, Harold Dale Louis, AO46797.
Schmucker, George Cleland, AO32944.
×Schneider, Albert Henry, AO34531.
Schneider, Edwin Alden, AO47251.
×Schobel, Sumner, AO44678.
Schofield, Charles Stanley, AO52902.
Schold, George Bertie, Jr., AO44650.
Schonka, Jeo Mitchel, AO33498.
Schott, Carl Victor, AO33286.
×Schott, Murry M., AO33654.
Schou, Andrew James, AO44884.
×Schrack, Fred Richard, AO53060.
Schrader, Lawrence Wilford, AO52454.
Schratz, Robert Kress, AO53606.
Schudel, Charles Richard, AO43903.
×Schuknecht, Lowell Albert, AO45962.
×Schulherr, Richard Moglin, AO52695.
Schulstad, Louis Melvin, Jr., AO35749.
Schulte, Orville John, AO47393.
Schultz, Kenneth Walter, AO47323.
Schultz, Leonard Corwin, AO35106.
×Schultz, Melvin Rae, AO36040.
Schultze, David Rowland, AO52894.
×Schumacher, Richard Powers, AO21654.
Schupp, Ferdinand Francis, AO44371.
×Schuster, Robert Charles, AO36818.
Schutten, Bernard Joseph, Jr., AO37223.
Schuyler, Dean Hanson, AO35926.
Schwartz, David Gibbon, AO26313.
Schwartztrauber, Ernest Phil, Jr., AO52872.
Schwarze, Elroy Henry, AO47062.
Schweiger, Walter John, Jr., AO36494.
Schweitzer, John Henry, AO32316.
Schwellenbach, Thomas William, AO36301.
×Schwengels, Forrest Victor, AO44509.
Schwikert, Frank Donald, AO44419.
×Sbofield, Frank Clark, Jr., AO24604.
Scott, George Edward, AO47051.
Scott, Richard Martin, AO24964.
×Scott, Robert Ray, AO35760.
Scott, Travis Moran, AO44451.

Scott, William Richard, AO52860.
×Scott, William Fontaine, AO26264.
Scroggins, James Harris, Jr., AO43814.
×Scruggs, John Alexander, AO43686.
Scullion, J. Donald, AO35724.
Scurlock, Reagan Andrew, AO45014.
Seab, Malcolm William, AO33530.
Seal, Earl Dunbar, AO56911.
Seale, Maxie Ben, AO47189.
Searles, De Witt Richard, AO37110.
Sears, Meldrum Lewis, AO32226.
Seay, William Woodrow, AO52827.
Sebille, Louis Joseph, AO33179.
Seemann, Karl Wilhelm, Jr., AO44314.
×Seiler, James Richard, AO46643.
Seith, Louis Theodore, AO25457.
×Selden, Littleton Cole, AO35469.
Selenger, Walter Kingsley, AO35540.
×Sellers, Coleman, AO52419.
Selling, Holger Arthur, AO53228.
×Sensenbrenner, Ralph Debald, AO44606.
Service, Robert Hubbard, AO40755.
Sevier, Coy T., AO54133.
Seward, Wayne Jack, AO34517.
Sewell, Virgil Roy, AO48950
×Sexton, Ralph Eugene, AO44789.
Shaban, Zenon, AO43527.
×Shackelford, Walter Scott, Jr., AO46127.
Shadell, Kenneth Lee, AO53209.
Shaefer, Richard Francis, AO25866.
×Shaffer, Dale Lester, AO46655.
Shahan, Michael Elsworth, AO34898.
Shaka, Napoleon Athan, AO44117.
Shambeck, Clarence Herman, AO41037.
×Shankin, Donald William, AO46582.
Shanklin, William Frank, AO44239.
×Shapton, Leslie Douglas, AO46538.
×Sharp, Charles Elton, AO44802.
Sharp, Daniel Francis, AO35798.
×Sharp, William Eugene, AO45978.
Sharpe, Carl Lewis, AO47966.
×Sharpless, Thomas Frank, AO52593.
Shaver, Dale Anderson, AO35270.
Shaw, Charles Howard, AO34823.
×Shaw, Donald Adrian, AO40350.
×Shaw, Lauren Launder, Jr., AO53874.
Shay, Michael, AO44935.
Shay, Steve Oseh, AO52496
Shea, Daniel Francis, AO26111.
Shealy, William Thomas, AO40297.
×Shean, John Paige, AO53952.
×Sheehan, Roy Hampton, AO44502.
Sheldon, Porter Farley, AO47273.
Sheley, Edward Lee, Jr., AO25438.
Shelton, Eldridge Gudeion, Jr., AO36047.
Shelton, Harvey Wirt Courtland, AO24686.
×Shelton, Lee Mercden, AO45243.
×Shelton, Orville William, AO46171.
×Shelton, William Mays, AO33760.
×Shepard, Charles William, AO46993.
Shepard, Ernest Berryman, AO36101.
×Sheppard, Chris Jewel, AO36016.
×Shepperd, Virgil Earl, AO44102.
Sherborne, Henry Hall, AO52301.
Sherman, Lenard, AO35121.
×Sherrill, Stephen Huntting, Jr., AO26318.
×Sherwood, Joseph Huling, Jr., AO46342.
Sherwood, Vernon Melvin, AO37269.
Shewbart, William Monroe, AO43555.
Shields, Benjamin Bayard, AO45477.
Shiely, Albert Raymond, Jr., AO25928.
Shiffrin, Benjamin Hankin, AO44315.
Shiner, Byron David, AO47581.
Shinnamon, Charles Wesley, AO52443.
×Shinners, John Wilford, AO54154.
×Shipley, Edward Vail, AO44713.
×Shirey, Clair Leo, AO36890.
Shirk, Harley Owen, AO52656.
Shirley, Fred Allen, AO45740.
Shirley, Paul, AO36100.
Shivers, Julius Dewitt, Jr., AO35327.
Shockley, Thomas Leon, AO54901.
Shomo, William Arthur, AO46706.
Shook, Carmel Monroe, AO37297.
Shook, Harold Graham, AO46351.
Short, Howard Earl, AO44530.
Short, Robert Bryan, AO24742.
×Short, William Walter, Jr., AO46312.
Shotwell, William Bedford, AO44950.
Showalter, Roy Russell, Jr., AO41042.
×Shubin, Murray Joseph, AO35809.
×Shumway, John Rollin, AO35597.
Sianis, Pete Chris, AO46196.
×Siler, Fred Le Roy, AO53460.
Silliman, Clifford Roger, AO39166.
Silva, John Joseph, AO46971.
×Silvester, Lindsey McDonald, AO26157.
×Simcoe, Desider Anthony, Jr., AO54368.
Simler, George Brenner, 4th, AO36453.
Simmons, Hal Francis, AO35605.
Simmons, Henry Caraway, AO47027.
Simmons, Joe Linn, AO32422.
Simmons, John Albert, Jr., AO46581.
Simmons, William Ballis, AO47150.
Simon, Edward Rudolph, AO40535.
Simon, Edwin Herman, AO44825.
Simonetti, Lino David, AO44534.
×Simpson, Charles Edwin, AO36288.
×Simpson, Robert Tennent, 4th, AO16174.
Simpson, Thomas Samuel, AO36456.
×Sims, Harold Hilson, AO48168.
Sinex, Charles Helm, Jr., AO52209.
Sinskie, Daniel Alexander, AO35603.
×Sipes, Richard R., AO35200.
Sipes, William Claude, Jr., AO47313.
Sipper, Joseph Robert, AO44425.
Sirney, John Ashton, AO44682.
Sisler, Orland Odell, AO34432.
Sittman, William Lewis, AO47839.
Skalak, Rudolph, AO44443.
×Skelton, Milton Bruce, AO45064.
Skinner, Ernest Harold, AO49001.
Skinner, Paul McDonald, AO44252.
Skipp, Francis Edwin, Jr., AO53924.
Skousen, Samuel James, AO35646.
×Slater, Herschel Harold, AO48027.
Slater, Ralph Phipps, AO44775.
Slaton, Howard Westley, AO24926.
×Sloan, William Alfred, Jr., AO36971.
Slocum, Paul James, AO35356.
×Slocumb, Clyde Buchanan, Jr., AO35034.
×Slough, Andrew Elmer, AO43736.
Slough, James Carl, AO44657.
Sluder, Amos Leslie, AO45662.
Slusher, John Thomas, AO48113.
Slusser, Hayden Colvar, AO48196.
Small, Arthur, AO35344.
×Small, Richard Dante, Jr., AO47328.
Smart, Howard Frederick, AO43532.
Smiley, Bert Nelson, AO34436.
×Smith, Alan Bronson, Jr., AO53152.
Smith, B. J., AO35107.
Smith, Brandon Corder, AO44446.
×Smith, Carroll C., AO34588.
Smith, Cecil Burnett, AO45939.
Smith, Charles Chesely, AO54243.
Smith, Claude Wesley, AO47348.
Smith, Clure Elton, Jr., AO53699.
Smith, Clyde Harrison, AO43787.
Smith, Cornelius Marcellus, Jr., AO36580.
Smith, Derwood K., AO46480.
Smith, Don Ansel, AO43576.
Smith, Earl Octavis, Jr., AO46825.
Smith, Edward Donald, AO46445.
×Smith, Elmer Frank, AO53551.
Smith, Everett Hensel, AO44531.
Smith, Forrester McLain, Jr., AO33706.
Smith, Frank Joseph, AO44361.
Smith, Gerald Thornton, AO33594.
Smith, Harvey Neal, AO46793.
Smith, James Gordon, AO47058.
×Smith, James Murray, AO36464.
Smith, John Edward, AO45187.
Smith, John Michael, AO53002.
×Smith, John Robert, AO53392.
Smith, Joseph Carlyle, AO47362.
×Smith, Kenneth Bates, AO25955.
×Smith, Leon Allen, AO47665.
×Smith, Leslie Albert, AO46176.
Smith, Lowell Blair, AO25920.
×Smith, Raleigh Delmer, AO40671.
×Smith, Ralph Lester, AO48965.
×Smith, Raymond Miller, AO46001.
Smith, Reet Poe, AO44237.
Smith, Richard Earl, AO52839.
Smith, Robert Emmett, AO46486.
Smith, Robert Elbert, AO52688.
Smith, Robert Chanell, AO44067.
Smith, Robert William, AO35078.
Smith, Rodney Ellsworth, AO44089.
×Smith, Roy Orval, Jr., AO24749.
Smith, Russell Jackson, AO25660.
Smith, Sidney George, AO44516.
Smith, Stanley, AO46593.
Smith, Sydney Philip, AO35870.
×Smith, Vernon Arthur, AO32117.
×Smith, Vincent Edgar, AO43534.
Smith, William Eugene, AO36820.
Smith, William Kenneth, AO46259.
×Smith, William Kirland, AO44936.
Smith, William Radcliffe, AO35637.
×Smith, Woodrow Wilson, AO45130.
Smoot, Oliver Reed, AO44236.
Smutko, Leonard Steven, AO47637.
Smyrl, James Arthur, AO37034.
Snaider, Himey Jones, AO44618.
Snavely, William Wayne, AO26254.
Snipes, Gilmer Lee, AO39157.
Snipes, James Cook, Jr., AO36206.
Snodgrass, Okey Warren, Jr., AO46796.
×Snow, David Joseph, AO46182.
Snow, Wilbur Deane, AO24737.
Snyder, Edgar Ernest, Jr., AO35334.
Snyder, Vincent Lucian, AO35148.
Snyder, Wayne Keith, AO48483.
Soha, Walter Michael, AO46596.
Solem, Herman Stanley, AO36721.
×Sommers, Norval Isom, Jr., AO40614.
Sorey, Robert Lexford, AO35633.
Sorrell, Larue Scott, AO52820.
Sorte, Martin Eugene, AO35505.
Souleyret, Kenneth, AO39310.
Sours, Lyle Samuel, AO46939.
Sours, Robert John, AO47450.
Souva, Raymond Francis, AO52491.
Sowers, Gordon Thomas, AO46290.
Spawn, Douglas Wilson, AO35240.
×Spear, Peter Holden, AO46813.
Spear, Sid Franklin, AO54197.
Speer, Maurice Edmund, AO33290.
Spells, Tadas Joseph, AO47246.
Spencer, Charles Flavius, AO54168.
Spencer, Gordon Abbott, AO53256.
Spencer, Harold Melville, AO44511.
Spielan, Richard, AO45758.
Spieth, Charles, Jr., AO26334.
×Spieth, Robert, AO43869.
Spitler, Lee William, AO37286.
×Spohn, Clifford Adams, AO52731.
Spooner, Julius Leonard, AO43588.
Sporn, Martin, AO47756.
Sprawls, Philip Claudius, AO33051.
Springer, Ralph Robertson, AO47222.
×Spurrell, William Alfred, AO44263.
×Stafford, Gordon Howard, AO40476.
×Stafford, Robert Cottom, AO44786.
Stahl, Horst Adolph, AO54114.
×Stainback, Frank Pleasants, Jr., AO23801.
Staite, Robert Alfred, AO47093.
Stallings, Gordon Kenneth, AO54132.
Stallings, Guy Harrison, AO52628.
Stallings, McLendon Montgomery, AO40510.
Stambaugh, Claude Kendall, AO34097.
Stanley, Gregory Quinn, AO52770.
Stanley, Ralph Willard, AO52810.
Stann, Leon, AO24863.
Stansbury, Jay Wayne, AO35339.
Stanton, Carroll Lane, AO45587.
Stanton, George LaRue, AO40541.
Stanton, William Joseph, Jr., AO48604.
×Stapleton, Carl William, AO24740.
Starke, Eugene Clifford, AO47207.
Starr, Stephen Albert, Jr., AO32902.
Staskewitz, Benjamin Edward, AO43701.
Stay, Jesse Eldred, AO36363.
Steakley, Ralph Douglas, AO46437.
×Stealy, Edward James, AO45734.
Stebelton, Samuel Frederick, AO25081.
Steel, Byron Mevell, AO53982.
Steele, Richard Andre, AO52524.
Steele, William, AO32009.
Steen, Garland Creighton, AO45353.
Steere, Samuel Adams, Jr., AO25281.
×Stehling, Henry Joseph, AO40912.
Stein, Frederick Philip, AO54355.
Steiner, Irvin Carl, AO52834.
Steiner, William H., Jr., AO46677.
Steinhauer, Raleigh Fred, AO36927.
Steinle, Paul Leonard, AO26217.
Stell, Glenn Aswell, AO35430.

Stellenwerf, William Atkinson, AO46319.
Stephens, Allen Wright, AO45358.
×Stephens, Donald Alfred, AO45106.
Stephens, Lawrence Edward, AO54000.
Stephens, Raymond Dee, AO52492.
Stephens, Robert Winston, AO36594.
Stephenson, Ottis Virgil, AO46811.
Sterling, Edwin Leigh, AO40794.
Sterne, Paul John, Jr., AO40489.
×Stevens, John LuRae, AO52150.
Stevens, Kenneth Ray, AO34329.
×Stevens, Raymond Wesley, AO45032.
Stevens, William Fay, AO45334.
×Stevenson, Horace Adlai, Jr., AO47031.
Stevenson, John Thomas, AO47657.
Stevenson, Robert John, AO45169.
×Stewart, Carl W., AO33028.
Stewart, George Benjamin, AO34207.
×Stewart, James Thompson, AO35903.
Stewart, John Leger, AO52725.
Stewart, John Smith, AO35756.
Stewart, R. C., AO54048.
Stewart, Robert William, Jr., AO52495.
Stewart, Tom Benjamin, AO45959.
Stewart, William Robert, Jr., AO25741.
Stiefel, Max Allen, AO45100.
Stiglich, John Jack, AO52248.
Stiles, Kenneth, AO52268.
Stiles, Lowell Augustus, AO54031.
×Stiles, Richard Henry, AO52546.
×Stines, Harrison Oberdorf, AO52578.
×Stinson, Frederick Austin, AO53652.
Stinson, Floyd Harold, AO45956.
Stitt, Austin Walter, Jr., AO45615.
Stitt, Glenn Theodore, AO44041.
Stockett, John Clifton, Jr., AO32705.
Stockton, William Arthur, AO42921.
Stoddard, Richard William, AO26093.
×Stoffel, Nicholas Peter, AO46731.
Stokely, Joe Edwin, AO32957.
×Stone, Albert Wilson, AO53366.
Stone, Francis Marvin, AO52873.
Stone, Lynn Elden, AO52757.
Stoney, Paul Roberts, AO36278.
Strait, William Van, Jr., AO54140.
Strang, Charles Francis, AO46553.
Strathg, Charlton Graham, AO40533.
Strauss, William, AO46610.
Streete, Alec Beaver, AO35128.
Streeton, Jack Wesley, AO24571.
Strickler, Marshall Handy, AO35341.
Strihafka, Louis Francis, AO40545.
Stringer, Robert Dillon, AO33154.
Strode, Ross Dexter, AO36874.
Strom, Charles Walter, AO52281.
Stroud, Conley Burns, Jr., AO52832.
×Stroud, Herbert Ogden, AO45563.
Stroud, Walter Charles, AO45132.
Stuart, John Montgomery, Jr., AO43967.
Stuart, Joseph Alexander, Jr., AO25711.
Stubbs, Gail Lewis, AO36747.
Stubbs, James Marcus, AO47711.
Stubbs, Robert Reid, AO28533.
Suber, Stanley Edgar, AO54807.
Stubiaree, Michael Jack, AO33421.
Stulb, Joseph George, Jr., AO40638.
×Sturdevant, Donald Ernest, AO55050.
Sturges, Claude C., Jr., AO22557.
Sturgis, James Edwin, AO32234.
Stutzman, Robert Gordon, AO33865.
Sudbury, David Vincent, AO52494.
Suddeth, David Andrew, AO35201.
×Suehr, Richard Charles, AO45583.
Suggs, John Jacob, AO44615.
Suggs, Ralph Goodrich, AO35659.
Sullivan, Arthur Joseph, AO52654.
×Sullivan, Daniel Francis, AO32374.
×Sullivan, Edward Donald S., AO34202.
Sullivan, Frederick Edward, AO52320.
Sullivan, Woodruff Turner, Jr., AO35345.
Sullivan, William Charles, AO37332.
Sulloway, Alexander Mark, AO44036.
Summerfield, Leslie Francis, AO46296.
×Summers, Clarence Eugene, Jr., AO43978.
×Summers, Charles Leroy, AO35627.
Sun, Jack Klotz, AO32761.
Sunderland, Duane Oral, AO52912.
Suta, Nicholas Henry, AO44725.
Sutin, Nathan, AO52530.
Sutter, Marshall Royce, AO52997.
Suttle, Dale Davenport, AO52144.
Sutton, John Liggett, AO43718.
×Svejkar, Joseph, AO47140.
Svenvold, Harold Richard, AO36791.
×Svoboda, Milton Joseph, AO53074.
Svore, Ferdinand Luther, AO35482.
Swan, Clinton David, AO49062.
Swanke, Edwin Alden, AO53167.
Swann, Franklin Wilburn, AO34410.
Swanson, Charles Kenneth, AO43761.
Swanson, Darwin Earl, AO34353.
Swanson, Ralph William, AO53247.
Swanson, Richard Walter, AO44520.
Swanson, Theodore Benedict, AO44567.
Sweat, Dale Sidney, AO52239.
Sweeney, James Earl, AO47621.
Sweetland, Earle Everett, AO35769.
Sweigart, Bert LeRoy, AO44596.
Swenson, Shirl H., AO32963.
×Swindler, Harold, AO52630.
Swiren, Alfred Milton, AO35778.
×Swofford, John Ferrest, AO34416.
Sydnor, Robert Austin, AO45741.
Sykes, George Kunkel, AO25487.
×Sylvester, Joseph James, AO46200.
Symes, Isaac Mathias Baker, AO52693.
Tainsh, Alexander Simpson, AO35354.
Talbot, Joseph Louis, AO54004.
Talbott, Carlos Maurice, AO25797.
Taliaferro, Walter Richard, AO25591.
×Talmage, Henry Gardner, AO42655.
Talmant, Alex William, AO47314.
Tanberg, Lawrence Frederick, AO35513.
×Tankersley, Carl Ray, AO45240.
×Tansel, Dave Collins, AO44651.
×Tapp, James Buckley, AO33246.
Tapscott, Wilbur Alan, AO37319.
Tara, Hollis Barker, AO36017.
Tarbet, Dale Fife, AO36507.
Tarbutton, Jean Dupuy, AO35786.
Tarver, William Head, Jr., AO53363.
Tarvin, Russell Wayne, AO35406.
Tatman, Paul Preston, AO33253.
×Tattini, Leno, AO44729.
Tatum, Theodore Penfield, Jr., AO36022.
Tatum, William, AO52346.
Tauscher, Robert Edwin, AO46292.
Taylor, Ben, AO44050.
Taylor, Charles Meredith, AO44659.
Taylor, Dayton Reed, AO40938.
Taylor, Edward Hamilton, AO54472.
Taylor, Emery Durell, AO37245.
Taylor, Fitzgerald, AO35567.
Taylor, Glenn Watson, AO46678.
Taylor, Henry Weston, Jr., AO52657.
Taylor, Joe DeLay, AO45020.
Taylor, John Peter, AO46595.
Taylor, Lester, George, Jr., AO25618.
Taylor, Ralph Gordon, Jr., AO36911.
×Taylor, Richard, AO35183.
Taylor, Richard Winn, AO46433.
Taylor, Robert Arthur, AO37000.
Taylor, Thomas Edward, AO40313.
Taylor, Robert Harold, AO46435.
Taylor, William Earl, AO33255.
Taylor, William Elton, AO22602.
Taylor, William Vaughn, AO52339.
Tebbs, Jim Reid, AO43518.
Teberg, Daniel Ernest, AO34826.
×Teller, J. Craig, AO26275.
×Telzrow, Thomas Eugene, AO45727.
Temple, Kenneth Leo, AO46733.
Templeton, Horace Arnold, AO46940.
×Tennant, Charles Willis, AO33245.
Tennis, Langdon Carlyle, AO40436.
Terhune, Claude Mitchell, AO45506.
Terry, Melvin Paul, AO52468.
Terzian, Roger Hornsby, AO45833.
Teubner, Harold Charles, AO35398.
Thabault, George Bernard, AO44548.
Thaler, David, AO52527.
Thayer, Arthur Linwood, Jr., AO32931.
×Theisen, Emmett John, AO46429.
Therrien, Patrick Elcgius, AO52290.
Thiele, Harold Edwin, AO43872.
Thomas, Clarence Lamar, AO43836.
Thomas, Frank Leslie, AO53244.
×Thomas, Leonard Laughlin, AO53371.
Thompson, Alden George, AO24077.
×Thompson, Arthur John, Jr., AO44695.
Thompson, Charles Edward, AO47963.
Thompson, Dan Fox, AO35470.
Thompson, Dillard Norman, AO43862.
×Thompson, Donald Warren, AO25673.
Thompson, Donn Graydon, AO37298.
×Thompson, Francis Newton, AO53471.
Thompson, Glen Wilson, AO33738.
Thompson, Harry James, AO54559.
Thompson, Harry Melvin, AO45916.
×Thompson, Jesse Duncan, AO23952.
Thompson, John Arthur, AO46032.
Thompson, John Keller, AO36723.
Thompson, Kenneth Dean, AO35266.
Thompson, Lorenzo Maurice, AO45600.
Thompson, Milton Elmo, AO22826.
Thompson, Russell Bertel, AO40576.
Thompson, Shirley Boyd, AO36558.
Thompson, William Martin, AO25775.
×Thompson, Edwin Wesley, AO33377.
×Thorne, James Howard, AO33392.
Thorne, Walter Edward, AO53403.
×Thornton, Clark Olmsted, AO46523.
Thornton, Julian Roy, Jr., AO44019.
Thornton, W. Henry, Jr., AO52799.
Thrash, Joe Merriwether, Jr., AO40230.
Thurston, Joseph Walter, AO35952.
Tibbetts, Oscar Norland, AO44434.
Tibbs, Charles Edwin, AO35493.
Tidball, Dale Richard, AO44366.
Tiernan, Thomas John, AO47398.
×Tigner, Edwin Brown, AO43744.
×Tilghman, Marvin Hugh, AO44669.
Tillery, James Hightower, AO44068.
Tilley, George Franklin, Jr., AO35191.
Tilley, Reade Franklin, AO54390.
Tilley, Thomas Marshall, AO35343.
Tillman, Herman George, Jr., AO48710.
Tillman, James Dan, Jr., AO43865.
Timbers, George Theodore, AO36590.
Timm, Paul August, AO45052.
×Timmons, Herschel Marvin, AO52453.
×Tingwall, Robert Leon, AO40771.
×Tippen, Forrest Wade, AO35977.
Tipton, Richard Pike, AO35808.
Tisdale, Paul Arthur, AO33228.
Titus, Harold Jack, AO45376.
Todd, Robert Francis, AO46271.
Toland, Butler Bell, Jr., AO36500.
Toler, Richard Grant, AO35304.
Tomlinson, Franklin Eugene, AO34786.
Toole, Richard Allen, AO34618.
Toon, Charles Maxwell, AO52515.
Topper, Morse, AO44666.
×Tornes, Howard, AO45249.
Torr, Francis Evelyn, AO45066.
Tosti, Carlo Ralph, AO47103.
Totten, Jerry Mac, AO35856.
Tower, Archie Almond, AO44988.
×Towne, Raymond Lester, AO33827.
Townsend, Barry Baldwin, AO33319.
Townsend, Guy Mannering, AO47074.
Toye, Edward Eugene, AO43836.
Tracy, Henry Lewis, AO45045.
×Tracy, Joseph Francis, AO45027.
Trail, Charles Darwin, AO35180.
×Trask, James Edward, AO46739.
×Trask, John Alvin, AO54585.
Trautt, Edward Ambrose, AO44349.
Trearse, Albert, AO32989.
Treland, Oscar, AO47060.
Trenkle, Robert Anthony, AO44291.
Trexler, Troy Lee, AO45044.
Triantafeilu, Rockly, AO36770.
×Tribble, Randolph Louis, AO44113.
Trimble, Harry White, AO24083.
×Trojanowski, Maurice John, AO43618.
Trotter, Claude Augustus, Jr., AO34998.
True, Oscar Harold, AO43942.
×Trzyna, Casimir John, AO46975.
Tucker, Albert Sidney Johnston, Jr., AO26270.
Tucker, Norman Percy, AO35528.
Tueler, Jack LeRoy, AO35755.
×Tunks, Emerson Ambrose Anthony, AO44118.
Turbak, Chester, AO44658.
×Turk, Laurel Agee, AO52705.
Turk, Wilbert, AO37042.
×Turnbull, John Frederick, AO34696.

Turner, Barney Ellsworth, AO35929.
Turner, Billy Markley, AO32600.
Turner, Egbert Snyder, Jr., AO52457.
Turner, Hiram Glenn, Jr., AO25543.
Turner, John Mac, AO34918.
Turner, Lewis Mack, AO53336.
Turner, Vernon Richard, AO26113.
Turnipseed, Felix Martin, Jr., AO53966.
×Turton, John Stephen, AO46902.
Tweedie, Roy Leonard, AO47317.
Twichell, Wallace Bruce, Jr., AO53563.
Tyler, James Otey, AO36399.
×Tyler, Joe Milton, AO46461.
Tyler, John Thomas, AO45881.
×Tyler, Morgan Seymour, Jr., AO35134.
Tyler, Robert Andrew, AO35219.
Tyrrell, Robert Louis Fredricka, AO54925.
Tyson, John, AO35623.
Uglow, Ray Daniel, Jr., AO45965.
Uhle, Richard Bauer, AO53548.
Uhrich, George Adams, AO35348.
×Uhrig, Robert A., AO40412.
Umoff, Alexis Paul, AO48518.
Underwood, Herbert Arthur, AO56038.
Upchurch, Jerry Emerson, AO46919.
Upchurch, Terrell Martin, AO52447.
Upson, Linus Frederick, Jr., AO53826.
Urbach, Leonard Henry, AO43947.
Urban, Emil Lewis, AO52611.
Utley, William Andrews, AO44154.
Vacca, Gerald Robert, AO43578.
Vail, Hugh Beugler, AO46062.
Valentine, William John, AO36686.
Valusek, John, Jr., AO32826.
Van Buskirk, Arthur Brown, AO38940.
Van Deusen, Clark Bedell, AO45074.
Van Duyn, John Edgar, AO25708.
Van Neste, Henry Irving, AO44311.
Van Patten, Isaac Toll 3d, AO45558.
Van Pelt, James Hillgoss, AO35043.
Van Sickle, Wendell Mac, AO33091.
Van Steenis, Loren Clifford, AO44549.
×Van Vliet, Charles Thrasher, AO44312.
×Van Wagoner, Robert Norton, AO44260.
Van De Car, Howard Thomas, AO34624.
Vanden Dries, William Peter, AO48398.
Vanden Heuvel, George Renzel, AO45641.
Vandeveer, Lawrence Edwin, AO36420.
Vaughn, Clare Ray, AO52347.
Vaughn, Jasper Melvin Paul, AO46713.
Vaughn, William Enoch, Jr., AO32877.
Vaught, Robert Harry, AO45773.
Veatch, Bernard Willmore, AO33581.
Veazey, Madison Arnold, Jr., AO40907.
Vega, Carl Emmanuell, AO44926.
×Velde, Robert Lee, AO34058.
Ventriss, Donald Edwin, AO47092.
Verbeck, Peter, AO32908.
Verbeek, Harry Peter, AO32268.
Verbruggen, George John, AO33294.
Vernon, Elmer Harland, AO53921.
×Vestal, Howard Lee, AO35895.
×Vetter, Fred William, Jr., AO48293.
Vick, John Oliver, AO44904.
Vickers, Laverne Delmar, AO35685.
Vickers, Roth Edward, AO43936.
Vickery, Benjamin Patterson, Jr., AO52329.
Victor, Henry Grant, AO45582.
Vignetti, John Lawrence, AO44506.
Vivian, Edward Alfred, AO25601.
Vivian, Jerrold Morris, AO47885.
Vivian, Lawrence, AO36487.
Vlcek, Donald Henry, AO25541.
Vogt, John William, Jr., AO35001.
×Vogt, Louis Richard, AO46635.
Voigt, Jack Parks, AO47184.
×Voruz, Herbert George, Jr., AO52836.
Voss, Nathaniel Reid, Jr., AO43976.
Vreeland, Robert William, AO43837.
×Wade, Robert Edwin, AO33070.
Wade, William Glenn, AO49031.
Wagner, Carl Emil, AO44995.
Wagner, Harry Alden, AO53083.
Wagner, Wilfred William, AO44670.
Wagnon, Manford Kinney, AO34525.
×Walck, Richard Eugene, AO35928.
Waldroup, Marvin Martin, Jr., AO46641.
Walior, John Thomas, AO36159.
Walker, David Henry, AO22579.
Walker, Donald John, AO45204.
Walker, George Theodore, AO46213.
×Walker, Hal Tabb, AO47456.
Walker, James Harper, AO25987.
Walker, Joe, AO34461.
Walker, John Henry, AO44568.
Walker, Lewis Harold, AO47497.
×Walker, Ralph Lee, AO35009.
Walker, Richard Louis, AO47682.
Walker, Roy Ralph, AO43918.
Walker, Templeton S., AO32775.
Walker, Walter Bertram, Jr., AO44228.
Walker, William Allan, AO33122.
×Walker, William Jennings, AO52485.
Wall, Edward Martin, AO45277.
Wallace, Duane Galen, AO49056.
Wallace, Eugene Dye, AO46360.
Wallace, Robert Davis, AO34901.
Wallace, Wesley Fillmore, AO45215.
Wallach, John Andrew, AO37134.
×Wallen, Francis Leroy, AO34418.
Wallen, Phil Jack, AO46695.
Waller, Walter Ralph, Jr., AO36606.
Walling, Robert John, AO25722.
Walrath, Richard Drake, AO45554.
×Walsh, David Ignatius, AO48146.
Walsh, George Henry, AO46477.
Walsh, Henry Joseph, AO52559.
Walsh, Howard Benjiman, AO35033.
Walsh, James David, AO52528.
Walsh, Martin Raymond, Jr., AO35368.
Walsh, Michael Joseph, AO52224.
Walter, Clarence Douglas, AO52598.
Walters, Harold Stephen, AO53546.
Walters, Joe Paul, AO35750.
×Walters, Robert Whiting, AO52808.
Walters, Therwin Stanley, AO36043.
×Waltz, Robert Wesley, AO36972.
Wambold, William Henry, AO48768.
×Wanamaker, Martin Eugene, AO52324.
Wansley, Theodore, AO32259.
×Ward, Albert McConnell, AO25008.
Ward, George Phillip, AO45097.
Ward, James Aubrey, AO44968.
×Ward, Joseph Lea, AO40875.
Ward, Oliver Clark, AO35706.
Ward, P. J., AO32762.
Warden, Wayne, Jr., AO45115.
Ware, William, AO43613.
Warfield, Allen, Jr., AO48128.
Warner, George Oliver, AO44848.
Warns, Thomas Francis, AO47917.
Warren, John Edgar, AO43993.
Warthman, Jack Dussel, AO44619.
×Washburn, Walter Raleigh, Jr., AO45455.
×Waslenko, Michael, Jr., AO53340.
Waste, Robert Jackson, AO53003.
Waters, Joseph R., AO17041.
Watkins, James Dudley, AO44913.
Watkins, James Howard, AO25921.
Watkins, John Raymond, AO44533.
Watkins, John Jefferson, AO35662.
Watkins, Loy Edwin, AO45531.
Watson, Dudley Malone, AO48047.
Watson, George Henry, AO36459.
×Watson, James Wyatt, AO54641.
×Watson, Lawrence Middleton, AO25945.
Watson, Oscar Lafayette, AO46530.
Watson, Richard Clark, AO44545.
×Watson, William Burdette, AO45035.
Watts, George Joseph, AO53141.
Watts, John Ruben, AO52361.
Watts, Ralph Kenton, AO33380.
Watwood, Louis V., AO44125.
Wayne, Byron Mitchell, AO49078.
Weart, George Spoor, AO25569.
Weatherford, Sydney William, AO35868.
Weaver, Frederick, AO32323.
Weaver, James William, AO36037.
Weaver, Marvin Eugene, AO44986.
×Weaver, William Joseph, AO44830.
Webb, Allen Sterm, AO53475.
Webb, Clarence Russell, Jr., AO47098.
Webb, Joe Slaughter, AO52787.
Webb, Rudelle Baxton, AO33591.
Webber, Paul Eugene, AO36255.
Weber, John Lerdy, Jr., AO25522.
Webster, Frank Russell, Jr., AO32337.
Webster, Lewis Frazer, AO26087.
Wedding, John Francis, AO36468.
Weddle, Owen Allen, AO47241.
Weeks, Howard Tolford, AO44803.
Weeks, James Bernard, AO47489.
Weeks, James Lew, AO35452.
Weems, Woodrow Wilson, AO47265.
×Wegenhoft, Victor Charles, AO40718.
Weide, Edward James, AO52879.
Weidner, Joseph John, AO24039.
Weigel, Andrew Hudson, AO24778.
×Weikel, Paul Wilson, AO43738.
×Weil, August Edward, AO48349.
×Weiner, Joseph, AO43732.
×Weir, Robert Adam, AO41073.
Weisbrodt, Charles Richard, AO52644.
×Weiser, Gus, AO48258.
Weiss, Sidney, AO45008.
Welch, Darrell Gall, AO53231.
×Welch, George Coleman, AO35128.
×Welch, James Edward, AO45973.
Welch, Rupert Carlton, AO45017.
Wellborn, Jeffery O'Neal, AO46206.
Weller, Russell Kenneth, AO36063.
Wells, George Louis, AO34411.
×Wells, John Pender, AO45362.
Wells, Ray Edward, AO36953.
Weltzin, Richard Fredrick, AO35440.
Weniger, Robert Lee, Jr., AO39235.
Wenk, Walter Rudolph, AO46093.
Wentz, Paul Norwood, AO48034.
×Wernlein, Frank Allen, AO44785.
×West, Howard Barnell, AO34379.
West, Howard Fletcher, AO46413.
West, Robert Willard, AO44276.
Westberg, Kenneth Charles, AO52850.
×Westbrook, Jasper Alton, AO45499.
Westbrook, Marston Thorn, AO26130.
×Westenhoff, John Hurst, AO24956.
Westfall, William Bryan, AO53565.
×Westmoreland, Lonnie Quitman, AO35871.
Westwood, John Raymond, AO32327.
Wethe, J. Duane, AO25889.
×Wetzel, Albert John, AO24582.
Wheeler, Frederick Grant, AO35773.
×Wheeler, Joe Dell, AO34896.
Whitaker, Keith Albert, AO26195.
White, Andrew Milton, AO56902.
White, Ernest Johnson, Jr., AO24961.
White, Jack Clement, AO34975.
White, Joe Ross, AO45878.
×White, Ralph James, AO24885.
×White, Richard Durwin, AO40332.
×White, Robert Harry, AO36401.
White, Thomas David, AO34513.
×White, William Roland, AO52698.
White, William Thomas, AO35804.
Whitehead, Chauncey Brownloe, AO44540.
Whitehorn, Kenneth Walker, AO35515.
Whitenack, George Minor, 3d, AO32688.
Whitfield, Joe Mangham, AO36265.
Whitker, Frederic Edward, AO53839.
×Whitley, Charles George, AO34557.
Whitley, Edgar Duer, AO40883.
×Whitlow, Floyd Bruner, Jr., AO34474.
×Whitlow, Robert Victor, AO25763.
Whitman, Edward Bostwick, Jr., AO45831.
×Whitmire, James Martin, Jr., AO46441.
Whitmore, Robert Alvin, AO36225.
Whitney, William James, AO53110.
Whitsett, Jack William, AO36247.
Whitson, Jack Henderson, AO25925.
Whitt, James Andrew, AO47945.
Whittaker, Roy Eugene, AO35361.
Whittingham, Douglas James, AO45637.
×Whittington, Riley Norwood, AO52493.
Whittle, Frederick James, AO43912.
Wickham, Wallace, AO37015.
Wicklund, Harold Alphonse, AO35807.
×Wiecks, Max Reid, AO52609.
Wiehrdt, Leonard Irving, AO46464.
×Wiener, Murray Arnold, AO52906.
×Wientjes, Gerard Francis, AO45550.
×Wiesner, Paul Francis, AO44192.
Wigbels, Lawrence Gerrard, AO45794.
Wigger, William Franklin, AO47507.
×Wight, Carroll Herbert, AO34468.
Wilcox, Frank Hurst, Jr., AO34082.
×Wilcox, Roland MacGowan, AO34072.
Wilde, Linn Erlon, Jr., AO45597.
Wilder, Harlan Cree, AO35296.
×Wildinger, Joseph Valentine, AO44124.
Wilfong, John Jay, AO47181.
Wilk, Jake Louis, Jr., AO53667.
×Wilkerson, William Frank, AO53557.
Wilkinson, Richard Gaddis, AO34878.

Willcox, Grover Cleveland, Jr., AO46639.
Willetts, David Leonard, AO53869.
Willey, Carl Raymond, AO35098.
×Willey, Clifford Alvoid, AO36828.
Williams, Augustus Forney, Jr., AO34775.
Williams, Coleman Osborne, Jr., AO37005.
Williams, Carl Felton, AO43879.
Williams, Charles Carter, AO35581.
Williams, Charles William, AO45206.
Williams, David Munroe, AO48010.
Williams, de Jack, AO35497.
×Williams, Donald Grant, AO32022.
Williams, George Vincent, AO34617.
Williams, George Pershing, AO36340.
Williams, Hilbert Baker, AO52707.
Williams, Jack Pryer, AO52866.
×Williams, Jack Wilford, AO45514.
Williams, James Madison, AO35340.
×Williams, James Willis, AO44122.
Williams, John Grenville, AO45260.
Williams, Lawrence Dale, AO53423.
Williams, Lee Roy, Jr., AO35759.
Williams, Leslie Benjamin, AO46394.
Williams, Richard Arnold, AO52623.
Williams, Todd Gill, AO54985.
Williams, Walter Pippen, AO35283.
Williams, William Allen, AO25209.
Williams, Willian Milburn, AO33497.
Williams, Yancey, AO52771.
Williamson, Laurence David, AO46997.
Williamson, Samuel Samson, Jr., AO54442.
Willis, Lloy Cecil, AO44381.
Willis, Milton Dean, AO45009.
Willis, Robert Franklin, AO36644.
×Willms, Gene Charles, AO47643.
Wilmot, Allan Eustis, AO45691.
Wilson, Campbell Ferry Monroe, AO52598.
Wilson, Charles Smith, AO44032.
Wilson, Edward Lewis, Jr., AO35632.
Wilson, Frederick William Hildebrand, AO32397.
Wilson, Harold Lewis, AO46388.
×Wilson, Harry Alvin, AO54613.
×Wilson, Iri Donaker, Jr., AO44731.
Wilson, James Arthur, AO39161.
Wilson, Jerald Bruce, AO52773.
×Wilson, John McLain, AO44696.
Wilson, Louis Locke, Jr., AO25623.
Wilson, Richard Ashby, AO54253.
×Wilson, Robert Alden Hamilton, AO47962.
Wilson, Vernon Eugene, AO53706.
×Wilson, Walter George, AO52240.
Wilson, Walter James, AO33235.
Wilson, William Ashley, Jr., AO36215.
Wilson, William Monroe, AO37108.
Wilson, Woodrow, AO44776.
Wimsatt, Joseph Francis, AO46882.
×Winberry, William Matthew, AO53462.
Wine, Chester Bolton, AO46201.
×Winebrenner, Louis Elmer, AO44831.
×Winfree, Isaac Owen, AO28836.
×Winfrey, Hal Cawood, AO46912.
Winget, Francis Edward, AO39540.
Winkler, John Moon, AO35512.
×Winn, Chasteen Guy, Jr., AO41091.
×Winn, Otis Ellsworth, AO48765.
Winneshiek, William Sherwood, AO47676.
×Winter, William Fredrick, AO48126.
Wintner, Bernard Godfrey, AO46591.
Wischmann, George Adolph, AO44444.
Wiseman, Joseph Lewis, AO48844.
Wiseman, Lee Verne, AO36455.
Wisniewski, Raymond Francis, AO36928.
Witt, Lynn Elwood, Jr., AO33416.
×Witt, Thomas F., AO36594.
Witters, Arthur George, AO53398.
×Wobbe, Roger Lawrence, AO35535.
Wolda, Joseph Anthony, AO45180.
Wolnowsk, Russell Kenneth, AO44528.
Wolcott, John Payne, AO52156.
×Wold, Leonard Reginald, AO46623.
Wolf, Charles Sebastian, AO52978.
Wolf, John Joseph, AO43943.
Wolfe, Gerald, AO48556.
Woltanski, Thaddeus Lewis, AO22834.
Wood, Griffin Howard, AO53253.
Wood, Jim Henry, AO47602.
Wood, Joseph Thomas, Jr., AO44255.
Wood, Lynn Frederick, AO52656.
×Wood, Marvin James, AO52683.
Wood, Thomas Donnelley, AO52299.
Woodring, Dugan V., AO45921.
Woodruff, David Terry, AO44882.
Woodruff, Harold Delmar, AO39222.
Woodruff, Leymont Venson, AO48646.
Woodruff, Roscoe Barnette, Jr., AO24074.
Woods, Everett Newton, AO44057.
Woods, James Russell, AO44199.
Woods, Jesse Leroy, Jr., AO36630.
Woods, Willie Green, Jr., AO35661.
Woodson, Harold William, AO26206.
Woodward, Paul Berkshire, AO24762.
Woody, Robert Elwood, AO34357.
Wooles, Marcellus Ronald, AO44381.
Wooster, Vernon Oliver, AO52592.
Wooten, Clyde Curtis, AO34554.
×Wooten, Edward Densmore, AO54259.
Work, Robert Ernest, AO45256.
Workman, Bryant Arthur, AO46390.
×Workman, Jack Blease, AO40915.
×Works, Le Eustis, AO52370.
×Worley, Ernest Lee, Jr., AO54283.
×Wormington, Jack Edwin, AO48076.
Worthington, Roy Henry, Jr., AO47144.
Worthmen, Paul Emil, AO45292.
Would, William Jeffrey, AO45751.
Wray, Cletus, AO46450.
Wray, James William, Jr., AO36002.
Wray, Robert Alexander, Jr., AO45774.
×Wright, Edmund Augustus, Jr., AO26266.
Wright, Ellis William, Jr., AO34013.
Wright, Frank Edward, AO35003.
Wright, Fred Paul, Jr., AO47382.
×Wright, Julian Carleton, AO44585.
Wright, Lewis Walter, AO40300.
Wright, Robert James, AO48596.
Wright, Robert Lee, AO37275.
Wright, Theodore Roger, Jr., AO35385.
Wright, Wallace Ashley, AO33455.
Wright, William Jefferson, AO53786.
Wunderlich, Herbert Emmanuel, AO46303.
Wyatt, Harold Erskine, AO43870.
Wyatt, William Henry, AO52432.
Wydner, Clarence Stimson, AO37189.
Wyman, Frank Melvin, Jr., AO45026.
×Wymond, Gilbert Osborne, Jr., AO35366.
Wysocki, Chester Constantine, AO44805.
×Yancey, Gordon Allen, Jr., AO33775.
Yandoh, Thomas Roderick, AO47942.
Yarbrough, Walter Rudell, AO35533.
Yeater, James Wilbur, AO36933.
×Yoder, Harry David, AO52701.
×Yun, Pershing Lockey, AO46435.
×Yopchick, Michael Paul, AO54651.
Young, Franklin Frederick, AO33583.
Young, Gail, AO33396.
×Young, Hugh Denton, AO36308.
Young, William Blakey, AO52346.
Young, William Ross, AO46574.
Youngblood, Curtis Nolan, AO43980.
Youngman, Reginald Bunker, AO52274.
Younkin, Leland Alfred, AO56440.
Younkin, Richard Carl, AO47266.
Yount, Barton Kyle, Jr., AO25739.
×Yucker, Julius Lyman, Jr., AO36197.
Yundt, Robert Wellings, AO52491.
×Zachmann, Robert Francis, AO52737.
×Zeidler, William Xavier, AO52564.
Zeigler, Carl Emerson, Jr., AO53823.
Zeigler, Jack Spiers, AO46394.
Zeine, Merle Milton, AO36732.
Zell, Lucian Thompson, 2d, AO39277.
Ziegeweid, Eugene Joseph, AO44538.
Zielinski, Urban Joseph, AO45037.
Zink, Harry Johns, AO36495
×Zins, William Elmer, AO24140.
Zitar, Edward Robert, AO44284.
×Zohn, Bernard, AO52769.
×Zorka, Jack Carl, AO44677.
Zubon, Michael, AO26075.
×Zurek, Walter John, AO44738.
×Zweifel, Everett E., A45676.

To be first lieutenants

Ahern, Timothy Ignatius, AO38514.
×Atkinson, Obbie Orville, AO56669.
×Barish, David Theodore, AO50457.
Bellamy, Jack, AO56601.
×Black, Elmer Ellsworth, AO50466.
Black, William James, AO50428.
Blackmon, Waldo Neely, AO56663.
×Borchert, Francis William, AO56644.
×Bork, Ervin Francis, AO56671.
Bowers, Hurst Gray, AO50471.
Boyes, Peter Edwin, AO56667.
×Bradley, Ernest Elmore, Jr., AO38254.
×Brauneis, Ernest Frederick, AO56650.
Bryant, Melvin Harold, AO50449.
Cameron, Louis Jackson, Jr., AO56592.
Carter, James Baker, AO50439.
Castanza, Angelo Nicholas, AO56628.
×Cavnar, Bobbie Joe, AO50486.
Chapman, Harry Moulton, AO50474.
×Christensen, Swen Aage, AO56655.
Coates, Robert Eugene, AO50455.
Cobb, William Andrew, AO56626.
Coffman, William Frederick AO38499.
Collins, David Carter, AO38513.
×Collins, Harold Edward, AO38515.
Conner, Robert Walter, AO56596.
×Crawford, David Frank, AO56654.
×Cunningham, O. D., Jr., AO52268.
Curry, Hayden Charles, AO31795.
×Daoust, John Bulger, AO50503.
Davis, Marion McDonald, Jr., AO56651.
×Davis, Richard Lee, AO41348.
×De Vries, John Atwood, AO50488.
×Drury, George Francis, AO56640.
Duggar, Omar Paschal, Jr., AO56631.
Dukes, Joseph, Jr., AO50430.
Edmunds, Edmund William, Jr., AO38487.
×Ellis, Calvin Kemp, AO41350.
Embery, Robert Lee, AO50481.
Erwin, Max L., AO56597.
Ewing, Donald Edward, AO50510.
Fauth, William Ward, AO50485.
×Fellows, Charles Warrington, Jr., AO56648.
Fields, Jack Harold, AO50464.
Flanagan, Jesse Laddie, AO50469.
Fries, William Walton, AO50453.
×Frith, Thomas John, AO56662.
Garcia, Ray Joseph, AO41346.
Gillette, Harvey Wendell, AO38486.
×Girardin, Robert Laurent, AO50509.
×Glass, Lawrence Stuart, AO56670.
Gommel, William Raymond, AO41338.
×Graffunder, William Otto, AO50458.
Graham, Robert Paul, AO50460.
×Graves, Grover Cleveland, Jr., AO38268.
Graves, Norman Calvin, AO56630.
Griffin, Hiram, AO38502.
Grubbs, James W., Jr., AO50463.
×Guay, Georges Raymond Joseph, AO50491.
Guerny, Gene, AO41336.
Harbison, John Jeter, AO50432.
×Hardy, Charles Raymond, AO50487.
×Harer, Richard James, AO56646.
Heckel, Charles Clark, AO41344.
Hendricks, William Tillman, AO38267.
Hensz, Robert Louis, AO56622.
Hester, James Bert, Jr., AO56611.
Hislop, Sherman LeMoyne, AO50498.
Hodgin, Robert Howe, AO50450.
Holifield, Karl Louis, AO56658.
Holland, Thomas Marion, Jr., AO56673.
×Hummel, Richard Edward, AO50504.
Jackson, Stuart Lee, AO56589.
×Jacobs, Ralph Edward, AO56625.
Johennesen, Robert Fremont, AO56604.
Jolliff, Robert Charles, AO56637.
Jones, Forrest Phillips, Jr., AO56599.
Kamp, Walter Baird, AO39477.
Kaufman, Robert Joseph, Jr., AO56615.
×Keir, James McLaren, Jr., AO50436.
Kenworthy, Robert Barclay, AO41345.
×Koski, Raymond Julius, AO56666.
Kramb, John Henry, AO50515.
Kroman, George Franklin, AO38500.
La Casse, Wyndall, AO56633.
Lane, David Timothy, AO56605.
Larkin, Harold Joseph, AO56593.
×Laroche, Edward Arthur, AO56610.
×Laroche, Harold Douglas, AO50482.
Lawrynovicz, Casimer Paul, AO56627.
Lemon, Austin Cecil, Jr., AO50429.
Leonard, James Martin, AO50462.
Lewis, Theodore Shelby, AO50484.
Lind, Charles Louis, AO50423.
Lingo, John Ellis, AO56602.
Loepkey, Charles Rudolph, AO56603.
×Loesch, George Peter, AO50511.
×Lowry, Merlin Dolynn, AO56659.
Lucy, Robert Stanley, AO50454.

McCulley, Neil W., AO56643.
McKusker, Kent Marcus, AO56591.
Miller, James Micou, AO38490.
×Moore, Frank Grae, AO50492.
Mungenast, Andrew John, AO50446.
Nastoff, Daniel, AO50433.
Neal, Thomas James, AO38494.
Neiss, Ainsley Thomas, AO50448.
×Nelson, Thomas O'Neil, AO56670.
Newkirk, Mahlon Max, AO50431.
Newman, Robert Colea, Jr., AO38493.
Nissen, Jim Christian, AO50493.
×Norberg, Marcus Lynn, AO50483.
Odiorne, John McFall, AO50434.
Oliver, John Walthall, Jr., AO56642.
×Orlando, Michael Amato, AO56649.
Pakalka, William, AO50426.
Patson, George J., AO56629.
Payne, William Raymond, AO50479.
×Pelzel, Alfred Otto, AO56665.
Perry, William Edward, Jr., AO56618.
Peterson, Hilden Eugene, AO56624.
Pohlen, Paul Donald, AO56660.
Quinn, John Tietjen, AO38503.
Raine, C. O., 3d, AO38504.
Ratto, Stanley Nicholas, AO50461.
Robinson, Marion Moore, AO50459.
Rezelle, Vernon Lawrence, AO56614.
Rushlow, Frederick Edward, Jr., AO56609.
Seales, Lowell D., AO50424.
Self, David Anthony, Jr., AO50465.
Shadel, William Noel, AO56657.
Shearer, Wayne Gordon, AO38506.
Sinclair, William Donald, AO50513.
×Sizemore, Robert, AO56639.
Skiffington, Thomas Joseph, AO56595.
Slay, Alton Davis, AO50496.
Smith, Howard Persons, Jr., AO41347.
×Smith, Joe Hill, Jr., AO50444.
Smith, Roscoe Beverly, AO38508.
Stickney, Lawrence Mallory, AO50441.
Stockton, Glen William, AO38498.
Stukas, Robert Russel, AO50478.
×Switzer, John Wilbur, AO39476.
Taylor, Charlie Tilphord, Jr., AO50480.
Timmie, James Davis, AO50506.
×Unger, Edward Frank, AO56616.
Van Liere, William Peter, AO56620.
Vermeire, Virgil Louis, AO50452.
Walsh, Theodore Harold, AO56608.
×Warden, Rex Wall, Jr., AO50508.
Wareham, Samuel Arnold, AO50477.
×Warren, Willard, AO38510.
Webb, James Edward, AO39478.
Wiley, Miles Carter, Jr., AO41341.
Woolfolk, William Francis, AO56645.
Yeaton, Carl George, AO56698.

NOTE.—All officers named on this nomination received recess promotions during the recess of the Senate. Dates of rank for those officers nominated for promotion to the grade of first lieutenant are not indicated as these officers were promoted between July 2, 1948, and December 30, 1948.

PROMOTIONS IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 518 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion.

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from January 2, 1949

×Alston, Robert Philip, AO29057.
Asch, William Waldo, AO50964.
Bankard, Roy Thomas, AO29049.
Bell, Charlie Hilliard, AO41516.
Bell, Lawrence Duffy, AO39574.
Breedlove, Clarence Henry, AO38618.
×Broadhurst, Richard Bishop, AO50968.
Clark, Kenneth Malcolm, AO41487.
×Cleveland, Sidney Eugene, AO41482.
×Clough, Ernest Lynwood, AO41492.
Collett, Wells, AO29016.
Craig, Harry William, AO41481.
Craig, Joseph Oliver, AO41468.
×Dean, Lloyd C., AO50996.
Dellinger, Olin Elbridge, AO41544.
Drittler, Frank John, AO50992.
Eckhoff, Harry Charles, AO41522.
Fackler, Homer Elmer, AO28934.
Fagan, Thomas Moulton, AO41515.
Faubion, Richard William, AO28972.
×Freeman, Cleon Eugene, AO51020.
Fuller, John Ray, AO50977.
×Garber, Gares, AO29059.
×Gribi, Sam Gotlieb, AO29000.
Gross, John Goodhart, AO29291.
Handwork, Bertrand A., AO41546.
Hawley, Ray Matthew, AO41519.
Herbine, Richard Gernant, AO41474.
Hillman, Edgar Kendall, AO29030.
Hinds, Paul, AO28986.
Hopkins, Philip Emmett, AO41570.
Howard, George Sallade, AO41509.
Hutchison, Clifton Cornelius, AO51000.
King, Marcus Randolph, AO41499.
×Kneussl, James Kenneth, AO39508.
Lansing, James Waggoner, AO41520.
Larsen, Arthur James, AO41541.
×Leuenberger, Harold Walter, AO41557.
Lewis, Gomer, AO41532.
Lewis, Jackson, Wesley, AO29006.
Light, Eugene Clarke, AO28995.
Logsdon, Krit Gibson, AO39582.
×Marshall, Stewart Andrew, Jr., AO41560.
×McKenzie, Arnold Edwin, AO41527.
Meserve, George Donald, AO41502.
Miller, Robert Samuel, AO41551.
Moreland, Lester Duane, AO41543.
Morris, James Bingham, AO50962.
×Moseley, Stuart Younger, AO41510.
Nabell, Edward Gordon, Jr., AO28929.
O'Keefe, Keefe, AO39556.
Potter, Merwin Elwood, AO50984.
Powell, Hubert Glenwood, AO50988.
×Purviance, Russell Alpheus, AO41567.
Ready, William Drennan, AO38617.
×Reverski, Harold Frederick, AO50961.
Sebode, Martin Fred Charles, AO41496.
Sheldon, Clifford Arthur, AO38615.
Sims, Robert D., AO50953.
×Stuart, Frank Bailey, AO41568.
×Thacker, Lloyd William, AO50991.
Todd, Harold Elworthy, AO38614.
Tunberg, Bertel Karl, AO41524.
Turner, Charles Marion, AO41511.
Williams, Frank Welbourne, AO50974.
×Yater, Moss, AO41564.

To be majors with rank from January 2, 1949

×Adams, Irving Winthrop, AO51616.
Alexander, Marvin, AO30501.
×Arietta, Frank, AO51619.
Badley, Burton Elmore, AO39974.
Barger, Walter Berl, AO42436.
×Barrett, Buford Russell, AO51686.
Batty, Paul Stewart, AO51738.
Berry, Ralph Clifton, AO30476.
Borecky, Antone, AO51565.
×Brown, Coke Fowler, Jr., AO51591.
Bullock, William Wilson, AO51692.
×Butt, Stanley Samuel, AO30387.
Carey, Eugene Courtney, AO42668.
Chioffe, Harry Vincent, AO51614.
Ciccone, Mario Augustus, AO51560.
Clarke, Charles E., AO51554.
Clist, Angus Southey, AO38800.
Cone, Charles Louis, AO42696.
Coursey, Harry, AO20026.
Crabbe, Gerald William, AO39930.
Davis, James Beatty, AO51636.
×Dillemuth, George Frederick, AO39928.
Downing, John Weaver, AO42653.
Eirick, Robert McCurdy, AO42465.
Fisher, Henry Bishop, AO20043.
Ford, Herman, Wendell, AO42450.
Gaffney, John Bedford, AO42459.
Galer, Michael John, AO51549.
Gephart, Harry Lane, AO42650.
×Gibbs, Howard Jefferson, AO42686.
×Gilland, William Flinn, AO51552.
Gordon, Edward Louis, AO51695.
Groves, Fergus Coleman, AO42478.
×Hall, Claude, Newton, AO51721.
×Hartley, Edwin Alexander, AO30368.
Heath, Lester Ellis, AO42723.
Heaton, Herman Shelby, AO42569.
Herndon, George Berry, AO42694.
×Hickox, Dan Whitney, AO51592.
Hodson, James Albert, AO51683.
Hooks, Claud Hardy, AO51649.
×Horseman, Reginald James, AO51585.
Jennette, John Henry, AO42529.
Klaas, John Henry, AO51601.
×Kolbus, Walter Benjamin, AO42469.
Linberg, Leif William, AO42709.
×Livingston, James Lee, AO51586.
Mandel, Samuel, AO42738.
Mandell, Leo, AO51558.
Matthews, William Stuart, Jr., AO42499.
McCaslin, Orval Howard, AO30375.
McNew, Glen Talmage, AO51610.
Mitchell, Howard Albert, AO42547.
×Monford, Harry Nirkirk, AO42675.
×Newman, Samuel William, AO51698.
Niskanen, William, AO42649.
×Noakes, Gilbert Fulton, AO30352.
Pocock, William Stephen, Jr., AO38796.
Quattlebaum, Arthur Cecil, AO42698.
×Ray, Hugh Jefferson, AO51716.
Rhoads, Donald Carson, AO51553.
×Richardson, Edward Charles, AO51625.
×Riggs, John Wesley, AO51583.
Roberts, Tracy Lloyd, AO51620.
×Rogers, Frank, AO42496.
×Ross, Robert Clement, AO51587.
Sargeant, Bliss Pilgrim, Jr., AO42684.
Schmidt, Eugene E., AO51681.
Sharp, Douglas, AO51630.
×Siemon, August Francis, AO51607.
Smith, Edward Cecil, AO42687.
×Smith, Ira Hyatt, AO42544.
Spence, George Gillies, AO42681.
Springfield, Robert Walter, AO51650.
States, Charles Adelbert, AO42548.
Steves, Fred Le Monte, AO30302.
Stickle, Horton Whitefield, Jr., AO51661.
×Strandberg, Earl Rodell, AO51719.
Tarson, Herbert Harvey, AO30568.
Terry, James Bell, AO51720.
Tolle, Carroll Keith, AO51726.
×Tucker, Almon A., AO42462.
Tucker, Temple Arthur, AO42717.
×Wheeler, Charles Alfred, AO51599.
Whiteside, Sam, AO42550.
Wine, Leonard Eldon, AO42305.
×Withington, Kenneth, AO42522.
×Yount, Dean Burdette, AO42652.

To be captains with rank from January 2, 1949

Abbitt, Charles Webb, AO46254.
Abernethy, Robert Joseph, AO35676.
Acebedo, Adrian Wood, AO46130.
Ackerman, Donald Leroy, AO46699.
Adair, Asa Andrew, AO46911.
Adams, Bill Russell, AO35312.
Adams, Charley John, AO45207.
Adams, John Clayton, Jr., AO24924.
×Adams, William Henderson, Jr., AO46775.
Addis, Walter Arthur, AO53986.
×Agne, Howard Charles, Jr., AO45400.
Aitken, John, Jr., AO39176.
×Akers, William Dale, AO45426.
Alba, Michael, AO53741.
Alexander, Arthur Kenneth, AO47116.
×Alexander, Woodrow Ervin, AO53059.
Allen, Arvol Duane, AO24795.
Allen, Hubert Eldridge, AO53975.
×Allen, Merle Francis, Jr., AO47141.
Allen, William Carroll, AO47045.
Allison, Eugene, AO46751.
Anderson, John Herman, AO35609.
Anderson, Ralph Richardson, Jr., AO54022.
×Anderson, Richard Roth, AO47242.
Anderson, Richard William, AO45315.
Anderson, Wyman Doyle, AO46905.
×Andresen, Malcolm Knapp, AO53760.
×Angevine, Frank Willis, AO47282.
×Arens, Herbert William, AO46653.
Armstrong, John Alan, AO53381.
×Arnold, Harold Mort, AO53046.
×Ash, Stanley James, AO45430.
Ashcraft, Gerald Scott, AO47037.
Ashley, Garland Olsen, AO47266.
Ashton, Morton Ross, AO53578.
Atkinson, Ivan Charles, AO46526.
Austin, Joe, Jr., AO53807.
×Ayers, Augustine William, AO53938.
Back, Charles Harold, AO45882.
Badgett, William Ross, AO46550.
×Badraun, Warren Wendell, AO53803.

Baker, Marvin Earl, AO53554.
Baker, Robert Gordon, AO53156.
Baker, William Virgil, AO35765.
Bakewell, Don Albert, AO47236.
Baldwin, Allen Edward, AO53250.
×Baldwin, Elwyn Seward, AO53086.
Baldwin, Garde Bowles, AO35058.
×Baldwin, Irl Edgar, AO53464.
Baliga, Joseph Robert, AO45329.
Ball, Fred George, AO53236.
Ballard, Herbert LaRoy, AO53530.
×Ballinger, Edward Paxton, AO47813.
Ballweg, Lawrence Henry, AO46355.
×Barker, Arthur Forbes, AO46276.
Barker, Glenn Snyder, AO46779.
×Barker, Stephen Ray, Jr., AO35722.
Barley, John Nicholas, AO36036.
Barnes, George Roy, AO43077.
×Barr, Robert Ray, AO53539.
Barrentine, George Thomas, AO47279.
Barrett, Harold Warren, AO53139.
Barrett, James Herman, Jr., AO46750.
Bartos, Edmund John, AO35928.
Bashant, Norman William, AO45158.
Bastian, Earl Lehne, AO5511P.
Battle, John Samuel, AO33573.
Bauer, James Earl, AO46844.
Bauers, Frank William, Jr., AO53469.
Bean, Joe Merritt, AO33731.
×Bearden, Joe, AO53592.
Beary, Kermit Edwin, AO35872.
Beaty, William Emery, Jr., AO46102.
Beaven, William Morris, AO46442.
Beck, James Alston, AO45440.
Beckham, Vance Wesley, AO45223.
Beebout, Vance LeRoy, AO46658.
Beeler, Robert Lee, Jr., AO47124.
×Behrens, John Nevin, AO46415.
×Bell, Gerald Benjamin, AO53711.
Bell, Jack Anthony, AO47103.
Bell, Roscoe Leonard, AO47028.
Bell, Thomas Angus, AO45419.
Bellan, Rudolph Alexander, AO47243.
Benner, Ralph Warren, AO46463.
Bennett, Warren Allen, AO53347.
Bency, Harlan Hults, AO53627.
×Benson, August Gerald, AO53580.
Benson, Morrie, AO35946.
Benton, Roger, Gardiner, AO47158.
Beretta, Alessandro Harry, AO53859.
Berk, Irving Boris, AO46663.
Berman, Harold, AO46657.
×Berthiaume, Raymond Francis, AO46863.
Bickerstaff, Curtis Ergil, AO39133.
×Biggs, Ernest Edgar, AO36051.
Bilotta, Joseph Paul, AO35957.
×Bilyeu, Hal Errett, AO46802.
×Binks, William Porter, Jr., AO46147.
Binnell, Francis Elwin, AO39184.
Bird, Sidney Albert, AO53645.
Black, John Lewis, AO35877.
Black, William Howard, AO46305.
Blackwell, Anslum McLaurin, AO33711.
×Blackwell, Lynn Douglas, AO34784.
Blair, Duane Charles, AO45442.
Blair, Frank Sloan, AO53920.
Bledsoe, Samuel Black, Jr., AO53713.
Bock, Floyd Oscar, AO45161.
Bock, Harry, AO46496.
Bone, Marshall Baker, AO46918.
×Bonner, Thomas Woodrow, AO46619.
×Booth, Clifford Richard, AO46812.
Boren, Francis Terance, AO45326.
Boren, James Russell, AO46967.
Bortell, Charles Kelly, AO24943.
Boston, James Dwight, Jr., AO53009.
×Bounds, William Faye, AO35141.
Bowden, John Daniel, Jr., AO47111.
Bowen, Lewis Love, AO53490.
Bowers, Waldo, AO45282.
Bowers, William Robert, AO47069.
Box, Francis Marion, AO46295.
Boyd, Robert Watson, AO45314.
Boyd, Wilmer Ellsworth, AO53043.
Boyer, Max Weldon, AO35659.
Bradley, James Lewis, Jr., AO53907.
Bradley, Leonidas Cicero, Jr., AO53637.
Brady, Bernard John, AO46512.
Brailey, Walter Suvier, Jr., AO40788.
Brandon, Harold Edward, AO46964.
Brandstrom, Alfred Raymond Williams, AO53686.
Brant, Francis Arthur, AO46786.
Brantley, William Lawrence, AO53946.
×Brassfield, William Herbert, AO53944.
Brazil, Virgil Lee, AO47072.
Brazile, Berry Dee, AO46624.
Brengle, Paul Staley, AO45322.
Brennan, David Thomas, AO53676.
Bressan, Christopher, AO47119.
Brewer, James Franklin, AO45293.
Briery, Jack, AO53947.
Briggs, James Kay, AO25288.
Brtley, Carlus Lindon, AO53066.
Brimberry, Will Olan, AO46729.
×Brimhall, Victor Owen, AO53916.
Brinegar, Marion Frederick, AO46826.
Britt, Jessie Willard, AO52648.
Britton, Wilbur Randall, AO35506.
Brockman, Warren Douglas, AO47048.
×Brooks, Clarence Rolland, AO46408.
×Brooks, Donald Leroy, AO45270.
Brown, Clarence Washburn, AO36158.
Brown, Claude Joseph, AO53756.
Brown, Clement Frazier, Jr., AO39212.
Brown, David Anthony, Jr., AO36094.
×Brown, John Harrington, AO39162.
Brown, John Todd, Jr., AO45317.
×Brown, Kimbrough Stone, AO46404.
Brown, Ned Halstead, AO52344.
×Brown, Robert Gardiner, AO46869.
Bruce, Avery Creedon, Jr., AO53533.
×Brundage, Robert Sayles, AO45481.
Brundydge, Henry Harold, AO46264.
Bruner, William Preston, AO34733.
Brush, Elvin Watson, AO46478.
Bryant, Donald Daniel, AO46321.
×Bryant, James Robert, AO33845.
Buckhiester, Wendell McCall, AO45341.
Buckwalter, John Stump, AO39197.
Budroe, George Leon, AO53689.
Burgeson, Darell George, AO35878.
×Burk, Marvin Franklin, AO53532.
Burke, Billy, AO46369.
Burns, Robert James, AO47247.
×Burris, John Franklin, AO34680.
Burt, George Washington 3d, AO47126.
Burtnette, Claude Sidie, Jr., AO53467.
×Burton, Herbert Clarence, AO53847.
Burwell, John David, AO53747.
Bush, Beverly Oliver, AO45318.
×Bush, John E., AO46857.
Bye, George Ewing, AO46568.
Byers, Howard Earl AO53698.
Byers, John Albert, AO46377.
Bynum, Clyde Holstun, AO53107.
Byrne, George Thomas, AO33686.
×Byrnes, Conley Henderson, AO53566.
Cain, James Walter, AO53736.
×Caldcleugh, Clarence Milton, AO45238.
Caldwell, John James, Jr., AO53649.
Callis, William Alexander, AO47167.
Calnon, Jack Fred, AO47183.
Campbell, Claude Whitner, AO46840.
Cannon, William Boyd, AO47227.
Cantor, Al, AO52919.
Caplan, Aaron Edward, AO46667.
×Carlco, Robert Martin, AO45449.
Carr, George Theron, AO53355.
Carson, Charles Raymond, AO53593.
Carter, Walter Thomas, AO35921.
Caskey, James William, AO46915.
Cauble, Mark Waverly, Jr., AO45766.
Cavoli, William Joseph, AO46806.
×Champion, Patrick David, AO45221.
Chesmore, Emery Richard, AO16419.
Christiansen, Kenneth Paul, AO47035.
Christianson, Lyle Clinton, AO47120.
Clair, William Alonzo, AO46346.
×Clark, Cortis Anderson, Jr., AO45732.
Clark, Jack Wilson, AO45703.
×Clark, John Max, AO53806.
×Clark, Wallace Nichols, AO46929.
Clements, Manen Osco, Jr., AO45787.
Clymer, Harvey Claude, AO35930.
Coakley, Donald Virgil, AO53605.
Coe, Grover Krueger, AO35311.
Colchagoff, George Demeter, AO53727.
Coleman, William Woodrow, Jr., AO45635.
×Colley, Gordon Townsend, AO34409.
Collie, Robert Lucius, AO53534.
×Collings, Orval Dwain, AO45312.
Collins, Hamilton Purcell, AO52975.
Combs, Lloyd Donald, AO46960.
Compton, William Benjamin, AO34920.
Conley, Bruce Roff, AO33638.
Conners, Thomas Aloysius, AO46756.
×Cook, Edwin Jarecki, AO53601.
×Cook, Eugene Harry, AO53544.
×Cooney, Frank William, Jr., AO46823.
Cooper, Roy D., AO45296.
×Copley, Robert Edgar, AO45570.
Corcoran, Edward Lawrence, AO24853.
×Correll, Harold McCullough, AO53310.
Correll, Tommy Elbert, AO35702.
Cosby, William Lee, Jr., AO53845.
Cosel, Rirhard Morton, AO46667.
Cotter, James Daniel, AO45267.
Cottrell, Bert Maxwell, Jr., AO46012.
×Covell, Paul Michael, AO45436.
Cox, Luther Christian, AO46795.
Cox, Nicholas Henry, AO46729.
Cox, Omer Loraine, AO40801.
Craft, Albert Olaf, AO45264.
×Champton, William Cowles, AO53697.
Craven, Charles Waller, AO35404.
Crawford, John Douglas, Jr., AO46522.
Crawford, Richard Wallace, AO46862.
×Crawford, Robert, AO45261.
×Creighton, Crandell Charles, AO46790.
Crilly, James Calvin, AO36212.
Cronin, Harold Joseph, AO39178.
Cronkhite, John Lyle, AO35625.
Crosby, John William, AO35945.
×Cross, George Edward, Jr., AO46411.
Crowder, Noral Farrel, AO46678.
Crutcher, Robert Bryan, AO53346.
×Culp, William Kenneth, AO53318.
×Culp, Willis Powell, AO56905.
Culwell, Orrel, AO46888.
Cummings, Claude Harold, Jr., AO39158.
Curran, Arthur Ranger, AO36001.
×Curtis, James Edward, AO36052.
×Cushman, George Hawley, AO46455.
Czapski, Edmund, AO46723.
Dabolt, Robert Lewis, AO53488.
Dafler, Henry Arthur, AO46568.
Dahl, Norval Alfred, AO46508.
Dahl, Paul Warren, AO45972.
×Dailey, John Joseph, Jr., AO53941.
Dale, Theodore Roosevelt, AO34751.
Dannelly, Frank Porter, AO35565.
×Daugherty, Francis Leslie, Jr., AO53307.
Davis, Calvin Crawford, AO47129.
Davis, Charles Irving, Jr., AO33653.
×Davis, George Harrison, AO45915.
Davis, James Daniel, AO46842.
Davis, John Pheron, AO40728.
Davis, Paul Allen, AO46555.
Davis, Robert Emmett, AO40824.
Davis, William Francis, AO35663.
Davison, Walter Corwin, AO52993.
×Deangelis, John Jean, AO46501.
DeBord, Robert Louis, AO35125.
×DeCesare, Anaclethe, AO53971.
×DeGiacomo, Gene Michael, AO53668.
DePriest, Wilson Marshall, AO33863.
Devoe, Robert Charles, AO39214.
Devore, Ralph Nelson, AO53719.
×Deakyne, Howard Carl, Jr., AO53655.
Dean, Floyd Rhadamanthus, AO45607.
×Decker, Harold Raymond, AO46414.
Decker, John Allen, AO46315.
Dees, Robert William, AO45966.
×Deitch, Raymond Roland, AO46631.
Delanoy, Charles Wesley, AO40587.
Dent, George Herndon, AO53615.
Derck, Walter Frank, AO45472.
×Dibble, George Arthur, 2d, AO53576.
Dickert, James Ray, AO45461.
Dickey, Woodrow Wilson, AO48038.
Dillon, Francis Joseph, Jr., AO46718.
Donahue, Donald Augustine, AO53617.
Donohue, John William, AO53759.
Doolittle, James Harold, Jr., AO53465.
Dougan, William Page, AO47016.
Dougherty, Ralph Edwin, AO36116.
×Douglas, Robert Emmet, AO36769.
Downey, Robert John, AO34652.
Downing, Alvin Joseph, AO45165.
×Doyle, Lloyd George, AO40364.
×Draemel, Dean Harlan, AO53898.
Dubois, William Jay, AO35733.
Dufresne, Roland Joseph, AO35574.
Duckworth, Ernest Marion, AO33828.
×Duda, William, AO40603.

Dugger, James Ernest, Jr., AO46702.
Dumas, James Lee, AO35393.
Duncan, Cecil Charles, AO53646.
Durston, Glyn, AO46662.
Dzamba, John Pershing, AO35308.
Eberenz, Richard Joseph, AO34236.
Eckley, Paul Witherspoon, AO 53466.
Eddy, Harvey William, AO53575.
Edelen, Carroll Lee, AO53785.
Edwards, John Lee, Jr., AO53114.
Edwards, Joseph Ellison, AO47168.
×Egert, John, 3d, AO40610.
Eisert, Fred Joseph, AO45297.
Eldridge, George William, AO36256.
Eley, Carl Wayne, AO53909.
Ellifritz, Vernon, AO46323.
Ellis, Charles Justice, Jr., AO47177.
×Ellis, Samuel Wayne, AO46366.
×Ellis, Sherman Edward, AO53485.
Ely, Kenneth Eugene, AO45369.
×Emmons, Perry Chauncey, AO47163.
Epperson, Virgil Roland, AO45404.
Erspamer, Curtis Richard, AO52941.
Ervin, Davis Fletcher, Jr., AO39086.
Espinosa, Lorenzo, AO52938.
Evens, Bruce Harvey, AO45167.
×Everett, Phillip Eugene, AO47216.
Ezekiel, Thomas Clark, AO46076.
×Fancher, Robert Edwin, AO45474.
Farrell, John Edward, 2d, AO52942.
×Fassmann, LeRoy John, AO53461.
Favors, Marcus William, AO46938.
Fehrenbacher, Joseph Harold Thomas, AO46617.
Feicht, Edward R., Jr., AO46170.
Ferguson, Roy Eugene, AO35612.
Ferrari, Joseph Salvadore, AO53718.
Feser, Joseph Leonard, AO45259.
Fetterly, Donald John Walter, AO45310.
Fields, Lloyd Fondren, AO46644.
×Fife, William Paul, AO25085.
Fillos, John Edward, AO45382.
Finton, James Robert, AO46132.
Firestone, Clinton Dewitt, Jr., AO46123.
Fisher, Max Leroy, AO53903.
Fisher, Norman Decatur, AO53235.
Fitz, Robert Ernest, AO45397.
Fiumara, James Martin, AO35772.
Fleming, David Thomas, AO53633.
Fleming, William Harry, Jr., AO45713.
Flentke, Donald LeRoy, AO47138.
Flesner, Eugene Edward, AO39211.
×Floyd, Percy Mellor, Jr., AO45251.
Flynn, Thomas Grover, Jr., AO46901.
Focht, Robert Henry, AO53876.
Foley, James Edwin, AO24624.
Fortner, John William, AO52949.
Foss, Joseph Aldridge, AO46164.
×Foster, Otis, Jr., AO46809.
Foster, Robert Lee, AO54026.
Foust, David Howard, AO53860.
×Fowler, J. Riley, AO46393.
Fowler, John Russell, AO46634.
Frawley, Allen Everett, AO24855.
Freed, Lyle Chambers, AO33679.
French, Joseph Elmer, AO53293.
French, Philip Nelmes, AO47042.
Friedline, George Jonathan, AO46556.
Friedman, Leon Jerome, AO46717.
Frink, Earl Eby, AO53015.
Fritchman, Curtis Clayton, AO53202.
Fross, Horton Lawrence, AO35766.
×Frost, Foy Benson, AO53674.
Frost, Jack William, AO39081.
Fuchs, William Robert, AO46423.
Fuerst, Robert Edward, AO53345.
Furbee, Charles Elbert, AO46559.
Furst, Howard Irving, AO53953.
Gaede, David Livingstone, AO45823.
×Gahl, Ralph Dana, AO46914.
Gallogly, William Francis, AO35541.
Gannon, John Ernest, AO35816.
Garber, Harold, AO46558.
Garcia, Abraham Gabriel, AO46980.
Gardinier, Russell John, AO35771.
Garfinkel, Bernard, AO53157.
×Garrett, William Alton, AO46438.
×Garrison, Harry Anthony, AO53638.
Garrison, John Henry, Jr., AO45399.
Gaspard, Richard Eddy, AO24727.
Gaston, Arthur Dale, AO35374.
Gault, James Andrew, 3d, AO36021.
×Gawthorp, Paul, AO46586.
Gay, Robert Eugene, AO53410.
Gay, William Marcus, AO47065.
×Gaygan, Jack Aloysius, AO53232.
Gebaur, Arthur William, Jr., AO54007.
Geck, John James, AO44832.
×Gentry, M. D., AO46397.
George, Arthur Franklin, AO53562.
George, Paul Ernest, AO45248.
Gervase, Edward Mark, AO46932.
Gessner, Harlan William, AO45625.
Gianatsis, James Arthur, AO45375.
Giannini, Jack Lloyd, AO54009.
Gibson, Orrin Lovewell, AO47067.
Giddings, Richard Elmer, AO46543.
×Giese, Edwin James, AO53873.
×Gilbert, Jack Clifford, AO40879.
Gilkerson, Harold Raymond, AO45179.
Gill, William Alexander, AO46927.
Gillett, Richard LeMar, AO39140.
Gillis, Jack Thomas, AO53848.
Gilmore, James Robson, AO53321.
×Gilpin, John Ashbrook, AO53526.
Girard, Henry John, AO36213.
Gisel, Clarence Paul, AO53735.
Gladstone, James Tatum, AO35631.
×Glettler, Bernard Urban, AO45408.
×Glickman, Emanuel, AO46402.
Glyer, John Robert, AO35364.
Godsey, Joseph Daughety, AO45342.
Gold, Joe Milton, Jr., AO46742.
Goller, Fred Franquet, AO46517.
×Good, Clyde Earl, AO47237.
×Goodbread, Jonah Eugene, AO53521.
×Goodson, Walter Cass, AO53509.
Goodwin, Dexter Beven, AO40765.
Gordon, Anyan Allison, AO45216.
Gordon, Benjamin, AO52968.
Gordon, Vincent Paul, AO53049.
×Gorgol, George Frank, AO53506.
Gosnell, Emmett, AO45385.
×Grady, Robert Joseph, AO36261.
Graham, H. Allen, AO53369.
Grant, John Clifford, Jr., AO35692.
Gray, Billy Cooper, AO35764.
Gray, Zack, AO40708.
Greenwood Thomas William, Jr., AO46854.
Gregg, Charles Robert, AO47056.
Griffin, Ira Lester, AO46791.
Griffin, Ralph Harvy, AO35782.
Grimwood, Don Milford, AO46252.
Grover, Roy Lee, AO53917.
Gshwandtner, Frank Joseph, AO53892.
Gudith, Roy Elmer, AO39168.
Guinnee, Robert Peter, AO47039.
×Gunning, Edward Joseph, AO46976.
×Gunther, Robert William, AO35788.
Guy, Carroll Wilson, AO53515.
×Guyer, Loren Ezra, AO35473.
×Halber, Alexander Dominic, AO33115.
Hale, Ivan Lee, AO33810.
×Hallett, Duane Hartley, AO53659.
Hamblen, William, AO35466.
Hamilton, Charles Edward, Jr., AO53427.
Hamilton, George Granville, O52971.
Hammer, Kenneth Merle, AO46498.
Hammett, Charles Edgar, AO47110.
Hancock, Jack Leland, AO35880.
Hanger, Harry Hunter, AO45391.
Hanlen, Joseph Richard, AO53800.
×Hanson, Marshall Everette, AO53034.
×Harb, Wallace Sylvester, AO46324.
Harchalk, George, AO53578.
×Hardison, John David, AO53561.
Hargis, Troy Alvis, AO53348.
×Harless, Leonard Jackson, AO53127.
Harmon, Clarence Lurlin, Jr., AO35562.
Harms, Warden Dana, AO46325.
×Harrelson, Jay Barnard, AO35298.
Harrington, Jasper Jackson, AO46566.
Harris, Charles Alexander, AO36219.
Harris, Howard Lee, Jr., AO47109.
Harris, Jack Hamilton, AO34946.
Harris, Wallace Andrew, AO45744.
Harris, Walter Raymond, Jr., AO45910.
Harris, William Patterson, AO53839.
Harrison, Charles Dean, AO53522.
×Harrison, Robert Clarence, AO39124.
×Hart, Gordon Lamar, AO46430.
Hart, Raymond Jay, AO47064.
Harvey, Luther Rockwood, AO33681.
Hasskamp, Harold Edward, AO53906.
Hathorn, Vernon Burkett, Jr., AO35253.
Hathway, James Ayers, AO46726.
Hau, Andrew Jerome, AO53970.
×Havens, John Jacob, AO45450.
Hawthorne, Cooper Franklin, AO46431.
Hayes, Burgain Garfield, AO35433.
×Hayes, Harold Carl, AO45467.
Hayes, Oliver Thomas, Jr., AO33883.
Hayter, Gerald Hargrave, AO47248.
Hearn, Walter Jackson, AO53827.
Heiman, Grover George, Jr., AO45457.
Heissenbuttel, William George, AO45247.
×Helvey, Hazen Dale, AO45999.
Henry, Charles Fogg, AO53752.
×Hensley, Harold Storey, Jr., AO46647.
Henton, Samuel Hampton, Jr., AO25006.
×Herbold, Robert Vernon, AO34765.
Herweg, John Bernard, AO54470.
Hessey, Francis Dodson, AO46054.
Hesterberg, Raymond Chester, AO46741.
Hickey, Rolet V., AO46376.
×Hickman, John Clark, AO45232.
Hicks, Lonnie Walton, Jr., AO47223.
Hicky, Dan McHenry, AO47020.
×Hill, Gordon, AO45393.
×Hill, John Kenneth, AO45155.
Hill, William Harris, AO46482.
Hilliard, Ray Lewis, AO53468.
Hilton, John William, AO53416.
Hinton, Jay Stephen, AO36223.
Hislop, James Stewart, AO46568.
Hitchcock, Charles Ivan, AO46030.
Hoagland, Edward Carl, Jr., AO46982.
×Hobson, Richard Eugene, AO46676.
Hockett, Chester A., AO35316.
Hodgkin, Myrl Norris, AO47185.
Hodgson, Charles Willis, AO46855.
Hoff, Burton Marvin, AO36555.
Hogan, Floyd Hyer, AO46827.
×Hoke, DeAlbert Southerland, Jr., AO46209.
Holden, William John, AO46567.
Hollinger, Llewellyin Earl, AO35887.
Hollingsworth, Dal Oliver, AO35401.
Holmes, Besby Frank, AO45722.
Holmes, Elwin Franklin, AO46711.
Holmes, John Hooper, AO45304.
×Holstead, James Rex, AO47057.
×Hooker, Freeman Fernando, AO54150.
Hopfenspirger, Thomas Warren, AO45640.
Hopkins, Harold Jessie, AO53071.
×Hopper, Roy James, AO35847.
Horn, Frank William, Jr., AO47153.
Horton, Harold Everett, AO46449.
Hostler, Gilbert Earl, AO53790.
×Houston, Cornell Clifford, AO47173.
Howe, Charles Elbridge, Jr., AO24782.
Howe, Robert Maitland, AO39134.
×Howell, James Ralph, AO53066.
×Huard, Norman Phillip, AO45398.
Hubbs, Edgar Henry, AO46620.
Hudson, Reed Clin, AO47143.
×Huebner, William Anthony, AO53585.
Huggard, Peter John, Jr., AO46920.
Hughes, William Evan, AO45214.
×Huguley, Edward Amos, AO52957.
Hull, Joseph DuBarry, AO46257.
Hume, Robert Adelbert, AO35742.
×Hunt, John Graham, AO46797.
×Hunt, Richard Hugh, AO53720.
Hunter, James Edward, AO35637.
×Hupperich, Herman Culrose, AO45896.
Hurt, Charles Clyde, AO36233.
×Husemoller, Kenneth Earl, AO39209.
Huston, James Leslie, Jr., AO53732.
Hutchins, Ralph, AO47096.
Illing, Richard George, AO46572.
Ingalls, Murray Harold, AO54006.
×Ingram, Sidney Oscar, Jr., AO46375.
Italia, Santo, AO53979.
Ivey, James Monroe, Jr., AO53065.
Jackson, Larkin LeRoy, AO45251.
×Jacoby, Joseph Harry, AO33273.
×James, Paul Carr, AO40773.
Jarrell, Howard Ray, AO46851.
Jarvis, Melvin Eugene, AO35889.
Jenkins, Donald Eugene, AO47131.
Jensen, Howard Warren, AO45299.
×Jensen, Willard Cecilius, AO35613.
Jenstrom, Eino Emil, AO53900.

×Johnson, Percl William, AO53329.
Johnson, Frank Burtis, AO46624.
Johnson, George Wilburn, Jr., AO47018.
Johnson, Isham Marvin, AO46937.
Johnson, Perry Guess, AO53233.
Johnson, Ralph R., Jr., AO46246.
Johnson, Raymond Fredric, AO53456.
Johnson, Roland Stuart, AO46701.
Johnston, Kingsley Maxwell, AO35068.
×Jones, Elmer Douglas, Jr., AO53511.
Jones, Ernest Charles, Jr., AO53841.
×Jones, Fred Guy, AO35890.
Jones, Garland Maurice, AO46798.
Jones, Harry Arthur Lawrence, Jr., AO53767.
×Jones, James Sompayrac, Jr., AO36013.
×Jones, Jerome Judson, AO35862.
×Jones, Lewis Carriker, AO46194.
Jones, Martin Luther, AO53640.
Jones, Robert John, AO34464.
×Jones, Warren Harding, AO46882.
Jordan, Jay Julian, AO45535.
×Joyner, William Holloway, AO53899.
Junker, Jules Xavier 3d, AO35805.
Kampmann, Charles William, AO53351.
×Kanter, Merwin, AO53028.
Karhuse, Carl Andrew, AO45689.
Kearney, Clinton Charles, AO52992.
×Keating, Walter Franklin, AO53571.
Keene, Forrest Matthew, Jr., AO47200.
×Keene, Thomas James, AO35088.
Kehoe, Nicholas Bernard, Jr., AO35962.
Keith, Benjamin Martin, Jr., AO33614.
Kelleher, William Francis, AO53208.
×Keller, Howard Wesley, AO53537.
Keller, Russell Aristides, AO53855.
×Kelly, Doran Louis, AO53669.
×Kelso, John Maller, AO56303.
×Kemp, Otto Carl, AO45283.
×Kemper, George Alex, Jr., AO47081.
Kendig, Robert Lintner, AO40591.
×Kennedy, Clarence Charles, AO36181.
Kenney, Richard Frusher, AO36044.
×Kesler, Joseph, Jr., AO46409.
Kidd, Campbell Augustus, AO52987.
Kiel, Kenneth J., AO45275.
×Kiesel, Chester Gustav, AO54420.
Kilman, Ray Richard, AO45369.
Kilness, Kenneth Freeman, AO45159.
×King, Joseph Franklin, AO36050
King, Joseph Henry, AO53487.
×King, Lester Stanley, AO35756.
×King, Max James, AO35523.
Kingery, William Ward, AO36005.
×Kirby, Frank Ernest, AO45259.
Kirkland, Jack Manuel, AO53894.
Kirsner, Sheldon Weiss, AO47218.
×Kjelland, James Oliver, AO34698.
Klemme, Meade, AO35875.
Kleppinger, Paul Gribble, AO47195.
Klotz, Robert Charles, AO45431.
Klucarich, Stephen, AO53014.
Kluender, Carl Albert, AO52979.
Knauber, Leo Von Moltke, AO52956.
×Knauf, Albert Sledge, AO46212.
Knisely, James William, AO52927.
Knofczynski, Joseph John, AO46197.
Knutson, Bruce Barry, AO53875.
Koepp, Harry Jesse, AO35936.
Koerschner, William Frederick, Jr., AO40749.
Koller, Rudolph Carl, Jr., AO46943.
Kramer, Guy Maurice, Jr., AO47149.
Krebs, John Louis, AO35485.
Kreps, Conrad, AO52928.
Krier, Rene John, AO46532.
Kunde, Clinton Myhre, AO52958.
Ladner, Pat Harrison, AO33691.
Lake, Donald Jackson, AO45547.
Lake, Robert Schmidt, AO46669.
Lally, Glenn John, AO47234.
Lamb, Gordon Douglas, AO53707.
×Lambert, Dwight Arden, AO46554.
Lambert, Lee Roy, AO47069.
Lambertson, Norman Franklin, Jr., AO46948.
Lamburth, James Laurence, AO53500.
Lane, George Vondoehlen, AO36331.
Lantz, Roy Frederick, AO45689.
Larsen, Marvin Henry, AO40801.
×Larson, Leon Hubert, Jr., AO46401.
Larson, Milo George, AO46831.
×Lassiter, Charles Beers, AO35177.
Latkovich, George, Jr., AO53581.
LeGrand, John Joseph, AO53620.
Leqwin, John Hardy, AO46072.
Ledbetter, Llewellyn Harper, AO53796.
Lee, Merle Julian, AO33602.
Lehman, Hugh Roberts, AO46740.
×Leighten, George David, AO53038.
Leonard, William Robert, AO54018.
Lett, William Robert, AO53903.
Lewandoski, Joseph Walter, AO53935.
Lewin, Walter William, AO45569.
Lewis, George Dewey, AO46222.
×Lewis, Roy, AO54019.
×Lewis, Stanley Coryell, AO35510.
×Lewis, Warren Russell, AO47106.
Leyrer, Robert Joseph, AO53286.
L'Heureux, Harry Daniel, AO47152.
Lian, Elmer Theodore, AO35189.
Libby, William Albert, AO53751.
×Lichte, Martin Edgar, AO53337.
Lightfoot, Berl Everett, AO47268.
Lindahl, Thomas Burdick, AO46448.
Lindquist, David Max Wadsworth, AO53473.
Linebaugh, John Harvey Moore, AO46871.
Lipari, James Raymond, AO53950.
Little, Robert Dickson, AO46761.
×Littrell, William Leon, AO46765.
Livingston, George Laeton, AO46764.
Lloyd, Marion Gene, AO34995.
Lockhart, George Madison, AO47022.
Logan, Samuel Porter, Jr., AO53840.
Long, Walter William, AO47097.
×Longridge, Thomas Maxwell, AO45379
Loomer, Perry Douglas, Jr., AO53757.
Lorino, Nash Earl, AO47001.
Lower, Charles, AO53031.
×Lowrance, Joseph Butler, Jr., AO32025.
Lutz, Charles Lester, AO53573.
Lutz, Reed Woodrow, AO53032.
Lynch, Clyde Melvin, AO59210.
Lyness, Charles Joseph, AO46936.
Lynn, Bert Hausmann, Jr., AO46702.
Lynn, William Jerome, AO35561.
MacAaron, Kenneth Abbott, AO43308.
×MacDonald, Earle Frederick, AO33990.
MacComba, Robert, AO52033.
Machemer, Carl Conrad, AO52642.
Mack, Ernest Wilmer, AO46680.
×Mackey, John Joseph, AO53130.
Magers, James William, AO46924.
Magness, Fed G., AO35516.
Maier, Oscar Lee Walter, AO35000.
×Malley, John Davidson, AO45287.
×Malmgren, Victor Paul, AO52924.
Malmstrom, Donald Oscar, AO53372.
×Malone, Francis Mathew, AO53050.
×Manch, Jacob Earle, AO34073.
Manley, James Colby, AO53355.
Manlove, Clifford Thomas, AO46730.
×Mann, Linn Embry, AO53654.
×Mann, Roy Everett, AO47245.
Manning, Albert Henry, Jr., AO46755.
×Manship, Joseph, AO45231.
Manteuffell, Roger William, AO36039.
×Manthe, Frederick Laverne, AO53501.
Mapes, Byron Alvin, Jr., AO46681.
Marple, George E., AO47249.
Marr, Frederick William, AO53761.
Marshall, Henry Curtis, Jr., AO53459.
Marsiglia, Joseph Pasquale, AO35711.
×Martin, Ewell, AO46364.
Martin, Frank Herbert, AO46447.
Martin, John Gordon, Jr., AO46202.
Martin, Kenneth Robert, AO53849.
Martin, Richard Reinhard, AO53902.
Martin, William Albert, AO53754.
Martin, William Price, AO53978.
×Mastropaolo, Salvatore, AO53764.
Mathews, Gerald Arthur, AO45460.
Mathias, Albert Christian, AO53911.
Mathis, Charles Eugene, AO53734.
Mathis, William Howard, AO53948.
×Matthews, Allen Randolph, AO46683.
Matthews, Jewell, Jr., AO3444.
Matthews, Thomas, AO53257.
Matthews, Thurman R., AO46564.
×Maucher, Robert Allen, AO46487.
×Maurer, Paul Henry, AO52999.
Maxey, Horace Hagood, AO47091.
×Maxey, Robert Lafayette, AO52970.
×Maya, Harold Douglas, AO45434.
Maya, John Billy, Jr., AO45559.
Maze, Charles Leslie, AO35947.
Mazza, Vincent, AO46776.
×McAllister, Ira Norton, AO53011.
McAuley, Milton Kenneth, AO53726.
McAuley, Walter J., Jr., AO53716.
McBeth, Harold William, AO47128.
McCabe, James Selby, AO45441.
McCalpin, Robert Anthony, AO46626.
McCauley, Harris Kelley, AO34069.
×McClellan, John Markle, AO46412.
McClelland, Alva Lawson, AO53869.
×McClendon, Lee, AO46703.
McClure, Frank Leslie, AO3539.
McColl, James Quentin, AO46051.
McCormick, Kenneth James, AO45243.
×McCurdy, Lauchlan Neil, AO52943.
McCutchen, Robert White, Jr., AO47229.
×McDill, James Nixson, AO53370.
McDonald, Donald Montrose, AO36237.
×McDonald, Paul Roger, AO45206.
McDowell, Bert, Jr., AO35202.
McElroy, Carroll Bernard, AO24426.
McGee, George Robert, AO47008.
McGill, John Raymond, AO35684.
×McGill, Paul Edward, AO54013.
McGrath, Thomas John, AO47127.
McHugh, John Francis, AO53961.
McIlhaney, Sam Frank, AO52925.
×McIntosh, Richard Kent, AO47071.
×McKay, Archie Leitch, AO40806.
×McKee, Eustis Ewart, Jr., AO53022.
McKee, Harvey Arthur, AO36042.
McKenny, Donald Charles, AO45182.
McKnight, Theodore, Jr., AO47250.
McLaughlin, Burl William, AO46210.
McLean, Lawrence Sylvester, AO45226.
McMaster, John Bruce, AO53622.
McMillin, Wallace Duke, AO36193.
McMurray, Robert Auburn, AO46694.
×McPherson, William Elwood, AO53682.
×McQueen, Verden, AO53556.
×McVeigh, Don Raymond, AO47174.
McVicker, Maurice Francis, AO53675.
Melendez, Ismael Felix, AO46507.
Melton, F. C., Jr., AO35975.
Menczkowski, John Marion, AO45789.
Mende, Robert Gerald, AO45234.
Mercer, Cassa Jay, Jr., AO45686.
Merritt, Herschel Roscoe, AO35619.
×Messall, Lawrence Emory, AO52965.
Meyer, Erwin Adolph, Jr., AO46042.
Meyer, James Hannon, AO47201.
Meyers, William Christopher, AO53564.
Mihailov, Nicholas Nicholas, Jr., AO34147.
Militefr, Lud James, AO46634.
×Millar, Harry Alvin, AO53744.
Miller, Carr Littleton, AO46954.
Miller, Clyde George, AO53616.
Miller, Daniel Jay, AO52918.
Miller, Emmett Hart, Jr., AO53604.
Miller, James Andrew, AO53728.
Miller, James Earl, AO45922.
Miller, Jesse William, AO33786.
Miller, Joseph Atlee, AO46692.
Miller, Raymond Laurence, AO24902.
Miller, Samuel Ford, AO46664.
×Miller, Victor Norman, Jr., AO53568.
Miller, William Alexander, AO45266.
Mills, Benjamin Lloyd, AO47260.
Milner, Robert Stanley, AO45863.
Mink, Wesley Stiles, AO46333.
Mitchell, Kirk Richard, AO45913.
×Mitchell, Max Oliver, AO40783.
×Mitchell, William Joseph, AO45403.
Mittelstadt, Frederick William, Jr., AO45332.
Miotkowski, Henry Francis, AO53623.
Moberly, James Alfred, AO47099.
Modesitt, Walter Emmett, AO46907.
Moffatt, Robert, Jr., AO46757.
Moncada, Valdo Vincent John, AO33853.
Moore, Ballinger Bryan, AO33705.
Moore, Bryce Stearns, AO36325.
Moore, Earl Lester, AO53660.
Moore, Floyd William, Jr., AO40240.
Moore, James Merton, Jr., AO35416.
×Moore, Milton Randolph, AO35962.

Morhous, William Bee, AO45869.
Mork, John Henry, AO53007.
×Morris, James Harl, AO53056.
Morrison, Harry Bernard, Jr., AO47187.
Morrison, Marvin Charles, AO46350.
Moseley, Wendell Ford, AO40233.
Moultrie, Homer Howard, Jr., AO52984.
Moutier, John Louis, Jr., AO40760.
Moy, John James, AO52962.
×Mueller, Glen Edward, AO53401.
Murphy, Charles Louis, AO53851.
×Murphy, Dennis Everett, AO34707.
×Murphy, Lloyd Joseph, AO46419.
Murphy, Thomas Lavelle, AO46608.
Myrick, Morris Nichols, AO46830.
Myszka, John Edward, AO45459.
Nadler, Paul Oscar, AO46958.
Nash, John Fredrick, Jr., AO36156.
×Neal, George Clayton, AO33875.
×Neal, Robert Jack, AO53784.
×Neelly, Dale, AO35318.
×Neff, Warren Harding, AO46856.
Nele, Reuben William, AO47052.
×Nelson, Charles Leonard, AO53925.
Nelson, Douglas Towle, AO53702.
×Netherland, James Ollian, AO45487.
Netherton, Clyde Bryant, AO53729.
Newton, Dalton Francis, AO34714.
Nibouar, Grover Cleveland, Jr., AO52974.
×Nicholls, Walter Lee, Jr., AO46801.
Nichols, John Clark, AO53647.
Nicholson, Jack, AO53603.
Nicholson, William Stevens, AO45203.
×Nickols, Jess Ralph, AO46906.
Nixon, Horace Cecil, AO46760.
Noble, Daniel Joseph, AO33697.
North, Charles Anthony, AO35825.
Northcutt, George Carl, AO53129.
Nowinski, Will Michael, AO40801.
Nylen, Arthur Howard, Jr., AO53816.
×O'Brien, Gilbert Mouzon, AO52973.
O'Neil, Donald Edward, AO35704.
×O'Sullivan, Francis Joseph, AO53700.
Odom, Felton Harris, AO53629.
×Oehlman, Gene W., AO53967.
×Oldham, Nile William, Jr., AO35657.
Oliver, John Gordon Lindsay, AO47188.
Oliver, Paul, AO45365.
Olney, Richard Oscar, AO53987.
Olson, George Andrew, AO52938.
Oppelt, Alexander Leslie, AO53473.
Ostman, Byron Reynold, AO53768.
Overholser, Earle Long, Jr., AO47062.
Oxman, Jaffee Victor, AO46687.
×Paap, Donald Herbert, AO35715.
Paige, Harold William, AO35158.
Palmer, James Morton, AO35408.
Pappas, Thomas Robert, AO35984.
×Park, Lionel Ormandy, AO40590.
×Parkerson, Eugene Campbell, AO35864.
Parrish, Alexander Hoffman, AO36093.
Patten, Ronald Oscar, AO45263.
Patterson, Jerry Frank, AO45809.
×Paul, William Edward, AO33912.
Pautz, Martin Reinhardt, AO47151.
×Pearson, William Osgood, Jr., AO36027.
Pearson, William Paul, AO53704.
Peirson, Jean Saxton, AO53389.
Pelaez, Emmanuel Antonio, AO45351.
Pemberton, John Martin, AO47077.
Pennington, Donald Jeffris, AO35830.
Perkins, Richard Murray, AO47204.
Perry, Paul Lawrence, AO45324.
×Perry, William Dewey, Jr., AO45470.
Peterson, Conrad Reginald, AO45418.
Petscher, James Adolph, AO53887.
×Petway, Joseph Guy, AO53867.
×Phillips, Verne Douglas Joseph, AO53302.
Phillips, Francis Theodore, Jr., AO47252.
Pickett, Thomas Marshall, AO46509.
Pirozek, Wasil, AO46961.
Pivarnik, Michael, Jr., AO46974.
Planey, John Anthony, AO40841.
Plattner, Milton, AO46745.
×Platz, Constant Victor, AO45225.
Plecha, Stanley Larry, AO53928.
Plocher, Martin Ernest, AO53678.
Plott, Paul Arll, AO46090.
Poe, William Edwin, AO46557.
Polio, Nicholas Samuel, AO53771.
Polve, James Herschel, AO54017.
Poole, Joseph Ray, AO45335.
×Pope, Fred William, AO53072.
×Porter, Vernon Davis, AO45611.
Poston, Denzil, AO53016.
Powell, Clarence Linton, AO46766.
Powell, William Howard, AO45605.
Powers, Clarence Arthur, AO25280.
Prarat, Victor Henry, AO53109.
Pratt, Dwight William, AO53316.
Pratt, Perry Harlow, AO53939.
×Price, Charler Trabert, AO46086.
×Price, Edward Carson, AO35313.
Proctor, Kenneth Earle, AO45845.
Purdom, Brooks Elbert, AO53740.
Putnam, Royal Augustus, AO53018.
Quenin, James Henry, AO33790.
Rader, Thomas Owen, AO46541.
Ragsdale, Roy Daniel, AO53883.
Rainwater, James Allen, AO53767.
Randall, George Floyd, AO53870.
Ray, Gerald Harmon, AO53045.
×Ray, John Arthur, AO53602.
Rea, Kenneth Ross, AO45580.
×Rea, William Robinson, AO53762.
Readhimer, Thomas Cecil, AO53670.
Rector, John Angus, AO53746.
Redden, George Alfred, AO53106.
×Redfield, Tyler Adams, AO53499.
Redman, Frank Owen, AO40807.
Reed, Donald Albert, AO35729.
Rees, John Edward, AO46609.
Rees, John Warren, AO36074.
×Reese, Harry Dee, AO53864.
×Rehm, Maurice Pate, AO54029.
Remele, Courtney Albert, AO53746.
Renz, L. Jay, AO34433.
Revere, Floyd, Jr., AO54023.
×Reynolds, William MacKenzie, Jr., AO53905.
Rice, Charles Sutton, AO45949.
Rice, James Harold, AO47263.
Rich, Robert Stewart, AO53758.
Riddle, Cecil Edward, AO46571.
Rieger, Jack Aaron, AO46938.
Riley, Martin Eldridge, AO34913.
Roath, William Roderick, AO53643.
×Roberts, Edward Theo, AO46406.
Roberts, Leo Paul, AO36214.
Robinson, James Bushfield, 3d, AO35434.
×Rodden, Jasper Aaron, AO53567.
×Roelofs, Milton, AO45490.
Rogers, Charles Wesley, AO45281.
Rogers, Frederick Albert, AO53222.
Rogers, Gerald Talbot, AO53494.
Rogers, James Morical, AO45269.
Rogers, Robert Charles, AO45213.
Rogers, William Blain, AO35910.
Rohrbough, Merrill Heaton, AO47176.
Roitsch, Clarence Alfred, AO46575.
Rollings, Raymond Sydney, AO46549.
Rood, Ralph Winton, AO35136.
Roper, Hilliard Marshall, AO45360.
Ross, Donald Harding, AO34048.
Ross, James Montgomery, AO53443.
×Roes, William Marion, AO53854.
Roth, Myron Alfred, AO35459.
Rowden, Stanley, AO53862.
Roy, Clyde, AO35314.
Royce, Ralph Scott, AO39171.
×Rudd, Robert John, AO39080.
×Rudig, James William, AO53574.
Rudolph, James Otto, AO46205.
Rullen, Donovan Waldamore, AO33809.
Ryden, Reinhardt August, AO46841.
×Saabye, Herbert John, Jr., AO46638.
Sackett, Carl Leroy, Jr., AO47266.
Sage, Wayne Philip, AO53297.
Saliba, Ernest John, AO35518.
Saltmarsh, Frederic Ashley, AO53893.
Saltzman, Stephen Ginns, AO34324.
Sampson, Allan Theodore, AO34961.
Sanders, William Allie, Jr., AO45603.
Sandusky, William Franklin, AO47229.
Sanford, Raymond Pape, AO35881.
×Satterfield, John Robert, AO46452.
Saxe, Richard Talbot, AO47054.
Saylor, David Wallie, AO46824.
Scanlan, John Francis, AO45907.
×Scariano, Frankie Roxie, AO36218.
Schaffer, Glenn Joseph, AO46283.
Schiltz, Glen Dale, Jr., AO46057.
Schleier, Erich Edwin, Jr., AO46625.
Schultz, Chester Martin, AO46821.
Schumacher, Otto Henry, AO45336.
Schwaderer, Willard Eugene, AO53723.
Schwartz, John Carroll, AO46628.
Scott, Charles Sidney, Jr., AO46691.
Scott, George William, AO47066.
Sculley, Raymond, AO46778.
×Sealy, Harry Haller, AO46760.
Searle, Maurice Ortiz, AO53782.
Sears, Aubrey Chester, AO45517.
Secor, Howard J., Jr., AO46590.
Selverson, Forest Glenn, AO53912.
Sells, Orlliff Vincent, AO46527.
Senecal, Robert Percy, AO45890.
Setterich, Jack, AO35919.
Shaw, Elmer Carl, AO46990.
×Shaw, John Blackshire, Jr., AO46421.
Sheffield, James Russell, AO46615.
×Shek, William, AO53033.
Sheldon, John Warren, AO46372.
Shellito, Robert Thomas, AO45237.
×Shepperd, William Morris, AO53562.
×Sherman, John Edward, AO46510.
Shimanek, Robert James, AO35774.
Shofner, Floyd Kelly, AO46489.
Shotts, Tom Daniel, AO53650.
Sickels, George Harrington, Jr., AO46659.
Siegismund, Robert Wentling, AO39186.
×Sifford, Lynn DeWitt, Jr., AO25986.
Sigler, Kerney Lee, AO46843.
×Siiger, James Edwin, AO53078.
Sill, Leo Glenn, AO35124.
Simmons, Albert Durant, AO46221.
Simmons, Harlan Gilliam, AO53981.
Simmons, Herbert Walter, AO35906.
×Simonson, Sidney Arnold, AO45471.
Simpson, Drewry Narvin, AO35635.
Simpson, Jesse Ward, Jr., AO53974.
Simpson, Robert Howard, AO53934.
Sims, John Wendell, AO35031.
×Sjodin, Daniel LaVerne, AO34395.
Skaggs, Jesse Sparks, Jr., AO53802.
Skalomenos, Alcibiades, AO54000.
Skawienski, Theodore Louis, AO53775.
Skidmore, Lester Jay, Jr., AO36091.
Slade, Alliston, AO35721.
Smith, Alvin Wayne, AO53972.
×Smith, Charles Crowe, Jr., AO53596.
Smith, Charlie Martin, AO53940.
Smith, Clifford Earl, AO47118.
Smith, Earle Marshall, AO35027.
×Smith, Edward Douglas, AO45485.
Smith, Francis Henry, AO46957.
Smith, Franklin Quick, AO46616.
Smith, Fred Barton, AO45166.
Smith, George Allen, AO53868.
Smith, Harold Vincent, AO52946.
Smith, James Charles, AO46268.
Smith, John Whelan, AO54035.
Smith, Kenneth A., AO46720.
×Smith, Lawrence John, AO53923.
Smith, Leighton Clifton, AO45279.
Smith, Merton Vincent, AO53004.
Smith, Raymond Earle, AO33820.
×Smith, Robert Nelson, AO53846.
Smith, Willard Hurlan, AO33644.
Smith, William Arthur, AO45803.
Smith, William Dulty, Jr., AO46865.
Smith, William Henry, AO53754.
Snodgrass, James Pope, AO52964.
Soderberg, James William, AO35998.
Solomon, Joseph Lloyd, AO36030.
Sorenson, John Maxwell, AO39148.
Southall, Russell Melvin, AO34356.
×Sowerby, Theo James, AO53603.
Spears, Byron Polk, AO47626.
Specht, Leonard Harvey, AO45172.
×Speight, John Joshua, Jr., AO53710.
Spence, Aubrey Albert, AO47154.
Spence, Claude Pierce, AO46017.
Spencer, Donald Lee, AO47070.
Spencer, William Lewis, AO46629.
×Spiller, William Lacy, AO53407.
Sprague, Carl William, AO40844.

Sprinkle, James Frank, AO62976.
St. Clair, Carney Edward, AO35045.
×Staebell, Edward Franklin, AO35865.
Stalzer, Eugene Anthony, AO46570.
Stanch, Paul Martin, AO46522.
Standifer, Lee Roy, Jr., AO35157.
Stanley, Richard Edward, AO53712.
Staples, George Madison, AO45618.
Starkey, Earl Eugene, AO47387.
×Steigner, John Martin, AO48427.
×Steiner, Irwin Oscar, AO53817.
×Stemme, Robert Bolton, AO46497.
Stepelton, Mark Henry, AO52901.
Stephen, Gerald Leroy, AO47063.
Stephens, Glenn Frederick, AO53811.
Stephens, Marvin Leslie, AO47115.
Stephens, Sidney Alexander, AO35822.
Stephens, Valdane, AO47215.
Stephens, William Hoyt, AO46256.
Stetson, Alvin Elliott, AO33753.
Stevens, Robert Drake, AO33611.
Stevens, Vaughan Orvis, AO53520.
Stevenson, Dudley Wadell, AO46385.
×Stewart, Donald Sylvester, AO53063.
×Stewart, Harris Lloyd, Jr., AO53495.
×Stewart, Raymond Ronald, AO52961.
Stoner, Lyle Wilson, AO47000.
×Story, James Benjamin, AO46156.
Stout, Thomas Edward, AO53703.
Stow, Kenneth Reeves, AO46528.
Stowell, Philip Musgrave, AO45612.
×Stribling, Robert Arris, AO46432.
Stroh, Benjamin Franklin, AO47264.
Sullivan, John Willys, AO46814.
Sullivan, Robert James, AO35595.
Sutton, John Lawrence, AO47224.
Swafford, Frederick Lee, AO46573.
×Swan, Frederic Ferris, AO52929.
Swanson, John William, AO46329.
Swickard, Jack David, AO36035.
×Switzer, Alfred Joseph, AO45357.
×Syslo, Benedict Francis, AO53621.
Szapiel, Stanley Vincent, AO45273.
Tacker, Lawrence James, AO46531.
Tally, William Sherman, AO35976.
Tanassy, Emil George, AO53553.
Tannen, Martin Robert, AO46063.
×Taylor, Daniel James, Jr., AO46594.
Taylor, Gerald Othel, AO46154.
Taylor, Oliver DeForest, AO35036.
×Taylor, Robert Floyd, Jr., AO47205.
Taylor, William Walter, AO46424.
Teasley, Joel Hunt, AO45346.
×Tester, James Harley, AO45478.
Teliczan, Raymond Joseph, AO53589.
×Testa, John Joseph, AO46003.
Tharp, Thomas Gordon, AO47017.
×Thomas, David Bernard, AO46533.
Thomas, Glen, Jr., AO33735.
Thomas, Harry Jack, AO35592.
×Thomas, William Kirby, AO52955.
Thompson, Donald Melvin, AO45748.
×Thompson, Donald Vern, AO53852.
×Thompson, Joel Clay, Jr., AO46201.
Thompson, Raymond Gail, AO35491.
Thornton, John Mack, AO53024.
×Thrash, James Andrews, Jr., AO52073.
×Tietz, Edward Christian, AO45363.
×Tiffany, Robert Samuel, Jr., AO46451.
Tillotson, Floyd Merle, AO45422.
Tilton, Harvey Sparling, AO45311.
Timmons, Durward Earl, AO52524.
×Timms, George Deeson, AO46347.
Tisone, Albert Anthony, AO45854.
Tormos, Jose Ramualdo, AO53818.
Torpey, Robert Francis, AO54014.
Towne, Ralph Waldo, AO46593.
Townsley, Howard Beshear, AO45352.
Trainer, Thomas Kennedy, AO24933.
×Travis, E. B., AO46704.
Treat, Mark Gilmour, AO34905.
Trefny, Milton Joseph, AO53580.
Trewitt, Harvey Sidney, Jr., AO45193.
×Trimble, Harry Burt, AO34940.
Truman, Robert Virgil, AO46833.
Trumble, John Bernard, AO47157.
Truscott, James Calvin, AO35211.
Tullock, Willard Donald, AO46115.
Turner, Charles Sheridan, AO46382.
Turner, Stevens Heyward, AO35638.
Tyson, James Leroy, AO35967.
×Umpleby, Arthur Norman, AO53283.
Urban, John Alexander, AO35667.
Van Dyk, William Cornelius, AO34095.
Van Epps, John Siegfus, AO46793.
Van Wingerden, Nicolas, AO46848.
×Vance, Zeb, Jr., AO46514.
Vandebogart, Warren Melendy, AO35579.
×Vaughan, William Roliand, AO35111.
Vaut, Bert A., Jr., AO45355.
Vehlow, Roy Charles, AO53990.
Venable, James Madison, Jr., AO46940.
Vernon, Damon Arthur, AO45462.
Vinson, Elmer Leroy, AO45591.
Vintson, Stonewall Pershing, AO53829.
×Vitunac, Walter Charles, AO46144.
Voyles, James Homer, Jr., AO45749.
×Wachendorfer, Charles, Jr., AO53372.
Wadley, Robert J., AO52991.
Waldmire, Henry William, AO33312.
×Walk, William Edward, Jr., AO56651.
Walker, Demelt Eugene, AO35115.
×Walker, Willie G., AO54011.
Wall, Risden Bennett, AO46999.
Wallace, Arthur Lee, AO46337.
Wallace, Robert Andrew, AO53080.
Walsh, Francis Robert, AO46479.
Walsh, John Joseph, AO46318.
×Walsh, Raymond Lee, AO52035.
Walsh, Robert Leslie, AO47193.
×Walter, Benjamin Burton, AO34025.
Waltman, William Smedley, AO45788.
×Ward, Rufus Alexander, AO45693.
Warden, Ray Sterling, AO46301.
Warwick, David Christy, AO24479.
Washburn, Jesse Eugene, AO46821.
Watkins, Miles Hunter, AO47179.
×Watkins, Thomas Greene, Jr., AO40627.
×Watson, James Wallace, AO52035.
Watters, John Furniss, AO34045.
Webb, John Davis, Jr., AO33752.
Weldman, Roy Andrew, AO45305.
×Weigand, Frederick Ellsworth, AO47011.
Weil, Melvin Simon, Jr., AO16895.
Weinheimer, Jacob, AO33306.
Weir, Gordon Thomas, AO53703.
Welling, William Brayshaw, Jr., AO35723.
Wells, Earl Muncey, AO45269.
Weitl, Conrad Joseph, AO46307.
Wendell, Helmer Clifford, AO47104.
Wenzinger, Harlan Joseph, AO53010.
Werner, Crowell B., AO46539.
×Westmoreland, Ivey Teddy, AO53026.
Wettstein, James Daniel, AO54025.
Whalen, John Lester, AO53433.
Whipples, Donald Eugene, AO35754.
×White, Floyd, AO54016.
White, Foster Lee, AO35417.
×White, George Gillette, AO15425.
×White, George William, AO46949.
White, Harrison Gurney, AO53263.
White, John Adam, AO52933.
White, Oscar Edward, AO35021.
×White, Samuel Augustus, Jr., AO53865.
Whitescarver, John Thomas, AO45252.
Wickman, Robert John, AO46858.
Wiese, Keith Irvin, AO45344.
Wilemon, Max Walter, AO46754.
Wiley, Woodrow Jean, AO33884.
Williams, Charles Irwin, AO45266.
Williams, Daniel Boone, AO53309.
Williams, John L., AO53339.
Williams, Owen James, AO45171.
×Williams, Roger Allan, AO53084.
×Williamson, George Austin, AO35455.
Wilson, Billy Baldwin, AO46752.
Wilson, Carl Woodrow, AO53263.
Wilson, Gerald Phillip, AO32834.
Wilson, Richard Alvin, AO35617.
Windsor, Leon Joseph, AO46446.
×Wingfield, Roy Glenmore, Jr., AO47166.
Winham, Lucian Chesley, Jr., AO53626.
×Wisniewski, Stanley Joseph, AO53599.
×Whitsell, Edward Fuller, Jr., AO35529.
Wockenfuss, Wilbur Eugene, AO35681.
Wojdyla, Henry Edward, AO52943.
×Wolters, Elmer Henry, AO35325.
Womack, Jack Edwin, AO47034.
Wood, Melvin Clinton, AO46845.
Wood, Robert Edward, AO53977.
Wood, Thomas Lucas, AO34394.
×Wood, William Penn, AO35481.
Wood, Willis Herbert, AO45219.
×Woods, Durward Allen, AO39083.
×Worde, Marcus Howard, AO46913.
×Work, Byron Russell, AO46289.
Working, William Harrison, AO46925.
Worthington, William Jacob, Jr., AO45443.
Wright, Fred Arthur, Jr., AO46867.
Wright, Theodore Otis, AO47076.
×Wylie, Harold Greever, AO53757.
Yaden, Earl Noble, AO53922.
Yeates, William Edmund, AO35950.
Yelton, John Fred, AO46603.
Yeoman, Edwin T., AO46944.
Young, John Newton, AO53569.
Young, Robert Warren, AO45446.
×Zagorsky, Stanley Charles, AO35781.
×Zepp, Rex Elbert, AO47133.
×Zeuty, Edward James, AO53613.
Zick, Marvin Darrell, AO46500.
Zimmer, Robert William, AO53570.
Zipper, Harry, AO47094.
Zweig, Louis Emil, Jr., AO53012.

To be first lieutenants

Adams, Donald Dee, AO38525.
Bechtold, Louis Addison, AO56522.
×Blades, Leo Leslie, AO56519.
Chille, Peter Joseph, AO56674.
×Disharoon, Jerry Benton, AO30516.
×Draper, Russell C., AO56681.
Eger, Charles Henry, Jr., AO41355.
Eichelberger, William Rex, AO56680.
Flansaas, Glenn Arthur, AO56524.
Harris, Thomas Drextol, Jr., AO56635.
×Hench, Noel Joseph, AO36521.
Houck, Warren Putnam, AO56675.
Hoyt, Thurber, Lewellyn, AO41351.
Hughes, Robert Malcolm, AO33524.
Hyde, James Richard, AO35687.
Klingler, Ralph Reno, Jr., AO56682.
Laughlin, William Edward, AO38526.
Lavender, Emory Candler, Jr., AO41353.
×Linn, Julius, Jr., AO56760.
Melendez, Michael John, AO50520.
Nelson, Thomas O'Neil, AO56670.
Philips, Robert James, AO56684.
Schconover, Orville Geralle, AO56673.
Shupe, Bennie Allan, AO39482.
Tarrant, Edward Wayland, AO56677.
Temple, Robert Joseph, AO56683.
Thompson, John Arnold, AO50521.
Troutman, George Glenn, AO50518.
Ventres, Robert Lee, AO35520.
Watson, Allan Ray, AO50523.
Winters, Melvin Percy, AO56686.
×Wolcott, Dean William, AO56676.
Wolf, Daniel Warren, AO50517.

NOTE.—All of the officers named on this nomination received recess promotions during the recess of the Senate, except those officers nominated for promotion to first lieutenant. The officers nominated for promotion to first lieutenant complete the required 3 years' service for promotion during the months of January and February. Dates of rank for those officers will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

The officers named herein for appointment in the National Guard of the United States of the Air Force of the United States under the provisions of section 33 of the National Defense Act as amended:

TO BE MAJOR GENERAL

Maj. Gen. George Griffin Finch, AO180579, Georgia Air National Guard, to date from November 22, 1948.

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS OF THE LINE

Brig. Gen. Lawrence Coffin Ames, AO131519, California Air National Guard, to date from April 23, 1948.

Brig. Gen. Harry Crutcher, Jr., AO300841, Texas Air National Guard, to date from May 23, 1948.

Brig. Gen. Hillford Richard Wallace, AO224721, Washington Air National Guard, to date from April 13, 1949.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named persons for appointment in the Medical and Dental Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.) and title II of the act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.):

To be majors

William A. Collins, Jr., MC, O340156.
George A. Peck, MC, O23567.

To be captains

Marvin D. Blackburn, Jr., MC, O447156.
Charles I. Bryans, Jr., MC, O464805.
Slater M. Dozier, MC, O436387.
Ian N. J. Eggeling, MC, O518418.
Kermit H. Gruberg, MC, O437490.
Royce E. House, MC, O391211.
James B. Hutchinson, MC, O1765131.
Fred E. Jenkins, MC, O470023.
Thomas P. Jernigan III, MC, O470996.
Frank H. Ketcham, DC, O469419.
Grady W. Phillips, MC, O1735667.
Frank K. Raymond, MC, O391287.
Albert K. Schoenbucher, MC, O440171.
William Stone, MC, O430283.

To be first lieutenants

Ellsworth C. Alvord, Jr., MC, O1727381.
Marshall B. Atkinson, MC, O1787024.
William P. Barron, MC.
George W. Blair, Jr., MC.
William J. Blake, MC.
Norman E. Brodeur, MC, O1704751.
James W. Carson, DC.
John J. Carter, MC.
Frank J. Cozzetto, MC.
Norman Fisher, MC, O947150.
Charles F. Ford, MC.
George E. Groleau, MC, O1727332.
Carl L. Hansen, Jr., MC, O935824.
Thomas L. Hendrix, MC, O1786167.
Ernest E. House, DC.
Laurence S. Jackson, MC, O1727035.
Albert R. Jones, Jr., MC.
Roger A. Juel, MC, O484803.
Richard L. Kasper, MC.
Marvin M. Keirns, MC, O1747040.
Evan L. Lewis, MC, O474583.
Frank W. Little, MC.
Harold T. McIver, MC, O1736104.
Robert D. McKnight, MC.
James L. McNeil, MC.
Richard E. Ogborn, MC, O1767593.
Gerald A. Orken, MC, O1736075.
Edwin E. Pontius, MC.
James A. Reilly, Jr., MC.
Robert W. Saunderson, Jr., MC.
Evan W. Schear, MC, O1746681.
Gene S. Smith, MC.
Martin A. Swerdlow, MC.
Lonis L. Schurter, MC, O1776295.
John B. Selby, MC.
John B. Sheffer, MC.
Ralph F. Shirer, MC, O1776174.
James G. Stouffer, MC.
William W. Thompson, MC.
Edward J. Tomsovic, MC.
Harry J. Umlauf, MC, O1727442.
William P. Walton, MC, O1786501.
John Watt, Jr., MC.
George C. Weinland, MC.
Edwin J. Westfall, MC.
John C. Wilsey, MC.
Kent T. Woodward, MC.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

To be first lieutenant

Paul J. Kovar, O387604.

To be second lieutenant

Hubert M. Nicholson, Jr.

The following-named person for appointment in the Women's Army Corps, Regular Army, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of Public Law 625, Eightieth Congress, June 12, 1948. This person was previously given recess appointment in the grade of second lieutenant in error. Appointment of this individual will not exceed authorization for the Women's Army Corps, as established by Public Law 625:

Irma V. Bouton, L228827.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Army Nurse Corps, Regular Army, in the grade specified, under the provisions of Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress:

To be second lieutenants

Primrose M. Gifford, N737952.
Sara C. Mooney, N763056.
Theresa R. Cardillo, N794154.
Marjorie R. Samson, N792133.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be senior assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance:

Paul Fremont-Smith	Brinton T. Darlington
John S. Benson	Andrew O. Fitzmorris
Leo A. Sapirstein	Roland T. Smith
Jacob K. Frenkel	Joseph F. Shanaphy
Clarence A. Imboden, Jr.	Bernard E. O'Malley
	Frederick C. Kuharich
Roger K. McDonald	William A. Walter, Jr.
Lynn L. Fulkerson, Jr.	McClain Johnston
Andrew Ranier	Paul Francke, Jr.
Ruth E. Dunham	Richard A. Malmgren
Fridolph E. Erlandson	Ralph F. Patten
Martin J. Gunter	Edward A. McNulty
Swan Burrus, Jr.	Walter M. White, Jr.
Lewis McLaurine Williams	James E. Hamill

To be assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of acceptance:

John H. Waite	William H. Sage III
James K. Conn	James R. Lewis
Ben Fisher	Paul K. Benedict
Ernest V. de Moss	Arthur P. Burdon
Sidney Ketyer	Charles W. Whitmore
Victor E. Archer	John F. Laws
Ernest G. Hanowell	Joseph A. Gallagher
Leland K. Dayton	Lawrence V. Hastings
Robert Hanan	Maurice R. Wingo
Carl C. Sanscole	John V. Osborne
Merlan E. DeBolt	Thomas F. Heighway
John B. Baldi	Jerold E. Phelps

To be senior assistant sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance:

Earl H. Arnold
Donald B. Stevens

To be assistant sanitary engineer (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of acceptance:

John B. Saxton

To be junior assistant sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of second lieutenant), effective date of acceptance:

Howard C. Kellogg	Gordon E. Stone
John K. Brown	Donald M. Keagy

To be senior assistant pharmacist (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance:

Allen J. Brands, Sr.

To be assistant pharmacist (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of acceptance:

Richard R. Sherwood

To be junior assistant pharmacists (equivalent to the Army rank of second lieutenant), effective date of acceptance:

Leo Klugman
Paul H. Honda
Paul R. McDaniel, Jr.

To be senior assistant nurse officer (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance:

Mildred Jones

To be assistant nurse officers (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of acceptance:

Henrietta J. LeGrand	Hilda A. Nivala
Kathryn M. Meyer	Ruth S. Fitzgerald
Edith W. Campbell	Mary L. Hasty

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 27, 1949:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

James E. Webb to be Under Secretary of State.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Albert J. Loveland to be Under Secretary of Agriculture.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

William Marvel to be United States attorney for the district of Delaware.

Gilmore S. Haynie to be United States attorney for the northern district of Indiana.

Miles N. Pike to be United States attorney for the district of Nevada.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Thomas N. Curran to be United States marshal for the district of Maine.

Paul B. Messick to be United States marshal for the district of Delaware.

Jack R. Caufield to be United States marshal for the district of Oregon.

UNITED NATIONS

MILITARY AND NAVAL STAFF COMMITTEE

Rear Adm. Bernhard H. Bieri, United States Navy, to be the senior naval member of the Military and Naval Staff Committee of the United Nations.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Rear Adm. David H. Clark, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Ships in the Department of the Navy, for a term of 2 years.

SELECTIVE SERVICE

Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, United States Army, to be Director of Selective Service.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Gen. Omar Nelson Bradley, O3807, Chief of Staff (major general, U. S. Army) for appointment as general in the Regular Army.

Lt. Gen. Stephen J. Chamberlin, O3397, United States Army (major general, U. S. Army), for appointment as commanding general, Fifth Army, with the rank of lieutenant general.

ADVANCEMENT ON THE RETIRED LIST

Maj. Gen. Willard Stewart Paul, O5616, United States Army retired, for advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE GRADES INDICATED

To be major generals

Alexander Russell Bolling, O7548.
Edmond Harrison Leavey, O8559.
Bryant Edward Moore, O8633.
Doyle Overiton Hickey, O10123.
David Goodwin Barr, O10313.

To be brigadier generals

Vennard Wilson, O7207.
Paul Wolcott Rutledge, O7289.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be brigadier generals

Albert Pierson, O11838.
Joseph Pescia Sullivan, O5328.
Fenton Stratton Jacobs, O6931.
Letcher Ogle Grice, O8273.
Hugh Bryan Hester, O8405.
Kester Lovejoy Hastings, O12219.

APPOINTMENTS BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES WITHOUT SPECIFICATION OF BRANCH, ARM, OR SERVICE

First Lt. John Marshall Evans, O29403.
First Lt. James Rock Walpole, O38579.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTIONS 502 AND 508 OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947

(Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to examination required by law.)

To be first lieutenants

Donald Wesley Alberti, O56695.
Douglas Albright Armstrong, O38527.
Bud L. Jones, O38522.
×Leo Thomas McMahon, Jr., O41352.
William Jeremiah McNeese, O41354.
Howard Deschler Rhodes, O50525.
Jasper Clyde Vance, Jr., O56715.
John Henry Von Der Bruegge, Jr., O38523.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 107 OF THE ARMY-NAVY NURSES ACT OF 1947

To be first lieutenants, Women's Medical Specialist Corps

Joyce Bodycomb, J22.
Francine B. Bundt, M10018.
Joaphine Mary Burt, M10081.
Ruth Eleanor Clevenger, M10049.
Mae Augusta Engsberg, M10032.
Theresa Maria Ferrazzoli, M10080.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTIONS 502 AND 510 OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947

The complete list of nominations of James Melvin Epperly et al., which were this day confirmed, may be found in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 13, 1949, beginning with the name of James Melvin Epperly, occurring on page 229, and ending with the name of Foster LaMarr Watts, which appears on page 240.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTIONS 502 AND 518 OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947

The complete list of the nominations of Francis Nicholas Miller et al., which were this day confirmed, may be found in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 17, 1949, beginning with the name of Francis Nicholas Miller, appearing on page 324, and ending with the name of Dorothy Edith Fisher, appearing on page 402.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

APPOINTMENT AS GENERAL

Gen. Carl Spaatz, AO3706, Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, for appointment as general, United States Air Force, with rank from February 11, 1945.

The nominations of Walter Francis Dix and other officers for promotion in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 518 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, which were confirmed today, appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 13, 1949, beginning with the name of Walter Francis Dix, which is shown on page 240, and ending with the name of James Joseph Connolly, which is shown on page 259.

IN THE NAVY

APPOINTMENTS

Admiral Raymond A. Spruance for permanent appointment in the grade of admiral in the Navy as authorized by Public Law 791, Eightieth Congress.

The following-named officers to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving under a designation in accordance with section 413 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

George D. Murray	Donald B. Beary
Gerald F. Bogan	Felix B. Stump
Russell S. Berkey	

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS TO THE GRADE OF REAR ADMIRAL

Wesley M. Hague	Walter G. Schindler
Thomas H. Binford	George L. Russell
Walter E. Moore	Milton E. Miles
Burton B. Biggs	Harold D. Baker
Grover B. H. Hall	Thomas M. Stokes
Lorenzo S. Sabin, Jr.	Robert E. Blick, Jr.

The appointments of Theodore C. Lonnquest et al. for permanent appointment in the Navy, which were this day confirmed, appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 13, 1949, beginning with the name of Theodore C. Lonnquest, appearing on page 259, and ending with the name of Anna L. Welsko, which appears on page 261.

The appointments of Jimmie Allred, Jr., et al. for appointment in the Navy, which were this day confirmed, appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for January 17, 1949, beginning with the name of Jimmie "B" Allred, appearing on page 322, and ending with the name of Sherwood H. Werner, appearing on the same page.

The appointments of Carroll A. Andrews et al. for appointment in the Navy, which were this day confirmed, appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 17, 1949, beginning with the name of Carroll A. Andrews, appearing on page 322, and ending with the name of Carl Whittles, Jr., appearing on page 323.

The appointments of Arland A. Adams et al. for appointment in the Navy, which were this day confirmed, appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 17, 1949, beginning with the name of Arland A. Adams, appearing on page 315, and ending with the name of Frank D. Wilson, appearing on page 322.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate January 27, 1949:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Jesse J. Gilbert of Ohio, to be Assistant Register of the Treasury.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 27, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Russell W. Lambert, minister, First Methodist Church, De Kalb, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, whose spirit moves within the humankind of all nations, and whose goodness has been ever availed to us, we pause for a moment at the beginning of these deliberations to give Thee our minds and hearts.

Cleanse them, renew them, shape them to Thy will. Guide them in high purpose and toward noble achievement, that these minds and hearts may serve our Nation and our world in new pathways of service that lead from a worthy past into a still greater future. Aware of the burden of responsibilities and acknowledging the manifold needs of the hour, we are conscious of our loyalties to Thee and our Nation, and we are filled with the hopes and dreams that stem from a precious heritage. The future of our country and the world rests with these minds and hearts, so fill them with Thy wisdom and love that Thy holy presence may breathe through us and Thy will may be known unto our land and unto all the world. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 25, 1949, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. TYDINGS a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, vice Mr. BRICKER.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. DOUGLAS a member of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, vice Mr. Ball, whose term as Senator expired.

REQUEST TO SUSPEND RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker be authorized to recognize today a motion to suspend the rules.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what for?

Mr. McCORMACK. The bill intended to be brought up under suspension is a joint resolution from the Committee on Appropriations making an additional appropriation, as I understand, of $500,000 for disaster relief. There is a very emergent situation throughout the West and Middle West, that terrific storm disaster.

I make this statement as majority leader that if unanimous consent is granted this is the only bill that will be brought up under suspension.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker will make the same statement.

Mr. TABER. And it is very desirable that it be done immediately.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is the information I have received.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CERTAIN PERSONNEL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 62) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective February 1, 1949, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, compensation at the basic rate of $4,500 per annum for the services of an assistant cashier who shall be designated by the Sergeant at Arms of the House subject to the approval of the Speaker.

SEC. 2. That effective January 4, 1949, the compensation of the Deputy Sergeant at Arms in Charge of Pairs, Office of the Sergeant at Arms, and the compensation of the special employee, Office of the Doorkeeper,

shall be at the basic rate of $4,000 per annum, respectively.

SEC. 3. That effective February 1, 1949, the compensation of John Andrews and William F. Russell, designated by House Resolution 39, adopted January 10, 1949, as minority employees, shall be at the basic rate of $7,000 per annum, respectively.

SEC. 4. There shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, compensation at the basic rate of $5,000 per annum for the services of an assistant Journal clerk; compensation at the basic rate of $5,000 per annum for the services of an assistant tally clerk; compensation at the basic rate of $3,900 per annum for the services of an assistant enrolling clerk; compensation at the basic rate of $3,000 per annum for the services of an assistant bill clerk; all of whom shall be designated by the minority leader subject to the approval of the Speaker.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD explaining the purpose of the resolution just adopted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it has long been recognized by the leadership of the House that it was desirous to have a corps of trained personnel to function in the various key positions under the service of the House. In order to accomplish that, the resolution creates four assistant clerkships which shall be taken out of patronage and filled by competent men who have proved their worth.

It has been recognized by all of the older members that the load-work of the House long ago justified additional clerical assistance in the various departments that this resolution contemplates.

If this resolution is not adopted at this time the men who held the jobs as head of these various departments will leave the service of the House and their experience and efficiency will be lost. It is desirable that they not only assist in training the top men of the various departments who will shortly be appointed but will aid appreciably in ameliorating the work of these departments.

It was contemplated in the Legislative Reorganization Act that career employees should be provided for in the staffing of committees but nothing tangible was done concerning the employees of the House directly. This resolution will take care of that need by providing a career service for the employees who have proved their worth.

In the unhappy event that the present majority of the House should become the minority in the Eighty-second Congress then the top men in the departments in this Congress would be designated by the next minority leader to fill the clerkships that this resolution provides, so that in the future there will always be majority and minority employees who are experienced and trustworthy.

FREE ENTRY OF CERTAIN ARTICLES IMPORTED TO PROMOTE INTERNATIONAL GOOD WILL

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 88.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 2 of the joint resolution of June 25, 1948 (Public Law 769, 80th Cong.), entitled "Joint resolution permitting the free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will, and for other purposes," is hereby amended by striking out "December 31, 1948" and by inserting in lieu thereof "March 31, 1949."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman to explain what this resolution means?

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, this resolution merely provides that we extend the date to June 30, 1949. There will be an amendment offered to the resolution changing the date from March 31 to June 30.

On June 19 last year there was adopted by the House and by the Senate, and also signed by the President, a bill to provide for a Thank-You Train coming from France—a train of 48 boxcars containing merchandise which France was sending to this country as a gesture of appreciation for the Friendship Train we sent over there. This train was supposed to arrive in the United States last October. It is now loaded aboard the ship *Magellan* and is due to arrive in this country sometime next week. Unless we pass this bill, it will be necessary for the Government of France or for us to pay an import duty on these articles. The 48 or 49 cars, of the old 40-and-8 type that World War I veterans knew so well, will be left here, one in each State, as souvenirs. The merchandise donated by the people of France will be sold at public auction, the proceeds from which will go to charity.

For this reason, the administration is heartily in favor of the pending bill, and I sincerely hope we can pass it today.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORAND. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. Is it not a fact that this resolution was passed unanimously out of the Committee on Ways and Means?

Mr. FORAND. It was passed unanimously yesterday by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "March 31, 1949" and insert in lieu thereof "June 30, 1949."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISASTER RELIEF

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the resolution (H. J. Res. 112) making an additional appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the following sum:

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

Disaster relief: An additional amount for disaster relief, $500,000, subject to the limitations and restrictions under this head in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, there is very little I can tell you about this item that you do not already know. The papers have been full of reports concerning the situation surrounding the cattle and sheep in storm stricken areas in about 10 of our western areas.

Realizing the urgency of the situation and on urging by many Members of the Congress the committee held a hearing yesterday afternoon to determine the need for financial aid. As a result the committee is recommending in the accompanying resolution an amount of $500,000 for the President's disaster relief fund. This amount is in addition to $500,000 appropriated for use of the President in case of emergencies and catastrophes in the current year.

According to information furnished the committee by the Department of the Interior it is estimated that there are around 3,000,000 head of sheep and 1,000,000 head of cattle snow-bound on public grazing lands and in jeopardy of starvation. Uncounted thousands of sheep and cattle are similarly snow-bound on private lands. The President has already allocated the sum of $360,000 to alleviate the suffering, both human and animal.

The principal use to which these funds will be put is the opening of primary and secondary roads as well as for the creating of trails in order that food and water may be conveyed to the starving animals.

This catastrophe, as you might well realize, not only jeopardizes our food supply for the next 4 or 5 years, but threatens the entire economy of that portion of our country whose principal industry is cattle and sheep raising.

Adequate safeguards are provided for the expenditure of this money in that before any commitments are made by the Federal Government it is to see that reasonable expenditures are to be made by the governments of each State involved and the local governments therein as well as other agencies.

I cannot see reason for much debate on this matter, and I hope this resolution is adopted.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Appropriations had presented to it yesterday the distress out in the range States in the far West resulting from the terrific snowfall. The roads are blocked, especially the back roads, and it has been impossible to get feed to the cattle on the back roads. It is also impossible for many of the people living in the small settlements to get out to get medical attention or anything else.

The President previously allocated $100,000 out of the disaster fund to help the situation. Yesterday he allocated $200,000 more, and placed General Fleming, the head of the Federal Works Agency, in charge of the operation as coordinator.

The Army has available a large number of trucks and bulldozers and various pieces of equipment that can be used for the purpose of opening the roads. It is not proposed that the farmers be supplied with feed for their animals, for they are expected to do that themselves, but it has been impossible for the local authorities with the equipment they have had available to open the roads and maintain traffic so that the farmers could get in to take care of their cattle and their feed.

Including what is presently in the disaster fund, which the President can use if it is necessary, this will make available a total of $750,000. I hope it will help in meeting that situation.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. As I understand, this fund is to be added to the President's fund to be allocated to disaster areas when conditions requiring its use arise. Will this fund, with the amount here appropriated additionally to the President's fund, go entirely to the area in the West that is suffering from this terrific catastrophe?

Mr. TABER. I have no idea. I would expect the President to use it for that purpose insofar as it is desirable or necessary.

Mr. HARRIS. I am highly sympathetic with the situation in the West, but we had a terrific tornado at Warren, Ark., in which 56 people were killed and 175 were injured and millions and millions of dollars' worth of property was destroyed. I wonder if this fund would be available for any additional relief that might be necessary in connection with that disaster.

Mr. TABER. I would assume that whatever the President thought should be done with the fund could be done. It is not earmarked in any way. It is an open proposition for the President to deal with, and I would expect that he would handle it in such a way as to meet the situations that are pressing the hardest.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I feel that this resolution should be adopted.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. This is simply a supplemental appropriation, subject to the terms and conditions of the prior appropriation for the President's disaster fund?

Mr. TABER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman ask unanimous consent that all Members who are interested in this subject may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who so desire may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the subject under consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, along with the other States in the Rocky Mountain area, northern Arizona is receiving a large share of the suffering and hardship caused by the unprecedented snowfall of the past 2 weeks. I have just received word that in some sections of my State 100 inches of snow has fallen. I believe this is an all-time record, and it is easy to picture the paralysis that has resulted.

The Arizona National Guard is attempting to feed some of the cattle stranded in deep drifts near Williams, and other local efforts are being made. However, the fact that the blizzards are continuing makes it imperative that outside help be forthcoming soon if valuable livestock is to be saved.

I have also received word that the heavy weather is causing a great deal of suffering among the Indians who dwell on the plateau areas in northern Arizona. These unfortunate people are not prepared for this sort of weather, and many are in need of help today.

While we in Arizona welcome the snowfall and resultant run-off that will fill our reservoirs, we also realize that unless we receive some assistance the losses in livestock will more than offset those gains. Therefore, we urgently request that our State be included in the $500,000 joint resolution for relief of disaster areas.

THIS IS THE WAY TO ACT QUICKLY

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, on January 2 the snowstorm sweeping the West whirled into western South Dakota. It was accompanied by a wind of hurricane velocity, and continued for 4 days. Snowfalls ranged from 1 to 3 feet. Drifts of 20, 25, and 30 feet were created. All highways were blocked. Side roads were drifted full. All transportation came to a stop. Indeed, many people were unable to stir from their homes. Livestock on the open range drifted with the storm until fences stopped them or until they tumbled over snow-filled banks and gullies and were buried.

During the month there have been four succeeding storms of varying intensity, but each one more or less undoing the work of clearing roads that was accomplished between. The Milwaukee Railroad from Mitchell to Rapid City got in yesterday 26 days late. The first Northwestern got in only 13 days late, but after a 2-day run was snowed in again. Yesterday six locomotives were reported fighting to reopen a distance of 58 miles.

The State of South Dakota has spent over $425,000 in extra snow-removal efforts and has appropriated another $100,000. Counties are doing all that time and weather permit, regardless of their finances. One county, I learned today, is spending a thousand dollars a day. That is a county of only 6,000 people. Ten counties are severely hit in my district, 20 are badly affected. It is estimated that close to $750,000 has been spent locally in combating the storm.

Now, some people mistakenly have the idea that all of the Dakotas are a land of ice and snow in winter. That is not normally true in western South Dakota.

The average snowfall in these 10 counties is from 3½ to 4 inches for January, over a period of 40-year records. But in this January they have had from 25 to 60 inches of sharp, wind-driven snow.

Cattle have been isolated and stranded from feed. Homes have been isolated. Food and fuel are running short. One report yesterday was that over 400 families in an area 100 miles by 150 miles have not been heard from since January 2. What stories of suffering will eventually be told we can only guess at this time.

Yes, planes have been at work, carrying both food and medical supplies whenever they could fly. State and county highway crews have been working night and day. The time has come when more equipment must be brought in and thrown into the battle to reduce suffering, save lives, and to the extent possible, save some of the foundation herds of livestock in this a high-producing area for cattle and sheep.

The situation in South Dakota is not worse than elsewhere. The situation is catastrophic in at least seven States. Representatives from these range States were given a very generous hearing by the Appropriations Subcommittee, yesterday. This morning the full committee adopted the resolution now before the House.

No one pretends to say that this amount of money will do the job, but it will start the operation of extra bulldozers, weasels, and cats or half-tracks which can be secured from the Army or from private contractors. And it will keep the President's disaster relief fund solvent so that further allocations may be made as the battle goes on.

If more funds should be needed, as I believe they will, they can be added. But this resolution is the way for prompt, immediate action. I feel sure it will have the approval of the House today.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, we have no quarrel with the Committee on Appropriations who have made this recommendation and have made these funds available for the President's emergency fund. The only complaint we have perhaps is that it is too little and very late and perhaps a little too late. I hope that the Members of the House are not going to be led to believe that this is a bill to make these funds available to feed anybody's livestock. That is not the case at all. This is simply to furnish sufficient funds to open roads and trails not only to the livestock but to isolated communities that have been isolated since the 1st day of January. The situation is still very urgent.

I, for one, shall certainly ask the President of the United States as time goes on to add to these funds if this emergency continues. We are certainly grateful to the committee for the speedy action they have taken. We hope that this money will be spent in the proper places.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Of course I am in favor of this resolution because this is a disaster which the people involved could not prevent. I also agree with the gentleman from Arkansas that funds ought to be provided to take care of situations where a flood, cyclone, or tornado destroys homes and public buildings and where the people are unable to take care of themselves.

Mr. GRANGER. You will never have any trouble on that score so far as I am concerned, I can assure the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I am in sympathy with this resolution. I wonder if the gentleman will enlighten the House as to what action the States are taking in trying to alleviate conditions so far as feeding starving livestock and opening of roads is concerned.

Mr. GRANGER. May I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that that is a proper question. In nearly every instance in every one of these States emergencies have been declared by the various governors. Ten dollars has been appropriated and spent by the States to every one that is appropriated here. Much money has been spent in the counties and by the local organizations in those States.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. In response to the question raised by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I would like to state that while only about half of the State of Nebraska is involved in the most serious way, the Governor informs us that the local and State groups are stretching themselves to the breaking point. I believe it was the day before yesterday that the Nebraska Legislature provided $500,000 additional for this purpose.

Mr. GRANGER. I heard that testimony yesterday and I believe that that is the fact.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, at the outset, I want to express my appreciation to the committee and the leadership for acting so expeditiously on this bill. I am constrained to say, however, that, in my judgment, the sum of $500,000 is wholly inadequate to bring any substantial measure of relief to the stricken area. The storms visited upon the West since the turn of the year, in my opinion, constitute a national disaster. Substantial parts of seven States have been fighting blizzard conditions of unprecedented severity, day in and day out, for nearly 4 weeks. Never in the history of the West have there been storms with 40 to 60 inches of snow, with subzero weather, for 26 straight days, sometimes ranging more than 30 degrees below zero, with blinding winds up to 70 miles an hour. The snow was so fine that roads were repeatedly opened one day and filled in the next. It was common to see drifts 20 and 30 feet high everywhere in the area. In the first 3 days of the storm, over 21 lives were lost in the intermountain area. It is impossible to estimate the livestock loss as it has been increasing daily. Many small farmers and ranchers have lost their entire herds. The sheep and cattle have lost weight each day and the exact extent of the losses cannot be determined for several weeks. The Denver Post of last Monday carried a headline at the top of its first page as follows: "Empire sheep industry faces total loss." It quoted Sylvan J. Pauly, of Deer Lodge, Mont., president of the National Wool Growers Association, to the effect that—

> The record-breaking series of January storms in the Rocky Mountain empire threatened the industry with annihilation.

About 10 days ago, a survey was made to determine the stock loss in Wyoming, and, Mr. Speaker, I desire to quote from an article in the Wyoming Eagle of a week ago:

NINE MILLION DOLLARS STOCK LOSSES ESTIMATED

> The combined figures of two livestock experts indicated last night that Wyoming stockmen lost some $9,000,000 in dead animals in the big January blizzard.
>
> Federal-State statistician George Knutson and Russell Thorp, secretary of the Wyoming Stock Growers Association, released estimates which fixed stock losses in the storm at approximately 55,200 head of cattle and 105,000 head of sheep.
>
> Knutson said that cattle losses, based on $125 a head, would total about $5,900,000, and sheep, figured on $20 per head, would come to a loss of $2,100,000.
>
> Cattle losses were estimated on a 12-percent loss out of some 460,000 head believed to have been in the storm area, and on a 15-percent loss out of 760,000 head of sheep.
>
> Both men stressed that only rough estimates were possible at this time, since many more cattle and sheep may be dead or dying in the storm's aftermath.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Instead of calling it a storm, it is what you might call an unprecedented disaster?

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I thank the gentleman. Never in the history of the West have storms of this severity and intensity lasted so long. The people of that area are wholly unable to cope with the situation. I may say the weather man has predicted another storm for this week end.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. While we have not had storms of such severity in Minnesota, it is true that this affects the whole United States in that if we can save some of this livestock it means that much in dollars and cents to the consumers next year. Is that not true?

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. That is quite true. In the storm area there are at least a million head of cattle and 3,000,000 head of sheep. Thousands of cattle were frozen standing on their feet. Many cases were reported of cattle losing their hoofs. Hundreds of ranchers have reported that their herds were stranded upward of 50 miles from the highways and railroads and, because of a lack of feed, the livestock was slowly starving to death. For areas of several hundred miles, the grass, and even the sagebrush, was covered completely with snow. In most cases it was impossible to get the livestock to the feed or the feed to the livestock. In days when it did not snow, the wind caused ground blizzards throughout the area. Practically every State, county, and town has appropriated money to fight the storms. The Wyoming Legislature appropriated $200,000, which was matched by the counties on a 60–40 basis. In addition, towns and private individuals spent unlimited sums in endeavoring to keep roads and trails open. The Bureau of Land Management did an excellent job in furnishing snow-fighting equipment of all kinds and character and supplied personnel to assist the States and counties. The Forest Service, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Park Service, and other agencies of the Government have assisted materially in their efforts to open roads to isolated ranchers over the whole area. The Air Force, through the operation Hay Lift, furnished hay to cover extreme emergencies. Much has been done, but much more remains to be done if we are to save the thousands of farmers and ranchers from being completely wiped out. The herds of cattle and sheep in this area are the foundation of breeding stock which furnishes the feeder cattle and sheep for the Corn Belt year in and year out. If the herds are wiped out in this storm, the Nation will suffer a continuing loss of meat supply for years to come. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD at this point a copy of a wire received from the Governor of our State on Monday last:

> CHEYENNE, WYO., *January 24, 1949.*
>
> Representative FRANK A. BARRETT,
> *Washington, D. C.:*
>
> Urgently request your interest in securing release of all available Federal equipment for use in opening roads in our storm areas to permit movement of feed to livestock and livestock to accessible feed supplies, and to open and maintain essential rural mail routes. Many such routes have been blocked

for more than 3 weeks. Our need for emergency use of snow-removal equipment is beyond our own resources. This emergency need is critical to the economic stability of many western areas. The exhaustion point of man and beast is rapidly being reached because of snowbound vital avenues of transportation.

A. G. CRANE,
Governor of Wyoming.

As I said in the beginning, Mr. Speaker, I think the committee should be congratulated in bringing this bill in, but I am compelled to state that, in my judgment, the funds provided are wholly inadequate to carry on the fight.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, what has been said by previous speakers regarding this disaster is also true in half of my State of Nebraska. I have been in constant communication with the Governor, who tells me there is 60 inches of snow on the ground; that he has asked the legislature to appropriate $500,000 to help in this disaster. He is pleading with us to pass some legislation immediately in order to bring relief.

The mayors of many towns have telephoned to me telling me that farm families have been isolated in many cases for 19 consecutive days. They cannot be reached because the roads are blocked by the heavy snowfall, drifts from a half mile to a mile long, 8 to 15 feet deep. Livestock has perished and human life is endangered. The doctors cannot reach these homes because the equipment which these towns have is not sufficient or heavy enough to break through these long snowdrifts. They are asking us for some jeep weasels in order to get over the top of these snowbanks, in order to bring medicine and succor to these suffering families.

One suggestion has been made that perhaps the Army could transfer some of our experienced troops from Alaska, who are experienced in this kind of weather, to come into Nebraska and these other stricken States and bring relief to these suffering human beings. It would be great psychology.

Mr. Speaker, with other members of the Nebraska delegation, I have introduced two bills. I favor this resolution and this appropriation, which is certainly not sufficient to take care of this gigantic problem. I ask unanimous consent that I may insert these two bills in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]?

There was no objection.

The bills referred to are as follows:

A bill making appropriations for disaster relief in case of snowstorms, blizzards, and other catastrophes

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sum is appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and to remain available until expended, to enable the President, through such agency or agencies as he may designate, and in such manner as he shall determine, to supplement the efforts and available resources of State and local governments or other agencies, whenever he finds any snowstorm, blizzard, flood, or other catastrophe in any part of the United States is of sufficient severity and magnitude to warrant emergency assistance by the Federal Government in alleviating hardship, or suffering caused thereby, and if the governor of any State in which such catastrophe shall occur shall certify that such assistance is required $3,000,000 to remain available until June 30, 1949, and to be expended without regard to such provisions regulating the expenditure of Government funds or the employment of persons in the Government service as he shall specify: *Provided*, That no expenditure shall be made with respect to any such catastrophe in any State until the governor of such State shall have entered into an agreement with such agency of the Government as the President may designate giving assurance of expenditure of a reasonable amount of the funds of the government of such State, local governments therein, or other agencies, for the same or similar purposes with respect to such catastrophe: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for departmental personal services: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for permanent construction: *Provided further*, That within any affected area Federal agencies are authorized to participate in any such emergency assistance.

A bill making appropriations for emergency flood relief

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby appropriated the additional sum of $10,000,000 out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and to remain available until expended, for flood control general (for emergency fund), for flood fighting and for the repair, restoration, and strengthening of flood control structures threatened or destroyed by floods pursuant to section 208 of Public Law 858, Eightieth Congress, second session.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING].

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, the state of emergency which has hit us in the Western States, especially in my own State of Nevada, and particularly in the eastern and central sections of the State, calls for an immediate emergency measure. This section of the country has seen the worst storm condition that it has had in years, and the livestock, sheep and cattle, are all in imminent danger. In this desperate situation which has arisen in the Western States, my own State of Nevada is one of the worst stricken. In many places the snow is measuring from 40 to 60 inches in depth. Continuous series of high winds and blizzards are drifting the snow to as high as 20 feet. This is causing intense human suffering and loss of life, as well as a grave loss to property and livestock. One hundred thousand sheep are involved in this desperate situation, 35,000 of which are in critical condition. These sheep will have to be shipped out or they will die. They will need feed and forage. Stockmen anticipate a 50-percent loss unless feed is forthcoming at once.

Mr. Speaker, in order to get the true picture, let me emphasize that the stricken cattle are range cattle—breeding cattle—and in many sections of Nevada there is not a fence within a hundred miles, so they cannot be herded into a corral or barn to be fed. These cattle range on public lands. Unless roads can be broken through, and feed taken to the livestock, they will perish, for there is no way that they can be sheltered. As I have already stated, this is the deepest snow on record in more than half a century, and even the large crawler-type tractors are unable to cope with the drifting snows. Some feed has been flown in by the "operation haylift" method. Equipment has not been able to reach the outlying stretches of county roads. Standard snow equipment cannot take care of the situation. Heavy tractors and trucks are needed to break through the roads so that feed convoys can reach the sheep and cattle herds.

The sheep can do without water longer than the cattle but owing to the fact that subzero temperatures have caused all of the water holes to be frozen over, all of the livestock are imperiled. The consistency of the snow is of a powdered variety and offers very little water content, so the fate of the sheep is extremely desperate.

Railroad rates should be made on feed and livestock to and from the stricken areas. Because of the fact that many areas are still isolated, we have not yet heard the true picture in actual figures.

All of the assistance that you can give us in obtaining relief in order to save our livestock will be greatly appreciated. Gentlemen, I urge that the emergency be taken care of today, for another 4 days will be too late.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I want to say only that this storm is probably the peer of all storms that has ever occurred in the Rocky Mountains and Plains State region. Only this morning we hear again that a bigger and more terrific blizzard is heading for the same area.

It is almost impossible to keep the roads open. When snow plows clear the highways, new winds have been arising to fill in the snow once again. It melts, then freezes and becomes almost solid ice and the next time it storms there are these terrible walls of ice on each side of the highway, making it necessary to take men with shovels to re-clear the highway. A most difficult task.

We are not asking for feed. I support this resolution and I hope the House passes it unanimously, because it deals with one of the most terrific disasters that has ever touched the northwestern part of these United States.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

STRIKES AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Speaker, we have a law which says that management and labor must above all recognize under law that neither party has any right in its relations with any other to engage in acts or practices which jeopardize the public health, safety, or interest. The law then defines and punishes practices on the part of labor and management which affect commerce and are inimical to the general welfare. These quotations are the voice of the Taft-Hartley law. Elsewhere, and to the same end, I hear another voice:

> Employers and workers must not rage against one another in struggle over pay and wage scales, damaging the economic existence of both, but must solve these problems jointly in a higher instance, which must above all constantly envision the welfare of the people as a whole and of the state.

This latter quotation is the voice of Hitler from the pages of Mein Kampf. These voices are alike and both blare forth the song of totalitarianism. This Congress should promptly repeal this law and reinstate our good American system.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tomorrow to file a report on the bill (H. R. 1660) to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. COFFEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes on Monday next, following the regular business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered for that date.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three separate instances and to include letters and resolutions.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a very interesting article which appeared in the Boston Herald of January 19.

Mr. MICHENER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JONAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Times-Herald.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the change in House rules and to include a letter from a former Member of the House, Mr. John O'Connor, on the same subject.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio message.

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two articles from the Washington Post and a letter that he has written to the President of the United States.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. COLMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

BLUE STAR MOTHERS OF AMERICA

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide for the incorporation of the organization known as the Blue Star Mothers of America.

The objectives of this organization as set forth in its constitution are patriotic, educational, social, and for service; true allegiance to the Government of the United States; assistance to veterans and especially to those mothers who gave their sons or daughters in the service of our country; fostering of true democracy; alertness against un-American activities; upholding freedom, justice, and equal rights; and the defense of the United States from all enemies.

Those eligible for membership in the organization are mothers, adopted mothers, or stepmothers living in the United States of a son or daughter serving in our armed forces, or who have sons or daughters honorably discharged from our armed forces during the emergency of World War II.

Few of our people have displayed such heroism, have made such sacrifices, and have given so much of themselves in worry and heartache as the mothers eligible for membership in this organization. Here is a truly patriotic group, a potential as well as an active force with capacity to bind our people together by fostering those things that build a strong America, even as they will be a bulwark against the infiltration of those life concepts that contradict our American purposes and our ideals.

Mothers of service men and women, as represented by the Blue Star Mothers of America, should have this Federal recognition, so taking their rightful place beside such groups as the various service organizations that have been granted Federal charters.

I hope the bill will have early and favorable consideration, both in the Committee on the Judiciary and in the House.

GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR IS BREAKING THE GIANT COMBINES OF JAPAN

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to represent the city of Little Rock, in which one of the great military leaders of modern times was born, just 69 years ago yesterday. Gen. Douglas MacArthur has spent little time in his native State, but we in Arkansas like to think that one characteristic which he has demonstrated in his direction of the affairs of Japan is associated with his knowledge of economic problems of the South and the West.

It was the feeling of the agricultural sections of this country that their relationship to the industrial power of the Nation, sometimes referred to as a colonial status, led to the passage of the Sherman Antitrust Act, and later to the Clayton Act, in an effort to break the hold which the big combines and the giant industries had fixed upon large segments of the Nation.

Japan, too, in the years before the war, had similar combines—in fact, a very large percentage of the industrial wealth of Japan was tightly held by only a handful of managerial families. These people were known as the Zaibatsu, or money clique.

One of the large problems in the reorganization of the Japanese economy at the end of the war has been to decentralize these combines so that the wealth which they produced might be more generally held and the people of Japan as a whole might cease to suffer from the monopolistic practices.

General MacArthur has been actively favoring this policy of reorganization of Zaibatsu power, and his efforts in that direction are appreciated by the citizens of the area which is proud to claim him as a native son.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

THE GERMAN PEOPLE

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am taking the floor to call to the attention of the House another of those decisions of the German-staffed denazification courts which are causing more and more concern to American citizens who can recall the unhappy lassitude with which the

world listened to the soft peace whines of the Germans following the First World War.

I refer today to the action of a German denazification court which set aside an earlier conviction of Count Franz von Papen and reduced his fine. A light touch to this aging and ailing man was the prohibition against participation in politics. Von Papen has been one of the most valuable men in Germany for 40 years, and he has never been openly in politics. He has been the master international fixer, the sly gray fox of Vaterland diplomacy.

Example could be piled on example. Fritz Thyssen and Hjalmar Schacht are among the most glaring examples.

More recently Walter Gieseking suddenly appeared on the horizon as a cleansed and purified artist, purged of his Naziphile record and perfumed for the delectation of music lovers.

Gieseking is admittedly one of the world's greatest living pianists, and I regret that I was forced by my convictions and my conscience to take the lead in forcing his expulsion from the country as an undesirable after the State Department had granted him a visitor's visa. As Dr. Hans Kindler expressed it, we have to draw the line somewhere; and in the flood of visiting pro-Nazi artists, musicians, journalists, scientists, lawyers, and what not, I chose to draw the line at Walter Gieseking, not only because I believe that he himself is a danger to the security of this country, but to dramatize the flow of whitewashed Nazi crows who are entering while the victims of Hitlerism are still confined to DP camps.

However, the most terrifying thing about this situation, both as to visiting Nazis and to those who stay in Germany, is the clue given as to the attitude of the German people and, perhaps, of our own Americans in Germany.

I do not wish to cast any intemperate reflections at the gallant Americans, military and civilian alike, who are manning our own farflung bastions of security in middle Europe, yet it cannot escape my mind that the denazification courts would not be so lenient to flagrant guilt if it were not well understood that the Americans are not mad at the Germans any more.

For almost 2,000 years the German people have been a constant threat to civilization.

Mr. Speaker, we must not let ourselves be lulled into forgetfulness of the death and horror and misery they have brought to Europe and America over the centuries. Let us not permit the German dream of empire to be brought to new and bloody reality.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. HOLIFIELD) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in each printed items.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Philadelphia Inquirer in reference to my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], who for 16 years has been one of the most distinguished Members of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DURHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Dr. Philip C. Jessup, United States representative of the Security Council in Paris.

Mr. GRANAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by John M. Cummings, appearing in the Philadelphia Inquirer.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include in each an editorial.

Mr. EVINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by a former Member of Congress.

INSTITUTE FOR RHEUMATISM AND ARTHRITIS RESEARCH

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill that would authorize the establishment in the United States Public Health Service of an Institute on Rheumatism and Arthritis. This bill follows in general, Mr. Speaker, the same type of research study that has been authorized in the mental health bill, cancer, tuberculosis, and heart bills.

I am happy to say that I have been joined in this effort by the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. I hope that we can, with this approach, get some legislation passed soon that will be helpful in research in this field.

RHEUMATISM AND ARTHRITIS RESEARCH

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Tennessee has said, we have introduced today a bill to set up an institute within the Public Health Service to look into the research, the cause, and the cure of arthritis and rheumatism. Statistics show that arthritis and rheumatism are the greatest crippliers of all the diseases. There are 7,000,000 people who are now suffering from rheumatism and arthritis within the United States. One hundred and forty-seven thousand people today are immobilized in bed by reason of arthritis. It is not a spectacular disease. It does not attract the headlines. At the same time it is a very cruel and merciless disease, confining many people to lifetime of imprisonment, suffering, and torture. I say this not from any statistics, but from the personal experience of a member of my own family. Twenty-five years ago this man weighed 175 pounds and was a fine physical specimen. Today he weighs 108 pounds and his body is as rigid as a rail, completely ossified. It was a sad and tragic sight to watch this dread disease creep from his knees into his hips, up his spine, into his neck and shoulders, leaving them completely cemented. Today, arthritis is sealing his jaws and closing his eyelids—it does not kill, but it might be more humane if it did. He has been to every clinic and sanatorium of repute in the Western Hemisphere, and it is sad to report that no one knows anything about arthritis. Certainly a Government that gives millions to develop land and electricity and roads—a Government which gave $11,000,000 to make paths through forests last year—can and should get behind a movement to find out the cause and cure of arthritis, the Nation's great crippler.

ADJOURNMENT OVER AND PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman please tell us the program for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be glad to. At the present time there is no specific program for next week. If, however, any bills are reported out of committee—and I cannot see any that will have to have the attention of the House on Monday, Tuesday, or probably Wednesday—and in order to have sufficient flexibility so that the House will feel I am keeping faith with them—I will give the House 24 hours' notice; for example, the reorganization bill. I do not know whether or not that bill or any other bill will come out of committee next week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. We will have 24 hours' notice?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will give the House 24 hours' notice. With that flexibility, I have no program to announce for next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL ARTHRITIS AND RHEUMATIC RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, the No. 1 crippler of our people is arthritis and rheumatic diseases. Strange as it may seem, basic research in this field has been exceedingly limited.

Seven million Americans are suffering from some type of arthritis or other forms of rheumatic disease. One hundred forty-seven thousand are completely disabled. Over 800,000 are partially disabled, and more than 6,000,000 others are subject to chronic or recurrent disability and pain. It is time that the resources of the Nation were mobilized to fight this destructive crippler of mankind.

Following the pattern set by the Congress in the National Mental Health Act, the Cancer Act, and the Heart Act, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the gentleman from Wisconsin who is now speaking have today filed identical bills proposing to establish a National Arthritis and Rheumatic Research Institute as a part of the Public Health Service. I sincerely hope that this legislation will receive an early hearing, and I am convinced that it will pass the Congress by unanimous consent and thus set in motion a program that will develop the scientific and medical resources of this Nation and the world in an effort to find the cause and a cure for this No. 1 crippler of our people. It is purely a bipartisan effort, conceived in the interest of the American people. I trust that every Member of Congress will become familiar with the provisions of this act and give it the same unanimous support that has been accorded similar legislation in the fields heretofore referred to.

OUR FATS AND OILS PROBLEM CAN BE AND MUST BE SOLVED

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the House a matter that affects every section of the United States and gives you an illustration of how delegations of powers to the departments of government can be misused either through ignorance or deliberate intent.

Congress was asked to give the different departments of government the power to control and allocate exports of various products. Among these products are fats and oils, produced from farm products in the United States. The importance of our fats and oils cannot be overestimated in thinking of national prosperity.

Mr. Carl H. Wilken, economic analyst of the Raw Materials National Council, through his studies of our national economy has revealed the fact that each $1 of gross farm production generates $7 of national income. Our production of fats and oils—butter, cottonseed oil, linseed oil, corn oil, soybean oil, peanut oil, tung oil, lard, tallow, and greases—approximates 10,000,000,000 pounds per year. Our annual production of fats and oils therefore is very important in our national economy. For each 10 cents per pound there is involved $1,000,000,000 of gross farm income and $7,000,000,000 of national income.

Fats and oils are the concentrated food product from much of our farm production. A pound of fat contains 4,080 calories as compared to 1,260 calories in a pound of lean meat. It is the most highly concentrated form of food to create human energy.

Using the control which we, the Congress, as a body gave them, the various departments have permitted the imports of fats and oils from world supplies. At the same time they have curtailed the allocations for exports to the extent that supplies have accumulated in the United States and have depressed the price. All told our imports were approximately 470,000,000 pounds greater than the exports which they permitted, even though we have this great surplus of fats and oils.

As a result of these indirect OPA tactics the price of lard in the past 12 months has dropped from 28 cents per pound to 14.5 cents. Other fats and oils have dropped in proportion. The packer knows when he buys hogs, cattle, and sheep that he will take a loss of at least 12 cents per pound on the lard and tallow, so to make up this loss he must charge several cents more per pound for the meat.

The effect can be easily estimated for different sections of the Nation. For example, the estimated cottonseed oil production from the 1948 cotton crop will approximate 1,650,000,000 pounds. Because of the price reduction of approximately 15 cents per pound the farmers of the South will lose approximately $250,000,000 if we permit this control to continue.

In the case of tallow, a part of a fat corn-fed steer, the price has been forced down to a price below that established under the days of the old OPA. In fact the price of all these fats and oils are rapidly reaching OPA levels.

As Members of Congress we should all realize that, if we are to meet the President's budget request of approximately $45,000,000,000, we must maintain a high national income. What right have we as a body to permit the different departments of Government to destroy the very income we need and destroy our primary income from agriculture.

In my opinion there is no excuse for this situation. Europe is being rationed at the rate of 1 pound of edible fat per month, or about one-fourth of our domestic consumption. Fats are the cheapest form of calories and the most vital for building up human energy. Yet here we find ourselves deliberately buying up world supplies, and refusing to permit Europe to have the necessary fats for a good diet because some bureaucrat is misusing powers which we have voted. Here is one place where the reciprocal trade treaty is beginning to hurt and hurt badly.

Under the circumstances I feel that the Congress should notify these departments to make increased allocations at once and that when legislation to renew these powers comes before this body we refuse to extend this control over the exports of fats and oils and misuse of authority. Congress in granting these powers did not intend that it should be used as price control.

In order that you may rest assured that various groups called this matter to the attention of those in control, I would like to insert in the RECORD as a part of my statement an analysis made by our friend Carl H. Wilken for the Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc. This analysis was presented to the Fats and Oils Branch of the Production Marketing Division on August 30, 1948. Therefore the blame rests directly upon the departments in charge. It looks as if it requires direct action by this body to remove this world monopoly over fats and oils which we have permitted through legislation.

If we wish to have meat production in the United States then we must prevent the penalty of low prices for fats and oils which curtails the feeding of livestock.

Our farmers and leading farm organizations are greatly concerned about this matter and they are insisting that it be corrected, and rightly so. Here is a letter from Mr. Howard Hill, president of the Iowa Farm Bureau, which I will also read to the House:

IOWA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Des Moines, Iowa, January 21, 1949.

Hon. BEN F. JENSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BEN: The farmers of Iowa are very much concerned over the decline in lard prices, which, as you know, is being reflected in the price of live hogs. Current prices have dropped as low as 13 cents a pound. The reason for this decline in the price of lard is, of course, the supply. The supplies of lard in cold storage January 1 were 112,000,000 pounds as compared with a 5-year average of 105,000,000 pounds on that date.

One of the reasons for the increase in supply is the lower export allocations. The allocations made thus far for the January–March quota amount to 72,000,000 pounds. In the same quarter a year ago, exports were 96,000,000 pounds. Revised United States Department of Agriculture estimates indicate that we will produce 683,000,000 pounds for this current quarter.

The members of the Iowa Farm Bureau board of directors have asked me to write and seek your support for additional allocations for the European relief program. Recommendations concerning ERP shipments are made by the Department of Agriculture to the Department of Commerce. It is our understanding that the Department of Agriculture has recommended higher export allocations, but as yet these recommendations have not been approved by the Department of Commerce.

At the present price, lard is a very cheap source of food. We feel that it is one of the best commodities the Europeans could purchase since they have a need for animal

fats, and at this price I know of no commodity they could purchase to secure more food value for their money.

The per capita consumption of meat went down from 155.2 pounds in 1947 to 145.2 pounds in 1948. In the case of pork (including lard) the per capita consumption went down from 70.0 pounds in 1947 to 66.8 pounds in 1948. In 1939–41 average consumption of pork was 67.7 pounds per capita. The people want more meat and an increase in the exports of lard would encourage the production of hogs, which in turn would help relieve the grain situation when we run into a surplus grain problem.

I am calling this to your attention because we feel that the Department of Commerce may need some urging and because we feel that this is an opportunity to benefit both the recipients of the European relief shipments and the Midwest farmer.

If we can be of service at any time, please feel free to call on us.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

E. HOWARD HILL,
President.

ANALYSIS OF LIVESTOCK SITUATION, FATS AND OILS PRICES—PRODUCTION AND POTENTIAL GRAIN SUPPLIES

(By Carl H. Wilken, economic analyst)

Mr. E. F. FORBES,
President, Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.:

In making an analysis of the livestock situation and the relationship of fats and oils to the industry involves many factors not only from the standpoint of production of meats but also the attitude of national economic policies that affect the industry in many ways.

The present situation of fats and oils in the general price structure presents a distorted picture when compared with the long range of price relationship between meat products and fats and oils. This distortion, in my opinion, is entirely the result of governmental controls over the exports and imports of fats and oils and the failure of those in charge to analyze all the factors that enter into a realistic allocation of fats and oils for export.

RATIONING OF FATS AND OILS

Legislation which gives the different departments of Government the power to control exports of fats and oils indirectly carries with it the power to ration supplies to other nations. Failure to make proper allocations of lard, tallow, and other greases for exports can very easily increase the domestic supply sufficiently to reduce the price far below the normal price structure.

Too low a price for the fats and oils in turn affects all branches of the livestock industry, from the farm to the consumer.

For example, in August 1947, fats and oils reached a relatively low price as compared to the live cost of cattle and hogs. As a result the packer in buying heavy or lard hogs reduced the price to the farmer as much as $8 per hundredweight. The farmer in turn having taken a loss on his hogs because of their weight curtailed his productive efforts with the result that hog numbers January 1, 1948, were back to 1939 levels.

Even though the packer was able to protect himself to some extent by lower bids for heavy hogs, he was forced to pass on some of the loss on lard and tallow to the wholesaler and retailer of meat.

This branch of the industry in turn being confronted with losses on the sale of fats and oils trimmed from the carcass, were forced to pass it on to the consumer in a higher price for choice cuts such as pork chops and hams. It is interesting to note that in the period from May 1947 through August 1947, as the price of lard in the Washington retail market dropped 10 cents per pound, the price of pork chops increased 10 cents per pound This relationship was recognized by the OPA in their ceilings on meat products. During the era of price control the price of pork chops was approximately double the price of lard.

NO ONE GAINED

No one benefited particularly from the rationing of fats and oils by the departments, with the possible exception of the soap industry, which found it possible to buy relatively cheap fats for their soap products. Because of the buying power of the public the packer and retailer in most cases were able to pass on the loss on fats and oils to the consumer of meats. As a direct result the consumer has been forced to pay from 10 to 15 cents per pound more for steak, pork chops, hams, etc., than would normally be necessary. The packer, farmer, and retailer all were blamed for the high meat prices when in fact most of the blame should be placed directly on the unsound policies followed in making the proper allocations to maintain the price balance.

These departments will very likely state that they are not interested in the price, but by preventing exports and allocations they have controlled supply and indirectly the price, regardless of whether they intended to do so or not.

FUTURE SUPPLIES

In addition to the factors I have mentioned, excessive purchases of grains at critical periods in the market last year sent grain prices sky-rocketing. Widespread publicity of the shortage of grain and high price resulted in the liquidation of millions of head of livestock. Numbers of cattle and hogs as of January 1, 1948, indicate that meat production for 1949 will drop back to approximately 19,000,000,000 pounds. This drop of over 4,000,000,000 pounds, from the production of 1945, 1946, and 1947 is a drop of approximately 18 percent. The drop in production will in turn reduce the per capita consumption to approximately 130 pounds as compared to 155 pounds in 1947.

Unless the departments adopt a realistic attitude towards fats and oils prices, permitting them to rise to a level which will induce the farmer to feed to heavier weights, we will have future shortages of both fats and oils and meat products.

To illustrate, if a program were initiated to induce the farmer to add 50 pounds to the weight of each hog marketed, the 40,000,000 spring pigs available for market in 1948 and the early part of 1949, we could increase our meat production—live weight—2,000,000,000 pounds. In the process of producing the additional weight we would have an increase in both meats and fats and oils. But, after the experience of the last few years, the farmer is not likely to feed for additional weight if the present dislocation in fats and oils prices as compared to meat continues.

FEED SUPPLIES

Present crop estimates indicate the largest supply of feed grains in history, and the Nation could have the additional meat and fats by bringing the livestock and grains available together, the former as the factory and the latter as the raw material.

Unless such a program is brought into being, meat supplies will remain in short supply for several years. In fact, our expansion in livestock production has not kept pace with the increase in population since 1930.

In 1920 we had a population of 105,000,000 with a cattle population of 70,400,000, hog population of 60,159,000, and a sheep population of 40,743,000.

At the present time we have a population of approximately 145,000,000 with a cattle population of 78,000,000, a hog population of 55,000,000, and a sheep population of 38,571,000.

1948 MEAT PRODUCTION

It should be remembered that some of the 1947 and 1948 meat production was the result of liquidation of livestock numbers. With the large crop of feed grains and lower grain prices the tendency of the producer will be to replace some of the liquidation of livestock. In bringing this about breeding stock held back for expansion will reduce the marketable animals for 1949, thus decreasing meat production to that extent.

PRICE RELATIONSHIPS

In analyzing price relationships of fats and oils, hides, and meat products to live costs, it should be borne in mind that the producer cannot segregate these items and in the feeding process must produce all of them. The attitude of the departments toward the fats and oils situation indicates that they look upon fats, hides, etc., as byproducts and seem to forget that when a steer is purchased at $40 per hundredweight that this also represents the cost per pound of tallow and hides. Any reduction that the packer or distributor must take below the live cost has to be added on to some other part of the carcass in order for it to pay out.

As a result of this fact the price of lard, tallow, and hides to break even should be somewhat higher than the average live cost. To illustrate, you will note the tabulation below as to the average live cost of cattle, the price of hides, and the price of tallow. In the case of tallow, the price in the period 1925–29 which I have used was somewhat lower than the live cost of all beef steers. The low tallow price was the result of competition from two factors, first, the imports of coconut oil and, second, the fats or greases rendered from many sources.

	Average price of all steers at Chicago	Price of hides at Chicago, heavy native	Wholesale price of tallow at Chicago
	Per hundredweight	*Cents per pound*	*Cents per pound*
1925	$10.16	15.96	9.7
1926	9.47	14.08	8.7
1927	11.06	19.28	8.1
1928	13.91	23.85	8.8
1929	13.43	16.98	8.5
Average	11.66	18.03	8.7

Using the 1925–29 prices as an index of 100, a comparison with live cost for 1947 of $25.83 per hundredweight for all beef steers, the increase was 121 percent. On this basis the average price of tallow in 1947 should have been 221 percent of the 1925–29 average or 19.2 cents per pound. It happens that this checks exactly with the average price in 1947 as given in the Fats and Oils Situation (BAE) for January–April 1948.

Applying the same index to hides, the average price of heavy hides at Chicago in 1947 should have been approximately 40 cents per pound.

The average price of cattle in the week ended August 21 at Chicago was $34.78 per hundredweight. This is approximately an increase of 200 percent from 1925–29 averages. At this price level, tallow should sell for 26.1 cents per pound and hides at 54 cents per pound.

The current price for prime inedible tallow is approximately 13.5 cents per pound and heavy hides 29 cents per pound. The loss on these two items, as compared to present live costs, is approximately $22 on a beef which has a live weight of approximately 950 pounds and a beef carcass of 500 pounds.

Marketing specialists in the United States Department of Agriculture estimate the suet, cod, and shop fat at 10 percent of carcass weight. Deducting this from the carcass weight of 500 pounds, it leaves 450 pounds of

meat. Deducting from this an estimated shrink and waste of 10 percent, the 500-pound carcass has 400 pounds of salable meat.

To absorb the loss of $22 from too low a comparative price on hides and tallow, the mark-up on the salable meat must be approximately 5.5 cents per pound. A choice beef carcass will yield roughly 25 percent of steak or 125 pounds. If the loss is recovered from a mark-up in the price of steak it would require an additional charge of 17.6 cents per pound.

In newspaper accounts of high meat prices steak is usually used as an illustration. The news items, however, do not point out that rationing of fats and oils and relatively low prices for fats and hides, as compared to live costs are responsible and that the packer or the retail butcher is being unjustly criticized for highjacking the public.

HOG PRICES

A similar condition exists in the relative price of lard, live costs of hogs, and retail prices. The tabulation below gives average hog prices and lard prices in the period 1925–29.

	Average hog prices at Chicago	Average lard prices at Chicago [1]
	Per Cwt.	*Cts. per lb.*
1925	$11.81	17.9
1926	12.34	16.9
1927	9.95	13.7
1928	9.22	13.3
1929	10.16	12.9
Average	10.70	14.9

[1] Refined lard, wholesale.

In 1947 the average price of hogs at Chicago was $24.45. This represented an increase from the 1925–29 average of 129 percent. The price of lard to maintain the relative price to live costs in 1925–29 should have been 34.1 cents per pound.

The average price during the year 1947 was 25.6 cents per pound. Live costs at Chicago the week ending August 21, 1948, averaged $27.48 per hundredweight or 156 percent above the average of 1925–29. Current prices for refined lard should be 38.1 cents per pound. The current price is approximately 18 cents. In other words, the packer, wholesaler, and retailer must absorb a loss of 18 cents per pound on lard at present market levels.

Lard production (average 1942–46) is approximately 20 percent of total pork production. On this basis a good butcher weighing 250 pounds and dressing 178 pounds would yield 35.6 pounds of lard.

With the present price relationship between live costs and lard, the packer loss on lard is approximately 20 cents per pound or $7.12 for each 250-pound hog. This loss is passed on to the consumer in the sale of the dressed carcass weighing approximately 150 pounds after deducting the lard. The loss of $7.12 spread over the total salable meat is approximately 5 cents per pound if allowance is made for cutting shrinkage.

The loins and bacon combined represent approximately the same weight as the lard part of the carcass. With lard selling at a loss of 20 cents per pound, to make up this loss a similar number of pounds of pork chops or bacon or ham, bacon and pork chops must be sold at a higher price level. As I have pointed out, the price of pork chops advanced in direct ratio to the drop in lard prices. With pork chops or pork loins representing about 15 pounds of the carcass from a 250-pound hog, it is evident that about one-half of the loss is passed on in this way. The rest of the loss must be recovered from higher prices for hams, bacon, etc.

SUMMARY

Summarizing the effect of the price dislocation, no one has gained as the result of it, with the possible exception of the soap industry, which has had the advantage of cheap fats for their industry. The consumer has paid for the lower lard prices, the advance in choice cuts of meat having been used to offset the relatively low lard price.

The principal result has been to discourage the producer in feeding to heavier weights, thus curtailing the production of both fats and meat products. In addition, the farmer has suffered a direct financial loss. This loss can be quite accurately determined.

For example, if he markets 230-pound hogs at $30 per hundredweight, the approximate price in July for that weight, he receives $66 per head. In July the heavy hogs, 360 pounds, sold for $24.50 on the Chicago market and the farmer received $88.20, or an increase of $22.20 for the additional weight of 140 pounds. For this additional weight he received 15.85 cents per pound as compared to $30 per hundredweight for the hog sold at 220 pounds.

His comparative loss is approximately $22. This penalty for weight is not a good incentive for either the production of meat or fats and the shortage which has developed will continue.

That the price differential is entirely the result of too low a price for lard is revealed by heavy-hog and light-hog prices for the years 1925, 1927, 1929 and 1943 (OPA ceilings).

	Prices at Chicago	
	Heavy hogs, 330 to 360 pounds	Light hogs, 200 to 250 pounds
	Per cwt.	*Per cwt.*
1925	$12.19	$12.23
1927	10.16	10.45
1929	10.29	10.52
1943	14.41	14.66
1948 (July)	24.51	29.66

The record indicates clearly that there is no great differential if lard prices are in proper ratio. This price balance has been upset by the unwise rationing of fats and oils to the extent of depressing the price.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The various departments should provide for larger allocations of tallow and lard for export. Fats are a very much needed food in Europe and represents an economical food. Fat is a highly concentrated food and there is no cost of freight for water content such as we have in meat, fruits, potatoes, etc.

In my opinion a supplemental allocation of 100,000,000 in the third quarter of 1948 would have corrected the price situation. Proper allocations should be made in the fourth quarter to restore the historical price balance which is an entirely natural one.

With a proper price ratio for fats, etc., to remove the penalty for weight, the producer should be encouraged to feed to heavier weights, thus overcoming some of the present shortage of fats and meats.

The estimated corn crop of 3,500,000,000 bushels can be turned into fat and meat, the only process we have to get increased production. Unless such a course is followed high meat prices and a shortage of fats and meat will continue and the stocks of corn will pile up as a surplus stock of raw materials for meat and fat production.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Omaha Herald.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a report from the Bristol Courier of January 3, 1949, entitled "The Year 1949."

ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I am very much grieved this morning to see in the statement of the Federal Treasury as of January 17 that, while last year we had a credit balance of $1,571,000,000 as of that date, today we have a deficit of $112,000,000. This means we should get down to brass tacks, talk economy and practice economy in our Government.

Think of what the President's messages to Congress were.

There were many proposals to spend and spend and spend. He did not say anything about economy in Government. It grieves me greatly to think that the President is not going to try to instill in the minds of the people of America, especially the Members of this Congress, that we have to economize in the many things we are doing in this Nation if we are to preserve our stability. Just look at the Government deficits we have had in the past few years.

In 1943 the deficit was $57,400,000,000.

In 1944 the deficit was $51,400,000,000.

In 1945 the deficit was $53,900,000,000.

In 1946 the deficit was $20,700,000,000.

In 1947, under a Republican Congress, we had a surplus of $754,000,000.

In 1948 the Republican surplus amounted to $8,400,000,000. It shows what the Republicans can do; besides, they cut the taxes of our American people. The Republicans believe in a solvent Government—a Government of the people, for the people, and by the people.

Look what the President has done in starting us off for 1949—he advocates spending to the extent that we have a deficit for 1949 of $373,000,000, and for 1950 a deficit of $2,700,000,000. All he thinks of is spending. Why does not the President and the Congress have some degree of sane, sensible sound business in Government operation? With a debt of over $252,000,000,000, more deficit financing means ruin for Government, ruination for our people. Again I say to you,

Where in the world will you get the money for this ruthless spending?

Stop, look, and for goodness' sake, listen.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a series of editorials favoring statehood for Hawaii.

NATURALIZATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide for the naturalization of certain noncitizen parents of persons who served in the armed forces of the United States, or in the merchant marine, in World War I or World War II.

The sons and daughters of these noncitizens filled the ranks of our services. Many of them paid the supreme sacrifice.

They have rightfully earned for their parents the privilege of citizenship.

Through force of circumstance or economic necessity, in many instances, these parents of large families were denied the ready accessibility to citizenship.

They were occupied with the problem of rearing the future citizens of America. They should not be penalized for devotion to so noble a duty. Rather, a medal of citizenship should be struck and bestowed for meritorious service to this country.

There can be no loftier grant, no finer gesture, than the extension of the much-cherished privilege of American citizenship to persons whose moral, spiritual, and physical contribution to our greatness produced offspring citizens who have fought and bled and sacrificed and otherwise distinguished themselves as true Americans.

Can there be any hesitancy about accepting them for citizenship when they have so capably exhibited and proved by actual practice that they possess the prime requisities for graduation to actual and official Americanization.

Is this not one of those times when all minds concur to make this possible?

They fathered and mothered our manpower for the battlefields and for our arsenals at home, for the professions and the arts, and the businesses, and for every field of contributory endeavor that has brought us to our present position as a leading world power.

We would be grateful, for we are a grateful people, to do what is clearly obvious.

They qualify in every respect but one.

Shall we refuse to adopt them legally as our own simply because, unwittingly, and perhaps unintentionally, we had thrown a road block in their path to citizenship.

They have proved their worth; they have earned their fare. Their undeniable attachment to the principles of Americanism should impel us to remove that obstacle.

In this specific instance, the educational requirements should be waived.

The bill that I present today is meant to do just that. It is a reasonable move. It is an Americanlike attitude. It is the exercise of typically American virtues. Fundamentally, it is gratitude expressed as only America could express it.

It is my hope that on both sides of the aisle there is recognized the moral obligation incurred over the years and especially during the last two World Wars.

For in the process of building the greatness that is ours, theirs was a contribution no less patriotic, no less civic-minded, and no less devoted than ours.

The flesh and blood of these fathers and mothers were bartered for the sake of our preservation on Normandy's shore, on Gaudalcanal, on the seas of the world, and in the skies over lands far from the good old U. S. A.

I urge early and favorable consideration of this bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD with reference to a bill he is today introducing to establish an immigration quota for the state of Israel.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, there was spent for unemployment insurance last year $750,000,000 in a time of full employment. When I read in the papers that thousands of people are spending their winters in Florida on unemployment insurance, it suggests to my mind the old axiom, "Where ignorance is bliss, 'tis folly to be wise." And this suggests the following more modern axiom, "When you can cheat the Government by not working and vacation in the sunny climes of Florida on unemployment insurance, why work?"

That is what is happening in thousands of cases, because the administration of unemployment insurance has been so loose that thousands of wage earners, when through with one job, refuse to take another one, claiming that the offered employment is not suitable.

In too many instances the Government agency obligingly agrees with the job applicant who goes on unemployment insurance. Many wage earners themselves refer to unemployment insurance as rocking-chair money. To some extent it has become a Nation-wide racket for the accommodation of loafers, at the expense of those who are willing to work.

Mr. Speaker, New York papers carry the story that over 1,000 New Yorkers on unemployment insurance are vacationing in Florida and escaping the more rigorous climate of the North.

From northern Illinois the papers say that over 200 of these so-called unemployed are rocking away their time, also basking in the sunshine of Florida.

The press in Washington carries the story that over 300 District citizens are receiving their unemployment compensation while spending the winter in Florida in a climate more to their liking.

These are only a few of the many thousands throughout the Nation who are taking advantage of the loose administration of this law.

The administration has recommended more weeks of unemployment insurance be granted the workers and, in some States, more pay per week. If such a bill passes, it is to be hoped that no over-indulgent Congressman will offer an amendment to it to include for the comfort of those who see fit to spend their winters in Florida, free beach chairs, or rocking chairs, also at the expense of the taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the people generally want this act tightened up, so only those who are really in need and are entitled to unemployment insurance get it. That was the real intent of the law.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. JUDD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances: in each to include extraneous material.

Mr. MEYER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD with reference to the production of strategic materials.

Mr. MACK of Washington (at the request of Mr. TOLLEFSON) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

KEEPING HISTORY STRAIGHT ON CHARPENTRY, FRANCE

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, much as I dislike to spoil a good story, I must correct the one related in the Washington Star of Saturday, January 22, 1949, for the sake of historical accuracy.

In substance the news story stated that Capt. Harry Truman, in command of Battery D, One Hundred and Twenty-ninth Field Artillery, "forgot" an order against firing across the division boundary separating the Thirty-fifth Division—Kansas and Missouri National Guard—and the Twenty-eighth Division—Pennsylvania National Guard—on the west side of the Aire River left of the Thirty-fifth Division in the Muese Argonne.

The story goes on to say that by forgetting the order, Captain Truman trained his guns on the village of Charpentry, knocked out six guns, and enabled the Twenty-eighth Division to capture Charpentry with little loss of life—thus saving the lives of many Pennsylvania men.

Those are not the facts.

Let us keep history straight.

The Twenty-eighth Division did not capture Charpentry.

The Thirty-fifth Division did that job.

Charpentry was in the Thirty-fifth Division sector a few miles north of Vauquois Hill, taken by the Thirty-fifth Division on the first day of the drive.

Charpentry was taken by the Thirty-fifth Division before noon September 28, by the One Hundred and Thirty-seventh Infantry of which I was a member. Some troops from the One Hundred and Thirty-ninth Infantry also participated in taking this objective.

These are the facts—not fiction. If there is any doubt about this the War Department, histories, battle maps, and other members of the Thirty-fifth Division will verify them all.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent and also a brief newspaper article.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address by Reuben H. Markham.

Mr. HERTER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a brief statement made by a Member of Congress.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, with reference to an extension of remarks which I requested yesterday, to include some extraneous material with reference to urban relations, the Public Printer estimates that it will cost $390. I ask unanimous consent that it may be included in the RECORD notwithstanding the extra cost.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding and without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HAND asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech made by a former Member of Congress, Captain Bradley, before the Baltimore Rotary Club.

Mr. HARVEY (at the request of Mr. NORBLAD) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from a Newcastle, Ind., newspaper.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a summary of a bill introduced by 10 Republican Members on housing.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include certain excerpts.

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in each case to include an editorial.

Mr. DAGUE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Herman A. Love.

DR. PETER MARSHALL

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, not only is the Congress brought low in mourning for the spiritual leader lost, but his flock, the people of our National Capital, of our Nation, as well as many parts of the world, are united in grief as they lovingly recall the voice so recently stilled.

So young, fresh, strong, winsome, and thrilling, as he constantly gave the challenge to climb in the steps of his Master; so potent in prayer; our smiling friend, Dr. Peter Marshall, leaves a happier, better world because he lived; a clearer, surer hope because he still lives and beckons, where there is no death.

They that turn many to righteousness shall shine as the stars, forever and ever.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after all business and any other special orders, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD by inserting an article entitled "The Blockade of Berlin."

RESEARCH IN THE CURE AND TREATMENT OF RHEUMATISM AND ARTHRITIS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to be able to join with my distinguished colleagues on the Democratic side, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and my distinguished colleague on the Republican side, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], in introducing the bill for research into the causes and cure of rheumatism and arthritis. I would like to underscore what the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] has just said about the fact that this whole program is of a pattern and that it ties in very closely with the enlargement of the research facilities of our State universities, medical schools, and research centers around the country. I think this pattern is the most eloquent rebuttal of the idea that by undertaking this humanitarian program the Federal Government is engaged in discouraging private and individual enterprise. On the contrary, it is bringing out the best in our private economy and in private research. It is at long last doing justice to the millions of sufferers from heart disease, cancer, mental illness, tuberculosis, and now rheumatism and arthritis who have found no other adequate relief while they have seen billions expended—necessary as they are—for military weapons. A chart of the distribution of United States Public Health Service funds for these research purposes, follows:

Distribution of United States Public Health Service funds, by types—fiscal year 1949

	Intramural research	Project grants-in-aid research	Teaching and aid to medical schools, fellowships	Grants-in-aid to States	Research construction grants	Other	Total
National Heart Institute	$257,009	[1] $1,463,300	[2] $226,000	$175,000		$312,079	$2,633,388
National Cancer Institute	2,760,000	3,300,000	2,995,000	2,500,000	$8,000,000	2,445,000	22,000,000
National Mental Health Institute	57,600	470,000	1,550,000	3,550,000		3,420,400	9,028,000
Tuberculosis	675,000	[3] 601,666	7,500	6,780,000		1,578,500	9,553,666
Venereal	678,763	[3] 637,664	3,600	15,008,507		1,550,338	17,917,922
Arthritis and rheumatism		106,284	7,300	(4)			113,584
Deaths associated with childbirth (maternal, stillbirth, neonatal)		62,971	3,600				66,571
Dental institute	173,725	168,928	33,550			1,000,000	1,376,203

[1] Represents actual commitments at this time. Amount budgeted for this purpose is $1,875,000.
[2] Includes $51,000 for research fellowships awarded at this time. Amount budgeted for this purpose is $150,000.
[3] Plus antibiotics.
[4] Unspecified amount included in $11,214,666 of general health grants.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has expired.

THE LATE HONORABLE THEODORE CHRISTIANSON

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House with reference to the death of a former Member.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I report to the House the passing of a respected former Member of this body.

Theodore Christianson, three times Governor of Minnesota and a Member of the Seventy-third and Seventy-fourth Congresses from that State, died suddenly at his home near Dawson, Minn., on December 9, 1948.

Born in Lac qui Parle township of Lac qui Parle County, Minn., in 1883, he graduated from the University of Minnesota in 1906 and won his law degree there in 1909. He then started practice in Dawson, Minn., 9 miles from where he was born, and also acquired the Dawson Sentinel, which he published until 1925. He served in the State legislature from 1914 until his first term as Governor.

His many friends in Congress will remember him as a friend of the farmer and small business. While in Congress he opposed huge Government spending and centralization of power in the Federal Government and as Governor of our State gave the people of Minnesota a splendid administration.

After he left Congress he first became associated with the National Association of Retail Grocers and later in 1939 became public relations counsel for the National Association of Retail Druggists. In fact, he had just retired in October from the drug association and had planned to enjoy his retirement by spending his summers on his farm near Dawson and his winters in Florida, but fate decided otherwise.

Ted was a very scholarly man and was always seeking avidly further knowledge. He was a good customer of book shops, as evidenced by his large private library in which every book was well marked with notations and comments. His was not a superficial knowledge, for from his earliest college days he had dug deep into the study of history, politics, economics, and literature.

He was the author of Minnesota: a History of the State and Its People, which is one of the most scholarly histories of our great State. He also edited the National Association of Retail Druggists Journal and wrote numerous articles on government which were published in our foremost magazines.

He had two sons, Robert James and Theodore, Jr., by his first wife, Mrs. Ruth E. Donaldson Christianson, who died in 1944. He married his second wife, Mrs. Mayme B. Bundy, of Chicago, Ill., in 1946.

Last October he and Mrs. Christianson came to Washington to visit at the home of his brother, Mr. Curtis A. Christianson. He spent a whole day at the Capitol visiting all the haunts so familiar to him. His one regret was that Congress was not in session so that he could see his old friends. It is quite possible that he had a feeling that it might be his last visit.

I am sure his many friends in Congress will join in paying tribute to a great statesman and a great American.

I insert herewith three editorials, all printed in the Dawson Sentinel, which so aptly describe his outstanding career as a public servant:

TED CHRISTIANSON: A FRIEND

Newspapers all over the State of Minnesota will pay tribute to Theodore Christianson this week, most of whom will probably stress his public service. Other editorials on this page are expressions from the Twin City newspapers, each paying high tribute to the man who held the respect and esteem of men and women of all political faiths. Ted Christianson was no ordinary man, but like so many others who have achieved greatness, the bouquets come after death when his eyes can no longer read, nor his ears hear the praises and accolades.

His public service is well known to Sentinel readers, as is his ability as a writer and speaker. For many years Ted Christianson's opinions appeared in these columns while he was editor and publisher of the Sentinel, and from this chair he went on to fame and fortune. He was a self-made man, and his attainments came from his own efforts and abilities. He knew first hand the struggles and privations of pioneer life, and through that experience learned the valuable lesson of thrift and honesty, qualities which remained with him throughout his entire life.

His ability was recognized by others early in life, and it was the prediction of his minister during his confirmation days that Theodore Christianson would go on to greatness, becoming either a governor or a United States Senator. The first prediction came true, and Minnesota was given 6 years of State administration which set a pattern of achievement which has not been reached since. Economy and honesty in government was an imperative creed with Theodore Christianson, and though there were those among his political family who failed him, Theodore Christianson lived up to his pledges made during his first campaign. His was a political courage rare in the annals of State history.

We could devote this entire page in an attempt to pay just tribute to the career of Dawson's greatest citizen, but others, more able than we, will speak of nearly every phase of his life. We want to devote our tribute to the quality which we home folks knew better than anyone else—his friendliness.

We hope we will be pardoned for referring to our personal experience with Ted Christianson—we call him Ted, for no one around here called him anything but that. He was the kind of a man for whom one felt a personal friendship at the first meeting.

Back in 1916 Ted Christianson gave the commencement address to a class of six seniors at Belview. The writer was one of those six, and though we do not remember the message the speaker gave to us that night, we do remember that it exerted a powerful influence on us. We did not meet Ted Christianson again until in 1921. We were filling the position of superintendent of schools at Milan at that time, and, remembering the 1916 speech, we came over to Dawson to secure the services of Ted Christianson for our commencement exercises at Milan. We do not remember that speech, either, but we do recall that there was the same magnetic appeal. Our acquaintanceship ripened from that time on, and many were the times that an encouraging word or an inspiring conversation with him gave us a needed lift.

During our superintendency of the Dawson schools we felt the need for a change of profession. We discussed this with some friends, and Mr. and Mrs. Christianson heard of our plans and asked us to come and see them to talk over a proposition they had for us. Their genuine interest in our welfare and confidence in us influenced us to enter a profession entirely new to us, and their generosity gave us the opportunity of going into business for ourselves.

During our nearly 12 years as editor of this newspaper there have been times when we have been much discouraged, ready to throw in the sponge and try something else. However, encouraging letters and talks during Mr. Christianson's frequent visits gave us the needed impetus to keep going. He always maintained a keen interest in the paper he formerly published and never failed to visit the shop one or more times when here on a visit.

What Ted Christianson did for us is just one example of the influence his friendliness exerted. He was of the common people, and neither wealth nor fame made any difference in his treatment of his host of friends. His own success did not change him, and he was never so content as when spending his vacations in his home community and realizing some of the dreams and plans he had made for his declining years.

Ted Christianson was always planning for the future, and just a brief hour before his death was talking of plans he had for his home when he and his wife returned from their anticipated winter holiday in Florida. Had his plans materialized, the world would have been richer, for a part of his plans included the writing of several articles and possibly a book. His keen mind and sound philosophy of living won for him the kind of life most of us seek and never find.

Ted Christianson was a great man, and above all a great friend. We can think of no better way to express our feelings than to say that we shall sincerely miss him.

"MORE TED, LESS TAXES"

Theodore Christianson's first campaign for Governor of Minnesota was opened a quarter of a century ago by Gunnar Bjornson in the weekly Minnesota Mascot with an editorial titled "More Ted, Less Taxes." The slogan struck the popular fancy and helped Christianson win three terms as Governor. Economy was his platform and he carried it out with a consecration few men show in public office.

Christianson was a farm boy who worked his way through school to a law degree. He believed that self-reliance was a splendid asset for the individual and that thrift was a virtue to be cultivated in private living and government administration. Thus he found himself out of step with later political thought which held that a nation could spend itself out of difficulties.

Now Theodore Christianson has passed on and his philosophy seldom is heard in public places. Yet it still persists in the minds of men, like a voice of conscience, and some day may be brought into the open again.

The former Governor himself is not forgotten by any who knew him, for he was an able, honest, and friendly figure. He ran the Dawson Sentinel for many years and the loyalty of the country press to him was almost unanimous. As Governor and Congressman, he lived up to the responsibility this placed upon him. He served his State and his own ideals well.—Minneapolis Star-Journal.

HIS MONUMENTS ENTURE

Theodore Christianson, who died near his old home at Dawson, Thursday night, was the descendant of territorial pioneers, who came from Norway to settle in western Minnesota. He was the first native son of a native son to become Governor of the State. Editing a five-volume history of Minnesota, in 1935, Christianson paid tribute to the outstanding work in that field by the late William Watts Folwell, as "a monumental achievement by a man who not only wrote history but made it."

While the writing skill he displayed for years as editor of the Dawson Sentinel marked his effort as historian too, it is as a maker of Minnesota history rather than a recorder of it that Theodore Christianson will be remembered. Few men ever came to the governorship better prepared for its duties. Through 8 years in the House, much of that time chairman of its Appropriations Committee, he had an intimate, practical knowledge of State problems and governmental techniques.

It seems old-fashioned in view of more recent trends to recall his emphasis on economy as governor. But it was part of his concept of stewardship of a public trust. He believed government should abide by the same fundamental rules as to efficiency and economy which private business applies. And

he furthered that objective in the Reorganization Act of 1925, which rates as the greatest achievement in his 6-year administration as chief executive.

Institution of the preaudit system of budgeting and the maintenance of safeguards against spending State funds simply because it may be possible to spend them are fundamentals of reorganized State government that brought sweeping reforms when Christianson introduced them as Governor. They remained as time-tested essentials in such changes as the new reorganization act of 1939 brought.

The same traits of dependability and leadership marked Theodore Christianson's career in private business as had distinguished his work as State legislator, Governor and Congressman. The last public appearance he made in Minnesota was when called here to dedicate a memorial to the late C. M. Babcock, highway commissioner, at Elk River. He described as the most enduring monument to Babcock's career the State trunk highway system which he made a reality. Theodore Christianson leaves his own enduring monument in the high caliber of his civil leadership, and in technical phases of State government, reforms he fostered will endure, even long after their origins may have been forgotten. (St. Paul Pioneer Press.)

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to Theodore Christianson. He was an outstanding and one of the ablest governors in the history of our State. As a member of the State legislature and as Governor of our State he left a magnificent record—in legislation and in his program during his service as Governor—which is a monument to his ability as a legislator and Governor.

Theodore Christianson was a man of outstanding scholarly attainments, an able speaker, a gentleman of culture and integrity.

The State of Minnesota has in my opinion lost one of its ablest sons and I join in tribute to an outstanding American who gave so many years of his life in the public service.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of knowing Governor Christianson for at least 20 years. He was one of the finest and best men I ever knew. He was not only an able and wise man but he was also a very intelligent man in every way. He was a good, genuine, public-spirited citizen; he was civic-minded and always working in the interest of his country; he was truly a great American.

Governor Christianson during his life was famous and outstanding as a lawyer, newspaper publisher, historian, State legislator, Governor, Congressman, publicist, organization worker, and militant protagonist of small business. His passing is a great loss to the entire country.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in connection with my remarks an article which appeared in the journal of the National Association of Retail Druggists shortly after Governor Christianson's death.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The article referred to follows:

DEATH COMES TO THEODORE CHRISTIANSON

Theodore Christianson, editor emeritus of the NARD Journal, died on December 9 from a heart attack while en route to his farm home near Dawson, Minn. He was 65 years old on September 12.

Mr. Christianson was a former Governor of Minnesota and he had served two terms in Congress. He left behind an exemplary record of service, one that men in political positions today might well try to follow, for it was made through individual acceptance of the highest concepts of citizenship. He gave to public service the fullest measure of the abilities he possessed and conscientious recognition of the responsibilities that accompany election to an office of government. The ideals that guided him are the beacons of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States of America.

Mr. Christianson had been a stalwart fighter through the years for the basic values of a society built on the bedrock of freedom. Never once did he compromise on issues coupled to the fundamentals of liberty. He held fast to convictions he derived from intensive study of history. It pained him to see the people betrayed through the treachery of political leaders they had been induced to follow. He was troubled over the expansion of bureaucracy in government. "The consequence will be dictatorship," he often observed.

For a long time he had been much concerned anent the struggles of small business to survive. On numerous occasions he pointed to the onward march of monopoly. "It is bound to bring collectivism unless it is stopped before it is too late to save small business," he emphasized. He believed that it had become compulsory to enact legislation to make it illegal for corporate empires to purchase the assets of competitors. "Otherwise monopoly will continue to grow unchecked," he insisted. He also took the position that the laws against trusts must be modified to allow individual retailers to come together in concerted action to bargain with the manufacturers. He argued that now the small dealers were compelled to operate as best they could in an uphill fight against the unfair tactics of the producers.

Mr. Christianson joined the headquarters staff of the NARD as public-relations counsel in 1939. To the position he brought a thorough knowledge of economics and a background of experience that gave him familiarity with the force of public opinion. The programs he developed to help the independent retail druggists were realistic and in line with the problems of the individual retailers. He traveled over the country to arouse small business to the necessity for united action, and everywhere he went he stimulated militant activities against the destroyers of freedom of enterprise. He also wrote numerous articles to advance the cause of independent retail druggists and small business in general. To him it was an obligation of citizenship to strive for the preservation of the way of life that built the United States.

Then in 1945 he became editor of the NARD Journal. He continued in that position until he retired on November 1, 1948. The final contribution he made to the independent retail druggists was the farewell address he delivered at the golden jubilee convention of the NARD. It was published in full in the NARD Journal dated November 1.

Mr. Christianson was born on a farm in Lac qui Parle County, Minn. He was a son of Robert and Emma Christianson. They were of rugged stock and from them he first learned the great lessons of liberty. He clung with tenacity to the heritage of a pioneer society in the prairies of the Northwest.

After he was graduated from the high school at Dawson, Minn., he matriculated at the University of Minnesota and was graduated with the bachelor of arts degree in 1906. Then he served as principal of the public school of Robbinsdale, Minn., a suburb of Minneapolis, and at the same time studied law at the University of Minnesota to earn the bachelor of laws degree in 1909. Soon thereafter he purchased the Dawson (Minn.) Sentinel and he combined publication of the newspaper with the practice of law at Dawson.

One of the teachers on his staff in the public school at Robbinsdale was Miss Ruth Donaldson. They were married in 1907 and to them two sons were born, Robert James and Theodore, Jr. Both are attorneys; the former practices in Minneapolis, the latter in St. Paul. Mrs. Christianson died in 1944. Mr. Christianson was married again in 1946, to Mrs. Mayme Bunde, of Chicago.

Mr. Christianson was elected to the Minnesota House of Representatives in 1914 and he served six terms, during four of which he was chairman of the important appropriations committee. Then in 1925 he was elected Governor on the Republican ticket. He served three terms in the office and became recognized as one of the greatest chief executives in the history of Minnesota. For a time thereafter he was associated with a manufacturer in Minneapolis. In 1932 he was elected a Representative in Congress. After he had served two terms, he became a candidate for United States Senator but was defeated in the leftward swing of the majority of the people of Minnesota.

Mr. Christianson then accepted the managership of the National Association of Retail Grocers. He continued in that position until NARD's executive secretary, John W. Dargavel, induced him to join its headquarters staff.

It seems appropriate to quote the final words Mr. Christianson spoke in the farewell message to the independent retail druggists delivered at the golden jubilee of the NARD:

"Those who established this country had a dream, the finest dream ever conceived by man—

"'Here on this soil began the kingdom, not of kings but men;
Began the making of the world again,
Where equal rights and equal bonds were set,
Where all the people equal-franchised met,
Where doom was writ of privilege and crown,
Where human breath blew all the idols down,
Where crests were naught, where vulture flags were furled,
And common men began to own the world!'

"That was the American dream. To make it come true must be your continuing objective."

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, a great teacher once said, "By their fruits ye shall know them."

It was not my privilege to know well Governor Christianson, a former Member of this House, because I did not come to the State of Minnesota until about the time when he was leaving active public life; but, judged by the fruits he left, which are visible to all in Minnesota, the imprint he made on the hearts of his fellow citizens, the record on the statute books, in public works, and in

advancing every other good cause in the State of Minnesota, he was a truly great man. I can think of no person who has left larger footprints in the sands of time as the result of what he did. His record is what impressed a person coming along after him with the remarkable ability, integrity, versatility, and superior leadership he must have had. I know I am speaking for all the people of Minnesota. We pay tribute to one of her greatest sons, and certainly one of the ablest public servants it has been our State's privilege to send into public life.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the gentleman from Minnesota and the delegation from Minnesota in an expression of deep regret over the death of former Governor Christianson. He was a warm personal friend of mine; one whose friendship I cherished for many years. I knew him as a true friend, great public servant, a Christian gentleman, and a great American. We have all suffered a serious loss in his passing.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks three editorials.

I also ask unanimous consent that all Members so desiring may extend their remarks at this point on the life and character of the late Theodore Christianson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the requests of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

MEMBERS ON THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 63) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers provided for by section 5 of Public Law 115, Seventy-eighth Congress, shall consist of two members of the Committee on House Administration to be appointed by the Speaker.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 63, Eighty-first Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers the following Members of the House: Mr. GARMATZ, of Maryland; Mr. BISHOP, of Illinois.

MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 585, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. DURHAM, North Carolina; Mr. HOLIFIELD, California; Mr. PRICE, Illinois; Mr. KILDAY, Texas; Mr. JACKSON, Washington; Mr. COLE, New York; Mr. ELSTON, Ohio; Mr. HINSHAW, California; Mr. VAN ZANDT, Pennsylvania.

MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 64) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committee of Congress:

Joint Committee on Printing: Mrs. NORTON, New Jersey; Mr. DEANE, North Carolina; Mr. LECOMPTE, Iowa.

Joint Committee of Congress on the Library; Mrs. NORTON, New Jersey; Mr. REGAN, Texas; Mr. ALBERT, Oklahoma; Mr. LECOMPTE, Iowa; Mr. BISHOP, Illinois.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF PALESTINE REFUGEES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 46)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the enclosed letter from the Acting Secretary of State and the accompanying draft legislation to authorize an appropriation for a special contribution by the United States to the United Nations for the relief of Palestine refugees. In submitting this proposed legislation, I wish to invite attention to the provisions of the resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations emphasizing the critical situation of these refugees and urging all States Members of the United Nations to make voluntary contributions as soon as possible to meet their needs.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 27, 1949.*

(Enclosures: Letter from Acting Secretary of State, draft of proposed legislation, general assembly resolution.)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

A FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT DAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take advantage of this occasion to note an anniversary which has by now become indelibly stamped in the public consciousness as a day of commemoration and dedication.

In the American calendar of days for patriotic observance we are accustomed to the yearly recurrence of so-called name days. Lincoln's Birthday, Washington's Birthday, Jackson Day, Jefferson Day, Jeff Davis Day in the great Southland, and Columbus Day are typical of the holidays set aside for remembrance of great men whose figures loom large in the panorama of our national history.

January 30 of each year is also gradually taking its place in the roster of notable dates in American history.

For that date, Mr. Speaker, is one of no mean significance.

Entirely aside from the fact that it is the anniversary of the natal day of the lamented and revered Franklin Delano Roosevelt, it has become recognized as a rallying day in the fight of the American people against the dread disease which so sorely afflicted that superlative statesman.

Hence we do not have Roosevelt Day or Franklin Roosevelt's birthday—but instead, the President's birthday.

No greater detail, no more specific designation is needed.

The President's birthday means but one thing to all Americans.

It is a day of happy combination. At once a day of remembrance—the birthday anniversary of a magnificent American—and a day of devotion—dedicated to the drive to raise funds to combat infantile paralysis.

There is a peculiarly fitting tribute implicit in the term by which this memorable day is designated.

Of all our outstanding Executive leaders, only one has had his birthday anniversary set aside as that of the President's. But one man could aptly fill such a singular niche of specification. That man and that President is Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

As one who knew intimately his greatness of heart and soul, I like to think that such a simple yet unique designation for the birthday anniversary of Franklin Roosevelt is the eloquent tribute of a grateful people who recognized in him their leader, their champion, and, in a particular manner, their own beloved President.

The President's birthday, then, means Franklin Roosevelt's birthday—the birthday of the President of the people, and the remembered anniversary of the only man who so won their affection as to achieve the highest office within their gift for four consecutive terms.

The second meaning of the day is one which meant more to Franklin Delano Roosevelt than the anniversary itself.

Early in his career as President he sanctioned celebration of the day, not as one of personal glorification, but as a day of dedication to the humanitarian cause of relief of suffering.

Each year since has seen the setting aside of January 30 as the climax of a concerted annual national effort to conquer infantile paralysis.

Thus the anniversary of the birth of Franklin Roosevelt is not an idle commemoration but is a day of achievement for the betterment of the lot of man. He, more than any of his fellow citizens, was pleased that something of his could be devoted to such high purpose.

It is perhaps characteristic of such a selfless leader that so personal a thing as his own birthdate should be perpetuated primarily as an occasion for lessening the pain and sorrow of those with whom he felt a special kinship.

I say this because of all the splendid qualities with which God and nature endowed him, the most notable was his humanitarianism.

He conceived of government as an instrumentality for the service of man.

Every piece of the major legislation which marked the social revolution of his administrations was purposely designed to alleviate the social conditions of the masses he loved.

His enemies—which are those also of the commonalty—were fear, want, poverty, social injustice, physical suffering, and human indignity.

He battled them with the shining swords of charity, social justice, good will, humane philosophy, and democratic government.

In war and in peace, his sole concern was centered around the rights of man, both as an individual and as a member of society.

He subscribed wholeheartedly to the deathless principle that the salvation of the world lay in the recognition and effectuation of the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God.

What is more, he acted, resolutely and courageously, upon that principle; and he did so to the extent that the most fruitful years of his energetic life were dedicated to the gradual attainment of that sublime goal at home and abroad.

He so lived in accordance with his high principles that at his death he bequeathed the pattern of them for the guidance of America and the edification of the world.

The impress of his greatness is all around us.

This nation is stronger and greater because he has lived in it, gave himself to it, and died in its service.

It is true that his beloved land and the community of nations which he struggled to bring into the sunshine of peace and prosperity have not yet attained the goal.

But the influence of his dynamic leadership still gives an impetus toward that goal, and the vanguard of the march of the peoples of the world toward it is led by the spirit of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

It was his incessant prayer that mankind should so advance in understanding, friendship, and good will that discord would vanish from the face of the earth. That prayer is still our aspiration.

On Sunday next, if God had spared him to us, Franklin Roosevelt would have been 67 years old. The vibrant voice, the friendly smile, the warm handclasp, the generous heart—all these are no more. But the ageless spirit of the man abides with us.

That spirit is abroad today. It is a part of the spiritual fabric of America which holds the courage of his people to the great moral issues which beset the world today.

It is with the faith of that great spirit that those issues will be solved.

The name and memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt will live in the minds of people everywhere for all time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS—SMALL BUSINESS—PRESIDENT TRUMAN ENTITLED TO COOPERATION OF CONGRESS IN EFFORT TO AID SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, small-business men have the right to expect a lot from the Eighty-first Congress. The plain people of this country, generally, have a right to expect a lot out of the Eighty-first Congress. President Truman is known as a friend of the small-business man. His every heart throb and every pulse beat have been on the side of small business and against monopoly. We have, too, fortunately, a fine Attorney General of the United States selected by President Truman to enforce the antitrust laws of our country. He is the Honorable Tom Clark from the State of Texas. The people of this Nation are proud of him because of the fine way that he has enforced the antitrust laws fearlessly, fairly, and impartially. He is alert; he is able; and he certainly is on the side of the people and small business and against monopolistic practices and monopolies. It is now up to Congress to do something. We must provide money and enact needed laws. The private enterprise system built our country. It is the finest and greatest system in the world. We want to preserve and protect that system. We do not want socialism, communism, or fascism. We want the American system, the democratic system.

A DEMOCRACY IN A REPUBLIC

The question has been raised in this country about whether or not we have a democratic form of government. Some have suggested it is a republican form of government. Without discussing the matter in detail, it is true that under our Constitution of the United States each State is guaranteed a republican form of government, but at the same time there is nothing said about the kind of government that is guaranteed as a Federal Government. However our Government set-up is unquestionably a representative democracy. It will be remembered that a State cannot impair the obligation of contracts. That is prohibited by the Federal Constitution. But, the Federal Government is not restrained or prevented from impairing the obligation of contracts. There is a difference between the States and the Federal Government.

In 1918 the House of Representatives adopted what has been known and is known as the American's Creed. It was written by the Honorable William Tyler Page, a former Clerk of this House, and a very fine man. I had the pleasure and privilege of knowing him several years before he passed away. A prize was offered, at least, a premium was offered of $1,000 to the one who wrote the best American creed. The Honorable William Tyler Page won that prize of $1,000. The American's Creed is exactly 100 words. In that creed, that was adopted by this House of Representatives, our Government and our system and form of government is described as "a democracy in a Republic."

WHO IS THE REAL SOCIALIST

In connection with small business, as I said a while ago, we want to continue to have the kind of business we have had in the past. Many people are disturbed. I am impressed with the fact that the people who seem to be disturbed the most and are making the most noise are the ones who are putting our country in the direction of socialism.

I ask the question, Who is a real Socialist in this country, the person who has nothing but a loud voice advocating socialism or the big man who is putting the units of an industry all in one package and making it ripe for Government ownership and control?

SOCIALISTS BELIEVE IN MONOPOLY

Dr. Steinmetz was one of the most famous scientists and engineers in the world, I presume, before his death. He was the chief consulting engineer of the General Electric Co., quite a big company at that time as well as now. He was a Socialist. He admitted he was a Socialist. He believed in socialism, he advocated socialism, and he made speeches for socialism.

One day he was asked by an inquiring person in his audience, "Why is it, Dr. Steinmetz, that you are a Socialist, yet you work for one of the biggest concerns in the United States, that is more grasping all the time and getting larger all the time? How can you be consistent under those circumstances?"

He said, "That is easy. I am a firm believer in socialism and I know that the quicker you have monopoly in this country the quicker we will have socialism."

There is a very short step from monopoly in any industry to socialism in the Government. I think Dr. Steinmetz was right, I think he was very consistent in advocating monopoly for the purpose of arriving at socialism.

It has happened in other countries, in England recently, when only six companies had control of the steel production and the Government of Great Britain took over the steel production. It has happened the same way in other industries. When you get an industry in one package, it is almost invariably taken over by the Government.

If you will read the platform of the Republican Party and the Democratic Party for the past 50 years, you will see in practically every platform this or similar language, "Private monopoly is indefensible and cannot be tolerated." If you will read the Socialist platform, you

will find that they advocate that the Government should own the trusts. It is perfectly consistent with Dr. Steinmetz's teachings that the Government should own the trusts. So when a few people become the owners of the steel industry or the automobile industry or the electric industry or any other industry, that industry becomes ripe for Government ownership, and then it will be almost irresistible.

The plea is that the Government should own, that private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable and therefore we must prevent private monopoly. We must not allow a few people to own any one particular industry. It must be scattered and all people should be given an opportunity to engage in any business that they want to engage in and be protected from unfair competition.

I have a statement here which was delivered before our Committee on Small Business last November by the Honorable Wendell Berge, formerly in charge of antitrust prosecutions in the Department of Justice of the United States under the present Attorney General, Hon. Tom Clark. This is such an interesting statement I am going to insert it in the RECORD in connection with my remarks.

He brings out some points such as this:

> We hear a great deal about the trust-busting policies of President Theodore Roosevelt, but even when you survey his 7-year administration you find that relatively few suits were instituted. The fame which he attained as a trust buster rests largely on several cases—the Northern Securities case, the Packers case, the Standard Oil case, and the Tobacco case. I do not mean to underestimate the importance of those cases. They were important as landmarks.

Then he says:

> In the Theodore Roosevelt administration the average number of lawyers in active service on antitrust matters was five. Five lawyers cannot do very much in policing against the monopoly practices of the whole industry of America.
>
> In the Wilson administration when the World War had caused prices to skyrocket, the number of lawyers engaged in this work rose to 18. In the 1920s, when corporate mergers proceeded at a fantastic pace, the number of lawyers engaged in antitrust enforcement did not exceed 25. Not until 1938 were as many as 50 lawyers actually employed in this work and not until 1939 did the professional personnel reach 200 lawyers and a half dozen economists. For almost its whole life, the antitrust division has been a kind of corporal's guard.

I call that to your attention and I hope you will read the entire statement by Hon. Wendell Berge at the end of these remarks so that you will realize the need for sufficient money for the Department of Justice to enforce antitrust laws of this country and I will add sufficient money for the Federal Trade Commission, too, because the Federal Trade Commission is engaged in important work in connection with the prevention of mergers, monopolies, and trusts, and for the protection of small business.

COSTLESS CAPITAL

There is something that has been brought up during the last few years in connection with the raising of capital for small businesses, which was unknown before. What chance has a young man now, a G. I., for instance, who goes out and borrows his money in the open market, and who must pay interest on it—what chance has such a young man against the huge concern that does not have to borrow its money, which has costless capital? What chance has the young man against that concern?

I want to explain to you about costless capital. That is a new thing that has been brought up in recent years. It is used to destroy small business. Last year the large corporations of this country earned more than $35,000,000,000. After the payment of taxes they had more than $21,000,000,000, which is about four times as much as they ever earned before in any one year prior to World War II.

STOCKHOLDER—FORGOTTEN MAN

Now, what did they do with that $21,000,000,000? Did they pay it to the stockholders as they used to pay it to the stockholders before World War II, when they paid 70 percent of their earnings to the stockholders? No, they did not do that. The stockholder in this country is becoming the forgotten man. Since World War II these corporations have been retaining 65 to 70 percent of their earnings, and only paying out 30 to 35 cents on the dollar to their stockholders. So that means out of these $21,000,000,000, $7,000,000,000 were paid to their stockholders, only. Fourteen billion dollars were retained as earnings to be used to acquire new plants, new equipment, unrelated business, and even their competitors, in some cases.

How did they get that money? By high prices. That is how they got it. When they needed capital they simply raised the prices. So, what chance has the average businessman in competition with these huge concerns who have gotten their capital from the consumers of America? It is absolutely costless to them. What chance has the small-business man in a case like that? I ask you.

So, who is really the Socialist in this country? The little fellow who honestly believes in socialism, who has not had the right break in life and is pretty noisy about what he believes? Or is it the big-business man, the big industrialist, who is putting industries together in one package, and making them ready for Government ownership? We will have Socialism in this country much quicker through monopoly than we will have any other way. We do not want it either way.

So, the way to prevent socialism is to enforce the antitrust law. That is No. 1. We must do that. We have a lot of people in this country in business and industry. Of course, generally they are very fine people, fine men and women. We all like them and respect them. We admire them. But in every business and industry we have some Captain Kidds who are not willing to play according to the Golden Rule. They are always taking an unfair advantage of their competitors and their customers. So to take care of them, the people who are not willing to just live and let live, but who want to get that unfair advantage, we have laws, and those laws, if properly enforced by the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission, will give these small-business men a chance. They do not have that chance now.

So that is No. 1.

No. 2: We need some new laws. We cannot keep up with a growing country like it is today, a quarter of a trillion dollars—$250,000,000,000 national debt—without new problems arising every day. Those new problems have arisen now, and we must have new laws to take care of them.

For instance, in Illinois 2 years ago they had a famous case, known as United States against the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. The judge there decided that the national corporate chains were harmful to the independent merchants of the country. It finally developed that this great concern sold goods at a loss in certain stores, for the purpose of destroying a competitor. Then, after the competitor was destroyed, of course the price would go up. We need a law to prevent that being done, and permitting the person doing it to get a tax advantage on it, like it is now. When the A. & P. sold at a loss in 29 percent of its stores it could take a tax deduction on those losses, and it did not lose so much. When it lost there, it was made up at other places. So under our present system the United States Government is, in effect, subsidizing the destruction of private independent business in this country. That should not be permitted. Our tax laws should be changed to prevent it.

USING PROFITS TO BUY COMPETITORS

Another law should be enacted to prevent these concerns from acquiring their competitors as they are doing now, and putting them out of business. The head of one of the biggest food companies in the United States testified before our committee, the Joint Committee on Economic Report, during November 1948, that his concern had spent undistributed profits amounting to $50,000,000 in the past 4 years to buy up a large number of industries, naming them, and some of them were competitors of that concern. Something should be done about that.

REGULATION W

Then we have a problem, which I think is serious, in the restriction of credit. I hope it does not go too far. You will recall we had a panic in 1920 because credit was restricted. It caused banks to call loans, and when you call one loan it causes repercussions not only in that community but all over that section of the country, dependent on the size of the loan, of course. That caused a big depression in 1929–32. The lack of credit contributed to this depression. The Federal Reserve Board doubled, or increased 100 percent, if you please, the reserve requirements of the banks in 1937, a very drastic action that almost threw our country into a tailspin and another depression. Finally we came out of that. A credit squeeze can cause a depression quicker in an economy such as our own, in a country like our own, than any other one thing that can possibly be done. I will admit that there are other things that may be more important, but it is very important at this time because it affects so many people,

that is regulation W. The Federal Reserve Board came before us last year and asked Congress to give them, the Board of Governors, power to place restrictions on credit, on goods sold on the installment plan; and we gave them that power with the understanding, we thought, that they would use it discreetly and with great caution, and they had no idea in mind of putting back these same drastic terms, for instance, on automobiles, that they had during the war; but after we gave them the power the old drastic terms were not exactly reimposed, one-third down and the balance to be paid in 15 months as under the old terms, but what is nearly as drastic, one-third down and the remainder in 18 months. This is causing a great credit restriction in our country today, and a lot of people who would like to have automobiles and who should own them in their own business, cannot get them because of these credit restrictions. Under present requirements a person must have an income of $5,000 a year before he is able to provide himself and family with a home and an automobile. First he must buy his home way out, or out in the country, and ordinarily to get there and back he must have some kind of motor-vehicle transportation. By the time he makes a down payment on that home and promises a payment of so much a month he does not have enough money left to buy an automobile for transportation unless he has an income of $5,000 or more.

CHARACTER BEST SECURITY

I am a firm believer in character as security as much as I am in money. Some of the best and finest people on earth are people who have character to use in the place of money—and oftentimes you would just as soon have character as to have money. We must encourage people with character. These people after building up a good character and fine reputation over a period of a lifetime want to buy something but find themselves restricted and denied that privilege because of regulation W. Others less deserving are able to buy anything they want.

RELAX REGULATION W

I have appealed to the Federal Reserve Board to relax that restriction and to make it at least 24 months instead of 18, but to no avail. They are always making a new study, a new investigation. It occurs to me that something should be done, and done quickly. The widespread reports could be the beginning and the danger sign of something more serious to come. I am inserting herewith a statement adopted January 25, 1949, by the NADA concerning regulation W. It is as follows:

NATIONAL AUTOMOBILE DEALERS ASSOCIATION,
San Francisco, January 25, 1949.

REGULATION W

The following is the statement voted Tuesday, January 25, by the National Automobile Dealers Association executive committee and issued by President Ben T. Wright to voice the feeling of the national convention of automobile dealers meeting now in San Francisco, Calif.:

"Reports from throughout the Nation that regulation W is imposing grave hardships on persons of small incomes who must use a motorcar in their work or business greatly disturbed members of the National Automobile Dealers Association meeting here today.

"So serious did the association's executive committee regard the situation that it issued a special statement strongly urging the Federal Reserve Board anew to take remedial action immediately. The Board is authorized to ease the present time-payment terms of one-third down and the remaining two-thirds in 18 months whenever it sees fit. The Board now has before it a request from the association that the time-payment period be extended to 24 months.

"The statement said, 'The executive committee of NADA has heard with renewed concern from thousands of its 35,000 members attending its national convention here that the application of regulation W is hurting persons of small income who must have cars to help them earn a livelihood. Workers who must travel long distances to their employment and small-business men who use cars for making deliveries and other gainful purposes are being hit especially hard. Most of them are able to make the initial payment, but find it impossible in many cases to meet the subsequent 18 months' requirements.

"'These payments, even on the smallest cars, now approximate $100 per month. Of course, persons in the low-income brackets simply cannot meet such terms.

"'This is not a question of dealers being unable to move all the cars they can get. They can do that because there are enough customers with higher incomes ready and able to buy all available new cars. But the higher-income classes generally do not need cars to help them make a living. Therefore, the regulation puts pressure on the segment of car buyers least able to stand it.

"'NADA has previously called the attention of the Federal Reserve Board to the situation as reflected by scattered reports and the Board has been investigating this limited number of cases and others brought to his attention. Since arriving here, however, your executive committee has learned from dealers representing all States that complaints against the harsh terms of the regulation are general.

"'We, therefore, are again urging the Board to give the small buyers relief immediately.'

"Informal discussions looking to amendment of the regulation by congressional action in case the Board continues to decline to modify the terms of the regulation have been held. Thus far, however, NADA has made no direct appeal to Congress for legislative assistance."

MAN-MADE RECESSION UNJUSTIFIED

I was told by a member of the Federal Reserve Board that we should have a recession, that the quicker we have a recession the better off this country will be. That was the most shocking thing I ever heard come from a public official. It was very much like the statement made by the Federal Reserve Board in 1920 when this country went into a real panic.

MUST NOT DOUBLE NATIONAL DEBT

Why should we have a recession? We must have good prices, we must have good wages; otherwise we cannot support a $250,000,000,000 national debt. If it were possible for this Congress and the President or some power in our country arbitrarily to reduce wages one half and prices one-half we know that would have the same effect as doubling our national debt in what the people have to pay with. It would absolutely ruin this country. We must have good prices and good wages or we cannot pay the national debt in honest dollars. We must do that.

Who is going to say when prices are too high? Have we left that to the Federal Reserve Board? No, we have not left that to the Federal Reserve Board; but it seems like the Board is attempting to usurp that function, that duty, and that obligation, if you please. I think it is going too far and is having a very harmful effect on our country.

MUST HAVE HIGH NATIONAL INCOME

Mr. Speaker, this debt is a large one but it is not impossible. We can pay it in only one way, however, and that is with a high national income. We must have an income of over $200,000,000,000 a year, which means we will have to have a national product of between two hundred and twenty-five and two hundred and forty billion dollars a year. In order to have that high national income we must have good wages and good prices. There is no other way to do it. If the Federal Reserve Board or any other power takes upon themselves the obligation and purpose of arbitrarily reducing prices or wages, it is going too far and it is going against the interests of the people of our Nation.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. May I ask the gentleman how he accounts for small businesses increasing to the extent of 100,000 in the past year?

Mr. PATMAN. That is not unusual at all. You know small businesses go out of existence every night and a lot of new ones come into business the very next day. It depends upon the type of business in which they are engaged. Before World War II normally about 1,000 businesses went out every night and about 1,000 came in the next morning. There are many small businesses and many different types, so it is not unusual for them to increase in that manner.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. May I commend the gentleman. It is well known that he is the champion of small business and free enterprise in our country. He has made a splendid statement. He is also coauthor of the Robinson-Patman Act intended to give the small-business man, the small merchant, and the independent operator in this country a fair deal as against monopolistic enterprise. I want to commend the gentleman for the fine statement he has made.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman because I know of his interest in this subject and the fine work performed by him on the Federal Trade Commission before coming to Congress.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I should like the gentleman to know that I have watched his work as a member of the Small

Business Committee of the House and his frequent championing of the cause of small business in this House for the past 6 years. He has rendered, in my opinion, a very valuable service to our American economy. I trust that the Small Business Committee of the House will be re-created and does not meet the fate of a similar committee in another body. I also hope that the gentleman from Texas will become chairman of that committee and continue giving the Members of the House a place to come with their complaints from small business that is being rapidly ruined by the great monopolistic corporate interests of our country. Being a pretty good sized merchant himself he is very familiar with these problems.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I want to add to what previous gentlemen have already said in reference to my colleague's statement today and in reference to his work in the past on behalf of small business. I have the honor to represent a district adjoining that of the gentleman from Texas and I have therefore gone out of my way to observe his work on behalf of small business during the time he has been a Member of Congress. I remember when he first became chairman of the Small Business Committee at the time it was first organized. His people have a right to be truly proud of the fine work he is doing for small business and the small enterprises in his part of east Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman very kindly, and I want to express appreciation to him for his splendid cooperation on these small-business matters in the past.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make one other statement with reference to steel, which has resulted in a rather alarming situation. I was called up by a fabricator in the Southwest not so long ago who told me that he could not get steel from his supplier; that his business was over 50 years old, having been founded by his father. It was founded by his father and he and his brothers had kept it going since his father's death. They had been making septic tanks and other kinds of tanks out of steel, and all at once the steel company representative told him, "You cannot get any more." "Why?" "Well, we do not know; you just cannot get it." The following week a new industry sprung up in that town owned by that steel company, getting all the steel it wanted. It was a new industry. That is going on all over the country. That is the reason they want steel scarce so they can control it. We lack at least seven to ten million tons of steel a year now to supply the real domestic demand in this country. But they want it scarce; they want to keep it scarce so that they can control this business.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman has brought out a very important point there, and that is known in the trade as the vertical set-up; a set-up of the manufacturer, the distributor, and the retailer of a basic product. That particular vertical type of a set-up was expanded during the war due to the scarce market and due to the fact that the producer of scarce articles had a tremendous advantage, and they could take it and distribute it themselves and get the additional profit. Now, that has not only occurred in the steel industry but it has occurred in the textile industry. Great vertical set-ups occurred there and have monopolized to a great extent some of our important lines of trade from the top to the ultimate consumer, or from the basic producer to the ultimate consumer. That is one of the great dangers the gentleman has pointed out, and it is through the use of undistributed profits that they are able to do that particular thing.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman.

MONOPOLISTIC AND UNFAIR TRADE PRACTICES

(Thursday, November 18, 1948, House of Representatives, Subcommittee No. 2 of the Select Committee on Small Business, Washington, D. C.)

The subcommittee met in room 129, Old House Office Building, at 9:30 a. m., the Honorable William H. Stevenson, presiding.

Present: Representatives William H. Stevenson, R. Walter Riehlman, and Wright Patman.

Also present: Willis J. Ballinger, economic counsel.

Mr. STEVENSON. The meeting will come to order.

We will have as our first witness Mr. Wendell Berge.

STATEMENT OF WENDELL BERGE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BAR

Mr. BERGE. Mr. Chairman, for the record I might say that my name is Wendell Berge. I am practicing law in Washington as a partner in the firm of Posner, Berge, Fox & Arent. I was first appointed to the staff of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice in 1930, served as a member of that staff for about 10 years, and during that period I was alternate member of the Temporary National Economic Committee; and at the beginning of 1941 I was appointed Assistant Attorney General by the President and assigned to head the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice.

In the middle of 1943, August of that year, I was transferred by the Attorney General to head the Antitrust Division, and from August of 1943 until I resigned as of May 1, 1947, I was head of the Antitrust Division.

Tradition against monopoly

Mr. Chairman, there is a strong tradition in this country against monopoly. This tradition has been expressed in the Sherman Antitrust Act and numerous other Federal laws, as well as in State legislation. We repeatedly assert our faith in free enterprise. We believe in economic opportunity. We are against regimentation of business. We want businessmen left as free as possible to take risks, decide their business policies, and then to succeed in their ventures or fail according to their abilities and the whims of fortune.

This is the American philosophy. And yet despite the generality of its acceptance, it has not prevented monopoly from gaining ground. Indeed, concentration of economic control in a sense that a few companies together control the major output of an industry is today the standard pattern of American business.

I shall not burden you with statistics on this point. You are familiar with the many studies of economic concentration which have been made in recent years. The accumulated evidence in antitrust investigations, in the volumes of data which have been compiled by this very committee, by the temporary National Economic Committee, and by other congressional committees, reveals the vast extent of monopoly control in many of our largest industries—the metallurgical industry, the chemical industry, the electronics and electrical-equipment field, the production of pharmaceuticals, the manufacture of precision instruments and machines, the distribution of foodstuffs and tobacco, the petroleum industry, and even investment banking with its vast control over money and credit. This is just a sampling of the industries where monopoly controls are dominant, and it by no means exhausts the list.

Concentration

The war undoubtedly accelerated this trend toward concentration. More than two-thirds of all war contracts went to 100 companies. And the larger companies have shared well in the disposal of surplus plants and property. Since the war numerous corporate mergers have taken place which further emphasize the trend toward concentration and monopoly.

Nearly every political platform of both major parties since the passage of the Sherman Act has demanded its vigorous enforcement. Presidential candidates have almost invariably promised to outdo their rivals in enforcing the law. Even President McKinley, who is generally thought of as one of our more conservative Presidents, was vigorous in his vocal denunciation of monopolies. And, of course, the crusades of Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson are part of our recent well-known history. But notwithstanding this ideological devotion to free enterprise, and our instinctive abhorrence of monopoly, we have done very little in a practical way toward effective antitrust enforcement.

Lack of vigorous enforcement accounts for the Sherman Act's ineffectiveness to stem the rising tide of monopoly control. During a large part of the act's history, enforcement was little more than a token. Only a small staff was possible under the paltry appropriation. Few cases were instituted and no attempt was made to apply the law on a broad front; to make it really effective, really significant as an instrument of economic policy.

Trust-busting policies of President Theodore Roosevelt

We hear a great deal about the trust-busting policies of President Theodore Roosevelt. But even when you survey his 7-year administration you find that relatively few suits were instituted. The fame which he attained as a trust-buster rests largely on several cases—the Northern Securities case, the Packers case, the Standard Oil case, and the Tobacco case.

I do not mean to underestimate the importance of those cases. They were important as landmarks in the judicial interpretation of the law and they were moderately successful, at least temporarily, in attaining economic results within the industries with which they were concerned. But when you consider that these cases were instituted over a 7-year period and that during this very period many of the industrial giants of the future were being formed in other industries which the Department of Justice of that day did not challenge, you cannot reach any other conclusion than that the Sherman Act was not being enforced on a broad front.

And how could it have been? In the Theodore Roosevelt administration the average number of lawyers in active service on antitrust matters was five. Five lawyers cannot do very much in policing against the monopoly practices of the whole industry of America.

In the Wilson administration, when the World War had caused prices to skyrocket, the number of lawyers engaged in this work rose to 18. In the 1920's, when corporate mergers proceeded at a fantastic pace, the number of lawyers engaged in antitrust enforcement did not exceed 25. Not until 1938 were as many as 50 lawyers actually employed in this work and not until 1939 did the professional personnel reach 200 lawyers and a half dozen economists. For almost its whole life the Antitrust Division has been a kind of corporal's guard.

More suits last 10 years than 48 years before

About 10 years ago there occurred something of an awakening as to the significance of the economic concentration that was occurring. The hearings of the Temporary National Economic Committee focused the problem. The Department of Justice adopted a more active policy. Congress appropriated larger funds, and for the first time in history an effort at broad enforcement was made. More antitrust suits have been brought by the Federal Government since 1938 than in the entire preceding 48 years of antitrust history. The war necessarily retarded the momentum of the new policy and hampered its effectiveness. Yet during the last 10 years there has been an increasing awareness of the fact that competition has been rapidly disappearing in many American industries.

But even so, I do not think that the American people or the Congress has been sufficiently aroused of the danger that this growing concentration of economic power presents to capitalism and democracy. The capitalistic system and democratic government developed together and in the long run they can exist only together. The historical development of this truth is interesting, but there is not time to sketch it now except to point out that throughout history wherever despotism has existed the economic life of the people has been organized along noncapitalistic lines. Political freedom has only existed for any length of time in countries having capitalistic economic systems. Webster defines "capitalism" as—"an economic system in which the production and distribution of wealth, the employment and reward of human labor, and the extension, organization, and operation of the system itself are entrusted to and effected by private enterprise and control under competitive conditions."

The alternative to this kind of system is an authoritarian economic system. The evolution of such a system would probably come about, first, by increasing private controls over production, prices, wages, and all other phases of distribution. These controls would gradually be superseded by Government controls, as popular demand would require that the Government take over. If we are going to have a controlled system, in the long run the people would not stand for private control. Control would ultimately be exercised by the Government itself taking over the regulation of monopolies, resulting in complete Government control of the economic life of the people.

I think that no demonstration is needed to this committee that we cannot have an authoritarian economic system without authoritarian government, and the civil and political liberties ultimately vanish when the government assumes direction of all industry.

Mr. BALLINGER. Is it possible to regulate a monopoly—I mean today we hear a good deal that you perhaps could regulate monopoly better than to allow competition to proceed.

Mr. BERGE. I don't think that it is, but I think that if we failed in antitrust enforcement and if the present trend went on, we would probably try it. I think the effort would be futile in that I don't believe that it is possible for government effectively to cope with the economic power that true industrial monopolies would exercise. I think that what would probably occur, and it is perhaps rather bold to undertake to make a prophecy, which I know is purely speculative, but taking a long shot into the future, I would suppose that over a period of years there would be a sort of a blending of Government and private control, with the monopolies in effect controlling the Government.

If you could assume that the techniques of regulation were sufficiently good to bring about a real control of monopoly by the Government, with Government actually in the saddle, it would take a bureaucracy of terrific proportions to do it, but my own guess would be that the gesture would be made without accomplishing real results, and you would really have industrial giants in the saddle both in Government and industry, with the inevitable result of a type of Fascist pattern developed in time.

Mr. BALLINGER. The issue today, then, is not to regulate monopolies, but to restore competition in those industries?

Mr. BERGE. Right; absolutely.

Mr. BALLINGER. Where it should work and can be made to work if we will take certain steps to restore it?

Mr. BERGE. Absolutely; and the theory of the antitrust laws is not to regulate monopoly, but the theory is to keep Government out of the regulation field to the maximum extent possible, leaving the important decisions of production, distribution, price, to businessmen themselves acting competitively.

I do, however, want to say parenthetically at this point, that I recognize the necessity of temporary Government controls in periods of emergency. What I say now does not apply to that problem. When a war, or other economic crisis, is thrust upon us resulting in an extraordinary demand which takes the productive output of our resources, Government controls are necessary to insure equitable distribution and distribution that promotes the national economic policy. The unusual demands of war production necessitate direction of industrial output and that direction, of course, must come from the Government. You have to limit the volume of goods going into civilian channels and direct them into the wartime channels, and there has to be control in emergency situations like that, as I see it.

Similar temporary Government controls may be necessary from time to time in crises short of war, such as the great industrial depression of the early 1930's, or the unusual demands of a recovery program, such as the European recovery program. Where these governmental programs are necessitated by temporary crisis and not by a monopoly condition, the American people have demonstrated time and again their capacity to submit temporarily to such controls and to remove them when the crisis has passed. This we have proved can be done without any sacrifice of basic civil or political liberties. Nothing that I say today is to be construed as opposition to such emergency measures as may from time to time be required.

But that is quite a different thing from the permanent controls that we would ultimately be forced to adopt if the insidious growth of concentration and monopoly should undermine the vitality of a free enterprise system. If we accept the proposition, which I believe has been amply demonstrated that capitalism in the long run cannot survive except under conditions of free competitive enterprise, then it follows that as that enterprise is progressively eliminated from our system regimentation of business progressively takes over. That regimentation, as I have already stated, may at first be private regimentation, but ultimately it would become Government regimentation.

Economic power ignored

I maintain that, notwithstanding the greater enforcement activity of the last 10 years, we have never broadly applied the Sherman Act to the concentration of economic power in American industry. The tools which have been given the Department of Justice are like slingshots—wholly inadequate as against the Goliaths of American industry. Admitting that the antitrust laws can in some respects be strengthened by legislative action, I do not think that the primary difficulty is with the laws themselves. There are new laws that ought to be passed, such as the Kefauver bill to amend section 7 of the Clayton Act. I also think there is great merit to the civil penalty proposal that has been advanced from time to time, but I do not think the fundamental trouble is in the law itself.

More money needed to enforce

The real reason, in my judgment, why the Sherman Act has not been more effective is that the annual appropriation for its enforcement has never been anywhere near adequate for the accomplishment of effective economic results. A statute such as the Sherman Act is not self-executing. It lives by appropriations. Not until the fiftieth year of the Sherman Act was as much as $1,000,000 appropriated annually for its enforcement. Between 1908 and 1935, the appropriation varied between $100,000 and $300,000 annually. In 1936 the figure was increased to $439,000. In 1939 it had increased to about $800,000; and for the fiscal years of 1940 and 1941, to an all-time high of about $1,300,000.

Between 1943 and 1946 the appropriation ranged, in round numbers, between $1,500,000 and $1,870,000; in 1947 it went up to a little over $2,000,000; in 1948 it went up to $2,400,000; and the current appropriation is about $3,400,000. I think I should have mentioned that in 1942, which apparently was skipped here in the text, the appropriation did reach in round numbers $2,300,000 and then was cut back during the war.

Although there has been some increase in the appropriation in recent years, it should be remembered that enforcement costs are now much higher. Whereas in 1938 it was possible to secure good lawyers at from $3,000 to $5,000 per year, and to get satisfactory law clerks at $1,800 to $2,000 per year, the Government now must pay on the average twice as much for the same type of legal talent. Other enforcement costs are also correspondingly higher. Therefore, the additional funds available for enforcement in the last few years do not accurately measure the additional enforcement effort that has been provided. You will find that the staff today is not much larger in terms of manpower than the prewar staff on a much smaller appropriation. I am informed that the professional staff at present numbers 329 lawyers and economists as against an average of 281 for fiscal year 1942.

As a result of our niggardly policy toward appropriations for antitrust enforcement, the resources available against all violators in 1 year were less than the sums expended by defendants in a single antitrust case. When I was in the Department, the Antitrust Division proceeded against the patent monopoly in the field of glass containers or bottles. That was the now famous Hartford Empire case. There were eight major defendant corporations.

I learned at that time that one of these corporations expended approximately $900,000 in the trial of the case in the district court and an estimated $500,000 more in prosecuting its appeal to the Supreme Court and in the final settlement of the decree. The expenditures of the other seven defendant corporations were not known exactly, but they exceeded a million dollars. These sums should be viewed in the light of the fact that the entire appropriation of the Antitrust Division for the years in which the Hartford Empire case was pending, except for the year 1942, had been less than $2,000,000 per year.

The Government willingly expends millions of dollars annually to conserve the fertility of the soil and on other conservation measures. No one should question the necessity of protecting our basic natural resources. But is it not equally obvious that the fundamental social resource of the American economy—freedom of economic opportunity—merits as much consideration. Neglect in conserving either our physical resources or our free competitive economy can have equally irreparable consequences.

I do not have the figures available but this committee has the means for readily making comparisons between the current appropriations for antitrust enforcement and those for administering other Government agencies. Such comparisons, I am sure, will show that many single agencies dealing only with a restricted field of the American economy, such as the ICC dealing with carriers only, are granted much larger appropriations than are given to the Antitrust Division which must police against uneconomic restraints virtually the whole of American industry.

A striking statement of the problem is found in one of the TNEC monographs entitled "Antitrust in Action" (Monograph No. 16, Antitrust in Action, by Walton Hamilton and Irene Till, p. 24, Government Printing Office, 1940), from which I quote the following:

"A brief comparison of antitrust with the metropolitan police is suggestive. As 01,325,000 is being used to police industry, break up restraints, enforce competition throughout the United States, a sum around $60,000,000 is spent to preserve peace and order within New York City alone. The Antitrust Division now has 200 attorneys";—this was written about 1940 I believe—"the police force of New York City runs to an aggregate of 20,000 persons. An analog between unlikes must not be pushed too far; but, niceties aside, here is evidence of basic weakness in giving effect to the Sherman Act."

How much money needed

How large an appropriation is needed annually for antitrust enforcement? It is difficult to answer this question in the abstract. I think it should be progressively increased each year until we begin to be satisfied with the results. I suspect that the job requires ultimately an annual appropriation of somewhere between $10,000,000 and $15,000,000. But as one who for several years was charged with the responsibility for antitrust enforcement, I realize that it would not be practical to grant such an increase all at once. The recruiting of qualified lawyers and economists, training them for their work, and organizing them into effective operating units requires planning and careful administration, and it cannot be done overnight. The present head of the Antitrust Division can best tell what are the immediate needs. I should suppose that the amount should be increased substantially each succeeding year until a point is reached where Congress believes the results are adequate.

What is the criterion of adequacy in antitrust enforcement? Today when our criminal laws are violated we have reasonable confidence that in most cases the violators will be apprehended and punished. Our criminal administration is not perfect by any means but we do have the confidence that on the whole our police forces, investigative agencies, and prosecuting attorneys are on top of their job. In the usual case persons who commit fraud or engage in other commercial crimes are apprehended and tried in courts of law. And the same can be said as to crimes of violence.

When the time comes that businessmen recognize the generality of antitrust enforcement to the extent that they refrain from entering into conspiracies, combinations, and agreements in restraint of trade, we will know that the Antitrust Division is attaining the potency that the job requires. When our monopoly-controlled industries have been deconcentrated to a point where new business organizations can form and enter the competitive picture without bucking artificially imposed barriers, we will know that the Sherman Act has been made effective. Technology must be freed from monopoly control. Monopoly control over basic materials, necessary for use in fabricating industries, must be terminated so that small business can get ready access to such materials. We should not seek to prevent efficient operating units from enjoying the advantage that comes from sheer efficiency; but we should deprive large corporate aggregations of any advantage that comes from artificial restraints of trade or from the power to exclude competitors from the market.

Government should seek two objectives

I should say that the Government ought to seek two general objectives under the antitrust laws:

1. It should attack by divestiture or dissolution actions those corporate structures which in and of themselves have attained the power to exclude competitors from the market. Effective legal actions of this type must be grounded upon thorough economic research and a full comprehension of the various ramifications of the industry involved. The preparation and trial of such suits takes a great deal of time and manpower, but the objective must be accomplished in many of our industries if independent enterprise is to have any future chances of survival. Successful preparation of such cases requires a competent staff of economists and experts as well as lawyers—men with specialized experience and knowledge of the particular industries under scrutiny.

2. It—that is, the Government—should provide a broader enforcement against conspiracies and agreements among nominal competitors to fix prices, limit production, and otherwise to refuse the public the benefits of real competition. This type of enforcement requires a large organization and many field offices throughout the country. It requires getting down to restraints which often operate only on a local level. A small-business man may be eliminated from the market in his community by the combination of local competitors with manufacturers or wholesalers to monopolize the distribution of a product locally. To the small-business man who is being squeezed out in such a process, the enforcement of the Sherman Act is extremely important, even though his operations may be infinitesimal in relation to the national picture. The point is that the accumulation of thousands of such restraints on the local level throughout the country has in the aggregate tremendous economic significance. Sporadic enforcement on behalf of small business accomplishes very little except for the few beneficiaries in particular cases. I know that the files of the Antitrust Division abound with complaints, many of which are meritorious, that the Division has never been able adequately to investigate. Investigation in many of these would reveal glaring violations of law which should be prosecuted. Moreover, many small-business men lack the resources to employ counsel or make a trip to Washington to present their complaints. A widespread system of field offices would help. The Antitrust Division has some field offices, but not enough.

There is a good deal of cynical discussion about the ineffectiveness of the antitrust laws. I have always felt that it was out of order to dismiss the Sherman Act as unenforcible before enforcement has been given a fair trial. It may be anomolous to say that enforcement has not had a fair trial when the law has been on the books for 58 years, but, in my judgment, that is the fact.

And no one within my knowledge has yet produced a workable alternative to the enforcement of the Sherman Act. The consequences to capitalism and democracy of doing nothing at all about the problem, I have already discussed. If the antitrust laws are not the proper approach, then what is? Self-regulation by industry is out. It is simply a gloss for monopoly control. The Government cannot escape its responsibility. If that responsibility is not to be exercised through the antitrust laws, then it would have to be performed through bureaucratic regulation of industry by boards or commissions. Without laboring the point, I want to say that I believe that a system of such regulation for all industry would be abhorrent to the American people, and furthermore, I do not think it would work. Effective regulation of industry by a board or a commission to prevent monopoly and restraint of trade would require a bureaucracy that would dwarf anything that we have ever contemplated. It probably would not work, and if it did it would be a menace to freedom.

So I come back to the basic proposition that the premises of the antitrust laws are sound. They contemplate that the vast area of American industry shall be free from bureaucratic regulation, but shall be subject to the prohibitions of the law against restraints of trade and monopolization. So long as business does not offend these prohibitions, it has freedom of choice in making the important decisions regarding production and distribution practices and policies. We must make the antitrust laws work if we are to escape the alternatives—which are socially, economically, and politically undesirable. The answer is to be found in strong, undeviating congressional demand and support for a vigorous antitrust enforcement policy.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Have you any questions?

Mr. BALLINGER. Mr. Berge, have you any idea how much it costs the Government in a big suit? You were speaking about the Hartford Empire case. They spent millions and the suit is very expensive for the Government. I have heard Mr. Wooden say that the FTC would take at least $150,000 of their limited appropriation to even go after one big concern.

Mr. BERGE. Yes; well, of course, there isn't any cost accounting or cost allocation system operating in a division like antitrust where you could accurately measure that, because one man may be devoting his time to several different cases, and it is possible, therefore, to have some doubling up. However, I would certainly say that the unit costs, if there were a cost allocation system in effect, I am sure it is a very safe statement to make that the costs for the Government are very much less than the costs that private industry pays to defend the suits. Just take two examples that come to me from memory. The so-called Socony Vacuum or the Madison Oil case up in Wisconsin. That trial lasted a long time, several months, as I recall. I think the Antitrust Division had not more than five lawyers up there, sometimes probably less, men whose salaries ranged from at that time the top was $7,500 down to maybe $3,000; perhaps not more in annual salaries involved in that case than $35,000 or $40,000; men living on a per diem of $5 or

$6 a day; so, it would relatively not count up to very much as against 65 defense counsel who were present. I am not in private practice, and I don't want to cast any aspersions upon the profession or its capacity to pull in good fees, but it is a safe general situation that the counsel for the various oil companies concerned, operating, of course, in a free market for professional services, which is quite proper, were very well paid for their services. And you can make similar comparisons down the line.

The Aluminum case. It was expensive in the sense that it ran several years, but the man in charge of that case was earning $7,500, and there were not more than, well, there was a large staff on that case for a Government case. I think there were perhaps 10 or a dozen men on that case, but there again the over-all cost of it might have run, well, this is just a shot in the dark, possibly $100,000. The case went over several years.

The conclusion that you draw from that is that antitrust enforcement is more expensive per case than the average criminal case, of course, because the economic data is complex and it requires long study and analysis, and it requires the type of men who have pretty deep grasp of problems. On the average, I think a good antitrust lawyer deserves a higher salary than any of the lawyers in Government service whose work is of a more routine character. To prosecute large suits against large combinations for divestiture or dissolution takes a relatively large staff, large in the sense of 3 to 6 or 9 lawyers, and considerable time. Maybe a year or two to a case.

On the other hand, in comparison with the savings to consumers that come out of these various cases and the long-range support that it gives to our private enterprise system, I don't think the cost is high, and it certainly is not high in comparison with what private industry pays to defend such cases.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Have you any questions?

Basing point

Mr. PATMAN. Your statement is a very fine one, Mr. Berge, and I appreciate it. I want to read carefully the part that I did not have the opportunity to hear before I came in. I wonder if you had given consideration to the basing point.

Mr. BERGE. When I was in the Department, when I was head of the Division, we instituted a suit against the cement industry which in many respects paralleled the Federal Trade Commission's action. I have no hesitancy in saying that insofar as the basing point system is carried out by agreement among competitiors, it is clearly illegal and should be, that is, if a particular company sells on a delivered price basis because its competitors are doing so, and it has agreed with them that it would be part of the system, that is a clear price fixing in my judgment.

As to what constitutes proof that they are doing that is something else, but I don't think there can be any question but what the Federal Trade Commission's findings in that respect are amply supported by the evidence according to the rules or proof of conspiracy that have been long accepted.

If a company doing business, say, in Washington in quoting prices for delivery in Washington, adds freight from New York because that is the basing point, and it has agreed with its competitors directly or indirectly that it would do so, that is price fixing just as much as anything else.

When you get into the Robinson-Patman Act phase of that case, it presents a little more complex problem, and I have not made the kind of study of it that would warrant my declaring myself with any deep conviction. The court, as you of course know, the committee knows, found that even the individual absorption of freight or utilization of such of system where it resulted in the quoting of different prices to customers was a violation of the Robinson-Patman Act.

All I can say is this: I have heard a great deal of discussion on that point. I attended the American Bar Association meeting and heard some very carefully considered papers in the section on corporation banking and mercantile law. They were all critical of the result that was reached in the decision. They were read by lawyers who were representing companies that had reason to complain of the result, who were, no doubt, quite conscientiously speaking as advocates of the point of view of their clients.

It did raise a question in my mind about this one point: Whether an absolute—and I want to reserve judgment because I have not recently read the opinion with this in mind—if the opinion has the effect of absolutely outlawing the individual absorption of freight to meet competition, I can see that in some instances it might have an effect of strengthening monopoly controls in local areas rather than promoting competition. A simple illustration: If you can't absorb freight to meet competition, it might bar you from some local market and tend to strengthen the monopoly position of the person doing business in the local market.

Mr. PATMAN. Is it not a fact that the Government has never attempted either through the Department of Justice or the Federal Trade Commission to prosecute any person, firm or corporation on the basing point unless there was collusion or conspiracy?

Mr. BERGE. That is right.

Mr. PATMAN. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. BERGE. That is right.

Mr. PATMAN. And you do not know of any person in the Government now, or will probably be in the future, who would attempt to prosecute anybody?

Mr. BERGE. No.

Mr. PATMAN. Unless there was collusion or conspiracy?

Mr. BERGE. I think that probably in that respect it is a tempest in a teapot, and that the question is not one—well, I think there is undue agitation about it, because I cannot conceive the Federal Trade Commission prosecuting an individual for meeting his competitor's prices, and I am sure that under the Sherman Act there would be no basis for it. Of course, the Department of Justice has no jurisdiction except in the presence of a combination or conspiracy or monopolization, so they would not have any interest in it anyhow.

The only theoretical question would be if the FTC enforcing the Robinson-Patman Act should decide to proceed against an individual. As a practical matter, I can't conceive of them doing it; and these corporation lawyers who are greatly concerned about it seem to put their concern on the theoretical basis that the language of the Supreme Court's opinion is susceptible to the interpretation that the individual use of the utilization freight absorption techniques is illegal, and, therefore, they can't advise their clients it is safe to do it unless the law is changed.

I, frankly, have not followed the thought entirely through but my instinctive reaction at this point is that we should not now enact any legislation to, in effect, overrule that decision, but at least give the thing a few years' try and see if that creates the confusion in business that they say it does. I think that while there might be room for intellectual argument and discussion on the point, I cannot feel that at present there is any real crisis that requires all of this agitation and hullabaloo. I would like to see the status quo preserved and see business operate for a few years under this decision and see whether the Robinson-Patman Act as applied to this industry is going to create confusion that they complain of. I doubt that it will.

Mr. PATMAN. I am apprehensive that some of them, not all of them, but a few of the more selfish ones, are taking advantage of this opportunity to try to use this decision as a springboard for the purpose of weakening or destroying our antitrust laws. I am just like you: I do not see where they have anything on earth to fear as long as there is no collusion or conspiracy.

Of course, we have to be careful in the House about speaking about Members of the other body. That is, on the floor, you know; but I notice where the distinguished and prominent member of the other party has said that he wants a law that will permit the absorption of any or all freights so long as conspiracy or collusion is not involved. Well, there is nothing to fight over. It is only where collusion or conspiracy, one or the other, is involved that any prosecution takes place. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. BERGE. Right.

Mr. PATMAN. And I cannot conceive of any officer with any department of the Government or any United States district attorney ever, under any circumstances or conditions, proceeding against any person on the basing point unless there is collusion or conspiracy or used for the purpose of destroying a competitor or an unfair trade practice or to create a monopoly.

Mr. BERGE. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. I suspect we better add those in there, too.

No need for legislation on basing point

Mr. BERGE. Yes. I think that you are quite right about it, and I do not believe now that there is any need for legislation. I was very much concerned about the operation of the basing point system through collusion, any evidence that we had when I was head of the Division that moved me to recommend the institution of our cement case—of course, the Department cement case did not have any concern with the Robinson-Patman Act, and it was not involved in it. That was an additional point that only the Federal Trade Commission was concerned with. We felt that as the basing point system was operating, it was clearly a conspiracy and agreement in restraint of trade and that the evidence was sufficient to sustain that position.

Unwitting tearing down of antitrust laws

It has been so held in the Federal Trade Commission case. I have not kept wholly up to date on the progress of the Department's case since I left, but I think that is the problem, and I am concerned about any attempts to whittle down by seemingly plausible legislation the enforcement of the application of the Sherman Act, carving out exemptions here, there and elsewhere, and I can see that there is danger that the result of this inquiry now that is going on into the operation of the basing point system on the Capehart committee could result in an unwitting tearing down of the Sherman Act.

Mr. PATMAN. I notice out of the large number of volunteers to help the committee and whose names were listed in the newspapers, a large number of them were directly connected with the steel and the cement industries that are vitally affected in the decisions.

Mr. BERGE. Well, those are two of the principal industries that had operated under that system.

Mr. PATMAN. Now, the steel industry, I mean U. S. Steel, owns cement factories, cement mills, too, do they not?

Mr. BALLINGER. Owns the largest cement company in the world.

Mr. PATMAN. So evidently the tie-in there between the two.

You recall for the last 15 years or longer that the cement companies have made identical bids, and I understand while Mr. Ickes was Secretary of the Interior that when he was asking for bids on huge amounts of cement and they had all come in exactly the

same down to one-hundredth of a cent, that he was so irritated about it that he adopted the policy of accepting the bid of the one the greatest distance away from where it was to be delivered. Did you know that?

Mr. BERGE. No I was not aware of that. That is very interesting.

Mr. PATMAN. I suspect, though, that they had a way of handling that.

That is all.

Mr. BALLINGER. Thank you very much, Mr. Berge, for coming.

Mr. BERGE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extracts and inserts.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include excerpts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a recent address by the Most Reverend Richard J. Cushing, D. D., archbishop of Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER: Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 15 minutes.

STEADY LONG RANGE AIRCRAFT PROGRAM ESSENTIAL TO KEEP SKILLED WORKERS AND TO MAINTAIN PRODUCTION EFFICIENCY

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, there have been many statements and speeches made by Members of the Congress on the subject of air power. Most of such remarks have been made by members of the special House-Senate Aviation Policy Board or by members of appropriate committees. Much of the content of these statements has been with special regard to the defense aspects of the size of the Air Force Department and the air arm of the Navy. I do not qualify as an expert in the field of advising Congress as to how many groups the Air Force Department needs nor the size of the Navy's air arm, although I have been a supporter of the air power programs advanced by those Members of Congress, both Republicans and Democrats, who do qualify as experts in this field.

I have supported the movements to create for America an overwhelmingly superior air arm because I feel as most of you do, as indicated by past votes of this body, that air power is our first line of defense and also will continue to be our foremost offensive weapon.

But there is another and a special phase of this problem that I wish to bring to the attention of Congress today.

This problem is best dramatized by the fact that in the past week or two one aircraft manufacturer alone, the North American Co., has had to lay off over 2,600 employees. Those employees are residents of the Los Angeles area, a part of which I serve as Representative. Those craftsmen have skills that do not come easily and they are skills that are a vital national asset in these times of uncertainty.

The wanton, seemingly unthinking dissipation of our Nation's aircraft worker skills could very well contribute greatly to a national disaster if it is allowed to continue.

As you probably are aware, the loss of these skills results from the recent cutbacks in airplane production orders by the Air Force, which in turn is brought about by proposed budget cuts in airplane procurement and the resulting disruption of the 5-year air power plan adopted by Congress during its last session.

In addition to the loss of skills that is involved, there is an economic loss of $18,000,000 in annual pay roll in Los Angeles County and a loss of $3,000,000 in subcontracts with about 600 subcontracting firms, most of which are located in southern California.

These cut-backs and the lay-offs of thousands of aircraft workers bring up the whole problem of sound planning in our air-power program and the absolute necessity of achieving some kind of steadiness in the procurement of aircraft.

Steadiness is needed not only to avoid the costly and perhaps disastrous dissipation of aircraft worker skills, but also to provide more units of airplanes for less cost to the Government and its taxpayers, and to properly maintain aircraft manufacturing facilities in a state of readiness so that they can be vastly expanded when and if needed.

I do not plead here that any certain size air force department be maintained or that any certain size Navy air arm be put into being. There are others in this House whose job it is to recommend to us on such matters, and whose committee assignment and personal experience better qualify them to judge the claims of the various defense departments.

My plea is that Congress stick to its decisions as to what size that air arm should be with at least some degree of consistency. I had thought we made our decision last year when we made the down payment on a 70-group air force and a 14,500-airplane Navy. But this year we are presented with a budget which calls for a 48-group air force and about a 7,500-airplane Navy.

Therefore it is obvious that a long-range planning policy or policy of steadiness in aircraft procurement does not exist in any real or practical way. Instead, we are in effect operating under a short range, hit or miss, feast or famine policy that is uncertain, costly, and inefficient, and under which the aircraft industry and aircraft worker skills cannot hope to remain strong and able to perform their basic functions in any national security program.

The contributions of a long-term, carefully planned, steady program of aircraft procurement to our national security are many and of the highest importance.

In the first place a long-term steady program is essential to the defense of this country. According to the studies made by the President's Finletter Commission and the Congressional Air Policy Board, it is only by such a program that we can be assured of keeping our air striking arms fully modern, up to date, and able to repel and then successfully attack any aggressor. The last war taught the truth of the adage that a second-best air force is worse than none, and that an air force that is not fully modern will always be second best.

Moreover, without adherence to a carefully planned long-term program our air striking arms will not have a sufficient quantity of modern equipment on hand to discharge their roles and missions in the national defense. The experience of the last two decades teaches all too graphically that hit-or-miss procurement programing, with procurement funds being expanded one year and then contracted the next, jeopardizes the very survival of a healthy aircraft industry. It is also true that without a healthy industry capable of rapid expansion in an emergency, our air forces will not be able to get the modern planes they need, in the quantities required, on time.

The important point here is that we as a Nation cannot cut back from a 70-group program one year to a 48-group program the next year without paying a tremendous financial penalty and without paying a tremendous penalty in the lessening of our production ability. Conversely, and more important, we cannot appropriate and plan for a 48-group program this year and then next year expect to be able to quickly expand to a 70-group program, when it is very possible that a 70-group program, or even a 150-group program, might be badly needed.

In the second place, a long-term program that assures continuity and steadiness in planning and production is the most important means of effecting economy in our national defense expenditures. Studies presented to the Finletter Commission and the Congressional Aviation Policy Board indicate that savings up to as much as 25 percent could be effected in aircraft procurement if our Nation will establish and then adhere to a long-term plan. Such savings alone would justify us in the Congress insisting that the National Defense Establishment develop and stay with a steady 5-year plan of aircraft procurement.

In the third place, it is extremely important that a long-term program be established and maintained if the industry is to be able to maintain a crew of skilled workers and trained engineers. Such a crew is the foundation on which the industry would expand in case of emergency and these workers must be retained and kept in the practice of production or the whole aircraft industry will disappear as a national asset—an asset absolutely vital in the event of an international emergency.

Twenty-six hundred skilled workers and trained engineers already have been lost to our national-defense program, and unless we insist that the program of aircraft procurement remains steady from here on out, there may be tens of thousands more laid off in my State of California and in many other States, too.

For it has been demonstrated time and time again that engineers and skilled workers such as we have in the aircraft industry simply will not remain—indeed, they cannot afford to remain in an industry subject to drastic fluctuations in production and jobs—fluctuations that must result when aircraft procurement

is expanded and then cut back suddenly without regard to a plan or a program.

The interest of aircraft workers in a long-term program is exemplified by the concern expressed in the subject by the workers' representatives. The International Association of Machinists, which holds the bargaining contracts at many of the aircraft plants, has long actively campaigned for a long-term, steady program. The activities in this field by this great union are summarized in the report submitted to the national convention held by the union last fall in Grand Rapids. I would like to quote three paragraphs from that report:

> The recommendations of the President's Committee and the Congressional Committee strongly affirm our country's need for the prompt adoption of a program designed to give us air supremacy by 1953. That length of time is required to complete the over-all program based on an air force composed of 70 groups. Emphasis is placed on the need for a new approach to aircraft production. Rather than Congress providing funds on a year-to-year basis, a long-range program is urged which will give adequate consideration to all phases of the problem.
>
> In studying this industry, it is both interesting and reassuring to find that our organization, at the 1945 convention unanimously adopted a report prepared and submitted by the aircraft committee. This report, in substance called for a well-planned and full program for world peace, and for legislation that would enable the air forces to proceed with a postwar program embodying full experimental and continuing technological improvements in the latest type aircraft to keep this Nation always ahead in air power and to assure continued peace.
>
> As we assemble here in this 1948 convention we are faced with the seriousness of our Nation's problems. Supremacy in the air is the first requirement for maintaining peace, and of meeting an attack upon the United States, Canada, and Newfoundland by another country. The interests of our countries require building and maintaining not only a strong air force, but one that will give us supremacy in the air at the earliest possible date.

Yet the cut-backs that have been so far announced in contracts held by California aircraft companies show that the warnings issued by the machinists union have been almost completely ignored. The Congress last year voted the funds to start the first year of a 5-year program of aircraft production. During the debates preceding the adoption of this appropriation, Congressman after Congressman of both parties emphasized that the intention was to initiate a long-term program that would provide assurance and steadiness to the air forces, the managers of the aircraft industry, and to the thousands and thousands of skilled craftsmen employed by the industry. The vote on the program was completely nonpartisan and was overwhelmingly carried with only three dissenting votes in the House and two nays in the Senate.

It seems to me most unfortunate, therefore, that not quite one year after Congress acted the 1950 budget is presented proposing to scrap the 5-year program, seemingly with little or no consideration or discussion of its merits and values. Nowhere in the budget do I find any mention of the need for steadiness and continuity in aircraft production and aircraft employment. There is no mention of the findings of the Finletter Commission or the Congressional Board. I regret to say there is no recognition of the dangers of dissipating the asset that is our skilled aircraft worker group.

There can be but one effect, and that is to make the skilled aircraft workers anxious to get out of the industry and to seek employment in other more stable lines not so subject to the vicissitudes of bad Government planning.

Workers in California are very much concerned over these cut-backs and lay-offs, and they are wondering if a pattern is being set which will dislodge thousands more of them in the next few months. I believe that aircraft workers in California and elsewhere want to see a 5-year program of aircraft production and procurement continued so as to guarantee our Nation's leadership in the air.

I support their plea. And I strongly urge that this Congress give full consideration to the possible disastrous and very costly effects of short-term planning as represented by the present cut-backs, and that we give full consideration to the good effects that will come from steadiness in our planning for the aircraft manufacturing industry.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BURNSIDE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND THE SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONNER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. JONES of Missouri, for balance of this week, on account of illness in family.

Mr. LYNCH, for balance of this week, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 31, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

114. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949, in the amount of $1,000,000, for disaster relief (H. Doc. 45); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

115. A letter from the Chairman, National Park and Planning Commission, transmitting a list of land acquisitions for parks, parkways, and playgrounds, cost of each tract, and method of acquisition, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Public Works.

116. A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

117. A letter from the Director, Naval Petroleum Reserves, Navy Department, transmitting a copy of the amendatory and supplemental agreements entered into on December 22, 1948, by and between the United States of America, acting by and through the Secretary of the Navy and the Standard Oil Co. of California; to the Committee on Armed Services.

118. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a list of eligible institutions and organizations which have requested donations from the Navy Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

119. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill relating to the pay and allowances of officers of the Naval Establishment appointed to permanent grades; to the Committee on Armed Services.

120. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting two copies of a dispatch forwarded by the Governor of American Samoa, embodying resolutions adopted by the Fono of American Samoa during its present session; to the Committee on Public Lands.

121. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill relating to the pay and allowances of officers of the Naval Reserve performing active duty in the grade of rear admiral, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

122. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a list of the lands exchanged under the provisions of the act of June 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 741, 43 U. S. C., sec. 869); to the Committee on Public Lands.

123. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report to the Congress of all reservations made in conformity with the provisions of section 13 of the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 858); to the Committee on Public Lands.

124. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, Government of the District of Columbia, transmitting the fourteenth semiannual report of the Administrator of Rent Control for the District of Columbia, covering the period July 1 to December 31, 1948; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 1660. A bill to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans; without amendment (Report No. 8). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FORAND: Committee on Ways and Means. H. J. Res. 88. Joint resolution extending the time for free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will; with an amendment (Report No. 6). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KERR: Committee on Appropriations. H. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes; without amendment (Report No. 7). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced und severally referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMPSON:

H. R. 1879. A bill authorizing preliminary examinations and surveys of the streams, and their larger tributaries, flowing through the Austin-Washington soil conservation district, the Bastrop-Fayette soil conservation district, the Calhoun-Victoria soil conservation district, the Middle Guadalupe Basin soil conservation district, the Navasota soil conservation district, and the Copano Bay soil conservation district, in the State of Texas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THOMPSON (by request):

H. R. 1880. A bill to incorporate the Retired Officers Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming:

H. R. 1881. A bill providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio:

H. R. 1882. A bill to incorporate the Blue Star Mothers of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1883. A bill to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 1884. A bill to provide for the acquisition of site and preparation of plans and specifications for a new Federal building and post office in Manitowoc, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1885. A bill to provide for the acquisition of site and preparation of plans and specifications for a new Federal building and post office in Green Bay, Wis., to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H. R. 1886. A bill to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. R. 1887. A bill to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 1888. A bill making emergency supplemental appropriation for disaster relief; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 1889. A bill to amend section 9 (a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 1890. A bill to provide for the granting of honorable discharges to certain persons who served in the armed forces during World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1891. A bill making appropriations for disaster relief in case of snowstorms, blizzards, and other catastrophies; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DEWART:

H. R. 1892. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to certain Indian lands in Lake County, Mont.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1893. A bill to repeal the wartime increases of taxes on telegraph, radio, and cable services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 1894. A bill to repeal the taxes on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1895. A bill to repeal the taxes on transportation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 1896. A bill to amend section 124 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 1897. A bill to provide for the admission into the United States of persons of the Korean race, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 1898. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, so as to change the age for old-age and survivor benefits from 65 to 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 1899. A bill to extend the period of validity of the act to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 1900. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 1901. A bill to provide free postage for members of the armed forces of the United States while on active duty; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1902. A bill to provide gold star lapel buttons for widows, parents, and next of kin of persons who lost their lives as the result of serving in the armed forces of the United States in World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. R. 1903. A bill to amend and supplement the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 1904. A bill to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HEDRICK:

H. R. 1905. A bill to provide compensation for veterans of World War II who have had pulmonary tuberculosis; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 1906. A bill to amend section 6 of the War Claims Act of 1948, with respect to compensation payable to individuals who went into hiding in order to avoid capture as prisoners of war; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUBER:

H. R. 1907. A bill to provide that rural carriers in the postal service shall be appointed without regard to political affiliations and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the position; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 1908. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to support research and training in diseases of arthritis and rheumatism, and to aid the States in the development of community programs for the control of these diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JONAS:

H. R. 1909. A bill to provide a limited exemption from income tax in the case of retirement pensions and annuities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 1910. A bill to establish an immigration quota for Israel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1911. A bill to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEEFE:

H. R. 1912. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to support research and training in diseases of arthritis and rheumatism, and to aid the States in the development of community programs for the control of these diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 1913. A bill to provide for the acquisition of sites and the preparation of plans for Federal public buildings outside the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1914. A bill to provide that the gain realized on sale of a residence shall, in certain cases, be exempt from income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 1915. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 1916. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Westlake, La., a post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 1917. A bill to amend section 2402 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and to repeal section 2402 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 1918. A bill to authorize the furnishing of water to the Yuma auxiliary project, Arizona, through the works of the Gila project, Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1919. A bill to authorize mining, milling, or smelting loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1920. A bill to amend the Columbia Project Act with reference to State lands, to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1921. A bill relating to the amount of Federal payments to the States under the Social Security Act with respect to State payments to Indian wards of the United States of old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the blind; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1922. A bill to amend section 10 of the Reclamation Act of 1939; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 1923. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 1924. A bill to increase the rates of pay of Federal employees whose wages are set by wage boards or other administrative authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 1925. A bill to establish the United States Air Academy at Davis-Monthan Field, Tucson, Ariz.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1926. A bill relating to the amount of Federal payments to the States under the Social Security Act with respect to State payments to Indian wards of the United States of old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the blind; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER:

H. R. 1927. A bill to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 1928. A bill increasing the immigration quotas for Italy for fiscal years 1949 and 1950, by amount equal to unused quotas for past 10 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 1929. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to support research and training in diseases of arthritis and rheumatism, and to aid the States in the development of community programs for the control of these diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 1930. A bill granting pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependent children equivalent to the pensions granted to veterans of the war with Spain and their widows and dependent children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H. R. 1931. A bill to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 1932. A bill to provide increased retirement benefits for certain persons who served in the armed forces during World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 1933. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to provide for the naturalization of certain noncitizen parents of persons who served in the armed forces of the United States, or in the merchant marine, in World War I or World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 1934. A bill providing direct Federal old-age assistance at the rate of $60 per month to needy citizens 60 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 1935. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to support research and training in diseases of arthritis and rheumatism, and to aid the States in the development of community programs for the control of these diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 1936. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to grant a right-of-way; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1937. A bill to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 1938. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STEFAN:

H. R. 1939. A bill making appropriations for emergency flood relief; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 1940. A bill making appropriations for disaster relief in case of snowstorms, blizzards, and other catastrophes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 1941. A bill to provide for limiting participation as beneficiary under the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1942. A bill to provide for a service credit for veterans for the purposes of title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1943. A bill to amend the income limitation governing the granting of pension to veterans and death-pension benefits to widows and children of veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 1944. A bill to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

H. R. 1945. A bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947 by providing that the Vice President shall be a member of the National Security Council; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 1946. A bill to provide for the appointment of one additional circuit judge in the third circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1947. A bill to provide for the appointment of two additional circuit judges in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1948. A bill to provide for the appointment of two additional district judges in the eastern district of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1949. A bill to amend section 12b of the Federal Reserve Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 1950. A bill for the relief of certain consultants formerly employed by the Technical Industrial Intelligence Committee of the Foreign Economic Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1951. A bill to amend section 334 (c) of the Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1156–1157; 8 U. S. C. 734); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1952. A bill to amend section 292 and section 293 of the Criminal Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1953. A bill to increase the fees of witnesses in the United States courts and before United States commissioners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1954. A bill to prohibit the transportation of obscene literature in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1955. A bill to provide for the detention, care, and treatment of persons of unsound mind in certain Federal reservations in Virginia and Maryland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER (by request):

H. R. 1956. A bill to amend the immigration laws relating to stowaways; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 1957. A bill making appropriations for emergency flood relief; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 1958. A bill to provide for a decennial census of radio broadcasting receiving sets; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 1959. A bill for the relief of the county of Allegheny, Pa.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 1960. A bill to amend and supplement the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 1961. A bill to permit widows of officers and enlisted men of the Army to purchase from Army commissaries; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MEYER:

H. R. 1962. A bill to stimulate the exploration, production, and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals and for the establishment within the Department of the Interior of a Mine Incentive Payments Division, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 1963. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1964. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1965. A bill to defer the repayment in full by States of certain loans made by the Federal Works Administrator; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1966. A bill establishing a procedure by which the Administrator may assure veterans full educational and training opportunities commensurate with the tuition charges by educational and training institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 1967. A bill to amend section 4 of the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 654); to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1968. A bill to amend section 5 of the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 654); to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1969. A bill to encourage better management of privately owned forest lands and to increase the efficient production, processing, marketing, and utilization of forest products through making available technical services and assistance to forest owners, operators of wood-using industries, and consumers of forest products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1970. A bill to authorize appropriations for carrying out the provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 of the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653), as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1971. A bill to amend and supplement the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 1972. A bill to authorize grants to enable local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred or defense-incurred school enrollments to increase school facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 1973. A bill to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LODGE:

H. R. 1974. A bill to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KERR:

H. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. J. Res. 113. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming:

H. J. Res. 114. Joint resolution to permit the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., to make certain disaster loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. J. Res. 115. Joint resolution to provide that any future payments by the Republic of Finland on the principal or interest of its

debt of the First World War to the United States shall be used to provide educational and technical instruction and training in the United States for citizens of Finland and American books and technical equipment for institutions of higher education in Finland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. J. Res. 116. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. J. Res. 117. Joint resolution to make January 30 a legal holiday dedicated to human freedom and dignity and known as Roosevelt Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. J. Res. 118. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the election and term of office of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. J. Res. 119. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SECREST:

H. J. Res. 120. Joint resolution to make it unlawful for members of the Communist Party to be candidates for Federal elective office and to provide for the immediate deportation of aliens found to be members of the Communist Party; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Con. Res. 20. Concurrent resolution to provide for an investigation of the life-insurance industry of the United States with particular regard to the applicable antitrust laws and to the extent to which the operations of such industry comply with such laws; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. Res. 65. Resolution to protest the summary arrest and imprisonment of Cardinal Mindszenty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SOMERS:

H. Res. 66. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Public Lands to make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SECREST:

H. Res. 67. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate and study the recent reductions in the price paid to producers of Pennsylvania-grade crude oil; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAVENPORT:

H. R. 1975. A bill for the relief of Rudolf A. V. Raff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 1976. A bill to authorize the sale of certain allotted inherited land on the Flathead Indian Reservation, Mont.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 1977. A bill for the relief of the heirs of Ross Kennedy and Jane Rankin Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1978. A bill for the relief of Boehme's Butternut Bakery, a partnership; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 1979. A bill for the relief of Soo Hoo Yet Tuck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. R. 1980. A bill for the relief of Walter H. Houston; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1981. A bill for the relief of Carolyn McMillan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREGORY:

H. R. 1982. A bill for the relief of Cumberland Manufacturing Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 1983. A bill for the relief of Edward L. Barreras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 1984. A bill for the relief of Kazuo Minami, Mrs. Yoshiko Minami, and Tadao Minami; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 1985. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Tibor Jankai and Irene Alexander Jankai, his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 1986. A bill for the relief of Ella Spellman Geiger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1987. A bill for the relief of Jeno Stern and Aranka Stern; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIND:

H. R. 1988. A bill for the relief of Leslie A. Fry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 1989. A bill to provide for the retirement with pay of Commander Nicholas T. Gansa; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER:

H. R. 1990. A bill for the relief of Istvan Hedvig and Peter Paul Gulyas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Texas:

H. R. 1991. A bill for the relief of Alexander Stewart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELCH of California:

H. R. 1992. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Adelaide Dibbs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 1993. A bill for the relief of Samuel Fadem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 1994. A bill for the relief of Frank F. Miles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

28. By Mr. KEARNEY: Resolutions adopted by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of New York, expressing condemnation of the Hungarian Government for its arrest and imprisonment of His Eminence Josef Cardinal Mindszenty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

29. By Mr. LYNCH: Memorial of the Assembly of the State of New York, urging that the Congress, the Secretary of State of the United States, and the President do everything in their power to bring about the immediate release of Cardinal Mindszenty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

30. By the SPEAKER: Petition of members of the Puerto Rico Telephone Industry Workers Union, petitioning consideration of their resolution asking that their affiliate of the Puerto Rico State branch of the American Federation of Labor be given extension to Puerto Rico, in regard to the wages and hours law; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 31, 1949

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we have entered upon a new week with tasks and responsibilities which are far beyond the wisdom of our own finite minds.

Grant that daily we may hold counsel with the God of all wisdom and yield ourselves unreservedly to the discipline and guidance of Thy Spirit.

May we also hear and heed the command which came to Thy servant in the long ago: "Stand thou still a while that I may show thee the word of God."

We pray that Thou wilt create within men and nations those finer feelings and nobler thoughts which are the progenitors of achievement in the building of a better world.

We thank Thee, O God, for the memory of Thy servant who ministered here in spiritual things. His sun went down while it was yet day, only to rise again in heavenly glory. We rejoice in the high and holy privilege that was ours to walk and work with Him for a little while upon this earth.

Hear us in the name of the Christ, our Saviour. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On motion of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 27, 1949, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following act and joint resolution:

On January 18, 1949:

S. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution making January 20 and 21, 1949, holidays for Federal employees and employees of the District of Columbia in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia.

On January 19, 1949:

S. 103. An act to increase rates of compensation of the President, Vice President, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 27th instant,

The Vice President, on January 28, 1949, signed the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 112) making an additional appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk (Edward E. Mansur, Jr.) called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hoey	Mundt
Anderson	Holland	Murray
Baldwin	Humphrey	Myers
Brewster	Hunt	Neely
Bricker	Ives	O'Conor
Bridges	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Broughton	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Butler	Johnson, Tex.	Reed
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Cain	Kefauver	Russell
Chapman	Kem	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kerr	Schoeppel
Connally	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Donnell	Langer	Sparkman
Eastland	Lodge	Stennis
Ecton	Long	Taft
Ellender	Lucas	Taylor
Flanders	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Frear	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Fulbright	McFarland	Thye
George	McKellar	Tydings
Gillette	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Green	Martin	Watkins
Hayden	Maybank	Wiley
Hendrickson	Miller	Williams
Hickenlooper	Millikin	Withers
Hill	Morse	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on official committee business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

REPORT OF NATIONAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 5 (a) of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, approved June 12, 1934, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the National Capital Housing Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 31, 1949.*

NOTE.—The report accompanied a similar message to the House of Representatives.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred, as indicated:

REPORT ON CERTAIN CLAIMS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a report and recommendations (annex I) regarding legislation to enable this Government to effect settlement of certain outstanding claims against the United States; and (annex II) a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to effect the payment of certain claims against the United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON FOREIGN SURPLUS DISPOSAL

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the twelfth report of the Department of State on the disposal of United States surplus property in foreign areas, dated January 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CHANGE IN FORM OF GOVERNMENT FOR AMERICAN SAMOA

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting resolutions adopted by the Fono of American Samoa, relating to a change in the form of the government of American Samoa (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF NAVAL MOTOR LAUNCHES TO STATE OF NEW JERSEY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the State of New Jersey had requested the Navy Department to transfer two 40-foot motor launches to be used by the Shell Fisheries Division of the Department of Conservation of that State; to the Committee on Armed Services.

DISSEMINATION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION TO AMERICAN BUSINESS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the dissemination of technological, scientific, and engineering information to American business and industry, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PARKING OF VEHICLES ON PROPERTY OWNED BY THE UNITED STATES FOR POSTAL PURPOSES

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to prohibit the parking of vehicles upon any property owned by the United States for postal purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF CAPITAL TRANSIT CO.

A letter from the president of the Capital Transit Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that company for the calendar year 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES BY THE CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the vice president and comptroller of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of receipts and expenditures of that company for the calendar year 1948 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

BALANCE SHEET OF THE CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the vice president and comptroller of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a comparative general balance sheet of that company, for the year 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF ADMINISTRATOR OF RENT CONTROL, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Administrator of Rent Control for the District of Columbia, for the period July 1 to December 31, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman and members of the Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fifth semiannual report of that Commission, dated January 31, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN COMPACT

A letter from the representative of the United States, upper Colorado River Basin compact negotiations, transmitting a conformed copy of a compact entered into among the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, to determine the rights and obligations of those States respecting uses and deliveries of water of the upper basin of the Colorado River (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A radiogram from the International Longshoremen's Association, local No. 1740, of San Juan, P. R., favoring the enactment of legislation to extend the Fair Labor Standards Act and social security to Puerto Rico on an equal basis with the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NEELY:

A letter and 28 telegrams in the nature of memorials, from sundry citizens of the State of West Virginia, remonstrating against the enactment of Senate bill 248, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BUTLER:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

"Legislative Resolution 5

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to defeat Federal aid to education

"Whereas there is pending in the Congress of the United States a bill, Senate file No. 246, providing Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools of the United States; and

"Whereas, should this bill be enacted into law, there is reason to believe that it will lead inevitably to Federal control and supervision of the public schools of the Nation, thereby taking control out of the hands of the local districts; and

"Whereas the several States are now able through their own taxing powers to make ample provision for their elementary and secondary schools without Federal aid; and

"Whereas the Federal Government is already burdened with a staggering debt of more than $250,000,000,000, calling for retrenchment if the solvency of the United States is to be preserved: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the members of the Nebraska legislature in sixty-first session assembled:*

"1. That Senate file No. 246, or any similar legislation now before the Congress of the United States, be defeated.

"2. That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to the Vice President of the United States as Presiding Officer of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress of the United States from Nebraska."

PARITY PRICES—RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE GEORGIA STATE ASSEMBLY

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Georgia, relating to parity prices, and ask for its reference to the Committee on Agriculture.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, the resolution will be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

Whereas the gross debt of the Government of the United States has increased from about 40 billion to approximately 252 billion dollars during the period of 1939 to 1949; and

Whereas interest must be paid annually and the debt gradually liquidated if the Government is to be saved from insolvency or bankruptcy; and

Whereas it must be self-evident that if we are to avoid lower living standards and if this debt is to be serviced and paid, it must be through the production of new wealth from the natural resources of the United States; and

Whereas the national income of the United States and the gross income of agriculture of this country have each only slightly more than doubled during the same time, and these must bear the chief burden of taxes (directly or indirectly) in maintaining the national solvency; and

Whereas our gross farm income represents about 65 percent in dollar value of our annual production of new wealth and in turn our national income regularly averages approximately seven times the dollar amount of gross farm income; and

Whereas a return to the 1939 price and income levels for farm products would reduce our national income about 50 percent: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the senate and the house of representatives concurring, hereby petitions Congress to pass permanent legislation to maintain a floor of not less than 90 percent of parity on all basic farm crops, to protect such floor prices with commodity loans of like amount and to prescribe such import duties, excise taxes, or quotas on competitive imports as may be needed to maintain these price levels and our national income; be it

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to President Harry S. Truman, Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan, and to Senators and Congressmen from the State of Georgia requesting their cooperation and expressing the appreciation of the general assembly for same.

AMENDMENT OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938—MEMORIALS

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I present a letter and 28 telegrams in the nature of memorials concerning proposed amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. I ask unanimous consent that a list of the names of the authors of these memorials be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The memorials will be appropriately referred, and, without objection, the list of names of the authors of the memorials will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list of the names of the authors of the memorials was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In accordance with the second paragraph of rule 7, Mr. NEELY presented a letter and numerous telegrams in the nature of memorials relative to proposed amendments of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 from the following: E. C. Jones, president, Jones, Inc., Fairmont, W. Va.; Dewey E. S. Kuhns, secretary and treasurer, West Virginia Retailers Association, Charleston, W. Va.; H. P. Reip, controller, the Parsons-Souders Co., Clarksburg, W. Va.; W. A. Pankey, general manager, Bluefield Telephone Co., Bluefield, W. Va.; the Merchants Cooperative Association, Wheeling, W. Va.; Raphael Maisin, president, Lane Bryant, Inc., 465 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.; J. W. Stokes, president, Hinton Chamber of Commerce, Hinton, W. Va.; John Morgan, chairman, retail council, Parkersburg Board of Commerce, Parkersburg, W. Va.; R. D. Kemp, W. T. Grant Co., Beckley, W. Va.; Dave Abrams, Modern Furniture Co., Beckley, W. Va.; Thomas J. Richards, president, Watts Sartor Lear Co., Clarksburg, W. Va.; E. E. Bibb, president, Beckley Hardware & Supply Co., Beckley, W. Va.; Nelson Clark, manager, chamber of commerce, Martinsburg, W. Va.; Paul F. Sheets, president, Clarksburg Trade Association, Clarksburg, W. Va.; E. D. Armstrong, Beckley, W. Va.; N. Joe Rahil, Beckley, W. Va.; S. C. Ballengee Furniture Co., Beckley, W. Va.; C. T. Stromberg, Leader Furniture Co., Beckley, W. Va.; Cliff Holdren, secretary, Charles Town Ranson Board of Trade, Charles Town, W. Va.; T. W. Keffer, secretary-manager, chamber of commerce, Moundsville, W. Va.; W. B. Woolfe, president, and Chester J. Compton, executive secretary, Mineral County Chamber of Commerce, Keyser, W. Va.; Arthur C. Cundy, managing director, Beckley Chamber of Commerce, Beckley, W. Va.; Gordon W. Lewis, White Sulphur Dry Cleaners, White Sulphur Springs, W. Va.; Joseph W. Greer, president, J. M. Hartley & Son Co., Fairmont, W. Va.; Walter A. Hupp, American Laundry, Fairmont, W. Va.; R. J. Bryan, manager, Reilly Tar & Chemical Corp., Fairmont, W. Va.; Don Harper, president, Elkins Chamber of Commerce, Elkins, W. Va.; J. M. Bear, president, West Virginia Independent Telephone Association, Marlinton, W. Va.

RESOLUTION OF MINNESOTA STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR RELATING TO AMERICAN FEDERATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a resolution dealing with a number of problems of interest to the Government employees was approved by convention of the Minnesota State Federation of Labor in September. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Federal employees are an important and constituent part of the labor movement; and

Whereas the American Federation of Government Employees represents Federal employees; and

Whereas the American Federation of Government Employees is affiliated to the American Federation of Labor; and

Whereas Lodge 364 of the American Federation of Government Employees is affiliated to the Minnesota State Federation of Labor; and

Whereas the American Federation of Labor, in its national convention in 1946, endorsed the 1947-48 legislative program of the American Federation of Government Employees: Be it therefore

Resolved by Minnesota State Federation of Labor in regular convention, assembled at Hibbing, Minn., That the Minnesota State Federation of Labor endorses the following legislative program of the American Federation of Government Employees for 1948-49.

1. Legislation to effect a pay raise which will truly reflect the increased cost of living; that ceilings be eliminated from the pay scales, and a general revision of the salary schedules of the Classification Act of 1923.

2. Optional retirement at full annuity regardless of age after 25 years of service.

3. Optional annuity after 20 years of service for all employees engaged in hazardous occupations at rates provided in the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended February 28, 1948 (sec. 1-1).

4. Optional retirement after 20 years of service at a reduced annuity, if separated or demoted as a result of reduction in force.

5. Enactment of the Keating bill to increase compensation payments.

6. Legislation that will preserve competitive civil service for positions located in the Canal Zone for citizens of the United States.

7. Elimination of multiple taxation of Government employees' incomes by States or subdivisions thereof.

8. Legislation to exempt from income taxes any retirement annuities or pensions provided by the Federal, State, or other political subdivisions.

9. Legislation to provide employees of Government with complete uniforms, accessories, and equipment, where required, at the expense of the Government.

10. Increase in per diem and mileage rates of Government employees in travel status; minimum $10 a day for subsistence and 7 cents a mile for privately owned auto in official travel.

11. Legislation to secure for all Federal employees fair overtime pay not otherwise provided at rates in accordance with Fair Labor Standards Act.

12. Repeal of a law which places professional employees in Veterans' Administration outside Classification Act.

13. Unemployment compensation for Federal employees.

14. Legislation for payment of automatic within-grade increases on completion of respective periods of service required.

15. Reclassification of various positions of Public Building Administration guard force and that FBA guards be designated as United States Building Police.

16. Transfer to the Labor Department of the authority to fix local wage rates of per diem and unclassified employees; that all employees be given the right to appeal job classifications to the Civil Service Commission.

17. Medical and surgical treatment at Public Health Service hospitals for retired Federal workers.

18. That overtime be paid employees for work beyond 8 hours in any 1 day.

RESOLUTION AND PETITION RELATING TO BANNING OF YELLOW COLOR FROM OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution which I have received from Mr. Al Stoldt, president of the Wisconsin Swiss and Limburger Cheese Producers' Association, of Monroe, Wis. This resolution expresses very well, I believe, the need for banning the yellow color from oleomargarine in order to prevent fraudulent competition with butter.

Along this very same line I have received a communication from several veterans who are receiving on-the-farm training under the GI bill of rights and who have commented on this same subject. I feel that their views represent true grass-roots sentiments, and I ask that their letter be printed in the RECORD at this point, following the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution and letter were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OLEOMARGARINE

That whereas the principle of protection of the established identification characteristics of the products of the physical and mental labors of its citizens by the United States Government is evidenced by its laws pertaining to trade marks, brands, copyrights, patents, and similar subjects, designed to prevent others from profiting by indiscriminate imitation; and

Whereas the traditional yellow color of butter and the labor of all the dairy farmers who have created and maintained the high standards of the dairy industry are deserving of protection similar to that of other individuals and groups in our great country:

We recommend that if the present Federal tax is removed from oleomargarine, direct and effective Federal legislation be passed which will forbid the sale of any oleomargarine colored yellow in imitation of butter.

PLYMOUTH, WIS., *January 26, 1949.*

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: We, the undersigned, all veterans and students of institutional on-the-farm training and actively engaged in diversified farming, after due consideration of all facts, firmly believe that any change of the present oleo laws would be a death-dealing blow to the entire dairy industry as well as injurious to the welfare of the peoples of the Nation we love.

We believe that butter substitutes spread fraud and deception and should be sold only by their own colors and merits.

We believe that the 10,000,000 people directly gaining their livelihood from the dairy industry are entitled to protection because of their vital contributions to the Nation's diet and health, and to soil conservation. We believe what hurts the dairy industry hurts everyone, either directly or indirectly.

We believe that you, as the representative of America's dairyland, should and will do everything that is humanly possible to protect the interests of the dairy industry and the consuming public. We believe that the present laws should remain.

Very truly yours,

Carl E. Broph, Warren Lammers, Victor D. Last, J. Paul Tempas, Elroy Arndt, John H. Holbrook, Ray E. Richter, Harry Hortink, Irvin Arentsen, Roger Erncise, Howard J. Arentsen, Leonard J. Tauber, Reuben Arentsen, Alfred Verhulst, Homer Melvin, Instructor.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY SOUTH CAROLINA NATIONAL GUARD ASSOCIATION

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, four resolutions adopted by the South Carolina National Guard Association, in conference assembled on January 22, 1949, at Columbia, S. C., relating to the National Guard, a long-range armory construction program, and universal military training.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution for the preservation of the integrity of the National Guard of the United States

Whereas the National Guard of the United States is the successor to the Organized Militia, which was brought into being by the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas democracy is the basic philosophy of the National Guard system, which is accomplished by keeping our Army close to the people through State control in time of peace; and

Whereas in its dual capacity the National Guard serves the States as a security force in time of peace, and the Nation as combat troops in time of war and by virtue of such dual status giving to the State and Nation the greatest amount of security for the least possible cost; and

Whereas the National Guard has preserved law and order in the several States of the Union on many occasions, and twice has gone to war, fighting with telling effectiveness all over the world and justifying the foresight and wisdom of the framers of the Constitution of the United States by its great contribution to victory in these two World Wars; and

Whereas at this time efforts are being made to destroy the National Guard by removing it from State jurisdiction and combining it with the Organized Reserves, another reserve component of the Army of the United States, to the end that the Army, including all components, will be organized and controlled in Washington; and

Whereas the South Carolina National Guard Association regards these efforts as far reaching in its impact on the political, economic, and military life of our country; and condemns strongly and without any reservation as unwarranted and down-right dangerous any movement designed to effect this radical change in the basic concept of our historic policy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the South Carolina National Guard Association, in conference assembled this 22d day of January 1949, at Columbia, S. C., That the officers of the South Carolina National Guard Association are hereby instructed and directed to do all things which at their discretion they deem wise and necessary:

(a) To prevent the removal of the National Guard from State control,

(b) To prevent the interference in the slightest degree with the full command of the Guard by the Governors of the several States in time of peace,

(c) To prevent any change in the organization of the National Guard which would destroy or affect its integrity as both a State and National force, operating under the plan created by constitutional and statutory law; and be it further

Resolved, That the officers of this Association are directed to inform each Member of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives from South Carolina of this action and that they be fully informed of the background, the policies and purposes of the National Guard of the United States and our determination to see that the National Guard be not destroyed; be it further

Resolved, That the officers of this association are directed to bring this matter to the attention of the South Carolina General Assembly now in session in order that they shall have a full realization of the vital necessity of memorializing Congress, through the medium of a joint resolution, in opposing any attempt to change our present military system.

Resolution condemning that part of the report of the Committee on Civilian Components appointed by the Secretary of Defense recommending the destruction of the National Guard and substituting in lieu thereof a single Federal reserve or militia to be organized under the Army clause of the Constitution

Whereas on or about June 30, 1948, the Committee on Civilian Components that had been appointed by the Secretary of Defense charged with making an impartial study of the civilian components of the armed forces submitted to him its report embodying certain conclusions and recommendations affecting the National Guard, and which report included therein the following conclusions and recommendations:

1. National security required that all services each have one Federal reserve force.

This should be accomplished:

(a) by establishing the reserve forces of the Army under the Army clause of the Constitution.

(b) by similarly establishing the reserve forces of the Air Force under appropriate legal authority;

(c) by incorporating the National Guard and Organized Reserve Corps into the Army reserve under the name of the National Guard of the United States;

(d) by incorporating the Air National Guard and the Air Reserve into the Air Force reserve force under the name of the United States Air Force Reserve.

and in support of which recommendations the Committee on Civilian Components stated that it had arrived at its conclusions concerning the National Guard only after the most careful consideration: Therefore be it

Resolved by the South Carolina National Guard Association in conference assembled this 22d day of January 1949, at Columbia, S. C., That in common with the National Guard Association of the United States and the United States Conference of Governors, it condemns without reservation the report of the Committee on Civilian Components recommending the establishment of a single Federal reserve or militia as un-American and contrary to our concept and philosophy of life and government, and that the proposals made therein are not only ill-advised and illegal, but, if put into effect, would destroy the National Guard which, by the committee's own admission, has performed with effectiveness and brilliancy in two world wars and which has, in the brief space of 2½ years, organized more than 4,795 units with a strength of more than 320,000, contained in 27 divisions, other highly essential tactical units including Antiaircraft and Air Force units, all of which are a part of the M-day force and essential to the defense of the Nation; be it further

Resolved, That the South Carolina National Guard Association direct its officers to call upon and to write the Members of the Congress from South Carolina to resist this effort to centralize the military power in the hands of a few in Washington and to destroy the National Guard as it is today organized, and to forward each Member of the Congress from South Carolina a copy of this resolution; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded the Governor of South Carolina and to the National Guard Association of the United States.

Resolution calling on the Congress to establish a system of universal military training

Whereas the National Guard Association of the United States, the Reserve Officers'

Association, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled War Veterans, and numerous other veteran organizations, the Department of National Defense have consistently advocated the establishment of a system of universal military training to the end that there would not only be assured the greatest possible degree of national security, but that such responsibility would be recognized as a common duty, to be shared equally by all; and

Whereas the President's Advisory Committee on Universal Military Training, after 6 months of exhaustive study and examination into the broad field of our national security, and the relation of universal military training to such a problem, has brought out a report of great significance on the subject, in which they urge universal military training as an integral part of our national security establishment on a par with Central Intelligence, research, and development, industrial mobilization, and an adequate Regular Establishment; and

Whereas this exhaustive study and the unanimous recommendations of the committee, in which it finds there is justified fully such a program in the interest and necessity of our national security, and emphasizes the urgency of such a measure, places great responsibility on the people and the Congress for passage of such an act as the fairest, most equitable, and most economical means of effecting national security; and

Whereas the mission of the National Guard as an effective component of the M-day force in being would be vitally promoted, the efficiency of the National Guard raised to a high level of training and its strength maintained so that the National Guard would be able to successfully meet its M-day missions; and

Whereas the findings of the President's Advisory Committee on Universal Military Training were fundamentally and substantially those principles long advocated by the organizations above-mentioned: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the South Carolina National Guard Association, in conference assembled this 22d day of January 1949, at Columbia, S. C., That we endorse the stand supporting the principle of universal military training as advocated by the above-mentioned organizations and the President's Advisory Committee on Universal Military Training and directs its officers to so inform each Member of the Congress from South Carolina and that they be urged to exert every effort in securing the enactment of legislation designed to accomplish this purpose; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Governor of the State of South Carolina and to the National Guard Association of the United States.

Resolution providing for the enactment of legislation incident to a long-range armory-construction program

Whereas the reorganization of the National Guard has progressed to the extent that at the present time we have in the federally recognized units throughout the Nation a total membership of more than 320,000; and

Whereas many States have a strength which now exceeds the armory facilities available. If the National Guard is to continue forward along the lines contemplated, it is imperative that the Congress provide, in line with approved War Department policies, the necessary legislation and the funds with which to construct new armories, and to add additions to present armories for the proper housing of contemplated strength of the National Guard: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the South Carolina National Guard Association in conference assembled this 22d day of January 1949 at Columbia, S. C., That the officers of this association are hereby directed to write to each Member of the Congress from South Carolina of the urgent need for legislation to provide for a long-range armory-construction program and to forward each Member a copy of this resolution; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Governor of South Carolina and to the National Guard Association of the United States.

THE FARM PROGRAM—LETTER FROM MASSACHUSETTS FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, following my statement, a letter from the Massachusetts Farm Bureau Federation, embodying two resolutions passed on November 18. I consider this letter so important that I ask that it be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Waltham, Mass., January 26, 1949.

Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SALTONSTALL: There are two things which the Farm Bureau Federation in Massachusetts would particularly like at this time to call to your attention. These are resolutions adopted at our annual meeting November 18, 1948, at Worcester which read as follows:

"Whereas we realize that we cannot keep asking for favors and services without surrendering more and more of our independence: *Be it resolved*, That we favor legislation that will work toward the decentralization of both power and authority from Washington to the end that we shall have more and not less independence as the years go by."

"Whereas we realize the importance to the over-all national economy of some system of farm support prices until world conditions become more stable: *Be it resolved*, That we favor the continuance of a price support program at figures low enough to discourage overproduction and high enough to insure some protection in the event of price collapse."

The Farm Bureau in Massachusetts represents some 7,000 farm families in every county of the State. Our policy is arrived at by discussions of issues first within the county and second in State meetings. I think that the two resolutions are particularly important at this time when the question of a farm price support program is again becoming very controversial. Last year the farmers here favored the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1948 and we see no reason at this time to change our position. We hope that you will do everything in your power to prevent a return to a rigid 90 percent of parity support price and to continue the act which would insure to agriculture a floor that would keep it from going into bankruptcy through its own high production and yet would not be high enough to call for governmental regimentation in our field.

We believe that this is no less important to our own economy than to agriculture. It seems hardly necessary to remind you of the severe attack farmers have been under in the metropolitan papers in Massachusetts because of such programs as the potato support program. Our organization wants no repetition of that sort of thing. Under a flexible support program such as is contained in the 1948 act, I am very sure that we will have provided against abuses and return the farmers to a freer market in most years.

Respectfully yours,
CARLETON I. PICKETT,
Secretary.

MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN ECONOMIC COOPERATION

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I wish to announce that I have appointed, pursuant to law, the following Members of the Senate on the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation:

TOM CONNALLY, of Texas; WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia; and H. ALEXANDER SMITH, of New Jersey.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 372. A bill to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Americus, Ga., as the Marcus George Veterans Memorial Hospital; without amendment (Rept. No. 29).

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 460. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to the Helena Chamber of Commerce certain described parcels of land situated in the city of Helena, Mont.; without amendment (Rept. No. 26); and

H. J. Res. 68. Joint resolution extending the time for free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will; without amendment (Rept. No. 27).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 492. A bill to amend the act approved June 29, 1948, entitled "An act to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va."; without amendment (Rept. No. 28).

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE DOCUMENT ENTITLED "RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SOCIAL SECURITY LEGISLATION"

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 35, submitted by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] on the 27th instant, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the resolution.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on Finance 2,400 additional copies of Senate Document Numbered 208, Eightieth Congress, second session, entitled "Recommendations for Social Security Legislation."

Mr. HAYDEN. I am advised by the printing clerk that the type has been saved and that the cost will be about $500.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE TO STUDY PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS (S. REPT. NO. 25)

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, at the request of the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], who is the chairman of the Committee To Study Problems of American Small Business, I submit that committee's final report, entitled "Oil Supply and Distribution Problems."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed.

SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 7

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, at the request of the junior Senator from Nebraska, who is unavoidably absent, I ask unanimous consent to submit and have printed as a Senate document the final report by the chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee entitled "Independent Business: Its Struggle for Existence."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received and printed as a Senate document.

PERMISSION FOR SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee To Study Problems of American Small Business be allowed to file the remainder of its final reports with the Senate up to and including February 15, 1949.

This request is made because the committee expires as of midnight tonight, and, although the reports are all prepared, we have not had the opportunity to have them approved by the committee members.

I want to make it clear that this request does not allow the committee to employ any personnel or incur any further expense. This is merely to allow the committee to have time to approve and print these final reports.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 713. A bill to amend Public Law 533 of the Eightieth Congress authorizing the construction of a building for the General Accounting Office on square 518 in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Works.

(Mr. CHAVEZ also introduced Senate bill 714, to provide for comprehensive planning, for site acquisition in and outside of the District of Columbia, and for the design of Federal building projects outside of the District of Columbia, to authorize the transfer of jurisdiction over certain lands between certain departments and agencies of the United States, and to provide certain additional authority needed in connection with the construction, management, and operation of Federal public buildings, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 715. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1948; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 716. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to George Peters; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 717. A bill to provide increases in compensation for members of the Police and Fire Departments and teachers in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, and Mr. BALDWIN):

S. 718. A bill to restore to the active list of the Army and Air Force officers retired due to lack of funds and to correct injustices and inconsistencies; and

S. 719. A bill to correct injustices and inconsistencies in Public Law 810, Eightieth Congress, approved June 29, 1948, designated as the "Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 720. A bill for the relief of Vesa Reijo Luukkonen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. 721. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1947, to authorize the creation of 10 professional and scientific positions in the headquarters and research stations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BALDWIN (for himself and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina):

S. 722. A bill to create a Government corporation to operate cafeterias and conduct certain other activities in Government buildings and on Government property; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 723. A bill to authorize the transfer of certain agricultural dry land and irrigation field stations to the States in which such stations are located, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. FLANDERS (for himself, Mr. TOBEY, and Mr. IVES):

S. 724. A bill to provide for direct Federal loans to meet the housing needs of lower-income families, to provide liberalized credit to reduce the cost of housing for such families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 725. A bill for the relief of Ralph E. Garlock; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 726. A bill to provide for disposition of inherited interests in the estates of deceased Indian allottees;

S. 727. A bill to provide that the Governors of the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska shall be elected by the people of those Territories, and for other purposes; and

S. 728. A bill to authorize the participation of States, Territories, and insular possessions in revenues from national parks, national monuments, and other areas subject to the primary administrative jurisdiction of the National Park Service, to provide for the acquisition of land within certain areas administered by the National Park Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 729. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act so as to extend the time within which claims may be filed for return of any property or interest acquired by the United States on or after December 18, 1941; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 730. A bill to clarify the application of the tax on cabarets; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 731. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Edison Glenn a patent in fee to certain land; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 732. A bill providing for the taking of action in 1949 with respect to quotas for the 1950 crops of corn, wheat, cotton, rice, and tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and Mr. LUCAS):

S. 733. A bill relating to acreage allotments for certain farm products in 1949; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 734. A bill to provide for the appointment and compensation of counsel for impoverished defendants in certain criminal cases in the United States district courts;

S. 735. A bill for the relief of Leslie A. Connell:

S. 736. A bill for the reimbursement of Puget Sound Bridge & Dredging Co.;

S. 737. A bill for the relief of Henry A. Ninemires; and

S. 738. A bill for the relief of Earl B. Hochwalt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 739. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, to make the personnel ceiling provisions of such act inapplicable to employees of the Navy Department whose wages are fixed by wage boards or similar administrative authority; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. BUTLER) also introduced Senate bill 740, providing for the construction of a railroad connecting the existing railroad system serving the United States and Canada and terminating at Prince George, British Columbia, Canada, with the railroad system serving Alaska and terminating at Fairbanks, Alaska, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 741. A bill to place certain restrictions upon the transfer of generating plants and electric transmission and distribution lines financed in whole or in part through loans made pursuant to the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 742. A bill for the relief of Robert Johanna Sorensen; and

S. 743. A bill for the relief of Lars Daniel Sorensen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 744. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide certain benefits for annuitants who retired prior to April 1, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 745. A bill to provide for the designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Chicago, Illinois, as the Albert A. Sprague Veterans' Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 746. A bill relating to the admission of attorneys at law to practice before departments and agencies of the Government;

S. 747. A bill relating to dismission of indictments, information, or complaints in criminal cases by the Attorney General or the United States Attorney;

S. 748. A bill for the relief of Charles L. Bishop;

S. 749. A bill for the relief of Ferd H. Gibler;

S. 750. A bill for the relief of Everett C. French;

S. 751. A bill for the relief of Olga Lengyel;

S. 752. A bill for the relief of the E. J. Albrecht Co.; and

S. 753. A bill for the relief of Sisters Antoinette Cometti, Mary Gibin, Angela Pelosin, Emma Ghisleni, Elisabetta De Caterin, and Onorina Franzina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 754. A bill to amend the Act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever," approved February 28, 1929, by including therein the name of Gustaf E. Lambert; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 755. A bill to extend the time for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Shawneetown, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. HUNT):

S. 756. A bill making available certain funds for relief of farmers in storm-stricken areas; to the Committee on Appropriations.

(Mr. CAIN (for himself and Mr. BRICKER) introduced Senate bill 757, to provide an effective method for the construction of low-rent homes for low-income families with a minimum of Federal control and expenditure, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. J. Res. 43. Joint resolution establishing a commission to select a site and design for a memorial to the contributions of members of all religious faiths to American military and naval history; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. WILEY, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. THYE, and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. J. Res. 44. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a statue of Leifr Eiriksson in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(Mr. FREAR introduced Senate joint resolution 45, to authorize the issuance of a stamp in commemoration of the life of Emily P. Bissell, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. J. Res. 46. Joint resolution proposing to amend the Constitution of the United States to exclude aliens in counting the whole number of persons in each State for apportionment of Representatives among the several States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. J. Res. 47. Joint resolution to suspend the operation of section 401 (e) of the Nationality Act of 1940 in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEM:

S. J. Res. 48. Joint resolution authorizing a study of certain matters looking to the better protection and preservation of migratory birds and game mammals; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill in which I believe the Senate will be interested. The bill provides for comprehensive planning, for site acquisition in and outside of the District of Columbia, and for the design of Federal building projects outside of the District of Columbia, to authorize the transfer of jurisdiction over certain lands between certain departments and agencies of the United States; and to provide certain additional authority needed in connection with the construction, management, and operation of Federal public buildings, and for other purposes.

The bill (S. 714) to provide for comprehensive planning, for site acquisition in and outside of the District of Columbia and for the design of Federal building projects outside of the District of Columbia, to authorize the transfer of jurisdiction over certain lands between certain departments and agencies of the United States; and to provide certain additional authority needed in connection with the construction, management, and operation of Federal public buildings, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CHAVEZ, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

ALASKA RAILROAD

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing for the construction of a railroad to Alaska, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a letter I have received from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and a letter from the Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget to Mr. Willis T. Batcheller, executive vice president and chief engineer of the Canadian Alaska Railway Co., be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and letters will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 740) providing for the construction of a railroad connecting the existing railroad system serving the United States and Canada and terminating at Prince George, British Columbia, Canada, with the railroad system serving Alaska and terminating at Fairbanks, Alaska, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. BUTLER), was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized, through such channels as he may deem proper, to negotiate and enter into an agreement or agreements with the Dominion of Canada for the survey, location, and construction of a railroad of standard gage to connect the existing railroad system now terminating at Prince George, British Columbia, Canada, with the railroad system serving the Territory of Alaska and terminating at Fairbanks, Alaska, together with all branches and extensions of said new railroad system, and in cooperation with the Government of the Dominion of Canada, to cause a survey or surveys to be made to determine the most practicable route for such railroad, as well as construction plans and specifications and estimates of the probable cost thereof, and plans for financing its construction, operation, and maintenance.

SEC. 2. The President is further authorized to designate such agency or agencies of the United States as he may select to carry on, either directly or under contract, the work of survey and location of the route for such railroad and, upon the completion of negotiations and the execution of the agreement or agreements herein authorized, to proceed either directly or under contract, with the construction, operation, and maintenance thereof after such route shall have been determined and approved by the President. Such agency or agencies are authorized and directed to cooperate directly with like agencies or officials to be designated by the Government of the Dominion of Canada for the purpose of coordinating and expediting the work of such survey, location, construction, operation, and maintenance thereof.

SEC. 3. The work of all existing agencies which may be engaged in like or affiliated activities in the Territory of Alaska and in western Canada shall hereafter be correlated with the work contemplated under this act.

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sum as may be necessary, to be expended under the direction of the President, through such agency or agencies as he may designate, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the act: *Provided*, That no money shall be appropriated under this act for the construction of any part of such railroad outside of the Territory of Alaska until the agreement or agreements provided for in the first section of this act have been entered into.

The letters presented by Mr. MAGNUSON were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington 25, D. C., December 13, 1948.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
United States Senate,
Washington 25, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: This will acknowledge your letter of November 24 to Mr. Webb concerning the construction of an Alaska railroad.

I believe you will be interested in the attached copy of my lettter of June 22 to Mr. Willis T. Batcheller on the subject. So far as I am aware, the fundamentals of the situation have not changed since that letter was written.

In the interval we have received the views of Secretaries of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and State concerning House Concurrent Resolutions 214, 215, and 216 which are similar in many respects to your bill, S. 2867.

The Department of State has pointed out that negotiations with the Canadian Government on this matter would be likely to succeed only if they were based on specific and concrete proposals and that passage of these resolutions would be premature until the national defense and economic priorities of the project had been determined by the agencies concerned and until definite proposals were available concerning financing construction, operation, and related problems.

The Navy Department has indicated that it is sympathetic "to all measures which will facilitate the movement of freight and passengers to and from Alaska," but has pointed out that the Navy would not expect to be able to use the railroad transportation to any great extent in supplying their installations in the area.

The Army Department has indicated concern for the inadequacy of existing transportation facilities serving Alaska, but has pointed out that from a military point of view, a railroad to Alaska, "while being a valuable asset, is not sufficiently vital at this time to the defense of that territory or the continental United States to entitle it to priority over other projects. It cannot, therefore, be considered a military necessity. The Department of the Army is hopeful that the future development of the natural resources of Alaska will either warrant, for economic reasons, Government support of the proposed railroad project or will interest private enterprise therein."

The views of the Department of the Air Force are essentially similar to those of the Navy.

It is evident that the agencies primarily concerned with national defense and security do not advocate assignment of a high priority to the Alaska Railroad project. However, we feel that continuing study of economic prospects and development of the kinds of data suggested by the Department of State as requisite to negotiations with the Canadian Government are fully justified.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. WEBB,
Director.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., June 22, 1948.

Mr. WILLIS T. BATCHELLER,
Executive Vice President and Chief Engineer Canadian Alaska Railway Co.,
Mayflower Hotel,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BATCHELLER: Your letter of May 15, 1948, in the interest of a Canadian-Alaskan Railway project, addressed to the President, has been referred to me for consideration and acknowledgment.

The very real interest of the President in the affairs of Alaska has been freshly evidenced by his special message to the Congress under date of May 21, 1948. In this message, of which a copy is enclosed, President Truman, after urging early enactment of legislation granting statehood to the Territory, discussed at some length the transportation needs of Alaska and outlined several specific steps toward meeting these needs. As you will note the message also recommends other important measures with respect to housing, community facilities, land settlement, agricultural and industrial development.

In connection with the broad studies of Alaskan needs and opportunities which are now under way in various Federal agencies the idea of a Canadian-Alaskan Railway has been advanced and given such consideration as present circumstances appear to warrant. It is quite obvious, however, that this project, involving as it would governmental action by both Canada and the United States, requires much more study and analysis before any formal proposal could be placed before legislative bodies for their consideration. It is also felt that from the standpoint of immediate needs the measures proposed in the enclosed message represent the highest priorities and that their attainment would have important bearing upon final judgment as to the need, value, and economic merit of the railway project.

Your interest in this proposal and in the general acceleration of Alaskan development is much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK PACE, JR.,
Assistant Director.

ISSUANCE OF STAMP COMMEMORATING LIFE OF EMILY P. BISSELL

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp in commemoration of the life of Emily P. Bissell, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill, prepared by me, may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from Delaware will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 45) to authorize the issuance of a stamp in commemoration of the life of Emily P. Bissell, introduced by Mr. FREAR was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The statement presented by Mr. FREAR was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FREAR

The contribution made by Emily P. Bissell in the battle against the ravages of tuberculosis can only be adequately measured in terms of human lives—lives saved because of Miss Bissell's notable efforts in promoting the sale of the Christmas seal, under the banner of the National Tuberculosis Society.

From 1907 when she founded the seal in America until her death in March of 1948, this gallant woman led the crusade for her little stamp until the name "Christmas Seal" became unanimous with the words "Fight Tuberculosis." Miss Bissell lived to see the battle against the disease being won—thanks in a large measure to the generosity of the American people who had faith in her idea and who supported her undertaking in ever greater degree.

Miss Emily P. Bissell was born in Wilmington Del., May 31, 1861, and was a native of her State all of her life. Her grandfather, John Bissell, settled in Windsor, Conn. Her father, C. A. Bissell (1829–1899) graduated from Yale in 1850. Her mother, Josephine Wales (1832–1919) was a daughter of John Wales who was born in New Haven, Conn., but later settled in Wilmington, Del. He was a United States Senator. Miss Bissell was educated in Delaware and New York. She attended Miss Charller's Private School in New York City.

Pioneer work always interested her. She started the west-end reading room in 1889 and it had the first free kindergarten, the first children's playground in Delaware, the first better babies' demonstration, the first boys' brigade (forerunner of the Boy Scouts), and the first free gymnasium for boys. In 1913, it began the first Americanization work in Delaware, in its Italian Neighborhood House.

Miss Bissell was instrumental in putting through the first child labor law in Delaware, and served on the first child labor commission. She was one of the organizers of the Children's Bureau, and served on its board until her death.

She was the first president of the Consumer's League, and aided the passage of the first law limiting the hours of women in industry. At the request of the Hon. George Gray, she aided him in establishing the Delaware Chapter of the American Red Cross in 1904, and was its secretary for many years.

She was a director of the Associated Charities for many years, and was chairman of Social Service in the Federation of Women's Clubs for 8 years.

In connection with all these responsibilities came the raising of large amounts of money. The Christmas stamp of 1907 was not a momentary idea—it was the result of a great deal of practical experience, in starting and carrying forward new experiments in Delaware, applied to this Government idea from Denmark. The Story of the American Christmas Seal, written by Miss Bissell herself was published in booklet form in 1946 by the National Tuberculosis Association.

Miss Bissell's contribution to mankind has been acknowledged nationally and internationally. In December of 1936, she was honored in Wilmington, Del., at a Christmas seal birthday luncheon attended by 400 friends and health workers representing many sections of the country and several foreign countries. In December of 1937, the city of Wilmington, the State of Delaware, and two nations, again paid honor to Miss Bissell when the Tuberculosis Associations of the United States unveiled a bronze tablet which was placed on the main building of the Brandywine Sanatorium, Marshallton, Del., with this legend: "This tablet commemorates the founding of the first Christmas seal in this country by Miss Emily P. Bissell, of Wilmington, Del., December, 1907. From small beginnings, the annual Christmas seal sale has financed the development of the organized fight against tuberculosis in every State, resulting in saving thousands of lives. Erected by the Tuberculosis Associations of the United States, December 1937."

In 1942, Miss Bissell was awarded the Trudeau Medal of the National Tuberculosis Association, the first nonprofessional worker to receive this reward since it was inaugurated in 1925. The award is given annually to the individual who, in the judgment of the association, has made the most meritorious contribution to the cause, prevention, or treatment of tuberculosis.

In 1945, Miss Bissell was honored by the Delaware State Board of Health when the main building at Brandywine Sanatorium was dedicated in her honor, hereafter to be known as the Emily P. Bissell Building. Miss Bissell is the author of many poems, which have been collected in a volume entitled, "Happiness and Other Verses."

Miss Bissell was president of the Delaware Anti-Tuberculosis Society from 1909, until her death.

She was an honorary member of the National Tuberculosis Association, and in 1946 was again honored when her portrait appeared on each sheet of Christmas seals. Miss Bissell passed away on March 8, 1948.

POLITICAL FEDERATION OF EUROPE

Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. THOMAS of Utah) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 12), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

In order to encourage a peaceful and prosperous order in Europe, but with no intention of imposing any particular form of political or economic association upon its people, it is hereby,

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the political federation of Europe.

EXTENSION OF TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES FROM PRINCE GEORGE, BRITISH COLUMBIA, CANADA, TO ALASKA

Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. BUTLER) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 13), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas the development of the Territory of Alaska, its lands and resources, is essential to the economic welfare and security of the United States; and

Whereas such development is necessary to the defense of the Territory; and

Whereas adequate transportation facilities within the Territory of Alaska and between the Territory of Alaska and the United States are essential to the development of the resources and the defense of Alaska; and

Whereas existing transportation facilities within the Territory of Alaska and between the Territory of Alaska and the United States are inadequate for the development of the resources and the defense of Alaska: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President is requested to commence negotiations with the Canadian Government with a view toward determining the desirability of extending the existing railroad system now terminating at Prince George, British Columbia, Canada, to the Territory of Alaska, and to cause surveys to be made and plans, specifications, and cost estimates be prepared covering the construction of a railroad connecting the existing railroad system terminating at Fairbanks, Alaska, with a railroad system extended from Prince George, British Columbia, Canada, to the Territory of Alaska; also including studies with the Canadian Government for reciprocal tariff and immigration arrangements in connection with this project.

SEC. 2. The President is further requested to report to the Speaker of the House and President of the Senate, within 60 days following enactment of this resolution, progress achieved in effecting the purposes of this resolution.

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS AFFECTING THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION AND SUCCESSION

Mr. GREEN submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 14), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is

hereby created a joint congressional committee to be composed of five Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate and five Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The joint committee shall select a chairman from among its members. A vacancy in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original appointment.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the joint committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of all matters connected with the election of the President and Vice President from the time of the nomination of the President and Vice President, through the time of their election and the time of their inauguration until the termination of their respective terms of office, with the purpose of making the law certain as to the Presidential election and succession. These matters shall include, but shall not be confined to, the following:

(1) Whether or not the President and Vice President should be elected by the electoral college, as at present, and if so whether or not the members should be legally bound to vote in accordance with their instructions.

(2) Whether or not provision should be made for the case where before the election of Presidential electors, or after such time but before the election of President and Vice President, a candidate for the Presidency or for the Vice Presidency dies, declines to run, or is found ineligible to take office if elected.

(3) Whether or not provision should be made for the case of the death of any of the individuals from whom the House of Representatives may choose a President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them, and for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate may choose a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them.

(4) How it shall be determined whether the President, or individual acting as President, is unable to execute the powers and duties of the office, and how the duration of such inability shall be determined.

(5) Whether or not provision should be made for an individual to execute the office of President in case of removal, death, resignation, or inability, both of the President and Vice President, where by reason of removal, death, resignation, or inability there is no individual upon whom the powers and duties of such office would otherwise automatically devolve.

(6) Whether there are, or should be, any differences between the status, powers, duties, and privileges of an elected President and any other individual executing the office of President.

SEC. 3. The joint committee shall report to the Senate and House of Representatives the results of its study and investigation together with its recommendations, including drafts of legislation recommended and of any proposed constitutional amendments considered necessary or desirable. The joint committee shall submit its final report to the Senate and House of Representatives not later than May 2, 1949, and thereupon the existence of the joint committee shall terminate.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this concurrent resolution, the joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Congress, to employ counsel, clerical, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed $10,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the joint committee. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN MATTERS PERTAINING TO THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. MAGNUSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 45), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Whereas the United States merchant marine, allied industries, and trained personnel therein are indispensable to national security; and

Whereas the reduction in ships flying the American flag is proceeding at an alarming rate; and

Whereas this places in jeopardy the employment of men skilled in repairing, constructing, and manning the United States merchant marine and creates the risk that skills and facilities will be unavailable in the event of national emergency; and

Whereas geographical dispersion and utilization of repair and construction facilities and the skilled manpower related thereto is essential to national defense and economy; and

Whereas the transfer of American ships and those of other countries to flags of certain nations jeopardizes world-wide stability of the maritime industry; undermines seafarers' and safety-at-sea standards; and deprives the United States Treasury of substantial tax revenues; and

Whereas revival of ship construction and operation in occupied countries is of legitimate interest to the United States merchant marine; and

Whereas participation of American bottoms in transporting United States financed cargoes has been threatened: First by failure of certain Government agencies to give proper consideration to the importance of maintaining an adequate United States merchant marine, and second by actual or proposed use, directly or indirectly, of funds and scarce materials to build or acquire ships for foreign nations; and

Whereas United States tramp operators confront problems which may require Government assistance for solution; and

Whereas there exists in and among the several agencies having jurisdiction over maritime matters, serious problems of coordination and efficiency; and

Whereas Congress, agencies affected, and industry have found no long-range solution to the problems of water transportation to Alaska, and coastwise and intercoastal shipping; and

Whereas shipping operations of the Armed Services bear a definite relationship to the present and future welfare of the United States merchant marine; and

Whereas there is urgent need for congressional study and expression of policy on these and related problems: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation of all such matters pertaining to the merchant marine as it may deem proper.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date but not later than March 15, 1950.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable, and is authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

IDA RAFFEL KLAFF

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 46), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Ida Raffel Klaff, daughter of Louis Raffel, late an employee of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

AMENDMENT TO REVENUE BILL

Mr. LANGER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to a bill to provide revenue, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. THOMAS of Utah submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 249) to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and ordered to be printed.

PRINTING OF REPORT ON UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN COMPACT (S. DOC. NO. 8)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, there was transmitted to the Vice President today by Harry W. Bashore, the representative of the United States in the negotiations for a compact among the upper Basin States of the Colorado River, a report which includes the compact, which was entered into on the 11th of October 1948, and the recommendations of Mr. Bashore.

I ask unanimous consent that these documents may be printed as a Senate document for the use of Members of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHANGES OF REFERENCES

Mr TYDINGS. Mr. President, Senate Joint Resolution 32, a joint resolution to authorize the cancellation and release of an agreement dated December 31, 1923, entered into between the port of Seattle and the United States of America, represented by the United States Shipping Board acting through the United States

Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, was referred to the Armed Services Committee. However, the same joint resolution was considered by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at the last session of the Congress. It is true that a report from the War Department was required, to give the committee full information about it; but the purport of the joint resolution shows clearly that it should have been referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Therefore, as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, to which the joint resolution was referred, I ask that the Armed Services Committee be discharged from the further consideration of the joint resolution, and that it be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the change of reference will be made as requested.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, Senate bill 529, to promote maximum employment, business opportunities, and careers in a free competitive economy, a bill introduced at the last session of the Congress, and again introduced in the Eighty-first Congress, was referred to the Finance Committee. Upon examination, it appears that the bill should be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Banking and Currency Committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the change of reference will be made.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, on Thursday last, Senate bill 672, to amend part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) so as to provide entitlement to educational benefits for those individuals who enlisted or reenlisted prior to October 6, 1945, on a same basis as for those individuals who enlisted or reenlisted within 1 year after October 6, 1945, was referred to the Finance Committee. I am advised that that was an inadvertence, and that the jurisdiction of the bill is in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the change of reference will be made.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, on the day upon which the President delivered his first message to the Congress in this session, and following that message, I introduced Senate Bill 152, to retrocede to the State of New Mexico exclusive jurisdiction held by the United States over lands within the boundaries of the Los Alamos (New Mexico) project of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, a bill which was prepared at the request of the Atomic Energy Commision for the purpose of retroceding certain lands in New Mexico back to the jurisdiction of the State of New Mexico.

I had done some work on it last summer, at the request of the Atomic Energy Commission; and I have in my possession the various departmental approvals of that particular bill. I introduced that bill as Senate bill 152.

Thereafter the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] introduced a bill known as Senate bill 210. It is identical in verbiage with the bill I had previously introduced. I have no pride of authorship or concern about the measure, except that it be passed in orderly fashion.

But at the last meeting of the Senate, I noticed that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] requested the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], to whose committee both bills were referred, to consent to the discharge of his committee from the further consideration of Senate bill 210, and the reference of that bill to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The Senator from Wyoming, with his usual courtesy, and realizing that the bill did relate to atomic energy, said he would give such consent; and the requested change of reference was made, with the result that the bill now has been referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

However, no mention was made of the previous bill, Senate bill 152, which I had introduced. As I have said, Senate bill 210 is a comma-for-comma, sentence-for-sentence duplicate. Of course, as to that I make no complaint. I merely wish to ask the Senator from Wyoming, in whose committee now reposes my bill, Senate bill 152, whether he would have any objection to having a similar change of reference made in the case of Senate bill 152, which is identical with Senate bill 210. In that case Senate bill 152 would be referred, likewise, to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I believe that should be done because I believe that at least duplicate pieces of proposed legislation of that kind and on that subject are properly lodged with the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

I have not seen the Senator from Wyoming before, today, and this is my first opportunity to present the matter to him.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in giving the consent of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to the change of reference of Senate bill 210 at the last meeting of the Senate, let me say that it was the purpose and thought of the chairman of the committee that all bills dealing with that subject should be referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I am sure I speak for the entire committee in saying that we have no objection to the requested change of reference of the Senator's bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is that the request of the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 152, and it will be referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

THE FUTURE OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Future of the Republican Party," delivered by him at the McKinley Memorial, Niles, Ohio, January 28, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTEGRATION OF COUNTRIES OF WESTERN EUROPE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LODGE

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on American policy favoring the integration of the countries of western Europe, delivered by Senator LODGE before the Maryland Bar Association at Baltimore, Md., on January 29, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS ON ATOMIC ENERGY BY SENATOR HICKENLOOPER

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on atomic energy delivered by Senator HICKENLOOPER before the Association of Commerce in Baltimore earlier this month, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR KNOWLAND AT KANSAS DAY DINNER

[Mr. KNOWLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at the Kansas Day dinner at Topeka, Kans., on January 29, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

MEMORIAL ADDRESS ON FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

[Mr. SPARKMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator KEFAUVER at a memorial dinner for the late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt on Friday, January 28, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

LIMITATION OF DEBATE—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAYBANK

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued by him on January 28, 1949, on the subject of limitation of debate, which appears in the Appendix.]

CLOTURE IN THE SENATE—ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Republicans in Senate Seen Making Mistake in Favoring Cloture" written by David Lawrence and published in the Washington Evening Star of January 29, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NATIONAL HEALTH PROGRAM—LETTER FROM PAUL R. HAWLEY AND STATEMENT BY SENATOR LODGE

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by Dr. Paul R. Hawley, chief executive officer of the Blue Cross, together with a statement prepared by Senator LODGE, commenting upon the letter, which appear in the Appendix.]

COUNT OF ELECTORAL VOTES

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD certain newspaper editorials commenting on the constitutional amendment proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 2, which appear in the Appendix.]

NEED OF INCENTIVES TO INVESTMENT—ARTICLE BY MRS. FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Mrs. Franklin Delano Roosevelt dealing with the

need of incentives to investment, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS—ADDRESS BY LUCIUS E. BURCH, JR.

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Lucius E. Burch, Jr., a corporation lawyer, discussing the subject of labor-management relations, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY RENAH F. CAMALIER TO GRADUATING CLASS OF ANACOSTIA HIGH SCHOOL

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Renah F. Camalier to the graduating class of Anacostia High School, in Washington, D. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

A NATIONAL PROSPERITY BUDGET—ARTICLE BY LEON H. KEYSERLING

[Mr. SPARKMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "For a National Prosperity Budget" published in the New York Times magazine of January 9, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

RECORD OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY—EDITORIAL FROM OMAHA EVENING WORLD-HERALD

[Mr. SALTONSTALL (for Mr. WHERRY) asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "God Hates a Coward" published in the Omaha, Nebr., Evening World-Herald of January 26, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

POST OFFICE DEFICITS—EDITORIAL FROM THE TRENTON EVENING TIMES

[Mr. HENDRICKSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Good Suggestion," published in the Trenton Evening Times of January 14, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

PETER MARSHALL—ARTICLE BY TRIS COFFIN

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relating to Peter Marshall, late Chaplain of the Senate, written by Tris Coffin and published in the Washington Times-Herald of January 28, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOREWORD TO THE MEMOIRS OF GEN. CLAIRE LEE CHENNAULT

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the Foreword to the Memoirs of Maj. Gen. Claire Lee Chennault, written by him, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERNATIONAL FISHERIES COMMISSION—EDITORIAL FROM SEATTLE TIMES

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Nations Pull Together So Everybody's Happy," published in the Seattle Times of January 16, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

OPERATIONS OF FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION—LETTER FROM FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION OF SPOKANE

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated January 21, 1949, from the Farm Credit Administration of Spokane, correcting certain impressions in an article from Life magazine of December 6, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

NEED FOR RETRENCHMENT IN FEDERAL EXPENDITURE—EDITORIAL FROM THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "What Are We Promising?" published in the Christian Century of January 26, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHO PAYS THE TAXES?—EDITORIAL FROM MILES CITY (MONT.) STAR

[Mr. ECTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Just Who Does Pay the Taxes?" published in the Miles City (Mont.) Daily Star of January 29, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIAL OF COMMUNIST LEADERS—ARTICLES BY VIVIAN MEIK

[Mr. WATKINS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two articles written by Vivian Meik, discussing the New York trial of Communist leaders, published in the Deseret Evening News, of Salt Lake City of January 18 and January 19, 1949, which appear in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO TO INDEPENDENT BROADCASTERS

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address recently delivered by him before a group of independent broadcasters at Chicago, Ill., which appears in the Appendix.]

NATURAL RESOURCES—STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the subject of natural resources, made by him before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on January 31, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED DENIAL OF MARSHALL PLAN AID TO THE NETHERLANDS—ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Missions Parley Urges ERP to Cut Off Dutch," published in the New York Herald Tribune of January 8, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, January 26, 1949, was the anniversary date of the birth of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur. On that date a testimonial dinner in commemoration of the event was given at Hotel Astor in New York City. At that time a scroll was prepared and ordered sent to the general. The general was advised in advance of the dinner, and sent a communication to those participating in the dinner.

I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point a copy of the scroll, and likewise a copy of the reply sent by General MacArthur to the Veterans' and Citizens' Committee.

There being no objection, the scroll and the reply from General MacArthur were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO GENERAL OF THE ARMY DOUGLAS MACARTHUR, SUPREME COMMANDER FOR THE ALLIED POWERS, TOKYO, JAPAN

Who chose to remain at his post of command in Tokyo rather than return to his homeland to receive a hero's acclaim from a grateful people and place himself immediately available for the nomination to the Presidency of the United States of America.

His sincere and forthright reply to invitations to return to Washington to testify on serious conditions in the Far East is best exemplified by his own words, "It would be peculiarly repugnant to me to have it felt that I sought to capitalize to political advantage the public good will which might manifest itself upon my first return to American soil following the victory which countless gallant Americans, living and dead, contributed by unfailing and invincible devotion." That document typifies the honor, statesmanship, and discipline which has always guided his distinguished career. It was a tribute to the memory of and the spiritual devotion he felt for the men of his command who made the supreme sacrifice.

His fearless leadership against the encroachment of communism and other subversive manifestations in the preservation of the true American way of life will ever remain a matchless contribution to the welfare of our country.

To Americans, and to history, the name of Douglas MacArthur will ever be an inspiration for love of God, duty, honor, country.

Presented by the Veterans and Citizens Committee on the birthday anniversary of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, at Hotel Astor, New York, N. Y., January 26, 1949.

Following radiogram received from Gen. Douglas MacArthur to the Veterans and Citizens Committee birthday dinner in his honor on January 26, at the Astor Hotel, New York City:

"I am profoundly moved by this gathering of fellow Americans on the anniversary of my birth in welcome manifestation of the strength of their friendship, the invincibility of their trust, and the enduring quality of this support. I accept it in humble gratitude, not only as a mark of valued friendship, but more particularly as a reconsecration of tried and true Americans resolutely to advance the American cause. For that cause is imperiled by enemies both at home and abroad who, by misrepresentation and deceit, sow the seeds of distrust, contention, and discord as the means to undermine the public confidence in the integrity of American effort, American efficiency, and American personnel. In the resulting confusion they hope to destroy the traditional unity of the American people. If our cause in the preservation and advance of human liberty is to prevail, complete unity of purpose is essential, with the maximum support of which Americans are capable—a deep spiritual support such as prompted Stephen Decatur so eloquently to pledge himself to 'My country, right or wrong, my country.'

"Standing on this outpost far from America's shores, with the vast continent of Asia aflame before the Communist sweep to engulf civilization's gains in the liberty and the dignity of man, and charged to preserve here an impenetrable western frontier for the forces of human freedom, the trust and support of my fellow Americans is, indeed, the source of my greatest strength.

"While unable to estimate the military potentialities because of the many yet undetermined and imponderable factors beyond my assessment or control, I can and do give complete assurance that with the firm spiritual support of the American people, this frontier outpost of democratic freedom, regardless of the tide of conflict upon the adjacent mainland, will not yield to political or social pressure, communism, or any other concept of enslavement. For the Japanese people are now blessed with a way of life, patterned after our own concepts of freedom and justice, which provides them with moral values which communism can neither offer nor supply; they will not fail to cherish and do all in their power to preserve it. This is well known to the local sponsors of the Communist doctrine who, despite complete freedom to propagate their cause under the protection of those very concepts they seek to destroy, have failed to gain converts among Japan's responsible citizenry. It is even better known to their mentors in Moscow who, in an increasing sense of frustration at being unable to gain an ideological foothold, are coming to see goblins in every nook and cranny of this well-ordered and peaceful land.

"To all my friends and comrades in arms present, I send my cordial and affectionate greetings, and I gratefully acknowledge their rededication of American support to this distant American effort. Without that support, the American cause here could not prosper—this frontier of freedom could not survive.

"MACARTHUR."

PRICE AID TO DAIRYMEN—ARTICLE BY ALFRED D. STEDMAN

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article published in the St. Paul Pioneer Press, and written by Alfred D. Stedman, be incorporated in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks on the question.

The dairy farmers throughout the United States who are dependent upon an outlet for their dairy products through the process of manufacture—such as butter, powdered milk, and powdered buttermilk—are meeting with ruinous low prices, and unless something is done immediately the young farmers will go broke, more especially the veterans who have commenced farming in the past few years, assuming great financial obligations in the purchase of machinery, livestock, and feed. With milk prices decreasing as they are, they will not be able to meet their obligations, and that means financial foreclosure and disaster for the veteran who has gone into the business of farming in the past 3 years. The article by Mr. Stedman covers the question so clearly that I should like to have Senators, as well as Members of the other legislative body, read it. For that reason I ask that it be incorporated in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOLONS JOIN DAIRYMEN IN PRICE AID DEMAND

(By Alfred D. Stedman)

Four hundred harassed dairymen were joined by Minnesota legislators here Thursday in demanding that the Truman administration make good its pledge that the farmers will not again be the first victims of a postwar depression.

Mincing no words, they called on two top dairy officials of the United States Department of Agriculture to assure immediate, emergency Government action to stop the present slump in milk prices and save co-op and other dairy plants having backs to the wall.

The two administration spokesmen, Philip Nelson and Don S. Anderson, were told bluntly by dairymen and legislators assembled in the Capitol Office Building auditorium that the farm vote in the dairy States swung the recent Presidential election against Dewey and to Truman.

The farmers voted in expectation that the Truman administration pledges of price protection would be fulfilled. Now, when the dairymen are being forced up against it, is the time to make those pledges good, the Federal officials were told.

STEPS OUTLINED

Responding to those demands, the two officials who are, respectively, Director of the Production and Marketing Administration's Dairy Branch and Chief of its Manufactured Dairy Products Section, told the mass meeting these three things:

First. They believe the Secretary of Agriculture has discretionary power to establish a separate parity for manufacturing milk, as distinct from bottled milk, as the dairymen demanded.

Second. That an official search now is on in Washington for funds to finance Government buying to support country milk prices up to 90 percent of that new parity. (A support price of $3.11 a hundredweight as against recent bottom prices between $2.50 and $2.70 was discussed.)

Third. That the way for dairymen to have permanent price supports is to get together on a long-time program which provides funds and disposal outlets through school lunches, stamp plan, or otherwise for Government purchased products.

THIRD POINT IS HOT

Clearly calling for new dairy legislation, this third point was a "zinger." It plunged dairymen into the coming congressional scramble over amendments to the Aiken-Hope Act, one of whose provisions strikes out three little words allowing Government dairy price supports at more than 90 percent of parity in a pinch. In fact, official warnings were sounded to dairy, wheat, and other farmers that the administration likes room for flexibility of any Government farm price supports, is against inflexible and mandatory supports, and also is against piling up huge surpluses in the Federal hands without having definite, legal methods of disposing of those surpluses.

Three Minnesota farm legislative leaders, State Senators Ancher Nelsen and Oscar A. Swenson, and Representative August B. Mueller, served notice that the Minnesota Legislature will take a hand in the budding fight for a better deal for dairymen.

TOO MANY PLEDGES

Also it was Senator Swensen, Fred Rohe, president of the Twin City Milk Producers Association, and Frank Stone, Land O'Lakes Creameries executive, who laid the Truman administration's political responsibilities to Midwest dairymen on the line.

"The situation is especially embarrassing to me," said Rohe, "because I happen to be a Democrat. We Democrats made altogether too many pledges before election. Now we're got to keep them. If this price drop had come before November 2 this whole thing could have been settled in 10 minutes."

"If these same farmers that elected Truman are going to repeat 4 years from now, there will have to be a dairy program to help them," warned Senator Swenson.

From W. A. Gordon, editor of the Dairy Record, and Harry R. Leonard, chairman of the board of the American Dry Milk Institute, both of St. Paul, who called the meeting, came these warnings:

The recent drop of farm prices for milk from $4.50 a hundredweight to $2.50 or $2.70 means that dairymen are face to face with a critical situation. A basic trouble, they said, is that the Government's present method of averaging in $6 eastern bottled milk prices with the Midwestern $2.50 prices and interpreting the average to mean that farmers are getting more than parity is a severe discrimination against this region. It is like averaging up a barefooted man with a man wearing $20 shoes and saying both are well shod on an average of $10 shoes.

NEED HELP QUICK

The Government help must be immediate if it is to save many dairies in Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Iowa, the meeting heard. But with quick action a good recovery is possible, dairymen said, because of basically sound demand for dairy products.

The situation now is such that Midwest dairymen have been heavily selling their cows to eastern dairymen. These in turn have been expanding production in response to the much higher prices there, and putting their surpluses into manufactured dairy products in competition with Midwestern dairymen who sold them cows in the first place. This is a process which is complicated by recent increases in railroad freight rates, and by steadily rising costs of production on farms and in creameries, cheese factories, and milk powder plants that buy milk for manufacturing.

BUTTER AID NOT ENOUGH

Speakers brought out that the Government practically forced dairymen to go heavily into powder production to meet war needs. So supporting powdered milk prices is the Government's moral responsibility now, dairymen declared. Just supporting butter prices alone won't do the protection job, they declared.

The frankness and unfailing good humor with which the two Federal officials answered questions made a hit with the crowd of very earnest dairy farmers and manufacturing plant executives.

Arrangements are being made now to carry the dairymen's case to Washington with representations at the White House, the Department of Agriculture, and Congress.

VOLUNTARY AGREEMENTS IN INDUSTRY, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there are no further concurrent and other resolutions or routine matters, the morning business is concluded, and, under the unanimous-consent order of Thursday last, the Chair lays before the Senate as the unfinished business Senate bill 547, which the clerk will state by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 547) to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans.

FREE ENTRY OF CERTAIN ARTICLES INTO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me in order that I may submit a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, without displacing the unfinished business, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 88) be taken up for present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the joint resolution for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 88) extending the time for free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 2 of the joint resolution of June 25, 1948 (Public Law 769, 80th Cong.), entitled "Joint resolution permitting the free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will, and for other purposes," is hereby amended by striking out "December 31, 1948" and by inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1949."

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement. The resolution was passed in the Eightieth Congress. It merely permits the

entry into the United States of the so-called Thank-You Train sent by the people and the Government of France. The joint resolution is simply to provide an extension of time. The train having been delayed, it is now expected to arrive in New York over the week end. The joint resolution was passed by the House unanimously, and was recommended by the Senate Finance Committee. I ask unanimous consent that it may be taken up at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia requests unanimous consent, without displacing the unfinished business, that the Senate take up for immediate consideration the joint resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Reserving the right to object, let me ask the Senator from Georgia, in the event the joint resolution extends the time for entry, do the goods ultimately have to go out of the country again, or do they remain here permanently?

Mr. GEORGE. They remain permanently in the country, I may say to the Senator. The goods that come in are to be sent to the capitals of the several States, there sold, and the proceeds devoted to charity. Certain railroad cars in which the goods are loaded will remain in the country, but they cannot be disposed of to any commercial enterprise, and, under the terms of the resolution or of the report accompanying it, they are to be turned over to veteran organizations in the several States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Thank You Train is merely a good-will train; we have already passed one resolution, and the train was delayed. The present joint resolution is to extend the time?

Mr. GEORGE. That is all there is to the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF STORM-STRICKEN AREAS IN THE WEST

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. Without displacing the unfinished business, I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, it was necessary for me to be absent from the Senate at the last session when the bill was introduced and passed for the relief of the storm-stricken areas in the West. I want to add my hearty approval to the action which was taken by the Senate, and that which no doubt will be taken also by the House today. In the meantime, the President himself has come to the rescue of the people in the stricken area. I, for one, want to express my heartfelt approval of the action which was taken by the President in the issuance of a letter dated January 29, addressed to the Secretary of Defense, which I think should be made a part of the RECORD at this time. I may state that the storm damage still continues and is pronounced by everyone in that area who is familiar with it to be by far the most destructive storm the western country has ever experienced. There is no way to estimate the damage, but now that, through the orders of the President, the Army and all other Federal agencies are cooperating on the job, we feel that everything is being done that can be done to afford relief.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letter referred to will be printed in the RECORD.

The letter is as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 29, 1949.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The disaster caused by the unprecedented storms in several of the Western States makes it imperative that the full resources of the Federal Government be mobilized immediately to furnish such emergency assistance as can be made available through the various Federal agencies.

Acting through any department, agency, officer, or employee of the National Military Establishment as you may designate, you are authorized and directed to utilize such resources of the National Military Establishment as are appropriate to the relief of this area, based on requests by the Federal Works Administrator, whom I have designated as the coordinator of Federal relief activities in the disaster area.

The departments of the National Military Establishment are authorized and directed to expend such sums as are required for this purpose from any funds now available to those departments, including funds available for river and harbor and flood-control works of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, without regard for existing apportionments. I will transmit to the Congress a request for such appropriations as may be considered necessary to replace such funds of the departments of the National Military Establishment as may be used for this purpose.

A copy of this letter is being furnished to General Fleming for his information and guidance.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

IRVINE L. LENROOT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. Without displacing the unfinished business, I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I am asking the distinguished Senator to yield for a few moments, in order that I may say a few words in relation to the passing of a former distinguished Member of this body, Senator Lenroot; and I ask that the unfinished business be not displaced.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Wisconsin, for the purpose stated?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I rise to pay a few words of deep respect in tribute to a great former member of this body, the Honorable Irvine L. Lenroot, who has gone on ahead in the journey which all mortals must take. As Nancy Byrd Turner says—

Death is only an old door
Set in a garden wall.
On gentle hinges it gives, at dusk,
When the thrushes call.
Along the lintel are green leaves,
Beyond, the light lies still.
Very willing and weary feet
Go over that sill.
There is nothing to trouble any heart,
Nothing to hurt at all.
Death is only a quiet door
In an old wall.

The story of Irvine Lenroot, United States Senator from Wisconsin, who started as a grocery clerk in Superior, is truly an American saga. Irvine Lenroot, who would have been 80 years old today, could look back to a great career in the service of his State and his Nation.

I first knew Irvine Lenroot back home, 40 years ago, and in all my contacts with him during these years, I always felt a deep sense of pride that the Badger State had reared so great and self-made a statesman.

The late Senator Lenroot served in the Wisconsin State Assembly from 1900 to 1906; in the House of Representatives from 1908 to 1918; and in the United States Senate from 1918 to 1926. These are, however, the bare facts which can hardly tell the memorable saga of Irvine Lenroot's contributions to his Nation. The newspapers have recorded the closeness with which he approached nomination to the Vice Presidency in 1920. They have recorded how former Senator Lenroot, who served for many years with distinction as an able captain to the Honorable Robert M. La Follette, Sr., later broke with Senator La Follette over the war issue, and thereafter parted the ways with this other great son of Wisconsin. Theirs was a difference of opinion as wide and as deep as had been their friendship and harmony previously. But although they did part in political ways, these two great sons of Wisconsin showed how men can differ with one another in opinion, but still have a great respect for one another in the true American way.

Members of the Senate knew Irvine Lenroot as a splendid debater and able parliamentarian, a diligent worker, an independent in voting. It was he who led the successful fight for American adherence to the World Court. It was he who championed the St. Lawrence seaway for many years in this body.

Later, following his retirement from the Senate, he served with distinction in the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

Mark Twain said, in answer to the question of how to take this life:

How to take life? Take it just as though it was—as it is—an earnest, vital, and important affair. Take it as though you were born for the task of performing a merry part of it—as though the world awaited your coming. Take it as though it were a grand opportunity to do and achieve, to carry forward great and good schemes, to help and cheer a suffering, weary, and, it may be, a heartbroken world.

Mr. President, I had the privilege of visiting with former Senator and later Judge Lenroot in his home in this city on a number of occasions. I knew him from the days when he was a young, vital, dynamic character in Wisconsin, working for those concepts which have since been called progressivism. As the years came and passed, he mellowed, and saw that in this world men with differing ideas could be right. His philosophy of life was of the kind we need in order to guide our own steps as we progress.

So it might be said of him:

Let us not think of our departed dead
As caught and cumbered in these graves of earth:
But think of death as of another birth.
As a new freedom for the wings outspread.

A new adventure waiting on ahead,
As a new joy of more ethereal mirth,
As a new world with friends of nobler worth,
Where all may taste a more immortal bread.

Senator Lenroot leaves behind him a great record of which his family and his State may be proud. Father of a distinguished daughter, Katharine Lenroot, Director of the Children's Bureau; uncle of another distinguished bearer of the family name, Arthur A. Lenroot, Jr., of Superior, State senator in Madison, Senator Lenroot also leaves behind him a brother, sister, and devoted wife.

Speaking of his passing, the Milwaukee Journal has stated:

In the traditional American sense, Irvine L. Lenroot was a self-made man. Without wealth, powerful friends, or formal education, he fought his way to the State legislature, to the House of Representatives, to the United States Senate, and almost to the Presidency of his country.

Irvine Lenroot was a strong man, an able man, and a friendly man. He was a brilliant debater, and excellent parliamentarian. On occasion he showed a remarkable independence. He rates in the upper bracket of men Wisconsin has sent to the United States Senate.

The Fond du Lac Commonwealth Reporter has stated:

Mr. Lenroot has long been away from the Wisconsin scene. But he was a native son of the Badger State, which loses one of its really great leaders in his death. * * * The Lenroot family helped to pioneer much of the legislation which has made Wisconsin a leader in the social-security field.

We bid hail and farewell only to his physical presence from this scene because we know that the spirit of devotion to the land to which his father and mother emigrated from Sweden, this spirit of faithfulness and loyalty to the American way of life, to the United States Congress, and to the American institution of government—this spirit of Irvine Lenroot will go on for all time to come.

If I could sing the song within my heart
Of loves immortal, gates of death and birth,
And sleeps and wakings; if I could impart
Some measure of my gladness to the earth,
And men could understand and know it true,
This consciousness that thrills me through and through,
This memory of never-broken being,
This vision seen and yet beyond all seeing,
More joy were mine than since the world began
Because of joy that I could give to man.

If I these sweet assurances could tell
And show how clear and certain is the truth;
If I could bring all souls beneath the spell
Of spirit in its never-ending youth;
If I could give what God to me has given
And prove it as it has been proved to me,
'Twould make the earth seem nearer unto heaven
Than ever it has seemed since Galilee.

And can I not? Will not the power divine
That works in other spirits as in mine
Help me to tell, and then to hear, the story
Until all earth is brightened with its glory?

VOLUNTARY AGREEMENTS IN INDUSTRY, ETC.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 547) to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the Committee on Banking and Currency has considered S. 547, has reported favorably on that bill, and has recommended that the bill pass.

S. 547 would extend through September 30, 1949, section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress. This action provides that the President may consult with representatives of industry, business, and agriculture, with a view to making voluntary agreements providing, among other things, for "priority allocation and inventory control of scarce commodities which basically affect the cost of living or industrial production."

After the approval of such agreements by the Attorney General, the President may request compliance with them and actions taken in compliance with such requests are exempted from the provisions of the antitrust laws and the Federal Trade Commission Act.

The purposes for which these voluntary agreements may be entered into are, as stated in section 1 of Public Law 395—

to aid in stabilizing the economy of the United States, to aid in curbing inflationary tendencies, to promote the orderly and equitable distribution of goods and facilities, and to aid in preventing maldistribution of goods and facilities which basically affect the cost of living or industrial production.

The President, under Executive Order 9919, of January 3, 1948, delegated this authority under section 2 of Public Law 395 to the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Director of the Office of Defense Transportation.

The Department of Commerce has had considerable success in formulating and carrying out voluntary plans for the allocation of steel and pig iron for various essential purposes.

At the present time the Department of Commerce has 14 of these voluntary plans in effect, and is about to put into effect 2 more. These plans, and the tonnage of steel or pig iron allocated under them for February 1949, are as follows:

Voluntary allocation plans

Purpose	Monthly tonnage (as of February 1949)	
	Steel	Pig iron
1. Freight cars	250,000	
2. Atomic Energy Commission projects	22,265	
3. Warm-air heating equipment	31,622	
4. Housing products		102,526
5. Factory-made steel houses (30,000 tons total)	[1] 9,835	
6. Anthracite industry	2,370	
7. Armed forces	102,505	
8. Barges and towing vessels	25,000	
9. Tank and oil-field production equipment	16,530	
10. National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	1,996	
11. Oil tankers	40,380	
12. Merchant vessels	15,415	
13. Mining machinery	26,400	
14. Manganese ore cars (13,000 tons total)	[1] 2,192	
15. Pipe line for Oak Ridge (25,500 tons total)	[1] 4,750	
16. Farm-type grain storage bins (50,400 tons total)	[1] 8,400	
Total tonnage	559,790	102,525

[1] Average.

In addition to these plans, the Department of Commerce has under consideration other proposals to set up plans for the allocation of steel to the Economic Cooperation Administration countries and to distressed municipalities needing steel for important public health and welfare needs, and possible additional provisions for housing and for the armed forces. The possibility of additional assistance to increase the production of such scarce materials as aluminum was discussed at the hearing.

While these programs have not by any means solved all the problems arising out of shortages of materials, they have accomplished very desirable results in directing scarce steel and pig iron to uses important to our domestic economy and to our national security.

At the hearing the committee inquired at length into the operations under section 2 of Public Law 395, and the way in which these voluntary plans have been formulated and carried out, with particular reference to the consideration given to small business and the effects on small business.

The testimony revealed that several steps occur in the formulation of these plans.

When the Department of Commerce, either on its own initiative or at the request of a steel-consuming industry, reaches the conclusion that a plan seems appropriate, it calls a general meeting of the consuming industry, to which all members, or a substantial cross section, of the industry are invited. The proposal is discussed generally, and if the sentiment of those present is in favor of the proposal, suggestions are requested from those present as to possible members of an industry advisory committee.

Industry advisory committees are selected by the Secretary of Commerce. The order under which these committees are set up provides that—

The committees are formed of representatives of the minimum number of companies necessary to represent a fair cross section of the industry from the standpoints of (1) large, medium, and small companies; (2) geographical distribution; (3) trade-association membership; and (4) segments of industry (types of products, degree of integration, etc.). In forming industry advisory committees, the Department of Commerce will be governed by the principles of Senate Concurrent Resolution 14 (80th Cong.) and the President's memorandum to heads of executive departments and agencies of December 12, 1947, with respect to the representation of small business on Government committees.

After a voluntary plan has been worked out by the Department of Commerce, in consultation with the industry advisory committee of the consuming industry and the industry advisory committee of the steel-producing industry, a public hearing is held to which the public is invited. Notice of these hearings is given in the Federal Register and by press release. Consideration is given to any changes needed in the light of the public hearing.

The plan is then forwarded to the Department of Justice, for the approval of the Attorney General. Representatives of the Department of Justice are invited to all the meetings, and work closely with the Department of Commerce in the formulation of these plans.

If the Attorney General approves the plan, written requests are made by the Secretary of Commerce for compliance with the plan. The plans, and the requests, are then published in the Federal Register in accordance with the law.

I have here a copy of the Commerce Department order setting up this procedure, which I ask permission to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the close of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See Exhibit 1.)

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, at all stages of the formulation of a plan, at the preliminary general meeting, the meetings of the industry advisory committees, and at the public hearings, full opportunity is given to small business to cooperate in the formulation and approval of the plan.

In the operation of the plan small business is also given a full opportunity to participate. Allocations are made by the Secretary of Commerce, after taking into consideration recommendations of a task committee of the consuming industry; these allocations are based on the capacity of the individual firm and its production plans for the product covered by the program, as well as its past production. An outstanding example of this principle was discussed at the hearing, the warm-air heating industry. In that case some 43 concerns, all small business with little or no historical base, did not apply for any steel at the time the plan was promulgated. The problem was presented to the Steel Products Committee and an additional 2,000 tons of steel a month was made available to these small firms.

I have here a table prepared by the Office of Industry Cooperation of the Department of Commerce showing the number of large and small firms receiving steel under 10 of the programs, showing the amount of steel going to large and small firms, and also showing the percentage of the amount requested which was allocated to the large and medium firms on the one hand and to the small firms on the other hand.

In terms of number of participants in these programs small business firms range from 28 percent, in the case of freight cars, to 86 percent in the case of the steel house program. In the case of six programs, 75 percent or more of the participating firms are classified as small business.

The tonnage going to small firms varies from 7 percent in the case of the anthracite program to 29 percent in the case of pig iron for housing products.

In the case of three programs small business received a larger proportion of the amount requested than did large or medium firms. In the case of four programs small firms received a somewhat smaller proportion of what they requested than did large or medium firms. In the case of three other programs the proportion was virtually the same.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question, or would he rather wait until the end of his statement?

Mr. MAYBANK. I should rather wait until I have concluded, if the Senator does not mind.

Mr. President, I ask that the table to which I have just been referring also be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the committee heard two witnesses, representatives of small firms receiving steel under the tank and oil-field production-equipment program, who testified as to the benefits they had received under the program, as well as the benefits of the program to the oil industry.

It appeared, therefore, that while the plans are designed to carry out programs essential to the domestic economy and the national security rather than specifically to assist small business as such, full consideration is being given to small business in the formulation of these voluntary plans and in their operation, and that many small firms have been benefited greatly by the operations of the program.

The voluntary agreements promulgated by the Department of Commerce provide, in accordance with the law, that they terminate on or before March 1, 1949. In accordance with a ruling of the Attorney General, however, provisions have been made for a wind-up period of 6 months under section 2 (f) of the law. This wind-up period is of limited effectiveness, as no amendments or modifications can be made during that period. This would reduce substantially the benefits of the existing plans. Furthermore, no new plans can be entered into under this provision, and it would be impossible even to consider the pending proposals for the Economic Cooperation Administration for municipal programs and for increased assistance for housing and the armed services.

I am advised that a broader stabilization program will be submitted to the Congress. Pending consideration of this broader program, the proposed temporary extension of section 2 of Public Law 395 should be promptly enacted in order that the important benefits of the voluntary program to the domestic economy, the national security, and the foreign policy of the United States may be preserved.

EXHIBIT 1

TITLE 15—COMMERCE

SUBTITLE A—OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Part 11—Organization and functions of the Office of the Secretary

VOLUNTARY AGREEMENTS

SEC. 11.11. Voluntary agreements under Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress—(a) Consultation with industry and the public under section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress: Under section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, the President is authorized to consult representatives of business and agriculture with a view to making certain voluntary agreements and to approve and request compliance with such agreements. Executive Order 9919 (13 F. R. 59) delegates this authority to various officials, including the Secretary of Commerce. This Executive order also provides that consultation with industry may be through representative industry advisory committees and that an opportunity shall be given to industry, labor, and the public generally to present their views with reference to a proposed agreement or plan.

(b) Organization of industry advisory committees: As the purpose of industry advisory committees formed under this section is to give advice to the Department of Commerce on proposed voluntary agreements and plans affecting an industry, their members are selected so as to assure that the advice so obtained will represent the viewpoint of all parts of the industry. The committees are formed of representatives of the minimum number of companies necessary to represent a fair cross section of the industry from the standpoints of (1) large, medium, and small companies; (2) geographical distribution; (3) trade-association membership; and (4) segments in the industry (types of products, degree of integration, etc.). In forming industry advisory committees, the Department of Commerce will be governed by the principles of Senate Concurrent Resolution 14 (80th Cong.), and the President's memorandum to heads of executive departments and agencies of December 12, 1947, with respect to the representation of small business on Government committees (appendix A attached). To promote free discussion, different levels of production and distribution are generally represented by

separate industry advisory committees consisting of customers and suppliers. The membership of industry advisory committees is checked with compliance proceedings of the Department of Commerce in accordance with the policy of suspending or removing from the committee members who are found in violation of Department of Commerce orders and regulations. Members of committees pay their own expenses and are entitled to no compensation for their services as committee members.

(c) Functions of industry advisory committees: The functions of an industry advisory committee formed by the Department of Commerce under this section are to furnish information, to give advice, and to make recommendations to the Department of Commerce, at regular committee meetings, on problems affecting the industry either in connection with the formulation of a proposed voluntary agreement or plan or in connection with an existing voluntary agreement or plan. In order to eliminate any question as to the propriety of the activities of these industry advisory committees under the antitrust laws, the activities of these committees are limited strictly to those specified (see the Attorney General's letter of January 29, 1948; appendix B). No other activities by these industry advisory committees or by their members are sponsored or authorized by the Department of Commerce under this section. These industry advisory committees are not authorized to determine policies for the industry nor are they authorized to compel or coerce any person to enter into any voluntary agreement or plan or to compel or coerce any person to comply with any request or order made by the Department of Commerce.

(d) Industry advisory committee meetings: Industry advisory committee meetings will be called by the Department of Commerce when a voluntary agreement or plan is under consideration or at any other time when the advice of an affected industry is appropriate in connection with a voluntary agreement or plan. The agenda of the meeting will be prepared by the Department of Commerce. Representatives of interested agencies of the Government will be invited by the Department of Commerce. If a member of a committee is unable to attend a meeting, he may suggest the name of another representative of the same organization to serve as his alternate for that meeting, and as a general rule the Department of Commerce will invite the suggested alternate to that meeting. A representative of the Department of Commerce will preside at every committee meeting. The Department of Commerce will keep minutes of each meeting, and will make summaries available to members of the committee, and the industry and the trade press, and will issue press releases concerning the meeting.

(e) Hearings on proposed agreements and plans: In order to carry out the requirement of Executive Order 9919 that an opportunity shall be given to industry, labor, and the public generally to present their views with respect to a proposed agreement or plan, the Department of Commerce has adopted the policy of holding a public hearing at which such views may be presented. Notice of such a hearing will be given by publication in the Federal Register, by press release, and by any other method considered appropriate by the Department of Commerce. The notice will include a statement of the time, place, and nature of the hearing, and either the substance of the proposed plan or agreement or a description of the subjects and issues involved. The notice will ordinarily provide that persons who desire to participate in the hearing must file in advance a written notice of appearance and that persons failing to file such written notice in advance will not be heard unless good cause is shown. The scope, time, or place of a hearing for which notice has been given may be changed when necessary. Reasonable notice will be given of the hearing and of any changes. Ordinarily the time set will not be less than 10 days nor more than 15 days from the publication in the Federal Register of the notice of hearing. The hearing will be conducted by an official of the Department of Commerce as hearing officer. The hearing officer will regulate the course of the hearing, including the order in which statements may be presented and the length of time to be allowed for making oral statements. He may adjourn or continue the hearing to a later date or different place and will receive written statements and memoranda at the hearing or within such time after the hearing as he may determine. Such statements and memoranda should be filed in triplicate. The hearing will be informal in nature. A stenographic transcript or summary will be made of the proceedings. After the close of the hearing, the hearing officer will prepare and file a report with the Secretary's office summarizing the statements made at the hearing and will file with his report all written statements presented in connection with the hearing.

(f) Requests for compliance with voluntary agreements and plans: When a proposed voluntary agreement or plan under section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, has been formulated by the Department of Commerce with the advice of the appropriate industry advisory committee or committees and after a public hearing has been held, the Secretary of Commerce may forward his favorable recommendation of the proposed agreement or plan to the Attorney General for the latter's approval, together with the statement of facts required by Executive Order 9919. If the Attorney General approves the agreement or plan the Secretary of Commerce, upon giving his final approval, will make written request to carry out and comply with the agreement or plan to each concern which is to take action under it. The agreement or plan and the requests will be published in the Federal Register and forwarded to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives by the Attorney General in accordance with Public Law 395. (Pub. Law 395, 80th Cong., Executive Order 9919, Jan. 3, 1948, 13 F. R. 59.)

Issued this 30th day of January 1948.

[SEAL] W. A. HARRIMAN,
Secretary of Commerce.

APPENDIX A

MEMORANDUM TO THE HEADS OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND ESTABLISHMENTS

Senate Concurrent Resolution 14 (80th Cong.) provided

"That the Congress recognize the valid claim of the small-business men of America to equal representation as an entity with labor, agriculture, and other groups, on those Government commissions, boards, committees, or other agencies in which the interests of the American economy may be affected; and that the President of the United States, the members of the Cabinet, and other officers of the Government be, and hereby are, respectfully urged to accord the small-business men of America representation on such Government agencies including particularly policy-making bodies created by Executive appointment."

In determining whether a business is a small business for the purpose of this resolution, the appointing agency should consider the relative size and position of the business in relation to the industry, the nature of its area of operation, the size of the group supplying capital and holding ownership and control, and the independence of its management.

As an alternative guiding principle for the appointing agency, a business may be considered a small business if it is a business enterprise, or a group of business enterprises under common ownership or control, which is not dominant in its field and which:

(a) If a manufacturing enterprise, has 100 employees or less; or

(b) If a wholesale establishment, has less than $500,000 annual net sales volume; or

(c) If a retail, service, hotel, amusement, construction, or other enterprise not included under (a) or (b), has annual net sales or receipts of less than $100,000; or

(d) If engaged in two or more separate types of businesses, does not exceed the maximum applicable under either (a), (b), or (c) to any of such businesses.

The heads of the executive departments and establishments should bear in mind the will of Congress as shown by this resolution when asking appointments to commissions, boards, committees, and other agencies in which the interests of the American economy may be affected.

The appointment of representatives of small business should be made in such a manner as to provide the small-business man an equal opportunity for representation along with labor, agriculture, and other groups on those Government commissions.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
December 12, 1947.

APPENDIX B

JANUARY 29, 1948.

Hon. W. AVERELL HARRIMAN,
Secretary, Department of Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SECRETARY HARRIMAN: I have received the annexed procedures, which you propose to adopt in connection with the operations of the Department of Commerce under Public Law 395 and Executive Order 9919.

In my opinion, the procedures which you propose are appropriate under Public Law 395 and Executive Order 9919. Under such procedures the functions of industry advisory committees are limited to the furnishing of information and advice to your Department in connection with proposed voluntary plans and agreements and related matters at regular committee meetings. Such committees do not have any authority to determine policies for the industry. Neither the committees nor any of their members have authority to compel or coerce any person to enter into a voluntary plan or agreement or to compel or coerce any person to comply with any request or order made by the Department of Commerce.

I wish to advise you that the activities of industry advisory committees in conformity with your proposed procedures and within the limitations contained therein would not constitute a violation of the Federal antitrust laws. I believe it would be appropriate, however, to make clear to any persons whom you appoint as members of an industry advisory committee that their membership on such committee does not create any immunity under the Federal antitrust laws for any other activities which might be in contravention of those laws.

Sincerely yours,

TOM C. CLARK,
Attorney General.

(13 Federal Register 495)

EXHIBIT 2

Approximate small-business participation in certain voluntary programs

Program allocation	Number of consumer participants			Allocations made (monthly unless otherwise noted)				Allocations requested (monthly unless otherwise noted)			
	Number of large and medium firms	Number of small firms	Percent of small firms	Tons	Tonnage to large and medium firms	Percent of tonnage to small firms	Tonnage to small firms	Tonnage requests, large and medium firms	Tonnage requests, small firms	Percent of requests allocated to large and medium firms	Percent of requests allocated to small firms
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Steel houses	1	6	86	[1] 53,415	42,395	21	11,020	79,600	15,451	53	71
Tank and oil-field production equipment	6	18	75	18,530	14,469	22	4,061	18,492	4,467	75	90
Warm-air heating	74	268	78	[1] 238,994	173,812	28	64,592	347,996	163,656	50	49
Anthracite	24	31	56	2,570	2,232	7	164	2,232	164	100	100
Mining machinery	31	79	61	26,400	22,430	15	3,865	23,767	4,500	94	86
Housing products (pig iron)	20	88	81	103,730	75,195	29	30,535	104,937	51,469	70	60
Freight cars	183	72	28	247,980	224,886	9	23,094	280,574	26,523	80	87
Barges	18	70	80	24,760	20,818	16	3,942	29,465	[2] 6,745	71	58
Tankers [3]	9	10	53	40,380	31,745	14	8,772	36,024	5,983	96	96
Merchant vessels [4]	7	22	75	15,415	11,882	23	3,533	12,621	3,795	94	93

[1] Cumulative tonnage for program period.
[2] Tonnage applications were excessive in comparison with actual orders on hand by some small firms.
[3] Figures shown combine new construction firms and repair firms.
[4] Data combined for repair, reconstruction, and reconversion.

Source: Department of Commerce, Office of Industry Cooperation, Jan. 27, 1949.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment to Senate bill 547. I move to strike out "September 30, 1949", in line 6, and insert in lieu thereof "March 31, 1950"; to strike out "September 30, 1949", in line 9, and insert in lieu thereof "March 31, 1950."

Mr. President, the purpose of the amendments is to continue the voluntary allocation controls for a full year from the expiration date of the present law. Senate bill 547 would continue them for a period of 6 months. Under the bill there could be an end of the program 6 months after the expiration of the authority to enter into the voluntary agreements.

When this matter was under consideration at the last session there was skepticism as to whether or not the plan would work. It was generally understood that the most imperative need was in the field of steel and steel production, the allocation of steel to various starved industries which were dependent upon steel in the fabrication and foundry business.

At the hearing on Senate bill 547 the Secretary of Commerce came before the committee and brought to our attention the fact that the voluntary allocation program has been working very effectively; that the Department is satisfied with the cooperation of industry, which was generally entered into the program; that the only program they have put into effect has been in the steel industry, that they are now studying the aluminum industry, the production and distribution of aluminum, to determine whether there is a desire or any need for the program in that field. Generally conditions have improved throughout the country, prices have come down, production has increased, and the result is that the only program put into effect has been in the steel industry.

Mr. President, the Secretary of Commerce testified that there is need for continuing the program as long as there is a shortage of steel. His figures were to the effect that this year there would be a shortage of 7,000,000 tons of production under demand in this country, taking into consideration the need for 4,200,000 tons in the export field.

Representatives from small business also came before our committee, particularly from the outlying sections of the country and the far West, which before this program was put into effect had been practically starved out of the field of steel production and steel processing. They testified that the voluntary allocation program under the Department of Commerce, administered through the industry generally, has been very effective, and as the result of the program they have had sufficient steel to establish or reestablish themselves in business and continue their production effectively.

The bill, S. 547, would continue the authority for a period of only 6 months. My amendment would continue the authority for a period of 1 year. At that time, March 31, 1950, the Congress will be in session. We would have the advantage of another year of production. We would then be in a position to know whether prices have actually stabilized, as it is indicated at the present time they are going to stabilize. We would know then what world needs might be.

As an indication of the fluctuations in the world's demands for steel in the past few years, it was estimated 2 years ago that there would be a need for 6,600,000 tons for the past year, 1948. The demand for steel in the export field dropped from the 6,600,000 tons in the year 1947 to 4,400,000 tons in 1948. The Department of Commerce estimated that there would be a need in the export field of only 4,200,000 tons in 1949. The production in Europe, in the Ruhr, in France, in Belgium and in England, is such as to give encouragement that the export need for the year 1949 will be even less than the figure of 4,400,000 tons estimated by the Secretary of Commerce.

With respect to the steel production in this country, some very significant facts are now apparent in the record to indicate that the steel industry may be able this year to meet practically the total demand not only in this country but for export purposes as well. The Secretary of Commerce, as I have stated, testified that there is a gap of 7,000,000 tons. His production figures were based upon an increase this year of 2,300,000 tons, as I recall. The industry generally believes—and these are the figures from the Steel Institute—that there will be an increase in steel production in this country this year of between three and four million tons if there is uninterrupted production. Of course the only thing that will interrupt the production of the steel mills which are now operating at actual capacity will be something in the nature of a strike, or may be the cutting off of the manganese supply without replacement of it, as is threatened at the present time. But in the absence of those factors entering into the full production program in 1949, the Steel Institute estimates that the steel industry will be able to produce steel ingots to the total capacity of 92,000,000 tons, and if the January production, for which we already have the records, shall be continued throughout the year, there will be a total production of 97,000,000 tons of steel ingots, an unprecedented production in the steel industry for all time.

Compare that with 1948. In 1948, 88,533,729 tons of steel were produced, as against 92,000,000 tons anticipated in 1949. There were 60,848,000 tons of pig iron produced in 1948, as against an estimated 68,000,000 tons this year, if there is uninterrupted production in the steel field. So we can look forward, I think, to a production that will within a year's time meet the demands generally, domestically and in the foreign field.

Therefore, Mr. President, I feel that by the end of the year there will be proof that there is no need for any compulsory controls, such as suggested in the committee, such as has been suggested by the administration, and that at the end of the year it will be perfectly apparent, if the present program of production is continued, if the present world-wide trend continues, and if increased production in foreign countries, in which there is the most imperative demand, continues as it is at the present time—and we have no reason to think that it will not continue—that by the end of the coming year, or by March 31, 1950, there will be no need at all for any kind of controls, either voluntary or compulsory.

So with that in mind, and with the Secretary of Commerce, the representatives of small business, and the administrator of the program testifying fully as to adequacy of voluntary allocation and its success in the field, I think that we in the Congress should continue the present arrangement for another year, until the Congress is in session, and that we may then take a look at the whole field of production and of world-wide demand, as well as the domestic demand.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish to ask the Senator from Ohio one question. He said that the supply of steel might be stopped in two ways; first, by labor difficulties and, second, by shortage of raw material. Would the Senator be willing to go a little more in detail into the second phase, the possible shortage of raw material?

Mr. BRICKER. The raw material involved is manganese, and we are threatened at the present time with a cutting off of the supply from Russia. The supply coming from Russia is approximately 25 percent of the need for manganese in the country for the finished products. There are adequate supplies available in other places. It is a question whether they can be made available soon enough if the supply from Russia is cut off; whether there may be a slowing down or a drag on the production of steel between the time Russian supplies may be stopped and arrangements can be made, with the aid of the Government, to furnish an adequate and timely replacement of the Russian shipments if they should be cut off.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to say in addition to my previous statement that the committee held hearings on the pending legislation only on the point of whether the voluntary arrangement should be extended through September 30. No hearings were held by the committee respecting whether the arrangement should be carried on for another 15 months. As the Senate well knows, the Department of Justice is concerned about this matter. The Tariff Act is also affected by it. Many other factors are involved in the subject. When we gave notice of public hearings on Senate bill 547 it was with the distinct understanding that the arrangement was only to be continued through September of this year. Had there been a suggestion of further extension, other witnesses might have appeared and testified on that point. Other testimony, no doubt, would have been made with respect to the matter.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. I merely wish to ask a question. I notice in the report of the committee the following sentence:

> The committee finds that the existing voluntary plans have provided substantial benefits to the national interests.

That is a very conservative statement of what has been repeated here by the distinguished Senator from Ohio in wholehearted support of the continuance of this particular method of dealing with allocations. What I should like to ask my distinguished friend from South Carolina is whether or not any witness who appeared testified in any way that these voluntary allocations were not adequately and successfully meeting the situation? Was there any opposition to the extension of this method of allocation?

Mr. MAYBANK. There was no opposition to the extension of these allocations through September 30, but no one was asked a question as to extension of the program beyond that date. There was nothing but favorable comment respecting the voluntary allocations. I agree with the Senator from Ohio when he says that all those who testified had only the kindest word to say respecting the steel companies themselves and the voluntary plans in which they participated. There was one point brought out respecting fraud, a case which the Government is now prosecuting in New York, in connection with other things that might be taken up by the Department of Justice. The Department of Justice is investigating the matter. No one, however, testified against the voluntary allocations. I wish to reiterate that no one testified respecting the extension of the voluntary allocations beyond September 30. The meeting was called for the sole purpose of discussing the advisability of extending the voluntary allocations to that date.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. The voluntary allocations have been in force or in operation for more than a year. The provisions of the law are more than a year old. Can the Senator enlighten me, why, if the voluntary operations have worked as well as they have until now, there is something peculiar and mystical about the date, September 30, beyond which the operation should not be extended? Can the Senator state what those circumstances are?

Mr. MAYBANK. I can easily answer that. The majority of the committee felt that the committee should have an open mind and hear representatives of business firms and of the various departments, including the Department of Commerce, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, and others, and then we should make up our minds whether or not these agreements should be continued, or whether other amendments to the bill should be offered. The administration believes that if these voluntary allocations are to be continued, they should be continued for 2 years, and not for 1 year. We should not have to go through all this again next January.

Mr. BALDWIN. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that these agreements ought to be extended for 2 years?

Mr. MAYBANK. The administration believes that these voluntary agreements, along with other agreements which are now being prepared, should be extended for 2 years.

Mr. BALDWIN. Why do we not cross that bridge now?

Mr. MAYBANK. We have had no hearings.

Mr. BALDWIN. The fact remains, does it not, that this program, laid down in the Eightieth Congress in December 1947, really has worked adequately and successfully? Is not that a fact?

Mr. MAYBANK. I should say that it has worked successfully in the case of steel. I would not say that it has worked successfully in other fields. The agreements are purely voluntary. The steel companies did a good job in their voluntary agreements. However, there are other fields which the administration wishes to consider—for example, aluminum, copper, zinc, and other products.

Mr. BALDWIN. As I understand, the pending bill picks up section 2 of the anti-inflation act which was passed by the Eightieth Congress, and seeks to have it continued.

Mr. MAYBANK. Through September 30.

Mr. BALDWIN. The amendment of the Senator from Ohio would continue it for a year.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. BALDWIN. It has already been in operation for a year; and all the testimony before the committee indicated that it has worked successfully. Is that correct?

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct. The Congress did a good job in enacting that legislation, and the administration and the executive departments have done an excellent job with business and industry.

Mr. BALDWIN. So the program has been an unqualified success to date.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should say so, but only insofar as the voluntary agreements are concerned, and insofar as those who were under such voluntary agreements are concerned. But the program is limited entirely to those who are willing to enter into such agreements.

Mr. BALDWIN. The voluntary agreements apply not only to steel but to other metals as well and to other shortages.

Mr. MAYBANK. They apply to some, for example, aluminum, manganese, zinc, and copper. I believe there is a list of approximately 20 products.

Mr. BALDWIN. So far as the other items are concerned, the voluntary allocation plan is working well, is it not?

Mr. MAYBANK. I may say to the Senator that, as I understood the testimony, other agreements, such as that relating to aluminum and other items have not yet been worked out or agreed to.

Mr. BALDWIN. But they are in process.

Mr. MAYBANK. They are in the discussion stage; but they have not been concluded.

Mr. BALDWIN. The section which the Senator seeks to continue is section 2 of the Anti-Inflation Act which was passed in the Eightieth Congress, in December 1947.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes.

Mr. BALDWIN. As I understand, neither the committee nor the administration is yet prepared to present to the present Congress any anti-inflationary measures other than those contained in this bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. I would not say that. The administration has been working on the problem for some time. Certain proposals will be presented by Senators on this side of the aisle, and perhaps other proposals will be presented by Senators on the other side of the aisle. I cannot say exactly when these proposals will be introduced, but it will be very shortly, perhaps in a week. We cannot do everything all at once. Congress has been in session for less than a month. We must consult the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, the Department of the Interior, the Bureau of the Budget, and others.

Mr. BALDWIN. I remind my distinguished friend that the President of the United States suggested that we should deal with this and 17 other measures in 2 weeks. We have already been in session for 4 weeks. It is true, is it not, that so far as the administration is concerned, or so far as any of the Federal departments or agencies are concerned, they are not prepared with any anti-inflationary program other than the continuance of a measure which was enacted in a Republican-controlled Congress in December 1947. Is that correct?

Mr. MAYBANK. Unfortunately the administration has to go into what the Republicans did in the Eightieth Congress, and it takes a little longer, perhaps, to suggest some undoing in order to better the legislation.

Mr. BALDWIN. I will say to my distinguished friend that I understood that he and his colleagues had all the answers last fall in the campaign, and that this problem was to be taken care of immediately.

Mr. MAYBANK. We had the answers, but we did not expect to undo in 30 days everything the Eightieth Congress did.

Mr. BALDWIN. The Senator is not trying to undo something. He is asking that it be continued.

Mr. MAYBANK. We are asking that the program be continued for a few months, until we can handle the problem properly.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. Does the Senator from South Carolina recall that Mr. Clark, representing Secretary Sawyer, stated, in answer to a question of mine, that if the Congress saw fit to extend the voluntary control system beyond the limitation date suggested by the Secretary, no harm of any kind would result?

Mr. MAYBANK. I am not prepared to testify for Mr. Clark. I am not questioning the Senator's statement at all. The record may show that. I know that Mr. Clark stated that they would not object. It is understandable that a bureaucrat, or anybody connected with a bureau, is not going to object to the enactment by Congress of a law extending its powers, and which he feels is doing a good job.

Mr. CAIN. If I may be so bold as to suggest it, the question was more important than that. It was obvious to some of us that Mr. Clark and Secretary Sawyer simply had not given much consideration to a longer period of extension than was recommended by the Secretary, and he quite honestly said, "If that is what the Congress wants to do, it will give us no cause for concern."

I should like to be of assistance to the thinking of all Members of the Senate. Let me refer for a moment to page 3 of the hearings, and to a comment made in conclusion by Secretary Sawyer in his testimony. Secretary Sawyer said:

> In conclusion, I feel that the voluntary program, while not the complete solution to our stabilization problems, has been successful so far in overcoming many of the problems arising from shortages of goods and facilities and in contributing to mitigating inflationary pressures. Consequently, I will urge a longer-term continuation of the program when the broader stabilization program is presented to the Congress. Until that program is presented and acted upon, I believe that the current voluntary program should be kept on a going basis, and, for that purpose, strongly recommend prompt enactment of S. 547.

We, as members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, listened to Mr. Sawyer and were impressed by what he said, namely, that this voluntary system was working well. During the remainder of the day we listened to representatives of industry who stated that the plan had meant the difference between failure and success so far as they were concerned. They were most complimentary. So quite naturally we raised the question, Why should we jeopardize a good thing through a termination date which, logically enough, should be further in the future than the administration has recommended?

We want to cooperate with Mr. Sawyer, Mr. Clark, and the administration. Mr. Sawyer said that in due time—he could not answer the question as to when—recommendations for continuing voluntary agreements would be presented to the Congress.

I join with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] in thinking that we would be doing ourselves and the Nation a service by extending these agreements reasonably beyond the limitation of extension suggested by the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, what the distinguished Senator from Washington read and quoted is exactly what I said. Secretary Sawyer testified in favor of Senate bill 547. It provides the September 30, 1949, date.

Mr. President, this matter concerns not only the Department of Commerce, but it concerns the Department of Justice. It concerns the oil allocations under the Department of the Interior. It concerns the Department of Agriculture. Those agencies must meet and combine their views, if the plan is to be a success.

A present distinguished Member of this body was formerly Secretary of Agriculture and served as such when this plan was in operation. He will bear me out in saying that the plan has not worked in agriculture. It has worked in the Department of Commerce in connection with the steel allocation program; but the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] knows it has not operated successfully in agriculture.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I do not know that we are bound by the testimony of the Secretary of Commerce in favor of the proposal, or that we are bound to conclude that the testimony of the Secretary of Commerce in favor of a 6 months' extension was an argument against a year's extension. He testified very clearly, I feel, that the voluntary program has been successful so far in overcoming many of the problems arising from shortages of goods and facilities, and in contributing to mitigating inflationary pressures. He also testified that there are investigations proceeding in other fields of production, as well as in the field of steel production, looking toward putting into effect a voluntary allocations program, if it is shown to be needed.

Mr. President, the extension time now proposed is not sufficient to take care of such investigation and to permit the program to be put into effect. We have the testimony of the Secretary of Commerce and the testimony of Mr. Clark, who is in charge of this program, the testimony of representatives of small business, who are extremely well satisfied with the operation of the program, and the testimony of witnesses from the oil fields that already there is an adequate supply of pipe and drilling material for the needs of the industry this year. That includes, because we expressly asked the question of the representatives of the industry in Texas and Oklahoma, the industry located there, which has tremendously increased its capacity in the last year. At the same time there is an application before the RFC for a loan of $65,000,000 to expand a steel production plant at Daingerfield, Tex. The testimony at the hearings was that already there is an adequate supply of steel products to take care of the needs in the great production areas in Texas and Oklahoma.

It was only toward the end of the last day of the hearings that it became apparent that the steel industry, within a year—and I think the figures thoroughly support this statement—will be able to meet the demands domestically and in the export field. As a result of that testimony and the statement by Mr. Clark that no damage would be done, I thought it would be advisable to provide a further extension. The only argument against the plan is that probably there would be a desire to have the present Congress put into effect a compulsory program of some kind. I wish to say here and now that I am confident that a majority of the Senate, on both sides of the aisle, do not expect or anticipate a compulsory program, and do not expect to vote for one.

So we might as well face the issue, as it became apparent in the hearings, that a year's extension will be sufficient to take care of the need, and by the end of that time the steel supply will be adequate.

Congress will be in session on March 31 of next year, and then will be able to face the issue again. By that time we shall have the experience of a whole year's production and demand, and we shall be able to ascertain the needs of the country before we pass upon the matter at that time.

The program has been working well. It is continuing to work. There is no opposition to a year's extension.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Ohio that the steel industry has done a fairly good job. I wish to say to him further that when a proposal for a compulsory program comes up, there will be hearings and debate. No one knows what prices will be in the next few months, and no one knows what the armed services and the plants at Oak Ridge will need in the way of steel in the next few months.

So I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question. I still do not quite understand all the arguments for and against the different provisions.

If the extension is desired to run for a full year, instead of 7 months, is there any way the Senator from South Carolina knows by which the steel companies could continue the extension of time 5 months beyond the time proposed in the bill? I still do not see the difference between a 12 months' and a 7 months' extension of time. There must be some reason back of the proposal for an additional 5 months, and I should like to know what it is.

Mr. MAYBANK. There is no reason back of it, except it had been hoped the Congress would extend the present law for a few months until a complete study, through the Banking and Currency Committee, could be made of all legislation along these lines.

Mr. AIKEN. Why was the September 30 date taken?

Mr. MAYBANK. Because, as was explained to those of us on the committee, it seems that various firms make their business and earnings, statements, and reports on a quarterly basis. The September 30 date was taken merely because that is the nearest date to the ending period of the business concerns which make quarterly statements.

Mr. AIKEN. I asked the question for the reason that it seems possible that Congress may not be in session at that time. I think all of us hope it will not be in session then.

Mr. MAYBANK. That date was taken for the benefit of the various businesses and industries concerned. I may add that the Committee on Banking and Currency will have ample opportunity to consider other legislation along these lines before the end of this session.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, as a part of the debate, I think Senators will be interested in an article on the steel industry which is pertinent to the discussion. It appeared in yesterday's New York Times. The article is by Thomas E. Mullaney, and the heading reads: "Demand for Steel Is Seen Dwindling—Cancellations are occurring and placement of any new orders is slackening."

I think all of us will have a deep concern as to the validity of such comments, so I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMAND FOR STEEL IS SEEN DWINDLING—CANCELLATIONS ARE OCCURRING AND PLACEMENT OF ANY NEW ORDERS IS SLACKENING

(By Thomas E. Mullaney)

Although high-level steel operations will be required of the Nation's mills for several months yet, the end of the acute postwar shortage of steel is in sight, several of the industry's leaders intimated last week after releasing their 1948 financial statements.

Steel executives say that demand and supply for steel products, except pipes and tubes and a few other items, may be balanced fairly well in 6 months. Some members of the industry are even beginning to wonder whether too much, rather than too little, steel capacity has been installed during the 41 months since the end of World War II.

These statements on the steel outlook were the most important development emanating from last week's quarterly meetings of steel company directors. Also significant, however, were the record profits for 1948 reported by many companies of the industry and the proposed three-for-one split of the common stock of the United States Steel Corp.

Up to now, the steel industry had seen only prospects for maximum operations for an indefinite period. Record tonnages of steel were being produced and yet backlogs of unfilled orders seemed to be increasing. Now, however, the backlogs are dwindling, order cancellations are occurring and the placement of new orders is at a slower pace.

PUNGENT VIEW BY GRACE

E. G. Grace, chairman of the Bethlehem Steel Corp. and one of the top steel officials of the country for many decades, made the most pungent observations on the steel-supply picture.

"There isn't any question but that there is a softening in many lines for steel," he said. "The household-goods lines are filled to the gunwales. There have been even some important cancellations of steel orders recently in both the capital-goods and the consumer-goods fields."

It is understood, for instance, that the demand for steel by oil-well drilling-equipment manufacturers has subsided somewhat. The demand for steel for shipbuilding and ship repair work is also considerably smaller as is the pressure for fabricated structural steel.

Mr. Grace said that his company would have full steel production schedules until the middle of 1949, but he refused to make any predictions beyond that. He also remarked that he considers steel supply and demand in "very good order right now" and indicated actual demand for steel "has been very much padded."

The head of the Nation's second largest steel company also disagreed with an estimate of the Department of Commerce that the shortage of steel at the end of 1949 would be some 7,000,000 tons.

Irving S. Olds, chairman of United States Steel, also disclosed a slackening in steel demand, but his statement was more conservative. United States Steel, the Nation's largest producer, now holds a volume of unfilled orders equal to "4 or 5 months' operations at the present rate," he said. In previous quarters, the estimate had been "5 or 6 months."

Another steel official likened the current situation to the 1920–21 period. He pointed out that in the middle of 1920 steel was still riding high on the crest of postwar orders from the peacetime economy—from the construction, automotive, and railroad industries. Orders vanished almost overnight, he added, and the industry did not get back to its former levels until 1925.

The records show that in 1920 the domestic steel industry produced 47,189,886 net tons of raw steel from operations averaging 75.7 percent of capacity. In August of that year, however, United States Steel noted a decline of 313,430 tons in its future business.

At that time, the decrease was ascribed to the following reasons: (1) New business was not coming in as rapidly as ordinarily because of uncertainty over prices for the following year; (2) shipments were moving faster because of the improved supply of freight cars; and (3) orders were being canceled, principally from the automotive companies. A little later, higher steel production in Europe reduced the need for American steel in foreign countries.

Today, steel orders are declining because many consumer lines are being filled, earlier estimates of steel demands in certain lines have proven to be inflated, and steel production in foreign countries is expanding rapidly.

It was in 1921 that the post-World War I bust came for the steel industry here. Companies such as Bethlehem Steel saw their operations decline to levels even below 20 percent of capacity, and the whole domestic industry operated at only 34.5 percent of capacity in turning out 22,157,853 tons. It was the worst steel-production year since 1905.

It is doubtful whether so drastic a transition would occur in this era, but the domestic industry is eyeing the situation closely and warning persistently against rash over-expansion of steel facilities, as some Government officials have been advocating.

With respect to steel earnings last year, the industry considers them only fair because of the decreased purchasing power of the dollar. Most companies reported record earnings for the year, but, because of heavy requirements for their expansion programs, much of the earnings had to be reinvested in the business.

The generous dividend action and proposed common-stock split-up of United States Steel has attracted considerable speculation in financial circles. The stock division will give broader distribution to the stock, as the company announced was its intention. But one observer wondered whether the dividend action and the plan for the split might not be the prelude to some new financing. Bethlehem Steel took similar stock action at the end of 1947 and then successfully accomplished $70,000,000 of stock and bond financing within a year.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I hope Senators will study the article. It bears out what I have been saying, namely, that no one really knows what will happen between now and September. So why extend this plan for a full year? Let us first have the benefit of the experience of the next few months.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator asks why we should extend it beyond the date recommended by the administration. I think there is a good reason for doing so. Admittedly we are concerned about a good many features of the steel industry and other industries, but we are certain that the voluntary allocations system has been and is working well.

Mr. MAYBANK. In the case of steel.

Mr. CAIN. Yes; in the case of steel. With reference to that problem, there can be no possible harm, it seems to some of us, in extending the program into the future. If in the meantime we should find good, sound reasons for improving upon the legislation, I know of no reason why that could not be accomplished through an amendment.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the distinguished Senator.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes, or I am glad to yield the floor.

Mr. FLANDERS. I simply wish to inquire whether there is any presumption of difficulty whatever in connection with extending for 13 months the date of this admittedly good arrangement, in view of the fact that the Senate can at any time between now and the end of this session modify the bill in any way it pleases. Is it not true that back of the proposal to shorten it to a 7 months' period is the presumption that there is something wrong with it? Is not that the presumption?

Mr. MAYBANK. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Vermont, I do not think there is anything wrong with it, or is any presumption implied by the 7-month extension or compared with a 13-month extension. Just as the Congress could pass a 15 months' extension, and then cut it down, so the present Congress can pass an extension to September 30 and continue it for another year after September 30. If we want to extend the plan to June or July, that can be done. It works both ways.

Mr. FLANDERS. The question, it would seem to me, I may say to the Senator from South Carolina, is that, nevertheless, there remains a presumption unfavorable to the present working of the program. Is it quite 50–50 whether we extend and shorten, on the one hand, or whether we shorten and extend, on the other? It would seem to me, I may say to the Senator, that he introduced into this proposal an unfavorable presumption not warranted by the testimony.

Mr. MAYBANK. I can only say to the Senator with respect to the 50–50 proposition to which I referred, as to whether it is extended for 13 months and is then cut down, or whether it is cut down to 6 months or 7 months, and later extended, we should keep in mind that the bill S. 547 extended the program only to September 30 of this year as it was introduced in the Senate. Hearings were conducted and the newspapers throughout the country carried accounts that the plan was to be extended by that bill only until September 30. There was never a word of testimony by qualified witnesses that we should extend voluntary agreements for 1 year. The Department of Justice, charged with enforcement of the antitrust laws, was not consulted about it. Neither the Department of Agriculture nor the Interior Department appeared. In the hearings I distinctly stated that the Secretary of Commerce told me he had discussed with the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice and with the Attorney General himself the question of the agreements, and that the Attorney General had agreed upon the date of September 30.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield first to the Senator from Connecticut, who has been waiting some time.

Mr. BALDWIN. The Senator was on the floor on December 17, 1947, as I recall, when we were debating the previous bill. Does the Senator recall that at that particular time the distinguished minority leader, the present Vice President of the United States, offered an amendment calling for compulsory controls? Does the Senator from South Carolina recall that?

Mr. MAYBANK. I shall have to refresh my memory.

Mr. BALDWIN. My question is, Why is it, if that particular provision was so good at that time, that it is not offered now, instead of asking a continuance of the Republican control measure? Of course, the measure is working better than the compulsory method would have worked.

Mr. MAYBANK. I can only answer the Senator's question as I did before, that it is going to take the Democrats a long time to undo some of the Republican measures enacted during the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. BALDWIN. I might remind my distinguished friend that in that day and time, December 17, they were here with an amendment that they said would provide adequately for the situation. Let me quote from what the distinguished Senator from Kentucky at that time said. Today, it has added authority to what it had then, because he is now Vice President of the United States.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The Senator from South Carolina has the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am glad to yield for a question, but if anyone wants to make a speech I shall be glad to yield him the floor.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I again press my question, which is, why is it that the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky when he was minority leader, which was represented at that time as something that would adequately take care of the situation, and in the place of this voluntary plan, is not offered now?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I am not here to speak for the distinguished former Senator from Kentucky, who is now the distinguished Vice President of the United States and the Presiding Officer of the Senate. I feel certain that if he were still the majority leader, he could answer that question.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from South Carolina obviously has several reasons for opposing the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have three reasons.

Mr. CAIN. But it seems to me that the Senator's primary reason for objecting to the proposal is that he thinks, because there were no hearings with respect to any date other than the date recommended by the administration, we should adhere to the date recommended by the administration. Is that true?

Mr. MAYBANK. Not only that. I shall be perfectly frank with my friend from Washington in saying that was one of the reasons, but as I said in the committee, I had other reasons. We ought to keep the matter open. We ought to keep an open mind about it in deference to the people who on November 2 overwhelmingly chose Mr. Truman as President and Mr. Barkley as Vice President.

Mr. CAIN. But I may say in answer to the Senator's first proposition——

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not want the Senator from Washington to understand for one moment that I have any controls in mind. I have only an open mind. All I want to know is what is proposed, and all I want to know is that I may be my own judge, in my own mind, of what is in the interest of my people.

Mr. CAIN. I think this question is fundamentally important. I assume from the Senator's opposition to this particular date that he conceives that whenever the administration, on a proposed piece of legislation, recommends a date, it must necessarily follow that that is the only date we can use.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator suggests an inference. I am sure he did not mean, if the administration were to send a measure to the Congress containing a certain date, that I would follow it blindly.

Mr. CAIN. Not the Senator; no.

Mr. MAYBANK. Because I never did and never intend to do such a thing.

Mr. CAIN. No, not the Senator from South Carolina personally; but I refer to his objection to the date, because we did not have hearings on any other date. I think my contention is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. No, because, as the Senator knows, I stated very definitely at the meeting that the Secretary of Commerce had told me he and the Attorney General had agreed on this date, in order that they might make a further study in the Justice Department in connection with antitrust suits, and the New York case, which is undergoing prosecution.

Mr. CAIN. But the Senator from South Carolina would agree that if the Senate saw fit to determine a different date, the Senate would have the perfectly sound ground, in its legislation, to call for any date it saw fit, would he not?

Mr. MAYBANK. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, to conclude my remarks in regard to the 1-year extension, I wish to call attention to an editorial which appeared in the New York Times on January 19.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator, if he will permit me to do so, I shall yield the floor to him, since I stated I would yield only for a question otherwise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield the floor, unless the Senator has a question.

Mr. BRICKER. No, I have no questions.

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield the floor.

Mr. BRICKER. I wish merely to conclude my remarks in regard to the matter by the insertion of this editorial in the RECORD:

No one, probably, would say that the allocations system has worked out perfectly or to the satisfaction of everyone. But, as Secretary Sawyer observes, it "has been successful within the limits inherent in any voluntary program" in overcoming some of the Nation's recent shortages in goods and facilities. It has been especially valuable in providing for the steel requirements of the armed services and the Atomic Energy Commission.

Those are two very important fields. This program has met the needs for the production of steel of atomic energy activities and the activities of the armed services.

Coming to the question of the Senator from New Hampshire as to whether or not there is an inference that the program is perhaps belittled by limiting its time, I think he is upon perfectly sound ground when he concludes there must be some inference of failure, if the program is to be limited to 7 months. At that time the Congress will not be in session. We hope we can conclude the program, as it has been laid out for us, in less time than that. Congress will not be here at the time, then, when the voluntary program ends. At any time, in the operation of this voluntary program, either industry or the Department of Commerce can cease to function under it, but there is no question, if it terminates in September 1949, that this perfectly wholesome and constructive and, thus far, successful program could be continued without a violation of certain of the statutes, particularly the antitrust laws.

But if we continue it until March 31, Congress will again be in session and can amend or discontinue the program if there is further need for it.

Furthermore, if the real reason for advocating a year's extension is that there is a demand for a compulsory program, such as that suggested by the President and the leadership on the other side, certainly such a compulsory program could be put into effect by the Congress, and it would override the voluntary program. Many faults may be obviated and many dangerous situations may be corrected if we continue the program until March 31.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the complete editorial from the New York Times of January 19, 1949, in regard to controls, be inserted in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS AND CONTROLS

Steps were taken yesterday, with the backing of the administration, to see that two of the Government's basic controls over shortage materials are continued in force pending congressional action on the eight-point program laid down by the President in his state of the Union message.

Chairman SPENCE, of the House Banking Committee, introduced two bills for this purpose. One of these calls for the extension for 6 months of the voluntary agreements anti-inflation law enacted by the Eightieth Congress. The other provides for continuing export controls for another 27 months, or through June 30, 1951. Almost simultaneously, Chairman MAYBANK, of the Senate Banking Committee, announced that his group would speed action on companion measures. Without such legislation both of these laws would expire automatically at the end of next month.

The so-called voluntary agreements program is the compromise plan worked out by the Republicans last year as a substitute for the stand-by price production controls proposed by President Truman. It authorizes industries to enter into agreements for the allocation of materials in short supply. Agreements of this kind have been employed by the steel industry: for example, to guarantee minimum quantities of steel for certain essential uses under Government-established priorities. The export-control law gives the Government authority to say what can and what cannot be shipped out of the country. Its principal purposes are: (1) to prevent domestic shortages from being aggravated by the export of items needed at home; (2) to safeguard supplies of materials required in the interest of national security; and (3) to see that, in the words of Secretary of Commerce Sawyer, critically needed commodities are made available to "those areas where they will be used to promote world recovery."

Extension of these controls is obviously desirable and necessary until Congress has decided what, if anything, it wishes to do about Mr. Truman's recently proposed program, two of whose suggestions, at least, go further in the direction of Government control than the country has gone except when it was at war or on the fringe of war. No one, probably, would say that the allocations system has worked out perfectly or to the satisfaction of everyone. But, as Secretary Sawyer observes, it "has been successful within the limits inherent in any voluntary program" in overcoming some of the Nation's recent shortages in goods and facilities. It has been especially valuable in providing for the steel requirements of the armed services and the Atomic Energy Commission.

Demand for steel is still running ahead of current production, and probably will continue to do so for some time to come. But there are signs that this bottleneck is widening rather than narrowing. In situations such as these the market is usually a more reliable guide than personal judgment, and it is a noteworthy fact that gray-market premiums on steel, like black-market premiums on automobiles, have recently shown pronounced declines. In scrap steel, a sort of subbottleneck, prices are reported as beginning to crack under the weight of increasing supplies. At any rate, with present controls extended Congress will be in a position to consider, without feeling that it is under too great pressure of time, the wisdom of moving further in the direction of Government control.

Should voluntary allocations fall short of meeting the Nation's emergency needs, the next logical step would seem to be that indicated in the fifth of President Truman's eight points: namely, priorities and allocations of key materials in short supply. But the President's program goes on from compulsory allocations to price control, and from price control to a suggestion that the Government either finance the private expansion of certain shortage industries or build its own plants to compete with such industries.

It is interesting and encouraging to note that Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, the President's chief economic adviser, has disassociated himself from the last-named proposal. Productive activities, Dr. Nourse pointed out in this city on Saturday, "are affected by conditions that can only be known by those right on the ground." But basically the chief criticism of Mr. Truman's program, as we see it, is that when it goes beyond compulsory allocations it moves into plans which presuppose a wartime economy and by the time it reaches point eight it is assuming the country is ready to try its hand at state socialism. The first of these assumptions is implausible; the second is, we think, virtually inconceivable.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, ever since I have been a Member of the Senate I have been very much interested in the question of inflation and high prices, as have all of us. At the two sessions of the Eightieth Congress I worked as vigorously as I knew how to get some legislation which would deal adequately with the existing situation. The subject matter is one which is very close to my heart. In the last campaign and during the first and second sessions of the Eightieth Congress, there was great tub-thumping on the part of the administration and those representing it regarding the whole subject of inflation and high prices and what a Democratic-controlled Congress would do to reduce high prices for the benefit of all the people.

I am surprised and astounded that the first measure which comes from the other side of the aisle to deal with the whole subject of anti-inflation is what? Is it a proposal for some new legislation to deal with the situation? Is it something that the administration or some of its many agencies worked out to deal with one of the most critical situations before the American people? No, Mr. President; it is not that. It is a request to continue on the statute books a measure to deal with inflation which was passed by the Eightieth Congress, a Republican-controlled Congress. That is the first step in the President's program—a continuation on the books of Republican measures which were passed to deal with inflation.

Why, Mr. President, is it asked to have this legislation continued on the books? Because witnesses from various agencies have testified that the act has been working successfully.

In the day and time when we were considering anti-inflation measures I remember that the former distinguished Senator from Kentucky, who was then the minority leader, offered an amendment and urged its adoption, and those on the other side of the aisle vigorously supported him in connection with that amendment. The amendment would do away with section 2, which it is now asked to have continued. It would place in effect compulsory allocations and compulsory controls. It was pointed out, with great vigor and great enthusiasm, that the Republican measure would not work, that there must be compulsory controls.

But, Mr. President, where is that provision now? Where is that amendment? Why did not the committee, which is controlled by members on the other side of

the aisle, bring forward that proposal which appeared to be so marvelous in December 1947? We are now asked to continue the Republican measure which was urged upon the Congress on the basis that it would work—a Republican measure, Mr. President, which has worked, according to the open testimony before the committee and by the admission which is implicit in the bill asking a continuance of these powers. Why will it not continue to work? What is the great difficulty with regard to it?

The bill now pending would continue voluntary allocations until the 30th of September. If we live up to the provisions of the Reorganization Act, the Congress will not be in session on the 30th of September. Then we could not do anything regarding inflation, Mr. President, if nothing is done in the meantime—and there is every indication that nothing else will be done about it in the meantime.

The distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] has offered an amendment to continue the law in operation for another year. According to the argument made by the distinguished chairman of the committee, the law's provisions have helped in large part to settle the situation as to one of the basic commodities of our economy. If it is desired in the meantime to offer some kind of substitute, let it be offered, debated, and considered on the floor.

Mr. President, I say I am surprised and astounded that the first step the administration and its representatives on the other side of the aisle take in dealing with the matter of high prices is a continuation of a Republican measure passed in the Eightieth Congress.

I should like to call attention also to the fact that this bill deals only with one provision of that legislation, section 2. So far as we know, up to date—and it is more than a month after the opening of the Congress—all the other provisions passed by a Republican-controlled Congress dealing with the subject of inflation will be continued on the books.

In the political campaign, we were given to understand that legislation which we had passed was fundamentally wrong, that we had committed a grave error in passing it. Yet, I repeat, Mr. President, the first suggestion that comes from the administration is for a continuation of one section of a Republican law to control inflation. Apparently the administration is perfectly satisfied to have all the remainder of the law continued; in fact, it has asked that it be further continued. That is a strange action, after all the talk about what a Democratic-controlled Congress would do. The answer to it is this, and it is being demonstrated day after day in the newspapers and over the radio, that prices are falling. This legislation, passed at the previous session, was wiser than we thought it was. It adequately dealt with the situation; it worked.

I am happy, indeed, to stand here and see the irrefutable proof of the fact that the legislation has worked, proof in the form of a bill introduced by a Democratic-controlled committee of a Democratic-controlled Senate, asking that one provision of the law expiring by limitation of time be continued in effect.

Mr. President, I looked over the record of the debate in connection with adopting the amendment offered by the former distinguished Senator from Kentucky, Mr. BARKLEY. Some of that debate, Mr. President, I think would bear repetition here. I wonder why, in the face of the language used in that debate, our friends are now urging the continuance of what appeared to be such an iniquitous and unworkable piece of legislation.

Said the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] on page 11501 of the RECORD:

> I think the Congress and the country appreciate any step toward meeting this very serious situation, but I think the country is going to be disappointed in the probable effectiveness of the program the Senator from Ohio is now outlining.

The Senator from Ohio being Mr. TAFT, then chairman of the committee, as I recall, who was proposing the particular legislation under consideration.

Has the country been disappointed? The supply of steel has risen tremendously, and we have been able adequately to meet the situation.

I continue reading what the distinguished Senator from Florida said at the time:

> The alternative action that might be taken, it seems to me, if the program were intended to be most effective, would be to give the President authority to fix prices in certain selective fields, either by forcing concurrence in a so-called voluntary agreement, or by prescribing what is a fair price, and simply to order that price put into effect, at least in the selective fields, in the case of steel, for example, and in the case of certain other commodities which might be regarded as key commodities. But if we continue without one of the emergency measures being adopted by the Congress in the present session, it simply means more time will pass and the situation will become far worse, and we shall still be tinkering with some sort of questionable procedure.

The distinguished Senator from Florida so described the procedure. Has that happened? I know the distinguished Senator from Florida is a great and able Senator, and I have high regard for him, but I say that in this particular instance he turned out to be a very poor prophet, indeed.

Then the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, the present great Vice President of the United States, in urging the adoption of an amendment which would impose compulsory controls, had this to say about the matter, as appears on page 11515 of the RECORD. He was replying to a statement by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to the effect that what was proposed would make it impossible to pass the measure then pending before Christmas. I read from the RECORD:

> Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know about that. I am not sure that even the milk-and-water proposition we are now considering will pass before Christmas.

Now, Mr. President, what do the administration spokesmen ask us to do? They ask us to reenact and continue in force this Republican milk-and-water proposition about which they had so much to say a year and some months ago. Why do they ask that it be continued? Because time has demonstrated that it has worked well, that it has been effective.

Then the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], speaking in favor of the amendment which would put into effect compulsory controls, said:

> I think the Senator's amendment is entirely in order. Something of the kind is absolutely necessary if we are to do anything more than hand out a campaign document in an effort to show that we have done a great thing for the economy of the country.

Mr. President, I for one entertained some doubt at that time as to whether or not we were going far enough with the particular measure then being considered. But time has demonstrated to me that my doubts should have been completely dissipated, and, indeed, they have been by the adequacy with which the measure as passed has dealt with the situation.

I remember the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] saying:

> Mr. President, I should like to add a few words to those which have been said by the distinguished minority leader. I believe we are dealing with one of the most important and difficult questions ever presented to this Congress. That statement has been made several times in the last few years. That is because the world itself has been in turmoil.
>
> The issue which is now presented in section 2—
>
> The one which would be continued under the pending bill—
>
> between the bill reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency and the amendments which have been offered by the Senator from Kentucky, is simply the issue of whether we shall have an economic government in this crisis by those who have controlled our economic system, privately, or whether we shall have the Government in charge. It could be stated even more simply. It is an issue between private government and the people's government.

Mr. President, I am one who does not wish to see big business, or big labor, or big anything else, run this country or control our economy. But I was again surprised and astounded when the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], who is chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, said on the floor of the Senate that he complimented the leaders of the steel industry for the fine, patriotic manner in which they had cooperated to carry out these voluntary allocations.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Why should the Senator be surprised if I said a good word for corporations?

Mr. BALDWIN. I know the distinguished Senator from South Carolina well enough to understand that he is most charitable, and that he always says a good word for everybody and everything. I grant him that. The point I wish to make is that we were told by spokesmen on the other side of the aisle

that big-business men would run away with the situation. On the other hand, we are now told from the other side of the aisle that which is uncontrovertibly true, namely, that these men have cooperated, that big business and little business have cooperated, and the law has been a great success.

I grant that my distinguished friend the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is a great statesman and a great Senator, but I say that he, like the distinguished Senator from Florida, is a poor prophet in this particular situation.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield for one question?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. There is only one question in issue in connection with the pending bill, namely, the fixing of a proper date for the termination of the program. Can the Senator from Connecticut tell the Senator from Illinois just why the Republicans chose March 1, 1949, for the termination of their program?

Mr. BALDWIN. No; I cannot.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I was not a member of the committee. Perhaps the Senator from Ohio can answer the question.

Mr. BRICKER. It was merely because the Congress would be in session then. That is the real reason why the date March 1 was recommended and chosen. The Congress would then have been in session long enough to see how the program was working. That was the date fixed from a practical standpoint, and it seemed to be the most reasonable and best date.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senate passed the original bill in December 1947.

Mr. BALDWIN. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. And the termination date fixed in that bill was March 1, 1949; was it not?

Mr. BALDWIN. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. May I ask the Senator from Ohio if that is correct?

Mr. BRICKER. That is the correct date, as fixed in the original bill.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BALDWIN. That demonstrates that we have had more than a year of satisfactory operation under this particular measure, and my reason for supporting the amendment of the Senator from Ohio is that if we have had a year's experience with it, and with an improving situation, it is fair to assume that the program will continue to be satisfactory, and that we should continue the act.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I was informed that I was honored by some reference in the able Senator's remarks.

Mr. BALDWIN. I am always delighted to honor my distinguished friend from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I was greatly honored to receive even temporary recognition by my able friend, but naturally I should be even more pleased to hear him repeat what he said. He spoke about my being a poor prophet in what I said about the workability of the voluntary allocation program.

Mr. BALDWIN. I should be very glad to repeat what I said. I read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Eightieth Congress, page 11501, where the distinguished Senator from Florida is reported to have said:

> I think the Congress and the country appreciate any step toward meeting this very serious situation, but I think the country is going to be disappointed in the probable effectiveness of the program the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is now outlining.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The alternative action that might be taken, it seems to me, if the program were intended to be most effective, would be to give the President authority to fix prices in certain selective fields, either by forcing concurrence in a so-called voluntary agreement or by prescribing what is a fair price, and simply to order that price put into effect, at least in the selective fields, in the case of steel, for example, and in the case of certain other commodities which might be regarded as key commodities. But if we continue without one of the emergency measures being adopted by the Congress in the present session, it simply means more time will pass and the situation will become far worse, and we shall still be tinkering with some sort of questionable procedure.

In order that the Senator might be fully informed, I want to say that I questioned the Senator's ability as a prophet, although I paid the Senator high tribute in other respects, and then I went on to say that the first step in the President's program of combating high prices was a continuance in operation of a measure passed by a Republican-controlled Congress. That was the first step. I ask the Senator why we were asked to continue something that the distinguished Senator said was a "questionable procedure."

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am perfectly prepared for the RECORD to indicate the accuracy or the inaccuracy of the prediction I made when the President's proposals were before the Republican majority of Congress and declined. I think if the Senator will make a canvass of small business in America, and of the little-business men, the little manufacturers, to see whether or not they have obtained under a voluntary allocation system steel in quantity comparable to what they should have had, he will find that the little manufacturers have not. I know of many instances in my own State where little manufacturers, the little fellows who are trying to secure a small quota of steel, have not been able to secure it because they are not on the favored list of big steel producers. I realize that sort of thing always occurs when there is a voluntary allocation system.

What the President was proposing, and what he repeated, as I understand, in his recommendations to the Congress in his state of the Union message, is authority to impose compulsory allocations when he finds that the public need requires it. I supported that proposal last year. I shall support it again when the matter comes up.

The Republican majority was opposed to the President having even an alternative authority that might be compulsorially exercised. But I go back to the basic proposition that if we are to have allocations, if we are to have rationing, the only way we can be assured that there will be a fair distribution of what is allocated and what is rationed is for some public authority at least to have supervision over it, if not direction of it. So I am perfectly prepared to let the small-business men of America who need steel to be the conclusive witnesses as to whether they have obtained the share of the Nation's output of steel they would have had if we had had a compulsory allocation and distribution system.

Mr. BALDWIN. I will say in reply to my distinguished friend that he apparently is prepared to ask the same question I am. If what he says is so, why do we not have reported from the committee a measure providing for compulsory control? Why does not the committee have the courage to report such a measure? Why has not the committee in a year and 3 months prepared the legislation necessary to deal with the subject on a compulsory basis?

Mr. President, I would not vote for it, but what I am wondering is why, if voluntary allocation has not worked successfully, some compulsory measure along the lines my distinguished friend urges, has not been presented to the Senate?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, let me state what the facts are.

Mr. BALDWIN. I wish to say a word more on this particular point.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut allow me one moment?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. I inquire who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. So far as writing a program is concerned, I would have vested in the President the authority which might be compulsorily exercised when in the President's opinion the public need requires. The President asked repeatedly of the Eightieth Congress, and has asked the present Congress—and he asked the Eightieth Congress especially in the special session—for the power to allocate by authority, if the situation requires it, and the side of the able Senator from Connecticut has steadfastly and successfully opposed such legislation. Now today, while it may be that the measure now proposed is not all that some of us would like it to be, yet it is twice as good as that advocated by the Republican side of the aisle. The measure before us seeks only 6 months' extension of the temporary authority to allocate by the steel industry, but the Republican side of the aisle is insisting upon 12 months' extension. So our proposal, while defective, no doubt, and I think it is, and I think it

is inadequate, yet is twice as good as what the Senator from Connecticut now associates himself with on the other side of the aisle. He wants a year of immunity of the steel industry from any public control, whereas the bill before us suggests only the extension for 6 months of the voluntary control now in effect, until the matter can be more thoroughly investigated.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, if the Senator feels the way he has just expressed himself he should submit an amendment for the Senate to consider. Let the Senator offer such an amendment as the distinguished former Senator from Kentucky offered when section 2 was under consideration in December 1947. Let the Senator from Florida propose such an amendment, which provided for compulsory control. It was suggested at that time by spokesmen on the other side of the aisle that it would be adequate. If my friend from Florida is so anxious to have compulsory controls, let him offer that proposal again by way of amendment. What I am saying is that the majority party is attempting to carry water on both shoulders in this matter.

Replying now to the question as to why the President was not given authority to take compulsory measures, I call my friend's attention to section 6 of the act we are discussing. Section 6 happened to be an amendment which was incorporated in the bill as the result of the efforts of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and myself. It provides a method by which the President can require Congress to give him or to deny him the right to impose compulsory controls on specific selected items, and yet not once in all the time since the law has been on the books has the President attempted to exercise the broad powers he has had under this particular provision of the law. So, Mr. President, there are in the existing law provisions under which compulsory controls could be required.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I am not the President's official spokesman in this body, and have no right to speak his mind, but I can imagine that it may be that the President is not asking for compulsory authority, although he did recommend stand-by power, because the President unequivocally recommended that additional steel-production facilities should be provided, and if private industry would not provide them, then that the Government of the United States should see to it that they were constructed. The President may have felt that if we could increase the steel output by new facilities—and that policy may be still under consideration by the administration—perhaps rationing of any sort might not be imperative. I hope the Senator from Connecticut, who I am sure wants every business and industry to have a reasonable and fair quantity of steel, will join us in supporting the President's proposal that provision be made for additional steel facilities in the country so that steel production may be increased. May I hope the Senator from Connecticut will take that attitude?

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I may say in response, that the testimony before the committee—and like my distinguished friend, the Senator from Florida, I was not on the committee, and so I had no opportunity to know what the testimony was until I read it and saw the report—was that the situation was being taken care of very adequately. My point is that if the situation is being taken care of very adequately in the absence of compulsions, we had better continue in that particular course rather than put into effect some other program when we do not know how it will work in this day and time.

Mr. President, there is no State in the whole Nation which for its size uses more steel than does Connecticut. I do not recall any particular pressure from any business people back home. As a matter of fact, I received a letter the other day pointing out that the particular small company represented by the writer could not obtain steel, and when I went to work on the subject and obtained a report on it, the company advised me that since they had last corresponded with me they had been adequately taken care of. So I assume in that particular situation at least that the present method we are using in dealing with the situation is working satisfactorily.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, if I correctly understood the Senator from Florida several minutes ago, he stated that he would be willing to call as witnesses small-business men, particularly in his State, to testify that the voluntary system was not working satisfactorily. Did I correctly understand the Senator?

Mr. PEPPER. I stated that in my State there were numerous instances which had been very forcibly brought to my attention, of little users of steel being unable to get it because they were not included in the voluntary allocation system. Obviously the steel companies favor their old customers; and if one were not an old customer or a favored customer—at least in my State—he could not get steel. Many small-business men complained that they were unable to get steel. The able junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who is seated at my left, tells me that he has recently talked with representatives of the Department of Commerce, and that the Department had stated that there was not sufficient steel to satisfy the small users of the country; that it simply did not exist. Therefore they could not get it.

Mr. CAIN. The statement of the Senator from Florida was to the effect that small-business men generally believed that the voluntary allocation system was not working effectively.

Mr. PEPPER. I was simply saying that there is not sufficient steel for all the small steel users of the country. It is only human nature, as well as confirmed business practice, that when those who produce a commodity do their own rationing, they give it to their old customers or to their friends. That is not only human nature but business practice.

Mr. CAIN. It is an obvious fact that when there is a shortage of a particular commodity, we are by no means certain that a better distribution will follow from a mandatory, as opposed to a voluntary, allocation system. It is that question with which we are seriously concerning ourselves. Let me ask the Senator from Florida if he has read the testimony given before the Committee on Banking and Currency, which gives rise to the whole question now before us.

Mr. PEPPER. No. I am not a member of that committee and I have not read the testimony. But I know that during the war if all the allocation systems and all the quota systems had been left to voluntary judgment and conscience, a few would have been favored, and many would have been discriminated against. That is inherent in the voluntary system.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator has stated that he is not a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency. Some of us are. We therefore take it for granted that the Senator from Florida would like to know the character of the testimony before that committee, and by whom it was given. The Senator from Florida has just stated that small-business men would testify to the unworkability of the system which we are discussing. Let me state to the Senator from Florida that the witnesses before the Committee on Banking and Currency were small-business people. They said that whereas a year and a half or two years ago, in the absence of the voluntary system, they were rapidly going out of business, with the adoption of the voluntary system, they were today getting every ounce of steel they considered they were entitled to.

Mr. PEPPER. How many small-business men testified?

Mr. CAIN. Approximately half a dozen.

Mr. PEPPER. Approximately half a dozen small-business men. Unless they were elected to speak for the small-business men of America, or had made a survey of the small-business men of America, I do not believe that they could be regarded as decisive spokesmen.

Mr. CAIN. But we, as representatives of the Senate, were interrogating them. If the Senator does not care to consider that testimony as valid, does he feel that the reference which he has just made to small-business men in Florida as being out of harmony with this program should be considered as valid?

Mr. PEPPER. I was only saying that I had received numerous complaints. I could name those who made the complaints. Other Senators tell me the same thing. I know that the steel mills have been working at capacity. The President has found it necessary to propose additional facilities. I know that with a limited output and a voluntary system of distribution, the little fellow is going to get the least.

Mr. CAIN. But the testimony clearly indicated to us that conditions are becoming materially better, and that a considerable degree of credit is being given to the very system the duration of which the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], through his amendment, seeks to extend. That is important to us. If it is good, we must be very cautious about getting rid of it, in the absence of something better to take its place. Nothing better has thus far been advanced on either side of the aisle.

Mr. PEPPER. I am sure that we do not want to confuse the record. Is it not a fact that the simple question before the Senate is whether the voluntary method now in existence shall be extended for 6 months or 12 months? The Democrats are recommending an extension for 6 months, and saying that in that time we shall know more about what to do as a permanent policy. The Republicans are saying, "No; exempt the subject from consideration for a whole year."

Mr. CAIN. May I answer that observation for the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], who is leading the opposition, is chairman?

During the previous remarks of the Senator from Florida, he stated that the Democrats want to extend the program for 6 months, and that the Republicans want to provide immunity to the steel industry for a year. The Senator said essentially that, did he not? He stated that he thought the Republicans wanted to give immunity to the steel industry for a period twice as long as that recommended by the Democrats.

Mr. PEPPER. I stated that I thought the issue was whether the present voluntary method should be extended for 6 months, as provided by the bill reported by the Democratic leadership, or whether the whole subject should be sealed up for 12 months, so that we would not be able to reconsider the matter in the interim, and perhaps determine upon something else as a permanent policy. So, today we are not voting for compulsory control or voluntary allocation. We are merely voting whether we want voluntary allocation for 6 months or 12 months. That is all there is to it.

Mr. CAIN. I think the Senator from Florida will be interested in the testimony which came from the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Sawyer. He said, in substance, "We are asking for a temporary extension of this law because we are presently preparing a broader stabilization program to be presented to the Congress, in which we are going to recommend an extension of the voluntary system for not less than 2 years."

Mr. Sawyer stated that such a recommendation was to be included among the recommendations for a broader stabilization program. So it is a little difficult for us on this side to see any valid opposition to our recommendation for a reasonable extension beyond the time recommended by the committee, in view of Mr. Sawyer's declaration of purpose of an extension for 2 years.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Washington that Secretary Sawyer did say that a 2-year extension was to be recommended in the over-all bill. I want the RECORD to show that as chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I talked not only with the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Agriculture, but with many others. If there be any fault in recommending this particular provision, it is mine, because I suggested to the various secretaries that I hoped that legislation on this subject would be considered piecemeal, bill by bill, considering separately the Federal Reserve legislation, agricultural legislation, and legislation affecting the Commerce Department. That is one of the reasons why there is no over-all bill at this time. If anyone is to be charged with responsibility for that situation, I am glad to assume the responsibility, because it is my thought that the legislation should be considered bill by bill.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield further?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. I merely wish to say to the Senator from South Carolina that there was no intention on my part to assess responsibility with reference to the presentation of the pending legislation. We merely take exception to the date. But what is so clearly familiar to members of the Committee on Banking and Currency on both sides of the aisle is not the information which was available to the Senator from Florida. It was for that reason that I wanted to clear in his mind, if I could, the details concerning the subject about which we are actually talking.

Mr. BRICKER and Mr. PEPPER addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, so that the RECORD may be clear and that the Senator from Florida may have clearly in mind the facts as to the testimony adduced at the hearings, let me say that the chairman of the committee was very careful to ask every witness whether small business was being adequately considered by the Department and by the industry in the allocations program. The testimony was universal, from all the witnesses, that they were being adequately taken care of. There were present a small-business representative from the Middle West, one from the far West, and one from the Oklahoma and Texas area. Not only did they testify to that effect, but, likewise, the Department of Commerce, through Secretary Sawyer, testified that they were taking care of small business. The administrator of this program testified likewise.

Furthermore, in direct answer to an explicit question as to whether a man desiring to go into the steel business or into a fabricating business or a processing business could get an adequate supply of steel, the Secretary of Commerce testified that an adequate amount had been set aside, or adequate at least under the proportion that had been established and set aside for supplying new businesses, as well as supplying established businesses.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Ohio will not leave the floor until I have an opportunity to present a letter which is on its way here, and to which I should like to call attention.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, during the course of the argument on this matter on December 18, 1947, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming said:

> Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in order to exculpate myself for voting for a measure which contains section 2, I desire to say that I associate myself with everything the Senator from Kentucky has said. I wish to add that, in my judgment, it will be utterly impossible to carry out the provisions of section 2, and that the waiver of the antitrust laws in these circumstances is utterly improper. I wish to express the opinion that the President will find it impossible to approve any agreement drawn under the terms of this joint resolution. Although I am convinced of the impracticality of that portion of this measure, nevertheless, I think I am justified in casting my vote for the joint resolution in order that there may be an extension of the powers of the Government to control exports and to allocate transportation facilities.

Mr. President, I should like to point out that, as learned and distinguished a statesman as I think the Senator from Wyoming is, nevertheless he turned out to be a poor prophet in this case, because the plan has worked, because the President, through the various agencies, provided for the program under the legislation, and the agencies he has authorized to do so have approved the agreements, and they have been effective.

In response to one of the statements made by the Senator from Florida, let me point out that if he feels as strongly as he seems to about the need for compulsory controls to deal with the situation, then let me remind him that if we turn back to the debates of December 17, and 18, 1947, he will find that what was proposed by Senators on his side of the aisle at that time was an amendment which provided for compulsory controls. Feeling as strongly as he does, why does he not offer such an amendment now? I would not vote for it, but he would have an opportunity to do so. Why does not his party offer an amendment providing for the form of controls they urged upon the Congress so vigorously back in those days?

Let me add that the then Senator from Kentucky, Mr. BARKLEY, was the one who ably presented that side of the argument. He urged that the compulsory controls be imposed; and at the end of the argument Senator BARKLEY said this:

> Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I neglected to say that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], who has been called away from Washington because of the death and funeral of his secretary, has just advised me that he wishes to associate himself with the sentiments I have expressed here in regard to this measure; and for the same reasons which I have given as actuating me in casting my vote, he wishes to be recorded as voting for the joint resolution if he were present and voting.

Mr. President, in closing my remarks, I ask this simple question: Why is it that this administration, which now controls a majority of the Congress, which has had so much to say about the subject of high prices, and whose representatives in Congress voted in large part against everything the Republicans had to offer in the Eightieth Congress—why is it that they choose, as the first step in their program to combat high prices, the reenactment, the continuance in force and effect, of a vitally important provision of a measure passed by a Republican-controlled Congress?

My answer to that question, Mr. President, if I may venture one myself, is that they have no better program than the one the Republican Party put through the Eightieth Congress, and which, on the testimony before the committee, and by the fact that they now ask to have it continued, is shown to have worked successfully.

Mr. President, I submit that the voluntary program having worked so successfully, the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Ohio should be adopted.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, when the able junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] was listening to the debate and the discussion a moment ago, he said to me that he had on his desk a letter which pertained to the subject of the discussion. He has obtained the letter, and I now have it before me. It is dated December 21, 1948, and is from the J. Gruman Iron & Steel Co., by J. G. Meyers, of 537 Seventh Avenue North, Minneapolis 11, Minn. The letter is addressed to Mr. William Simms, 3204 Coquelin Terrace, Rock Creek Knoll, Chevy Chase, Md. It reads as follows:

J. GRUMAN IRON & STEEL CO.,
Minneapolis, Minn., December 21, 1948.

Mr. WILLIAM SIMMS,
Rock Creek Knoll, Chevy Chase, Md.

DEAR SIR: We have been attempting to purchase steel for warehousing purposes from several steel mills, but our efforts for the past 4 years have been unsuccessful.

Knowing that Senator-elect HUMPHREY is desirous of helping small businesses, I am taking the liberty of writing to you so as to acquaint you with conditions in the steel industry, and also in the hopes that perhaps you can do something to help us in obtaining steel. The picture briefly is as follows:

In order to obtain new steel in 1944 it was necessary to produce records of past sales, and the mills then permitted you to replenish your stock only to the extent of the amount of the sales. Since we were just getting started in the sale of usable steel, we naturally were only able to buy a small quantity at that time. By the time we were in a position to reorder, the mills adopted a system of allocations, using the years 1939 and 1940 as base years, and apportioning their customers steel on that basis. That left us out of the picture, as we did not handle any steel during those years.

I made several efforts by mail, phone, and personal visits to Inland, Carnegie, and Bethlehem Steel Co.'s, and others, but have been unable to purchase anything from any of them. Our only sources of supply have been other warehouses, and in some instances free-lance brokers, and, as a result, we have paid more for the steel than we would have had to were we able to purchase direct from the mill. Naturally, we have had to charge more than the normal warehouse price when we resold this steel.

I believe that the mills in refusing to sell us steel direct have discriminated against us and have been indirectly responsible for making it necessary for the veteran to pay more than he should have for the I-beam or other steel he needed to build his house. The blacksmith who needed steel to repair farm equipment, the small factory that manufactured farm equipment, and numerous others who needed steel in small quantities and who normally turn to a source like us for their needs had to pay more than they should have.

While I realize that there is a shortage of steel, I feel that, since we were able to get it in roundabout ways, it should have been possible for us to get some steel directly from one or more of the mills I contacted in the last 4 years. Our customers for the most part are contractors, blacksmiths, small factories, and generally people who need small quantities of steel for essential purposes. We are in a position to use from 500 to 1,000 tons per month, and if we were able to obtain the steel from the mills I believe it would be of great benefit to the people we deal with, and in some measure would help the economy of the country.

I would thank you to call Senator-elect HUMPHREY's attention to this letter, and perhaps something can be done to eliminate the discriminatory practice of the mills.

Yours very truly,

J. G. MEYERS.

Mr. President, in my opinion, that letter accurately and fairly depicts the situation. It is exactly the kind of thing that has been brought to my attention by a small steel user in Bradenton, Fla. What is said here about farm implements was brought to my attention by Mr. George Morrow, of Graceville, Fla., telling me about the high gray-market prices, which in substance are the black-market prices, they had to pay to get farm machinery and the steel for farm purposes.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. I take it from what my distinguished friend says that he is very much concerned about the opportunity of small steel users to get steel.

Mr. PEPPER. I certainly am.

Mr. BALDWIN. If that be so, I press the same question I have asked before. When we were debating this subject in December 1947, the former distinguished Senator from Kentucky, who was then minority leader, offered an amendment which would have provided for compulsory controls. If my friend from Florida feels as strongly about it as he does, why does he not offer a similar amendment? Why is it that his party comes forward, not with an amendment calling for compulsory controls, but with one merely asking for continuation of an act already on the books, passed by a Republican Congress? If he feels so strongly as he does, if he believes in compulsory controls, let him offer the amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. I may say to the Senator he must realize, when he views this matter in perspective, that we had a rather effective allocation and price-control system in this country until mid-1946. In mid-1946, with Republican Senators voting almost solidly—and I regret to say, a few Democrats on this side of the aisle joining with them, but only a minority of the Democratic Party membership in Senate and in House—the control system was destroyed. In a little while it had to be eliminated entirely. That is when we had an effective and fair compulsory rationing and allocation system. The President of the United States vetoed the bill, which was designed to destroy those effective and fair rationing, allocation, and price-control provisions. Later on, the President made numerous recommendations for restoration of a compulsory control, allocation, and price system. They were all refused and denied by the Congress, and I may say, solidly, by the Republican membership of both Houses. Later on, when it appeared that that was the only thing he had any possible hope of getting, the President recommended stand-by controls, after the amendment of the then Senator from Kentucky, our present able Vice President, had been defeated. I, of course, voted for the amendment. I am afraid the Senator from Connecticut did not. His colleagues did not, but I certainly voted for it, and most of my colleagues on this side of the aisle voted for it; but it was defeated. The amendment of the Senator from Kentucky was defeated, and the Republican majority adopted the voluntary allocation system.

Now, the President comes back to the Congress. He recommends two things—first, that he have stand-by authority which could be used in case of necessity. I hope the Republicans are going to support us Democrats in voting to give the President such authority. The President also sees the shortage of steel in the country, to which this writer has referred, which had been a matter of common knowledge. The President says we must have greater steel production facilities if the economy of America and the world is not to suffer. We are required to limit the amount of steel exports, of course, because of the limited steel production here at home. So he says: "Give me stand-by authority, and give me the authority to bring about, through Government aid if necessary, the production of more steel by providing additional production facilities."

Then we come to this day, when the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, having before it the same evidence that our Republican friends have been able to observe and to hear, recommends a 6 months' extension of the voluntary provision which is now in effect in the law. But the Republicans say "No; we are not satisfied with a 6 months' extension, and giving the Government time and opportunity to study the proposal for new facilities, or to see, in the light of conditions 6 months hence, what may be necessary." They want to say, "No; we will do nothing for 12 months. We will let the Government do nothing for 12 months along the line of providing the steel which is necessary, and assuring its fair distribution to the people of this country." So today, as I say, we come back to a simple issue: Do you favor this voluntary system for 6 months, with the Government having an opportunity in the meantime to determine what our policy should be thereafter, or are you willing to put the cloak of immunity around the subject for a guaranteed minimum of 12 months, and de-

prive the Government of the opportunity to review the policy, unless the law is set aside in a shorter period than that? So it seems to me the issue is very clearly drawn on the immediate question of what we should do. At the end of 6 months, it will be determined by circumstances as they exist at that time.

Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. CAIN, and Mr. LANGER addressed the Chair.

Mr. PEPPER. I yield first to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I merely want to call attention to the vote on the passage of the measure to which reference has been made. There has been much talk about the amendment offered by the then Senator from Kentucky. On final passage of the bill, the vote was 77 to 10. I do not see how any side can claim all the credit for this one section of the bill which was passed. The amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky was defeated by two votes.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I am sure the Senator from Florida is familiar with what has happened because of the fact that the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky was not adopted. Today there are 23,000 miles of REA posts, for which steel cannot be obtained for use in the conductors. There are 23,000 farmers, therefore, who are unable to get power. That is only a small fraction of the number, because posts have been set for thousands of miles, and it is impossible to obtain the wire conductors.

Again, if one goes into a farming community like Minnesota and tries to buy a combine, he will find that a second-hand one costs $5,500. Every crook and grafter in the country has enriched himself by being a parasite on the farmers in the Great Plains States who had crops they had to harvest. They were unable to buy new combines. I myself telephoned to the heads of every manufacturing company engaged in the production and sale of combines or farm machines. In the little county of Hettinger, N. Dak., according to the sworn testimony of the county agent, the farmers lost more than $1,000,000 on crops, because they could not obtain repairs for the old binders and combines they had—$1,000,000 in one county.

Again, when it comes to well tubing, there is an institution that needs well tubing. The institution is connected with a veteran's home and with trailer camps. It took me over 3 weeks, with all the support I got from the War Assets Administration, to locate tubing for even a quarter of a mile.

Compare the prices of farm machinery with the prices the farmers are getting today for their products. On page 2 of the report it is stated that the President delegated his authority under section 2, of the law enacted by the Eightieth Congress, to the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Commerce. How did the farmers fare? Let us take hogs. What happened to the price of hogs? The high during last year was $31.75 a hundred. A week ago, it was $20.50. Now it is less. Steers were $39. Two weeks ago they were $28.25. Heifers dropped from $35.50 to $25.50—$10. The price of cows dropped from $24.75 to $19. The price of oats dropped from $1.39½ to 65½ cents.

Mr. MAYBANK. What about the price of steel?

Mr. LANGER. I do not have the figures for steel. I think the price increased, as a matter of fact.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the Senator is showing how farm prices have suffered. In the last half of last year United States Steel made as much profit as it made in the whole previous year.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Let us consider the price of eggs. The price dropped from 33 cents to 23 cents. The price of butter, in Chicago, dropped from 88¾ cents to 57½ cents. The price of apples dropped from $3.83 to $1.12.

That is the situation which has developed so far as agriculture is concerned.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not true that the price of fats and oils has gone down by a very large percentage?

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. President, in the Middle West it is not possible to buy automobiles promptly. They are sold with one hand under the counter, trying to get a few hundred dollars more.

As a Republican on this side of the aisle, I simply want to say that I agreed with the position taken by the Senator from Kentucky at the time his amendment was offered, so far as the farmers are concerned.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, much has been said regarding this so-called Republican measure. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] a few minutes ago rather took the majority of the Banking and Currency Committee to task for bringing forth a measure which seeks to extend only one provision of the law. I believe it might be well for us to consider why the committee has done that particular thing.

First, Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that this so-called Republican law was, as the able chairman of the committee has pointed out, passed by the vote of every Democrat with the exception of eight. Two Republicans voted against the bill, and eight Democrats voted against it. In other words, it passed with almost the unanimous support of this body, in spite of the fact that it contained a provision relating to the antitrust laws to which many Members were conscientiously opposed.

There were given to the President three powers which expire on a particular date. Section 2 expires on February 28, 1949; section 3 expires on that date; and section 4 expires on that date. Those are the only three provisions which have an expiration date.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the Senator a question. Did not he and the other members of the committee believe that we should first take up those provisions which expired in February and March before going into the consideration of new legislation?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is exactly correct. In accord with the suggestion of the chairman of the committee, I personally spoke to Secretary Brannan who, as I understood, would handle this legislation before the respective committees, and suggested to him that instead of waiting to bring all these measures forward in one package, we should act early on the particular measures which had an early expiration date. Of the two measures which came to us—and, as I recall, they both came at the same time—one related to voluntary allocations of scarce materials, and the other to export controls. We first took up the matter of voluntary allocations. There was a reason for considering that matter first. As I pointed out a few minutes ago, that power expires on February 28 of this year. Unless there is an early extension, the whole effectiveness of the program will be lost for a certain period of time. It requires about 60 days to work out one of these voluntary agreements, because certain notices are required and certain invitations are sent to members to come in and participate. A committee has to be established and notice given to the public in order that anyone who may be interested may appear and be heard.

If Senators will read the hearings before our committee it will be seen that the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Sawyer, very pointedly said that if we are to avoid a delay, this extension must be made quickly.

That is the reason for our acting first on this particular measure. Other measures will be before the Senate before very long. The question of allocations of transportation facilities for grain will come up very shortly before our committee, and in ample time a bill will be reported to the Senate relating to that particular subject.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. As I understand, the first step of the President's program is to continue in force section 2 of a measure passed by a Republican-controlled Congress. The second step, as I understand, in the anti-inflation program is to continue in effect another section of a bill passed by a Republican-controlled Congress. Is that correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I do not say it is offered in such a sequence as the Senator suggests. I just finished stating that different members of the Banking and Currency Committee asked that this legislation be in a form in which it could be acted on quickly. Particularly we were interested in the voluntary-agreement legislation because of the 60-day period which is necessary to put any agreement into effect and make it operative.

If the Senator will allow me, I do not want to rest only on that statement; I should like to go on, because I think I know the next question which the Senator will ask is whether we could not extend it just as quickly for a longer period of time.

There are reasons why this stop-gap legislation is desirable at this particular time. I shall mention one. There are many things which have not yet been fully studied and cannot be fully studied by our committee and given the thorough consideration they should have, in order to have legislation perfected and passed before February 28. Even if that were done, there would be a 60-day drag, which I mentioned a few minutes ago.

For instance, on January 19 the Secretary of Commerce, I believe it was, issued a press release regarding the misuse of some steel which had been allocated under one of these voluntary agreements. He has referred that matter to the Attorney General. It is not yet known whether or not the party charged can be prosecuted under the law as it exists today for a very definite infringement of what was intended under such a voluntary agreement as that which has been approved by the Attorney General's office.

It was stated a few minutes ago that the Secretary of Agriculture has not yet given his opinion as to how the act has worked with reference to the farmers; that the Secretary of the Interior has not yet told us how it has worked with reference to many of the metals, minerals, and scarce materials, basic materials—our natural resources. In other words, we have not been able, and we will not be able before February 28, to give to this law the kind of careful study it should have before we take a step toward continuing it to some far distant future date.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. In regard to the extension of the particular section under discussion, section 2, granting that there are in contemplation all the plans he mentions to propose further legislation, what harm would come if the law were extended for a year? The other legislation could still be offered. The limitation date suggested by the bill would end the program when Congress presumably would not be in session. The limitation which the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio places on the program would make it expire when the Congress was in session.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me answer briefly, and then I shall yield.

We certainly do not plan to wait until Congress has adjourned and will have to be called back into special session, as was the case with the Eightieth Congress. We plan to act before the present session of Congress adjourns.

The Senator asked me why we should not do what is proposed by the Senator from Ohio. I might ask in the same language, why not do what the committee has suggested, and when the permanent program, or the regular program, comes before us, if that is not satisfactory to the Senator from Connecticut, then he can propose an extension to suit his wishes at that time.

I now yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I have been asking myself the very question which the able Senator from Connecticut has just asked the Senator from Alabama, and I have resolved by own thoughts in support of the committee's position, for the reason that if we extend the program through to March 1950, and then find that the extension has been too long, and we desire to p... some other legislation, we will be in the position of having told the steel industry, for example, that up until March of next year this will be the plan upon which they can proceed to do business, whereas if we extend it only until September of this year, we have then the option of extending it still further if we think that is the desirable thing to do, or writing substitute legislation prior to September 1949, in either of which events we will not have told the industry it can proceed for a definite length of time, and then change the rules before that length of time has passed. So, in answering that question for myself, in complete sympathy with the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio, I have found that I cannot support it because to do so and then vote for legislation which would take effect prior to March 1950 would be the equivalent of changing the rules after the steel industry had proceeded to act upon the basis first presented. Therefore, for that reason, it seems to me that as between the two alternatives, the safer policy and the fairer way in which to treat the subject would be to give industry a definite date when they can act in complete confidence that the rules will be thus and so, and subsequently to extend the time for six more months if that should be found to be desirable, or to curtail it beginning September 1949 rather than to take the other alternative, of extending the time for a full year, and then make a new policy before the full year has run out. I think for that reason the committee date is the preferable of the two proposed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I am certainly indebted to the able Senator from Maryland for what I consider to be an absolutely correct analysis of the situation.

Furthermore, suppose we extend the time to some date beyond September of the year 1949, and agreements are drawn up looking to that date, and those agreements, according to the provisions of the law, are approved by the Attorney General of the United States in the face of the antitrust laws; and suppose further that we find, or the Attorney General finds, that a party could not be prosecuted under one of those agreements; then we would have hanging over our heads every one of the commitments which had been entered into, and they would be fast commitments until March 30, 1950.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator by illustration has supported the exact point I raised, that Congress should not place itself in a position where it purports to tell business it can proceed under one set of rules, and then, if it desires to change the rules, and actually does change them, puts business in the position of having made commitments for the future which are canceled automatically by a change of the legislation fixing a date prior to the first date the Congress fixed.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. In a moment. I do not care to get into a legal argument with the Senator from Maryland, with whom I am in agreement, but it seems to me we might find ourselves even more embarrassed than as he states it, because I am of the opinion that the agreements which are made will become commitments, will become obligations, contracts will be made under them which we cannot cancel, and they will become binding in the face of the antitrust statutes which we waive by this so-called Republican measure.

By the way, Mr. President, in that connection, I am delighted to see the Senator from Connecticut deriving so much pleasure out of one Republican measure that did work. I hope he will get full pleasure out of it. It is the first one that came out of the Eightieth Congress, I have yet heard of that he or anyone else on the other side, or anywhere in the country, could boast of, even though it was passed with almost the unanimous support of the Democrats in the Senate.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more observation? If so, I will not interrupt him again.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. If we make September 30, 1949, the termination date to which these voluntary agreements may run, and then desire to extend the time for six more months, we can do so, and thereby adopt what the so-called Republican measure purports to have done. On the other hand, if we extend it until March 1950 and find that we desire to contract it to a date within that period, we run into the very situation which the Senator from Alabama is discussing, namely, of having told business it can proceed under one set of rules and having business proceed on that expectancy, and then before the expectancy has terminated, have Congress say, "Notwithstanding you have made contracts and agreements upon the theory that you had a year to go, we are going to give you only 6 months," and thereby in the courts and in other places where controversies are discussed and settled bring into question our authority to curtail the time because contracts were made in good faith.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator from Maryland. By the way, there is another thing to keep in mind, too. In extending this stopgap legislation, as is proposed, for a period of 6 months, we are in effect bringing the cut-off date and the effective date to the same time. In other words, it is just a halfway extension, after all, because under the law as

it now exists these agreements can be entered into up to February 28, but deliveries may continue to be made under them until September 30, 1949, or during a 6-month period, so that what we are really doing is to bring the two dates together.

Mr. President, I said something a moment ago about the pleasure some of the distinguished Members across the aisle are deriving from the fact that a Democratic Senate now is asking for a continuation of a Republican measure, and there has been much said here about how well this measure has worked. I agree that so far as it has gone it has worked well. But how far has it gone? Only a very small number of agreements have been entered into, most of them dealing with steel and steel products.

It has been said here that small business has indicated its complete satisfaction. I do not want to be understood as agreeing to any such statement as that. As a matter of fact, we had two representatives of small business before our committee. We had one other witness from Arkansas who really presented the case of the failure of the agreement to provide pipe to enable the opening of the Jones Mill aluminum plant, designed to produce aluminum, which is certainly in critical shortage in this country, and he said the plan had not worked in that instance.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I placed in the RECORD the protest I had received from some small-business men in my State. It had to do with one of the things the able Senator from North Dakota mentioned, soil pipe, which is absolutely essential for any housing program that may be undertaken. I do not know whether it is generally known, but the great center of the soil-pipe industry of the United States, and in fact the greatest in all the world, is located in my State, in the Birmingham-Gadsden-Anniston-Tuscaloosa area. Sixty-eight percent of all the soil pipe produced in the United States is made there. So I believe I know something of what has been happening with respect to the soil-pipe manufacturers in connection with iron and steel.

Reference has been made at different times to one or two individual plants. Mr. President, I want to say that it has not been a small matter with me. Complaints have come in from small-business men engaged in the manufacture of soil pipe. I placed in the RECORD a short quotation from one of the letters I had received, in which the writer stated that the voluntary agreement, so far as he was concerned, simply would not work and that was all there was to it. I remember he came to my office and talked with me personally after he had attended the industry committee meeting here, and he told me the agreement was not going to work. I asked him why. He said, "The Big Steel boys first say how much we are going to receive. Then we are supposed to form a committee to see how that is to be divided among ourselves, and of course that committee will be made up of the large users, the regular customers of the big steel companies, and they are going to receive just what they have been receiving."

I submit, Mr. President, that the record in this case shows that very largely that prediction came true. For instance, a soil-pipe manufacturer in my State wrote me that, whereas some of the big producers of soil pipe were able to buy pig iron in the Birmingham area at $36 a ton, he could not buy it there. The allocation program was not helping him to obtain $36-a-ton pig iron. He was obliged to buy pig iron from Texas, and pay $75 a ton for it. Yet he had to go on the market and compete with the manufacturers or with the syndicate the members of which were able to buy their pig iron at $36 a ton. I have received many complaints on the subject.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] referred to the fact that many manufacturers in his State used steel and steel products, but that he had received no complaints with respect to the shortage of steel. I want to tell of a friend of mine in Birmingham who called me on the telephone not long ago, and said, "I am simply being starved out of business. I cannot obtain iron." He told me a story. I said, "I wish you would write me a letter to that effect. What you have told me are facts which I should like to see referred to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, to the Small Business Committee, and to the Committee on Banking and Currency. I should like to make some use of this matter." He said, "Oh, no. I am not going to write you a letter. I do not dare do that. If I wrote you a letter and it got out I would not even receive the small amount of steel I am now receiving."

I was interested in the extension of a natural gas pipe line in my area of the State.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I should like to read a statement made by the administrator in charge of the program, as it appears on page 9 of the hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency on January 25, 1949. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] asked the question:

> Here is an elementary question:
>
> Once a firm has made its request known, does it automatically share in the allocation?
>
> Mr. CLARK. If it has made its request known, it does share, providing it qualifies in terms of the product required and the type of end product which is being produced. If they qualify, they are then taken care of.

I recall to the Senator's mind the testimony of Secretary Sawyer as it appears on page 6 of the record, wherein he mentioned cast iron pipe radiation, plumbing-drainage products, and cast-iron soil pipe particularly, which is manufactured largely in the Senator's State, and he said there were 40 participating firms, of whom 35 qualified as small business. That may not encompass the industry, but certainly it would seem that the small business in the soil-pipe industry has been taken into consideration, and sits as a part of the committee which makes the allocation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Sawyer said that they had the privilege of participating, and that a great many small businesses had participated. However, if anyone wants to see the extent to which small business has participated, I simply refer him to a table on page 48 of the hearings, and suggest that he compare the number of small businesses given there to the number of small businesses throughout the United States.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. No problem with which I have been confronted in the past year has caused as much work, worry, and concern as the shortage of steel to the small-business man. I honestly believe that if it had not been for the Small Business Committee functioning in Congress the small-business man would have had a greater problem than he actually did have. The Small Business Committee did a splendid job, as I observed it, in policing the affairs of the big steel companies to see that small business was given a certain amount of steel in every monthly allocation.

I do not care to hold a post mortem over yesterday. What I am concerned about is this: Do the facts, as the committee now finds them, show that the future will be brighter and that there will be more steel for the small-business men, or is there a necessity at this time actually to put into effect positive, rigid control? That is the question I think we are all wrestling with. Is it necessary to fix positive controls? If it is, we should be moving in that direction. If it is not, then surely we should extend the time through the interim, or the fall months, when we expect Congress to be in recess, into the next year when Congress will be back in session. In that view of the case, then an extension for a period of a year would be more reasonable than an extension for 6 months. So the whole question is: If we are going to have ample steel then we might as well extend the voluntary agreement provision for a year. If we are not, then we might as well talk about regimentation and doing something about it, rather than merely converse about it.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield for one question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. I take it from what my distinguished friend, the Senator from Alabama, has said, that he considers the situation to be still critical and grave?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does the Senator refer to the shortage of steel?

Mr. BALDWIN. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I consider the situation critical and grave. I may call the attention of the Senator to the fact that Mr. Sawyer, in response to a question I put to him, said that he anticipated the shortage for 1949 would be 7,000,000 tons.

Mr. BALDWIN. If that is the case, I should like to recall to my friend's mind that when we were debating the subject in December 1947, an amendment was offered to section 2 of the bill, the extension of whose provisions we are discussing by the then minority leader the distinguished Senator from Kentucky,

Mr. BARKLEY, providing for a system of compulsory controls. That amendment is still in existence somewhere. My question is this: If my friends on the other side of the aisle feel that this is so urgent, and requires immediate attention, why do they not bring forward that amendment and let us have an issue on the question of compulsory controls now? Why postpone it? Why delay? Why not have a show-down now? The people of the country were given to understand that if control over the Congress were placed in Democratic hands, the matter of prices would be disposed of in short order. We have been in session for four weeks, and the first measure which comes before us to deal with the question of prices is the continuance of a Republican measure. Now my friend tells me that the next measure to come before us is to call for the continuance of another Republican measure. I ask my friend, if he is so disturbed about this thing, why he does not offer as an amendment the amendment which was offered a year and a half ago? It was most earnestly urged at that time that that amendment was the type of legislation needed to deal with this situation. Why does not my friend offer such an amendment?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am very glad my friend the Senator from Connecticut asked that question. I am also glad to have the question of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]. I believe that the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota are quite pertinent to the discussion we are having. There is a shortage of steel——

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. May I finish answering the question?

Mr. BRICKER. I merely wished to verify some figures.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Having to do with the tonnage of the shortage?

Mr. BRICKER. Yes. The Secretary of Commerce did say that, according to his best estimates, there was a shortage of 7,000,000 tons, including our European shipments, upon a production basis of 68,000,000 tons this year of finished products. That was based upon a production of steel ingots estimated at 92,000,000 tons. The production in January, if carried throughout the year, would give us 97,000,000 tons of steel ingots, which would raise the production of finished products to approximately 72,000,000 or 73,000,000 tons, an increase over the estimate by the Secretary of Commerce. Likewise, production in Europe is going up rapidly. Production in Germany, France, Belgium, and England is increasing, so there will be a more adequate supply there, which might cut down the amount estimated for export, of 4,200,000 tons, which would, of course, narrow the difference between supply and demand in this country. As the best proof of that, in 1947 foreign shipments were, as I recall, 6,600,000 tons. Last year they were 4,600,000 tons, and the estimate for this year is 4,200,000 tons. If our production of ingots remains where it was this month, there will not be a difference of 7,000,000 tons, but it will be appreciably smaller than that. Frankly, on the basis of the estimate and the production capacity, I believe that if there is no interruption by strikes or in the supply of some of the component parts, there will be almost an adequate supply of steel by the end of this year, if not quite an adequate supply to take care of the domestic and foreign needs.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Ohio for his suggestions. I certainly hope that his hope may be realized. I know of nothing that would be better for the economy of the country than for that to come to pass. However, I know that the Senator from Ohio would be one of the first to realize that the statement he has just made had six or eight different contingencies in it. It is one of the "iffiest" statements I have ever heard. I think it may very well serve as an answer to the question propounded by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]. We do not know whether rigid controls are going to be necessary. A year ago last December I supported the amendment for rigid controls, and I have no apology for having supported the amendment. I still believe that had that amendment been written into law we would have been much better off from the standpoint of manufacture of steel and steel products, and all the various products of which steel is the basic material.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I have listened nearly all afternoon to the debate upon this subject, and especially the questions which have been repeated over and over by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN]. At least five distinct times he has asked why some Senator does not offer the amendment which was offered by the distinguished Vice President when he was a Senator, 2 years ago. He has claimed all the credit for the measure which was enacted by the Republican-controlled Congress.

At this point I think it is well to remind the Senate that the only way the Republicans got back into session in 1947 was that the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, called Congress back into extraordinary session to do something about inflation after the Republicans had adjourned the Congress. It was through the efforts of the President that any legislation whatever was enacted having anything to do with the problem of inflation. I mention that in passing.

I agree with the Senator from Alabama that if the Senator from Connecticut can get any enjoyment out of this legislation he is welcome to it. Instead of criticizing and condemning us for trying to continue it for 6 months, he ought to be commending us and thanking us for going along with such a wonderful piece of legislation enacted by the Eightieth Congress, which was Republican-controlled.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may say a word in response?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to my friend from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. Let me point out to my distinguished friend that I am enjoying this discussion, because, as I stated in my previous remarks, I am not only surprised but I am astounded that after 2 years of debate on what the Democrats would do to combat high prices if they once got in control of the Congress the very first step is to continue in force and effect a Republican measure, and their second step is going to be to continue in force and effect another one.

If this problem is so urgent, why do we not have the legislation which we were led to believe we were going to have? Apparently we do not have it because what the Republicans did is working. That is demonstrated by the fact that the Democrats now ask to have it continued. It is demonstrated by the fact that the heads of the agencies downtown say that it is adequate and is working. I do not believe that we ought to allow this occasion to pass without taking some note of that fact.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me say in response to my friend from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] that I have never seen anyone really excited or astounded who was also happy. The Senator from Connecticut may be happy about this measure, but he has also been astounded all afternoon by the fact that we dared bring in a proposal to continue something which the Republican-controlled Congress adopted 2 years ago. The only reason Republicans adopted any sort of an anti-inflation measure was, as I previously stated, that the President of the United States, Hon. Harry S. Truman, called the Congress back into session at that time and prodded it into action upon the serious question of inflation. It did nothing until the latter part of December of 1947, and then only in self-defense.

The Republicans took all the time they wanted in order to bring forth these few little popgun anti-inflation measures.

Now, because the President of the United States wants a little time, working with the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, and other agencies of the executive branch of Government who are vitally concerned with economic stabilization, we find this political criticism on the opposite side of the aisle. We are criticized because we do not rush in and do this, that, or the other thing. So far as the Senator from Illinois is concerned, if I can only get my brethren on this side of the aisle to go along with me, we will control the date for the enactment of legislation instead of letting the Republicans do it.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President——

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, let me say a few words in my own time, and then I shall be glad to yield again. Particularly do I wish to yield to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], who has been on his feet for some time.

Before we get too far away, I should like to correct the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] in connection with one statement which he made, in fact, in connection with several statements.

I admit that the measure which we are considering today was passed by the Republican-controlled Congress as a substitute for the anti-inflation program recommended by the President, and advocated in legislation introduced by the then able minority leader, who is now Vice President. But when the Senator from Connecticut talks about export controls being Republican legislation, I should like to call his attention to the fact that that legislation has been on the statute books since 1940, and all the Republican Congress did was simply to extend it. When it comes to the question of the allocation of transportation facilities for grain, I should like to call his attention to the fact that that was provided for in the War Powers Act of 1942. So I do not know but that perhaps he has been getting a little too much pleasure out of what we Democrats propose to do with this so-called Republican measure.

I say again that I am glad we did find a little good in one measure they presented. I do not agree with him when he says it was adequate. It was not adequate; it has not been adequate. It has accomplished some good, and I hope that when we have had an opportunity to study this measure in the light of testimony that will be given to our committee by the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, and—do not forget—the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Commerce, we may be able to continue a voluntary system of allocations that will be workable. I am not saying that I believe we shall be able to do so. In 1947 I supported the amendment for compulsory allocations, and I think we could have done an adequate job under it. I do not think we have done an adequate job under the present law; but it may be that we can stop up enough loopholes to make it adequate, so that rigid controls will not be necessary. But today as a committee we are not in position to recommend to the Senate that that be done.

I should like to call the attention of the able Senator from Minnesota to the fact that recently it was discovered that one iron fabricator was obtaining iron for use in the manufacture of warm-air heaters, but, instead, was using it for the manufacture of shoeshine stands. That question has been submitted to the Attorney General. We are not at all certain that this Republican measure of 1947 will permit the Attorney General to proceed against that man. Certainly if we can stop up loopholes such as that—and we do not know how many more there will be—we can increase the amount of iron that can be allocated to the processors and the fabricators all over the United States. It may be that we can work out a system whereby we can obtain assurance that the 26,000 miles of rural electrification lines can be supplied with the necessary conductors, so that 100,000 or more farm homes can be supplied with electricity. It may be that we can stop up enough loopholes to make the law workable. If we can, I assure the Senate that the Banking and Currency Committee will be glad to return with a recommendation that it be continued, not only for 1 year, but for 2 years. The Secretary of Commerce indicated in his testimony that that is what he was talking about.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I followed the statement of the Senator from Alabama with respect to what the other side hopes to accomplish in the way of providing more steel for more purposes for more people. However, I cannot understand how the extension of the voluntary agreements act for an additional 6 months beyond September could prejudice that program in the slightest. Will the Senator please address himself to that question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I spent perhaps 10 minutes or more in talking about that matter some little time ago. There was an exchange of suggestions between the able Senator from Maryland and myself with reference to it. Perhaps the Senator from Oregon was unfortunately detained from the floor of the Senate at that time.

However, with the indulgence of the other Senators, I do not mind restating very briefly what was said at that time. Under the law as it now stands, the power to enter into these agreements expires February 28. However, there is a 6-month extension within which the agreements made may be effective.

All we are doing in this bill is to bring the first date up to the latter date, so that the whole thing would be extended to September 30, 1949.

Mr. CORDON. I understand that perfectly. But what happens within another 6 months?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I hope the Senator will keep in mind the fact that a part of this law is a waiver of the Antitrust Act with reference to these particular agreements. Suppose we extend the law to March 30, 1949, and suppose voluntary agreements are made before there is any change in the law, and assume that later a change is made. To my way of thinking—and I believe the Senator from Oregon will agree with me—every one of those agreements, voluntarily entered into, and approved by the Attorney General of the United States, would become a commitment. The Antitrust Act would be waived so far as those particular agreements were concerned.

Later on, after we have made the thorough study and have listened to the Attorney General and the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, and have taken their recommendations, even though we may decide that we want to stop up some of the loopholes, any proposals of that sort cannot be applied to the agreements which have been entered into prior to the enactment of the subsequent measure.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Does the Senator know of any provision in the present law which requires the President to extend these agreements beyond any time which his pleasure and judgment dictate should be their limit? Let me call the attention of the Senator for a moment to the law itself. I am reading from page 3, section 2, subparagraph (b) of the original law:

> The President is authorized to approve any such agreement which he finds will carry out any of the purposes declared in section 1 of this joint resolution, except that he shall not approve any agreement unless such agreement specifically provides that it shall cease to be effective on or before March 1, 1949.

Does the Senator agree that that is authority for the President to make an agreement for the full period or one-half of the period or any other fraction of the period which in his judgment is proper?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I say to the Senator that that question has been submitted to the Attorney General of the United States.

Mr. CORDON. Does not the Senator understand the plain language?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Attorney General has held that whereas no agreement could be entered into subsequent to February 28, 1949, nevertheless, once the agreement is made, deliveries could continue to be made under that agreement for 6 months.

Mr. CORDON. The bill now before the Senate, as amended, contains an amendment to the provision in the original act, and it is to be found at the bottom of the single sheet, which is Senate bill 547. That proposed amendment is:

> (f) This section shall expire on September 30, 1949, and any requests made and voluntary plans adopted under this section shall have no force or effect thereafter.

The plain purpose of that is to require that the execution of all agreements be within the period of the maximum limitation, which here is set in September, and which some on this side prefer to extend until next March. If that be the case, is it not the Senator's opinion of this plain language that the President might well develop and properly make agreements to extend say from this or any immediate period to, let us say, the last of May, the last of June, or the first of July, the end of the year, or any other period, and thus maintain within himself the power not only to use any standby control which he may get, if he gets it, but also the power to make these agreements, which power will lapse at the time set in this amendment, or on the 1st of March, whichever date is taken? Would it not be better for the country if the President were given the power to use his judgment under, mind you, Mr. President, the approval of the Attorney General as to the wisdom and legality of his action, and let that power continue so that he may get voluntary agreements, if he can, with his reserved right, if he gets it, to use the whip?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I may say to the honorable Senator from Oregon, I think I was in error a few moments ago in saying that the Attorney General had given an official opinion to the effect that deliveries could be made until September 30, 1949, but it is my understanding that that is the opinion of the officials who are administering the act, and that the matter has been submitted to the Attorney General. But let me call the attention of the Senator from Oregon to the

fact that on August 18, 1948, a letter went to Secretary Sawyer from the acting majority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], in which he stated his interpretation of the law. At that time, the Senator from Nebraska was chairman, if I remember correctly, of the Special Senate Committee To Study Problems of American Small Business, and he was writing in that capacity. He of course, as the able Senator knows, is now minority leader. He wrote to Secretary Sawyer, stating that his interpretation of the law had been checked with the Banking and Currency Committee—which, by the way, was under the control of the Republican majority and which had on it three members of the Small Business Committee—and his interpretation was that agreements made prior to March 1, 1949, could continue in existence for 6 months thereafter. He further stated, at the same time, that the Attorney General agreed with his view.

Secretary Sawyer, in reply to the Senator from Nebraska and the Small Business Committee, and the Republican Congress, said that he would abide by the interpretation, and would proceed on the assumption that agreements made prior to March 1, 1949, would continue to be in effect for 6 months thereafter, in accordance with the suggestion that came down to him from the Republican leadership of the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Very briefly. I want to conclude.

Mr. CORDON. I regret that I have taken so much of the Senator's time. I am deeply appreciative.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am not complaining. I merely said I would like to yield briefly, because I do not want to prolong my own remarks.

Mr. CORDON. I assure the Senator that with the few remarks I have made I shall not interrupt him further. I am deeply appreciative of the Senator's courtesy.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I have no desire to prolong the discussion further. The one point I think we should keep in mind is that we, the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, considered the pending legislation and voted for it. As I recall, at the time the vote was taken, there were 10 members present, and the vote was 8 to 2. Eight Democrats to two Republicans voted to report the legislation favorably. We realized it was a stop-gap measure. We were not asking for anything else. All in the world we were asking was that the voluntary agreement law, accomplishing whatever good it was accomplishing, be continued until we had a chance to hear from other interested persons regarding it, and could make a recommendation as to whether it should be continued for a longer period of time; and, if so, with what amendments; or, if not, what substitute legislation should be offered.

Mr. LUCAS and Mr. BALDWIN addressed the Chair.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. LUCAS. Was there any testimony before the committee with respect to continuation of the emergency legislation beyond the 6 months' period?

Mr. SPARKMAN. There were a few questions, I think, put to Secretary Sawyer, which may be said to bear upon it, but no direct testimony. We did not go into that question at all.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, the question whether it should be continued for 6 months or a year arose at the conclusion of all the testimony, did it not?

Mr. SPARKMAN. And in executive session.

Mr. LUCAS. Those who are now seeking to continue it for 1 year failed to produce a single material witness before the committee in support of that being done?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Or even to cross-examine the witnesses who had come before the committee for the purpose of recommending the 6-month stopgap legislation.

Mr. LUCAS. Did they ever give an excuse as to why they did not produce witnesses before the committee or present evidence bearing upon the continuation for a year?

Mr. SPARKMAN. None whatever.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. I wish to correct the Senator's statement that the bill was ordered reported to the Senate by a vote of 8 to 2. After the amendment was defeated by a vote, as I recall, of 8 to 2, the bill was then ordered reported favorably by the unanimous vote of the committee.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct. I meant that the question of the extension of time was decided by a vote of 8 to 2. The committee was unanimous in favorably reporting the bill, which is before the Senate today.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the Senator from Connecticut asking the Senator from Alabama to yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. No. I request the floor in my own right.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I can see no harm in continuing the method of voluntary allocation, which apparently has worked so successfully, for a longer period than September 30. Of course, the reason which has been advanced by the proponents of the measure for continuing the law to September 30—and I may say I intend to vote for it—is that it is desired to continue in force and effect the present law until something better is found. Presumably, they think they can find something better. I say that in the face of the fact that all the testimony before the committee, even including the agencies downtown having charge of such matters, was to the effect that this had worked very successfully.

I assume that what may be proposed ultimately is a method whereby the President may impose some real controls. I submit that provision is already in the act, and I call the attention of the chairman of the committee, and the attention of my distinguished friend from Alabama, to section 6, which sets up a procedure whereby the President can secure from the Congress legislation providing for the control of any specific commodity which he may find to be in short supply. It may be, Mr. President, that while the Congress was under the control of a Republican majority, the President or the administration may have anticipated that such approval would not be forthcoming.

But that is not now the situation. Under the provisions of section 6, a President who was elected as a Democrat could come to a Congress controlled by a majority of Democrats in both Houses and lay before them his program to establish compulsory controls and, I assume, secure very prompt action on it.

When we read section 6 of this act, which was passed by a Republican-controlled Congress, along with a provision for the extension of voluntary controls, there is a complete program to deal with the question. I take it that all of us would prefer to see private business and individual enterprise do the job. Many of us think that when it fails to do the job it should be prodded into doing it. Some of us may think that if private enterprise fails to do the job the Government should step in and supplement its controls.

I submit that the act as it presently stands is admirably designed to do that very thing. So, if we were to continue it for a period of years instead of for six months, there is still in the act a provision whereby the President could ask for the enforcement of specific controls on particular items.

So, Mr. President, I think that in order to have a well-rounded program we could well adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio, continuing the provision for a year.

I close by saying, Mr. President, that I am happy indeed that the first step in the President's program to control inflation is the adoption and the continuance of a measure enacted by a Republican-controlled Congress more than a year ago.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the subject has been rather fully debated, but it may be that not sufficient attention has been paid to the legal effect of the law as it now exists and of the powers which would continue if the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio should be adopted and an extension of the act thereby made.

There seems to be some misunderstanding as to exactly what the act means. It would appear to the Senator from Oregon to be perfectly clear. Perhaps it is not. The authority granted to the President to negotiate agreements in the public interest with private industry in the field of allocations is an added power granted to the President which would be, except for this act, nonexistent, because it permits agreements which, except for this authority, would be in conflict with and prohibited by the antitrust laws. When the act was drawn the language was made very specific, in that no agreement could be made until the President, as the Chief Executive of the United States, should find it in the public interest, and then only after clearance from the Attorney General. If both those protections were thrown around the power granted, even a Republican majority in the Eightieth Congress was willing to trust a Democratic President of the United States with that power, which no Congress had ever permitted except in an emergency, in time of war.

When that power was granted to the President, it was not in the form of a command. It was a power which the President might or might not exercise. That would depend on whether it was found by him to be in the public interest. It was a power that he might exercise for a short time or for any length of time up to the maximum limit provided in the act.

There is no requirement in the act that agreements made by the Chief Executive must extend for the full maximum period. That is a matter which is discretionary with the President. If the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio prevails and this power is extended until the end of March of next year, there is no requirement that the President shall use it at all. He may make agreements for 1, 2, 3, 7, or any other number of months that he feels will best serve the public interest, provided only that the agreement does not go beyond the last day of March.

The arguments we hear that if this extension be granted to March 31 of next year, the President may be administering another act and that private industry will not know where it stands, to me is twaddle. There is no basis for it in the law as it exists or in the extension which is suggested. If we grant the President this additional power he will simply be in the most enviable position in which any president of a republic could ever wish to be. He will have the power to negotiate a voluntary agreement. He will have the power to carry out agreements for a long period of time if he shall deem it necessary, or make no agreement unless, in his judgment, it should be made. In any case in which he may make an agreement which is not carried out he would be justified in using any other power he might have. On the other hand, if after such extension there be given stand-by control, there is nothing in the stand-by control that would in any way apply to any private industry which was already operating voluntarily under agreement.

Mr. President, I can see no reason under the shining sun why this extension should not be made. I cannot understand why Senators on the other side of the aisle would not gladly accept the amendment. It is certainly in line with all the ideas and ideals of self-government.

The very thought of stand-by controls is predicated upon the basic proposition that such controls are not now needed, but that they should be available some time in the future if they shall be needed. Certainly if my friends on the other side of the aisle believe in that philosophy—and I believe in it—they should welcome the opportunity for the Chief Executive, who is also of their political faith, to have an opportunity to carry out this allocation on a voluntary basis, by voluntary agreement, rather than to establish all the intricate machinery necessary to force industry, as has been done in the sorry past.

There is no political aspect in this matter, so far as I am concerned. To me it would appear that my friends on the other side of the aisle should accept this amendment and be glad to do so. There can be no prejudice either to industry, the public, or the standing of the President in accepting this amendment for the period of time stated. On the other hand, Mr. President, if we do not extend it, what will happen? My friend from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], in his presentation a little while ago, said, in substance—I do not claim to quote him exactly—that we do not know that stand-by controls will be used or that it will be necessary to use them. I say to my friend from Alabama that if the bill passes according to the way in which it was reported on the floor, so that the voluntary-control provision expires on the 30th day of September of this year, all he will do is to guarantee that the controls must be put on under authority of that reserve stand-by power, because he will have taken from his own President the right to make such an agreement beyond the 30th day of September. Certainly it is not intended to do that. Certainly no one desires to set up all the intricate machinery of control and allocation if it be unnecessary.

There must be some other reason for this limitation as of September 30, when we realize that September 30 would represent the day in all the year upon which we could be almost morally certain that Congress would not be in session. If this act be continued only to September 30, we are taking a permissive authority from the President at a time when we cannot give it back to him. If we pass the bill but leave that date in the act, then we shall hear the argument made, "We must give the stand-by controls, or after the 30th day of September there will be no power of agreement and allocation." I hope, Mr. President, that that is not what is sought. That is not in the public interest.

There has been offered a sound and constructive amendment, to increase the period of time until the last of March of next year. That entire period of time can be utilized by the President, or not at all, as he sees fit. That time goes sufficiently far into the next session of the Congress to afford Congress an opportunity to determine whether the time for voluntary agreements should be extended even further. Any stand-by control that may be enacted can go side by side without any inconsistency whatever with that power, and we may, and I hope we will, find in that event that the record made of voluntary agreements, and the administration of those agreements, the keeping of those agreements by industry, will make unnecessary any execution or use of any control power which may be vested as a mandatory authority in the President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I question not in the slightest the excellent motives of the distinguished Senator from Ohio in offering his amendment, and I think I understand, from the able arguments made, that there are some reasons why such an amendment should be considered. But I think that the philosophy followed by the committee is a preferable one in this case, for a reason which I should like to state into the RECORD at this time.

Let me first, however, commend the committee for keeping this subject, in its report, on an entirely nonpolitical basis, and insofar as the junior Senator from Florida is concerned, his debate will be confined to such a basis.

I commend particularly the wording of the report, which I read into the RECORD now:

> The principal activities under this section, up to the present time, have been those carried on by the Office of Industry Cooperation of the Department of Commerce with respect to existing and proposed voluntary plans providing for the allocation of steel and pig iron to various programs of importance to the domestic economy, the national security, and the foreign policy of the United States. The committee finds that the existing voluntary plans have provided substantial benefits to the national interests.

There is no question there of depriving anyone of the credit, and I am glad that such is the approach.

The committee report continues, a little later:

> The committee is advised that a broader stabilization program will be submitted to the Congress in the near future and that this program will include provisions for the allocation of scarce materials for essential purposes. Pending consideration of this more comprehensive program, it is the recommendation of your committee that the authority for the present activities under section 2, Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, should be extended, in order that the benefits of this program to the domestic economy, the national security, and the foreign policy should not be lost.

There is no claim at all that there have not been benefits under the act which is now in force, but a well-considered statement, in my view of the facts, that since a much more comprehensive program for stabilization of industry, critical supplies, and so forth, is on the way and will be here shortly, final action on that particular measure should preclude any great extension, in terms of many months, of the present law. Hence the recommendation for the limited extension of 6 months.

Mr. President, before coming to my principal point, I wish again to commend the completely nonpolitical approach made by the committee, by unanimous vote, as I now understand, and I think that is a sound approach to make in matters which do vitally affect the national economy. I think that the recommendation is based on good, sound

grounds, good business reasons, when a longer extension than 6 months is not recommended, because of the announced fact that in the early future this committee is expecting a more comprehensive program, and will expect to pass upon a program, so as to fit in any new enactment with the rather limited extension which is proposed under the bill now under consideration.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Not for a moment, if the Senator please. I should like to complete my statement; then I shall be glad to yield.

I may say, Mr. President, that my own concern in regard to the pending measure arises because of some experience which I had about the time of the enactment of the present law, when serving on a subcommittee of the Small Business Committee of the Senate, and in trying to discover what was wrong with the steel industry. I call the attention of Senators to the fact that that subcommittee made a report, which appears in Senate Document 825, Eightieth Congress, which was agreed to by all members of the subcommittee. In other words, it was a nonpolitical report, in which the effort was to bring to the attention of the Senate and of the country the fact that certain things had caused grave concern to the members of the subcommittee in connection with steel. Some of the things I should like to quote out of the report for the RECORD at this time, if I may. First, from page 8 of the report I read this paragraph:

> In addition to some steel mills withdrawing their distribution from areas previously served and refusing to ship steel where it is needed, the subcommittee has investigated other evidences of disruption to normal channels of supply marked by growths in horizontal and vertical integrations in the steel-producing industry. There is no question but that smaller steel producers and users are being forced out of business and their facilities either scrapped or taken over by the larger integrated companies.

Then, continuing on the same subject, on pages 9 and 10 of the report, I quote again:

> Many complaints received by the subcommittee indicate that some of the integrated steel companies, which constitute the principal source of supply for crude, semifinished, and finished steel in this country, have refused to continue to supply old customers on the grounds that the steel is needed by the producer to take care of the requirements of his own wholly owned or controlled fabricating or manufacturing units.

I digress from the quotation simply to state that the committee was alarmed to find to what a degree the manufacturing companies had taken over the erectors and the fabricators, or had themselves organized competing erectors and fabricators, which were driving the little folks out of business.

I continue to read:

> The supply of basic materials to the smaller units of the steel industry is one of the vital points in the relations between the large integrated producers and the small business of the steel industry.

Then there are several other statements to like effect. Instead of reading them at this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD immediately following my present remarks all of that portion of the report of the subcommittee beginning with the heading "Integrated operations reduce supplies to independents" on page 9 and continuing down to but not including the heading "Exports of steel" on page 10.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTEGRATED OPERATIONS REDUCE SUPPLIES TO INDEPENDENTS

Many complaints received by the subcommittee indicate that some of the integrated steel companies, which constitute the principal source of supply for crude, semifinished, and finished steel in this country, have refused to continue to supply old customers on the grounds that the steel is needed by the producer to take care of the requirements of his own wholly owned or controlled fabricating or manufacturing units.

The supply of basic materials to the smaller units of the steel industry is one of the vital points in the relations between the large integrated producers and the small business of the steel industry.

Colonel Rockwell, of the Rockwell Manufacturing Co., in testimony referred to above, has outlined the logical consequences of the continued development of integration of steel-producing and manufacturing facilities. He speaks with the authority of an experienced and eminent industrialist, and his words quoted below should carry weight:

"It is obvious that, if the steel companies continue to enter into competition with their customers in the fabricating and in the steel-consuming manufacturing industries, we shall soon be competing with vertical trusts of the type which existed in Germany.

"When there is a slowing down of business, such steel companies will try to obtain business from the independent steel barrel manufacturers and other consumers [of steel]; but, when business is expanding rapidly, such customers will be faced with a refusal to supply steel at the very time when it is impossible to buy from other steel companies who are considerate enough to take care of their established customers.

"As far as we know, this is the first time in history that some steel companies have had a sustained demand, and, at the same time, have been in competition with their customers. They have, therefore, cut off some established customers in order to build up their own business in the steel-fabricating or steel-consuming manufacturing industries."

One of the first complaints laid before the subcommittee was that of an independent steel erector, the Karl Koch Erecting Co., of the Bronx, N. Y. (p. 1904, hearings). This company testified that they were unable to bid on the erection of Government hospitals in New York State because the steel bids tendered by the only bidders, Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corp. and Bethlehem Steel Corp., provided not only for the furnishing of the steel but its fabrication and erection as well. Under the limitations of the bidding form, the independent was unable to bid, due to the fact that he could not furnish the steel for the erection services he would perform. This method of bidding made a difference in the cost to the Government of $151,800 in the building of a veterans' hospital in Brooklyn, N. Y. (p. 1915, hearings.)

Mr. C. A. Johnson, general manager of sales, fabricated steel construction, Bethlehem Steel Corp., stated (p. 1931, hearings) in response to questioning by the subcommittee that his company would not bid on steel for these Government hospitals unless they could secure the complete job, which would include fabrication and erection. He also gave as his reason the need to keep the Bethlehem erection department busy.

As a result of these hearings, the subcommittee was able to secure for all the independent erectors a revision of the Government bid form which would enable them to bid on the separate services on Government construction, and require the integrated companies to bid, separately, on each service to be rendered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, as one member of that subcommittee, it was crystal clear to me that many of the small erectors and fabricators had actually been driven out of business already, and that the course of operations was designed to eliminate more and more of them from business. It was my fear that the legislation in December of 1947 was too weak to cope with that particular situation.

The junior Senator from Florida supported the motion made by the then senior Senator from Kentucky, Mr. Barkley, but, having failed in its adoption, he supported the bill, taking what he could to deal effectively with this problem.

But now, Mr. President and Senators, I am not satisfied that that particular acute problem in this field which relates to small business has been solved, and my reason is that during the time of operation of the current law I have had not one, but repeated complaints from small-business operators in my own State and elsewhere, because they have not been able to get their supplies of steel from the manufacturers, and because the manufacturers are sending those supplies in undue quantities, so these small people believe, to the fabricators and erectors who belong to the manufacturers. And, Mr. President, because of my having received a large number of complaints of that kind during the operation of this existing law, I am glad that the committee confines itself in its recommendations to a limited extension of 6 months and gives notice and warning that it proposes during that period of time to take up a more comprehensive program, and of course to make report and recommendation for the enactment of legislation in that more comprehensive program.

And here is something that makes me even more fearful that the present law is not meeting the situation. I quote from the printed report of the hearings of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the United States Senate on the subject of the bill to extend the voluntary controls agreement, on January 25, 1949. I quote from page 43 of those hearings. The sentence which I shall read comes out of the report of Secretary Sawyer. It is in response to questions during the course of the hearings as to how small business was affected by the operation of the present law. In candor I must say that the Secretary in his testimony stated that he felt that small business was being pretty well cared for. All I can say is that that feeling varies from the reports that have come to the junior Senator from Florida. But when he was asked to submit written recommendations and a written statement and a written report on its operation under this measure, he included this particular sentence, which I call to the attention of the Senate, and which, it seems to me, makes it wholly clear that the operation of the present

law, within the limited time that it has been afforded, has not been carried down the line to the point where it does serve to protect small users of steel and small business in the steel industry. I quote the sentence which appears as subsection (4) of section C on page 43:

> All the present plans provide for shipments from producing mills, and it has not yet been possible to make arrangements for allocations for shipments by warehouse and other distributors. Therefore, the existing voluntary plans cannot take care of consumers who buy only from warehouses and other distributors.

That is the end of the quotation, Mr. President and Senators, and it would appear from the report of the Secretary of Commerce made to the committee but a few days ago, that he stated frankly to the committee that the operations of his Department, the operations of the Nation under the present law, had not been carried down to the consumers or to the small people, and that he made no pretense that such was the case.

Mr. President, in closing it seems to me that it would be very foolish for the Senate to create a problem such as that suggested by the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], by extending the law for a greater period than the 6 months, and that, to the contrary, the proposed action should be regarded as a stopgap extension, and I, for one, in view of the wholly nonpolitical position taken by the committee will be looking with confidence to the committee to bring in a much-farther-reaching report based upon the comprehensive recommendations which the committee tells us it will be in position to receive and to study within a very short period.

I think that is the cautious, that is the prudent, that is the common-sense, that is the businesslike way to approach the problem, and so far as I am concerned, I believe that the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] is not the proper way to approach the subject, and I hope it will be defeated.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator has read excerpts from the report of the Committee on Small Business, indicating that the handling of steel allocation was not satisfactory to small business. Does the Senator know whether that condition resulted from a failure of the Secretary of Commerce properly to administer an agreement, or from a failure of the President to make the right kind of an agreement?

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to make clear the statement I made. I thought it was clear before.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator had not touched that point.

Mr. HOLLAND. The report was made upon a study which was made by the subcommittee of the Small Business Committee just prior to the meeting of the special session of Congress in December, I believe it was, of 1947, and the report is dated in December of 1947, immediately after the enactment of the present law. Therefore the situation complained of in the report of the committee developed during the hiatus—during that time between the knocking out of all controls in the summer of 1946 and the time in December of 1947 when the new control measures were passed. But in addition to that definite knowledge which the Senator from Florida has as to the existence of that fact at that time, I also have ample showings from numerous small users that that condition has not been corrected. And then when I see in the report of Secretary Sawyer the statement which I read into the RECORD indicating that the program had not yet had time to be continued down to and to reach to the actual users of steel, it seems to me that there is a statement that should put me and should put the Senate on guard as to what has been done to small business under the operation of this particular law, and until we do know what has been done, after adequate studies have been made by the committee, which I think the Senator will agree has proceeded in a nonpolitical way—until we do know how small business now can say that it has been affected by the operations of this law, I think any approach to permanent or semipermanent legislation would be a mistake. That is the position I am taking here.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Ohio suggests that the extension of voluntary agreement be made to the 31st of March 1950 rather than the 30th of September 1949.

Is the Senator in agreement with the Senator from Oregon, that if that be not done, and the time limit be the 30th of September, as provided in the committee's bill, the Congress, in considering any legislation which may be presented, is faced with the proposition that it must take the administration bill or have nothing at all after the 30th of September? Is that the Senator's view?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is not the view of the junior Senator from Florida.

Mr. CORDON. What situation would exist?

Mr. HOLLAND. On the contrary, if the Senator will allow me to make my own answer to his suggestion——

Mr. CORDON. I have not attempted to suggest an answer. I apologize for the second question.

Mr. HOLLAND. On the contrary, it is my view that this report, taken as a whole, makes it very clear that the committee proposes to study the question diligently and to make recommendations for legislation which can be passed while we are in session in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. I think the report makes it very clear that the committee is hoping that much more effective legislation can be enacted to operate after September 30, which will allow a little time to prepare all the multifarious details of such a program, and which will not allow this relatively uncontrolled situation to continue into next spring.

If I felt that the committee was not willing speedily to make a study and report, and that the committee was not anticipating the passage of more effective and more comprehensive legislation while we are in session during the first session of this Congress, effective September 30, I would agree with the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon. But there has been nothing in the performance of the committee which indicates to my mind anything other than an intention to go ahead as rapidly as possible consistent with caution and the exercise of good judgment, and to come back with a comprehensive program for enactment before we get away from here, effective September 30.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. If the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] should be adopted, and the Voluntary Agreements Act should be extended to the last of March of next year, could not the President in his wisdom, having in mind as the Senator has, a comprehensive study of the whole problem, and the possible introduction of comprehensive legislation to meet whatever situation the committee should find exists—could not the President, under the extended terms of the act, the purpose of which is only to limit the time of his authority and not to require his exercise of it up to that time, go forward and make voluntary agreements extending only to September 30 of this year, or even a shorter time, if he thought it was in the public interest, and so keep more careful and complete control of the whole situation in his own hands pending enactment of other legislation, if it were to be enacted? Could not that be done?

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course it could be done; but the Senator overlooks the fact that the President is not the only one concerned in this question, or in the enactment of further legislation to supplement this legislation. I apprehend that there would be factors in the steel industry, and there would be Members of this body and of the other body of Congress coming from the areas where those industries are very powerful industrial agencies, who, if machinery were created which would operate until March 30 next year, would be much more insistent in their objection to machinery which I might feel and the majority of the Senate might feel would be much more adequate to deal with this problem than is the present law. I for one would not want to put the Senate or the Congress in the position of having created a law which would encourage some to oppose the enactment of a better law because they would have this law operative as to their businesses until March 30 next year. I think much the sounder approach is that suggested by the committee, which I approve.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator has suggested, if I correctly understand him, that he not only does not want to encourage Senators who may disagree with the legislation offered to vote against it, but, in effect, by placing the September 30 limit on the voluntary agreements, if those Senators feel that any kind of allocation is necessary, he is going to coerce them into voting for the legislation

Then there are several other statements to like effect. Instead of reading

steel for these Government hospitals unless they could secure the complete job, which would include fabrication and erection. He

which, it seems to me, makes it wholly clear that the operation of the present

complained of in the report of the com-

and more comprehensive legislation

force them into voting for the legislation

which comes up later. Is not that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator uses the word "coerce." I would not use it. The word "influence" would be better.

Mr. CORDON. I will accept "influence."

Mr. HOLLAND. A limitation 8 months into the future could hardly be called close enough to this date to be at all coercive in its effect.

Mr. CORDON. Would the addition of 6 or 7 months seriously affect anybody?

Mr. HOLLAND. My answer would be that it would bring the matter into the next Congress, and would encourage those who might be disposed to do so in this Congress to use all kinds of parliamentary procedure to hold onto what the majority might feel was a much less effective machinery, namely, the one under the present act, rather than to go to a much more effective machinery, which I hope will be suggested and recommended shortly by the able committee.

Mr. CORDON. If I follow the Senator, his view is that he would rather have permissive authority than no authority, but he does not want the permissive authority to go any further than September 30, solely because he wants an inducement to those who disagree with him to go along with the over-all legislation which may come forward, even though they do not believe in it.

Mr. HOLLAND. I would rather state my position in this way: The Senator from Florida sees no point in extending the authority for 12 months when he thinks an extension of 6 months will allow not only ample time, but several times the ample amount of time necessary to give serious and deliberate consideration to the more effective legislation, which I confidently expect to come from the committee shortly.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator does not expect the Congress to be in session on September 30, does he?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida joins the Senator from Oregon in his hope that we shall not be in session at that time, and thinks that that has nothing to do with the situation, because under the law, as the Senator understands, we may be here until the end of July. It does not seem to me that there could be any possible question of there being adequate time, and much more than adequate time between now and the end of July, to give full consideration to this important question, and to adopting much sounder legislation in this field than that which now exists.

Mr. CORDON. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, there has been considerable debate of this subject. As the Senate well knows, the committee voted, with only two dissenting votes, to report the bill favorably. It seems to me that about all that is involved is the point that the amendment is designed to foreclose a study by the committee of the proposals for additional controls which the administration is considering, but which have not yet been considered in the committee. Of course the minority do intend to foreclose such a study. Regardless of how the House of Representatives and the Senate may in the long run decide on the question of additional controls, I think that at the very least the matter should be considered by the committee, and that is the purpose of the committee bill. So of course I intend to support the bill.

The Senator from Alabama in the course of his remarks made some reference to a difficulty that we are having in bringing into production part of the aluminum plant at Jones Mill, Ark. I wish to clarify that point for a moment, because at the hearings the other day I had considerable to say about that particular item. The fact is that the pipe to bring natural gas from the natural gas fields to that plant has been on order for some 2 years by the Arkansas-Louisiana Gas Co. Intervening and subsequent to the ordering of that pipe by that gas company, the Atomic Energy Commission has decided that as a supplemental and an auxiliary source of gas, it would like to bring gas, by pipe line, to the Oak Ridge plant. The Department of Commerce has, I believe, at least tentatively—and I think it expects to do so permanently—made the allocation to the Oak Ridge plant.

My objection is simply that the Oak Ridge plant does not need pipe line in order to operate. It simply would give the Oak Ridge plant an additional or auxiliary source of fuel; but that is not as critical, from the point of view of national defense, as is the bringing into production of the two pot lines that are not now producing in the Jones Mill plant. In other words, it is a question of judgment as to which is the more important in the national interest, and there was a difference of opinion as between me and the persons who are interested in the production of aluminum and the Atomic Energy Commission. That was the point referred to by the Senator from Alabama. Regardless of my difference of judgment on that point, I still think this bill should be passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 83) extending the time for free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will, and it was signed by the Vice President.

A UNITED STATES OF EUROPE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, some time ago I thought there was a possibility of promptly obtaining a vote on the bill relating to voluntary agreements and plans for the allocation of scarce materials, and therefore I did not obtain the floor to speak on the matter to which I am about to address myself. Since that time I have understood that several other speeches on the subject are scheduled. Therefore I wish to say a few words about an action which I think is extremely important. It does not relate to the bill which has been under discussion during the day.

In March 1947, joined by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], I introduced in the Senate a joint resolution which would have placed the Congress of the United States on record as favoring the creation of a United States of Europe, within the framework of the United Nations.

This, I might add, was several months before the Secretary of State, General Marshall, made his Harvard speech on June 5, 1947, which resulted in the Marshall plan and the European recovery program. It was also several weeks before the then Under Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, made his Cleveland, Miss., speech, which has been said to be the forerunner of the Marshall plan.

On April 7, 1947, when aid to Greece and Turkey was being discussed, I spoke at some length on the subject of European federation, saying this:

> I submit that unless we are able to create a different, a more sensible, economic and political order in Europe, there is no hope for a prosperous or a peaceful solution to her difficulties. It is my belief that if all we are able to do is to recreate the prewar crazy quilt of jealous sovereignties, neither Europe nor the Near East is a good risk. If we persist in preserving an irrational and obsolete economic and political system in Europe, we can be sure that, for a third time, its internal frictions will supply the spark for world conflagration. No one can guarantee that a federation will absolutely prevent all sparks, but at least there will be a chance that it may.
>
> Unless we are willing to write off Europe as a friend and supporter of democratic principles, it behooves us to use our economic power and our talents of persuasion to induce Europeans to create a free and democratic federation of states. Under such a union the world may again see a renaissance of culture, of freedom, and of spiritual power which once before led the world out of the confusion and tyranny of the dark ages.

Mr. President, on March 3, 1948, when the Senate was debating the Economic Cooperation Act, I offered an amendment to the preamble of that act, to express the hope that the participating countries would exert efforts to achieve political unification.

During the course of the debate it became clear that although the then chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the present chairman, and other members of the committee approved the objective and purposes of the amendment, at the same time they objected to its inclusion in the bill.

I then said:

> It is with reluctance that I withdraw the amendment; but in view of the opposition of the committee, and the probability that such a defeat would be interpreted as this Nation's disapproval of European unity, I feel compelled to follow this course. * * * I still feel that unless the OEEC countries can achieve political unification during the next few years, the ERP program not only will fail to bring peace and stability to Europe, but, on the contrary, if those countries succumb one by one to the Communists, it will actually result in a tremendous subsidy at our expense to the growth of Communist power.

Last June 11, when the Senate was considering the Vandenberg resolution, I asked the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee if, under paragraph 2

of that resolution, dealing with regional defense arrangements, a federation of the European countries might be contemplated.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] replied as follows:

> Most emphatically, and I join the Senator from Arkansas in thinking that it would be one of the most hopeful possible evolutions that could be contemplated. * * * I think the emphasis in the present resolution upon the development of regional and other collective arrangements specifically includes the great idea of a United States of Europe, to which the Senator from Arkansas has been so devoted.

Upon this assurance, and the assurance of other members of the committee, that the concept of European federation was included in the language of the resolution, I did not press at that time for a more specific endorsement of the idea.

Mr. President, I give this background for the purpose of emphasizing that, although the Senate has not specifically recorded itself as favoring European federation, there is a great deal of legislative history on the subject, and there is reason to feel that many Senators believe in the necessity of European federation. I also wish to say I think that discussion is beginning to bear fruit.

In the New York Times of Saturday, January 29, 1949, there was a very interesting dispatch upon this subject, and I think it is perhaps the most significant move that has occurred in a long time with regard to progress under the ERP. Unfortunately the indication by Marshal Stalin of his willingness to talk things over has distracted the attention of most people from this action, which I feel has far greater significance. I wish to read only a selected paragraph or two, but at the conclusion of my remarks, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be included.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is dated January 28:

> The Western Union powers agreed today to create a Council of Europe and thus fulfill a dream of centuries of European statesmen.
>
> There will be a committee composed of government Ministers meeting in secret and capable of making binding decisions, which means—

And I emphasize this sentence—

> which means the actual delegation of sovereign powers to a European body.

That is the crucial question which has been involved in the discussions of all international bodies since the creation of the League of Nations, and it is the very point upon which all of them have failed. In no previous case that I know of has any real delegation of sovereign power been given to any international body.

The next paragraph which I think is particularly important is:

> These are not mere proposals; they are agreements made by the Foreign Ministers of Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg. The British Cabinet, for instance, held an emergency meeting this afternoon to approve these momentous decisions, which now commit the Government of Great Britain.
>
> * * * * *
>
> When the Foreign Ministers, who had been meeting in the office of Foreign Secretary Bevin, came out this evening at the end of their 2-day conference, they were visibly elated. They knew they had made history.
>
> They had taken the first important practical step toward a goal that has beckoned European statesmen from the seventeenth century "grand design" of the French statesman Sully to Briand's "United States of Europe."

I think this is by far the most significant move by the European nations since the war.

I also notice in the same edition of the New York Times in a dispatch from Oslo that the Scandinavian Foreign Ministers endorse the plan. It is true that with regard to the Atlantic Pact, due to the pressure from Russia, the Norwegians did not see fit to participate; but apparently Norway endorses the creation of a Council of Europe. It is also my understanding that other countries in Europe will be invited to join the Council of Europe. The article mentions that:

> Foreign Minister Count Carlo Sforza (of Italy) said today, "Italy will be one of the founding states" of the new Council of Europe.

Only a short time ago, Mr. President, it was assumed by many persons that the idea for the creation of a real political federation or council of Europe, using the terms that were used by the Ministers on last Friday, was entirely beyond any realistic hope at this time. In fact there was an article in the New York Times magazine of last week—that is, January 23—by Mr. Callendar, one of their staff writers, entitled "We Expect Too Much From the Marshall Plan." The thesis of that article, less than a week preceding the action on the part of the foreign minister of the Brussels pact countries, is that some of us expected entirely too much; in other words, we had expected it would promote a political federation of Europe, and that expectation was entirely beyond all reasonable possibilities at this time. I would say this action on the part of the foreign ministers on Saturday completely negatives Mr. Callendar's whole thesis.

There was one paragraph in Mr. Callendar's article which I think was entirely uncalled for, reading as follows:

> Since the United States has accepted western Europe as both a financial and a military responsibility or liability, certain Americans have insisted upon urging and prodding Europe into a union that presumably would stand on its own feet and relieve the United States of its present responsibility for this Continent. This may not be precisely an isolationist attitude, but it is one that displays dislike of the huge international responsibilities that have been assumed by the United States and a desire to be rid of them as soon as possible.

I certainly, for one, would like to be rid of some, if not all, of these responsibilities, and would like to diminish the impact of those responsibilities upon our own economy. But I would not admit that that is, in the words of Mr. Callender, an isolationist attitude.

Mr. President, I think this action on the part of the Foreign Ministers of the Brussels Pact countries certainly deserves recognition by the Congress of the United States and by the people of the United States. Last fall, while I was in Europe, I stated that unless some progress were made toward political unification, unless they at least accept political unification as an objective of the present plan, I would find it extremely difficult to justify a continuation of the ERP program. The establishment of the Council of Europe, assuming the account which I have read from the Times is correct, I think is a justification for the continuation of the program. I might also call attention to the fact stated in an article in the New York Times of January 11, in which one of the prominent members of the British House of Commons stated that a United States of Europe would cut the Marshall plan costs by 66 percent.

That, of course, is a very extreme statement. I do not know how one would arrive at that exact percentage, but there is no doubt in my mind that it would certainly decrease the costs. That statement is from Mr. R. W. G. MacKay, who has written extensively on this subject.

Mr. President, I think the time has come when the Congress should specifically endorse the idea, particularly as we are about to consider the proposed North Atlantic Alliance and the renewal of the Economic Cooperation Act.

For this purpose, I have introduced today, together with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the following resolution:

> In order to encourage a peaceful and prosperous order in Europe, but with no intention of imposing any particular form of political or economic association upon its people, it is hereby
>
> *Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Congress favors the political federation of Europe.

I hope the Committee on Foreign Relations will give some consideration to this resolution when it holds hearings on the extension of the Economic Cooperation Act, and that it may give some expression of the belief that progress toward the goal of European federation should be accomplished with our assistance under the ECA.

At Harvard, Secretary Marshall said:

> Any assistance that this Government may render should provide a cure rather than a mere palliative.

I believe that the revival of European economic prosperity alone, without some permanent form of political federation, is a mere palliative and not a cure. I do not believe that the relatively small and independent political sovereignties of Europe, as they now exist, can, under modern political and economic conditions, retain their independence or economic prosperity without aid for very long.

If the same old prewar Europe of many small, independent states is economically rehabilitated, I do not think we shall have achieved anything of lasting value, commensurate with the sacrifices that we

shall have made. Europe reconstructed can protect herself from neither alien domination nor internal quarrels. Standing alone none of the 16 nations can withstand the determined pressure of the Russians. While they may think they can take refuge in neutrality, the last war has proved how futile that is.

For centuries—from the grand design of Henry IV, in 1638, to Winston Churchill today—many of the greatest statesmen of Europe have called for European federation. It is no longer a philosophical longing or an idealistic dream. The ancient prejudices about sovereignty are beginning to dissolve, and a United States of Europe has actually become a matter of practical politics, as was demonstrated on last Friday.

I believe that we should promote the idea of European federation with all our powers of persuasion and, provided the Europeans are willing, with all our economic and industrial strength.

My efforts to obtain an expression of the Congress endorsing European federation have met with one consistent objection: that it is an unwarranted interference in the affairs of other countries. I think the announcement by the Brussels powers will do much to dispel this notion. I am not, by this resolution, attempting to force an alien notion upon the free governments of Europe. I am rather attempting to record this Nation's endorsement of a great movement, and to urge its further development before it is too late.

We have made, and probably will make, additional enormous loans and grants to the nations of Europe, and we are about to consider a program of military assistance and alliance. As a consequence we are faced with such a tremendous drain upon our national resources that we are forced to take stock of our wealth lest we impoverish ourselves in helping others. It would be strange if we did not take a selfish interest in the possibilities of a United States of Europe. But whatever malicious propaganda the Kremlin may spread to the contrary, the fact remains that the primary reason for our assistance is our wish to create a stable and orderly world in which we, and all peoples of the world, may live in peace. I am convinced that the federation of Europe is a fundamental pillar of a stable world order.

Our concern is not simply an idealistic dream of bringing relief to suffering Europe; nor is it the hard-shelled manipulations of economic imperialism. We have a deep and inescapable interest in the welfare of Europe—in its military, economic, and political strength. Twice in 25 years we have shed our blood and spent our treasure in world wars which grew out of European feuds and power politics. We know that our present well-being will be short-lived unless Europe recovers and carries on normal economic, social, and political relations with us. Rich as our country is, we cannot indefinitely subsidize an impoverished, dependent, Europe. That Continent must learn again under modern industrial and commercial conditions how to take care of itself.

Our interests are personal; they are immediate and they are real. But there is another very urgent reason for our interest. If western Europe were to succumb to the Russians, then the systems, institutions, and values which have made all North America great, would be imperiled. A healthy, prosperous, rehabilitated, and united Europe is one of the best guaranties that our country, that all free peoples, will remain free and strong.

We have today in Europe another interest and responsibility. As a result of the war, we are now for practical political purposes a sovereign nation on the European Continent. The United States actually governs a substantial and important part of western Europe. Where our troops are occupying parts of Germany, Austria, and Trieste, we must govern and protect Europeans. We have no intention of retaining these territories for our own, and, indeed, we are anxious to rid ourselves of their burden. But we cannot until we are certain that our withdrawal will not menace the peace of western Europe and hence the United States.

The German problem, and to a lesser degree, the problems of Austria and Trieste, cannot be settled irrespective of our desires and interests. Indeed it is our duty to promote settlements which in our judgment are in the best interests of Europe and America.

Now, as we have an interest in the military, economic, and political welfare of Europe, and as our interests are genuine, and our purposes are not imperialistic, do we not have the right even to express the hope that Europe may achieve political federation?

If the reason for our reluctance to express our desires is our fear of offending Russia, is it not absurd to think that military cooperation, joint maneuvers, advice, and even equipment are not equally offensive?

If our reasoning is that expression of our hope that federation may be brought about is an unwarranted interference in the affairs of other countries, how can we explain that our advice in military and economic affairs is not? No one yet has been able to determine successfully the line between the external and the internal affairs of nations, but as their federation involves internal affairs that is only incidental to its real purpose. If, as history proves, their external affairs are of vital consequence to us, are we not entitled to urge a remedy for the recurrent quarrels they create?

This criticism, that advocating a federation of Europe is officious intermeddling by Americans, is often made. At the same time, however, we are told that we have a responsibility to use our power, our knowledge, and our wealth to rehabilitate the stricken areas of the world. These views are inconsistent. If we grant that we have this obligation, then we must also be obliged to see that the rehabilitation is sensible and effective. There can be no obligation to reestablish the same old divided Europe, from which two world wars have emerged to afflict us. Surely we have a legitimate interest in the purposes for which the products of our land and the work of our people are to be expended. As we govern and support much of Germany, are we not entitled to propose a solution to the problems of Germany's future in keeping with Europe's needs?

If we reason that federation is too remote, what can we possibly lose by encouraging and urging federation? Even if it is not to be achieved can we take the chance that but for our reluctance, or timidity, in promoting it, it might have come about?

Of course, we cannot force this goal of federation upon Europe. Yet we may have the power to make it a reality, by encouragement and assistance. We must use the power tactfully, but this is not to say we must not use it at all.

The final responsibility which I believe attaches to the United States is that, in opposing Soviet Russia's initiative, we must offer some alternative which will maintain order in Europe. Negation—even of Russian domination—is not enough for this aggressive and restless world. We shall continue to be negative at our own peril. In peace, as well as in war, victory will not come to the negative defensive strategy. A certain boldness, a positive resourcefulness, is essential to win any battle, in war or peace.

The Germans in 1914 and again in 1939 to 1941 did not believe that the democracies of the west would go to war over the neutrality of Belgium or the independence of Poland. We shall never know what course world events would have taken had they known, but we can be reasonably sure it would have been different and better. We were then given a period of months and years in which to make our decision and to prepare to follow it.

The world today wants to know where we stand. Many Europeans believe we may once again withdraw from Europe. The Russians believe it and are striving to bring it about in Berlin and Germany and all over Europe. They hope that we shall become so disgusted, disillusioned, and tired of the ever-intensified war of nerves that we shall give up and go home. We are trying to convince Russia and Europe now that we will stay.

I believe that we can, and will, stay—but only so long as we believe that by our defense and assistance we can accomplish something which gives hope of progress toward lasting peace. From our own experience we can, and do, believe in the principle of federation as a means of assuring domestic tranquillity, common defense, and general welfare. It is an idea which we have held for 160 years, in which we have faith for the future, and which, I am convinced, the people of Europe can adapt to their own great security, prosperity, and happiness.

It is, I believe, of the greatest importance that the people of Europe be given a goal, a hope for the future. The unity of Europe, solid and permanent, is such a goal. It is a goal which I believe will inspire them to great creative acts and to great sacrifices, such as they have per-

formed in the past and which I am sure they can achieve again, to their own benefit and to the benefit of the world.

EXHIBIT A

COUNCIL OF EUROPE FORMED BY FIVE WESTERN UNION POWERS—TWO BODIES SET UP—SOVEREIGN RIGHTS GIVEN TO MINISTERIAL GROUP, WITH RULINGS BINDING—PUBLIC ASSEMBLY TO AID—OTHER COUNTRIES ARE INVITED TO JOIN—BRITISH CABINET QUICKLY APPROVES PLAN

(By Herbert L. Matthews)

LONDON, January 28.—The Western Union Powers agreed today to create a "Council of Europe" and thus fulfill a dream of centuries of European statesmen.

There will be a committee composed of government ministers meeting in secret and capable of making binding decisions, which means the actual delegation of sovereign powers to a European body.

Alongside this committee will be an advisory consultative body representing the national parliaments of Europe. This group will meet in public.

These are not mere proposals; they are agreements made by the Foreign Ministers of Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg. The British Cabinet, for instance, held an emergency meeting this afternoon to approve these momentous decisions, which now commit the Government of Great Britain.

ONLY DETAILS TO BE SETTLED

Only details remain to be settled. They are to be worked out by the Permanent Commission of the Brussels Pact Powers, which meets weekly in London. This commission is composed of the Ambassadors of the four continental countries plus Hubert Gladwyn Jebb, of the British Foreign Office.

When the Foreign Ministers, who had been meeting in the office of Foreign Secretary Bevin, came out this evening at the end of their two-day conference, they were visibly elated. They knew they had made history.

They had taken the first important practical step toward a goal that has beckoned European statesmen from the seventeenth century "grand design" of the French statesman Sully to Briand's "United States of Europe." Here is a relevant passage of the communiqué they issued after their meeting:

"After considering the most valuable preparatory work accomplished in Paris by the Committee for the Study of European Unity, the Council [the Consultative Council of Brussels Powers] agreed that there should be established a Council of Europe consisting of a ministerial committee meeting in private and a consultative body meeting in public."

OTHERS INVITED TO JOIN

"The Permanent Commission was instructed to study the detailed application of the decisions of principle taken by the Council. The Council decided to invite other European countries to take part in the negotiations for the establishment of the Council of Europe."

Although many of the proposed details remain secret and others are still to be worked out, it is possible to add some flesh to these bare bones.

It was agreed that the appointment of delegates to the consultative body and their voting powers should be left to the discretion of each country, which can satisfy its own constitutional practices.

France, for example, can elect her delegates by a majority vote of her National Assembly and thus exclude Communists. Britain could appoint delegates from the Labor Party or all three parties.

This is one of the compromises reached during the past 2 days because the French wanted delegates to the European assembly to be elected and Britain wanted them nominated by the Governments.

Britain originally wanted voting in the assembly, or consultative body as it is now called, to be compulsory bloc voting by nations. Mr. Bevin, as expected, yielded on this point and the decisions will be made by a majority vote of all delegates voting individually, not as national groups.

A British compromise proposal whereby the ministerial committee would control the agenda of the consultative body was accepted. Subjects for discussion by the consultative body can be determined on the initiative of either organization but the ultimate control of the agenda, which is to say the power of veto, will rest with the ministerial committee.

The principle on which voting will take place in both organizations has been decided but it is being kept secret. Guessing is that it will be by two-thirds vote in the ministerial committee and a majority in the consultative body. This would reflect the fact that the latter body is merely advisory whereas the former has executive powers.

Nothing is being said either about the weighting of representation, but it is presumed that the greater powers will have a proportionately heavy vote in the ministerial committee while each individual delegate will have equal weight in the consultative body.

NAMES WILL BE CHANGED

Incidentally the clumsy names used in tonight's communiqué—consultative body and ministerial committee—are only makeshift. In preliminary discussions they were called the European Assembly and the European Council, but as the combined organization is now called the Council of Europe, other names must be found.

The invitation to other European nations to join is what carries the new Council beyond the concept of the Western Union of the Brussels Pact Powers. The conference had hardly ended when Duke Tommaso Gallarati Scotti, Italian Ambassador, was called to the Foreign Office and informed that his Government would be invited to join the Council of Europe.

Portugal and the Scandinavian countries are doubtless being invited in on the ground floor. However, it was denied that all 19 European countries of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation would be invited or expected to take part from the beginning.

That is a goal to be achieved and western Germany will be a member in time, but the Brussels Pact Powers decided to start with a relatively small manageable council and expand it as time passed.

The permanent center of the Council of Europe will almost certainly be Strasbourg. It is centrally located and has a properly cosmopolitan European atmosphere.

For the time being the Western Union will remain in being. On its defense side it will soon merge into the projected north Atlantic defense pact. In other respects it will gradually expand into the Council of Europe. That Council, in its turn, will be integrated into the United Nations as a regional arrangement.

The Western Union also has important cultural and social relations now, which were discussed in a special communiqué. It was agreed, for instance, to hold courses for teachers on the Western Union, to hold exhibitions and issue pamphlets and films.

On the social side emphasis was placed on an exchange of views and information on public health, as well as exchanges of medical personnel, workers, and student employees.

Enterprises of this sort will not be abandoned for the Council of Europe cannot be formed overnight. The Permanent Commission should be able to work out most of the details by the time the Foreign Ministers of the Brussels Pact Powers meet again in April.

Four other governments will have to sanction today's agreement as the British Cabinet already has done. French Foreign Minister Robert Schuman, who alone might be expected to find difficulties, was confident tonight that he had won enough points from Mr. Bevin to get support in Paris.

The European movement, which Winston Churchill sponsored and which is headed by his son-in-law, Duncan Sandys, issued a statement enthusiastically welcoming the decision to set up the Council of Europe. It looks as if Mr. Bevin at home and Britain on the Continent have set many doubts at rest.

SFORZA SAYS ITALY WILL JOIN

ROME, January 28.—Foreign Minister Count Carlo Sforza said today, "Italy will be one of the founding states" of the new Council of Europe.

His brief statement, released by ANSA, semiofficial Italian news agency, indicated Italy already had been invited to take part in setting up the Council.

"European union is born," Count Sforza said, "and Italy will be one of the founding states. Italy will give all her efforts with full loyalty to the creation of the Council of Europe."

JUDGE KNOX'S METHOD OF SELECTING JURIES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on Thursday, I called to the attention of this body the statement made by Federal Judge John C. Knox that he handpicks the jurors in his district, and intends to keep on doing so. I expressed at that time my aversion to having jurors hand-picked by judges, or, for that matter, by anybody else, and I pointed out how historically miscarriages of justice have resulted from jury packing.

Since then I have taken a little time to look into the way Judge Knox handpicks jurors, and what the consequences of his selection are. As Senators know, Judge Knox is senior judge of the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, which is our biggest and busiest Federal court. I felt that making this investigation was my simple duty as a United States Senator, as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and as a plain American citizen who happens to feel, along with the framers of our Constitution, that a fair and impartial administration of justice calls for juries selected, without hand picking, from a representative cross section of the people.

I was personally shocked by the facts that I learned in the course of this investigation. But beyond this, these facts are of such great concern to the integrity and reputation of our judicial system, and thus to our democracy itself, that it is time they were fully revealed to the Senate and to the American people.

But let me first disclose where the record of these facts can be found. Judge Knox's jury selection system is described in a memorandum of January 2, 1941, written for the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, by Leland L. Tolman, Assistant

Chief, Division of Procedural Studies and Statistics. On February 5, 1941, Henry P. Chandler, the Director of that Office, sent copies of this memorandum to all United States circuit and district judges, and I have one of them in my hand, over the signature of Mr. Chandler.

In addition to this, a statistical analysis has been made of this system in operation, verified by affidavit, in a petition filed recently in the United States Supreme Court by the attorneys for the 12 Communist leaders who are now on trial in New York.

Just so that there shall be no mistake, I repeat now what I said on Thursday, that I care not who a defendant may be, and what the offense alleged, whether it is murder, arson, or robbery, whether he be Democrat or Republican or Communist, he is entitled in a United States court to a jury that is impartially and honestly picked. If some think differently, remember that Judge Knox's hand-picked juries serve in all jury cases in his district, civil and criminal, whether the parties are radical or conservative, or whatever you please, in their political and economic beliefs.

But to get back to Judge Knox's jury-selection system. It seems that about 10 years ago Judge Knox decided that the jurors serving in the southern district of New York were an inferior lot. The jury rolls, it seems, included a lot of relief workers and housewives. Of course, this is hardly cause for amazement. In those days there were many relief workers in New York City, and there were then and still are plenty of housewives. But to Judge Knox, apparently, relief workers and housewives, no matter how big a part of the population they are, are not suitable for jury service. Why, I do not know. Perhaps he thinks that poor people and housewives are just naturally inferior, or perhaps they did not convict enough defendants to suit him. Anyway, Judge Knox decided to get jurors of "better quality."

The first thing Judge Knox did to serve this purpose, says Mr. Tolman's memorandum, was to appoint as jury commissioner an attorney who "has good business and social connections." Then, says the memorandum, which I have here, "he also arranged for the appointment, as deputy jury clerk, of an energetic young man of pleasing manner, who is a good judge of character, and has a thorough practical knowledge of the social, racial, and economic groups of New York City and their geographic distribution."

These, then, were the men who were to carry out Judge Knox's endeavors to get quality jurors, and I call attention to what their assets for this job were—"good business and social connections" and knowing the geographic distribution of the "social, racial, and economic groups of New York City."

Judge Knox now had the right kind of people to do the picking. Now he had to see that they had the right kind of people to pick from.

Until then, in the southern district of New York, the names of jurors had been picked primarily from the registry list of voters. But to Judge Knox this was an unsatisfactory list. They are just the people who decide who shall be our President and who shall be our Senators and who shall be our mayors and our governors. They are just the people who pick the persons who pick our Federal judges. They are the people who pay our salaries, and Judge Knox's, too. They are the people the Government is supposed to represent. In short, they are the American people. But the people are not good enough for Judge Knox. He has to have the better quality for jury service in his district.

According to Mr. Tolman's memorandum, therefore, the voters' registry list was supplemented by drawing from more select materials. What were these? Who's Who in New York, Poor's Directory of Directors, the Engineers' Directory, the Social Register, and various college and university alumni directories. Note the various. Mr. Tolman does not tell us, but we can guess, that to Judge Knox the alumni directories of Princeton or Dartmouth are better source material than those of the City College of New York or New York University.

Even more important than these books of the aristocracy is the subscription edition of the New York City telephone directory, which is arranged by street numbers and location rather than alphabetically by names. This directory permits the deputy jury clerk—you remember, Judge Knox' energetic young man of pleasing manner—to use his thorough knowledge of the geographic distribution of the social, racial, and economic groups of New York City to pick out the names of those who live in higher-class residential neighborhoods. In addition, this young man adds names of citizens who are personally known or introduced to him as good potential jurors. Relief workers and women were simply eliminated as volunteer jurors. If anyone has any doubt about it, I have a copy of the original memorandum here in my hand.

Now of course this so-called system of supplementing the registry list of voters does not really supplement the list at all. Those residents of New York who are in Who's Who, the Directory of Directors, and even the Social Register, are, by and large, also on the voters' registry list. The fact is, then, that these names are not added to the list; they are selected for preferential attention.

But just to make sure that no unsuitable people slip through, the jury clerk calls in and interviews each person whose name he puts on the list of prospective jurors. Only those people whom he is satisfied with following the interview are finally qualified as jurors. At the same time the jury commissioner—the man with the good connections—persuades personnel officers of large corporations to allow their employees to perform jury duty without financial loss. In other words, Judge Knox is willing to have on his juries lesser employees than executives, provided they know they are being paid by their big corporate employers during their service.

The consequence of all this is that the selection of the juries in the southern district of New York represents a deliberate and systematic exclusion of all but a token few of the lower income groups and of those persons who are without social graces valued by Judge Knox, in favor of an elite class.

According to a verified petition filed with the Supreme Court, an analysis of the jury lists in the district over a period of 9 years shows that 54 percent of the jury panel were executives, although they represent only 9 percent of the population. Twenty percent of the panel were professionals or semiprofessionals, although they were only 11 percent of the population. Clerical and sales employees, largely drawn from a few big corporations, made up 30 percent of the panels; they were 25 percent of the population. Manual workers made up only 5 percent of the panels, although they were 55 percent of the population.

I quote from the document sent out through the Administrative Office, from the Supreme Court Building in Washington. What do we find? This document is dated the 5th day of February 1941. We find about 2 percent of the names in the wheel are unemployed or retired. Eighty-eight percent are business or professional men. Ten percent are women.

The same verified petition also shows that the juries were loaded with persons who resided in the most exclusive neighborhoods. The so-called "silk-stocking" district, the Seventeenth Congressional District in Manhattan, supplied 56 percent of the members of six panels which were studied, although the district cast less than 20 percent of the vote in Manhattan alone in the 1948 elections. These same panels drew only 10.2 percent of their membership from the Eighteenth, Nineteenth, and Twenty-second, Twenty-third, and Twenty-fourth Congressional Districts taken together, although these districts accounted for 42 percent of the vote from both Manhattan and the Bronx. These latter districts contain mostly working-class people, including Negroes, Jews, citizens of Italian descent, and Puerto Ricans.

Mr. President, this system is not only offensive because of its snobbishness. It is a conscious selection of jurors on class and racial bases, and the result is that the so-called justice which is handed out in that district may be characterized as class and racial justice.

It is only natural that jurors tend to place greater credence in the testimony of people of their own kind. The whole purpose of the constitutional guaranty of a fair and impartial jury, representative of the community, is to offset the prejudices or predilections of particular groups. Only a fair cross section of the community will assure a fair and impartial trial in which evidence will be weighed according to the common judgment of the people, on its merits alone. It is perfectly clear that the system prevailing in the southern district of New York, and perhaps in many other places, is calculated to avoid juries which are truly representative.

To the people of the world, Mr. President, we boast of the superiorities of our government. We claim we are a democracy in which all people are free and equal. We profess equal justice for all, regardless of race or creed or economic status. How can we reconcile these assertions with the fact that in our

largest Federal district, and perhaps elsewhere as well, our judiciary so blandly dispenses justice through hand-picked juries heavily weighted with the wealthy or well-to-do.

This situation is our problem and our responsibility. It is in the power of Congress to enact legislation which will guarantee the selection of fair and impartial juries in our Federal courts. It is fitting that the Senate should take the lead in this respect, since it is the Senate which confirmed the appointment of Judge Knox and all other Federal judges, and which therefore has some responsibility for their actions.

Hand-picked juries have no place in our democracy. They are a stench and are a disgrace to honest law enforcement. They result in there being no fair play either in criminal or civil cases.

THE CONFIRMATION OF MR. ACHESON'S NOMINATION

Mr. BRIDGES obtained the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire of the Senator how long he expects to speak?

Mr. BRIDGES. Only a very few minutes I will say, on a very interesting subject.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on Tuesday, January 18, the Senate confirmed the President's nomination of Dean Acheson to be Secretary of State. I was one of only six Senators to vote against that nomination. Once again I found myself among a small minority of Senators opposing a Presidential appointment for a high position in our Government. On previous occasions I have voted with the few against appointees to important Government posts later to have my minority opposition completely justified.

I made no statement when Mr. Acheson's nomination was before the Senate. But since the confirmation of that nomination, in reply to inquiries, I have defined my position.

In this uncertain time the post of Secretary of State is vitally important to the security of America and the peace of the world. I believe the eligibility of the man who occupies that post should be beyond any doubt. In my opinion, Mr. Acheson did not meet that test.

I have reasonable doubts about Mr. Acheson. The hearings conducted by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee did not remove those doubts. My mind persisted in its severe questioning of Mr. Acheson's previous associations and expressed attitudes. My doubts became more profound.

Throughout my service in the Senate I have made it a policy to resolve such doubts in favor of my country rather than to gamble with my country's future. That is what I did with reference to the Acheson appointment. I have told others and I tell the Senate today that I hope my doubts regarding Mr. Acheson will not be justified by the events of passing time.

Yet I feel I should call to the attention of the Senate a news report which appeared in the New York Times of Friday, January 28.

The headline reads:

United States aid seen lost in China, Greece—Prof. E. C. Acheson also doubts money expended on Germany ever will bring results.

First of all, who is Prof. E. C. Acheson? He is the brother of Dean Acheson, Secretary of State of the United States. The New York Times article says that during the war Professor Acheson served in the United States Embassy in China. The Times says further that Professor Acheson was President Truman's personal representative on an economic mission to Germany last year. He is now professor of foreign relations at George Washington University. The New York Times article about which I am talking and from which I shall quote says that Professor Acheson was expressing his foreign-policy views at a meeting in Washington on January 27.

Let me read from the Times article:

WASHINGTON, January 27.—Prof. Edward C. Acheson, brother of the new Secretary of State, has declared here that the United States has written off as practically a total loss its huge expenditures in Greece and China. He predicted that substantially the same thing would happen in the recovery program of western Germany.

I want the Senate to note the New York Times report of Professor Acheson's remarks interprets them as almost a statement of fact. The question arises, then, whether the professor's comments are based upon his own speculation or upon information which may have been given to him by his brother, the new Secretary of State. Can it be that the professor is voicing the opinions of the administration which have not yet been announced by the new Secretary of State to the Congress and the people? Can it be that the Truman doctrine and the Marshall plan to try to halt the spread of communism in the world are to be abandoned? Just what connection is there, if any, between the firmly expressed views of the professor and the views of his brother, the new Secretary of State? I, for one, should like to know.

I realize that no man is his brother's keeper, but I say very frankly, Mr. President, that the minds of Senators were plagued only a few days ago by perplexing questions regarding Dean Acheson's attitude toward Russia, the stubborn roadblock in the way of peace. Most Senators found his statements to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee convincingly firm as regards Russia. But on January 28 we read in the New York Times that the new Secretary's professor brother—who at least implies some authority to his statements—"took an optimistic view regarding future relations with Russia." I ask the Senate whether such an optimistic view could be based upon some particular information available to the brother of the new Secretary of State but not to the Congress or the people? Or could it be based upon some special representations made to Professor Acheson which would lead him to believe that the American attitude toward Russia is to soften and our relations with Russia thereby made more smooth? It is natural that such questions should arise from profound statements of a man who has been close to the President and is the brother of our Secretary of State. Spread abroad, as the remarks of the brother of the new Secretary of State will be, they could well create grave suspicion in the nations which have joined us in the effort to stop the spread of communism, that we are about to abandon that fight, or in some way alter our major policies.

As another example of the potential danger to the position of the United States that the remarks of Professor Acheson constitute, let me quote further from the New York Times article:

If the Russians get into China, which I doubt, they will have the same miserable experience they had when they sent Michael Borodin there in the 1920's. Borodin got nowhere then, and I see little prospect of the Russians getting anywhere now. The basic conditions and factors in China remain unchanged.

Those are the remarks of a former State Department official, a confidant of the President of the United States, and the brother of the new Secretary of State at the very moment when the world is witnessing the forces of communism taking over control of much of China.

That is one of the very tragic things that is happening in the world, and which has happened in our day. The fact that we in this country have turned our backs upon China, our friend, who stood by us in the days of trouble, will some day come back to haunt the administration in Washington which has made such a thing possible, by reason of our policy in virtually selling China down the river to the Communists.

Again I ask the Senate, is there any connection between the profound opinions of Professor Acheson—implying authority as he seems to do—and the opinions of his brother, the new Secretary of State?

In the same article, the New York Times quotes Professor Acheson as accusing General Clay of employing Nazi-like methods in Germany, which is the same as accusing the United States Government of retaining nazism abroad. Couple this with the friendly attitude Professor Acheson seems to express toward our future relations with Russia, and what questions arise in Senators' minds?

Again I refer to the fact that it was the doubt regarding Dean Acheson's attitude toward Russia, and our program against communism in general, which led to the hearing on his appointment to be Secretary of State. To say the least, it is unfortunate that his brother should speak now as he did in Washington, with the authority he seemed to imply. It is particularly unfortunate because of the publicity it will receive all over the world.

I consider it appropriate, under the circumstances, to call upon Dean Acheson, the new Secretary of State, to speak out and give the people of our country the opportunity to hear his opinions with reference to the statements his

brother has already made. Will the Secretary of State tell the country whether there is any connection between his own views and those expressed by Professor Acheson? I feel that he should recognize the responsibility to reassure us all that there is no present intention or future possibility of any further compromise of American principles in Russia's favor. I urge the new Secretary of State to reemphasize firmly, with the influence of his high office, the American intention to promote peace on earth within the standards of American freedoms and the high level of American justice.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times article of January 28, 1949, to which I have referred, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES AID SEEN LOST IN CHINA, GREECE—PROF. E. C. ACHESON ALSO DOUBTS MONEY EXPENDED ON GERMANY EVER WILL BRING RESULTS

WASHINGTON, January 27.—Prof. Edward C. Acheson, brother of the new Secretary of State, has declared here that the United States has written off as practically a total loss its huge expenditures in Greece and China. He predicted that substantially the same thing would happen in the recovery program of western Germany.

Mr. Acheson voiced these views at a meeting of Williams College alumni of the District of Columbia. Now a professor of foreign relations at George Washington University, he served in the United States Embassy in China during the war, and last year was President Truman's personal representative on an economic mission to Germany.

"In a few weeks we will have to write off China as a 100-percent loss," Mr. Acheson declared, "and it is only a matter of time when we will have to do the same regarding Greece. In Germany, our military will continue their occupation duties, but we will find it necessary to abandon the inferior Nazi-type controlled economy which General Clay has been operating there.

"We cannot expect the world to believe we are spreading democratic concepts when we employ in Germany the same kind of system the Nazis used with far more efficiency than we have demonstrated. If we are going to keep on with that kind of system, which I doubt, we might as well restore Hjalmar Schacht to power and let him run it. He originated the system of differential currencies now operating in Germany."

Mr. Acheson cited a personal experience to illustrate his condemnation of United States economic policies in Germany.

"I was sent to Europe by President Truman to negotiate for $75,000,000 in Danish foodstuffs for the Allied zones in Germany," he related. "We had a treaty with the Danes on how we would pay for these supplies. We were to pay for them in pounds sterling, because Denmark is in the sterling area. But General Clay rescinded this treaty, in effect, the day before I was to begin my negotiations with the Danish Ministers. He ruled that all purchases in Germany would have to be paid for in dollars. That cut the ground out from under me. The Danes wanted German coal, but paying for it in dollars would have made it too costly for them."

Professor Acheson took an optimistic view regarding future relations with Russia.

"How the Russians feel about the inevitability of war and what they will do to wage war are two different things," he declared. "If the Russians get into China, which I doubt, they will have the same miserable experience they had when they sent Michael Borodin there in the 1920's. Borodin got nowhere then, and I see little prospect of the Russians getting anywhere now. The basic conditions and factors in China remain unchanged.

"The Chinese people are 95 percent agricultural and 90 percent illiterate. No ideology can cope with that. Even the Kuomintang, which has been running China for many years, has failed to make any inroads against this situation. I do not think that the Chinese Communists are Moscow Communists. Even if they were, they will still have their hands full administering the vast territories they have overrun. As the Russian empire keeps spreading out in Europe and Asia, it is beginning to rattle at the edges. Yugoslavia is a graphic instance of this. That's why I feel there is a definite possibility of better relations with the Soviets."

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I listened with interest, of course, to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire about the Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, and his brother. I do not know his brother. I have never seen him. I have never heard of him, and did not know that Dean Acheson had a brother until the information imparted by the Senator from New Hampshire.

When the nomination of Mr. Acheson was before the Committee on Foreign Relations we held a public hearing, which is unusual in the case of Cabinet officers. The hearing was held not in the committee room, but in the caucus room, where everyone had an opportunity to come and look and listen, and speak if he wished to do so.

The Senator from New Hampshire did not ask to appear as a witness. I do not know what information he may have had at that time. But every witness except two who appeared was permitted to testify. The two who did not testify were persons who knew nothing about the case, but were permitted to file statements. Their statements are now in the files of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

In addition to holding a public hearing we held a secret hearing, because the subject touched a great many intimate, high level, confidential international matters. In that hearing, before every member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, Mr. Acheson made a complete and full reply to all questions which were propounded to him. The Senator from New Hampshire says he thinks he ought to make a statement now showing that his attitude is different from that of his brother. The statement of Mr. Acheson was quoted in the Senate when his nomination was confirmed, making his position as to communism and totalitarianism clear beyond any question of doubt. His record in the Department and his record as a public officer bear witness to the fact that he has no sympathy with the evil doctrine of communism.

So, Mr. President, I do not think the Secretary of State is to be held responsible for what his professor brother may have said.

Was he in China when he said it, or was he here?

Mr. BRIDGES. He was here, close at hand, so that he had easy access to his brother.

Mr. CONNALLY. Did the Senator ever see him with his brother?

Mr. BRIDGES. No.

Mr. CONNALLY. Did he have access to his brother?

Mr. BRIDGES. I understand he had very close and intimate access.

Mr. CONNALLY. I assume that if he had any contacts, they were of a brotherly or kinship nature. Certainly he did not undertake to tell his brother how to conduct his affairs. He was a brother, and brothers seem to tend to have independent views on various questions—not similar views, but independent views.

He does not say he was a Communist; does he?

Mr. BRIDGES. No.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator draw the inference that he is somewhat sympathetic to communism?

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not draw the inference that he is sympathetic to communism, but I do draw the inference that he is certainly for a "soft" policy and for scuttling a good deal of the work this Government has been doing against communism in the world. When he says we must "write off" Greece, and then makes the same statements about China, and then makes very pointed remarks about the administration of General Clay in Germany, I say that at least, regardless of what the Secretary of State may have to say on this matter, it is unfortunate that he has a brother who at this time is making such remarks which will be so widely publicized all over the world.

Mr. CONNALLY. With the aid of the able Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I merely desired to clear up the matter.

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course, many persons will read what the Senator from New Hampshire says. They will not pay much attention to what Professor Acheson has to say; but the Senator from New Hampshire from his place in the Senate will give the statements widespread publicity which will carry a degree of conviction which Professor Acheson in his own right never could convey.

Mr. President, we have made various appropriations of money for China. I do not recall the exact amounts. It seems to me there was one appropriation of $680,000,000 and another appropriation of $125,000,000, which the Chinese could use for arms and equipment. We sold China millions upon millions of dollars' worth of war matériel for only a fraction, a small percentage, of what it cost—1 percent or 2 percent in some cases—amounting practically to a gift. The Senator from New Hampshire has been chairman of the Appropriations Committee for the past 2 years. If those appropriations were not adequate, why did not the Senator from New Hampshire make them adequate?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The distinguished Senator from Texas may not recall it, but the Senate of the United States did appropriate, on the 1st of last April, $125,000,000 which might be used for military supplies for the Chinese. However, up to the time, perhaps within 2

or 3 weeks ago, when the critical situation in China became so acute, only two shiploads of those materials had arrived in the Pacific waters; and up to that time none of the actual materials had reached the fighting forces of China. In other words, regardless of the intent of the Congress and the appropriations made by the Congress, the supplies did not reach the Chinese Nationalist armies.

Prior to that, for a period of almost 2 years, in spite of their dire need for small arms and cartridges and other munitions in order to be able to continue to fight, we turned our back upon Chiang Kai-shek and the Chinese Nationalists, and we virtually turned them over to the mercies of the Chinese Communists.

One of the things Mr. Acheson said in the article, if the Senator will read it, is that the Chinese Communists are not Moscow Communists. I wish the Senator would read the article carefully before he takes issue with me, because I think probably he would share some of the views I have expressed regarding it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire refers to an appropriation of $125,000,000. Let me say that appropriation was so framed as to give the Chinese the right to do anything they wanted with it. That was done in order to enable them to spend the money for arms, ammunition, and other supplies of a military character.

But the Senator from New Hampshire omits to state that prior to that time we had, on the islands in the Pacific, great masses of military equipment, which we diverted to the Chinese, and the Chinese used it. The information coming to us was that hundreds of thousands of cartridges which supposedly were reaching the Chinese Nationalist armies, actually were turned over to the Communists, either by the Nationalists or by some other Chinese officials. The Communists thus were using material, including arms and ammunition, which the United States had supplied.

Let me refer for a moment to Secretary Marshall. The Senator from New Hampshire is acquainted with him, of course.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am.

Mr. CONNALLY. Before he became Secretary of State, General Marshall spent 13 months in China, trying to give aid to the Chinese.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, if the Senator from Texas will permit me to interrupt him for a moment, let me say I do not think it is appropriate or correct to state that General Marshall spent 13 months in China attempting to give aid to the Chinese. I think he spent 13 months there in a rather futile effort to bring the Communists and the Nationalists together in a sort of coalition movement. But he accomplished nothing, and he returned very embittered. The result has been that China, to all intents and purposes, has been scuttled.

I have a very high opinion of General Marshall as Chief of Staff.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think he did a wonderful job during the war. But as an emissary of this Government to China, I think his efforts were of questionable value.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator from New Hampshire has so much confidence in Mr. Marshall as a general, it seems to me he might trust Mr. Marshall after he had 13 months' experience in China, with close contact with the situation there. Certainly under those circumstances, it seems to me, the Senator from New Hampshire might trust Mr. Marshall as well as he might trust some person who remained here in the United States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from Texas will yield to me, I should like to say to the able chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee that I do not know whether his committee has yet had a chance to examine the directive under which Mr. Marshall went to China. Both on behalf of the Senate and on behalf of the people of the United States I certainly hope the Foreign Relations Committee will examine the directive under which Mr. Marshall went to China. They should determine whether that directive grew out of the discussions at Yalta, where the Chinese, our historic friends and our allies in a great war, were "sold down the river."

Certainly the results of what happened at Yalta are now being made clear in China today, where it looks as if the Communists will be able to overcome our historic friends and allies in China.

I know the able Senator from Texas will not lose sight of the fact that sitting in with the high Government officials, including the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and our high naval and military authorities, was a State Department official by the name of Alger Hiss.

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, well, Alger Hiss. Every time something comes up here they get out a Communist and chase him all around.

Mr. President, I do not sympathize with the Communists. However, it seems that the only argument some persons can present is to holler about Alger Hiss, and then refer to Yalta. They seem to have to dig up something about the dead President of the United States, and they go back to Yalta. The trouble started with the first conference we had on Europe. I heard Secretary Marshall when he came back from his first journey. We heard him testify before the committee. He told us what the troubles in China were, and I shall refer to some of them. He made no charges against the personal character of Chiang Kai-shek. Chiang was surrounded, he said, by many Chinese officials who had been with him since he first emerged as a leader, but who had lost the confidence of their people. Chiang did not have the courage to dismiss them, because they were his old friends and supporters. I do not know whether it was true, but they were charged with graft and corruption, and it was claimed a large part of the funds we were appropriating never got to the people of China themselves. General Marshall endeavored to bring about a coalition government, which he thought was the best way out. He endeavored to have the——

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. Just a moment. Let me finish a sentence. I have yielded to the Senator several times. I shall yield again.

Mr. BRIDGES. I would like to ask the Senator a question, in a word, at that point.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me finish one little sentence, before the Senator interrupts. If the Senator will please bear with me——

Mr. BRIDGES. Very well.

Mr. CONNALLY. General Marshall undertook to bring about a coalition government. We heard him report about it. We heard him tell how he had flown from one place to another, with little groups assigned to that area, and he thought when he first came back that progress was being made. He thought that a coalition government would be the best solution of the situation. Otherwise, armed operations would have to continue. General Marshall went to China a second time. He was not able to bring about what he desired. He came away with sadness, and with disappointment, but not with bitterness. He did not come back with bitterness toward the Chinese people. He did come back with disappointment and bitterness toward those officials in the nationalist government who were untrue to their trust and who had lost the confidence of the people of China. I now yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Those were the people who refused to join the Communists.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I do not know that that is true at all. The Senator may know. If he does, if the Senator will assert——

Mr. BRIDGES. I merely want to point out——

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator will assert on his responsibility as a Senator that that is true, I will accept it.

Mr. BRIDGES. I believe it to be true.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator believes. I want him to assert it as a fact. I do not want any belief. Some persons even believe in ghosts.

Mr. BRIDGES. I assert most things as facts, but I believe a good many things I do not know to be facts, but of which I may have a reasonably accurate knowledge. However, the Senator says that General Marshall's object was to bring the Communists together in a coalition government with the nationalists. I should like to ask the Senator if he can name any country in the world where the Communists have been brought into a coalition government, where within a reasonable time they have not undermined the government and taken over the country?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Texas is not going to undertake a historical research and lay before the Senator from New Hampshire all the scholarship of the past. The Senator comes from New England, where scholarship is just hanging around in gobs. The Senator should know his history, without referring to one who like myself comes from a bucolic area such as the State of Texas. Of course, the Communists are working at their job, just as every other cult and ideology is undertaking to advance its views—almost as vigorously as

the Senator from New Hampshire tried in the recent election and is trying at present to put forward his views and his ideology. We cannot all succeed. In China there was a realistic condition. General Marshall had to face conditions. He had to make the best of what was there. He could not wave a magic wand and convert all the Communists north of the Yangtze River. He could not wave another wand and bring all the Nationalists into a love feast with the Communists, or the Communists with the Nationalists. No, Mr. President, he could not do that. But in closing I simply want to say that I think the attack by the Senator from New Hampshire on the Secretary of State is wholly unjustified.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I made no attack on the Secretary of State. I merely referred to the remarks of his brother, and as to the new Secretary of State, raised the question whether it would not be very proper for him to reveal to the Congress and to the country whether his brother's views, so forcibly expressed, represented his own. It was not an attack on the Secretary himself.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; it was no attack at all—it was merely kicking him in the ribs, punching him in the nose, and pummeling him. It was no attack at all. Of course, it was an attack; not such an attack as a witness might make under oath in court. It was not an attack like that of a witness who must produce facts. But it is an attack by way of insinuation. "His brother thinks so and so, and therefore, if his brother thinks so and so, he is bound to think so and so. His brother's mind is reflected in his mind."

I do not doubt that the characters of the two men differ considerably. I know nothing about the man of whom the Senator speaks, but I do know Mr. Dean Acheson. I know that he appeared before our committee and that every Senator was invited to come before the committee in secret hearing to interrogate him. Senators did not come. When the vote came, every Senator who was at the hearing voted unanimously to report the nomination favorably. The committee held a public hearing, at which everybody was invited to be present, and it was attended by a large audience. So, Mr. President, I hope the Senator——

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes, I yield. I hope, not much further.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator was chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and no doubt he is familiar with the incident. Can he tell us why General Marshall, as Secretary of State, and other responsible Government officials suppressed the Wedemeyer report on China?

Mr. CONNALLY. I know nothing about the Wedemeyer report. I have never seen it.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator knows about it, does he not?

Mr. CONNALLY. I understand there is such a document as the Wedemeyer report.

Mr. BRIDGES. Why does the Senator suppose we sent to China an outstanding general like General Wedemeyer, who spent much time in studying conditions and preparing a report, only to have the report treated as such a secret document that the whole power of the United States Government has been used to suppress it?

Mr. CONNALLY. I suppose one reason was, the report was not made to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct. Had it been, it would have been published.

Mr. CONNALLY. Another reason was, it was not made to the Senate of the United States. I assume the report was made to the Chief Executive of the United States, under whom General Wedemeyer was serving. I do not know why it was not made public. I suppose it served its purpose. I suppose it advised the President of the United States of the things General Wedemeyer wanted to impart to him, and it probably was not deemed necessary or advisable or wise to publish the report. That is my answer.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does not the Senator, as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, feel that was very vital, a very important report, and that it would have been only courtesy to him to show him that report?

Mr. CONNALLY. I was not chairman of the committee when the report came in.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator not think that as ranking minority member, he was entitled to see it?

Mr. CONNALLY. I have been chairman only a very short time.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator not think it would be a very nice thing if the Senator would call for it now?

Mr. CONNALLY. Why does the Senator not call for it? The Senator can offer a resolution. Let him submit a resolution calling upon the President to dig it up. Let him say in the resolution, "Cough up, Mr. President, the report of General Wedemeyer's." The Senator has his recourse. I was not chairman, and I was not responsible for the report, or for its publication. I know nothing of what is in the report.

There is a great deal of suspicion. It is as though someone were saying, "Let us find out something here, if we can, that we have not seen. Let us find something wrong here. I can smell it. Something wrong."

Mr. President, I do not want to indulge in such procedure.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to ask the Senator one further question. Inasmuch as the Senator has suggested that a resolution be introduced to call for the Wedemeyer report, and has recommended that be done——

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I have not recommended anything of the kind.

Mr. BRIDGES. I assumed that.

Mr. CONNALLY. No. The Senator makes too many assumptions. I said the Senator had his remedy, if he wanted to follow it. I have not recommended it. I have not suggested it.

Mr. BRIDGES. Very well.

Mr. CONNALLY. Anyone who suggests anything to the Senator from New Hampshire acts upon a great presumption.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Texas, who is chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, if I should offer such a resolution and it should be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, will the Senator assure me that it will be reported favorably?

Mr. CONNALLY. No; the Senator from Texas will not assure the Senator from New Hampshire anything of the kind. The Senator from Texas is only a member of the committee. The resolution might contain anything.

VOLUNTARY AGREEMENTS IN INDUSTRY, ETC.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 547) to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Holland	Mundt
Anderson	Humphrey	Murray
Baldwin	Hunt	Myers
Brewster	Ives	Neely
Bricker	Jenner	O'Conor
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Broughton	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Cain	Kefauver	Russell
Chapman	Kem	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kerr	Schoeppel
Connally	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Donnell	Langer	Sparkman
Ecton	Lodge	Stennis
Ellender	Long	Taft
Flanders	Lucas	Taylor
Frear	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Fulbright	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
George	McFarland	Thye
Gillette	McKellar	Tydings
Green	Magnuson	Watkins
Hayden	Martin	Wiley
Hendrickson	Maybank	Williams
Hickenlooper	Miller	Withers
Hill	Millikin	
Hoey	Morse	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio, which the Clerk will state.

The CHIEF CLERK (Emery L. Frazier). On page 1, line 6, it is proposed to strike out "September 30, 1949" and to insert "March 31, 1950"; and on the same page, line 9, to strike out "September 30, 1949" and to insert "March 31, 1950."

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this amendment the yeas and nays have been requested.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea."

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. If present, the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay" and the Senator from Michigan would vote "yea."

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH] is paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "nay" and the Senator from North Dakota would vote "yea."

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. If present, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay" and the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] would vote "yea" and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on official committee business and is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] would vote "yea" and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] would vote "yea" and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate, and is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] would vote "yea" and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is unavoidably detained.

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 48, as follows:

YEAS—31

Aiken	Hendrickson	Saltonstall
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Schoeppel
Brewster	Ives	Smith, Maine
Bricker	Jenner	Smith, N. J.
Bridges	Kem	Taft
Butler	Knowland	Thye
Cain	Lodge	Watkins
Cordon	McCarthy	Wiley
Donnell	Martin	Williams
Ecton	Millikin	
Flanders	Mundt	

NAYS—48

Anderson	Hunt	Morse
Broughton	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Myers
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Connally	Kefauver	O'Conor
Ellender	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Frear	Kilgore	Pepper
Fulbright	Langer	Robertson
George	Long	Russell
Gillette	Lucas	Sparkman
Green	McClellan	Stennis
Hayden	McFarland	Taylor
Hill	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Hoey	Magnuson	Thomas, Utah
Holland	Maybank	Tydings
Humphrey	Miller	Withers

NOT VOTING—17

Byrd	Gurney	Tobey
Capehart	McCarran	Vandenberg
Douglas	McGrath	Wagner
Downey	McMahon	Wherry
Eastland	Malone	Young
Ferguson	Reed	

So Mr. BRICKER's amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is still open to amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORIZATION FOR A COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be authorized to report during the adjournment following today's session Joint Resolution 31, providing for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THRIFT IN THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the Treasury has recently undertaken to establish among the school children of the Nation what is called thrift week in connection with the sale of bonds. I have in my hand a letter from a friend of mine in Mason City, Iowa, the writer being Mr. F. C. Heneman, who sends me a news story from the Mason City Globe Gazette which indicates, at least, I believe, the expression of one portion of public sentiment with regard to the whole philosophy involved. I wish to read a few excerpts from this news story:

The request to Mason City's pastors to help with the observance of thrift week failed of a wholehearted response.

"Our National Government today is trying to solve the problem of having an unprecedented deficit by having the Nation's school children practice thrift while the Nation's political leaders waste with an arrogance and contempt that no story book ever presumed to portray," Dr. Roy C. Helfenstein, of the First Congregational Church stated.

"Somebody always has to pay the fiddler. In this case it is the taxpayers who have nothing to take the place of money when taxes take all the money they have.

"It would all come nearer making sense if the leaders in Washington, from the President on down, would set the example of thrift which our Nation and the world at large so sorely needs.

"It all sounds hypocritical, if not silly, for the National Government to ask all the children of the Nation who are in our public schools to practice thrift for 1 week while our Nation's political leaders go merrily on throwing the people's money to the four winds without thought for a single minute about the importance of thrift in high places as well as low."

Asking four billion additional taxes at this time is ridiculous, the pastor pointed out, adding that:

"Asking the people to practice thrift in order that the leaders in Washington may be able to spend with an abandon and prodigality which, if practiced by the citizenry of the Nation, would soon put the entire populace on the relief list—in the light of this—the request for their observance is absolutely out of place and grossly and unpardonably inconsistent," he said.

"The best observance that the public school could make of thrift week would be for the susperintendents, principals, and teachers to persuade every pupil or student to write a letter to the Federal thrift committee, United States Congress, Washington, D. C., asking that the Nation's leaders set a good example before the school children of the Nation by practicing the principles of thrift."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter of transmittal from Mr. Heneman and the entire news story be printed immediately following my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF MASON CITY,
Mason City, Iowa, January 28, 1949.

The Honorable BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HICKENLOOPER: As you probably know, the Treasury Department in connection with the sale of United States savings bonds, has been endeavoring to have a thrift week program put on through the school system of the country. At the same time they have asked the ministerial association to make thrift the topic of a Sunday morning service. I think you would be interested in some reactions that we have noticed in this town of a little more than 30,000 people. I am enclosing a clipping taken from the Mason City Globe Gazette of January 26, 1949, which represents a brief summary of points made by one of our leading ministers at his morning service.

I am also enclosing a copy of a letter from our superintendent of schools, who is a man of high standing in this community, in which he sets forth very clearly the ideas he has in

connection with this type of move. I am sending these to you because I believe they are signs of our times and that you will find them of interest.

Sincerely yours,

F. C. HENEMAN, *President.*

[From the Mason City Globe-Gazette of January 26, 1949]

SAYS REQUEST FOR THRIFT IS HYPOCRITICAL

The request to Mason City pastors to help in the observance of thrift week failed of a wholehearted response.

"Our National Government today is trying to solve the problem of having an unprecedented deficit by having the Nation's school children practice thrift while the Nation's political leaders waste with an arrogance and contempt that no storybook ever presumed to portray," Dr. Roy C. Helfenstein, of the First Congregational Church, stated.

"Somebody always has to pay the fiddler. In this case it is the taxpayers who have nothing to take the place of money when taxes take all the money they have."

SHOULD SET EXAMPLE

"It would all come nearer making sense if the leaders in Washington, from the President on down, would set the example of thrift which our Nation and the world at large so sorely need.

"It all sounds hypocritical, if not silly, for the National Government to ask all the children of the Nation who are in our public schools to practice thrift for 1 week while our Nation's political leaders go merrily on throwing the people's money to the four winds without thought for a single minute about the importance of thrift in high places as well as low."

Asking four billion additional taxes at this time is ridiculous, the pastor pointed out, adding that:

IS INCONSISTENT

"Asking the people to practice thrift in order that the leaders in Washington may be able to spend with an abandon and prodigality which, if practiced by the citizenry of the Nation, would soon put the entire populace on the relief list—in the light of this—the request for their observance is absolutely out of place and grossly and unpardonably inconsistent," he said.

"The best observance that the public school could make of thrift week would be for the superintendents, principals, and teachers to persuade every pupil or student to write a letter to the Federal thrift committee, United States Congress, Washington, D. C., asking that the Nation's leaders set a good example before the school children of the Nation by practicing the principles of thrift."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa asked unanimous consent, I understand, and I was on my feet addressing the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The consent was granted, the Chair understood.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was on my feet addressing the Chair, because I desired to make a statement to be placed in the RECORD immediately following the article which has been read by the Senator from Iowa.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wyoming reserve the right to object?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I reserve the right to object because I think the article is an extremely good illustration of the complete misconception which a great many people have of the expenditures of the Federal Government.

The Eightieth Congress, which went out of existence at the beginning of this year, made appropriations for the fiscal year 1949. Those appropriations were made after due consideration of the President's budget. Many members of the majority in the Eightieth Congress asserted over and over again that the expenditures of the Federal Government were wasteful, that they should be reduced, and while they were making the protestations that the President's budget was wasteful, they were themselves approving recommendations of the Budget Bureau and passing the appropriation bills. The reductions which were put into effect made very little difference in the total budget, and frequently were followed by deficiency appropriations.

Now the fact of the matter is that the expenditures of the Federal Government have been made very high because from 75 to 80 percent of them are for war-connected expenses which cannot be avoided. So I want the author of the statement, when he reads it in the RECORD, to read also the statement of at least one Member of the Senate that his criticisms are utterly without foundation.

The President of the United States, in submitting his budgets to the Congress of the United States ever since he assumed that high executive responsibility, has endeavored—and I think successfully—to cut expenditures to the bone. He has been faced, however, with the necessity of providing funds to take care of veterans' services, to maintain the Army and the Navy and the United States Air Force, to carry on international obligations, and to pay the interest upon the national debt, which amounts to $5,000,000,000 annually—an interest which must be paid if the national debt is to be serviced. All of what is expressed in the statement is based upon an entire misconception of the responsibility of the Government.

I may say that the Senate only last week passed unanimously an appropriation bill adding $500,000 to the disaster fund of the President of the United States, although in a previous Congress the President's disaster fund was seriously cut. This same Congress, without any dissent at all, passed a bill which was introduced by the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] on behalf of the Senator from six Western States, authorizing the appropriation of some $3,000,000 for relief from the unprecedented blizzard which affects the entire West, from western Nebraska and western South Dakota to the Pacific coast. These expenditures of government are made on the recommendation of the President and on the approval of the Congress only because they have to be made to provide for unavoidable expenses devolving upon the Government of the United States.

CONSTRUCTION OF LOW-RENT HOUSES

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, out of order I ask unanimous consent to introduce, on behalf of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and myself, a bill dealing with housing. I also ask to have the bill printed in the RECORD, and to be permited to make an explanatory statement with respect to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD. And without objection, the Senator may proceed with his statement.

The bill (S. 757) to provide an effective method for the construction of low-rent homes for low-income families with a minimum of Federal control and expenditure, introduced by Mr. CAIN (for himself and Mr. BRICKER), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as "The Mutual Low-Rent Homes Construction Act."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. Because a shortage of housing is contrary to the national interest, and because increased home ownership will promote the national welfare, it is the policy of the United States to assist in relieving housing shortages, and to foster and promote the increase of home ownership among the people of the Nation. Because the provision of decent, safe, and sanitary housing for families of low income is a matter of national concern and a prerequisite to the achievement of the freedom from want and freedom from fear which are among our national objectives, it is the policy of the United States to join with States and municipalities in providing a subsidy to make possible the construction of low-rent homes wherever they may be needed in any State. It is the policy of the United States to provide this assistance to home construction without doing violence to the traditional American preference for private enterprise under local rather than Federal control and supervision, and without unjustifiably increasing the size or powers of the Federal agencies. It is the purpose and intent of this act to carry out these policies.

LOCAL LOW-RENT MUTUALS

SEC. 3. A local low-rent mutual, to qualify under this act, shall have (1) not less than 5 nor more than 7 trustees, each named for a term of 5 years, and each of whom shall have been individually appointed as such trustee by the local municipal or county government before the issuance of a State charter to the mutual, (2) a membership committee, appointed by unanimous vote of the trustees, which shall establish rules and procedure for the membership, and (3) members selected by the membership committee from families having family incomes in the lowest one-fifth of family incomes in the community.

GRANTS TO LOCAL LOW-RENT MUTUALS

SEC. 4. (a) The Administrator of the Federal Works Administration is authorized to make grants to local low-rent mutuals to assist in the construction of homes projects undertaken by such mutuals. The amount of any such grant shall be equal to 25 percent of the estimated total development cost of the homes project involved. The aggregate amount of all such grants shall not exceed $1,750,000,000.

(b) A local low-rent mutual shall be eligible for a grant as provided in this section when (1) the municipality within which such mutual was formed shall have approved, by referendum or appropriate action of the local governing authority, establishment of a fund to be used for making grants equal to 12½ percent of the estimated total development cost of low-rent homes projects within such municipality, (2) such a grant from such

fund shall have been made to such mutual, (3) the plans for the mutual low-rent homes project and the site for such project shall have been approved by the local governing authority for the community within which such site is located, and (4) the State within which such site is located, or some appropriate agency thereof, shall have made a grant to such mutual equal to 12½ percent of the estimated total development cost of such projects.

RULES AND REGULATIONS

SEC. 5. The Administrator of the Federal Works Administration is authorized to make necessary rules and regulations to carry out the purposes of this act.

AUTHORITY FOR APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, including funds for making the grants provided in section 4. Not more than 10 percent of the funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be available for low-rent homes projects in any one State.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 7. As used in this act—

(1) "Community" means a municipality;

(2) "Mutual homes project" means a project for the development and construction of low-rent homes sponsored by a local low-rent mutual pursuant to the terms of this act, and occupancy of which is limited to members of the local low-rent mutual;

(3) "Family" means a group of not less than 2 persons related to one another by blood or marriage and living within the same dwelling unit;

(4) "Family income" means the total of the combined annual incomes of the members of a family;

(5) "Local low-rent mutual" means a mutual association or non-stock corporation formed and chartered under State law and qualifying under section 3;

(6) "Local municipal or county government" means the mayor, city manager, town or city council, village board, board of aldermen, board of county commissioners, or other responsible administrative authority of a municipality, having appropriate jurisdiction under applicable local law;

(7) "Local law" means the currently existing law of a State or municipality;

(8) "Low-rent home" means a family dwelling unit for which total development cost is between $3,000 and $7,000;

(9) "Municipality" means a county, parish, city, town, village, or other municipal subdivision of a State, having an organized municipal government;

(10) "State" means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, or Alaska;

(11) "Total development cost" means the aggregate cost of development, including actual or allocable expenditures for land, planning, site preparation, roads, streets, and utilities not normally a municipal responsibility, and all construction costs;

(12) "Low-rent homes project" means a mutual homes project sponsored by a local low-rent mutual.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, it is my privilege, on behalf of the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and myself, to submit for the consideration of the Congress and the Nation a bill which will provide 1,000,000 housing units, if they be needed, which will rent for $30 per month or less, at a cost to our Federal Government not to exceed $1,750,000,000.

I should like to point out to the Senators that when compared with S. 138, which is designed to provide for 1,000,000 public housing units, our bill would mean a savings of $16,050,000,000 to the taxpayers of the Nation. In addition, our bill would provide for eventual home ownership for the occupants of the low-rent housing units so provided.

Mr. President, since coming to the Congress 2 years ago the junior Senator from Washington has been more perplexed and concerned by the Nation's low-rent question than by any other. I have been among those who have strongly resisted the efforts of the administration, and many Members of the Congress, to have the Federal Government create and administer a large-scale subsidized low-rent program throughout the Nation. I have willingly agreed with those who wish to foster such a program that there is a real need to create a substantial housing for a segment of our society which is economically unable to secure present-day housing at a price they can afford to pay, but I have vigorously opposed their belief that this objective can best or only be achieved through management, supervision, and almost complete subsidy by the Federal Government. My thought has been that management and supervision are proper prerogatives of local government, and that required subsidies must be jointly shared by local, State, and Federal levels of government.

Those who have shared my point of view, and there are a number on both side of the aisle, have likewise shared my conspicuous opposition weakness. We have up to this time been opposing something we thought to be wrong, with nothing. We have had nothing constructive to offer as an approach to the subsidized low-rent question. We have merely been against what we did not like. This negative position has brought us distress, and it has been often misunderstood by many who considered us to be obstructionists.

The bill which the Senator from Ohio and I have just sent to the desk is conceived by us to be a solid, reasonable, and constructive approach to the subsidized low-rent problem. All we hope is that serious students of the housing question, both in and out of Congress, will critically examine this new approach, for it has not previously been publicly considered. The Senator from Ohio and I have absolutely no pride of authorship. The idea we advance is not original with us. It has come partly from America and partly from abroad—certainly from Sweden. If others, after study, think it as good as we do we want to join with them in doing something about it.

From some points of view the bill has three surface weaknesses, none of which I conceive to be valid. When compared to every other present proposal before the Congress, the Cain-Bricker proposal does not cost enough. The bill is so simple in concept and words that it can be understood by everybody, and there are those who think that legislation must be complicated to be good. The proposal, if adopted, would return the low-rent problem to the American city and county, where it belongs. That many will fight the idea for this reason is clearly obvious. All the sponsors ask, Mr. President, is that the legislation be examined against the standard of writing legislation which serves the best interests of our citizens everywhere.

I should like to outline briefly what our bill proposes. It is designed to organize mutual low-rent-housing societies at the local level by providing grants-in-aid by local, State, and Federal Governments equal to 50 percent of the total development cost of the housing projects.

We feel that local influence and control must prevail if a project is to be successful. We provide for initiating the grants-in-aid by the local government through the medium of a local referendum which will assure 12½ percent of the total development cost of the project by the municipality. After the local community has voted upon the subject and pledged 12½ percent of the cost, the State in which the project is located would provide 12½ percent of the cost. Then the Federal Government would match these two grants-in-aid by local and State governments in the amount of 25 percent of the total development cost. Thus, with local, State, and Federal grants-in-aid, 50 percent of the cost would be assured.

The remaining 50 percent for the development would be secured from private first-mortgage sources with a long-term mortgage regularly amortized and with the lowest possible interest rate.

Mr. President, I mentioned a few moments ago that our bill, for comparison purposes, would provide the same number of low-rent housing units, namely 1,000,000, at a maximum cost of $7,000 per unit. That totals $7,000,000,000 for the total cost of 1,000,000 units. However, the Federal Government is obligated only to the extent of one-fourth of this total cost, or $1,750,000,000. I should like to point out that S. 138 provides for an annual subsidy of $445,000,000 for a 40-year period, which amount totals $17,800,000,000, and which, presumably, is to supply 1,000,000 public-housing units. Therefore, the difference, Mr. President, between the cost to the Federal Government in form of subsidy for 1,000,000 units under S. 138 and the Cain-Bricker proposal is $16,050,000,000.

Every Senator has heard much, Mr. President, about Federal aid to education, Federal aid to medicine, Federal aid for this, and Federal aid for that. The saving which could be realized in this one piece of legislation alone would more than pay for all of the other proposals—assuming, of course, Mr. President, that the Senate would approve those proposals.

Whereas a substantially large agency is necessary to administer the administration's legislation, our bill would require nothing but local administration. This is made possible by the fact that the bill provides for only one payment in the form of grants-in-aid and no Federal or State administrative agency, while the administration bill provides for a continuity of 40 years' administration through a Federal agency during the time provided for payment of the subsidy.

The maximum cost limit under this Cain-Bricker bill is $7,000 per house, including the land, while the administration bill limits the cost to $2,500 per room.

Taking the average two bedroom, five-room house, the maximum cost per house to the taxpayer under S. 138 would be $12,500 exclusive of land and other facilities. Mr. President, practically every city in this Nation has tax land already owned by the city. This could well be the nucleus for the start of a project as proposed in our bill.

I repeat, Mr. President, that this bill provides that only one-fourth of the total cost of the development of these projects be assumed by the Government. Under S. 138, the administration bill, a minimum of 90 percent of the total cost is borne by the Federal Government.

Home ownership is the eventual goal of our bill. The tenants who are participants in these mutual housing developments would eventually become owners of their own homes in which they live. This is impossible under the administration's housing bill, because it is set up to be rental housing at all times.

Although the administration bill refers to local public-housing agencies as the governing agencies, I know from my own personal experience that this is not true, because the plans, sites, tenants, and procedures are all screened and finally passed upon by Washington. Under the Cain-Bricker bill, full and complete control would be vested in the local community and local authorities. Neither Federal nor State Government would have any controlling influence.

Qualifications for admission to these mutual housing projects proposed in our bill are specifically limited to those families having an income in the lowest one-fifth of the family incomes in the community, as determined by the trustees who are appointed by the municipal or county government. Under S. 138 the local public housing agency must show the Washington office that a gap—and I quote from the bill, Mr. President—

> A gap of at least 20 percent has been left between the upper rental limits for admission to the proposed low-rent housing and the lowest rents at which private enterprise is providing (through new construction and available existing structures) a substantial supply of * * * housing toward meeting the need of an adequate volume thereof.

The only assurance that the lowest income groups can get into the housing provided for by the administration bill is that there shall be no discrimination against them.

The Cain-Bricker bill provides that the mutual housing projects to be constructed shall pay local ad valorem taxes to lessen the tax burden of the local community. The administration bill, however, specifically exempts the public housing units from paying local real-estate taxes, thereby adding to the burden of the community which must provide sewerage, water, police, and fire protection with no income from the project to assist in payment for these services. However, a token payment may be made in lieu of taxes.

The rents being paid in public housing projects today admittedly average over $30 per month. Rentals under the Cain-Bricker bill could be kept within a $13–$30 per month range. This would be possible because administration costs are confined to the local project and are not part of a superstructure of Federal agencies.

Mr. President, our bill recognizes States' rights. Under this proposal action must first be taken by the local community through local referendum before a project can be considered. In other words, the voters in every community in the Nation would have an opportunity to choose for themselves whether or not they want a mutual low-rent project in their community, as well as determine the extent of their need. Under the administration bill the local public housing agency deals directly with the Federal Government, bypassing the State. The extent of local determination is merely a request for assistance. The final decision rests in Washington. I have always contended, Mr. President, that Washington cannot foresee the requirements and needs of every community of this Nation. It must be a community-controlled-and-operated project to succeed.

While under this proposed bill the local community would participate in 12½ percent of the construction cost, the administration bill requires the community to pay 10 percent of the construction cost. But, Mr. President, I should like to point out to the Senators that the community would recover, under the Cain-Bricker bill, its portion of the grant-in-aid in the form of real-estate taxes in 7 to 12 years. Under the administration bill no real-estate taxes are paid, except the possible token payments in lieu of taxes.

I should like to point out now that because of economic rents being paid today in public-housing projects surpluses have been accumulated, and these surpluses, under the administration bill, would accrue to the benefit of the Federal Government. Under the Cain-Bricker bill, however, any profits by reason of good management go to the tenants in lower rents.

I want to state here that we used the one million units figure only as a basis for comparison with S. 138, the administration bill. There is no specific number of units that may be constructed under our proposed bill, because, of course, that number must be determined by the local communities. And there is no number picked out of a hat based upon economic theories. This bill will provide incentive for home ownership and will give the tenant an opportunity to help himself by sharing responsibilities that are rightfully his and the community's.

Aside from the fact that this bill would save the taxpayers $14,300,000,000—which is quite a sizable sum—it does not set up a Federal bureau which, by reason of the legislation, would be continued for at least 40 years. It will provide better housing for the people for whom it is intended—those in the lowest income groups of their respective communities. And, finally, full and complete authority always is vested in the local community.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a detailed explanation of the bill which, because I think it will be of thought-provoking interest to every Senator, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOCAL LOW-RENT MUTUAL HOUSING SOCIETIES

Five to seven trustees, 5-year terms.

Municipal or county government to appoint trustees.

State grants corporate charter.

Membership committee appointed by trustees.

Members selected by membership committee from lowest one-fifth family incomes in community.

Municipal referendum on establishment of fund to be used for making grants of 12½ percent of total development cost of various welfare homes projects.

Mayor or county commissioners approve plans and site, making project eligible for State and Federal grants.

State government makes grant equal to 12½ percent of total cost.

Federal Government makes grant equal to 25 percent of total cost.

Private lender makes long-term, low-interest, first-mortgage loan equal to 50 percent of total.

RESULTS

Secure long-term tenancy leading to home ownership. Monthly charges: Basic (principal and interest, common maintenance, taxes, and insurance), $13 to $30; plus charges for management and reserves established by trustees for units costing $3,000 to $7,000.

No local tax exemption.

Large element of self-help by lowest income families.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Edward H. Foley, Jr., of New York, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury, in place of A. Lee M. Wiggins, resigned;

John S. Graham, of North Carolina, to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, in place of Edward H. Foley, Jr.;

George B. Gillin, of California, to be Superintendent of the Mint of the United States at San Francisco, Calif., to fill an existing vacancy;

Gilroy Roberts, of Pennsylvania, to be engraver in the Mint of the United States at Philadelphia, Pa., to fill an existing vacancy;

Daniel A. Bolich, of New York, to be Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue, in place of Stewart Berkshire, resigned;

Ralph W. Cripe, of South Bend, Ind., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Indiana, to fill an existing vacancy;

John J. Fitzpatrick, of Connecticut, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Connecticut, to fill an existing vacancy;

John H. Alsmiller, of Kentucky, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 42, with headquarters at Louisville, Ky., in place of Harry M. Brennan, deceased;

William H. Burke, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 4, with headquarters at Boston, Mass. (reappointment);

Charles F. Murphy, of Massachusetts, to be comptroller of customs, with headquarters at Boston, Mass. (reappointment); and

George McGill, of Kansas, to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission for a term expiring June 16, 1954 (reappointment).

By Mr. GEORGE (for Mr. BYRD), from the Committee on Finance:

Stuart L. Crenshaw, of Virginia, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Virginia.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Finance:

Tully Garner, of Texas, to be collector of customs for customs collection district numbered 23, with headquarters at Laredo, Tex., vice Harry P. Hornby, deceased.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Maurice J. Tobin to be Secretary of Labor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ralph Wright to be Assistant Secretary of Labor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William E. Willett to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the nomination by President Truman of Mr. William Edward Willett, of Maryland, as a Director of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, is one which seeks to retain in the service of the Government a thoroughly competent public servant who has proven his competence both in private industry and as an official and director of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. Willett was for a number of years active in banking and the purchase and sale of securities before assuming his position with the Federal Government. It was because of his demonstrated capacity as assistant loan manager of the RFC and in other capacities that President Truman first appointed him a Director of the Corporation on June 19, 1948.

To say that he is eminently qualified for the position is encompassing in a few brief words the highest recommendation that I could give him. I sincerely trust that he will be confirmed promptly by this honorable body.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The clerk will state the next nomination on the Executive Calendar.

COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Preston Delano to be Comptroller of the Currency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank P. Douglass to be a member of the National Mediation Board.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John M. Houston to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James M. Mitchell to be a Civil Service Commissioner.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask that that nomination be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hon. F. Ryan Duffy to be circuit judge, Seventh Circuit, of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES CUSTOMS COURT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hon. Paul P. Rao to be a judge of the United States Customs Court.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William T. McCarthy to be United States district judge for the district of Massachusetts.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas Patrick Thornton to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Michigan.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hon. Roy W. Harper to be United States district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James T. Foley to be United States district judge for the northern district of New York.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hon. Samuel Hamilton Kaufman to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hon. Wilson Warlick to be United States district judge for the western district of North Carolina.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

SUPREME COURT OF PUERTO RICO

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hon. Angel R. de Jesus to be Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Luis Negron Fernandez to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph F. Deeb to be United States attorney for the western district of Michigan.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John B. Tansil to be United States attorney for the district of Montana.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Cleon A. Summers to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Oklahoma.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Gerald A. Gleeson to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Pennsylvania.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frederick Elliott Biermann to be United States marshal for the northern district of Iowa.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edwin D. Bolger to be United States marshal for the western district of Michigan.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harold K. Claypool to be United States marshal for the southern district of Ohio.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Carl H. Fleckenstine to be United States marshal for the middle district of Pennsylvania.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the Public Health Service are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I inquire what business will be considered next, and when will the Senate meet again?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senate will adjourn until Thursday next. At that time the only business coming before the Senate will be the bill reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, dealing with the continuation of the Freedom Train. That is a nonpartisan measure, and I anticipate that it will take only a short time.

Mr. President, I now move that the Senate adjourn until Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, February 3, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 31, 1949:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Dean Rusk, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Jesse M. Donaldson, of Illinois, to be Postmaster General.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Walter Lee Dunham, of Michigan, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for a portion of the term expiring June 30, 1950.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

John B. Dunlap, of Texas, to be collector of internal revenue for the second district of Texas, to fill an existing vacancy.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

Lt. Col. Walter J. Renfroe, Jr., as professor of modern languages, United States Military Academy, under the provisions of Public Law 449, Seventy-ninth Congress, June 28, 1946, and section 520 (a) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

NOTE.—This officer was given recess appointment on December 2, 1948.

IN THE ARMY

CHIEF OF ENGINEERS

Maj. Gen. Lewis Andrew Pick, 08396, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), for appointment as Chief of Engineers, United States Army, and for appointment as major general in the Regular Army of the United States under the provisions of section 11, National Defense Act, as amended, and title V, Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

CHIEF OF FINANCE

Brig. Gen. Eugene M. Foster, 06228, United States Army, for appointment as Chief of Finance, United States Army, and for appointment as major general in the Regular Army of the United States under the provisions of section 9a, National Defense Act, as amended, and title V, Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named midshipmen (aviation) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949:

Billy J. Baggett
Robert A. Westropp

John E. Parsons, Jr. (Naval R. O. T. C.) to be an ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949:

Robert S. Blake	Thomas A. Kamm
William J. D. Bradford 3d	Adair Miller
William W. Davenport	Joseph J. Packo
Benjamin Dillahunty	Kenneth F. Pedersen
Edward J. Francois	Neil A. Swartz
	Stanford J. Watson

Lek K. Von Kaesborg (civilian college graduate) to be an ensign in the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949, in lieu of ensign in the Navy as previously nominated, to correct date of rank.

James H. Greene (civilian college graduate) to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy (special duty officer).

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, to rank from date indicated after each name:

Erwin L. Aufdenkamp, June 3, 1949.
James H. Breunlin, June 4, 1948.

George L. Moreman (civilian college graduate) to be an ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949, in lieu of ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy as previously nominated, to correct date of rank.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Ferris G. Hodge
Frederick S. Welham

LIEUTENANT

Eldon O. Schnoebelen

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

June V. Alvis	Martha J. Hennessee
Eileen M. Bartels	Laura M. Hoff
Violet E. Bors	Eva M. Jacobsen
Wanda C. Bowman	Louise F. Jakshe
Reba M. Bradford	Marie A. Johncola
Marjorie J. Brumit	Mary-Jeanne Lagano
Edith M. Cadman	Clara J. Leoni
Mary G. Cain	Leslie E. McBratney
Jacqueline M. Camp	Mary P. McCarthy
Mary Cerrato	Betty L. McDonald
Eleanor M. Chapman	Kathleen M. Malloy
Patricia E. Cresap	Marcella A. Micklewicz
Nancy J. Crosby	
Dorothy K. Cummings	Constance A. Miller
Martha K. Daugherty	Doris M. Mortimer
Mary I. Dekenys	Geraldine L. Newstrom
Helen M. DeWitt	Regina M. Olko
Vivian M. M. Dicke	Celia Olshefski
Catherine R. Dupuis	Angie L. Pettit
Virginia C. Faeth	Joan E. Pollick
Mary J. Franco	Evelyn F. Przybylek
Maurine G. Frederick	Muriel E. Ramage
Dorothy L. French	Madeleine J. Ruppert
Ina A. Gibson	Carolyn J. Shearer
Dorothy F. Giorgio	Katherine Vagenas
Rebecca Gomez	Florence H. Volkering
Anna G. Hart	Genevieve E. Wagasky

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

COMMANDER

Richard B. Phillips

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Alexander A. Bolton, Jr.	Carl W. DeOnier
William McG. Crafft	William W. Manson

LIEUTENANTS

Sidney D. Bond, Jr.
John A. McAfoos
Carl E. Pruett

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Robert H. Lemmon	Eugene C. Stone, Jr.
John L. Reed	Roger K. Wallace
Anthony P. Rush	

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

COMMANDER

Willard J. Goldring

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Allen L. McInturff
Syrus E. Tande

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS

Frederick E. Batterson	Ralph A. Sennott
Robert S. Leopold	Carroll M. White

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

William E. Hull
Willard J. Goldring

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS

Ethel J. MacNaughton
Mary J. Wolfe

Otto A. Fennig to be a lieutenant in the Navy, for limited duty only, classification engineering, in lieu of lieutenant in the Navy, for limited duty only, classification Engineering, as previously nominated, to correct spelling of name.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The below-named officer for appointment to the permanent grade of major general in the Marine Corps:

Franklin A. Hart

The below-named officer for appointment to the temporary grade of major general in the Marine Corps:

John T. Walker

The below-named officer for appointment to the permanent grade of brigadier general in the Marine Corps:

Lawson H. M. Sanderson

The below-named officer for appointment to the temporary grade of brigadier general in the Marine Corps:

Walter W. Wensinger

The below-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of colonel in the Marine Corps:

Wayne H. Adams	Albert J. Keller
Elliott E. Bard	Ralph M. King
Nelson K. Brown	August Larson
Austin R. Brunelli	Harry S. Leon
Edward B. Carney	Richard C. Mangrum
John H. Cook, Jr.	Francis J. McQuillen
Harlan C. Cooper	Luther S. Moore
Edward J. Dillon	Ben Z. Redfield
Robert E. Fojt	Charles D. Roberts
Edward H. Forney	Charles J. Schlapkohl
Harry G. Fortune	Walter T. Short
Edmund B. Games	Clifford H. Shuey
Bankson T. Holcomb, Jr.	William B. Steiner
Lewis C. Hudson	Samuel G. Taxis
	John A. While
	Frederic L. Wieseman

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps:

Thomas J. Ahern	Arthur A. Poindexter
Darrell L. Cool	Bennet G. Powers
George E. Dooley	Charles O. Rogers
Carl V. Larsen	Eugene N. Thompson
David E. Marshall	Vernon O. Ullman
Arba L. Norton	Harry A. Waldorf
Edward L. Peoples	

The following-named officers for appointment to the temporary grade of lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps:

Olin L. Beall	August F. Schonefeld
Robert E. McCook	Rupert E. Stone

The following-named officer for appointment to the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps Reserve:

Donald R. Nugent

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of major in the Marine Corps:

Anthony A. Akstin	Robert I. Bryan
William E. Baird	Lyle E. Buck
William J. Barnatt	Roscoe E. Cole
John H. Blumenstein	Francis P. Dayton
Richard L. Braun	Frederic F. Draper
Joseph A. Bruder	Cecil D. Ferguson

Herbert Gomes	Albert L. Pope
Robert H. Hammond	Kenneth L. Reusser
Charles H. Horn	Thomas H. Rogers, Jr.
Roy N. Johnston	John E. Shepherd, Jr.
Bolish J. Kozak	Clyde T. Suttle
George E. Leppig	Edward C. Thoemmes
Truman K. Lyford	Harold Wallace
Charles L. McIndoe	Warren E. Whipple
Carl A. Nielsen	James S. Williams
Glenn E. Norris	Russell L. Young
William R. Ourand, Jr.	John W. Zuber

The following-named officers for appointment to the temporary grade of major in the Marine Corps:

George K. Acker	James D. Ludvigson
Emory L. Anderson	John W. Mace
Max Beruefly, Jr.	Gilbert McConville
Richard Burgess	Doyle A. New
Charles W. Case	Frederick O'Connor
Zadik Collier	Fulton L. Oglesby
Philip J. Costello	Harry C. Parsons
George R. Eargle	George S. Plantier
John H. Faggart	Lee E. Roberts
Thomas G. Fields	Charles Seiler
Harry D. Hargrave	Frederick M. Steinhauser
Johnny Jennings	
Samuel A. Johnstone, Jr.	Reuben S. Stoner
	Vernon A. Tuson
Arthur L. Kent	John W. Webber
Harry E. Kipp	Lloyd O. Williams
Wilfred S. LeFrancois	William L. Williams
Stephen Leako	William L. Woodruff

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of captain in the Marine Corps:

Arthur H. Ackerman	Odia "E" Howe, Jr.
Howard K. Alberts	James O. Huston
Philip R. Anderson	Joseph N. Irick
Stanislaus A. Antos	William C. James, Jr.
Wade W. Atkins	George E. Jenkins
James P. Aynes	Charles D. Jones
Billy H. Barber	States R. Jones, Jr.
Irvin "J" Barney	Joseph R. Kapsch
George F. Bauman	Theodore A. Kelley
Herbert L. Beckington	George C. Knapp
Louis W. Benjamin, Jr.	Alexander Kositch
William C. Benton	George A. Krumm
James L. Berard	Eugene F. Langan
Albert J. Bibee	Stewart R. Lauer
Richard L. Bland	George E. Lawrence
James D. Boldman	Harry Lee
Raymond N. Bowman	Claude H. Lewis, Jr.
Lawrence H. Brandon	William R. Lobell
William B. Buckner, Jr.	Edwin B. Long
	Edward "H" Mackel
Robert H. Buettner	John H. Maher
Clarence J. Busick	Norbert C. Manley, Jr.
Warren A. Butcher	Kenneth L. Mann
Raymond J. Butters	William S. McCarson
Robert O. Carlock	James D. McGough
Nicholas Chernock	Oscar "J" Morel
Richard W. Cline	Robert J. Morrison
Frank R. Collen	Victor E. Myers
Ralph D. Coplan	James R. O'Moore
Charles E. Crew	Will S. Patee, Jr.
Calvin K. Currens	Uel D. Peters
Eldon E. Davidson	Franklin N. Pippin
Stanley Davis	Eugene J. Pope
William E. Deeds	John G. Prestridge
Charles F. DeKeyser	Joseph Pultorak
Gerald T. Dixon	Richard H. Rainforth
John J. Doherty	Raymond J. Rightmyer, Jr.
Charles E. Dole	
James W. Donnell	David Riley
William R. Duncan	John J. Rollins
Richard A. Flanagan	Carroll D. Rowe
James G. Fox	Leonard L. Schultz
Burnette R. Gallagher	Robert R. Scott
Baylor P. Gibson, Jr.	William A. Shepherd
George "M" Golleher	Robert C. Shipp
David T. Gooden	Frank "A" Shook, Jr.
James B. Graves	Almond H. Sollom
Joe R. Greene	Ira E. Spieker
Harold K. Hall	Parks J. Stallings
Curtis F. Hamlin, Jr.	Elmo J. Stingley
Merlin L. Hasley	Harold H. Stirling, Jr.
Paul B. Henley	Marvin R. Stout
Thomas R. Hickey, Jr.	John B. Sullivan
Robert W. Hoffman	Walter E. Sullivan, Jr.
Marvin K. Hollenbeck	Wilson "C" Terry
Howard G. Holt	Nicholas G. W. Thorne

Eddie C. Torbett	Warren E. Weinberg
Johnnie V. Townsend	Robert M. Wetzel
Thomas B. Trammell	James L. Whitaker
Marion G. Truesdale	Patrick E. Wildman
Herman L. Ubbins	Frank E. Wilson
Eugene "A" Walles	James E. Wilson, Jr.
Herbert R. Waltz	Ray Woods
Stephen G. Warren	Robert P. Wray
Warren C. Watson	Frank R. Young
Robert J. Weaver	

The following-named officers for appointment to the temporary grade of captain in the Marine Corps:

George J. Batson, Jr.	Francis L. Miller
Hersel D. C. Blasingame	James B. Seaton
	Howard B. Smith
Walter E. G. Godenius	Ben W. White
Harry D. Hutchcroft	Ellis R. Wright

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

James C. Allison	Melvin K. Green
Eugene J. Ambrosia	Richard P. Grey
Henry G. Ammer	Leo Gumienny
William E. Androsko	Arnold J. Hammons
Frederick L. J. Ashworth	Autrey B. Hammon
	Frank W. Harris III
Guy O. Badger	Howard H. Harris
Lonnie P. Baltes	Robert G. Harris
John H. Barclay	Lester Heinz, Jr.
Paul W. Barcus	Clayton V. Hendricks
Wallace C. Barrett	Russell S. Hibbs
Raleigh E. Barton, Jr.	Norman W. Hicks
Richard Bell	Joseph J. Holicky
George H. Benskin, Jr.	Louis S. Hollier, Jr.
Joe R. Bibby	Thomas J. Holt
George G. Blair II	Frank H. Horn
Donald M. Blomgren	Kenneth C. Ives
Dorsie H. Booker, Jr.	Curtis A. James, Jr.
James T. Breckinridge	Robert E. Jochums
John C. Breckinridge	Tracy N. Johnson
Fitzhugh L. Buchanan, Jr.	David G. Jones
	Edward H. Jones
Edwin B. Bucholz	George P. Jones
Lyle W. Bullard	Robert A. Jones
Edwin "A" Burns	Robert W. Jorn
Harrison M. Butler	Timothy J. Keane, Jr.
John C. Butner III	Jack R. Kearney
Robert W. Calvert	John H. Keith, Jr.
Ira T. Carr	Gene S. Keller
Michael P. Carroll	James P. Kelly
Frank A. Cassiano	Edward B. Keyes, Jr.
Franklin R. Chambers	Edwin W. Killian
William E. Clark	Lee A. Kirstein
David A. Clement	Harrol Kiser
Stanford Cluggish	Herbert J. Korstange
Thomas B. Collins	Orin D. Krone
James G. Costigan	Fred D. Kuhlmann
Robert E. Cox	Robert J. Larsen
Theodore T. Culpepper	Harold V. Larson
Asa B. Culver, Jr.	Fred Lawton, Jr.
William J. Cupelo	Thaddeus F. Lewandowski
Clarence G. Dahl	
Charles M. Darracott	Elmer "M" Lewis, Jr.
John G. Demas	Harry M. Lindberg
Edmund G. Derning, Jr.	James E. Machin
	Fletcher B. Maddox
Jack N. Dillard	Reginald G. Martin
Jack W. Dindinger	Jan Mason
Thomas S. Dlugos	Donald L. May
Donald W. Dorn	John R. McGuigan
Robert E. Downen	Frederick C. McLaughlin
Earl C. Dresbach, Jr.	
LeRoy M. Duffy	Clare R. McMahon
William F. Dyroff	George C. McNaughton
Edward W. Dzialo	
Edward V. Easter	Robert L. McNeely
Paul M. Edwards	Merrill J. Melton
Harry D. Elms	John B. Melvin
Donald E. Estes	George A. Merrill
James D. Feltman	Jack L. Miles
Henry Fischer, Jr.	Frank N. Mitchell
Joseph R. Fisher	Arthur B. Montague
Thomas R. Freeman	Clarence G. Moody, Jr.
Homer D. Frison	Gail A. Newkirk
Robert W. Frye	William J. Nietschmann
Edward D. Gelzer, Jr.	
Nolan R. Gibbons	Richard F. Noble
Gerald W. Gibson	Robert G. Parrish
Hobson J. Gifford	Harold L. Parsons
Ronald L. Glendinning	William H. Peck

Jack B. Phillips	Charles H. Sullivan
Brockman L. Plauche	Theodore Summers
Ray D. Pineo	William Swanson
Arthur J. Poillon	William E. Sweeney
Linus F. Pottebaum	Warren G. Tanzler
Robert G. Price	Alfred C. Taves
Elmore P. Ravensberg	David S. Taylor
James H. Reid, Jr.	Jay "J" Thomas, Jr.
Lester F. Reid	Robert J. Thomas
Knowlton P. Rice	William L. Tipton, Jr.
Alvin R. Rieder	Charles A. Turpin
Glenn W. Rodney	Robert A. Underwood
Harold E. Roland, Jr.	Rollin F. VanCantfort
John J. Roothoff	Robert N. Vance
Maurice Rose	Jo M. Van Meter
Ted J. Ryder	Floyd L. Vuillemot
James R. Schoen	John A. Wachter
Gerald F. Schultz	Denzil E. Walden
Benjamin B. Selvitelle, Jr.	Charles M. Wallace, Jr.
James F. Shea, Jr.	Henry M. Walter, Jr.
Donald A. Silva	Ralph L. Wals
John B. Sims	Alan J. Warshawer
Frederick D. Singer	Charles T. Westcott
Perry T. Smith	Howard A. Westphall
Richard E. Smith	Jack D. White
Harry A. Spaight, Jr.	William A. Whitesell
Donald E. Spencer	Edward A. Wilcox
Raymond B. Spicer	Loren K. Wildermuth
Clarence R. Stanley	Wallace L. Williamson
Richard E. Stansberry	Ralph C. Wood
Thomas J. Stevens	Kermit M. Worley
Howard D. Stewart II	John R. Wyatt, Jr.
Hugh W. Stewart	Robert F. Young, Jr.
Howard E. Stidham	Vance L. Yount, Jr.

The following-named officers for appointment to the temporary grade of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

George M. Best	John F. McCarthy, Jr.
Jack F. Boles	Kenneth R. Porter
Johnny L. Carter	Cluese T. Powell
Robert E. Follendorf	James A. Tootle
Russell T. Gorter	Frank C. Trumble
William J. Hamilton	Wilmon Varnado
James M. Haney	Andrew M. Young
Raymond E. Logan	

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of commissioned warrant officer in the Marine Corps:

Oscar W. Cargile	Paul H. Mikkelsen
Thomas J. Chandler	John F. Pendark
Claude N. Harris	

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of major for limited duty in the Marine Corps:

Walter E. Anderson	Wallace Henry
Wilbur R. Barnes	Harold R. Jordan
Kennard F. Bubier	Norman D. Kent
Ira Brock	Clyde H. Long
James E. Buckle	Francis J. Lutz
Hall V. Cartmell	Edward J. McCabe
Harry E. Detwiler	Lee Moberly
Thomas H. Dougan	Bero Nori
Frederick Dykstra	Joseph P. Stepka
Grammer G. Edwards	Samuel M. Trippe
Frank W. Ferguson	Herman A. Zehngebot

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of captain for limited duty in the Marine Corps:

Herman T. Barbee	Cletus K. Gibson
Leonard I. Beatty	Walter R. Giles
Paul F. Brandenburg	Raymond F. Gotko
Richard P. Brezinski	John P. Grando
Willie W. Brock	Robert C. Gunsalus
James E. Brown	James K. Harris
Good Burleson	Milligan G. Hereford
Theodore R. Cathey	Ralph H. Hobbs
Frank J. Cermak	Michael J. Hogan
Francis L. Churchville	Arthur L. Jackson
	Boyd J. Jackson
Robert J. Corbett	George Jones
Thomas H. Cutler	Albert H. Keith
Robert L. Dickey	Seldon Lidyard
Walter H. Eastham	Raymond L. Luckel
Edward E. Elder	Floyd M. McCorkle
James W. Eldridge	Thomas W. McNeely
Irvin H. Elrod	Charles E. McPartlin
James P. Evans	Arthur J. Nooman
Joseph R. Foster	Ronald J. Nourse
Howard C. Frazer	Frederick V. Osborn
Elwood E. Gebhart	Thomas C. Palmer, Jr.

Paul R. Paquin
Howard H. Parker
Frank G. Paul
George T. Perschau
Fred R. Philpot
Paul J. Preston
Caryll A. Price
Joseph J. Reardon
John F. Ricard
William B. Richards
Joseph C. Schwalke
William A. Searight
Frank C. Sheppard
Michael J. Sisul
Samuel L. Slocum
Robert A. Smith
Allen P. Stockdale
Robert G. Straine
James D. Swinson
Max C. Taylor
Harold M. Tupper
Robert E. Wall
William F. Watson
George L. Williams
Adolph Ziegler

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of first lieutenant for limited duty in the Marine Corps:

Oscar A. Bosma
Woodrow W. Brown
Alfred T. Coon
Felix L. Ferranto
Henry G. Goare
Bill E. Grimes
Dudley J. Hagen
Adolph J. Kutilek
Walter P. Landis
Lornie Leslie
Virgil R. Martin
William D. Miears
Adam A. Metz
Warren L. Mobley
Howard E. Morris
William L. Nolte
Bill L. Parham
Gerald L. Pines
William M. Rossiter
Kenneth M. Stayer
St. Clair Tant
Russell Tarver
John H. Tomlinson
Charles M. Whitley

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant for limited duty in the Marine Corps:

Raymond L. Amos
Everett L. Anderson
John T. Bates
Daniel M. Blue, Jr.
Louis J. Caminiti
Robert B. Dowdy
William A. Flander
Allison G. Folsom, Jr.
Thomas F. Ford
Hollis W. Glass
Frank L. Howard
Stevan Jungerich
Lawrence W. Keenan
Homer King
Frederick J. Knack
Richard C. Laubach
Frank Lisi
Michael M. Marks
George M. Mathis
Glenn E. McComas
George E. McKain
John A. Mitchell
Louis A. Murphy, Jr.
Howard W. Pearson
Albert L. Protz
Estes N. Ratliffe
Leon C. Riley
Norman Rubin
Thomas J. Shaw
William H. Shuman
Edward Stallknecht
Clyde H. Stamps
Judson J. Swallow
James V. Valentour
Maurice S. Wahrer
Peter P. Yezierski
Albert J. Zlamal

The following-named woman officer for appointment to the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps:

Katherine A. Towle

The following-named women officers for appointment to the permanent grade of major in the Marine Corps:

Julia E. Hamblet
Pauline E. Perate

The following-named women officers for appointment to the permanent grade of captain in the Marine Corps:

Pauline E. Beckley
Barbara J. Bishop
Margaret M. Henderson
Emma H. Hendrickson
Elsie E. Hill
Helen J. McGraw

The following-named women officers for appointment to the permanent grade of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Kathleen J. Arney
Eunyce L. Brink
Ben A. Day
Frances A. Denbo
Mary J. Fischer
Jeanne Fleming
Mary J. Hale
Margaret S. Ordemann
Pauline F. Riley
Margaret L. Stevenson
Jeanette I. Suatad

The following-named officers (former enlisted men) for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Hugh S. Aitken
Ralph M. Anderson
John R. Bigler
Joseph A. Borowski
Travis D. Brown
George Caridakis
Oliver W. Christianson
Harold L. Coffman
Wallace E. Crowder
Rodger I. Eddy
Robert F. Edgar
Wendall C. Endsley
John C. Fite
Jerry D. Fly
Clarence W. Friesen
John "J" Gates
Tom L. Gibson
Harvey A. Goss
Edward C. Hall, Jr.
Edmund W. Hanlon
Ray Heck
John J. Hess
Frederick W. Hopkins
John W. Hutchinson
Edwin G. Javor
Austin C. Jenson
James E. Johnson
Nicholas Kavakich
David D. Kelley, Jr.
Damon J. Larson
"R" Michael McCarthy
Joseph Mordente
Francis W. Muetzel
Edward S. Murphy
Earle W. Pye, Jr.
Robert O. Risinger
Alexander S. Ruggiero
Stanley J. Seward
Carl F. Shiflette
Emmett B. Sigmon, Jr.
Joseph V. Slawta
Robert H. Starek
Vaughn R. Stuart
Warren H. Taylor
Roy R. VanCleve
Wayne D. Walton
John O. Williams, Jr.
Leslie C. Williams
Henry S. Zdankowski

The following-named officers (former enlisted men) for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Walter G. Ackerman
Harry L. Alderman
Merle W. Allen
Roscoe W. Anderson
Nickolas D. Arkadis
George L. Armitage
Milton S. Ashcraft
Dean C. Baker
John E. Baker
Harvey W. Baron
Donald F. Bays
Elbert "T" Bell
William J. Berlinguette
Frank W. Boules
Donald E. Bradley
Donald R. Brimmer
Dale L. Brown
Douglas L. Brown
Clayton O. Bush
Arnold F. Bynum
John J. H. Cahill
Richard E. Carey
Ray N. Carter
Dana B. Cashion
Charles A. Christiansen
John N. Christolos
William R. Clifton
Edward E. Collins
Orville D. Cooney
Manley H. Cosper, Jr.
John D. Counselman
Bert "R" Covert, Jr.
David R. Cowling
Richard J. Coyne
Lamar G. Crawford, Jr.
Ronald N. Davis
Paul E. Denny
Edwin A. Deptula
Richard M. Doezema
William K. Duryea
Raymond S. Eason
William S. Edler
David J. Ellington
Billy J. Elliott
Edward T. Emmelman
Tyler D. Evans
Richard G. Eykyn
Paul R. Fields
Bert Fisher
Basil L. Flannagan
Harry A. Florence, Jr.
Howard O. Foor
William C. Foster
Marvin D. Gardner
Joseph M. Glasgow
Raymond J. Glodowski
Frederic W. Golles, Jr.
Daniel J. Griffin, Jr.
James E. Hannan
Dale M. Henz
Jack M. Hermes
Roy E. Hess
Wallace A. Heyer
Willis T. Howland
John M. Jackson
Spencer H. Jarnagin
Richard M. Johnson
Donald R. Jones
Joris F. Kenyon
Ethmer W. King
John W. Kostnik
Roy E. Krieger
William A. Kronberg, Jr.
Thomas P. Lennon
Clarence W. Littleton
Frank J. Mackin
William H. Marlowe
James H. Marshall
Ronald A. Mason
William J. Masterpool
Charles H. Mattox
George E. McAlee
Eugene A. McGuire
Floyd H. McKay
Edmund C. McPoland
Joseph P. Mitchell, Jr.
Arthur R. Mooney
Edward C. Morris
Joseph E. Muir
Richard L. Musselman
Joseph Namesnik
Bud F. Nelson
Joseph A. Nevin
Rollie D. Newsom
Minard P. Newton, Jr.
Jack L. Nolan
Arthur A. Oakley
James P. O'Connell
Marion R. Ozburn, Jr.
Eugene J. Paradis
John M. Patrick
Peter M. Payne
Edward C. Post
Robert J. Post
Frederick K. Purdum
Wallace J. Reid
Patrick C. Roe
Raymond E. Roeder, Jr.
Paul J. G. Roosen
Victor A. Salvo, Jr.
Robert P. Scheunemann
Harold G. Schmidt, Jr.
Hugh C. Schryver, Jr.
Kenneth M. Scott
Donald W. Sharon
Stewart A. Shaw
George E. Shepherd
Michael J. Shinka
Van J. Simmons, Jr.
Frederick L. Simonson
Donald D. Sisson
Patrick G. Sivert
Louie J. Smith
Robert J. Smith
Taylor B. Smith
James W. Stemple
Gerald H. Stewart
Charles R. Stiles
Ralph E. Sullivan
Russell G. Swift, Jr.
Harold A. Thomas
Carl B. Thompson, Jr.
Robert P. Thomson
Ralph J. Tuley
Leon N. Utter
Edgar W. Wagner, Jr.
Wayne P. Wallace
Joseph A. Ward
Lars R. Wargin
Andrew T. Watt
Joseph R. Wayerski, Jr.
Richard P. Wells
Robert F. Werner
William W. Westphall
Kenneth C. Williams
Goode D. Wilson, Jr.
LeRoy K. Wirth

The following-named officers (civilian college graduates) for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Nate L. Adams II, a citizen of Virginia.
Stanley "G" Alexander, a citizen of California.
Wendell O. Beard, a citizen of California.
Howard G. Blank, a citizen of Maryland.
John S. Carson, a citizen of the District of Columbia.
James L. Crutchfield, a citizen of New York.
Brian J. Cummings, a citizen of New Jersey.
Bruce F. Cunliffe, a citizen of New York.
Jack H. Davis, a citizen of Illinois.
Thomas J. Deen, Jr., a citizen of Florida.
Joseph K. Gastrock III, a citizen of Pennsylvania.
John N. Guild, a citizen of Colorado.
Gordon S. Hosmer, a citizen of New York.
George J. Kleess, a citizen of New York.
Donald J. Krabbe, a citizen of Missouri.
Donald E. Marchette, a citizen of South Carolina.
Donald V. McCloskey, a citizen of California.
Francis E. McDonald, a citizen of Missouri.
Philip T. O'Hara, a citizen of New York.
Joseph R. Owen, a citizen of New York.
Laurence M. Phelps, Jr., a citizen of Florida.
Charles B. Quinn, a citizen of New Jersey.
John A. Reames, a citizen of South Carolina.
Thomas C. Redfern, Jr., a citizen of North Carolina.
Allan L. Reid, a citizen of California.
Edward W. Snelling, a citizen of South Carolina.
William A. Speer, a citizen of South Carolina.
Robert G. Staffney, a citizen of Pennsylvania.
John J. Swards, a citizen of New York.
Phillip F. Thomas, a citizen of Tennessee.
Francis W. Tief, a citizen of New York.
Robert G. Topp, a citizen of Mississippi.
John M. Walker, a citizen of Pennsylvania.
Robert M. Winter, a citizen of California.
Cullen C. Zimmerman, a citizen of North Carolina.

The following-named officers (former contract NROTC students) for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Mayhlon L. Degernes, Jr., a citizen of Minnesota.
Edwin W. Hakala, a citizen of Michigan.
Lawrence W. Hetrick, a citizen of Ohio.

The following-named officer (former midshipman) for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Thomas H. Johnston

The following-named officers (former Regular officers) for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Allan G. Copp
Raymond C. Damm
Billy C. Marks
Wesley E. Stanley
William P. Yerger

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 31, 1949:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Maurice J. Tobin to be Secretary of Labor.

Ralph Wright to be Assistant Secretary of Labor, United States Department of Labor.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

William E. Willett to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for a term expiring June 30, 1950.

COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

Preston Delano to be Comptroller of the Currency.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Frank P. Douglass to be a member of the National Mediation Board for a term expiring February 1, 1952.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

John M. Houston to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of 5 years from August 27, 1948.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

Hon. E. Ryan Duffy to be circuit judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

UNITED STATES CUSTOMS COURT

Hon. Paul P. Rao to be judge of the United States Customs Court.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

William T. McCarthy to be United States district judge for the district of Massachusetts.

Thomas Patrick Thornton to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Michigan.

Hon. Roy W. Harper to be United States district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri.

James T. Foley to be United States district judge for the northern district of New York.

Hon. Samuel Hamilton Kaufman to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York.

Hon. Wilson Warlick to be United States district judge for the western district of North Carolina.

SUPREME COURT OF PUERTO RICO

Hon. Angel R. de Jesus to be Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico.

Luis Negron Fernandez to be Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Joseph F. Deeb to be United States attorney for the western district of Michigan.

John B. Tansil to be United States attorney for the district of Montana.

Cleon A. Summers to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Oklahoma.

Gerald A. Gleeson to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Pennsylvania.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Frederick Elliott Biermann to be United States marshal for the northern district of Iowa.

Edwin D. Bolger to be United States marshal for the western district of Michigan. (Now serving under an appointment which expired March 31, 1948.)

Harold K. Claypool to be United States marshal for the southern district of Ohio.

Carl H. Fleckenstine to be United States marshal for the middle district of Pennsylvania.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment and promotion in the regular corps of the Public Health Service:

SENIOR ASSISTANT PHARMACISTS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF CAPTAIN), EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 1949

Abraham Wolfthal
William E. Dudley
Robert L. Capehart

ASSISTANT PHARMACISTS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF FIRST LIEUTENANT), EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 1949

Jean M. Lynch
Joseph J. Hackett

JUNIOR ASSISTANT PHARMACISTS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF SECOND LIEUTENANT), EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 1949

Edward J. Vesey
Lowell R. Pfau
Adelbert E. Briggs

SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR), EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 1949

Isaac M. Zigler
J. Howard Beard

SENIOR ASSISTANT SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF CAPTAIN), EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 1949

Charles M. Gillikin
Robert F. Wettingfeld
Harry R. H. Nicholas III
Edward B. Lehmann
Alan F. Thometz
Daniel M. Enerson
James V. Woodworth

SENIOR ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF CAPTAIN), EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 1949

Edmond G. Vanden Bosche
Tyler C. Folsom, Jr.

SENIOR SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Charles L. Newberry, October 20, 1948.
Hildrus A. Poindexter, November 5, 1948.
Richard P. Boyd, December 29, 1948.

SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Harold Heller, June 30, 1948.
Frederick G. Gillick, July 16, 1948.
Michael J. Clarke, November 20, 1948.
James G. Telfer, December 14, 1948.

SENIOR ASSISTANT SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF CAPTAIN) EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Calvin W. Applewhite, June 29, 1948.
James B. Gilbert, June 29, 1948.
J. Carter Wright, June 29, 1948.
Frederick E. Phillips, June 30, 1948.
J. D. Leggett, June 30, 1948.
Eldis M. Christensen, July 1, 1948.
Ted E. Becker, July 1, 1948.
Allen N. Koplin, July 1, 1948.
Roland H. Corbet, July 1, 1948.
John H. Tuohy, July 1, 1948.
P. Councilman Morgan, July 1, 1948.
Edwin B. Thomas, July 1, 1948.
David M. Dumville, July 1, 1948.
R. Raymond Green, July 1, 1948.
Donald J. Ottenberg, July 2, 1948.
Harold H. Davidson, July 2, 1948.
Jules Glenn, July 2, 1948.
John J. Johnson, July 2, 1948.
Eugene V. Nininger, July 3, 1948.
William H. Gutstein, July 3, 1948.
Frederick A. Thompson, Jr., July 5, 1948.
Richard A. Reiss, July 6, 1948.
Gerald Giges, July 6, 1948.
Robert W. Mowry, July 8, 1948.
Reed M. Broadbent, July 14, 1948.
Andrew G. Morrow, July 15, 1948.
Paul W. Rogers, July 15, 1948.
Robert O. Scow, July 22, 1948.
John F. Montroy, July 24, 1948.
Victor A. McKusick, October 1, 1948.
Charles H. Fish, October 1, 1948.

ASSISTANT SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF FIRST LIEUTENANT), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Victor A. McKusick, July 1, 1948.
John M. Vogel, July 1, 1948.
R. Guy Lewis, July 1, 1948.
David S. Wilder, July 1, 1948.
Glenn M. Gordon, July 1, 1948.
Robert L. Price, July 1, 1948.
Stewart M. Williams, July 1, 1948.
McClain Johnston, July 1, 1948.
Richard A. Saavedra, July 2, 1948.
Arnold W. Pratt, July 2, 1948.
Edward A. Rogers, Jr., July 3, 1948.
Gordon L. Farrell, July 8, 1948.
Albert L. Patrick, July 9, 1948.
Milton Sheinbein, July 16, 1948.
John F. Lowney, July 23, 1948.

DENTAL SURGEON (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR), EFFECTIVE DATE INDICATED

Harry G. Trautman, June 28, 1948.

SENIOR SANITARY ENGINEERS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Hugh R. McCall, October 27, 1948.
Alfred H. Wieters, October 29, 1948.

SANITARY ENGINEERS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

M. Allen Pond, August 25, 1948.
Duncan A. Holaday, September 9, 1948.
Hayse H. Black, December 27, 1948.
Paul D. Haney, December 30, 1948.

SENIOR ASSISTANT SANITARY ENGINEERS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF CAPTAIN), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Bernard B. Berger, October 7, 1948.
Frederick S. Kent, October 8, 1948.
Donald J. Schlieesmann, October 9, 1948.
Samuel R. Weibel, October 11, 1948.
Ernest P. Dubuque, November 23, 1948.
Ralph J. Johnson, November 24, 1948.
Sheldon L. Lang, November 24, 1948.
Lawrence B. Hall, November 24, 1948.

ASSISTANT SANITARY ENGINEERS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF FIRST LIEUTENANT), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Irwin P. Sander, October 1, 1948.
Robert L. Stenberg, October 7, 1948.
Ronald E. Bales, November 15, 1948.
Gerald N. McDermott, November 30, 1948.

JUNIOR ASSISTANT SANITARY ENGINEERS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF SECOND LIEUTENANT), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Albert L. Platz, September 29, 1948.
Mary E. Rydberg, September 30, 1948.
Howard E. Ayer, October 1, 1948.
Frederick Nevins, October 1, 1948.
John G. Morris, October 2, 1948.
Leo Weaver, October 2, 1948.
Charles E. Sponagle, October 3, 1948.
Leland J. McCabe, Jr., October 3, 1948.
George W. Burke, Jr., October 7, 1948.
Dade W. Moeller, October 8, 1948.
John V. Miner, Jr., October 8, 1948.
George R. Shultz, October 28, 1948.
Robert A. Gerber, November 12, 1948.
James P. Sheehy, November 12, 1948.

PHARMACISTS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Guy H. Trimble, November 1, 1948.
J. Solon Mordell, November 10, 1948.

SCIENTIST DIRECTORS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF COLONEL), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Lyndon F. Small, November 12, 1948.
Helmuth H. Schrenk, November 13, 1948.

SCIENTISTS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Clarence M. Tarzwell, June 29, 1948.
Leon Jacobs, December 30, 1948.

VETERINARIANS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

William T. S. Thorp, July 1, 1948.
Robert T. Habermann, December 30, 1948.

SENIOR ASSISTANT NURSE OFFICERS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF CAPTAIN), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Mary E. O'Connor, October 29, 1948.
Marie D. Grant, December 27, 1948.

ASSISTANT NURSE OFFICERS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF FIRST LIEUTENANT), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Mary E. Allen, November 2, 1948.
Albina A. Bozym, November 19, 1948.
Joyce B. Beveridge, December 13, 1948.
Mildred E. Barnett, December 27, 1948.
Ruth E. Anderson, December 27, 1948.

JUNIOR ASSISTANT NURSE OFFICERS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF SECOND LIEUTENANT), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Florence A. Canada, November 2, 1948.
Marion E. O'Neil, November 15, 1948.
Frances R. Donoghue, November 28, 1948.

SENIOR SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Fortunat A. Troie, July 1, 1948.
Oswald F. Hedley, July 1, 1948.
Paul A. Neal, July 1, 1948.
Erwin W. Blatter, July 1, 1948.
George G. Van Dyke, July 1, 1948.
Waldemar J. A. Wickman, July 1, 1948.

Donald W. Patrick, July 1, 1948.
Calvin B. Spencer, July 1, 1948.
Victor H. Haas, July 1, 1948.
Bert R. Boone, July 1, 1948.
Carroll E. Palmer, July 1, 1948.
W. Palmer Dearing, July 10, 1948.
Alexander G. Gilliam, July 10, 1948.
Leonard A. Scheele, July 10, 1948.
Frederick J. Brady, August 20, 1948.
Thomas H. Tomlinson, Jr., August 22, 1948.
John R. Heller, Jr., October 15, 1948.
Henry A. Holle, November 1, 1948.
Arthur B. Price, November 3, 1948.
Paul E. Walker, December 1, 1948.
Theodore J. Bauer, December 1, 1948.
Thorburn S. McGowan, December 1, 1948.
Wilson T. Sowder, December 1, 1948.
John W. Hornibrook, December 1, 1948.
Seward E. Miller, December 1, 1948.
John E. Dunn, December 1, 1948.
Eugene A. Gillis, December 15, 1948.
Anthony Donovan, December 20, 1948.
John W. Cronin, December 29, 1948.
Havelock F. Fraser, December 29, 1948.
Jonathan B. Peebles, Jr., December 29, 1948.
Edgar W. Moreland, December 29, 1948.
Harry Heimann, December 29, 1948.
John B. Alsever, December 29, 1948.
Alexander A. Doerner, December 29, 1948.
Russell E. Teague, December 29, 1948.
Abraham Wikler, December 29, 1948.
Mabel Ross, December 29, 1948.
Lydia B. Edwards, December 29, 1948.
Ira Lewis, December 29, 1948.
Carl M. Eklund, December 29, 1948.
Ladislaus J. Zbranek, December 29, 1948.
Erwin C. Drescher, December 29, 1948.
Marion B. Noyes, December 29, 1948.
John B. Hozier, December 29, 1948.
Virgil J. Dorset, December 29, 1948.
Curtis R. Chaffin, December 29, 1948.
Paul T. Erickson, December 29, 1948.
Eugene W. Green, December 29, 1948.
Hugh L. C. Wilkerson, December 29, 1948.
Robert L. Cherry, December 29, 1948.
Charles F. Blankenship, December 29, 1948.
Frederick J. Krueger, December 29, 1948.
Frank S. French, December 29, 1948.
Harold M. Janney, December 29, 1948.
Russell O. Settle, December 29, 1948.
Robert F. Martin, December 29, 1948.
Herman E. Hilleboe, December 29, 1948.
John R. McGibony, December 29, 1948.
Theodore L. Perrin, December 29, 1948.
Harris Isbell, December 29, 1948.
David J. Zaugg, December 29, 1948.
Howard D. Fishburn, December 29, 1948.
Rolla R. Wolcott, December 29, 1948.
James F. Lane, December 29, 1948.
John N. Bowden, December 29, 1948.
Ralph B. Hogan, December 29, 1948.
Waldo B. Edwards, December 29, 1948.
Henry W. Kassel, December 29, 1948.
Vernon B. Link, December 29, 1948.
Norman H. Topping, December 29, 1948.
James A. Grider, Jr., December 29, 1948.
Byron J. Olson, December 29, 1948.
Harold R. Sandstead, December 29, 1948.

SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR), EFFECTIVE DATES AS INDICATED

Samuel C. Ingraham II, July 7, 1948.
David M. Gould, July 7, 1948.
Robert E. Miller, July 11, 1948.
Donald J. Birmingham, July 14, 1948.
Roland K. Iverson, December 18, 1948.
Bernard D. Davis, December 29, 1948.
Raymond Hofstra, December 29, 1948.
Will H. Aufranc, December 29, 1948.
James A. Hunter, December 29, 1948.
Burnet M. Davis, December 29, 1948.
Paul V. Joliet, December 29, 1948.
Gilcin F. Meadors, December 29, 1948.
William L. Hewitt, December 29, 1948.
George A. Shipman, December 29, 1948.
John C. Cutler, December 29, 1948.
David S. Ruhe, December 29, 1948.
Carruth J. Wagner, December 29, 1948.
George W. Comstock, December 29, 1948.
H. Charles Franklin, December 29, 1948.
William C. Jenkins, Jr., December 29, 1948.
Randolph P. Grimm, December 29, 1948.
Elmer L. Hill, December 29, 1948.
Robert M. Foote, December 29, 1948.
James F. Maddux, December 29, 1948.
Eugene J. Gillespie, December 29, 1948.
Bertrand E. Bennison, December 29, 1948.
I. Ray Howard, December 29, 1948.
Robert H. English, December 29, 1948.
Edward T. Blomquist, December 29, 1948.
John B. Spriggs, December 29, 1948.
William H. Errgong, Jr., December 29, 1948.
James L. Elliott, December 29, 1948.
Willys M. Monroe, December 29, 1948.
John J. Davies, December 29, 1948.
Leon A. Heppel, December 29, 1948.
Arthur Kornberg December 29, 1948.
Andrew P. Sackett, December 29, 1948.
Fred W. Thyng, December 29, 1948.
Leroy R. Allen, December 29, 1948.
Theodore E. Hynson, December 29, 1948.
Glenn H. Algire, December 29, 1948.
Mary Walton, December 29, 1948.
John G. Hume, December 29, 1948.
Elton S. Osborne, Jr., December 29, 1948.
Robert W. Rasor, December 29, 1948.
William W. Richards, December 29, 1948.
Lewis C. Robbins, December 29, 1948.
Willoughby J. Rothrock, Jr., December 29, 1948.
James A. Salmons, December 29, 1948.
Frederic C. Bartter, December 29, 1948.
Herbert Tabor, December 29, 1948.
Milton I. Roemer, December 29, 1948.
Carl R. Kunstling, December 29, 1948.
Griffith E. Quinby, December 29, 1948.
Robert J. Huebner, December 29, 1948.
Jacob C. Wagner, December 29, 1948.
Fred W. Harb, December 29, 1948.
Arthur L. Koven, December 29, 1948.
Leo P. Krall, Jr., December 29, 1948.
William G. Hollister, December 29, 1948.
George J. Cooper, Jr., December 29, 1948.
Joseph Kovacs, Jr., December 29, 1948.
J. Frederick Bell, December 29, 1948.
William Roemmich, December 29, 1948.
Paulo de A. Pamplona, December 29, 1948.
James O. Davis, December 29, 1948.
Richard B. Stephenson, December 29, 1948.
Maurice L. Brodsky, December 29, 1948.
Raymond F. Corpe, December 29, 1948.
George Adams, December 29, 1948.
James T. Hearin, December 29, 1948.
Robert Guthrie, December 29, 1948.
Robert L. Faucett, December 29, 1948.

SENIOR ASSISTANT SURGEON (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF CAPTAIN)

Raymond W. Herrmann, December 29, 1948.

SENIOR DENTAL SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL) EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Oscar Mikkelsen, July 1, 1948.
Ralph S. Lloyd, July 2, 1948.
John W. Knutson, July 2, 1948.
George E. Jones, July 2, 1948.
William P. Kroschel, July 2, 1948.
Bruce D. Forsyth, July 2, 1948.
Henry F. Canby, November 16, 1948.
Norman F. Gerrie, December 29, 1948.
Robert M. Stephan, December 29, 1948.
Herbert A. Spencer, Jr., December 29, 1948.
Charles H. Wright, Jr., December 29, 1948.
Howard J. Woodbridge, December 29, 1948.
Francis A. Arnold, Jr., December 29, 1948.
William W. Calhoun, Jr., December 29, 1948.
George E. Waterman, December 29, 1948.

DENTAL SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Edward J. Driscoll, December 29, 1948.
George A. Nevitt, December 29, 1948.
Eugene H. Hess, December 29, 1948.
Howard K. Wyatt, December 29, 1948.
Dennis E. Singleton, Jr., December 29, 1948.
John C. Heckel, December 29, 1948.
Earl C. Hewitt, December 29, 1948.
Maurice S. Rodgers, December 29, 1948.
Carl E. Johnson, December 29, 1948.
John W. Holt, December 29, 1948.
David B. Scott, December 29, 1948.

SENIOR ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEON (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF CAPTAIN), EFFECTIVE DATE INDICATED

Frank W. Nelson, December 29, 1948.

SENIOR SANITARY ENGINEERS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Elmer J. Herringer, October 1, 1948.
Walter N. Dashiell, December 29, 1948.

SANITARY ENGINEERS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Russell W. Hart, August 1, 1948.
Malcolm C. Hope, September 19, 1948.
Frederick C. Roberts, Jr., December 29, 1948.
Harry G. Hanson, December 29, 1948.
Wesley E. Gilbertson, December 29, 1948.
Callis H. Atkins, December 29, 1948.
Edmund C. Garthe, December 29, 1948.
Chris A. Hansen, December 29, 1948.
Frank Tetzlaff, December 29, 1948.
Albert H. Stevenson, December 29, 1948.
Ralph C. Falange, December 29, 1948.
Richard S. Green, December 29, 1948.
Richard S. Mark, December 29, 1948.
Arthur H. Neill, December 29, 1948.
George D. Clayton, December 29, 1948.
Richard F. Poston, December 29, 1948.
Charles D. Spangler, December 29, 1948.
Hershel Engler, December 29, 1948.
Leonard M. Board, December 29, 1948.
Kaarlo W. Nasi, December 29, 1948.
Richard L. Woodward, December 29, 1948.
Elroy K. Day, December 29, 1948.
Gerald W. Ferguson, December 29, 1948.
Conrad P. Straub, December 29, 1948.
Henry L. Roahrig, December 29, 1948.
Ernest C. Anderson, December 29, 1948.
George L. Carley, Jr., December 29, 1948.
Donald L. Snow, December 29, 1948.
Roscoe H. Goeke, December 29, 1948.
Graham Walton, December 29, 1948.
Ralph C. Graber, December 29, 1948.
Herbert W. Haas, December 29, 1948.
William W. Payne, December 29, 1948.
Howard W. Chapman, December 29, 1948.
William E. Holy, December 29, 1948.
Richard Hammerstrom, December 29, 1948.
Henry N. Doyle, December 29, 1948.
Leonard B. Dworsky, December 29, 1948.

SENIOR SCIENTISTS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Howard L. Andrews, July 1, 1948.
Joseph M. Bobbitt, December 29, 1948.
Samuel W. Simmons, December 29, 1948.
Sidney H. Newman, December 29, 1948.
Harry J. Bennett, December 29, 1948.
John C. Keresztesy, December 29, 1948.

SCIENTISTS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Lewis J. Crailey, December 6, 1948.
Pope A. Lawrence, December 29, 1948.
Harry D. Pratt, December 29, 1948.
Roy F. Fritz, December 29, 1948.
Ralph C. Barnes, December 29, 1948.
H. Page Nicholson, December 29, 1948.
John A. Rowe, December 29, 1948.
Francis M. Middleton, December 29, 1948.
Don E. Eyles, December 29, 1948.
Raymond Fagan, December 29, 1948.
George A. Hottle, December 29, 1948.
William J. Bowen, December 29, 1948.
Falconer Smith, December 29, 1948.
Samuel B. Salvin, December 29, 1948.
William C. Frohne, December 29, 1948.
Harold B. Robinson, December 29, 1948.
Dohrman H. Byers, December 29, 1948.
Dale R. Lindsay, December 29, 1948.
Oliver R. Placak, December 29, 1948.
Marion M. Brooke, December 29, 1948.
William W. Smith, December 29, 1948.
David B. Lackman, December 29, 1948.
Howard W. Bond, December 29, 1948.
Elmer G. Berry, December 29, 1948.
John H. Hughes, December 29, 1948.

VETERINARIAN (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR), EFFECTIVE DATE INDICATED

James H. Steele, December 29, 1948.

SENIOR ASSISTANT NURSE OFFICERS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF CAPTAIN), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Loretta C. Parsons, July 1, 1948.
Viola E. Matheson, July 1, 1948.
Madge M. Neill, July 1, 1948.
Ruth N. Crawford, July 1, 1948.
Florence T. Thieman, July 1, 1948.
Mary A. Brimberry, July 1, 1948.
Mary A. Rice, July 1, 1948.
Irma C. Thomsen, July 1, 1948.
Magdalene E. Roller, July 1, 1948.
Elizabeth C. Laczko, July 1, 1948.
Hazel E. Owen, July 1, 1948.
Katherine L. Tucker, July 1, 1948.
Mary Matthews, July 1, 1948.
Beatrice Zingle, July 1, 1948.
Adele L. Henderson, July 1, 1948.
Gertrude L. Anderson, July 1, 1948.
M. Lois McMinn, July 1, 1948.
Gertrude I. Miller, July 1, 1948.
Myra I. Johnson, July 1, 1948.
Helen Gertz, July 1, 1948.
M. Estelle Hunt, July 1, 1948.
Jean C. Feely, July 1, 1948.
H. Jean McIver, July 1, 1948.
Irma M. Lamberti, July 1, 1948.
Arne L. Bulkeley, July 1, 1948.
Dorothy G. Erickson, July 1, 1948.
Henrietta Smellow, July 1, 1948.
Stella M. Williams, July 1, 1948.
Winifred M. Mendez, July 1, 1948.
Sally Wladis, July 1, 1948.
Flora Jacobs, July 1, 1948.
Henrietta Rust, July 1, 1948.
M. Elizabeth McBride, July 1, 1948.
Sylvia Simon, July 1, 1948.
Helen E. Enright, July 1, 1948.
Mary E. Ingle, July 1, 1948.
Marie F. Henzel, July 1, 1948.
Edna L. Easterday, December 29, 1948.
Anne J. Lello, December 29, 1948.
Genevieve T. Piette, December 29, 1948.
Helen A. Gentilman, December 29, 1948.
Latis M. Campbell, December 29, 1948.
Anne K. Buck, December 29, 1948.
Mary F. Callan, December 29, 1948.
Dorothy L. Connors, December 29, 1948.
Vivian L. Gibson, December 29, 1948.
Mary B. Krause, December 29, 1948.
Emilie S. Wilson, December 29, 1948.
Florence J. Ullman, December 29, 1948.
Jennie Rakich, December 29, 1948.

JUNIOR ASSISTANT NURSE OFFICERS TO BE ASSISTANT NURSE OFFICERS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF FIRST LIEUTENANT), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Joan M. Norkunas, July 13, 1948.
Norma G. Russell, August 1, 1948.
Margaret M. Sweeney, October 20, 1948.

ASSISTANT DIETITIANS TO BE SENIOR ASSISTANT DIETITIANS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF CAPTAIN), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Myrtle M. Morris, July 1, 1948.
E Grace Gibson, July 1, 1948.
Engla J. Anderson, July 1, 1948.

SENIOR SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL)

Reuben F. Reider
Clarence A. Smith
Richard H. Smith

SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR)

Norman B. McCullough
Harold S. Barrett
Wade H. Etheridge
Marvin O. Lewis
Eliah M. Nadel
Birdsall N. Carle
Clinton C. Powell
J. Russell Mitchell
Pasquale J. Pesare
George A. Spendlove
Rheim M. Jones
Weldon C. White
R. Carl Millican

SENIOR ASSISTANT SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF CAPTAIN)

Robert M. Paine
Charles O. Metzmaker
Laurence Finberg
Keith H. Frankhauser
Gordon L. Farrell
John F. Lowney
Ralph S. Paffenbarger, Jr.
Arthur D. Fisher
Glenn M. Gordon
John P. Utz
Delmo A. Paris
Wendell L. Pierce
Milton Sheinbein
Carlyle F. Stout
Sidney Shindell
Richard A. Saavedra
Leonard J. Ganser
Norman G. Hepper
William H. Baker
Stewart M. Williams
Robert A. Sammons
Russell G. Lewis
John W. Cashman
Robert L. Price
David S. Wilder

SENIOR DENTAL SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL)

Harry G. Trautman
Arthur G. Malucky

DENTAL SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR)

Thomas J. Riley, Jr.
Maurice Costello

SENIOR ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF CAPTAIN)

William J. Braye
Robert W. Anderson

SENIOR SANITARY ENGINEER (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL)

Mark D. Hollis

SANITARY ENGINEERS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR)

Howard W. Spence
Floyd B. Taylor

PHARMACISTS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR)

Ronald G. Esson
Reid M. Hovey
Francis R. Ellis
Robarts L. Proper
Arnold H. Dodge

SCIENTISTS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR)

Milton Silverman
Louis J. Olivier
Alan W. Donaldson
Joseph Greenberg
Libero Ajello
Isadore Zipkin
Richard P. Dow
James E. Birren
Morris B. Ettinger
George R. Weber
Julius S. Youngner
Herbert A. Sober

SENIOR ASSISTANT NURSE OFFICERS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF CAPTAIN)

Anne Woudema
Mary M. Bouser
Enid L. Taylor
C. Vistula Lancaster

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 31, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou Eternal One, from whom all blessings flow, our times are in Thine hands. We implore Thee to help us to be diligent, lest we fail ere the setting of the sun. Give us a sane and reasonable faith, lest our fears conquer us; give us a sympathy that includes all suffering and distressed humanity; give us a religion that will stand every test, and a large measure of health, wisdom, and deep consideration for all men. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 27, 1949, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on January 28, 1949, the President approved and signed a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 38. Joint resolution to authorize the United States to break through snowbound areas in western range States, to take other necessary action to move in supplemental feed and otherwise care for livestock isolated by storms in such States, and to provide emergency relief for Indians in areas isolated by such storms.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

JANUARY 31, 1949.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to the authority heretofore granted, the Clerk of the House received from the Secretary of the Senate on January 27, 1949, the engrossed resolution (H. J. Res. 112) entitled "Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes," attested by the Secretary as having been passed by the Senate on January 27, 1949.

Very truly yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had on January 27, 1949, examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that following authority granted the Chair on January 27, 1949, he did on January 28, 1949, sign the following enrolled joint resolution: House Joint Resolution 112, a joint resolution making an additional appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes.

GEN. COURTNEY HODGES

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. As there is no legislative program for today, without objection that may be done.

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, today a great soldier will retire from the United States Army after more than 43 years of continuous service. I speak of Gen. Courtney Hodges, who rose from the enlisted ranks to become a four-star general and the great wartime commander of our mighty First Army.

He was born in Perry, Ga., on January 5, 1887. He was the son of John Hicks

Hodges and Katherine Norwood Hodges. His father was a newspaper publisher.

Ever since his boyhood, he was filled with an ambition to become a soldier. And so in 1904, at the age of 17, he entered the United States Military Academy at West Point. But misfortune overtook him in his first year as a result of his difficulties in geometry and he was forced to leave the Academy.

Undaunted and determined upon a soldier's career, he promptly enlisted as a private in the Seventeenth Infantry, United States Army, at Fort McPherson, Ga. He served 3 years as an enlisted man and then won a competitive examination for a commission as a second lieutenant of infantry. This was in 1909, when he was 22 years old. After 7 years of service at Army posts in the southwest United States and in the Philippines, he was promoted to the rank of first lieutenant in 1916. From March of that year until the following February he served in Mexico under General Pershing.

In 1918, now a captain, he was sent to France with the Sixth United States Infantry Regiment, Fifth Division. During World War I he received promotions through temporary grades to lieutenant colonel and fought as a battalion commander and later as a regimental commander in the Lorraine, Argonne, and St. Mihiel offensives. He rendered service with such distinction in these actions that he won the Distinguished Service Cross and the Silver Star.

During the long peacetime years after World War I, he devoted himself assiduously to the task of increasing his professional knowledge and abilities. He attended the Field Artillery School at Fort Sill, Okla., in 1920, and was promoted to the permanent grade of major in that year. Shortly thereafter he served as an instructor in the department of tactics at West Point. Tours of duty at the highest level service schools followed with his assignment to the Command and General Staff School at Leavenworth in 1925 and with later duties at the Infantry School, Fort Benning, Ga., and the Air Corps Tactical School at Langley Field. Finally, in 1934 he completed the course at the War College in Washington, D. C., thus completing his formal military education.

Following his promotion to lieutenant colonel in October of 1934, he served for 2 years on the general staff of the Philippine department, from 1936 to 1938. Thereafter he returned to the United States and was assigned as assistant commandant and later as commandant of the Infantry School at Fort Benning, Ga. There he laid the foundations for modern infantry training and the instruction of officers and men which later made possible the rapid wartime expansion of that important school. His work in this respect alone should earn him the undying gratitude of all Americans. But however important, it has been completely eclipsed by his later more illustrious accomplishments as a field commander in World War II.

With the expansion of the Army immediately prior to World War II, he was rapidly promoted to the rank of colonel and brigadier general. In March of 1941 he was assigned to the Office of the Chief of Infantry in Washington, D. C., and soon thereafter he himself became in succession Acting Chief of Infantry and then Chief of Infantry. He was promoted to the rank of major general in May 1941. Because of General Hodges' recognized abilities as an able and experienced field commander, it was not long after the commencement of World War II before he was ordered to Texas to activate the X Corps, which was then a part of the Third Army, under Gen. Walter Krueger. In February 1943, after promotion to the rank of lieutenant general, he succeeded General Krueger. A year later he was ordered overseas as deputy commander of the First United States Army, under Gen. Omar N. Bradley, commanding general. From his headquarters in Bristol, England, he took up the task of directing the training and coordination of the various corps, divisions, and other units attached to the First Army in preparation for the coming assault on Fortress Europe.

On June 6, 1944, D-day, General Hodges landed in Normandy. A few weeks later, when General Bradley assumed command of the Twelfth Army Group, General Hodges took command of the First Army. That was in August of 1944, and under his leadership the First Army punched a hole through the German defenses at Avranches and Mortain, thus enabling Gen. George S. Patton's armor to make the famous breakthrough at St. Lo. General Hodges threw back a strong counter attack by five Panzer divisions at Mortain and rushed forward to meet the British Second Army, coming up from the west, thus creating the Falaise-Argentan pocket, where some 100,000 Germans were surrounded and captured, thus eliminating the German Seventh Army as a combat force.

General Hodges' First Army not only made the first landings on the Normandy Beach, and the first breakthrough at St. Lo, but was also the first to enter Paris on August 25, 1944. Following the capitulation of the French capital, General Hodges drove on to the Aisne and the Marne, reaching the Belgian frontier on September 2. He liberated Liége on the 8th of September, crossed Luxemburg, and on September 11 the First Army again checked off another first by being the first American troops to enter Germany.

The capture of Aachen and the battle of the Huertgen Forest followed in October and November. The stage was now set for the capture of the Roer River dams, the strategic key to any further advance across the Roer River to the Cologne plain. However, this planned operation was suddenly interrupted by the ferocious counterattack of Von Rundstedt, known as the Battle of the Bulge.

In 2 weeks of the bitterest fighting in fog, rain, snow, and freezing weather, the combat divisions of General Hodges' First Army halted Von Rundstedt's attack and resumed their own offensive on January 3, 1945.

Exploiting Von Rundstedt's failure, General Hodges took off again to the east early in January of 1945 and a few weeks later, on March 7, he reached the Rhine through the ruins of Cologne. At this point one of the most dramatic incidents of the war occurred, the crossing of the Ludendorff Bridge at Remagen before the Germans had time to destroy it. This opportunity was immediately exploited to its fullest extent as armor and infantry poured rapidly across the damaged bridge and established a firm bridgehead across the Rhine before the damaged structure finally collapsed.

Two and one-half weeks later, the First Army broke out of its Remagen bridgehead and raced on across Germany in its final drive to destroy the German forces. Some elements pushed on toward Frankfurt-am-Main and others sped forward to make contact with the United States Ninth Army, which by now had also crossed the Rhine and was driving eastward.

Finally at Torgau, on the Elbe, on April 25, 1945, 10 days after General Hodges had been promoted to the four-star rank of full general, First Army divisions were the first American troops to contact the Russian armies at the Elbe-Mulde River line. Thus the First Army was first on the Normandy beaches, first to break through at St. Lo, first to liberate Paris, first into Germany, first across the Rhine, and first to make contact with the Russians. The First United States Army had lived up to its name and its great accomplishments were due in no small measure to the leadership and ability of General Hodges, a soldier's soldier, whom Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower has referred to as sturdy and steady Hodges. Sturdy and steady he was, indeed, and at the same time a man so modest and self-effacing that, in spite of his gigantic accomplishments in World War II, he has not received the same public attention as some of our more widely proclaimed heroes. He is one of those quiet men of extraordinary competence whose very steadiness itself has kept him out of the spotlight of glamor. But history will recognize him among the ranks of our greatest soldiers.

It is sad, indeed, that this energetic man, whose blue eyes and vigor of movement belie his 62 years of age, must now enter upon retirement. May we wish him continued good health and a long and happy life and may we express to him the profound gratitude of all Americans.

MOHANDAS KARAMCHAND GANDHI

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the anniversary of the death by assassination of Mahatma Gandhi, one of those rare ones who lived his belief in every hour of his days and nights, whose influence encircles the earth.

It was my privilege to be included among those invited by the Ambassador of India to the impressive and deeply moving memorial services held in the auditorium of the Department of the Interior. With great understanding the Indian Embassy recognized that here in Washington are many who revere this

great spirit that chose to serve mankind in this moment of universal need in the frail form of Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, known to us as the Mahatma, to many of his followers as Bapu—an untranslatable name of love.

No one who was present could fail to have been deeply moved by the simplicity of the service. For myself I was lifted up as I have not been in many long moons. The reality of spiritual force pervaded me, the universality of truth enveloped me, and I came away renewed in body and soul. It is with deep appreciation that I take this method of thanking the Ambassador from India and Lady Rama Rau for this uplifting experience that has given me new courage and certain hope that one day all the people of the world will live together in complete understanding and demonstration of the nonviolence for which Mahatma Gandhi gave his life.

That there may be in the RECORD a less personal word of this memorial hour I am inserting a clipping of this morning from the Washington Post:

MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR GANDHI ATTRACT MORE THAN 700 HERE—INDIAN AMBASSADOR CONDUCTS RITES IN INTERIOR AUDITORIUM

An impressive memorial service to Mahatma Gandhi, featured by prayers chanted and spoken by the Indian leader's personal physician, was held here yesterday on the first anniversary of Gandhi's assassination.

Conducted by Sir Benegal Rama Rau, Ambassador of India to the United States, the service was held at the Department of the Interior auditorium and was attended by more than 700 persons, including ambassadors and other high-ranking Washington representatives of many nations.

Gandhi's physician, Dr. Sushila Nayar, was attended in the prayer service by 11 ladies of the Indian Embassy, attired in flowing saris of white, as a symbol of the simplicity which was one of the spiritual leader's characteristics.

Explaining that Mahatma Gandhi respected all true religions, she opened the service by chanting a Buddhist prayer, and, after 2 minutes of silence, sang verses from the Hindu scriptures. Then followed excerpts from the Mohammedan Koran, from the Bhagavad-Gita, supreme scripture of Hindu India, from scriptures of the Sikh sect, and from the Sermon on the Mount, Gandhi's favorite part of the Bible.

Dr. Nayar, who is in this country for postgraduate work at Johns Hopkins and Columbia Universities, said the United Nations is not respected in some places because the big nations have violated one of Gandhi's principles, that of nonaccumulation of great material possessions. Accumulation of material power has made everyone want to be big, just as Gandhi insisted it always did, with individuals or with nations, she said.

Dr. Paul Douglass, president of American University, reviewed the high points of Gandhi's life, while Lady Rama Rau in a brief talk spoke of him as a great spiritual leader from the historical point of view, but a "man whom we loved" to "the humble Indians."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include a newspaper editorial in each.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by the chairman of the board of directors of the Jones & Laughlin Steel Co.

Mr. BREHM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Wall Street Journal.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a bill he is today introducing.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "Expansion Estimates to 1960 for Pacific Northwest Industries." I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $266.25, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. MADDEN asked an was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement with respect to William McKinley and the annexation of Hawaii.

PERMITTING UNINCORPORATED BUSINESSES TO BE TAXED LIKE CORPORATIONS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill which will permit unincorporated businesses to be taxed like corporations. The bill will permit the business enterprise, if the owners so elect, to be treated as if it were a corporation, and amounts received from such business enterprise by the individual owners will be regarded as dividends. By treating such business enterprise as a corporation, it will be permitted to accumulate earnings for expansion and increased production purposes without being subject to any higher rate than the rate applicable to corporations.

At the present time, an individual in business is compelled to pay the full normal and surtax on any earnings left in his business. Of course, if the earnings are accumulated beyond the reasonable needs of the business enterprise, the provisions of section 102, relating to unreasonable accumulation of earnings for the purpose of avoiding individual surtaxes, will be applicable. Because of administrative difficulties, the relief is necessarily granted to businesses owned by not more than 10 individuals.

My bill becomes effective for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1949. It is introduced at this time so that it can receive full study and analysis by all persons interested in such a proposal.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] has had a death in his family necessitating his return to Louisiana. I ask unanimous consent that he be granted a leave of absence for 6 days.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEES

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk House Resolution 68 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on District of Columbia: JAMES WADSWORTH, New York.

Committee on Un-American Activities: J. PARNELL THOMAS, New Jersey; RICHARD M. NIXON, California; FRANCIS CASE, South Dakota; HAROLD H. VELDE, Illinois.

The resolution was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INDEPENDENT OIL OPERATORS

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include a telegram.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Speaker, the independent oil operators of our country are rapidly being squeezed out of business through two forces that our Government should do its utmost to correct.

These independent oil operators are composed of the real type of American pioneers that have made this country of ours great.

Men who go forth to risk their all in the discovery of new horizons and new wealth for the benefit and good of all and for the hoped-for reward and gain that their efforts and risks sometimes provide them.

During the recent war in which our country was engaged it was these men, the independent oilmen of America, that concentrated their energies and their means, their ability, and techniques to keep apace with our great increase in demand for petroleum and its products that played such a huge and all-important part in winning the war.

Since the cessation of hostilities these same men have found it increasingly difficult to pursue their business.

First, the black market and extreme scarcity of well pipe due to a large extent

to the export of great tonnage of this necessary commodity to the foreign fields of Iran, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia.

Now, following the exportation of this tremendous quantity of pipe the resultant production of foreign oil is reaching our shores to create a surplus and discourage, if not stop, further exploration drilling, discoveries, and production in our own country.

Are we to encourage and condone this procedure to the end that this vital industry shall further suffer and be killed?

I offer a telegram from my good friend, R. L. Wood, as one of the many expressions of protest received from representatives and members of the great fraternity of pioneers:

WICHITA FALLS, TEX., *January 28, 1949.*
Congressman KEN REGAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Statement by the executive committee and State vice presidents of the Independent Petroleum Association of America at Wichita Falls, Tex., January 28, 1949:

"An increasing flood of foreign oil is jeopardizing our national economy, our national security, and resulting in the unemployment of American labor.

"Two world wars have proved that America cannot depend on foreign oil in an emergency. Foreign oil, thousands of miles away in troubled areas and under the insecure control of a combination of a few importing companies, is a slender thread on which to hang the security of the American people.

"Domestic oil producers since the war have increased the production of crude oil in the United States until they are now more than able to supply every need of the American consumer. The output of domestic oil can be further increased. It will not be increased if this market is absorbed by foreign oil, thus depriving the independent oil producer of the funds necessary to discover and develop adequate reserves in the United States.

"The few large importing companies, through short-sightedness, indifference, or selfish interest, are endangering the national security in their rush to produce and sell their foreign oil in the markets of this country. Most of their foreign reserves are in the Middle East. Less than 2 hours' bombing time from Russia.

"This revival of international cartels, which owe allegiance to no country, should not be permitted to monopolize or destroy American life.

"The Independent Petroleum Association of America insists that the Congress should protect the welfare and security of the American people by enacting such legislation as is necessary to restrict petroleum imports to only such quantities as may be needed to supplement domestic production."

BOB WOOD.

MIDLAND.

OUR PRESIDENTS' HEALTH

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I recommend to my colleagues that they read a recent book, by Dr. Carl Wold, on the physical health of our Presidents. Dr. Wold has spent years on this research and tells how the health of our Presidents has affected great decisions of this country and the world. Look magazine for this week publishes one of the chapters of this book on the health of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. His paralysis, later illnesses, and unusually lengthy term of service, during an era of great national strain, focused more than usual attention on the state of the President's health.

Our Presidents carry a tremendous burden that at times seems more than the strongest man might be able to bear. Our Presidents, because of their tremendous responsibilities, need to divide these responsibilities so that part of them could be carried by a so-called Assistant President, and by a strong Cabinet.

I am certain that if the people had been properly informed of Franklin Roosevelt's health by competent, unbiased physicians, he, himself, never would have made the sacrifice of running for a fourth term, and indeed might be alive today. It seems to me that often selfish, greedy politicians, officeholders, and leeches on our political body use undue force and persuasion to keep their political advantages.

The world now knows that Franklin Roosevelt was an ill man at the end of his third term. His condition became worse when he was a candidate for a fourth term. In the early part of his fourth term he had important conferences with world leaders. He and his advisers made agreements with Joe Stalin that have cost this country billions of dollars and perhaps even a third world war. He gave his best and perhaps came to an untimely death because of the crushing burdens forced upon an ill man.

I have often recommended that Presidents be examined periodically by unbiased, well qualified medical men and that a report be given to the proper committee of Congress. I am also just as certain that no President should ever serve more than two terms. This Nation ought to profit by past mistakes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. LANHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include three speeches that I made in this House in the last two Congresses.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 22, Rept. No. 9), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of 10 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a study and investigation of the problems of small business, existing, arising, or that may arise, with particular reference to (1) whether the potentialities of small business are being adequately developed and, if not, what factors have hindered and are hindering the normal operation of established small business and/or its development and enterprise; (2) whether agencies, departments of the Government or Government owned or controlled corporations are properly, adequately, or equitably serving the needs of small business; (3) whether small business is being treated fairly and the public welfare properly and justly served through the allotments of valuable materials in which there are shortages, in the granting of priorities or preferences in the use, sales, or purchase of said materials; and (4) the need for a sound program for the solution of the postwar problems of small business.

The committee may from time to time submit to the House such preliminary reports as it deems advisable; and prior to the close of the present Congress shall submit to the House its final report on the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session may be filed with the Clerk of the House.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to borrow from Government departments and agencies such special assistants, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any properly designated chairman of a subcommittee thereof, or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 2, strike out the word "ten" and insert in lieu thereof the word "nine."

Page 3, at the end of line 6, after the period, insert the following: "The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses."

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file another privileged report, and possibly one other in addition thereto. One is a bill from the Committee on Banking and Currency on which there has been a unanimous report. A request will be made for a rule at 2 o'clock on another bill, which also has the unanimous support of the committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what committee does that bill come from?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will deal with that matter in a moment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

COCKTAIL PARTIES

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I have read numerous reports in the press recently from individuals placed in high position by the electorate to the effect that the rounds of cocktail parties and the drinking in Washington have become so great that they cannot attend to their public business.

I am afraid that the publication of those statements in the press would be a reflection upon the hard-working Members of Congress of the United States who have the ability to withstand the invitations of those society climbers who would have the Members of Congress attend cocktail parties every day. But I want it said that as a result of 10 years' experience of my own here in this body it has been my observation that the hard-working Members of this body, and most of them are, are able to resist the temptation, if such a thing exists. I can say to those who are complaining that all they have to do is simply say "No." Let them not attend those cocktail parties that are interfering with their activities, and quit drinking cocktails if it interferes with doing business. The overwhelming majority of the Members of Congress have done so and are able to do so today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Times-Herald.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I present a privileged resolution (H. Res. 50) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State is requested to transmit to the House of Representatives at the earliest practicable time the following information, namely:

1. What does the Department know about whether Egypt and Transjordan, or either of them, has invoked its mutual assistance treaty with Great Britain?

2. Has the United States asked Great Britain for an explanation of the recent presence of its military aircraft over the battle zone between the Israeli and Egyptian forces on the border of Palestine and Egypt?

3. Has the United States asked Great Britain for an explanation of the recent shipment or proposed shipment of troops to the port of Aqaba in Transjordan, and the purposes for which said troops are proposed to be employed?

4. In the opinion of the Department, did the presence of British military aircraft over the Israeli-Egyptian fighting zone, or the arrival of British troops at Aqaba, infringe upon the resolutions of the General Assembly or the Security Council of the United Nations adopted in 1948 with respect to Palestine?

5. What information does the Department have regarding British sales or shipments, if any, directly or indirectly, of arms or implements of war since April 17, 1948, to Transjordan, Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, or Yemen?

6. If the sales or shipments referred to in question 5 have taken place, did such sales or shipments constitute, in the opinion of the Department, infringements upon the resolutions of the General Assembly or the Security Council of the United Nations adopted in 1948 with respect to Palestine?

7. What is the present policy of the Department regarding the continuance or lifting of the embargo, announced on December 5, 1947, on the shipment of arms or implements of war to Israel and the other Middle Eastern countries?

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk the adverse report of the committee, together with a memorandum report from the Secretary of State. I ask unanimous consent that the report of the committee, together with the memorandum report, be read, but that the excerpts accompanying the report from the records of the United Nations not be read, due to their length and in order to conserve the time of the House, but that such excerpts be printed in the RECORD, together with the other documents.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman is not asking for the passage of this resolution now, is he? He is not attempting to bring the resolution up, is he?

Mr. KEE. Of course, the resolution is before the House.

Mr. RANKIN. I certainly am not willing to join in this war on Great Britain.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Mississippi will be patient, the Chair understands that a motion will be offered which will dispose of that question.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand; but I am not willing to join in this war on the British people. This Palestine proposition has developed into a satellite state of Soviet Russia. We need not kid ourselves any further. I am not willing for the Congress of the United States to join in making war on Great Britain or aiding Russia by financing or feeding or supplying her satellite state.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Foreign Affairs, to which was referred the resolution (H. Res. 50) to obtain information from the Secretary of State on the Palestine situation, having considered the same, reports unfavorably thereon without amendment and recommends that the resolution do not pass.

The recommendation of the committee is based on a communication received from the Department of State, the text of which is included in this report for the information of the House.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 26, 1949.

The Honorable SOL BLOOM,
Chairman, Foreign Affairs Committee,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BLOOM: Pursuant to our conversation this morning, I enclose a memorandum report on House Resolution 50, together with copies of the General Assembly's resolutions of May 15, 1947, and December 11, 1948, as well as the resolutions of the Security Council dated May 29 and July 15, 1948.

If I can be of further assistance to you, do not hesitate to make known your desires.

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT MCCLINTOCK,
Special Assistant to the Director,
Office of United Nations Affairs.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE MEMORANDUM ON HOUSE RESOLUTION 50, JANUARY 26, 1949

House Resolution 50, calling for information on the Palestine situation, comes at a time when very delicate and important conversations are in progress between the representatives of the Provisional Government of Israel and several of the Arab governments, looking toward the establishment of peace in Palestine. It would be unfortunate if information furnished pursuant to House Resolution 50 should become public during these negotiations. Furthermore, the United States Government is a member of the Palestine Conciliation Commission appointed pursuant to the General Assembly's resolution of December 11, 1948. This Government must use its utmost endeavor to preserve its position of strict impartiality as a member of the Palestine Conciliation Commission in order that its best efforts may be used on the Commission in an endeavor to assist the parties to the Palestine dispute to reach a peaceful and permanent solution of their problem.

UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION OF MAY 15, 1947

The General Assembly calls upon all governments and peoples, and particularly upon the inhabitants of Palestine, to refrain, pending action by the General Assembly on the report of the Special Committee on Palestine, from the threat or use of force or any other action which might create an atmosphere prejudicial to an early settlement of the question of Palestine.

Seventy-ninth plenary meeting, May 15, 1947.

PALESTINE: PROGRESS REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS MEDIATOR

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-SIXTH PLENARY MEETING, DECEMBER 11, 1948

The General Assembly having considered further the situation in Palestine—

1. Expresses its deep appreciation of the progress achieved through the good offices of the late United Nations mediator in promoting a peaceful adjustment of the future situation of Palestine, for which cause he sacrificed his life; and

Extends its thanks to the acting mediator and his staff for their continued efforts and devotion to duty in Palestine;

2. Establishes a Conciliation Commission consisting of three states members of the United Nations which shall have the following functions:

(a) To assume, insofar as it considers necessary in existing circumstances, the functions given to the United Nations mediator on Palestine by the resolution of the General Assembly of May 14, 1948;

(b) To carry out the specific functions and directives given to it by the present resolution and such additional functions and directives as may be given to it by the General Assembly or by the Security Council;

(c) To undertake, upon the request of the Security Council, any of the functions now assigned to the United Nations mediator on Palestine or to the United Nations Truce Commission by resolutions of the Security Council; upon such request to the Conciliation Commission by the Security Council with respect to all the remaining functions of the United Nations mediator on Palestine under Security Council resolutions, the office of the mediator shall be terminated;

3. Decides that a committee of the Assembly, consisting of China, France, the Union of

Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America, shall present, before the end of the first part of the present session of the General Assembly, for the approval of the Assembly, a proposal concerning the names of the three states which will constitute the Conciliation Commission;

4. Requests the Commission to begin its functions at once, with a view to the establishment of contact between the parties themselves and the Commission at the earliest possible date;

5. Calls upon the governments and authorities concerned to extend the scope of the negotiations provided for in the Security Council's resolution of November 16, 1948, and to seek agreement by negotiations conducted either with the Conciliation Commission or directly with a view to the final settlement of all questions outstanding between them;

6. Instructs the Conciliation Commission to take steps to assist the governments and authorities concerned to achieve a final settlement of all questions outstanding between them;

7. Resolves that the holy places—including Nazareth—religious buildings, and sites in Palestine should be protected and free access to them assured, in accordance with existing rights and historical practice; that arrangements to this end should be under effective United Nations supervision; that the United Nations Conciliation Commission, in presenting to the fourth regular session of the General Assembly its detailed proposal for a permanent international regime for the territory of Jerusalem, should include recommendations concerning the holy places in that territory; that with regard to the holy places in the rest of Palestine the Commission should call upon the political authorities of the areas concerned to give appropriate formal guaranties as to the protection of the holy places and access to them; and that these undertakings should be presented to the General Assembly for approval;

8. Resolves that, in view of its association with three world religions, the Jerusalem area, including the present municipality of Jerusalem plus the surrounding villages and towns, the most eastern of which shall be Avu Dis; the most southern, Bethlehem; the most western, Ein Karim (including also the built-up area of Motsa); and the most northern, Shufat, should be accorded special and separate treatment from the rest of Palestine and should be placed under effective United Nations control;

Requests the Security Council to take further steps to insure the demilitarization of Jerusalem at the earliest possible date;

Instructs the Conciliation Commission to present to the fourth regular session of the General Assembly detailed proposals for a permanent international regime for the Jerusalem area which will provide for the maximum local autonomy for distinctive groups consistent with the special international status of the Jerusalem area;

The Conciliation Commission is authorized to appoint a United Nations representative who shall cooperate with the local authorities with respect to the interim administration of the Jerusalem area;

9. Resolves that, pending agreement on more detailed arrangements among the governments and authorities concerned, the freest possible access to Jerusalem by road, rail, or air should be accorded to all inhabitants of Palestine;

Instructs the Conciliation Commission to report immediately to the Security Council, for appropriate action by that organ, any attempt by any party to impede such access;

10. Instructs the Conciliation Commission to seek arrangements among the governments and authorities concerned which will facilitate the economic development of the area, including arrangements for access to ports and airfields and the use of transportation and communication facilities;

11. Resolves that the refugees wishing to return to their homes and live at peace with their neighbors should be permitted to do so at the earliest practicable date, and that compensation should be paid for the property of those choosing not to return and for loss of or damage to property which, under principles of international law or in equity, should be made good by the governments or authorities responsible;

Instructs the Conciliation Commission to facilitate the repatriation, resettlement, and economic and social rehabilitation of the refugees and the payment of compensation, and to maintain close relations with the director of the United Nations Relief for Palestine Refugees and, through him, with the appropriate organs and agencies of the United Nations;

12. Authorizes the Conciliation Commission to appoint such subsidiary bodies and to employ such technical experts, acting under its authority, as it may find necessary for the effective discharge of its functions and responsibilities under the present resolution;

The Conciliation Commission will have its official headquarters at Jerusalem. The authorities responsible for maintaining order in Jerusalem will be responsible for taking all measures necessary to insure the security of the Commission. The Secretary-General will provide a limited number of guards for the protection of the staff and premises of the Commission;

13. Instructs the Conciliation Commission to render progress reports periodically to the Secretary-General for transmission to the Security Council and to the members of the United Nations;

14. Calls upon all governments and authorities concerned to cooperate with the Conciliation Commission and to take all possible steps to assist in the implementation of the present resolution;

15. Requests the Secretary-General to provide the necessary staff and facilities and to make appropriate arrangements to provide the necessary funds required in carrying out the terms of the present resolution.

RESOLUTION ON THE PALESTINIAN QUESTION ADOPTED AT THE THREE HUNDRED AND TENTH MEETING OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL, MAY 29, 1948

The Security Council, desiring to bring about a cessation of hostilities in Palestine without prejudice to the rights, claims, and position of either Arabs or Jews—

Calls upon all governments and authorities concerned to order a cessation of all acts of armed force for a period of 4 weeks:

Calls upon all governments and authorities concerned to undertake that they will not introduce fighting personnel into Palestine, Egypt, Iraq, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Transjordan, and Yemen during the cease fire;

Calls upon all governments and authorities concerned, should men of military age be introduced into countries or territories under their control, to undertake not to mobilize or submit them to military training during the cease fire;

Calls upon all governments and authorities concerned to refrain from importing or exporting war material into or to Palestine, Egypt, Iraq, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Transjordan, and Yemen during the cease fire;

Urges all governments and authorities concerned to take every possible precaution for the protection of the holy places and of the city of Jerusalem, including access to all shrines and sanctuaries for the purpose of worship by those who have an established right to visit and worship at them;

Instructs the United Nations mediator for Palestine in concert with the Truce Commission to supervise the observance of the above provisions, and decides that they shall be provided with a sufficient number of military observers;

Instructs the United Nations mediator to make contact with all parties as soon as the cease fire is in force with a view to carrying out his functions as determined by the General Assembly;

Calls upon all concerned to give the greatest possible assistance to the United Nations mediator;

Instructs the United Nations mediator to make a weekly report to the Security Council during the cease fire;

Invites the states members of the Arab League and the Jewish and Arab authorities in Palestine to communicate their acceptance of this resolution to the Security Council not later than 6 p. m. New York standard time on June 1, 1948;

Decides that if the present resolution is rejected by either party or by both, or if, having been accepted, it is subsequently repudiated or violated, the situation in Palestine will be reconsidered with a view to action under chapter VII of the Charter; and

Calls upon all governments to take all possible steps to assist in the implementation of this resolution.

RESOLUTION ON THE PALESTINIAN QUESTION ADOPTED AT THE THREE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-EIGHTH MEETING OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL, JULY 15, 1948

The Security Council taking into consideration that the provisional government of Israel has indicated its acceptance in principle of a prolongation of the truce in Palestine; that the states members of the Arab League have rejected successive appeals of the United Nations mediator, and of the Security Council in its resolution of July 7, 1948, for the prolongation of the truce in Palestine; and that there has consequently developed a renewal of hostilities in Palestine;

Determines that the situation in Palestine constitutes a threat to the peace within the meaning of article 39 of the Charter;

Orders the governments and authorities concerned, pursuant to article 40 of the Charter of the United Nations, to desist from further military action and to this end to issue cease-fire orders to their military and paramilitary forces, to take effect at a time to be determined by the mediator, but in any event not later than 3 days from the date of the adoption of this resolution;

Declares that failure by any of the governments or authorities concerned to comply with the preceding paragraph of this resolution would demonstrate the existence of a breach of the peace within the meaning of article 39 of the Charter requiring immediate consideration by the Security Council with a view to such further action under chapter VII of the Charter as may be decided upon by the Council;

Calls upon all governments and authorities concerned to continue to cooperate with the mediator with a view to the maintenance of peace in Palestine in conformity with the resolution adopted by the Security Council on May 29, 1948;

Orders as a matter of special and urgent necessity an immediate and unconditional cease fire in the city of Jerusalem to take effect 24 hours from the time of the adoption of this resolution, and instructs the Truce Commission to take any necessary steps to make this cease fire effective;

Instructs the mediator to continue his efforts to bring about the demilitarization of the city of Jerusalem, without prejudice to the future political status of Jerusalem, and to assure the protection of and access to the holy places, religious buildings, and sites in Palestine;

Instructs the mediator to supervise the observance of the truce and to establish procedures for examining alleged breaches of the truce since June 11, 1948, authorizes him to deal with breaches so far as it is within his capacity to do so by appropriate

local action, and requests him to keep the Security Council currently informed concerning the operation of the truce and when necessary to take appropriate action;

Decides that, subject to further decision by the Security Council or the General Assembly, the truce shall remain in force, in accordance with the present resolution and with that of May 29, 1948, until a peaceful adjustment of the future situation of Palestine is reached;

Reiterates the appeal to the parties contained in the last paragraph of its resolution of May 22 and urges upon the parties that they continue conversations with the mediator in a spirit of conciliation and mutual concession in order that all points under dispute may be settled peacefully;

Requests the Secretary-General to provide the mediator with the necessary staff and facilities to assist in carrying out the functions assigned to him under the resolution of the General Assembly of May 14, and under this resolution; and

Requests that the Secretary-General make appropriate arrangements to provide necessary funds to meet the obligations arising from this resolution.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the resolution be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 101, noes 1.

So the motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL WEDNESDAY AND LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, I simply do this to inquire as to the program on Wednesday.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad the gentleman made that inquiry, as I had intended to make a statement to the House. I had previously indicated there would be nothing on Monday and Tuesday, and that as far as Wednesday or any other day of this week was concerned I would give 24 hours' notice to the Members.

On Wednesday, if a rule is reported from the Rules Committee—and I am not specifying the order as I make this statement—we will call up H. R. 1660. That is a bill to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is the same bill that we passed last year?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct.

This bill simply extends it until September 30.

Then there is House Resolution 22, introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], creating a select committee to be known as the Small Business Committee. The older Members are familiar with that.

Then there is H. R. 128, a bill to provide that acreage planted to cotton in 1949 shall not be considered in computing the cotton acreage for any ensuing year. I understand that has the unanimous approval of the committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That will be on Wednesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. I have scheduled those matters for Wednesday. If they are not completed then, of course they will come up on Thursday.

While I have no knowledge of any other legislation for the remainder of the week, I wish to announce that if any is reported out I reserve to myself the right to call up any such bills on Thursday and Friday. I know of none now. I will try to give the House 24 hours' notice, if I can, in connection with any other legislation. I give notice now that if they are reported out and they can be called up I shall call them up.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. You are simply serving notice so that everybody will be on the job Thursday and Friday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly, but particularly Thursday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mr. Frank R. Kent; also to extend his remarks and include an article from the Wall Street Journal.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include telegrams and resolutions.

BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF WILLIAM McKINLEY

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday was the birthday anniversary of William McKinley. Heretofore we have observed that with some fitting ceremony. The House not being in session, we could not do it this year.

I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and also I ask unanimous consent that any Member may have permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD with reference to McKinley and his achievements.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the requests of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday was the birthday of President McKinley.

For quite a number of years we have here in this House taken notice of McKinley's birthday by some kind of fitting observance. Because this date came on Saturday this year, when this House was not in session, we could not well hold one of our usual ceremonies, so we decided to distribute our red carnations today as we have done for a number of years. To our colleagues the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman McGREGOR, and the gentlewoman from Ohio, Congresswoman BOLTON, we are indebted for making the arrangements whereby the carnations were distributed.

We, the congressional delegation from Ohio, appreciate the fact that practically all of the membership are wearing one of these carnations here now, and this regardless of political affiliations.

The reason we from Ohio feel justified in holding these special observances is due to the fact that Mr. McKinley was, without any doubt, one of America's greatest Congressmen. We have had many great Presidents, but we have had very few Presidents who have been Members of Congress. From Lincoln, who had once been a Member of Congress, down to Mr. Truman, who had been a Member of the United States Senate, I think that Mr. McKinley and Mr. Harding were the only Presidents, except Mr. Garfield, who had ever been Members of Congress.

I have always maintained that the most important work of Mr. McKinley was the work that he did while he was a Member of Congress. He was a great Governor of Ohio after he left Congress, and he was a great President after the people of the country promoted him from the governorship to the Presidency, but he would never have been elected Governor except for his preeminent service as a Member of the Congress.

McKinley was a man of the highest character. His strength of character manifested itself when he volunteered to join the Union Army when he was only 18 years of age. This strength of character manifested itself when General Sheridan, in one of the fierce conflicts of the Civil War, complimented him for his heroism and his sensible generalship in that great battle.

McKinley was a man of great ability. He discharged his every responsibility with great fidelity.

McKinley was a great statesman. This fact will be attested to by all impartial persons who write history.

McKinley was a great Congressman, for his record made on this floor will prove it.

WILLIAM McKINLEY AND THE ANNEXATION OF HAWAII

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, on the lawn of Hawaii's largest high school stands an imposing statue of William McKinley. The school, which bears his name, is a living memorial to the twenty-fourth President of the United States.

To the people of Hawaii, President McKinley's name holds a place of honor and esteem. There is reason for this—it was he, on July 7, 1898, who signed the resolution which made Hawaii a part of the United States.

Soldier, statesman, teacher, and twice-elected leader of his country, William

McKinley was a man of great foresight and keen awareness of America's destiny. He saw Hawaii not as an isolated group of islands in the middle of the Pacific, but as a crossroads of trade and commerce and a new American frontier in the West.

President McKinley's role was not merely that of affixing his signature to a resolution. The annexation of Hawaii to the United States was to him a matter of deep personal conviction. He had the vision to see that the people of Hawaii, like the people of Texas, Oregon, and California, were pioneers who were forging a new frontier.

The move to annex Hawaii was not without opposition. In 1893, 4 years before McKinley became President, a treaty of annexation was offered in the Senate but action was not completed.

President McKinley took office in March 1897 and 3 months later another annexation treaty was submitted to the Senate.

In an accompanying message of support, President McKinley reviewed the history of American-Hawaiian relations and justified annexation on the grounds that it was a logical and legitimate step and not a departure in American foreign policy. He stressed the fact that the new Republic of Hawaii, founded on the will of the people, had demonstrated its stability and its fitness to become a part of the United States.

In spite of this, and the strong public support which annexation had received, there was a highly vocal group in the Senate, consisting chiefly of antiexpansionists and opposing commercial interests, that argued against the treaty. As a result the Senate again adjourned without taking action.

When Congress reconvened in 1898, the administration renewed its fight for acceptance of the treaty. President McKinley, aware of the growing tension over the issue both in the Senate and in the islands, had a joint resolution for annexation introduced in Congress in place of the treaty.

Although the President's move was dictated by practical statesmanship, it gave the House of Representatives a chance to express its will on this vital measure.

The strategy brought quick results. The House approved the resolution 209 to 91. In the Senate the issue continued to be debated heatedly, but largely as a result of President McKinley's dynamic leadership the resolution was approved in the Senate by a vote of 42 to 21. The President signed the bill on July 7, 1898, and Hawaii became an integral and indivisible part of the American Union. Two years later Hawaii became a Territory and, we of Hawaii believe, set on the road to statehood.

There are few people now who will question this great American's judgment. Today, a half century after annexation, the record of Hawaii as an American community and its contribution to the country can leave no doubt as to wisdom and foresight of our country's twenty-fourth President, William McKinley.

Today the students of McKinley High School in Honolulu will honor the memory of this great American whose statue serves as a constant reminder to the people of Hawaii of his faith in them and their role in the American Commonwealth.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a statement of the executive committee of the National Catholic Resettlement Council, asking for an impartial and effective administration of the Displaced Persons Act.

Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a speech on displaced persons.

Mr. BOYKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two articles from his home paper.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COCKTAIL PARTIES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I was very happy to hear the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] make the remarks he did. A lot of misinformation naturally goes throughout the country as the result of some unnecessary and unfortunate observations that have been made.

Members of Congress are a very hard-working group. We do not want to be praised for it; that is our duty. But on the other hand it is only fair that the people of the country realize, and this is what the gentleman had in mind, that there is very little activity of the nature referred to that received wide publicity, engaged in by the great majority of the Members of Congress. This is an 18-hour day job for any of us; and so far as I know, on both sides of the aisle, the Members of this body and of the other body likewise—a great majority of the Members of both bodies—devote themselves wholly to the duty of representing their people and trying to carry out their legislative duties as Members of Congress.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Leaving out religious bodies, I dare say that this is the soberest body of men on earth of its size.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman's observation is absolutely correct; not only sober in the use of intoxicants, but sober in thought.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I have been invited to a great many of these cocktail parties but I have still to take my first drink.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Speaker, somebody must have drunk my share, for I have not been asked to go to any cocktail parties.

Mr. McCORMACK. Other than the observation made by the gentleman from Wisconsin, I think perhaps the best thing to do is to ignore the matter. We simply want to stop the erroneous impression from going further.

This is a hard-working body, and the people of the country should know it. I know they appreciate it.

ANNOUNCEMENT FROM COMMITTEE ON LABOR

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have heard rumors and even received calls from Members of the House to the effect that the Committee on Education and Labor was not interested in testimony from interested witnesses. That is not a fact. We are trying to give everybody as much time as possible. That is the reason we are holding hearings forenoons and afternoons also when time is available.

I wish also to announce that yesterday you read in the press that repeal of the Taft-Hartley bill was introduced in the Senate in the nature of a substitute. I am today dropping the original bill in the hopper, in substance the same as the Senate bill.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—REPORT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk and together with the accompanying papers referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 5 (a) of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, approved June 12, 1934, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the National Capital Housing Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 31, 1949.*

JOINT COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN ECONOMIC COOPERATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

JANUARY 28, 1949.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
The Speaker,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In conformity with section 124 of Public Law 472, Eightieth Congress, I have this date appointed the following members to represent the Committee on Foreign Affairs on the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation for the Eighty-first Congress: Hon. SOL BLOOM, New York; Hon. JOHN KEE, West Virginia; Hon. JOHN M. VORYS, Ohio.

Very sincerely yours,

SOL BLOOM, *Chairman.*

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN ECONOMIC COOPERATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

JANUARY 28, 1949.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In conformity with section 124 of Public Law 472, Eightieth Congress, I have this date appointed the following members to represent the Committee on Appropriations on the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation for the Eighty-first Congress: CLARENCE CANNON, Missouri; JOHN TABER, New York.

Very sincerely yours,

CLARENCE CANNON, *Chairman.*

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

JANUARY 27, 1949.

The SPEAKER,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the act of April 16, 1937, as amended (Public Law No. 38, 75th Cong., 1st sess.), I have appointed the following members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy for the year 1949: Hon. EDWARD J. HART, Hon. CLARK W. THOMPSON, Hon. ALVIN F. WEICHEL.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Yours very sincerely,

S. O. BLAND, *Chairman.*

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

JANUARY 27, 1949.

The SPEAKER,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Public Law 301 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, I have appointed the following members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy for the year 1949: Hon. EDWARD J. HART, Hon. HERBERT C. BONNER, Hon. ALVIN F. WEICHEL.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Yours very sincerely,

S. O. BLAND, *Chairman.*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial comment.

Mr. DEANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. PATTERSON (at the request of Mr. SADLAK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two newspaper editorials.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON LABOR MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 4, Public Law 101, Eightieth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. LESINSKI, Michigan; Mr. BARDEN, North Carolina, Mr. KELLEY, Pennsylvania; Mr. KENNEDY, Massachusetts; Mr. McCONNELL, Pennsylvania; Mr. GWINN, New York, Mr. SMITH, Kansas.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 34, section 1081, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. SASSCER, Maryland; Mr. FALLON, Maryland; Mr. THORNBERRY, Texas; Mr. STEFAN, Nebraska; Mr. MILLER, Maryland.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 301, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. BOGGS, Louisiana; Mr. LATHAM, New York.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 183, Seventy-sixth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. BURLESON, Texas; Mr. PATTERSON, Connecticut.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COFFEY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE AIR FORCE

Mr. COFFEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention to some remarks recently made by Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz, who was commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet during the last war, and whose brilliant contribution to victory over Japan is one of the most glorious in the history of that war.

While I join with every American in expressing the greatest admiration for Fleet Admiral Nimitz and his demonstrated ability as a naval strategist, I am alarmed by this grand old seadog's statement that the World War II land-sea-air team in any future war will have the same roles as in the last war. When we put our faith in the limited description of air-power effectiveness given us by the admiral, I am afraid that we may be following the fatal example of the French who placed their confidence in the Maginot Line philosophy of the generals of World War I. A later error equally fatal was made by the Germans when they concentrated on short-range tactical planes for their air force basing this decision on their earlier successes.

I feel that each of my countrymen, in view of the present world situation, must remain keenly aware of recent technical developments and their application in the development of new strategic concepts. Those of us more recently in touch with the latest techniques and technology of war think in terms, not just of orthodox bombing, as Admiral Nimitz expressed himself in a recent article, but rather as members of a nation living in an atomic age and possessing atomic weapons. I believe the present Air Force leaders have an acute understanding of this fact and have developed means and methods of delivering this new weapon to any place in the world.

Let us very briefly review a few of the basic and salient facts of the last war. For the first 2 years the Air Force, inadequate as it was, fought a delaying action characterized by the Battle of Midway and culminating in the beginning of the daylight bombing of Germany. Some of the action during this period was tactically offensive, but the strategic conception was a holding action, while our pitifully small Army and our Navy, all but destroyed at Pearl Harbor, prepared themselves for their later glorious achievements. The success of this mission was realized when our Army, Navy, and Air Force coequally shared in that great combined operation, the invasion of Normandy. This landing epitomized the triphibious warfare concept of Admiral Nimitz. Then plans were made ready for a similar combined offensive against Japan. The cost in lives anticipated by this offensive was made unnecessary, however, by the swarms of B-29's and escorting fighters over the strategic heart of Nippon and the coup de grace administered by one B-29 against Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

World War II has written indelibly the fundamentals of a new strategic concept. That which has astounded the world, particularly in the closing days of this war, will be vastly outmoded and outdated for any future war. In this the possibility of a future war and national protection against future wars lies the rebuttal to a triphibious cause.

Let us for the moment examine the portent of this statement.

The atomic bomb is at present nothing more than a very fine bomb, a thousand times more powerful than any before it, but nevertheless a bomb to be delivered to the target by its carrier, the airplane. This bomb gives to the aggressor nation an advantage so catastrophical in its implication that no defenses exist as such. If this aggressor should shoot first and

can shoot several times before we can shoot back, he will, in all likelihood, win the next war. To secure ourselves against any again-rising international gangster, we must be able to strike with greater power, almost simultaneously with his initial attack. The knowledge that we will be able to do this will best deter him from making this attack.

Let us look also at another aspect of this possible future war:

Where is it likely its theater will be? From where can any aggressor nation attack most swiftly with the least amount of warning at the heart of our Nation? Obviously, to meet these conditions, he will want to strike over the shortest possible route, along which it will be most difficult for us to place the radar nets and other warning devices which we have on hand. That is across the polar wastes. Just as obviously we must strike back in a similar direction. Now, I ask you, Is any war fought in this area an army, a navy, or an air war?

There appears to be some objection to this strategic plan on the grounds that triphibious success—as costly as it was—in this war leads to the conclusion that the land-sea-air team composed of each member in equal strength is now essentially sound. Admiral Nimitz's recent article in support of this balanced team challenges the arguments for the new strategic concept on the grounds that he does not believe it to be practicable to use orthodox bombs in the quantities necessary to inflict important damage on military objectives by air operations in excess of 3,000 miles involving a round trip of 6,000 miles. In other words, if we do not have bomber aircraft that can get to the target from fixed bases as they now exist and are available to us, let us move up the bases, let us advance the aircraft by means of carriers. But this is a tactical rather than a strategic argument. It is the frighteningly recurring Maginot-line-mind argument that we now refer to as triphibious operation. What the admiral calls an orthodox bomb is no longer a strategic weapon.

In any future war, the bombs for a strategic target will be the same, and we dare not have it otherwise, as imprinted Hiroshima so deeply in our minds. Furthermore, it is a fact that what the Air Force calls its "today" airplane has already made a round trip of just under 10,000 miles, employing refueling techniques now being rapidly developed. Such in-flight refueling methods are thoroughly practical. Some of you may recall that 20 years ago, in 1929, Maj. Carl Spaatz, Capt. Ira Eaker, and Lt. Pete Quesada kept a Fokker trimotor aloft over Los Angeles for 151 hours—over 6 days—by in-flight refueling. At present-day bombardment aircraft speeds of 300 miles per hour and over, their plane would have traveled over 45,000 miles without coming to earth. At this point it is interesting to note that the cost of one of the new mammoth aircraft carriers now planned by our Navy could provide for the construction and delivery of 150 modern, long-range strategic bombers and their operational cost for 2 years. Add to this the probable number of bombers that could be built for the initial cost and operation of the task force supporting one supercarrier—cruisers, destroyers, submarines, and a line of supply ships extending entirely across the ocean.

We can summarize our rebuttal with the words of one of the world's foremost aeronautical experts, Alexander D. Seversky, who, in his article, Peace Through Air Power, in the current Reader's Digest stated:

We need to be reminded that the triphibious strategy of World War II was an improvisation forced upon us by failure to provide air power with sufficient range to strike at the vitals of Japan from bases already in our possession.

This is the opinion of a man who has proven not only his technical ability but also his farsightedness time and time again. I ask unanimous consent to include this article in the RECORD.

The picture of air power in the atomic era is a frightful one, a fright no longer conceivable and interpolated into our past conception of military might. Similarly, if another war should come 20 years hence, the conduct of that war may be beyond our present imagination, but there is one thing we can be sure of—the weapons, projectiles, rays, or what have you, will come to us through the medium of air.

We, the representatives of our people, recognizing our responsibility for the security of our Nation, must stay alert to the new techniques, the new technology, and to up-to-date concepts of global stategy. Only thus may we utilize, with the wisest economy, our resources allocated to national defense.

Let us not suffer again the consequences of disinterest, or inaction, or, above all, wrong action. While paying tribute to the heroes of World War II, we must not allow our clear conception of the future to be clouded by the glories of the past.

[From the Reader's Digest of February 1949]

PEACE THROUGH AIR POWER

(Condensed from a chapter of a forthcoming book)

(By Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky)

In a world that has not yet learned to dispense with force, our ardent hope is that our military strength will prevent war. The important question is, What kind of strength?

Mere quantity in armed men and weapons will not serve. If war comes, the enemy will have at his disposal teeming populations, and possibly vast resources of the whole Eurasian Continent. American strategy must therefore gear to quality rather than quantity.

Fortunately, we have within our grasp a strategy that meets this condition. It is uniquely suited to American genius and capacity. It is the strategy of air power.

But what kind of air power? The assumption that a lot of indiscriminate planes—a 70-group air force, a huge naval air arm, a tactical air force supporting an army, marine aviation, Coast Guard aviation—add up to air power is wrong. A country may possess swarms of aircraft, yet be deficient in air power, as Hitler and Tojo learned too late.

True air power means a strategic striking force that can rise from our own American continent for direct assault against the industrial solar plexus of the enemy and return to its home bases. It means aviation freed from dependence on overseas bases. The creation of such an aerial force is fully possible. It calls for no new inventions; the necessary aircraft are already in the skies, but we are not building enough of them. What is more, this air power can be created as soon as, if not sooner than, the mountains of equipment on land, sea, and in the air now proposed.

Instead of continuing to spread our limited manpower and resources thin in all three elements, the proposed air strategy would concentrate on the decisive weapon for clean-cut superiority in the decisive element. By reducing sharply the roles of armies and navies, the fearful drain on men and materials can be stopped, the crushing burden of military expenditures can be eased.

With control of the air ocean enveloping the whole globe in our hands—the test and purpose of adequate air power—our position would be analagous to Great Britain's in the last century. A small island off Europe in effect gave mankind a century of peace, the Pax Britannica. It did this without militarizing or regimenting its people. This miracle was possible because Britain did not attempt to be strong on land and sea at the same time. Living in an era when water was the decisive medium for carrying destruction to enemies, Britain channeled practically its entire military potential into sea power, attaining command of the seas through an invincible fleet.

Today the air has become the primary medium of global power. An air force capable of commanding the skies can enforce its will on everything below. If we hold our effort on land and sea to a minimum and channel our resources into long-range air power, we likewise can be incomparably strong without the risk of military regimentation. When we muster the intellectual courage to face the new power equation, we can have a century of peace. Not a Pax Americana but a Pax Democratica, in partnership with all other free nations.

It sounds incredible today, but more than 2 years after the outbreak of World War II, and months after America was in it, bomber aircraft were still at the bottom of the priority lists. The men who were then—and for the most part are still—in charge of our military destinies locked on them as an unwarranted luxury. For these generals and admirals the unfolding struggle was merely a continuation, with modern trimmings, of the surface strategy of World War I.

That grim spectacle of stubborn inertia left airmen like myself no alternative but to speak out vigorously.[1] I believed an enlightened public opinion could serve as a corrective on the natural conservatism of a great military establishment rooted in tradition. That faith was amply justified.

Today it is again a deep anxiety for the state of our national security that moves me to write. The moment is crucial because we are now in the first stages of a large-scale rearmament. The plans now being shaped up, if allowed to congeal, cannot easily be undone. They will commit us irrevocably.

It would be against nature to expect the elder services to make a strategy decision amounting to an order for their own demotion to secondary roles. It is the American people who must determine the military course through their Congress and their President. They must choose between the profligate land-sea-air strategy of the recent past and the interhemispheric air strategy opened up by modern aeronautics.

Winning nations tend to glorify the methods and weapons that brought them victory. France at the end of World War I, flushed with triumph in the trenches, proceeded to construct a supercolossal de luxe trench: the Maginot Line. It was an engineering marvel, embodying all the latest scientific gadgets. But it was still a trench: a steel-and-concrete monument to the tragic belief that any new war would be as static as the last one.

[1] See Victory Through Air Power, the Reader's Digest, July 1942.

True, a young officer named Charles de Gaulle foresaw the advent of mobile and motorized warfare that would nullify supertrenches. But would France listen? Its illusions of safety were confirmed by such newly haloed heroes as Foch, Joffre, Pétain, Gamelin. To question their military wisdom at that time seemed close to treason.

The implications of the Maginot Line—a symbol of futility—have not been fully grasped. We Americans are at this very moment perpetrating a tragedy of the same order, for the same reasons, with the blessings of our own haloed heroes of recent victory. Having won the last war with triphibious task forces, Army-Navy-Air teams, we are proceeding to build supercolossal task forces which will embody all the latest technological innovations. Little gliders are being displaced by big gliders; tanks by supertanks. Assault barges firing primitive rockets are being replaced by superbarges firing V-2 rockets. Escort carriers are to be replaced by gigantic floating islands at a quarter of a billion dollars a throw. In America today, as in France a generation ago, legislators are overawed by the prestige of the five-star generals and admirals who delivered victory.

We need to be reminded that the triphibious strategy of World War II was an improvisation forced upon us by failure to provide air power with sufficient range to strike at the vitals of Japan from bases already in our possession. Such air power was technically possible but had been arbitrarily brushed aside by surface-minded planners. The land-sea-air team was an emergency device for carrying short-range aviation step by step, island by island, within striking distance of the ultimate target.

Indeed, as the range of available aviation was extended, those steps could be stretched, by-passing the intermediary islands where the enemy was entrenched. Every enlargement of range thus paid off in lives saved. In the final stage, our Superforts were planted within direct striking reach of Japan proper. At that point their surface teammates became in effect mere bystanders, as air power undertook the systematic demolition of the enemy sources of power.

Air power finished the job—and this is the key to an understanding of the events—with great Nipponese armies on the home islands and on the Asiatic mainland still intact, but impotent. Air power finished the job with a fantastic mass of American land and sea forces likewise intact and useless.

As late as June 21, 1943, General Marshall explained in a speech that "your adversary may be hammered to his knees by bombing but he will recover unless the knock-out blow is delivered by the army." Fortunately he was wrong. The knock-out blow was delivered by air power, sparing perhaps a million American and Japanese lives. Our actual invasion came after the surrender. A handful of American officers landed and took control of a country still possessing millions of fresh troops.

Most civilians could grasp the obvious lessons of this picture. But professional surface-strategists, innocent of the aeronautical facts of life, were bewildered. With few exceptions, they emerged from the war sold to the hilt on the triphibious team for securing outlying bases. They still remain blind to strategy based on victory without the orthodox show-down by foot soldiers on a battlefield. We are still witnessing the Maginot Line mentality at work. The current program of defense through balanced forces operating from a chain of bases means only one thing: the perpetuation of the methods of the last war.

Our projected 70-group air force is built around 20 groups of medium bombers of the B-29 and B-50 types—which is to say, around a 5,000-mile flying range, 2,000-mile striking radius. (Striking radius is about 40 percent of total flying range.) It provides for only 5 groups of long-range B-36 bombers, which have an effective flying range of 10,000 miles—with current modifications promising 13,000 miles—enough to blast any target in Eurasia from our own continent. Why do we thus continue to put our faith in an old-fashioned and technologically outmoded air force?

The telltale fact about the 2,000-mile radius is that it requires an array of overseas bases. Bases in turn call for large land and sea forces to hold and supply them. The over-all military pattern thus remains unchanged. Whether we have 70 groups or 700, the complex set-up on the surface remains indispensable. The more air power of this limited reach, the larger the land and sea forces required to make it operative.

Before the last war we had built and flown 82-ton aircraft with a flying range of some 8,000 miles. Did we put them into production to fight the war? Not at all. Instead, we produced 20-ton aircraft with a flying range of 2,000 miles. Today we have a few bombers of 150 tons with a flying range of 10,000 miles. But what are we building? Seventy-ton bombers with a flying range of 5,000 miles (combat striking range, 2,000)—just short enough to rule out transoceanic offensives.

True, we are now resorting to air-refueling and other tricks to extend the range of action. These will work under conditions of surprise, but I am convinced that sustained offensives cannot be maintained without planes of inter-hemispheric range. One can understand the present face-lifting improvisations by our Air Force. Its leaders have no alternative. Aircraft of inadequate range have been imposed upon them by military planners hell-bent on fighting from distant bases guaranteed by huge armies and navies.

The arguments advanced today for holding back the extreme planes are the same as those we heard when the 82-ton B-19 seemed extreme. The real explanation for freezing our strategy at the 2,000-mile radius is not technological but psychological. Military minds of the old stamp cannot admit the possibility of war without show-down land and sea battles, spearheaded by marines and supported by complex supply lines all over the world.

I do not hesitate to challenge the 2,000-mile-radius restriction. It is destined to join the Maginot Line in the limbo of outlived military notions. Even if a war should begin on this basis, it would inevitably be transformed into an all-out contest of interhemispheric dimensions before a decision could be scored. The logic of air power means an air force with enough range to strike from its own continent. The nation that is first in preparing for intercontinental aerial warfare will win the next war.

The United States should begin now. Tomorrow may be too late.

The advent of the atomic bomb does not alter this picture. The bomb is not a new military force, in the sense that the Army, Navy, and the Air Force are military forces. It is a new and horribly destructive explosive, as yet of finite scope. Before it can score a decision, it must be delivered, like any other explosive, by one or a combination of military forces to the right target at the right time. Thus it is not the stock pile of atomic bombs that will decide the issue, but superior means of delivery—and that means air power. Far from nullifying the art of war, the atom bomb puts a higher premium on correct strategy.

There are two possible strategies open to us. One, when air power can deliver the atom bomb only when provided with overseas bases. This demands a large army and a great navy. The national effort is split three ways so that none of the forces attains its maximum potential.

Two, when air power has sufficient range to deliver the atom bomb directly from this continent, without need of overseas bases. This reduces our Army and Navy to a minimum and allows us to put most of the national effort into the Air Force so that it attains its maximum potential.

There is nothing novel about the first strategic plan. That is how the last war was fought, and it is, unfortunately, the strategy underlying our present plans for national defense. But suppose that Soviet Russia possessed similar air bases in Cuba or Greenland—how long would they remain Russian after the start of hostilities? Obviously, we could kill them off by throwing against them the full weight of our bombing power. We would operate from the source of our strength and supplies, while the enemy could use only one segment of his and would have to depend on thousands of miles of vulnerable supply lines. The idea that Russia could hold Cuba or Greenland is fantastic.

But is it any less fantastic when we propose to hold bases on the periphery of the Eurasian Continent? Our projected air outposts in north Africa, Europe, the Near East, and the Far East are within striking range of Soviet air power. Most of these bases could be attacked not only by long-range bombers but also by great masses of short-range tactical planes, a type in which quantity rather than quality is the vital consideration. And we know that German and Russian factories are now producing thousands of tactical planes. The Soviet leaders can be expected to use these planes ruthlessly, considering them as expendable as so many shells. Finally, to hold these bases and keep them supplied would also mean challenging the 300 divisions of the Red Army.

The use of outer bases for initial surprise action is possible. But their permanent control for sustained strategic offensive is the stuff of dreams. Being within the orbit of the total hostile air potential, these bases will be captured or demolished, paralyzing the strategy dependent upon them. The ultimate decision will be postponed until we are ready to use long-range strategic aviation based on our own continent. Unless the enemy is ready with that kind of air power first.

Everything we have said about fixed bases applies a hundredfold to the floating bases called aircraft carriers. The only advantage they claim is mobility. But maneuverability reckoned in hundreds of miles becomes meaningless against aircraft covering thousands of miles. How a ship sailing 600 miles a day can evade detection by planes flying 600 miles an hour the admirals haven't explained.

In the last war carriers could not operate in the Mediterranean or North Sea within reach of the German Luftwaffe. Enlarging a carrier merely provides the foe with a larger target. The 80,000-ton floating islands on which our Navy has set its hopes are military monstrosities. They will be quarter-of-a-billion-dollar expendables, good at most for one limited sneak assault before they are annihilated. And their planes will be inferior to equivalent planes operating from the ground. I have no doubt that when military history is written these marine mastodons will be cited as a prime example of strategic folly.

If this strategy of carriers, overseas bases, and short-range aviation is allowed to stand, we would be called upon, in the event of war, to produce simultaneously the world's largest army, navy, and air force, while dividing our aeronautical effort between strategic and tactical planes, both in maximum numbers. Since our resources are not infinite, we could not hope for absolute superiority in any one of these forces. And, according to Government figures, we would be putting 10 dollars into surface elements for every dollar put into the skies. We don't need a calculating machine to realize that we are here dealing with strategy which, if it is to have the magnitude for victory over the

world's No. 1 land power, would bankrupt a nation 10 times as rich as the United States.

A recent press summary of the views of our high command stated that "the United States can develop overwhelming superiority in the air and at sea, but will find it hard to compete with Russia's land power." The allusion to sea superiority is frivolous. Soviet Russia, a self-contained and blockade-proof continent, has no navy, needs no navy, fears no navy. But if a contest on land is dangerous, if superiority in the air can be made overwhelming, why do we earmark a third of America's manpower and resources to face an admittedly superior land force and the near certainty of defeat? Why allocate another third to futile and irrelevant sea power? Why not convert the whole potential to the force recognized as our realm of supremacy—the Air Force?

Let us have the intellectual clarity and daring to break with the past. For a small fraction of the cost of conquering, maintaining, and supplying bases for short-range aviation, we can buy long-range aviation that nullifies the need for those bases and the huge surface forces that go with them.

The Air Force stated recently that "the possession of the B-36 will make it possible for us to operate against a possible aggressor anywhere in the world" from bases on the North American continent. Why, then, is the bulk of our money being put into 20 groups of medium bombers, while only 5 groups of the B-36 type are projected?

The answer is that our defense policy is shaped by men reared on surface concepts. Critics warn that the huge, unwieldy B-36 will be shot down. Of course some will. The medium-range bombers we plan to send from overseas bases will also be shot down. War without combat is a pipe dream.

We face today a crucial choice. Either we continue to divide our national potential three ways for land-sea-air operations tied to distant bases or we channel our strategy boldly into the skies for direct operations, with command of the whole air ocean as the objective.

That is the only strategy that will serve as a real deterrent to aggressors. It is the natural product of our way of life. No one will be able to challenge that kind of force. In order to create it—and more important, to exercise it properly—the challenger would have to possess talents equivalent to ours, and to acquire those talents he would have to adopt our way of life. But if he adopts our way of life, there will be no need for war.

The change called for is a bold reversal of prevailing concepts. Nothing less than an aroused public opinion can accomplish this. The pressure of the American people on their representatives in Congress can force revision of obsolete strategic plans.

The decision must be made quickly. Only the Nation as a whole can make it. Our people must choose between outmoded methods and an historic opportunity to win peace through air power.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include an editorial.)

INFORMATION, PLEASE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, without having consulted any Member of the Senate or the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and disregarding the truth of the statement that "fools rush in where angels fear to tread," because it is my desire to maintain friendly relations and a good-neighbor policy with the citizens of our sister Republic to the south, will endeavor once for all to settle a question as to my gender. Although fearful, I will endeavor to follow this suggestion as to the giving of advice to Mr. Dewey, which advice, I hope, will not involve us in any international entanglements, but which, if accepted, might aid in giving the American people an overdue opportunity to express their will on foreign and domestic policy.

From an individual who may be man or woman, spinster or bachelor, widow or widower, who gives the address of Medellin 184, P. B., Colonia Roma, Mexico City, Mexico, signed Lee Gandee, comes the following letter:

DEAR MRS. HOFFMAN: I noticed in the papers that you have been reelected and mentioned it to a friend of mine from Detroit. She said she knew that you had been reelected, but this chance remark led to a discussion that has grown into something of a dispute which you can settle perhaps better than anyone else.

My friend maintains that you are a spinster, and that you have been in Congress several years. She likes to speak of you as an example of the success that a liberated American woman can enjoy in a political career, by devoting her life to public affairs unencumbered by a husband and children. The Mexicans, who believe that woman's place is the home, find her opinions quite shocking. I maintain that you have had no such career, for I am quite certain that I remember a Mr. HOFFMAN having been in the House of Representatives not many years ago, and I think I read some time later that following his death, you as his widow, were selected to complete his term, as has been the case with other women in Congress. I have given this explanation to our mutual friends, who feel that there is a certain propriety in this situation which places you in a more favorable light than my friend's contention. It is a high compliment to your ability that the electorate of your district has returned you to office in your own right. Please accept my congratulations.

It is to be deplored that Mr. Dewey, due to his poor technique of campaigning, failed to enjoy the success that you have attained. It must be a bitter experience for him to be repudiated, when a mere woman, faced with the inherent obstacles attending female participation in public life, has been returned to office by her constituents. You ought to give him a little motherly advice.

I shall appreciate having you settle our contention by telling us your exact status, whether spinster or widow.

Yours very truly.

As so often happens, I cannot settle this argument with the simple statement that either party is right. As a matter of fact, both are in error. I am not, as Lee Gandee insists, a widow and, on the other hand, I cannot accurately be described as a spinster. I do not chew tobacco, smoke, or make a practice of drinking hard liquor, but those facts are no longer decisive on the question of sex.

Searching back into history, yes, even before man or woman began to write or print on paper a record of their doings, there is evidence that our ancestors, both men and women, had and exercised equal rights in the pursuit of many activities.

But judged by all the accepted standards of the modern day, as well as by those which prevailed in the horse-and-buggy days, it has been established that I at least belong to the male sex, though my good wife sometimes insists that I have never grown up, am still in some respects a child, that I have never attained the dignity which a Congressman, to say nothing of a Senator, should have. That is not due to the fact that time has not given me an opportunity to become either inactive or dignified. Sometimes pompousness is mistaken for dignity. As long as I am able to enjoy some of the pleasures of youth such as hunting and fishing and to act like a boy when such a trip appears possible, I will probably embarrass some of my friends by my lack of dignity and sedateness. In fact, figuratively speaking, I hope to be able to walk to my own funeral.

After giving the matter the usual consideration given by a Congressman or a Senator to a constituent's inquiries or requests, I wrote my Mexican correspondent that I was neither a spinster nor a widow; that I was twice a father, five times a grandfather, and still the husband of a long-suffering wife gifted with an unusually kind and tolerant disposition.

Thinking that my Mexican correspondent might be disappointed to learn that I am not a woman, attention was called to the fact that today we have in the House a number of women on both sides of the aisle who are not only a credit to their constituents, but who chart a course in decorum, legislative procedure, and domestic and foreign policy which might well serve as a guide for their less accomplished colleagues.

Attention was also called to the fact that a former Member of the House from Maine—and I trust this observation is not a transgression of the rules of the House—now sits in another body—the Senate—where it is certain other Members of that august body will have an opportunity to profit by watching her in action. Already in the Senate, as formerly in the House, she has outlined a sound domestic policy which the country may follow with profit.

But to get back to that part of the letter which refers to Mr. Dewey, my correspondent writes:

> It is to be deplored that Mr. Dewey, due to his poor technique of campaigning, failed to enjoy the success that you have attained—reelection. It must be a bitter experience for him to be repudiated, when a mere woman, faced with the inherent obstacles attending female participation in public life, has been returned to office by her constituents. You ought to give him a little motherly advice.

Let me again quote that last sentence: "You ought to give him a little motherly advice."

Mr. Dewey has a wonderful mother, a typical American mother. Undoubtedly she has given him much good advice. Beyond question, she is, as she has a right to be, extremely proud of her son, who made an unexcelled record as a prosecutor in New York. Tom Dewey is known throughout the Nation as one who did a most remarkable job in exposing the activities of and convicting gangster criminals. Tom Dewey has a magnificent record as an administrator of the great State of New York. He has given that State a businesslike administration

and has earned the approval, as a governor, of the overwhelming majority of the citizens of that great State. No one has ever questioned his sincerity, his executive ability, and undoubtedly there lies before him brilliant success in his chosen field of the law and politics.

He has never asked and undoubtedly never will ask for my advice, for he has always had experts to advise him. However, believing in the good-neighbor policy, I am willing to do the best I can, and, on the suggestion of my Mexican correspondent, offer gratuitously to the Honorable Thomas E. Dewey a few random thoughts. I might, if it was to be motherly advice, advise him as mother advised me, by using the old, old words: "If at first you don't succeed, try, try again."

But, speaking as a Republican, I might quote to Mr. Dewey these words:

> Like warmed-up cabbage served at each repast, the repetition kills the wretch at last.

I might use the old saying of the Danes:

> The goose goes so often to the kitchen that at last she is fastened to the spit.

Thomas Fuller once said:

> The pitcher that goes often to the well, comes home broken at last.

Bovee wrote:

> A sound discretion is not so much indicated by never making a mistake as by never repeating it.

Then here is one more from the Universal Songster:

> Hope tells a flattering tale,
> Delusive, vain, and hollow.
> Ah! let not hope prevail,
> Lest disappointment follow.

Or, disregarding the words of others, think it permissible to suggest to Mr. Dewey that he and his associates, yes, and I might include certain other individuals who are presumed to have been the Republican leaders during the last few years, having gone to bat twice and whiffed on two occasions, the last time with three men on base and two out. Tom and some others might sit on the bench through at least one game and let someone else come up as a pinch hitter.

Of course, we have been told so many times that we almost believe it, that Senator TAFT just cannot get the votes. We learned to our sorrow that a group of Dewey's supporters and promoters gave Senator BRICKER, who looks, talks, thinks, and acts like a real American President, a basswood bat at a gridiron dinner, and so sent him back to the bench.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] was at Omaha. Did Mr. Dewey win there?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman, in his statement relative to the soundness of officials in Ohio, is eminently correct. Anyone from Ohio always takes a sound position on governmental matters, especially the gentleman from the other body who was a candidate for President.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I was speaking of Governor BRICKER. I regret very much that he was not the nominee of the Republican Party.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And so do I regret that Ohio's candidate, Senator TAFT, was not the nominee. I might also add, in answer to the gentleman's inquiry about Omaha, that if the gentleman's representatives on the committee from his own State of Michigan had followed the advice, counsel, and leadership of members of the national committee from the State of Ohio he would not be quite as embarrassed as I am sure he is at this moment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You are right again. They did it, but they will hear from some of us in Michigan. Do not think they will not. They can ride on the rear end of an old broken-down wagon, but I will not.

Mr. Dewey would make a great Senator from the great State of New York, and, as such, he could very effectively voice the desires of his New York City constituents that we go along with the Acheson foreign policy as announced by the President in his inaugural address, and increase our efforts to feed, clothe, and house the unfortunate peoples of the world. But as a candidate for the Presidency, Mr. Dewey has twice gone to bat. Perhaps the pitcher in the first contest was a Bob Feller or a Dizzy Dean and hence the young man's strike-out was excusable. But on this last occasion, a soft, easy ball was tossed up to him and he just did not take his bat off his shoulder or start to swing until the catcher had it in his mitt.

No, in all fairness, Mr. Dewey, his "me-too" and international supporters, should get out of the batter's box, cease trying to carry the ball, and if they cannot run interference or do some minor job on the team, go back and sit down on the bench.

It is long past time when the American people should have an opportunity to vote upon the very simple issue as to whether the interests of this country are to be given first consideration or whether the ideas, the policies, and the practices used in other lands where they have been demonstrated to be failures, should be continued here without the people being given an opportunity at a national election to say whether they approve or disapprove. The rank and file of Republicans are tired of taking a New Deal remedy even though the bottle out of which it comes is labeled "Republican."

From the Niles Daily Star of Niles, Mich., comes an editorial of John R. Schamehorn, under date of January 25, which reads as follows:

> TIME TO STEP DOWN
>
> There are continuing signs that Thomas E. Dewey is still attempting to head up the Republican Party. If he continues in those efforts it will inevitably result in disaster for both himself and the party.
>
> Dewey and his advisers were solely responsible for shaping policies during the last campaign and it resulted in failure, as it did 4 years ago. The whole thing seemed to be so much in the bag that he declined to put on a hard-hitting campaign.
>
> His speeches were so indecisive, in fact, that he was continually criticized for not expressing his opinion on various issues of the campaign.
>
> As a twice rejected candidate, Dewey should step aside as far as national politics is concerned and not pretend any longer to head the party. He had that chance a few days ago but failed to take advantage of it. Instead, he left the impression that he might be available again in 1952.
>
> Mr. Dewey should know from past history that voters will not support him in a third attempt for the White House. Under the circumstances, he should make a prompt disclaimer of any further aspirations in that direction so that party leaders will not be hampered by the efforts of any of his faithful supporters in a die-hard struggle that could only result in further damage to the party.

That is typical of practically every editorial comment in southwestern Michigan.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has expired.

Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

OLEOMARGARINE AND THE DAIRY INDUSTRY

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, the new dairy policy toward oleo is in harmony with the Democratic platform. The Democratic platform favored the removal of taxes on oleomargarine, but said nothing about allowing the unrestricted sale of the yellow product. The President has said that he wants the taxes removed. Leading dairy and farm organizations favor the same action.

However, the time is absolutely inopportune for placing a greater burden on dairy farmers. Numerous bills have been introduced to permit unrestricted sale of oleomargarine colored yellow in imitation of butter. Yet there is growing economic distress among the people who milk cows in the great dairy States. Why anybody would want to do anything to make their burden heavier, I am unable to understand.

I am speaking about the people in every congressional district in the country who build the county roads and maintain schools. Hay is now as high as $45 a ton and cottonseed cake fed to dairy cattle costs from $80 to $100 a ton, yet the oleo interests would make it still more difficult for these people to survive.

In the Western States it has been snowing intermittently since the first of January. Hundreds of thousands of cattle and sheep are marooned, and losses will be tremendous. This is one of the most devastating and unprecedented blows at our livestock economy within the memory of man. We cannot afford further to imperil our supplies of meat, as well as our source of milk and other vital food products, by striking at the dairy industry.

Members of this House who are also members of the Committee on Agriculture are well aware of the difficulties which face the southern cotton grower. It is necessary, we are told, to preserve the economy of the Cotton South. But, Mr. Speaker, it is even more necessary to preserve the family-sized farms of this country that depend upon dairying for their continued existence. To the more than 2,500,000 dairy farmers of this country, the dairy industry represents a regular source of cash income throughout the year, a decent standard of living for their families, education for their children, and increasing productivity for their land.

These things are important to the farmers of the South as well as to the

northern farmers—perhaps even more important. Dairy farming has made splendid progress in the South, to the enrichment of whole areas of land that had begun to lose its fertility under single-crop cultivation. The hard facts are that we cannot afford to sacrifice either southern gains or northern accomplishments in the development of a diversified agriculture merely to meet the selfish demands of a handful of oleomargarine manufacturers.

Oleomargarine is a substitute for butter, and therefore competes with butter in the market place. Ordinarily, substitutes do not differ greatly from the original in price, but through the years oleomargarine has maintained a price level approximately half that of butter, on the average. The price of butter has not been dragged down to the level of the substitute, because oleomargarine, colored or uncolored, has not been as acceptable to consumers as real butter. Moreover, colored oleomargarine—being less distinguishable from butter than the uncolored form—has been carefully regulated under Federal tax legislation. Finally, the dairy farmer has not been able to afford to produce butter at the price of oleomargarine.

Now it is proposed to repeal the restrictions on yellow oleomargarine, which will then be able to compete more closely with butter. Oleomargarine manufacturers may take advantage of this opportunity to increase their prices and profits, thus destroying the price differential. Or they may hold their prices unchanged and increase their profits through increased sales volumes, at the expense of butter. In any case, it cannot be denied that an improved competitive position for oleomargarine would result in reduced sales of butter.

INCREASED OLEO SALES HURT BUTTER SALES

In the past an increase in the sales of oleomargarine has usually been accompanied by a somewhat larger decrease in the sales of butter. In the 35 years from 1912 to 1947, there were 22 years when oleo consumption went up, and in 16 of those years, butter consumption decreased. On an average, over those 22 years the increase in oleo consumption per capita was approximately one-third of a pound, while the accompanying change in butter consumption was a per capita decrease of almost one-half a pound.

During 11 of the 13 years in which oleo sales showed a decrease, butter sales increased. The average oleo decreases were about one-third of a pound per capita, accompanied by an average increase in butter sales of slightly more than that amount.

It is clear that when oleo is sold as a substitute for butter, either fraudulently or because consumers made a conscious choice, the immediate effect on the dairy farmer is the same as though the supply of butter had increased. Naturally this lowers the price at which his butter can be sold. On the average, a 1-percent increase in the quantity of butter available tends to result in a 1-percent decrease in the selling price of butter. In other words, the loss of 1 percent of butter sales to competitive oleomargarine results in a 1-percent drop in the price of butter.

The experience of other countries shows that unrestricted competition in yellow oleomargarine demolishes the market for butter. In this country, under similar conditions, oleomargarine might very well take over from two-thirds to three-fourths of the total sales of spread fats, according to competent economists. The total annual consumption of oleomargarine in the United States would then be 1,500,000,000 pounds, as against 870,000,000 pounds in 1948. On a pound-for-pound displacement, the butter market would shrink to 900,000,000 pounds as against 1,500,000,000 pounds in 1948.

IMMEDIATE RESULTS OF INCREASED OLEO SALES

The first result of a possible 600,000,000-pound expansion in oleo sales would be a 20 to 40 percent drop in butter prices. In this connection, a 10-percent increase in butter production in the fall of 1948, over the corresponding months of 1947, was accompanied by an equal reduction in oleo sales on a 25-percent fall in butter prices.

Price reduction of 20 to 40 percent probably would protect butter against loss of sales, but dairymen could not stand any such decline in butter prices for long. Thus, as a second effect of increasing oleo sales, there would be a drastic decline in butter production, as dairymen in large numbers left the dairy business or sought other markets than butter. This decline in production would lead to some recovery of butter prices, but a decline of 5 to 10 percent over the long-run probably would liquidate milk production to the equivalent of 600,000,000 pounds of butter.

DAIRY FARMING WOULD VANISH IN SOME AREAS

These effects accounted for part of the 600,000,000-pound butter decline in production from 1941 to 1948. The declines would have been more drastic, and wider spread, if the artificially stimulated export trade in dairy products of 1941 to 1948 had not absorbed the annual output of approximately one million cows. Allowance also should be made for the increase in demand resulting from population growth.

It is reasonable to expect that the further displacement of 600,000,000 pounds of butter by oleo would lead to the displacement of another 2,000,000 cows. But 2,000,000 cows in butter areas produce only 360,000,000 pounds of butterfat annually, and a 600,000,000-pound loss of butter markets would mean 480,000,000 pounds of butterfat. Where would the other 120,000,000 pounds of butterfat go?

THE STRUGGLE FOR MARKETS WOULD ENDANGER DAIRY PRICES IN ALL CORNERS OF THE UNITED STATES

Some dairy farmers, rather than accept extinction, would struggle to dispose of their milk in the form of products whose prices already teeter precariously between too low for producers and too high for the market demand. Increased cheese, evaporated milk, ice cream, and fluid cream—even increased fluid milk—would overburden those markets and tear down the level of returns to every producer in the land.

Even the South would reel from the blow. There a thriving dairy industry has supported the most vigorously growing farm enterprise for more than two decades, yet the wrecking of price levels at the South's ice-cream plants, condenseries, and cheese factories would cripple dairying in that region. Factory dairy products other than butter now utilize 33 percent of the milk sold by farmers in the South Atlantic States and 45 percent in the South Central States. These markets in South, North, East, and West would react to the pressure of dairy farmers deprived of their butter market. The lowered level of all dairy prices then would force some dairy farmers out of business in every State—up to another half-million cows.

NET RESULTS TO FARM INCOME

It should be apparent that anything which would lead to a liquidation of 10 percent of the milk cows in the country would be a major disaster, yet there is another way of calculating the effect of increased oleo sales.

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics calculates that the farmer received 12.8 cents out of every pound of oleomargarine sold in 1947. The farmer received 59.7 cents per pound from butter. Thus, for every pound of oleo which displaced a pound of butter, the total income of American agriculture was reduced by 46.9 cents. If oleo replaced butter to the extent of 600,000,000 pounds, the loss to agricultural income in general would total more than a quarter of a billion dollars. This would occur even before reckoning the sizable side effects on other dairy products. It disregards the probability that increased demand for vegetable oils would be met by increased imports, with no benefit at all to domestic producers.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill which would protect the farmers of this country against the loss of more than a billion dollars. The bill is fair to the consumer, in that it makes it possible for the housewife to buy all the oleomargarine she wants in its most economical, uncolored form, without the payment of any taxes whatever. It is a fair bill in that it relieves the oleo retailer, wholesaler, and manufacturer from all license fees and reporting requirements. But most of all, my bill is a fair bill in that it protects the dairy farmer against a sure loss of income—a loss which a large part of our agricultural economy cannot afford at this time.

I am convinced that the administration does not intend to let farm income suffer in this country, and that no Member of this House would willfully sponsor any measure to that effect. By contrast, my bill is in complete harmony, as I have said earlier, with the Democratic platform on which the majority of this House was elected.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman will recollect that some Members of this House who favor the coloring of oleomargarine yellow have insisted that the dairy farmers of the country must yield to scientific progress. If the gentleman will permit, I would like to elaborate on that a little bit.

The scientific progress that has been made on oleo to make it taste and appear like butter results from a ruling made by Mr. McNutt, when he was head of the Pure Food and Drug Section, because he issued a regulation that the oleo industry could put in vitamins the equivalent to butter and he also ruled that they could use butter flavor and flavor the product to taste like butter. He also ruled that they could churn it in milk in order to give butter texture to the product so that it would taste like butter and have the same nutritive value as butter. I therefore contend that it was not as a result of scientific progress but it was by edict of a man in Government who issued a regulation permitting this apparent deception and fraud on behalf of a product in order to take the market away from the legitimate dairy farmers of the country.

Now, as the gentleman said, they want to color the product yellow to make it look like butter, thereby to not only destroy the integrity of two and a half million dairy farmers but also permit deception and fraud on the housewives of the country.

Mr. GRANGER. I think that is a fair statement. I do not want to argue the quality of margarine as compared with butter. But, now, we are getting down to what the issue really is in this fight. It is simply a question of color, and the oleo interests are determined to sell oleomargarine as butter. Make no mistake about that. If they are able to do that, it is going to mean that many of the dairy farmers of the country, and especially those in the South, will go out of business. I have been all over the South in the last 2 or 3 years. There has been great development down there in every line, and especially in dairying. While this bill is not sponsored entirely by people from that section of the country, undoubtedly they have a right to be interested in it.

It seems to me it would be a short-sighted policy to do anything to retard its development. The dairy farms and the dairy herds conform in every way with the preservation of our soil. As a Member said here the other day, one of the crying needs of our time is the preservation of our soil. The dairy farmer in his operations conforms in every detail with that program.

As I have said time and time again, these are little people that we cannot afford to run out of business. As a result of dairy farming, we have built up in every section of the country, in every congressional district, some activity connected with dairying. Either cheese making, butter making, or the preparation and delivery of milk to the home.

I dare say that in every congressional district of this country, regardless of where it is situated, there are more people who earn a living from dairying than there are who do from the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] that the dairy farmers of his State are being punished a great deal worse by this one-way freight rate than they are by competition with oleomargarine. That applies to every dairy farmer west of the Mississippi and south of the Ohio, outside of a few along the Pacific coast, where preferential rates are given to meet water competition.

I wonder if the gentleman will go along with us on the bill I have introduced to outlaw the one-way freight rates that the South and West have been punished with for the last 75 years, in order that those dairy farmers—and I will say to the gentleman from Missouri who is looking at me that I refer to farmers from Missouri and from every other State west of the Mississippi River—might receive something like justice in transportation rates for the dairy products and for other products they manufacture. I wonder if the gentleman will go along with me on that proposition?

Mr. GRANGER. I have always gone along with the gentleman in his fight for justice, for the South and West and other sections, with respect to how railroad rates should be handled, and certainly I would be willing to go along with him on that.

BUTTER VERSUS OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the splendid remarks made by the gentleman. I ask unanimous consent that the request I made earlier in the day be vacated and that I be allowed at this point in the RECORD to extend my remarks and include therein a very well written article by Louis Bromfield.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, Louis Bromfield, world-famed novelist and operator of the successful Malabar Farm in my district, recently prepared a keen analysis on the butter-oleo question which appeared in approximately 50 newspapers in 20 States through the Bell Syndicate. Mr. Bromfield's judgment is considered as most responsible in agricultural circles throughout the world. I introduce the text of this article into the RECORD at this point:

A VOICE FROM THE COUNTRY—ASK RESTRICTION ON MARGARINE PROFITS

(By Louis Bromfield)

The butter-oleomargarine fight has come into the open again and it might be well to analyze the true elements in a situation which affects every citizen far beyond the point of whether oleo is cheaper than butter or whether it be taxed or not. Probably no controversy in American history as presented has caused so much confusion in the minds of the people. This is so because the issue has been based, by the oleo interests, upon the easy political dodge of cheaper living costs and partly because many of the newspaper editorials on the subject have been written with perhaps incomplete knowledge of the whole question. Very great and even economically profound implications lie behind the battle.

Let me say at the outset that most of the butter producers have long since abandoned their fight to maintain the tariff tax which the oleo interests refer to as discriminatory.

The butter people seek only two things—the restriction of the oleo people's attempt to deceive by the close imitation possible and some sort of restriction upon the immense profit potentialities of the oleo and oleo-oil manufacturers. With the butter business, which can never create its product at a figure anywhere near the production costs of oleomargarine, knocked out by competition from big business and monopoly, there is no limit within reason to the profits of the industrially produced oleo.

Essentially the struggle is one between big business and tacit monopoly on one side and small private enterprise on the other and, as such, it touches the very foundations of our social economy and our political future.

Butter is produced largely by some 4,500 creameries, mostly individually or cooperatively owned, and by the thousands of dairy and general farmers who produce the cream from which butter is made. Oleomargarine, an assembly line industrial product, is concentrated in the hands of 28 companies, with 65 percent of production in the hands of only five gigantic industrial corporations such as Procter & Gamble and vast Lever Bros. interests.

PACKAGES SIMILAR

Since the very beginning, the whole purpose of the oleo interests has been to attempt the imitation of butter as closely as possible. Their slogan might well have been not "as good as butter" but "the same as butter" which oleo is not.

One only has to look about in a grocery to see oleo packaged exactly like butter, nearly always in yellow cartons, with dairy scenes for ornamentation, even to such deceptive trade names as "Churngold."

The obvious campaign is less to imitate than to deceive and plenty of us know even today how often in restaurants and dining cars, oleo is served as butter.

It seems to me that the element of unfair and deceptive competition in this respect is clear as crystal.

The oleo interests, down to the oil-refining plants, represent big business and the oleo interests have been very successful in dividing the dairy from the soybean and cotton elements in the farm bloc so that agricultural representation has become badly weakened and divided.

They have accomplished this by holding up phantom profits on the materials used in making their synthetic product to cotton and soybean farmers, who, largely speaking, represent the most destructive and greedy element in American agriculture and are already the most highly subsidized at the taxpayers expense.

Before the war, foreign vegetable oils, produced by labor in Asia and Africa, paid at what in this country could only be regarded as slave wages, were largely used in oleo manufacture.

During the war, the oleo manufacturing interests found these cheap foreign oils unavailable and were forced to use home-produced cottonseed and soybean oils, but once the same interests have won their fight, there is no reason, judging from the whole history of big business, to prevent them from shifting

back again to cheap labor materials produced abroad.

The American cotton and soybean people, left holding the bag, will then ask for another protective tariff to add to living costs.

LASTING BENEFITS DOUBTED

Protective tariffs are by no means dead and can never be until that incredible day when there is free trade and universal leveling off of wages and living standards to a point far below that to which the American people are accustomed.

In the meanwhile, there will be either tariffs on imported goods or internal subsidies and high prices, both paid inside the country by the average tax-paying citizen. The popular assumption that wholly unrestricted oleo production will provide a universally cheap table spread by which everyone will benefit is merely a silly oversimplification of a very complex and profound problem.

It is significant that the interest in tariffs generally has shifted from the big manufacturing interests to organized labor and small business because obviously American labor cannot compete with slave-labor wages in the more primitive parts of the world and small business cannot compete with the power of the price controls exercised by vast cartels and tacit monopolies.

The question of tacit monopolies and hidden understandings among a few enormous industrial producers is one which has consumed endless precious hours in the Supreme Court, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and other governmental agencies.

Where understandings among vast cartels and interests begin and end is a difficult problem, but even the average citizen knows that they operate.

The whole oleo question is one in which both organized labor and the Small Businessmen's Association might well take an interest, and the average citizen along with them. It is not as simple or as demagogic a question as the oleo interests have tried to make it.

Incidentally, I have in my possession an original letter circulated among the oleo interests pointing out the great advantages of pouring plenty of money into the advertising accounts of newspapers, especially in the butter areas, as mean an insult to the integrity of the American press as has been perpetrated in a long time.

I might also point out that great cartels and monopolies are the first step in the death of real free enterprise and in the direction of state socialism. There arrives a point when, as Europe well knows, they become intolerable and the state takes over.

Socialism arrives at the point where free enterprise has ceased utterly to exist and the big-business monopolies have taken over.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Christian Science Monitor.

Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a memorial passed by the Legislature of Nebraska.

SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Wednesday next, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found to be truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HESELTON (at the request of Mr. AUCHINCLOSS), for the week of January 31, on account of the serious illness in his family.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 38. Joint resolution to authorize the United States to break through snowbound areas in western range States, to take other necessary action to move in supplemental feed and otherwise care for livestock isolated by storms in such States, and to provide emergency relief for Indians in areas isolated by such storms; to the Committee on Appropriations.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Wednesday, February 2, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

125. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 in the amount of $500,000 for disaster relief (H. Doc. No. 47); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

126. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1950 in the amount of $20,000,000 for the Philippine War Damage Commission in the form of an amendment to the budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 48); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

127. A letter from the president, Capital Transit Co., transmitting a report covering the operations of Capital Transit Co. for the calendar year 1948, with balance sheet as of December 31, 1948; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

128. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of the proposed transfers of two 40-foot motor launches to be used by the Shell Fisheries Division of the Department of Conservation of New Jersey; to the Committee on Armed Services.

129. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a report and recommendation concerning certain claims against the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

130. A letter from the Assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to clarify the provisions of section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 880; U. S. C. 144); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

131. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 7, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Wood Island Harbor, Maine, and the pool at Biddeford, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 49); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

132. A letter from the president, Potomac Electric Power Co., transmitting the report of the Potomac Electric Power Co., for the year ended December 31, 1948; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

133. A letter from the United States Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting the Fifth Semiannual Report of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, January 1949; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

134. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting proposed legislation to prohibit the parking of vehicles upon any property owned by the United States for postal purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

135. A letter from the Assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act providing for the appointment of court reporters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

136. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the twelfth report of the Department of State on the disposal of United States surplus property in foreign areas, January 1949; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

137. A letter from the Assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, to preserve the nationality of naturalized veterans, their wives, minor children, and dependent parents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

138. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the 1948 Annual Report of the Secretary of the Interior on the Investigations of Synthetic Liquid Fuels, Parts I, II, and III; to the Committee on Public Lands.

139. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting the Tenth Annual Report of the Civil Aeronautics Board, 1948; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

140. A letter from the vice president and comptroller, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting a statement of receipts and expenditures of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1948, in compliance with chapter 1628, acts of Congress 1904; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

141. A letter from the representative of the United States upper Colorado River Basin compact negotiations, transmitting a copy of a compact entered into on October 11, 1948, among the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, to determine the rights and obligations of these States respecting uses and deliveries of the water of the upper basin of the Colorado River; to the Committee on Public Lands.

142. A letter from the president, Washington Gas Light Co., transmitting a detailed statement of the business of the Washington Gas Light Co. together with a list of stockholders, for the year ended December 31, 1948; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 22. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study and investigation of the problems of small business; with amendments (Rept. No. 9). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PACE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 128. A bill to provide that acreage planted to cotton in 1949 shall not be used in computing cotton-acreage allotments for any subsequent year; with an amendment (Rept. No. 11). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 73. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 1660, a bill to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans; without amendment (Rept. No. 12). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 74. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 128, a bill to provide that acreage planted to cotton in 1949 shall not be used in computing cotton-acreage allotments for any subsequent year; without amendment (Rept. No. 13). Referred to the House Calendar.

ADVERSE REPORT

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. KEE: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Resolution 50. Resolution to obtain information from the Secretary of State on the Palestine situation; without amendment (Rept. No. 10).

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEE:

H. R. 1995. A bill making an emergency authorization of an appropriation for the purpose of erecting in Bluefield, W. Va., a post-office and courthouse building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 1996. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Opelousas, La., a post office and Federal court building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 1997. A bill to authorize the survey of a proposed Mississippi River Parkway for the purpose of determining the feasibility of such a national parkway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1998. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the conveyance to Pinellas County, State of Florida, of certain public lands herein described," approved June 17, 1948 (Public Law 666, 80th Cong.), for the purpose of correcting a land description therein; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1999. A bill to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2000. A bill to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 2001. A bill to amend section 9 of the act of May 22, 1928, as amended, authorizing and directing a national survey of forest resources; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. R. 2002. A bill to provide for the design and construction of highway bridges near certain dams; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 2003. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Lynchburg, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2004. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Smithville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2005. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Woodbury, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 2006. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 730), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 2007. A bill to equalize annual leave and sick leave of postal employees with that of other Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 2008. A bill to create a presumption of service connection for World War II veterans in certain cases of tuberculosis disease; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 2009. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 2010. A bill relating to the acquisition and disposition of land and interests in land by the Army and the Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 2011. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to support the price of milk at not less than 90 percent of parity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2012. A bill to authorize the erection and operation of a museum at Klukwan, Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2013. A bill to make effective in the District Court for the Territory of Alaska rules promulgated by the Supreme Court of the United States governing pleading, practice, and procedure in the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 2014. A bill to extend time for filing claim for pensions or other benefits withheld from persons residing in countries occupied by the enemy forces during World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2015. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey and exchange certain lands and improvements in Grand Rapids, Minn., for lands in the State of Minnesota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 2016. A bill to amend section 2000 (c) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code relating to taxes on tobacco and tobacco products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2017. A bill to amend section 2000 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code relating to taxes on tobacco and tobacco products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 2018. A bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 to authorize the admission into the United States of 500 displaced doctors and 1,000 nurses, to provide for their employment in Government hospitals, including Indian hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. R. 2019. A bill to amend section 5155 of the Revised Statutes, with respect to the establishment of branches by national banking associations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 2020. A bill to enable certain former officers or employees of the United States separated from the service subsequent to January 23, 1942, to elect to forfeit their rights to civil-service retirement annuities and to obtain in lieu thereof returns of their contributions with interest; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2021. A bill to provide increased pensions for widows and children of deceased members and retired members of the Police Department and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GILMER:

H. R. 2022. A bill authorizing the Wyandotte Tribe of Oklahoma, through its business committee, to sell and convey, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, the Wyandotte Indian public burial ground in Kansas City, Kans.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 2023. A bill to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2024. A bill to extend pension benefits under the laws reenacted by Public Law 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, August 13, 1935, as now or hereafter amended to certain persons who served with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, after July 4, 1902, and prior to January 1, 1914, and to their unremarried widows, child, or children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2025. A bill to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to assist the States in the development of community recreation programs for the people of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KELLEY:

H. R. 2026. A bill to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to assist the States in the development of community recreation programs for the people of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2027. A bill to amend section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (39 Stat. 875–878; 8 U. S. C. 136); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 2028. A bill to authorize the construction of a new post office at Bayside, Long Island, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2029. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt payments under said act from taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2030. A bill granting exemption from income tax in the case of retirement pensions and annuities received by State, county, and municipal employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 2031. A bill to stimulate exploration, development, mining, production, and conservation of strategic and critical minerals and metals within the United States and its Territories, to establish an Office of National Minerals Development, Production, and Conservation within the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 2032. A bill to repeal the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, to reenact the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2033. A bill to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 2034. A bill to provide for the coinage of a 7-cent piece; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 2035. A bill relating to the promotion of certain officers and former officers of the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 2036. A bill to increase the mileage allowances of civilian officers and employees for use of privately owned vehicles and to increase the per diem allowances of civilian officers and employees while traveling on official business; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2037. A bill to provide optional retirement for Government employees who have attained the age of 60 years or who have rendered at least 25 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2038. A bill to provide for the retirement of certain employees in neuropsychiatric hospitals of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2039. A bill to provide for promotion procedure within the executive classified civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 2040. A bill to prohibit any carrier subject to part I of the Interstate Commerce Act, in transporting property between two points, from making a difference in its charges depending on the point of origin or destination; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2041. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to the Helena Chamber of Commerce certain described parcels of land situated in the city of Helena, Mont.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2042. A bill to amend title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, to make clear the authority of the Administrator to negotiate rates of compensation for training in certain institutions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2043. A bill to clarify the provisions of section 602 (u) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 2044. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1946; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 2045. A bill to provide a program of assistance for the expansion and construction of medical colleges in the several States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. R. 2046. A bill to amend Public Law 533 of the Eightieth Congress authorizing the construction of a building for the General Accounting Office on square 518 in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BARING:

H. R. 2047. A bill to stimulate the exploration, production, and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals and for the establishment within the Department of the Interior of a Mine Incentive Payments Division, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2048. A bill to amend the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 with respect to retirement of certain officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2049. A bill for the relief of certain postal employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2050. A bill to provide for a jury commission for each United States district court, to regulate its compensation, to prescribe its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2051. A bill to establish uniform qualifications for jurors in the Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 2052. A bill to amend the act of June 30, 1945 (Public Law 390, 79th Cong.), as amended, to provide true time and one-half for overtime and true double time for Sunday and holiday duty and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 2053. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to provide homes for veterans, through veterans' homestead associations, and the public facilities essential therefor; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 2054. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Oberlin, La., a post office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LeCOMPTE:

H. R. 2055. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site for, and the construction of, a Federal building in Ottumwa, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 2056. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia", approved February 27, 1929; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 2057. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 2058. A bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to authorize payment of claims arising from correction of military or naval records; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2059. A bill relating to the furnishing of tools and equipment to veterans pursuing institutional on-farm training; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2060. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1920; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2061. A bill for the benefit of employees involuntarily separated from the service of the United States, to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2062. A bill to create a United States Civil Service Board of Appeals; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 2063. A bill to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 2064. A bill to permit unincorporated businesses to be taxed as corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 2065. A bill providing that certain real property, together with improvements thereon, acquired for military purposes, or for housing projects, national parks, or monuments, shall not be exempt from taxation by States and their political subdivisions; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 2066. A bill to provide special pensions for certain persons awarded medals for extraordinary heroism in combat; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 2067. A bill to provide for the restoration of a monument of the former Speaker of the House, the Honorable Henry T. Rainey; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 2068. A bill to provide pensions for veterans of World War I and World War II based on non-service-connected disability and attained age; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. J. Res. 121. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. J. Res. 123. Joint resolution relating to the high cost of living and shortage of housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. Res. 69. Resolution requesting the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Navy to urge the State of California to construct a tube and causeway across San Francisco Bay in accordance with the recommendations of a Joint Army-Navy Board; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WELCH of California:

H. Res. 70. Resolution requesting the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Navy to urge the State of California to construct a tube and causeway across San Francisco Bay in accordance with the recommendations of a Joint Army-Navy Board; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. Res. 71. Resolution requesting the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Navy to urge the State of California to construct a tube and causeway across San Francisco Bay in accordance with the recommendations of a Joint Army-Navy Board; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SOMERS:

H. Res. 72. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation authorized by House Resolution 66; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States for the consideration of their Resolution No. 19, asking that the tax on oleomargarine be repealed; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 2069. A bill for the relief of Alton Bramer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2070. A bill for the relief of Peter Konotopko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2071. A bill for the relief of John I. Malarin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2072. A bill for the relief of Rachel D. Gattgno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2073. A bill to authorize payment of certain claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property and personal injury arising from activities of the Army; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2074. A bill for the relief of Edwin B. Anderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 2075. A bill for the relief of Frank G. Moore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2076. A bill for the relief of Cliff Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2077. A bill for the relief of Jack Getty Pinkerson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 2078. A bill for the relief of Winston A. Brownie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 2079. A bill for the relief of Emil Sbarbori; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2080. A bill for the relief of Anthony Perfetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2081. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mildred Apren; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2082. A bill for the relief of Lillian Taylor (nee Rose Mary Lillian Walker); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2083. A bill for the relief of Edna Perfetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 2084. A bill for the relief of Teiko Horikawa and Yoshiko Horikawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2085. A bill for the relief of Edit Hannach; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 2086. A bill for the relief of the Sun Laundry Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2087. A bill for the relief of Seaman Second Class Joseph T. Sypko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 2088. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lula Wilson Nevers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. R. 2089. A bill for the relief of William Price; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 2090. A bill for the relief of Sam Wooten, F. M. Maloy, and Mrs. Althea Arthur; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAYBURN:

H. R. 2091. A bill for the relief of Jack McCollum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 2092. A bill for the relief of Flury & Crouch, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 2093. A bill authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to execute a quitclaim deed to property owned by Jacob F. Riedel; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 2094. A bill for the relief of Romuald K. Mirzabekian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 2095. A bill for the relief of the estate of Kenneth N. Peel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

31. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Chairman, Conservation Administration of Kewaunee County, Wis., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a Federal Government support price on butter; to the Committee on Agriculture.

32. Also, petition of executive vice president, Newspaper Guild of New York, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to immediate record vote on the question of repeal of the Taft-Hartley Labor Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

33. By Mr. SADLAK: Resolution adopted by the officers and members of the United Societies of St. Catherine's Church, Riverside, Conn., expressing condemnation of the Hungarian Government for its arrest and imprisonment of His Eminence Josef Cardinal Mindszenty; to the Committee on Foreign affairs.

34. By the SPEAKER, petition of chairman, legal committee, Palm Beach Post No. 12, American Legion, West Palm Beach, Fla., petitioning consideration of the resolution with reference to the passage of a bill to amend and enlarge the definition of treason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

35. By the SPEAKER, petition of Adrian Russo, German civilian, Wiesbaden, Germany, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to the Malmedy case, and asking that hangings be discontinued in Germany; to the committee on the Judiciary.

36. By Mr. HART: Petition of New Jersey Retail Liquor Stores Association, urging stricter enforcement over the manufacture and sale of illicit alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

37. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of the Board of Commissioners of the city of Bayonne, N. J., memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from June 30, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Joseph O. Parker	Attorney	$5,164.98
John J. Heimburger	Research specialist	4,927.68
Hugh H. Soper	do	2,678.29
George L. Reid, Jr.	Clerk	5,164.98
Katherine D. Wheeler	Assistant clerk	2,861.10
Mary Elizabeth Laxton	Stenographer	2,102.40
Ruth B. Phillips	do	2,067.90
Lorraine Adamson	do	1,688.78
Fred H. Benham	Attorney (Apr. 26, to Aug. 10, 1948).	840.18

H. Res. 298 and H. Res. 317 of the 80th Cong., 1st sess., authorized and appropriated $25,000 for the House Committee on Agriculture to conduct hearings, studies, and investigations by the committee acting as a whole or by a subcommittee. H. Res. 676, 80th Cong., 2d sess., appropriated an additional $5,000, making a total of $30,000. The funds so appropriated have been used for traveling expenses, hotel and other expenses of the committee in conducting hearings in the various parts of the United States. No personnel has been employed from these funds.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$30,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	19,267.63
Amount expended from June 30, to Dec. 31, 1948	4,644.05
Total amount expended from July 1, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1948	23,911.68
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948	4,088.32

CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

JANUARY 3, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
George Y. Harvey	Clerk	$5,164.98
Kenneth Sprankle	Assistant clerk	5,164.98
William A. Duvall	Second assistant clerk.	4,992.90
Corbal D. Orescan	Assistant clerk	4,992.90
Arthur Orr	do	4,663.68
R. E. Lambert	do	4,663.68
Robert P. Williams	do	4,334.52
Paul M. Wilson	do	4,334.52
Claude E. Hobbs, Jr.	do	4,005.36
Jay B. Howe	do	4,005.36
Bert J. Skinnard	Junior assistant clerk.	1,618.77
Lawrence C. Miller	do	2,516.22
G. Homer Skarin	do	2,309.34
Earl C. Silsby	do	2,102.40
Melvin E. Lefever	Clerk-stenographer	1,895.52
Watson L. Cormier	do	1,481.70
Robert M. Lewis	Messenger	1,605.84
Frank B. Avery, Jr.	Page	1,481.70
William H. Jahn, Jr.	Clerk to minority	5,164.98
Dorothy Davis	Clerk-stenographer to ranking minority member.	1,895.52
Lawrence A. DiCenzo	Clerk-stenographer to subcommittee chairman.	1,895.52
Molly J. Turner	do	1,895.52
Mary Jane Fisher	do	1,895.52
Helen Knechtel	do	1,895.52
Charlotte B. Plumley	do	1,895.52
Vivian I. Raber	do	1,895.52
Dorothy E. Henry	do	1,579.60
Graham W. Howe	do	1,579.60
David J. Phillips	do	315.92
Marjorie V. R. Dement	do	947.76

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$185,000.00
Amount expended from July 1, to Dec. 31, 1948	84,190.87
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948	100,809.13

JOHN TABER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS (INVESTIGATIVE STAFF)

JANUARY 3, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert E. Lee	Chief investigator	$4,992.90
Harris H. Hinton	Investigator	4,005.36
James J. Kerr	do	3,675.20
Harry S. Barger	do	3,675.20
Eugene F. Rinta	do	3,675.20

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Benjamin S. Simmons	Investigator	$1,909.77
Clarence Turner	do	728.28
Enid Morrison	Legal clerk	2,309.34
Mildred E. McGinnis	Clerk-stenographer	1,252.73
Lois Moore	do	1,333.53
Virginia S. Keep	do	663.85
Stella M. Mohr	do	321.92

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures $150,000.00
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948 ..... 31,060.80
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948 ..... 118,939.20

JOHN TABER,
Chairman.

ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert H. Harper	Chief clerk	$5,184.02
James Deakins	Assistant clerk	1,785.12
John R. Blandford	Professional staff member.	4,739.56
Clinton B. D. Brown	do	4,460.22
Bryce N. Harlow	do	4,739.56
Robert W. Smart	do	4,739.56
Agnes H. Johnston	Secretary	2,308.34
Rosemary Curry	Stenographer	2,102.40
Berniece Kalinowski	do	2,102.40
Gladys E. Flanagan	Stenographer (investigation staff).	1,813.88
Townsend W. Hoopes	Assistant to the chairman (July 1 to Aug. 15, 1948).	1,050.71

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures $25,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported. 5,130.94
Amount expended from July 1, to Dec. 31, 1948 ..... 3,292.63
Total amount expended from July 26, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1948 ..... 8,423.57
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948 ..... 16,577.43

W. G. ANDREWS,
Chairman.

BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Orman S. Fink	Technical staff director.	$4,832.04
William J. Hallahan	Clerk	4,268.64
Elise L. Goulet	Deputy clerk	3,344.50
Margaret P. Battle	Stenographer	2,309.34

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
Chairman.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMITTEE

DECEMBER 14, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Mabel G. Haller	Executive secretary (clerk).	$4,274.35
William N. McLeod, Jr.	Minority clerk	3,676.20
Ruth Pingley	Stenographer	2,309.34

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Chairman.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOME RULE AND REORGANIZATION, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMITTEE

DECEMBER 14, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee, Clarence M. Pierce, Profession, assistant staff director. Total gross salary, $3,728.56.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures $30,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported. 20,223.81
Amount expended from June 1 to Dec. 31 ..... 3,750.70
Total amount expended, 80th Congress. 26,521.51
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948 ..... 3,478.49

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
W. Manly Sheppard	Chief Clerk	$5,000.00
F. Albert Reiman	Assistant clerk (professional staff).	5,000.00
Irving G. McCann	Chief counsel (professional staff).	5,000.00
Frank S. McArthur	Investigator (professional staff).	5,000.00
Bingham W. Mathias	Minority clerk (professional staff).	5,000.00
Jennie Ward Carter	Clerk-stenographer	2,433.96
Mary Pauline Smith	do	2,433.96
Mary Ellen Sanders	do	2,433.96
Myrtle S. Lecher	do	2,433.96
Frances A. Los	Clerk-stenographer (minority).	2,433.96
Special employees pursuant to H. Res. 111		
John O. Graham	Special investigator	5,000.00
Raymond Davey	do	2,666.67
Agnes Aitillian	Clerk-stenographer	2,433.96

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures $115,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported. 70,793.33
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948 ..... 37,392.29
Total amount expended from February 1947 to Dec. 31, 1948 ..... 108,385.62
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948 ..... 6,614.38

FRED A. HARTLEY, JR.,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Annual base salary rate during 6-month period
Douglas E. Alcock	Professional staff	$7,000.00
Helen M. Baker	Clerk	3,700.00
Helen M. Boyer	Majority clerk	5,000.00
Dolores Fel'Dotto	Clerk-stenographer, July 1 through July 31, 1948.	2,900.00
Carl E. Hoffman	Professional staff	6,000.00
Hazel Huffman	Investigator	6,200.00
Francis T. O'Donnell	Professional staff, Nov. 1 through Nov. 30.	6,000.00
Martha C. Roland	Clerk	3,700.00
William A. Young	Professional staff	5,000.00
Annabell Zue	Clerk, Aug. 1 through Sept. 30.	3,500.00
	Clerk, Oct. 1 through Dec. 31.	3,700.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures $60,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported 1,210.01
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948 ..... 1,053.13
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1948 ..... 2,263.16
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948 ..... 4,244.84

CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EXTRA-LEGAL ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

None (all work done by staff of full committee).
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures $40,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported. 10,384.60
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948 ..... 5,117.62
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1948 ..... 15,502.22
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948 ..... 24,497.78

CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Extra-Legal Activities of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

STATE DEPARTMENT SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee, Francis T. O'Donnell, Profession, counsel. Total gross salary for period July 1-1948, to October 31, 1948, and December 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, $3,612.10.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures $10,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported. 973.13
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948 ..... 3,612.10
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1948 ..... 4,587.23
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948 ..... 5,412.77

J. EDGAR CHENOWETH,
Chairman.

SURPLUS PROPERTY SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee, Anna-Marie Hogin. Profession, stenographer. Total gross salary, July 1 to November 10, inclusive, $1,518.40.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures $60,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported. $88,578.32
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948 ..... 1,793.30
Refund of deposit on air travel contract 425.00
Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1948 ..... 89,946.62
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948 ..... 53.38

ROSS RIZLEY,
Chairman.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLICITY AND PROPAGANDA OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

JANUARY 14, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Oscar L. Hume	Staff coordinator	$3,899.04
Elizabeth Voth	Clerk	2,033.46
Hayward G. Austin	Chief investigator	1,721.64
Alfred J. Watson	Investigator	299.99
Richard J. Hodson	do	372.18
Barbara Yeaple	Typist	119.45

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures $80,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported. 50,148.70
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948 ..... 10,101.28
Total amount expended from May 1947 to December 1948 ..... 60,249.98
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948 ..... 23,750.02

FOREST A. HARNESS,
Chairman.

PROCUREMENT AND BUILDINGS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

DECEMBER 30, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Brooks, Benjamin J.	Special counsel	$812.57
Christerson, Mariella	Clerk-typist	627.42
Coleman, Peter	Sentographer	1,978.26
Cooley, Thomas, II	General counsel	3,610.32
Craft, Virginia	Investigator	384.89
Deem, Jane	Stenographer	1,603.84
Galland, Marion	Secretary to counsel	2,148.41
Glassie, Henry H.	Chief counsel	4,935.28
Judd, Betty L.	Typist	715.98
Lincoln, Virginia C.	Stenographer	799.84
Manual, Pritzie	Investigator	3,676.20
Stillman, Saul G.	Associate counsel	3,676.20
Terry, C. D.	Chief clerk	3,676.20
Weber, Gertrude	Investigator	1,520.47

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures:
First session $40,000.00
Second session 40,000.00
Supplemental 15,000.00
Total 95,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported. 44,287.60
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31 ..... 33,725.40
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948 ..... 10,562.20

Few outstanding bills remaining to be paid in January 1949.

GEORGE H. BENDER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Boyd Crawford	Clerk and administrative officer.	$5,164.98
Charles Burton Marshall.	Staff assistant	5,164.98
George S. Pettee	do	5,161.98
John W. Easton	do	5,164.98
Howard Piquet	do	5,164.98
June Nigh	do	2,378.31
Doris Leone	do	2,378.31
Winifred Osborne	do	2,738.16
Mabel Henderson	do	1,904.46

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures $125,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported 99,429.01
Amount expended from July 1, 1948, to Dec. 31, 1948 ..... 5,265.22
Total amount expended from July 1, to Dec. 31, 1948 ..... 44,708.23
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948 ..... 80,291.77

CHARLES A. EATON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Marjorie Savage	Clerk, Committee on House Administration (standing).	$3,544.80
Frank J. Specht	Assistant clerk, Committee on House Administration.	3,412.86

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Jack Watson	Assistant clerk, Committee on House Administration.	$3,412.86
Irene Gilchrist	do	2,102.40
Gladys Riggs	do	2,102.40
Maureen B. Sandiford	do	2,102.40

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$5,000
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948	5,000

K. M. LECOMPTE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Clerical staff		
Elton J. Layton	Clerk	$5,164.98
Marjorie A. Biddle	Assistant clerk	2,309.34
Royice Reno	do	2,309.34
Georgia G. Glassmann	Assistant clerk-stenographer.	2,185.14
Julia Watterson	do	2,185.14
Roy P. Wilkinson	Assistant clerk	1,619.64
Professional staff		
Arlin E. Stockburger	Aviation and engineering consultant.	5,164.98
Andrew Stevenson	Expert	5,164.98
Kurt Borchardt	Professional assistant.	5,164.98
John H. Frederick	Consultant	3,867.84
Additional staff personnel		
Martha E. Schatz	Stenographer	1,895.52
Louis Berlusky	Assistant clerk	668.53

The above additional staff personnel is pursuant to H. Res. 163, transportation survey and their services terminated as of Jan. 3, 1949.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$55,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	12,159.24
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948	12,843.19
Total amount expended from June 30, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1948	25,002.43
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 1, 1949	29,997.57

CHAS. A. WOLVERTON,
Chairman, Eightieth Congress.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
C. Murray Bernhardt	Chief Clerk	$4,663.73
Velma Smedley	Assistant Chief Clerk.	4,334.55
Walter B. Lee	Claims specialist	3,676.20
Walter M. Besterman	Clerk-stenographer	3,056.54
Anne J. Berger	do	2,171.40
Frances Christy	do	2,171.40
Harriet B. Lamb	do	2,171.40

SCHEDULE A

1. Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures since Jan. 1, 1947:

A. Unexpended balance July 1, 1948, preparation of new edition of U. S. Code, 1944–46	$79.90
B. Unexpended balance July 1, 1948, preparation of new edition of U. S. Code (no year)	101,750.71
C. Revision of the laws, 1947	8,000.00
D. Revision of the laws, 1948	10,000.00
E. Revision of the laws, 1949	10,000.00
	129,810.61

2. Amount previously expended during period covered by prior reports:

A. Preparation of new edition of U. S. Code, 1944–46	0
B. Preparation of new edition of U. S. Code (no year)	24,419.08
C. Revision of the laws, 1947	0
D. Revision of the laws, 1948	4,959.54
E. Revision of the laws, 1949	0
	59,378.62

3. Amount expended from July to Dec. 31, 1948:

A. Preparation of new edition of U. S. Code, 1944–46	0
B. Preparation of new edition of U. S. Code (no year)	32,000.00
C. Revision of the laws, 1947	0
D. Revision of the laws, 1948	0
E. Revision of the laws, 1949	5,124.54
	37,124.54

4. Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1948:

A. Preparation of new edition of U. S. Code, 1944–46	0
B. Preparation of new edition of U. S. Code (no year)	86,419.08
C. Revision of the laws, 1947	0
D. Revision of the laws, 1948	4,959.54
E. Revision of the laws, 1949	5,124.54
	96,503.16

5. Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948:

A. Preparation of new edition of U. S. Code, 1944–46	79.90
B. Preparation of new edition of U. S. Code (no year)	15,311.63
C. Revision of the laws, 1947	[1] 8,000.00
D. Revision of the laws, 1948	[1] 5,040.46
E. Revision of the laws, 1949	4,875.46
	33,307.45

[1] Returned to Treasury.

EARL C. MICHENER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Gus S. Caras	Professional staff	$3,939.54
Elizabeth B. Bedell	Chief clerk	2,999.04
Leonard P. Pliska	Clerk	2,171.40

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$30,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	3,809.04
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948	7.75
Total amount expended Dec. 31, 1948	3,873.79
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948	46,126.21

ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
Chairman.

POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
George M. Moore	Chief counsel	$5,164.02
Frederick G. Behn	Counsel	4,663.68
Lucy K. Daley	Assistant clerk	2,171.40
Elayne Morelle	Secretary	1,964.46
Lillian Hopkins	do	1,826.52
Ann Hayden	Secretary (Oct. 1 to Dec. 31, 1948).	809.82
Employed under H. Res. 176		
Edward J. McCormack	Chief, Studies and Investigations (July 1, 1948 to Sept. 17, 1948).	2,192.16
Ann Hayden	Secretary (July 1, to Sept. 30, 1948).	809.82

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$30,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	26,488.38
Amount expended from July 1, to Dec. 31, 1948	4,585.13
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1948	31,073.51
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948	18,926.49

EDWARD H. REES,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
George H. Soule	Mining expert	$4,304.15
Ernest A. Grant	Clerk	5,164.98
Claude A. Bacan	do	2,861.10
Nancy J. Arnold	do	2,861.10
Gemma M. O'Brien	do	2,861.10
Forrest Reeve	do	238.42
Edith C. Curtiss	do	2,638.55

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (H. Res. 94)	$25,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	13,711.75
Amount expended from July 1, to Dec. 31, 1948	488.01
Total amount expended from July 1, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1948	14,199.76
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948	10,800.24

RICHARD J. WELCH,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

JANUARY 3, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert F. McConnell	Clerk of committee	$3,136.98
Joseph H. McGann, Sr.	Professional staff member.	4,171.53
Joseph H. McGann, Jr.	Minority clerk	2,309.34
Mrs. Vera Watts	Stenographer-clerk	2,654.19
Mrs. Elaine Jackson	do	2,654.19
Mrs. Violet Young	do	2,654.19
Subcommittee investigating questionable trade practices		
John T. M. Reddan	Counsel	5,164.98
E. R. Ferguson, Jr.	Assistant counsel	3,939.54
Martin O. Hanson	Chief investigator	1,531.74
Charles F. Meany	Investigator-accountant.	2,654.16
Arthur Perlman	Investigator	2,916.24
Walton Woods	do	3,150.72
Joseph M. Mannix	do	828.57
Herbert J. Cooney	do	1,757.84
Jay S. Hartzell	do	2,681.76
William E. Davis	do	2,100.48
Doris M. Mahood	Stenographer-clerk	1,992.06
Catherine C. Hubbard	do	1,964.46
Dorothy B. Hayward	do	1,964.46

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$125,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	56,766.74
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31	42,826.33
Total amount expended to Dec. 31	99,593.07
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31	25,406.93

GEO. A. DONDERO,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

JANUARY 3, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
House pay roll		
Robert E. Stripling	Chief investigator	$5,164.98
Benjamin Mandel	Director of research	4,663.68
Louis J. Russell	Investigator	4,564.92
Donald T. Appell	do	4,050.54
John W. Carrington	Minority clerk	4,058.42
Ann D. Turner	File chief	3,676.20
Carolyn Graham	Assistant file chief	2,585.27
Juliette Joray	Clerk-stenographer	2,309.44
Marraret S. Kerwin	do	2,484.22
Rosella A. Purdy	do	2,792.10
Voucher pay roll		
Virginia Allen	Clerk-typist	2,309.44
Jo Benisch	do	2,309.44
Jean D. Carey	Clerk-stenographer	2,309.44
Lucille Fitzgerald	File clerk	2,309.44
Lillian E. Howard	Research clerk	2,539.22
Mary E. McFerran	Clerk-stenographer	2,309.44
Lorraine M. Nichols	do	2,309.44
Thelma I. Scearce	do	2,481.75
Ruth Tunstil	do	2,263.36
Peggy Shaw	Clerk-typist	2,309.44
Catherine Lee Crews	do	2,309.44
Sadie C. Cagle	do	1,998.38
Alice Elaine Walker	do	2,309.44
Lucille Lowther	do	2,309.44
Lois Marie Padberg	do	1,688.58
Helen Irene Mattson	Research clerk	2,792.10
Assella S. Poore	do	2,539.22
Anne W. Kelliher	Clerk-typist	2,309.44
Mary Ann Moffett	Research clerk	2,309.44
Alvin W. Stokes	Investigator	3,676.20
William A. Wheeler	do	3,807.84
Robert B. Gaston	do	3,807.84
Walter Wiecnernak	do	2,136.98
Courtney Owens	do	1,662.92
Charles E. McKillips	do	4,152.63
Margaret Mattson	Clerk-typist	1,153.25
Sonia Martinez	do	1,111.06
Jeanette Craig	Clerk-stenographer	238.51
Joy Cockrell	do	1,221.75
Michael Carey	Clerk	242.60
Rose Sanko	Clerk-stenographer	1,599.56
Helen Boyle	do	1,190.67
Barbara Hampson	do	1,219.79
Marjory Amidon	do	1,257.30
Barbara Mallon	File clerk	241.33
Mrs. Bert Kelly	Clerk-typist	459.12
May S. McKay	do	293.22

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures Jan. 1, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1948	$300,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported (Jan. 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948)	141,335.14
Amount expended from July 1, 1948, to Dec. 31, 1948	109,159.62
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1948	250,494.76
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948	49,505.24

J. PARNELL THOMAS,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Karl Standish	Clerk, Committee on Veterans' Affairs.	$5,164.98
Bessie N. Kenyon	Assistant clerk	4,005.36
Louise M. Peter	Clerical staff	1,924.45
Frances Montayne	do	2,309.34
Mary C. Schmidt	do	2,309.34
George J. Turner	do	2,378.28
Casey M. Jones	Professional aide	5,164.98
Edwin B. Patterson	do	5,164.98
Ida Rowan	do	4,611.34

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$25,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	11,864.91
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948	1,320.86
Total amount expended from March 1947 to December 1948	13,185.77
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948	11,814.23

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

DECEMBER 30, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Serge N. Benson	Tariff expert (P)	$4,663.68
James A. Tawney	Social security adviser (P).	777.28
Charles W. Davis	Minority adviser (P)	4,663.68
Lynn L. Stratton	Tax adviser (P)	4,260.22
Gordon Grand, Jr.	Clerk (C)	4,663.68
T. Janet Schnitz	Assistant clerk (C)	2,676.20
Gladys Kullberg	Clerk-stenographer (C).	2,309.34
Donald Larsen	do	2,171.40
Susan Alice Taylor	do	2,061.00
Margie Halsey	Stenographer (C)	697.00

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Virginia P. Turner	Stenographer (C)	$1,167.75
Harry Parker	Messenger	1,318.16
Sam Hardy	do	1,275.96
Hughlon Greene	do	1,275.96

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$25,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	2,463.53
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31	849.19
Total amount expended from July 25, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1948	3,312.72
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31	21,687.28

HAROLD KNUTSON,
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON NEWSPRINT AND PAPER SUPPLY

JANUARY 3, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to January 3, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee, Alyce E. Warren. Profession, clerk. Total gross salary during 6-month period, $1,713.97.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$25,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	7,608.41
Amount expended from July 1, 1948, to Jan. 4, 1949	1,724.51
Total amount expended from Mar. 1, 1947, to Jan. 4, 1949	9,332.92
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 4, 1949	15,667.08

CLARENCE J. BROWN,
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
James W. Foristel	Chief of staff	$4,372.96
Paul O. Peters	Staff investigator	4,186.44
Leo P. Cullinane	do	3,676.20
Hobart Cooper	do	1,907.44
Willis J. Ballinger	Economic counsel	4,619.48
Virginia F. Flatley	Stenographer	1,610.42
Arvilla Benson	do	761.04
Hilfred O. Wood	do	1,695.25
Bettie H. Henderson	do	821.48
Jean Hudson Ellis	do	658.87
Gertrude V. Tefft	Stenographer	$1,277.72
Willie E. Foristel	do	410.37
Virginia Rice	do	454.98
C. J. Reynolds, Jr.	File clerk	1,412.70

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$130,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	87,056.48
Amount expended from July 1, 1948, to Dec. 31, 1948	40,716.34
Total amount expended from Mar. 24, 1947 to Dec. 31, 1948	127,772.82
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948	2,227.18

WALTER C. PLOESER,
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE COMMODITY TRANSACTIONS

JANUARY 12, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Golden N. Dagger	Chief counsel (July 1 to Sept. 15, 1948).	$2,775.70
Charle D. Budd	Investigator	3,379.04
Bertram M. Long	Investigator (July 1-11, 1948).	132.69
Marie E. Wolff	Secretary	1,564.46

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures:	
H. Res. 407, Dec. 19, 1947	$25,000.00
H. Res. 674 June 18, 1948	10,000.00
Total	35,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	12,263.00
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30	12,263.00
Total amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31	9,562.12
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 12, 1949	13,174.88

AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

JANUARY 14, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Frank T. Bow	General counsel	$5,164.98
J. Robert Brown	Investigator	3,171.42
T. F. Simpson	do	2,854.27
E. E. Fine, Jr.	do	2,142.55
Dolores L. Fel'Dotto	Chief clerk	2,675.06
R. M. Thompson	Clerk	1,010.68

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$25,000.00
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec 31	18,355.65
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948	6,644.35

FOREST A. HARNESS,
Chairman.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
H. Ralph Burton	General counsel (July 1 to Dec. 31, inc.).	$4,235.52
William E. Murray	Chief investigator (July 1 to Nov. 30, inc.).	3,282.95
Robert B. Barker	Investigator (July 1 to Sept. 30, inc.).	1,838.10
Frank F. Evans	Investigator (Oct. 19 to Nov. 4, inc.).	296.27
J. V. Falvey	Investigator (July 1 to Nov. 30, inc.).	2,614.15
Edward E. Fine, Jr.	Investigator (Aug. 3 to 11 inc.).	106.85
Gomer A. Gibson	Investigator (Oct. 17 to Nov. 4, inc.).	231.12
John L. Grabber	Investigator (Oct. 17 to Nov. 4, inc.).	331.12
Robert A. Grosselfinger.	Investigator (Oct. 29 to Nov. 2, inc.).	87.13
John A. Kendrick	Investigator (Aug. 1 to 7, inc.; Oct. 17 to Nov. 4, inc.).	453.11
Paul F. Morrison	Investigator (July 14 to 26, inc.).	226.55
Walter K. Van Olinda	Investigator (July 1 to Dec. 31, inc.).	3,676.20
Charlotte S. Crosson	Stenographer (Oct. 25 to Nov. 9, inc.).	134.97
LaRue Dickson	Typist (July 1 to Dec. 31, inc.).	1,619.64
Anna-Marie Hogin	Stenographer (Nov. 11 to Dec. 31, inc.).	184.00
Kathryn E. Smith	Chief clerk (July 1 to Dec. 31, inc.).	2,309.34

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$40,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	8,937.51
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948	30,291.47
Total amount expended from Apr. 15 to Dec. 31, 1948	39,228.98
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948	771.02

ROSS RIZLEY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. C. Stanley Lowell, pastor, Wesley Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, the Father of us all, wilt Thou grant in Thy goodness that as we enter this time-honored room we may leave behind all that which does not deserve to be here. Let all self-seeking and tainted motives remain without. Let false pride and lurking grudge set no foot within these walls. Let all that is ignoble and mean, all that is partial and prejudiced find no place in these solemn deliberations.

Yet, as we come may we bring with us all that edifies and ennobles. Let integrity of purpose here be joined with unwearying resolve. Let there be firmness in the right mellowed with the understanding of human frailty. Let there be a kinship of words and deeds for good. Let sharp division whet the edge of our common purpose. Thou knowest what we are. We would it were more. Yet let us bring the very best and all we have to the meeting of these sacred trusts.

As we bring our best, wilt Thou, our Father, make it better. Let others concern themselves, if they will, with the facade of power. Teach us the meaning of its substance—not of wealth, nor of arms, nor of things, but of the spirit. May our excellence be not in might nor in power but in virtue. Let our strength be as the strength of ten because our hearts are pure. We pray in the name of Christ the Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 31, 1949, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 547. An act to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans.

EXTENDING TIME FOR FREE ENTRY OF CERTAIN ARTICLES IMPORTED TO PROMOTE INTERNATIONAL GOOD WILL

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

JANUARY 31, 1949.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to the authority heretofore granted, the Clerk of the House received from the Secretary of the Senate on January 31, 1949, the engrossed resolution (H. J. Res. 88) entitled "Joint resolution extending the time for free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will," attested by the Secretary as having been passed by the Senate on January 31, 1949.

Very truly yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had on January 31, 1949, examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 88. Joint resolution extending the time for free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on January 31, 1949, he did on that day sign the following enrolled House joint resolution:

H. J. Res. 88. Joint resolution extending the time for free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will.

JOINT INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

JANUARY 27, 1949.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to authority granted by section 5001 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code, the Committee on Ways and Means did on January 14, 1949, elect the Honorable JOHN D. DINGELL, of Michigan, to be a member of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation to serve with the following other House Members who have previously been duly elected by the Committee on Ways and Means as members of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation: ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, of North Carolina; JERE COOPER, of Tennessee; DANIEL A. REED, of New York; ROY O. WOODRUFF, of Michigan.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means.

THE LATE HONORABLE HOMER HOCH

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, it is with sorrow and deep regret I announce the death of Justice Homer Hoch, a former Member of this House. Justice Hoch passed away at Topeka, Kans., last Monday morning.

Homer Hoch was a member of this House during a period of 14 years, having been elected from the Fourth Congressional District of Kansas in 1918, and served until 1932.

As a Member of Congress he served with credit to himself and to the State he represented in this body. While a Member of Congress he was active in legislative matters, and for a long period of time was a member of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. He was coauthor of the Hoch-Smith resolution, which paved the way for general grain-rate reductions on middle western railroads. While serving in this body, he was called upon to preside many times as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Justice Hoch was the son of a former Governor of the State of Kansas. Prior to his election to Congress he was engaged in the newspaper business at Marion, Kans. After his service in Congress, he returned to Kansas and was appointed to the chairmanship of the corporation committee of our State. He was afterward elected to the Supreme Court of Kansas, where he was serving with distinction at the time of his death.

Justice Hoch's long career in public service kept him well abreast of the law, first as a lawyer, then a lawmaker, and finally an interpreter on the Kansas court bench. Justice Hoch was known to his colleagues on the high bench as one who felt that law should be interpreted in the light of its social effects upon the people of his State and Nation, rather than in narrow confines of strict legal construction.

In the passing of Justice Hoch the State and Nation mourn one of their foremost, outstanding citizens. He was a great man with a deep sense of justice toward his fellow men. He was indeed a Christian gentleman.

Well may he rest from his labors and may his State and Nation confer upon him the commendation, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the death of the Honorable Homer Hoch, of Kansas, practically coincided with the birthday of that great State. I think that fact symbolical in that Justice Hoch and his family were a part of the great State of Kansas and its great history.

Judge Hoch's father served with distinction as Governor of the State. He himself served with great honor in many public offices, his final one being that of justice of the supreme court of the State. He was recognized, not only by his colleagues and the State of Kansas, but by the legal profession and others throughout the country, as an able, conscientious, and sincere jurist. His quiet, yet courageous, manner caused him to be loved by all who knew him.

It is with deep regret that I have learned of this tragic end of Justice Hoch. His loss to Kansas is a loss to his Nation.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I have learned of the death of Homer Hoch, who was, for 14 years, a distinguished Member of this House.

I had the privilege of serving with him in the House for 6 years. I am sure that all Members who were here at that

time will recall him as a most able, hard-working, and conscientious Member of Congress. During the time I knew him he was one of the leaders in the House, one of its ablest debaters, and a skilled parliamentarian and presiding officer. His public service did not end with his retirement from Congress in 1932, and since that time he has rendered great service to our State as chairman of the corporation commission, and as a distinguished member of its highest court. In all he spent over 30 years in the service of the public. Homer Hoch was a friendly man. He was very helpful to me when I first came to Congress as a new Member. I shall never forget the kindness that he showed me at that time. He was a man who in every respect could be called a good man, with everything which that term implies. He will be missed among all those who knew him. My deepest sympathy goes to his widow and his fine son and daughter.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my words to those already spoken in memory of this beloved Kansan, whose service to the public should be an example to every young man seeking to follow a public career.

Justice Hoch was a success in the finest sense of the word.

His passing is a great loss to the State of Kansas.

His accomplishments and service are reasons for the justifiable pride his family, his friends, and his neighbors had in him.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the price we pay for living is to see our dear friends pass from us. It is with great regret that I learned of the death of my good friend of many years, Homer Hoch. When I first came to Congress he was one of the outstanding men in this body. He was an able debater and a splendid parliamentarian. He served often with distinction as a presiding officer. He rendered a great service to his country here and later in his own State of Kansas.

The country has lost a great citizen, and I extend my deep sympathy to his family in their hour of bereavement.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, no news has brought more sadness to me than this report of the death of Homer Hoch, with whom I served in this House for many years.

Someone has said that the friendships that spring up between Members of the different parties in this House should be compared to the flowers that overhang the walls of party politics.

We went through some of the hardest battles together I have ever experienced; and I am not giving away any secrets when I tell you I have been through many battles in this House.

Homer Hoch and I were largely responsible for preventing the reapportioning of the House of Representatives under the census of 1920. Because it was taken at the wrong time of the year and at a time when large numbers of our soldiers had not returned from the first World War it would have discriminated against the agricultural States. I remember distinctly that we fought for an amendment that would have protected his State and mine, and other agricultural States, from having their representation taken away and given to people from foreign countries who had been in this country only a short time.

During the last few years of his services here we fought through an amendment to the Muscle Shoals bill that blazed the way for protecting the American people in the enjoyment of that vast wealth of water power this country possesses. When the Muscle Shoals bill was passed, Mr. Hoch being in the majority, we agreed that he should offer the amendment to have the Government fix the retail price of the power generated and not have the power trust plunder the people in the TVA area with exorbitant overcharges.

That amendment was adopted, the bill was passed, but was vetoed by the then President of the United States.

It was later written into the bill which Senator Norris and I sponsored, creating the Tennessee Valley Authority which, as I have often said, has wrought the greatest developments of ancient or modern times.

I never met a finer man in or out of Congress than Homer Hoch. He was a Christian gentleman, who put the welfare of his country above party politics.

I recall the old days when we lived together at Congress Hall. It brings back a good many other faces like Dan Anthony, Gordon Lee, and a large number of others who have now passed on.

When I remember all
The friends so linked together,
I've seen around me fall
Like leaves in wintry weather—
I feel like one
Who treads alone
Some banquet hall deserted,
Whose lights are fled,
Whose garlands dead,
And all but he departed.

Kansas has lost one of its greatest citizens; this country has lost one of our finest Americans in the passing of Homer Hoch.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of Homer Hoch, I have lost a good friend—the State of Kansas has lost an able and devoted son. Mr. Hoch was a useful and patriotic citizen of our common country.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who may so desire may extend their remarks at this point on the life and character of the late Homer Hoch.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that I learned of the passing of Justice Homer Hoch. It was not my privilege to serve with him in the House. It was, though, my privilege to know him as a warm friend. I knew him well, and admired him profoundly because of his kindliness, his sympathetic understanding, and his gentleness. I knew him not only as a fellow publisher, but as an outstanding and useful citizen in the service of his community, his State, and the Nation. The entire country has lost a great and honorable man.

I join my colleagues in paying this tribute of respect to him, and expressing our deep sympathy to his family at his passing.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, Homer Hoch and I entered Congress at the same time. We immediately became acquainted and that perfunctory new Members' acquaintance soon ripened into genuine friendship, and that friendship has endured down through the years.

Mr. Hoch was an unusual man. Coming from a good family, the son of the Governor of his State, he was especially well educated. He was a cultured, friendly, Christian gentleman in every sense of the word. His passing will be a great shock to his splendid family. During his service in Washington, I was in his home many times, and his family life was ideal. Mrs. Hoch was a charming hostess, and the children just what children should be. Since Mr. Hoch retired from Congress, I have often heard from him directly and indirectly, and I do know that he carried on his traditional congressional record as a leader of men and a distinguished public servant.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with others who served in Congress with Mr. Hoch in these memorial exercises. I extend to the family my genuine sympathy.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to serve with Hon. Homer Hoch during the entire time he so ably served the people of the Fourth Congressional District of Kansas in the House of Representatives of the United States. The fine character of the man won for him the respect of his colleagues and of all who knew him. I can say that his service in the House of Representatives was that of a statesman of a very high order. The attribute of a statesman was once stated by Edmund Burke, "A disposition to preserve and an ability to improve, taken together would be my standard of a statesman." Measured by this yardstick, Hon. Homer Hoch, of Kansas, will always and rightfully be known as a true statesman. I extend my heartfelt sympathy to his bereaved family.

MIDDLETON BEAMAN

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one of the most prominent members of the House organization for many years—learned, scholarly, gentlemanly, devoted to his duties throughout the years—is Middleton Beaman, who was legislative counsel of the House of Representatives. For more than 30 years in different capacities, all responsible, he served with outstanding ability, with great devotion, this legislative body of which you and I have the honor to be Members. Congresses came and Congresses went,

but Middleton Beaman always continued, highly respected by all the Members of the House without regard to party, making powerful contribution to the drafting of legislation that we, who are Members of the House, well know about but which the people generally are little acquainted with.

After over 30 years of service he has retired. We regret very much to see the retirement of this outstanding member of the House organization. I will not say "employee" or "servant" because I do not like to use those words in relation to Middleton Beaman. I shall say instead outstanding member of the House organization.

My purpose today is to pay tribute to him and to the great contribution he has made, to let him know as he leaves the House organization that he leaves with the profound respect and admiration of every Member of the House who served in any Congress with which he was connected in his many years of service and to also express the hope that in retirement he will enjoy many years of happiness and contentment. I also hope that he will visit the House frequently, that he will not in retirement remain inactive, but will keep in touch with his many friends here and keep close contact with the many friendships he has developed in past Congresses.

I also hope that in retirement he will devote some time to the writing of a book with reference to his experiences, giving to the people of the country the benefit of his vast knowledge in the intricate field of legislation, a benefit that would be of great advantage not only to Members of Congress but to the people generally.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to concur in the remarks of the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], with reference to the services of Mr. Beaman, head of the legislative counsel. His position was one of great responsibility, which required great technical skill as well as a thorough knowledge of his work. He worked for our committee in drafting various pieces of legislation which were presented to the House in the past.

I have never known a man who performed his work more efficiently and more thoroughly or more satisfactorily. He was an indefatigable worker. He did not spare himself at all. He worked night and day in order to prepare legislation for the various committees to present to the House.

As I stated, I concur in the remarks of the majority leader in expressing the hope that Mr. Beaman may have many years yet in which to rest from his labors and to enjoy a well-earned rest that he richly deserves. In my experience of 38 years I have never known of any man connected with the public service and the work of the Congress who has discharged his duty more thoroughly, more efficiently, and more satisfactorily than Mr. Beaman.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, as one who has had the opportunity to observe the work of Mr. Beaman, I appreciate the great loss that the House organization has had in his retirement. Mr. Beaman was faithful, conscientious, and loyal. He understood thoroughly the legislation that came before the House. I am delighted to join with the majority leader in wishing for him many years of happiness and good health.

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a happy privilege for me to join in expressing my very sincere tribute to Mr. Beaman, and I concur in the remarks made by the distinguished majority leader and others who have spoken. As a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, it has been my privilege to work with him very closely throughout the years, and I regard him as one of the most valuable men holding any position in the service of this Government. It is my conviction that many of the outstanding statutes have stood the test of constitutionality very largely because of the able assistance given by Mr. Beaman. He was one of the greatest lawyers I have ever known. It was my privilege to be a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means that worked for months in the drafting of the Social Security Act. I shall never forget the outstanding contribution made by Mr. Beaman in the drafting of that measure. It was my privilege to attend many conferences with the late President Roosevelt, with the Attorney General of the United States, and other officials who were working on that important measure. We found the advice and counsel of Mr. Beaman to be valuable at all times, and it is my conviction that that measure today has stood the test of constitutionality largely because of the valuable contribution made by Mr. Beaman.

I join in this tribute, and join in wishing for him many years of happiness in his retirement, although we regret exceedingly to see him leave the position in which he rendered such faithful service to the House of Representatives.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman, and I am in complete agreement with him, because I was a member of the committee that conducted hearings on social-security legislation which was drafted under the chairmanship of the able and distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have just learned that my friend, Mr. Middleton Beaman, has just retired as legislative counsel of the House of Representatives. I am sure that those who have known Mr. Beaman during his long career in this position feel that he has justly earned his retirement. There is no question that his extraordinary legal ability in drafting of intricate legislation has saved the Government, as well as litigants, countless millions of dollars and possibly billions. The exhaustless energy of this outstanding public servant has been something that could not be compensated for by any salary he has ever received. I doubt if there is a legal firm in the country which would not have welcomed Mr. Beaman to it as a member of the firm. Yet here we have a man who has dedicated his remarkable intellect to the service of his country at a nominal salary compared with what he might have earned outside of the Government. I have always looked up to Mr. Beaman as that type of citizen who stood for principles and yielded to no pressure or to no man who might seek to have him violate them. Those of us who have served with Mr. Beaman are well aware that he merits years of happiness, health, and prosperity, and that is what I am sure that all of us who know him wish for him.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the younger Members of the House I should like to say that the person about whom we are talking is a man who has for years been the chief of those who provide the language and knowledge required to write complicated legislation. I think Mr. Beaman is one of the half dozen smartest men intellectually that I have ever met. Mr. Beaman has an incisive mind, the like of which is possessed by few men. In addition to this incisive mind he has a character that has stood up on all occasions. In his work he did not flatter or fear anyone. I am glad to take this opportunity to give my testimony and show my thankfulness for having had the opportunity to work with this wonderful man.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate the contribution made by the gentleman from Ohio, and I agree with him that Middleton Beaman is one of the half dozen ablest men I have ever met.

In conclusion I know that I speak the sentiments of all of the Members who knew him in the years that he was connected with the House organization by saying, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as part of my remarks a letter sent to Middleton Beaman on February 1 by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. The letter referred to is as follows:

FEBRUARY 1, 1949.

Mr. MIDDLETON BEAMAN,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR BEAMAN: I have your letter of January 5, 1949. I want to express to you my deep regret that you find it necessary to resign your office as chief legislative counsel of the House.

I look back upon our long association with great pleasure and pride in the fact that I have had your confidence and you have had mine. You can always look back upon your 30 years here on the Hill with the assurance that everyone who has come in contact with you is your friend and is deeply grateful to you for your fine work, and the help that you

have given each and every one of us individually and collectively as Members of the House of Representatives. Your clear head and trained mind, combined with your love of the work you were doing, have made your service here outstanding.

For the years that are allotted to you I trust that you shall enjoy to the fullest measure the blessings of health and happiness.

With assurances of my high regard I am pleased to subscribe myself,

Your sincere friend.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure we are all sorry to know that Middleton Beaman, the legislative counsel, is retiring from active duty. I have known Mr. Beaman personally and well for more than a quarter of a century. I never knew of an individual in public life who was more interested in his work and more determined to do that work well.

Mr. Beaman thought and worked objectively. He always determined where he was going, and had the ability and the foresight to select the words and the language best suited to the accomplishment of his purpose. I have often marveled at his capacity for work. I have sat in conference committee with him early and late, and there was never a word of complaint because the hour of meeting was too early or the hour of adjournment too late. Others with whom Mr. Beaman has been associated in the Congress have discussed at length his unusual qualities and qualifications for the responsible position in the House which he filled so efficiently and acceptably. A gentleman and a patriot always, he has set a good example for the rest of us to follow.

Here is hoping that he may live long and enjoy his well-earned retirement.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for one-half hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TEAGUE (at the request of Mr. KILDAY) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one extraneous matter.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FEIGHAN (at the request of Mr. YOUNG) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short newspaper article.

Mr. JONES of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the St. Francis levee district of Missouri.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include editorials.

Mr. LYNCH (at the request of Mr. DELANEY) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I cannot refrain from taking this minute to pay my respects and appreciation to someone we still have with us, and to express the deep gratitude of the people of my district and the State of Utah to the President of the United States for his humanity and his ability to see and understand an emergency when it exists.

Long before the newspapers were full of the disaster that has stricken the West, the President of the United States had already taken action. He had directed every Federal agency available to lend every assistance possible to the stricken people of that area.

It is indeed gratifying for us as a people, and the people of the world, to know that we now have in the White House a man who understands humanity, a man of action, a man of courage, who will meet all the issues that arise in these troublous times.

AMENDMENT OF SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to exempt from the provisions of the Selective Service Act of 1948 those merchant seamen who served in the United States merchant marine during World War II. My motive in presenting this bill is to eliminate a great inequity in the Selective Service Act under which merchant marine veterans are now being drafted after years of hazardous wartime shipping service all over the world—an inequity which does a grave injustice to these veterans by denying recognition to them for their great contributions to our victory over the Axis, and by requiring new sacrifices from those who have so willingly sacrificed before.

Our merchant marine veterans are the forgotten men of America's armed forces. These men chose this branch of the service in response to their Government's call for volunteers to carry the materials of war to the battlefields all over the world, yet they have been denied veterans' benefits, insurance and hospital services, and educational benefits under the GI bill of rights. The only gesture of recognition for their heroic services was given when the President issued merchant marine certificates of discharge.

The final unfair blow to our seamen veterans came during the last session when the Eightieth Congress refused to exempt from the draft seamen with wartime service—a repudiation of the provision of Public Law 87 of the Seventy-eighth Congress which relieved merchant seamen from further classification under the selective-service system. Now, our seamen veterans, who had their education and their life's work interrupted once by the call to service, find themselves drafted into the armed forces.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Eighty-first Congress to amend the Selective Service Act to grant draft exemption to these forgotten men of World War II, and thus grant them some measure of recognition for their sacrifices in the last war—recognition which they so richly deserve.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Ottumwa (Iowa) Courier on Federal grants.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in one to include an editorial from the veterans' report.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

INCREASING TREND TOWARD ACQUISITION OF TAX-EXEMPT PROPERTY BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the membership to a table which I intend to place in the Appendix of the RECORD, with the permission of the House. That table shows the extent to which the Federal Government is increasing the trend toward ownership of tax-exempt property in various States of this country.

It emphasizes that this is an extremely serious situation for many States and municipalities and for the property owners in those localities who own real estate subject to taxation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend these remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE].

VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, sometimes during peacetime a Member places himself in some jeopardy when he speaks in favor of the veterans of any war. I am at this time, however, calling attention to that magnificent group of soldiery which went forth in 1917 and 1918 to the fields of France, and who sacrificed themselves in the defense of their country, the men who fought in World War I.

I want to call the attention of the House to the words of Rudyard Kipling when we consider an attempt to malign the veteran. Those words are:

It's Tommy this, an' Tommy that, an' "Chuck 'im out, the brute!"
But it's "Savior of 'is country," when the guns begin to shoot.
An' it's Tommy this, an' Tommy that, an' anything you please,
But Tommy ain't a bloomin' fool,
You can bet a dime he sees.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted, I may address the House today for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MEYER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include some excerpts.

Mr. ADDONIZIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

ACTION BY PRESIDENT TRUMAN IN STORM DISASTER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleague from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] in the words he has spoken about the prompt action taken by the President of the United States in looking after the disaster area in the far West and Midwest. I think President Truman should be commended highly for his action in our behalf in helping to save our cattle and in placing at our disposal all Government agencies so that these conditions can be alleviated at the earliest possible moment. We in Montana are grateful to the Congress and the President for their understanding of these problems of ours and their speedy action in our behalf.

DE JURE RECOGNITION OF ISRAEL

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my bit to the chorus of praise which is ringing out all over the world for our great President, Harry S. Truman, in recognition of his statesmanship in granting full de jure recognition to the new state of Israel, that glorious new democracy in the Middle East which we who have long championed the Zionist cause believe and prophesy will be a bright luminary in the family of nations and demonstrate true democracy in the Middle East.

President Truman should be and will be hailed and commended for this courageous act, and for his generous attitude in choosing a time when no political advantage can accrue to him personally, while he sets the United States in the forefront of the great powers in granting to Israel every privilege and right of established government in international comity.

President Truman has given to peace, to democracy, and to freedom a precious gift of great value. He has proved to the world that the United States keeps its promises. He has proved to the people of Israel that America is a friend. He has given us reason for pride in a great President and a great Nation.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, President Truman rightly shall receive the plaudits of thousands of loyal Americans of Jewish extraction for his most recent evidence of interest in and good will toward the new state of Israel. Our de jure recognition of Israel will do much to stabilize that noble country; will enable it to the better take its rightful place among the nations of the world; and will assist materially in settling conditions in that most important part of the world. The state of Israel has received a tremendous expression of confidence from the United States. We are sure it will continue to merit it.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the last day of January 1949 marked the first day of de jure or full recognition by President Truman of the state of Israel. This fulfilled the President's pledge made last year at the time of his conditional or de facto recognition when the state of Israel was carved out. At that time he promised full recognition by the United States when a permanent government in Israel would be established.

These elections were held on January 25, 1949, and less than one full week later Israel has seen President Truman fulfill that promise—a truly great and momentous decision in these times.

We are reliably informed that the news of President Truman's fair-minded decision was most amiably received throughout all Israel as soon as it was made known there.

It is sincerely hoped that this step will go a long way in effecting a better understanding toward a solution of our problems of today.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOLLINGER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, at long last, the people of Israel have been accorded by the United States the recognition they so richly deserve. Perhaps no nation in history has suffered so much or fought so courageously for the right to take its proper place among the democracies of the world. By its steadfast belief in the principles of democracy, and by its willingness to sacrifice life and property for its ideals, it has earned the recognition of full statehood by the United States. Through the United Nations, it will lend its efforts toward world peace for which there is a prayer in the hearts of all of us. President Truman as the leader of our great Nation has helped pave the way for a new Israel, and the Israelis will, with pride in their country, maintain and uphold those democratic principles which we realize must be fought for with all our ability and strength, if they are to survive.

The enemies of democracy are many—that a new nation, Israel, joins with us in our efforts for peace and freedom, is cause for rejoicing.

THE DEMOCRATIC PATH OF PEACE

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great satisfaction that I add a word to the fulsome but deserving praise of our courageous President, Harry S. Truman.

I believe that I can claim the unique distinction of having predicted the election of heads of two great governments. When I was in the state of Israel in September 1948 I called on Prime Minister David Ben Gurion.

During the course of our discussion he asked when our Government would extend de jure recognition to his government. I told him that there was not a doubt in the world but that President Truman would keep his promise—just as he did—and would extend de jure recognition to the state of Israel immediately following the establishment of a permanent government by means of a democratic election. He then asked what would happen if it were necessary to postpone the Israeli election until after our own. I told him that there would be no change because I was certain that President Truman would be reelected.

Upon my return to this country I visited President Truman and told him, among other things, that, in my opinion, the provisional government of the state of Israel headed by Prime Minister Ben Gurion would be elected as the permanent government by the Israeli citizenry in a free and popular election.

I rejoice that all of these things are now realities.

We are grateful to the President for his extension of de jure recognition to this new democracy because it is symbolic of stretching out the hand of friendly fellowship in the true tradition of brotherhood. It is further evidence that this country, under the leadership of our great President, is ready to teach the world by precept and example how to tread the democratic path of peace under the guidance of God.

The following poem by Sir William Jones, entitled "A State," is apropos:

What constitutes a state?
Not high raised battlements or labored mound,
Thick walls or moated gate;
Not cities proud, with spires and turrets crowned,
Nor bays and broad arm ports,
Where, laughing at the storm, rich navies ride;
Nor starred and spangled courts,
Where low-browed baseness wafts perfume to pride—
No!—men, high-minded men,
With powers as far above dull brutes endued,
In forest, brake, or den,
As beasts excel cold rocks and brambles rude—
Men, who their duties know,
But know their rights; and, knowing, dare maintain,
Prevent the long-aimed blow,
And crush the tyrant, while they rend the chain,
These constitute a state.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join with the gentleman from New York and other friends of Israel in commemorating this historic occasion in which our great President of the United States lends his high office to the official de jure recognition of the establishment of Israel as a nation.

At long last, from a tumultuous beginning, the heroic men and women of Palestine have forged for themselves and their children for generations to come a new nation, a new homeland for the Jewish people in the Middle East. For generations these people of biblical times have been persecuted in many lands, but with tenacity, fortitude, vision, and wisdom they have clung to the belief that some day, somewhere in the land of their forefathers, they would reestablish themselves again.

President Truman, true to his pledge and in the name of the Government of the United States of America, has led the way for legal recognition for these deserving people.

In the interest of democracy as we know it, I am confident that this historic occasion will create a new era in the Middle East, where a dynamic and positive democratic program is so sorely needed.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, President Truman deserves and is receiving the plaudits of the democratic world for the recognition of the new state of Israel, not only by the United States but by Great Britain as well, for the British recognition is generally regarded as a result of the diplomatic influence of the President of the United States.

Historically, the Jew is a democrat and he is preeminently an individualist. Indeed, the persecution of the Jewish people throughout the ages and, most conspicuously, in the recent past, has come from totalitarian dictators and their minions, in an effort to crush the individualism of the Jew, which did not submit to the tyranny of totalitarianism.

It is a foregone conclusion that the new state will take its place among the democratic nations of the world and will join in the fight for freedom, individual liberty and the dignity of man throughout the future.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I too wish to join the chorus that has raised its voice in jubilation over the full de jure recognition of the new state of Israel by our courageous President, Harry S. Truman.

At long last, the dream of a homeless and oppressed people has become a reality. A promise has been fulfilled.

President Truman, by his immediate recognition of the state of Israel, has proved to the world that the United States keeps its promises. The President has proved that America can be a trusted friend, at a time when friendly relations through the world are so vitally needed to secure the peace for which we all yearn.

I feel confident that very shortly the state of Israel will be admitted as a member of the United Nations and will make a real contribution to the work of that great international body in bringing about a better understanding toward the solution of our present-day problems.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a memorandum concerning some important legislation under consideration by the Committee on the Judiciary at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]?

There was no objection.

STORM CONDITIONS IN THE WEST

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. O'SULLIVAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, as you all know, my State of Nebraska, together with the greater portion of the Western States, has been made practically helpless by a series of very bad blizzards. Through the cooperation of the Federal Government we were able only a few days ago to begin the movement by airplane of hay to several hundred thousand head of cattle which are starving in these beleagured areas.

This morning Mr. Bud Crawford, of Broken Bow, Nebr., who has maintained radio communications through his "ham" set with most of the ranchers in my State, telephoned me a serious complaint.

Mr. Crawford tells me that the price of hay has skyrocketed. Prairie hay that had been selling at from $12 to $15 a ton now is quoted at $30 and $40. And many of those owning the hay are holding it for still higher prices, according to Mr. Crawford's information. I have telegraphed Governor Peterson of Nebraska, demanding an investigation into this matter of profiteering on this animal misery. I may also ask prosecuting authorities to look into the situation with a view to prosecuting the offenders if this is possible.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I too wish to second the remarks of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. O'SULLIVAN] and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. CRANDALL] who have spoken so well of the quick and effective work of the President on this relief program. I trust we will have quick action by the House on Senate Joint Resolution 38 which implements the work of relief. On Monday Secretary Krug told a committee what had already been done and yesterday Assistant Secretary Warne elaborated on it.

I find that the storms have extended farther south than most of us realized. They have touched northern Arizona and covered the Navajo Indian Reservation deep with snow. That reservation, including the Hopi Reservation, is as large as the entire State of West Virginia. I fear it is a great crisis for those Indians. It may be true of other Indians as well. Probably there will be loss of life as well as loss of livestock. Aviators flying over that region say they can detect Indian hogans at different places but they can find no tracks going out of them. Those Indians are snowbound and covered up. Undoubtedly there will be loss of life. I hope we will take quick action on Senate Joint Resolution 38. At this point I want to include a telegram just handed me.

FEBRUARY 2, 1949.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C.:

Navy planes really did a job here today. With two Army ships, moved 35 tons of hay into reservation and to ranches along highway 66 Seligman area.

Fifty CAP planes in action out of Winslow, Prescott, made several flights over reservation, dropping food and spotting concentration of cattle, sheep, and Indians.

Red Cross dropped 10,000 pounds of food. Indian Bureau also flew into Bodaway Plateau 2,000 pounds firewood. Red Cross has ready for shipment Wednesday 50 pounds DDT for Navajo Mountain School. Increased food drop tomorrow.

Dr. Schulz, Fort Defiance, got into Navajo Mountain on Bureau chartered helicopter, plans to establish temporary hospital in school. Red Cross has 36 Army cots ready to be flown in Wednesday.

Fifteen planes standing by at Phoenix Skyharbor loading hay tonight, expect take off tomorrow first flight with 70 tons, hope to fly additional 100 tons tomorrow. Navy moving base to Litchfield Park Airbase to facilitate handling 150 men and officers, maintain air equipment. Winslow will be advance base. Hay train departed Phoenix 235 tons, arrives Winslow 11 a. m. tomorrow, where planes will pick up cargoes.

Bureau has arranged for handling cargoes there. Planes loaded here today by Indian students and 20 chain gang pupils from Phoenix Bastile. Drafting additional chain gangers for tomorrow.

Army has supplied four dozers from Yuma. Have secured 16 dozers from outside area altogether.

Established radio communication with Bennett Hyde at Cayenta through local HAM hook-up here, relayed through Marion, Ohio. Hyde reports food drop at Cayenta O. K. and asked for hay at Black Mesa.

Chartered helicopter returned Tuba City to pick up Bureau nurse who will be flown in there tomorrow at Schulz request. Food situation at Navajo Mountain school O. K., but fear measles, pneumonia, frostbite may be bad. Possibility of diphtheria unconfirmed at Tes Nos Pas, but likely.

John Osborne, Seligman, rancher, reported to Pierson that hay lift has saved most of his 1,200 head, only 8 dead so far.

New blizzard reported on way, but may miss reservation. Temperature in affected area predicted for tonight zero minimum. Snow still drifting on reservation.

Army surgeon attempted to fly into Gallup today in Army packet, but forced to return here tonight. Will fly into Shiprock tomorrow and will be transported by Bureau jeep to Tes Nos Pas tomorrow with Dr. Kassell.

DAUGHERTY.

Mr. CARROLL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my remarks on this same subject at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with other western colleagues in the House of Representatives in commending President Truman for his speedy action in calling upon the agencies of our Government to lend every aid and assistance to the great mountain and plains region of this Nation, which has been suffering as a result of unprecedented snowstorms.

President Truman is to be commended for his splendid action, without which the economic and agricultural life of the West may have suffered irreparable damage.

It is hoped that the legislative branch of the Government will give continuing and substantial aid to these stricken areas in view of the urgency of the situation.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate the privilege of elaborating on the situation in Arizona as it is at the present time. Not only is the condition serious from the standpoint of below zero weather, with more snow and cold predicted as of last night, but the latest reports verify the fact that cattle are starving. Even the antelope in the district north of Seligman where the wildlife range are subjected to weather so serious that they cannot survive. Certainly domestic animals, from which these people derive their livelihood, cannot be expected to survive without food and shelter.

To make the condition even worse—and something we have heard little about so far—we now find evidence of measles, pneumonia, and diphtheria on the Indian reservations. This necessitates medical supplies and doctors. We are not only concerned with their economy, but it is now a matter of life and death for the people living in those areas. It is imperative that additional aid be forthcoming immediately.

The people of Arizona extend their thanks to the Government and President Truman for the assistance that has already been given them and for the efforts being made here. But I would further like to state that the condition is such that it will continue to demand our close attention, since many areas will require assistance not merely for the time being. And it may be several weeks or even months before the people of Arizona in these areas are again placed on a stable economic basis where they can again resume their normal activities.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITAKER (at the request of Mr. CHELF) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

REPEAL OF ANTIMARGARINE LAW

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, an attempt is being made to persuade Members of Congress and others that the administration will be breaking faith with midwestern dairy farmers if it goes ahead with its plans for repeal of the Federal antimargarine law.

This attempt does not take into account the very plain facts of the situation.

The Democratic platform, adopted in June, carried a plank proposing repeal of the Federal taxes on margarine.

This was unequivocal and meant what it said—complete repeal of the Federal antimargarine laws.

Everyone, including the butter interests, apparently so agreed at the time.

At the time, the butter groups had not come forward with their proposal for repeal of the taxes and the substitution of a ban on the manufacture and sale of yellow margarine.

This effort to further hamstring margarine was not made public until a few days before the November election. The statement explaining that the butter interests were willing to see the Federal taxes repealed in return for the ban on yellow margarine did not refer to the Democratic platform. Apparently the butter spokesmen felt that the Democratic plank on margarine meant outright repeal of the antimargarine laws—with no other crippling legislation to be substituted.

Obviously, the butter groups were counting on the election of Governor Dewey and there had been a good deal of quiet rejoicing in their ranks over antimargarine statements attributed to the Republican Presidential nominee.

But President Truman won the election. The farmers voted for Mr. Truman knowing that the Democratic platform carried the plank proposing repeal of the antimargarine laws and knowing that the President had been quoted at a press conference as saying that he would sign a repeal bill if one came to him from the Congress.

Furthermore, if any further proof is needed, the President in his economic message to the Eighty-first Congress, on January 7, 1949, again recommended repeal of the margarine taxes. Repeal of the taxes means that all restrictions on the sale of yellow margarine would be done away with.

In view of the circumstances related, I do not see how anyone can say that repeal of the antimargarine laws will be breaking faith with the midwestern farmers. I insist, that in view of their support of the President in the national election, complete repeal of the antimargarine laws will be keeping faith with them.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article which appeared in the Chelsea (Mass.) Record; also, to extend his remarks and include a statement he made before the Ways and Means Committee recently.

NON-COMMUNIST OATH FOR MANAGEMENT

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the Taft-Hartley Act will be repealed.

Another labor-management-relations act will be passed to fill the vacuum.

We hope that it will strike a better balance in governing those conditions under which labor and management resolve their differences.

Taft-Hartley "put the finger" on labor by requiring union officials to swear under oath that they are not Communists.

By implication, this gives management a clean bill of health, while putting labor leaders under constant suspicion.

On a grave issue such as communism, which threatens our national well-being and the future of every man, woman, and child in the United States, we cannot afford to put any one group under the onus that it alone is subject to Communist infiltration.

To require one party to a controversy to take a loyalty oath while exempting the other party is weighing the scales in an un-American manner, which can only please the Kremlin.

Equal treatment before the law is the cornerstone of justice and security.

But this tenet is flagrantly violated by the terms of the Taft-Hartley Act.

We have been well warned concerning the Communist technique of infiltrating a labor union.

We have not been warned concerning the far more subtle technique of Communists in worming their way into management.

It would be far more effective for an agent to avoid all Communist affiliations, establish a thoroughly conservative viewpoint, and work himself into a responsible position all in readiness for the day when he could do the most harm without ever being suspected.

In fact, we must guard against both possibilities.

Therefore, in any labor-management-relations act that is passed by this Congress to replace the discredited Taft-Hartley Act, we must treat all alike when the question of our national security is involved.

As the Chelsea Record, of Chelsea, Mass., observes editorially in its issue of January 7, 1949:

> This is not a question of lining business up against labor or labor against business, in any sense of the word.
>
> It is a case of lining up American men and women, regardless of where they work, or what they work at, against a common enemy that is using every means, fair and foul, to break down our economy.

What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.

If this House decides to retain that provision which requires union-labor officials to sign a non-Communist affidavit, the American people, actuated by a sense of fair play and the need for full security, will demand the same from the managers of industry.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MACK of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. JONAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the Miles County News Review under date of January 20.

Mr. GOLDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial that exposes Russia's great source of our scarce materials and suggests a remedy.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three instances, and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in five separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JACKSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article, Will the Minimum-Wage Law Decrease Unemployment?

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. VORYS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech made by a distinguished alumnus of the Ohio State Alumni Club on January 18.

Mr. McCULLOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Cincinnati Inquirer.

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. GWINN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include certain excerpts from the Labor and Management joint report.

Mr. SMITH of Kansas (at the request of Mr. GWINN) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. McCONNELL (at the request of Mr. GWINN) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

ISRAEL RECOGNIZED

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the de jure recognition of Israel is of course deeply gratifying to all who have fought for justice for the small state, and for a place of sanctuary for the unhappy Jews of Europe. I have joined in this fight believing first in our American principle that justice to minorities is the key to the success of democracy, and second that Israel will be a bridgehead of democracy in a Middle East ridden with chronic depression, illiteracy, bad health, and feudal social conditions. Israel now has a great part to play in the recovery and modernization of this whole area which has long been a tinder box for war. By contributing to the recovery of the Middle East with Israel as a focal point we shall be safeguarding peace and our national security, while at the same time serving best the cause of the triumph of democracy in the world.

RECOGNITION OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to commend President Truman for his prompt action in the fulfillment of his promises to give to the new nation of Israel full and complete recognition. I have long subscribed to the principle that there should be a national home for the Jewish people in Palestine. Palestine is the home of two great religions, the Christian religion and the Jewish religion. The magnificent fight the people of Israel have put up for a national homeland certainly deserves the success they have now achieved.

We, who have fought so long for de jure recognition of Israel, are confident that this new nation will function on democratic principles. We are sure that the nations which are adjacent to Israel will profit through increased commerce and, most of all, by the example which the new nation of Israel will set in the practice of democracy.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "Third Commonwealth." I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $195.25, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, many of us have noticed with a great deal of interest the action of Veterans' Administrator, Carl R. Gray, Jr., as announced yesterday, eliminating the 13 branches of the Veterans' Administration as supervisory units and limiting these offices to operational activities in handling national service life insurance and death claims.

Mr. Speaker, I think this action of the Veterans' Administrator deserves the highest commendation as it perhaps sets an example in the executive department of our Government that may be worthy of wide emulation.

There has been much criticism and some justified that the Veterans' Administration was so big and bunglesome that it became very difficult indeed to obtain the service in many instances the veteran is entitled to receive. This action of the Veterans' Administration will, he believes, increase efficiency in operations, avoid the overlapping of responsibilities and make it possible to utilize personnel

more economically now that we have reached the leveling-off point in our operations.

I personally have never seen the advisability of having such a glorified organization with responsibility in so many places. While I strongly believe in decentralization of the governmental agencies insofar as possible, the experience of large intermediate branch offices apparently proves a more direct contact from the local and district level to the central office would produce better service and greater efficiency.

There is much consideration being given to reorganization in Government agencies, and I am sure much to be accomplished. I am sure General Gray in taking the initiative had in mind accomplishing the objectives to be sought in both economy and efficiency. As a result of this action, it is estimated the savings will mean approximately 2,500 people and $10,000,000, as well as better care for war veterans.

If after careful study and analysis the Veterans' Administrator can do what he says he can and I have every reason to believe he can, it should be a guiding star for others to follow and certainly is a fine display of administrative statesmanship.

EXTENDING THE AUTHORITY OF THE PRESIDENT UNDER SECTION 350 OF THE TARIFF ACT OF 1930

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means have until midnight Friday, February 4, 1949, to file a report on the bill (H. R. 1211) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I would like to also propound a unanimous-consent request that the minority members of the Ways and Means Committee may have until midnight Saturday to file their report.

The SPEAKER. The minority views?

Mr. REED of New York. The minority views, yes.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from North Carolina include that in his unanimous-consent request?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes, I shall be pleased to include the request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Tuesday next to consider under the general rules of the House the bill (H. R. 1211) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; that the time for general debate be not to exceed 1 day, and be equally divided and controlled by myself and the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, how much time is the gentleman going to allow for general debate?

Mr. DOUGHTON. One full day; not to exceed 1 day.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The bill will be read for amendment the next day?

Mr. DOUGHTON. The bill will be read for amendment the next day.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. We will have general debate on Monday?

Mr. DOUGHTON. The bill will be called up under the rules of the House on Tuesday morning.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And read on Wednesday?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Read under the 5-minute rule on Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

THE STATE OF ISRAEL

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my praise to that previously given today to President Truman for his recent de jure recognition of the state of Israel. I think those hardy pioneers in that country, who have literally turned a desert wilderness into a land of milk and honey, and who are basing their government upon the sound social justice preachings of the prophets of old, deserve the support of the people of the United States. I am hence happy that the President has taken this action.

The recent election in Israel is full proof that those people, many of whom have suffered under the evil practices of totalitarianism, have absolutely no use for totalitarianism in any form and indicates that they will establish an island of democracy in the Near East. Every American, every lover of democracy throughout the entire world, should hail the establishment of Israel as a landmark in the never-ending fight for human freedom.

RELIEF OF WESTERN STATES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on tomorrow for the Speaker to recognize Members to suspend the rules in connection with an additional bill in relation to relief for the Western States that have been visited with a terrible disaster.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of the majority leader if he can tell us the program for the rest of this week; and if he can enlighten us any for next week, we will be happy to receive the information.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be glad to. Tomorrow the bill on which unanimous consent has been given for the Speaker to recognize Members to suspend the rules will be brought up. On Friday we are hopeful that the first deficiency appropriation bill will be brought up. There has been a unanimous agreement made in relation to Tuesday and Wednesday of next week. If the Committee on Expenditures reports out the reorganization bill, and if a rule is obtained between now and Saturday, it is my intention to bring that bill up on Monday.

From Wednesday on there will be no further business for the remainder of the week, except such matters that can only go through by unanimous consent and which will require immediate consideration. By "unanimous consent" I mean only with the permission of the minority leadership, of course, as well as all other Members.

Under the agreement I have with the minority leader, I feel that we will have to continue the House in session on Wednesday until the reciprocal trade agreement bill is disposed of. I made a commitment to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] that from Wednesday of next week and the following Monday there will be no controversial legislation. There may be some the following Monday of a noncontroversial nature. Many of the Members on the minority side are going to make speeches a week from Saturday in connection with Lincoln Day dinners. That same courtesy is extended to us as regards Jackson-Jefferson Day dinners. I have made that agreement, and that agreement will be carried out.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, it is under that understanding that we will have Tuesday and Wednesday, if we need that much, for the Reciprocal Trade Act?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly. I am giving Tuesday and Wednesday for the Reciprocal Trade Act. As to the reorganization bill, I think we can dispose of that on Monday, because there will not be much opposition, as I see it, to that bill; there may be on one or two points, but as to the bill itself I do not think there will be much opposition to the purposes and objectives of such legislation.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I want to say that if the deficiency appropriation bill comes up, that it will probably have controversial items in it.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman for giving me that information, because that serves notice that the Members should be here. When the gentleman from New York makes that observation, I draw the inference that he is conveying to the House that there will probably be some roll calls.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GWINN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] may have permission to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article.

INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 51)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the House of Representatives of the United States:

The constitution of the International Labor Organization provides in article 19 thereof, with respect to each convention and recommendation adopted at a session of the International Labor Conference, that "each of the members undertakes that it will," within a given period, bring the convention or recommendation "before the authority or authorities within whose competence the matter lies, for the enactment of legislation or other action."

In accordance with the above-mentioned obligations of the Government of the United States of America as a member of the International Labor Organization, I transmit herewith, for the enactment of legislation or such other action as the House of Representatives may consider appropriate, authentic texts of certain conventions, an instrument of amendment, and recommendations adopted at recent sessions of the International Labor Conference, as follows:

Convention (No. 81) concerning labor inspection in industry and commerce;

Convention (No. 82) concerning social policy in nonmetropolitan territories;

Convention (No. 83) concerning the application of international labor standards to nonmetropolitan territories;

Instrument for the amendment of the schedule to Convention (No. 83) concerning the application of international labor standards to nonmetropolitan territories;

Convention (No. 84) concerning the right of association and the settlement of labor disputes in nonmetropolitan territories;

Convention (No. 85) concerning labor inspectorates in nonmetropolitan territories;

Convention (No. 86) concerning the maximum length of contracts of employment of indigenous workers;

Recommendation (No. 81) concerning labor inspection; and

Recommendation (No. 82) concerning labor inspection in mining and transport undertakings.

The Conventions and Recommendations listed above were adopted at the thirtieth session of the International Labor Conference at Geneva from June 19 to July 11, 1947. The Instrument of Amendment was adopted by the Conference at its thirty-first session held at San Francisco from June 17 to July 10, 1948.

I transmit also the report of the Acting Secretary of State regarding the above-mentioned Conventions, Instrument of Amendment, and Recommendations and a letter of December 3, 1948 from the Acting Secretary of Labor to the Secretary of State regarding those documents.

I am requesting the Secretary of the Interior to transmit the above-mentioned Conventions, Instrument of Amendment, and Recommendations to the Governments of Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands for the enactment of legislation or other action. I am transmitting those documents to the Secretary of the Navy for appropriate action and advice with respect to Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory.

I am also referring the texts of the Conventions, Instrument of Amendment, and Recommendations to the Senate.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 2, 1949.*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times.

EXTENSION OF VOLUNTARY AGREEMENTS AUTHORITY

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 73 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1660) to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except 1 motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the bill H. R. 1660, which was unanimously reported out by the Committee on Banking and Currency and as I have been informed, has already been passed by the other body by a unanimous vote. This bill extends the act of December 1947 which provided for voluntary agreements up to March 1, 1949, to September 30, 1949.

The reason for this extension is that the committee has not had ample time to prepare legislation which they intend to recommend to the House which will broaden the act and also provide for and safeguard the interests of American business and the American people generally. I hope such a bill will be forthcoming in due time from that great committee and I hope that such legislation will be approved by the Congress.

The law that is being now extended contained the words "voluntary agreements." I feared when the legislation was enacted that American industriclists and big business would take advantage of that provision because they were not subject to the Antitrust Act or the Federal Trade Commission Act.

Of course, we were assured at that time that the intent of the legislation was to hold and reduce prices. But unfortunately, such was not the case, and the cost of living has gone up; that is, until the last election. Since that time, of course, the cost of living has gone down somewhat and I hope it will continue to go down, so that the American people will not be held up by high prices as they have been, especially during the last few years. There being no opposition to this legislation, I am not going to take up more time, and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the distinguished gentleman from Illinois has explained to the House, this resolution, House Resolution 73, does make in order, under an open rule, the consideration of the bill, H. R. 1660, reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency by unanimous vote. This measure was introduced by the chairman of that committee, the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. SPENCE.

I believe H. R. 1660 will have the unanimous support of the House. I know of no reason why any Republican should oppose this bill, because it is a continuation of a measure enacted by that often-discussed Eightieth Congress, the Congress which was condemned throughout the length and breadth of the land by the President of the United States—not that I agreed with him—as the second worst Congress in history because it enacted legislation exactly like this. So I am indeed pleased to see that one of the first legislative bills

brought in by the Democratic majority, by the administration now in power, is for the continuation of a law passed by the Republican Congress in December 1947, during the special session called by the President, to deal with the inflationary threat which either existed or was believed to exist at that time.

I understand fully that this measure extends the present law only for 7 months. If I understood my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] correctly, the 7-month period has been fixed in order to give the Eighty-first Congress time to bring in some sort of new legislative program, presumably to fix upon the American people a new system of controls. I am wondering whether 7 months will be a sufficient length of time for this Congress to pass legislation to control the economy of this Nation? While I would not for one moment question the sincerity or the honesty of the opinion expressed by my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], I am of the conviction that perhaps he is in error. I feel rather certain in my own mind that when the 7 months have come and gone there will be no controls placed upon the economy of this country by legislation enacted by the Eighty-first Congress.

In fact, if I might be slightly facetious and yet deadly serious, I might add that if we can judge by that which has occurred thus far, there is grave question whether any legislation will be enacted in this Congress in the next 7 months. I am not unmindful of the fact that after the Eightieth Congress was in session for the first 30 days there were loud cries going up to high heaven that it was a "do-nothing" Congress; that it had not enacted any legislation; that it had failed to keep the promises and pledges which had been made to the people of the country in the campaign of 1946. Well, if the Eightieth Congress was a "do-nothing" Congress I am not at all sure what we can term the Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. As I recall the debates which took place at the time this measure was before the Eightieth Congress, it was asserted by many on the other side of the aisle, who were complaining of the inadequacy of the measure, that it would not work. Since the enactment of this legislation, my understanding is that it has worked and it has worked well and successfully; that it met the problem insofar as allocation is concerned. Of course, I can conclude nothing other than that it must have been so, by the fact that now we are being asked to extend the very same measure for a period of 7 months.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the distinguished gentleman very much for his remarks. I think they are very apropos. I had intended to refer later to that very same situation. The workings of this law, as the gentleman from Indiana has well pointed out, is proof of the contention of the Republican majority in the Eightieth Congress, and very well demonstrates, that you do not need compulsion or force to get industry and business here in America to cooperate with the Government. I think we can look back over the last few months and be proud of the way we have gradually worked our way out of the many difficulties that resulted from the world's greatest armed conflict. We can look back with much satisfaction to the way in which the free-enterprise system here in America, under a plan set forth and provided by the Eightieth Congress, has met the needs of this Nation for production. In almost every instance distribution of scarce commodities has been made in a fair manner.

I feel that those on the other side of the aisle can strike this particular piece of legislation from the so-called scoreboard of bad legislation passed by "the second worst Congress in the history of the Nation," because, seemingly, they are now agreed that after all the judgment and the wisdom of the Eightieth Congress was excellent in connection with this particular problem. At least they are now ready and willing to keep this legislation on the statute books for 7 months more. I predict that this Congress will never enact compulsory control legislation to take its place.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I have been much interested in the gentleman's statement. In that regard, I would hazard the opinion that there will not even be any extension of voluntary controls at the expiration of the 7 months' period, assuming that the country remains at peace. There has been a lot of talk around here about the Government going into the steel business. I am not so sure but what by the time this 7 months' period expires we may be wondering what to do with the steel then being produced under this free-enterprise system in our country instead of worrying about having the Government go into the business of producing steel.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I find myself very much in agreement with what the gentleman from Indiana has said; and perhaps I might go just a little further to say that if the Truman depression, which now seems to be well under way, goes as far and as deep as many people feel it may, that we will not long be talking about how to control production or how to distribute scarce commodities and products. Instead, we will be, by the time 7 months rolls around, discussing here what we can do to spur on, to implement, and to expand both industrial production and employment in this country, what we can do to give some help and some relief to the hungry. It is a situation we do not talk about very often or very loudly—but we all know that the economic condition of this country, as a result of the mistakes of the administration in power, is not any too good or too healthful. I am glad, therefore, to see that it is the judgment of the majority, at the present moment at least, that it is not wise to introduce any of the so-called mandatory controls legislation, or to establish in this country a controlled economy, as was suggested in the campaign, by the President and others throughout recent months because, as I said in the beginning, the American free-enterprise system has met the situation. Our supply pipe lines, as the gentleman from Indiana has said, have been filled. We already have an overproduction in many lines. It will not be long until we may be worrying with the problem as to how we can get rid of our surpluses, and how we can continue to give employment to those who are now working.

I hope every Member of the House will vote for this legislation. I am very sure every Republican Member will.

In closing, may I say again to those on the majority side that we are grateful to you for your endorsement of your open admission that our legislation was wise and of real benefit to the people of America. By its continuation, as long as conditions remain unsettled, you are acting wisely, and in order to act wisely you have been forced to give your approval to all that has been done in connection with this particular problem by "the second worst Congress in American history."

Mr. Speaker, there are no other requests for time on the minority side.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I observe that the former majority leader [Mr. HALLECK] and the present minority leader [Mr. MARTIN] agree with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] that the Eightieth Congress was a great Congress; however, the vast majority of the American people disagreed with these gentlemen in the last election by the tremendous vote that they cast in reelecting our great President who has a great deal of power under this bill. Because of the power that he judiciously exercised the bill actually did work to some extent and some of the things that were feared were not permitted under his guidance and control.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1660) to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1660, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know that the prolongation of any acrimonious political discussion will be helpful to the consideration of this bill. I accept the compliment of the gentleman from Ohio that I selected the best piece of legislation

passed by the Eightieth Congress for the consideration of this Congress. I do not think anybody contends that there was no good legislation passed by the Eightieth Congress. Even a blind pig sometimes finds an acorn. But, the people by their votes said they condemned the record of the Eightieth Congress. I judge that was the issue in the last election, and I have aways thought the voice of the people was the voice of God. The people are the court of last resort. You have been tried and found wanting. We are at the bar of public opinion now, and I am confident we will make good.

I do not say that in any spirit of harshness to you gentlemen on the other side. Personally I feel kindly toward you, but the people have said you did not do a good job in the Eightieth Congress, and the people are the final arbiters. Now, I hope this controversy will not hurt this very meritorious bill which was passed by the Eightieth Congress and which will be continued, by the resolution offered, to September 30 this year, if passed.

This bill confers on the President the power to make voluntary agreements with industry, business, and agriculture, in the production, distribution, allocation, and transportation of strategic materials in short supply essential to our national economy. Its operation has been successful. Almost all of the voluntary agreements have been with reference to steel and steel products. It has not only helped industry in general but it has been very beneficial to the small businesses, because by the allocations they have obtained materials which they otherwise could not have obtained.

This is interim legislation. It only extends the operation of this act until the end of the first quarter of the next fiscal year. In the meantime I hope that we will have a bill that will meet, so far as legislation can, the conditions that now prevail, an over-all bill, incorporating the President's plans, in which there will be some controls.

I believe this is a democratic process. I believe we should always resort to voluntary actions if mandatory actions can be obviated by reason of that. Obedience is government, and lack of obedience is anarchy and chaos. Men will naturally obey the agreements they voluntarily make. I think this bill is based upon sound principles. It is good for industry and agriculture and business; good for both the producer and consumer if it is honestly and faithfully administered. It has been so administered by President Truman, to whom the authority is delegated.

The bill was reported out of the Committee on Banking and Currency unanimously, without going into executive session. I understand a similar bill has been passed by the Senate without objection. No witness appeared against the bill in committee and the opinion of the committee was very strongly in favor of the passage of this bill.

It continues the act in effect until the general program can be considered. To continue it to September 30 of this year will give us ample time for that consideration. Perhaps the provisions of this bill will again be considered and placed in that program. All phases of the grave conditions that confront us and the remedy for same must be considered, and it is just to give us time to give proper consideration to this bill that we take this action today.

I do not think it is necessary to go any further into the matter, and I hope the House will unanimously pass this bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, in committee there was no particular opposition to the continuance of this authority to enter into voluntary agreements.

I might explain that the only reason why any legislation is necessary is that the agreements entered into by industry and business might be in violation of the Clayton and the Sherman Acts if we did not pass legislation to provide that the participants in these agreements should not be subject to the penalties of those acts.

All of the testimony and all of the facts show that the program has been more than reasonably successful. They have been able in conferences and through these agreements to do what otherwise might have been done by mandatory controls. I think the Congress should be quite proud that we did not enact mandatory controls a year ago, that we preserved the free-enterprise system, and that we took one more step away from the socialization of any segment of our industry when we enacted this legislation.

We understand that an issue will be framed later, not only on whether mandatory controls shall be legislated in the field of allocations and priorities to which this particular bill applies, but also on whether price controls and wage controls shall be enacted. As I understand the situation, it is because they expect to introduce such mandatory legislation, which will incorporate the provisions of this bill to all intents and purposes, that this extension is necessary. We will meet the major problem, the basic, fundamental issue of whether we shall socialize American industry, the American economy, when that question is presented to us in the long-range bill. For that reason, and the fact that this program has worked so successfully, there was no opposition whatsoever to the bill on the Republican side of the committee, and I do not believe there should be any opposition to it here on the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. Out in our area we have a great deal of trouble every fall in getting enough freight cars and refrigerated cars to carry off our grape crop. Under this act would it be possible, pursuant to section 2 (a), subdivision 1, for the growers to get relief in trying to get the necessary freight cars to haul away their crops?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; the necessity for allocating freight cars was before the committee when we considered this bill last year. That was one of the reasons we enacted the legislation so that they could agree to meet any seasonal emergencies that might exist.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time on our side.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, my father was a Baptist minister. You know we Baptists believe in complete immersion. I recall a day many years ago when I was about 10 or 12 years old, when my father baptized me. We lived next door to the church and on Sunday afternoon, prior to the baptism, I went over to the church all alone and took off my shoes and stockings to test the water to determine whether it was too cold.

When I heard that the Democratic side of this House had introduced this bill, a Republican bill, I wondered if perhaps they were getting some Republican religion. I was reminded of the declaration of principles which the Republican Party adopted at the National Convention. It states that the Republicans believe in a maximum voluntary cooperation between citizens and a minimum dependence upon law, never however declining courageous recourse to law if necessary.

Then as events developed, when I found that this bill was for 7 months' duration only, and as I listened to the gentleman from Ohio a short while ago say that he doubted if any control bills were adopted by this Congress, voluntary or mandatory, I came to the conclusion that after all we must not hope for conversion on the part of our good friends, the Democrats.

As evidence of the fact that we have heard a great deal of conversation and no action on controls I want to point out that the special session last fall was called by the President, at the Democratic National Convention because of the emergency which existed with reference to inflation. At the special session over 100 speeches were made, and articles included, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on price control and inflation.

The Congress has now been in session longer than the special session—not one speech about price control or rationing has been made on the floor of this House or on the floor of the other body. Not one bill has been introduced in this House asking for price control. I ask you gentlemen what has become of the issue of inflation and price control? Was it merely political expediency?

As a matter of fact, I have been waiting expectantly for the charming gentlewoman from California to bring forth her market basket and talk about it, but she has not discussed nor introduced measures concerning price control. So I think we will hear discussion about it but nothing else. This bill is evidence of that fact.

I introduced a similar measure to the bill now under consideration. I introduced it before the Democratic side of the House introduced a bill. I believed it to be a Republican measure and I believed it to be a program upon which we could go to the country and say, "Here is a plan for voluntary cooperation to assist producers to do the job."

I do not believe that this measure will do the job. Why? It cannot do it because of the termination date. Seven months will not give sufficient time for the producers of these scarce materials to plan and to know what is ahead for them. Therefore, it becomes necessary, in my judgment, to allow additional time in which to continue the voluntary agreements.

In my bill I provided for 2 years so business then might be able to plan their operations for the future.

Voluntary cooperation, therefore, as I see it, is a Republican measure, upon which the Republicans stood in the Eightieth Congress.

Mandatory provisions may be proposed, but in my judgment will not be supported by the Democratic side of the House. Mandatory allocations would further throw industry into greater turmoil, not knowing how to plan in advance, and causing a freezing of production to such an extent that the very aims and objects which we hope to gain will be defeated.

I will vote for this bill because of the voluntary provision. Even with the defect I pointed out, it is better than the incentive-stifling red tape proposed by the Democrats.

In closing I want to say this one thing: We might suggest to the Democratic side of the aisle that they test further the baptismal water; that it is not quite as cold as they think. It is only invigorating. While they have just touched it with this bill they are unwilling to be immersed. We suggest that you Democrats continue along the path of maximum cooperation between individuals and a minimum of reliance upon law, instead of, as you have in the past, a maximum reliance on the law and a minimum cooperation among individuals.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE] has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE].

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, as you know, there are no printed hearings on the pending bill available to the Members at this time. Therefore I should like to call attention to two or three points recorded in my personal copy of the typewritten hearings.

I interrogated Secretary of Commerce Sawyer on these points, and I call your particular attention to the replies that were given. I refreshed his memory on the fact that Members were called back in extraordinary session in the late fall of 1947 to consider controls, not of a voluntary sort but controls by force. At that time the then Secretary of Commerce spoke especially about steel, which my distinguished and amiable chairman referred to in his speech a moment ago. Secretary Harriman said at that time that the most difficult problem he had to struggle with was the gray market in steel. Therefore, I interrogated Mr. Sawyer on how the voluntary program which we set up in late 1947 has worked and is working now with reference to the gray market.

I asked him: "What is the situation insofar as the gray market is concerned at the present time?"

Secretary SAWYER. It exists but is disappearing; it is much less.

And he, speaking as a good American citizen, agreed that the only complete answer to a gray market or a black market is adequate production of the commodity involved.

That is the contention the Republican Party has always made.

Then I inquired further about steel production. I wanted to know if our production as of the present time would be sufficient to meet our needs, if we shipped nothing abroad: My question was: "If none at all were shipped abroad would our domestic needs be met?"

Secretary Sawyer replied:

All I can do is to give you mathematics. Our estimate is, as I said a while ago, that production will be 68,000,000 tons. The steel people say tentatively that they think production will be 70,000,000 tons. Our estimate of consumption or demand is 70,000,000 tons. If our estimate of demand and their estimate of production are correct and there is no shipment abroad, the answer to your question is, "Yes."

That reply raises the question: What shall we do about shipments abroad? Historically, the heart of the heavy capital goods industry in Europe has been Germany. I wanted to know whether the dismantling of plants had been stopped and whether progress had been made in steel production there.

Secretary Sawyer said:

Germany produced before the war, I think, 14,000,000 tons of steel a year. Their production is now back to 7,000,000 tons.

Then I wanted to know whether the production of steel is increasing, standing still, or declining, in Germany. Secretary Sawyer replied:

It has been increasing.

Now, then, should the Government of the United States enter into the business of making steel as proposed in the President's message last month at a time when the estimates of the Department of Commerce and the estimates of the steel-producing people show that our needs can be met, if we send nothing abroad? I am not arguing that we should not send any abroad, but steel production abroad is rising; and as my very able colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] said a moment ago, we may soon be worrying about what to do with surplus steel instead of worrying about shortages.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am very happy at this hour to be able to report that the voluntary program the Eightieth Congress set up in the fall of 1947 has worked so well—so well, in fact—that the majority party is now ready to embrace it without a single negative vote. It is further evidence that the American people can be led very successfully, but they cannot be driven.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I was a Member of the Eightieth Congress and I remember distinctly when that Congress had under consideration the very legislation which the present resolution proposes to extend for a period of 7 months. The Republicans were in the majority at that time as you gentlemen are in the majority now.

In order to be a guide for our conduct in this session of Congress, it might be well to just go back to that day December 19, 1947, when this very legislation was before the House for consideration. It was proposed by the Republican membership of the House Banking and Currency Committee. It was most violently opposed by the minority, led by the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky who now chairmans that committee.

Listen to what the gentleman said. From the RECORD of December 19, 1947, I am quoting the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky with respect to the legislation that was then before the House, and which is the identical legislation before the House today:

Mark Twain said, "The weather is always discussed at length, but nothing is ever done about it." That is the attitude in which this Congress finds itself now. The discussion of this bill is mere conversation. It will have no effect. The die is cast.

The same gentleman is here today asking us to vote an extension of that very bill for a period of 7 months. He was ably supported in that attitude by some other Democratic Members. I remember especially the statement made by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] which appears on page 11733 of that same day's RECORD. This is what he said after a long discussion of the bill:

Mr. Chairman, this bill—Senate Joint Resolution 167—is a fraud and a hoax on the American people. It will no more stop the tides of inflation than Canute could have stopped the waves of the sea.

I wonder what the gentleman from Montana will say with respect to this legislation before the House today that he condemned in such violent language in the Eightieth Congress.

A gentleman who carried the laboring oar in that debate was my very distinguished friend from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. Listen to what the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] said about the legislation then pending and which you are now asked to extend for a period of 7 months without crossing a "t" or dotting an "i":

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, aside from the label on this bill, which for some strange reason is called an anti-inflation bill there is very little good in the bill. I agree with my colleagues who have said it will have absolutely no effect on the present skyrocketing cost of living. It is sold to the country on that basis; it is completely a misnomer.

This bill is a straw man.

Therefore, you are not putting anything genuinely effective in the bill that we could not do here in 5 minutes when the House is in regular session.

You are sending Caspar Milquetoast out to combat the giant of inflation. You might as well know that the bill was doomed to failure in controlling inflation so far as the public is concerned before it was ever brought out.

And so I could go through the record of debates from what gentlemen on the

minority side, now the majority, thus described the bill that was presented to the Eightieth Congress, the identical bill which you are now asked to extend for a period of 7 months.

Is it not a very sad commentary upon the thinking of our people that in debates here on the floor of Congress we become so politically inspired in our thinking that we are sometimes unable to see the truth when it stands right up in front of us. If this bill was so bad on December 19, 1947, I wonder what has happened in the meantime to make it so good that the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee comes in and asks for a unanimous vote on both sides in support of this legislation? Is it not a fact, my friends, that when you were damning that legislation presented by the Eightieth Congress you were simply building a foundation to which you could make reference in the oncoming campaign, and thus mislead the American people as to at least one thing that the Eightieth Congress did in its efforts to stop inflation? Now, if the fires of inflation are still burning as vigorously as was described by you gentlemen when that bill was under consideration in the Eightieth Congress, what are you doing about it? You have been here for a month. You brought nothing in here but to ask for the extension of the bill you so vigorously denounced when the Republican Eightieth Congress brought it to your attention.

Oh, it is a little different story today than it was when you were out in the hustings arguing and speaking and making political speeches telling the American people what you are going to do to stop the rise of prices. Now those prices are coming down just as we told you they would at that time when this legislation was under consideration. You now find that the things you then advocated are no longer necessary. You now find that the things you talked about in the campaign have not come to pass. The chickens are coming home to roost. Thank God they are resting on your doorstep today.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. The thought just suggested itself to me—I am a freshman Congressman—that perhaps because we do have a Democratic majority in both Houses that big, bad business has decided to be good and has begun to cut the prices down and that we have a sufficient club over their heads; that if they do not be good we can enact probably the very necessary legislation which will make bad business good.

Mr. KEEFE. Well, the club that you are raising over their heads is the old man Milquetoast that was so beautifully described by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. That is not very much of a club to hold over anybody's head, and you are not kidding anybody, and you are not ultimately going to kid the American people, and that sort of an argument will not have very much of an appeal, in my humble judgment, even in the minds of business or in the minds of the American people. They will get smart after awhile when they read the record of these proceedings and see that you are now again advocating the very remedy that the Republican Eightieth Congress wrote on the statute books over your violent protests.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to get into a political discussion on this issue.

I am for the resolution. I think it should be passed. I do not think that it has accomplished in every way all that was hoped for when the bill was passed. Certainly it has not accomplished all that its most ardent sponsors had hoped for. I rise at this time simply to say to the Committee on Banking and Currency that I hope in the 7 months ahead during which this act will be in operation, that this committee will give particular attention to the effect of this plan with reference to the small-business operator who desires and needs steel for his operations. I have had a great many complaints from small operators. I have not had the opportunity to investigate whether all these complaints are justified. I know in one case in my own State in which a manufacturer of milk cans, a very important item to the agricultural economy of that area, has been unable to get steel for the manufacture of his product. I know of several other instances that have come to my attention, and I have investigated sufficiently to be convinced, in a way, that this program, perhaps, has been too much dominated by the large operators.

I am aware of the fact that perhaps any voluntary plan eventually will run into that sort of difficulty but I do hope the committee will give some attention, as a follow-up to the passage of this bill today, to the effect that it may have on the small operator who has been unable in many instances to get a proper allocation of steel.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I wonder if the gentleman could tell us just how soon the Committee on Banking and Currency is going to bring out a new OPA bill.

Mr. PRIEST. I will have to refer my distinguished friend to the members of the committee.

Mr. HALLECK. There were a lot of promises along that line made during the campaign, and recent messages have indicated quite a bit of favorable opinion, apparently, on the gentleman's side of the aisle for a revival of OPA. I know a lot of small-business men who would look upon that as the last straw. I hope the committee takes that into consideration, too.

Mr. PRIEST. I am sure this great committee will take that into consideration and will dispose of it in a way that will be in the public interest. I feel that we can place full confidence in the committee in that respect.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Did it not take the other side a very long time last year to get out even this "milquetoast" proposition?

Mr. PRIEST. I recall it was very near Christmas.

Another situation developed very recently in my own State in connection with an agreement entered into under the terms of this act for steel allocation that not only affects a vital industry in that State, but also affects the national security, because it is related to some developments at Oak Ridge, Tenn. Up to this time the allocation under the voluntary-agreement plan has not been carried out in this case. I do not care to go into details on the matter, because it is purely a local matter, but I simply take this time to urge the committee to look into this situation as we go into the months ahead to see if it might be possible for a little more attention to be given to the needs of small operators who need steel, and who are not worried at all about what we might do with the surplus, as was suggested by the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin.

They are worried about getting some plan that would give them steel to keep their plants operating today so that they can carry on their legitimate business, meet their pay rolls, and prosper to some degree.

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman will yield further, I wonder if the gentleman could enlighten us as to the present thinking of the committee, as to whether or not we need ceilings on prices more than we need floors under prices.

Mr. PRIEST. The gentleman knows, of course, that I am not a member of this great committee, and I would not presume to attempt to enlighten anybody about the thinking of this committee. I am sure members of that committee are doing some thinking.

Mr. Chairman, all of us, I am sure, desire voluntary allocations in preference to compulsory controls, so long as the public interest is protected and no segment of our economy is unduly burdened. I do not question the good faith generally of the industry in carrying out the voluntary allocations program. But I repeat that the Congress must be diligent and vigilant in guarding against domination of such a program by the larger operators at the expense of small business.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (b) of section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress (61 Stat. 945), is hereby amended by striking out "March 1, 1949" and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1949."

Subsection (f) of said section 2 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(f) This section shall expire on September 30, 1949, and any requests made and voluntary plans adopted under this section shall have no force or effect thereafter."

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments?

There being no amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1660) to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans, pursuant to House Resolution 73, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 547) to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2, of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans, and that the Senate bill be substituted for the House bill just passed.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE]?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I assume the Senate bill is identical to the House bill?

Mr. SPENCE. It is identical.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (b) of section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress (61 Stat. 945), is hereby amended by striking out "March 1, 1949" and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1949."

Subsection (f) of said section 2 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(f) This section shall expire on September 30, 1949, and any requests made and voluntary plans adopted under this section shall have no force or effect thereafter."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The proceedings by which the bill, H. R. 1660, was passed were vacated and that bill was laid on the table.

COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 74 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 128) to provide that acreage planted to cotton in 1949 shall not be used in computing cotton acreage allotments for any subsequent year. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 74 makes in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 128 which was reported out of the Committee on Agriculture. In brief, it would make it possible in the allocation of cotton acreage in 1950, if the Secretary of Agriculture saw fit, to exercise his authority to require cotton quotas so that whatever cotton was planted in 1949 would not be considered in the historical background upon which quotas are based.

In other words, the purpose of this bill is simply to say that if it becomes necessary to impose quotas in the future, as the Secretary of Agriculture has the power to do, that the cotton planted and produced in 1949 will not be considered in that allocation. The question of the merits of the allocation program is not involved. The purpose of this bill is to discourage, as I understand it, the production of cotton in 1949. I am informed by those who have the statistics at hand that there will be an approximate carry-over of 6,000,000 bales of cotton this year. Those who make a study of this problem and whose responsibility it is are apprehensive that if this bill is not enacted into law there will be a great rush on the part of the cotton farmers throughout this country to plant cotton this year in order to secure their proper quota when and if quotas are invoked by the Secretary of Agriculture.

So it merely has as its purpose a deterrent to increased production of cotton in 1949.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McSWEENEY. When is cotton planted? I am sorry to say I do not know.

Mr. COLMER. Cotton planting, of course, varies in the various sections of the country. Ordinarily, in a few weeks in the South the farmers will begin to prepare to plant their cotton.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the great authority on cotton, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. From the lower Rio Grande, reports are that they are planting now.

Mr. COLMER. Of course, the gentleman is very familiar with the facts. Cotton is produced on the west coast also, in California, and down in the Rio Grande, as was pointed out by the gentleman, and they are now beginning to plant there.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Would this be a deterrent to increased planting if it is passed immediately?

Mr. COLMER. That is the purpose of the legislation, as I understand it. In other words, it is to prevent increased production of cotton and an additional carry-over, with the possible resultant necessity for the Government, under the support-price program, to purchase this additional cotton.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] is necessarily detained and has asked me to handle the time on this side in his absence, there being no other member of the Rules Committee present at the moment. I may say there are no requests for time on this side, and if the gentleman is prepared to move the previous question, we can proceed with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE], member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I speak at this time with the hope that I may clarify in my own mind, and in the minds of many of my colleagues, the issue or issues involved in passage of H. R. 128. This measure had the unanimous consent of the Committee on Agriculture after hearings and consideration. That alone, of course, is persuasive of favorable consideration.

Its introduction by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] resulted in much confusion, uneasiness, and uncertainty upon the part of many farmers throughout the Nation. They were not able to anticipate its effect upon them and their plans for the future. I can well understand this confusion and uncertainty. The most casual investigation will convince anyone that few people of the United States, including the trained experts of the Department of Agriculture and the able and qualified members of the Committee on Agriculture, are able to predict and anticipate with any degree of certainty, the effect this legislation will have upon the cotton industry.

In order to cast an intelligent vote upon it, and to be able to explain its effect to the farmers of my district, I have spent these past several days in a sincere effort to analyze it. One thing, and one thing only, can be said with any degree of certainty about this measure; that acreage planted to cotton in 1949 will not be considered in the future for marketing and quota provisions in the event of the invocation of restrictions by the Secretary of Agriculture. Outside of that, no one can say what this legislation means.

I am sure that all of you will agree that the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and subsequent amendments, and particularly the marketing quota provisions of such act, are difficult for the average one of us to understand.

The passage of H. R. 128 and its subsequent interpretation, based upon the present Agricultural Adjustment Act, will, unquestionably, work hardship upon many famers in south and west Texas, in California and New Mexico and Arizona.

During the past years and presently, thousands of acres of land that have heretofore not been subject to cultivation have been cleared, broken, and put into farm lands. It is my judgment that such farms and farmers by this act will be placed out of competition with farmers and farms which grew cotton prior to and since 1942. However, to add confusion to an already confused situation, I am reliably informed that this measure, H. R. 128, cannot be interpreted in relation to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and amendments, for the reason that this basic act will be changed before 1950, and that a new system for acreage allotment and marketing and quota provisions will be enacted.

I cannot question the necessity for a national plan for the influencing of, if not the control of production and marketing of a product such as cotton, which so vitally affects our entire economy. The large surpluses now on hand and those which may reasonably be anticipated as a result of the 1949 harvest, are dangerously large and will inevitably affect the future price of cotton. The costs of producing cotton per acre have increased out of proportion to its basic price and a material drop in the basic price of cotton would be a great shock to the industry and to our economy. There must be, of course, some intelligent manner of keeping a reasonable balance of production and use. None of us would care to go back to the memorable days when the price of cotton put many of us on starvation incomes. I can personally remember the days when cotton sack was difficult to sell for 5 or 6 cents a yard and farmers had difficulty in buying overalls at 98 cents a pair.

Nevertheless, I would caution against hasty consideration of any legislation so vitally affecting so many of our people. Particularly would I be hesitant to enact any legislation which would discourage young farmers and new farmers from entering into the great field of agriculture. The future, not only of our own country, but that of the world, may well depend upon a vital, progressive, and prosperous agricultural economy in America. Millions of acres of new land must be considered in any long-range agricultural program. It would not be wise, in my judgment, to enact legislation which would freeze out new farmers for the protection of the old, and which would make it impossible for young farmers to compete with those who have been in business longer. Nor would it be wise, in my judgment, to penalize progress.

During the past 18 or 20 years, cotton has materially declined in the economy of Texas. This resulted from many factors. From 1930 to 1940 in Texas, harvested acreage of cotton dropped to approximately 50 percent, from approximately 17,000,000 acres to 8,500,000 acres. In 1946 we harvested approximately 6,000,000 acres of cotton. It is interesting to note, however, that the value of the cotton crop harvested on the 6,000,000 acres in 1946 was considerably higher, by $100,000,000, than that crop harvested off of 16,000,000 acres in 1930. The production of cotton in Texas has been discouraged. The cost became high, the labor scarce, and it was thought in the interest of our economy, State and national, to divert our land to other uses. During the war, and subsequently, we have attempted to produce on our farms a great diversity of crops more vital and necessary to the Nation generally than cotton. We do not anticipate a return to the kingship of cotton, for it would not be good business. We do not feel, however, that we should be placed out of competition by legislation.

There were many farms in south Texas, comprising thousands of acres, that produced cotton prior to the war but which have been better utilized for other crops. Many of them have valuable equipment, suitable for cotton farming. The passage of this act will say to them, "You will be relegated to not more than 2 percent of the State acreage allotment in the event restrictions are put into effect by the Secretary of Agriculture in 1950 under provisions of the present Agriculture Adjustment Act." It will say to the farmers who have put in new land, subsequent to the war, and many of them are veterans, "If you have not planted cotton, you cannot compete with those who have."

The committee amendment has some saving grace. The amendment which reads, "Provided, That any farm on which cotton was not planted in 1947 or 1948—or regarded as planted in 1947 under Public Law 12, Seventy-ninth Congress, because of the production of war crops or of serving in the armed forces of the United States—shall be regarded as having a 1948 planted acreage equal to the 1942 farm acreage allotment" will make it possible for farms which were alloted cotton acreage in 1942 to be considered old growers if they have grown war crops.

At this point I wish to quote the regulations promulgated in March 1945, by the Department of Agriculture pursuant to Public Law 12:

War crop determination for the protection of cotton allotments: That in establishing cotton-acreage allotments under title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, or under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, for any farm for which a cotton-acreage allotment was established for the 1942 crop, if the total acreage of war crops grown on the farm during 1945 or any subsequent year during the present emergency is in excess of the total acreage of war crops grown on the farm in 1941, the cotton production history for the farm for any such year will not be considered as representative of the normal history of the farm and the farm will be considered as one on which cotton was planted in such year. For the purpose of this determination, the following are designated as war crops: Soybeans for beans, peanuts picked and threshed, flax for seed, Irish potatoes, sweetpotatoes, dry edible beans, grain sorghums, sugar beets, sugarcane, rice, tomatoes for processing, peas for processing, snap beans for processing, sweet corn for processing, oats, barley, sweet sorghums, Sudan grass, biennial and perennial legumes, and mixtures containing biennial and perennial legumes.

In connection with this the Department of Agriculture tells me that it will be a man-sized job to determine war crops in relation to cotton and acreage allotment under provisions of the old act, and this amendment we are considering today, for they have little or no history of the war crops. They had not anticipated the problem of considering war crops in cotton acreage allotment under restrictions.

I call these matters to your attention that you may know how difficult it is for you to make an intelligent decision on this present measure. I am sure the Committee on Agriculture had in mind that the immediate passage of H. R. 128, as amended, would discourage the planting of cotton in 1949 and would, therefore, lower the surplus that is accumulating. Notwithstanding the great respect I have for their judgment, I question this conclusion. Acreage will be planted in cotton in 1949, in my judgment, in the relation to the prospects for a profit. The price of cotton will, in large measure, control the amount of acreage planted. Because of the lack of storage for grain last year, many farmers became disgusted with the program of loans and support prices on grain, which were not available without adequate storage, and are turning again to cotton.

Planting is beginning in south Texas. The Department of Agriculture has not announced a support price program for grain. No adequate provisions have been made for storage. We do not know what to anticipate. Many are returning to the basic crop of cotton.

This legislation will not discourage their planting cotton. It will penalize them if they had no farm history as of 1942, or have not subsequently planted cotton.

I have no more intelligent solution to the problem, and consequently I cannot ask you to follow my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN] and me in voting against the passage of the bill, but I did feel that I should, as intelligibly as I could, call your attention to the difficulty of reaching an intelligent decision upon this important measure.

It is quite possible that a completely new basic law will erase much of the hardship, or, perhaps I should say, much of the apparent restriction that this measure will place upon growing and expanding communities and upon farms and farmers who have diverted their acreage to crops more needed than cotton.

I shall not oppose the rule, but I do find it necessary to vote against the passage of the measure because of the uncertainty of its effect and because of its seeming discrimination against a large part of south Texas.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 128 to provide that acreage planted to cotton in 1949 shall not be

used in computing cotton acreage allotments for any subsequent year.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 128, with Mr. MONRONEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, the issue involved in this bill is one that requires hasty action, which, in part, accounts for your Committee on Agriculture, reporting the same as its first bill in this Congress. It is supported by a unanimous vote of the Committee. I think it well to bring to your attention certain facts which make it imperative that the bill pass.

During 1948 there were 23,300,000 acres of land in the United States planted to cotton. This acreage produced one of the largest crops in history. The crop was so large that by August 1 this year it is estimated that the carry-over will approach 6,000,000 bales. You might say that we will have a 6,000,000-bale surplus. Controls and quotas were barely averted for 1949. It is the opinion of almost every one connected with the cotton industry that quotas will be invoked next year.

If quotas are invoked next year the allotment of acreage will, under the present law, be based upon the acreage which the individual cotton farmers put to cotton during the preceding years, that is, 1947, 1948, and 1949. It is only natural that every farmer desires to have the largest allotment possible. In order to secure the largest allotment possible he would be inclined to plant cotton this year, as the saying goes, "up to the doorsteps." If that should happen, then the 1949 crop would undoubtedly add several million bales to the present surplus, and that would leave cotton under a burden similar to that which existed before the war. The effect of overplanting this year would be disastrous.

So, Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this bill is simply to discourage overplanting in 1949. Even though the bill becomes law, it is the opinion of the cotton experts around the country that cotton acreage this year will show some increase over 1948. This of itself could and might add to the surplus. If the bill should not become law the acreage will be further increased. So, it is our responsibility to discourage, as much as possible, overplanting in 1949, and this bill will do just that.

We realize that the bill on its face appears to work a hardship against the man in the new brushland areas of my distinguished colleague from Texas, Mr. LYLE. His problem is with regard to land upon which a single stalk of cotton has never been planted. It is new land. But already we have too much cotton land. That is the very thing we have tried so hard to get away from throughout the last 15 years. More and more cotton land does not solve cotton's problem of surplus production. It only aggravates the situation. On the other hand, the present law provides that 2 percent must be set aside for allotments to new land. I am sure that this or a similar provision will be retained in the new quota law, if one is written. Furthermore, under any program which might be hereafter adopted the great State of Texas will receive approximately 7,500,000 acres of cotton land, which is a third or more than will be allotted to all remaining cotton States. Based on a 7,500,000-acre allotment, 150,000 acres will be set aside in Texas for new land. I sincerely believe this will care for the new-land problem out there. I have a very high regard for my distinguished and able colleague from Texas. So do the other members of my committee. None of us would want to do him or his constituents the slightest injustice. We respect his opinions and views and I personally wish to give assurance that I will work with him on this problem, which I know is an important one to him.

Cotton faces a very sick economy. We are trying to do something about the situation before it is too late. We are compelled to view the situation in the light of what is best for all cotton growers, not just a few but all of them—whether they be old, new or would-be growers. Cotton's present position approaches that of 1937 when almost every grower in the belt planted cotton "up to his doorsteps" and produced a surplus which would never have been disposed of had the war not come on. We learned our lesson in 1937. At least, I thought we did. With the unexpected and most undesirable help of a war, cotton's economy has improved. But God forbid that we should ever again be forced to endure similar experiences.

This bill has the support of the Department of Agriculture, the American Farm Bureau, the National Grange, the Farmers Union, the cotton industry in general and cotton farmers in general. It is further supported by a unanimous vote of the Agriculture Committee. It is in the interest of the cotton farmer in general. If it were not, certainly someone on our committee would have dissented.

The cotton farmer is again at the cross roads. It will not profit him anything to repeat what happened in 1937. He can very easily produce another very large crop in 1949 but what will it profit him without a price? You can help him by passing this bill. By the bill, we simply ask you to eliminate 1949 acreage planted to cotton in determining allotments in future years should quotas be invoked. By so doing you will remove the incentive and the desire which now prevail to overplant in 1949 in order to have a larger historical base for determining future acreage allotments. The bill is short, simple, and treats all growers alike. You will be doing them a favor by voting "aye."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, this bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Agriculture. I think it is a bill which serves a useful purpose at this time. It is thought, and I think with good reason, that because of the possibility of cotton quotas and acreage allotments within another year or two, a great many farmers might be tempted to expand their acreage this year beyond what they otherwise would contemplate planting. It is a very natural thing to do. The purpose, of course, would be to insure that they have a base for future allotments and quotas which would be in line with that secured by their neighbors. The committee felt that in view of these considerations and the fact that it is not desirable to increase cotton acreage this year, that the bill should be passed. I do not see a need for any prolonged discussion of it, because it is a rather simple bill, easily explained, and easily understood. I shall, therefore, not take any further time.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS].

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I trust that this bill will be enacted into law. In the year 1948, cotton planting amounted to 23,000,000 acres of land. The testimony before our committee has been to the effect that there would be some 12 to 15 percent or more increase in planted acreage to cotton in the crop year 1949. That being the case, there would be an estimated 15,100,000 bales of cotton produced in 1949.

If this bill is enacted into law, it is believed by many that a large number of farmers who anticipate planting in 1949 would not do so because they would feel that it would not in any way give them a high base for their 1950 crop year and for the years ahead. To say the least, cotton farmers throughout the belt would probably reduce their cotton acreage in 1949 if this legislation is enacted.

In 1937 the cotton farmer was out loose, free to plant as much as he saw fit to plant in acreage to cotton. As a result of that, there were produced in America in that year 19,000,000 bales of cotton. It took the cotton farmer almost 10 years and a world war to get rid of the surplus that accumulated as a result of such excessive planting.

This is a great psychological move, but speed is essential because of the fact that, as has been stated here in debate on the rule, they have already started planting cotton this year in the Rio Grande Valley. I hope and trust the bill will pass without a single vote against it.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TACKETT. Should it become necessary to place a quota on cotton in 1950, what years would be used upon which to base the quota?

Mr. GATHINGS. That matter is now under most serious consideration. The Subcommittee on Cotton of the Committee on Agriculture is holding hearings at this time. It will be another few days before those hearings will be concluded. Then the committee will go into executive session and consider the years that will be placed in the base period for the 1950 crop year and the years ahead of 1950.

Mr. TACKETT. Is there a law in existence at this time which would govern such controls, should it become necessary to have controls? That is, would the 3 years prior to 1950, excluding 1949, be considered under the present law?

Mr. GATHINGS. It is going to be necessary to revamp that law, because under the law now on the statute books, the 1938 Triple A Act and the amendments thereto, the farmers could not plant less than 27,000,000 acres to cotton. If that were to happen, of course, the surplus would just be insurmountable. We would not know now just exactly how to answer the gentleman's question until the committee has concluded the hearings and has gone into executive session to determine the years that should be used.

Mr. TACKETT. Is it possible that the larger cotton farmers within the States of Arkansas, Texas, Louisiana, and the other States that raise a considerable amount of cotton, could have foreseen the possibility of the enactment of this bill so as to give them a break under the controls by virtue of knowing that 1948 cotton-crop acreage would be used as a basis?

Mr. GATHINGS. I do not believe the gentleman should be disturbed. Nineteen hundred and forty-eight is a very good year to consider, because then it was wide open. The farmer could do what he wanted to do. He could plant or he could not plant. The man who is already established in the cotton business, who has his implements, his labor for cotton-production purposes, his seed, and is ready to go, of course, should be continued in the business of planting cotton.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I merely wanted to state that the pending proposal to exclude the 1949 cotton acreage from future calculations comes to the House with the recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture, the recommendation of the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, and the National Farmers' Union. It was unanimously reported out by the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 128, as now presented to the House, has asked that the 1949 cotton crop not be used in computing cotton acreage allotments for any subsequent year. It is realized that one of the reasons for the initiation of this bill is that the growers will not feel obliged to plant all their land in cotton this year in order to assure themselves of a good cotton allotment on their land in future years, as the allotment would be based perhaps on several years' average. I think the purpose of the bill is a most commendable one, but I believe that the manner in which it tries to achieve its objective can result in serious inequities unless, in the final agricultural bill which is presented to Congress, allowances are made to provide fair allotments to these men who have not planted cotton before. If this bill becomes the law without this session of Congress and the final agricultural bill making allowances for these new cotton farmers, then these men who have recently cleared and put into use for production lands of Texas would be seriously penalized in future years. It is difficult to evaluate the full significance of this bill at this time without knowing on what basis future quotas will be based. I have been told by members of the Agriculture Committee that efforts will be made to see that these new cotton farms receive equitable allotments, and if such is done, then the present bill would be beneficial in discouraging a large crop this year. We already have almost a 6,000,000,000-bale surplus carry-over from last year.

At the encouragement and recommendation of the United States Government many returning war veterans of south Texas have taken lands of very low economic value and at a high cost have cleared the brush and put them into cultivation to grow cotton and feed crops. On return from the service, it took some time for these young men to become adjusted, to establish themselves, and then, after they had purchased this land, it was a long and arduous process clearing off mesquite and ebony trees to put it into shape where it was suitable for cotton growing. Many of them have just accomplished this in the past year, and 1949 will be the first cotton crop they have planted on this land. Their improvement of this land has taken property that was on the tax rolls at values of $2 and $3 and increased their valuations tremendously, resulting in immense benefit to the counties and the State of Texas. Many of these young men have incurred heavy debts and mortgages so they were able to purchase this land. Much of this land has been cleared by their own labor in order that they might provide themselves with an agricultural livelihood and help produce materials and food for a hungry world. Thousands of tenants and small farmers have also made this move, now to see this dry land with its limited uses further restricted by law which would seriously curtail any cotton quota that they might obtain, say in the year 1950.

Probably an attempt will be made to, in part, take care of these new farms by setting aside for example a 2 percent of the Nation's quota for such new lands, and this 2 percent to be allocated by the county bureaus, but because of the large number of acres that have been cleared in south Texas, west Texas, and many of the Western States, I believe that this 2 percent will be inadequate.

It is my hope that this percentage will be increased to 3 or 4 percent, which would take relatively little away from the quotas of the old cotton growers but would greatly increase the quotas for new cotton farmers. If the Agriculture Committee is determined to keep this at a figure of 2 percent, then I think that this percentage, and its allocation, should be administered from Washington, and that those States in the Southeast who do not use their full part of the 2 percent, having insufficient new lands, that the balance of their 2 percent will be applied to States such as Texas and other Western States where they will probably have more than 2 percent set aside for new lands. Unless this is done, new farms could easily obtain quotas far below the county average.

As further assistance in making a fair distribution of the cotton quota, I believe a 10 percent of the State quota should be set aside in each State to be administered by a State agency as a bank to be given to those counties which have increased their production and taking it from those counties which have decreased their production, thereby giving consideration to trends in cotton planting. Many counties of central and east Texas have decreased their cotton planting and would perhaps receive higher quotas than the land that they were actually planting to cotton and this quota could be distributed to counties such as we have in the fifteenth district who have materially increased their planting to cotton.

I believe consideration should be given to States which find that they can more efficiently and economically produce cotton and who have been increasing their acreage. Otherwise, you will find that anything similar to our old system of quotas will perpetuate inefficient and uneconomical growth of cotton in some States in the Union at the expense of those areas which can produce it at less cost and more efficiently. The objective of the Government should be to encourage these people who cannot efficiently and economically produce cotton to gradually turn to other crops to which they are more adapted.

It is not my purpose to see these people economically dislocated and their quotas drastically slashed, but I definitely believe that the eventual net decrease in cotton quotas, as set by the Government to maintain an economical price support, should be the same for all areas, regardless of whether they are old or new cotton-producing areas.

If 1949 is not allowed in future cotton quotas and the cotton-quota law, as yet to be drafted, does not provide a means of giving them quotas substantially up to the county average, it will bankrupt a number of men, including many World War II veterans who are planting new lands to cotton this year for the first time, since they would have their cotton allotment appreciably decreased in 1950. Much of this new land cannot be profitably farmed unless a large percentage of it is planted to cotton. Passage of the bill in its present form could result in favoritism for the benefit of cotton-growing States at the expense of those veterans who were fighting overseas and have only recently returned to enter farming.

I make this statement as a word of caution and a request that if the bill is adopted in its present form that then, certainly, some means should be set up along the lines I have suggested to protect those States and veterans who have materially increased their cotton acreage.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, there are no further requests for time.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of title III of the Agriculture Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, or of any other law, State, county, and farm acreage allotments for cotton for any year after 1949 shall be computed without regard to acreage planted to cotton in 1949.

With the following committee amendment:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, or of any other law, State, county, and farm acreage allotments and yields for cotton for any year after 1949 shall be computed without regard to yields or to the acreage planted to cotton in 1949: *Provided*, That any farm on which cotton was not planted in 1947 or 1948 (or regarded as planted in 1947 under Public Law 12, 79th Cong., because of the production of war crops or of serving in the armed forces of the United States) shall be regarded as having a 1948 planted acreage equal to the 1942 farm acreage allotment.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MONRONEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 128) to provide that acreage planted to cotton in 1949 shall not be used in computing cotton-acreage allotments for any subsequent year, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 22 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of 10 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a study and investigation of the problems of small business, existing, arising, or that may arise, with particular reference to (1) whether the potentialities of small business are being adequately developed and, if not, what factors have hindered and are hindering the normal operation of established small business and/or its development and enterprise; (2) whether agencies, departments of the Government or Government owned or controlled corporations are properly, adequately, or equitably serving the needs of small business; (3) whether small business is being treated fairly and the public welfare properly and justly served through the allotments of valuable materials in which there are shortages, in the granting of priorities or preferences in the use, sales, or purchase of said materials; and (4) the need for a sound program for the solution of the postwar problems of small business.

The committee may from time to time submit to the House such preliminary reports as it deems advisable; and prior to the close of the present Congress shall submit to the House its final report on the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session may be filed with the Clerk of the House.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to borrow from Government departments and agencies such special assistants, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any properly designated chairman of a subcommittee thereof, or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 2, strike out "10" and insert "more."

Page 3, line 6, insert the words "The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] is recognized.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. Speaker, this resolution reestablishes a select committee that has rendered valuable services in the past to the country and to the House. In view of the service rendered and the need for legislation to protect, safeguard, and aid small business, the Speaker and the minority leader entered into an agreement which is in conformity with the amended resolution and provides for a select committee of nine members.

The Small Business Committee has been in existence since 1941 or 1942. During these years they have penetrated many, many matters which tend to protect small business from being completely eliminated and absorbed by the various large industrial organizations. I was pleased with the work which that committee rendered 4 or 5 years ago, which, due to its splendid investigation, resulted in action by the Department of Justice against one of those large chain stores, the Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., which was found guilty of violating the law to the disadvantage of the small-business men by receiving rebates and discounts that were not forthcoming to the small-business men and which inured to the benefit of them. What applies to that concern applies to many of the other chain stores and the mail-order houses. Between those two groups the small-business man is gradually being forced out of existence.

This committee has been endeavoring to the best of its ability to bring about the elimination of the special favors that are granted to and are taken advantage of by these large corporations and industrialists, of course mainly controlled from Wall Street, to the disadvantage of local people and the small-business men. I am therefore in favor of this resolution to create this committee. I am in favor of having it continue the splendid work it started years ago. It should not hesitate for one moment to investigate the biggest and most powerful violators of decency and justice; and I hope it will do so. As you have observed and are aware, this committee threw the light of publicity on the gray market in steel. I do not know why they call it gray because it has been and is the blackest of all black markets that I know of. The steel trust for nearly 2 years, notwithstanding the efforts of the committee and Congress to insure fair distribution of raw materials, allocated steel only to their favored few, to the disadvantage of the small manufacturer, thereby forcing many of them out of business. Not only that, but where a small manufacturer had contracts to fulfill and was obliged to obtain steel, he was held up by the black marketeers controlled by the steel trust to such extent that he was obliged to pay from $250 to $275 a ton for steel that originally sold for only $60 or $75 a ton. I have heard of cases where they were obliged to pay $300 a ton. Outrageous. And what applies to the steel trust and steel companies has been practiced by many other manufacturers. I hope that such practices will be prevented in the future and that this committee, though it has no legislative power, will shortly recommend legislation that will stop these abuses that are destroying the independent and small merchant and businessmen in our Nation.

I am of the opinion that notwithstanding the terrific load of these mail-order houses and the chain stores that control nearly 80 percent of the business, whose profits have been tremendous, and who have accumulated great surpluses in their Wall Street vaults and banks, that this committee will not hesitate to continue to ferret out abuses on the part of these men and corporations; that it will recommend legislation and that the Congress will pass such legislation as will safeguard the interests of the little fellow, the small country merchant. Just look at it. These big houses have hundreds, yes, thousands of stores. They spend millions of dollars a year for advertising in all the magazines and newspapers. A small business having one store or two stores cannot compete with them. We have aided and still are aiding these mail-order houses to the tune of nearly $200,000,000 a year by absorbing the actual cost of mail transportation on their catalogs and the cost of mail transportation of newspapers and magazines in which they advertise.

I have urged legislation which would force these people to pay the fair mailing cost of their catalogs and other

advertising in these magazines. So far I have not succeeded in my efforts, but I shall not give up. I shall continue. I am going to ask the committee, in which I have confidence, to see to it that the contribution on the part of the Government to these corporations, an avaricious group, ceases immediately and that we make them pay for the transportation of their catalogs, magazines, and newspapers, and thereby, to some extent at least, protect the little fellows all over the Nation. This should be done without undue delay because, as it is, every year thousands of these small and independent businessmen are being driven out of business because of these concerns and because the big Steel Trust and other raw-material dealers or producers play favorites and refuse to furnish the little manufacturer raw materials, allocating them to a favored few to the disadvantage of the many little fellows.

Mr. Speaker, I favor the pending resolution. It has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as I am sure the Members of the House who have been here some time know, as an individual, I have long had a great and active interest in the problems of small business. It is an interest that arises very naturally, I think, from the desire of all right-thinking people in the country to preserve and protect the interests of small business—recognizing, as we do, the importance of small business in the economic and industrial structure of our country.

I hope my friends on the other side of the aisle will indulge me when I say that my personal interest and the interest of those on our side of the aisle were expressed in the early fall of 1941 when, under the leadership of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], who is now our minority leader, we created a small-business committee made up of members on our side of the aisle. This committee of 20 was charged with the responsibility of doing what it could to protect and promote the interests of small business. I was very proud to be named chairman of that committee.

I well recall some of the meetings we had in Indianapolis, Ind., Columbus, Ohio, New York State, and various other places, where we heard from the small-business people themselves something of their problems and their recommendations as to what they thought the Government might do. At that time the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], who has himself had a long-time interest in the problems of small business, and being then in the majority party, as he is today, introduced a resolution for the creation of a small-business committee. I joined with him in bringing about the adoption of that resolution. I argued for it on the floor. I was happy at its adoption. I was happy that thereupon the leadership on my side of the aisle appointed me to serve on that committee as the ranking Republican member.

I well recall those very difficult days when we were getting into the war effort and those of us who were familiar with the situation saw that the interests of small business were not being properly protected and promoted, and that for the maximum war effort the capacities of small business needed to be utilized. We saw the effect of the war effort on small business all across the land and we worked diligently and energetically, and I think with wisdom, to help solve those problems. I think the committee did contribute much to their solution.

In my experience on the committee—and I shall not take any issue with any of the things that have been said by my dear friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] who expressed here quite forcibly some contentions that he has about certain types of business organizations in the country—I have never prejudged any of them and I do not intend to prejudge them now. I do not think that it is necessary in order to protect and promote the interest of small business that anyone in a somewhat larger business needs to be destroyed just because he is big. Certainly it is well within the province of the Congress of the United States, charged, as we are, with promoting the best interests of the Nation as a whole, that we work along as best we can in the determination of all these problems and not engage in witch hunts, or in the promotion of any particular prejudice against any activity that any one of us might have, but rather as in a forum in which the small-business men of the country may make their voices heard and their influence felt. And then, of course, we should follow up that action with any sort of legislative action or advice to administrative agencies that might seem to be proper under the circumstances.

So, I am glad to add my voice today to those who urge favorable action on this resolution.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana has correctly stated the history of the Small Business Committee. The Small Business Committee was organized in the House about a week before Pearl Harbor in 1941. Very soon thereafter we realized the plight of small businesses in trying to get war contracts. A very few concerns were getting the contracts. At this time we have a huge national defense program going on. It is necessary that some agency of our Government be charged with the duty and the responsibility of seeing that small concerns are given a fair opportunity to obtain the contracts that they are capable of filling. That will be one of the objects of this committee, as I understand it.

Next, the sources of credit in this country are drying up. Small business cannot borrow money like it could have in the past to go into business initially or to extend or operate after going into business. Something should be done about that. Recommendations should be made and possibly laws should be passed.

Another reason this committee is needed is on account of scarce materials. When materials are scarce, the first concerns that are hurt are the small-business concerns. The big fellows can look after themselves, but the little fellows are the first to be hurt when materials are scarce.

The Small Business Committee during the war served a very good purpose in helping people a distance away from the Nation's Capital. The big people had their lobbyists here and their public-relations people to help them. They did not need any Small Business Committee, but the small-business man far removed from the Nation's Capital needed someone to appeal to to help him. He had that help in this committee during the past 8 years.

I believe the committee that is to be set up under this resolution, if it is adopted by the House of Representatives, and I hope it is, should, as one of the first things it does, try to coordinate the different agencies of our Government having to do with small business, for instance, the Department of Justice, the Federal Trade Commission, the Department of Commerce, the Small Business Division of the National Security Resources Board, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and other agencies. There is a lot of valuable information in these different agencies, and we can get valuable suggestions from them if we will only coordinate our efforts and work together; and I believe this committee should do that.

We should also make sure that the smaller concerns are protected against monopoly and unfair competition. If the laws are not sufficiently strong to safeguard small business in that respect, this committee should recommend the kind of legislation that this Congress should pass in order to give them the protection from monopoly and unfair practices to which they are entitled in a free country like ours under the private-enterprise system. We cannot have private enterprise and monopoly, too, so we must protect small business from monopoly.

Next, we must provide equality of opportunity for small-business men, independent merchants, and give them a fair chance to live and let live, not to get any unfair advantage over any others but to have a fair opportunity or equality of opportunity themselves.

REGULATION W

When I appeared before the Committee on Rules in support of this resolution the members of that committee asked me what I thought about regulation W. I told the committee very frankly that I felt that the matter should be gone into carefully to make sure that small businesses are not discriminated against and that the small man is not discriminated against by regulation W.

I presume you know what regulation W is. Congress passed a law to permit consumer-credit regulation to be administered by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. We did not

contemplate that a harsh and rigid rule would be placed in effect immediately similar to what we had during the war. For that reason, no one seriously objected to that power being given, and I think power should be given that way, but I think it should be used discreetly and not abused.

Very much to my surprise and disappointment, very soon after the Board of Governors was given this power it imposed not exactly the same restrictions concerning automobiles, for instance, that we had during the war, but almost the same restrictions. During the war the purchaser of an automobile was required to pay one-third down in cash and the remainder over a period of 15 months. The regulation the Board of Governors put into effect just last fall, after getting this authority again in peacetime, was one-third down and the remainder over a period of 18 months—very little difference.

In the first place, I do not think much of regulation W. I think it is undemocratic.

I do not think we need it in a country such as ours right now, although I am willing for someone like the President—or some board—to have the power, say in an extreme case, or an emergency. But generally I am not in favor of it. It certainly is undemocratic according to the way I look at things. We have been trying to get the Board of Governors to change that regulation to at least give 24 months' time to the purchaser of an automobile. A young man now with a family wanting to get settled in a home is compelled to go out in the suburbs of a city or out in the country to obtain a home at a fair price. In that case an automobile is a must. After he buys a home, if he is required to pay for that automobile within 18 months, unless he makes $5,000 or more a year, it is just impossible for him to buy that automobile.

I do not feel as if that is exactly right. Furthermore, I think that character is the poor man's capital, and we should encourage that kind of capital. Character, if you please. When people have character, their credit is good and they are going to pay these bills and debts.

Why should some arbitrary rule or restriction prevent that man from purchasing an automobile which he needs in his business and must have in order to make a living for himself and family?

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. LYLE. One of the difficulties confronting small business as it appears to me is this matter of short-term capital. They want to go into business, they want to borrow money for a very short time. Under the tax structure on a short-term loan, they are not permitted to pay back the loan and pay their taxes and accumulate anything for operating expenses. Are you considering problems of that nature?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. LYLE. They need to have made available to them longer term capital perhaps and larger basis over which they could pay their taxes so that they could accumulate some development capital.

Mr. PATMAN. I agree with the gentleman.

May I state that in compliance with the suggestion of the Committee on Rules I believe it was the unanimous opinion of the committee that we should go into regulation W. If I am a member of the committee and if I have any influence with the committee, I think it should be of the first order of business to try to get regulation W changed.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I realize that with the approval of the Speaker of the House, and the approval of the majority and minority leaders, and the powerful Committee on Rules together with a large number here on the floor, that this resolution setting up a Committee on Small Business will undoubtedly pass.

I am a small-business man myself, and I recognize and realize the problems that small-business men have. I realize and recognize the splendid work that has been done by the distinguished gentleman from Texas, and the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, and others who have served on the Small Business Committee for a number of years.

The point I would like to make today is that in passing any special committee resolution, we are deviating from the proper, effective, and efficient organization of the committee structure of the House of Representatives.

I sincerely hope that with the passage of this resolution establishing one special committee that the Committee on Rules then will stand firm against this special committee process which saps, confuses, and confounds the carefully worked out jurisdiction of the regular standing committees of the House.

It is always easy to make a case for almost any kind of special committee, and particularly one where so many thousands of people are extremely interested in setting up a committee to deal with their particular problems. I am frank to admit that little business has many, many of these problems. But if we establish a small-business committee now, and next week we establish a newsprint committee, then the week following that the committee to investigate Federal communications, and so on, we then sap and tear down the jurisdiction of the standing committees of the House.

How much better would the organization of Congress be if we were to establish these matters as specialized jobs for subcommittees of the standing committees of the House. They have the power under the standing committees, not only to investigate and study the specialized problems, but they have the jurisdictional right to bring in corrective legislation and to do something about it. I sincerely hope that with the improved staffing of the standing committees and perhaps lessening the burden on the standing committees, that these specialized problems, such as small business and other requests that will be brought to us in the future, can be handled within the framework of our regular standing committee structure.

I wish to serve notice on the House that I will fight every single item for the establishment of special committees from this one on. I regret very much that the leadership has found it necessary to solve this problem by the establishment of a special committee here today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ELLMILLER). The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH].

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to urge the adoption of this resolution. Having had the privilege for a number of years of serving as a member of the select committees on small business which preceded this one, I think I can assure the membership of the House that those committees, as will this one, if created, have sought, in a completely nonpartisan, constructive way, to direct their attentions and energies and ability to the vast and numerous problems of small business.

I feel that in the adoption of this resolution we have an opportunity to effectuate the planks of both major political parties with respect to small business. It is with trepidation that I take issue with our distinguished Member the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. His monument that will live for generations after him, in the form of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, is assured. However, I cannot subscribe to his thinking that, having set up within that act the organization of the Congress, thereafter there should not be any select or special committees created. I submit that the Congress should organize itself to accommodate the public and its needs. A select committee on small business has been the only forum before which the small-business men, singly and organized, have been able to come and to receive a sympathetic and attentive hearing. This is not a legislative committee. It is, however, a funnel through which the problems facing small business may logically and concisely be presented to the proper standing committees.

Mr. Speaker, small business in this country needs such a committee, and so does this Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, all over the United States small units of industry are folding up because they are running out of orders. The first thing this committee should do, and this committee is certainly in a position to do it, is to see that small-business units in this country which have plants ready to

operate, staffs ready to work, employees—now being thrown off the pay roll—buildings, machinery, and machine tools tuned up, should be given a portion of these Government orders for the production of war goods. That is the first job this committee should do. I am going to support this resolution on the assumption that this committee will lose no time in approaching the proper officials to allocate these contracts to small industry, and see that the intent of Congress as set forth in the appropriation bills to finance this rearmament program are carried out, namely, that these orders shall be given to small industry, a part of them, and that the material be provided so that the orders may be filled after they are placed with small industries.

The charge is being made almost every day by the administration, from the President down, to the effect that private industry is not willing or cannot provide the production of the goods that this country needs. I challenge that statement and call upon the administration to use all of its powers to utilize those buildings, the machines, and the machine tools, and the workers who now stand ready but who are being thrown out of employment. All over the State of Michigan these small industries are closing up and there is no excuse for it, because the Government is going to have these goods produced anyway. Little business is entitled to a substantial amount of those contracts.

In my extension of remarks I shall set forth, in detail and specifically, how the operation of letting contracts is handled in Michigan and show how utterly impossible it is for the small companies to get a proper cut of this business.

We are moving into this rearmament program and the thing for us to do is to utilize, first, the machinery and the tools that we have before we further authorize the Government to go into a great governmental financing and construction program with funds provided by the taxpayers and bond buyers. Let private industry have a chance at this instead of permitting the machinery of Government, along with the cooperation of big industry, crowd out small business and get all of the contracts. The little man is entitled to a share. There is a job for this committee to do now and with its proper staff it can do this work and begin its work within 10 days after the passage of this resolution. I hope the chairman of the committee will look after that.

THE SITUATION IN MICHIGAN

We are now reentering military production. This production will have to be produced by facilities now existent and those to be placed in operating condition by (a) private industry or (b) the Federal Government.

There are those, from the President himself down, who argue that the Federal Government must provide funds for the building and erection of productive facilities and they use, in support of this must, that private industry cannot or will not do it.

What percentage of the total war goods for which orders are now being placed will be produced by private facilities, (a) so-called big industry, (b) so-called little industry?

The answer to the above question can be found in the almost impossibility of little industry obtaining a cut on this Federal Government business and here are the basic reasons why little industry which now stands ready with substantial capital, organizations, machinery in good repair, and an absence of business at this particular moment on their books, cannot fairly participate in the war orders. I shall give an illustration applicable to Michigan.

Company A, or a consolidated group of companies, A, B, C, D, and E, wish to acquire a Government contract. Insofar as they know, they must proceed along the following lines: Have prepared their calling card. This calling card is presented to the chief of the Detroit ordnance district, Colonel Cone, and in reply they are told, "They are not a registered company," due to the fact they are not in Dun & Bradstreet or Thomas' Register, but Detroit ordnance district will process their brochure putting them on the register as a subsidiary to some large manufacturer who is registered. In addition to above statement, the general procedures of the Detroit ordnance district to obtain competitive bids from manufacturing facilities is to examine Dun & Bradstreet or Thomas' Register and mail inquiry sheets to firms listed therein. Should any one of these manufacturers appear as 3A or 4A-1—by this, a company with financial capital running anywhere from $1,500,000 up to $3,000,000—they are eligible for receiving these bids. Consequently anyone having a net worth of $200,000 to $1,500,000 has not been contacted to send any competitive bids.

In connection with the National Emergency Act I think the RECORD will show there was a statement made by the President, and is believed by this speaker to be in writing: that there shall be no plant too small and none too large for the Department of Industrial Mobilization Plan to talk to. But specifically, in the case of the State of Michigan, industrial mobilization planners were only called upon to visit and survey 86 different manufacturing facilities. Initially, Detroit Ordnance District, Detroit, Mich., in helping the Munitions Board, so-called, prepared a manufacturers' facility register and only sent in 125 Form 59's—this form is used for the purpose of getting the name and address of the manufacturing facility on the alphabetical register which is in turn used by the Industrial Mobilization Planning Board in locating various manufacturing facilities so as to be able to talk to management and make a preliminary survey of the facilities—out of a potential estimated number of probably three to five thousand manufacturing firms in the State of Michigan. Not more than 86 manufacturing facilities were visited. A conference was held in Colonel Cone's office, Detroit, as to why more manufacturers were not on the facilities register and the question was raised as to the procedures used in getting these manufacturers on this particular alphabetical register. Did Lieutenant Colonel Cone and Mr. Deloria use or have for their use any World War II information as to who manufactured what and how much of, so as to arrive at a decent decision?

Lieutenant Colonel Cone stated there was no particular procedure used in deciding what manufacturers to turn in to the Munitions Board for them to register them as a manufacturing facility. The question was raised "what should be done with the uses of manufacturers outstanding in the State, perfectly competent of manufacturing various war items"? Lieutenant Colonel Cone replied in substance that at some later date, we would unofficially visit these manufacturing facilities and try tying them in somewhere as a possible facility for manufacturing. Later it was decided by the military department that in the case a manufacturer could not manufacture an end item—completed article—this particular manufacturer would not be contacted as a possible manufacturer.

It is thought a much better procedure would be to have the properly qualified personnel group the manufacturers in such a manner as to be able to comply with the requisite of the various military departments. To date no one has given such a procedure any consideration so far as practical results are concerned.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair is advised that the law providing for appointments to the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy and the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy was changed by enactment late in the last session of Congress. Unfortunately, the Chair on Monday last announced the appointment of certain members on the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy under the provisions of the old law. Without objection, therefore, the appointments made last Monday will be vacated and the Chair will later make the appointments under the new law. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 816, Eightieth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy the following members

on the part of the House: Mr. SHEPPARD, of California; Mr. SASSCER, of Maryland; Mr. STEFAN, of Nebraska; and Mr. MILLER of Maryland.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEE ON THE RECONSTRUCTION OF CEILING AND REDECORATION OF HOUSE CHAMBER

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 155, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Committee on Plans for Reconstruction of the Ceiling, Redecorations, and other improvements to the House Chamber the following members of the House: Mr. BLOOM, of New York; Mr. TRIMBLE, of Arkansas; Mr. SMATHERS, of Florida; Mr. MCGREGOR, of Ohio; and Mr. GOODWIN, of Massachusetts.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 601, title VI, Public Law 250, Seventy-seventh Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Committee to Investigate Nonessential Federal Expenditures the following members of the Committee on Ways and Means: Mr. DOUGHTON, of North Carolina; Mr. COOPER, of Tennessee; and Mr. REED, of New York; and the following members of the Committee on Appropriations: Mr. CANNON, of Missouri; Mr. KERR, of North Carolina; and Mr. TABER, of New York.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 16, section 715a, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission the following Members of the House: Mr. KARSTEN, of Missouri, and Mr. BREHM, of Ohio.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO SERVE AS DIRECTORS OF COLUMBIA HOSPITAL FOR WOMEN

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of the act of June 10, 1872 (17 Stat. L. 360), the Chair appoints as directors of the Columbia Hospital for Women the following Members of the House: Mrs. NORTON, of New Jersey, and Mr. MILLER, of Nebraska.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO SERVE AS DIRECTORS OF COLUMBIA INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 4863, Revised Statutes of the United States, the Chair appoints as directors of the Columbia Institute for the Deaf the following Members of the House: Mr. BLOOM, of New York, and Mr. GRAHAM, of Pennsylvania.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES DEVISE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Resolution 124, Seventy-fifth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Committee on the Oliver Wendell Holmes Devise the following Members of the House: Mr. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, Mrs. WOODHOUSE, of Connecticut, and Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, of Massachusetts.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES TERRITORIAL EXPANSION MEMORIAL COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Resolution 32, Seventy-third Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the United States Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission the following Members of the House: Mr. THOMAS of Texas, Mr. SULLIVAN, of Missouri, and Mr. BARRETT, of Wyoming.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE NATIONAL CAPITAL SESQUICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 203, Eightieth Congress, the Chair appoints as Commissioners of the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission the following members on the part of the House to serve with himself: Mr. BLOOM, of New York, Mr. THORNBERRY, of Texas, and Mr. HORAN, of Washington.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF COMMISSION TO CONSIDER A SITE AND DESIGN FOR A NATIONAL MEMORIAL STADIUM

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 523, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Commission to consider a site and design for a national memorial stadium to be erected in the District of Columbia the following members on the part of the House: Mr. MCMILLAN, of South Carolina, Mr. SASSCER, of Maryland, and Mr. SIMPSON, of Illinois.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF UNITED STATES COMMISSION FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A WASHINGTON-LINCOLN MEMORIAL-GETTYSBURG BOULEVARD

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Resolution 19, Seventy-fourth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the United States Commission for the construction of a Washington-Lincoln Memorial-Gettysburg Boulevard the following members on the part of the House: Mr. LIND, of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BEALL, of Maryland.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered for today, I may have permission to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COOLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include two brief editorials.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE ARKANSAS PLAN FOR CIVIL-RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein copies of bills which I have introduced.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, today marks the passing of a full year since the President sent to the Congress a message on civil rights. I wish to discuss the significance of events related to this controversy beginning with the most noteworthy fact of all, namely, that not a one of the President's major recommendations has been approved. It seems to me that it is appropriate to take a second look both at the President's message and the report of the Commission on Civil Rights upon which the message was based. The proponents of the civil rights program would surely concede that failure to win congressional approval of a single item signifies that there are valid and substantial objections to that program. At the same time, as one who has joined generally in the resistance, I am prepared to concede that there are some meritorious features in the report. Furthermore, I concede that the continued agitation for these proposals should be convincing on one point, namely, that the problems do exist, but it should be just as clear that they do not yield to categorical solutions.

The Commission's report itself carries a misleading label. It deals not primarily with civil rights, although the proposals dealing with antilynching legislation are directed to the basic and fundamental right of every man to a trial according to the great traditions of our judicial system. This is a civil right, but the others deal with social aspirations, some of which are entirely proper, and are receiving consideration by the leadership of the respective States and communities.

Today I want to propose to the House that we consider compromises based upon those maximum concessions which each side is willing to make. I do not expect any Member to abandon principles, but I would be less than frank with you if I did not urge in specific terms that this is a compromise, that it springs from a conviction entertained by many of us that the controversy is divisive, that it tends to weaken the Nation in an hour when the need for cooperation and unity is great.

Southern representatives have been the most prominent ones in opposing this proposed legislation. Perhaps our reaction has been too emotional. Perhaps we have been inaccurate in some of our judgments. I note, for example, that on the question of segregation views sometimes attributed to the President are not contained in his message at all and we may not have been meticulous in distinguishing his message from contents of the Commission report. I am not pleading that our case as presented to this date has been a perfect one and I

assume my own share of the responsibility for these deficiencies. I would be glad to recall some of my own inaccurate statements but I can assure the House now that having read and studied not only the message but the report itself I am prepared to apply a more rigid standard to my presentation. I am aware of the occasional misunderstanding of an approach of this kind. That is, the presentation of a southern point of view. I do not mean to offend but because the South lives in such proximity to the problem of our largest and most important racial minority—certainly the most important when civil rights issues of this type are considered—I believe it is entirely fair and proper to present as a background of my own thinking the traditional Southern viewpoint. Yet I am just as sure that the answer we should seek is not the conventional Southern answer nor, indeed, the non-Southern answer. We seek and must find the right answer.

If an answer to the difficult problem involved in the proposals is found we must study the problem in sections. It is regrettable that the recommendations have been submitted as one proposal—impinging as they do upon an infinite variety of human relations and involving widely different legal questions.

The South does not ask any exemptions from a statute soundly conceived and based upon judicial principles applying to our national community of 145,000,000 people. Furthermore, we have no intention of disregarding the legitimate rights of our minority citizens, and we deny that our opposition to some of the proposals contained in the civil rights report is due to an uncharitable attitude toward the Negro race or any other race. This is not the time nor place to speak as we of the majority group often like to speak; namely, of the happy relationship that exists generally in the South between colored and white groups. But one reason for our warnings is the obvious deterioration of the condition of mutual respect and cooperation which has resulted from political agitation.

The civil rights report, stripped of features not related to sectional and intergroup differences, contains four controversial matters: Segregation, poll-tax repeal, antilynching legislation, and the FEPC. Let me speak of these in order.

It is my opinion that congressional action is not necessary in order to achieve the President's objective as to nonsegregation in interstate travel as outlined in his message, although he probably had in mind some clarification and minor extensions of Federal policy based upon the Supreme Court decision invalidating a Virginia statute requiring segregation of passengers. The Supreme Court in effect sustained a nonsegregation policy for common carriers in all interstate travel. The nonsegregation aspects of civil rights discussions have doubtless grown out of language in the report of the President's Commission, intimating that steps should be taken to outlaw segregation policies as now generally enforced in many States. Certain statements in the report justify the fears of those who are concerned with avoiding friction and upheavals in thousands of communities where the races are accustomed to existing patterns of life.

It would help a lot for proponents of civil rights legislation to renounce any purpose of projecting Federal authority into purely local situations, particularly where such authority might be exercised to discard the existing relationships to which we are conditioned. On these issues, there is not an open mind. Everyone who knows anything at all about group relations knows that to invoke the power of law for social intermingling would meet the stiffest resistance and the only result of an attempt by Federal action to change the thinking of our people on this score—and I include Negroes as well as white persons—would be to destroy the dignity and prestige of Federal law. Surely, we learned from our experience with Federal prohibition that some social and individual habits and attitudes defy Federal regimentation. It is well to be frank on this score. Not even the most liberal of Southerners has any other thought, if wisdom and experience direct his thinking at all. I use the words "social intermingling" rather than "social equality" because this phrase more accurately expresses the basis for the customs of our region. Present patterns are maintained with personal good will and without preventing the necessary and desirable relations which interracial groups must maintain for the progress of both races.

If we could agree, Mr. Speaker, that no legislation should be adopted on the subject of segregation, it would be the first step in a proper compromise.

Now let us look at the poll tax. Here, I think, we of the poll tax States should give ground. We will not withdraw our objections to a statutory repeal by Congress, but I do concede that the rest of the country has concluded that as a matter of policy, the payment of a poll tax should not be required for voting in our elections. I do not agree with this judgment. I mean by that that while I do not like the tax, I think it is a reasonable exercise of States' rights and I do not think that there is any substantial impairment of citizen rights to vote. It is a policy that might well be left to the determination of the respective States. This is my own judgment—I am not arguing it. I have heretofore presented it in the debates in the House, but I realize that we have not won many adherents and that the rest of the country wants the seven States retaining the tax to get rid of it.

But repeal should be by constitutional methods. The payment of a poll tax as a voting qualification is permitted under the provisions of section 2, article 1, of the Federal Constitution, and is a matter solely for the States to determine. It is asserted, however, that it is an impairment—not a qualification—but it is clear from more than one decision that the Supreme Court of the United States does not consider the poll tax as constituting an impairment. Nothing less than a constitutional amendment can accomplish in a legal and proper way what the adherents of poll-tax repeal have in mind, but if the constitutional amendment is offered—if statutory repeal is abandoned—I think there will be no trouble at all in inducing the people of the poll-tax States to accept defeat gracefully.

The two most difficult aspects of the civil-rights controversy are the antilynching proposal and the so-called fair-employment practices plan.

The lynching evil has been virtually extinguished. It is not a national problem. We agree, of course, with the authors of the Commission report that one lynching is too many, but lynchings are so rare and the other problems of criminal law enforcement so tremendous that the agitation over this particular question hardly seems fitted to the conditions of 1949.

To advance their cause, the proponents of civil rights have invoked words that have a rich meaning in American life—justice, democracy, equality, opportunity—and yet the proposed application of these concepts is not only vague and unconvincing but, if implemented by Federal law, would actually obstruct the realization of many of these great principles. In grounding their appeal for antilynch legislation upon the guaranties of our judicial system, however, the proponents have some good arguments. In the realm of economics, the references to equality seem out of place since individuals are not equal in productiveness, but in the realm of law and in the quest for justice there is an authentic ring about the claim of equality. One would have to know something of the abuses of Federal intervention in State and local affairs wherever race relations have been involved to understand fully why the invasion of judicial functions reserved to the States and communities is resented. This is not legalistic and it is not due to any indifference to the terrible evil of mob violence. I know from actual experience. I have lived in communities where lynchings have occured, first as a boy 40 years ago and as a young man in another community about 25 years ago. I have had an opportunity to observe the aftermath of mob violence. Every sensitive person could feel the pall of anxiety and fears. Residents of States that have experienced lynchings know enough about this to verify our principal point that lynchings are committed by lawless people and are in such violent conflict with our ideals that gradually the processes of law have been fortified and violence put down. The passage of a Federal law would have little if any effect, in my opinion, on the continuing struggle to eliminate the evil altogether. The final crushing out of mob violence, the depriving of persons suspected of crimes of the precious right of a trial will not be accelerated by a Federal statute. Nevertheless, I can see the basis for arguments that have been advanced by the President's Commission. There are many people in Southern States who recognize the soundness of some of these arguments.

I have written to a number of newspaper editors in the South who, as a group, are generally alert to social problems and free from prejudice and political considerations. I have been impressed by what some of these editors have said about working out, if possible, a Federal statute that would strengthen the laws against this evil without creating counter-influences that would retard the movement to eliminate it altogether. I refer, for example, to the distinguished editor of the Louisville Courier Journal, Mark Ethridge, formerly of Georgia, widely known and widely respected. Mark Ethridge writes me as follows:

> Our failure to have a national policy on lynching affects us most adversely all over the world. The Russians use it with great effect. I personally can't see any excuse we can make to ourselves for not having a national policy on it and for not making prosecution the business of the Federal Government where State law enforcement breaks down. Don't you think it's anachronistic that we are willing to legislate about motor-vehicle stealing, about kidnaping, and about crossing State lines with a woman for immoral purposes, and yet as a Nation we cannot bring ourselves to say that the right to life is sacred enough that it ought to be protected by the Federal Government? I think a declaration by the National Government in the form of effective legislation would have tremendous effect on people all over the world. It's something we owe ourselves in good conscience, but beyond that we do owe it to the world as its leader.

One does not have to agree with this point of view to recognize the fairness and the social vision of the author and the relevancy of his comment. The question of lynching laws tends to become altogether a moot question, but since the whole question enters so substantially into the civil rights controversy I recognize reasons quite outside the practical considerations of law enforcement for a declaration by the Congress. The absence of such a declaration may be misunderstood abroad. If by yielding on this point for the purpose of presenting a solid front to the nondemocratic world we can symbolize our devotion to the ideal of "equality under law," I, for one, would be glad to attempt to work out such a declaration.

I do not like to begin with the proposition that racial groups in other parts of the world feeling a kinship with certain minority groups in America are imposing unfavorable judgments upon us or that because the Communists abroad are exploiting imperfections in our American social structure, we must legislate. It is true, of course, that the Communists are exploiting isolated incidents, but our emphasis should be on the fact that the harmony which prevails among the races here is much greater than that in any country with a comparable situation. The rights and privileges accorded the racial minorities are so much greater here than in any other part of the world that I regard the argument as to anti-Communist strategy as secondary. I do, however, see value in assurances to members of minority groups in the United States that every available power will be extended to protect all civil rights. Consequently, if it can be done constitutionally, and I am convinced that it can, and if a proposed statute carrying the declaration I speak of can be so phrased as to leave unimpaired the primary responsibility of the States themselves to deal with the evil complained of, I see no reason why we should not grant to the racial minority in this instance the Federal buttress they regard as essential.

Here is how I think it can be done. Add to chapter 13, relating to crimes involving civil rights, of title 18 of the United States Code, a simple statute making lynching a Federal crime, but avoid vagueness in defining the crime so that only a person who knowingly participates in a lynch mob shall be subject to the penalty. Leave out all references to property, limit the jurisdiction to offenses involving violence upon an individual either in the custody of a peace officer or suspected of a criminal offense, and require the Government to show that such violence was for the purpose or consequence of taking the life of such individual. If such violence results in the person's death, then the motive is immaterial. Otherwise, violence to become a Federal offense must be committed for the purpose of taking the person's life. This will avoid bringing gang fights and rioting under Federal jurisdiction. The extensive hearings by the Judiciary Committee of previous Congresses should be convincing on the point that the Federal Government should not be involved in minor disturbances associated with race antagonism. Leave out of the Federal statute all penalties upon the innocent people living in the locality where the crime occurs. Stripped of these extraneous matters, a statute would provide assurances that the Federal Government will be concerned with the essential guaranties of organic law.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, in order to project Federal authority into only those situations where State instrumentalities are not functioning, I would add to the statute a limitation that the Government shall not have jurisdiction of an offense in States authorizing the attorney general or the governor or an attorney acting under the direction of the governor to direct prosecutions for lynching and authorizing the State authorities to conduct such prosecutions in a local government subdivision other than that in which the offense was committed. If any State agrees to exercise its sovereignty to this extent by moving into a vacuum that has been permitted to exist in areas where pressures and fears in a decentralized judicial system have prevented effective prosecution, then that State will be free from any interference by the United States authorities. In States having this kind of statute the Federal courts should not be given authority to institute proceedings unless the Government could show that the prosecution has been impaired by willful failure of the attorney general of the State or the governor to exercise authority with respect thereto, and, if sufficient time has elapsed since the offense was committed, to enable the State law-enforcement officer to begin the prosecution. Thus, we would be able to say to any State complaining of Federal intervention in this type of offense that if intervention shall become intolerable, all that the people of that State would have to do would be to adopt the statute as described.

Mr. Speaker, this represents some research and I have consulted with many students of the problem in an effort to work out a sound approach, one that can be defended. In previous debates on the subject we have had presented only the question of a simple Federal declaration. Under such statutes, it would be possible for the Attorney General of the United States to become involved in local situations no matter how bona fide the local prosecution. That should not be permitted by the Congress. Its political implications are apparent, and I will not dwell upon them. On the other hand, my suggestion does not impair our time-honored provisions for State responsibility in criminal prosecution. It simply provides for a criterion in determining whether or not Federal action is justified by reason of failure of the States to act. This could in all probability be administratively achieved anyway but there is every reason in this instance for Congress laying down the limitations upon action by the Federal Department of Justice.

Finally, there is the recommendation of a permanent Fair Employment Practices Commission, embodying penalty provisions and giving Federal authorities power to enforce regulations, invading as no statute in our history has attempted to do, the intimate relations that are inherent in our free society. There are basic and fundamental objections to this type of legislation and the objections transcend all racial or sectional considerations. The Congress cannot afford to take this step toward statism, regardless of the purposes back of the proposal. The good faith of the proponents is not questioned. But this is a principle in government which cannot be compromised.

Considering, however, the problem of discrimination, to the extent that it exists, there is a basis for action that does not involve compromise of principle—action that involves no legal sanctions, but a legitimate exercise of governmental powers in the field of education and human relations. Patterns are already established in the Department of Labor. We may perhaps do as much for members of a minority suffering from discrimination in employment as we have done for physically handicapped workers, whose condition has been greatly improved without breaching the principles of our economic system. I see no objection to the creation of a division within the Department of Labor, operating under congressional mandate, to counsel with management and labor for the elimination of discrimination and to work toward wider employment opportunities for all groups. In previous discussions of the problem, I have commended the wartime FEPC for its

handling of the Sun Oil Co. case, in which a satisfactory adjustment of grievance of Negro workers was reached without imposing penalties or threatening prosecution.

Some of the complaints are understandable. I think I can illustrate by referring to a situation that probably has been corrected. It involves a Negro mechanic—a skilled instructor of apprentices in a certain plant, the location of which is not important to this discussion. It was the mechanic's duty to train young white workers who came into the plant. He must have done a good job, because having completed their instruction, the trainees moved immediately into assembly line jobs and began to receive more than the instructor, although everything they knew about their job had been acquired from him. We do not have to have a coercive law to become sensitive to an injustice of that kind. But I submit to the Congress that it would be quite in order for a Federal division to counsel for the correction of such a grievance and this without retreating from our insistence that nongovernmental procedures are far more effective in the long run in working out such maladjustments.

There is nothing wrong with the contention often advanced by proponents that there should be equal pay for equal performance. It is hard enough, however, to achieve this ideal, for example, for certain feminine workers and handicapped workers, and if we should invoke the great instrumentalities of the Federal Government for situations involving indefinable elements such as race prejudice and religious preferences, the powers of the Federal Government will have been prostituted. Equality of opportunity is an ideal to be cherished and the pursuit of the ideal should continually engage us, but it is better to leave every man free to think himself and his group superior and be wrong than as a matter of law proclaim him or his group to be the equal of others in economic activities.

In a few days we will celebrate the birthday of the Great Emancipator. Surely Abraham Lincoln would not be accused of race prejudice, yet in his Peoria speech on October 16, 1854, he said in discussing the slavery question and proposals based upon certain equality concepts:

> My own feelings will not admit of this and if mine would, we well know that a great mass of the whites will not. Whether this feeling accords with justice and sound judgment is not the sole question, if indeed it is any part of it. A universal feeling, whether well or ill-founded, cannot be safely disregarded.

In my opinion, no utterance of Lincoln's is more timely in its application to the disregard of the thinking of the people.

In closing let me quote Mark Ethridge again, having indicated from his statement on antilynching that he does not discard the civil rights program in its entirety. On the FEPC case, however, he is emphatic, and Mark Ethridge knows this subject, for he was one of the policy makers of the wartime fair-employment program.

> If anything at all is to be done about FEPC, it ought to be put as a minor section in the Labor Department. It ought not, however, to have any coercive powers. It would be, therefore, very largely an information section which might provide manufacturers and others with information, and this information as to the experiences of States in handling the problem will be valuable all over the country.

It appears, Mr. Speaker, that a majority of the people who are familiar with this problem are opposed to a permanent FEPC.

In the interest of harmony and economic justice to all, the civil rights controversy should be settled and I believe this can be achieved without sacrifice of principle by either side by, first, limiting Federal nonsegregation policies to interstate movements; second, repeal by constitutional amendment of poll tax requirements for voting; third, a modified antilynching bill leaving primary responsibility with the States; and, fourth, abandoning all proposals for coercion in employment but establishing a counseling service to work for nondiscrimination in industry.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. DEANE. As a southerner I certainly appreciate the attitude expressed by the gentleman from Arkansas.

May I make this observation. Perhaps undue criticism has been lodged against one member of the President's Commission from North Carolina. He does not need any defense by me. I refer to President Frank Porter Graham, of the University of North Carolina. I do not need to speak for Dr. Graham and neither do I know what may have been in his mind as a member of the President's Commission. The chances are that he did not agree with the entire report, but from time to time I have heard statements made on the House floor which perhaps have been most unfair to this great southerner, this great liberal.

I believe that in the not distant future the liberal movement in this country is going to stem from the southern part of our great country.

Going back to Dr. Graham, I am sure we noticed in the press of Saturday night, I believe it was, the award to him of the Sidney Hillman trophy for outstanding meritorious service. One speaker in referring to Dr. Graham, stated:

> He has never asked, "Is it safe?" His only concern has been, "Is it right?"

I believe that is the key thought that we as southerners must face as we come to grips with this serious legislation.

Upon the scroll awarded to Dr. Graham I note these lines so characteristic of this distinguished gentleman:

> Frank Porter Graham has earned the affection and regard of all those who love freedom and justice. Where racial differences have been used as an excuse for discrimination and oppression, he has exemplified a brotherly understanding. Where economic greed has enriched the few while impoverishing the many, he has championed the cause of the people. Where temporary expediency and social responsibility have made conflicting demands upon him, he has dared to serve the common good.
>
> To him the best of a community is the condition of the citizens who compose it and the test of a citizen lies in his capacity to quicken the conscience of his community.

On Monday, January 31, I inserted in the RECORD an outstanding editorial, The Task of the South, from the pen of Jonathan Daniels, the brilliant editor of the Raleigh News and Observer. The Members are invited to read this editorial, which in a most forceful way comes to grips with this subject of civil rights.

Of further interest is the fact that this editorial received first-place award in the best editorial division, as voted by the North Carolina Newspaper Institute, during the past week.

As indicated by the gentleman from Arkansas, it is to be hoped that we can honestly come to grips with this perplexing subject. We cannot evade the issue.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina, whom I admire very much.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I would like to compliment the gentleman from Arkansas for his very illuminating discussion of a very difficult and perplexing problem. In my own district I may say that perhaps we are not confronted with the difficulties which exist in some other parts of the country. Recognizing, however, that this is an acute and difficult situation which must be met, I appreciate all the more the proposals made by the gentleman from Arkansas.

I would like to ask the gentleman if he will elucidate a little further upon this advisory proposal which he suggests in connection with the fair employment practices matter. I am not clear what he has in mind.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I may say in answer to the question in reference to the nonpenalty FEPC that in certain measure it follows a suggestion of Senator TAFT, of Ohio, who said in the early days of the discussion that the only proper way to approach the problem would be through a nonpenalty provision.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, if it is not inconvenient to those having special orders following, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 10 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have the next 10 minutes and I will be very glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I appreciate that very much.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I think the gentleman is entitled to the attention of every Member of the House for the statement he has made.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I appreciate the comment of the gentleman from Michigan very much.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I would like to ask the gentleman one question, speaking of FEPC, which would bar discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, or state of origin. I recall that several years ago when the bill was up I offered a similar bill but added to it that there should be no discrimination in one bill because of sex and in another bill, which was more important, because of membership or nonmembership in any union, but I could not find any vociferous advocate of FEPC who was willing to accept that amendment. Has the gentleman any explanation of why, as long as they wanted to do away with discrimination, they would not let the fellow who wanted to work go to work, in other words provide that there should be no discrimination against him?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I would like to say in that connection I think that it is a good illustration of the difficulty of invoking law in these matters of employment. It touches many of the fields which the gentleman from Michigan has mentioned. I think one of the best illustrations of the efficacy of the counseling service is what we have done with the handicapped workers. We have not said that any plant must employ a person who is handicapped. We have not said it must employ him, but we have demonstrated to a lot of employers that certain handicapped groups are exceptionally productive and efficient. It is quite impressive to study the statistics of productiveness of the handicapped workers. It is remarkable what they have done, often excelling people who are not handicapped. That is not done by forcing a nondiscrimination policy, but counseling by skilled Government employees who know how to bring people together and induce management to do things which, when convinced, they are glad to do.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. Because of my personal association and very close friendship with the gentleman from Arkansas, I have been aware for quite some time of the very studious and serious effort he has been making in a study of this proposal. I think we can all appreciate the contribution the gentleman has made in attempting to approach this subject from a broad, unbiased, unprejudiced viewpoint, recognizing the fact that it does present a great many very serious problems; recognizing the fact, as he stated a few moments ago, that in this report there may be some proposals that were objectionable to various sections of the country, but in it also there is the problem, or series of problems, that we must face. The gentleman, I think, in his study and in his proposal has compromised and has made a very valuable contribution to our consideration of this problem. I compliment him on his very calm and unimpassioned presentation of the situation. In considering the problems presented in the President's message and in the so-called civil-rights program, if we can approach them and consider them in that same unimpassioned, calm, deliberate spirit in an effort to arrive at what is best for the country, I think we can make some very good progress.

I commend the gentleman from Arkansas for his presentation today.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I appreciate the gentleman's statement very much.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the gentleman's address today and I believe that it is a new approach to a very old problem. I remind him, however, that it is much older than a lot of people think. My father told me—and he lived in Newport, R. I.—that in various places in the East, when he was a young man, particularly in Massachusetts, they had signs posted which read, "Men wanted. No Irish need apply." But as time went on it seems the Irish have solved their own problem, and they are sending them now to legislative halls and putting them in high positions, because they sought to benefit themselves and work out their own salvation instead of looking for helpful legislation.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Well, they are doing the hiring themselves now, are they not?

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Knowing the gentleman from Arkansas as I do, I know of his deep sincerity in what he has had to say. I gather that his approach is on the theory that you can get the most good out of the civil rights proposal with the least emotional strain. Is that what the gentleman advocates?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I am very grateful to the gentleman for stating it just that way.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I, too, would like to compliment the gentleman from Arkansas for the dispassionate way in which this issue has been discussed here today. If we can only go through this session with an open-minded attitude or willingness to try and resolve the differences, I think we will get a lot closer to solving this problem than we will by the heat of debate or incriminations that have often taken place on this floor in the past.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I am very grateful to the gentleman for that comment.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, I too wish the opportunity of congratulating my colleague from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] upon his attitude in his efforts to compromise the serious and complex civil rights issues, even though he is willing to go much farther than I could either commit or permit myself.

The arguments usually advanced by the proponents and opponents of such legislation are comparable with the often expressed view that "to prominently promulgate the congregated diversions of an abstainer of intoxicants is to dissimilate his true character." For the northern and eastern proponents of such proposed legislation to pick out only the adverse racial relations and occurrences within the South, and for the opponents to, in turn, counteract with like charges against and within the North and East—each such group failing to give a true picture of the racial problem as it actually exists and its effects in each locality of our Nation, offers no solution.

However, I want to state that because of my inherent and fundamental belief in States' rights, I could not and would not go along with my colleague in his compromise efforts with such proposed Federal legislation.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I appreciate that very much.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BIEMILLER. I have always had a very high regard for the ability and the temperate approach of the gentleman from Arkansas. Today my regard goes even higher. I agree with those who have spoken ahead of me and said that if we can approach this civil rights question in a temperate and easy-mannered way we may reach a solution for it. The only point I should like to add at this moment is that I do not think any of us should assume that the civil rights question is peculiarly a problem of the South. I think it is a question that exists throughout the entire 48 States. That should never be lost sight of.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I am glad to have that comment. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman very much.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I realize that this country does need unity. I appreciate the fact that the gentleman from Arkansas has approached this matter not only from the attitude of a Congressman but as a Christian.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I am very grateful to all the Members for what they have said.

In yielding the floor I should like to say that my primary purpose was to undertake to state, in a dispassionate way, a position which I believe is typical of a vast number of our people, and, secondly, to give the House the benefit of the study I have made of the technical side. It will all be in the RECORD.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Unfortunately I did not hear all the gentleman's discussion. I yield to no one in my very high appraisal of the gentleman from Arkansas. I know that whatever he said was said with the great sincerity that symbolizes his usual conduct upon the floor of this House. Since I did not have the benefit of hearing all the gentleman's address, may I ask if I am correct in assuming from what I have heard here on the floor that the gentleman thinks this is a matter that cannot well be solved by legislative edict, that it is a matter that will have to be worked out?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I think that reflects a portion of my comment. The problem will continue; no matter how skillful our craftsmanship, no matter how good our performance, there will be a continuing problem in the realm of human relations; but we can, however, since the Nation has focused attention upon the problem, find a degree of legislative authority that might be required. That is the thing I have pointed to in the desire to find the basis for a compromise. I think it is possible for us to find it. But I agree with the implication of the gentleman that it is not primarily a legislative problem.

I am very grateful to the House.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, I include the following bill to permit the prosecution of lynching in Federal courts when the governor or attorney general of the State concerned lacks authority to direct the prosecution in State courts, or such prosecution is impaired by his refusal to do so:

Be it enacted, etc., That chapter 13 (relating to crimes involving civil rights) of title 18 of the United States Code is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"245. Lynching.

"Whoever willfully instigates, incites, organizes, aids, abets, or commits a lynching by any means whatsoever, or is knowingly a member of a lynch mob, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both.

"As used in this section:

"The term 'lynch mob' means any assemblage of ..... or more persons which, without authority of law, commits or attempts to commit violence upon the person of any individual in the custody of a peace officer or suspected of, charged with, or convicted of the commission of any criminal offense, with the purpose or consequence of taking the life of such individual.

"The term 'lynching' means any violence by a lynch mob upon the person of any such individual, with the purpose or consequence of taking the life of such individual."

SEC. 2. The table of contents of chapter 13 of title 18 of the United States Code is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof

"245. Lynching."

SEC. 3. Section 3231 (relating to jurisdiction of district courts) of title 18 of the United States Code is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, a district court of the United States shall have jurisdiction of an offense against section 245 of this title only if the court finds, with respect to each State in which the offense was committed, that—

"(1) the act or acts constituting the offense do not also constitute, under the laws of the State, an offense which may be prosecuted (A) by the attorney general of the State or an attorney acting under his direction or the direction of the governor of the State, and (B) in a local governmental subdivision other than that or those, as the case may be, in which it was committed; or

"(2) the prosecution of the offense against State law has been impaired by the willful failure or refusal of the attorney general of the State or the governor of the State to exercise his authority with respect to such prosecution; and a sufficient time has elapsed since the offense against section 245 was committed to enable State law-enforcement officers to begin the prosecution of the offense against State law."

SEC. 4. This act shall take effect on January 1, 1950.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. McCARTHY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LYLE). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include two newspaper articles.)

POLL TAX LEGISLATION

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, permit me to call your attention to two articles which show that it does not make very much difference what the Congress or any committee of the Congress may do. Neither the Congress nor its committees will ever get full public approval from a certain section of the press.

There will always be the knock, "Why did you do it? Why didn't you do it? You are a publicity seeker. You are a witch hunter. You are covering up for your political friends." For years the Dies committee and its successor have been pilloried by the Communists and their friends and, worse yet, by its friends because forsooth its hearings were unduly spectacular. Comes the new committee and announces that newsreel cameramen, photographers, radio, and television technicians are to be barred and all heck is to pay—read the news story from last night's Times-Herald—then get the editorial from this morning's issue. Here they are:

RED PROBE BANS PHOTOGRAPHERS—RADIO, TELEVISION ALSO BARRED AT HEARINGS

(By Ed Nellor)

Members of the House Un-American Activities Committee last night banned newsreel cameramen, photographers, and radio and television technicians from all future hearings—but reaction was loud, strong, and immediate.

In the unprecedented move, designed to add decorum to spy-hunting probes, only newspapermen were left untroubled—for the time being.

Representative WOOD, Democrat, of Georgia, new chairman of the committee, casually made the announcement following the organization session. He acted like a man whose scalp already was tingling.

The first response came from the House radio gallery, whose chairman, Albert L. Warner, quickly declared, "Radio has a fight on its hands."

His rallying cry was echoed by George M. Dorsey, head of the White House News Photographers Association, who represents both still and motion picture cameramen.

A visit to Attorney General Clark also was decided upon by the House Communist hunters and a three-man subcommittee was appointed to confer on mutual problems today.

Naming Representatives WALTER, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, HARRISON, Democrat, of Virginia, and NIXON, Republican, of California, for this chore presages another new approach—cooperation with the Justice Department. During the Eightieth Congress the committee and Clark swapped insults at regular intervals.

STAND UP OR FOLD UP

The newly organized House Committee on Un-American Activities took its first step toward oblivion Monday in barring radio recorders, newsreels, television and news photographers from future hearings.

Its members have clearly shown they do not have the guts to carry on the program that has grown to be the most important phase of congressional effort in these times, namely to put the finger on communism.

By cutting down on their own publicity weapons, the committee has left the field wide open for the Communists to go ahead spreading hate and poison with little if any fear of rebuttal from Congress.

SCARED OF THEIR JOB

What is the committee afraid of? Of course, congressional investigating committees are created to find out whether new legislation is needed. But every investigating committee learns, sooner or later, that recommendations of law are not worth a hoot unless the people understand the basis for the committee's proposals.

Hence, publicity is a vital weapon in lawmaking.

A classic example was the Senate Banking Committee's investigation of 1933. It was interesting and exciting stuff from the start, but rather complicated and tough to understand. The public was not getting it at all. But a circus press agent walked into the dignified realms of the Senate caucus room one day and planked a midget down on the knees of none other than J. P. Morgan.

HEADLINES BY EXPERTS

Did the committee pale and fold up and run for cover? It did not. Instead, it played for the headlines with every art and trick while it had the public's attention and the

public in turn soon grabbed at every piece of information they could get concerning the committee's basic program.

For another example of how tough a congressional committee can get, we refer you to the case of Howard C. Hopson, another top financier.

It was 1935 and both Senate and House committees were investigating lobbies. Both wanted Hopson.

Hopson hid out. The Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, employees of the House, and the District police chased him all through this city, with newsreels and all the attendant agents of publicity invited along. The whole country was fascinated by the man hunt and learned much about lobbies, in consequence. Hopson got 5 years in the "jug" before it was all over.

The men who operated congressional committees in those days were ruthless, tough, and smart. They knew they had to be, to get anywhere.

And if the present members of the House Committee on Un-American Activities are scared before they start by the mere accusation that they're publicity seekers, they aren't tough or smart enough to ever do anything effective with such 10-minute eggs as the Reds.

The press has just been yelling—not the reporters so much as the caption writers and the editors, the columnists, and radio commentators—that the House Committee on Un-American Activities was all the time looking for publicity, using circus methods, and the moment the committee takes effective action to do away with what the critics said was an evil or a bad practice, they jump on the committee.

Permit me to comment on the subject which was discussed so ably and so fairly by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] who just left the well of the House:

He is absolutely right about this poll-tax matter. I think I am the only Republican who since 1935 has consistently voted against that poll-tax legislation every time there has been a roll call.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. I would like to advise the gentleman that others have voted against it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. All right; thanks. I stand corrected. Perhaps there are others.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that I have consistently voted against it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Thanks again. I find myself in better and better company all the time.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from Minnesota both stated on the floor that they voted against the bill. Now the gentleman says that he is going to check. Does he mean that he is going to check whether they are making a true statement or not?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, no. I am just going to check my own records and make the correction. Having been corrected by my distinguished colleagues I thank them and hasten to apologize and extend my congratulations to the gentlemen. Perhaps there are other Republicans present who wish to repeat their statements of adherence to the good old Constitution.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. FELLOWS. I have spoken against that three times.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, here on the floor at this time are at least four of us who have not followed this political football on its unconstitutional meandering.

Mr. FELLOWS. After hearing the speeches today, I wonder if I am going to be left as the only Republican from Maine, and the only man against that proposition.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Against what?

Mr FELLOWS. I wonder after hearing these speeches if I am going to be left.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The citizens of Maine are sound-thinking individuals. In the past, they have recognized merit when it came their way, and I have not the slightest doubt that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS] will be here as a plain-spoken, effective guardian of the Constitution long after some of those who think it is outmoded have left the national scene. That is my hope and the hope of the gentleman's colleagues.

If the advocates of this repeal of the poll-tax legislation really want to get that repealed, all they have to do is to submit the issue to the States as a constitutional amendment. Unless I am mistaken, when the women wanted to vote it took them something less than 2 years to have the States approve a constitutional amendment giving them what they demanded. The States could, and would, approve the amendment within a year. That is the way it should be done. Again, I may be mistaken, but in my opinion that is the only fair, legal way to do it.

Let us go next to the antilynching bill. Am I wrong? Did you gentlemen vote against the antilynching bill, or was I one of the few Republicans on that? How about it?

Mr. SHORT. I voted against the poll tax, against the antilynching bill, and FEPC, and I will vote that way again.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. As a primary opponent once said, "HOFFMAN is only 100-percent right. I am 300-percent right."

I said, "Yes; but we are figuring on a thousand-percent basis, so you are not so good, after all."

But my beloved colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], to my sorrow the only Republican from that State—we have one too many Democrats in the White House—is, as usual, 100-percent right—perhaps his foresight and wisdom are the reason he is here.

Now, to get down to this antilynching bill, the purpose of that is good. I will vote for an antilynching bill, if in defending lynching they will include mob violence in labor disputes and strikes. For every case that they can point to where someone has been lynched in the South during the last year, I can cite two cases where someone has died from violence in a labor dispute in the North. For every case where someone was beaten in the South because of race or some crime committed there, other than in a labor dispute, I can cite 10, from sworn testimony, where someone was beaten in a labor dispute or strike in the North. For every home wrecked in the South by a mob I can cite a half-dozen instances where, during strikes, the homes of men, whose only offense was that they wanted to work for a livelihood and not join a union or pay union dues, were maliciously damaged by missiles being thrown in the windows or paint being thrown on porches or against the siding.

These advocates of the antilynch bill I do not believe can match this one, which happened on the 1st day of December in the adjoining county of Kalamazoo, in the Third Congressional District of Michigan, Mr. PAUL SHAFER's district, where goon squads went in, two or three hundred of them, with CIO buttons on them, and some in the mob grabbed a young lady by the hair of her head this way and shoved her head that way, slapped her in the face, first on one side, then on the other, knocking her this way, then that way, or where they chased a fellow up to the second floor and three of them beat him until the bones on the left side of his face were broken, knocked him down and kicked him. I have a picture of a pool of blood two and one-half feet across on the floor, where they left him after they got through with him. Do these hot advocates of the antilynching bill want to include a provision against that kind of activity in the antilynching bill? Oh, no. The President is as silent as the grave on that one. Oh, no. If the CIO, his political ally—not the ally of you gentlemen but of the New Deal Party—wants to carry on with goon squads, that seems to be all right, we hear no demand that rioting-mob violence by labor goons be barred either by labor legislation or by an antilynching bill, but give the South a dose of Federal law, let the CIO, the Communists and the racketeers, by force and violence, make the nonunion stand and deliver. If we are to have an antilynch bill, let us have it cover mob violence of all kinds, even when it comes from a labor union in the North. Let us have it the country over.

Do you know in the packing house strike involving 20 States, mobs burned freight cars; obstructed railroad tracks? There is no Federal law against it, as far as Federal statutes go, unless it is a mail train. They can do all they want

to along that line without violating a Federal law. Now, let us be fair about this. You can talk calmly about it, but I have to shout about it, because it really makes me out of patience when people who want to work cannot go to work and are discriminated against because they do not belong to a union and helpless are beaten, kicked, assailed in their homes—their property destroyed or damaged. Our hearings disclose that the rank and file of the unions do not approve of that—the paid professional goons do that.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, I yield.

Mr. SHORT. I hope the gentleman is not displeased with some of his colleagues on this side because we agree with him 100 percent on both the civil-rights program and on this mob violence.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, I am like a gentleman I admire very much, a great eradicator of gangsters, a most efficient administrator, Tom Dewey, who I hope some day will be the Senator from New York. Like Mr. Dewey I am getting now, as an aristocratic lady said, the approval of the better people, only there are not enough of them.

Now, so much for the antilynching bill.

What about FEPC? Into my office there came a gentleman from my district, a colored gentleman, Mr. Ampey. In fact, his brother or his cousin, I do not remember which, campaigned with me in my first primary campaign. I get along with the colored folks all right. The other day he came in and he said, "CLARE, we don't like your view on this FEPC bill." I said, "I know you do not, but that is the way I feel, because no one has ever yet been able to tell me when or where preference ended and discrimination began." So I said, "You do not have any trouble in Paw Paw"—that is where he lives—"do you?" "No," he said, "only with one barber." The farmer, the businessman, they treat me all right." "But," he said, "one place they did not."

I said, "When you ride on the train that runs from Chicago to Detroit, the New York Central, you do not have any trouble, you can go in any car you wish?"

"Yes, sir."

I said, "Lige, why would you not go along with this proposition: That is a big road, they have plenty of money, they can afford it; why can we not have one car for colored folks, one car for white folks, and one car for mixed folks? I do not mean mixed folks, I mean a car where everybody can go and sit or eat or sleep, whether he be black or white or brown or yellow?"

"Oh," he said, "that would not be right, that would not be fair."

I cannot see why it is not fair. That arrangement ought to please everyone. Why is that not all right? Why would it not be all right? Then people could go where they wanted, associate with the people of their choice. A few of the colored folks in my district do not like me, those who come from Chicago, Philadelphia, Detroit, and Pittsburgh, but the home folks do; they are all right and they think I am all right; we treat each other as equals. As a matter of choice, we do not discriminate; we put into practice the Golden Rule; and we do not need any professional agitator to force on us a law to make us do something we are now doing. Why not fix it so everybody can choose his associates? Do you see the point? Extend equal facilities; yes. But do not discriminate against the majority by imposing upon them obligations granting special privileges to minorities.

I would go one step further. The mayor of one of the cities in my district talked to me one time and said, "What do you think about this; you have been in Washington a long time and you ought to know everything; just tell us what to do."

I said, "All right, I have been in Washington and I should know everything. What do you wish to ask me about?"

"Well," he said, "we are having some trouble with the bathing beach; trouble between the colored folks and the whites, they get mixed up sometimes," he said. "What can we do?"

I said, "Why do not you divide that beach, not according to population,"—the colored folks there were only 10 to 15 percent of the population, maybe not that much. I said, "Do not divide it on that basis; split it even, 50-50. Then call the leaders of the colored organization in and say, 'All right now, here, Mr. Jones, Mr. White, Mr. Smith, you just take your half; choose the half of the bathing beach you want, north or south half.' Give them equal facilities, better even; give them more because they have not had as many years of opportunity as the whites have had; give them the long end of the lever. Why not? It is all right. Let them have it. And then when they have taken that let them stay over on that side and let the white people stay over on their side, and if you want to give them another beach where they can mix up if they want to, give them that, divide the beach into three equal sections if they wish and make everyone happy by letting everyone into the third division."

But why force business by an FEPC to employ this one, that one, or the other one? Where will we get? Suppose you have a Catholic hospital, a Catholic publishing house; under this law if along comes an atheist who wants a job or a Communist who says there is no God, still if he or she is qualified under the proposed bill you have got to take him or her as an employee.

Would you not have to take in an atheist, would you not have to take a Lutheran, as I am, into a Jewish religious establishment, a publishing house? Of course you do not want that. Suppose you are a Christian and along comes an atheist Communist, you have got to take her in under the FEPC and teach your children in a public or parochial school.

Let me give you a hint of what may be behind this. Massachusetts, I think, has an FEPC, New York has it; I think New Jersey has it. They are losing a lot of industry up in the Northeast because of some of these restrictive laws. They have no great supply of gas, oil, coal or ore, hence, are dependent upon industry. Having swallowed this trouble-making FEPC which may force some of their industries south they would like to fix you folks in the South so you will not offer quite so much competition. Do you get it? That is what they may be up to. They swallowed something that has given them industrial indigestion and they do not want it, they cannot get rid of it so they want you to have a dose of the same so they can compete on more equal terms. That may be what they are after—why they are so insistent that it become a national policy.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVENPORT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

CARDINAL JOSEPH MINDSZENTY

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, no incident of recent months has stirred up such world-wide reactions as the arrest of the primate of Hungary, Cardinal Joseph Mindszenty.

The flood of official and private protests from all parts of the world are ample evidence of that.

The imprisoned cardinal is generally regarded as the champion of basic human rights and religious liberty. He is regarded as the Hungarian champion of those rights which are guaranteed to every American citizen by the Constitution of the United States.

The Hungarian Government prepared a yellow book against the cardinal in which he is accused of high treason and espionage.

The Hungarian Government also announced the full confession of the cardinal to above charges.

His trial is to start tomorrow.

But public opinion refuses to recognize the validity of the charges and refuses to believe that the trial will serve the cause of justice.

In the name of the American Catholic hierarchy, Archbishop John T. McNicholas, of Cincinnati, called upon the Catholics of the United States to observe next Sunday, February 6, as a day of prayer and protest over the arrest, imprisonment, and trial of Cardinal Mindszenty. In his letter the Archbishop of Cincinnati made this poignant statement:

> The public opinion of our country and the whole noncommunistic world may not influence the despotic rulers of Hungary. The trial of the cardinal will be a travesty of justice. The political court will do the bidding of the tyrannous rulers. We must be prepared to have the torturers and jailers of the cardinal employ every inhuman means to break down the physical and mental powers of his eminence before he appears in the trial. In vain will the Hungarian Government set up false fronts to deceive the world regarding the fantastic charges made against the cardinal primate of Hungary. The Hungarian people will not be deceived.
>
> They know the despotic treatment to which they are subjected. They are conscious of their utter inability at present to resist the brutal and degrading power of those who have seized the control of government under the aegis of the Soviets.
>
> Hungary is an occupied country. The right of occupation is vested in the Soviet Union.

> But according to newspaper reports the head of the Soviet State is willing to come to an agreement with the United States on the great issue of peace.
>
> If the Soviet leader, Mr. Stalin, really means what he reportedly said, then here is the opportunity. He, as chief of the occupational forces in Hungary, should prevail on the Hungarian Government and secure the release of Cardinal Mindszenty and of all those who together with him were imprisoned.
>
> Such an act would prove to an anxious world that the Soviet Union is ready and willing to fulfill her obligation as a member of the United Nations, and guarantee the freedom of thought, speech, and religion everywhere in the world.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVENPORT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I commend the gentleman for the remarks he has just made on this distressing incident. It is too bad that in these days of enlightened civilization such incidents occur which shock the conscience of all the rest of the civilized world. May we hope that the reign of terror which exists in many of these countries behind the iron curtain may soon come to an end and that democracy may again raise its head so that people everywhere in the world will have at least freedom of religion and freedom of speech.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I thank the gentleman.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 22, Eighty-first Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Select Committee To Conduct a Study and Investigation of the Problems of Small Business the following Members of the House: Mr. PATMAN, of Texas, chairman; Mr. KEOGH, of New York; Mr. HARDY, of Virginia; Mr. MANSFIELD, of Montana; Mr. EVINS, of Tennessee; Mr. HALLECK, of Indiana; Mr. HILL, of Colorado; Mr. RIEHLMAN, of New York; Mr. LICHTENWALTER, of Pennsylvania.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SMITH of Ohio, for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On January 28, 1949:

H. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes.

On January 31, 1949:

H. J. Res. 88. Joint resolution extending the time for free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 3, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

143. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revised estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 involving an increase of $375,000 for the Housing Expediter (H. Doc. No. 50); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

144. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report of officers above the rank of major of the Army or lieutenant commander of the Navy, with the average monthly flight pay authorized by law to be paid to such officers during the 6-month period preceding the date of January 27, 1949; to the Committee on Armed Services.

145. A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Armory Board, transmitting financial statement of the District of Columbia National Guard Armory Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

146. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter requesting that the case of Ding Soy Hing or Ting Swee Heng or Ding Say Hing, or Ding Fot Hing or Sing Say Hing, file No. A-6286624, CR 22925, involving suspension of deportation, be withdrawn from the cases now pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

147. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter requesting that the case of William Gregory Kelsall, Jr., file No. A-1546967, CR 22616, involving suspension of deportation, be withdrawn from the cases now pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

148. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter requesting that the case of Gabriel Morales, file No. A-1687430, CR 21860, involving suspension of deportation, be withdrawn from the cases now pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

149. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting the Annual Report of the United States Maritime Commission, covering the activities and transactions of the Commission during the fiscal year 1948; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

150. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting lists or schedules or parts of lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee of House Administration.

151. A letter from the Chairman, Displaced Persons Commission, transmitting the First Semiannual Report of the Displaced Persons Commission, for the period ending February 1, 1949; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

152. A letter from the assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the adjustment of royalties and like charges for the use of inventions for the benefit of or by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

153. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John; to the Committee on Public Lands.

154. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and the Municipal Council of St. Croix, V. I.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

155. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John and the Municipal Council of St. Croix; to the Committee on Public Lands.

156. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John and the Municipal Council of St. Croix; to the Committee on Public Lands.

157. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 3, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Cove Harbor and Cove Pond, Conn., authorized by the River and Harbor Act, approved on July 24, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

158. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 13, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of St. Ignace Harbor, Mich., authorized by the River and Harbor Act, approved on June 20, 1938, and of harbor at St. Ignace, Mich., authorized by the River and Harbor Act, approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

159. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 3, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Crystal River, Fla., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

160. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 15, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Townsend Inlet, N. J., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives, adopted on May 18, 1937; to the Committee on Public Works.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURNSIDE:

H. R. 2096. A bill to authorize the erection of a Federal office building in Huntington, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 2097. A bill to repeal the war tax rate on the retail sale of furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2098. A bill to discontinue in effect certain war excise taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 2099. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii," approved April 30, 1900, as amended; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 2100. A bill to terminate the war tax rates on certain miscellaneous excise taxes,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 2101. A bill to authorize the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., to make certain disaster or emergency loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 2102. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 2103. A bill relating to the disposition of permanent housing acquired or constructed by the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina (by request):

H. R. 2104. A bill relating to orders to banks doing business in the District to stop payment on negotiable instruments payable from deposits in, or payable at, such banks; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 2105. A bill to authorize the appointment of three additional judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia and prescribe the qualifications of the judges of such court; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 2106. A bill to amend the act of July 1, 1902, as amended, to provide exemption from payment of personal property tax in the District of Columbia for veterans' organizations incorporated by acts of Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. POTTER:

H. R. 2107. A bill to authorize the transfer of the Federal Government's interest in certain defense housing to the States and their political subdivisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 2108. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents" to define the term "wife" to include "dependent husband"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2109. A bill to provide that all employees of the veterans' canteen service shall be paid from funds of the service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 2110. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the eightieth anniversary of the incorporation of Abilene, Kans.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RHODES:

H. R. 2111. A bill to grant equitable compensatory time to postal employees for holidays which fall on Saturdays and Sundays; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2112. A bill to increase the compensation of all postal and classified employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2113. A bill to amend the act approved March 14, 1936, entitled "An act to provide for vacations for Government employees, and for other purposes," as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2114. A bill for the benefit of employees involuntarily separated from the service of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2115. A bill to provide for promotion procedure within the executive classified civil service; to the Committee on Pos' Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2116. A bill to authorize the Federal Bureau of Investigation to investigate and assist in the prosecution of cases involving the killing or assaulting of officers of the United States Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 2117. A bill to repeal wartime tax rates on telegraph, telephone, radio, and cable services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 2118. A bill to provide for standards to be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture governing imported agricultural food products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2119. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to announce the parity price of milk and to immediately make effective the support price of milk; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2120. A bill to repeal the Alaska Railroad Retirement Act of June 29, 1936, as amended, and to extend the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to officers and employees to whom such act of June 29, 1936, is applicable; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2121. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey abandoned school properties in the Territory of Alaska to local school officials; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2122. A bill to promote the settlement and development of the public domain in the Territory of Alaska by facilitating the construction of necessary housing therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 2123. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Kensington, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2124. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Lonaconing, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2125. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Woodsboro, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2126. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Western Port, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2127. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Brunswick, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2128. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Emmitsburg, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2129. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Williamsport, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2130. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Thurmont, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2131. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Silver Spring, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2132. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Hancock, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2133. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Gaithersburg, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BIEMILLER:

H. R. 2134. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 2135. A bill to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 2136. A bill to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 2137. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 2138. A bill to repeal paragraph (4) of section 15 of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 2139. A bill to amend the Immigration Act of 1924 to provide a nonquota status for the unmarried dependent grandchildren of certain immigrants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 2140. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal," approved May 29, 1944; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H. R. 2141. A bill to provide rest rooms in certain post offices; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2142. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the eightieth anniversary of the birth of Booth Tarkington; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2143. A bill to require Federal district courts and State courts to enforce certain support orders of courts of other States, and to confer jurisdiction on Federal district courts to make support orders in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2144. A bill to create a Committee on Capital Clearance for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 2145. A bill to grant recognition for wartime service in the United States merchant marine and to provide that persons who served in the wartime merchant marine shall not be liable for induction into the armed services under the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2146. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide full annuities, at compensation of half salary or wages based on the five highest

years of earnings, for individuals who have completed 30 years of service or have attained the age of 60; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 2147. A bill to provide for the preparation and distribution of booklets of information relating to Members of, and Delegates to, and the Resident Commissioner in, the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 2148. A bill to repeal certain excise tax rates on watches and clocks and cases and movements therefor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 2149. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to contract for certain investigation reports in connection with insurance claims; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 2150. A bill to extend the period of validity of the act to facilitate the admission into the United States of alien fiancees in cases where the failure to enter within the period heretofore prescribed was the result of causes beyond the control of the parties to the proposed marriage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 2151. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2152. A bill granting pensions to veterans of World War I and World War II who are 65 years of age or over; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 2153. A bill to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the county of Culpeper, Va.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WHITE of California:

H. R. 2154. A bill to authorize the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., to make certain disaster or emergency loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 2155. A bill to grant recognition for wartime service in the United States merchant marine and to provide that persons who served in the wartime merchant marine shall not be liable for induction into the armed services under the Selective Service Act of 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 2156. A bill to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 2157. A bill granting exemptions from income tax in the case of retirement pensions and annuities of governmental employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 2158. A bill to amend section 3 of the act of June 18, 1934, relating to the establishment of foreign trade zones; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 2159. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of Dauphin Island Bay, Ala.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BREHM:

H. R. 2160. A bill to incorporate the Legion of Guardsmen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARROLL:

H. R. 2161. A bill to broaden the cooperative extension system as established in the act of May 8, 1914, and acts supplemental thereto, by providing for cooperative extension work between colleges receiving the benefits of this act and the acts of July 2, 1862, and August 30, 1890, and other qualified colleges, universities, and research agencies, and the United States Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2162. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2163. A bill to amend section 3 of the act of June 18, 1934, relating to the establishment of foreign-trade zones; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2164. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of naturalized veterans, their wives, minor children, and dependent parents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2165. A bill to clarify the provisions of section 8 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 880; 8 U. S. C. 144); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2166. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, section 456, so as to increase to $15 per day the limit on subsistence expenses allowed to justices and judges while attending court or transacting official business at places other than their official station, and to authorize reimbursement for such travel by privately owned automobiles at the rate of 7 cents per mile; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2167. A bill to amend the Sherman Antitrust Act with respect to the application of the antitrust laws in the case of certain agreements; to the Committe on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2168. A bill to amend title 18, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," and title 28, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," of the United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 2169. A bill to provide increases in compensation for officers and members of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 2170. A bill declaring children of competent Crow Indians to be competent members of the Crow Tribe; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 2171. A bill relating to the disposition of permanent housing acquired or constructed by the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 2172. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2173. A bill to incorporate the Blue Star Mothers of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 2174. A bill to amend section 3804 of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to the time for performing certain acts postponed by reason of war; to the Committee on Waya and Means.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. R. 2175. A bill to amend sections 613, 624, 625, 631 of the Hospital Survey and Construction Act (60 Stat. 1042, 1045–1047); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2176. A bill to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act (title VI of the Public Health Service Act), to extend its duration and provide greater financial assistance in the construction of hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2177. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to announce the parity price of milk and to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to immediately announce the support price of milk; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2178. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the nine hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the discovery of America by Leif Erikson; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 2179. A bill to provide for national cemeteries in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 2180. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide hospital and medical treatment for persons who have performed 25 years of service as seamen; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. R. 2181. A bill to grant pensions to veterans of the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition who served less than 70 days; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 2182. A bill to permit the prosecution of lynching in Federal courts when the governor or attorney general of the State concerned lacks authority to direct the prosecution in State courts, or such prosecution is impaired by his refusal to do so; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. R. 2183. A bill to facilitate the admission to the United States of alien spouses, alien minor children, and alien fiancées or fiancés of World War II veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 2184. A bill to amend section 113 (b) (1) (B) of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the adjustment of the basis of property for depreciation, obsolescence, amortization, and depletion; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 2185. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to announce the parity price of milk, and to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to immediately announce the support price of milk; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 2186. A bill providing for the construction of a railroad connecting the existing railroad system serving the United States and Canada and terminating at Prince George, British Columbia, Canada, with the railroad system serving Alaska and terminating at Fairbanks, Alaska; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 2187. A bill to provide that certain disabled veterans be entitled to special parking privileges in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 2188. A bill relating to the promotion of Government employees who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during World War II; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 2189. A bill to create additional Secretaries of the Armed Services for Reserve components; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. R. 2190. A bill to provide for the education, medical attention, relief of distress, and social welfare of Indians under the jurisdiction of the Sisseton Indian Agency, South Dakota; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2191. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to announce the parity price of milk and to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to immediately announce the support price of milk; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 2192. A bill to establish minimum space requirements for post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H. R. 2193. A bill to provide for the waiver of certain physical requirements for Federal positions in the case of certain disabled veterans who have efficiently discharged duties comparable to the duties of the position for which they are being examined, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2194. A bill to authorize the annual admission of 100,000 immigrants of Italian nationality for a period of 5 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2195. A bill to authorize the President to make available for immigration purposes certain unused immigration quotas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 2196. A bill to authorize the elimination of lands from the Flathead Indian Irrigation Project, Montana; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2197. A bill to authorize acquisition by the county of Missoula, Mont., of certain lands for public use purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 2198. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, to make the personnel ceiling provisions of such act inapplicable to employees of the Navy Department whose wages are fixed by wage boards or similar administrative authority; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2199. A bill providing for the construction of a railroad connecting the existing railroad system serving the United States and Canada and terminating at Prince George, British Columbia, Canada, with the railroad system serving Alaska and terminating at Fairbanks, Alaska; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

H. R. 2200. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to announce the parity price of milk and to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to immediately announce the support price of milk; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 2201. A bill granting equipment allowances to postmasters at offices in which post-office fixtures and equipment are furnished by the postmaster; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2202. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended, to include administrative reorganizations within the provisions of the act relating to reduction in personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2203. A bill to provide for a decennial census of housing; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 2204. A bill authorizing the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of the Navy, and the United States Maritime Commission to dispose of certain materials to the United States Coast Guard Auxiliary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H. R. 2205. A bill to facilitate the admission into the United States of alien relatives of members and honorably discharged veterans of the United States armed forces; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NOLAND:

H. R. 2206. A bill to provide for a new Federal building in Bloomington, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2207. A bill to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to execute and deliver to present owners of certain real property quitclaim deeds to minerals in or under such property; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 2208. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to announce the parity price of milk and to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to immediately announce the support price of milk; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 2209. A bill to increase from $3,000 to $7,500 the maximum amount that a retired commissioned officer and certain other Federal employees may receive as combined retired pay and compensation from a civilian office or position under the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PHILLIPS of California:

H. R. 2210. A bill to authorize the credits to certain public agencies of the United States for costs of construction and operation and maintenance of flood protective levee systems along or adjacent to the lower Colorado River in Arizona, California, and Lower California, Mexico; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 2211. A bill to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 2212. A bill to change the name of the Gatun Locks, the Gatun Dam, and the town of Gatun in the Canal Zone to "Sibert Locks," "Sibert Dam," and "Sibert" respectively, in memory of the late Maj. Gen. William L. Sibert, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 2213. A bill to provide for centralizing certain wage rates to the supervision of the Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 2214. A bill to provide for the development, administration, and maintenance of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway and the Suitland Parkway in the State of Maryland as extensions of the park system of the District of Columbia and its environs by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 2215. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to announce the parity price of milk, and to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to immediately announce the support price of milk; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 2216. A bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to provide for an Under Secretary of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. R. 2217. A bill to dispense with the maximum income requirements necessary to establish eligibility for pensions for widows and children of veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2218. A bill to provide that pensions shall be extended to the widows and children of deceased World War II veterans on the same conditions as they are now extended to the widows and children of deceased World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 2219. A bill authorizing a completion of the improvement of the Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 2220. A bill to provide for the national security of the Nation by requiring that all qualified young men undergo a period of training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VURSELL:

H. R. 2221. A bill making appropriations for emergency flood relief; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 2222. A bill to provide a 2-year moratorium with respect to the application of certain antitrust laws to individual, good faith delivered price systems and freight absorption practices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHEELER:

H. R. 2223. A bill to amend and supplement the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. J. Res. 124. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALLECK:

H. J. Res. 125. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the Grand Army of the Republic; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. J. Res. 126. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARROLL:

H. J. Res. 127. Joint resolution to provide for designation of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Denver, Colo., as "Edward W. Combs Veterans Facility Hospital"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. J. Res. 128. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for the adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. J. Res. 129. Joint resolution designating the first Sunday in June of each year as

Shut-In's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of California:

H. J. Res. 130. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H. J. Res. 131. Joint resolution to provide for designation of the Veterans' Administration hospital to be constructed in St. Louis, Mo., as the John J. Cochran Memorial Veterans' Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. J. Res. 132. Joint resolution to name the Chain of Rocks improvement the Cochran Canal and Locks; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McKINNON:

H. J. Res. 133. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. J. Res. 134. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. J. Res. 135. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. Con. Res. 21. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing as a House document of the pamphlet entitled "Manual Explanatory of the Privileges, Rights, and Benefits Provided For Persons Who Served in the Armed Forces of the United States During World War I, World War II, or peacetime (After April 20, 1896), and Those Dependent Upon Them, With Special Reference to Those Benefits, Rights, and Privileges Administered by the Veterans' Administration"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. Con. Res. 22. Concurrent resolution suspending legislative budget until May 1, 1949; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. Con. Res. 23. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that the 7th day of March of each year be known and designated in the several States as Friendship Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. Con. Res. 24. Concurrent resolution relative to reform in procedure before congressional committees; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. Res. 75. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. Res. 76. Resolution investigating certain matters pertaining to the United States merchant marine; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. Res. 77. Resolution providing for expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (h) (1); to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WOOD:

H. Res. 78. Resolution to authorize the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States for consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 3, in relation to the effect of the recent freezing weather conditions on the agricultural industry of California; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States for consideration of Legislative Resolution 5, and asking that Senate bill 246, providing Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools of the United States, or any similar legislation now pending before the Congress, be defeated; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States for consideration of Senate Concurrent Memorial No. 1, dealing with the existing labor-management dispute between the Kennecott Copper Corp., Utah copper division, and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 2224. A bill for the relief of the Winona Machine & Foundry Co., a corporation, of Winona, Minn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2225. A bill for the relief of William B. Buol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 2226. A bill for the relief of Victor C. Kaminski (also known as Victor Kaminski); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 2227. A bill for the relief of William Alexander Blum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2228. A bill for the relief of Paul B. Herrington; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 2229. A bill for the relief of John P. Hayes; Peter J. Grant, assistant postmaster; William W. Crist, superintendent of money orders; and John S. Bantham, station examiner; at Albany, N. Y.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARROLL:

H. R. 2230. A bill to reimburse Arthur S. Horner, Leah B. Horner, and Maude Brewer, partners composing a firm doing business as A. S. Horner Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEANE:

H. R. 2231. A bill for the relief of Marie E. Wright; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 2232. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Solveig Normanson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 2233. A bill for the relief of Ewa Plantation Co., a Hawaiian corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2234. A bill for the relief of Gladys J. Senyohl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FURCOLO:

H. R. 2235. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Armand Ribeiro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2236. A bill for the relief of Merman A. Bennink; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 2237. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Wadlow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 2238. A bill for the relief of Robert L. Campbell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2239. A bill for the relief of the estate of W. M. West; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2240. A bill for the relief of Mrs. James M. Cooper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2241. A bill to record the lawful admission of Ibrahim Wadie Harb to the United States for permanent residence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2242. A bill for the relief of Rufus H. Grant; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 2243. A bill for the relief of Constantine N. Perkins; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2244. A bill for the relief of Edward T. Hunter; Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LODGE:

H. R. 2245. A bill for the relief of First Lt. Henry S. Watcke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 2246. A bill for the relief of John DelGatte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LODGE:

H. R. 2247. A bill for the relief of Ethel S. Wakeman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 2248. A bill for the relief of Wataru Kitagawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. R. 2249. A bill for the relief of Al W. Hosinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 2250. A bill for the relief of Pietro Fazzalari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2251. A bill for the relief of Marie Cataldi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 2252. A bill for the relief of Orren J. Lucht, Mora, Minn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 2253. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Arthur Earl Trotel, Jr., a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 2254. A bill for the relief of Osmore H. Morgan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2255. A bill for the relief of Kwan Hon Cheun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H. R. 2256. A bill for the relief of Angelina Marsiglia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 2257. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever," approved February 26, 1929, by including therein the name of Gustaf E. Lambert; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 2258. A bill for the relief of Antonio M. Opisso and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 2259. A bill for the relief of Ewing Choat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REGAN:

H. R. 2260. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Chagra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 2261. A bill for the relief of Eva C. Netzley Ridley, William G. Stuff, Lois Stuff, and Harry E. Ridley; and the estates of Clyde C. Netzley and Sarah C. Stuff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2262. A bill for the relief of Angelo Miletto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 2263. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gee Yee Shee, Mrs. Wong Tew Quey Gee, Ruth Shue-Kim Gee and Joseph Doo-Keung Gee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 2264. A bill for the relief of C. H. Bolling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SOMERS:

H. R. 2265. A bill for the relief of Thomas Nicholas Epiphaniades and Wanda Julia Epiphaniades; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2266. A bill for the relief of Morris Tutnauer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2267. A bill for the relief of Anna Constantios Nicourezou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 2268. A bill for the relief of Forest L. Weatherly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

38. By Mr. MACK of Washington: Petition of Northwest Rivers and Harbors Congress urging Congress to specifically exempt the Corps of Engineers from any legislation which will transfer civil-works functions of the corps to any other agency; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

39. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Thomas D. Leadbetter, city clerk, city of Detroit, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to establishment of aerial gunnery areas in Lake Huron and the establishment of October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1949

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, we are again approaching Thy throne through the old and familiar way of prayer which is never closed to those who come with a humble spirit and a contrite heart.

May this be a moment of insight and of inspiration. Grant that the whole day may be glorious in the realization of Thy presence, Thy peace, and Thy power.

We pray that Thou wilt transform our lives from what they are to what they ought to be. Establish within us those loyalties and those integrities which cannot be shaken.

Guide us by Thy spirit as we seek to minister to the needs of all the members of the human family who are finding the struggle of life so difficult. Show us how we may release the hidden splendor of humanity and bring to fulfillment those ideals and capacities which Thou hast planted in the soul of man.

To Thy name we ascribe the praise. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 31, 1949, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 547) to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 126) to provide that acreage planted to cotton in 1949 shall not be used in computing cotton acreage allotments for any subsequent year, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

THE MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. LANGER proceeded to address the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota will understand that remarks are not in order at this time.

Mr. LANGER. I thought I had 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; there is no 5-minute rule which operates during the transaction of the routine morning business. Under the rule speeches of any length are not in order. The 5-minute rule applies when the Senate is considering the calendar during the morning hour, not during the transaction of the routine morning business.

Mr. LANGER. Then I ask unanimous consent that my remarks may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

[Mr. LANGER'S remarks appear elsewhere in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.]

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I think, in order to save time, that I should suggest the absence of a quorum, and I do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Holland	Murray
Anderson	Humphrey	Myers
Baldwin	Hunt	Neely
Brewster	Ives	O'Conor
Bricker	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Broughton	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Reed
Byrd	Kefauver	Robertson
Cain	Kem	Russell
Chapman	Kerr	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Connally	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Donnell	Lodge	Sparkman
Douglas	Long	Stennis
Eastland	Lucas	Taft
Ecton	McCarthy	Taylor
Ellender	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Flanders	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Frear	McKellar	Thye
Fulbright	McMahon	Tydings
George	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Gillette	Martin	Watkins
Hayden	Maybank	Wiley
Hendrickson	Miller	Williams
Hickenlooper	Millikin	Withers
Hill	Morse	
Hoey	Mundt	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on official committee business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

PETER MARSHALL

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a certified copy of prefatory remarks made by the chaplain of the Ohio State Senate regarding the death of Rev. Peter Marshall, late the Chaplain of the United States Senate, which, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The United States Senate is without a Chaplain. A brilliant life came suddenly to an end yesterday in Washington. The Reverend Peter Marshall has had a distinguished career as Chaplain of the Senate, if my information is correct, following that of the late Dr. ZeBarney T. Phillips, of Springfield, Ohio. He was popular with the Senators, being as he was an outspokenly honest man who challenged them constantly to be outstanding leaders in the high office to which the American people had elected them. He was pastor

of the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church, where Abraham Lincoln worshiped while President of this great Nation. We shall remember him and his loved ones in their bereavement today in our prayer:

"In the midst of life we are in death; of whom may we seek for succor, but of Thee, O Lord, who for our sins art justly displeased?"

Let us pray:

"O God whose days are without end and whose mercies cannot be numbered, accept our prayers on behalf of the soul of Thy servant departed and grant him an entrance into the love of life and joy, in the fellowship of Thy saints. Defend the members of his bereaved family with Thy heavenly grace that they may continue Thine forever and daily increase in Thy Holy Spirit more and more until they too come into Thine everlasting Kingdom.

"May the souls of the faithful by the mercies of God rest in peace.

"May he rest in peace." Amen.

This is to certify that this is a true and correct copy of prefatory remarks made by the Rev. John I. Byron, chaplain, Ohio State Senate, Columbus, Ohio, January 26, 1949, regarding the death of Rev. Peter Marshall, Chaplain of the United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DWIGHT L. MATCHETTE,
Clerk of the Senate.

TEXTS OF CERTAIN CONVENTIONS, ETC., OF INTERNATIONAL LABOR CONFERENCE (H. DOC. NO. 51)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Senate of the United States:

The Constitution of the International Labor Organization provides in article 19 thereof, with respect to each convention and recommendation adopted at a session of the International Labor Conference, that "each of the members undertakes that it will," within a given period, bring the convention or recommendation "before the authority or authorities within whose competence the matter lies, for the enactment of legislation or other action."

In accordance with the above-mentioned obligations of the Government of the United States of America as a member of the International Labor Organization, I transmit herewith, for the enactment of legislation or such other action as the Senate may consider appropriate, authentic texts of certain conventions, an instrument of amendment, and recommendations adopted at recent sessions of the International Labor Conference, as follows:

Convention (No. 81) concerning labor inspection in industry and commerce;

Convention (No. 82) concerning social policy in nonmetropolitan territories;

Convention (No. 83) concerning the application of international labor standards to nonmetropolitan territories;

Instrument for the amendment of the schedule to convention (No. 33) concerning the application of international labor standards to nonmetropolitan territories;

Convention (No. 84) concerning the right of association and the settlement of labor disputes in nonmetropolitan territories;

Convention (No. 85) concerning labor inspectorates in nonmetropolitan territories;

Convention (No. 86) concerning the maximum length of contracts of employment of indigenous workers;

Recommendation (No. 81) concerning labor inspection; and

Recommendation (No. 82) concerning labor inspection in mining and transport undertakings.

The conventions and recommendations listed above were adopted at the thirtieth session of the International Labor Conference at Geneva from June 19 to July 11, 1947. The instrument of amendment was adopted by the Conference at its thirty-first session held at San Francisco from June 17 to July 10, 1948.

I transmit also the report of the Acting Secretary of State regarding the above-mentioned conventions, instrument of amendment, and recommendations, and a letter of December 3, 1948, from the Acting Secretary of Labor to the Secretary of State regarding those documents.

I am requesting the Secretary of the Interior to transmit the above-mentioned conventions, instrument of amendment, and recommendations to the governments of Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands for the enactment of legislation or other action. I am transmitting those documents to the Secretary of the Navy for appropriate action and advice with respect to Guam, American Samoa, and the trust territory.

I am also referring the texts of the conventions, instrument of amendment, and recommendations to the House of Representatives.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 2, 1949.*

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Acting Secretary of State; (2) letter from the Acting Secretary of Labor; (3) authentic texts of conventions, instrument of amendment, and recommendations.)

RATIFICATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TERM OF OFFICE OF PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Governor of the State of South Dakota, transmitting a certified copy of a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the term of the office of the President, which was ordered to lie on the table.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON WAR CONTRACT TERMINATIONS AND SETTLEMENTS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the eighteenth quarterly report on war contract settlements for the period October 1 through December 31, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FLIGHT PAY OF CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE COAST GUARD

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, reporting, pursuant to law, the number of officers above the rank of lieutenant commander on duty involving flying, by rank and age groups, with the average monthly flight pay authorized by law to be paid to such officers, during the 6-month period ended December 31, 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REMOVAL OF LIMITATION ON COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 301 of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948, to remove the present limitation on the compensation of certain officers and employees (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

Three letters from the Attorney General, withdrawing the names of certain persons from reports relating to aliens whose deportation he suspended more than 6 months ago, heretofore transmitted by him to the Senate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON SYNTHETIC LIQUID FUELS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on operations under the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act of April 5, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON VIEWS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF STATE OF CALIFORNIA ON CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the views and recommendations of the State of California on the central Arizona project (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS PASSED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCILS OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN AND ST CROIX, V. I.

Four letters from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws passed by the Municipal Councils of St. Thomas and St. John and St. Croix, V. I. (with the accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON SOLANO COUNTY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report and findings on the Solano County project in the Central Valley Basin of California (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, reporting, pursuant to law, on tort claims paid by that Commission for the calendar year ended December 31, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF DISPLACED PERSONS COMMISSION

A letter from the members of the Displaced Persons Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the first semiannual report of that Commission for the period ended December 31, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the tenth annual report of that

Board, for the year 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PROGRESS REPORT OF WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of the War Assets Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a quarterly progress report of that Administration, for the period October-December 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES PHILIPPINE WAR DAMAGE COMMISSION

A letter from the director, Washington office, of the Philippine War Damage Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fourth semiannual report of that Commission, for the period ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF POTOMAC ELECTRIC POWER CO.

A letter from the president of the Potomac Electric Power Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that company for the year ended December 31, 1948, together with a list of the stockholders (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF WASHINGTON GAS LIGHT CO.

A letter from the president of the Washington Gas Light Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of the business of that company, together with a list of stockholders, for the calendar year ended December 31, 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ARMORY BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the District of Columbia Armory Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

CONFIDENTIAL SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON STOCK-PILING PROGRAM AND STATISTICAL SUPPLEMENT

A letter from the Chairman of the Munitions Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential supplement to the semiannual report on the stock-piling program and a confidential statistical supplement for the operations covering the period up to June 30, 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers in various departments and agencies of the Government, recommended for disposition, which appear to have no permanent value or historical interest (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER as the members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, protesting against the enactment of legislation to provide Federal aid to education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. BUTLER on January 31, 1949 (p. 667), CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Utah; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Concurrent Memorial 1

"Concurrent memorial urging the congressional delegation from the State of Utah to introduce a resolution in the Congress of the United States requesting President Truman to use his good office in securing the appointment of a fact-finding board to investigate and recommend a basis for settlement of the existing labor-management dispute between the Kennecott Copper Corp., Utah copper division, and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, such as was recommended by the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service and the Industrial Commission of the State of Utah on November 6, 1948; copy attached

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring therein):

"Whereas the economy of Utah is substantially stifled due to a prolonged industrial dispute at the Kennecott Copper Corp., Utah copper division; and

"Whereas the national security of the United States requires a stock pile of 90,000 tons of copper by June 30, 1949; and

"Whereas the open-pit mine at Bingham Canyon, Utah, of the Kennecott Copper Corp., produces approximately 30 percent of the national output of newly mined copper; and

"Whereas the Kennecott Copper Corp. and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen have been unable to settle the current dispute through direct negotiations: Be it therefore

"Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of Utah approve the adoption of this concurrent memorial urging the congressional delegation from the State of Utah to introduce a resolution in the Congress of the United States requesting President Truman to use his good offices in securing the appointment of a fact-finding board to investigate and recommend a basis for settlement of the existing labor-management dispute between the Kennecott Copper Corp., Utah copper division, and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, such as was recommended by the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service and the Industrial Commission of the State of Utah on November 6, 1948; copy attached; be it further

"Resolved, That copy of this concurrent memorial be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each member of the Utah delegation of the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of Labor, and the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service."

Three joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Joint Resolution 3

"Joint resolution to memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in relation to the effect of the recent freezing weather conditions on the agricultural industry of California

"Whereas recent and unprecedented freezing weather has occurred in the State of California and, particularly in the southern portions thereof, has caused the outright destruction of a large part of the crop of citrus fruits and avocados and has caused damage to the trees bearing such crops to an extent the magnitude of which cannot at this time be definitely ascertained but which well may reach calamitous proportions; and

"Whereas the practical destruction of the citrus fruit and avocado industry of California, coupled with the impairment of production of other types of agricultural products not so severely affected, bids fair to result in a serious impairment of the economic structure of the State of California, affecting not only the individual ranchers but successively affecting the communities in which they live, the State of California, and the United States as a whole; and

"Whereas it is probable that when the full extent of this disaster becomes known its scope will be so great that it will be beyond the power of the State of California to take the remedial steps necessary to alleviate the conditions caused thereby; and

"Whereas the Legislature of the State of California deems it appropriate officially to advise the United States Government of the situation that now exists and probably will exist in this State: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California hereby respectfully requests the President and the Congress of the United States to make a thorough investigation of the conditions resulting from the recent freezing weather in California and the results thereof on the agriculture of the State and to take such steps as may be necessary, by providing subsidies or otherwise, to alleviate the situation and to ameliorate the condition of the persons who have suffered because of the destruction resulting from such freezing weather; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States."

"Senate Joint Resolution 9

"Joint resolution relative to funds for the Joint Commission for the Eradication of Foot-and-Mouth Disease in the Republic of Mexico

"Whereas foot-and-mouth disease, a major and devastating disease of livestock, is present in the Republic of Mexico; and

"Whereas the Republic of Mexico and the United States of America have joined forces to control and eradicate the disease in Mexico; and

"Whereas the chief instrument for the control of the disease is the joint commission established for that purpose and supported by the two nations with financial, scientific and general ways and means; and

"Whereas great strides are being made in the Republic of Mexico by the efforts of the joint commission toward the control and eradication of this disease, which is not known to exist elsewhere in North America; and

"Whereas it is in the general welfare of the two contracting nations to continue the work of the joint commission without any slackening of effort or loss of research, program or planning: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to approve an appropriation of funds, and such other enactments as are necessary, to continue without interruption the work of the Joint Commission for the Eradication of Foot-and-Mouth Disease in the Republic of Mexico, and commends the commission for its excellent work; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to every Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"Senate Joint Resolution 10

"Relative to the Federal livestock-disease research laboratory

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has enacted legislation providing for the livestock-disease research laboratory, with particular reference to foot-and-mouth disease; and

"Whereas neither a site for such laboratory has as yet been selected nor have funds been appropriated for it; and

"Whereas the need for such a laboratory is very great in view of the outbreak of the foot-and-mouth pestilence in the Republic of Mexico; and

"Whereas, because of the large movement of livestock east from the Pacific coast, the establishment of the laboratory on the Pacific slope would be least desirable because of the greater possibility of wide dissemination of the foot-and-mouth disease in the event of its escape from the laboratory; and

"Whereas several years will be consumed before it will be possible to construct and equip a laboratory during such time research could be greatly furthered by sending young men abroad to work with foreign research laboratories: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States immediately to make provision for the construction of a livestock-disease research laboratory, with particular reference to foot-and-mouth disease, other than on the Pacific slope, and during the interim prior to the completion of such laboratory, to make provision for sending young men abroad to work with foreign research laboratories in the accomplishment of scientific research with respect to the control of foot-and-mouth disease; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to every Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the Assembly of the State of California; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"House Resolution 46

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to effect legislation which will enable the Civil Aeronautics Administration to prohibit the taking off of aircraft from airports during periods of poor visibility

"Whereas there have recently occurred several serious aircraft accidents in Seattle, Wash., Portland, and other areas during periods of poor visibility; and

"Whereas these accidents have resulted in the deaths and injuries of many persons, thereby causing tremendous losses to the air transportation industry due to lack of public confidence in air transportation because of such accidents; and

"Whereas it is believed these accidents were caused by take-offs from airports during weather conditions of poor visibility; and

"Whereas the Civil Aeronautics Administration does not have authority under the presently existing laws to prevent aircraft from taking off during periods when visibility is below the legal minimum; and

"Whereas, if granted such authority it is believed that many of the recent tragic aircraft accidents could have been prevented: Therefore be it

"Resolved, by the Assembly of the State of California, That the President and the Congress of the United States be memorialized to effect and enact legislation authorizing the Civil Aeronautics Administration to prohibit the taking off of aircraft from airports during periods when visibility is less than the legal minimum; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of California."

A letter in the nature of a petition from Ruth Bishop, of Covington, Ky., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide military status for women who served overseas with the Army of the United States during World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter from the Purdue Aeronautics Corp., Lafayette, Ind., signed by Grove Webster, director, relating to legislation pertaining to a separate air academy (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Detroit, Mich., requesting that certain areas in Lake Huron be designated as aerial gunnery areas; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Kentucky Margarine Consumers Committee, favoring the enactment of fair margarine legislation; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Whittier Council of Church Women, Whittier, Calif., favoring world peace; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Community Councils of the City of New York, N. Y., protesting against Foreign Secretary Bevin's Palestine policy; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Petitions of sundry citizens of New York City, N. Y., praying that the delegates of the United States to the United Nations take the lead in proposing that Italy be assigned the United Nations trusteeship of her former possessions in Africa; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of Los Angeles, Calif., favoring the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 4, relating to the Colorado River compact; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Letters and papers in the nature of memorials of sundry citizens of the United States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to provide for a single Resident Commissioner in Congress to represent both Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Weber County Canning Crops Association, Ogden, Utah, favoring the enactment of legislation to permit persons of Japanese ancestry to become citizens of the United States on the same basis as other nationalities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Polish-American Congress, Maryland Division, Baltimore, Md., praying for the enactment of legislation to correct some of the alleged deficiencies in the present displaced persons law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolutions adopted by the Council of the City of Rochester, N. Y.; Common Council of the City of St. Paul and the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, both in the State of Minnesota; the Common Council of the City of Detroit, Mich.; and the City Council of the City of New Bedford, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation proclaiming that October 11 of each year be designated as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUCAS:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"House Resolution 17

"Whereas no segment of the American people has made a greater contribution, in peace and in war, to the welfare of our Nation than have the working men and women of America; and

"Whereas this magnificent contribution was made possible through the long struggle of organized labor to secure for the workingman recognition of certain fundamental rights; and

"Whereas Public Law 101 of the Eightieth Congress, otherwise known as the Taft-Hartley Act, attempts to abridge labor's fundamental rights and to set the cause of the workingman back a generation; and

"Whereas the Taft-Hartley Act not only adversely affects organized labor but jeopardizes the peace and prosperity of the entire country, because whatever hurts labor hurts the Nation: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-sixth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That the Congress of the United States now assembled be urged to take immediate steps to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act and to restore to the working men and women of America the rights to which they are entitled and the respect they so richly deserve; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent by the Secretary of State to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each of the Members of the Congress of the United States from the State of Illinois."

Adopted by the house, January 25, 1949.

By Mr. MILLER:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Senate Joint Memorial 1

"Joint memorial memorializing the President and Congress of the United States through appropriate budgetary and legislative action to continue a plan of expansion of local service air transportation facilities as recommended by the President's Air Policy Commission and the Congressional Air Policy Board, by extending to 5 years the term of experimental or temporary certificates of convenience and necessity for such air transportation now in effect, including that of Empire Air Lines, Inc., now serving Idaho

"Your memorialist, the Thirtieth Legislature of the State of Idaho, now convened in regular session, respectfully represents to the President and Congress of the United States:

"That Empire Air Lines, Inc., of Boise, Idaho, is a temporarily certified local (feeder) service air line now operating air-mail route No. 78 under a temporary certificate of public convenience and necessity which will expire September 28, 1949, unless extended by the Civil Aeronautics Board;

"That the air mail, passenger, and express service rendered by said Empire Air Lines, Inc., is a valuable asset to the State of Idaho in that such service overcomes the existent geographic barriers against convenient and speedy surface transportation, which have heretofore resulted in dividing our State politically, socially, and economically;

"That the continuation of such air service is vitally needed in the promotion of the unity and welfare of Idaho and its people;

"That the President's Air Policy (Finletter) Commission and the Congressional Air Policy Board have concurred in recommending that the present experimental 3-year certificates of

convenience and necessity issued to and held by local or feeder air lines be extended to 5 years;

"That the present and planned development of the Snake River area and its water resources for power, irrigation, and other beneficial uses will substantially increase the population, commerce, and trade within the area now served by Empire Air Lines, Inc.;

"That your memorialist, being deeply concerned with the future growth of Idaho, believes that it is in the public interest for the United States to foster and further develop feeder and local air service, particularly in the Western States: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the senate of the thirtieth legislature (the house of representatives concurring)*, That the President and Congress of the United States be, and they hereby are urged and requested, through appropriate budgetary action and financial support, to provide for the extension of the term of experimental or temporary certificates of convenience and necessity of local or feeder air lines, including that of Empire Air Lines, Inc., from 3 to 5 years; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be and is hereby ordered to send copies of this memorial to the President of the United States of America and the Members of the Idaho delegation and the Congress of the United States of America.

"This senate joint memorial passed the senate on the 25th day of January 1949.

"This senate joint memorial passed the house of representatives on the 27th day of January 1949."

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

GENERAL PULASKI MEMORIAL DAY—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF NEW BEDFORD, MASS.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and myself I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the City Council of New Bedford, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation proclaiming October 11 of each year as General Pulaski Memorial Day.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress.

Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

Whereas the 11th day of October 1779 is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Kansas, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union, through legislative enactment designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and

Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated October 11, 1929, October 11, 1931, October 11, 1932, and October 11, 1946 to be General Pulaski's Memorial Day, in the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of New Bedford, State of Massachusetts, in session assembled—

SECTION 1. That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States, to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

SEC. 2. That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and each of the United States Senators and Representatives from Massachusetts.

In city council, January 27, 1949: Received, placed on file, and resolution adopted.

CHARLES W. DEASY, *City Clerk.*

A true copy, attest:

CHARLES W. DEASY, *City Clerk.*

AMERICAN MILITARY TRIALS IN GERMANY—TELEGRAM FROM PAUL H. MUELLER

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a telegram received by me from Paul H. Mueller, publisher of the Abendpost, Chicago, Ill., dealing with United States military trials in Germany.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *February 2, 1949.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

In view gravity of charges against prosecuting staff, investigators, and United States military officials participating military trials at Dachau, Germany, I urgently suggest that you try to get subcommittee with fullest investigating powers to its work on spot, i. e., Dachau und Landsberg, Germany. Catholic bishops in western zones of Germany, also Protestant Bishop Dr. Worm, Wuerttemberg, condemned trials repeatedly and demanded investigation of methods American military justice, particularly in connection with so-called Malmedy massacre. Highly probable that third degree, even outright torture, used to obtain confessions to acts, crimes never committed. Death sentences pronounced on basis of such confessions. Believe depositions should be obtained from Germans subjected to these methods, and American investigators, etc., participating in these cases should be sharply questioned by Senators.

PAUL H. MUELLER,
Publisher, Abendpost.

TRANSFER OF BUSHNELL GENERAL HOSPITAL NEAR BRIGHAM CITY, UTAH—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I report favorably, with an amendment, the bill (S. 170) to authorize the transfer of certain property to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 30) thereon. The committee's report was unanimous. I want to ask, either now or at the conclusion of the morning hour, unanimous consent for immediate consideration of the bill by reason of the urgency of the situation covered by it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and the bill will lie on the table.

IDA RAFFEL KLAFF

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 46, submitted by Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma on January 31, 1949, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. This is the usual resolution adopted in similar cases.

There being no objection, the resolution was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Ida Raffel Klaff, daughter of Louis Raffel, late an employee of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS RELATING TO INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONSHIPS

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 51), which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection (g) (2) (D) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period beginning on February 16, 1949, and ending on February 15, 1950, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, in addition to any unexpended balance under Senate Resolution 189, Eightieth Congress, agreed to January 28, 1948, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee as the case may be.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, conforming with the practice followed over the past 6 years, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit the report on civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government for the month of December 1948, with the request that it be printed in the body of the RECORD.

In view of the fact that this report is for the last month of the calendar year 1948 and the sixth month of the fiscal year 1949 the following observations will be of interest to Members of Congress in connection with the facts which the report develops.

The number of Federal employees in the executive branch increased 108,987 during the calendar year 1948—the net increase averaging 297 for every day in the year.

This was revealed today by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures on the basis of its compilation of personnel reports certified to the committee by each of the Federal agencies.

The new report covers civilian employment by all Federal agencies for December 1948, and it shows the total for the month—both inside and outside continental United States—was 2,104,456 as compared with 1,995,469 a year ago.

INSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Inside continental United States total employment increased 137,407, a daily average increase of 375 for the year. In December 1948 the total was 1,910,589. A year ago the total was 1,773,182.

OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Federal agency personnel employed outside continental United States in December 1948 totaled 193,767, as compared with 222,337 a year ago. The decrease during the year totaled 28,570, or a daily average decrease of 78.

CIVILIAN AGENCIES

Exclusive of the Military Establishment, Federal civilian agencies at home and abroad increased their personnel during the year by 47,992, rising from 1,166,236 a year ago to 1,214,228 in December 1948. The daily average increase for these agencies was 131. There was a net increase both inside and outside the country.

MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

The number of civilian employees in the Military Establishment increased during the year at an average of 166 per day. The number in December 1948 was 890,228, or 60,995 more than it was a year ago.

The military agencies employed additional civilian personnel at the rate of 246 a day during the year inside continental United States, but showed a decrease averaging about 80 a day abroad.

The total employed inside the country in December 1948 was 750,734, as compared with 660,745 a year ago. Civilians employed by the military agencies outside the country in December 1948 totaled 139,494, as compared with 168,488 a year ago. Much of the decrease abroad was among the so-called industrial employees.

NOVEMBER–DECEMBER

There was a net decrease of 141 in all Federal civilian employment during December, as compared with the previous month, due largely to heavy reductions in Army civilian employment overseas, to reductions by the War Assets Administration which is in liquidation, and to reductions in the Agriculture Department, where employment is seasonal. There were heavy increases in the Military Establishment employment inside the continental United States and the Post Office Department, which had the Christmas rush.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH, NOVEMBER–DECEMBER 1948, AND PAY OCTOBER–NOVEMBER 1948

NOTE WITH REFERENCE TO PERSONAL SERVICE EXPENDITURE FIGURES

It should be noted that the latest expenditure figures for personal service shown in table I of this report are for the month of November, and that they are compared with personal service expenditure figures for the month of October, whereas the latest employment figures covered in this report are for the month of December and are compared with employment figures for the month of November. This lag in personal service expenditure figures is necessary in order that actual expenditures may be reported.

(Figures in the following report are compiled from signed official personnel reports by the various agencies and departments of the Federal Government. Table I shows total personnel employed inside and outside continental United States, and pay, by agency. Table II shows personnel employed inside continental United States, by agency. Table III shows personnel employed outside continental United States, by agency. Table IV gives by agency the industrial workers employed by the Federal Government. For purposes of comparison, figures for the previous month are shown in adjoining columns.)

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I)

According to monthly personnel reports for December 1948 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures:

	Civilian personnel in executive branch—			Pay roll (in thousands of dollars) in executive branch—		
	In December numbered—	In November numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In November was—	In October was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total	2,104,456	2,104,597	−141	535,303	525,487	+9,816
1. Agencies exclusive of National Military Establishment	1,214,228	1,214,182	+46	316,094	312,488	+3,606
2. National Military Establishment	890,228	890,415	−187	219,209	212,999	+6,210
Within National Military Establishment:						
Office of Secretary of Defense	1,190	1,132	+58	415	392	+23
Department of the Army	367,365	369,016	−1,651	84,443	87,144	−2,701
Department of the Air Force	156,679	157,799	+1,120	39,136	35,711	+3,425
Department of the Navy	363,874	363,588	+286	95,215	89,752	+5,463

Table I, on page 3, breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agency.

Tables II, III, and IV break down the above employment figures to show the number of employees inside continental United States, the number outside continental United States, and the number in the so-called industrial categories. This further break-down in tables II, III, and IV does not include pay figures because pay-roll reports submitted to the committee by some agencies are inadequate for this purpose.

INSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

(See table II)

Federal personnel within the United States increased 3,804 from the November total of 1,906,885 to the December total of 1,910,689.

Exclusive of the National Military Establishment there was an increase of 676 from the November total of 1,159,279 to the December total of 1,159,955.

Total civilian employment within the United States for the National Military Establishment for December was 750,734, an increase of 3,128 over the November total of 747,606.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense increased 58 from the November total of 1,132 to the December figure of 1,190.

The Department of the Army civilian personnel within the United States increased 1,186 from the November figure of 295,863 to the December figure of 297,049.

The Department of the Air Force civilian personnel within continental United States increased 1,302 from the November figure of 129,644 to the December figure of 130,946.

The Department of the Navy within the United States increased 582 from the November figure of 320,967 to the December figure of 321,549.

OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

(See table III)

Outside continental United States Federal personnel decreased 3,945 from the November total of 197,712 to the December total of 193,767.

A decrease of 630 was reported in the overseas civilian employment of the departments and agencies, other than the National Military Establishment, from the November total of 54,903 to the December total of 54,273.

Total overseas civilian employment for the National Military Establishment decreased 3,315 from the November total of 142,809 to the December total of 139,494.

The Department of the Army reported a decrease of 2,837 in overseas employment from the November figure of 73,153 to the December figure of 70,316.

The civilian personnel of the Department of the Air Force overseas decreased 182 from the November figure of 27,035 to the December figure of 26,853.

The Department of the Navy reported a decrease of 296 in overseas employment from the November figure of 42,621 to the December figure of 42,325.

INDUSTRIAL EMPLOYMENT

(See table IV)

Total industrial employment during the month of December decreased 2,485 from the November total of 576,932 to the December total of 574,447.

The departments and agencies other than the National Military Establishment decreased their industrial employment by 846 from the November total of 20,172 to the December total of 19,326.

The National Military Establishment decreased its total industrial employment 1,639 during the month from the November total of 556,760 to the December total of 555,121.

The Department of the Army decreased its industrial employment 1,721 from the November figure of 208,326 to the December figure of 206,605. Inside continental United States there was an increase of 389, while overseas industrial employment decreased 2,110.

The Department of the Air Force industrial employment increased 304 during the month of December from the November figure of 94,944 to the December figure of 95,248. Inside continental United States the Air Force industrial employment increased 649, while outside continental United States it decreased 345.

The Department of the Navy decreased its industrial employment 222 from the November figure of 253,490 to the December figure of 253,268.

The term "industrial employees," as used by the committee, refers to unskilled, semi-skilled, skilled, and supervisory employees paid by the Federal Government, who are working on construction projects such as airfields and roads, and in shipyards and arsenals. It does not include maintenance and custodial employees.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1948, and comparison with November 1948; and pay for November 1948, and comparison with October 1948*

Department or agency	Pay (in thousands of dollars)				Personnel			
	October	November	Increase	Decrease	November	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):								
Agriculture	19,582	18,419		1,163	76,767	74,966		1,801
Commerce	12,276	12,195		81	40,361	40,139		242
Interior	13,197	13,466	269		50,447	49,484		963
Justice	8,913	9,178	265		26,279	26,195		84
Labor	1,062	1,131	69		3,481	3,507	26	
Post Office	124,068	125,072	1,004		501,854	508,321	6,467	
State	5,375	5,649	274		19,932	20,001	69	
Treasury	25,070	26,573	1,503		88,714	88,567		147
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	124	85		39	218	214		4
Bureau of the Budget	234	248	14		537	538	1	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	12	15	3		64	64		
National Security Council [1]	9	9			19	19		
National Security Resources Board	145	170	25		378	390	12	
Council of Economic Advisers	21	23	2		39	39		
Emergency war agencies: Office of Defense Transportation	15	12		3	40	40		
Postwar agencies:								
Displaced Persons Commission	22	32	10		106	116	10	
Economic Cooperation Administration	738	800	62		2,491	2,852	361	
Office of the Housing Expediter	1,530	1,585	55		4,810	4,837	27	
Philippine Alien Property Administration	31	32	1		137	134		3
Philippine War Damage Commission	210	217	7		936	937	1	
War Assets Administration	4,153	4,155	2		10,241	7,549		2,692
Independent agencies:								
American Battle Monuments Commission	13	14	1		138	135		3
Atomic Energy Commission	1,825	1,682		143	4,869	4,835		55
Civil Aeronautics Board	244	260	16		666	664		2
Civil Service Commission	1,189	1,247	58		4,109	4,118	9	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	58	60	2		125	123		2
Federal Communications Commission	481	503	22		1,360	1,354		6
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	352	371	19		1,025	1,031	6	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	184	198	14		379	377		2
Federal Power Commission	307	353	46		829	831	2	
Federal Security Agency [1]	8,935	9,321	386		35,048	34,972		76
Federal Trade Commission	230	244	14		636	634		2
Federal Works Agency	6,019	5,731		288	22,924	22,853		71
General Accounting Office	2,717	2,887	170		9,443	9,411		32
Government Printing Office	1,995	2,099	104		6,986	6,953		33
Housing and Home Finance Agency	3,677	3,636		41	11,780	11,678		102
Indian Claims Commission	6	6			11	11		
Interstate Commerce Commission	325	372	47		2,297	2,286		11
Maritime Commission	1,723	2,099	376		6,773	6,530		243
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	1,975	1,816		159	6,780	6,887	107	
National Archives	158	105		53	371	380	9	
National Capital Housing Authority	68	70	2		306	306		
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	7	9	2		20	20		
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission	1	2	1		3	3		
National Gallery of Art	76	80	4		319	317		2
National Labor Relations Board	543	574	31		1,837	1,681		166
National Mediation Board	59	53		6	104	107	3	
Panama Canal	4,355	3,290		1,065	23,051	22,918		133
Railroad Retirement Board	649	683	34		2,401	2,388		13
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	1,836	1,832		4	4,801	4,623		178
Securities and Exchange Commission	462	467	5		1,139	1,139		
Selective Service System	970	1,075	105		5,933	5,979	46	
Smithsonian Institution	157	166	9		560	555		5
Tariff Commission	98	103	5		241	239		2
Tax Court of the United States	54	54			124	124		
Tennessee Valley Authority	4,171	3,510		661	14,307	13,982		325
Veterans' Administration	49,282	51,501	2,219		214,585	215,078	493	
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	312,488	316,094	7,292	3,686	1,214,182	1,214,228	7,649	7,603
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			3,606				46	
National Military Establishment:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	392	415	23		1,132	1,190	58	
Department of the Army:								
Inside continental United States	[3] 71,697	71,312		385	295,863	297,049	1,186	
Outside continental United States	13,447	13,131		2,316	73,153	70,316		2,837

[1] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency.
[2] Includes personnel and pay for the Columbia Institute for the Deaf and Howard University.
[3] Revised.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1948, and comparison with November 1948; and pay for November 1948, and comparison with October 1948*—Continued

Department or agency	Pay (in thousands of dollars)				Personnel			
	October	November	Increase	Decrease	November	December	Increase	Decrease
National Military Establishment—Continued								
Department of the Air Force:								
Inside continental United States	30,747	33,800	3,053		129,644	130,946	1,302	
Outside continental United States	4,964	5,336	372		27,035	26,853		182
Department of the Navy	89,752	95,215	5,463		363,588	363,874	286	
Total, National Military Establishment	212,999	219,209	8,911	2,701	890,415	890,228	2,832	3,019
Net change, National Military Establishment			6,210				187	
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	525,487	535,303	16,203	6,387	2,104,597	2,104,456	10,481	10,622
Net change, including National Military Establishment			9,816				141	

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during December 1948, and comparison with November 1948*

Department or agency	November	December	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):			
Agriculture	74,958	73,101	−1,857
Commerce	37,141	37,138	−3
Interior	44,895	44,325	−570
Justice	25,810	25,725	−85
Labor	3,445	3,471	+26
Post Office	500,121	506,585	+6,464
State	7,462	7,608	+146
Treasury	88,067	87,919	−148
Executive Office of the President:			
White House Office	218	214	−4
Bureau of the Budget	537	538	+1
Executive Mansion and Grounds	64	64	
National Security Council [1]	19	19	
National Security Resources Board	378	390	+12
Council of Economic Advisers	39	39	
Emergency war agencies:			
Office of Defense Transportation	40	[2] 40	
Postwar agencies:			
Displaced Persons Commission	42	45	+3
Economic Cooperation Administration	838	854	+16
Office of the Housing Expediter	4,784	4,813	+29
Philippine Alien Property Administration	2	2	
Philippine War Damage Commission	7	7	
War Assets Administration	10,150	7,326	−2,824
Independent agencies:			
American Battle Monuments Commission	7	7	
Atomic Energy Commission	4,887	4,832	−55
Civil Aeronautics Board	646	644	−2
Civil Service Commission	4,103	4,113	+10
Export-Import Bank of Washington	123	121	−2
Federal Communications Commission	1,323	1,318	−5
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,025	1,031	+6
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	379	377	−2
Federal Power Commission	829	831	+2
Federal Security Agency [1]	34,084	33,994	−90

[1] Exclusive of personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.
[2] Revised.
[3] Includes personnel of the Columbia Institute for the Deaf and Howard University.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during December 1948, and comparison with November 1948*—Continued

Department or agency	November	December	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Independent agencies—Continued			
Federal Trade Commission	636	634	−2
Federal Works Agency	22,463	22,394	−69
General Accounting Office	9,443	9,411	−32
Government Printing Office	6,986	6,953	−33
Housing and Home Finance Agency	11,738	11,634	−104
Indian Claims Commission	11	11	
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,297	2,286	−11
Maritime Commission	6,734	6,492	−242
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	6,780	6,887	+107
National Archives	371	380	+9
National Capital Housing Authority	306	306	
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	20	20	
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission	3	3	
National Gallery of Art	319	317	−2
National Labor Relations Board	1,815	1,648	−167
National Mediation Board	104	107	+3
Panama Canal	484	635	+151
Railroad Retirement Board	2,401	2,388	−13
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	4,786	4,610	−175
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,159	1,159	
Selective Service System	5,773	5,819	+46
Smithsonian Institution	555	550	−5
Tariff Commission	241	239	−2
Tax Court of the United States	124	124	
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,307	13,982	−325
Veterans' Administration	212,998	213,475	+477
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	1,159,279	1,159,955	+7,508 −6,832
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			+676

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during December 1948, and comparison with November 1948*—Continued

Department or agency	November	December	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
National Military Establishment:			
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,132	1,190	+58
Department of the Army	295,863	297,049	+1,186
Department of the Air Force	129,644	130,946	+1,302
Department of the Navy	320,967	321,549	+582
Total, National Military Establishment	747,606	750,734	+3,128
Net increase, National Military Establishment			+3,128
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	1,906,885	1,910,689	+10,636 −6,832
Net increase, including National Military Establishment			+3,804

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during December 1948, and comparison with November 1948*

Department or agency	November	December	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):			
Agriculture	1,809	1,862	+53
Commerce	3,240	3,001	−239
Interior	5,522	5,159	−363
Justice	469	470	+1
Labor	36	36	
Post Office	1,733	1,736	+3
State	12,470	12,393	−77
Treasury	647	648	+1
Postwar agencies:			
Displaced Persons Commission	64	71	+7
Economic Cooperation Administration	1,653	1,998	+345
Office of the Housing Expediter	26	24	−2
Philippine Alien Property Administration	135	132	−3
Philippine War Damage Commission	929	930	+1
War Assets Administration	91	23	−68

TABLE III—Continued

Department or agency	November	December	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Independent agencies:			
American Battle Monuments Commission	131	128	−3
Atomic Energy Commission	3	3	
Civil Aeronautics Board	20	20	
Civil Service Commission	6	5	−1
Export Import Bank of Washington	2	2	
Federal Communications Commission	37	36	−1
Federal Security Agency	964	978	+14
Federal Works Agency	461	459	−2
Housing and Home Finance Agency	42	44	+2
Maritime Commission	39	38	−1
National Labor Relations Board	12	13	+1
Panama Canal	22,567	22,283	−284
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	13	13	
Selective Service System	160	160	
Smithsonian Institution	3	3	
Veterans' Administration	1,587	1,603	+16
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	54,903	54,273	+444 −1,074
Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment			−630
National Military Establishment:			
Department of the Army	73,153	70,316	−2,837
Department of the Air Force	27,035	26,853	−182
Department of the Navy	42,621	42,325	−296
Total, National Military Establishment	142,809	139,494	−3,315
Net decrease, National Military Establishment			−3,315
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	197,712	193,767	+444 −4,389
Net decrease, including National Military Establishment			−3,945

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during December 1948 and comparison with November 1948*

Department or agency	November	December	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):			
Commerce	1,360	1,237	−123
Interior	4,270	3,955	−315
State	363	359	−4
Treasury	4,283	4,305	+22
Independent agencies:			
Atomic Energy Commission	175	157	−18
Housing and Home Finance Agency	2	1	−1
Panama Canal	1,964	1,887	−77
Tennessee Valley Authority	7,775	7,445	−330
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	20,172	19,326	+22 −868
Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment			−846
National Military Establishment:			
Department of the Army:			
Inside continental United States	158,474	158,863	+389
Outside continental United States	49,852	47,742	−2,110
Department of the Air Force:			
Inside continental United States	74,814	75,463	+649
Outside continental United States	20,130	19,785	−345
Department of the Navy	253,490	253,268	−222
Total, National Military Establishment	556,760	555,121	+1,038 −2,677
Net decrease, National Military Establishment			−1,639
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	576,932	574,447	+1,060 −3,545

TABLE IV—Continued

Department or agency	November	December	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
National Military Establishment—Continued			
Department of the Navy—Continued			
Net decrease, including National Military Establishment			−2,485

COMPILATION OF CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT RECORD OF AGENCIES IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, among the services rendered the Congress and the public by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is the compilation of the civilian employment record of the agencies in the executive branch of the Federal Government.

Due to the recess 6 months have elapsed since the last monthly report of the committee on this subject was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I submit two tables which set forth the changes in the personnel situation since that time.

The first table sets forth the changes in the number of employees in the various agencies of the executive branch. The second table sets forth the changes in the costs of personal service in these agencies.

It may be noted also that the first table is broken down to show total employment, employment inside continental United States, employment outside continental United States, and industrial employment.

I request publication of this material in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE I-A—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during the period June 30 through Dec. 31, 1948, with comparison by months*

Department or agency	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Comparison, June-December: Increase	Comparison, June-December: Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):									
Agriculture	85,103	86,749	84,839	81,027	79,299	78,767	74,963		10,140
Commerce	40,935	40,523	40,729	40,577	40,382	40,381	40,139		796
Interior	56,338	57,218	55,918	52,380	50,736	50,447	49,484		6,854
Justice	26,288	26,244	26,026	25,891	26,015	26,279	26,195		93
Labor	4,514	3,556	3,425	3,470	3,382	3,481	3,507		1,007
Post Office	498,415	508,834	514,620	517,482	492,090	501,854	508,321	9,906	
State	21,919	20,737	20,249	20,029	19,857	19,932	20,001		1,918
Treasury	89,386	87,395	87,333	87,603	88,412	88,714	88,567		819
Executive Office of the President:									
White House Office	214	218	219	218	218	218	214		
Bureau of the Budget	582	536	521	521	530	537	538		44
Executive Mansion and Grounds	60	92	66	63	85	64	64	4	
National Security Council [1]	22	21	21	21	22	19	19		3
National Security Resources Board	232	265	288	322	326	378	390	158	
Council of Economic Advisers	44	42	42	39	39	39	39		5
Office of Government Reports [2]	17								17
Emergency war agencies: Office of Defense Transportation	54	52	51	47	41	40	40		14
Postwar agencies:									
Displaced Persons Commission [3]				34	74	106	116	116	
Economic Cooperation Administration	571	954	2,042	1,985	2,458	2,491	2,852	2,281	
Office of the Housing Expediter	4,588	4,618	4,679	4,726	4,760	4,810	4,847	259	
Philippine Alien Property Administration	142	141	139	138	138	137	134		8
Philippine War Damage Commission	908	926	923	925	934	956	967	29	
War Assets Administration	17,129	15,981	14,165	11,754	11,014	10,241	7,349		9,780

[1] Exclusive of the personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.
[2] Liquidated June 30, 1948.
[3] Established pursuant to Public Law 774, 80th Cong.

TABLE I-A—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during the period June 30 through Dec. 31, 1948, with comparison by months*—Continued

Department or agency	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Comparison, June-December: Increase	Comparison, June-December: Decrease
Independent agencies:									
American Battle Monuments Commission	121	132	133	134	138	138	135	14	
Atomic Energy Commission	5,030	5,064	5,058	5,041	4,964	4,890	4,835		195
Civil Aeronautics Board	632	625	634	653	663	666	664	32	
Civil Service Commission	4,106	4,152	4,116	4,099	4,101	4,109	4,118	12	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	125	128	131	127	128	125	123		2
Federal Communications Commission	1,380	1,385	1,373	1,362	1,364	1,360	1,354		26
Federal Deposit Insurance Commission	1,095	1,091	1,091	1,022	1,023	1,025	1,031		64
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	383	376	380	372	381	379	377		6
Federal Power Commission	809	825	828	827	828	829	831	22	
Federal Security Agency [1]	34,552	35,184	34,920	34,998	34,812	35,048	34,972	420	
Federal Trade Commission	574	594	615	623	626	636	634	60	
Federal Works Agency	22,565	22,708	23,000	23,049	23,002	22,924	22,853	288	
General Accounting Office	9,170	9,177	9,191	9,229	9,368	9,443	9,411	241	
Government Printing Office	7,074	7,034	7,041	7,024	6,960	6,966	6,953		121
Housing and Home Finance Agency	11,734	11,690	11,637	11,683	11,652	11,780	11,678		56
Indian Claims Commission	11	11	11	11	11	11	11		
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,301	2,290	2,277	2,266	2,287	2,207	2,286		15
Maritime Commission	7,219	6,798	6,938	6,717	6,809	6,773	6,530		689
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	6,279	6,670	6,687	6,670	6,700	6,780	6,887	608	
National Archives	341	350	354	364	365	371	380	39	
National Capital Housing Authority	282	290	299	297	302	306	306	24	
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	20	19	20	22	21	20	20		
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission [2]			3	8	3	3	3	3	
National Gallery of Art	322	321	321	317	319	319	317		5
National Labor Relations Board	1,992	2,107	1,953	1,911	1,833	1,827	1,661		331
National Mediation Board	109	106	98	103	102	104	107		2
Panama Canal	23,477	22,647	23,042	22,956	23,340	23,031	22,918		559
Railroad Retirement Board	2,599	2,545	2,492	2,443	2,391	2,401	2,388		211
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	5,382	5,184	5,017	4,891	4,801	4,801	4,623		759
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,149	1,148	1,151	1,153	1,161	1,159	1,159	10	
Selective Service System	758	772	3,508	5,122	5,725	5,933	5,979	5,221	
Smithsonian Institution	516	535	555	554	553	560	555	39	
Tariff Commission	219	227	234	241	240	241	239	20	
Tax Court of the United States	126	125	125	124	124	124	124		2
Tennessee Valley Authority	15,223	15,110	15,148	14,657	14,352	14,307	13,982		1,241
Veterans' Administration	205,451	207,179	209,883	210,236	212,682	214,585	215,078	9,627	
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	1,220,567	1,229,611	1,233,624	1,230,563	1,205,063	1,214,182	1,214,228	29,443	35,782
Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment									−6,339
National Military Establishment:									
Office of the Secretary of Defense	984	995	1,019	1,054	1,104	1,132	1,190	206	
Department of the Army:									
Inside continental United States	275,239	280,092	286,979	288,514	291,640	293,863	297,049	21,810	
Outside continental United States [3]	126,733	121,470	116,547	108,918	76,819	73,153	70,316		56,417
Department of the Air Force:									
Inside continental United States	121,103	123,182	124,259	125,969	128,361	129,644	130,946	9,843	
Outside continental United States [3]					27,391	27,035	26,853	26,853	
Department of the Navy	347,687	351,911	356,442	359,976	361,315	363,588	363,874	16,187	
Total, National Military Establishment	871,746	877,650	885,246	884,431	887,130	890,415	890,228	74,899	56,417
Net increase, National Military Establishment									+18,482
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	2,092,313	2,107,261	2,120,870	2,114,994	2,092,193	2,104,597	2,104,456	104,342	92,199
Net increase, including National Military Establishment									+12,143

[1] Includes personnel of Howard University and the Columbia Institute for the Deaf.
[2] Established pursuant to Public Law 203, 80th Cong.
[3] Under the Unification Act the Department of the Army and the Department of the Air Force personnel reports for civilian employees outside continental United States were separated as of Oct. 1, 1948. The figures above for these departments indicate separate reports accordingly.

TABLE I-B.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during the period June 30 through Dec. 31, 1948*

Department or agency	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Comparison, June-December: Increase	Comparison, June-December: Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):									
Agriculture	83,249	84,800	82,987	79,220	77,549	74,958	73,101		10,148
Commerce	37,953	37,225	37,389	37,270	37,100	37,141	37,138		815
Interior	50,310	50,781	49,347	45,985	45,021	44,895	44,325		5,985
Justice	25,852	25,800	25,572	25,441	25,559	25,810	25,725		127
Labor	4,431	3,519	3,390	3,456	3,348	3,445	3,471		960
Post Office	496,822	507,211	512,389	515,776	490,377	500,121	506,585	9,763	
State	7,685	7,618	7,783	8,960	7,393	7,462	7,608		77
Treasury	88,730	86,751	86,690	86,987	87,771	88,067	87,919		811
Executive Office of the President:									
White House Office	214	218	219	218	218	218	214		
Bureau of the Budget	582	536	521	521	530	537	538		44
Executive Mansion and Grounds	60	92	66	63	85	64	64	4	
National Security Council [1]	22	21	21	21	19	19	19		3
National Security Resources Board	232	265	288	322	326	378	390	158	
Council of Economic Advisers	44	42	42	39	39	39	39		5
Office of Government Reports [2]	17								17
Emergency war agencies: Office of Defense Transportation	54	52	51	47	41	40	40		14

[1] Exclusive of the personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.
[2] Liquidated June 30, 1948.

TABLE I-B.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during the period June 30 through Dec. 31, 1948*—Continued

Department or agency	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Comparison, June-December	
								Increase	Decrease
Postwar agencies:									
Displaced Persons Commission [1]				19	36	42	45	45	
Economic Cooperation Administration	402	690	790	743	767	838	854	372	
Office of the Housing Expediter	4,542	4,392	4,682	4,699	4,733	4,784	4,813	271	
Philippine Alien Property Administration	2	2	2	2	2	2	2		
Philippine War Damage Commission	7	7	7	7	7	7	7		
War Assets Administration	16,772	15,642	13,887	11,511	10,828	10,150	7,326		9,446
Independent agencies:									
American Battle Monuments Commission	4	4	4	5	7	7	7	3	
Atomic Energy Commission	5,027	5,061	5,055	5,038	4,961	4,887	4,832		195
Civil Aeronautics Board	612	605	614	633	643	646	644	32	
Civil Service Commission	4,101	4,147	4,111	4,094	4,096	4,103	4,113	12	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	123	126	129	125	126	125	121		2
Federal Communications Commission	1,341	1,346	1,336	1,323	1,327	1,323	1,318		23
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,092	1,091	1,091	1,022	1,023	1,025	1,031		61
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	383	376	380	372	381	379	377		6
Federal Power Commission	809	825	829	827	828	829	831	22	
Federal Security Agency [2]	33,215	33,943	33,959	34,023	33,881	34,084	33,994	779	
Federal Trade Commission	574	594	615	623	628	630	634	60	
Federal Works Agency	22,112	22,351	22,642	22,595	22,535	22,403	22,394	282	
General Accounting Office	9,170	9,177	9,191	9,229	9,368	9,443	9,411	241	
Government Printing Office	7,674	7,634	7,641	7,624	6,980	6,986	6,953		121
Housing and Home Finance Agency	11,691	11,650	11,696	11,638	11,608	11,738	11,634		57
Indian Claims Commission	11	11	11	11	11	11	11		
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,301	2,290	2,277	2,295	2,287	2,297	2,286		15
Maritime Commission	7,128	6,664	6,565	6,680	6,770	6,734	6,492		636
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	6,579	6,679	6,687	6,676	6,700	6,789	6,887	308	
National Archives	341	350	354	364	365	371	380	39	
National Capital Housing Authority	282	290	299	297	302	306	303	21	
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	20	19	20	22	21	20	20		
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission [3]			3	3	3	3	3	3	
National Gallery of Art	322	321	321	317	319	319	317		5
National Labor Relations Board	1,983	2,098	1,942	1,900	1,823	1,815	1,648		335
National Mediation Board	100	106	98	103	102	104	107		2
Panama Canal	643	641	646	638	641	484	635		8
Railroad Retirement Board	2,599	2,545	2,492	2,443	2,391	2,401	2,388		211
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	5,366	5,170	5,001	4,877	4,788	4,788	4,610		756
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,149	1,148	1,151	1,153	1,161	1,159	1,159	10	
Selective Service System	742	755	3,368	4,983	5,596	5,773	5,819	5,077	
Smithsonian Institution	510	529	540	549	548	555	550	40	
Tariff Commission	249	227	234	241	240	241	239	20	
Tax Court of the United States	123	125	125	124	124	124	124		2
Tennessee Valley Authority	13,223	13,110	15,148	14,657	14,332	14,307	13,982		1,241
Veterans' Administration	203,855	205,599	208,306	208,653	211,069	212,998	213,475	9,620	
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	1,164,608	1,174,772	1,180,184	1,176,779	1,149,755	1,159,279	1,159,955	27,475	32,128
Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment								—4,653	
National Military Establishment:									
Office of the Secretary of Defense	984	996	1,019	1,054	1,104	1,132	1,190	205	
Department of the Army	275,239	280,092	286,979	288,514	294,040	295,836	297,049	21,810	
Department of the Air Force	121,103	123,182	124,259	125,969	128,361	129,644	130,946	9,843	
Department of the Navy	303,627	308,577	313,344	316,889	318,880	320,967	321,549	17,922	
Total, National Military Establishment	700,953	712,846	725,601	732,426	739,985	747,606	750,734	49,781	
Net increase, National Military Establishment								49,781	
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	1,865,561	1,887,618	1,905,785	1,909,205	1,889,740	1,906,885	1,910,689	77,256	32,128
Net increase, including National Military Establishment								45,128	

[1] Established pursuant to Public Law 774, 80th Cong.
[2] Includes personnel of Howard University and the Columbia Institute for the Deaf.
[3] Established pursuant to Public Law 293, 80th Cong.

TABLE I-C.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during the period June 30, 1948, through Dec. 31, 1948*

Department or agency	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Comparison, June-December	
								Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):									
Agriculture	1,854	1,949	1,852	1,807	1,850	1,809	1,862	8	
Commerce	2,982	3,298	3,340	3,307	3,282	3,240	3,091	19	
Interior	6,028	6,437	6,571	6,395	5,715	5,552	5,159		869
Justice	436	444	454	459	456	469	470	34	
Labor	83	37	35	34	34	36	36		47
Post Office	1,523	1,623	1,631	1,706	1,713	1,733	1,736	143	
State	14,234	13,119	12,466	11,069	12,464	12,470	12,393		1,841
Treasury	656	641	643	646	641	647	648		8
Postwar agencies:									
Displaced Persons Commission				15	38	64	71	71	
Economic Cooperation Administration	79	264	1,252	1,252	1,691	1,653	1,998	1,919	
Office of the Housing Expediter	26	26	27	27	27	26	24		2
Philippine Alien Property Administration	140	139	137	136	136	135	132		8
Philippine War Damage Commission	901	921	919	918	927	929	930	29	
War Assets Administration	357	339	278	243	186	91	23		334
Independent agencies:									
American Battle Monuments Commission	117	128	129	129	131	131	128	11	
Atomic Energy Commission	3	3	3	3	3	3	3		
Civil Aeronautics Board	20	20	20	20	20	20	20		
Civil Service Commission	5	5	5	5	5	6	5		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	2	2	2	2	2	2	2		

TABLE I-C—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during the period June 30, 1948, through Dec. 31, 1948*—Continued

Department or agency	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Comparison, June-December	
								Increase	Decrease
Independent agencies—Continued									
Federal Communications Commission	39	39	37	39	37	37	36		3
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	3								3
Federal Security Agency	1,337	1,241	976	975	951	964	978		359
Federal Works Agency	453	447	448	454	467	461	459	6	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	43	40	31	43	44	42	44	1	
Maritime Commission	91	42	38	37	39	39	38		53
National Labor Relations Board	9	9	11	11	10	12	13	4	
Panama Canal	22,834	22,006	22,396	22,318	22,699	22,567	22,283		551
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	16	14	16	14	13	13	13		3
Selective Service System	16	17	140	139	139	160	160	144	
Smithsonian Institution	6	6	6	5	5	5	5		1
Veterans' Administration	1,596	1,580	1,577	1,583	1,583	1,587	1,603	7	
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	55,959	54,839	55,440	53,784	55,308	54,903	54,273	2,396	4,082
Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment								1,686	
National Military Establishment:									
Department of the Army [1]	126,733	121,470	116,547	108,918	76,819	73,153	70,316		56,417
Department of the Air Force [1]					27,391	27,035	26,853	26,853	
Department of the Navy	44,060	43,334	43,098	43,087	42,935	42,621	42,325		1,735
Total, National Military Establishment	170,793	164,804	159,645	152,005	147,145	142,809	139,494	26,853	58,152
Net decrease, National Military Establishment								31,299	
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	226,752	219,643	215,085	205,789	202,453	197,712	193,767	29,249	62,234
Net decrease, including National Military Establishment								32,985	

[1] Under the Unification Act the Department of the Army and the Department of the Air Force personnel reports for civilian employees outside continental United States were separated as of Oct. 1, 1948. The figures above for these Departments indicate separate reports accordingly.

TABLE I-D.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during the period June 30, 1948, through Dec. 31, 1948*

Department or agency	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Comparison, June-December	
								Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):									
Commerce	1,605	1,427	1,445	1,401	1,313	1,360	1,237		368
Interior	7,770	7,745	6,670	5,664	4,673	4,250	3,935		3,835
State	380	378	395	374	363	363	359		21
Treasury	3,630	3,835	4,001	4,097	4,175	4,283	4,305	675	
Independent agencies:									
Atomic Energy Commission	217	212	213	210	187	175	157		60
Housing and Home Finance Agency	2	2	2	2	2	2	1		1
Panama Canal	2,007	2,012	2,001	2,082	2,086	1,904	1,887		120
Tennessee Valley Authority	8,437	8,349	8,387	7,971	7,827	7,775	7,445		992
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	24,048	23,960	23,114	21,801	20,626	20,172	19,326	675	5,397
Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment								—4,722	
National Military Establishment:									
Department of the Army:									
Inside continental United States	144,503	148,100	153,038	154,267	156,137	158,474	158,863	14,360	
Outside continental United States [1]	94,387	89,893	85,157	77,992	53,130	49,852	47,742		46,645
Department of the Air Force:									
Inside continental United States	71,086	71,944	72,208	73,197	74,254	74,814	75,463	4,377	
Outside continental United States [1]					20,721	20,130	19,785	19,785	
Department of the Navy	242,558	245,326	248,502	251,830	252,866	253,490	253,268	10,710	
Total, National Military Establishment	552,534	555,353	558,905	557,286	557,108	556,760	555,121	49,232	46,645
Net increase, National Military Establishment									+2,587
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	576,582	579,313	582,019	579,087	577,734	576,932	574,447	49,907	52,042
Net decrease, including National Military Establishment									—2,135

[1] Under the Unification Act the Department of the Army and the Department of the Air Force personnel reports for civilian employees outside continental United States were separated as of Oct. 1, 1948. The figures above for the industrial employees of these Departments indicate separate reports accordingly.

TABLE II.—*Table of pay, in thousands of dollars, of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during the period June 30 through Nov. 30, 1948*

Department or agency	June	July	August	September	October	November	Comparison, June-November	
							Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):								
Agriculture	18,807	19,233	19,898	19,712	19,582	18,419		388
Commerce	11,050	11,989	12,151	12,338	12,276	12,195	1,145	
Interior	15,824	14,445	13,288	15,283	13,197	13,496		2,328
Justice	8,299	8,916	9,011	9,049	8,913	9,178	879	
Labor	1,133	1,090	1,132	1,157	1,062	1,131		2
Post Office	102,600	121,622	122,263	121,850	124,068	125,072	22,472	
State	5,392	5,282	5,066	5,365	5,375	5,649	257	
Treasury	24,529	25,361	25,840	26,420	25,070	26,578	2,049	

TABLE II.—*Table of pay, in thousands of dollars, of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during the period June 30 through Nov. 30, 1948*—Continued

Department or agency	June	July	August	September	October	November	Comparison, June-November: Increase	Comparison, June-November: Decrease
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	83	82	83	87	121	85	2	
Bureau of the Budget	272	254	284	247	231	248		24
Executive Mansion and Grounds	11	11	13	12	12	15	4	
National Security Council [1]	9	9	9	9	9	9		
National Security Resources Board	80	96	118	127	145	170	90	
Council of Economic Advisers [2]	22	23	23	23	21	23	1	
Emergency war agencies: Office of Defense Transportation	17	16	26	14	15	12		5
Postwar agencies:								
Displaced Persons Commission [3]				9	22	32	32	
Economic Cooperation Administration	133	442	525	757	738	800	667	
Office of the Housing Expediter	1,456	1,441	1,570	1,582	1,530	1,585	129	
Philippine Alien Property Administration	26	31	34	32	31	32	6	
Philippine War Damage Commission	144	181	213	215	210	217	73	
War Assets Administration	9,193	6,314	6,187	6,172	4,153	4,155		5,038
Independent agencies:								
American Battle Monuments Commission	13	13	14	14	13	14	1	
Atomic Energy Commission	1,553	1,664	1,666	1,711	1,825	1,682	129	
Civil Aeronautics Board	226	247	246	248	244	260	34	
Civil Service Commission	1,080	1,203	1,249	1,259	1,189	1,247	167	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	56	60	60	62	58	60	4	
Federal Communications Commission	486	495	511	509	481	503	17	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	367	367	369	364	352	371	4	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	177	185	189	193	184	198	21	
Federal Power Commission	289	309	321	322	307	353	64	
Federal Security Agency [4]	8,443	8,672	9,055	9,168	8,535	9,321	878	
Federal Trade Commission	226	235	260	268	230	244	68	
Federal Works Agency	5,022	5,608	5,701	5,821	6,019	5,751	729	
General Accounting Office	1,764	2,709	2,830	2,567	2,717	2,887	1,123	
Government Printing Office	2,254	2,140	2,163	2,103	1,993	2,099		155
Housing and Home Finance Agency	3,240	3,545	3,249	3,257	3,677	3,636	396	
Indian Claims Commission	6	6	6	6	6	6		
Interstate Commerce Commission	822	840	869	862	825	872	50	
Maritime Commission	1,974	2,075	1,726	1,721	1,723	2,099	125	
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	1,825	1,985	2,055	2,060	1,973	1,816		9
National Archives	92	98	100	103	158	105	13	
National Capital Housing Authority	59	65	67	67	68	70	11	
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	7	9	6	7	7	9	2	
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission [5]			1	1	1	2	2	
National Gallery of Art	70	75	76	79	76	80	10	
National Labor Relations Board	500	574	585	571	543	574	74	
National Mediation Board	52	50	41	39	50	53	1	
Panama Canal	3,507	3,484	3,120	2,232	4,355	3,290		217
Railroad Retirement Board	651	688	630	698	649	683	32	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	1,949	2,024	1,965	1,920	1,836	1,832		117
Securities and Exchange Commission	499	447	461	450	462	467		32
Selective Service System	145	164	234	1,254	970	1,075	930	
Smithsonian Institution	126	158	170	171	157	166	40	
Tariff Commission	91	95	99	101	98	103	12	
Tax Court of the United States	59	49	56	71	54	54		2
Tennessee Valley Authority	3,961	2,933	3,723	3,943	4,171	3,510		451
Veterans' Administration	45,376	48,366	51,737	51,952	49,282	51,491	6,125	
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	285,994	309,468	315,970	316,590	312,488	316,094	38,868	8,768
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment							+30,100	
National Military Establishment:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	312	347	369	392	392	415	103	
Department of the Army:								
Inside continental United States	68,496	70,027	72,111	74,231	71,697	71,312	2,816	
Outside continental United States [6]	23,459	20,596	20,605	16,364	15,447	13,131		10,328
Department of the Air Force:								
Inside continental United States	30,439	31,235	31,772	30,841	30,747	33,800	3,361	
Outside continental United States [6]				3,807	4,964	5,356	5,356	
Department of the Navy	87,528	88,257	91,255	93,056	89,752	95,215	7,687	
Total, National Military Establishment	210,234	210,462	216,112	218,691	212,999	219,209	19,303	10,328
Net increase, National Military Establishment							+8,975	
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	496,228	519,930	532,082	535,281	525,487	535,303	58,171	19,096
Net increase, including National Military Establishment							+39,075	

[1] Exclusive of the pay of employees of the Central Intelligence Agency.
[2] Liquidated June 30, 1948.
[3] Established pursuant to Public Law 774, 80th Cong.
[4] Includes personnel of Howard University and the Columbia Institute for the Deaf.
[5] Established pursuant to Public Law 288, 80th Cong.
[6] Under the Unification Act the Department of the Army and the Department of the Air Force personnel reports for civilian employees outside continental United States were separated as of Oct. 1, 1948. The figures above for these departments indicate separate reports accordingly.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 758. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to venereal disease rapid treatment centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 759. A bill for the relief of Mina Mauricides, formerly Asemina Kokkinos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 760. A bill for the relief of Hakiam Uddin; and

S. 761. A bill to provide for the admission into the United States of persons of the Korean race, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 762. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to announce the parity price of milk and to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to immediately announce the support price of milk; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 763. A bill to further amend the United States Code, title 28, section 239, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 764. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Forest Lumber Co.;

S. 765. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Algoma Lumber Co. and its successors in interest, George R. Birkelund and Charles E. Siddall, of Chicago, Ill., and Kenyon T. Fay, of Los Angeles, Calif., trustees of the Algoma Lumber Liquidation Trust; and

S. 766. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and

render judgment upon the claim of the Lamm Lumber Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRICKER (for himself and Mr. O'CONOR):

S. 767. A bill to establish a National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 768. A bill for the relief of Gerald G. Smith; and

S. 769. A bill to extend the time within which suit may be commenced against the United States by Mike Boskovich, of Midvale, Utah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

S. 770. A bill for the relief of Henry Dankowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 771. A bill to provide for renewal of and adjustment of compensation under contracts for carrying mail on water routes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 772. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Gordon; and

S. 773 (by request). A bill authorizing the naturalization of Peter You Lo Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. 774. A bill authorizing financial assistance to disabled veterans in obtaining an automobile or other conveyance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 775. A bill to provide for payment of compensation for disability caused by chronic or tropic diseases presumed to be service connected under the act of June 24, 1948 from the time when the disability was first incurred; and

S. 776. A bill to provide that no interest on an income tax deficiency shall be collected if the deficiency is the result of an honest error of the taxpayer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 777. A bill for the relief of Calvin D. Lynch & Son, W. Thomas Lockerman; Sudlersville Supply Co.; George C. Moore and H. A. Moore; J. McKenny Willis & Son, Inc.; Hobbs & Jarman; C. S. Thomas; and Royse R. Spring; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 778. A bill to provide for the development, administration, and maintenance of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway and the Suitland Parkway in the State of Maryland as extensions of the park system of the District of Columbia and its environs by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 779. A bill relating to the pay and allowances of officers of the naval establishment appointed to permanent grades; and

S. 780 (by request). A bill for the relief of Commander Edward White Rawlins, United States Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

S. 781. A bill authorizing the construction of certain works of improvement near Kendrick, Idaho, in the interest of flood control; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 782. A bill for the relief of William S. Meany; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 783. A bill to provide for the payment of a disability retirement annuity to Joseph J. O'Loughlin; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. GURNEY):

S. 784. A bill for the relief of the First, Second, and Third National Steamship Cos.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAIN:

S. 785. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Fred A. Fletcher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAIN (for himself and Mr. CORDON):

S. 786. A bill to authorize improvement of navigation facilities on the Columbia River, and completion of alterations to the Hood River Bridge, made necessary by Bonneville Dam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 787. A bill for the relief of William (Vasilios) Kotsakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 788. A bill to aid the States in establishing and maintaining scholarship and loan programs for the purpose of enabling individuals to obtain education in the eleventh year of school grade or above; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr BARKLEY):

S. 789. A bill to authorize the reimbursement of public agencies for the damage to their air-navigation aids and air markers caused by Federal agencies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. MCFARLAND, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. HUNT):

S. 790. A bill to grant the consent of the United States to the Upper Colorado River Basin compact; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 791. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Karl Frederick Kucker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 792. A bill to repeal paragraph (4) of section 15 of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 793. A bill to repeal the Alaska Railroad Retirement Act of June 29, 1936, as amended, and to extend the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to officers and employees to whom such act of June 29, 1936, is applicable; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 794. A bill for the relief of certain contractors employed in connection with the construction of the United States Appraisers Building, San Francisco, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 795. A bill to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to extend financial assistance to homestead entrymen, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. REED:

S. J. Res. 49. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the eightieth anniversary of the founding of the city of Abilene, Kans.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. J. Res. 50. Joint resolution for the relief of certain creditors of the Norwood Pulp & Machinery Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES—AMENDMENT

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 52) to authorize the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

NATIONAL HOUSING OBJECTIVE—AMENDMENT

Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. NEELY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 138) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I submit a resolution and ask that it be read for the information of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 47) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration is hereby discharged from the further consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 15) relating to cloture.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie over for one legislative day.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like an appropriate opportunity to discuss the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona wish recognition?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is not now in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will not come up today for action.

INVESTIGATION OF CONDITIONS AT ARMY DISCIPLINARY TRAINING CENTER AT LOIRE, FRANCE

Mr. LANGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 48), which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Armed Services, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation of conditions prevailing at the Army Disciplinary Training Center, at Loire, France, with particular reference to the charges made by James H. Schaffner, of Cheektowaga, N. Y., including the circumstances under which he contracted tuberculosis and what, if any, steps the Army took to determine whether or not the said James H. Schaffner had tuberculosis at the time of his discharge.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

GOVERNMENT LOANS ON WHEAT

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I submit a resolution, and ask that it be printed in the body of the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 49) was received, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the President has made the following statement:

"Our national farm program should be improved—not only in the interest of the farmers, but for the lasting prosperity of the whole Nation. Our goals should be abundant farm production and parity of income for agriculture. Standards of living on the farm should be just as good as anywhere else.

"Farm price supports are an essential part of our program to achieve these ends. Price supports should be used to prevent farm price declines which are out of line with general price levels, to facilitate adjustments

in production to consumer demands, and to promote good land use. Our price-support legislation must be adapted to these objectives. The authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation to provide adequate storage space for crops should be restored"; and

Whereas the Economic Cooperation Administration and the Army Quartermaster Corps are using United States dollars to buy foreign agricultural commodities which are in excess supply in the United States; and

Whereas export restrictions are being maintained which prevent the exportation of agricultural commodities including corn and wheat other than through the Department of Agriculture at the same time that the Department of Agriculture is offering to purchase corn and wheat at prices far below the support prices therefor; and

Whereas such activities of the Economic Cooperation Administration and the Army Quartermaster Corps and such export restrictions tend to undermine price-support programs for agricultural commodities: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation of any and all actions of Government agencies which tend to undermine price-support programs for agricultural commodities.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem desirable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, inasmuch as the resolution calls attention to something which is very questionable, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized for approximately a minute to make a statement with reference to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Information has come to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that certain agents of the Government, especially ECA, are using funds appropriated for the cooperative movement in making purchases abroad. For example, they are now purchasing 120,000,000 bushels of wheat from Canada, at $2 a bushel. That means an expenditure of $240,000,000. That is not all. Because of such purchases, farmers owning wheat will have to put their wheat in the loan, and that will require approximately another $240,000,000. So this one illustration is costing the taxpayers approximately half a billion dollars.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks a brief statement and copies of three letters which give information with respect to the resolution.

There being no objection, the statement and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Since the last date the farmers could obtain Government loans on wheat (December 31) basic commodity prices have been declining at an alarming rate, much more rapidly than the cost of what the farmers buy. Wheat and corn are both well below 90 percent of parity, the Government loan or support price. This sharp drop has caused widespread alarm in agriculture which could well plunge this Nation into a depression. Freedom from fear of a depression is absolutely necessary to keep the farmer buying the goods he needs that in turn keeps full employment in the factories and with labor.

Senator YOUNG, of North Dakota, has made charges against the ECA who administers the Marshall plan which are in effect an indictment. He has asked the Senate Agriculture Committee to immediately investigate ECA's plan to allocate some quarter billion dollars to England for the purchase of 120,000,000 bushels or more of Canadian wheat at a base price of $2 per bushel, free on board Fort Williams, Canada. This plan, he claims, winks at the law which requires the dollars we grant under the Marshall plan be spent in the United States when they go for commodities of which we have a surplus.

Upon a brief investigation of these charges it appears that ECA dollars are being used to buy Canadian wheat at prices equal to or higher than United States wheat now being grown. Also, I am informed that Burmese and Indochina rice is being shipped to China in preference to United States rice of which we have a surplus. During my cursory examination I am informed that the Army Quartermaster Corps is buying linseed oil from Canada while at the same time flaxseed is being placed under Government loan because the price of linseed oil is too low to allow processing the seed that is now flowing into Government loan.

If these practices are in effect, as indicated, and continue, they will destroy not only our agriculture-support program but our entire economy. Yesterday, the price of wheat was $1.93 at Wichita, Kans., which is 11 cents below the Government-support price. Wheat at Kansas City, Mo., for immediate delivery is 14 cents below the loan and for September delivery was quoted at $1.91 per bushel, which is 29 cents below the existing loan. If this ECA plan goes through, it will probably cost the United States Government a half billion dollars as we will be required to not only grant a quarter billion to England to buy the wheat but another quarter billion advanced under the loan.

I am also informed that the CCC's offer to buy wheat is based on the Chicago May futures price which yesterday was some 13 cents per bushel below the loan. At the same time the CCC prohibits all exports by producers and the private grain trade, requiring all buyers to buy from the CCC. Some commercial buyers, like the Belgian grain trade, object to buying from the CCC because no one ever knows what wheat costs until after shipment is made. I understand the same restrictions on exports also apply to corn of which we have a huge surplus and the price is far below the loan level.

I have been in hopes that the ECA, Department of Agriculture, and the Army Quartermaster Corps were coordinating their efforts to a common goal. If, as reported, the ECA is granting United States dollars to buy foreign commodities instead of our basic commodities in surplus supply, it should be investigated and stopped.

If the Army Quartermaster Corps has a policy to buy foreign commodities to the detriment of our agriculture producers and processors, that should be stopped. If one branch of the Department of Agriculture is restricting exports of wheat and corn while the other branch is accumulating surpluses, that should be coordinated. If these evils are not corrected immediately, it may require legislation.

The problem is so serious and the charges are so grave I have presented a resolution to the Senate which will authorize an investigation and hearings will be held by the Senate Agriculture Committee, at which time the ECA, Department of Agriculture, and the Army Quartermaster Corps, and other interested parties will be heard.

JANUARY 25, 1949.

Mr. PAUL G. HOFFMAN,
Administrator, Economic Cooperation Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: I have been reliably informed that ECA has advanced $55,000,000 to the United Kingdom for the purchase of wheat in Canada.

Such an agreement, in my opinion, is entirely contrary to the purpose of the ECA program. I voted for the program and for the appropriations which were requested, but it was my belief that this appropriation contained every necessary safeguard to secure the purchase of food supplies in the United States. While Canada may be deserving of assistance, I did not understand that this country was considered eligible under the Marshall plan for assistance.

There are other reasons why I would question the advisability of such an agreement. When $7,000,000,000 is given as grants and loans for European aid and the purchases are largely made in the United States, a tremendous benefit accrues to the people of the United States through increased production and through the employment of labor in that production. On the other hand, when United States dollars in grants or loans are used for purchases in foreign countries the final and real cost to our over-all economy is far greater.

To purchase wheat in another country at the same time that we are accumulating vast surpluses of farm commodities, and particularly wheat, in the United States, all eligible for price support, just does not make sense to me. I understand that the Commodity Credit Corporation has under loan or purchase agreement approximately 300,000,000 bushels of wheat and that, in all probability, the Federal Government will suffer at least some loss in the operation of this price-support program. It is entirely possible also that within the next year or two many farm commodities, because of accumulated surpluses, will have to go under quotas and acreage control. The result would be a vast decrease in the United States farmers' income which would also greatly reduce their purchasing power.

With respect to accumulated farm surpluses in the United States and the resultant cost of this program, I was informed yesterday by Secretary Brannan that it is entirely possible by next year that all of the $4,750,000,000 borrowing authority given to the CCC to support farm commodities will be committed. In view of all this, I hope that no further agreements similar to this one with the United Kingdom and Canada will be entered into.

May I also request that you prepare for the Appropriations Committee, of which I am a member, figures showing the amount of ECA purchases of food within the United States and purchases in offshore countries.

With kindest personal regards,

Sincerely yours,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senator.

ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., February 1, 1949.

Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR YOUNG: This is in reply to your letter of January 25, expressing concern about the purchase by the United Kingdom of $55,000,000 worth of Canadian wheat with funds made available to the United Kingdom by ECA.

From April 3 through December 31, 1948, ECA has authorized the purchase of food and agricultural commodities valued at $1,799,000,000. Of this total, $1,184,400,000 have

been authorized for purchases in the United States, $354,200,000 for purchases in Canada and Newfoundland, $164,800,000 for purchases in Latin America, and $95,700,000 for purchases in other parts of the world. Total authorizations for this period amounted to $4,044,800,000, including $336,700,000 for ocean freight. Of the authorizations for purchase of food and agriculture products in Canada and Newfoundland, $256,400,000 have been purchased of bread grains.

During the earlier part of the 9 months ending December 31, 1948, purchases of bread grains in Canada were necessitated by the lack of availabilities from the United States. More recently, authorizations for purchase in Canada have been limited to purchases by the United Kingdom where, because of the existence of an agreement between these two countries, prices paid have been $2 a bushel, in store, Fort William. Currently, participating countries are paying about $2.43 a bushel for hard red winter wheat at the Gulf and higher prices for spring wheat at Atlantic ports. Prior to August 1, 1948, the price United Kingdom had been paying for Canadian wheat was $1.55 a bushel, in store, Fort William, whereas hard wheat at the Gulf was costing from $2.50 to $2.75 a bushel. During the 9 months ending December 31, the wheat purchased by United Kingdom from Canada and paid for with ECA funds, has cost at least $50,000,000 less than it would have cost if purchased in the United States.

However, this saving has not been the sole or even the main reason for authorizing the use of ECA funds for these purchases; nor have these purchases been made in disregard of the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act. The Act provides that the Administrator shall not authorize the use of ECA funds for offshore procurement for commodities for which supplies available in the United States are sufficient to meet the requirements of the participating countries. To date, we have not felt that the supplies of wheat available in the United States were sufficient to meet the requirements of the participating countries as well as all of the requirements of nonparticipating countries. As a consequence, it appeared to us to be most desirable to authorize the use of ECA funds for the purchase of low-priced wheat under the Canadian-United Kingdom wheat agreement, thus saving the American taxpayers money, rather than to require all purchases of wheat for the participating countries to be made from the United States when prices are uniformly substantially above $2 a bushel and thus forcing the nonparticipating countries to shift at least a major portion of their purchases to Canada.

The assistance which Canada has obtained under the Marshall plan is, as I am sure you realize, wholly indirect. This indirect assistance has been, I believe, considered to be a major incidental advantage of the entire program. ECA's responsibility is to furnish recovery assistance to the United Kingdom. This assistance is given when it allots funds for the purchase of the wheat needed to maintain bread distribution in that country. When these funds are spent in a country other than the United States, as for example Canada, that country is thereby benefited. It should be pointed out, however, that the American dollars which the United Kingdom pays to Canada are in turn spent by Canada in the United States so that the United States ultimately gets the benefit of the increased production and employment of labor that grows out of the expenditure of funds authorized by Congress for European recovery even though some of the dollars thus expended return to the United States via a third country. Incidentally, the expenditure by the participating countries with ECA funds in Canada has sufficiently improved the dollar position of that country to permit it to relax many of its restrictions on imports from the United States. These restrictions formerly applied to a long list of agricultural commodities.

I am enclosing a copy of a letter that the Director of our Food and Agriculture Division recently wrote to Mr. Charles Dewey on this same subject which contains additional information thereon. We recognize that a potential development of agricultural surpluses in the United States may create many problems for all of us and we shall, of course, want to do everything possible to contribute to a solution of these problems, consistent with the specific responsibilities assigned to us by Congress of encouraging and assisting European economic recovery. Perhaps you would like to discuss this matter, particularly as it affects wheat, with Dr. FitzGerald. If so, he will be delighted to make himself available at your convenience.

Sincerely yours,
PAUL HOFFMAN, *Administrator.*

JANUARY 28, 1949.

Mr. CHARLES S. DEWEY,
Agent General, Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation, Congress of the United States, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DEWEY: This is in reply to your letter of January 26, regarding the sale to Great Britain by Canada of some 702,000 tons of wheat valued at about $55,000,000 for which ECA funds were being provided.

The answers to your specific questions with respect to the matter, insofar as it is possible to answer them, are as follows:

1. The term "carry-over" when used with reference to wheat usually refers to the stocks of this grain which are carried over from the end of one season to the beginning of the next. It includes, of course, as an irreducible minimum, the necessary working stocks in the distribution system. Since it is now the middle of the season, rather than the end, there is no current carry-over of wheat in the usual use of the term.

According to the Department of Agriculture, stocks of wheat in all positions as of January 1, 1949, amounted to 857,000,000 bushels. This stock is available to meet domestic requirements for food, feed, and seed, for export and for meeting minimum end-of-season carry-over requirements. Of these January 1 stocks, 381,700,000 bushels were held by farmers and would not, of course, be immediately available for export. Ignoring this fact for the moment, it may be assumed that a very large proportion of the January 1 stocks, perhaps 90 percent or more, would be suitable for export. It would, of course, be most unwise to attempt to export such a quantity of wheat since it would leave no supplies for any domestic uses.

2. The export allocations for the first quarter 1949 announced by the Department of Agriculture, together with all supplemental export allotments to date and expected exports in the same period to the Western Hemisphere and Philippines, amount to 126,000,000 bushels. This total covers both participating and nonparticipating countries. About 12,000,000 bushels allocated during October–December 1948 had not been exported on January 1, 1949, and were included in January 1 stocks. These also will be exported in the first quarter of 1949.

The volume of exports to participating countries, including overseas territories, in the April–June quarter of this year may be estimated at 68,000,000 bushels, and those to nonparticipating countries at 25,000,000 bushels. In both instances, these estimates include the wheat equivalent of anticipated flour exports.

3. In addition to these exports, domestic requirements for wheat which will need to be met from January 1 stocks are estimated to be as follows:

Food 240,000,000 bushels, feed 60,000,000 bushels, seed 26,000,000 bushels, or a total of 326,000,000 bushels. Thus, the June 30, 1949, carry-over of wheat is expected to be about 300,000,000 bushels.

4. The exportable surplus of Canadian wheat for the 1948–49 crop season is estimated to be about 300,000,000 bushels, of which 60,000,000 bushels may be considered as a necessary year-end carry-over. Of this quantity, 140,000,000 bushels have been sold to the United Kingdom at a price of $2 per bushel for No. 1 hard northern wheat, in store, Fort William.

5. Three years ago the United Kingdom and Canada entered into a 4-year wheat agreement which provide that Canada would sell and the United Kingdom would buy 160,000,000 bushels of wheat a year during the first 2 years of the agreement and 140,000,000 bushels a year during the next 2 years of the agreement. This agreement is now in its third year. During its first 2 years the price at which Canada sold wheat was $1.55 per bushel for No. 1 hard northern, in store, Fort William. During the current year, as previously stated, it is $2 per bushel, and a recent announcement indicates that this will also be the price for the last year of the agreement, that is, 1949–50 crop year. Over the 4 years of the agreement provision was made for exporting 600,000,000 bushels of wheat. As of this date, approximately 370,000,000 bushels have been exported.

6. The recently announced authorization for the purchase of $55,000,000 of Canadian wheat covers payment for about 26,000,000 bushels of Canadian wheat, which is roughly 20 percent of the total quantity covered by the United Kingdom-Canadian wheat agreement for the current crop season. ECA is paying for this wheat on the basis of $2 per bushel, in store, Fort William. The current price of United States wheat at Gulf ports is about $2.43 per bushel. The use of ECA funds to purchase Canadian wheat for the United Kingdom, in addition to helping meet the essential United Kingdom requirements for its bread ration, also helps the Canadian dollar position. It might be noted in passing that as a result of the improvement of the Canadian dollar position growing out of this ECA programing, Canada has been able to relax materially its previously existing restrictions against United States imports.

Sincerely yours,
D. A. FITZGERALD,
Director, Food and Agriculture Division.

INVESTIGATION OF FINANCIAL CONDITION OF THE AIR-LINE INDUSTRY

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 50), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Whereas commercial air-line operations have a direct bearing upon the national defense of the United States; and

Whereas the maintenance of the domestic and international air-lines operations of the United States in healthy financial condition is indispensable to the national security; and

Whereas financial distress has been experienced by many such air lines during a period of general business prosperity, and reasonably may be expected to be further aggravated in the event that general levels of business activity should decline in the future; and

Whereas the Congress, the Government agencies concerned, and the air-line industry have not agreed upon a long-range solution which would effectively insure the continued operation of such domestic and international air lines upon a sound financial basis; and

Whereas there is urgent need for a comprehensive study of this and related problems by the Congress to the end that sound policies for their solution may be evolved and

embodied in such legislation as may be found to be necessary: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to make a full and complete study and investigation of such problems relating to the financial stability and operational efficiency of the air-lines industry as it may deem proper.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings, and recommend such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-first Congress, (1) to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable, (2) to perform such travel, and to authorize such travel by such assistants, as it deems advisable, and (3) with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

PRINTING OF FIFTH SEMIANNUAL REPORT OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. McMAHON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 53), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document the fifth semiannual report of the Atomic Energy Commission and that 500 additional copies be printed for the use of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

SERVICE ON JOINT COMMITTEE ON LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I am no longer a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I ask to be relieved from further service on the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

With the resignation from the joint committee of the Senator from Louisiana there are now two vacancies, the other being caused by the retirement from the Senate of Senator Ball, of Minnesota. Under the law, the requirement is that members of the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations shall be members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate or of the similar committee in the House. Therefore the Chair appoints, in pursuance of that law, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] to fill the two vacancies on the joint committee.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. BALDWIN asked and obtained consent to be absent from the Senate after 1 o'clock today.

Mr. MILLIKIN asked and obtained consent to be absent from the Senate until February 16.

PUBLICITY CONCERNING CERTAIN PHASES OF ATOMIC ENERGY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR McMAHON

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the Economic Club of Detroit on Monday, January 31, 1949, respecting publicity concerning certain phases of atomic energy, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN RELATIONS WITH RUSSIA AND MILITARY PREPAREDNESS—ARTICLE BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Myths That May Mean Mass Suicide," prepared by him and published in the February 1949 issue of the magazine The Reserve Officer, which appears in the Appendix.]

OLYMPIC NATIONAL PARK AND OLYMPIC NATIONAL FOREST, WASH.

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two related impartial reports made recently by him to citizens of his State relative to the Olympic National Park and the Olympic National Forest in the State of Washington, which appear in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY DR. JOSEPH F. THORNING BEFORE THE INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS CLUB OF HOOD COLLEGE

[Mr. TYDINGS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of The Americas and World Affairs, delivered before the International Relations Club of Hood College, which appears in the Appendix.]

A TAFT-HARTLEY MANDATE?—LETTER FROM THOMAS W. PARRY

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter headed "A Taft-Hartley Mandate?" written by Thomas W. Parry, and reprinted from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE INAUGURATION OF PRESIDENT TRUMAN—STATEMENT BY JUDGE ADRIAN BONNELLY

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by the Honorable Adrian Bonnelly, judge of the municipal court of Philadelphia on January 20, 1948, at the time of the inauguration of President Truman, which appears in the Appendix.]

A LANDLORD LOCK-OUT—EDITORIAL FROM THE PITTSBURGH POST-GAZETTE

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Landlord Lock-out," published in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of January 27, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

BEVIN BEATS A STRATEGIC RETREAT ON PALESTINE ISSUE—EDITORIAL FROM THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Bevin Beats a Strategic Retreat on Palestine Issue," published in a recent issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer, which appears in the Appendix.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there are no further concurrent or other resolutions, morning business is concluded.

THE MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks an article entitled "MVA Plans Redrafted," which appeared on the front page of the Bismarck Tribune of Saturday, January 15, 1949.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, it is somewhat strange to see this naive attempt on the part of three Democratic Senators to help their party to get the credit for the establishment of the Missouri Valley Authority, or, as they now call it, the Missouri Valley Administration, or Missouri River Basin. Everyone knows that it was a Republican, the late Senator George Norris, who was responsible for the first of the great so-called authorities—the Tennessee Valley Authority. It was the Republican administration of Theodore Roosevelt that led the first big fight for the conservation of the natural resources of our country. Naturally I want to congratulate the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the distinguished junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], who has just been reelected after serving one term in the Senate, for going with the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] to the White House and getting the President once again to restate and reiterate the views with which all of us have long since been familiar. But I want these three distinguished Senators to know that for over 20 years at different times in North Dakota, under the Republican administration, the fight has been going on for the development of the Missouri River Basin and for the St. Lawrence waterway, and many legislatures of North Dakota have for over 20 years appropriated money for preliminary surveys of these projects. As the head of the farmer-labor branch of the Republican Party, I wish to assure these three Democratic Senators that when they finally get their bill drafted they can count upon my full support of the measure and, I believe, of many Republican Senators, and that as a Republican I shall be delighted to join in the sponsorship of the Missouri Valley Administration bill, and if the measure does not meet my views entirely, I shall endeavor to get it amended on the floor, because I have not been consulted in the drafting of it, and only know in general terms what it contains.

EXHIBIT 1

MVA PLANS REDRAFTED—DEMOCRATIC SOLONS REVEAL PLAN AFTER WHITE HOUSE VISIT

WASHINGTON.—Three Democratic Senators said after a White House call Friday that President Truman voiced his support again for unified development of the Missouri River Basin.

The Senators said they were redrafting the old Missouri Valley Authority bill so as to leave construction of dams and other facilities under the Army engineers and other existing Federal agencies rather than give it to a new authority. The measure would give the name "Missouri Valley Administration" to the general directing agency instead of calling it the Missouri Valley Authority.

Senators MURRAY (Democrat, Montana), GILLETTE (Democrat, Iowa), and HUMPHREY (Democrat, Minnesota), called on the President.

"We want to get away from the use of the word 'authority' because of the kind of odium which has been attached to that name in connection with this proposed development," MURRAY told reporters. "Opponents

pretend to see spies, socialism, and other evils attaching to that name."

The Senators said the President, long an advocate of unified development of the Missouri and its tributary system, is as strong for it as ever.

They said he told them he was having studies made and getting reports from Government agencies.

A reporter told MURRAY that the President had observed at his recent budget seminar that 9 out of 10 States in the Missouri Basin were against a Missouri Valley Authority.

MURRAY said that probably the President meant that a number of governors of States were opposed to the separate authority since the people in all the States are for it.

He said that the people demonstrated they were for the measure when they reelected him in Montana after he was denounced by some of the newspapers for his support of it.

"The President said he feels that the operation of the MVA should be coordinated by a single authority."

MURRAY said that a decision would be made later on whether to propose three or five directors for a Missouri Valley Administration.

In a joint statement, the three Senators asserted:

"The inadequacy and infeasibility of present plans for development of the Missouri River Basin are today widely recognized. It has become apparent here in Washington, as it is to the people of the valley, that there is not sufficient water in the basin for both the Pick flowing channel navigation scheme and irrigation projects already authorized.

"It also has become apparent that there has been inadequate consideration of hydroelectric power production to stimulate industry and development of resources now urgently needed by the Nation."

They added:

"As quickly as our bill can be completed, we, together with other Members of the Senate, will offer a measure to create a Missouri Valley Administration. The first work of such an administration will be engineering examination of present programs. It will serve the interests of the prompt action called for by the President, and now urgently needed, by providing immediate continuity between the examination of present programs by the MVA engineers and the execution of revised plans as rapidly as they are approved by the Congress."

They said there is need for immediate study of the feasibility of using low-grade manganese ores of South Dakota and expanding manganese production elsewhere to help meet shortages.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to refer to the resolution submitted by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] to discharge the Committee on Rules and Administration from further consideration of a resolution relating to cloture which has been referred to it by the Senate. The clear implication is that the Committee on Rules and Administration has not been diligent in performing its duties as a servant of the Senate. As chairman of that committee, I think it would therefore be appropriate for me to address the Senate briefly and to state just what is the situation.

The resolution relates to an amendment to rule XXII of the Senate, which makes it possible for two-thirds of the Senate to close debate on any pending measure. Rule XXII was adopted not quite 32 years ago, on March 8, 1917, as the result of the work of a committee of five appointed from the Republican side of the Senate and the Democratic side. It was then realized that there should be some limitation on debate in the Senate. A resolution agreed to by both the Republican and Democratic conferences was brought up by unanimous consent by the Democratic leader, Senator Martin, of Virginia, and was debated all during the day of March 8, 1917, and adopted about midnight by a vote of 76 to 3.

The rule was found to be defective, first, on November 22, 1922, when repeated amendments were offered to the Journal of the previous day and were decided to be in order. At a later date a second equally serious fault was developed when it was determined that a cloture petition could not be filed until after a bill had become the unfinished business of the Senate. The result is that a motion to proceed to the consideration of a measure may be debated indefinitely.

In the last Congress there were submitted four resolutions to amend rule XXII, all of them being introduced on January 6, 1947. The Committee on Rules and Administration held hearings beginning on January 28 and ending on February 18, 1947, a period of nearly 3 weeks. A proposed amendment to rule XXII by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] provided that a mere majority of the Senate might impose cloture. The committee, after careful consideration, changed the amendment to rule XXII so that the two-thirds limitation would remain, just as it is, but provided that debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, could be closed by the adoption of a cloture petition.

The Saltonstall amendment to the rules was reported to the Senate on April 3, 1947, 43 days after the hearings had closed. It was placed upon the Senate Calendar, and absolutely nothing was done with it during the entire session of the Eightieth Congress. It died on the calendar at the close of the Congress last December.

This year similar resolutions were submitted and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration on January 6. On January 24 the committee opened hearings on the five resolutions then pending. In order to save time, it was agreed that only the testimony of Senators would be taken, because it was felt that they knew better than anyone on the outside what changes should be made in the rules of the Senate.

Hearings began on January 24 and were concluded last Monday, the hearings extending over a period of approximately 8 days.

Yesterday the committee met to determine what to do about the several cloture resolutions, and, after discussion among the members, it was evident that a number of the Senators had not yet made up their minds as to exactly what procedure they wanted to follow, and a reasonable time was asked in which they might give further consideration to the subject.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] embarrassed me somewhat by moving on yesterday that the committee favorably report a resolution submitted by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and myself which proposed that cloture may be applied in all instances by a two-thirds majority; but I felt justified in voting for a motion to adjourn the committee for 1 week in order that members of the committee, particularly the new Senators, might have an opportunity to determine what they should do.

I will say frankly to the Senate that I am well satisfied that of the committee of 13, at least 7 are opposed to any change in the rule which would permit a mere majority of the Senate to impose cloture.

There are two resolutions pending before the committee—one by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] and another by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] providing that a mere majority may bring debate to a close. Another resolution, submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], is in identical language with the resolution as finally reported from the committe to the Senate last year. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and I in a resolution submitted by us also proposed that the Senate shall consider the text of the resolution which was favorably reported to the Senate last year, making possible cloture by a two-thirds vote.

Not only does the committee have the problem of considering what it shall do, but it also has the problem, as I pointed out in a statement made to the committee at the opening of the hearing, of giving consideration to what the Senate will do after an amendment to rule XXII is reported to the Senate. There is a great divergence of opinion as to just what should be done.

Let us first consider the procedure in the Senate when a motion is made to proceed to the consideration of an amendment to the rules. That motion is debatable indefinitely under the present rules. So it is quite certain that there will be discussion for some time as to whether the Senate should consider the proposal at all.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the Senator from Arizona agree with me when I say that if there is to be a change in the rule, it is proper that the question should be brought up early in the session, in order that the Senate may take advantage of the change of the rule, if a change is to be made, and in order, if there is to be no amendment of the rule, that we may know it and go ahead with the ordinary business of the Senate? In other words, should not we act on the matter as speedily as possible, one way or the other?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator from Massachusetts will agree with me, I am sure, that up to now the Committee on Rules and Administration has acted as speedily as possible. My protest is that we have been accused of a lack of diligence, an accusation not justified by the facts.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I am sure the Senator from Arizona will agree with me that it has been the custom in committees, in the case of absent Senators or new Senators, to give them 2 or 3 weeks' additional time for the study of important matters before the committee; in other words, when requests for additional time are made under those circumstances such requests have been granted.

Mr. HAYDEN. Of course, we were faced with that situation in the committee. But I wish to state that the Senators who are members of the committee gave up their other business, held consecutive hearings which were concluded within 8 days, and no other Senator who desired to testify failed to have an opportunity to do so.

Mr. LANGER. But has it not been the rule, during the last 8 years, at least, in connection with committee consideration and proceedings, that if a new member of the committee or a member who had been absent wished to familiarize himself with the testimony in regard to a particular measure, as a matter of courtesy he has been allowed 1 or 2 weeks within which to do so?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is correct as to that. Usually such courtesy is extended.

I have described the way our committee has proceeded. Now, to get back to the situation in the Senate when the question of whether the amendment to the cloture rule is to be considered at all, that question, as I have said, is debatable; and we do not know how long the debate on it will last. It has been suggested that if the occupant of the chair at the time were to reverse the established precedents of the Senate, and were to decide that a cloture petition could be filed on a motion to proceed to the consideration of a measure, then some time might be saved.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wonder whether the very simple solution the Senator suggests would be an appropriate subject of a parliamentary inquiry of the Chair.

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not care to have the Chair take up my time at the moment.

The situation I have described remains true, to the extent that no one now knows whether the Senate would sustain such a ruling, if it were made by the Chair. That would have to be developed, after some discussion, perhaps, upon a motion to lay on the table an appeal from the decision of the Chair.

Nevertheless, assuming all that were done, then the Senate would again be faced with the fact—and there is no escape from it—that in order to bring such a proposed change in rule XXII to a vote in the Senate, under the present rules it would be absolutely necessary for two-thirds of the Senators present to vote in favor of cloture. That is where we encounter a great deal of difficulty, as Senators can appreciate, because I find the feeling to be quite general among Senators that they do not wish to have any proposal become a Trojan horse which would bring before the Senate an amendment to the rule, ostensibly on a two-thirds basis, but, once cloture was adopted for its consideration, would then be open to an amendment in the Senate to reduce the number to a mere majority. I doubt whether two-thirds of the Senators present will vote for cloture on any amendment to rule XXII unless they thoroughly understand that it means two-thirds cloture, and not a majority cloture, because the general sentiment in the Senate, as I understand it, is decidedly opposed to majority cloture.

If some feasible way could be found whereby it might be known that a majority of the Senators are opposed to majority cloture then I think perhaps it might be possible for the Senate to adopt such a cloture rule as is provided in Senate Resolution 15. But until some understanding of that kind is developed, I am quite sure that there will be very great difficulty in bringing the debate to an end. There certainly will be very great difficulty in finding a two-thirds majority in the Senate willing to vote for cloture, so that anything at all can be done about it. That is my judgment. Senators can take it for whatever they think it may be worth.

I am making this statement today, Mr. President, because I can see no occasion at this time for the adoption of the resolution presented by the Senator from California, and I hope it will not prevail when it comes before the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Arizona has undertaken to defend himself against what he says are charges of dereliction that are implied by the filing of the resolution offered by the Senator from California. I wish to take the other side of the matter, and with profound regret criticize my friend, the Senator from Arizona, for the speed with which he has hastened the committee's consideration of the cloture resolution. There is certainly nothing more important that can possibly come before the Senate of the United States than the matter of changing the rules of this body. Every additional day a member of the Senate remains here, he attaches more importance to the rules and the precedents which guide our deliberations.

I think the Senator from Arizona has rushed this matter along. I know he gave all of us an opportunity to be heard; but in the committee there was a feeling that we were somewhat imposing upon it; and out of deference to the committee I did not make a very lengthy statement.

Not only did the committee take much longer in its deliberations in the Republican Eightieth Congress, as the Senator from Arizona has stated, but this year we have had an inauguration, which we did not have 2 years ago, and none of the committees could begin functioning until after the inauguration of the President of the United States.

The Republican Congress not only gave the proposed changes longer consideration in the committee, but after reporting it to the Senate permitted it to languish on the calendar for 2 years without ever making a simple motion to proceed to the consideration of the bill.

Now the same men who had control of the last Senate, and who did not make any effort to press the change in the rule, bitterly complain because they cannot rush the matter to a quick conclusion.

The Senator from Arizona has handled this resolution with his usual diligence. He has brought it to a conclusion in the committee, and threatens to bring the resolution to the floor at some time in the very near future. I do not believe the Senate will discharge so diligent a committee. As has been correctly said, it is a matter of fundamental courtesy always shown Senators to allow them a reasonable time in which to read the hearings, for example, or refresh their minds, or make some collateral investigation of a matter brought before a committee.

Certainly the Senator from Arizona has not been derelict in his duty. He has expedited the committee's consideration of the resolution at such a pace that some of us who are opposed to it feel we have almost had it rammed down our throats. Of course, he did not accept the rather unusual proposition that a matter of this importance be presented to the Senate without any hearings at all, but he went as far as he could in that direction and confined the hearings to Members of the Senate. Only Senators could appear as witnesses. He has now closed the hearings, and because he has allowed Members who wished it a week's time to study this important matter, he is threatened with a resolution to discharge his committee. I would that the parliamentary situation under the rules of the Senate permitted me to file some kind of resolution that would force the committee to go into this important question more thoroughly. The Senator is always fair. In this instance I think, if he has erred at all, it has been on the side of pressing this matter, rather, to this point.

Mr. HAYDEN. It may be a habit of mine to try to perform as soon as I conveniently can any work that may be assigned to me in order that I may take up other duties. I felt in this instance that the Senators were busy with their work on other committees, and that they should not be asked to devote more time than was absolutely necessary in attending the sessions of the committee. I will say that the hearings were most interesting and should be read by Members of the Senate who could not find the time to be present.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would ask whether the Senator from Arizona has concluded?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have concluded.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next order of business is the calling of the calendar.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the calling of the calendar be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORITY TO REPORT BILL

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may be authorized, during the adjournment following today's session, to report the export control bill (S. 548), and that it may be taken up for consideration Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REGULAR ARMY AND AIR CORPS NOMINATIONS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent to report from the Committee on Armed Services numerous routine promotions in the Regular Army and in the Air Corps. The Air Corps is the new arm of the Military Establishment, and has had to be reorganized in the last 2 years.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the reports will be received.

Mr. TYDINGS. I also ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, that these routine promotions be confirmed, and that the President be notified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, do I correctly understand from the chairman of the Armed Services Committee that there was no objection in the committee, and that so far as the chairman knows there is no objection to any of the nominations?

Mr. TYDINGS. The committee reported them unanimously, and there was not a single objection to any of them. Moreover, they are all routine promotions to fill up the Regular Army and the Air Corps, as provided by Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed, as in executive session, and the President will be immediately notified.

ELECTION OF CHAPLAIN

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, out of order, I send to the desk a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the resolution.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 54) as follows:

Resolved, That Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., of Washington, D. C., be, and he is hereby, elected Chaplain of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to present consideration of the resolution? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the resolution is agreed to, and Dr. Harris is chosen as the Chaplain of the Senate.

SUPPORT PRICE ON MILK

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, someone has stated that the politicians seem to have selected profit as public enemy No. 1. I can assure those who listen to me that profit is fast going out of the milk picture. In Wisconsin and in many other States, this is becoming so evident that recently there met in Chicago the representatives of seven different milk-producing States, namely, Kentucky, Tennessee, Missouri, Wisconsin, Ohio, Michigan, and Illinois. Those participating in that meeting came to the conclusion that the Government must immediately take action to support milk prices. Let me, as I have done on other occasions, state the situation concretely. In Wisconsin the milk prices at the present time are about 32.8C a hundred pounds. There are approximately 48¼ quarts of milk to the hundred pounds, which makes the price about 6 cents a quart. When it is considered that we have a 60-cent dollar, it means that the farmer receives about 3.6 cents per quart, based on the 100-cent dollar.

Mr. President, we are very much concerned about labor; we are very much concerned about repealing the Taft-Hartley Act, and we are very much concerned about taxes. Yes, I know that some folks are very much concerned about giving China several billion dollars more, and of course we are concerned about continuing our $6,000,000,000 or $7,000,000,000 appropriation for Europe. What I am asking, Mr. President, is not that we shall fail to give appropriate evaluation to these subjects, but we should evaluate them in view of the fact that the States I have mentioned constitute, along with several others, the backbone of this country, the Mississippi Valley; and in view of the well-established fact that the prosperity of the farmer means the prosperity of the Nation, we had better make sure we do not injure the Nation's backbone. If we want economic health, we had better see to it that the milk farmers, comprising the largest segment of the farm industry, do not have their incomes sabotaged. It may be said the State of Wisconsin is about 50-percent industrial and 50-percent agricultural. Everyone knows the economic health of the villages and cities of my State, as well as of other States, depends upon the good, sound, economic health of the farmer. It depends upon the economic current flowing from the farm to the cities and villages, and from them, back to the farm.

So, today I ask, What is the Government going to do about it? I read in the newspaper last night an intimation that the Secretary of Agriculture was going to do something. I hope he will. I have no criticism. I have on my lips a prayer of hope that he will take immediate action, pursuant to the authority he has, to support the price of dairy products, to the end that the farmer may at least obtain the cost of production and a reasonable return for his investment and labor.

Let me repeat what I have many times said before on the floor of the Senate, that there is good Scriptural authority for what I am asking at this time. Paul, the great metaphysician, said:

> If any provide not for his own, and especially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith and is worse than the infidel.

So, while it may be well to look after strangers and look into distant continents and see the problems there, we had better get a new set of glasses and look at our local problems. It might be well for us to pause and consider our obligations to "our house" and how to build it strong morally, economically, and spiritually, instead of constantly looking into distant lands for an opportunity to do good.

Mr. President, the time is not far distant when there may be restated in this country the fact that persons who look to their own are not all to be placed in the category of "damned isolationists." After all, the best market in the world is in America, if we keep our economic current sound and healthy. There is no reflection on those who want to be good Samaritans abroad. There is a reflection, however, on those who do not sustain their own, who will not look after their own.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. McCARTHY. Am I correct in the statement that if we should support milk production at 90 percent of parity we actually would not add 1 cent to the milk bill of the citizens? Milk is now selling at retail for 18 or 20 cents a quart, so that a support of the milk price at 90 percent of parity which would be about 3.11 per hundred or less than 7 cents per quart would not add 1 cent to the milk bill of the consumer. Is that correct?

Mr. WILEY. I think it is substantially correct. Of course the question of parity is one which I do not care to enter into at this time, because there is a question of a restatement of it. There is a question of whether it is possible later to evaluate parity, taking into consideration market prices on the east coast, where the farmer is receiving from $4.50 to $5 a hundred, whereas in Wisconsin, he is receiving but $2.80. We send our powdered milk, rich in butterfat and ice-cream fats, to the East. I am thinking of the common-sense rule that "the labor is worthy of his hire." I know of no one who labors more diligently and industriously than does the farmer; and for his labor he should receive at least the cost of production, plus a reasonable return.

I have further comments to make——

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. First, let me say that I think the dairy farmers are fortunate in one respect, in that we now have a Secretary of Agriculture who seems to have an intelligent grasp of the problems of the dairy farmers. Is it not a correct statement that, while there is a temporary surplus of manufactured milk products, unless the price is supported many farmers will be forced to sell their dairy herds for beef, and that when that happens, ultimately persons in the cities who are buying cheese, butter, and milk will have to pay much more than would be the case if we were now to adopt a sensible support program? Would the Senator say that is correct?

Mr. WILEY. I think my colleague has made a substantially correct statement, except that I would not say that there is a surplus of milk products. I would say that there is a fault in our distribution system.

A short time ago I was present at a reception and was told by persons from

New York and from this great city that they had gone from store to store and could not obtain Wisconsin cheese. There is something wrong about that situation. It may have something to do with the present prices.

I am speaking for the farmer. He must have relief, because, considering the 60-cent dollar, and the costs amounting to $2.80 a hundred, we can see what the farmer is receiving. The farmer's problem is not simply failure to get a good price; his problem is in failing to obtain labor. It is further complicated by the fact that for everything he buys, his machinery and supplies, and other items, he must pay increased prices. The cost of labor has increased 400 percent over what he used to pay, and in order to meet that change in the situation, he must have machinery. I used the illustration several days ago, of the tractor which could be bought for $1,000, including some other equipment, but which has gone up in price to approximately $2,600. He is thus caught in a squeeze, which may mean, as suggested by my colleague, a lessening of the milk herds of the Nation. That means not only depletion of the soil but also ruinous devaluation of farms, a loss in taxable property, and more and more of a centralization of population in the cities. So it is a vicious circle. We are asking that the Government take action in connection with that downward trend.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the price to the Wisconsin farmer has decreased from $4.50 to approximately $2.80, but in spite of that tremendous decrease, of 35 or 40 percent, actually the price to the consumer of liquid milk has not changed at all. The individual buying 1 or 2 quarts of milk a day is not benefited at all by the reduction in the price. All the dairy farmers are asking is that their business be stabilized to at least the same degree as that at which other branches of farming are stabilized. In other words, we have placed a support price under corn, flax, wheat, and other commodities but not under milk. The dairy farmers are merely asking for the same consideration. Is that correct?

Mr. WILEY. I again say that the statement of my colleague is substantially correct. In some places the price of milk to the consumer has been reduced 1 cent a quart. In other words, the price may have been 19 cents, and it has gone to 18 cents, the farmer receiving approximately 5 cents for his milk. That is a point which was never made clear to many people in the cities, who did not comprehend the problems of the farmer. Particularly in the last campaign, the farmer was held up as a gouger in certain places, and he was also told that his prices would be kept up. Both statements have proved to be fallacious.

Mr. President, the first point my colleague made was as to the price, and I have answered that. What was the second point?

Mr. McCARTHY. The dairy farmers are not asking for anything which the other branches of agriculture have not already received. In other words, our dairy farmers are merely saying, "You have stabilized the price of corn, the price of wheat, the price of tobacco; we merely ask now that you do the same for the dairy industry you have long since done for other branches of agriculture."

I should like to make it clear that what I am saying is not intended as criticism of our present Secretary of Agriculture. I think he has a more intelligent grasp of the problem of the dairy farmer than any Secretary of Agriculture has had for a long time—excluding, of course, the junior Senator from New Mexico, who was Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in speaking on this subject I am not merely speaking for the dairy farmer. I am speaking for what might be called the public interest. I have already stated, first, that the backbone of the Middle West is the dairy farmer, and when the farmers of Illinois met a few days ago—and I see the distinguished senior Senator of Illinois smiling—they joined in the demand for the constructive action I have asked to have taken by the administration.

Mr. President, I am not merely speaking for the dairy farmers. I say that when there is any segment of our society that is very ill, the disease transmits itself to every other segment; and when such an important segment as the dairy farmers, who, by virtue of their industry being what it is, have no control over their prices, cannot fix their prices, it might be said they are in a hole; and in view of the dairy industry being the largest segment among the farm industries of the United States, and in view of the fact that it produces the food that is best for human kind, it is not asking favoritism of the Government; it is merely asking a "fair deal," and that, I understand, is the slogan of the new administration. I would say give it a square deal, and see that adequate prices are provided.

Mr. President, I shall now return to the remarks I had prepared, which will not be long.

We now have an opportunity to do good for our own—and I am using the phrase so often employed among the do gooders—for the dairy farmer is of our house, and I am not one of those who want to deny the faith and be worse than an infidel. Oh, I know it probably does not have very much noise appeal, as do some of these other ideas that are being thrown into the political jackpot to gain the attention of the electorate, but I know, Mr. President, it has in it a thing of substance that goes to the question of maintaining the vitality of the Nation.

Mr. President, recently there appeared in the Evening Star an editorial entitled "Mr. Truman Pays a Debt." It was a very good editorial, which I ask to have printed at the end of my remarks. It relates to what lengths the administration is willing to go to pay its obligation to the labor leaders of this country. If any Senators have not read this editorial, they should because it is very pertinent to this issue.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there was a segment of our dairy farmers that voted for Mr. Truman because they had been made to fear that "if the Republicans get in it will result in a deterioration of dairy prices." I know whereof I speak, because many in my own State, while they voted the State Republican ticket, had been made to fear on this subject and voted for Mr. Truman. The farmers are asking in this case for no special privilege, they are asking that they get at least the cost of production out of the goods they produce and which mean so much to the health and the vitality of the Nation.

Mr. President, if one could think of producing anything for 6 cents a quart or less—that is, a whole quart, not a fifth, as in the case of something else I might mention—could one think of producing anything comparable to milk for 5 cents a quart, or 6 cents a quart? Yet here is the best food in the world, nature's food, full of the rich substance of butterfat, full of the great mineral and food requirements that we must have in our bodies, and it is all for 6 cents. Of course, purchasers pay more, because of handling charges and distribution charges. They pay anywhere from 18 to 21 cents.

Now, my good friends of the opposition, if you feel you owe a debt for that fear propaganda that was interjected into the campaign—no, I will not say that, I will say if you feel that the producers of this great food have a right to the cost of production and a little bit in addition, is there not more involved than even paying a debt? There is a question of maintaining the national economy.

Mr. President, I do not want to see a return of that condition, a condition which really resulted in my being sent to the Senate, a condition when there were foreclosures, when I sold the milk from my own farm at from 95 cents to $1.25 a hundred, when farms were being foreclosed by the thousands, by governments and by insurance companies, when men were cracking up because they saw what they had accumulated go out the window. Mr. President, that was from 1933 up to the time when the war came on this Nation, and that farm situation continued. I do not want to see a repetition of that. The Government owes an obligation, and I want to see that obligation discharged.

EXHIBIT 1

MR. TRUMAN PAYS A DEBT

The President's version of a new labor law, drafted in consultation with union lawyers, reveals a distressing willingness to bow to the demands of the labor bosses.

This bill makes a mockery of any rights which employers might be supposed to have. Except in one tiny area, it gives the green light to unions to take whatever they can get by the use of economic force, and, finally, it does not protect the public against strikes designed to attain a union objective by depriving the Nation of some essential commodity or service. Small wonder that the administration men in the Senate are trying to railroad the bill through without adequate hearings, for it is not a measure which can meet the test of full and honest scrutiny.

The Taft-Hartley Act, which has been condemned in emotional terms because it cannot be substantially discredited by any factual showing, tried to bring about some balance between unions and industry. It sought to equalize the one-sided relationship that grew out of the original Wagner Act. This new bill repeals the Taft-Hartley Act and revives the Wagner Act in an amended form which promises to be more unjust to industry than was the original law. The Taft-Hartley Act assumed that employers and employees were entitled to equality under the law. The President's bill clearly repudiates that assumption, and stands on the premise that unions should have special and favored treatment. As an illustration, the President will lift all restraints on political spending by his union political allies. But the ban on political contributions by corporations and banks would be continued in effect.

The President's bill recognizes only two improper union practices. These are certain types of jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts designed to maintain a proscribed jurisdictional strike, and even in this drastically limited area the remedies proposed are so time-consuming that, for practical purposes, they are apt to prove ineffective.

On the larger issue of strikes which threaten the life of the Nation the President's bill is deplorably inadequate. In this respect the Taft-Hartley law offered little enough—at best, an 80-day stay of a crippling strike through resort to the unjunction process. The President's bill knocks out any appeal to the courts. It provides only that when a dispute threatens the national health or safety the President may issue a proclamation calling upon the parties to stay on the job for 30 days. It says that the parties "shall" observe this proclamation, but there is nothing which requires them to do so. It is further provided that the President appoint a fact-finding board which would investigate the dispute and make recommendations for settlement. The bill does not require either party to accept the recommendations.

In practical effect this would mean that the White House would be back in the business of mediating major labor disputes. We have had unhappy experience with that procedure in the past, and if this bill becomes law we will have more unhappy experiences in the future. Presumably, the Government could bring enough pressure to bear to compel an employer to accept a fact-finding body's recommendation. But it has been amply demonstrated that the Government, without the aid of the Federal courts, cannot similarly coerce a strong union. So, as a practical matter, what Mr. Truman proposes is that the Government be disarmed as the representative of all the people when their welfare is threatened by a strike.

There are a variety of other things wrong with the President's bill. Among these are the devices to return the Conciliation Service to the Labor Department, to knock out State bans on the closed shop, to cut down the general counsel of the Labor Board, and to lift the curbs on Communist domination of unions. Fortunately, however, the bill cannot be fastened on the country without Senate approval. As it stands, it represents a handsome payment by the President of his political debt to organized labor. But the Members of the Senate are not under the same political obligation. They are free to examine all of the provisions of the measure and to debate them fully. This will be done, and that debate will be one which the people of this country would be well advised to follow with close attention.

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN CENTENNIAL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Saturday, February 5, there will be observed throughout the world, by alumni of the University of Wisconsin, founders' day—honoring that day 100 years ago when the first university class assembled for instruction at Madison.

I feel that I would be remiss if I did not invite the attention of my colleagues and of the Nation to the 100 candles in the birthday cake of this great State university. It is not only a natural pride that any legislator would feel for the State university of his own particular State, his alma mater, which prompts these remarks. Rather, it is the fact that the University of Wisconsin has achieved a fame for pioneering in higher education, which is the pride not only of the citizens of the Badger State but of all the 48 States.

The brilliant achievements of the university in the field of education, of science, of the arts, of political science, of technology, of agriculture, are so many in number and so diverse, that it would require volumes for me to give them appropriate description. In this connection, Mr. President, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the Sunday, January 30, 1949, centennial section published in the Wisconsin State Journal and in the Madison Capital Times—a brilliant edition of which any American newspaper might well be proud.

To the faculty and students of the University of Wisconsin, we bid Godspeed in celebration of this one hundredth anniversary and in entering the second century of progress for the good of mankind. As far back as last June, I pointed out the many celebrations which are being and have been held in connection with this centennial, and I am glad to add these few additional words of comment in tribute to a great university, a leader among universities, and a great educational tradition of freedom, of adventure, of going forward—the University of Wisconsin.

TRANSFER OF BUSHNELL GENERAL HOSPITAL NEAR BRIGHAM CITY, UTAH

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I reported favorably, earlier today, Senate bill 170, with an amendment. The bill authorizes and directs the Administrator of the War Assets Administration to transfer to the Secretary of the Interior, for use by the Bureau of Indian Affairs as a vocational school for Indian children and a center for housing and training adult Indians for off-reservation employment and placement, the property known as the Bushnell General Hospital, near Brigham City, Utah. The Indians in question are Navajo Indians. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the bill. I may say again that the bill was reported from the committee unanimously. There was no objection to it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, do I correctly understand from the Senator that time is of the essence; that if the bill is not acted upon promptly it will be of no particular value?

Mr. HOEY. That is true. Unless the transfer is made in time so that an appropriation can be made to take care of the school this year, it will not be of any benefit to the 22,000 Navajo Indian school children who will be served by this transfer and by converting the property into a vocational school property.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have no objection.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 170) to authorize the transfer of certain property to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the word "Interior," to insert "without reimbursement or transfer of funds."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of the War Assets Administration is hereby authorized and directed to transfer to the Secretary of the Interior, without reimbursement or transfer of funds, for use by the Bureau of Indian Affairs as a vocational school for Indian children and a center for housing and training adult Indians for off-reservation employment and placement, the property known as the Bushnell General Hospital near Brigham City, Box Elder County, Utah, comprising 298.5 acres, more or less, together with roads, buildings, and other betterments thereon.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to take over the property as soon as Congress has appropriated the necessary funds to provide for alterations, maintenance, and operation.

TRIAL OF JOSEF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY, PRIMATE OF HUNGARY

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, more than a month ago the Communist-dominated Government of Hungary announced the arrest of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, primate of that country, on suspicion of plotting against the Government, spying, treason, and black-market dealings.

On December 29, 1948, the Honorable Robert A. Lovett, the then Acting Secretary of State, denounced the arrest as "a sickening sham," terming it the culmination of a long series of oppressive acts by the Hungarian Government against personal freedoms, human freedoms, and now religious freedom.

Mr. Lovett declared that the charges upon which the cardinal's arrest allegedly were based were patently false, and that the unwarranted arrest indicated what the attitude of the Hungarian Government is toward the liberties to which the rest of the world attaches the greatest importance.

In a statement issued on December 28 by the National Lutheran Council, in New York, the Reverend Dr. Paul C. Empie, executive director, asserted that the cardinal's arrest was consistent with the policy of the Hungarian Government, which seeks to dominate and control every area of church life in that country. Lutherans throughout the world, Dr.

Emple added, deplore this additional instance of persecution of the Church of Hungary, and sympathize sincerely with the unfortunate victims of persecution behind the iron curtain.

Mr. President, now the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty is to begin. From advance notices already made public it is a foregone conclusion what the verdict will be. As a sequel to a travesty of justice it can be expected that the sentence will be either death or a lengthy term of imprisonment.

No stone is being left unturned, from all available accounts, in the efforts to remove this defender of democracy permanently from the Hungarian scene. The "sickening sham" of his arrest, so vigorously protested on behalf of our Government by Acting Secretary of State Lovett, will pale into insignificance, foreign sources tell us, in comparison with the shameless mockery of justice now starting to function.

Mr. President, the program of suppression against the Hungarian primate has followed a familiar pattern. First, a policy of attempted intimidation, culminating in the arrest of his secretary, followed by the merciless "questioning" of that unlucky person to obtain a "confession" that would involve his superior. Then the arrest of the cardinal, on trumped-up charges of suspicion—suspicion, mind you—of plotting against the Government, of spying, treason, and, ridiculous to relate, of black-market dealings.

It must be admitted that the Communist leadership made frantic efforts to avoid arresting the outstanding religious figure in the nation. They had tried to still his voice by forbidding him to appear at public gatherings, except in church; they had banned the Catholic Youth groups; they had arrested his priests; they had prohibited religious processions, and ordered the discontinuance of all but a few minor church publications.

Was it for plotting, or treason, or black market operations, that Cardinal Mindszenty was arrested? Or was it because, as the correspondent of the London Times reported, that "The only surviving center of opposition (to the illegal Communist government) was the Catholic Church under the leadership of the primate of Hungary, Cardinal Mindszenty"?

Was it because the Moscow-trained occupation officials found him, as the Nazi occupation forces earlier had found him, a focal point and unyielding symbol of resistance to despotism, when they, too, were forced to carry him off to prison to still his potent denunciation of tyranny?

The world knows by now how to evaluate correctly the "confessions" gained from Communist prisoners, by their unique and ingenious methods. Already, it is reported, the cardinal has "confessed" and talk of drugs is heard, new drugs that deaden the consciousness, and make the person under questioning ready to admit anything the torturers demand of him.

Now, the news from Hungary says, petitions are being circulated among workers and peasants demanding the utmost in punishment for Cardinal Mindszenty. Thousands undoubtedly will sign them, for to disobey would involve serious, even tragic, consequences.

Further these accurate reports say, a special tribunal is set up for the trial, composed entirely of judges whose hopes for future preference rest solely upon their subservience to the Communist regime. Indeed, a meeting of influential Communist leaders already has been held, we are told, to determine upon the sentence to be imposed at the conclusion of the farcical proceedings.

The end of this latest attempt to eradicate, by violence, all opposition to the illegal government of Hungary may be foreseen. The very violence used is a confession of fear and of impotence on the part of Hungary's oppressors. Instead of stilling the voice of justice and freedom, however, it will engrave indelibly on the hearts of freedom-loving people everywhere, we may be confident, the unforgettable words of courage and good will with which he addressed the people of his country in his final pastoral, which was broadcast to the people of Hungary by the Voice of America when suppressed by the Communist officials.

I stand for God, church, and my country—

The intrepid cardinal declared.

I pray for the world of justice and brotherly love; I pray for those who, in the words of my Master, know not what they are doing. I forgive them with all my heart.

Every American, who values the freedoms which are his precious birthright, will protest this latest Communist move to crush all opposition and particularly to still the voice of religion, the only vocal force abroad now standing in the path of complete Communist conquest. We must condemn such an attack on free institutions.

Because it depicts so clearly the true meaning of events in Hungary revolving around Cardinal Mindszenty, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the body of the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, an excerpt from an editorial in America, issue of January 8, 1949, entitled "The Challenge of Mindszenty."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF MINDSZENTY

In arresting Cardinal Mindszenty, the Communists are clearly making a test of strength. They have done what Hitler dared not do in Germany. If their brazen action passes uncensured by a world-wide movement of revulsion and protest, the Communists will know that they can affront the conscience of the world and get away with it. The whole world must rally to Mindszenty's defense. Said the cardinal himself in his statement of November 16: "Two of my predecessors fell on the field of battle; two were dispossessed of all they had * * * John Vitez (fifteenth century) was thrown into jail; Martinuzzi fell at the hands of assassins, hired by the mighty ones of his day (1551) * * * and Pazmany (1616-37), the greatest of all, was sent into exile. * * * But of all my predecessors, no one stood as bereft of means of defense as I do." This is not a juncture where any believers in justice can say it is none of their concern. Here is a question of a naked show of force—godless tyranny against man's spiritual nature. Through Cardinal Mindszenty communism is striking at the spiritual nerve of the West—at those religious values which are the West's strongest defense against totalitarian atheism. All who believe in these values will join with the world's Catholics to protest the injustice which is being staged in Hungary today.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 136) making a further appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bill and joint resolution were each read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 128. A bill to provide that acreage planted to cotton in 1949 shall not be used in computing cotton acreage allotments for any subsequent year; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. J. Res. 136. Joint resolution making a further appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

William McChesney Martin, Jr., of New York, N. Y., to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury; and

John B. Dunlap, of Texas, to be collector of internal revenue for the second district of Texas.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Dean Rusk, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State;

Louis F. Blanchard, of New Mexico, and several other Foreign Service staff officers, for appointment as consuls and a Foreign Service officer; and

Ralph H. Ackerman, of California, and sundry other persons for appointment and promotion in the Foreign Service.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Paul Fremont-Smith and sundry other candidates for appointment in the regular corps of the Public Health Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Dewey G. Rushford and Gordon D. Scott, to be ensigns in the Coast and Geodetic Survey; and

George F. Hicks and sundry other officers for promotion in the United States Coast Guard.

By Mr. MAYBANK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Frank A. Southard, Jr., of Ithaca, N. Y., to be United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund to fill an existing vacancy.

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Donald F. Carpenter, of Connecticut, to be Chairman of the Munitions Board, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate; and

Karl T. Compton, of Massachusetts, to be Chairman of the Research and Development Board, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

NOMINATION OF JESSE M. DONALDSON TO BE POSTMASTER GENERAL—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service I report favorably the nomination of Jesse M. Donaldson, of Illinois, to be Postmaster General. The committee decided unanimously that Mr. Donaldson's nomination should be confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and placed on the Executive Calendar.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—NOMINATION PREVIOUSLY PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James M. Mitchell to be a Civil Service Commissioner, which nomination had been previously passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edward H. Foley, Jr., to be Under Secretary of the Treasury.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John S. Graham to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George B. Gillin to be Superintendent of the Mint of the United States at San Francisco, Calif.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Gilroy Roberts to be Engraver in the Mint of the United States at Philadelphia, Pa.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George McGill to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Daniel A. Bolich to be Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John J. Fitzpatrick to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Connecticut.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ralph W. Cripe to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Indiana.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Stuart L. Crenshaw to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Virginia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John H. Aismiller to be collector of customs for district No. 42, with headquarters at Louisville, Ky.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William H. Burke, Jr., to be collector of customs for district No. 4, with headquarters at Boston, Mass.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Tully Garner to be collector of customs for district No. 23, with headquarters at Laredo, Tex.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles F. Murphy to be comptroller of customs, with headquarters at Boston, Mass.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR DISASTER RELIEF

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations I report favorably House Joint Resolution 136, making a further appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. The joint resolution calls for an additional appropriation of $500,000 for the relief of sufferers in the storm-stricken areas of the West.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 136) making a further appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President be authorized to sign, after the adjournment of the Senate today, bills and joint resolutions which have been examined and found truly enrolled.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I inquire what is expected to be taken up on Monday next?

Mr. LUCAS. We hope to take up on Monday next a bill which is expected to be reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, dealing with export and import controls. I am sure that the committee will file the report. It has already obtained unanimous consent to file the report during the adjournment, in the hope that the Senate can consider it on Monday.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. May I ask also when the majority leader expects the calendar to be called?

Mr. LUCAS. I presume that sometime next week the calendar will be called.

I now move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 7, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 3, 1949:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

J. Rives Childs, of Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Saudi Arabia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officer for appointment to the permanent grade of captain for limited duty in the Marine Corps:

Cecil E. Anderson

The following-named officer for appointment to the permanent grade of first lieutenant for limited duty in the Marine Corps:

William Fellner

The following-named officer for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant for limited duty in the Marine Corps:

William H. Howard

The following-named citizen (contract NROTC student) for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Raymond R. Rall, Jr., a citizen of Pennsylvania.

The following-named midshipmen for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Samuel E. Englehart

William F. Saunders, Jr.

The following-named former Regular officer for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Warren J. Skvaril

The following-named officer for appointment to the permanent grade of commissioned warrant officer in the Marine Corps:

Harold K. Jackson

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 3, 1949:

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

James M. Mitchell to be a Civil Service Commissioner. (Appointed during the last recess of the Senate.)

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Edward H. Foley, Jr., to be Under Secretary of the Treasury.

John S. Graham to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

MINT OF THE UNITED STATES

George B. Gillin to be Superintendent of the Mint of the United States at San Francisco, Calif.

Gilroy Roberts to be Engraver in the Mint of the United States at Philadelphia, Pa.

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

George McGill to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission for a term expiring June 16, 1954.

BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Daniel A. Bolich to be Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE

John J. Fitzpatrick to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Connecticut.

Ralph W. Cripe to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Indiana, to fill an existing vacancy.

Stuart L. Crenshaw to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Virginia, to fill an existing vacancy.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

John H. Alsmiller to be collector of customs for customs collection, district No. 42, with headquarters at Louisville, Ky.

William H. Burke, Jr., to be collector of customs for customs collection, district No. 4, with headquarters at Boston, Mass. (Reappointment.)

Tully Garner, to be collector of customs for customs collection, district No. 23, with headquarters at Laredo, Tex. (Now serving under temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.)

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

Charles F. Murphy to be comptroller of customs, with headquarters at Boston, Mass.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment in the Medical and Dental Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.) and title II of the act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.):

To be majors

William A. Collins, Jr., MC. O340156.
George A. Peck, MC O23567.

To be captains

Marvin D. Blackburn, Jr., MC. O447156.
Charles I. Bryans, Jr., MC. O464805.
Slater M. Dozier, MC. O436367.
Ian N. J. Eggeling, MC. O518418.
Kermit H. Gruberg, MC. O437490.
Royce E. House, MC. O391211.
James B. Hutchinson, MC. O1765131.
Fred E. Jenkins, MC. O470023.
Thomas P. Jernigan III, MC. O470996.
Frank H. Ketcham, DC. O469419.
Grady W. Phillips, MC. O1735667.
Frank K. Raymond, MC. O391287.
Albert K. Schoenbucher, MC. O440171.
William Stone, MC. O430283.

To be first lieutenants

Ellsworth C. Alvord, Jr., MC. O1727381.
Marshall B. Atkinson, MC. O1787024.
William P. Barron, MC.
George W. Blair, Jr., MC.
William J. Blake, MC.
Norman E. Brodeur, MC. O1704751.
James W. Carson, DC.
John J. Carter, MC.
Frank J. Cozzette, MC.
Norman Fisher, MC. O947150.
Charles F. Ford, MC.
George E. Gorleau, MC. O1727332.
Carl L. Hansen, Jr., MC. O935824.
Thomas L. Hendrix, MC. O1786167.
Ernest E. House, DC.
Laurence S. Jackson, MC. O1727035.
Albert R. Jones, Jr., MC.
Roger A. Juel, MC. O484893.
Richard L. Kasper, MC.
Marvin M. Keirns, MC. O1747040.
Evan L. Lewis, MC. O474583.
Frank W. Little, MC.
Harold T. McIver, MC. O1736104.
Robert D. McKnight, MC.
James L. McNeil, MC.
Richard E. Ogborn, MC. O1767593.
Gerald A. Orken, MC. O1736075.
Edwin E. Pontius, MC.
James A. Reilly, Jr., MC.
Robert W. Saunderson, Jr., MC.
Evan W. Schear, MC. O1746681.
Gene S. Smith, MC.
Martin A. Swerdlow, MC.
Louis L. Schurter, MC. O1776295.
John B. Selby, MC.
John B. Sheffer, MC.
Ralph F. Shirer, MC. O1776174.
James G. Stouffer, MC.
William W. Thompson, MC.
Edward J. Tomsovic, MC.
Harry J. Umlauf, MC. O1727342.
William P. Walton, MC. O1786501.
John Watt, Jr., MC.
George C. Weinland, MC.
Edwin J. Westfall, MC.
John C. Wilsey, MC.
Kent T. Woodward, MC.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

To be first lieutenant

Paul J. Kovar, O387604.

To be second lieutenant

Hubert M. Nicholson, Jr.

The following-named person for appointment in the Women's Army Corps, Regular Army, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of Public Law 625, Eightieth Congress, June 12, 1948. (This person was previously given recess appointment in the grade of second lieutenant in error.) Appointment of the individual will not exceed authorization for the Women's Army Corps, as established by Public Law 625:

Irma V. Bouton, L228827.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Army Nurse Corps, Regular Army, in the grade specified under the provisions of Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress:

To be second lieutenants

Primrose M. Gifford, N737952.
Sara C. Mooney, N763056.
Theresa R. Cardillo, N794154.
Marjorie R. Samson, N792133.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The nominations of Leland Francis Adair and others for promotions in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, which were confirmed today, may be found in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 24, 1949, beginning with the name of Leland Francis Adair, O41473, appearing on page 499 and ending with the name of Marian York, N81, which appears on page 512.

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

APPOINTMENTS IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for appointment to the positions indicated under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

Lt. Gen. Elwood Richard Quesada, AO16731, Air Force of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), to be special assistant to the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, for Reserve forces, with the rank of lieutenant general, with rank from October 1, 1947.

Lt. Gen. Curtis Emerson LeMay, AO17917, Air Force of the United States (major general, U. S. Air Force), to be commanding general, Strategic Air Command, United States Air Force, with the rank of lieutenant general, with rank from October 1, 1947.

Col. Reginald Carl Harmon, AO28790, Air Force of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), for appointment as Judge Advocate General, United States Air Force, with the rank of major general, for the period of 4 years beginning September 8, 1948, under the provisions of Public Law 775, Eightieth Congress.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE AIR FORCE OF THE UNITED STATES UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 515, OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947

To be major generals

Richard Cox Coupland, AO9792.
Kenneth Perry McNaughton, AO16491, Air Force of the United States.
Thomas Sarsfield Power, AO17854, Air Force of the United States.
Robert Whitney Burns, AO17961, Air Force of the United States.
Carl Amandus Brandt, AO18171, Air Force of the United States.

To be brigadier generals

Abraham Robert Ginsburgh, AO9747.
Wallace Gordon Smith, AO11471.
James Francis Joseph Early, AO15212.
James Elbert Briggs, AO17103.
Howard Graham Bunker, AO17200.
Walter Campbell Sweeney, Jr., AO18060.
Millard Lewis AO18163.
Robert Broussard Landry AO18868.
Pierpont Morgan Hamilton AO900788.
John Bevier Ackerman AO18706.

(NOTE.—Prior to being placed on their present assignments, Lieutenant Generals Quesada and LeMay were assigned as commanding general, Tactical Air Command, and commanding general, United States Air Forces in Europe, respectively. All of the officers named on this nomination received recess appointments to the positions and/or grades indicated, except Col. John B. Ackerman AO18706, United States Air Force.)

PROMOTIONS IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The nominations of Robert Philip Alston et al., for promotion in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, which were confirmed today, may be found in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 27, 1949, beginning with the name of Robert Philip Alston, AO29057, appearing on page 633, and ending with the name of Daniel Warren Wolf, AO50517, which appears on page 638.

The nominations of Theodore Roosevelt Hikel et al., for promotion in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 518 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, which were confirmed today, may be found in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 27, 1949, beginning with the name of Theodore Roosevelt Hikel, AO29782, appearing on page 604, and ending with the name of Carl George Yeaton, AO56608, which appears on page 633.

THE OFFICERS NAMED HEREIN FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OF THE AIR FORCE OF THE UNITED STATES UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 38 OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE ACT AS AMENDED

To be major general

Maj. Gen. George Griffin Finch AO180579, to date from November 22, 1948.

To be brigadier generals of the line

Brig. Gen. Lawrence Coffin Ames AO131519, to date from April 29, 1948.

Brig. Gen. Harry Crutcher, Jr., AO300541, to date from May 23, 1948.

Brig. Gen. Hillford Richard Wallace, AO224721, to date from April 13, 1948.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of mankind, amid the contradictory currents of this day, teach us that faith which will keep us strong and patient; which will lift us above the need of praise, and stresses works rather than words.

Make manifest unto us the wonder of our privilege of working together for the common good. Under all conditions, may our country be first on the honor roll of the world. O sustain us by Thy strength, inspired by the ageless truth that right makes might, and eternal truth is the only sword. In the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE LATE DEAN M. GILLESPIE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, those of us who served with the Honorable Dean M. Gillespie in the Seventy-eighth and Seventy-ninth Congresses heard with profound sorrow of his untimely death on February 2, 1949.

Mr. Gillespie was elected to the House March 7, 1944, at a special election held in the First District of Colorado to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the Honorable Lawrence Lewis. Mr. Gillespie was reelected to the Seventy-ninth Congress, and served as a member of the Appropriations Committee.

I knew Mr. Gillespie for many years. He was a great business and community leader. He truly represented the personal opportunity and private-enterprise efforts offered to young men everywhere under our form of government. He organized and managed many business enterprises—all of them successfully. He was a tireless worker with abundant energy—a friendly man who respected and appreciated those with whom he worked and cooperated. He had great courage and boldly stood foursquare on great issues which he knew and understood could not be compromised.

Mr. Gillespie was born in Salina, Kans., May 3, 1884, a son of a pioneer physician. He moved to Denver, Colo., in 1905 and went into business for himself. At his death he was president of the Dean Gillespie & Co.; vice president and treasurer of Bluhill Foods Corp. of Denver; president, Motoroyal Oil Co., Denver. He was a member of the Denver Rotary, Denver Athletic Club; member of Society of Automotive Engineers, Society for Research of Meteorites, and Society of American Military Engineers. He also was an Elk, Mason, and a Shriner.

Greatly appreciating his high qualities of citizenship, loving and admiring his character and personality, all of his friends and associates of the Congress pause a moment to pay tribute to this great American. And to his daughters and grandchildren we extend our deepest and most sincere sympathy.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MARSALIS].

Mr. MARSALIS. Mr. Speaker, I learned with deep regret yesterday of the death of Dean Gillespie, a former Member of this body. While it was not my privilege to have had a personal acquaintanceship with Mr. Gillespie during his lifetime, I did know him as one of the outstanding business and political leaders of the State of Colorado. His business activities reached into nearly every section of the State and in my district there were large billboards that advertised the Dean Gillespie & Co. His friendships also extended over the entire State. Many of his friends in my district have frequently referred to his ability, his fine character, and his human qualities.

Colorado has, indeed, lost an outstanding leader and citizen and his family has lost a devoted husband and father.

I join with the other members of the Colorado State delegation in paying tribute to his memory and in offering my deepest sympathy and condolences to his family.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, Dean Gillespie came here with great business experience. He was a fine character and very able citizen. He was on the Committee on Appropriations in the Seventy-ninth Congress and served very effectively on the Committees on the State, Justice, and Commerce, and the Treasury and Post Office. He was diligent. He was forceful; he was effective on the floor. That kind of man is one that this country can ill afford to lose. I wish to extend to his State of Colorado and to his family my sincerest and deepest regrets.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the death of my good friend Dean Gillespie came to me as a great shock. In his demise the country lost one of its most patriotic and able citizens. A successful businessman, he brought that viewpoint into the political life. He served with distinction and great ability as a Member of Congress and his retirement brought universal regret. To his family I extend my deepest sympathy. A great American has passed away.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we certainly have lost a great friend in the passing of Mr. Gillespie, a former colleague of ours. We mourn his passing because we realize that he was a man who was honest in his convictions. He was sincere in the things that he tried to do. He was capable and able. The Government has lost a great citizen. The State of Colorado has lost a man whom I am sure all the Members of Congress respected during his tenure of office. He certainly will be missed, not only by those who knew him but all those who have come to realize and appreciate the things he stood for and that he did in his lifetime. Those things are going to remain with us as a life of energy and accomplishments. Certainly he was a man who had great influence for good and for the things that make this world a better place in which to live.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sorrow that I learned of the passing of Dean Gillespie. As a Member of Congress privileged to serve with him, I can only say that on every occasion I found him to be a man of the highest principle and of deep sincerity. He had a fine understanding of the problems that came before the Congress and the country.

He was a man of courage, intelligence, and conviction. I am sorry indeed that he has been taken from our midst. Every one of us who knew him and were privileged to serve with him can say that for his being among us and for his having served in the Congress of the United States the country and the world is a better place in which to live.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL].

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I learned yesterday of the passing of one of Colorado's foremost citizens. His sudden death comes as a distinct shock, both to me and the other members of the Colorado delegation, and also to the many other friends in this body with whom he had served.

Dean M. Gillespie served as a Member of the House of Representatives from the First District of Colorado during the Seventy-eighth and Seventy-ninth Congresses. He was elected to Congress on March 7, 1944, after the death of Lawrence Lewis, who had represented the district many years.

Dean Gillespie brought to this body the viewpoint and convictions of a successful businessman who, through his own industry and ability, had reached a place of high stature in the business life of the city of Denver and the State of Colorado. His record in the House of Representatives was clear and consistent, and he never deviated from the principles in which he believed. His warm personality and his sincerity made him many friends during his service in Washington.

Although I was not intimately acquainted with Dean Gillespie, and although it fell to my lot to replace him in this body, it can be truthfully said that in all of our personal dealings he showed a spirit of friendliness and generosity which was characteristic of this fine American.

I know that the friends of Dean Gillespie in this body and the members of the Colorado delegation will join with me in expressing sincere regrets and deepest sympathy to his two daughters on this occasion.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the remarks of the senior Senator from Colorado, Hon. EDWIN JOHNSON.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(The remarks of Senator JOHNSON are as follows:)

Dean M. Gillespie was one of the most useful citizens of this country whom I have ever known. In fact, he was a great American from every standard of measurement. His parting is a distinct loss to his State and his Nation. As a very close personal friend, I feel his loss keenly.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to insert following the remarks of Senator JOHNSON, the remarks of the junior Senator from Colorado, Senator MILLIKIN.

The SPEAKER. Withou objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(The remarks of Senator MILLIKIN follow:)

I would like to join my colleague, Senator EDWIN JOHNSON, and the Members of the Colorado delegation in the House of Representatives in paying tribute to former Congressman Dean M. Gillespie, who represented the First District during part of the Seventy-eighth and the Seventy-ninth Congresses. His sudden death came as a shock and has saddened all of us.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, it comes to me as a shock to hear of the death of our former colleague, Dean Gillespie, of Colorado. It was my happy privilege to be associated with him as a member of my Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Federal Judiciary. I knew him intimately. He was a sober, able, and industrious man. He set a splendid example in his travels with me to many parts of the world.

Dean Gillespie's passing is a loss to this Nation.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, another milestone along the highway of life has become a monument to a departed friend.

About 2 or 3 days ago my friend Mr. Dean Gillespie called me over the telephone and, failing to reach me, dictated a short statement to my secretary, praising the work I had done in trying to protect America against the subversive elements in this country. I will not quote what he said, but I considered it the greatest compliment I have ever received.

Dean Gillespie was one of the finest Americans who ever served in this House. We did not belong to the same political party. We did not agree on those issues that divide the two great political parties, but on those questions that go to the preservation of our form of government and our American way of life we did agree.

I cannot express my sorrow at learning of the death of Dean Gillespie, as I said, one of the greatest, finest, most patriotic men with whom I have ever served.

Goodbye, dear friend.

"And flights of angels sing thee to thy rest."

Thou'rt gone, the abyss of heaven
Hath swallowed up thy form; yet, on my heart
Deeply hath sunk the lesson thou hast given,
And shall not soon depart.

He who from zone to zone,
Guides through the boundless sky thy certain flight,
In the long way that I must tread alone,
Will lead my steps aright.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my deep sympathy to the family of Dean Gillespie and to the people of the State of Colorado at his untimely passing. I know of his great work here in the Congress. He was a tireless worker for his State and his country. He had business interests in my State for a matter of 25 years. He was well known and highly regarded throughout the entire State of Wyoming. We will miss him in the years that lie ahead.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, the news of the passing of our former colleague came to me as a distinct shock.

One of the inestimable privileges of service in this House is that it is the only means known to a citizen of this country whereby he may have the privilege of knowing intimately and enjoying the friendship of men worth knowing from every section of this great country. Dean Gillespie was a typical American. Nature cast him in a big mold. He was great of mind and heart. He loved people, he loved his family, his friends, and his country. There was in this House no more generous man. He delighted to talk to his friends, to entertain them, and to be with them. He was eminently successful in his business. He was a diligent, able, and effective Member of this House. His passing is a grievous loss to those who knew and loved him, and to his country which he served so well while a member of this body.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, we who served with Dean Gillespie knew the sterling qualities he possessed and the attributes which made up his splendid American character.

It was my privilege to pass through Denver last year. I stepped into a haberdashery store and talked with a clerk. I asked him about Dean Gillespie. We often measure a man by what his neighbors and associates say of him. This clerk spoke very highly of him and told me that the people of the city of Denver felt that he was one of the finest friends they had ever known in public life.

I came to know him well in the brief period he served here. While he was a Member of this House, he pursued his duties with sincerity of purpose. He always voted his convictions and was devoted to the truth.

Dean Gillespie helped build the better America in which we live today.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Like my colleagues, I, too, received the news of the passing of Dean Gillespie, my good friend, with deep regret and sorrow. It was my privilege to know him well. I was his guest in Denver, Colo., a few years ago. We visited on several occasions about the great West of early days because he was a friend of the old West. He was one of very few people still living in this country who knew of conditions in the early days of the West. He was a personal friend of Col. William F Cody—Buffalo Bill.

As a businessman, and as an American, Dean Gillespie had no peer in this country. When the type of man Dean Gillespie was no longer lives in the United States the Republic of which we are citizens will no longer exist. He was a man of generous impulses. He was a strong and stalwart American, an able legislator, a good man. I have lost a warm friend and our country a distinguished citizen.

I extend my sympathy and sorrow to his family and to his many friends. Someone years ago appropriately said that "as the years go by the milestones become headstones and beneath every one a friend."

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the others in paying tribute to the life and character of the late Representative Dean Gillespie of Colorado. Mr. Gillespie's service in the House was not long, but he did a good job in the time that he was here. He came to Congress with the background of a successful businessman. As I understand, he started from scratch and made his own way. It is often said that there are not enough businessmen in Congress. Well, Dean Gillespie was the best example of the fact that a good businessman in Congress is a genuine asset. He was soon recognized for his true worth, his courage, his fairness, his kindliness, and his practical approach to all legislative matters.

Few men succeed in obtaining a place on the powerful Appropriations Committee in as short a time as did Dean Gillespie. He was an ideal worker and made a splendid impression on all of us. In short, I think all who knew him liked him, regardless of our political affiliations.

I did not have the privilege of being acquainted with his family, but I do want to join with the others in this tribute to the memory of a distinguished colleague.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have

the privilege of extending their remarks at this point in the RECORD in reference to Mr. Gillespie.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sorrow that I read in the paper today of the death of Dean Gillespie, a former Member of the House from Colorado.

It was my great privilege to have been a close friend of Dean, and I say without reservations that we have lost a real American. I visited Dean in his home in Denver and I know how well the people regard him in Colorado.

Dean Gillespie is a fine example of what this country offers in opportunity to the man who has initiative, courage, and integrity. He was successful in all ventures he undertook. He had all the attributes which make up a real man, such as character, generosity, and kindness.

Therefore I take this opportunity to pay my humble respects to the late Dean Gillespie.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have just learned of the fact, very distressing, that my good friend Dean Milton Gillespie died on Tuesday. It is unnecessary for me to say that he served his State with notable ability as one of the great men Colorado has furnished the Nation and was one of the most distinguished members of the Seventy-eighth and Seventy-ninth Congresses. The record proves that.

Dean Gillespie was my next-door neighbor on the fourth floor of the Old House Office Building. I knew him intimately and very well.

As I judge men, he possessed in a very real and rare degree those outstanding qualities and elements of character we Americans esteem and apprize in others most highly.

It was interesting for me, from my standpoint as an old member, to watch him grow in mental stature to fill the great frame which carried his heart and brain. He illustrated that capacity inherent in man to outgrow such restrictions as are imposed by environment and local usage. He legislated for the whole country.

His frankness was compelling. His business honesty, which had spelled for him great success therein, made him hate hypocrisy and sham and deceit, and he saw through every such curtain as if it were glass.

He believed and he justified the statement that a public office is a public trust.

We mourn his passing. We cannot afford to lose such men of diamondlike integrity as was he, for his honesty of purpose, fixity of conviction, definiteness of decision, businessman as he was, made him a very great asset to those with whom he closely associated and to all his colleagues.

Colorado and the country lost a great son when, as Bunyan said of Vallant for Truth, Dean M. Gillespie—

Passed over as all the trumpets sounded
For him on the other side.

FURTHER APPROPRIATION FOR DISASTER RELIEF

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KERR moves that the rules be suspended and the joint resolution making further appropriation for disaster relief and for other purposes, House Joint Resolution 136, be passed.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read House Joint Resolution 136, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the following sum:

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

Disaster relief: A further amount for disaster relief, $500,000, subject to the limitations and restrictions under this head in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, the pending resolution before you is similar to the one enacted last week and involves relief for the disaster-stricken areas in the West. Much headway has already been made in relieving the suffering of both human and animal life; however, the continuation of the snows and blizzards has made this additional amount of $500,000 necessary. This will complete in full the President's request for this purpose of $1,000,000. In addition to this, the President has authorized from funds made available for the current year the amount of $300,000 for relief purposes. I also wish to state that the President has directed the National Military Establishment to expend such sums as may be required for this purpose from any funds which may be available to the armed services.

To summarize, the following has now been allocated for disaster relief:

Original allocation	$300,000
H. J. Res. 112	500,000
H. J. Res. 136	500,000
Total	1,300,000

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. I would like to ask if any of this money may be used in flood disaster relief. We have a very serious flood situation bordering on 100 miles of river front in southern Illinois in my particular district. There is great devastation. The State is trying to get some relief. There is an attempt being made to pass a bill, I believe, to get relief from the State. I introduced a bill for general disaster relief with reference to floods yesterday, and I am wondering if it is contemplated that any of this money might be used where it was imperatively necessary to alleviate suffering by reason of flood disaster, or is this for the sole purpose of the blizzard condition in the Northwest?

Mr. KERR. Frankly, I think this resolution and the items I referred to can only be used for blizzard and storm relief.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. This is an emergency fund and could be used in the discretion of the President.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. For the benefit of the gentleman from Illinois, the committee report states that this fund is for use in the storm-stricken areas of the Midwest and West. I assume the report of the committee constitutes, while not binding, a direction.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The whole thing goes to the President. While the storm has been in the Midwest and the West—and which condition has been the driving force behind this appropriation—nevertheless this goes to the President with the authority to use it in his discretion, and he could go beyond it. He also has a small balance left out of this fund that he could use for any emergency item.

Mr. KERR. If you consider it as an emergency item then I think the gentleman from New York is probably correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. If that is so, then some of this money could be used up in New England in connection with the flooded areas.

Mr. TABER. It could be used out of this fund. There is money in this fund that is not covered in this appropriation.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think we ought to have the record clear so that the people in other areas will not be disappointed. As I understand, this is in connection with the storm-stricken areas in the Midwest and the West. Inasmuch as what the gentleman from New York says is probably correct, I think the President would feel constrained—I know I would if I were President—to use this money in connection with the disaster that visited the Midwest and the West. As much as I would like to make appropriations in other directions, I think in all fairness to the gentleman from Illinois you better concentrate on that directly.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I quite agree with the majority leader that the intention was to allow the President to use this money principally for the stricken areas of the Midwest and the West, but technically the gentleman from New York may be correct; that he does have the power to use it elsewhere. I want to make clear, however, that it is my understanding that this money is sent to the States by the President to

be used almost exclusively for the relief of human suffering and it is not to be used to open roads and trails, and to transport hay and feed to the suffering livestock in the West. I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that several of the departments of the Government, particularly the Bureau of Land Management, have spent a large amount of money in opening roads to cities and towns and out to the ranches so that hay and feed could reach the stranded livestock. I should like to inquire of the gentleman from North Carolina, Judge KERR, if the committee proposes to bring in legislation that will reimburse the various departments including the Army for the expenditures that they have made from the funds appropriated in the last Congress.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. As to reimbursing the various departments of the Government, that could be done by action of the President. Under the direction of the President, some of the departments of the Government, especially the Army, have been told to exert their effort.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. If the gentleman will yield further, all these departments, particularly the Army, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Forest Service, have spent considerable sums of money on their own initiative. I insist, therefore, that the President has no way to reimburse these various departments. As I understand, several proposals have gone to the gentleman's committee asking that action be taken to reimburse the departments for the expenditures they have already made and are making pursuant to directions from the President.

Mr. RABAUT. Nothing has come to the committee with reference to reimbursing the various departments. These reimbursements would come up at the request of the President. The President is giving the orders to those departments under his powers.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. I wonder if the gentleman was right in that statement. The departments, as the gentleman from Wyoming has said, especially the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service, have exhausted funds that should be spent now. How does the gentleman propose that these departments continue to run?

Mr. RABAUT. In the regular course of business they will go to the budget to justify their expenditures and ask for a deficiency. It is up to the departments to do that. The budget is in the Executive Office. It will then come to the Congress, and find its way to the Deficiency Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. GRANGER. Are we prepared to say that appropriations will be made to cover the expenditures that have already been made by the departments?

Mr. RABAUT. We could say that individual Members of Congress are very much interested in the actions the departments have taken, and it can be a matter of record when the question is later taken up, but it will depend on how much those appropriations have been depleted and what is needed to carry them on. If they desire reimbursement for the funds expended, they may make such a request to the budget, and that is in the executive department. We take the short cut of saying it is up to the President. Is that clear to the gentleman?

Mr. GRANGER. The gentleman is not saying now that any of the funds in the appropriation that is being made today will be used for that purpose?

Mr. RABAUT. That is entirely within the discretion of the President.

Mr. GRANGER. Does the gentleman mean to say that the President can use emergency funds to reimburse departments that have spent money?

Mr. RABAUT. He could if he wished. I am not saying he is going to do it. We are not tying the President's hands.

Mr. GRANGER. I understand that this money goes direct to the States and they are the ones who put it out.

Mr. RABAUT. No; this money goes to the emergency fund of the President.

Mr. GRANGER. It has been the practice in connection with funds of this kind that they have been distributed and expended through State agencies.

Mr. RABAUT. Yes. He can do that. The gentleman knows that the committee has been very sympathetic to his request. He is the Member who originally brought the matter to the attention of the committee. In deference to the gentleman, I want him to understand that no one is at all opposed to it here. He is asking for an explanation of how this fund is used and then trying to say how it is used. This fund goes to the President's emergency fund, and the President has indicated that he wants to help relieve the disaster in the West.

Mr. GRANGER. Of course, I am in favor of that. I am also in favor of relieving the people who have already spent money and who do not have anything to operate on until we make funds available to them.

Mr. RABAUT. They have a right under our system of government to present their case for reimbursement to the Budget.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I think the committee should be commended for what they are doing today, but I have a serious doubt if this is enough to do the job. May I call the attention of the House to the fact that year after year we make an appropriation for emergency flood relief, rescue work, sandbagging, and the like. Without a doubt this fund ought to be increased, and increased now. When this great snow commences to melt, we are going to have added to our present floods, floods throughout the length and breadth of the country that might be most severe.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. I do not believe that even $1,000,000 will be sufficient money to carry out the program that the President and his aide or coordinator have in mind in the Middle West. Every day letters and telegrams pour in saying that it is too little and too late. I, for one, think that the President ought to have the authority to handle the funds in keeping with this resolution. I believe that every cent of this money will be used in the storm-stricken areas of the West and Middle West and that it probably will not be enough.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman's statement, I would say that the President will have had, including this $500,000 appropriation, $1,300,000 in all. Over and above that he has delegated work to be done by the various agencies, as I said before, for these agencies to go out and assist in this relief work. Therefore, the amount expended is much in excess of $1,000,000 if this is to be measured in dollars and cents. Whether it is enough—whether what has been done is enough or not enough, only time will tell. It all depends on the weather. You must go back to Mark Twain's famous saying, "Everybody talks about the weather, but nobody does anything about it."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this resolution has been brought to the floor of the House with the unanimous vote of the Committee on Appropriations. The whole problem has been approached on both sides of the aisle with the utmost sympathy for the situation that exists in the Middle West and the Northwest and with the desire in every possible way to be helpful. We have provided the full amount which the Bureau of Public Works asks for. If occasion arises where we have to consider this again, I am sure that the committee will be sympathetic.

On the other hand, the million dollars which has been appropriated, that is, with this resolution, and the $300,000 which was in the disaster relief fund of the President, which he used, are but a small part of the funds which are being used in connection with this operation. It is only fair that the folks in the West and Northwest should realize this. There are $50,000 in the President's disaster fund besides this particular set-up which can be used for an acute emergency in other directions if it is needed. I am sure that it is being approached on a broad scale and being approached sympathetically.

What will be done with this particular money is almost entirely an allocation to the States to operate with.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. I am sure we all appreciate the sympathy that has been expressed by the committee and the action that they have taken, but many of us from the West have urged these departments, every one of them in the storm areas, to get busy and help with the job. They have done it, but many of them have exhausted the funds that they already have to do their normal work.

We feel some responsibility in seeing that that fund is replenished. What is the committee going to do about that?

Mr. TABER. They will consider it when it is presented to them. I think I may speak for the committee in that connection. I am sure that is their disposition. I am sure that as soon as the departments have exhausted their funds and they are out of money that they will come. I have never known a department to be backward about doing that, and I do not think they will be in this particular instance.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from New York. As I said before, I understand the fund provided by this appropriation is sent to the States to be used practically entirely for human relief. In my own particular State the legislature has already appropriated $200,000 which was matched by the counties, and provided a total of $330,000 most, if not all, of which has been expended. They are presently considering an additional appropriation of $300,000, and when appropriated the State of Wyoming and the counties will have expended a total of $300,000 in fighting the storms. The people themselves have expended considerable money on their account and so considerably in excess of a million dollars has been spent in our State exclusive of Federal funds, if you take into consideration the expenditures by private individuals in fighting this storm. The various departments of the Government that helped immeasurably in opening roads and trails and transporting feed have exhausted most of their appropriations. I think some action ought to be taken in the very near future to reimburse those departments.

Mr. TABER. I do not have the slightest doubt but that any of those departments will come before the committee with a budget estimate as soon as they feel that their funds are down to a point where they need replenishment. I am sure that where funds have been used for this purpose and the appropriation is close to exhaustion or it looks like it is going to be because of what has been done to relieve the trouble due to the snow, the committee will give it very earnest consideration. I think I may say that, may I not, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. KERR. Yes; the gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I was much interested in the statement of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT]. The last part of his statement was that we would reimburse the States and counties——

Mr. TABER. No. That is not what the gentleman said at all. He said he hoped we would reimburse the treasuries of the Federal agencies that have spent their money in connection with this storm item.

Mr. RICH. I am glad I misunderstood the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the evidence clearly shows that the people of a number of the Midwest and Western States will have been visited in recent weeks by storms that they have never encountered before.

Assistant Secretary of the Interior Warne, in a letter dated January 27, 1949, to Senator O'MAHONEY, said in part:

> The storms that have swept the region repeatedly since December 22 are without precedent since the white man has penetrated the high plains in the intermountain area.

The case is very clear that immediate action certainly is necessary to bring relief to the people of this blighted area, or the area visited by these unprecedented storms; also, to do everything else possible to protect property, whether real, personal, or mixed, particularly the herds of animals in that great area which mean so much not only to the people living in the area but to the people of the entire country. To me, this action is a most refreshing incident on the part of the Congress. It shows how far we have advanced in our thoughts that the crying problems of any section are the problems of the people of all sections of the country. This is the true nationalistic spirit, and I use "nationalistic" in the sense that when a section of the country has problems such as the people of the Midwest and West have now, all sections should realize that it is their problem and the problem of the Federal Government to participate in either solely or in conjunction with the States affected to bring about the greatest relief possible to the people of the blighted area.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I agree fully with the remarks of the gentleman. I have had the opportunity to see some of the blizzard-swept States of the West recently. The situation is serious. It is an act of God that has developed into such a catastrophe that the United States Government certainly should come to the aid of the people in those regions. The President, I am happy to say, has already answered the appeal received from various governors of Western States. It is being handled in a nonpartisan manner and should continue to be so handled.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I thank him for the contribution. It is fully nonpartisan. The President certainly has acted with sound judgment and courage; and the Congress is supporting him in his action. It will be remembered that last Saturday the President ordered the use of military funds to speed Federal relief in the western blizzard area. He sent a letter to Secretary of Defense Forrestal to have the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force spend whatever funds were needed without regard to existing apportionment. We can expect that the departments that have done so will ask the Congress to have the funds so used reappropriated, or that they be reimbursed by congressional action. I have no doubt but that Congress will do that. I have no doubt that the Appropriations Committee will not view too critically the action of the department heads in the spending of money on the Federal level to help the people of the States affected because action was necessary and it is not a question of consideration of what the Federal Government should do over weeks, it had to be done immediately; and when action has to be taken immediately we have got to view the judgment of the officials who take that action in the light of the necessities of the situation and not in the light of having plenty of opportunity to investigate, inquire, and marshal facts, and then sit back calmly over a reasonable or protracted period of time and form a judgment.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

If no more time is desired, the Chair will put the question.

The question is on suspending the rules and passing the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and (on a division demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 123, noes none.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce in addition to what I stated yesterday as the schedule for Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, that if a rule comes out of the Rules Committee extending the February 15 date on the legislative budget to May 1 I shall call that matter up on Monday.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, if this matter is to be called up it might as well be called up on Monday and be disposed of, but I would like to observe that the requirement for the determination of the legislative budget by February 15 was enacted by the Seventy-ninth Congress. In the Eightieth Congress we struggled with that problem and in the second session came to an agreement within the time of determination.

I rise only to express regret that the spirit and the letter of the proposed Reorganization Act adopted by the Seventy-ninth Congress is not being followed in this Congress. It does seem to me that if there ever was a time when the legislative branch of our Government should sit down and try to figure out what receipts can reasonably be expected and then try to cut the cloth of expenditures to fit the pattern of receipts, now is the time. Of course, if it goes over until May 1, I assume that many of the appropriation bills will have been disposed

of, possibly most of them will have been disposed of. If that is true the original purpose, as I understand it, of the determination of the legislative budget will have been lost.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the members of the Ways and Means Committee, the Appropriations Committee, and the Members of this House should determine how much money we have and how much money we are going to spend. A lot of the things that have been proposed by the Chief Executive would never be enacted into law if we did that because we cannot afford it. The people of this country ought to know that and the sooner they know it the better.

It seems to me it is wrong to continue beyond the 15th of this month action by the responsible heads of this House. In my opinion, you ought to determine that before the 15th of February and not continue on until April or May or June. You will not have anything to stop you. You will be worse than a lot of spendthrifts. That is the only thing to stop you from doing it.

I hope that the Ways and Means Committee, including the gentleman from North Carolina, and the Appropriations Committee, including the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], will get together and determine before the 15th of February just what amount of money is necessary to spend, and then put the brakes on.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The action of the committee during the last Congress did not serve as a deterrent to the House in this respect. It did not stop action of the House at all. It did not have any effect on the action of the House in making appropriations.

Mr. RICH. We had a balanced budget last year. You are not going to get anywhere near a balanced budget this year. There is no one in this House I have a greater regard for than I do for the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I simply rose to announce an additional program. I have been listening with interest to my friend from Pennsylvania and on some later occasion I shall undertake to convince him of the errors of his way.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

PENSION BILL

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute for the purpose of making an announcement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans' Committee of the House instructed me to announce to the House that Members of Congress will be heard by that committee on the pending pension bills on next Tuesday morning at 10:30.

Those of you who would like to appear before the committee and make statements are invited to do so. But any of you who want to insert statements in the record, if you will supply those statements to the committee on or by next Tuesday, they will be made a part of the record.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman does not mean to say that he is going to bring in a bill here now to provide pensions at the rate of $100 a month for veterans after they become 60 years of age? It seems to me that there are lots of veterans that will not want legislation of that kind.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania evidently has not read the bill. I am inviting him to come over and be heard before the committee next Tuesday or send over a statement to be inserted in the hearings.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I was not on the floor when the majority leader explained the situation as to legislation. The Committee on Rules met this morning to consider granting a rule on the first deficiency appropriation bill, but came to no conclusion because of the absence of certain facts which I hope will be forthcoming this afternoon at 2:30 o'clock when the committee will meet again. There has been an application for a rule on House Concurrent Resolution 23, namely, the budget resolution, extending the time from February 15 to May 1. I think the Committee on Rules in all likelihood will approve that concurrent resolution this afternoon so that the same can be considered tomorrow if there is no other business before the House. There may be two investigating resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, and that may give the House something to consider tomorrow or the first of next week.

MERCI SHIP

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the French ship *Magellan* steamed into New York Harbor yesterday carrying 49 railroad cars filled with French treasures, one for each State and one for the Capital. This is the gracious manner in which the French people say "merci" to the people of America for the Friendship Train conceived by the worthy journalist Drew Pearson. The *Magellan* is called the Merci Ship. Among the rare museum pieces are a Lafayette chair, a hat of Napoleon, a Louis XV sedan chair. President Auriol has sent 49 precious Sèvres vases. All are heartfelt gifts from France to the United States. These acts are great symbols of the long years of amity and accord between our two Nations. It is significant that 64 years ago another French ship, the S. S. *Isere*, sailed into New York Harbor carrying a bulky yet wondrous token of friendship and democracy, the Statue of Liberty, that now graces the port of New York and raises the torch of liberty for all. France again rewards us with her good will and friendship. Merci ships and friendship trains are excellent means of breaking down barriers and establishing good will among nations. We accept the gift of France with heartfelt thanks.

I also salute the distinguished French Ambassador Bonnet who has done so much to cement friendliest relations between our countries. He is a tower of strength to France as well as to the United States.

We salute our sister republic, France.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in each extraneous matter.

Mr. WOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include four resolutions adopted by the 23 associations of the Women's Patriotic Conference.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and include in one a radio address, and in the other a letter.

Mr. STIGLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $177.50, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

ELECTIONS IN NORTHERN IRELAND

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, an election has been called for the 10th of February, to be held in the six counties of Northern Island. The unexpected announcement of these elections was made on January 20, and the candidates were given until January 31 to file their nominations. No reason has been given for calling this election, other than the statement of Sir Basil Brooke to the

effect that it has become necessary to ask the people to reaffirm their determination not to desert the people of Great Britain in these hard times.

The haste with which this election has been called is in reality due to the alarm, which Sir Basil feels, concerning the growing sentiment in the northern counties of Ireland for union with the rest of Ireland. By calling these elections now, the old register, which was established in February of 1946, will be used, and anyone who has attained voting age since January 31, 1946, will not be entitled to vote in this election. Were the election to be held some 6 weeks later, the new register would be in effect and all who have recently turned 21 years of age would be eligible to vote. By eliminating these younger voters, Sir Basil hopes to be able to point to the results of this election as a proof that the people of Northern Ireland do not desire to be united with the rest of Ireland.

Because of the undemocratic methods being employed in this election, Mr. John A. Costello, the Prime Minister of Ireland, called for a conference to be held in the Mansion House in Dublin last Thursday, January 27. At this conference to study means of assisting the antipartition candidates of Northern Ireland, the leaders of all the parties in the Irish Parliament at Dublin, including the leader of the opposition, were present. Those attending the conference were: Mr. John A. Costello, Prime Minister, Fine Gael Party; Mr. W. Norton, Deputy Prime Minister, Labor Party; Gen. Richard Mulcahy, Fine Gael Party; Mr. Sean McBride, Ciann na Poblachta; Mr. Joseph Blowick, Farmer's Party; Mr. James Everett, Labor Party; Mr. James Dillon, Independent Party; Mr. Eamonn de Valera, Mr. Frank Aiken, and Mr. Patrick Smith, all of the Fianna Fail Party.

Following the conference a statement was issued, which I believe to be worthy of the careful reading and consideration of all the Members of the House. With the permission of the Speaker I desire to include that statement in my remarks. It reads as follows:

Efforts are being made to represent the results of the forthcoming elections in the six northern counties as justifying the continued unnatural division of our country. We, representing the overwhelming majority of the Irish people, assert that the continuance of partition is a flagrant denial of the democratic right of national self-determination and is bitterly resented by the Irish people. The partition of Ireland was effected by a British Parliament in 1920, in defiance of the clearly expressed wishes of the Irish people, and no Irish vote, north or south, was passed in favor of it. We assert once more the right of the Irish people to the ownership and control of all the national territory and we repudiate the right of Britain to carve up the Irish nation or to occupy any portion of it, even though a local majority against unity can be procured in the area which was deliberately selected for that purpose by the British Parliament.

Elections in that artificially selected area, based as they are on gerrymandered constituencies and an out-of-date register, are a violation of democratic principles. They are calculated only to serve the interests of the privileged group, who by electoral manipulations in Derry City, the counties of Tyrone and Fermanagh and many other areas, have not hesitated to make one partitionist vote equal to two or more antipartitionist votes; the result of elections in these circumstances must be a foregone conclusion.

Efforts are being made to arouse sectarian hatreds and to create intolerance; we appeal to our fellow countrymen in the northeast, irrespective of creed or politics, not to allow such efforts to blind them in their common interests and duty as democrats and Irishmen. The continued domination of a small and privileged ascendancy in a portion of our island can hold out the prospect of nothing but bitterness and strife—a united Ireland could make what a divided Ireland never can; an effective contribution to the causes of world peace based on democratic institutions, and Christian principles. The candidates in the forthcoming election which stand for the unity of Ireland vindicate the just demand of the Irish nation in this regard, and as such, deserve the support of the united Irish Nation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. JAVITS (at the request of Mr. BOGGS of Delaware) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. JENKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one a newspaper article and in the other a newspaper editorial.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an excerpt.

Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a table.

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, and include in one a letter from the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, in another a list of national associations adopting resolutions supporting statehood for Hawaii, and in the third an address he delivered to the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one some correspondence he had with the president of the Wisconsin Farmers Union.

FARM PROGRAM

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have just been granted permission to insert in the Appendix the text of some correspondence I had with the leader of one of the farm organizations of my State.

During the campaign of 1948 we sort of expected to be subjected to unfair criticism and to incomplete truths and insinuations regarding the farm program of this country, but that campaign ended 3 months ago. It seems to me that of this date the energies of our political opponents could much better be expended in developing a real, sound, long-term farm program than in uttering recriminations against the Eightieth Congress for either the real or the fancied ills of our national granary.

I think perhaps the farmers of the Middle West ought to be reminded that it was the Republicans of the Middle West who stood as the bulwark against the repeal of the oleo taxes as pledged by the Democrats, and that the farmers ought to be reminded that the Eightieth Congress provided more funds for rural electrification than any other Congress and more than the President has requested of this Congress for the next fiscal year.

It might be well to remind them, too, that the Democrats, and not the Republicans, must bear the responsibility for the declining prices of milk and other farm products in the Dairy State. A year ago they asked for another OPA to roll back farm prices. Now that prices are descending too rapidly, the same group is blaming the Hope-Aiken bill, which is not yet in effect for parity purposes, for that. If it were so, would anyone on the other side of the aisle be so false as to deny that the Hope-Aiken bill was the Truman administration's program, supported by Secretary of Agriculture Brannan and others high in the administration?

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may sit during the session of the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, are graduates of the fourth Federal academy to be continually harassed by the selective-service system?

That is a question being asked by the graduates of the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y., and it is a question we in Congress might well consider.

Because a strong merchant marine is necessary to national defense and security, we have appropriated money to establish this fourth Federal academy,

and each year we appropriate funds for the training of merchant marine officers there. We spend money each year to aid in the building of merchant marine vessels. Yet we are permitting the men trained at this academy, with Federal funds—the men necessary to officer the ships we want built—to be drafted under the Selective Service Act.

A cadet at the Merchant Marine Academy is militarily trained from 2 to 4 years, as a specialist in the Navy and merchant marine, at a cost of approximately $9,000 of the taxpayers' money. This training, so valuable in both war and peace, is wasted when he is inducted into the Army under selective service. A graduate of Kings Point is ready for immediate service under section 7 of the Selective Service Act, and he can be called to active duty by the President at any time, so we are not increasing our Reserve components, but we are sacrificing special skills, when such graduates are inducted.

Induction of a graduate of the United States Merchant Marine Academy could cost the taxpayers $24,000, and would not enhance the security program. It costs $9,000 to train this graduate originally at Kings Point, $6,000 to train him in the Army after induction, and another $9,000 to train a replacement merchant marine officer in event an emergency does arise.

We have been prone to do too little for the men of the merchant marine while expecting them to do much for us in time of war. Seamen have received little or no rewards for the sacrifices they made during the last war. One of the least things we can do to show some consideration for that service, and at the same time aid national security, is to pass legislation deferring graduates of the Merchant Marine Academy—the fourth Federal academy—from the draft.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. BEALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution from the Farmers' Cooperative.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

CHINA

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I take this minute to call the attention of the Members to an article which I think is of the greatest significance. It appears on page A457 of the Appendix of the RECORD and was inserted by Senator BRIDGES. The article is the foreword of a book The Way of a Fighter, written by Gen. Claire Chennault, and has just been published this week.

For those who are confused with regard to the situation in China—and who is not—this man can shed real light. He knows more about it, perhaps, than any other living American, because he has been working at the problem from the inside out rather than standing on the outside giving moral lectures and advice. I think every Congressman owes it to himself and to his constituents to read carefully at least this foreword and get Chennault's analysis and constructive suggestions for our policies in China in the immediate future. His record as a fighter for freedom and for our country's interest in China long before other people woke up, and his repeatedly demonstrated ability to retrieve situations which the experts said were hopeless, must command the respect of every responsible person who realizes the seriousness to our own country's future of what is happening in China.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight and midnight tomorrow to file reports.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, for what bills is the gentleman making this request?

Mr. SABATH. On those bills on which the Committee on Rules will grant rules. That is on the resolutions that it will report this afternoon.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, may the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] be repeated for the benefit of the House?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has asked unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules, if it reports any rules, may have until midnight tonight or midnight tomorrow night to file such reports.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Mansfield Advertiser by the editor, Edwin S. Coles, entitled "How Much Do People Know?"

Mr. WHITE of Idaho asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include certain excerpts.

REBURIAL OF OUR WAR DEAD

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly call to the attention of the membership a matter which may very sadly affect someone in each of our districts.

Many American lads are now overseas. Unfortunately, some of them have died or have been killed, or will die or be killed while serving outside the continental limits of this country. The present method of returning their bodies, employed by the War Department, is shockingly slow. I have called this to the attention of the War Department as emphatically as I know how, but apparently I have not been convincing.

It would be unfortunate, I think, if it should be necessary for this Congress to change this policy by legislation. It can and should be done administratively. This will, of course, entail the expenditure of money and will involve change and effort.

There can be little more compelling reason, however, for the change and the expenditure of money than the comfort it would bring to the hearts and minds of those Americans whose loved ones have died in the service of their country.

You understand, of course, that I do not speak of those who died in the war—only those who have died since the war.

A period of 6 to 8 weeks required for the return of these bodies is an unconscionable delay, and, I believe, an unnecessary delay. It would be well for each of you to check with the War Department and see if we may not remedy this matter through administrative change.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of February 1.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include excerpts.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GORE). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW] is recognized for 15 minutes.

REPEAL OF TAX ON OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time so that I might address the House on a question of grave importance to the State of Wisconsin, and particularly to my district which is one of the leading producers of butterfat in the Nation. I am opposed to the removal of the tax of 10 cents per pound on colored oleomargarine. This tax has been somewhat of a protection to butter producers in preventing oleo colored yellow from being sold in imitation of butter whose natural color is yellow. This has also been a protection to the consumer who wants butter and not an imitation.

I understand that leading dairy and farm organizations are agreed on the suggestion that oleo taxes and license fees be repealed. This is being misinterpreted to mean the repeal of all restrictions on the manufacture and sale of yellow oleomargarine. This movement which threatens the very existence of the dairy industry is sponsored and financed by the oleomargarine manu-

facturers, a small industrial group that seeks to remove all restrictions on the sale of oleomargarine colored yellow in imitation of butter.

The fight between oleo and butter is an economic battle. On the one hand you have 2,500,000 dairy farm families, 40,000 small dairy plants and their employees as against 28 large oleomargarine manufacturers. The dairy farmers are a vital part of our national economy, they pay substantial taxes and also provide the Nation with vital and nutritious food. They merely want the synthetic product called oleomargarine to be sold for what it is and not to permit it to be disguised as an imitator of butter by coloring it yellow.

I believe it is very conservative to say that the relationship between the producers of cotton and the oleo and crushers of cottonseed has not been conducive to a sound economy. The cottonseed oil industry sets the market price—they make the money, not the cotton farmer.

The dairyman is in an economy in which butter is the balance wheel; more than 25 percent of all milk produced goes into butter. The consumers of the Nation are dependent on dairy farmers for 40 percent of their beef and veal, and all of their milk.

From year to year the dairyman, by reason of rigid State requirements and voluntary usages relative to sanitary requirements, has invested hundreds of thousands of dollars in more modernized farm equipment; built new or remodeled old barns and silos, bought milking machines, and so forth, fertilized the soil so as to produce more and better feed. In most areas, he has carried on soil conservation work, has prevented, in part, soil erosion. All of this has been done because he anticipated that this greatest of all agricultural industries, namely dairying, and, I might say at this point that most of this work was done under the guidance of the State and Federal Government—at least with their approval. Farm boys have attended the universities in ever-increasing numbers, so that they in turn can take over, and in an intelligent way carry on the work so well done by their parents. They have the intellectual and technical ability to carry on in this worthy endeavor. They are literally the backbone of the Nation. Shall their future be jeopardized by the Congress permitting this synthetic product to be sold in imitation of their natural and wholesome product?

The family-sized farm is doomed if this terrible economic blow is dealt to the dairy industry.

Competent economists have shown, and it has not been questioned, that to sell yellow oleo unrestricted would take away an additional 600,000,000 pounds a year in butter sales. The cost of this loss in sales to the dairy farmers would be a quarter of a million dollars in cash income. The long-term result would be liquidation of dairy herds on a large scale. The small farm unit would not be able to operate any longer. This terrible economic readjustment is threatened because the oleo interests of the Nation, who are making handsome profits now, want to expand their business by being permitted to color their product yellow in imitation of butter, whose natural color is yellow. Their object is to fool the consumer and break down a natural sales resistance.

The dairy farmers welcome the expansion of dairying in the cotton areas, and it is of vital interest to you from cotton States that the status of butter be preserved. The cotton producer realizes, I believe, that the farmers of the Nation are their best customers by buying edible vegetable oils in shortenings for salad and desserts, and for spreads; likewise cottonseed meal is used for feed, which is bringing at the present time between $85 and $100 a ton; and also cotton products.

It must also be recognized that there is a critical shortage in edible oil in the manufacture of shortening and salad dressing. In fact, in each of the years 1935–37, it was necessary to import as much as 100,000,000 pounds of edible cottonseed oil from outside the country to satisfy their needs. The increased demand for cottonseed oil that would be created by the unrestricted sale of oleo colored yellow would create a further acute shortage.

It must also be borne in mind that any break in the economy of the dairy farmer would severely impair the soil-conservation program which is making wonderful strides in the voluntary conservation of our soil. A break in that economy would also affect adversely our rural-electrification program which, with its further expansion, will accomplish more to raise the standards of living of those in the rural areas than any one other factor. A blow to the dairy economy would also endanger our farm-credit program which is doing much to help our farm economy. In fact, a blow to our dairy economy would have severe repercussions to the entire agriculture set-up.

This is a most inopportune time to be considering this type of legislation, with dairy prices on a sharp decline, and legislation in the hopper for further farm-price supports. With all somewhat in accord that we must cooperate in an effort to help one another, in come the oleo interests to completely—if they are successful—upset the best of our plans with a scheme which is as destructive as it is deceptive.

Oleo manufacturers are guilty of trying to mislead the public to believe that their product is naturally yellow, and that they are compelled by Federal restrictions to remove this yellow color by bleaching or pay the 10-cent tax per pound. They also say that butter is colored with the same dyes with which oleo is colored and to restrain their use of yellow color is unjustified discrimination.

The natural color of oleo is white or gray, and, I understand, must be bleached in most instances to make it white. The natural color of butter is yellow, except during the winter months when the cows are off pasture. Then a coloring is used to make the color uniform the year around. But it is not put in to deceive the consumer.

I am reliably informed for the year 1947 that the oleo manufacturers spent $6,600,000 for advertising directed in part toward the repeal of oleo restrictions. In 1948 they spent an additional $5,400,000 to mislead the American housewife on the question of yellow oleomargarine.

Perhaps there are people whose incomes are so low that it may be necessary for them to eat oleomargarine instead of butter, but it is not fair for them to be deceived by the yellow color into thinking they are buying and eating butter.

Fraudulent substitution of yellow oleomargarine for butter must be prevented. This can be accomplished by a flat ban being placed on the imitation of butter through the commercial manufacture or sale of yellow oleomargarine.

Under such a prohibition, the housewives could obtain all the oleo they wanted to buy uncolored and tax-free. At the same time, the ban on imitation butter would curb unfair competition for the butter market.

My people are alarmed; they know what happened to agriculture from 1920 to 1929. They are fearful that this latest unwarranted attack may have the same disastrous result—not merely the collapse of the great dairy industry but likewise the disintegration of our entire economic structure, for agriculture is our basic industry.

If the taxes are repealed, then there should be an effective prohibition of the manufacture and sale of yellow oleomargarine.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHROW. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. If I recollect correctly, the gentleman was at La Crosse, Wis., on October 18 at the National Catholic Rural Life Conference attended by a couple of thousand people when Dr. Carlson and I had a debate of some 3 hours on this subject. Dr. Carlson, of the University of Chicago, is the official mouthpiece of the Oleo Trust. The gentleman will probably remember also that Dr. Carlson said that day that filled milk was equal to natural milk, which is the next step if they are able to pass this oleo legislation, is that right?

Mr. WITHROW. That is right. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHROW. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. BURDICK. As I understand it, the gentleman would be perfectly willing to take off the tax on oleomargarine provided they would arrange the legislation so that this inferior grade of foodstuff could not be disguised to take the place of butter, is that right?

Mr. WITHROW. That is exactly it, so that there is a real prohibition against the manufacture and sale of yellow oleomargarine.

Mr. BURDICK. The gentleman would let them have all the oleo they want without tax, if they did that?

Mr. WITHROW. That is correct. I thank the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHROW. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. May I compliment the gentleman on the fine presentation he has made.

Mr. WITHROW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. May I ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that wherever we find a good dairy section in America or the world, a section in which there are plenty of dairy cows, we find good, healthy people and good, healthy soil; but, to the contrary, where they do not have sufficient dairying you will generally find a poorer class of people and poor soil; is that not right?

Mr. WITHROW. That is correct.

Mr. JENSEN. For that very reason most of the Southern States which are clamoring for this oleo bill should be the ones protecting the dairy industry lock, stock, and barrel; is that not right?

Mr. WITHROW. I believe that is so; yes. I thank my colleague.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHROW. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. GOLDEN. I would like to have some information. Under the bill that the gentleman is advocating, if white oleo is sold to the housewife, would the bill permit the coloring matter to go along with the package of oleo and let the housewife do her own coloring?

Mr. WITHROW. Yes; I understand it would. The bill I have in mind is the bill introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN]. I understand that that bill permits the housewife to buy uncolored oleomargarine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until 12 o'clock midnight Saturday to file a report on H. R. 1661.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. JONAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include House Resolution 17, adopted by the Sixty-sixth General Assembly of the State of Illinois on January 5, 1949, a photostatic copy of which was submitted to him by Hon. Edward J. Barrett, secretary of state.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

DR. FRANK P. GRAHAM

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, a strange incident has bobbed up in the news involving the good name of the great State of North Carolina.

However, before discussing this I want to make it clear that I deplore the fact that it becomes necessary for me to bring this matter to the attention of this House because I do not come from North Carolina. In doing so I do not in any sense or suggestion cast any reflection on the great State of North Carolina, or its loyal, patriotic citizens; nor do I in any way suggest that the Members of the North Carolina delegation in this House are in any way responsible for this unfortunate situation. The Members of the North Carolina delegation in this Congress are all distinguished gentlemen who have demonstrated on numerous occasions their devotion and their loyalty, not only to their State, but to their Nation. Any State could well be proud of such representation in the National Congress.

Not only has the State of North Carolina given to this body a distinguished group of men, but the roster of outstanding Government officials who have come to Washington in years past, and who are at present in Washington, includes the names of those who claim the State of North Carolina as their own.

The problem of the State of North Carolina is well the problem of my own State of Louisiana or any other of the 48 States. I approach the discussion of this situation on a national, not a State, level. In the far Northwest one great university, the University of Washington, has already publicly accepted its responsibility of the challenge to this menace, and has picked up the gauntlet in the fight to keep our universities clean of any misdirected instruction, attachment, or association, whether given wittingly or unwittingly.

With this explanation behind me I now call your attention to an example of how a great State university and its president can be used by forces of evil which would destroy the system of government which so many of us are trying so desperately to maintain.

The Security Board of the Atomic Energy Commission has decided that Dr. Frank P. Graham, president of the University of North Carolina, ought not, for security reasons, be permitted to come near the atomic secrets. If he cannot be entrusted with our atomic secrets, why is he trusted with the education of thousands of young Americans in these times of peril? What is he doing at the head of the University of North Carolina?

The Board that branded him as a bad security risk is not a collection of village red baiters. It is headed by former Justice Owen J. Roberts, of the Supreme Court of the United States; Joseph P. Grew, former Under Secretary of State; Dr. Karl Compton, former head of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Henning Webb Prentiss, Jr., president of the Armstrong Cork Co.; and G. M. Humphrey, president of the Hanna Coal Co., of Cleveland. Not only that but Admiral John Gingrich, security officer of the Atomic Energy Commission, on his own authority, has similarly barred Dr. Graham from atomic secrets. But Mr. David Lilienthal has overruled both these authorities, because he has already opened the atomic secrets to Dr. Graham.

But what is Dr. Graham doing prying into atomic secrets at Oak Ridge? Well, he is president of the Oak Ridge Institute of Nuclear Studies. It is supposed to be interested in promoting the activity of southern colleges in atomic research. But how does it come about that Dr. Graham bobs up in that spot?

Dr. Frank P. Graham, aside from being president of the University of North Carolina, has another more dubious claim to fame. The Communist Party, being highly unpopular, does most of its work through so-called front organizations, bearing seemingly respectable names, such as the American League for Peace and Democracy. The game is to get into these organizations Americans who are gullible enough to allow the use of their names in order to hide the Communists in the organization who pull the strings behind the scenes. A good example is this American League for Peace and Democracy. The live spirits in this front were such persons as Earl Browder; Lewis Merrill, Communist labor leader; Ben Gold, Communist editor; Abram Baxer; Muriel Draper; Max Yergan; Donald Ogden Stewart; and other Red stooges. The Attorney General of the United States has officially branded this as a Communist-front. Now what was Dr. Frank P. Graham doing in that company as one of their sponsors? Yet there he was until the Attorney General's attack broke up the organization. And, of course, he was billed as president of the University of North Carolina. The prestige of this great institution was used to exploit this flagrant Red agency.

Of course, Dr. Graham could be fooled once. After all, peace and democracy are alluring words. But Dr. Graham is not a simple-minded man. And so what must we say when we find him in half a dozen similar organizations? Did the Commies fool him six times in a row? Well, it is a little worse than that. The Committee on Un-American Activities lists him as being either a director or sponsor of 18 Communist-front organizations or causes.

Dr. Graham joined these groups, he says, to defend civil rights and freedom of speech. These are fine causes, to be sure. But is not the Communist Party a strange place to go for comrades in the fight for freedom of speech? Could Dr. Graham find no better allies than these American agents of the most tyrannical government in the world? Is Dr. Graham that simple-minded?

However, he insists that he could see no wrong in teaming up with Communists when Russia was our ally in a great war. This is the defense he made to Fulton Lewis, Jr., who denounced him over the radio. But this will not hold water. The doctor was in a number of these Communist fronts before the war started and nobody dreamed of Russia being an ally. He was in the American Friends of Spanish Democracy, the International Labor Defense, the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, all Communist fronts, before 1939. Russia was not our ally then. But it is worse than this. He was one of the sponsors of the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born in May 1940. Of course, that sounds like a good cause, too. But this was a Communist-organized committee to prevent the deportation of Reds. At that time Russia was not only not

our ally, she was the ally of Hitler and the President of the United States had denounced the Russian dictatorship as one of the most brutal in the world. At that moment Russia had invaded and terrorized Poland and Finland and was supplying Hitler with war materials.

In his defense of himself, Dr. Graham points out how he was opposed to Mussolini, Hitler, and Franco. Of course he was. So was Stalin. But if he was so much opposed to dictatorships and so much in love with free speech, why is it that he could be found in 18 organizations opposed to Hitler, Franco, and Mussolini, and to various American activities, yet not in one opposed to Stalin?

And, if he joined these Red-front organizations because he saw nothing wrong in teaming up with Communists while Russia was our ally, what is he doing in so many of these organizations now? Is Russia still our ally? Have these organizations ceased to be Communist fronts? And who does Dr. Graham think he is kidding?

When the war in Spain started, Communists in this country tried to sell the idea that this was a war between the democratic Republic of Spain and the Fascist rebels. But that was a fraud. The Republic was originally launched by true republicans. But the Commies got control of it. In the Spanish war which followed it was a war between the Fascists and the Communists. The Communists in America organized the American Friends of Spanish Democracy and another front called the Coordinating Committee to Lift the Embargo. President Roosevelt had induced Congress to prevent the shipment of arms to both sides—Fascists and Communists. But there was Dr. Graham in the Commie-formed committee to lift that embargo so that arms could be shipped to the Reds in Spain. And if he had had his way there would now be a Red dictatorship in Spain as well as in Yugoslavia.

The serious point in all this is that this man was being courted by the Reds because they could advertise his support as that of the president of the University of North Carolina. These Communist fronts require two things: They need money, and they need the prestige of prominent names. They manage to get plenty of money from rich Americans who have inherited it and are ashamed of the system under which they become rich. And they get the prestige of respectable names through these front organizations from Americans with prominent names in Hollywood, the theater, social work, and the colleges. The president of a State university paid for by the people of North Carolina is a prize catch. But one wonders how such a man ever bit on that hook.

Earl Browder, then head of the Communist Party in America, was in jail. Of course a Citizens Committee to Free Earl Browder was organized by the Communists. Elizabeth Curley Flynn, a notorious party member, was secretary of the committee. And there was the inevitable Dr. Frank P. Graham on the list and of course the title president of the University of North Carolina. The Communist Party has been exploiting the prestige of the university for years through the activities of Frank P. Graham.

Of one of these organizations Dr. Graham was president and is now honorary president. This is the Southern Conference Council for Human Welfare. How can Dr. Graham be in any doubt about this strange affair? The Committee on Un-American Activities reports that the conference actually is being used in devious ways to favor basic Soviet and Communist policy. And the Communist Party not only admits this but boasts that it started the organization.

Robert Hall, secretary of the Communist Party in Alabama, wrote in January 1939:

> We can say that the Southern Conference was a brilliant confirmation of the line advanced by Comrade Browder at the tenth convention * * * Our party contributed in a modest but constructive manner to the success of the conference.

Earl Browder testified before a congressional committee under oath that the conference was one of the party's transmission belts. William Weiner, former treasurer of the Communist Party, testified that a subsidy of $2,000 was paid to the Communist Party of Alabama when the conference was organized. Robert Hall has described how resolutions were prepared by the Communist Party and then adopted by the conference. James Dombrowski, executive secretary of the conference, signed a statement in March 1941, while Stalin and Hitler were allies, defending the Communist Party. And he helped launch a joint Socialist-Communist united front movement in the South in 1935. During all this time Dr. Graham was the president or honorary president of this organization. Is there no way of aiding the cause of the Negro in the South save through the Communist Party? Can anyone imagine that the Communists here wanted to improve the lot of the Negro and make him more contented in America? The Communist revolutionaries have only one object in moving amongst Negroes and that is to arouse them, to urge them on to inconsiderate action in order to produce an angry reaction in their white neighbors. Their purpose is to set Negro against white man, worker against employer, Christian against Jew, North against South, East against West, town against country. They work ceaselessly for division and disorder and chaos in our society. What is Dr. Graham doing lending the prestige of the University of North Carolina to a Red front organism working among southern Negroes? He has headed this organization for over 10 years, before the war, during the Hitler-Stalin alliance, and since the war when the whole vicious pattern of Communist disruptive activity has become known.

Now we have the crowning episode of this disquieting incident. The atomic enterprises of the Government have attracted a swarm of Red agents and American dupes eager to penetrate the dread secret of this terrible weapon. In Canada a member of Parliament and a distinguished British scientist were caught red-handed giving secrets to the Russian Embassy. It is difficult to believe such a thing could happen in America. Yet here we have been shocked at the recent disclosures as a result of which Alger Hiss is under indictment for perjury for denying under oath his connection with the supplying of secret information to Russian spies—Hiss, who sat with President Roosevelt at Yalta as one of his advisers when he was dealing with Stalin and who was, until indicted, head of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Now an organization is formed called the Oak Ridge Institute of Nuclear Studies. Its announced purpose is to promote the cooperation of southern universities in nuclear research. And who should pop up at its head but Dr. Frank P. Graham. And immediately the question arises whether the head of this institute should be admitted to the atomic secrets. In order to protect our country on this dangerous front, the Government Atomic Energy Commission has named a security officer—Admiral John Gingrich—to investigate all persons approaching this guarded secret. Admiral Gingrich investigated Dr. Graham and reported that he should not, for security reasons, be admitted to these secrets. Then the matter went to the board headed by former Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts. That board, composed of five eminent and very sober-minded citizens, also held that Graham, for security reasons, should not be allowed near the atomic secrets. I do not suppose Dr. Graham is a Communist or a Red agent, but it is disgraceful that a man in so great a position should so conduct himself that he cannot be trusted in any situation involving his country.

The facts in the case of Dr. Graham, his long record of association with Reds and Red agents and now this decision of the security officer of the Commission and the security board, cannot be ignored by the trustees or regents of the University of North Carolina. The gravity of this situation is actually increased by the fact that David Lilienthal, whose own views and sympathies have been called in question, prevailed upon this board and against the opinion of his own security officer, Admiral Gingrich, and admitted Graham to these atomic secrets.

What can we expect of the youth in our colleges when the trustees of a great American university permit these bedfellows of American Reds to preside over this institution of learning? Of what avail will all the warnings to our impressionable youth be when conduct such as Dr. Graham's is known and approved by permitting him to remain at the head of one of our leading universities supported by the taxes of the citizens of North Carolina who hate everything that Dr. Graham has been playing with these 10 years. Dr. Graham enjoys under our Constitution the great right of freedom of mind and speech. No one proposes to deprive him of it. But when he uses it to support the revolutionary activities of the most hated and condemned organization in America today, he has no right to remain at the head of a great university and use the prestige of his position to promote the designs of the

greatest enemies this country has had in its existence.

This is a State-supported institution. It is entirely probable that the people of the State do not know the truth about Dr. Graham. It is possible the members of the State legislature are not informed about it. It may be that the regents of the university are not fully informed. But there can no longer be any excuse. The university should be relieved of the incubus of this man's operations and he should be freed in order to ply his activities as the ally and front of any organization he wishes without involving the university in the deal.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman has not told the worst part of the story yet. It developed that there was a Communist organization inside the student body of the University of North Carolina, which institution is presided over by this man Frank Graham. Everybody knows that it is the object of the Communist Party to overthrow this Government and to destroy the American way of life; yet this man who has been connected with all these Communist fronts, which have been and are now being used by the Communist Party, is now the president of a great university that has a Communist organization, an organization of members of the Communist Party, inside its student body as the records of the Committee on Un-American Activities will show.

Mr. HÉBERT. I think the gentleman also knows from his many years of activity in attacking this menace that the infiltration of the Communist line and the breaking down of our system of government and our institutions of higher education is one of the most dangerous things in this country today as exemplified by Elizabeth Bentley, who attended both Columbia University and Vassar.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one more statement? And then I will not interrupt him further.

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield

Mr. RANKIN. I want to say that if every American knew how recklessly our atomic secrets were being handled today they would be shocked beyond measure. This country is not safe, in my opinion, and in the opinion of Members connected with the Committee on Un-American Activities who have investigated it, for these secrets are being slipped out to our potential enemies with the ultimate purpose of destroying America.

Mr. HÉBERT. May I ask the gentleman from Mississippi if he agrees with the philosophy, thinking, reasoning, or logic, that it takes only lawyers to find unpatriotic people in this country?

Mr. RANKIN. No; I may say to the gentleman from Louisiana that such an excuse was used to dupe some of the present members of the Ways and Means Committee into keeping the gentleman from Louisiana off the Committee on Un-American Activities. If that were the law, if that rule had been adopted at the beginning of our Government, Benjamin Franklin could not have served on such a committee; George Washington could not have served on it; U. S. Grant or Robert E. Lee could not have served on it; neither could Jefferson Davis or Herbert Hoover. That was one of the most stupid things I have ever known Members of Congress to do.

Mr. HÉBERT. I may say to the gentleman from Mississippi that those responsible for removing me from the committee did not have to go so far; they could have laid down the rule that only Members of the House with two eyes could be eligible for service on the committee; that would have left me out for I have only one eye.

Mr. RANKIN. This move to curtail the membership of that committee has been going on behind the Communist line for years. I am not kicking, for I will be here on the floor of the House to carry on this fight as long as I am a Member of this body; but I have never known a more stupid piece of asinine performance than that by the alleged Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee in the way they juggled their resolutions in order to cripple the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. It seems to me that the people who took the gentleman from Mississippi and the gentleman from Louisiana off the committee were Democrats, were they not?

Mr. RANKIN. I am not surprised that the gentleman thought that was the case.

It was the hand of Esau and the voice of Jacob.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have here in my hand an official report of the Committee on Un-American Activities in connection with Dr. Graham. It consists of four and a quarter pages of single-spaced typewritten matter. I ask unanimous consent to include it at the end of my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. I would like to have the gentleman tell us why it is that during all the years of the activities of this Un-American Activities Committee we have not been able to convict someone of subversive activity. In the State of California during the early twenties we were harassed by people of this kind. The Industrial Workers of the World were out there. They were destroying property, they were preaching violence, and they were practicing violence. We indicted some of them in my county. It was my duty to try them. We spent 3 months on it and convicted four of them, putting them in the penitentiary, where they belonged. For over 15 years we never heard one word from those kinds of people.

I wish the gentleman would tell us why it is not possible for us to take some of these individuals who are advocating the overthrow of our Government, find a way to indict them, convict them, and put them out of the way?

Mr. HÉBERT. The gentleman from California has put his finger on a very important subject. I cannot answer the question. The Attorney General of the United States is the only one who can answer it, if he would.

During the hearings last year on the so-called Mundt-Nixon bill—this is a very enlightening thing—the Attorney General of the United States appeared before the committee and denounced communism. He gave a very fine statement; we all agreed with him, but he did not discuss the bill. So I asked the Attorney General: "Mr. Attorney General, I am very much interested in what you say, but tell us about your opinion of the bill now before us?" He replied in substance: "Oh, I cannot give an opinion now. The Department has not given an opinion." I asked him what the Department's opinion had to do with his opinion, that he was the Attorney General, and he replied in effect that he would not desire to give an opinion because the Department might be influenced by what he thought.

Are those the kind of opinions we are getting out of the Department of Justice, whether it is the law we get or what an individual thinks? We asked the Attorney General repeatedly to give us his own opinion on how to strengthen existing laws which he said were inadequate or else forward us his own bill. He said that the statutes on the books at the present time were not sufficient to successfully prosecute these people. He placed himself in the position of the doctor who said that the medicine is no good, but who refused to administer the medicine to find out whether it was any good or not. Then when we asked him and practically begged him to come up with some type of a bill that would have teeth in it, what did we get? I personally asked him to do it. Up to the end of the Eightieth Congress he did not come up with any bill on any request of the committee, though repeatedly, on many occasions, he declined the assistance of the committee and said that they had never come up with anything toward offering an effective means of combating subversive elements in this country. He repeatedly said the committee never got out an effective bill, but he failed to say that he, the Attorney General, had failed to offer any suggestions in spite of our requests.

Mr. JOHNSON. Then this is the effect of the gentleman's opinion, that after 10 years of continual investigation we have not any law on the books to effectively handle these people.

Mr. HÉBERT. In the matter of espionage, no. The laws are ineffective, according to the Attorney General. As to present laws there are the Smith Act and the Vorys Act and acts of that type, but the Attorney General claims that they are not adequate and for that reason has not made use of them. It is for the courts to rule if they are adequate enough. How can we tell if the medicine is any good unless we try it? It is his

duty to prosecute under the existing laws, and he has failed in his duty.

Mr. JOHNSON. I will accept the gentleman's word for it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Every person the Committee on Un-American Activities has cited, and that has been tried, has been convicted. Today they are trying a group of Communists in New York for attempting the overthrow of this Government, and the Communists are picketing the court. They even sent down thousands of people here the other day to try to influence Congress, in order to bring about the intimidation of the courts of New York.

We uncovered the greatest spy ring in history in the Hiss case and exposed a group that was perpetrating treason at a time when our boys were dying by the thousands on every battle front in the world. What was our reward? It was called a red herring.

Mr. HÉBERT. To continue with the gentleman from California, let us take the so-called Hiss-Chambers affair. It is perfectly obvious to a schoolboy that either Hiss or Chambers was lying. One or the other had to be a liar, and perjury before a congressional committee is a crime. It is a crime to lie before a congressional committee. What did the Attorney General or the Department of Justice do, with that absolute crime staring them in the face? It was not the responsibility of the committee to determine which one of the two was lying. That was the responsibility of the Department of Justice, the enforcement agency, the prosecuting agency. And, with that crime produced in full view, with the corpus delicti at their feet, they refused to do anything about it. It took a civil action in Federal court to finally bring about an indictment of one of the two men. If Hiss had not filed civil action against Chambers, nothing at all would have been done. As a matter of fact the Department of Justice has done nothing yet about perjury before the Un-American Activities Committee. Hiss is under indictment for alleged perjury before the New York grand jury which indicted him and not for alleged perjury before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

JANUARY 22, 1949.

A check of the files, records, and publications of the Committee on Un-American Activities has revealed the following information concerning Frank P. Graham:

Letterheads dated September 22, 1939, January 17, 1940, and May 26, 1940, as well as the Daily Worker of March 18, 1939, page 2, reveal that Frank P. Graham was a member of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom. This affiliation is also shown by a leaflet, Citizens Rally, which was held by that organization on April 13, 1940, at Carnegie Hall, New York City.

The American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom was established on Lincoln's birthday, 1939, with the announced purpose of preservation and extension of democracy and intellectual freedom. Its establishment was featured on page 1 of the Daily Worker. (Daily Worker, February 13, 1939.) In Report 2277, dated June 25, 1942, the Special Committee on Un-American Activities found that the line of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom has fluctuated in complete harmony with the line of the Communist Party. The organization was again cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report 1311 of March 29, 1944, as a Communist front which defended Communist teachers.

A letterhead of March 15, 1940, and the letterhead of the Fourth Annual Conference, Hotel Annapolis, Washington, D. C., March 2–3, 1940, lists Frank P. Graham as a sponsor of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born. The program of the Fifth National Conference of this organization, held at the President Hotel, Atlantic City, N. J., March 29–30, 1941, lists Frank Porter Graham as a sponsor.

Of this organization, the Special Committee on Un-American Activities stated: "Numerous witnesses who have appeared before our committee have given testimony indicating that the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born is a Communist-dominated front. In particular * * * the testimony of Humberto Galleani * * * that the Communist Party, of which he was once a member, assigned him to work in the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born and that there was no doubt about the party's complete control of the organization." (Report 2277 of June 25, 1942, p. 13.)

The organization was again cited as one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States in the committee's report of March 29, 1944. The American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born has been cited as subversive and Communist by Attorney General Clark in lists furnished by him for use of the Loyalty Review Board. (See press releases of the U. S. Civil Service Commission dated May 28, 1948, and September 21, 1948.)

Frank P. Graham was a member of the Committee of the American Friends of Spanish Democracy, according to a letterhead of February 21, 1938, and was one of those who signed this organization's petition to lift the arms embargo as shown by the Daily Worker of April 8, 1938 (p. 4). New Masses, January 5, 1937 (p. 31), discloses that he was a general committee member of the American Friends of Spanish Democracy, medical bureau.

In 1937–38, the Communist Party threw itself wholeheartedly into the campaign for the support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations * * * such as * * * American Friends of Spanish Democracy. (Rept. 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, March 29, 1944, p. 82.)

Frank P. Graham has been affiliated with the American League for Peace and Democracy as a signer of a statement on the international situation which that organization issued. (See New Masses, March 15, 1938, p. 19.) According to a letterhead of May 18, 1938, and another of June 11, 1938, and the Daily Worker of April 8, 1938 (p. 2), he was a sponsor of the Easter drive of the China Aid Council of the American League for Peace and Democracy.

The American League for Peace and Democracy has been cited as a Communist front organization in three reports of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities: reports of January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944. The league was established in 1937 as successor to the American League Against War and Fascism, and was designed to conceal Communist control, in accordance with the new tactics of the Communist International. (Attorney General Francis Biddle, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, part 6, p. 7443.) The American League for Peace and Democracy has been cited as subversive and Communist by the present Attorney General. (Press releases of the U. S. Civil Service Commission, dated May 28, 1948, and September 21, 1948, respectively.)

A folder of the Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder, which was issued in 1942, names Frank P. Graham as one of the prominent American educators who favored Presidential clemency for Earl Browder.

When Earl Browder (then general secretary, Communist Party) was in Atlanta Penitentiary serving a sentence involving his fraudulent passports, the Communist Party's front which agitated for his release was known as the Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder. * * * Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, one of the few outstanding women leaders of the Communist Party in this country, headed it. (Report 1311, Special Committee on Un-American Activities, March 29, 1944.) The Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder was cited as a Communist organization by Attorney General Francis Biddle. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, part 6, p. 7446.)

The affiliation of Frank P. Graham with the Coordinating Committee to Lift the Embargo as a representative individual is shown by a booklet, These Americans Say, page 7. The Coordinating Committee to Lift the Embargo was cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities as one of a number of front organizations, set up during the Spanish Civil War by the Communist Party * * * through which the party carried on a great deal of agitation. (Report 1311, March 29, 1944, pp. 137–138.)

According to Equal Justice, publication of the International Labor Defense, Frank P. Graham sent greetings to the National Conference of the International Labor Defense. (Equal Justice, July 1939, p. 4.)

The International Labor Defense was cited by Attorney General Francis Biddle as the legal arm of the Communist Party. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, part 6, p. 7446.) The organization has been cited as a Communist front in three reports of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities: reports of January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944. The organization has been cited as subversive and classified as Communist by the present Attorney General. (See press release of the U. S. Civil Service Commission, dated May 28, 1948, and September 21, 1948.)

Frank P. Graham, according to a letterhead of July 6, 1938, was a national sponsor of the Medical Bureau and North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy. A letterhead of the Michigan Chapter, dated February 2, 1939, also reveals that he sponsored this organization. The Medical Bureau and North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report 1311, dated March 29, 1944. (See paragraph 2 on page 2 of this memorandum concerning the Spanish relief organizations.)

The Prospectus and Review, page 3, of the Lawyers Committee on American Relations with Spain discloses that Frank P. Graham supported the Conference to Lift the Embargo. When it was the policy of the Communist Party to organize much of its main propaganda around the civil war in Spain, this Communist lawyers' front organization supported the movement. (Report 1311 of March 29, 1944, Special Committee on Un-American Activities.)

Frank P. Graham, according to Soviet Russia Today, February 1943 (p. 34), sponsored the Soviet Russia Today dinner which celebrated the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Red Army. The publication, Soviet Russia Today, has been cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in two reports—reports of June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944.

A letterhead of February 7, 1946, a letterhead of June 4, 1947, an official report of the organization, and an announcement of

the third meeting, April 19-21, 1942, at Nashville, Tenn., reveal that Frank P. Graham was honorary president of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare. An official report of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare lists Frank P. Graham as chairman, and the program of the conference held in Birmingham, Ala., November 20-23, 1938, reveals that he delivered the opening address. The Call to the Second Southern Conference for Human Welfare, Chattanooga, Tenn., April 14-16, 1940, reveals that Frank P. Graham participated in that conference. According to a letterhead dated August 13, 1940, Frank P. Graham sponsored the League of Young Southerners, Youth Division, Southern Conference for Human Welfare. Frank P. Graham was one of the signers of a statement issued by the Southern Conference for Human Welfare which appeared in the Daily Worker of May 29, 1947, page 5.

In a report on the Southern Conference for Human Welfare dated June 16, 1947, the Committee on Un-American Activities found: "The most conclusive proof of Communist domination of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare is to be found in the organization's strict and unvarying conformance to the line of the Communist Party in the field of foreign policy. It is also clear indication of the fact that the real purpose of the organization was not human welfare in the South, but rather to serve as a convenient vehicle in support of the current Communist Party line" (p. 8). The Southern Conference for Human Welfare had previously been cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report 1311 of March 29, 1944.

It is noted that Frank P. Graham was one of the signers of a statement issued by 87 American liberals which includes an attack on the Communist Party of the United States. This statement appeared in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 11, pages A2459–A2460.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 547. An act to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Monday, February 7, 1949, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

161. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting a report on claims paid during the calendar year 1948 under the Federal Tort Claims Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

162. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the Eighteenth Quarterly Report on Contract Settlement, covering the period October 1 through December 31, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

163. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 in the amount of $8,274,500 for the legislative branch, Architect of the Capitol (H. Doc. No. 54); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

164. A letter from the Chairman, Munitions Board, transmitting the semiannual report on the stock-piling program and a confidential statistical supplement; to the Committee on Armed Services.

165. A letter from the Administrator, War Assets Administration, transmitting the quarterly progress report of the War Assets Administration for the period October-December 1948; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

166. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 301 of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employee Salary Act of 1948, to remove the present limitation on the compensation of certain officers and employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KERR: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 136. Joint resolution making a further appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 14). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LYLE: Committee on Rules. House Concurrent Resolution 22. Concurrent resolution suspending legislative budget until May 1, 1949; without amendment (Rept. No. 15). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 66. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Public Lands to make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 16). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 75. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction; without amendment (Rept. No. 17). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 2269. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code (Crimes and Criminal Procedure) to make unlawful the transportation or importation of false and defamatory statements designed to arouse intergroup conflict; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2270. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code (Crimes and Criminal Procedure) to make unlawful the transportation or importation of false and defamatory statements designed to arouse intergroup conflict; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. R. 2271. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code (Crimes and Criminal Procedure) to make unlawful the transportation or importation of false and defamatory statements designed to arouse intergroup conflict; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 2272. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code (Crimes and Criminal Procedure) to make unlawful the transportation or importation of false and defamatory statements designed to arouse intergroup conflict; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 2273. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code (Crimes and Criminal Procedure) to make unlawful the transportation or importation of false and defamatory statements designed to arouse intergroup conflict; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PICKETT:

H. R. 2274. A bill to amend section 5 of the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 654); to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2275. A bill to amend section 4 of the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 654); to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2276. A bill to encourage better management of privately owned forest land and to increase the efficient production, processing, marketing, and utilization of forest products through making available technical services and assistance to forest owners, operators of wood-using industries, and consumers of forest products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 2277. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code to provide for a minimum wage; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 2278. A bill to extend the statute of limitations with respect to suits by certain immigrant inspectors and employees for extra pay for Sunday and holiday services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALSH:

H. R. 2279. A bill to authorize the allocation of funds to Grant County, Ind., for payment of one-half the cost of a certain bridge across the Mississinewa River in Grant County, Ind., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 2280. A bill to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act with reference to the general powers of Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 2281. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to effect the payment of certain claims against the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 2282. A bill to make certain Government-owned facilities available for international broadcasting in the furtherance of

authorized programs of the Department of State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:

H. R. 2283. A bill to provide for the construction of the Hartwell Reservoir on the Savannah River, S. C. and Ga.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 2284. A bill to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to assist the States in the development of community recreation programs for the people of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committe on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2285. A bill to amend title 17 of the United States Code, entitled "Copyrights," with respect to relaxation of provisions governing copyright of foreign works; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEVENGER:

H. R. 2286. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to announce the parity price of milk and to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to immediately announce the support price of milk; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COMBS:

H. R. 2287. A bill to provide assistance for local school agencies in providing educational opportunities for children on Federal reservations or in defense areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 2288. A bill authorizing the construction of certain public works at Hubbell, Nebr., for flood control; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2289. A bill authorizing the construction of certain public works at Beatrice, Nebr., for flood control; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2290. A bill to provide for cooperation by the Smithsonian Institution, with State, educational, and scientific organizations in the United States for continuing paleontological investigations in areas which will be flooded by the construction of Government dams; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 2291. A bill to provide more adequate and effective rent control until June 30, 1951, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 2292. A bill to provide that enlisted personnel of the Fleet Reserve and the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve who served in World War I or World War II or both be entitled to receive reserve or retired pay as provided in the Navy Appropriations Act of July 1, 1922, on the basis of enlisted service actually rendered; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 2293. A bill to restore the status quo in respect of certain employment taxes and social-security benefits pending action by Congress on extended social-security coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 2294. A bill to vest title to the Laguna project lands in the pueblo of Laguna of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 2295. A bill granting exemption from income tax in the case of retirement pensions and annuities of Government employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 2296. A bill to amend and supplement the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 2297. A bill to provide for the construction of a veterans' hospital in Broome County, N. Y.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H. R. 2298. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in wildlife-restoration projects, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 2299. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 2300. A bill to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union as a State; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2301. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2302. A bill granting to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependent children pensions equivalent to the pensions granted to veterans of the war with Spain and their widows and dependent children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2303. A bill to amend the Public Health Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2304. A bill to raise the minimum wage rate; to the Committe on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2305. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to the Helena Chamber of Commerce certain described parcels of land situated in the city of Helena, Mont.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2306. A bill providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 2307. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Dassel, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 2308. A bill to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2309. A bill to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 so as to authorize the payment of fair compensation to persons contracting to deliver certain strategic or critical minerals or metals in cases of failure to recover reasonable costs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2310. A bill to adjust the rates of pension and compensation payable under the laws and regulations administered by the Veterans' Administration on the basis of the cost of living in the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2311. A bill establishing a presumption of service-connected disability in the case of disease or injury existing within 5 years after discharge from service in the armed forces during the present war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2312. A bill to provide for the sale of certain submarginal lands owned by the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2313. A bill to suspend certain import taxes on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2314. A bill to amend the act of December 5, 1945, entitled "An Act granting travel pay and other allowances to certain soldiers of the war with Spain and the Philippine Insurrection who were discharged in the Philippine Islands"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2315. A bill to amend the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act to provide a secondary market for farm loans made under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2316. A bill relating to compensation for veterans of World War II who have a service-contracted or a service-aggravated tuberculosis condition; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2317. A bill to permit any veteran of both world wars to elect to have his service in World War I counted as service in World War II for the purpose of determining eligibility for certain benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2318. A bill to increase to $1,500 the income limitation upon the payment of compensation under the act of June 28, 1934, to widows without children, and to children, of World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 2319. A bill to increase the salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 2320. A bill to increase the salaries of assistant superintendents in the Metropolitan Police force; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 2321. A bill to extend the coverage of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system under voluntary agreements to employees of State and local governments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2322. A bill to provide pay increases for employees of the Federal Government and of the District of Columbia municipal government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2323. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to provide the same benefits for husbands and widowers under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system as are provided for wives and widows; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 2324. A bill to terminate certain wartime and other excise-tax rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 2325. A bill to grant the consent of the United States to the upper Colorado River Basin compact; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MARSALIS:

H. R. 2326. A bill to grant the consent of the United States to the upper Colorado River Basin compact; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 2327. A bill to grant the consent of the United States to the upper Colorado River Basin compact; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 2328. A bill to grant the consent of the United States to the upper Colorado River Basin compact; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mrs. BOSONE:

H. R. 2329. A bill to grant the consent of the United States to the upper Colorado River Basin compact; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CARROLL:

H. R. 2330. A bill to grant the consent of the United States to the upper Colorado River Basin compact; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming:

H. R. 2331. A bill to grant the consent of the United States to the upper Colorado River Basin compact; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 2332. A bill to grant the consent of the United States to the upper Colorado River Basin compact; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MILES:

H. R. 2333. A bill to grant the consent of the United States to the upper Colorado River Basin compact; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 2334. A bill to grant the consent of the United States to the upper Colorado River Basin compact; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER:

H. R. 2335. A bill to extend the date for application for terminal-leave bonds; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POTTER:

H. R. 2336. A bill to authorize the Maritime Commission to convert certain vessels to types suitable for use on the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 2337. A bill to provide for an examination and survey of the rivers of the New England States to further the program for the generation of electric energy in such States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 2338. A bill to extend the maximum-hours provisions of section 207, title 29, United States Code, to employees of common carriers by railroad; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 2339. A bill providing for the construction of a railroad connecting the existing railroad system serving the United States and Canada and terminating at Prince George, British Columbia, Canada, with the railroad system serving Alaska and terminating at Fairbanks, Alaska; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 2340. A bill for the purpose of erecting a Federal building in Enumclaw, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2341. A bill for the purpose of erecting a Federal building in Kirkland, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2342. A bill for the purpose of erecting a Federal building in Gig Harbor, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 2343. A bill to authorize medical and hospital service for those employed in the maritime service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. J. Res. 137. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. J. Res. 138. Joint resolution for the authorization of a special contribution by the United States to the United Nations for the relief of Palestine refugees; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. J. Res. 139. Joint resolution making available certain funds for relief of farmers in storm-stricken areas; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. J. Res. 140. Joint resolution to provide for a suitable and adequate system of timber access roads to and in the forests of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. J. Res. 141. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 142. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. J. Res. 143. Joint resolution to authorize vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore between United States ports on the Great Lakes during the period from March 15 to December 15, 1949, inclusive; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WHITE of California:

H. J. Res. 144. Joint resolution making available certain funds for relief of farmers in storm-stricken areas; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LANE:

H. J. Res. 145. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. Res. 79. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate and study the spread between the prices received by producers of goods and commodities and the prices paid by consumers; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. Res. 80. Resolution requesting the Secretary of National Defense to transmit to the House a report with respect to the progress which is being made in carrying on the national defense program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the Federal Livestock Disease Research Laboratory; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to effect legislation which will enable the Civil Aeronautics Administration to prohibit the taking off of aircraft from airports during periods of poor visibility; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to funds for the Joint Commission for the Eradication of Foot-and-Mouth Disease in the Republic of Mexico; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to reconsider the closing of the airfield at Kearney, Nebr.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to continue a plan of expansion of local-service air transportation facilities as recommended by the President's Air Policy Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 2344. A bill for the relief of Charles W. Miles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 2345. A bill for the relief of Louis J. Waline; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2346. A bill for the relief of Guy Albert Wheaton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2347. A bill for the relief of P. S. Cook Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. R. 2348. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alice Dalton; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GORSKI of Illinois:

H. R. 2349. A bill for the relief of Col. Wlodzimierz Onacewicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H. R. 2350. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marion M. Martin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2351. A bill for the relief of Allen L. Sherwood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H. R. 2352. A bill for the relief of Roy Durbin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 2353. A bill for the relief of Joel W. Atkinson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2354. A bill for the relief of William F. Thomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 2355. A bill for the relief of Anna Der A. Wing Jee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 2356. A bill granting to Frank S. Howell certain pay and allowances for his travel from the Philippine Islands to the United States following his discharge from the Army in such islands in 1900; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 2357. A bill for the relief of Lazar Gartenstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2358. A bill for the relief of Giuseppa Biasco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN (by request):

H. R. 2359. A bill for the relief of the estate of Robert W. Listman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER (by request):

H. R. 2360. A bill for the relief of Theodore Papachristopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

40. By Mr. ELSTON: Petition of 160 residents of Cincinnati, Ohio, urging an amendment to the Selective Service Act which would grant exemption from the draft to graduates of the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point; to the Committee on Armed Services.

41. By the SPEAKER: Petition of manager, Local 62, International Ladies Garment Workers Union, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the immediate repeal of the Taft-Hartley labor law and restoration of the Wagner labor-regulations law; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

42. Also, petition of manager, Local 62, International Ladies Garment Workers Union, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of legislation for a $1 Federal legal minimum wage; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

43. Also, petition of the clerk of the Common Council, city of South Bend, Ind., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the resolution entitled "General Pulaski's Memorial Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1949

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of the living and the living dead: In the midst of life we are in death; yet when the throb of eternity is felt within us we know that life is not measured by heartbeats nor by figures on a dial. We give Thee thanks for the witness of Thy servant who ministered in holy things to this Chamber, now gone so suddenly from our side and sight to a larger sphere but still in the radiant presence of the Master of all good workmen. Knowing that we will not pass this way again and that the sands of our brief years are so swiftly falling, may we so number our days as to apply our hearts unto wisdom, putting into the fugitive fragments of every day such quality of work as shall make us unashamed when our little day is over and all the days are done. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 3, 1949, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hoey	Murray
Anderson	Holland	Myers
Baldwin	Humphrey	Neely
Brewster	Hunt	O'Conor
Bricker	Ives	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Broughton	Johnson, Tex.	Reed
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Byrd	Kefauver	Russell
Cain	Kem	Saltonstall
Capehart	Kerr	Schoeppel
Chapman	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Chavez	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Connally	Langer	Sparkman
Cordon	Lodge	Stennis
Donnell	Long	Taft
Douglas	Lucas	Taylor
Eastland	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Ecton	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	McFarland	Thye
Ferguson	McGrath	Tobey
Flanders	McKellar	Tydings
Frear	McMahon	Vandenberg
George	Magnuson	Watkins
Gillette	Malone	Wherry
Gurney	Martin	Wiley
Hayden	Maybank	Williams
Hendrickson	Miller	Withers
Hickenlooper	Morse	Young
Hill	Mundt	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 3d instant,

The VICE PRESIDENT, on February 3, 1949, signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, which had been previously signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 547. An act to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans; and

H. J. Res. 136. Joint resolution making a further appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE FILED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 3d instant,

Mr. MAYBANK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill (S. 548) to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments, on February 4, 1949, and submitted a report (No. 31) thereon.

REPORT OF AIR COORDINATING COMMITTEE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 59)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information and consideration of the Congress the Report of the Air Coordinating Committee for the calendar year 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 7, 1949.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN NAVAL VESSELS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, on the proposed transfer of naval vessels to certain institutions and organizations, under authority of section 1 of the act of August 7, 1946, chapter 804 (60 Stat. 897); to the Committee on Armed Services.

DEVELOPMENT AND CONSERVATION OF CERTAIN RESOURCES IN SUBMERGED COASTAL LANDS

A joint letter from the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote the development and conservation of certain resources in the submerged coastal lands adjacent to the shores of the United States (with accompanying papers; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

COLLECTION AND PUBLICATION OF COTTON STATISTICS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the collection and publication of cotton statistics (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT OF COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Commission relating to the general management of the executive branch, dated February 1949 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

OFFICE BUILDING AT SUITLAND, MD.

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Works Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the construction of an office building at Suitland, Md. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

CONSTRUCTION OF GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE BUILDING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Works Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend Public Law 533 of the Eightieth Congress authorizing the construction of a building for the General Accounting Office on Square 518 in the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

A letter from the Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the first semiannual report of that Commission for the period July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of all tort claims by that agency for the period January 1, 1948, through December 31, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INC.

A letter from the secretary, Federal Prison Industries, Inc., Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that corporation, for the fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Legislative Resolution 2

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States with respect to a national compulsory sickness-insurance program

"Whereas the American people now enjoy the highest level of health, the best standards of scientific medical care, and the finest medical institutions ever attained by any major country in the world; and

"Whereas these accomplishments of American medicine are the results of a free people working under a system of free enterprise; and

"Whereas, the experience of all countries where government has assumed control of medical care has been a progressive deterioration of medical standards and medical care, to the detriment of the health of the people: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in sixty-first session assembled:*

"1. That the Legislature of the State of Nebraska respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to refrain from imposing upon the citizens of this Nation any form of compulsory insurance, or any system of medical care designed for national bureaucratic control.

"2. That Nebraska Senators and Representatives now in the Congress of the United States be, and are hereby, respectfully requested to use every effort at their command to prevent the enactment of such legislation.

"3. That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to the President of the United States, the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate, the United States House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Congressman from Nebraska."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Joint Resolution 17

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress to consider flood control needs in California

"Whereas recurrent floods in California have caused loss of life and property, disruption of commerce and transportation, and the wasting of water detrimental to the health, safety, and welfare of the people of the State; and

"Whereas the local agencies concerned in flood-control works have joined together in the California Flood Control Conference and developed a coordinated program for construction of authorized Federal flood-control projects; and

"Whereas the State Water Resources Board has held public hearings on and carefully screened the requests for appropriations presented by the California Flood Control Conference, and determined an urgent need for appropriations for the following projects and amounts:

"Project:

San Francisco engineering district: Salinas River	$1,000,000
Los Angeles engineering district:	
Upper Los Angeles River	2,000,000
Tujunga Wash	3,000,000
Compton Creek	2,268,000
Whittier Narrows	12,000,000
Sawtelle - Westwood (lower)	3,917,000
Live Oak Wash	500,000
San Antonio flood-control basin	2,500,000
Stewart Canyon (Ventura County)	880,000
Carbon Canyon (Orange County)	1,000,000
San Diego River	3,500,000
Sacramento engineering district:	
Black Butte Dam	500,000
Cherry Valley	1,500,000
Farmington Dam	2,000,000
Folsom Dam	5,000,000
Isabella Dam	6,000,000
Merced group	500,000
Pine Flat Dam	12,500,000
Sacramento River major and minor tributaries	1,000,000
Sacramento River (old project)	6,000,000
San Joaquin River levees	1,000,000
Success	500,000
Terminus	500,000
Total	69,565,000

and

"Whereas the Legislature of the State of California demonstrated its concern in the flood-control problems of the State and the authorized Federal program by appropriating $25,000,000 to pay the cost of local participation in these projects; and

"Whereas the President's budget for the fiscal year 1950 provides $430,267,600 for flood control general which would complete the general flood-control program of the United States in 10 years; and

"Whereas the proposed general flood-control appropriations for California projects contained in the President's budget represent about half the amount required to complete California's program on a 10-year basis: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Legislature of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to consider the flood-control needs of California on a basis of equality with the national program and to that end provide appropriations commensurate with the need as justified in the program developed by the State water resources board; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Joint Resolution 1

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in relation to the establishment of a support price for black-eyed beans

"Whereas the Federal Government has established and pursued for some time the policy of providing support prices for agricultural products to the end that the agricultural industry of the Nation should be stabilized, and that the effects of fluctuation of prices for agricultural commodities below the cost of production may be eliminated and the hardships on the farmers resulting from such lowered price levels avoided; and

"Whereas the production of black-eyed and all varieties of dried beans has become an important segment of the agricultural industry of the State of California but no support price for such products has been established and the market price for such products has fallen below the cost of production; and

"Whereas the producers of black-eyed and all other dried beans in this State and in the other States should be given the same consideration and protection as have been given to producers of other agricultural products, and unless such protection is afforded to them they will suffer an immediate loss which in turn will be reflected in the general economy of the State because of the lowered purchasing power of such producers: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Legislature of the State of California hereby respectfully urges the President and the Congress of the United States to take such steps as may be necessary for the establishment of an appropriate support price for black-eyed and all varieties of dried beans; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"Senate Joint Resolution 8

"Joint resolution relative to the proposed international animal quarantine station on Swan Island

"Whereas the people of this State remember with the direst apprehension of the outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease in 1924 and 1929 and the paralyzing effect each of these outbreaks had upon the economy and welfare of California; and

"Whereas the bulwark of protection against the introduction of foot-and-mouth disease into the United States or this State has been subdivision (a) of section 306 of chapter 497 of the United States Statutes of 1930, providing that if the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States determines that foot-and-mouth disease exists in any foreign country, he shall officially notify the Secretary of the Treasury and give public notice thereof, and thereafter, and until the Secretary of Agriculture gives notice in a similar manner that such disease no longer exists in such foreign country, the importation into the United States of cattle, sheep, or other domestic ruminants, or swine, or of fresh, chilled, or frozen beef, veal, mutton, lamb, or pork, from such foreign country is prohibited; and

"Whereas restrictions on importations have from time to time been issued pursuant to the authority of Congress and by that means foot-and-mouth disease has been kept from the United States or any part thereof; and

"Whereas chapter 592 of the United States Statutes of 1946 authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture, in his discretion, to establish and maintain on Swan Island, situate in the Caribbean Sea, an international animal-quarantine station and permits the Secretary of Agriculture, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, but subject to regulations prescribed by him to prevent the introduction into the United States of communicable diseases of animals, to permit animals to be brought into the Swan Island Quarantine Station from any country, including those in which the Secretary of Agriculture determines that foot-and-mouth disease exists and to permit the same to be subsequently imported into other parts of the United States under the regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture; and

"Whereas on December 7, 1948, the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States gave notice of his intention to issue regulations relating to the Swan Island Quarantine Station, which regulations permit ruminants and swine to be shipped into the quarantine station if they originate in an area in a foreign country which has been free from foot-and-mouth disease for at least 60 days immediately preceding the date of movement of the ruminants and swine therefrom and after quarantine at Swan Island for not less than 90 days may be brought into the United States; and

"Whereas the report on foot-and-mouth disease made to the Senate of California on March 18, 1948, by the Senate Interim Committee on Livestock Diseases, created by Senate Resolution No. 145 of the 1947 session of the California Legislature, shows that 316 Cebu bulls were landed on Sacrificios Island in April of 1946 and were removed from said island to the vicinity of Vera Cruz, Mexico, on the 26th of September 1946, and were thereafter inspected by two veterinarians of the Bureau of Animal Industry of the United States Department of Agriculture and found to be free from foot-and-mouth disease and 3 weeks thereafter foot-and-mouth disease broke out in the vicinity into which the Cebu bulls had been imported; and

"Whereas the regulations for the operation of the Swan Island Quarantine Station proposed by the Secretary of Agriculture can therefore not give any assurance that Swan Island will not become the avenue through

which foot-and-mouth disease will be introduced into the United States; and

"Whereas the California State Board of Agriculture at its meeting on January 17, 1949, attended by representatives from the California Farm Bureau, the California Cattlemen's Association, the California Wool Growers Association, California Farmers, Inc., the Agricultural Council of California, and the Agricultural Department of the California State Chamber of Commerce, adopted a resolution with the unanimous concurrence of those in attendance, that the regulations for the Swan Island Quarantine Station should prohibit the importation into the United States of animals susceptible to foot-and-mouth disease from any country in which it is determined that foot-and-mouth disease exists: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President of the United States and the Secretary of Agriculture thereof that no action be taken for the use of Swan Island as a quarantine station with respect to the importation into this country of animals susceptible to foot-and-mouth disease from any country in any part of which exists foot-and-mouth disease, and respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to this effect; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to every Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Resolution 5

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in relation to changing present Federal laws pertaining to the employment-security programs of the States, and to providing sufficient funds to permit proper administration of the public employment service and the unemployment insurance programs of the State of California

"Whereas this legislature believes firmly in the continuing value of the traditional principle that ours shall be a government of laws and not of men; and

"Whereas although it may be expedient at the beginning to vest broad powers in an administration to legislate by interpretation in order to work out practical methods and corollary principles in the development of a new concept in government, this legislature believes that discretionary administrative powers of interpretation of law should be reduced progressively by more specific law as rapidly as experience permits; and

"Whereas it appears that there is now enough accumulated experience with the employment-security program for Congress to be able to put more into specific provisions of law many of the standards and prescriptions to which a State must conform in order to receive Federal approval, many of which are now so general as to be, for all practical purposes, at the discretion of the Federal Security Administrator; and

"Whereas this legislature believes firmly in the principle that the national interest is best served by permitting each State to experiment with and develop its individual solutions to its own particular problems, insofar as the results are not clearly harmful to the interests of other States or of the Nation as a whole; and

"Whereas the present system, under which the administration of a State's employment service and unemployment-insurance programs is financed fully with Federal money and so is subject to purse-string influence and control by the Federal Government, is inconsistent with a sound State-Federal partnership in solving what is partly a State and partly a National problem; and

"Whereas the present method now prescribed and used by the Federal Security Administrator for budgeting State requirements and apportioning Federal appropriations among the States for administration of the States' own programs offers no incentive to a State to reduce its cost of administration, effectively controls the emphasis which a State may place on any phase of its own program, effectively prevents a State from experimenting in any direction of which the Administrator does not happen to approve, and tends to reduce administration of employment-security programs to a dead level of mediocrity throughout all of the States; and

"Whereas the Federal Unemployment Tax Act now effectively prevents a State from using certain methods of reducing its tax rates for contributions to its unemployment fund to less than the maximum 2.7 percent of subject pay rolls permissible for offset against the Federal tax, whether or not such methods will provide revenue sufficient to maintain the solvency of its unemployment fund; and

"Whereas this legislature believes firmly in the principle that, because ignorance of the law is no excuse for violation of the law, it is a responsibility of government to put the law into such form that a person can find out what provisions of law are effective without a major research effort; and

"Whereas substantive provisions of Federal law which pertain specifically to employment security are scattered through a number of different Federal acts, frequently without indication of what provisions of one act have been amended by another act; and

"Whereas there is now no provision for emergency funds to finance additional administrative costs of employment-security programs due to unforeseen conditions creating overloads; and

"Whereas in the 11 years from July 1, 1936, to June 30, 1947, since which time accurate figures have not yet been published, the Federal Government has made a profit of $49,900,000 from the difference between the $97,900,000 it has collected from California's employers under the unemployment tax and the $48,000,000 it has returned to the State of California in grants for administration of the State's employment-security programs; and

"Whereas because the total amount appropriated by the Eightieth Congress for employment-security administration was substantially less than the amount recommended to be appropriated by the Federal agencies, the Federal grant for administration of the employment-service and unemployment-insurance programs of the State of California for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, is about $4,000,000 less than the $18,300,000 recommended by the Region 12 office of the Federal Security Agency and is insufficient to enable the State properly to serve its citizens and to protect its unemployment fund, as required by State law: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California (jointly)*, That the President and the Congress of the United States are hereby respectfully memorialized and requested to take such steps as are necessary to bring about the following results:

"1. Wherever practical reduce to more specific standards and prescriptions, stated in law, the requirements to which a State's employment security laws and practices must conform to receive Federal approval, and cut down present broad powers of the Federal Security Administrator to legislate by interpretation of law.

"2. Change the present method of financing administration of State employment security programs to insure that each State may receive a fair proportion of the contributions of its employers for such administration and to reduce the purse-string control of the State's administration by the Federal Security Agency. Amend Federal law to provide that the present 0.3 percent part of the unemployment tax not subject to offset shall be divided between the Federal Government and the State whose employers contribute it, and thereafter that State administration shall be financed by a combination of appropriation by the State and a Federal grant-in-aid.

"3. Amend Federal law to provide that a State may use any method of experience rating or other form of reducing its own unemployment tax rate that it sees fit to use, without loss of the additional credit privilege in computing tax offset against the Federal unemployment tax, provided only that the resulting State tax will maintain the solvency of its unemployment fund, in accordance with specific standards of measurement stated in Federal law.

"4. Rewrite and reenact Federal laws related specifically to employment security activities to consolidate all their provisions into a single act, in logical sequence and without obsolete provisions.

"5. Provide for an emergency fund for State administration of employment security programs, from which additional funds will be available to a State within a fiscal year in unforeseen circumstances which create an administrative overload not contemplated in its original budget.

"6. Provide an immediate emergency supplemental Federal grant to the State of California, for administration of its employment service and unemployment insurance programs, of $2,387,000 to make up the deficit of $500,000 unavoidably incurred in the first half of this current fiscal year as a result of the drastic cut in the expected Federal grant without forewarning, and to restore to the State the $1,887,000, the difference between the amount indicated to be recommended by the Federal agencies and the actual grant for the second half of this fiscal year; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate shall prepare and transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Senate and of the House of Representatives of the United States from California."

"Senate Joint Resolution 14

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States in relation to repealing the transportation tax

"Whereas for the purpose of meeting wartime emergency necessity, the Congress of the United States enacted as excise taxes a 15-percent levy upon the transportation of persons and a 3-percent levy upon the transportation of property; and

"Whereas one of the principal purposes of levying such tax upon the transportation of persons was to discourage unnecessary wartime travel, the need for which no longer exists; and

"Whereas it is the opinion of the Legislature of the State of California that excise taxes should not impose an unfair burden on the long distance shipper and the long distance traveler as does the present tax on

the transportation of property and persons; and

"Whereas it should be a principle of Federal taxation to levy taxes in such a manner as to prevent them from falling as an unequal burden on citizens residing in different areas of the country; and

"Whereas the distances to, from, and within the West impose an unfair burden on the western traveler and shipper; and

"Whereas the present transportation tax on property is unfairly burdensome upon the State of California as it adds what is in effect an additional tariff on the goods shipped from California to the eastern markets, with the result that those goods are not able to compete freely with the goods originating in more closely adjacent southern areas; and

"Whereas the State of California is particularly interested in preserving the eastern market as an open market in which the agricultural products of California, in particular, may compete freely with southern produce without the hindrance of artificial barriers such as the present transportation tax; and

"Whereas the State of California is particularly interested in protecting and developing its vacation and tourist travel on an equal basis with other vacation travel areas; and

"Whereas the transportation of both persons and property plays such a vital role in the economic life of this country to the extent that the costs of transportation should always be kept at the lowest possible level; and

"Whereas transportation is in no sense a luxury but is a vital necessity and there is, therefore, sound reason for distinguishing between the transportation taxes and other excise taxes that are imposed upon luxury items; and

"Whereas it is the opinion of the Legislature of the State of California that the best interest of the country and particularly the Western States, who are now discriminated against by the present transportation taxes, would be served by a repeal of those taxes; and

"Whereas there is presently pending before the Congress of the United States H. R. 205 which would repeal the tax on transportation of property and H. R. 208 which would repeal the tax on transportation of persons: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact into law H. R. 205 and H. R. 208 or any other bill or bills which would accomplish the same purpose; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

Four joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Resolution 6

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in relation to two irrigation canals to supply water from the Sacramento River to areas in northern California

"Whereas the great Central Valley of California consists of two connected valleys, the one to the north comprising the watershed of the Sacramento River and the one to the south comprising the watershed of the San Joaquin River; and

"Whereas the State water plan of California developed from a series of comprehensive investigations conducted principally in the decade following 1920 and envisioned, among other things, a plan for the transfer of large quantities of water from the northern area where water was plentiful to the southern area where it was acutely needed; and

"Whereas the Central Valley Project Act of 1933 had for one of its principal purposes such a large-scale transfer of water from the Sacramento Valley to the San Joaquin Valley; and

"Whereas the State water plan also envisioned the utilization of the water of the Sacramento River within the Sacramento Valley but the original Central Valley Project Act, while it provided that no watershed or area wherein water originates should be deprived of water required for its needs, nevertheless made practically no provision for the utilization of water within the Sacramento Valley; and

"Whereas in 1941 the California Legislature recognized that the project should include some provision for the utilization of the water of the Sacramento River in the area in which it originates and added to the project two units, one, called the Tehama-Colusa conduit, extending from the Sacramento River near Red Bluff through the counties of Tehama, Glenn, and Colusa west of the river, and the other, called the Tehama-Butte conduit, extending from a point near Red Bluff through the counties of Tehama, Butte, and Sutter east of the river; and

"Whereas the United States had theretofore taken over the Central Valley project as a Federal project and the two units have not been added to the project as now being constructed; and

"Whereas in the 1949 session of the Congress of the United States a bill introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressmen CLAIR ENGLE and HUBERT SCUDDER of California will be under consideration which provides for the inclusion in the Central Valley project of two new features, one called the Tehama-Colusa conduit and the other the Chico conduit; and

"Whereas the conduits provided for in the Engle-Scudder bill will effectuate the same general purposes as the two units above referred to which have already been added to the project as described in the California act; and

"Whereas the Engle-Scudder bill further safeguards the interests of the people of the area affected by requiring that the relevant documents of the State water plan be considered and that local interests affected be consulted; and

"Whereas the utilization of the water of the Sacramento River for the purposes contemplated will not affect or jeopardize any of the other features of the project but, on the contrary, will bring the project into closer conformity with the State water plan, and provide an additional water supply in areas where it is needed: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to give favorable consideration to the Engle-Scudder bill hereinabove referred to, or to take whatever steps may be necessary to provide in such other manner as may be suitable for the construction of the same or similar conduits for the same or similar purposes; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States."

"Senate Joint Resolution 11

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in relation to establishing a 10-year experimental range program

"Whereas there are approximately 15,000,000 acres of land in California recognized to be grazing land and not suitable for purposes other than providing forage for livestock; and

"Whereas the value of these lands for grazing purposes is subject to the encroachment of noxious weeds and the growth and spreading of useless brush which cause a serious detriment to the value of such lands for grazing purposes; and

"Whereas the United States Forest Service for a period of years conducted a series of studies all relating to rodent damage to pasture lands, the control of rodents, the use of fertilizers, and the planting of new or different types of grasses to improve and preserve the productivity of such grazing lands; and

"Whereas the experiments of the United States Forest Service were conducted at what is known as the San Joaquin Experimental Range, which is located in almost the exact geographical center of the State and is typical of the grazing lands throughout the State; and

"Whereas the work of the United States Forest Service and the benefits derived therefrom have been augmented by a series of studies made by the University of California to determine the value of the grasses as cattle feed, and the value of feeding concentrates as auxiliary to the feeding of such grasses in order to produce more beef value at a lower cost; and

"Whereas the desirability of increasing the productivity of the millions of acres of California grazing land is apparent and a very slight proportionate increase throughout the State would produce millions of dollars in additional values; and

"Whereas the State of California is rapidly developing and increasing in population and all possible steps should be taken to increase the value of the grazing lands of California and the production of livestock to meet the needs of the growing population; and

"Whereas a long-range program of 10 or more years' designed to improve the productivity of California's grazing lands would be very desirable and would return many times the cost of such program: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the President and the Congress of the United States are hereby memorialized and requested to take such steps as may be necessary to provide for a 10-year experimental range program to be conducted within the State of California, and preferably at the San Joaquin Experimental Range, and to make available sufficient funds so that such program can be conducted upon a scale commensurate with its potential value in increasing the productivity of California grazing land; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and the Vice President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"Senate Joint Resolution 13

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in relation to the Forestry Service special-use permit fees

"Whereas the new Forestry Service fee schedule now being executed by the Federal

Forestry Service is based upon a percentage of gross revenue of the permittee; and

"Whereas a fee based upon a percentage of gross revenue in practical effect taxes the permittee on the capital investment he has added to the unimproved lands; and

"Whereas this would discourage the investment of capital to improve our public lands, thus retarding its development and reducing facilities available to the vacationing public; and

"Whereas there is no relationship between the value of land before improvement by the permittee and the fees charged; and

"Whereas the new fee schedule will cause great hardship in many cases by increasing the fees charged by many hundred percent; and

"Whereas the increase of fees for the use of lands appears entirely inconsistent with the Federal rent-control laws; and

"Whereas increased fees will necessarily raise the cost of services to the vacationing public, thus lessening the volume of business for the permittee, and consequently reducing the revenue for the affected countries: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California hereby respectfully urges the President and the Congress of the United States to take such steps as may be necessary to suspend the new fee schedule pending a full investigation of the conditions, and to revise the schedule so that it will bear a reasonable relationship to the value of the lands, and the use being made of such lands; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate shall prepare and transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each member of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States from California."

"Senate Joint Resolution 15

"Joint resolution respecting memorializing Congress to enact legislation for the relief of gold mining

"Whereas under War Order L-208, effective October 1942, an unusual and unprecedented hardship was inflicted upon the industry of gold mining causing a general suspension of gold mining throughout the United States, thereby seriously injuring many gold-mine operators and ruining many others; and

"Whereas many fine communities in California have been for nearly a century almost wholly dependent upon gold mining and are now threatened with becoming ghost towns, because enforced abandonment of these gold mines is imminent under existing circumstances; and

"Whereas gold mining was the industry which originally founded the prosperity of California and has continuously been one of California's major industries and sources of new wealth up until the said L-208; and

"Whereas the injury and injustice to gold mining has not been remedied but on the contrary becomes more acute, causing poverty and dislocation among the many communities of California's extensive mining regions threatening excessive and unnatural unemployment with the great costs and expense incident thereto a heavy burden upon the State: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of California (now in regular session), That the Congress of the United States be petitioned and urged to take early and effective action toward remedying the distress caused by the said L-208 and to effectuate ways and means of restoring, rehabilitating and preserving in its former circumstances prior to the said L-208, the gold-mining industry; and be it further

"Resolved, That this resolution be sent to the President of the United States and the Congress and to each Member of the Senate and the Representatives from California."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois favoring repeal of the so-called Taft-Hartley Labor Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. LUCAS on February 3, 1949 (p. 783), CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A resolution adopted by the Little Popple Grange, Iron Mountain, Mich., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide a support price for butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution adopted by the Women of the International League for Peace and Freedom, Boston, Mass., favoring repeal of the Selective Service Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the national headquarters of Enlisted Veterans of America, Minneapolis, Minn., mourning the death of Josephus Daniels, and favoring the enactment of legislation to create an investigation and adjustment board of the military services (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Chad F. Calhoun, of Washington, D. C., relating to the Federal Reserve Board (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter in the nature of a petition from W. T. Smith, of Louisville, Ky., relating to taxation of mutual and reciprocal insurance companies; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Morocco Post, No. 1, the American Legion, Casablanca, Morocco, stating their position with reference to treaty violations that threaten American business in Morocco (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by Charles Rozmarek, president, Polish American Congress, Inc., relating to the liberalization of the displaced-persons law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a memorial, signed by Mary Anderson, chairman, of the National Committee on the Status of Women in the United States, remonstrating against the adoption of the so-called equal-rights amendment (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolutions adopted by the Common Councils of the Cities of Toledo, Ohio, and South Bend, Ind., and the City Council of Chicago, Ill., favoring the enactment of legislation proclaiming October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Navajo Assistance, Inc., Gallup, N. Mex., signed by Bert Pousna, managing director, relating to direct assistance to the Navajo Indians (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A petition of sundry American citizens residing in Puerto Rico, Salinas, P. R., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the extension of social security to Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A radiogram in the nature of a petition from members of the Puerto Rico Telephone Industrial Workers, San Juan, P. R., praying for inclusion of Puerto Rico in the provisions of the wage-and-hour law and other social legislation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Telegrams in the nature of memorials from the American-Virgin Islands Civic Association, New York City, N. Y., signed by Ashley L. Totten, president, and the Liberal Party of St. Thomas, V. I., remonstrating against the enactment of the so-called Butler bill to create a single resident commissioner for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen of Chelsea, Mass., relating to Federal aid to schools in urban communities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A petition of sundry citizens of the United States, praying for the repeal of the so-called Taft-Hartley Labor Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from the American Council of Christian Churches, Wilkinsburg, Pa., signed by W. O. H. Garman, president, remonstrating against repeal of the so-called Taft-Hartley labor law (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Letters and telegrams in the nature of memorials, of sundry citizens of the States of Ohio, Kentucky, North Carolina, Maryland, New Jersey, Montana, Pennsylvania, and New York, remonstrating against repeal of the so-called Taft-Hartley labor law; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter and a telegram in the nature of petitions from the Italian Cloak, Suit, Skirt, and Reefer Makers' Union, Local 48, and the executive board of Local 66, International Ladies Garment Workers, both of New York City, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation providing a Federal minimum wage of $1 per hour; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Union de Choferes de Trailers y Trucks, Union Local No. 1, Ponce, P. R., favoring the enactment of legislation providing minimum wages of 75 cents per hour for workers in industry; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A petition of sundry members of the Committee of Low-Grade Mail Clerks, Council Bluffs, Iowa, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 107, restoring automatic four-grade pay raise to postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by Herman Edelsberg, legal counsel, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, Washington, D. C., favoring the adoption of a cloture rule to prevent filibusters (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A resolution adopted by the Society of Medical Consultants of World War II, in the State of Maryland, relating to the medical departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"House Concurrent Resolution 4

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States not to federalize the practice of medicine

"Whereas the American people now enjoy the highest level of health, the finest standards of scientific care and the best quality of medical institutions thus far achieved by any major country in the world; and

"Whereas the great accomplishments of American medicine are the results of a free profession working under a free system unhampered by Government control; and

"Whereas the experience of all countries where government has assumed control of medical care has been progressive deterioration of the standards and quality of that care to the serious detriment of the sick and the needy: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Arkansas, a majority of all the members elected to each house agreeing thereto:

"1. The Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized not to enact any proposed legislation the effect of which will be to bring the practice of medicine in this country under Federal direction and control, either through a form of compulsory insurance or any system of medical care designed for national bureaucratic control.

"2. The Senators and Representatives from Arkansas now in the Congress of the United States are hereby respectfully requested to bend their every effort and utilize all facilities at their command to prevent the enactment of such legislation.

"3. Copies of this resolution shall forthwith be transmittted to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each Senator and Congressman from Arkansas."

By Mr. MILLER:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Public Works:

"House Joint Memorial 1

"*To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress Assembled:*

"We, your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, assembled in its thirtieth session, do respectfully represent: That—

"Whereas the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army has favorably recommended the construction of a series of four dams with locks to provide slack-water navigation from the mouth of the Snake River to Lewiston, Idaho; and

"Whereas the site locations are, namely, Ice Harbor Dam, at mile 10.2 above the mouth of the Snake River; Lower Monumental Dam, at mile 44.7; Little Goose Dam, at mile 72.2; and Lower Granite Dam, at mile 113.1; and

"Whereas these dams are to be enduring structures, constructed for the welfare and benefit of the people of the United States; and

"Whereas the names and works of many of our early explorers and missionaries are indelibly written in the history and development of the Snake River and the entire Pacific Northwest: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the name of the Ice Harbor Dam be changed to Whitman to commemorate the deeds of Dr. Marcus Whitman, who was martyred in the performance of his missionary works among the Indians of the Northwest; that the name of the Lower Monumental Dam be changed to Lewis, honoring and perpetuating the name of Capt. Merriwether Lewis, who led the first expedition to explore and open the Northwest country; that the name of the Little Goose Dam be changed to Clark in honor of Capt. William Clark, who so ably assisted Capt. Merriwether Lewis; and that the name of Lower Granite Dam be changed to Spalding, honoring and commemorating the name of Rev. Henry Harmon Spalding who, after 1836, taught the Christian faith and better ways of living to the Nez Perce Tribe of Indians until his death; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state of Idaho be hereby authorized and directed to send copies of this joint memorial to the President of the United States, to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, and to the Senators and Representatives of Idaho in the two Houses of Congress."

By Mr. BUTLER:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Legislative Resolution 9

"Whereas in Thurston County, Nebr., there are 183,222.5 acres of deeded land on the tax books; and

"Whereas there are 18,000 acres of Indian land that is taxed in Thurston County which is known as the Learning allotments; and

"Whereas there are two Indian reservations containing 41,285 acres of land subject to taxation if rented, and not being leased by an Indian; and

"Whereas on account of this large acreage amounting to nearly 25 percent of all land in Thurston County being tax exempt, Thurston County is having a difficult time to raise sufficient funds with which to adequately improve and maintain highways; and

"Whereas the allotments under the Federal aid road program should be increased to the State of Nebraska to provide a program and make it possible to assist Thurston County in improving and maintaining county highways: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in sixty-first session assembled:*

"1. That the Commissioner of Public Roads in charge of the Federal aid road fund increase the allotments to Nebraska for the purpose of improving and maintaining roads in Thurston County.

"2. That copies of this resolution, suitably engrossed, be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to the Vice President of the United States as Presiding Officer of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member from Nebraska in the Senate of the United States, and in the House of Representatives of the United States and to the Commissioner of Public Roads in charge of the Federal aid road fund."

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Legislative Resolution 8

"Whereas there has been established at Kearney, Nebr., an airfield by the United States Air Forces; and

"Whereas the United States Air Forces has notified the commanding officer and persons in charge that such airfield is to be closed and equipment and personnel will be moved from the State of Nebraska; and

"Whereas this airfield means much to the people of Nebraska, and especially to the ones living in and around Kearney, Nebr., who generally will suffer from the security and prosperity enjoyed if this airfield is closed down: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in sixty-first session assembled:*

"1. That the United States Air Forces reconsider the order to close the airfield at Kearney, Nebr., and move the equipment and personnel from Nebraska in order that this field may be retained at Kearney by the Air Forces.

"2. That copies of this resolution, suitably engrossed, be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to the Vice President of the United States as Presiding Officer of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member from Nebraska in the Senate of the United States and in the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the commanding officer of the United States Air Forces."

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

THE TRIAL OF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD a telegram from Mrs. John Roberge and family, regarding the unjust trial of Cardinal Mindszenty. I have before me 128 other telegrams and 15 letters dealing with the same subject, which have been received by me, but which I shall not ask to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIDDEFORD, MAINE, *February 7, 1949.*

Urge your kind support in protesting against unjust trial of Cardinal Mindszenty.

Mrs. JOHN ROBERGE AND FAMILY.

ISSUANCE OF SPECIAL STAMP—RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF ALDERMEN OF SOMERVILLE, MASS.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and myself, I present a resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen of the city of Somerville, Mass., regarding the issuance of a special stamp, which I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, Where the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the event where General Gage seized the powder at the powder house in Somerville (then a part of Charlestown) was one of the acts that precipitated the Revolution, and where this was more than an ordinary occurrence: Be it therefore

Resolved, That in keeping with our educational and psychological campaign to preserve our liberties, we can look with an artistic view to the possible design of the old mill, or as we know it, the powder house, and realize that it would make a decorative stamp of rare beauty, with the background of being one of the choicest antique relics of the United States: Be it therefore

Resolved, That this board of aldermen do hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to take the proper action to formulate the printing of a stamp depicting the afore-mentioned event; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be spread upon the records of this board of aldermen, and copies shall be sent to each congressional Representative and United States Senator, the President, and the Postmaster General.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 77. A bill to repeal section 509 of title 34 of the United States Code, approved June 30, 1876 (ch. 159, 19 Stat. 69); without amendment (Rept. No. 32);

S. 629. A bill to authorize the disposition of certain lost, abandoned, or unclaimed personal property coming into the possession of the Treasury Department, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 33);

S. 630. A bill to amend section 19 of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), so as to remove the upper age limit for appointment to commissioned grade in the Supply Corps of the Navy; without amendment (Rept. No. 34);

S. 632. A bill to authorize certain personnel and former personnel of the Naval Establishment to accept certain gifts and a foreign decoration tendered by foreign governments; without amendment (Rept. No. 35); and

S. 673. A bill relating to the pay and allowances of officers of the Naval Reserve performing active duty in the grade of rear admiral, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 36).

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

H. R. 128. A bill to provide that acreage planted to cotton in 1949 shall not be used in computing cotton acreage allotments for any subsequent year; with an amendment (Rept. No. 38).

By Mr. HOLLAND, from the Committee on Public Works:

S. 713. A bill to amend Public Law 533 of the Eightieth Congress authorizing the construction of a building for the General Accounting Office on square 518 in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 37).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 790. A bill to grant the consent of the United States to the upper Colorado River Basin compact; without amendment (Rept. No. 39).

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I desire to announce the appointment of the following Senators to be a part of the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget:

Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. GURNEY.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on February 3, 1949, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 547) to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McMAHON. I propose to submit a concurrent resolution. I should like to make about a 10-minute address in connection with the concurrent resolution. Is it necessary for me to submit the concurrent resolution now and reserve my address on it until later in the day?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The order of submission of concurrent resolutions will be reached in a few minutes. It will not, however, be in order to make a speech with regard to it until the morning business has been concluded.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 796. A bill to establish the grade of General of the Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mr. TYDINGS also introduced Senate bill 797, to provide for the withdrawal of the sovereignty of the United States over the island of Puerto Rico and for the recognition of its independence; to provide for notification thereof to foreign governments; to provide for the assumption by the government of Puerto Rico of obligations under the treaty with Spain of December 10, 1898; to define trade and other relations between the United States and Puerto Rico; to provide for the calling of a convention to frame a constitution for the government of the island of Puerto Rico; to provide for certain mandatory provisions of the proposed constitution; to provide for the submission of the constitution to the people of Puerto Rico and its submission to the President of the United States for his approval; to provide for the adjustment of property rights between the United States and Puerto Rico; to provide for the maintenance of military, coaling, and naval stations by the United States on the island of Puerto Rico; to continue in force certain statutes until independence has been granted; and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 798. A bill for the relief of Christian David; and

S. 799. A bill for the relief of Spero Carcouen known as Sam Carson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON (for himself and Mr. MOSS):

S. 800. A bill to provide for the reestablishment of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission with the same functions which it had prior to the time Reorganization Plan No. 2 became effective; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 801. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide certain benefits for the widows of employees who died, prior to February 28, 1948, and for other purposes; and

S. 802. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps to encourage the mailing of good-will letters between citizens of the United States and those of foreign countries; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

S. 803. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a tract of land in Prince George's County, Md., to the State of Maryland for use as a site for a National Guard Armory; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. THYE):

S. 804. A bill authorizing the completion of certain works of improvement in the Red River of the north drainage basin, Minnesota, South Dakota, and North Dakota, in the interest of flood control and allied purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HUNT:

S. 805. A bill to amend section 5 of the act approved July 10, 1890, as amended, relating to the admission into the Union of the State of Wyoming, so as to permit the leasing of school lands within such State for mineral purposes for terms in excess of 10 years; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUNT (for himself and Mr. O'MAHONEY):

S. 806. A bill authorizing the erection of a monument to Sacajawea; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. 807. A bill authorizing financial assistance to blind veterans of World War II in obtaining an automobile or other conveyance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BALDWIN (for himself and Mr. McMAHON):

S. 808. A bill for the relief of Walter Paterson, doing business as the Paterson Steel & Forge Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN (for himself and Mr. HUNT):

S. 809. A bill to provide for the construction, rehabilitation, expansion, conversion, operation, maintenance, and joint utilization of buildings, structures, utilities, and other facilities, including the acquisition of land, for the reserve components of the National Military Establishment of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mr. HENDRICKSON (for himself, Mr. WILEY, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. IVES, and Mr. O'CONOR) introduced Senate bill 810, to establish a National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 811. A bill to adjust the effective date of certain awards of pensions and compensations payable by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McFARLAND (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN):

S. 812. A bill to protect scenic values along Oak Creek Canyon and certain tributaries thereof within the Coconino National Forest, Ariz.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 813. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to announce the parity price of milk and to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to immediately announce the support price of milk; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 814. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mrs. Emma Spotted Eagle Tinnell and Andrew Spotted Eagle, heirs of John M. Paul, to certain lands;

S. 815. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Mrs. Avena M. Chips-White Bull a patent in fee to certain land;

S. 816. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mrs. Anna Richard Lone Dog and other heirs of James Richard, deceased, to certain lands; and

S. 817. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Paul High Horse and his wife, Anna High Horse, a patent in fee to certain land; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. PEPPER):

S. 818. A bill authorizing the transfer of certain lands in Putnam County, Fla., to the State Board of Education of Florida for the use of the University of Florida for educational purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 819. A bill for the relief of Herman L. Weiner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 820. A bill to provide dispensary treatment and hospitalization in Army, Navy, and Air Force hospitals for retired personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CHAVEZ (by request):

S. 821. A bill to prohibit the parking of vehicles upon any property owned by the United States for postal purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 822. A bill to repeal the tax on transportation of persons and the tax on transportation of property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 823. A bill to amend section 304 of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, with regard to interest rates on premiums for reinstated United States Government life insurance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MARTIN (for himself and Mr. MYERS):

S. 824. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of an experiment station

in northwestern Pennsylvania for research on the production, refining, transportation, and use of petroleum and natural gas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 825. A bill to reduce juvenile delinquency by providing for the care and prompt return home of run-away, transient, or vagrant children of juvenile age, going from one State to another without proper legal consent, through the use of funds appropriated under the provisions of the Social Security Act for aid to dependent children, under certain conditions; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 826. A bill authorizing the Grove Petroleum Co. to obtain consideration of its claim for refund of income taxes for the taxable years 1936 through 1941; and

S. 827. A bill to amend the act of June 16, 1934, to provide for allowances to the heirs, representatives, and assigns of Frank J. Boudinot, deceased, in the event of favorable determination by the Indian Claims Commission of certain claims of the Cherokee Indians; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 828. A bill for the relief of James R. Frazer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 829. A bill to extend the office of the War Assets Administrator and the War Assets Administration from February 28, 1949, until June 30, 1949; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 830. A bill for the relief of Fred E. Gross; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. MORSE):

S. 831. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, for the purpose of permitting States, and political subdivisions and instrumentalities thereof, to secure coverage for their officers and employees under the old-age and survivors insurance provisions of such act; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 832. A bill for the relief of the J. B. Kendall Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. CONNALLY (by request) introduced Senate bill 833, to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. KERR, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MCFARLAND, and Mr. HILL):

S. 834. A bill to authorize Federal aid to school districts overburdened with war-incurred or defense-incurred school enrollments for the construction of additional school facilities; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 835. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to James Madison Burton; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 836. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Clarence M. Scott; and

S. 837. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Irene Scott Bassett; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 838. A bill providing for investigations and experiments into problems relative to maintaining productive meadows at high altitudes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 839. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Silvia Mabelli;

S. 840. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. William Trebing;

S. 841. A bill for the relief of Michele Bartolomeo Marchisio;

S. 842. A bill for the relief of Jewett M. Brannaum;

S. 843. A bill for the relief of S. M. Price;

S. 844. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Jacques Kurickis and Brigitte Kurickis;

S. 845. A bill for the relief of Bretti Bruno;

S. 846. A bill for the relief of Satirios Christos Roumanis;

S. 847. A bill for the relief of Maria Berta;

S. 848. A bill for the relief of Lorenzo Buira Sarrate;

S. 849. A bill for the relief of certain persons who, while serving as members of the Army Nurse Corps, were commissioned as officers in the Army of the United States but were not paid the full amount of pay and allowances payable to officers of their grade and length of service; and

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. MILLIKIN):

S. 850. A bill conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Vaso B. Bendersch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 851. A bill to promote the settlement and development of the public domain in the Territory of Alaska by facilitating the construction of necessary housing therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 852. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act (U. S. C., title 49, sec. 3 (1)), so as to prohibit the segregation of passengers on account of race or color; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 853. A bill to provide for the admission into the United States of persons of the Korean race, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes; and

S. 854. A bill for the relief of E. La Ree Smoot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 855. A bill to authorize a program of useful public works for the development of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Works.

(Mr. MAGNUSON introduced Senate bill 856, to provide for an adequate and balanced flow of fish and fish products in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. J. Res. 51. Joint resolution to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

WITHDRAWAL OF SOVEREIGNTY OF UNITED STATES OVER ISLAND OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I introduce a bill which I have introduced in the last two preceding Congresses, to provide for the withdrawal of the sovereignty of the United States over the island of Puerto Rico and for the recognition of its independence. I think the bill should be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The bill (S. 797) to provide for the withdrawal of the sovereignty of the United States over the island of Puerto Rico and for the recognition of its independence; to provide for notification thereof to foreign governments; to provide for the assumption by the Government of Puerto Rico of obligations under the treaty with Spain of December 10, 1898; to define trade and other relations between the United States and Puerto Rico; to provide for the calling of a convention to frame a constitution for the government of the island of Puerto Rico; to provide for certain mandatory provisions of the proposed constitution; to provide for the submission of the constitution to the people of Puerto Rico and its submission to the President of the United States for his approval; to provide for the adjustment of property rights between the United States and Puerto Rico; to provide for the maintenance of military, coaling, and naval stations by the United States on the island of Puerto Rico; to continue in force certain statutes until independence has been granted; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. TYDINGS, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish a bi-partisan national commission on intergovernmental relations, in which all levels of government are represented, to study problems in Federal, State, and local governments which make for overlapping services, duplication of effort, and sheer waste in tax dollars.

I ask unanimous consent to make a brief statement with reference thereto.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am constrained to object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard. The Senator understands that under the morning business procedure, remarks are not in order except by unanimous consent.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a statement incorporated in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, and also to have the text of the bill printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 810) to establish a National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, introduced by Mr. HENDRICKSON (for himself, Mr. WILEY, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. IVES, and Mr. O'CONOR) was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby established a national bipartisan commission, in which the various levels of government are represented, to be known as the National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (hereinafter referred to as the Commission). In view of the constantly increasing complexity, during the last century and a half, of a vast network of relationships among the Federal, State, county, and municipal governments in the United States, this Commission is established for the purpose of studying and making recommendations to the President and the Congress, in an effort to bring about:

(1) The finding of ways and means of establishing a more orderly and less competitive fiscal relationship between the several levels of government. Major aspects of this problem include the overlapping and confused systems of taxation and the increasing demands made upon the Federal Government and the States for tax-sharing and grants-in-aid, without following any consistent over-all pattern.

(2) The elimination of duplication and overlapping services, activities, and functions, and the securing of a better coordination of such services, activities, and functions among the several levels of government.

(3) The attainment of such an allocation of governmental functions among the several levels of government as will contribute to economy in governmental administration on the one hand, and maximum service to the public on the other.

(4) A reduction in the total governmental expenditures to the lowest possible level consistent with the efficient performance of essential services, activities, and functions.

(5) The development, within the existing constitutional framework, of a governmental structure, and such cooperative policies and procedures as will tend to overcome existing obstacles to efficient governmental administration, and to lay a sound foundation for future development.

SEC. 2. (a) The Commission shall be composed of 14 members as follows:

(1) Five appointed by the President of the United States, two of whom shall be officers of the executive branch of the Government, and three of whom shall be private citizens, all of whom shall have had experience with or knowledge of major problems in the field of intergovernmental relations;

(2) Two appointed by the President of the Senate, who shall be Members of the Senate;

(3) Two appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, who shall be Members of the House;

(4) Two appointed by the President of the United States, who shall be State officials, from a panel of at least four, submitted by the Council of State Governments;

(5) Two appointed by the President of the United States, who shall be municipal officials, from a panel of at least four, submitted jointly by the American Municipal Association, the International City Managers Association, and the United States Conference of Mayors;

(6) One appointed by the President of the United States, who shall be a county official, from a panel of at least two, submitted by the National Association of County Officials.

(b) Of the members enumerated in paragraph (1) of subsection (a), not more than three members shall be from any one political party; of each class of members enumerated in paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (5) of subsection (a), not more than one member shall be from any one political party.

(c) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) The Commission shall elect a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

(e) Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

SEC. 3. It shall be the duty of the Commission:

(1) To make a thorough and comprehensive study of the subjects listed below, and of any related subjects, with a view to determining what changes in existing relationships, in its opinion, are necessary to the accomplishment of the purposes set forth in section 1 of this act:

(A) The origin and development, and present status, of the relations and interrelations of the Federal, State and local governments of the United States.

(B) The allocation of governmental functions among the Federal, State, and local Governments of the United States.

(C) The problem of geographical areas as related to governmental functions, field administration, and metropolitan communities.

(D) The gradual encroachment upon our Federal system of current and impending developments in the fiscal relations of the Federal Government with the States, and of the States with their political subdivisions.

(2) To submit its final report and recommendations to the President and the Congress on the subjects indicated above, and suggest plans and procedures for carrying these recommendations into effect, not later than February 1, 1953.

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission may, in carrying out this act, hold such hearings and take such testimony, sit and act at such times and places as it deems advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission. The Commission may delegate the powers conferred by this subsection to any member or to a group of members of the Commission.

(b) The Commission is authorized to secure from any department, agency or independent instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government any information it deems necessary to carry out its functions under this act: and each such department, agency, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

(c) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of a director of research and all other necessary personnel without regard to the civil service laws, and without reference to political affiliations, solely on the ground of fitness to perform the duties of their office.

SEC. 5. (a) Members of the Commission, other than those to whom subsections (b) and (c) of section 2 are applicable, and within the provisions of subsection (c) of section 5, shall receive compensation at the rate of $50 per day for each day they are engaged in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission, and shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission.

(b) Members of the Commission who are Members of Congress shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission.

(c) Each member of the Commission from the executive branch of the Government shall receive, in addition to the compensation for duties performed in the executive branch, $50 per day for each day he is engaged in the performance of his duties as a member of the Commission: *Provided, however*, That his total aggregate annual salary shall not exceed $12,500; and shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred in the performance of his duties as a member of the Commission.

SEC. 6. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 7. The Commission shall cease to exist at the end of the fiscal year during which its final report to the President and the Congress is made.

The statement by Mr. HENDRICKSON was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HENDRICKSON

This bill, Mr. President, represents the views and expresses the considered judgment of many Members of this body who have served in State government. It is the result of their experience at local and State levels of government that it now comes before us for study, consideration, and appropriate action.

The distinguished junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] has already introduced a resolution to the same effect and purpose. The distinguished junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] has introduced similar legislation. The distinguished Congressman at Large from Delaware, Mr. CARAS ROGERS, is introducing a counterpart of this measure in the House today. The able Governor of my own State, Alfred E. Driscoll, keynoted the proposal at the biannual convention of the Council of State Governments in January 1947. The activities and the deep interest shown by the members and the experts of the Council of State Governments in this matter over the past years demonstrates clearly that there is a definite need for the study established by this bill.

In presenting a very able report on the coordination of Federal and State taxes to a Senate committee last April, our very distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Ohio [Senator BRICKER] said: "The committee was fully aware that these recommendations do not in any sense offer a comprehensive solution of the present problems of intergovernmental fiscal relations."

This bill, Mr. President, as I have indicated, provides for the establishment of a bipartisan, or better still, a nonpartisan, Commission on Intergovernmental Relations which will examine all aspects and phases of National, State, and local government with special attention to the serious fiscal problems which threaten to overwhelm us today. It is true that there have been many studies in this general field in the past—but none of them have had the full participation of our National Government.

Under this bill, the commission will represent all of the parties at interest, both public and private, Federal, State, and local; legislative and executive, and where necessary, judicial. It will be given the opportunity and the responsibility to report its findings to the people of the Nation.

It is not intended that this group shall lend itself to any criticism of the basic structure of government levels as we know them or to their general purposes, but it is our intention that we improve the services of government at each level and at the same time stretch the value of the tax dollar in respect to the rendition of those services.

When he introduced the bill to establish the Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts said:

"This is not a job which Congress alone, working through congressional committees and using its own staffs, can do. We in Congress have not the time. There is no use deluding ourselves about that. We have not the time to do the job that needs to be done. We would have to leave it to our staffs; and our staffs would not have the standing which the members of this Commission would have in relation to the departments. All sorts of expert knowledge would be required, including the services of industrial engineers and management experts. It would take time and money."

I most heartily agree that such an undertaking requires full-time work from many experts of proven ability in the several fields we propose to study.

Since this bill envisages a full-scale investigation on all levels of government, it is necessary to include the representatives of local and State governments, Members of Congress, administrative officials, and men and women from private life.

The purposes as stated in the bill itself open exciting vistas for tremendous progress in efficient and effective government. To me they spell new opportunities to employ sound and scientific business methods in public operations.

The entire world watches us day by day as we conduct our public affairs. To friends and foes we are the outstanding example of the democratic processes of government. If we are to prosper and be worthy of the hopes of those who trust and rely upon us, we must be eternally vigilant that our system does not become fatally enmeshed in coils of its own construction.

The time is ripe for such an undertaking as this—indeed our present situation demands positive and definite action.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, following the remarks which have just been ordered printed with relation to the bill of which I am a cosponsor, I may have the privilege of having printed in the RECORD a statement which I have prepared.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY

CONTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. President, I am introducing today on behalf of myself and others, a companion bill to a very important measure prepared by and being introduced today in the House of Representatives by the Honorable J. CALEB BOGGS, Congressman at Large from the State of Delaware. The purpose of this bill is to establish a temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations along the lines of the Hoover Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

Congressman BOGGS has devoted nearly a full year of study in cooperation with many prominent individuals and groups preparatory to introduction of this legislation. He has kindly invited members of his own Republican and of the Democratic Party to join with him in co-sponsoring similar legislation and I am happy to do so here on the Senate side for myself and others.

Hodge-podge of duplication

The purpose of this bill is to study the slap-happy, hodge-podge of duplication of authority and functions between Federal, State, and local governments; to analyze the jig-saw puzzle of overlapping taxes between Uncle Sam, the States, and localities; to prepare a comprehensive survey of "grants-in-aid" which have become used to a tremendous extent in recent years; to analyze the increasing centralization of power of the Federal Government and of its fiscal authority.

Congressman BOGGS is preparing a very comprehensive statement on this subject in the House today and I respectfully commend his statement to the attention of my colleagues.

Jumble-jungle-jangle of duplication

I, personally, have been deeply interested in this subject since my coming to the Senate in 1939, and I have introduced my own decentralization legislation on several occasions. I feel that there are few more important subjects for active interest of Congress and of our people than this matter of straightening out the haphazard, jumble, jungle, and jangle of Federal, State, local work.

Undoubtedly, the Hoover Commission will itself be making preliminary recommendations for a survey of this very field, and I feel that by our consideration of this legislation in the early future, we will be that much more advanced toward solving one of the really pressing problems of our times.

Problem in Wisconsin and other States

I can state personally that in my own State of Wisconsin, the fact that the Federal Government has pre-empted many sources of tax revenue, has served to "dry up the tax spring," so to speak, in many localities, and this has resulted in a staggering burden on our financially overburdened villages, municipalities, and State Government. The same is true throughout the Nation.

The Council of State Governments, to name but one of many prominent organizations, has been intensely active toward a resolution of this problem. I feel that this national commission being recommended today could go a long way in making a monumental contribution to restoring governmental and fiscal sanity at all levels of American political administration.

I feel, too, that if this legislation is approved by the Congress, as I hope it will be, it will mark a historic turning point at which a gradual decentralization of authority may be begun. Considerable economies may be expected as a result of recommendations which will come from such a Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill. It is introduced by request, because it relates to the ECA. It is quite technical in some of its provisions, and we have not had an opportunity thoroughly to digest some of its provisions. We want to start hearings on the bill tomorrow, and it is necessary to have some form of bill before us.

The bill (S. 833) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADEQUATE AND BALANCED FLOW OF FISH IN INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide an adequate and balanced flow of fish in interstate and foreign commerce, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me, together with statistical and summary data taken from Senate Document No. 51 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, entitled "Fishery Resources of the United States," be printed in the RECORD. These data demonstrate in a summary fashion the importance of fisheries to our economy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the remarks and statistical and summary data will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 856) to provide for an adequate and balanced flow of fish and fish products in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement by Senator MAGNUSON, together with the statistical and summary data, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

This bill proposes to create a Fisheries Stabilization Corporation in the Department of the Interior. It proposes to capitalize this Corporation for $5,000,000 and give it a borrowing power of $75,000,000. My bill authorizes and directs the Corporation to conduct operations aimed at stabilizing the price of fish to the producer—our fishermen.

There are approximately 150,000 fishermen in this country. These men are dependent for their livelihood upon the size of their catch, but even more so, upon the price they get for the raw fish. The price paid the fisherman for his product is subject to extreme fluctuations. Just as the farmer is receiving Government assistance through price-support activities, as carried on by the Commodity Credit Corporation, so this bill proposes similar operations for fishermen.

I frankly state, I do not consider this bill a finished product. I think, however, it will serve as an excellent starting point for the committee as it considers the problem of our fishermen, and how to extend to them the benefits of a stabilized industry. Legislation to assist the farmer is familiar to all of you. There are before the Congress now numerous proposals to raise the minimum wages of our workers to 75 cents an hour. I have supported all measures of this character and request all of you who have consistently advocated farm price supports and adequate minimum wages to study my bill carefully, give me the benefit of your thinking on it and lend me your assistance in enacting legislation to stabilize the fisheries industry.

ECONOMICS OF THE UNITED STATES FISHERIES

In an average prewar year with purse seines, 13,000 fishermen caught 2,100,000,000 pounds; with otter trawls, 11,000 fishermen caught 700,000,000 pounds; with lines, 24,000 fishermen caught 500,000,000 pounds; with gill nets, 19,000 fishermen caught 200,000,000 pounds; with pound nets, 6,000 fishermen caught 400,000,000 pounds; with all other types of gear, 19,000 fishermen caught 500,000,000 pounds. Total production, 4,400,000,000 pounds of fish.

These fish were processed thus: 1,500,000,000 pounds were canned, 340,000,000 pounds were fillet-packaged, 150,000,000 pounds were cured, 130,000,000 pounds were frozen whole, 680,000,000 pounds were sold fresh, 1,600,000,000 pounds were made into fish meal and oil and other byproducts.

Statistics on fishermen: 31,900 fishermen worked regularly on vessels of over 5 tons net; 33,400 fishermen worked regularly on smaller boats or from shore; 59,500 fishermen worked casually on smaller boats or from shore.

THE 1943 VALUE OF FISH AND FISHERY PRODUCTS

The initial value of the fresh fish to be canned was $60,300,000; canning added $96,200,000; wholesaling added $15,700,000; retailing added $57,500,000; for canned fish the United States public paid $230,200,000.

The initial value of the fresh fish to be made into oil, meal, and byproducts was $12,000,000; manufacturing added $42,900,000; distributing added $5,500,000; for oil, meal, and byproducts the United States public paid $60,400,000.

The initial value of the fish to be sold as fresh fish was $60,400,000; primary wholesaling added $22,100,000; secondary wholesaling added $20,700,000; retailing added $34,400,000; for fresh fish the United States public paid $137,600,000.

The initial value of fish to be filleted and packaged was $23,600,000; processing added $40,400,000; wholesaling added $16,000,000; retailing added $26,700,000; for packaged

fillets the United States public paid $106,700,000.

The initial value of fish to be frozen (other than filleted) was $6,700,000; processing added $2,300,000; primary wholesaling added $3,200,000; secondary wholesaling added $3,000,000; retailing added $5,100,000; for frozen fish (other than filleted) the United States public paid $20,300,000.

The initial value of fish to be cured, smoked, and pickled was $10,800,000; processing added $7,200,000; primary wholesaling added $6,800,000; secondary wholesaling added $6,200,000; retailing added $10,200,000; for cured, smoked, and pickled fish the United States public paid $40,900,000.

Total initial value, $174,300,000; total paid by United States public, $596,100,000.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

These are the conclusions to be drawn from the facts given:

1. The United States fishery resources are a very important part of the national wealth. Their money and employment value, their unique food properties, and their universal recreational-appeal make them worth whatever effort is necessary to maintain them at high productive level. Like any other form of wealth, this inheritance of ours can be abused, misspent, and ruined from want of care. It can be wasted as much by a miserly failure to use it fully. This book has given us examples of fishery resources that were once great and valuable but which now are reduced to insignificance through bad management (Great Lakes ciscoes and whitefish of Lake Huron; Atlantic salmon, among others); and it has given us other examples of fishery resources that are still hardly touched (Pacific coast anchovies, cod, pollock).

2. From a conservation viewpoint, the fisheries are perhaps the most poorly managed of all our national resources. Legislative regulations governing them, where they exist at all, are piecemeal, localized, and often based on lay opinion, superstition, or snap judgment, rarely on knowledge. Yet there is a science of fishery conservation, which is highly specialized and exact. That it has not been more fruitful in this country is no reflection on the science or the scientists but rather on the public's failure to back them up. True, fishery science is costly. It has to be costly if it is to be properly done; but it more than pays for itself in increased value and security of wealth which it strives to protect. Nevertheless, Federal and State conservation agencies have everywhere been required to do their fishery conservation work on a financial shoestring. Small wonder that they have obtained shoestring results. There is only one example of a fishery resource that has been successfully studied and conserved over most of its range; that is the Pacific halibut, administered by the International Fisheries Commission since 1930. This is the only fishery conservation agency that has come even close to being adequately supported in money and personnel.

3. However much the American public might treasure its fish for the food and recreational value they afford, it shows little respect for the water they must inhabit. It defiles its streams and lakes with sewage and industrial wastes; it draws from them for irrigation and for domestic and manufacturing purposes; it uses them for transportation, and it blocks them off with high dams. These uses all involve modifications in the water courses of one sort or another, which are too often antagonistic to fish life. In addition, all sorts of other human activities serve to destroy fish habitats. Yet there is no reason why man's uses of water need be inimical to maintaining fishery resources. That they have been so is largely the consequence of the lack of coordination among the many agencies—Federal, State, municipal, private—which are separately concerned with the various uses of water, and the lack of representation by conservation agencies in the designing and operation of water-use plans.

4. The commercial fisheries, taken as a whole, are among the least progressive industries in the United States. They are generally slow to improve their products, to develop new ones, to exploit virgin resources, to correct wasteful fishing methods or to utilize the whole of their raw material. This backwardness is not the fault of the industry, but rather the consequence of its widespread, diffuse character. The fishing industries are composed of small, independent enterprises, widely scattered throughout the country and along extended coast lines; they are concerned with a great diversity of local fisheries, and they are beset by a notoriously unstable supply. Most fishery companies must be conservative to survive and are too small to carry on technological research for developing new fields, except at best on a very limited scale. In most States public agencies have not been equipped or staffed to help them, and the Federal Government gives them only a fraction of the aid it affords other food industries.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there further bills or joint resolutions? If not, the next order of business is concurrent and other resolutions.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, concurrent resolutions are now in order. As I understand, the resolution to discharge the Committee on Rules and Administration from the further consideration of Senate Resolution 15 is not yet in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is not now in order. It comes up automatically at the end of the morning business. Following the order under which the Senate is now operating, namely, concurrent and other resolutions, that resolution will be laid down automatically.

THE INDONESIAN SITUATION

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I submit a resolution. Associated with me in it are also the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY]. This resolution deals with the Indonesian situation. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with a statement of facts of the situation, the speech of Ambassador Philip C. Jessup in the Security Council on January 11, 1949, and a further statement of facts, together with a series of questions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be printed in the RECORD, and the matters referred to by the Senator from Maine will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 56) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Royal Netherlands Government, on December 19, 1948, in violation of her sworn commitments under the Renville agreement, signed by the Netherlands and the Republic of Indonesia aboard the U. S. S. Renville, January 17, 1948, under the auspices of the United Nations Good Offices Committee, did willfully and without warning launch a military attack against the Republic of Indonesia; and

Whereas the United States delegation to the Security Council of the United Nations did join with the delegations of Colombia and Syria to introduce a resolution in the Security Council, at Paris, December 22, 1948, stating that the Security Council "* * * considers such resumption of hostilities (in Indonesia) to be in conflict with the resolution adopted by the Security Council at its one hundred and seventy-first meeting of August 1, 1947 * * *" and "* * * calls upon the parties (a) to cease hostilities forthwith; and (b) immediately to withdraw their armed forces to their respective sides of the demilitarized zones established under the truce agreement (Renville) of January 17, 1948 * * *"; and

Whereas the United Nations Security Council, on December 24, 1948, did order the Royal Netherlands Government to cease hostilities forthwith and "immediately to release the President [of the Republic of Indonesia] and other political prisoners arrested since December 18, 1948 * * *"; and

Whereas the Royal Netherlands Government did ignore these orders of the United Nations Security Council and did ignore further orders of the Security Council, issued on December 27, 1948, calling for release of the political prisoners within 24 hours: Therefore be it

Resolved, That, in full support of the foreign policy of the United States and in support of the United Nations, the President is hereby urged to cause an immediate cessation of all financial aid, through the Economic Cooperation Administration or any other United States Government agency, directly or indirectly, to the Royal Netherlands Government, in Europe as well as in Indonesia, until the Royal Netherlands Government ceases hostilities against the Indonesian Republic, withdraws her armed forces to her side of the demilitarized zones established under the Renville Agreement of January 17, 1948, releases all Indonesian Republican Government leaders arrested since December 18, 1948, and opens bona fide negotiations with the Indonesian Republic under the terms of the Renville agreement.

The matters presented by Mr. BREWSTER were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACTS OF THE CURRENT INDONESIAN SITUATION

1. The Dutch have received more than one billion dollars since VE-day: $350,000,000 lend-lease and UNRRA, $290,000,000 World Bank, $195,000,000 Export-Import Bank, $400,000,000 ECA.

2. The Dutch are asking for $600,000,000 in ECA funds for next year.

3. The Dutch have maintained 150,000 troops in Indonesia for the past two years at an expense exceeding $1,000,000 per day.

4. The Dutch own $4,000,000,000 in Indonesia; the Indonesians $15,000,000. United States investments total $250,000,000 in Indonesia. By and large, the Dutch have shut American business out.

5. The Dutch, for 30 years, have taken at least $200,000,000 a year clear profit out of Indonesia—the fact is that 70,000,000 Indonesians average 15 to 30 cents a day as family income (an average family of five). In brief Indonesia is a gold mine.

6. For the past 40 years, a national independence movement has existed in Indonesia, led by moderate Republicans who have consistently fought all radical tendencies and within the past year have suppressed by force of arms a small Communist uprising.

7. Following VJ-day the Dutch promised full independence to Indonesia and made two

agreements to this effect, the Linggadjati and Renville Agreements, the latter agreement being negotiated under the auspices of the UN Good Offices Committee.

8. On December 19, without warning, the Dutch attacked the Indonesian Republic and took prisoner its leading officials.

9. The State Department on December 22 condemned this act of aggression in the Security Council meeting at Paris and by resolution asked that (a) a cease fire order be issued, (b) the Indonesian Republican leaders be released immediately, and (c) the Dutch troops withdraw from Republican territory.

10. Points (a) and (b) were adopted by the Security Council; the Dutch refused to comply with the order of the Security Council.

11. Nehru of India promptly called a conference of 19 Asiatic and African nations (including Australia and New Zealand) to take action against the Dutch.

12. Moscow has seized upon the situation and its radio is proclaiming day and night that the United States is hypocritical, pointing to the fact that we have financed the Dutch and are continuing to do so.

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR PHILIP C. JESSUP IN SECURITY COUNCIL ON JANUARY 11, 1949, ON INDONESIA

The United States Government can find no adequate justification for the military action taken by the Netherlands in Indonesia. In many important respects, the reasons put forth by the Netherlands representative at the meeting of the Security Council on December 22 in Paris and again here last Friday as to the justification for their action are not supported by the reports of the Committee on Good Offices. In our view, the Netherlands military action is in conflict with the Renville agreement and with the Security Council's resolutions of August 1 and November 1, 1947.

As the United States delegation has frequently made clear, it is our opinion that these two Security Council resolutions were adopted under the provisions of article 40, chapter VII of the Charter, and that, therefore, in accordance with article 25 of the Charter, the Netherlands Government was and is under obligation to comply.

On the initiative of the United States, the Security Council was called into session in Paris to consider the emergency created by the military action of the Dutch authorities. The United States, joining with Colombia and Syria, introduced a resolution which called upon both parties to cease hostilities forthwith and immediately to withdraw their armed forces to their respective sides of the demilitarized zones under the Renville truce agreement of January 17, 1948. Unfortunately, the paragraph calling for the withdrawal of forces was not adopted by the Council. The Council on December 24 passed the resolution calling upon the parties to cease hostilities forthwith and to release the political prisoners which had been arrested since the 18th of December. Later, on December 28, the Council passed an additional resolution calling upon the Dutch authorities to release the political prisoners within 24 hours. The Netherlands representative has assured the Council that his Government has complied with the cease-fire and release of prisoners order of the Council. Neither my Government nor the Committee on Good Offices consider they have done so. The Committee has reported on this as follows:

"The Committee is not in a position to report that there has been satisfactory compliance with subparagraph (A) of the resolution of December 24, which called on the parties to cease hostilities.

"(A) The telegram dispatched to territorial commanders in Java by the chief of staff of the Royal Netherlands Indonesian Army at 1700, December 29, 1948, is, according to its terms, for information and cannot be construed as an order to 'cease hostilities forthwith.' (Par. 9 above.) The dissemination of the order of the commander in chief to territorial commanders in Java which confirmed the fact that hostilities in Java had ended at 2400 of December 31 was begun at 1845 Batavia time, January 2. (Par. 9 above.) In Sumatra where a 'special emergency situation' existed, the parallel order disseminated late on January 4 had an effective time of 1200, January 5, 1949. (Par. 10 above.)

"(B) It is noted that these orders were issued at a time when the 'operational phase' of military activities presumably had been completed. (Appendixes I and II of Netherlands letter of January 3, par. 4 above.) The orders noted respectively that hostilities had terminated on December 31, 1948, in Java and on January 5, 1949, in Sumatra, but charged the troops to 'carry out action against roving groups, bands of individuals, who attempt to cause unrest or, as was stated by our representative to the Security Council, to act against disturbing elements, who either individually or collectively endanger public security or interfered with or prevent the supply of food and other essential commodities to the needy population.'

"The orders permit the continuation of the very type of military action that would be required against the guerrilla resistance likely to be offered by regular or irregular Republican forces (pars. 5 and 9 above).

"(C) As a result of the immobilization of its military observers the committee has no first-hand information as to the effect of the order discussed above.

"(D) The committee is of the opinion that these orders issued more than a week after the adoption of the resolution of December 24, and expressed as they were, cannot be looked upon as satisfactory compliance with subparagraph (A) of the resolution.

"(E) There is no channel available to the committee for dissemination of the resolution of December 24 to the Government or to the commanders of the Republican Army (par. 8 above). Subparagraph (b) of the Security Council's resolution of December 24, calling for the immediate release of the President of the Republic and other political prisoners, has not been implemented. So far as the committee is aware, President Sukarno, Vice President Hatta, and the other members of the Republican Government, who were captured by Netherlands forces on December 19, are still under detention."

Despite the statements to the Security Council by the Netherlands representative on December 27 and 29, the committee has not been in a position to make independent investigations of any kind in the field for the purpose of carrying out its functions under the resolution of December 24. It has been heard unofficially and informally that certain military and naval liaison officers attached to some of the consular officials in Batavia took advantage of a Netherlands offer to conduct them on a tour of some of the military areas on January 5–6. These officers are not the military observers of the Committee of Good Offices and their observations are not available to the committee, even if their tour was the type of field investigation and observation required by the functions of the committee.

The continuance of military action of the Netherlands authorities after the Security Council resolution of December 24 was clearly an act of defiance on the part of the Netherlands authorities. No excuses offered by the Dutch Government can conceal the fact that they have failed to comply with the Security Council demands, both in refusing to cease-fire immediately and in refusing to release the political prisoners immediately. In the opinion of the Government of the United States, the representative of the Netherlands has failed to relieve his Government from the serious charges that it has violated the Charter of the United Nations.

The purpose of the Security Council cease-fire order of December 24 was to stop the fighting in Indonesia immediately so that the dispute could be settled not by force, but by the processes of peaceful settlement enjoined by the Charter on member states.

Even though members of the Council were well aware that it was the Netherlands authorities which had initiated the resumption of military action, the resolution of the Security Council called on both parties to order a cease-fire. In such situations this is an appropriate form of Security Council resolution since the cessation must be mutual no matter who was responsible for starting the fighting.

It must be assumed therefore that in ordering a cease-fire, the Council could only have intended that such an order would apply equally and simultaneously to both sides. The Council could not have expected one side to comply unilaterally while the other considered itself free to comply at such a time and in such a way as it saw fit. The continuance of military action by the Netherlands forces until all military objectives have been taken cannot be regarded as compliance with the cease-fire order. Certainly the reservation of the right by one side to use its own forces in the territory of the other side to eliminate armed adherents of that side, which may so far have escaped destruction, cannot be regarded as compliance with the cease-fire order. Taking these factors into account, I am sure that the Security Council has no intention of approving action consolidating military victories which themselves were gained as a result of open defiance of an order of the Council.

Probably the most striking and clearest disregard of the orders of the Security Council is to be found in the refusal of the Dutch authorities to release President Sukarno and Prime Minister Hatta and the other leading officials of the Government of the Republic of Indonesia. Quite aside from the disregard of the Security Council's resolution of December 28, which required that these prisoners should be released within 24 hours, there is the present fact that these persons are still not at liberty. The Security Council cannot be expected to accept the view of the Netherlands Government that these prisoners have been released because they are given a certain liberty of movement on the island of Banka. In an archipelago comprising thousands of islands, liberty of movement which is restricted to a single island, one which, I might add, was under Netherlands control even under the Renville truce agreement, cannot be regarded as being in conformity with the Council's resolutions of December 24 and 28. The clear intent of these resolutions was that the high officials of the Republican Government should be restored to a position in which they would be free to exercise their governmental authority. The minimum which would seem to be called for at this moment is that the President and other interned officers of the Republic should be allowed to return to their capitol and to exercise their appropriate functions there free from the constraint of any occupying army. They should be free to establish and maintain contact with other officials of their government. They should also be free to provide their own forces for maintenance of law and order in Jogjakarta.

Further, my government in considering the Netherlands-Indonesian dispute cannot but recall a history of noncooperation on the part of the Netherlands in the work of the Good Offices Committee in Indonesia.

The failure to achieve political settlement and the protracted negotiations which followed the signing of the Renville agreement in January 1948 brought about in Indonesia an increased tension between the Netherlands and the Republic with a consequent increase in provocative incidents which sorely strained the truce. The bill

of particulars for these actions has, over a period of months, been reported by the GOC to the Council. From these reports it appears that even prior to the resumption of military action against the Republic, the Netherlands pursued a policy which had the effect of weakening the Republic; working unnecessary hardship on the population; isolating the Republican Government economically and politically, and presenting it with a prefabricated interim administration for Indonesia with which it was to associate itself but which it had no part in forming. My government considers these actions and the Netherlands failure to enter into *bona fide* negotiations since May of last year to be indicative of a reluctance to utilize the procedure for pacific settlement made available by the United Nations, and to be in conflict with both the spirit and letter of the Linggadjati and Renville agreements.

From a purely pragmatic point of view it should be pointed out that the quick military successes of the Netherlands forces will not effect a solution of the Indonesian problem. The United States Government cannot associate itself with any aspect of the Netherlands military action. The use of force in this situation makes the solution of the problem far more complex and difficult. The problem remains a matter of international concern with which the Security Council must continue to deal. It cannot be solved if we begin on the basis of acceptance of the fruits of the illegal use of force.

The Republic of Indonesia represents the largest single political factor in the projected federation and should therefore have a voice in the formation of the federation. The Republic has a twofold nature. Firstly, it is a political entity and secondly, it is the heart of Indonesian nationalism. This latter attribute cannot be eliminated by any amount of military force. The Netherlands Government may find that far from assuring law and order in the Indies the action they have embarked upon may instead let loose forces of terror, chaos and sabotage. It may well be that the only victory will be that of the forces of anarchy.

My government is of the opinion that real peace in Indonesia can be expected only if there is a settlement of the political issues on the basis of the principles and procedures agreed to by the parties in the Linggadjati and Renville agreements and under the auspices of United Nations machinery.

The responsibility for the future rests in the first instance on the Netherlands authorities. The Security Council has a right to assume that the Netherlands Government will in accordance with its obligations bring to an end its defiance of the Security Council and give its full cooperation toward a fair and reasonable solution of the Indonesian question.

My Government has over a substantial period of time devoted serious thought to the problem and to its proper solution. Our views are contained in the plan which our representative on the Good Offices Committee submitted to the two parties on September 10 of last year and which was accepted by both of them as a basis for the resumption of negotiations. If Indonesian leaders were restored to their rightful position as the responsible representatives of the Republic of Indonesia, free to conduct the affairs of their Government and to negotiate freely with the Netherlands Government concerning the future of Indonesia, and if these two Governments could proceed to negotiate on the basis of this proposal in accordance with their earlier undertakings this would be a notable contribution to the ultimate solution of the Indonesian problem.

A first and fundamental step in this direction should be the fixing of a definite date for the holding of elections throughout all Indonesia with a view to establishing the foundations of the United States of Indonesia. Secondly, and also of fundamental importance, is the fixing of a firm date for the transfer of sovereignty from the Kingdom of the Netherlands to the United States of Indonesia.

The elections should be for the purpose of choosing an assembly to represent the people of Indonesia as a provisional legislature and at the same time as a constituent assembly for the purpose of drawing up a constitution. The elections should be held by secret ballot with all the safeguards necessary to insure a vote free from any coercion. Freedom of assembly, speech, and publication must be guaranteed as provided in the Renville agreement. This program contemplates a termination of the type of military occupation of the country which has been brought about by Dutch military action. The withdrawal of the Dutch armies should commence at the earliest possible date and as rapidly as the need for the preservation of law and order permit. The occupation must be completely terminated before an effective transfer of sovereignty could take place.

My Government believes that the length of time which should elapse between the present and the date when elections should take place, and also the date of transfer of sovereignty, should be calculated in terms of months and not in terms of years. As soon as elections have been held and a provisional regime set up, authority should be turned over progressively to the new regime by the Netherlands Government, and the transfer should have been completed by the time when sovereignty is assumed by the United States of Indonesia.

As I have stated earlier, the problem of Indonesia remains a matter of international concern with which the Security Council must continue to deal. The carrying out of the steps necessary for the ultimate transfer of the sovereignty of the United States of Indonesia should, we believe, be accomplished under the auspices of the United Nations and with the help of the machinery it affords. The Good Offices Committee in its report of January 7 has appropriately pointed out that it does not wish to be put in a position of seeming to approve by its participation or even its authentication any settlement based on force rather than on true negotiation. The Good Offices Committee was created at the outset as an instrument to further free negotiations between the parties. The Dutch action has temporarily suspended the Committee's ability to carry out that function. But the Council's agencies in the field remain in existence ready to carry out any task assigned to them by the Security Council. No temporary suspension of the functioning of an agency of the Security Council can operate to remove an established interest of the United Nations in dealing with a situation to which the Security Council has already addressed itself. In this connection it is necessary to call attention to the report of the Good Offices Committee which indicates that the Netherlands authorities took upon themselves the authority to question whether the military observers were reporting to the Consular Commission or the Good Offices Committee. This is not a question which concerns the Netherlands authorities. The Security Council can utilize any agency which it considers appropriate, and it is the obligation of a member of the United Nations to cooperate with any and all agencies operating under Security Council instructions.

It cannot be denied that despite the efforts of some governments of states which are members of the Security Council, this body has not yet succeeded in overcoming the obstacles which have been placed in the path of achieving a peaceful settlement in Indonesia. The responsibility of the Netherlands Government for this lack of success has already been made clear. Another obstacle has been created by the action of a member of the United Nations which has in many parts of the world sought to obstruct the successful operation of the United Nations. I refer to the Soviet Union.

When this question of Indonesia was being discussed in the Security Council in Paris, the Soviet Union speaking both through its own representative and through the Ukrainian representative followed its familiar procedure of endeavoring to cloak its own improper actions by seeking to place the blame on someone else. The representative of the Soviet Union and the representative of the Ukraine both insinuated that the Government of the United States was in some way responsible for the action of the Netherlands in resorting to hostilities against the Indonesian Republic. It thus becomes necessary to point out again certain salient facts. In the first place, it was the Government of the United States which took the initiative in convening an urgent meeting of the Security Council when it became apparent that the Dutch were resorting to military action. It was the Soviet Government that prevented the Security Council from acting promptly by insisting that the Council meeting should be deferred for 3 days. Every other member of the Council attended the meeting on December 20 except the two Soviet representatives. The United States also took the initiative in conjunction with the representatives of Colombia and Syria in proposing a resolution to the Security Council to deal with the situation, but the Soviet representative refused to support this resolution. He later tried to cover up this further attempt to prevent the Security Council from acting by introducing a resolution of his own which he knew could not be adopted by the Council.

More fundamental, however, than these obstructionist tactics in the Security Council is the fact that the Soviet Union is fundamentally opposed to the government of the Republic of Indonesia and has itself through the Communist Party, which is, of course, its mouthpiece throughout the world, sought to undermine and overthrow this government. No one doubts that the Communists in Indonesia like the Communists throughout the world are responsive to and act in accordance with instructions from Moscow. The Communist revolt against the government of President Soekarno and Premier Hatta was thus an effort on the part of the Soviet Government to overthrow the Indonesian Republic. Furthermore, when the resumption of hostilities by the Netherlands Government against the Indonesian Republic took place, the official Communist line as printed in the Communist press instead of deploring this action, openly gloated that this action was a punishment for the government of President Soekarno and Premier Hatta who had successfully put down the Communist revolt. The Communist line, which I again repeat means the line of the Soviet Government, accused that distinguished statesman of the Indonesian Republic, Dr. Hatta, of being a traitor to his country. At the very time when editorials were appearing to this effect in the Communist Party organ in Paris, the Soviet representative on the Council sought to cover up the actual policy of his government by identifying himself with the Council's endeavors to ensure the release of Dr. Hatta and other political prisoners. These are the facts on the record which are known to the world and which reveal that the Soviet Government has no interest in supporting the government of the Indonesian Republic or of restoring peace to Indonesia. On the contrary, it is following its familiar tactics which it has used in Korea, in Greece, and Berlin,

and again now in Indonesia, and which have been described in the speeches of many delegates in the last session of the General Assembly, namely, seeking to overthrow a lawful democratic government and to undermine its authority. The Soviet Union does not want an independent Indonesia. It wants an Indonesia under the domination and control of a Communist minority taking its orders from Moscow. Anywhere in the world when a Communist government climbs in through the window, independence is kicked out of the door.

The Government of the United States on the contrary has viewed with admiration the efforts of the Indonesian people both in the Republic and elsewhere to gain their independence and has steadfastly sought to support them. It still takes that position and it is for this reason that it has taken the lead in endeavoring in the Security Council and in the Good Offices Committee to bring about a peaceful adjustment of the difficulties between the Indonesian Republic and the Netherlands Government and to establish the United States of Indonesia as one of the fully sovereign and independent peoples of the world.

IT'S 1776 IN INDONESIA

December 19, 1948, Holland invaded the Republic of Indonesia with a crushing, sneak attack like Japan's on Pearl Harbor, like Nazi Germany's on Holland itself.

The UN-negotiated Renville agreement was trampled. Solemn international discussions were used as cover-up for weeks of Dutch preparation.

Holland, home of Kris Kringle and good cheer, timed its murder for Christmas. World leaders were conveniently dispersed. The UN General Assembly had adjourned. So had the United States Congress.

In Indonesia itself, the Dutch first cut off the UN delegation's telegraph lines, then notified it. Elaborate deceptions kept republicans off guard.

Then the Dutch struck without mercy or honor, but with American-manufactured planes, tanks, guns.

The Netherlands lately and always has promised Indonesia independence in words, brutally suppressed it in fact.

THE RENVILLE AGREEMENT, JANUARY 17, 1948

Promise: Free plebiscites within 6 months to a year in areas claimed by both sides; a constituent convention; an all-Indonesia legislature; voluntary Dutch-Indonesia union. On February 3, 1948, Queen Wilhelmina broadcast to the world: "Colonialism is dead."

Deed: All-out invasion on December 19, 1948; complete sea blockade of republican trade for 2½ years, even on essential imports like medical supplies.

THE LINGGADJATI AGREEMENT, MARCH 1947

Promise: A sovereign United States of Indonesia by January 1949; guaranty of Indonesian rights in interim period; voluntary Dutch-Indonesian union.

Deed: All-out invasion on July 20, 1947, stopped short of complete destruction of the Republic only by Security Council cease-fire order; refusal to implement agreement because of reinterpretation; sea blockade.

POSTSURRENDER PERIOD, AUGUST 1945

Promise: Constitutional reform; new era.

Deed: Immediate mobilization of war-starved Dutch reservists for invasion service in Indonesia; dispatch of 120,000 troops over the next year or two.

QUEEN WILHELMINA'S WARTIME PLEDGE, DECEMBER 6, 1942

Promise: A postwar conference leading to "a commonwealth in which the Netherlands, Indonesia, Surinam, and Curaçao will participate."

Deed: Prewar refusal to train Indonesians militarily for their own defense; postwar use of armed force to restore Dutch power.

The direct Hitlerlike rupture of the Renville agreement is the most recent case in point.

Promise: The Renville agreement, January 17, 1948, reached through the UN Good Offices Committee, with especial United States encouragement, stipulated in particular: "10.) This agreement shall be considered binding unless one party notifies the Committee of Good Offices and the other party that it considers the truce regulations are not being observed by the other party and that this agreement should therefore be terminated."

In general, it provided a military truce and a set of 18 political principles as a basis for final settlement.

Deed: The Dutch notified the committee and the Republic of their December 19 invasion just as it began. Telegraph facilities of both were cut in advance, eliminating UN communications.

The Linggadjati agreement, March 1947, was likewise breached by a bloody, unheralded invasion during negotiations on its implementation.

Promise: After hysterical, false denunciation of the Republic as Japanese created, terror by Dutch forces and establishment of Dutch-controlled independent states outside the Republic had all failed to break it, the Dutch next tried negotiation.

The Linggadjati agreement, which resulted, guaranteed Indonesian freedom, with something like dominion status. It also provided an interim period during which a mixed Dutch-Indonesian administration would prepare for the transfer of power. Furthermore, it gave formal Dutch recognition of the Republic as the de facto authority in Java, Sumatra, and Madura, the three main islands.

Deed: The agreement reached was 90 percent Dutch, but the Republic accepted it to facilitate a quick settlement. This was in June 1946. Republicans were assured Dutch ratification was a matter of a few days or weeks. Actually, it was March 1947 before Dutch signatures were affixed. The intervening months were occupied with Dutch obstruction and attempts to force new proposals on the Republic.

Both before and after signing, Holland repeatedly ignored the agreement, occupying major republican cities, bringing in 120,000 troops, 30,000 more than previously agreed. Dutch interpretations of their commitments were so extensive that even after the signing, implementation was impossible. Negotiation continued.

At midnight July 20, 1947, while republican leaders awaited reply to their latest formal communication, they were abruptly notified of suspension of the agreement. Simultaneously, full-scale war was launched. It ended only when the Security Council issued a cease-fire order some days later.

By that time, Holland had what it wanted most, the richest producing areas of the Republic.

Before, during, and just after the war, Holland volubly promised freedom, belied itself in action.

Promise: The famous Visman report of 1941 supposedly laid the technical base for it; Queen Wilhelmina's speech of December 1942, pledged it; Dutch utterances just after the surrender of Japan seemed to assume it.

Deed: The Visman report provided excuse for years of delay, while being made; Dutch administration and weakness left Indonesia defenseless before Japan. After the war, Holland left no effort undone to thwart, then destroy the universal vehicle of Indonesian independence—the Republic.

These infamies against 70,000,000 peaceful, long-suffering Indonesians—and against the United Nations—spring inevitably from the faithless Dutch repression of 3 centuries.

Dutch double talk notwithstanding, the cornerstone of all democracy, universal literacy, was effectively prevented. Funds were never assigned, teachers never developed for mass education. Pleading poverty in the world's richest colony, Dutchmen developed only specialized schools for Indonesian aristocrats' sons and daughters, who learned obedience along with their three R's and in higher education.

Mass organizations were unceasingly harassed. Nationalist leaders, including those who head the Republic today and many others who did not survive, were exiled for years at a time to remote swamps and jungles, often killed.

A nominal People's Council or Volksraad before the war was subject to the veto of both Governor General and the Dutch Parliament. Even then a high proportion of its members were appointed, not elected. And on top of that, those elected were chosen by a system of suffrage so indirect as to be meaningless.

Brutality like that of the Nazis at Lidice was meted out when the cup of slavery ran over and an uprising occurred. In 1926 whole districts of villages in Java were burned to the ground, the inhabitants murdered by fully equipped Dutch troops. In 1947 some 30,000 Indonesians were massacred in Macassar, Celebes.

Under its masquerade of paternalistic colonizer, Holland's program was extremely simple—self-enrichment.

Indonesia was a vast treasure house and workshop where 70,000,000 lived at subsistence level, their output streaming to the profit of a minority in Holland's 9,500,000 population: 15 percent of Holland's national income; $200,000,000 per year in straight profits (which made up annual Dutch foreign exchange deficit); $4,000,000,000 invested Dutch capital in Indonesia; the average income of a family of five Indonesians was 15 to 30 cents per day; 400,000 Dutch persons possessing a vested interest in Indonesia as a colony; complete Dutch monopoly of Indonesian trade, excluding the United States and others.

QUESTIONS

1. Is our State Department engaged in international double talk?

2. Will the Dutch withdraw from the Atlantic Alliance? And what difference will it make if they do? And where will they go?

3. By our continuing to support the Dutch, are we not throwing all of Asia to Moscow

4. If the Dutch have $4,000,000,000 in assets in Indonesia and are shutting out American business, why are we financing the Dutch at the rate of $500,000,000 a year?

5. Why has the President and the State Department attempted to kill the proposed Senate resolution?

6. Has the State Department been telling the Dutch to go ahead—privately, of course?

7. How long do we propose to pour American money into countries whose governments take actions that create the exact opposite of what our policy intends to accomplish?

8. Do we intend to support nineteenth century Dutch-British-French imperialism in Asia which will create a climate for the growth of communism? Or do we intend to support the moderate republican nationalists throughout Asia?

9. Does the United States intend to uphold the UN or not?

10. Does the Senate intend to take dictation from the executive department on all foreign-policy matters? Has the Senate relinquished its right to ask questions regarding our foreign spending policy?

STANDING COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS—AMENDMENT OF SENATE RULE

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and myself, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution to amend the Senate rule by creating a standing committee on small business.

The resolution (S. Res. 58) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That section (1) of Rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(p) (1) The Committee on Small Business, to consist of 13 Senators, to which shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the problems of American small business enterprises.

"(2) It shall be the duty of such committee to study and survey by means of research all the problems of American small business enterprises, and to obtain all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest, but which would aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation.

"(3) The provisions of section (4) of this rule shall not be applicable with respect to membership on such committee."

Mr. WHERRY subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to have the RECORD show that I have been permitted to join with the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] in the resolution asking to set up a business committee as a permanent standing committee of the Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am very happy to have it so appear.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

INVESTIGATION OF SHORTAGES IN ALUMINUM AND ALUMINUM CONDUCTOR

Mr. BUTLER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 59), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Whereas there exists in the United States a serious shortage of aluminum conductor; and

Whereas such shortage is seriously hampering extension of rural electrification; and

Whereas it appears that the rural electrification program may not be receiving its fair share of the supply of aluminum conductor available; and

Whereas there is further an over-all shortage of virgin aluminum metal; and

Whereas it appears that much of the available metal is being used for nonessential purposes; and

Whereas the full facts with respect to the shortage of aluminum and aluminum conductor have not been made available to the general public, nor has any effective action been taken by any Federal bureau or agency to alleviate the disastrous results of the shortage: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the causes of the existing shortage in the supply of aluminum and aluminum conductor, and of the effects of such shortages in hampering the extension of rural electrification, and the committee is further authorized to recommend a course of action to be taken by the Congress or the executive branch of the Government for the purpose of fostering the rapid extension of rural electrification. The committee, or a duly authorized subcommittee, shall include within the scope of such study and investigation a consideration of (1) the possibility of securing for the extension of rural electrification a large proportion of the available output of aluminum conductor; (2) the possibility of securing for the manufacture of conductor and other electrical equipment a larger proportion of the available supply of aluminum material; (3) the possibility of securing additional power for the manufacture of an increased quantity of aluminum; (4) the possibility of securing increased imports for a temporary period from Canada or other foreign countries; (5) the possibility of curtailing shipments of aluminum to Europe without hampering the program of the European Cooperation Administration so as to make larger supplies available for use in this country for extension of rural electrification.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practical date the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF ARMY RESERVE

Mrs. SMITH of Maine submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 60), which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Armed Services, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the administration, plans, policies, and status of the Army Reserve and the administration of the Army Reserve program by the Department of the Army and the United States Army.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its investigation together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem advisable.

INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF THE AIR FORCE RESERVE

Mrs. SMITH of Maine submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 61), which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Armed Services, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the administration, plans, policies, and status of the Air Force Reserve and the administration of the Air Force Reserve program by the Department of the Air Force and the United States Air Force.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its investigation together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

INVESTIGATION OF DOMESTIC LAND AND WATER TRANSPORTATION CONDITIONS

Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. MYERS) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 62), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, be authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of all domestic land and water transportation to determine:

A. Whether existing conditions conform to the national transportation policy as declared in the Interstate Commerce Act; and

B. The effect of large expenditures of public moneys and private capital upon transportation charges and to what extent such expenditures are reflected in costs of production and prices to consumers; and

C. Generally to consider and make legislative recommendations to the Congress as to all other matters and things necessary in its judgment in meeting the purposes of the studies herein specifically set forth and the general public interest.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-first Congress, to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The committee is authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the service, information, and facilities of any of the departments or agencies of the Government. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN MATTERS RELATING TO RADIO, TELEGRAPH, AND TELEPHONE COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. McFARLAND (for himself and Mr. TOBEY) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 63), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation of all matters relating to radio, telegraph and telephone communications including (a) the problems relating to American common carriers operating in the domestic and international fields, including the relationship of these problems to the national security of the United States; (b) the problems presented by requirements of international treaties and conventions in relation to such revisions as may be necessary to the Communications Act of 1934; (c) the problems arising from unprecedented demands for frequencies for such communication services as television; safety and special services, including aviation, railroads, busses, trucks, taxicabs; common-carrier uses; and industrial uses; and the policies which the Congress should adopt for the granting of such allocations; (d) the manner in which the Federal Communications Commission exercises its licensing authority with respect to radio applications; (e) the extent to which the Federal Communications Commission examines the qualifications of applicants for licenses or renewals of licenses in order to determine that only qualified persons are licensed to operate radio stations or other licensed facilities; (f) the extent to which the Federal Communications Commission examines the operation or proposed operation of radio stations in order to assure that such stations have been or will be operated in the public interest; (g) and generally to consider and make legislative recommendations to the Congress as to all other matters and things necessary in its judgment in meeting the purposes of the studies herein specifically set forth and the general public interest.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such

hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-first Congress, to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The Committee is authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the service, information, and facilities of any of the departments or agencies of the Government. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $15,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF FISHING RESOURCES

Mr. MAGNUSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 64), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation of all matters pertaining to the fishing resources of the United States as it may deem proper.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date but not later than March 15, 1950.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable, and is authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF PANAMA CANAL

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 65), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized to make a full and complete study and investigation of the Panama Canal and interoceanic canals generally.

Such study and investigation shall include (1) a review of the operations of the Panama Canal for the purpose of ascertaining what, if any, additional facilities or improvements are needed to provide safe and speedy transit for vessels;

(2) Consideration of the matter of tolls levied for the use of the Panama Canal;

(3) Consideration of the construction, ownership, maintenance, operation, and defense of another canal or canals connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans adequate to meet the future needs of interoceanic commerce and the national defense.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings, and recommend such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-first Congress, (1) to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable, (2) to perform such travel, and to authorize such travel by such assistants as it deems advisable, and (3) with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $10,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

LABOR DISPUTES BURDENING OR OBSTRUCTING INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself and Mr. MUNDT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 249) to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and ordered to be printed.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORT ON THE IMPROVEMENT AT ALBENI FALLS ON PEND OREILLE RIVER, IDAHO (S. DOC. NO. 9)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated November 29, 1948, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of the report on the improvement at Albeni Falls on Pend Oreille River, Idaho, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE HEARING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the Committee on Foreign Relations to hold hearings in the afternoons as well as in the mornings.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEDICAL CARE OF PERSONS NOT ORDINARILY INSURABLE—LETTER FROM DR. PAUL R. HAWLEY

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have been in correspondence with Dr. Paul R. Hawley, chief executive officer of the Blue Cross, whose address is Associated Medical Care Plans, 330 South Wells Street, Chicago 6, Ill. As the Senate knows, he is one of our foremost medical statesmen, having been the chief medical officer for the European theater operations during the war and the chief medical officer of the Veterans' Administration.

I asked him in a recent letter what could be done to help a man with chronic heart disease whose condition could not be insured under sound insurance principles. I inquired whether help could not be given to such a man by having the Government assist him in making available expensive medicines and X-ray. I received a reply which I think is so interesting and constructive that I ask that it be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 3, 1949.

The Honorable HENRY CABOT LODGE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LODGE: In reply to your question about the medical care of people who are not insurable by agencies operating upon sound insurance principles, there is a way, other than open public charity, by which they can be provided with essential medical care. This is by issuing such persons Blue Cross and Blue Shield cards which entitle them to exactly the same benefits as regular subscribers to Blue Cross and Blue Shield.

The financing of the protection of such people, however, differs from that of regular subscribers in that no subscriptions, or premiums, are paid for such cards. Instead, when in need of medical care, such people apply to a physician or hospital with their cards, the care is given exactly as to a regular subscriber, the Blue Cross and/or Blue Shield plan is billed for such care, and the bill is paid by the plan. Then the plan bills the proper welfare agency for reimbursement of the exact amount of the bill plus a very small percent to cover the actual cost of administration of the transaction.

Such an arrangement has been tried in one or two areas, and has proved most satisfactory to all parties concerned. First, it conceals all outward evidence of charity. The medically indigent person holds the same kind of Blue Cross or Blue Shield card that paying subscribers hold. He gets exactly the same service—in semiprivate or even private accommodations in the hospital, instead of charity ward, if the welfare agency so desires.

Second, the cost of Blue Cross administration is far below that of government administration; and the administrative overhead of such a program would be less than if the government—local, State or Federal—undertook to operate a similar plan. Furthermore, the wider the application of this principle, the lower the per capita administrative cost would be. While I cannot commit any Blue Cross or Blue Shield plan to any course of action, I have reason to believe that most of these plans would write off a considerable part of the administrative cost as their contribution to a public service.

As to the financing of such a program, there seems to me to be no good reason why the Federal Government should not offer subsidies to States, somewhat as provided in the Taft bill of the last session. This would permit low-income States to offer the same program as the wealthier. And the cost of such subsidies should be very, very much less than the amount from its general revenues that the Federal Government would be forced to put into the Ewing program.

The objection may be raised that neither Blue Cross nor Blue Shield offer a complete medical-care program, including all home and office calls, spectacles, artificial limbs, false teeth, wigs, and other such appurtenances, the provision of which appears to threaten the solvency of the present British scheme. My reply to such an objection would be that both Blue Cross and Blue Shield recognize that their present benefits are, in certain areas, not as broad as they should be; and you may expect both organizations to extend their benefits as rapidly as actuarial experience justifies. Both Commissions are committed to extend coverage to the limit of financial stability of plans.

One cannot escape the fact that no plan for the prepayment of medical and hospital care, which is operated upon insurance principles, can survive 1 month if it pays $1.01

in benefits for each dollar of income. Mr. Ewing's plan would have to be subsidized heavily from the general revenues of the Federal Government. He probably will not agree with me, but my own investigation of the problem has convinced me that the income from his suggested pay-roll deductions will cover less than 40 percent of the cost of his program—even when such deductions reach his suggested maximum—and that general taxation must furnish more than 60 percent of the cost. I find some confirmation of my figures in the estimates, not published for obvious reasons, of an agency supporting compulsory health insurance that such a program as Mr. Ewing's would, if supported by contributions of the insured, require pay-roll deductions of at least 12 percent.

Let no one be deceived that Mr. Ewing's plan is, as he categorically states in the Nation's Health that it is, "a thoroughly American system, resting upon insurance principles which have been part of our national fabric for generations." The only kind of insurance that has been part of our national fabric for generations is insurance resting upon the two principles that the premium charged bears a direct relationship to the risk involved, rather than to the income of the insured, and that the premiums collected are adequate both for the payment of losses and for the administration of the business. Certain proponents of compulsory health insurance have advised me that Mr. Ewing's plan is not intended to be "regular insurance" but "social insurance," which operates upon very different—and apparently very weird—principles. My reply is that "social insurance" has not been part of our national fabric for generations, and that the only insurance that has is the regular insurance with which we are all familiar.

The press reports that Mr. Kingsley was very upset by my statement to you that the Nation's Health was, for the most part, a book of truth; but that its truths were interlarded with palpable untruths. If the foregoing quotation from the Nation's Health is not an untruth, we must now redefine "truth" as well as "insurance principles."

With kindest personal regards,

Sincerely,

PAUL R. HAWLEY, M. D.,
Chief Executive Officer, Blue Cross-Blue Shield Commissions.

GENERAL PICK'S PROMOTION—EDITORIAL FROM THE OMAHA (NEBR.) EVENING WORLD-HERALD

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "General Pick's Promotion," published in the February 1, 1949, issue of the Omaha (Nebr.) Evening World-Herald.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL PICK'S PROMOTION

The people of the Missouri Valley will receive the nomination of Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick to be Chief of Engineers with mixed feelings.

Naturally, they will regret to see the general go. Since he came into the valley, a stranger, and fired the imagination of the people with his magnificent conception of river development, they have adopted him as their own. They will regret, too, that he cannot stay on as Missouri River Division Engineer, to carry forward the gigantic projects he initiated.

But they will be pleased to see the general honored by promotion to the Army's top engineering job—a particularly unusual promotion since he is no West Pointer.

And they will know that in Washington the general will keep a friendly eye on the great development of the Missouri Valley, now well under way. More than that, all of the country now will have the benefit of his soaring imagination, his uncommon ability to inspire others, his organizational and executive talents, and his engineering skill.

Mr. Truman made a very fine choice.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JOSEPH W. KEHOE TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, DIVISION NO. 2, DISTRICT OF ALASKA

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, February 15, 1949, at 11:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. Joseph W. Kehoe, of Alaska, to be United States district judge for division No. 2, district of Alaska. Judge Kehoe is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired December 7, 1948. At the indicated time and place, all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman; the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]; and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ANTHONY J. DIMOND TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, DIVISION NO. 3, DISTRICT OF ALASKA

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, February 11, 1949, at 10:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. Anthony J. Dimond, of Alaska, to be United States district judge, division No. 3, district of Alaska. Judge Dimond is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 10, 1948. At the indicated time and place, all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman; the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]; and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

TVA AND THE GOVERNMENT POWER PROGRAM — ADDRESS BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "TVA and the Government Power Program," recently delivered by him before the seventh annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association at the Commodore Hotel, New York City, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT OF GEORGE J. BURGER BEFORE THE TRADE POLICIES SUBCOMMITTEE OF SENATE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the statement made on December 6, 1948, by George J. Burger, director in charge, Washington office, National Federation of Small Business, before the Trade Policies Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROBLEMS AND PAY OF STATE LEGISLATORS — ARTICLE BY RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on the problems and pay of State legislators, written by Richard L. Neuberger, and published in This Week magazine of January 30, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HOLLAND TO THE BALTIMORE REAL ESTATE BOARD

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator HOLLAND on February 5, 1949, before the members of the Real Estate Board of Baltimore, Md., at their thirty-third annual banquet, which appears in the Appendix.]

INAUGURAL ADDRESS BY GOV. ADLAI E. STEVENSON, OF ILLINOIS

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the inaugural address delivered by Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois, before a joint session of the General Assembly of Illinois at Springfield, on January 10, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONDITIONS IN CHINA—STATEMENT BY SENATOR McCARRAN

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Senator McCARRAN regarding conditions in China which appears in the Appendix.]

RADIO REPORTS BY SENATOR CAIN ON THE TVA AND THE PROPOSED CVA

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD reports recently made by him over the radio to citizens of the State of Washington regarding the Tennessee Valley Authority and the proposed Columbia Valley Authority, which appear in the Appendix.]

EDWARD W. ALLEN, "FISHERIES STATESMAN"—ARTICLE BY VICTOR B. WESTPHAL

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Fisheries Statesman," relating to Edward W. Allen, member of the International Fisheries Commission, written by Victor B. Westphal, and published in the Seattle Times of January 30, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

JOSEF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY—STATEMENT BY REV. DR. FREDERICK BROWN HARRIS, AND EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Rev. Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the Senate, and an editorial from the New York Times of February 6, 1949, dealing with the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty, which appear in the Appendix.]

JOSEF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD telegrams received by him in protest of the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty in Hungary and the text of the sermon of Cardinal Spellman of New York on February 6, 1949, which appear in the Appendix.]

REPORT ON NITROGENOUS FERTILIZER

[Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a report by John Pillsbury, staff member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations on the subject of nitrogenous fertilizer, which appears in the Appendix.]

SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a press release by his office concerning an amendment submitted by him and Senator HOLLAND relative to the national school lunch appropriation, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL DENTAL CARE

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a press release from his office relative to a bill introduced today by himself, Senator MURRAY and Senator AIKEN to provide Federal assistance to the States in developing and maintaining dental health programs, which appears in the Appendix.]

BOOTLEGGING MENACE SPREADS—ARTICLE FROM THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

[Mr. ROBERTSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Bootlegging Menace Spreads," written by Roscoe Drummond and published in the Christian Science Monitor of February 4, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF FEDERAL ACTIVITIES—ARTICLE FROM THE HANOVER COLLEGE BULLETIN

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Camel's Nose," dealing with the subject of extension of Federal activities, published in the February 1949 issue of the Bulletin of Hanover College, Hanover, Ind., which appears in the Appendix.]

E PLURIBUS UNUM—ARTICLE BY JESSE B. HORNUNG

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on the motto of the United States of America, E Pluribus Unum, by Jesse B. Hornung, published in the February 1946 issue of the Reminder of Our National Heritage, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR RURAL ROADS

[Mr. STENNIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him relative to Senate bill 244, together with a copy of the bill, which appear in the Appendix.]

PRESERVATION OF WOODLAWN ESTATE AS HISTORICAL SHRINE

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by him relative to the preservation as an historical shrine of the Woodlawn estate on the Potomac River, which appears in the Appendix.]

PORTRAIT OF BENITO JUAREZ—ARTICLE FROM THE ALBUQUERQUE TRIBUNE

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Albuquerque Journal entitled "Benito Juarez," together with a biography of Benito Juarez, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE TWO VOICES OF SOVIET RUSSIAN POLICY—LETTER BY JULIUS EPSTEIN

[Mr. MUNDT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter dealing with Soviet Russian policy, written by Julius Epstein, and published in the New York Sun of January 15, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

SPECIAL SMALL-BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution to create a Senate special small-business committee, to be composed of 12 Members of the Senate, and I ask that it be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution, Senate Resolution 55, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a special committee to be composed of 12 Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a study, by means of research and investigation, of the existing or future problems of American independent small business, including but not limited to the following problems:

(1) Supply and distribution of basic industrial materials with particular reference to whether or not independent small business is obtaining its fair share of such materials under existing or future distribution methods and patterns.

(2) Policies of Federal Government departments, agencies, and corporations with respect to inclusion of independent small business in their present programs and future planning with particular reference to the procurement activities of such departments, agencies, and corporations.

(3) Prices charged for materials needed and utilized by independent small business to determine whether they are fair and equitable in relation to prices charged their larger competitors.

(4) Pressures of vertically and horizontally integrated combinations to eliminate independent small business in the American industrial distributive system.

(5) Inability of both new and old independent small business to adequately finance itself from its own earnings due to tax structure and effect of such tax structure on the merger movement.

(6) Participation of independent American small business in foreign-aid programs and adequacy of representation of independent American small business by diplomatic and consular officials abroad.

(7) Development of program to adequately insure independent small business a fair share of raw and finished materials and services produced on and from publicly owned mineral resources, forest reserves, and irrigation and reclamation projects.

(8) Development of a sound program to safeguard the place of independent small business in the American economy.

The committee shall begin its study as soon as practicable and shall continue and prosecute such study expeditiously and with all possible dispatch and shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable with recommendations for legislation.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate during the Eighty-first Congress, to employ such experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to request such information from any departments and agencies of the Government, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report the educational material and data on such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any properly designated chairman of a subcommittee thereof, or any member designated by either of such chairmen, and may be served by any person designated by the person over whose signature the particular subpena is issued. The expense of the committee, which shall not exceed———, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. To what standing committee has the resolution been referred?

The VICE PRESIDENT. To the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I respectfully appeal from the decision of the Chair, and I desire to submit a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the appeal debatable at this time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will hear the Senator as to the reasons for his appeal. Before he proceeds, the Chair would like to make this comment on the reference of his resolution:

The Committee on Rules and Administration, with respect to the contingent fund of the Senate, is not a legislative committee. It is not a substantive committee for the consideration of resolutions providing for investigations. Therefore the Committee on Banking and Currency, which would otherwise have jurisdiction of the matters involved in the question of small business, is the appropriate legislative committee to which it should be referred. That is the reason for the reference by the Chair.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to inquire whether the Senator will withhold his discussion until we dispose of concurrent and other resolutions in the morning hour.

Mr. WHERRY. If I do so, it will be some time before we finish consideration of the appeal. As I read the Reorganization Act, it is now in order to debate the appeal. I should like to present my observations as to why I feel this resolution should go to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska declines to yield. The Chair will state to the Senator that if he wishes to withhold his remarks for the accommodation of other Senators, until concurrent and other resolutions can be disposed of in the morning hour, the Chair will recognize him then to speak upon the appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. WHERRY. When I was seeking recognition I was about to ask the distinguished Presiding Officer if I might be recognized after the other matters were disposed of under the pending order of business, so I will not at this time present my observations on the appeal,

but will hold whatever right I may have so far as the floor is concerned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is entitled to recognition now; but for the accommodation of other Senators he may withhold his remarks.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

ARREST AND TRIAL OF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and myself, I submit a resolution, and ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 57) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate condemns as unjust the arrest, confinement incommunicado, and trial of His Eminence Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, Roman Catholic primate of Hungary.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes on the resolution.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I shall be forced to object. I am as much in favor of that resolution as anyone could be, but I have been forced to follow the rule. I think that if we are to lay down rules, we should follow them, so I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

The resolution will lie over under the rule.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Is it appropriate at this time to submit an amendment to a resolution which I previously introduced on January 5?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ordinarily, unanimous consent is required.

Mr. MORSE. I do not wish for a moment to vary from the rule. If unanimous consent is required, I shall wait until an appropriate time for offering an amendment to the resolution.

Will the Chair inform me when it will be appropriate to offer an amendment to the resolution?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The offering of amendments to resolutions or bills which have previously been submitted or introduced falls under no particular category of the morning business. The Chair will recognize the Senator from Oregon when the morning business is concluded, to permit him to submit amendments to his resolution.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to modify Senate Resolution 12, on page 2, line 11, to strike out "two hours" and insert "one hour", and that the resolution be reprinted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SPECIAL SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

The Senate resumed the consideration of Mr. WHERRY's appeal from the decision of the Chair referring Senate Resolution 55 to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, we are now debating the appeal taken from the decision of the Chair. Am I correct in my understanding that we are not operating under the 5-minute rule, but that we can debate this matter as long as we wish to do so?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no 5-minute limitation on debate on an appeal from a decision of the Chair.

Mr. LUCAS. Even though it arises during the morning hour?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HOLLAND. The resolution submitted by the junior Senator from Florida immediately prior to the submission of the resolution just referred to would call for the creation of a Senate Small Business Committee as a standing committee. My question is, To what committee was that resolution referred?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It was referred to the Banking and Currency Committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT subsequently said: The Chair wishes to make a correction in the statement which he made a while ago regarding reference of the resolution submitted by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. The Chair stated that the resolution would be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, but the Chair was mistaken, because the resolution submitted by the Senator from Florida proposes a permanent amendment in the rules of the Senate, and therefore must go to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it is my opinion that the Committee on Rules and Administration is the standing committee of the Senate which should consider the resolution which I have already submitted, and also that it is the committee which should consider the resolution previously submitted by the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Since the Congress convened I have been contacted by businessmen throughout the country asking that I lend every possible assistance to securing an extension of the Senate Special Committee on Small Business. I wish the RECORD to show that I have done, and will do, everything possible to see to it that such a committee is provided for so that the work of the Special Committee on Small Business may be continued.

Recently the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] submitted a similar resolution. It was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. That committee has not seen fit to report it to the Senate calendar. In fact, it is my understanding that the members of the Banking and Currency Committee voted favorably regarding the creation of a Small Business Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee, which of course they have a perfect right to do. But as of this date, the Banking and Currency Committee has not taken favorable action on the so-called Murray resolution providing for the extension of the Special Committee on Small Business.

It is my feeling that the Senate of the United States should not delay longer in creating a new committee or extending the old Special Committee on Small Business. I also wish the RECORD to show that I am in favor of the adoption of the resolution submitted by the Senator from Montana; and if it is reported favorably by the Banking and Currency Committee, I shall support it not only with my vote, but with any observation I can make in the interest of continuing the Special Committee on Small Business.

So strongly do I feel that the work of the Senate Special Committee on Small Business should continue that I believe the time has come when a resolution so providing should be presented to the Committee on Rules and Administration, which I contend has proper jurisdiction of the matter. It is my hope that the members of that committee will look with favor upon the proposal for the creation of a new or the extension of the old Special Committee on Small Business, and will report the resolution favorably, at an early date, for Senate consideration.

It is for that reason that it becomes necessary for me to make an appeal from the decision of the Chair. The Chair has ruled that the resolution should be referred to the Banking and Currency Committee, but my appeal is that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, because it is my opinion that if the resolution goes to the Banking and Currency Committee, it will meet the same fate as that of the so-called Murray resolution which now is before that committee.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. WHERRY. I prefer not to yield until I have concluded these remarks, and then I shall be very glad to yield.

Mr. President, it is with regret that the first action I take as minority leader is in opposition to the former majority leader of the Senate, who now is the distinguished Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate. So it is with profound regret that I have taken the appeal from the decision the Chair has just made. But I feel so strongly that the Committee on Rules and Administration should be the standing committee of the Senate to consider the resolution that, notwithstanding my affection for the President of the United States Senate and my respect for his opinion and judgment and for the decision he has made, I am forced to disagree with the Chair's decision and to appeal from it.

I may say to the Members of the Senate that there is a precedent for referring to the Committee on Rules and Administration the resolution creating a Special

Committee on Small Business. In the Eightieth Congress, Senate Resolution No. 30, a resolution creating a Special Committee on Small Business, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, at my request, without opposition, and was reported favorably by that committee, and was adopted by the Senate. So there is a precedent. Therefore what I ask today is not unusual. What I ask is not in contradiction of what the Senate has done on prior occasions in respect to an exact duplicate of this resolution, in which case the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I prefer not to yield until I have concluded my statement, and then I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. President, the Committee on Rules and Administration is the proper committee to which such a resolution should be referred. If this were a resolution providing for changing the rules of the Senate, as is being attempted, apparently, by the resolution submitted by the Senator from Florida, which calls for the creation of a new standing committee, in my opinion the resolution would be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration without question. I think there can be no doubt as to that. The special committee authorized by the resolution just submitted by me is in fact a committee of such broad authority that only its lack of legislative power and continuity from Congress to Congress makes it different from one of the standing committees of the Senate. Therefore, it naturally follows that such a resolution falls more nearly under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration than under the jurisdiction of any other of the standing committees of the Senate.

There appears to be some misunderstanding or confusion regarding the terms of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Some persons have said, and have told me, and some Members of the Senate have said, that special committees are prohibited by that act. Mr. President, that simply is not so; such a prohibition is not to be found among the provision of that act. When the legislative reorganization bill passed the Senate, it contained a provision prohibiting the creation of special or select committees. I say it contained that provision when it passed the Senate; but many of us, including the junior Senator from Nebraska went along with such a provision in order to get the entire act passed because of the fact that time was running out. It will be remembered that when consideration was given to the bill on the floor of the Senate, time was running out, and we took the bill as the Senate passed it, with that provision included. But section 101, subsection (b) gives full right to the Senate to change its own rules, one of which recognizes the committee-forming power of the Senate. However, when the bill went to the House, the provision prohibiting the continuation or creation of special or select committees was stricken from the measure. In conference, the House insisted on its amendment. The House amendment provides for the creation of such committees.

One of the authors of the bill, former Senator La Follette, of Wisconsin, seated where the Senator from Kansas is now seated, voted to accept the House version of the bill, and in this form it was enacted into law. Therefore, from a legal standpoint there is no prohibition against the creation of a special committee either by Senate resolution, or by joint resolution, or by an act of the Congress itself.

That is the history of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. I supported that act. I voted for its passage, and I did it with that full understanding. At that time I was a member of this special committee, and even though when the Senate passed the bill I voted for the provision against the creation of special committees, yet when the conference report came back it pleased me very much, and the bill passed the Senate by adopting the conference report, which did not prohibit the creation of special committees. Indeed, this is amply evidenced by the creation or the continuance of many joint committees by this body, such as the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations, the Joint Committee on Housing, the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation, which were created in 1948. The fact that these committees have been created by an act of Congress or by a joint resolution rather than by Senate resolution in no way changes their status.

Distinguished Members of the Senate have told me they recognize it is not a violation. One of our best constitutional lawyers tells me it is not a violation of the provisions of the Reorganization Act. Some of those who oppose special committees say, "No, their creation does not violate the law, but does violate the spirit of the act." Certainly Senators who feel that way will agree with me that the joint resolutions and acts of Congress creating the various special joint committees I have enumerated have been passed by their votes, and they have not moved to abolish those committees since they were created. So if those who oppose this resolution on the theory that it violates the spirit of the Reorganization Act continue to appropriate money and to set up special joint committees as they have done, then they are doing exactly what is sought by the resolution I have offered and asked to have referred to the Rules and Administration Committee. There is no difference. The legal status is the same. There is no violation of the spirit of the act; if one is right, so is the other. If we continue to create such committees, if we continue them in existence, if we continue to appropriate for them, we are doing nothing more, there, than I am asking the Senate to do, in this instance. It involves neither a violation of the act itself nor a violation of the spirit of the act.

There is no reason to dwell upon this, for it is my strong conviction that neither the creation of those joint committees nor the creation of the special committee sought by the resolution violates the spirit of the Reorganization Act.

The reason for the passage of the Reorganization Act, as I understand, was to simplify the operation of Congress, and with that I am in total agreement. The original provision contained in the Senate version of the act prohibiting the creation of special committees was designed to prevent creation of special committees when a standing committee had jurisdiction of the subject matter. That was the principal argument used. It was said "Here is a standing committee which has jurisdiction. Therefore, a special committee that assumes the same jurisdiction, duplicates the work." I can remember the arguments so ably presented by the then Senator from Wisconsin. He certainly made a convincing argument on that basis, and that was one of the reasons given, if I recall correctly.

When the Reorganization Act went into effect, the Senate had, I believe, 33 committees. We reduced the number to 15 standing committees. The reason the then Senator from Wisconsin continued to argue in support of the Reorganization Act and against special committees was the fact that many such committees had exceeded the jurisdiction confided to legislative committees. It was a sound argument. But that is not the situation here. The committee proposed by this resolution covers such a wide range of problems, both specifically and generally, that it reaches into the jurisdiction of nearly every standing committee of the Senate. I am sure all Senators will agree with my statement if they will read the record, and review the activities of this committee for 6 years, first under the able leadership of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and during the past 2 years under the leadership of the junior Senator from Nebraska. If they will review the record, if they will read the reports, if they will be fair in their estimates and judgments, they cannot refrain from saying that the work the committee does cuts across the work of each and every standing committee of the Senate.

Obviously any special committee to investigate the problems of American small business must have broad authority to explore all its problems, else such committee would be of little if any value to the independent-business men of America. But this broad authority permits research, investigations, and recommendations only. All recommendations for legislation by the special committee will in turn be considered by standing committees having jurisdiction over the particular subject matter. We have abided by that. The Small Business Committee has not attempted in any way to assume legislative authority in the enactment of legislation. We have time and time again pointed out on the floor of the Senate legislation that, after consideration by the legislative committee, should be proposed. That is its purpose. This makes the special Senate Committee To Study the Problems of America Small Business a valuable adjunct to the work

of the Senate and of its standing committees. It does not duplicate, it does not take away from the work of any standing committee. Instead, it supplements that work by pinpointing the problems of small business and calling them to the attention of the proper standing committee for inclusion in its over-all consideration. That has been its purpose. That has been the thing we have attempted to do. We have kept the faith within the provisions of the act. Certainly, Mr. President, this is in accord with the spirit of the Legislative Reorganization Act and is not violative of it in any manner.

The resolution just offered authorizes the creation of a special Senate Small Business Committee composed of 12 Senators. The committee is authorized and directed to study by means of research and investigation the existing and future problems of American independent small business. While the resolution specifies certain problems important to the continuation of a healthy, independent small business, the committee is not limited to the investigation of such specific problems.

Here is the first problem which the committee is directed to study. Let me quote this particular provision:

> Supply and distribution of basic industrial materials with particular reference to whether independent small business is obtaining its fair share of such materials under existing or future distribution methods and patterns.

That is the first provision of the resolution and it covers supply and distribution. The Senate and the House can go a long way in their study of the supply and distribution problems of small business, but unless they are corrected the small-business man will go out of the picture. There can be no doubt about that.

I want the Members of the Senate to know, as one who has worked on this problem—I think I have given 75 percent of my committee time to the work of the Small Business Committee—that thousands of applications have come to me from men who are depending upon this committee. The question of whether they will continue as future small-business men will depend upon the help and the aid that such a committee can give them in the Senate and in the House.

The time has come when, if we are to protect the corner grocery store, the family doctor, and the banker in small communities, they must have a proper distribution of materials. They do not have anyone representing them in legislative bodies at this time.

So, Mr. President, the first provision of the resolution is one to which each Member should give consideration, because of the observation which I am about to make. Nothing can be more important than is this problem. Industrial materials are the food for the manufacturing industry. Cutting off the supply of industrial materials or inequitably distributing them results in business mortality, just as surely as starving a human being would bring about his death. One is as important as the other. The smaller the businessman the easier it is to put him out of business by cutting off his materials and his supplies. It is like the very food which is required to supply the human body.

This is a study which might fall within the jurisdiction of one of three committees. This first provision might fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or the Committee on Banking and Currency. But from the standpoint of the small-business man's problems in this connection, a special committee studying the particular needs could go into the question more thoroughly and then recommend appropriate legislation.

The second problem to be studied and investigated is very important. The President of the Senate has been across the water and knows something regarding procurement for the agencies, departments, and corporations. There should be a study of the policies of Federal Government departments, agencies, and corporations with respect to the inclusion of independent small business in their present procurement and future planning, with particular reference to the procurement activities of such departments, agencies, and corporations.

Mr. President, there exists a vast Federal bureaucracy. That word is used by me merely as one of description. Many of these bureaucracies have within them offices through which small business is supposed to be aided. I can think of two or three of them at this time. Moreover, the Federal Government, directly and indirectly, is today one of the largest, if not the largest, purchaser of commodities in the world. I think it is the largest purchaser. It is important to determine whether small business is being adequately and equitably treated by those agencies and whether the agencies are operating effectively so that they will carry out administratively what Congress has directed them to do.

As chairman of the Special Small Business Committee I offered an amendment to the National Selective Service Act in 1948 to require that small-business men be given their fair share. This should be done also, by other procurement agencies, and the Special Small Business Committee should see that it is done. That should be one of its jobs.

Such a program might fall within the purview of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or the Committee on Armed Services, or possibly the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; possibly the Committee on the Judiciary. But the independent small-business man's interests can be protected only by a committee which has that as its principal objective, and not have it divided as it would be if it were assigned to all those committees.

The next point is the prices charged for materials and supplies used by independent small-business men to determine whether they are fair and equitable. That is something which needs investigation. This is a problem for small business in either an inflationary or a deflationary economy. The solution of the problem falls within the purview of both the Banking and Currency Committee and the Judiciary Committee. Shifts in our economic system hit the small-business man harder than they hit anyone else. A committee authorized specifically to study the impact on small business, which must report to the Congress with legislative recommendations which are referred to the standing committee having legislative jurisdiction, is the only effective course, to my mind, to pursue.

The next specific problem set forth in the resolution is pressures by vertically and horizontally integrated combinations, starting at the beginning, when a product is taken from the soil and moves through to the consumer level. This should receive the utmost consideration of every Member of the Senate. This is the only Nation in the world which actively avoids the creation of industrial and distributive cartels. It is the only Nation which feels that the independent small-business man is the balance wheel of our economy. In this field the Committee on the Judiciary, which has jurisdiction over antimonopoly legislation, or the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which has jurisdiction over interstate and foreign commerce generally, might conduct a study of the problem. But, again, the special Small Business Committee can best serve the interests of small-business men and of the Nation as a whole when it makes a study of the situation and makes recommendations to a standing committee having legislative jurisdiction.

The next problem, Mr. President, is found in the fifth paragraph of the resolution. It has to do with the inability of the independent small-business man adequately to finance himself from his own earnings, due to tax structures, and the effect of such tax structures.

The Special Small Business Committee will directly file a report on the question of taxation and its impact on small business.

Sufficient consideration has not been given to this problem. During the Eightieth Congress an expenditure of $5,300,000,000 was authorized for the European recovery program. This appropriation and the materials purchased with it affected every man, woman, and child in the United States. It affected every one of us in connection with the price structure. It has obviously had an effect on the availability of materials to the independent small-business man in the United States, and no one can deny it. So the resolution includes the authorization of the following studies:

Participation of independent American small business in foreign-aid programs and adequacy of representation of independent American small business by diplomatic and consular officials abroad.

Certainly when these commitments are made the impact comes back on the domestic economy, and those making them should know, through an investigation, if in no other way, what the impact upon the small-business man, in this community, and the other communities of the Nation, will be. Certainly that

comes within the purview of such a committee. Certainly the small-business man should be assured the right to a fair participation in the foreign-aid programs which we are financing today.

But what are the facts? I shall give one example. From the beginning of the European recovery program up to and including December 3, 1948, about 2 months ago, there was a total authorized purchase, out of ECA funds, of 103,641,571 pounds of cotton. Remember that figure, about 103,000,000 pounds of cotton. Now this is the important fact; one company received 71.2 percent of that entire cotton business. That is something for the record.

In the case of tobacco—and no doubt the President of the Senate is interested, as are many other Senators, in tobacco—up to December 3, 1946, the total authorized purchases amounted to $13,075,101. In this case, again, one company received 80.98 percent, four-fifths, of the business; and that company was not even an American company, but, instead, was British-owned.

On good authority I have been informed that less than 500 firms participated in ECA commitments up to December 3, 1948, on authorizations for $4,000,000,000 of expenditures, and that of these 500 firms to which the commitments were made approximately 150 were foreign firms.

Obviously, American independent small business is not getting fair participation in the foreign-aid program, and the one who suffers most is the small-business man. The Small Business Committee has held preliminary hearings on this matter, but was not able to go into it as thoroughly as should be done.

This is a problem falling within the jurisdiction of the Foreign Relations Committee, I imagine, and the so-called watchdog committee, which was authorized, and which, incidentally, is a special joint committee set up by the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, section 124–A, and has no different status legally, or within the spirit of the act, from that of the special committee we are attempting to authorize by the resolution I am discussing. There is no difference. If one is legal, if one is within the spirit of the act, so is the other.

The next problem of particular interest to small business which is directed to be investigated by the resolution is:

(7) Development of programs to assure independent small business fair share of raw and finished materials and services produced on and from publicly owned mineral resources, forest reservations, and irrigation and reclamation projects.

The special Small Business Committee, during the past 2 years, investigated several phases of this problem. A Newsprint Subcommittee checked into the possibility of national forest reserves in Alaska being developed as a source of newsprint for the small independent newspaper. A Mining and Minerals Subcommittee was set up, devoted, in part, to the intelligent and fair development of our mineral resources so as to assure small-business participation. The committee also assisted small-business firms which had contracts for the construction of vital portions of irrigation and reclamation projects, as well as helping independent small-business enterprises to obtain electrical power produced as an adjunct to such reclamation projects.

I recall that the committee went to Kansas City, Mo., where steel was fabricated and that it was the Small Business Committee which was the final committee to which the parties seeking relief came for relief. It was the work of the Small Business Committee which took the matter up with the agency involved and showed how necessary it was that the necessary materials should be supplied; otherwise we would not keep pace with the power development so badly needed in that area. There is need for further study and many recommendations for legislation which, in this case, would ultimately be passed upon by the Public Lands Committee.

Finally, the last specific task authorized to be studied under the resolution is this: Development of a sound program to safeguard the place of independent small business in the American economy.

It is not necessary to go into detail about this. Certainly Senators have had enough complaints so that they know how the economy is being affected. Suffice it to point out to the Senate that a program of this nature could conceivably involve the jurisdiction of every committee mentioned thus far, all of them, and possibly the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Committee on Appropriations, and even the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It cuts across those committees. So one committee cannot take the jurisdiction. The Committee on Banking and Currency has jurisdiction, according to the Reorganization Act, as interpreted by the Parliamentarian, from whom I made inquiry, over financial matters, and I agree with that. Anything we could do to help the committee, or any subcommittee, should be done. But the Committee on Banking and Currency has no more jurisdiction over the other items I have mentioned than has any other committee. Therefore, if we are to have an over-all committee which is to be the mouthpiece of small business and the place where it can go, there must be a special committee cutting across lines. I think it should be a permanent committee, if legislative authority could be given it, but that is a different question, and until we arrive at some decision on that point, the special committee should be continued because it does cut across lines.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I have asked that Senators do not request me to yield until I have concluded. Then I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

In addition to all these studies and investigations, it has been an important function of the Senate Small Business Committee to assist individual small-business men in many ways. The committee has helped small-business men who became lost in the maze of Government agencies. If Senators think that some of the people who have sought relief have not been lost, they should hear some of the stories that have been told us, of cases where they have not only had difficulty in finding an agency set up to help them. Small business did not know where to go or what to do.

We have even presented their cases—and I say this modestly—in hundreds of instances, to suppliers and producers of materials, so as to keep them from going out of business. That has been a part of the work of the Small Business Committee, to take individual cases and send the parties to those who could help them get needed materials.

I now ask all Senators on the floor, is there any Senator who served in the Eightieth Congress who did not have constituents helped in some instances by the Small Business Committee? I have here a list of Senators whose constituents have been helped. I can refer to the Senator from Maryland, who a year ago, in the winter time, presented a plea for oil. Ask him who got the oil. I can refer to the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], representing a State where a great deal of industry is centralized, one of the greatest producing areas of this Nation, if not in the world. Time and time again representatives of small business have come from Chicago and other communities in Illinois asking the Small Business Committee to help them secure materials so that they might remain in business—not alone oil, but steel.

I have in the files covering the past 2 years thousands of letters from the 48 States of the Union asking for help in order that small businesses might keep their doors open, and continue to get what they needed in order to fabricate their products and thus continue in business.

I have heard many Senators say that it is not the function of a Senate committee to secure relief for individuals, and that it is beneath our dignity to do such a thing. But, Mr. President, the small-business men of America cannot be convinced that it is not the function of the Senate Small Business Committee to do just that, and I will tell the Senate why. The legislative branch is just as vital a part of this Government as is the executive branch, and any way in which the Congress can be of assistance to and help in the preservation of the small-business man, be it by legislative aid or be it by immediate spot assistance, is important and appropriate. It does not make any difference whether the assistance is rendered through a legislative committee, a subcommittee of a legislative committee, or through a special committee. It requires the work of all such committees to provide the aid so desperately needed at this time by small-business men.

Certainly the House of Representatives when reviving, by unanimous vote, its select Small Business Committee last week thought it was both important and appropriate to do so. As a matter of fact, the House of Representatives did not feel that what it was doing was a violation of the spirit of the Reorganization Act. The House helped to create that act.

As a matter of fact, if for no other reason than that the small-business man

should have a place to come to in the legislative branch of the Government, this Small Business Committee should be continued.

During the past 8 years the Small Business Committees of the Senate and House have been the mediums through which the small-business man, who finally did get up courage to come or write to Washington, sought and obtained relief.

Small business has grown to depend upon these committees as the ones to which they could come for relief, and as their spokesman in the legislative halls. Certainly, as long as we continue the commitments abroad, and there are material shortages, the small-business men will depend more than ever upon this special committee to aid them in all those problems that confront them—problems that cross over legislative committee jurisdictional lines.

Mr. President, it is said that a standing committee, or some subcommittee thereof, can do the same thing the Small Business Committee can do. I will agree with that statement. In fact, some standing committee might do a better job. It can, provided it goes outside the jurisdiction granted to it by the Reorganization Act. That is the point I am making. If the work previously done by the Small Business Committee were to be turned over to one of the standing committees, or a subcommittee, it would be necessary for the committee or the subcommittee to go outside the jurisdiction granted it under the Reorganization Act. But for a standing committee to go outside of its jurisdiction is certainly a violation of both the letter and spirit of the Legislative Reorganization Act. So why not continue the committee that has already been built up over the years.

It has been said in some quarters the investigations of the Senate Small Business Committee can go on indefinitely—and that it is high time that most of the problems of small business be brought to the point of legislation. Perhaps that is a good criticism. I submit the record of what has been done, and Senators can vote on that record.

There is no question that there are many problems of smaller business upon which legislative action should be taken at once—based upon the facts which the Senate Small Business Committee investigations and surveys have brought out.

But there is no break-off point in the problems of small business—there is no place at which we can say, "Now we have finished with the American small-business man. Let us close up shop."

For example, many of us thought that when controls over price and distribution were lifted in the fall of 1945, the increased production resulting thereby would adjust most supply problems. Production has increased in most strategic lines.

But the pattern of distribution for many vital materials has shifted as crazily as a patch-work quilt, particularly as our international policies have develped.

An important consideration in determining whether to create a committee especially to handle the problems of small business is the flexibility and rapidity with which such a committee can operate. In the past 2 years, there have been many times when the need for prompt action on conditions affecting small business has been amply demonstrated. For example:

First. A smaller, independent erector of steel construction came to the Steel Subcommittee of the Senate Small Business Committee, stating that he was unable to bid on the erection of Government buildings, due to the fact that the Government bid form required that he bid on furnishing the steel for the job as well. With steel in short supply, and faced with competition from large integrated steel companies which have erection subsidiaries, the smaller man was out of luck. This committee worked out, with the Government agencies involved, a revision of the bid form, which now makes its possible for the independent erector to bid on Government construction without requiring him to bid upon furnishing the steel. That revision is in force today, and many a small steel erector has been saved and his company has been saved because we absolutely provided that the agencies change the bid form upon which contracts with Government agencies can be made.

Second. The continuous protests which this committee has made, and its hearings and investigations on the export of large quantities of steel from this country, have resulted in both legislative and administrative action to strengthen export controls and curtail the export of strategic materials. When the Steel Subcommittee began its investigation of the export situation with respect to steel in May 1947, only a few steel products were under control and there was no knowledge as to destination or end use. By December 1947, 95 percent of all steel products were under export control and more realistic quotas were being set. At the end of 1948, exports of steel were reduced 2,000,000 tons under 1947 exports—a sizable contribution to the domestic economy—effected by administrative action influenced by this committee.

Third. Similarly this committee's recommendations to correct licensing procedures and policies in the Office of International Trade have been acted upon favorably by the Department of Commerce, and have resulted in reducing errors in export licensing and trafficking in licenses which had permitted millions of dollars worth of short-supply materials to leave the country illicitly.

Fourth. An independent survey made by this committee on the amount of steel going to smaller, independent manufacturers of farm machinery has resulted in hardship aid for hundreds of smaller manufacturers. For instance, in the harvesting season just past the committee was successful in getting a shipment of steel chain to a manufacturer of corn pickers in Kansas, which enabled him to complete delivery of 500 pickers through the Middle West.

I could cite hundreds of cases. Hundreds of smaller dealers and distributors of petroleum products in the Illinois area and throughout the Middle West were saved from complete extinction in a price and distribution squeeze which they experienced in 1947. The major oil companies were cutting off independent customers in favor of their company-owned outlets. I do not think anyone can deny that. They were stifling other channels of distribution. Let anyone go to Illinois and examine the record and talk with any distributor, large or small, and he will find that the situation which I have described existed.

The tangible results of the research and investigations of the Senate's Small Business Committee could be detailed for hours. The committee is now nonexistent. It never had the personnel or the time to permit it to make a compilation of all the requests which have been made by Senators and by various legislative committees to alleviate the troubles of small business generally, and help individual small business enterprises.

An examination of the appropriations and a check of the personnel will disclose, I think, that the total personnel of the Small Business Committee at the time it folded up was 14. That was the highest number during the past 2 years. I will check that figure. It never had the personnel to do the job we would like to have done. However, if the work of the members and personnel of that committee be compared with the work of any other committee, I challenge anyone to show a committee, legislative or otherwise, which has done more for the benefit of the taxpayers with the amount of money which was spent. It is a safe and conservative estimate to say that thousands of cases were handled. Furthermore, the constitutents of many Senators have been helped by the Small Business Committee. I can furnish many comments which have been made in letters to the Small Business Committee.

Mr. President, if the Senate fails to revive the Small Business Committee, the result will be the folding up of an agency to which the small-business men of the country look for assistance.

I have made the statement on the floor of the Senate that I would not seek the continuation or revival of a special Senate Small Business Committee whenever a standing committee was able to take over its functions. However, I am convinced, after looking into the record and considering the spirit of the act itself, that there is no existing standing committee which can take over those functions and do so effectively. If it should do so, it would violate the very spirit of the act, as it is claimed that this resolution, if adopted, would do.

Mr. President, I refuse to stand idly by and see this committee fumbled out of existence. If this resolution is not referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, to which I think it should go under established precedent, as I have indicated by the observations which I have already made, then I intend to submit a resolution seeking to create a permanent Small Business Committee, in order to cover adequately the urgent needs of independent small business. This committee is a part of our economy which must be preserved at all costs if we are to maintain our private-enterprise system.

Mr. President, I very respectfully ask for a reversal of the Chair's reference of this resolution to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. TOBEY and Mr. MAYBANK rose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. WHERRY. I agreed to yield to two or three Senators. One was the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK]. The other was the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. I shall be glad to yield the floor unless they wish to ask me questions.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have no questions to ask.

Mr. WHERRY. If no other Senator has any questions to ask me, I am glad to yield the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like, for the information of the Senate, to read the rule under which he referred this resolution to the Committee on Banking and Currency, not in an argumentative way, but as a basis for his ruling.

Prior to the enactment of the Reorganization Act, as Senators all know, there was a specific rule in the Senate that when any resolution was submitted which fixed a charge upon the contingent fund of the Senate, such resolution must first go to the committee having jurisdiction of the legislation involved in the resolution. Therefore, for many years prior to the Reorganization Act, when any resolution was submitted providing for an expenditure from the contingent fund of the Senate, the resolution was referred to the appropriate standing legislative committee, and if that committee submitted a favorable report, the resolution then went to the old Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate to determine the amount of money involved in the expenditure, or whether there would be any.

When the Reorganization Act was passed creating the committees and establishing their jurisdiction, as set forth in rule XXV in the Manual, in prescribing the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the second item read as follows:

> 2. Financial aid to commerce and industry, other than matters relating to such aids which are specifically assigned to other committees under this rule.

That means to other standing committees. The Chair has been unable to find, in the jurisdiction of any other standing committee under the rules, any reference to financial aid to commerce and industry. There may be some indirect reference to that subject in the jurisdiction of other committees, but the Committee on Banking and Currency is specifically given jurisdiction over legislation providing financial aid to commerce and industry.

In the rule on page 39 of the manual, setting forth the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration, the following is found:

> Matters relating to the payment of money out of the contingent fund of the Senate or creating a charge upon the same; except that any resolution relating to substantive matter within the jurisdiction of any other standing committee of the Senate shall be first referred to such committee.

Inasmuch as the Committee on Banking and Currency obviously has specific jurisdiction over aid to business and industry, and inasmuch as the resolution submitted by the Senator from Nebraska provides for a charge upon the contingent fund of the Senate, it is obvious that in the adoption of the Reorganization Act no substantial change was made in the previous rules of the Senate, requiring that any such resolution involving an expenditure from the contingent fund must go to the standing committee having jurisdiction of the substantive matter involved in the resolution. Therefore, to all intents and purposes, the rule is the same now as it was prior to the enactment of the Reorganization Act.

It is true that the Senator from Nebraska submitted a resolution a couple of years ago which, by unanimous consent, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. However, as a former Vice President once said, the Senate can do anything by unanimous consent—a comment to which the Chair does not completely adhere. However, that related only to one resolution. It did not change the rule of the Senate. It could not affect any other resolution, and it could not operate as a precedent for the guidance of the Chair under the rule which has just been read, under which the Chair feels that he had no alternative except to refer this resolution to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The Chair probably should have made this statement when he made the ruling; but not knowing that the Senator intended to appeal from the decision, the Chair did not do so.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the observations made by the President of the Senate. I am in total agreement with the interpretation which has just been made relative to the requirement that a resolution must first be referred to the committee having jurisdiction, and then must go to the Committee on Rules and Administration if it provides for the payment of money from the contingent fund. But the entire point I am making is that although it is said that the resolution has been referred to the committee which has jurisdiction of the substantive matter, nevertheless, as I maintain, there is no standing committee which has jurisdiction over the 12 problems which are presented by my resolution. That is my point. In a sense, therefore, I am asking for a change of the rules, because I am asking that one of the standing committees take charge of the resolution, and make investigations in connection with it and hold hearings regarding it; and yet the scope of the resolution is so broad that no one of the standing committees has complete jurisdiction. That is the point I make, and I think it is well taken.

I agree with the distinguished occupant of the chair that, in the ordinary course, resolutions similar to the ones which have been mentioned have eventually come to the Committee on Rules and Administration for appropriations. But I submit to the Chair, because I know no one is more interested in small business than is he, that after 6 years of hard work on the part of this special committee, our point of view should receive some consideration. Of course, no personal matter is involved in the request for continuation of the committee, because we on this side of the aisle know that we shall not be in charge of the committee. I hasten to add that I am sure I shall be satisfied with whatever selection is made for the membership of the committee. But I say it is not proper to refer this resolution to any of the other standing committees, because the subject matter of the resolution exceeds the limitations of the jurisdiction of any of the other standing committees. I said that 2 years ago when I asked unanimous consent that a similar resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and I repeat it now.

I agree that a resolution providing for financial aid to industry, or similar matters, should properly be referred to the Banking and Currency Committee; but I submit that in this resolution there are 10 provisions which go away beyond the jurisdiction of the Banking and Currency Committee. I so stated to the distinguished occupant of the chair when I pointed out that the time has come to make a ruling on this matter.

Mr. President, when the legislative reorganization bill was before the Senate I supported it. But the Legislative Reorganization Act is not infallible. Apparently it does not specify the committee to which an all-encompassing resolution should be referred. If it were agreed that all the problems I have included in the resolution relate to financial aid, then of course I would agree that the resolution should be referred to the Banking and Currency Committee, and then there would be no argument about the question of reference of the resolution. But I point out that the complaints which have been made are combined complaints; they relate to finance and to distribution and to allocations and to prices and to various other matters. So it cannot correctly be said that all the matters encompassed by the resolution are properly within the jurisdiction of the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. President, I have no quarrel with the Banking and Currency Committee. There is no Member of the Senate for whom I have a higher regard than the chairman of that committee; and if that committee properly had jurisdiction of the resolution I would not be making this fight.

Knowing the feeling of the Chair about small business, I humbly suggest now that, even though the Chair has indicated that the decision of the Chair is based on the only course the Chair can follow, nevertheless a proper consideration of the various provisions of the resolution will certainly show that it should be referred to the committee which properly has jurisdiction of all the matters which are to be considered in connection with small business.

Therefore I would ask unanimous consent, although I suppose such consent would not be given, that my resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. At any rate, I submit that the resolution, which is similar to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Florida, which I did not know he was to offer, should be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

In concluding my statement, Mr. President, I wish to announce that if the resolution is not referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, then I shall submit a resolution providing for the creation of a standing committee on small business.

Under these circumstances, Mr. President, why cannot what I am requesting be done in view of the provisions of the resolution?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not wish to argue the matter with the Senator from Nebraska. However, the difference, as the Chair sees it, is that the resolution of the Senator from Florida would change the rules, by establishing a new permanent committee.

On the other hand, the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska proposes the establishment of a special committee. Even though the Committee on Banking and Currency might not have jurisdiction over everything affecting small business, nevertheless some committee must be given jurisdiction of the resolution; and under no conditions could the resolution go to the Committee on Rules and Administration without first going to some other committee.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, let me inquire whether the Chair feels that all resolutions providing for the establishment of special committees must first be referred to some other legislative committee before they are referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is a question which the Chair is not prepared to pass upon just now. However, the Chair will give his opinion on the question under discussion. There may be other committees which might have some jurisdiction over some matters affecting small business; but as the Chair sees it, in accordance with the practice of the Senate heretofore, the Banking and Currency Committee has had jurisdiction and has exercised jurisdiction over most of the resolution's legislative proposals affecting small business, and it is the only committee which has in the statement of its jurisdiction any reference to aid to industry and commerce, whether large or small, so far as that is concerned. No distinction is made under the rule.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I appreciate the observation the Chair has made, and I shall propound no further interrogations. It is not my purpose in any way to oppose or obstruct the ruling of the Chair. But the very observation just made by the distinguished occupant of the Chair is the basis of the argument I submit to the Senate. None of the standing committees has jurisdiction of the subject matter of my resolution, because the resolution includes matters going outside the jurisdiction of all of them. Under these circumstances, it might be argued with equal force that the resolution should be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce or the Committee on Armed Services or the Committee on Foreign Relations, because the various functions covered by the resolution cannot be separated.

Therefore, Mr. President, the only committee that I know of that could properly be given jurisdiction of the resolution is the Committee on Rules and Administration. Of course, if it is agreed that a change of the rules is necessary, then let us change them. All I know is that I shall continue to fight for an extension of the work for small business in the United States. I shall support the resolution of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], or any other resolution providing for continuing the Special Committee on Small Business.

Inasmuch as the House of Representatives has already set up a committee of like character, regardless of the provisions of the Reorganization Act, I hate to see the Senate fold up the Special Committee on Small Business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The attention of the Chair has been called to another rule which has some bearing on the subject. It refers to controversies over the jurisdiction of committees.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Chair please state the page of the Reorganization Act to which he refers?

The VICE PRESIDENT. This rule is to be found on page 24 of the Reorganization Act.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that it is section 137.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The provision reads as follows:

> In any case in which a controversy arises as to the jurisdiction of any standing committee of the Senate with respect to any proposed legislation, the question of jurisdiction shall be decided by the Presiding Officer of the Senate, without debate, in favor of that committee which has the jurisdiction over the subject matter which predominates in such proposed legislation; but such a decision shall be subject to an appeal.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Therefore, so far as the rule giving specific jurisdiction to committees is concerned, which was one of the objects of the Reorganization Act, undoubtedly the preponderance of jurisdiction—even though that might not include all the jurisdiction which could be conceived of in that connection—would be in the Banking and Currency Committee; and the rule even seems to preclude debate on that subject. However, of course the Chair is anxious to extend every courtesy.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I agree with the distinguished President of the Senate. Of course we are now arguing as to the appeal, which is subject to debate.

I realize the present occupant of the chair has done exactly what the rule provides, and that in referring the resolution to the Committee on Banking and Currency he has referred it to that committee because in his opinion he feels it has jurisdiction. I am not quarreling with the fact that it is assigned to the Committee on Banking and Currency. If I were the occupant of the chair I would not know to what committee to refer it, because if the RECORD is examined it will be found that possibly the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or possibly the Committee on the Judiciary, has more of the subject matter within its province. I would not know where to refer it. So I think the present occupant of the chair in carrying out the provisions of the act, referring the resolution to the Committee on Banking and Currency, has at least referred it to one committee having some jurisdiction over the problem. But that is the very point I make. It cannot be assigned to any one of the committees, because it cuts across all committee lines, and in that respect it should be referred to a committee that can give it the consideration that would be given if the rule were changed, as provided by the rule suggested by the Senator from Florida. I have asked for it in the resolution. If it is desired to send it to the Committee on Rules and Administration, I see no difference, whether the resolution I offer is accepted or not, or whether it is sent to a standing committee having jurisdiction.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I have listened to the remarks of my friend, the minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], with great interest. To me, after listening for some time, I think they form a perfect illustration of Milton's reference to "Linked sweetness long drawn out." I think the Senator from Nebraska had his fingers crossed in some of the points he made, and I propose to uncross his fingers for a few minutes.

Let us review the situation very briefly. The question before the Senate is, Shall the present incumbent of the chair, the distinguished Vice President, the Presiding Officer of the Senate, be overruled by the Senate, on a ruling he has made to send the resolution to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency? I think the Chair was correct in his ruling. I think he has made a good case, but as a further aid to him, "to make assurance double sure," let me point out to the President of the Senate as to every other Member, that for many years, the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency has had referred to it by the Presiding Officer of this branch of Congress, all proposed legislation on prices, on allocation of supplies and distribution, in addition to the financing of industry.

Now a word about the special Committee To Study the Problems of American Small Business. There is a Latin proverb, "de mortuis nil nisi bonum," which, as of course every Senator knows, means "concerning the dead, nothing but good." Far be it for me to impugn that committee, rather I would commend its work in the past, but I want to add that the Senate, on no less authority than that of the Senator from Nebraska, who has spoken, was assured 2 years ago, when I fought in an hour's speech

against the continuance of special committees, that he would never ask for any further extension of this committee.

The point I want to make, Mr. President, is that the Committee on Banking and Currency is charged, in my judgment, with this jurisdiction, and the President of the Senate has so made his ruling. I will not believe that any Member of the Senate would, because of a secondary motive, vote against sustaining the decision of the Chair on this matter, merely because of a partisan aspect. I would not be a party to that, of course. I believe the President of the Senate has done the right thing.

Speaking now of the Committee on Banking and Currency, we have already, last week, started to hold hearings to aid small business, when we had before us the distinguished Secretary of Commerce, when we made a very thorough, a very earnest seeking out of allocations for steel, metals, and supplies to small business. It is in our hearts. It is our purpose. Small business will not suffer one jot or one tittle by this reference to the Committee on Banking and Currency. We will have a staff just as good as, if not better than the previous one. I intend no reflections on them. We will be thoroughly staffed as a committee of nine members headed by the distinguished chairman, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] himself. I am "one of the least of these my brethren," and I would not sanction this thing, if I believed for one moment that the small-business men of the country would be jeopardized or put under a handicap or behind the "eight ball" in any sense or to any degree.

When the Senate wrote the Legislative Reorganization Act they wrote into it, and it passed the Senate, a prohibition of all special committees. It went over to the House, and the House struck out the prohibition. Then under the duress of conference and the inability otherwise to get the bill through, in their judgment, the conferees on the part of the Senate yielded, remonstrating they did not believe the prohibition should be stricken out. So the Senate of the United States is on record, and wisely so in my judgment, as opposed to special committees to handle the business of the Senate. Here is a standing committee, the Committee on Banking and Currency, charged by precedents, with respect to allocations, prices, supplies, and distributions, and in the law with aid to financing business. I ask Senators on both sides of the aisle to stand by the President of the Senate and uphold his decision.

I make one reference now to my friend, the Senator from Nebraska. Last year, I was asked to start an investigation of the great Textron matter, a $30,000,000 corporation. That was not small business. At the request of Wallace White, then chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I accepted chairmanship of the subcommittee. We went to Nashua and began hearings. I cite this as a concrete example of how a small-business committee should not act. Up there came a gentleman from the Small Business Committee. His name was Mr. Dickey, and he gave press interviews. He impugned in the press the motives of the standing committee of the United States Senate, and the members of the Subcommittee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It was not according to Hoyle. It was below the belt. We rose above it, but I rebuke that practice now, and I can name it if it is desired. But I say that by the rules of reason, by the precedents of the Senate, this resolution should go where the Vice President sent it, to the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate. We will do a goob job for the little people of this country.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I merely want to concur in what the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire has said. I had intended for the RECORD to read section 137 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and also the sections relating to financial aid, the Federal Reserve control of prices, and the many other things committed to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The distinguished Vice President himself was a member of that committee when I first went on it in 1941. No one knows better than the present occupant of the chair the enormous amount of work done by that committee. In recent years practically 90 percent of the legislation suggested by the Special Committee on Small Business has been acted on in one way or another by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

I realize there are some matters that should go to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and some, perhaps, that should go to the Committee on Finance. I am perfectly willing to rely upon the decision of the Vice President in sending to the appropriate committees resolutions and bills when they are presented.

In the meantime, Mr. President, I want to remind the Senate that we passed a bill last week relating to voluntary allocations and allotments. A large part of the time consumed by our committee was in connection with small business. Matters were discussed by the distinguished Senator from Florida, in connection with small business.

Last week I obtained unanimous consent to report a bill during the adjournment of the Senate, Senate bill 548. We held hearings all last week on the bill, which deals principally with small business. If Senators will examine the bill, it will be found that we wrote into the bill section B, in the interest of small business concerns, who must be taken into consideration. In fact, section B, line 21, page 3, of Senate bill 548, shows the interest of the Committee on Banking and Currency in small business. I can only say to the Senate I recognize well the fact that the Special Committee did excellent work in investigating. The Senate may rely upon the Committee on Banking and Currency to do equally as well, if not better, with respect to the subject under discussion, because after that committee investigates, it can legislate. The special committee can only investigate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following my remarks, statements which the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] made 2 years ago, in which they advocated the continuance of the Small Business Committee until a regular standing committee could be properly organized. It was for that reason, and that reason only, that the resolution providing for the special committee was adopted by the Senate by only two votes.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Two years ago, when the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] was arguing for the continuation of the Small Business Committee, he rested his argument upon the contention that the standing committees were not yet properly organized under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Addressing himself to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], he asked:

"Does not the Senator further feel that until the standing committees of the Senate are properly organized, when perhaps other procedure shall be established, the present Senate special committee should continue, at least during the present session, to be the advocate of the small-business men, and to be the one committee where the small-business man can come, in view of the fact that he has heretofore been taught to come for aid to that committee during the past 6 years?"

To which the Senator from Montana replied:

"Mr. President, I think the Senator from Nebraska has stated the situation exactly."

Toward the close of the debate the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] stated:

"Mr. President, I also wish to say that I am not asking that the special committee be made a permanent special committee. I see no reason why, in the future, the Senate cannot use for such purposes the Banking and Currency Committee and the other committees which otherwise would handle such problems. For instance, I refer to the Judiciary Committee and the Interstate Commerce Committee as well. When those committees are properly organized they can take care of the subject matter, and then the Senate can terminate the work of the special committee which is proposed by Senate Resolution 20. Because of that fact I have amended the resolution so as to provide for the continuation of the special committee for only 240 days."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to say to the Senate that we are now proceeding under the heading morning business, and when the hour of 2 o'clock arrives the morning hour will terminate. If it is the desire of the Senate to have a decision on the question today, it must be done before 2 o'clock; otherwise morning business will be concluded and the Senate will proceed with something else.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I think every Member of the Senate who has heard the discussion has been greatly impressed with the earnestness of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] who has spoken with such vigor regarding the encouragement and preservation of small business and the solution of its problems. There has been mentioned once or twice during the course of the discussion a fear that if the resolution should be referred to a committee other than the Committee on Rules and Administration it would suffer a fate similar to that which was suffered by an

earlier bill. Reassurance has been given by one or two Senators that upon the consideration of the subject by the Committee on Banking and Currency there will be an adequate, complete, and fair treatment of the subject by that committee.

I assume, as I am sure every other Senator does, that every member of the committee will endeavor to give a fair, full, and adequate consideration of the subject.

I rise for two purposes, one, to suggest most respectfully that the question before the Senate should not at all be determined on the basis of whether the resolution will have a better chance of success before one committee than before another committee. I take it that it is entirely a question of the proper construction of the rules of the Senate as to whether the appeal which is now pending should be sustained or should not be sustained.

In the second place, to my mind, the ruling of the Chair is unanswerable. In my judgment, the Chair has made a proper ruling. It would appear to me that the resolution could be referred, and I understand it is sought to be referred by the Senator from Nebraska, to the Committee on Rules and Administration, only on one theory, namely, that included in the jurisdiction of the committee are matters concerned with the payment of money out of the contingent fund of the Senate or creating a charge upon it, and that there is no standing committee which has jurisdiction over the subject matter of the resolution.

It occurs to me that the resolution may have numerous facets and points which do not at all detract from the right of the Chair to refer it to the committee which section 137 provides has jurisdiction over the subject matter which predominates. That section obviously contemplates that there may be matters over which more than one committee has jurisdiction. Otherwise section 137 would not have used the significant language to which I have reference, and which I quote "jurisdiction over the subject matter which predominates in such proposed legislation."

The resolution which is before the Senate does raise the question as to which subject matter predominates. It would seem perfectly clear to me, Mr. President, that the mere fact that the resolution calls for payment of money out of the contingent fund of the Senate or creates a charge upon the same is not the subject which predominates in the resolution. Obviously, to my mind, the subject which predominates is one of financial aid to commerce and industry, as the Chair, I think, has very properly pointed out.

So, Mr. President, in the first place, while paying tribute, which I think is properly deserved, to the Senator from Nebraska and to his associates on the special committee which has heretofore functioned, and paying a tribute to others who have cooperated, I should, in fairness, say that in my judgment, whether this resolution should be referred to any given committee is not at all to be determined by the committee before which the resolution will stand the best chance, but, clearly and obviously, to my mind, under the rules of the Senate, the subject matter which predominates in the resolution is one which is under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I am, therefore, in favor of affirming the decision by which the Chair has made the reference to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the hour is drawing near to 2 o'clock. I hope we can get unanimous consent to continue the debate. I am asking consent now for the debate to continue until after the hour of 2 o'clock.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and in view of the statement made by the junior Senator from Oregon——

Mr. LUCAS. I do not want the Senator's argument to continue after the hour of 2 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has no control over the clock.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall have to object because of the statement made by the junior Senator from Oregon that he wanted to have notice of unanimous-consent requests.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move to lay the appeal from the decision of the Chair on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That motion is not debatable.

Mr. LUCAS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the vote be taken after the hour of 2 o'clock?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is simply a matter of unanimous consent.

Mr. WHERRY. Then I submit we are not making any progress.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I withdraw my request.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hoey	Murray
Anderson	Holland	Myers
Baldwin	Humphrey	Neely
Brewster	Hunt	O'Conor
Bricker	Ives	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Broughton	Johnson, Tex.	Reed
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Byrd	Kefauver	Russell
Cain	Kem	Saltonstall
Capehart	Kerr	Schoeppel
Chapman	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Chavez	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Connally	Langer	Sparkman
Cordon	Lodge	Stennis
Donnell	Long	Taft
Douglas	Lucas	Taylor
Eastland	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Ecton	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	McFarland	Thye
Ferguson	McGrath	Tobey
Flanders	McKellar	Tydings
Frear	McMahon	Vandenberg
George	Magnuson	Watkins
Gillette	Malone	Wherry
Gurney	Martin	Wiley
Hayden	Maybank	Williams
Hendrickson	Miller	Withers
Hickenlooper	Morse	Young
Hill	Mundt	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the morning hour is concluded.

Mr. LUCAS and Mr. McMAHON addressed the Chair.

REGULATION OF EXPORTS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the special order, which the clerk will state.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 548) to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 47, and ask that it be read by the clerk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Illinois that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 47.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Is the motion in order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is in order. The resolution has gone over 1 day, and therefore the motion of the Senator from Illinois is in order. The clerk will state the resolution by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 47) to discharge the Committee on Rules and Administration from the further consideration of Senate Resolution 15, relating to cloture.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion.

Mr. TAFT. I inquire what is the vote on, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the motion to take up Senate Resolution 47.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator from Illinois yield for an inquiry?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. As I understand, the motion is to take up the resolution. After the motion has been voted upon, if the vote is favorable, the resolution will be open to debate and discussion, will it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is a debatable question. Does the Senator from Illinois ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to take up the resolution?

Mr. LUCAS. I withdraw the request for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion that the resolution be taken up for consideration.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate is in the process of voting.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The result has not yet been announced, has it?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. The Senator from California is entitled to the floor to speak on the motion, is he not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is debatable.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator from California is entitled to the floor if he gets recognition. The Senator from Connecticut has been here for 2 hours seeking recognition.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from California understood he had been recognized.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks that in spite of the fact that the Senate was in process of voting viva voce, the Senator from California is entitled to recognition.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the question before the Senate today is whether Senate Resolution 15 shall be withdrawn from the Rules Committee and placed on the Senate Calendar. Senate Resolution 15, submitted by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] for himself and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], reads as follows:

Resolved, That subsection 2 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, relating to cloture, be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"If at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

"'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a two-thirds vote of those voting, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

Mr. President, in regard to this matter of the Senate securing an effective cloture process against an unlimited filibuster, we are faced, as President Cleveland once said, "With a condition and not a theory."

The cold, hard facts of the situation are that there is little hope, if any, of amending the rules of the Senate in this regard unless the matter is acted upon in the first 60 days of a legislative session. Both the proponents of a change and the opponents to any change recognize this fact. It is for this reason, with the full knowledge that each day's passage of time makes more difficult the problem, that I offered the motion to withdraw resolution 15 from the committee.

Certainly no disrespect for the Rules Committee, of which I am a member, was intended or implied by this action, nor was there intended any disrespect for the able chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from Arizona, for whom I have a very high regard and a personal affection. He is one of the few present Members of either House of Congress who was serving in the House of Representatives during a part of the 12-year period my father served in that body.

The basic question we must face is whether the unlimited use of the filibuster is something that should be corrected. Do we believe that any man or small group of men should have the power to obstruct the legislative process? The fundamental issue is whether this body should be in such a vulnerable position that its legislative functioning can be blocked to such an extent that the security of our Republic and the peace of the world may at some future date be placed in jeopardy.

If this be the problem, then it seems to me clear that all those who prudently wish to lock the barn door before the horse is stolen and not afterward should be willing to meet this issue without evasion.

Certainly I admit that on this as on other great public questions there is an honest difference of opinion. I wish to commend the very able presentation made by the opponents of a change in the cloture rule. With sincerity and ability they presented their case before the Rules Committee, as they no doubt will present it at length to the Senate itself when the matter is before us.

In fairness I will also state that I believe they have made a very strong case against any change in the rules that would permit cloture by majority vote. It is not my intention today to make any prolonged statement in regard to this matter. When the issue comes before the Senate, as inevitably it will come, I shall have more to say.

This issue is so fundamental that it is not going to be allowed to die, nor are we going to permit the question of the correction of this defect in the rules to be brushed under the carpet of legislative procrastination as a poor housekeeper might brush dirt under the rug.

It is my very strong belief that this issue must be met frankly and that the Senate is entitled to vote upon it. Whatever action is taken here today will not end the matter. It shall be brought to the Senate for action in one form or another "again and again and again."

The very able junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and a number of his colleagues recognize the fact that in time of a national emergency it is conceivable that the functioning of the Senate could be effectively blocked by a small handful of Members. We have been informed that an amendment will be presented to take care of that phase of the situation. Such an amendment, I believe, has merit not as an alternative to the two-thirds rule but in addition thereto. Majority cloture is not the issue here at this time.

The senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] jointly submitted Senate Resolution 13 which is identical with Senate Resolution 15 submitted by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], which in turn is identical with the resolution favorably reported to the Senate by the Rules Committee during the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. President, the charge has been made before the committee, in the public press and on the floor of the Senate that the resolution reported to the Eightieth Congress was not acted upon while the Republicans were in control.

I am not one of those Republicans who believes that all the virtues are to be found in my party and all the faults in the opposition. I believe that a serious error was made on this side of the aisle in not pushing to a show-down early in the last session an amendment to the rules. However, Mr. President, two wrongs do not make a right.

I would not make an issue of the point, Mr. President, that the Democratic Party, which has been in control of the executive branch of the Government for the last 16 years, and of the legislative branch for 14 of those 16 years, was also a bit lax in acting on civil rights and other legislation in which the administration segment of that party now professes such keen interest.

The present rule 22 dealing with cloture reads as follows:

If at any time a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any pending measure is presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by an aye-and-nay vote the question:

"Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?"

And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a two-thirds vote of those voting, then said measure shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the pending measure, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion or dilatory amendment or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate.

This was adopted in the Senate on March 8, 1917, by a vote of 76 yeas and 3 nays. It grew out of the filibuster in the previous session on a bill which had

been proposed by the Wilson administration to arm merchant vessels.

Referring to the defeat of that bill President Woodrow Wilson said:

It would not cure the difficulty to call the Sixty-fifth Congress in extraordinary session. The paralysis of the Senate would remain. The purpose and the spirit of action are not lacking now.

The Congress is more definitely united in thought and purpose at this moment, I venture to say, than it has been within the memory of any man now in its membership. There is not only the most united patriotic purpose, but the objects Members have in view are perfectly clear and definite.

But the Senate cannot act unless its leaders can obtain unanimous consent. Its majority is powerless, helpless. In the midst of a crisis of extraordinary peril, when only definite and decided action can make the Nation safe or shield it from war itself by the aggression of others, action is impossible.

Although, as a matter of fact, the Nation and the representatives of the Nation stand back of the executive with unprecedented unanimity and spirit, the impression made abroad will, of course, be that it is not so, and that other governments may act as they please without fear that this Government can do anything at all. We cannot explain. The explanation is incredible.

The Senate of the United States is the only legislative body in the world which cannot act when its majority is ready for action.

A little group of willful men, representing no opinion but their own, have rendered the great Government of the United States helpless and contemptible.

The remedy? There is but one remedy. The only remedy is that the rules of the Senate shall be so altered that it can act. The country can be relied upon to draw the moral.

Certainly in 1917 the Members of the Senate thought that they were providing an effective way to control the unlimited use of the filibuster. To take any other position is to affirm that what they did was an empty gesture and of no consequence. It is to say in effect that they agreed to this amendment with tongue in cheek for the purpose of kidding either themselves or the American people. I do not believe that such is the case. Nor do I believe that any reasonable reading of the record will support any such thesis.

Yet under the precedents of the Senate now existing this present two-thirds cloture rule is meaningless. In the narrow interpretation of the word "measure" it has been held that the rule does not apply to motions. Since no measure can be brought before the Senate except by motion it is apparent that there is at the present time no cloture whatsoever. Not even by two-thirds of the Senate. Indeed, not even by nine-tenths of the Senate.

The present rule was presented to the Senate by the then majority leader Senator Martin, of Virginia. On the day the amendment was passed Senator Pomerene said; as found on page 20 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 8, 1917:

Mr. President, I had hoped that this rule might be so drawn as to make it a little more drastic during the last few days of a session.

My belief has been that a majority or at least a two-thirds vote of the Senate should have the right to further limit or conclude debate in the closing days of a session. I am satisfied, however, and I have talked the subject over with a number of Senators, that the rule presented by the Senator from Virginia is perhaps the best that can be obtained now. For this reason I earnestly hope that the proposed rule will be adopted, if we can get nothing better.

On the same day Senator Curtis said:

Mr. President, I am very heartily in favor of this resolution which proposes to amend rules of the Senate so that debate may be closed. In 1911, when certain Senators on the other side were filibustering against certain measures which were then pending, I offered an amendment to the rules providing that two-thirds of the Senators might close debate after a certain time. That proposed amendment was not reported from the committee. In May 1916, an amendment to the rules substantially like the one now proposed was reported unanimously from the Committee on Rules. That resolution, which enabled two-thirds of the Senate to close debate was on the calendar from May 1916 to March 4, 1917, but was not taken up. The change proposed by the resolution was agreed to by a joint committee of the majority and the minority. I therefore hope this resolution may be adopted.

These statements and many more like them, any fair reading of the rule itself, and common sense indicate that the two-thirds cloture was meant to be something and not a dead letter and an empty gesture. That clever men found a loophole in the rule that permitted them to destroy it does not relieve us of our obligation to correct it. That is all that we are trying to do.

There are some who make the statement that this change in the rule is timed so that it will affect legislation on which one section of our country is in violent disagreement. Such is not the case. This amendment to the rules would and should be presented even if there were no civil rights legislation pending before Congress and recommended by the President of the United States.

While the amendment we are discussing is only intended to make effective the two-third cloture adopted by the Senate in 1917 by a vote of 76 to 3, I would certainly not deny that the defeat of the temperate proposal we have submitted will make certain the defeat of the entire civil rights program presented by the President of the United States. If that be the desire of the majority leadership, let them make their record here today.

I believe that it is contrary to orderly legislative procedure for any small group to prevent the Senate of the United States from voting on legislation of importance to the country after there has been full debate and two-thirds of the Senate has expressed its own desire that debate be brought to a close. There still remains the additional safeguard that each Senator has an hour to discuss the legislation after cloture is voted before the final vote is taken. I can understand how some of our colleagues who are sincerely opposed to Federal legislation in the field of civil rights can and do object to any change whatever, but Mr. President, I cannot understand how those who purport to support the civil rights program can join in the processes of delay when every Member of this body knows that each day's delay makes less likely any change in the rule.

Time is priceless in the atomic age in which we now live. The use we make of it may well determine not only the strength of our own Republic, but of western civilization as well. Need I remind the Senate that in World War II Holland was overrun by Nazi Germany in 5 days, Yugoslavia in 12 days, Belgium in 19 days and Poland in 28 days. There have been filibusters in the Senate that lasted longer than it took these nations to lose their independence and their people their liberty. One of the longest filibusters in the Senate took place in 1893 over the repeal of the purchase clause of the Sherman silver law. This filibuster consumed 42 days. In 1946 the Oregon bill was filibustered for 2 months.

To permit one person or a small group to obstruct the legislative process even after two-thirds of the Senate have in their judgment determined that the time had come to act and not just to talk is to place in the hands of one Senator more power than the Constitution gives to the President of the United States. The President's veto can be overridden by a two-thirds vote.

Some of the opponents of any change try to raise the issue that this moderate proposal is in some way in conflict with the Constitution. Such, of course, is not the case. Section 1, article I of the Constitution provides:

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

Section 3 of article I as amended by the seventeenth amendment provides:

The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for 6 years; and each Senator shall have one vote.

When the unlimited filibuster is used, less than 5 percent of the Senate can effectively prevent 95 percent of the Senate from ever exercising their constitutional right to represent their States by casting a vote on issues which they too believe to be in the public interest and in conformity with the Constitution.

It was not we, the farmers and the merchants, it was not we, the employees and the employers, it was not we, the gentiles and the Jews, it was not we, the Protestants and the Catholics, it was not we, the Caucasians, Negroes, and orientals, but it was:

We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

The preamble does not refer to part of the people. The Constitution does not say that the Senate shall be elected by a segment of the people. The fifteenth amendment is no less valid than the nineteenth amendment or any other amendment or original article of the Constitution.

Both amendments state: "Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation." It is clear

that while it is not mandatory that Congress enact any specific legislation it is likewise clear that Congress is given the power to legislate on the subject. The unlimited use of the filibuster deprives the Senate of its constitutional power in this regard. Section 5, paragraph 3 of article I provides—

the yeas and nays of the Members of either House on any question shall, at the desire of one-fifth of those present, be entered on the Journal.

Yet the unlimited use of the filibuster can prevent the yeas and nays from ever being entered and the people learning how their Senators stand upon questions of vital interest to the people and to the States.

Section 8 of article I sets forth the powers of Congress. Yet an aggressive use of the filibuster by a small number of Members can completely veto the ability of Congress to exercise any of those enumerated powers in a manner as effective as the abuse of the veto by the Soviet Government in the Security Council.

This then is the issue which confronts the Senate of the United States. It confronts it today, it will confront it tomorrow, and every day the Senate remains in session.

Is it not, therefore, a wiser solution for the Senate to proceed diligently to discuss this question now and reach a conclusion before other legislation of importance is ready for action by this body? We have been in session now for more than 33 days. We have been recessing for 3-day periods. For those who want time for ample discussion, now is the time and here is the place. No one will have any desire to cut off a full and free discussion of the merits of the issue on the part of any Senator who desires to discuss them.

After the merits pro and con have been discussed, if there are those who desire to exercise the unlimited right of filibuster for the purpose, not of discussing the merits, but of blocking the right of the Senate to act on the measure, then now is the time and here is the place to meet that issue head-on.

For the reasons I have enumerated, and for many others that will occur to other members of the Senate, I have felt that a good purpose would be served by bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate as expeditiously as possible. Because of the vital importance to the Senate and the country of making the existing two-thirds-cloture rule effective, I have no apologies to offer for my motion or for other parliamentary moves that will follow in the very near future.

The Senate, of course, is the sole and final judge of what action it shall take. Each Senator in the light of all the facts must vote according to his conscience on the merits of the issue. I certainly have no quarrel with any legislator regarding how he votes on this or any other issue. I only ask that each Senator vote his convictions and not deny me the right to do the same.

PROPOSED MEETING BETWEEN PRESIDENT TRUMAN AND MARSHAL STALIN

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, there is a very simple method by which to test the sincerity of Mr. Stalin's statement that he honestly desires a meeting with President Truman to discuss a pact for peace.

In view of the conditions attached to this latest so-called peace bid by Mr. Stalin, I believe the American Government acted wisely and well in its rejection.

But the attainment of peace is still the supreme task of this generation. The peoples of the world, including the Russian people, ardently wish for peace. In fact, the penalties of failure are so dreadful that a moral obligation rests upon this Government and every other government to test and explore every pathway which has a reasonable chance of opening the way to understanding.

From the experience of the past 3 years, however, we have learned the salient fact that another meeting in itself will add nothing to the cause of peace unless the conditions for such a meeting are radically changed in advance. In recent years there have been constant meetings between representatives of the democratic countries and Soviet Russia, both inside the United Nations and elsewhere. Many of these meetings have taken place within the boundaries of the Soviet Union. Even the bravest optimist would hardly assert that these meetings have produced anything else than bitter fruit.

Because of this record, I believe another such meeting would be worse than futile unless we employ a new and radically different method of approach. Not only have prior meetings proved abortive, but the records show that the Soviet Union has consistently violated the solemn pledges made to this Nation and to other nations over the past several years.

Why is this true? What are the causes of failure, and how can they be corrected?

The reason for failure is clear and obvious. It is that the Soviet Government has no responsibility and no accountability to the Russian people. By means of the iron curtain, the Soviet Government has persistently and deliberately deceived the Russian people as to the peace aims and aspirations of the United States and the other democratic governments.

If the Russian people were to know the truth as to our aims and purposes and intentions, I cannot believe that they could ever be led into a war of aggression upon us or upon any of the nations of Europe.

This latest alleged peace gesture by Mr. Stalin is a perfect illustration of Kremlin methods. While Mr. Stalin was telling the world of his wish for a peace pact with President Truman, the Politburo was busy informing the Russian people that the warmongers of the democratic nations would never consent to such an agreement. This is the same two-edged propaganda thrust so often employed in the past.

The press and radio of America were used to tell our people of Mr. Stalin's peaceful intentions; the press and radio of Russia were used to falsify the peace aims of the American Government.

This proves conclusively what every thinking person knows to be true—namely, that the greatest peace menace in the world is the iron curtain rigidly maintained by the Soviet Government.

The very fact of its existence is evidence that the Soviet Government will not permit the truth about world affairs to penetrate to its own people. And where there is no truth, there is no hope of peace.

The iron curtain proves not only that Mr. Stalin is suspicious of the democratic countries; it proves beyond reasonable doubt that Mr. Stalin does not trust the Russian people. Only a government afraid of its own people would erect a barrier to block the passage of truth across its own borders.

Few people realize that the iron curtain blocks the pathway to peace by other means than the suppression and distortion of news and information. On the record, we are justified in asserting that the desire to maintain the iron curtain is the primary reason, if not the sole one, why the Soviet Government has refused to accept the plan for effective international control of atomic energy.

This plan of control is now the official plan of the United Nations. It has been accepted by all the nations except Russia and her satellites. Under this proposal, the United Nations would have the right to send impartial inspectors into Russia to make certain that the terms of peace were being carried out. In the same way, the United Nations would send impartial inspectors into the United States, and every other country.

Let us make no mistake, about it, Mr. President: this plan for the effective control of atomic energy is the most practical peace plan ever devised, and Premier Stalin could accept it tomorrow if he would. We need no personal meeting of the heads of states to carry it into effect. Soviet acceptance of the United Nations plan would be a major victory in the cause of permanent peace.

But Russia has stalled its acceptance for more than 2 years in the councils of the United Nations. The reasons advanced publicly for this refusal to cooperate are so transparent that they can surely be dismissed as frivolous. Behind these objections lies the stubborn refusal of Soviet authorities to admit inspectors of the United Nations behind the iron curtain. And so the Russian people, as well as ourselves, are victimized because truth must be suppressed to protect the political security of the Politburo.

From this situation we may arrive at this conclusion—there will be no durable peace while the iron curtain remains in existence. To remove this obstacle to understanding should be the primary task not alone of the United States but of the United Nations as well.

The cause of peace is so paramount, the mounting dangers of the cold war so apparent, that I believe a peace meeting between Premier Stalin, President Truman, Prime Minister Bevin, and Premier Queuille, is vitally urgent.

But as an evidence of good faith I believe the iron curtain should be voluntarily lifted by the Soviet Government as a precondition of that meeting. I believe that what the heads of democratic government wish to say to Mr. Stalin, they should be permitted to say to the Russian people as well.

What I am proposing is a direct radio talk by President Truman and the other heads of government to the Russian people on the eve of formal negotiations. The talks should set forth plainly the proposals of the democratic governments for peace. There should be guaranties in advance for adequate translations into the Russian and other Soviet languages. Mr. Stalin, in his turn, should be invited formally to address the American people either by radio or through the press, whichever method he prefers.

In fact, negotiations for this entire public exchange of information should be handled in detail by officials of the United Nations. In carrying out its functions the United Nations could perform no higher duty. It is well equipped to monitor radio stations, to interpret news stories—in short to make certain that conditions for the exchange of information are carried out in absolute good faith.

It is obvious that a single series of talks by the heads of democratic governments to the Russian people will not produce a permanent breach in the iron curtain. But in the peace negotiations to follow the democratic nations should insist upon the right of the United Nations to operate radio stations in each of the Big Five nations, including Russia. Only through the permanent breaching of the iron curtain in this fashion can the cause of peace be served.

In my opinion, if President Truman is accorded the right to address the people of Russia, it will be an evidence of Soviet good faith, and this fact in itself will be a great step forward along the path of peace. But if the right is denied, we may rightfully assume the Soviet attitude is less than frank, the iron curtain is still the greatest stumbling block to peace.

There are many facts which President Truman could tell the Russian people—facts which have been denied them by the iron curtain. He should be able to tell them of our offer to share atomic secrets and that acceptance of this plan will banish the horrors of atomic warfare and lay the foundations for eventual peace.

President Truman should be permitted to tell the Russian people we have poured out our lives and our treasure in two world wars, and that as a result of these victories, we have not taken a single foot of territory belonging to another nation. President Truman should be permitted to tell the Russian people about the billions of dollars which we are spending to succor not only our former allies but our former enemies as well.

And, above all, President Truman should be permitted to tell the Russian people about the deep-seated yearning of the American people for permanent peace.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does not the Senator also feel that the President of the United States should be permitted to tell the Russian people just what material contribution we made to their armies during the recent war?

Mr. McMAHON. I am glad the Senator from Oregon reminds me of that, because I know he realizes we spent some $11,000,000,000 or $12,000,000,000 to send matériel to the Russian people, only to find that much of the matériel had our name plates removed and Russian name plates substituted.

For three long years the Soviet propaganda agencies have employed the press and radio of the United States and other democratic countries to brand our people as warmongers and imperialists. During the same period, the Russian people have remained as remote from us as though they existed on another planet.

The proposal I have made certainly goes beyond the limitations of orthodox diplomacy. But the traditional patterns of statecraft are inadequate to meet the existing situation. We must be as bold and imaginative in winning the peace as we were in winning the war.

I believe the heads of democratic governments should propose a peace meeting with Mr. Stalin—under rigid conditions that what they propose shall be made known fully and factually to the Russian people. The Soviet Government, which erected the iron curtain, can end it at will.

Certainly, the place of meeting is secondary. We may accept in sincerity Mr. Stalin's statement that his health will not permit him a lengthy air or sea voyage. But a trip to nearby Stockholm could be made without endangering his health. Or, if he prefers, the place of meeting could be limited to his choice, provided always there is guaranteed the right of access to the Russian people.

In my judgment, it would be a tragic error to close the door entirely. There are many thoughtful people who believe the democratic countries have not gone far enough to meet what they consider to be a peace bid by Mr. Stalin. We would simply be deceiving ourselves if we overlooked the propaganda value of this latest Soviet peace offensive. There will be more of the same to follow.

Once again, Mr. Stalin has made use of the American press and radio to make known his willingness to discuss a pact for peace.

Is not it about time we had a chance to make known our peace aims to the Russian people? And if we are denied that right, should we not inform the world the reason why?

Mr. President, I have a concurrent resolution which I ask unanimous consent to offer, out of order. The resolution carries forward certain of the thoughts contained in the remarks I have just made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 15) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the policy of certain countries in keeping their people uninformed on the true issues relating to present day international problems is not conducive to world peace; and

Whereas the policy of such countries in propagandizing the people of other countries with half truths and untruths leads to confusion and misunderstanding among the people of the world; and

Whereas all the people of the world desire peace and good will among men; and

Whereas such peace and good will will never be achieved until said people are informed of the international problems of their respective countries and the true facts underlying such problems: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress of the United States that the President of the United States hereafter refuse to meet with the heads of other countries for the discussion and settlement of international problems unless the head of each country attending such meeting agrees prior thereto that the proposals and objectives of the respective countries, together with the underlying facts therefor, will be disseminated to the people of each such country through press and radio facilities in such country prior to, during, and at the conclusion of such meeting.

It is also the sense of the Congress of the United States that the United Nations, at its next session, take suitable and appropriate action to provide for the dissemination everywhere throughout the world of factual reports of the proceedings of said United Nations.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois to proceed to the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 47). The resolution will be debatable if the Senate takes it up.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator want to debate the motion, or the resolution itself?

Mr. HAYDEN. I hope the Senate will make it the unfinished business, so I can discuss it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Connecticut for what I consider to be a very constructive contribution which he has just made to the problem of defining the issue which exists between the Soviet Union and the United States. I think it of great importance that certainly the American people and the peoples in those countries where free press and free speech still exist should understand clearly the position the United States is taking in connection with its differences with the Soviet Union.

I want to commend the Senator from Connecticut, not only for his remarks, but for the introduction of the resolution, because I hold to the view, Mr. President, that we cannot continue indefinitely with the relationship that now exists between the Soviet Union and our country and arrive at our goal, which is peace. Therefore, I think now is the time to do everything within our power to try to impress upon the Russian leaders and, to the extent that they will permit us, to make available to the Russian people, information as to our sincerity in seeking to reach a peaceful understanding with the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, I make those comments quite independently of the subject matter which I rose to discuss, which deals

with the motion now pending before the Senate and with the comments of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

I do not think that now is the time to debate the merits of various cloture proposals pending before the Senate, but we should endeavor to decide whether we want to take up at this time the motion to proceed with consideration of the resolution of the Senator from California. In that connection, Mr. President, I want—and I am sure that the Chair knows that I mean no disrespect—to discuss a previous ruling of the Chair today, because I think that ruling illustrates very well the point I want to make.

That ruling deprives Members of the Senate of an opportunity to file, during the morning hour, without asking for unanimous consent, amendments to resolutions they have previously introduced. Under that ruling we may find ourselves frequently in the situation in which I now find myself, that of being faced with other action by the Senate on the same subject matter, without having had any opportunity to get on file an amendment to my own resolution pertaining to the same subject matter.

So I most respectfully, Mr. President, wish to address myself for a moment to the ruling which the Chair rendered earlier today, under rule VII, dealing with morning business. I want to commend the Presiding Officer for the position he has taken in urging upon the Members of the Senate the necessity of following strictly the order of business as set out in the rules of the Senate. I think the efficiency of the Senate will be greatly improved. I think we shall be able to transact our business in a much more orderly fashion if we give to the Presiding Officer of the Senate our full cooperation in following the rules of the Senate and the order of business as set out in those rules, and confine ourselves, step by step, under those rules, especially during the morning hour, to the transaction of business which is permitted at a given time under the rules. Of course, Mr. President, in our effort to adhere strictly to the rules we must always be subject, as we all understand, to the exceptional case and where there is some good reason why an exception should be asked for, by way of unanimous consent, we should be ready to take something out of order rather than to insist on slavishly following the steps set forth in the rule. I recognize that that is not only the right of the Senate, but it is a right which we ought to exercise if, in our honest judgment, the circumstances merit it.

However, I want to point out to the Presiding Officer what I think one ruling will do to some of us if it is to be considered a precedent. I do not want it to become a precedent, and I do not think it will, with this protest. Certainly the Presiding Officer, and possibly the Parliamentarian, should look into the question as to whether the junior Senator from Oregon is correct or is in error in the position he now takes.

I refer to rule VII, on page 9 of our Senate Manual.

The first section of it reads as follows:

After the Journal is read, the Presiding Officer shall lay before the Senate messages from the President, reports and communications from the heads of Departments, and other communications addressed to the Senate, and such bills, joint resolutions, and other messages from the House of Representatives as may remain upon his table from any previous day's session undisposed of. The Presiding Officer shall then call for, in the following order:

The presentation of petitions and memorials.

Reports of standing and select committees.

The introduction of bills and joint resolutions.

Concurrent and other resolutions.

All of which shall be received and disposed of in such order, unless unanimous consent shall be otherwise given.

Senators having petitions, memorials, pension bills, or bills for the payment of private claims to present after the morning hour may deliver them to the Secretary of the Senate, indorsing upon them their names and the reference and disposition to be made thereof—

And so on. I could go on and read the rest of the entire rule, Mr. President, and I submit that we would not find in it any language which prevents the Chair from ruling that when he calls for the introduction of bills and joint resolutions during the morning hour an amendment to an existing bill or to an existing resolution is to be interpreted as a bill or a resolution. Otherwise the Senator who wishes to offer such an amendment, under the Chair's ruling, will have no opportunity during the morning hour to offer such an amendment; he will have to wait until the morning hour has passed. He then will be in the position, Mr. President, of having to take his chances of securing the floor, and he may find that before he can secure the floor, other Senators have put before the Senate proposed action on the very subject matter with reference to which during the morning hour he may have wished to serve notice in regard to an amendment.

As I go through rule VII, Mr. President, I do not find in it any language which supports the Chair's ruling that it requires unanimous consent, during the morning hour, to introduce an amendment to a bill or a resolution. To the contrary, Mr. President, I submit that if the Chair will read rule VII from its four corners, taking into account the purpose of the rule, he cannot escape the conclusion that the purpose of the rule was to expedite the transaction of all business of the Senate which is encompassed in the introduction of memorials, bills, resolutions, and petitions, so that it can be done in a regular fashion, step by step. I say, Mr. President, it is certainly a highly literal interpretation, to take the position that, whereas rule VII specifically provides a step for the introduction of bills and joint resolutions, it does not encompass the introduction of amendments to bills or resolutions previously introduced.

Let me show how easily the ruling could be changed from one of substance into one of mere form.

If I had not wanted to offer my amendment to a resolution today, a resolution previously existing, I could have gone through the formality of submitting a new resolution containing the identical language I wished to offer by way of my amendment, and I would then have been in order without requiring unanimous consent. I do not think those who wrote our rules had any intention of requiring that a Member of this body should be put in the position of having to follow that kind of a formality, but they clearly had in mind that when we got to the order of bills and resolutions, at that point a Member of the Senate should be in a position where he could offer whatever perfecting amendment he might wish to make to a previously introduced bill or resolution.

Mr. President, since the Chair's ruling this morning I have read the rule very carefully, and I think it is a rule which sets out in general language the order of procedure which shall be followed in connection with the introduction of resolutions, petitions, and memorials, as well as amendments thereto. If the framers of these rules meant any such limitation as the Chair has ruled today—and which I submit is going to become a very unfortunate precedent unless reversed—they could have said so very simply. But I think the general term "bills and resolutions" certainly carries with it the intention to permit the introduction of amendments thereto without any unanimous-consent requirement.

Let us apply my criticism of the Chair's ruling to what has actually transpired since the close of the morning hour. During the morning hour I sought, within the rule, and without requiring unanimous consent—because I agreed with the Presiding Officer that we should sparingly use the unanimous-consent device in order to do things on the floor of the Senate which at that time would be out of order except for unanimous consent—I sought to offer an amendment to Senate Resolution 12, which resolution deals with my cloture proposal, my proposal to adopt cloture in the Senate of the United States by majority vote rather than a two-thirds vote. I wish to say to the Senator from California, without at this time debating the merits of our differences, that my only difference with the Senator from California, the Senator from Massachusetts, and others who support the two-thirds requirement in their cloture petition, is this matter of whether cloture should be brought about by a two-thirds vote or a majority vote.

I take the position, as I have taken it before the Committee on Rules, that the two-thirds vote requirement is not going to accomplish the results which needs to be reached, because the statistics of the history of cloture in the Senate of the United States show that only four times since 1917 has it been possible to garner a two-thirds vote of the Senate to apply cloture.

Therefore it is my position that if Senators really desire to have an effective cloture rule in the Senate then we ought to have a rule that would permit the Senate by a simple majority vote to

get itself into such a position that we could pass legislation in the public interest. There is no reason that we should not be able to stop debate by the same vote by which we pass such major legislation as I cited in the committee, such as lend-lease, the Marshall plan, labor legislation; yes, Mr. President, even a declaration of war, that is by a simple majority vote.

If it is desirable to pass important legislation by a majority vote, then I say it is equally desirable to have a rule which will get the Senate in position so that we can pass that legislation by the application of a majority vote cloture rule.

When I introduced my resolution on January 5 of this year, I was of the impression that if we are to have cloture by a majority vote rule there should be a guaranty to the minority that after cloture has been adopted each Member of this body shall have 2 hours in which to debate the merits of an issue, with the right to farm out all or part of his 2 hours' time. But since offering the amendment I have made further research into this subject matter, because I try at least to render my decisions on the basis of objective data dealing with a given controversial issue; and I find that the statistical material which I have analyzed shows that, after cloture had been adopted, not once, so far as I can find, has the Senate used up the total 96 hours which would be permissible under the existing cloture rule, which provides, as the Presiding Officer well knows, for 1 hour of debate for each Senator after cloture has been adopted. I was greatly impressed with what I found in my statistical analysis.

Mr. President, I am therefore satisfied that after cloture has been adopted 1 hour is sufficient for each Senator, provided we can get an agreement on an acceptance of the view that the principle of farming out the time ought to be adopted. As I said before the committee, I think senatorial courtesy is adequate to guarantee to any Member of this body whatever time he may wish to take on the merits of an issue, if he can satisfy his colleagues on the floor that he is confining himself to the merits of the issue. If he wants 10 hours, or 15 hours, or 20 hours, to debate the merits of an issue, I have not any doubt that even Senators holding opposing views to his on the merits of the controversy would gladly give him their time, and I think there are plenty of instances in the history of the Senate which bear me out in this observation.

So, Mr. President, I sought today, during the morning hour, as I told the Committee on Rules I would do, to offer an amendment changing the 2-hour provision in my resolution to a 1-hour provision. But the effect of the Chair's ruling is that during the morning hour, unless there is unanimous consent, a Member of this body cannot offer amendments to bills or resolutions previously introduced by him, but will have to wait until after the morning hour is closed.

I say, Mr. President, with all respect, that that ruling, in my judgment, just cannot be reconciled with the purpose of rule VII. The purpose of rule VII was to expedite the introduction of resolutions and bills, and I think it carried with it the introduction of amendments to resolutions or bills.

Practically the first thing that transpired here on the floor of the Senate today after the morning hour, or almost the first thing, was the presentation of the motion by the Senator from Illinois to take up the Knowland resolution. I happen to be in favor of taking up the Knowland resolution; but that is not the material fact. It is within the realm of possibility that on some other occasion, or even at this time—and I am speaking hypothetically—the very introduction of an amendment during the morning hour might have a direct bearing upon the position a Senator might take subsequently, after the morning hour, when action was proposed on some phase of the same subject matter. I do not have to tell the Presiding Officer that a great many extenuating circumstances may develop in the Senate which may keep a Senator off the floor at the very time that subject matter is being brought up, and there would be no notice in the RECORD of the Senate, there would be nothing pending at the desk, in respect to an amendment which he had offered as a perfecting amendment to a resolution or bill previously introduced by him.

It is quite possible in this instance, certainly hypothetically possible, that some Senator might have his mind made up entirely on the question as to whether or not, under a majority-vote rule for cloture, a Senator should be allowed only 1 hour instead of 2 hours, because there are Members of this body who have said to me——

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Not at this time. I shall yield later.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Senators have said to me, "We think your 2-hour limitation is too long. If you make it 1 hour, we might be more favorably inclined to your resolution." That is as far as anyone has gone, Mr. President, in speaking to me with respect to support of my resolution, although I may say to my good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] that with this amendment my resolution differs now only in respect to the farming-out provision, and unless the Senator from Pennsylvania is opposed to the idea that after cloture each Senator ought to have the right to farm out his time, or part of his time, if he does not want to use it, to some colleague, I ought to find him as an enthusiastic colleague and supporter of my resolution. Or, to put it in reverse, I will be very glad, as I have said to the Senator privately, to join with the Senator from Pennsylvania in support of his resolution, which is based upon the majority vote rule principle, if he in turn will accept the amendment which I sought to offer today, but which the ruling of the Chair prevented me from offering until after the morning hour, in the absence of unanimous consent.

I close, Mr. President, by assuring the Presiding Officer of my sincere desire to cooperate with him in every way possible in following the order of business set out in the rules, but I respectfully say to him that, in my judgment, his ruling today establishes a very unfortunate and, I think, unsound precedent, and I respectfully urge him to give it further consideration, and in due course of time advise the Senate as to whether or not he thinks rule VII really supports the ruling he has handed down today, because should that be the Chair's final ruling, I shall myself respectfully appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Oregon permit the Chair to ask him a question?

Mr. MORSE. If I can answer the question I will be very happy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Obviously under the order of business the offering of an amendment would not be in order under the heading of "Petitions and memorials." It would not be in order under "Reports of committees."

The next order is the "Introduction of bills and joint resolutions." An amendment is not a bill, although it proposes to amend a bill which has been introduced; and it is not a joint resolution. The Chair might interpret a bill to include any amendment that the author of the bill desires to offer to it and have considered in the committee. Of course, it is not necessary to offer in the Senate an amendment to a bill that has been referred to a committee. It can be done in the committee itself, or it can be done on the floor if the bill should come before the Senate for consideration.

The next order is "Concurrent and other resolutions." Well, an amendment is not a concurrent resolution. It is not any other kind of resolution. And the Chair would have to interpret one of those orders of business—for instance "Bills and joint resolutions"—to include amendments, which the language does not provide, in order to allow an amendment to come in under that heading.

The Chair appreciates the difficulty to which the Senator from Oregon has referred, and the Chair shares the view that if the Senator wants to offer an amendment to a bill which has been previously introduced it looks like there ought to be some place to do so, without securing unanimous consent, but unless I can interpret a bill to mean an amendment, it could not be done under that item of business.

The Chair will be glad to give further consideration to the suggestion of the Senator, and I hope the Chair is not so hide-bound as to sustain any ruling he has made if he is convinced that the contrary should be the ruling.

I appreciate the Senator's viewpoint, and I thank him for his expression.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, all I ask for is a reconsideration by the Chair of his ruling, because the difference between us is a difference growing out of the Presiding Officer's observation that he cannot interpret an amendment to a bill as business to be transacted at the time bills are to be introduced, or the Chair's ruling that an amendment to a

resolution previously introduced cannot be interpreted as a resolution under that section of the rule that deals with resolutions.

I submit that if the Chair will read the entire rule, in the light of its background and its purpose, that the most logical conclusion to reach is that when the Senate arrives at the point where the business is the introduction of bills and joint and other resolutions, in view of the fact that a bill or a resolution which has previously been introduced can be resubmitted with changes or amendments, that is with the perfecting language added, amendments to a bill which has already been introduced can be offered, or when a resolution has once been introduced, amendments to the resolution can be offered. It certainly must have been intended that amendments to bills can be submitted at that time, and that amendments to resolutions can be submitted at that time, because it is not to be presumed that the writers of the language intended such literal construction as the Presiding Officer has given to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 47. Unless there is some objection to proceeding to the consideration of the resolution, the Chair will declare that by unanimous consent the motion is agreed to. The resolution itself is debatable.

Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. HAYDEN rose and addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona wish to oppose the resolution?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have sought recognition to speak on the resolution itself. As chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, I should like to discuss the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks the Senator from Arizona is entitled to recognition, if the Senator wishes to discuss the resolution now. The Chair wishes to expedite the matter by getting the resolution before the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. As I understand, the resolution is now before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No, the resolution is not before the Senate. The motion of the Senator from Illinois to proceed to the consideration of the resolution is still pending. Does the Senator from New Hampshire object?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have been trying to secure recognition here for several hours, and I have been taken off my feet, and a few more Senators are going to be taken off their feet, too, if I do not secure recognition.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has not taken the Senator off his feet. From a legislative standpoint the Senator has not been on his feet. The Chair is trying to expedite the business of the Senate. The resolution is debatable after the motion is agreed to. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Arizona if he wishes to speak on the motion.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. I do not want to be overly technical, but I certainly question whether recognition of any Senator should depend on whether he desires to address himself to the subject-matter under discussion. I am sure the Presiding Officer does not mean that recognition of the Senator from Arizona is to be given on that basis. What the Presiding Officer has suggested is that he would recognize the Senator from Arizona if the Senator from Arizona proposes to speak on the resolution. I would have to raise a point of order if that is the intention of the Presiding Officer.

Mr. HAYDEN. In order to settle the matter——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Arizona if he wants recognition.

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to my friend from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I may say first——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. What is the question now before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 47, the Knowland resolution.

Mr. RUSSELL. That motion has not yet been put to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has not been put.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the question of considering certain other legislation had been before the Senate, and as much time had been spent in debating the motion to take it up as has been spent on the motion now before the Senate, there would not be enough printer's ink to proclaim a filibuster to be in progress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Hampshire.

JOSEF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the conscience of the free peoples of the world is shocked by the diabolical trial of Cardinal Mindszenty in Hungary. Especially does the heart of America reach out to this new martyr on the tragic list of those who have been bitterly persecuted by the Communists. Once more we witness the torture of a friend of freedom because he dared speak out with the courage of his convictions.

As Cardinal Mindszenty sits alone in his cell awaiting the verdict of a court which mocks at justice, I for one would like to have him know that those who represent the people who champion liberty are thinking of him in grateful admiration. I should like to have him believe that here in America we accept his unfaltering stand as a true symbol of men everywhere who have freedom in their hearts.

The fraudulent trial in Budapest should be for our Government and people another grave reminder that although our wars in defense of decency and justice have been valiant, we have failed pitfully in what we intended would be our moral leadership of the world. In speaking out for the right since the ending of World War II the Government has sometimes displayed a squeamishness which does not compliment our country.

I am aware that there are those who are sensitive to any reference to America's failures in the field of foreign relations. But the horrible truth stares us in the face nevertheless. It was America which led in the appeasement of communism. It was America which led in the compromise of the principles which inspired freemen to win the war. It was America which first dampened the postwar ardor of those who have continued uncompromisingly the struggle against totalitarian abuse.

Yes, our dollars have been poured out by the billions, and our resources have been distributed by the millions of tons. But all too often the burning desire of the American people to augment their material gifts with a firm moral leadership has been denied.

If we lack the courage to speak out for freedom in such an hour as this, then all of our dollars and all of our goods will not keep the torch of liberty aloft in the world. If those whom we would save from Communist slavery are to know that our gifts come from our hearts, then we must let our hearts speak out when they are about to lay down their lives in our common cause. From his cell of torture Cardinal Mindszenty sends his quiet but eloquent message to remind us again that freedom cannot be bought with gold, and that men who believe in freedom must live for it and sometimes die for it, if it is to survive.

Perhaps our protest will not save the life of Cardinal Mindszenty, but it will put Communist forces on notice that America is marking down the Cardinal's plight for what it is—another shocking Communist offense against decency and against the free nations of the world.

Our protest should give to us and to the American people a new hold upon the principles we consider fundamental to our own liberty, a new hold upon our hope for a just peace in the world. The Senate's condemnation of the unjust, torturous, shocking treatment of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty will be notice to those whose lack of moral principle is obvious that America is still a Christian nation and intends to continue as a bulwark of Christianity in the world.

The act against which my resolution is directed is not an isolated offense, Mr. President. It is a part of the design for world conquest which has its origin in Moscow. Let there be no mistake about that. And let there be no mistake about the awful truth that the day may come when mere protests on the part of free America will not be enough, when as a result of the Communist hatred of freedom and love for power all the world may again be caught up in the terrible holocaust of war.

I see only one real source of hope for avoiding a clash of arms between those who believe in freedom and those who embrace the Communist philosophy. It

is an uncompromising stand by our own Government and our own people for justice and decency. If we continue to hesitate to give voice to the things we know to be true and continue to hesitate to speak out against the things we know to be false, then we shall encourage those who seek the downfall of free nations the world over.

The eyes of free men everywhere are focused upon a prison cell in Budapest, Hungary, today. One of our number is probably about to lay down his life for all of us. The attention of Communist Russia and her satellites is focused upon that same cell, but also upon those who stand opposed to their slave philosophy. We shall add to the tragedy of Cardinal Mindszenty's plight if we keep our silence today. I therefore submit my resolution, by the passage of which the United States Senate would condemn the Cardinal Mindszenty trial, but even more would condemn before all the world unprincipled, un-Christian communism. We should speak out for freedom in an hour like this or accept as inevitable another fight for it later on.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me say to the Senator from New Hampshire that I appreciate the opportunity he gave me to join in the sponsorship of this resolution condemning as unjust the arrest, confinement, and trial of Cardinal Mindszenty. Like him, I come from a section of our great country which was founded by those who believed in the free practice of religious worship, and who were willing to suffer in order to worship God in the manner they deemed best. The condemnation, without a fair trial, of a great religious leader who has the courage to guide his people in the practice of their faith, and his sentence to death or other terrible punishment must not be condoned or passed over by us.

I am glad that the Senator allowed me to join in the sponsorship of this resolution.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to say that I have identified myself with this resolution. Nothing has shocked me more than what I read in the newspaper today regarding this terrible miscarriage of justice, the condemnation of an innocent man who, because he believed in his God and what his religion stood for, must pay the penalty. I think we are justified in this great body in expressing our strong objection and our condemnation of any such action by an autocratic state.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Will the Senator permit me to join as a sponsor of this resolution?

Mr. BRIDGES. I am very glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. TOBEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from New Hampshire for having submitted this resolution. I associate myself with him and with the Senator from Connecticut in what they have said regarding the persecution of Cardinal Mindszenty.

In December, when I first heard of the proceedings against him, I addressed a protest to the State Department and received a reply which indicated complete sympathy with the viewpoint which I expressed. It is interesting to note in the press this morning a statement by Rev. Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, who is the Chaplain of the Senate. I read from the press account:

> He told the congregation of Foundry Methodist Church, of which he is pastor, that the trial is also the "signal for war between an anti-Christian colossus and any church which refuses to submit to its supremacy and regimentation."
>
> "This trial," he continued, "is only the first in a series of onslaughts that may be expected. In this fear-haunted world the battle is drawn between Christ and anti-Christ."
>
> TRIAL OF CHRISTIANITY
>
> "The cardinal is really on trial for defending the things which every Christian steadfastly believes. The plain fact is that he is simply anticommunistic and that is the unpardonable sin with the present masters of the Kremlin and the puppet police states which they control," Dr. Harris declared.
>
> Dr. Harris said the trial has been "following the usual Soviet pattern," in which the victim confesses, "at least partial guilt."
>
> "One shudders to think of what diabolical torture wrings such false admissions from human lips which before have spoken so uncompromisingly," he continued.
>
> NEW DAY OF TERROR
>
> "So-called Christian churches who will agree to let 'politics' alone," he continued, "will not be molested. Silence and acquiescence may buy temporary safety. But to defy communism and its godless implications is to court martyrdom in this new day of terror," Dr. Harris declared.
>
> "Every Christian minister who has eyes to see the sinister significance of the cardinal's trial stands with him and for him as he sits in the prisoner's dock before the modern Pilates. With him in the dock is Christendom.
>
> "This fight is not just between Roman Catholicism and communism. It is between a godless communism and any type of Christianity worthy of the name," he concluded.

I believe that those views may be fittingly described as expressing the opinion of Christians everywhere.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I should like to make a very brief observation on the address of the Senator from New Hampshire. I agree with the remarks which have been made concerning the complete horror of the Christian world, our world, at the situation which exists in Hungary today. Anyone who looks at a picture of the man who is now in what is called a trial, and a picture of the same man taken 2 years ago, cannot help concluding that they have persecuted and tortured him shamefully. It is a spectacle which disgraces civilization, and I heartily and strongly join in the protest which has been made here today. Cardinal Mindszenty may be killed by those who wish to enthrone communism in the place of God, but the things for which he stands will survive eternally.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, at about 3 o'clock tomorrow morning Washington time, the world will know what the Communist masters of Hungary have determined to impose as a sentence on Josef Cardinal Mindszenty. That it will be harsh is taken for granted. That it will be in complete defiance of the facts and the truth and human decency is also taken for granted by all civilized people.

All over America, decent people of all faiths, of all political views except one—the Communist—and of all races and creeds, have reacted to the arrest and kangaroo-court trial of the Hungarian primate, first with shock, then disbelief, then utter disgust. Millions of voices have been raised in protest, but so far, under the sorry state of world affairs and of widening totalitarian influence, these voices can be raised only to one authority able to do anything effective about the situation, and that authority, of course, is the Supreme One, the ultimate source of all justice.

Meanwhile, however, it is my earnest hope that the United Nations can be enlisted in some way, perhaps through the instrumentality of the Hungarian peace treaty, in conducting a thorough investigation into the depraved manner in which "justice" is being accorded an outstanding world figure in a state so recently liberated from one type of totalitarianism only to fall into another.

Mr. President, typical of the comments which informed Americans are making on the sickening sham of justice as it operates under Communist totalitarianism are several editorials which I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks. The Pittsburgh Press refers to this trial as an obscene travesty on a court of law. The Philadelphia Inquirer says that not only were impartial foreign observers excluded but that justice has also been excluded. The Washington Star makes similar comments. These are but a fraction of the angry and sorrowful editorials throughout America on this inhuman spectacle in Budapest.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Pittsburgh Press of February 6, 1949]

TRIAL BY TERROR

The Budapest trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty cannot prove either his guilt or innocence of treason, espionage, and black marketing, or of any other charges.

It cannot be a fair trial or a legitimate judicial proceeding for the obvious reason that it is held under a reign of terror.

Not only the defendant is the victim of that terror. All connected with the exhibition, including prosecutor and judge, whether willing or unwilling participants, are subject to a law which puts itself above the laws of man and God. That is the law of dictatorship.

In the eyes of that lawless rule all men of honor and conscience who oppose it forfeit their right to live. Whether they are ignored or shot or tortured to death or sent to a prison camp, or whether they are used as drugged or terrorized puppets in an obscene travesty on a court of law, depends solely on the will of the dictatorship.

Even the chief executioner himself is not immune, as shown by the unnatural deaths of succeeding heads of the Russian secret police.

The cardinal's alleged confessions and testimony are as worthless as the charges—as he warned they would be in his prophetic letter to Hungarian Roman Catholics written before his expected arrest by the dictatorship.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 5, 1949]

RED TRIAL OF CARDINAL GRIM TRAVESTY OF JUSTICE

It is cause for wonder that even the Hungarian Communist bosses have had the effrontery to stage such a trial as that in which Cardinal Mindszenty is declared to have confessed that he is guilty in principle to charges of treason and black marketing.

This so-called trial is proceeding according to a Red pattern now wearisomely familiar: the people's court presided over by a judge who is also prosecutor; the incredible confessions and the certainty that the cases were settled and the sentences fixed before this Red farce opened.

If there had been even some slight departures from Communist routine the Budapest trials might not be so utterly suspect to logical men. The Catholic Church has charged, and the belief is reiterated by former Premier Ferenc Nagy, now in this country, that Cardinal Mindszenty's alleged confessions are the result of torture.

We must not forget that in the Red sphere opposition to communism is treason. Cardinal Mindszenty has been a bitter opponent of the Red regime that has grabbed Hungary.

Before his arrest Cardinal Mindszenty wrote to the Hungarian Board of Bishops: "I have participated in no conspiracy whatever. I will not resign my episcopal see. I will make no confession. If after this you should hear that I have confessed or resigned and that this is authenticated with my own signature, consider that to be only a consequence of human frailty and, in advance, I declare it null and void."

That, and the fact that he wrote a letter, which was intercepted by the Communists, appealing last week to United States Minister Seiden Chapin to assist him to flee the country, strengthen the belief that Mindszenty's admissions in court are not those of a man speaking according to his free will.

The events of this spectacle, from which foreign government observers have been barred, increase the suspicions of torture and the use of drugs to obtain "confessions." This trial, from which justice has also been excluded, is a stern reminder to all of us that the Communists will go to every length to destroy those who oppose them.

[From the Washington Star]

THE MINDSZENTY TRIAL

Under totalitarian regimes, prosecutions for alleged offenses against the state follow an invariable pattern. This has been true of Soviet Russia ever since the Bolshevik revolution more than 30 years ago. It was likewise consistently true of Nazi Germany, the notorious Reichstag fire trial occurring in the early years of Hitler's Third Reich. And the Soviet satellite governments set up since the late war are running true to form.

The basic feature of all such trials is that they are political in character rather than juridical, as we understand the processes of justice. They are held before a special tribunal known as a people's court, with its own rules of procedure. The prosecution always alleges major crimes against the state tantamount to treason, usually coupled with alleged offenses such as black marketing which tend to discredit the character of the accused. Furthermore, the defendants are often charged with seditious relations with the representatives of foreign powers. The case against the main defendants is usually strengthened by confessions made by minor defendants who turn state's evidence. Indeed, in many cases, the chief of the accused voluntarily confesses his own guilt, either wholly or in part. Finally, it may be significant that accredited foreign correspondents have not been permitted to attend and report the Mindszenty trial.

It is against this background that the current trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, Roman Catholic Primate of Hungary, should be evaluated. The cardinal had long since made himself a marked man to Hungary's totalitarian rulers by his vigorous opposition to measures depriving the Roman Church of its historic rights and privileges in that country. For it is a basic tenet of totalitarianism that all opposition to its limitless authority must be broken. Such a trial, once started, is a major political test which can have only one outcome. An acquittal would dangerously compromise the prestige and power of the totalitarian regime, which, in the last analysis, must always be right.

Under these circumstances, every development of the Mindszenty trial adverse to the cardinal should be regarded with skepticism. This certainly applies to the qualified plea of guilty voluntarily made by the cardinal in open court. It likewise applies to the genuineness of incriminating documents allegedly found in his possession, notably the letter purporting to involve our legation in Budapest in a plan to spirit him out of the country.

Unless this trial turns out to be the proverbial "exception which proves the rule," the only uncertain factor is the severity of the penalty imposed on Cardinal Mindszenty after the verdict of guilty has been pronounced by the people's court. And we may be sure that the degree of punishment imposed will be determined by political rather than factual considerations. Justice, in our meaning of the word, will play no part.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

The Senate resumed the consideration of Mr. LUCAS' motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 47, to discharge the Committee on Rules and Administration from the further consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 15) relating to cloture.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 47.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, now that the resolution submitted by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is before the Senate, I should like to discuss it.

I construe the resolution as an indictment of the Committee on Rules and Administration for dereliction of duty. I should like to have the Senate itself pass upon the question of whether a committee which conducted hearings and completed them in less than 10 days has been derelict in its duty, when 2 years ago a similar committee in considering a similar resolution required more than 20 days to accomplish the same result.

With respect to the hearings, I wish to say that the members of the committee were diligent in their attendance. A quorum was always present. The Senators who appeared and testified before the committee did so at inconvenience to themselves, in that their presence there interfered with the performance of their other duties. A Senate committee which acts as promptly as that should not be criticized or condemned in this manner.

Furthermore, I should like to have the Senate pass judgment upon whether it is unreasonable for the members of any committee to take a brief time to determine what position they shall take on an issue of such grave importance, an issue which vitally affects what they may do or may not do upon the floor of the Senate. It is but fair that every one of them individually should have a reasonable time in which to make up his mind as to what he should do.

Following completion of the hearings, all that the committee did was to vote that 1 week—and only 1 week, a postponement of that length of time—be taken before the committee would again take up consideration of the cloture resolution.

I have no definite means of knowing what the committee will do on next Wednesday. It will meet then, and will take up the resolution to amend rule XXII, which is the unfinished business before the committee. If the resolution should be reported to the Senate next Wednesday, I wish to assure Republican Senators who have made engagements to make Lincoln Day addresses that they can plan to go away and will not be required to come back and be in their seats in this body before a cloture rule comes before the Senate. No debate on it will occur in that interval. I am glad that we on this side of the aisle can extend that courtesy to Republican Senators, because we know it will be returned to us in full measure when Jefferson Day comes around, and that regardless of what business is then before the Senate, they will permit Democratic Senators to go out to make their addresses.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator from Arizona realizes, of course, that that is in consonance with a great Republican doctrine of long standing, originated by McKinley—namely, reciprocity.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am glad to give reciprocal assurance to the Republican Senators that they can go away next Saturday and there will be no cloture resolution brought before the Senate before they can return, because undoubtedly it will take a little time—if I am honored by the committee by being asked to write the report—to prepare it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I am reminded, of course, of what the able Senator from California has said—namely, that in the event immediate action is not taken, he will again and again file a motion to discharge the committee from the further consideration of this matter. So, in view of the statement of the Senator from California, I doubt whether the Senator from Arizona can count on such an interval.

Mr. HAYDEN. I doubt whether the Senate would sustain any such renewed motion. I can positively state no Senator has suggested to me that there should be a delay of 15 months before such a resolution is even indirectly considered by the Senate. Yet that is exactly what happened in the last Congress.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. Let me preface my question with a brief statement: I heard what the Senator from California had to say about the motion. I wish to hasten to tell my friend the Senator from Arizona, who is chairman of the committee, that as I heard the remarks of the Senator from California, I did not understand them to imply any criticism whatever of the chairman of the committee.

I wish merely to add this inquiry: Can the Senator from Arizona give us any assurance as to when we shall have an opportunity to vote on this particular matter?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I am the despair of some of my good friends, the newspapermen, who are much more interested in what is going to happen than in what has happened, because I refuse to make predictions. All I can say is that the committee will meet on next Wednesday, and that as, if, and when the resolution is reported, I am quite sure there will be no 15 months' delay in bringing it before the Senate.

Mr. BALDWIN. I take it from what my friend says that the present state of the matter is such that it is even beyond prophecy—and of course prophecy is rather an easy thing. The Senator from Arizona would hesitate even to make a guess about it, then; would he?

Mr. HAYDEN. I simply do not engage in predictions. In that way I keep myself 100 percent correct.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from New York.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona yields for a question.

Mr. IVES. Does the Senator yield only for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, that is all the Senator from Arizona can yield for at this time. However, the Chair would point out that this debate has been running along, by unanimous consent, in violation of the rule; so the Chair will not clamp down at this time and enforce the rule as against the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. I appreciate the Chair's position. Nevertheless I shall attempt to abide by the rule, by framing the statement in question form: Does the Senator from Arizona remember the statement of the Senator from California that two wrongs do not make a right? I refer to the Senator's statement that the Republicans by their delay had made a mistake, and we recognize the mistake, and we do not want the mistake to occur again and to cause, by unwarranted delay, a continuation of such a mistake or a repetition thereof?

Mr. HAYDEN. Does the Senator from New York insist that up to this moment there has been any unwarranted delay?

Mr. IVES. Yes; I do. However, I have not the floor.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have asked a question of the Senator. I should like to know what delay has been unwarranted.

Mr. IVES. The 10-day delay when the hearings were delayed from the 14th to the 24th.

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, we should have conducted hearings during the period of the Presidential inauguration; is that the point? I am entirely willing to let the Senate pass judgment on that delay.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. IVES. Let me point out to the Senator that the time I referred to, in saying that the hearings should have begun on the 14th, was not during the inaugural period. There was ample opportunity on the 14th and 15th, at least, and perhaps on the 17th and 18th.

I wish to point out to the Senator from Arizona that we already have an excellent precedent for Saturday hearings because of what is going on before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

To my mind, the delay which occurred in this case was inexcusable, and it may eventually prove to have been disastrous.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me again state that no motion was made at any time during the entire life of the Eightieth Congress to take up for consideration the cloture resolution reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration on April 3, 1947. The only reference ever made to that resolution occurred at the time when an entirely different proposal was under consideration.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I do not think the Senator from Arizona quite understood what I was driving at. I tried to indicate that the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] pointed out to the Senate in his preliminary remarks, the first he made today on this question, that the Republicans had erred in that delay; and we admit it, but we do not want to see a repetition of it.

Mr. HAYDEN. Be that as it may, what happened was, as we all well remember, that the President of the United States, after the Democratic and Republican National Conventions had adjourned, called Congress into extraordinary session. In a message to Congress the President suggested there were certain bills which had passed one House or the other, that could be considered and passed, and if that action were taken, it would redeem pledges made in both the Democratic and the Republican national platforms. The Republican leadership of the House decided the particular bill which should be taken up, among all subjects mentioned by the President, was an antilynching bill. They well knew when they made that decision, that a similar bill had been rejected by the Senate on at least five different occasions. They also knew that the Senate had twice in 1938 and again in 1946 refused to vote cloture on a very similar bill.

What happened was exactly what the Republican leadership expected to happen. The antilynching bill caused a filibuster to take place in the Senate. The debate was unlimited. It went on and on until an attempt was made to file a cloture petition to close debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. Then, the President pro tempore, the very able Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], ruled, and properly so, that the present rule XXII did not apply to a situation of that kind. Very shortly thereafter the Republican leadership determined it was useless to carry on discussion with respect to that bill. It was at that late date that notice was served upon the Senate that immediately upon the convening of the Eighty-first Congress an effort would be made to adopt an amendment to rule XXII, which would correct it to conform to what many Senators believed to be the original intent at the time that the rule was adopted in 1917.

That announcement was made, that pledge was given, on the assumption the Republicans would continue in control of the Senate. Let us suppose there had been a Nation-wide landslide, that the Republican Party had gained the Presidency and had retained control over both Houses of Congress. Let us imagine for a moment what the situation would have been at the beginning of this Congress, in January 1949. The very able Senator from Michigan undoubtedly would have been reelected President pro tempore of the Senate. If a motion had been made to proceed to the consideration of a resolution to amend rule XXII, no one would have expected him to reverse his ruling that the motion to proceed is debatable indefinitely. It is also reasonable to expect that extended discussion would take place on the floor of the Senate.

I assume therefore that if an effort had been made to rush the consideration of a cloture resolution we would have been faced with this dilemma: Could the Senate have attended the inauguation of President Dewey, if a filibuster were going on at that very time in this body?

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I may point out to the able Senator from Arizona that under such circumstances we certainly would have been very glad to attempt to do so.

Mr. HAYDEN. Furthermore, it is very doubtful whether the Republicans would have attempted to take up a change in rule prior to the inauguration, any more than the Democrats did. They would have known how the President pro tempore of the Senate would rule, and that debate could not be cut off. They might well have preferred to wait until after January 20, and then see whether Vice President Warren might be persuaded to modify the ruling made previously by President Pro Tempore VANDENBERG.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. At this very moment, with the resolution of the Senator from California pending, do we not have an excellent opportunity to see how the distinguished Vice President of the Democrats would rule on the same motion? Perhaps, if my friend were to press it, we might have that opportunity now.

Mr. HAYDEN. The question pending before the Senate at the time is whether or not the resolution offered by the Senator from California shall be adopted. The motion to take it up has been disposed of so there is no occasion for a ruling by the Vice President.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. A few moments ago the distinguished Senator remarked that the cloture resolution would come up for consideration before the Committee on Rules and Administration next Wednesday.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. The distinguished Senator stated he did not know what action would be taken, in the event the resolution is reported favorably to the calendar. The resolution in question is the Hayden-Wherry resolution; is it not?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is true, and the resolution offered by the Senator from California reads:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration is hereby discharged from further consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 15) relating to cloture.

Senate Resolution 15 is the particular resolution which the Senator from Nebraska and I have offered.

Mr. WHERRY. In the event the meeting is held by the Committee on Rules and Administration next Wednesday and favorable action taken, does the Senator from Arizona now say it will be immediately taken up for consideration in the Senate?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. I assured the Senate that such action would not be taken, because Republican Senators are entitled to be away from the Senate in order to deliver their Lincoln Day addresses.

Mr. WHERRY. How about next Monday? If it is reported Wednesday, would it be ready for debate next Monday?

Mr. HAYDEN. Whenever the resolution is reported to the Senate and placed upon the calendar any Senator may move to proceed to its consideration. I do not want to indicate that such a motion will be made on Monday. I do not want Senators to be hurrying back after they have been away to deliver their addresses. I do not think Democratic Senators who had been away for Jackson Day would want to be hurried back. All that I am trying to impress upon the Senate is that I know of no one who would expect that there should be any such delay in the consideration of a cloture resolution as occurred in the previous Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. I thought I understood the Senator to say there probably would be extended debate. But I was very greatly pleased with the statement he made, that if the resolution were favorably reported it would be taken up immediately for debate. I hope the Senator meant that he would not only report it to the calendar, but would move to take it up.

Mr. HAYDEN. I certainly would have to consult with the Senator from Nebraska and other Senators about what would be the proper time to do that.

Mr. WHERRY. I want the Senator from Arizona to know I am ready to have the resolution taken up at any moment, and the sooner the better. So if we can do it next Monday, that would be perfectly agreeable to me.

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not anticipate, once the resolution is placed upon the calendar, there will be any interminable delay in its consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Has the Senator from Arizona concluded?

Mr. HAYDEN. I conclude by saying I hope the Senate will at this time vote down the Knowland resolution and reject any implication, any condemnation of the Committee on Rules and Administration, which committee I insist has been diligent in the service of the Senate, and will continue to be so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

THE WORK OF THE COMMISSION ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I should like to address myself today to the subject of governmental reorganization and the work of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, popularly known as the Hoover Commission. Today seems an appropriate time to offer a few remarks because ex-President Hoover has just released the first official recommendations of the Commission, and many more will shortly follow.

I wish to take this opportunity, Mr. President, to place myself in principle squarely behind the recommendations which the Hoover Commission has made, and will make in the future. I can think of no comparable objective from which the people of the United States can benefit more in the long run, than a thorough and meaningful reorganization of the Federal Government. Whether we like it or not, Mr. President, big government is with us to stay, but it behooves the people's elected representatives to grant the necessary authority, to allow the President and his executives to make it run efficiently, with an absolute minimum of overlapping jurisdictions, duplications of functions, and unaccountable waste.

A historic battlecry of both political parties in their campaigns for many years has been the reduction of Federal expenditures. A just concern over this subject has often resulted in negligence of well-considered programs of minimum proportions. How much more logical it would be, and how much more in keeping with our tremendous national responsibilities, if the Congress would adopt, with a minimum of qualification, the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. I would venture to say that millions of dollars would be saved, and unmeasurable benefits in increased efficiency would be realized.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that the time is propitious for favorable action. Consider the makeup of the Commission. It is composed of 12 highly qualified men, 6 from each political party. It is headed by a man whose mature years have been spent in public service for his fellowmen. Since the Commission is nonpartisan, neither party can logically nor legitimately line up against its recommendations. The resolution sponsoring the study by the Commission was initiated in this body by that keen student of government, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. The President of the United States, a Democrat, publicly endorsed the work of the Commission, after the recent campaign, in spite of its being headed by a former Republican President. Surely no more favorable political and psychological setting could be found.

But I am frankly worried, Mr. President, in spite of this apparent fortunate climate. The history of proposals for reorganization of the Government has been a dismal one. Rather than burden the Members of the Senate with a detailed summary of this history, I would like to ask unanimous consent to have an article written by Mr. James H. Rowe, a member of the Hoover Commission, in yesterday's Washington Star, made a part of my remarks at the conclusion of my remarks. This scholarly article is well written and to the point, in recognizing the difficulties inherent in any governmental reorganization, and is well worth the attention of the Members of the Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit I.)

Mr. TOBEY. Let me say, Mr. President, that I want to serve notice here and now, as one individual Senator, that I will strenuously oppose any efforts by well-meaning Government administrators and their clientele to undermine the efforts of the Commission. It is a well-known occupational disease of all administrators, whether public or private, to seek to avoid the curtailment of privileges and prerogatives which have long been theirs. However, it is clearly evident to me that the burden of proof in the proposals to come before Congress will fall almost prohibitively on those who seek to retain the status quo.

The need for a thorough and complete reorganization of the machinery of government has been recognized for years.

The Hoover Commission is now ready to make its report. The time to meet and adopt these recommendations is now. It would be a tragedy if the long and sincere efforts of this committee to meet the need should die, or be shunted aside.

The responsibility to meet this need in the people's interest devolves upon the Congress. It has a great opportunity and a great privilege.

There is nothing that Congress could do, which, in my judgment, would meet with more universal approval by the people of this country than to carry out the recommendations which the Commission will make.

As always, when somebody's toes are stepped on, or some power is abridged, logrolling begins. Those of us who have been familiar with government down through the decades, recognize that this matter will be no exception. Just as in tariff legislation or tax legislation, those who in their judgment are being asked to give up some prerogative, seek to place the burden of the change upon the other fellow, so it will be with this.

Congress must rise to great heights. It must refuse to be led aside by these specious appeals; in other words, to use the language of Farragut of Mobile Bay, "Damn the torpedoes; go ahead!" And people will commend us for so doing.

The magnitude of the task is beyond the comprehension of any one man. I, for one, am willing to place my faith in the expert hands of the nonpartisan Hoover Commission, subject to a careful study on my part in each instance.

The time for constructive action is now. In my judgment, a similar favorable psychological and political climate will never be found.

The Members of Congress owe to their constituents an overwhelming obligation to apply logic and reason to the octopus of big government.

The Members of Congress owe to their constituents assurance that they recognize the attendant evils in administration of government. They propose to do something constructive about it, something more than merely to assail extravagance and inefficiency in government.

Here is the way. May we not be found wanting.

EXHIBIT I

FEDERAL REORGANIZATION LONG BUT FUTILELY SOUGHT—INDIFFERENT SUCCESS AT HANDS OF CONGRESS WAS THE FATE OF SIX MAJOR ATTEMPTS MADE BEFORE THE HOOVER REPORT

(By James H. Rowe, member of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government)

This week the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government will send to Congress the first of a series of reports containing its recommendations for the reorganization of the Federal Government.

More familiarly known as the Hoover Commission (its chairman is the former President of the United States), this 12-man body is, at least in form, a new technique for an old problem: The task of bringing order out of governmental chaos, of making that hardy perennial, the Federal "bureaucracy," responsive, efficient, and economical. It is not the first time this has been tried, nor will it be the last. Our history is littered with the corpses of other bodies politic which have perished in similar adventures.

POLITICALLY BALANCED GROUP

Created by the Eightieth Congress in 1947, this Commission, however, is at least in membership a new departure. It includes legislators (two Senators and two Representatives), public administrators from the executive branch itself and six private citizens who have had previous Government experience. Although such bodies, named royal commissions, have long been used to study specific major problems in England and Canada, this is their first appearance in the United States. The sponsor of the act in the House, CLARENCE BROWN, of Ohio, is a member of the Commission. Secretary of State Dean Acheson was a private citizen when made Vice Chairman of the Commission.

To quell partisan political suspicions, which flower easily enough in the governmental arena, its sponsors provided that six members be Republicans, six Democrats. Although its Chairman, is, of course, a Republican, President Truman has consistently and publicly encouraged the group's work. The heads of the Government agencies, particularly the President's own staff advisers such as the Budget Bureau, have gone far beyond mere lip service in their cooperation and have been really helpful in every instance. Both the Eightieth Congress and its successor have been generous with money and support.

Such an agreement on all sides indicates general awareness on the part of the people and their servants, the public officials, that there is a problem. There is.

What is its nature? What are the chances of improvement?

Until the Commission has reported its findings to the Congress its conclusions cannot be discussed. The nature of the problem can, however, be outlined, previous attempts to meet it can be indicated. Success or failure of the Commission will depend in part on the merits of its proposals but also in part on the inherent difficulties of any thoroughgoing governmental reorganization in a democracy.

HODGEPODGE OF 1,800 UNITS

However one approaches it, reorganization is not a new problem. It may be more difficult, more complex, even more pressing. But it has been with us for a long time. Since 1900 the steady growth, in size and in variety, of Federal functions, have made the Government almost impossible to direct and coordinate. Its machinery has gradually become more disorderly and complex. For governmental growth is never at a steady, or even pace. It takes place in fits and starts caused by conditions Government itself does not control. The impact of two world wars, of several severe depressions, of new and compelling desires by the people it serves, has skewered the structure out of shape. And each need, once accepted as real by the Congress, was handled as it arose. Congress viewed only its particular solution with little or no concern for its relevance to an over-all pattern. Worn as it is, the most apt description is that the Government has just grown like Topsy.

Today it is a "combined hodgepodge" of more than 1,800 different units. The budget for the fiscal year 1950 is $43,000,000,000—$7,000,000,000 more than our entire national income in 1939. More than a third of today's budget, almost a tenth of our entire national production, goes to the military establishment alone.

After each sudden growth in governmental functions an inevitable attempt has been made to make the structure more businesslike, more efficient and more economical. Almost all Presidents and Congresses have been increasingly concerned with reorganization. After each crisis of war or depression, proposals were made to rationalize the new agencies or bureaus into the over-all structure.

All serious recommendations were designed to repair three major flaws:

1. Activities had been placed in agencies which had no relation to the major purpose those agencies should perform.

2. Related agencies, which performed the same or similar functions, were put in different departments.

SIX OTHER ATTEMPTS MADE

3. The executive branch as a whole lacked definite direction and control.

Every major study of governmental reorganization has emphasized these defects. The one consistent thread which has run through all proposals to bring order out of this chaos is the constant reassertion of these three principals. Those of the Hoover Commission will be no exception.

It has been said that George Washington was the first President to try to reorganize the Government.

Certainly sporadic attempts were made in the nineteenth century to tamper with the Government structure. But it is only during the twentieth century, particularly since World War I, that the attention of public administrators, political scientists, and legislators has been scientifically fixed on this problem.

There have been six previous major efforts to reorganize the executive branch.

In 1912 President Taft presented to the Congress the report of his Commission on Economy and Efficiency, but no action was taken.

In 1923 President Harding sent his suggestions for improvement to a Joint Congressional Committee on Reorganization of the Executive Departments. Several of his most far-reaching changes were not accepted by the joint committee, which recommended its own plan instead. It, too, did not receive congressional approval.

The Institute of Government Research, a private organization interested in public administration, also in 1923 submitted a reorganization proposal, but Congress again took no action.

TWO SIMILARITIES

In 1932 President Hoover was granted broad powers to reorganize the executive branch by executive order with the provision that either house could nullify it by disapproval within 60 days of the transmittal of such order to the Congress. President Hoover submitted a wide-scale reorganization, but the House of Representatives disapproved his proposals.

The last major attempt to reorganize was the twofold effort in 1937. The Brookings Institution made a lengthy report to a select committee investigating the executive agencies, but no legislation resulted.

The report of the President's Committee on Administrative Management, a group of political scientists appointed by President Roosevelt, also made its report in 1937. Most of its recommendations did not become law.

If one reviews these past recommendations, he will be immediately struck by two things:

1. They have met with indifferent success at the hands of Congress.

2. All proposals center around several major problem areas. And although succeeding Congresses have refused to accept the suggested solutions, they are made time and time again. Once more the recommendations of the Hoover Commission will prove no exception to this general rule.

Why did Congress react so indifferently in the past to reorganization? The experienced members of the Congress are better informed and more concerned about our sprawling bureaucracy than any other group of American citizens. They struggle with its intricacies daily and they are sincerely appalled by their own inability to control it through legislation, investigation, and appropriation. They are intelligently disturbed, far more than the individual citizen.

NOT A JOB FOR CONGRESS

Past experience suggests there are several reasons.

For one thing, the Congress is unable to legislate every detail or to examine every one of the departments and agencies with sufficient precision to complete an over-all plan. Probably the hardest working body in the world, it is necessarily immersed in day-to-day problems which require immediate answers.

Also each Congressman is for many reasons more aware and more interested in the activities of one department or agency than in

the many others. Each agency has its friends, its sponsors on the hill.

Students of the Federal Government have therefore long been convinced that only the President can really reorganize the Government on an over-all basis. He can do this only if Congress wil give him the power. For that reason a new technique was created in 1939 especially for reorganization. First suggested by Secretary of Commerce Hoover, this power eventually was granted to President Roosevelt. It allows the President to draw up and submit to Congress a plan for reorganization. If both Houses of Congress do not disapprove the plan within 60 days it becomes law. Since this is clearly a legislative function the Congress was long loathe to give up such a power. But over the years it too had grown to realize that this was the only way. Led by such able students of government as Senator James Byrnes, later Justice of the Supreme Court and Secretary of State, and Representative Lindsay Warren, now Comptroller General, the Congress temporarily granted this power to President Roosevelt in 1939. This power was once renewed but again expired in 1948.

Last month the Hoover Commission formally requested both Houses to grant it once more to President Truman and hearings on such a bill are now being held in both Houses.

Inevitably certain Government agencies will ask that they be exempted from the provisions of the new reorganization bill. Some have been so exempted in the previous acts. Once exempted that is the end of it, as a practical matter. Then the only way to reorganize such agencies is by the regular legislative method. Since 1939 no agency which has acquired an exemption has been reorganized by congressional statute.

EXEMPTIONS WILL BE ASKED

The trouble with exemptions is that if several of the most important segments of the Government can take themselves out of the reorganization game it is most difficult to create the necessary coherent pattern for the entire executive branch. This has been the big stumbling block since 1939.

Everyone believes in reorganization—for the other fellow. Every public administrator can, and will, give countless examples of duplication in effort, unnecessary waste, and ridiculous expenditure. But it is always the agency down the street, not his own. And every official knows various agencies pulling at cross purposes with each other or the President—but they are always two other agencies.

This is a natural, indeed human, quality. Each administrator, of course, knows much more about the flaws and virtues of his particular work than any commission however expert. It is not very surprising that he finds faults in an over-all plan because it has not been able to master all the detailed knowledge at his fingertips. But he forgets that such a commission sees the over-all pattern, something he does not.

And every agency has its clientele—citizens who as general taxpayers are properly horrified by cost and inconsistent administration of the Government, but who also derive special service from one particular agency. They, too, favor reorganization—but not of their pet agency.

The consequences are always the same. The particular department and the influential group who support its activities for their own specific reasons want to be untouchable. They sincerely think they are a special situation, so they make their views known to the Congress. Multiply each agency and its own group by the total number of agencies and groups, some of them far stronger throughout the Nation than others, and the opposition to reorganization is clear.

PRESIDENT HAS OVER-ALL VIEW

The only person on the other side of the fence is the President. He has a national, an over-all point of view. He is held responsible for making this "combined hodgepodge" work. So he wants it to be an efficient, businesslike, nonwasteful organization.

Standing with him—theoretically, at least—are all of us, the great mass of taxpayers and citizens.

It is unfortunately notorious that taxpayers and citizens while they complain bitterly about cost and inefficiency in Government, do nothing more than that. They fail to make their views known to the Congress.

In general, these are the reasons that reorganization proposals of the past have met with the indifference they have. The same fate awaits the Hoover Commission unless the attitude of the general citizen has changed remarkably.

There is good reason why he should have changed. The growth, the size, and the cost of the executive branch over the past few decades is apparent to him.

Perhaps Presidential reorganization plans should be sent to the Congress only on March 15—income-tax day.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 47), which is as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration is hereby discharged from the further consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 15) relating to cloture.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the adoption of the resolution of the Senator from California, Senate Resolution 47.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I desire to address myself for a few brief moments to the resolution which is now before the Senate.

I am a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and I also have a resolution on the same subject which is before the Committee on Rules and Administration for consideration. That committee met on the twelfth of January, and during the course of its deliberations it was suggested that the committee should fix a date for hearings on these cloture resolutions. It was suggested that the committee should meet on the 14th, which was a Friday, and continue hearings to the 15th. We realized that we could not finish our hearings at that time. We well knew that the week of inauguration would intervene and we endeavored to get the committee to agree amicably that hearings would begin on the fourteenth of January. I was a good deal surprised to hear it said that a delay of 2 days might well be disastrous. We know that cannot be true. We cannot stretch our imaginations to such an extent as to think that a delay of 2 days would in any way destroy that resolution or its effect.

Committees do not usually sit on Saturdays, but the suggestion was made that the committee sit on Saturdays.

Several Senators asked the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] to waive a roll-call vote, but the Senator from California was adamant; he wanted to put the committee members on record as to whether they were in favor of beginning hearings on the 14th or on the 24th of January. In view of the record of the last Congress, it seems to me that was rather ludicrous. It was amazing. I felt that there was some reason, some purpose, for the suggestion other than merely having hearings 10 days later. So the question was put to a vote, and we had a party vote. The eight Democrats voted that the hearings should commence on the 24th of January. The five Republicans voted, in effect, to commence hearings on the 14th of January. We began hearings on the 24th, Mr. President, and we had hearings all that week. Then we had hearings on Monday and Tuesday of last week. Then the committee met on Wednesday. Some members of the committee wanted more time. There had been 7 or 8 days of hearings. Two of the committee were new Members of the Senate, and another was a new member of the committee. Although he had previously served in the Senate, and was somewhat familiar with the legislation in question, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], too, asked for further time to consider the resolution, or all the resolutions.

As has been said, I have offered a resolution providing that the Senate may impose cloture by a majority vote. My resolution is the first measure pending before the Committee on Rules and Administration, because I offered it as an amendment to the Hayden-Wherry resolution when it was brought up last Wednesday. But some of the Senators asked for another week. I said to the committee that I had been close to this subject for a long period of time, that I did not think I needed any further time to consider the resolution, that I had heard much of the evidence, was familiar with it. But we had to have a vote then, so I voted against continuing the matter until the coming Wednesday. But I certainly think when the chairman of a committee and some of our colleagues in the Senate ask that more time be granted by a standing committee of the Senate to consider legislation, that much courtesy is due them, and they should be given at least 3 more days, today, tomorrow, and Wednesday, in which to consider the testimony and the entire subject.

Mr. President, I see no reason for the pending resolution. I see no reason whatsoever for bringing the resolution before the Senate, and I am sure the author of the resolution and those on the other side of the aisle know that the committee is going to meet on Wednesday, and undoubtedly—I cannot predict, but I am quite convinced—the committee will come to a vote, and will vote on the pending resolutions. Although I can give such assurance to no one, personally I am convinced we will reach a vote. In view of that situation, I cannot quite understand the reasons or the motives for insisting that the committee be discharged.

One may say he has the greatest love and affection for the chairman of the committee, but I do not think the present move shows courtesy toward the chairman of the committee, and I think it is a discourtesy, too, to some other Senators who asked for a few days, and whose committee gave them the few days, which will expire on Wednesday.

Therefore, Mr. President, I sincerely trust that, in view of the record, the pending resolution will be voted down, and I hope we will not again be told, when we vote it down, that such action

will be disastrous, for certainly a delay for these few days will not change anyone's mind and will not mean life or death to this cloture resolution.

I am convinced the committee will reach a vote, and I am convinced, too, that the Senators on this side who asked for just a few days should certainly be granted that time. I do not know of an instance in the history of the Senate when a committee has been discharged after 7 days of hearings when it could not come to a vote immediately on the day following the close of the hearings. I do not think there is of the Senate precedent for such action.

I repeat, I am for the resolution offered by myself, I am for a resolution pending before the committee to cut off debate, and to make cloture applicable to all motions; I believe the rule should be changed, as I have always believed; but, nevertheless, I think that the pending resolution should be voted down, and that the Committee on Rules and Administration, a standing committee of the Senate, should itself be given an opportunity on next Wednesday to determine this question.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. MYERS. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Pennsylvania has referred to something that happened before the Committee on Rules and Administration with respect to the pending measure. I should like to know whether what I have heard is true or false, viz: that the proponent of the resolution to discharge the committee even requested in the beginning that no hearings whatsoever be held, that no Senator be permitted to testify before the committee, and that a vote be had immediately to report the resolution favorably.

Mr. MYERS. I hesitate to give a categorical reply to the question, but I do know that discussion was had in the committee, that hearings were held, lengthy hearings, complete hearings, and that there was no necessity for any further hearings. Then when it was said, "Senators should at least be permitted to testify," several times members of the committee desired to cut off their testimony and to give them only 2 or 3 days, and at the end of those 2 or 3 days cut off the hearings. That question arose several times, but fortunately it never came to a vote.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I to understand that no Senator who desired to testify was denied the privilege of testifying before the committee?

Mr. MYERS. That is very true; every Senator who indicated a desire to testify was given opportunity.

Mr. IVES and Mr. MORSE addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. MYERS. I think the Senator from New York first asked for recognition, and I yield to him.

Mr. IVES. I appreciate the views of the Senator from Pennsylvania, I appreciate fully the situation with which he has been confronted, and I appreciate his interest in the proposed action, which I know is sincere. However, I wish to ask the Senator whether he does not believe that the sooner this matter is handled the more likelihood there will be that it will be handled successfully from the standpoint of the proponents.

Mr. MYERS. Of course, I believe that the sooner proposed legislation before the Congress is handled the better it will be for Congress and the country.

Mr. IVES. I refer to the particular resolution we are discussing.

Mr. MYERS. I thoroughly agree with the Senator that the sooner we can get to the consideration of this question, the better.

Mr. IVES. May I ask the Senator another question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield further?

Mr. MYERS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. IVES. Does the Senator believe that as soon as a resolution is reported by the committee, whether it be the Senate Resolution 15 or his own resolution it should have a position of priority on the Senate Calendar for consideration on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. MYERS. I would rather the Senator would address that question to the majority leader, but it is my understanding that at the moment there is nothing on the calendar. Something may have come in during the last day or so, but there is little on the calendar that would precede the resolution, I believe.

Mr. IVES. I know the sincerity of the Senator from Pennsylvania in this matter, and I am wondering if he does not agree with me that the best and the quickest way to handle this question is to handle it first and get it out of the way.

Mr. MYERS. Of course, the more expeditious attention we give to the resolution, the better. But that is not the question before the Senate. The question is, Should a standing committee of the Senate be discharged from consideration of a resolution after 7 days of hearings because it refused to vote to report the resolution a day after the hearings closed? That is the question before the Senate.

Mr. IVES. That is the question before the Senate, but it does not happen to be the question I raised to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania. Does the Senator agree with me that a question of this kind, this particular question should be given any priority on the floor once a resolution is reported by the committee, or once it is before the Senate, whether it be by report of Senate Resolution 15, or of some other resolution?

Mr. MYERS. I believe the sooner we can get to this resolution, the better, if we expect to have it adopted during the present session of the Congress.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. MYERS. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania believe that the subject matter of this resolution is more or less complicated than the subject matter pending before the Labor and Public Welfare Committee on labor legislation?

Mr. MYERS. I will ask the Senator to repeat the question.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania believe that the subject matter of the resolution on cloture is more or less complicated than the subject matter of the labor legislation pending before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare?

Mr. MYERS. That will depend on the definition of the word "complicated."

Mr. MORSE. I will take the Senator's definition.

Mr. MYERS. I would say that it is less complicated, probably, than the labor question, although feelings are just as deep and men on both sides have just as sincere convictions on this question as on the labor question.

Mr. MORSE. Then, in view of the answer of the Senator from Pennsylvania to that question, does he share the view of the Senator from Oregon that more time should have been allowed by the Democrats on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for extensive hearings on labor legislation?

Mr. MYERS. No; I think just the opposite; that the Republicans have been insisting upon more and more time on labor legislation, but have been insisting that we cut off debate on this legislation. It probably all depends on how the shoe fits, I may say.

Mr. MORSE. We will discuss that for a moment by way of questions and answers. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania believe that February 10 is a proper date to fix for the closing of hearings on labor legislation?

Mr. MYERS. Well, I think that the committee itself is probably more competent than I to give an answer to that question. I am satisfied with the date, February 10, if that is a sufficient answer, although I am not a member of the committee, and therefore was not present when all the arguments were advanced for closing off hearings on February 10 and all the other arguments were advanced for extending hearings beyond that date.

Mr. MORSE. But the Senator from Pennsylvania is not satisfied that the length of time which has elapsed in the consideration of the cloture resolution by the Rules and Administration Committee has as yet been adequate.

Mr. MYERS. I did not say that. I said that so far as I was concerned I did not need that week's time. But I did say that three or four Senators asked for that additional time, and when the committee voted to postpone consideration of that resolution 1 week, I thought that the Senate and the members of the committee should extend that courtesy to the chairman and to those members of the committee who had asked for additional time since the committee itself by majority vote had so determined.

Mr. MORSE. Now with reference to the observation of the Senator from Pennsylvania as to what foot has what shoe on it, does the Senator from Pennsylvania think that the same courtesy should have been extended Senators who felt that a longer period of time in the Labor and Public Welfare Committee for the consideration of the very complicated subject of labor legislation, should have been granted beyond February 10?

Mr. MYERS. The committee determined not to grant such time. The Committee on Rules and Administration determined to grant that additional time. The Committee on Rules and Administration having so determined, having so acted by majority vote, then I would think the Senate should sustain the Committee on Rules and Administration. On the labor question, the committee itself, by a majority vote, determined not to grant such additional time.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not true then that what the Senator's argument reduces itself to is that the Senate ought to approve whatever action the Democratic majority takes on any committee on which they have a majority?

Mr. MYERS. Oh, I would not hope that all votes would be along party lines. I would think that we would be able many times to cross the party lines. I do think there is too much of politics in this particular resolution before us today. Since the Senator from Oregon has brought up the question, I will say that I think there is too much politics in that resolution.

Mr. MORSE. I want to say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that I certainly share his hopes. I would like to join with him in eliminating partisan politics, and I most respectfully suggest to him that if the Democrats really want to eliminate party politics on the labor issue they will proceed to lift the February 10 ban, because the legislation cannot possibly be considered on its merits in that period of time.

Mr. PEPPER and Mr. STENNIS addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. MYERS. I yield to the Senator from Florida, because I believe he has an observation to make somewhat in line with what the Senator from Oregon has been saying.

Mr. PEPPER. Obviously, Mr. President, there are some of us who are on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare who think the Senator from Oregon might more properly discuss the subject with his colleagues, with whom he has heretofore discussed it, than with the Senate as a whole, the Members of which are not so well acquainted with the details of what has happened as are the members of the committee.

I think it might be observed for the benefit of the Senator from Oregon that, if I understand the situation correctly, in the Committee on Rules and Administration all the Senators who desired to be heard were heard. I do not believe the public was heard at all. Senators were heard for 8 days. I understand that the print of the hearings before the Committee on Rules and Administration has not yet become available to Senators. However, the matter is being now considered by the committee, following the conclusion of the hearings, if I understand the situation correctly. I do not know that any limitation has been imposed by the committee on when they shall have to come to a final decision about reporting the resolution or not reporting it, although I am informed that the committee is going to act upon the matter when they next meet.

I suppose they will give consideration to it, and it is my assumption that whenever the committee feel that they are prepared to do so, they will report the resolution. Certainly my own vote, in voting against the resolution of the Senator from California does not indicate that I am not in sympathy with the two-thirds cloture rule applicable to any pending question in the Senate, but it means that I do not believe it is quite appropriate to demand the discharge of a committee which has had 8 days of hearings, which hearings have not yet been printed, and when the committee has only had a few days to deliberate upon the results of the hearings. I mention that because I want to contrast it with the situation in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which the Senator from Oregon spoke. That committee, by a vote of 8 to 5, resolved to limit the public hearings, but specifically indicated that any Senator, of course, at any time could be heard before the committee, and made no limitation at all upon the period when the committee itself could deliberate upon and debate the matter in committee.

So I want the situation very clearly understood. It will be only fair to the committee if it be clearly understood that although the Labor and Public Welfare Committee fixed a limitation upon the time in which the public could be heard, until February 10, there has been no suggestion of a limitation as to the length of time the committee itself should take to debate upon or deliberate upon the subject of the hearings on the whole matter before the committee. As I understand, in this instance there remains the mere matter of the committee itself deliberating upon the subject to determine what action it will choose to take. I thought it was only fair to distinguish the cases.

Mr. MYERS. I thank the Senator from Florida for his statement.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is on his feet, and I yield to him.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, at the time the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania was making his observation the idea came to my mind that possibly the matter could be settled by postponing the question to a date after the committee might have an opportunity to pass upon the matter next Wednesday. I happen to be a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration. I have worked faithfully with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] to try to have resolutions and other matters before the committee disposed of speedily. If the motion to discharge the committee should prevail not much can be done before next Thursday. If the motion to discharge the committee should fail not much can be done until Thursday.

Mr. President, I submit to the Members of the Senate a mechanical solution to the problem, which is that we postpone further consideration of the resolution until next Thursday at 2 o'clock p. m. That will give the Committee on Rules and Administration, of which I am a member, an opportunity to do what I have been led to believe the chairman thinks might be done, and that is that the resolution be reported favorably. If that meets with the favor of the Members of the Senate, I suggest that it would be a satisfactory solution. I propound the question to the majority leader whether he does not believe that it would be a satisfactory solution of the problem to give the Committee on Rules and Administration a chance to report the resolution favorably on Wednesday. If it does not report it on Wednesday, the junior Senator from California, who is very anxious to have the resolution brought before the Senate, would lose but very little time. I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania if he will yield to me further so I may again submit the question to the majority leader.

Mr. MYERS. I think it might be better if I were to yield the floor, and the Senator from Nebraska could then discuss the matter with the majority leader.

Mr. WHERRY. I propound that question to the majority leader.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question before the Senate is the adoption of Senate Resolution 47. That motion is open to debate.

Mr. STENNIS rose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi wish to be recognized?

Mr. STENNIS. I do.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield long enough so that the majority leader may answer my question? Will the Senator defer his remarks until the majority leader has had an opportunity to answer?

Mr. STENNIS. I do not care to debate the question, but I want to make a statement in regard to the facts, and will take but a few minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Mississippi declines to yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I think the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration has been too modest in his statement of the actual facts as they occurred during the conduct of the hearings. Hearings were set for January 24. I do not think there was as much as 1 minute's delay in the start of the hearings each day. There was a good attendance of committee members. Senators who came there and testified apparently laid aside all other business and gave preference to this subject matter. Senators waited until their turn came to testify. I know that the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] had to return on the second day in order to have an opportunity to be heard. The chairman was always present, and the hearings were continually in progress.

Two days were taken by the proponents, and 4 days were taken by those who were opposed to one resolution or the other. I do not believe that anyone testified for longer than 30 minutes, except the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the time which he took was well taken. I believe also that the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] took a little more than an hour. There

was not much cross-examination. It was very brief and limited. The junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] had to condense his testimony to a great extent. He was pressed for time, and he waived the opportunity of extending his remarks further.

I believe that the record will show that all the testimony given on every day by all the witnesses was strictly on the merits, and to the point. I feel that the entire record will indicate that the chairman has been far too modest in his representations about the way the hearings were conducted. I know that other Senators wished to be heard, but could not find time within the limit of 6 days during which the hearings were conducted; and therefore waived their opportunity to be heard. There was no disposition on their part or on the part of any member of the committee to ask that the hearings be extended in order to give those Senators an opportunity to be heard, because they had not been able to obtain a hearing within the limited time.

In answer to the charge of unwarranted delay, let me say that I was greatly impressed with the very fine evidence which was brought out on both sides of this controversy. I was further greatly interested by the way in which the four new members of the committee were impressed. Members of the press who attended the hearings were impressed by what was said there.

Mr. President, I believe that there will be much food for thought in this record when it is finally printed. I know that particularly the four new members of the committee had their minds aroused. Points were brought to their attention that they had not previously considered. They have been wrestling with the question of what action they should take on this matter. I believe that their request for a little more time to weigh the evidence and think it over comes from their hearts.

It has been stated that we lost 10 days at the beginning. I believe that the great brevity and dispatch with which the chairman conducted the hearings under the circumstances I have outlined far more than outweigh the loss of the 10 days because of the inauguration ceremonies. The chairman of the committee and the ranking Republican member of the committee were both on the inaugural committee and were charged with official and specific duties in connection with that occasion.

I do not care to argue this question; but with due deference to everyone, it seems to me that instead of debating about discharging the committee, we ought to be considering a resolution of commendation praising the chairman for the fine example which he has set before the Senate in disposing of the business of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it is with some reluctance at this late hour that I rise to address the Senate on the motion of the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] to discharge the Committee on Rules and Administration from the further consideration of Senate Resolution No. 15, relating to an amendment to the cloture rule. However, in view of the debate which has taken place today, I believe that as majority leader I must say a few words.

Since the distinguished Senator from California has become a Member of this body, I have formed a very warm affection for him. I do not underestimate his ability. He is very gracious, and very personable. However, I confess that I have been a little disturbed and somewhat disappointed because of the procedure he has chosen to follow, which to my way of thinking is most unusual. It is very unusual to attempt to discharge a standing committee from the orderly transaction of its business.

Mr. President, committees of Congress have been with us as long as the Republic has been in existence. Standing committees are at the base of parliamentary rule. Unless the prerogatives and power of standing committes are protected, there can be no orderly business in the Senate of the United States or any other parliamentary body. The integrity of the orderly transaction of business is deeply involved in this motion to discharge the committee. A committee should not be discharged from its duties unless there is gross and palpable neglect on the part of the committee in delaying a report on important legislation which it is considering, or unless the committee, through arbitrary action or through some whim or caprice, or for some other unjustifiable reason, refuses to report a measure. The precedents show that it is only then that the motion to discharge a committee from further consideration of a measure has been used.

What are the facts in this case? We have heard the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, as well as other Members of the Senate who are members of that committee, disclose to the Senate exactly what happened by way of testimony before the committee. The sole question for the Senate to determine, if we want to be fair and honest about our decision, is whether or not the committee is guilty of lack of diligence in the consideration of the evidence adduced before the committee, and whether or not the committee has failed to report the resolution as soon as it should have done so. That is really all there is to this controversy before the Senate. If we want to decide it as fair and impartial jurors should decide the issue, that is the only question before us.

The evidence demonstrates beyond the shadow of a doubt that the chairman of the committee and the members of the committee have been extremely diligent in hearing the testimony and in scheduling hearings upon this measure. So far as I am concerned, I wish to have the RECORD show that I commend the chairman of the committee and the committee as a whole on the diligence they have exhibited in the consideration of this measure.

Mr. President, the present overzealousness on the part of my good Republican friends on the opposite side of the aisle is in sharp contrast to the inactivity and the lethargy they exhibited 2 years ago. Now those on the other side of the aisle want someone to specify the exact hour and minute when we shall begin debate on this matter. Yet the same Senator from New York, who a few moments ago was propounding questions to the Senator from Pennsylvania, was then and is now a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration. He was a member of that committee 2 years ago. With all the enthusiasm for action bubbling from every pore of the Senator from New York and the Senator from California, yet for weeks and months—yes, for almost 2 years—those Senators who now crave action sat silently by during that period of time and never once made a motion to take the then pending resolution from the calendar and have it debated.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. In just one moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois declines to yield for the present.

Mr. LUCAS. But now Mr. President, they complain—even the Senator from New York complains to the Senator from Pennsylvania—because the committee has not acted more promptly. Mr. President, I wonder what the Senator from New York would have done upon this issue, had his friend Mr. Dewey been elected President of the United States. Immediately before the inauguration, no doubt, the Senator from New York would have been conferring with Mr. Dewey insisting that the proposal to amend the cloture rule be taken up immediately upon the convening of the Senate, just as he is doing now.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I can imagine the Senator's following that enthusiastic course of action, and I know other Senators can imagine the same thing. The Senator from California no doubt would have again, again, and again insisted that Governor Warren, had he been elected Vice President, should call upon the Senate to take up his resolution and eliminate all the other business of the Senate from consideration. The Senator would have said, "Oh, let's postpone action on housing legislation, rent-control legislation, export-control legislation, labor legislation and everything else, but for God's sake get this resolution to the floor of the Senate, so we can debate it." I can imagine how the able Senator from California would have done that very thing if Mr. Warren were now in the chair of the President of the Senate.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. In a moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois declines to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I know what is behind this matter. No one can make me believe that Republican politics is not involved in this insistence and this enthusiasm for the setting of an exact date and time for the consideration of this matter. Republican Senators can use this point in the 1950 campaign if they choose to do so. Mr. President; they can do all they want to do on the question of civil rights; but whatever those on the other side of the aisle

do, they will never take from President Harry Truman, in the White House, the credit for what he has done about civil rights, and what he believes, and he is the Chief Executive for another 4 years. As a result of the Republican lethargy and inactivity for the past 2 years, the people know that what the Republican Senators are doing here in insisting that we name the hour and minute, the exact time, when the committee will report and the Senate will take up the subject is political poppycock.

Let me say to the Senator from New York and the Senator from California that the Senators on their side of the aisle are not going to arrange the timetable of the Senators on the Democratic side, so long as we are in control. We shall take up the subject when we get ready to do so. We shall take it up in due course. Do not misunderstand me on this issue; everyone knows where I stand. Everyone knows how the people of my State stand upon the issue of civil rights and all other problems. The Democratic majority will handle this situation in the way we believe to be proper, and we do not propose to be pushed around for political reasons. Those who are truly interested in this great question understand fully our intention and our position—and yours. The Senator from California can file another resolution tomorrow if he wishes to do so, and can do the discourteous thing to the Senate of the United States and the comity which exists between committees, and we shall again debate that on the floor of the Senate.

I think the pending resolution is utterly unfair and unwise. During all the time the cloture resolution of 2 years ago remained on the calendar throughout the life of a Republican-controlled Congress I did not see a single move or motion from the Republican side of the aisle to do anything about it.

Now, Senators on the other side say two wrongs do not make a right; they advise us they have learned a great lesson as a result of the past 2 years—a great political lesson, Mr. President. But what they are doing now will not result in what they hope for in the 1950 campaign, which they loudly proclaim to the country they have already started. We shall meet not only this but all other issues in proper manner here, Mr. President, and we shall meet them with another Democratic victory again at the polls.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief reply to the Senator from Illinois.

I wish to say that in my judgment the record of the Senate of the United States for some years past on the whole question of civil rights and cloture is a record where the Democratic Party has made very fine speeches about civil rights, but has made no record of really trying to pass some civil-rights legislation. My reply to the Senator from Illinois is briefly this: It is perfectly obvious what his floor generalship on this matter really seeks to accomplish. In my judgment, the Senator from Illinois is trying to keep in the background for a good many days and, I think, weeks, civil-rights legislation, on which the President of the United States has made so many fine speeches.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I will not yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon declines to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to extend to the Senator from Illinois the same courtesy in that regard that he extended to Members on this side of the aisle.

I wish to say that the Democrats in the Senate of the United States have not made a record of delivering on their promises in the field of civil rights. I wish to say that if the Democrats in the Senate of the United States want to make a record, then let them come forward now with civil-rights legislation. My opinion is that they dare not do so because that would split that side of the aisle wide open, and they know it.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I decline to yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon declines to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say that so far as the junior Senator from Oregon is concerned, ever since I have been in the Senate, time and time again I have pleaded for action on both sides of the aisle; and last summer when the Republicans at their convention adopted the resolution pledging to the American people that they would proceed immediately in this field, that was our answer to the Senator from Illinois. Had we had control of the Senate of the United States in January 1949, our position would have been to press for the enactment of civil-rights legislation.

I say from this desk this afternoon to minority groups in America: You have heard another fine speech from a Democrat in the Senate of the United States in terms of promises, but in my judgment you are going to have to make very clear to the Democratic Party that you are tired of their speeches, and that you want some action on civil-rights legislation taken in the Eighty-first Congress; and the best time to take action to break the filibuster is at the beginning of the session, because, as the Senator from California has pointed out, it is almost physically impossible to break a filibuster at the end of a session.

I say to the majority leader that if he really wants to make good on his assertions about where he stands on civil-rights legislation, let him take such action that he can as majority leader in getting some civil-rights legislation before the Senate now, and see what happens.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I will not yield.

The Democrats in the Senate of the United States, with such legislation before the Senate, would very soon put on a spectacle, I predict, a spectacle that would show there is no unity on the part of the Democrats in this country to put through the President's recommendations on civil rights.

Mr. LUCAS and Mr. MYERS addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I merely rise for a moment to answer my good friend from Oregon on some of the implications he has made with respect to my leadership, with which I wholly disagree. My people in my section of the country know me, and they know my record. They will know where I stand when the roll is called, or when debates are in progress, and they will not call on the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to find out where I stand from day to day.

When the Senator from Oregon speaks about unity, I should think he would feel a little guilty in attempting to lecture the Democratic Party on that issue. If I read the newspapers correctly the Young Turks of whom he is one, have been trying to tell the Old Guard of the Republican Party what they should or should not do. Consequently it ill behooves the Senator from Oregon, as a result of the split that has existed on the other side of the aisle ever since I have been in the Senate, to try to lecture us or give us a lesson as to what we should do with respect to unity or disunity.

I heard a good many unity speeches in the last campaign. The Democrats did not have unity in that campaign. We had a lot of folks against us in the South and we had a lot of folks against us in the North. The Republicans had unity, but the Democrats with all of the disunity, won the election. I would rather have honest disunity than the phony unity I saw in the Republican campaign, and what I am seeing in this Chamber when I listen to some of the good speeches being made.

I wonder, Mr. President, since we are talking about unity, just what some of the Senators on the other side of the aisle will do on next Tuesday night when Mr. Dewey comes down to address the folks in Washington on Lincoln's birthday. I hope he continues to speak on unity, but not the kind of unity we recently saw at Omaha, Nebr., during the wonderful peace conference the Republicans held there, from which my friend, the minority leader, Mr. WHERRY, has just returned. Was that unity? [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. There was much snow in Nebraska, but I got out from under it, and now I want to say that the meeting about which the Senator is talking manifested that honest disunity which exists in the Democratic Party. We had our family differences, but we had one of the finest meetings I have ever attended. In fact, a little disunity once in a while proves that a party is alive and ready for business. We are ready to go to work. For the life of me, I cannot see that all this argument has a thing to do with the vital legisla-

tion we are here to consider. Why talk about campaigns that have been won and lost? Why talk about unity and disunity? We should be talking here today about civil rights.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am not yielding for a speech.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois does not yield further.

Mr. WHERRY. We have been violating the rules all afternoon, Mr. President. The Chair indicated he would be rather lenient with Senators during the remainder of the afternoon.

Mr. LUCAS. The Chair has been lenient.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is within the province of the Senator to decide how long he will yield, without a violation of the rule.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for 2 minutes more, in order that I may finish?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not want the Senator to make a speech.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield, or does he not?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I want the Senator from Illinois to show the unity he has been talking about. The Senator will agree with me, the only sensible thing to do in considering the question is to forget politics. Let us continue this matter until 2 o'clock Thursday, to give the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration a chance to call his committee together. Let the committee take action. Let them report the resolution favorably, and there will be no need of further speeches on unity or disunity in the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator for his suggestion. I am not ready to agree to it.

Mr. WHERRY. It is merely a proposition.

Mr. LUCAS. I cannot agree to it. When the Senator talks about extraneous, immaterial matters that we are discussing, I agree with him. But I listened to the Senator this afternoon on his appeal from the decision of the Chair. That was strictly a legal proposition. The Senator took 2 hours to debate the power of the Small Business Committee instead of debating the ruling of the Chair. So the Senator is not in a very good position to tell me I should stick to my text. The Senator departed from his text considerably in the early part of the afternoon.

Mr. President, I merely want to conclude by saying that so long as I am a Member of the Senate, regardless of whether I am in the majority or in the minority, I shall never vote to take a matter from a standing committee unless there is a justifiable reason. Under the Legislative Reorganization Act, we have 15 committees with vast, unusual powers in connection with the handling of legislation. Once resolutions to discharge committees are freely permitted, the orderly transaction of business in the Senate will have been absolutely broken. If continued, it would ultimately destroy parliamentary law. Every Senator knows that.

There is no particular haste, Mr. President, unless we decide to play into the hands of Republican politics. The committee intends to meet on Wednesday and I am certain the Members will act with expedition and dispatch.

Your hustle and bustle, your stir and fuss amazes Republicans, as well as us.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the adoption of the resolution, on which the yeas and nays have already been ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Holland	Myers
Anderson	Humphrey	Neely
Baldwin	Hunt	O'Conor
Brewster	Ives	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Bridges	Johnson, Tex.	Reed
Broughton	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Byrd	Kefauver	Russell
Cain	Kem	Saltonstall
Capehart	Kerr	Schoeppel
Chapman	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Chavez	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Connally	Langer	Sparkman
Cordon	Lodge	Stennis
Donnell	Long	Taft
Douglas	Lucas	Taylor
Eastland	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Ecton	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	McGrath	Thye
Ferguson	McKellar	Tobey
Flanders	McMahon	Tydings
Frear	Magnuson	Vandenberg
George	Malone	Watkins
Gillette	Martin	Wherry
Gurney	Maybank	Wiley
Hayden	Miller	Williams
Hendrickson	Morse	Withers
Hickenlooper	Mundt	Young
Hill	Murray	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to Senate Resolution 47, offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], to discharge the Committee on Rules and Administration from further consideration of the cloture resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a vote "yea" means to discharge the committee, and a vote "nay" means the contrary, does it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

On this vote the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas would vote "nay" and the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay" and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] would vote "yea" and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] is detained on official business and is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] would vote "yea" and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 56, as follows:

YEAS—31

Aiken	Hendrickson	Smith, N. J.
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Taft
Brewster	Ives	Thye
Bricker	Knowland	Tobey
Bridges	Lodge	Vandenberg
Cain	Malone	Wherry
Capehart	Martin	Wiley
Cordon	Morse	Williams
Ferguson	Saltonstall	Young
Flanders	Schoeppel	
Gurney	Smith, Maine	

NAYS—56

Anderson	Hunt	Mundt
Broughton	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	Myers
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Chavez	Kefauver	O'Conor
Connally	Kem	O'Mahoney
Donnell	Kerr	Pepper
Douglas	Kilgore	Reed
Eastland	Langer	Robertson
Ecton	Long	Russell
Ellender	Lucas	Sparkman
Frear	McClellan	Stennis
George	McFarland	Taylor
Gillette	McGrath	Thomas, Okla.
Hayden	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Hill	McMahon	Tydings
Hoey	Magnuson	Watkins
Holland	Maybank	Withers
Humphrey	Miller	

NOT VOTING—9

Butler	Green	McCarthy
Downey	Jenner	Millikin
Fulbright	McCarran	Wagner

So Mr. KNOWLAND's resolution was rejected.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, before the Members of the Senate start to leave the Chamber, I wish to announce that there will be a session of the Senate tomorrow, at which time we will take up the export control bill, and will also perhaps call the calendar for the first time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill to which the Senator has referred, which was made the special order for today, was displaced to take up the resolution just voted on.

REGULATION OF EXPORTS

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 548, to provide for continuation of

authority for the regulation of exports, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Reserving the right to object, is the Senator going to explain what the bill provides?

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator want to have it taken up tonight?

Mr. MAYBANK. No; I merely wish to have it made the unfinished business.

Mr. WHERRY. With that in view, I should like to ask the majority leader whether there will be an adjournment this evening and a morning hour and morning business tomorrow, or will the Senate take a recess today?

Mr. LUCAS. I had planned to move to adjourn.

Mr. WHERRY. If there is an adjournment tonight there will be a morning hour tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 548) to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with amendments.

THE RACE QUESTION IN THE SOUTH

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, at a time when a contemplated change in Senate rules to limit debate is before the Senate Rules Committee for consideration, I think it appropriate to read into the RECORD a United Press dispatch, date lined East St. Louis, Ill., February 1.

The headlines read as follows:

WHITE PUPILS WALK OUT IN RACE PROTEST

I quote the story:

The Rock Junior High School here was closed today when about 400 white pupils walked out of classes when they learned Negro children were in the building attempting to enroll.

Small groups of students at East St. Louis High School also walked out of classes when six Negroes renewed attempts to enroll there. Classes, however, were not interrupted.

Ten Negro children, accompanied by adults, walked into the Rock school before classes began and were seated in a vacant classroom. The pupils, accompanied by scores of parents, immediately walked out and many of them, carrying signs urging the Negroes out, paraded around the school.

Two squads of police were on hand to keep order. The Negroes remained in the classroom.

The attempt to enroll the Negroes at three East St. Louis public schools, now restricted to whites, began yesterday when groups of them tried to register but were turned down. Miss Bernice Goedde, president of the board of education, said the policy of segregation would continue.

William Jones, Negro attorney, said Illinois law makes no provision for segregation in public schools and he would seek a writ of mandamus in circuit court to force enrollment of the Negroes.

Mr. President, my purpose in calling this report of an unfortunate incident in Illinois to the attention of the Senate is not to reflect adversely on the great State of Illinois.

I desire by calling attention to this case to point out specifically that so-called racial discrimination is not restricted to one region of this country, namely, the South. Quite frequently I see in the press of the Nation reports of this and other occurrences, many of them brutal and horrible. Never, however, do I observe the press of this country giving the same prominence of display to a story of racial strife that originates in New York, Michigan, California, the District of Columbia, Illinois, or some other area outside the South, as it does to the reports of infrequent instances below the Mason and Dixon's line.

I take this opportunity to again urge the Senate to deliberate a long time before it forces through a rule change which would permit drastic limitation of debate and thus pave the way for legislation which is designed to accomplish by coercion that which can only be rightly accomplished by education, patience, and persuasion.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works:

Harry Alfred Curtis, of Missouri, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the remainder of the term expiring 9 years after May 18, 1949.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations of the Executive Calendar.

POSTMASTER GENERAL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jesse M. Donaldson to be Postmaster General.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dean Rusk to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William McChesney Martin, Jr., to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank A. Southard, Jr., to be United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

MUNITIONS BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Donald F. Carpenter to be Chairman of the Munitions Board.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Karl T. Compton to be Chairman of the Research and Development Board.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John B. Dunlap to be collector of internal revenue for the second district of Texas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dewey G. Rushford to be ensign.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Gordon D. Scott to be ensign.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COAST GUARD

The legislative clerk read sundry nominations in the Coast Guard.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the Coast Guard are confirmed en bloc.

Without objection, the President will be notified at once of all confirmations of today. That completes the executive calendar.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 8, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 7, 1949:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Henry F. Grady, of California, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Greece, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Chief of the American Mission for Aid to Greece, to

which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

Waldemar J. Gallman, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Poland, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

Loy W. Henderson, of Colorado, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to India and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Nepal, to which offices he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

Joseph E. Jacobs, of South Carolina, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Czechoslovakia, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

George Wadsworth, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of of America to Turkey and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Chief of the American Mission for Aid to Turkey, to which offices he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

Edward S. Crocker 2d, of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iraq, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

Myron Melvin Cowen, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Australia, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

Stanton Griffis, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Egypt, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

Richard C. Patterson, Jr., of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Guatemala, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

Robert M. Scotten, of Michigan, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to New Zealand, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

Laurence A. Steinhardt, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Canada, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

Edward R. Dudley, of New York, to be envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Liberia, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

James Grover McDonald, of New York, to be special representative of the United States of America to the Provisional Government of Israel, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

UNITED NATIONS

Gerald A. Drew, of California, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Special Balkan Committee established by the General Assembly of the United Nations October 21, 1947.

Edward F. Bartelt, of Illinois, to be the United States member of the Fiscal Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 3 years, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

H. Merle Cochran, of Arizona, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Good Offices Committee of the Security Council of the United Nations on Indonesia, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

W. Averell Harriman, of New York, the United States special representative in Europe, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as the representative of the United States of America on the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

John J. Macdonald, of Missouri, a Foreign Service officer of class 3, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Truce Commission for Palestine which was established by resolution of the Security Council of the United Nations April 23, 1948, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

Dr. H. van Zile Hyde, of New York, to be the representative of the United States of America on the executive board of the World Health Organization, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION

The following-named persons to be members of the Public Advisory Board, established under title I, of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, to which offices they were appointed during the recess of the Senate:

Sarah Blanding, of New York.
James Barron Carey, of the District of Columbia.
Jonathan W. Daniels, of North Carolina.
Albert S. Goss, of Washington.
Robert Henry Hinckley, of Utah.
Eric A. Johnston, of Washington.
Allan Blair Kline, of Iowa.
Herbert H. Lehman, of New York.
Arlon Everett Lyon, of Illinois.
George Houk Mead, of Ohio.
George Meany, of New York.
James George Patton, of Colorado.

DISPLACED PERSONS COMMISSION

The following-named persons to be members of the Displaced Persons Commission for terms ending June 30, 1951, to which offices they were appointed during the recess of the Senate:

Ugo Carusi, of Vermont
Edward M. O'Connor, of New York.
Harry N. Rosenfield, of New York.

NATIONAL SECURITY RESOURCES BOARD

Mon C. Wallgren, of Washington, to be Chairman of the National Security Resources Board.

UNITED STATES ASSAY OFFICE

Charles L. Singer, of New York, N. Y., to be Superintendent of the United States Assay Office at New York, N. Y., to fill an existing vacancy.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

James S. Lamb, of North Dakota, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of North Dakota, in place of Hector H. Perry, retired.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Harris Walthall, of El Paso, Tex., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 24, with headquarters at El Paso, Tex. (Reappointment.)

APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Brig. Gen. Hubert Don Hoover, 07924, United States Army, retired, for appointment as major general in the Army of the United States under the provisions of title V, Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade and corps specified, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Army under the provisions of Public Law 56, Eightieth Congress, Public Law 366, Eightieth Congress; and Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress:

To be lieutenant colonels

Robert M. Coats, MC, O510996.
Lyman C. Duryea, MC, O283287.
Franklin H. Grauer, MC, O261176.
Harry C. McClain, MC, O383769.
John G. McKissick, MC, O374605.
Cecil G. Stillinger, MC, O387001.

To be majors

Donald M. Alderson, MC, O323693.
Robert D. Anderson, MC, O419558.
George C. Bess, MC, O328552.
John F. Breslin, MC, O364490.
Harold E. Dilley, DC, O303417.
Fred C. Dye, MC, O314380.
Juan Gonzalez-Rodriguez, MC, O215224.
I. Louis Hoffman, MC, O295088.
Charles E. Hollingsworth, MC, O350130.
Parker B. Hollingsworth, MC, O317630.
Thomas W. Howell, MC, O374247.
Albert E. Montgomery, MC, O383474.
Arthur C. Nesseman, MC, O308606.
James B. Nell, DC, O400175.
Robert B. Newell, MC, O344343.
Ross Owens, MC, O363873.
Stephen W. Ranson, MC, O400856.
Mathias F. Regner, MC, O360660.
James T. Rogers, MC, O325024.
Vance M. Rothrock, MC, O436556.
Horace W. Shreck, MC, O323055.
Allen D. Smith, MC, O356613.
Arthur Steer, MC, O294814.
Robert C. Stokes, MC, O291507.
William J. Wilson, MC, O323058.

To be captains

Charles P. Alexander, MC, O381897.
Joseph H. Allen, MC, O547135.
Thorwald R. Anderson, MC, O1765038.
Kenneth L. Artiss, MC, O336873.
Curtis P. Artz, MC, O459035.
Dean B. Becker, Jr., MC, O470622.
Patrick X. Bienvenu, DC, O482287.
Ernest M. Bralley, Jr., MC, O1774759.
James N. Brien, Jr., MC, O1735080.
Robert E. Broaddus, MC, O470773.
Kenneth W. Brown, MC, O496503.
Ralph E. Brown, Jr., MC, O367870.
Franklin Brundage, MC, O460297.
Samuel J. Camarata, MC, O389004.
Ralph P. Campanale, MC, O1716217.
Leonard H. Campbell, MC, O1775441.
Roy E. Campbell, MC, O468727.
Layne E. Carson, MC, O470589.
James R. Compton, MC, O409022.
Bernard I. Copple, MC, O391445.
James M. Davis, MC, O541570.
Linus M. Edwards, Jr., DC, O353459.
John P. Fairchild, MC, O308344.
Herbert G. Giddens, MC, O472355.
Thomas K. Goodman, DC, O364558.
Edwin S. Grantham, MC, O474346.
Ruben P. Groom, DC, O1735428.
Alfred Hamilton, MC, O1774777.
Harold F. Hamit, MC, O479081.
Richard A. Hayden, MC, O460743.
Thomas H. Hewlett, MC, O386246.
John G. Higgins, MC, O524808.
Walter E. Horn, MC, O542157.
Robert F. Horseman, MC, O476126.
Carl W. Hughes, MC, O471013.
Wendell T. Jackson, DC, O1765247.
John R. Jameson, DC, O1726009.
Russell R. Jauernig, MC, O443237.
Whedon Johnson, MC, O474893.
Edmund R. Kleiman, MC, O470074.
Paul J. Kowallek, Jr., MC, O1745849.
Marvin M. Kuhn, DC, O479803.
Leo J. Leonard, DC, O479178.
Lloyd Lister, DC, O1685995.
Vincent Marchese, MC, O480762.
Howard W. McCall, DC, O1735409.
Ashton A. Moody, DC, O368427.
Donald S. Myers, MC, O547270.
Alfred S. Nelson, MC, O542293.

Arthur G. Nugent, MC, O503604.
Walter G. Olin, Jr., MC, O1775107.
Harold G. Page, MC, O1704831.
Howard K. Pedigo, MC, O470708.
Edgar T. Pfeil, Jr., MC, O1724821.
Thomas F. Puckett, Jr., MC, O1785726.
William L. Reed, MC, O1726983.
Wallace K. Reese, Jr., DC, O401456.
Robert P. Reynolds, DC, O397874.
Van R. Richmond, MC, O368203.
John G. Ritzenthaler, MC, O473257.
George W. Rock, DC, O1689532.
Daniel H. Rowe, MC, O463701.
John F. Schlechter, MC, O1689722.
Francis W. Shaffer, DC, O1755456
George W. Smith, MC, O1767145.
Robert C. G. Stanley, MC, O382859.
Donald W. S. Stiff, MC, O1704985.
Thomas W. Taylor, DC, O1702453.
Joseph W. Thomas, MC, O431639.
Roy B. Turner, MC, O1727264.
Jay F. Tuttle, MC, O371685.
Kryder E. Van Buskirk, MC, O381911.
Walter B. Watson, MC, O480162.
Hamilton B. Webb, MC, O498101.
George S. White, MC, O378378.
William M. White, MC, O481641.
William E. Wilson, MC, O339921.
Louis E. Wolford, MC, O472120.

To be first lieutenants

William A. Abele, MC.
Arthur W. Adams, MC.
Ernest F. Adams, MC, O945336.
David W. Aiken, MC, O935217.
Joseph Allison, MC.
James D. Amos, MC, O1786614.
Carl H. Anderson, DC, O1767560.
Saul B. Appel, MC.
Sherman L. Armstrong, ChC, O932956.
Harry D. Arnold, Jr., MC.
Clifton W. Arrington, MC.
Frank H. Austin, MC, O1767227.
Theodore Bacharach, MC, O1718966.
Robert E. Baird, MC.
Robert H. Baker, MC.
Stewart L. Baker, Jr., MC, O1725275.
Davis A. Baltz, MC.
Harry Banoff, MC.
George R. Barnes, Jr., MC.
John C. Bates, MC, O1764751.
James C. Bell, MC.
James S. Berger, MC, O1718453.
John H. Bickerton, Jr., MC, O1786813.
Robert H. Bickford, MC.
Frederick C. Biehusen, MC.
Edward O. Bierman, MC.
Raymond W. Blohm, Jr., MC, O945334.
Alan I. Blumberg, MC.
John G. Boutselis, MC.
Dale C. Bowers, DC, O1746759.
William R. Breg, MC.
Edward S. Brezina, MC, O945339.
Arnold J. Brody, MC.
Walter Z. Brown, DC, O945468.
Paul J. Bruel, DC, O938187.
Robert D. Buchanan, DC, O1706054.
Charles E. Buck, MC.
John W. Burkett, MC, O936824.
Bruce L. Bushard, MC, O1736383.
John M. Cahill, MC.
Sebastian J. Campagna, DC, O945447.
Robert E. Campbell, MC, O935692.
Charles A. Cashman, MC, O1775011.
Jose Cerra-Quinones, MC.
George H. Chambers, MC, O1765051.
Robert L. Chancey, MC, O1735731.
John J. Coffey, MC, O1767003.
Norman J. Cole, MC.
Ray G. Cowley, MC, O935215.
Morton C. Creditor, MC.
Charles B. Crow, Jr., MC.
Arthur J. Crumbley, Jr., MC.
Warren T. Culver, MC, O1714755.
Hugh P. Curtis, MC.
Paul W. Dale, MC.
Charles A. DeKovessey, MC, O1718814.
Frank R. DeLuca, MC.
Donald F. DeMarse, MC.
Stephen H. Deschamps, MC.
Robert L. Devine, MC, O1784796.
James L. Donahue, DC, O946748.
James F. Donovan, MC, O1764805.
Joseph J. Downing, MC, O935982.
Eugene L. Dybowski, DC, O1746660.
Warren D. Eddy, Jr., MC, O935825.
Bert E. Eldred, DC, O1786992.
James P. Elkins, MC.
John T. Elston, MC, O1766651.
Franklin H. Epstein, MC.
Robert J. Fanning, DC, O937340.
Joel C. Fink, MC, O945353.
Francis E. Foley, MC, O478346.
Paige B. Follo, MC.
Richard M. Fox, MC.
Albert S. Freed, Jr., MC, O1725931.
John W. Frye, MC.
Donald H. Giesler, MC.
Robert G. Gildersleeve, MC.
Frederic S. Glazener MC, O945036.
Norman Goldstein, MC.
Arthur Goldwyn, MC.
Paul M. Gowan, DC, O1736700.
Fay B. Graves, MC, O945338.
Stuart Graves, Jr., MC.
Lloyd J. Gregory, Jr., MC.
Harold L. Guard, MC, O1767416.
Edward F. Gudgel, MC, O937026.
Paul F. Guerin, MC, O1725174.
Ben D. Hall, MC.
Charles I. Hamilton, Jr., MC, O1785711.
Charles W. Hanford, MC.
Walter W. Hannah, MC.
Robert V. Harroun, MC.
Frederick A. Helig, DC, O1727407.
Richard L. Howard, DC, O1786105.
Robert F. Hufner, MC.
David J. Hughes, MC.
Kenneth W. Hughes, DC, O945363.
Samuel W. Hunter, MC.
Glenn W. Jamieson, DC.
Gerriet A. Janssen, MC.
Francis W. Jeffords, MC.
John A. Jenicek, MC, O1756753.
Kenneth E. Johnson, MC.
Lester D. Johnson, Jr., MC.
Merlin H. Johnson, MC.
Robert E. Johnston, MC, O1726829.
Augustus B. Jones, Jr., MC, O935677.
Eugene H. Jones, DC, O1746673.
Lewis E. Jones, MC.
Blackburn S. Joslin, MC.
David C. Kellsey, MC, O945351.
John S. Kelly, MC.
John F. Kendrick, Jr., MC.
James V. Kennedy, MC, O1718013.
Eldon G. Ketring, MC, O1756916.
Allen F. Kingman, Jr., MC, O945443.
Robert R. Koefoot, MC.
Edward J. Kollar, MC, O1755023.
Edward A. Langdon, MC, O1746265.
Robert V. Larrick, MC, O1746847.
Charles H. Lasley, MC.
John K. Leach, MC.
Carter H. Lewis, Jr., DC, O1727345.
Sherman Lewis, DC, O938156.
Joseph N. Lionti, MC, O1704828.
Roderick L. Lister, DC, O945448.
David I. Livermore, MC, O955535.
Albert B. Lorincz, MC, O935828.
John F. Loyd, MC, O1746723.
Charles L. Lynch, MC.
Richard J. Maloney, DC, O945444.
James W. Mankin, MC.
Robert A. Markelz, MC.
Oliver A. Mays, MC, O473791.
Kenneth L. McEwen, MC, O1705333.
Worthy W. McKinney, MC, O1776185.
John R. McLelland, MC, O1736056.
Campbell A. McNicol, MC.
John C. Mebane, MC, O943979.
Charles H. Meeks, MC.
John J. Meyerdierks, MC.
Eugene V. Meyerding, MC.
Clarence S. Miller, MC, O1725994.
Frank L. Miller, MC, O1725000.
Joe E. Mitchell, MC.
Charles F. Moller, MC, O1706257.
Alfred E. Moore, MC, O1716323.
St F. Moorehead, Jr., MC, O1736154.
Robert B. Mullins, MC, O936821.
William M. Mutch, Jr., MC.
William J. Natoli, MC, O1716031.
Joseph R. Newton, MC.
Robert P. Newton, MC.
John A. Norman, MC, O958831.
Edward T. O'Dell, MC.
John W. O'Grady, MC.
Walter M. Ormes, Jr., DC, O954817.
Venedict M. Osetinsky, MC, O479890.
Ellis Oster, MC, O1767351.
Howard W. Owen, MC, O1766706.
Fred D. Ownby, MC.
John M. Palmer, MC.
James P. Parker, DC, O1786021.
Marvin E. Perkins, Jr., MC, O475247.
Jack D. Pigford, DC, O937685.
Charles C. Pixley, MC.
Thomas R. Plowright, MC, O1705360.
Warren E. Porter, MC.
Robert W. Puckett, MC.
Bela R. Rieger, MC.
John E. Roberts, MC, O935763.
Alexander L. Sadowski, DC.
Thomas L. Robbins, MC, O945341.
Joseph A. Roy, MC.
Henry T. Russell, MC.
James H. Sands, MC.
George E. Schafer, MC, O1746940.
Lionel A. Schwartz, MC, O1766948.
Norman M. Scott, Jr., MC, O1705500.
John J. Sheridan, MC, O1736002.
Robert A. Simenson, MC.
Charles B. Smith, MC.
Walden R. Smith, MC, O1746523.
Albin J. Sowka, MC.
Robert W. Spaulding, MC.
James F. Stagg, MC, O945335.
Richard U. Stern, MC, O1718192.
Herbert P. Sube, MC, O1757084.
Yiwen Y. Tang, MC, O958440.
Donald R. Taylor, MC, O933224.
Vann S. Taylor, MC, O1776470.
George E. Thoma, Jr., MC.
Miles E. Thomas, MC.
Ralph G. Thomas, MC.
Edgar M. Thomason, MC, O1775563.
Acors W. Thompson, MC, O483178.
Willis H. Thornburg, MC.
Walter R. Tkach, MC, O1725691.
William W. Tucker, MC.
Francis L. Van Veen, MC, O1784867.
Willard R. Warren, MC, O1717495.
Donald R. Watkins, MC, O958307.
Herschel J. Wells, MC, O1776253.
Dick D. Wetzel, MC.
Glenn R. Weygandt, MC.
Daniel C. Wilkerson, Jr., MC, O945342.
Donald S. Wilkins, MC.
Harold E. Wilkins, MC.
Fred C. Williams, MC, O1787172.
David H. Wilson, MC, O945344.
Howard R. Wilson, Jr., DC.
Norris A. Wimberley, Jr., MC, O945345.
Dean F. Winn, Jr., MC.
Samuel P. Wise, III, MC, O936529.
Walter M. Wolfe, MC, O1727075.
Vladimir A. Yaholkovsky, MC, O936835.
John B. Zaontz, MC, O945346.
Henry L. Zak, DC.
Branko K. Zec, MC, O932777.
Reginald J. M. Zeluff, MC, O1786121.

To be second lieutenant

Marian A. Tierney, ANC, N744675.

WOMEN'S ARMY CORPS

The following-named persons for appointment in the Women's Army Corps, Regular Army, under the provisions of Public Law 625, Eightieth Congress, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Army:

To be majors

Anita H. Ashmead, L300308.
Elizabeth G. Bell, L501093.
Elizabeth W. Bianchi, L201120.
Geneva H. Bobbitt, L500027.
Elizabeth C. Boltwood, L600233.
Helen H. Bouffler, L200002.
Florence B. Boush, L115030.
Mildred C. Burgess, L220008.
Magdalen I. Crum, L906060.
Mercedes O. Cubria, L305435.
Sara F. Dodge, L603063.

Cloe E. Doyle, L600385.
Nell E. J. Farnham, L903687.
Dorothy S. Farrand, L1005150.
Norma F. Flachsland, L215405.
Cora M. Foster, L215397.
Lillian F. Foushee, L303243.
Irene O. Galloway, L702007.
Emily C. Gorman, L215008.
Dolas M. Grosjean, L510110.
Mary A. Hallaren, L115009.
Selma L. Herbert, L200680.
Ruby E. Herman, L200051.
Anna K. Hubbard, L603442.
Rosalyn J. Kaiser, L600325.
Charlee L. Kelly, L802502.
Mary J. Key, L125287.
Wilma H. Key, L401180.
Frances M. Lathrope, L701001.
Beatrice D. Levin, L302094.
Pauline V. Linch, L304011.
Virginia M. Mathew, L401624.
Clara M. Matthews, L607770.
Rosalie N. McClary, L200940.
Ruth E. Meyers, L1001447.
Alice M. Miller, L263022.
Edna R. Miller, L708303.
Anne C. Moe, L1000640.
Harriet N. Moses, L602037.
Helene V. Novak, L305700.
Rebecca S. Parks, L301246.
Alice A. Parrish, L303722.
Esther P. Pulis, L204870.
Julia L. Regan, L117233.
Charlotte E. Rhodes, L215697.
Beatrice I. Ringgold, L200018.
Elizabeth A. Rutledge, L220013.
Laura M. St. Clair, L400875.
Beatrice E. St. Helens, L701158.
Mary E. Savage, L705171.
Arlene G. Scheidenhelm, L225017.
Vera A. Sievers, L963048.
Elizabeth C. Smith, L502016.
Katherine Stull, L803004.
Sara L. Sturgis, L502734.
Eleanore C. Sullivan, L115602.
Margaret M. Thornton, L900058.
Hattilu C. White, L806617.

To be captains

M. Frances Aman, L215707.
Mary O. Anderson, L502512.
Edith A. Ayers, L400905.
Harriett C. Bendfelt, L610361.
Martha M. Bonner, L803191.
Hortense M. Boutell, L704000.
Margaret E. Brewster, L502948.
Hazel B. Bundy, L115615.
Miriam L. Butler, L903357.
Maribeth T. Cardinal, L400928.
Florence M. Clark, L903007.
Kathryn D. Cleveland, L304026.
Margaret W. Condon, L120243.
Eunity F. Elderdice, L302009.
Robin Elliott, L1006225.
Patricia E. Elwell, L100091.
Lillian R. Faust, L801572.
Eda J. Flanigan, L700758.
Helen K. Foreman, L500141.
Annie V. Gardner, L100005.
Merle M. Gardner, L704069.
Florence P. Gibbons, L117823.
Arlenne H. Goodridge, L115007.
Ruth R. Gorton, L705008.
Lillian Harris, L302057.
Catherine L. Hart, L406256.
Helen H. Hart, L703010.
Elizabeth S. Hazen, L105000.
Helen H. Hickman, L604349.
Muriel J. Janikula, L909362.
Mary J. Kunz, L909272.
Cecile M. Lane, L600327.
Mary C. Lane, L1009920.
Margaret A. Long, L200079.
Sue Lynch, L903935.
Catherine J. Lyons, L304041.
Marie J. Madigan, L116093.
Billie M. McConnell, L800255.
Mary G. McDonald, L809134.
Mary L. Milligan, L300004.
Olive E. Mills, L305449.
Bertha G. Moser, L304350.
Mary K. Moynahan, L800005.
Ethel C. Munson, L216942.
Billie L. Murray, L808694.
Lucile G. Odbert, L115871.
Elaine M. Olmsted, L918013.
Margaret E. Onion, L800016.
Mercedes M. Ormston, L203510.
Jane H. Parsel, L401005.
Mary J. Regan, L115065.
Frances W. Rice, L607004.
Helen M. Roy, L116972.
Kathryn J. Royster, L400018.
Sarah C. Seawell, L400132.
Irene M. Sorrough, L200216.
Nora G. Springfield, L819573.
Mary W. Stephenson, L600903.
Ariel E. Stout, L900485.
Mary L. Sullivan, L703039.
Anne E. Sweeney, L903080.
Ruth D. Thompson, L500033.
Evelyn Tonsfeldt, L205302.
Irene A. Van Houten, L909258.
Dale A. Van Vacter, L802007.
Mary B. Warner, L1000885.
Lois A. Wassom, L905643.
Ruth S. Westbrook, L400633.
Margaret R. Wharton, L807860.
Adeline G. Wheatley, L902779.

To be first lieutenants

Onolette Apley, L505149.
Imogen E. Averett, L303063.
Doris L. Ayers, L303585.
Mary J. Bailey, L604791.
Maxene M. Baker, L702082.
Susan E. Bastion, L501835.
Mary R. Bell, L203438.
Mary O. Boggess, L501238.
Elizabeth H. Branch, L125014.
Evelyn C. Brown, L225040.
Kathleen Burns, L115158.
Hedwig J. Cadell, L215401.
Miriam A. Cameron, L116969.
Lane Carlson, L703403.
Anna E. Colgan, L202406.
Virginia R. Deady, L202258.
Jimmie B. Dollahite, L403016.
Ellen V. Dunbar, L501001.
Katherine J. Flaherty, L100011.
Mary K. Flannery, L117456.
Margaret M. Franko, L502080.
Dorothy P. Frome, L304330.
Ruth Fuchs, L201029.
Neva G. Gillis, L901464.
Clara Goldman, L900113.
Patricia E. Grant, L203206.
Dorothy Gray, L403287.
Mary J. Guyette, L310942.
Marcelette L. K. Hall, L504285.
Elizabeth P. Holsington, L909193.
Alice N. Howes, L225174.
Mary O. Kennedy, L306085.
Dorothy A. King, L401024.
Marie S. Knaslak, L602998.
Constance D. Kolokotrones, L912029.
Sylvia C. Levy, L220233.
Elizabeth A. Machen, L304611.
Ethel M. Martin, L600171.
Agnes A. Mashidlausky, L115658.
Helen B. Meisner, L115436.
Martha L. Mills, L405372.
Barbara A. Nelson, L303014.
Lenore M. Price, L903257.
Josephine L. Redenius, L225657.
Ruth S. Reece, L503003.
Veronica A. Reilly, L200676.
Barbara E. Root, L903071.
Alice V. Sawyer, L117950.
Iona B. Sherman, L703031.
Margaret E. Sinclair, L502353.
Faye Sloan, L413899.
Mary E. Stanton, L400008.
Betty J. Truax, L507615.
Sue B. Trulock, L410001.
Betty J. Venable, L811609.
Carol M. Williams, L906268.
Charlotte I. Woodworth, L215676.
Hope Wray, L701127.
Frances M. Yonlack, L200394.

To be second lieutenants

Fannie L. Davis, L527823.
Norma J. Fischer, L926381.
Lillian V. Jones, L930005.
Virginia H. Kaufmann, L306916.
Marie L. Malone, L915468.
Florence B. M. Newlen, L609394.
Frances A. Pesmenski, L600259.
Lucille D. Schneider, L201658.
Clara M. Zunker, L600529.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army in the grade specified, under the provisions of Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Army:

To be first lieutenants

Daniel J. Costello, O2049782.
Joseph M. Kelly, O866530.
John A. Macomber, O1049965.
Francis G. McDonald, O387161.
Leonard Petkoff, O569746.
Joseph P. Ramsay, O353177.
Harry J. Salsbury, Jr., O1039892.
James S. Talbot, O2079196.
Clayton B. Tasker, O1576724.
Carl E. Winkler, O392805.

To be second lieutenants

William J. Andrews.
Paul L. Applin, Jr., O946845.
Donald A. Beardsworth.
Robert L. Bewley, O957032.
William P. Binger, O958711.
Robert L. Bryant.
Vernon W. Bryant, O947783.
George J. Buckley, O955001.
John A. Burdick.
Richard F. Burns, O957065.
John D. Caldwell, O1112624.
Adelbert L. Campbell.
Orel D. Choate, O949892.
Abraham E. Cohen, O955791.
William M. Cole.
Sidney H. Cook, Jr., O954672.
John T. Coughlin, O553946.
Charles R. Darby.
Henry D. Doiron.
Henry B. Edwards, Jr., O955559.
Richard O. Eiler, O954869.
Harold N. Elliott, O957052.
Charles H. Fisher, O954879.
Ralph H. Girton, O1586501.
Ray M. Golden.
Charles E. Green.
Monroe M. Gregory, Jr.
Strather W. Hawkins, O949503.
Martin D. Hecht, O957771.
William B. Hill, O956293.
Ernest A. Hinojosa, Jr., O1948757.
Jackson H. M. Holbrook.
James L. Hundemer, Jr., O956037.
Kenneth F. Jackson, O949645.
John M. Jenkins.
Roderick W. Kallgren.
William O. Keeling, Jr., O956264.
Robert A. Kimbel.
Robert R. J. Koch, O949368.
Wheeler E. Laird, O953732.
Renn M. Lawrence.
Eldredge R. Long, Jr., O955080.
Kenneth S. Mackenzie, Jr.
Richard M. McBride.
Robert I. McCreight, O954870.
Norman B. Newcomb.
Thomas E. Oberley, O948417.
Manuel Olivera-Barroso, O1282402.
Clyde H. Patterson, Jr.
Vernon W. Patterson, Jr.
George E. Peck, O947779.
Alva W. Pendergrass, Jr., O956302.
Fred W. Peters, Jr., O955769.
Duane E. Raph, O2020464.
John E. Reed, O947338.
William H. Rhodes, O948418.
Jorge F. Roach, O949549.
George H. Rosenfield, O955503.
David R. Rosson.
John J. Sarazen, O1319369.
Alfred Sasser, Jr., O955004.
Thomas S. Schreiber, O411401.
Tommy E. Sidebotham, Jr., O949370.
Ralph W. Spence.
Joel E. Stone, O956363.
John E. Stringer, Jr., O927198.

Robert M. Stump, O966373.
Norman E. Sudnick, O1536512.
Charles H. Underwood.
Lyle H. Wharton, O957339.
Jesse E. White.
Richard V. White.
Charles R. Whitfield, O960003.
Joseph O. Wintersteen, Jr.
Gus A. Wolman, Jr., O519213.

NOTE.—These persons were given recess appointment on June 30, 1948, July 17, 1948, August 18, 1948, September 4, 1948, September 22, 1948, October 20, 1948, November 13, 1948, December 1, 1948, December 10, 1948, December 11, 1948, December 16, 1948, December 17, 1948, and December 18, 1948.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the grade of captain in the line of the Navy:

Griswold T. Atkins
Oscar M. Browne, Jr.
John F. Delaney, Jr.
Harry B. Dodge
Harry W. Englund
William B. Epps
James H. Hean
Harold M. Heiser
Wellington T. Hines
Ephraim P. Holmes
Peter H. Horn
Frederick J. Ilsemann
Leonard T. Morse
Stanley G. Nichols
Robert E. Perkins
Manley H. Simons, Jr.
Paul B. Tuzo, Jr.
Frank I. Winant, Jr.
Sanford B. D. Wood

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 7, 1949:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Dean Rusk to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF THE CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Ralph H. Ackerman
David McK. Key
Karl L. Rankin
Howard K. Travers

CONSULS GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

H. Lawrence Groves
Stephen E. Aguirre
Archibald E. Gray
Robert M. Taylor

CONSULS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Charles W. Adair, Jr.
Frederick J. Cunningham
H. Francis Cunningham, Jr.
Sherburne Dillingham
Harrison Lewis
Charles Gilbert
George Lybrook West, Jr.

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 3, CONSULS, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Robert Alexander
Charles R. Enlow

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 4, CONSUL, AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

William Kling

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 6, VICE CONSULS OF CAREER, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

James F. Amory
Raymond J. Barrett
Jack B. Button
Stuart B. Campbell, Jr.
Thomas F. Conlon
Robert W. Eastham
Benjamin A. Fleck
Jackson E. Heffner
Jack T. Kilgore
James F. Leonard, Jr.
Ralph J. McGuire
Daniel J. Meloy
Richard B. Parker
John B. Root
Robert W. Ross
John A. Sabini
Michel F. Smith
Karl E. Sommerlatte
Christopher T. Talounis
George E. Tener 2d
Sidney Weintraub

CONSUL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Don A. Gribble

SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Mallory Browne
George Kenneth Holland
William R. Tyler

CONSULS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Ernest L. Eslinger
Arnlioth G. Heltberg
Frederick C. Johnson
Ernest V. Polutnik
James R. Riddle
Louis F. Blanchard
Louis B. Mazzeo

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 6, A VICE CONSUL OF CAREER, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Robert C. Brewster

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

William McChesney Martin, Jr., to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

POSTMASTER GENERAL

Jesse M. Donaldson to be Postmaster General.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Frank A. Southard, Jr., to be United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund.

MUNITIONS BOARD

Donald F. Carpenter to be Chairman of the Munitions Board.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD

Karl T. Compton to be Chairman of the Research and Development Board.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

John B. Dunlap to be collector of internal revenue for the second district of Texas.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR CORPS OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Senior assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

Paul Fremont-Smith
John S. Benson
Leo A. Sapirstein
Jacob K. Frenkel
Clarence A. Imboden, Jr.
Roger K. McDonald
Lynn L. Fulkerson, Jr.
Andrew Eanier
Ruth E. Dunham
Fridolph E. Erlandson
Martin J. Gunter
Swan Burrus, Jr.
Lewis McLaurine Williams
Brinton T. Darlington
Andrew O. Fitzmorris
Roland T. Smith
Joseph F. Shanaphy
Bernard E. O'Malley
Frederick C. Kuharich
William A. Walter, Jr.
McClain Johnston
Paul Francke, Jr.
Richard A. Malmgren
Ralph P. Patten
Edward A. McNulty
Walter M. White, Jr.
James E. Hamill

Assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of acceptance

John H. Waite
James K. Conn
Ben Fisher
Ernest V. de Moss
Sidney Ketyer
Victor E. Archer
Ernest G. Hanowell
Leland K. Dayton
Robert Hanan
Carl C. Sansocie
Merlan E. DeBolt
John B. Baldi
William H. Sage III
James R. Lewis
Paul K. Benedict
Arthur P. Burdon
Charles W. Whitmore
John F. Laws
Joseph A. Gallagher
Lawrence V. Hastings
Maurice R. Wingo
John V. Osborne
Thomas F. Heighway
Jerold E. Phelps

Senior assistant sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

Earl H. Arnold
Donald B. Stevens

Assistant sanitary engineer (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of acceptance

John B. Saxton

Junior assistant sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of second lieutenant), effective date of acceptance

Howard C. Kellogg
John K. Brown
Gordon E. Stone
Donald M. Keagy

Senior assistant pharmacist (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

Allen J. Brands, Sr.

Assistant pharmacist (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of acceptance

Richard R. Sherwood

Junior assistant pharmacists (equivalent to the Army rank of second lieutenant), effective date of acceptance

Leo Klugman
Paul H. Honda
Paul R. McDaniel, Jr.

Senior assistant nurse officer (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

Mildred Jones

Assistant nurse officer (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of acceptance

Henrietta J. LeGrand
Kathryn M. Meyer
Edith W. Campbell
Hilda A. Nivala
Ruth S. Fitzgerald
Mary L. Healy

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

TO BE ENSIGNS, EFFECTIVE FROM INDICATED DATES

Dewey G. Rushford, October 8, 1948.
Gordon D. Scott, October 21, 1948.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

TO BE CAPTAINS, TO RANK FROM DATES INDICATED

George F. Hicks, March 20, 1945.
Alexander L. Ford, March 20, 1945.
Stephen H. Evans, March 20, 1945.
John A. Glynn, March 20, 1945.
John E. Fairbank, March 20, 1945.

TO BE COMMANDERS, TO RANK FROM DATES INDICATED

John S. Merriman, Jr., October 20, 1942.
William H. Snyder, November 18, 1942.
Peter J. Smenton, January 1, 1944.
Thomas R. Midtlyng, January 1, 1944.
John B. Oren, January 1, 1944.
Harry E. Davis, Jr., January 1, 1944.
Joseph Howe, January 1, 1944.
George W. Holtzman, January 1, 1944.
William W. Childress, January 1, 1944.
John H. Wagline, January 1, 1944.
John J. Hutson, Jr., January 1, 1944.

TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS, TO RANK FROM DATES INDICATED

Warren L. David, October 1, 1942.
Victor E. Bakanas, May 15, 1943.

TO BE LIEUTENANTS, TO RANK FROM DATES INDICATED

Robert S. McLendon, December 31, 1942.
Vincent J. Cass, May 15, 1943.

TO BE LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE), TO RANK FROM DATES INDICATED

Robert O. Bracken, December 31, 1942.
Charles Wayne, April 1, 1944.
Robert H. Roberts, May 1, 1945.
Albert G. Jones, November 15, 1946.
Donby J. Mathieu, November 15, 1946.
Donald E. Ullery, January 1, 1947.
Robert N. Rea, January 1, 1947.
John G. Milcsic, January 15, 1947.
Theodore L. Roberge, January 15, 1947.
Francis Twarog, January 15, 1947.
Thurston L. Willis, January 15, 1947.
Bernard B. Wood, January 15, 1947.
Samuel W. Branin, January 15, 1947.
Jack E. Stewart, January 15, 1947.
Norman P. Weinert, January 15, 1947.
James A. Emery, January 15, 1947.

Paul L. Anderson, February 1, 1947.
William C. Carber, February 1, 1947.
Rubin E. Young, Jr., February 1, 1947.
Fred J. Michalson, February 1, 1947.
Richard C. Green, February 1, 1947.
James B. Reynolds, February 1, 1947.
Wesley J. Quamme, February 1, 1947.
William C. Akers, February 1, 1947.
Philip S. Bell, February 1, 1947.
Donald D. Davison, February 1, 1947.
Ivan C. McLean, February 1, 1947.
Edward G. Taylor, February 1, 1947.
Louis E. Price, February 1, 1947.
Franklin F. Bohlk, February 1, 1947.
Samuel H. Yearta, August 22, 1948.
Russell W. Lentner, August 22, 1948.
William H. Yates, August 22, 1948.

TO BE ENSIGNS, TO RANK FROM DATES INDICATED

William C. Wallace, January 15, 1947.
Henry G. Cassel, January 15, 1947.
Harley B. Shank, January 15, 1947.
Raymond M. Miller, January 15, 1947.
Charles A. Haley, January 15, 1947.
Everett B. Kopp, January 15, 1947.
Philip G. Ledoux, January 15, 1947.

TO BE PROFESSOR, WITH RANK OF LIEUTENANT, TO RANK FROM OCTOBER 1, 1942

Robert E. Reed-Hill.

TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS, TO RANK FROM DATES INDICATED

Elvin C. Hawley, June 5, 1943.
Emery H. Joyce, June 5, 1943.
Frank McLaughlin, June 14, 1943.
Allan V. Falkenberg, June 24, 1943.
Russel O. Foster, July 7, 1943.
Frank T. Burtle, July 29, 1943.
Arnold J. Larsen, December 1, 1943.
Lionel H. DeSanty, December 1, 1943.

TO BE LIEUTENANTS, TO RANK FROM DATES INDICATED

David H. Douglas, May 15, 1943.
Theron H. Gato, May 15, 1943.
Paul F. Foye, July 1, 1944.

TO BE LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE), TO RANK FROM DATES INDICATED

George A. Philbrick, March 1, 1944.
Henry W. Stinson, Jr., March 1, 1944.
John W. Day, January 1, 1947.
Thomas G. Condon, January 1, 1947.
Maurice W. Tichen, January 1, 1947.
Leo M. Bracken, January 1, 1947.
Paul S. Hofmeister, January 1, 1947.
Albert P. Hartt, Jr., January 1, 1947.
George E. Tooloose, January 1, 1947.
William E. Sale, January 1, 1947.
Andrew B. Christensen, January 1, 1947.
Harold A. French, August 22, 1948.
Sam Pisicchio, September 15, 1948.

TO BE LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE), DATE OF RANK TO BE COMPUTED UPON EXECUTION OF OATH

Walter J. Felton
Harry G. Kosky
Richard W. Bagnell
Edward P. Sawyer
Leonard A. Wardlaw, Jr.
Leonard J. Knight, Jr.
Jerry Komorech
Enoch A. Poulter
Douglas D. Vander Meer
Charles D. Zettler
Frank A. Klafs
Hugh C. McCaffrey
Owen B. Smith
Eric G. Grundy
Merle L. Harbourt
Harold L. Appleton
Gordon Crymes
William A. McCreary
Francis J. Bell

TO BE ENSIGNS, DATE OF RANK TO BE COMPUTED UPON EXECUTION OF OATH

Robert E. Ogin
Roger J. Dahlby
Nelson W. Allen

TO BE PROFESSOR (TEMPORARY), WITH RANK OF LIEUTENANT, TO RANK FROM JULY 1, 1944

Raymond J. Perry

TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, UNITED STATES COAST GUARD, TO RANK FROM JUNE 3, 1943

Carl A. Anderson

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1949

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Love divine that stoops to human needs, hear us when we call. We come to Thee with our cares, our problems, and our limitations.

We ask for wisdom and for grace that this day may be fruitful with good works for our country. Our land cannot fulfill its great mission without reverence for those institutions which make secure its perpetuity—reverence for authority, for law, for Thy church of whatever name, and for the rights of the individual.

Do Thou regard our prayer, as we pray in our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 3, 1949, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on February 3, 1949, the President approved and signed a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 88. Joint resolution extending the time for free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 170. An act to authorize the transfer of certain property to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes.

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order today to consider the bill (H. R. 2361) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes, that all points of order against the bill or any of the provisions contained therein be waived, and that there shall be not to exceed 2 hours of debate, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and the ranking minority member of that committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HALLECK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does that include also that the bill will be read under the 5-minute rule?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. It will be read under the 5-minute rule in the regular way?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. That was not included in the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. McCORMACK. That automatically follows. My unanimous-consent request provided for 2 hours of general debate. Of course, after that, if it is necessary, consideration under the 5-minute rule will follow.

Mr. HALLECK. I am not going to object to the request, and I trust there is no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments may sit during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman mean today, or when?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is for today. It is just to permit a brief meeting to report out formally the bill for the consideration of which unanimous consent was just obtained.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If they have a bill on the floor they ought to be here.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is just so they can meet and report the bill out officially.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

DISASTER RELIEF

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

FEBRUARY 3, 1949.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to the authority heretofore granted, the Clerk of the House received from the Secretary of the Senate on February 3, 1949, the engrossed resolution (H. J. Res. 136) entitled "Joint resolution making a further appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes," attested by the Secretary as having been passed by the Senate on February 3, 1949.

Very truly yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had on February 3, 1949, examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 136. Joint resolution making a further appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on February 3, 1949, he did on that day sign the following enrolled House joint resolution:

H. J. Res. 136. Joint resolution making a further appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes.

TRIAL OF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, the events that have transpired during the past few days at the anti-Christian trials in Hungary should awaken the whole world to the true menace of communism.

While we all have great compassion for His Eminence, the cardinal, and his codefendents, at the same time we realize that something bigger than any individual or group of individuals is being drawn through the Red furnace. Here is the final struggle. Here it will be decided whether the conduct of men and nations in the future will be governed by a civilization that traces its beginnings to the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount or whether the governing philosophy shall spring from irreligion, paganism, materialism, and lust.

Mankind must decide once and for all whether the pernicious doctrine of Marx and Lenin with its godless philosophy rejecting the dignity of man is to be the rule of conduct for the world. If we are to accept this immorality, then civilization is through and the anti-Christ has triumphed. No longer will there be any such thing as a free man with a free mind. No longer will there be such a possession as human dignity. No longer will there be such a thing as honor and word between men and nations. Courts of justice will be cesspools of iniquities. The established order of life will be anarchy.

Since this is the future that the Communists would foster upon us and our children, let us quickly accept their brazen challenge. Let Catholic, Protestant, and Jew, all of us whose social and political philosophy springs from a common source, march under the one banner—civilization—to battle until the death the monster that would destroy morality.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE] has expired.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON] is detained in his district on business. I ask unanimous consent that he may be granted leave of absence for today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include three articles pertaining to Cardinal Mindszenty, notwithstanding the fact that the estimate of the Public Printer is that matter will cost an additional $213.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may sit today while general debate is in process, during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is going to receive that request, but the Chair is not going to receive many requests for committees to sit during the sessions of the House hereafter.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WICKERSHAM asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio message by Evangelist Dale Crowley.

Mr. KARST asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. RODINO asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. PRICE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include a resolution adopted by the Illinois House of Representatives.

Mr. CHESNEY asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include newspaper articles.

Mr. DURHAM asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. LANE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GRAHAM asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by his colleague [Mr. LICHTENWALTER].

INCOME-TAX EXEMPTIONS FOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO CHARITABLE, RELIGIOUS, AND EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill which will raise the limitation for charitable, religious, and educational contributions from 15 percent to 20 percent.

Under the existing law, gifts to charitable, religious, and other institutions are deductible only to the extent that they do not exceed 15 percent of a taxpayer's income.

My bill raises this limit to 20 percent, and thus encourages more contributions.

The loss in revenue will be inconsequential. The bill will encourage private contributions, and thus lessen the demand from the Federal Government for additional grants. I feel that we ought to do all we can to encourage private contributions to our schools, colleges, charities, and religious institutions.

The bill applies to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1948.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of intergovernmental relations.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill in which every Member of the Congress and all other persons concerned with efficient and effective government should be keenly interested. This bill provides for the establishment of a temporary bipartisan Commission on Intergovernmental Relations in the United States, with attention directed especially to the serious fiscal problems with which all levels of government are now so sorely beset.

I want to make it unmistakably clear at this time, Mr. Speaker, that I am fully cognizant of the fact that with the development of our great Nation government at all levels must assume greater responsibilities with respect to the general welfare of the people. The purpose of my bill, however, is to study these needs and to settle upon and establish a logical and equitable pattern or plan by which government, with a proper division of functions and authority, may best discharge its responsibilities to the people.

It is my earnest hope and my request that Members of both Houses of the Congress, and regardless of political affiliation, will join with me in sponsoring this critically needed legislation.

UNITED STATES HELP TO CHINA

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for half a minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the situation in China has reached another critical hour of decision in which the United States cannot be anything but the deciding element as the Central Government will not be able to continue its resistance to and battle against the Communist forces without our help. Granted that China's vastness gives seeming strength to the argument behind the questions: Do you want to bankrupt the United States? Where will you get the money and the goods? But how can we who have declared to the world that we will help those countries that fight for their freedom fail the greatest of them all, especially when so very little will do so very much?

Are we still so naive, so unable to recognize the Communist propaganda to which we are so subtly subjected for what it is? There is no shadow of a doubt about the nature of this army that has reached the Yangtse River, nor of the land reformers with them. They are regular offshoots of Moscow, spreading chaos as they take over. Yet people in high places try to tell us otherwise.

What area in the world is more important to peace, to freedom, and so to the United States as China? What area is more important to Soviet plans for world control? There is no country that has suffered so much from the vacillations and mistakes of our changing policies and our ignorance than this great land of China. Are we going to fail her in this extremity? And more than that, are we going to fail ourselves?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article on the machine-tool industry and national defense.

Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two editorials.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances and include newspaper articles.

Mr. LEMKE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by Col. Charles L. Hall, which appeared in the Chicago Tribune of Sunday, January 30, 1948.

Mr. REES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address delivered by Chancelor Mallott, of Lawrence, Kans.

Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from a Richmond paper.

Mr. TALLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a broadcast he made over the Mutual network last Thursday.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor today to remind the House of the great need for additional security for our elder citizens, and to request that action should be taken at once to provide better old-age pensions.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that a majority of the people in our respective districts are expecting us to give immediate attention to this matter. Both major political parties committed themselves, during the national campaign last year, to provide adequate old-age pensions and social security. Both parties, and perhaps nearly every spokesman for each party, stated time and again that our old-age pensions should be increased. This problem, Mr. Speaker, is not a partisan matter. Republicans get just as hungry, and just as cold, as Democrats, and vice versa. Republicans and Democrats are working together in this Congress to do something about this pressing matter. There are many questions, Mr. Speaker, on which we may disagree. But on this question there is no partisanship. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have been in session here over a month. We are waiting for committee action for work on this floor. Why not bring forth a bill to provide a decent, uniform, American old-age pension? Why not act on it now? I think we all agree that the need is very acute. It is entirely justified. It is not a partisan question. Then why not let us have action? In the last session of Congress we acted with rapidity to appropriate billions of dollars to afford relief to the stricken people of the world. Why cannot we take action with equal rapidity to provide for our aged people who in the declining years of their lives need our help.

Mr. Speaker, why cannot we have action now?

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a statement by the Iowa Creameries Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

[Mr. TALLE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes today following the regular business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute to make an announcement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I first ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor be permitted to sit during the session of the House providing there is general debate or the House is not in session.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object; for how long?

Mr. LESINSKI. For this week, for 1 week.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor may sit during general debate only if the House is in session.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If the House is in session and there is general debate.

Mr. LESINSKI. During general debate, and I want to provide also when the House is not in session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT RE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I also wish to announce that we will continue hearings on the minimum-wage bill this week, including Wednesday. On Thursday we are going into executive session and will attempt to bring out H. R. 658, dealing with the question of overtime on overtime, which is a burning question. We want to forestall any coal strikes that may be pending now or which may happen in the future.

VETERANS' PENSIONS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to renew my invitation to Members of the House who desire to be heard on the pending pension bill to appear before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs tomorrow morning at 10:30 a. m. or to send whatever statements they have to make.

I know there is a great hue and cry against pensioning the old men who went through the First World War and who have now reached the same age, and in the same condition, that Spanish-American veterans had reached when they were pensioned and the same age and in the same condition as the veterans of the Civil War were when they were pensioned.

If we can feed and clothe every lazy lout from Tokyo to Timbuktu out of the American taxpayer's pocket and continue to finance the satellite states of Soviet Russia that are dedicated to the destruction of this Government, then we can certainly look after our own veterans, the men who fought the Nation's battles in time of war and sustained its institutions in time of peace, and who are now old and unable to take care of themselves.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. If we take care of all of these countries the gentleman is talking about, from New York to Timbuktu, how are we going to be able to take care of our own veterans? We are going to have a hard time taking care of the American soldiers if we take care of all of these foreign countries.

Mr. RANKIN. All right, get on my side and stay there. I am opposed to financing every other country in the

world, and leaving our own disabled veterans out.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a sermon delivered by the pastor of a Presbyterian church.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include memorials from the Montana House of Representatives and Senate urging the early construction of the Yellow Tail Dam.

Mr. FALLON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by a former attorney general of Maryland.

Mr. GILMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a brief article from a national magazine.

Mr. GORE (at the request of Mr. SUTTON) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Denver Post.

Mr. IRVING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article in reference to Hon. CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri.

Mr. MICHENER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in four instances and include newspaper articles, editorials, and a speech.

Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

TRIAL OF JOSEF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I think it is fitting that I should make my first speech on the floor of this House in protest against what appears to be one of the most flagrant violations of human rights in modern history. I rise to reflect the indignation and sorrow of thousands of loyal Americans in my district at the cruelty and travesty on justice of the so-called trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty. I shall urge and support a resolution of inquiry as to why our Government should not denounce the cruelty, inhumanity, and injustice of that trial in the name of the rights of man.

THE LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up for consideration House Concurrent Resolution 22.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the date of reporting the legislative budget, as set forth in section 138 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as it may apply to the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, is hereby postponed until May 1, 1949.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules, having had under consideration this concurrent resolution, reports the same to the House with the recommendation that it pass.

For the benefit of the Members who have come to the House since the Seventy-ninth Congress, and for the benefit of those of us who were here but whose memories, like mine, are clouded, I would briefly review the original legislation and the reasons that are persuasive of the proposed change. The Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress filed a report during the second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress strongly recommending a provision whereby the House, soon after its organization each session, could have a comprehensive and clear picture of the proposed expenditures and the probable income of the Government. It would, perhaps, be helpful to quote briefly from that report:

Control of the purse for all Federal governmental activities is one of the major functions of Congress. Numerous witnesses appeared and recommended various changes designed to strengthen the position of Congress in relation to fiscal affairs.

These recommendations stressed the need for the adoption each year of an over-all fiscal policy that would consider both the income and expenditures of Government. It was pointed out that the control over revenues and expenditures is divided not only between the House and Senate, but also within each House between its revenue and appropriations committees. Neither of the two appropriations committees imposes any over-all limitations upon its total appropriations before the individual supply bills are voted on by the Houses. Nor do they attempt to coordinate appropriations with revenues so as to fix an over-all fiscal policy for the year.

With this divided authority existing not only between the appropriation committees of each House, but also among their many subcommittees, and among the revenue-raising committees, how could Congress have a general fiscal policy or follow it if it had one?

Other recommendations called not only for strengthening the staffs of the important appropriation committees and their subcommittees, but made several suggestions for basic changes in methods of controlling expenditures, improving auditing procedures, and developing better administrative management in Government agencies.

Your committee agrees that primary responsibility rests with Congress to improve legislative control over governmental expenditures and that means must be provided to permit a closer scrutiny of them, and not only by the committees charged with this duty but also by the individual Members and Congress itself.

Your committee believes that Congress has not adequately equipped itself to resist the pressure of departments and agencies in behalf of larger expenditures. We have equipped the agencies with ample funds to collect and present evidence to support their appeal for larger sums or to forestall reductions. But we have failed to implement Congress with adequate facilities for scrutinizing these justifications.

It becomes increasingly difficult for a Member of Congress to maintain a clear picture of expenditures and income, and because of this difficulty it is often impossible to make the intelligent decisions on legislation that our responsibilities require.

The House very wisely adopted a provision in the Reorganization Act—now Public Law 601—which requires:

The Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, or duly authorized subcommittees thereof, are authorized and directed to meet jointly at the beginning of each regular session of Congress and after study and consultation, giving due consideration to the budget recommendations of the President, report to their respective Houses a legislative budget for the ensuing fiscal year, including the estimated over-all Federal receipts and expenditures for such year. Such report shall contain a recommendation for the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year which shall include such an amount to be reserved for deficiencies as may be deemed necessary by such committees. If the estimated receipts exceed the estimated expenditures, such report shall contain a recommendation for a reduction in the public debt. Such report shall be made by February 15.

The report shall be accompanied by a concurrent resolution adopting such budget, and fixing the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year. If the estimated expenditures exceed the estimated receipts, the concurrent resolution shall include a section substantially as follows: "That it is the sense of the Congress that the public debt shall be increased in an amount equal to the amount by which the estimated expenditures for the ensuing fiscal year exceed the estimated receipts, such amount being $———."

Subsequent to the adoption of the Reorganization Act, the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations found it impractical, if not impossible, with the information at hand, to intelligently comply with the act of February 15. They were relegated to a speculative figure which could not be helpful to the Congress. During the last session of Congress considerable heat was generated as a result of an effort to comply with the above provision, and because of the haste and the lack of adequate information the figures arrived at provoked considerable criticism.

It is unnecessary, I think, at this time to consider this from a political standpoint, but it is perhaps inevitable, and while there will be no serious opposition to adoption of this resolution there will likely be considerable debate about the manner in which the legislative budget report was handled during the Eightieth Congress and is presently being approached. Certainly, however, it is very impractical for the joint committee to bring in a conclusive and accurate report by February 15. This is the experience of both parties. The date should be set back.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] introduced this resolution, which, as you see, provides that the date of reporting the legislative budget shall be postponed until May 1 of this year. He expresses the hope of the joint committee that by that time a useful and comprehensive report may be brought before the House, outlining a fiscal framework within which we may work.

It is of particular importance to our economy and the proper discharge of the functions of this Congress that we do not totally disregard this important part of the Reorganization Act. The earliest possible date should be agreed upon for the reporting of the legislative budget as set forth in section 138, Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

As so very ably presented by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] on many occasions, the Congress should not abandon its quest for a sound fiscal policy to guide us in our work. We are attempting by this measure to find a workable date, one that will be timely and useful to the Members of Congress, and we are attempting to give the joint committee an opportunity to work it out in good order.

There can rightfully be no politics in the consideration of this resolution and there should be no opposition to its adoption. I believe that I express the majority view when I say it is in the interest of orderly and effective procedure that we adopt the resolution. Experience alone will permit us to agree upon a permanent, timely date.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time yielded to me in connection with this resolution be transferred to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], the ranking minority member of the committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Texas has explained, House Concurrent Resolution 22 would amend section 138 of the Reorganization Act so as to make the effective date for the filing of the so-called legislative budget for the coming fiscal year May 1.

I think perhaps it may be well for us in considering this legislation to recall just a little bit of recent history. When the Reorganization Act was before the House, the purpose of section 138 was explained rather thoroughly and I think very well by the sponsors of that legislation, to the effect that by filing such a legislative budget or an estimate of receipts and expenditures early in each session of Congress we would then at least have some figure to shoot at in connection with both revenue raising and tax spending.

In practice, it has worked out that it was rather difficult to make anything like an accurate appraisal of either our revenues or our spending program, because February 15, the day provided in the original act, was rather early. It was impossible in many instances to know what revenues would be coming in, and certainly impossible to know what action Congress might take on the appropriation bills, or even what appropriation bills the Committee on Appropriations might report. As a result, back in the first session of the Eightieth Congress, in 1947, no agreement was reached by the joint committee set up to create and to submit this legislative budget as to what the budget should be.

The joint committee was severely and soundly and roundly criticized—actually denounced, as it were—for failing to meet the requirements of the Reorganization Act. The Republican majority of the Eightieth Congress was, in fact, openly accused of trying to sabotage and destroy the Reorganization Act. The leader of that denunciation, the man who made, should I say, the most rabid speeches against those charged with the responsibility of attempting to work out a legislative budget, was none other than my very good friend and namesake, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], who rather peculiarly now happens to be the author of this House concurrent resolution—wanting to do the very thing for which he condemned his Republican colleagues in the House just two short years ago. It is very, very peculiar what changes just a little bit of time will make in people's viewpoints and attitudes. If I may let you in on more or less of a legislative secret—and I do not want to call it that because I am sure the gentleman did not mean to be secretive—now and then humorous things often happen, even in that terrible Committee on Rules, which has been chastised recently by the Congress.

By mistake, Mr. Majority Leader—for I presume it was by error, and I am sure also that it was not your responsibility in any way—House Concurrent Resolution 13, introduced by the gentleman from Missouri, was presented to the committee. Lo and behold, it provided to just do away entirely with the legislative budget, and not to have any at all, or to just strike out or repeal that section of the Reorganization Act. If I may get confidential with my colleagues, I am not so sure but that that is not the best way to meet the situation. I am certain of one thing: it is the most honest way of meeting it, because when you pass the pending resolution, all you are doing is circumventing—as I am certain the gentleman from Oklahoma will tell you if he speaks on the measure—the intent and purpose of the Reorganization Act by saying, "Oh, we will set up a budget after we know what the tax income is going to be, and after we have passed out most of the appropriation bills and have decided what we are going to spend."

Well, that was not the idea, purpose, or intent behind this provision of the Reorganization Act, I am sure. The purpose and intent of the Reorganization Act, section 138, was to at least attempt to hold down public spending and to hold down taxes and to give the Congress an opportunity, before it acts, to take an over-all look at the annual great, gigantic spending program to see what it is we are going to spend and what we are going to have available to spend.

It is proposed here to make the date May 1, and that is after the horse is out of the barn, as it were.

I hope and I believe it would just be a matter of fair play, if I may express it that way, that the gentleman from Missouri who is the sponsor of this legislation will offer his apology to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]—and I am sorry that Mr. Knutson is not here—and to all those who were charged with this responsibility back in the Eightieth Congress, and say to them in substance, at least, "Well, boys, I was wrong, and I am sorry that I criticized you, because now that the responsibility is mine, I realize that I cannot meet it any better than you could meet it when it was yours. I am here to admit to you that I was playing just a little bit of politics back in the Eightieth Congress."

Of course, I can understand why the gentleman from Texas said to you that we should not discuss this in a political vein. Of course, I am not discussing it from a political angle. But, nevertheless, it was discussed from a political viewpoint, purely and simply, back in the Eightieth Congress.

Here is No. 2 on the list of peculiar legislative flip flops by our Democratic friends. Oh, I remember somebody keeping score on us, Mr. Majority Leader, back in the Eightieth Congress. So, perhaps it is a good time to set up another score board and to start keeping a little score and a little record. But this is buck-pedaling bill No. 2 to come before the House. It is either the third or fourth piece of legislation of any kind which we have had before us. But it is the second bill or resolution that has come before the House that in fact approves something the Eightieth Congress did in connection with some particular piece of legislation. It admits that the Eightieth Congress and those leaders in that Congress who were charged with the responsibility of handling the legislative budget were right at the time they were being so soundly and so roundly criticized by my good friends on the Democratic side of the aisle.

In order that we may have a picture of what is occurring here, I have attempted to describe to you what has gone before, including the peculiar past actions of some of our colleagues. As far as the legislation is concerned, I hope that if we are going to take any action at all we will be absolutely honest and actually do the thing that this resolution attempts to do by circumvention or evasion of the Reorganization Act—just repeal the whole section. We either ought to live up to that section or, if it is not workable, then we ought to have the legislative manhood and womanhood, and honesty of purpose

and forthrightness with the general public, to say, "We have found out that section 138 of the Reorganization Act is not workable, and instead of trying to kid you or mislead you a bit by setting a date so that the legislative budget means nothing, we are just admitting that the section will not work and we are repealing it." That action would be honest and forthright, but what is done, of course, depends upon the wishes and the will of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly said on the floor of the House, and I repeat it, that I consider the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] the best Republican politician in the House of Representatives. That does not mean to say that there are not other good ones on that side, but his versatility, of course, is known to all of us who have served with our distinguished friend.

In his remarks he overlooked one important factor, however, that 2 years ago the Democrats attacked the arbitrary manner in which the Republican Party undertook to comply with section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act. Lest they forget, let me refresh the memory of my friend from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], that instead of meeting it in an honest way, as we are meeting it now, his party brought in a resolution calling for a $6,000,000,000 cut in the budget recommendations. Now, if the Republican leadership had approached it the way we are approaching it, and we had then opposed it, the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], would be pertinent. But we took the position that a $6,000,000,000 cut was arbitrary; that it disregarded the equities and the necessities of specific items included in the President's budget. Of course, every bit of evidence in the Eightieth Congress confirms our position. After the House adopted this arbitrary $6,000,000,000 cut, and, of course, that was done by the then majority party, the resolution went over to the Senate; and the Senate majority party voted a $4,500,000,000 cut. Then the resolution went to conference, and of course it never saw the light of day again. At that time when the resolution was reported to the House and was pending in the House if a resolution along these lines had been introduced, a different situation would have existed; and if we Democrats opposed, I repeat, then the gentleman from Ohio in his "nonpolitical" speech that he says he has just made would have been on more tenable grounds. The best answer is that the gentleman himself admits that this is the honest approach to a situation that we know is difficult for both branches of Congress to work out in accordance with the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act at the present time; to wit, action on or before February 15.

As we construe the remarks of my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]—and there is no Member of the House more adroit in expression and in drawing the lines of differentiation between logical debate on the proposition and political argument—the remarks of the gentleman are in complete support of the resolution that is now pending before the House. I respect the gentleman in his further statement that he believes that the time limit should be completely eliminated. That may be so; I am not prepared to agree with that today. I think we ought to have one more year's experience, at least; but certainly in his frank way he has told the House and told the country just how he feels; that it is not a resolution, in his opinion, that goes far enough. I am not prepared to challenge that now; but, in any event, this resolution is based upon the necessities of the situation that confront the Congress; and the gentleman's remarks are certainly in support of the particular resolution, which, so far as this particular year is concerned in determining the budget limit for the fiscal year 1950, is a decided step in the right direction, according to his way of thinking.

I rose, however, to set the record straight and to show that our opposition to the resolution in the first session of the Eightieth Congress was based on the arbitrary cut, and that an approach of this kind would have been an honest one and probably would not have incurred our opposition.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, America today is facing a very serious situation. Federal tax collections from the people of the United States in the current fiscal year will run between $42,000,000,000 and $44,000,000,000. State and local tax collections will run nearly $15,000,000,000, and the total will run somewhere around $57,000,000,000. The expendable income, money that can be spent by the people, not the gross income that you hear talked about, but the expendable income, is less than $150,000,000,000. What does this mean? That we are paying today in this country for taxes 35 percent of what is taken in. Is it not about time that we begin to take into consideration what is going on instead of proposing additional taxes to ruin the country?

Mr. Speaker, as far as this particular resolution is concerned, I do not believe it will make the legislative budget provision of the Reorganization Act work. It could not be made to work last year, although we gave of ourselves all the time that it was possible to give in an effort to make it work satisfactorily. Instead of bringing in a subterfuge like this, I am wondering why the majority of the House does not have the courage to bring in a repealer? Every time that we suggested a reduction in over-all appropriations last year and the year before the spenders—those with special projects and other spenders—began to holler. They said that what we were trying to do was to cut down on particular projects that they had in mind.

Why do we not be honest with the House of Representatives and the people of the United States if we are going to do anything about this matter other than to try to make it work the way the reorganization bill provided? Why do we not have the courage to bring in a repealer of that provision?

I could not support this proposition when it was up for consideration before. I stated then just how it would work when the bill was on the floor for consideration. Let me ask again, Why do you not have the courage to face the music?

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor at this time to express my opinion that the postponement of this date for filing the legislative budget until May 1 this year is not in contravention or subterfuge to violate the intent of the legislative budget.

I also would like to answer the remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio and the distinguished gentleman from New York that we should in all honesty abolish the legislative budget.

In the first place, there is nothing sacred about any date or any particular time mentioned in the Reorganization Act. The Congress is a fluid organization and any Member of Congress must know that no one can possibly write a bill and the Congress cannot pass a bill that must not be looked at in the light of experience and of trial and error.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman misquoted me.

Mr. MONRONEY. I would not want to do that for the world. I thought I had quoted the gentleman correctly.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No. My statement was that we should be honest about this, if this will not work, that instead of circumventing the law we should be honest about it and say it will not work and repeal it. We should take one step or the other. We ought to keep it as it is or we ought to repeal it.

Mr. MONRONEY. Perhaps I erred and should not have said that the gentleman from Ohio takes the same position as the gentleman from New York. The gentleman from New York has been on record consistently since the legislative budget was first proposed in opposition to any legislative budget idea.

The original date in the Reorganization Act for filing the legislative budget, I believe, was April 15. At the request of the Appropriations Committee of the other body that was moved forward to March 15, then at the suggestion of the Appropriations Committee leaders over here, and in an effort to reach a compromise, it was finally made February 15. So this extension now to a later date more or less bears out the original idea that a quick consideration of the important items of a legislative budget are apt to mislead the country and the Congress on the attainment of a factual and a definite budget that Congress can live within.

So I do not think it is going to hurt the congressional reorganization a bit to postpone the date for this year only and try at a later date—I would much rather have a later date—to get closer to hitting the target of the legislative budget.

The accuracy of the budget is more important than to just keep the February 15 date and miss it by $6,000,000,000, as was done 2 years ago. If this mechanism of the legislative budget is to work and to be helpful to the country, then I think it must be as nearly accurate as possible in the light of carefully considered congressional estimates on appropriations and on revenue for that year.

I would like to express myself now on the abolishment of the legislative budget. Its abolishment would tear out the second most vital part of the reorganization of Congress. This was one of the principal things that gave hope to the people of the country that Congress would meet its most important task, and that is, the controls over the power of the purse.

People look to Congress as the guardian of the purse strings, and why the gentleman from New York would stand up here and ask that this mechanism be torn out of the Legislative Reorganization Act without giving it a fair trial, I simply cannot understand.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman mean that we did not give it a fair trial last year or the year before?

Mr. MONRONEY. I will say to the gentleman that the bringing in of a $6,000,000,000 cut in the President's budget on February 15, 2 years ago, was not a fair trial. Even though I was one of the sponsors of the legislative budget, I voted against that $6,000,000,000 cut, because I knew from my experience it was unrealistic and impossible of attainment.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman really believe in saving a dollar?

Mr. MONRONEY. I certainly do.

Mr. TABER. It is about time somebody did.

Mr. MONRONEY. If you will work and perfect this legislative budget as it was intended to be worked, if you put a staff on the legislative budget and study the budget requests of every single department, and follow from the time the desire of appropriation brings glint into a bureau's eye, and follow that request through the budget office of the President down to the time it comes to Congress, you will be aproaching the financial responsibility of the job Congress has to do.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Does the gentleman know that the testimony before the subcommittee of the War Department last year developed that they had $5,270,000,000 in 1946 and prior years' funds available for expenditure which the President did not include in that very budget the gentleman is talking about?

Mr. MONRONEY. I will say to the gentleman that we should have the very finest staff that money can employ for the Congress to know and understand every single budget item as it comes from these departments and from the President and the failure of the legislative budget has been largely because we have not had a proper staff employed for the legislative budget organization.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. And $4,000,000,000 of that amount remains in the Treasury today.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. The one thing, I think, that we have to realize as Members of Congress is that there are two ends to every budget:

First. How much are you going to spend; and

Second. How much are you going to take in?

In a simple analysis of legislative budget we ask that the Congress do exactly as every individual in business does, try and estimate his over-all expenditure and his over-all income, and try at one point in our congressional session to put these two important items in focus.

If we ignore the amount of revenue that we are going to have coming in at the time we try and fix an over-all budget ceiling on expenditures, then I think we are ignoring one of the principal tasks of this job. The Committee on Ways and Means before the Civil War used to handle both appropriations and also the matter of taxation, and they had control at both ends of the important fiscal job of Congress.

Now we have two committees operating in an airtight, hermetically sealed compartment. Under the legislative budget they must meet together and discuss the matter of revenue and appropriations. These two items, and their relationships of income and outgo, are problems that the people of the United States want to know and understand.

They want to know how are we going to balance the budget and how much revenue are we going to have to meet the necessary total expenditures?

The legislative budget should not be abolished; it should be made to work.

I do not yield to any man in my opinion of the ability of this great legislative body. We can, if we try, make a sound and reliable budget, just as capably as the executive department can. We only need to put the best efforts forward in this approach to an improved fiscal control by Congress.

I am tired, as one Member, of seeing our appropriations total grow haphazard as the result of many loosely connected subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee. Our total expenditure figure should be one that is in line with our ability to pay—and only by a legislative budget, taking into consideration both income and outgo, can we do our job.

The suggestion made that May 1 will be too late for any use, is not in line with the facts. A leading member of the Appropriations Committee informed the Rules Committee when this measure was before them, that three-fourths of the appropriations would not have been passed by both Houses before the May 1 date. My own opinion is that not much more than one-third of the money bills will have passed even one House before that date.

It is far more important to set the date forward to May 1 than to abandon the legislative budget. It is more important to change the date than to put up with meaningless budgets hastily arrived at without due consideration.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in the statement of the gentleman from Oklahoma. He said that any business concern wants to determine how much money it has to spend and how it is going to spend it. I agree with him 100 percent on that. But he said so much more that I do not agree with much of his arguments. Those in charge of any business do not wait until they have spent all their money and then come with recommendations for new features to their business. They decide what they have and what they want before they start any venture. Those responsible for the operation of any good, sound, business concern first sit down and try to analyze just how much it is going to cost them to run their business, new things they want in their business, and then find out how much money they have to spend in order to determine just what they can do. They determine it almost to the penny. If they do not have the money themselves, they want to know where they are going to get it, in order that they can carry out the proposals they are going to inculcate into their business. They do not start new improvements to cost great sums without knowing where the money is coming from.

Why is not that the sensible thing for this Government to do? That is what this law as it was adopted was intended to do. The Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Appropriations, and other Members of the House and Senate were to get together and try as best they could to find out exactly what was going to be required in the way of spending for the year, then they were going to analyze the new things they had, that the President had proposed in his messages to Congress and that the Members of Congress were going to propose in way of legislation. If you propose so much legislation that you are not going to have the money to finance it, and you are going to have deficit spending, then is the time to call a halt, and the report of this committee would be a deterrent to deficit spending.

The gentleman says the Members of this Congress are bright enough, smooth enough, and sweet enough that they are not going to ask for a whole lot of things, but every Member of Congress wants to have something for his own district that costs much money. He is more interested in that than he is in the welfare of the country as a whole. At least it looks that way. He wants to see if he can get appropriations through the Committee on Appropriations and through the Congress, because that will help him in his district.

What has been proposed in the President's budget? The President has proposed some new things. Military pay

adjustments are going to require over $300,000,000. Before we start on that, just remember that you have a $252,000,000,000 debt. The President has asked for $41,800,000,000 for next year. He realized that he is not going to get that money, that he is going to be short $855,000,000 from a balanced budget, when he presented all these requests. Someplace, somewhere, sometime, you will have to cut the cost of government and the President's recommendations.

This committee ought to come in here with these things and tell us just what we are going to have to cut out. Then we ought to be big enough to say that we are going to have a stable, sound Government, and are not going to spend any more than we have to spend. It would be a deterrent to too much legislation if this committee would come in here and make such recommendations to cut out a lot of the President's recommendations, or recommendations of Members of Congress.

Universal military training as proposed by the President is going to cost anywhere from $600,000,000 to $3,000,000,000 per year. Changes in the employees' accident compensation rates are going to cost per year from three to four million dollars. Slum clearance and housing are going to take $210,000,000 to $545,000,000 additional per year. Research and administration and losses on loans, although there has been no official estimate as to the cost, are thought by some people in Government to run as high as $2,000,000,000. That is a lot of money.

For Federal aid to education they want $300,000,000 the first year. The second year it will take $500,000,000. The third year it will take a billion dollars at the least. That is a lot of money. Where are you going to get it?

The National Science Foundation will take from $2,000,000 to $100,000,000 per year. Grain storage will take from $25,000,000 to $30,000,000 a year. The international wheat agreement will take from $55,000,000 to $70,000,000 a year.

Flood control on Missouri River Basin $4,000,000, and no one knows the final cost; probably like the TVA, it might be a billion dollars.

Health insurance or socialized medicine will run into hundreds of millions of dollars annually.

Unemployment compensation, higher rates and broadening the base.

Steam power plant on TVA—Government in business competing with private enterprise, $75,000,000. Oh, foolish legislation and proposals by the President.

Bureau of Reclamation—rehabilitation and betterment as required by the President will take from $4,000,000 to $12,000,000 a year.

The construction programs that he has asked for, such as the St. Lawrence seaway project, are to take $93,000,000 the first year up to a sum total in 7 years of $3,573,000,000—survey and educational building needs and study for scholarships and fellowships will take a million dollars a year or more.

Then there are grants for scholarships and so on. This thing is enormously important; this ought not to be delayed 1 minute, this report should be here by February 15. It can be done; it should be done. You ought to defeat this resolution.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for an observation?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I was very much interested in the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], wherein he suggested that this measure was in complete compliance with the spirit of the Reorganization Act. Being a man of peace and one who loves harmony, I would like to suggest to the gentleman that inasmuch as all of the appropriation bills of the House will probably be through the House by May 1, which would, of course, mean that the budget would mean nothing—in order to be certain that he will know exactly what he is going to do that he might well make this August 1 or September 1, or even January 1 of next year, so that he could be quite certain in knowing just where he was.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], who claims the great distinction of being one of the authors of the reorganization bill, in an attempt to justify his position on this resolution, which to my mind very surely represents a desertion of the very principle for which he originally fought, made the remark that the Congress is a fluid body. I am quite sure since he has so characterized all of us collectively as being a fluid body that he would not object to my suggesting that perhaps his position on this matter of the legislative budget is a little fluid.

Let us just take a look at the history of the Legislative Reorganization Act. Great numbers of right-thinking people in the country thought that the Congress of the United States needed to be streamlined, that it needed to be brought up to date in its procedure. So we in the Seventy-ninth Congress, a Democratic Congress, enacted the Reorganization Act. There were three things principally outstanding in that measure which were supposed to be helpful to the country. One of them was that we were to shrink up the committees from 48 to 19 in the House and make a like reduction in the other body. The second was that we were to give adequate staffing to those committees in order that they might have the benefit of expert advice and not be dependent upon the executive branch of the Government for all of our information. Thirdly, we were to adopt a legislative budget.

The Congress, may I suggest to the gentleman from Oklahoma, is in truth and in fact the guardian of the purse strings of the Nation. The Congress itself was to take 45 days to sit down, the House cooperating with the Senate, to determine first of all what the revenues could reasonably be expected to be during the coming year, and then to say, "Here is what we propose to spend."

It was assumed, I am quite sure, that those targets would be set and that then the Congress would go to work to try to fit the cloth to the pattern.

Now, what have we already seen? First of all, it fell to the lot of the Eightieth Congress to put the Reorganization Act into effect. I have said before, and what has here transpired today lends additional strength to my statement, that if the Eightieth Congress had not been a Republican Congress the provisions of the reorganization bill would never have been put into effect. You would not have had a shrinking up of committees; you would not have provided for an adequate staffing of those committees, and you would not have undertaken to comply with the requirements for a legislative budget.

In the Eightieth Congress we did put the Reorganization Act into effect. We did not change it in any one single essential feature. We strove to comply with all of its provisions, including the legislative budget.

It is true that in the first session the House and Senate did not finally agree in conference, but the Members of the House and the Members of the Senate at least had courage enough to grapple with the problem and to each state its views as to what the revenues would be and what the expenditures should be.

In the second session we did get out a legislative budget. We did say what we expected would be taken in and how much we should cut expenditures. And let me say to the membership, many of whom were not here in the Eightieth Congress, unfortunately, that we not only announced a legislative budget in the second session, but we lived up to that legislative budget, and we saved billions of dollars to the taxpayers of this country by cutting out unnecessary waste and extravagance.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Coming back to the statement that I made when the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] yielded to me, I have in my possession a detailed statement which I obtained from the War Department after 2 years of work with investigators. This statement shows that the War Department had $5,270,000,000 in 1946 and prior years funds available for expenditure at the time when the budget was submitted to the Legislative Budget Committee by the President. That budget which was submitted by the President to the Legislative Budget Committee did not contain this $5,270,000,000 which was available to the War Department for expenditure. Four billion dollars of that sum remained in the Treasury, either through rescission or refusal to reappropriate. The balance of $1,270,000,000 was obligated by the War Department. Part of these funds were used by the War Department in building those $74,000 houses for Army officers in Alaska.

Mr. HALLECK. Now, may I say that in my opinion the legislation before us today is a subterfuge, a face-saving device, calculated to permit my friends on the majority side from meeting the responsibility that they themselves imposed on themselves when they had control in the Seventy-ninth Congress. I do not think it is an honest attempt, and this is why it cannot be honest, and the argument of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], amazes me: By May 1, if I understand the timetable correctly, most of the appropriation bills will be through the House of Representatives and will have been acted upon. If that is true, what is the use of kidding ourselves by saying that making this May 1 we are going to make a determination. The fact of the matter is you have not even had a committee meeting to try to arrive at a legislative budget. You have not turned a wheel to try to meet the responsibility that you imposed on yourselves.

May I say further——

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I cannot refrain from yielding to my good friend from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman is well informed that in very few sessions have we been able to get out a majority of the appropriation bills, and when we did they would remain in the other body for an additional 2 months; so that there is ample time.

Mr. HALLECK. Now, you see, that is just some more of the earlier apology for this completely indefensible action you are taking here today.

May I say to the gentleman from Illinois that while action may not be completed in the other body on appropriation bills we over here have the first responsibility on appropriations and we ought to have before us the legislative budget in order that we may proceed to cut the cloth to fit the pattern. If there ever was a time when we ought to have that guidance it is now when we are confronted with demands for additional expenditures of billions and billions of dollars. I am afraid that too many of my Democratic friends are already demonstrating that they have no real intention to cut expenditures or balance the budget. Somewhere a line must be drawn on what we can take out of the economy and not destroy it. If the Democratic majority were not busy welching on its responsibility to determine the legislative budget, a good beginning could be made.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain newspaper excerpts; and to include in 7½-point type remarks made at the time of the adoption of the law.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the Legislative Reorganization Act was approved by the President in 1946. It provided for reduction in the number of committees, for increased congressional personnel, for the abolition of investigating committees and special committees, for the transfer to other agencies of private bills, for the control and registration of lobbyists, for the discontinuance of executive hearings by committees, for committee procedure in the consideration and reporting of bills, and for budgetary control through a joint Committee on the Legislative Budget consisting of the two taxing committees and the two spending committees of the two Houses.

No action of the Seventy-ninth Congress met with wider acclaim or more general approval. The bill passed both Houses by an overwhelming vote and was warmly endorsed by the press of the Nation.

But from the beginning the statute was singularly ineffective. In no instance, and in no respect, did it realize expectations and in no instance did it achieve the objective for which it had been drafted.

Now in its third year we can look back and appraise its effect in the light of comprehensive experience.

Through the association of frequently the most incongruous jurisdictions, it drastically reduced the 81 standing committees of the House and Senate to 146 subcommittees. As the United Press said, "The Senate instead of having 33 full committees as it had before the consolidation now has 15 committees and God knows how many subcommittees." The Senators who complained of having so many committees meeting at the same time now have more subcommittees meeting at the same time.

The Act was especially intended to eliminate special committees. But special committees have been created by both Houses in violation of both the spirit and letter of the law. The Senate after extended debate began by perpetuating the War Investigating Committee as a special group outside the committees authorized by the Reorganization Act and continued the practice. The House voted 269 to 100 to establish a seven-man committee to study the shortage of newsprint and later voted 270 to 92 to set up a nine-member committee on small business. The Commitee on the Disposition of Executive Papers with all its onerous duties followed.

So, in effect, this provision of the Reorganization Act which was perhaps stressed as strongly as any in the entire bill has been completely nullified.

It still exerts, however, one untoward effect. There are 47 men now serving in the two Houses, 29 men in the House and 18 in the Senate, who have been deprived of chairmanships which they have earned and to which they are entitled. And the same number of men on the other side of the aisle have been denied ranking minority assignments on committees through the operation of the act. They do the work and carry the responsibilities of a full committee. They have rendered efficient and distinguished service and are entitled to a chairmanship. But submerged in a subcommittee they are denied the recognition which they and their constituencies should have. Under this system able men may come to Congress and work for years and then retire without ever having reached a chairmanship. It is not only unjust to the Member but it does not contribute to the best interests of the Congress or the Nation.

And we were to be relieved of "trivia." Section 121 of the Reorganization Act was designed to relieve the membership of the burden of handling private bills. Such bills were to be delegated to administrative and judicial agencies. How has it worked? On the first day of last June the House had passed 187 private bills and 167 public bills. And the House, after 2 years, is still carrying the private calendar and in the last session was calling up private bills every 2 weeks.

The Reorganization Act also carried provisions prohibiting legislation by conference committees, the reporting of bills by a committee without majority vote, dictatorial action of a committee chairman contrary to the wishes of his committee, and similar well-established procedures. All such provisions are mere padding as all of them have been embodied in the law and practice of the House from a time when the memory of man runneth not to the contrary.

The act banned closed sessions. Open hearings were to be the rule. And yet both the Ways and Means Committee and the Committee on Appropriations, for example, have continued closed sessions. I do not recall a single open session by the committee, or any subcommittee, of the Committee on Appropriations since the law was enacted. Like all other provisions of the act the inhibitation of executive sessions is honored by its breach.

Another of the reforms to be instituted by the Reorganization Act was the control of lobbyists. They were to be required to register and in that way the evil was to be eradicated or at least reduced to inoccuous proportions. The newspapers report that during the entire Eightieth Congress, and with increasing activity in the Eighty-first Congress, the lobbyist has flourished as a green-bay tree. There are said to be more high-powered, high-priced lobbyists in Washington today with larger expense funds at their disposal than ever before. And so far as can be noted by the casual observer they have not been affected by the Reorganization Act in the slightest.

The National Legionnaire, in commenting on this section of the Reorganization Act, said:

> American Legion legislative representatives registering under the new Lobbying Act describe it as a weak and flexible measure denying the public a true picture of expenditures and they proposed legislation requiring complete financial statements such as those furnished by the Legion for decades.
>
> John Thomas Taylor, national legislative director of the American Legion, one of three to register, condemned the section of the act as being a "camouflaged works which is an insult to the intelligence of the American citizen, whom it would deceive."
>
> "This section," Director Taylor charged, "is a farce, which enterprising lobbyists must praise as they gleefully behold the many loopholes.

Although the Reorganization Act was launched with the universal approval and commendation of the press, the failure of the law to effect economy or increased efficiency has been so marked that its most ardent editorial advocates have become critical.

For example, the United States News, which strongly championed its enactment, says:

BRAKES ON SPEED-UP PROGRAM AS SUBCOMMITTEES RISE, BUDGET LAGS—LITTLE CHANGE IN OUTPUT OF LAWS DESPITE $5,000,000 A YEAR FOR EXPERT ASSISTANCE

The Eightieth Congress is remodeled and streamlined for efficiency. It has $5,000,000 a year in new experts and technicians, all sorts of new controls and machinery designed to put lawmaking on a scientific basis. But a careful study of its work indicates that Congress is going along in about the same old way.

An investigation shows:

Legislative output is about on a par with that of other Congresses.

The legislative budget, designed to bind together governmental income and outgo controls, is caught in a dispute and all but forgotten. Appropriation and tax bills are moving as usual.

A streamlined committee system is now filling the Capitol with subcommittees, and, in some cases, this new committee system is adding another layer of red tape to the legislative processes. More red tape, no greater output.

Lobbyists, who were to be controlled, still are busy in committees and at the nightly social affairs of the Capital.

BUDGET TANGLE

The legislative budget was designed to bring the spending and taxing committees of Congress together for a study of the Nation's fiscal situation and for agreement upon over-all spending and taxing policies. A figure for total spending would be set and appropriation bills cut to fit that total. Taxes would be fixed accordingly.

But House Republicans demanded a $6,000,000,000 cut in the budget President Truman submitted, so as to assure tax reduction. Senate Republicans wanted a smaller cut, and there was dispute over how much should go toward retirement of the national debt.

In the midst of that row, the legislative budget mired down. It now rests in a joint committee of Senators and Representatives. Meanwhile, taxes are going in one direction and appropriation in another.

FROM COMMITTEES TO SUBCOMMITTEES

Streamlining trimmed off about three-fifths of the old committees. Each committee was expected to do whatever investigating was needed in its own field.

But the streamlining left 47 Senators and Representatives who otherwise would have been committee chairmen without any committees to head. The first breaks in the reorganization plan came with the creation of special investigation committees; for national defense and small business in the Senate; for supply of newsprint and small business in the House.

After the committees were organized, the dam broke. The new committees were large, and dealt with many subjects. And there were about 40 chairless would-be chairmen. The committees broke into huddles of subcommittees. In the House, some committees have 10 or 12 subcommittees. Members who used to go from one committee meeting to another now go from one subcommittee meeting to another.

This new technique in some cases is tending to add another layer of red tape to congressional procedure. Under the old system, the committee that prepared a bill brought the measure to the floor, directly. Now the first group to handle a bill usually is a subcommittee, and the product has to be approved by the full committee before going to the floor.

If the chairman insists upon a meticulous study by the full committee before approval, the work of the subcommittee is gone over from end to end, amounting to a double job.

In like vein the Washington Times-Herald commented:

Congress is bidding fair to reorganize itself into a state of utter confusion. If it continues to streamline and simplify at its present pace, it will become so complicated and unwieldy that another city will have to be built just to house the overflow subcommittees.

The major idea behind reorganization was to cut down the committees to a practical minimum; to avoid overlapping and duplication of effort. This was very laudible, because there was almost as much duplication hereabouts as duplicity.

The actual result, however, seems to be that Congress has merely gone from confusion to chaos. Although the regular standing committees have been reduced materially, five subcommittees now bloom where only one was a blooming nuisance before.

Take the House Army and Navy Affairs Committees as a notable example. Theoretically, they have been merged into one committee on the Armed Services. But whereas there were these two committees before, now this merged committee has 12 subcommittees.

The Army and Navy Committees had a room each under the old order. The merged committee now takes up two committee rooms and nine suites—practically one entire corridor of the old House Office Building.

The number of standard committees in the House was cut from 49 to 19, but there is less room now than ever before. In fact, nearly a month after the reconvening of Congress, upwards of 20 members still are without offices and are forced to transact their business at make-shift desks stuck in the corners of caucus rooms or storerooms.

These officeless statesmen have literally been reorganized out of a joint they can call their own. It seems every possible bit of space around the Capitol and environs is occupied by a subcommittee on something or other.

Unless something is done, very few members will ever have any clear idea of proposed legislation. It used to be that a bill was threshed out in its entirety before the full standing committee. The committee then was able to present it in fairly clear form to the entire body. Every member of the committee, if he had listened carefully and intelligently, had a good idea of the picture as a whole.

Let us again take the merged military committee as an example. Its twelve subcommittees are composed of 10 members each, who consider various phases of the proposed bill. The net result is that the full committee never gets to hear the full legislation.

But of all the unworkable and impracticable provisions of the Reorganization Act, the section providing for a legislative budget is the most unworkable and impracticable.

And may I say, Mr. Speaker, that the legislative budget has had a fair trial. I want to extend my compliments to the gentleman from New York, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations last Congress, and Senator BRIDGES, chairman of the Appropriations Committee in the Senate, on their efforts to make it work. They gave it a fair trial and they made every effort to get results.

So far as I am personally concerned, let me say that I have not changed my position as was intimated here. In the last Congress I introduced this same resolution, and it was pigeonholed.

I introduced also in this session a resolution providing for the suspension of this section pending further study and I am glad to note that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] agree with me that the section should be taken out of the law.

Why did we not press that resolution instead of the pending resolution? Because the leadership on that side of the House has repeatedly issued releases to the press in the last 2 or 3 weeks in which they said emphatically they would fight to the death any effort to abolish the provision. Rather than engage in a partisan contest, on a matter on which there should be no partisanship, we then proposed this resolution with the thought that it would meet with general approval.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I regret that I do not have the time, but I shall be glad to entertain an interruption by my beloved friend from Pennsylvania at some other time.

Mr. Speaker, of all of the unworkable and impracticable provisions in the Reorganization Act none is so unworkable and impracticable as the legislative budget. We have tried it. We gave it every opportunity. It cannot be made effective. We can no more expect success, Mr. Speaker, with this well-meant but hopeless proposal than we can expect a verdict from the jury before it has heard the evidence.

How can we judge the correctness of this mass of estimates? The Government has been working on its preparation for more than a year. It is a book the size of an unabridged dictionary. It is possible there are proposed expenditures in there which ought to come out. It may be there are others which should be included. But, how can we tell without studying them? How can we reach a dependable over-all figure? It is absolutely impossible. It cannot be done, gentlemen, try as we may.

If under the proposed system you fix the date early enough to affect expenditures there is no time in which to hold hearings and arrive at a dependable conclusion. If on the other hand you delay the date until after hearings have been held the bills will already have been passed and it is too late to affect them.

Let us take up the bill itself with this problem before us.

Section 138 created a Joint Committee of Congress on the Legislative Budget consisting of the two taxing committees—Ways and Means of the House and Finance of the Senate—and the two appropriating committees of Congress—Appropriations of the House and Appropriations of the Senate. The combined membership of these four committees is 104.

The law requires this joint committee to report to the respective Houses of Congress not later than February 15 of each year a legislative budget for the next year including the estimated over-all Federal receipts and expenditures. They are also required to report a recommendation as to the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in the next year with a reserve for emergencies if deemed necessary. If there is an estimated surplus, the joint committee has to make a recommendation for a reduction in the public debt. Nothing is said about a decrease in taxes. The law leaves

no choice to the joint committee as to the disposition of the surplus; it ties their hands in favor of debt reduction.

The controversial nature of the action under section 138 comes from the requirement that the joint committee accompany their report with a concurrent resolution proposing adoption of the legislative budget and fixing the maximum amount to be appropriated by Congress at that session for expenditure in the next fiscal year. Nothing is said about a limit on appropriations for the subsequent fiscal years which might conceivably be an important factor in the financing program of those years. If there is an estimated deficit instead of a projected surplus, the concurrent resolution is to contain a declaration that it is the sense of Congress that the public debt should be increased by the amount of the deficit. Again it ties the hands of the joint committee as to the manner of meeting the deficit. A recommendation for new taxation or partial new taxation and partial increase in debt would not suffice.

There is no clarity as to what Congress intended in section 138 by the legislative budget. Did it envision the complete make-up of the present appropriation bills in final detail? Did it hope for one consolidated appropriation bill? Did it contemplate only a schedule of the items in general? Or did it intend simply an allocation of available revenue in general lump to each of the departments and other agencies? The only definite expression in the section is that it shall be a legislative budget and include the estimated receipts and expenditures and recommend a maximum limit on the total to be appropriated for expenditure in the ensuing year.

The outside date fixed for reporting the legislative budget is February 15 of each year. This automatically precludes a detailed budget because it could not be made ready by that time. If it envisioned only schedules of items or allocations by agencies those could only soundly be reached by consideration of the details which comprise the whole and again the dead line of time defeats practical compliance. A consolidated appropriation bill is ruled out for the same reason. The upset date contributes to make section 138 action the vehicle of the cleaver instead of the scalpel.

As will be noted, the over-all budget figure, even when finally adopted, is not mandatory. It is not binding in any respect. It establishes no statutory limitation on the Federal budget or on the amount appropriated by Congress or on expenditures. It is merely the expression of a pious hope, which Congress may disregard, and which Congress has invariably disregarded.

The plan is wholly impracticable. A figure was finally adopted in the last session. But has any Member of the House ever heard it referred to in connection with any appropriation bill? After the legislative budget was adopted in the Eightieth Congress we passed all the supply bills carrying innumerable items and billions of dollars. Was the over-all figure ever considered or referred to at any time during the consideration of these bills? After its adoption by the House and Senate it was never heard from again. If adopted in this Congress it will not be taken into consideration in the preparation and passage of a single appropriation bill. It is wasted time and effort. Try as we may, give it our wholehearted support, and it is still a dead letter. It cannot be made effective.

We take the time of a committee of 104 busy men, at a particularly busy time in the session and we expend, in printing and other expenses incident to the passage of a legislative budget, over $31,000, as we did in the last Congress. And at the end of the session there is no advantage of any kind to compensate for the expenditure of time or money.

Permit me to quote from men whose opinion should have some weight in such matters: Here are comments taken from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

OPINIONS

Mr. BROWN. The provision is of no great value. We cannot fix this early in any congressional session with any accuracy just what the spending requirements will be. If we wait until later there will be no necessity of fixing the ceiling because it will already have been fixed by the votes on appropriation bills.

Mr. TABER. Impossible to take the figures herewith submitted and arrive at any conclusion which will jibe with appropriations that so far have been made and which will be made in the rest of the session. That part of the Reorganization Act was a mistake. It is not binding on the Congress and is not a satisfactory guide to what might result. The whole thing is a stab in the dark.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. This requirement has proved itself to be impracticable.

Senator BRIDGES. The Legislative Reorganization Act became a law August 2, 1946. It directed the four House and Senate Revenue and Appropriation Committees to recommend to their respective Houses a legislative budget for the ensuing fiscal year. Such report to contain a recommendation for the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in that year.

As the act is now written I do not believe that the legislative budget will ever be more than a pregame guess at the final score. It asks the Joint Budget Committee to give its estimates of a multitude of new facts, figures, conditions, and requests with which it has had little or no time to become acquainted.

Actually, long and detailed hearings are necessary if we are to have a realistic picture of the proper relationship between revenues, appropriations, expenditures, and debt reduction.

Senator TAFT could claim no more for it than an intelligent guess, while Representative RAYBURN, of Texas, House Democratic leader, said all that was done was to "pick a figure out of the air."

These comments do not come from men lacking responsibility. From the joint committee's report, many are from men in positions of high responsibility and leadership. They do not want deliberately to confuse, yet they are required by law to perform a duty which leads nowhere.

The press of the country is in a large measure in agreement with this view. The Washington Star, one of the great papers of the Nation, which has consistently supported efforts to achieve a workable legislative budget, said editorially:

BUDGET CUTTING BY GUESSWORK

The manifest irresolution with which the Senate resolved to cut President Truman's budget by two and a half billion dollars is understandable. The Senate was making a necessary gesture, in accordance with provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act, but the report of the Joint Legislative Budget Committee makes it plain that the gesture should not be taken too seriously.

The committee, for its part, tossed its budget reduction recommendation into the Senate's lap with a warning that it was little more than a figure grabbed out of a hat. Chairman BRIDGES of the joint committee put it this way in his report: "As the act is now written, I do not believe that the legislative budget will ever be more than a pregame guess at the final score." The law, he pointed out, requires the committee to give its estimate "of a multitude of new facts, figures, conditions, and requests with which it has had little or no time to become acquainted."

When the legislative budget plan was first tried out last year, the committee made a sincere effort to get the facts, holding hearings at which the Budget Director was a witness. But Senate and House were unable to agree whether the President's budget should be slashed six billions or four and a half billions, and the plan ultimately failed. This year the committee did not even bother to hold hearings. Not even the Budget Director was questioned. The committee just made a guess and handed it to Congress on a take-it-or-leave-it basis.

It would not be fair, however, to criticize the committee for this casual attitude toward a matter of such moment to the country. As Chairman BRIDGES stressed in his report and as others at the Capitol have said before him, it is just expecting too much to require a newly constituted group of more than a hundred legislators to submit an intelligent report before the February 15 dead line fixed by law. This cumbersome group of changing membership has found it impossible to study, analyze, and report on a fifteen-hundred-page budget in the few weeks allowed.

The Star also carried an article analyzing admirably the entire situation:

Although the La Follette-Monroney Act reorganizing the Congress is properly regarded as a forward-looking piece of legislation, it is becoming increasingly clear that at least one of its provisions is of dubious value. This is the section directing Congress to establish a legislative budget.

Under this portion of the act the committees which handle revenue bills and the committees which handle appropriation bills in each House are required to meet at the beginning of each session of Congress. After consultation and consideration of the budget recommendations of the President these committees are directed to report to their respective Houses an estimate of receipts and expenditures. The difficulty with this section is that it requires this report to be filed on February 15 and to contain a recommendation for the maximum amount to be appropriated. The recommendation is to be accompanied by a resolution adopting the budget and fixing a ceiling on the forthcoming appropriations.

Until the passage of the La Follette-Monroney Act the preparation of the Federal budget was considered a purely executive function. The itemized list of proposed appropriations for each department and agency of Government is transmitted by the President to Congress on the day after his message on the state of the Union. This, of course, does not mean that the executive budget is binding upon Congress since in

passing appropriation bills either House can revise or reject any item contained in it. It did mean, however, that with respect to any reductions made by Congress the agency affected had been afforded an opportunity for a hearing before both the House and Senate Appropriation Committees and a consideration of its case on the merits. The only aspect of finality to the President's recommendations is that no agency may ask its subcommittee on appropriations for an amount in excess of his budget estimate.

As a result of the limited period available to Congress to frame a budget, the joint committees are now compelled to act without an opportunity for scientific appraisal of the merits of the particular items. Consequently the budgetary proceedings in the House and Senate and in the Republican caucuses have been distinguished more for partisan prejudice than for sober legislative thought. While informed persons would agree that with the cessation of hostilities it became incumbent upon the President and Congress to adhere to a budget which would bring about a significant reduction in the national debt, apparently the majority leaders in Congress have given little or no thought to the question of whether the best way of attaining this was to cut expenditures or to increase the tax rates. Instead the Republicans accepted as party gospel the theory that Federal expenditures were much too high and that the President's budget could be reduced anywhere from $6,000,000,000 to $4,000,000,000.

Inasmuch as the Republican leadership in both branches took the position that the joint legislative budget committees were justified in making such a recommendation without disclosing specific items in the present budget which are to be reduced or omitted, it is apparent that both the six billion and the four billion figures were picked out of the air. The only approximation which either of these figures bears to the arithmetic of the problem is that if Representative Knudsen, the new chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, is permitted to carry out his pledge of a 20-percent reduction in income taxes, the estimated loss to the Treasury would be close to $4,000,000,000.

Of course, it is understandable that after long years of frustration, apostles of economy in government are naturally resentful of a budget of $37,000,000,000. But to strike out blindly without considering the merits of the functions which the Federal Government would necessarily have to abandon under the proposed legislative ceiling is to pursue a course which would defeat the underlying policies of the La Follette-Monroney Act. By and large the purpose of this legislation was to enable Congress to act upon information and mature consideration, rather than upon passion and prejudice. To realize this objective, the act not only limited the unwieldy size and number of committees but also made provisions for staffing them with expert advisers. But before placing this scientific committee machinery to work on the highly technical problem of putting our fiscal house in order, Congress is now acting in a vacuum on a question having tremendous repercussions upon our fate abroad as well as upon our domestic economy.

Mr. Speaker, the section should be suspended and opportunity afforded to substitute a method through which an accurate and dependable budget can be determined and determined in time to affect the appropriations and expenditures of the annual budget. As that is impossible at this time, the only alternative is to adopt the pending resolution and provide time in which to make the best computation possible under the circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion may I revert to remarks on this subject when the adoption of the Reorganization Act was under debate:

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives is the heart and soul of the American system of government. Destroy or nullify its functions and you have left but the shell of free government. Any influence which tends to reduce the confidence or the regard in which it is held by the American people militates to that extent against the effectiveness of the Government, if not the preservation of the Government itself.

Mr. Speaker, wherever dictators and usurpers have climbed to autocratic power in any country, their first care has been to strike at the representatives of the people in the legislative branch of the government. Oliver Cromwell, in proroguing the English Parliament, pointed his sword at the mace lying upon the table of the House of Commons and cried, "Take away this bauble." When it was carried out there went with it representative government in all England.

Again, Napoleon, stalking into the French Chamber of Deputies at the head of his grenadiers, cried, "Follow me. I am destiny. I am the divinity of the day." As his bayonets drove out the representatives of the people, some of them climbing through windows to escape, they drove out civil and religious liberty.

From that day until the end of the Napoleonic dynasty, France, and all Europe controlled by France, was without representative government.

Again, so recently, Hitler, endeavoring to seize the reins of government in Germany, as the first step toward world domination, burned down the Reichstag Building, so that Germany's House of Representatives, unable to meet, was scattered in confusion, and before it could reassemble, a large number had been proscribed or were in concentration camps, and free government in Germany had been destroyed, and free government was in peril throughout the world.

Here in America, whenever any man or group of men has sought to establish autocratic control, whether political, economic, or industrial, they have struck, either directly or by innuendo, at the influence of the Representatives of the American people on this floor. Of course, the American people have long ago advanced beyond the stage of armed interference with the legislative branch of the Government by military authorities. That would be impossible in America today. Our state of civilization does not countenance the political prison or the concentration camp. But there are other ways of undermining the standing and influence of the Congress in the regard and confidence of the people, which, whether with or without sinister motives, can be just as effective when carried to their ultimate conclusion.

The Congress has been subject to criticism—as it should be—ever since the establishment of the Republic. One of the most priceless prerogatives of every American is the right to criticize Congress and the Members of Congress, and that right has been widely and fully exercised from the First Congress down to the Seventy-ninth Congress now in session. At times that criticism has been more virulent and more undeserved than at others. And that is as it should be. Better that Congress and Congressmen be unjustly accused on many occasions than that they should escape merited stricture on any single occasion.

But, Mr. Speaker, in the last 2 years such a flood of unwarranted and unsupported abuse and castigation has been loosed against Congress and its procedure as has no equal in the annals of congressional condemnation.

Newspaper columnists and radio broadcasters have vied with written and spoken jeremiads delivered here on this floor to an extent that at times transcend even the bounds of truth and good taste. The abuse of Congress, criticism of the Congress and its membership and its procedure, has been without precedent since the stormy days of the Sixtieth and Sixty-first Congresses when the House Rules were a national political issue.

Effort has been made to convince the American people that something is so wrong with congressional procedure that dire disaster menaces the country, its form of government, and its democratic institutions, unless immediate and drastic action is taken to save the Nation and its democratic practices from onrushing ruin and destruction. In order to foster this propaganda a campaign of abuse and disparagement of Congress individually and collectively has been waged. Let me quote from just a few of many such castigations. Here is a summarization of such criticism epitomized by one of the distinguished Members of the other body and published in the Pageant magazine:

> The trouble with Congress is, briefly, Congressmen. Their two main interests have been getting reelected and lining their pockets. Short of everything else they are lazy and overpaid. They have it soft. The lobbyists write our laws, and in a way that is fortunate for Congressmen are numbskulls, they are windbags, obstructionists, and worse. Only a vigilant press deters them from raiding the Treasury.

Here is a quotation from a statement made on our own floor:

> The people think we are a bunch of clowns.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Maybe the gentleman who made that statement has heard from his home folks and he does not know about the rest of us.

Mr. CANNON. That is quite possible. These statements reflect not only on Congress and Congressmen but on the American people. Here is a statement from a national magazine, Life:

> Like the American people, they—
>
> That is the Congressmen—
>
> Like the American people they represent, they are indeed often ignorant, provincial, and greedy.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. There are good people, honest people, patriotic people, who lack sufficient experience to be able to weigh those statements. Especially is that true when they see those statements in books or pamphlets.

I have received many letters stating, "If the charge is not true, why do you not sue him?" But the gentleman knows how futile and how expensive that sort of procedure is. When a charge is made against the House as a whole, it does occur to me that the makers of the charge should be brought before the bar of the House.

Mr. CANNON. I would hardly favor bringing in the publisher of any magazine or newspaper. As I have said, it is better that Congress be accused untruthfully a hundred times than not to be accused one time when we should be accused.

I think we should demonstrate, as we have demonstrated, and as we are demonstrating, on the floor here, the untruthfulness of these statements.

Mr. Speaker, here is another statement appearing in Reader's Scope:

> Washington's great Capitol dome covers a lot of statemanship and a lot of skulduggery and bungling inefficiency.

Again, here is an editorial appearing in one of the great newspapers of the Nation:

> Congress is unintelligent, lacks courage, is bogged down in red tape.

You will notice, Mr. Speaker, that there is no distinction here between the Congress and its membership. They do not make that statement with reference to some one or two Members of the House. They make the broad statement that the Congress is unintelligent, lacks courage, and is bogged down in red tape. It is in the deadliest form in which it could be put in order to affect the sentiment of the country. There is no differentiation between the institution and its membership.

Then I include a statement from the Saturday Evening Post, in one of the most astounding articles I have ever read in a national magazine, a number of copies of which have been sent to me from different parts of the United States:

> Congress has been ridiculed by the public and kicked around by the executive departments until a groveling inferiority complex has brought wide conviction to its Members that the future is without hope.

An astonishing statement in a great national magazine, that all hope is gone. These statements have appeared in newspapers and periodicals in every city in the United States, not merely once, but systematically and serially. They are not merely attacks upon the House and its membership, but the idea intended to be conveyed to the people is that a serious situation obtains today which, if not remedied in the immediate future, is fraught with catastrophic disaster.

The impression is given that the situation amounts to a national crisis in which the liberties and the integrity of the Government itself are at stake. As an example, in this article in the Saturday Evening Post the situation is represented as "an issue as grave as any in the history of federalization."

Now that is covering a wide territory but that is the phraseology of the statement. The article goes on to say this supreme and transcendent issue is "whether Congress can modernize its archaic machinery and thoroughly regain its historic position of power without which the democratic process will fail."

It will be noticed that the unmistakable inference is that Congress has lost its powers, and that unless some miracle of recovery can be achieved, democracy is dead, and this in face of the fact that Congress in this session has brushed aside any conflict with other branches of the Government, has maintained its position and power under the Constitution as never before, and has just administered victoriously, without error or scandal, the greatest war in history—a record unapproached in that respect by any Congress since the establishment of the Republic.

Another Member of the coordinate body of the Congress make this statement: "Upon a stronger and more effective Congress may well depend the preservation of democracy in the United States."

You cannot imagine a statement of a more serious tenor.

And another Member of the same body says that something should be done "to see that the American Congress does not wither away."

Another Member of this body says: "Unless the representative system is strengthened, Congress will fade out as an effective control by the people of their Government."

And, again, this: "Situation means a concentration of Government power in one branch of Government. It is a threat to the basic liberties of the people."

And, by another Member of the other body: "We must have a reorganization of Congress to the end that the Congress of the United States may reclaim its lost powers and prestige, and may once again become a truly coordinated branch of the Government."

These Jeremiahs insist that it is not merely a problem; that it is a danger. For example, here is a quotation from the floor:

> Rule by the people must surely end if the Federal Legislature is abolished or reduced to relative unimportance. Both friends and foes of Congress agree that has in a measure already come.

Mr. RANKIN. I wonder how they ever got the idea that the friends of Congress agreed to any such proposition.

Mr. CANNON. I think anybody who is familiar with the actual situation here will appreciate the absurdity of it.

Mr. RANKIN. Of course, the gentleman from Missouri who is now addressing the House knows more about parliamentary law and parliamentary procedure than any other man alive today. I say that advisedly. I knew him when he was a Parliamentarian. I knew him when he first came to Congress. I believe I am as familiar with CANNON's precedents as any other man in the House. I am sure the gentleman from Missouri will agree that the rules of the House of Representatives as they now stand constitute the greatest system of parliamentary procedure the world has ever known. Am I right in that?

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman is unfortunate in his premise but he affirms the opinion of every constitutional authority in his estimate of the rules of the House.

Our system of procedure is the product of more than a thousand years of legislative experience. Some objection has been made that it is not up to date, that like a woman's hat or a man's necktie, it ought to change every year. As a matter of fact, parliamentary procedure is based upon fundamental rules of decorum which do not change any more than the fundamental rules of human conduct as set forth in the Ten Commandments change. It has been built up through centuries of experience in various legislative bodies, beginning with the Anglo-Saxon Witenagemot, continuing down through the development of parliamentary government in the colonial legislatures in this country and under our own system of government for more than 150 years.

The tenor of these statements is that the Government faces a crisis. That the threat is serious, the danger is real, the life of representative government is at stake. I ask you seriously, if there is any basis for these statements so industriously disseminated over the country.

Continuing, here is an editorial from one of the great newspapers of the Nation, a newspaper which probably ranks as 1 of the 10 great papers on the American Continent. This is what it says, referring to the situation supposed to have brought about the appointment of the streamlining committee:

> The crisis is a challenge to do something before it is too late. It is an alarming situation.

"Do something before it is too late." Too late for what? "An alarming situation." What is it that is so alarming?

This Congress has been tried as no other Congress has been tried. It has had to meet situations no other Congress has been called upon to meet and it has met them effectively and successfully. Still they say that the situation is so alarming that before it is too late something must be done or chaos will follow.

Every once in a while a messiah arises to predict the end of the world, but the world keeps on going, and despite these tongues of Thersites, Congress keeps on doing a good job—the best it has ever done—but these prophets of calamity say that something must be done, must be done quickly, must be done before it is too late.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri has consumed 30 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I will use another 30 minutes.

Continuing, this statement says:

> Congress has largely abdicated its legislative as well as its supervisory functions and duties.

Gentlemen, anyone visiting the House on any day it is in session would be surprised at that statement. What has Congress abdicated? What right or prerogative has it relinquished? What function has it waived? Wherein has it failed in any duty or responsibility?

I have read some of the testimony adduced before the streamlining committee. The committee invited all Members

of the House and Senate and anyone else who had a grievance and felt that something was wrong and ought to be remedied, to appear before them. Much of the testimony adduced before the committee borders on the ridiculous. One of the first Members of the other body who appeared before that committee began his statement with an excoriation of the acoustic properties of the Senate Chamber. It has been claimed here that the liberties of the Republic were at stake, and when he was called in and asked how and why they were at stake, he said he could not be heard when he spoke in the Senate Chamber and something ought to be done about it. Another mentioned in his opening statement that he had received a request from a constituent as to where colored feathers could be sold. He was irked because a constitutent who wanted to dispose of commodities which he was in a position to produce inquired of him where a market could be found. He was advised to stand on his dignity and refuse to answer.

Mr. Speaker, we invite every legitimate criticism. But many of the statements that have been so widely circulated in order to whip up interest over this question, are without any foundation of fact.

For example, the statement has been made on the floor here and copied in most of the metropolitan papers of the country, and one of the great newspapers of the country carried it in a box on its editorial page, day after day, week after week, and month after month, as follows:

> Not since 1893 has the machinery of Congress been overhauled.

Largely on that one statement they based their demand for a change of congressional procedure.

Now, that situation, even if it were true, might not be so serious, because the fundamental rules of procedure in a deliberative body do not change from year to year. There are no fashions in legislative procedure. We do not have to have a new set of rules every spring. But the thing I am calling attention to is that the statement which has been so widely publicized, and upon which most of the objection to our procedure has been founded, is utterly without a basis of fact. It simply is not true.

For example, instead of going back to 1893 for a revision of our procedure, the greatest revision of the rules of the House of Representatives of all time was in the Sixty-second Congress, 1911–12. There are Members still on the floor who participated in that revision. We had just come through a political campaign in which the issue was the rules of the House, and, in particular, the control of the Speaker over the House, and the country had, by its vote at the polls, demanded a change in the rules and curtailment of the power of the Speaker. When the House assembled that was the prior item of business.

Accordingly the revision of 1911–12 was the most drastic in the history of the Congress. Committees were established and discontinued. That is the piece de resistance before us today—as to whether we will have new committees or retain old committees or consolidate committees, or what we are going to do about it. In the revision of 1911–12 many committees were created and abolished. Committees were created and abolished. The control of the Speaker over the House, which had become autocratic, was broken. The Speaker's power of recognition, which had been one of his great prerogatives, was circumscribed by the establishment of the Unanimous Consent Calendar, the Discharge Calendar rule, provision for Calendar Wednesday, and restriction to the minority of the right to offer a motion to recommit.

The House took away from the Speaker those powers which had given him autocratic control over legislation. Reference of bills to committees was standardized by the rigid enforcement of the rule of jurisdiction. Recalcitrant committees and managers of conferences were rendered subject to summary discharge. The Holman rule was permanently incorporated in the rules of the House—a provision which has saved more money than any other one provision in the rules. The right to appoint committees, perhaps the greatest source of his power, was taken from the Speaker. Previously he could put a man on a committee or could take him off. If a man did not do what he was told to do, he was taken off the committee, or was sometimes put on a committee with the understanding that he would take some particular action. That power—a power which had been in effect since the beginning of the Government—was taken from him. The Speaker was made ineligible to membership on the Committee on Rules. I remember when the Committee on Rules consisted of three members: John Dalzell, of Pennsylvania; Speaker Joseph G. Cannon, of Illinois; and the gentleman from Mississippi, one of the most distinguished Members of this House of all time, John Sharp Williams. The committee would bring in a rule providing for the consideration of such legislation as they wanted. John Sharp Williams would rise and protest vigorously against the "outrage." Finally, when they wanted a meeting of this committee, John Dalzell would go over to Mr. Williams on the floor and say, "Come on, John, we are going to perpetrate another 'outrage.'" No bill could be brought up unless the Speaker approved it.

All this was changed in 1911–12. For the first time in the history of the House, its rules were completely democratized. It constituted the most important and farthest-reaching revision in the annals of parliamentary government in the United States; numerous other changes have been made in subsequent revisions; and yet the country is told that nothing has been done in the way of revising the rules since 1893. In other words, this statement, which has been used more than anything else to bolster up the claim that our procedure is antiquated, out of date, and inadequate, is based upon a statement that is utterly without foundation.

Among the statements lacking in accuracy but advanced as a reason for revision of House procedure is the statement that bills are referred to committees in consideration of the attitude of the chairman toward the proposed legislation. As you know, the Parliamentarian actually refers the bills by authority granted to the Speaker under the rules of the House. The inference is that the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the man who so enjoys the confidence and affection of this body as to be elected its Presiding Officer, will, if he is opposed to a measure, refer it to the committee where the chairman is hostile to that measure, or if he favors it, will refer it to a committee where the chairman is favorable to the legislation. I have here the book and page on which this charge is set forth.

As a matter of fact, nothing could be further from the facts. Never has the oldest Member of this House ever heard, much less known, it to be so much as intimated that the Speaker was governed by his attitude on a bill in its reference to a committee.

Then I think there is no charge that has been made more frequently, and more inaccurately, in an endeavor to secure public approval of some notion that something is seriously wrong with the procedure of the House than the statement that committees have overlapping and duplicating jurisdiction. As a matter of fact, the jurisdiction of the committees of the House is so definitely established and has been for so many years that the question of the reference of a bill never arises on the floor. There is no overlapping committee jurisdiction in this House.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Is it not a fact that the rules of the House provide that, if any Member has an objection to the reference of a bill, he can make a point of order and bring the matter to the attention of the House and the Speaker and have a ruling by the House itself?

Mr. CANNON. I appreciate the gentleman's suggestion, because I was just proceeding to make the statement the gentleman has made. If a bill should be referred to a committee which does not have jurisdiction, there is every provision for its rereference to the committee properly having jurisdiction. If it is a private bill, as the gentleman very well says, a point of order can be raised by any Member. I ask you, when did you ever hear a point of order raised on the floor against the reference of a bill to a committee? I do not recall that in recent years anybody has ever made a point of order against the reference of a bill. Still they would have the country believe that we have such confusion here and so many committees have jurisdiction of the same subject matter that it interferes with the transaction of the business on the floor of the Congress.

The committees of the House are jealous of their jurisdiction, and if anybody, at any time, by the improper reference of a bill should infringe upon their jurisdiction, that committee would immediately protest. The rules provide that if a public bill is improperly referred there are three methods of rereference to proper jurisdiction.

First. By unanimous consent. A Member may rise on the floor and say, "This bill has been referred to the wrong committee. My committee has jurisdiction. I ask unanimous consent that the bill

be rereferred." The fact that you have heard no such request in many years is convincing proof that jurisdiction of the committees is well established and understood and there are no conflicting jurisdictions which would give rise to any dispute between committees as to the reference of any of the thousands of bills which are referred every session.

Second. Rereference may be made on the authorized motion of the committee claiming jurisdiction. If any committee thinks a bill to which it is entitled has been improperly referred, they may come in here and ask for a rereference. Have you heard in recent years of a rereference on the motion of a committee claiming jurisdiction of a bill assigned to another committee?

Third. A rereference may be made on the motion of a committee to which a bill has been erroneously referred. Motions for change of reference are privileged, and yet there has been no contest over jurisdiction of committees on motions or change of reference since I can remember. There can be no more convincing proof of the lack of interference between the jurisdictions or the lack of overlapping jurisdictions between the committees of the House. In other words, the widely publicized charge that there is overlapping jurisdiction is without foundation.

Every facility is given for a change of reference if there has been an improper reference, even on appeal. And the fact that none of these facilities have been invoked in recent years is conclusive evidence that there is no foundation for the charge of overlapping jurisdictions so often reiterated through the columns of the press.

It is seldom that a bill is introduced in the House which does not contain matter falling within the jurisdiction of one committee, other matter within the jurisdiction of a second committee and still other matter under the jurisdiction of a third or fourth or fifth committee. In the same bill may be several provisions each of which comes within the province of as many different committees. However, the rule which always applies, and the rule which is always followed by the Parliamentarian, and the rule which has always been satisfactory to the House, is that the bill goes to the committee which has jurisdiction of the major matter in the bill. No change in rules of jurisdiction that you can suggest will prevent that. That is not a conflict of jurisdiction. It is the way in which the bill was drawn, and no change that you can make in the rules would affect it in the slightest.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. No matter how many committees you set up or how you outline the jurisdiction of the particular committees you set up, the same thing would occur in the future at all times?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly. It could not be avoided by any provision of the rules.

So far as departmental officials coming before several committees on the same subject is concerned, the repetition of evidence before different committees is highly salutary. The members of the committee have an opportunity to review the data submitted by the witness on former appearances and are in better position for cross-examination; the witness goes back to the department with a larger cross section of congressional opinion; and the executive and legislative branches of the Government have been each time a little more closely associated. The more frequently the departments are subjected to congressional inquiry the better—and the more carefully they will watch their step in administration and the greater care they will exercise in the expenditure of public funds.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for another 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, there are other instances of misstatements made in order to inflame the people against Congress and congressional procedure. One such instance, for example, is the statement that 95 percent of the bills passed by Congress are drafted in the departments. We had the testimony of the legislative drafting authorities of the Senate and House on that matter. In the House they testified that 23 percent of the bills introduced, and practically all the major legislation which passed the House, passed through their office. On the Senate side, they testified that 50 percent of the bills enacted passed through their office. Any member of the Committee on Appropriations can testify that no department has ever written any appropriation bill that ever came to the floor. In other words, the country is led to believe that a situation exists here which is completely different from what actually exists and that this situation makes it imperative that the procedures of the House be radically revised.

Here is still another misrepresentation: A Member of the House last week reprinted an editorial in the RECORD from a newspaper in his district which said that because he was a new Member he was not allowed to speak and had no opportunity to express himself on the floor. We all know that the newest Member of the House stands on equal footing with the oldest Member of the House, in that respect.

The Committee on Appropriations, like the rest of the committees of the House, frequently has bills on the floor, and any Member who applies can get all the time he wants. No distinction in recognition for debate is made between Members on the ground of length of service. If this gentleman had applied, he could have talked as frequently and as long as the oldest Members of the House, either in point of age or service, or previous condition of servitude.

Another charge which will not bear the test of accuracy is that the men who serve as chairmen of committees have ex officio the power to report legislation or to kill legislation. On the face of it the charge cannot be sustained. Nothing could be further from the truth. The committee of which I happen to be a member has 45 members and the chairman has 1 vote in the 45 and no more. He cannot report a bill unless a majority of the other 44 members approve and he must report a bill if a majority of the committee directs him to report it no matter how unalterably opposed he may be to the measure. The myth that the chairman of a committee has any more power than any other member of the committee is another fabrication calculated to disturb the people and shake their confidence in the one institution which is the safeguard of their liberties and the guaranty of their right of free government.

In the brief time remaining let me say just a word about the much-mooted question of seniority. It is a matter that is not included in the report but it has been so widely discussed I would like to scatter just a few grains of truth and reason on the subject.

To begin with, the importance of the chairmanships is greatly exaggerated. There may be a little glamour connected with the chairmanships but that is about all. Some chairmen have extra rooms and patronage, but as chairman of one of the House committees I do not have even these modest perquisites. I have no more personal clerks and no more office space than I had before I became chairman, and I pay for all my own stationery.

Furthermore, the rule of seniority does not always obtain in the election of a chairman. The rule of seniority is in that respect neither absolute nor invariable. In my own committee there have been notable instances in which the rule of seniority was disregarded. For example, in the Fifty-eighth Congress, although Henry H. Bingham, of Pennsylvania, was ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, James A. Tawney, of Minnesota, was elected chairman. Again, in the Sixty-seventh Congress, although Charles R. Davis, of Minnesota, was the member of longest service on the committee, Martin B. Madden, of Illinois, was made chairman.

The House, under its system of procedure, may elevate a member from the foot, or from any intervening position, to the chairmanship of a committee—and has done so, the seniority tradition to the contrary notwithstanding.

But, regardless of the effect of its application, why should the rule of seniority be deprecated in the Congress of the United States, when it is followed implicitly in every other major activity and industry in the United States?

In the armed forces, in the Army and the Navy, the rule of seniority obtains and has been followed from the days of Gen. George Washington and Commodore Barry. Here is a quotation from a recent editorial in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat:

> Regular Army promotions up to brigadier general are traditionally automatic, predicated on seniority.

It is the rule in the War Department and in the Navy Department, and has been so in all armies and navies for time immemorial.

It is likewise the rule in the labor unions of the Nation. Quoting from the International Teamster:

Members of labor unions rank according to seniority. War veterans are assured they will be given their seniority rights when they return from the service.

The rule of labor seniority has been affirmed in two recent decisions in the Federal courts—one by Judge Lederle, in the Federal Court of the District of Columbia, and the other by Judge Briggle, of Springfield, Ill.

Commenting on the decision of Judge Lederle, the CIO News said:

"A veteran is rehired in accordance with his seniority, and continues to work in accordance with his seniority," the CIO veterans' committee pointed out in interpreting Judge Lederle's ruling. "Seniority under union contract is the controlling factor, and if operations are curtailed the veteran may be laid off in line of seniority just as any other worker."

With reference to the Briggle opinion, Labor, the official organ of the railroad brotherhoods, said:

A returning serviceman should regain his old job rights and seniority plus accumulated seniority for time spent in uniform. Thus, a veteran should have the same seniority standing as though he had never left his job.

The rule of seniority is followed in international relations and the dean of the diplomatic corps is always the ambassador of longest service, irrespective of the size or standing of his country.

In keeping with that long-established precedent, the United Nations organization follows the rule of seniority. In order to be elected to the International Court of the UN, a candidate must secure a majority vote in the 57-nation Assembly and also in the 11-nation Security Council.

Here is the rule:

If more than one citizen from the same country gets a majority, only the eldest can become a member of the Court.

The new Russian Constitution, direct and dynamic in its approach to the administrative problems of the day, recognizes the rule of seniority and under its provisions the first sessions of the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R. are always opened by the oldest deputies of each chamber.

Just today President Truman himself emphatically voiced the importance of long service in Congress.

I quote from an Associated Press dispatch just released:

President Truman said today he believes it is a good general policy for Senators of long service to remain in the Senate rather than take other jobs.

He made this observation at his news conference in response to a question bearing on his recent action in urging Senator MCFARLAND, of Arizona, to remain in the Senate rather than take a Federal judgeship in his State. The questioner wanted to know if the President thinks this is a good general policy.

The President replied affirmatively, asserting that a Senator with lengthy service is invaluable to his State and should remain in the Senate.

In matters spiritual and ecclesiastical, as well as civil and temporal, the rule of seniority is observed, notably in the Holy Roman Catholic Church and the Church of England. In both, recognition and advancement are by seniority.

St. Peter himself admonishes:

Likewise, ye younger, submit yourselves unto the elder. Yea, all of you be subject one to another, and be clothed with humility, for God resisteth the proud and giveth grace to the humble.

In every department of the economic life of the world—national and international—the rule of seniority obtains, and has obtained for time immemorial. Why should Congress be made the exception to the rule?

Directly associated with the diatribes against seniority is the charge that age and experience accumulated in the service of the House disqualify for further usefulness as a Member of the Congress.

Since when has age become a disqualifying factor in human endeavor and accomplishment? Between the ages of 70 and 83, Commodore Vanderbilt added $10,000,000 to his fortune. Verdi at 85 produced his magnificent Ave Maria, his Stabat Mater, and his Te Deum. What a loss to the world if he had been retired at 80. Oliver Wendell Holmes at 79 wrote his Over the Teacups, and Tennyson at 83 wrote Crossing the Bar. Samuel Gompers was head of organized labor in his seventy-fifth year and John Cardinal Glennon, of St. Louis, was elevated to the cardinalate in his eighty-fourth year. President Roosevelt's war Cabinet was made up of Hull at 72, Jones at 70, Ickes at 70, Knox at 70, and Stimson at 76—the Cabinet that won the greatest war in history—and Henry Ford at 82 came back from retirement to make an incalculable contribution to industry and American victory.

Carried to their ultimate conclusions, these critics of seniority propose, in effect, to demote General MacArthur and put a second lieutenant in command, to retire William Green and substitute a husky young hodcarrier, to superannuate His Holiness Pope Pius XII and elevate a parish priest, to fire Eugene Meyer and install a young police-court reporter, to supersede Speaker RAYBURN and put a young two-termer in the chair. They badger men grown old in honored service in the House, men who have made supreme contributions to the Nation in the most critical period in human history with the taunt: "Yeah, yer gittin old." It is the philosophy of the aborigine; the culture and finesse and good taste of the jungle.

It is a philosophy repudiated by a thousand years of experience in the parliaments of the world. The situation is well summarized in a speech delivered by President Taft before the Ohio Society of Washington:

We are told by Edmund Burke himself that it was by slow degrees and constant discussion that Charles James Fox became the greatest parliamentary debater the world ever saw. Fox entered the British Commons before he was 20 years old. He remained a member of that body until his death.

Had Fox been an American and a Member of our Congress, he would have been fortunate if he had been chosen to and served in 10 Congresses—20 years. Sam Randall was not bred a statesman, but he became one of our great parliamentary leaders by reason of his long service. Had John G. Carlisle been English born, he would have served in the House of Commons, at the least, 50 years. Gladstone was in the Commons 50 years. Had he been an American, it is doubtful if the whim of a single constituency would have allowed him 12 Congresses.

There is a truth as profound as political experience can make it.

It is further expressed by a speech delivered by Speaker Clark on the floor of the House during his speakership:

A man has to learn to be a Representative just as he must learn to be a blacksmith, a carpenter, a farmer, an engineer, a lawyer, or a doctor.

The best rule is for a district to select a man young enough to learn and to grow, with at least fair capacity, industrious, honest, energetic, sober, and courageous, and keep him there so long as he discharges his duties faithfully and well. Such a man will gradually rise to high position and influence in the House.

But the young man must be willing to learn, and grow, and should be content to rise gradually. We can all appreciate his impatience. We have all been through it ourselves, to a greater or lesser degree. After a spirited campaign we were finally elected to Congress—the culmination of a life's ambition. The newspapers of our district and State had daily featured our speeches and activities. An enthusiastic delegation with a brass band saw us off on our train to Washington and our friends freely predicted that we would wake Congress up. In fact we rather encouraged that idea.

I recall a Congressman who came to Washington a few years ago assuring his constituents that when he got here he would start Congress off at 9 o'clock in the morning instead of waiting to meet at noon and wasting half the day. Some years ago I happened to be walking behind a new Congressman and his wife on their way over from the House Office Building to attend his first session and his charming little wife said nervously, "Oh, I do hope they will not call on you the very first day."

So, as we all recall, it is something of a disappointment when we reach Washington not to find a delegation and a brass band at Union Station to welcome us to the National Capital. And by some oversight there is no note from the President asking us to hurry down to the White House before unpacking. Most surprising of all, there is nothing in the morning papers about our arrival on the national scene. And when our committee meets we are not elected chairman. It is then we discover there is some sort of conspiracy by the old fellows who have been hanging around the Capitol for several years to keep a young man down. They refuse to recognize ability. And we immediately perceive that the system is all wrong. Let me assure these ardent young Members we have all been through it. It is an old story. Do not take it too hard.

These "old duffers," like you, have come up the hard way. They have not only been through your experience but they have repeated it many times—the

odds against them growing heavier each time as they gradually accumulate from year to year inevitable opposition and antagonism growing out of requests for services they are unable to render and the unreasoning slogan, "It is time for a change." In the average congressional district there are at least a hundred able men who every 2 years covertly appraise their chances of defeating the sitting Congressman. Everyone of them would file in the primary if he thought he had a chance to win. They have many advantages in such a contest. The Congressman is constantly on the rack. He must vote on every controversial question before the Nation. On every roll call he must alienate large numbers of his constituents who disagree with him. He must daily confess his inability to find jobs, to secure discharges, to modify the mail service, to provide appropriations for roads, dams, and Federal buildings in his district. In a thousand ways he must fall short of the expectations of his friends and constitutents in failing to accomplish the impossible and then must so ably serve his district and his country as to be able to overcome this growing handicap at every election. And yet there are those who in the press and over the air and on this floor insist that because he has had the capacity to retain his seat in Congress over all actual and prospective competitors through many elections, he is an incompetent moron and disqualified from presiding over a committee.

Time and experience are necessary to give the Nation effective service in Congress. James R. Mann, of Illinois, universally conceded to be the greatest and most effective Parliamentarian who ever sat in the American Congress, said: "I did not open my mouth for the first 2 years I was a Member of the House." On the other hand, William Murray—"Alfalfa Bill"—of Oklahoma, a man of exceptional native capacity who had served his State as president of its constitutional convention, speaker of its house of representatives, and Governor, convulsed the House with derisive merriment when he attempted to debate a point of order a short time after he came to Congress.

Let our impatient young friends, who are so eager to take over the ship of state, serve an apprenticeship as Webster and Calhoun and Lincoln and Truman and Rayburn did before dismissing all the elder statesmen and heading the old ship out to sea in these critical times. Let them serve for a time as seamen "before the mast" before essaying to push the admiral off the quarterdeck.

Seniority, based upon the capacity of men to demonstrate such a high order of statesmanship as to warrant their return to Congress over growing oposition, election after election, offers the only practical system of priority in House and committee procedure.

Seniority settles harmoniously the problem of priorities without dispute or controversy and without jeopardizing morale. Abolition of the rule would be followed by logrolling, factional fights, and political trading on a grand scale.

And I am reading from a recent book on the subject:

The danger that committee places would go to those who were chosen with specific bills or policies in mind would be real and would be suspected even when it did not exist. The bitter personal feeling engendered by an open contest would complicate party management and there would be a delay in beginning work until personal and sectional quarrels could be smoothed out.

It is difficult to conceive of anything that would have a more disastrous effect on the work of a committee than a continuous potential rivalry between half a dozen members of the committee as to which of them would be made chairman in the next session, or in event of a sooner change. The entire membership of the committee would be immediately divided into factions. There would be such continuous maneuvering for position and such suspicion of every move by any faction, however inconsequential, as to seriously impede the work of the committee and prejudice its conclusions. No chairman, however qualified, could secure maximum results in such an atmosphere.

On the other hand, the present system of seniority has been in effect so long no one gives any particular attention as to who is presiding, or who will preside in the future. The system is understood and respected. Attention is concentrated on the work of the committee. The difference between the seniority system and any alternative system is the difference between order and chaos.

But let us take up the one issue on which all reformers of Congress and all streamliners and renovaters of congressional procedure are agreed—the number of committees. We are told that the foundations of free government, the preservation of democracy, and the maintenance of American institutions rests on the number of committees. According to newspaper and magazine statements, if the number of committees is reduced the Republic is safe; if the number of committees is not reduced all hope is gone.

Now what would be accomplished by the reduction of the number of committees? Would there be less work? No. Would the reduction of the number of committees reduce the number of men required to do the work of the committees? No. The reduction of the number of committees would neither reduce the amount of work nor increase the number of men to do the work. In other words, whether you have 10 committees or a hundred committees, you have the same amount of work and the same number of men to do the work. And you would follow the same system of handling the work.

The only difference would be that instead of doing the work in committees, as at present, it would be done by subcommittees made up of the same men. As soon as you combine the 48 committees of the House into 18 committees, you immediately appoint 48 subcommittees. For example, one of the stock arguments in favor of consolidation of committees is that we have three committees dealing with pensions. They fail to note that each of the three committees deals with an entirely different phase of pensions, deals with a different class of beneficiaries, different periods of service, different statutory enactments. The three do not conflict or overlap in any way. So when you consolidate, instead of having three committees and three chairmen, you have one committee and three subcommittees and three subchairmen. The same would be true of every consolidation of committees in the reform.

Now, if a man does the work why should he not have the credit? A chairman of a subcommittee will have to do identically the work he now does as chairman of a committee. Why should he not have a chairmanship?

A manufacturer who operated his plant successfully during the war was awarded an E, and it was conferred with great ceremony. A scholar who has distinguished himself in his particular field is given a doctor of laws degree. An Army or naval officer serving creditably at his desk here in Washington is awarded a bronze star or a promotion. Why should not a man who has served faithfully and effectively through the years here on this floor have some slight recognition? Why should he not have a chairmanship? Under the proposed change—with only 18 committees—men will come here and serve a lifetime, and though they give the Nation the most distinguished service, will never reach a chairmanship. They will do the same work, their subcommittees will do the same work, but there will be no recognition.

"Oh," they say, "one Member is serving on half a dozen committees. He cannot attend them all." He can at least choose those in whose work he is most interested. If he was on one or two, he would be confined to the work of those committees. As a matter of fact, conflicts between any two committees to which a Member may be assigned can usually be arranged if he requests it. Assignment to a number of committees gives him a wider range of work and usefulness than if he is limited to one or two.

And much is made of the statement that some two or three men from the departments have been called to testify before a number of committees on the same subject matter. The more often they are called to testify the better—the closer the relation between the executive and legislative branches, the better opportunity for the executive to judge the reaction to his testimony and the more searchingly the committee can scrutinize the operations of the bureaus of the Government. The complainers complain because the representatives of the executive branch are called to testify so frequently and then they complain because there is not a closer relation between the two branches of the Government. The time of the representatives of the departments is not so valuable that they cannot come before the congressional committees and subcommittees whenever requested—and the more frequently the better.

So all this hullabaloo about the number of committees is pointless and misleading. Reduction of the number of committees would not affect the situation. The same men would still do the same work and do it no better and no worse. There would be no advantages to offset the disadvantages.

Connected with the question of committee structure is the proposal to make further unnecessary and more expensive additions to committee staffs. In this connection the report reflects on the system which has been in use by the Committee on Appropriations for more than three years. The system has been too often discussed here on the floor to require further justification. Suffice to say it has met every requirement. No information has been requested which it did not supply and its cost of maintenance in comparison with service rendered has been the smallest in the history of congressional investigations. The Drafting Service of the Congress has met every requirement. I have never yet heard of a request for service which they have failed to supply. The Legislative Reference Service of the Congressional Library has likewise supplied every need. If any of these research services has failed in its functions, no one has called it to the attention of the House. I have frequently asked on the floor, and in the committee, when complaint was made of lack of research facility, "What information does the gentleman desire? What does he want investigated?" And in no instance has the complainant ever been able to specify any date desired or any particular subject or agency he wanted investigated or on which needed information could not be obtained. If they happen to need further funds at any time, the Committee on Appropriations will provide them in the future, as in the past, on the authority of the legislative committees, having jurisdiction, without the report of a special committee. The recommendation for a stenographic pool and an $8,000 assistant for each Congressman borders on the preposterous.

The recommendation that salaries of Members be increased and privileges of retirement be provided has a somewhat more sinister connotation. We witnessed here yesterday the extrordinary spectacle of a determined effort by members of the streamlining committee to restrict all proposals relative to salaries and retirement annuities of Congressmen to the bill recommended by the streamlining committee—for the frankly announced purpose of baiting and sugarcoating such a bill to the extent that Congressmen would be induced to vote for all committee proposals in order to secure larger pay and retirement privileges for themselves. Surely there must be a dearth of merit in the committee proposals if the committee feel that it is necessary to resort to such questionable means of securing consideration of their recommendations, and the streamlining committee does not encourage a very flattering opinion of the membership of the House in suggesting so broadly that Congressmen can be cajoled into supporting its measures for a remunerary consideration—in order to get an increase in pay.

Perhaps the most extraordinary recommendation by the streamlining committee is that relating to fiscal control:

Recommendation: That by joint action the revenue and appropriations committees of both Houses submit to the Congress within 60 days after each session opens (or by April 15) a concurrent resolution setting over-all Federal receipts and expenditures estimated) for the coming fiscal year. If total expenditures recommended exceed estimated income, Congress should be required by record vote to authorize creation of additional Federal debt in the amount of the excess. All appropriations, excepting those of a permanent nature, interest on the public debt, veterans' pensions and benefits, trust expenditures, and public-debt retirement, would be reduced by a uniform percentage in case total appropriations exceeded the amount of the approved budget figure.

Let us consider the effect of such a recommendation. If observed, it could only mean committing the Congress to a budget in advance of detailed consideration. It would be physically impossible to conduct adequate hearings in the time proposed.

Following the committee's recommendation through, after having voted more or less blindly on a ceiling, there would be lessend interest in affecting reductions in the estimates for the several Federal agencies on the part of the committee and the House. It is difficult to appraise such a proposal in any other light than that of discouraging economies rather than that of contributing to economies.

The provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act are much more practical and effective:

If the estimated receipts for the ensuing fiscal year contained in the budget, on the basis of laws existing at the time the budget is transmitted, plus the estimated amounts in the Treasury at the close of the fiscal year in progress, available for expenditure in the ensuing fiscal year, are less than the estimated expenditures for the ensuing fiscal year contained in the budget, the President in the budget shall make recommendations to Congress for new taxes, loans, or other appropriate action to meet the estimated deficiency.

As to supplemental or deficiency estimates, it further provides:

Whenever such supplemental or deficiency estimates reach an aggregate which, if they had been contained in the budget, would have required the President to make a recommendation under subdivision (a) of section 202, he shall thereupon make such recommendation.

This is the law today. It leaves the door open to reductions determined upon after searching inquiry, and it carries the incentive to so curb appropriations as to avoid the need for new taxes, loans, or other means of avoiding deficit spending.

The tendency of the proposal carried in the report of the streamlining committee would be to lessen the interest of Members of the Congress generally in appropriations other than those particular items in which there was a direct interest.

There is too great a tendency in this direction as it is. Appropriation bills go through too quickly. There is too much reliance on the committee reports and too much dependence on the recommendation of the committee. Under the rules the committee merely reports its recommendations as an agent of the House. The presumption is that these recommendations will be sharply scrutinized and subjected to critical analysis when taken up for consideration on the floor. Every bill reported by the Committee on Appropriations should be carefully reviewed and, if necessary, amended by the House. In the last analysis it is the responsibility of the House and the country profits to the degree that responsibility is exercised. The House works through its committees, but committees may, and do, err at times, and the House should not rely too implicity on its committees' recommendations. The final responsibility is here on this floor. The suggestion of the streamlining committee would not emphasize this responsibility. Under its proposal, Members of Congress could without compunction vote against all tax bills and for all appropriation bills. And it would always be possible under such procedure to include in any appropriation for popular projects, such as flood control, a provision that the amount provided for such purpose be not included in the list when the percentage reduction is applied.

Mr. Speaker, we do not have the time to dwell too long on these questions of technical procedure. They are comparatively inconsequential. The frenzied vituperation of sensationalists to the contrary notwithstanding, the Congress can be depended upon to do its work and do it well—as it has been doing it with particular efficiency during the war sessions.

The important thing is to stop all this byplay and stop alarming the country. If there are minor defects which need adjustment, let us make them—preferably on consideration and recommendation by the committee having jurisdiction—and have the matter over with and stop prejudicing the public against the legislative branch of the Government and against their Representatives in the House and Senate.

It would be unfair to the press and the country not to include here, along with the unbridled criticisms which have been quoted, some of the sane appraisals of the Congress in general, and this Congress in particular.

Here is one by William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor:

Anything that brings Congress into disrepute weakens the fabric of American democracy.

Mr. Speaker, nothing in recent years has so disturbed the public and so shaken their confidence in, and their regard for, their Government as this campaign to capitalize on the general lack of knowledge of the minutiae of congressional procedure.

Here is a comment from Fulton Lewis, Jr., one of the most reliable of the commentators of the day:

The Seventy-eighth Congress adjourned sine die last night. It was a good Congress, a very good Congress, probably the best and most courageous Congress that we have known since the days of the last World War, and perhaps for even longer than that. It did more to revive and restore the dignity and integrity and the prestige of the legislative branch of the American Government than any other Congress in many, many decades. We might well give it a salute of a job well done, and we might dub it, in congressional history, the Great Seventy-eighth.

Let me also include a pertinent comment from Labor, one of the prominent labor journals of the Nation:

We shouldn't make radical changes without mature reflection and until we are certain we have a better system. Labor still believes that the best way to streamline Congress is to elect the right kind of men to the House and Senate. They will always find a way to enact desirable legislation.

And here is a considered opinion by one of the outstanding historians of our times, Prof. Charles A. Beard:

After studying the operations of the First Congress of the United States and the operations of the Seventy-sixth Congress, I am convinced that for the absence of corruption and concern with the public good, the present body is of the highest order.

Mr. Speaker, in 1944 the United States Government collected more money, borrowed more money, spent more money, and created a greater deficit than any government in any country has ever collected, borrowed, spent, or owed in human history. It is a world record. And in 1945, Congress rescinded more appropriations, reclaimed more money, and made greater reductions in expenditures than was ever effected by any government before in fiscal history. That likewise is a world record. And in all this accumulation and disbursement of wealth—in amounts beyond the capacity of the finite mind of man to comprehend—there has been less unwarranted expenditure, diversion, and waste in proportion to the amounts involved, and results secured, than ever before since government was established among men.

In all the annals of the past there is no parliamentary body which has borne such heavy responsibilities, administered such vast empires of production and distribution, and discharged its duties so faultlessly as the war Congress of the United States. The American people are to be congratulated on the efficiency and integrity with which their representatives in Congress have successfully met the problems created by a war of extermination with the mightiest war machines modern science and military proficiency could create.

It is a great Congress—and it could not have operated so satisfactorily without a great system of procedure.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the resolution.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 230, nays 142, not voting 61, as follows:

[Roll No. 4]

YEAS—230

Abernethy
Addonizio
Albert
Allen, La.
Andrews
Aspinall
Bailey
Barden
Baring
Barrett, Pa.
Bates, Ky.
Battle
Beckworth
Bentsen
Biemiller
Bland
Blatnik
Boggs, La.
Bolling
Bolton, Md.
Bonner
Bosone
Boykin
Breen
Brooks
Brown, Ga.
Bryson
Buchanan
Buckley, Ill.
Burke
Burleson
Burnside
Burton
Camp
Cannon
Carlyle
Carnahan
Carroll
Cavalcante
Chatham
Chelf
Chesney
Christopher
Chudoff
Clemente
Coffey
Colmer
Combs
Cooper
Cox
Crook
Crosser
Davies, N. Y.
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Deane
DeGraffenried
Delaney
Denton
Dollinger
Donohue
Doughton
Douglas
Doyle
Durham
Eberharter
Elliott
Engle, Calif.
Evins
Fallon
Feighan
Fernandez
Fisher
Flood
Fogarty
Forand
Frazier
Fugate
Furcolo
Garmatz
Gathings
Gilmer
Gordon
Gorski, Ill.
Gorski, N. Y.
Gossett
Granahan
Granger
Grant
Green
Gregory
Hardy
Hare
Harris
Havenner
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Hedrick
Heffernan
Herlong
Hobbs
Holifield
Howell
Huber
Irving
Jackson, Wash.
Jacobs
Javits
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N. C.
Karst
Karsten
Kelley
Keogh
Kerr
King
Kirwan
Klein
Kruse
Lane
Lanham
Larcade
Lesinski
Lind
Linehan
Lucas
Lyle
Lynch
McCarthy
McCormack
McGrath
McGuire
McKinnon
McMillan, S. C.
McSweeney
Mack, Ill.
Madden
Magee
Mahon
Mansfield
Marcantonio
Marsalis
Marshall
Mills
Mitchell
Monroney
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Moulder
Multer
Murdock
Murray, Tenn.
Noland
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Neill
O'Sullivan
O'Toole
Pace
Passman
Patman
Patten
Perkins
Peterson
Pickett
Poage
Polk
Preston
Price
Priest
Quinn
Rabaut
Rains
Ramsay
Rankin
Redden
Regan
Rhodes
Ribicoff
Richards
Rodino
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney
Sabath
Sadowski
Sasscer
Sheppard
Sikes
Smathers
Spence
Staggers
Stanley
Steed
Stigler
Sullivan
Sutton
Tackett
Taurielio
Teague
Thomas, Tex.
Thompson
Thornberry
Trimble
Underwood
Vinson
Wadsworth
Wagner
Walsh
Walter
Welch, Calif.
Welch, Mo.
Wheeler
White, Calif.
Whitten
Wickersham
Wier
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Okla.
Wilson, Tex.
Winstead
Wood
Woodhouse
Worley
Yates
Zablocki

NAYS—142

Allen, Calif.
Andersen, H. Carl
Anderson, Calif.
Andresen, August H.
Angell
Arends
Auchincloss
Barrett, Wyo.
Bates, Mass.
Beall
Bennett, Mich.
Bishop
Boggs, Del.
Bolton, Ohio
Brambletт
Brehm
Brown, Ohio
Burdick
Byrnes, Wis.
Case, N. J.
Church
Clevenger
Cole, Kans.
Cole, N. Y.
Corbett
Cotton
Crawford
Cunningham
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Wis.
D'Ewart
Dolliver
Dondero
Eaton
Elston
Engel, Mich.
Fellows
Fenton
Ford
Gamble
Gavin
Gillette
Golden
Goodwin
Graham
Gross
Hagen
Hale
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hall, Leonard W.
Halleck
Hand
Harden
Harvey
Heselton
Hill
Hinshaw
Hoeven
Hoffman, Mich.
Holmes
Hope
Horan
Hull
Jackson, Calif.
James
Jenkins
Jennings
Jensen
Johnson
Judd
Kean
Kearney
Keating
Kilburn
Kunkel
LeCompte
LeFevre
Lemke
Lodge
Lovre
McConnell
McCulloch
McDonough
McGregor
McMillen, Ill.
Mack, Wash.
Martin, Mass.
Mason
Merrow
Michener
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Morton
Murray, Wis.
Nelson
Nicholson
Nixon
Norblad
O'Hara, Minn.
O'Konski
Patterson
Pfeiffer, William L.
Philbin
Phillips, Calif.
Phillips, Tenn.
Plumley
Potter
Poulson
Reed, N. Y.
Rees
Rich
Riehlman
Rogers, Mass.
St. George
Sanborn
Scrivner
Scudder
Shafer
Short
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Wis.
Stefan
Stockman
Taber
Talle
Tollefson
Towe
Van Zandt
Velde
Vorys
Vursell
Weichel
Werdel
Wigglesworth
Wilson, Ind.
Withrow
Wolcott
Wolverton
Woodruff

NOT VOTING—61

Abbitt
Allen, Ill.
Bennett, Fla.
Blackney
Bloom
Buckley, N. Y.
Bulwinkle
Byrne, N. Y.
Canfield
Case, S. Dak.
Celler
Chiperfield
Cooley
Coudert
Davenport
Davis, Tenn.
Dingell
Ellsworth
Fulton
Gary
Gore
Gwinn
Harrison
Hart
Hébert
Herter
Hoffman, Ill.
Jenison
Jonas
Kearns
Kee
Keefe
Kennedy
Kilday
Latham
Lichtenwalter
Macy
Martin, Iowa
Meyer
Miles
Miller, Calif.
Murphy
Norton
Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Powell
Reed, Ill.
Rivers
Sadlak
Scott, Hardie
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Secrest
Sims
Smith, Ohio
Smith, Va.
Somers
Taylor
Thomas, N. J.
Whitaker
White, Idaho
Whittington
Young

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mrs. Norton for, with Mr. Coudert against.

Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. Canfield against.

Mr. Whittington for, with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., against.

Mr. Bennett of Florida for, with Mr. Jonas against.

Mr. Kennedy for, with Mr. Meyer against.

Mr. Harrison for, with Mr. Lichtenwalter against.

Mr. Whitaker for, with Mr. Allen of Illinois against.

Mr. Young for, with Mr. Ellsworth against.

Mr. Hart for, with Mr. Kearns against.

Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Macy against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Hardie Scott against.

Mr. Byrne of New York for, with Mr. Reed of Illinois against.

Mr. Gary for, with Mr. Sadlak against.

Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Chiperfield against.

Mr. Kilday for, with Mr. Jenison against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Secrest with Mr. Blackney.

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Gwinn.

Mr. Kee with Mr. Latham.

Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer with Mr. Keefe.

Mr. Somers with Mr. Herter.

Mr. Cooley with Mr. Martin of Iowa.

Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. Case of South Dakota.

Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Gore with Mr. Fulton.

Mr. Murphy with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who so desire may have five legislative days to extend their remarks in the RECORD in connection with House Concurrent Resolution 22.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

AIR COORDINATING COMMITTEE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 59)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information and consideration of the Congress the Report of the Air Coordinating Committee for the calendar year 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 7, 1949.*

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I ask unanimous consent that that committee may have permission to sit during general debate for the balance of this week while the House is in session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2361) providing for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2361, with Mr. HARRIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under unanimous consent agreement, debate is limited to 2 hours, one-half of which will be under the control of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON] and the other half under the control of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, Members of the House of Representatives, it becomes my duty and responsibility as chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to present at this time for your consideration H. R. 2361, a bill for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes. I consider it a high privilege to stand before you in this capacity, first, because of the nature and the composition of the committee of which it is my good fortune to be the chairman. To my mind there is no more hard-working committee in all this Congress. As I think of its membership, with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], our majority leader, a member thereof; with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], the ranking minority member, a member thereof; with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] a member thereof, I say I think it is a high privilege to present the report of such a committee. Your committee has worked long and hard on this bill and has heard many witnesses. We believe we have brought to you a bill calculated to render to the people of this country one of the greatest services this Congress could afford, the reorganization of its Government agencies.

In the last 20 years, our Government has grown from about 350 agencies to over 1,800 bureaus and agencies. The number of employees has increased from five-hundred-and-seventy-thousand-odd to over 2,100,000. Expenses have grown from $3,600,000,000 to more than $42,000,000,000.

We have heard many speakers on the floor of this House during the last few years talk about the vast cost of our Government to the taxpayers of this country. When you gaze at the condition of the executive department, you can appreciate that a realining of its agencies, the cutting down of its personnel, and the streamlining of its business, can and will result in a great saving of millions of dollars to the taxpayers.

This plan of reorganization giving the President of the United States the power to take the initiative in bringing out a reorganization plan is nothing new. This type of reorganization has been tried in the past and has been responsible for some great gains. In bringing this bill to you, we are profiting by the experiences and the trials and errors of former bills. We believe that if this bill is adopted by the Congress and becomes a law it will be one of the greatest steps forward we have promulgated in the history of the Congress.

There is at present no law empowering the President to take the initiative in the reorganization of the executive departments. That authorization expired in 1948. So if we mean business let us get busy and give him the power to give us a reorganization plan in time for it to be considered and acted upon by the time the Congress adjourns. We ought to pass this legislation as speedily as possible.

There are certain provisions in this bill that are not found in other bills. I think the best way to present it to you, since we have had the Reorganization Act of 1945, is to call to your attention some of the differences.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. First of all, I want to thank the gentleman for the nice things he has said about the committee, including me, and to say here and now that I am happy to be on that committee and serving with the gentleman from Illinois.

The gentleman has referred to the fact that if this legislation is adopted we ought to be able to proceed expeditiously with the reorganization of the Government. I agree with the gentleman in that regard. I am wondering if the gentleman would agree with me that with the basic work that has been done by the so-called Hoover Commission, with the enactment of this legislation, and with the fact that the Congress is now Democratic, as is the Chief Executive, this job ought to be accomplished in the next 2 years.

Mr. DAWSON. I think we ought to get reorganization plans submitted to this Congress within a very short time.

Further, I wish to say concerning our committee that there has never at any time been any question of partisan politics raised. Every member of the committee went about the job of attending to the business of the Congress as that job presented itself to him.

I refer now to page 7 of the report, setting out the major differences from the Reorganization Act of 1945. By and large the bill follows the 1945 act which, in turn, was largely based on the 1935 act. The major differences between this legislation and the 1945 legislation are as follows: First, that the legislation here proposed would be permanent, while the 1945 act operated for a limited time. In that connection, I want to refer to the hearings. On page 6 of the hearings there is found an excerpt from the message from the President of the United States to the Congress. That excerpt is as follows:

> First, the reorganization legislation should be permanent rather than temporary. While the work of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government makes such legislation especially timely and essential, the improvement of the organization of the Government is a continuing and never-ending process. Government is a dynamic institution. Its administrative structure cannot be static. As new programs are established and old programs change in character and scope to meet the needs of the Nation, the organization of the executive branch must be adjusted to fit its changing tasks.
>
> The impracticability of solving many problems of organization by the regular legislative process has been frankly recognized for many years by congressional leaders.

On page 137 of the hearings we have this statement made by Hon. Herbert Hoover, former President of the United States:

> Mr. HOOVER. My opinion is that it ought to be permanent legislation because the executive branch of the Government is a constantly changing body. We need no better proof of that than the growth in the number of agencies from 350 to 1,800. I would expect a constant shift in the focus of government, giving emphasis to first one type of action and then to another, with the development of new phases of such action, all of which must be constantly refitted into the whole pattern of the executive branch.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is it the purpose of this bill to create the over-all machinery under which the Hoover report may be worked into the affairs of government?

Mr. DAWSON. You are right. So that that part of the Hoover report—for which we are spending so much money—where the need is shown, may be presented to the Congress by the President. So that the President will have the power to incorporate it into his plan and present it to the Congress.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Without this kind of implementation the Hoover report could not be used?

Mr. DAWSON. It could not be used in the light of the experiences of the past.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. VORYS. Under the saving provisions of the bill on page 9 it is provided that any statute or regulation shall have the same effect as if a reorganization act had not been made except by or under authority of law by the abolition of a function.

My question is this: Could there be any change in the substantive law of the country by the abolition of a function, or by the abolition of a function would it merely mean a change in who might be required to carry out the law? It is not quite clear to me what abolition of a function means. As I understood it, this Reorganization Act is not intended to change the laws, except the organization which might enforce the law. Can the gentleman answer that question?

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. I think there is no question but that the act does not permit the President to submit a plan that changes the basic law. But the abolishment of a function means that where two organizations have been discharging the same function, if that function is given to one of the organizations it may be abolished as far as the other organization is concerned.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DAWSON. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. For instance, if two or three agencies were authorized to make loans, the combining of those functions by the abolishment of the function for a number of the agencies could not repeal the authority to make loans? Am I correct?

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DAWSON. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. VORYS. So that we are not changing any substantive law in voting for this?

Mr. LANHAM. Not at all.

Mr. VORYS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DAWSON. I would like to say further on that point of the permanency of the legislation, this bill is supported by the views of the only two people in the world who have had experience on the subject. The present President has had the experience of his past term. The former President had the experience of his term in office. We all know from history that no man was more interested in reorganizing the agencies in the executive department than was the former President of the United States, Mr. Hoover. So on the question of the permanency of the legislation, we have the testimony, in no undecided terms, of the only two men who have had actual experience. It gives the incoming President the opportunity and the power, as he becomes experienced, to suggest to the Congress any legislation combining agencies and bureaus, or for the reorganization of departments, for the good of the country that presents itself to him.

No. 2, reading from page 7 of the report:

> No executive agency is exempted under this bill, while under the 1945 act a number of agencies were exempted. It is felt that exemptions, even of major regulatory commissions, would seriously hinder the reorganization effort. Many of the regulatory commissions have nonregulatory functions which appropriately might be assigned to a different type of agency.

That takes care of what has been one of the great faults in past legislation. The exempting of so many agencies and the inclusion in the bill itself of language which was not capable of clear interpretation prevented the Executive from initiating many reforms that were needed because, in his judgment, if made, it would be the occasion of many lawsuits which might continue through the years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

On page 7 of the hearings we have this statement in the President's message:

> Second, the new reorganization act should be comprehensive in scope; no agency or function of the executive branch should be exempted from its operation. Such exemptions prevent the President and the Congress from deriving the full benefit of the reorganization-plan procedure, primarily by precluding action on major organizational problems. A seemingly limited exemption may in fact render an entire needed reorganization affecting numerous agencies and functions wholly impractical. The proper protection against the possibility of unwise reorganization lies, not in the statutory exemption from the reorganization-plan procedure, but in the authority of Congress to reject any such plan by simple majority vote of both Houses.

That quotation is taken from the President's message.

On page 135 we have the testimony of Mr. Hoover on the same subject:

> I might add to this statement what I proposed that I have given here, that I strongly support the idea that there should be no exceptions in this legislation. The reasons for that view are that I do not know any method by which the Congress can make a differentiation of executive and quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial functions in these agencies. It might be possible to arrive at such a definition with regard to them, but we have to bear in mind that there are such functions—quasi-judicial and quasi-legislative—in practically every department of the Government. We immediately get into difficulties if we try to make definitions. On the other hand, it would seem to me that Congress has an ample check on any action that would undermine those judicial and legislative functions when the President makes his proposed plans.

So upon that change in the bill you have the testimony without question and without equivocation of the only two men who have had opportunity to try out these reorganization plans.

Continuing with the major differences from the Reorganization Act of 1945, I quote from the report of the committee:

> (3) This bill will permit a type of reorganization not authorized under the 1945 act—the granting to any officer of authority to delegate any of his functions. The main purpose is to make it possible for top officials to delegate routine functions which are vested in them by law in such manner as to prevent delegation.
>
> (4) The bill omits the provision of the 1945 act relating to quasi-judicial and quasi-legislative functions of independent agencies. The omission of this provision is in line with the recommendation of the President and the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.
>
> (5) The bill permits submission of reorganization plans with respect to the government of the District of Columbia.
>
> (6) The bill grants broader authority to create offices made necessary by a reorganization. Under the 1945 act the new offices which could be created were only those of "heads" and "assistant heads" of agencies. The change will permit a plan to provide for the appropriate type of officer in each case.
>
> (7) The bill differs from the 1945 act with respect to the limitation on the rate of compensation applicable to offices created by a reorganization plan.

This makes no change in salaries but merely enables the President to name salaries in compliance with executive law.

We have had the 1945 act, we have had the 1939 act. The bill under consideration differs from them only in the manner that I have stated here in talking over the matter at this time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON. I yield.

Mr. MADDEN. I wish to compliment the gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the Expenditures Committee, on the outstanding presentation he has made of this legislation. In bringing in this H. R. 2361 the members of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments are indeed entitled to a great deal of commendation, particularly by reason of the complicated and complex nature of the legislation. It is a subject that should have been presented to the Congress before this session. I hope the Congress will reward this committee and also the taxpayers of the Nation by passing this legislation. I again wish to compliment the chairman of the committee for bringing in this bill.

Mr. DAWSON. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Illinois

[Mr. DAWSON] correctly stated, th's bill came out of the committee without any previous political discussion. No one has greater respect for the sincerity and honesty of former President Hoover than have I. Beyond question, in recommending this legislation Mr. Hoover was expressing his own ideas, being sincere and honest. And the same may be said of our present President. They both have assumed that every other President, every President who might succeed Mr. Truman, would have the same degree of sincerity and honesty.

Without in any way being personal, it might be suggested to the House that some day we might get a Wallace with a Wallace Senate or a Wallace House. The results that might then come out of this legislation if left in its present form might not only be surprising but astounding to the people of the country.

There is no question but that a reorganization of the executive department is needed. It may be assumed that the failure of previous Congresses and of the present Congress up to this time to enact legislation similar to this is due—and please note this—either to the lack of ability, the lack of information, or the lack of courage on the part of the Members of Congress. Something has always been lacking, because everyone concedes that there must be a reorganization.

Starting with the premise that to serve the people we must have reorganization, and assuming that the Congress will not act if left to itself, where do we go from there? I am in favor of everything this proposed legislation seeks to do, but I want it done in a constitutional way. I do not want to surrender the powers of the Congress to accomplish something that is vitally needed, unless it is necessary to save our national security. Unless our national security is presently threatened, I cannot support the proposed legislation unless we can preserve the legislative powers of the Congress.

This bill, as previous reorganization acts, provides that the President of the United States may submit a plan to the Congress, that upon the expiration of 60 consecutive legislative days the plan so submitted to the Congress shall become the law of the land unless within the 60 days both Houses of the Congress have vetoed it.

This plan not only ignores the constitutional provision that the legislative power is vested in the Congress, but goes farther than that. It reverses the legislative procedure. This plan provides that the President shall submit, and his ideas and his suggestions become the law of the land unless each House within 60 days overrules, vetoes, if you please, what he sends down here. Now, is there any necessity for that? None at all. But, say the advocates of this bill, the Congress will not act if left to itself. Well, assume that to be true. It is not necessary that we leave the Congress to itself to refuse to act.

When this bill comes before the House under the 5-minute rule an amendment will be proposed which will state—and it follows the language of the bill on page 7, section 6—that the plan submitted by the President must be acted upon by both Houses of Congress within 60 days, and that to become the law of the land it must receive the sanction of the two Houses of Congress.

Is there any reason why, having been elected as the people's representatives, having taken the oath here before the Speaker when we were sworn that we would uphold the provisions of the Constitution, that we should not follow that procedure?

It is quite true that section 3 of article II provides that the President shall annually advise the Congress on the state of the Union and that he may on any occasion recommend to the Congress the measures which he considers necessary or good for the national welfare. But the Constitution also says in the very first sentence of section 1 of article I that the legislative power is vested in the Congress which shall consist of a House of Representatives and a Senate.

Section 7 states in no uncertain terms that no bill shall go to the President until it has received a majority of the votes of the Members of each House.

Now, my colleagues, I ask you: Are we to follow through and perform the duty which our constituents impose upon us, and which is marked out sentence by sentence in the Constitution itself? Or are we to delegate our legislative power to the President reserving to ourselves only the right of veto?

If there were a great national emergency threatening immediately the security of our Nation we might waive the constitutional provisions on the ground of necessity.

Assuming that, in order to preserve our constitutional form of government, we must overcome this waste, this inefficiency, it is not necessary that we do it in an unconstitutional manner.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Under the provisions of the pending legislation a bare majority of the two Houses could reject within 60 days after receiving the President's proposal any proposal that he might make, but once the proposal is accepted and it becomes law, then it would require a two-thirds majority in both Houses in order to overcome the President's veto.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is true and is just an added reason why we should amend the bill, but do it now. There is not a schoolboy who has ever taken a look at the Constitution, if you ask him the question: "How does a bill become law when a bill is presented to the Congress?" but who would say: "Well, it must pass the House of Representatives, it must have a majority vote in the Senate," would he not? Sure. Then it goes to the President and he may veto it, he may pocket it, and then the procedure of two-thirds follows, and it becomes the law of the land.

I want to go along with this legislation. We need the reorganization. The Congress, as stated before, and I repeat it, has heretofore lacked either the ability, the courage, or the inclination to do the job. It has not been done. I am willing to have the President send down any plan he may wish—and I do not care whether you make any exemptions in this bill of this or that department, or agency. I care nothing about that. I am not so particularly concerned about whether the legislation is limited or permanent. All that I ask is that we do not delegate the power specified in the Constitution as belonging exclusively to the Congress to the Executive or any other grantee.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], whom I respect highly, has stated that Congress lacks the ability, the courage, or the inclination to do the job of reorganization. While I do not care to endorse that statement, I do say that in 160 years of historical record Congress has failed to take affirmative action for the type of reorganization which all of us, including the gentleman from Michigan, admit is desirable in the executive branch. So notwithstanding any technical assertions that Congress should do the job, the fact remains that Congress has not done the job, and every attempt on the part of Congress to take affirmative action to do a good job, a complete job of reorganization of the executive branch, has miserably failed.

Ex-President Hoover, in appearing before our committee, pointed out the reason for that. He said there are 1,300 agencies in the executive branch, and he pointed out that it is clearly impossible for Congress, with all of its other duties, to go into the highly technical and complicated structure of every department and agency of Government and do the job of reorganization that has been found to be necessary.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I think it should be pointed out, as distinguished from the present situation, that when Mr. Hoover submitted those recommendations Congress was not of his political faith. Of course, that situation does not prevail now, as far as the Chief Executive and Congress are concerned.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I do not see where that has any bearing on the record of 160 years of the failure of Congress to do a reorganization job, nor do I see where it has anything to do with the size of the job that needs to be done.

We all realize that reorganization plans are desirable. We realize that Congress has not been able to do it by affirmative action. So I consider that it is highly constitutional for the Congress to delegate within certain limits the job of reorganization. We merely say to the President, "Avail yourself of the tremendous value of the 24 task-force reports to the Hoover Commission, and whatever subsequent reports and recommendations the Hoover Commission will make based on those 24 task-force reports. Then, after considering all this material, the procuring of which was endorsed by the Eightieth Congress when we set up the so-called Hoover Commission. The Hoover Commission has been in session now for over 18 months and

has spent over $1,000,000, with over 300 of the finest technicians in Government that we could procure, sending up to the Congress plans, not one plan, but several plans." Then, I say we will have a firm base upon which a worth-while reorganization of the executive branch of Government can take place.

When the President sends up a plan the Congress then has 60 days in which to consider the plan. If we find out that there is something bad about the plan we have in title 2 of this bill a highly privileged resolution which can be offered on the floor by any Member of the Congress who is in favor of a resolution to disapprove the plan. Any Member of Congress can arise under high privilege and ask that a vote be taken on a particular plan and provision is made for 1 hour of debate on that question. Any committee that is affected by this plan, let us say that it is a plan with reference to the Department of Agriculture, immediately the Committee on Agriculture is on guard concerning this plan to reorganize the Department of Agriculture. Thus the Committee on Agriculture can consider that plan. It can ask for hearings. The hearings can be had in the Committee on Executive Expenditures. The chairman or any member of the Committee on Agriculture can come before that committee and present its case. Then, if the committee itself refuses to bring forward a resolution of disapproval, any member of the Committee on Agriculture can bring to the floor of the House for the consideration of the House a concurrent resolution of disapproval and the House at that time can hear the arguments pro and con and vote it up or down.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It is quite true, I assume, as the gentleman said, that any Member of the House can arise and propose the disapproval of a plan submitted. Assuming that the House does disapprove, unless we can get the other body to go along, the proposal still becomes the law of the land, does it not?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is true.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. If we pass a bill in this body it has to go to the other body and they have to consider it. If they do not take it up, what can we do? Furthermore, this provision that any Member can call it up as a matter of high privilege within 10 days after the reorganization plan comes up will apply to the other body the same as it applies to the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. But the difference is that the reorganization plan still becomes the law of the land without the action of one body while in the case of a bill it must have the approval of both Houses to become law. You gentlemen realize the difference.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would like to point out, however, that that approval is a majority approval. In the case of a bill which has been vetoed by the President and sent down here, it takes two-thirds vote of the House to override the veto. It seems to me this is a very well-balanced arrangement, that only a majority of each House is necessary to disapprove a plan. I point out to you that if a plan is so highly undesirable, certainly the Congress of the United States can at that time exercise its responsibility and by a majority vote of each House disapprove such a plan. I point to the record. Such a thing did occur six times out of seven in the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield, that particular provision is nothing new in a reorganization bill, and it was in the one which expired in April.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Exactly so. That is the one I just referred to. Seven reorganization plans were sent to the House by the President under the Reorganization Act of 1945, and six of them were disapproved by majority action of both Houses. There is no use bringing up a straw man here and then knocking it over. We have the best bill that has ever been presented to the Congress, so far as reorganization is concerned. It gives the President, for the first time in history, the power to go ahead and use this great mass of information compiled by the Hoover Commission, and bring before the Congress plans for our approval or disapproval. Plans which we cannot originate in the House with all of the business that we have to attend to and with all of the logrolling and pressure from groups which are concerned with every facet of every bureau of the great sprawling bureaucracy of government.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORRIS. Assuming that this bill should become law, the Congress could later repeal the law if it decided it should do so, could it not?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Exactly. Any part of this plan which becomes law can be nullified. I point out that in the Reorganization Act of 1932 it gave to President Roosevelt great powers, and that later on, in 1933, such action was taken and a limitation was placed upon his power.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Another outstanding contribution in the progress of the history of this legislation—and I want to congratulate the members of the committee on both sides—is the fact that it is permanent legislation, recognizing that this is a problem not for a matter of a year or 2 or 3 or 4 years, but one that is constantly arising, and in which we, the majority party—I speak for myself—have complete confidence. We may disagree with the President of the United States, but I have complete confidence in whoever may be the President of the United States, recognizing the serious responsibility of that office, that any man in that office would carry on to the highest degree humanly possible in the exercise of his best judgment in the interest of the country. I think it is a marked contribution in the progress of legislation of this kind.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The Congress has delegated to the President broad authority to reorganize the executive branch of the Government five times in the past 17 years. The bill which we present to you today is the sixth presentation of a reorganization bill within the past 17 years. Under all of these reorganization acts, Congress has delegated to the President power to reorganize, on the grounds of economy and efficiency, the sprawling, complicated structure of Government in the executive departments. We have delegated this authority because we have been forced to come to the conclusion that Congress has neither the time nor the ability for unified action to successfully accomplish a reorganization in the executive branch. This principle of lack of ability to execute a real reorganization has been well established and we are setting no precedent today.

The administration of the laws which Congress has passed has become more complicated and burdensome as bureau after bureau has been established and expanded, and as the personnel of the executive branch has multiplied from a few thousand to nearly 2,000,000 governmental employees.

The reorganization acts which Congress has passed have varied in some degree over the years, but one prime purpose has been contained in each of these acts: That purpose has been to delegate to the President authority to do a job which we in the Congress admit that we cannot do. Congress, however, has been fearful in the delegation of this authority, that such delegation would be abused. The Congress has in the past, also, yielded to its fears, and in some instances has been influenced by the tremendous pressures which have been brought on Congress to exempt certain agencies of Government completely from the President's delegated power to reorganize.

In the 1939 Reorganization Act, we exempted 21 agencies of the executive branch from Presidential reorganization; in the 1945 Reorganization Act, we exempted 11 agencies from reorganization. All students of government recognize that these exemptions have crippled the President and have tied his hands in his effort to set up an economical and efficient structure of Government in the executive departments.

Experts in governmental organization have assured us, after careful and objective analysis that these exemptions have prevented, to a lesser or greater extent, the main purpose of a reorganization act.

The present Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has had the same experience as previous committees charged with the responsibility of reporting a reorganization act. Witnesses have appeared before our committee from outside the Congress, and from inside the Congress, making pleas for the exemptions of special departments of Government. We have listened to their pleas, and, in some instances, our personal feelings have been

sympathetic to their arguments, and to their positions. We have also had before our committee, some very notable witnesses, who have insisted that this time the Congress give to the President the power to reorganize the executive branch of Government and to send to the Congress his plan of reorganization, in order that we may curb the sprawling, overlapping, duplicating bureaus of Government which have grown Topsylike in the executive departments of our Government.

President Truman, in his state of the Union message, and in his special letter to the committee, has requested that we give him complete power to present to the Congress, efficient plans of reorganization, which will bring the economy into our Government functions that public opinion is clamoring for. He has asked that we make no exemptions in the pending bill.

The only living ex-President of the United States, the Honorable Herbert Hoover, has also appeared before our committee, and has asked this committee to report a bill without exemptions. He has testified that it is only in this way that a real reorganization can be accomplished. The testimony of ex-President Herbert Hoover bears additional weight at this time because, as chairman of the so-called Hoover commission, which was instituted during the Eightieth Congress for the express purpose of studying our Government structure and reporting back to the Congress, is now ready to start making its report to the President.

I understand that 24 separate task forces have made their reports to the Hoover commission. The Hoover commission will base their report to the President on these 24 task-forces reports. President Truman will, in turn, no doubt, base the reorganization plans which he will send to Congress on the reports of the Hoover commission. In the establishment of the Hoover commission, Congress acknowledged the weight of public opinion on this pressing problem. Approximately 18 months' time has been consumed and upward of a million dollars spent on objective analyses of the different departments of Government. Following these objective analyses, the task forces have made their reports to the commission. The commission, as you know, is completely bipartisan in its approach to this great problem. If we are to cash in on the value of the most extensive study which has ever been made of our sprawling Federal bureaucracy, now is the time.

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has presented to this Congress a good bill—a bill which we believe will give the President the power to proceed in an orderly fashion—prepare the reorganization plans to present to the Congress for approval or disapproval.

Today's bill does not contain the exemption of any executive department or agency of Government. We have, however, recognized the great concern felt by many Members of the Congress in changes in certain very important executive departments. We have, therefore, prepared what we believe is a fair compromise approach between those who want no exemption and those who want exemptions.

We have provided that any plan affecting the National Defense Establishment, which everyone admits needs reorganization, be sent to the Congress in a single reorganization plan. This will enable the Congress to review such a plan without having to consider the merits or demerits of any accompanying reorganization plan. We can then, in the exercise of our judgment, either accept or reject such a plan. This provision, we believe, will meet the fears and the concern which many Members have expressed regarding changes in the status of the Marine Corps or in the civil function of the Army engineers or the Navy air arm or other related matters to our national defense.

We have extended this same separate treatment to three other agencies of the executive branch: The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Securities and Exchange Commission.

In the opinion of the committee, these three great bureaus can be considered to be the vital keystones to our financial and business structure. Upon them rests the economic welfare of our Nation. We, therefore, believe that these three agencies should have separate treatment. Many other agencies of Government are vitally important and there will be many who believe that these should also be considered separately. However, it was the opinion of the committee that the functions of the other agencies were not so widespread nor as important as the three bureaus or agencies named, and it was also believed that in many cases more than one agency could be handled by the Congress in the same reorganization plan.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, the committee has worked diligently and certainly with expedition in bringing this matter to the floor. I think it is obvious to all of us that this is basic legislation and must be enacted if the proposals that we hope will be forthcoming for the reorganization of the Government may be adopted.

Of course, those proposals that have been the subject of study by the Hoover Commission for months and months are the direct result of action taken by the Eightieth Congress in setting up that commission, recognizing that basically a job had to be done.

I assume, of course, that this legislation will be passed and that it will become law in some final form that will be effective.

May I say to my friends on the right side of the aisle and my friends on my side of the aisle that, as these recommendations of the President begin to come up, we are going to find that we have a great responsibility before us. Certainly, to those of you who hold the majority power, the matter is up to you, and may I say the baby is going to be on your doorstep. Certainly those of us who think that we need reorganization badly are going to look to you to meet the issue and the challenge with courage and with wisdom and with fair consideration to the people of the country who pay the bills.

I have asked for this time particularly because there is one thing that has disturbed me. It has disturbed me ever since these matters of reorganization to be initiated by the executive branch of the Government have been before the Congress. That has to do with the way they may affect the great quasi-judicial and quasi-legislative agencies of the Government. By that I refer to such agencies as the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the United States Tariff Commission, the Railroad Retirement Board, the Civil Functions of the Army Engineers, and a number of others that could be mentioned. Those agencies are primarily, in my view, the creatures of the Congress of the United States. Theirs is the responsibility to administer in the public welfare legislation enacted by the Congress.

The members of those commissions are appointed for a term. The members of the commissions do not change when the administration changes. Since they are appointed for a term they go on. There is a continuity of their operations. They deal with the very lifeblood of the country; with the economy of the country. If there is, for instance, in the Interstate Commerce Commission a continuity of pattern and determination about the rates involved in transportation then, of course, the people of the country may know and understand from time to time what those operations are to be and what the action ought to be. Certainly, it seems to me that it would be disastrous indeed if we were to bring about a situation under which the quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial functions of this great agency should be brought into the executive branch of the Government in such manner that their operations become political instead of nonpolitical.

Take, for instance, the matter of the Federal Communications Commission. You may say that this is a completely far-fetched proposition, but it could happen. Suppose that the functions of the Federal Communications Commission were transferred to the Department of Commerce; you might have a situation under which radio licenses issued to stations might, on a pure political basis, be changed. People build up great businesses on the issuance of a license. They are to have that license as long as they use it in the public interest. And that is the value and the merit and the function of such a commission. As I say, it would be inconceivable to my mind that any such result would be brought about, but certainly there are some in the country and I am afraid some in the Government who would argue that even the quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial functions of those great agencies should be brought within the realm of the executive branch of the Government and, hence, subjected to political control. In the previous reorganizations that we have considered some of those agencies have been specifically exempted. It is argued, and I can understand with what force, that it is difficult in respect to any agency to

distinguish the executive functions from the legislative or judicial functions. I recognize that and certainly I, for one, want to write the kind of basic legislation that will make effective reorganization possible. But the fact that there was concern about what might happen to these agencies under this system by which in effect, unless the provision is amended, legislation is written by the executive branch and one branch of the Congress, not two, there should be some safeguard. So some of these agencies in the past have been exempted. In the act passed in 1945 there were certain exemptions. I think probably it has been pretty well agreed on the advice of Mr. Hoover and others that such exemptions should be kept out of this bill. It is said that no President would think of transferring to the executive branch of the Government these great legislative and judicial functions performed by these agencies. But it has been urged, and I find myself in that school of thought, that the pattern that is provided in this legislation under which the reorganization plans regarding four such independent agencies must come up separately and independent of the plans effecting any other reorganization might well be extended to some of these other agencies.

This does not mean that reorganization plans in respect to those agencies cannot be presented here by the President to be acted upon in whatever manner may be finally prescribed in the House. It simply would require that that plan as it affected one of these great independent agencies should come up here standing on its own bottom. You understand that if this legislation is adopted and a reorganization proposal comes up it might have five or six titles. One of them may be bad; all the rest of them may be good, but you cannot pick the good apples out of the barrel and leave the bad ones; you have got to take the whole barrel or leave the whole barrel.

I cannot see how it really would interfere with the effective functioning of this legislation to extend to some of these other agencies the same protection that is contained in the bill on page 7 in subsection (b).

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. If a situation like the gentleman said should occur, where five different plans are treated within the same reorganization plan, four of them being good and one of them being bad in the judgment of Congress, would it not be possible for the Congress to take affirmative action to nullify that part of the plan later on after the whole plan had been passed or accepted as law? Could not the Congress exercise its responsibility by taking affirmative action as to that particular agency?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Indiana two additional minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. Yes; I may say to the gentleman from California, I suppose if a plan came up here with five titles, that might be done. Of course, it could not be the Interstate Commerce Commission because that is included in the four. But take the case of the Civil Aeronautics Board which regulates air carriers like the Interstate Commerce Commission regulates surface carriers. We could adopt the whole thing, then turn around and start legislation through the mill to reestablish the independence of the Civil Aeronautics Authority. But, may I say to the gentleman from California, it seems to me that that begs the question. First of all, such action would be subject to a Presidential veto. The damage done in the meantime might be irreparable. As I say, I want above everything else to have effective legislation that will work. I would like to be optimistic about what the final results are going to be. We have had this sort of scheme on our books for quite awhile and not a lot has happened. Yet I am still optimistic about it. At the same time, I cannot remove completely from my mind the responsibility that I believe is mine to try to see to it that there is a scintilla of safeguard of the independence for these great quasi-legislative and qausi-judicial agencies. Many of them are bipartisan.

Why is that? Because it is expected that in the administration of the basic law passed by the Congress, in which minority and majority combined, there will be expression of the minority viewpoint, whatever that may be, so far as that particular agency is concerned and to avoid political control. Of course, to transfer it to the executive branch of the Government would entirely do away with the whole concept of these independent agencies as that concept has developed through the years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the Democratic and Republican members alike, has approached the consideration of this question from a very fine angle. There are only two differences of opinion, one expressed by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] and the other by the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

In relation to the observations made by the gentleman from Indiana, may I refresh the memory of my colleagues of the furor that developed in 1940 when the Civil Aeronautics Authority was put under the Commerce Department, though the board was expressly made independent of the Secretary. It was put in there for budgetary reasons. Instead of having that and a number of other agencies floating around and making up their own budgets, the Bureau of the Budget thought it advisable to put them in with certain other departments, yet maintain an independent status. Some Members of Congress honestly expressed the fear that the independence of the CAA would be taken away, that politics would enter into the matter, that planes would crash on account of lack of safety rules, that the pilots would operate the planes through the skies in a negligent manner. Yet none of that has happened. The independence of the agency still exists. It is in the Department of Commerce for budgetary purposes and mainly for that purpose.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, in that transfer the Congress had already effected a separation of the administrative functions from the quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial function, and the only part of the operation that was transferred to the Commerce Department was the Office of the Administrator which did include the executive functions.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, that is true, but you remember back 8 years ago the fears that were expressed as to the effect, and they have not materialized.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman indulge me in one further observation?

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly.

Mr. HALLECK. I have talked to some of the folks who are running that branch of the Government, and they are not quite sure whether the Secretary of Commerce is running it or the Civil Aeronautics Administrator, so I do not know what we finally accomplished as a result of it. Maybe we just put a few more people on, but I am not quarreling with the essential fact the gentleman has stated.

Mr. McCORMACK. Now, we have 1,800 agencies in the Federal Government; most of them executive, one distinctly legislative—the General Accounting Office. Then we have these independent agencies.

Former President Hoover made an able presentation, and both he and President Truman are in agreement in relation to this bill; as a matter of fact, they both felt there should not be any exceptions at all or, rather, even any exceptions in the nature of a separate reorganization plan. President Hoover—and he speaks with the voice of experience—has testified that there are over 30 agencies engaged in lending money and making guaranties and in insurance activities. There are 23 activities engaged in major construction work competing against each other for labor and material. They are scattered over 11 departments of the Government. There are 10 agencies dealing with major transportation questions; that is, not connected with regulatory functions, that are scattered through 8 departments and independent agencies. There is the question of the agencies reporting to the President. He had three lists before him. One list showed 65 such agencies. Another computed 94 such agencies. Another computed them as 101 agencies reporting to the President. As the former President said, "The discrepancy in the lists is a difference of opinion as to how much responsibility the President may have in each case. Most of them exercise some executive function." The gentleman from Indiana presents a very interesting question and I am very glad he did. I have some observations to make which, I think that, as realists and legislators, we

cannot escape considering. We must face the realization of what has developed in the growth of so-called administrative law. At the outset of our country we were an agricultural nation. While the framers of the Constitution, as well as the later Congresses amending the Constitution, recognized the necessity of constitutional flexibility to meet changing conditions, particularly in the powers delegated to the Central Government under the general welfare clause, and the power to regulate interstate commerce, it is quite probable that they never contemplated the growth of our country into the great industrial Nation it is today. In order to try and meet the perplexing and trying problems arising from our intense economic system, which is a combination of our industry and agriculture, Congress, through necessity to try and meet the complicated situation, brought into being, which is now highly developed and will undoubtedly increase as necessity demands, a system through the establishment of many agencies, most of them independent, with quasi legislative power, authorizing them to enter into the field of detailed regulatory legislation as well as delegating to them quasi judicial powers to function effectively in carrying out the intent of the Congress, Congress resorted to the device of establishing independent agencies in the executive departments. That is where they are located. The Interstate Commerce Commission was the first instance, but the increase since its establishment has been rapid. The legislation that created them usually consisted of a declaration of the policy of the Congress, the promulgation of broad rules to govern the acts of individuals and corporations in a particular field, and a commission established with the authority to implement and enforce the policies and principles stated by the Congress. The theory is that the Congress did not advocate or even delegate its legislative functions, but it exercised that function of broad, general declarations leaving the application of its policy in a particular instance to an agency of its own creation.

The rules and regulations can only be set aside by an act of Congress or by decisions of the court, if any rule in the latter case goes beyond the authority granted to the agency. Until such action takes place, they have the force of law.

Such agencies have broad quasi-judicial powers in their given fields, with a limited review by the courts. Such agencies were born of the necessity that faced the Congress in meeting the important public questions, the recognition from a practical angle by the Congress of its inability to pass detailed regulatory legislation and also conduct necessary quasi-judicial hearings. That question of necessity arose in accomplishing its legislative purpose and objective.

But these agencies also have functions that are purely executive. In addition, the heads or members of the boards or commissions are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, the same as strictly executive agencies. Their executive functions have increased tremendously. No matter what the intent of the Congress was in their creation, that they were intended as arms of the legislative branch, the very necessities of the operations of these agencies, the ever-growing questions that arise in their field, the large increase in the number of employees as a result thereof, and the many other demands made upon them, have brought about a sharp change in the character of these agencies and their operations and the original intent of the Congress in creating them.

Confining myself to the question of this bill, which is a reorganization bill, we must face the practical situation. There is no reason why these agencies should not be the subject of reorganization consideration. The very growth of their jurisdiction and duties, they being not responsible directly to the people, really makes them a fourth department of the Government. That is what they constitute. That is what it has developed into. We never intended that, but they have really developed into a fourth department of the Government. As they are now constituted, this raises some very serious questions as to whether the Congress should continue to consider them as arms of Congress or parts of the executive branch.

This question is not directly involved in this bill, but the fact does remain that if we exclude them or provide for a separate reorganization in so many agencies, we are not facing the realities of the situation. To provide in the case of every agency that a separate reorganization plan must be submitted by the President would seriously cripple the effectiveness of any reorganization of the executive branch. There are too many such agencies in existence.

I will admit that if I had my way we would not have made the exemptions we did, but this bill is the best bill that has ever been reported out of any committee. The first reorganization bill not so many years ago had 21 exemptions. The next one had 12 or 14 exemptions. In this bill there are no exemptions. We only provide that in the case of three agencies and one department a separate reorganization plan shall be submitted to the Congress.

These independent agencies have developed for all practical purposes into a fourth department of the Government, and the very serious implications arising therefrom cannot be overlooked by you and me as legislators. They cross the lines of the legislative, executive and judicial branches of government. They include all of the jurisdiction of the legislative, executive and judicial branches which were expressly established by the Constitution. Congress, through necessity, created them. We know, as experienced legislators, that Congress cannot, through necessity, successfully reorganize them. The very fact that we are considering this bill and the fact that Congress has in the past enacted into law reorganization bills is a frank admission of the inability of Congress to effectively reorganize the executive branch of the government, not to mention the so-called independent agencies. The many complicated questions involved make that very difficult from a practical angle. I think we have the courage. There is no question about it. But just think of the vast scope of the executive branch of the government and think of these independent agencies and how they are interrelated. That is a very delicate and technical subject which Congress, from a practical angle, finds it difficult to approach. I cannot conceive of any President in reorganizing the independent agencies doing so in a manner which would affect the intent of Congress insofar as quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial functions are concerned, so that such agencies retain either an independent or an autonomous position—either independent as now, or autonomous within some other agency or department. Furthermore, we possess under this bill the right to refuse to approve any reorganization plans submitted to us. The gentleman from Indiana has done a very constructive piece of work in bringing this up. I make these observations for your consideration. Our independent agencies have gone far beyond the intent of Congress. They constitute, in fact, a fourth department of government. We will not reorganize them. This is the only way it can be done, by conferring upon the President the power. That will bring them back under one responsible head at least and not take them further away from the people than either the President or you or me as Members of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN].

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to vote for this legislation as it was reported from the Committee on Expenditures, of which I am a member. Ever since I have been in Congress reorganization of the executive branch of our Government has been a subject of keen interest to me. With the Reorganization Act of 1939, and again in 1945, there has been no recommendations of magnitude which would lend toward more efficient and economical operation of the executive branch of our Government. As at the present time, there is a tremendous overlapping and duplication of the functions of many of the agencies and bureaus of our Government, I cite just a few: Lending Government funds, 29 agencies; acquisition on land, 24; wildlife preservation, 16; welfare matters, 28; gathering statistics, 65. Is there any wonder that there is a lack of efficiency and economy and overall direction with so many agencies dealing with the same subjects? If we are ever going to curtail the unnecessary expansion of our Government, we must start now to consolidate and abolish those bureaus and agencies which are not necessary to the service of our people.

I feel that the President should be given the authority at this time to make whatever recommendations that are necessary for the reorganization of the executive branch of our Government with all agencies and bureaus coming within the scope of this plan. It would, however, exclude the General Accounting Office and the courts of the District of Columbia. I am in wholehearted

agreement with the testimony given before our committee by Comptroller General Lindsay Warren. I questioned him as follows:

Mr. Warren, I have been greatly impressed today with the sincerity and the earnestness of your presentation with regard to this legislation. I followed it through carefully and I believe it is your earnest feeling that, if this legislation is enacted, there will be greater efficiency in the departments of our Government, and also there should be a tremendous amount of economy.

Mr. WARREN. I certainly do think that, Mr. RIEHLMAN. I would like to say this—and I weigh my words when I say it: If this fails, then we might as well close up the shop for good regarding hopes of ever reducing the size of this Government or eliminating waste and extravagance and useless functions. I say that very sincerely. I think this is just about the last chance. It is almost the last chance I will have coming up here on it.

Mr. Warren is not alone speaking as Comptroller General but with the background as a Member of Congress for many years.

Mr. Hoover, appearing before the committee, made this remark:

This is a step in the right direction and a step which should and must be taken without delay.

I feel, with this authority granted to the President by the Congress, there should be no reason why he cannot carry out the recommendations set forth in his letter to Congress asking for this authority. Therefore, if proper recommendations are not made, there will be no question as to where the responsibility can be placed.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER].

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, at this time I should like to state that I deem it an honor and a privilege to serve on the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments under the chairmanship of that able and distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON].

I am in favor of a reorganization of Government agencies, and I hope this proposed legislation will provide the efficiency and economy that we think it will.

I recognize that there are no exemptions for any agencies in this proposed legislation, but I would be remiss in my duties if I did not point out to the Members of this House that I have received a great many letters and telegrams from my constituents urging that the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, be exempt from reorganization under this legislation.

Since George Washington's time the civil functions have been historically performed by this highly trained, nonpolitical branch of the Army, on a nonpartisan and very efficient basis. They have performed with great credit in peacetime the river and harbor work especially where it involves the big multiple-purpose projects, such as navigation, reclamation, power, flood control, and in my district, particularly, bounded by two of the Great Lakes—Erie and Ontario—containing the Niagara River, and many small harbors, they have been of immeasurable assistance to the area. These peacetime duties have contributed greatly to the success of our war efforts in the last two great world wars.

I would hate to see the functions now performed by the corps transferred to some other Federal agency, which may have tremendous political influence by virtue of a Secretary having Cabinet status, and to have these duties performed on the basis of politics rather than of high professional competence.

I hope, however, that the proposed legislation, which provides that a reorganization plan providing for reorganization affecting the National Military Establishment will have to be submitted to Congress in a so-called "one package" plan, will afford this great corps the protection it so richly deserves.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to congratulate the gentleman from Massachusetts who just left the well of the House upon the acceptance by the now mapority of the proposition offered by Mr. Hoover so many years ago, and upon their final belated recognition of his great services to our country.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, my purpose in addressing the House is to support this resolution and I do commend it to the House. I think it should pass. I say I support this resolution—I am supporting the principle of the resolution. It was my own experience at the State level to serve in the capacity of attempting to help reorganize the State government. The general assembly made two or three rather futile attempts and finally passed a bill which in effect delegated that authority to the budget committee, of which I happened to be chairman at that time. I know the blood, sweat, and tears that came out of that particular type of effort. I say that this effort which is now before us is certainly a most laudable one because in comparison the need for reorganization at the Federal level is far, far greater than any that might be in existence at the State level.

For the last 20 years we have needed this. There have been a number of attempts made to reorganize the executive, most of which have achieved little general benefit, not only so far as the people are concerned but the efficiency of those who are empowered within the Government itself.

The Congress has not accomplished this very necessary task, and evidently will not. The present plan seems to be the very best hope to do so. While it does not provide the usual approach for the enactment of legislation, in that the President inaugurates the resolution and the Congress either votes it up or down, nevertheless the plan has already been used. There remains some doubt in the minds of Members of the House, particularly those who are constitutional lawyers, as to the constitutionality of this act. Not being an attorney, I am not attempting to pass on it. I do say, however, that the positive approach would seem the most legical one, but in the event that it is not adopted, certainly I can say that this approach does provide all the necessary safeguards it would seem to me. For the final power is invested in the representatives of the people.

I want to congratulate the chairman of the committee, who I think has made a very valiant attempt to try to get a good resolution before the House. This has not been an easy task.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to say I am very happy the gentleman from Indiana is a member of this committee because of the long years of experience he has had with this kind of problem. There is no limitation on the number of Government employees who can be employed at any particular time in this bill, is there? There is no provision at all to limit Federal employees?

Mr. HARVEY. That is right.

Mr. JENSEN. Does not the gentleman think that is one of the greatest weaknesses of the bill? Does not the gentleman feel that there should be a limitation placed in this resolution or in some bill which would provide that no more than so many Federal employees could be on the pay roll at any one time? I am afraid that this legislation will permit them to shift employees from one department, agency, or bureau of the Government to another, and we will get no reduction in the administrative personnel cost to the Government.

Mr. HARVEY. I thank the gentleman. And I wish to say that his point is well taken. However, due to his long experience in the field of appropriations, I would suggest to him that primarily the responsibility for reducing Government employees should be resolved in the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. JENSEN. I think the gentleman is right, except that I think that sort of thing could be placed in this bill. I wish to say to the gentleman that the subcommittee on the Interior Department in the Appropriations Committee, of which I was chairman last year, limited the amount of funds which could be spent by the Bureau of Reclamation to $48,000,000.

Mr. HARVEY. May I congratulate the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. HARVEY. I may say that Mr. Lindsay Warren, our present Comptroller General, who testified before our committee and who was a Member of the Congress during the time when the 1939 act was placed on the books, said that it was defeated by the great army of "butters"; that everybody who came and testified before the committee said, "We are for this legislation, but," and then proceeded to ask for the exemption of some particular department. By the time the bill was through the Congress, two-thirds of those affected by the bill had sneaked out from under, so that when you start making exemptions in a

bill of this nature you will nullify its benefits.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Is it not true that it is impossible to write a specific limitation into a bill, in view of the fact that government is not static; it is dynamic and a constantly changing function of service to the people, and by the very fact that Congress itself creates new services and new functions, it would be impossible to prescribe a definite limitation of personnel?

Mr. HARVEY. I might say to the gentleman that it was perhaps best described by the gentleman from Illinois as a fluid condition.

I shall conclude briefly by saying that I feel that the responsibility under this act will be placed directly on the President. I hope he will meet the obligation under the privilege we are giving him with no strings attached to it, and that he will perform this much-needed task for the improvement, efficiency, and economy of our Government.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, in discussing this bill I wish to do so under three headings: First, the necessity for reorganization; second, the plan or method of reorganization; and, third, to touch briefly on the constitutionality of the proposed legislation. Under the latter head I need not take very much of the time of the Committee because I believe it is rather late to be raising the question of the right of Congress to delegate legislative authority. We have been doing it for the past hundred years, and so long as we set up proper standards to guide the person to whom the delegation of authority is made it is constitutional.

I am extending in the RECORD at this point a detailed argument for the constitutionality of this bill.

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE REORGANIZATION BILL

Some question was raised at the hearings on H. R. 1569—Eighty-first Congress—as to the constitutionality of turning over to the Executive the legislative function involved in reorganization of the executive branch. The bill proposes authority to transfer, consolidate, or abolish agencies and/or functions of the Federal establishment, the President's orders or plans for such purpose to become effective only after they have lain before Congress in session for 60 days without the adoption by the two Houses of a concurrent resolution of disapproval.

From one point of view there is no delegation at all. That is, as suggested at the hearings, there is merely a reversal of the legislative process, the Executive acting first, and the Congress completing the legislative action by declining to negate the propositions. This is not, however, tenable, because the legislative process requires—Constitution, article I, section 7, clause 2—that both Houses concur separately on each enactment; under the plan of the present bill a reorganization plan will become law notwithstanding one House may vote its outright disapproval.

Rather, it seems more in order to regard the plans as legislation by the Executive, under authority delegated in the present bill, subject, as a safeguard, to veto if both houses disapprove during the 60-day waiting period. Is such delegation authorized?

It is far too late to raise a question whether the legislative function may be delegated. What was sanctioned by over a hundred years of decisions—*The Brig Aurora* (7 Cr. 382 (1813)), *Field* v. *Clark* (143 U. S. 649 (1892)), *Intermountain Rate cases* (234 U. S. 476 (1914))—of the Supreme Court was not intended to be overturned by the two decisions in the NRA cases 14 years ago—*Panama Refining Co.* v. *Ryan* (293, U. S. 388), *Schechter Poultry Corp.* v. *United States* (295 U. S. 495). The latter gave direction, but did not call a halt. That this, on reflection, is obvious, is demonstrated by the more recent delegations of legislative power now fully sustained on topics and subjects far more essentially legislative in their nature and incidence, for example, devaluation of the dollar, tariff adjustments by reciprocal trade agreements, price fixing by OPA, rent control, as still in effect, and many others—*Yakus* v. *U. S.* (321 U. S. 414, 64 S. Ct. 660), *Bowles* v. *Willingham* (321 U. S. 503, 64 S. Ct. 641). What was given point by the NRA cases was the requirement that Congress fulfill its function by delineating the policies to be followed, demarking the guides for Executive action, and detailing the standards which the President must follow. It is believed the first five sections of the bill comply with these requirements admirably. They set forth the aims to be sought, the methods to be used, the objectives to be reached to effect the aims, and the limits and restraints which may not be encroached upon. Thus while it has been objected that the bill proposes to abdicate the legislative power of the House to the President and to the Senate—since the joint approval of the latter could effectuate a plan turned down by the House—it seems more correct to say the House is now, by the adoption of this bill, exercising its constitutional function and giving force in advance to whatever plans of the Executive are promulgated under its authority—and, more importantly, pursuant to its provisions—and are not disapproved by the Senate.

Two authorities seem to be so closely in point as themselves to be determinative. While the concurrent resolution veto was called for by the 1939 and 1945 acts, no tests were possible under the former because Congress approved each plan affirmatively by what amounted to a new statute in each case—Fifth United States Code 133s-u-v—and no court cases on the question have been noted under the 1945 act.

But in two cases the constitutional issue was directly raised under the previous but quite similar Reorganization Act of March 3, 1933. It is notable that that act was much broader than the present bill, in that there were no exempt agencies or single-plan method called for. There was less detail in the way of guides and standards, and while the Executive orders were required to lay before Congress for 60 days, there was no provision for a congressional veto other than by the enactment of new legislation. Certain sections of the Government-wide reorganization effected under that law—Executive Order No. 6166 of June 10, 1933—were questioned upon the basis that the delegation of authority was unwarranted under the Constitution. The case came up before a statutory three-judge court, composed of Circuit Judge Chase, District Judge Bondy, and District Judge Robert P. Patterson. The reorganization was fully sustained in the decision of the court, the opinion stating, Congress "elected to have the President investigate and decide what should be done in this regard in the furtherance of efficiency and economy and then adopted his decision. The result was to abolish a board whose existence was dependent upon the will of Congress and to delegate to the Department of Commerce the same powers and duties the board had possessed. This seems in accord with correct standards as to delegation of authority to act within proper limits prescribed by Congress"—*Isbrandtsen-Molter Co., Inc.* v. *United States et al.* (14 F. Supp. 407 (1936)).

That opinion was adopted and given full approval by a similar three-judge court in the District of Columbia, composed of Appeals Justice Groner, District Judge Wheat, and District Judge Proctor, in *Swayne & Hoyt* v. *United States* (18 F. Supp. 25).

While the two cases were later affirmed in the Supreme Court, the decisions did not turn on this issue because in the meantime Congress had given express sanction to the reorganization by means of later legislation. However, in one subsequent case the Supreme Court referred with apparent approval to the method of reorganization contained in the 1939 act with its provisions, as here, for the plans to become effective unless a concurrent resolution disapprove them—*Sibbach* v. *Wilson & Co.* (312 U. S. 1, 15 (1941)).

Also, it is worth while to be noted that the method of reorganization proposed by the present bill to be readopted has been fully approved by the commentators on this subject. See, for example, a symposium on Federal executive reorganization in volume 40, American Political Science Review, at page 1152, and the article entitled "The Legislative Veto and the Reorganization Act of 1939," by Millett and Rogers in volume 1, Public Administration Review, No. 176, 1941. It is suggested also, as a most significant and persuasive authority, that the Congress itself has already fully examined the constitutionality of this identical procedure, and after extended debate has approved and adopted it. See seriatim, the debates in the House and the Senate on the 1945 Reorganization Act.

As to the necessity for the legislation it seems that it is hardly necessary that I say very much. We are all, I believe, agreed that there ought to be reorganization in principle, as somebody said before our committee; and then somebody suggested that we must in this case rise above principle and exempt certain agencies. We all agree in principle that there

should be reorganization; the trouble is that every agency of the Government wants to be exempted. Reorganization is needed not only for efficiency and economy but that we may give to the Executive some real power. He has a responsibility to execute the laws of the land, but we have so hedged him about that it is sometimes very difficult for him to do so. I saw the statement credited to him in the newspapers a few days ago to the effect that it had gotten to the point where he had to kiss some of these officials on both cheeks before he could get them to do what was their plain duty; kissing them on one cheek was not enough. I am sure some of you have had the experience that I have, that you almost feel you have got to kiss some other portion of their anatomy to get any consideration. This situation demands correction.

As to the necessity for economy in government, I was struck by what Mr. Hoover said in his testimony. Somebody asked him about taxation and the raising of more revenue for the Government. He said that we had reached the saturation point in taxation; and I am inclined to agree with him. We cannot cut down our appropriations for national defense. We are embarking, or we say we are going to embark, upon a program of additional service to the people which will cost money. There is but one place left, then, where we can economize, and that is in the actual operation of the machinery of our Government, and here is a chance for us to do it not only in principle but actually. How shall it be done? The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] proposes that instead of doing it this way we do it some other way. Everyone agrees that for the past 150 years it has been impossible or impractical for the Congress itself to do this reorganizing job. We have not done it and there is nothing to indicate that we are in any better condition to do it now than we were then. The gentleman from Michigan says that we are overturning our constitutional procedure, and I have great respect for the gentleman's views on the constitutionality of this question.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have the greatest respect for the gentleman's judgment. Will he tell us why in his opinion the Congress has not done it?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes, I will tell the gentleman why. It is because, as Mr. Lindsay Warren said, of the ganging up process.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I agree with the gentleman and we have been complacent enough to go along.

Mr. LANHAM. That is right. The departments have ganged up on us and we cannot do the job. I do not say the President will do it; however, I think he will try to do the job. He will certainly have no excuse if he does not do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, the primary object of the legislation before the House today is efficiency and economy in government and, goodness only knows, every Member of Congress realizes that that should take place.

There are two things about this legislation that I do not like. The first is that there is no termination date in this bill. It seems to me there ought to be a time limit. There should be 2 or 3 years within which to act and then we ought to stop, because we should not be subject to a President bringing in legislation whenever he wants to, regardless of who the President might be, when he thinks there ought to be a change in government. I have seen Presidents who wanted to change the Government a whole lot when I did not think it ought to be changed. Sometimes they get enough enthusiasm worked up for a particular thing that it goes through and after it is passed we are sorry it happened. Many of you have experienced those changes yourself.

I listened very intently to the testimony of Lindsay Warren, Comptroller General of the United States, in which he made his recommendations. There is no one in Government I hold in higher respect than I do Lindsay Warren. He knows more about the operation of Government, in my opinion, than any living man, at least since I have been a Member of Congress. It is his job to study our Government. He has vision and he makes recommendations as he sees them for the best interest of Government economy and efficiency.

If you will turn to page 37 of the hearings you will see there the examples of overlapping and duplication which occur in Government in the following table:

	Agencies
Lending Government funds	29
Insuring deposits and loans	3
Acquisition of land	34
Wildlife preservation	16
Government construction	10
Credit and finance	9
Home and community planning	12
Welfare matters	28
Forestry matters	14
Examination of banks	4
Gathering statistics	65

When you think of 65 agencies of the Government sending out requests to the business people of this country asking for information, it is no wonder that the business people of the country are sick and tired of making out reports. It is time to stop it.

When we have all of these duplications in Government certainly there is need for consolidation, a need for efficiency. We want to get the operation of our Government down to the point where the affairs of Government are conducted without so much red tape, without so much cost. When you look back to 1932 you will find that it cost $4,600,000,000 annually to run the Government, while today it is costing $41,858,000,000. In other words, in 1932 the per capita cost of running our Government was $37.49, while today the per capita cost has risen to $282.82. The thing has just gone up by leaps and bounds. It is wrong. I tried to stop it but was unable to do so.

Do you know that in 1932, when we had a President who said, "I am going to consolidate the bureaus and eliminate waste in Government" that there were only about 300 agencies of Government, and now we have 1,800 agencies of Government. Why, the thing has grown in leaps and bounds. I will never forget that as long as I live, and I do not want to see it happen again. Then we had Mr. Hoover and his committee, and on that committee there was the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. Manasco, who were helping to make the recommendations that are going to go to the President of the United States. Now we have men of that caliber trying to make recommendations to the President, and he should bring something in here that will simplify Government. Of course, the President does not have to follow out the recommendations made by the Hoover Committee. But, I feel this way: The thing has gone so far we are headed for the rocks, and while this legislation is not the way I want to do it, I am willing to accept it, because I know it is about as good as you can get. If you get something that is about as good as you can get, and you think it is going to try to stop wrongs in Government, you better grab hold of that or else you are going to swamp or drown in Government red tape and confusion, and I am not ready to drown yet. So I will accept this as the best legislation you can get at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, it has been an exceedingly fine experience to serve on the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments in the House of Representatives. It has been my good fortune to have had an opportunity to observe the operations of Congress here in the Capitol for 24 years; 16 years of this time from outside, from the gallery, and from around in the corridors as a secretary, and for 8 years or a little better as a Member of the House. I have watched the expansion of the Federal Government. I have watched what we call and what we term the bureaucrats and the "brass" coming in and taking charge, and looking over the tops of their glasses and telling the secretary from your office this, that, or the other, and then when they report and you go down they tell you this, that, or the other. So, why, Mr. Chairman, are they so untouchable? This Congress was created with, and this House and the other branch of the Congress are delegated with, power to carry out the public business. Every 2 years the Membership of this House and every 6 years the Membership in the other body are called on to give an account of their stewardship. The public, the voters if you please, are the check and balance of Congress. But here someone rises up and says, "Oh, you must not touch this agency; you must not touch that agency." They are sort of holy affairs. They are created for a special and

approval.

lay before Congress for 60 days, there

cies. We all agree in principle that there

a specific purpose. They are delegated to do this, that, or the other. Well, I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that any agency, any private business, any Government, or any other functions should run without a balance wheel and in this legislation we prpose to add the balance wheel to the Government. We propose in this legislation to set forth a form by which they should be audited and checked and made to come in and give an account of themselves, and if they are found superfluous, then to be amalgamated with some other agency so that the machinery can go on in a better fashion and not require so much oiling. In the bill we have under consideration there are only three controversial matters.

Since I have become a member of the committee I have spent quite a bit of time reading the debates on this subject in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD back through the years. I recall the debate in 1939 when this floor was packed and jammed, when the galleries were packed and jammed, and when the corridors were full. The able gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] participated in the debate, which went on for days and days. The former Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], participated in the debate. The present Speaker of the House participated in the debate. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] was a great participator, as was the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

It is very noticeable and apparent here today that this question has been debated so much, and every one of the three phases that are in controversy here today have been discussed so much that the seasoned Members of this House and the country as a whole have come to the conclusion that there is nothing further to say about the matter and that further debate is unnecessary; that this Congress should go forward with a program similar to this program, which is the best that can be had, this program which has been thrashed out by the committee, the Members on both sides agreeing to present the matter to the floor of the House, reserving in the legislation that we are passing today a part of the responsibility in reorganizing the Government. The part is that in effecting the law we reserve the right here in the House to say whether it shall be done or shall not be done as proposed by the Chief Executive.

Mr. Chairman, I would not enter into debate with any constitutional lawyer here on the floor of this House, but it has been interesting to me to read about the constitutional question which was debated in 1939, in 1945, and in other years. I think some of the gentlemen on the floor here today participated in those debates. I believe those who participated in the debate in 1939 and those who read that debate will agree that the provision laid down in this proposed legislation, reserving the right in this body to say whether the proposal shall be in effect, is not the constitutional question. The constitutional question is taken care of in the law we propose to pass here today, and it has so been discussed in connection with the act of 1939 and other acts, and evidently by the large favorable vote sustained.

I think it is beyond a question of doubt that with the passage of this bill we will have an opportunity to reject or accept such proposals as will come to the Congress. Whether they are money saving or not is not the question. The question is whether the Government will function better under the proposals as sent down or as the Government is functioning today.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, the legislation under consideration, according to its sponsors, is to give authority to the President for reorganization of executive agencies, and, further, according to the sponsors of this bill, it is hoped that by reason thereof the executive department may run more efficiently and with more economy.

It is at least interesting to observe that the duplication and multiplication of effort, as well as waste and extravagance, have come about largely through administrative practices, and because agencies that have been created have taken power and authority under themselves that was never intended by Congress. So you are saying today that even though Congress did not intend to provide all of the duplication and multiplication of effort in the Government, it takes an act of Congress to correct it. Independent agencies have, of course, extended and expanded far beyond the intent of Congress.

Those of you who have served in Congress during recent years know that I have put forth a special effort to bring about more efficiency and less extravagance in the Government, and have tried to deal with the question of duplication and multiplication of effort that has spread itself far and wide throughout our agencies.

I submitted to this House on two occasions legislation to deal in a constructive manner with this problem. My legislation would have provided for an arm of Congress that would constantly study the problems we are discussing today and would make recommendations to Congress as to how and wherein the Government could be made to operate more efficiently and economically.

Examples of some of the overlapping and duplication of effort are set forth in the committee hearings in support of this legislation. For example, there are 29 agencies dealing with lending of Government funds. There were 34 agencies during the war dealing with acquisition of land. There are 16 agencies dealing with wildlife preservation, 10 with Government instructions. Home community planning seems to be a popular thing to do. We have 12 agencies dealing with that problem. There are 28 agencies that deal with welfare matters, and 14 agencies with forestry. There are 65 agencies gathering statistics. It is no wonder that people are confused.

I think one of the best authorities on this subject matter, and one who has given the problem a great deal of study, and one who has tried to deal with it realistically and in a practical manner, is our Comptroller General, Mr. Lindsay Warren. Let me quote briefly some of the things he had to say, and you find his statements in the hearings:

> This unsegregated, sprawling crop of Government functions and functionaries cannot hope to operate efficiently or to do well the job the taxpayers are paying for unless someone can assume the burden of putting like functions together, to make only one or two bureaus grow where dozens grew before. What is more, reorganizing is not just reshuffling; it is also abolishing agencies and functions. A tree expected to grow must be carefully pruned, for new branches to have life we must cut off those no longer bearing fruit.

Let me quote further from his statements:

> I reiterate that the present set-up is a hodgepodge and crazy quilt of duplications, overlappings, inefficiencies, and inconsistencies with their attendant extravagance. It is probably an ideal system for the taxeaters, but it is bad for those who have to pay the bill.

Ex-President Hoover has been quoted many times on both sides of the aisle today. It is rather interesting that President Hoover, after 16 or 18 years out of Government, should be called upon to assist in dealing with this question. Of course, I am in favor of legislation that will bring about more economy, more efficiency, and less waste and extravagance in our Government. Whether the enactment of this proposed legislation will do the job is yet to be determined.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. In just a minute, if I have time. The distinguished gentleman from California who is now on his feet was a member of the House Committee on Civil Service and is presently a member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. He is one of the active working members of that committee and gives of his time and energy in the study of the problems that come before that committee. He will recall I submitted legislation, the intent and purpose of which was to deal with this problem in a constructive and effective manner. I believe if that proposed legislation had been enacted into law, a great share of the waste, extravagance, and duplication and multiplication of effort to which the majority floor leader has called attention would not have been as big as it is today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I wish to announce to the Republican Members that the conference which was to be held this afternoon following the session has been postponed until tomorrow morning at 10:30 o'clock.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, this is a far-reaching and an important measure. Far be it from me to intimate that something should not be done about this situation in which we find ourselves. We

all seem to be agreed and nobody would dispute the proposition that we do have too many agencies. Many of them are overlapping. Many of them are pyramided, one above the other. There are many duties and functions of government that are duplicated, that are performed by people whose services are not necessary. However, it occurs to me—and I say this with all due deference to the gentlemen who have studied this matter and have spent days in its consideration—that you and I have just been handed this measure upon the spur of the moment. I would like to have had time to read this proposal and the hearings, but this proposal and the hearings were not available until today. It is a reversal of the traditional methods of legislation. Ordinarily, when an end is to be accomplished by the enactment of law, the law is written before it is submitted to the House.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. No; not now. I am seeking the light and I am afraid when the blind lead the blind they will both fall into the ditch.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman would not say that applies to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. JENNINGS. Oh, there is nothing personal about this. I am just being impersonal and making an observation which, if my good friend will take to heart and meditate upon it, it may be a salutary thing for him.

Mr. McCORMACK. I always listen to my friend with a great deal of interest.

Mr. JENNINGS. I appreciate the fact you do, and I always listen with interest and profit to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. JENNINGS. I could not refuse to yield to my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. My friend probably did not know it, but a copy of the hearings and a copy of the bill now before us, together with the report of the committee, was sent to every Member of the House so that they were received last Saturday.

Mr. JENNINGS. Well, I did not get it. I do not know whether it came to my office or not. I am not angry. I am not laboring under any sense of having been disregarded or neglected. I know that the gentlemen involved are all my friends, but I am just talking about the magnitude of this task and the magnitude of this proposal.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Now my friend will be gracious enough to yield to me, will he not?

Mr. JENNINGS. Yes; I will yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I want to yield the gentleman one additional minute to talk on the bill.

Mr. JENNINGS. Perhaps the gentleman from California and I should have a private conversation on this question.

All I am undertaking to say is that it is proposed to delegate to the President these vast powers, yet everybody here knows that the President will not have a thing in the world to do with it; somebody else will work it out. I do not know who will write this proposed reorganization plan affecting all these agencies. I am saying that when a measure is brought in embodying such far-reaching effects that it should spell out, within its pages, exactly what is being provided. I cannot see why this is not done. If you have not had time to write a measure, if you have not had time to abolish agencies, if you have not had time to consolidate their powers or abolish their powers, now is a good time for you to do it and bring in a bill so clear and specific that we will know exactly what we are voting on. We will know exactly who is going to carry out the proposed measure. We all know the President is not going to do this thing personally; he will simply give it his sanction when those to whom he delegates the power we delegate to him have written their report; when they have written the law we alone should write. It looks to me as though this is a delegation of power upon a delegation. You are inaugurating a new system of multiplication, overlapping, duplication, and pyramiding here when you adopt this proposal. You delegate to the President the power to redelegate that power to someone whose identity you do not know and may never know.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, as I am sure many of you know, I am one of the two Members of the House who, under the provisions of H. R. 775, the law which created the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, represent this body on that important Commission. The Commission, just to review for one moment, is a bipartisan commission. It is made up of 12 members, 6 from public life and 6 from private life. Four members were named by the Speaker of the House, one Democrat and one Republican being Members of the House and one Democrat and one Republican being private citizens; four were named by the President pro tempore of the Senate, two from the Senate and two from private life, on a bipartisan basis; four were appointed by the President of the United States, two from the executive branch of the Government and two from private life. The Commission has been meeting for approximately 18 months on a night and day schedule. We have used some 28 task forces in the work of studying the possibilities for helpful reorganization in the executive branch of the Government. These task forces were named on a nonpartisan basis. Some three hundred outstanding citizens of America have contributed their time and their efforts as leaders of these task forces, or as members of the special committees and special commissions that have been set up to study some particular problem of government—some function, some activity, or perhaps, in some cases, some single department or agency of the Government.

I am very happy and very proud to be able to say to the House today that never once in all of the meetings of the Commission, nor in all of the various considerations given to the work of this Commission by the task forces, has there ever been a division along party lines or between the civil members, the private citizens, on the one hand, and the so-called official group on the other. If there has ever been an honest effort made to do a job for the benefit of all the people of America, it has been done by your Commission under the able and splendid leadership of the only living ex-President of the United States. I am also proud to say that the President of the United States, the occupant of the White House at the present time, has aided materially in many, many ways the work of this Commission. The heads of the various departments of government in the executive branch have also cooperated. So I can assure you I approach this legislation entirely from a nonpartisan angle.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this bill will be enacted into law. I may say, and I have to say this to you in all honesty, that when the question of requesting of Congress the enactment of a reorganization act came before the Commission I had some reticence in my own mind as to just how we should approach the problem, and as to just what sort of reorganization act we should adopt. Yet I became firmly convinced, as we considered the matter, that if we want to accomplish the great purposes for which the Commission was created by the Congress by unanimous vote—and approved by the President promptly—we must give some single authority, to wit, the President of the United States, the power to put most of the Commission's reorganization plans into effect. I was rather concerned about the section of the proposed bill which seemingly sets aside the old well-established constitutional procedure, or at least my understanding of it, whereby it is the legislative branch which legislates, and the President or Chief Executive who acts as the braking power or the controlling power to veto any measure which the Congress may pass, so that Congress must reconsider its position before taking final legislative action.

This provision in this bill, which sets up the requirement whereby each branch of Congress must veto or vote down in any reorganization plan the President may submit, did give me serious concern. Yet I was willing to accept it. Finally I agreed, in the Commission, to accept that section providing we had one other safeguard in the bill. We do have the understanding in the Commission, by the way, that any of us may dissent on any matter, be free to express our own opinion. As I stated, I am willing to accept the section requiring both Houses of Congress to vote down a reorganization plan providing we would have this one safeguard—that there be no permanent authority granted to the President or to his high office to reorganize the Government anytime he wants and in any way he wants.

I am truly sorry that I cannot agree with some of my colleagues on the Commission and with some of my colleagues in the House in support of the provision for a permanent power to be placed in the hands of the President to reorganize the Government. In fact, I think if a time limitation were put on his power to reorganize, if we set a date by which action must be taken, the result will be that the Chief Executive will more rapidly put into effect the recommendations this Commission may make.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. The gentleman probably knows more about this problem than most anyone in the House. Is this a correct analysis of it: That what we are doing is not delegating legislative power; we are merely giving wider administrative power, including the power to unite and eliminate agencies, and so forth, to make for better administration, and we are merely reserving the right to negative that administrative action by legislation?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No; I do not want to go that far with the gentleman. Under the Constitution, and under the law, the President of the United States, regardless of what we may do, does have a great deal of power to put into effect a large part of the recommendations and the findings that the Commission will make from time to time to the Congress. But in other instances the President must have this legislative authority and power to make the program comprehensive, and to really do the job of reorganizing. In some instances under the Constitution and statutes already effective we will have to have legislative enactments to accomplish the purpose of the Commission.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not a truer statement to say that we are not in this bill delegating reorganizing powers to the President; we are delegating to the President the authority to prepare a plan, as our agent, because he is in a better position than we to prepare a plan of reorganization, which then comes back to us, and we either disapprove it, or, by doing nothing, allow it to become the law and he can then issue orders carrying it out?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think there is much to what the gentleman says. There is a very fine point involved. We are authorizing the President to make and submit certain reorganization plans subject to our possible disapproval. That is actually what the bill provides.

Mr. JUDD. Not to our disapproval of the actual orders given but to our disapproval of the plan. He cannot issue an order to carry out this reorganization until the 60 days have gone by without adverse action by us.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is right.

Mr. JUDD. So that we do not veto a reorganization; we veto a plan which he has prepared as our agent.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It would be a plan of reorganization.

Mr. JUDD. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I do want to say to the House that the great Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, on which I had the honor and pleasure of serving in the last Congress, has, in my opinion, acted wisely and well in bringing this legislation to the floor. Certainly we cannot accomplish the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government, for the purpose of bringing about greater efficiency and economy in its operation, unless reorganization powers, such as contained in the bill, are given to the President. However, there is one dangerous provision in the bill. I can readily accept all other provisions, as I said a moment ago, although I am not too happy about one or two of them. I certainly do not want to see established, as a pattern by which we will be guided in the future in our legislative meditations, either that Congress should act only as an agency to veto actions of the President or that he be given permanent authority to reorganize the Government. Rather than lose the great good that can come from this reorganization, I am willing to accept this bill, if necessary, but I do think we should keep the power in our own hands over the organization of the executive branch of the Government by placing a limit upon the length of time the President can exercise the great power this measure confers. I do not know who may be President 10, 20, or 30 years from now. As much as I respect the President and the Presidency, I would rather always trust the future of the country to the people's representatives in the Congress than to any one individual who may rise to power as President of the United States in the future.

What I say here today is not a reflection on the gentleman who now occupies the White House, as I am sure, from conversations and from the interviews we have had as a commission with him, that he is just as much interested in seeing these reforms go into effect as the Commission which has worked upon them.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman is of course making a most valuable statement. I, who have served with him on the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments for the last 2 years, know the valuable service he has rendered on that committee and also on the Hoover Commission, on which he is now serving.

In regard to the limitation of the time, I think the gentleman certainly makes a point there. However, I would ask him if it would not be possible that the Congress by affirmative action at any time could place such a limitation of time upon this program.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes; I agree with the gentleman, but that is a dangerous method to pursue, I am afraid, because we can grant a power to the Chief Executive by a simple majority vote of this Congress, but, under our constitutional processes, if a President does not wish to surrender a power, we cannot take that power away from him by legislative action unless we have a two-thirds majority. That is the one great danger I see in the present bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Moreover, we have been assured by the gentleman from Illinois, the distinguished chairman of the committee, that the President could bring about these reorganizations not within 2 years but within a few months, so why extend it indefinitely.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I do not know whether he can do it all in just a relatively few months. I think we have to give him a couple of years, at least, to be fair. However, I do believe that the placing of a time limitation on his authority will act as a spur or a prod to get prompt action—so that there will not be any delay—whereas if the President is given permanent power it may be said, "Oh, there is plenty of time to do that." It is a human failing to put things off, and this governmental reorganization should not be put off. The people of America want action quickly, and I think the President wants action.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. DAWSON. I thank the gentleman for his very, very valuable contribution to this matter. It comes from long experience. We know that his interest in this subject matter is great, and we know of his work with the committee.

I said that we would expect some form of reorganization action upon the different phases as they were presented to us within a few months, but not on the entire reorganization plan, which must necessarily spread over the years.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I say in answer to the gentleman that the Commission will file its reports soon. I believe the first report was filed today at noon. That was our schedule. Other reports will be filed every 2 or 3 or 4 days between now and March 13. Of course, the President cannot possibly get all of these matters before him before that time. It will take many months for him to act, but, in my opinion, he should not have permanent power to reorganize, because we want quick action.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER].

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote in support of the reorganization bill, H. R. 2361, but I am going to do so with full knowledge of the fact that we are passing on to our President a job that Congress has repeatedly tried to do and failed.

I am supporting the measure because I think the recommendation of the committee ought to be carried out in the interest of economy and better service.

The only thing that gives me concern in the enactment of this bill is the knowledge that no matter what kind of reorganization measure the President may propose he is sure to be condemned by part of the people on the ground that it does not go far enough and by everybody else on the ground that it goes too far. In other words, whatever measures are offered will lead only to criticism.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN].

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Chairman, for the past 15 years I have been connected with the Executive Expenditures Committee in one capacity or another. During that period I have seen many reorganization proposals, but in my opinion the bill we have before us today is the best reorganization legislation that has ever been presented to the House.

In the strict sense of the word, this bill is not in itself a reorganization bill. Rather, it is the mechanical device with which a reorganization of the executive branch of the Government can be accomplished. The bill sets up a simplified method for revising the organization of the Government through the cooperation of the President and the Congress. The legislation authorizes the President to submit to the Congress plans for reorganizations of agencies and functions of the executive branch. These plans will become effective after 60 days unless they are rejected by a majority vote of the two Houses. In adopting this legislation we reserve to the Congress the right to veto any proposed reorganization plan with which we may not agree. The advantage of this mechanical device is that it enables the President, who has the immediate responsibility for effective administration, to initiate improvement in organization, subject to the review and rejection by Congress. The passage of this bill is the first step that must be taken to bring about any reorganization of the 1,800 offices, bureaus, commissions, administrations, and departments, which make up our Government today.

A year and a half ago the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments reported a resolution to the House providing for the establishment of a Commission To Study the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government with the view of recommending improvements. This resolution was passed unanimously. The Commission was set up and chose as its Chairman, former President Herbert Hoover. It is composed of two Representatives of the Congress, two Members of the other body, two administrators of the executive branch, and six private citizens. The Commission has made an extensive study of the administration of the Government and within the coming weeks will submit many recommendations for improving the Federal structure. The committee had the privilege of hearing Mr. Hoover and he pointed out that passage of this bill is absolutely necessary if we are to bring about a reorganization of the executive branch of the Government. His testimony made clear that many of the most important recommendations of this Commission can be accomplished only if Congress adopts legislation as provided in this bill.

I believe all of us will agree that keeping the executive branch of the Government in good order is a continuing operation. Reorganization of the Government is not a one-time undertaking. Almost every administration for the past hundred years has urged Federal reorganization but none has brought any major overhaul of the executive agencies.

At the present time agencies of related objectives are scattered all over the Government. There are many Government offices duplicating the same type of work as other agencies. Perhaps not all of such activities can be concentrated in one agency, but we can certainly improve the existing governmental structure.

Practically all of the witnesses who appeared before the Committee felt that this bill should be passed. Of course, we have had the same requests for exemptions that have heretofore been made in connection with legislation of this character. In writing this bill, however, we made no exemptions. The history of this type of legislation shows that where one exemption is made that exemption becomes the basis for others. To make all of the exemptions that would ordinarily be requested in connection with a bill of this kind would destroy its effectiveness. Instead of a bill to facilitate governmental reorganization, we would simply wind up with a bill of exemptions.

In writing this bill, however, we have recognized the desirability of adopting the single reorganization plan method insofar as the National Military Establishment is concerned as well as the major quasi-judicial agencies. The bill does not exempt these agencies from reorganization, but simply provides that any plan for their reorganization must be submitted singly rather than in a general proposal that might affect other Government offices. In this way, Congress will have the opportunity to vote separately on the controversial fields of Federal reorganization.

Suppose, for example, that the Corps of Engineers of the Army is involved in a reorganization plan. That plan can relate only to the National Military Establishment, of which the Engineers is a part. It cannot be tied in with a plan to reorganize some other Government agency. This will certainly assure adequate protection for the so-called controversial agencies.

I do not want to engage in a constitutional discussion, but in my opinion this bill certainly creates no dictatorial powers. In proposing that the President take the initiative and originate plans for the redistribution of executive agencies, Congress reserves a veto power over such plans that he may submit. As you know, the President also has the power of veto. This idea is not a new one. It was first recommended in 1931 by former President Hoover and it has been passed in this House in several reorganization bills since 1939. It is true that the constitutional authority to legislate is vested in the Congress, but this bill does not in any way divest Congress of its legislative prerogative. The bill contains no ban nor limitation on the Congress or its right to legislate. Rather than a limitation, this legislation is an implementation of the legislative prerogative of the Congress.

I hope that the House will adopt this bill and that it will be passed without adding a lot of exemptions. We have the opportunity now to make a major contribution in bringing about greater efficiency in the operation of our governmental offices and departments. It is our responsibility to see that these departments and agencies are as efficient as they can be made, which in turn will be reflected economy and savings to the people we represent.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK].

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in support of this measure, the Reorganization Act of 1949, and to go on record as saying that I am in full accord with its objectives and provisions. The House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has submitted this bill to the House and recommended its passage only after extensive hearings, careful study, and deliberation, and I am convinced that it offers a workable method of executive-legislative cooperation for making changes in the Federal administrative organization to promote efficiency and economy in Government.

This is a simple bill—it contains no bugs or hidden jokers—its provisions can easily be understood by everyone. The purposes of this bill now under consideration are to reduce expenditures and promote economy in Government—to provide better service to the American people at less cost to the American taxpayer. This end is to be achieved through the regrouping and consolidation of agencies and functions into a more orderly and integrated administrative organization, and in this way eliminate the overlapping of functions and duplication of effort in our Government.

The procedure established by this bill to bring about a reorganization of the administration is simple and workable—it merely provides that the President shall examine the administrative set-up from time to time from the viewpoint of obtaining more efficient and economical execution of Federal policy, and present recommendations for any adjustments in the form of reorganization plans for the consideration of Congress. Such plans shall go into effect after 60 legislative days unless Congress, through concurrent resolution passed by both Houses, rejects said plan. In other words, the President initiates plans for reorganization, and the Congress reviews, ratifies, or rejects such plans. This is a democratic procedure to which there should be no objections.

The need for a general overhauling of our administration has been recognized

by every President since Theodore Roosevelt, and by every responsible student of government. Today the Federal administration is a great sprawling labyrinth of agencies—there are over 1,800 of these bureaus, departments, commissions, divisions, administrations, and offices which have accumulated by legislative and executive actions throughout the years. Within this maze of agencies there is considerable overlapping of functions, conflicts of jurisdiction, competition between different agencies, waste, and working at cross-purposes. As a result of this multiplicity and overlap of agencies, there is a great deal of red tape, confusion, and inefficiency.

Now, I am not blaming anyone for this condition. The fact is that our huge administrative mechanism has, as a result of the needs of the people for new services and the demand of two world wars, been built up without plan or design, like the barns, shacks, silos, toolsheds, and garages of an old farm, to become a veritable jungle of unrelated units and services. As a result the President cannot properly execute the laws for which he is held responsible—he is forced to waste his time dealing with some 45 to 80 agencies which report directly to him, and which prevent him from concentrating on the more important duties of his office.

Mr. Chairman, Congress is obligated to take action to remedy this disorganized state of affairs, and the path to follow has been well defined. As the result of research, investigation, and practical experience in business and government, certain well-established principles of organization have developed, and are now generally accepted as the fundamentals of sound public administration. These guiding principles said to be basic in the reorganization of government may be summarized as follows:

First. The functions of government should be grouped into a few orderly departments, with each department being responsible for carrying out all related functions contributing to one major objective;

Second. Each major department should be headed by an administrator appointed by and responsible to the President, thus giving the Chief Executive power to effectively control and direct the administration;

Third. The President should not have more than 20 agency heads reporting to him directly, thus freeing him from the mass of administrative detail, and permitting him to devote his time to major questions of policy;

Fourth. The lines of authority within the departments should be clearly defined and direct from the upper to the lower levels of the administrative hierarchy; and

Fifth. Purely administrative functions should be separated from quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial functions, with the latter being placed under the jurisdiction of autonomous boards and commissions.

These are the standards of sound public administration, and the goals toward which we move in seeking more efficiency in government. This reorganization bill is the first step—the enabling step—toward sound management in our Federal Government. I am sure that its passage will provide better service and more efficient management at less cost to the people of the United States, and I call upon the Congress to enact it into law.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, for a great many years the question of reorganizing the executive agencies of our Government has been a matter of concern, not only to the Congress but to every taxpayer. The subject is not new but the need for reorganization is continually getting more acute.

The number of executive agencies has increased with every Congress and their fields of activity have been expanded.

This situation has brought about many instances of overlapping jurisdictions and duplication of effort which have been accompanied by inefficiency, wastefulness, and ineffectiveness.

Everyone who has any contact with the Federal agencies recognizes the existence of the situation and sees an urgent need for better utilizing the manpower on the Federal pay roll.

The subject has been much discussed but few worthwhile results have been achieved. This is a problem of tremendous magnitude which the Eightieth Congress recognized. Two years ago we passed legislation which resulted in the establishment of the Commission headed by former President Hoover. That Commission has been at work for nearly 2 years making exhaustive studies of our governmental set-up and soon its reports will be submitted to us and to the President with recommendations for remedial action.

The bill before us today will provide a vehicle for the effectuation of recommendations based on the studies of the Hoover Commission. Without this legislation much of the value of the work the Commission has done will be lost.

During the hearings conducted before our committee, many people denounced the existing situation and spoke of "deadwood" in the executive agencies. It is significant, however, that many of the witnesses, while espousing the cause of reorganization, sought exemptions for specific agencies in which they or their constituents were personally interested. This brings into point the need for giving to the President the authority to make recommendations of corrections under legislation which will assure prompt and positive action.

In the testimony it was frequently stated that Congress increases agencies and authorizes additions to the Federal pay roll, but seldom finds it expedient to eliminate an agency or to reduce the number of Federal employees. It is difficult for us who are charged with overall legislative responsibility to visualize specific needs for reorganization and the very nature of the legislative process makes it essential that the President be given a freer hand in revamping the agencies he administers and in eliminating such agencies as are unnecessary, or the functions of such agencies when they are duplicating services performed by other agencies.

In the past we have had similar authority conferred upon the President, but in each instance it has been so circumscribed by exemptions and provisions for special treatment to specific gencies that it has made the problems of the President extremely difficult. In the legislation before us no exemptions are provided and the President will be enabled to recommend reorganization plans in keeping with the needs which are obvious to him and without regard to special interests.

Even so, the legislation provides ample safeguards for the protection of the legislative functions of Congress through the provision by which the Congress can disapprove a plan recommended by the President and thereby make it inoperative. In order to prevent undue delay, the legislation provides for a 60-day period within which the Congress must act if it disapproves of the reorganization plan.

I think it should be pointed out that under this legislation the President can merely transfer agencies or functions of agencies or abolish agencies or functions of agencies. He cannot broaden the authority of any agency beyond that which has already been provided by law. Neither can he establish or abolish completely any executive department whose head has Cabinet status.

We talk efficiency and economy. We all know that it is urgent, especially during this period of international unrest when it is necessary that we make large expenditures in the interest of national security. Our internal economic conditions require maximum efficiency. Let us therefore proceed speedily to pass this legislation in order that the effectiveness of our domestic agencies may be increased, that the expenditures for essential services to our people may be reduced, and that our gigantic governmental activities may be put on a more businesslike basis. I hope this legislation will pass in its present form. I hope that the Members of this body will view the subject from its broadest aspects and will vote for this legislation without seeking to incorporate amendments to give special treatment to pet agencies. If we are in earnest about desiring efficiency and economy in Government, about reducing the Federal pay roll, and making better utilization of the services of Federal employees, we will act speedily to pass this legislation as it has been recommended by the committee.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I speak in favor of the passage of this bill to provide for the reorganization of the Government agencies, and for other purposes.

After a careful reading of the hearings before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, a copy of which hearings is furnished us with a

copy of this most important bill, I conclude that Congress itself must recognize that Congress itself is not qualified, because of lack of time, opportunity, and training, to itself enter into the field of reorganization of Government agencies in the executive or administrative branches thereof. This being true, the President of the United States and his associates must have the power.

Evidence shows that for several years Congress has undertaken to pass a reorganization bill from which would flow savings of the taxpayers' money and increased efficiency; but in this bill it appears plainly to me that here is the opportunity for the best piece of legislation in this field yet enacted, or considered.

For instance, it provides no exemptions; it provides no time limit; and there is no limitation either to begin or to end, so that the President has opportunity to come before Congress with his planned reorganization at such time as he is ready to do so. The bill provides that he must examine and reexamine the reorganization of all agencies of Government and must determine what change shall be necessary to accomplish six worthy objectives, which are:

First. To promote the better execution of laws.

Second. To reduce expenditures and promote economies to the fullest extent consistent with operational government.

Third. To increase the efficiency of the operations of government.

Fourth. To group, coordinate, and consolidate agencies and functions of government according to major purposes, as nearly as may be possible.

Fifth. To reduce the number of agencies by consolidating those having similar functions under a single head and to abolish such agencies or functions thereof as may not be necessary for the efficient conduct of government.

Sixth. To eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort.

Mr. Chairman, if we were operating our own private business establishments or if we were in the employ of any of the great successful American corporations, these six objectives would be continuously called to our attention as worthy and essential. And, just because we are employed by the American taxpayers is no reason that these same six objectives should not be continuously before our great Government. Efficiency and operation of major objectives at a minimum of expense is not less essential in government than it is in private business.

The two living men best qualified to tell us their considered opinion have given us their joint opinion on the objectives of this bill—President Herbert Hoover, who happens to be a registered Republican, and President Harry Truman, who happens to be a registered Democrat. These two great Americans have joined forces and have made a recommendation to us as representatives of the people. If experience ever talks, here is where it should talk; and these two great leaders of American executive responsibilities, both past and present, tell us plainly that this bill is the bill which should pass. I am willing to take the strong recommendations of these two men. Their interests have been and are the interests of the American people in these matters.

The bill clearly protects the interests of the American people by providing that the President shall first submit proposed changes to the United States Congress; and, then, the bill gives us, as representatives of the taxpayers, a 60-day period within which to state in writing our objections. This certainly is time enough for us to act and is fair to Congress and does not hold the President up too long.

I shall vote for the bill as the committee has reported it and desires it to be enacted. This is in the interests of the public welfare.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 2361. It is apparent to me after a careful reading of the testimony of the witnesses who appeared before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments in the interest of this legislation that there is a drastic and immediate need for the passage of this type of reorganization legislation.

I have paid particular attention to the testimony of a fine American and may I add one of the few Americans who has had actual experience and, with the exception of our present President, is best qualified to speak in behalf of this measure. I refer to former President Herbert Hoover. I realize, of course, that Mr. Hoover has presented not only his own views, but, as chairman of the so-called Hoover Commission, he is speaking for all of the outstanding men who comprise that Commission. In addition to his opinion, we have the benefit of the experience of the Comptroller General of the United States, Mr. Lindsay Warren, who has served as a Member of Congress and has spent many years following the subject of this legislation with extreme care. His past position, coupled with the high position he now holds, lends great weight to the force of his testimony.

The constant and steady growth of the Government of this great Nation has produced overlapping and duplication to such an extent that it is not only wasteful from a monetary standpoint but has produced great inefficiency and in many instances we have found Government departments working at odds with one another.

Every Member of Congress should read carefully, not only the testimony of these two important witnesses but the majority report of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. The passage of this bill will and should pave the way for more efficient government and for greater economy.

It is obvious, as we witness the increase in the national budget from year to year, that we must exert every effort to streamline our Government, eliminating waste in the interests of economy and for the benefit of taxpayers.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.,—

TITLE I

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "Reorganization Act of 1949."

NEED FOR REORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 2. (a) The President shall examine and from time to time reexamine the organization of all agencies of the Government and shall determine what changes therein are necessary to accomplish the following purposes:

(1) to promote the better execution of the laws, the more effective management of the executive branch of the Government and of its agencies and functions, and the expeditious administration of the public business;

(2) to reduce expenditures and promote economy, to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government;

(3) to increase the efficiency of the operations of the Government to the fullest extent practicable;

(4) to group, coordinate, and consolidate agencies and functions of the Government, as nearly as may be, according to major purposes;

(5) to reduce the number of agencies by consolidating those having similar functions under a single head, and to abolish such agencies or functions thereof as may not be necessary for the efficient conduct of the Government; and

(6) to eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort.

(b) The Congress declares that the public interest demands the carrying out of the purposes specified in subsection (a) and that such purposes may be accomplished in great measure by proceeding under the provisions of this act, and can be accomplished more speedily thereby than by the enactment of specific legislation.

REORGANIZATION PLANS

SEC. 3. Whenever the President, after investigation, finds that—

(1) the transfer of the whole or any part of any agency, or of the whole or any part of the functions thereof, to the jurisdiction and control of any other agency; or

(2) the abolition of all or any part of the functions of any agency; or

(3) the consolidation or coordination of the whole or any part of any agency, or of the whole or any part of the functions thereof, with the whole or any part of any other agency or the functions thereof; or

(4) the consolidation or coordination of any part of any agency or the functions thereof with any other part of the same agency or the functions thereof; or

(5) the authorization of any officer to delegate any of his functions; or

(6) the abolition of the whole or any part of any agency which agency or part does not have, or upon the taking effect of the reorganization plan will not have, any functions,

is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 2 (a), he shall prepare a reorganization plan for the making of the reorganizations as to which he has made findings and which he includes in the plan, and transmit such plan (bearing an identifying number) to the Congress, together with a declaration that, with respect to each reorganization included in the plan, he has found that such reorganization is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 2 (a). The delivery to both Houses shall be on the same day and shall be made to each House while it is in session. The President, in his message transmitting a reorganization plan, shall specify with respect to each abolition of a function included in the plan the statutory authority for the exercise of such function.

OTHER CONTENTS OF PLANS

SEC. 4. Any reorganization plan transmitted by the President under section 3—

(1) shall change, in such cases as he deems necessary, the name of any agency affected by a reorganization, and the title of its head; and shall designate the name of any agency resulting from a reorganization and the title of its head;

(2) may include provisions for the appointment and compensation of the head and one or more other officers of any agency

(including an agency resulting from a consolidation or other type of reorganization) if the President finds, and in his message transmitting the plan declares, that by reason of a reorganization made by the plan such provisions are necessary. The head so provided for may be an individual or may be a commission or board with two or more members. In the case of any such appointment the term of office shall not be fixed at more than four years, the compensation shall not be at a rate in excess of that found by the President to prevail in respect of comparable officers in the executive branch, and, if the appointment is not under the classified civil service, it shall be by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

(3) shall make provision for the transfer or other disposition of the records, property, and personnel affected by any reorganization;

(4) shall make provision for the transfer of such unexpended balances of appropriations, and of other funds, available for use in connection with any function or agency affected by a reorganization, as he deems necessary by reason of the reorganization for use in connection with the functions affected by the reorganization, or for the use of the agency which shall have such functions after the reorganization plan is effective, but such unexpended balances so transferred shall be used only for the purposes for which such appropriation was originally made;

(5) shall make provision for winding up the affairs of any agency abolished.

LIMITATIONS ON POWERS WITH RESPECT TO REORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 5. (a) No reorganization plan shall provide for, and no reorganization under this act shall have the effect of—

(1) abolishing or transferring an executive department or all the functions thereof, establishing any new executive department, designating any agency as "Department" or its head as "Secretary," or consolidating any two or more executive departments or all the functions thereof; or

(2) continuing any agency beyond the period authorized by law for its existence or beyond the time when it would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made; or

(3) continuing any function beyond the period authorized by law for its exercise, or beyond the time when it would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made; or

(4) authorizing any agency to exercise any function which is not expressly authorized by law at the time the plan is transmitted to the Congress; or

(5) increasing the term of any office beyond that provided by law for such office; or

(6) transferring to or consolidating with any other agency the municipal government of the District of Columbia or all those functions thereof which are subject to this act, or abolishing said government or all said functions.

(b) A reorganization plan providing for a reorganization affecting any agency named below in this subsection may not provide also for a reorganization which does not affect such agency; except that this prohibition shall not apply to the transfer to such agency of the whole or any part of, or the whole or any part of the functions of, any agency not so named. No provision contained in a reorganization plan shall take effect if the reorganization plan is in violation of this subsection. The agencies above referred to in this subsection are as follows: National Military Establishment, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Interstate Commerce Commission, and Securities and Exchange Commission.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: On page 7, after line 20, insert a new section as follows——

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. The gentleman is offering a new section. I have an amendment that I want to offer to this section.

The CHAIRMAN. Do I understand the gentleman from Michigan is offering a new section?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am offering a new subdivision under section 5, following subsection (b).

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Will the Chair advise me whether or not the offering of the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan adding a new section or paragraph will preclude me from offering my amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Not if the gentleman's amendment is otherwise in order.

The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: On page 7, after line 20, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"(c) No reorganization specified in the reorganization plan shall take effect unless the plan is submitted to Congress before January 20, 1953."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment which would bring about a limitation upon the power; that is, instead of its being permanent legislation it would be limited to January 20, 1953, which would be the date of the expiration of the President's term of office.

I may say that this amendment was drawn by legislative counsel from the Comptroller General's office. This language is word for word, period, comma, and semicolon the same as the previous law. There should be some limitation upon this legislation, although some Members will probably reply that Mr. Hoover said that is not so. It is with a great deal of pleasure that I hear you gentlemen on the Democratic side quoting Mr. Hoover. I wish in previous years, in other campaigns, other elections, along in some October, all down through October and up to election day in November, you gentlemen had quoted Mr. Hoover with a little more appreciation than you did.

Many, many times from the well of the House I have heard members of the party to which the gentlemen who are now quoting Mr. Hoover with approval, who are now citing him as the embodiment of all wisdom and all patriotism, charge that almost everything disagreeable that happened to this country between January of 1928 and the day of the convening of the Eighty-first Congress was due to the mistakes, the lack of wisdom, the unsound policies, of this same Herbert Hoover.

Had Mr. Hoover's reorganization plan been accepted by a Democratic Congress, some of the evils which you seek to cure now might have been ended years ago.

Had his views been given just a little of the consideration which you now claim for them, it might not only have helped some of us on this side, but the country might have been saved billions of dollars, given greater efficiency, and the executive department might have been now operating in an efficient, economical way.

But we are willing to forget your previous criticism of our former President and his views. Many of us are happy, are thankful, to know that, at this late day, you are now recognizing the ability, the straightforwardness, of our great former President, who was so unmercifully pilloried during the years which have elapsed since he left the office.

If some of you now appreciate Mr. Hoover and his service to his country, there should be at least as much rejoicing as there was over the finding of the sheep which was lost and returned to the fold. You know what they said about that fellow who was saved at the last moment. I am glad so many have been converted to at least some of Mr. Hoover's views. Enough of that.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. The gentleman means Mr. Hoover who appeared before the committee?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. BONNER. I am thinking of Mr. Hoover as the Chairman of the Commission. I am not thinking of Mr. Hoover as a political candidate or as a former President. I take it that Mr. Hoover was not expressing entirely his own views with respect to reorganization. I take it he brought to the committee the joint views of the members of the Commission. It was a nonpartisan Commission.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I cannot yield any more.

Mr. BONNER. I just wanted the RECORD to show that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. My only point is that today so many Members of the House, so many people in this country, have recognized that there is something good in some of Mr. Hoover's views. It is an acknowledgment of a great service which has been too long delayed. That is the only point I was trying to make at this time. Conversion long delayed is a good thing, even if it comes a little late.

If the gentleman knew as much about the workings of this Commission as some other folks he would know that it was not altogether a body of but one mind, and I think Mr. Hoover has from time to time changed his views as the matter went along.

Let us get down to the pending amendment. Some day the gentleman who holds the office of President at the present time will die. He will no longer be President. He may not even be elected to a third term. No one knows who is going to be President in the future, and I want to know what you gentlemen on the other side of the aisle are going to do and where you will be if along comes a President as has a previous President and sends down a reorganization plan which takes over so many of these agencies, for example the USES, and puts it in the Labor Department. The House killed that one twice.

What are you going to do if you should get a President like Mr. Wallace, for example, or some other man, or even the present President who apparently gets his views on labor legislation from the Labor Department, from Phil Murray and from the CIO, and he should send down here a reorganization plan putting the Conciliation Service, the Labor Relations Board, and all of their functions in the Labor Department? What are you going to do if you have a filibuster over in the Senate and a plan like that is not acted on in 60 days? You are going to swallow it lock, stock, and barrel. We ought to think about that.

There should be some limitation on the President's power. There should be an opportunity for the House as well as for the Senate to vote on any plan he sends down here. Both House and Senate should be forced to act. You see where you are getting? You have Phil Murray sitting here on one side, John Gibson of the CIO, and Tobin of the Labor Department sitting on the other side of the President and from that combination down comes a plan, as came down this demand that we repeal the Taft-Hartley Act and go back to the old Wagner Act—a plan which the House does not like, which the House rejects unanimously, but which under this bill may still become the law of the land, either because a majority of the Senate does like it or because of a filibuster which prevents action by the Senate.

Just as sure as you adopt this plan, you some day may have a bill which neither the House nor the Senate would pass becoming the law of the land, rammed down your neck, and you will not like it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would make the bill in that respect just like all of those that have gone before. Nothing has been done under the other bills so far. We speak of Mr. Hoover with reverence because we believe that from his experience as President of these United States he did learn some very valuable lessons that can serve us in this day. The House must have believed that when he is serving now as chairman of one of the greatest commissions this Congress has ever authorized. I do not believe there is any greater patriot in this country than our former President. We look upon him equally with all other great patriots. But he has something that no other man has; that is experience. He has been the President. He has gone through this. He asked for reorganization in his day. One of his last acts was to request that a reorganization measure might be passed in order to enable his successor to do the things that he never had an opportunity to do.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON. I did not disturb you, sir. I will not yield at this point.

So, he gave us his experience, and this committee used it. The same way with our present President. We do not question his patriotism. We do not question his love of country. I do not believe that he can be influenced by any outside influence any more than any Member of this House can be influenced by outside influence. Had you been a member of this committee you would know how much influence has been brought to bear upon the members of this committee by various agencies in order to take themselves out of the workings of this bill. But, we are bringing in a bill that we believe is the best that can be had and that we believe will do the job.

If you are going to question the integrity of somebody, then perhaps we ought to start off with a President and a former President. If you are going to agree that they have equal love of country with us, then we ought to use the valuable experience that they have gained, in arriving at a determination which brought this bill about.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield

Mr. DAWSON. I do not yield at this point.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. But you are misquoting him.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. DAWSON. So, both the present President, whom you are going to charge with this responsibility, and a past President, who has had experience and can talk to us from the viewpoint of experience, ask you to take off that handicap, ask you to make this permanent legislation, ask you to give every President the responsibility of a power to do the thing which you say is necessary to be done and that only a President can do. Sure, you have had this argument in past reorganization plans, and the thing that you did then has been one of the handicaps in bringing about new organization plans.

So, I am going to ask the members of this committee, in the light of past experience, in the light of testimony of these witnesses, in the light of the job to be done for the people of this Nation, that is, setting in motion machinery that can wipe out this overlapping, that can do away with these unnecessary functions, that can streamline the operations of government, even as big business must do today, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] said, to accept the bill as recommended by the committee. Big business has streamlined its own affairs. Gone are the methods of yesterday. No good businessman would stand for his organization to be in the shape that our executive department is in today.

So, I am asking you to stand back of this committee which has given a good deal of thought to this thing, heard witnesses upon it, and have brought you their sober judgment that permanent legislation is necessary in order to do the job.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the statements made by the chairman of our committee. I agree in a great measure with those statements. However, during the discussion of this legislation I asked that we set a termination date that this legislation might expire on. When I asked Mr. Hoover whether it should not expire in 8 years, he made the statement that he hoped it would not be necessary to continue it that long. I spoke to our committee about the 8 years, and they thought that it was too long. I was under the impression all the time that we were going to have this legislation expire in not over 4 years.

The situation is just this: We have built up this great organization of government for 150 years, and now we are going to try to readjust it. This commission has spent a couple of years getting ready the suggestions upon which the President will act, and under this amendment the President will have 3 years from this time to see that they are consummated. It seems to me it is only wise that a termination date be placed on this legislation, regardless of whether you make it 3, 4, 5, or 6 years. The amendment the gentleman has offered provides, I think, for 3 years. I cannot for the life of me see why it would not be the wise thing to do.

I quite disagree with my chairman on that one point. Otherwise, he has been handling the affairs of this committee in fine shape and has been doing a good job. I admire the way he has handled the committee. I take my hat off to him. But I do think we could put a limitation on the time for which this legislation is to extend and it would be in the best interest of the country. Speaking for myself, I shall vote for this amendment, and I hope the Members of the House will see fit to terminate this power at some time. If you pass this legislation and have no termination date, you will always be in turmoil. You will never know when a reorganization plan might be sent down from the White House, regardless of who the President might be, and at some time it will catch somebody napping and they will not be prepared for it. However, as long as we have the chairman we have now, and as long as we know there is something coming, we will be expecting plans to come in here in the next 2 or 3 years, so that if we are on the anxious seat and are waiting for something, and do not want it to pass, we will take action and see that it does not pass. However, if we let this thing ride along, I can see where damage might happen to this Government that might be irreparable.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MORRIS. Assuming the bill should pass as it is, without the amendment, could not any future Congress or could not this present Congress repeal it if it wanted to?

Mr. RICH. Yes, sure; we have lots of laws. That same thing applies to just

what is trying to transpire here now. The Congress can change it, but we will not do it; that is the point. You can get action when you have a termination date or have something to do and you know you are going to do it. If you know you are going to die in 2 weeks from now you will make a will, if you do not have one already; but you say, "Oh, I can make a will any time," and you just let it ride on and on, and then you do not do it. That is the point I am trying to bring out.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this matter I would say is not of tremendous and vital importance. It is a matter of policy. It is a matter which, if decided either way, would not vitally ruin the bill or vitally make the bill. It is a matter of policy which has been decided, on mature consideration, by the members of the committee after having heard testimony before the committee.

In the first place, the President has asked for this power to be made a matter of permanent legislation, and I will get to the points supporting permanent legislation in just a moment.

In the second place, the chairman of our committee asked this question of Mr. Hoover when he was before the committee, and you will find this testimony on page 137 of the hearings:

The CHAIRMAN. This bill, Mr. Hoover, is to be permanent legislation? There has been some discussion as to whether or not it should be limited to the term of the President and then a new bill drawn as a new President comes in. Can you give us your opinion on that subject, sir?

Mr. HOOVER. My opinion is that it ought to be permanent legislation because the executive branch of the Government is a constantly changing body. We need no better proof of that than the growth in the number of agencies from 350 to 1,800. I would expect a constant shift in the focus of government giving emphasis to first one type of action and then to another, with the development of new phases of such action, all of which must be constantly refitted into the whole pattern of the executive branch.

This is not just one action of one administration or one President, it is a continuous operation. As long as the Congress has the veto, I do not see that there is any great danger in conferring such a power.

I want to point out to you that in the 1932 Reorganization Act we gave to President Roosevelt a permanent type of legislation. This is an answer to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], who is my colleague on the committee, when he said that Congress would not do this. In the amended 1933 form, however, the Congress did take away the permanent type of legislation and set a limitation upon the time. That shows that Congress can, has, and could in the future function in regard to the termination of the power. The reorganization of the government is not a one-time undertaking. It is conceived as a continuing problem. Our Government is not a static type of government. It is a constantly growing and changing type of government. Every action which the Congress takes and every law which is passed by the Congress which changes the administrative function or adds to or takes from such functions, creates a different situation in administrative powers. Therefore, there is constantly before the President the need of reorganization. That is why we are asking for permanent legislation. If at any time the President misuses that type of power, we can limit it by legislative enactment. We can speed up his action by bringing before the Congress an act which says that by a certain day he shall take such-and-such an action or the power shall be taken away from him.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. RICH. In the hearings on page 143 I asked Mr. Hoover the following question:

How long do you think it will require the present President or any future Presidents to accomplish everything that should be attained in this legislation?

Mr. Hoover replied:

Well, Mr. RICH, there are two steps here. One of them is to get a definite plan and have it approved by the Congress, or, rather, have the Congress leave it alone; and the other is the taking of a number of individual steps that will each require specific legislation. I take it that we will be in the throes of reorganization even with the utmost cooperation for at least over a year before we will get the machine working and in a position to give us the subsequent benefits. This is no easy task.

Then I asked him this question:

Therefore, it is going to take a lot of time; even 6 or 8 years would not be too long for the Chief Executive to have his organization get things in preparation to make suggestions, would it?

Mr. Hoover said—and this is the point I want to make:

It certainly is quite a period. I hope it is not that long because I would like to live to see the end of it.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Hoover, of course, was referring in that conversation, as I take it, to the Hoover Commission reports, and it is not conceded that the Hoover Commission reports will be the last attempt to reorganize the administrative part of our Government machinery.

Mr. RICH. I have been trying my best to make it clear that what I wanted to know was how long it would take the President to effect this organization.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I know the gentleman does not want the House to think that once action is taken on the present Hoover Commission reports that that will end for all time the necessity for continuing scrutiny of government and continuing reorganization.

Mr. RICH. Oh, no; I would not want to try to fool anybody any place anytime. I want to be straight, open, and aboveboard, and tell them just what I think. If anybody has the idea that I am trying to fool anybody I wish that they would get that out of their mind.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I know the gentleman is not trying to fool anyone, but I just wanted to clarify a point in the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize there is a great deal of good in the Hoover Commission report and a great deal of good in this bill. I recognize the imperative need for reorganization in Government and greater efficiency in Government and for more economies and for the reduction of expenses; but I want to take this time to voice this serious thought with reference to the Army engineers:

This bill goes as far as the committee felt it should go with reference to assisting in the demand which I hear voiced in this Congress regarding the administrative integrity of the Army engineers. This bill separates the program of reorganization so that any plan involving the national defense will come back separately to the Congress and therefore receive a separate vote. However, I feel that the Army engineers have done such a grand job, both in peace and in war, that no reorganization of the Army engineers should occur. I wanted to take just this moment to voice this opinion. I have made a study of the work, as I am sure have a great many other Members of Congress. The Army engineers have done a wonderful job and they are now doing a magnificent job.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to my chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Does not the argument which the gentleman is advancing with reference to the Army engineers apply equally to the Army, the Navy, and the Air Corps?

Mr. BROOKS. In a sense it applies equally; but in another sense I do not think it does apply equally. The Army engineers are in a peculiar position. The Army engineers perform in time of war as a part of our national defense. In time of peace the Army engineers perform as a part of our peacetime set-up. They perform differently from any other agency of Government. That is the reason I felt that I should take this brief opportunity to voice the serious concern which I feel in reference to any effort to change the Army engineers, in the handling of their civil functions as given to them by the Congress.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. As the gentleman may know, there is a provision in the bill, on page 7, which would require that in respect to four named agencies, any reorganization proposal must come up in respect to them apart from and independent of any other proposal. One of those so referred to is the National Military Establishment.

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. It has been represented to me by some members of the Committee on Armed Services that that definition is broad enough to include the civil functions of the Army engineers. I am wondering if the gentleman so interprets it, or the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] so interprets it.

Mr. BROOKS. That is my interpretation. I will say I have discussed the bill with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] and with other Members, and I personally feel it is broad enough to cover the civil functions of the Army

engineers. But I cannot fail to feel some serious concern regarding any proposal that would seek to change the set-up by which the Army engineers handle the civil functions of the War Department.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I wonder, for future use in determining the legislative intent, if some members of the committee on the majority side would say whether the language includes the Army engineers.

Mr. BROOKS. I trust the Members, by exercising use of the time they have in the course of debate, will express themselves. I am sorry that time does not permit at this time for them to express themselves. I want to continue to say that I have seen the work of the Army engineers in time of war and I think they must continue to have peacetime work to train them for emergencies. They must have "civil functions work" in time of peace, in order that they be an efficient, hard-working force in our national defense organization in time of war. I hope that no plan of reorganization coming to this body will take any present powers from them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] has expired.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana who has just spoken has raised a very important question, and our distinguished former leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has tried to clarify that. I think this is the right time to have an expression from the chairman of the committee, because, if this does not include the civil functions of the Army engineers I am sure the temper of this House is such that we can insert language that will do that. I would like to hear the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs on this proposition.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. I suggest to the Committee in the interest of orderly procedure that we dispose of the Hoffman amendment and then later deal with the question that has been raised by the gentleman from Louisiana as well as the gentleman from Ohio. We are beginning to get just a little bit confused. The question raised by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is whether this legislation should be permanent or whether it should terminate in 1953. When we come to the section dealing with the Military Establishment we will have a clear opportunity to debate the question.

Mr. JENKINS. I may say to the gentleman from Georgia that I agree with him that that will be the logical place to discuss this, but, inasmuch as it has been injected into the debate, I think it should be clarified now. What I want is that the Army engineers be not disturbed in the work they do for civil activities of the Government. We all know that the Army engineers are one of the most efficient agencies of the Government, and I am sure that Congress will not do this group any injustice. I hope the gentleman from Georgia will introduce the proper amendment at the proper time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in relation to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] I hope that the Committee of the Whole will vote the amendment down. There are certain compelling reasons which prompt me to oppose his amendment. Experience has shown as a result of the passage of certain reorganization bills during the past 16 years or so that the fears we have entertained in the past need no longer be entertained by us. Furthermore, the reorganization of the executive branch is a continuing affair. I have no fear about a future President of the United States. I have no fear of a President after 1953; if it is not President Truman I have confidence that the man who will be in the White House will perform his duty in accordance with his trust and to the best of his ability, having in mind the best interests of our country and our people. I might disagree with him, but that is different from impugning his motives.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not saying that the gentleman does, that is not raised in the gentleman's amendment and I know it does not exist in the gentleman's mind, but I am expressing my thoughts as to why I oppose the amendment. In no way do I want my remarks to be construed by anyone as a thought on my part that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] entertains any opposite view to the one I have expressed in relation to confidence in the present or any future President. But I think we have had the experience that justifies us now in making permanent legislation out of a reorganization bill.

President Truman, in his message to Congress, specifically on two occasions emphasized that he hoped the Congress would pass a bill of a permanent nature; and former President Hoover, the only living ex-President we have with us today—and let us hope that he will be with us for many, many years to come—also is in complete agreement with President Truman. Each is in agreement with the other. Here we have one, the present President, one a former President, one elected as a Democrat, the other elected as a Republican, both urging the Congress of the United States to make this type of legislation permanent. I appreciate the fears entertained by those who want a limitation, and in disagreement I want any Member to know that I thoroughly respect his views and his right to entertain the views he has; but I think in the light of the evidence, in the light of the situation that confronts us now, and with our experience that we can take this step with permanent legislation particularly when two such eminent Americans as the President of the United States and a former President of the United States, both men of experience as Chief Executive of this country, are agreed on it.

One is the leader, from a party standpoint, of the Democratic Party. Notice I did not say as President, but as leader. As President he is President of all the people. He is a leader of the Democratic Party. No one will disagree with the statement that former President Hoover is one of the outstanding leaders of our country today and probably the recognized leader of the Republican Party. I think we can accept their judgment in the light of their past experience with confidence and vote to have this legislation permanent in nature.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I concur in the estimate the gentleman has made of the two individuals of whom he has been speaking. If when the act expires we have a President in whom everybody has confidence there will of course be no difficulty in extending it. But if the day comes when we have a President in whom we do not have confidence, we cannot easily end the power granted. He would veto our action and it would require a two-thirds vote. A doctor hopes for the best but prepares for the worst. If we should someday get a man as President that we cannot trust, we have given away our chance of bringing this power back to the legislative body. It is just when we might want to take it back that we would find we cannot.

Mr. McCORMACK. I stated that I respect the views of those who disagree with me; however, I think my friend is reacting to fear.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment conclude in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, the only proposition involved here is whether or not we are going to make this a law of men or a law of the country. As I see it, under this proposal we are making the President of the United States supreme. It is my duty, after swearing to uphold the Constitution of the United States, to make this a country of laws and not of men. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, this does not make it a country of laws but a country of men.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DAWSON. Does the gentleman appreciate that if there ever should come a time when we have a President in whom the Congress does not have confidence, and he sent down a reorganization plan to the Congress, the Congress could reject that plan?

Mr. NICHOLSON. We probably could.

Mr. DAWSON. Is it the gentleman's understanding of the bill that the power to reject is always in the Congress?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I do not think it is in the Congress. Under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan there is a limitation, namely, 1953. Under the bill as it is presently written they have an opportunity to keep it there forever, so far as he is concerned.

Mr. DAWSON. The President submits a plan to the Congress and the Congress can reject under the method provided by this bill. Is that the gentleman's understanding of the bill?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I know what the bill provides, but I have seen bills work. If a party is in control all the time, then they go along with the President, or I assume they do.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Does not the gentleman think that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], hit the nail on the head when he said that we are placing a power in the hands of the President which in order to get back would require a two-thirds vote of the House and a two-thirds vote of the Senate in order to get it back into the hands of the Congress? Therefore we ought to have a time limit on this legislation. It seems to me that is most important. A lot of times some of you gentlemen have voted for legislation to give power to the Chief Executive and then have later regretted it. You had better be careful that you are not going to give away your birthright again.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I also agree with the remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD]. I am afraid of giving one man control of anything, and as long as we have an opportunity I think we ought to take advantage of it and go along with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. I have heard a great deal about putting a lot of trust in the Chief Executive. Does the gentleman not feel that we ought to have the same trust in this body 4 years from now; that it might be possible to extend the time if it was found necessary to be extended?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I want a law written on books so that we will know what the law is, and not depend upon whether a man is honest or dishonest or whether he is a good executive or a bad one. If you want to put something in the law, write it in there so that the people will know what it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALLECK: Page 7, line 20, after the word "commission" strike out the period and insert the following: "National Mediation Board, National Railroad Adjustment Board, Railroad Retirement Board, Federal Communications Commission, Civil Aeronautics Board, United States Tariff Commission, National Labor Relations Board, Federal Trade Commission, and Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation."

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, in general debate I spoke on this matter at some length and I do not know as it is necessary to repeat too much of that now. I recalled then and I think probably I should recall now, because some of you may not have been here, that as these basic reorganization proposals have come up here from time to time there has been experienced on both sides of the aisle a great concern about the possible threat to the independence of action of the great quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial bodies of the Government. They are the creatures of the Congress. They are to carry out the will of the Congress. They should not be subjected to political control and certainly their actions and their decisions which so vitally affect the economy of the country should not be in the realm of political action. That is why many of us through the years have sought to protect their independence. That genetally took the effect of specific exemptions in the legislation that we passed. Most recently, in 1945, there were a number of specific exemptions, and there was also language in that act that undertook to prohibit the limitation of the exercise of the independence of these agencies in respect to their quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial functions. Also in the 1945 act was a new device. It was a device that did not provide for exemption, and this amendment that I have provides for no exemption, but that device simply said that in respect to these great agencies any reorganization proposal affecting them shall come up here independent of any other reorganization proposal.

That is just simply so the Congress could act on that proposal without any reference to any other proposal, and make its determination. I say it does provide some fair safeguard for the continuing independence of those agencies and at the same time can affect in no way the effective operation of this legislation.

If you have before you a copy of the bill, you will find on page 7, in subsection (b), in the last of that paragraph, four different agencies are so treated. They are not exempted, but it just simply is provided that separate plans shall come up for them. They are the National Military Establishment, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Securities and Exchange Commission. My amendment would simply add to that list a list that I assume is in this legislation with administration approval—in fact, I know it is in there that way because it has been so stated in the papers.

The Interstate Commerce Commission is included in the list of four presently in the bill. The Civil Aeronautics Administration is the same kind of an agency. It regulates the air carriers just as the ICC regulates the surface carriers.

As I said earlier in the debate, I want to support this legislation. I am supporting it. I worked on the committee in support of it. I offered this amendment in the committee. If any of you thinks that someone in some agency has pressured me into offering this amendment, may I disabuse your mind. No one has spoken to me about it. My action in this regard comes only from a deep conviction about the matter and a deep sense of the responsibility that I feel I owe the country in respect to the preservation of the independence of action of these great agencies.

I trust that this amendment can be adopted. As I say, it is no exemption, let us understand that. It simply provides that in respect to any one of these agencies the matter would come here free and clear of any sort of an entanglement, before the Congress could act on it.

I recall how the gentleman from Georgia came before the committee to get in there the language "National Military Establishment." He was quite vehement and vigorous in his contentions before the committee. He said, "All we want is our day in court in the Congress of the United States. All we want is the right to come in before the Congress and debate whatever plan may be up there affecting the Military Establishment, and not have it involved with other considerations."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for one additional minute, so that I may ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I am very much interested in the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. Does the gentleman's amendment include that?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes, it does.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I think that should not be disturbed.

Mr. HALLECK. That was given the same treatment in the 1945 act. Also the Railroad Retirement Board, the Mediation Board—I have that language here before me, but they were given the same treatment.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I certainly do not want this agency to go into the Federal Reserve.

Mr. HALLECK. I know many people have had concern about that.

This treatment in the 1945 act was accorded the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the United States Tariff Commission, and the Veterans' Administration. I did not include the Veterans' Administration.

I might also add that there was specific exemption in the 1945 act for the National Mediation Board, the National Railroad Adjustment Board, the Railroad Retirement Board, and the civil functions of the Army engineers.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I congratulate the gentleman on leaving the Veterans' Administration out of the provisions of

his amendment because the Commission is making a special report to the Congress on the Veterans' Administration alone. The Veterans' Administration will be considered by the President and by the Congress as a single entity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have another illustration by the offering of this amendment of an experience in connection with this legislation. In the first bill there were 21 exemptions. That was due to fear. In a later bill there were 12 or 14 exemptions and they were based on fear. Of course, it was honestly entertained at the time. But as time passed on and we gained experience we realized that in many cases some of our fears were unjustified. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana will add a number of other agencies to the formula established by this bill in relation to the four agencies. The adoption of the amendment will only hinder reorganization and not help it.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, this is not an exemption to begin with. But does the gentleman contend that the inclusion of the four agencies named in the bill is a hindrance to reorganization?

Mr. McCORMACK. I did not say that those were exemptions. I said they were additions to the formula already in the bill.

Mr. HALLECK. If the additions will hinder reorganization, then will the gentleman say that the inclusion of the four agencies hindered reorganization?

Mr. McCORMACK. They hinder it much less than if the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana is adopted. We are very practical men. We realize there were 21 exemptions in the first bill which were placed in the bill because of practical considerations. Then as we gained experience because of practical considerations there were 12 or 14 exemptions. Then we have had several more years of practical experience. As a result of that, we have had no exemptions, but specific reorganizations in the case of four of our agencies; that is, three agencies and one department. Again that is the result of practical experience. Now, what does former President Hoover say in his testimony on this particular subject?

The reasons for his views against any exemptions are:

I do not know any method by which the Congress can make a differentiation of executive and quasi legislative and quasi judicial functions in these agencies. It might be possible to arrive at such a definition with regard to them, but we have to bear in mind that there are such functions—quasi-judicial and quasi-legislative—in practically every department of the Government. We immediately get into difficulties if we try to make definitions. On the other hand, it would seem to me that Congress has an ample check on any action that would undermine those judicial and legislative functions when the President makes his proposed plans, and I should not imagine he is going to propose to do otherwise than to remove purely executive functions.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Speaking of the matter of hindrance, the gentleman earlier referred to the reorganization proposal in respect to the Civil Aeronautics Administrator. As I remember it, that was carried through to a successful conclusion, and it came up here as an order standing by itself, and affecting nothing other than the Civil Aeronautics Administrator. So there was accomplishment under this very formula in respect to that agency.

Mr. McCORMACK. And the gentleman will remember the furor that was raised at the time, and the fears that were entertained that it was going to put the agency into politics and that decisions would be made along political lines, and that it would lose its independence, although it was given independence within the Department of Commerce. None of the dire predictions has resulted.

Earlier in the day I called attention to a situation where the intent of Congress in the establishment of independent agencies has outgrown itself. It is not a question of one or two agencies that are arms of the Congress. We now have many of them. They are performing both quasi-legislative, quasi-judicial, and executive functions. We have established for all practical purposes—and this has no application to the Department of National Defense, because that is a department in itself—we have established in these independent agencies, for all practical purposes, a fourth department of government, and it is not enumerated in the Constitution.

The adoption of this amendment now, in the light of the experience we have had, in my opinion, would be a serious hindrance to real reorganization, and I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. DAWSON. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that all debate on this amendment, and all amendments thereto, be limited to 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this time is taken to state that if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON], speaking previously, intended to say that I had some distrust of the motives of either former President Hoover or the present occupant of the White House, he was completely mistaken. I am not distrusting anybody, and I want that made perfectly clear.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. DAWSON. I wish the gentleman to know I have the highest opinion of him and that no word of mine was intended to impute to the gentleman anything but the highest motives. My words were not calculated to state a feeling as stated by the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is very kind, and I thank the gentleman very, very much.

This amendment is not a move to exempt these agencies, neither the four nor the additional ones proposed by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]. If you will read the section, you will notice that all that section requires is that these plans, as to this, that, or the other department, come up one at a time; just one at a time, so that the Congress may have an opportunity to act intelligently on the plan.

You will all recall that some time ago the President sent up three or more reorganization plans. One of those plans included three separate and distinct proposals, and it was rejected. It was rejected because of the inclusion, with two good ones, of one that the Congress, both the House and the Senate, considered inadvisable. That is why I think the committee accepted the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], with reference to the Military Establishment. And then the others were added.

Now, the present amendment proposed by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] merely asks that these other departments be considered in the same way. If the President wants to send up a plan, he should send it up in one package—not two, but one—so that the Congress will have an opportunity, both Houses, to act. We can get along with this thing very quickly.

When he was on the floor before the gentleman from Indiana asked the gentleman from Illinois to yield, the gentleman from Illinois yielded. Then the gentleman from Indiana said:

I am wondering if the gentleman would agree with me that with the basic work that has been done by the so-called Hoover Commission with the enactment of this legislation and with the fact that the Congress is now Democratic as is the Chief Executive, this job ought to be accomplished in the next 2 years.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON] replied:

I think we ought to get a reorganization plan submitted to this Congress within the next few months.

There you are. In the revision made by the gentleman I notice the gentleman said, "Within a very short time."

So if these plans will come up one at a time, one agency at a time reorganized, the Congress can very easily pass upon that one simple question; so I think we should have this amendment.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. As I understand it, these agencies named in the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] are agencies that have been created by this Congress and that in the

discharge of their duties they are independent of the control of the Chief Executive, just like a court would be to act upon a lawsuit brought before it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is right.

Mr. JENNINGS. But if they are included within this reorganization plan, then the President could reduce them to mere automatons or people who could be pushed about and whose decisions might be controlled by the Executive.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Not only that but I venture to bring it up here, as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] insisted with reference to the armed services—and I remember he appeared before the committee and there were 45 votes he told us on his committee. I do not think that was with any intimation that we ought to watch out for those 45 votes, but anyway he told us of those votes.

There is no reason at all why these other agencies should not come up in the same way. They are entitled to just as much consideration, I say, as the one that comes before the committee of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. I notice he has nodded his head. I wish he would get up and make a talk.

Mr. VINSON. I will in a minute.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Make a talk now before my time runs out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief statement?

Mr. DAWSON. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Would not this amendment, if adopted, prevent these railroad agencies from being absorbed, or taken up by some other agency or department, without having their day in court, without giving them a right to be heard? I am particularly interested in the Railroad Retirement Board, the Railway Mediation Board, and the National Railway Adjustment Board. I would like to see them if possible have their day in court before they are absorbed into some other agency. These organizations are self-supporting and do not cost the taxpayers one cent for administration or any other purpose.

Mr. DAWSON. The answer to the gentleman's question is "No"; they would have their day in court under the bill as written.

Mr. BREHM. They would?

Mr. DAWSON. They would.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time and ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HALLECK) there were—ayes 86, noes 151.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAILEY: On page 7, line 20, after the words "Securities and Exchange Commission", strike out the period, insert a comma and add "Railroad Retirement Board, National Mediation Board, and National Railroad Retirement Adjustment Board."

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, these agencies were included in the amendment that has just been defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may say to the gentleman that this is a different amendment in that in the previous amendment there were additional agencies included. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, despite the action taken on the previous amendment I want to press for the adoption of the present one. I predicate my position on the assumption that the committee which studied this legislation and reported it to the House must have had some sound, basic reasons for extending preferential consideration to the National Military Establishment, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Securities and Exchange Commission. I submit, Mr. Chairman, there are sound basic reasons why the Railroad Retirement Board, the National Mediation Board, and the National Railroad Adjustment Board should be extended this same preferential treatment.

May I call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that the Railroad Retirement Board is not a Government functioning body. There are no governmental tax moneys involved. This is a Board created and financed by assessments against the wages of the individual workers in the railroad industry and the railroad companies. The Government only functions in the status of a trustee. I never heard tell of a trusteeship being dissolved except by some order of the court. I thought a trusteeship once set up was sacred. Yet we are proposing to bring this in under one of the other departments of our Government which may drag these agencies into politics. If there is one thing you can say about its administration and its functioning in the past it has been free of politics. What is said about the Railroad Retirement Act can also be said about the Railroad Mediation Board. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that there has been less trouble between labor and management in the functioning of that Board than in all the other labor legislation.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. I entirely agree with my distinguished friend. A large number of railroad employees from my home town of Knoxville brought that very question up to me as I came in this Chamber this morning. It would be a blunder, and I think a grievous blunder, to interfere in any manner with the independent, impartial status of those agencies.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. I also agree with the gentleman. A bit ago I asked the question if they would have their day in court, and the chairman of the committee assured me that they would have. Now, would it not be possible, if this legislation becomes a law, to group these railway agencies in with other legislation which might have some good features in it, and then have the railway organizations become lost in the shuffle and become part of the Labor Department?

Mr. BAILEY. Yes.

Mr. BREHM. Which we do not want.

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman is right.

Mr. BREHM. I will support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. In addition, let me say that I assume the object of this reorganization bill is one of economy. I remember that there was a tremendous amount of savings stressed when the committee proposing this legislation reported it. The assumption is that you will be able to let out hundreds of thousands of Federal workers. I want to say to you that there are probably less than 150 or 200 employees involved in all three or four of these railroad boards for which I am asking this preferential treatment. You will not effect any savings to speak of, because there are only a few employees attached to each one of the functions. I would also like to ask the consideration of the House that we keep, so far as possible, just as many of our governmental functions out of politics as possible. I believe it can be said of these railroad functions that they are not now and have not been matters of party politics, and I strenuously object to their inclusion in one of the ordinary functions.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I will say to the gentleman that he realizes that the Railroad Retirement Act sets up the Railroad Retirement Board and that the function thereof is basic legislation; that no change could be made in the death benefits or the pensions or any other functions of that act. It would require enabling legislation to be sent to the Congress, and if any administrative economy could be performed within the Board itself, the gentleman certainly would not object to the President, who is deeply concerned with the rights of labor, presenting a plan for the Congress to decide upon that would recommend certain economic or efficiency measures within it without changing any of the basic provisions.

Mr. BREHM. How about the Social Security Administration?

Mr. BAILEY. I will answer the gentleman by saying that regardless of what action we may take, it is still a trust fund and I do not think that Congress should have any business dealing with it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend any remarks that I make on the floor today.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. For a question.

Mr. BREHM. I just want to say that in my opinion it would be a shame to put any of the railroad boards under the Social Security Administration, which could happen if this legislation passes as it is now written.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It would be worse if you put it under the Labor Board.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have been wondering what position the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON] are going to take on this amendment. As I said a moment ago, I do not distrust or challenge the motives of the President or of any former President nor, I may add, of any Member of the House or the other body, but I try to be a realist. But it is strange indeed that all the trust must be on one side. If we should not and if we do not mistrust the present President, why should not the President trust the present Congress, or at least trust a majority of the 435 Members of this body, a majority of the 96 Members of the other body?

Why not mutual trust? Why not require the other body and the House, or at least one body entrusted with the legislative power, to act, as the Constitution contemplated, affirmatively upon any matter presented to it before the matter became the law of the land? I am wondering now, when from the press, at least, yes, when from a committee of the other body, the Labor Committee, come reports that the Secretary of Labor came up and asked for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, and if I understood correctly, the reenactment of the Wagner Act. He asked for the transfer of the Mediation Service over to the Department of Labor. He is going to make the National Labor Relations Board, if he gets the legislation he wants, a part of the Department of Labor.

We notice in the press that organized labor is saying to the President, "We elected you," and let me add that they are saying that to the Members of the House and I assume to the Members of the other body. "We elected you; now, come on. Give us what we say you promised during the campaign."

The CIO is only one segment of labor. The railroad men are laborers and workers, too. They are saying, "If this railroad legislation and the railroad organizations are going to be at the mercy of the President, if he wants to send down a plan sticking them over in the Department of Labor, reject it. We do not want that." Do you gentlemen in the majority want these independent agencies or their functions, their duties, transferred to the Department of Labor, which is under the control of or is favorable—and rightly so—to organized labor? But to all of it—not just to the CIO as it seems to assume.

Of course, the Labor Department speaks for organized labor, but unfortunately at the moment it is speaking for one segment of organized labor. The CIO assumes that it elected the President and a majority of the Members of Congress, so they are demanding now—not only asking, they are demanding now—that the Congress come across and pay for that election by legislation favorable to it. Put some of these agencies like the Railway Retirement Board in Social Security or the Labor Department and soon you may find CIO again raiding the A. F. of L. and perhaps the railway unions.

I agree with the gentleman who just left the well of the House that labor legislation which applies to the railroad workers has worked exceptionally well over the years. No one has found any particular fault with it. So if it is to be tampered with—let us say, if it is to be improved, let it come up as the gentleman then proposed, in one package, so that the Congress, this House and the other body, may have the opportunity of saying whether we want that labor organization to be transferred over to and put under the jurisdiction of the Labor Department or the Social Security Agency.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is just some of the procedure that the Congresses have faced in past years and have yielded to, and by virtue of having yielded, have passed bills that did not enable the President to do the job they were hoping he would do.

You saw these organizations or these branches or agencies named here included in an amendment a few moments ago. You saw them voted down. Then you saw them come to us once again standing by themselves, on the theory that we are going to do something to them, that this bill does something to them.

This bill is not going to put any agency anywhere. This bill is not going to interfere with any agency, to take anything from them or give them anything. This bill is plainly enabling legislation in order to give the power to the President to do a job of reorganization that must be done.

All these agencies that come and ask us now to make special provision for them are but the creatures of ourselves, the creatures of the Congress. Any plan the President submits or draws up or presents must come back to the Congress once again.

The legislation provides that the plan must be sent to the Congress. After the plan comes to the Congress, the Speaker of the House will refer it to the appropriate committee. There the committee is given a certain length of time to take action on it. Then a friend of any agency that is affected by that plan—not by this legislation but by that plan which the President submits—may file a resolution to reject it. That goes to the committee. If they do not act on it, then any member who is in favor of that resolution can move to discharge the committee and bring it to the floor of the Congress. Therefore, this bill makes adequate provision to protect every agency. The President cannot do anything to any agency unless it comes back to the Congress. What are we going to do here today? Are we going to pass a bill which is going to do the job which should be done? If any of these agencies are examined and if any of the Executive powers can be changed to the benefit of the taxpayers, should not that be done? In 1 minute we hear talk about the size of the Government and how the agencies are eating up the taxpayers money. I have heard Members standing here telling us about some of these same agencies which now do not want to be included in this bill. They tell us that they have grown so big that no Congressman can talk to them any more.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON. I yield.

Mr. BONNER. Under the decision recently rendered by the Chair, if this amendment carries, then it will follow that each item which was defeated in the so-called Halleck amendment can come up one by one and other items can come up one by one. Thus you will be here all afternoon voting on separate agencies when they have all been beaten collectively in the so-called Halleck amendment.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, may I say further, we have had our public hearings. Every agency had an opportunity to appear before us. If there were any reasons then to do the thing which they seek to have you do now, your committee would have acted thereon. Therefore, I am saying that this is but an instance of how former Congresses have failed to do the thing we are now trying to do. We have endeavored to bring to the Committee of the Whole a bill that will work. We have tried to bring to this committee a bill under which the President can reorganize the executive departments and do all the things that we have been talking about. The terms of the legislation are clear. There are no exemptions in it, and there should be no exemptions in it.

The President is not going to interfere with any agency that is functioning in the best interests of the people. If the President did interfere, do you not know that officials of that agency would immediately alert the very Members who are standing here now?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Was not the unanimous consent request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON] limiting debate granted by the Committee?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is referring to a request made concerning the previous amendment and which does not apply to the pending amendment.

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, my purpose is to ask the gentleman from Illinois a question. The gentleman has made very much of a point of the fact that exemption of this railroad retirement group would prevent a great deal of money being saved to the taxpayers. I would like to have you show me how in any way, if you cut down the

amount of money that is spent by that organization, cut it in half, how you would in any way help the taxpayers, bearing in mind that of the money that is paid to the Railroad Retirement Board, 6 percent comes out of the employee and 6 percent from the employer. How would you save the taxpayers any money? This is truly an independent function.

Mr. DAWSON. Are there any administrative workers there at all? Do they exercise any functions of the executive department at all?

Mr. WITHROW. They are all paid out of the money that comes into the fund by reason of the 6 percent that is taken from the employee's wages, and the 6 percent that is paid to the Railroad Retirement Board by the railroad companies.

Mr. DAWSON. This bill does nothing to destroy any function set up by law, nor can any reorganization plan of the President do that; but if there are any executive functions, either in itself or related to other agencies, then the President can combine them, in order to have them work more efficiently, or for the sake of economy, and then it will be brought down in a plan, and if it is not a good plan, you and the others in this Congress, including myself, will reject that plan.

Mr. WITHROW. The gentleman has not answered my question. My question is: How will the taxpayers be saved any money, if you cut the railroad retirement administration 50 percent?

Mr. DAWSON. If you cut it in two, you would be bound to save some money.

Mr. WITHROW. Where would that money go? It would go back into the fund, would it not?

Mr. DAWSON. Certainly.

Mr. WITHROW. And how would it save the taxpayers any money?

Mr. DAWSON. If in its administrative function any of the personnel can be cut down which are paid for by the Government, then that will be a saving to the taxpayers. Your question has nothing to do with the Government. You seek to intimate that this legislation can affect basic legislation where we set up an agency. That cannot be done under this bill and that cannot be done under any reorganization plan proposed by the President.

Mr. WITHROW. You are attempting to place me in a position that I will not be placed in.

Mr. DAWSON. And you are attempting to put words into my mouth.

Mr. WITHROW. No; just a moment. I am in favor of this legislation. I have confidence that the President of the United States will do a good job, but I do object to your saying that it is going to save the taxpayers any money when the taxpayers do not have anything to do with this Board.

Mr. DAWSON. There are some of its functions that are executive. Then those employees must be paid by the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW] has expired.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] made the very point which has disturbed me so much. The gentleman said that if we now pass this amendment relating to the railroad boards, then each of the others previously voted down in the Halleck amendment will come up in turn, and you will be voting on all of them all over again. That is exactly what can happen to the Railroad Retirement Board, the Mediation Service, and the Adjustment Board. They can be lost in the shufle. They can be pushed into another agency, say, like Social Security, and be brought up here and thereby lose their identity. What is wrong in permitting those agencies to be brought up here separately and acted upon? You bring them up in one large package and there may be incorporated in that particular package something which may be good; and you will destroy them. That is exactly what I am fearful of. You will vote for the good in the package and take the evil along with it.

Mr. DAWSON. That very thing would prevent the President from ever putting a bad plan in with a good plan.

Mr. BREHM. Oh, he is still a human being and subject to the frailties of human nature. A person can be sincere and still make mistakes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BREHM. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Just a moment ago the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] made a statement that we wanted to vote on this bill tonight and therefore we should not fool around with quite so much debate, or words to that effect.

Mr. BONNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BONNER. The gentleman is not correct. Now, let us get it straight. The question that is now being debated has been debated and has been voted on. By a ruling of the Chair, the question has arisen again individually, or in this case with two or three other organizations thrown in.

Mr. BREHM. It is not going to cost anyone a penny nor is it going to save a penny for anyone if this amendment prevails. However, it may save a most essential service to the railway brotherhoods for which they and their employers have been paying for the past 10 years.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; all right; and under——

Mr. DAWSON. So it is just a repetition of the debate and a repetition of the decision which the committee has already made.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I admire the gentleman very much. I am sorry I cannot agree with him in this instance. We should have some opportunity to debate the bill. If you expect to finish this bill tonight, do not force us too much.

Neither in the committee nor in the House has anyone on the minority side raised the slightest objection or done anything to delay matters, but we do want to discuss some of these items; and, if you go to strict parliamentary procedure and gag us, you cannot possibly vote on this bill tonight if somebody wants to object; not tonight. All we want is a little consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BAILEY) there were—ayes 122, noes 99.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Florida: Page 7, line 20, after the period insert the following: "No reorganization plan containing any provision affecting any civil function of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army or of its head, or affecting such Corps or its head with respect to such civil functions shall take effect until the two Houses of Congress pass a concurrent resolution which states in substance that the Congress favors such new reorganization plan."

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I am not an enemy to this legislation; this is a friendly amendment and I am supporting this bill because I believe this Congress should approve of anything that would bring economy in our Government, less spending, and more efficient Government, and the doing away with duplication and overlapping.

I am sure none of us has had any criticism of the Corps of United States Army Engineers. They are doing a wonderful job. They have been in existence for 174 years and I do not know of any organization plan that could better the operations of this particular branch of our Government.

I am not asking by my amendment that the Corps of Engineers be exempted from any reorganization plan. In the act that we passed in 1945 that organization was exempted and I have used the same language in this amendment as was used in section 5, subsection (e), of the reorganization bill passed in 1945.

We are all satisfied with what the Army Engineers are doing. They work in peacetime taking care of our floods, taking care of our rivers and harbors, and taking care of a lot of our problems that are particularly interesting to our local governments.

I do not see how anyone can have any possible objection to my amendment. My amendment says that before any reorganization plan in reference to the Corps of Engineers shall go into effect the Congress must approve by concurrent resolution. In other words, it is affirmative action instead of negative action. If we take it as it is and they are involved in some reorganization plan, then we have to act within a period of 60 days, else the plan becomes effective.

The Corps of Army Engineers is primarily for the people. This is something you ought to be interested in. I do not want any plan to go into effect, whether proposed by the President or anybody else, until the Congress has had an opportunity to scrutinize the program and the purposes therein. When the Congress has it up for consideration, the Congress could say: "Mr. President, you have done a good job, and we approve it. The Corps of Engineers ought to be

changed." When that happens and the Congress agrees, good and well. The organization itself is not exempted.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. If the Corps of Engineers are not taken out of the bill where do they go and how do they function?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I cannot answer that question because I do not know where they are going. But if we adopt this amendment, before anything is done, before any plan becomes operative and effective, this Congress by affirmative vote must say it is a good plan and we must affirmatively adopt it by a concurrent resolution of the Congress. It takes action on the part of both Houses. If we get some plan that is not good we can reject it. This is simply a question of whether we are going forward or backward.

Mr. DONDERO. I agree with the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WHITE of California. The gentleman said that he could not answer the gentleman's question in regard to where the civil functions of the Army Engineers would go. I think I have the answer. Those functions could be taken over by the United States Bureau of Reclamation, insofar as reclamation projects are concerned, or flood control, in areas where reclamation, irrigation, power, and flood control go together, and they certainly should be combined.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Nothing could be done so far as the Army Engineers are concerned, and no plan could become effective until the House and Senate by affirmative action stated it could be. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully request the attention of the committee while I try to explain what is meant by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida, and what is proposed in subsection (b). The distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] asked if by using the words "National Military Establishment" it included the civil functions. I respectfully call his attention and the attention of the committee to the Security Act of July 26, 1947, which specifically sets out what constitues the National Military Establishment. It states:

The National Military Establishment shall consist of the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force, together with all other agencies created under title I of this act.

So there can be no doubt, wherever used in the law, the words "National Military Establishment" do include all component parts of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. Then there can be no doubt in the gentleman's mind that the civil functions of the Army Engineers is a secondary matter with them, and that their connection with the Army itself brings them within this bill.

Mr. VINSON. Absolutely; there is no doubt about it. This amendment was prepared by the Drafting Service not only of the Armed Services Committee but by the Drafting Service of the House, so the House can fully understand that wherever used in here, "National Military Establishment" means the civil functions of the Army Engineers.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thoroughly concur in the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, and I want the RECORD to show that in putting the National Military Establishment in here, that the committee intended that that included the United States engineers within this formula.

Mr. VINSON. If there is any doubt in any man's mind, and to make it doubly sure, after the words "National Military Establishment," someone could offer an amendment to put in brackets "including the civil functions of the Department of the Army." But there is absolutely no need to do so because the words "National Military Establishment" mean all components of these services.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, is it not true that the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts was at one time a member of the committee from which this bill originates, and is now?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am a member now.

Mr. VINSON. To set the record straight, I will ask the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments if he does not interpret the words "National Military Establishment" to include the civil functions of the Department of the Army.

Mr. DAWSON. That was the understanding of the committee, and the language was used with that in view.

Mr. VINSON. That is it exactly.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. Would this give the President the power to delimit the jurisdiction of the Engineers? For instance, one of the members suggested that they should not build any more stands. Could the President take out that part and the rivers and harbors part?

Mr. VINSON. In 2 or 3 minutes I will explain what this amendment does. I appeared before the committee and suggested that an amendment along this line be considered. The committee after considerable debate reached the conclusion to draft it in the language set out in the bill.

Now, what does it do? I am addressing this strictly to the Military Establishment. It simply means if the President of the United States wished to submit to the Congress a reorganization plan to take the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers away from the War Department and put it in the Interior Department, he would have to send that up here in a reorganization plan separate and distinct. It could not be tied in with any reorganization plan with reference to any other civil agencies or functions of different departments. It would have to come here so that the Congress could determine that sole cut issue, and, of course, as a Member of the House, if such an issue comes up, I would be very much opposed to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. There is still this question: Could they take part of the jurisdiction of the Engineers away from them?

Mr. VINSON. He could not touch the Corps of Engineers or any agency of the National Military Establishment and mix it up with any other function of the Government. They have to come here separate and distinct. This language is so written that he cannot take one thing away. However, he can do this: He can add some other agencies to the Military Establishment without sending it separate, but he cannot take one iota of the power or authority from the Army, the Navy, or the Air Force without sending it here as a separate proposition. That is all it does.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Is it not true that my amendment is in accord with the bill?

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman's amendment would disturb the whole situation, because he would require it to be an affirmative act instead of a negative act. He would require that the Congress would have to approve it in a particular resolution by a vote of the House and Senate, and the bill is based on a different basis.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Is it not true that they would have to do that anyhow, according to the statement made here? Before the organization could do anything there would have to be a plan?

Mr. VINSON. The provisions of the bill are such that when it comes in here the committee taking jurisdiction of it must act within a certain time. If one House disapproves it and the other House approves it, it becomes a reorganization plan. The gentleman's statement provides that before it can become a reorganization plan it must have the sanction of both Houses.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Does it not also mean that if this amendment is adopted the President could not take the Corps of Engineers or the civil functions and place them over in the Department of the Interior, and then say to that Department, "From now on you shall have charge of all the river and harbor work of this country"?

Mr. VINSON. He would have the authority to do so. He would have the authority to take the Marines and put them in the Army. He would have the authority to take Naval Aviation and put it in the Air Force. But when he would do it, he would have to send it to Congress on that one issue and then Congress could debate it. I am perfectly willing on any reorganization plan to have an opportunity to present the reasons why certain things should not take place.

Mr. DONDERO. But only in case the gentleman's amendment passes this House.

Mr. VINSON. No. His amendment would disturb it.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman is the chairman of the committee on which I have the honor to serve. May I say that I am, of course, deeply concerned that the status of the Engineers be not changed.

Mr. VINSON. So am I.

Mr. BROOKS. I am happy to hear the gentleman say that.

Mr. VINSON. I am very much opposed to taking them away.

Mr. BROOKS. Is not the proper interpretation of the amendment offered by the gentleman that no reorganization can occur but what every Member of the House of Representatives will have the right, in the event the committee fails to report it, to call it up for a vote before the House?

Mr. VINSON. That is right. I am merely safeguarding this organization by saying that when you propose to reorganize it you cannot mix it up, you must send it in in a separate package, and any Member of Congress, under the bill, has a right to call it up and let a majority of Congress determine what is the proper thing to do about it.

Mr. JOHNSON. If the gentleman will yield further, the Rogers amendment would not do that; it would just muddy the waters.

Mr. VINSON. The amendment would accomplish just exactly what I have said. It is as plain as the nose on your face.

Mr. JOHNSON. Is it the Rogers amendment about which the gentleman is talking?

Mr. VINSON. I am talking about what is in the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes, but the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] has offered an amendment.

Mr. VINSON. His amendment in the first place is not necessary, because the Corps of Engineers is within the purview of the committee bill.

Mr. JOHNSON. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. Yes, exactly. Therefore, I am asking this Committee to vote down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] because it is not necessary. The Corps of Engineers is amply protected. We will have a separate vote on it whenever it comes in here. That is not the only thing in the reorganization of the Department of National Defense that might come up. There are other important items that might come up.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. PICKETT. Under the present law which you favor, if there were a reorganization proposal for the National Military Establishment set down which provided for something that the House did not approve of and the House rejected the proposal, it would still go to the other body and if approved there, the reorganization plan would take effect, would it not?

Mr. VINSON. That is the provision in the bill and it not only relates to this, but relates to everything else in the bill.

Mr. PICKETT. Therefore, the language of the present bill does not actually take care of the situation that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] is directed to.

Mr. VINSON. I believe that if we could justify a negative decision on a proposal, the other body would probably go along with our viewpoint.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto end in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON]?

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto end in 10 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, may I ask if there was a demand for a reading of the engrossed copy, would there be a vote on this bill tonight?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would advise the gentleman from Michigan that such a question would arise in the House and not in the Committe of the Whole. Therefore, the Chair cannot pass on the gentleman's inquiry at this time.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, of course, the committee realizes what discussion can be made about this matter in 1 minute, but I will use that 1 minute to make this brief statement.

If the gentleman from Georgia, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, and others profess a great respect for the Army engineers that we all entertain, then why not adopt this amendment and end this question now as to whether or not the Army engineers ought to be disturbed. I would much prefer to go further than this and write a direct exemption here with reference to the Army engineers because it's the one arm of this Government which enjoys the confidence and respect of every Member of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE].

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to address you as a member of the Committee on Public Works to say that I regret very much that the gentleman from Mississippi, the chairman of the committee, Hon. WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON, whose judgment is respected so highly by the Members of the House, and who has taken such an active part in flood control and rivers and harbors work in the Congress for the last 20 years and who has been dealing with the Corps of Engineers during all of that time, was called away for a flood-control meeting in St. Louis, and as a result I know that he is missed in this debate by the Members of the House. Had it not been for the fact that our chairman made a previous engagement several months ago, he would have been here today. However, I do want to say that I have contacted the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] in regard to the section with respect to the Corps of Engineers under discussion, and that it is his opinion that, under the provisions of this legislation the Corps of Engineers are protected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT].

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I will yield my 1 minute to the next speaker.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKETT] is recognized.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Rogers amendment. I think the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] stated the case exactly a moment ago when he said this issue ought to be decided now. Under the proposed bill, as it is presented by the committee and as it will be passed unless the Rogers amendment is adopted, you have a situation where if a reorganization plan involving the Corps of Army Engineers is submitted, you must take positive action to reject that proposal in both Houses, else the proposal will become operative and become a part of the reorganization plan. Under the Rogers amendment you are required to act affirmatively, in both bodies, upon the proposed reorganization plan. So you have this situation under the bill as the committee wants it passed: A proposed reorganization plan involving the Corps of Engineers might be deemed to have no merit and be rejected by the House, but the other body may not do so. Then the proposed plan becomes operative as a reorganization plan though the House has rejected it. The Rogers amendment corrects that situation and requires affirmative action by both Houses approving it before such a proposed plan can become operative. The amendment then is a guaranty that no amalgamation of the Corps of Engineers to the detriment of its performance can be effected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKETT] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I have already spoken on this amendment. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply sensitive of the need for reorganization legislation. At the same time, I am not unmindful of the magnificent work which has been performed by the Corps of Army Engineers. I express the deep concern which I feel that some misguided reorganization plan may affect this great organization. I think any plan which may affect the organizational integrity of the engineers would be a serious mistake and may hurt our defense establishment.

I have seen the Corps of Engineers work, both in war and in peace, and I feel that we have just the set-up which is most conducive to a well-trained and efficient Corps of Engineers. The country generally is satisfied that they are doing the job efficiently and wants no change.

I recognize that the Committee in drafting this measure was compelled to follow fundamental rules. The Committee did not wish to exempt any agency from the operation of this bill. But the Committee did prescribe that the engineers and other military organizations, if they are subject to reorganization under this measure, should be placed in a separate plan so that this body may cast a separate vote upon the plan submitted. I personally would like to go further and entirely exempt the Corps of Engineers. Since this is not now practical, I am going to accept the present language of the bill with the hope that the Senate may go much further in the degree of protection which it may give to an organization which has functioned since the very beginning of this Government with superb credit to itself and to our people.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion which is at the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House, with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to have to make a preferential motion, but, as stated once before, neither in committee nor on the floor of the House has there been the slightest inclination by anyone on this side to in any way delay or hinder consideration or passage of this legislation.

As a matter of fact, if I judge the sentiment on our side correctly, I know of no one who opposes the principles laid down in this bill. There are those of us who do object to the method but we are not disposed to start a filibuster, but here is an amendment that has been offered. Some of the Members want to talk about it—but are being denied the opportunity. Now, what does this amendment provide? Who now is afraid? And of what?

I spoke earlier, and I will speak later on, if occasion requires, about an amendment which will not only enable but will force the House and the other body to act one way or the other, vote up or down, any and every plan which may come down from the Executive Office.

This particular amendment seeks to make it certain that the engineers cannot be put out of business without the consent of the Congress. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]—and I have the highest respect for his judgment and for his opinion—he, it may be said, if I might use such language on the floor, has been the daddy or the guardian of the Navy. Now he has assumed the same role, and I know of no man better qualified to take it, of all the armed forces. What he was afraid of was that if this bill went through without the amendment which he put in during consideration by the committee—requiring that any plan having to do with the armed services should come up in one package—he was afraid that by the inaction by either branch of the Congress it might go through and something might be taken out of the National Defense Establishment.

I fear he may wake up some fine day—I believe he will, if he does not watch his step—and learn that legislation affecting the Engineers, putting them out of their civil functions, will come up to the House. Then what happens? One Member of the House can bring it up and we will all vote on it. But suppose someone in the other body starts a filibuster or that no one there wants to take it up; there is nothing that can force them to take it up. We can vote the plan down; every Member in the House can vote against it; but unless we find some way of making the other body act, the plan will still be the law of the land and the Engineers or any other agency or function of an agency will be out of existence. It is that situation, it is that danger, that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] seeks to avoid.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. Is not what the gentleman says true of every other reorganization plan?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Of course it is; and that is why I want to preserve the constitutional method of legislating. I propose to offer an amendment which will compel this body and the other body to act before a plan can become a law.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Do I understand that this amendment if adopted would provide for this one agency of the Government an entirely different method of procedure as far as Congressional approval or disapproval is concerned?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I dislike to answer that because the answer will mitigate against the amendment I am going to offer later on applying the same procedure to all plans which may be sent down.

The situation is this: The first love of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] is the Navy, his second love is the Army, the third is the Engineers, and the Engineers, like the Marine Corps, have worked perfectly. No one wants to see the Engineers put out of business; but if we do not watch our step, and if perchance the other body should fail to act or not act in concert with us, then the civil functions of the Engineers might in some reorganization plan go out of the Department.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. Does not a Senator have the same right to bring up legislation on the floor of the Senate that a Member of the House has in this body?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; sure. But will he?

Mr. VINSON. Why should we treat the Corps of Army Engineers by a separate method of determination from the others?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is just what you did with your amendment inserted by the Committee at your request as subdivision (b) of subdivision 6 of section 5 of the bill, when you provided for consideration of any plan affecting the "National Military Establishment."

Later, three other agencies were also given special treatment in reorganization plans.

I favor this amendment, because if I cannot get all I want I am willing to take what I can get to save one of our best agencies, the Engineers. Certainly any Member of the Senate could bring it up, but I ask the gentleman how long has the civil rights program been under consideration over there? Both parties are pledged to that program but strange, strange indeed, it has not been acted upon in that body.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for 1 minute to answer a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would state that on the preferential motion there are 5 minutes in support of the motion and 5 in opposition.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan.

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, the Corps of Army Engineers was started by George Washington, and was continued by every President of the United States right on down the line through Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman, all having acquiesced in the good judgment of the first President. That is the reason for this furor here; that is the reason we want to see something done about the Corps of Army Engineers. We realize that it is necessary to keep these officers

busy in peacetime as well as in times of war. The peacetime accomplishments of these men are most beneficial to the Nation in an emergency

What would result if the Corps of Army Engineers were to be thrown over into the Public Works Bureau? I will tell you what that would mean. It would mean a mammoth organization with one big head possessing more power than any official in the executive branch of this Government should have. So, Mr. Chairman, we ought to support this amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida. Let us write his amendment in.

It is an affirmative expression on the part of the Congress. Should the President send over a proposal to consolidate the Corps of Engineers with some other department we, in each House, would have only 60 days to reject such a plan. The 60 days pass in a hurry sometimes and because of other important matters pending in both Houses it is difficult to obtain a vote in both Houses. I trust that the amendment of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] will be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, while I must confess I do not exactly like the approach of the gentleman from Florida to this problem, I am going to support his amendment.

The Corps of Army Engineers has earned the gratitude and respect of all Americans. I am fearful of the pressure which has been exerted in the past and which is now being exerted to absorb the Corps of Army Engineers into some super-duper department of public works or to consolidate it with various agencies in the Department of the Interior. I am fearful of such a move. If it did happen I do not believe it would promote either economy or efficiency. The Corps of Engineers has accumulated an experience which is invaluable to the flood control and protection of this country.

I support, with reservation, his testimony insofar as the Corps of Army Engineers is concerned. I am naturally particularly concerned about the Corps of Army Engineers because I live in the city of New Orleans which is at the mouth of the Mississippi River, which drains about two-thirds of the United States of America.

We know first hand what floods are, what devastation can be wrought by the forces of nature when they are on the loose. We have lived with the Mississippi River since we have been a community and we are eternally grateful to the Corps of Army Engineers. In my judgment, there is no finer group of men in this great country of ours. They have been efficient; they have been capable; they have performed their duties without political favor or favoritism of any kind. They have been on the job in emergencies and they have accumulated, over a period of years, a tremendous amount of knowledge and experience.

I realize that we are faced with a quandary here when we talk about reorganizing the Government. Inevitably, someone appears before the responsible committee of Congress and asks that certain agencies be excluded.

I, too, favor—certainly in principle—all that this committee is attempting to do. It seems to me that the sprawling, overlapping functions of the Government must be consolidated in the interest of efficiency and economy; but in doing so I think that we must be careful not to interfere with agencies which have demonstrated, over a period of many years, their complete and total efficiency; and to my way of thinking there is no economy that could possibly be achieved by consolidating the Corps of Army Engineers with any other agency of the Government.

I do not know of anything else that I could add, Mr. Chairman, except again to say that we who have lived with the problem of flood control are immeasurably proud of the Corps of Army Engineers and we would be gravely alarmed if we felt that the Congress did anything which might jeopardize their efficiency.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I favor the adoption of this amendment. I do not believe that the Army engineers in the performance of their civil-functions work have been influenced by political considerations whatsoever. If this civil-functions work should be transferred to some other agency, as it has been rumored was in contemplation, I greatly fear that thereafter, such work would be subject to political considerations and political influence.

So far as I know, word has not come to Congress from the executive department as to what agencies or departments will be reorganized, changed, or abolished. I do know that rumors have been current that the civil-functions work of the Army engineers may be transferred to a new department to be created.

My own opinion is that this bill should provide that either House of Congress should be able to reject a reorganization plan, and that it should not require the concurrent action of both bodies. This bill, as it now stands, would require that it be rejected by both. That reverses ordinary legislative procedure. Today the civil-functions work may not be removed from the Army engineers except by affirmative action on the part of both Houses of Congress. If this bill passes in its present form, that will no longer be the case. The House may vote to reject such a plan, but mere failure to act on the part of the other body will result in a reorganization plan going into effect.

This seems to me to be an acknowledgment that Congress is no longer able to perform the functions belonging to it under the Constitution.

The Rogers amendment will require that both Houses must concur in order to remove these functions from the engineers, and I favor this requirement.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE].

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I do not know when I have found myself in a happier position than I am at the present time. I am told by the chairman of the committee handling this bill and by the gentleman from Georgia, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and by the majority leader that the Corps of Engineers is safe. I am also told by the sponsor of this amendment that if it passes they are also safe.

I have a very high regard for the Corps of Engineers and its ability. The members of that Corps are not only builders but in building they learn in peacetime the things that stand them in such good stead in war. Regardless of whether this amendment is passed or not, I feel that the Corps is safe under any interpretation. I hope so, and the civil functions will remain in their hands.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, we are all concerned with the Army Corps of Engineers and we believe it has been adequately taken care of under this bill that we have brought to the committee today for consideration. We know that the legislative language is good and we ask the House to stand by the committee and vote down this superfluous amendment because it is unnecessary. We urge the House to stand by its committee.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, under the provisions of this bill if a reorganization plan is returned to the Congress and if the House approves it and the Senate disagrees, then we cannot interfere with the reorganization plan; is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may say to the gentleman that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PICKETT) there were—ayes 82, noes 143.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TACKETT: On page 7, line 8, strike out subsection (b).

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, this bill is intended to provide the administration with power to reorganize the various agencies of our Government by grouping, consolidating, coordinating, and abolishing any of the agencies and bureaus so as to eliminate overlapping and duplicating efforts in the hope of reducing Federal operating expenditures and promoting economy to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of our Government.

Section 5 (b) of this bill is intended, in effect, to exclude four privileged agencies from the general operation and purpose of this proposed legislation. My amendment seeks to strike section 5 (b) so as

to make every Federal agency subject to the provisions of the reorganization plan.

During our campaigns this last summer and fall, most of us promised to come here and support a tremendously needed reorganization bill, and I had understood by the introduction of this bill that we would be afforded the opportunity to carry out that campaign promise. However, we are now finding that our reorganization bill has the same faults and defects as the 1939 and the 1945 reorganization bills—meaning that our pet agencies and bureaus are excluded from the provisions of this bill just as they have been excluded by former bills introduced for the same purpose. Of course, the Expenditures Committee uses more technical language and advises us that these four privileged agencies are not excluded, but explains that these four pets just do not come under the same kind of set-up. At the same time, we know that when these four particular privileged pets are allowed to come under the provisions of subsection (b), they are not to be treated as these other agencies of the Government under the reorganization plan; and, therefore, it can well be expected that there will be no reorganization of the, first, National Military Establishment; second, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; third, Interstate Commerce Commission; and, fourth, Securities and Exchange Commission.

Now, if I had a pet to be excluded from the provisions of this bill by being placed along with the four agencies under section 5 (b), it would be the choice of a majority of us—the civil engineers. This would be my pet because the civil engineers have petted the people of my country more than the other agencies. However, I can assure you that I have no Government-agency pets to be considered foremost to the people I represent.

It is my opinion that if we want to reorganize our Federal agencies, attempt to save money for the taxpayers of this country, and reduce the number of employees that we have on the payroll who are doing nothing more than drawing pay, we should make a straightforward attempt to do so at this time. All of us realize that there is nothing more permanent in Washington than temporary employment with the United States Government. We get up on the political platforms throughout our sections of the country and each of us holler to the top of our voices, "If you will send me up there to replace that fellow who has been representing you in Congress, I can assure you that I will lower the cost of our Government." As an attempt to live up to our promises, we come forth with a reorganization plan that should cover all Federal agencies; I am at a loss to know how four Federal executive department agencies have managed to become excluded by that great committee of ours known as the Committee on Expenditures. A few minutes ago when someone offered an amendment for the purpose of adding his pet agency to be included in the exclusions, the chairman of that committee said:

Is this Congress going to pass a bill that will get the job done; or are we going to put in exclusions that will prohibit the President from having any power to reorganize the executive department of this Government?

My amendment adds no agencies to the list of exclusions that will cripple the efforts of the President and his administration to properly reorganize the executive agencies of our Government; but, to the contrary, this amendment, if adopted, will remove the four stumbling blocks that can only be classified as "privileged pets" of the Expenditures Committee with no more right to be excluded from the provisions of this bill than any other Federal agencies that we could mention.

Now, friends, if we want to vote for a reorganization plan, let us vote for it and not a subterfuge. You have a chance here now. By taking out subsection (b) of section 5, you will be treating every Federal agency just exactly alike.

I want to ask you: Why is the Securities and Exchange Commission left in here under subsection (b) as an exclusion to the provisions of this bill? Why is it excluded under subsection (b)? Is it more important than the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, or many other Federal agencies that we could mention, or is it just somebody's pet?

Why is the Interstate Commerce Commission excluded from the organization purpose of this bill by being placed as a privileged agency under subsection (b)? This is the first time that I ever knew that organization had any political friends, but I can readily see that it has some friends somewhere on the Expenditures Committee.

Of course, it is not hard to see why the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System is listed among the privileged few because that all-powerful organization spreads its politics throughout the Nation.

The National Military Establishment is excluded as a privileged agency, I presume, under the theory that someone might be criticized by some person back home who might think we were trying to hurt his organization.

All Federal agencies, including the Military Establishments, could stand some reorganization, if the voters and taxpayers are to be considered. The hiring of civilian employees in the Military Establishments is now and has been during the past 12 months increasing more than 166 persons per day. Exclusive of Military Establishments, the daily average increase for the Federal civilian agencies during the same time is 131—a total of 297 new Federal employees each day the sun rises.

Mr. Chairman, it is known by all, regardless of party affiliations, the ever-present need for making the changes suggested by this bill in the reorganization of the executive agencies of the Government, hopeful of limiting expenditures to the lowest amount consistent with the efficient performance of essential services, activities, and functions, but more than anything else, eliminating a duplication and overlapping of services, activities, and functions. Such need is not exclusive to all Federal agencies except four privileged ones—but is needed as much so in one agency as the other. If an agency be perfect, needing no reorganization, why would that particular agency fear being scrutinized by the reorganization commission?

Mr. Chairman, it does not take debate on this amendment issue. If you actually want to curtail expenditures of the Federal Government, which the Republicans have gone out and declared the Democrats were not attempting to do; and if the Democrats want to retaliate with some sound action and bring about a saving of needless Federal expenditures, we have a chance to do it now. If we merely want to appease the people with a camouflage, then vote against my amendment. After viewing the success of other efforts to amend this piece of proposed legislation, I do not expect you to pass the amendment anyhow because I see that the Expenditures Committee is certainly running the show here now.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TACKETT) there were—ayes 58, noes 149.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and that the bill be open to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON]?

There was no objection.

The remainder of the bill is as follows:

TAKING EFFECT OF REORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 6. (a) Except as may be otherwise provided pursuant to subsection (c) of this section, the provisions of the reorganization plan shall take effect upon the expiration of the first period of 60 calendar days, of continuous session of the Congress, following the date on which the plan is transmitted to it; but only if, between the date of transmittal and the expiration of such 60-day period there has not been passed by the two Houses a concurrent resolution stating in substance that the Congress does not favor the reorganization plan.

(b) For the purposes of subsection (a)—

(1) continuity of session shall be considered as broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die; but

(2) in the computation of the 60-day period there shall be exluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain; except that if a resolution (as defined in section 202) with respect to such reorganization plan has been passed by one House and sent to the other, no exclusion under this paragraph shall be made by reason of adjournments of the first House taken thereafter.

(c) Any provision of the plan may, under provisions contained in the plan, be made operative at a time later than the date on which the plan shall otherwise take effect.

DEFINITION OF AGENCY

SEC. 7. When used in this act, the term "agency" means any executive department,

commission, council, independent establishment, Government corporation, board, bureau, division, service, office, officer, authority, administration or other establishment, in the executive branch of the Government, and means also any and all parts of the municipal government of the District of Columbia except the courts thereof. Such term does not include the Comptroller General of the United States or the General Accounting Office, which are a part of the legislative branch of the Government.

MATTERS DEEMED TO BE REORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 8. For the purposes of this act, the term "reorganization" means any transfer, consolidation, coordination, authorization, or abolition, referred to in section 3.

SAVING PROVISIONS

SEC. 9. (a) (1) Any statute enacted, and any regulation or other action made, prescribed, issued, granted, or performed in respect of or by any agency or function affected by a reorganization under the provisions of this act, before the effective date of such reorganization, shall, except to the extent rescinded, modified, superseded, or made inapplicable by or under authority of law or by the abolition of a function, have the same effect as if such reorganization had not been made; but where any such statute, regulation, or other action has vested the function in the agency from which it is removed under the plan, such function shall, insofar as it is to be exercised after the plan becomes effective, be considered as vested in the agency under which the function is placed by the plan.

(2) As used in paragraph (1) of this subsection the term "regulation or other action" means any regulation, rule, order, policy, determination, directive, authorization, permit, privilege, requirement, designation, or other action.

(b) No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against the head of any agency or other officer of the United States, in his official capacity or in relation to the discharge of his official duties, shall abate by reason of the taking effect of any reorganization plan under the provisions of this act, but the court may, on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within 12 months after such reorganization plan takes effect, showing a necessity for a survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain a settlement of the questions involved, allow the same to be maintained by or against the successor of such head or officer under the reorganization effected by such plan or, if there be no such successor, against such agency or officer as the President shall designate.

UNEXPENDED APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 10. The appropriations or portions of appropriations unexpended by reason of the operation of this act shall not be used for any purpose, but shall be impounded and returned to the Treasury.

PRINTING OF REORGANIZATION PLANS

SEC. 11. Each reorganization plan which shall take effect shall be printed in the Statutes at Large in the same volume as the public laws, and shall be printed in the Federal Register.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The following sections of this title are enacted by the Congress:

(a) As an exercise of the rule-making power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in such House in the case of resolutions (as defined in section 202); and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(b) With full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

SEC. 202. As used in this title, the term "resolution" means only a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: "That the Congress does not favor the reorganization plan numbered ——— transmitted to Congress by the President on ———, 19—.", the blank spaces therein being appropriately filled; and does not include a concurrent resolution which specifies more than one reorganization plan.

SEC. 203. A resolution with respect to a reorganization plan shall be referred to a committee (and all resolutions with respect to the same plan shall be referred to the same committee) by the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House of Representatives, as the case may be.

SEC. 204. (a) If the committee to which has been referred a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan has not reported it before the expiration of 10 calendar days after its introduction (or, in the case of a resolution received from the other House, 10 calendar days after its receipt), it shall then (but not before) be in order to move either to discharge the committee from further consideration of such resolution, or to discharge the committee from further consideration of any other resolution with respect to such reorganization plan which has been referred to the committee.

(b) Such motion may be made only by a person favoring the resolution, shall be highly privileged (except that it may not be made after the committee has reported a resolution with respect to the same reorganization plan), and debate thereon shall be limited to not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. No amendment to such motion shall be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which such motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

(c) If the motion to discharge is agreed to or disagreed to, such motion may not be renewed, nor may another motion to discharge the committee be made with respect to any other resolution with respect to the same reorganization plan.

SEC. 205. (a) When the committee has reported, or has been discharged from further consideration of, a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan, it shall at any time thereafter be in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of such resolution. Such motion shall be highly privileged and shall not be debatable. No amendment to such motion shall be in order and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which such motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

(b) Debate on the resolution shall be limited to not to exceed 10 hours, which shall be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. A motion further to limit debate shall not be debatable. No amendment to, or motion to recommit, the resolution shall be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution is agreed to or disagreed to.

SEC. 206. (a) All motions to postpone, made with respect to the discharge from committee, or the consideration of, a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan, and all motions to proceed to the consideration of other business, shall be decided without debate.

(b) All appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan shall be decided without debate.

SEC. 207. If, prior to the passage by one House of a resolution of that House with respect to a reorganization plan, such House receives from the other House a resolution with respect to the same plan, then—

(a) If no resolution of the first House with respect to such plan has been referred to committee, no other resolution with respect to the same plan may be reported or (despite the provisions of sec. 204 (a)) be made the subject of a motion to discharge.

(b) If a resolution of the first House with respect to such plan has been referred to committee—

(1) the procedure with respect to that or other resolutions of such House with respect to such plan which have been referred to committee shall be the same as if no resolution from the other House with respect to such plan had been received; but

(2) on any vote on final passage of a resolution of the first House with respect to such plan the resolution from the other House with respect to such plan shall be automatically substituted for the resolution of the first House.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

On page 8, line 5 strike out the words "the two Houses a concurrent" and insert in lieu thereof "either House a."

On line 6, strike out the words "the Congress" and insert in lieu thereof, the word "it."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, even at my age, there is no law against indulging in what might be termed a little flirtation if it be harmless. I have been listening to what might be termed either the orders, the blandishments, or the advice of some Members who, I hope, are my friends, and who sit to my right. They found some fault with the broader amendment which I proposed to offer and they persuaded me—or at least I am doing it—to offer this amendment. All this amendment does is to preserve half of the Congressional power to legislate. All it requires is that when the President sends a plan here it will not become the law of the land if either House of the Congress puts through a resolution disapproving it, saying that it does not approve of the plan. I hope my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle have not led me astray and that they are not going to leave me out on a limb.

I hope—I would almost say I pray—that they will remember the words of advice which they have been giving me during the past week and again today when some suggested that this amendment would probably go through the House and that the prerogatives of the House would be preserved and that the duty of the House to legislate would still rest upon us to act on a plan within a certain time after the President sent it to us.

I hope—oh, I hope—that I have not been deceived, gentlemen. I hope you are going to go along with me on this amendment.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. As I understand it, the gentleman's amendment merely provides

that any reorganization plan goes through unless the House votes that it should not go through.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And the same thing applies to the Senate.

Mr. VORYS. That is it, is it not?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. VORYS. That is all it provides. It leaves it to the House, and the reorganization plan will go through unless the House says it should not.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is right.

Mr. VORYS. In that way the Members who have been fearful concerning favored organizations will have their chance if their organization is to be damaged to have their say before the House and we can thus preserve the responsibility of the House in legislation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is right. If the friends of the Engineers or of any other group think that something is going to be done to their pet, if you want to describe it that way, or if you want to express it more accurately, if something is going to be done which they think should not be done, then the House can vote it down. It can just say, "We do not approve of that legislation."

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. In the absence of this amendment, any plan proposed by the President, approved by the Senate, or a plan in respect to which the Senate took no action whatever, would become the law of the land, even if every Member of this body were opposed to it?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is right. The House might vote unanimously to reject a plan and yet unless this amendment goes through it would be the law of the land if the other body did not act.

I am just asking for half a loaf, and for the support of those who advised me to take this course.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has expired.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to tell a story that I think will illustrate the point that this amendment simply ruins the effectiveness of this bill.

A certain colored man down in Georgia had caught a large channel catfish. Let me say to you that unless you have eaten a channel cat, freshly caught and fried in deep fat, and unless you have had some hushpuppies to go along with it, you do not know what real eating is. Well, this colored gentleman had caught a big catfish and he was trying to skin that catfish. The catfish was floundering around, and finally finned him. The colored man said, "Catfish, what are you trying to do?" He said, "Quit that floppin' around." He said, "I ain't trying to do a thing but gut you."

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is not trying to do a thing but gut this bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Of course, after he guts the catfish nobody is going to eat it.

Mr. LANHAM. Now, my friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], asked me in the debate earlier in the day why it was that Congress itself could not reorganize the executive agencies of the Government, and he agreed with me that I was right when I said that these executive agencies and their friends gang up on them. Now, you are making it possible for them to gang up now, and they will not have to fool with us in the House at all. They will simply gang up over in the Senate where there are only 96 men to try to influence, and they will give us the go-by sure enough.

If you want to hinder reorganization, if you want to block it and stop it, although you say you are for it, then you should vote for this amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. In my opinion, irrespective of the fact that the gentleman from Michigan has offered his amendment in good faith, in my opinion the adoption of this amendment for all practical purposes, would mean the ineffective operation of any reorganization bill. This amendment was very seriously considered in the committee. Furthermore, the last reorganization bill carried substantially the same provision as is contained in this bill. Agreeing with my friend in his unique story about gutting the catfish, this amendment, while not intended as such, will bring about the result that this bill will be gutted. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. LANHAM. It will be gutted just the same.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM] has expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in this amendment we are faced with the real question of whether or not we want to continue the long-standing and tested legislative procedure, whereby no action under the authority of Congress is taken without the approval of both Houses of the Congress. Nothing else ever becomes law or goes into effect unless both Houses of Congress approve. Why should a reorganization plan? A hundred bills a year are passed by this House which are not adopted by the other body, and, of course, they do not become law. The same is true of bills passed by the other body but not by us. But under this bill as it now stands the President and one House of Congress can legislate, even though the other House expressly disapproves. It seems to me that as a matter of principle that is an extremely unwise thing to do. I do not believe any piece of legislation ought to be put into effect if one House disapproves. Do you? Does anybody really want a piece of legislation to go through that one House of Congress is opposed to?

Under this amendment the President sends down his bill with a plan for reorganization. After 60 days it automatically goes into effect unless one House passes a resolution disapproving. If one House passes such a resolution, that does not kill the plan; it merely returns it to the President for him to make such modifications as will remove our objections. The debates here will tell him what part of the plan we do not like. He revises it and sends it back to us. It is precisely like the way we handle a conference report. If we do not like any part of a conference report, we reject it and it goes back to conference; the conferees revise it and bring it back until we can let it become law.

Three years ago, when I was privileged to be a member of this great Committee on Expenditures, I offered this same amendment in the last Reorganization Act, and it came within 14 votes of winning. It came up late in the session, later even than today, and we did not have a chance to explain it fully. I do not see how anybody can rightly object to this when he understands it. Surely we do not want to delegate to one House of Congress and the President the power to enact laws.

Under this legislation we do not authorize the President to reorganize; we authorize him to prepare a plan of reorganization. He is in better position than we to prepare a plan. We want the President to take the lead—he has to—in suggesting specific reorganization steps. But reorganization is a legislative function and therefore our responsibility. We cannot rightly delegate to somebody else that responsibility without having a chance to look at it and have the final say before he can issue orders to put it into effect. Under the amendment, if either body for whatever reason seems to it adequate decides to pass a resolution within 60 days disapproving the particular plan the President has submitted, it goes back to him, he reworks it, brings it back in better form and it goes through.

The amendment cannot possibly gut the bill. It merely sticks to the basic system of government that we have had in this Republic for more than a hundred and fifty years whereby the two Houses of Congress and the President legislate, not the President and one House of Congress. What is wrong with that?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. If the amendment is not adopted it means, does it not, in effect that one House of Congress and the President alone can legislate without the other House?

Mr. JUDD. Precisely; and that is exactly what I believe ought not to be done. If I felt sure the President would always send us what I personally would regard as the best reorganization plans ever devised, I still would be opposed to a system where the House could not hold it up if a majority should think it unwise.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is not the first time this particular amendment has been presented to the House, when a reorganization plan was proposed. This language which we have in the pending bill is the same language that was passed in the 1939 Reorganization Act and the 1945 Reorganization Act. Now, I am going back further, to the act of 1932, when Mr. Hoover was the President and his Attorney General was William D. Mitchell. In discussing this particular amendment which has been offered here today, it said:

> If either branch of the Congress within such 60 calendar days shall pass a resolution disapproving of such Executive order or any part thereof, such Executive order shall become null and void to the extent of such disapproval.

In discussing that particular amendment, he said:

> It must be assumed that the functions of the President under this act were Executive in their nature or they could not have been constitutionally conferred upon him; and so there was set up a method by which one house of Congress might disapprove Executive action. No one would question the power of Congress to provide for delay in the execution of such an administrative order, or its power to withdraw the authority to make that order provided the withdrawal takes the form of legislation. But to attempt to give either house of Congress by action which is not legislative power to disapprove administrative acts raises a grave question as to the validity of the entire provision in the act of June 30, 1932, for executive reorganization of the governmental functions.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. But the situation he was describing was not at all comparable to the one we are discussing. He ruled that it was probably unconstitutional for one house of Congress to make null and void an Executive order issued by the President, and I agree. But this bill does permit Congress to nullify Executive orders, it does not in the first instance authorize the President to issue orders effecting reorganization and then submit the orders to Congress for approval or disapproval. It authorizes him to prepare a plan and submit that to Congress. He will have issued no orders. We will merely be enacting or not enacting into law the plan he submits. Only after 60 days have gone by without disapproval of the plan by the Congress does the plan become law and he have authority to issue Executive orders. We debated that when reorganization was under consideration in 1945, and the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Sumners, the eminent jurist who was chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, said the two situations were not alike. He said:

> Attorney General Mitchell rendered an opinion that an Executive order made under the grant of legislative power could not be vacated or set aside by any congressional action short of legislation. It is perfectly apparent to the Membership of the House that this bill was drawn with the view of naming the President as the ministerial agent of the House rather than vesting in him legislative power, and therefore the provision contained in this bill whereby Congress may vacate any action taken by the President by concurrent resolution is perfectly valid, because it is a condition subsequent and is a part of the law itself.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I realize the gentleman's position and he has had 5 minutes to sustain it.

Mr. JUDD. But the situations are not similar.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. There is some question as to the constitutionality of the amendment which has been offered. The House by its action today will confer upon the President certain powers, delegating him to do certain things within limits. No one has attacked the constitutionality of that. Likewise when the plan comes back to the Congress the action of two Houses in disapproving it is just as important as the action of two Houses in approving. The gentleman's amendment does exactly what the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM] said, in my opinion. You know, you can always get one side of the Congress to agree for certain reasons to obstruct an act.

Mr. JUDD. Does the gentleman believe it is wise for legislation to be passed that one House of Congress disapproves?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That one House of Congress disapproves?

Mr. JUDD. Yes; the amendment provides that the President will be empowered to carry out the plan and to issue directives and orders under the plan only if within 60 days neither House has disapproved. If neither House has disapproved, it goes on its way. If one House disapproves within 60 days he has to take the plan back.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. You are conferring upon one House legislative functions in fact.

Mr. JUDD. No; we are preventing one House alone from exercising legislative functions.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Under the bill presented by the committee it requires the action of both Houses to disapprove.

Mr. JUDD. That is true. But many of us believe we should stick to the basic system in our Constitution under which action can be taken under the authority of the Congress only if both Houses approve—that is, if neither disapproves. Let me read you what the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] said when this was before us previously:

> If it is within the competency of Congress to provide for vacating a plan that might be submitted under the bill by the President, by a concurrent resolution; it is of course equally within the right of Congress to provide that the order might be vacated by a simple resolution of either body.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Committee of the Whole stand behind the committee on this and vote down the amendment as it will nullify the whole act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to tell my colleagues a little story, about an occasion that happened, I think in 1940, in connection with what was then Reorganization Plan No. 3. That reorganization plan, among other things, abolished what was known as the Air Safety Board. Very shortly thereafter occurred a series of air accidents, something like 28 or 30 in number. In the course of that time the House appointed what was known as the Select Committee of the House of Representatives to Investigate Air Accidents. I believe I am the only Member of the House today who was a member of that select committee. The accident near Atlanta, Ga., in which our own beloved colleague and friend, Bill Byron, of Maryland, was killed, and Capt. Eddie Rickenbacher seriously injured, pointed the need for a congressional investigation.

We proceeded to investigate 26 air accidents. It was considered at first by that committee, and I concurred in the thought, that abolition of the Air Safety Board had nothing to do with the accidents, but the further we went into it the more we became convinced that its abolition did have something to do with it. I bring that up only for one reason. When that reorganization plan was brought before the House of Representatives, the House by a very substantial majority voted its disapproval of that plan. I cannot now just remember whether the Senate did not concur with the House or whether no action whatever was taken in the other body. But, at all events, with the complete disapproval of the House, that plan nevertheless became law. Since then we have tried to arrive at some reasonable conclusion in our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that would provide for a new Air Safety Board. The difficulties have been great. Perhaps, administratively, it is now being corrected. I trust it is. But, there was one serious instance when the House of Representatives by a considerable majority disapproved of a Presidential plan for reorganization largely because of the abolition of the Air Safety Board, and it became law nevertheless. We believed in our select committee unanimously that the Air Safety Board should not have been abolished. We could not do a thing about it in the House, because while we had disapproved its abolition, the plan nevertheless became law.

It seems to me that the House of Representatives is capable of judging the rightness or the wrongness of any plan for reorganization just as well as any other body in the Congress, and I think for myself that we should retain here the right to approve or disapprove any of those plans, regardless of any other agency of the Government. I think if we do not do that, that we will be giving away a very important part of our rights as representatives of the people of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JUDD) there were—ayes 95, noes 142.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee may return to page 6 of the bill in order that I may offer a correcting

amendment which is not at all hostile to the purposes of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. WADSWORTH: On page 6, line 1, after the word "for" strike out the words "winding up" and insert the word "terminating."

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, the committee accepts the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment. Since debate will undoubtedly not change any votes, I ask for a vote on the amendment upon the conclusion of its reading.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: On page 6, in line 3 of subsection (c) of section 6, after the semicolon following the word "it", strike out the words "but only if" and insert in lieu thereof the words "provided that" and in line 5, strike out the word "not" and in line 6 strike out the word "not." In line 7 after the word "plan" strike out the period, insert a semicolon and add the following words, "provided further that the Congress shall, within such 60-day period, either approve or disapprove of such reorganization plan."

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HARRIS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2361) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan moves that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith with the following amendment: On page 8, after the word "by" strike out the words "the two Houses a concurrent" and insert the words "either House a"; and in line 6 strike out the words "the Congress" and insert the word "it."

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 358, nays 9, not voting 66, as follows:

[Roll No. 5]

YEAS—358

Abernethy
Addonizio
Albert
Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Allen, La.
Andersen, H. Carl
Anderson, Calif.
Andresen, August H.
Andrews
Angell
Arends
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Bailey
Barden
Baring
Barrett, Pa.
Barrett, Wyo.
Bates, Ky.
Bates, Mass.
Battle
Beall
Beckworth
Bennett, Mich.
Bentsen
Bishop
Blatnik
Boggs, Del.
Boggs, La.
Bolling
Bolton, Md.
Bolton, Ohio
Bonner
Bosone
Boykin
Bramblett
Breen
Brehm
Brooks
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Ohio
Bryson
Buchanan
Buckley, Ill.
Burke
Burleson
Burnside
Burton
Byrnes, Wis.
Camp
Cannon
Carlyle
Carnahan
Carroll
Case, N. J.
Cavalcante
Chatham
Chelf
Chesney
Christopher
Chudoff
Church
Clemente
Clevenger
Coffey
Cole, Kans.
Cole, N. Y.
Colmer
Combs
Cooley
Cooper
Corbett
Cotton
Crawford
Crook
Crosser
Cunningham
Curtis
Dague
Davies, N. Y.
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
Deane
DeGraffenried
Delaney
Denton
D'Ewart
Dollinger
Dolliver
Dondero
Donohue
Doughton
Douglas
Doyle
Durham
Eberharter
Elliott
Elston
Engle, Calif.
Evins
Fallon
Feighan
Fellows
Fenton
Fernandes
Fisher
Flood
Fogarty
Forand
Ford
Frazier
Fugate
Furcolo
Gamble
Garmatz
Gathings
Gavin
Gillette
Gilmer
Golden
Goodwin
Gordon
Gorski, Ill.
Gorski, N. Y.
Gossett
Graham
Granahan
Granger
Grant
Green
Gregory
Gross
Gwinn
Hagen
Hale
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hall, Leonard W.
Halleck
Hand
Harden
Hare
Harris
Hart
Harvey
Havenner
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Hebert
Hedrick
Heffernan
Herlong
Heselton
Hinshaw
Hobbs
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Holifield
Holmes
Hope
Horan
Howell
Huber
Hull
Irving
Jackson, Calif.
Jackson, Wash.
Jacobs
James
Javits
Jenison
Jenkins
Jennings
Jensen
Johnson
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N. C.
Judd
Karst
Karsten
Kearney
Kearns
Keating
Kelley
Keogh
Kerr
Kilburn
Kilday
King
Kirwan
Klein
Kruse
Kunkel
Lane
Lanham
Larcade
LeCompte
LeFevre
Lemke
Lesinski
Lind
Linehan
Lodge
Love
Lucas
Lyle
Lynch
McCarthy
McConnell
McCormack
McCulloch
McDonough
McGrath
McGregor
McGuire
McKinnon
McMillan, S. C.
McMillen, Ill.
McSweeney
Mack, Ill.
Mack, Wash.
Madden
Magee
Mahon
Mansfield
Marcantonio
Marsalis
Marshall
Martin, Mass.
Merrow
Michener
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Mills
Mitchell
Monroney
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morton
Moulder
Multer
Murdock
Murphy
Murray, Tenn.
Nicholson
Nixon
Noland
Norblad
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Neill
O'Sullivan
O'Toole
Pace
Passman
Patman
Patten
Patterson
Perkins
Peterson
Pfeiffer, William L.
Philbin
Phillips, Calif.
Phillips, Tenn.
Pickett
Poage
Polk
Poulson
Preston
Price
Priest
Quinn
Rabaut
Rains
Ramsay
Redden
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees
Regan
Rhodes
Ribicoff
Rich
Richards
Riehlman
Rodino
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rooney
Sadowski
St. George
Sanborn
Sasscer
Scrivner
Scudder
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Sims
Smathers
Smith, Kans.
Spence
Staggers
Stanley
Steed
Stefan
Stigler
Sullivan
Sutton
Tackett
Taile
Taurielle
Taylor
Teague
Thomas, Tex.
Thompson
Thornberry
Tollefson
Trimble
Underwood
Van Zandt
Vinson
Vorys
Vursell
Wadsworth
Wagner
Walter
Weichel
Welch, Mo.
Wertel
Wheeler
White, Calif.
Whitten
Wickersham
Wigglesworth
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Ind.
Wilson, Okla.
Wilson, Tex.
Winstead
Withrow
Wolverton
Wood
Woodhouse
Woodruff
Worley
Yates
Zablocki

NAYS—9

Mason
Nelson
O'Hara, Minn.
O'Konski
Rankin
Shafer
Short
Taber
Wolcott

NOT VOTING—66

Abbitt
Bennett, Fla.
Blackney
Bland
Bloom
Buckley, N. Y.
Bulwinkle
Burdick
Byrne, N. Y.
Canfield
Case, S. Dak.
Celler
Chiperfield
Coudert
Cox
Davenport
Dingell
Eaton
Elsworth
Engel, Mich.
Fulton
Gary
Gore
Harrison
Herter
Hill
Hoffman, Mich.
Jonas
Kean
Kee
Keefe
Kennedy
Latham
Lichtenwalter
Macy
Martin, Iowa
Meyer
Miles
Murray, Wis.
Norton
Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Plumley
Potter
Powell
Rivers
Sabath
Sadlak
Scott, Hardie
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Secrest
Sheppard
Smith, Ohio
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Somers
Stockman
Thomas, N. J.
Towe
Velde
Walsh
Welch, Calif.
Whitaker
White, Idaho
Whittington
Wier
Young

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mrs. Norton with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Gary with Mr. Kean.
Mr. Secrest with Mr. Macy.
Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer with Mr. Towe.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Sadlak.
Mr. Byrne of New York with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Lichtenwalter.
Mr. Bennett of Florida with Mr. Meyer.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Potter.
Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Blackney.
Mr. Cox with Mr. Chiperfield.
Mr. Harrison with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Somers with Mr. Elsworth.
Mr. Whittington with Mr. Engel of Michigan.
Mr. Young with Mr. Case, of South Dakota.
Mr. Kee with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Gore with Mr. Stockman.
Mr. Bloom with Mr. Velde.

Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. Welch of California.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Smith of Ohio.
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.
Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Herter.
Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Keefe.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Martin of Iowa.
Mr. Bland with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.
Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Hill.
Mr. Davenport with Mr. Fulton.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, let us no longer tolerate the bestial, uncivilized conduct of the Soviets and their puppets. We cannot afford longer to appease and temporize with palpable conspiracies against this Nation and the cause of human freedom everywhere.

Shall no voice of protest be raised by this Government against this latest outrage against Christianity and democracy? We should officially protest this persecution, this unspeakable cruelty. If protests are unheeded, we should promptly withdraw diplomatic recognition. The time has come to act in defense of our freedoms and security.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two newspaper articles.

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech.

Mr. ZABLOCKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution and an editorial.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include excerpts and resolutions.

Mr. POAGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address he delivered.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution

Mr. SHORT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include three editorials.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement from the Executive Office of the President.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post.

Mr. HORAN and Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. EVINS (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Gen. Jonathan Wainwright.

OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 84) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective February 1, 1949, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, additional basic compensation per annum to the following employees in the office of the majority leader:

1. Additional clerk, at the rate of $100.
2. Assistant clerk, at the rate of $300.
3. Stenographer, at the rate of $100.

The resolution was agreed to.

AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, American agriculture needs a slightly different gearing toward better adjustment, but let us not strip the gears in the process. We must decide on an approach that will not ignore such important things as national economic security, the conservation of our agricultural resources and keeping them intact for any eventuality, and the social well-being of every American.

I shall from time to time point out some of the hazards of the present law governing price supports on basic farm crops. We should not become complacent after removing certain features of this legislation, such as the provision that permits support of basic farm prices at less than 90 percent of parity after January 1, 1950. That is only the beginning. Following that, we must provide a program that will help and encourage and be an incentive to the farmer to carry on genuine soil conservation practices, to adjust his production so that we can have high production, high agricultural income, along with protection against excessive imports to insure a high national standard of living, and a secure national economy.

We need the continuance of a 90-percent parity price support, especially on basic farm crops, to provide an incentive for the farmer to produce. But at the same time, we must provide the farmer the right kind of assistance so that he can make the needed adjustments for continued fuller balanced production but which will not necessitate huge expenditures to support prices.

With that in view, I have today introduced a bill which I am confident will provide the framework to do this, legislation which will direct the United States Department of Agriculture to move ahead in the only sane way there is to help the farmer solve these problems. This legislation does not provide for reduced production, but rather for a better balance of production.

It provides for the farmer to receive technical and financial assistance so that he can convert his poorer, now uneconomic producing land to a safe, long-time economic production use. He will be able to increase the fertility of his land so that he can produce more and better crops at cheaper cost, and at the same time give his land the protection it needs for maximum conservation and profitable continued production.

This legislation does not call for new agencies. It provides for the Secretary of Agriculture to use the same agencies, namely, Soil Conservation Service, Extension Service, and PMA, and also enables him to direct such manpower for more concerted action in soil conservation and for balanced farm production.

What will it cost the taxpayer? Definitely not one cent more than is now being appropriated. In all probability in due time it will cost less than is now being appropriated for benefits to agriculture and in addition will save untold millions we will need otherwise to support farm prices. This legislation provides that the money being appropriated for agricultural conservation payments—between two hundred and fifty to three hundred million dollars a year—be used for genuine conservation and balanced production purposes.

Let us glance momentarily at some of the beneficial adjustments these payments could bring about. Farmers are now growing about 11,000,000 more acres of wheat than they did on an average from 1937 to 1946. Half of this increased acreage was made possible by using land which previous to that was in grass, and should go back to grass. The other half was made possible by using land which formerly was used for hay, and moisture conserving practices. At the same time, livestock numbers have gone down. We have 11,000,000 fewer head of sheep than we did in 1942. We have 5,000,000 fewer head of beef cattle. This does not account for the livestock losses occurring from the recent subzero weather and blizzard conditions which have attacked our western cattle country in the past few weeks. These are just two items in our maladjusted agriculture. We today have 5,000,000 more acres of soybeans than we had in the 1930's, more acreage in cotton, corn, and other basic crops—and all at the sacrifice of either our soil resources or other production. Is it any wonder we have an erosion problem and an unbalanced agriculture? And these are but a very few of the out-of-adjustment crops we are confronted with.

This needed adjustment could be brought about by an expenditure of but one-third of present conservation payments—or approximately $100,000,000 a year, leaving the rest of these funds to serve additionally for conserving our soil resources and rebuilding the productivity of the rest of our land for any eventuality and making full economic use of every acre, whether it be for crops, livestock, fruit, or timber.

In brief, this legislation also provides for the joining together for a unified purpose the conservation work now be-

ing done by certain agencies of the United States Department of Agriculture—a recommendation being made by all persons who have investigated present conditions and understand the erosion and production problems in agriculture. This bill ties together the conservation payments of the Production and Marketing Administration and the excellent technical services being offered by the Soil Conservation Service to farmers in soil conservation districts embracing over three-fourths of our farmland. Furthermore, this legislation strengthens the necessary and proper approach by helping farmers work out their own farm problems through their soil conservation districts which are organized by farmers themselves under State law. The district activities are supervised by locally elected farmers. The Federal Government does not spend anything for salaries or expenses of these supervisors. Where such financial help is given directly to districts, it is being done by the various States in cooperation with this phase of our national conservation efforts.

All of us know that on a large share of our land its long-time economic and safe use demands carefully planned rotations. Bypassing these rotations is one of the chief contributors to today's agricultural maladjustment.

The 1945 census shows that about 403,000,000 acres of land was being cultivated annually. In addition, the census reported that there are about 47,500,000 acres of plowable pasture making a total of about 450,000,000 acres currently classified as cropland. According to our best authorities in agriculture, about 61,000,000 acres of this land are not suitable for cultivation. This land is now being bled of its fertility and topsoil and land we must save for a type of production which will not destroy it.

Of the total acreage now or potentially available for safe cropping in the United States—approximately 460,000,000 acres when certain conversions are made—around 25 percent is now being damaged at a rapid rate of erosion. On another 110,000,000 to 120,000,000 acres of cropland, erosion is proceeding at a less rapid but still serious rate.

If we allow this land destruction to continue for another 25 years at its present rapid pace, continue present rate of increase in population, how strong will we be agriculturally by 1975? Obviously, we will be much weaker. What if we are again faced with a world conflict at that time and are called on to feed ourselves and our allies? If an overflowing arsenal of food is as important at that time as it was in World Wars I and II, we will definitely fail unless we take more aggressive action to stop the loss of our irreplaceable soil resources.

In view of all of these factors, I consider that for a logical approach to this problem of helping farmers balance their production we must begin with the proper use and conservation of our soil and water resources. Using the facilities we already have in the Department of Agriculture, and making full use of the incentive program of conservation payments, in the legislation which I am introducing, I request that in addition to the needed basic national land policy which most of us have discussed before and favor, the following be enacted:

That the funds appropriated for conservation payments be divided into three groups of payments.

First. That there be class A payments to be used to encourage farmers to convert the use of land after it has been in grain, row, or other soil-depleting crops two or more previous years. These payments shall be used to help the farmers convert this land, for a reasonable time, to non-soil-depleting uses such as meadow, hay, pasture, and woodland. This conversion will encourage the production of more livestock and less grain but will not reduce the farmers' income. At the same time, it will encourage better land use, help to reduce erosion, and will greatly help to rebuild the fertility of our priceless soils. The payment shall be largest on the first year of conversion and on a reduced basis for the succeeding 5 years.

Second. That there be class B payments which shall be made for practices and other improvements of a permanent or semipermanent nature, such as terrace systems, drainage and irrigation installations, retirement of eroded cropland, farm ponds, range water diversion systems, and for other practices as may be needed to prevent permanent loss to the productive capacity of the land.

After 1952, class A and B payments shall be made only when land conversion or when such practices or improvements are carried out as part of a complete farm or ranch conservation plan on the basis of a cooperative agreement between a soil conservation or other conservation district and the landowner or operator.

Third. That there be class C payments which shall be made for recurring practices that will retard depletion of soil fertility, such as liming, fertilizing, grass seeding, crop rotation, cover cropping, mulching, and prevention of stubble burning. Such payments shall be made annually.

In brief, the foregoing and following are the major features and basic consideration which have brought about the introduction of this legislation. By its enactment, we will—

1. Establish a national land policy which will provide as a basis for agriculture's balanced production the conservation and proper use of our agricultural resources.

2. Achieve success in adjusting agricultural production for a high standard of living.

3. Protect our agricultural and national economy against bankruptcy.

4. Recognize the interdependency between a productive agriculture and a productive industry for national prosperity.

5. Help farmers to achieve greater success in soil and water conservation which will contribute extensively toward the agricultural security of our Nation.

6. Give to the American farmer the type of assistance he wants and needs—technical help he cannot obtain otherwise—and make it available through his locally farmer organized and administered soil conservation district.

7. Enable the Secretary of Agriculture to obtain greater farmer and national benefits from conservation payment funds.

8. Bring about a new era in American agriculture, which will lead to a more productive agriculture and industry, and give a permanent insurance for the preservation of our form of government.

OBJECTORS' COMMITTEE ON THE DEMOCRATIC SIDE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce the appointment of the objectors' committee on the Democratic side. The distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE], the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE], and the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL]. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE], being the ranking member, is chairman of the objectors' committee on the Democratic side.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] is recognized for 20 minutes.

FINANCIAL SOLVENCY OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, numerous references have been made to alleged mandates growing out of the recent election. I think an analysis of the issues and the vote clearly show that no specific mandate on legislation was voted by the people.

Mr. Speaker, there is, however, one continuing and compelling mandate and responsibility resting upon this Congress which demands highest priority over any so-called legislative mandates from the November election. That mandate placed imperative responsibility upon the members of this Congress to keep this country sound financially.

It far transcends the call for additional billions of dollars for new legislation by the pressure groups. If they were made to understand their requests for constant greater appropriations may jeopardize the financial solvency of this country, they would cease to exert such pressure.

The Communists within our gates are the only ones who want to wreck the Nation financially, destroy the value of all of our Government bonds, wreck the banks, insurance companies, and destroy the credit of the Nation which would bring about chaos and the triumph of communism in this country.

That mandate and responsibility, when this Government was formed, was written into the Constitution of the United States at Philadelphia in 1787 and was regarded as one of its most important provisions. It is still in there, and its importance has grown with age.

Mr. Speaker, the mandate I refer to placed upon the Congress, and not upon the Chief Executive, the responsibility

and the sole power to levy taxes with which to finance our Government. That provision was so important it provided that all tax legislation should originate in the House of Representatives, the Members of which were regarded as being the representatives subject to the most immediate control of the people. Their terms of office were fixed at 2 years so that if they failed to properly represent the people, they could be turned out of office at the next election.

The members of the Constitutional Convention all regarded the taxing power of great importance to the financial solvency of the Government. Thomas Jefferson well defined the thinking of those who wrote the Constitution on this particular subject when he made the statement, "The power to tax is the power to destroy."

That immortal statement is as true today as the founders of our Constitution held it to be at that time. Our responsibility to maintain a sound fiscal policy in these chaotic times when we are carrying a national debt load of $252,000,000,000 should rest more heavily on the conscience of each Member of this Congress today than ever before.

Nothing is more important to the well-being of the people of this Nation and of the world today, than that this Congress, with the cooperation of the Chief Executive, see to it that this Nation is kept in a sound financial condition.

Fifteen billion dollars appropriated in this session of Congress for national defense, $6,000,000,000 for compensation and care of veterans, almost $2,000,000,000 for agriculture, billions for social security, and all of the $42,000,000,000 we are asked to appropriate will mean nothing unless we keep the Government sound financially. We must keep this Nation strong against any eventuality.

Mr. Speaker, Lenin, the founder of communism, 30 years ago proclaimed the philosophy that capitalistic forms of government would eventually spend themselves into financial bankruptcy and become an easy prey to communism. Stalin in recent years has predicted that the United States would spend itself into financial bankruptcy. They have been anxiously waiting for this to happen. The Communists in this country have the same fervent hope and expectation.

May I emphasize this point: The Members of this House who face legislation to constantly expand the cost of Government, not only have the responsibility, but they have the power, and it is their duty, to stop the enactment of unnecessary legislation which will add billions of dollars of expense to the cost of Government each session. They also have the power, and should use it, to greatly reduce the cost of Government. I hope, in this session, the Members of this Congress will rise to their responsibility and prevent every possible waste in Government. We should reduce appropriations, rather than increase them.

With the tremendous debt hanging over the people, and the possible threat of another war, it seems most unfortunate that the President has recommended to the Congress a volume of new legislation which, if enacted into law by this Congress, will add several billion dollars annually to the present debt load, and will increase as the programs are put into operation, billions of dollars each year. Some have estimated that the legislation recommended by the President will require possibly $10,000,000,000 additional each year in taxes. We cannot carry such an additional tax load.

The President has asked a direct tax raise of $4,000,000,000, plus about $2,000,000,000 more money for social security. His budget request for $42,000,000,000, if it can be held to that for the coming fiscal year, amounts to $283 for each man, woman, and child in America.

Mr. Speaker, it is not a question of the desirability of any of the requests for new legislation. Even though some of them may be justifiable and desirous, little if any legislation requested is absolutely necessary. Take, for example, proposed legislation for socialized medicine, federalized or socialized housing; great expansion and extension of river valley power developments; the spending of $500,000,000 to develop the St. Lawrence seaway; universal military training costing more billions; and many other projects. None of them are absolutely necessary at the present time. We grew to our present strength, fought and won the last war without any of them.

The Federal Government is being called upon for billions of dollars for grants-in-aid to States, when the State treasuries are generally in much sounder condition than is the Federal Government.

WHO IS THE GOVERNMENT?

One hundred and forty million people and their property make up the Federal Government. It consists of some 40,000,000 families. The Government is not some particular agency in Washington that is supposed to take care of the people and support them; the people support their Government with the $42,000,000,000 in taxes asked from them by the President for the coming year.

The Government should operate like a family. If the farmer is heavily in debt and has a Ford car for the family's use, his son may want him to buy him a new Cadillac; the wife and daughters might like to have a new piano, additional and more expensive electrical appliances and clothes. They do not have to have them, but it would be nice if they could. The conservative, sensible farmer will think of his debts that he must reduce, and he will refuse to be pressured into increasing his debts by a few thousand dollars more, but will take his surplus cash and reduce his debts or mortgage. The Congress must protect the Government in the same sensible way; we must not spend billions for things we can do without. We must reduce the national debt instead.

Mr. Speaker, the Government is in debt today as never before. Millions of our people have loaned the Government billions of dollars through their purchase of Government bonds. We need to reduce the debt and keep those bonds at par value. We cannot do it if we permit the many pressure groups to get their hands into the Federal Treasury and take more and more billions out of the Government. This thing has got to stop before it is too late; this Congress can and should stop it.

Unfortunately, the President promised too much in additional services and extra hand-outs to the people during the heat of the recent campaign. Nearly all of the promises made by the President are now being formulated into legislation which, of course, will keep his political campaign promises. If they are kept, some will benefit temporarily; yet, all of the people eventually will lose.

This Eighty-first Congress will have to decide whether it will enact into law a volume of new legislation recommended by the President which will add to the cost of government many billions of dollars annually for years to come, or whether it will adopt a policy of economy in government, refuse to enact any unnecessary legislation, cut the cost of government, and reduce the Federal debt by many billions of dollars annually. I believe a great majority of the people want us to embark upon a policy of economy, rather than to vote additional unnecessary billions which will make it necessary to increase taxes. We can well afford to wait until we are better able to pay for additional projects and services.

Mr. Speaker, it seems significant that the President in his message to the Eighty-first Congress put no emphasis on economy in Government. Instead he recommends a broad legislative program that able economists who have made a study of it claim will cost the Government over $100,000,000,000 within the next 10 years; that it will compel an increase in taxes of between 19 and 27 percent. They claim that it will increase taxes by 1950, if all legislation is approved, by $26,000,000,000, which added to the present $42,000,000,000 would make the annual tax load $68,000,000,000 for 1950.

The $42,000,000,000 budget for the coming year requested by the President will cost the taxpayers and residents of Illinois alone $3,300,000,000 for its share in the cost of the Federal Government. This will take from my State, seven times all property taxes collected for all State and county governments in Illinois in 1948. It will take from the taxpayers of Marion County, where I live, $14,358,000. This is nine times as much as the $1,788,000 paid in Marion County in 1948 to cover the cost of all schools, city, and county governments.

It will take from Saline County in my district $9,603,000 as that county's share of the $42,000,000,000 budget requested by the President. This is over nine times as much as the $1,001,000 paid in Saline County in 1948 to cover the cost of schools, city and county government. It will penalize all counties in my district in the same way.

The Eighty-first Congress has before it two great opportunities for service to the people. The first is to refuse to enact all proposed new legislation not absolutely necessary that will add extra billions to the cost of Government.

Its second opportunity is to reduce the cost of Government by $4,000,000,000 and to defeat any attempt to increase taxes.

Unemployment is increasing every day. This proposed new legislation to increase taxes is one of the major reasons for the increase in unemployment. Businessmen will not risk their capital, stay in business, and expand it when they are threatened with a constant increase of taxes by the Federal Government. A tax policy that chokes the rewards of enterprise will destroy our prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest services that could be rendered to the laboring people of the Nation, and to everyone, would be to drastically cut the cost of Government at the present time, and reduce, rather than increase, our taxes. In fact, excise taxes such as the 25 percent tax on telephone and telegraph communications, and dozens of such taxes on items that are not luxuries should be greatly reduced, or wiped out completely. We should be reducing taxes, rather than even considering raising tax rates.

This is certainly not the time to spend additional billions on new legislation. This is not the time to add 4 or 6 billion dollars additional taxes onto the taxpayers and the economy of our Government. If we do, we may prove that Jefferson was right when he said "the power to tax is the power to destroy." If we do, and pass additional new and unnecessary legislation that will cost many billions annually for the years to come, we may destroy the financial solvency of this Government to the great delight of Stalin, Molotov, and their Communist followers in our country.

This Congress, if it has the courage to stand up against the pressure groups and do the things they know within their own conscience is right, can cut the cost of Government and effect other economies by over $4,000,000,000.

Senator BYRD, of Virginia, has repeatedly called for a reduction of many thousands in Federal pay rolls. For the past 7 or 8 months, pay rolls have constantly increased. If we pass the legislation requested by the President, countless thousands of additional new pay-rollers will be added to the sprawling bureaucracy of this country. Their salaries will be a constant cost against the Government. Bureaucratic pay rolls should be reduced in this session of Congress by over 200,000 people at a saving of $600,000,000.

This is a time when the Congress, yes, and the Chief Executive ought to be calling for a reduction in spending, instead of calling for an increase in spending and taxes.

The Hoover Commission authorized by the Congress to make a thorough study and bring in recommendations for the reorganization of the executive department of Government in an effort to stop waste and overlapping of bureaus and greater efficiency and economy in government, will soon make its final report.

The Commission has given out several partial reports. Every report indicates that billions of dollars can be saved, and greater efficiency accomplished if the full report, soon to be made to the Congress, is adopted.

Instead of enacting a broad and expensive program of new legislation that will add countless thousands to this bureaucracy, why not wait till the next session of Congress until we have put the executive departments on an efficiency and economy basis, rather than add additional rooms and wings to the rambling bureaucratic structure we have today?

Comptroller General Lindsay C. Warren last week, in testifying before the House Executive Expenditures Committee in Washington, had this to say:

> The Federal bureaucracy—
>
> Now numbering over 2,000,000 persons—
>
> is a Frankenstein monster, and an ideal system for tax eaters—attached to the public teat.

Further he said:

> Our present Federal set-up is a hodgepodge and crazy quilt of duplications, overlapping, inefficiencies, and inconsequences.
>
> As I have testified before—

Stated Mr. Warren—

> at times it (the bureaucracy) arrogantly snaps its fingers in the face of Congress and openly defies it.

This comes from the Comptroller General of the United States, incidentally a Democrat, who is the agent of the Congress and a part of the legislative branch of the Government.

We can cut billions out of this bureaucracy in salaries and waste, and I for one want to see the Congress move in that direction instead of increasing the taxes. The President's proposed new legislation will increase pay rolls and make more taxes necessary.

Mr. Speaker, every segment of the American people now in my opinion are carrying as heavy a tax load, from the humblest to the highest, as they should be compelled to carry. If this Congress follows the recommendation of the President to increase taxes in the higher brackets and on corporations, the little taxpayers and a part of the laboring crowd who approve such a policy, will find that they who earn and pay taxes on less than $5,000 a year will have to pay at least two-thirds of this extra $4,000,000,000 in taxes.

Big business is paying war times taxes now like all of the rest of us. When additional taxes are placed on business and the corporations, the cost of these taxes will be added to the cost of goods bought by the little fellows earning up to $5,000 a year.

The millions of small taxpayers will pay about 64 percent of the $42,000,000,000. This is true because there are so many more of them.

In addition to income taxes, they will continue to pay hundreds of hidden taxes that go into the cost of the clothes they wear, the houses they live in, or the food they eat, and never know the tax is being passed on to them in the price of merchandise after it is loaded on to business or the corporations in taxes by the Federal Government.

May I close my remarks by expressing the hope that the 435 Members in the House of Representatives will realize in this session of Congress, as never before, that they will serve their constituents best, and that they will serve themselves and the Nation best, if we will reduce Government spending and prevent an increase in taxes.

The national defense of this country depends on keeping the Nation in a sound financial condition. If we fail as a nation financially, we cannot defend ourselves against any foe from within or without.

We cannot fully discharge our duty unless we reduce spending and cut the cost of Government. The time to act is now. It is later than we think. It is the responsibility of the Eighty-first Congress. It is the greatest challenge before you and the people that can come to this Congress. It may well mean the protection of your freedom and liberty for the future, and the preservation of our representative form of Government.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE UNITED STATES RICE INDUSTRY

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include statements, statistical material, and other matter in relation to the rice industry.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, last week the Members of Congress from the three southern rice-producing States—Louisiana, Texas, and Arkansas—held a meeting with the officials of the Economic Adjustment Administration and the Department of Agriculture, and a statement was issued by those attending the meeting stating that in their opinion there was not too much cause for alarm in regard to the situation obtaining in the rice industry at this time.

The meeting was held largely to ascertain whether or not there was prospect of the Economic Adjustment Administration making purchase of approximately 1,000,000 pockets of rice from the United States under their allocation to China, and it was learned that because of the precarious situation existing as a result of the reverses of the nationalist government in China, these purchases have been deferred.

There are approximately 5,000,000 bags of rice of the 1948 crop in the hands of the growers and millers in the States of Louisiana, Texas, and Arkansas. The Economic Adjustment Administration deferring the purchase of the allocation for China, and the fact that it is estimated that more than 50 percent of the remaining rice stocks in the States mentioned is of an inferior grade and poor milling quality, presents a major problem of distribution, and many of our growers and millers are becoming somewhat disturbed as to the sale of the remainder of the stock on hand, and while the world-wide demand for rice is in excess of the available supply at this time, the deferment of the purchase of rice for relief purposes in China by the Economic Adjustment Administration is deplored as the industry had anticipated the utilization of a large portion of the low grades in that program.

In previous years the Government has taken all of the low-grade rice and exported it on a price basis that would return to farmers approximately the same price that they received for the better grades; however, it must be borne in mind that conditions have changed and the Asiatic countries, which produced the major portion of the world supply prior to the war, were forced to reduce their production during the war to a point where the United States was called upon to expand their production in order to make up some of the deficit, and as a result of the scarcity of this product, prices for rice, like all other scarce commodities, increased in price comparable with prices prevailing during the First World War.

Other factors have now further changed the picture. Not only has the United States increased its production but a number of South American countries have expanded their production, and the Asiatic countries are now being rehabilitated, and they also are rapidly increasing their production, and from this time on the United States producers can look for a competitive market.

I think one of the best discussions of the situation in respect to commodity prices, including grains, hogs, and livestock is that by J. H. Carmical, in an article in the New York Times of Sunday, February 6, 1948, which I am quoting, as follows:

Under the weight of huge supplies, commodity prices—particularly domestic farm products—are going through their second readjustment in the postwar period. Coming just a year after the first price break, which was followed with only moderate and intermittent rallies, the present decline generally has wiped out the sharp rises in the immediate postwar period and has brought a number of commodities even below the level fixed by the Office of Price Administration during the war.

Despite the intervention of the United States Government with its price-support measures, the trend of commodity prices seems to be following those of every major war in the last two centuries. A sharp upward trend for a year or two until production again could get under way always has been followed by a sharp decline. Because of this Government's activities, including its aid program abroad, most people and especially the farmers had been led to believe that there would not be any sharp deflationary trend after World War II.

The huge supplies and prospects of large yields this year are among the factors in the present price trend. On January 1 last stocks of the six major grain crops in the United States were 1,372,600,000 bushels larger than a year earlier. When this was announced on January 25, it caused the grain trade to wonder if the Government's support program could remain effective in the face of another near-record yield this year.

Under the present Agricultural Act, the United States Government is committed to make nonrecourse loans to farmers at 90 percent of parity. Normally, the loan level would be the "floor" price on any farm product. However, with corn, and also wheat in recent months, dropping below the loan level, the trade realized that it was not safe to count on Government support prices as the absolute bottom.

STORAGE SPACE SCARCITY FELT

Among the reasons why prices have not held at the loan levels is the lack of storage space. This has caused some distress selling during the heavy marketing periods. In addition, many of the smaller farmers have sold their products in the open market rather than take the trouble involved in obtaining a Government loan. In some instances, the quality of a product is such that it will not qualify for a loan with the result that it is disposed of in the regular commercial way.

Another reason why support prices do not work in cases of abnormally large crops is that once a commodity has passed from the farmers' hands it enters the "free" supply and becomes subject to demand influences. Under the law the producer is the only person who may obtain a nonrecourse loan from the Government.

Probably the most important influence is the knowledge that there are excess supplies of all grains. The trade realizes that these ultimately will be made available, at least at loan redemption costs, and consumers are in no hurry to anticipate requirements very far in advance. Also, there is the further uncertainty as to when and at what price the Government will dispose of its loan holdings.

SUPPORT POLICIES A FACTOR

Further uncertainty involves the question of future farm price-support policies. The present support program of 90 percent of parity expires at the end of this year. Although a new plan providing for a sliding scale ranging from 60 to 90 percent of parity then is scheduled to apply, an effort is being made in Washington to set future price-support levels at a rigid 90 percent of parity. However, there are reports that some compromise arrangement may be worked out that would satisfy those of the farm bloc who are insisting on a rigid 90 percent loan level.

Despite all the efforts being made to hold farm-product prices and the billions of dollars that are being expended directly and indirectly for that purpose, the action of the grain markets over the past year indicates that it requires more than Government support to stem an economic trend.

In January 1948, May wheat in Chicago reached $3.06½ a bushel. In September, the May 1949 delivery sold at a low of $2.11⅞ when the post-harvest movement of wheat to terminals was at its height. Subsequently the price recovered moderately, but recently declined to around $2.15. However, July and September 1949 wheat have broken through the $2 level.

BREAK IN CORN SPECTACULAR

The break in corn price has been more spectacular. From a high in 1948 of $2.70¾ a bushel, May 1949 corn futures late in the year dropped to $1.39½. In the recent break, the price receded to around $1.27, or less than one-half of a year ago. The record corn crop last year and the heavy post-harvest movement to market have resulted in that cereal dropping sharply below its loan level of $1.56 a bushel at Chicago.

The heavy snows recently in the West, which have been accompanied by unseasonably low temperatures, have resulted in the deaths of a vast number of livestock, which will mean a lessened demand for corn for feeding purposes in the months ahead. In addition, the added moisture has improved the outlook for the present winter wheat crop.

For the first time since the end of the war, there are heavy surplus supplies of all important grains and the market simply is adjusting itself to the changed conditions. Had it not been for the support program, the decline probably would have been more drastic.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to quote a portion of an editorial from the Washington Post, also of date Sunday, February 6, 1948, entitled "Turn in the Tide" which also discusses prices for basic farm products, and which also states that the downward movement of commodity prices is no cause for alarm, as follows:

TURN IN THE TIDE

Government officials have been quick to point out that the current drop in employment and the downward movement of commodity prices is no cause for alarm. So far, certainly, there is nothing to worry about in the rise in unemployment, which, judged by prewar standards, is still at low levels. Prices for basic farm products have already undergone a sharp deflation that has been salutary rather than otherwise, while the much-advertised drop in retail prices has been extremely limited, bringing living cost indices only three points below the peak level reached a few months ago.

The prevailing uneasiness is due chiefly to a belief, supported by an abundance of confirmatory evidence, that the period of scarcity and consequent booming prices is coming to an end. That had to happen sometime and there is good reason to be thankful that it seems to be taking place while employment and consumer incomes are still at high levels. However, the shift from an economy characterized by scarcity to a more normal peacetime economy of comparative abundance in which the seller no longer has the upper hand entails some hazards. As backlog demands for durable goods are satisfied, for instance, some industries have to curtail their operations, others feel the effects of seasonal declines in buying that were once taken for granted, and marginal high-cost firms may be forced out of business by inability to market their products at profitable prices.

Many of our farmers do not realize that, in respect to rice, the United States normally produces approximately 1 percent of the world supply of this commodity, and, in this connection, I wish to submit a table showing the production of rough rice for the 1947–48 crop year from the Commodity Yearbook as follows:

Production of rice, 1947–48 crop year, from Commodity Yearbook

	Bushels
United States	79,000,000
India	2,050,000,000
Burma	269,000,000
China	2,348,000,000
Japan	545,000,000
French Indochina	210,000,000
Philippines	109,000,000
Korea	129,000,000
Java and Madura (1946–47)	250,000,000
Siam	143,000,000
Brazil	111,000,000
Estimated world total	7,086,000,000

In addition to the countries included in the above and foregoing table, two other countries produced a large amount of rice. The figures given are for Mexico, which had a rough-rice production—1946–47—of 6,760,000 bushels; 1947–48, 7,300,000 bushels; 1948–49, estimated, 7,350,000 bushels. Guatemala produced in 1945, 544,000 bushels, and in 1948 produced 14,000 short tons.

Egypt and other countries are also increasing their production to a substantial degree. With these facts staring us in the face, it must be realized that we must evaluate the situation as it now confronts the United States rice industry.

With the end of the war and with changed world-wide conditions, while it is anticipated that the balance of the United States stocks of rice will be utilized at a price above the present parity price, we must realize that in the future, with increased production from the

Asiatic and other countries, the United States industry will find itself in a competitive market, and it is a known fact that we cannot produce rice to sell in competition with the Asiatic countries whose standard of living and cost of production is so far below that of the United States. Therefore, the question arises, What is the future of the rice industry in the United States?

The consumption of rice in the United States is only about 50 percent of the amount of rice produced in the United States, and the United States is able to produce a better grade of rice than are our competitors—the long-grain variety. Our principal export customer is Cuba and Cuba prefers long-grain rice rather than the lower grades. Therefore, the answer is hypothetical. We must either increase domestic consumption or reduce our production and plant only the higher quality of rice which is preferred not only by Cuba but by our domestic market. We will be unable to compete in a competitive market against the Asiatic countries as stated before due to the cost of production in the United States, even on the lower grades. Even at this time, the Asiatic countries can deliver a ton of rice to Canton, China, for $190 per ton, whereas it costs $225 per ton for United States rice.

Another question also arises in connection with our opportunity to export rice—as well as many other commodities. That is, many of the countries which might prefer to buy our products are now impoverished and do not have the dollars with which to buy. Notwithstanding all of this, in view of the information which we have from the Government officials and other informed sources, it is hoped that the United States industry will be able to dispose of the remaining stock of the 1948 rice crop at a price above the present parity price, as rice is selling in the present market at approximately 122 percent of parity, and there is not enough rice in sight to meet the world demand, and even though a major portion of the remaining crop is of a low and inferior quality, it is believed that customers will be found to buy and pay for the remainder of the 1948 crop on hand.

For the future some predict that it will be 2 or 3 years before Burma, Siam, and Indochina will be able to reach normal production; however, it is my opinion that those countries will increase production to such a degree by next year that this fact will affect the demand and sale of United States rice next year, and the only salvation for the United States industry is to curtail production of, and grow only the higher quality and best grades of rice this year and in the years to come. It has been proven that cattle can well and profitably be produced on rice lands, and since the same situation as respects competition does not exist in the cattle industry as will exist in the rice industry, it would seem a good idea for the rice farmers of the United States to hedge and play safe and reduce rice production and increase cattle production.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. COUDERT (at the request of Mr. LEONARD W. HALL), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. ABBITT (at the request of Mr. BLAND), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. SMITH of Virginia (at the request of Mr. GARMATZ), on account of illness.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 170. An act to authorize the transfer of certain property to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did, on February 3, 1949, present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 136. Joint resolution making a further appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 8, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

167. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting the first report of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, relating to the general management of the executive branch (H. Doc. No. 55); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

168. A letter from the Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, transmitting the first semiannual report of all educational exchange activities carried on from July 1 to December 31, 1948, pursuant to Public Law 402, Eightieth Congress (H. Doc. No. 56); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

169. A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the killing of starlings in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

170. A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide that children be committed to the Board of Public Welfare in lieu of being committed to the National Training School for Girls; that the property and personnel of the National Training School for Girls be available for the care of children committed to or accepted by the Board of Public Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

171. A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act entitled "An act regulating the retent on contracts with the District of Columbia," approved March 31, 1906; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

172. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1950 in the amount of $2,500 for the judiciary, Court of Claims (H. Doc. No. 57); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

173. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revised draft of a proposed provision and revised estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 involving a decrease of $4,265,500 for the Department of Agriculture (H. Doc. No. 58); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

174. A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill relating to the removal of weeds from lands in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

175. A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill relating to disposal of dangerous weapons in certain cases; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

176. A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting an amendment, a request, and the letter of compliance relating to the voluntary plans for the allocation of steel under Public Law 395; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

177. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a report of claims paid by the Federal Security Agency during the period January 1 to December 31, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

178. A letter from the secretary, United States Department of Justice, Federal Prison Industries, Inc., transmitting the Annual Report of the Directors of the Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the Fiscal Year 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

179. A letter from the Assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to authorize payment of claims based on loss of or damage to property deposited by alien enemies"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

180. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Works Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend Public Law 533 of the Eightieth Congress authorizing the construction of a building for the General Accounting Office on square 518 in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on Public Works.

181. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Works Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the construction of an office building at Suitland, Md."; to the Committee on Public Works.

182. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to promote the development and conservation of certain resources in the submerged coastal lands adjacent to the shores of the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

183. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 3121 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

184. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting the sixteenth report to Congress by the United States Maritime Commission of action taken under section 217 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Public Law 498, 77th Cong.); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

185. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the collection and publication of cotton statistics; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 1661. A bill to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 18). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 1211. A bill to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 19). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REED of New York: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 1211. A bill to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 19, pt. II). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRISON: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. House Joint Resolution 84. Joint resolution to provide for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train by the Archivist of the United States, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 20). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. H. R. 1243. A bill to amend the Hatch Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 21). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 1432. A bill to amend the act approved June 29, 1948, entitled "An act to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va."; without amendment (Rept. No. 22). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 2361. A bill to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 23). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 24. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 25. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 669. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Shirley Leinwand; without amendment (Rept. No. 26). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 773. A bill for the relief of Engelbert Axer; without amendment (Rept. No. 27). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1052. A bill for the relief of Lawrence G. McCarthy; without amendment (Rept. No. 28). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1700. A bill for the relief of Ezra Butler Eddy, Jr., and wife, Marie Claire Lord Eddy; without amendment (Rept. No. 29). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1993. A bill for the relief of Samuel Fadem; without amendment (Rept. No. 30). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. R. 2361. A bill to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 2362. A bill to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

H. R. 2363. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Gulf coast and creating the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 2364. A bill to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BISHOP:

H. R. 2365. A bill for the relief of the city of Chester, Ill.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 2366. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits and to reduce the age requirement for old-age and survivors insurance benefits from 65 to 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. R. 2367. A bill relating to the disposition of war housing acquired or constructed by the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. R. 2368. A bill to provide for establishment of a soil- and water-conservation policy, the coordination of soil- and water-conservation activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 2369. A bill to authorize an appropriation to complete the International Peace Garden, North Dakota; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. McGUIRE (by request):

H. R. 2370. A bill to extend to the veterans of the Mexican border service of 1916 and 1917 and their widows and minor children all the provisions, privileges, rights, and benefits of laws enacted for the benefit of veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 2371. A bill to extend the coverage of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to the self-employed, employees of nonprofit institutions, and, under voluntary agreements, employees of State and local governments, increase the benefits payable under such system, lower the age requirements for female beneficiaries, and liberalize the eligibility provisions of the system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 2372. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, with respect to clerks in air-mail field railway post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 2373. A bill to amend the act establishing the Hot Springs National Park; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 2374. A bill to restore to the active list of the Army and Air Force officers retired due to lack of funds and to correct injustices and inconsistencies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2375. A bill to provide for the per capita distribution of certain funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 2376. A bill to increase the deduction from gross income allowable for charitable and other contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SUTTON:

H. R. 2377. A bill to amend the National Housing Act so as to authorize the Federal Housing Commissioner to insure construction advances on single-family dwellings; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 2378. A bill to prevent retroactive checkage of retired pay in the cases of certain enlisted men and warrant officers appointed or advanced to commissioned rank or grade under the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603), as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2379. A bill to provide pensions for veterans of World War I and World War II based on non-service-connected disability and attained age; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 2380. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. R. 2381. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 2382. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 2383. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 2384. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 2385. A bill providing for the construction of Federal buildings at Mount Hope, W. Va., and Wilkes-Barre, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BARING:

H. R. 2386. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of a rare and precious metals experiment station at Reno, Nev.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2387. A bill authorizing the Governor of Alaska to fix certain fees and charges with respect to elections; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 2388. A bill to provide for the payment of compensation to the Swiss Government for losses and damages inflicted on Swiss territory during World War II by the United States armed forces in violation of neutral rights and authorizing appropriations therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 2389. A bill to establish a National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2390. A bill to exempt graduates of the United States Merchant Marine Academy, or from any State maritime academy, who hold commissions in the Naval Reserve from induction or service under the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 2391. A bill relating to eviction of tenants from publicly operated housing accommodations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 2392. A bill to provide for the liquidation of the trusts under the transfer agreements with State rural rehabilitation corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. D'EWART (by request):

H. R. 2393. A bill to repeal section 9 of the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 751), relating to the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 2394. A bill to create the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Redwood Forest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2395. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 2396. A bill to provide for the investigation of discriminations against women on the basis of sex, to establish policies for the removal of such discriminations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 2397. A bill to provide for the retirement of any judge of the United States District Courts for the Districts of Hawaii or Puerto Rico, the District Court for the Territory of Alaska, the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone, or the District Court of the Virgin Islands, any justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, and any judge of the circuit courts of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FELLOWS:

H. R. 2398. A bill to authorize for a limited period of time the admission of displaced persons into the United States for permanent residence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 2399. A bill providing for the construction of Federal buildings at Mount Hope, W. Va., and Wilkes-Barre, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 2400. A bill to amend section 2402 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and to repeal section 2402 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 2401. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and enter judgment upon the claims of the State of California for reimbursement for moneys advanced and expended in aid of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 2402. A bill to extend the office of the War Assets Administrator and the War Assets Administration from February 28, 1949, until June 30, 1949; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 2403. A bill to amend section 2401 of title 28 of the United States Code with respect to certain tort claims against the United States of persons who are minors or insane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2404. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 in respect to rates of wages in Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MICHENER:

H. R. 2405. A bill to further amend the United States Code, title 28, section 239, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 2406. A bill to stimulate exploration, development, mining, production, and conservation of strategic and critical minerals and metals within the United States and its Territories; to establish an Office of National Minerals Development, Production, and Conservation within the Department of the Interior; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2407. A bill to exempt air carriers from statutory provisions requiring payments for compensation for customs employees' overtime services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 2408. A bill to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to assist the States in the development of community recreation programs for the people of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 2409. A bill to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 2410. A bill to limit and restrict the ownership and use of radio broadcast stations in chain or network broadcast service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 2411. A bill to authorize a preliminary survey to determine the feasibility of constructing a waterway to connect Philips Inlet, Fla., with the intracoastal waterway; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2412. A bill to amend and supplement the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653); to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2413. A bill to authorize a preliminary survey to determine the feasibility of constructing a waterway to connect Basin Bayou and Choctawhatchee Bay, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2414. A bill to authorize a preliminary survey to determine the feasibility of constructing a boat basin and channel along Wayside Park at Thos. A. Johnston Bridge in Pensacola Bay, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2415. A bill to provide for the transfer for State park purposes of the land on which Fort Gadsen, Fla., is located; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2416. A bill to authorize a preliminary survey to determine the feasibility of extending the channel in the dock area at Carrabelle, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2417. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to improve recreational facilities at Eglin Field, Fla.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2418. A bill to authorize restocking, propagation, and conservation of game in the Eglin Field Reservation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TACKETT:

H. R. 2419. A bill relating to the disposition of moneys received from the national forests; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 2420. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2421. A bill to amend section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to provide for the reduction of the public debt by at least 10 percent of the estimated over-all Federal receipts for each fiscal year; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 2422. A bill to provide assistance for local school agencies in providing educational opportunities for children on Federal reservations or in defense areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2423. A bill to authorize Federal aid to school districts overburdened with war-incurred or defense-incurred school enrollments for the construction of additional school facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 2424. A bill to provide for the purchase, construction, rehabilitation, expansion, conversion, and joint utilization of buildings, including armories, structures, utilities, and other facilities, including the acquisition of land, for the Reserve components of the National Military Establishment of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 2425. A bill relating to the pay and allowances of officers of the Naval Establishment appointed to permanent grades; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2426. A bill relating to the pay and allowances of officers of the Naval Reserve performing active duty in the grade of rear admiral, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H. R. 2427. A bill to provide assistance for local school agencies in providing educational opportunities for children on Federal reservations or in defense areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 2428. A bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 2429. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to provide a standard for determining the continued absence of parents from home in cases of aid to dependent children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2430. A bill to change the method of computing Federal grants-in-aid to States for aid to dependent children, to authorize such grants-in-aid for aid to needy relatives who provide homes for such children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2431. A bill to amend section 202 (c) (2) of the Social Security Act, as amended, so as to increase children's insurance benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 2432. A bill restoring to tribal ownership certain lands upon the Colville Indian Reservation, Wash., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 2433. A bill to amend the Federal Administration Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 2434. A bill to authorize the disposition of certain lost, abandoned, or unclaimed personal property coming into the possession of the Treasury Department, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 2435. A bill to amend sections 210 and 209 (f) of the Social Security Act so as to increase the benefits payable to veterans of World War II and their survivors, and to remove the 3-year limitation upon survivors' insurance benefits in the case of deceased World War II veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 2436. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 2437. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved July 7, 1947; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 2438. A bill providing equal pay for equal work for women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 2439. A bill to provide for renewal of and adjustment of compensation under contracts for carrying mail on water routes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

H. R. 2440. A bill to authorize the Public Housing Commissioner to sell the suburban resettlement projects known as Greenbelt, Md., Greendale, Wis., and Greenhills, Ohio, without regard to provisions of law requiring competitive bidding or public advertising; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 2441. A bill to provide assistance for local school agencies in providing educational opportunities for children on Federal reservations or in defense areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 2442. A bill to increase the amount of deduction allowed, for income-tax purposes, for medical and dental expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 2443. A bill to authorize the payment of additional compensation to special assistants to the Attorney General in the case of *The United States* v. *Doheny Executors;* to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAVIN:

H. R. 2444. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of an experiment station in northwestern Pennsylvania for research on the production, refining, transportation, and use of petroleum and natural gas; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 2445. A bill exempting admissions to activities of elementary and secondary schools from the tax on admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2446. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 and to preserve the equities of permanent classified civil-service employees of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 2447. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," and incorporate therein provisions relating to the United States Tax Court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 2448. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey certain lands to the city and county of San Francisco; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. J. Res. 146. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for the adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. J. Res. 147. Joint resolution providing for closer cooperation between the legislative and executive branches of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. J. Res. 148. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. J. Res. 149. Joint resolution to authorize the temporary admission to the United States as agricultural workers of students and leaders in countries receiving assistance pursuant to the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE of California:

H. J. Res. 150. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. J. Res. 151. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. J. Res. 152. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. Con. Res. 25. Concurrent resolution protesting against the prosecution and trial of Cardinal Mindszenty by the Hungarian Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution favoring the political federation of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAHON:

H. Res. 81. Resolution providing that, effective January 4, 1949, the compensation of the clerk of the official committee reporters shall be at the basic rate of $4,000 per annum; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 82. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 22; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KING:

H. Res. 83. Resolution to instruct the Banking and Currency Committee to undertake study of the effects of rent-control laws and formulate legislation granting financial relief, in the form of subsidies, to landlords of residential rental units suffering financial loss from effects of inflation and rent ceilings; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. R. 2449. A bill for the relief of Tom R. Hickman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2450. A bill for the relief of William Bergen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIEMILLER:

H. R. 2451. A bill for the relief of Christ Nick Vans, alias Christos Nick Ventouras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2452. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis D. Papapanagiotou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY of New York:

H. R. 2453. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to bestow the silver star upon Michael J. Quinn; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CARROLL:

H. R 2454. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna McCarthy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2455. A bill for the relief of Harry B. Landers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 2456. A bill for the relief of Charlie Hales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2457. A bill for the relief of Helen Morren; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 2458. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alfonso Vidal y Planas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2459. A bill for the relief of Rene Belbenoit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2460. A bill for the relief of Anna and Solomon Lagstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 2461. A bill for the relief of Irene Senutovitch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 2462. A bill for the relief of Miju Iseri Tsuda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 2463. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Florence Byvank; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 2464. A bill for the relief of Charlie Sylvester Correll; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 2465. A bill for the relief of John Keene; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 2466. A bill for the relief of Zygmunt Pakula (also known as Pakuta); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2467. A bill for the relief of Hieronim Henry Kolodziejczyk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2468. A bill for the relief of Lester John Skiba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2469. A bill for the relief of Mario Tiberi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 2470. A bill for the relief of Clarence J. McDonald; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGUIRE:

H. R. 2471. A bill for the relief of Walt W. Rostow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2472. A bill for the relief of R. Wallace & Sons Manufacturing Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 2473. A bill for the relief of Virgil L. Hesterly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 2474. A bill for the relief of Frank E. Blanchard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 2475. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to sell to Albert M. Lewis, Jr., certain land in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 2476. A bill to authorize certain personnel and former personnel of the Naval Establishment to accept certain gifts and a foreign decoration tendered by foreign governments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

44. By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming: Memorial of the Thirtieth Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation appropriating money to complete the building of the Eden Valley irrigation project; to the Committee on Appropriations.

45. By Mr. BUCKLEY of Illinois: Resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois, urging the Congress to take steps to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

46. Also, petition of the City Council of the City of Chicago, to pass the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

47. By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Arkansas, memorializing the Congress of the United States not to federalize the practice of medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

48. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of the Board of Commissioners of the City of Jersey City, N. J., memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

49. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Walter C. Peterson, city clerk, Los Angeles, Calif., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to the adoption of legislation now pending before the Congress relative to granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1949

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., Litt. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, hallowed be Thy name. In our wayward hearts Thou hast implanted a love for truth and beauty and goodness. May Thy truth make us free—free from pride and prejudice, and from all the ugly sins of disposition that do so easily beset us. May the lure of Thy beauty lift us above the mud and scum of mere things to the realm of the excellent and the lovely. In a deceitful world which offers its cheap and empty prizes, where each ounce of dross counts its ounce of gold, enrich us with those durable satisfactions of life, so that the multiplying years may not find us bankrupt in the things that matter most, the golden currency of faith and hope and love. We ask it in the Name that is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 7, 1949, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2361) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 22) suspending legislative budget until May 1, 1949, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hoey	Murray
Anderson	Holland	Myers
Baldwin	Humphrey	Neely
Brewster	Hunt	O'Conor
Bricker	Ives	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Broughton	Johnson, Tex.	Reed
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Byrd	Kefauver	Russell
Cain	Kem	Saltonstall
Capehart	Kerr	Schoeppel
Chapman	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Chavez	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Connally	Langer	Sparkman
Cordon	Lodge	Stennis
Donnell	Long	Taft
Douglas	Lucas	Taylor
Eastland	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Ecton	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	McFarland	Thye
Ferguson	McGrath	Tobey
Flanders	McKellar	Tydings
Fleer	McMahon	Vandenberg
George	Magnuson	Watkins
Gillette	Malone	Wherry
Gurney	Martin	Wiley
Hayden	Maybank	Williams
Hendrickson	Miller	Withers
Hickenlooper	Morse	Young
Hill	Mundt	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred, as indicated:

VOLUNTARY PLANS COVERING ALLOCATION OF STEEL PRODUCTS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to section 2 (e) of Public Law 395 (80th Cong.), an amendment, a request, and the letter of compliance with the amendment and request, to the voluntary plans for the allocation of steel products for United States Atomic Energy Commission projects, the requirements of the armed forces, and the requirements of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF MARITIME COMMISSION ON ACTIVITIES UNDER MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on action taken by that Commission under section 217 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Public Law 488, 77th Cong.) (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska favoring increase in the allotments to Nebraska for the purpose of improving and maintaining roads in Thurston County, Nebr.; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. BUTLER on February 7, 1949, p. 826, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas, memorializing the Congress not to federalize the practice of medicine: to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. MCCLELLAN on February 7, 1949, p. 825, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relating to a series of four dams on the Snake River, Idaho; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See joint memorial printed in full when presented by Mr. MILLER on February 7, 1949, p. 826, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 1

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to consider and pass legislation appropriating money to complete the building of the Eden Valley irrigation project

"*Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Wyoming (the senate concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized as follows:

"Whereas the building of the Eden project would increase to double its present size this farming community; and

"Whereas the completion of this project would provide farm homes for some 80 new farmers, preference being given to veterans of the World War; and

"Whereas this increased acreage could contribute to the need of the agricultural products in a world already short; and

"Whereas this coal-mining community provides an excellent market for the products raised in Eden Valley, we at the present time being dependent for our milk supply on adjacent States and communities far distant, when Eden Valley has proven its suitability for dairying; and

"Whereas considerable sums have already been expended on this project which now lies idle; and

"Whereas because of existing conditions, that is, lack of drainage and the possible deterioration of the irrigation system, should the Government withdraw its support therefrom, there is no agency which will make real-estate loans on property lying within the irrigation project; and

"Whereas, the Federal Land Bank of Omaha, because of conditions as aforesaid, suspended the making of all loans to anyone within the district in the year of 1937: now, therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Wyoming (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be, and is hereby, memorialized to appropriate money for the completion of said irrigation project; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to United States Senators JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY and LESTER C. HUNT, Congressman FRANK A. BARRETT and the Honorable Secretary of the Interior."

Approved, January 26, 1949.

LESTER C. HUNT, *Governor*.

A memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Memorial 1

"House memorial to the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman; Senator James E. Murray, Senator Zales N. Ecton, Congressmen Mike Mansfield and Wesley D'Ewart; Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney, chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Lands; Julius Krug, Secretary of the Interior; and Michael Straus, Commissioner of Reclamation; requesting the introduction and enactment into law of the necessary and proper legislation authorizing that sufficient appropriations be provided the Bureau of Reclamation for the immediate construction of Yellowtail Dam located in Big Horn County in southern Montana

"Whereas Yellowtail Dam site is located in Big Horn County, in southeastern Montana, and Yellowtail Dam will be constructed across the Big Horn River, about three-fourths of a mile above the mouth of Big Horn Canyon—35 miles southwest of Hardin, Mont.; and

"Whereas Big Horn Canyon is the passageway of the Big Horn River between the northern end of the Big Horn Mountains and the Pryor Mountains. For more than 50 miles Yellowtail Reservoir will lie within the rugged, inaccessible canyon, the steep walls of which tower hundreds of feet above the narrow and winding river bed, forming a natural damsite of unique splendor that will in future years provide Montana and Wyoming with one of the greatest lake-recreation areas in the Western Hemisphere; and

"Whereas the United States Bureau of Reclamation was authorized by section 9 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, as a part of the Missouri River Basin project, to prepare preliminary surveys and construction of Yellowtail Dam; and

"Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation has practically completed preconstruction work at the site of Yellowtail Dam. Design specifications for the Dam and power plant have been started. Surveys have been made of the irrigable area, and transmission line location, and plans are ready or completed for construction of access roads, construction camp and other essential base work necessary before actual construction is undertaken; and

"Whereas Yellowtail Dam is being designed to provide for irrigation, hydroelectric power production, flow control, silt retention, conservation of fish and wildlife, recreational development and other related beneficial uses of value to all mankind; and

"Whereas construction of Yellowtail Dam will make possible the irrigation of 45,000 acres of new land along the Big Horn River from the Big Horn Canyon to approximately 10 miles north of the city of Hardin, and supplemental irrigation water for large areas now inadequately served will be also provided. Because irrigation of lands along the Big Horn, Powder and Yellowstone Rivers is dependent upon pumping, a source of low cost power is prerequisite. Construction of Yellowtail power plant will make possible the irrigation of many proposed and desirable projects along these three valuable but presently little utilized rivers; and

"Whereas construction of Yellowtail Dam offers a priceless solution for the equitable interstate use of the waters of the Big Horn by the creation of the Yellowtail Reservoir on the Montana-Wyoming State line; and

"Whereas power generating facilities to be constructed at the Dam will have an installed capacity of at least 120,000 kilowatts, and will produce about 712,200,000 kilowatt-hours of electrical energy annually. The said power produced at Yellowtail Dam will be used for irrigation pumping, and will serve as a part of the Bureau of Reclamation's power system constructed to provide power for construction of other developments and to supply surplus power to principal load centers to permit its use by new and old industries and residents of the area; and

"Whereas the Big Horn River is the greatest silt offender in the entire Yellowstone River system. Retention of silt behind Yellowtail Dam will be of material benefit; and

"Whereas fish and wildlife resources will gain by the dam, fishing and hunting, as well as the many allied recreational opportunities that will follow, will be of immense value to Montana and Wyoming; and

"Whereas Yellowtail Dam as planned will be a concrete arch-type structure towering some 499 feet above the river bed, and will have a crest length of 1,480 feet, and will have a storage capacity of 1,366,000 acre-feet; and

"Whereas the construction of said Yellowtail Dam will attract new industries into southern Montana, and thereby be of great benefit to the entire State of Montana, as well as the entire Nation, by supplying cheap electricity for industrial and home use, and this postwar period is the time to develop such industries: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Montana, That the Congress of the United States of America be respectfully urged and requested to make sufficient funds available immediately for the construction of Yellowtail Dam in Big Horn County in southern Montana; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be submitted by the secretary of state of the State of Montana to the presiding officers of both Houses of the National Congress—ALBEN BARKLEY and SAM RAYBURN, to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives in Washington, D. C., to the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, the Commissioner of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Secretary of the Interior, the Governor of the State of Wyoming, and the presiding officers of both houses of the Wyoming State Legislature, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States from the States of Montana and Wyoming."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of California; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Resolution 73

"Resolution memorializing the Federal Government to preserve the forests of sugar pine growing in Tuolumne County, Calif.

"Whereas hundreds of giant sugar pine trees of Tuolumne County have grown to great height and size, in the 500 or more years of their lives, and exist today only in the State of California and southern Oregon; and

"Whereas these beautiful and majestic monarchs of the forest that can never be replaced are threatened with complete destruction within the next few months at the hands of a midwest lumber company, notwithstanding that there is no valid commercial requirement for their cutting; and

"Whereas it is represented that the present financial condition of the government of the State of California may be used to delay fatally the immediate acquisition of this sublime forest as part of a great State park now proposed to be created as a permanent memorial to those who gave their lives for us in the World Wars: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the Assembly of the State of California, That these sugar pine forest areas ought, in spite of all obstacles, to be preserved for the enjoyment, pleasure, and cultural enrichment of the present generation and all posterity; and be it further

"Resolved, That the assembly, on behalf of the people of the State of California, hereby memorializes and urges the United States Government to take immediate action pursuant to title 16, section 494, United States Code, which statute grants to the United States Secretary of Agriculture full authority, at his discretion, to take possession of these forest lands by allowing the present private owners the right to select, in lieu thereof, within 60 days, other forest lands belonging to the United States Government; and be it further

"Resolved, That when this immediate and most feasible emergency action has been taken to preserve the forests from destruction by logging operations, that chapter 368, United States Statutes at Large, be amended to permit the State of California to acquire title to the sugar pine forest areas in Tuolumne County in addition to the 1,200 acres of land in this immediate vicinity already offered to the State of California for State park purposes; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly at once send copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the United States Secretary of Agriculture."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 16

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in relation to the mooring of surplus vessels in the northern waters of San Francisco Bay and the waters connected therewith

"Whereas the United States has caused a large number of surplus vessels, both naval and merchant marine, to be moored in the waters of the northern part of San Francisco Bay and in waters connected therewith; and

"Whereas the presence of such surplus vessels in such waters seriously interferes with commercial fishing therein and creates a

hazard to navigation, particularly the navigation of fishing vessels; and

"Whereas while it is recognized that it is necessary that these surplus vessels be moored at some suitable place, there is no apparent reason why they could not be moored at places where no interference with commercial fishing would result and where such vessels would not constitute any menace to navigation; and

"Whereas the difficulties and inconvenience caused by such mooring of surplus vessels is particularly acute in Suisun Bay, Broad slough, and the waters off Stake Point, and the removal of such vessels from such waters would eliminate a large part of the difficulties involved in this situation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the President and the Congress of the United States are hereby requested to take such steps as may be necessary to cause the surplus vessels now moored in the northerly waters of San Francisco Bay and waters connected therewith, and particularly those vessels moored in Suisun Bay, Broad slough, and in the waters off of Stake Point, to be moved to some other mooring place where such vessels will not interfere with commercial fishing nor constitute a hazard to navigation; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and President pro tempore of the Senate, each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from California, the Secretary of the Navy and the Maritime Commission of the United States."

Three joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 2

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in relation to two irrigation canals to supply water from the Sacramento River to areas in northern California

"Whereas the great Central Valley of California consists of two connected valleys, the one to the north comprising the watershed of the Sacramento River and the one to the south comprising the watershed of the San Joaquin River; and

"Whereas the State water plan of California developed from a series of comprehensive investigations conducted principally in the decade following 1920 and envisioned, among other things, a plan for the transfer of large quantities of water from the northern area where water was plentiful to the southern area where it was acutely needed; and

"Whereas the Central Valley Project Act of 1933 had for one of its principal purposes such a large-scale transfer of water from the Sacramento Valley to the San Joaquin Valley; and

"Whereas the State water plan also envisioned the utilization of the water of the Sacramento River within the Sacramento Valley but the original Central Valley Project Act, while it provided that no watershed or area wherein water originates should be deprived of water required for its needs, nevertheless made practically no provision for the utilization of water within the Sacramento Valley; and

"Whereas, in 1941, the California Legislature recognized that the project should include some provision for the utilization of the water of the Sacramento River in the area in which it originates and added to the project two units, one called the Tehama-Colusa conduit, extending from the Sacramento River near Red Bluff through the counties of Tehama, Glenn, and Colusa west of the river, and the other, called the Tehama-Butte conduit, extending from a point near Red Bluff through the counties of Tehama, Butte, and Sutter east of the river; and

"Whereas the United States had theretofore taken over the Central Valley project as a Federal project and the two units have not been added to the project as now being constructed; and

"Whereas in the 1949 session of the Congress of the United States a bill introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressmen CLAIR ENGLE and HUBERT SCHUNK, of California, will be under consideration which provides for the inclusion in the Central Valley project of two new features, one called the Tehama-Colusa conduit and the other the Chico conduit; and

"Whereas the conduits provided for in the Engle-Scudder bill will effectuate the same general purposes as the two units above referred to which have already been added to the project as described in the California act; and

"Whereas the Engle-Scudder bill further safeguards the interests of the people of the area affected by requiring that the relevant documents of the State water plan be considered and that local interests affected be consulted; and

"Whereas the utilization of the water of the Sacramento River for the purposes contemplated will not affect or jeopardize any of the other features of the project but, on the contrary, will bring the project into closer conformity with the State water plan, and provide an additional water supply in areas where it is needed: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to give favorable consideration to the Engle-Scudder bill hereinabove referred to, or to take whatever steps may be necessary to provide in such other manner as may be suitable for the construction of the same or similar conduits for the same or similar purposes; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 10

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States in relation to the waters of the Colorado River

"Whereas more than 3,500,000 inhabitants of this State are dependent upon the Colorado River as a source of supplemental water supply for domestic purposes; and

"Whereas the metropolitan areas of southern California, including those within approximately 2,200 square miles of coastal plain and foothills extending from Los Angeles to Riverside and San Bernardino and those in San Diego and vicinity, are dependent upon the Colorado River as a source of supplemental water supply for municipal and industrial purposes; and

"Whereas over 1,000,000 acres of lands of this State are solely dependent upon the Colorado River as a source of water supply for irrigation purposes; and

"Whereas there is now pending in the United States Senate a bill (S. 75) which, if enacted, would authorize the central Arizona project; and

"Whereas there is insufficient water available in the lower basin of the Colorado River to supply the central Arizona project without depriving the people of California of their right to use that water and jeopardizing their investment in distribution facilities, which amounts to more than $500,000,000; and

"Whereas the States of California and Arizona have been unable to agree as to their respective rights to the use of the water of the Colorado River; and

"Whereas resolutions (S. J. Res. 4 and H. J. Res. 3) are now pending before the United States Congress which would, if adopted, authorize a suit in the United States Supreme Court to determine the respective rights of the States of Arizona, Nevada, and California to the use of the water of the Colorado River; and

"Whereas the authorization of the central Arizona project prior to an adjudication of water rights would greatly intensify the dispute between the States of California and Arizona and result in the possible expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars of public money to construct a project for which there would be an inadequate water supply: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the United States Congress is respectfully memorialized and urged to adopt one of the resolutions authorizing a suit in the United States Supreme Court to adjudicate the respective rights of the States of Arizona, Nevada, and California to the use of the water of the Colorado River; and be it further

"Resolved, That the United States Congress is respectfully memorialized and urged to suspend further consideration of the proposed central Arizona project pending the determination of the respective rights of the States of Arizona, Nevada, and California to the use of the water of the Colorado River; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 15

"Joint resolution relative to the tidelands and submerged lands adjacent to the coast of California

"Whereas the United States has recognized that all the States since July 4, 1776, or since their admission to the Union, have exercised full powers of ownership over all lands beneath navigable waters within their boundaries and of all natural resources within these lands and waters; and

"Whereas each State has maintained full control of its natural resources with the acquiescence and approval of the United States and in accordance with numerous decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States and the executive departments of the United States that these lands and resources were vested in the respective States as an incident to State sovereignty and that the exercise of these powers of ownership and control did not and will not impair or interfere with the exercise by the Federal Government of its constitutional powers in relation to the control and regulation of commerce, navigation, national defense, and international relations; and

"Whereas large sums of money have been expended by the several States, their subdivisions, and persons lawfully acting pursuant to State authority in improving and reclaiming lands, and in developing the natural resources in the lands and waters relying upon the recognized rule of State ownership; and

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has recently held that the Federal Government has certain paramount powers in respect to a portion of these lands and natural resources without reaffirming or settling the ultimate question of their ownership and control; and

"Whereas this decision of the Supreme Court recognizes that the question of the ownership and control of these lands and natural resources is within the 'congressional area of national power' and that Congress will not execute its powers 'in such way as to bring about injustices to the States, their subdivisions, or persons acting pursuant to their permission': Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That it is in the public interest that title and ownership of the lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the States be confirmed in these States by the Congress of the United States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States recognize, confirm, and establish title to these lands in the States so concerned; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States release and relinquish to these States all right, title and interest which the United States has in these lands; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 6

"Joint resolution relative to California water projects

"Whereas it is evident from past experience in California that the cycle of dry years has not ended and in all probability will continue at least until 1950; and

"Whereas the underground water table in California has been receding year after year; and

"Whereas California farmers depend to a great extent upon underground water for the irrigation of specialty crops; and

"Whereas in some parts of the State the underground waters have already been polluted by the intrusion of salt water; and

"Whereas this condition is growing more serious each year and much of the land will be ruined unless the water supply is soon replenished; and

"Whereas Governor Warren has repeatedly stated that not a drop of water which can be conserved for a beneficial use should be wasted into the sea; and

"Whereas the President of the United States has recommended to the Congress that $113,000,000 be appropriated for the Central Valley and other water projects as authorized or to be authorized in California to be expended during the next fiscal year by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Army Engineers; and

"Whereas such an appropriation to California would go far to continue the prosperity of the State and would also stabilize the economy of the Federal Government in that such an appropriation at this time would be more or less in the nature of a loan, a large part of which would be returned to the Government by repayments and by continued large tax returns from California: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to appropriate the amount recommended by the President for expenditure for water projects in California during the next fiscal year to make possible the preservation of California lands through the replenishment and augmentation of its water supply at the earliest possible date; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 8

"Joint resolution relative to providing a veterans' hospital at San Diego

"Whereas the population of the city of San Diego includes the largest proportion of veterans of any California city; and

"Whereas existing Federal hospital facilities are not available to veterans except in case of emergency; and

"Whereas it was heretofore proposed to construct a 200-bed hospital in the Linda Vista section of the city of San Diego for the use of veterans, but funds were not made available for that purpose; and

"Whereas an acceptable site for a veterans' hospital in San Diego is presently owned by the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That the President and the Congress of the United States are hereby respectfully memorialized and requested to make funds available and to provide for the construction of a 200-bed hospital for veterans in the city of San Diego; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 13

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in relation to establishing parity prices for California products

"Whereas in order to lend stability to the agricultural industry of the United States, Federal legislation has been enacted providing for support prices for a number of agricultural products; and

"Whereas such legislation operates to provide a floor below which the level of prices paid to the producers of products covered by such legislation will not fall, and thus assures to such producer a minimum payment designed to effect a parity of income between such producers and other classes of citizens as calculated for a prescribed base period in certain years preceding World War I during which the relationship between agricultural, industrial, and other income was in what is considered to have been a desirable condition; and

"Whereas such support prices are provided for a number of basic and staple products and operate as insurance to the producers of such products against the effects of fluctuations of the market prices thereof below the level necessary to provide an adequate income to such producers; and

"Whereas the State of California, by reason of its climatic conditions, is suitable for the production of specialty crops, notably fruits and vegetables, which are extensively produced in the State, the farm value thereof in 1947 being more than $700,000,000; and

"Whereas the producers of such specialty crops must compete with the producers of crops protected by such support prices in the purchase of farm supplies, the recruitment of farm labor, and in all other services or supplies necessary for farm operations; and

"Whereas the need for the protection afforded by support prices does not depend upon the nature of the crop produced but rather upon a number of conditions to which farming operations are subject and over which the individual farmer has no control; and

"Whereas the same facts that justify support prices for producers of basic commodities equally justify support prices for all agricultural commodities produced in commercial quantities: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Legislature of the State of California hereby respectfully memorializes and requests the President and the Congress of the United States to take such steps as may be necessary to provide for the extension of congressional legislation relating to support prices and parity payments to cover all agricultural commodities produced in commercial quantities and to provide uniform standards of eligibility for such support-price assistance for all agricultural commodities commercially produced; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk for the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States."

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by Mayor James B. Pettit (by Richard Lamb), of Pomona, Calif., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide relief for the citrus growers of California (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by Virgilio Brunet, president, the Puerto Rico Teachers Association, San Juan, P. R., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the inclusion of Puerto Rico in the bill for Federal aid to education; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by Charles F. Gerhard, president, Philadelphia district Central Verein of America, Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation granting members of the Philippine Army the same rights and privileges granted to other veterans under the veterans bill of rights (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A telegram in the nature of a memorial from Rt. Rev. Msgr. Anthony A. Tralka, pastor, Our Lady of Mount Carmel, Bayonne, N. J., remonstrating against the trial and conviction of Cardinal Joseph Mindszenty; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Resolutions adopted by the Council of Binghamton and the Common Council of the City of Buffalo, both of the State of New York, and the City Council of the City of Bethlehem, Pa., favoring the enactment of legislation proclaiming October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

"House Concurrent Resolution A

"Concurrent resolution petitioning Congress to enact permanent legislation to maintain a floor of not less than 100 percent of parity on all basic farm crops

"*Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the senate concurring therein)*:

"Whereas it must be self-evident that if we are to avoid lower living standards and if this national debt is to be serviced and paid, it must be through the production of new wealth from the natural resources of the United States; and

"We therefore recommend that the Eighty-first Congress enact legislation in 1949 which will first provide a new parity formula which is fair to farmers and to the consumers of the Nation. We recommend that support prices be established pursuant to this fair parity formula under which farmers shall be assured not of fractional parity but of 100 percent of the parity prices. These prices should be consistent with the objective of abundant production. We believe that in the new legislation account should be taken where they have an opportunity for decent living standards, including adequate health protection, good housing and better educational opportunities for farm children: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the senate concurring therein)*, That we hereby petition Congress to pass permanent legislation to maintain a floor of not less than 100 percent of parity on all basic farm crops, to protect such floor prices with commodity loans of like amount and to prescribe such import duties, excise taxes, or quotas on competitive imports as may be needed to maintain these price levels and our national income and to equalize the differential between the dollar value of our production and that of foreign countries; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution properly authenticated be forwarded by the secretary of state to the Presiding Officer of each House of the National Congress and to each of the United States Senators and Representatives from North Dakota, and the Departments of Agriculture and Labor at Washington, D. C."

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Resolution 11

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress

"Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

"Whereas the 11th day of October 1779 is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

"Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union, through legislative enactment designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and

"Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated from October 11, 1929, to October 11, 1946, to be General Pulaski's Memorial Day in the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Arkansas:*

"SECTION 1. That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

"SEC. 2. That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, and each of the United States Senators and Representatives from Arkansas."

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Arkansas identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INFLATION—RESOLUTION OF NORTHERN BERKSHIRE MINISTERIAL ASSOCIATION OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the Northern Berkshire Ministerial Association of Massachusetts, concerning the problem of inflation, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD. The resolution is interesting, and I hope it will be read by Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTH ADAMS, MASS., *February 3, 1949*.

Mr. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
The Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SALTONSTALL: The Northern Berkshire Ministerial Association of Massachusetts, at its meeting on January 3, 1949, adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas we are deeply concerned about the evils resulting from the present-day period of inflation in the United States—the fact that millions of people suffer great hardships and are the victims of ever-deepening anxieties because of the disastrously high cost of living; and

"Whereas we are certain that excessive inflationary prices for all the basic necessities of life are a serious menace to our entire economic and political system and bring our United States free-enterprise ideals into jeopardy or disrepute: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we urge the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, the officers of the National Association of Manufacturers, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the American Federation of Labor, the United Mine Workers, and the press to cooperate in doing immediately whatever is possible to lower the cost of living for every person in the United States, believing that no greater service could be done for our entire Nation at this time of bewilderment and anxiety than to help the United States to a wiser and safer basis for our cost of living; and be it furthermore

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to President Harry S. Truman; to our National Congress; to the officers of the National Association of Manufacturers; to William Green, of the American Federation of Labor; to Philip Murray, of the Congress of Industrial Organizations; to John L. Lewis, of the United Mine Workers; and to the editor of the North Adams Transcript."

PHILIP L. FRICK,
VICTOR B. CHICOINE,
ELMER N. HALEY,
Members of the Committee.

WATER POWER DEVELOPMENT—RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, last week the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association met in New York, about 4,000 being present. The association adopted a resolution specifically endorsing the Missouri Valley Authority, the Columbia River Authority, and the St. Lawrence waterway project. I ask for its proper reference, and that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We support early, unified development of all of America's river basins for the fullest possible production of economic hydroelectric power consistent with other purposes.

We support the recommendations of the President and his Council of Economic Advisers, submitted to the Congress in the Economic Report and Review, for immediate action on the St. Lawrence, the Missouri, and the Columbia Rivers, construction of the TVA steam plant and other power facilities.

We are disturbed by reports that the Missouri Basin plans include less than half of feasible economic hydroelectric power, indicating that construction is proceeding without even a total survey of potentialities, or without a basin-wide plan for water operation and management in future years.

While supporting the specific projects calendared by the President and his advisers, we also urge prompt action on other basin developments which have been suggested throughout the Nation. A Nationwide power development program is necessary at once to meet present shortages and increasing demand.

NATIONAL PARKS AND MONUMENTS—RESOLUTION OF PORTLAND (OREG.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Portland, Oreg., Chamber of Commerce, relating to national parks and monuments.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the national parks and monuments constitute one of the great resources for public recreation and the study of natural history in the United States; and

Whereas the 174 areas of the national park system attracted last year 25,250,000 visitors; and

Whereas Crater Lake, Rainier, Olympic National Park nearby, and Yosemite, Lassen, Yellowstone and Glacier at a somewhat greater distance, have a special appeal to the people of Portland; and

Whereas of the $115,000,000 needed for physical improvement of the national parks, Congress has appropriated for such purpose only $1,652,350, of which $762,350 was earmarked for specific purposes, thus leaving for the physical improvement of all other national parks only $890,000; and

Whereas for maintenance of roads and trails in the national parks $3,600,000 was estimated, of which $3,100,000 was appropriated, but of which only $2,500,000 can be allotted for maintenance: Be it

Resolved, That the Portland Chamber of Commerce urge the congressional delegations of the Western States united effort in obtaining for the national parks such appropriations for maintenance, protection and improvement of existing buildings, highways and scenic trails as will make them more valuable to the tourists of the Nation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be furnished to each of the Senators and Representatives representing the Western States, and that copies be forwarded to Newton B. Drury, Director, and Frank A. Kittredge, Chief Engineer, of the National Park Service, Washington, D. C.

NATIONAL FOREST RECREATION AREAS—RESOLUTION OF PORTLAND (OREG.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the Portland (Oreg.) Chamber of Commerce, relating to the national forest recreation areas, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the four principal resources of the national forests are: (1) timber, (2) water, (3) recreation and (4) forage; and

Whereas no funds have been provided in the budget of the United States Forest Service by Congress specifically and regularly for recreational development; and

Whereas many of the campground facilities provided by CCC labor and others, have deteriorated to the point where they are no longer usable, nor even subject to repair because of lack of maintenance money; and

Whereas the National Forest Service is badly in need of men and money to care for existing facilities and to install the additional ones made necessary by tremendously increased public use; and

Whereas the business establishments whose livelihood is dependent upon recreationists' patronage and whose income and other taxes largely contribute to repaying such Federal expenditures: Be it

Resolved, That the Portland Chamber of Commerce urge the congressional delegations of the Western States united effort in obtaining recognition of recreation as a principal resource of the national forests and in making available sufficient funds to assure proper rehabilitation of existing camp and picnic facilities and to install the additional ones made necessary by the increased public use; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be furnished to each of the Senators and Representatives of the Western States and that copies be forwarded to Secretary of Agriculture Charles Brannan and Chief Forester Lyle Watts.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McGRATH, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 135. A bill to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District; without amendment (Rept. No. 40).

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. J. Res. 36. Joint resolution for the authorization of a special contribution by the United States to the United Nations for the relief of Palestine refugees; with amendments (Rept. No. 42).

INVESTIGATION OF PRICES OF AGRICULTURAL AND OTHER COMMODITIES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MAYBANK. From the Committee on Banking and Currency I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 31, to investigate prices of agricultural and other commodities, submitted by me on January 13, 1949, and I submit a report (No. 41) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and, under the rule, the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. MAYBANK. I now ask unanimous consent that following my remarks in the RECORD there appear clippings from various newspapers in connection with retail prices and the decline in agricultural prices throughout the Nation.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal of February 5, 1949]

PRICE TRENDS—COFFEE, CORN, SCRAP, AND STEERS—COMMODITIES—ARE MOVING DOWNWARD—FUTURES MARKETS HINT SLIDE MAY CONTINUE; FOODS ARE AMONG WEAKEST STAPLES—FUEL OIL, LUMBER, COAL OFF

Commodity markets sputtered warnings of further deflation this week.

From coffee to corn, from steel scrap to steers, prices dipped nervously. It was a continuation and quickening of a price trend noticeable all last month.

Basic foodstuffs have been among the pace setters in the downhill race. For instance, glance at what's happening to steak-on-the-hoof. A steer worth $30.50 a hundred pounds in Chicago barely a month ago was priced at only $24.50 a hundred yesterday.

Corn, the principal feed that makes meat, milk, butter, and eggs, sold in Chicago yesterday at $1.27 a bushel, the lowest in 2 years. A month ago corn was worth $1.50. A year ago it sold for $2.52.

At 42 cents a dozen in the big Chicago wholesale market yesterday, eggs were 7 cents a dozen cheaper than 4 weeks ago and nearly 20 cents cheaper than at the end of 1947.

FURTHER IN THE FUTURE?

Prices in the futures markets demonstrated an expectation of cheapening of the cost of supplying a dinner table. The Dow Jones Commodity Futures Index, which reflects prices commodity men think will prevail 5 months hence, closed the day yesterday at the lowest level since mid-1947. It has dipped steadily and steeply since early December.

But the price trend is far broader than the food field. Worth $43 a ton at Pittsburgh a month ago, heavy steel scrap is now quoted there at $39 a ton. In other cities it has dropped even more. Steel scrap is a basic raw material in making finished steel, which has been one of the last lingering scarcities in the Nation's economy.

In other metals—copper, lead, zinc, tin—official price quotations thus far hold firm. But, significantly, the premiums that were paid above official quotations not long ago have faded from the scene. And out of Waterbury, Conn., the Nation's brass-producing center, came the report this week that big brass makers had found their January new orders falling 20 percent below the December level. The brass industry is a major consumer of copper. On top of this, a labor tie-up of the vast Kennecott copper mines in Utah is apparently nearing its end. Its ore could be refined in about 90 days.

BUILDING MATERIALS

Sky-high building materials, which have kept many a would-be home owner from buying or building, are also weakening. Lumber, the bellwether, in the past 2 months has had its sharpest price spill since the war's end.

In lumber, as in most other materials of home and industry, the story is one of huge production catching up with or passing demand. Lumber mills poured out about 38,000,000,000 board feet of lumber last year, half again as much as was milled in prewar 1939.

While this lumber flood was rising, the number of new homes put under construction started slipping last June, and has been falling ever since. In the latter part of 1948 the mills found themselves producing more lumber than they were selling. Lumber that had sold in New York for $120 a thousand feet in late 1948 was down to $105 a thousand by late January.

Fuel prices, too, are joining the downward slide. Heavy production of bituminous coal, helped by a light winter in the East, is bearing down on the cost of that major food for furnaces. Some coal has changed hands recently at prices 20 to 25 percent below the level of a few months ago.

OIL GOES DOWN

And what's happening in coal is happening in fuel oil. With supplies burdensomely high, four successive cuts within the past 2 months lopped about 30 percent from the cost of heavy fuel oil in the big east coast consuming area.

[From the Wall Street Journal of February 5, 1949]

FOOD PRICES CONTINUE TO DECLINE FOLLOWING DIP IN FUTURES; NOURSE CALLS CROP PROSPECTS KEY TO TREND

WASHINGTON.—Food prices generally continued their slide yesterday following new sharp declines in commodity prices. But Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, believes there is nothing disturbing in the situation.

Dr. Nourse said the recent downward trend reflected last year's large crops rather than any basic trend. He added that whether prices start up again depends on prospects for this year's crops.

Long-range economic prophets reexamined their predictions, however, on the reports of new declines.

Statistics of the National Industrial Conference Board indicated that the downward inclination was sharp even in December. The board's consumer index showed food prices were off 1.2 percent in that month from December. The board's general index, which includes housing, clothing, fuel, house furnishings, and sundries in addition to food, dropped only 0.6 percent during December.

EGG, MEAT PRICES DOWN

Two big eastern grocery chains yesterday announced they were passing on to their customers immediately the fall in some commodity prices. One, Grand Union Stores, cut grade A white eggs from 65 cents to 63 cents, and grade A large brown eggs from 61 cents to 59 cents. This followed a 1-cent decline in the wholesale market. The reduction in retail price for both brown and white eggs totals 6 cents since February 1.

The New York City Markets Department reported retail meat prices in the city dropped 2 to 4 cents a pound in the past week.

Despite Dr. Nourse's reassurances, and an opinion by Agriculture Secretary Brannan that the sag was only an adjustment, some observers showed marked concern.

Charles W. Holman, secretary of the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, said the collapse in prices paid to Midwest dairy farmers is threatening future milk and meat production.

He asserted that milk prices have fallen far below production costs and that some farmers are selling their cows. "Dairy cow numbers are at the lowest point since 1940," he said, "and the decline last year was the sharpest in history.

"With our added losses in the recent western storms, this will be reflected in shortages and higher prices for milk and meat."

Mr. Holman held that lower dairy prices are unwarranted, and result from temporary surpluses. He said current prices of milk used in making dairy products have

fallen as low as $2.45 for 100 pounds, compared to over $4 in June last year.

MILK, BUTTERFAT PRICE SUPPORTS

In Washington, meanwhile, the Agriculture Department announced it was working on plans to support the price of milk and butterfat. Butterfat prices have slumped down near levels at which the Government is required to support them.

A Department official said an announcement may be made soon on the support program for butterfat at 90 percent of parity. He declined to say exactly what method would be used, but he indicated the most feasible way would be to buy butter itself at a price which would lend strength to butterfat.

Representative HOEVEN (Republican, Iowa) said there are disturbing signs of weakness in the farm-price picture, with the demand for meat down a half pound per person per month. He said individual consumption of bread, cereal products, and potatoes also is on the down grade. Mr. HOEVEN's conclusion was that consumers aren't willing to spend as much of their income for food as they did during war days.

CANADA LIVING COSTS HIGHER

OTTAWA.—The official cost of living jumped seven-tenths of a point during December, bouncing back to its high of 159.6, according to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

This increase erased exactly the seven-tenths of a point drop—the first in 23 months—which had taken place during November.

[From the Washington Evening Star of February 7, 1949]

EXPERTS STILL WORRIED ABOUT INFLATION DESPITE SHARP MARKET BREAK

Despite the sharp break in stock and commodity prices last week, some Washington officials say inflation rather than the threat of a depression still is the Nation's most immediate economic problem.

While losses of some stock shares were being extended as much as $3 in Saturday's trading, Secretary of Labor Tobin and Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, chorused that they were not alarmed. And Senator O'MAHONEY, Democrat, of Wyoming, said "the postwar boom has not ended," and that prices still are higher than they ought to be.

The Senate-House Joint Economic Committee, of which Senator O'MAHONEY is chairman, called a public round-table session to open tomorrow. It invited in both agriculture and economic experts to ascertain whether the break in prices and increasing unemployment presages a general depression or is nothing more than a postwar adjustment.

CONSUMER PRICES STILL HIGH

In addition to the sharp price breaks, January employment was reported to be off 700,000, but Senator O'MAHONEY said the 57,500,000 persons employed last month were more than were employed in the first 3 months of 1948.

"We still have a problem in inflationary pressure," he said, "because as long as the Government and people who are employed are buying things they want, the pressure is upward. Wholesale prices have not dropped halfway down to the level they occupied in 1947. Consumer prices haven't dropped nearly as far as wholesale prices."

Although the week ended with grain prices on the Chicago Board of Trade showing some rallying tendency, cash corn was at its lowest price since December 1945, and 35 cents under the Government support level. With steers and heifers at the lowest price since 1947, some corn belt farmers were reported losing money on their operations. Hogs were at the lowest price since October 1946, except the January 3 quotations.

PRICE BREAK FAIRLY GENERAL

The week's price break was fairly general all along the line at the wholesale level. It included cotton, fats, oils, eggs and butter, with corn and cotton suffering the sharpest setbacks.

Cotton lost as much as $1.30 a bale in Saturday's trading, while the losses of up to $3 in stock shares were in addition to the Friday drops which ranged up to $5.

But the Agriculture Department said some recovery in the prices of meat and meat animals was in prospect within the next month or two and CIO research experts called a conference this week to assemble data which might be the basis for demands for a fourth-round wage increase.

The recommendations by the experts will be considered by the 51-member CIO executive committee March 2. The CIO convention last November declared itself in support of a fourth-round wage increase.

[From the Wall Street Journal of February 5, 1949]

NEW SOAP PRICE CUTS

Two more top-soap manufacturers reduced wholesale prices yesterday on major household soap products.

Procter & Gamble Soap Co. and Lever Bros. followed Colgate-Palmolive-Peet Co. in announcing 6-percent reductions.

As a result two large grocery chains in the East trimmed price tags as much as 2 cents. Bohack & Co., operating in Brooklyn and Long Island, and Grand Union Co. with stores in New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Vermont, announced lower prices on soap flakes, powder, cakes, and synthetic detergents.

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation two lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. TYDINGS introduced Senate bill 857, to unify, consolidate, revise, and codify the Articles of War, the Articles for the Government of the Navy, and the disciplinary laws of the Coast Guard and to enact and establish a Uniform Code of Military Justice, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOEY:

S. 858. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sanford Pruitt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 859. A bill to authorize all Federal agencies to donate surplus property for educational purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 860. A bill to authorize Sacramento Valley Irrigation Canals, Central Valley project, California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; and

S. 861. A bill for the relief of Chen-Kya Hahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND (for himself and Mr. DOWNEY):

S. 862. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey certain lands to the city and county of San Francisco; and

S. 863. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey certain lands to the city and county of San Francisco; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HENDRICKSON (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

S. 864. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. 865. A bill to increase the rates of service-connected death compensation payable to, or on account of, the children of persons who served in the active military and naval service; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CAIN:

S. 866. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Y. Mueller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH:

S. 867. A bill for the relief of Theodore Papachristopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (by request):

S. 868. A bill to provide for the dissemination of technological, scientific, and engineering information to American business and industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 869. A bill for the relief of Leon Haim and his family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. AIKEN):

S. 870. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to provide assistance to States in developing and maintaining dental health programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 871. A bill to provide military status for women who served overseas with the Army of the United States during World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REVISION, ETC., OF ARTICLES OF WAR—UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to unify, consolidate, revise, and codify the Articles of War and the Articles of the Government of the Navy, and the disciplinary laws of the Coast Guard, and to reenact and to establish a uniform code of justice.

In connection with the introduction of the bill, I ask to have printed in the RECORD a release by Defense Secretary Forrestal, concerning the need for uniform military justice. The release is submitted by him for the consideration of the Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the release will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 857) to unify, consolidate, revise, and codify the Articles of War, the Articles for the Government of the Navy, and the disciplinary laws of the Coast Guard and to enact and establish a uniform code of military justice, introduced by Mr. TYDINGS, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

There being no objection, the release by Secretary Forrestal was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE

Secretary of Defense James Forrestal today submitted to Congress a proposed uniform code of military justice for the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Coast Guard.

The proposed code, based on a study by a special committee, would supersede the Articles of War, including the amendments effective February 1 which were made by the Selective Service Act of 1948, under which the Army and Air Force courts martial systems operate, and the Articles for Government of the Navy. It would be uniformly applicable to all the armed forces in time of war and peace.

Secretary Forrestal asked the committee, appointed last August, of which Prof. Edmund M. Morgan of the Harvard Law School is chairman, to prepare a code, uniform in substance and in interpretation and application, that would protect the rights of those subject to it and increase public confidence in military justice without impairing performance of military functions.

In providing for uniformity, the proposed code makes all punishable offenses identical for all the armed forces, sets up the same system of courts for each and the same procedures, including those for a Board of Review in each Department and a single Judicial Council which is the court of last resort for each of the forces.

This single Judicial Council, composed of civilians, would make final decisions on all questions of law and also act with the Judge Advocates General of the three Departments as an advisory body to secure uniformity in policy and in sentences and to correct any defects discovered in the system and its administration.

The courts provided for each Department are: (1) General, for capital and other serious offenses; (2) Special, for less serious offenses; (3) Summary, for minor offenses.

Chairman Morgan, in a summary of some of the more important provisions of the proposed code, points out those designed to provide for uniformity in administration, those designed to assure the accused a fair trial, those designed to prevent undue control or interference with the administration of justice, and those designed to preserve appropriate military functions.

Outstanding among the provisions in the proposed code are those made to give added legal protection to enlisted men and other accused persons and to prevent discriminations between enlisted persons and officers. These include certain limitations of command authority, provision for enlisted men to sit as members of general and special courts martial, the right of the accused to peremptory challenge of a member of a court martial and the right to be represented by defense counsel equally qualified with trial counsel.

While the commanding officer would appoint the court martial and it would make its findings under his command, appeals would be reviewed concerning law and fact in higher echelons not under his control. Voting on challenges, findings and sentence also would be by secret ballot of the members of the court martial.

A commanding officer is forbidden to censure a court martial, or any member or officer, because of any judicial action. Any attempt improperly to influence action by anyone in any aspect of a trial or its review is also forbidden.

Provisions concerning general courts martial require a pretrial investigation, which the accused may attend, with counsel, to present evidence and cross-examine witnesses. Trial is prohibited on any charge which does not state an offense or is not supported by sufficient evidence. It also is mandatory that the defendant be provided with competent, legally trained legal counsel and enlisted men have the privilege of having enlisted men as members of the court. A law officer, who is not a member of the court, with the duty to instruct the court on questions of law, is also provided.

A stenographic record of a general court martial must be made and review of the record for errors of law and of fact by a board of review is automatic, with the right of the accused to be represented by legally competent counsel on appeal. Review by the judicial council, for errors of law, is automatic where a death sentence or dismissal is involved and may be obtained by petition showing probable error of law where sentence imposes more than 1 year's confinement or a discharge.

In special courts martial it is not required that the defense counsel be a lawyer unless the prosecuting counsel is. Both must be equally qualified, however. Enlisted men may have enlisted men as members of the court. If a bad-conduct discharge is imposed, a full stenographic transcript must be made and the case reviewed in the same manner as a general court-martial record.

Peremptory challenge of a member of a special court martial is provided, as in a general court martial; also voting by secret ballot. Review by the judge advocate or legal officer is required.

Provision is made for permitting an accused person to refuse trial by a summary court (trial by a designated officer) if he prefers to be tried by a special court martial. He then would have the privilege of counsel and of having enlisted men on the court if he were an enlisted man. Review by a judge advocate or legal officer is required.

Among the provisions to prevent interference with due administration of justice are:

1. The convening authority may not refer charges for trial until they are found legally sufficient by the staff judge advocate or legal officer.

2. The staff judge advocate or legal officer is authorized to communicate directly with the Judge Advocate General.

3. All counsel at a general court martial trial are required to be lawyers and to be certified by the Judge Advocate General as qualified to perform their legal duties.

4. The law officer—a competent lawyer—rules on all questions raised at the trial, except on a motion for a directed verdict and on the issue of the accused's sanity.

5. The commander, who is the convening authority, must not act on a finding or sentence of a general court martial without first obtaining the advice of his staff judge advocate or legal officer.

6. The board of review, located in the office of the Judge Advocate General and removed from the convening authority, is composed of legally trained men and reviews the trial record for errors of law and of fact.

7. The judicial council is composed of civilians and passes finally on all questions of law.

8. When counsel appear before the board of review and the judicial council, both parties must be represented by qualified lawyers.

9. Censure by a commanding officer of a court martial or any member or officer thereof because of any judicial action of the court or any member or officer is forbidden and any attempt improperly to influence official action in any aspect of a trial or its review is prohibited.

Among command functions the proposed code would retain are:

1. Commanding officers refer the charges in general, special, and summary courts martial and convene the courts.

2. Commanding officers appoint the members of the courts.

3. Commanding officers appoint the law officer and counsel for the trial.

4. Commanding officers retain full power to set aside findings of guilty and to modify or change the sentence, but are not permitted to interfere with verdicts of not guilty nor to increase the severity of the sentence imposed.

5. The powers of commanding officers at mast and company punishment are retained for minor offenses which require prompt action and for which comparatively light punishments can be imposed. The procedural safeguards in this type of nonjudicial punishment are considerably less than in the courts martial but are believed to be reasonably adequate.

In addition to Chairman Morgan, the members of the Committee on a Uniform Code of Military Justice are Under Secretary of the Navy W. John Kenney, Assistant Secretary of the Army Gordon Gray, and Assistant Secretary of the Air Force Eugene M. Zuckert.

Felix E. Larkin, assistant general counsel, Office of the Secretary of Defense, acted as executive chairman of the committee and as chairman of a working group composed of representatives of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, with an unofficial observer representing the Coast Guard, which in time of war operates as part of the Navy.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—AMENDMENT RELATING TO SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM

Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, fiscal year 1950, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page —, lines —, strike out the words "To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of the National School Lunch Act (42 U. S. C. 1751–1760), there is hereby made available $——— of the funds appropriated for the current fiscal year 1950 by section 32 of the act approved August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612 (c)), such amount to be without regard to the 25 percent limitation contained in said section 32, and to be exclusive of funds expended in accordance with the last sentence of section 9 of the National School Lunch Act: *Provided*, That no part of such funds shall be used for nonfood assistance under section 5 of said act." And substitute therefor the words "To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of the National School-Lunch Act of June 4, 1946 (42 U. S. C. 1751–1760), $150,000,000.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 2361) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 22) suspending legislative budget until May 1, 1949, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

CONSOLIDATION OF GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILLS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and myself, I submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution providing for a single appropriation bill, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement by me of the concurrent resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 16) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the joint rule of the Senate and of the House of Representatives contained in section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) (1) Commencing with the second session of the Eighty-first Congress, all general appropriations for each fiscal year shall be consolidated in one general appropriation bill to be known as the Consolidated General Appropriation Act of —— (the blank to be filled in with the calendar year in which the fiscal year for which such appropriations are being made ends). As used in this paragraph the term 'general appropriations' shall not include deficiency or supplemental appropriations.

"(2) The consolidated general appropriation bill, and each deficiency or supplemental general appropriation bill, shall show in tabular form by items and totals (A) each item of appropriation, (B) the amount to be expended in the ensuing fiscal year from such appropriation, (C) the amount to be expended in the ensuing fiscal year from all other appropriations made in prior years for the same purpose as the item of appropriation referred to in clause (A) is made, (D) the total amount to be expended in the ensuing fiscal year from such appropriations, and (E) that part of the item of appropriation referred to in clause (A) which will be available for expenditure subsequent to the close of the ensuing fiscal year.

"(3) Amendments to any general appropriation bill which would have the effect of changing any figures required to be shown by paragraph 2 of this subsection, shall contain a provision changing such figures to conform to the proposed amendment.

"(4) No general appropriation bill and no amendment thereto shall be received or considered in either House unless it conforms with this rule."

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. BYRD was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Under present procedure neither Congress nor the American public has an opportunity intelligently to analyze fiscal legislation. If such an analysis could be made, I believe it would be a measurable deterrent to nonessential Federal expenditures. For this reason a joint resolution was introduced in the United States Senate today to provide for consideration of all regular appropriations in one bill each year.

Sponsors of the resolution were: Senators BYRD, BUTLER, BRIDGES, O'CONOR, KNOWLAND, and GILLETTE.

The Federal Government of the United States is the biggest financial operation on earth and nothing is as economically important to as many people as the fiscal situation of this country. Yet, we attempt to finance vast domestic and world programs through legislative processes in which it is impossible to know whether income and outgo are in balance until after the budget is enacted.

Most of the difficulty in comprehending budgetary action arises from confusing language and archaic procedure. In these days of huge multiyear programs and projects an appropriation may be available for expenditure in more than 1 year. Most of an appropriation adopted in a year when revenue is high may actually be spent in a year when revenue is low.

There may be vast difference between appropriations and expenditures in a given fiscal year. But spending legislation is always considered in terms of appropriations, while revenue must be comparable to expenditures—not appropriations. There is no readily available facility for either Congress or the public to translate current and previous appropriations into terms of annual expenditures either by items or by totals.

As Congress passes spending bills under present procedure it has no idea as to what the over-all total of either appropriations of expenditures will be. Under the system the President submits a budget message requesting appropriations and revenue, and after that the budget picture is never seen again as a whole until after it has become the law of the land.

Congress breaks down the appropriation side of the budget message into a dozen or more bills each dealing with a group of activities. Each bill is handled separately by a different subcommittee in each House of Congress. They are brought in one by one for passage over a period of 6 months. They are not accompanied by an expenditure estimate. There is no way of telling what total appropriations or expenditures are, and there is no way of comparing the effect of action on the bills with the revenue situation.

It is impossible to consider appropriation items by relative merits, importance, or cost in view of the whole fiscal situation. The bills are passed as separate and unrelated pieces. If the public knew what was in these money bills as they are considered I am confident its demand for elimination of at least the obvious nonessentials would be vigorous.

A long initial step toward this end would be accomplished by adoption of a single appropriation bill which would consolidate and total all appropriation items into one act and specify how much of each item could be obligated in the ensuing year. And such a bill would be accompanied by a report translating appropriations into expenditures. It would be considered as a whole and in full view of the revenue side of the budget.

This would be accomplished under the resolution introduced today which actually would require only a simple change in the rules of congressional procedure. The facts that the resolution would simplify procedure and facilitate proper consideration of fiscal legislation should justify adoption of the resolution. If it serves as a deterrent to nonessential items, that was never more urgently needed.

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANTS TO COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. KILGORE (for Mr. MCCARRAN) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 66), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized, until otherwise provided by law, to employ two additional professional staff members and three additional clerical assistants to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202 (e) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and the provisions of Public Law 4, Eightieth Congress, approved February 19, 1947.

CERTAIN HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. MAGNUSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 67), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, the report of such hearings and of making investigations, as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the Eighty-first Congress to make such expenditures and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $10,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SEC. 3. Upon the termination of the special committee, authorized pursuant to Senate Resolution 20, Eightieth Congress, to study problems of American small business and enterprises, those files and records of such committee relating to small business and enterprises falling within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as defined in part I, section 102 (j) Public Law 601; shall be transferred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ARREST AND TRIAL OF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 57) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate condemns as unjust the arrest, confinement incommunicado, and trial of His Eminence Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, Roman Catholic primate of Hungary.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CONNALLY. What is the status of this matter?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, unless some other disposition is made of it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does it not go to the committee?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It does not, except on motion or request. A resolution coming over from a previous day automatically comes before the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. Was this resolution considered yesterday at all?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution was submitted yesterday, and under the rule had to lie over for 1 day.

Mr. CONNALLY. Then it is simply before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is before the Senate. The question is whether the Senate will agree to it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] that Senate Resolution 57 be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BALDWIN subsequently said: Mr. President, as I understand the action just taken by the Senate, the resolution

submitted yesterday by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], calling for some action on the part of the Senate expressing its sentiment in the Mindszenty case, has been referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. BALDWIN. It seems to me Mr. President, that if the sentiment of the Senate is going to be of any use in this particular matter, we should have an opportunity to vote on it today on the floor of the Senate. I regret that when the subject came up on the floor of the Senate today, the Senator from New Hampshire was not here. I assume he did not anticipate it was going to be taken up so early.

I wish to explain that my vote was not a vote in opposition to the resolution, but I voted "no" against a reference of the resolution to the committee, because it seemed to me that if we in the Senate were going to take any action which would be in any way helpful in that case, by expressing the sentiment of this body as to the inhuman treatment the cardinal has received, today is the day we should take it. I regret very much that the resolution has been referred to the Foreign Relations Committee, so that we cannot have an opportunity to act on it today.

NOTICE OF HEARING BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations had planned to hear Mr. Paul Hoffman, the Administrator of the ECA, further this afternoon at 2 o'clock. On reconsidering the matter the committee determined that it would hold a hearing tomorrow at 10:30, in the caucus room in the Senate Office Building, and that it would be open to the public. I make this announcement for the information of the press and others who may be interested.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ANTHONY J. DIMOND TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, DIVISION NO. 3, DISTRICT OF ALASKA

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, February 15, 1949, at 11:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. Anthony J. Dimond, of Alaska, to be United States district judge, division No. 3, District of Alaska. Judge Dimond is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 10, 1948. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] chairman, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

THE TAFT-HARTLEY LAW—ADDRESS BY SENATOR DOUGLAS

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address in relation to the Taft-Hartley law, delivered by Senator DOUGLAS on February 7, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR KERR TO THE YOUNG DEMOCRATS OF NORTH CAROLINA

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator ROBERT S. KERR to the Young Democrats of North Carolina at their State meeting in Southern Pines, N. C., February 5, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHY THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT MUST BE REPEALED—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Why the Taft-Hartley Act Must be Repealed," delivered by him on Friday, February 4, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1948—STATEMENT BY E. H. AGNEW

[Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Mr. E. H. Agnew, president, South Carolina Farm Bureau, with respect to the Agricultural Act of 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MARSHALL PLAN—ARTICLES BY MORLEY CASSIDY

[Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a number of articles with respect to the operation of the Marshall plan, written by Morley Cassidy, and published in the Philadelphia Bulletin, which appear in the Appendix.]

REPUBLICAN SALESMANSHIP—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Hot Tip From CAPEHART," published in the Washington Times-Herald of January 28, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

NEED FOR PRODUCTION—QUESTIONS ON THE TAFT-HARTLEY LAW

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Arcadia (Wis.) News-Leader relative to the need for production, and questions by the National Small Businessmen's Association on the Taft-Hartley law, which appear in the Appendix.]

SHORTENING THE ODDS—EDITORIAL FROM THE PROGRESSIVE

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Shortening the Odds," relating to President Truman's program, published in the Progressive for February 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

JOSEF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY—EDITORIAL FROM THE BALTIMORE NEWS-POST

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial with respect to the case of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, published in the Baltimore News-Post of February 7, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

MORE HASTE, LESS SPEED—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to read three sentences from an editorial published in this morning's Washington Post, and then ask to have the full editorial inserted in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks. Is it appropriate for me to do so?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Strictly speaking it is not, but the Chair——

Mr. MORSE. I would not want to do it if in doing so I did not comply strictly with the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has sought to emphasize the fact that under the Senate rule no speeches of any length are in order at this time.

Mr. MORSE. I do not wish to make a speech. I simply want to read from material which I wish to place in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Reading extracts from the editorial would constitute debate.

Mr. MORSE. Then Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD an excellent editorial entitled "More Haste, Less Speed," published in this morning's Washington Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE HASTE, LESS SPEED

If the Senate Labor Committee holds to its announced schedule, hearings on the proposed substitute for the Taft-Hartley Act will close on Thursday. It is now unmistakably evident that the committee cannot in the next 3 days hear more than a small fraction of the witnesses demanding an opportunity to state their views. Nor will it have before it all the information it will need for the delicate task of rewriting the law controlling labor-management relations. A Senate committee cannot act on so momentous an issue with such haste without opening itself to the charge of substituting the rubber stamp for full inquiry and legislative deliberation.

This unreasonable haste will not work to the advantage of labor, the Administration or the committee. No organic labor-management legislation can work well or last long unless it wins general public support, and that will be forthcoming only if the public believes that the legislation has been shaped with deliberation and in a spirit of sensible compromise. The Administration ought to be aware of the fact that legislative tempers are already frayed because of this unreasonable haste. Thus the executive-legislative unity that is so essential to carrying out the President's program is in danger of being undermined for no good reason. Another week or 10 days of hearings would go a long way toward convincing both legislators and the people that the Administration is seeking legislation in the public interest and not merely to pay a political debt.

JOSEF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, from all over my State I have received letters and resolutions voicing the indignation of the people of Wisconsin of all faiths against the trial and sentencing of courageous Cardinal Mindszenty.

I have issued today a statement in protest against this shocking procedure.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point a gracious letter which I have received from Mr. J. Marlowe Boyle, of Milwaukee, regarding the trial, and that there be printed following Mr. Boyle's letter my statement supplementing my previous comments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 10.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGREGATION OF ST. ROSE,
Milwaukee, Wis., February 6, 1949.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Only a cause justly serious and far-reaching in its implications could induce us to add to your burden of legislative duties with a request for your official and personal favor.

Your intimate knowledge of the deeply religious nature and innate dignity of the people of Wisconsin will enable you to fully understand and appreciate the great consternation aroused in us by the wholly unjustified arrest and imprisonment, on fabricated charges, of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, primate of Hungary, by the Communist puppets who rule his nation through the voice of the Kremlin.

If the espousal of human rights and the dignity of man be crime; if the voice of a great spiritual leader raised in suppliance for the right of his people to worship their God be treason; then Cardinal Mindszenty is a criminal and a traitor, and is deserving of no outside help.

Since we know, however, that communism is in itself traitorous to the free individual and to his free democracy, then we must also conclude that his eminence is guilty only of being a churchman in a Communist controlled state.

It is on this basis, therefore, that we respectfully entreat your good offices for the purpose of lodging, through the Department of State and its official diplomatic channels to Budapest and Moscow, a vigorous protest against the most barbarous usurpation of human rights, epitomized in the arrest and imprisonment of Cardinal Mindszenty. It is our earnest hope that you will lend the influence of your office to the efforts to obtain the release of his eminence.

Respectfully yours,
ST. ROSE HOLY NAME SOCIETY,
J. MARLOWE BOYLE,
Catholic Action Chairman,
(On behalf of our 1,200 members.)

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY

RENEWED PROTEST AGAINST TRIAL OF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

The civilized world has been shocked and outraged by the fraudulent trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty. The faked confession, based quite clearly upon the drugging of the courageous primate, the phony justice, and all the other elements of the trial have violated the conscience of men of good will of all religious faiths throughout the world.

Every decent individual throughout the globe, whether or not he or she is of Catholic faith, can say, "There but for the grace of God stands my minister or rabbi or spiritual leader." Cardinal Mindszenty represents the forces of man's spirit, the moral force of enlightened humanity against the fanatic hords of atheistic Communists; against the antichrist which has arisen in the form of the Communist International.

The trial of Cardinal Mindszenty is a fraud, a farce, a fanatic demonstration of the depravity of the leaders of the Communist state and their satellites.

The American Government must redouble its efforts to register with the Hungarian authorities the absolute indignation of all of its citizens of every faith against this shocking and sinful proceeding. This trial mocks the pious statements of Premier Stalin regarding his desire to see President Truman and work out a peace settlement.

Cardinal Mindszenty stands before the Red fanatics as a symbol of the ideological war between our way of life and the Red way. The sentence which will be imposed upon him tomorrow will be one more bar against any basis for real understanding between ourselves and the Red authorities.

How can we possibly negotiate with these depraved men who utilize every means to destroy the light of freedom and the light of spirit? How can we possibly talk with them around the conference table when they stand ready to crucify man's spirit?

The American Government has always spoken out against the persecution of religion, as I stated in my remarks printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 10. It must do so again and right now.

The persecution of Cardinal Mindszenty and Lutheran Bishop Ordass must be protested by every means at the command of our Government.

We had coddled the Red governments abroad. We have dealt with them with kid gloves. We have pampered them so that they believe they can get away with anything, regardless of how venal it may be.

The persecution of church leaders in Hungary must be condemned by the American Government and by all the western governments in the most vigorous, direct, and forthright terms and in the most meaningful way if we are to be worthy of our obligations as the upholders of the light of civilization.

The persecution which stems from the Marxian doctrine that religion is the opiate of the people must be branded by our Government as one of the most shocking demonstrations of Marxist materialism that any human being has witnessed on the face of this planet.

DATE FOR REPORTING LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, yesterday the House passed Concurrent Resolution 22, postponing the date for reporting the legislative budget, as provided in section 138 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 as it may apply to the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, until May 1, 1949. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a House concurrent resolution, which will be read.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 22) was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the date of reporting the legislative budget, as set forth in section 138 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as it may apply to the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, is hereby postponed until May 1, 1949.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I object to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask that the concurrent resolution be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the concurrent resolution will be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. DONNELL asked and obtained leave to be excused from attendance on the Senate on February 10, 11, and 12, 1949.

Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to be absent from the Senate on February 10 and 11, 1949.

Mr. VANDENBERG asked and obtained leave to be absent from the Senate on February 10, 1949.

Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to be absent from the Senate on February 14, 1949.

Mr. LANDERS asked and obtained leave to be absent from the Senate on February 9, 10 and 11, 1949.

THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is concluded. Under the rule, the next order of business is the call of the calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hoey	Murray
Anderson	Holland	Myers
Baldwin	Humphrey	Neely
Brewster	Hunt	O'Conor
Bricker	Ives	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Broughton	Johnson, Tex.	Reed
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Byrd	Kefauver	Russell
Cain	Kem	Saltonstall
Capehart	Kerr	Schoeppel
Chapman	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Chavez	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Connally	Langer	Sparkman
Cordon	Lodge	Stennis
Donnell	Long	Taft
Douglas	Lucas	Taylor
Eastland	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Eaton	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	McFarland	Thye
Ferguson	McGrath	Tobey
Flanders	McKellar	Tydings
Frear	McMahon	Vandenberg
George	Magnuson	Watkins
Gillette	Malone	Wherry
Gurney	Martin	Wiley
Hayden	Maybank	Williams
Hendrickson	Miller	Withers
Hickenlooper	Morse	Young
Hill	Mundt	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The clerk will proceed with the call of the calendar.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 130) to provide for the demonstration of public library service in areas without such service or with inadequate library facilities, was announced as first in order.

Mr. TAFT. I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

LOSS OF OR DAMAGE TO PROPERTY DEPOSITED BY ALIEN ENEMIES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 29) to authorize payment of claims based on loss of or damage to property deposited by aliens, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 2, in line 2, after the figures "1707)", to insert "the possession of which property was not prohibited by law prior to said promulgations."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill? I should like to know how much money, if any, is involved in this commitment.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, we do not have an exact estimate of the amount, but the bill limits the amount which may be paid to any one person to $1,000. The idea is that the claims must come in under existing law, but that if such claims are in amounts of $1,000 or less, they can be settled without the enactment of special bills. Formerly that was prohibited by law.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment reported by the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 2, in line 5, after the word "ancestry", to strike out "with local police authorities."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, in line 13, after the word "prescribe", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided further*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the Attorney General to pay or settle any claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property which had been used for espionage or for other illegal purposes on or before December 7, 1941."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, in line 22, after the word "any", to insert "decision or."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is hereby authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, settle, and pay in an amount not in excess of $1,000, when accepted by the claimant in full satisfaction and final settlement, any claim against the United States arising on or after December 7, 1941, for damage to, or loss or destruction of, personal property, the use, operation, possession, custody, or control of which was prohibited by proclamation No. 2525, dated December 7, 1941, and proclamations No. 2526 and No. 2527, dated December 8, 1941 (55 Stat., pt. 2, pp. 1700, 1705, and 1707), the possession of which property was not prohibited by law prior to said promulgations and which was deposited by alien enemies or United States citizens of Japanese ancestry in the manner provided in the regulations promulgated by the Attorney General on February 5, 1942, as amended (7 Fed. Reg. 844; 28 C. F. R. 30.1–30.16): *Provided*, That the damage to or loss or destruction of property shall not have been caused in whole or in part by any negligence or wrongful act on the part of the claimant, his agent, or employee, and that the claim is substantiated in such manner as the Attorney General may by regulation prescribe: *Provided further*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the Attorney General to pay or settle any claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property which had been used for espionage or for other illegal purposes on or before December 7, 1941.

SEC. 2. No claim shall be considered unless presented in writing within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 3. Any decision or settlement made by the Attorney General under the authority of this act and such regulations as he may prescribe shall be final and conclusive, notwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary.

SEC. 4. The Attorney General may report such claims as exceed $1,000 to Congress for its consideration.

SEC. 5. Such appropriations as may be required for the settlement of claims under this act are hereby authorized.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN BASQUE ALIENS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 27) for the relief of certain Basque aliens, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 2, line 14, after the name "Salvador", to strike out "Vizcar" and insert "Viscay"; in the same line, to strike out "Recaide" and insert "Recalde"; and in line 22, after the word "quotas", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That if the Attorney General finds that Cipriano Aznarren Udi is otherwise entitled to the benefits of this act, he is authorized and directed to accord him such benefits, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, insofar as it relates to illiteracy", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Jose S. Algarra de Carlos, Domingo Asiain Hualde, Patricio Asiain Hualde, Cipriano Aznarren Udi, Gracian Azparren Gazcue, Pedro Aspiroz Echechuri, Anastasio Barbarena Elizegaray, Melchor Burusco Domench, Pedro C. Cemborain Garmendia, Angel Dufur Iturri, Bernardo Dufur Iturri, Primitivo Egozcue Seminario, Modesto Elgorriaga Exposito, Felipe Errea Huarte, Esteban Erro Inda, Ambrosio Esnoz Recalde, Lino Goicoa Arozerena, Alberto Ibarregui Iriberri, Pablo Inda Sagardoy, Felipe Itturri Castilla, Francisco Jorajuria Andiaarena, Joaquin Juanarena Dufur, Francisco Larrea Ibarrola, Manuel Lecumberri Barber, Silvestro Martinez Exposito, Serpio Mendiguia Lerumbe, Jose Moulian Mendia, Jose Narvarez Berendiain, Antonio B. Nuin Exposito, Jose Ochandorena Petricorena, Jose M. Ochandorena Petricorena, Primitivo Olondriz Echeverria, Mateo Pedroarena Barberena, Leandro Urrutia Villanueva, Pedro Valencia Llorente, Prisco Villanueva Montoya, Marcelino Villanueva Urrutia, Salvador Viscay Oroz, Demetrio Zubiri Uriz, Pedro M. Recalde Iribarren, Celestino Arozarena Elizagaray, Jose Betelu Zubiriaga, Dionisio Betelu Zubiriaga, Fermin Jorajuria Andiaarena, Tomas Iriarte Lerindegui, Miguel Redin Equiza, Miguel Inda Juandeaburre, and Jose Zubiri Coni, as of the respective dates of their lawful temporary entry into the United States in 1944, if they are found to be admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws other than those relating to quotas: *Provided*, That if the Attorney General finds that Cipriano Aznarren Udi is otherwise entitled to the benefits of this act, he is authorized and directed to accord him such benefits, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, insofar as it relates to illiteracy. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number for each alien named herein from the quota of the appropriate country of the first year that the said quota is available.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RICHARD KIM

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 90) to provide for the naturalization of Richard Kim, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws Richard Kim, who served as a member of the armed forces of the United States, shall be considered to have been lawfully admitted for permanent residence as of the date of his last entry into the United States, upon the payment of the visa fee of $10 and the head tax of $8. The Secretary of State is directed to instruct the proper quota-control office to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that said quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PREVENTION OF PURCHASE AND SALE OF PUBLIC OFFICE

The bill (S. 15) to amend the act entitled, "An act to prevent purchase and sale of public office," approved December 11, 1926, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KNOWLAND. May we have an explanation, please?

Mr. KILGORE. The bill is drawn at the request of the Civil Service Commission, to strengthen the law against attempts of persons, for fees, to procure appointment to any civil position in the United States Government. In other words, the endeavor is to prevent a person from being able to say, "For so much money I can get you an appointment as a clerk in the post office."

The bill would make it much easier to administer the law, and would fix the penalty.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of December 11, 1926, entitled "An act to prevent purchase and sale of public office" (44 Stat. 918), is amended by adding the following new paragraph to section 2:

"SEC. 2. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person, firm, or corporation to solicit or receive any sum of money or thing of value whatsoever in consideration of aiding or assisting any person to obtain any appointive office or employment under the Government of the United States, either by referring his name to any executive department, agency, or independent establishment of the United States for consideration, or otherwise, or to require the payment of a fee from any person because such person has secured any appointive office or employment under the Government of the United States."

JOSE BABACE

The bill (S. 26) for the relief of Jose Babace was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to cancel any deportation proceedings which might arise in the case of Jose Babace (Irigoyen), Minden, Nev., legally admitted, but who has remained in the United States longer than permitted by law and regulations, and that this alien shall be considered as having been admitted for permanent entry as of the date of his actual entry on the payment of the visa fee of $10 and the head tax of $8.

Upon enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Spanish quota for the first year that the said Spanish quota is available.

MILO JURISEVIC AND OTHERS

The bill (S. 32) for the relief of Milo Jurisevic, Mrs. Jelena Jurisevic, Svetozar Jurisevic, and Radmila Jurisevic was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of the immigration and naturalization laws, the aliens Milo Jurisevic; Mrs. Jelena Jurisevic, wife of the said Milo Jurisevic; Svetozar Jurisevic and Radmila Jurisevic, son and daughter, respectively, of the said Milo Jurisevic and the said Mrs. Jelena Jurisevic, all of Fresno, Calif., shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted, on October 23, 1946, to the United States for permanent residence.

LT. JOHN T. McDERMOTT

The bill (S. 279) to authorize the advance on the retired list of Lt. John T. McDermott, United States Navy (retired), to the grade of lieutenant commander was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, Lt. John T. McDermott, United States Navy (retired), shall be advanced to the grade of lieutenant commander on the retired list effective for all purposes from the date of his retirement.

PAYMENTS ERRONEOUSLY MADE TO RETIRED OFFICERS OF NAVAL RESERVE

The bill (S. 278) to prevent retroactive checkage of payments erroneously made to certain retired officers of the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the term "Reserve components" as used in section 6 of the act approved February 21, 1946 (60 Stat. 27; 34 U. S. C. 410b), shall include officers on the honorary retired list of the Naval Reserve or Marine Corps Reserve established by section 309 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended (34 U. S. C. 855h).

SEC. 2. This act shall be effective from February 21, 1946.

DR. CHUNG KWAI LUI

The bill (S. 315) for the relief of Dr. Chung Kwai Lui was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record Dr. Chung Kwai Lui as having entered the United States in 1936 for permanent residence, upon the payment by her of the visa fee and head tax.

SEC. 2. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any warrants of arrest or orders of deportation which may have been issued, and to discontinue any deportation proceedings which may have been commenced, in the case of Dr. Chung Kwai Lui. The Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Chinese quota for the first year that a quota number is available.

GHETEL POLLAK KAHAN AND OTHERS

The bill (S. 331) for the relief of Ghetel Pollak Kahan, Magdalena Linda Kahan (wife), and Susanna Kahan (daughter, 12 years old) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record Ghetel Pollak Kahan, Magdalena Linda Kahan (wife), and Susanna Kahan (daughter, 12 years old), as having entered the United States on August 21, 1945, for permanent residence. The said Ghetel Pollak Kahan, Magdalena Linda Kahan (wife), and Susanna Kahan (daughter, 12 years old), shall not be subject to deportation by reason of such entry.

CLARIS U. YEADON

The bill (S. 335) for the relief of Claris U. Yeadon was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration laws, relating to the issuance of immigration visas for admission to the United States for permanent residence and relating to admissions at ports of entry of aliens as immigrants for permanent residence in the United States, that provision of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 136 (c)), which excludes from admission into the United States persons who have been convicted of or admit having committed a felony or other crime or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude, shall not hereafter be held to apply to Claris U. Yeadon (nee Claris U. Davis), the wife of Cecil S. Yeadon, an American citizen. If she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, an immigration visa may be issued and admission granted to the said Claris U. Yeadon under this act upon application hereafter filed.

ENGEBERT AXER

The bill (S. 307) for the relief of Engebert Axer was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General of the United States shall record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Rev. Engebert Axer, Society of Jesus, as of September 26, 1937, the date on which he was originally admitted to the United States as a student.

JOYCE VIOLET ANGEL

The bill (S. 485) for the relief of Joyce Violet Angel, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of the immigration and naturalization laws, Joyce Violet Angel, a resident of Alexandria, Egypt, shall be deemed to be a native of Great Britain.

STAMPS COMMEMORATIVE OF THE THREE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF ANNAPOLIS, MD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 22) to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the three hundredth anniversary of Annapolis, Md., was announced as next in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to submit an observation in respect to this measure.

This is the first of the measures at this session ordering commemorative stamps. All of us are familiar with the fact that so many commemorative stamps for so many different purposes, and sometimes for highly doubtful ones, were ordered during the last session that the value of almost all commemorative stamps was diluted to a pathetic degree. Furthermore, the wholesale practice of ordering commemorative stamps resulted in very general condemnation throughout the country, not only among philatelists but also among those who are interested in preserving the value of the use of the postal service for commemorative ends.

Obviously, the objective of the joint resolution which is now before the Senate is a completely justified one; but it occurs to me that at the beginning of this session we should accommodate ourselves to some type of procedure by which to put under some sort of discipline the business of the issuance of commemorative stamps. My own hope has been that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service would hold back all measures providing for the issuance of commemorative stamps until well toward the end of the session, assess the relative value of the purposes sought to be commemorated, and then in one final bill present to the Senate a budget of commemorative stamps, held within a reasonable number, and confined to the major events sought to be commemorated.

I have no desire to interfere with the authorization of commemorative stamps in connection with the three hundredth anniversary of Annapolis. I may ask the Senator from Maryland whether there is any such urgency in this matter that it would interfere with his hopes and aspirations in this connection if the joint resolution were to go over until the whole subject might have some collaborated consideration?

Mr. O'CONOR. In answer to the inquiry of the Senator from Michigan, I may say there is such urgency. The celebration is scheduled for this spring, and arrangements for it have already been made by civic leaders and organizations, officials of the Naval Academy, St. Johns College, and of other individuals in and around Annapolis. The joint resolution was actually passed by the Senate last year, but, at the end of the session, it failed of passage in the House.

It is thought this is an exceptional case. Agreeing entirely with all that has been said in the general connection

by the distinguished Senator from Michigan, I can give assurance there have already been expressed in the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service sentiments which I am confident will result in a more coordinated program, although we do think this is an exceptional case.

Mr. VANDENBERG. My position in regard to making any exception is that one exception invites others. However, I hold to the statement of my friend from Maryland in connection with Annapolis, because this is so obviously justified, and I am not going to object. But I think I shall object to other bills providing for commemorative stamps, which may be brought forward one by one, and I should like to give such notice now. In fact, I think we should look to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without any order of the Senate, to create some sort of procedure which will bring the whole thing into one package at the end of the session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired. The Senate is now operating under the five-minute rule.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object I wish to make it plain that, as a matter of fact, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service cannot prevent the Post Office Department from issuing commemorative stamps. The Postmaster General has full discretion. Last year, after the committee turned down two proposals for stamps, the Postmaster General issued them any way. That is the law.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does the Senator not think, however, there is congressional responsibility at least for those we do approve, and that when we approve 20 or 30 commemorative stamps in 12 months, it simply reduces the whole process to a fantastic degree?

Mr. LANGER. I agreed fully. We cannot solve the problem here unless we change the law, because the Postmaster General can go ahead and issue such stamps anyway.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I suggest to the Senator we can at least by our own procedure reach a concentrated result at the end of the session with respect to the commemorative stamps we recommend, so that we at least recognize our responsibility.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I do not understand, or did not hear, the explanation made by the Senator from Maryland as to the urgency of this particular measure.

Mr. O'CONOR. I said there is urgency, in our opinion, because of the fact that the celebration is to be observed within the next month or two, and that, inasmuch as all plans have been perfected by the chamber of commerce and by civic organizations at Annapolis, the home of the Naval Academy and St. Johns College, for the commemoration of the three hundredth founding, it is important the joint resolution be passed at this time in order that completed arrangements may be made.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I observe that Calendar No. 21, Senate bill 492, likewise relates to the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two-hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va. I am wondering whether or not in that case the Senator knows, or if either Senator from Virgina may advise me, whether or not there is a similar emergency.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, Alexandria is in exactly the same category as Annapolis. It is about to celebrate the two hundredth anniversary of its founding in 1749. Preparations are now being made for it. Alexandria is one of the most historic cities in America, as the Senator knows. It was George Washington's home, Robert E. Lee lived there, and among other things, the city was once a part of the District of Columbia. Preparations are now being made for the celebration in 1949, within 60 or 90 days.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I merely want to concur in everything the senior Senator from Michigan has said with reference to the issuance of stamps, here, there, and everywhere. The committee discussed the subject when these two measures came before it. It was thought under the circumstances, because Annapolis was at one time the Capital of the United States, that on its three hundredth anniversary, when a big celebration is to take place, it would be well to issue the stamps.

In regard to the stamp commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, the senior Senator from Virginia has already expressed the reason why the committee favorably reported that bill. But I want to assure the Senate that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in the future intends to take such matters up with the Post Office Department and obtain clearance before reporting similar measures to the floor of the Senate. That I believe will expedite matters in regard to this subject.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should think, under the Senator's statement and under the statement of the able Senator from Virginia, that these are two perfectly legitimate objectives. I am not going to object to either one, on the basis of the assurance of the able Senator that the committee will undertake some sort of rationalization in connection with other requests of this nature for the remainder of the session.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. This is not merely the statement of the chairman of the committee. The committee discussed the subject when the two measures were before it. We assure the Senate something will be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 22) to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the three hundredth anniversary of Annapolis, Md., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to prepare for issuance in May 1949 a special series of 3-cent postage stamps, of such design as he shall prescribe, in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of Annapolis, Md.

MARCUS GEORGE VETERANS MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 372) to provide for the designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital in Americus, Ga., as the Marcus George Veterans Memorial Hospital.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I desire to say a few words regarding this bill. I think it is a magnificent thing for the Senate to pass it and provide that the United States veterans' hospital in Americus, Ga., shall be known as the Marcus George Veterans Memorial Hospital. It is well known that Lieutenant George died a heroic death in the North Atlantic while endeavoring to rescue other aviators who were imperiled. Senators are more or less familiar with the account of his exploits and of his failure to return from the flight he was ordered to make.

I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Committee on Finance be printed in full in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the report (No. 29) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (S. 372) to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Americus, Ga., as the Marcus George Veterans Memorial Hospital, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The official record of service of the late Lt. Joseph Marcus George, United States Naval Reserve, active, is as follows:

1911, November 16: Born in Vienna, Ga.

NATIONAL GUARD SERVICE

1935, January 21: Enlisted in Company L, One Hundred Twenty-first Infantry, Georgia National Guard. February 2: Promoted to rank of sergeant.

1936, June 15: Discharged.

ENLISTED UNITED STATES NAVAL RESERVE SERVICE

1938, July 13: Enlisted in United States Naval Reserve. October 10: Enlistment terminated.

OFFICER UNITED STATES NAVAL RESERVE SERVICE

1938, October 11: Accepted appointment and executed oath of office as aviation cadet, United States Naval Reserve, to rank from October 3, 1938. October 30: Reported to United States Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Fla.; for active duty undergoing training.

1939, September 18: Designated naval aviator (heavier-than-air). October 20: Accepted appointment and executed oath of office as ensign, A-V (N), United States Naval Reserve, to rank from October 15, 1939. Detached United States Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Fla., and transferred to Patrol Squadron 53 for active duty involving flying. Reported November 9, 1939. Further transferred to Patrol Squadron 83 for duty involving flying.

1942, January 23: Accepted appointment and executed oath of office as lieutenant (junior grade) A-V (N), United States Naval Reserve, for temporary service. June 27: Accepted appointment and executed oath of office as lieutenant A-V (N), United States Naval Reserve, to rank from June 15, 1942, for temporary service.

1943, February 7: Detached Patrol Squadron 83 and transferred to a bombing squadron for duty involving flying. Reported February 18, 1943.

Education: University of Georgia.

Medals: American Defense Service Medal, Fleet Clasp, Purple Heart.

Died: Presumptive August 8, 1944. Officially reported to be missing in action as of August 7, 1943, when the plane which he was aboard was lost in the Atlantic area. In compliance with section 5 of Public Law 490, as amended, death is presumed to have occurred on the 8th day of August 1944.

Place: Atlantic area.

Cause: Plane lost (enemy action).

According to the records on file Lieutenant George was listed on the records of the Navy Department in the status of missing in action as of August 7, 1943. He was on board a plane which took off from the naval air station, New York, on an antisubmarine patrol flight. Several minutes after the plane took off, it was instructed by its base to proceed to position 37° 35' north latitude and 71° 20' west longitude, in order to investigate that area and to stand by a plane which had landed to pick up survivors of another plane which had been shot down by an enemy submarine. The last message received was an acknowledgment of the receipt of the above message. Weather conditions in the area at the time included excellent visibility and a calm sea with light swells. Extensive but unsuccessful search operations were conducted. Reports received state that the reason for the failure of the plane to return is unknown but its loss is believed to have been the result of enemy submarine gunfire.

The committee is in accord with the purposes of the bill and recommends its enactment.

Mr. CONNALLY. Lieutenant George was a son of our colleague the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], chairman of the Committee on Finance. The United States, through the Congress, does a most appropriate and gallant thing in making this public recognition of our admiration for Lieutenant George's heroism, his patriotism, and his great achievements in his chosen work.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the proposed United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Americus, Ga., shall be known and designated on the public records as the Marcus George Veterans Memorial Hospital.

RECONVEYANCE OF LAND TO HELENA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

The bill (S. 460) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to the Helena Chamber of Commerce certain described parcels of land in the city of Helena, Mont., was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that, in my judgment, the bill is an exceedingly meritorious one in that it does not violate the general principle in regard to the disposal of Federal property, which I in times past have sought to protect. But because controversy will undoubtedly arise in the future in connection with other transfers of Federal property, I wish to make a few comments on the pending bill.

As the committee's report shows, it relates to a piece of property, valued at between $10,000 and $15,000, which was transferred to the Veterans' Administration by the Helena Chamber of Commerce for the specific purpose of erecting on the property a Veterans' Administration regional office. The transfer was for that purpose, and that purpose only, with the reservation, of course, in the conveyance that if the property were not used for that purpose, it would revert to the Helena Chamber of Commerce. The committee report shows that it has now been decided that the property will not be used for the purpose originally intended, because the Veterans' Administration has agreed upon a consolidation program which will make possible the use of an office building in another vicinity. Therefore, under the terms of the conveyance itself, the Federal Government is not entitled to the retention of the property, and consequently the bill is a meritorious one.

I make that statement because I want to lay down the distinction between this case and cases which, I surmise, may arise in the future as they have in the past. So far as the junior Senator from Oregon is concerned, he will not give unanimous consent to making gifts of Federal property to cities, counties, and local governmental units of States without just compensation paid to the American taxpayers who own the property.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, in addition to what the Senator from Oregon has stated, I desire to say that the Federal Government has incurred no expense in the improvement of this property. The transfer will be made without cost to the Federal Government.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 460) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to reconvey by quitclaim deed to the Helena Chamber of Commerce, a corporation, two parcels of land in Helena, Mont., commonly designated as lot numbered 10 and the south 55 feet of lot numbered 9 of the Henry Thompson placer mining claim in Lewis and Clark County, Mont., which parcels were conveyed to the United States of America by the Helena Chamber of Commerce by deed dated February 7, 1947, and recorded among the land records of said county, in Book 140 of Deeds at page 63.

STAMP COMMEMORATIVE OF THE TWO HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF FOUNDING OF ALEXANDRIA, VA.

The bill (S. 492) to amend the act approved June 29, 1948, entitled "An act to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va.," was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved June 29, 1948, entitled "An act to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va.," be amended to read as follows:

"That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to issue, during 1949, a special 6-cent air-mail postage stamp, of such design as he shall prescribe, in commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va."

REGULATION OF EXPORTS

The bill (S. 548) to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That bill is the unfinished business before the Senate, and will go over until later.

COTTON ACREAGE PLANTED IN 1949

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 128) to provide that acreage planted to cotton in 1949 shall not be used in computing cotton acreage allotments for any subsequent year, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, or of any other law, State, county, and farm acreage allotment for corn, wheat, cotton, and rice for any year after 1949 shall be computed and apportioned without regard to acreage planted, or to yields, in 1949.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It is a House bill, dealing with cotton. When the bill came to the Senate committee, it was decided to include wheat, corn, and rice. The amendment provides that the acreage planted this year to the production of cotton, wheat, corn, and rice shall not be used in future years in computing the acreage applicable to any farmer.

The purpose of the bill is to discourage production after this year, for the reason that we now have a surplus of some 6,000,000 bales of cotton. The record shows approximately 300,000,000 bushels of wheat at the end of the year, and we shall also have a large supply of corn and a reasonable supply of rice. Having these large supplies on hand, it was the recommendation of the Department that we should not consider the acreage planted this year in computations for allotments for production and marketing.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, do I correctly understand from what the Senator has said that it will tend to cut down the amount of subsidies which the Government may be expected to pay?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Obviously so. The reason for this proposed legislation, as I understand and believe, is this: Farmers, knowing they will have a high support price for this year's acreage, 90 percent, believe they can plant and raise a large crop and get a higher

support price. That is one reason. Another reason is that by an increase in their acreage they thought that perhaps they could increase their parity. So the bill is designed to curtail or eliminate those two points.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I should like to add to what the Senator from Oklahoma has said, that when a quota of acreage is established it is usually on a historic basis as to what the particular producer has had over the years. The great increase in wheat and cotton acreage naturally would distort the quota.

I think it is highly desirable that some control be had over the acreage. Excluding this increase in acreage of cotton, and, to some extent, applying it to other production, is a desirable thing.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Would not the necessary effect be to result in more planting of cotton this year, 1949?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The cotton season has not started yet. Some has been planted in the Southern States. The reason for offering the bill is to serve notice officially on all cotton planters that they cannot have considered their acreage for this year.

Mr. TAFT. I see. It is to have the opposite effect.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary be authorized to correct the title to conform to the body of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (S. 713) to amend Public Law 533 of the Eightieth Congress authorizing the construction of a building for the General Accounting Office on square 518 in the District of Columbia, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of Public Law 533, Eightieth Congress, approved May 18, 1948, limiting the cost of the General Accounting Office Building to $22,850,000 be, and the same are hereby, amended to increase such limit of cost to $25,400,000.

REPEAL SECTION 509 OF TITLE 34, UNITED STATES CODE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 77) to repeal section 509 of title 34 of the United States Code, approved June 30, 1876 (ch. 159, 19 Stat. 69).

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to repeal an act passed by Congress in 1876, which prohibited the Navy Department from employing any person within 60 days of an election, unless the Secretary of the Navy issued a certificate that the employment was necessary, and the certificate was published. That statute is entirely archaic now, in view of the civil-service system, and other laws.

The bill S. 77 was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 509 of title 34 of the United States Code, approved June 30, 1876 (ch. 159, 19 Stat. 69), is hereby repealed.

DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN PERSONAL PROPERTY

The bill (S. 629) to authorize the disposition of certain lost, abandoned, or unclaimed personal property coming into the possession of the Treasury Department, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force, respectively, are hereby authorized to dispose of by sale or otherwise, 1 year after date of receipt, all lost, abandoned, or unclaimed personal property which is now or may hereafter come into the possession, custody, or control of the Treasury Department, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force, as the case may be: *Provided*, That an effort shall be made to determine and locate the owner or owners thereof, or their legal representatives, and that in all cases where the owner thereof, or legal representative, has been determined the property shall not be sold or otherwise disposed of for a period of 90 days after written notice has been sent to his last known address.

SEC. 2. The net proceeds received from the sale of any such property by the Treasury Department, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 3. Claims for the net proceeds, if any, of such property so disposed of may be filed with the General Accounting Office by the rightful owners or their legal representatives at any time prior to the expiration of 3 years from the date of the disposal of the property and, if not so filed, are barred from being acted on by either courts or the accounting officers.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force, respectively, are authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes and provisions of this act.

SEC. 5. Any property coming within the provisions of this act which may be delivered to the Soldiers' Home under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Air Force shall be limited to papers of value, sabers, insignia, decorations, medals, watches, trinkets, manuscripts, or other articles valuable chiefly as keepsakes.

SEC. 6. This act shall not be construed as amending or repealing the act of March 29, 1918 (40 Stat. 499); article 112 of section 1, chapter 11, of the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 809); the act of February 21, 1931 (46 Stat. 1263); the act of December 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 662), as amended; or the act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 846-847), as amended.

AGE LIMIT FOR APPOINTMENT IN SUPPLY CORPS

The bill (S. 630) to amend section 19 of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), so as to remove the upper age limit for appointment to commissioned grade in the Supply Corps of the Navy, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That section 19 of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"SEC 19. No person shall be appointed to a commissioned grade in the Supply Corps of the Navy who will be less than 21 years of age on July 1 of the calendar year in which appointed and until his physical, mental, and moral qualifications have been established to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Navy."

AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT CERTAIN GIFTS

The bill (S. 662) to authorize certain personnel and former personnel of the Naval Establishment to accept certain gifts and a foreign decoration tendered by foreign governments, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following-named members and former members of the naval service are hereby authorized to accept such gifts as have been tendered them by foreign governments as of the date of approval of this Act: Rear Admiral Harold M. Martin, United States Navy; Captain William R. Brust, United States Naval Reserve; Captain Bennett W. Wright, United States Navy; Captain George C. Wright, United States Navy; Captain Richard W. Ruble, United States Navy; Commander Robert F. Carmody, United States Navy; Commander James I. Cone, United States Navy; Commander Jack Dean, United States Navy; Commander Gordon Fowler, United States Navy; Commander Richard L. Fowler, United States Navy; Commander John E. Hausman, United States Navy; Commander Draper L. Kauffman, United States Navy; Commander James A. Knowlton, United States Naval Reserve; Commander John P. Lunger, United States Navy; Commander Robert M. Milner, United States Navy; Commander Frank G. Raysbrock, United States Navy; Commander Frederick M. Stiesberg, United States Navy; Commander William A. Stuart, United States Navy; Commander Richard S. Rogers, United States Navy; Commander George R. Lee, United States Navy; Lieutenant Commander Raymond A. Boyd, United States Navy; Lieutenant Commander Laurence B. Green, United States Navy; Lieutenant Commander Melvin C. Hoffman, United States Navy; Lieutenant Commander Victor A. Moitoret, United States Navy; Lieutenant Commander John C. O'Conner, United States Navy; Lieutenant Commander Henry Nelson, United States Naval Reserve; Lieutenant Commander Norman L. Paxton, United States Navy; Lieutenant Commander Bryon G. Shepple, United States Navy; Captain James J. Bett, United States Marine Corps; Lieutenant Irwin J. Vanderswag, United States Marine Corps; Lieutenant George H. Belk, United States Navy; Lieutenant Samuel Hopkins, Junior, United States Navy; Lieutenant Jack Scott, United States Navy; Lieutenant (junior grade) La Verne W. Brown, Junior, United States Navy; Lieutenant (junior grade) Leonard B. Di Napoli, United States Navy; Lieutenant (junior grade) Thomas L. Neilson, United States Navy; Lieutenant (junior grade) Horace A. Thomsen, United States Navy; Ensign Robert P. Armstrong, United States Navy; Chief Boatswain Anthony S. Ciccone, United States Navy; Boatswain Earl L. Hause, United States Navy; Joseph G. Pardovich, chief boatswain's mate, United States Navy; Robert D. Clendenon, chief musician, United States Navy; Carl F. Heine, chief machinist's mate, United States Navy; Gilbert H. Dobler, chief photographer's mate, United States Navy; Myrl A. Yeaman, chief photographer's mate, United States Navy; Crisanto Dolor, chief cook, United States Navy; Master Sergeant Lionel E. Simmons, United States Marine Corps; Willie F. Maguire, chief signalman, United States Navy; Donald K. Lobdell, chief radioman, United States Navy; Gorman "T" Perry, motor machinist's mate, first class, United States Navy; Jack O. Montgomery, boatswain's mate, second class, United States Navy; Charles R. Dickinson, boatswain's mate, third class, United States Navy; Lawrence H. Wasser, musician, third class, United States Navy; Gordon C. Wyman, fire controlman, third class, United States Navy; Robert Charles Vail, shipfitter, third class, United States Navy; Delmere B. Blackburn, private first class, United States Marine Corps; Paul Hermann, seaman, first class, United States Navy; James E. McCall, seaman, first class, United States Navy; Charles H. Kilpatrick, seaman, first class, United States Navy; Clifford E. Kintner, seaman, first class, United States Navy; Bernard I. Landau, seaman, first class, United States Navy; Harold A. Masters, seaman, first class, United States Navy; Kenneth Karl Hrabal, seaman, first class, United States Navy; Nicholas Vignovich, seaman, first class, United States Naval Reserve; Leonard Stanley Tur, fireman, first class, United States Naval Reserve; L. R. Weedle, fireman, first class, United States Navy; R. N. Young, fireman, first class, United States Navy; and Michael Strusinski, coxswain, United States Naval Reserve.

SEC. 2. The following-named members of the naval service are hereby authorized to accept such awards as have been tendered them by foreign governments as of the date of the approval of the Act: Rear Admiral Edward W. Hansen, United States Navy; Captain Albert E. Fitzwilliam, United States Navy; and Lieutenant (junior grade) John E. Nichols, United States Navy.

SEC. 3. Dr. Mina S. Rees, a civilian employee of the Navy Department, is hereby authorized to accept and wear the King's Medal for Service in the Cause of Freedom which has been tendered her by the Government of Great Britain.

PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF OFFICERS OF THE NAVAL RESERVE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 673) relating to the pay and allowances of officers of the Naval Reserve performing active duty in the grade of rear admiral, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wonder if we may have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this bill is reported by the committee in an effort to eliminate any injustice done certain Reserve officers of the Navy.

Rear admirals of the Navy for pay purposes are divided into the upper half and lower half. Those in the lower half numerically draw the same pay and allowances as a brigadier general of the Army while those in the upper half that of a major general.

Under a ruling of the Comptroller based on the wording of several laws, certain Reserve rear admirals on active duty cannot draw the pay of the upper half regardless of relative rank and length of service. This bill provides that a Reserve rear admiral on active duty will be entitled to upper-half pay when the Regular Navy rear admiral next junior to him draws upper-half pay. The immediate effect of this bill is that one Reserve rear admiral now on active duty will draw upper-half pay instead of lower-half. This difference in pay amounts to approximately $2,200 a year.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I shall not object. My purpose for asking an explanation was that during the war we found existing a situation in which Reserve officers would be commissioned as rear admirals, and it was never intended that Reserve officers, prior to the passage of the so-called Reserve Act, would be in the upper brackets, which were for men who had devoted their lives to the Navy and who were presumably more expert. We found men coming in from civilian life who would finally be rear admirals, and then they wanted to be in the upper brackets. Now that the component of the Navy is so large and we must rely on a great many Reserve officers who will probably make a career of the Navy to a much greater extent than heretofore, I suppose it is all right to allow them to get into the upper brackets.

Mr. RUSSELL. The bill involves only one, but I see no reason for discriminating against a reserve officer who is on active duty and serves for a long time, to the extent that he cannot under any circumstances get into the upper half. As it is now, the regular officers, the Annapolis graduates, who are rear admirals, can pass over the reserve officer and get into the upper half, and as it is now the reserve officer cannot under any circumstances get into the upper half and attain the rank of rear admiral. The bill applies to only one man, who is a specialist, and the Navy Department is very anxious to have it passed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the Reserve officers remain in the Navy long enough to become rear admirals, they should be a part of the Regular Navy.

Mr. RUSSELL. The man affected by the bill is a specialist, and, as I have said, the Navy Department is anxious that the bill should be passed. But I may say that for my part I have never been in favor of discriminating against a man because he is a Reserve officer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any officer of the Naval Reserve serving in the grade of rear admiral shall receive the pay and allowances prescribed by law for rear admirals of the upper half when any officer of the active list of the line of the Regular Navy, junior to him, is in the upper half of the list of rear admirals: *Provided*, That the provisions of this act shall not apply to officers of the Naval Reserve while on any lineal list established pursuant to title III of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947: *Provided further*, That no back pay or allowances shall be held to have accrued under the provisions of this act for any period prior to the date of its approval.

UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN COMPACT

The bill (S. 700) to grant the consent of the United States to the upper Colorado River Basin compact was announced as next in order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over. My colleague, the senior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], is out of the city on official business, and his office has requested that the bill go over. We certainly have no objection to early consideration of the proposed legislation, but we merely desire to be sure that there is nothing in the bill that will adversely affect the lower-basin waters.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I merely wish to state for the RECORD that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs instructed its staff yesterday to advise the office of the senior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] of the fact that the bill had been reported, so that if he desired to have it held up, he would be on notice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under objection, the bill will be passed over. That completes the calendar.

REGULATION OF EXPORTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 548) to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the Committee on Banking and Currency has considered S. 548, has unanimously reported the bill, as amended, and has recommended that the bill do pass.

Exports of commodities from this country have been controlled by law since the power was first requested by President Roosevelt in 1940. From that time to the present this authority has been renewed periodically by the Congress. However, the nature, scope, and purposes of the controls exercised under it have been modified to meet the changing needs of the national interest.

In 1940 export controls were being used to strengthen the national defense. During the war they were used to prevent supplies from getting to our enemies and to direct goods to our fighting allies, while at the same time protecting our own scarce supplies.

Since the end of the war they have been used and at the present time they are being used, first, to cushion the domestic economy from the inflationary effects of abnormal foreign demand for some of our supplies which are still short; second, to direct such goods as we can spare to those countries where need is greatest and where world recovery will be speeded up; and finally, to check exports of industrial commodities which might affect our national security.

In other words, these controls are necessary now, and are being used, to protect the domestic economy by limiting exports of scarce materials, and to channel exports to countries where the need is greatest, and where our foreign policy and national security interests would be served best.

President Truman, in his State of the Union Message, emphasized the need for continuation of these controls, and asked for renewal of the present legislation, together with provisions for more adequate enforcement, which have been

included in the pending bill. The testimony of the Secretary of Commerce, the Under Secretary of Agriculture, and other Government witnesses, as well as witnesses invited from the trade, who appeared before the Subcommittee on Small Business of the Banking and Currency Committee, was very convincing as to the need for maintaining export controls throughout this period of unsettled world affairs.

As pointed out in the committee report, a number of witnesses urged a shorter extension, of only 16 months, not because they questioned the need for the longer extension, but only in order to provide for an annual review by the Congress. Such a review is not precluded in S. 548. On the contrary, specific provision is made for quarterly reports to the Congress of operations thereunder, and for termination of the controls at any time by simple concurrent resolution. The evidence at this time is fairly clear as to the need for these controls for at least two years to come.

In this connection, it should also be observed that the Investigations Subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments which had made an exhaustive survey of the program during the last Congress, stated in its report of December 18, 1948:

> The failure to maintain adequate export controls at this time can have extremely harmful effects upon our national security and domestic economy. The national security aspects of our export control program are of transcendent importance. * * * The economic phases of the export control program are also important.

Generally speaking, S. 548 makes no substantive changes from the present law. The legal authority is continued for the control of commodities, the licensing of specific exports, and the exercise of destination, end-use, price and other pertinent licensing standards and criteria to carry out the purposes of the bill.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question, or would he rather that I wait until he concludes his remarks?

Mr. MAYBANK. I have no objection to yielding.

Mr. BALDWIN. I notice in the committee report that the controls which the Senate is being asked to extend by the pending legislation, are substantially the same controls and continued in the same language by which they were continued in section 3 of the joint resolution of December 30, 1947. Was not that the so-called Anti-inflation Act which was passed in the fall of that year? And was not that section 3 of that act?

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct. That was after certain items had been controlled. It was during the administration of President Roosevelt, in 1940, that these controls were begun. The controls became greater and greater during the war. In the year to which the Senator referred some decontrols were put into effect. They were considered at that time by the Committee on the Judiciary, by the Commerce Committee, and by other committees. The controls then dealt substantially with materials which were scarce at that time, and which apparently are scarce now.

Mr. BALDWIN. In other words, this is a continuation of section 3 of the act setting up anti-inflation measures adopted in a Republican-controlled Congress in December 1947. The other day we continued in force and effect section 2 of that act. Now we continue section 3.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BALDWIN. So, what we are asked to do now is to continue in force and effect a section 3 in substantially the same form as it was passed in a Republican-controlled Congress?

Mr. MAYBANK. After control had, of course, been commenced by President Roosevelt in 1940; yes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. What is the justification for extending this control for 2 years and 3 months? Why is not 1 year enough? Why cannot we reasonably hope that a year from this time there will no longer be need for export control.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am very hopeful that it will not take a year. That is why we have the provision in the bill that the control can be ended by the adoption of a concurrent resolution at any time.

The principal additions to the present law are the provisions which are designed to improve enforcement of export controls. These are contained particularly in sections 3 and 6. The report of the investigations subcommittee, previously mentioned, pointed out the necessity for such a stronger compliance program. The President emphasized the need for strong enforcement measures, and the Secretary of Commerce has made a similar recommendation. In order to give effect to these recommendations, which are discussed more at length in the committee's report, specific authority is provided in this bill for undertaking all necessary enforcement measures.

The determination of what commodities shall be decontrolled and the fixing of export quotas have been delegated by the President to the Secretary of Commerce, but the decisions on such matters are made only after an extensive review by an interagency committee on which all interested departments are represented.

The committee felt that the Secretary of Agriculture should, because of his general responsibilities in the field of food and agriculture, be given final responsibility for determining the total amount of agricultural commodities, including fats and oils, which are in excess of our own needs and which could, accordingly, be authorized for export.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. As a matter of fact, I understand that the European prices for fats and vegetable oils are higher than those in the United States.

Mr. MAYBANK. The statement is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. We have a surplus of such fats and oils in the United States, and yet permission is not granted to export the surplus to Europe.

Mr. MAYBANK. I will say to the Senator from Texas that we have prepared an amendment, the purpose of which is to leave that matter entirely to the Secretary of Agriculture. I may say that the President himself spoke to the chairman of the House committee, Mr. SPENCE, and also to Representative BROWN, of Georgia. The Secretary spoke to me, authorizing me to say that he would not object to having the matter turned over to the Department of Agriculture.

I am glad the Senator from Texas is present on the floor of the Senate at this moment. I wish to say to him that I think the fats and oils situation, as the testimony will show, has in the past been handled miserably. We undertook a full investigation of that subject. I wish to call to the attention of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], who asked about similar language, that the law which permits the Secretary of Commerce to have a veto with respect to export of agricultural products is, to my way of thinking, all wrong. The price of cottonseed has gone down. The price of lard has gone down. As every western Senator knows, the price of soybeans has gone down. The latest figures we have received, since the hearings were closed, show that the price of soybeans is still declining. To illustrate, let me for a moment compare the prices of soybean oil and cottonseed oil at the beginning and end of last year. The price of soybean oil, for instance, in January 1948 was 26.6 cents. The price in December 1948 was 17.3 cents. The price of cottonseed oil in January 1948 was 28 cents as compared with 17.08 cents in December 1948. Last Thursday's quotation on cottonseed oil, crude in the valley, was 13.75.

I want the Senator from Texas, who has a wide knowledge of cotton and of agriculture, to help us, if he can, so far as ECA is concerned. The ECA has not bought sufficient cottonseed oil, nor has the ECA bought sufficient soybeans, nor has the ECA bought the inedible fats and the edible fats which are selling for almost nothing in this country, and which could be used, particularly in the region where General Clay has jurisdiction, as the testimony shows. The Senator is correct in his statement. This matter has been poorly handled. I hope it will be handled better under the Secretary of Agriculture. I hope the ECA will take an interest in the program. The farmers of the country are in dire need of such help.

Mr. CONNALLY. Has the Senator from South Carolina any assurance that if control of the matter should be placed under the Department of Agriculture it will be handled better than it is now?

Mr. MAYBANK. No; but that is the only suggestion that was made.

Mr. CONNALLY. The authority ought to be trimmed down quite materially before it is placed anywhere.

Mr. MAYBANK. We trimmed it down.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say a word respecting ECA. My information is that vegetable oils are selling in Europe for higher prices than they are selling for in the United States.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator, I believe, is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. So we could very easily help the objectives of the ECA by shipping more vegetable fats to Europe, and bringing down the price in Europe, rather than spending our money by paying the higher prices here at home.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is eminently correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. I certainly hope the committee will do something to relieve the situation. The present policy seems to me to be foolish. It benefits no one.

Mr. MAYBANK. I may say to the Senator that inedible fats have already been decontrolled.

Mr. CONNALLY. Not entirely.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. An allocation was made the other day for the first quarter of the year.

Mr. MAYBANK. No; inedible fats have been decontrolled.

Mr. CONNALLY. How about edible fats? Inedible fats cannot be eaten. If we are going to relieve Europe, we ought to give its people something they can eat. There is no use attempting to relieve them by giving them inedible fats, and leaving the edible fats under control.

Mr. MAYBANK. With respect to edible fats, additional allocations amounting to 35,000,000 pounds each of lard, cottonseed and soy beans, were issued last week. The Department is now considering the subject. I feel that as soon as authority is vested in the Department of Agriculture—it is vested in the Department of Commerce now——

Mr. CONNALLY. I understand.

Mr. MAYBANK. As soon as it is vested in the Department of Agriculture, I hope the Department will decontrol them.

The question is whether ECA could not render a great service by providing Europe with more inedible as well as edible fats, because, as the Senator says, ECA is paying higher prices for European fats than our farmers are receiving for theirs. Not only that, Mr. President, but the same situation is true with respect to Canada and South America.

Mr. CONNALLY. Speaking of edible fats, wholesome food needed by the people of Europe and by the people of all the world, we have now more of them than we need in the United States, and those in control of the exportation of such fats have placed a fence around them and will not permit them to be exported. The difficulty about vesting the authority in any of the Federal departments is that the Secretary himself cannot personally examine every application. The Secretary of Commerce receives 10,000 applications a week.

Mr. MAYBANK. Certainly.

Mr. CONNALLY. Some clerk in the Department smells around and secures reports. He knows nothing about inedible fats; he knows nothing about cottonseed oil; he knows nothing about soybean oil. He simply makes some sort of a calculation and fixes the quota that shall be allowed to go abroad.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am in thorough accord with the Senator. That is the reason why we talked with the President and were assured that the responsibility for the determination of export quotas, exportable surpluses of agricultural commodities would be turned over to the Department of Agriculture. That is the reason for the amendment. I intend to follow it up to the limit of my ability as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, and I feel certain that my good friend, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, will help us out with ECA.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will help the Senator and his committee if they will do their part. It is proposed to turn the administration of this subject over to the Department of Agriculture. If that is done, I hope that the Secretary of Agriculture will be fully informed as to what has transpired.

Mr. MAYBANK. I talked with him only this morning.

Mr. CONNALLY. That will do no good unless the Senator talks with him tonight and tomorrow and the following night, and the next day and the next night.

Mr. MAYBANK. At least, he will be responsible.

Mr. CONNALLY. What does that amount to? The Secretary of Commerce is now responsible, but what does it amount to? All it amounts to is that we rise in the Senate and make little speeches, and that is the end of it.

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not agree with the Senator in that respect. We listened to more than a week of testimony. I feel that agricultural products do not belong under the Department of Commerce, and have no place there.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think it would be helpful to the discussion to point out to the senior Senator from Texas that we were informed that the allocations of edible fats and oils are not being taken up at the present time. The export licenses are not consuming all the allocations available. So it would make little difference if the controls were removed.

Mr. MAYBANK. The trouble is the great shortage of dollars outside this country.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. It will not do any harm if they cannot buy the goods and pay for them. No one will be hurt. But if the products are dammed up and cannot be exported, our own producers are hurt.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator was eminently correct as the situation existed last fall. What went on was outrageous. But since the present Congress has been in session both inedible and edible fats and oils have been available. Since we held the hearings quotas have been increased to the point where we are informed that they cannot all be taken up.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I merely wish to confirm what the distinguished chairman of the committee has said about the zeal with which we went into the subject. On the Committee on Banking and Currency there are members who are not bankers. Some of them come nearer to being farmers than bankers. We are very much interested in what affects the farmer. We went into the subject very fully. We feel that we have amended the language of the bill so as to protect the situation. We have the assurance of the President, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Commerce that the intent and purpose of this amendment will be carried out.

I wish further to say to my distinguished colleague from Texas that we shall make it our business to keep in touch with this problem, to see that there are no unnecessary restrictions, red tape, or delays which will result in banking up unconsumable surpluses of edible and inedible fats and oils in this country.

On the first of March a new allocation quota will go into effect. The authorities are now at work liberalizing the quota with a view to moving all the accumulated surpluses for which there are proper markets. I feel that no Member of the Senate need have any uneasiness about the steps we have taken and plan to take to protect the producer, the processor, and the distributor of fats and oils in this country.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. Does the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency feel that the main reason for keeping allocations and export licenses is to control the destination of edible fats and oils, and to keep them from going to certain countries? As I understand, that is the only reason for keeping controls at this time.

Mr. MAYBANK. I will say to the Senator from Idaho that I understood that some of the controls are designed to keep certain products from going to certain countries. However, I do not believe that was the chief reason for keeping fats and oils under control. I have heard that the only reason why edible fats were selling at such high prices in Europe was that they were being held back here. Why should our farmers be punished and have their goods stocked up in this country when there is a shortage in Europe, and fats and oils are bringing such high prices? As the Senator knows, inedible fats go largely into soaps and products of that kind.

Mr. TAYLOR. But that is not true of edible fats. If the purpose is not to control the destination, then I am at a loss to see any reason for retaining controls.

Mr. MAYBANK. In my opinion there should be no controls on edible fats and oils. As the Senator knows, during our hearings, the allotments on lard, cottonseed oil, and soybean oil were increased by 35,000,000 tons a quarter. The Senator also knows that because of the facts which we brought out with respect to inedible fats, the price of soap was reduced a few cents by the soap manufacturers of the country who have been stocking up on much of the inedible fats at sacrifice prices.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to make a brief statement. Export controls certainly do not promote trade and commerce, so far as the sale of our own products is concerned. Red tape and delay certainly militate against the rapid and orderly carrying on of trade and commerce. These controls have been extended for a period of more than 2 years, and they seem to me to be wholly unnecessary. It is not the policy of the United States to use export controls except under certain emergency situations.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is what the law provides.

Mr. GEORGE. The general policy of the United States is to do away with export controls, tariff restrictions, exchange restrictions, and all other restrictive measures which impede commerce. There is no doubt that any exporter in this country must go through certain red tape procedure in order to obtain a permit. All such restrictions operate against the rapid passing into trade of our own products. Here the emphasis is placed upon oil, and that is important.

Mr. MAYBANK. It was emphasized only because the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] had asked specifically about oils.

Mr. GEORGE. The amendment itself emphasizes fats and oils. It provides as follows:

> (c) The authority conferred by this section shall not be exercised with respect to any agricultural commodity, including fats and oils, during any period for which the supply of such commodity is determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in excess of the requirements of the domestic economy, except to the extent required to effectuate the policies set forth in clause (b) or clause (c) of section 2 hereof.

I presume that all vegetable and animal fats and oils must receive attention from the Secretary of Agriculture if this bill is passed.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. But there are other agricultural products, as the Senator from South Carolina well knows, which are not absolutely prohibited from entering interstate and foreign commerce under the present law. I refer, for example, to naval stores. However, the red tape and the long delays involved make it quite impossible to export them. There would seem to be very little reason for continuing these export controls, which are contrary to the general policy which this country has followed for a long time. Such controls should not be used except in case of necessity.

Let me invite the Senator's attention to a further fact. It would be quite impossible, I believe, for anyone except an international trader to do much trading in a commodity such as cotton.

Mr. MAYBANK. I agree.

Mr. GEORGE. He must make his quotations, but he does not know how long it will be before he will get a permit to enable him to export. It is pretty difficult for him to protect himself.

Mr. MAYBANK. That question was discussed over a period of 1 or 2 days with Dr. McIntyre. He is the Assistant Director of OIT. I believe the hearings will show that the procedure has been expedited and that at the present time it is being handled satisfactorily. Even those who had been opposed to it testified that it had been greatly improved in the past 2 months.

Mr. GEORGE. No doubt it has been greatly improved; but the point I am making is that a continuation of export controls necessarily will hamper, to some extent and in some way, our foreign trade.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. So the controls should not be extended, in my opinion, 1 day beyond the actual necessity.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course, by concurrent resolution the Congress can do away with the controls. However, the Senator will admit, I am sure, that some commodities, such as steel and other very scarce articles, including manganese, must be controlled.

Mr. GEORGE. I suppose there are yet some scarce articles. However, my observation is that the pipe lines in this country are filling up.

Mr. MAYBANK. I agree.

Mr. GEORGE. And we are approaching a period when surpluses are ahead of us—in many lines, at least.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is the situation as regards cotton, wheat, corn, and other commodities; and that is why declines have occurred. But I say to the Senator from Georgia that there are scarcities of strategic metals and minerals, the list of which is printed in the hearings.

Mr. GEORGE. I think there should always be export control of critical and strategic metals and minerals. But our policy with respect to ordinary commerce and trade certainly should be one of complete liberty and freedom, and not one of restrictions. So, to continue this act for 2 years and 3 months strikes me as too long a time. I would much rather vote for it if it would continue controls for only 1 year.

It is true, as the Senator has said, that Congress can get rid of it by concurrent resolution, but it is very difficult to get Congress to act, sometimes. Once a law is placed on the statute books, it tends to remain there. Something in the nature of inertia often affects the Congress in that respect, and we do not move very fast.

Mr. MAYBANK. I say to the Senator from Georgia what I said at the hearings, namely, that I have reference to a long list—some three pages in extent—of strategic and critical materials and metals, including soil pipe made of cast iron, and so forth.

Mr. GEORGE. I agree that there should be some control of strategic materials; but in peacetime I think controls should be removed from ordinary commerce as rapidly as possible.

Mr. MAYBANK. I agree.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question, if the Senator will yield to me.

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is it not true that under the bill the Department of Commerce will be able to decontrol any commodity which it sees fit to decontrol?

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is it not also true that the Department has already decontrolled fats and oils?

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes; and also lumber.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is it not also true that last year, when the Congress was asked to appropriate more than $5,000,000,000 for aid to the Marshall plan countries, the charge was made that the expenditure of that sum of money abroad would have an inflationary effect upon our economy, and is it not said that this export control is merely an over-all attempt in foreign policy to aid the countries of Europe and at the same time to avoid a serious effect in regard to items which might be in short supply in this country?

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Does not the Senator from South Carolina also agree that, with world development and as the possibility of peace becomes more nearly a reality, the sooner we can drop all these controls the better it will be?

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes. I do not know how many commodities have already been decontrolled, but I know a large number of commodities have been.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Of course, no one would contend that such controls do not hamper and restrict and to some extent burden foreign commerce, but certainly not so much as it was claimed a little sawmill in the mountains of Virginia burdened interstate commerce under the wage-and-hour bill, because apparently anything anyone does nowadays will burden interstate commerce.

However, these restrictions do have some burdening effect; and naturally we shall urge, insofar as we have the privilege of doing so, the dropping of all export controls on items that are not vital in our over-all policy.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course, the extreme scarcity of so many of these articles is, as the Senator from Virginia knows, what has caused high prices.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. As the Senator from South Carolina knows, I personally would favor going further into the matter of decontrols than this amendment does.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes; I talked with the Senator yesterday.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am constrained not to object too much to this amendment, because I think perhaps it is the best decontrol provision we can obtain. But I wish to call the attention of the Senator to one provision of subsection (c), on page 3, which is the decontrol amendment on fats and oils.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes; it is the farm amendment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to call the Senator's attention to the particular language there, which is a requirement that the Secretary of Agriculture make an affirmative finding of the existence of a surplus. Did the Senator or did the committee consider language

which would provide that the decontrols would not apply unless the Secretary of Agriculture were to make an affirmative finding that there was not sufficient amount of the commodity in this country to meet the demand?

Mr. MAYBANK. We did not. No; that was never brought up in the committee, I may say to the Senator.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Under this amendment, the Senator from South Carolina and I might agree among ourselves that there was an excess supply. The price might and many other factors might indicate it. But if we could not get the Secretary of Agriculture to make an affirmative finding of the existence of a surplus, the commodity would still be under controls.

I wonder whether it would be better to provide that the commodity would be removed from controls unless the Secretary of Agriculture made an affirmative finding of the existence of a short supply in this country. Of course it is a difficult matter to phrase.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understand the Senator's point of view, and we discussed it yesterday. However, that point was not discussed in the committee.

The amendment which is now set forth was thoroughly discussed in the committee, and I am hopeful that it will be adopted.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am in thorough agreement with the statements heretofore made to the effect that the objective must be to get rid of controls as quickly as possible and to return to a balanced economy. But I think the objection in the past to most of the controls has arisen from the fact that the Department of Agriculture might say, "We would like to decontrol this commodity, but the Department of Commerce will not agree, and we must obtain their consent," and the Department of Commerce might say, "We would like to decontrol this commodity, but we cannot obtain the consent of the Department of Agriculture."

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is entirely correct; that was the testimony.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. However, this amendment represents an improvement, because it would fix the responsibility in one agency.

Personally, the amendment would appeal more to me if it provided for the decontrol of agricultural commodities, and only permitted controls to be imposed when the Secretary of Agriculture, acting under his own responsibility, said, "We do not have enough in this country to go around. Therefore I will reimpose export controls." I would feel better if the amendment read that way, rather than the way it does. Nevertheless, I believe the amendment constitutes a forward step.

Mr. MAYBANK. I appreciate the Senator's position, and I can understand from his remarks just the way he feels about the matter. I say to him that we did not discuss the so-called negative approach.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In other words, I believe we had better take the view of keeping the economy going and letting the public official take the responsibility of closing it down, rather than of closing down the economy and then letting the public official on his own responsibility say it should be opened up. I think an important matter of public policy is involved in that connection.

However, I shall not oppose the amendment. I have no amendment to offer at this time. I believe this will substantially accomplish what the Senator is seeking.

Mr. MAYBANK. I appreciate what the Senator has said. I hope at least this step forward will not permit any such situation to exist again in the United States as has existed in the South and West during the past three months with respect not only to fats and oils, edible and inedible, but soybeans and their by-products, as well as cotton. The amendment we just discussed will, I believe, go a long way to prevent any such similar situation from developing.

Mr. President, your committee was particularly concerned and carefully looked into the effect of the export control program upon small business. It should be noted that specific provision is made in this bill, section 4 (b), that in granting licenses for export, consideration shall be given to the interests of small and merchant exporters among others. Provision is also made that there shall be trade consultation with respect to the determination of licensing practices and standards.

In this connection your committee noted with approval that the Department of Commerce had announced sometime ago, in its order providing for the establishment of trade advisory groups, that it will be governed by the principles announced in Senate Concurrent Resolution 14, Eightieth Congress, regarding small business. The committee was also furnished with information indicating the distribution of licenses in a number of commodities among small business, merchant exporters, and new exporters, and was generally impressed that by and large a fair distribution had been made. It was further noted that it was chiefly due to present-day abnormal conditions in foreign trade that small-business men were having difficulty in obtaining a larger share of export business.

Your committee was also concerned to determine how export controls have affected the farmers. During our hearings evidence was presented as to the growing surpluses of inedible and edible fats and oils and the serious drop in their prices. Accordingly, action was taken by the Department of Commerce to decontrol inedible fats and oils for export, and to authorize larger export quotas for cottonseed and soybean oils and also lard.

I ask to have inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks the releases issued by the Department of Commerce giving the larger quotas and decontrolling certain articles, while our hearings were under way.

There being no objection, the releases were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RELEASE FROM UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Controls will be removed effective February 7 from the export of most inedible fats and oils, the Department of Commerce announced today through its Office of International Trade.

Among the inedible fats and oils removed from the positive list of goods requiring specific licenses for export are all soaps, flaxseed, linseed oil, fish oil, olive-oil foots, inedible tallows and greases, stearic acid, oleic acid, neat's-foot oil, fatty acids of vegetable origin, vegetable-oil foots, and soap stock. These products were decontrolled because of generally improved supplies. United States prices of these products are lower than they have been at any time since the removal of OPA price ceilings and the prospects for increased production during the next half year are good.

OIT officials pointed out that existing regulations governing all shipments to Europe remain in effect for these commodities.

Following is a list of the commodities that have been removed from the positive list:

Commodity	*Schedule B. No.*
Neat's-foot oil	080300
Lard oil	080901
Inedible animal oils, n. e. s. (report oleo oil in 005600)	080998
Fish oils (report medicinal in 811910, 811950, and 811990)	081900
Grease stearin (include lard stearin)	084300
Oleic acid, or red oil	084700
Stearic acid	084900
Tallow, inedible (report ring grease in 085898)	085700
Pig's-foot grease (formerly 085805)	085898
Other hog grease (formerly 085805)	085898
Beef suet	085898
Ring grease	085898
Other inedible animal greases and fats, n. e. s. (report lubricating greases in 504100)	085898
Flaxseed	222003
Linseed oil	223200
Fatty acids of vegetable origin	224801
Vegetable-oil foots, except olive-oil foots (report olive-oil foots in 224913)	224905
Vegetable soap stock (include vegetable tallow if used for soap stock)	224898
Olive oil, inedible, except sulfured or foots (formerly 224915)	224913
Olive oil, sulfured or foots (formerly 224903)	224913
Soap:	
Toilet, fancy, and medicated (include gift sets of toilet preparations where value of soap exceeds value of other items)	871100
Laundry and household soap in bars:	
White (formerly 871300)	871310
Yellow (formerly 871300)	871350
Other (formerly 871300)	871390
Laundry, chips and flakes, bulk and packaged (formerly 871600) (include Lux, Fab, Chipso, Ivory Flakes, etc.)	871610
Laundry, granulated, powdered, beaded, and sprayed, bulk and packaged (formerly 871600) (include Ivory Snow, Rinso, etc.)	871650
Industrial soap powders (formerly 871600)	871690
Shaving creams, in bulk only	871800
Shaving powders, in bulk only	871900
Nonabrasive types of pastes, powders, and household washing powders (fat content not over 25 percent) (formerly 872400) (report household washing powders, fat content over 25 percent, in 871650)	872450
Abrasive types of soaps (fat content above 10 percent) other than pastes and powders (formerly 872400)	872490
Other soaps	872900

RELEASE FROM DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Supplemental export allocations totaling 105,000,000 pounds of edible fats and oils for the January-March quarter of 1949 were announced today by the Production and Marketing Administration of the United States Department of Agriculture. These allocations consist of 35,000,000 pounds each of cottonseed oil, soybean oil, and lard.

Department officials stated that the allocations announced today have been made possible by the availability of somewhat larger supplies of edible fats and oils than had been anticipated when the first quarter of 1949 allocations were determined. Production of lard and butter has been larger than expected, and domestic disappearance of edible fats and oils in general has been somewhat smaller. Specific information on domestic disappearance and January 1 stocks of edible fats and oils was made available by the Bureau of the Census on January 28. The increased availability of edible fats and oils makes it possible to meet more of the continuing needs abroad.

United States production of edible fats and oils for the current crop year ending September 30, 1949, is estimated to be about 550,000,000 pounds larger (7 percent) than the 7,170,000,000 pounds produced in 1947–48. Export allocations for edible fats, oils, and oilseeds issued to date for the period October 1948–March 1949 (including the allocations announced today) total 729,000,000 pounds, oil equivalent, compared with 425,000,000 pounds allocated during the corresponding period in 1947–48.

The following table shows in thousands of pounds, the distribution by countries, and type of procurement of the allocations announced today:

Country	Cottonseed oil	Soybean oil	Lard	Total
Cuba	[1] 1,000	[1] 500	[2] 3,000	4,500
Bizone, Germany	[3] 8,500	[3] 8,000	[3] 10,200	26,700
Italy	[3] 6,600	[3] 6,600	[3] 6,600	19,800
Austria	[3] 6,600	[3] 6,600	[3] 4,400	17,600
French zone, Germany			[2] 2,400	2,400
Netherlands		[4] 4,400		4,400
Canada	[1] 6,000	[1] 4,400		11,000
Philippines	[1] 500			500
Uruguay	[1] 880			880
Greece	[2] 2,000			2,000
United States commercial projects abroad	[1] 400	[1] 500	[1] 1,000	1,900
Contingency	[1] 4,720	[1] 4,000	[1] 4,000	13,720
Total	35,000	35,000	35,000	105,000

[1] Commercial.
[2] Production and Marketing Administration.
[3] ½ commercial and ½ Army.
[4] Army.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, among other things, the export controls aided farmers with respect to our supplies of farm needs, seeds, fertilizers, barbed wire, baling wire, binder twine, jute and burlap bags, and milk cans, have been protected through export controls. If the rest of the world had free access to the United States market, it is clear that farmers would have had to pay more for their supplies and operate with smaller quantities.

Export controls have further benefited farmers by reducing exports of materials they buy in competition with other consumer groups. Examples of these are petroleum products, steel products, electrical equipment, and some machinery, the supplies of which are allocated for export with due regard for the needs of the farmer and other consumers.

For a program that is so complicated; that affects in such a direct way the financial interests of so many exporters; that affects the economic and social welfare of every country in the world; I must say that I, and I believe I speak for the membership of the committee, was impressed with the fact that the complaints and the criticisms were comparatively few and of relatively small consequence. I am confident that with the experience already gained by the Office of International Trade and with the benefit of the review our Subcommittee on Small Business intends to provide, we can look forward with confidence to a sound intelligent, and efficient administration of this program, which is so important to the welfare and peace of the world.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the pending bill is the first of the bills which continue certain of the controls which were imposed during the war and which have since been continued. Last year, I supported the bill to extend export controls, and I am willing, rather reluctantly, to support the pending bill. I feel very strongly that the general policy of controlling exports and imports is a mistake, that it interferes with foreign trade and with the initiative of men to develop American industry, as well as foreign industry. Whether it is exercised by the Department of Commerce or by the Department of Agriculture, a great deal of red tape is involved in the process. A man who tries to make a contract with somebody abroad to sell him something cannot be certain he will be able to get a license.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Allow me to say that, in the main, I agree with the Senator in his views, but does he not think there should be an exception made in the case of strategic materials necessary for our security and national defense? We exerted ourselves during the war, and before the war, spending millions of dollars to acquire such materials. The necessity for acquiring them continues.

Mr. TAFT. I do not quite agree as to the Senator's statement regarding strategic materials, because we are dealing with them.

Mr. CONNALLY. I withdraw my agreement to the Senator's general principles, then.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I understand. I am not going to oppose the enactment of the pending bill, although in the case of strategic materials we are asked this year to give $550,000,000 or more to the Army and Navy for the purpose of enabling them to accumulate the strategic materials they need. I feel sure they certainly are able, by and through the general voluntary allocation power we have given, to get the proper allocation of domestically produced materials.

I merely want to emphasize the fact that the application of controls is a check on the economic development of all countries. I was in Europe in November and December, when, as a matter of fact, international trade hardly existed in the sense even that it exists here, because of the restrictions upon imports and exports being so tight. Every country in Europe is trying to increase its exports and decrease its imports. The controls are so strict that a man in Europe simply cannot buy something where he finds it cheap, and try to sell it where he can make a reasonable profit on the sale, because he is subject to so many restrictions that he simply cannot undertake such an activity. His operations are so involved in restrictions that he cannot do it.

A typical example of the condition may be found in Holland, for instance. The purpose of their controls is to get more goods exported, which is the particular thing they desire to bring about. If one goes to Holland and tries to buy china to take to his home in another country, the people in the stores say, "The restrictions are so great, and it is so difficult, that unless you carry this china in your hand with you, we doubt if we ever can get it to you from here, either to the steamer in France or to the United States." Every country in Europe is operating in a kind of water tight compartment. I feel very strongly that as soon as we can get rid of that condition, we should get rid of it.

My principal reason for hesitating to oppose the pending bill is our situation with regard to Russia. There may be many things that should not be shipped, not only to Russia, but perhaps to other countries to be reshipped to Russia. So long as that situation exists, I do not like to oppose a bill giving the power. Yet I hope the Administration will remove controls from everything possible, everything that does not have some direct bearing on national defense.

I think the first reason given for enactment of the bill is hardly justified, except perhaps as to a very few materials. I refer to the argument with respect to protecting the domestic economy against an excessive drain of scarce materials, and reducing the inflationary impact of abnormal foreign demand. That was a very good reason a year ago. In 1946 there was a total export surplus of approximately $3,000,000,000. We were exporting $8,000,000,000 worth of goods and services more than we were importing. In 1947 approximately $11,000,000,000 more goods and services were exported than were imported. They did not all go to Europe, by any means. In the second quarter of 1947 there was an extraordinary export period in which we exported at the rate of $13,000,000,000 worth of goods in excess of imports, more than half of it going to countries outside Europe. That particular situation has come to an end rapidly. The truth is, the rest of the world has exhausted the dollars they accumulated during the war. They have exhausted the power to buy goods here and thereby acquire dollars.

The President's Economic Report for January says:

> The only major component of the Nation's economic budget which did not increase between 1947 and 1948 was net foreign investment; it declined from 8.9 billion dollars to approximately 1.8 billion. Net foreign investment represents the portion of our excess of exports over imports of goods and services that is financed by loans and investments and by net liquidation of foreign dollar assets and gold. It does not include the portion financed by grants, gifts and other unilateral transfers made by the United States Government and by private citizens.

So the total export surplus has dropped down from $11,000,000,000 in 1947 to $6,500,000,000 in 1948. In 1949 it may well be reduced further. So the situation now is that we are in balance, except to the extent that under the ECA we finance 5 or 6 billions dollars' worth of exports. Of course, so far as those exports are concerned, the ECA has the power to say what they shall be. It has the power to say whether they shall include short-supply commodities, such as steel. One great difficulty is that persons who wish to export must procure a license from the Department of Commerce, and practically a license from the ECA, so that the ordinary small-business man says, "What is the use? Let us sell this stuff in America and not try to do any export business."

I am willing to vote for the bill, but I do think that the administration should take export controls from everything from which it can possibly remove them. So far as I am concerned, at the present time, except for a few things I think controls should be removed from everything except those affected by the situation which now exists in relation to Russia.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not the Senator's judgment that the lack of dollar credits and the lack of dollars in Europe will militate against our exports? The only way we can help them at all is through ECA. Is not that correct? The tight economy in Europe is caused by the lack of dollars, or by a limited amount of dollars, perhaps I should say.

Mr. TAFT. It is caused by the fact that today there is no reserve. They have used it. They do not seem to be making articles that can be exported. But from the rest of the world we are buying more goods in dollars than we have ever bought before in the history of the United States. I think our imports amount to approximately $8,000,000,000 or $9,000,000,000. I have the figures somewhere, but I cannot refer to them at the moment. The large imports result in the rest of the world having $8,000,000,000 or $9,000,000,000 which they can use to buy our goods. It is not as if there were a dearth of dollars. We are doing our share by importing a tremendous amount of goods from all over the world. We are dealing through the ECA. Except for the Russian situation, the question of what shall be exported, it seems to me, might be left to such control as is exercised by the ECA. Persons who are able to do so are selling us goods. The use of preexisting dollars, which they were using 2 or 3 years ago, is coming to an end.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from South Carolina a question. Before I do so I should like to say that inasmuch as the distinguished Senator from Ohio has expressed generally my views on the bill which is now being considered, it is unnecessary for me to make a statement. I also was in Europe. It was my feeling, when I was there on two or three different occasions, that the Department of Commerce was not sensitive to the impacts of commitments which we had over there, not only those that raised prices but those that lowered prices, and relief was not given in many instances as quickly as it should have been given.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is my understanding.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator spoke of decontrolling inedible fats. In the Small Business Committee there has been request after request from rendering plants with reference to that subject. There will be a terrific loss of livestock in the Western States where inedible fats can be processed and used. There has been such a quantity that the price of lard, which was as high as $30 a hundred pounds, is already down to $11 a hundred pounds. Now there comes a terrific amount of fats that might be processed as inedible, which should be decontrolled. The question has been taken up with the Department of Commerce time and time again. Today I received a statement from the Department of Commerce. I suppose the Senator from South Carolina is well aware of it. Only this past week an order was issued which will become effective, I believe, today. All the inedible greases and tallows have been completely deallocated and can be shipped without license to any place in the world. Is that correct?

Mr. MAYBANK. I am not certain whether these products can be shipped to any place in the world.

Mr. WHERRY. When was that order issued?

Mr. MAYBANK. When the Senator was absent, last week.

Mr. WHERRY. It was effective yesterday, was it not?

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I approve the order. The President had the power to delegate authority to the Secretary of Commerce. If that department had been more sensitive to the situation at home, possibly we could haxe exported some of the surplus.

I desire to ask: Is the reason for placing the operation of this proposed legislation in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture because the Senator feels, or the administration feels, that the Department of Agriculture will be more sensitive to our domestic economy in helping to facilitate exports under decontrol, or vice versa?

Mr. MAYBANK. I cannot answer as to what reason the administration may have. I think it would be better to place the authority in the Department of Agriculture than in the Department of Commerce. When the Department of Commerce had a veto, it was always passing from one Department to the other. The Senator knows my feelings on farm matters. I think this is a step forward.

Mr. WHERRY. That is really the purpose, I take it, for the Secretary of Agriculture's being included under congressional authority to carry out the provisions of the bill. I am not speaking for the administration, but I interpret the administration as feeling that the Secretary of Agriculture is acquainted at all times with the situation and is close to it, and that Department will be more sensitive to the impact on our domestic economy, either of high prices or low prices, and therefore orders will be put into effect probably more quickly than has been done, not only to alleviate shortages but also long supplies.

Mr. MAYBANK. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. With respect to the orders issued by the Department of Agriculture, I wish to say that, speaking for the Small Business Committee, I feel it is a step in the right direction. Certainly we are going to be confronted with a surplus of fats and oils in the low brackets so that it will hardly pay to transport them unless some provision is made to see that they are sold and something is done to help the producers who are now going to have such an impact upon them.

Mr. MAYBANK. I may add to what the Senator has said that I brought this matter to the attention of the committee before I was chairman of the committee. I make no criticism of the committee; the matter was handled I think wonderfully well. I am hopeful that there will be no repetition of what has happened.

Mr. WHERRY. One more question.

Paragraph (c) of section 3, the amendment we have been discussing, reads as follows:

> (c) The authority conferred by this section shall not be exercised with respect to any agricultural commodity including fats and oils, during any period for which the supply of such commodity is determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in excess of the requirements of the domestic economy, except to the extent required to effectuate the policies set forth in clause (b) or clause (c) of section 2 hereof.

If the Senator will bear with me and refer to section 2, I should like to ask a question or two about that, especially since the Senator from Ohio has said on the floor that exports could be sent to any country in the world, including Russia. What do clauses (b) and (c) provide?

Mr. MAYBANK. I did not understand the Senator from Ohio to say what the Senator has just repeated.

Mr. WHERRY. Perhaps I am mistaken. I will ask, then, Does this amendment provide that the exports of fats, or whatever the Secretary may determine, exports of items which are decontrolled, can be shipped to any country in the world?

Mr. MAYBANK. Not necessarily.

Mr. WHERRY. What are clauses (b) and (c) on page 2, in section 2, intended to provide? I suppose ECA operates only in the countries which are parties to the program.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. What about the other countries, the satellite countries? The Senator remembers the long debate we had one afternoon during the consideration of the ECA bill, when some of us asked whether or not it would be possible to furnish the satellite countries with materials.

Mr. MAYBANK. I may say that when materials are completely decontrolled, so far as I know they can go to any country.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. As I understand, clause (b) relates to such conditions as the administration desires to retain control of in connection with American exchange furnished the 16 countries by ECA. It leaves the administration with some control over what that American exchange shall be used for. Clause (c) of course relates——

Mr. WHERRY. It relates to the stock piling, does it not?

Mr. FLANDERS. For instance, suppose we furnish dollars to France, we will say, and France desires to buy a quantity of goods which we do not think are necessary for her recovery. We want to keep control of the dollars.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct; we desire to keep control over the dollars.

Mr. WHERRY. I am going further than dollars. I should like to ask either of the Senators whether the Department of Agriculture has control in any way over scarce materials or surplus materials which are sent out of the country without any control at all. Do we say to what countries they shall go?

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator said "scarce materials." When fats and oils are decontrolled, I do not know any law against that.

Mr. FLANDERS. If a thing is decontrolled, it is decontrolled.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that, but what I am asking is, even though it is decontrolled, does the Government still have any jurisdiction over it, any right to impose a prohibition in regard to it?

Mr. FLANDERS. No.

Mr. WHERRY. Are we to assume that, in regard to any of the surplus fats and oils, they can be shipped to any country in the world, including Russia.

Mr. MAYBANK. No, I have just reread the release of the Department of Commerce on the decontrol of inedible fats and oils, and I note that they are careful to point out "that existing regulations governing all shipments to Europe remain in effect." In other words shipments of any inedible fats and oils to Russia, or its satellites would still be subject to control. So they are not really completely decontrolled.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. In clause (c), section 2, page 2, line 10, the language is "to exercise the necessary vigilance over exports from the standpoint of their significance to the national security." That gives the administration the right, if it cares to exercise it, to refuse to ship any fats and oils to Russia or to any other country, if our security might be affected.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate the observation made by the distinguished Senator from Indiana. My interpretation of that provision is that it refers to control over dollar exports, and also that it has to do with stock piling in the interest of national security.

I do not know that the question I have raised is very highly important, because certainly in carrying out international responsibilities, no doubt what is covered in the bill will be done. But I go back to the argument made here 2 years ago when the question was asked, What are we to do with these materials; are the satellite countries to get them; are we going to let them finally get to countries which are endangering the peace? We finally get back to the question of peace, and keeping the peace is what ECA is for. It seems to me that when the Government is decontrolling, it should step into the picture and say that fats and oils which are desperately needed across the water shall find their way into the hands of friendly countries under ECA, and others to which we want them to go, and not go to the satellite countries, which might export them to Russia. In view of what Senator Maybank has said I assume this type of control can be maintained.

Mr. MAYBANK. I agree with the Senator.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND POLICIES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, 2 years ago I read into the RECORD a portion of an editorial from the London Economist of August 28, 1945, which warned the victor powers that "There is no other cure for the German sore on the body of Europe than to heal it."

I might say, Mr. President, that the people of the Middle West, and of some States such as New Jersey and California, were vitally interested in what the London Economist of that date had to say. Here was a newspaper which could not possibly be charged with being biased in favor of Germany.

The editorial went on to say in firm and prophetic words:

> The conviction that the peace proposal at Potsdam is a thoroughly bad peace is not based on any sentimental softening toward Germany. It is based upon belief that the system proposed is unworkable. It offers no hope of ultimate German reconciliation. It offers little hope of the Allies maintaining its cumbrous controls beyond the first years of the peace. Its methods of reparations reinforce autarchy in Russia and consummate the ruin not only of Germany but of Europe. Above all it has in it not a single constructive idea.

Mind you, Mr. President, this is the London Economist, one of the leading newspapers of England, which says:

> Above all it has in it not a single constructive idea, not a single hopeful perspective for the postwar world. At the end of the mighty war to defeat Hitlerism the Allies are making a Hitlerian peace.

Mr. President, I bring up this matter because these prophetic words have merely confirmed the futility of the policies we have been following in central Europe, and the necessity for the American Government now earnestly to reorient its policies on the basis of the obvious truth that "the only way to cure the German sore on the body of Europe is to heal it." It must be clear now to the American people that there can be no hope of peace whatever, until this Government abandons its role of a hate-happy hangman and restores some semblance of sanity to our relation with the vanquished peoples in central Europe.

Mr. President, I know of no more urgent or crucial problem confronting the American people, and crying for solution, than this problem of how we shall abandon the role we are continuing to play in this victor-and-vanquished drama.

Is it not all the more astounding then, Mr. President, to find that on January 20 President Truman in his inaugural address, deliberately omitted—I say it was done deliberately—any reference whatsoever to this crucial problem. Mind you, Mr. President, he omitted it after he had been told by his various military leaders that Germany was our first line of defense in any war with Russia. He omitted it after it had been made plain by the military leaders and by the various leaders of churches that it was most important to save Germany from communism. President Truman did deal with five specific matters including communism, the United Nations, our program for world economic recovery, the North Atlantic pact and his "bold new plan" for raising the standards of living of all the freedom-loving people around the world.

Again, Mr. President, let me call attention to the fact that any hope whatever of achieving any constructive solution to the problems involved in putting these five programs into effect is absolutely dependent upon, and inseparable from, our healing of the German sore on the European body politic. But the President did not one single time mention this most important problem during his entire inaugural address.

The President's deliberate omission of any mention of this most pressing problem is obvious for two reasons. The first I shall refer to but briefly, with the intention of dealing with it in great detail in the near future. It is the glaring contradiction between the President's professed desire to raise the standards of living of impoverished freedom-loving peoples around the world and the economic insanity which is involved in the policy he is continuing to pursue in Germany, 3 years after the end of hostilities.

The President cannot reconcile, nor can any Senator on the other side of the aisle reconcile, what the administration has done on the one hand and what it is continuing to do on the other.

For his bold new program he is asking $1,000,000,000 to make available skilled engineering and scientific personnel to undeveloped agrarian peoples. Yet, at the same time, he is spending $1,000,000,000 a year carrying out that murderous blueprint for destruction called the Morgenthau plan, which calls for exactly the opposite policy, namely, for the pastorilization of one of the most highly industrialized nations on earth. Could anything be more savage or moronic, Mr. President, than for this Government to proclaim to the world out of one side of its mouth "a bold new program" for developing the industrial capacity and standards of living of the undeveloped agricultural nations of the

world and then, at the same time, to demand that those nations which have become highly industrialized nations, upon which Europe is absolutely dependent even for maintaining a minimum standard of living, be reduced to the agrarian misery which we are professing to alleviate?

This could only happen in an atmosphere where the truth has been suppressed.

Nowhere is the effective suppression of the true facts by American authorities more glaringly obvious than in the continued suppression of the report on German industry prepared by the Collison Commission last summer, at the specific request of the President. This report, along with the Wolfe report and the Humphrey report, also prepared at the request of the President, are still top secrets denied to the American people. They are just as secret, Mr. President, as were some of the agreements I called for a year ago, some of them only in the possession of the President of the United States and of the Department of State, agreements which even the Foreign Relations Committee of this body had not seen up to that time and have not yet seen.

Yet the Collison report clearly proved that if we continue our senseless policy of destruction of German industry, it will take 180,000 man-years to dismantle and reassemble those plants, all at an incalculable cost to the American taxpayers.

Mr. President, there is an even more obvious reason for the President's omission of the German problem from his inaugural address, namely—the President knows only too well that his program for strengthening freedom throughout the world can only be accomplished by the restoration of national and international law among the peoples concerned. He and no one else in the world can do it without the restoration of national and international law among the peoples concerned.

Important as the solution of the economic problems of the world is, it is of secondary importance to the moral and spiritual struggle which we must win. Nowhere is this so important as in the case of the German-speaking peoples. If we are not able to convince them that our American form of government and way of life provide safeguards of human dignity, human decency and human freedom—security for individuals under a system of law that guarantees his rights, not only the war and the peace but the whole cause of human freedom will be lost to communism, in Europe, as well as in Asia.

Mr. President, how are we succeeding in this struggle? Even Mr. Justice Jackson himself, who helped to formulate the procedures under which the War Crimes Trials are being conducted, insists that the most important function of these trials is to show the German people what happened under the savage repudiation of all human values under their own totalitarian regime, and the vast difference between that system of law and our own magnificent system of legal justice.

Are we succeeding in this objective? The record of what has transpired is becoming more contradictory, and more disgraceful to America day by day. The steady deterioration of our attempts to administer American concepts of justice, and to restore a legal basis upon which human dignity and the security of personal rights may be restored in Germany, becomes more of a mockery of our own traditional principles of jurisprudence with every day that passes.

Mr. President, slowly but surely the whole question of what constitutes the legal basis upon which we are carrying out our conqueror's role in Germany becomes more of a frightening enigma. I ask my colleagues on the Senate floor if there is a single one of them who knows just what basis our continuing actions in Germany have in constitutional or international law? I ask them further just what people are going to do if they awaken some day to discover that instead of Administering our interests and American principles of justice in the occupied countries, we have been playing the role of a hate-happy hangman in violation of the plain mandates of the Constitution, in prostitution of our own standards of justice, in violation of the Hague Convention of 1908, which guaranteed the inviolability of personal rights and property, and in violation of the Geneva Convention's safeguards of the rights and interests of prisoners of war.

Mr. President, these questions are all now pointing up the larger question of just what constitutes the legal foundation upon which we are carrying out our international programs.

Does any Senator know? Does any member of the Committee on Foreign Relations know?

When we look into this matter, we find that the war crimes trials themselves were set up under the authority of the London four-power agreement of August 8, 1945, which set up the Nuremberg trial procedures.

Since then we have been parties to 10 additional trials, which were based on the authority of the Allied Control Council law of December 20, 1945. This Control Council Law No. 10 thus is also derived from the authority of the four-power agreement.

Yet all these procedures have been based on the executive order which authorized Justice Jackson to represent the American people at the Four-Power Conference.

The basis of this Executive order is found in the secret conference which produced the Moscow Declaration in 1943.

These facts become all-important because of the fact that our own Supreme Court has now become divided against itself on the question of similar procedures which have been followed by this Government in the Far East.

On December 16, the International Tribunal which has tried the Japanese war crimes cases was attacked before the Supreme Court by Mr. Walter Logan, of New York, as an illegal creation of this Government. This body was described as a rare creation of the executive branch of our Government and the military authority thereunder, and it was contended that this action was carried out without a treaty, which must be approved by Congress.

This international tribunal was set up by order of General MacArthur, on February 15, 1946, under the authority of the Potsdam Declaration and the Moscow Conference of Foreign Ministers, to which I previously referred.

The confusion which surrounds these issues is best revealed by the tie vote of the Supreme Court on the question of whether it even had the power to hear Mr. Logan's petition. I want every Senator to realize this; and I hope that some Senator on the other side of the aisle will answer it if he can.

Mr. Justice Jackson broke the tie which brought the case before the Court because he admitted that for us to let the convictions of the Japanese stand by a tie vote, while it would embarrass the United States to review the matter, "would leave a stain on our record in the oriental mind forever."

Mr. Justice Frankfurter further revealed the confusion which continues to mount when he admitted that under our present international agreements:

> Something may be illegal and still be international, and so be something over which this court has no jurisdiction.

The ominous prospects for the future, which are being strengthened by every day we let this whole matter go unchecked, are revealed in the Government brief which was prepared on this case, which warns that—

> Once it is suggested that American courts may review the judgments of an international court, or pass upon the actions of an international authority's agents, most unhappy consequences can be anticipated in the development of international affairs.

That is the very best that the lawyers for our Government could do in that case.

Mr. President, in spite of the gathering evidence to prove the questionable and dangerous legal basis upon which we are conducting our international relations—evidence which continues to mount—we now find that the President, instead of taking constructive action to review this extremely important matter, has now asked the Senate to get in even deeper by ratifying the Inter-American Charter which was signed by our American representatives at the Bogota Conference last year.

Yet the ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], has himself become aroused over the legal implications of our international policies.

I want every member on the opposite side of the aisle to reflect upon this. The Senator from Georgia has attacked this Inter-American Charter as "fantastic and ridiculous" and charges that it would violate United States principles of State and municipal rights in the fields of education, labor, and racial matters.

I am delighted to note that the Senator from Georgia is present. I commend him for the fine, honest statement

which he made in connection with this agreement of a year ago.

He has declared that he was astonished by the scope of the details of this Charter, which amounted almost "to the detailed regulations of a local police force."

Mr. President, I raise this whole question as to the legal basis for our present international policies at this time because it has become perfectly apparent that if Congress does not now assume full responsibility for investigating this over-all problem, we may find some day that we have acted too late to stop the destruction of our American concepts, principles, and safeguards of justice.

Mr. President, I intend, also at a later date, to go into this whole subject exhaustively. Yet, as proof of the possibility that such prospects lie in store for us, I want again to refer to specific charges that have been made against the administration of justice by the military courts conducted by American authorities in Germany. I wish to call attention to developments that have transpired since I submitted on the Senate floor, last Thursday, January 27, Senate Resolution 39, which calls for an investigation of these charges.

These charges were made by Col. Willis N. Everett, a distinguished American lawyer who had served as defense counsel for the 74 Germans accused in the famous Malmedy case. These charges stated that American investigators at the United States court in Dachau, Germany, used brutal, vicious, Nazi methods to obtain confessions from men who are being hanged by American prison authorities.

In response to these charges, Secretary Royall last spring appointed Justice Gordon Simpson, of the Texas Supreme Court, and Judge Edward Van Roden to investigate these trials. The report of the investigators is contained in a recent article written by Judge Van Roden, appearing in the February issue of The Progressive, which I now ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN ATROCITIES IN GERMANY

(By Judge Edward L. Van Roden)

(Edward L. Van Roden, a Pennsylvania judge, served in World Wars I and II, in the latter as Chief of the Military Justice Division for the European Theater where he saw service in Normandy, Belgium, the Rhineland, the Battle of the Bulge, and in the Ardennes. In 1946 he was reassigned to active duty and served on several important court martial trials in Germany. In 1948 Secretary of the Army Royall appointed him to an extraordinary commission charged with investigating the Dachau war crimes program.)

I

American investigators at the United States Court in Dachau, Germany, used the following methods to obtain confessions:

Beatings and brutal kickings.
Knocking out teeth and breaking jaws.
Mock trials.
Solitary confinement.
Posturing as priests.
Very limited rations.
Spiritual deprivation.
Promises of acquittal.

Complaints concerning these third-degree methods were received by Secretary of the Army Kenneth Royall last spring. Royall appointed Justice Gordon Simpson, of the Texas Supreme Court, and me to go to Germany and check up on the reports. Accompanied by Lt. Col. Charles Lawrence, Jr., we went to Munich, Germany, set up offices there, and heard a stream of testimony about the way in which American atrocities were committed.

But first, a bit of the background:

Last spring the Supreme Court refused the habeas corpus petition of Col. Willis N. Everett, Jr., an American lawyer, who had served as defense counsel for the 74 Germans accused in the famous Malmedy case. Everett is a very able lawyer, a conscientious and sincere gentleman. He is not a fanatic.

In his petition, Everett charged that the Germans had not received a fair trial. Everett did not claim that all the German defendants were innocent, but since they did not have a fair trial, there was no way of telling the innocent from the guilty.

The tragedy is that so many of us Americans, having fought and won the war with so much sweat and blood, now say, "All Germans should be punished." We won the war, but some of us want to go on killing. That seems to me wicked.

If Everett's shocking charges were true, they would be a blot on the American conscience for eternity. The fact that there were atrocities by the Germans during the war against Americans, or by Americans against Germans, would not in the least lessen our disgrace if such peacetime atrocities were to go unchallenged.

Our specific assignment was not only to examine Colonel Everett's charges, but also to examine the cases of the 139 death sentences, which at that time remained unexecuted; 152 Germans had already been executed.

The 139 doomed men who were still alive fell into three groups. They were accused of involvement in the Dachau concentration camp crimes, in the killing of American fliers, or in the Malmedy massacres. Let me say that I believe the crimes for which these Germans were tried actually took place, and that some Germans were guilty of them.

But we should not let the indiscriminate hate of all Germans that was generated during and after the war blind us to the necessity of punishing the guilty ones only.

After this investigation, and after talking to all sides, I do not believe that the German people knew what the German Government was doing. I am convinced the German populace had no idea what diabolical crimes that archfiend, Himmler, was committing in the concentration camps. From the atrocities we learned about, he must have been the very prince of devils.

But as for the Germans at large, they fought the war as loyal citizens with a fatherland to support, and a fatherland to defend.

Some American fliers, shot down on bombing raids over Germany, were killed by German civilians. These Germans felt that the American fliers were the murderers of their defenseless wives, mothers, and children who were in the bombed cities—just as the English felt that German fliers were their murderers. That's war.

I felt deeply about these fliers. I had two sons in the Air Force. Jimmy made 35 missions over Germany and returned safe, thank God! Dick made 32 missions and was finally shot down over Italy. He spent 12 months in a German prisoner-of-war camp and was fairly well treated. He is now in a sanitarium in Arizona recovering from TB he contracted in the camp.

II

The Malmedy massacres, in which a group of American prisoners of war were mown down after being captured during the Battle of the Bulge, actually happened. But can't we distinguish between the assertion that these atrocities did happen, and the assertion that they were committed by these 74 Germans who had been in or near Malmedy at that time?

Because some wicked, sadistic German individuals did it, are we doing the right thing by saying any and all Germans we lay our hands on are guilty and should be destroyed? I personally don't believe that. That's not the way of thinking I learned in my church, or you learned in your church.

On Russian insistence, the Americans couldn't retry these men. The Russian philosophy in these matters is that the investigators determine the guilt or innocence of the accused, and the judge merely sets the sentence. We accepted the Russian formula of no retrial, but we won out on the presumption of innocence before trial.

The American prohibition of hearsay evidence had been suspended. Second- and third-hand testimony was admitted, although the Judge Advocate General warned against the value of hearsay evidence, especially when it was obtained, as this was, two or three years after the act.

Lieutenant Colonel Ellis and Lieutenant Peri of the prosecution pleaded that it was difficult to obtain competent evidence. Peri told the court, "We had a tough case to crack and we had to use persuasive methods." He admitted to the court that the persuasive methods included various "expedients, including some violence and mock trials." He further told the court that the cases rested on statements obtained by such methods.

The statements which were admitted as evidence were obtained from men who had first been kept in solitary confinement for 3, 4, and 5 months. They were confined between four walls, with no windows, and no opportunity of exercise. Two meals a day were shoved in to them through a slot in the door. They were not allowed to talk to anyone. They had no communication with their families or any minister or priest during that time.

This solitary confinement proved sufficient in itself in some cases to persuade the Germans to sign prepared statements. These statements not only involved the signer, but often would involve other defendants.

III

Our investigators would put a black hood over the accused's head and then punch him in the face with brass knuckles, kick him, and beat him with rubber hose. Many of the German defendants had teeth knocked out. Some had their jaws broken.

All but two of the Germans, in the 1939 cases we investigated, had been kicked in the testicles beyond repair. This was standard operating procedure with American investigators.

Peri admitted use of mock trials and persuasive methods including violence and said the court was free to decide the weight to be attached to evidence thus received. But it all went in.

One 18-year-old defendant, after a series of beatings, was writing a statement being dictated to him. When they reached the sixteenth page the boy was locked up for the night. In the early morning Germans in nearby cells heard him muttering, "I will not utter another lie." When the jailer came in later to get him to finish his false statement he found the German hanging from a cell bar, dead. However, the statement that the German had hanged himself to escape signing was offered and received in evidence in the trial of the others.

Sometimes a prisoner who refused to sign was led into a dimly lit room, where a group of civilian investigators, wearing United States Army uniforms, were seated around a black table with a crucifix in the center and two candles burning, one on each side. "You will now have your American trial," the defendant was told.

The sham court passed a sham sentence of death. Then the accused was told, "You will hang in a few days, as soon as the general approves this sentence; but in the meantime sign this confession and we can get you acquitted." Some still wouldn't sign.

We were shocked by the crucifix being used so mockingly.

In another case, a bogus Catholic priest (actually an investigator) entered the cell of one of the defendants, heard his confession, gave him absolution, and then gave him a little friendly tip: "Sign whatever the investigators ask you to sign. It will get you your freedom. Even though it's false, I can give you absolution now in advance for the lie you'd tell."

Our final report on these trials has been turned over to Secretary of the Army Royall. In spite of the many instances like those I have described, we found no general conspiracy to obtain evidence improperly. With the exception of 29 cases, we saw no reason why the executions should not be carried out. For the 110 others, there was sufficient competent evidence obtained from other sources to warrant the death penalty, exclusive of the evidence obtained by the third degree.

The 29 men whose sentences we recommended for commutation certainly did not have a fair trial by American standards. Twenty-seven of them were to have their terms reduced to life, one of them was to get 10 years, and one would get two and one-half years, according to our recommendations. We also recommended a permanent program of clemency for reconsideration of the sentences of other prisoners convicted in war crimes cases.

Secretary Royall has saved our national conscience. Could we as Americans ever have held our heads up, if he hadn't looked into it? He has saved our national prestige and our international reputation.

However, in spite of Secretary Royall's action in this matter, there is little real room for complacency on the part of Americans. Rather our report reveals, by implication, that we still have a serious situation in Germany to clear up. Moreover, five of the men for whom we recommended commutations have been hanged since we turned in our report. In all, 100 of the 139 we set out to investigate are now dead.

IV

The American investigators who committed the atrocities in the name of American justice and under the American flag are going scot free.

At this point there are two objectives which should be aimed for:

1. Those 39 prisoners whose death sentences have not been commuted and who have not yet been hanged should be saved, pending full judicial review.

2. American investigators who abused the powers of victory and prostituted justice to vengeance, should be exposed in a public process, preferably in the United States, and prosecuted.

Unless these crimes committed by Americans are exposed by us at home, the prestige of America and American justice will suffer permanent and irreparable damage. We can partially atone for our own misconduct if we first search it out and publicly condemn and disavow it. If we wait for our enemies to blazon our guilt abroad, we can only bow our heads in shamed admission.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, suffice it to say, these findings were accompanied by recommendations for clemency and judicial review of 29 cases because of the third-degree methods used by the American prosecutors, a fact which has been admitted by a certain Lieutenant Peri, one of the prosecutors, as the article states.

In all fairness, let us also admit that certain Americans connected with the trials have protested that these charges are not true and are demanding the right to answer them, as the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] pointed out on the Senate floor on January 27.

In other words, Mr. President, this is a general statement of developments in this particular matter up to last Thursday. In spite of the gravity of these charges, neither the accusers nor the accused nor the victims have been able to have a chance to present the facts or to justify their own actions before an impartial court of review.

Yet since then events have transpired which make action by this body all the more imperative if we are to see that American concepts of justice are not to become an international disgrace.

It now develops that the Protestant churches of this country have become so aroused that, on January 19, Dr. Franklin C. Frye, president of the United Lutheran Church, and Dr. Samuel Cavert, of the Federal Council of Churches, visited the Attorney General, seeking to expedite a review of these charges. They were informed, however, that while the Department of Justice admitted responsibility for the general procedures under which these trials are being conducted, it would not accept any responsibility for specific procedures subsequently conducted, and that complete jurisdiction lay in the hands of the military.

Then, Mr. President, on January 29, 2 days after I submitted my resolution, a Democratic Senator and two Members of the House of Representatives visited Secretary Royall and obtained a 60-day reprieve for 12 of the German soldiers condemned to death in these trials. According to the Detroit Times, these legislators "protested bitterly that the executions would be a blot on American justice before the entire world and might vitally affect international relations with European countries."

Yet, Mr. President, it further develops that General Clay has also acted, granting Colonel Everett 30 days more in which to bring his petition for review before the International Court at the Hague. Such action is a direct and deliberate evasion of the recommendations of the investigating committee appointed by Secretary Royall that the whole procedure be reviewed by American courts.

Now, Mr. President, in spite of all the promises and recommendations of the authorities, we learn that last Wednesday six more Germans were hung at Landsburg prison.

Mr. President, a man who is determined to see justice done, and who is determined above all else to preserve the integrity and the principles upon which our whole American system of jurisprudence depends, cannot let this continuing outrage go unchallenged. Where there is so much smoke, there must be a fire raging. If these fires are destroying innocent victims, it is an international crime. If these fires are destroying the reputation and injuring the character of American personnel, who have been entrusted with carrying out these orders, it is a national disgrace. If the military authorities continue to insist on ignoring their promises, or evading the full responsibility for what has happened by diverting review of this matter to an international court, they insult our whole American judicial system and flaunt their power in the face of Congress itself.

Mr. President, I am pleading now for an American investigation of this whole tragic affair, because as matters have developed, it becomes more and more apparent that unless Congress now steps into the picture and puts its full power into a determined effort to clear up not only this affair but the whole question of the legal basis upon which we continue to administer occupied countries, we may be found guilty, in the course of the passing years, of having permitted, by our silent acquiescence, the destruction of constitutional and international law, upon which our future as a free people is absolutely dependent.

In closing, Mr. President, I feel it my duty to call the attention of the members of the Senate and the attention of the American people to additional evidence of the vengeful spirit which only hate-happy hangmen would exhibit as representatives of the American people in the administration of justice.

I offer this information because I believe it reveals the extent to which hate has gripped many of those who are carrying on American interests, a hatred which breeds only hatred, which prolongs and intensifies mutual jealousies, bitterness, and a burning desire for revenge—hatred which goes even so far as to despoil the graves of victims of its own perverted delight. In saying this, Mr. President, no one is more determined than I to see stern justice meted out to those who have been guilty of indescribable crimes against humanity. But I cannot forget the greatest heights that have ever been reached by an American statesman, when Abraham Lincoln pleaded in his Second Inaugural Address for justice administered "with malice toward none, with charity for all."

Mr. President, I am about to read from a letter written to General Clay on December 6, 1948, by Johann Neuhausler, Catholic auxiliary bishop of Munich. Mr. President, if the other Members of the Senate read nothing else of what I have to say at this time except this letter, I shall be satisfied. The letter reads as follows:

DEAR GENERAL: I would like to call to your attention two deplorable incidents which have happened at Landsberg.

On December 2, the guards tore down the Christmas wreaths, which the prisoners had put up in their cells, and kicked them to bits.

I was astonished to hear this because I never experienced anything like it or so shocking during the 4 years, and Christmas I spent as prisoner at the concentration camp at Dachau. There the Christmas wreath was never taken from us.

The second matter is much more important. In recent weeks in the Spoettinger graveyard, near Landsberg, the crosses and tablets with the names of those buried there were taken away. The graves of those are the graves of men executed at Landsberg. In the place of the crosses little tablets with the numbers of the prisoners were put up.

Even if one actually believes that after death, even the names of the condemned men must be wiped out, it is still incredible, from the Christian standpoint, to take away from them the cross that priestly hands have put over them with the words: "May the Cross of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, who has redeemed you in this sign, be shown above you. Peace be with you."

When the church speaks over such graves these words of grace for law-breakers, it only follows the example of its founder who promised paradise to a sinner on the cross. And on His grace we are all dependent.

Formerly, when the Nazis tore down the crosses in graveyards, as at Munich, Catholic men and women rose up and put the crosses back in spite of all danger. Priests were sent to concentration camps for many years for doing this, for instance, Father Martin Rohrmeier of Affertig.

Christians of many professions see also in the removal of the crosses from the graves, a contempt of the cross itself and a violation of the dead. These Christians will not and cannot be silenced, so deeply do they resent and condemn what was begun by the Nazis.

I am sure that the general will condemn this behaviour of the prison authorities at Landsburg and will order restoration of the crosses at once.

(Signed) JOHANN NEUHAUSLER,
Auxiliary Bishop of the Catholic Diocese of Munich.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I say when administrators of American justice have to stoop to these levels to wreak their hate and vengence even on the dead, it is time the American people demanded to know if this is what American justice has come to be, so grand a name for so mean a thing.

So I say once more, Mr. President, the resolution offered last Thursday by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut and the resolution I offered on the same day deserve favorable consideration by the Senate, so that the American people may know once and for all whether the charges made by Lutheran and Catholic, the charges made by Judge Simpson and Judge Van Roden, two men appointed by the President, are true or whether they are false.

REGULATION OF EXPORTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 548) to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments will be stated.

The first committee amendment was, in section 2, on page 2, in line 9, after the word "and", to strike out "fulfill" and insert "to aid in fulfilling," so as to make the section read:

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that it is the policy of the United States to use export controls to the extent necessary (a) to protect the domestic economy from the excessive drain of scarce materials and to reduce the inflationary impact of abnormal foreign demand; (b) to further the foreign policy of the United States and to aid in fulfilling its international responsibilities; and (c) to exercise the necessary vigilance over exports from the standpoint of their significance to the national security.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next committee amendment was, in section 3, subsection (a), on page 2, in line 21, after the word "financing", to strike out "carriage" and insert "transporting"; and on page 3, after line 2, to insert the following:

(c) The authority conferred by this section shall not be exercised with respect to any agricultural commodity, including fats and oils, during any period for which the supply of such commodity is determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in excess of the requirements of the domestic economy, except to the extent required to effectuate the policies set forth in clause (b) or clause (c) of section 2 hereof.

So as to make the section read:

AUTHORITY

SEC. 3. (a) To effectuate the policies set forth in section 2 hereof, the President may prohibit or curtail the exportation from the United States, its Territories, and possessions, of any articles, materials, or supplies, including technical data, except under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe. To the extent necessary to achieve effective enforcement of this act, such rules and regulations may apply to the financing, transporting, and other servicing of exports and the participation therein by any person.

(b) The President may delegate the power, authority, and discretion conferred upon him by this act to such departments, agencies, or officials of the Government as he may deem appropriate.

(c) The authority conferred by this section shall not be exercised with respect to any agricultural commodity, including fats and oils, during any period for which the supply of such commodity is determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in excess of the requirements of the domestic economy, except to the extent required to effectuate the policies set forth in clause (b) or clause (c) of section 2 hereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next committee amendment was, in section 4, subsection (a), on page 3, in line 15, after the word "department" to insert a comma, and after the word "agency" to insert a comma and "or official"; and in subsection (b), on page 4, in line 5, after the word "agency", to insert a comma and "or official", so as to make the section read:

CONSULTATION AND STANDARDS

SEC. 4. (a) In determining which articles, materials, or supplies shall be controlled hereunder, and in determining the extent to which exports thereof shall be limited, any department, agency, or official making these determinations shall seek information and advice from the several executive departments and independent agencies concerned with aspects of our domestic and foreign policies and operations having an important bearing on exports.

(b) In authorizing exports, full utilization of private competitive trade channels shall be encouraged insofar as practicable, giving consideration to the interests of small business, merchant exporters as well as producers, and established and new exporters, and provisions shall be made for representative trade consultation to that end. In addition, there may be applied such other standards or criteria as may be deemed necessary by the head of such department or agency, or official to carry out the policies of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next committee amendment was, in section 6, subsection (a), on page 5, in line 4, after the word "court", to insert "of the United States"; and in subsection (c), in line 17, after the word "department", to insert a comma and "or official", so as to make the section read:

ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 6. (a) To the extent necessary or appropriate to the enforcement of this act, the head of any department or agency exercising any functions hereunder (and officers or employees of such department or agency specifically designated by the head thereof) may make such investigations and obtain such information from, require such reports or the keeping of such records by, make such inspection of the books, records, and other writings, premises, or property of, and take the sworn testimony of, any person. In addition, such officers or employees may administer oaths or affirmations, and may by subpena require any person to appear and testify or to appear and produce books, records, and other writings, or both, and in case of contumacy by, or refusal to obey a subpena issued to, any such person, the district court of the United States for any district in which such person is found or resides or transacts business, upon application shall have jurisdiction to issue an order requiring such person to appear and give testimony or to appear and produce books, records, and other writings, or both, and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.

(b) No person shall be excused from complying with any requirements under this section because of his privilege against self-incrimination, but the immunity provisions of the Compulsory Testimony Act of February 11, 1893 (27 Stat. 443), shall apply with respect to any individual who specifically claims such privilege.

(c) No department, agency, or official exercising any functions under this act shall publish or disclose information obtained hereunder which is deemed confidential or with reference to which a request for confidential treatment is made by the person furnishing such information unless the head of such department or agency determines that the withholding thereof is contrary to the national interest.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next committee amendment was, in section 8, on page 6, in line 7, after the word "agency", to insert a comma and "or official", so as to make the section read:

QUARTERLY REPORT

SEC. 8. The head of any department or agency, or official exercising any functions under this act shall make a quarterly report, within 45 days after each quarter, to the President and to the Congress of his operations hereunder.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next committee amendment was, in section 11, on page 7, in line 5, before the word "regulations", to insert "rules", so as to make the section read:

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 11. This act shall take effect February 28, 1949, upon the expiration of section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended. All outstanding delegations, rules, regulations, orders, licenses, or other forms of administrative action under said section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940, shall, until amended or revoked, remain in full force and effect, the same as if promulgated under this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in my judgment, the time has come to take off all limitations and restrictions on exports

of agricultural products, except those necessary from the point of view of our national security and our diplomatic position.

On the basis of our experience during the last few months with the administration of these controls on exports, they have been used to a large extent to beat down the prices of many of our principal agricultural products. During the last few days in particular, the cattle market has been in a tailspin. All the grain markets generally have been falling further, and the fats and oils have suffered worst of all. The price of lard has actually fallen to a point lower than at any time since 1942. In the face of these facts, the administration is still holding down sale of our surpluses to foreign markets of most of these products.

In section 2 of this bill, the declaration of policy under (a), it is stated that the purpose of the bill is "to reduce the inflationary impact of abnormal foreign demand." Translated into plain language, I presume that means that it is the purpose to push down the prices of the controlled commodities. Certainly that is what has been done, very effectively. A manipulation of these controls has pushed the price of lard down almost to prewar prices. Apparently some administration officials feel that the cure for inflation is to push farm prices down to prewar levels. That policy simply will not work today. It is out of the question for the farmer to operate on the basis of prewar prices for the products he produces when his living costs, his costs of operation, his hired man, and everything else he must pay have gone up about double and have stabilized at a new high level.

On the side of agricultural prices there is no longer a problem of inflation. The real problem is deflation. That has been true for some months, and it is more true than ever today. Apparently many officials of this administration do not realize that fact.

The distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from South Carolina, has said frankly that in his judgment the controls on fats and oils have been miserably handled. Certainly that is the case. Although controls have been taken off the inedible fats and oils, our exports of edible fats, such as lard, are still under control in spite of the extreme slump in the markets. Under these circumstances, I cannot see why our Government should continue to restrict our export outlets. If we do extend this authority, we can only expect that the controls on lard and other agricultural products will continue to be "miserably handled," as the distinguished Senator has put it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there are no further amendments, the question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSEF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Mr. O'CONOR. The expected has happened. True to their predetermined plan the Communist government of Hungary has imposed a sentence of life imprisonment on Josef Cardinal Mindszenty. His "crime" was that he remained true to his convictions and refused to be intimidated by oppressors who are bent upon spreading the doctrines of Soviet Russia.

The sentence is worse than death. The tortures, to which this helpless individual has been subjected, will now be continued.

Of course, the individual considerations of any one person, serious though they may be, might not be of world-wide importance. But, in this instance, the real issue is not one man. No better description of it could be given than in the words of the reverend Chaplain of the Senate, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, when he said:

> This fight is not just between Roman Catholicism and communism. It is between a godless communism and any type of Christianity worthy of the name.

We protest this outrageous treatment of an outstanding religious leader. If allowed to remain unchanged, it offers proof that conditions behind the iron curtain are abhorrent to American concepts. Because it is the climax of continued and uninterrupted persecution and oppression of free institutions, it stamps Communist leaders everywhere, taking orders from Moscow, as determined to uproot the basic principles from which democracy springs.

Most significant is the statement made today by the so-called judge in imposing the sentence on Cardinal Mindszenty. This morning in citing three alleged extenuating circumstances in the case, he specified one, as follows:

> The United States through its Minister here, Selden Chapin, made him (the Cardinal) hope that the United States of America would start a war and this war would help him attain his aims.

That is an excellent sample of the integrity, the truth, and the justice of this disgraceful court. The news dispatches declare that the presiding judge severely criticized the United States for meddling in Hungarian affairs. Such criticism is praise, indeed. America will continue to cry out in protest against godless men who are engaged in a vain effort to abolish religion from the hearts of men.

I respectfully urge that the State Department, voicing the feelings of the American people as revealed so definitely these past few days, convey to the Hungarian Government the sense of outrage and shock which has been the reaction of the American people to the arrest and trial of Cardinal Mindszenty.

I urge that the State Department present as vigorously as possible to the representative of the Hungarian Government the conviction that immense good could be accomplished toward the improvement of relations between Hungary and the United States if this sentence of life imprisonment could be suspended.

TWO-YEAR CRUSADE—BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, one of America's great agencies, the Boy Scouts of America, which operates under a Federal charter granted by Congress, is this week observing its thirty-ninth anniversary. Since it was founded, in 1910, over 15,500,000 Americans have been members, a segment of our population large enough to exert a real impact on our national life. The Boy Scouts of America are inaugurating what they term a 2-year crusade, under the slogan Strengthen the Army of Liberty.

The purpose of this campaign is to stimulate a better understanding of the principles of liberty and democracy, symbolized by the great Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor, and specifically to give training to boys in citizenship and those vigorous qualities of character which we like to believe are typically American.

The Boy Scouts of America have announced that as an appropriate celebration of their fortieth anniversary next year they propose to present to America by the end of 1950 a Scout movement surpassing in its outreach and program anything that has been previously achieved.

I am sure that all American citizens will wish the Scouts well in this ambitious undertaking. I hope that Members of the Senate will go further, and lend our support and leadership to them, both in our home communities and on a national basis.

SPECIAL SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished minority leader submitted a resolution which he requested be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. The resolution dealt with small business. The Chair held that the resolution should be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, from which ruling the able Senator from Nebraska took an appeal. At the close of the morning hour we were still debating that appeal. It is now on the table, as I understand the parliamentary situation, and I should like to move that the Senate proceed further to consider the matter.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it is unnecessary for the majority leader to move to bring up the resolution. If he wants to consider it at this time, I should be glad to grant consent. I have already stated to the majority leader that I wanted to work with his program, as I understood it. As I understand the situation, a vote was not taken and the resolution is now at the desk or on the table, and has the same status as would a bill. It can be raised by unanimous consent or by a motion. Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is on the calendar. It may be taken up either by motion or by unanimous consent.

Mr. WHERRY. Yesterday we considered the resolution offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and this subject was the unfinished business. I do not wish to delay the proceedings. I should be glad to grant unanimous consent to proceed to debate and a vote on the appeal.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Nebraska, and I ask

unanimous consent for the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the appeal from the ruling of the Chair taken by the Senator from Nebraska.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The Senator from Illinois made a motion that the appeal be laid on the table. That went over with the resolution.

Mr. LUCAS. I will withdraw that.

Mr. WHERRY. Does it require unanimous consent to withdraw a motion to lay on the table?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No, it does not, no action having been taken.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hoey	Murray
Anderson	Holland	Myers
Baldwin	Humphrey	Neely
Brewster	Hunt	O'Conor
Bricker	Ives	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Broughton	Johnson, Tex.	Reed
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Byrd	Kefauver	Russell
Cain	Kem	Saltonstall
Capehart	Kerr	Schoeppel
Chapman	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Chavez	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Connally	Langer	Sparkman
Cordon	Lodge	Stennis
Donnell	Long	Taft
Douglas	Lucas	Taylor
Eastland	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Ecton	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	McFarland	Thye
Ferguson	McGrath	Tobey
Flanders	McKellar	Tydings
Frear	McMahon	Vandenberg
George	Magnuson	Watkins
Gillette	Malone	Wherry
Gurney	Martin	Wiley
Hayden	Maybank	Williams
Hendrickson	Miller	Withers
Hickenlooper	Morse	Young
Hill	Mundt	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on the appeal of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] from the ruling of the Chair referring his resolution, Senate Resolution 55, to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, before the vote on the question now pending, I desire to address the Senate briefly in reply to the argument that was made by the distinguished minority leader [Mr. WHERRY] yesterday.

I think it goes without saying that the distinguished Vice President, in his answer to the able Senator from Nebraska, said all that could be said with respect to the merits of the controversy pending before the Senate at this time. The sole question is whether or not the Senate will approve the position taken by the Chair in referring Senate Resolution 55 to the Committee on Banking and Currency, or will sustain the appeal from the decision of the Chair, which would mean that Resolution 55 would be sent to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Any Senator who has carefully examined the Reorganization Act, and studied the jurisdiction of the various committees which are created by the Reorganization Act, must reach the conclusion that the Committee on Rules and Administration has no jurisdiction whatsoever of the subject matter of Senate Resolution 55. In my judgment the Committee on Rules and Administration is the last committee of the Senate which has any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in the resolution. I agree with the able Senator, and agree with the position taken by the distinguished Vice President, that many committees do have jurisdiction over some of the questions which are involved in the problems of small business, but by and large, when consideration is given to all the bills which have been referred to the Banking and Currency Committee with respect to finance, the allocation of materials, controls, and all other similar questions, obviously this resolution must go to the Committee on Banking and Currency if it is to be decided strictly upon a legal basis.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. I have been following the distinguished Senator's argument for the past 2 or 3 minutes, and I ask him if the issue is not whether the problem of small business is of such consequence and importance in our country today, by reason of a number of different factors, that it warrants the creation of a special, separate committee. That being the case, it seems to me it is not a question of whether the particular subject to be dealt with by the committee falls under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency, but rather, it is an administrative question. That is, in the organization of the Senate, in order for the Senate to carry on its business, is not the problem of the small-business man so important that it warrants being dealt with through the services of a special committee? Is not that really the issue?

Mr. LUCAS. I would not agree with the Senator from Connecticut that that is the issue so far as the pending question is concerned.

I do not want to be misunderstood, Mr. President, with respect to my interest in small business. Members of the Senate will recall that the Senator from Illinois, before the Reorganization Act came into being, was chairman of the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate of the United States. As chairman of the Senate Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate from 1941 through 1946 it became my duty to pass upon the amount of funds to be allotted to carry on the activities of the Small Business Committee during that year.

Mr. BALDWIN. Will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. LUCAS. Let me finish, please. From 1941 to 1946, as chairman of the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I saw to it that $380,000 was appropriated by the United States Senate to carry on the activities and the functions of the Small Business Committee. The distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] at that time was a minority member of that committee, and we worked together with respect to the amount of funds that we believed to be necessary in order for the Small Business Committee to carry on in an efficient manner.

Mr. President, I relate the early history of the Small Business Committee created in the United States Senate so that the Senate and the country may know that the Senator from Illinois is just as interested in finding a way here in the Senate to help small business, as is any other Senator. But what I am arguing today is not that question at all. I am merely presenting the argument before the Senate with respect to the wording of the resolution which is before us; and the merits or the demerits of the Small Business Committee have nothing to do with the parliamentary situation with which the Senate is now confronted.

Let me say a word, Mr. President, with respect to parliamentary law and procedure. I undertake to say that the Senate of the United States must adhere rigidly and strictly to parliamentary procedure if we are to handle the business of the Senate in an orderly way.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois a question. Does he believe—and I base the question upon his representation, which I know to be sincere, of his wide interest in small business—does the Senator believe that the problem of the small-business man is so important and so peculiar that it warrants the creation of a separate committee to deal with it?

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator mean a separate standing committee?

Mr. BALDWIN. A separate committee, standing or otherwise.

Mr. LUCAS. I will say to my friend that this question is not before the Senate at this time. The question is not germane to the issue here at all. And while I know the rule of germaneness does not apply, and that a Senator can ask another Senator almost any question he desires, the only reply I am going to make to my able friend is that small business will not suffer one iota under the Democratic administration here in the United States Senate, whether it functions through a special committee, whether it functions through a standing committee, or whether it functions through a subcommittee of a standing committee.

Mr. BALDWIN. I submit, Mr. President, that my good friend is trying to carry water on both shoulders on this matter.

Mr. LUCAS. Oh, no.

Mr. BALDWIN. I did not ask the Senator whether the small-business man is going to suffer under the Democratic administration. I asked the simple question whether my distinguished friend from Illinois thinks that the importance and the complications of the problems of small business warrant a separate committee. That, it seems to me, Mr. President, is what we are dealing with here. It is an administrative question. In carrying on the business of the Senate is this problem so important and so complicated that it requires a special committee? That is really the point. I know that my distinguished friend has obligations, as majority leader, but I am asking him for his own opinion as to whether he thinks that the difficulty in which the small-business man now finds himself requires separate treatment? Personally, I think it does. What does the Senator from Illinois think about it?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Connecticut has made quite a speech in my time. I do not object to that at all. I think we should get away from that as much as we possibly can, however, under the strict interpretation of the rules.

Mr. BALDWIN. All my friend has to do in order to quiet me down is to answer my question and I shall be satisfied. I shall be satisfied if he answers "Yes" or "No."

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator from Connecticut does not quiet down I will have to ask the Vice President to invoke the rule, because I did not yield to him for a long speech. The only thing I am going to say to my good friend from Connecticut is that if I must ever carry water on both shoulders I know exactly the person to whom to go in order to give me accurate information respecting how it is done. I will always turn to my friend from Connecticut if I need information as to how that performance can be accomplished.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I will yield in a moment. But what the Senator from Connecticut asks has nothing to do with the issue here. I am not going to answer the Senator from Connecticut on that point at all, because it is not before the Senate. I will answer that question at the proper time, and there will be no doubt as to what I stand for when that time comes, Mr. President. My vote will be recorded. I will be here on the floor of the Senate when that issue is raised, and I will debate the issue at that time with my good friend. The great trouble with my friend, the Senator from Connecticut, is that he is an expert in what he is now doing. He always wants to bring in extraneous questions. He does not want to hew to the line.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. No, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois declines to yield to anyone.

Mr. DONNELL. I did not know whether the Senator objected to a query.

Mr. LUCAS. Just one moment.

Mr. DONNELL. Certainly.

Mr. LUCAS. I have always found it to be true that when a Senator is making a point, some other Senator rises and asks, "Will the Senator yield?" because he does not want the first Senator to finish the argument he is making. That is an old trick.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a query?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Missouri for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the able Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator for yielding. In order that he may not feel disturbed by my request, I will say that it is not my purpose to disturb him. Indeed, I agree with him quite heartily.

I should like to ask the Senator a question. In the first place, the question now before the Senate is not on the merits of the resolution submitted by the Senator from Nebraska, is it?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. DONNELL. It is merely the appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is precisely correct.

Mr. DONNELL. Therefore the only question is a question under the rules of the Senate, as to whether the Chair has or has not complied with the rules of the Senate in determining to which committee the resolution should be referred.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Missouri has correctly stated the position of the Senator from Illinois, and he has correctly stated the question with which we are dealing. This is really a technical parliamentary argument, and nothing else.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I will not be carried away by the eloquence or any other persuasion of my friend from Connecticut upon some extraneous, irrelevant matter.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. LUCAS. I am going to address myself to the point before the court, so to speak, just as I would do in arguing a demurrer before a court in a lawsuit. I will say to my good friend from Missouri that there will be plenty of time to discuss the merits or demerits of the question as to how a small-business committee should be handled in the United States Senate when that issue is raised. But that is not the present issue; and I am not going to be taken away from the issue.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President——

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to complete my inquiry?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. In other words, I take it that the Senator from Illinois takes the view that the merits of the pending resolution are not before the Senate at this time for consideraion. The only question is whether or not the Chair was correct in his ruling that the resolution should be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency rather than the Committee on Rules and Administration. Therefore the question is solely a question to be determined under the rules of the Senate, and not on the basis of the merits of the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska. Is not that correct?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Missouri states my view exactly, and I think he is eminently correct. That is the only point before the Senate. The merits are not involved. The substance of the resolution is involved, of course——

Mr. DONNELL. Only as determinative of the committee to which reference should be made.

Mr. LUCAS. Only in making a final determination, from the subject matter contained in the resolution, as to whether it should be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency or some other committee. However, the question raised by my good friend from Connecticut is another issue, to be decided on another day.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator from Connecticut has raised a question as to the merits of the resolution, rather than the legal question before the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. TOBEY and Mr. BALDWIN addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield first to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. I suggest to the distinguished majority leader, and to the Senator from Connecticut in response to his suggestion, "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof." Let me put into the form of a resolution the question now before the Senate:

Whereas, a resolution was submitted in the United States Senate; and

Whereas, by decision of the Presiding Officer, such resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency because that committee traditionally has considered all matters of costs, distribution, and production, plus the La Follette Act suggestion that all matters pertaining to financial aid to industry should be referred to that committee: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That such action on the part of the Presiding Officer is fully justified.

It is beyond my understanding how anyone can attack the action of the Vice President in referring this resolution to the Committee on Banking and Currency. So far as small business is concerned, let me say that there is not a member of that committee, headed by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], who would permit any letting down of the bars so far as concerns help to small business, by virtue of our handling of the subject.

Mr. BALDWIN and Mr. ROBERTSON addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield first to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. Let me state the issue as I see it——

Mr. LUCAS. I ask the Senator not to take too long in stating the issue.

Mr. BALDWIN. The Senator says that we have before us a technical parliamentary question. The question is, Which committee is going to pass upon the question of whether or not there is to be a small-business committee? That is the issue. My point is that that issue is an administrative issue.

We have in the Senate a Committee on Rules and Administration. Therefore, that committee should pass upon that particular administrative question. It is

not a question of the substance of the resolution at all. It is a question of determining in what way the Senate shall function. I submit that it is the job of the Committee on Rules and Administration to determine through what committees the Senate shall function. In determining that question, ultimately we must pass upon the question whether or not the problem of the small-business man is so important and so peculiar that it warrants a special committee. In approaching the question from that angle, we have a question of rules and administration, which I submit should properly be decided by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

That is the point I wished to make, in order to make my position clear. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. LUCAS. I congratulate the Senator for at last confining his arguments strictly to what is before the Senate. I appreciate that. The Senator has his viewpoint on the question, and I respect it, although I wholly disagree with him. I do not believe that his argument would be sustained in any fair and impartial court; and I know that the distinguished Vice President is a fair and impartial individual.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Early in the session a resolution was submitted by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] to continue the Select Committee on Small Business. That resolution was referred—and properly referred, in my opinion—to the Committee on Banking and Currency. It is my understanding—and I wish to ask the Senator from Illinois if I am correct—that this is a similar resolution. The effort is now being made to have one resolution to continue the Small Business Committee before the Committee on Banking and Currency and another before the Committee on Rules and Administration. Is not that the issue?

Mr. LUCAS. To all intents and purposes, the resolutions are the same, in my opinion. I have examined Senate Resolution 55, submitted by the able Senator from Nebraska. It is much longer and contains more material, more substance, than the Murray resolution.

Mr. ROBERTSON. But its purpose is to establish a select committee to aid small business. Was there any objection to reference of the Murray resolution to the Committee on Banking and Currency? If not, why is the issue raised now?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator will have to ask my good friends on the other side of the aisle, who are now raising the issue.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Illinois for information. Does he remember to what committee the original resolution by which the Small Business Committee was established was referred?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not. That was before the Reorganization Act was passed. I cannot answer that question.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is the Senator from Vermont referring to the original resolution?

Mr. FLANDERS. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. If my memory serves me correctly, that resolution was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor in 1940 or 1941. At that time I happened to be a member of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as was the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. FLANDERS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, there is not much more that I can add to what has already been said.

It seems to me that the United States Senate must sustain the position taken by the distinguished Vice President.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Will the Senator discuss his views as to the difference between a resolution for the creation of a Special Committee on Small Business, on the one hand, and a resolution for the creation of a standing committee of the same type, on the other hand, with respect to the standing committee which should consider and report such a resolution?

Mr. LUCAS. I shall not go into that question, I say to my friend the Senator from Oregon, because to my way of thinking that question is not now before the Senate. So I shall not be drawn into a discussion of it. It is an important question, I say to my friend, but I shall not be drawn into an argument on that point at this time, because if I am drawn into arguments on points which I do not consider germane to the issue before us, I shall be talking all afternoon.

The issue before us, as I see it, is based on the fact that the President of the Senate has ruled that the resolution should be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, whereas certain Senators believe it should be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. In my study of the Reorganization Act and the precedents involved, I am certain that there cannot be any question about the correctness of the decision of the Chair in this matter.

I sincerely hope that all Democratic Members of the Senate will vote to sustain the decision of the Chair; and as a matter of good parliamentary practice and a matter of keeping straight our precedents regarding important matters of this kind, I appeal to my friends on the Republican side of the aisle also to vote to sustain the decision of the Chair.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. I wish to ask my friend the Senator from Illinois this question: Is it true that already the Banking and Currency Committee has indicated by its action that it will not report this resolution to the floor of the Senate? In other words, I understand that the Banking and Currency Committee has set up a Subcommittee on Small Business. Am I correct as to that?

Mr. LUCAS. I think the Senator is correct, according to my information, but that answer may be subject to qualifications.

Mr. BALDWIN. Under those circumstances, the Banking and Currency Committee has already judged the case, for that committee has created a subcommittee to deal with this matter. I submit to my friend the Senator from Illinois and I also submit to the President of the Senate that that is perfectly within the province of the committee and is perfectly proper procedure; but under those circumstances can my friend, the Senator from Illinois, assure me if the Senate ever will have an opportunity to vote on the issue whether there should be a separate standing committee to deal with the important question of the small-business man and all his complicated problems?

I submit that if the resolution is referred to the Banking and Currency Committee, as the Chair has ruled that it should be, the Banking and Currency Committee will never report it. It is not in the nature of things that the committee should do so, for it already has taken the step of creating a special subcommittee, which, as I have previously stated, it is within the committee's province to do, and is a perfectly proper thing for it to do. But my question is, When shall we have an opportunity here in the Senate to vote on the question of whether there shall be a separate committee to deal with the small-business man's problems?

A consideration of that question will give my good friend, the Senator from Illinois, an opportunity to express his feelings, as he has previously indicated he wishes to have a chance to express them, toward the problems of small business. But I submit that, under these circumstances, the question is whether the resolution will ever be reported.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. I have the floor, but other Senators are still making speeches in my time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will say that every Senator has a right to protect himself against an invasion of the rules, but if Senators do not feel inclined to protect themselves in that way, the Chair will attempt to do so himself.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I dislike to attempt to apply the rule strictly as against other Senators, unless a serious question is involved. However, I should say that my good friend, the Senator from Connecticut, could have made a speech much more effectively in his own time, rather than in mine.

Mr. BALDWIN. I tried to ask a question, but perhaps it was too long.

Mr. LUCAS. The question was about as long as from here to the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. It was an argument, rather than a question.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. ROBERTSON. What I have to say will not strictly be a question, but the Senator may be assured that it will be brief.

We discussed this matter in the Banking and Currency Committee this morning, and all of us in the committee agreed that if the resolution comes to us, it will be reported. I do not say it will be reported favorably, but it will come out of the committee.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a moment ago, when I began to answer the question of the Senator from Connecticut, he immediately proceeded to go into another question, and I never had an opportunity to tell him that I do not know, any more than he does, what the Banking and Currency Committee will do about the resolution. The Senator is a member of two committees, and if he can tell what the committees of which he is a member are going to do from day to day, he can do more than most Senators can.

Yet he wishes me, as majority leader, to advise him what members of the Banking and Currency Committee will do with the resolution. Obviously, I do not know what the committee will do. The Senator could file a motion to discharge the committee from the further consideration of the resolution, if he is so interested in it, and thus get it on the floor, if such a resolution were agreed to. Such an attempt on another resolution was made yesterday.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. In connection with what the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] has said, I should like to say that Senate Resolution 29, submitted by Senator MURRAY on January 15, was referred to the Banking and Currency Committee. Question regarding the resolution came up this morning at the meeting of the committee. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] was there, and also the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] and other Senators.

I then suggested that no action be taken on the resolution in the committee at this time, in view of the issue now before the Senate. Of course, I do not know what the Banking and Currency Committee will do so far as the resolution is concerned; but at any rate, at the meeting of the committee this morning we postponed taking action on the resolution, pending the determination of the issue, now before the Senate, regarding the appeal from the decision of the Chair on the reference of the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], which is similar to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and which is pending before our committee.

Let me say to the Senator from Connecticut that in the Banking and Currency Committee there has been a Subcommittee on Small Business ever since I have been a member of the committee, and two-thirds of the legislation enacted for the benefit of small business has been handled by the Banking and Currency Committee. For instance, it has handled all the legislation regarding the meat problem and all the legislation relative to war assets, as affecting small business.

I do not know whether the committee will act favorably on the resolution; but I can state, at any rate, that it met this morning, and at that meeting I asked that action on the resolution be withheld until the issue now before the Senate is determined.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the Chair state the pending question. The question is on the appeal from the decision of the Chair referring the resolution to the Committee on Banking and Currency. Therefore, when the vote is taken, the question will be, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I shall take only a minute or two of the time of the Senate.

For 4 years I have been a member of the Special Committee on Small Business. I am very anxious, as I am certain all other Senators are, to have the Senate select some sort of committee to which the small-business man may bring their problems.

We now have before us three proposals: First, that we continue the special committee; second, that a standing committee on the subject be created to handle the matters affecting small business; and, third, that a subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee handle all matters which heretofore have been handled by the special committee, with a special staff, with additional appropriations, and that the subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee take over the files and the staff of the special committee.

I do not know that I particularly care which way the matter is handled, so long as a good job is done; and I believe either the special committee, a standing committee, or a subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee can do a good job.

I presume my preference might well be for a standing committee. Of course, that is something which would take a little time to decide, and I am certain that the Senate would wish to give considerable thought to the question of the creation of an additional standing committee.

I feel confident that a subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee can and will do a good job. That is particularly true if the Committee on Rules and Administration will allocate additional funds to it.

I am inclined to agree with the majority leader that at the moment the question is not whether we should or should not have a small-business committee; but I should like to ask this question, if it is in order: Would it be possible by unanimous consent to suspend the rule, in order that this question may be decided? I understand the staff of the Small Business Committee are not at the moment able to draw any pay. The authority of the committee has expired. It is therefore unable to function. The staff members I presume are quitting, because they are not being paid. I ask, when can this matter be settled? Can we have a statement from the majority leader at this time, that either a special committee, a standing committee, or a subcommittee within the Banking and Currency Committee, with sufficient funds and with a sufficient staff, will be created to handle the small-business problem?

Mr. LUCAS. I think the question is a fair one. It is hardly germane to the discussion.

Mr. CAPEHART. I appreciate that, but I think we are entitled to know.

Mr. LUCAS. As majority leader of the Senate, I may say to my able friend from Indiana, I shall make it my business to try to take constructive action with respect to the creation of some sort of small-business committee, with all convenient speed.

Mr. CAPEHART. In other words, it is not the intention, is it, to eliminate entirely some sort of committee having to do with small business, either standing or special or a subcommittee within Banking and Currency?

Mr. LUCAS. No. I know of no Senator on this side of the aisle who favors doing without a small-business committee of some kind. It is solely a question of how such a committee should be established, and of who should be in charge of it. That is about all there is to it. We will endeavor to work it out.

Mr. CAPEHART. I feel certain the Senate should be able to handle the problem or to come to a decision with respect to it within the next week.

Mr. LUCAS. I may say to my friend, if there is one resolution on the question of small business pending before the Banking and Currency Committee, and another resolution goes to the Committee on Rules and Administration, nothing will be accomplished as a result of the exercise of divided authority upon two similar resolutions to speed up the matter in line with what the Senator from Indiana is trying to accomplish.

Mr. CAPEHART. I may say in closing, I am most anxious to see a continuation of some sort of committee which will help small business. I hope the particular question now under discussion may be resolved, and then, within the next few days, the Senate may decide exactly what it intends to do. With such a decision, I am certain, whether it be to continue the special committee or to constitute a standing committee or a subcommittee of Banking and Currency, either one of the three, a good job will be done on behalf of the small-business men of America.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I merely feel that inasmuch as a few observations have been made and questions asked, which I think have not been answered, I should like to make a very brief statement in what I hope will be the closing argument on this matter.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield for a question.

Mr. DONNELL. I merely wanted to say I should like to be heard briefly on

the matter. The Senator is proceeding upon the theory that his remarks will be the concluding remarks. I should like to have the Senator understand I expect to say a few words.

Mr. WHERRY. I waited briefly. I thought everybody was through. If the Senator desires to speak, I shall be glad to yield the floor to him. On the other hand, I would just as soon go ahead and sum up my observations at this time.

Mr. DONNELL. Certainly, but I want it understood I expect to make a few remarks after the Senator has spoken.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the question has been raised as to what is involved in this debate, and the statement has been made that it is only a question of procedure, that the merits of the resolution are not involved. There is no other way I know of to get a resolution or a bill referred to another committee except to appeal from the decision of the Chair after an order of reference has been made. Merely because the President of the Senate has made his decision, even though I respect it, and although I have a deep affection for the occupant of the chair, does not preclude me from asking that the resolution be referred to another committee. It is no reflection at all upon the present occupant of the chair if I avail myself of the only procedure I know of to seek to have the resolution referred to another committee where, in my opinion, it will receive more favorable consideration than in the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The distinguished Senator from Connecticut hit the nail on the head when he said it is a matter of procedure. In the final analysis what it really is, and what the businessmen of the country know it to be, is the question of whether the Congress is going to establish a special committee or a standing committee to help solve the problems of small business. That is what is involved. So when the distinguished occupant of the chair in his wisdom—and certainly he has sound argument to support his position—assigns the resolution to the Committee on Banking and Currency, he does so on the ground, as stated, that the committee predominantly has jurisdiction over the subject matters involved in the resolution. I ask the majority leader, or any other lawyer in the Senate, on that basis, how in the world are we to determine the jurisdictional question unless we make a study of substantive law? That is imperative. That is why I presented in the argument yesterday nine points showing that the provisions of the resolution go completely outside the province of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wish to say as chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, when the President of the Senate refers the resolution to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as he did the resolution offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], we shall take action. I do not know what type of action it will be, but we shall take action. I want the Senator to know that since January 1 we have been doing everything we could for the small-business men. We have already had controls removed from oils and fats.

Mr. WHERRY. That is fine.

Mr. MAYBANK. We have already studied steel.

Mr. WHERRY. That is fine.

Mr. MAYBANK. We have obtained some allotments for small producers in the steel business, and so forth. I may say to the Senator, the Eighty-first Congress is going to do a great deal more for small business than was done by the Eightieth Congress, whether the matter is considered in the Banking and Currency Committee or in the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, there has been much said here, not about the merits or demerits of the proposition, or even about procedure, but about what is to be done for the small-business man. I appreciate that. I am glad to have all those declarations. But one of the first things to be done, and it should be done now, is to give the small-business men a place to come. In the event a small-business committee is set up as a subcommittee of Banking and Currency, what would happen? In order to do that, it would be necessary to go completely beyond the jurisdiction set by the Reorganization Act. The committee does not have jurisdiction of matters pertaining to monopoly. The committee would be given authority to go into questions of interstate commerce, which again is not within its province. I could stand here and cite case after case involving problems of small business, subjects entirely beyond the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency. That is what I object to. I may say now in defense of the decision of the present occupant of the chair, when he referred the resolution to the Committee on Banking and Currency, he thought that committee had predominant jurisdiction; but he knows, and the majority leader knows, that if the matter is assigned to Banking and Currency, and a small-business subcommittee is set up in the Banking and Currency Committee, we shall be attempting illegally to give to a subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee matters over which that committee does not now have jurisdiction. Senators may argue from now till doomsday, but that is the fact.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. TOBEY. If the Senator had absolute power, to what committee would he assign the resolution?

Mr. WHERRY. I answered that question yesterday. I said that if I were the present occupant of the chair I would not know to what committee to refer the resolution, for the very reason that the resolution I introduced cuts across every committee line. I think there are predominantly more subjects involved in it that are judicial in character than subjects which would be under the jurisdiction of the Banking and Currency Committee, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any of the other committees, because, in my humble opinion, if I may say so to the Senator from New Hampshire, the most vital problems involving small business today hinge around the Judiciary Committee, such as the question whether we will eliminate vertical competition which is centralizing industry in the hands of the few, whether we will provide protection for the rights which are being encroached upon in the small-business field, and whether we will permit small-business men to procure materials necessary to enable them to produce. Those questions involve consideration by the Committee on the Judiciary; they involve monopoly.

So, Mr. President, my answer is that I would not know to what committee to refer the resolution, because one standing commitee has as much jurisdiction as another. For that reason I asked to have the resolution referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. The question was asked, "Why was the resolution creating a permanent committee assigned to the Committee on Rules and Administration?" The answer was the creation of a standing committee involved a change in the rules of the Senate. The statement was made very eloquently yesterday by a distinguished Senator that the creation of a special committee was in violation of the spirit of the Reorganization Act. Every Senator has a right to his own opinion. I agreed when the reorganization bill was considered by the Senate to the inclusion of a provision which would ban special committees. The bill went to the House in that form, and that provision was eliminated. I submit to the President of the Senate and to every Senator that establishing special committees does not violate the spirit of the Reorganization Act.

As I say, I would not know where to send the resolution, so far as the standing committees are concerned.

Mr. TOBEY. If we should continue the committee, the Senator would be, to use the vernacular, "reneging" on his convictions of 2 years ago. The Senator from Nebraska is opposed to special committees, is he not?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator gave as his dictum last year that he would never ask for a continuance of the Small Business Committee.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a great deal has been said with regard to my not asking for a continuation of the committee. My statement was always predicated on the premise that if and when a standing committee or committees would take over the work of the Small Business Commitee, I would not ask for a further continuance of that committee.

Mr. TOBEY. That time has arrived. It is here.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, at this point I should like to read the statement which I made on March 15, 1948, which is found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page 2806. The statement is as follows:

Mr. President, if the Senator making the objection will withhold it for a moment, I should like to explain the purpose of the resolution. It is very necessary that the

resolution should be agreed to if the Small Business Committee is to be extended for the remainder of the session. The life of the committee terminates on the 1st day of April. If that is to occur, and if that is what the Senate wants, it is imperative that the personnel of the committee be notified now. The resolution asks for a continuance of the committee for the remainder of this Congress. When this Congress terminates, the committee likewise would terminate. It is not requested that it be extended into the next Congress.

I know that there are those who feel that because it is a special committee it should not be continued. But the Members of the Senate will recall that when the resolution was considered at the last session, a compromise was reached under which the date of termination was fixed at April 1.

At that time I stated—

Here is what I said—

that while I felt the committee should be continued until the termination of the Congress—

That is the Eightieth Congress—

if there were no need for it, and if a standing committee had in the meantime taken over the work, I would not ask for its continuance.

Mr. TOBEY. Now, Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment. I have the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The then minority leader, Mr. BARKLEY, asked this question:

If this resolution should be agreed to, either at this time or under a motion to take it up, which the Senator can make at any time, may we have the assurance that no effort will be made to extend it beyond this Congress?

That meant the Eightieth Congress. Here is my answer:

It so happens that my term as United States Senator will terminate this year, and it would be rather embarrassing for me to answer that question, inasmuch as I may not be in the Senate next year.

Certainly everything I had to say at that time referred to the Eightieth Congress, not to the Eighty-first Congress. It would have been rather embarrassing for me to answer the question before I went through the campaign.

I read further:

But the same question was raised by some of the Republican Members, and I believe I can say, with assurance, that several Members are in the same position in which the Senator from Kentucky finds himself. They feel that if the committee is to continue it should not be as a special committee; that if it is to continue at all, it should come under the provisions of the Reorganization Act, by action of both Houses.

Some Members took that position, which I think is tenable, to a certain extent.

Personally, I feel it involves a great deal of work, and so far as I am concerned, if it be the will of the Congress to terminate the committee—

I was speaking of the Eightieth Congress—

I should like to have an early vote on it. I personally feel that it should be continued. I again call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky to the fact that I voted for the reorganization plan and that I share in his belief relative to the existence of special committees under the provisions of that act.

I want to say, as sincerely as I possibly can, that there is no standing committee which can take up the work of the Small Business Committee at this time and serve the purpose needed to be served for the small-business man. I should like to see the committee continued until this Congress shall terminate. There will be no more requests from me for any further extension.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I refuse to yield until I finish my remarks. The Senator is not questioning my integrity, is he?

Mr. TOBEY. Oh, no; certainly not.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska declines to yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, a question of privilege.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No Senator can interrupt a Senator on the floor without the Senator's consent.

Mr. WHERRY. I said there would be no more requests from me for any further extension of the special committee. My interpretation of what I said, in view of everything I said before, in all the paragraphs of my statement, is simply that if the work of the Special Small Business Committee could be taken over by some other committee I would not ask for the continuance of the Small Business Committee. That time has not yet arrived. The more I have gone into the question, during the past 2 years especially, the more I have become convinced, regardless of any statement to the contrary, that we need a special committee or a standing comittee which will handle the problems of small business. That is my opinion.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire at this time.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, what I took exception to was the side-remark of the Senator. He inquired if I was trying to challenge the sincerity of his remarks. I want to read something which the Senator did not read. It is found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 7, 1949. This is the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] speaking:

Mr. President, I also wish to say that I am not asking that the special committee be made a permanent special committee. I see no reason why, in the future, the Senate cannot use for such purposes the Banking and Currency Committee and the other committees which otherwise would handle such problems. For instance, I refer to the Judiciary Committee and the Interstate Commerce Committee as well. When those committees are properly organized they can take care of the subject matter, and then the Senate can terminate the work of the special committee which is proposed by Senate Resolution 20. Because of that fact I have amended the resolution so as to provide for the continuation of the special committee for only 240 days.

The time limit is up. The Senator said only 5 minutes ago, Mr. President, that when a standing committee was ready to take over the work, it should take it over. The Committee on Banking and Currency is the very one to do so. That committee was organized, and its godfather is on the bench and it will begin functioning in very short order for the benefit of small business.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nebraska has been very lenient with his time in yielding to the Senator from New Hampshire to make a speech on his interpretation of my remarks.

Mr. TOBEY. I have merely read the Senator's speech.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me comment about my remarks. I said:

Does not the Senator further feel—

And so forth. Then we start in with the quotation:

I also wish to say that I am not asking that the special committee be made a permanent special committee.

I never asked that until I joined a few days ago with the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and that was after I felt that this resolution would not go to the Committee on Rules and Administration as I had hoped it would, and as it should under the precedent already established. I do not care whether it goes by unanimous consent or by motion or in what way it goes.

Two years ago a similar resolution went to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and its reference to that committee established a precedent as to where the pending resolution should go. Whether it is by unanimous consent or otherwise makes no difference at all. The precedent is established.

So I said, in answering the question:

I see no reason why, in the future—

And I see no reason now—

the Senate cannot use for such purposes all of its standing committees if they would set up a subcommittee, each and every one of them, to carry out the work of the special committee.

Let any Senator read the RECORD. Anyone who would interpret it any differently is prejudiced.

Mr. President, I did not intend to take so long, but I am glad to answer these arguments. We may argue about procedure, we may argue about merit, we may argue about the jurisdictional question, but let me tell the Senate that the interpretation of the small-business man will be that if this resolution goes to the Committee on Banking and Currency it will meet the same fate the Murray resolution met. The Murray resolution has been here for several weeks, and not longer ago than a few hours, I was contacted and asked if I would sign a petition to discharge the Committee on Banking and Currency because it failed to act on that resolution.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator himself well knows that there has been such a movement on the other side of the aisle, and some of us have been solicited to go along with it. I waited for a month and a half. I tried my level best to have the Murray resolution reported; but nothing has been done about it. So the only thing I could do, as chairman of the committee that has been folded up

because it terminated, was to submit a resolution asking that it be continued.

I knew when I offered the resolution that it would be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, because that is where the administration here wants it to go.

I now yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I was merely going to make a suggestion because I know the Senator would wish to be correct. The Murray resolution has not been before the Committee on Banking and Currency for a month and a half.

Mr. WHERRY. I said several weeks.

Mr. MAYBANK. It was offered on January 19.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. About 2 weeks ago. We have had two regular meetings since, and it was brought up this morning at the second regular meeting, and it was determined to defer action, in view of the appeal pending before the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not disagree with the Senator. I have much respect and affection for the Senator from South Carolina, and I will say to him that if a standing committee of the Senate is to have a small-business subcommittee, that is all right with me.

I know something else that has been done. Request has been made that the committee files of the special committee be turned over to the Senator's committee because they want to proceed with the work, and if that is done, in those files will be found communications, applications, problems, which belong to every other standing committee besides the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course we want the special committee files.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator raised a very important question, with respect to the files. The special committee is dead. Just who has the files?

Mr. WHERRY. Until it is either permanently dead, or is reorganized, it will be up to the Senate to dispose of the files in whatever way the Senate desires to dispose of them. I brought out the fact that the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency expects to take complete jurisdiction of what the Special Small Business Committee has been doing, and that it has asked for the files.

Talk about setting a precedent as to special committees. A precedent is being set here this afternoon, by authorizing one standing committee to reach over the lines of all the other standing committees.

Mr. LUCAS and Mr. MAYBANK addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield and if so to whom?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to whoever desires to speak.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has to indicate to whom he yields.

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. LUCAS. I raised a question a moment ago about the files. The committee expired on the night of January 31, and somebody has asked for the files. I was asking who would have the files.

Mr. WHERRY. When the Senate takes action and directs that the files should go to any committee, we will be glad to send them.

Mr. LUCAS. I think it is perfectly proper for the Senator to turn over the files.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me complete my remarks.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to comment on what the Senator said about the Small Business Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency asking for the files. We asked for the files in view of the legislation we were being called upon to study and were studying. If there were any that belonged to the Committee on the Judiciary, certainly the Committee on Banking and Currency would be the first to pass them on.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, all this argument, summed up, is complete support of my position. I realize it is very difficult to override the decision of a distinguished Presiding Officer on an appeal, but if this appeal is lost, there will be no other procedure whereby I can have this resolution referred to any other committee. It will be gone, and to my mind I think it is through now. I appreciate what the Chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency has said, but in my opinion it is through.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. I do not yield now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska declines to yield further.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senate today sustains the ruling of the Chair, then what the Senate really is doing is permitting a subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency to be given authority to continue the work of the Small Business Committee in all its various fields, and when that is done, it either by assumption or by acquiescence gives to a standing committee more authority than ever was intended in the Reorganization Act. So I have asked that the resolution go to the Committee on Rules and Administration. I agree with the Senator from Connecticut that it is an administrative matter. I think it should go there, because a resolution was submitted by the Senator from Florida, setting up a permanent standing Small Business Committee, in submitting which he permitted me to join as a cosponsor last night, and that resolution was sent to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and properly so.

Of course that must be the rule, if we want to be technical about the matter, but in this instance there is no other way to have the resolution referred to another committee except by taking the course I have pursued. In doing so I cast no reflection upon the President of the Senate, none whatever. Whatever decision he makes, of course, that is his decision.

Mr. President, the businessmen of the country are looking to what the Senate is going to do this very afternoon with respect to continuing the special Committee on Small Business. My opinion is that a vote to sustain the appeal means that the committee is killed, and a vote not to sustain the appeal means that the resolution will be sent to the Committee on Rules and Administration, where it will receive favorable consideration and have a chance to be reported to the Senate, and then, either as a special committee, or as a permanent committee under the Holland resolution, we can go forward with a committee which is duly authorized, which has the authority to handle the problems of small business. That is the whole thing in a nutshell.

Senators can speak about procedure; they can speak about politics; they can speak about anything. All I want is to have the Small Business Committee continued. I have said I will support the Murray resolution; I have said I will support the Holland resolution; and, of course, I shall support the resolution I have submitted.

Mr. DONNELL and Mr. TOBEY addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Before recognizing any other Senators the Chair wishes to make a statement in response to a suggestion by the Senator from Nebraska a moment ago in debate when he stated that the Chair referred the resolution to the Committee on Banking and Currency because the administration wanted it sent there. The Chair does not know just what implication was in the Senator's mind when he made that statement. But the administration as such, either outside the Senate or in the Senate, has made no suggestion to the Chair as to how he should rule on the resolution. The Chair made his ruling on his own interpretation of the rules, and after consultation with the Parliamentarian of the Senate, for whom the Chair is sure every Senator has respect. No administration representative, inside or outside the Senate, has the slightest influence or would have the slightest influence on the Chair in passing upon a rule of this sort.

Mr. DONNELL and Mr. TOBEY again addressed the Chair.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I reply to the statement just made by the Presiding Officer?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Nebraska for that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Chair for calling the matter to my attention. I did not mean for one moment that the present occupant of the Chair had been asked by the administration to send the resolution to the Committee on Banking and Currency and that he complied with such a request. It is my opinion that the administration wanted the resolution sent to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the administration had any such desire it never communicated it to the Chair.

The Senator from Missouri is now recognized.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, it seems to me that the argument that the

resolution should be sent to the Committee on Rules and Administration because it would be more favorably received there than in the Committee on Banking and Currency is not a proper consideration for either the Presiding Officer or the Senate. The same point was made yesterday. For instance, at page 839 of the RECORD the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the minority leader, said:

> My appeal is that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, because it is my opinion that if the resolution goes to the Banking and Currency Committee, it will meet the same fate as that of the so-called Murray resolution which now is before that committee.

A few minutes ago the Senator from Nebraska again in substance said that the only way that he could get the resolution before a committee in which he would obtain favorable action is the course which he is now following, which is to appeal from the ruling of the Chair and seek to cause the resolution to be sent to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Earlier this afternoon the Senator from Nebraska in substance said that he is asking that the resolution go to the Committee on Rules and Administration where, as he said in substance, the resolution will receive more favorable consideration.

Mr. President, before addressing myself to what is the real question in this matter, I would like very briefly to express myself as being in opposition to the view that the reception that is to be accorded by a particular committee to a given resolution shall determine which committee it is to which the resolution shall be referred. As I see it, the Presiding Officer should not base his position upon any such question as that. The rules of the Senate presumably direct the Presiding Officer as to the committee to which reference should be made. Of course he realizes, as do we all, that in numerous instances it is difficult to determine to which committee the reference should be made. There are many cases, as was pointed out last year by the preceding Presiding Officer of the Senate, in which more than one committee may well be argued to have jurisdiction. The La Follette-Monroney Act clearly recognizes, as the Chair pointed out yesterday, and as was pointed out in debate, that cases may arise in which there will be controversy as to which committee shall have the resolution referred to it. Section 137 of that act of the Congress, the La Follette-Monroney Act, provides:

> In any case in which a controversy arises as to the jurisdiction of any standing committee of the Senate with respect to any proposed legislation, the question of jurisdiction shall be decided by the Presiding Officer of the Senate, without debate, in favor of that committee—
>
> Which committee?—
>
> that committee which has jurisdiction over the subject matter which predominates in such proposed legislation.

So, Mr. President, clearly the La Follette-Monroney Act, under which we operate, namely, Public Law 601 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, recognizes the probability of cases arising in which a reference may be made, or may be claimed to be subject to being made, to more than one committee.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the question involved here is comparatively simple. The Chair has referred the resolution to the Committee on Banking and Currency. An appeal has been taken from the action of the Chair on the ground that the reference was improper, and the proponent of the appeal has taken the view that the reference should have been made to the Committee on Rules and Administration. On yesterday he said at page 838 of the RECORD:

> I should like to present my observations as to why I feel this resolution should go to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

And again on page 839 he said:

> I believe the time has come when a resolution so providing—
>
> That is, providing as his does—
>
> should be presented to the Committee on Rules and Administration, which I contend has proper jurisdiction of the matter.

Now, Mr. President, the question before the Senate is the same question that was before the Presiding Officer before he ruled, and that is, under the rules of the Senate to which committee should the reference be made? We are not undertaking here this afternoon to decide the merits of the resolution; not to decide whether a special committee should be set up; not to decide whether the functions of that special committee should embrace the various projects and purposes set forth in the resolution. The only question now before the Senate is that with which the Presiding Officer was confronted, namely, to which committee, under the rules of the Senate, should the reference be made?

I have studied as best I could, after hearing this question raised, the contents of the rules as I see them that are applicable to the situation. I have studied as best I could the provisions of the Senate's rules in the endeavor to find out to which committee the resolution the Senator from Nebraska has submitted should have been referred. I have been aware of the proposition asserted by the Senator from Nebraska, as I have indicated from the RECORD, that it is the Committee on Rules and Administration to which reference should be made. I have searched the provisions of the La Follette-Monroney Act to ascertain the particular portion of the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration which, in the opinion of the Senate, could justify sending this resolution to the Committee on Rules and Administration, or make mandatory such reference.

A great variety of subjects is embraced in the rule relative to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration. Obviously, many of them have no applicability whatsoever—for illustration—

> Matters relating to the Library of Congress and the Senate Library; statuary and pictures; acceptance or purchase of works of art for the Capitol; the Botanic Gardens; management of the Library of Congress—

And a number of others which I need not detail, which clearly have no possible connection with the resolution now before us.

There are two provisions in the rule relative to jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration to which I have addressed myself—I trust with reasonable care. One of those items of subject matter embraced in the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration is:

> Matters relating to parliamentary rules.

It seems to me that the resolution now before us clearly is not one which is embraced within the term "matters relating to parliamentary rules." I see nothing in the resolution which could bring it within the term "matters relating to parliamentary rules."

I searched further in the provisions of the La Follette-Monroney Act to see what other basis of jurisdiction the Committee on Rules and Administration could have. The only thing I could find, by a somewhat careful search of the rules, is this:

> Matters relating to the payment of money out of the contingent fund of the Senate or creating a charge upon the same.

I observe that in the resolution submitted by the Senator from Nebraska there is a sentence which reads as follows:

> The expense of the committee, which shall not exceed $———, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

It may be that at first glance one would say that the Committee on Rules and Administration has jurisdiction over this subject matter because there is a provision in the Wherry resolution which relates to the payment of money out of the contingent fund of the Senate, or creating a charge upon that fund. But when we study the resolution, as was so eloquently and clearly described and set forth yesterday, and argued by the Senator from Nebraska, it seems to me that clearly the matter of the payment of money out of the contingent fund of the Senate, or the creation of a charge upon that fund, is not the predominant subject matter of the resolution.

In the first place, the resolution, as set forth in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, consists of language which covers substantially one entire column of small type. The entire portion which relates to a charge upon the contingent fund of the Senate is contained in one sentence in that entire column. I believe that from the standpoint of the mere matter of space, there is at least a hint that the charge upon the contingent fund of the Senate is not the predominant purpose of the matter contained in the resolution. That hint is well justified and corroborated by reading the resolution. I shall not read it because it would take too much time; but I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that the committee

which the resolution undertakes to create, and to which various authorities and directions would be given, is—

To conduct a study, by means of research and investigation, of the existing or future problems of American independent small business, including but not limited to the following problems.

Then follows a series of eight specific problems which are set forth. I mention only two or three of them.

(1) Supply and distribution of basic industrial materials with particular reference to whether or not independent small business is obtaining its fair share of such materials under existing or future distribution methods and patterns.

(2) Policies of Federal Government departments, agencies, and corporations with respect to inclusion of independent small business in their present programs and future planning with particular reference to the procurement activities of such departments, agencies, and corporations.

(3) Prices charged for materials needed and utilized by independent small business to determine whether they are fair and equitable in relation to prices charged their larger competitors.

Now that I have gone thus far, I may be permitted to mention the remaining purposes which this committee, if it should be created, would carry out.

(4) Pressures of vertically and horizontally integrated combinations to eliminate independent small business in the American industrial distributive system.

(5) Inability of both new and old independent small business to adequately finance itself from its own earnings due to tax structure and effect of such tax structure on the merger movement.

(6) Participation of independent American small business in foreign-aid programs and adequacy of representation of independent small business by diplomatic and consular officials abroad.

(7) Development of program to adequately insure independent small business a fair share of raw and finished materials and services produced on and from publicly owned mineral resources, forest reserves, and irrigation and reclamation projects.

Finally—

(8) Development of a sound program to safeguard the place of independent small business in the American economy.

Is it not too clear to require further argument that the provision about the payment of expenses from the contingent fund is merely minor and incidental—although very important, of course—to the larger purposes the consummation of which the appropriation of such money is intended to effectuate?

It seems to me that every one of the provisions which I have read relates to financial aid to commerce and industry, particularly, and perhaps almost, if not entirely, exclusively, with relation to small business. The language of the rule relating to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency is:

Financial aid to commerce and industry, other than matters relating to such aid which are specifically assigned to other committees under this rule.

Financial aid to commerce and industry, to which I have referred, is a subject matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency, as set forth in rule XXV of the standing rules of the Senate, under the La Follette-Monroney Act.

So if it be contended—as it has been by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska—that more than one purpose is set forth in the resolution, if we come to that question, I say that certainly it cannot be successfully contended that the mere charge of the expense of all these purposes to the contingent fund of the Senate is a predominating subject matter of the resolution.

So, Mr. President, we have a case very clearly for applicability of section 137 which makes it the duty of the Presiding Officer to decide the question of jurisdiction in favor of the Committee on Banking and Currency. It may be that some of the subject matters to which reference is made, and which I have read this afternoon, constitute matters which may properly come within the purview and jurisdiction of other committees of the Senate. But obviously every one of them comes within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The question raised by the Senator from Nebraska in his own mind is as between the Committee on Rules and Administration on the one hand and the Committee on Banking and Currency on the other. It seems perfectly clear to me that under the contention of the Senator from Nebraska it is undoubtedly true that the subject matter which predominates in his resolution is that which comes clearly within the jurisdictional matter placed within the functions of the Committee on Banking and Currency by the La Follette-Monroney Act. So, Mr. President, it seems to me, first, that the question whether or not this resolution would fare better in one committee or the other is not the question before the Senate, any more than it was the question before the Presiding Officer.

Second, the real question, and the only question before the Senate in connection with this particular resolution, is, To what committee should the Presiding Officer have referred the resolution? Should he have referred it to the Banking and Currency Committee or to some other committee? It seems to me, Mr. President, most respectfully, that none of the arguments adduced tend even remotely, to convince one that the Chair erred in referring this resolution to the Banking and Currency Committee. I earnestly believe, and shall support that belief with my vote, that the President of the Senate ruled correctly in referring the resolution to the Banking and Currency Committee; and I submit that the appeal which has been respectfully presented by the Senator from Nebraska with all the earnestness he commands, and in view of his great interest in small business, in which so many of us join, should not be sustained by the Senate.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. The Senator from Missouri has eloquently summed up the situation, and I concur 100 percent in his remarks.

In all kindness to my friend, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], I wish to quote statements made by him on two occasions, one when a few minutes ago he said, if I correctly jotted down his words:

If you do away with the special committee, you will be giving a standing committee more power than it should have or ever has had before.

That is his statement regarding the dire effect which he anticipates if we take that step.

Yet here is the Senator from Nebraska speaking of the effect, in another instance:

Mr. President, I also wish to say that I am not asking that the special committee be made a permanent special committee. I see no reason why, in the future, the Senate cannot use for such purposes the Banking and Currency Committee and the other committees which otherwise would handle such problems.

* * * * *

When those committees are properly organized they can take care of the subject matter, and then the Senate can terminate the work of the special committee which is proposed by Senate Resolution 20.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I wish to speak very briefly to the subject, because I suspect that the way I shall vote on this little matter will please few of those who have been writing to me, and will displease more.

Let me say that it seems to me one would need the wisdom of Solomon to correctly refer this resolution. I likewise, as did my friend the Senator from Missouri, examined the Reorganization Act, and found myself in somewhat more doubt as to where the resolution should be referred, because it seemed to me that the question is, not whether the subjects covered by the resolution shall lie in the purview of the Banking and Currency Committee, but how they should be handled. So the issue presented by the reference to the Banking and Currency Committee is not a clear-cut one.

Furthermore, if I correctly understand the situation, the chair is perhaps in the somewhat embarrasing position of having referred three resolutions relating to this matter, two of them to the Banking and Currency Committee, and one to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Out of this somewhat confused situation, it seems to me that my own course in voting is clear, and it has been made clear by the assurance of the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee that the resolution will not be allowed to languish behind the closed doors of that committee, but will be brought back to this floor within a very short period of time.

That being the case, Mr. President, it seems to me that most of the time we have spent in talking about this matter has been—and I do not say this in criticism of anyone—largely wasted, for this resolution will be presented on the floor of the Senate; it will come back here, perhaps with a report which will be either favorable or unfavorable; but at any rate we shall have a chance to decide here, within a very few days, what shall be done.

Since the President of the Senate has made his reference of the resolution and since it seems to me, in view of the assurances given, that the question of the committee to which the resolution should be referred is not too important, and since we can do with the resolution what we will when it returns here, I shall vote to sustain the decision of the Chair.

Mr. PEPPER addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from West Virginia.

He is not in the Chamber. The Chair promised to recognize him for a moment.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish to take only a few minutes of the time of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon will state it.

Mr. MORSE. I did not catch the Chair's observation in regard to having promised to recognize some Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] was seeking to introduce a bill, and the Chair persuaded him to wait until the debate concluded, or at least until the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Vermont concluded their remarks. The Chair was merely seeking to carry out that obligation.

Mr. MORSE. Is the junior Senator from Oregon correct in his understanding that the rule is that Senators should be recognized in the order in which they address the Chair?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; the Senator is not correct.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield for the purpose of permitting the propounding of a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am very anxious to complete my remarks and be able to leave the floor of the Senate. If the Senator from Oregon will indulge me, I should prefer not to yield for a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida declines to yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the greatest threat to American democracy is the concentration of economic power in the hands of a few giant corporations. There has been a constant increase in the importance of these huge corporations, and there has been a decline in that of small-business concerns. More than 500,000 small-business men were forced out of business during the war years. Today the 250 largest corporations in the United States own about two-thirds of the Nation's usable manufacturing facilities. At the beginning of 1948, 113 manufacturing companies, each with assets of more than $100,000,000, owned 50 percent of the Nation's entire manufacturing property, plant and equipment. Seventy thousand others owned the other 50 percent. About 2 percent of our manufacturing concerns employed 60 percent of all the industrial workers.

So, Mr. President, I thoroughly believe in the re-creation of the special Committee on Small Business, which has done such excellent work since its establishment in 1940, at the instance and by the initiative of the able senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], my esteemed neighbor in the Senate Chamber.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the body of the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, a list of publications issued by the Special Committee To Study the Problems of American Small Business, dated October 10, 1946. This publication will show altogether almost six entire pages of various publications which were issued by the Senate Special Committee on Small Business during its tenure. So I ask unanimous consent that the list may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, in addition, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the body of the RECORD, following the printing of the list of publications to which I have just adverted, a statement by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] of reasons for the continuance of the Senate Small Business Committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit B.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, that document states ably and succinctly the justification for the continuance of the Special Committee on Small Business, which has served very well not only the Senate but the country in the more than 8 years of its existence since its establishment in 1940, as I have said, as a result of the initiative and farsightedness of the Senator from Montana. So, Mr. President, I very strongly believe the Senate should recreate a Special Committee on Small Business. I believe when a small-business man living in any of the States thinks in terms of somebody in Washington who might be able to help him with his small-business problem he primarily thinks of one of the special committees in the Congress on small business, the Special Committee on Small Business in the House of Representatives, under the able chairmanship of Mr. WRIGHT PATMAN, of TEXAS, who was, I believe, the author of the resolution creating the special committee in the House, and the Special Committee on Small Business of the Senate. If a businessman of small stature gets into trouble and writes a letter to Washington to the Small Business Committee of Congress, that letter would go to one or the other of those special committees. But, Mr. President, if the only agency of the Senate—because the House has already re-created its Special Committee on Small Business—if the only agency in the Senate dealing with that subject is a subcommittee, that troubled small-business man in the country does not know whom to write. I merely believe he will have a feeling that a source of help upon which he has depended, and with considerable confidence and credit to the committee in the past, will be taken away from him.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield for a question.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does not the able Senator from Florida feel that a committee within the Committee on Banking and Currency with the same number of dollars, with the same sized staff, manned by five or seven Senators, would be able to do just as good a job as a special committee?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I think in the debate the answer has already been given to that question. In the first place there is no single committee in the Senate which has exclusive jurisdiction over the problems of small business. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee might with almost equal propriety be said to have the same problems before it, and the Senate Committee on Finance has one of the important aspects of the matter within its jurisdiction, namely, the tax feature with respect to small business.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I should like to finish the answer, if I may. That is the first answer. The second answer is that a special committee, while it no doubt has its vices, has also its peculiar virtues. The members who are on such a committee ordinarily have a considerable interest and sometimes zeal for the prosecution of problems with which the committee was created to deal. I am sure that would be true of the able Senator of Montana, if he were to continue as chairman of it, as he was under the Democratic regime in the Senate. No doubt Senators specially interested in the problem would make request for appointment by the President of the Senate to membership on the committee.

In the third place, a special committee not restricted to a particular jurisdiction is seldom limited to a particular point of view. It realizes this problem is one which concerns almost every general committee in the Senate. It would take a broad perspective of the problem, and would try to formulate a comprehensive program which might be the subject of recommendation to appropriate committees thereafter. So, while as I say, I think special committees are not to be too much encouraged, and while, as a member of the Reorganization Committee of the Congress, I was in accord with the recommendations first made by that committee to exclude special committees altogether, yet, since the Congress did not see fit to adopt the committee's recommendation, and since there was no such inclusion in the final law, due to the fact that the House of Representatives did not concur in the prohibition that was in the version of the bill passed by the Senate, of course Congress itself chose to leave the respective bodies free to set up special committees when in their respective wisdoms they might see fit to do so.

While opinions might differ, those are the general reasons which impel me to believe on that question alone in the desirability of the continuity of the special committee on small business. I do not hesitate to say to my colleagues on this side of the aisle that since the Democrats, recognizing this problem, initiated the special committee, I do not see any

inconsistency in our continuing it, now that we are again in the majority in the Senate. As I said, the House has already created a special committee on small business. But, as much as anything else, the special committee is a symbol to the small-business men of the country. For more than 8 years the small-business man has repeatedly turned to a special committee on small business in the Senate or House, and he has obtained a considerable measure of relief, because this was a general matter which a special committee could approach with a little more perspective than any standing committee might have the opportunity to do.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I am anxious to allow other Senators to be heard, but I shall yield to the Senator again, because I certainly do not want to deny him an opportunity to ask any other questions. I shall appreciate it if the Senator will ask what he started to ask a moment ago.

Mr. CAPEHART. I simply wanted to ask, is it not a fact that the special committee has no legislative authority and therefore cannot initiate legislation?

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct; and, if the Senator will allow me to answer, no general committee in the Senate has legislative jurisdiction over the whole matter that needs to be attacked.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is very true. All the special committee can do is to hold hearings and investigate. That is all in the world the special committee can do, besides answering letters from small-business men and giving them personal help. I have been a member of the committee for 4 years. I know of its plans, I know of its work. Under no circumstances would I ever vote to discontinue the Small Business Committee of the Senate. But my position is that it can be handled equally well, possibly better, by a subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, providing the subcommittee is given the same amount of money and has the same staff, and provided there is the same interest in it as there is on the part of members of a special committee; which I am certain there would be.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, I should like to make this observation: As I said, there are perhaps a score of things at the moment that should be done to afford additional relief to small business.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just one moment? It will not take 30 seconds.

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I merely want to point out to my friend from Florida the fact that 2 years ago he was one of the Senators on the other side of the aisle who voted against a continuation of the Special Committee on Small Business.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is absolutely correct. I am glad he brought that up, because I was going to bring it up myself, so I would not appear in a contradictory or inconsistent position. But, if I may, I shall finish my answer to the able Senator from Indiana. I say, let us suppose there are at a minimum 20 different things that should be done in the near future to aid small business. It is unlikely it seems to me that the standing committees of the Senate, 15 in number, are likely to carry on a contemporaneous inquiry into what should be done to aid small business. It is very unlikely those committees would take up this subject at even anything like the same time. It is unlikely that a comprehensive program would come from a standing committee of the Senate, which will tend to meet the challenging problems of small business. Especially is that so, if it is more or less generally recognized that one of the committees, namely, the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, is taking the initiative in that field, and——

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. Excuse me; let me finish my sentence—and that any other committee might perhaps be infringing a little bit or encroaching somewhat upon the initiative and jurisdiction of the committee. I now yield to the Senator.

Mr. CAPEHART. I agree 100 percent with the able Senator, unless the Senate gives the subcommitee of the Committee on Banking and Currency the same amount of money which would be given a special committee, and unless the Senate gives them the same kind and type of staff as is given to a special committee. Unless we do that, I should be opposed to a subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency handling the matter, but there is no reason why the Senate should not be just as willing to give a subcommittee as much money and as large a staff as it gives to a special committee.

Mr. PEPPER. But would not the Senator have to add one more condition? The Senator has said the standing committee should have the same amount of money as the special committee, it should have a staff of the same size and caliber. Would not the Senator have to ask also for the same breadth of jurisdiction as the special committee would have?

Mr. CAPEHART. My opinion is the Committee on Banking and Currency at the moment could make the same sort and type of inquiries that the Senate Small Business Committee could make. I think they have that authority at the moment.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I have expressed the idea that the other committees would be a little hesitant about initiating an inquiry if one committee had already announced that it had received a special allocation of funds for the making of such an inquiry or investigation. I have been addressing myself to a matter which I want to make very clearly of record, and that is that I favor the principle of a continuation of the Special Committee on Small Business in the Senate.

Let me advert to what was suggested by the able Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. Two years ago I was one of the Senators who voted against a continuation of that special committee. We were in the midst of our first session of the Congress after the enactment of the Reorganization Act. I wanted to preserve as much as possible the spirit as well as the letter of the Reorganization Act. But we have learned by experience. In 2 years' time some things have caused us to take a different attitude from the one we took 2 years ago. For example, it was discovered in the Democratic council a few days ago that it was not feasible to report a legislative budget by the 15th of February, as the Reorganization Act requires. I have heard of no opposition from the minority side to the position of the majority that it was not found feasible to report a legislative budget by the 15th of February. So that led us to defer the filing of the legislative budget until a later time. I do not know what date has finally been fixed. If that matter had come up 2 years ago, I venture to say a different position would have been taken, because we did not know at that time whether it was altogether feasible and practicable to observe the literal requirements of the Reorganization Act. I think that in 2 years' time a Senator should be open to learning something. I should not care to have it said that I had not learned something in the past 2 years.

In view of the fact that the House struck out the prohibition in the Reorganization Act excluding special committees, now that the House has continuously had a special committee on small business, now that the Senate, against my vote 2 years ago, continued the special committee, I am not disposed now to cut them off.

So, Mr. President, I think the Senators who voted the other way 2 years ago are not at all to be charged with improper inconsistency. I am sure we shall not find applicable the admonition of the sage of New England, who said:

> A foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds, adored by little statesmen and philosophers and divines.

Mr. President, I want to make it clear as to how I stand upon this issue, but it does not lead me to favor the position of my distinguished friend the minority leader in this matter. I think the Chair has ruled correctly. I think a reading of the rule which defines the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration makes it obligatory for the Chair to refer the resolution to the Committee on Banking and Currency. In view of the fact that if the special committee is created it will be a charge upon the contingent fund of the Senate, it would be equally necessary for the Chair to refer the resolution to the Committee on Rules and Administration. So certainly not only shall I not hope to override the Chair, but I shall welcome an opportunity to confirm the rightness of the Chair's ruling. However, I go further and say that if the Banking and Currency Committee should not report the resolution favorably, and the subject comes up again, I certainly shall vote on the floor to create a committee on small business as a special committee. But I think attention should be called to the fact that before the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska was offered, the resolution offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], who was the original sponsor of the special committee

on small business, had already been offered and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. It certainly would not be proper or consistent for the Chair to have referred an identical resolution to another committee.

So, Mr. President, I am hopeful that we shall get what the Senator from Nebraska has in mind. On the merits of the matter I am very much in accord with him and the Senator from Montana. I think that probably another opportunity will be afforded. I am sure it can be worked out in some way for the Senate to continue its Committee on Small Business as a special committee.

EXHIBIT A

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS ISSUED BY THE SENATE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS PURSUANT TO SENATE RESOLUTION 26 (79TH CONG.) EXTENDING SENATE RESOLUTION 298 (76TH CONG.)

SENATE COMMITTEE PRINTS

Seventy-seventh Congress, first session

No. 1. Small Business Problems in the Nursery Industry.[1]

No. 2. The Supreme Court in Relation to Small Business and the Sherman Act.

No. 3. Small Business Problems of the Tire and Rubber Manufacturers and Retailers.

No. 4. Small Business Bibliography.

No. 5. Small Business Bibliography. Chain Store Reference, 1920–30 (appendix to Committee Print No. 4).

No. 6. Small Business and Defense.[1]

No. 7. Small Business Research and Education.

Seventy-seventh Congress, second session

No. 8. Small Business Loans and Risk Capital.[1]

No. 9. Digest of Bills To Aid Small Business Introduced into Congress, 1939–41.

No. 10. Survey of Private Automobile Passenger Car Needs of Major War Plant Areas.

No. 11. Record Keeping for Small Stores. (Revised and reprinted, 79th Cong., 1st sess., as Senate Committee Print No. 2; October 1, 1945.)[2]

No. 12. Pooling for Production.

No. 13. Small Retailers Face the War.

Seventy-eighth Congress, first session

No. 14. The Fate of Small Business in Nazi Germany.[1]

No. 15. Small Business: Access to Capital.[1]

No. 16. The Federal Agencies and Small Business.

No. 17. Small Business Wants Old-Age Security.

No. 18. Effect of the War on British Retail Trade.

Seventy-eighth Congress, second session

No. 19. Buyer's Guide for Surplus Property. (Second revised edition, December 18, 1944.)

Seventy-ninth Congress, first session

No. 1. Construction, Small Business and Employment. September 12, 1945.

No. 2. Record Keeping for Small Stores. (Revised Edition, October 1, 1945.)[2]

No. 3. Maintaining Free Competitive Enterprise. December 6, 1945.

Seventy-ninth Congress, second session

No. 4. Small Business Opportunities in FM Broadcasting. April 10, 1946.

No. 5. Operations Under the Federal Reports Act. May 16, 1946.

[1] Copies no longer available.

[2] Supply limited. Can only fill individual orders. Copies may be purchased from Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., at 35 cents per copy.

No. 6. Economic Concentration and World War II, June 14, 1946. (Reprinted as S. Doc. No. 206.)[3]

No. 7. Farm Construction. May 30, 1946.

No. 8. Standards for Measuring Housing Needs. June 4, 1946.

No. 9. Sustained-Yield Capacity for American Forests in Relation to Postwar Requirements for Lumber. June 6, 1946.

No. 10. Progress Under the Federal Reports Act—International Statistical Coordination. July 22, 1946.

No. 12. Antitrust Cases in the Construction Industry. September 12, 1946.

SUBCOMMITTEE PRINTS

Seventy-eighth Congress, second session

No. 6. Survey of the Nation's Critical and Strategic Minerals and Metals Program.

No. 7. Future Problems of the Nation's Critical and Strategic Minerals and Metals Industry. January 16, 1945.

Seventy-ninth Congress, first session

No. 1. Disposal of Surplus Consumer Goods by the Treasury Department. February 27, 1945.

No. 2. World Markets for Small Business. March 17, 1945.

No. 3. American Small Business in Foreign Trade. June 18, 1945.

No. 3a. Disposal of Surplus Machine Tools. May 21, 1945.

No. 4. The Gold-Mining Industry. August 7, 1945.

No. 5. Future of Light Metals. September 10, 1945.

Seventy-ninth Congress, second session

No. 6. Barkley-Bates Amendment and Other Factors Affecting Operation of Meat-Packing Industry. April 24, 1946.

No. 7. Export Insurance Act of 1946. May 13, 1946.

No. 8. Premium Price Plan for Copper, Lead, and Zinc. February 1, 1946.[4]

No. 9. OPA Shortening and Vegetable Oil Price Policy. May 3, 1946.

No. 10. Discussion of Contract Settlement for the Critical and Strategic Minerals and Metals Industry. May 21, 1946.

No. 11. Small Business and the Webb-Pomerene Act. August 21, 1946.

No. 12. The Veteran in Small Business. July 10, 1946.

No. 14. Transportation Program for Small Business. September 16, 1946.[4]

SENATE REPORTS

Seventy-seventh Congress, first session

No. 479, part 1. A Report on the Federal Reports Act of 1941. June 26, 1941.

Seventy-seventh Congress, second session

No. 479, part 2. Recommendations on Effective Participation and Protection of American Small Business in the War Effort; and On Its Preservation and Extension in the American Economy After the War. S. 2250. February 5, 1942.

No. 479, part 3. Recommendations for the Relief of Dealers in Rationed Commodities. S. 2315. February 25, 1942.

No. 479, part 4. Recommendations for the Effective Utilization of Existing Stocks of Rubber Tires, etc. S. 2560. June 1, 1942.

[3] Committee allotment exhausted. Copies may be purchased from Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., at 50 cents per copy.

[4] Committee allotment exhausted. Copies may be purchased from Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., at 35 cents per copy.

[5] Supply limited. Can only fill individual orders. Copies may be purchased from Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., at 25 cents per copy.

Seventy-eighth Congress, first session

No. 12, part 1. Report to Congress on the Work of the Committee. January 18, 1943.

No. 12, part 2. Small Business in War and Essential Civilian Production. March 11, 1943.

No. 12, part 3. Poultry Market. July 6, 1943.

No. 12, part 4. War Contract Termination Legislation. July 1943.

Seventy-eighth Congress, second session

No. 12, part 5. Preparing Small Business for Postwar. July 14, 1944.

No. 12, part 6. Commercial Rent Control. October 1944.

No. 12, part 7. Progress Under the Federal Reports Act. November 17, 1944.

Seventy-ninth Congress, first session

No. 47, part 1. Senate Small Business Committee—Its Record and Outlook. February 12, 1945.

No. 47, part 2. Two Years of Progress Under the Federal Reports Act. March 20, 1945.

No. 47, part 3. Impact of Reconversion Policies on Small Business. July 27, 1945.

Seventy-ninth Congress, second session

No. 47, part 4. Small Business Price Problems and Government Stabilization Policies. May 14, 1946.

DOCUMENTS

Seventy-ninth Congress, second session

No. 135. Small Business and Civic Welfare. February 13, 1946.

No. 206. Economic Concentration and World War II. June 14, 1946. (Committee Print No. 6, 79th Cong., 2d sess.)[3]

HEARINGS

Seventy-seventh Congress, first session

Part 1. Small Business and the War Program; December 15, 16, 17, 18, 1941.

Seventy-seventh Congress, second session

Part 2. Tire Dealer and Rebuilder Problems; March 3, 4, 5, 6, 1942.

Part 3. Conference of Retail Automobile Dealers; January 9, 10, 1942.

Part 4. Small Business Conference, Bozeman, Mont.; September 21, 1942.

Part 5. Small Business Conference, Miles City, Mont.; September 14, 1942.

Part 6. Small Business Conference, Helena, Mont.; September 17, 1942.

Part 7. Small Business Conference, Billings, Mont.; September 18, 1942.

Part 8. Economic Background and Tendencies; September 29, 1942.

Part 9. Adjustment of Obligations—Long-Term Capital—Public Morale—Independent Packers—Food Distribution; September 30, October 1, 6, 7, 1942.

Part 10. Smaller Concerns in War Production: I; October 13, 14, 15, 1942.

Part 11. Smaller Concerns in War Production: II; December 3, 4, 7, 1942.

Part 12. Smaller Concerns in War Production: III; December 8, 15, 16, 1942.

Seventy-eighth Congress, first session

Part 13. Critical, Strategic and Essential Materials; January 13, 1943.

Part 14. Problems of Small Distributors; January 19, 20, 21, 1943.

Part 15. Long-Term and Equity Capital; February 23, 24, 1943.

Part 16. Smaller Concerns in War Production; IV; March 4, 1943.

Part 17. Effect of Exchange Services on Retail Trade; March 16, 17, 1943.

Part 18. Critical, Strategic, and Essential Materials; II; March 30, 31, April 1, 1943.

[6] Committee allotment exhausted. Copies may be purchased from Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., at 50 cents per copy.

Part 19. Tire Dealer and Rebuilder Problems: II; April 5, 6, and 8, and May 6 and 13, 1943.

Part 20. Rationing Problems of the Baking Industry; April 9 and 12, 1943.

Part 21. Maritime Procurement: I; May 4, 5, and 14, 1943.

Part 22. Price Practices of OPA; May 11, 1943.

Part 23. Quota for Florida Livestock Industry; June 1, 1943.

Part 24. Poultry Market Situation; June 11 and 15, 1943.

Part 25. Maritime Procurement: II; July 19, 1943.

Part 26. Critical, Strategic, and Essential Materials: III—Tucson, Ariz., April 5; Phoenix, Ariz., April 6; and Prescott, Ariz., April 7, 1943.

Part 27. Critical, Strategic, and Essential Materials: IV—Riverside, Calif., April 7; Sacramento, Calif., April 15; and Los Angeles, Calif., April 16, 1943.

Part 28. Critical, Strategic, and Essential Materials: V—Las Vegas, Nev., April 9; Grants Pass, Oreg., April 10; Reno, Nev., April 13; Picche, Nev., April 20; Salt Lake City, Utah, April 24; and Deming, N. Mex., April 21, 1943.

Part 29. Critical, Strategic, and Essential Materials: VI—Helena, Mont., August 2; Missoula, Mont., August 4; Spokane, Wash., August 5; and Seattle, Wash., August 7, 1943.

Part 30. Navy Yard Subcontracting and the Type C Contract; October 26, 1943.

Seventy-eighth Congress, second session

Part 31. Small Business in the Changing War Programs; April 25, 1944.

Part 32. Small Business in the Changing War Program: II; April 26, 1944.

Part 33. Small Business in the Changing War Program: III; April 28, 1944.

Part 34. Small Business in the Changing War Program: IV; May 3, 1944.

Part 35. Small Business in the Changing War Program: V; May 9, 1944.

Part 36. Businessmen's Views on Reconversion Needs: I—Indianapolis, Ind.; May 24 and 25, 1944.[1]

Part 37. Businessmen's Views on Reconversion Needs: II—Fort Wayne, Ind.; May 26, 1944.

Part 38. Businessmen's Views on Reconversion Needs: III—Boston, Mass.; June 22, 23, and 24, 1944.

Part 39. Commercial Rent Control; July 14, 1944.

Part 40. Developing the West Through Small Business: I—Kalispell, Mont.; July 24 and 25, 1944.

Part 41. Developing the West Through Small Business: II—Seattle, Wash.; July 26 and 27, 1944.

Part 42. Developing the West Through Small Business: III—Portland, Oreg.; July 28, 1944.

Part 43. Developing the West Through Small Business: IV—San Francisco, Calif.; July 31 and August 1, 1944.

Part 44. Developing the West Through Small Business: V—Los Angeles, San Diego, Calif.

Part 45. Developing the West Through Small Business: VI—Phoenix, Tucson, Prescott, Ariz.; August 7, 8, and 9, 1944.

Part 46. Surplus War Property Disposal; December 12, 14, and 15, 1944.

Seventy-ninth Congress, first session

Part 47. Future of Light Metals; February 27, 1945.

Part 48. Future of Light Metals; February 28, 1945.

Part 49. Future of Light Metals, March 1, 5, and 6, 1945.

Part 50. Future of Light Metals; March 7 and 20, 1945.

Part 51. Future of Light Metals, March 21, 1945.

[1] Copies no longer available.

Part 52. Future of Light Metals; March 22, 1945.

Part 53. Future of Light Metals; March 27, 1945.

Part 54. Future of Light Metals; March 28, 1945.

Part 55. Future of Light Metals; March 29, 1945.

Part 56. Future of Light Metals; March 30, 1945.

Part 57. Future of Light Metals: The Shipshaw Contract I; March 30 and April 10, 1945.

Part 58. Future of Light Metals: The Shipshaw Contract II; April 11, 1945.

Part 59. Future of Light Metals: The Shipshaw Contract III; April 12, 1945.

Part 60. Future of Light Metals: The Shipshaw Contract IV; May 14, 1945.

Part 61. World Markets for Small Business: I; April 17, 18, 20, and 25, 1945.

Part 62. World Markets for Small Business: II; May 18 and 21, and June 5 and 6, 1945.

Part 63. Machine Tools Industry; April 25, 26, and 27, 1945.

Part 64. Construction Industry; May 8, 9, and 10, 1945.

Part 65. Impact of Reconversion Policies on Small Business; June 15, 18, and 19, 1945.

Part 66. Investigation of Textile Problems; July 10, 1945.

Part 67. Surplus Machine Tools; July 27 and August 3, 1945.

Part 68. Restaurants and Foods; I, July 30 and 31, 1945.

Part 69. Restaurants and Foods: II, August 7, 1945.

Part 70. Fats and Oils, Margarine; August 6 and 7, 1945.

Part 71. Postwar Adjustments of Domestic Mining Industry; August 7 and 8, 1945.

Part 72. Sugar Supply Problems and Their Impact on Small Business; August 22, 1945.

Part 73. Butter, Oleomargarine, Fats, and Oils, and Meat Distribution; October 22, 1945.

Part 74. Problems of Housing Shortage, Construction and Housing Price Controls: I; October 23 and 24, 1945.

Part 75. Problems of Housing Shortage, Construction and Housing Price Controls: II; October 25, 1945.

Part 76. Impact of Price Controls and Stabilization Policies on Small Business: I; December 4, 1945.

Part 77. Impact of Price Controls and Stabilization Policies on Small Business: II, December 5, 1945.

Part 78. Impact of Price Controls and Stabilization Policies on Small Business: III; December 6, 1945.

Part 79. Impact of Price Controls and Stabilization Policies on Small Business: IV; December 11, 1945.

Part 80. Impact of Price Controls and Stabilization Policies on Small Business: V; December 12, 1945.

Part 81. Impact of Price Controls and Stabilization Policies on Small Business: VI; December 13, 1945.

Part 82. Impact of Price Controls and Stabilization Policies on Small Business: VII; December 17, 1945.

Part 83. Impact of Price Controls and Stabilization Policies on Small Business: VIII; December 18 and 19, 1945.

Seventy-ninth Congress, second session

Part 84. Problems of Smaller Users of Steel Products as a Result of Recent Steel Strike; February 7 and 8, 1946.

Part 85. California Looks to its Economic Future: I; San Diego, Calif.; February 20 and 21, 1946.

Part 86. California Looks to its Economic Future: II; Fresno, Calif.; February 25, 1946.

Part 87. California Looks to its Economic Future: III; Los Angeles, Calif.; February 26, 27, and 28, 1946.

Part 88. Nylon and Rayon Hosiery Production and Distribution Problems; April 10 and 11, 1946.

Part 89. Food Shortages and World Relief as Related to Small Business; April 15, 1946.

Part 90. OPA Shortening and Vegetable Oil Price Policy; April 25, 1946.

Part 91. Nylon Hosiery Wholesale-Retail Distribution Problem: May 25, 1946.

Part 92. World Food Supplies in Relation to Small Business: I; June 3, 4, and 5, 1946.

Part 93. World Food Supplies in Relation to Small Business: II; June 6, 7, and 10, 1946.

Part 94. World Food Supplies in Relation to Small Business: III; June 11, 12, and 13, 1946.

Part 95. World Food Supplies in Relation to Small Business: IV; June 14 and 15, 1946.

Part 96. Effect of Current Surplus Property Disposal Policies on Veteran in Small Business: I; June 12 and 13, 1946.

Part 97. Effect of Current Surplus Property Disposal Policies on Veteran in Small Business: II; June 18, 1946.

Part 98. Effect of Current Surplus Property Disposal Policies on Veteran in Small Business: III; June 19, 1946.

JOINT HEARINGS

Seventy-ninth Congress, first session

Parts 1 to 5, inclusive. Aluminum Plant Disposal (Revised); October 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19, 1945. (Together with Surplus Property Subcommittee of Committee on Military Affairs and Industrial Reorganization Subcommittee of Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning.)

LEGISLATION SPONSORED BY THE COMMITTEE

Public Law 549 (77th Cong.): An act for the relief of dealers in certain articles or commodities rationed under authority of the United States.

Public Law 603 (77th Cong.): An act to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes.

Public Law 831 (77th Cong.): An act to coordinate Federal reporting services, to eliminate duplication and reduce the cost of such services and to minimize the burdens of furnishing information to Federal agencies.

Public Law 47 (78th Cong.): An act to provide for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States (including the Territory of Alaska).

Public Law 349 (78th Cong.): An act providing for the suspension of certain requirements relating to work on tunnel-site mining claims.

Public Law 457 (78th Cong.): An act to aid the reconversion from a war to a peace economy through the distribution of Government surplus property and to establish a Surplus Property Board to effectuate the same, and for other purposes.

Public Law 157 (79th Cong.): An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to modify provisions of a contract for purchase of power plant for use in connection with San Carlos irrigation project.

LEGISLATION UPON WHICH THE COMMITTEE EXERTED A SUBSTANTIAL INFLUENCE

Public Law 395 (78th Cong.): An act to provide for the settlement of claims arising from terminated war contracts, and for other purposes.

Public Law 458 (78th Cong.): An act to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide a national program for war mobilization and reconversion, and for other purposes.

Public Law 88 (79th Cong.): An act to permit the continuation of certain subsidy payments and certain purchase and sale operations by corporations created pursuant to section 5d (3) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

EXHIBIT B

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JAMES E. MURRAY

REASONS FOR THE CONTINUANCE OF THE SENATE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Independent and small businesses need this committee because of present abnormal economic conditions

As changing conditions in the Government and the economy have required, the Senate Small Business Committee has focused its work on the solution of those problems which affect the survival and growth of independent and small business. Consequently, it has come to mean a great deal to the independent business community in every State of the Nation. Today when business hazards are mounting, these businessmen need the Senate Small Business Committee as never before. Here are some illustrations:

1. The Federal Government is the biggest single buyer in the country. All its experience, bureaucratic tradition, and the desire to get the job done the easiest way point toward big purchases from big business. For example, the Defense Establishment will buy some $15,000,000,000 of goods this next year. It has no adequate machinery for contracting with small and independent businesses. On its own it apparently is not inclined to do so. Yet at least $5,000,000,000 of all its purchases should go to such businesses, which would spell the difference between a healthy situation and one where many of these smaller business firms will sustain losses or fail.

The Senate Small Business Committee has proven by its wartime efforts in forcing the services to establish purchasing practices equally fair to small and big business, and in continuing to police these practices and to break bottlenecks as they occur, keeping the procurement program constantly under scrutiny, that this is the only practical way of insuring a square deal for independent and small business. Experience has shown that only the surveillance of a Senate Committee having a full-time staff and possessed of the powers of subpena and public hearings gets the job done well.

All but a very few of the Members of the Senate have used the specialized service of the Senate Small Business Committee in behalf of their constituent small businesses. This saves the Senators much time and gives them expert help. Because of the respect of Government agencies for the effectiveness of the committee, the work has received high commendation. The practice has developed of not only getting action on individual cases, but of using them to illustrate the need for correct procurement and contracting policies, to the end that the Government agencies eventually establish them.

2. Major shortages continue to menace independent and small business. For example, thousands of fabricators of steel and aluminum products cannot get their normal amounts of these basic raw materials, and are prevented from developing prosperous expanding businesses during good times, laying up the needed reserves against any eventualities—all because of raw-materials shortages entirely beyond their individual control.

The Senate Small Business Committee has held hearings and conferences over several years, repeating them as necessary, to get a better break for these small concerns from their suppliers who are at the same time their competitors. Often only the threat of publicity, and possible imposition of compulsory controls, suffice to bring about fairer treatment. Pressure has to be kept on almost continuously to force some big-business operators to dribble out supplies of raw materials to these independent and small concerns. The files of the committee and the remarks of many Senators give ample proof that this service is a most important tangible help to American small business during these times of abnormal scarcities of needed raw materials.

3. Large integrated companies are in a position to put the "squeeze" on small or independent suppliers during these days of full use of resources, which an alert Senate Small Business Committee can and does prevent. An example of such effort is the recent case of the independent oil companies in California whose crude oil can only be processed if refineries operated by the large integrated corporations will process it. In normal times this is no problem. But now the large corporations refused to accept more than a small fraction of the usual amount of crude oil from the independent companies. The Senate Small Business Committee was asked to investigate and take appropriate action. A 1-day hearing was sufficient to force the big corporations to halt their detrimental action and reinstall former practices, resulting in savings of many thousands of dollars to the small independents.

4. Grey and black markets are a serious menace in these times of materials shortages. The Senate Small Business Committee uncovered an active grey market in steel, and its hearings and watchful oversight of the situation have materially reduced such harmful activities, to the lasting benefit of many small businesses.

5. A large export program is underwritten by the Government through the European recovery program. American independent and small business has never received its rightful share of attention in the procurement programs which use our taxpayers' dollars. Only a beginning effort has been made by the Senate Small Business Committee to insure fair procedures and practices in such purchases. Much yet remains to be done in this connection if the remaining 3 years of ECA are to benefit our independent business community as they should.

6. Export controls and policies have never been developed with the peculiar problems of small and independent business in mind. These important elements in our business community are discriminated against by the Government and the purchasing missions of foreign governments. The Senate Small Business Committee has begun an investigation of such conditions, and if allowed to complete its work will force through changes in policies and procedures which will give small business fair treatment.

7. A substantial program of plant expansion is now contemplated in the interest of national defense, urged by the administration and particularly advocated by the President. Included are programs to develop vestly more hydroelectric power, steel, aluminum, and strategic metals such as copper, chrome, and manganese. Special consideration should be given, also, to the need for an increased supply of wood pulp for newsprint.

Much of the preliminary work of investigation to establish the need for such expansion has already been done by the Senate Small Business Committee. Its steel investigation, and the report, Steel Supply and Distribution Problems, made by Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, the first chairman of the committee, have been a major factor in focusing attention on this situation. The work has only been partly done. The committee contemplates further study and active participation in the formulation of any proposed legislation to carry out the recommendations of the President. It intends that such legislation will not increase the concentration of economic power but provide for a wider degree of competition as the only business atmosphere in which small and independent business can operate successfully. Therefore, it is imperative to have the Senate Small Business Committee continued during the Eighty-first Congress when these decisions on plant expansion will be made.

The administration and the Democratic Party are pledged to the continuance of the Senate Small Business Committee

The President of the United States, in his campaign for election, pledged his administration to a vigorous program specifically directed toward the peculiar and particular needs of independent and small business. The National Committee of the Democratic Party established an Independent Business Committee for Truman and Barkley and the Democratic Candidates, and issued literature directing the attention of the business people of the Nation to the record in their behalf as made by the Democrats. That record was pointed up largely in terms of the work of the congressional Small Business Committees. The Democratic Party pledged itself to continue these efforts in behalf of independent and small business. This effort played no small part in the successful outcome of the November elections.

After the election, Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, long-time chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, called upon the President to ascertain his views concerning the continuance of the committee. President Truman was emphatic in his endorsement of the committee and insistence that it be continued during the Eighty-first Congress.

Senator HOWARD MCGRATH, who, as Democratic National Committee chairman, had set up the independent and small business committee referred to above and has testified to its great contribution in the campaign, has informed Senator MURRAY that he unequivocally endorses the Senate Small Business Committee and urges its continuance as a partial fulfillment of the party's pledge to the voters. Numerous other Senators have indicated their support for continuance of the committee.

The continuance of the Senate Small Business Committee does not contravene either the spirit or practice of the reorganization bill

Mention has been made that continuance of the Senate Small Business Committee might be in contradiction to the Reorganization Act. That act contemplated keeping special committees to a minimum, permitting subcommittees of standing committees to do particular tasks of short duration for which special committees are usually set up.

The Senate Small Business Committee's work overlaps the legislative interest of several standing committees. That work does not primarily, nor necessarily, lead directly to legislation. When it does (as witness the record of its accomplishment in the passage of such substantial contributions as the Smaller War Plants Corporation, the Surplus Property Act, and the Full Employment Act, and several other measures designed to aid small business directly, such as access roads to small mines, and stock piling of strategic materials), the investigating work done by the committee is made use of directly in the hearings on proposed legislation held by the appropriate standing committees. This is not duplication of effort, but on the contrary speeds up the legislative process, for a phase of legislation, that of the investigation of the problem in all its ramifications, has already been done and a considerable understanding has developed upon which specific legislation can be built and hearings conducted.

But the peculiar importance of the Senate Small Business Committee is that the independent business community of the Nation knows it has a committee in the Senate avowedly concerned with its manifold problems. In this day and age, when the encroachments of large corporations into all fields of economic endeavor threatens the very life of the free competitive-enterprise system which is the foundation of our cherished American institutions, it is not too much to expect that the Senate of the

United States would be sufficiently interested in the problems of independent and small business to maintain a committee devoting full time to investigating these problems and their solution.

The work of the Senate Small Business Committee, while often leading to legislation, is in very considerable measure concerned with the effectiveness of legislation already passed and being administered by the administrative branch of the Government. This work, as has been pointed out above, overlaps the special province of any one standing legislative committee. Moreover, and this is of substantive importance, it is of a character that is considerably beyond the scope and experience of standing committees or their staffs. It calls for specialized experience and requires experts trained in investigation and negotiation in a broad field of business, economics, and government administration, all of which is pointed up in terms of the specific interests of independent and small business. To include such work as a part of the effort of a standing committee would be to overshadow that committee's customary effort, for the volume of work done by the Senate Small Business Committee, the demands on its time and staff, are considerably greater than that required by the usual standing committee in the course of its legislative work.

The work of the Senate Small Business Committee does not duplicate in any noticeable way any work now being done or contemplated by standing legislative committees. It has an important field all to itself, and over the years the dependence of the business community at large upon it furnishes ample proof that this is a field of congressional activity very much in the public interest and demand. If the committee should be discontinued, and some subcommittee of a standing committee be given its assignments, not only would it distort the work of the standing committee, but no savings in time of Senators, or in funds would be made, unless it is the intention by such action to deliberately destroy the effectiveness of the program being carried on in behalf of independent and small business. That has never been suggested as a purpose behind any move to discontinue the Senate Small Business Committee and tuck its effort away as a subcommittee activity of a standing legislative committee. But American business men and women who have contacted the members and staff of the Senate Small Business Committee view with alarm any such move, for they fear that this is just another way of curtailing, stifling, and eventually killing the program in behalf of independent and small business.

The Reorganization Act has been in effect long enough now to have settled into the fabric of congressional organization. Consequently, no rash of new special committees will break out if the decision is made to continue the Senate Small Business Committee. For it is widely recognized that this committee is of a very special character and therefore does not fit into the pattern of subcommittees of standing committees, whereas all the special investigations sought can be organized expeditiously that way.

The House of Representatives is continuing its Special Committee on Small Business. If the Senate Committee is not continued, there results a lopsided arrangement, where Members of the Senate will have to refer the problems of their small-business constituents to the House for action, action which is entirely beyond their control and cannot be fitted into their own efforts in behalf of their constituents. The House of Representatives sees nothing in the continuance of its Small Business Committee which is disturbing to the effectiveness of the Reorganization Act.

Proposed program of the Senate Small Business Committee during the Eighty-first Congress

The work of the committee is practical—it is aimed to make certain that independent and small business comes through this unnatural postwar period of inflation and shortages as well as is possible, to the end that competitive business will survive and grow strong. This work is divided into two, not completely distinct parts: (1) Those investigations, negotiations, hearings, and meetings which result in independent and small business receiving fair and equal treatment with big business competitors in relationships with the Government, and (2) an investigation of those fundamental and long-range problems which restrict competition and strengthen monopoly practices to the detriment of independent business.

Specifically, the Senate Small Business Committee intends working in the following areas:

1. Small business participation in Government procurement (military, research and development, and normal procurement programs).
2. Small business participation in international trade (ECA, export-control policies, etc.).
3. Breaking the bottlenecks of scarce materials for small business (steel, aluminum, newsprint, power, etc.).
4. Small business participation in the plant expansion and development program launched by the Government as a defense and economy plan.
5. Small business participation in the program of development and stock piling of strategic metals and materials.
6. The antitrust laws and practices of the agencies (Federal Trade Commission, Department of Justice, Department of Commerce, and Department of Labor) as they affect small business.
7. Accounting, statistics and reports required by the Government and their effect on small business.
8. Transportation problems of small business.
9. Small business interest in the surplus property disposal program.
10. Financial problems of small business (equity, capital taxation).

The continuance of the Small Business Committee has widespread support

Any attempt to discontinue the Senate Small Business Committee, or to tuck it away as a subcommittee of a standing legislative committee, will meet with the greatest disfavor of many thousands of American businessmen scattered widely over the Nation. They have come to expect its services as necessary in their behalf, as one small means of balancing the scales in comparison to their powerful big business rivals. They have repeatedly given the finest commendations of its work. Its continuance has been pledged them by responsible leaders in the Congress and the administration.

No attempt has been made to assemble any pressure, or to allow any pressure to be exerted in behalf of continuance of the committee, for that has such obvious merit that no such pressure would appear to be required. It is recommended, therefore, that full support be given the resolution being introduced to continue the committee during the 81st Congress.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS, COAUTHOR OF BILL

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, on the 10th of January I introduced Senate bill 287 to provide for grants to assist the States, Territories, and dependencies in the construction of elementary and secondary schools. That bill is now before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I ask unanimous consent that it be reprinted for the sole purpose of having the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] joined as cosponsor of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPLICATION OF RULE XIX

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish very respectfully to refer to the application of rule XIX of the Senate. The rule reads as follows:

When a Senator desires to speak, he shall rise and address the Presiding Officer, and shall not proceed until he is recognized, and the Presiding Officer shall recognize the Senator who shall first address him. No Senator shall interrupt another Senator in debate without his consent; and to obtain such consent he shall first address the Presiding Officer.

The rule goes on to cover other matters not germane to the point which I wish to raise.

A few minutes ago the Presiding Officer recognized the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], who was not at the time even on the floor, although at that time the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] was seeking recognition. The junior Senator from Oregon raised the question, by way of a parliamentary inquiry, as to the propriety of the course of action of the Presiding Officer under that rule. As the RECORD tomorrow will show, as a result of the exchange between the junior Senator from Oregon and the Presiding Officer, the Senator from Oregon found himself in a position in which the senior Senator from Florida would not agree to yield for any further raising of the parliamentary inquiry.

I want to assure the Presiding Officer, because I think he knows, on the basis of his relationships with the Senator from Oregon, that the Senator from Oregon holds the Presiding Officer in very fond affection. I meant it when I said some days ago that I think the Presiding Officer is a great inspiration to the liberals of the country, and that his record has been a great record of social service. But my extremely high regard for the Presiding Officer must be considered quite independent of my duty to protect my rights and the rights of other Senators who have since this occurrence this afternoon conferred with me and expressed complete agreement with the point of view I am now expressing that rule XIX should be applied by the Presiding Officer in accordance with its clear meaning and without any understandings or arrangements entered into between the Presiding Officer and any Senator whereby he will recognize some other Senator in preference to a Senator who first addresses the Chair, is standing on the floor, and is seeking to be recognized.

This is not the first time in the history of the Senate that the Chair—not the present Presiding Officer, but another Presiding Officer—has recognized a Senator who was not even on the floor at the time. I remember quite clearly a couple of years ago an occasion when the then Presiding Officer recognized the junior

Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], because, on the basis of a list that was being kept at the desk, he was supposed to be the next Senator to be recognized, but he was not on the floor at the time, and after some little exchange a Senator who was on the floor at the time was finally recognized.

I wish to say, in all courtesy and with deep respect, that I think that we must insist that the present Presiding Officer and every other Presiding Officer of the Senate, see to it that our rights under the rules are protected, and I submit that the type of ruling the Chair handed down this afternoon may, by accretion of further misrulings, eventually reach the point where our rights are in fact seriously jeopardized. We cannot start varying the letter as to our rights under the rules of the Senate without soon finding ourselves in the position of finding that our rights are seriously interfered with.

I have been moved to comment on a recognition which occurred on the floor when I was acting as minority leader, and which I protested at the time, and I turn to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, page 854, the first column on the page, starting with the language in which the RECORD says:

Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. HAYDEN rose and addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona wish to oppose the resolution?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have sought recognition to speak on the resolution itself. As chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, I should like to discuss the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks the Senator from Arizona is entitled to recognition, if the Senator wishes to discuss the resolution now. The Chair wishes to expedite the matter by getting the resolution before the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. As I understand, the resolution is now before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No, the resolution is not before the Senate. The motion of the Senator from Illinois to proceed to the consideration of the resolution is still pending. Does the Senator from New Hampshire object?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have been trying to secure recognition here for several hours, and I have been taken off my feet, and a few more Senators are going to be taken off their feet, too, if I do not secure recognition.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has not taken the Senator off his feet. From a legislative standpoint the Senator has not been on his feet. The Chair is trying to expedite the business of the Senate. The resolution is debatable after the motion is agreed to. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Arizona if he wishes to speak on the motion.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. I do not want to be overly technical, but I certainly question whether recognition of any Senator should depend on whether he desires to address himself to the subject matter under discussion. I am sure the Presiding Officer does not mean that recognition of the Senator from Arizona is to be given on that basis. What the Presiding Officer has suggested is that he would recognize the Senator from Arizona if the Senator from Arizona proposes to speak on the resolution. I would have to raise a point of order if that is the intention of the Presiding Officer.

I think the remarks of yesterday speak for themselves, and as a Member of this body, Mr. President, I most respectfully urge that at all times rule XIX be strictly complied with at this session of the Congress.

I find myself in opposition to a practice which I have heretofore protested time and time again on the floor of the Senate, namely, of keeping a list at the presiding officer's desk, which list should be followed in recognizing Senators on the floor of the Senate. I respectfully submit that rule XIX was put into the rules to protect each and every one of the 96 of us, insofar as we are first on our feet, and asking for recognition, to be so recognized by the presiding officer, whoever he may be. I respectfully submit that this afternoon when the presiding officer announced the recognition of the Senator from West Virginia when the Senator from West Virginia was not here to be recognized, rule XIX was violated.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair feels compelled to make an observation, in view of the remarks of the Senator from Oregon. The Chair is as sincere in his belief that rule XIX should be observed by the Presiding Officer, whoever he may be, as any Senator could possibly be. As we all know, from time immemorial Senators who wanted to be recognized sometimes came to the Chair and indicated their desire for recognition. I have for many years protested the keeping of a list at the desk by private arrangement, made in the order in which Senators approached the Chair and desired to be recognized.

The Chair recognizes the full force of the rule that the Chair should recognize the first Senator who rises and asks for recognition. But when two or more Senators rise at the same time it is not always possible for the Chair to tell just which one rose first, and therefore he must exercise some discretion in determining which Senator he will recognize under the circumstances.

What has happened today is not serious. The Senator from West Virginia came to the Chair and said that he desired to reintroduce a bill, and asked me if I would recognize him. I asked him to await the conclusion of the debate on the pending appeal, and especially await the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and told him that if he were on his feet asking recognition then, the Chair would recognize him.

When the Senator from Vermont concluded his remarks the Chair looked over on the right to see whether the Senator from West Virginia was on his feet asking recognition, and made inquiry whether the Senator from West Virginia were in the Chamber, and was advised that he was not, whereupon the Chair recognized the Senator from Florida. So that it is not a serious infraction of the rule.

If the Senator from West Virginia had been in the Chamber and on his feet asking recognition to do what he has since done, namely, reintroduce a bill, the Chair would have recognized him. The Chair did not recognize the Senator from West Virginia in his absence from the Chamber. The Chair inquired whether the Senator from West Virginia was in the Chamber, and on being advised he was not, recognized the Senator from Florida, who was on his feet.

Calling the attention of the Chair to rule XIX has served a purpose, and the Chair thanks the Senator from Oregon. The Chair has long insisted that a Senator need not yield to any other Senator for any purpose while he has the floor, unless he is guilty of misconduct or violation of the rules himself so that he is called to order and is compelled to take his seat. A Senator is not required to yield to another Senator to make a point of order, to make the point of no quorum, or for any other purpose, and even when he yields he can yield only for a question, under the rule.

In view of the importance of legislation of all sorts, which will be controversial, that is likely to arise in the Senate at this session, the Chair hopes he will have the complete cooperation of Senators in observing and enforcing all the provisions of rule XIX, and not merely one provision.

The Chair felt he was called upon to make these remarks in view of the observations of the Senator from Oregon, in explanation of why the Chair had indicated to the Senator from West Virginia that if he were present and on his feet asking recognition to do what he did the Chair would recognize him at a certain point.

SPECIAL SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

The Senate resumed the consideration of Mr. WHERRY's appeal from the decision of the Chair referring Senate Resolution 55 to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is——

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. As I understand, the question before the Senate is whether the Senate will vote to sustain the Chair in his reference of the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to the Committee on Banking and Currency. It is also my understanding that a resolution establishing a special committee on small business has been referred to the Banking and Currency Committee and is now in the hands of that committee. It is further my understanding, which I should like to have confirmed, that the Committee on Banking and Currency expects to act upon that resolution at a very early date, probably sometime next week, and to report it back to the Senate, either favorably or unfavorably, so that the matter of establishing a special Small Business Committee will be before this body within the next few days. I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency if my understanding is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, of course, the only question before the Senate, as the Senator from Vermont knows, is the question of the appeal from the decision of the Chair on the reference of the pending resolution. Speaking for myself, and I think the committee will agree with me, we should consider this resolution and the one previously referred to it, and they should be reported to the Senate either favorably or unfavorably. Now whether or not that will be done this week, or the next week, or whether it will be done the following week, I cannot say. All I can say is that I urge it be done as soon as possible, and I am certain that the committee will report the resolution within 2 weeks. I do not say it will be done this week, because our regular meeting day has been on Tuesdays.

Mr. AIKEN. What I wanted to get clear in my mind is whether we would very soon have a chance to discuss the establishment of a special committee for small business on the merits of the question.

Mr. MAYBANK. I can only say that the Committee on Banking and Currency will report the two resolutions, the one by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the other by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], if it should be referred to it, within a reasonable time, and I believe it would be certainly within 2 weeks.

Mr. AIKEN. With that understanding, Mr. President, it seems to me that the Senate could have an opportunity to act upon the matter itself as early or earlier if the Committee on Banking and Currency would report the resolution back to the Senate within a week or so, than it could if such a resolution were referred to an entirely different committee, which probably has not considered the matter at all up to this time.

Mr. MAYBANK. While I now speak only for myself, the consensus of opinion of the Committee on Banking and Currency it seemed to me was that the resolution should be reported within a reasonable time.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to ask a question with reference to the latter part of the remarks just made by the Chair, with particular reference to paragraphs 2, 3, and 4 of rule XIX. As I understood the Presiding Officer's remarks, it is not in order for any Senator to interrupt another Senator while he is speaking, except for a question, and with his consent—not even for points of order. My inquiry of the Presiding Officer is: If a Senator does transgress the rules as outlined in paragraphs 2 and 3 and refuses to yield for a point of order, is there not a way that a Senator can, under those circumstances, call the other Senator to order, if the Presiding Officer does not do so?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator who has the floor makes some remark that reflects upon the integrity or the good faith—the Chair is not quoting verbatim the language of the rule—of some other Senator, he may be called to order and required to sit down, whereupon he may be permitted to proceed in order. Otherwise a Senator is not required to yield the floor for any purpose, so long as he does not violate the rules of the Senate in his own conduct, or misconduct, as the case might be.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the appeal from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. LUCAS obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Inasmuch as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency has now made a positive statement that within 2 weeks one of the resolutions will be reported back to the Senate, if I heard him correctly——

Mr. MAYBANK. I was speaking for myself as chairman of the committee, and I believe the other members of the committee feel the same way I do. I have no right to bind any other member of the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. I realize that, Mr. President. That is quite right. The chairman has said that he will do everything within his power to report back one of the resolutions within 2 weeks.

Mr. MAYBANK. I said I hoped to.

Mr. WHERRY. Well——

Mr. MAYBANK. Now, Mr. President, I wish no one to misunderstand me. I have only my own vote in the committee. I cannot pledge any other member of the committee. No member of the committee has given me any statement that I could use here. I represent only my own vote. But I thought it to be the consensus of opinion in the committee that within a reasonable time we would report the resolution. However, I cannot pledge any other member.

Mr. WHERRY. I will make this request then. In view of the statement made by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, in whom I have absolute confidence, I will say that I shall have accomplished the purpose I had in mind if either resolution be reported favorably by the committee. In view of the statement by the chairman of the committee, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my appeal.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I object, because I do not desire the charge to be made that I, as chairman of the committee, have been speaking for the committee. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the ranking minority member of the committee, was not at the meeting held today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate in referring Senate Resolution 55 to the Committee on Banking and Currency? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Nebraska have the parliamentary right to withdraw his appeal if he so desires?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and it cannot be done after that. The Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DONNELL. A vote "yea" is a vote to sustain the Chair. Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. A vote "yea" is a vote to sustain the ruling of the Chair. A vote "nay" is a vote to overrule the decision of the Chair.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business at Government departments.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired on this question with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea," and the Senator from Missouri would vote "nay."

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is paired on this question with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "nay."

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is paired on this question with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is paired on this question with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "yea," if present.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is detained on official business and is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. If present and voting, the Senator from

New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] would vote "nay" and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] would vote "nay" and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] is detained on official business and is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. If present and voting, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] would vote "nay" and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is absent on official business and is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] would vote "nay" and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 57, nays 20, as follows:

YEAS—57

Aiken	Hill	Miller
Anderson	Hoey	Myers
Broughton	Holland	Neely
Byrd	Hunt	O'Conor
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Chapman	Kefauver	Robertson
Connally	Kerr	Russell
Cordon	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Donnell	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Long	Sparkman
Eastland	Lucas	Stennis
Ellender	McClellan	Taylor
Flanders	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Frear	McGrath	Thomas, Utah
George	McKellar	Tobey
Gillette	McMahon	Tydings
Hayden	Magnuson	Williams
Hendrickson	Maybank	Withers

NAYS—20

Baldwin	Lodge	Taft
Brewster	Malone	Thye
Ecton	Martin	Watkins
Ferguson	Morse	Wherry
Hickenlooper	Mundt	Wiley
Ives	Saltonstall	Young
Knowland	Schoeppel	

NOT VOTING—19

Bricker	Gurney	Millikin
Bridges	Humphrey	Murray
Butler	Jenner	Reed
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Vandenberg
Downey	Kem	Wagner
Fulbright	McCarran	
Green	McCarthy	

So the decision of the Chair was sustained.

INFLATION AND EMPLOYMENT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the sessions of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report to consider at a public meeting the recommendations made by the President began this morning in the caucus room in the House Office Building. Problems of inflation, production, purchasing power, and employment are under consideration. The testimony which will be offered there will be of vital importance, I think, to the people of the United States.

Mr. Leon Keyserling, vice chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, testified this morning. Mr. Keyserling will be followed tomorrow by Dr. John D. Clark, also a member of the Council of Economic Advisers. Thereafter testimony will be presented by the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Charles Sawyer; the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. John W. Snyder; the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Maurice Tobin; the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Julius A. Krug; and the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Charles F. Brannan.

Mr. Raymond M. Foley, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency; Federal Security Administrator Oscar R. Ewing; Assistant Secretary of State Willard L. Thorpe; and Chairman Thomas B. McCabe, of the Federal Reserve Board, will conclude the presentation of the testimony which has been organized by Secretary Brannan on behalf of the administration.

The Joint Committee on the Economic Report has invited a panel of nationally known economists and experts in the various problems which will be under consideration. Representatives of agricultural organizations, labor organizations, and business organizations have also been invited to attend the hearings, which will be concluded with two round table discussions, one by each of the groups which I have mentioned. These round table discussions will be conducted in public before the committee, in order to develop the best possible consensus of opinion regarding the economic situation.

In order that this information may be made available to as many readers as possible, I have had prepared a summary of the testimony which was offered this morning by the Vice Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, Mr. Leon Keyserling. I ask unanimous consent that this summary of his statement, together with a table which shows the state of employment in the United States from January 1946 to 1947, and a table on consumers' prices for the period 1939 to 1948 may be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

INFLATION AND EMPLOYMENT

TESTIMONY OF LEON H. KEYSERLING, VICE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

The Employment Act of 1946 has two basic objectives—economic stability and a continuing growth of the economy. At present the economic condition of the country is good, but there are maladjustments which if not stopped by appropriate action may produce unemployment and lower national income. While the prices of some farm products and foods have gone down in some areas, there are many strategically important parts of the economy in which prices are continuing to rise. Industrial prices have reached an all-time peak. The same contrast and imbalance between managed industrial prices and low farm prices that caused so much unemployment in the 1929–33 depression is beginning to appear again and could have similar consequences unless the danger is quickly recognized and firmly met.

There are six basic maladjustments in the current economic situation that require attention.

1. The cost of living has risen 74 percent since the middle of 1939, and 29 percent since the middle of 1946. The down-turn in the cost of living in recent weeks has thus far been only about 2 percent. At current costs clearly more than a fifth and probably a fourth of the families in the country do not have sufficient income to maintain what by scientific standards has been indicated as the minimum standard for maintenance of health and decency. People in the lowest income brackets have been hit hardest. Of those getting as little as $3,000, more than one-fourth suffered decreases in money income last year compared with 1947, and an additional 45 percent had no increases at all. On the other hand most of those already in the upper income brackets got further increases.

2. The relationship between industrial prices and farm prices has operated to the detriment of the farmer since the middle of 1946. "Since the last prewar year 1939, farm prices and incomes have risen more than most other prices and incomes. This helped to redress the unfortunate position of the farmer in the prewar economy. But since the middle of 1946, industrial prices and incomes have been outpacing agricultural; since then, wholesale prices of farm products have risen 22 percent and of industrial commodities 45 percent * * * with per capita net income of persons on farms estimated at $909 in 1948, contrasting with $1,569 for persons not on farms, we again face the emergence of the traditional problem of maintaining agriculture in balance with the rest of the economy. The farmer's share of the consumer's dollar has dropped constantly since 1946." The cost of living can and should be reduced without driving farm income further downward. This can be accomplished by lower distributor margins, and by a comprehensive program of increased farm efficiency.

3. There are "sharp and continued increases in prices of certain vital industrial products. * * * On top of earlier price increases, during the second half of 1948 there were further increases in such significant categories of wholesale prices as fuel and lighting materials and house furnishings." Prices of metals and metal products increased 6.7 percent in the second half of 1947, 4.6 percent in the first half of 1948, 9.7 percent in the second half of 1948, and 2.2 percent during January 1949. In the second half of 1948, the price of zinc increased 44.4 percent and of lead 22.9 percent. "These continuing price increases, although selective, are at vital spots where they influence the whole economy. An unchecked upward trend of these prices, when farm prices have been falling and other prices softening, may lead to even more serious maladjustment than when almost all prices were rising together."

(4) "Consumer expenditures or demand have dropped from 76 percent of total output in 1929, and 75 percent in 1939, to only 70 percent in 1948. * * * Correspondingly compensation of employees as a share of total national income has dropped from 65.9 percent in 1939 to 61.5 percent in 1948, thus moving close to the undesirably low 58.1 percent of 1929; while business and professional income and corporate profits as a share of total national income are much higher than in 1929 and even more above the 1939 level. Readjustment in the current ratios, which cannot be sustained permanently, is essential if we are to maintain full demand for an increasing output of about 3 percent per year without a large and continuing increase in Government expenditures."

(5) "The aggregate of corporate profits has been running higher than needed to maintain current or even somewhat increased levels of business investment. Between 1947 and 1948, corporate profits after taxes increased by $2,700,000,000 and undistributed profits increased by $2,000,000,000, while there was a decline of $2,000,000,000 in corporate uses of funds." At the same time that small businesses are earning less profit in 1948 than in 1947, the larger corporations are able to finance a phenomenally high proportion of their operations from internal sources. Corporate stockholders received in dividends but 36.5 percent of net profits after taxes in

1948, contrasted with 69 percent in 1929 and 76 percent in 1939.

(6) "Some basic industries are not increasing their capacities sufficiently to attain the production levels required for the steady growth of a maximum employment economy." Instead, they are gearing their capacities to the assumption that in the future as in the past there will be a sharp drop in the business cycle. This assumption of recession or depression, in turn, increases the likelihood of the very evil against which reserves are being amassed. • • • The road to more production in the main is not higher prices and profits later on, but, instead, a rounded policy which adjusts prices and profits and capacities to a long period of stability and growth."

The easiest time to correct these maladjustments is before a crisis appears, that is now. The hardest time will be later on when neglect has actually produced the crisis. Those who are intelligent and conservative have long realized that a "stitch in time saves nine," but, unfortunately, sometimes the shiftless counsel of drift and do nothing is allowed to bring on damage that is irreparable.

Labor force, 1946–49

[Thousands of persons, 14 years of age and over]

Month	Total labor force, including armed forces [1]	Civilian employment			Armed forces [1]	Unemployment
		Total	Nonagricultural	Agricultural		
1946—January	59,490	51,020	44,300	6,720	6,170	2,300
February	59,120	51,240	44,300	6,940	5,240	2,650
March	59,620	52,460	44,930	7,530	4,470	2,700
April	60,300	54,120	45,950	8,170	3,850	2,330
May	60,870	54,820	45,970	8,880	3,410	2,310
June	62,600	56,360	46,350	10,010	3,070	2,570
July	62,820	57,840	47,870	9,970	2,710	2,270
August	62,200	57,690	48,550	9,140	2,450	2,060
September	61,340	57,050	48,300	8,750	2,220	2,070
October	61,160	57,030	48,410	8,620	2,170	1,960
November	60,580	57,040	49,140	7,900	2,010	1,930
December	60,320	56,310	49,100	7,210	1,890	2,120
1947—January	59,510	55,390	48,890	6,500	1,720	2,400
February	59,630	55,520	48,600	6,920	1,600	2,490
March	59,960	56,060	48,820	7,240	1,570	2,330
April	60,650	56,700	48,840	7,860	1,530	2,420
May	61,760	58,330	49,370	8,960	1,470	1,960
June	64,007	60,055	49,678	10,377	1,398	2,555
July	64,635	60,079	50,013	10,066	1,371	2,584
August	63,017	59,569	50,594	8,975	1,352	2,096
September	62,130	58,872	50,145	8,727	1,346	1,912
October	62,219	59,204	50,583	8,622	1,327	1,687
November	61,310	58,595	50,609	7,985	1,294	1,621
December	60,870	57,947	50,985	6,962	1,280	1,643
1948—January	60,455	57,149	50,089	7,060	1,241	2,065
February	61,004	57,139	50,368	6,771	1,226	2,639
March	61,005	57,329	50,482	6,847	1,236	2,440
April	61,760	58,330	50,883	7,448	1,236	2,193
May	61,660	58,660	50,800	7,861	1,238	1,761
June	64,740	61,296	51,899	9,396	1,261	2,184
July	65,135	61,615	52,452	9,163	1,293	2,227
August	64,511	61,245	52,801	8,444	1,325	1,941
September	63,578	60,312	51,590	8,723	1,366	1,899
October	63,166	60,134	51,506	8,627	1,391	1,642
November	63,138	59,893	51,932	7,961	1,414	1,831
December	62,828	59,434	52,059	7,375	1,453	1,941
1949—January	61,546	57,414	50,651	6,763	1,468	2,664

[1] Excludes about 150,000 members of the armed forces.

NOTE.—Detail will not necessarily add to totals because of rounding.

Source: Department of Commerce.

Consumers' prices, 1939–48, for moderate-income families in large cities

Period	All items [1]	Food	Apparel	Rent
	1935–39=100			
Monthly average:				
1939	99.4	95.2	100.5	104.3
1940	100.2	96.6	101.7	104.6
1941	105.2	105.5	103.3	105.2
1942	116.5	123.9	124.2	108.5
1943	123.6	138.0	129.7	108.0
1944	125.6	138.1	138.8	108.2
1945	128.4	139.1	145.9	108.3
1946	139.3	159.6	160.2	108.6
1947	150.2	193.8	185.8	111.2
1948	171.2	210.2	198.0	117.4
1939—June	98.6	93.6	100.3	104.3
1945—June	133.3	145.6	157.2	108.5
1947—June	157.1	190.5	188.7	109.2
1948—January	168.8	209.7	192.1	115.9
February	167.5	204.7	195.1	116.0
March	169.9	202.3	196.3	116.3
April	169.3	207.9	196.4	116.3
May	170.5	210.9	197.5	116.7
June	171.7	214.1	196.9	117.0
July	173.7	216.8	197.1	117.3
August	174.5	216.6	199.7	117.7
September	174.5	215.2	201.0	118.5
October	173.6	211.5	201.6	118.7
November	172.2	207.5	201.4	118.8
December	171.4	205.0	200.4	119.5
	Percentage increases			
Since June 1939 [2]	74	119	100	15
Since June 1945 [2]	29	41	27	10
Since June 1947 [2]	9	8	8	0

[1] Also includes housefurnishings, fuel, electricity, and refrigeration, and miscellaneous goods and services.

[2] To December 1948, latest data available.

Source: Department of Labor.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Hawthorne Arey, of Nebraska, to be a director of the Export-Import Bank of Washington to fill an existing vacancy, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. McGRATH, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

Aubrey B. Fennell, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harry Alfred Curtis to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to make an announcement for the benefit of Members of the Senate. When the Senate concludes its business today, it is planned to adjourn until Thursday next. I see no reason why we should be here for any considerable length of time on Thursday. At the conclusion of business on Thursday, it is planned that the Senate shall adjourn until Monday.

I now move that the Senate adjourn until Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, February 10, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate February 8, 1949:

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Hawthorne Arey, of Nebraska, to be a director of the Export-Import Bank of Washington to fill an existing vacancy.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate February 8, 1949:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Harry Alfred Curtis to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the term expiring 9 years after May 18, 1948.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Dale Crowley, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, God of all mercy and grace:

With grateful hearts, we acknowledge that Thou hast wonderfully blest our Nation. We ask that Thou will give to all Thy servants a sense of true thanksgiving, and with this an awareness of our stewardship before Thee. Grant that every man in this Chamber today, and every day, may think not merely of his responsibility to his constituents, but especially of his high trusteeship under God. Like Daniel Webster, exemplary statesman that he was, may our foremost thought be our accountability to God.

Give wisdom, so that we may be able to discern between the right and the wrong. Give courage, that we may ever stand for that which is true. Give humility, that we may walk before Thee

acceptably; and give devotion, that we may serve Thee faithfully. We ask it in the name of our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

RENT CONTROL

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill on the controversial subject of rent control.

It is a bill that preserves the basic fundamentals of free enterprise. At the same time it prevents tenants from being gouged by the small percentage of landlords who might with justification be termed "unscrupulous and selfish." The bill provides for decontrol, but at the same time it permits any tenant who is about to be gouged the right of appeal to a local board composed of citizens in his own county. I recommend that the Members of this body study this particular measure. It will allow free collective bargaining between individual tenants and landlords with the local board acting as the final arbiter if the landlord refuses to be fair and just. We must remember that rent is merely the wage of the people who have been thrifty enough over the years to save sufficient funds to own an equity in real property. Under the present rent-control law and under the administration's proposed bill, the Government sets the rent and there is no attempt made to allow a gradual relaxation of rent control. Instead controls are to be extended for 27 months and the regulations are to be more stringent. My bill will act as a steam valve to protect the many tenants, but at the same time it will preserve the fundamentals of free enterprise.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DAGUE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in the first to include an editorial from the Philadelphia Enquirer, and in the second to include a letter from Time magazine.

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution on statehood for Hawaii.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was granted permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a magazine article written by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. LYNCH asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR MEN AND WOMEN

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, on January 5 I introduced House Joint Resolution 68, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women.

This resolution is nonpartisan. It has been a plank in the Republican national platform in 1940, 1944, and 1948.

It has been a plank in the Democratic national platform in 1944 and 1948.

It was also a plank in the Progressive Party's national platform in 1948.

For these reasons many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have joined me as cosponsors of the resolution and we hope that the two major parties will live up to the promises, oft repeated in their platforms.

The following Congressmen are cosponsors of this resolution: FRANK BUCHANAN, J. HARRY MCGREGOR, WILLIAM LEMKE, ERNEST K. BRAMBLETT, A. L. MILLER, THURMOND CHATHAM, EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN, HARLEY O. STAGGERS, THRUSTON B. MORTON, ROBERT F. RICH, CLARE MAGEE, ROBERT T. SECREST, TOBEY MORRIS, GORDON L. MCDONOUGH, F. EDWARD HÉBERT, CHESTER A. CHESNEY, CHARLES B. DEANE, HENDERSON LANHAM, FRANK W. BOYKIN, WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER, HOMER D. ANGELL, JAMES F. LIND, DANIEL A. REED, CHARLES E. BENNETT, HOWARD W. SMITH, EDWARD A. GARMATZ, FRANK A. BARRETT, ANTHONY CAVALCANTE, M. G. BURNSIDE, JACK Z. ANDERSON, ROBERT J. CORBETT, WAYNE L. HAYS, THOR C. TOLLEFSON, BOYD TACKETT, BRENT SPENCE, CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, DONALD L. JACKSON, RALPH W. GWINN, CLINTON D. MCKINNON, HARRY L. TOWE, W. G. STIGLER, WILLIAM T. BYRNE, WALT HORAN, JAMES S. GOLDEN, FRANCIS CASE, MORGAN M. MOULDER, CHARLES A. PLUMLEY, B. W. KEARNEY, PAUL CUNNINGHAM, ABRAHAM J. MULTER, JAMES G. FULTON, CLIFFORD DAVIS, EDWARD JENISON, JOHN PHILLIPS, JAMES G. POLK, EARL WILSON, WILBUR D. MILLS, WILLIAM P. BOLTON, E. H. HEDRICK, TOM B. FUGATE, CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, H. R. GROSS, G. R. WITHROW, RICHARD NIXON, RICHARD W. HOFFMAN, CLAIR ENGLE, JOHN R. MURDOCK, EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, ISIDORE DOLLINGER, DWIGHT L. ROGERS, CLIFFORD R. HOPE, CHARLES P. NELSON, TOM STEED, IVOR D. FENTON, A. S. HERLONG, JAMES T. PATTERSON, OTTO E. PASSMAN, CECIL M. HARDEN, DAYTON E. PHILLIPS.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced H. R. 2389, a bill providing for the establishment of a National Commission on Governmental Relations. At that time I emphasized the vital need for such a Commission and for a study such as the bill directs it to make, especially with respect to the fiscal problems existing among the various levels of government.

At that time, Mr. Speaker, I urged that other Members of the Congress, without respect to political affiliation, join with me in sponsoring this legislation. Consequently, it is with real pleasure and deep gratitude that I am able to report to the Members of this House that a bill identical with H. R. 2389 was introduced in the other body of the Congress yesterday by eight distinguished Members. S. 810 was introduced by Senator HENDRICKSON, of New Jersey, for himself and for Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin; Senator BRICKER, of Ohio; my colleague, Senator WILLIAMS, of Delaware; Senator SMITH, of New Jersey; Senator SCHOEPPEL, of Kansas; Senator IVES, of New York; and Senator O'CONOR, of Maryland.

Let me say again, Mr. Speaker, that I very much appreciate the interest of those distinguished Senators in this important matter. I also reiterate my statement of yesterday in the House, to the effect that I will welcome the introduction into the House of identical bills by any of the distinguished gentlemen in this Chamber.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the legislative business of the day and any other special orders I may address the House today for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE]?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may sit today during the general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

THE TRIAL OF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the world stands aghast at the accusation, trial, and punishment of the martyr, Cardinal Mindszenty. We are filled with horror and anger at this travesty of justice. Not only is the cardinal on trial, but all free men are being tried; all religions are on trial. The dignity of man is trampled upon. The honor of the church is defiled. Today it is a Catholic prelate that communism lays foul hands upon. Tomorrow it is a rabbi, and the next day a Protestant minister.

The lesson that burns into our consciousness is the need to purge the world of communism and its poison. The antidote is vigorous protest, followed up by appropriate economic sanctions, if necessary, by free nations, headed by the United States, if Hungary continues her dreadful and dreaded practices against the cardinal.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WALTER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BARING, Mr. GARMATZ, and Mr. COLE of Kansas asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an address by Governor Sparks, of Alabama.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech on health insurance.

Mr. GREEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the American magazine of December 11, 1948, on Cardinal Mindszenty.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. COOPER, Mr. MILLS, and Mr. REED of New York asked and were given permission to revise and extend the remarks they expect to make in the Committee of the Whole today and to include excerpts of material to which they may refer.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement he made this morning before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. BURDICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a report from the welfare board of the county in which the Sioux Indians reside.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances and to include extraneous matter.

UNITED STATES SAVINGS BONDS

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, 75,000,000 people now own United States savings bonds. Plans are now being made for the spring campaign to stimulate even greater participation in bond-buying. Meanwhile the Savings Bond Division of the United States Treasury is seeking an official bond song to be sung and played on all appropriate occasions. The peace-time song will replace Irving Berlin's great war-time song, Any Bonds Today? As a member of the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber Shop Quartet Singing in America, Inc., I am proud to announce that the Treasury's quest is assured of success. The Treasury turned to the SPEBSQSA's 26,000 members, and invited them to produce the song. Entries are pouring in to International Secretary Carroll P. Adams in Detroit headquarters of the Society, and many more entries are expected before the competition closes February 15. Two thousand barber shop quartets have volunteered their services to the Treasury to sing the song at rallies scheduled in every State in the Union. Ed Place, of the Washington, D. C., chapter, whose 100-man singing capital chorus recently entertained the society's No. 1 member, President Truman, at the inaugural gala, is in charge of the savings bond song competition for SPEBSQSA. He has extended an invitation to a Congressional quartet to introduce the winning song, and I am sure that this body can supply the necessary harmonizers and harmony to assist the savings bond campaign in such a manner. The SPEBSQSA motto, Keep America Singing, will soon be augmented by Keep America Saving. [illegible] ing to know that this rapidly [illegible] public-spirited organization of male harmonizers will hold its annual midwinter meeting in the District of Columbia in January 1950. There is no finer recreation or hobby than lifting our voices in song, and it is pleasing to know that the Nation's Capital is leading the way in this great pastime.

DECISIVE FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, as we open hearings today on the European recovery program it becomes clearer than ever that our own national security and world peace are far from being a certainty. The European recovery program has saved Europe from communism, but democracy is losing China, and the United States seems impotent to even try to stop it. We must develop an immediate, vigorous, and affirmative program in Asia, and we must at the same time further fortify democracy's position in Europe and the Middle East. We are learning in Europe that a recovery program without economic and even political unity—is recovery without a point.

Mr. Speaker, our foreign policy must take the logical next step and insist that the regional groupings organized in recovery programs become regional economic and political federations—this is the true intent of the Vandenberg resolution—and the basis for an ultimate world federal government, man's hope for permanent peace.

There are appended two articles from today's Washington Post bearing on this very question:

EUROPEAN UNION

(By Sumner Welles)

SHADOW INSTEAD OF SUBSTANCE

I wonder if there is much justification for the enthusiastic reception which public opinion in the United States has given the announcement that the five Brussels pact countries have agreed upon a project for a Council of Europe.

The present plan is unquestionably a weak compromise. It rejects the French contention that a powerful European parliament should be constituted. It accepts the British thesis that nothing should now be done beyond the creation of machinery to facilitate inter-governmental cooperation between the western European countries.

So far nothing in fact has been settled except for an agreement that a constitution is to be drafted which will provide for a ministerial committee meeting in private, in which every country will have a veto power, and a consultative body meeting in public, which will be given no authority whatever. The British suggest that the council should hold its first meeting in Strasbourg before 1950 and the five Brussels pact countries have also agreed that Italy and other European countries are to be asked to join as founding members.

The project makes no provision for the limitation of national sovereignties. It possesses no real vitality. It responds to no overwhelming popular demand for a people's union. It ignores the eloquent and urgent warnings of the handful of statesmen that Europe still possesses, such as Churchill, Herriot, Reynaud, Blum, and Sforza, that Europe's only hope of salvation lies in political and economic federation.

Outside of the cooperative measures required by the European recovery program the only practical steps that have so far been taken to lay the foundation for such a federation are the economic agreements between Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg, and the agreement between France and Italy for a customs union.

There are several reasons for Britain's obstinate refusal to acquiesce in the demands

of the continental countries for the establishment of a European parliament possessing wide powers.

The British delegate on the permanent commission, Hugh Dalton, alleged that Britain opposed a European parliament which could overside national governments.

The continental governments have now learned that the British Labor Party is determined to reject any plan for European union which might hamper its ability to carry out its own internal policies or limit its capacity to impose economic controls and pursue its present course of rigid bilateral trading.

The British Government also differs radically with France and with Germany's other western neighbors concerning the kind of Germany we are to see in the future.

The basic British viewpoint is succinctly expressed in the Economist's recent complaint that the French "strain at the gnat of German nationalism but are willing to swallow the camel of European instability." In other words, the British feel that the French should acquiesce in the resurrection of German power as a bulwark against Soviet Russia.

It is the viewpoint of the 1920's all over again. The fact that France, after the First World War, was so tragically right in her fear of German nationalism and the English-speaking powers so tragically wrong in their insistence that there was no cause for apprehension seems to count for nothing in Downing Street.

It is also a strange anomaly that the cartels and vested interests in the continental countries that are out to sabotage any kind of European union which could deprive them of the benefits they have so long derived from customs barriers and exchange controls should now be joining hands with Britain's Socialist government in impeding, if not permanently blocking, the creation of that form of European union with Clement Attlee himself only 2 years ago officially proclaimed to be Europe's one chance for survival.

The United States until now has limited itself to a few platitudinous expressions of pleasure that plans for a European union should be under way. Yet is such a shadow of a European union as that now projected likely to be of any practical benefit to the United States or to become a regional bloc capable of strengthening the foundations of the United Nations?

It is generally admitted here in Washington that western Europe will still be a long way from recovery when the European recovery program ends in 1952. It is also believed that only a far-reaching political and economic union can make western Europe self-supporting. The negotiations for the North Atlantic defense pact have clearly shown that in many parts of western Europe there is already a trend toward regional isolation rather than toward a pooling of sovereign rights in the common interest. It would certainly seem to be plain that only a real and vital European federation, such as that envisaged by Mr. Churchill, could prevent a return to such a fractionized western Europe as that which made possible the catastrophe of 1939.

The State Department has properly refused to use the European recovery program as a means of influencing the national policies of the Marshall plan countries. But is there any valid reason why the countries which are receiving help under the European recovery program and which will obtain arms for self-defense as a result of the North Atlantic defense pact should not be frankly told that one of the principal ends sought by the American people in return for their sacrifices on behalf of western Europe is a real federation of the western European countries.

Might it not be the better part of wisdom for us to adopt before it is too late a less negative attitude with regard to this vital issue?

PARTNERS OR ALLIES

Only in the last few weeks has it dawned on the world that the United States and the Soviet Union are locked in a deadly struggle for allies in the next war. This is the lesson of the tug-of-war over Norway. The Soviet refuses to accept the Norwegian answer as the clarification that it sought of Norway's stand on the Atlantic Pact. And assuming that Moscow had any right to call for any such clarification, the answer was indeed cryptic. Norway said she would not permit the establishment of foreign bases on Norwegian soil "as long as Norway is not attacked or subjected to threats of attack." Russia rightly construes the explanation as leaving the Norweglans a free hand to determine the conditions which would persuade them to put bases in Norway at the disposal of the United States.

Moscow, however, chooses to ignore the fact that Norway is already bound solemnly under the United Nations to keep the peace. If the Soviet would be reassured by another pledge, it is doubtful whether Norway would. For a nonaggression pact in the Soviet lexicon has become the entering wedge of aggression. Cases in point are all the peace treaties that Moscow signed with the Balkan states. The fate of Czechoslovakia, in particular, makes a mockery of the Soviet request. Before the war the Soviet was the first to recognize that a nonaggression undertaking by Nazi Germany meant nothing, and first Litvinov and then Molotov insisted on spelling out all the phases of aggression, both internal and external; and then demanded guaranties. Stalin has taken a leaf out of Hitler's copybook. The plain fact, as the world no less than Norway sees it, is that as a result of Soviet postwar actions there is absent in relations with the Soviet Union the basic ingredient of what is now called a nonself-operating agreement, viz, good faith. It could thus be taken for granted that even if Norway were to sign a nonaggression pact with Soviet Russia, she would not thereby be deterred from seeking closer association with the Atlantic nations.

However, the occasion might be taken to reexamine the nature of the particular kind of Atlantic association under discussion. Why limit the association to a military alliance providing for the acquisition of bases, for arms consignments, and for a pledge to wage war together? If we feel a sense of association with western Europe, why not offer an association for peace as well as for war? Metternich said after the Napoleonic wars that "a unifying idea" was the foundation of postwar reconstruction and pacification. The "unifying idea" of his day was legitimacy of government. Today it is freedom and union—as the free peoples all recognize in their dreams, though their governments are not guided by it. Specifically, before this country sets its hand to a military alliance and embarks on a course that all history teaches will infallibly lead to war, let us issue a call for a constitutional assembly for the consideration of a grand Federal Union.

Such a call from the United States—the "music maker" for the free world—would lift the present discussions onto a new plane. It would reach peoples as well as governments, and inspire them to lift up their voices in an irresistible demonstration. In their hearts they want to relate themselves to other peoples. They know that distance has been annihilated, that what affects one affects everybody; yet they see their governments building up vested and nationalistic interests in such things as fighting currencies, state trading systems, and other forms of anarchy. It must seem to them defeatist as well as senseless. They cannot be encouraged, either, by the spectacle that this reversion to pathological nationalism is being financed under ERP, though, to be sure, the ERP ideal is eventually to create interdependence out of a sturdier independence.

Is it not remarkable that the first thing to be forgotten in time of peace is our war aims? Cannot we see that in all the postwar schemes of pacification and reconstruction we have undershot the mark? Partnership is the effective alliance, and the only one. Before the reaction to a mere military alliance gets altogether crystallized, an effort to realize the aspirations of the men who have had to fight a couple of world wars in the last 35 years ought to be explored, and the idea of a great community taken out of the hearts of mankind and given some form and substance.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITTINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address he delivered before the thirtieth annual convention of the Mississippi Valley Association, St. Louis, Mo., on Monday, February 7, on the subject, A Sound Program of Flood Control and River and Harbor Improvements Must Be Maintained.

THE PANAMA CANAL

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the Congress now has before it a question of national and international significance—the Panama Canal.

An important contribution to the many discussions of this subject was published in the Proceedings of the American Society of Civil Engineers, January 1949, volume 75, No. 1, pages 142–145, in the form of a technical discussion by Harry Outen Cole, a consulting engineer of Morgantown, W. Va.

Mr. Cole is an engineer of great distinction who knows the Panama Canal and the problems related thereto, based upon his own personal knowledge as resident engineer of the Pacific division of the Canal, including the Pacific locks. His words will carry great weight.

I urge that every Member of the Congress and all others who are interested in the Canal question read his illuminatory discussion, which should go a long way toward clarifying the issues.

TRADE AGREEMENTS EXTENSION ACT OF 1949

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1211) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1211, with Mr. WALTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] is recognized.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, since erroneous charges have appeared in the press that might lead some Members of the House to conclude that there was inadequate opportunity to be heard on this bill, it may be helpful to compare the background of the present bill with the procedure adopted by the Republican majority in the disposition of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948.

Last year, a subcommittee conducted the hearings on this important legislation. This year, hearings were held by the full committee.

The 1948 hearings were held behind closed doors with the press and public barred, and with a number of people deprived not only of the opportunity to be heard, but also of the right to know what other witnesses were saying before the subcommittee. In contrast, the hearings on H. R. 1211 were open to press and public and everyone who sought an opportunity to be heard was permitted to testify. Last year, although hearings were held for 6 days from May 3 to May 8, 1948, a bill was not introduced in the House until May 24. In contrast, the committee this year has had from the beginning of the hearings the benefit of knowing precisely the terms of the bill upon which the hearings were being held.

Last year the time allotted between proponents and opponents of the reciprocal-trade program was divided equally, that is, 3 days to a side. This year, the opposition had 4 days while the proponents had but 3 days. Even the terms of debate on the floor are more advantageous to the present minority than those prescribed by them when they were in control of the Eightieth Congress. Under the agreed procedure any Member will have an opportunity to offer an amendment to H. R. 1211 while last year the Republicans brought their bill to the House under a closed rule under which there was no opportunity for amendment whatever. If ever there has been a full, fair, and free hearing, discussion and deliberation of any legislation, it has been provided for the pending bill.

The bill under consideration by the House to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 as amended, and for other purposes, will, if enacted into law, restore and unshackle the authority of the President to enter into foreign trade agreements. The Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948, Eightieth Congress, was written by the foes and not the friends of the reciprocal trade method of dealing with tariffs and international trade. It was proposed and sponsored by those who on every previous occasion had opposed and voted against the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act beginning with 1934 and continuing to 1948.

The reciprocal trade method of dealing with tariff problems had proved so popular with the people of the country that its opponents would not risk an open effort to wipe it off the statute books, but attacked it by flank movement by the substitution of a bill which weakened, emasculated, and crippled the original act.

When the President reluctantly signed the 1948 act he protested that—

> The act prescribes a new complicated, time-consuming, and unnecessary procedure for the negotiation of reciprocal trade agreements. This change in procedure will necessarily hamper and obstruct the negotiation of new agreements, a defect which is particularly undesirable in view of the act's limitation to a single year.

However, the President, loyal to his constitutional duty, proceeded to schedule reciprocal trade negotiations with 13 foreign countries, beginning in April. In his letter to me of January 8, 1949, the President requested that the Committee on Ways and Means take up the extension of the Trade Agreements Act, without hampering amendments, at the earliest possible date. He further stated:

> The restrictive provisions and limited extension of the present trade agreements law materially hamper the effectiveness of United States participation in this effort. That is why it is so important that the existing Trade Agreements Act be promptly repealed, and that the act as it existed on March 1, 1948, be extended for a further substantial period. I suggest that this period be until June 12, 1951.

ORIGIN OF RECIPROCAL TRADE PROGRAM

In order to view the reciprocal trade program in its proper perspective, we should never forget that it was conceived by the eminent, respected and revered world statesman, Hon. Cordell Hull. Of the many magnificent contributions Mr. Hull has made to his own country and to the world community of nations, no star of his achievement shines more brightly than his reciprocal trade program. Cordell Hull, in my judgment, will be rated by future historians as one of the greatest statesmen America has ever produced. If Cordell Hull in all his long public career ever said or did an unwise thing, I never heard of it.

I distinctly remember his appearance before the Committee on Ways and Means on March 8, 1934—the same committee on which he had served so illustriously for 18 years. In his appearance on this occasion he soundly advised our committee as follows:

> Extreme obstructions to international trade inevitably result in serious economic controversies or wars, the minimum of commerce between nations, constant over-production through lack of facilities for distribution, together with every sort of artificial device to deal with the domestic price situation, vast idleness of labor, and emigration of capital into thousands of foreign industrial plants, to say nothing of the difficulties of effecting transfers of debt service due from one country to another. The alternative policy would appear to comprise a liberalization of the existing obstructions and restrictions by degrees and over a period of time through careful trade arrangements, to a more moderate and reasonable basis.

That was 15 years ago. The wisdom of his advice was appreciated and followed by the Committee on Ways and Means and the bill was approved on June 18, 1934, which was the first Trade Agreements Act.

HISTORY OF THE OPERATION OF THE TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The Trade Agreements Act brought forth a basic change in our tariff philosophy. In the enactment of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930, and other high tariff measures, the ruling philosophy was that the determination of the United States tariff was solely and exclusively a matter of domestic concern. Rates were fixed at inordinately high levels to conform to the wishes of domestic producers with little or no consideration given to the importance of our export trade or the American consumer.

It will be remembered that when the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act was under consideration it was opposed by the Tariff Commission, although our friends who opposed the Hull tariff policy now seem to lay great weight on the opinion of the Tariff Commission.

It may be helpful to remember that more than one thousand eminent economists throughout the country warned those in charge of the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill that, if it should be enacted into law, serious economic consequences would ensue. The Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, although heralded as a harbinger of national prosperity, was followed by the worst economic catastrophe in the history of our Government. Although it was proposed as a means of abolishing poverty and spreading prosperity throughout the land, the country experienced exactly the opposite. Under its operations industry was bankrupt, agriculture paralyzed, labor pauperized, banks failed by the thousands, and the economy of the country was shattered almost beyond belief or description, almost to the point of a revolution.

The Trade Agreements Act policy, on the other hand, recognized that tariffs are a proper subject for discussion and negotiation between and among countries interested in either import or export trade, or both.

The act, up to 1948, authorized the President to reduce excessively high tariffs up to 50 percent, not arbitrarily, but in return for concessions from foreign countries when it could be done to the mutual benefit of each. It is a repudiation of economic isolation.

Since 1934 agreements have been consummated with more than 40 foreign countries, which together with the United States account for the preponderant part of world trade. Tariffs and other barriers to trade have been progressively and selectively reduced or removed so as to facilitate the flow of profitable trade and thereby improve the standard of living and enhance the prosperity of the many countries concerned. Our many agricultural and industrial producers whose output is in excess of domestic requirements must find a profitable outlet abroad for their surpluses and in return take foreign products which are necessary either as raw materials to keep our industrial machine running or as consumer goods to supplement our own production.

How can opponents of the reciprocal trade program seriously contend that our national economy has been impaired when national income has increased from $48,600,000,000 in 1934 to $224,000,000,000 in 1948? Has business been hurt,

or seriously threatened, when income from manufacturing has increased sevenfold? When agriculture, which relies heavily upon foreign markets for disposal of surplus crops, has increased its cash income from six and one-half billion dollars in 1934 to more than 31 billions in 1948?

Of course sole credit is not claimed by the friends of reciprocal trade for all these achievements, but it can be truthfully asserted that the Trade Agreements Act has played a major part in our prewar economic recovery. While no law can make us immune from the horrors of war, it is a significant fact that in World War II we did not engage in conflict with a single reciprocal trade agreement country.

Department of Commerce figures show that United States exports to trade agreement countries for the 2 years 1934–35, as compared with the 2 years 1938–39, increased 63 percent with trade agreement countries as against an increase of only 32 percent with nonagreement countries. Imports into the United States increased but 12½ percent from nonagreement countries in comparison with an increase of 27 percent from agreement countries. Our total exports for 1948 amounted to nearly $17,000,000,000 while imports totaled slightly more than $10,000,000,000. The balance in our favor in our foreign trade at present is being made up largely by grants and loans to foreign governments, but every sound thinker knows this cannot continue without national bankruptcy. Consequently, if we are to sell abroad the surpluses of our farms, mines, and factories we must take in payment goods from other countries in such quantities and on such terms as will not seriously affect or injure our domestic producers.

PROCEDURES PRIOR TO 1948 COMPARED WITH PRESENT LAW

Under the Trade Agreements Act, prior to the 1948 amendments, the following procedures were in effect:

The Interdepartmental Trade Agreements Committee, just as under existing law, served as the agency through which the President obtained advice and information before negotiating a trade agreement. The broadest interests of American agriculture, industry, and labor, and of national security were represented on the Trade Agreements Committee by a member of the Tariff Commission and by persons designated by the Secretaries of State, Treasury, War, Navy, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor. The information and advice submitted to the Trade Agreements Committee were from three principal sources:

(a) Interested persons, including, of course, domestic producers, might either submit statements or briefs or appear in person at public hearings. I have heard of no complaint in the hearings that interested parties have been denied courteous and impartial treatment.

(b) The Tariff Commission made a study of the imports and the effect of possible concessions.

(c) The Department of Commerce made a similar study with respect to each export item considered for inclusion in a trade agreement. The Trade Agreements Committee then made its recommendations to the President, who made the final decision respecting the items included for negotiation and the extent of concessions to be offered. If any member of the Trade Agreements Committee dissented, the President was provided with a full report giving the reasons for the dissent.

The foregoing procedure provided an adequate opportunity for all interested parties to be heard before a trade agreement was negotiated. The interest of specific producers was balanced against and considered along with the over-all interest, first of the general public, then of industry, labor, agriculture, and our military, financial, and foreign policies.

The above procedures were found to operate effectively and efficiently in enabling the United States to take the initiative toward reduction and elimination of barriers to world trade. Since 1942, moreover, domestic industry has had the protection of both the careful preparation before actual negotiation of a trade agreement and also of the insertion of an "escape clause" in each agreement. Under this escape clause, concessions made with respect to any article may be modified or withdrawn if, as a result of unforeseen developments and of a concession in the trade agreement, any article on which a concession has been granted is being imported in such increased quantities and under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury to any domestic industry.

I am advised by the Acting Chairman of the Tariff Commission that, as of January 31, 1949, only three applications had been filed under an escape clause. Two of the applications—one on marrons and one on whisky—have been dismissed, while the third, on spring clothespins, is still pending.

Apparently domestic industries have not considered themselves seriously injured or threatened with serious injury, else they would have invoked the escape clause procedures more frequently.

Despite the great benefits to our national economy and the maintenance of our leadership in international trade, and the safeguards to domestic producers, a hostile majority in the Eightieth Congress skillfully and deliberately set about hamstringing that program that they did not dare attempt abolish.

Despite overwhelming public sentiment to the contrary, the House passed a bill so bad that Secretary of State Marshall advised me in a letter that "our national interests would be better served to permit the Trade Agreements Act to expire than for H. R. 6556 to be enacted."

Despite modification in the other body of the deadly restrictions voted by the House, the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948, as finally enacted, and reluctantly approved by the President, imposed the following hampering limitations upon the tried and tested procedures previously in effect:

First. The Tariff Commission could no longer be represented on the Interdepartmental Trade Agreements Committee to advise and consult with the President in preparing for trade-agreement negotiations.

Second. The President was prohibited from negotiating any trade agreement until he had received a report from the Tariff Commission fixing a peril point, or minimum tariff level, on each article to be considered for possible modification of duties, or until 120 days had elapsed.

Third. On the firing line of actual negotiation with experts of foreign countries, the President was denied the participation and assistance of some of the best qualified personnel in our own Government—the members of the Tariff Commission and their staff.

Fourth. If in the over-all national interest, the President negotiated a reduction in tariff rates below the minimum recommended by the Tariff Commission—whose only concern under existing law is the interest of the specific domestic industry—then he must be subjected to the spectacle of a public justification of his actions to the Congress.

The bill under consideration would remove the restrictions of the 1948 act and would clear the path for the negotiations with 13 countries scheduled to begin in April, and would eliminate the doubt created by the Eightieth Congress whether the United States has definitely and permanently turned away from economic and political isolationism.

ENACTMENT OF H. R. 1211 ESSENTIAL TO OUR FOREIGN POLICY AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Every interested representative of the executive branch of the Government—the President, the Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, Secretary of the Treasury, Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of Commerce, Secretary of Labor and Economic Cooperation Administrator—have advised that the revival and extension of the reciprocal trade program for another period of 3 years from June 12, 1948, without the crippling amendments contained in the present law, is essential to the success of our foreign economic policy.

Assistant Secretary of State Thorp testified:

> The trade agreements program is an integral part of our over-all program for the world economic recovery.
>
> * * * Viewed in that perspective, it is perfectly clear to me that the trade agreements program must continue in the form which will render it most effective; namely, the form introduced in H. R. 1211, the form which has stood the test of experience for 14 years.

Secretary of the Treasury Snyder wrote on January 24, 1949:

> Far-reaching developments in world economic relationships require that we plan for a changed basis for international economic stability, if our friendly partners in the world community are generally to achieve economic self-sufficiency. The careful and selective study and progressive elimination of trade barriers must go hand in hand with the programs of financial assistance we are administering. For this reason, I consider the reciprocal trade agreements program to play a vital role in supporting our foreign financial policies.

Secretary of Agriculture Brannan reported the direct interest of the American farmer as follows:

> The farmers of this country normally produce many commodities in greater quantities than are required for use in the United States. Any acceptable United States farm program, therefore, must be associated with a program for keeping open the channels of

international trade in a manner that will permit United States agricultural products to compete abroad. The American farmer must not have his products excluded from foreign markets by excessive tariffs and other barriers or discriminated against through preferences and other special deals between foreign governments.

Secretary of Commerce Sawyer observed in a letter dated January 25, 1949, with regard to American producers and consumers that—

The tariff adjustments which have resulted have benefited our consumers at a time when supplies were short. The concessions received from other countries have also been of significance to some of our exporters.

Secretary of Labor Tobin wrote on January 28, 1949:

I need not dwell at length on the interest of American workers and their families in the continuation of the trade-agreements program. High levels of world trade mean high standards of living at home, making available to labor those materials and products that can be produced most efficiently abroad, and making available to workers abroad, both for consumption and for economic development, what we produce in the United States.

Economic Cooperation Administrator Hoffman warned:

ECA's interest in reciprocal trade agreements legislation stems from the basic objectives for the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 which are to furnish materials and financial assistance to the participating countries in such a manner as to aid them, through their own individual and concerted efforts, to become independent of extraordinary outside economic assistance within the period of operations under this title * * *.

An increase in the world volume of trade is not only desirable but vitally necessary if the other countries are to recover their ability to pay their own way.

Opposition witnesses and members of the minority have recklessly asserted that the reciprocal trade program has jeopardized our national security by threatening, or injuring, domestic industries essential to the defense of our country.

It is argued, at page 6 of the minority report, that the peril-point report of the Tariff Commission should be continued so that the findings of the Commission as to the point below which tariff reduction might endanger our vital industries will be known to the President.

Of course, there is nothing whatever in the 1948 act that requires the Tariff Commission to consider anything more than the private interests of domestic producers. There is not a single word in the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948 that requires the Tariff Commission to consider the national defense in fixing its peril point. If this factor is so important why was it not written into the 1948 act?

In a deliberate effort to becloud the issue by attributing to the trade-agreements program perennial financial embarrassment of one manufacturer of jeweled watches, the minority report reprints a letter addressed to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] by Lt. Gen. LeR. Lutes, Director of the Staff of the Munitions Board.

This letter states, in brief, that the maintenance of at least a minimum level of operation by the American jewel-watch industry is vital to the defense of the United States.

In order to clarify the record finally and permanently, insofar as the watch industry is concerned, I wrote Secretary of Defense Forrestal, the member of the President's Cabinet whose uppermost consideration at all times is the maintenance of our national security, as follows:

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In the recent hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means on the extension of the Trade Agreements Act there has been some conflicting testimony whether the reciprocal trade authority has been administered in such a way as to impair the important role of the domestic watch industry in our program of national defense.

Will you please give me your opinion on this question? Inasmuch as the bill H. R. 1211, to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, is scheduled for debate in the House early next week, your expeditious consideration of this inquiry will be appreciated.

On February 4, 1949, Secretary Forrestal replied as follows:

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your letter of February 3, 1949, requesting my views on the question of whether the reciprocal trade authority has been administered in such a way as to impair the important role of the domestic watch industry in our program of national defense.

The domestic jewel watch industry has fulfilled its role in our program of national defense, and I am not aware that its capabilities have been adversely affected by the reciprocal trade authority.

It is true, as General Lutes pointed out in his letter of February 1, 1949, to Representative THOMAS E. MARTIN, a copy of which I sent you the other day, that the maintenance of at least a minimum level of operation by the American jewel-watch industry is vital to the defense of the United States and should be preserved. I believe, however, that the trade agreements program is so designed as to permit adequate protection in this regard. For example: The program offers an excellent means of protecting those industries considered vital to the national security by the retention of tariffs. The National Military Establishment member on the inter-departmental committee which administers the law has frequently made representations of this nature in the interest of national defense.

As I stated to you in my letter of January 28, 1949, the National Military Establishment believes that the Trade Agreements Act should be renewed. It is considered that such a step is in the interest of national security both in the immediate and in the long-term sense.

Now, perhaps the opponents of the reciprocal trade program will stop using the cry of national defense behind which to cloak their hereditary high-tariff protectionism.

OVERWHELMING SUPPORT OF H. R. 1211 BY REPRESENTATIVES OF AMERICAN AGRICULTURE, CONSUMERS, INDUSTRY, AND LABOR

The overwhelming desire of the vast majority of the American people in private life is also to restore unimpaired the original Hull reciprocal trade program. The people understand and concur in such statements made to the Committee on Ways and Means as the following:

First. Mr. Russell Smith representing the National Farmers Union:

Our farmers still believe that the senseless race of self-sufficiency among nations which the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act chiefly incited was among the principal causes of World War II. They still believe that a prosperous world cannot be achieved without free exchange of commodities. They still believe that dilution of the Trade Agreements Act will be construed by the world at large as proof that American deeds do not accord with American professions.

Second. The American Farm Bureau Federation, with a membership of 1,325,000 farm families in 45 States strongly favors the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act without crippling amendments, as testified before our committee by Mr. Allan B. Kline, president. Among other things Mr. Kline said:

No group in the United States has a greater stake in maintaining a high level of exports than American farmers. The American farmer needs foreign markets. In 1948 the production of agricultural products was 38 percent above the prewar level. In the case of some products the increase in production was much greater.

* * * That is why they are so vitally interested in the success of the reciprocal trade agreements program, which seeks to remove the barriers to trade so that trade can expand.

We, therefore, support the continuation of the Trade Agreements Act for another 3-year period and the elimination of the restrictions enacted in the 1948 Extension Act which tend to hamper the successful operation of this program.

Third. Mrs. C. D. Wright, chairman, legislative department, General Federation of Women's Clubs:

The general federation strongly endorses the legislation now under consideration by the House Ways and Means Committee providing for a restoration of the 1934 act and a return to the 3-year cycle which has operated with such success in the past.

Fourth. Mrs. Margaret F. Stone, chairman of legislation, National Women's Trade Union League, who also appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means for the American Home Economics Association and the National Council of Jewish Women:

The women of this country, in large numbers, are for the trade-agreements program and want to see it made permanent, without shackles. They are for it as housewives interested in the family budget and making the dollar go as far as possible. They are for it as workers, whether in industry, in offices, or in other occupations. They are for it, above all, as humanitarians who want to see every pillar in the foundation of world peace made as strong as possible.

Fifth. Mr. Charles P. Taft, speaking for the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America:

On March 26, 1947, the executive committee of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, on recommendation of the commission on the basis of a just and durable peace, reaffirmed its endorsement of the reciprocal-trade-agreements program and deplored any course by Members of the Congress which might cast any doubt upon the continued adherence of the United States to the fundamentals of this program.

The development of the European recovery program lends added importance to the increase of multilateral exchange of goods and services. As the Federal Council of Churches executive committee said in this connection on January 13, 1948:

"If the United States is to fulfill its long-term responsibility in the world economy it must help enable other countries to manufacture and sell their own goods and services in order to buy what they need.

"Therefore, the European recovery program should be linked with long-range planning to increase American imports so that European economic life as well as our own may be maintained at a high level."

Sixth. Mr. Walter J. Mason, national legislative representative, American Federation of Labor:

The chief instrument by which this Nation can contribute toward a progressive reduction in world trade barriers is the reciprocal-trade-agreements program. * * * Because of our stake, as workers in a free society, in developing a peaceful and prosperous world, we firmly support a 3-year extension of this program.

Seventh. Mr. Stanley H. Ruttenberg, director of education and research, Congress of Industrial Organizations:

It has been alleged that the trade-agreements program, by reducing American tariffs, will reduce American wage levels to the wage levels of foreign countries. * * *

High productivity, rather than the American tariff, accounts for the American wage level. If our labor productivity were low, we would not have high wages even if our tariffs were raised a thousand times. Many foreign countries have much higher tariffs than the United States, yet their wage levels are lower than ours. The plain truth is that foreign countries worry about their ability to compete with us.

* * * * * *

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is an important cog in our complex domestic economy. But the importance of the act does not stop there. Reciprocal trade agreements play an equally important part in enabling us to carry out our tremendous world responsibilities and commitments under the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 to reduce trade barriers.

CONCLUSION

It is my considered judgment that international trade conducted on an equitable, live-and-let-live, just-and-fair, Golden Rule basis will do much to promote prosperity and international good will among the nations of the world. In my opinion, peace, freedom, and world trade go hand in hand.

I do not question the motives nor the sincerity of those who differ with me on this very important legislation. What I do question is the logic of their reasoning and the soundness of their conclusions.

I will make my position plain on the subject of the tariff. I am not a free-trader in the generally accepted meaning of the term and would oppose any lowering of the tariff that would inflict serious injury upon any legitimate, efficiently managed domestic industries. On the other hand, I am not an apostle of a high, panic-producing, monopoly-sheltering, trade-throttling, enemy-making tariff. Truth never abides in extremes—a safe, middle-of-the-road course, free of extremes, is the highway we should travel in tariffs, as well as in all public matters. This bill keeps us well within that course, and I trust and expect the House will give it an overwhelming approval.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 8, 1949.

Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In my message on the state of the Union I asked the Congress to act promptly to extend the Trade Agreements Act without the hampering restrictions placed on it by the last Congress.

As you know, negotiations will begin in April to extend the benefits of the general agreement on tariffs and trade to 13 countries that did not participate in the original agreement. This general agreement, concluded in the autumn of 1947, is the most important and comprehensive trade agreement in history. Under it the United States and 22 other nations agreed to reduce their tariffs, or to maintain low tariffs, or none at all, on a wide variety of products. The products affected accounted in 1938 for over half of the world's international trade. In addition, the participating countries agreed to curb the use of other trade restrictions, such as import quotas, and to limit various kinds of discrimination, such as preferential treatment of imports from one country as against those from another. Never before have so many nations combined in such an intensive effort to reduce barriers to trade.

The extension of the benefits of this agreement under the authority of the Trade Agreements Act is a practical cooperative effort to remove unnecessary obstacles to the building of a stable and prosperous world. The restrictive provisions and limited extension of the present trade-agreements law materially hamper the effectiveness of United States participation in this effort. That is why it is so important that the existing Trade Agreements Act be promptly repealed, and that the act as it existed on March 1, 1948, be extended for a further substantial period. I suggest that this period be until June 12, 1951.

Unless nations can sell each other the products of their agriculture, labor, and industry to the greatest possible extent, there can be no sure foundation for economic peace. Unless world trade is increased, the tremendous investment we are making toward world economic recovery will be largely wasted. Unless trade restrictions are relaxed, the lot of the private trader in international trade will become increasingly difficult.

In the achievement of these objectives, United States leadership and United States action is a decisive influence.

The trade-agreements program has proved itself to the people of the United States. It has justly earned their overwhelming support. We must be in a position to press that program forward with vigor.

I know that I can count on your continued support in securing necessary action to this end at the earliest possible date.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

I have today signed H. R. 6556, the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948. Unfortunately, this act extends for only 1 year the authority to enter into reciprocal trade agreements. It also makes unwise changes in the procedure for negotiating such agreements.

I regret very much that the Congress has not seen fit to renew this authority for the customary 3-year period. There is no valid reason for a 1-year limitation, which appears to cast some doubt upon our intentions for the future.

Moreover, the act prescribes a new, complicated, time-consuming, and unnecessary procedure for the negotiation of reciprocal trade agreements. This change in procedure will necessarily hamper and obstruct the negotiation of new agreements, a defect which is particularly undesirable in view of the act's limitation to a single year.

The reciprocal-trade-agreements program has long occupied a key position in our foreign policy and in our endeavors to assist world recovery. As I pointed out in a special message to the Congress last March, the program is a tested and practical means for achieving the benefits of expanding world commerce for the United States and other countries and a continuing evidence of the determination of the United States to contribute its full share to the reconstruction of a sound and growing world economy as a basis for enduring world peace.

As part of the European recovery program, the participating countries have agreed to work together to lower barriers to trade. The United States can surely do no less than show its determination to support the same principle, which is so important to an expansion of world markets and world trade.

It is so essential that the reciprocal-trade-agreements program should not lapse that I have signed this act in spite of its serious defects.

I will do my best to make the new procedures work. As a first step, I intend to proceed in the near future with plans for bringing other countries into the general agreement on tariffs and trade signed with 22 countries at Geneva in October 1947.

The reciprocal-trade-agreements program is one of high national policy. When the act is again extended next year, I trust that the defects contained in this year's extension will be corrected, in order that the act will be restored as a fully effective instrument of permanent United States policy.

JUNE 26, 1943.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, January 24, 1949.

Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On March 1, 1948, the President addressed a message to the Congress recommending that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, then due to expire on June 12, 1948, be extended for a period of 3 years from that date without change. Despite this recommendation, the Eightieth Congress enacted the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948, extending the authority for entering into reciprocal trade agreements only for a period of slightly more than 1 year, and prescribing new procedures which in fact constituted obstacles to the negotiation of such agreements. The interested agencies of the executive branch of the Government advised strongly against these changes. The President reluctantly approved the bill, since the only alternative was to permit the program to lapse.

On June 2, 1948, while the Senate had under consideration H. R. 6556, Eightieth Congress, which later became, with amendments, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948, I set forth the views of the Treasury Department on the bill in a letter to the then chairman of the Committee on Finance of the Senate. At that time I wrote:

"The bill purports to extend the reciprocal-trade-agreements authority in the Executive for an additional period of approximately 1 year; but, in the judgment of this Department, its provisions are such as to disrupt the present smoothly operating interdepartmental machinery and to render the reciprocal-trade-agreements program unworkable."

A detailed report on the difficulties encountered in administering the program in accordance with the procedural requirements set forth in the 1948 act is being put before you by the Department of State. The Treasury Department, which shares responsibility for the administration of the program, has been furnished with an advance copy of the statement which is to be placed before your committee today by the State Department, and is in full agreement with it.

However, there is one aspect of the question which I particularly wish to bring to the attention of your committee. Under the provisions of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, I serve as Chairman of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, the interdepartmental body which has responsibility for coordinating the policies and operations of this Government in the foreign financial, exchange, and monetary field. Currently, the Council is giving its primary attention to a series of far-reaching programs involving financial assistance for other countries of the world. In carrying out these functions, the Council has constantly borne in mind the policies enunciated by the Congress in this connection, calling for the progressive reduction of trade barriers, the elimination of unfair trade practices, the expansion and balanced growth of international trade, and the establishment of stable international economic relationships (Bretton Woods Agreements Act, sec. 14; Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, sec. 102 (a)).

The achievement of these aims and the restoration of a healthy international economy cannot be accomplished merely by looking backward toward a restoration of prewar conditions. Far-reaching developments in world economic relationships require that we plan for a changed basis for international economic stability, if our friendly partners in the world community are generally to achieve economic self-sufficiency. The careful and selective study and progressive elimination of trade barriers must go hand in hand with the programs of financial assistance we are administering. For this reason, I consider the reciprocal-trade-agreements program to play a vital role in supporting our foreign financial policies.

The President, on January 8, 1949, repeated the recommendation he made on March 1, 1948, that the reciprocal-trade-agreements program should be extended for 3 years from June 12, 1948, without the limitations on the Presidential authority contained in the 1948 legislation. A bill has now been introduced (H. R. 1211) to accomplish this purpose. I strongly urge that your committee give favorable consideration to that bill.

This Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Very truly yours,

JOHN W. SNYDER,
Secretary of the Treasury.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington 25, D. C., January 24, 1949.

Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. DOUGHTON: I am writing in connection with the hearings being held by your committee on H. R. 1211, a bill to extend the authority of the President (to negotiate foreign-trade agreements) under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended. This Department favors the passage of H. R. 1211.

On May 6, 1948, I appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means to advocate the extension of authority provided in the bill under reference. The Trade Agreements Act granting that authority had been in effect without significant alteration for 14 years. I stated the basic interest of agriculture in the reciprocal-trade-agreements program. That program is the necessary foreign counterpart of a long-term domestic agricultural program.

The farmers of this country normally produce many commodities in greater quantities than are required for use in the United States. Any acceptable United States farm program, therefore, must be associated with a program for keeping open the channels of international trade in a manner that will permit United States agricultural products to compete abroad. The American farmer must not have his products excluded from foreign markets by excessive tariffs and other barriers or discriminated against through preferences and other special deals between foreign governments.

Agriculture is interested in the trade-agreements program not only in connection with agricultural exports but also in connection with industrial exports. Agriculture needs a wide and dependable market in the United States for American farm products. Sales abroad of products of the American factory result in greater employment and consequently greater domestic demand for products of the American farm. This is particularly true of products which are consumed increasingly as incomes rise, such as dairy and poultry products, meats, fruits, nuts, and vegetables. But a high level of American industrial exports can be maintained only in a climate of world prosperity, a climate which can prevail only when there is extensive interchange of goods and services between countries. The trade-agreements program is designed to facilitate such an interchange.

In order that foreign countries may pay for our farm and factory products, they must obtain dollars. For the time being, of course, conditions resulting from the war have made it necessary to supply many of our exports as gifts or on credit. However, this cannot be continued indefinitely. The most important continuing source of dollars for our foreign customers is their sale of goods to us; that is, our imports. Under the reciprocal-trade-agreements program, we have developed a mechanism whereby we can reduce the barriers against imports into the United States in such a way as to increase those imports without causing injury to established United States industry.

The imports thus obtained tend to raise our living standards. The large block of our population represented by farm people is an important group of consumers. They know that the benefits of trade do not lie merely in getting rid of a maximum amount of goods. They want to get as much as possible in return. The trade-agreements program is designed to facilitate that.

As a long-term program, the trade-agreements program can be of aid in the immediate problem of European recovery. Under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, the United States has launched on a program of direct aid so that the other participating countries may carry their recovery to the point where they are enabled to join us as partners in a going international economy. The reduction of trade barriers now can help assure progress toward such an economy.

Despite the difficult circumstances of international relations which prevailed between the original adoption of the Trade Agreements Act in 1934 and the beginning of the war, experience under the program in that period showed a consistent advantage to the American farmer. Our farm exports to countries with which we had trade agreements increased more than exports to other countries. Moreover, the exports of items on which tariff reductions had been obtained increased more than exports of other products. There was also an increase in imports. The agricultural commodities involved in the increase in imports were those needed either because they are not produced in the United States or are not produced here in sufficient quantity for United States needs. The importation of items directly in competition with American agricultural products increased relatively little.

On the basis of experience under the program, there has been worked out a method of dealing with cases of unforeseen injury or threat of injury to domestic industry. This is the escape clause, which enables us in any case where producers sustain or are threatened with injury due to operation of the agreement to suspend or withdraw the concession made. This clause will be included in all reciprocal trade agreements to which the United States become a party.

The previous Congress changed the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in a way that makes it more difficult to operate. These changes do not improve the procedures under the act either from the point of view of accomplishing its objectives or of preventing injury to United States producers. I should like to support H. R. 1211, which would restore the legislation substantially to its previous form.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary.

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, January 25, 1949.

Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DOUGHTON: I understand that your committee has begun public hearings on H. R. 1211, the reciprocal-trade-agreements legislation. Although I do not care to appear before the committee to speak on the bill, I do wish to have the views of the Department of Commerce included in the record of the hearings.

The history of this legislation is well known to your committee and the policies it represents need not be elaborated. There is no doubt but what the disturbed conditions of world trade arising from World War II and the conditions which have existed since then have not been peculiarly favorable toward securing the fullest benefits from these policies. However, it does seem clear that the tariff adjustments which have resulted have benefited our consumers at a time when supplies were short. The concessions received from other countries have also been of significance to some of our exporters.

I should like to urge that the authority to conclude trade agreements under this legislation be extended for at least 3 years from June 30, 1948. I also endorse the proposal that this extension be in substantially the same form as the act prior to the 1-year renewal last spring. The former act was tested in practice and enabled the administration to carry out effectively the intent of the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES SAWYER,
Secretary of Commerce.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, January 28, 1949.

Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to offer a statement of the position of the National Military Establishment in connection with the hearings which your committee is presently conducting on the extension of the Trade Agreements Act.

The Military Establishment considers that the Trade Agreements Act should be renewed. It is considered that such a step is in the interest of national security both in the immediate and in the long-term sense.

The stated position is the position of the Munitions Board. For greater detail, I attach a staff analysis by the staff of the Munitions Board, prepared at my request, which considers the various interests of the Military Establishment in the extension of this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

STATEMENT PREPARED BY THE STAFF OF THE MUNITIONS BOARD

NATIONAL SECURITY AND THE TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The extension of the Trade Agreements Act in 1948 provided that the War and Navy Departments should be represented on the Trade Agreements Committee. The extension in 1948 substituted representation by the National Military Establishment. Experience since 1945 has proved that this representation has proved valuable by providing a direct expression of opinion on national security in trade-agreement negotiations. It has also emphasized the importance of the trade-agreement program to national security.

1. The trade-agreements program helps the United States meet its problems in strategic commodities: The National Military Establishment has an obvious and well-recognized interest in strategic commodities. Some of these commodities are produced in adequate quantities in the United States but for others we are dependent in whole or in part upon supplies from foreign countries. For those which are produced in the United States it is sometimes necessary to balance the desire for a large-scale current production to maintain a strong domestic industry with the conflicting desire for adequate emergency reserves. World War II seriously diminished our reserves at the same time that it made clear that the demands of war upon strategic commodities have greatly increased and that the problems of overseas transportation may be serious. As a result the Congress provided for stock piling and later that the expenditures for Economic Cooperation Administration be used in part to aid the stock piles.

Negotiations under the Trade Agreements Act can and have been used to reduce United States tariffs on strategic commodities where it was desirable to increase supplies from foreign sources and in a few cases to reduce or eliminate the export duties or restrictions of other supplying countries. It is desirable that the authority to take similar action in the future be preserved.

2. The trade-agreement program helps keep our national economy strong: The United States is fortunate enough to possess a large domestic market which allows many commodities to be produced efficiently on a large scale. These strong domestic industries frequently produce commodities which other countries like to buy if they have the dollar exchange to do it, since they can purchase them from us more economically than they can produce on a small scale for their own more limited market. Often they can in turn sell us other commodities which they can produce efficiently because they possess the natural resources or the type of labor required. Even at present, and to a greater extent when the emergency programs of assistance come to an end, our ability to export will be limited by the ability of others to sell to us.

Our national security planning is largely based on our industrial capacity. Its size and its ability to be mobilized quickly and effectively for the production of supplies and equipment needed by the armed forces form one of our greatest bulwarks. Our machine-tool industry, our automobile industry, and our radio industry are all cases in point. They are also examples of industries which are in part dependent upon exports and which have benefited from the trade-agreements program in the past.

The trade-agreements program is so designed as to permit flexibility in operation. It can be used to encourage exports and imports and can also be used to limit the amount of goods received from foreign countries. For example, the program offers an excellent means of protecting those industries considered vital to the national security by the retention of tariffs. The National Military Establishment member on the interdepartmental committee which administers the law has frequently made representations of this nature in the interest of national defense. Natural rubber has long entered the United States free of duty, but in trade agreements this country has retained the right to restrict imports of natural-rubber products in order to protect synthetic-rubber production. Through the efforts of the Military Establishment provisions of this nature with respect to rubber have been included in the ITO charter as well as the general agreement on tariffs and trade.

3. The trade-agreement program is an aid to friendly countries: The United States is today a strong proponent of multilateral world trade on a nondiscriminatory basis. Many countries which formerly favored such a policy are lukewarm toward it at present because of their postwar difficulties in trade and exchange. Our trade-agreement program buttresses our policy position, strengthens the economies of countries friendly to us and offers them an avenue of escape from the maze of international discriminations into which the world economy might so easily deteriorate.

The United States, by implementing the Marshall plan, has proved itself willing at considerable cost to aid the economies of friendly countries. But this is a temporary expedient looking toward their getting firmly upon their own feet again. That result will depend in no small part upon their access to our market, which is aided by the trade-agreement program. A healthy world economy is of interest to the United States for national security as well as for other reasons.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, January 28, 1949.

Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman, Ways and Means Committee, House of Representatives, Washington 25, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DOUGHTON: As one of the departments which have been directly involved in the administration of the Trade Agreements Act, the Department of Labor would like to place its views before your committee in connection with consideration of the act's extension.

I need not dwell at length on the interest of American workers and their families in the continuation of the trade-agreements program. High levels of world trade mean high standards of living at home, making available to labor those materials and products that can be produced most efficiently abroad, and making available to workers abroad, both for consumption and for economic development, what we produce in the United States. If we are to participate in the development of productivity and living standards abroad in the manner outlined by the President in his inaugural message, we must surely visualize a continually expanding stream of multilateral trade.

In the opinion of the Department of Labor, an immediate extension of the Trade Agreements Act is desirable to facilitate the negotiations for which the administration is now preparing, and thereby broaden the coverage of the general agreement on tariffs and trade. The present duration of the act is too brief to assure reasonably adequate accomplishment within its term.

It is also the Department's opinion that the 1948 amendments to the act which established the "peril point" mechanism should be removed, and that the method for the negotiation of agreements should revert to the procedure of fully cooperating interdepartmental machinery previously in use under the statute. The Department of Labor believes that, insofar as tariffs are concerned, the well-being of workers and their families in the United States can be adequately protected through such machinery.

I should also like to call your attention to one other respect in which the language of the act might be improved. It is now provided that the President shall seek information and advice, in connection with the negotiation of a trade agreement, from several Government agencies specifically named, and from "such other sources as he may deem appropriate." The Department of Labor has been added by Executive order to the group of agencies specifically mentioned by name. Since 1947 the Department of Labor has been represented on the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements, and since 1948 on the Committee for Reciprocity Information. The inclusion of the Department of Labor among the agencies specifically mentioned in the statute would make clearer to the general public the broad base upon which the trade-agreements program is administered.

It has been impossible to effect clearance of this letter with the Bureau of the Budget prior to its transmittal to you.

Yours very truly,

MAURICE J. TOBIN,
Secretary of Labor.

ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington 25, D. C., January 27, 1949.

The Honorable ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman, Ways and Means Committee, New House Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DOUGHTON: Enclosed please find a statement of ECA's views on the trade-agreements legislation now before Congress.

Sincerely,

PAUL G. HOFFMAN, *Administrator.*

ECA'S POSITION IN REGARD TO THE FORTHCOMING RECIPROCAL-TRADE-AGREEMENTS LEGISLATION

ECA strongly supports the trade-agreements legislation now before Congress. In line with the over-all objectives of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, ECA is especially concerned with accelerating the export of goods from European countries to all foreign markets, including the United States, as a means of enabling these countries to balance their international payments and so reduce the assistance they require from the United States. We support the legislation now pending before Congress in that it aids in this effort.

ECA's interest in reciprocal-trade-agreements legislation stems from the basic objectives of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 which are to furnish materials and financial assistance to the participating countries "in such a manner as to aid them, through their own individual and concerted efforts, to become independent of extraordinary outside economic assistance within the period of operations under this title. * * *."

An increase in the world volume of trade is not only desirable but vitally necessary if the other countries are to recover their ability to pay their own way. The reciprocal-trade-agreements legislation now pending before Congress is a basic means to the expansion of world trade, for this legislation will give the President authority to adjust tariff rates and enter into tariff agreements (subject to definite limitations and procedures) for an extended period of time, thus affording continuity of action.

Six countries now receiving ECA assistance are already parties to the general agreement on tariffs and trade, a comprehensive tariff agreement entered into by the United States under the authority of the Trade Agreements

Act. Four additional countries which now receive ECA assistance will participate in tariff negotiations this coming April, looking toward accession to the agreement. The potential for recovery inherent in these negotiations depends upon favorable action by Congress in establishing the proposed trade-agreements legislation now pending before Congress.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of January 26, 1949]

EDITORIAL

IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act should be restored to normal health as soon as possible. Indeed, in the interest both of a sound national economy and of international peace the State Department should be encouraged to engage in even more vigorous efforts to reduce trade barriers.

This newspaper has steadily supported the Hull policy of carefully exploring specific measures for broadening mutually beneficial trade. The method of permitting the State Department to investigate, hear objections from domestic producers, and negotiate reciprocal agreements has seemed to us vastly superior to the politics-ridden, logrolling, tariff-making Congress has too often indulged in. The old system generally resulted in higher and higher barriers because favors were granted to one local interest after another as against the welfare of the Nation as a whole.

One of the greatest advances under the reciprocal policy was made in 1947 when the United States signed an agreement with 22 other nations covering tariff rates on 45,000 items. Then last summer Congress reversed the whole trend. It extended an emasculated act for only 1 year—to await further attention when the Republicans had taken over both White House and Capitol and had reconciled their differences. The last three Republican Presidential candidates had supported the reciprocity idea—which had good Republican antecedents. But a majority of Republicans in Congress had clung to protection.

We opposed the bill passed by the Eightieth Congress. It reflected the division and confusion within the Republican Party and could be regarded only as a most unsatisfactory expedient. Its very temporariness made planning and negotiating most uncertain. And in the main it expressed the old protectionist doctrine. It harked back to the idea that foreign goods should not be allowed to enter the country if they undersold a domestic producer—no matter whether they benefited American consumers or enabled foreign consumers to buy goods other American producers had to export. It appeared to give no weight to over-all national interest or to trade's effects on international peace.

Congress never had any popular mandate for this backward step. It would be well now to return promptly and firmly to the policy of promoting trade. We welcome President Truman's request to Congress to renew the Trade Agreements Act for 3 years. We trust the House Ways and Means Committee will not be thrown off by the efforts of a few Republican die-hards to cast suspicion on the State Department and to link the Hull policy with communism. We hope the extreme nature of its unworthy effort only reflects weakness in the protectionist position.

For the necessity of lowering trade barriers has become increasingly clear as America's new creditor position has become clear. The interests of farmers and of much of the business community are now directly lined up behind efforts to find foreign markets for American goods. An intelligent tariff policy is required to supplement the Marshall plan in easing the dollar famine abroad. It is equally essential to undergird with economic cooperation the political and potential military cooperation outlined in the Atlantic security pact.

[From the Mobile (Ala.) Register of January 31, 1949]

INDEED PUBLIC SENTIMENT APPROVES HULL-TYPE RECIPROCAL-TRADE POLICY

House Ways and Means Committee hearings are scheduled to be resumed Monday on legislation to free the reciprocal-trade-agreements program of the shackles placed on it by the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress.

Meanwhile Representative ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, North Carolina Democrat, gave pointed answer at week end to charges by Representative DANIEL A. REED, New York Republican, that the Democratic majority on the committee has engaged in "steamroller tactics."

Mr. DOUGHTON is chairman of the committee, and Mr. REED is the top-ranking Republican member.

According to International News Service, Chairman DOUGHTON said with respect to his Republican colleague's criticism:

"These baseless attacks appear to be an attempt to camouflage the historic and consistent Republican hostility to the reciprocal-trade program, which is now thoroughly understood and overwhelmingly accepted and approved by the American people.

"In contrast with the procedure of the Committee on Ways and Means in the Eightieth Congress, when a subcommittee allotted 1 week for hearings behind closed doors, all interested persons have been granted the opportunity to be heard in open session, with the public and press present. * * *

"There is absolutely no foundation for the charge that unfair tactics are being used in our committee."

Congressman DOUGHTON can find confirmation in every direction for his statement that reciprocal-trade policy has overwhelming approval of the people. Republicans in the Eightieth Congress who had a hand in hamstringing the trade program cannot justifiably feel proud of their performance.

Urging prompt removal of the handicaps fashioned by the preceding Congress, the Christian Science Monitor says:

"The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act should be restored to normal health as soon as possible. Indeed, in the interest both of sound national economy and of international peace, the State Department should be encouraged to engage in even more vigorous efforts to reduce trade barriers.

"This newspaper has steadily supported the Hull policy of carefully exploring specific measures for broadening mutually beneficial trade. The method of permitting the State Department to investigate, hear objections from domestic producers, and negotiate reciprocal agreements has seemed to us vastly superior to the politics-ridden, logrolling tariff-making Congress has too often indulged in. The old system generally resulted in higher and higher barriers because favors were granted to one local interest after another as against the welfare of the Nation as a whole.

"One of the greatest advances under the reciprocal policy was made in 1947 when the United States signed an agreement with 22 other nations covering tariff rates on 45,000 items. Then last summer Congress reversed the whole trend. It extended an emasculated act for only 1 year—to await further attention when the Republicans had taken over both White House and Capitol and had reconciled their differences. The last three Republican Presidential candidates had supported the reciprocity idea—which had good Republican antecedents. But a majority of Republicans in Congress had clung to protection.

"We opposed the bill passed by the Eightieth Congress. It reflected the division and confusion within the Republican Party and could be regarded only as a most unsatisfactory expedient. Its very temporariness made planning and negotiating most uncertain. And in the main it expressed the old protectionist doctrine."

As the Wall Street Journal sees it, "What looks like the preliminaries to an old-fashioned wrangle over tariff protectionism are going on in hearings of the House Ways and Means Committee."

The Journal goes on to comment:

"This newspaper believes that tariff protection, as a principle or a theory, has outlived most of its usefulness. We think the part it plays in maintaining high living standards in this country has been much exaggerated.

"Industries which have been built up in the shelter of a tariff wall can be injured, at least temporarily, when the wall is removed or lowered. But by and large, neither our employers nor their employees, fortified as they are with the world's best power tools and production methods, should fear the competition of cheap foreign labor."

And the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin says in commenting on reciprocal trade:

"One of the misdeeds of the Eightieth Congress was to throw doubt on the continuance of our policy of lowering excessive tariffs by reciprocal-trade treaties. The Republican Congress did not kill the Trade Agreements Act but it renewed it only for 1 year, and added complications in procedure which make the conclusion of trade treaties with other countries more difficult."

The action taken by the Eightieth Congress was indeed a blundering step in the field of trade policy. The present Congress can render a genuine service by correcting the error.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. To keep the agricultural picture straight, did I correctly understand the gentleman to say that all farm organizations are in favor of it?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I did not say all of them. I do not know how many there are. The National Farmers Union, the American Farm Bureau Federation, and a number of them, I will say the preponderance of them, and of their members, favor this policy. I do not think the gentleman will dispute that, and I know he cannot refute it.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I just want to keep the discussion factual. The Grange says we had better keep what we have until we get something better.

Mr. DOUGHTON. This policy has been proven by 14 years of successful operation. The gentleman knows that. Compare the national income of the United States now with what it was in 1934. The income of agriculture has increased over fivefold under the reciprocal-trade policy. Every occupation and business in the United States has prospered. Manufactures have increased sevenfold. What more proof does the gentleman want?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The only proof that is, is that we should be in a war all the time.

Mr. DOUGHTON. No; that is the gentleman's opinion.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That is a fact, too. I read their testimony, and the Farm Bureau is for it, but they want to keep section 22 of the Triple-A Act so

they can put an embargo on any time they want to, which your administration has done time after time for products raised south of the Mason and Dixon's line.

Mr. DOUGHTON. What does my friend want to do, abandon the reciprocal-trade program and go back to the Smoot-Hawley logrolling, back-scratching program, whereby the beneficiaries of the high tariff wrote the schedule?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The reciprocal-trade policy as well as the tariff policy, from the viewpoint of international relationships, is deader than a dodo bird, because so many things have happened since we started out with the reciprocal-trade program.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Would my friend abandon it and go back to the old system, or would he continue it with such amendments as might be demonstrated by experience to be necessary?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would leave the situation the way it is at the present time. We have a tribunal, the Tariff Commission, to which you can go and tell your story. I do not believe in delegating the power to the President to give away the rights of the people and to have control over every grocery bill in this country and over every farm income in this country.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Neither do I, but under this Tariff Act the farmers are given an opportunity to present their case. And if they are injured, or even threatened with injury, then under the escape clause they can have the matter reconsidered and have the agreement modified, or have the whole thing rescinded. The gentleman knows that. Every single safeguard under Heaven was provided in this bill. Those who believe in the old law are, like Ephraim of old, "joined to their idols." They cannot be convinced. You just cannot ever convince them that their idea of the old logrolling tariff is not sound policy.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. What the gentleman says may be so.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I have not yet found where my friend stands.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I told you where I stood. I stand for leaving it alone the way it is at the present time.

Mr. DOUGHTON. You mean the way it was changed by the 1948 act, or the original act?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I mean the way it is right now in the 1948 act. You had better leave it alone.

Mr. DOUGHTON. That expires in June.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. All right, then you had better extend that act the way it stands now.

You say the farmers know what is happening down here. How many farmers know right now that they recently held hearings to lower the duty on foreign types of cheese? How many farm organizations were represented at the hearings?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Everyone had an opportunity to be heard. If they were not heard it is their own fault. The public were invited to attend these hearings and an open invitation was extended by publication in the press and elsewhere so that everybody could be heard.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Suppose they do not read the Washington papers.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Why were you not at the hearings? You did not come.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I was there.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I beg the gentleman's pardon. You mean you attended the hearings of the Committee for Reciprocity Information—not the hearings of our committee.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Surely I went there, and testified about lowering the duty on cheese. I surely did.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Oh, you talk about cheese. You talk about this, that, and the other things. You never consider the innocent American consumer. You never consider our surpluses. You never consider any of those things. The interests of all groups must be considered together. The domestic consumer, the exporter, the importer, and the American public.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Do you mean to tell me it is part of the Golden Rule policy to have this administration during all this time talking about Golden Rule and the good-neighbor policy and all that goes along with that to erect the most vicious—now get this—the most severe and most vicious trade barrier ever erected in the history of our country and that is when your administration passed a bill which is on the books today which says that you cannot even send a handful of tobacco seed out of this country? Is that part of the good-neighbor policy?

Mr. DOUGHTON. No. That was an act of Congress. That was not done under the reciprocal-trade authority.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Did you see anything in the paper about any opposition by the Secretary of State?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I do not see everything that is in the paper, and I do not suppose that my friend does.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Possibly that was part of the Golden Rule program of the present administration.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Of course the gentleman knows that we remember things that we want to remember, and the things that we do not want to remember we shut our eyes on.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That is right; and until this administration takes the tobacco-seed embargo off the books there is no use of President Truman talking about reciprocal trade.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The gentleman would seem to know more than the people of the country know. The people of the country, by the November election, showed what they believe. I do not say that they were so enthusiastic about the Democratic Party, but they just would not have the Republican Party. They remembered how they were wrecked under the Hoover administration, and what happened in the Eightieth Congress. The people remembered what they lost, and how they suffered under Hoover, and they realized what they had gained and what they enjoyed in 1948. There is no question as to what their position was.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That is the second point, and I want to give you an answer now so that it will be in the book. If your administration does not watch its step it is going to give the people some Truman prosperity that is going to be similar to the Hoover prosperity you complain about.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The gentleman talks about my administration. It is not my administration, it is the people's administration. It is the administration of the American people by an overwhelming majority. And when the gentleman talks like that, he is jumping in the face of the enlightened judgment and intelligence of a majority of the American people.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. President Truman is a minority President.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, the bill H. R. 1211 here for consideration is dangerous to the safety of our economy and to our national security.

It comes to the House with vital facts suppressed. I say this because the Democratic majority of the Ways and Means Committee flatly refused our request to invite the Military Establishment to appear before the committee and state whether or not the jeweled-watch industry, together with its respective skilled precision technicians are vital to our national defense.

We, the Republican minority, know that our domestic jeweled-watch industries have been destroyed by foreign competition to such an extent that today only two of them remain solvent. Therefore we tried, even by a record vote, to have a representative of the Military Establishment invited or requested to appear and testify before our committee touching on the importance of the jeweled-watch industry to our national defense; but our motion to obtain this vital information from this official and authoritative source was defeated by the Democrats.

There are known to be more than a hundred other strategic and critical industries located throughout the United States. The products of these industries are absolutely necessary to the defense of our country. I claim that such strategic and critical industries must not be destroyed or even so crippled that they will be inadequate for our defense purposes. Many of these industries are new and in need of every possible assistance to insure their continued success and solvency. I say with all the force and sincerity at my command that the life of these strategic and critical plants must under no circumstances be placed in jeopardy, whether from enemies within or from enemies without the United States. These vital plants and skilled workmen must not be sacrificed for political or diplomatic purposes. Alleged trade advantages, whether export or import, must not take priority over national security.

We all know that enemies from without will use every means to cripple, weaken, or destroy our long list of strategic and critical facilities. I say that when legislating, as we are today, relating to the preservation of our national

security, it is no time to remove the safeguards to our national defense which H. R. 1211 proposed to do.

We hear much about the necessity of making tariff concessions in trade agreements to build up exports. But, if we weaken or sacrifice our critical and strategic defense industries to gain a temporary increase in exports, we strike a blow at the very heart of our national security. We must not let the heat of political debate blind us to the reckless folly of such a disastrous course upon which the Democratic majority now appears to be embarked.

Heretofore this Nation has been blessed with a strong foreign relations policy free from political bickering. One of the principal architects of that policy was Republican Senator VANDENBERG, of Michigan. Other prominent Republicans in the Congress played dominant roles in cementing such a policy. But since his recent election the President has evidenced a desire to abandon this bipartisan program. In the past few weeks important decisions have been made respecting our international affairs without the customary Republican participation or advance knowledge. Mr. Truman has stated that his proposed extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is one of the cornerstones of the administration's foreign policy. He neither encouraged nor accepted Republican cooperation in the formulation of that trade policy. It becomes obvious that he is scrapping the desirable bipartisan handling of foreign affairs and that henceforth the Nation's national and international policies will be dictated by one man in the White House who increasingly refers to himself as the Commander in Chief.

Obviously also, because the New Deal needed a commander in chief, Mr. Truman feels that the Fair Deal needs one, too. A commander in chief is much more important in one-man government than is a mere President, and it is much easier for a commander in chief to assert nonexistent inherent powers over the Nation and its people such as Mr. Truman asserted in connection with his right to deal with labor-management strife without specific congressional authorization and without expressed constitutional authority. During the past 16 years we have witnessed scores of attempts to circumvent the Congress. Apparently these attempts are to continue, and during the next 4 years we may expect to see a new Commander in Chief riding around on a rejuvenated donkey looking for more inherent powers.

As a direct consequence of H. R. 1211, the President will be deprived of the most effective bipartisan fact-finding machinery ever created by law to serve the President and other governmental departments in the conduct of our foreign trade agreements program.

A trade-agreement concession based upon inaccurate or incomplete information as to its possible impact on domestic producers will be a menace to the stability of our economy and to our national defense.

I wish to call to your attention that when the trade-agreement legislation was under consideration in 1934, the proponents of it urged its adoption as a means of increasing exports. The adoption of it, however, did not increase exports.

The failure of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 to increase exports came as a shock to its advocates. They were stunned and exasperated at their failure. But next came Hitler, then Mussolini, and finally Japan to their rescue. Hitler needed war materials to build up his military establishment for war. To his surprise he found there would be no objection on the part of the New Deal administration to his purchasing steel, refined copper, scrap copper, iron, and steel scrap.

The raid on our essential war material, in an attempt to justify the State Department's trade agreements, started in 1936 with the shipment of enough steel plate to enable Hitler to build more than 150 destroyers, or 3,000 tanks, and innumerable jeeps. No wonder Hitler thought the United States would remain neutral. But if not fully convinced of the neutral and friendly attitude because of the steel shipments to him, could he doubt the sincerity of the New Deal administration when it suffered and permitted the export to him during the years 1936, 1937, 1938, and 1939 of refined copper amounting to over 330,000,000 pounds.

"See how our exports are increasing under the trade-agreement program," said the State Department officials.

Then followed the exports to Hitler by the United States during the years 1936 to 1939, inclusive, of scrap copper amounting to over 72,000,000 pounds. When bragging about the growth of exports, the character of the exports was suppressed but the amount of the exports in dollars was emphasized.

We were getting short of iron and steel scrap, yet the administration group had to show exports to uphold the purpose of their trade agreements, so there was also exported to Hitler during 1936, 1937, 1938, and 1939 a total of over 340,000 tons of iron and steel scrap. Our boys came in personal contact with these export materials on many a battlefield in Europe.

The zeal of the State Department in the early days of the trade-agreement program knew no bounds. Exports was the only battle cry for freedom. The other propaganda slogan was perpetual peace throughout the world under the leadership of the State Department, promising peace to all who would crusade for the trade-agreements program. Yet, at the very time this hope was being held out to gain support from numerous organizations of women and anxious mothers seeking world peace, more than 10,000,000 long tons—2,240 pounds—of United States iron and steel scrap was exported during the years 1936 to 1940, inclusive, to Japan. How well I remember the day the State Department officials went into an urgent huddle with the Ways and Means Committee and asked to have the tariff removed on some of these materials. Why? Because the United States had made itself so short of these essential war materials that we had to immediately comb every inch of Central and South America and the islands in the Carribean to collect old track, old sugar mills and junk piles, wherever they could be found, to replace the exports to our enemies.

During the years 1936 to 1941, inclusive, when World War II was slowly creeping upon us, could the Army, the Navy, the Department of Agriculture, or Commerce, or any other executive department of the Government, check this madcap policy to the public by the State Department and sold under the honeyed words of "reciprocal trade." Yet today in the very period which may be leading to the fatal hour of all mankind, the Democratic majority would destroy the Tariff Commission now charged with the duty of advising the President, and hence the State Department, of the point below which tariff reduction would imperil the effectiveness of our own industries. The Democratic majority would turn from the bipartisan expert Tariff Commission to the State Department as the alpha and omega in the conduct of our trade-agreement program.

Who organized and propagandized the Citizens Reciprocity Committee to put pressure on Congress to defeat the 1948 Trade Agreements Extension Act in which every safeguard to our industries and our national security was included?

This organizer of the country-wide citizens' pressure group was, and is no other than one Alger Hiss, now under indictment for perjury. Have there been any charges made of an infiltration of spies and Communists in the State Department?

I want to call your attention to one matter because the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means called attention to the wonderful attributes of character of one Charles Taft which, of course, I do not question; however, in his zeal he said that Alger Hiss was not connected with the State Department, that he was not employed by it. Yesterday I asked for copy of a report from the Un-American Activities Committee on a few of the Communists who helped write our trade agreements and I want to read some of these to you at this point.

First as to Victor Perlo:

VICTOR PERLO

Testimony of Victor Perlo, August 9, 1948: "I think I was officially an alternate member on the Committee for Reciprocity Information and the Trade Agreements Committee, which were identical or substantially identical in membership. These were interdepartmental committees which took care of all of the technical work in the preparation of trade agreements under the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act and also to a certain extent a lot of preparatory work for the International Trade Organization."

On the same day, Miss Elizabeth Terrill Bentley, a former member of the Communist espionage ring, confronted Mr. Perlo and identified him as a member of this ring while she was active. When questioned on these charges Mr. Perlo refused to answer charging that his rights under the first and fifth amendments were being violated and that such answer "might tend to incriminate or degrade me." Perlo was also identified as a member of this ring by Whittaker Chambers on August 3, 1948.

We go next to Henry J. Wadleigh:

HENRY J. WADLEIGH

Testimony of Henry J. Wadleigh, December 9, 1948: "I was in the Division of Trade Agreements from 1936, until the war in Europe broke out * * * (superiors were) Henry Grady in the Trade Agreements Division, then Harry Hawkins, then Leo Pasvolsky, special assistant to the Secretary of State, and in Italy, Henry Grade * * * Mr. (Francis B.) Sayre was Assistant Secretary in charge of the Trade Agreements Division when I first was employed there. Mr. Acheson later took Mr. Sayre's place."

On December 6, 1948, in an executive meeting of the Committee on Un-American Activities, Whittaker Chambers identified Julian Wadleigh (Henry Julian Wadleigh) as a source from which the former received documents for transmission to representatives of the Soviet Military Intelligence. When questioned by the Committee on Un-American Activities on December 9, 1948, Mr. Wadleigh refused to answer all questions dealing with such activity on the ground that such testimony might tend to incriminate him. Mr. Wadleigh has since been a witness before a Federal grand jury in New York and it is our understanding that he has been a cooperative witness.

We come now to Alger Hiss, as to whom Mr. Taft referred as not employed in the State Department:

ALGER HISS

On December 23, 1948, Mr. Francis B. Sayre, former Assistant Secretary of State, who was in charge of the Department's Division of Trade Agreements, testified that on April 28, 1936, he recommended that Alger Hiss be appointed as his assistant in the Department of Trade Agreements. He further testified that Mr. Hiss' duties included the legal preparation of trade agreements. Hiss was transferred to another division of the State Department on January 16, 1942.

Attached herewith is the second report of the Committee on Un-American Activities on Soviet Espionage Within the United States Government. A study of this report which contains facsimiles of State Department documents emanating from the Department of Trade Agreements and, according to Mr. Chambers, furnished to him by Alger Hiss and Julian Wadleigh for transmission to the Soviet Military Intelligence agents, will disclose to some extent the proportions of this leakage of information.

Alger Hiss is now under indictment by a Federal grand jury in New York for perjury.

I have, of course, a bound volume from the same source, which I have not the time to read now, but anybody who wants to protect the United States of America and its security can get that report and read it and see just where this whole plan is taking us.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman has indicated that he has given this matter a great deal of study. Now, quite a number of representatives of the State Department appeared before our committee, and some of the things that the gentleman has stated in his statement here came out before the committee. I want to ask this: Did the gentleman see any effort on the part of anybody connected with the State Department or anybody connected with the majority party in this House that would indicate that they ever intended to get rid of those people down there, or make any effort whatever to get rid of them, and is it not a fact that the only people that they have gotten rid of are the people uncovered by the Committee on Un-American Activities of this House?

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the gentleman for that inquiry. The State Department has known of the situation since 1937. When I asked Mr. Clayton before our committee how many experts he was taking abroad to the Geneva negotiations, he has said there were either 101 or 102, I have forgotten which, and I asked him to put in the record the names of the 101 or 102 with their addresses. I had those checked by the department to which I turned on this subversive proposition, and nine of those people were going over there, and yet Mr. Clayton said at the time that they could not let us have the information that we wanted with reference to the things that we were going to trade on.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Would the gentleman please name the committee, the department, to which he turned to obtain this information?

Mr. REED of New York. The FBI.

Mr. MILLS. Do I understand that the FBI informed the gentleman that there was some question concerning the nine men at the Geneva Convention?

Mr. REED of New York. They had all been connected in some form or other with the Communist Party.

Mr. MILLS. Would the gentleman identify for the RECORD the names of those individuals?

Mr. REED of New York. No; I would not.

Mr. MILLS. Has the gentleman submitted any statement involving any one of the nine to the State Department?

Mr. REED of New York. I have not.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman has not given the State Department the benefit of that information?

Mr. REED of New York. I have not, and for a very good reason.

Mr. MILLS. I would certainly like to suggest to the gentleman that he do that at his earliest convenience.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. I would just like to interpolate this much. Why would it not be the duty of the State Department to find out?

Mr. REED of New York. They should. They can find it out if they wish to, but they just do not care.

I want to point out in that connection that of all the spots in the United States absolutely vital to our security, the very heart of it, is in this question of the State Department. Any country that wanted to upset or overthrow this country can spend any amount of money, make any amount of effort to get people in there to write down the tariff on our vital and critical defense materials.

Mr. JENKINS. I am sure the gentleman does not want to give the impression, and I do not either, that everybody in the State Department is wrong.

Mr. REED of New York. Not at all.

Mr. JENKINS. All the gentleman is trying to say, I dare say, to the committee, is that there are a lot of people down there that are not true Americans, especially in connection with the ideas of commerce.

Mr. REED of New York. I will say this, that in the State Department there are any number of fine, splendid, patriotic Americans, and it is not fair that they should be permitted to be smeared by what everybody in this country is beginning to know, that they have been harboring subversive elements there and passing out information that is vital, and nobody will ever know how many of our boys went to their death on the battlefields of Europe because of the information peddled out by these subversive elements.

Is the State Department per se a fact-finding body? Should the State Department be legally clothed with the attributes of infallibility in furnishing information and advice to the President in negotiating trade treaties involving the national economy of our country?

Yet, this is what H. R. 1211 would do.

I call attention to the membership of the House that the 1948 act, which the Democratic majority has been called upon to repeal, made only procedural changes in the conduct of our trade-agreements program despite all false accusations to the contrary. Furthermore, let me say that we stand squarely behind these procedural changes which are centered around the so-called peril-point report. The peril-point report is nothing more than a report made by the Tariff Commission specifying the points below which it would be perilous to our domestic economy to go in reducing tariffs. The peril-point report was the outgrowth of exhaustive study and thought and was specifically designed to assist the State Department in adhering to the policy of not injuring any segment of our domestic economy in the conduct of the trade-agreement program. The reasons which dictated the creation of the peril-point report have been justified by subsequent events.

We of the Republican minority feel that it is urgent, as a bare minimum, to preserve this peril-point feature of the 1948 act by an amendment to H. R. 1211. No thinking patriotic American can oppose such an amendment which is essential to the preservation of our national economy and our national security.

In the Republican minority's proposed peril-point amendment to H. R. 1211, the only requirement is that the peril-point report of the Tariff Commission be submitted to the President for his guidance. He should have it prior to negotiating a trade agreement. He can completely ignore it and will not have to tell the Congress that he has done so. It will be submitted for his confidential information only.

Why is it so essential that the peril-point report of the Tariff Commission be made available to the President in his

trade-agreement negotiations with foreign nations? It is because there is no other fact-finding agency of the Government that is so well equipped by ability and long experience, operating in a strictly bipartisan, scientific capacity as the Tariff Commission to give this important information to the President.

Since the organization in 1916 of the Tariff Commission with this special provision for bipartisan representation, the Commission has furnished to the President, to the Congress, and to the general public impartial facts and unbiased information on all tariff, foreign trade, and foreign-trade policy questions affecting the United States and other countries of the world. In doing so over the past 32 years it has established a high reputation as a scientific fact-finding agency. Its reports are accepted by representatives of both political parties in Congress and by whatever President representing either party happens to be in the White House. This basic and essential information makes it possible to establish the policy for the Government on a more sound and adequate foundation and has proved quite satisfactory to both political parties.

The Commission, as is well known, had developed and has available a vast fund of information and rather complete files of statistical and technical information collected and analyzed and summarized over its 32 years of operation on each of the items of importation under the more than 800 paragraphs of the Tariff Act. Such information has been made available in published reports of the Commission not only to the President and to the Congress but to all other agencies of the Government. These reports show the conditions affecting the competition between the many thousands of imported articles under the various tariff rates in the Tariff Act and the like or similar articles of domestic production.

Any prudent President would welcome such a report from the Tariff Commission pointing out the proposed danger to our economy and national security that might result from reducing certain tariff rates below specified points.

The President and all members of the administration testifying before the Ways and Means Committee have said that they would operate the trade-agreements program so as not to injure domestic industry. This provision merely helps them to comply with their own stated objectives. It seems peculiar that if they are really serious in stating that they will operate the program so as not to injure domestic industries that they should in any way resent having the help of this well-established bipartisan fact-finding agency. Do they object to having the Tariff Commission make findings on these matters because they themselves, the President and the State Department, expect to make findings that will injure domestic industries and threaten the security of millions of our workers from Maine to California? Are they unconcerned by the fact that day by day more American industries are operating only part time? Unemployment is mounting; exports diminishing; competitive imports increasing?

Every thinking American who has any concern for the continued prosperity of our domestic economy, the well-being of millions of workers and the fulfillment of our international commitments to the freedom-loving peoples throughout the world must support two amendments to H. R. 1211.

Because we realize that we cannot save the 1948 act, we urge that one feature of this act be maintained. This is simply the requirement that the United States Tariff Commission furnish the President for his confidential guidance a report of its findings specifying the points below which it would be perilous to our domestic economy to go in reducing tariffs.

No one can claim this amendment to be a hampering restriction, and I accuse those who oppose this amendment with the deliberate attempt to sacrifice our domestic producers and the security of millions of our workers. Accordingly, I urge that H. R. 1211 be amended to retain the peril-point report, established by the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948.

I also urge that an amendment to H. R. 1211 be made providing that all existing trade agreements that do not now contain an escape clause to the same general effect as article XIX of the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade be modified so as to incorporate such a clause.

The reason for this second amendment is that at the present time many industries whose tariff protection has been seriously reduced in agreements prior to 1943 are unfairly discriminated against because they are denied the privilege which other industries have of appealing for relief under the escape clause. All industries should, of course, have equal treatment and a chance to have their day in court. This inequitable situation is spotlighted by the plight of the jewelwatch industry. There is no escape clause in the Swiss trade agreement made in 1936. However, there is an escape clause in all trade agreements made subsequent to 1943.

The sole purpose of these two amendments is to better the procedure leading to the negotiation of foreign trade agreements to the end that our domestic economy will not be injured in accordance with the stated policy of the President.

I charge those who oppose these two amendments with the responsibility for the economic evils which will beset us by any ill-advised tariff reduction.

I want to repeat that essential facts relating to the issues involved in the whole trade-agreements program were suppressed by the action of the Democratic majority. The Republican minority sought to have the whole Ways and Means Committee, through its distinguished chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina, Representative DOUGHTON, extend an invitation to the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Tariff Commission to appear to testify with reference to the role of the Tariff Commission to our domestic economy in the trade-agreements negotiations. This the Democratic majority refused to do, even by a record vote. This is an astounding perversion of representative government. Thus, the Ways and Means Committee, the Members of the House, and the public are deprived of pertinent facts relating to the preservation of our domestic economy as well as our national security.

The testimony from a long list of witnesses before the Ways and Means Committee representing a large segment of our economy urged the retention of the peril-point report, and asked for an escape clause in all trade agreements. This testimony fell on the deaf ears of the Democratic majority of the Ways and Means Committee. What is the Democratic majority saying to the country when it ignores the peril-point amendment? The Democratic majority is saying, in effect: "We are not concerned with the conduct of our trade-agreements program. We have our must orders to obey."

If the peril-point report amendment to H. R. 1211 is disregarded by the Democratic majority, then every workingman who has a stake in the continued prosperity of our Nation should hold the Democratic Party strictly accountable for the economic evils and disastrous consequences which will beset our national economy as a result of any ill-advised tariff reduction.

The Democratic majority may make light of the attempt to salvage the peril-point report and the proposed escape-clause amendment and vote against these two imperative safeguards, but devastating consequences will follow. This story illustrates my point; it was told by the distinguished lecturer John B. Gough:

"I remember riding from Buffalo to Niagara Falls, and I said to a gentleman: 'What river is that, sir?' "

"That," he said, "is Niagara River."

"It is a beautiful stream," said I, "bright, smooth, and glassy. How far off are the rapids?"

"Only a few miles," was the reply.

"Is it possible that only a few miles from us we shall find the water in the turbulence which it must show when near the rapids?"

"You will find it so, sir."

"And, so I found it, and that first sight of Niagara Falls I shall never forget. Now, launch your bark on that river; the water is smooth, beautiful, and glassy. There is a ripple at the bow of your boat, and the silvery wake it leaves behind adds to your enjoyment. You set out on your pleasure excursion. Down the stream you glide; oars, sails, and helm in proper trim. Suddenly, someone cries out from the bank: 'Young men, ahoy!' "

" 'What is it?' "

" 'The rapids are below you.' "

"Ha, ha! We have heard of the rapids, but we are not such fools as to get into them. When we find we are going too fast, then we shall up with the helm and steer to the shore; we will set the mast in the socket, hoist the sail, and speed to land. Then on, boys, don't be alarmed, there's no danger.

"Young men, ahoy there!

"What is it?

"The rapids are below you!

"Ha, ha! We will laugh and quaff; all things delight us. What care we for the future? No man ever saw it. Sufficient for the day is the evil thereof. We will enjoy life while we may; we will catch pleasure as it flies. This is enjoyment—time enough to steer out of danger when we are sailing too swiftly with the current.

"Young men, ahoy!

"What is it?

"Beware, beware! The rapids are below you!

"Now you feel them! See the water foaming all around! See how fast you pass that point! Up with the helm! Now turn! Pull hard; quick, quick! Pull for your lives! Pull till the blood starts from the nostrils and the veins stand like whipcord upon the brow. Set the mast in the socket, hoist the sail! Ah, ah, it is too late; faster and faster you near the awful cataract, and then, shrieking, cursing, howling, praying, over you go."

Mr. Chairman, this proposal before us today vitally affects all Americans—the farmer, the working man, the consumer. It may well determine whether we go forward to a higher standard of living with high wages, full employment, and more production; or whether we blunder into another recession or depression with production curtailed and workers on relief. America's trade policies are too vital to the Nation's welfare to trust to the whims of one man however well-intentioned that one man may be.

And so we go on, and we strike the rapids, and we go over the cataract, as we have time and again, as result of these low tariffs. We had low tariffs in the Democratic Underwood bill. And when we got into the last war what happened? Six million men out of work. Not a bit of smoke coming from a smokestack in this country. They were putting up their soup kitchens everywhere all over this Nation. What was done? The Republican Party came into power. They had these low-tariff rates revised—not as low as you have got them now. We put in a tariff bill to protect our farmers, our workmen, our industries. It was not long thereafter until we had 6,000,000 people at work again and the smoke was coming out of the smokestacks.

We have been through this disastrous mill once. When you Democrats draw a picture of 1929 why do you not look back to the time of your Underwood low tariff and see what happened. I tell you this is an American question. It is not a political question at all. It is our own national defense and our own security that is the issue. When you see the type of people who are writing these trade agreements sitting on the inside, and you know the subversive infiltrations, and the evidence is so overwhelming I cannot understand why any person who loves America should wish to support H. R. 1211, and thus permit these subversive agents to barter away our safety. We know that for years Communists have infiltrated into our departments of Government, especially into the vital spots where they can drive a dagger into the heart of Uncle Sam.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I would like to ask you if, in 1932, when I was selling wheat for 35 cents a bushel, corn for 14 cents, and hogs for 3 cents a pound, and butterfat for 9 cents a pound, and eggs for 6 cents a dozen, and when a good milk cow would bring only $15, if those products were right then and there being protected—and I said "protected"—by the highest tariff duties in the history of this country.

Mr. REED of New York. Let me tell you, sir, that was the aftermath of a Democratic war.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Oh, sure. You have always got to go off like that. You will not stand hitched.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield for a question.

Mr. LYNCH. I would like to know, after the gentleman has finished his discourse, in view of the fact that he has spoken against reciprocal trade agreements, and in view of the fact that he has spoken in favor of them, whether or not you are today in favor of or against reciprocal trade agreements as a principle.

Mr. REED of New York. Just as long as the State Department, like a nest of vipers—Communists, which I am sure you do not love—are on the inside, writing the trade agreements, I shall always be against them. When they are written by real Americans, as they should be, patriotic men like the gentleman who is addressing me, then it will be a different question.

Mr. LYNCH. I can understand the gentleman's point with respect to Communists, but, after all, has there been any evidence produced before the committee that Communists actually wrote or had any part in the writing of any reciprocal trade agreements, to the knowledge of the gentleman?

Mr. REED of New York. You heard what I read today.

Mr. LYNCH. Yes; I heard what you have said, but I have asked you whether or not there is any definite evidence that they actually had anything to do—these people who you say are Communists—actually were the persons in whose hands is placed the obligation of writing reciprocal trade agreements.

Mr. REED of New York. According to their own testimony. You do not need to have it in this record at all. The gentleman knows, and I have taken that position since 1934, that they should not have part in these agreements. I voted against them.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. LYNCH. Is it not a fact that if the gentleman knew of any particular person who was associated with the Communist Party or with a Communist-front organization, if the gentleman knew that any such persons had to do also with the writing of the reciprocal trade agreements, does he not think in all fairness to the Congress that he should give the names of those persons?

Mr. REED of New York. Let me tell the gentleman that in the hearings in the Senate every effort was made to let them see the minutes, and they refused. That is in the hearings; a refusal by Mr. Clayton to let them see what was in the minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, it has been my privilege to speak every time this subject has been considered here in the House. Realizing that time is limited and that many Members desire to speak, I shall ask your indulgence for a short time only on this occasion.

The pending bill, H. R. 1211, is in response to a message of the President of the United States and is a very important administration measure. It was favorably reported by a vote of 17 to 8 by the Committee on Ways and Means. I shall endeavor briefly to cover the provisions of the bill and then as time may permit to discuss the trade-agreements program. As will be observed by a reading of the bill, it contains six sections.

Section 1 embraces the title of the bill: The Trade Agreements Act of 1949.

Section 2 repeals the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948, this Republican measure to which they point with such pride on the other side of the Chamber. Section 2 repeals that act.

Section 3 of this bill provides that the period during which the President is authorized to enter into foreign-trade agreements under Section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 as amended is extended for a period of 3 years from June 12, 1948. This means it will be extended for the customary period of 3 years from the time the last extension expired.

Section 4 deletes from the preamble of the act of 1934 certain language which is no longer applicable and is not necessary to be included.

Section 5 simply provides that the Military Establishment shall be substituted for the War Department and the Navy Department as is provided in the previous act for the reason that the act which was passed by Congress unifying the military services now provides for the Military Establishment instead of War Department and Navy Department.

Section 6 applies only to Cuba and would enable the United States to raise rather than lower certain tariff rates. That covers the provisions of the pending bill.

The trade agreements program was adopted by the act of June 12, 1934, and has been extended by the acts of 1937, 1940, 1943, 1945, and 1948. As I have said on previous occasions while discussing this program, in its far-reaching consequences to the future happiness and welfare of the people of this country and the world, it is probably the most important measure that could challenge the thoughtful attention of this Congress.

The Trade Agreements Act of 1934 conferred discretionary authority upon the President of the United States to negotiate and enter into trade agreements

with other countries of the world. There has been so much confusion injected into this subject and so much discussion that is entirely irrelevant and has no application to the matter now under consideration that it might be well for us to remind ourselves of the provisions contained in the 1934 act, which is the real subject of consideration here today because all the pending bill proposes to do is to extend the provisions of the act of 1934 as it has been modified by the different extension acts since that time.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. As I understand the gentleman, actually the extension is only for 2 years from next June; is that right?

Mr. COOPER. That is correct. It is extended for 3 years, the customary period that has been usually done in the past, from the time it should have been extended last year when our Republican friends were in the majority and did everything they could to try to kill the program. They have opposed it all the way through and realizing that they could not go before the American people in the campaign of 1948 with a record of having completely killed the reciprocal trade-agreements program they tried to do all they could to accomplish that purpose and still be able to say that they had extended the program.

Mr. GRANGER. Going back to the last extension, the authority under the act is not changed at all with respect to the limitations of these trade agreements; is that right?

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is correct. The purpose of this bill today is to extend the original Cordell Hull reciprocal-trade-agreement program for a period of 3 years from June 12, 1948.

Mr. GRANGER. Under this bill we would be acting according to the limitations on the power of the President to make trade agreements?

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is correct. By briefly referring to the act of 1934, it will be observed that the act provides, among other things:

For the purpose of expanding foreign markets for the products of the United States * * * by regulating the admission of foreign goods into the United States in accordance with the characteristics and needs of the various branches of American production so that foreign markets will be made available to those branches of American production which require and are capable of developing such outlets by according corresponding market opportunities for foreign products in the United States.

For that purpose—

The President, whenever he finds as a fact that any existing duties or other import restrictions of the United States or any foreign country are unduly burdening and restricting the foreign trade of the United States and that the purpose above declared will be promoted by the means hereinafter specified, is authorized from time to time—

(1) To enter into foreign trade agreements with foreign governments or instrumentalities thereof; and

(2) To proclaim such modifications of existing duties and other import restrictions, or such additional import restrictions, or such continuance, and for such minimum periods, of existing customs or excise treatment of any article covered by foreign trade agreements, as are required or appropriate to carry out any foreign trade agreement that the President has entered into hereunder.

Now, bear this in mind:

No proclamation shall be made increasing or decreasing by more than 50 percent any existing rate of duty or transferring any article between the dutiable and free lists.

In other words, this simply confers upon the President of the United States, the duly chosen representative of all the people of this country, the authority to negotiate these trade agreements. It simply means in practical application that we realize that we produce large surpluses of products in this country. In normal times about 55 or 60 percent of our cotton is surplus; about 40 percent of our tobacco; about 50 percent of our packing house lard, as well as vast quantities of other agricultural products are surplus. We produce that much more in this country than we normally consume.

There are countries throughout the world that need those products. If they are not sold and exported to those places throughout the world, where they are needed, and are left here on the American market, they can have only one effect, and that is to beat down the prices that our farmers receive for the products of their toil. There are vast surpluses of many industrial products, and this program simply means in practical application that the President of the United States is authorized to sit down around the table, through his chosen representatives, and say to the other countries of the world, "We have certain surplus products in this country. Many of them are needed by you. You have some products in your country that are needed by our people. Let us sit down and see if we cannot work out a trade, a trade that will be to the advantage and in the interest of the people of both countries." That is the purpose of this program, and it has worked remarkably successfully up to this time.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LYNCH. When the gentleman says, work out a trade, he means, does he not, that there would be a working-out or elimination of the various trade barriers that have been erected as the result of tariffs in the various countries; is that not a fact?

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is correct; to stimulate the flow of trade between our country and these other countries of the world.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WILLIS. The gentleman spoke of commodities produced in surplus in the United States. Is it not also true that in instances where we have a less quantity produced than we consume, such as sugar, that special provisions, such as the sugar quota acts, have been enacted to take care of that situation, too?

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is correct. In the Trade Agreements Act a direct approach was made to the trade-barrier problem. Foreign trade increased, and the increase was on a sound basis. Congress has carefully reviewed the program periodically and has approved it by extending the act. Between the years 1934 and 1935, and the years 1938 and 1939, our exports to trade-agreement countries increased by 63 percent, while our exports to non-trade-agreement countries increased by only 32 percent.

Our imports from these agreement countries increased by 22 percent, and imports from nonagreement countries by only 13 percent.

Trade agreements have been negotiated with 42 countries, and 39 of them are still in effect. Hundreds of concessions have been obtained for the benefit of products of this country and, of course, concessions have been made by us for the benefit of products of other countries. Over 65 percent of our normal foreign trade is carried on with trade-agreement countries. These countries have made concessions on something like 75 percent of their agricultural imports from this country and on something like 50 percent of imports of industrial products from this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 additional minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Will the gentleman explain what position the Tariff Commission will assume in this picture if this bill passes?

Mr. COOPER. The Tariff Commission assumes the same position that it did under the original act. It participates in all the hearings, all the consideration, and even in all the negotiations, which is not true under the act of 1948.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. Not in a single instance has the Tariff Commission as such had anything to do with it.

Mr. COOPER. That just shows how little the gentleman from New York knows about it.

Mr. REED of New York. I know absolutely, sir, and the gentleman knows that I do.

Mr. COOPER. That just shows how little he knows about the program. A man who has always opposed the trade-agreement program, a man who stood right here and voted for the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill, a man who has opposed all of our international program, now gets up here and tries to tell you what ought to be done with an important program like this.

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman did not answer my question.

Mr. McDONOUGH. There is evidently a difference of opinion here between two members of the committee. May I ask the gentleman to point out the section of the bill that gives the authority to the Tariff Commission to continue this authority under the bill?

Mr. COOPER. The original act contains that authority, and this pending bill extends the original act that has been in existence throughout the years.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I hope my question will not interfere with the logic of the gentleman's presentation and the manner in which he is presenting it to the House. Will the gentleman address his remarks to this wording in section 6:

Nothing in this act shall be construed to preclude the application to any product of Cuba (including products preferentially free of duty) of a rate of duty not higher than the rate applicable to the like products of other foreign countries (except the Philippines), whether or not the application of such rate involves any preferential customs treatment. No rate of duty on products of Cuba shall in any case be decreased by more than 50 percent of the rate of duty, however established, existing on January 1, 1945 (even though temporarily suspended by act of Congress).

Will the gentleman explain that?

Mr. COOPER. As I endeavored to state earlier, section 6 applies only to Cuba. It would enable the United States to raise rather than lower certain tariff rates. It comes about in this way: There are certain products that are covered in the general agreement on tariff and trade upon which United States duties were increased. By reason of the application of that situation to Cuba, which the gentleman understands occupies a peculiar position of its own, some of the rates that were included in agreements with other countries result in an advantage to the same products coming in from Cuba. Section 6 would enable those rates to be equalized. That is all it means.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Will this affect products of Mexico in like manner as those coming from Cuba?

Mr. COOPER. I do not recall any illustrations given about Mexico.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. The gentleman will realize that I represent a district where they have a great deal of winter farming, where we raise many products. The products of Cuba and of Mexico come in competition at the full bloom of our production.

Mr. COOPER. I do not think this has anything to do with that. The illustration given the committee was this: There were certain parts of chronometers originally included in the 1933 trade agreement with Great Britain, which was superseded by the Geneva agreement of last year. The result is an effective rate on British chronometer parts higher than can be applied to parts for chronometers imported from Cuba. This bill would merely enable the same rate to be applied to such Cuban imports.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Is it not true that William McKinley was considered one of the early tariff experts and that in the last speech that he made before he was unfortunately assassinated he advocated reciprocal-trade agreements, saying that the tariffs had gone as far as they could in the purpose for which they had been originally enacted and he thought that we should begin to have reciprocal-trade agreements?

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman tell me whether in his opinion there are as many restrictions today in international trade as there were in 1934 prior to the reciprocal-trade-agreements program?

Mr. COOPER. Certainly not.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman tell me whether any have been removed other than reductions in tariffs on our part?

Mr. COOPER. Yes, and the gentlemen well knows that.

Mr. Chairman, concessions were obtained on thousands of individual products which enter into the export trade of the United States. For example, over 1,400 concessions were made in our favor in the agreement with the United Kingdom, while over a thousand were made by Canada. Some 400 concessions were made by Cuba, and many concessions by other countries of the world. Every State in the Union produces some of the products on which concessions were obtained.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. Out in my State we have this problem both directly and in reverse. We ship a great deal to Europe—dried fruits and things of that kind. Those who are apprehensive about the reciprocal-trade program are the people who raise nuts, such as the walnut and almond growers, of whom there are a large group in my district. The one complaint they make to me, the one complaint that they reiterate time and again is this: they say that they come to the hearings prepared with their data and submit it. They claim they have no way of knowing whether the Reciprocal Trade Committees pay a bit of attention to what they submit. Can the gentleman comment on that, please?

Mr. COOPER. I can say to the gentleman that I have heard every witness who has ever testified before the Committee on Ways and Means on this program. It has been my privilege to be a member of the committee longer than any other man on it, except our distinguished chairman. I have heard every witness who testified before our committee on this subject, and I say to you that it is my honest conviction that no American industry has been seriously injured by any of these trade agreements which have been negotiated. But more specifically answering your question, every American interest has full, ample and complete opportunity to appear before the responsible authorities of this Government, who are engaged in this important work of assembling material and information, to be considered during the negotiations on these agreements. All of them have full, ample, and complete opportunity to be heard. The original act so provides. That program is to be continued. This program is administered with the most painstaking care of anything I have ever known to be undertaken by this Government.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. I would also like to have the gentleman's comment on the clause in the proposed change in the act where it provides that the United States Tariff Commission's information and data shall be considered by the President. Is it working out that way, that the President does in fact consult the Tariff Commission?

Mr. COOPER. Absolutely, and the original act provides that. The Tariff Commission is to furnish data and information and material to the Interdepartmental Committee, and to the President of the United States. Under the old program which we are seeking to continue by the pending bill, the Tariff Commission itself has representatives on these various committees, and participates all the way through, even to the negotiation of the trade agreement itself, whereas, under the act of 1948, sponsored by our distinguished former colleague who is unfortunately not with us any longer, Mr. Gearhart, the Tariff Commission was taken out of all of that participation, and set apart, separate and apart to make a study and finding, without the benefit of going through all these considerations that are given by these various committees, and then was authorized to make certain reports to the President.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] has again expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. Does the Tariff Commission hold exhaustive hearings itself, so they have ample data to give and to advise?

Mr. COOPER. Oh, the Tariff Commission is a constantly continuing agency that gives every possible thought and consideration to tariff matters.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield briefly.

Mr. COLE of New York. Will the gentleman indicate to what extent, if at all, the Tariff Commission has appeared before the Ways and Means Committee, either this time or in previous years, and expressed its views with respect to the procedure by which these agreements are made?

Mr. COOPER. Members of the Tariff Commission, at least the chairman of the Tariff Commission, and I think other commissioners, have appeared many times in the past. None of them appeared this time.

Mr. COLE of New York. Were they critical of the program?

Mr. COOPER. Oh, they have always appeared in support of the program. The chairman of the Commission has more or less always taken the attitude: "I am

here to give you any information, any counsel that I can"; but he has always supported the program.

We have heard considerable discussion about the value of the trade-agreement program to agriculture. Coming from an agricultural district, I am intensely interested in the welfare of our farmers, and have worked for and supported all agricultural legislation since I have been privileged to serve in this body. It is my conviction that this program is of greater value to agriculture than most any part of the life of this country. I invite your attention to the hearings, and especially to a statement by Mr. Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, who appeared before the committee in support of the pending legislation. Among other things he said:

> No group in the United States has a greater stake in maintaining a high level of exports than American farmers. The American farmer needs foreign markets. In 1948 the production of agricultural products was 28 percent above the prewar level.

Then, passing on to another point in Mr. Kline's statement, I quote:

> We therefore support the continuation of the Trade Agreements Act for another 3-year period, and the elimination of the restrictions enacted in the 1948 extension act, which tend to hamper the successful operation of this program.

A great deal has been said from time to time on the subject of wage scales in this country and other countries of the world. I invite attention to the fact that it should be remembered that unit costs, not wages, determine the competitive position of the manufacturers. Information from our Department of Commerce shows that the output per man-hour in our factories is more than 50 percent greater than in Canada, and more than twice that in the United Kingdom. It is generally conceded that in many industries we have the lowest production costs in the world. This is confirmed by the volume and diversity of our exports to markets in which we compete on an equal basis with other manufacturing nations.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. I hate to take the gentleman's thought off his present subject matter, but going back to this question of the exception made in the case of Cuba; that is a departure from the favored-nations provisions of the act, is it not? Do we make other exceptions?

Mr. COOPER. We have given certain consideration in the case of Cuba for many years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has again expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I wish very briefly to touch upon one phase that is frequently mentioned and discussed, and that is the most-favored-nations policy. You will recall that this was initiated by that former distinguished Secretary of State, Charles Evans Hughes. It has been followed throughout the application of the reciprocal-trade-agreements program. Some time ago a special study was made by the State Department and the Tariff Commission of the generalization of concessions, and also the other side of the question. Those investigations show that the generalizations that we made to other countries amounted to about $30,000,000 in trade. On the other hand, by that very generalization policy we protected something like $250,000,000 worth of our own export trade. The ratio stands about $9 in benefits that we have received for every $1 of concessions we have granted. A 9-to-1 advantage is considered to be a pretty good trade.

Mr. Chairman, we realize, of course, that at this critical time in the affairs of the world this program is of greater importance than it has ever been in the past. We realize that we are now spending billions of dollars in the great European recovery program. This cannot continue indefinitely. We must try to see to it that international trade is restored to the extent that those countries now receiving financial aid from us will be able to stand on their own feet. In the European Recovery Act it is provided that the countries receiving benefits thereunder shall make an effort to reduce tariffs and trade barriers between themselves and with other countries of the world. Certainly, it is very important that we continue this program that makes it possible for us to carry on foreign trade with other countries throughout the world.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Does the gentleman feel that the European recovery program, which requires the reduction of trade barriers between European nations, can possibly succeed unless we in this country encourage that by the adoption of this program?

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is correct. This is a very vital part of our international program. It perhaps means more than any one particular part of it and certainly we must go forward with this program as it was originally conceived by the man who stands out in bold relief as one of the greatest statesmen of all the world, our former colleague in this House, the distinguished Cordell Hull.

The purpose of this bill is to extend this program that has been tried and found beneficial to the people of this country as well as the other countries of the world, and it should receive the support of those in this Chamber who have favored our international program. This is perhaps the most important part of our effort to bring about a proper degree of recovery throughout the entire world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, for a few minutes I should like to reply to some of the arguments advanced by my very distinguished friend the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER]. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] sought to leave the impression that all the agricultural organizations in the land are in favor of the pending measure. As far as I am concerned, I think the most representative organization among the farmers of the United States is the Grange.

We had Mr. Goss, the distinguished president of the Grange, before us and here is what he stated, summing up his appraisal of the situation:

> We would much prefer to see the committee—

Meaning the Ways and Means Committee—

> devote its time to the enactment of such legislation and let the present law stand until a sound and effective tariff measure can be passed.

By the words "present law" he means the law passed by the Republican Eightieth Congress.

There is in clear language what the president of the Grange stated.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. He also testified that the Grange had a membership of 813,000 farmers?

Mr. JENKINS. That is right. I think it is the oldest and largest of all the farm organizations. I should also like to reply to the argument of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] when he recited to us the wonderful and beneficent effects of these trade agreements. Here is a question I should like to direct to anyone on the majority side. Is it not a well-established fact that the tariffs and trade barriers are higher against us now in every country than they were when we began to negotiate them?

Here is another thing I should like to stress. It has been brought out before our committee time after time, year after year, that the tariff authorities have never negotiated any rate upward. They have always negotiated them downward. There was a witness the other day who said, "Yes, they have negotiated one rate upward." That was on sardines. They have negotiated the rate on sardines upward. But under questions from one of our members he divided the sardines into four groups and said that they raised the rate on only one group, so three-fourths of the sardines are in the same class as everything else. They have never raised a single tariff anywhere. I can't see how it could be consistent with fair play or even the law of averages how these fellows who make these agreements could possibly claim that they were fair with our country when they could not find where they could not in one single instance give to our country a little increase in protection duties.

Why is this not reciprocal? Why is it we have to pay what they all ask every place? We take the short end of the stick all the time and every place, and if I am not stating the true facts in reference to that, I invite you to recite one single instance where these activities have raised the duty at any time.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Not only are those rates higher but in addition—I want to see if the gentleman agrees with this—they impose currency controls against us which have the effect of blocking the movement of goods into those countries.

Mr. JENKINS. I cannot answer this positively that all the countries have manipulated their currency against us, but in the majority of the cases it has been done.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And our State Department continually proceeds with a program which encourages them in doing that.

Mr. JENKINS. Yes, the gentleman is absolutely right. Take Mexico. The Mexican escape clause is considered the prize agreement of all. That is considered the model escape clause. What has Mexico done? Just deliberately walked out of it. I do not think any country in the whole world has kept this agreement with us. We keep all our agreements all the time, but they renege and run out, and they change their currency and do anything they please to render the agreement nugatory.

Let me say to my good friend the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] I am proud of him, because he always extols his fellow Tennessean, Cordell Hull. But, you know, I served with Cordell Hull, and I served with Mr. JERRY COOPER. To my mind the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] far surpasses Mr. Hull both intellectually and as a statesman.

Now, let us talk a little about these negotiations. Someone asked the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] the question about how these negotiations are entered into. His reply was such that I cannot agree with it. These negotiations are such that I am reminded of the statement in the Bible where speaking of man it says that he was "fearfully and wonderfully made." My friends, I want to leave this thought with you. We questioned dozens of men who went down before these tariff committees, and we never found anybody yet who has been satisfied. Without exception every person who discussed the experiences that he had before these trade committees said in effect that their appearance before those committees was absolutely unsatisfactory. Now I would like to ask my good friend, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], who has been a member of the Ways and Means Committee for a long time, did he ever see anybody or hear of anybody that ever appeared before us that said he was satisfied with the treatment he received down before the trade committees?

Mr. MILLS. I will answer the gentleman by saying this——

Mr. JENKINS. Well, just answer me positively "Yes" or "No" without making a speech.

Mr. MILLS. Those who appeared before our committee in opposition to the program——

Mr. JENKINS. In opposition or in favor. Answer me the question that I asked you. Did the gentleman ever hear anybody say that he was satisfied, or defended the program in any way at any time?

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman will remember Mr. Kline's statement, the head of the American Farm Bureau, when he said that they had been treated all right. The gentleman will remember the statement of Mr. Casey, representing the glove industry, where he said that they had been received properly.

Mr. JENKINS. Yes, but the gentleman knows that Mr. Casey was one of the most ardent opponents of this measure which the gentleman supports, that ever appeared before our committee.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman, of course, knows that the man who has protection does not want to give it up.

Mr. JENKINS. Certainly, and he ought not to be compelled to do so if it will destroy his business. But he told you at the same time that if he did not get some protection, he was going to go out of business. That is exactly what he said. Now, if you want to take the responsibility for putting him out of business, that is your responsibility.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman quite well remembers that Mr. Casey was concerned about imports from Japan; the program of exporting from there conducted by our own Army.

Mr. JENKINS. But this gentleman, Mr. Casey, made a very fine statement and came voluntarily. He made a statement against the program that the majority is now favoring and he was bitterly against it.

Now then, let me talk to you further about these negotiations. This system employed by these trade-agreement boys of the State Department is about the most un-American program that I have ever heard. I repeat to you, we had dozens of fine men, lawyers, agriculturists, and businessmen come before us at different times, and all complained against the treatment accorded them and not a single person at any time ever said he had fair treatment and not a single person ever knew who considered the statements and arguments made by them, or ever knew who decided against them and why the decision was made and they got no advice or information of any kind. They all said, "We go down there and a couple of nice looking fellows come out, and they are suave, and they are nice. They sit there and we tell them our story. They do not even pay much attention to it. When we are through they say we can go. We never hear another thing about it. We do not know what became of it."

That is not right, that is not treating our American taxpayer right, and it cannot be made right until some change is made.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to my friend the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McSWEENEY. I remember the old days under the tariff programs back in the twenties when I was trying to help the clay-products industry of our State, with the cooperation of our then colleague from Ohio, Mr. Murphy. The gentleman may remember him.

Mr. JENKINS. He was a great protectionist if there ever was one. You did well to get his help.

Mr. McSWEENEY. We tried to get his help in connection with the brick, the clay-products industry, which is an important industry in our State. We could not get anywhere at that time, as the gentleman may remember.

Mr. JENKINS. That is right.

Last week one of the big brick industries in my section suspended operation temporarily, leaving 500 men out of employment. That is the result all over this country because of this program. You may wonder why I am a little zealous about this. I have hundreds of fine men in my own district who make their living working at brick and tile plants. I am interested in them.

Mr. McSWEENEY. They were not protected under the old system.

Mr. JENKINS. I will come to that a little later, when I talk about what is on the free list. But I will say to the gentleman that the duty on brick importations is now only about one-half of what it was at the time the gentleman refers to.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. If this thing goes through, will it not hurt the man who labors with his hands in this country?

Mr. JENKINS. Most assuredly. Everybody knows that the gentleman is right in his viewpoint in that connection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Will the gentleman advise me just how high the tariff would have to be to protect this brick concern about which he is talking?

Mr. JENKINS. I do not know. I cannot give the gentleman the exact figures. But, as I have already said, the duty on brick has been reduced about 50 percent under these agreements. However, I would do this, if I could. I would go down there and ask them about it, or somebody should, for if I went they would not tell me. I would never find out anything about it. Some of the brick people out there just had to quit. It was no use for them to come to Washington. Oh, I know this is a free-trade program. This is a free-trade Cordell Hull program. Cordell Hull is probably the greatest free-trader America ever produced. This is Cordell Hull's program. There is no use to come to Washington. Everybody says you cannot get any satisfaction in Washington.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman is such an able member of our committee, and I mean that seriously, that I am certain he could obtain that information from the Tariff Commission.

Mr. JENKINS. If I could relieve the situation that I am talking about, if I could bring to the American people the justice to which they are entitled in connection with these matters and correct the shameful conditions that go on down

there. I would quit this House today and go down there and do that job. I would be doing the greatest service for millions of our people that anybody has done for a long time.

Mr. MILLS. Would the gentleman be entirely satisfied if the House should adopt the two amendments referred to in the minority report on page 1? Would the gentleman be entirely satisfied with that program?

Mr. JENKINS. I would be satisfied with that for 1 day's work, tomorrow. I hope we get it done. That will be a fine day's work for 1 day, but I would not stop at that. I would do many other things against which our people are complaining. Many businessmen in the country are afraid to make their protests down here in Washington because they fear reprisals.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman might be satisfied on Wednesday, but he might not be satisfied on Thursday?

Mr. JENKINS. I would go further. I would do good on Wednesday, and then do more on Thursday.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman would have some more amendments on Thursday?

Mr. JENKINS. That is right; we agree.

Mr. NICHOLSON. If the gentleman will yield further, may I say that I am for anything that will help industry or the people who work in this country. If anybody is going to walk the streets, I would prefer that they walk in foreign countries, not in our country.

Mr. JENKINS. We both agree exactly.

May I take up now, the allusion that was made to Mr. McKinley's position. I do this in all humility because there is no question about Mr. McKinley's great ability and his position on the question of protective tariff. There is no question but that Mr. McKinley was the greatest tariff expert of his generation.

Mr. McKinley gave us the word "reciprocity." This is where it came from. Then as now, sometimes, I think we talk too much about the tariff, because 65 percent of all the commodities that come into the country come in free. Sixty-five percent of all our trade with all the nations comes in free of any tariff at all. That percentage was very great in Mr. McKinley's time, also, but Mr. McKinley advanced a program and said something to this effect: If we are going to let these people come in free with all their goods from all over the world, why not demand a little reciprocity? And we did demand a little reciprocity.

McKinley's theory always was—and even up to the day that he was assassinated at Buffalo, he had never retreated from that position—that reciprocity was advisable if it would be reciprocal by both parties and also that the measure of the tariff should be the difference between the cost of production in our country and the cost of production in the country from which the goods came. That was his policy all the time. That is our policy and that is my policy today. The only change is a change due to the change of world conditions. It was our duty to help some of the war-torn countries to reestablish themselves but when they became reestablished it is not necessary for us to admit free their products in competition with our products.

Let me answer if I may a few of the arguments made by my distinguished friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]. I yield to no one in paying my respects to this distinguished gentleman who has lived and worked among us many, many years. He has been in Congress probably longer than some of our new Members have been on earth. But the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] laid great stress on, and so many Members speaking on the Democratic side talk so much about, the Smoot-Hawley law. Some of our new Members have come here and have heard people talk about that law. You have made speeches against the Smoot-Hawley law year after year and year after year. Do you not know that nobody on your side ever since the Smoot-Hawley law was passed has ever come up here with a bill to repeal it? No, you have not. Why does not somebody come up with a measure to repeal this nefarious monstrosity?

Nobody ever has had the temerity to do it. Why, today in practically all of the procedures under which the Tariff Commission operates they operate under that law.

What is the use in hashing up things that are of no consequence at all today, because if there is anything wrong about it, why do you not take it out? Nobody has ever tried to do it.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield.

Mr. CAMP. Does not the gentleman know that the very purpose of the act which we are extending here is to permit the President to reduce the rate in the Smoot-Hawley bill where he thinks it is for the benefit of trade?

Mr. JENKINS. May I say to my friend that that is what I have been complaining about. The President and the Commission have a right to reduce these rates and they have been reducing and reducing and reducing.

He also has the right to increase the rates, but he has never increased them in a single instance.

Mr. CAMP. But his action has been on the basis of McKinley's policy of reciprocity of which you are in favor.

Mr. JENKINS. Yes; but that reciprocity applies to us as well, as I said before. When we give our market, which is by far the greatest market on earth, to the world and when we say to the whole world that 65 percent of everything that comes in can come in free, when we give them something, do you not think that they ought to give us something?

Mr. CAMP. Of course I do. And that is why we have reciprocal trade so we can get some benefits.

Mr. JENKINS. That is right, and that is what I think, too. But we do not have an organization that can give us that and we never have had.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman confuses me somewhat. He complains of the fact that we have not repealed the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act and in the next breath he complains because the tariff rates in the United States are equal to or under the Underwood Tariff Act rate. It seems to me that we have not only repealed the Smoot-Hawley tariff rates, but repealed other rates.

Mr. JENKINS. Yes; but you are repealing all the time without any consideration of the consequences. That is the way you have drawn your agreements and when they commence to pinch these foreign countries, they squeal out of it. You do nothing about it and our industry has had to bear the brunt of it and take the consequences.

Mr. MILLS. Does the gentleman contend that nothing can be done about it?

Mr. JENKINS. Why certainly, if this bill passes. Our amendments would help a great deal.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. I remember what the distinguished Henry Rainey, who was leader on that side of the House many years ago, said on the floor. He said, "You talk about repealing the Tariff Act. Why, the Republicans will not do it, and we do not dare."

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Has not the demonetization of the dollar made effective tariffs on an ad valorem basis much more effective than they would have been before the demonetization of the dollar?

Mr. JENKINS. I do not know how that would work out in figures, but I just know how they do in other parts of the world. I know how they manipulate their currency. They make the contract with us first and then they manipulate the currency to suit the contract. That is the way they do it. And do not forget that. That is one of the greatest factors in business activity in the world today—the manipulation of currency in foreign countries.

If I may proceed. I have listened to some pretty spurious arguments. I want to answer them, because I think I have the answer right here in the book.

Nearly every New Dealer who discusses the reciprocal-trade agreements says something to this effect, "Well, is it not true that business between our country and the foreign countries increased in every case as we made these trade agreements?"

They say that in every case, when we made a trade agreement, business increased with that country and it did not increase with other countries.

Now, let me give you the facts with reference to Norway and Sweden for instance. We made a contract with Sweden and we did not make one with Norway. Our business with Norway increased more than it did with Sweden in the same time. Now, why do you make such arguments as that when they are absolutely not borne out by the facts?

Let us take Argentina and Brazil. We make a contract with Brazil and we do not make a contract with Argentina. Our trade with Argentina far surpasses

our trade with Brazil in the same time. Let us go to Venezuela and Colombia. The same thing applies there. We make a trade treaty with Colombia and we do not make one with Venezuela. Business with Venezuela increased far more than it did with Colombia.

So why do you make such arguments? Why do you make arguments with reference to certain periods of inactivity? They say, "Mr. Hoover's time. Mr. Hoover's time." His time terminated in 1932. We had a Democratic Congress in 1930. When did WPA come into existence? Who ever heard of WPA up until that time?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. JENKINS. The Hull reciprocal-trade agreements were in effect in 1935, 1936, and 1937, when WPA was in effect and employed more people than any other industry. What good did the trade agreements do to the country when they were first passed? I do not say that WPA came on because of these agreements, but I say that these agreements did not do for the country what you claim they did. Mr. Chairman, I hope to develop some of these matters further as this debate progresses. I am sorry that my time has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, you will recall that during the very first days of this session, I introduced a resolution providing for a permanent delegation to the President of authority to enter into trade agreements with foreign countries. Under my bill, it would no longer have been necessary for Congress to press legislation every 2 or 3 years to keep the Reciprocal Trade Act alive. However, the Congress would have continued to keep a close eye on the President's exercise of this authority through investigatory supervision.

I still maintain that there is considerable merit in my resolution. However, as a result of the hearings held by the Ways and Means Committee and of the important revelations that were made there by the technicians and experts in charge of the day-to-day operations of the trade-agreement program, I have decided to support in full the committee bill.

I am supporting the committee bill for three important reasons:

First. The Hull reciprocal-trade program was one of the vital issues in the recent election. The people have repudiated the crippling amendments made by the Republican Eightieth Congress by refusing to reelect both the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Tariff and Reciprocal Trade. The author of the Gearhart bill and many who sustained him have been defeated at the polls. The plunderbund of Smoot-Hawley high-tariff boys, the American Tariff League and the Grundyites of reactionary republicanism, has been decisively checkmated.

The farmers, the housewives, and the labor unionists—all those members of the consuming public who played their part in bringing about this repudiation at the polls—have a right to expect prompt action on our part to restore the Hull program. I would be the last one to stand in the way of such positive action. Perhaps at a later date, when there is more time, the merits of my resolution can be discussed at greater length.

Second. Time is of great importance in regard to this legislation. Early in April very extensive tariff negotiations are scheduled to commence in Annecy, France, close to the Swiss border. It is essential that the United States play its full and unfettered part in these negotiations. Thirteen additional countries have indicated a desire to participate in the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade, concluded in the autumn of 1947 between the United States and 22 other countries.

The general agreement is the most important and comprehensive trade agreement in history. By this agreement 23 nations agreed to reduce their tariffs or to maintain low tariffs or none at all on a wide variety of products. The products affected accounted in 1938 for over half of the world's international trade. In addition, the agreement includes commitments to curb the use of other trade restrictions, such as import quotas, and to limit various kinds of discrimination, such as preferential treatment of imports from one country as against those from another. Never before have so many nations combined in such an intensive effort to reduce barriers to trade.

The extension of this agreement to 13 new countries is consequently a very important step in the series of moves which the United States is making to remove barriers which stand as unnecessary obstacles to the building of a more stable and a more prosperous world.

We know that unless nations can sell each other products of their agriculture, labor, and industry to the greatest possible extent, there can be no sure foundation for economic or political peace. We know that unless trade restrictions are relaxed, the lot of the private trader in international trade will become increasingly difficult. We know that unless world trade is increased, the tremendous investment we are making in the European recovery program will be largely wasted.

Preparations for tariff negotiations take time—particularly when a large number of countries are involved. Planning for the April negotiations has been going on for over 6 months. The effectiveness of United States participation in the negotiations has been drastically hampered, despite the best efforts of the technicians, by the restrictive provisions and limited extension of the present trade-agreements law. Faced with uncertainty as to the status of the law after June 30, foreign countries unquestionably have been more reluctant to plan important and far-reaching commitments than they otherwise would have been. Faced with the prospects of niggardly offers, limited by the United States Tariff Commission's overcautious peril points, foreign countries must be contemplating niggardly offers in turn, which would result in a niggardly attempt to reduce world trade barriers.

This is no time for niggardly attempts to solve basic world problems. Bold and imaginative steps, offset by reciprocal action, must be taken and taken now, not next year or the year afterward. Realizing this as I do, and recognizing that the April negotiations should not be postponed until we decide upon a new basic trade-agreements law, I am willing to defer consideration of my resolution for a permanent trade-agreements act until a more suitable time.

Third. There is still one last reason why I am supporting unchanged the committee bill at this time. It has to do with the attitude of people throughout the world toward the United States. They are wondering how quickly and to what degree the Eighty-first Congress can reverse the reactionary isolationist trend started by the unlamented Republican Eightieth Congress. Today we face the first test. We can show the world the temper of this new Congress, and by the number of votes cast for this resolution we can make a concrete demonstration which will be talked about in Moscow, in New Delhi, in Cairo, and in all of the capitals of the earth. By this vote and by the speed with which we act we can show again that America is alive to the grave economic problems facing the peoples in most of the world outside our frontiers and that we are prepared to do our fair share toward helping to solve these problems. We can effectively take the wind out of the sails of those who keep propagandizing the colonial peoples, to the rising younger nationalities, and to the poverty-ridden everywhere. We can say with reason and with confidence, pointing to this law and the action that will be taken under it, that this country will continue to do its share and more than its share to the end that men everywhere will have a better chance for economic as well as political freedom in the years immediately ahead. We will thus assure the peaceful and economic future of America; of this there can be no doubt.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to read into the RECORD a statement by the Detroit Board of Commerce. It constitutes unchallengeable and documentary evidence the value and effectiveness of which cannot be refuted.

DETROIT BOARD OF COMMERCE,
Detroit, Mich., February 4, 1949.

STATEMENT ON EXTENSION OF THE RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT ON BEHALF OF THE DETROIT BOARD OF COMMERCE

To Members of the House Ways and Means Committee:

The world affairs committee of the Detroit Board of Commerce has always, in the past, strongly supported the reciprocal-trade-agreements program. In conformance with the traditional policy, the world affairs committee respectfully urges that H. R. 1211 be favorably reported by your committee and be passed by Congress.

DETROIT AND MICHIGAN'S INTEREST IN WORLD TRADE

The city of Detroit and the State of Michigan both have a vital interest in a successful trade-agreements program. The following facts indicate the paramount importance

of a healthy world trade to the economy of this area:

1. The Detroit area is the world's largest producer of industrial products for export.

2. Over 900 Michigan firms are actively engaged in some form of world trade.

3. It has been estimated that one out of every seven dollars spent in this area was derived from foreign sales.

4. More than 300 imported items are necessary for the production of automobiles in Detroit.

5. Many chemical, pharmaceutical, paint, machinery, and other industrial firms in this area are dependent upon imported raw materials.

6. Over 100 oceangoing steamship companies maintain offices in Detroit.

7. During the navigation season oceangoing vessels ply the waters between the port of Detroit and the ports of Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Holland, Belgium, England, Venezuela, and Colombia.

8. Air lines connect Detroit with nearly every major commercial center in the world.

Michigan fathered modern industrialization with the development of mass production methods in the automotive industry. With this development came the need of mass consumption and mass markets. A decline in consumption or a limitation of markets wreaks havoc upon our industrial society. Thousands of workers become idle, expensive equipment and machinery lies useless, purchasing power declines, and the resultant economic stagnation creates a tremendous burden for the city, State, and Federal Governments. Both agricultural and industrial interests suffer. Detroit industries believe every effort must be made for the expansion of world trade and the maintenance of world markets. A workable reciprocal-trade-agreements program can contribute to the realization of this goal.

The catastrophic effects of the last war have made it difficult for many nations of the world to compete in the world's markets or to purchase the products we produce. Dollar shortages have appeared in every corner of the globe giving an impetus to the demand for increased tariff walls, quota restrictions, preferential tariffs, regional trade systems, bilateral trade agreements, exchange controls, and other types of trade barriers. These are largely designed to limit United States participation in the exploitation of world markets. We believe the reciprocal trade agreements program is an effective method of combating the present trend.

Opponents of the reciprocal trade agreements program argue that the curtailment of our export trade would have little effect upon our economy as it represents only about 10 percent of our total production. They claim that increased imports of products produced by cheap labor will cause unemployment and economic hardship to both labor and industry groups in the United States.

Though our exports may represent only about 10 percent of production, that 10 percent may often be the difference between profit and loss. It may represent an increased volume of production making possible a lower per unit cost. It affords stability to Detroit manufacturers and labor by mitigating the effects of slack periods in the domestic market. During severe depressions in the domestic market, export has made possible the continued operation of a number of Detroit industries that might otherwise have had to close down operations.

The claim that the importation of products produced by so-called cheap labor will be injurious to employment in this country is fallacious. Foreign labor is not cheap. Productivity as well as wages determines value of labor. The employees of Detroit industries, as a result of the heavy investment in equipment, tools, and machinery and improved techniques of production, are competitive with other labor groups all over the world. On the other hand, the undue protection of uncompetitive labor in other domestic industries results in a lower standard of living and the limitation of markets to the detriment of the more economic industries.

CONCLUSION

Trade agreements executed in the past have been beneficial to a great majority of Detroit and Michigan industries. Agricultural interest has also benefited from the reciprocal trade agreements program.

Never before in history has the need for a healthy world economy been as apparent as it is today. Nations throughout the world need the products and the production know-how available here in Detroit for the rehabilitation and the reconstruction of their war-torn Communist-threatened economies. We cannot afford to refuse their demands. On the other hand, we cannot afford to continue indefinitely the process of giving away the bulk of our exports without receiving payment as has been the case in the past. It is imperative that markets for the world be opened to Detroit and Michigan industries and that the means of payment for these products be available, thus relieving the American taxpayer of the burden of paying for our own exports.

Therefore, the world affairs committee of the Detroit Board of Commerce urges the Ways and Means Committee to favorably report on H. R 1211 and it be passed by Congress.

Respectfully submitted.

WORLD AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, DETROIT BOARD OF COMMERCE,
RICHARD B. FROST, *Secretary.*

VERIFICATION

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
County of Wayne:

Personally appeared before the undersigned authority, Richard B. Frost, who being first duly sworn, deposes and says that he is secretary of the world affairs committee of the Detroit Board of Commerce, Detroit, Mich., and that he executed the foregoing instrument and that the allegations of fact therein are true and correct to the best of his knowledge and belief.

RICHARD B. FROST,
Secretary, World Affairs Committee, Detroit Board of Commerce.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 4th day of February 1949.

NICHOLAS J. RINI,
Notary Public, Wayne County, State of Michigan.

My commission expires November 23, 1952.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP].

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, the present joint resolution to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, which, if passed, will enable the President through the Secretary of State, to continue for another 3-year period to enter into foreign-trade agreements or reciprocal trade agreements, is as important legislation as will come before this session of Congress. It affects the prosperity of every American. To my way of thinking, it is the greatest hope we have of keeping up our present high levels of employment as well as the high income of farms, mines, and factories.

There was a time when our foreign trade was of such proportions that the specter of unemployment was unknown and the worry of our cotton and grain farmers was not the question of markets but the problem of supplying the world demand. Ships bearing cargoes of American manufactured goods and agricultural products sailed the seven seas, our ports were beehives of commercial activity, and our people enjoyed a firm and stable prosperity.

In other words, we traded with the world. We brought to our country goods from all over the world, and we sold to the world our entire surplus of manufactured goods and agricultural products.

In 1933 the new administration at Washington began a study of the causes of the loss of our world trade. The President had called to his aid as Secretary of State a statesman who had given many years of his life to the study of world trade and tariffs and who had foreseen the inevitable result of the iniquitous tariff policy of the Government under the Republican administrations. This quiet and studious man from the rugged State of Tennessee, Hon. Cordell Hull, believed that by making reciprocal treaties with the foreign countries much of our trade could be revived and prosperity gradually brought back. So the Congress passed the act of June 12, 1934, empowering the President to make these reciprocal trade agreements.

What are these trade agreements? They are nothing more nor less than a method of breaking up the log jam and opening up the trade channels between our country and the other countries of the world.

Some people have an erroneous idea of the meaning of foreign or world trade. They seem to cling to the idea that trading with the world means selling the rest of the world our goods without buying any of theirs. Trading means the exchange of goods for goods—just as the farmer takes his produce to town and exchanges it for the supplies he needs, as the trapper on the frontier used to exchange his furs for food and clothing. So we see that if we will have world trade we must take the goods and products of other countries in exchange for ours. We must buy as well as sell. To revive this trading a Democratic administration devised these reciprocal trade agreements. These agreements made it easier for the foreign buyers of our goods to find a market for their goods here. Each one provides increased opportunities for a country to expand its purchases of our goods; provides that the trade of one country shall be treated fairly by the other country to the agreement relative to the trade of a third country, thereby preventing discrimination.

These trade treaties became necessary because as we built high tariff walls in this country, other countries of the world retaliated by building high tariff walls against our goods and these tariffs became formidable barriers to world trade. It was found to be impossible to get rid of all these trade barriers at once, but these trade agreements, by reducing our tariffs on some goods in exchange for an agreement on the part of another country to reduce its tariffs and other restrictions on our goods, encouraged trade instead of discouraging it.

These trade agreements are openly and fairly made. A clear description of the method of their negotiation is as follows:

Before we enter into trade-agreement negotiations with a country, public announcement is made of our intention to do so. The trade-agreements work is conducted by the Trade Agreements Committee, an interdepartmental undertaking in which participate the Departments of State, Treasury, Agriculture, and Commerce, and the Tariff Commission. This committee is made up of nonpartisan experts, men of experience and judgment in foreign trade, who have no interest in anything except what is best for the country as a whole.

As a result of study of the trade and products of the two countries, there is published at the time announcement is made of intention to negotiate a trade agreement a list of products in respect of which we will consider making concessions to the other country.

When these products have been announced in this open and aboveboard manner, so that everybody who produces or deals in these products may know about it, then a date is set when all interested persons may be heard. If you do not think a product in which you are interested should be included in these negotiations, you have a full chance to say so. You can appear before the Committee for Reciprocity Information at public hearings in Washington and state your case, or you can file a written brief of your arguments and have them carefully considered. In one way or another everybody affected has a chance to be heard—an equal chance. There are no back-door methods; no chances for lobbyists to exert political pressure; no secret deals or swaps.

Why has the trade agreements program become so universally accepted? Even men who have made a career out of fighting the program no longer speak of outright repeal of the Trade Agreements Act. They only dare use the back door and try to weaken the program through crippling amendments.

The reason why trade agreements are today so universally acclaimed is not hard to find. Trade agreements make a vitally important contribution both to our domestic prosperity and to the success of our foreign policy. Let us consider how this is so.

First, as to our domestic prosperity. America is now the world's largest foreign trading nation; our domestic economy is geared into the world economy. We need to export to keep our present high level of production. A falling off of exports of just one product has effects which reverberate throughout our economy. But if we want to continue our exports we must also be willing to import. We cannot sell unless we buy. Furthermore, imports are valuable in their own right because they raise our standard of living and supply us with raw materials on which our production depends. A large volume of both exports and imports is therefore essential to our domestic prosperity. What is the best way to insure that this volume will be large? Obviously by reducing trade barriers and allowing the forces of competition to determine the flow of goods among nations. Trade agreements are designed to accomplish just this.

There is another reason why trade agreements are vitally important to our domestic economy. We in America believe in the system of free competition. We know that America owes its economic strength to that system. Trade among nations today is not free, but is largely regulated and controlled by governments through bilateral agreements, exchange controls, and quotas. When nations regulate and control their foreign trade in this fashion, they sooner or later find it necessary to control their domestic trade as well. If our system of free competition is to survive and if our own prosperity is to continue, we must convince the world of the value of reducing and eliminating these governmentally-imposed barriers to trade. The trade agreements program has been invaluable for teaching this lesson to the world. With its aid, we have led in the fight to reduce and eliminate controls and barriers on international trade. We must continue to lead in this fight if we want to convince the world of the superiority of our economic system.

No one can question, therefore, the value of trade agreements to our domestic economy. This alone would be sufficient reason for renewal of the act. But it is when we turn to foreign policy that the case for trade agreements becomes overwhelmingly convincing.

Our foreign policy aims at the establishment of a peaceful world in which democratic, free institutions flourish. Our economic foreign policy supports this ultimate goal by creating the prosperity and economic stability which is the surest foundation upon which to build a peaceful, democratic, and free world.

The great depression and World War II made the goals of our economic policy difficult to achieve. The depression left a heritage of economic controls. The war added to these controls and left many other scars on the world economy. The industrial plants of many nations were nearly destroyed, transportation and normal business channels were disrupted, and basic commodies were in severely short supply. Faced with such conditions, war-torn nations could take no other source of action but to invoke controls, make barter deals, and resort to a host of other restrictive devices. When trade is artificially channeled, the volume of trade falls off and the flow of goods slows down to a trickle. Most of these countries recognized that the controls which they imposed were not going to assist them in the permanent solution of their problems but they were not in a strong enough economic position to take any other course of action.

American economic policy is aimed at breaking down these depression-born and war-fostered barriers which block the flow of goods and deny to the world the prosperity which comes from a mutual sharing of goods. We are in a strong enough economic position to take the lead. We have obtained, in the last few years, some very important commitments to remove these controls just as soon as it is economically practicable and possible to do so. Trade agreements have proved to be one of the most effective weapons in this battle against trade barriers and in obtaining these significant commitments.

Furthermore, trade agreements have stood the test of time; they have been in successful operation for 15 years. Trade agreements are concrete and down to earth; they face the problem squarely by reducing specific barriers on specific goods.

Trade agreements are not the only means we are using to achieve the goals of our economic foreign policy. We also have the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank, the vitally important European reconstruction program and the proposed International Trade Organization. The trade-agreements program is interlocked with these programs. The success of one depends upon the success of the other.

The International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development are designed to establish financial conditions that will contribute to a maximum expansion of world trade. The function of the fund is to prevent abnormal fluctuations in exchange rates. The bank reinforces the efforts of the fund by granting long-term loans to war-devastated and economically underdeveloped countries. Thus, both institutions supplement each other and assist in expanding trade.

The Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 provides that nations participating in the recovery effort must cooperate to reduce trade barriers. The United States should be the leader in carrying this out. By enacting strong trade agreement legislation, we can show that we mean business when we talk about reducing trade barriers. Furthermore, the long-run success of the European recovery program hinges on reduced trade barriers. The goal of the program is to make the countries of Europe self-supporting. If they are to pay for what they buy, they will have to earn by selling to other countries. Such selling would be impossible if the channels of trade are clogged with barriers.

The proposed International Trade Organization is another vitally important arm of our foreign economic policy. We have been the leaders in persuading the world to accept the code of fair trade practices embodied in the ITO Charter, and that charter stresses that member countries shall negotiate for reduction of trade barriers. We need a workable and effective Trade Agreements Act as the authorization to carry out this undertaking.

But trade agreements do more than help us establish world prosperity and economic stability. They contribute to the ultimate goal of our foreign policy—the establishment of a free and peaceful world, in which democratic institutions flourish. Trade agreements help in two ways. First, they contribute to peace by reducing and limiting the use of trade barriers which are a major source of friction among nations. Second, they contribute to freedom and democracy by bringing the internal prosperity which is the best antidote to communism.

It is this, in the last analysis, which is the most compelling reason for the continuance of a strong trade agreements program. We have become the rallying point for the free nations of the world.

The free world looks to us for leadership. Every move we make is watched. If we make one faltering step, incalculable harm may be done. In the eyes of the world, a weak Trade Agreements Act is such a faltering step. A strong 3-year Trade Agreements Act, on the other hand, would be a clear sign that we are continuing resolutely on the course we have set for ourselves and our friends.

I have listened with interest to some of the arguments of those who do not favor the reciprocal-trade-agreements program. I have heard them say that the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill of 1930 had not been repealed. I cannot understand why they protest for under this reciprocal-trade-agreements program it has been effectually and properly repealed.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I wish to ask the gentleman why it is that we have to pay 35 and 40 cents for a package of Piedmonts, Camels, or Lucky Strike cigarettes up in Canada. The gentleman is talking about reciprocity. Will he tell me why we have to do that?

Mr. CAMP. I do not know anything about the price of things in Canada or how the prices are made up. I do know that our trade agreement with Canada has given us great concessions, and that we are now exporting to Canada a great quantity of agricultural products from my section of the country that we did not export to them before our trade agreement with them. I do not know what part of the price of cigarettes in Canada is tax, but I do know that when you buy a package in the United States some three-quarters or more of the price is made up of tax.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CAMP. Yes; I will yield to the gentleman; but remember I do not have very much time, and I do not want to spend it all in a dialogue with one Member.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I do not desire to take any of the gentleman's time because I believe that tobacco, cotton, and the other commodities that we raise here should be protected in these United States. Furthermore, if the gentleman ever went into a foreign country he would know that we cannot sell tobacco, cotton, or anything else because there is no reciprocity in the other countries.

Mr. CAMP. I do not know what countries the gentleman refers to; but we are trying our dead level best to get reciprocity with all countries. If you kill this bill you will destroy the only means you have of obtaining reciprocity.

Now, my good friend whom I respect very greatly, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] asked my colleague from Arkansas if he has ever seen anybody satisfied who came before our committee. I will ask him this: Have you ever heard any of these people who came before us who did not start off just like our constituents back home used to talk to us about the price-control bill: "Oh, I am in favor of price control but—"? They say, "Oh, yes; I am in favor of the Trade Agreements Act, but—"; and we are all in favor of it; are we not?

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. I am surprised at the gentleman because he is one of the brightest men in this House. I did not say anything about them being dissatisfied with coming before our committee. I said they were dissatisfied with going down to the tariff people.

Mr. CAMP. Oh, I am talking about the reciprocal-trade-agreements program.

Mr. Chairman, last Christmas a year ago I wanted to give my wife some dishes. She had asked for some chinaware a month or two before, and I thought I would kill two birds with one stone by giving them to her on Christmas. So I went into a store here in Washington and asked for chinaware. They were very nice to me. They took me over and introduced me to the head of the department. He said, "Mr. CAMP, I am ashamed to take you into our department. We do not have anything." So I went over to another large store and told the lady clerk that I wanted to give my wife some nice china for Christmas. "Oh, well," she says, "we have got just one set." So you see that one of the largest department stores here in Washington had only one set to offer.

Well, I thought that was bad. I thought there must be a good demand for chinaware in Washington, and perhaps I could get it in Atlanta. So I went into a store in Atlanta and the same thing was told me.

Yet here last year when we had hearings, the chinaware men came before us scared to death of this trade agreements act. I asked one the question, "Are you selling your product?" "Yes." "Do you have any unfilled orders?" "Oh, yes, for a year or two." "Well, what is the matter with you?"

Mr. Chairman, the whole trouble is fear. We recently had a great man in this country who used to say that fear was the greatest enemy of mankind. These people are afraid that in some 5 or 10 years from now or maybe in 3 years from now they will catch up on the backlog of orders and some Frenchman might send in a little beautiful chinaware and it might be sold to a man who wants to give his wife a Christmas present, who could not otherwise find the china. If we will take some of this product that can be sold here and not hurt our chinaware manufacturers, and ship them some bales of cotton over there, or some cheese, or something else we can spare, we will be helping the American farmer and at the same time satisfying the man who wants to give his wife a present.

I cannot understand how anybody can possibly oppose a program so fairly administered. You talk about not getting satisfaction from the Tariff Commission or the Trade Agreements Administration. Why, under this law the Tariff Commission, the Army and Navy, the military establishments, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce jointly with the Secretary of State hold hearings. They meet and work out each item on the list and before they will negotiate an agreement they publish to all the manufacturers of products to be included or, if an agricultural product, to all of the producers of it a list of the articles they are going to talk about. They invite those people to appear before the committee.

There was a time when people came to America in search of every product we produced. There was a time when my great State of Georgia had British agents going over it begging our farmers to plant more acres of cotton so they could get the cotton. That same thing brought about the greatest expansion of trade that any State has ever enjoyed. During that time when we could sell all we could produce and the world market would take everything we had to offer, my State built the first railroad that was ever built in the United States. Fifty miles long, and later the first one that was 100 miles long. We built in our own docks with Georgia money the first steamship that ever crossed the Atlantic Ocean. The reason was we had a market for what we produced. But when times changed, and our surplus crops could not be sold abroad it stagnated the home market, and no section of this land has suffered more from the loss of export markets than my section.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. I just want to say this to the gentleman and to the committee. The question has been raised here by the gentleman from Ohio, who refused to yield to me, and I think there is some substance to that, as to the reception that is given to Members of Congress down before the Reciprocal Trade Committee. It seems when you go down there that they are not interested; they are just about as warm and responsive and receptive as a frozen Eskimo. They evidently do not care anything about what you say there, or, at least, that is the way you feel. I think it is wrong and I think it is subject to criticism. Perhaps you people who have not been down there have not had the experience, but that is the feeling I have.

Mr. CAMP. Well, I have been down before them. I have raised sand about some of the items they were considering but I think that the program is not to blame. I think that the administration may be a little wrong. Let us correct the administration if it is wrong, and not disturb this great program.

Under this program I think our President can and will perform our greatest act in bringing about world peace, and that is by reviving world trade. People that are trading with each other do not hate each other. Trade will prevent war because it will keep people at work. Trade will bring on prosperity because it will give to us in the foreign countries a market for our surpluses. It is that great fear of unsold surpluses that hovers

over our economy today and keeps us from going forward as we should.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I hope very much that if my good friend and able committeeman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP], has not as yet procured for his wife the fine set of dishware he sought a year or two ago, he might do so now. I suggest he go to one of the great department stores downtown and he there will find he has a wide choice of chinaware. If his experience should be anything like the experience of my wife within the past week, he will return to his home and upon opening the package discover that he has bought some chinaware which was made in England. Or, possibly, in Czechoslovakia. Then, if he should continue his trip on out into the western part of Pennsylvania, or specifically into the eastern and southern part of Ohio, he will there find on the unemployment rolls American workmen who can and should be making that chinaware which would be sold here in these stores. Instead, the American skilled worker sits idly by as the cheap labor overseas produces china. That has taken place in the chinaware industry and it is taking place in some half dozen other industries right now, today, in the United States. It is taking place because goods are imported from overseas for sale here at prices less than the American workingman can or will produce those goods for sale here. Part of the reason is that the tariffs are so low that the American workingman in these industries to which I refer is not protected.

Earlier in the day the statement was made that the Tariff Commission under the law as it existed prior to 1948 did sit upon the various committees which are charged with preparing the trade agreements. That is not correct. That is not in accordance with the hearings. As has been testified by Mr. Ryder, Chairman of the Tariff Commission, members of that Commission do meet with the various committees in the preparation of trade agreements, but they do so unofficially. They do not; they never appear and speak for the Tariff Commission.

It is the purpose of those of us on this side of the House to offer an amendment to the bill (H. R. 1211) tomorrow which will impose upon the Tariff Commission the continued duty of determining just what the peril point is with respect to any commodity which is up for negotiation. The peril point is the Tariff Commission's finding as to that rate below which any reduction in tariff would damage or threaten serious damage to an American industry. I shall not argue the merits of that amendment at the moment. I hope to do so tomorrow. But I cannot conceive of anyone in this great body opposing the President's having the knowledge and advice of the Tariff Commission, that highly valued and respected branch of the Congress, as to just what they believe to be a point below which a tariff should not be cut. We will be doing a service to the President, we will be doing a great service to this Congress, and we will be doing a greater service to the American workingman and to industry in general if we do provide that the President be given that information. The Tariff Commission is the only group in all the United States that has the ability, the background, and the courage, if you please, to do its duty and to say, "Here is the level below which, if American industry is to be protected, you must not go in cutting tariff."

I think it is most unfortunate that we do not have the benefit of long hearings by the Committee on Ways and Means on the bill we are now considering. No one appeared before our committee other than at his or her personal request. The committee did not invite anyone to appear. The committee took the position that anyone who chose to come before the committee and to talk about the bill H. R. 1211 might do so, and the committee would be glad to listen.

Whoever heard of an investigation being made in that way? We are all familiar with the fact that when you want to learn something about a subject you usually ask the people who do not rush forward volunteering information. In our congressional committees we request representatives of various departments of the Government to come before the committee and present their case. That is the way to get the information; that is the way to learn about the bills that are up for consideration. But our committee chose only to hear volunteers.

We went further than that, as you have been told, and we specifically voted that we would not invite to come before our committee members of the Tariff Commission, that group which I have previously said has the most information about tariff cuts, and incidentally the group that is affected more than any other group by the bill we are now considering.

Incidentally our committee would not invite the group who are affected by the bill we are considering more than any other group. Our committee would not invite them to come and be heard and they did not see fit to volunteer. Likewise we did not have before us the military in the face of repeated statements that our strategic materials and our very national security is jeopardized by the operation of parts of this reciprocal-trade-agreements program. In view of that and in view of the allegations that this trade-agreements program is a most important part in our international program today, I submit it was not proper that we come before you today without complete hearings on those subjects.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Would the gentleman mind telling the committee how long the hearings lasted last year, and whether or not the press or the public were permitted to participate in those hearings.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I am very happy to tell the gentleman that they lasted only a short time and I would also point out that the extension was only for one year. I admit it was contemplated that there would be hearings again this year. Perhaps undoubtedly we were wrong as to who might be in charge of the hearings this year, but the fact remains that it was contemplated that hearings would be held again this year.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Were the hearings open?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. The subcommittee hearings were not open.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Were the full committee hearings open?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. They were not open.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I would like to ask the gentleman if he remembers that I came before the committee and was not allowed to say a word.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I seem to recollect that, yes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield, I would not like for that to remain in the RECORD, without a clarification. The gentleman appeared before the committee and he said, "My position is the same as the position of the gentleman who just testified before the committee." I believe that that was the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

He also said, "I take the same position that the gentleman does, and I have no further statement to make." If I am wrong about that, I would like to be corrected.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I do not want to get involved in any controversy between the two gentleman. I appreciate what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] has put in the RECORD.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I do not like for any Member of the Congress to say on the floor of the House that the Committee on Ways and Means has not given them an opportunity to be heard, because that simply is not in conformity with the fact or the policy of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I rise at this point so that there would not stand in the RECORD a statement which I believe was based on a misunderstanding of the question posed by the gentleman from Louisiana. He inquired as to whether or not the committee hearings during the Eightieth Congress were open hearings. I remind the gentleman that beginning on March 26, 1947, the committee held hearings up to May 9. Those hearings are published and available to the gentleman from Louisiana. They consist of over 1,731 pages of testimony, all of which was in open hearings.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. In the past in considering these trade agreements, I am convinced the committee had in mind the fact that industry in

our country should be protected. They did not go out and trade them down the river. In accordance with the testimony before our committe any industry which was seriously damaged, or threatened with serious damage would have the right to come before an appropriate committee and make a protest and at least hope to have some measure of relief. But there was an element spoken of as Yankee ingenuity or Yankee trading, if you please, which was the then announced basis upon which our negotiators worked with the negotiators for foreign countries. We came back from these trade-agreement meetings and at one time and another we claimed success. We sought to measure our success, and we seemed to glory in the fact that we were getting the better of the bargain. I submit to you that as of this day there is a new consideration found in the minds of our negotiators as they travel the world over considering reducing tariffs.

The new factor may be called a political consideration. Indeed Mr. Thorpe, in appearing before our committee, stated in effect that the protectionist idea was no longer a controlling matter with respect to the cutting of tariffs. There were other considerations, and under questioning he stated that conditions throughout the world in general was one of the other factors.

So I submit that no longer is the welfare of industry the only or the principal consideration as to whether or not tariff cuts should be made. Today the consideration that, in my opinion, dominates, is the matter of political wisdom as to whether cuts should or should not be made.

We are told that the trade-agreements program is part of the greater American program to improve the stature of the other nations of the world and that as such we must support our Government's policies. The great foreign relief program we are using today is the European recovery program, headed by Mr. Paul Hoffman, a great industrialist of our Nation. Undoubtedly he is doing an excellent job. My plea to you as Members of Congress is this, that in considering this trade agreement we should see its place in the over-all picture, which includes the European recovery program.

In that connection I would like to point to a statement by Walter Lippmann, wherein he points out that American industry must prepare itself to take a loss, to make sacrifices, if the European recovery program is to work.

Then I have a statement from Mr. Paul Hoffman, and this is enlightening to a Member of Congress today, one who has not particularly thought about what the European recovery program might mean to a business in his or her congressional district. He says:

> The hope of European economic recovery does not lie in piling up a greater deficit in trade with the Western Hemisphere. What we hope to see is a gradual reduction in Europe's dependence on Western Hemisphere supplies and a marked increase in its exports to the Americas. That way lies Europe's hope of long-range solvency.

Then he goes along and he says this:

> If this must be done—

That is, if more imports must come here and fewer exports go abroad, he says:

> If this must be done at the expense of American exporters, I would remind you it is the only way for European creditors and debtors to settle their accounts.

The countries of Europe that are in the Marshall plan have recently filed a report with Mr. Hoffman. In that report they make no bones about this fact, that it is their deliberate purpose to do all the trading they can within the confines of the various countries participating in the European recovery plan. They do not plan to trade with the United States at all, so far as purchases are concerned, if they can avoid it, and they will not take our surpluses if they can get the surpluses somewhere else. However they do plan to sell us more and more of their products. That is all in black and white in this official report which has been made and which states that in 1952 and 1953, when the 4 years of the Marshall plan shall have been passed, there will then nevertheless be an adverse trade balance against the United States from a European viewpoint. In other words, Europe will not then be entirely self-supporting, but will owe the Western Hemisphere one or two billions of dollars.

So those of us who may be inclined to think that the Marshall plan will provide more moneys which will in turn purchase our supplies which are in surplus, have another guess coming. Europe will do all she possibly can to buy from within the zone represented by the member nations of the European recovery program.

Indeed, in Great Britain, in accordance with their report not yet made public, it is their plan to cut purchases from the United States over 1947 by some $997,000,000. It is Great Britain's announced plan to ship into the United States $794,000,000 more goods than she did in 1947 and to reduce imports from our country by $997,000,000, a difference of $1,600,000,000.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. PERKINS. Is the gentleman in sympathy with the European recovery program?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I am; I supported it and I am in sympathy with it; I hope to continue to do so. My point is that the American producer must be realistic and realize that there is a sacrifice required of every industrialist in this country.

Mr. PERKINS. Does the gentleman consider that the reciprocal-trade-agreements program is needed as an active part of the Marshall plan?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I do not. We must remain strong if we are to continue to be the source of these assets which presently are so vital to the recovery of Europe; we in this country must remain strong or we will not be able to help overseas.

Mr. PERKINS. In other words, the gentleman believes we should pursue the same path that we followed after World War I; is that correct?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. That does not follow. I submit that today in making gifts to Europe we are imposing a burden upon the American citizen by sending some of the products of his work to help the people overseas just as in the 1920's we did that, only at that time we sent it over disguised as loans.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman's position is like mine that when foreign recovery reaches the point where the foreign countries are able to compete with us disastrously then it is time to do something else.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Oh, yes; and the long-range program does not contemplate the free-trade markets between the United States and Europe that we did have after the last war when the European trade balance was favorable to us; they took so much more from us than we took from them that at the end of the year they had to settle with us in gold. That has been against us from their standpoint, they have not been self-supporting. It is a trend which has existed in European international trade for many, many years; hence, it must be an accepted fact that to help Europe recover we are to be deliberately discriminated against. Under present policies through the use of import licenses, only selected exports from the United States may enter the British Isles. These controls will be closer and closer as time passes. Soon we will sell nothing to Europe she can make herself, and we will be expected to open our doors for all the surplus manufactured goods Europe can produce.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. COOPER. I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH].

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I am thoroughly in accord with H. R. 1211, introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee [Mr. DOUGHTON]. It is a bill that will, when enacted, be of tremendous value in again setting in motion the machinery for reducing world trade barriers. It was this machinery that our Republican colleagues, when they were in the majority in the Eightieth Congress, sought to sabotage with crippling restrictions. Although some damage was done to world trade by the hampering restrictions of the 1948 Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, fortunately for this country and the countries of the world who are adhering to the capitalistic system, we, by the passage of the present bill, will be able to repair the damage. Trade barriers have long been a cause of war, and therefore it is in the interests of world peace and

our own national security that, as far as possible, these barriers be eliminated.

We cannot and should not confine our products and our industries within the limitations of unscalable tariff walls. We cannot isolate ourselves today economically any more than we can do so militarily. Economic isolation is a thing of the past and I hope will never again be revived. We need markets for our surplus foods and goods. Unless this surplus is made salable in foreign countries, it means an excess at home that will eventually mean overstocked food supplies and excess inventories that will eventually lead to the ruin of the farmer, the bankruptcy of our industries, and the unemployment of our workers.

New markets mean more avenues over which our surplus may be shipped to the benefit of business and agriculture in the United States. This bill will help keep our foreign markets open to us until at least June 12, 1951, when the Congress will take another look at the world picture and determine whether we shall again extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

I recall in 1945 when our Republican colleagues were agreeable to the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for a period of 1 year. It seemed to me that if reciprocal trade agreements are correct in principle, then our colleagues of the minority should cease, each time the act comes up for extension, their obstructive tactics.

We are asking today for the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in virtually the same way we advocated in 1945; in fact, we are advocating the continuance of the scientific approach to the whole tariff question established in 1934 and its successful and unhampered operation, until the 1948 extension forced through the Congress by the Republican majority.

Our distinguished ranking minority Member has called attention to the fact that there are 800,000 farmers who are members of granges and he concludes that they are opposed to this legislation. Let me suggest to my distinguished friend that the results of the 1948 elections in the agricultural States give little support to the contention that the farmers are opposed to the Democratic concept of reciprocal trade agreements.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, so much has been said in the minority report and by Members of the minority speaking on H. R. 1211 that it is difficult for one in support of the legislation to decide just where to begin in arguing its merits. For some time I have been very seriously concerned with the charges which my good friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] has made. As I recall the first time he made that statement was on May 21, 1947, in connection with the introduction of a resolution creating a select committee to investigate the loyalty of certain associates and advisers to the Under Secretary of State for many years. The gentleman today stated that he has upon a reliable basis information that some nine individuals out of approximately 101 who attended the Geneva Convention in 1947 were either Communists or Communist fellow travelers. I have asked the gentleman, and I think it is his duty, to report such information as he has and the source of that information to those people in the State Department who are charged with the responsibility of conducting these loyalty tests. It is my understanding that every man who attended the Geneva Convention from all of the departments representing our Government, as the result perhaps of the original charge of the gentleman from New York, has been very, very carefully screened, not only by the heads of the departments employing those individuals but by the FBI itself.

I have a letter addressed to me, dated February 3, 1949, from Mr. John A. Peurifoy, one of the Assistant Secretaries in the State Department, which I shall include as a part of my remarks, and I hope and trust the gentleman will read it in the RECORD.

> DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
> *Washington, February 3, 1949.*
>
> The Honorable WILBUR D. MILLS,
> *Committee on Ways and Means,*
> *House of Representatives.*
>
> MY DEAR MR. MILLS: I understand that Mr. Charles Davis, clerk of the House Committee on Ways and Means, has requested the Department for a statement in connection with a question pertaining to the loyalty or security of certain members of the United States delegation to the International Conference on Trade and Employment held in Geneva, Switzerland, in 1947.
>
> When this matter was originally brought to my attention, I requested the Division of Security to recheck the files of all officers and employees of the Department who attended that Conference. This Division advises me that:
>
> 1. All officials or employees of the Department listed as attending that Conference have either been investigated by the Department or checked with the Federal Bureau of Investigation. In most instances they have been investigated by the Division of Security in addition to being checked with the Federal Bureau of Investigation.
>
> 2. In no case has information come to the attention of the Division of Security either from the Federal Bureau of Investigation or other sources which would support the conclusion that any such person is either disloyal or a security risk.
>
> I have also requested and received from the Secretaries (or other responsible officials) of the Departments of War, Navy, Treasury, Commerce, Interior, Agriculture, Labor, and the United States Tariff Commission, certificates or other written assurances as to the loyalty of their delegates to this Conference.
>
> Needless to say, if any member of the committee will advise me of the nature of any derogatory information relating to any official or employee of this Department, I will personally undertake to see that the matter is thoroughly and completely investigated.
>
> I shall be happy to make available to you any further information which may be of use to you in connection with this matter.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> JOHN E. PEURIFOY,
> *Assistant Secretary.*

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I may say to the gentleman that I will include a letter from Mr. Hoover himself that the gentleman may read.

Mr. MILLS. I will be glad to do so, but I want him to put in the RECORD the names of the individuals, if the gentleman knows that there are Communists in the State Department. I believe it to be his duty in upholding the Constitution of the United States to divulge those names.

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman can get that information from the executive department if he wishes to have it.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman did not get it from the executive department. The gentleman said he got it from the FBI. If he did, why does he not make that information available, not only to us but to those in the departments of Government that employ these individuals? The gentleman knows he voted for legislation establishing the President's authority to conduct loyalty investigations. He did that. Now, if he has this type of information, I beseech him to give it to those departments that are charged with the responsibility of employing these people; otherwise I must assume the gentleman injects this argument in connection with reciprocal trade agreements because he and his colleagues have run out of valid objections to the program.

Mr. REED of New York. I may say to the gentleman that when you get a lead on these people and you give out their names it interferes with the operations of the FBI and the gentleman knows that.

Mr. MILLS. Well, the gentleman mentioned the name of a Mr. Wadleigh. The gentleman also mentioned the name of a Mr. Perlo.

Mr. REED of New York. I got those from the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. MILLS. In what connection did they serve the trade-agreements program?

Mr. REED of New York. That was put in the RECORD today.

Mr. MILLS. Have they ever in any capacity been connected with the reciprocal trade-agreements program?

Mr. REED of New York. The RECORD shows the facts and I put them in and the gentleman knows it. It is in the RECORD for the gentleman to read and for all the world to read.

Mr. MILLS. I am asking the gentleman, in anticipation of my reading it, whether or not they have ever had anything to do with the reciprocal trade-agreements program?

Mr. REED of New York. Read the RECORD and the gentleman will see it.

Mr. MILLS. Were they at Geneva in 1947?

Mr. REED of New York. Oh, perhaps not, but they were the legal advisers of the people who were helping write the trade-agreements program and knew all the details.

Mr. MILLS. Will the gentleman put in the RECORD in connection with his remarks when these gentlemen were employed and in what capacity they served?

Mr. REED of New York. It is in the RECORD. They were read into the RECORD and the gentleman heard it.

Mr. MILLS. I did not hear it.

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman should have been here.

Mr. MILLS. I was on the floor but I did not hear the gentleman say that these gentlemen had anything whatsoever to do with this program.

Mr. REED of New York. I tell the gentleman that it is in the RECORD.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. The statement that was read on the floor, and I paid careful attention to it, was that these men named in their own testimony before the Senate committee stated that they had things to do with these reciprocal trade agreements.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman said that themselves?

Mr. MASON. Yes. They themselves said it in testimony before the Senate committee.

Mr. MILLS. Does my friend, the gentleman from Illinois, know whether they are now employed with the Department of State or not?

Mr. MASON. I do not.

Mr. MILLS. Well, it has come to my attention that they are not and have not been since 1944, and that the gentleman that they complain about the most was not even in the Department when the Swiss agreement was negotiated in 1935. They were not at the Geneva Conference in 1947 and had nothing whatever to do with it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. It appears to me that some on the opposition side to this measure have come to the conclusion that they should oppose the measure because perhaps some fellow travelers are in favor of it. That is about the argument they are using.

Mr. MILLS. Of course, they know and you know and I know that there is no program that has been conceived by our Government to which the Communists in Russia or in the United States so vociferously object as the European recovery program and the reciprocal trade agreements program. Now, is there any argument about that? The Russian Government did everything that they could do to prevent the success of the Geneva Conference.

Does the gentleman from New York know whether or not these nine men he complains of participated in the movement to scuttle the Geneva Conference?

Mr. REED of New York. I do not know a thing about that, but I know exactly what this record shows here, which I read, and if the gentleman will yield time to me I will read it to him again.

Mr. MILLS. I am just as much concerned about this situation as the gentleman from New York is.

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman seems to be very much concerned.

Mr. MILLS. Because of this: I cannot understand my friend's reluctance in divulging these names. If I had them, I would give them up to the State Department, or whoever employed them.

Mr. REED of New York. You cannot divulge the names of individuals when the FBI is following leads in its investigation. That has been the rule of the Government for a long time.

Mr. MILLS. How in the world did the FBI divulge the names to the gentleman then, if that is the rule it follows?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. This charge has been made several times in the past; is that not a fact?

Mr. MILLS. Oh, yes; it has been made in the past.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I have been informed that the State Department sent a representative to the office of the gentleman from New York and asked to get these names.

Mr. MILLS. A gentleman by the name of Wilson, so I am informed.

Mr. REED of New York. That I do not deny, sir.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman did not give the names to him, however.

Mr. REED of New York. Why should I give them out when they were making an investigation? Not at all.

Mr. MILLS. But the gentleman did not give the names to this State Department representative, did he?

Mr. REED of New York. I did not.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. PHILBIN. Why did they not go to the FBI and get the names?

Mr. MILLS. They have canvassed with the FBI just as much as the gentleman would if he were the head of the Department. They have been screened. The State Department has asked that everyone of them be investigated. I am not trying to defend anybody who is a Communist or fellow traveler, but what I want to know is why, at this late hour, when Mr. Perlo had something to do with the trade-agreements program from 1936 for a while—why at this late hour, when they have run out of arguments, just to find opposition to this program, the allegation of Communists among the administrative personnel now has to be injected.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. I do not know why the gentleman would want to bring the name of Wilson into this discussion. I know nothing about any of it. But, if Mr. Wilson wanted to find out, he is a representative of the State Department, as I understand.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Wilson has talked to the FBI about every one of these people, and he did not receive the information that the gentleman from New York says he has received.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman did not let me finish my question. Why did not Mr. Wilson, if he is an attaché of the State Department, talk to the FBI and find it out himself?

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman has made a very diligent effort to do that but he did not receive this information. I hope the gentleman from New York will help us in our effort to ferret out these communists, and not keep these names to himself when matters like this come to his attention. I am interested in seeing all of them dismissed, and I know my friend from New York is. The easiest way to do it is to let the folks who employ them know the facts such as he has at his disposal.

I have read the report which has been filed by the minority members of the committee. I have attempted to analyze this report as best I can. I have even called on some of the minority members to advise me as to what they had in mind, and they have been nice enough to tell me what they did have in mind. I shall read the first paragraph of the report:

> We of the Republican minority of the Committee on Ways and Means are opposed to H. R. 1211 for the reason that H. R. 1211 repeals, rather than extends, the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948, thereby eliminating the existing procedural safeguards to domestic producers and to our national security in the conduct of the trade-agreements program.

The Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948 makes no special provision for safeguards to national security; in fact, it does not even make reference to national security. The Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948 simply directs the Tariff Commission to determine the lowest tariff rates that can be established without causing serious injury or threat of injury to domestic industries, without regard to whether the industries are essential to national security or, for that matter, without regard to any other consideration. Even if the Tariff Commission were of the view that our national security dictated the lowest possible duties on imports of those strategic and critical materials which we have not produced in adequate volume—the Tariff Commission would still be obliged, under the present law, to be governed solely by considerations of injury or threat of injury to individual industries. Of course, the President is not legally prevented under the present law from disregarding the Tariff Commission's findings, but if he elected to do so, he would be placed on the defensive and would be forced to explain to the Congress the reasons for his nonobservance of the Commission's findings.

I wish the Members who signed that report would advise me in what particulars the 1948 act accomplishes that purpose of safeguarding the domestic producers and our national security.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Under the 1948 act, the Tariff Commission would find what we term a peril point, a point below which a cut in the tariff would endanger or seriously damage an American industry. The President in preparing his trade agreements thereafter would not be bound to follow that recommendation. He could if he saw fit cut below that recommendation, and thereafter the President would have to report to the public, to the Congress, that he had cut below the level recommended by the Tariff Commission. That information would be available to the industry and would show the industry just what this administration saw fit to do, if the President by any presumed carelessness would cut the tariff below the recommended amount. That would provide a protection to the American industry.

Mr. MILLS. To the American industry, but would it provide any protection to our American economy, or would it provide any protection to our national security?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. The American industry and American economy are more or less synonymous.

Mr. MILLS. I understand from the gentleman's point of view they are, but American industry is only one segment of our American economy, of course. If the present law actually required the Tariff Commission to relate its findings to what would be perilous to our domestic economy, it would be a far better law than it is. The Commission would then have to take into account such considerations as national security, the interests of the domestic consumer, and the cost to the Federal Treasury. But under the present law, the Tariff Commission must relate its findings solely to what would be perilous to individual industries. The interests of individual industries are not at all synonymous with the interests of our domestic economy.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman asked me two questions. With respect to national security, that information would be available to the public, and public opinion would rise up against any individual who would flout a recommendation of the Tariff Commission. I call to the gentleman's attention the matter of watches in this country.

Mr. MILLS. Yes; I want to discuss watches, if the gentleman will permit me, a little later. But the Tariff Commission is not instructed to report with regard to national defense.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. With respect to national defense, they are strategic and essential. Certainly if the tariff is to be cut to their harm, the American public should know it.

Mr. MILLS. Let me reason with the gentleman a few minutes, if I may. He insists upon the retention within the 1948 act of the authority of the Tariff Commission, acting as a commission, to determine peril points.

The premise on which the amendment is offered is that the peril-point procedure contained in the present act can achieve the objectives claimed. Under present law the Commission is considering 400 items. The Commission is allowed only 120 calendar days in which to establish peril points, which means that if the Commission devoted every day of the week, and had nothing else to do, it would have to cover these items at the rate of over three a day. This is manifestly impossible if the Commission is to arrive at judgments which could be useful. In ordinary investigations, the Commission would seldom determine a rate for a single item in less than a month or two, and on occasions has taken over a year or more. The Congress cannot both require that the Commission shall make a scientific study of an indeterminate number of items and report in an interval of 120 days. Moreover, and perhaps a more serious objection, is that the whole concept of a peril-point is misweighed. The Commission is in effect asked to isolate just one of the many factors, and often one of the less important, which bear on the economic prosperity of a domestic industry. We deny that an industry which is protected from imports is automatically assured of prosperity.

Moreover, what constitutes a peril point? Any industry which has competition from imports has in it some "weak sisters." Marginal producers are those most vulnerable to competition, and there is never a time when an industry is receiving competition from imports that a reduction in duty does not hit someone. The question is, How far down the line do you want to go—what are criteria of serious injury? A peril point for a single industry may not be such for all other like competing industries but they will attempt to use it to obtain greater protection than they had ever before thought necessary.

The whole concept is one injected for the purpose of sabotaging the trade-agreements program, and the best evidence is that it is advocated and introduced by those who had always voted against renewal of the act. The fact that in response to public pressure they found they had to endorse continuation of some sort of trade-agreements program tempted them to inject into that program a lethal measure, and this is it. The Tariff Commission, as such, has never passed on the wisdom of the peril-point procedure, as evidenced in the Commissioner's testimony before the Senate last year. Commissioner Ryder's views are no different now than when he appeared and testified before the Senate in 1948, as follows:

> I doubt the advisability of transforming the Commission into a policy-making agency and thus subjecting it more than in the past to political vicissitudes. The attempt to determine the degree to which duties may be reduced without injury to domestic producers or impairment of the national defense would require the making of such difficult and fundamental judgments that the Commission would in effect be making major policy decisions.
>
> The element of judgment, of course, enters into the various phases of the Commission's present work. This is especially true of the duties which have been assigned to it under the escape clause in trade agreements. In cases under that clause, however, its findings as to whether serious injury to domestic industry has occurred or is threatened will be based on actual observation of the imports after the trade-agreement concession has come into force.
>
> In contrast, the findings required under H. R. 6556 would have to be based to a large extent, especially under present abnormal conditions, on assumptions and estimates as to future probabilities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield ten additional minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. I want to know whether the gentleman from Pennsylvania and his colleagues want a scientific study of the Tariff Commission, or a snap judgment.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman implies that the Tariff Commission cannot do the job. The Tariff Commission was given the burden in the 1948 act. They have never complained nor said they would not do it. The assumption is that they will carry out the law, and the gentleman and the members on this side of the committee refused to invite members of the Tariff Commission to come before us so that we could ask them, and they could tell us, whether or not they could carry out the law.

Mr. MILLS. I can assure the gentlemen that we were not calling for the press, when the gentleman and his colleagues last year refused to let the press in. The gentleman, I am sure, realizes fully that the Tariff Commission in the past has spent as much as a year in attempting to determine the effect of imports upon a single item. I do not believe that the information that the 200 people employed by the Tariff Commission have, enables the Tariff Commission to advise the President within a period of 120 days of the effect of any import on any commodity about which there may be some doubt in the minds of anyone.

Oh, yes, you say it is nice to have this information given to the President. You say it is going to be in confidence, and that the Tariff Commission is acting to serve the President, so that when these individuals who negotiate these agreements come to him with the work done, he can put that alongside of the work done by the Tariff Commission and decide whether or not he will approve the agreement. It would not be so bad if a scientific study could be made, and if the President could really receive helpful information. The danger of it is this, and I wonder if the gentleman has considered this factor. The gentleman and I have been in Washington long enough to know that very, very seldom does a report or a statement of findings made by a department of the Government to the President fail to leak out. If it is going to leak out and if the Tariff Commission, on the basis of snap judgment, establishes a point below which it is dangerous to the industry, then to whom is this information going to leak? It is going to leak to the industry that is interested, and to the producer who is interested, and who wants that information. In what position, then, does that put the Tariff Commission? May I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania, in the event that this producer should come to the Tariff Commission at some subsequent date under section 336 or 332 and ask for an investigation or study of injury

to him, would not the Tariff Commission already have committed itself?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Certainly if the industry knew that those making the agreement were willing to sell his industry out by cutting below the peril point, that industry should come before the Congress and complain and undertake to safeguard it.

But may I ask the gentleman this question: Is it, or is it not, a fact that scientific study is made today before the cuts are made in tariffs?

Mr. MILLS. Not under the 1948 act.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Well, I mean in the past.

Mr. MILLS. Under the old law, yes. So far as the law in effect prior to the act of 1948, the gentleman is correct. The Tariff Commission could do this job in all probability if the gentleman would permit them sufficient time. But the gentleman wants them to establish a peril point on 400 items in 120 days at the rate of less than 3 hours per item. I would like to know how many employees the Tariff Commission would have to have in the gentleman's opinion in order for any of them or all of them to think that fast.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I do not know, and I do not care. But I do say the industry should be heard.

Mr. MILLS. Is this not the gentleman's concern—that it is not possible for industry to be fully advised during the course of negotiations as to the cuts that may be in prospect for that industry? I think that is the concern of the gentleman and those who oppose a continuation of the old law. Does the gentleman realize that there is not one individual who sits on a trade agreements committee who can tell me or anyone else how much of a cut will be made in any tariff affecting any item until the negotiation has occurred? You say nobody knows how they have been received before the committees on reciprocity information. Nobody knows what impression he has made. Yes, they do. If there has been no reduction in the tariff affecting them, if there has been a very moderate reduction in the tariff, if the committee has not gone below the levels which the industry pointed out, is it not logical to assume that their arguments were considered? Certainly they were considered. The gentleman knows that.

If the gentleman had a valid position I would be perfectly frank. If it were practicable to establish a scientific peril point I cannot see any harm in it. But I do not want the President of the United States to be bound, in negotiating these agreements, on the basis of anybody's snap judgment. But now let us consider the second amendment relating to the escape clause. The gentleman's argument for an escape clause, which will be made tomorrow, I am sure will sound very plausible. Well, here we are. The administration has declared it to be the policy, and it has been the practice since 1942, to insert escape clauses in every negotiation under this act. Some trade agreements negotiated a few years ago did not contain escape clauses. It was thought very wise by the Congress earlier to include section 332, so that, in the event an industry could actually show threat of injury or existing injury, it might have an opportunity to go before the Tariff Commission, the whole body, acting officially, and if it made a case, the Commission had the responsibility under the law—and they have it now—of making that fact known to the President of the United States, and he can terminate, modify by agreement or otherwise, everything that is in any reciprocal-trade agreement.

What is the purpose of the Annecy meeting in France in April? The purpose of that meeting is to negotiate with 13 countries, 8 of which we already have agreements. If there are any new agreements arrived at at Annecy, every one of those agreements will have an escape clause. There will be some 10 agreements left without escape clauses. Now, what is the purpose that the gentleman expects to accomplish by a directive from the Congress that an escape clause be included in these agreements, when it is already the policy of the administration to include an escape clause in every one of them, and efforts will be made in the future to include such a clause in those that do not now have it? The only way in which such a clause could be included in these agreements is by negotiations; it cannot be done by congressional legislation. The United States cannot unilaterally insert such a clause in agreements which do not contain them. This recommendation therefore amounts to a request for the renegotiation of a number of trade agreements including the Swiss trade agreement. It is doubtful that such action is warranted at this time inasmuch as the United States is already in the process of renegotiating the outstanding trade agreements which do not contain an escape clause; all new agreements must, of course, incorporate such a clause.

Furthermore, if the executive is required to obtain the consent of these 10 countries to the insertion of the clause in our agreement with them, even without a rigid time schedule, a situation might easily come about in which the only alternative would be to denounce the agreement, thereby losing valuable concessions for United States exporters. Continuation of the present course of renegotiations on an over-all basis appears in general to be the most feasible procedure.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. After the Annecy agreement in April, there will be more discrimination than there is today, because certain nations, notably Switzerland, will not have any escape clause, which we propose to require.

Mr. MILLS. I am sure the gentleman is thinking in terms of the great hardship that has come to the Waltham Watch Co. That company did not have any great success in years past under a protective tariff. It has not gone any deeper in the red under the reciprocal trade-agreements program. The gentleman knows the testimony before the committee by a gentleman representing the Gruen Watch Co., to the effect that he tried to buy Waltham Watch Co. plant but only on terms, which were turned down, that he could modernize the antiquated plant. What is he doing? He is going out to Cincinnati and putting in a new plant out there, lock, stock, and barrel. If only imports were hurting Waltham, would the Gruen Watch Co. manufacture its own parts in the United States?

The minority report, on page 5, asserts:

> Alarming evidence was presented to the committee, showing that several of our industries which manufactured vital military equipment in World War II are in a critical condition as a direct reason of tariff concessions. The most publicized, but by no means the only example, is that of the jeweled-watch industry. The importance of this industry to our national defense is shown by the following letter from Lieutenant General Lutes.

I do not find that Lieutenant General Lutes' letter at all substantiates the charges made by the minority. The letter reports some employment data based on information supplied by Mr. Cenerazzo, an independent labor organizer who now represents the employees of three domestic companies. Lieutenant General Lutes' letter states further that the skilled manpower of the watch and clock industry is highly important to our National Military Establishment and that—

> The maintenance of at least a minimum level of operation by the American jeweled-watch industry is vital to the defense of the United States and should be preserved.

I am not aware that any member of the majority has expressed a contrary opinion. Actually there is no dispute about this point at all. Lieutenant General Lutes does not say that there is any need to limit imports of Swiss watches or that the present domestic watch and clock industry is inadequate to meet the needs of our military services in the event of a national emergency. So far as I have been able to ascertain, neither Lieutenant General Lutes nor any other officer of the military services has ever officially advocated any restriction whatsoever of imports of Swiss watches. I respectfully invite the minority members to submit any evidence to the contrary.

The current controversy about the watch industry centers principally about bankruptcy of the Waltham Co. and the efforts of that company to reorganize on the basis of loans from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and from others, including employees of the Waltham Co. The evidence submitted to the Ways and Means Committee at our hearings which ended last week indicates clearly that the Waltham Co. failed, not because of excessive competition from Switches, but primarily because of the inefficiency and incompetence of its management and the obsolescence of its plant. Three other American companies that also make wholly domestic watches have been able to sell profitably all of the watches they have been able to make; and a fourth American company, which now imports all its watch movements, is in process of building a plant to manufacture movements in the United States. If competition from Switzerland were so foreboding, why would the Waltham Co. alone go bankrupt? And why would Elgin, Hamilton, and the domestic Bulova plant make such handsome profits? And why would a leading importer of Swiss movements

erect a watch movement plant in this country at this time?

I should like to clarify one other matter. In recognizing that the watch industry is essential to our national defense, we do not want to lose sight of the fact that it is not the only such industry. There are hundreds of others. Undoubtedly we could have used during the last war many more persons with watchmaking skills, but we could also have used many more mechanics, opticians, doctors, aviators—and soldiers—and for that matter, many more janitors, street cleaners, handymen, and housemaids. The fact is, we were so much shorter of persons who knew how to make electric meters—and many other articles needed by the military—than we were of watchmakers, that our military had our watch industry manufacture many articles that it was no better equipped to produce than the manufacturers of electrical instruments, camera equipment, typewriters, and toy trains. If the situation had been just the opposite, that is, if electric meter makers, for example, had been obliged to turn to making watches, there might then be a concern about a possible shortage of watchmakers in a future emergency. Actually the domestic watch- and clock-making facilities in this country are now at an all-time high. The plants devoted to making these articles are still in process of enlargement and modernization, and thousands of GI's as well as others, have been trained in watchmaking skills since World War II.

I submit, Mr. Chairman that the reason the complaining domestic watch producers have not received relief from Swiss imports that they have not been injured by them, and not because the Swiss trade agreement lacks an escape clause. If the domestic watch industry were in fact being jeopardized by imports from Switzerland, I am confident that our military services would so advise and that the State Department or the Tariff Commission would take appropriate action. If need be, the Swiss trade agreement could even be terminated.

Only a short time ago the Tariff Commission made a thorough study of the watch industry at the request of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House and the Committee on Finance of the Senate. Its report is almost 200 printed pages. Nothing that appears in that report and nothing that has transpired since that report was written indicates—so far as I am aware—the need for the kind of restrictive action advocated by the three domestic complainants and Mr. Cenerazzo.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has again expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I think we have witnessed the greatest display of deep concern for the Communists. I brought the subject into this debate here today so that you people would not go blindly into this question of turning everything over to the State Department to be run and handled, because as I pointed out in my speech we have a hundred critical industries in this country producing critical materials for war, and we are building up these types of industries all the time in this country as far as we can. These are vital to the defense of this country; they must not be traded away. As I pointed out today the purpose of the peril point is to see that they are not traded away under any circumstances. The greatest fact-finding commission we have in this Government is the Tariff Commission. Everybody knows it, every department of the Government turns to it, but not once during the existence of these trade agreements—and my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] said, the Tariff Commission had taken part in the making of these trade agreements. They have had individuals that sat in on these agreements, but as a commission it is never called on for findings on these peril points. That is a matter of record that cannot be disputed, because the record shows that never has the Tariff Commission as such been asked for its report on peril points.

Now, for the benefit of my friend from Arkansas who has become very excited in regard to the Communists: He wants nothing disclosed; he wants to stop all further investigations in regard to Communists in the State Department, and it is to be essential always that the names should not be disclosed. But here we have a report from a department that has investigated, a committee created by this Congress to aid them in knowing something about the Communist infiltration into this Government. I want to read from the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities, what they had to say. Here is their report on Victor Perlo:

VICTOR PERLO

Testimony of Victor Perlo, August 9, 1948: "I think I was officially an alternate member on the Committee for Reciprocity Information and the Trade Agreements Committee, which were identical or substantially identical in membership. These were interdepartmental committees which took care of all of the technical work in the preparation of trade agreements under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and also to a certain extent a lot of preparatory work for the International Trade Organization."

On the same day, Miss Elizabeth Terrill Bentley, a former member of the Communist espionage ring, confronted Mr. Perlo and identified him as a member of this ring while she was active. When questioned on these charges Mr. Perlo refused to answer charging that his rights under the first and fifth amendments were being violated and that such answer "might tend to incriminate or degrade me." Perlo was also identified as a member of this ring by Whittaker Chambers on August 3, 1948.

Then we have this report from the Committee on Un-American Activities on Henry J. Wadleigh:

HENRY J. WADLEIGH

Testimony of Henry J. Wadleigh, December 9, 1948: "I was in the Division of Trade Agreements from 1936, until the war in Europe broke out * * * (superiors were) Henry Grade in the Trade Agreements Division, then Harry Hawkins, then Leo Pasvolsky, special assistant to the Secretary of State, and in Italy, Henry Grade * * * Mr. (Francis B.) Sayre was Assistant Secretary in charge of the Trade Agreements Division when I first was employed there. Mr. Acheson later took Mr. Sayre's place."

On December 6, 1948, in an executive meeting of the Committee on Un-American Activities, Whittaker Chambers identified Julian Wadleigh (Henry Julian Wadleigh) as a source from which the former received documents for transmission to representatives of the Soviet military intelligence. When questioned by the Committee on Un-American Activities on December 9, 1948, Mr. Wadleigh refused to answer all questions dealing with such activity on the ground that such testimony might tend to incriminate him. Mr. Wadleigh has since been a witness before a Federal grand jury in New York and it is our understanding that he has been a cooperative witness.

Another is Alger Hiss. They had this to say:

ALGER HISS

On December 23, 1948, Mr. Francis B. Sayre, former Assistant Secretary of State, who was in charge of the Department's Division of Trade Agreements, testified that on April 28, 1936, he recommended that Alger Hiss be appointed as his assistant in the Department of Trade Agreements. He further testified that Mr. Hiss' duties included the legal preparation of trade agreements. Hiss was transferred to another division of the State Department on January 16, 1942.

You will recall that Mr. Charles Taft in testifying stated he was not employed in the State Department.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes.

Continuing:

> Attached herewith is the second report of the Committee on Un-American Activities on Soviet espionage within the United States Government.
>
> A study of this report which contains facsimiles of State Department documents emanating from the Department of Trade Agreements and, according to Mr. Chambers, furnished to him by Alger Hiss and Julian Wadleigh for transmission to the Soviet military intelligence agent, will disclose to some extent the proportions of this leakage of information.
>
> Alger Hiss is now under indictment by a Federal grand jury in New York for perjury.

If the gentleman from Arkansas is so concerned about these Communists and feels nothing should be said on the floor when they have had parts in this transaction why, then, I have nothing more to say. He seems to be wanting to defend these people, he seems to want to criticize me for bringing this to the attention of a group of citizens who are entitled to the facts.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLS. The criticism of the gentleman, if I have any criticism of my beloved friend, is the fact he does not name nine men so that they can be fired from the State Department like all of these individuals he has just read have been.

Mr. REED of New York. I am not at all questioning the patriotism of the gentleman from Arkansas but he knows as well as I do and as every Member of this House knows, that you cannot interrupt

an investigation that is going on, and I have been told that often, when I have asked for certain investigations to be made. They do not disclose anything until the investigation is complete. I am telling you that investigation is going on now. It should continue until all the facts are disclosed and before we continue this reciprocal-trade-agreements program.

Mr. MILLS. I hope they get them all.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from New York that this spy ring was operating during the war, passing out these secret documents to our enemies at a time when our boys were dying by the thousands on the battlefields of Europe.

Mr. REED of New York. Undoubtedly thousands of our boys were killed as a result of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, during the course of the hearings on this bill I asked a representative of the State Department to name the foreign countries that have been helped by the reciprocal trade agreements, to list the countries and then for each country that was helped to list the industries that were specifically assisted, also the number of people that were restored to the pay roll in that industry. I did not get the information. I wish that someone on the majority side, if he has the facts and figures showing that any foreign nation has been helped by this program and can prove it with proper statistics, would put them in the RECORD so that we will have them tomorrow.

A great deal has been said about the evils of the old method of writing tariff legislation. We have heard a great deal about log-rolling tariff bills. It is my honest opinion, Mr. Chairman, that the action of the majority, the partisan position they have taken in regard to this matter, will do more to return this country to log-rolling tariff acts than anything that has been done in a generation.

Their determination to repeal the 1948 act and their refusal to call the Tariff Commission and the military department to testify were unjustified.

The Eightieth Congress extended the Trade Agreements Act. They attempted to try to throw around it some rules and some safeguards. Many of us believe in genuine reciprocity. We want some of that so-called Yankee trading. It would be foolish to say that the old tariff days were without fault and without evil. No one is arguing to go back. We want to go forward. If certain amendments are added I will support this measure.

The State Department should clean house with respect to the men connected with the trade agreements. Take this man Alger Hiss. The gentleman from New York made reference to his activity in regard to trade agreements. In the fall of 1945 in this Hall I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement asking the State Department to have the FBI investigate Alger Hiss and make that record known. It was not done. The statement of the gentleman from New York that Mr. Clayton journeyed to Switzerland to negotiate trade agreements and took nine Communists with him was not challenged in the committee. The State Department never denied it. Now, if there is anything in the world that the Communists want it is a depression in America and a weakening of our national defense. That can happen under the present system. You can call it a red herring if you want to.

I want to call as my witness the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], who on January 25 stated on this floor:

> Mr. Speaker, over this week end we have learned the extent of the disaster that has befallen China and the United States. The responsibility for the failure of our foreign policy in the Far East rests squarely with the White House and the Department of State. The continued insistence that aid would not be forthcoming unless a coalition government with the Communists was formed, was a crippling blow to the National Government.

Now, that is the crowd that is going to write your tariff law. That is the crowd that is going to determine the future of industries in this country that are so vital to our welfare. That is the group that is going to write the tax law that means the life or death over industries essential to our national defense.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I cannot yield right now. When I finish I shall be glad to yield.

Again, I say, the State Department in the hearings never denied that they took nine Communists and fellow travelers to Geneva to help plan world trade. It is quite evident that they took them to San Francisco. Anyone who reads Mr. Hiss' record knows that.

I would like to see this legislation amended so that I can support it. I would like to see an escape clause. The peril-point procedure should be retained. I would like to see some safeguards thrown around this law so that the national defense of this Republic could not be bartered away by men who either do not know or do not care.

I was one of those people who had hoped that we would have here in America following the war a growing, expanding synthetic rubber industry. We could have lost the last war if it had not been for the great strides we made in synthetic rubber production. That industry is very essential to our national defense. What has the State Department done in regard to it? Among other things, they have frozen rubber on the free list. We cannot impose a tariff against natural and synthetic rubber without violating our agreements. And that is not all. At the present time we are maintaining a synthetic rubber industry through the power that this Congress delegated to the President to issue directives requiring a certain percentage of our rubber to be synthetic. The State Department bound this country not to increase that formula in favor of synthetic rubber production. Did they ask Congress about it? Did they come to the Committee on Armed Services? No, they did not.

It was not so many months ago that the chief champion for trade agreements that came before our committee was none other than Henry Wallace. About the last official functions of Alger Hiss were in connection with trade agreements. Again, I remind you that Mr. REED's charges were never denied by the State Department.

Now I want to say something about this great American watch industry of ours. Where would we be in America if we did not have that pool of trained workers, those experts whom it takes at least 10 years to develop, some of them, to make the timing instruments, these precision instruments so necessary to make machines of war? Our own Military Establishment sent up a letter stating that the maintenance of the watch industry is necessary for the national defense.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call attention to a portion of the testimony of Mr. James G. Shennan which is found in the hearings:

> The 1936 trade agreement with Switzerland reduced the tariffs on watches, and thereafter the American industry's share in the American market fell sharply. Subsequent to the 1936 trade agreement, four factors, in addition to the reduction of tariffs, operated to reduce further the tariff protection which remained to the industry.
>
> First, in 1934, the United States reduced the value of the dollar. This is one of the reasons given in the Tariff Commission's digest of trade data on the trade agreement with Switzerland, for reducing watch tariffs by the Swiss trade agreement in 1936. Four months after consummation of the agreement, the Swiss devalued the franc by approximately 35 percent, but no compensating increase was thereafter made in the reduced tariffs.
>
> Two, the tariff duties on watches are specific, that is to say so many dollars and cents per watch. The subsequent inflation has operated to reduce further, on an ad valorem or percentage basis, the protection left by the trade agreement and the devaluation of the Swiss franc.
>
> Three, the duty on "adjustments," which was intended to afford progressively greater protection the higher the quality of the watch, has been rendered completely ineffective by the marking of imported watches as "unadjusted," regardless of the fact.
>
> Four, the cost of watch-movement manufacture, which is practically all labor, has more than doubled in this country since the beginning of the war.
>
> The dollar increase here has been disproportionate to that in Switzerland, inasmuch as we started from a higher base cost because of the much higher labor rates in this country. Our labor rates are approximately 2½ times those of the Swiss for comparable jobs.
>
> Over 55,000,000 jeweled watches and movements have been imported into this country since 1941; the high point being 1946 when imports of jeweled watches exceeded the 9,000,000 mark.
>
> During the first 11 months of 1948, the latest statistics available to us, the imports of jeweled watches exceeded 7,100,000. This is an average of almost 7,000,000 jeweled watches annually over the years beginning with 1941, as contrasted to an average of about 2,600,000 from 1936 through 1940, and an average of less than 1,000,000 for the years 1930 through 1935.

> All of these watches are advertised and sold as jeweled watches, and are competitive with the products of this industry.
>
> Waltham has already felt the full impact of this competition, and any weakening of the watch market in this country could have serious repercussions on the remaining companies in the industry. The break-even point of the American watch industry has steadily risen, during the war and since, and this requires a larger volume to sustain profitable operations than ever before.
>
> Price increases were granted to the importers of Swiss watches by OPA during the war, and their profits were not subject to renegotiation. This, and their continued heavy volume during our reconversion, has enabled the importers, during and since the war, to more extensively advertise their brand names than ever before.
>
> In addition to this advertising of brand names by the importers, the Swiss watch manufacturers themselves, within the last year, for the first time, have gone into a tremendous institutional advertising campaign promoting the Swiss watch in this country in an effort to enhance the already dominant position they hold in this market.
>
> The trade agreement with Switzerland has been in effect since 1936, 12 years next month. During this period inflation and other influences have operated on the specific duties of the watch tariffs to completely obsolete them. In addition, the war took the American industry completely out of the market, and imposed on the American industry a difficult reconversion problem.
>
> It is our opinion that this agreement, when it was entered into 12 years ago, was not intended to create an inflexible situation. But the agreement has never been changed in that entire 12-year period. Furthermore, the agreement does not contain an escape clause, as do the more recently negotiated or renegotiated agreements, and as is now required by Executive order.

Mr. Shennan went on to say:

> We have been told by the National Security Resources Board that they anticipate Switzerland will be completely cut off in the event of another war.
>
> Additional tariff protection, designed to equalize the cost of movement production in this country and the cost of movements to the importers, is necessary to insure the future of this industry as a matter of national defense, if for no other reason.
>
> A great many governments are attempting to reduce imports by quota or exchange restrictions. We are not asking this. Under the conditions that exist today we do not think this is the answer to the industry's problem.
>
> The American jeweled-watch industry is not seeking an advantage in the American market. Gentlemen, we ask only for equality at the border of the United States; we ask for realistic duties which will equalize the cost of a movement to the importer with the cost of a comparable movement made in America by American labor. From this point on, the material, labor, and other services required are, and should be, on a competitive basis.
>
> Correct these tariff inequities by giving us equality at the border. It will stimulate American-movement production. It will attract others to the business. It may well attract Swiss importers to set up factories here. This we would welcome. It would stimulate competition. And furthermore, it would strengthen the defenses of this Nation by preserving and enhancing the skills necessary for the production of precision time mechanisms.

Mr. Chairman, it is a matter of record that the Swiss watch industry sold their timing instruments to our enemies in the last war. Perhaps it will be said they were a neutral and had a right to do that. It must be borne in mind, however, that during that same time the American jeweled-watch industry went to war totally. Without it, we could not have attained victory. Since the war the Swiss have refused to ship watch-making machinery to the United States and have done everything they could to establish a world monopoly. I again want to call your attention to the testimony of Mr. Shennan.

Mr. CURTIS. What is the situation in regard to the past existence of an embargo on the export of watch-making machinery by the Swiss?

Mr. SHENNAN. The situation which arose in 1946 and still obtains is that we cannot buy any watch-making machinery from the machine builders in Switzerland except on a lease arrangement called machor, which has certain conditions in it that are very repugnant to the American theory of business which is to do the best you can and compete but not agree not to compete.

Mr. CURTIS. Is the Swiss watch industry pretty much of a controlled operation? How do they operate; do you know?

Mr. SHENNAN. Well, sir; it is rather complicated but in general there are several principal watch trusts that control and direct certain branches of the industry. There is one trust for watch manufacturers and one for parts, which includes the tool builders, one for the jewel makers and one for case makers. They are tied at the top by two organizations called the Superholding and also the Swiss Watch Chamber.

There is Government representation, or at least considerable interest, I am not too familiar with that. There is joint and central Government research, there is Government training of the engineers and tool makers, and in general I think that you can say that the trust, with Government blessings, controls everything they do.

That is a matter of public record, sir.

Mr. CURTIS. That interest of the Swiss Government continues on in their negotiation with foreign countries on watches?

Mr. SHENNAN. I would say they were very skillful negotiators.

Mr. CURTIS. Suppose the other two jeweled-watch industries in this country were to go the way of Waltham, and we hope that Waltham recovers, but in the event they do not, would that lead to pretty much of a world monopoly of the jeweled-watch industry?

Mr. SHENNAN. I would say that it would be virtually a complete world monopoly; yes, sir.

Mr. CURTIS. How long has it been since a new jeweled watch company was organized in the United States?

Mr. SHENNAN. A great many years. It has been a great many years since a new company was organized. However, the Bulova plant was started in 1931, if I am not mistaken, 1931 or 1932, and has been operating since that time.

Mr. CURTIS. That is carried on by a company that is also in the business of import, is that true?

Mr. SHENNAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. CURTIS. In other words, your battle has been to hold your own without much hope of expansion, speaking for the industry generally?

Mr. SHENNAN. Yes, sir; that is true.

I might say this about the plant which is built by an importer. He may have the same reason to be worried about watch production as the United States Government. He may wish, therefore, to hedge his investment in his brand name by having some manufacturing on both sides of the ocean which I think is a reasonable sensible thing to do if you can afford to do it.

Mr. CURTIS. Now, if a more helpful climate could be created for the watch industry, that would have some degree of permanence and would not only protect the watch industry, that we have, but would make possible some expansion, would that be to the advantage of the American consumer and be of advantage to our Government from the standpoint of national defense?

Mr. SHENNAN. Yes, sir; I think it would. We do not believe in suppressing competition. I think in order to keep the industry on its toes, there must be a degree of competition but there comes a point when it is overwhelming. I do feel that if the industry had a chance to compete and grow, that eventually there would be benefits to both the consumer and to the national defense very definitely.

Mr. CURTIS. In other words, growth is a much better trend of things than mere maintenance of the status quo?

Mr. SHENNAN. I think if you stand still you very likely might go backward.

Mr. CURTIS. But from the standpoint of defense, we would not only be building up the factories and the machines to turn to but it would mean a new crop, a new-age group, of skilled workmen in more and new communities, would it not?

Mr. SHENNAN. That is the most important thing, as I see it, sir.

Testimony was submitted in our committee with reference to one particular type of watch movement that could be made in Switzerland, sent to this country, the reduced tariff paid on it, and the watch would still sell for $4.40 cheaper than it could be made here in America.

Some of these importers took the witness stand. I asked one of those gentlemen about his production costs. He said he did not know. He was the treasurer of a company manufacturing watches in Switzerland. I asked him about his wage rates. He said he did not know. Throughout the hearings, you will find question after question put in an effort to find out the facts, and they said they did not know.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I do not have the current information, but not long ago we were receiving from 1 to 3 plane loads of watch parts per week from Switzerland, amounting to something between 5 and 10 tons of watch parts. Watch parts are very small and they make an awful lot of watches out of 10 tons of parts.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. The latest information on the importation of Swiss watches is that they are coming in now at the rate of 9,000,000 watches a year.

Mr. CURTIS. I would like to have the attention of those Members who are interested in what the agricultural witnesses had to say. It has been said that the Farm Bureau favored this act. They did appear and speak generally in favor of trade agreements. I asked Mr. Kline:

> Would you favor the reduction of tariffs on agricultural commodities in exchange for reduction of a foreign country of their tariffs on our industrial products?

Mr. KLINE. Well, the question taken just by itself, I would say "No."

I then asked:

In carrying out the trade-agreement program in the Western Hemisphere, does not that problem enter into it?

Mr. KLINE. Yes, sir.

I asked him:

Has the Farm Bureau any position with respect to further action by trade-agreement negotiators with respect to any one of the commodities such as butter, cheese, wheat, wool, and so on down the line?

Do you have any position with respect to any particular commodity?

Mr. KLINE. We have made here a statement of the general position, and within that position we reserve the right to take a look at things as they come along.

Mr. Goss, of the Grange, testified, and I want to give you a word or two from his statement. He said:

We do not believe H. R. 1211 will provide the type of tariff system the Nation needs.

Then he goes on to say:

In the Trade Agreements Act we made two basic changes—the abandonment of the principle of protection and surrendering the making of tariff rates to the executive branch of the Government.

First, we abandoned the protection policy and adopted a trade promotion policy. We adopted no rules to go by except to promote trade. We assumed that all trade is beneficial without regard to its effect on our producers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has again expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. CURTIS. May I also suggest that you examine the testimony submitted by the representative of the independent oil producers. That gentleman pointed out that concessions made allegedly to foreign countries were made to large oil companies, most of them being American companies, that the companies received the benefits, and they were not passed on to the country where this oil was produced.

A representative of the fruit and vegetable people from Florida gave to us the benefit of his own investigation in Mexico, he told how we reduced the tariff and an American company on the American side of the line produced those vegetables in Mexico and got the benefit of our tariff reduction and none of that benefit was passed along to the many Mexican people who did that work.

This act should be amended to prevent the growth of monopolies and trusts. Benefits intended for foreign workers should actually help them and not further exploit them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has again expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I wish the membership would keep in mind that the minority report listed only two objections to the present measure. One objection was to the effect that the bill before us does not provide that every agreement shall immediately contain a so-called escape clause.

Now the true fact about the matter is that every agreement that has been entered into by this country since the year 1942 contains an escape clause and all future agreements will contain it. The State Department, the Interdepartmental Trade Agreements Committee, including the Department of Labor, the Department of Commerce, the National Military Establishment, and every other agency of the Federal Government concerned with the making of these agreements, have negotiated or are now negotiating, so that 18 out of 728 of our past agreements will contain this clause. The rest will be changed as soon as practicable.

Mr. Chairman, I wish the membership would also keep in mind that this act—this great Cordell Hull reciprocal-trade-agreements program—was first passed in 1934. It was renewed in 1937, renewed in 1940, renewed in 1943, and in 1945, and in 1948.

In other words, on six different occasions this question has been debated on the floor of the House and the floor of the Senate. We have gone through the agony in many instances of hearing the complaints of specific industries which were always afraid that they might be hurt. They always have the fear in their minds that the State Department and these other departments of the Government would negotiate concessions so that they would be put out of business; yet the record clearly discloses, Mr. Chairman, that in no single instance was any industry seriously hurt or damaged by any concession made under these reciprocal trade agreements. Every organization in the country that has, one might say, no special interest to plead is in favor of this great program.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to call the attention of the Members, now, to the fact that in 1934 the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee voted against this program, they voted solidly; they were against it; they were high protectionists; they were high-tariff people. In their minority report they listed 24 reasons why the act would practically ruin the American economy. But, mark you, Mr. Chairman, at that time they did not say the Communists were behind this. There was no "Beware, the Communists are behind it." On five different occasions this question has been debated on the floor of the House for days and days at a time and on the floor of the other body, yet never did they bring up this red herring. They bring it up today because all of the 24 reasons they had advanced in previous debates have been shown to carry no weight. They are throwing a lot of dead cats, if I may use that expression, Mr. Chairman, at the present renewal of this act in unrestricted and unhampered form. It was even charged in the hearings, Mr. Chairman, that these reciprocal trade agreements were largely responsible for the oil monopoly enjoyed throughout the world by five or six oil companies. It was even charged with failure because it had not prevented a Second World War. That was charged on the floor.

It was even charged in the committee hearings that the reciprocal trade agreements program was responsible for our not building up a sufficient stock pile of strategic materials; and on and on they go, trying to find excuses.

Why, they charged time and time again that the act was unconstitutional. That comes up at every hearing. The charge is made that the act is unconstitutional; and yet last year the Republican majority passed the act in practically the same form, insofar as constitutionality is concerned, as we passed it in 1945 and previous years, and as we are trying to pass it now.

Mr. Chairman, they pleaded last year in the hearings—in fact, it was pleaded here today—that we should return to the old logrolling days of the Smoot-Hawley tariff. They contended in previous debate on the floor that studies should be made of the difference in wages, studies which would probably take a couple of years to complete. They contend that we should obliterate the most-favored-nations clause.

Finally, we are down here today to the proposition that they have only two criticisms, each one of which evaporates after it is studied, by anyone not having a special interest to plead. So the only thing to do is to pass this bill as it has been presented to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Last year the Republicans, of course, were in the majority, and it being an election year they were afraid to go before the great American voting public and say, "No; we are going to kill the reciprocal-trade-agreements program." But what did they say? They said, "We will renew it for 1 year." But then they hung so many dead weights around that program that it could not work. This is the testimony of those who were in charge of the operation of the program; and it was so stated by the President. The President has told us that the reciprocal trade program cannot be effectively and efficiently consummated because of the dead weights that were hung around it in 1948. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that had there been a different complexion of the House today the matter of the reciprocal-trade-agreements renewal would not be on the floor of this House, because the high protectionists, the high-tariff lobbyists and the high-tariff Members of Congress wanted to kill the program. They were afraid to kill it outright last year but they thought they could do it and fool the American public by hanging these dead weights around it.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. Why is it that the gentleman and his entire party, when they were in full power back in the heyday of the New Deal, never had the courage to extend it more than 3 years? Why did not the gentleman's party extend it and why do you not extend it now and make it permanent if it is so good? You have the votes, you have the power; why do you not do it?

Mr. EBERHARTER. When this great program was presented to the country and to the Congress of the United States,

Cordell Hull asked for a certain time. He thought it would be a good thing for the economy of the country, for the betterment of world conditions and he thought it would be a helpful aid to peace. He was of the opinion it should be tried for 3 years. So we just got into the habit of renewing it every 3 years in order to review it to see whether it is being properly administered. Every Congress since 1937, when the first act expired, has seen the wisdom of renewing it up until the Eightieth Republican Congress, at which time they thought they could kill the program, but, thank goodness, the wisdom of the American public is such that that scheme of theirs did not go through.

When the 1948 Republican platform was first presented to the resolutions committee in Philadelphia, it contained two paragraphs unequivocally endorsing the reciprocal-trade-agreements program, but after the platform was looked over they changed the wording to a vague phrase: "The Republican Party favors a system of reciprocal trade." They did not say anything about agreements. They just favored reciprocal trade. They were beginning to hedge.

Mr. JENKINS. Of course, we talked about reciprocal trade because we are the originators of it. As I said in my remarks this afternoon, the reciprocal-trade-agreements program is a Republican matter, but we managed it under a system by which the officials down here in the Washington departments were responsible to the Congress. That is where it ought to be.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I will tell the gentleman what you did last year. You reported a bill out of the Ways and Means Committee unanimously supported by the Republican membership. You reported it under a gag rule so that no amendments could be offered and with only 3 hours of general debate. No amendments could be offered, as I said. That bill was passed by the House under the whip of the Republican majority, and the bill was so bad that Secretary Marshall said he would rather have no bill at all because the bill was so bad nothing could possibly be done. There was such a protest throughout the country at the terms of that bill that the other body, after studying the matter a little bit, improved it to a great extent. There is no question but what the Republican membership was committed to killing the program and the act they passed would have killed the program if it had not been for the other body and we would not have been able to start the negotiations that have already been held.

Mr. JENKINS. If this is such a terrible thing we did, why did President Truman sign the bill?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I said what the House passed was so terrible the Secretary of State made the unequivocal statement in writing—it is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—that he would rather have no measure at all than the one passed by the House. The other body made some improvement and corrections in it which were accepted because we had a little foresight. We thought perhaps we could start preliminary negotiations and in the fall of the year we could correct it. That is what is coming about, Mr. Chairman, we are correcting the dark deeds that were done last year.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Is this bill open to amendment? Is the bill subject to amendment on the floor of the House?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Oh, yes. We Democrats follow the policy, of course, of having free and open debate, as many hours as you want today, then tomorrow you will have all the opportunity you want to offer amendments, provided they are in order. We made it an open rule in order to give all of the Members, including the gentleman from Massachusetts, if he wants to, an opportunity to offer amendments. We did not do anything like was done last year.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. I am sure the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania remembers that the bill brought in last year by the Republicans was under a closed rule, with no amendments permitted except those offered by the committee.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Yes. I hope the gentleman from Massachusetts will remember that. I assume, perhaps, that he wanted to offer an amendment last year, but his leadership would not permit him to do it by reason of the gag rule that was in effect.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The rules were broad enough to protect our interests. I want to know whether this bill will be subject to amendment that will give us a chance to protect our fishery, and boot and shoe, and watch industries.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am glad the gentleman mentioned fisheries. Let me tell you something about that poor fishing industry. I think I have it here. The fishermen came down from New England. That is the section where the gentleman from Massachusetts comes from. They painted a very dismal picture about the flood of fish that were being imported. The whole industry was simply being ruined. It was a pitiful situation; pitiful. Well, Mr. Chairman, we wanted to get the facts on this problem of fish, and we asked a few questions. We asked them how many additional boats would be needed by the New England fishermen to bring in the fish that were being imported. What do you suppose the answer was? Six boats would bring in all the fish that were being imported, that were ruining the fishing industry. Afterward they reduced that figure. But, you know, if six boats can ruin a fishing industry, it is a pitiful situation, I will say to my colleague from Massachusetts.

There is another point I want to bring out.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I think the gentleman is well acquainted with some of the fishery-industry men that came down and testified.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I am sure the answer was incorrectly given or accepted. Even six vessels will not bring in 54,000,000 pounds of fish a year. I think the gentleman will agree to that.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I do not know how many fish there were. It depends on how big they are. Of course, there are different sized fish. Some member of the committee—I think it was the gentleman from Tennessee here—asked about the average annual income of these fishermen. I hope my colleague from Massachusetts will listen to this. You know, the crews of these fishing vessels are not paid wages; they are paid a share depending upon how many fish are caught. The answer was that the average earnings were around $5,000 per man per year last year. Of course, in 1945 they only made $4,500 a year—these poor fishermen. Now they are making about $5,000. Then the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] asked about their production. The production, Mr. Chairman, has doubled over what it was before the war. So, they certainly need a lot of tariff protection.

Oh, I have a lot of other instances here, Mr. Chairman. Here is one industry representative—I do not want to mention his name because it might embarrass the whole industry—but he was just weeping about what the imports were doing to their particular industry, or the industry he was speaking for. "We have the competition of these cheap imports from abroad," he said. "One manufacturer felt the competition so he had to do something he had never done before." We waited and waited and waited for the answer, and what do you suppose this manufacturer had been forced to do? He had been forced to advertise. That is the first time he had ever been forced to do that in all the history of his business. So he had been forced to advertise because of these serious imports that were coming in here.

They bring in this question of communism. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] said that these Communists are the ones that are forming this State Department policy; that they are the ones that are going to make up these trade-agreement programs. I suppose if there are any Communists to be found in the Government, that will be justification for every Republican Member to take a stand against every bill that is recommended by the President of the United States and by the departments down here—merely because somebody accuses somebody else of being a fellow traveler or having communistic leanings. It is easy to find a reason, you know, if you just point to somebody's name, Alger Hiss or somebody like that. Then we should oppose these programs, it is argued.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to the fact that the United States Chamber of Commerce, the United States associates of the International Chamber of Commerce, the National Foreign Trade

Council, the National Council of American Importers, the National Farmers Union, the American Farm Bureau Association, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the American Federation of Labor, and about 80 percent of the people of the United States are in favor of this program, so this flank attack, this attack by these special pleaders that come down here time after time, pleading especially the fear that something might happen to their industry—I think we should just about consider their true value and remember that they are special pleaders and pay no attention to them, because in the entire history of this act, since 1934, which is 14 years, at least, there have been only three complaints filed in the Tariff Commission. Two of the complaints were dismissed by the Tariff Commission itself as having no evidence to support their contention that they might in the future be injured, and the third complaint is still being investigated and has not been decided.

So, Mr. Chairman, I hope that on tomorrow, when some of these amendments are offered which really have no merit to them whatever, at least our side of the aisle will stand fast and send to the other body the measure which the President of the United States asked for, which the Democratic Members ran on their platforms when they campaigned for reelection to this body and for new election to this body. Let us go on in such a manner that we can show the European countries and all the rest of the world that we really mean it when we say we want to remove trade barriers, we want to have more international good will. We not only want to help raise the standard of living of the people of the United States but we want to help Europe recover. Let us go forward in a more peaceful world and not throw up barriers and set a bad example to all the rest of the world.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, the Eightieth Congress passed a 1-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and placed in the law a provision that in effect reestablished the United States Tariff Commission as an agent of the legislative branch of the Federal Government. The 1-year extension was made in order to have the law expire at the same time the charter of the International Trade Organization will come before this Congress for consideration, so that these closely knit Siamese twins, the ITO and the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, might be considered by Congress at one and the same time.

The Tariff Commission, when first set up, was an agent of the Congress, bipartisan in make-up, composed of experts. In 1934, when the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was passed, the Tariff Commission was buried in and subordinated to the executive department. Many of its findings and reports thereafter were made to the President and kept from the Members of Congress. The Eightieth Congress, in extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, in substance reestablished the Tariff Commission as an agent of the Congress, but provided that the Commission make a report to the President for his guidance in making future trade agreements. If for any reason he disregarded the findings of the Tariff Commission as to peril points, then the President would be required to make available to the Congress the Tariff Commission's Report, along with his reasons for disregarding the recommendations of the Commission as to peril points.

H. R. 1211, now before the Congress, proposes to repeal the 1948 act; to extend the period for 3 years from last June 12; to bury or subordinate the Tariff Commission again within the executive department; and to divorce it from the legislative department. Is that what we want to do?

Mr. Chairman, the United States adopted its reciprocal trade program in 1934. The program has been in operation 14 years. Its objective is to reduce or remove world trade barriers and permit the free flow of goods between countries, thereby removing one of the principal causes of war. That is an excellent objective, a very worthy purpose. How has it worked out? Testimony given before the Ways and Means Committee at recent hearings brought out the following very disappointing facts:

First. After 14 years, world trade barriers are greater today than ever before.

Second. We have experienced World War II, and the world today is in greater fear of war than when the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was adopted.

Third. American industries are being injured, American workers have lost their jobs, even though the full impact of the program upon our American industries has not as yet fully materialized.

Dr. Clair Wilcox, formerly Director of the Office of International Trade Policy of the State Department, and one of the best-posted men in America on our foreign-trade program, in commenting on the results of the 14-year record of our reciprocal-trade-agreements program, made this statement before the United States Chamber of Commerce Institute on June 15, 1948:

> The trade of the world today is more tightly regimented than it ever has been before in history, in time of peace. The tariff is the old-fashioned method of restricting trade. It is the mildest method of restricting trade that exists at the present time. As a matter of fact, a nation that confines trade restriction to the use of a tariff today can be said to be pursuing a liberal trade policy.

The June 1948 monthly letter of the National City Bank of New York contained the following statement:

> Foreign producers criticize our protective duties on certain articles. Nevertheless, the United States market generally is freer of access today than practically any other market in the world.

Mr. Chairman, embargoes, quotas, preferences, import license restrictions, currency manipulations, subsidies, state trading, and other restrictive trade devices have been adopted by foreign nations to control the movement of trade. They are much more restrictive than simple tariff barriers. Our feeble tariff barriers are as nothing when compared with the trade barriers set up by governments that have entered into reciprocal trade agreements with us.

Mr. Chairman, we have built up a watch industry in the United States that gives employment to scores of thousands of workers. These workers are paid a reasonably high wage that enables them to live decently upon a standard of living that is the highest in the world. Switzerland, under our reciprocal-trade-agreements program, has been dumping millions of watches on our American market at far less than it costs to manufacture them here. This has forced our factories either to go out of business or to go on part-time production. What is the difference between importing cheap labor to compete with our American labor—which our immigration laws forbid—and importing the products of cheap labor to compete with the product of our factories—which our reciprocal trade program permits—thereby robbing our factory workers of their jobs?

Before World War II—1931–35—47 percent of the American market for jeweled watches was supplied by imported watches from Switzerland, and 53 percent of the American market was supplied by our own American jeweled watch industries. In 1936 we negotiated a reciprocal trade agreement with Switzerland. Later our American watch factories were retooled and converted for war needs, making precision instruments for the Army and Navy. Switzerland then took over the American market for jeweled watches to such an extent that by 1946 Switzerland supplied 86 percent of the jeweled watches sold in America.

Since 1941, when we entered the war, a total of 59,000,000 Swiss watches have been imported. During the last 4 years, 1945–48, an average of more than 9,000,000 Swiss watches were imported each year. This importation of Swiss watches under our reciprocal trade agreement with Switzerland has seriously damaged our American-watch industry. Today there are only three American-jeweled watch companies left in the United States, Elgin, Hamilton, and Waltham, and the Waltham Watch Co. is already bankrupt and in the hands of a receiver.

Mr. Chairman, the serious question concerning the American-jeweled watch industry is the important part it plays in national defense. It is absolutely essential that a pool or reservoir of skilled watchmakers be maintained, to be drawn upon in time of war to make precision time instruments—chronometers, fire-control watches, time fuses, aircraft instruments, jewel bearings, etc.—without which not a battleship nor a warplane can be operated, not a bomb can be dropped, not a torpedo nor a rocket bomb fired, until a delicate timing instrument to operate it has been installed. There is no other source for the kind of skill needed to make these precision instruments other than the jeweled-watch industry. Yet our reciprocal trade agreement with Switzerland has almost destroyed our American jeweled-watch industry, an industry so essential to our national defense.

Switzerland has captured the world trade in jeweled watches. Even the

American market has been taken over to the extent of 80 percent. Switzerland furnished practically all of the precision instruments used by Germany in the last war. She also furnished most of the precision instruments used by our European allies. She could do this because she was a neutral in the war. Do we want to become dependent upon Switzerland in time of war for precision instruments? Dare we risk such dependency?

Mr. Chairman, after 14 years of experimentation with reciprocal trade agreements, it is time for us to "stop, look, and listen": it is time for us to analyze, to weigh, and to measure the results of the reciprocal trade program before we extend it for 3 more years, without the safeguards that were placed in it by the 1948 act. A careful analysis of the results of our 14 years' experience convinces me of the following:

First. The program has not contributed to international goodwill.

Second. The program has not removed nor reduced world trade barriers with the exception of our own.

Third. The program has neither prevented war nor removed the threat of war.

Fourth. The program has already damaged some American industries and thrown some American workmen out of work, even though the impact of the program upon our economy has not as yet fully materialized.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the passage of H. R. 1211 without proper and necessary safeguards being incorporated in the bill.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS].

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, I intend, in what I am going to say, to deal principally with the question of the jeweled watch industry as affected by our reciprocal-trade agreements, which subject has been discussed by two or three preceding speakers, including the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Before doing that, however, I want to talk just briefly on two other points discussed by preceding speakers.

The opposition to this bill has repeatedly discussed the peril-point proposition—that provision of the law of 1948 whereby the Tariff Commission is authorized to make a finding of that point below which, in its judgment, tariff rates cannot be lowered without injury to particular commodities. Instead of that provision being to the benefit of the manufacturer, it so hamstrings our representatives in negotiating trade agreements as to work against the American manufacturer. Let us follow that thought a little further. The theory of reciprocal trade is that the representatives of our country and other countries will sit around the table, and that mutual concessions will be made. In return for a concession made by us in respect to an article the negotiating country will make some concession with respect to the admission of American goods. In some instances instead of keeping out or reducing imports by high tariffs which would increase the cost to the American consumer, an agreement is negotiated whereby we limit imports.

It is necessary that our negotiators shall be free at the conference to make adjustment in return for concessions made to us by other countries. The peril-point theory as injected into the law by the act of 1948 removes the Tariff Commission from negotiations and requires it to sit back as a sort of separate entity to make a finding before the negotiation begins as to the point below which a rate cannot be lowered. That is an invitation to the American negotiators to go down to that point. Mr. Thorpe, testifying for the State Department, said that in many instances the negotiators had not gone as far in the reductions in certain tariffs as they would have been authorized to go by the findings of the Tariff Commission. From 1934 on to last year the members of the Tariff Commission with their expert knowledge and information sat in the negotiations. They could express then and there their view concerning the peril point, and lend their expert advice and assistance in the negotiations. But the effect of the restrictive amendment of the act of 1948 is to take them completely out of the negotiations, forbid them the right of attending the sessions where these agreements are negotiated. They are left in this country. Thereby our negotiators are deprived of the advice and expert help, counsel, and judgment of the Tariff Commission. In the second place, we talk about the danger of imports. Among nations, as among men, no nation can purchase more abroad than it can sell; it cannot long buy more than it sells without bankruptcy. If other nations are to buy our goods and pay their debts to us, they must sell us their goods and services. All over the world, from World War I on down, the world has maintained an uneasy sort of economic unbalance in which we have kept up world trade by grants and loans and the purchase of foreign gold which we buried at Fort Knox while the economy of the other nations languished. At long last we came to the viewpoint that trade is not a one-way street. That world prosperity depends on world trade. We came further to the viewpoint that we could not long maintain the prosperity and the freedom of our own Nation as a little island of prosperity and peace in a world-wide sea of rags and misery. That is the basis of the whole reciprocal trade agreements program.

A while ago the gentleman from New York, for whom I have the greatest respect, was tracing our downward decline toward a Niagara of destruction, as a result of reciprocal trade. I could not help but reflect that last year the profits of the American economy, the corporate profits of our Nation after the payment of taxes reached the highest peak in the Nation's history. Where is the Niagara? It does not exist except in the imagination of those who oppose the program that has worked so successfully for 14 years.

One other thing the gentleman from Nebraska referred to the grave harm done to the synthetic-rubber industry by the policies of the State Department. This happens to be something I know a little about, for the biggest synthetic-rubber plant in the world is located in my district, at Port Neches, Tex. It has a rated capacity of 125,000 tons of synthetic rubber a year. Right now it is operating at more than 50,000 tons a year above its rated capacity, turning out the synthetic rubber that goes to your tire plants in Ohio and other places. It is turning out this rubber for several cents a pound cheaper than you can import the natural rubber. It has increased the life of automobile tires more than double. They are now installing a new process, making "cold rubber," which will add one-third longer life to passenger-car tires. Because of this industry, which has been fostered by the policies of our Government, we have kept the price of automobile tires away down below what other comparable products have gone to in this period of inflation. At no time has the synthetic-rubber industry flourished as it is flourishing today. The gentleman from Nebraska was without his facts when he said that the policies of our Government have injuriously affected the synthetic-rubber industry.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COMBS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it not true that we have bound ourselves never to impose a tariff on rubber?

Mr. COMBS. I do not know about our binding ourselves. I know that our agreements have escape clauses. I know we have the rubber and we have it cheap and we have the best rubber and our rubber plants are operating successfully. So why worry?

Mr. CURTIS. Is it not true that we have bound ourselves not to increase the percentage of synthetic rubber that is required to go into our domestic consumption?

Mr. COMBS. There may have been some agreements with local industries. I do not know.

Mr. CURTIS. No, with foreign countries.

Mr. COMBS. With foreign countries?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. COMBS. The agreements we have so far may have been made to protect the American synthetic rubber industry. I'm not familiar with the agreements you refer to, but I do not think our synthetic rubber plants are operating at capacity production. The agreements may have been to protect against foreign imports.

Mr. CURTIS. That is not borne out in the hearings by testimony of the State Department.

Mr. COMBS. We will not argue that now.

Now let us go to the watch question. First of all, considerable argument has been made that the policies of our Government are completely wrecking the jewel watch industry and that this is going to sabotage our national defense. For fear some of you may overlook it, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means placed in the RECORD this morning a letter from the Hon.

James Forrestal, head of our defense establishment. I want to read you one paragraph of that letter:

> The domestic jewel watch industry has fulfilled its role in our program of national defense, and I am not aware that its capabilities have been adversely affected by the Reciprocal Trade Authority.

During the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee it became evident that opponents of reciprocal trade extension would use the Waltham Watch Co. as a horrible example of the great injury they contend is being done American manufacturers in general, and the watch industry in particular, by foreign imports under our reciprocal trade program. Much interesting testimony on this subject came out during the hearings. But knowing the opponents of the pending bill would use the alleged injury to the watch industry by Swiss imports, and that the present difficulty of the Waltham Watch Co. would be used as an example, I decided to pursue a little research in an effort to discover what the real trouble with the Waltham Watch Co. is. Several witnesses, including Hon. Charles P. Taft, made the statement that Waltham's difficulty is not due to foreign competition but to mismanagement. I shall shortly submit some facts that I think support this view beyond question. But before doing this let me make these observations.

The Waltham Watch Co. is about 100 years old. Its product bears an honored name in the American watch business. The company is now in financial difficulties and is undergoing a reorganization that I sincerely hope will put it back on its feet as one of the fine and prosperous industries of this country. The mayor of the city of Waltham and the entire citizenry of the community and the 2,300 employees of the Waltham Watch Co. have banded together and are digging into their savings, mortgaging their homes, and pledging portions of their future pay in order to raise a part of the capital needed to get the company on its feet again. I may add that the employees at Waltham have foregone requests for two pay raises that have been received by employees of other companies, and in one instance took a cut in their wages. The people of Waltham and the people of all Massachusetts, for that matter, are proud of the name and prestige of the Waltham watch. And I am sure the people of all America recognize with pride the efforts the employees and citizens of Waltham are making to rehabilitate their great industry. It is the same fine spirit the members of the Massachusetts community exhibited nearly 175 years ago. I am sure that every one of us wants our Government to do everything it can to assist these valiant Americans, and I am sure that it will be done. As a matter of fact, I am advised that RFC has agreed to extend a loan in the amount of several millions of dollars to assist in the modernization and rehabilitation of the Waltham Co. conditioned upon a reorganization that will insure successful operation.

But today we are debating a bill which would restore and extend the reciprocal-trade-agreements plan first inaugurated in 1934. And we are here met with the argument that the troubles at Waltham are caused by foreign competition. Is Waltham a case where a successful and prosperous company has been wrecked by imports under reciprocal trade? Or is its present plight the result of the failure of its management to use sound and modern methods of manufacturing techniques, sales, and financial policies? Well, let's see what the evidence is.

Mr. Cenerazzo, the president of the union representing the watchmakers in the plant, stated during his testimony before the Ways and Means Committee that mismanagement—and he emphasized financial skullduggery as well as poor choice of equipment, lack of advertising, improper distribution methods and other errors—was the primary difficulty at Waltham. A statement from the mayor of the city of Waltham read before the committee quoted the findings of two surveys of the situation to the effect that mismanagement and lack of working capital were the reasons for Waltham's condition.

Unfortunately, this condition seems to be nothing new at Waltham.

In the last day or so I have had the opportunity to examine a bcok entitled "Timing a Century"—history of the Waltham Watch Co. It was prepared by Mr. Charles W. Moore and published in 1945. It seems the study was suggested by the president of Waltham, and the Waltham Co., according to the preface in the book, provided financial assistance in publication. Now here are a few of the many interesting facts revealed by the book. Waltham Watch Co. was founded in 1850. But in 1857, only 7 years after it was established, it went through bankruptcy, was sold by the sheriff at auction for $56,000, and the proceeds prorated among its creditors. The company was promptly reorganized but was forced to close in September of that same year. It was reorganized and from 1859 to 1882 the company prospered in large part because of the demand which developed for watches during the Civil War. In 1864 the Elgin Watch Co. was organized and later two other companies were established. These companies began a strong competition and in 1891 Waltham found itself again in difficulties. It barely survived the panic of 1893. By 1901, however, the Waltham Co. was again prosperous. It seems that a sort of working agreement, or trust if you please, had been worked out among the American watch manufacturers so that they sold their products to the American people at a much higher price than they sold on the foreign market.

I recall reading, when I was a child, a statement, from William J. Bryan who was fighting high tariffs, in which he stated among other things that he had purchased a Waltham watch at a jewelry store in London for about one-half of what the same watch would cost him at an American jewelry store. This was around the turn of the century. But by 1904 President Theodore Roosevelt began his trust-busting crusade and the Waltham profits began to decline. And during the panic of 1907 declining earnings of the company, decay of management, and manipulations of securities sales caused a stockholders' revolt. The company again went through the wringer and was reorganized in 1910. It then began to diversify its production by adding traveling clocks, automobile clocks, time fuses, and automobile speedometers. Sales to the Government during World War I contributed to the company's earnings and it seems to have done very well until the depression of 1921 when Waltham again faced bankruptcy. This time, incompetence of the managing executives was a controlling factor. The company was saved from collapse at that time by liberal loans from banks, and the banks took it over. Their management was not successful and the Waltham Co. was again reorganized in 1923. The new management recognized that Waltham had not been producing what the market wanted, that the Swiss was setting the pace and style, particularly in small wrist watches. There was also recognition that the Swiss had developed superior watch-making machinery, and that Waltham prices were too high.

Waltham seems to have done very well until the begininng of the depression in 1930 when it again found itself in difficulties. It then spearheaded the move to curtail imports of watches and along with other domestic watch companies, Waltham was successful in getting into the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, the highest tariff rates on watches that this country has ever had. But instead of helping the situation it caused bootlegging of watches into this country and other difficulties. The outbreak of World War II produced war orders which enabled Waltham to keep going. But by 1944 it was in difficulties again, and changed presidents. It went into bankruptcy early this year.

These facts, it seems to me, establish beyond question the truth of the observation of Mr. Taft and other witnesses that Waltham's trouble is internal and is not due to foreign competition. There are many other facts that could be submitted in support of that view. For example two other American watch manufacturing companies, Elgin and Hamilton, have just completed the best year in their history—selling more watches, making as much or more profit as ever before. They did almost as well in 1947. Mr. James G. Shennan, president of the Elgin National Watch Co., has supplied the committee with information as to the combined sales, combined net profits, and the percentage of profits on sales made by three American watch manufacturing companies, Elgin, Hamilton, and Waltham, for the years 1940, 1941, 1946, and 1947. I want to read these figures to you:

Year	Combined sales	Combined net profit	Percent of sales
1940	$25,887,000	$2,724,000	10.53
1941	33,413,000	3,060,000	9.16
1946	30,902,000	1,650,000	4.89
1947	49,131,000	1,830,000	3.72

Elgin and Hamilton have been working at capacity since they reconverted from war work and, according to a statement in the National Jeweler of December 1948, page 274, made by W. H. Samelius, the director of Elgin Watchmakers College, the demand for watchmakers is so great that all students are placed even before graduation, and there is a waiting list for entrance. Mr. Samelius expects the demand for watchmakers to far exceed the supply for at least 2 to 5 years.

Now, these facts speak for themselves. If other plants are working at capacity, selling more watches, making as much or more money as before, is it reasonable to believe that the one plant that has failed was the victim of foreign competition? It would not be reasonable to say that even if Waltham had fallen behind the others in the market. But the simple truth is that Waltham made sales in 1947 that were almost double any prewar year, and the second highest in the company's history. Yet, Waltham managed to turn in a deficit of nearly $400,000 that year. And, if further proof were needed that Swiss imports are not destroying the American industry it is to be found in the expansion program presently going on at some of the American plants. The president of Elgin stated before our committee that about 20 to 25 percent increase is contemplated. The Gruen Watch Co. is erecting in New York a domestic manufacturing plant to supplement its import activities at a cost of about $5,000,000. The Bulova Watch Co. now manufactures in this country about one-half of the watches it sells here. Would these companies be using their reserves to go into or increase their participation in the domestic market if they felt they would be put out of business by foreign competition under our reciprocal trade program?

No, it was not foreign imports that brought about Waltham's difficulties. The evidence is overwhelming that it was mismanagement of the plant and its facilities. The company itself in its bankruptcy petition, recently filed, stated:

> The debtor is an old and established manufacturer of watches, whose name has for many years been associated in the retail market throughout the United States with quality watches; the debtor's present financial condition is due primarily to lack of working capital. The debtor believes that the enterprise is fundamentally sound and that its stability will be restored as a result of reorganization.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COMBS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I wonder whether the gentleman remembers the statement made in the hearings that the annual consumption or sale of watches is approximately 9,000,000, whereas the entire American watch industry can produce only 3,000,000, so that we need the importation of about 6,000,000 works in order to supply the American market.

Mr. COMBS. The gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. COMBS. Let us take a moment out to consider this. The demand for watches in America has increased by leaps and bounds. The present American companies could not supply one-half the demand. Suppose we shut off these Swiss importations and create a monopoly in four manufacturing companies in the United States, with the present demand, where would watch prices go? I have here a Hamilton watch which was presented to me in December in my home town. The jeweler told the purchaser that it was the last one he had in stock and was complaining that his consignor had not been able to get a sufficient supply of high-grade American jeweled watches to supply his customers. There is no evidence at all of any shortage of markets for the products of this country in the watch business.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COMBS. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. It was testified in the hearings that if there were no importations of works, that the prices of watches and wrist watches to the American public would be two or three times as much as they are today.

Mr. COMBS. That is correct.

Mr. EBERHARTER. It is practically impossible for a man to buy a good watch today. It is impossible for an ordinary workingman to buy a good watch today unless he saves for a considerable number of weeks so as to get enough money to buy one.

Mr. COMBS. That is correct. I want to point out another thing. Even the American watch manufacturers have come to value competition. Under the spur of competition the Elgin Watch Co. 2 years ago invented a watch spring, revolutionizing the business. Another concern invented an electronic machine for testing watches. Theretofore it took 4 to 6 months to test and regulate a watch after it was made. Now they have electronic machines which will do it in 2 minutes. That is by the application of the American know-how. In that fashion we will get more watches and better watches for the American people, and at the same time pay higher wages to the people making them. One other thing: these watch-importing companies that import the works into this country have to have cases, straps, boxes, and many other things. These are all made in this country. And the men and women who work in these assembly plants are just as skilled and just as highly paid as those who work in the places that manufacture completely their own watch works in the United States.

Mind you, these American companies that make their own watches import certain parts from Switzerland. If you were to shut out Swiss imports today, you would wreck every American watch company in the country. That reminds me of one other thing. These imports from Switzerland thus far have been reasonable. They can be handled under this adjustable plan of reciprocal trade. I would remind you that the Swiss people are a free people who maintain a high standard of living. The testimony before us was that there is very little difference in the cost of a Swiss movement and a comparable movement made in this country after the payment of the present tariff.

Otherwise, these companies having factories in both places would not have an American factory in this country. Our great watch business is developing because first we went to Switzerland and established factories there and then took the skills that we learned there and transferred them to this country, thus building up one of the great industries of the world, the watch industry of America.

Now, these Swiss people are free people. Switzerland is the oldest Republic in the world. Should we fail and refuse to exchange our goods for theirs and shut the doors of import in their faces, what would we be saying to the rest of the world that we are encouraging to adopt our kind of free life? Why, it is ridiculous.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COMBS. I yield.

Mr. PATTERSON. I happen to represent one of the largest watch industries. I know that right now in Waterbury, Conn., the United States Time Corp. is closing. Why? Because we are importing from Switzerland. Are we going to take the welfare of other countries and the welfare of their people ahead of the welfare of our own country and of our working people? I think our people should be No. 1 on the list.

Mr. COMBS. I do, too, sir. I think that they are No. 1 on the list. Permit me to make this observation.

I have not studied the Waterbury situation. But they make clocks, and clock-type watch movements as I understand it.

Mr. PATTERSON. They make clocks and watches.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COMBS. I yield.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman from Connecticut refers to a company that makes the pin-lever or clock watch. The importations from Switzerland are of jewel-lever watches only.

Mr. COMBS. That is right.

Mr. MILLS. We do not import the watches that the gentleman refers to, thus I cannot see how he can associate imports into the United States, imports which do not exist, with the laying off of men in the plant to which he refers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS].

Mr. COMBS. Now I will be as brief as I can.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COMBS. I am sorry. I cannot yield now. I must finish.

RFC has agreed to furnish $6,000,000 if the trustees can raise another $5,000,000 from private sources to put the Waltham Co. back on its feet as a going concern. The workers in the plant have agreed to raise $1,000,000 themselves. I understand they have already pledged more than $400,000 of that amount. The businessmen and citizens of Waltham feel certain they can get the remaining $4,000,000 from other sources. So, it would seem that the problem of

Waltham will be solved within the near future. I trust that the efforts of the workers and other citizens of the city of Waltham will be rewarded with the establishment of a fine, going concern. As the first, and in many respects the most highly respected manufacturer of fine American jeweled watches, the Waltham Co. is a great representative of the American watch industry. Its rehabilitation and successful operation will be a real American achievement by the people of Waltham. They will share the general prosperity that has come to this country as a result of our reciprocal trade agreements.

We have to look at this question of reciprocal trade agreements with the understanding that by it we are able to sell our surplus products to other countries and they can sell their products to us. The Swiss purchase many kinds of our products, such as machine tools, heavy industrial machinery, textiles, and many others. These goods bought from our country are made by our own workmen. It is in the sale of our manufactured products of that nature that we are able to sell the labor of our own people and to maintain our high standards of American living. So let us not sabotage this act that has worked so successfully for 14 years by hamstringing it with crippling amendments.

I have been surprised to see, with 2 weeks of hearings, that so few complaints have been made against the operation of this law and that no one came before the committee in those 2 weeks and expressed the idea that it should be abandoned. It has been endorsed by one Congress after another, and has demonstrated its great value.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS] has again expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. PATTERSON].

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, just in order to get the record straight on these watches, I realize that the United States Time Corp. does not make a jeweled watch, but it does make a wrist watch. It makes the Mickey Mouse watch, for one thing, and it makes a regular wrist watch which we use every day and which is not jeweled. But the imports from Switzerland in the lower bracket of watch movements have caused a great deal of trouble in our own domestic market. People will go into a store, for instance, and there is an American-made watch, which is not jeweled, on the counter, and there is one from Switzerland which is a jeweled watch. It is easier for the salesman to sell the one from Switzerland. It is in a low bracket. It sells for about $16.95 or $19. That brings up the case of great unemployment in my district, not only in the watch industry, but in others as well. That brings up a situation that I am confronted with right now, and I know a majority of the Members from New England are faced with the same situation in connection with shoes, textiles, and our clock industry, the Waltham clock industry, for example.

What will it be next? It will be the rubber industry; and, again, I represent United States Rubber and employees in Naugatuck, Conn. How can we here in America compete with countries like Czechoslovakia, which today is dominated by the Russian Government as its satellite and where there is slave labor? Shall we let the product of that labor come in to compete with the free labor of our country? Again, there is Switzerland, a country where labor costs are low. The Swiss have a system of home industries whereby different parts of a watch are made in individual homes. They are not set up on a scale like we are; it is peacetime work within the home. How can we expect our manufacturers and working people to stay in the watch industry when they have to compete with situations like that?

Mr. Chairman, I think this House should certainly take under consideration every protection we can possibly give to our own domestic industry. Let us take the brewers of our country today. I am just taking a circle of industries that are being affected by imports. The breweries are working 4 days a week. Or take the clothing industry—and the gentleman from New York may be interested in this. What is their workweek? They are working 3 days, sometimes 3½ days a week. And I can go right on down the list of our industries that are affected by imports.

I personally believe—I am qualifying my statements, I am not trying to sum up to a jury, believe me; I am clarifying my position. I believe in reciprocal trade but not beyond the point where it is going to be injurious to my own industry here at home; because, No. 1: Charity starts at home. I believe no one on the floor of this House will disagree with that statement.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut yields back 10 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, the tendency seems to have developed in this country within the past several years immediately to label as Communist anything with which you are in disagreement, to label it Communist or Communist-inspired. The charge has been hurled in this debate this afternoon, and I consider it not only a completely illogical argument but a thoroughly ridiculous one, that this program of promoting free trade rather than high protectionism is one that is either Communist-inspired or that it is aided and abetted by the Communists. No more ridiculous or illogical argument could possibly be advanced, because in promoting free trade, which we are attempting to do through this legislation, we are promoting something which is the antithesis of communism and planned economy. I cite the testimony before the committee of Mr. Charles P. Taft, the able brother of the senior Senator from the State of Ohio. He testified before the committee representing the Federal Council of Churches. He made this significant statement:

> The other group of opponents of the reciprocal-trade-agreements policy are those of the left, who advocate a planned economy at home. They must oppose the broadening of the base of multilateral trade because that kind of freedom is not compatible with domestic controls. In both instances, therefore, the reciprocal-trade-agreements stand for the free enterprise system, however inconsistent with that system other policies during recent years have been.
>
> Some of the opponents of the policy have taken the position that multilateral trade is no longer possible in the world of today, and that we should therefore adopt a pattern of bilateral closed agreements, Yankee barter deals.
>
> This was the program of the Nazis, and they certainly demonstrated what it could do to world trade. It is not a policy for which the American people will stand when they understand its character and effects.

In other words, here is a great American who made, in my humble opinion, the most forceful statement before the committee, asserting that this program is not only opposed by the Communists but that it is completely incompatible with their philosophy of a planned economy.

The Communists oppose this program for other reasons and other equally commanding reasons. We have adopted the European recovery program which has for its cornerstone the unification and the cooperation of the divided nations of Europe and has for its ultimate goal the rehabilitation of Europe so that the free nations of Europe working together cooperatively can stand on their own feet and again unifiedly oppose the encroachment of communism.

The cornerstone of the Marshall plan is economic cooperation, and that economic cooperation, it is our hope and belief, will ultimately lead to political cooperation; therefore, the Communists who have always attempted to dominate Europe by picking off the nations one by one, piecemeal, if you will, can see the danger to their program by continuation of the reciprocal-trade-treaty program. As a matter of fact, in my humble judgment, the Marshall plan was adopted as a direct answer to the Communist threat of picking one nation off at a time. You will recall that in March 1947, I believe it was, the President came here and delivered his message on the Greek and Turkish situation. We supported that program because it was a necessary program; it was something that had to be done; but the point was made, and I think with justification, that we had to adopt an over-all foreign policy, a policy for all of the free nations of Europe. Out of that thinking and out of that great debate developed the Marshall plan, which has created tremendous ire and apprehension on the part of those in the Kremlin.

As a direct result of the Marshall plan we are seeing in Europe today something about which statesmen have dreamed for many centuries. We are seeing a peaceful unification of that great continent. One week or so ago there was announced in London the formation of the Council of Europe, which is a direct outgrowth, in my opinion, of the adoption of the Marshall plan. The reciprocal-trade-treaty program in the mind of any fair-minded economist must be considered as an economic cornerstone of the Marshall plan in the European recovery program.

How any man who is a Member of this House can consistently support the Marshall plan and then turn around and vote against this program is beyond my comprehension, because he is denying with his right hand what his left hand is doing, and without the trade program, without the incentive to destroy barriers to trade and to commerce and to the movement of goods and materials, the Marshall plan cannot possibly succeed.

All of the arguments which have been advanced here today—and I have listened to most of them, and I do not pretend to be an authority on the history of this great debate which has been before this body for many, many years—all of the arguments advanced against this bill have been the old high-protectionist arguments. There has not been a new argument advanced here, and the only other idea pulled across the trail has been the completely illogical, ridiculous red herring that this is a program advocated and sponsored and fostered by the Communists.

Let us examine the high protectionist argument for a moment. For how many years has the argument been made in this historic body that if we fail to protect American enterprise and American goods by a high tariff we would wreck our economy? How many times have Members stood in this well, as the gentleman from Connecticut did here a moment ago, and said, "I favor the reciprocal-trade-treaty program, but I am first for my own district and for my own enterprise"? I venture to say that is the oldest, the most discredited argument which has ever been made in the House of Representatives.

What are the facts? Let us examine our economy as it stands today, the over-all picture of our economy. Let us not pick out one industry here and another industry here and another one here, all of which are subject to special treatment for many and various reasons, as the gentleman from Texas has so ably stated in the case of the Waltham Watch Co., and as someone might equally ably state in the case of certain other luxury items in which production is now catching up with demand. But let us examine our entire economy, because that is what this program is.

In 1929, the Congress of the United States adopted the highest tariff in the history of our Nation, the Smoot-Hawley tariff. There followed after the adoption of that tariff the greatest tariff war in the history of modern civilization, and in place of our business increasing, in place of these great enterprises growing and increasing their domestic markets and increasing their domestic pay rolls, what happened? We had the most devastating depression that this Nation has ever known, and after the enactment of that tariff there were more people out of employment, there were more bankruptcies, there were more hardships in America, there was more social unrest in America than at any time in the history of our great Republic. That followed the enactment of the highest tariff in the history of our Nation, and the same arguments which have been advanced here today in opposition to this program were advanced in favor of the Smoot-Hawley tariff in 1929. In 1934 a great Secretary of State appeared on the scene; a man revered not only in this country but throughout the free world today. He proposed that men and nations sit down and negotiate, that we import what was good for us to import and that we export what was good for us to export, judging the entire economy.

Through his great leadership and the leadership of the Democratic Party, and the leadership of President Roosevelt, we adopted the reciprocal-trade program.

Today, after that program has been in effect for 14 years or thereabouts, American production is at the highest level in all of our history. As a matter of fact, our production has exceeded the fondest wishes of even our greatest economists. I do not recall the exact figures of the Federal Reserve Board, but I remember seeing last year, while serving on the Committee on Banking and Currency, that our production in many industries was three time, four times, five times, what it was in 1929 and 1930.

If all of these dire predictions had any merit, then would our production be at the level at which it now stands in our country? I say to you that the proof of the reciprocal-trade-treaty program is self-evident, and stands as a great symbol of the economic advancement and prosperity of this country. Anyone who doubts it has only to compare what happened after 1929, when we listened to the high protectionists and when we enacted the highest tariffs in the history of the United States, and we had a depression, with the situation today, after 14 or 15 years of the operation of this program, and look at the vast producing enterprise of the United States of America. When you add to that the further important, commanding, paramount consideration that this program is intimately connected with the entire foreign policy of the United States, that this program is fought and feared by the Communists in the Kremlin, that this program has within it the seeds for the reestablishment of free trade and free enterprise all over Europe, it seems to me the height of inconsistency on the part of those who oppose communism to oppose this program.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I have just heard the very forceful remarks of the gentleman from Louisiana, who has made a very fine presentation of the old free-trade, destructive arguments. I have heard them many times and they are published in many books. Still, we are here as the United States of America. Washington was interested in the first protective-tariff bill, and the tariff policy has underwritten free enterprise of the United States. It was recommended by Hamilton. We built this Nation on that plan of keeping our markets as far as we could here in this country for our people and for the benefit not of few but all of them. Of course, I have heard this old free-trade argument, which is to buy in the cheapest markets in the world. The gentleman stated in his remarks, and very able remarks, that H. R. 1211 is a free-trade proposition. Well, you are down pretty low on the list. The other nations have all the world for their market, and they have over 60 percent of our market. Well over 60 percent of our imports come in free of duty.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to argue over the question of whether the trade agreements program has accomplished or has not accomplished some of the things that have been said here this afternoon. I often, however, do become somewhat amused when I listen to some of the proponents of free trade condemn those who might desire to give some degree of protection to our domestic economy when they themselves insist, not upon tariff or duty protection, but upon even more severe protection as the interference to the free flow of trade may be concerned. I call attention to the fact that the gentleman from Louisiana has just made a very fine address advocating great freedom of exchange of goods between the various countries of the world. I believe in the freest possible exchange, but I wonder if he would answer this question for me. Will he agree today to the elimination of the quota on sugar imports into this country? No; the gentleman comes from an area which produces sugar. There is an import quota on sugar. That is the maximum restriction that you can possibly have on any commodity. It is not a matter of just making the sugar competitive with American sugar as far as the protection of his industry is concerned—absolutely not. His protection is a quantitative restriction against the importation of sugar. What about our tobacco boys and various other of these people who come here and condemn those of us who want to see our industries have at least a fair degree of protection in the world markets? Let's take tobacco for example.

You cannot export one single seed of tobacco. Why? Because, if you do, it might mean that that tobacco might be produced elsewhere in the world and that that production might compete with our American-produced tobacco.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman from Wisconsin may not want to overlook the Louisiana rice industry, which enjoys a tariff protection of a modified rate of 2 cents per pound or $2 per 100 pounds. I join with the gentleman in criticizing southern people who ask for tariffs on what they produce and then deny the same protection to northern agriculture and northern industry. You cannot justify it in any way.

Protect all of us, North, South, East, and West. Then I will go along with you, but I will not go along with you on this idea of protecting one little section such as tobacco, rice, sugar, and so forth, and destroying the rest of us.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman from Michigan. But, as I say, it is not my intention to go into the various ramifications of free trade versus protectionism and so forth. I think this afternoon we have gone around

in a pretty big circle and have covered quite a large field and a great deal of territory.

As, if, and when we come down to the basic issue involved in the bill, H. R. 1211, I want to say it is not nearly as complicated as we have tried to make it appear this afternoon. I would like to refer those Members present to the minority report. I would like to read one of the introductory statements in that report, because I believe it gives to us what, basically, is the issue involved in this debate, and which will be involved tomorrow when we consider this matter under the 5-minute rule. I quote:

We favor the extension rather than the repeal of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948. We appreciate, however, that as the result of false political characterizations, the 1948 Act is destined to fail.

That is certainly apparent from the orders that have come down from on high to you gentlemen on the majority side.

In our opinion, however, such action is a manifestation that political emotionalism has triumphed over judgment and reason. Under such conditions, even the preservation of existing constructive legislation is unlikely. In view of this, and without retreating from principle, we urge that, as a bare minimum, H. R. 1211 be amended to provide—

(1) for the continuation of the "peril point" report of the Tariff Commission established by the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948; and

(2) for the insertion of an "escape clause" in all trade agreements which do not now contain such a clause.

The fundamental issue before us today and tomorrow is whether or not in the extension of the Trade Agreements Act we have those two provisions which are safeguards to the domestic economy.

I have not heard one single Member, speaking from the majority side, tell us what is wrong with those two protective features proposed by the minority. Not one.

We have been referred to the position of various groups that appeared before our committee in the study of the Trade Agreements Act. I think for the most part most of them believe sincerely, as I do, that we must continue some kind of negotiated agreements with foreign countries, in order to make possible the free flow of trade; but many, many of them say and feel that there should be certain limits, certain safeguards, so that those people who do the negotiating, when we enter into such agreements, do not exceed the bounds of propriety and the bounds that are necessary in order to maintain our domestic economy.

I would like to refresh the memory of those who sit on the committee and to call to the attention of those who do not serve on the committee and who did not have the benefit of the testimony of those who appeared before the committee, to some of the points made by representatives of these organizations.

I take, for instance, the American Federation of Labor. They did say that they believed in the extension of the Trade Agreements Act. I do not question that at all. They are for it and I am for it. But they put in a word of caution, and let me quote Mr. Mason, the spokesman for the American Federation of Labor. Let me quote also from a resolution which was passed at the American Federation of Labor convention in Cincinnati:

In supporting the trade-agreements program we recognize the need of safeguarding American labor in some industries, especially where the wages are a relatively high factor in the cost of production, against competition that threatens to undermine our labor standards.

Gentlemen, that is just what the minority members of the Ways and Means Committee want to do. That is the identical purpose of these two amendments that will be offered tomorrow.

Let me say further, I asked Mr. Mason during the course of the proceedings, and I am quoting from page 179 of the hearing, this question:

You know under the act passed last year one of the basic requirements, and the thing we hear the most complaint about, is that it is required by law that the Tariff Commission do establish what we call peril points——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin (continuing reading):

do establish what we call peril points; in other words, the point below which the domestic industry might be imperiled and the workingman in this country and his standard of living be imperiled, so you agree with me that is advisable procedure and the advisable thing to do?

Mr. MASON. That is right. We favor that. We favor the continuation of those findings.

That, Mr. Chairman, is all that the amendment pertaining to peril points which will be offered by the minority pretends to do; and that is all it does.

We have the National Farm Bureau Federation, which said it believed in the extension of the Trade Agreements Act. Let me point out their position on this matter. I call attention to page 694 of the hearings. Mr. Kline, representing the American Farm Bureau Federation, said:

We have not taken a specific position in which we took up the matter of peril points and said: "This is our position with regard to the Trade Commission as regards establishing peril points." At the same time, we have taken a position which makes it clear that we would oppose a proposition which made it possible for the Trade Commission to use this point or some other point to delay the development of a reciprocal-trade-agreement program. We certainly want that information available, and we certainly want it taken into consideration as the sort of machinery for the development of the reciprocal trade that we have suggested.

In other words, if the procedure desired does not delay the entering into agreements, Mr. Kline, in so many words, says they want that information and believe that that machinery should remain a part of the act.

We also find, Mr. Chairman, that the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation, another large agricultural group, took a stand on this matter at its thirty-second annual convention. Let me read from page 258 of the hearings an excerpt from a resolution adopted by that organization on November 11, 1948:

We favor a further extension of the Trade Agreements Act, but only on condition that adequate safeguards are written into the law to govern the exercise of the powers therein conferred. Such safeguards should include a procedure before the Tariff Commission similar to that provided in the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948 to determine the safe limits within which tariff modifications can be made.

That is a great farm organization speaking and I think, Mr. Chairman, that it states the basic issue involved in the discussion here today.

What is wrong with the two safeguard provisions that the minority asks be put into the extension of the Trade Agreements Act? There is the issue, Mr. Chairman, and I hope sincerely that this problem can be approached with a reasonableness of heart and mind in order that we may arrive at what is right and just for the American people instead of being guided by false propaganda and by political considerations that should have no place in the discussion of a bill of this kind.

The gentleman from Arkansas criticized the peril-point theory when he addressed the Committee this afternoon. He said that the Tariff Commission could not study 400 individual items. Mr. Chairman, if the Tariff Commission cannot do so, how, pray heaven, can the State Department do so? I certainly would rather trust the Tariff Commission with its staff of experts, with its experience in this field over the years to do the job in a limited time, than I would the State Department.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL].

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I trust the gentleman from Wisconsin will listen closly to what I have to say, for I agree with him in part that there has not been much discussion directed toward the issues that the minority has raised; but I should like to suggest to him that the majority of the committee and the majority Members of this House are not opposed to the peril-point system, the majority Members are not opposed to the escape-clause provision. The great difference is one of timing, and if the gentleman will permit me to continue for just a short time I will develop this matter further, then yield to him.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset I ought to clarify the statement that appears in the RECORD here as to where the American Federation of Labor stands. It is true that some Members of the minority attempted to put words in the mouth of the witness, but when he was questioned again the representative of the American Federation of Labor stated that he was in favor of H. R. 1211, that he was not in favor of the amendments which are here submitted by the minority party.

I want to join with the gentleman from Wisconsin in discussing what I consider to be the real issues in this debate. The minority party says: "We favor the extension rather than repeal of the Trade Agreements Act." So I assume now all of the Republicans have accepted the principal of the reciprocal-trade-agreements program. However, it is stated in the minority report that, "We desire to modify this in two respects." It is toward that end I desire to direct my remarks.

First of all, may I say the peril-point amendment that will be submitted tomorrow is one involving a difference of opinion. For one, I believe in the peril-point theory, but I do not agree with your timing. You want to put the peril point into operation before we have had the benefit of experience. Insofar as I am concerned, I want the peril-point theory to operate after we have had the benefit of experience, using the escape clause.

To amplify my remarks I want to call the attention of the Members of this Chamber to a letter addressed to the gentleman from North Carolina, the Honorable ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, on May 17, 1948, which I think so clarifies the issue that every argument that has been presented here against it will fall of its own weight. This letter was submitted to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] at the time the Republicans passed the 1948 bill and was submitted by the Chairman of the Tariff Commission in response to a letter written to him by the gentleman from North Carolina. I shall now read for the RECORD the answer of the Chairman of the Tariff Commission. First of all I will put the question of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]:

Do you think the procedure established by H. R. 6556 would enable the Commission to render a better public service than it now performs?

H. R. 6556 was the Republican measure of 1948.

Here is the response by a member of the Commission which you gentlemen have been eulogizing all afternoon and all through the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee. The Chairman stated:

The Commission was established in 1916 in order that the Congress and the Executive might have a reliable source of objective information on tariff matters, information which could be accepted as authentic by all sides in any tariff controversy.

Continuing, he says:

Thus, from the very beginning its primary function, has been to find the facts, leaving policy decisions to the Congress and the President. I doubt the advisability of transforming the Commission into a policy-making agency and thus subjecting it, more than in the past, to political vicissitudes.

My fear is that the attempt to determine the degree to which duties may be reduced without injury to domestic producers or impairment of the national defense would require the making of such difficult and fundamental judgments that the Commission would, in effect, be making major policy decisions. The element of judgment, of course, enters into the various phases of the Commission's present work. This is especially true of the duties which have been assigned to it under the escape clause in trade agreements. In cases under that clause, however, its findings as to whether serious injury to domestic producers has occurred or is threatened will be based upon actual observation of imports and domestic production after the trade-agreement concession in question has come into force. In contrast, the findings required under H. R. 6556 would have to be based to a large extent, especially under present abnormal conditions, on assumptions and estimates as to future probabilities.

I say that the answer of the Chairman of the Tariff Commission is the real difference, and I want the record to show the real difference in the thinking between the majority of the committee and the minority.

The majority viewpoint is that the Tariff Commission, or its representative, should participate, along with other agencies of the executive department, giving facts, advice, and the benefit of its judgment in the negotiation of trade agreements. This has been the policy since the law was first enacted in 1934. The Republicans in 1948 changed that policy by specifically prohibiting this important Commission from giving the benefit of its experience, advice, and judgment to the interdepartmental agencies charged with the formation and negotiation of the reciprocal-trade-agreements program.

The Republicans in 1948 set that important Commission aside in an effort to use it as a political and policy-making instrument for the possible purpose of embarrassing and acting as a block upon the President of the United States. Moreover, under the 1948 act, the Commission was required to give its judgment based not upon actual fact nor upon actual experience, but required as a bipartisan Commission to enter into the field of conjecture, to speculate, if you please, upon what might happen to some industry under certain conditions which might not ever arise. You said, "Give us your idea of what the peril point will be." Now I submit that in any endeavor of life, experience is the best teacher and, in the bill which you have before you today for consideration, requires the Tariff Commission to function as it has for many years past. We want it to return to its former position as a fact-finding body and not a policy-making body. We want to take it away from the political vicissitudes which the Chairman mentioned in his letter to Chairman DOUGHTON. At the same time it ought to be clearly understood, and I believe I am correctly stating the viewpoint of a majority of the committee, we are in favor of the inclusion of an escape clause to be included in every trade agreement hereafter negotiated. There is nothing new in this, for the history of trade agreements since 1942 indicates that has been the policy of the State Department.

Further than that, the policy of the State Department has been ratified and confirmed by the President of the United States in his Executive order issued in the early part of 1948, and which is in effect at the present time. This is the policy that is followed in all trade agreements now. But does this satisfy my Republican friends. Most certainly not, for tomorrow they will advocate an amendment to the present bill making it mandatory upon those charged with the negotiation of trade agreements, the people to whom we have delegated our authority, making it mandatory upon them to negotiate and renegotiate agreements which have heretofore been agreed upon but do not include the escape clause. I submit to you that such an amendment is not timely nor wise and it is not good business judgment to compel those who are negotiating trade agreements to be handcuffed by such an inflexible policy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. CARROLL. I am indebted to the gentleman from Wisconsin for raising the fundamental issues which will be made tomorrow as the bill is read. As a matter of fact, only this afternoon I discussed this matter with a gentleman in the State Department. That is one of the reasons I take your time this evening to put this in the RECORD, so perhaps the Swiss themselves will read the RECORD. I am one of those who believe that the Swiss ought to, out of good faith, agree to immediate negotiation of an escape clause in the Swiss agreement.

It is my understanding that all efforts will be directed by the State Department toward that end. But I am not going to vote to put into legislation a mandatory provision which will handcuff our bargainers.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Let us start working backwards. There are a number of things the gentleman has covered about which I want to inquire.

Mr. CARROLL. I cannot yield too much of my time. I am limited.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I should like to inquire about the escape clause provision. If the gentleman believes the escape clause provision is sound, why does he have objection to inserting it in all trade agreements?

Mr. CARROLL. I think the gentleman misconstrues my position. While I speak only for myself, I think it is the viewpoint of the majority members of the committee. Every person now, in the light of experience, is in favor of an escape clause in all trade agreements, and that has been the policy of the State Department; it is now the policy of the President of the United States, by Executive order, so it is now the policy of this Government, and such a clause will be in all future trade agreements. The gentleman knows that in all the agreements negotiated at Geneva, in every single one of those multilateral agreements, was included the escape clause.

The gentleman asks, why do I object? I thought I stated it very simply. I say it is not good for the Congress to amend this bill to handcuff your negotiators, because you put them in a position that is not flexible enough.

Let me give you one illustration. As a new member of this committee I have been trying to follow through with some consistency, with some desire for understanding, the problems which affect the American watch industry. I was very much impressed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE] who made such a brilliant presentation in behalf of the people of his district. I have been trying to find out if there is not

some way to help the people of Waltham. I find that if you amend this bill and create a mandatory situation there is a possibility—and I did not learn that until this afternoon—that the Swiss might come in, if we renegotiate under a mandatory provision of this law—I did not learn until this afternoon that on the 21-jewel watch movements, actually the present tariff operates as an embargo. There are many factors that the Members of this Congress cannot know, and, therefore, by general legislative mandatory action it is not good to freeze a situation which ought to remain fluid in the interest of good bargaining.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. What the gentleman is really trying to say is that in view of the fact that the proposal to incorporate escape clauses in all agreements is a Republican motion to amend a Democratic bill, therefore, it is bad.

Mr. CARROLL. No. I have tried to make my position very clear. I am trying to make a fair presentation. If you want to make this a partisan discussion, I say to you, based upon my experience in the last session, and based upon the experience I have had now, I believe the arguments presented by the minority here are specious. I believe the great majority of your group are not in favor of the reciprocal-trade program. I think you are using this as a device to emasculate it. That is what I really believe. You asked me my opinion, and I give it to you for what it is worth.

I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Certainly the escape clause provision is not any product of the Republicans. It was voluntarily established by the administration administering the program.

Mr. CARROLL. May I say to the gentleman from Tennessee, when I heard of this discussion about Communists and Communist writings in these trade agreements, I found that the State Department, itself, was the one that instituted the escape clause provision for the protection of American industry and it was the President of the United States who later carried it into effect by Executive order. I think then the issue is pretty clear on the question of the peril point. We on the Democratic side are anxious to protect American industry. Let us take a look at the logic of our position. If the Tariff Commission is to function, it will function best under the escape clause theory. It will function best when it has the evidence upon which to act, the facts and experience upon which to render judgment. In the event of damage or injury to American industry we may use the Tariff Commission through the escape-clause proviso in three ways. First, a complaint from an industry; second, an investigation initiated by the Tariff Commission itself; and, third, the President of the United States may call upon the Commission for guidance.

Labor, the A. F. of L. and CIO, the workingmen, and the farmers of the Nation want this program. Why? Because labor knows that if they are going to have high living standards, they must have full employment. We on the Committee on Ways and Means know that if we are going to get revenue to have a foreign-policy program, the Nation must have full employment. We have to have people making money so that we can get revenue to carry on the foreign program in the interest of peace. We cannot be appropriating five and six billion dollars in support of our foreign policy unless we have full employment. Labor knows that this sort of program will stimulate the flow of goods in international trade. It is my hope that the majority party members will reject overwhelmingly the two amendments which will be offered on the floor tomorrow as indicated by the minority report.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the discussion of the Reciprocal Trade Treaties has always been intriguing to me. I have always hoped that I would live long enough to see it operate south of the Mason and Dixon's line as well as north of it. The Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act is a fine instrument for the peanut-growers of the South. Oh, they love it. Yes, because they have a 7-cent duty on peanuts, which, incidentally, is more than 100 percent ad valorem and more than the product ever brought for 25 years in any year before the war. They also like it as was brought out here with reference to sugar. They have not changed the Smoot-Hawley tax on sugar. They like that down in Louisiana. They also like it on the rice.

Then we get into the cotton business. Oh, that is a real one. Oh, surely. Oh, we just believe in reciprocity and the good neighbor policy, and now the distinguished chairman of the committee is getting the Golden Rule in on it. We will not have any of these bad tariffs. What we will do, we will just put an embargo on it and say you cannot import cotton. You tell me any commodity that the Republican Party ever put an embargo on in the United States. I know you can't do it. An embargo was put on so that one could bring in only 135,000 bales of cotton while we produce 10 or 12 million bales a year.

They were not satisfied with that. The long-staple cotton fellows wanted to get in it. So they got Mr. Truman to put a quota on that too. This one is not quite so much of an embargo.

Then we will take wheat out in Colorado and down in Texas. Oh, sure. We are for reciprocal-trade agreements. We must have this good neighbor policy. We must have this Golden Rule, but we will put an embargo on wheat. Only 800,000 bushels of wheat can come into the United States out of over a billion bushels produced here. Such hypocrisy. When it comes to talking about looking after the people in your own district, I do not make any excuses for saying that in the short time I have been here I have figured out that I had better be looking after them, because I do not see anybody in the New Deal who would look after them and I have not seen anybody in the Fair Deal who is going to look after them.

But going back to this tobacco seed proposition. That is a honey. Oh, we believe in reciprocity. Oh, we believe in the good-neighbor policy. Oh, we believe in the Golden Rule. Under this set-up, I guess the Golden Rule means, "Do all you can for the big fellows and let the little fellows take care of themselves."

We passed the most vicious, the most serious trade barrier ever erected in the history of this country. I will yield at this time to anybody who will tell me when the Republicans ever put a trade barrier compared to the act to prohibit the exportation of tobacco seed from this country. I know you cannot show one such thing.

And to think you would have the effrontery to get up here and say the things you are saying today, with the history you have of erecting the worst trade barriers ever erected in the history of the country.

Today I wanted to confine my remarks to just trying to bust a few bubbles floating around here. I have a chart here that shows many things, among which was that when we had these reciprocal-trade treaties during these years we had the biggest agricultural imports we ever had in the history of this country. It shows another thing. It shows that today, with all the talk about what we are doing to the world, we are still importing more agricultural products than we are shipping out of the United States. To put it in less elegant language, we cannot give it away as fast as they are dumping it on to us. Does that mean anything? Are we going to sell out American agriculture so that somebody in Detroit can sell automobiles to somebody down in Timbuktu? That is the way it has worked out. If you like this program, I would like to see you try it south of the Mason and Dixon's line just once. Put it in operation down there. We do not like it. We do not want any more of it. So you help yourselves to it. When you do that, then I will believe that you mean what you say.

This chart shows that this last year we are importing more agricultural products than we are exporting. So you know and I know that what we are trying to do is give away the earnings of the American farmers so that you can sell a few industrial goods.

I really wished to talk to you today about five things that have happened. I do not want to get into a discussion about the wonders or lack of wonders of the reciprocal-trade program. I appeared before your committee and asked you to take the duty off altogether on feed grains in 1943 or 1944. You remember that winter of '43 and '44.

The duty was removed. I am not embarrassed, never having voted for the Smoot-Hawley tariff or against it, and I do not think the Smoot-Hawley tariff has much to do with anything we are discussing here today; nor do I really believe that the reciprocal treaty program does. The reason I say that is that many things have happened in the last 15 years. Let us stop and consider one, that is, state trading. What effect has state trading had on the economy of the United States? Two or three years ago what happened? The Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Wallace, sent a delegation

over to Russia. I am not just saying this here to you today, this is in a printed report before the Committee on Agriculture. In this report a man from the Department of Commerce made the statement the United States asked Russia to dump millions of dollars' worth of furs into this country; and today we have the fur farmers of America hanging on the economic ropes. If that is a part of the foreign policy of this administration, then I surely do not subscribe to it. That is point No. 1.

No. 2: The individual producer—I do not care whether he be a farmer or a worker in a factory—when he goes to bed tonight is in danger of having his business ruined by state trading. As good an example of that as I can give you is Mr. Perón. Mr. Perón has the opposite program in connection with his farmers; he buys the products as cheaply as he can and he sells them for whatever he wants to. Mr. Perón can ruin any farm producer in the United States any day he wishes to do so. Although our distinguished chairman does not want me to talk about the cheese business, I advise you that cheese is produced in my district. They are going to lower the duty again on Italian cheese. I do not know what they will pay for Italian cheese, but when Mr. Perón gets done with it he can put all these Italian cheese makers in the United States out of business whenever he wants to. We are talking of state trading. That is No. 1.

Then, to come back to No. 2, we have the United Nations and we have the FAO. I voted for the FAO; as a matter of fact, I voted for the United Nations. The reason I voted for the FAO was because to me the FAO was the instrument whereby we could funnel the surplus agricultural products of this world to the places of the world that need them and we would benefit out of this trading in the long run. I am not talking about the Tariff Commission in connection with this, but I am speaking of agriculture. That is an objective of the FAO. We must safeguard the United Nations and the work which they have done. But how many of you have been down before the Committee on Reciprocity as I have, time after time after time, a hopeless and futile thing? I like to feel when I go before a commission that there is somebody on the commission that has had experience in the field the commission is working in.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield for a question.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Does not the gentleman believe that the welfare of the farmer and the prosperity of the farmer depends upon the welfare of the workingman and the producers in the factories and the mills of the country? In other words, if there is unemployment in this country the farmer suffers more than the industrial worker. If we do not have a large export market then we will have in the industrial areas unemployment, and the farmer himself will be the worst sufferer. That is the way I look at the program anyhow.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The answer to that is that the gentleman may not live long enough to see agricultural exports equal to imports because ever since the twenties we have been on an importing basis. Way back in the twenties, before we ever had the Smoot-Hawley tariff, we were on an importing basis. Look here at the curves on this graph and see where it begins.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Anyone realizes, and I think the gentleman himself does, that the welfare of the people depends on a high level of employment, and without markets you are not going to get a high level of employment. That leads me right to the third point, that is the minimum wage. If we raise the minimum wage, I do not care whether it is to 75 cents or a dollar, or what figure we put it at, has anyone figured out what it will do to our employment; because if we are going to accept goods from the rest of the world that is not bound by any minimum wage, but goods which are made at as low a wage as the manufacturers can force the laborers to accept, how are we going to protect the American worker against that kind of product? How are we to protect American jobs?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I think one of the main factors of keeping the American workman employed, that is the industrial worker, is the fact that we will have plenty of manufactured goods to export. If we do not have an export market as an outlet for this surplus of goods that we produce, it will entail more unemployment than the fact of a little bit of imports coming in here. That is the theory.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The gentleman says a little bit of manufactured goods being imported. I go back to the old story, "Sell out the American farmer so somebody up in Detroit can sell a car to somebody in Timbuktu." That is the circle we are in.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I think the economic history in the last 15 years will show that the farmer has suffered the most whenever our exports were small. When our exports were large and in great amounts the farmer was better off because the worker in the mine, the mill, and the factory, in the cities and in the industrial plants, was employed and therefore able to pay for the farm products a good price. The farmer was more prosperous at that time because of the export business that American industry engaged in.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Of course, the answer to that one is we had 10,000,000 unemployed in 1940 and by 1940 our exports on agricultural products had dropped down to practically nothing, whereas our imports rose and at the time Henry was shooting the little pigs was the time we were bringing in the highest amount in quantity of agricultural products we ever did in the history of our country.

I wish I could spend a longer time on each one of these issues, because to me it is a serious matter. It is something which has to do with the lives of the great bulk of the average people in this country. I do not worry about these Golden Rule fellows, or that chap down in the State Department. I am not worrying about him. You know who I mean. He went over to Geneva last year and fixed up this deal.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Does the gentleman mean Mr. Clayton?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I think he will get along all right. I do not know what is going to happen to the cotton farmers in Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi when Mr. Clayton gets that $7,000,000 farm going out there in California because he can raise many bales of cotton on it.

Mr. REED of New York. He has been doing the same thing down in Mexico. He went down there to teach them how to raise cotton.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. He went down to Mexico, too, but I do not like to bring in personalities.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Did I hear the name of Will Clayton mentioned in the colloquy?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes, sir.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the gentleman knows he is a great American, he is a sound businessman.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. He must be.

Mr. McCORMACK. He is a very good American.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. He can keep the embargo on so far as cotton coming into the United States is concerned and can keep the American market for his own cotton. Yes, he must be quite a fellow. He seems to do pretty well for Mr. William Clayton. Then we have the price-support program.

We are in difficulty on this support program. In that connection I would like to correct the majority leader, too, if I had the time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is the gentleman opposed to the support program?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I am sorry the gentleman asked such a question. I regretted when President Truman killed it. I did not want him to kill that program.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a Democratic measure.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Oh, no.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman says it is somebody else's measure?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Now, be careful.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is not the gentleman's measure, is it?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Oh, no; I would have had a better one and I would not have had it killed like President Truman did.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sure the gentleman's measures are always better than anyone else's, but let me ask again, he is not opposed to a support program for agriculture?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. How can the gentleman ask such a question?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sure the gentleman is not.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I was not for the kind of deal that the Fair Deal administration tried to put over in the name of the Aiken bill either.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is now drawing a line of distinction. He is putting himself in the position where his farmers may think he is opposed to it and I do not want the gentleman to get into that position. I want to save my friend from himself. I have a very friendly feeling for the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I will try to save myself.

Now stop and analyze this support program. All major agricultural products that do not have an import embargo on them, like these southern products, or that do not have the protection of the Smoot-Hawley tariff have a world price and a duty that is less than our domestic support price. What are you going to do? Are we going to have an abnormal granary or a normal one? You better start telling the people right now if you think we are going to support prices all over the world. For example, I will show you this chart, as an example of what is happening to our wool. We are supporting the price of wool. Our good friend from Colorado did not say anything against that awhile ago. He kind of likes that protection that his farmers get, because it is in the Aiken bill. They get 42 cents. But we in the Midwest are not sitting so good at the present time. We are trying to iron it out. But, the gentleman has 42 cents on his wool.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I am sure the gentleman is aware that the wool growers of America can only produce 50 percent, or thereabouts, of the consumption of this Nation.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Can or do.

Mr. CARROLL. We do.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes, but we could if the New Deal had not run around and knocked all these sheep in the head. They killed the sheep off, because they were afraid of what you were going to do with them, and consequently you have not got as many sheep today as we had 50 years ago.

Mr. CARROLL. The gentleman's argument is that the Government destroyed the sheep and that is why we have not more wool.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mordecai Ezekiel went all over the country and said we should not raise sheep.

Mr. CARROLL. There was some testimony which came before the committee, some gentleman from Massachusetts, who was objecting to woolens coming into the country; that the tariff on them was too low.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That is right.

Mr. CARROLL. But, they said they were imposing a double penalty because the tariff on wool was too high. The gentleman knows that Australian wool comes in here in great amounts.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. A friend from Boston came down here, and he did not like the 42 cents that the Aiken bill gave the wool grower.

Mr. CARROLL. But the gentleman knows that the production of wool in this country is not sufficient to meet the demands of the consumers.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. It is not, but I say it could be.

Mr. CARROLL. At the present time it is not sufficient.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. No; because we import twice as much as we produce.

Mr. CARROLL. Therefore it is necessary to bring in other wood to keep pace with the demand.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. We will not have anything produced in this country pretty soon if you fellows stay in power.

Mr. CARROLL. Oh, the gentleman made that argument in November.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. But I did not do so badly. The people were pretty good to me. I told them the truth. I did not tell them falsehoods and bedtime stories. There are 600,000,000 pounds of wool imported and only 300,000,000 pounds produced in the United States and we have to support 900,000,000 pounds in this program from here on in.

We are going to be in one awful mess if we are going to support all the agricultural products in the world, because as I showed you on this chart, even at this hour we cannot give it away as fast as they are bringing it in here. For the fellow that has any respect for the United States Treasury, if we are going to keep the country anywhere near solvent, my position is that somebody has got to do something about those imports. Then we have the Marshall plan that I also voted for so I cannot blame anybody else that did, but we have to watch out in the Marshall plan that we do not subsidize the people, the farmers, the men in the factory, and subsidize their production, and then lower the duties here and bring other products into the United States. If I had the time, I could give you a very good example of just exactly that, where we have sent millions and millions of pounds and bushels of feed to a certain country, and they are sending their products into the United States and asking for a lower duty so that they can get more and more into the United States. When you take into consideration all those factors, I say first that those European countries should lower their own trade barriers between themselves, and then let us start, because you know how that is, if a chicken flies across the line over there and they want to shoot somebody about it, let them get their own house in order first; let them remove their own trade barriers, and my hope is that they are attempting to do it. Benelux, as I say, is an example, but before they ask us to give our markets to them, they have to first of all feel that their obligation is to get their own house in order.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I believe that a large majority of the people of this country favor the reciprocal-trade-agreements program as such, and believe that the President's authority to make concessions should be extended. The basic issue before this Congress is the precise form in which such continued authority should be granted. As the elected representatives of the people, bound by oath and solemn duty to watch over the welfare, we must scrutinize with great care any change requested in the terms of that granted authority, to be sure it does not plunge our constituents into a morass of difficulties far beyond any benefits it may bring to them.

The last Congress enacted a provision under which the President was, in effect, required to notify the United States Tariff Commission as to the commodities for which he intended to negotiate for reciprocal reduction of tariff and other trade barriers. Upon receipt of such notification the Tariff Commission was required to conduct hearings and to make an investigation to determine the point to which duties could be reduced without seriously injuring the domestic industry. Within 120 days after the notification the Commission was required to inform the President as to its findings.

The so-called peril points so established by the Commission were solely for the information of the President, and did not restrict him in any way in the granting of concessions. He was specifically permitted to disregard the peril points and to grant concessions below such points if he felt that the concessions to be gained from foreign countries, and other circumstances, made it advisable to do so. The only proviso was that he was required to report to Congress any concessions granted by him which were below the peril point recommended by the Tariff Commission, together with his reasons for doing so.

The President has now requested that this entire peril-point procedure be eliminated and the bill, H. R. 1211, now under consideration complies with this request. Before acceding to this request, it is highly proper for us to examine into the reasons for it. Congress has a great responsibility to the people of this country to make certain that any delegation of its powers over tariff matters is properly administered, and we cannot, without completely disregarding this responsibility, lightly issue to any President or any administrative body a blank check without at least inquiring into the question of what use is to be made of such blank check.

In negotiating trade agreements the President acts through the State Department and it may be safely assumed that the President's request emanated from, or at least meets the unqualified approval of, the State Department. It is thus highly pertinent to inquire into the State Department's official explanation of the reasons for the President's desire for elimination of the peril-point procedure.

This explanation was made by Mr. Willard L. Thorp, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, at the hearing conducted by the Ways and Means Committee of the House. Mr. Thorp

stated that such peril points would be set without regard to any national or international considerations, and would disregard benefits to be obtained by other countries, long-term needs of the economy for expanding markets, the necessity of obtaining the best possible use of domestic resources, possible strategic considerations, or the possible repercussions of our action upon the policies of other countries toward us.

He further stated that the peril-point procedure returns to the old protective theory that only the prosperity of an individual industry is affected by a tariff or a quota, and practically makes such narrow protectionism the sole criterion for determining the concessions which may be made by the United States in trade agreements.

In order that the basic explanation may become apparent, let us analyze Mr. Thorp's statement. In effect he says that the peril points established by the Tariff Commission do not take into consideration all of the factors which must be considered in making trade concessions. He then concludes that the establishment of these peril points practically makes the prosperity of individual industries the sole criterion for determining the concessions which may be made by the United States in trade agreements.

While it may be granted that in establishing peril points the Tariff Commission is primarily concerned with protection of domestic industries, Mr. Thorp's conclusion does not necessarily follow. If the President and through him the State Department, were bound by the peril points and could not grant concessions below such points when other considerations warranted such action, then Mr. Thorp's conclusion would be correct. However, that is not the situation. The State Department is not bound by such peril points and is specifically permitted to disregard them when other considerations, such as those mentioned by Mr. Thorp, indicate a need for such action.

There is no question in my mind that Mr. Thorp is correct in stating that benefits to be obtained by other countries, long-term needs of the economy for expanding markets, and so forth, are factors which must be taken into consideration in determining what concessions should be granted. However, I feel very strongly that protection of domestic industries is at least one other factor which should be considered. The peril-point procedure is designed solely to bring the needs of domestic industries to the attention of the President and to the State Department so that such needs may be weighed in the light of other considerations.

By demanding the elimination of the peril-point procedure, the State Department has in effect said, "We do not want to know the needs of individual domestic industries. We do not want to be told that if we grant a certain concession the effect will be to injure an individual domestic industry. We want to make our decisions without being influenced by any such considerations."

In other words, the State Department wants authority from this Congress to grant trade concessions without any regard to the effect which such trade concessions will have on domestic industry. It wants to close its eyes and ears to any information which would demonstrate the effect on domestic industry. This fact is further illustrated by the effort which has been made to rush this bill through this Congress. The present authority does not expire until June 30, 1949, and yet we are told that it is imperative that the extension be passed immediately. We are not given time to carefully consider the bill or to assemble the information which we should have before acting upon such an important measure, but are told that we must act now, merely because the State Department has demanded it.

Frankly, the only conclusion I can reach as to the reason for such pressure is that the State Department wants a complete free hand in connection with the pending trade negotiations to be held in Geneva in April. It wants to be able to grant concessions during the course of such negotiations without any regard for the effect on American industry.

Perhaps I am being unduly suspicious. However, anytime I am told that the department charged with the responsibility of making decisions which may affect the livelihood of countless thousands of American citizens, does not even want to receive the advice of a nonpartisan body, like the Tariff Commission, which was set up for the express purpose of compiling the pertinent facts and figures, I am suspicious, and it will take a lot to convince me that my suspicions are unfounded. We may be told that under the proposed bill the State Department will receive the advice of the Commission since section 5 instructs the President to seek such advice before concluding any agreement. This is quite true, but it does not explain why the State Department is unwilling to have the Commission make a real investigation and determine peril points. Unless the Commission conducts hearings and makes the investigations now required, it will not be in a position to advise the State Department fully as to the needs of domestic industries affected.

I can see no possible explanation for the State Department's demand, made through the President, other than that he wants blanket authority immediately to grant concessions in the Geneva negotiations in April without giving any consideration to the possible injury to domestic industries, and without having to explain to anyone the reasons for such concessions.

I feel that it is the responsibility of this Congress to make certain that adequate consideration is given to all factors, and that one of the most important of those factors is the effect on domestic industry. While I am completely sympathetic to the importance of encouraging the importation of foreign merchandise in order to improve the living standards abroad and to enhance the purchasing power of foreign countries, I do not feel that we should completely disregard the effect which such importations will have on domestic industries. Our first responsibility is to the people of this country and my responsibility is to the working men and women of my district, and we cannot ignore that responsibility.

At this point I will give you a concrete example of what gives me concern in the administration of the trade-agreements program. In my district are located a number of plants engaged in the manufacture of pottery and chinaware. They employ thousands of workers who depend upon this employment for a livelihood.

Before the last war imports of china and earthenware were very heavy, amounting to 35 to 40 percent of total consumption in the United States, in terms of number of pieces. During the war imports declined very sharply. Production in this country increased. Since 1946 imports began to increase. In that year imports of chinaware amounted to 198,000 dozen pieces, valued at $1,600,000 on the basis of foreign valuation. In 1948, through November, the quantity imported rose to 1,747,000 dozen pieces, or almost ten to one compared with 1946. Value of the imports went up to $6,202,000, representing an increase of nearly three to one.

In 1948 imports from Japan and Germany have shown the sharpest increase. In 1947 Japan sent us 205,000 dozen pieces of china, household, and tableware. In 1948, through November, this quantity had increased to 926,000 dozen. Germany sent us 118,000 dozen pieces in all of 1947 and 429,000 dozen in the first 11 months of 1948. In both instances the increase in value between the 2 years was even more striking. Together, Japan and Germany shipped us over $3,300,000 worth of chinaware in the first 11 months of 1948. In both cases the trend of imports was still distinctly upward.

If the pottery industry were a giant such as the automobile industry, imports of this magnitude could be contemplated with cool assurance that no threat was implied in them. However, our own production of household china has been estimated at only $10,000,000 for 1948. In other words, imports during the first 11 months of the year amounted to over 60 percent of the domestic production for the entire year.

Other branches of the pottery industry are also affected by a sharp rise in imports. Earthenware imports in 1948 amounted to more than $4,500,000, and imports of pottery artware amounted to approximately $3,500,000. Total pottery imports thus exceeded $14,000,000 in 1948.

Is there any wonder why we want to know where we are headed? The State Department minimizes such results of their action. They point to the escape clause as a remedy. This is a wholly unsatisfactory recourse.

It would be much sounder procedure to gain a better idea beforehand than to await damage that will be difficult to repair. The way to meet this situation is to have a competent agency make adequate investigation before action is taken.

What would we say if the Army or Navy proceeded on the theory that it is better to wait until we are defeated in battle before obtaining as full intelligence reports as possible? Certainly if

information is a proper guide to action in all other fields of human endeavor, this also applies to cutting the tariff, unless it is assumed that the welfare of industry and its employees is of no importance.

We have another example of how little the State Department is concerned with our industrial welfare, including the standard of living of our workers. This very day Czechoslovakia, which went under Russian control a year ago, enjoys the benefit of a trade agreement with us. During the first 11 months of 1948 we imported $475,000 of table and art glassware from Czechoslovakia.

This was more than we imported from any other country—nearly twice as much as we imported from Italy, Germany, and Japan combined. The entire glass industry of Czechoslovakia has been nationalized. By helping Czechoslovakia we give economic support to the countries behind the iron curtain, and we do this at the expense of employment in our own factories.

It is for these and similar reasons that I am not satisfied to rest the administration of the trade-agreements program wholly in the hands of the State Department. That Department has a legitimate and proper place in the program. We must look to it for all contacts and negotiations with foreign powers; but that does not mean that it should have a free hand to do as it pleases without guidance from the legislative branch in matters for which Congress is directly responsible to the people.

The most effective way of assuring this lies in lodging with the Tariff Commission the power to give authoritative guidance to the State Department on the basis of studies and investigations. With proper liaison between these two agencies, while maintaining the independence of the Commission, we could face with greater confidence the future course of the trade-agreements program.

The facts I have just given you in connection with the pottery industry are the facts about which the State Department wishes no information when negotiations are carried on next April at Geneva and thereafter until June 12, 1951. They are the facts which the Tariff Commission would consider in establishing peril points under the provision in the existing law, and the State Department has said that it does not want to know what those peril points are. I do not think the State Department or the President should be permitted to be without this information, or to ignore it when they have it. I think they should be required to consider the effect on American industry, along with other factors involved, and if they then decide to make concessions which may jeopardize the future of an American industry, the responsibility is on the President, and he should be required to explain the reasons to Congress.

We are entitled to know the facts. If an American industry is to be jeopardized in order to provide a market for foreign goods, or to provide a foreign market for the goods of other domestic industries, we are entitled to know the considerations which prompted the concessions which bring about such a result. We were elected for the purpose of representing the people who will be affected, and we are the ones who are going to have to explain the reasons why it was necessary to destroy the industries which have provided their livelihoods.

Why the State Department is unwilling to furnish us with the reasons I cannot understand. Perhaps they feel that in 4 years all will be forgotten and forgiven. It may be possible that people who are thrown out of their jobs as a result of concessions granted by the State Department next April, may have been able to get other jobs and be willing to forget and forgive 4 years from now, but I seriously doubt that they will have forgotten or forgiven 2 years from now when you and I are called to account.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, the pottery workers—those splendid craftsmen who produce chinaware—in the southern and eastern sections of my State of Ohio to whom the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON] adverted as being jobless because of the import of dishes from England—are employees of pottery manufacturers who have been operating highly profitable businesses during the past 14 years. These workingmen are my constituents. An overwhelming majority of them gave to the President of the United States and to me as candidate for Congressman at Large their votes last November, and I am serving this fine constituency and the people of this Nation with fidelity and zeal when I urge the passage of this bill. These workers were jobless and these potteries were closed back in 1932 following the enactment of the Smoot-Hawley prohibitive tariff which had stifled international trade and paralyzed our commerce.

Mr. Chairman, may I now explain briefly, just why the administration opposes the present legislation passed by the Eightieth Congress last June, and why it is considered imperative that the original Trade Agreements Act, in operation since 1934, should be restored in its entirety.

The Trade Agreements Act of 1934, fathered by this Nation's former great Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, one of this Nation's most farsighted and greatest statemen, is a tried and tested piece of legislation. It has been subjected to the anvil of public criticism for 14 years. It has been renewed in almost its original form four successive times. Only in 1945 was an important modification made in the original act and that was to provide a different base year upon which changes in tariff rates could be made. No significant procedural changes have been found necessary in all these years provided, and this is an important proviso, provided there is agreement on the basic purpose of the act.

Last year, and let no one misunderstand this, last year, there was no agreement on the basic purpose of the act. There was disagreement. Procedural changes were introduced, not for procedural reasons, but because the authors of the procedural changes were not in agreement with the basic underlying philosophy of the trade-agreements program. They sought through the introduction of procedural changes to alter and deflect the operation of the entire program—their protests to the contrary notwithstanding.

They did not attack the program and the act head on. They masterminded a flank attack under the guise of procedural amendments. These innocent appearing changes in procedure fooled a lot of people because they seemed so plausible and so innocuous. The only way the true significance of these changes could be quickly evaluated was to examine the records of the authors—records that indicated consistent and bitter opposition to the trade agreements program for fourteen long years.

The purpose of the Trade Agreements Act is to expand the international trade of both the United States and other countries. The act has been the cornerstone of our economic foreign policy. It is the legal authority for the trade-agreement program and is continuing evidence of the determination of the United States to contribute its full share to the reconstruction of a sound and growing world economy as the basis for permanent peace.

Mr. Chairman, a Republican majority, now a minority, did not further the expansion of international trade by introducing procedural restrictions into the basic law which is the keystone of our economic foreign policy. Mr. Chairman, you will agree that we did not strengthen the trade-agreements program by limiting the extension of the act to 1 year rather than the customary 3 years. On the contrary, last spring we weakened the trade-agreements program and we loaded the act with a lot of unnecessary restrictions—totally and absolutely unnecessary. These restrictions are today hampering the very people to whom we delegated the job of expanding our foreign trade and who are about to conduct negotiations with other countries looking to the reduction of trade barriers. It does not make sense.

Let us look at these new restrictions foisted upon our people last year by a protectionist minority and which we would like to eliminate and which we will eliminate by the passage of the pending bill.

The extension was only for 1 year compared with 3 years as was the case in the past. This makes foreign countries feel that we are vacillating, are not sure of the policy ourselves, and do not mean business.

It also makes other countries dubious about our efforts under the Economic Cooperation Act to get them to reduce their own tariff barriers against each other. The Economic Cooperation Act, section 115 (b) (3)—approved by both Republicans and Democrats in the Eightieth Congress—requires each ERP country, as a condition of obtaining aid from the United States, to conclude an agreement with the United States, under which it pledges its efforts toward cooperating with other participating countries in facilitating and stimulating an increasing interchange of goods and services among the participating countries and with other countries and cooperating to reduce barriers to trade

among themselves and with other countries.

The present trade agreement law, which we are preparing to change, permits the United States Tariff Commission to supply statistics and facts to the State Department and the other agencies which must make the decision on trade agreements, but it specifically forbids the Tariff Commission from giving advice. This is a serious defect because the Tariff Commission with its accumulated knowledge of tariff matters acquired since 1916 and with its bipartisan complexion—three Republicans and three Democratic Commissioners—is able to give very good advice. The Tariff Commission was a vital part of the entire interdepartmental machinery in the 14 years prior to June 1948.

Instead of advice, the Tariff Commission is directed to report to the President within 120 days on each item upon which the United States contemplates tariff negotiations. It is required to estimate in advance the exact point beyond which tariff cuts might cause or threaten injury to a domestic industry.

Because there is no scientific method of ascertaining such a hypothetical point which would hold true for 1 year, let alone 5 years, the Tariff Commission is forced to bend over backward in the direction of caution. No calculated risk can be taken. The effect, of course, is what the authors wanted, protectionist to the extreme.

The present law permits the President to go further than the Tariff Commission's so-called peril points, but if he does so he must give his reasons to Congress within 30 days. Let us not fool ourselves. This means as a practical matter that the limits set by the Tariff Commission are the controlling factors and the last say in tariff negotiations regardless of the viewpoints of other agencies.

The Tariff Commission cannot take account of the interests of our exporting industries in coming to its decision. The Commission cannot take account of the interests of consumers and the interests of industries using imported raw materials in coming to its decision. The Commission cannot even take into account the interests of the United States economy as a whole. No, the only factor to be taken into account by the Tariff Commission is the protection of domestic producers against threatened—not actual, but threatened—injury.

The so-called peril-point system is not only an impediment to the coming tariff negotiations but it is completely unnecessary. Every trade agreement negotiated by the United States in the last 6 years has contained an escape clause which specifically states that if after a tariff cut is made it results in abnormal imports that cause or threaten injury to domestic producers, the Tariff Commission shall investigate such cases, report to the President, and the President may withdraw the tariff concession without even having, in critical cases, to consult with or obtain the consent of the other parties to the agreement.

The advantage of this escape clause is that it can be utilized when injury is a fact or about to become a fact. It does not prevent concessions from being made, or an entire agreement from being made, because 10 years from now injury might be threatened by a rate which is cut today.

In all the 14 years of the operation of the trade agreements program the fear has been constantly expressed that modifications in the tariff would bring ruin to this industry and to that industry. No concrete evidence has been put forth to substantiate actual injury but much has been said about the future.

Mr. Chairman, we do not propose to formulate the basic economic foreign policy of this great country of ours upon a foundation of fear. We must and shall take a more positive, a more affirmative position. We shall be prudent like the pioneer who helped build this Nation, but we shall not strangle our future prosperity or the peace of the world because of a refusal to take a carefully calculated risk. We would not be able to look our children or our grandchildren in the eye let alone the people throughout the world who are struggling with poverty and the Circe call of a tyrannical collectivism that promises them the earth.

I hope the membership of this House, realizing the importance of this legislation, will vote affirmatively on the bill as reported from the Ways and Means Committee.

In the interest of a sound national economy and international peace, the State Department should be encouraged to engage in even more vigorous efforts to reduce trade barriers. International trade is not a one-way street.

The method of permitting the State Department to investigate, hear objections from domestic producers and negotiate reciprocal agreements is vastly superior to the politics-ridden, logrolling tariff making Congress has too often indulged in under the old order before 1934. The old system generally resulted in higher and higher barriers because favors were granted to one local interest after another as against the welfare of the Nation as a whole.

One of the greatest advances under the reciprocal policy was made in 1947 when the United States signed an agreement with 22 other nations covering tariff rates on 45,000 items. Then, last year a Republican Congress reversed the whole trend. It extended an emasculated act for only 1 year—to await further attention when the Republicans had taken over both White House and both branches of the Congress.

Under the Republican Smoot-Hawley Act, with the prohibitive tariff of early 1930, our international trade was destroyed. We built a wall around our country and other nations retaliated. Farmers became bankrupt. They could not make enough money to pay interest on their mortgages and to pay their taxes, and city workers were thrown out of employment by the millions. This largely because of the old protectionist doctrine that foreign goods should not be allowed to enter this country if they undersold a domestic producer—no matter whether American consumers benefited or whether foreign consumers were enabled to buy goods other American producers had to export. The old policy of special privilege to a favored few gave no weight to over-all national interest or to trade's effects on international peace.

We must not adhere to the old order. We must not turn back. We must go forward.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, a meeting of the contracting parties to the general agreement on tariffs and trade is scheduled for April 11 at Annency, France.

Therefore, we are being asked to rush through a bill which would extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act without proper safeguards.

To promote international trade and cooperation, the Congress is supposed to step aside and permit the State Department to have full freedom of action in this matter.

H. R. 1211 throws all precautions overboard and places the whole American economy at the mercy of the State Department.

I submit that such a blanket delegation of power without check is dangerous. It is a surrender by the Congress of its watchdog functions to an agency of the Government which is not primarily interested in domestic problems and is not prepared to cope with them.

I believe in the theory and the application of reciprocal trade, but not in a reckless fashion. We cannot achieve it overnight without losing our shirts. There is such a thing as being too generous, which leads to bankruptcy.

Why are so many nations concerned about developments within the United States? It is because they recognize us as the steadiest factor in a world economy. If we should falter, they will suffer. Remembering the high and rigid tariffs of another generation which were responsible for contraction of trade leading to global depression, they would have us go to the other extreme of free trade. But I contend that we can go too far and too fast in this direction. Great as our resources are, they are not limitless. If we go on giving and giving and giving we can exhaust ourselves and become absorbed by a world whose general level of economic activity is insufficient.

Reciprocal trade, to work, must be a two-way street. There is no use in helping others unless they will respond by making some effort to help themselves. And not as parasites sucking the lifeblood from our productivity.

There are other and undeveloped markets of the world where they can sell their goods without competing with our own manufacturers on our own home grounds.

We can help these nations with American technical know-how and with genuine loans, but not at the expense of our domestic market. There are raw materials and certain products which we need from them without inviting competition in those goods which we produce in abundance.

Duplication serves no purpose, even in the name of competition, unless both parties are somewhat evenly matched. That is the basis of our concern over

monopolies. An American industry, with all its financial strength, its managerial, technical and labor skills, cannot compete with foreign goods which are manufactured at slave wages without some tariff protection. The only other alternatives are:

First. A lowering of the American wage rate and standard of living, which is inconceivable; or

Second. An upward revision of wages paid in foreign industries, to put competition on a fair basis.

The latter is the crux of the whole problem, and I maintain that we should make tariff concessions only to those countries which raise the true wages of their industrial workers. Such tariffs should be graded downward to the extent to which such wages approximate those paid in a like industry in this country. In time, we might even work out a transport differential. Then competition would be truly free and fair.

The bill under our consideration ignores such necessities.

In order to comprehend the dangers in H. R. 1211, we must keep in mind the original Trade Agreements Act of 1934 and the present act, which was passed in June of 1948, to extend for 1 year the original act with amendments.

The Trade Agreements Act of 1934 was for the purpose of expanding foreign markets for the products of the United States as a means of assisting in the present emergency in restoring the American standard of living, in overcoming domestic unemployment and the present economic depression, in increasing the purchasing power of the American public, and in establishing and maintaining a better relationship among the various branches of American agriculture, industry, mining, and commerce.

Times have certainly changed since 1934.

We have no national economic depression and there is no surface evidence, at least, that agriculture, industry, mining, and commerce are feuding and fussing with one another.

Under the proposed bill, however, the President may enter into agreements solely for the purpose of expanding foreign markets, even though such agreements result in the practical destruction of existing domestic markets, with a consequent impairment of the American standard of living and a depletion of the purchasing power of the American public.

Existing legislation provides that the Tariff Commission shall determine the peril points beyond which tariff deductions will injure particular American industries and that, if the President disregards these peril points, he must explain to Congress the reasons for his action or inaction.

By inserting this provision, Congress recognized that officials who are preoccupied with our international relations are not the best judges of problems on the home front.

They have not demonstrated that the procedural requirements of the 1948 act are unworkable. In trying to remove present precautions, they indicate a fear of the facts. What other interpretation can be given to the rush tactics employed on this legislation, which is being steam rollered through as a top-priority bill? The present law does not prevent the President from acting in disregard of the findings of the Tariff Commission; it merely provides that when he does so, he must advise the Congress. The proponents of this new measure apparently believe that if the Congress is not given time to get at the facts, the negotiators of trade agreements will be given full and arbitrary power to do as they please. Their sole concern is to expand foreign markets at any cost—even at the sacrifice of some American industries.

Last year, Congress prudently limited the extension of the trade agreements to 1 year, knowing that economic conditions are not fixed and rigid. In the leveling-off period which we are entering, trying to find the balance between inflation and deflation, it is necessary that we give first consideration to the needs of American agriculture and industry. This requires a flexible rather than a dogmatic approach to economic problems. We cannot afford to jettison our textile plants and workers who clothe us for the sake of favored industries who might want to sell out American textiles so that they can fatten on foreign markets.

There are many who oppose the steadily increasing power of our Federal Government. But how about the further centralization of power within the National Government itself? I consider this to be the real danger. The Congress has already delegated too many of its responsibilities to executive agencies. Shall we continue this process to the point where we wash our hands of all responsibility to American industry and American workers? In my book the answer is "No."

I maintain that the United States Tariff Commission, a Government body of nonpartisan character as appointed by Congress, should be the chief agency for such fact finding in foreign trade negotiations. If you decide for the purpose of efficient administration to delegate the power to change trade treaties, such delegation should not be absolute. It must be given only to those whose public duty it is to constantly consider the effect of such proposals on the American industries involved. And they should report frequently to a watch-dog subcommittee of this House.

I represent a district which is the center of woolen and worsted manufacturing in the United States. In the 125,000 population area of greater Lawrence, Mass., over 12,000 people are out of work, and the situation is reminiscent of depression days. And English woolens and worsteds are on sale in Lawrence at prices lower than the same type of goods which are manufactured in the local mills.

This is coincident with the announcement that such goods have been lifted from the rationed list in England, which indicates that they have a sufficient supply for their own use and have a surplus to export.

Perhaps there are some consumers who would be willing to buy goods manufactured in a foreign sweatshop, because they can buy them cheaper, without giving a thought to the fact that they may be putting American textile manufacturers and textile workers out of business.

Again, there may be some American manufacturers and workers who may be short-sighted on this score. As long as they can do a little international log-rolling with foreign industries and through the medium of governments, they care not about those American industries such as textiles which are lost in the bargaining process.

A point falsely advanced to cover up such manipulations is that some American industries, chiefly those using metals, have no tariff protection. It is claimed that they do not fear imports in their line, even though they pay high wages for short hours. They assert that their productive skill will more than offset imports which are manufactured at low wages abroad.

The real point is, however, that foreign nations are not producing such goods in quantity and must import them from the United States. Incidentally, such types of metal goods as machinery will enable those foreign countries to become active competitors, with a definite low-wage advantage in the American domestic market.

It may sound like heresy to state this, but in the one field where we consider ourselves supreme—the automotive field—we note a beginning of a reverse trend. Thousands of lower-priced, smaller, and more-economical-to-operate English cars are being sold in this country.

Most of the raw material—wool—of the woolen worsted industry comes from outside the United States. The metal, or nonprotected industries like automobiles and typewriters, get nearly all of their main raw materials from within the United States.

These metal industries are strong supporters of no tariff or low tariff so that they can get dollar exchange in England where they sell their goods. Now this is fine for them, but at a reciprocal sacrifice of American woolens and worsteds which must then meet the unfair competition of English fabrics which are manufactured at one-third the labor costs of American goods. And there are many countries which pay lower wages to their textile workers—far lower even than those prevailing in England. Need I mention, for example, the alleged peace price by the Kremlin, the price of which will be a huge gift of machinery from the United States to set up a most formidable slave-wage competitor?

Russia, with modern American-made textile machinery and its slave labor, might sell woolens and worsteds in Detroit at a price with which our manufacturers of the same goods could not compete. The Detroit automobile worker might think he is getting a bargain. But how could he prosper, once this downward chain reaction begins? He would soon find himself out of work for the reason that displaced woolen-worsted workers of the United States, and those dependent on them, would be unable to buy the cars which he produces.

We cannot raise the world-level of prosperity by pulling our own level down.

The only way is to keep our standards high and to make tariff concessions only

to those nations which raise their living conditions and only to the degree in which they do so.

Let us export incentives to other countries, but not export the jobs of New England's woolen and worsted workers.

This textile industry, so vital to the American economy and to our national security, has been pushed back to the peril point by the overgenerous concessions of our reciprocal trade policy.

The supporters of H. R. 1211 point to the President's assurance than an escape clause will be incorporated in each trade agreement. I believe that this should be required by law to express the intent not only of the President but of Congress as well. I further believe that it should be so worded as to make it function immediately to protect any American industry which is threatened under a rate prescribed by a trade agreement. The escape clause heretofore used is inadequate. It must be so amended as to be mandatory, with provisions for its immediate and effective enforcement.

The Congress should maintain continuing interest in the manner in which supervision of tariff rates is used or abused. The Tariff Commission is an agency of the Congress, created to help us in our constitutional responsibility of regulating foreign commerce. But our first duty is to represent the people and the industries of our respective districts and to harmonize those interests with the needs of our Federal union.

Having given up to a request that certain of these functions be delegated to the executive branch of the Government, we should not abandon our responsibilities completely. We must insist on hearings and reports from the Tariff Commission, acting jointly with the Committee for Reciprocity Information. And we should require that the Executive report to us directly when he acts contrary to these tariff recommendations. This is our right and our duty.

Gentlemen, I beg you to make these reasonable amendments to H. R. 1211 before our great woolen and worsted industry, among others is bargained into a depression.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 40 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman the matter that brings me before the Congress, today, is not new. As a Member of the Seventy-ninth Congress in 1945, and as a rank tyro in legislative procedure I endeavored to establish certain safeguards under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for some of the major industries of my district and my native State of West Virginia.

Aside from the dubious honor of calling attention to the so-called escape clause in the Mexican agreement of 1945, I failed to obtain any relief. The manner in which this escape clause is being administered in existing reciprocal treaties leads me to wonder if I even won anything—even though the escape clause has been written into all agreements since 1945. I never like to criticize unless I offer constructive substitutes.

While the years subsequent to 1945 have added more gray to my fast-thinning hair, I sincerely hope they have also given me greater information and wisdom with which to plead the cause of these much harassed industries.

What, in the war year of 1945, was described by one of my opponents in debate as a mere skin irritation on our economy bids fair in these postwar years to break out into festering sores that will blight great sections of our industrial life, thereby causing unemployment, reduced purchasing power and destroy the economic well-being of thousands of America's skilled workmen.

Once more I crave your attention while I endeavor to depict not only what is happening to the woodworking, pottery, and hand-made glass industries of our Nation but what is sure to happen to these sorely pressed trades if H. R. 1211, now before you, is approved in its present form.

I am unofficially informed that the State of Oklahoma is greatly worried where State revenues derived from a production or severance tax on oil are dwindling and threaten to hamper governmental operations.

Mr. Chairman, it is clearly apparent to the Members that this protest is not just an isolated instance. Were it not for the apparent haste by which this pending legislation is being rushed through the Congress, I could place in the RECORD scores of instances to show where other of our basic industries are being and will be affected by this legislation.

In formulating a tariff policy, we have to contend with a problem peculiarly our own—the high standard of American life—which, expressed in terms of any money in comparison to an ounce of gold, shows we are willing to pay more for services and merchandise than any other country in the world.

Such a status is an invitation for the rest of the world to sell its goods, produced by means of cheaper labor, in our higher-priced markets, and of necessity, for the protection of our industry and our labor, we must adopt a tariff plan to cope with that situation.

I realize full well that I am treading on somewhat sacred ground—in that my party—the Democratic Party—is pledged to the theory of reciprocal trade agreements as a necessary function in expanding world trade. I, personally, made no such commitments. On the other hand, I stated clearly my determination to defend the interests of my State and district should the demand for continued reciprocal agreements be made in the Eighty-first Congress. I shall not again be misled into supporting any legislation so obviously injurious to my constituents.

One major fault, if I may make bold to suggest, in our tariff making policy is that import duties are based on foreign costs of production and not on American. On foreign standards of value, not our standards.

Our State and Commerce Departments and even our Tariff Commission compile their import data on the basis of import volume and not on a basis of import value. This policy supplies valuable information insofar as statistics go, but it affords no picture of the impact on our economy because it is not "spelled out" on a dollar and cents basis. To avoid these sudden fluctuations in foreign money standards and exchange rates would necessitate rewriting all of our tariff schedules—a huge task—but a task that some future Congress could well undertake.

Before speaking directly to the subject that brings me to the floor of the House I would like to browse around a bit and see how this panacea for all our economic ills is working in industries other than the pottery, woodworking, and hand-made categories. I was much impressed by testimony, given this past week before the House Committee on Education and Labor, of which I have the honor to be a member, by some of the South's outstanding textile producers who complained of competition from Mexico, Chile and Haiti where American capital was used during and since the war to build textile plants that are now exploiting the cheap labor of those nations and making and shipping into this country, under the favorable terms of existing reciprocal trade agreements, both finished and unfinished goods. In one instance men's shirts were being imported but without collars and cuffs. Those necessary appendages were put on after they were past our customs. A glance at paragraph 919 of the Hawley-Smoot Act of 1930 will explain the device used to take advantage of our adjusted rates to comply with the terms of a reciprocal agreement with that particular country.

The operators of the sponge industry in Florida are complaining of the mounting imports of sponges that are being reshipped under the Marshall plan to Germany and the United Kingdom for polishing hand-made china in the pottery plants.

Here is one that should interest my colleagues from Oklahoma and Texas who are just recovering from the solar plexus blow caused by the recent drop of approximately 75 cents per barrel in the price of crude oil. They can find the answer in recent Commerce Department reports on the importation of crude oil from Venezuela and Mexico. Already the impact of 600,000 barrels daily is being felt on the economy in the Red River Valley and on the Osage plains where domestic production is greatly curtailed and in some instances suspended.

Despite our Economic Cooperation Administration program, aimed primarily at rehabilitating war-ravaged western Europe, trade conditions remain unsettled. Already we have seen devaluation and repudiation of the value of money standards in these nations. In other nations, with which we have reciprocal relations, we see total disregard for their treaty obligations. In others, we see import quotas imposed that put American industry at a disadvantage. We cannot escape the observation that those charged directly with the administration of our Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act are lax in enforcement or totally disregard the rights

of American commerce through means of the escape clause in existing agreements.

Under our present tariff system there has grown up in this country mass production in many lines of industry. Whether this system is beneficial or not I am not discussing, but it must be apparent that under this system, with our present economic set-up, we will be impotent to provide necessary employment for all returned war veterans and other workers who will be out of employment when the cold-war emergency passes. Particularly will this be true if we sacrifice one American industry in an effort to give other nations buying power to enable them to purchase the exported products of some other American industry. My native State of West Virginia, now the leading glass-producing State in the Union and a large producer of pottery products and clothespins, protests being made the guinea pig for such an experiment.

The present trade agreements do not limit the amounts of any given article that can be imported, and in many cases we have observed that, due to this fact, we are uncertain regarding the quantity a foreign exporter of a given commodity will throw on our markets. Very often as little as 10 percent or less of an imported competitive article ruins the price structure of both the imported and the domestically produced equivalent article.

At present, under the terms of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1945 and as amended in 1948, we find deplorable conditions existing in the industries for which I plead. Lack of a backlog of orders or no orders at all has brought unemployment, forced lay-offs or resort to share the work plans. In view of this situation I question the wisdom of the Eighty-first Congress giving a free hand to either our State Department or even to the Tariff Commission any further authority to negotiate probable reductions in tariff rates on the clothespin, pottery or hand-made glassware, crude oil, textiles, shoes and many other industries of the Nation.

The situation, as it affects the glassware and pottery production, is further complicated by the actions of our military authorities in the occupied portions of Germany and Japan and by the Marshall plan administrators in England and Belgium, where millions in American tax dollars have been expended in rebuilding and rehabilitating pottery and glass plants from which the flow of imports threatens to close our American factories. Every effort on my part to get the details as to how many such plants have been rehabilitated and the cost of such work has been met by Army officials with the excuse—"Sorry we do not have the details." It occurs to me Congress might well be interested in knowing these details as a prerequisite to a safe and sane tariff policy.

I have information, the source of which I am not at liberty to disclose, to show that ECA has expended in England alone the sum of $1,250,000 in 1947 and 1948 for rehabilitation of pottery plants alone. Twelve million dollar program under way in Italy. How much of this is Marshall fund money?

Under the favored nations clause, these occupied territories are accorded the same reciprocal treatment as is accorded the other 21 nations party to the Geneva agreement in 1947, one of which nations is Czechoslovakia—behind the iron curtain—where good American dollars used in the purchase of glassware products are going to build up Soviet Russia's economy.

When I pleaded with you in 1945 conditions were bad in both the pottery and glass industry. Only because of the fact the rest of the world was gripped by war were they able to operate, producing ware for domestic consumption. Today their troubles are multiplied by the upward spiraling of foreign imports as other nations resume full production and must find a market in America for their surplus products.

CLOTHESPIN INDUSTRY

I desire to call the attention of the House to the subject of wooden spring clothespins. One of the largest plants making this product is located at Richwood, W. Va., and employs approximately 200 workmen, whose jobs are menaced by a form of competition they are unable to meet because of high production costs.

America is still geared to a wartime economy. Production costs per gross for these pins have mounted, on an average, from 31.4 cents in 1931 to 69.9 cents for bulk and 86.5 cents for packaged goods in 1948. Sweden and Denmark furnish most of the competition. They are responsible for 85 percent of all imports. Compared to our production costs the most recent estimate of production costs in Sweden show they are able to manufacture, pay the ocean freight, insurance, brokerage, and the 10 cents gross import duty and offer these pins for sale at New York for 59.3 cents per gross.

Swedish imports in 1935 were less than 100,000 gross. For the first 11 months in 1948 these imports were 909,865 gross worth $498,611 and are estimated to reach a total for the year of 1,140,000 gross. Figures obtained from our own Commerce Department show Sweden produced, in 1948, a total of 2,500,000 gross in excess of her normal domestic needs. She must find a foreign market for this surplus. One Swedish firm alone is prepared to offer 1,000,000 gross for sale. The price is 47½ cents per gross in lots of 10,000 gross or more.

It is estimated that the normal demand for spring clothespins in the United States is from 3,500,000 to 4,000,000 gross annually. Current average domestic production is at the rate of approximately 400,000 gross per month, or approximately 4,800,000 gross annually. For a variety of reasons current production is not up to capacity. Imports of 1,140,000 gross annually is more than 25 percent of domestic production. Domestic production capacity is more than adequate to supply the normal demand in the United States without importation of any foreign spring clothespins.

Because of high costs of manufacturing in the United States, there is little or no market for American spring clothespins in foreign countries, so that domestic producers are entirely dependent on the domestic market. Total exports during 1948 were less than one-half of 1 percent of domestic production.

In 1931, under the Hawley-Smoot Act, the import duty stood at 20 cents per gross. Today, under the 1945 Reciprocal Trade Act in conformity with the Geneva agreement of 1947, the duty has been reduced to 10 cents. Under the proposal now pending (H. R. 1211) it will be possible for a further reduction downward to 5 cents per gross.

Sweden is listed as one of the 13 nations for further reciprocal trade discussions at a conference to be held in Geneva in April of this year. She is asking for further concessions on clothespins, which if granted will apply to all other nations. If this is done, it will be at the expense of our American economy. I suggest that the Congress consider a restoration of the original 20 cents duty as provided in the original act, rather than permit further reduction of the present 10-cent rate of duty.

HAND-MADE GLASS INDUSTRY

I want to make clear to the Congress that I am not pleading the case of the American manufacturers of window glass and plate glass. It is common knowledge that the four large concerns in this country producing this type of glass have a virtual monopoly on their product through the means of cartel arrangements with Belgian producers which prohibit imports into this country.

United States manufacturers of hand-made glassware are fully cognizant of the necessity of stimulating foreign trade. They are not interested in creating tariff barriers just for the purpose of eliminating competition. All they are seeking is the equal opportunity of selling ware made by American workmen at American labor rates as is provided foreign manufacturers using foreign labor at low foreign wage rates.

In 1948 the hand-made glass table, ornamental, and stemware industry in the United States was estimated at $42,000,000. There are 78 companies which employ 35,000 workers. Most of these employees are highly skilled. They are wholly unfitted for work in other industries unless it would be using a pick and shovel.

Most of the plants making this type of ware are located principally in the States of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Ohio, New York, New Jersey, Oklahoma, and California, but there are a few plants scattered in other States. The majority of these glass plants are located in small communities and contribute very substantially to the economic life there. Only 10 of these plants are in or near cities of over 50,000 population, while the other 68 support smaller towns, of which 37 are the important industries in their communities of less than 10,000 people. Therefore, in the great majority of these plant locations the very existence of workers and their families, merchants, service business, and the entire area economy depends on the pay rolls and continued operation of these glass plants.

In order to avoid misunderstanding, I wish to state that the large variety of glassware referred to is produced by all known glass-manufacturing methods;

that is, first, entirely free hand; second, hand-blown or hand-pressed with the aid of molds; third, by semiautomatic blowing or pressing; and also by, fourth, full-automatic pressing or blowing. In hand plants the principal cost is in highly skilled labor while in automatic machine production expensive machinery and wages of skilled operators and mechanics represent the principal cost of production.

The hand-made glassware industry is in much greater danger from low-cost foreign imports. In spite of this, I have no thought of eliminating foreign competition. I only oppose tariff reductions on hand-made glassware, when the nature and extent of the proposed reduction will make it difficult for an American glass plant to operate with a reasonable profit and to maintain current high wages which our labor is entitled to and now receives. All this industry asks is the opportunity of selling its products in a fair competitive market in which foreign glassware will not have an advantage due solely to the cheap labor by which it is produced.

The Congress must realize the seriousness of the situation when I point to the fact that hand-made glass and artware is only 4 percent of the total domestic production which has a value of $904,000,000. On the other hand, since there are no imports of window glass and plate glass, all of the competition is against hand-made articles, where the imports of $5,556,000 are 13 percent plus of our total domestic production for 1947. Due to our Army and ECA activities this percentage is sure to rise and by the end of the year will reach the prewar level when imports were 23 percent of the domestic production.

It is all the more apparent why these industries need protection when you compare the imports of table and kitchen glassware in 1937 with the imports of 1947. The real story of their plight is found in comparing the imports of 1947 with the first 10 months of 1948 when imports from Sweden, United Kingdom, Belgium, Germany, Czechoslovakia, Italy, and Japan show an alarming upward spiral. A total of 70 percent of all imports of this type of glass comes from Czechoslovakia, the United Kingdom, and Sweden.

Since such a large volume of hand-made glassware could be shipped into this country so soon after the war and during the third year after hostilities ceased, we surely must expect considerably more in the near future, when more normal conditions will exist abroad. I can see no reason why we should share our own domestic markets with central European countries, when, because of our necessarily higher prices we would be prohibited from recapturing elsewhere in the world market this lost domestic-market volume.

The glass-producing countries abroad have always built and expanded their industry for export and not for home consumption. Here in America we have seen a steady growth of the whole glass-producing industry in step with our steadily growing domestic economy. While we have had a greatly increased export business during the recent war years, this can only be of a temporary nature. Particularly exports of hand-made glassware will soon shrink to insignificant low levels as soon as our very limited export markets can be loaded with cheaper products from European factories. Up until now, shipping facilities all over the world have been far from normal. However, steady improvements are being made and to the same extent to which they are made possible, our export volume is shrinking.

The war-torn countries of Europe as well as many other countries in this world which were isolated by the war, are in great need of all kinds of glassware. In some cases glass items are actually so scarce that an emergency exists. It is reasonable to conclude that in these places an abundant market exists for all foreign glass producers. Any increase in volume of their production, by all good reasoning, should go there, and not to the United States of America. It would be well if these countries would lower or even drop their import tariffs in order to attract glass imports.

For the same reason, it is not logical to divert the foreign trade in glassware from those who actually need it, toward our highly competitive markets in America by lowered tariffs and all kinds of special trade agreements. To help with every means at hand to expand the glass industry in Czechoslovakia, Sweden, and many other countries at the expense of our own prosperity is quite illogical to me. With importations at present high levels, foreign credit balances are enabling our competitors abroad to purchase glassmaking machinery and other glass plant equipment which they so urgently need. This in turn will surely make them more competitive than ever before, and only shorten our own chances of survival in an already highly endangered situation.

I cannot agree to a policy of selling out, nor relinquishing our chances to progress, to expand and contribute to the prosperity and future of America. Our State Department officials, who are soon to begin negotiating in Geneva, should most certainly be made aware of the fact that they are about to ruin the future of the handcraft industries in America, if they insist on further lowering tariff rates, and particularly do we desire to have them impressed with the fact that any reduction in tariff rates on hand-made glass items will shortly cause our industry to be face to face with oblivion.

We here in America with our high standard of living, high wages and favorable working conditions can not meet this "cut-throat" competition. Our hourly wage rate in the United States averages $1.42; the rate in Belgium is 31 cents; in France it is 33 cents; in Czechoslovakia, 30 cents; in occupied Germany it is 35 cents; in Japan it is 7 to 10 cents; in the United Kingdom it is 52 cents, and in Italy 34 cents.

So that I might give the Congress a true picture of what faces this particular industry, I have secured from my own personal representative in the area affected some startling facts. Here they are, taken from his communication to me:

You asked me about the condition of the number of plants in your district. It follows:

West Virginia Glass Specialty Co., Weston, W. Va.: Running full but very little backlog and scraping the barrel for new business.

Louie Glass Co., Weston, W. Va.: Opened last Monday, having been closed for 3 weeks because of no backlog or new orders.

Weston Glass Co., Weston, W. Va. Closed.

Lewis County Glass Co., Jane Lew, W. Va.: Opened last Monday after 2 weeks' lay-off because of no orders, and they report no backlog.

C. A. Borchert Glass Co., Weston, W. Va.: Running part time for lack of orders.

Colonial Glass Co., Weston, W. Va.: Running part time.

Mountaineer Glass Co., Weston, W. Va.: Running part time.

Ludwik Glass Co., Glenville, W. Va.: Opened last Monday after a 3-week shut-down because of no orders.

McBride Glass Co., Salem, W. Va.: Closed, no orders.

Mid-Atlantic Glass Co., Ellenboro, W. Va.: Closed, no orders.

Pennsboro Glass Co., Pennsboro, W. Va.: Running slow, part time. No orders.

Reports for other localities in West Virginia and Ohio are that business is very poor. Huntington Glass Co., at Kenova, W. Va., is closed.

On Tuesday of last week I contacted the chief of the United States Employment Service who has offices in the city of Clarksburg. He advised that his unemployed rolls are mounting. More than 2,000 men have been added in the past 30 days. These figures do not include the city of Weston, where hundreds more are idle. In one small town of 2,500 population, where a plant recently closed, 225 men have applied for work.

These startling facts force one to wonder whether now or in future years our Congress would be justified in legalizing reciprocal trade relations with nations in which the living standards, hours and wages and working conditions are so much at variance with the standards we have set up in America.

There now exist four active trade agreements in which the tariff rates on hand-made glassware have been reduced. They are the trade agreement with Sweden, made on August 5, 1935, in which the tariff on glass having a value of $4 or more in the country of origin was cut from 60 to 30 percent; the United Kingdom trade agreement, effective January 1, 1939, in which table and ornamental glassware, cut or engraved, having a value of $1 or more in country of origin, was cut from 60 ad valorem to 45 percent; the Mexican trade agreement, effective January 30, 1943, in which the tariff rate was cut from 60 to 30 percent; and the Geneva agreement of September 1947, which authorized the several reciprocal rates now in effect.

We now face the strong possibility that the glassware industry will suffer even more in the proposed Geneva Conference which is to convene in April of this year. Several of the 13 nations who will attend this conference are asking for further concessions which, if granted, will apply not only to the 13 nations attending the proposed conference, but under the "favored nations clause" the

same reduction would automatically apply to the 21 nations that participated in the original Geneva agreement of 1947. This would include all of the major nations now importing hand-made glass, table, and ornamental ware into the United States.

When I appeared before the House as a Member of the Seventy-ninth Congress in 1945, pleading the cause of the hand-glass industry, you were kind enough to protect this industry to the extent that all future reciprocal negotiations affecting imports of hand-made glass from Czechoslovakia were to be predicated on the import duty schedules as contained in the original Hawley-Smoot Act of 1930 and not on the schedules as they appeared in the several Reciprocal Trade Agreements Acts between 1930 and 1945. I sincerely hope that this Congress, in justice to this much harassed industry, will write similar safeguards against the importation of hand-made glassware and decorated-ware articles, not only from Czechoslovakia but from any other nation importing this type of ware that is a participant in any reciprocal agreement. An import quota on a percentage basis is indicated.

POTTERY, TABLEWARE, AND CHINA

Pottery, table, and kitchen articles, used in preparing, serving, and storing food and drink, fall roughly into two groups: Opaque pottery known as earthenware, and translucent pottery known as chinaware. Chinaware is of two types, hotel china and household china. Before the war practically the entire hotel china market in this country was supplied by domestic production, but nearly all the household china was imported. The bulk of the household earthenware consumed in the United States was produced here. Although earthenware imports were substantial, the greater volume of competition with domestic earthenware came from imported chinaware, especially the cheap chinaware imported from Japan. In the 1920's, taking all types and grades together, imports came chiefly from Germany and other central European countries; in the 1930's chiefly from Japan. In both decades, the United Kingdom was the principal source of imports of the expensive grades of household china and earthenware.

Pottery production is technically more efficient—that is, owing to the use of improved mechanical equipment, fewer over-all man-hours are required per unit produced—in the United States than in any other country, although in all countries such efficiency has increased in recent years. So far as costs are concerned, however, the greater efficiency in the United States has continued to be more than offset by the lower wages in the pottery industries in foreign countries.

In 1930 domestic production of household chinaware, porcelain, table, and kitchenware was 160,000 dozen. The estimated 1948 production, based on the first 11 months is 880,000 dozen and for the same year, 1948, estimated imports are 1,768,000 dozen. The domestic production for 1948 has a total value of $9,800,000, while the foreign value of all imports is $6,245,000, which when measured on the American standard of money value would be approximately $12,500,000. Here we face the shocking fact that the value of the imports, measured in American dollars, exceeds the value of all domestic production.

I am particularly alarmed, and this Congress should be alarmed, by the mounting imports of pottery and chinaware products from both Germany and Japan. The Congress will recall my earlier reference to the activities of the Army in rehabilitating and rebuilding Germany and Japan's pottery plants. This action accounts in a large measure for the sudden tripling and quadrupling of imports in recent months. In 1947 Germany imported 118,468 dozen pieces, worth $370,967. For the first 11 months of 1948 Germany imported 437,888 dozen, worth $1,593,708. In 1947 Japan imported 240,994 dozen, worth $414,303 and in the first 11 months of 1948 her imports had skyrocketed to 915,054 dozen, worth $1,755,836. As proof of the statement that most of this dangerous competition is coming from the occupied areas of Germany and Japan, let me call attention to the importations from the United Kingdom which were 182,516 dozen in 1947 and 221,000 dozen for 1948.

Total importations of china dinnerware in 1946 amounted to 203,000 dozen pieces, valued at approximately $1,600,000. In 1947 total imports amounted to 592,000 dozen pieces, valued at $3,200,000. This is up over 100 percent.

In earthenware tableware 1946 imports amounted to 930,000 dozen pieces, valued at $3,000,000; and in 1947 1,175,000 dozen pieces, valued at $4,300,000.

To show the rate of increase during the past year, we find that in the month of October 1947 total imports of china dinnerware amounted to 70,000 dozen and in October 1948 they amounted to 200,000 dozen pieces.

Regarding imports from Japan in comparative periods, we find that during the year 1946 Japan exported to us 67 dozen of decorated china dinnerware. In 1947 she exported to us 214,000 dozen of the same item. In the month of October 1947 Japan exported to us no decorated household earthenware, but in October of 1948 the figure amounted to 26,000 dozen.

Germany's exports to us of china tableware in 1946 were 241 dozen. In 1947 the figure was 131,000 dozen.

In 1937, before there were any restrictions on trade with Japan, she was importing into this country 86 percent of all the dinnerware of all kinds that came to us from all foreign countries. This amounted to close to 40 percent of all the dinnerware that was sold in this country, both domestic and foreign. The prices on the Japanese competing products in our industry were, in many cases, at that time less than one-half of the factory cost for producing comparable articles in American factories. This, you will note, was under the tariff rate of the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill of 1930 and before any reductions were made under the reciprocal trading program. The rates that were then in effect have been substantially decreased on certain types of both china and earthenware dinnerware in our trading treaties with Great Britain, Mexico, and Czechoslovakia and under the favored-nations clause Japan would be accorded the same consideration as all countries who were parties to the 1947 Geneva Conference. What future has this industry if Japan is given further advantage under the favored nations clause at Geneva?

I have in my files numerous telegrams and letters from both industry and labor protesting any action that will further endanger their livelihood, and of the estimated 20,000 workers in the pottery industry, based on statistics for 1948, more than 1,000 of these workmen are employed in one of the largest plants located in my home city of Clarksburg.

I submit that when the percentages of imports in any one industry from any one country vary from 300 percent to 400 percent in a space of 2 years, no domestic industry can meet such competition. The protection afforded this industry in the original Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act of 1930—an ad valorem duty of 60 percent—is meager enough and I suggest that this Congress take steps to stabilize rather than to confuse the economic future of these 20,000 workmen. Again an import quota is indicated.

I feel I would be remiss in my duty if I failed to call to the attention of the Congress the growing practice of industrial concerns in this country setting up similar plants abroad for the purpose of getting advantage of lower wage rates and less working restrictions. Many of the finished products of these foreign-owned plants are being imported into the United States and sold in competition with similar American goods and at a lower price. Reciprocal relations on such products should be forbidden regardless of the nation of origin.

In face of the unwarranted action of our War Department in diverting large amounts of its regularly appropriated funds for administration and national defense to the building and rehabilitating of foreign industrial plants, this Congress cannot avoid taking cognizance of the effect on American industries making articles on the reciprocal lists. Neither can the Congress afford to recommend legislation that will legalize trading with the enemy in this cold war between our economy and that of the nations that only last week were collaborating in an effort to destroy our Marshall-plan efforts in western and central Europe.

The avowed course of our Department of State at the approaching Geneva Conference will certainly and only result in the immediate displacement and ultimate unemployment of tens of thousands of America's most highly skilled artisans and craftsmen. Glass, china, kitchenware, clothespins, pottery are but a few of the product classifications slated for possible tariff-rate reductions in Geneva. Truly the matter we here discuss today is a far-reaching and most important one.

The industries I desire to protect are helpless. They have failed to secure State Department assurances that they would not be harmed in the coming

Geneva negotiations. I am hopeful that your interest, courtesy, and attention today is evidence of our intention to try to help them. Their very future is in your care. They ask only justice, not charity. I fear that easier and "cheaper" access to our markets can mean only economic ruin to industry and insecurity to the thousands of workmen that will be affected.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman is in favor of the reciprocal-trade-agreements program, as I understand it. It is my understanding that he is up here to get a little special protection for the pottery interests and the chinaware interests in his territory. The matter of the employees is incidental. Generally the country is not of sufficient importance to the gentleman that he is able to go along with a program as envisaged by his party and as presented by the President of the United States.

Mr. BAILEY. I have not stated I was for the program. I did vote for the previous reciprocal trade treaties program.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman in the hearings stated he was for the program generally but insofar as his particular area was concerned he wants something special. I therefore placed him in the category of the special pleader for that reason.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to say also at this time that the first escape clause written in any agreement prior to 1945 was written in a half-hearted manner in the Mexican agreement, the last one drawn prior to the action taken by this Congress in 1945.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED].

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, in connection with the consideration of this bill, I desire to call attention to the fact that the importation of foreign oil is becoming a matter of serious concern to Oklahoma and the oil industry. I am advised that foreign oil imports have increased 150 percent in the last year and that this oil is coming in at the rate of 600,000 barrels daily at the present time.

I also am advised that the surface storage of oil has increased 106,000,000 barrels during the last year and has now reached a point where additional storage is not available.

As a result of this situation, the Oklahoma Corporation Commission, in an order issued in January, curtailed the production of oil in Oklahoma by 40,000 barrels daily. Further curtailment will be necessary if the present rate of foreign importations is continued.

This not only works a hardship upon the oil industry but is beginning to threaten a large portion of the tax structure of the State of Oklahoma. For instance, on the basis of the present price of oil, the January curtailment order caused a loss of about $5,000 a day in Oklahoma tax revenues from its oil production.

Supporting this statement, I have a resolution passed unanimously by the Oklahoma Legislature, which is now in session, and dated January 31. I also have a copy of a resolution passed by the Oklahoma Corporation Commission on January 26 setting out the same facts.

I think it important these facts not only be called to the attention of the department controlling oil imports, but that Congress ought to take them into consideration with a view of limiting such imports to a point where they do not upset or harm one of America's most vital and important industries, and one without which we cannot have national defense.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I have been waiting since noontime to get in my 2 cents' worth, so I would like to make a few remarks at this time.

I am one of that group that was referred to several times today as "in favor of this bill but," and it has been insinuated that those members represent special interest. If you call representing the people with whom you were born and raised representing special interests, I do represent them. It is my duty and my responsibility as their Congressman to present their views regardless of party affiliation or the walk of life they may represent.

In the Second Congressional District of West Virginia which I represent are located several of the finest hand-made glass industries to be found in the United States. I, as well as many of my constituents believe that the present reciprocal trade bill will seriously impair and endanger their means of livelihood unless their situation is taken into consideration. Not for a moment would I oppose the assumption of world economic leadership by the United States; economic isolationism is dead, and intelligent assistance to our less fortunate sister democracies is in line with our own self-interest. Wisely administered foreign cooperation carries with it a commitment to purchase reasonable quantities of foreign merchandise. Trade is a two-way street and we cannot expect continuously to sell goods and to lend capital abroad unless we are prepared some day to accept payment in the form of people and services.

In my mind and my view that much is elementary economics and plain common sense.

Fear alone is not adequate justification for remedial action. When we fail to recognize those rights and to protect them we might as well say we are behind an iron curtain of our own as far as the rights of the people are concerned; and I am speaking primarily of Czechoslovakia. Continued trade with Czechoslovakia which is located behind the iron curtain now, as we call it, and that primarily is one of the factors that is endangering the hand-made glass industry in my district. With men and women now only on 60 percent of their time I think something should be done. At least I think the treaty with Czechoslovakia should be canceled.

Looked at from such an over-all point of view the problem seems simple. From such a distance imports are a vague concept and no difficulties appear.

But the problem becomes more complicated when we get closer to it. This is a big country which we live in and the interests of one section are quite different from the interests of other sections. Some of our industries are healthy and prosperous and quite able to take care of themselves in world markets without fear of, or favor from, Government. Others are less favorably situated and every so often find themselves imperiled by well-intentioned, but dangerous, acts on the part of Government officials.

Some of us, like myself, who happen to come from districts in which numbers of producers are not able to withstand unrestricted foreign competition find it more difficult than some of our colleagues who represent districts in which there is no such threat from competitive imports.

It so happens that in my district, in West Virginia, a leading industry is the making of hand-blown glassware, tableware and artware. In terms of the economy of the country as a whole this is a small and relatively high-cost, industry. To my constituents, however, its survival and prosperity means their daily existence.

Many years ago the skill of glass blowing was brought to this country from Bohemia. The skill has survived down to this day, notwithstanding severe and growing competition. The lower-priced products find it difficult to compete against the domestically machine-made glassware. The more expensive, decorated ware competes with imports from Sweden and Czechoslovakia.

The Department of State has included the high-priced ware for bargaining with Sweden next April. Such glassware is valued at $8 each abroad and is now dutiable at 30 percent. This is the glassware that retails for $25 or so per piece and represents only a small part of the total output. If it were all that we had to worry about I would not feel as alarmed as I do today.

What troubles me most is the action that has already been taken—at Geneva in 1947—when our delegates signed the so-called general agreement on tariffs and trade. For there the rate was reduced from 60 percent ad valorem to 50 cents per piece with a proviso that the rate is to be not less than 30 percent or more than 50 percent. At present prices the new rate is equal to about 35 percent.

American labor is high-priced labor. For that let us be thankful since it means that, by and large, we are more productive than other lands. It means that we get more real income for our work. I would not advocate that we do anything that would lower the wages of our glass-workers, who receive $1.42 per hour compared to those in Czechoslovakia, who receive about 20 cents per hour. In part, at least, the prevailing high wage rates in the United States are accounted for by large-scale production to satisfy large-scale markets, here and abroad.

We should not be dealing at all with any country that is dominated by Russia, inasmuch as they are not cooperating

with us and the money does not go to their working people but to build up the Russian military machine, which is certainly poor policy at the expense of our own people.

But what troubles the workers in my district is whether adequate care is being taken by the administration to make sure that in the cutting of tariff duties they will not be sacrificed unwittingly. The industries in my district have already experienced serious damage from the importation of Czechoslovakian glassware. They are now operating at about 60 percent of capacity. In my opinion this is due to the fact that the duty was cut on this product in Geneva in 1947.

Fear alone is not adequate justification for remedial action. When we fail to recognize those rights and to protect them we might as well say we are behind an iron curtain of our own as far as the rights of the people are concerned.

The national interest, of course, is all-important. But, gentlemen, we are still a democracy, and minorities, thank God, still have rights.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, due to an error, the supplemental statement of Mr. James G. Shennan, president of the Elgin National Watch Co., did not get printed in the committee hearings. For that reason, I would like to extend it into the RECORD at this point.

SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN JEWELED WATCH MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY ON THE BILL (H. R. 1211) TO EXTEND THE TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

This statement supplements the testimony of Mr. James G. Shennan, president of the Elgin National Watch Co., on behalf of the American manufacturers of jeweled watches—Elgin National Watch Co., Hamilton Watch Co., and the trustees of Waltham Watch Company—before the Ways and Means Committee of the United States House of Representatives on January 31, 1949, during the hearings on H. R. 1211 to extend the Trade Agreements Act.

The statement is filed to supply certain information not available to the witness at the time the testimony was given (transcript, p. 1083), and to correct certain inaccuracies in the brief filed, and the testimony given by the witnesses who appeared on behalf of the American Watch Assemblers' Association.

Mr. Shennan was asked to supply information as to the profits of the Elgin and Hamilton companies. The witness supplied the information for his own company, but did not have the comparable information for the Hamilton Co. The information is now available for both of these companies and the Waltham Co., combined, and is as follows:

Year	Combined sales	Combined net profit	Percent of sales
1940	$25,857,000	$2,734,000	10.57
1941	33,413,000	3,060,000	9.16
1946	39,902,000	1,950,000	4.89
1947	49,131,000	1,830,000	3.72

Mr. Shennan was also asked (transcript, pp. 1069–90) if the representatives of the United States at the forthcoming trade agreement negotiations in Geneva, Switzerland, next April could not "open up this matter of proper protection (tariff), including the inclusion of an escape clause for the watch agreement." In addition to the answer given by the witness at the hearing, it is desired to point out that Switzerland has not, as yet, become a party to the general agreement on tariffs and trade, and is not to be a party to the negotiations in April. Therefore, the Swiss trade agreement, and watches, will not be under review at that time.

The memorandum filed with the committee by the American Watch Assemblers' Association bases most of its argument on the assumption that the American jeweled watch manufacturers desire a quota. Actually, as stated to the committee by Mr. Shennan, the American manufacturers do not desire a quota, they desire only tariff rates which will afford them equality at the border. If this was granted to them, there would be absolutely no difference in the related economic activity which flows from the sale of watches in this country. All of that business, which the importers claim to create, would continue to remain here since the American-made movements require the same labor, the same material, the same services, as imported movements, to complete their manufacture and distribution. The real difference, and the one which is vital to the national defense, is that more facilities for the manufacture of movements, and more people trained in the skills required to make them, would be created and available in the event of another emergency; and it is timepiece movement manufacturing capacity which is essential to the national defense. Even the representatives of the assemblers' association who testified at the hearings conceded that neither they, nor any other industry in this country, could manufacture watches, and by watches they meant time measuring mechanisms.

In this connection it is significant to note that the representative of the Bulova Watch Co., who testified on behalf of the importers, stated that it took from 8 to 10 years before Bulova was able to get its plant at Woodside, Long Island, into production (transcript, p. 1344), and that it took 20 years to get it on a paying basis (transcript, p. 1346). He also stated that producing a watch is far different from producing other things (transcript, p. 1346). The other witness who testified on behalf of the importers stated that it was the intention of his company to manufacture movements in this country, and that they began setting up a pilot plant at Long Island a year ago which is ultimately to be moved to Cincinnati, where they now case their imported movements. But here again the difficulty of getting into movement manufacture is demonstrated by the fact that he also stated that they had not "as yet," after a year's time, made any movements in this country, not even in a pilot-plant operation, let alone on a production basis. This time element is the thing that is so vital to our national defense, and is the thing which gives us on whom the defense agencies are relying in the event of another war so much concern.

The spokesmen for the importers tried to minimize the significance of movement manufacturing in this country by asserting that the importers had also done a considerable amount of defense work during the last war. But in addition to conceding that they made no time measuring movements, only one item was specifically mentioned and that was "an electrical indication measuring instrument" (transcript, p. 1440). It was stated that instruments for ships, planes, and tanks were made by the importers but, aside from the above, no specification of them was given. A further statement was made to the effect that there was an adequate labor pool for defense work in the "watchmakers" being graduated from the various trade schools which could be readily converted to watch-movement manufacture. This completely ignores the fact that the manufacturing facilities are not available even if the statement were correct, and the statement itself is not correct. The training given to students in the watchmaking schools is to prepare them for the work done in the jewelry stores which maintain watch-repair departments. There is no training given in this country to prepare men in watch engineering, watch designing, watch machine building, watch tool and die making, watch manufacturing supervision, which are the critical skills.

The importance of American movement manufacturing facilities was also questioned by indicating that the American manufacturers of movements were all, to some extent, dependent on Swiss parts. With the single exception of jewel bearings the statement is simply not correct, and it should be remembered, jewel bearings were made by this industry during the last war. It is, therefore, not correct to say that the American manufacturers are in any sense dependent on the Swiss.

There was a sharp conflict with respect to the differential in the cost of making movements here, and importing Swiss-made movements. The committee was fortunate to have before it a representative of the Bulova Watch Co. who, although appearing on behalf of the assembler's association, is the treasurer of the one importer who also manufactures movements in this country. However, this witness would not indicate, even on a percentage basis, the difference in movement manufacturing costs between their American and Swiss plants and, as a matter of fact, claimed not to know, although he indicated, from a document on Swiss labor rates to which he made reference, that the top figure in Switzerland was about 60 cents an hour (transcript, p. 1343). If this is true, it more than supports the American industry's statement that the labor rate difference is about 2½ to 1. Nor was the testimony of the other witness for the importer much more specific on either of these points. Not having yet manufactured any movements in this country he was unable to say what his American costs would be, and on labor rates he indicated a 50–60 cents an hour differential (transcript, p. 1443). The schedule of wage rates in the Swiss watch industry is a matter of published information, and is available to anyone. This same witness readily conceded the importance of American movement manufacturing companies to the national defense (transcript, p. 1440). We call attention to this testimony to high light the necessity of determining the actual facts, particularly in view of the national defense importance of the American manufacturers, which is the reason we feel that this committee itself, through a subcommittee, should study the situation. We stand ready to submit audited production cost figures in confidence to such a subcommittee, as well as our labor rates.

In this connection, however, we wish to definitely clarify the assertion that Elgin's costs cannot be as high as was indicated by witnesses for the American manufacturers, because it sells watches at as low a price as $12 net (transcript, p. 1442). The reference was to a watch which retails at $29.75 and which the Elgin company actually sells for $15. It is a 15-jewel watch, whereas the testimony being commented upon related to 17 jewel, higher quality watches. Elgin has only two models at this price, one man's and one lady's, and is selling them at a low margin of profit in order to stay in the low-price category. This is the lowest-priced watch in the Elgin line.

One further comment on the testimony on behalf of the importers would appear to be in order. They blame the present financial difficulties of the Waltham Watch Co. entirely on bad past management. This has been the stock answer of the importers to the fact that there are so few remaining movement manufacturers in this country, and has been asserted time and again before this committee. Obviously, no one reason is the whole answer. Nevertheless, it is apparent to those of us who have actually

faced the importer's competitive advantage resulting from lower costs, that this factor is an important reason for the Waltham situation. Some one American company is always going to be the marginal producer, and the status of the industry now is such, from the national-defense considerations, that we cannot afford to lose the facilities of a single manufacturer.

May we reiterate that the American manufacturers of jeweled-watch movements are not suggesting any quota restrictions? We feel confident that with an equalization of cost factors this industry can successfully compete with the importers, which means that it can grow in an expanding economy. It is essential to the national defense that it do this, because it is presently not of sufficient size to meet the minimum requirements of a full-scale emergency. In view of its importance to the national defense, its present size and the competitive situation, and in view of the failure of the industry's efforts over the last 5 years to obtain relief from the agencies administering the trade-agreements program, it seems to us that the situation must be given study on the national policy level, and that this committee of the Congress is the only agency of the Government that is in a position to carefully investigate all phases of the problem.

This is not simply a matter of whether one or two or more business concerns in this country shall remain commercially vigorous. It is that consideration, plus the building of a highly essential defense facility. This is the aspect of the problem which we emphasized in the statement we made at the hearings. It is the aspect of the problem which we feel not only justifies, but necessitates, an investigation of the matter by a congressional committee. It is the reason why we have suggested a special subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee to give it attention.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of:

ELGIN NATIONAL WATCH CO.,
HAMILTON WATCH CO.,
WALTHAM WATCH CO.,
By JAMES G. SHENNAN,
President Elgin National Watch Co.

FEBRUARY 3, 1949.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, there appear to be no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1949."

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WALTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1211) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

MANUFACTURE OF COTTON TEXTILES IN SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, South Carolina, my State, has long since been recognized as the leader of the Nation in the manufacture of cotton textiles. I call your attention to the following newspaper article appearing in the Greenville News on February 7, 1949, from which you will observe South Carolina is also the leader in the consumption and manufacture of other fibers in the textile industry.

In South Carolina we manufacture every kind of textiles—from the most delicate and beautiful patterns of fine dress goods used to make women's garments to heavy woolen materials used for the manufacture of men's suits as well as duck and tarpaulin of unparalleled strength and durability. Time will not permit me to enumerate the thousands of types of textiles we manufacture.

STATE'S SPINDLES TOP NATION IN CONSUMING OTHER FIBERS—DOMINANT POSITION AS COTTON TEXTILE STATE INCREASED

COLUMBIA, February 6.—South Carolina is the Nation's leader in the consumption of fibers other than cotton on cotton-system spindles, Director H. W. Bishop, of the State research, planning, and development board, revealed today.

"The fact that the State's cotton-system spindles and its textile employees have sufficient versatility to produce other yarns is a highly important factor in diversifying textiles," he noted, and added:

"Management has been able to modernize and improve equipment in order to produce yarns without any loss in training new employees.

"Federal Department of Commerce figures for December showed that South Carolina had 498,000 of the entire country's 1,267,000 cotton-system spindles consuming materials other than cotton.

"The State had 39.3 percent of the Nation's total and 9 percent of all the cotton-system spindles in the State were consuming other fibers.

"The high productivity of South Carolina textile employees further is demonstrated by the fact that the State had 42.2 percent of the total spindle-hours for 1948 of cotton-system spindles working on other fibers."

Bishop said the Federal figure showed North Carolina ranked second with 319,000 spindles, followed by the combined New England States with 267,000 and Georgia with 91,000.

"A recent compilation of Federal figures showed South Carolina increased its dominant position as the No. 1 cotton-textile State with 26.39 percent of the Nation's active spindle-hours in 1948," Bishop recalled.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. SANBORN (at the request of Mr. REED of New York) asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. JENSEN (at the request of Mr. REED of New York) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEATING (at the request of Mr. REED of New York) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter in each.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times.

Mr. ADDONIZIO (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. BOYKIN (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include a statement and two newspaper articles.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

SPECIAL ORDER VACATED

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to cancel the special order that I had for today, which has been taken care of through an extension of remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. SECREST (at the request of Mr. YOUNG), on account of burial in Ohio of his brother, who lost his life in action overseas in the war and whose body was transported home for final burial.

To Mr. TEAGUE, for 2 days, on account of attending a funeral in Texas.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject the Reciprocal Trade Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

AMERICAN JOINT COMMISSION TO ASSIST IN THE UNIFICATION OF IRELAND

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, during the last Congress I introduced a resolution to provide for the creation of an American Joint Commission to assist in the unification of Ireland. Because of the pressure of other problems it was not possible for the House Committee on Foreign Affairs to give consideration to my resolution. I have therefore again introduced this resolution, which is House Joint Resolution 59 and is now before the House committee, where I hope that hearings will be given and careful consideration devoted to this vital issue, which today clouds the horizon of good will between the peoples of Ireland and Great Britain.

with us and the money does not go to their working people but to build up the Russian military machine, which is certainly poor policy at the expense of our own people.

But what troubles the workers in my district is whether adequate care is being taken by the administration to make sure that in the cutting of tariff duties they will not be sacrificed unwittingly. The industries in my district have already experienced serious damage from the importation of Czechoslovakian glassware. They are now operating at about 60 percent of capacity. In my opinion this is due to the fact that the duty was cut on this product in Geneva in 1947.

Fear alone is not adequate justification for remedial action. When we fail to recognize those rights and to protect them we might as well say we are behind an iron curtain of our own as far as the rights of the people are concerned.

The national interest, of course, is all-important. But, gentlemen, we are still a democracy, and minorities, thank God, still have rights.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, due to an error, the supplemental statement of Mr. James G. Shennan, president of the Elgin National Watch Co., did not get printed in the committee hearings. For that reason, I would like to extend it into the RECORD at this point.

SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN JEWELED WATCH MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY ON THE BILL (H. R. 1211) TO EXTEND THE TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

This statement supplements the testimony of Mr. James G. Shennan, president of the Elgin National Watch Co., on behalf of the American manufacturers of jeweled watches—Elgin National Watch Co., Hamilton Watch Co., and the trustees of Waltham Watch Company—before the Ways and Means Committee of the United States House of Representatives on January 31, 1949, during the hearings on H. R. 1211 to extend the Trade Agreements Act.

The statement is filed to supply certain information not available to the witness at the time the testimony was given (transcript, p. 1083), and to correct certain inaccuracies in the brief filed, and the testimony given by the witnesses who appeared on behalf of the American Watch Assemblers' Association.

Mr. Shennan was asked to supply information as to the profits of the Elgin and Hamilton companies. The witness supplied the information for his own company, but did not have the comparable information for the Hamilton Co. The information is now available for both of these companies and the Waltham Co., combined, and is as follows:

Year	Combined sales	Combined net profit	Percent of sales
1940	$25,857,000	$2,724,000	10.53
1941	33,413,000	3,060,000	9.16
1946	39,902,000	1,950,000	4.89
1947	49,131,000	1,830,000	3.72

Mr. Shennan was also asked (transcript, pp. 1069–90) if the representatives of the United States at the forthcoming trade agreement negotiations in Geneva, Switzerland, next April could not "open up this matter of proper protection (tariff), including the inclusion of an escape clause for the watch agreement." In addition to the answer given by the witness at the hearing, it is desired to point out that Switzerland has not, as yet, become a party to the general agreement on tariffs and trade, and is not to be a party to the negotiations in April. Therefore, the Swiss trade agreement, and watches, will not be under review at that time.

The memorandum filed with the committee by the American Watch Assemblers' Association bases most of its argument on the assumption that the American jeweled watch manufacturers desire a quota. Actually, as stated to the committee by Mr. Shennan, the American manufacturers do not desire a quota, they desire only tariff rates which will afford them equality at the border. If this was granted to them, there would be absolutely no difference in the related economic activity which flows from the sale of watches in this country. All of that business, which the importers claim to create, would continue to remain here since the American-made movements require the same labor, the same material, the same services, as imported movements, to complete their manufacture and distribution. The real difference, and the one which is vital to the national defense, is that more facilities for the manufacture of movements, and more people trained in the skills required to make them, would be created and available in the event of another emergency; and it is timepiece movement manufacturing capacity which is essential to the national defense. Even the representatives of the assemblers' association who testified at the hearings conceded that neither they, nor any other industry in this country, could manufacture watches, and by watches they meant time measuring mechanisms.

In this connection it is significant to note that the representative of the Bulova Watch Co., who testified on behalf of the importers, stated that it took from 8 to 10 years before Bulova was able to get its plant at Woodside, Long Island, into production (transcript, p. 1344), and that it took 20 years to get it on a paying basis (transcript, p. 1346). He also stated that producing a watch is far different from producing other things (transcript, p. 1346). The other witness who testified on behalf of the importers stated that it was the intention of his company to manufacture movements in this country, and that they began setting up a pilot plant at Long Island a year ago which is ultimately to be moved to Cincinnati, where they now case their imported movements. But here again the difficulty of getting into movement manufacture is demonstrated by the fact that he also stated that they had not "as yet," after a year's time, made any movements in this country, not even in a pilot-plant operation, let alone on a production basis. This time element is the thing that is so vital to our national defense, and is the thing which gives us on whom the defense agencies are relying in the event of another war so much concern.

The spokesmen for the importers tried to minimize the significance of movement manufacturing in this country by asserting that the importers had also done a considerable amount of defense work during the last war. But in addition to conceding that they made no time measuring movements, only one item was specifically mentioned and that was "an electrical indication measuring instrument" (transcript, p. 1440). It was stated that instruments for ships, planes, and tanks were made by the importers but, aside from the above, no specification of them was given. A further statement was made to the effect that there was an adequate labor pool for defense work in the "watchmakers" being graduated from the various trade schools which could be readily converted to watch-movement manufacture. This completely ignores the fact that the manufacturing facilities are not available even if the statement were correct, and the statement itself is not correct. The training given to students in the watchmaking schools is to prepare them for the work done in the jewelry stores which maintain watch-repair departments. There is no training given in this country to prepare men in watch engineering, watch designing, watch machine building, watch tool and die making, watch manufacturing supervision, which are the critical skills.

The importance of American movement manufacturing facilities was also questioned by indicating that the American manufacturers of movements were all, to some extent, dependent on Swiss parts. With the single exception of jewel bearings the statement is simply not correct, and it should be remembered, jewel bearings were made by this industry during the last war. It is, therefore, not correct to say that the American manufacturers are in any sense dependent on the Swiss.

There was a sharp conflict with respect to the differential in the cost of making movements here, and importing Swiss-made movements. The committee was fortunate to have before it a representative of the Bulova Watch Co. who, although appearing on behalf of the assembler's association, is the treasurer of the one importer who also manufactures movements in this country. However, this witness would not indicate, even on a percentage basis, the difference in movement manufacturing costs between their American and Swiss plants and, as a matter of fact, claimed not to know, although he indicated, from a document on Swiss labor rates to which he made reference, that the top figure in Switzerland was about 60 cents an hour (transcript, p. 1343). If this is true, it more than supports the American industry's statement that the labor rate difference is about 2½ to 1. Nor was the testimony of the other witness for the importer much more specific on either of these points. Not having yet manufactured any movements in this country he was unable to say what his American costs would be, and on labor rates he indicated a 50–60 cents an hour differential (transcript, p. 1443). The schedule of wage rates in the Swiss watch industry is a matter of published information, and is available to anyone. This same witness readily conceded the importance of American movement manufacturing companies to the national defense (transcript, p. 1440). We call attention to this testimony to high light the necessity of determining the actual facts, particularly in view of the national defense importance of the American manufacturers, which is the reason we feel that this committee itself, through a subcommittee, should study the situation. We stand ready to submit audited production cost figures in confidence to such a subcommittee, as well as our labor rates.

In this connection, however, we wish to definitely clarify the assertion that Elgin's costs cannot be as high as was indicated by witnesses for the American manufacturers, because it sells watches at as low a price as $12 net (transcript, p. 1442). The reference was to a watch which retails at $29.75 and which the Elgin company actually sells for $15. It is a 15-jewel watch, whereas the testimony being commented upon related to 17 jewel, higher quality watches. Elgin has only two models at this price, one man's and one lady's, and is selling them at a low margin of profit in order to stay in the low-price category. This is the lowest-priced watch in the Elgin line.

One further comment on the testimony on behalf of the importers would appear to be in order. They blame the present financial difficulties of the Waltham Watch Co. entirely on bad past management. This has been the stock answer of the importers to the fact that there are so few remaining movement manufacturers in this country, and has been asserted time and again before this committee. Obviously, no one reason is the whole answer. Nevertheless, it is apparent to those of us who have actually

faced the importer's competitive advantage resulting from lower costs, that this factor is an important reason for the Waltham situation. Some one American company is always going to be the marginal producer, and the status of the industry now is such, from the national-defense considerations, that we cannot afford to lose the facilities of a single manufacturer.

May we reiterate that the American manufacturers of jeweled-watch movements are not suggesting any quota restrictions? We feel confident that with an equalization of cost factors this industry can successfully compete with the importers, which means that it can grow in an expanding economy. It is essential to the national defense that it do this, because it is presently not of sufficient size to meet the minimum requirements of a full-scale emergency. In view of its importance to the national defense, its present size and the competitive situation, and in view of the failure of the industry's efforts over the last 5 years to obtain relief from the agencies administering the trade-agreements program, it seems to us that the situation must be given study on the national policy level, and that this committee of the Congress is the only agency of the Government that is in a position to carefully investigate all phases of the problem.

This is not simply a matter of whether one or two or more business concerns in this country shall remain commercially vigorous. It is that consideration, plus the building of a highly essential defense facility. This is the aspect of the problem which we emphasized in the statement we made at the hearings. It is the aspect of the problem which we feel not only justifies, but necessitates, an investigation of the matter by a congressional committee. It is the reason why we have suggested a special subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee to give it attention.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of:

ELGIN NATIONAL WATCH CO.,
HAMILTON WATCH CO.,
WALTHAM WATCH CO.,
By JAMES G. SHENNAN,
President Elgin National Watch Co.

FEBRUARY 3, 1949.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, there appear to be no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1949."

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WALTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1211) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

MANUFACTURE OF COTTON TEXTILES IN SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, South Carolina, my State, has long since been recognized as the leader of the Nation in the manufacture of cotton textiles. I call your attention to the following newspaper article appearing in the Greenville News on February 7, 1949, from which you will observe South Carolina is also the leader in the consumption and manufacture of other fibers in the textile industry.

In South Carolina we manufacture every kind of textiles—from the most delicate and beautiful patterns of fine dress goods used to make women's garments to heavy woolen materials used for the manufacture of men's suits as well as duck and tarpaulin of unparalleled strength and durability. Time will not permit me to enumerate the thousands of types of textiles we manufacture.

STATE'S SPINDLES TOP NATION IN CONSUMING OTHER FIBERS—DOMINANT POSITION AS COTTON TEXTILE STATE INCREASED

COLUMBIA, February 6.—South Carolina is the Nation's leader in the consumption of fibers other than cotton on cotton-system spindles, Director H. W. Bishop, of the State research, planning, and development board, revealed today.

"The fact that the State's cotton-system spindles and its textile employees have sufficient versatility to produce other yarns is a highly important factor in diversifying textiles," he noted, and added:

"Management has been able to modernize and improve equipment in order to produce yarns without any loss in training new employees.

"Federal Department of Commerce figures for December showed that South Carolina had 498,000 of the entire country's 1,267,000 cotton-system spindles consuming materials other than cotton.

"The State had 39.3 percent of the Nation's total and 9 percent of all the cotton-system spindles in the State were consuming other fibers.

"The high productivity of South Carolina textile employees further is demonstrated by the fact that the State had 42.2 percent of the total spindle-hours for 1948 of cotton-system spindles working on other fibers."

Bishop said the Federal figure showed North Carolina ranked second with 319,000 spindles, followed by the combined New England States with 267,000 and Georgia with 91,000.

"A recent compilation of Federal figures showed South Carolina increased its dominant position as the No. 1 cotton-textile State with 28.39 percent of the Nation's active spindle-hours in 1948," Bishop recalled.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. SANBORN (at the request of Mr. REED of New York) asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. JENSEN (at the request of Mr. REED of New York) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEATING (at the request of Mr. REED of New York) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter in each.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times.

Mr. ADDONIZIO (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. BOYKIN (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include a statement and two newspaper articles.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

SPECIAL ORDER VACATED

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to cancel the special order that I had for today, which has been taken care of through an extension of remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. SECREST (at the request of Mr. YOUNG), on account of burial in Ohio of his brother, who lost his life in action overseas in the war and whose body was transported home for final burial.

To Mr. TEAGUE, for 2 days, on account of attending a funeral in Texas.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject the Reciprocal Trade Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

AMERICAN JOINT COMMISSION TO ASSIST IN THE UNIFICATION OF IRELAND

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, during the last Congress I introduced a resolution to provide for the creation of an American Joint Commission to assist in the unification of Ireland. Because of the pressure of other problems it was not possible for the House Committee on Foreign Affairs to give consideration to my resolution. I have therefore again introduced this resolution, which is House Joint Resolution 50 and is now before the House committee, where I hope that hearings will be given and careful consideration devoted to this vital issue, which today clouds the horizon of good will between the peoples of Ireland and Great Britain.

Under the terms of House Joint Resolution 59, the President would be authorized to appoint a commission of 10 members, to be known as the American Joint Commission. This Commission would be authorized to consult with the British Government and its representatives to consider and to recommend an immediate and final settlement of the Irish question leading to the abolition of the border between the north and south of Ireland, and to sign such settlement in behalf of the people of the United States. By the establishment of such a commission, this country would be offering its services to act as a mediator between the Irish and the British in an effort to terminate the arbitrary and useless border which has been imposed upon the Irish countryside and which has served to divide Ireland into two separate countries, when in fact it is and can be only one nation, and served likewise to divide the Irish people and engender bitterness between the Irish and the British nations.

Throughout all Ireland today the demand for the removal of the northern border is constantly growing stronger and stronger. This sentiment in behalf of the unification of all Ireland cannot be ignored. The restoration of the six counties of the north to the bosom of the Irish nation cannot be impeded by propaganda nor prevented by edicts emanating from Sir Basil Brooke or his puppet Government of Northern Ireland. Not even the holding of special elections on February 10 in northern Ireland will in any way slow the demand of the Irish people that their entire country be united once again as a free and independent nation.

The elections in northern Ireland only serve to call the attention of the world to the nefarious scheming by which the Government in the six counties of the north is maintained. The sentiment of the people in the six counties is divided between those who desire union with Britain and those who desire the national unity of all Ireland. By an elaborate system of gerrymandering the boundaries of parliamentary districts, voters favoring British union are given a majority of the seats in the Stormont Parliament. Districts favoring union with all Ireland, in many cases, contain twice as many voters as do adjoining districts which favor British union. In the southwestern corner of northern Ireland, for example, the county of Fermanagh is divided into three parliamentary districts, two of which are partitionist in sentiment and the other antipartitionist. The county as a whole opposes partition by over 5,000 votes, but these votes are all enclosed within one heavily populated district, which votes antipartition by 9,000 votes. The other 2 districts scrape through with about 1,200 and 800 partitionist majorities. The result is that in elections one-half the population of the county elects two British-union candidates, while the other half of the population can only elect one Irish-nationalist member. Thus, here, as elsewhere in the northern six counties, two unionist votes are equal to one Nationalist vote.

In the current elections, hastily called by Sir Basil Brooke in an effort to silence the growing popular demand for unification of Ireland, not only is this system of gerrymandering of districts being employed, but also a 3-year register of voters will be in effect. As a result, those voters who have come of age during the past 3 years will be denied an opportunity to vote, as well as many others, who by change of residence or similar reason, have had their names dropped from the old register. Within 6 weeks after the holding of this election, the new register will become effective, and it is to avoid the possibility that the new register might affect the results in the old gerrymandered districts that this election is being rushed through. Evidently it would not require any very large change of residence on the part of the voters within the three parliamentary districts of Fermanagh County to completely change the results of an election there. The same situation holds forth in Derry City, in Tyrone County and elsewhere.

Throughout Irish history heroic patriots have frequently chosen death or imprisonment rather than submit to loss of their liberty or to foreign domination of their land. That spirit is not dead within the Irish. It never will die. The undemocratic processes of the present elections in Northern Ireland could well become the occasion to enkindle the flame of ardent patriotism within so many Irish hearts as to light the torch of riot and rebellion against the domination of the present government there and against the British subsidization of that government.

It is because this situation exists in Ireland today and will continue to exist as a threat to world peace until the only Irish border is the entire coastline along the sea that I have offered my resolution before this body. The democratic nations of the West cannot long tolerate the existence in their midst of any nation or part of a nation, however small, subject to the outside domination and control of a foreign country. The right of Ireland to freedom and self-determination is just as vital on the international scene as are the rights of Indonesia, of Israel or any other nation. It is in an effort to protect those rights and to eliminate the Irish question at least, that I have offered my resolution.

This Congress is in a position to take the first step in bringing about a new era of friendship and good will between the British and the Irish peoples. With each step won by the Irish in their march toward freedom, the ancient antagonisms and animosities toward Britain have been lessened and to a great extent eliminated. The northern border is the last vital barrier to a complete and full understanding between these two great races. By the passage of my resolution, we will make it possible for Great Britain to enter into negotiations for the elimination of this border in a dignified and gracious manner. The voluntary action of Great Britain, which the passage of my resolution will instigate, will tremendously strengthen the good will between Ireland and Great Britain. On the other hand, should this situation be much longer ignored, then we can anticipate that efforts will be made to force the elimination of the partition of Ireland, and as always, the use of force will leave in its wake a feeling of bitterness and ill-will. So in the interest of international good will and the peaceful arbitration of disputes, I urge the prompt consideration of my resolution both by the Committee of Foreign Affairs as well as by the House itself.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 49 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 9, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

186. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report on the cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Agriculture.

187. A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the Thirteenth Annual Report of the National Labor Relations Board, for the year ended June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

188. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to unify, consolidate, revise, and codify the Articles of War, the Articles for the Government of the Navy, and the disciplinary laws of the Coast Guard and to enact and establish a uniform code of military justice; to the Committee on Armed Services.

189. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to consolidate the Parker Dam power project and the Davis Dam project; to the Committee on Public Lands.

190. A letter from the Secretary, Department of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provisions with respect to the participation of the United States in such organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

191. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system in view of the increased cost of living; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

192. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting revised estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1950 involving a decrease of $1,139,440 for the Department of State (H. Doc. No. 60); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PETERSON: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 54. A bill to retrocede to the State of New Mexico exclusive jurisdiction held by the United States over lands within the boundaries of the Los Alamos project of the United States Atomic Energy Commission; without amendment (Rept. No. 31). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 164. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the Churntown Elementary School District, California; without amendment (Rept. No. 32). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 1401. A bill relating to the disposition of certain recreational demonstration project lands by the State of Michigan to the Mount Hope Cemetery Association of Waterloo, Mich.; without amendment (Rept. No. 33). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 1968. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the conveyance to Pinellas County, State of Florida, of certain public lands herein described," approved June 17, 1948 (Public Law 666, 80th Cong.), for the purpose of correcting a land description therein; without amendment (Rept. No. 34). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 1997. A bill to authorize the survey of a proposed Mississippi River parkway for the purpose of determining the feasibility of such a national parkway, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 35). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 2477. A bill to provide for the adjustment of royalties and like charges for the use of inventions for the benefit of or by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2478. A bill to amend the act providing for the appointment of court reporters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 2479. A bill to provide automobiles for veterans of World War I who are entitled to compensation for the loss of use of one or both legs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED:

H. R. 2480. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to pay service charges for cashing veterans' checks; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 2481. A bill to terminate certain war excise tax rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 2482. A bill to amend title II of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2483. A bill to provide retirement annuities for retired fourth-class postmasters with 30 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 2484. A bill to authorize grants to Ferry and Okanogan Counties, Wash., in lieu of taxes on certain lands restored to tribal ownership; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H. R. 2485. A bill to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the Eighty-third and Final National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held in Indianapolis, Ind., August 28 to September 1, 1949; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 2486. A bill to create a medal to be known as the Air Force Reserve Medal; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2487. A bill to create a medal to be known as the Army Reserve Medal; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. R. 2488. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to announce the parity price of milk, and to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to immediately announce the support price of milk; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2489. A bill to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIND:

H. R. 2490. A bill to amend subparagraphs (k) and (l) of paragraph II, part 1, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to provide increased compensation for certain specific disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 2491. A bill to provide salary increases for each officer and employee of the Federal Government, and each officer and employee of the District of Columbia municipal government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2492. A bill to provide for salary increases for employees of the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McKINNON:

H. R. 2493. A bill to provide equal treatment to disabled enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard on parity with existing law pertaining to disabled enlisted men of the Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 2494. A bill to permit the prospecting, development, mining, removal, and utilization of the mineral resources within the national forests and all public lands withdrawn for power development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

My Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 2495. A bill to provide salary increases for each officer and employee of the Federal Government, and each officer and employee of the District of Columbia municipal government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2496. A bill to provide for salary increases for employees of the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 2497. A bill to provide veterans' hospital construction at Detroit and Grand Rapids, Mich., and to authorize appropriations therefor; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 2498. A bill to unify, consolidate, revise, and codify the Articles of War, the Articles for the Government of the Navy, and the disciplinary laws of the Coast Guard and to enact and establish a Uniform Code of Military Justice; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 2499. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of a proposed extension of the New Iberia Commercial Canal; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma:

H. R. 2500. A bill to amend section 9 of the Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 2501. A bill authorizing and directing the United States Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to undertake a continuing study of the shad, alosa sapidissima, of the Atlantic coast with respect to the biology, propagation, and abundance of such species to the end that such Service may recommend to the several States of the Atlantic coast through the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission appropriate measures for arresting the decline of this valuable food fish and for increasing the abundance and promoting the wisest utilization thereof; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 2502. A bill appropriating to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service the sum of $75,000 for a continuing study of shad, alosa sapidissima, of the Atlantic coast, with respect to the biology, propagation, and abundance of such species to the end that such Service may recommend to the several States of the Atlantic coast through the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission appropriate measures for arresting the decline of this valuable food fish and for increasing the abundance and promoting the wisest utilization thereof; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LANE (by request):

H. R. 2503. A bill to limit working hours of Government employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2504. A bill to amend and supplement the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 2505. A bill to provide for home rule and reorganization in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 2506. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Snow Hill, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2507. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Princess Anne, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2508. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Federalsburg, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2509. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Berlin, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PICKETT (by request):

H. R. 2510. A bill to provide retirement annuities for certain former rural letter carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 2511. A bill to restore the rights of vessels engaged in the coastwise trade of the United States to pass through the Panama Canal without payment of toll; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 2512. A bill to provide pensions for veterans of World War I and World War II based on non-service-connected disability and attained age; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 2513. A bill to amend subdivisions d and e of section 56 of an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANBORN:

H. R. 2514. A bill to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to extend financial assistance to homestead entrymen, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WELCH of California:

H. R. 2515. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey certain lands to the city and county of San Francisco; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 2516. A bill to amend the Housing Act of 1948; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 2517. A bill directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to Palm Beach County, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 2518. A bill to amend the World War Adjusted Compensation Act to provide adjusted compensation for provisional, probationary, and temporary officers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2519. A bill relating to the use and occupation of certain lands acquired by the United States in connection with flood-control projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 2520. A bill to amend subsection 602 (j) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES:

H. R. 2521. A bill to promote the general welfare of the people of the United States by establishing a publicly supported labor extension program for wage and salary earners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2522. A bill to increase the compensation of all postal and classified employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2523. A bill to provide relief for veterans erroneously required to reimburse the United States for overpayment on their adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 2524. A bill to provide a program of assistance for the expansion and construction of dental colleges in the several States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2525. A bill to provide for dental education and assistance; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 2526. A bill to provide Federal hospital construction at Detroit and Grand Rapids, Mich., and to authorize appropriations therefor; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2529. A bill to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WERDEL:

H. J. Res. 153. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORSKI of Illinois:

H. J. Res. 154. Joint resolution to provide for the extension of patents whenever the use of the same has been prevented by war or other causes and providing for the extension of patents for persons who serve in the military or naval forces of the United States during the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. Con. Res. 27. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress that the issues raised by the action of the Government of Hungary in trying and sentencing Josef Cardinal Mindszenty should be referred to the United Nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. Con. Res. 28. Concurrent resolution to protest the arrest and imprisonment of Archbishop Stepinatz of Yugoslavia and Cardinal Mindszenty of Hungary; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SOMERS:

H. Res. 85. Resolution to sever diplomatic relations with the Government of Hungary; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COLE of Kansas:

H. Res. 86. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the Missouri Basin; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. Res. 87. Resolution protesting the prosecuting of Cardinal Mindszenty by the Hungarian Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. Res. 88. Resolution providing for the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (h) (1) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WHITTINGTON:

H. Res. 89. Resolution requesting the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to prepare a revised edition of pages 1 to 369 of House Document No. 106, Seventy-sixth Congress; to the Committee on Public Works.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House Concurrent Resolution 4, asking not to federalize the practice of medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States for the consideration of Assembly Joint Resolutions 2, 5, 6, 8, 10, 13, and 15 adopted by the California Legislature during January 1949; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolutions 5, 6, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, and 17 adopted by the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to the Yellowtail Dam in Big Horn County in southern Montana and requesting that funds be made available immediately for its construction; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to Legislative Resolution 9, requesting that the Commissioner of Public Roads in charge of the Federal-aid road fund increase the allotments to Nebraska for the purpose of improving and maintaining roads in Thurston County; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to their House Joint Resolution 2, ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of the office of the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Enrolled Joint Memorial 1, asking for the passage of legislation appropriating money to complete the building of the Eden Valley irrigation project; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to maintain a floor of not less than 100 percent of parity on all basic farm crops; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with reference to renaming of various dams in the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 2527. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Forrest J. McDermott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 2528. A bill for the relief of Costas Zavou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 2530. A bill for the relief of James R. Frazer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 2531. A bill for the relief of Elza Friedrych; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY (by request):

H. R. 2532. A bill authorizing the naturalization of Peter You Lo Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 2533. A bill for the relief of Commander Edward White Rawlins, United States Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 2534. A bill for the relief of Gabriel Gary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 2535. A bill for the relief of Samuel J. D. Marshall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

50. By the SPEAKER: Petition of shop 91, Local 19, UOPWA, CIO, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to repealing the Taft-Hartley Act immediately and restoring the Wagner Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

51. By Mr. LeCOMPTE: Petition of citizens of Harper, Iowa, urging the inclusion in the Federal aid to education bill of health and welfare services for non-public-school children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

52. By the SPEAKER: Petition of William Heller, president, Air Line Pilots Association of the Philippines, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting Uncle Sam's stand in the case of three United States civilian citizen pilots being held in prison in the Indonesian area; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

53. Also, petition of James W. Mockler, acting city clerk, city of Buffalo, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to asking the Congress of the United States to pass the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

54. By Mr. HART: Memorial proposed by Mayor Frank H. Eggers, of Jersey City, and adopted by the board of commissioners of that city, memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski Memorial Day resolution pending in Congress at present time; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

55. Also, petition of members of Capt. Clinton E. Fisk Post, No. 132, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Jersey City, N. J., urging that the Members of Congress enact legislation to prevent the displaced persons of Europe from coming to this country to make their homes for a period of not less than 10 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Most Holy God of our salvation, for the glory of Thy name, purge away our sins and endow us with a chastened sense of the liberties of all men.

These are times which try men's souls; minds are perplexed and hearts are sad and heavy. A consecrated servant of a great church has been outrageously judged in the name of a godless state. O bore into the ruthless minds of the leaders the deathless truth, that a nation that sows to the wind shall reap to the whirlwind, and whatsoever it sows, that shall it also reap. Teach them that right, and not might, that Christ, and not Caesar, speaks the final word by which nations live. O continue to work Thy great purpose, and Thine shall be the praise. In the name of a merciful and just Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 128. An act to provide that acreage planted to cotton in 1949 shall not be used in computing cotton acreage allotments for any subsequent year.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 15. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to prevent purchase and sale of public office," approved December 11, 1926;

S. 26. An act for the relief of Jose Babace;

S. 27. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens;

S. 29. An act to authorize payments of claims based on loss of or damage to property deposited by alien enemies;

S. 32. An act for the relief of Milo Jurisevic, Mrs. Jelena Jurisevic, Svetozar Jurisevic, and Radmila Jurisevic;

S. 77. An act to repeal section 509 of title 34 of the United States Code, approved June 20, 1876 (ch. 159, 19 Stat. 69);

S. 90. An act to provide for the naturalization of Richard Kim;

S. 278. An act to prevent retroactive checkage of payments erroneously made to certain retired officers of the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes;

S. 279. An act to authorize the advance on the retired list of Lt. John T. McDermott, United States Navy (retired), to the grade of lieutenant commander;

S. 307. An act for the relief of Engebert Axer;

S. 315. An act for the relief of Dr. Chung Kwai Lui;

S. 331. An act for the relief of Ghetel Pollak Kahan, Magdalena Linda Kahan (wife), and Susanna Kahan (daughter, 12 years old);

S. 335. An act for the relief of Claris U. Yeadon;

S. 372. An act to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Americus, Ga., as the Marcus George Veterans Memorial Hospital;

S. 460. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to the Helena Chamber of Commerce certain described parcels of land situated in the city of Helena, Mont.;

S. 485. An act for the relief of Joyce Violet Angel;

S. 492. An act to amend the act approved June 29, 1948, entitled "An act to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va.";

S. 548. An act to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports, and for other purposes;

S. 629. An act to authorize the disposition of certain lost, abandoned, or unclaimed personal property coming into the possession of the Treasury Department, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force, and for other purposes;

S. 630. An act to amend section 19 of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), so as to remove the upper age limit for appointment to the commissioned grade in the Supply Corps of the Navy;

S. 632. An act to authorize certain personnel and former personnel of the Navy Establishment to accept certain gifts and a foreign decoration tendered by foreign governments;

S. 673. An act relating to the pay and allowances of the Naval Reserve performing active duty in the grade of rear admiral, and for other purposes;

S. 713. An act to amend Public Law 533 of the Eightieth Congress authorizing the construction of a building for the General Accounting Office on square 518 in the District of Columbia; and

S. J. Res. 22. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the three hundredth anniversary of Annapolis, Md.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. NEELY and Mr. HUMPHREY as members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make an announcement. Those committees that have consent to sit during the sessions of the House during general debate are not supposed to sit this afternoon, and they have no authority to do so; so I trust that all chairmen of committees will take notice.

FEDERATION OF EUROPE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of talk about a proposed federation of western Europe. There will be some action taken, I presume, very shortly upon the proposed North Atlantic Pact. It is my belief that if we are going to have a federation of Europe—and I think we should—the component parts of that federation should be strong. I am, therefore, today introducing a concurrent resolution in order to encourage the development of a peaceful and prosperous order in Ireland, but with no intention of imposing any particular form of political or economic association upon its people. Under this resolution it will be resolved by the House of Representatives—the Senate concurring—that the Congress favors the political federation of northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland. There is no reason why this vexing problem of partition should not be solved so that the Irish Nation can once again become united to the end that Ireland, as a full-fledged republic, can again take its rightful position among the family of nations.

FARM ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 128) to provide that acreage planted to cotton in 1949 shall not be used in computing cotton-acreage allotments for any subsequent year, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. COOLEY, PACE, POAGE, HOPE, and AUGUST H. ANDRESEN.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged resolution (H. Res. 80) from the Committee on Armed Services, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary for National Defense is hereby requested, if not incompatible with the public interest, to furnish the House of Representatives at such time as may be convenient prior to the adjournment of the present session of Congress such factual information as may be definitely available showing administrative action on the program of preparedness for national defense.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, this resolution was introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]. Since a letter from the Secretary contains the information called for in the resolution, and that information has already been sent to the gentleman from New York, I move that the resolution be laid on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 313) to amend title 26, United States Code, so as to make the provisions thereof applicable to service personnel, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TEAGUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

Mr. GRANAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the

RECORD and include a letter to the Secretary of State from the Catholic War Veterans, protesting against the trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter and a resolution from the water project authority of the State of California.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a very fine editorial from the Cincinnati Post entitled "Trial by Error," and also a very fine editorial from the same newspaper entitled "Our Norwegian Ally."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to register my personal disapproval and indignation at the sham trial and conviction of Cardinal Mindszenty, of Hungary. He is a true man of God, a devout Christian whose only crime has been to preach the religion of Jesus Christ, and he faces life imprisonment only because the tenets of Christianity are incompatible with communism. I wish to publicly state that in my opinion his imprisonment will be an indelible blot on the record of his country and a challenge to Christians everywhere.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of this Congress, I also want to raise my voice in protest at the infamous and outrageous trial that was just held in Hungary and the conviction and sentence of Cardinal Mindszenty. This trial was a travesty on justice, involving a high dignitary of the church. It is not so much that it happened to be a high dignitary of the Catholic Church, because today it is Cardinal Mindszenty and tomorrow it may be a high dignitary of some other Christian denomination. Certainly this is a challenge to the Christian world. We as Christians should accept this challenge and raise the torch and carry it forward in our fight to eradicate these Godless men who have just completed this outrageous trial. Let us stand up and fight these ungodly forces who are trying to destroy Christianity throughout the world.

I am appending two articles from newspapers of my home city of Buffalo bearing on this very important question:

[From the Buffalo (N. Y.) Courier-Express of February 8, 1949]

COMMUNIST "JUSTICE"

Technically, Cardinal Mindszenty is awaiting the verdict of the Budapest "people's court" trying him on a charge of treason. Actually he is awaiting sentence. A verdict of "guilty" was determined by Hungary's Communist masters before the cardinal's trial began. The only question now is whether a death sentence or one of imprisonment is to be imposed. The choice between the two penalties will be made entirely on political and propaganda grounds, of course, without regard for principles of justice.

There has been much speculation as to how the cardinal's captors induced him to make certain statements at his trial which conflict with his pretrial utterances. There are suggestions of torture, drugging, and even of hypnotism. Whatever the explanation, there is nothing new about "confessions" in Communist-dominated courts. Going back to the first persecution of an internationally famous church leader in the Communist "courts"—that of Patriarch Tikhon, of the Russian Orthodox Church, in 1922 and 1923—we find some parallels with the Mindszenty case.

Because Tikhon had resisted Soviet attacks on the Orthodox Church in particular and on religion in general, he and a number of his clergy were brought to trial on charges of refusing to turn over church property for famine relief. Two archbishops and a number of priests were condemned to death, but Tikhon's trial was postponed. He was brought before a Communist-dominated "conclave," however, at which he was "unfrocked" and "expelled" from the church—but he denied the "conclave's" authenticity and continued to function as Orthodox primate of Russia. Later Tikhon was temporarily released and was quoted officially as making a proposal for Orthodox compromise with the Soviet government—a proposal completely in conflict with his earlier public pronouncements and policies. Then Tikhon's name disappeared from Russian dispatches until announcement of his death (presumably in imprisonment) in 1925. The circumstances surrounding his death never have been cleared up.

A more recent instance of Communist jurisprudence can be found in the purge trials of the old Bolsheviks a dozen years ago.

Among the prominent Communist leaders on trial were men with long and eminent records in overthrowing the old Czarist regime and then in establishing the Soviet system. There also was Marshal Tukhachevsky, once second in command of the Red army.

Most of these old Bolsheviks had been followers of Trotzky, who had been exiled and was later to be assassinated in Mexico. Trotzky was still attacking Stalin for compromising on the simon-pure gospel as handed down by Karl Marx and Lenin, and the outside world suspected strongly that Stalin was simply purging domestic opponents to solidify his position.

The charge was conspiracy with a foreign nation, which meant Nazi Germany. Yet in 1939 Stalin was to sign a treaty of alliance with that same Nazi Germany.

The accused admitted on the witness stand the complete truth of the charges against them—upbraided themselves as arrant traitors to Russia and to the working class of the world—insisted they were confessing voluntarily. Still the world wondered.

For one thing, their whole careers and their innermost convictions made it out of character for the accused to line up on the side of Hitlerism (several were of Jewish extraction). For another thing, the Soviet government was quite capable of inflicting excruciating torture and reprisals on families of the accused men.

[From the Buffalo (N. Y.) Evening News of February 8, 1949]

THE INQUISITION AT BUDAPEST

The Communist People's Court at Budapest has pronounced the sentence of life imprisonment on Cardinal Mindszenty of Hungary; in doing so it was simply echoing the decree of the high command at Moscow. From first to last, the issue was decided there. No one can doubt that it was at the instance of the Kremlin that the cardinal was arrested, tried, and convicted; that by the Kremlin his fate was determined. But one may believe that world opinion, voicing a sense of outrage at the proceedings, was at least effective to prevent the imposition of the death sentence.

The atmosphere of the trial is indicated in this acclamation by a leader of the Communist Party in Hungary:

"A new god has come to you, my people. * * * The new god is born from earth and blood. He strides ahead, and under the thunder of his steps the globe trembles from east to west. This is the Red god. The Seine shudders at his impact and tries to break its banks. Westminster trembles before him like Jericho, and across the green ocean his red shadow falls on the walls of the White House."

Therein was the inspiration for proceedings against Cardinal Mindszenty, the inspiration for everything that has followed. There was no semblance of a trial in such terms as democratic people know and respect. Under their system a man is regarded as innocent until he is proved guilty. Under the Moscow dispensation an accusation carries with it guilt. So it was with Cardinal Mindszenty; he was foredoomed. The so-called trial was farcical; it was pure sham.

As we understand it, Cardinal Mindszenty had opposed nationalization of the Catholic church in Hungary, where 60 percent of the people are Catholic; he had opposed communization of the schools, had maintained international relations—for instance, he had solicited and obtained American dollars in carrying on his work.

If he went further than this—if he did, indeed, challenge the Communist regime politically—this can be said in his defense that the Communists showed a strength of only 17 percent in the popular elections and had gained control of the government by a series of coups. But the Kremlin regarded the continuance of his international relations as his greatest offense. Such relations, beyond the Red influence, are held to be treason in the Kremlin code.

Moscow has manifested hatred of Christianity upon many occasions; it has committed itself to a relentless campaign against the Christian faith. The proceedings at Budapest were just another manifestation of this madness, proceedings which have shocked the whole Christian world. Cardinal Mindszenty in prison for conscience' sake will be an even greater force for Christianity and against communism than he has been in the exercise of his churchly office.

ANOTHER MILESTONE FOR SAM HARDY

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, today the ever good and faithful servant of the Committee on Ways and Means, Sam Hardy, completes the first year of his fifth decade of service—41 years altogether. There is today in the House of Representatives only one Member, the gentleman from Illinois, who was a Member of Congress when Sam Hardy embarked upon his career as an employee of the House. When I was elected to Congress in 1911 Sam was already a veteran of 3 years' service.

I can truthfully say that I have known of no employee during the 24 years that I have been privileged to serve with the Committee on Ways and Means upon whom the committee has relied more heavily in its daily manifold duties. From dawn until midnight, if need be, he has been always available to provide the needed references that any member of the committee might require in the consideration of the legislation before our committee. Service in terms of years is perhaps not so graphic as a quantitative record of the work-load of our committee during the period that Sam Hardy has been employed. He has seen 28 major tax bills enacted into law; 4 tariff bills and, counting the bill to be debated in the House today, 6 laws relating to the reciprocal-trade-agreements program.

I wish for Sam many more years of happy, useful service as a loyal Government employee.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the remarks made by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means in paying tribute to Sam Hardy, a very faithful and efficient employee of the Government. He is a man who enjoys the confidence, respect, and esteem of all the members of our Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the remarks that have been made with reference to Sam Hardy. I doubt if there is any man in the Government who has a better knowledge of all the documents and papers pertaining to the work of the Committee on Ways and Means over the last 30 or 40 years. He is a splendid outstanding public servant. If we were ever to lose him, it certainly would be a tremendous loss.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I join in what has been said in complimenting Sam Hardy. He is not only an efficient worker, but I compliment him for his innate constant courtesy. He is always courteous and ready to serve.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I trust that Sam will have many years ahead of him to serve the committee and serve the Congress and the country as well as to enjoy life.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITTINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by Lt. Gen. R. A. Wheeler, Chief of the Engineers, United States Army, at St. Louis, Monday, February 7, 1949, before the thirtieth annual convention of the Mississippi Valley Association.

FEDERATION OF WESTERN EUROPE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me conditions in Europe are becoming more serious. The recent trial of Cardinal Mindszenty and the pressure on Norway are symbols of a grave situation. I have therefore introduced the Pulbright resolution in the House, which calls for the approval of the new federation of western Europe. I think the action of Congress approving this newly formed federation may give it the strength and the courage necessary to carry on and to resist the spread of communism in the world.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a very interesting article which appeared in the last issue of the Boston Sunday Post.

EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H. R. 325) to amend the act of September 7, 1916, referring to the Employees' Compensation Commission, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GATHINGS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEEFE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address delivered by Mr. Joseph C. Harsch on January 30, 1949.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from Fortune magazine entitled "ECA Cannot Do Everything." Because it is beyond the limit allowed for printing such documents, I ask unanimous consent that it be included in spite of the cost which the Public Printer has estimated to be $242.50.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of California asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Sunday News.

THE MARINE CORPS

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am including an article from the Saturday Evening Post by Mr. Richard Tregaskis, famous war correspondent, whose dispatches from the combat theaters of the war brought him widespread and well deserved recognition. Certainly no contemporary newsman is better qualified by virtue of experience and keen insight to more adequately appraise the United States Marine Corps than is Mr. Tregaskis.

The article entitled "The Marine Corps Fights for Its Life" throws a bright spotlight upon what must be considered by any objective observer to be a subtle and unceasing attack upon this great fighting organization, an attack which has as its goal the dismemberment and the eventual abolition of the corps as an effective and highly efficient arm of our National military and naval establishments. It is my feeling, Mr. Speaker, that if the facts of this matter are known to the American people there will be such a widespread protest as to render ineffective any move which would threaten the integrity of this famous fighting organization. For that reason I bring to the attention of the Congress this important contribution by Mr. Tregaskis. We in the Congress who have had the high honor of service in the United States Marine Corps serve notice that we will not stand idly by in the way of thinly veiled threats against the corps.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MERROW asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in each to include an editorial.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement made by Mr. Walter W. Cenerazzo, president of the American Watch Workers Union.

Mr. LATHAM asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "The Freedom Road," notwithstanding the fact that the Government Printing Office estimates the cost will be $230.75.

Mr. LOVRE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a portion of the inaugural address of the Governor of the State of South Dakota.

Mr. TAYLOR asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Troy Record.

Mr. GROSS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial from the Waverly (Iowa) Independent.

Mr. HALE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted yesterday by the Republican conference.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. STAGGERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include proceedings of the American Society of Civil Engineers.

COMMUNISM—THE FORCES OF ANTICHRIST

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in a few minutes we are going to vote on a resolution providing $200,000 for the Committee on Un-American Activities.

I hope there will not be a dissenting vote. That committee has done more to expose the enemies within our gates, who are here plotting the overthrow of this Government and attempting to undermine and destroy everything for which our country stands, than any other agency of this Government.

I am no longer a member of that committee; but I am still giving it my wholehearted and unqualified support. For I am firmly convinced that unless that committee continues the great work in which we have been engaged, these enemies of our Government and our American way of life will continue their brazen efforts to destroy everything for which the Christian people of America stand.

The persecution of a great religious leader in Europe seems to have awakened some men in this House to the dangers that now confront us. Some of them waited, however, until the Communists had murdered 30,000,000 Christians in Europe.

Atheistic communism is largely composed of a racial minority that has swarmed into Europe through the Urals in the last 100 or 200 years, and has now swarmed into this country and constitutes three-fourths of the membership of the Communist Party in America. They seem to be more akin to Pharaoh than they are to Moses.

Sixty percent of the members of the Communist Party in this country are foreign born.

It is the same old gang that composed the fifth column of the crucifixion. They hounded the Saviour during the days of His ministry; persecuted Him to His ignominious death; derided Him during the moments of His dying agony; and then gambled for His garments at the foot of the cross.

They have been for 1,900 years trying to destroy Christianity and everything that is based on Christian principles.

They have overrun and virtually destroyed Europe.

They are now trying to undermine and destroy America.

God save our country from such a fate.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

AMENDING THE HATCH ACT

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 1243) to amend the Hatch Act.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the same bill that was passed by the House last year but not acted upon in the Senate?

Mr. STANLEY. I believe this is the same bill that was passed in the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And it was unanimously reported out of the committee?

Mr. STANLEY. It was unanimously reported from the committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman will yield—and the purpose of the bill is to give discretionary power to the Civil Service Commission rather than the mandatory direction now that punishment must be imposed in the most minor of cases.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 9 (b) of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious activities," approved August 2, 1939, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) If in the case of any person violating the provisions of this section it is found by the United States Civil Service Commission that such violation warrants removal he shall be immediately removed from the position or office held by him, and thereafter no part of the funds appropriated by any act of Congress for such position or office shall be used to pay the compensation of such person. If the Commission finds that the violation does not warrant removal, a lesser penalty shall be imposed by direction of the Commission: *Provided*, That in the case of any person who has heretofore been removed from the service under the provisions of this section, the Commission shall upon request reopen and reconsider the record in such case. If it shall find that the acts committed were such as to warrant a penalty of less than removal it shall issue an order revoking the restriction against reemployment in the position from which removed, or in any other position for which he may be qualified."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FUNDS FOR CONDUCTING STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS WITH RESPECT TO GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 88, Rept. No. 37) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations with respect to Government operations authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $50,000, including employment of such experts, special counsel, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FUNDS FOR EXPENSES OF INVESTIGATION AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 22

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 82) to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized in House Resolution 22 (Rept. No. 36) with amendment, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of the investigation and study to be conducted by the select committee created by House Resolution 22, not to exceed $125,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "$125,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 78), with an amendment, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by clause (1) (Q) of rule XI incurred by the Committee on Un-American Activities, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $200,000, including expenditures for printing and binding, employment of such experts, special counsel, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

That the funds granted may be expended retroactive to January 4, 1949.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the words "printing and binding".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes had it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I hope there is not a quorum present. Then we can have a roll call on this resolution. This is a real test.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will not announce that a quorum is present unless there is.

Mr. RANKIN. I know that.

The SPEAKER. Obviously there is not a quorum present.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be read again so that the Members of the House will know what they are voting on.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resolution may again be reported.

There was no objection.

The Clerk reread House Resolution 78.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 353, nays 29, not voting 53, as follows:

[Roll No. 6]

YEAS—353

Abernethy, Addonizio, Albert, Allen, Calif., Allen, Ill., Allen, La., Andersen, H. Carl, Anderson, Calif., Andresen, August H., Andrews, Angell, Arends, Aspinall, Auchincloss, Bailey, Barden, Baring, Barrett, Wyo., Bates, Ky., Bates, Mass., Battle, Beall, Beckworth, Bennett, Mich., Bentsen, Biemiller, Bishop, Blackney, Bland, Boggs, Del., Boggs, La., Bolling, Bolton, Md., Bolton, Ohio, Bonner, Boykin, Bramblett, Breen, Brehm, Brooks, Brown, Ga., Brown, Ohio, Bryson, Buckley, Ill., Buckley, N. Y., Burdick, Burke, Burleson, Burnside, Burton, Byrne, N. Y., Byrnes, Wis., Camp, Canfield, Cannon, Carlyle, Carnahan, Carroll, Case, N. J., Case, S. Dak., Cavalcante, Chatham, Chelf, Chesney, Chiperfield, Christopher, Church, Clemente, Clevenger, Cole, Kans., Cole, N. Y., Colmer, Combs, Cooley, Cooper, Corbett, Cotton, Cox, Crawford, Crook, Cunningham, Curtis, Dague, Davies, N. Y., Davis, Ga., Davis, Tenn., Davis, Wis., Deane, DeGraffenried, Delaney, Denton, D'Ewart, Dondero, Donohue, Doughton, Doyle, Durham, Eberharter, Engel, Mich., Engle, Calif., Evins, Fallon, Feighan, Fellows, Fenton, Fernandez, Fisher, Flood, Fogarty, Forand, Ford, Frazier, Fugate, Fulton, Furcolo, Gamble, Gary, Gathings, Gavin, Gillette, Gilmer, Goodwin, Gordon, Gore, Gorski, Ill., Gorski, N. Y., Gossett, Graham, Granger, Grant, Gregory, Gross, Gwinn, Hagen, Hale, Hall, Edwin Arthur, Hall, Leonard W., Hand, Harden, Hardy, Hare, Harris, Harrison, Hart, Harvey, Hays, Ark., Hays, Ohio, Hébert, Hedrick, Heffernan, Herlong, Herter, Heselton, Hill, Hinshaw, Hobbs, Hoeven, Hoffman, Ill., Holmes, Hope, Horan, Howell, Hull, Irving, Jackson, Calif., Jackson, Wash., Jacobs, James, Jenison, Jenkins, Jennings, Jensen, Johnson, Jonas, Jones, Ala., Jones, Mo., Jones, N. C., Karst, Karsten, Kean, Kearney, Kearns, Keating, Keefe, Kelley, Kennedy, Keogh, Kerr, Kilburn, Kilday, King, Kunkel, Lane, Lanham, Larcade, Latham, LeCompte, LeFevre, Lemke, Lesinski, Lind, Linehan, Lodge, Lovre, Lucas, Lyle, Lynch, McCarthy, McConnell, McCormack, McCulloch, McDonough, McGrath, McGregor, McGuire, McKinnon, McMillan, S. C., McMillen, Ill., Mack, Ill., Mack, Wash., Macy, Mahon, Marsalis, Martin, Iowa, Martin, Mass., Mason, Merrow, Michener, Miller, Calif., Miller, Md., Miller, Nebr., Mills, Morgan, Morris, Morton, Moulder, Murphy, Murray, Tenn., Murray, Wis., Nelson, Nicholson, Nixon, Noland, Norblad, Norrell, O'Brien, Ill., O'Brien, Mich., O'Hara, Minn., O'Konski, O'Neill, O'Sullivan, O'Toole, Pace, Passman, Patman, Patten, Patterson, Perkins, Peterson, Pfeifer, Joseph L., Philbin, Phillips, Calif., Phillips, Tenn., Pickett, Poage, Polk, Potter, Preston, Priest, Quinn, Rabaut, Rains, Rankin, Reed, Ill., Reed, N. Y., Rees, Regan, Ribicoff, Rich, Richards, Riehlman, Rodino, Rogers, Fla., Rogers, Mass., Rooney, Sadlak, St. George, Sanborn, Sasscer, Scott, Hardie, Scrivner, Scudder, Shafer, Sikes, Simpson, Ill., Simpson, Pa., Sims, Smathers, Smith, Kans., Smith, Wis., Somers, Spence, Staggers, Stanley, Steed, Stefan, Stigler, Stockman, Sullivan, Sutton, Taber, Tackett, Talle, Taurielle, Teague, Thomas, Tex., Thompson, Thornberry, Tollefson, Trimble, Underwood, Van Zandt, Velde, Vinson, Vorys, Vursell, Wadsworth, Wagner, Walter, Weichel, Welch, Calif., Welch, Mo., Werdel, Wheeler, White, Calif., Whitten, Whittington, Wickersham, Wigglesworth, Willis, Wilson, Ind., Wilson, Okla., Wilson, Tex., Winstead, Withrow, Wolcott, Wolverton, Wood, Woodhouse, Woodruff, Worley, Young, Zablocki

NAYS—29

Barrett, Pa., Blatnik, Bloom, Buchanan, Celler, Chudoff, Douglas, Granahan, Green, Havenner, Holifield, Huber, Javits, Kee, Kirwan, Klein, Madden, Mansfield, Marcantonio, Marshall, Mitchell, Multer, O'Hara, Ill., Price, Ramsay, Rhodes, Sadowski, Wier, Yates

NOT VOTING—53

Abbitt, Bennett, Fla., Bosone, Bulwinkle, Coffey, Coudert, Crosser, Davenport, Dawson, Dingell, Dollinger, Dolliver, Eaton, Elliott, Ellsworth, Elston, Garmatz, Golden, Halleck, Hoffman, Mich., Judd, Kruse, Lichtenwalter, McSweeney, Magee, Meyer, Miles, Monroney, Morrison, Murdock, Norton, Pfeifer, William L., Plumley, Poulson, Powell, Redden, Rivers, Sabath, Scott, Hugh D., Jr., Secrest, Sheppard, Short, Smith, Ohio, Smith, Va., Taylor, Thomas, N. J., Towe, Walsh, Whitaker, White, Idaho, Williams

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice:

Mrs. Norton with Mr. Towe.
Mr. Bennett of Florida with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.
Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
Mr. Secrest with Mr. Short.
Mr. Williams with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. McSweeney with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Dawson with Mr. Elston.
Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Lichtenwalter.
Mr. Monroney with Mr. Latham.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Meyer.
Mr. Redden with Mr. Dolliver.
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Golden.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Judd.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Poulson.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Murdock with Mr. William L. Pfeiffer.
Mr. Crosser with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mrs. Bosone with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, due to adverse weather conditions my plane arrived too late for me to answer to my name on the appropriation for the Committee on Un-American Activities. Had I been present I would have voted "No."

TRADE AGREEMENTS EXTENSION ACT OF 1949

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1211) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1211, with Mr. WALTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose yesterday, general debate had been completed, and the first section of the bill was read. That section is now open to amendment.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I expect to support this bill on final passage. With economic

conditions as they exist in the world today, the huge sums which we are sending abroad under the European recovery program may well be down the drain unless by increasing our imports we make it possible for friendly nations to get on their feet and thus reduce their dollar shortage.

Since World War I, except for a short period in the twenties when American bankers made ill-advised loans abroad, our export trade has largely been financed by the American taxpayer.

Today the $5,000,000,000 excess of our exports over our imports is still being financed by the American taxpayer. This cannot continue indefinitely.

During the war our farmers and our industrial plants greatly increased their productive capacity. If we are going to maintain prosperity here we must export our surpluses. The chief way in which we must receive payment for these surpluses is by purchasing more of what the world produces.

I quote from an editorial which appeared in the New York Times on February 3, 1949:

> Since we already possess most of the world's gold, the only way in which they can repay the loans which we are making is in the form of goods.

I also quote from an editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune, a Republican newspaper, on February 4, 1949. This is quoted in the minority report signed by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES] and myself:

> The explicit purpose of the Marshall plan is to free Europe from its bondage to the dollar shortage by 1952; but the dollar shortage will never end unless Europe is given reasonable opportunity to acquire dollars by the sound and straightforward way of sending us goods in honest exchange for them.

The administration has surrounded the trade-agreement program with sham and camouflage. They have given a different reason why they wish it renewed every 3 years. They claim that for every concession which we gave, we have received equal concessions. This is just not a fact. Hindrances to trade by foreign nations are greater now than they were before the trade-agreement program was even suggested.

I do not think it is necessary to fool the American people as to the necessity for this program. I believe that they are adult minded and I have confidence in their good sense. In spite of our failure to receive concessions equal to those which we have granted, the bare fact remains that to keep our country economically sound we must increase our imports, and it is for this reason that I expect to support this bill.

There is nothing in the law now in effect passed by the Eightieth Congress which would have hampered continuation of the program if it were administered in a bold and courageous manner. However, I can understand how a weak and vote-conscious executive department might fear the political implications of publicity of the peril points and that under these circumstances negotiations might be hampered. I, therefore, believe that omission of this publicity might be wise.

Though I will support this bill, this does not mean that it could not be improved.

I believe that all trade agreements should include the escape clause, not merely those negotiated in the past few years. Why should some industries have the benefit of the escape clause, while others do not?

I also agree that it should be mandatory for the Tariff Commission to supply the President with the so-called peril points in confidence. Negotiators should not negotiate blindly. State Department officials may be able negotiators, but they should have the tools with which to do the job properly. And if they wish to take the calculated risk of reducing tariffs below the peril point found by a nonpartisan body of experts they should do so with their eyes open.

However, from the attitude of the Democratic majority I gather that they are not going to allow any amendments, no matter how wise, to be added to this bill. And so in spite of the probable failure of passage of the amendments which I desire, I will vote for the bill as written because I feel that the continuation of this program is an important item in carrying out the present foreign policy of the United States which I am supporting.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, reciprocal trade agreements are generally acknowledged as essential. No one can honestly quarrel with pacts that stimulate trade and improve the economy of all nations.

And, of course, we want to aid in the rehabilitation and restoration of Europe and Asia. That makes good sense and is necessary if we are to have peace. Communism breeds where there is distress and poverty.

In the making of these treaties it must not be forgotten that we must also consider the prosperity of the American worker and the American businessman. The great industrial world of America produced the goods and materials that won two world wars; it has brought to the people of the United States a high state of happiness and prosperity never achieved by any other people. It must not be destroyed by our own Government officials. It is the administration of this act which will determine whether or not it is to be good for the American people.

I recall very well in years past a solemn promise being made that no agreement would be entered into which would destroy any American industry. During the war and the months immediately following an unprecedented demand for goods prevented any harm being done. Now it is a different story. Watchmakers, cotton and woolen textile workers, the jewelers, the silversmiths, the workers in the shoe factories, the hard-pressed pottery industry, the leather shops, the glassware and crockery are all deeply concerned. They see forces being curtailed; thousands losing their jobs. They see overtime shifts being discontinued and short-time schedules established, and in some instances factories closed. The newspapers have lately carried the story of the tragic fate of the once-famed American watch industry—only two left, one in Illinois and one in Pennsylvania, that are able to continue with their own resources. And one of them is also engaged in the manufacture of precision tools. A third, the Waltham Co., located in Waltham, Mass., is a Federal supplicant, seeking Federal funds to continue. The fate of 2,500 workers is in the hands of their Government; whether they shall lose their homes and be forced to wander away seeking a place to work. Those close to the situation frankly state that the future of these concerns is threatened by unfair competition from Switzerland. The jeweled watches from Switzerland can be sold here for less than half the cost of an American-made jeweled watch.

I know some of you will say if they cannot compete let them perish or do something else. That, I submit, is rather harsh treatment in these days when there is so much consideration for social welfare.

That the imports are to blame has been admitted to me by a high-ranking official of the administration.

The watch workers brought their case to the President. He expressed sympathy, so it is reported, and said he did not have the power to give relief. It was to Congress they must go and suggested a study committee in the Ways and Means Committee. Now a study committee is all right but what the 2,500 idle workers of Waltham need is action not study—and now is the time to give them a chance for their day in court.

Let me divert for a moment by saying this is not simply a watch-workers' case alone. Twelve large New England factories must get an RFC loan if they are to continue. Two factories—one in New England and one in Texas—are to be dismantled and shipped to Burma. Puerto Rico beckons with a factory and free taxes for 10 years, cheap labor, and a free import into the United States.

The factory workers have first felt the iron hand of adversity. It will not be long before the cotton grower, the wheat and corn farmer, and the potato grower will find they are in a similar plight.

I repeat my alarm is not against reciprocal trade. It can and must be administered on a fair basis.

Now what is offered in the two amendments of the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee.

One is that all items to be negotiated shall be studied by the Tariff Commission—a Commission appointed and controlled by the President. If these studies indicate any industry is placed in peril that fact shall be reported to the President. The report is secret; there is no publicity. The information is given to the President for his guidance. What is wrong with that? Where is there any crippling of the act. The answer is that there is nothing wrong about a President getting all sides of a question before he acts.

The other amendment is the so-called escape clause. This clause has been incorporated in recent treaties; it will presumably be incorporated in the new treaties. But it was not included in the early Swiss treaty. To ever do anything for the watch workers this amendment must be adopted. Let me again remind you it is not compulsory; it gives the administration the right to act if it so desires.

You give here the President broad powers. I am not complaining about that because I realize we are in a dangerous world situation; where other countries have embargoes, quotas, and stop trade by refusing to allow money to leave the country, there is need for broad latitude to our own Government. All we ask in this second amendment is we give the President a chance to act if he so desires to aid a crippled industry like the Waltham watch or others who come into real peril.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the matter we have under consideration today is one of tremendous importance to the economic and military security of this Nation. It is indeed unfortunate that the American people know so little about our trade relations with other countries of the world. Because of the fact that the whole subject of reciprocal trade is couched in more or less technical language, the daily and weekly press have held it to be of scant interest to the average newspaper reader. Yet the administration proposal we have under consideration this afternoon affects directly or indirectly the good health of our American industries and the job security of our American workmen.

Essentially what the President and his leaders in the Congress ask us to do is to rubber stamp one-man authority to negotiate and consummate treaties with other nations respecting the raising or lowering of tariff rates on goods shipped in from abroad. The President, and the President alone, wants the power to determine how much goods shall be imported into this country, the amount of tariff the importers will pay, and the extent to which these cheap imports will compete with American goods and American markets. Abuse of this power, wittingly or unwittingly, could destroy American industry and cause widespread unemployment among our workers. I submit that no one man, even the President of these United States, should possess such unlimited power over our national economy.

Mr. Truman, in submitting his recommendation for extension of the existing Trade Agreement Act, referred to crippling restrictions imposed by the last Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress. That Congress directed the Tariff Commission to study our trade agreements with specific reference to the so-called peril points—that is the point where the influx of foreign manufactured goods under lower tariff rates would unfairly compete with our own production and place our own industries at a great disadvantage. The Commission was directed to advise the President when a dangerous peril point was reached. If, despite the Commission's warning, the President persisted in further lowering of the tariff rate, he would have to explain to the Congress his reason for such action. These restrictions in nowise crippled, nor did they impede the successful conclusion of trade treaties with other nations. They were designed to protect and operate in the best interests of American industry and the American workingman. We Republicans in this House believe that this protection is not only desirable, but is vitally necessary for the preservation of our own national economy.

These elements of safety are what the President, in a bid for more personal power, seeks to have this Congress remove. In presenting the administration's case before the Ways and Means Committee, administration witnesses failed to show that the safeguards provided by the Eightieth Congress adversely affected the successful negotiation of trade agreements and that they have not operated in the best interests of these United States. Many of us in this House regard the President's attitude on this matter as additional evidence that the grab for executive power we have witnessed under 16 years of the New Deal is to continue unabated under Mr. Truman.

Unless the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act is administered to the advantage of this country, we are in for serious economic difficulties. In entering into agreements with other nations, we must constantly bear in mind that the paramount interests of the United States comes first. This does not imply that we should take unfair advantage of friendly nations in our relations with them. On the contrary, we should negotiate and consummate trade pacts that will promote a healthy flow of trade between the democratic nations of the world. It is through our trade policies that we can build up the tottering economies of our sister nations. But in so doing, we must not tear down or do irreparable harm to our national economy. We must remember that, through our economic recovery program and through other means, such as the Export-Import Bank and the World Monetary Fund, we are pouring literally billions of American dollars into European recovery.

We are rebuilding the industrial might of those nations participating in the Marshall plan. At our own expense we are providing the mass-production machinery which will enable them to mass-produce goods for sale in this country in competition with goods produced in America. These foreign industries employ cheap labor. The wage rates and the conditions under which their employees work are far below the wage and labor standards of the American worker. Their production costs are a mere fraction of the production costs of our industries here in the United States.

Under the stimulus of American aid, these foreign industries are recovering at a rapid pace. The only outlet for their mass production will be world markets, the most attractive of which is in these United States. It is only common sense that, if our tariff barriers are inadequate and our tariff rates are too low, these cheap foreign goods will flood this country, undersell our own products, cause curtailment of American production and result in widespread unemployment among our own workers. To hold our markets, we necessarily will have to reduce our costs of production, which means, of course, that wages must be reduced. The ultimate result will be that our boasted American standard of living will disappear. Anyone who believes we can, through the means of this bill, bring the whole world up to our standard of living is indulging in wishful thinking. We in the Congress are charged with the responsibility of protecting ourselves against such raids and such consequences.

We are already beginning to feel the ill effects of this administration's trade policies. The proceed-with-caution signal is already apparent. This should serve as a warning to go slowly and to be diligent in our future negotiations. Here, Mr. Chairman, are the danger signs: Our New England textile industry is in extremely bad shape. Some plants have closed down completely, others have curtailed production, some are moving to offshore areas, unemployment is steadily rising. Our glass industry is likewise in bad shape, so is our clock and watch industry. I am reliably informed that the Hamilton Watch Co. is the only company operating on a successful basis today. At one time we had 22 watch companies. Now we have three, and only one of the three is operating. The Department of Commerce has just reported that the total number of jobless soared 700,000 in the first week of January, to a total of 2,650,000 unemployed. That is the highest figure since March 1946, when war factories were reconverting to peacetime production. The Commerce Department's report on unemployment was ominous. It said, and I quote:

> Although unemployment ordinarily rises between December and January, with the customary seasonal reduction in trade and outdoor work, the change this year was considerably larger than can be explained by this factor alone.

Other official Government reports disclose that claims for unemployment compensation have increased steadily every week since October. In November, $62,200,000 was paid out in jobless compensation and claims were coming in at the rate of 185,000 a week. By December 25, claims were coming in at the rate of 281,300 a week. In the first week of January new claims were at the rate of 338,677 a week.

The administration knows that its trade policies are contributing to this alarming situation. We find, upon examination, that some of the raw materials exported from this country to other countries of the world as part of our various recovery enterprises, are coming back as finished products and are underselling their American counterpart. Italy, for example, is receiving American cotton and sending it back to us in the form of cotton garments which are competing with our own cotton and textile manufacturers. Foreign-made glassware is abundant in the United States.

There is another disturbing phase to the watch and clock industry. That industry is essential in times of national emergency, and we are literally destroying it through our unrealistic trade policies. During the past war skilled technicians from the watch and clock industry produced delicate precision instruments without which our Nation would not have been able to conclude the war so speedily and so successfully. These instruments were used in our aircraft and other weapons of war.

The watch and clock industry made a major contribution to the creation of the atom bomb. In letters introduced into the record of hearings before the Ways and Means Committee, an Army lieutenant general and a Navy rear admiral stated that this industry is vital to the successful conduct of future wars. Industry witnesses testified that they were told by the National Security Resources Board and other agencies of the national defense establishment that they must be equal to the needs of another emergency. The American jeweled-watch industry is the only major source of supply, outside of Switzerland, for ships' chronometers, navigation watches, stop watches, and so forth. Yet, because of our trade policies, these witnesses testified that they are not equal to the needs of another emergency. They pointed out that the 1936 trade agreement with Switzerland reduced the tariffs on watches and that thereafter the American industry's share in the American market fell sharply. Subsequent to the 1936 agreement, four factors, in addition to the reduction in tariffs, operated to reduce further the tariff protection for the industry. They were:

First. In 1934 we reduced the value of the dollar. This is one of the reasons given in the Tariff Commission's Digest of Trade Data on our trade agreement with Switzerland for reducing watch tariffs in 1936. Four months after the agreement the Swiss devalued the franc by approximately 35 percent, but no compensating increase was made thereafter in the reduced tariffs.

Second. Tariff duties on watches are specific—a definite sum per watch. The subsequent inflation has operated to reduce further, on an ad valorem or percentage basis, the protection left by the trade agreement and the devaluation of the Swiss franc.

Third. The duty on adjustments, which was intended to afford progressively greater protection the higher the quality of the watch, has been rendered completely ineffective by the marking of imported watches as unadjusted, regardless of the fact.

Fourth. The cost of watch movement manufacture, which is practically all labor, has been doubled in this country since the beginning of the war. The dollar increase has been disproportionate to that in Switzerland, inasmuch as we started from a higher base cost because of the much higher labor rates in this country. Our labor rates are approximately two and one-half times those of the Swiss for comparable jobs.

Over 55,000,000 jeweled watches and movements have been imported into this country since 1941. The highest point was in 1946 when imports exceeded 9,000,000. During the first 11 months of 1948 imports exceeded 7,100,000. All these watches are advertised and sold as jeweled watches and are competitive with our own products. The Waltham Watch Co. has already felt the full impact of this competition. The plant is closed, its employees out of work, and it is a question whether it will ever resume operation.

Mr. Chairman, the instances I mention are danger signals, and if in our future trade relations we ignore these signals our entire national economy will suffer and our national defense will be endangered. If we proceed to build up the resources of other nations at the expense of our own, we will be well on the road to that recession or depression we are all striving so mightily to avoid. I am not crying "wolf" when there is no wolf. I am not an undue alarmist seeking to disrupt or abolish America's trade relations with other lands. I believe in a healthy trade intercourse with other nations on a fair and equitable basis. But I also believe that our high standard of living should be adequately protected against an influx of cheap goods from abroad which would afford devastating competition with our own high-standard industry and our own highly paid workers.

I believe that the protections contained in the extension measure passed by the Eightieth Congress were necessary to safeguard our national interests. If, by refusing to continue any of those protections, the Congress forces the United States into an economic tailspin and retards our ability to defend ourselves and the Nation in another national emergency, then this Democratic Congress and the Democratic President must be prepared to assume full responsibility for the consequences. And I am most certain, Mr. Chairman, that, when the American people realize what this administration is trying to put over on them, they will demand an accounting. I suggest that the Democratic leadership be prepared with a good answer for its actions—that the answer be better than those given here today for the continuation of a foreign trade program which totally disregards American industry and the American workingman.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, in face of the fact that our bipartisan foreign policy now calls for the making of large loans as well as straight grants to key democracies abroad, with the obvious intent of strengthening their economies and battling communism, it seems to me the part of wisdom and enlightened self-interest that we receive some payments on the grants and loans through imports. Such is the only feasible basis upon which we can get back some of the outlay for the European rehabilitation program. The great role this country is playing in its huge creditor position is an increasingly large and more vital economic problem for this country to face on an international basis. If we should isolate ourselves from payments in kind, we would assure very little repayment of the debt we have created in our huge European outlays.

I believe the reciprocal-trade-agreements also will afford a good vehicle through which to restore our export and import business to private channels of trade at the expiration and termination of the European program. I likewise feel they will facilitate the handling of surpluses which seem to be becoming quite obvious in some industrial and agricultural products. However, I believe that the legislation contained in H. R. 1211 could be materially bettered by placing into its content a call on the President to incorporate an escape clause whereby this Nation could renegotiate a specific duty found to be injurious to American industry after a pact was negotiated. This will lead to a more fair and uniform treatment as all new trade agreements have automatically incorporated in them an escape-clause provision.

I also believe that the legislation could be bettered by calling on the President to furnish to the United States Tariff Commission a list of articles imported into the United States to be considered for possible modification of duty in a trade agreement. Upon receipt of such a list, the Tariff Commission should make an investigation and report findings to the President. This would serve as a guide to the President and negotiating agencies, first, to limit the degree of modification of duty; and, second, to serve as a guide to increase a duty or additional import restrictions, if required, to avoid serious injury to domestic industry.

The above-mentioned suggestions for bettering the legislation were made in the form of amendments by the minority and supported by me, but were not accepted by the majority members of the committee. Nevertheless, I believe that reciprocal trade agreements must continue with extension to 1951, in the face of the present international situation. I believe such action is recognition of reality.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, the reciprocal-trade-agreements program is something that very vitally affects many of the people whom I represent. In my district are raised a number of special types of crops, such as walnuts, almonds, cherries, and so forth. These same kinds of products are raised in several foreign countries. In the past it has frequently been proposed to make trade agreements with countries raising one or more of these products. In each instance, those who have their life savings invested in our specialized crops are apprehensive that the agreement which is made might be destructive of the prosperity and stability of the particular industry and crop which might be affected. Consequently, I feel it my duty to state, although it must be in more or less sketchy form, my reasons for voting for the Trade Agreements Act.

I have gone into this matter with a view of trying to determine what is the

proper thing to do in order to adequately protect the people and the property in my congressional district, and also to support a policy which will be proper for the welfare of the Nation as a whole. The underlying idea of the tariff principle is that, because of our high standard of living, and especially the high price paid for labor in America, it is utterly impossible for us to compete in some lines of production, with similar products made abroad with cheap labor, both as to things raised on the farms and as to others that are processed in the factory or the cannery. The basic idea of every tariff has been to equalize the cost of production. But the inevitable result has been, at least in the last two tariff revisions by the Congress, that the schedules have been placed higher than was necessary to adequately protect the difference in the cost of production. This comes about by the fact that the so-called log-rolling process finds full sway in such legislative procedure. One group will ask for protection and it will promise another or many other groups protection for receiving support for itself from the various groups. This vicious circle of trading benefits causes the rates to be set way above what is necessary to adequate protection. This result has followed time and again, despite the protests of Presidents and others that the proposed rates are entirely too high to equalize the difference in the cost of production.

For this reason, I have come to the conclusion that the Congress must protect itself against this inevitable result. Behind some of the tariff walls that we have made has grown up monopoly. The end result is that the consumer pays more for the things that he eats and wears, and uses in other ways, than he should.

Therefore, some years ago, after much discussion of the matter, the reciprocal trade agreement principle was enacted by the Congress. By this method, agreements are made with various countries in which tariff schedules are reduced and they may theoretically be increased, although I do not know of any case where they have been increased. Under the tariff law on books by the Trade Agreements Act, the State Department is authorized to negotiate such agreements.

The State Department, acting for the President, has set up certain machinery to arrive at what is considered fair adjustment. We have been told time and again that consideration is given to every phase of the subject and to the effect of any proposed reduction in tariffs on the economy of the particular product involved. A Committee for Reciprocity Information has been established. Opportunity is afforded to interested persons to appear before the committee and give information. It is stated that every consideration bearing on the problem is taken into account. For instance, it should be noted that in crops like almonds, walnuts, and cherries, that the soil is committed to that kind of a crop. That the investment is tremendous because the first 4 to 7 years are unproductive. It is to be noted that, if a man has a failure in either of these crops, he cannot without tremendous expense transfer to another crop, as it would require the pulling out of the trees which would probably cost more than the cost of the land. The effect of various other factors are alleged to be considered in the fixing of the rate. However, I must say that in all my contact with this matter, I have yet to learn conclusively, to my satisfaction, that the important and major factors are ignored by those who are to make the agreement. In other words, the recommendations are such that, in the opinion of those who are recommending the reduced tariff, the reduction will not affect our economy adversely. I have, therefore, come reluctantly to the view that our negotiations, regarding trade agreements, do in fact consider our American economy and the particular economy in each specific case, and try to adjust the rates so as not to affect it adversely, but simply subject it to reasonable and fair competition.

There is one point that I think should be considered seriously by the Congress in this connection. The ones who do the work are largely State Department officials, although in the present act it is stated that the Tariff Commission is to furnish necessary data in order to arrive at a proper and appropriate conclusion. This is purely optional and not mandatory. It has been charged that the State Department is more interested in building up good will than they are in protecting the American producer. I doubt whether this bald and broad statement is the real fact, but there is this peculiar situation that those who are affected sometimes feel that the State Department does, in fact, give more weight to building up good will abroad than it does to giving protection to the American economy involved.

It would seem to me that an independent agency, whose data should be considered, should make the study involving this single question: Will the proposed tariff reduction by means of a proposed trade agreement adversely affect the economy of the particular product concerned? Will the proposed schedule introduce ruinous competition that may destroy an American industry? The one to make that study is the Tariff Commission. On this Commission are men of great ability and they are supported by a technical staff, many of whom are devoting their lives to a study of tariff problems. These people would have only one objective, and that is to find out as accurately as possible how a proposed trade agreement would affect our economy and, especially, if it would have an adverse effect. I believe that this would give more weight to this conclusion and give more weight to the determination of the State Department as to the specific rate which should be placed in any trade agreement.

Another matter that harasses the minds of those who are affected by these trade agreements, as evidenced in correspondence and conversations with myself, is that they do not know what is the exact basis of the conclusion arrived at. They get no statement in the form of a report as to just what elements were taken into consideration when the conclusion was made. To the persons affected, a reciprocal trade agreement may be likened to a judgment of a court. It is a final determination of a rate on imports and it may be that this rate could or would adversely affect the particular segment of our economy involved. They are bound by it and there is nothing that they can do to change it, except get the trade agreement modified or amended, if there is an escape clause in the agreement. They should be entitled, since their economic life is involved, to a statement giving the reasons which motivated the decision as to the specific schedule entered into in a trade agreement.

I realize that California, in particular, is interested in foreign trade. Many of our agricultural products are produced in surplus, and we must find outlets for these products in foreign countries. Our agricultural economy in the past has been based on the assumption that we would have certain foreign outlets. The British Empire, the Scandinavian countries, Germany, France, the Netherlands, and others were excellent customers for our dried fruits, some types of our grapes, pears, and so forth. Therefore, it is to our advantage that we replenish the channels of international trade. The world is closely knit together, and we must find some way, in our expanding economy, to find outlets abroad for our products. Our ever-increasing production is bound to produce surpluses. At the present time we are not harassed particularly in this regard. The European recovery program is funneling off a great deal of our agricultural production, as well as a good deal of our manufactured goods. But we cannot live forever in this fool's paradise of inflation and short supply and high prices. Inevitably, if the European program works, it will redevelop the economy of Europe, and its people will find it necessary to send us some of their goods. We will also be plagued by surpluses, especially in good years, and we will have to have an outlet in foreign countries. As I see it, anything which tends to stimulate the channels of trade, without lowering our standard of living, is a good thing. An increase of the standard of living abroad to the extent that foreigners use and continue to expand the use of our products will help American prosperity. These are some of the things that have impelled me to vote for the reciprocal trade-agreements bill.

I intend to vote for the reciprocal trade bill now before us. However, I also intend to vote for the amendment requiring that in the process the Tariff Commission's data be the data that is used in determining the effect on the American economy of any proposed agreement. Whether the amendment passes or not, which I am convinced would be beneficial to everyone concerned, I intend to vote for the bill. No system which we devise can give complete justice to every single segment of our economy. But by and large, I believe the reciprocal trade program will replenish our foreign trade, will be administered so as to adequately protect producers and manufacturers in our localities in California and will result in the increase in foreign trade which will be desirable and beneficial to our overall economy.

Also, the escape-clause principle should be applied to all reciprocal trade agreements, past as well as future ones.

I also wish to state that, if any proposed trade agreement is suggested affecting any of our goods in California, I will do everything I can to help those who wish to appear to present a good case and also to receive fair trade treatment by the agencies involved in considering whether or not the proposed agreement should be entered into and what the rate should be in order to properly protect our local industry in California.

Another aspect of this matter is that I believe a healthy international trade situation will promote national security. It has been my privilege to study security problems intimately in each session of four Congresses. Nothing is more important than to try to build our security and to develop world peace. I believe that this general program will move in that general direction. It is impossible to accurately determine how much effect this will have on bringing about a stable and peaceful world. That it will have some effect, I am certain. This, likewise, weighs in my mind in favor of continuing the reciprocal trade-agreements program.

These are some of the thoughts that go through my mind which I wish my constituents to know as the impelling ones which move me to vote for this program. It was a difficult problem to decide, but I have convinced myself that I would be unworthy to those who elected me, as well as to my own conscience, not to follow the conclusions that I have arrived at after much thinking and serious deliberation.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge the adoption of the so-called peril-point amendment, the so-called escape-clause amendment, and any other amendment which may be offered to protect American labor.

I rise particularly to support the so-called escape-clause amendment which will shortly be offered, and to express the hope that the Democratic majority of this House will see fit to accept it.

This amendment will permit renegotiation by the President whenever an industry may be jeopardized under any trade agreement.

Frankly, I cannot see why or how any Member of this House, regardless of party affiliation, who has at heart the best interests of the great body of patriotic, hard-working men and women in this country who compose our labor force, can oppose this amendment.

I appreciate fully the importance of international trade. Under present world conditions, and the task which we have set for ourselves, confronted as we are by the menace of world-wide communism, international trade is vital.

But surely, Mr. Chairman, we have the right; yes, we have the obligation to safeguard American labor from the loss of its means of livelihood—from being thrown into the army of the unemployed—if the administration misjudges the effects of any particular trade agreement under existing policy.

We talk of a reciprocal-trade-agreement policy. That policy, Mr. Chairman, has never been reciprocal, in my opinion. But whatever it may be termed, every man and woman in this House today knows that once a concession is made to one country, that concession, generally speaking, applies to every other country on the face of the earth which produces the commodity in question.

Who can tell what the adverse effects under any trade agreement may be under these conditions?

The distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], has referred to the painful situation in the watch industry at this time. Please bear in mind, Mr. Chairman, that this industry has been certified by the military authorities as essential in terms of precision instruments in times of war.

A few years ago there were over 20 firms in this country commanding about 55 percent of the domestic market. Today there are only three firms commanding about 18 percent of that market. Of the three, one, the Waltham Watch Co., is in the State of Massachusetts. Recently it closed its doors, and today it would be without hope were it not for a helping hand recently extended by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The workers in that concern and their families comprise, I am informed, about 25 percent of the population of the city where it is located. It is a tragic situation; others may follow.

This country has been flooded with watches imported from Switzerland, produced by underpaid labor, at prices with which we cannot compete.

Again and again in recent years this situation has been brought to the attention of the Truman administration through the State Department and Tariff Commission. Nothing effective whatsoever has been done by the administration.

Why? Largely, Mr. Chairman, because there has been no proper escape clause in the applicable agreement with the Government of Switzerland.

A proper escape clause has been included in certain agreements from the outset. Still others have been renegotiated for the purpose of including that clause.

The amendment which will be offered will simply make it mandatory that every trade agreement hereafter shall include a proper escape clause.

I am for international trade, Mr. Chairman, but I am also for the protection of the men and women in this country who labor in our plants and contribute to the industrial success of this Nation.

In the name of American labor, in the name of American industry, essential in time of war, I appeal for the unanimous approval of the escape-clause amendment when offered and for the approval of any other amendments which will safeguard the jobs of the rank and file of labor.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, while I am not a member of the committee reporting this bill, this particular subject is one in which I have been very much interested for many years.

It seems to me there are two important points which have been brought up during yesterday's debate and again today, but which have not yet been sufficiently clarified. The first point is that section 5 of the proposed bill, as reported by the committee and on which we are now to vote, expressly provides, with reference to the powers and duties of the President, as follows:

And before concluding such agreement, the President shall seek information and advice with respect thereto from the United States Tariff Commission, from the Departments of State, Agriculture, and Commerce, from the National Military Establishment, and from such other sources as he may deem appropriate.

I read that especially in view of the comments of our distinguished minority leader, whose remarks seem to imply at least that, even though the President did appoint the Tariff Commission, he need not consult the Tariff Commission if he did not so desire. But the language I have just read makes it mandatory upon the President so to do.

I call the attention of the committee to the fact that it is compulsory in the bill before us today as written that the President shall seek information and advice from the Tariff Commission which he himself appoints. There is no need for the amendment proposed by the Republican minority that the Tariff Commission shall give the President information and advice. The committee bill as drawn already so provides.

And because I realize that many Members of the House have probably not had the time to read the full text of the voluminous hearings before the committee, and I having done that, I call attention to the fact that on page 751 of the printed hearings before the committee there is a letter dated in January of this year from the committee on commercial policy, United States Associates, International Chamber of Commerce, New York, which states:

The United States Associates strongly urge the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for a period of not less than 5 years.

The world now needs more than ever the assurance of a continuing and resolute foreign economic policy and strong leadership by the United States. If the act were to be extended for a period of not less than 5 years, this assurance of itself would be an act of leadership.

In April 1949 at Geneva the United States will participate in trade negotiations with 13 countries which have not yet subscribed to the 1947 general agreement on tariffs and trade. We should not be prevented there from securing and giving real concessions out of which can come a substantial incentive for further revival of international trade.

Instead, our team of negotiators at Geneva should be supported by a reciprocal-trade-agreements act permitting them to exert dynamic leadership. For that reason the crippling Gearhart amendment to the 1948

renewal of the act should be eliminated and the act should be extended early in 1949 before the Geneva negotiations begin.

JOSEPH M. HARTFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Commercial Policy.

I call the following sentence to the particular attention of the gentleman on the Republican side of this House:

For that reason the crippling Gearhart amendment to the 1948 renewal of the act should be eliminated and the act should be extended early in 1949 before the Geneva negotiations begin.

Now, I call attention to page 756 of the same hearings before the committee, on which there appears a letter dated January 24, 1949, to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of this House. It is from the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. I read this letter in part only to save time, but I think that the Members of Congress generally understand and believe that the Chamber of Commerce of the United States speaks loudly and primarily for the business, industrial, the manufacturing, and the commercial interests of our Nation. This is primarily what the chamber of commerce is organized for in each community and in the Nation, and they are not to be criticized for it. But, with this understanding, gentlemen, of their purpose, I read only one of the important portions of the rather lengthy letter printed in the hearings, as follows:

The policy of the Trade Agreements Act should be continued. * * * This policy, which was reaffirmed in 1946 through referendum of the chamber's membership, by a vote of 2,443 to 17, represents the present position of the chamber on the trade-agreements program.

In the spring of last year, preceding passage of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948, the chamber presented testimony at House and Senate hearings in opposition to proposed amendments being considered at that time. * * * We recommended that the legislation and the procedures as they then stood should be continued without alteration for a period of at least 3 years. * * *

The provisions of H. R. 1211, now before your committee, calling for the repeal of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948, and extension of the act as it existed before passage of that legislation for a period of 3 years from June 12, 1948, are in accord with chamber policy. We urge that the committee and the Congress approve the measure.

Sincerely yours,
EARL O. SHREVE, *President.*

It being a recognized fact, then, that the Chamber of Commerce of the United States speaks for the chambers of commerce all over the United States—and there are hundreds and hundreds of them—we have a right to assume, do we not, from this letter dated January 24, 1949, that the business, the commercial, the industrial, the manufacturing interests of our Nation want H. R. 1211 passed as submitted by the committee and without either of these amendments which the Republican minority have now submitted. Certainly, gentlemen, the United States Chamber of Commerce, under such recent date as January 24, 1949, and having had express knowledge of the pending consideration of reciprocal-trade agreements before our distinguished committee in this House, would never have written this official letter, received by the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee less than a month ago, if the business, industrial, shipping, fishing, commercial, manufacturing interests of the Nation had communicated through their respective chambers of commerce in their own localities opposition to the proposal of this Democratic administration to carry out the wishes and purposes of our distinguished President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, who communicated to our distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from North Carolina, Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, under date of January 8, 1949, his message asking that the crippling provisions of the Trade Agreements Act inserted by the Eightieth Congress be removed from the act. I call your attention to the letter of the President of the United States as it appeared on page 2 of the printed hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means, as follows:

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In my message on the state of the Union I asked the Congress to act promptly to extend the Trade Agreements Act without the hampering restrictions placed on it by the last Congress.

As you know, negotiations will begin in April to extend the benefits of the general agreement on tariffs and trade to 13 countries that did not participate in the original agreement. This general agreement, concluded in the autumn of 1947, is the most important and comprehensive trade agreement in history. Under it, the United States and 22 other nations agreed to reduce their tariffs, or to maintain low tariffs or none at all, on a wide variety of products. The products affected accounted in 1938 for over half of the world's international trade. In addition, the participating countries agreed to curb the use of other trade restrictions, such as import quotas, and to limit various kinds of discrimination, such as preferential treatment of imports from one country as against those from another. Never before have so many nations combined in such an intensive effort to reduce barriers to trade.

The extension of the benefits of this agreement under the authority of the Trade Agreements Act is a practical cooperative effort to remove unnecessary obstacles to the building of a stable and prosperous world. The restrictive provisions and limited extension of the present trade-agreements law materially hamper the effectiveness of United States participation in this effort. That is why it is so imporant that the existing Trade Agreements Act be promptly repealed, and that the act as it existed on March 1, 1948, be extended for a further substantial period. I suggest that this period be until June 12, 1951.

Unless nations can sell each other the products of their agriculture, labor, and industry to the greatest possible extent, there can be no sure foundation for economic peace. Unless world trade is increased, the tremendous investment we are making toward world economic recovery will be largely wasted. Unless trade restrictions are relaxed, the lot of the private trader in international trade will become increasingly difficult.

In the achievement of these objectives, United States leadership and United States action is a decisive influence.

The trade-agreements program has proved itself to the people of the United States. It has justly earned their overwhelming support. We must be in a position to press that program forward with vigor.

I know that I can count on your continued support in securing necessary action to this end at the earliest possible date.

Sincerely yours,
HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Therefore, gentlemen, this bill should pass without either of these crippling amendments being adopted for three reasons, amongst others:

First. The President of the United States, who is charged by law, custom, and position with such matters, has clearly called our attention to the fact that the reciprocal-trade agreements are an established part of our national and international policy in such matters, and he further clearly reminds us that the condition of the world demands its extension as provided in this bill and that the essence of this bill has already proved beneficial to our Nation and to world trade.

Second. The official speaking unit or committee for the business, industrial, shipping, fishing, mercantile establishments of our Nation, as represented by the United States Chamber of Commerce, by its official letter to Congress, disproves the claims of the Republican minority, who are fighting this bill and who threaten to try to put back into it the two crippling features which were written into it during the Eightieth Congress.

Third. The expressed desire and hope and wish of the American people in the November 2 election was clearly to the effect that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, as campaigned for by the President of the United States in his talks with the American people and his campaign by the Democratic records in the House and Senate of the United States, was to the effect that the American people again wanted the good will and the trade, on a reciprocal basis, to be extended between the nations of the world.

This can only be most promptly and adequately accomplished by the passage of the bill before the House without either of the emasculating amendments proposed by the minority being adopted.

I submit that the expressed opinion of the industrial, the commercial, and the manufacturing interests of the United States is not represented by the present opposition in the House to this bill.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOYLE. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman referred to the action of the New York Chamber of Commerce. Of course, I do not know everybody in the New York Chamber of Commerce, but I know one most distinguished member of that chamber of commerce. He has issued a pamphlet directly opposed to what the chamber says in the resolution which the gentleman has just read.

Mr. DOYLE. Of course he did it as an individual, but here we have the official action of the United States Chamber of Commerce itself as shown in its letter printed in the hearings.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican Party's No. 1 ghost has walked again. He has even talked again.

Last night, with the same self-assured, cocky air that has characterized him through two Presidential campaigns, Thomas E. Dewey came around to tell the few Republicans who are interested in his views what is wrong with the Republican Party. He revealed both his lack of political know-how and his innate bad taste. Why he ever accepted the invitation to speak again, this soon after his second debacle, only Dewey and his group of so-called advisers could tell.

News reporters were around, as usual, asking him if he would run again. If there are any reporters or members of the Republican Party who think that Dewey has one chance in ten billion in ever again being the Presidential standard bearer of the Republican Party, let me right now disillusion them. Thomas E. Dewey is through. Washed up. Finished.

And, now that he is through—finished—washed up—there is little need for him to go around the country pointing the finger of scorn at anyone else. There are only two men in the United States responsible for Thomas E. Dewey's defeat.

The No. 1 is Thomas E. Dewey. The other is Herbert Brownell, who was Dewey's campaign manager during the 1944 debacle and during the 1948 rout. In each instance, Brownell and Dewey forgot the first principles of political campaigning in this country. They went out of their way to alienate the politicians who had won elections for years and they searched frantically high and low for so-called public relations and advertising specialists. These advertising specialists were good at selling soap, Arrid, Tums, toothpaste, and other commodities you may eat, wear, or with which you may perfume yourself, but they had not the faintest conception of how to sell the people a man or an idea. They failed miserably in two campaigns, under the tutelage of Dewey and Brownell, but I did not see any notice of his mentioning them last night.

Mr. Chairman, I did not have a chance to get down to hear Dewey in person last night. I had another engagement, and, to tell the truth, I was not interested. I mean nothing personal against him, of course.

But I did glance over the newspapers this morning, and if he was correctly quoted he is so punch-drunk after two successive defeats that he does not know what hit him. In fact, he is so groggy that he seems to be taking cracks at his old self.

He told the Republican Party for instance, according to the newspapers, "to tell the people where it stands and why." O Lord, Mr. Chairman, Dewey is just about 4 months too late in learning this bitter lesson. He is the only man in American history to campaign for office of President and not take a single decisive stand on any issue whatsoever. Several of my friends remarked on that fact to me before the election. One of them stated flatly: "I suppose Dewey will win. But if so he will be the only man in American history ever to be elected President without taking a stand on a single, solitary issue."

Then Mr. Dewey started talking about liberals, progressives, and reactionaries. He did not define these terms. Oh, no; that would have been fatal, for then he would not have been able to talk any longer. There has been more bull spouted about liberalism, conservatism, progressivism, and reaction during the New Deal than in any other era in world history. Dewey still thinks it is an issue. By now he should have learned that these are symbols, carefully planted in the minds of the people by those who would confuse and divide America. The Republicans must quit falling for these symbols of the opposition. They must develop their own smear words and symbols. If we are going to have political wars let us have them fought out by two equals, not between a propaganda giant such as the New Deal represents and a propaganda pigmy such as Dewey and the Republican Party represented in the recent elections.

If the pepole are ruled by symbols—meaningless symbols in most instances—why should Dewey use the symbols cultivated and implanted by the New Deal to describe his own defeat? Because, as I often have maintained, Dewey is a New Dealer but he just does not know it. I am telling him. Instead of reading anyone else out of the Republican Party, which this self-styled elder statesman has no right to do, the officials of our party ought to invite him either to follow their leadership or move over to the opposition. Let no Republicans get angry and leave the party because of what Dewey has said. He has chalked up new losing records for this century and it is time for us to forget him once and for all.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment.

I had intended to offer an amendment to put fisheries in this bill so that the people whom I represent would have a fair chance with the people from Canada, Newfoundland, and the other countries that are in these so-called trade agreements. However, I am not going to offer that amendment because I am afraid if you turn that down you might turn down the other. I want you to have in mind when you vote on it what you are doing, because, under the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the former Speaker of this House, the people of this country, whom I represent and whom you represent, will be put on a square and fair deal with other countries so far as tariffs are concerned.

I was in the First World War and I was in England and France. You could not buy any American tobacco then. You cannot buy any American tobacco there today. If you go to your neighboring country, Canada, you pay 35 or 40 cents for a package of cigarettes. The only thing you can buy there is a package of cigarettes—I have forgotten the name of them now—but it was something that they put pictures in when I was a little boy. So there is only one thing that we have to consider as I see it, and that is whether or not we are going to protect the American workingman or the man who invests his money in tobacco, in cotton, or whatever it is. That is the only thing I think we are supposed to do here—to look out for our own. When we do that we will have peace with the world. It is all right from the top to talk about reciprocal trade. The only reciprocity there is is the United States of America. We get no reciprocity from any foreign country and we have not gotten it. If you want to ship something to some foreign country you just see what the tariff is on it, whether it is cotton, tobacco, watches, or any other thing that we produce in this country. If people are going to walk the streets, I want them to walk the streets somewhere else than in my district, and I think you do also.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON] has expired.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate having an opportunity to make a general statement at this time regarding the legislation now before the House. I will speak more specifically regarding amendments that are to be offered later on.

I wish to tell the House at this time that my particular interest in this legislation springs from my interest in national defense. But as I see the legislation outlined in this bill, it places the volume of trade first and national defense very much in second place.

An amendment to be offered will protect us in letting the President know where the peril points are. Without an amendment to this legislation you have no assurance that the President has any place to go for that information when it is most needed.

I have given more time to strategic and critical materials than any other phase of national defense, but I have also given considerable time to the matter of pools of skilled workers, and that is the reason for my interest in the health and welfare of the watchmaking industry.

To those of you who have mining interests, I suggest you read the prepared statements by Mr. Long and his associates on pages 420 and 422 of the hearings. If you have mining interests, if you are interested, as I am, in the health and vigor of the mining industry domestically, as a safeguard in our national defense, read those statements and ponder long and well before you support the legislation now before you without some investigation and without some analysis of the effect of the proposed amendments to this legislation and what they will do for you and your mining industry.

There is testimony in the hearings regarding the importance of a stock pile of strategic and critical materials. Let me tell you a healthy and vigorous mining industry is of far greater importance than the stock pile itself.

Let me call Forrestal's attention to the fact that, in his answer to the position I took in the committee during the hearings, at no time did he discuss the point

in this legislation that is vital to national defense. I did not ever maintain that the reciprocal-trade program was a threat; no, I maintained that a reciprocal-trade program where you march forward in the dark without a knowledge of the peril points is a step dangerous to national defense.

I look to the Tariff Commission to keep the President informed of when we are up to any kind of a peril point. That is not an argument for or against reciprocal treaties; that is an argument, I hope, to build a bigger and better reciprocal-trade program, one that is safe; and for me I will always put national defense ahead of mere volume of trade. To me this proposed legislation puts volume of trade ahead of national defense. National defense is told to go sit down in a corner. Forrestal did not discuss the need for the peril point determination in his letter. I wish he had given me a concrete and definite statement on that point, but he did not do it.

I am holding Forrestal, however, responsible for the caliber and the adequacy of our national defense; that is his responsibility. It is no cure to turn back to the days of 1940 and preserve that particular number of skilled watchmakers, because I sweat blood in the Committee on Military Affairs wondering whether we were going to get an adequate number of skilled workmen. It is time Forrestal was giving some attention to building up a better stock pile of skilled workers than we had in 1940, because we may not be given 2 years to get ready for any future war. That is his responsibility.

The reciprocal-trade program can by proper amendment be made safe for adequate national defense. Without those amendments you move forward at your peril. I will have more to say on that when the amendments are offered.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time simply to elaborate on what the distinguished gentleman from Iowa has said. There was something that happened in connection with the last World War that illustrated to me how important certain materials are. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] admonished us to be careful with reference to the mining industry. I am sure every Member of the House will remember that in the last World War there were five German spies arrested off the coast of Florida. It was discovered that those five had come to do damage to a very strategic industry that even I, brought up in the section where that industry flourishes, did not know was so important. Anyone who knows anything about the making of steel and iron knows that the white-hot molten product flows through a small opening in the bottom of the furnace. Everyone knows who knows anything about the steel industry that the hole in those furnaces is sealed or stopped up with a certain kind of clay. That clay is produced in a limited number of places in the United States. These spies were going to those places where that kind of clay was produced to destroy the clay plants there; and if they had been successful they could have stopped practically every furnace in the United States in a short time. Very few people in the whole country did or could know about how strategic this material was.

We cannot expect the President to know all about what commodity is important and what is vital; we cannot expect him to know the peril there will be to all industries in the admission of commodities. But we have a commission down there that does know and ought to know; I refer to the Tariff Commission, and that Commission ought to have a chance to have a say in such important matters. We propose to try to see that it does.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is interesting to note that the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Tobin, urges revision of trade pacts to help United States watchmakers in an Associated Press article of this date. I read as follows:

WASHINGTON.—Secretary of Labor Tobin said he thought that too many Swiss watches have been imported, and urged swift revision of reciprocal-trade agreements to help domestic watchmakers.

Mr. Tobin, former mayor of Boston and Governor of Massachusetts, recently intervened in an effort to save the Waltham Watch Co. plant at Waltham, Mass., from closing down.

He praised the effect of the reciprocal-trade agreements generally, but said that the large inflow of watches was an example of how it could affect a domestic industry adversely.

Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of Labor is to be congratulated upon his forthrightness, his honesty, and his loyalty to the workers of the United States and for his interest in the defense of this Republic.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Will the amendment which the gentleman proposes to offer later in the afternoon to provide for an escape clause in all trade agreements give some protection?

Mr. CURTIS. It will give some protection and it can give a great deal of protection. I want to be very frank about this. There are two things that are required, an escape clause and a forthright, honest administration. The escape clause is important because the act being passed today will be effective in trade agreements for years and years to come and it should be written into law. It will make possible a certain amount of relief.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. What form will that escape clause take and what will the procedure be that we have to follow in order to get the benefit of the escape clause in the bill?

Mr. CURTIS. The escape clause procedure is quite cumbersome. The affected groups, of course, will have to appear before the Tariff Commission and present their case. The Tariff Commission makes their finding and reports to the President. The President may or may not take action under the escape clause. The President may issue a directive at once taking advantage of the escape clause. But if he cannot get the foreign country to agree, that foreign country may withdraw equivalent concessions. It is a bit cumbersome and without the proper kind of administration it will not do what it ought to do, but we are legislating perhaps for many, many years to come and that is why it is important.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, everything related to the American concept of liberty and justice stands condemned to contempt and ridicule by minions of the Kremlin who have committed the basest of all crimes—the assassination of decency itself.

Men everywhere are horrified at the perfidy of Moscow, the epitome of deceit and treachery. While hirelings of the Kremlin mouth fancy phrases having to do with peace and democracy, the Moscow-dominated government of Hungary condemns to a living death the champion of truth and justice in that country.

In the conviction of Cardinal Mindszenty the rulers in the Kremlin have pronounced themselves irrevocably opposed to the American concept of liberty and justice. Not content with merely insulting the Catholics of the world, with malice aforethought, they conjured up a deliberate insult to the United States of America. With their bleatings of Yankee imperialism they have made their purpose clear. It is not only the Vatican Russia despises, it is these United States which they are also bent on destroying. And this great Nation of ours has fallen upon sad times if it permits this insult to justice and decency to go unanswered.

Committees of this Congress have before them resolutions denouncing the conduct of the Government of Hungary. I implore the chairman of our Foreign Affairs Committee to bring the House resolution to the floor. Let us set the record straight. We stand for honor and truth and justice. We revolt at this crime against humanity, which has been dictated by the Moscow overlords of Hungary. This is not merely a matter of the internal affairs of Hungary. This is conduct which shocks the hearts of all men. I insist that our Government must take formal action. This matter must be presented formally to the United Nations. The Government of Hungary and the men in the Kremlin must understand there is a limit to what we will stand for.

Unless this Congress acts now, I shall, though I am but one Member of this House, appeal to the Secretary General of the United Nations personally to bring this matter up at the very first opportunity.

In the meantime, the United States Minister to Hungary should be recalled immediately.

The Foreign Affairs Committee of the Congress needs his advice and counsel.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the arguments presented here in the last 10 or 15 minutes are an indication of how the minority is trying to becloud the issue before us today. They are pointing out the case of the Waltham Watch Co., which is a company that, since the turn of the century, has gone into bankruptcy at least three times because of the inefficiency of its management, because it has not kept in step with the progress of other companies in America manufacturing watches and because of some financial manipulations in which the controlling personnel of that corporation has engaged. The simple fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that the other two big watch companies in this country have been exceedingly prosperous. The American watch industry is in a very healthy condition. The American watch industry right now produces and is capable only of producing at its maximum effort 3,000,000 jeweled watches. Now the demand of the American people for watches is 9,000,000 jeweled watches a year. So the American watch industry is incapable of producing enough watches to supply the American demand.

They talk about national defense. Yesterday the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], read into the RECORD a letter from the Secretary of Defense which stated in effect that the American watch industry took its full share of the responsibility during the war period, and that he is not aware that the capabilities of the watch industry have been adversely affected by the reciprocal-trade authority.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing at all to this matter. These gentlemen on the minority side ask us to pass special legislation to take care of an industry that after the First World War went into bankruptcy, and before the First World War went into bankruptcy, and after the Second World War is asking the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for a loan of $6,000,000, when the Elgin Watch Co. and the Hamilton Watch Co. in this country are each making handsome profits.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is really his argument to finally kill this industry so vital to national defense?

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman is surely talking about a single company—not the watch industry. Sufficient testimony has been presented to show the inefficient management of the Waltham Co. that it has shown in wartime and peacetime, and it is not keeping up with the times. It is only a matter, Mr. Chairman, of trying to becloud the issue. If the membership will turn to page 986 of yesterday's RECORD, you will see where the Secretary of National Defense says that the domestic jeweled-watch industry has fulfilled its role in our program of national defense, and that he is not aware that its capabilities have been adversely affected by the reciprocal-trade-agreement program.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman's argument in regard to the watch industry and what its troubles amount to is not supported by the testimony taken before our committee, with the exception of the testimony of the Swiss importers who have a financial interest in this legislation.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that is just the opinion of the gentleman from Nebraska. Just the reverse is borne out by the record.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman is correct. And, I want to say this also for the information of the gentleman from Nebraska and the other Members, if they will turn to the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS] yesterday on this very subject, he referred to a book that was written by a man who was paid by the Waltham Watch Co., in which the history of the Waltham Watch Co. is detailed. This book indicates that the company had been inefficiently managed, and that its finances have been juggled around so that the company could never prosper under its present management and under its present financial situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, we have been exceedingly liberal here. We have allowed an hour of general debate. Not a single amendment has yet been offered. I think we ought to make some progress with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the first section of this bill and all amendments thereto close in not to exceed 20 minutes.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts and Mr. NICHOLSON objected.

Mr. COOPER. Then, Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on section 1 of this bill and all amendments thereto close in not to exceed 20 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I have no financial interest in the Waltham Watch Co. and know nothing about the company, but I deprecate the attack upon the laboring men of that company who produce the Waltham watches. I have in my hand a Waltham watch that I have used for over 20 years. It has kept better time than the clocks in the House. Therefore I hope that those who are now making an attack upon the integrity and skill of the American laborers in the Waltham watch factory will feel more kindly toward them when they consider the future welfare of these American workers.

As a Member of this House I have always felt that it is up to Congress to legislate for the welfare of the people when it comes to the question of tariffs. I thought that we as an elected body could do that in better manner than to leave it to some agency which is not responsible to the people. We have been elected and should do our constitutional duty instead of delegating it to the President.

I recognize that the magnitude of the business done by the United States Government and the multiplicity of policies we have in operation over the world makes things confusing not only to Members of the House but also for the people. I thought I would mention just one or two items that confuse the issue and are involved in reciprocal trade.

You remember that we are supporting the price of potatoes in this country. The United States Government will spend more than $200,000,000 to support the price of potatoes from the 1948 crop. We will buy over 32,000,000 bushels of potatoes in Maine. We will buy about 38,000,000 bushels in New York State at a cost of around $30,000,000. During the time that we are buying these surplus potatoes, because of the fact that the duty on potatoes from Canada was reduced from 75 cents to 37½ cents for 3,000,000 bushels in the reciprocal-trade agreements, more than 5,000,000 bushels of the Canadian crop have come into the United States and have been sold in the cities along the eastern coast at a price below the support price. Therefore, in fact, we in this country are compelled to spend more money for potatoes produced in the United States in order to provide a market for Canadian potatoes under the reciprocal-trade law, and it is going to cost the American taxpayers over $200,000,000 this year.

Another thing, although it may not directly relate to the reciprocal-trade program, is this. You will recollect that we had one of the biggest wheat crops in the history of our country in 1948. We consume about 800,000,000 or 900,000,000 bushels in this country, and we have to sell or give away the rest in the world market, and we want to get rid of our surplus to avoid crashes in the commodity market such as are taking place today.

To keep the record straight on wheat, I saw a few days ago that the Economic Cooperation Administration, or the Marshall plan, had turned over $55,000,000 to England to buy wheat in Canada. I thought it was rather strange that the American taxpayer should be taxed to give money to England so that they could buy wheat in Canada, when we have a large surplus in the United States. Before coming to the floor, I thought I would check on it, and, lo and behold, a report came from the ECA that it is not $55,000,000; that for the 12 months beginning April 3, 1948, we are turning over to England $300,000,000, to buy nearly 160,000,000 bushels of wheat in Canada, when we have a surplus here.

The wheat price has been going down the full 10 cents a day for the last 2 or 3 days, and nobody knows when it is going to hit the bottom.

Now these are matters that confuse me. Here the American people are paying taxes to give the money away to some other country so that they can buy something from still another country

while we are sitting here with a surplus of the same commodity that this other country, to wit, England, is purchasing today. That seems a little funny, does it not? And does not that potato deal seem funny?

We buy $200,000,000 worth of potatoes to destroy them and at the same time we provide a market for the Canadian farmers who can come to this country and sell potatoes at a lower price than the Government here is supporting them.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. In fact the gentleman from Minnesota, now speaking in the well of the House [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], is one of the most distinguished agriculturists in the United States, and it just illustrates the point that even he cannot get an answer on this question from the Tariff Commission.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentleman for his kind observation.

I favor support prices to encourage production of food in the United States, but the folly of the Truman administration's policy, as I have outlined, will require larger appropriations to support the price of wheat and potatoes produced in this country. We are, in fact, supporting the price of Canadian wheat and potatoes and providing a market for these products in the United States or some other country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I support the principles of H. R. 1211, the reciprocal-trade bill, which is before the House today. However, I do want to bring to the attention of the Members the situation which involves the employment of several thousands of workers in the Pacific Northwest area who are employed in the plywood, the fishery, and the fruit industries. It is my firm belief that we should write this legislation in such a way as not to destroy these industries which play such a vital part in our economy. It is true that from the broader viewpoint we must encourage world trade, and act upon trade barriers in such a way as to make possible the freer flow of goods between nations. In light of world conditions we are all aware of the tremendous task which is ours to stimulate world recovery from the effects of the late war. But let us not enter upon that task blindly. Let us recognize that to do an effective job we must ourselves be economically strong, otherwise we will fail in what we are trying to do. If we recklessly pass legislation without due regard to all the factors, we may in the process destroy certain segments of our economy. If enough segments are destroyed the whole economy may be so weakened as to make it impossible for us to attain our ultimate objective.

Should not those who are charged with the authority to negotiate trade agreements be given to understand that Congress does not intend that segments of our industry shall be destroyed? Should not they be asked to give due and serious consideration to the interests and problems of each industry affected by the particular agreement entered into with other nations? Is it asking too much for Americans to say to them, "Don't sell us down the river when you are negotiating trade treaties"? I do not believe so. Thousands of workers in the industries I have referred to are concerned because they know that when their products can no longer compete with foreign imports their jobs will be gone. Mr. Chairman, I urge the most serious consideration of this legislation now before us.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I am taking this time to talk to my Democratic friends and to tell them what I had intended to tell my Republican friends in our Republican conference yesterday morning when I did not have the time. The over-all question before the Eighty-first Congress, as I see it, is this: "Shall the Eighty-first Congress go down in history as the repudiating Congress?" We have already repudiated the good work that was done by the Rules Committee of the Eightieth Congress when we emasculated that committee because it had prevented from coming to the floor of the House $21,000,000,000 worth of authorizations which we did not want to face. When we repudiated the work of the Rules Committee of the Eightieth Congress we tactily admitted to the people of the Nation that President Truman was right when he characterized the Eightieth Congress the worst Congress in history. We are going to be called upon to repudiate the action of the Eightieth Congress in passing the Taft-Hartley bill. I am told by my friend from Michigan that we are going to do that. If we do we will be repudiating the work of the Eightieth Congress and tacitly admitting that the President was right in his characterization of the Eightieth Congress. We are going to be called on to repudiate the action of the Eightieth Congress on the tax-reduction bill which we passed. If we do that, again we will be tacitly admitting to the people of this Nation that the President was right in his characterization of the Eightieth Congress.

We are going to be asked to repudiate the action of the Eightieth Congress on the Aiken bill, the long-term agricultural bill, with its flexible support prices. If we do that, again we will be tacitly admitting to the Nation that the President was right in his characterization of the Eightieth Congress.

Today we are being asked to repudiate the record of the Eightieth Congress in placing safeguards around the administration of the reciprocal-trade agreements, and that is all we did. We have no quarrel with the theory of the reciprocal-trade agreements; it is the way they are being administered that we criticize and want to correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] has expired.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK] is recognized.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] yesterday, I thought, spoke rather scornfully and sarcastically about the tens of thousands of American fishermen who engage in the hazardous employment of going down to the sea to bring food for the American people.

When the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] expressed concern over the future of the fisheries of New England the gentleman from Pennsylvania ridiculed the thought that anyone should entertain any concern about fishermen.

"Why," said the gentleman from Pennsylvania, "the average fisherman last year had earnings of $5,000." Then the gentleman from Pennsylvania added, "of course, in 1945, they only made $4,500." And then he remarked, I thought, rather sarcastically, "the poor fisherman." I gathered from his remarks that he looks upon fishermen as the aristocracy of labor and, therefore, in his opinion, entitled to very little consideration by the Democratic majority of this Congress.

It may be true, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania said, that the average American fisherman in 1946 made $5,000. It may be true that the fisherman made $4,500 in 1945. But what about 1946 and 1947? The gentleman did not mention fishermen's earnings for those years. It may be that in those years the average fisherman did not make much more than enough money to pay for his groceries and the gasoline to operate his fishing craft.

In all the businesses in which the risk capital of Americans is employed the fishing industry is the most hazardous. A fisherman has a good year and he may make $5,000. Then he may have one, two, or three bad years in which he does not earn enough for the upkeep of his boat. If it were not for a good year now and then no one would be engaging in commercial fishing.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, yesterday, in discussing the annual fish catch of the United States remarked that the American fish take is now double what it was in the prewar years. Then he added, rather sarcastically, I thought, "So they"—meaning the fishermen—"need a lot of protection." By this, I took the gentleman from Pennsylvania to mean that American fishermen are entitled to no protection whatever. Since the gentleman from Pennsylvania is a member of the Ways and Means Committee I am wondering if it is the position of the Democratic Party that our American fishermen are entitled to no protection whatever against the low-wage, low-living standard competition of foreign nations.

Now, it is probably true that fish production is considerably higher than in the prewar years. There are many reasons for that. During the war years, due to heavy naval operations, many foreign fishing boats were destroyed. There has not yet been time to rebuild these foreign fishing fleets. The foreign fishermen have not yet gotten back to prewar production and had time to create these prewar surpluses which they formerly dumped in the United States.

If, when they do get back into full production, no protection is afforded our American fishermen the great fishing industry that has been built up in this country during the war years will be greatly reduced. If that happens, the

millions of dollars Americans have invested in canneries and other millions that thousands of little fishermen have invested in fishing boats and fishing gear will become largely worthless

This bill gives to the State Department the right to pass a life and death sentence upon every business and every community in this country that may be adversely affected by foreign imports. This bill gives to the State Department the right to say what businesses shall be destroyed and what businesses shall be permitted to live. This bill gives to the State Department the power to say what workers shall be permitted to continue in their present employment and what workers will be forced to give up their jobs and go and seek work elsewhere in other fields than those in which they are now engaged.

When such vast powers are given to any executive department of the Government they should be surrounded with every safeguard to protect the welfare of the people. One of the safeguards that should be provided is that of permitting the Tariff Commission to establish peril points below which, in the interest of the well-being of our American economy, no tariff should be reduced. Another of the safeguards needed is the escape clause.

If these reasonable safeguards are placed in the reciprocal-trade-treaty bill I shall vote for this bill. If they are not placed in this bill I shall, in the interest of thousands of fishermen of the Pacific coast, of nut growers, shingle mill employees, pulp and paper mill employees and others, be compelled to vote against it.

THE CRAB INDUSTRY

Let me tell you of what has happened to one fishing industry of the Pacific coast, that of crab fishing.

Prior to December 7, 1941, of all canned crab marketed in the United States 85 percent was imported from Japan. Our American crab fishermen and American cannery workers could not compete with the low-wage, low-living standards of Japanese cannery workers and Japanese fishermen.

When the Japs bombed Pearl Harbor they blasted themselves out of the American crab market. Americans built boats in American yards giving employment to American workers. In 1948 the crab-fishing business of the Pacific coast was 18 times what it was in 1941 and in the years prior to 1941. Thousands of American fishermen and cannery workers are now engaged in catching and processing crab.

If, through unwise treaties negotiated by the State Department, the Japanese are permitted to reenter the American crab market, then the time may come when Japanese canned crab again will control 85 percent of our American market.

If that is permitted to happen, the millions of dollars Americans have invested in crab-fishing boats and crab-fishing gear will be largely useless and worthless. Our American fishermen and cannery workers can no more compete with Japanese low wages and low living standards today than they could in 1941. If Japan again takes over our American crab market as she did in the years prior to 1942, our crab canneries will be idle and thousands of cannery workers out of employment.

What may happen to the crab industry may happen to many other fishing enterprises, our American tuna, bottom fish, salmon, and pilchards.

These fisheries ought to be protected at least to the point of giving them an opportunity to be heard by the Tariff Commission in establishing what are peril points, below which tariffs on fish should not be reduced. They ought to be protected at least to the point where if a treaty entered into begins to prove ruinous to an industry that there is an escape clause under which the United States Government may withdraw from such a disastrous treaty arrangement.

FILBERT NUTS

For the last half century Oregon and Washington have been a one-industry region, dependent almost solely on one industry—forest products. This dependency upon one industry frequently has led to severe booms and busts. To overcome this disadvantage our people have sought with vigor and intelligence to diversify their economic structure. Among the new diversified industries which have been developed are cranberry raising, bulb growing, and filbert raising.

Within recent years 850 filbert orchards have come into bearing in western Washington alone and more orchards, of later planting, are reaching year by year the bearing stage. These filbert orchards have progressed so far toward meeting the domestic demand for these nuts that the price on filberts, which was 27.5 cents a pound to growers in 1945, by 1948 had declined to 13.5 cents a pound, or less than half the price of 4 years ago.

If, under reciprocal-trade treaties, the duty on filberts or other nuts sold in competition to them, were to be lowered many of these orchards would be cut down and the trees, which required years of cultivation to reach a productive stage, would be converted into fuel, with tremendous financial loss to the orchardists and unemployment for their employees.

This bill, as a very minimum, should provide the safeguard to the nut growers that would exist if we maintain the Tariff Commission as an agency to set peril points below which no tariff reduction should go and an escape clause that will let us withdraw from any tariff agreement that time and experience proves is ruinous to any American industry.

CEDAR SHINGLES

We on the Pacific coast are familiar with how ruinous and unwise tariff arrangement may be to an industry. From time to time, we have seen thousands of our shingle weavers thrown into enforced idleness because through unsound and unwise treaties we had given away our shingle market to the Canadians.

The Canadians were permitted to export large shingle quotas into the United States under a treaty agreement.

When building was brisk and the demand for shingles so great that United States mills could not meet the demand our shingle-mill employees had jobs. However, whenever building slows down, it is the Canadian mills which supply the bulk of the American market with shingles while our own American shingle-mill workers walk the streets and they and their families go hungry.

The shingle weavers, like our American fishermen, cannot compete with the lower wages that prevail in Canadian shingle mills and Canadian logging camps.

With the wages in the Canadian lumber industry today 40 percent below those prevailing on the United States side of the border, it is impossible for our American shingle weavers to compete with the Canadian shingles.

Before we grant any concessions to Canada on shingles we ought to first consider what effect these concessions will have upon United States employment. Maintenance of the Tariff Commission to fix peril points below which no tariff should be reduced will help to do that.

If the majority permits some amendments to this bill and thereby will give our American industries and American workers assurance that they will not be sold down the river by the State Department I will vote for this bill. If the majority will not approve such amendments I shall be compelled in the interest of thousands of workers whom I represent to vote against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] is recognized.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield for a question.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I would like to have the gentleman from Massachusetts tell the House about how many fishermen owed the boat money previous to 1939 when they came in from their catch.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the 4 minutes allotted to me to discuss the very important matters affecting the industries of New England is entirely too short a time. We heard much said yesterday about gag rule. If this is not gag rule, restricting to 4 minutes a Member of this House, representing as many of us do, the great industrial areas of this country that need protection in years to come if this bill should become law, I do not know what is a gag rule. I shall not therefore be able to answer every question that will be asked in regard to this matter; but I am very interested, of course, in answering the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], who yesterday in a very slighting way referred to the fishermen and the occupation they follow in their hazardous work on the high seas. He said yesterday that in the testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means, notwithstanding the tremendous imports of fish in the last 50 years, that the sum total of all the imports of fish brought into this country could be brought in in six boats. Now, of course, as I said to you yesterday, there must have been some misunderstanding of the question and there was a misunderstanding in the giving of the answers.

The facts are, Mr. Chairman, that since 1939 imports of fish—and let me emphasize fish because it is an important part of our food supply—very vitally affect many of the communities along the Atlantic, the Pacific, and the Gulf coasts. In one particular city in my district alone over 60 percent of the industrial wages flow from that particular industry; namely, in the city of Gloucester, Mass., the oldest fishing port in the United States. In 1939 when they had remonstrance meetings in the city of Gloucester, when parades were the order of the day in protest of the heavy imports of fillet fish, that year the imports amounted to a little over 9,000,000 pounds and constituted only 10 percent of the total output of the New England fishing industry. But last year, 1948, instead of being 9,000,000 pounds it was 54,000,000 pounds; instead of being 10 percent of the total output last year it was 38 percent of the output of the New England fishing industry.

A similar situation applied a few years ago in the shoe industry when so many shoes were being imported from Czechoslovakia. Out of 28 factories in one city in my district making that particular type of shoe, 18 had closed their doors and the other 10 were in various stages of liquidation; and it was only as a result of the German march into Czechoslovakia in the spring of 1938 that we saved that shoe city where 70 percent of all the wages flowed from that industry.

Are we going to permit the same situation to arise again? Or are we going to have some protective clauses in this bill whereby the industry itself as well as the industry and the officials of those communities may come to Washington and plead before some agency of Government—not the Committee on Reciprocity Information, but some committee which will take notice of what they are saying and of their effort to save this industry in that part of the country?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired. All time on section 1 has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. The Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948 (Public Law 792, 80th Cong.) is hereby repealed.

SEC. 3. The period during which the President is authorized to enter into foreign trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended and extended, is hereby extended for a further period of 3 years from June 12, 1948.

SEC. 4. Section 350 (a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, is hereby further amended by deleting the following therefrom: "In the present emergency in restoring the American standard of living, in overcoming domestic unemployment and the present economic depression, in increasing the purchasing power of the American public, and".

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I heard the gentleman from Pennsylvania talk about the Waltham Watch Co. This concern is not located in my district but it is in the United States; and during the war, Mr. Chairman, that company did precision work for the United States Government in connection with dropping bombs and everything on our enemies. Then we allowed the Swiss who did not do anything for anybody to come in here and grab the watch companies' business. Now, I am not crying about them and I am not crying about any other unfair thing we have done in our tariff acts. I am sold, Mr. Chairman, on a protective tariff that takes care of the workingmen in this country and I am going to do that as long as I am here and as long as I am alive. I am working for the interests of the laboring man, not for the so-called labor leaders who come in and try to scare us to death by telling us we will not get elected again. Most of us do not care anything about them. We serve our country first.

The gentleman from Massachusetts told you about the fishing industry. I can remember when those fellows who went out there and sacrificed their lives to give you food owed the boat money when they came in. Certainly in 1943, 1944, and 1945 they made a lot of money.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. And those fishermen are not restricted to the 8-hour day or the 40-hour week. It is every day in the week and mostly every week in the month.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for adding something that I was about to say. Every time they go out they take their very lives in their hands. They come in with ice on their boats 10 inches thick to give you and me something to eat. They are entitled to everything they can get.

Mr. Chairman, I do not object to anyone standing up here on the floor and making his point, but when they talk about domestic things and the safety of the public, and when a company goes out and does everything that the United States Government asks them to do, then you allow a foreign country to send in parts of watches or anything else at half the price we can produce, we just cannot understand that. I do not believe anyone, whether he comes from California, Texas, Florida, or Massachusetts, believes any differently.

All we are asking here is that you see that the man who works for a living in this country gets a break. That is all we are asking. If you vote for that principle you will not be hurt in your district and I will not be hurt in mine.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. Section 4 of the act entitled "An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930," approved June 12, 1934, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 edition, title 19, sec. 1354), is hereby amended by striking out the matter following the semicolon and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "and before concluding such agreement the President shall seek information and advice with respect thereto from the United States Tariff Commission, from the Departments of State, Agriculture, and Commerce, from the National Military Establishment, and from such other sources as he may deem appropriate."

SEC. 6. Section 350 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U. S. Code, 1946, title 19, sec. 1351 (b)), is amended by changing the colon to a period, by deleting the proviso, and by adding the following: "Nothing in this act shall be construed to preclude the application to any product of Cuba (including products preferentially free of duty) of a rate of duty not higher than the rate applicable to the like products of other foreign countries (except the Philippines), whether or not the application of such rate involves any preferential customs treatment. No rate of duty on products of Cuba shall in any case be decreased by more than 50 percent of the rate of duty, however established, existing on January 1, 1945 (even though temporarily suspended by act of Congress)."

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania: At the end of the bill add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 7. Before entering into negotiations concerning any proposed foreign trade agreement under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, the President shall furnish the United States Tariff Commission (hereinafter in this act referred to as the "Commission") with a list of all articles imported into the United States to be considered for possible modification of duties and other import restrictions, imposition of additional import restrictions, or continuance of existing customs or excise treatment. Upon receipt of such list the Commission shall make an investigation and report to the President the findings of the Commission with respect to each such article as to (1) the limit to which such modification, imposition, or continuance may be extended in order to carry out the purpose of such section 350 without causing or threatening serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or similar articles; and (2) if increases in duties or additional import restrictions are required to avoid serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or similar articles the minimum increases in duties or additional import restrictions required. Such report shall be made by the Commission to the President not later than 120 days after the receipt of such list by the Commission."

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this is the proposed amendment which you have heard described as the peril-point amendment. It is designed to provide by law that the President shall request of the Tariff Commission the findings of what we describe as a peril point before the President or his negotiators proceed with the negotiation of any future trade agreements. Each of us must know that there is a point below which any tariff cut can lead to serious damage or injury, or actual injury, to any domestic industry presently protected by a tariff. The peril point is that point. There is no way at all under existing law by which the President can ascertain that particular point. The only group in the United States with long experience in doing just exactly this work is the Tariff Commission. They can find as a fact whether or not a tariff cut is apt to be disadvantageous or advantageous to our country's economy.

The Tariff Commission is, as you all know, in reality, an agent of the Congress. It is set up to provide the Congress—and specifically the respective committees of the Congress—with detailed information for the benefit of the Congress in determining our position upon tariffs and other matters affecting

imports and exports. The Tariff Commission is able to do the job. The Tariff Commission is today doing the job, and I submit that for the protection of American industry, for the assistance of the President and the negotiators, this amendment should be adopted. With its adoption, our negotiators, when going abroad to practice their skill at Yankee trading, will have had established as a guide a figure which a group of nonpartisan, independent experts in tariff matters have agreed is the point below which any cuts, if made, would threaten or actually cause damage to a particular industry in our country.

I submit, gentlemen, that those of you who are interested in protecting American industry cannot logically refuse to support this amendment. If interested in protecting American industry, this is the very minimum amendment that should be included in this bill. Such a person cannot logically oppose it. After the peril point is determined, cuts should not be made below it in tariffs. However, if made, we will do so with our eyes open. If for political or other considerations the peril point is disregarded, great damage will be done to American industry.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. Will the gentleman state whether or not this was the real gist of the measure which was passed in 1948, H. R. 6556?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. This was a part of the act of 1948.

Mr. CARROLL. But this is the real issue at stake in this whole thing?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. We were entirely unable to get before our committee those men who could have answered the gentleman's question more exactly as to just what the purpose of the act this year is. However, in the act of 1948, the finding of those facts is required. As the gentleman knows, under the act of 1948 the President had to make public the amount recommended by the Tariff Commission as the minimum below which we should not cut, if he saw fit to go below that point. Under the proposed amendment, the fact of the finding will be secret to everyone save the President. He will have the information. He will never have to disclose it. Consequently, our negotiators in the future will not be embarrassed by publicity having been given to the findings of the Tariff Commission.

To those of you who want this trade-agreement program continued, to those of you who want the President to have the true facts found by a group of nonpartisan, independent, capable members of the Tariff Commission available to the President as a guide, I say that I can see no reason why you should oppose this amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, of course the real purpose of this amendment is to kill the pending bill. That is the only practical purpose it could serve, and it is designed and intended for that purpose.

The act passed by our Republican friends last year contained just two things, for all practical purposes. One was that it continued the trade-agreements program for just 1 year when it should have continued it for 3 years, and the other was that it provided this so-called peril-point procedure, which was for the purpose of hamstringing and making the program unworkable. That is what it was intended for and that is the purpose it serves.

There is no practical reason for placing this provision in this bill or in this program. Every step of the way in the negotiation of a trade agreement affords an ample peril point. Every care and caution is exercised in the negotiation of these trade agreements under the original program, which the pending bill seeks to reestablish. The members of the Departmental Committee, the members of the Committee for Reciprocity Information, and those engaged in the negotiation of the trade agreement, have all of the data and information and material available before them all the time, and use extreme caution and great care in every step that is taken to see to it that no American interest will be seriously affected by any trade agreement that is negotiated.

Under the pending bill, providing for the original procedure to be again established, a member of the Tariff Commission occupies a position among those who actually negotiate the trade agreements. All of the material that is available to him as a member of the Commission is there considered by all of those engaged in these negotiations.

Certainly there is no reason for making this requirement except to so far hamper and restrict the negotiations as to make it impossible for any desirable results to be accomplished. The member of the Tariff Commission who serves with those negotiating the agreement, as well as any other member of the committee, has the duty and is required, if he disagrees with the majority opinion, to file his minority view. Those views have to be submitted to the President when he passes on these things. So from every practical and reasonable standpoint, a thoroughly adequate peril point is provided every step of the way. There is no reason for including this amendment in this bill and no purpose could be served by including it except to restore the provisions of the act of 1948. That is the only thing that could be accomplished by it. The Chairman of the Tariff Commission himself, appearing before the Senate Finance Committee on the bill considered last year, made the statement in effect that this plan proposed by this amendment was unworkable and undesirable. Therefore, there is no reason for giving favorable consideration to this amendment and to include it in this bill. I simply say that the only purpose to be served by it is to kill the pending bill and restore the Republican act of 1948. The very reason for our being here today is to try to remove the restrictive amendments imposed at that time and thus make it possible for us to go on with this program as it was originally designed and intended and which has meant so much to the people of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, someday I am going to get the answer to a question which bothers me a great deal, and that is why the majority Members must always feel that every amendment submitted to a piece of legislation by the minority side has as its only purpose and principal design the killing of the measure under consideration. I say to the gentleman who preceded me, and to the Democratic Members of the House, that my support of this amendment is in no way designed to interfere with the proper carrying out of a trade-agreements program. It is in no way designed to kill the legislation. In fact, my individual position is that I want us to be in a position to continue to negotiate agreements with other countries. Unless, however, there is at least this little protection, this little consideration given to our domestic economy, I cannot support the program. I say to the gentleman that if this amendment is adopted, if this little concern is shown for our domestic economy, I will support, and support vigorously, the passage of H. R. 1211.

So I resent personally, and for my fellow members on the Ways and Means Committee who share my views, the intimation of the gentlemen who say that our only purpose in introducing this amendment is to kill the legislation. That is absolutely not correct.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. If the gentleman is so concerned about these amendments, will the gentleman explain to the committee why it was that this bill was brought before the House last year with a gag rule prohibiting any amendments?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. May I say to the gentleman we are not debating what happened last year. We are debating a specific proposal before us today. We have an issue now confronting us. It is nice to live in the past, but, as for me, I would rather live today and for the future. We have committed sins, of course. But who among us is there who has not?

Now, let us go to the fundamental proposition involved in the peril-point amendment, the position of the Tariff Commission in relation to the trade-agreements program. The basic issue is whether we are going to eliminate the Tariff Commission completely from any real part in the determination of our policy in negotiating with other countries on trade agreements. The contention is made that the Tariff Commission today is part and parcel of the negotiations; that they are members of the Trade Agreements Committee; that they have membership on the Committee for Reciprocity Information. Yes. They

do have members there, but the Commission at no time, as a commission of six men appointed on a bipartisan basis—at no time does that Commission act as a commission in any determination with regard to the rates of duty. Surely, they have a member, but that member never has spoken as the spokesman for the Commission. I refer you to hearing after hearing, and particularly you can look at page 51 of these hearings, where we quote the testimony of Mr. Ryder, Chairman of the Commission, in previous hearings before the Ways and Means Committee, in which he states, as Chairman of the Commission and as a member of these various committees, that he did not speak in the name of the Tariff Commission as a group. There has been no such thing as a determination by the Commission. That is what we are asking. We have this Commission; why not use it? Why not have them give this advice to the President? They say the negotiators have all this information that the Tariff Commission might find. I will agree that the negotiators do, and the Committee on Trade Agreements have all of the material that the Tariff Commission can furnish to them. But it is not made available to the President of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to object, but I thought it was understood we would try to move along and not ask for additional time.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I was not aware of that. If you had such an agreement, I will withdraw the request.

Mr. COOPER. We did not have a definite agreement, but I thought that was understood. I do not say there was any definite agreement, but it was my understanding that we would try to move along and not ask for additional time. I will not object.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. As I said, there is no question but what all of the facts and information that are available to the Tariff Commission are made available by them to the Committee on Trade Agreements, and also to the negotiators; but the point I want to make, and the point that I think is very important in the procedure to be followed in entering into these agreements, is the fact that the President of the United States does not have available any determinations by the Tariff Commission. Why? Because the information that goes to the President goes to him from the Trade Agreements Committee. Under the procedure, the Trade Agreements Committee meets, and they find out various phases of the problem, and then they submit it to the President prior to going over and actually entering into negotiations with foreign countries. The right is given to members of the Trade Agreements Committee to file dissenting opinions with the President, but there is nothing there which provides that any impartial agency of this Government such as the Tariff Commission shall give to the President of the United States the facts which he can balance against the advice and opinions given to him by the Committee on Reciprocity or the Trade Agreements Committee.

There is nothing in the procedure contemplated under H. R. 1211 that will provide such information. By the amendment under consideration, we call upon the Tariff Commission, a bipartisan, factual agency, and we say to them, "Help the President to the extent of establishing what your facts, your information, lead you to believe is the peril point." There is a big difference, a very big difference, between the provisions of this act as we propose to amend it today and the provision which was contained in the 1948 act. In the 1948 act we required that the peril points established by the Tariff Commission be made public upon those occasions when they were exceeded by the President or by the negotiators. That has been removed. The purpose of this amendment is entirely to make available and put before the President information of an unbiased, unprejudiced nature. There is no question in the world but that—and anybody who has studied the operations of this program at all will admit it—this program is dominated from top to bottom today by the State Department. In my judgment and in the judgment of the minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means, provision should be made for an impartial agency to determine on a factual basis the extent to which our rates of duty can be lowered in order that the program can be carried out on a sound, sane basis for the protection of our country, with particular reference to our economy and our national defense and security.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman knows—everybody does—that the Constitution provides that the Congress shall have the sole responsibility of laying and collecting tariffs, does it not?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. Under the present practice, the Congress has very little to say. Is that right?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. In practice we really do not have anything at all to say.

Mr. JENKINS. We have practically nothing to say. The effect of the amendment on which the gentleman is speaking will simply be that the Tariff Commission, which is an agency constitutionally set up by the Congress of the United States, is bypassed entirely and is given no consideration.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Yes; it is our purpose to see to it that we have some agency which is not bound up with international diplomacy and international politics; some agency that has no concern except the economy of our own country, our own industry, and our own labor; an agency that will give to the President unbiased information as to where we should stop in the matter of lowering a duty.

May I say, too, that this proposal is not entirely restrictive. There are occasions when it is to the advantage of the negotiators to know how low they can go. There may be a situation whereby the findings of the Tariff Commission would give the Trade Agreements Committee and the President reasons to believe that they could reduce the duty much lower than they themselves thought they could. It thus increases their bargaining power; it is not just a one-way street.

Mr. Chairman, I hope you will not be guided by some of the prejudices that have entered into this debate, but will look at it from an honest, practical viewpoint.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, let us assume, for the purpose of argument, that my friend from Pennsylvania and my friend from Wisconsin are very sincere in offering the amendment which they have discussed and that they desire to improve the reciprocal-trade-agreements program as a result of this amendment. I have no desire to impugn the motives of these friends; I can, however, I believe, take issue with their judgment. I believe I know what they have in mind accomplishing. I want to point out as best I can that the very purpose they intend to accomplish here is provided for already. The action they now propose to us and this committee is unnecessary and absolutely unworkable.

Why do I say it is unnecessary? Their amendment would require the Tariff Commission to report to the President within 120 days on the so-called peril point of each item being considered in negotiations with other countries. There is nothing in the present law, there is nothing in this act, which prevents the President, if he desires to have that information, from calling upon the Tariff Commission under H. R. 1211 to supply him with the information.

Every bit of information that could be made available to the President of the United States under this amendment is made available at all times to those who engage in this matter of negotiating trade agreements. Nothing will be accomplished and it is absolutely unnecessary.

How is it unworkable? Let us take the present situation. The Tariff Commission has under consideration right now 400 items that were included in the President's list of those to be considered in April. The act of 1948 required that the Tariff Commission report back to the President within 120 days how low these items could be cut without injuring the industries of the United States—120 days to consider 400 items. How many items does that mean the Tariff Commission must consider in one day? Approximately three items per day, if they work Saturday and Sunday. The Tariff Commission has only 200 employes, including elevator operators, the folks who

clean up around the Tariff Commission, stenographers, and a very, very few economists. There are very few people in the Commission who are sufficiently skilled to consider this particular point. How many of them would be available within 120 days to determine peril points? Notwithstanding how many staff personnel might be available, the Commission would have to turn out three decisions a day. What this amendment requires in connection with the Annecy negotiation is for the six members of the Tariff Commission to be able to make up their minds within 120 days on 400 items. The next time we may have a thousand items, but still the decision would have to be made in 120 days.

My argument and my objection to the amendment are that you require the Tariff Commission to do something physically impossible. You want a scientific investigation made, but you force the Tariff Commission to give a snap judgment. I think I heard you Republicans complaining in the 1948 campaign that snap judgment had been used. Now you are trying to force this administration into the position of using nothing but snap judgment.

It will not work. This is what would happen if the pending amendment were adopted. You and I know, all of us who have been here any length of time know, that there is never a report or a statement of findings made to the President of the United States that does not leak out in some way. To whom does it leak? It leaks out to the very people who want most to know the information. So what do they do? They awaken to the fact that the Tariff Commission has said that a reduction in duty below this point may injure us. They go back to the Tariff Commission, after the negotiations and the approval of the agreement, and they say, "Our case is made, Mr. Tariff Commissioners. You have already decided ahead of time what the peril point is. So now grant us the relief we ask."

Mr. Chairman, the establishment of a peril point is not going to bring relief to the watch industry, if it needs relief; it is not going to bring relief to the fishing industry or to any other industry in the United States. It is merely going to becloud the whole situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, a moment ago expressed considerable chagrin and personal feeling because the thought had been advanced here that these amendments were being offered for the purpose of killing the legislation now before us. Without questioning his good faith, I think we might examine the record of his party insofar as reciprocal-trade programs are involved to acertain whether or not any representative of the Republican Party is genuinely sincere in saying that he favors the program if certain amendments are adopted.

Many of you Members were here and participated in these debates, but I would like to refresh your memory on the legislative history of the reciprocal-trade program. The first vote was in the year 1934. In that year 269 Democrats voted aye and 2 Republicans voted aye. In 1937, when the first extension came up, the Democrats made real progress. They brought in one more Republican. Three Republicans voted for the reciprocal-trade program, 278 Democrats voted for it, and 81 Republicans voted against it. In 1940, however, we lost ground. We slipped back. Again, only two Members of the Republican Party voted for the reciprocal-trade program with 212 Democrats voting for it. In 1943, under the exigencies of war, we secured some temporary converts. One hundred and forty-five members of the Republican Party lapsed from their old doctrine of high protectionism and voted for the reciprocal-trade program, but not for long, because when it came up again in 1945, the number dropped back to 33, with 205 Democrats voting for the program. Never have there been more than 12 Democrats, in the 15-year history of this program, opposing it.

Now, it seems, too, that the gentleman from Wisconsin, when he protests injury to his feelings, should have his memory refreshed just a little bit. The gentleman from Wisconsin sat on the Gearhart subcommittee last year which brought out the so-called extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act in this House. It came to this floor under a gag rule whereby no amendments were permitted, and the bill as it passed the House was described by the then Secretary of State, the great General Marshall, as being worse than no bill at all. So, it seems to me that in light of the record it can very well be said that those who sponsor this amendment are actually attempting to destroy and discredit this great reciprocal-trade program, and it is in line with Republican principles over the entire history of that party.

Let me cite from the platform of the Republican Party of a few years ago. Here is what was said:

> We will repeal the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Law. It is futile, and it is dangerous. Its effect on agriculture and industry has been destructive. Its continuation would work to the detriment of the wage earner and the farmer.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I leave to the good judgment of the members of the committee the question of who is in good faith on the extension of the reciprocal-trade-treaty program.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Chairman, I believe in and will vote to extend the trade-treaties program that is now before us. But I do believe that in granting the powers requested for the executive department of our Government, that the Congress of the United States should reserve some power of review to study and analyze their effect upon the trade and commerce of the United States. I believe it would be wise and prudent for this body to insist that the Tariff Commission, at the request of Congress, be authorized to find the limits within which tariff reductions may be made without injury to our American producers.

The pottery producers of my district are disturbed and alarmed at the increased importation of household china that is now taking place.

In 10 months of 1948, these importations regularly increased in volume, as follows:

January	$312,300
February	234,200
March	337,200
April	297,000
May	368,000
June	406,900
July	335,700
August	549,500
September	456,400
October	536,400

The difference in the amount of wages and the standard of living in the various countries being so great and uncertain makes it impossible to meet this threat to American industry by specific duties applied to all foreign countries alike, as was done in former tariff laws.

It becomes necessary to have a tax that is not specific, but a tax system that can be applied to imports from every such import country in a fair and impartial manner, so as to apply to each of said countries equally, and this can only be accomplished by a separate trade treaty with each export nation.

In the whole world there are not three countries where our rates of duty apply equally to the cost of production. When duties are set at a point which sell merchandise of some countries at a higher rate than others, our rate does not protect us or even any other country who sells us goods and who pays its workmen better than starvation wages.

An example will show what this bill will do to protect our trade and commerce against the dictator nations of the world who have no interest in international integrity or fairness with other than totalitarian nations who depend on money and currencies without value and employment at a fixed and dictated wage.

Compound duties, ad valorem and specific rates, if applied in a case where we assume the American wholesale price to be 75 cents and imports from one country 50 cents, a compound duty of 30 percent, plus 10 cents, would suffice and equal the American price, 75 cents.

However, if this compound duty were applied to a 25-cent cost of same article in some other country of import, the effect would be to bring it to only 42½ cents. This bill would equalize by adding the difference in any advantage given to such country by debased moneys and currencies by an increased tariff tax to place such imports on an exact footing in a competitive market.

TARIFF

The rational view of the tariff today is to secure only tariff for protection. As a revenue measure, it is of minor significance. The sole question is to learn the degree and methods of determining the amount of protection and the selection of industries and items which need protection against excessive imports.

We are the largest and greatest producer in the world; therefore, our tariffs should be adopted to protect these interests, as a large majority of our people are engaged in production, with a rate of duty high enough to protect the average producer. But to protect all producers under such a theory of tariff is impossible, because it has been found that technological progress is not uniform.

The largest firms, of course, are in the forefront in the installation of the most modern equipment and process. Small firms may lack the advantage of larger and better-equipped factories, and therefore may be in need of greater protection. These and other various items create a great problem in determining the average or normal producer.

Then again there are yet greater problems in the items of import. The cost of production differs largely in the various countries, also the relative parity of the moneys of the different countries from which imports are brought to the United States.

In the year 1947, decorated household china was shipped to us by 32 countries, of which four accounted for 80 percent. These were Japan, Germany, France, and China. Two were European countries and two Asiatic, represented by distinct standards of living and unequal competitive levels, yet the rate of duty was the same for all.

A single rate of duty in such instances frustrates the very function of a protective tariff. There can be no individual rate of duty equally applicable to all countries exporting their goods to America.

Of course, we assess our duties on the foreign invoice value of imports. We should substitute domestic value, but this alone would not take care of the difference in the value of foreign currencies, when compared to the value of the American dollar, nor would it always meet the problem of competitive differentials.

EQUALITY OF COMPETITION

In our tariff legislation, heretofore we enacted equal tax rates, that applied to all countries alike, regardless of the low standard of wages in most of them.

It seems to me, tariff rates, if they are to protect producers from such low-standard countries, must be fixed to equalize the equality of competition, rather than equality of rates. Of course, the most simple and direct method of producing equality of competition among the countries that export to us is to apply different rates of duty, depending upon the competitive level of such countries.

Since it has been the accepted theory in all countries that tariffs are only enacted to safeguard producers who are in need of protection against competition based on low wages and low standards of living, we must recognize the fact that this can only be done by a tariff rate that will fit the competitive factors prevailing among the different countries that export goods to us. Such a tariff, of course, would require detailed data and proper study of all conditions entering into the production in such countries.

TRADE AGREEMENTS

I believe the State Department, as an instrument of foreign policy, should continue to have the right to enter into trade treaties with foreign nations, but I also believe that an amendment to the trade agreement should be added that would enable the Tariff Commission to find the limits within which further reductions are to be held if we desire to prevent injury to domestic industry.

The Tariff Commission is a creature of Congress, and is the only organization of the Government that was set up and staffed with specialized and technical knowledge and training to adjust the tariff within prescribed limits authorized by Congress. It is the only agency in a position to make necessary inquiries and investigations for the purposes of proper tariff enactments and adjustments of the tariff that become necessary because of shifting economic conditions.

The results of our trade agreements made within the past 10 years should be reviewed. The Tariff Commission is the proper Government organization and the only Government body competent to review and report on the effects and changes necessary in all the trade agreements heretofore or hereafter entered into by the State Department with foreign nations.

And we should amend our tariff law of 1930, so that the valuation of imported goods should be taxed solely on the wholesale value of such merchandise in America and not on the value of the inflated yen.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in not to exceed 15 minutes after the gentleman from Michigan concludes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. LODGE. May I say to the gentleman from Michigan that personally I regret very much that partisanship has been injected into this issue by the gentleman from Louisiana. This is an important implement of foreign policy, and I feel that it is entitled not to be treated as a political football.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, it has been my great privilege to live in different sections of this country. I think I know what it means to the man who grows wool, mohair, beef and hides, pecans, peanuts, rice, and sugarcane, all in the Southern States, to have protection for his enterprise. As one who has southern blood in my veins, I can think in terms of protecting southern commodities the same as western and northern commodities. But in no way do I overlook northern agriculture and industry. I know what it is to have industry in the Northern States and to participate in farming in the West and the Northwest, which I think needs a little protection now and then, so I can look at this picture, I think, from about as many angles as any Member who sits on this floor.

This is not a political question so far as I am concerned, but I take the position that it is more important to protect all the industry, and all the jobs of all our people, than it is to protect any policy which may be promoted by this Government if that policy runs contrary to the interests of our people and the general welfare. Certainly Members of Congress and Congress as a whole and the President can get off on the wrong road once in a while, and when we are on the wrong road we can have the wrong policy. Many fine and capable workers are now losing their jobs as the administration continues to ask for billions of dollars to continue gifts to other nations in the name of defense.

My friend from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] has argued that this amendment would impose on the Tariff Commission an impossible job with respect to the 120 days. I have no sympathy whatever for that kind of an argument. If the Tariff Commission is not sufficiently informed on these major commodities and major issues, which the President may propose from time to time, to give a report of that kind within 120 days, then we had better fire the Tariff Commission and get somebody on the Commission who is on the job and knows what is going on. But I am sure the Commission can do the job.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. If the Tariff Commission cannot do it, how, pray, can the State Department or the Committee for Reciprocity Information do it?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Certainly I think the argument of the gentleman from Arkansas is absolutely unfounded, and without substantial foundation.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. The Tariff Commission has over 200 experts, and they practically have their job done ahead of time now.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Of course they do. You would not have a Tariff Commission worth a tinker's darn if it could not do that.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. The Tariff Commission at the present time is turning out three and more such findings per day.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Why, sure.

Those who supported the foreign policy of this country the last few years, and I refer specifically to the Marshall plan as well as lend-lease, have gotten themselves over a barrel with respect to this trade-agreement program.

When the Bretton Woods agreement was before the Committee on Banking and Currency, and I am not sure my friend the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] was then a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, Mr. William Green, of the A. F. of L., was before our committee, recommending the approval of Bretton Woods agreement. You will find several pages of cross-examination where I put right straight to him cold-blooded this kind of a question. I said:

> Mr. Green, when the goods produced in other countries start flowing back into this country against your workers and your union members, throwing them out of job, what do you propose to do?

His reply in substance was, and you will find this in volume 2 of the hearings, which I read only yesterday afternoon, that the Government of the United States must guarantee to the workers of this country that their standard of living, and this relates to their wages, will not be reduced.

I inquired:

> What is your formula for effectuating such a guaranty?

Mr. Green had not had time to work up the formula.

Of course, if you collect back these advances that you are making to these other countries, you will have to do it through the importation into this country of work in the form of goods by those who work in other parts of the world. When you begin doing that, you will close industries, create unemployment, and destroy the flow of national and social income in this country, and you will throw your Secretary of the Treasury charged with the management of a quarter of a trillion dollar debt, into a very bad predicament. That is what you will face if you expect to collect for these gifts which you know you are making. I do not think you are going to collect substantially from any of the countries. That is a reason, only one reason, that I have not supported this give-away program because there is a bottom to our meal barrel. This is not a limitless cornucopia that we are operating here in the United States. I am in favor of the amendment and hope that it will be adopted. We shall find in the coming months it is necessary to have jobs and production in this country if we are to meet budgets and our obligations, internally and externally.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I am glad that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE] raised the question as to partisan politics being brought into this debate by some of the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle. May I say at the outset that I am wholeheartedly supporting the President's European foreign policy of the Government of the United States. I am one of those who early supported it, and appreciated its value, not only insofar as the economic recovery of the western states of Europe is concerned, but also insofar as the future security of this country is concerned. This is a matter that cannot in any way be tied up with the foreign policy of our Government in a partisan manner. It seems to me that what we ought to do is to approach this question from the point of view of what is the over-all good for both our domestic and our foreign policy. With the support of the Marshall plan and the benefits that we hope will flow from that plan for the recovery of the 16 states of western Europe we also hope that we can sustain a high state of production and employment in this country.

This bill affects the very vitals of our own economy and the welfare of our own industry and of our own workers, our own pay rolls and our own purchasing power. The economic life of the Nation is involved in this measure which we are considering here today. In the State of Massachusetts in the past year, 1948, over $50,000,000 was paid out in unemployment compensation. That is $50,000,000, and the reserve fund is growing lower and lower every year. The reports that we are getting from many parts of the State are that unemployment is steadily on the increase.

This amendment simply provides that before any trade agreement is executed, that the Tariff Commission shall make a complete investigation and study of all the economic effects relating to the agreement that is to be considered and the adverse effects, if any, it would have upon our own domestic industries. We know that under the present Trade Agreements Act the benefits of the so-called most-favored-nation clause will now flow to all the Communist states of the world. We know that in those states behind the iron curtain they are developing so-called central export agencies in order to pool the resources of all the industries of those individual countries and then get the American dollar through the American market by sending their goods here, whether it be shoes, textiles or any other type of product which needs to get down below the selling price in the American market. That is a matter we should be deeply concerned about. This amendment, in my opinion, will be helpful in the protection of our own industries and the workers in the factories throughout the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], has expired.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I am the only member of the House today who took part in the conference between the House and Senate in 1939 on the strategic and critical materials stock pile, the original legislation in that field. From that day down to this I have been watching some phases of the national defense effort, that I had particular opportunity to look into during the 8 years I served on the Military Affairs Committee.

If the Simpson amendment is adopted, I could go along with this legislation. I want that safeguard, a determination of the peril points, because I have seen enough of the action of the State Department so far in handling reciprocal trade programs that I am not willing to subordinate national defense to their judgment, when that judgment is based on their diplomatic negotiations, rather than on the health of our essential industries, for our own national defense self-sufficiency.

I have looked carefully through Mr. Forrestal's statement in answer to my position in the committee, and he has not answered this point. I wish some Member on the majority side of the committee would get for me a specific statement from Forrestal that the peril point is not needed for national defense—specifically that statement; and then I will reserve my judgment as to whether he is sound in thus subordinating national defense, even if he should make that statement later.

We have a serious point. Some people argue that the escape clause is an adequate provision, yet, if it is adequate, why do you not put the escape clause in the Swiss agreements? There we get right down to a very vital point in national defense. Why do you not put the escape clause in the Swiss agreements? They are not there and you know they are not there. Then, when you get the escape clause in the Swiss agreements, let me admonish the Committee on Reciprocity Information to make some adequate use of that escape clause. Just read the statement by the mining industry on page 425 of the hearings:

> In the experience of the mining industry, however, the escape clauses have been found to be of no practical value whatever, and no remedial action under these clauses has ever been taken, even where all the conditions specified therein have been shown to exist. So far as we can learn, out of the many hundreds of reductions in duty which have been made under the trade-agreements program, the escape clauses have been successfully invoked only in two minor instances, involving silver fox furs and embroidered handkerchiefs.
>
> In the case of tungsten, in hearings held before the Committee for Reciprocity Information in January 1947, the committee assured industry representatives that their case was excellent and that they should have no fear of a tariff cut; nevertheless, the cut was made. Although further appeal was made 6 months after the cut, the Tariff Commission took the position that insufficient time had elapsed and that testimony could not be considered. It would appear that the industry must die completely before its case can be taken up.

Now that is a severe indictment. All I want is a proper system to give us effective protection when we approach the peril point, and then make effective use of the escape clause when we get it into the agreement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] for 4 minutes.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON]. Those who favor this amendment and who oppose the bill before the House as written may have been converted to the principles of the reciprocal trade method of dealing with tariffs and foreign trade; but if they have—and I do not question their motives—but I will say, if they have, that conversion is as mysterious and as sudden as that of St. Paul. I fear, by the

arguments they offer in support of the amendment, the scales have not yet fallen from their eyes.

Let us for a moment consider a little of the history of this reciprocal trade program. In the last Congress, when the present law was enacted, it will be remembered that the then majority, both in the Committee on Ways and Means and in the House, did not take the first step, if my memory is correct, to extend the reciprocal trade-agreements program. Instead, they waited until I, the ranking Democratic member on the committee, introduced a bill to extend the original law for another 3 years. Then they went into secret conclave behind closed doors, with the public shut out and the press excluded, and wrote the 1948 version of the reciprocal trade program.

In my humble judgment had we not taken that step of introducing the bill to extend the original reciprocal trade program, so that the Republicans could clearly see that the sentiment of the country was so overwhelmingly in favor of the reciprocal trade program, they would have just let the whole thing die. That is my opinion. But the sentiment of the country was so overwhelmingly in favor of the reciprocal trade method of dealing with tariffs that they did not dare do it after the question was raised.

As far as the question of sincerity is concerned, my good friend the gentleman from Wisconsin, a member of the committee, resents the suggestion that the majority members are not sincere. I do not pass on their sincerity, but I may say that one who lives in a glass house should not throw stones. His skin was so thin about some intimation that they might not have been sincere that, toward the end of his remarks, he turned to the majority and enjoined this side of the House not to be controlled or motivated by prejudice. While pleading for us to accept the sincerity of the minority, he suggests that we of the majority may be controlled and motivated by prejudice. It is not a question, Mr. Chairman, of sincerity; it is a question of what is right, what is just, what is fair, what is best for the economy of the American people.

As far as the peril point clause is concerned, the Chairman of the Tariff Commission, Mr. Ryder, in testifying before the Senate Finance Committee, said that the Tariff Commission was not constituted to formulate policy; they were constituted to furnish information; and the peril-point procedure required by the 1948 act meant the imposition upon them of the duty and the responsibility of formulating policy; consequently, he said, it was not practical; he said it was not workable.

Mr. Chairman, if we want a real, genuine reciprocal trade-agreements program let us realize that the program will not work if emasculated by crippling amendments and placed in a strait jacket. If you want a man to do a job, if you want the President of the United States to carry out this reciprocal-trade-agreements program, you must implement it the way he has asked that it should be implemented, the way the State Department says it should be implemented. We must write the law so it will work. It will not work under these amendments that are offered. The only thing to do, Mr. Chairman, is to pass this bill as it is written, not as it would be so severely crippled by such amendments as have been proposed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, in 1934 I opposed the bill giving to the President sole authority to enter into trade agreements with other nations because I felt that such reciprocal trade agreements were unconstitutional. The Constitution provides that the President "shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, providing two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

I also was opposed to it because it was an illegitimate child. Its daddies were the international manufacturers and bankers. In 1934 these "one-worlders" were out in the open and flooded Congress with their literature.

Here are a few of the original promoters of the reciprocal trade agreements: The Chase National Bank, the National City Bank of New York, General Motors, General Electric, Westinghouse, and scores of other corporations and individuals. All these were, and are, engaged in buying and selling foreign bonds and in selling American-manufactured products to foreign nations.

These wish the American people—especially the American farmer and laborer—to surrender their domestic market to these nations in order to service the foreign debt. In other words, so that these nations can buy their bonds and goods with the proceeds they get from the products they sell on our domestic market—products that can be, and should be, produced by our own people.

I have opposed this legislation and shall continue to. It is against the best interest of the laborer and the farmer. These two groups consist of the largest number of our people. I still believe that that is best which is for the best interest of the greatest number.

The original bill provided that the President could reduce the tariff 50 percent. Since then, it has been amended so that the President can lower the tariff 75 percent. Every agreement that has been entered into since the passage of this resolution has been favorable to the international manufacturer and banker and against the best interest of agriculture and labor.

It is true that the State Department will hold hearings on the proposed agreements, but they are a deception. The Department will listen to the opposition, but, invariably, their final decision will be the original agreement without a single change.

In the past chickens have come home to roost. They are again coming home. During 1936 and 1937 there were so many Canadian cattle shipped to the south St. Paul market that the farmers of North Dakota and surrounding States could not get their livestock marketed for even as low as 6 or 7 cents a pound. The market was absorbed and taken over by the Canadian producers.

Of course, the farmers protested, but it was too late. The agreements were in effect. Permit me to suggest to labor that in the campaign of 1936 most of the donkeys that many of my Democratic friends wore on the lapels of their coats were manufactured in Japan by labor that worked for 4 or 5 cents a day.

The California nut growers are now protesting against foreign nuts shipped into this country by the international profiteers. This while the people of the countries that produce them are hungry.

Soon the same will be true of citrus fruit. The citrus-fruit farmers of California and Florida and other States are already losing their farms by mortgage foreclosures because of the low price of their products. I am aware that fruit is still high enough in many parts of the Nation, but that is because of the high transportation charges. The producers of grapefruit a year ago in Florida got as low as 10 cents for a 60-pound crate.

Last fall the Department of Agriculture fixed a support price of $2 per hundred on domestic potatoes. Then under the reciprocal-trade agreements, the Canadians began shipping their potatoes into North Dakota, Maine, and other States, and sold them below the support price, with the result that the Canadian potatoes were consumed, and the American potatoes were piled up.

This forced the Secretary of Agriculture to lower his support price. Because of this performance—a support price on one hand and a reciprocal-trade agreement on the other—the American taxpayer, and the American housewife that purchased Canadian potatoes, will have to help pay millions of dollars in taxes to the producers of the American potatoes.

I will leave this warning with my friends. The time is here that we should use better judgment. I know that you are going to pass this resolution. I am confident when enough chickens have come home to roost, that then we will get rid of this international lunacy of destroying ourselves to enrich a few internationalist "one-worlders" for a profit under the pretense that we are doing something for other nations.

The time is not distant when we will reestablish the American system of protecting our own people—of continuing to have our American standard of living. This without tearing down any other nation, but by showing them how they too can have a higher standard of living if they will get rid of the internationalists—the parasites—that are always playing both ends against the middle.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired on the pending amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania) there were—ayes 114, noes 154.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. DOUGHTON.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 119, noes 167.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for the motion to recommit, and shall vote for the bill to extend the Reciprocal Trade Act on final passage. It is probable that conditions beyond my control may prevent my presence here in the Chamber at the time final vote occurs on the passage of the bill and I desire my position on this measure be clearly set forth.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS: Add a new section 7, as follows:

"SEC. 7. The President shall, as soon as practicable, but in any event not later than 90 days from the date of this act, institute such proceedings as are necessary to incorporate an escape clause to the same general effect as article XIX of the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade in all trade agreements to which the United States is a party."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, at the present time we have trade agreements with some 33 or 34 countries. About half of those agreements, perhaps, maybe a little bit more, have what we call the escape clause. The escape clause is the procedure that has been adopted by the administration. I think it is a good thing. I have every reason to believe that the majority ought to accept this amendment. This amendment provides that the President shall institute such proceedings as are necessary to have the escape clause inserted in all agreements to which the United States is now a party.

May I first define what we mean by an escape clause? It is provided in article XIX that "concessions may be withdrawn or obligations suspended if in view of unforeseen developments they result in increased imports so substantial as to cause or threaten serious injury to home producers. There must, however, be consultation with the affected countries either before or immediately after withdrawing the concession with a view to reaching an agreement. If the agreement is not reached and the action is nevertheless taken, the parties affected by the action can then withdraw equivalent concessions."

I want to say at the outset we feel the adoption of this amendment alone will not necessarily bring relief to everyone adversely affected by trade agreements. It must be coupled with an honest, fair, and considerate administration and a desire to protect American workers and industries and our national defense. This law runs for but 3 years. Under it trade agreements will be entered into which will extend for many years. Therefore it is important that now we insert not only in all future trade agreements, but that we have inserted in the trade agreements already made an escape clause.

In presenting this amendment, I have no desire to plead the case of any industry or any group. It is prompted by the desire that we should extend equal treatment to all foreign countries. If the trade-agreement law is going to be an instrument to promote good will and friendly relations around the world, how can we say to one country, "You will have to have an escape clause in the agreement that we have with you"; and say to another country, "Your agreement will not have an escape clause." In the interest of equal treatment of all foreign nations, certainly the friends of this program should support this amendment.

The second reason why we should have this amendment is that it would extend equal treatment to all segments of our own domestic economy. Certain industries and certain groups of workers are affected by a trade agreement with a country where there is an escape clause. They have that protection and concessions can be withdrawn if it becomes wise and for the best interests of our country. Other industries and groups of workers do not have that protection. In the interest of equal treatment of all of our people and equal treatment of all foreign countries I urge you to adopt this amendment.

I hope that this bill is amended so that I can vote for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] has expired.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to prolong this discussion except to bring up again a point that has not been discussed during the present debate on the Trade Agreements Act, and which never has been discussed over the period of the last 16 or 18 years when we have had trade agreement legislation under consideration.

In the past we have dealt with industry agreements. In the future we are going to deal with national agreements. By that I mean that all of the benefits of the so-called most favored nation clause, within the provision of the Trade Agreements Act, will flow to every communized state in the world. When we stop to think that in these Communist-controlled states—10 of which are in eastern Europe behind the so-called iron curtain—all industries in those countries are thoroughly nationalized. We know they are under the complete domination and control of the Communist governments of those countries. We know that in each of those countries they have set up central export agencies for the purpose of controlling exports. We know that all those industries that are not paying industries—as we understand it in private enterprise—will be subsidized by the government. We know that those countries are desperately in need of the American dollar in order that they may carry on world trade. We know that in order to get that American dollar they must get the American market. It therefore becomes easy to understand, in order to flow their goods into the American market, whether it is shoes or any other type of products coming from these industries in the communized states, they are going to subsidize the production of those products in order to get under the American selling price of the American-made product.

Mr. Chairman, we know that the industries in Czechoslovakia in 1938 were able to undersell the shoe industry in our section of the country. They specialized in a particular type of shoe that was made in larger volume in our section of the country than in any other.

We know that that one industry, the largest of its kind in the world, manufactures over 50,000,000 pairs of rubber and leather shoes. That is the so-called Bata factory which has now been taken over by the Czech Government. We know that once the bars are let down and the American market is free for them they will deluge our markets with their products. They are going to destory the market on which the products of our own working men and women must depend. I believe we ought to have protection in this bill so that American industry and our workers can come here to the seat of government and make a plea in the interest of their own industry and their own communities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in not to exceed 20 minutes, the last 5 to be reserved in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in not to exceed 20 minutes, the last 5 to be reserved in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, when the reciprocal trade treaties were first discussed by the New Dealers in Congress, the top New Dealers everywhere back in 1934 contended that above all else it was the best insurance to keep America out of war and to keep the whole world at peace. But in spite of these claims we got right in the middle of World War II, the most terrible in history; so that claim has fallen flat. Also, it was claimed that it would be good for the economy of America. Facts and figures show that between the time the Reciprocal Trade Treaties Act passed in 1934 and the time we started producing for war we had on an average in America over 10,000,000 people unemployed. Then came the war, then the postwar era which we are now experiencing. Now, I challenge any Member on either side of this House to point out any 10-day period, or any 15-day period, or any 60-day period, or any period however short or long since the reciprocal-trade-treaty program of this administration went into effect that shows the agreements have been good for America or for the world. I am waiting for someone to rise in his place and challenge that statement. I see no one on

their feet. So when you claim all these wonderful things for this reciprocal-trade-treaty program there is nothing to substantiate your claims whatsoever. At a meeting here in Washington, D. C., last spring which was called at the instance of Mr. Clayton himself, just a few days before we voted on this thing during the last session, I put the same challenge up to him as I have just done to any Member of this House and Mr. Clayton had to admit, with a red face before 25 Members of Congress, about half Republicans and half Democrats, that due to the fact that ever since the act was passed in 1934 we have experienced an abnormal economy in America.

Now Mr. Chairman, I have listened to a number of speeches yesterday and today on these so-called reciprocal trade treaties which of course are only reciprocal in favor of other nations.

The community market and stock market slump should be a warning to every one of us, that the New Deal honeymoon of the past and present is rapidly coming to an end, and that our give-away program must stop now to save the skins of the American farmer, labor, and industry and all Americans.

How can we expect to hold prices and wages up to a proper point when the party in power threatens to make it tough for everybody who has money to invest? One year ago today the price of corn with a 24-percent moisture content was selling at the midwestern farmer's crib for around $2 per bushel; today the same quality of corn is selling at the farmer's crib for around $1 per bushel. It is true that a lot of corn was sealed at around $1.40 per bushel, but the market is far below the Government support prices now, as are a number of basic farm crops, and still going down.

Now, what will the effect of this decline be on our national income and hence our ability to pay this extravagant administration budget request. If present prices for farm products are to be the average for the year 1949 the total gross farm income will be approximately $21,000,000,000 which will generate a gross national income of approximately $147,000,000,000, for the reason that the national income is always just about exactly seven times the farm income. That being a proven fact, I ask in all sincerity what will happen to the American taxpayers—who are to a great extent the ultimate consumers, for they pay the bill in the final analysis—and that includes the laborer, the farmer, the businessman, and all, when they are called upon by the local, county, State, and Federal Government to pay a total tax bill of between fifty-five and sixty billion dollars for 1948 out of a national income of $147,000,000,000 which they will be forced to pay if President Truman's request for funds is approved by this Congress.

Mr. Chairman, unless we maintain the annual farm income of our Nation at a level of around $30,000,000,000 until such time when the running expense of the Federal Government is drastically reduced, national bankruptcy will be our harvest for the whole New Deal give-away program. A full 90-percent support on basic storable farm crops for years to come is the best and only insurance against national bankruptcy, and all the misery that will come with it.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Chairman, I arise to call the attention of the House to the fact that under the trade programs of this administration, the filbert-nut industry of the Pacific Northwest is virtually bankrupted, and the important bottom-fisheries industry in my part of the country is almost entirely closed down.

Filbert imports, which have been coming into this country since the war, have exceeded 400 percent of prewar and placed our growers in a position where they will have to completely go out of business unless these imports are restricted. While these increased importations have been coming into our country, the costs of production have arisen just about the same percentage.

We do not ask that these foreign imports be completely cut off, but we do feel it only fair to ask that they be restricted to the same rate as before the war. If such a step is not undertaken by this Government, we will see the complete ruination of one of our important, stable Northwest industries—and such ruination will not be long in coming.

Our fishing fleets, which have produced for our American markets large quantities of bottom fish, are unable to compete with the extremely heavy imports from Newfoundland, Iceland, and Great Britain. This business was a very profitable one for our fisherman a few years ago, but they have suffered so greatly from these imports that the bottom-fisheries fleet stands idle in our ports most of the time. These men have investments in their equipment which is sizable and can be compared exactly to the investment a businessman makes in his store. Unless they are given some reasonable protection, they stand to lose a substantial part of their investments. I know many of these men and have seen them acquire their boats and gear over a period of years through good, honest labor and hard work, and it is lamentable to see them sitting idle most of the time. I ask that this Government take steps to see that these people are given fair and reasonable treatment—they do not ask for more.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR].

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, the subject before us today known as the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1949—H. R. 1211—vitally affects all Americans, the farmer, the workingman, and the consumer. It may well determine whether we go forward to a high standard of living with higher standards of wages, or whether we blunder into another depression or recession with vast unemployment. My candid opinion, Mr. Speaker, is that American-trade policies are too vital to the Nation's welfare to trust to the whims of one man, however well intentioned that one man may be. H. R. 1211, as it is now written, would give to the President of the United States the right to lower or raise tariff rates as he sees fit. In my opinion, the present bill will legislate, regulate, and finance the abolishment of hundreds of thousands of American workers' jobs. This legislation will allow products to be brought into this country from foreign nations where the living standards are much lower than ours in this country. Our farmers will also be forced to compete with the prices of farm products of foreign nations, which certainly are at a lower level because of the foreign wage element involved. I firmly believe that this act should be amended so that the peril point will be protected. The peril point is nothing more than a report made by the Tariff Commission specifying the point below which it would be perilous to this country to go in reducing tariff. Certainly no thinking and patriotic American should object to the inclusion of an amendment which is essential to the preservation of our Nation's economy and our Nation's security; and certainly the President should be willing to allow the Tariff Commission to submit this full report to him for his guidance. If this provision is not included in the law, may I call to your attention, that there is no other fact-finding agency of the Government with such vast experience, operating strictly on a bipartisan basis, as the Tariff Commission, which can give this information to the President. Surely this amendment would not hamper restrictions and it would most assuredly let the President know whether or not the importation of certain articles would definitely hinder our living standards.

I also urge that an amendment be included in H. R. 1211 to provide an escape clause. The reason for this is that at the present time many industries whose tariff protection has been seriously reduced are unfairly discriminated against, because they are denied the privilege which other industries have of appealing under the escape clause. I contend that all industries should have equal treatment and a chance to have their day in court.

If these two amendments are not incorporated in this bill, certainly the working people and all those who have a stake in the continued prosperity of our Nation should hold the Democratic Party strictly accountable for the economic evils and disastrous consequences which will beset our national economy, which would be the result of any ill-advised tariff reduction. When the time arrives when factories are closed and many millions are out of work, those directly affected should remember who is to blame.

May I reiterate my former statements, Mr. Chairman; when you reduce the tariff on products from other countries you are allowing products to be brought into this country made by low-income labor, which makes it impossible for the American worker to match. We all believe in reciprocal trade, Mr. Chairman, but let us make sure it is reciprocal, taking into consideration the welfare and living standard of our own people.

I hope the amendments I have referred to will be accepted so that we can show to our workers, our farmers, and all of our people, that we are sincerely trying to protect their interests.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. I have received a letter this morning from a small community in my district, a district of about 5,000 people, stating that 1,500 are out of work today.

Mr. McGREGOR. That is a concrete example of what is taking place and what is going to take place.

May I assure you, and I think the people of America will assure you, that the blame is entirely on your shoulders when you pass this type of legislation.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SADLAK. There are at the present time some 45,000 unemployed in the State of Connecticut and the lay-offs are increasing each day.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusets.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. May I say that in Massachusetts last year, according to the statistics I have received from the Social Security office, 240,000 workers receive a total sum in unemployment compensation of $50,000,000 and the condition is getting steadily worse.

Mr. McGREGOR. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I read into the hearings a letter to me dated February 1 from Lieutenant General Lutes, Director of the staff of the Munitions Board, to establish once and for all that these skilled workmen from the watchmaking industry are extremely important in our national defense as a source of skilled workmen for the making of small gears, pinions, and other control parts for the guided-missile program and for the making of compasses, time fuzes, watches, clocks, tachometers, navigational instruments, aircraft instruments, and time-delay devices. Instead of drawing comparisons between 1949 and 1940, Mr. Forrestal should take steps to build up our national defense in these skills to a point far beyond our present inadequate condition. An inadequate tariff, the denial of authentic and timely information provided by the Simpson amendment, or a trade-agreement program that provides no escape clause have all forced our own national defense to take second place to trade expansion.

Testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means revealed that it will require from 2 to 10 years to train men of these various skills. It is generally conceded that we will not have that time available for training these workers in event of another war.

Proponents of the bill now before us state that any industry adversely affested by reciprocal trade agreements can appeal to the Committee on Reciprocity Information for relief, but in this very watchmaking industry our trade agreements provide no escape clause and there is no disposition shown as yet by any responsible Government official to renegotiate those trade agreements and to place in them the escape clause so badly needed by our watchmaking industry.

Until the majority side of the House brings out better proof of their interest in national defense and gives us an escape clause in the Swiss trade agreement, I will condemn them for placing national defense in second place to trade expansion. As for me, I cannot approve such action, and unless this amendment is adopted, I will have to oppose this present legislation. I cannot see the reason or sense in denying our national defense that safeguard. I have listened carefully throughout all the proceedings of the Committee on Ways and Means, but I have not heard any argument that justifies keeping the Swiss agreement in effect without an escape clause.

Does the gentleman have the answer?

Mr. LYNCH. I think I have. I am reading from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 8, 1949, page 936, and the authority is none other than Secretary Forrestal whom I imagine the gentleman will concede knows something about national defense. He said:

> The domestic jewel watch industry has fulfilled its role in our program of national defense, and I am not aware that its capabilities have been adversely affected by the reciprocal trade authority.

I think that answers the question.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Forrestal does not tell you that we had an inadequate stock pile or pool of skilled workmen in 1940, and he does not tell you that we have an inadequate number of them today as is clearly the case. Let him get down to the fundamentals of this legislation and tell us why he does not stand up for a more adequate preparedness program. Positive action is needed. It is not sufficient preparedness merely to preserve an inadequate pool of skilled workers. The Simpson and Curtis amendments would safeguard our defense and at the same time they would help to build a sound reciprocal trade program. Without these safeguards our national defense is weakened and threatened and Mr. Forrestal's statement is merely a statement of his own unawareness of our peril in this phase of our preparedness.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am extremely glad the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] spoke as he did. Only 4 or 5 days ago I telephoned one of the Departments of National Defense and asked them how they felt about having the watch companies of the United States closed down and the workers of this country go to other countries, so that we would lose their skill. I remember his horrified answer at the thought of our skilled precision workers going to other countries when the need for a strong national defense is vital. The gentleman from Iowa has spoken truly. I for one will not vote for the trade-agreements program unless there is an escape clause in this bill. We in Massachusetts, in fact in all of New England, for I can speak for New England, too, realize just what we are facing today. I remember what the cotton industry faced at the time of the Japanese competition. People in the State Department were saying to me, "Oh, my dear Mrs. ROGERS, how can you hurt the feelings of the dear Japanese?" The dear Japanese stabbed us in the back and one of those very officials was calling for help from the United States from Corregidor before help came.

I think we are going through somewhat the same situation today. Some of you older Members remember the fight I and others made against the importation of Czechoslovakian shoes, against the construction of the shoe factory at Belcamp, Md., by the foreign Bata Shoe Co., where they were buying into slavery the children of our own United States, the families not realizing what they were doing. The administration was against me in that fight in the beginning. I want to tell the Members of the House, and I have the records of it, as the Department of Justice turned over findings regarding the illegal entry of the Czechoslovakians into this country under the pretense of being instructors, men who were operating under Nazi-dominated Germany.

I know in Massachusetts the recession that is taking place today, that is already taking place in the wool industry, the cotton textile industry, and the Waltham Watch and many other companies. Do you want to have a very large number of workers in the United States on unemployment relief? Do you not think they would prefer good wages and comforts instead of practically a dole or unemployment relief? How can the country stand paying all the unemployment relief the United States will have to pay if the recession in industry goes on?

The General Electric in Massachusetts, I am told reliably by workers and others, is curtailing its work in Massachusetts. Industry is receding in employment all over the country. I feel, Mr. Chairman, that if you do not vote protection in this bill you are putting nails in the coffin of our prosperity and the happiness of our workers and the welfare of our country. It would be a national calamity not to have skilled workers in our industries necessary for national defense. Soon after World War I, I introduced the first bill in Congress, and finally years later the bill was enacted providing for the War Department to educate American industry in the production of military items. We cannot permit foreign nations to control our industries or take them from us.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time primarily because the subject under discussion is of vital concern to the 2,300 watch workers and their families, of Waltham, Mass., whom I have the honor to represent in this body.

However, it is my conviction that it also should be of paramount interest to every Member of the Congress because,

by authoritative admission, it involves the question of adequate national defense.

In substantiation of this point, I am going to quote to you the exact words of Rear Adm. F. C. Denebrink, United States Navy, Director of Procurement, Manpower and Utilities, acting in behalf of the United States Munitions Board. These remarks are contained in a letter Admiral Denebrink recently sent to Mr. Harley Hise, Chairman, Board of Directors, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, in answer to an inquiry from Mr. Hise. The admiral stated, and I quote:

> The Waltham, Hamilton, and Elgin Watch Cos. were employed to 100 percent of their capacity in Government work from December 1941 to August 1945. During this period they manufactured jewel bearings, chronometers, fire-control watches, time fuses, aircraft instruments and other essential products. Most of these items could not then nor could they now be produced by other domestic watch companies.
>
> It is considered that the maintenance of at least a minimum level of operation by the Waltham, Hamilton and Elgin Watch Cos. is vital to the defense of the United States and should be preserved.

At this moment 2,300 workers, in an American community, a large portion of them veterans, are out of work. The substantial reason for this catastrophe is that these skilled precision-instrument workers were 100 percent engaged in war production and, while they were at war against the enemy, the watch manufacturing business of this country went to Switzerland.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to submit, here and now, for conscientious deliberation by each Member of this House, this question—is it your intention that an American industry shall be penalized to the point of extinguishment because of its whole-scale participation in the recent war effort?

I well recognize that the time period is limited this afternoon and it is not my intention to overburden you with extended recitation of comparative figures and tables of computation already of record.

In this respect I would like to refer you to the speech I made on this matter, on the floor of the House, last June 21, 1948, and the report of the recent hearings held before the Committee on Ways and Means on the dates of January 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 31, and February 1, all 1949.

A study of the testimony at these hearings reveals a graphic picture of the developments leading to the gradual strangulation of a vital American industry through no fault of its own.

Here is an American industry, employing American labor, paying American wages, trying to sell American products to the American people—and they are being deprived of an equal opportunity in their own American market.

Now, yesterday I listened carefully to the well-meaning words of my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS], for whom I have the greatest admiration. In substance, he attributed the present financial difficulties of the Waltham Watch Co. as entirely due to bad management, and went on to state that the two other American watch-manufacturing companies, Elgin and Hamilton, just completed the best year in their history, selling more watches, making as much or more profit than ever before. Let us see if this is so. On page 491 of the hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means on H. R. 1211, we find the testimony, on this point, of James G. Shennan, president, Elgin Watch Co. Chairman DOUGHTON asked Mr. Shennan this question, "How are your profits now, compared with profits before the war?" This is Mr. Shennan's answer, and I quote:

> The dollar profits are lower now than they were before the war. In 1940–41, for example, Elgin had net earnings, after taxes, of $1,540,000, and in 1947 we had $1,387,000. The figures for 1948 are not yet available but would not be substantially different. The percentage of net earnings to sales in 1940 was 12.4; in 1941 it was 9.4; and in 1947 it was 6.3. It has been said that 1946 was the year in which Elgin had the greatest earnings in its history. That was said at this hearing, and that is not true, sir. We made $1,130,000 in 1946 and earned 6½ percent of the net earnings through sales. Personally, I think that is too low to be healthy.

I submit that this testimony of Mr. Shennan clearly reveals that Elgin—and Hamilton is in a similar position—has so far managed to struggle against the financial strain imposed by Swiss importations, but is existing on a marginal line of security so vulnerable that a slight decrease in sales would plunge both Elgin and Hamilton into serious difficulty. If Waltham should go out of business, Elgin or Hamilton will inevitably be next, depending upon which one of them gets into trouble first.

The facts show that the jeweled-watch industry of the United States has done everything possible to meet the difference in cost of manufacturing watch movements here and abroad, and is not trying to hide behind a tariff wall. They wish no stifling of competition, they seek no monopoly in business, they ask only to be accorded the fair treatment they patriotically deserve.

The 1936 trade agreement with Switzerland reduced the tariffs on watches, and thereafter the American industry's share in the American market fell sharply. Subsequent to the 1936 trade agreement, four factors, in addition to the reduction of tariffs, operated to reduce further the tariff protection which remained to the industry.

First. In 1934, the United States reduced the value of the dollar. This is one of the reasons given in the Tariff Commission's digest of trade data on the trade agreement with Switzerland, for reducing watch tariffs by the Swiss trade agreement in 1936. Four months after consummation of the agreement, the Swiss devalued the franc by approximately 35 percent, but no compensating increase was thereafter made in the reduced tariffs.

Second. The tariff duties on watches are specific, that is to say, so many dollars and cents per watch. The subsequent inflation has operated to reduce further, on an ad valorem or percentage basis, the protection left by the trade agreement and the devaluation of the Swiss franc.

Third. The duty on adjustments, which was intended to afford progressively greater protection the higher the quality of the watch, has been rendered completely ineffective by the marking of imported watches as unadjusted, regardless of the fact.

Fourth. The cost of watch-movement manufacture, which is practically all labor, has more than doubled in this country since the beginning of the war.

The dollar increase here has been disproportionate to that in Switzerland, inasmuch as we started from a higher base cost because of the much higher labor rates in this country. Our labor rates are approximately 2½ times those of the Swiss for comparable jobs.

Over 55,000,000 jeweled watches and movements have been imported into this country since 1941; the high point being 1946 when imports of jeweled watches exceeded the 9,000,000 mark.

During the first 11 months of 1948, the latest statistics available to us, the imports of jeweled watches exceeded 7,100,000. This is an average of almost 7,000,000 jeweled watches annually over the years beginning with 1941, as contrasted to an average of about 2,600,000 from 1936 through 1940, and an average of less than 1,000,000 for the years 1930 through 1935.

All of these watches are advertised and sold as jeweled watches and are competitive with the products of this industry.

The trade agreement with Switzerland has been in effect almost 12 years and has never been changed during that entire period; that agreement does not contain an escape clause as the more recently renegotiated agreements do.

There was a negotiation between our State Department and the Swiss Government in 1946 by which the Swiss agreed to voluntarily restrict their exports to the United States, but the figure of 7,700,000 movements arrived at was practically the same as they were exporting at that time.

Now, throughout these years, the jeweled-watch industry has been unable to obtain satisfactory cooperation of the State Department even after repeated efforts and presentation of their case.

It is my information that Switzerland has not, as yet, become a party to the general agreement on tariffs and trade and will not be a party to the coming negotiations at Geneva in April.

Therefore, it appears clear there is no hope of relief to this industry without direct action of the Congress.

At the recent hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means a suggestion was made that a special subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means be appointed to study this whole problem and I wish to emphasize today my endorsement of that suggestion.

I consider it the patriotic duty of this Congress to exert every means at our disposal to afford the jeweled-watch industry of the United States an equality of opportunity in the domestic market.

I am not speaking in opposition to the bill which is before the House, nor am I personally opposed to the cooperative economic theory at the basis of the trade-agreements program, as a whole.

I am, however, of the heartfelt conviction that, in the midst of our charitable generosity throughout the world, it is obligatory upon this body to be particularly concerned with the community problems of our own people here in the United States. When the problem involves the preservation of irreplaceable skilled craftsmanship and an essential contribution to our national defense needs, then I say it is mandatory that we take appropriate action now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL].

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and say to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that I think there is a great deal of misunderstanding concerning the effect of this amendment.

Since 1942 the policy of our Government with reference to trade agreements has been to include the escape clause in all trade agreements.

In 1947 the President of the United States by Executive order set forth the rule which in substance directs that every trade agreement contain an escape clause.

Actually, the pending amendment is a most serious one. It is more dangerous than the peril-point amendment which this body has just voted down, for the reason that this amendment by law makes it mandatory upon the President of the United States to renegotiate existing trade agreements with a number of countries.

Not long ago at Geneva we entered into multilateral trade agreements with 22 other countries. In each of those agreements was included the so-called escape clause. Within the next few months this Government and a number of other countries are going to hold a conference at Annecy, France, for the purpose of negotiating and executing multilateral trade agreements in which also will be included the escape clause. The countries attending the conference at Annecy will be Colombia, Salvador, Haiti, Nicaragua, Sweden, Peru, and Uruguay. I mention the Annecy conference to you for the purpose of showing that with time, patience, and understanding the policy of this Government is dedicated to the inclusion of the escape clause in all existing trade agreements.

It is clear to everyone familiar with the history of the trade-agrements legislation that in 1934 Congress delegated to the executive branch of the Government the power to negotiate and enter into trade agreements with foreign countries. We have given the President wide latitude in this respect. As I have indicated before, the President, both in deed and in fact, since 1942 has set up a system of procedure which is designed to safeguard and protect American industry in the event of threat or injury to our economy. The present amendment, however, if it becomes law, makes it mandatory upon the President of the United States to renegotiate existing trade agreements with a number of countries. This mandate of the Congress would not only restrict the power of the President but it would place our negotiators at a definite disadvantage with a number of these countries with whom we now have trade agreements. There are a number of countries, for example, who will probably not attend the conference at Annecy, France. We have trade agreements with these countries which do not include the escape clause, although I am informed that every effort is being made and will continue to be made to have these countries accept the terms of the escape clause proviso. It would be well at this point to insert the names of these countries into the RECORD. They are: Argentina, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Switzerland, Turkey, and Venezuela. Suppose these countries refused to renegotiate? Suppose they refused to insert the escape clause? Would the mandatory provisions of this amendment force us to break off trade relations? Clearly, this is too serious a question to be disposed of in such a short time.

But there is another reason why we should not pass this amendment. It is not wise—it is not sound to place restrictions upon the President to whom we have delegated the power to negotiate trade agreements. This amendment unquestionably would tie his hands in many ways. In dealing with able negotiators such as the Swiss and those of Argentina by the approval of this amendment we would set the standards against your own traders and negotiators—not against the opposition. You place the executive branch of government in an unfavorable bargaining position. Such a practice would not only be unsound but would be detrimental to our foreign economic policy.

Yesterday during debate I stated that I hoped that the Swiss, in good faith, would agree to include the escape clause proviso in their trade agreement with us, but may I say to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that that in itself would not solve the problem confronting the American watch industry. Such an escape-clause provision merely provides that one of three methods may be used to determine whether or not an American industry has been damaged as the result of a trade agreement. Under the escape-clause proviso, an industry such as the Waltham watch industry may call upon the Tariff Commission to make an investigation to determine whether the industry has been endangered by a trade agreement, second, the Tariff Commission itself could initiate such an investigation; or, third, the President could call upon the Tariff Commission for such a report in the event he so desired.

Again I repeat—in addition to the unfavorable position in which we would place our negotiators, we must also consider whether an amendment such as this may vitiate or abrogate certain existing trade agreements.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. This amendment does not carry any penalties; does not withdraw any power from the President. It does not abrogate the existing trade agreements. It merely puts the Congress on record as asking the President to try to do it.

Mr. CARROLL. I say that this is a legislative mandate requiring the President to take positive action, and, if this amendment passes, you will be placing at a disadvantage and handcuffing the negotiators to whom the Congress has heretofore delegated its authority. I ask that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CURTIS) there were—ayes 119, noes 154.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. DOUGHTON and Mr. CURTIS to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 116, noes 159.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAND: Add a new section, to be known as section 1, as follows:

"SEC. 7. No such foreign trade agreement shall become effective until such agreement shall have been filed during a session of Congress for a period of 60 days with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and with the Secretary of the Senate. If during such period of 60 days, the Congress shall, by joint resolution, disapprove the agreement, it shall for all purposes be void."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAND. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in not to exceed 7 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a very simple one, and I doubt that I will require 5 minutes to speak briefly on it. In my opinion it does not interfere in any way with the powers asked for by the administration in connection with these reciprocal trade agreements. It does not put the Congress back into the business of writing detailed tariff legislation, which I would oppose. The power which is retained by the Congress under this amendment would be used but seldom, and only in the event of a real emergency. If an agreement were negotiated which was considered to be extremely detrimental to some segment of our economy or industry, or to the national welfare, the Congress under this amendment would have the retained power to interfere with the execution of that agreement.

I have always felt very strongly about this matter. It is my position that the Congress must not and should not abdicate its constitutional and historical prerogative to exercise ultimate control over tariff questions. It seems to me that those who believe in reciprocal trade in theory, and in this legislation, but who also believe in retaining in the Congress its constitutional and historical power

which it has had in the past and which it should retain in the future can vote for this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the committee give this serious consideration, because now that we have rejected the other two amendments, it seems to me this is the last chance to safeguard, in this reasonable fashion, the national economy.

Danger points are even now evident. The time will come when the industries of my district, particularly glass manufacture and fishing, will require some protection from foreign imports. Other industries throughout the country someday will suffer. Labor will suffer. When the day of reckoning comes I can say that I tried to help.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND].

Mr. Chairman, the very purpose of the reciprocal-trade-agreements program is to avoid the very thing this amendment would create. Certainly we know historically that there is very little chance to secure congressional approval of agreements of this kind. Although quite a number have been submitted throughout the years of the past only three were approved. So the adoption of this amendment would be about the most effective way to kill the program as a whole.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HAND. This does not require congressional approval. It requires the Congress to disapprove. The gentleman's party is in control of that situation.

Mr. COOPER. For all practical purposes it amounts to the same thing and the same result would follow.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we will shortly be called upon to vote for a continuation of the so-called reciprocal trade agreements. In the past I have voted against this legislation because, in my opinion, it was not reciprocity in the true meaning of the word, and because I felt that if this program was continued that it would eventually produce unemployment for my friends in the Eleventh Ohio District who work in the glass factories, the potteries, and perhaps in the paper factories, to say nothing of the further hardships which this unemployment would bring to industrial owners and all others dependent upon a constant and equitable pay roll.

It is difficult to understand how we are going to compete with foreign workers who are receiving 7 cents in wages for making an identical glass tumbler for which our American workers are receiving 60 cents in wages. It is also hard to explain how the workers in the shoe factories in my congressional district can compete with a foreign-made shoe which comes into America duty-free just because the heel has not been tacked on. This puts the shoe in the class of unfinished products which are permitted to enter free. It requires just a minute to tack on the ready-made heel and the shoe is then put on the American market to retail at a price which is less than it costs to manufacture the same shoe in the United States.

In the past when this legislation was before us the local unions, as well as the employers, have contacted me requesting that I oppose this extension. Now, I notice, though not contacted, that both the A. F. of L. and the CIO leadership are asking that the present bill be passed. Furthermore, not one manufacturer of shoes, glassware, clay products, paper, or any other product in my district has contacted me, either for or against this proposed legislation.

Therefore, it appears that only one course is open to me. If labor wants it and management does not oppose it, then who am I to set myself up as being superior in judgment to those who should be most affected by the act? This does not mean that I have abdicated principle in favor of expediency, but it does cause me to wonder if I have been correct in my previous deductions.

Personally, I think that if the escape-clause amendment which will be offered is adopted, it will materially strengthen the bill. But regardless of whether it is approved or rejected, I am fearful that a program as outlined in this proposed legislation will, if not properly administered, produce idle factories and men walking the streets looking for work, just as it has resulted in closing the Waltham Watch Co. If that time should come—and I pray that it does not—then I just want the men and women who work in the above-named industries in our congressional district to know that their labor leaders endorsed the program and asked for its passage.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAILEY: On page 3, after line 6, amend by adding a new section to be designated as a new section:

"SEC. 7. No reduction in duty under the Tariff Act of 1930 rates shall be made on imports competing directly with articles produced by handicraft industries in the United States. Handicraft industries are defined as those in which the salaries and wages or direct and indirect labor constitute 50 percent or more of the costs of production and include only those groups of manufacturers, excluding contractors, producing by recognized handicraft methods, like or similar products, from which the Bureau of the Census can obtain and publish industrial statistics. The Tariff Commission shall make the final determination of these qualifications."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against that amendment until I have examined it.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment because I realize that the Seventy-first Congress in 1930, which drafted and passed the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, must have considered this handicraft industry of china and glassware as being a rather delicate industry and needing a high degree of protection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close 2 minutes after the gentleman from West Virginia finishes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Again, let me say that they must have considered this handicraft industry as being in need of a large degree of protection, because they provided a 60 percent ad valorem import duty. I make the point that the reciprocal-trade agreement of 1934 and all subsequent agreements were wrong in that they lowered that rate of duty down to an ad valorem duty of approximately 30 percent. If H. R. 1211 is passed, it will be possible at the coming Geneva negotiations to reduce the major part of those rates from 30 percent ad valorem to as low as 15 percent ad valorem on certain grades of this material.

I would like to make the point that no relief was secured by these people when they called on the State Department or the other people who held hearings in preparation for the Geneva conference. I got no results in my plea before the Committee on Ways and Means. My only thought was that the House might accord relief when we could not get relief from any other source.

I would like to point out, if you please, that back when the first reciprocal-trade agreement went into effect, the importation of hand-made glass from Czechoslovakia alone for the year 1938, under the reciprocal-trade treaty, equaled 23 percent of the total domestic production of that kind of ware in this country. Only the war saved us, and, now that we are out of the war period, within 1 year the importations of that glass will exceed what they were in the prewar period. We were getting along all right during the war period, but now, because of the impact of the postwar period, these industries must have some protection. We must realize that they do not involve enough of our economy to ruin the reciprocal-trade-agreement program.

Let me quote a few figures. The chinaware industry domestic production of this grade of hand ware amounted to $9,800,000 and the imports amounted to $1,245,000. In the case of glassware, the total production of hand-made was $42,000,000 and imports were $4,505,000.

You can afford to exclude these two handicraft industries without hurting any of your over-all program.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman from West Virginia quoted imports from private industry from Czechoslovakia before the war. Now what he is quoting is imports from nationalized, Government-owned, Government-controlled industries in Czechoslovakia that will be subsidized, if necessary,

to get under the market price of the products manufactured in the gentleman's State.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman for the information.

I should like to say that right now the trouble with this industry is brought about by the activity of the Army in Germany and Japan, particularly in Germany, in rehabilitating and rebuilding these plants. They have even brought displaced persons from Czechoslovakia, skilled pottery workers, and they have them today working in the pottery plants in Germany. We cannot stand that kind of competition.

I trust the good will and the good judgment of the House to exclude the products of these handicraft industries.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane. It imposes duties and requirements upon the Bureau of the Census which are certainly not within the scope of the pending bill or the original act which is sought to be amended by the pending bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from West Virginia desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BAILEY. Not if the Chair intends to support the gentleman from Tennessee; it would be a waste of effort.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, the Chair will not prejudge this matter, but if the gentleman has no more confidence in the amendment than he has indicated, the Chair will rule that the point of order is sustained.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAILEY: Page 3, after line 8, insert the following:

"SEC. 7. During any calendar year after 1948 the total amount of imported wood wire spring clothespins, or the total amount of any article of china, hand-made glassware or tableware, which may be entered or withdrawn from warehouse in the United States for consumption, shall not exceed 25 percent of the production within the United States during the preceding calendar year of clothespins, or of such article of china, hand-made glassware or tableware, as the case may be."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against this amendment. It is certainly not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from West Virginia desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BAILEY. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

I based this amendment on the supposition that there were some sound basic reasons why the Congress in the past imposed an import quota on the shipment of Cuban sugar into the United States for the benefit of sugar producers in the State of Louisiana. I assume that the reason for doing that was predicated on the assumption that there was too much competition coming from Cuba and the other sugar-producing countries and that those producers in the State of Louisiana needed protection. I insist there is too much competition against the handcraft glass and pottery industries and that they need similar consideration from this Congress. I insist, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment is germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia might have been germane to another statute, but it certainly is not germane to the bill under consideration.

The point of order is sustained.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a third amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAILEY: Page 3, after line 8, insert the following:

"SEC. 7. No foreign-trade agreement concluded after the enactment of this act pursuant to section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, shall apply with respect to articles produced or manufactured by an American-owned factory in any foreign country. For the purposes of this section, the term 'American owned factory' means any factory (1) which is owned by citizens or residents of the United States, by a corporation or partnership created or organized in the United States or under the law of the United States or of any State or Territory, or by a foreign corporation the majority of the voting stock of which is owned by any of the foregoing, and (2) in the case of which such ownership was acquired after 1930."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment close in not to exceed 7 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment should most certainly interest the gentleman on the left of the center aisle.

If this amendment is not adopted, you stand to destroy a vaunted and boasted American economy by reducing it to the level of a world economy. Instead of keeping before us the idea that we should bring these people up to our level, the continuation of these reciprocal-trade agreements with the tendency of American capital to move their industries abroad as in the case of the Underwood Typewriter people going to Italy, Remington Rand going to Scotland, and the textile people going to Mexico, Colombia, Italy, and Haiti, and I could enumerate at least a dozen other instances.

If that is kept up, it is plain what is going to happen. It is obvious that they are going there for the purpose of exploiting cheap labor and cheaper working conditions than the standards we have here in America. It is time to break up that practice. If they were there before 1930, it would be perfectly all right to consider that they were legitimate. If they built a factory in another country since the first Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934, they should not take advantage of the reductions in reciprocal-trade rates for the simple reason that it is premeditated. If you do not call their hand now, you can figure that in future years we will cease to have an American economy and it is going to be a world economy because we are going to drag down our cost of living to the level of the cost of living of these people abroad. I do not think there is any danger in it. I think it is a matter of good judgment and common sense that the amendment be approved. It is time that we stopped the migration of American capital and industries abroad so that they can manufacture on a cheaper basis and import those products, just as the gentleman, who testified before the Labor Committee only this past week, said a textile company was producing in Haiti. The shirts were manufactured with the collar and cuffs left off so that they could get by our customs, and then they put the collars and cuffs on after they came into this country.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wonder if the gentleman's amendment would help protect American enterprise located in other countries, which are financed under this new proposal whereby the Government is to guarantee investments in other countries.

Mr. BAILEY. It would help your watch industry that has gone to Switzerland since 1930. It would help your fishing industry which you were complaining about. That is why I said you people on that side should be interested in this amendment.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Does not the gentleman think we should maintain a tariff in order to protect American labor and American enterprise so that that glass factory in your district would be able to operate?

Mr. BAILEY. My presence on the floor answers that.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Why don't you come over here and sit down with me? I agree with everything you say.

Mr. BAILEY. Then you will probably vote with me.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I will.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, the President has again asked Congress for a 3-year renewal of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934. Under the Trade Agreements Act, as it existed up to 1948, the President, by an act of Congress, was given authority to adjust downward tariffs in consideration that other countries make the same reciprocal concessions for the purpose of expanding our foreign trade and bettering our foreign relations.

This act which is now before Congress prescribes limits of authority beyond which the President cannot go. It provides safeguards for our domestic industries inasmuch as there is a careful study made by the interdepartmental branches of our Government before any concessions are made, and every trade agreement is executed with the provision that the United States reserves the right to withdraw or modify any concessions which threaten serious damage to any domestic industry.

The membership of this body are not so young but what they remember conditions in this country prior to the enactment of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934. Most of the countries of the world had barriers against our commodities. We recall the enactment of the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act and other high tariff legislation which brought about an ill feeling between nations in the economic field.

From our past experience, it is apparent that a sound world-trade program is an indispensable factor in international economic cooperation. We must not forget that we are living today in a sick world—a sick Europe—other nations looking to these United States for leadership.

In the circumstances we cannot afford to be persuaded by minority interest or be deceived by the false doctrines of economic nationalism into following the same path that we pursued after World War I.

This law that is before Congress today for enactment worked splendidly for 14 years. It is obvious that the 3-year extension is necessary in order that our Government may negotiate sizable trades with other nations.

An extension for 1 year, as was enacted last year, would imply to the other nations that we are not interested in a long-range trade program, and a betterment of living standards abroad. Such a limitation will frighten other countries and cause them to look with disfavor upon our product. We cannot go forward and be isolationists.

H. R. 1211 eliminates another objectionable feature that was enacted by the Eightieth Congress. In that bill the functions of the Tariff Commission were limited to report its findings on minimum tariffs and other import restrictions or the increases in tariffs, necessary to avoid the mere threat of injury to domestic industry, protecting any article up for consideration for trade-agreements concessions by the United States.

The guiding star in the 1948 law was the mere threat to that particular domestic industry, and not the welfare of this Nation or any other nation. Such findings were made without regard to any national or international consideration.

These crippling amendments were put in the bill to serve temporarily a few selfish interests without any consideration for the welfare of this Nation, or any benefit to be obtained by other countries. They were put in the bill for the purpose of carrying out the old theory, that only the prosperity of the industry is affected by the tariff, and make that the sole base in deciding what concessions the United States may make in trade agreements.

H. R. 1211, if enacted as drafted, will put into operation an effective world trade program that will go a long way in curing the economic ills of other nations.

We all know that the recovery of other nations is not dependent alone upon the enactment of the reciprocal-trade-agreements bill as written, but we do realize that this legislation will serve as an effective stimulant to bring about international cooperation and good will among the various nations. We know from experience that a high level of world trade means a high living standard at home, and insures the same living standard abroad.

H. R. 1211 should be enacted as reported to this House by the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia would have a tendency to destroy the reciprocal-trade-agreement program, and I ask that it be voted down without any further debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BAILEY) there were—ayes 74, noes 144.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAYS of Ohio: On page 3, after line 8, amend by adding a new section to be known as section 7:

"SEC. 7. No foreign trade agreement shall be concluded after the enactment of this act pursuant to section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, with any country wholly or partly in Europe which is not a participating country (as defined in sec. 103 (a) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948). Any foreign trade agreement concluded with any such country prior to the enactment of this act shall be terminated, in accordance with the agreement, as soon as practicable."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in not to exceed 7 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment not to destroy the Reciprocal Trade Act or to hamper it in any way. However, there has been a great deal said in the brief period I have been in this House about the Economic Cooperation Administration, and the job that it is trying to do.

I am simply asking in this amendment that we dry up the source of dollars for the countries in Europe that are trying to destroy this Economic Cooperation Administration. That source of dollars is the means that they use to disseminate their propaganda in the friendly nations which we are trying to reconstitute in the pattern of American democracy.

I had the privilege of being in Italy a few days after the Italian elections this spring; and I want to say to you that the Communists in Italy were well supplied with funds with which to propagandize the Italian people. All of their bills and accounts were paid in dollars. Where did those dollars come from? They came from countries which have industries which are nationalized and which sell products in this country and take those dollars and turn them over to the nationalized government to be used to undermine the program of this country not only in Europe but, if you please, even right in the United States to undermine our very Government.

This House today on the recommendation of the House Administration Committee of which I am a member granted $200,000 to the Committee on Un-American Activities; yet one little industry in a nationalized gangster-dominated country in Europe took out three times that much money in dollars last year under a reciprocal-trade agreement. I refer to Czechoslovakia. Let me say at this point that there are many people in my district of Czech nationality groups; they are fine people. I think I can say with authority that the Government of Czechoslovakia today, which is not the Government that negotiated the treaty, does not represent more than 2 or 3 percent of the people; it is a gangster government imposed on that country from without by threat of invasion and force. I think anyone on either side of the center aisle can conscientiously go along with this amendment. The adoption of this amendment will not harm the theory of reciprocity; nor will it tie the hands of our negotiators in the coming agreements. It will simply prevent American dollars from being siphoned into Russia from Soviet satellite countries for use in financing espionage and propaganda both here and abroad.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I know, of course, the good intentions of the gentleman from Ohio; but the fact is that the adoption of this amendment would greatly restrict and hamper this program and make its administration extremely difficult, if not impossible. I ask that the amendment be voted down.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. TACKETT. Why would it tie the hands of those who are to carry out this program to have Congress state that they may not consider a deal with those who are against the fundamental principles of democracy?

Mr. COOPER. This amendment imposes mandatory requirements in the negotiation of these trade agreements affecting countries which themselves are affected by the economic recovery program. The amendment is much more far reaching than appears on the face of it. It will greatly restrict the operation of the program and make it much more difficult of administration.

I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HAYS of Ohio) there were—ayes 77, noes 147.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill (H. R. 1211) back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WALTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1211) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania moves to recommit the bill (H. R. 1211) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Ways and Means, with instructions to report same back to the House of Representatives forthwith with the following amendments:

"SEC. 7. Before entering into negotiations concerning any proposed foreign-trade agreement under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, the President shall furnish the United States Tariff Commission (hereinafter in this act referred to as the "Commission") with a list of all articles imported into the United States to be considered for possible modification of duties and other import restrictions, imposition of additional import restrictions, or continuance of existing customs or excise treatment. Upon receipt of such list the Commission shall make an investigation and report to the President the findings of the Commission with respect to each such article as to (1) the limit to which such modification, imposition, or continuance may be extended in order to carry out the purpose of such section 350 without causing or threatening serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or similar articles; and (2) if increases in duties or additional import restrictions are required to avoid serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or similar articles the minimum increases in duties or additional import restrictions required. Such report shall be made by the Commission to the President not later than 120 days after the receipt of such list by the Commission.

"SEC. 8. The President shall, as soon as practicable, but in any event not later than 90 days from the date of this act, institute such proceedings as are necessary to incorporate an escape clause to the same general effect as article XIX of the the general agreements on tariffs and trade in all trade agreements to which the United States is a party."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire may have permission to extend their remarks on the pending bill at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, by leave granted I include herewith the statement made by Mr. O. R. Stockbein, executive secretary, America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, before the Ways and Means Committee during its hearings on extension of the Trade Agreements Act, which is self-explanatory:

The question has been raised what relations the Tariff Commission should bear to the State Department and its negotiators in the steps leading to a trade agreement.

This is a question that requires an analysis of the time element involved in such preparations and also of the coordination of efforts between two official groups that collaborate to bring about a single result.

In the first place, someone must decide which country or group of countries should be approached about a possible agreement. In reaching such a decision production and trade statistics offer the best guide. Here there is room for consultation between the State Department, the Commerce Department, and possibly the Tariff Commission. Appropriate liaison between such departments and agencies could readily pave the way.

The next step would consist of conversations with the representatives of the foreign countries to determine their willingness to enter into an agreement. This step would, of course, fall to the lot of the State Department.

The third step would call for the preparation of a list of items to be considered for concessions by this country. In preparing such a list collaboration between the State Department, other interested executive departments, and the Tariff Commission would certainly be in order. The Tariff Commission has issued a number of informational reports that would be available for this purpose. Proper liaison would permit the consultation of the commodity experts of the Commission. It would not be necessary for the Tariff Commissioners themselves to act as a body in making such information and assistance available except in the form perhaps of general instructions to the staff.

After appropriate sifting, the State Department would issue for distribution a list of the items on which hearings are to be held. A single hearing by a single agency would be sufficient. Such a hearing should be open to all interested parties, including exporters and importers.

The question now is who should hold the hearings, the Tariff Commission or an interdepartmental body with Tariff Commission representation.

Since this whole question has been raised because of the change brought about by the amendment of 1948, it will be appropriate to consider the situation under which the Tariff Commission would hold the hearings.

No one questions the competence of the Commission in this field. The objections that have been raised relate to the exclusion of the interdepartmental representatives from the procedure. Another objection goes to the amount of time consumed under such a procedure. Objection has also been made that the State Department would lose the value of the Commission's judgment.

There is no reason why the interested executive departments could not detail representatives to sit in the hearings of the Commission. The transcript of the hearings could be made available to them. There need be no loss of contact with the information produced in the hearings.

Up to this point there seems to be nothing at stake beyond departmental prestige.

From this point on we come to the merits of the principal objections. One of these objections, to repeat, is the amount of time consumed between the completion of the hearings and the findings of the Tariff Commission. During this period, it appears, the State Department is locked out, so to speak, from contact with the Tariff Commission.

It should be kept in mind (1) that the State Department and the interdepartmental personnel would have copies of the transcript and other accumulated data that might occupy some of their time. The real difficulty is caused by the fact that the Tariff Commission may find it necessary to supplement the hearings by inquiries of its own. If the hearings themselves provided sufficient information there would be no greater delay in the Commission's proceedings than in the same procedure as carried out by the committee for reciprocity information in the past.

Even during this period there is no reason why Tariff Commission experts could not give technical information and assistance to the representatives of the State Department and other agencies.

To say that the State Department would suffer from delay at this stage is like saying that a judge must hurry his consideration of evidence in order not to waste time. It is a question of adequacy of information, of its proper digestion, and of care in its consideration.

It has been said that the finding of peril points involves an act of precision that is beyond the competence of the Tariff Commission or of any other body. Yet, all State Department concessions also come down to specific points. They end up with precise figures in terms of ad valorem percentages or specific duty rates.

Some concern has been expressed that the Tariff Commission would act in too narrow a field of considerations. This objection carries some weight, but it is not fatal to the quality of the results.

The Tariff Commission having made its findings, these would be communicated to the President (for transmission to the State Department). The State Department would now be ready to negotiate.

Here the question arises whether Tariff Commission personnel should participate in the negotiations. There appears to be no good reason why they should not act in an advisory capacity. Presumably the State Department representatives are the best equipped to do the actual bargaining and it would seem unnecessary that Tariff Commission personnel take part in this function.

Once the negotiations had been completed and the President had proclaimed the agreement the Tariff Commission would issue a public report of its findings.

Chinaware and porcelain household table and kitchen articles—United States imports for consumption, by principal sources and by quarters, January 1947 to November 1948

QUANTITY (1,000 DOZEN PIECES)

	Total	Japan	United Kingdom	Germany	Czechoslovakia	France	China	All other
1947								
Jan.–Mar.	87	----	37	(1)	12	6	11	21
Apr.–June	159	77	53	(1)	3	9	10	7
July–Sept.	139	29	43	35	4	9	10	9
Oct.–Dec.	270	99	55	83	3	5	21	4
Total	655	205	188	118	22	29	52	41
1948								
Jan.–Mar.	346	144	79	81	6	5	17	----
Apr.–June	440	233	84	92	4	5	31	----
July–Sept.	538	288	63	145	2	12	18	----
Oct.–Nov.	450	261	56	111	1	5	11	----
Total	1,768	926	262	429	13	21	77	----

VALUE (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	Total	Japan	United Kingdom	Germany	Czechoslovakia	France	China	All other
1947								
Jan.–Mar.	540	----	319	1	38	52	51	79
Apr.–June	773	143	463	2	15	84	33	33
July–Sept.	763	75	393	124	24	80	29	38
Oct.–Dec.	1,014	196	429	244	13	37	61	32
Total	3,090	414	1,604	374	92	253	174	182
1948								
Jan.–Mar.	1,432	261	638	263	28	47	58	37
Apr.–June	1,589	483	571	363	15	34	66	57
July–Sept.	1,792	489	563	523	10	99	53	55
Oct.–Nov.	1,432	429	434	450	7	43	50	39
Total	6,245	1,702	2,206	1,599	60	223	207	188

[1] Less than 500.

Source: Compiled from official statistics of the U. S. Department of Commerce.

Mr. BLATNIK. This bill, H. R. 1211, now under consideration by the House is designed to extend the trade-agreements program until June 1951 and to free the President from the shackles placed upon his authority to negotiate trade agreements by the high-tariff boys in the Eightieth Congress. Its passage will represent a repudiation of the false philosophy of economic isolationism and extreme protectionism which characterizes the thinking of many members of the minority party—its passage will make a return to the commercial policies of enlightened self-interest formulated by two great American statesmen, Franklin D. Roosevelt and Cordell Hull.

During last year's debate on the trade-agreements program I opposed its emasculation by the Republican majority, and today I am happy to support this measure which will repair the harm done to this program in the Eightieth Congress and which will again place American trade policy on a rational and sane basis.

There are, in my opinion, two major considerations which justify the passage of H. R. 1211. In the first place, the extension of the trade-agreements program is required to expand American export trade, and an ever-increasing export trade is necessary to help guarantee domestic prosperity. It is a well-known fact that the United States must export 8 to 10 percent of its total production to maintain full employment—that this percentage makes the margin between prosperity and depression.

There can be no doubt but that the reciprocal-trade program has proven its worth as a policy for expanding our foreign trade. Department of Commerce statistics show that during the 4 years following the passage of the original Trade Agreements Act, export trade with trade-agreement countries increased by 63 percent as compared to an increase of only 32 percent to nonagreement countries. Likewise the imports from trade-agreement countries to the United States showed a greater increase than imports from nonagreement countries, the effect of which was to give trade-agreement countries more dollar credits to buy a still greater volume of American goods. Thus we see that the trade-agreements program played a major role in the prewar recovery program by stimulating foreign trade in general and American exports in particular, and thus contributing to prosperity in America and in the world.

In the second place, the passage of this measure is a step toward world peace. It is a generally accepted fact that the major cause of war is the economic rivalries between the Great Powers—that economic considerations far outweigh ideological differences as the root cause of war. Trade wars, tariff wars, and the struggle for markets and raw materials lead to shooting wars. On the other hand, the trade-agreements program has as its major purpose the abolishment of tariff wars by mutual consent of the nations of the world, and the creation of the conditions to permit the free flow of goods and services across State lines, and to make possible the distribution of raw materials through the regular channels of foreign trade. Such a program makes for world peace as it tends to eliminate the economic causes of war—its passage represents a step in building the economic foundations of lasting peace.

Finally, I want to point out that my State of Minnesota has a vital stake in an expanded American export trade, and therefore the people of Minnesota are in general accord with the trade-agreements program. The pattern of Minnesota's economy is most sensitive to changes in the level of foreign trade. The State's agricultural, mining, transportation, and manufacturing industries thrive when American exports increase, and suffer when such exports fall.

A considerable percent of Minnesota production is exported to foreign countries. Minnesota wheat, corn, meat, and flour flows into the channels of foreign trade. My State produces much of the iron ore which is used in the production of farm machinery, trucks, tractors, and automobiles, which are shipped abroad in considerable quantities. Minnesota produces condensed milk, asphalt roofing, rubber goods, and many other items for the export market.

Therefore it is possible for me to say without reservation that Minnesota has profited from the growth of our foreign trade under the trade-agreements program, and that my State has a vital stake in the increased trade which will result from its extension.

Mr. Speaker, it is my considered judgment that the passage of this bill will represent a real contribution to world peace and international prosperity, and that it is necessary to continued prosperity and full employment in the United States. These are ends which we all seek, and I call upon the Members of the House to enact H. R. 1211 into law.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, many historians have maintained that the Smoot-Hawley tariff of 1929, which erected the highest trade barriers of history around this Nation, and which started tariff wars throughout the globe, contributed directly to the economic collapse here and abroad, and sowed the seeds for the rise of Hitlerism and World War II.

The reciprocal agreements recognize the fundamental fact that trade is a two-way business. We cannot go on forever exporting more than we import. Other countries must be able to sell their goods to us if they are to get dollars to buy our products and to repay our loans. When we import foreign goods we improve the standards of Americans as consumers, and at the same time we make it possible to maintain foreign markets for our products. The lowering of trade barriers encourages private trading and free enterprise as distinct from Government trading.

For the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act has been a key part of our dealings with other nations for the past 14 years. Its fundamental purpose has been to promote a freer flow of world commerce, to eliminate retaliatory tariff walls, and to serve peace by stimulating a mutually enriching international exchange of goods on a fair quid pro quo basis. In short, it has been an integral part of our foreign policy—an indispensable economic support to the political aspects of that policy.

Indeed, with our reciprocity program, we have given the economic lead to all nations. Thus, as far as the postwar era is concerned, we have preached the principles of that program in taking the initiative to establish the World Bank and the World Monetary Fund. We have preached them, too, in connection with our successful effort last year to get 22 governments to join with us in the historic and far-reaching Geneva tariff agreement, and they constitute the animating spirit of the 53-nation charter of the International Trade Organization recently negotiated at Havana. Above all—and this is of very great importance—they have been written into the legislation enacted by Congress for the European recovery program, under which the 16 participating countries are expected to pledge themselves to reduce barriers to increase the exchange of goods among themselves.

In such circumstances, when Congress failed to properly renew the reciprocity program, it was telling the world, in effect, that we do not believe in practicing the good things we have preached. Worse, by thus committing a supreme act of inconsistency and backtracking, it was spreading confusion among all our friends abroad, upsetting the operations of the ERP, and planting the impression everywhere of an American drift back to the days of high protectionism; in other words, despite our political internationalism, our economic role was taking on a distinct isolationist slant.

But it is not only for reasons of this sort that the Trade Agreements Act should be renewed without crippling amendments. In the modern world such an act is essential. Without it there can only be tariff wars in which everybody will ultimately be the loser. From the standpoint of our own self-interest, strictly in terms of dollars and cents, we need reciprocity for the sake of American markets abroad. If we do not have it, if our overseas customers run up against protectionism here, then they will not be able to sell enough to us to acquire the money they must have to buy from us. And that is the kind of process that leads to factory shut-downs and deep economic depression.

Accordingly, looked at in any light, either as an instrument of foreign policy or as an instrument to promote our own prosperity, the reciprocal-trade program—which includes escape clauses guarding against serious injury to our domestic producers—must be renewed substantially in the form existing prior to the Eightieth Congress.

AMERICAN FARMERS, THE TRADE-AGREEMENTS PROGRAM, AND H. R. 1211

The American farmer has a bigger stake in prompt passage of H. R. 1211, providing for renewal of the reciprocal-trade-agreements program authority in a workable form, than has any other unit of the American economy. This program has helped and will help to maintain and enlarge markets, abroad and at home, for both our farm products and our industrial goods. Adequate markets for all he can produce are even

more vital to the farmer than to the industrialist. A farmer, unlike a big industrialist, cannot shut down his factory, lay off his employees, and live on his reserves when his market goes bad. In order to make a decent living American farmers have to grow and sell more wheat, cotton, tobacco, fruits, and many other crops than this country itself can buy and use. Unless we sell that extra production in other countries the American farmer either suffers or has to have a subsidy from the American taxpayer—and he does not like either alternative.

Since the turn of this century economic changes here and elsewhere have been tending to diminish the relative importance of our agricultural exports. But piled on top of that trend, especially since World War I, there have been rigid restrictions and insuperable barriers imposed by foreign countries against our exports to them. It is this development which the trade-agreements program is designed to cure.

It is nonsense to say that the trade agreements have sold American farmers down the river for the benefit of big industrialists. Through the agreements the United States has obtained as many or more foreign concessions on important farm exports as on industrial exports. Second, no industrial enterprise, under normal conditions, depends so heavily on foreign markets as do some of our major farm crops. Third, the American farmer's biggest and best market is an American market filled with customers who have jobs and are therefore able to buy meat, vegetables, milk and butter, and other farm products. A factory hand with a job making something that can be sold overseas can buy and pay for American farm products. If he loses his job because the foreign market for his product is closed, he cuts down his purchases of cotton overalls and shirts, woolen suits, cigarettes, meat, fresh vegetables and fruits, milk, and butter. That hurts farmers.

Before the war about 10 percent of total American farm production was actually exported, but for some of our most important farm crops the proportion ran far higher. The annual averages in 1934 and 1935 were 39 percent for tobacco, 56 percent for raw cotton, 16 percent for lard, 30 percent for prunes and plums, 34 percent for apricots, 29 percent for raisins, 13 percent for apples, 19 percent for pears, and so on. In 1937 and 1938 the figure for wheat was 12 percent—drought and other factors had held exports down in the earlier period, but since the war they have greatly increased.

All agricultural exports increased during and after the war, of course. In 1946 and 1947 they accounted for 13 to 14 percent of cash farm receipts. But when foreign production recovers from the devastation of war the American farmer will, more than ever before, need a good home market and, at the same time, benefit from the removal of the greatest possible number of barriers to his foreign markets.

Because they simply cannot pay for them, most foreign countries are, at present, strictly limiting their purchases of such things as fruits and tobacco, which are relatively less essential to them. That hurts American growers and the only way in which our foreign markets for these things can be restored or expanded is to enable foreign countries to pay for them and to remove the restrictions on their importation.

This leads to another aspect of the trade-agreements program which is just as important to American farmers as to industry. The American farmer likes to grow all he can, sell all he can, and be paid for it in the market place. He does not want to give his crops away or be paid a Government subsidy for growing them. That is just as true about the products sold in foreign markets as those sold in the home market.

If the United States is going to sell its products in foreign countries it must, in the long run, accept foreign goods and services in payment. During and since the war we have sent abnormally large quantities of goods overseas, but we have been giving many of them away or, at best, selling them on credit. Before the last war about 80 percent of our exports were paid for by imports, but from 1942 to 1947 we have been getting from abroad only about half as much as we have sent abroad. That is not good business for the national economy.

Our Marshall plan is designed to help friendly foreign countries get back on their feet and able to produce goods both for themselves and to exchange for the things we want to sell them. By reducing our own excessive tariffs through trade agreements we can increase the opportunity for other countries to sell their goods in our market. If we don't use the agreements for that purpose, foreign countries will simply be compelled to cut down on their buying of American goods. If they do that, American crops will again pile up in unsalable, price-breaking surpluses, American factories producing for export will shut down, and American workers as well as foreigners will drop out of the American farmer's market. We saw that happen back in the early 1930's. It meant that our living standard and our national income dropped—and the farmer is always the first to feel the pinch when national income goes down. Farm prices fall quicker and farther than other prices.

Some people claim to fear that if United States tariffs are reduced American farmers will suffer from competition with the products of farmers in other countries where living standards and wages are lower than in this country. The record does not show any grounds for such fears. A favorite saying of these people is that the American farmer is entitled to the American market, and so he is if he can supply that market adequately and at reasonable costs. But the size of the home market and the price it offers are far more important to the American farmer than is the exact percentage of it which he supplies. Eighty percent of a big market is better than 100 percent of a collapsed market.

The trade-agreements program is a mechanism for promoting a lively flow of sound trade among nations and helping to give each country a better chance to produce the things it is best fitted to produce and to trade them for goods which other countries can produce to better advantage. Trade agreements help that kind of trade—which is what the American farmer needs—by clearing away unnecessary and excessive governmental restrictions and obstacles to international commerce.

On the direct issue of opening foreign markets to American exports, the trade-agreement concessions obtained by this country from other countries apply to practically every important export product of the United States, agricultural or industrial. Agriculture is benefiting from foreign concessions on wheat, corn, barley, oats, and rice, and on fresh, frozen, dried, and canned fruits and vegetables. We have obtained concessions on various dairy products such as dried and evaporated milk. There are relatively few high foreign tariffs on raw cotton but a number of countries having colonies which they might wish to build up as sources of cotton have nevertheless bound cotton on their free lists or at low tariff rates. Many countries have made concessions on tobacco. There have been other concessions—many of them—on meat products, nuts, seeds, lumber, naval stores, and other things which we export.

Hundreds of American industrial products also benefit from foreign concessions. Those concessions are good for American farmers too because, as has been pointed out, foreign sales of American machinery, typewriters, electrical equipment, radios, automobiles, and other manufactured goods will mean greater demand in this country for farm products.

Next April 13 more countries are to meet to negotiate with each other and with the 23 countries already parties to the general agreement negotiated at Geneva in 1947, for further mutual reduction of trade barriers. The 36 countries, combined, account for much the greatest portion of the world's international trade. Passage of H. R. 1211 will greatly facilitate these negotiations and the United States preparations for them.

The 1948 legislation which this bill will repeal would hamper the President and his helpers in making effective trade agreements. When that legislation was passed the President pointed out its defects and its obstructionist provisions but he said he would do his best to make it work. It is up to this Congress to give the President a legislative implement which will work, to the benefit of the entire national economy.

American farm leaders are, themselves, fully alive to what the trade-agreements program means to this country's agriculture and why it must have a workable legislative basis. During its hearings on H. R. 1211 the Ways and Means Committee received statements from the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Farmers Union, and the Secretary of Agriculture, strongly supporting the bill and giving reasons for their support. Secretary Brannan said, in part:

That program is the necessary foreign counterpart of a long-term domestic agricultural program.

To sum it all up, the reciprocal trade-agreements program benefits the American farmer in his capacity as a producer by helping to maintain both his foreign and his domestic markets; it helps him as a consumer by helping to make available, at more reasonable costs, more adequate supplies of things he needs and wants from abroad and things which keep American industry in operation; it helps him in his capacity as a part of the national economy because he prospers when the country prospers and when the rest of the world prospers.

H. R. 1211 provides for a workable trade-agreements program and the interests of American farmers demand its immediate passage.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN THE RECIPROCAL-TRADE-AGREEMENTS PROGRAM—MAY 1948

LOUISIANA

On October 30, 1947, the United States joined with 22 other countries of the world in concluding a General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. This agreement was put into provisional effect on the part of the United States on January 1, 1948, under the authority of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, as amended.

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade is the most comprehensive international instrument ever negotiated for the reduction of barriers to world trade, having regard both to the scope of its provisions and to the volume of trade which they affect. The 23 countries participating in the negotiations were Australia, the Belgium-Netherlands-Luxemburg Customs Union, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, France, India, the Customs Union of Lebanon and Syria, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Southern Rhodesia, the Union of South Africa, the United Kingdom, and the United States. These countries accounted in 1938 for approximately three-quarters of the international trade of the world.

The schedules of tariff concessions apply to products which are estimated to account for approximately two-thirds of the import trade of the negotiating countries and for substantially half of total world imports. The concessions include the complete elimination of certain duties and preferences, reductions of duty and preference, the binding of duties at existing levels, and the binding of duty-free treatment.

The general provisions of the agreement are comparable to the general provisions of past reciprocal trade agreements and are necessary to safeguard and make effective the tariff concessions. The provisions of the general agreement have been adapted to present conditions and to the fact that this is an agreement among several countries rather than merely between two countries.

The agreement was put into effect provisionally on or before January 1, 1948, by Australia, the Belgian-Netherlands-Luxemburg Customs Union, Canada, Cuba, France, the United Kingdom, and the United States, which represent over 80 percent of the foreign trade of all negotiating countries. Other participating countries have until June 30, 1948, to put the agreement provisionally into effect. The agreement will enter definitively into force upon deposit with the Secretary General of the United Nations of formal acceptances on behalf of countries making up 85 percent of the foreign trade of all negotiating countries.

The agreement is a demonstration of the kind of constructive work that the United Nations can do in the economic field. Announcement of the agreement created an auspicious atmosphere for the opening of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment which convened at Havana on November 21, 1947, and within the long-term framework which the agreement establishes it should be possible for the reconstruction of Europe under the Marshall plan to proceed with more confidence that efforts to restore world economy will not again be defeated by commercial warfare between the great trading powers.

What the United States got in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade

Tariff preferences affecting a significant part of United States trade with countries in the British Commonwealth have been substantially reduced, and preferences on a considerable list of products which the United States exports to the various countries of the Commonwealth have been eliminated entirely. Under the terms of the agreement no new preference may be created and no existing preference may be increased, whether or not on products listed in the schedules of the agreement.

Total United States exports in 1939 of products covered by the new concessions amounted to over $1,400,000,000. Regardless of whether or not the agricultural and industrial products actually produced in Louisiana entered foreign trade in large quantities, the prices Louisiana producers received were directly improved by the fact that similar products were simultaneously being exported from the United States in considerable amounts, and, consequently, were not put on the domestic market in competition with Louisiana products as most certainly would have happened if the entire supply had to be consumed within this country. Some of the principal Louisiana products for which concessions were obtained from other countries are:

Rice and rice products: The United Kingdom reduced the duty on husked and unhusked rice.

The Belgium-Netherlands-Luxemburg Customs Union bound milled rice duty-free and placed a ceiling on the monopoly fee.

Cuba bound the existing rates on imports up to 325,000,000 pounds or more of rice annually.

France reduced the duty on husked rice in the whole grain and on breakfast cereals of rice.

Canada also made concessions on certain rice and rice products.

Strawberries: Canada, which before the war was by far the largest foreign market for United States strawberries, made a seasonal reduction on fresh strawberries.

Cotton: The United Kingdom, the Belgium-Netherlands-Luxemburg Customs Union, Canada, Cuba, Czechoslovakia and Norway bound raw cotton on the free list.

France bound raw cotton, linters and wastes on the free list.

Australia bound certain raw cotton on the free list and granted a substantial duty reduction on all other raw cotton, eliminating the preference.

Cottonseed and cottonseed products: Canada eliminated the duty and preferences on cottonseed.

The Belgium-Netherlands-Luxemburg Customs Union bound the monopoly fee on cottonseed oil if for industrial purposes.

Cuba bound the duty on cottonseed oil.

Cotton broadwoven goods: Cuba, Chile, Canada, and Newfoundland granted concessions on cotton broadwoven goods.

Hosiery: The United Kingdom, New Zealand, and the Union of South Africa granted concessions on hosiery.

Wood and wood products: The United Kingdom granted three concessions in the lumber schedule covering wood of the coniferous species. Concessions were also granted on square sawn hardwood and sawn staves.

Australia removed the duty and preference on certain undressed staves and reduced the duty and preference on other undressed staves. Australia also reduced the duty and cut the Canadian preference in half on a number of timber items.

China bound the duty on sawn softwood lumber.

South Africa reduced the duty and preference on unmanufactured softwood.

Czechoslovakia bound the duty-free treatment of non-European wood.

Norway bound hickory and oak lumber on the free list.

Canada reduced the duty on wood furniture.

Paper and paper products: China reduced duties on several kinds of writing and printing paper, and bound rates on numerous paper products such as paper napkins, towels, office forms and paper handkerchiefs.

New Zealand granted a reduction in the duty on paper.

Newfoundland reduced rates on certain types of paper and stationery products.

Cuba lowered the duty on cardboard containers in which goods are imported.

Petroleum refinery products: The United Kingdom bound the rate on paraffin wax and petroleum jelly.

France granted reductions on gasoline and lubricating oil.

Southern Rhodesia and the Union of South Africa bound their duties on lubricating oil.

Czechoslovakia granted reductions on paraffin and petroleum jelly.

The Belgium-Netherlands-Luxemburg Customs Union bound paraffin and petroleum duty free.

Lebanon bound lubricating oil at the existing rate.

Brazil reduced the duty on certain petroleum oil.

Chile reduced a duty on lubricating oil, on lubricating grease and on paraffin.

China granted duty reductions on lubricating oil and grease.

Sulfur: The United Kingdom bound sulfur on the free list.

France bound raw sulfur duty-free.

Czechoslovakia bound sulfur duty-free.

The Belgium-Netherlands-Luxemburg Customs Union bound crude sulfur duty-free.

Norway bound sulfur duty-free.

Carbon black: The United Kingdom bound the rate on carbon black.

France bound carbon black free of duty.

Australia eliminated the duty on carbon black.

What the United States gave in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade

Concessions were made to other countries on products accounting for $1,766,000,000 or 78 percent of total United States imports in 1939. However, bindings of the tariff status at the 1945 levels accounted for $1,259,000,000 of this total and reductions in duty were made on products the imports of which into the United States were valued, in 1939, at only about $500,000,000.

Some of the principal Louisiana products on which reductions were made by the United States:

Sugar: The duty on sugar was reduced 25 cents per 100 pounds. During the war quotas, which have regulated imports of sugar into the United States since 1934, were suspended. As of January 9, 1948, quotas again became applicable pursuant to special sugar legislation passed by Congress in 1947. Under this legislation the Secretary of Agriculture is required to determine annually the year's sugar requirements of the United States and this quantity is allocated to the different supplying areas according to a formula provided in the statute. It is this stipulated quantity available for consumption which determines the United States price of sugar and the tariff under this system thus loses much of its importance, as a protective device.

Unfinished petroleum oils: The excise tax on imports of unfinished oils was reduced from one-half cent to one-fourth cent a gallon. In 1939 taxable imports of unfinished oils, including topped crude, were valued at $4,541,000, nearly all from the Netherlands West Indies. However, more than half of the reported imports consisted of topped crude

on which the excise tax was reduced in December 1939. In 1946 taxable imports amounted to $30,000, nearly all from Canada; during the first 8 months of 1947 they amounted to $365,000, nearly all from Canada. Since unfinished oils are products not ready for use, most of the shipments which appear in published statistics are intracompany transfers or transactions between affiliated companies.

All concessions made by the United States were formulated within the limits and according to the procedures specified by the Trade Agreements Act. This Government is exercising its right under the agreement generally to withhold concessions which are of primary interest to those countries which were represented at Geneva until they have put their new tariff schedule into effect.

ADDENDUM, SEPTEMBER 1948

Since preparation of the accompanying material certain developments have significantly altered the facts presented there.

1. Twenty-two of the twenty-three countries (all except Chile) participating in negotiation of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade at Geneva, Switzerland, in 1947, signed the Protocol of Provisional Application before June 30, 1948, and tariff concessions provided for in the agreement are now in effect as regards those countries.

2. The Congress in June 1948 enacted Public Law 792 (approved June 26, 1948) extending to June 30, 1949, the President's authority to negotiate trade agreements and providing for certain changes in the procedure heretofore followed in such negotiations.

The new law:

(a) Prohibits the Tariff Commission from participating in any decision regarding the terms of an agreement or in negotiations for an agreement. The Commission will, however, continue to furnish factual data to other Government agencies for use in formulating and negotiating agreements. The agencies which, under law or executive order, now advise the President on trade-agreement matters are the Departments of State Commerce, Agriculture, the Treasury, and Labor, the Military Establishment, and the Economic Cooperation Administration;

(b) Requires the President, before negotiating an agreement, to submit to the Tariff Commission a list of all products on which possible United States tariff concessions may be considered;

(c) Requires the Tariff Commission, not more than 120 days after receiving the above list, to conduct hearings and an investigation and to advise the President as to (1) the limit to which tariff concessions may go without causing or threatening serious injury to domestic industries, and (2) the minimum tariff increases or additional import restrictions, if any, required to avoid such injury;

(d) Requires that the President, if he concludes an agreement involving greater tariff concessions than those specified in the above report, or failing to include increased import restrictions recommended by the Commission, must report the agreement to Congress not more than 30 days after it is concluded, together with a statement of his reasons for not following the recommendations of the Commission, which thereupon must file with the Congress a copy of its previous report to the President.

Existing procedure, under which the Committee for Reciprocity Information holds public hearings on all aspects of a trade agreement before its negotiation, is provided for in executive orders and will continue unchanged, except that the Tariff Commission will no longer participate in these hearings or in decisions based on information and views of interested parties presented there.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, having been unable to gain the floor during the consideration of the Trade Extension Act, I wish to make the following comments and observations with respect to that legislation.

For years the question of tariff was the outstanding issue between the two parties, and it was made a political football. The vast majority of the American people, however, demanded that the issue of tariffs be taken out of politics, and after many efforts, a Tariff Commission was created, with a nonpolitical soul, notwithstanding the opposition who for years thrived on high tariffs.

Upon the urgent recommendations of business and the American people as a whole, with the end pointed toward the increasing of our foreign commerce and enabling the United States to export its great surpluses in many commodities, we succeeded in passing the original Trade Agreements Act of 1934.

A brief review of the history of tariff legislation recalls to our minds the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill—the Republican high tariff bill—which produced, as a result of its unfair provisions, uncounted and wholesale trouble for our industrial and economic establishment. With the passage of this legislation which created a barrier of economic goods against a necessary trade-among-nations policy, our country aroused counterattacks against our foreign economy of goods, and as a result, barriers were raised against American goods which could easily have found markets throughout the world. Under this Republican measure, infant industries which had no reason for securing governmental assistance, were subsidized to the extent that they were permitted to compete with foreign products, which could have been imported by the American people at a cheaper price and sometimes at a better grade.

The record will also show that our foreign trade fell as a result of this unfair legislation, which was directly responsible, in part, for our falling into a depression out of which it required a Democratic administration to lead us. Profiting by this mistake, the Democratic Congress, led by that great sage and statesman, Cordell Hull, brought about a necessary reversal of this policy of closing our market doors to a world anxious to receive them.

There was then enacted a group of reciprocal trade agreements which recognized the strength and weaknesses of our industrial and agricultural products. It was inevitable that we should admit that we could not manufacture all the goods which the American people needed due to climatic and labor conditions, since many countries could raise products and manufacture them at a cost much less than our farms and factories permitted. As a result, the American people were brought face to face with the realization that trade with the peoples abroad begets understanding and friendliness, as well as a profitable exchange of goods. The Hull reciprocal trade agreements, always opposed by the Republicans, who still bask in the shadows of a high-tariff policy, which today is outdated and antiquated, proved an immediate success. An examination of the records of our import and export trade during the period of their existence speaks strongly for their continuance.

H. R. 1211 entitled "The Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1949," now under consideration, in effect does three things, namely: (a) repeals the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948, (b) extends for 3 years from June 12, 1948, the authority of the President to enter into foreign trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act, (c) and effects three minor changes in the original Trade Agreements Act of 1934, as amended. The effect of section 6 of the new bill, enables the United States to raise, rather than to lower, certain tariff rates, pursuant to the general agreement on tariffs and trade, negotiated at Geneva in 1947.

This bill effects a return to the procedures that were followed from 1934 to 1948, under the then existing Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, which as you know, resulted in the successful completion of some 42 agreements. Under the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948, as passed by the Republican Eightieth Congress, the President was bound by a hampering procedure in administering this law. The new act will return us to the procedures which have effectively been proven in the past.

The trade-agreements program insures us against a possible loss of the huge investment that we have made in the European recovery program, by putting into effect a powerful and practical method of expanding our international trade. By allowing other countries to sell us a greater portion of their raw material and other essential materials, we make available purchasing power which is used to obtain more of our own export products on a paying basis, and not as gifts. Business, labor, farming groups, and the consumer, are all vitally interested in the maintenance of these trade agreements, as they point toward the very essence of our national and international well-being.

I have observed that Great Britain, due to financial aid that we have been and are giving her, has been and is extending its exports. In the last few days, however, she has complained bitterly that Germany, through its cartels, is competing unfairly with Britain's exports. She also complains that Japan, due to its cheap labor, is underselling Great Britain in many quarters of the world.

With the United States aid given to Germany, Japan, Great Britain, and other countries, we are building up a great source of competition for our own export trade. Nevertheless I am certain that this Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1949 will not effect or retard our own exports or our own economy, and further, will not deprive us of the foreign trade which is so badly needed for our own great surpluses.

Since the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act, as amended, is the arch of our bipartisan foreign economic policy, a failure to enact legislation such as this, would in effect, be making our American leadership in world economic affairs subservient to the interests of a few producers. The foreign relations of the United States are interdependent upon and directly related to the doctrines of

peace and freedom, for which mankind is constantly striving. The delusive and artificial Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948 that seriously affected and disabled the Reciprocal Trade program, will be remedied by the passage of this bill.

The issue is that again of isolation-in-trade attempting, to be self-supporting, which we are not and cannot be, as against recognition of the fact that in just, fair, and equitable trade agreements, we can, as Americans, play an important part in the rehabilitation of the world's economy, as well as benefiting our own industries and our own social and industrial life.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the Waltham Watch Co. in its financial report for last year, which was issued yesterday, reveals that company had a deficit last year of $1,610,000. In 1947, the company reported a loss of about $300,000. A company that year after year loses money cannot long stay in business. It cannot continue to employ people.

One speaker today probably gave the reason why the Waltham Watch Co. has been losing money. That reason was that the Swiss shipped 9,000,000 watches into the United States last year under trade treaties that had greatly reduced the tariff on Swiss watches.

I spoke earlier in this debate about the harm that might be done to the crab industry, the filbert-nut industry, and the shingle industry if trade treaties are negotiated too hastily and without all members of an industry, labor and management alike, having a full opportunity to present their case.

This bill by eliminating the Tariff Commission as an agency to investigate how any tariff may affect any industry, certainly does not safeguard the interest of either workers or manufacturers.

This noon I had lunch with a western lumberman. I asked him if lumber was now being shipped into the United States from Canada. He told me that lumber imports from Canada, particularly of low-grade lumber, have increased enormously during recent months. If this importation of lumber from Canada continues to increase it certainly will throw many of our western sawmills out of operation and cause many western sawmill workers to lose their jobs. This is particularly true of the smaller mills, the mills that operate with crews of 10 to 40 men each.

We should not sell these little sawmill operators and the men they employ down the river. Surely, we should not sell them down the river without providing them their American right to be fully heard by appropriate committees or commissions of the Federal Government. Under this bill these operators and these workers will get adequate hearings. This bill makes the Tariff Commission a bipartisan, nonpolitical Commission a dead duck. Under this bill, when an industry and its employees are about to be liquidated by the State Department on the auction block of foreign trade, neither its management nor its employees are afforded any adequate, impartial hearing. This is not fair. This is not just.

I have lived all my life in a lumbering community. Many is the time I have seen most of the lumber mills of my home town idle while those in Canada were operating at full capacity. These Canadian mills operated while our American lumber mills were idle because the price of labor and of logs was much lower in Canada than in the United States.

The same threat that exists in this bill to the lumber industry also exists in this bill for the plywood.

During the past year, large eastern building material jobbing houses, hoping to profit by becoming agents for Canadian and Mexican concerns, have made a strenuous effort to persuade Congress to remove the present tariff on Canadian and Mexican plywood.

Were this plywood tariff to be reduced more than 13,000 American plywood workers who are employed in 43 plywood plants in Oregon, Washington, and California would be the principal sufferers.

The wage rates paid by Canadian plywood manufacturers are about 6 percent lower than those prevailing on the American side of the line. Also, log prices in Canada are much lower than in the United States. The differential between Mexican labor and American labor is even greater than that which exists between Canadian and United States labor.

If tariffs on plywood should be reduced more foreign plywood will invade the American market, our American plants will be forced to curtail operations or our American plywood workers eventually will have to accept lower wages in order to meet this foreign competition.

None of these eventualities should be permitted to happen. Our American plywood industry has been doing a good job in increasing production, in meeting building material demands.

In 1945, the production of fir plywood in the United States was 1,200,000,000 square feet; in 1946, it was 1,400,000,000 square feet; in 1947, it was 1,600,000,000 square feet; and in 1948, it was an estimated 2,000,000,000 square feet. It is now contemplated that the plywood output for 1949 will be 2,700,000,000 square feet or about two and one-half times the production of 4 years ago. Certainly, with such a record, the plywood industry has done a good job.

The plywood industry's management and workers should not be penalized by the adoption of new tariff policies in plywood, certainly not without giving the industry and its workers the fullest opportunity to be heard. This bill does not provide full hearings for the plywood industry, either its management or its workers, in the event the State Department should undertake to wipe out the present tariff that is imposed on Canadian and Mexican plywood workers.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for H. R. 1211, for extension of reciprocal trade treaty powers of the President, after voting for the motion to recommit to include in that act a means of determining the so-called peril points—and to require escape clauses to be incorporated in trade treaties negotiated with other countries. I believe it is important that the Federal Trade Commission be given direction to establish these so-called peril points or tariff rates below which it is dangerous to go in the protection of American industry and agriculture from cheap labor and slave labor foreign competition. I also believe it highly important that all trade treaties include an escape clause, because we are entering upon an era dangerous to the welfare of the American people in matters of foreign trade.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, it is well known or should be well known that the most important agricultural crops are protected absolutely. They are protected not by tariffs under the Reciprocal Trade Treaty Act, but by quota import limitations established by Executive order of the President under the Agricultural Adjustment Act and the Soil Conservation Act. The principal agricultural products so protected are short staple cotton, wheat, rice, cattle, dairy products such as butter and milk, and perhaps one or two others. There is also provision in the law which will enable the President even to grant export subsidies on agricultural products. This arises under authority of law contained in the Agricultural Adjustment Act and the Soil Conservation Act. They are still in effect. These authorities are as follows:

United States Code, title 7, section 608 (a) ?—the AAA:

"Subject to the provisions of subsection (1) of this section, the Secretary of Agriculture shall make payments, out of any moneys available for such payments, in such amounts as he finds, upon the basis of the investigation made pursuant to subsection (1) of this section, to be fair and reasonable and best calculated to effectuate the declared policy of this chapter:

"(a) To remove from the normal channels of trade and commerce quantities of any basic agricultural commodity or product thereof;

"(b) To expand domestic or foreign markets for any basic agricultural commodity or product thereof;

"(c) In connection with the production of that part of any basic agricultural commodity which is required for domestic consumption."

United States Code, title 7, section 624:

"624 (a). Whenever the President has reason to believe that any one or more articles are being or are practically certain to be imported into the United States under such condition and in sufficient quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective or materially interfere with any program or operation undertaken, or to reduce substantially the amount of any product, processed in the United States from any commodity subject to • • • he shall cause an immediate investigation to be made by the United States Tariff Commission. • • •

"(b) If, on the basis of such investigation and report to him of findings and recommendations made, in connection therewith, the President finds the existence of such facts, he shall by proclamation impose such fees on, or such limitations on the total quantity of, any article or articles which may be entered or withdrawn from warehouse • • • provided, that no limitation shall be imposed on the total quantity which may be imported from any country which reduces such permissible quantity to less than 50 percent of the average annual quantity of such article which was imported from such country during the period from January 1, 1929, to December 31, 1933, both dates inclusive."

Under authority of these sections of the Agricultural Adjustment Act and the Soil

Conservation Act, the import of short staple cotton is limited to approximately one-fourth of 1 percent of the amount of short staple cotton raised in the United States. That is almost a complete embargo against importation of that product. The import quota restriction on wheat permits the importation of approximately one-tenth of 1 percent of the amount of wheat grown in the United States, which is an even more perfect embargo against the importation of wheat into the United States. While the quota restrictions on the importation of cattle are not quite so severe, nevertheless under another section of the code relating to agriculture, no cattle or unprocessed meats can be imported from countries where foot-and-mouth disease exists, and among those countries are our chief competitors in the growing of cattle, Argentina, Brazil, and Mexico. Our own cattle growers are, therefore, almost 100 percent protected, not by tariff under the Reciprocal Trade Treaty Act, or even the so-called Smoot-Hawley Act, but under quarantine restrictions established under the Agricultural Code. During the war, the Quartermaster Corps of the Army purchased great quantities of Argentine beef for the use of our soldiers abroad. Recently they have offered to purchase additional large quantities of canned beef for our troops that still remain abroad, and in spite of the high price of meat in the United States, our domestic growers of beef cattle have seriously protested the use of such beef by the Army.

In addition to the embargoes which I have mentioned, we have another law on the books which protects completely, not by tariff, but by a curious type of embargo, the importation into the United States of Virginia-type tobacco. As I have indicated, that embargo arises in a peculiar way. In the thirties it was found that Virginia-type tobacco seed when planted in regions such as south China, would produce crops of Virginia-type tobacco just as good as that grown in our Piedmont sections of the central and South Atlantic States, mainly Maryland, Virginia, and North and South Carolina. However, if the seed from the plants grown elsewhere were again planted, then the second crop was not as good as the first, and the third crop so grown was not as good as the second. Therefore, it was necessary in those regions of the world, for tobacco growers there to purchase Virginia-type tobacco seed in the United States. Under an act sponsored by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR], the Congress prohibited the exportation of tobacco seed and live plants. In so doing we shut off completely production of Virginia-type tobacco elsewhere in the world, and consequently, not only protected the foreign markets from any competition whatever in that type of tobacco from competition of foreign-grown Virginia-type tobacco but at the same time, protected absolutely the domestic market from the importation into the United States of Virginia-type tobacco.

Hence, through laws enacted by the Congress in the 1930's—laws which are wholly unrelated to the Reciprocal Trade Treaty Acts and which the present Trade Treaty Act in nowise affects, we have on our statute books not merely protection in the form of tariff, but outright embargoes against the importation of agricultural products of the type I have named from any competition whatsoever by foreign producers of such products. It is easy enough for Representatives from areas growing tobacco, cotton, cattle, rice, and wheat to support the Trade Treaty Acts, if they are only interested in their own districts; they themselves while generally professing a desire to free the trade channels of the world through reduction of American tariffs, have no need for tariff protection themselves. They are just completely protected by laws and Executive orders pursuant to these laws which puts embargoes against any competitive products coming into the United States. They can rest easy, knowing that their districts are 100 percent protected. It is a curious thing how so many of these people can advocate tariff reductions on items produced in other parts of the United States, and wax enthusiastic over freeing the channels of trade, when the channels of foreign trade for their own district's products are protected by embargoes which are the equivalent of the highest tariffs that can possibly be placed on these products. It is a travesty of the highest order.

But even further than this, Mr. Speaker, there are other ways in which certain agricultural products are protected. There is for example the Cuban sugar agreement, which establishes an import quota on sugar, and which sets up in the several sugar-beet and cane growing States, acreage limitations. The States of California, Louisiana, and Florida, to say nothing of certain other States capable of growing sugar, want very much to see less Cuban sugar imported into the United States, and larger quotas established for domestic production. These people would like to have the domestic sugar market entirely to themselves, but certain powerful interests in the United States likewise have interests in the sugar plantations and cane mills in Cuba and Puerto Rico and are able to maintain a considerable share of the domestic market for what is called off-shore sugar, but the battle between the domestic growers and the domestic owners of off-shore production results in a compromise each year and quota limitations placed on both sides.

Mr. Speaker, one can go on to describe in further detail how the important single crops in terms of production and the millions of persons engaged in the growing or processing of such crops are completely protected from serious competition without benefit of tariffs. They do not need tariffs—they are not interested in tariffs. They have protection a lot better than any tariff could provide. In most cases they just embargo the importation of these crops altogether but under a different set of laws than the laws applying to tariffs or trade treaties. They talk glibly of tariff reductions, because tariff reductions do not apply to them, and cannot apply to them so long as the mile-high wall of protection under the import-quota system stands as their fortress. To my mind it is completely unfair to the users of other kinds of agricultural products not so protected by import quotas for these people who are protected to cry for tariff reductions. These other products are, of course, produced in relatively small quantities in the United States and in limited areas, but these products are just as important to the United States and to the growers of these products, small in number as they are, as the greater crops grown in wider areas. Apparently protection is offered, not on the basis of protection per se, but on the basis of how many people are engaged in the business. I could mention the fact that in my own State, California, the growers of walnuts, almonds, olives, and other nut crops, as well as certain fruit crops which result in dried fruit, are completely bare of import-quota protection, and yet serious tariff reductions on these products have been made. It seems there are not enough of these growers to raise a voice of such volume as to be heard in the nooks and crannies of the State Department in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to discuss the foreign trade program of the United States from a different angle. The mass-production industries of our country at the present time have no fear of foreign competition, because mass production was developed in the United States and, practically speaking, exists only in the United States. Hence, the mass-production industries, these industries which have made possible the millions of radios, typewriters, telephones, automobiles, electric lights, and gadgets of all kinds at prices so low that nearly everyone in the United States can afford them, do not today have any fear of foreign competition for their products. Naturally, they are quite anxious for tariff reductions on any and every product of the United States, because they know very well that in order for them to be able to sell also in foreign markets, the foreigners must be able likewise to sell in American markets. These people, as I say, do not need tariff because they are the lowest cost producers in the world in their respective lines, but they do need dollar credits established abroad which they can absorb by exporting their articles. So we have two large groups pressing for tariff reduction. On the one hand, the five or six principal agricultural crop producers are protected by import quota restrictions, and on the other hand, the mass-production industries which are protected by virtue of the fact that they are the world's lowest cost producers. In between these two groups, we have all the lesser crops of agriculture and all of the smaller more personalized industries of the United States. Are we to permit producers of the lesser agricultural crops and the smaller manufacturers to be run out of business, just because they do not have a strong enough political voice—or are we to look at the United States as a whole? If we do not do that, we may someday wake up to find that these lesser producers are out of business, and they also involve in the aggregate millions and millions of people. The net result will be that we will have in the United States a few large mass-production industries employing millions

of people, and the large agricultural producers employing millions of people. But the small farmer and the small-business man will have departed into the limbo of the forgotten. Big industries and big agriculture are important, Mr. Speaker, but to my way of thinking, little agriculture and little industries are more important, because they constitute the backbone of America, the backbone of freedom and individual enterprise. When they are gone, where will the young man turn to find a place where he may establish himself and exercise that vaunted freedom of opportunity which we say is a birthright of every American?

To conclude this dissertation, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that not since 1939 has it been possible for the trade treaties negotiated pursuant to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, to have an opportunity to demonstrate forcibly to the American people the full consequences of the program thus initiated. Since September 1, 1939, the most important producing sections of the world have been at war, and since 1941 the United States has been at war. No peace has yet been declared, although hostilities have ceased as such in the western world. Nevertheless, no one will deny that while the hot war has been turned off, for the time being at least, we have been engaged in a cold war all over the world. During hostilities there was in effect the well-known lend-lease program. Trade treaties were of no effect during that period. It may be recalled that at the same time we were engaged in Government purchasing of strategic materials and Government free distribution of arms, ammunition, food, and clothing all over the world. If any private business whatever was done, such business was accomplished under the export-license system. Since the end of hostilities, the United States has been spreading largess throughout the world, first by postwar loans to our ex-war allies, and through the Latin-American good will program, initiated by Nelson Rockefeller. Now we are engaged in spreading it even more thickly, through the so-called Marshall plan or the European recovery program or the Economic Cooperative Administration, or whatever you want to call it, but, nevertheless, to the tune of about $8,000,000,000 per year. Through this program, we have distributed our surpluses to foreign countries, meaning to foreign governments, thereby taking the surpluses off the American market—thereby removing the safety valve on prices. How long can the American people bear this burden, and what will happen when it stops?

Let us take a look at the present picture and what the results may be in the future, of our actions today. By giving our surpluses away and giving them away for free, Mr. Speaker, we are sustaining high prices at home. High prices cause labor to ask for and get higher wages. It is proposed that we now increase the minimum wage of the American people to 75 cents an hour in most cases and $1 per hour in some others. That is practically double the present minimum-wage provision. Wages are the highest in our history today. On the other hand, we have agriculturists who are protected by the so-called parity formula—a formula which establishes a price for farm production for the five or six principal crops in the United States based upon the costs of those industrial products which the farmer must buy. These crops are also protected against foreign competition by import-quota restrictions, as I have pointed out before. These farmers also have a floor built under themselves by virtue of laws which permit them to borrow from the Government up to 90 percent of the parity prices established for their crops. The higher industrial prices go, the higher parity prices go, and, of course, the higher 90 percent of parity is, and so we ask ourselves that ancient question: Why is a mouse when it spins? and the answer is: The higher the fewer. We think also, Mr. Speaker, of that fable we learned in childhood about the Pied Piper of Hamlin, as we see our children's natural fortitude debauched by something-for-nothing propaganda at every turn.

When the Marshall plan stops giving away American surpluses without charge to foreign governments—when minimum wages have been established at twice their former values, when the prices of agriculture's principal crops have been pegged at similarly high value, when tariff protection no longer exists for the lesser crops and industrial products, when Europe has recovered its productive capacity and starts exporting to the United States in earnest, I wonder what is going to happen in the United States. Think it over.

I support the present bill because it can be of little effect so long as the Marshall plan is in effect. But I demand that we have escape clauses which will permit us to defend ourselves, our small industries, and our small farmers against the products of cheap labor abroad, and in some cases, not cheap, but slave labor, and I think that it is necessary that the Tariff Commission stand guard, ready to tell us what the peril points are, so that we may know how to act when the avalanche of foreign goods buries employment in the United States.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, on leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to discuss H. R. 1211, now under consideration. As I view the pending bill, it is designed to accomplish three things: Repeal the peril-point report of the bipartisan Tariff Commission; repeal the escape clause from the Reciprocal Trade Act of 1948; and extend the Reciprocal Trade Act for a period of 3 years.

The Tariff Commission is a bipartisan commission appointed by the President to hold hearings and make investigations of all proposed tariff revisions. The President must seek advice and obtain expert knowledge in arriving at conclusions in reducing tariff rates to be sure that our domestic economy is not in jeopardy. The duty of the Tariff Commission is to make investigations and hold hearings to be able to determine to what length adjustments may be made in our tariff structure so as not to injure the domestic producers of the commodities concerned.

The Tariff Commission in rendering their report to the President must take into consideration any elements such as the wage schedules in the country involved as against our American standard, cost of transportation, accessibility of raw material, and whether or not these trade agreements might be at a disadvantage to our national defense.

Before the President could reduce tariffs below the peril point of the industry involved, he would be compelled to submit his recommendations to the Congress for their approval.

Many thousands of treaties are now in effect, the most of which do not carry an escape clause. On November 7 and December 17 the President submitted lists of commodities on which concessions would be negotiated with 11 countries. On December 7 the Tariff Commission began hearings, and on March 5 the peril-point report will be completed and ready for use in the pending negotiations in April.

Arguments were presented that the process was cumbersome and caused delay. This was offset by reports to the contrary, and that work in preparing information setting forth these "peril points" was well in hand. The tariff on some 400 articles will be considered at the April 1949 trade conference. A few of the articles which this conference will consider are: olive oil, cherries, nuts, canned tomatoes, sugar, fish, hides and skins, wallboard, plywood, box shook, matches, and so forth. A reduction in tariff on these commodities could adversely affect the economy of my district. We should have the advices of the Tariff Commission to establish the "peril point" in each of these articles under consideration, and also should have the escape clause in the event experience would show that the industry was being harmed by the negotiations entered into.

If the past can be an indication for what might happen in the future, these conferences usually result in the lowering of the tariff thereby placing the farmer, industry, and the laboring man at a further competitive disadvantage. The almond, filbert, and walnut growers are producing a surplus. A tariff reduction might bring chaos to these growers. The fish industry and fishermen cannot stand more discrimination. Many of our lumber mills have shut down. I am informed that lumber imports from Canada have increased enormously during recent months. If this continues, it will close more of our mills and throw many of our men out of work. A movement is on to try and have the tariff removed on Canadian and Mexican plywood. Should this be accomplished, more than 13,000 American workers in plywood plants on the Pacific coast would be in jeopardy. Plywood production in the United States is a comparatively new industry. The output of these plants in 1949 will be 2,700,000,000 square feet, or two and one-half times the production 4 years ago. Fifty-five million jeweled watches have been imported since 1941. The watch industry in this country is about ruined, and thousands of employees are out of work. The glass industry of West Virginia is almost out of business, causing great hardship and unemployment. No

escape clause is provided for these industries.

During the hearings on this bill, 63 organizations appeared in support of maintaining the peril-point report of the Tariff Commission contained in the 1948 Act. Among them were The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, National Council Farmer Cooperatives, United States Hop Growers Association, California Fish Canners Association, Inc., Mining industry of California, farm organizations, manufacturers, labor organizations, trade organizations, and many others.

In his testimony before the committee, Albert S. Gross, master of the National Grange, said:

We do not believe H. R. 1211 will provide the type of tariff system the nation needs. We would like to see sound tariff legislation far more comprehensive than anything contemplated in this bill, and we fear the enactment of such a measure would merely serve to assure the continuance of an unsound and objectionable situation for another 2 years—a period of readjustment in trade when we will probably need a sound tariff policy more than at any time in recent years. We would much prefer to see the committee devote its time to the enactment of such legislation and let the present law stand until a sound and effective tariff measure can be passed.

Mr. Ray B. Wiser, President of the California Farm Bureau Federation, states that—

Further tariff reductions should be made only after careful consideration of effects which such reductions may have on the industry affected. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948 contained provision for a tariff commission investigation and study of commodities for which tariff adjustment was contemplated and the establishment by the commission of a range within which adjustments could be made without severe adverse effects upon the industry involved. * * * We would therefore respectfully recommend your participation in efforts to obtain retention of the present provisions of the 1948 act providing for tariff commission investigation and reporting on the effects of proposed adjustments prior to the actual negotiations of trade agreements.

I cannot countenance the American taxpayer lending $300,000,000 to Great Britain to buy wheat from Canada when our warehouses are bulging, and no buyers; or to see our Government support a potato deal with a $200,000,000 loss for 1948, and permit Canadian potatoes to be imported and sold under our support price.

During the hearings and various debates, evidence has been brought out concerning the loyalty of the employees in the State Department charged with the responsibility of trade negotiations, which makes me feel doubly strong that the Tariff Commission should establish the peril point and that the escape clause should remain in the bill. It seems to be a foregone conclusion that our efforts are futile in trying to amend the pending bill to include the peril-point report and the escape clause. I shall vote for their inclusion and be one of a loyal opposition to vote against the final passage of the bill, and in so doing, express my feeling that our American industries, farmers, and workmen are not adequately protected, and that the American people should be warned to stop, look, and listen, lest it be too late.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 151, nays 241, answered "present" 1, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 7]

YEAS—151

Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Andersen, H. Carl
Anderson, Calif.
Andresen, August H.
Angell
Arends
Auchincloss
Bailey
Barrett, Wyo.
Bates, Mass.
Beall
Bennett, Mich.
Bishop
Blackney
Boggs, Del.
Bolton, Ohio
Brambiett
Brehm
Brown, Ohio
Burdick
Byrnes, Wis.
Canfield
Case, S. Dak.
Chiperfield
Church
Clevenger
Cole, Kans.
Cole, N. Y.
Corbett
Cotton
Crawford
Cunningham
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Wis.
D'Ewart
Donohue
Engel, Mich.
Fellows
Fenton
Fisher
Ford
Gamble
Gavin
Gillette
Goodwin
Graham
Gross
Gwinn
Hagen
Hale
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hall, Leonard W.
Harden
Harvey
Herter
Hinshaw
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Holmes
Hope
Horan
Hull
Jackson, Calif.
James
Jenison
Jenkins
Jennings
Jensen
Johnson
Jonas
Kean
Kearney
Kearns
Keating
Keefe
Kennedy
Kilburn
Kilday
Kunkel
Lane
Latham
LeCompte
LeFevre
Lemke
Lodge
Lovre
McConnell
McCulloch
McDonough
McGregor
McMillen, Ill.
Mack, Wash.
Macy
Martin, Iowa
Martin, Mass.
Mason
Michener
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Morton
Murray, Wis.
Nelson
Nicholson
Nixon
Norblad
O'Hara, Minn.
O'Konski
Patterson
Pfeiffer, William L.
Philbin
Phillips, Calif.
Phillips, Tenn.
Potter
Reed, N. Y.
Rees
Rich
Riehlman
Rogers, Mass.
Sadlak
St. George
Sanborn
Scott, Hardie
Scrivner
Scudder
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Wis.
Stefan
Stockman
Taber
Talle
Taylor
Tollefson
Van Zandt
Velde
Vorys
Vursell
Wadsworth
Weichel
Werdel
Wigglesworth
Wilson, Ind.
Winthrow
Wolcott
Wolverton
Woodruff

NAYS—241

Abernethy
Addonizio
Albert
Allen, La.
Andrews
Aspinall
Barden
Baring
Barrett, Pa.
Bates, Ky.
Beckworth
Bentzen
Biemiller
Bland
Blatnik
Bloom
Boggs, La.
Bolling
Bolton, Md.
Bonner
Boykin
Breen
Brooks
Brown, Ga.
Bryson
Buchanan
Buckley, Ill.
Buckley, N. Y.
Burke
Burleson
Burnside
Burton
Byrne, N. Y.
Camp
Cannon
Carlyle
Carnahan
Carroll
Case, N. J.
Cavalcante
Celler
Chatham
Chelf
Chesney
Christopher
Clemente
Coffey
Colmer
Combs
Cooper
Cox
Crook
Crosser
Davenport
Davies, N. Y.
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Deane
DeGraffenried
Delaney
Denton
Dollinger
Donohue
Doughton
Douglas
Doyle
Durham
Eberharter
Engle, Calif.
Evins
Fallon
Feighan
Fernandez
Flood
Fogarty
Forand
Frazier
Fugate
Fulton
Furcolo
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gilmer
Gordon
Gore
Gorski, Ill.
Gorski, N. Y.
Gossett
Granahan
Granger
Grant
Green
Gregory
Hardy
Hare
Harris
Harrison
Hart
Havenner
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Hébert
Hedrick
Heffernan
Herlong
Heselton
Hobbs
Holifield
Howell
Huber
Irving
Jackson, Wash.
Jacobs
Javits
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N. C.
Karst
Karsten
Kee
Kelley
Keogh
Kerr
King
Kirwan
Klein
Kruse
Lanham
Larcade
Lesinski
Lind
Linehan
Lucas
Lyle
Lynch
McCarthy
McCormack
McGrath
McGuire
McKinnon
McMillan, S. C.
McSweeney
Mack, Ill.
Madden
Magee
Mahon
Mansfield
Marcantonio
Marsalis
Marshall
Merrow
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Mitchell
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Moulder
Multer
Murdock
Murphy
Murray, Tenn.
Noland
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Neill
O'Sullivan
O'Toole
Pace
Passman
Patman
Patten
Perkins
Peterson
Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Pickett
Poage
Polk
Preston
Price
Priest
Quinn
Rabaut
Rains
Ramsay
Rankin
Redden
Regan
Rhodes
Ribicoff
Richards
Riehlman
Rodino
Rooney
Sabath
Sasscer
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Sims
Smathers
Somers
Spence
Staggers
Stanley
Steed
Stigler
Sullivan
Sutton
Tackett
Tauriello
Teague
Thomas, Tex.
Thompson
Thornberry
Trimble
Underwood
Vinson
Wagner
Walsh
Walter
Welch, Mo.
Wheeler
White, Calif.
White, Idaho
Whitten
Whittington
Wickersham
Wier
Willis
Wilson, Okla.
Wilson, Tex.
Winstead
Wood
Woodhouse
Worley
Yates
Young
Zablocki

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Plumley

NOT VOTING—40

Abbitt
Battle
Bennett, Fla.
Bosone
Bulwinkle
Chudoff
Coudert
Dingell
Dolliver
Dondero
Eaton
Elliott
Ellsworth
Elston
Golden
Halleck
Hoffman, Mich.
Judd
Lichtenwalter
Meyer
Miles
Monroney
Norton
Poulson
Powell
Reed, Ill.
Rivers
Sadowski
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Secrest
Shafer
Sheppard
Short
Smith, Ohio
Smith, Va.
Thomas, N. J.
Towe
Welch, Calif.
Whitaker
Williams

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Plumley for, with Mrs. Norton against.
Mr. Shafer for, with Mr. Sadowski against.
Mr. Meyer for, with Mr. Sheppard against.
Mr. Hoffman of Michigan for, with Mr. Coudert against.
Mr. Ellsworth for, with Mr. Judd against.
Mr. Lichtenwalter for, with Mr. Golden against.
Mr. Towe for, with Mr. Monroney against.
Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. Poulson against.
Mr. Elston for, with Mr. Dingell against.
Mr. Dolliver for, with Mr. Whitaker against.
Mr. Dondero for, with Mr. Welch of California against.
Mr. Short for, with Mrs. Bosone against.
Mr. Reed of Illinois for, with Mr. Bennett of Florida against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
Mr. Secrest with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Williams with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair; however, I voted on the last call. I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 319, nays 69, answered "present" 1, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 8]

YEAS—319

Abernethy
Addonizio
Albert
Allen, Calif.
Allen, La.
Andrews
Angell
Arends
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Barden
Baring
Barrett, Pa.
Bates, Ky.
Beall
Beckworth
Bennett, Mich.
Bentzen
Biemiller
Blackney
Bland
Blatnik
Bloom
Boggs, Del.
Boggs, La.
Bolling
Bolton, Md.
Bolton, Ohio
Bonner
Boykin
Breen
Brehm
Brooks
Brown, Ga.
Bryson
Buchanan
Buckley, Ill.
Buckley, N. Y.
Burdick
Burke
Burleson
Burnside
Burton
Byrne, N. Y.
Camp
Canfield
Cannon
Carlyle
Carnahan
Carroll
Case, N. J.
Case, S. Dak.
Cavalcante
Celler
Chatham
Chelf
Chesney
Christopher
Clemente
Coffey
Cole, Kans.
Cole, N. Y.
Colmer
Combs
Cooley
Cooper
Corbett
Cotton
Cox
Crook
Crosser
Cunningham
Davenport
Davies, N. Y.
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
Deane
DeGraffenried
Delaney
Denton
D'Ewart
Dollinger
Donohue
Doughton
Douglas
Doyle
Durham
Eberharter
Engle, Calif.
Evins
Fallon
Feighan
Fernandez
Fisher
Flood
Fogarty
Forand
Ford
Frazier
Fugate
Fulton
Furcolo
Gamble
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Gilmer
Gordon
Gore
Gorski, Ill.
Gorski, N. Y.
Gossett
Graham
Granahan
Granger
Grant
Green
Gregory
Gwinn
Hale
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hall, Leonard W.
Harden
Hardy
Hare
Harris
Harrison
Hart
Havenner
Hays, Ark.
Hébert
Hedrick
Heffernan
Herter
Heselton
Hill
Hinshaw
Hobbs
Hoeven
Holifield
Holmes
Hope
Horan
Howell
Huber
Irving
Jackson, Calif.
Jackson, Wash.
Jacobs
James
Javits
Jennings
Johnson
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N. C.
Karst
Karsten
Kean
Keating
Kee
Keefe
Kelley
Kennedy
Keogh
Kerr
Kirwan
Klein
Kruse
Kunkel
Lanham
Larcade
Latham
LeCompte
LeFevre
Lesinski
Lind
Linehan
Lodge
Lovre
Lucas
Lyle
Lynch
McCarthy
McConnell
McCormack
McDonough
McGrath
McGuire
McKinnon
McMillan, S. C.
McMillen, Ill.
McSweeney
Mack, Ill.
Madden
Magee
Mahon
Mansfield
Marcantonio
Marsalis
Marshall
Martin, Mass.
Merrow
Michener
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Mills
Mitchell
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morton
Moulder
Multer
Murdock
Murphy
Murray, Tenn.
Nixon
Noland
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Neill
O'Sullivan
O'Toole
Pace
Passman
Patman
Patten
Patterson
Perkins
Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Pfeiffer, William L.
Phillips, Tenn.
Pickett
Poage
Polk
Potter
Preston
Price
Priest
Quinn
Rabaut
Rains
Ramsay
Rankin
Redden
Regan
Rhodes
Ribicoff
Richards
Riehlman
Rodino
Rooney
Sabath
Sasscer
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Sims
Smathers
Somers
Spence
Staggers
Stanley
Steed
Stefan
Stigler
Stockman
Sullivan
Sutton
Tackett
Talle
Tauriello
Taylor
Teague
Thomas, Tex.
Thompson
Thornberry
Tollefson
Trimble
Underwood
Van Zandt
Velde
Vinson
Vorys
Wadsworth
Wagner
Walsh
Walter
Welch, Mo.
Wheeler
White, Calif.
White, Idaho
Whitten
Whittington
Wickersham
Wier
Willis
Wilson, Okla.
Wilson, Tex.
Winstead
Wolcott
Wood
Woodhouse
Woodruff
Worley
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—69

Allen, Ill.
Andersen, H. Carl
Anderson, Calif
Andresen, August H.
Barrett, Wyo.
Bates, Mass.
Bishop
Brambiett
Brown, Ohio
Byrnes, Wis.
Chiperfield
Church
Clevenger
Crawford
Curtis
Dague
Fellows
Fenton
Gillette
Goodwin
Gross
Hagen
Hand
Hays, Ohio
Herlong
Hoffman, Ill.
Hull
Jenison
Jenkins
Jensen
Kearns
Kilday
Lane
Lemke
Mack, Wash.
Macy
Martin, Iowa
Murray, Wis.
Nelson
Nicholson
Norblad
O'Hara, Minn.
O'Konski
Philbin
Phillips, Calif.
Reed, N. Y.
Rich
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Sadlak
Scott, Hardie
Scrivner
Scudder
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Wis.
Taber
Vursell
Weichel
Werdel
Wilson, Ind.
Wolcott
Woodruff

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

McCulloch

NOT VOTING—44

Abbitt
Bailey
Battle
Bennett, Fla.
Bosone
Bulwinkle
Chudoff
Coudert
Dingell
Dolliver
Dondero
Eaton
Elliott
Ellsworth
Elston
Golden
Halleck
Harvey
Hoffman, Mich.
Judd
Lichtenwalter
Meyer
Miles
Monroney
Norton
Peterson
Plumley
Poulson
Powell
Reed, Ill.
Rivers
Sadowski
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Secrest
Shafer
Sheppard
Short
Smith, Ohio
Smith, Va.
Thomas, N. J.
Towe
Welch, Calif.
Whitaker
Williams

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Bennett of Florida for, with Mr. Reed of Illinois against.
Mr. Towe for, with Mr. Meyer against.
Mrs. Norton for, with Mr. Plumley against.
Mr. Sadowski for, with Mr. Shafer against.
Mr. Battle for, with Mr. Bailey against.
Mr. Judd for, with Mr. Lichtenwalter against.
Mr. Golden for, with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan against.
Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Ellsworth against.
Mr. Harvey for, with Mr. McCulloch against.
Mr. Welch of California for, with Mr. Peterson against.

Additional general pairs:

Mrs. Bosone with Mr. Dolliver.
Mr. Secrest with Mr. Elston.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Paulson
Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Short.
Mr. Williams with Mr. Smith of Ohio.
Mr. Monroney with Mr. Dondero.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. BURDICK changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I voted "no." I have a live pair with the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. HARVEY. I therefore withdraw my vote of "no" and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

JOSEF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 19.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to announce before this resolution comes up for consideration that if there is prolonged discussion and the offering of amendments or any attempt to call the roll, the resolution will not be passed today.

The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas on September 18, 1946, Archbishop Aloysius Stepinac, Roman Catholic primate of Yugoslavia, was arrested on charges of committing "crimes against the people" and of "being the center of terrorist opposition" to the Government of Yugoslavia; and

Whereas on October 11, 1946, the said Archbishop Stepinac was sentenced to imprisonment for a term of 16 years and deprived of his civil rights for 5 years; and

Whereas the conduct of the trial of the said Archbishop Stepinac which resulted in such sentence was a travesty on justice and a violation of the fundamental rights of man; and

Whereas on December 26, 1948, Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, Roman Catholic primate of Hungary, was arrested on "suspicion of treason, attempting to overthrow the democratic regime, espionage, and foreign-currency abuses" and has been held incommunicado since such date; and

Whereas the charges upon which the said Cardinal Mindszenty was arrested constitute distortions of truth and justice: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the arrest and imprisonment of the two eminent Roman Catholic primates, Archbishop Stepinac, of Yugoslavia, and Cardinal Mindszenty, of Hungary, (a) constitute persecution on account of political and religious beliefs, (b) violate the declaration in the preamble to the Charter of the United Nations, namely: "to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men * * *", and (c) violate the third purpose stated in article I of the Charter of the United Nations, namely: "To achieve international cooperation * * * in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion." It is further the sense of the Congress that the issues raised by such violations should be submitted by the United States to the United

Nations at the next meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 16, after the period, strike out all of lines 16 down to and including line 20 and insert the following: "It is further the sense of the Congress that these issues shall be raised by the United States, either in the United Nations or by such other means as may be most appropriate."

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the whole civilized democratic world has been shocked again by the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty. Here again we see the totalitarian technique of using the hollow form of legal procedure to ruthlessly destroy the civil rights of an individual. Here again we see the dignity of a human being violated. We see every principle of democratic procedures, respect for human rights, respect for protective legal procedures, ruthlessly swept aside before the lust for revenge of a totalitarian state.

In view of the demonstration which has recently been perpetrated in Hungary, Catholics and non-Catholics alike must register their disapproval before the bar of world public opinion.

I wish to compliment the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for presenting to the Congress this resolution upon which we are about to vote, which condemns it, no uncertain terms this terrible travesty committed against the two outstanding religious leaders, Archbishop Stepinac and Cardinal Mindszenty.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution heartily. I have repeatedly said that communism aims at the destruction of every vestige of the Christian faith. What has happened in this case is merely a part of that effort to destroy Christianity. It is not a fight against any one church. It is backed by the same satanic power that challenged the deity of our Lord in the beginning and that has tried to destroy the soul of man through the ages. Here we see the fruition of the effort to destroy the will and dignity of man. In this mad communistic campaign the fate of all that is near and dear to us is at stake. This is a move to crush light, liberty, and conscience. Wherever religious liberty and Christianity are attacked, it is the direct concern of every Christian in the world. Mr. Speaker, as a young man I took my stand on the side of Christ and Christianity and there I stand.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I strongly favor the present resolution. The trial of Cardinal Mindszenty was, in my opinion, a farce. It represents a new low in human relations for the Soviet and for communism. In this trial there was a denial of freedom of speech, a denial of freedom of the press. The courts have been distorted and justice has become a hollow mockery. This Congress has a right to be upset over the anti-God attitude of the Soviet and I hope this resolution will pass without a dissenting vote.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I favor this resolution condemning the endeavor by terror to suppress religious freedom in Hungary. This threat to religious liberty affects equally people of all faiths everywhere. By this resolution the democratic world will be enabled to make clear to the Communist world the critical importance which it attaches to the trials of Archbishop Stepinac and Cardinal Mindszenty. Men who love freedom everywhere will applaud this act by this House.

I append hereto House Resolution 65 which I offered to the same effect as the resolution now being adopted and I am satisfied that the resolution now being adopted accomplishes the same result.

House Resolution 65

Whereas the democratic world and people everywhere who believe in justice have been profoundly shocked by the summary arrest and imprisonment of His Eminence Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, Roman Catholic Primate of Hungary, and by his being held incommunicado since December 26, 1948; and

Whereas the said arrest and confinement constitute persecution on account of political and religious bias and violate the declaration of the United Nations Charter of "respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms" (article I of the Charter of the United Nations): Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Congress that the arrest and imprisonment of the Roman Catholic Primate of Hungary, His Eminence Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, and his continued confinement incommunicado, amount to deliberate persecution on account of conscience and faith and violate a fundamental freedom guaranteed by the United Nations Charter and by the requirements of justice. It is further the sense of the Congress that the issues raised by such violations due to the actions of the Government of Hungary should be submitted by the United States to the United Nations at the next meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations for appropriate action.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, in these days when a shocked world is awakened by a horrible example of injustice invading the rights of freedom of religion and speech, as was evidenced in the trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, it is most properly fitting that I have secured permission to include at this point the sermon of Archbishop Patrick A. O'Boyle, of Washington, on the trial of the cardinal delivered in St. Matthew's Cathedral, on Sunday, February 6, at the 12:30 o'clock Mass. I take from his words a caption for his sermon:

THE MIMICRY OF JUSTICE

Just 1 month ago I came before you to voice a protestation against the indignity heaped upon a prince of the church in the arrest and imprisonment of His Eminence Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, primate of Hungary. During nearly 6 weeks of imprisonment, not a word about him had come to the wondering world, and no one but his accusers had seen him until he was brought to what is referred to as a trial early last week.

My purpose in returning here today has been determined by the events of that trial and the weird reports that have been coming to us through our only means of communication. That purpoe is to warn you insistently against misjudgments, born of the confusion worse confounded that has been produced with malice aforethought, by the sole sources of the news regarding this mimicry of justice now being staged in Hungary. For the fault certainly does not lie with our magnificent American press at all.

This so-called trial had hardly begun when headlines screamed in American newspapers that the cardinal was making "confessions." He was described as repudiating his famous letter written before his imprisonment in which he warned that any future "confessions" must be treated as frauds or wrung from him by torture, and were, therefore, to be disregarded entirely. The story of the trial so far is of a piece with the pattern of the infamous Moscow trials, and courts of justice wherever communism has triumphed. The queer spectacles of Moscow and Warsaw, to cite only two, have long since been stamped as fraudulent farces, travesties upon law and justice among civilized nations. Such trials would indeed be worthy of some laughter if they did not involve human lives and liberties, which were the precious things at stake in such courts of justice.

I cannot help but think to myself of the comparison between this trial in far-off Hungary and that which is presently being conducted in the city of New York. The contrast is enough to embitter a man, for the American principle is affirmed and upheld that a man's innocence must be sustained until beyond reasonable doubt his guilt has been proven on the basis of irrefutable evidence. There has been no secret prison cell for these well-cared-for defendants—there has been no use of drugs to dissolve human personality and wrest confessions as of men in a hypnotic dream—there have been no leading and illegal questions from the presiding judge to the defendants—and there has been no violence or refusal of choice of counsel. Instead there has been the spectacle of a judge leaning over backward to render justice according to American law, uncontaminated justice, even when the very dignity of his court has been outraged by the vocal recklessness of the massed array of legal counsel which fortifies the lines of the defense. It does not make pleasant reading, this exhibition of trifling with American liberality and gracious justice, but it does at least manifest the splendid willingness of American justice to take every single precaution and exhibit patient procedure so that justice may be done and man's rights safeguarded under the law of the land.

Now, consider that outrageously misnamed "trial" in Hungary under Communist inspiration and direction. Its features long ago were prophesied in a bluntly honest American press. Papers here in Washington, in New York, in Boston, and other cities were unanimous in openly ridiculing the future "trial" which would be merely an opportunity provided the cardinal for assenting to his guilt, however that consent was wrung from him by methods worthy of oriental dungeons. The trial, they said, would be the public confirmation of the "guilt" and nothing more.

The cardinal was not unaware of these Communist methods and prepared himself accordingly beforehand in the writing of the letter which bade his hearers to ignore what happened after he had been hurled into prison. The former Premier of Hungary, now a resident of our country, speaks of tortures which conceivably were inflicted upon the cardinal after his arrest—the drugging and the rest of the mistreatment which forced "confessions" from others, followed by a reconditioning to prepare him for public appearance at his "trial." A writer in one of our leading dailies yesterday gave a clear-cut analysis asserting that the use of drugs upon the cardinal was obvious, and based his assertions upon the voice, the manner, and the language of his eminence as the "trial" was broadcast from the courtroom to the nation of Hungary.

Now, unfortunately, these confessions have produced enough confusion during the past week in the minds of American readers, enough to make the Kremlin satisfied with its methods. For what is important to them

is not the rightness of their action but the success which it achieves. There has been confusion resulting from these headlines.

First of all, be it well remembered that there is only one American correspondent at this trial. The Hungarian regime refused visas to all other American correspondents. The British Legation of Budapest was denied the courtesy of a representative at the trial. The United States Legation in Budapest was refused the courtesy of an observer. The National Catholic Welfare Conference News Service, which has been accredited to cover news even in Moscow and Warsaw, was also denied admission to the trial. The only news we received during the past week, with one sole exception, comes from Hungarian writers alone, citizens of that stricken country, whose livelihood, whose families, and whose very lives are in jeopardy if they try to report this trial truthfully while writing under the shadow of a Government which is the implacable foe of religion. Do you wonder why, when the iron curtain was drawn around the trial, our news was slanted and the American newspaper could not do much else but print what their only sources sent, leaving it to the wisdom and intelligence of the readers, with editorial direction, to weigh the value of what was set forth in their columns.

It is the old story of the fear of truth, of a free press. But it has produced some confusion which demands a word of clarification at least. For apart from weighing the sources, the truly poisoned and biased sources of this Hungarian news, one has only to contrast the well-known figure of the eminent cardinal before and after this trial began. Only a few short weeks ago, he stood before the world as a giant figure and a thundering voice challenging injustice and violation of human rights. He was marked with a forceful personality, fearless, defiant when he was conscious of a duty to speak and be unafraid. He was well aware, too, of the consequences of his daring to impugn the Government for its lawlessness and indecency toward its citizens. Now, all of a sudden, he appears out of the hidden prison confines, no longer the dominating prince of the church, speaking as a man unafraid, but almost to say as one cringing and exhibiting the indignity of weakness and craven confessions to the most startling crimes, and calmly calling down upon his head the vindictive justice of a cruel and godless Government, the inhuman host of enemies whom before he had assailed as men who were a shame and dishonor to the name of man.

Now the very obvious aim of this Government and the whole vile business of the rigged and fixed trial is to discredit the cardinal in the eyes of his people and of the world. The scheming minds of the Kremlin have succeeded in some measure in throwing dust into the eyes of wondering humanity, who are left gaping at what the truth must actually be. But, for the most part, nobody has been fooled, either by the charges or the sensational revelations of the trial, which to say the least, are outrages upon common sense itself, if not silly obscenities unworthy of intelligent consideration. Unfortunately, they suffice for a Communist government to commit a man to prison or even to death itself as providing the legal basis for doing so. I think, on the whole, the world has not been misled by these atrocious lies and the heartless and unholy defamation of the character of the cardinal—I think, too, that nobody in his right mind can fail to perceive the utter fraud of the whole fearful farce which moves on to the end of destroying the utility of the cardinal as a God-given spokesman of the people in the defense and vindication of their human rights.

I have no intention of criticizing the fine American press alert to the fraud and infamy of the whole procedure. Its headlines state what the dispatches from Communist sources contain but for those who do not read beyond the headlines, there is danger that misunderstanding may ensue, and that would be ruinous.

To those who know the cardinal—I have met him myself three times—there is the recollection of a strong and fearless man, undaunted, and filled with a violent sense of justice. The change which must have taken place in such a man is a revelation, not of weakness in him, God knows, but of the unknown terrors or drugs to which he must have been subjected and which to all appearances have left him another kind of man from the one who braved the penalties invoked against him for the sake of the truth and for the victory of justice. We cannot allow ourselves to forget that stark and well-considered statement of his that no confession made after his arrest was to be considered his word—his truthful and free word—for he knew the diabolical malice and treachery he was soon to meet in the hidden silences of the prison. What went on there no one can say; but it is not difficult in the light of past performances of the same kind to know what the cardinal in silence endured.

The last sorry word came yesterday with the closing of the defense and the ludicrous apology of the defense counsel for the errors of his eminent client and the "hurts which he brought upon his country." That is the last straw in a great pile of foul straw. It is the descent to the lowest of indignities, but it is strictly conformable to Communist administration of justice, which has as its primary purpose the ridicule of a person and his degradation in the eyes of his fellow men, and then heaping insult upon injury, to thrust him forth as a coward and weakling for the defamation of his fellow citizens. It is nothing less than the moral destruction of an individual carried out in public and fortified by what is described as the process of law.

The Vatican has called this a pathological performance. That is a splendid name for the whole sorry mess. It is indeed a diseased and cancerous manifestation without legal health or human values. We know the lies and the deceits and the treachery, we Americans, for we have also been the subjects of Communist fraudulence. We have learned it, alas, when it has been written for us in the blood of every man who has died in the airlift to stricken Berlin, the attestations in blood and life of Communist trickery and Communist lies. We have our trustfulness as a people and a nation of freemen, and we have no desire to become distrustful when trust is warranted by every rational sign. But there is not one basic cause for trusting Communists on anything that has to do with virtue or moral principle—they have none; in what concerns basic law and just juridical process they acknowledge none; in safeguarding human rights and dignity they are worthy of no trust at all. It is as if reason itself has been dethroned to make way for the triumph of the Father of Lies. These are harsh words, but stern truth, and they can be documented from day to day in the history of the last few years of experience with Communist governments.

In conclusion, I remind you again that what happened in Budapest was not a trial, for a trial is a proceeding justly conducted in accordance with law as recognized by the civilized world. This proceeding violates the preamble and article I of the Charter of the United Nations and also the Hungarian Peace Treaty for it amounts to persecution for religious beliefs. This mock trial is a brazen attempt to conceal the ultimate purpose of destroying all organized opposition of the Communist Party in Hungary by hypocritically using the device of the judicial process, and to discredit abroad a friend of the United States and a prelate of the Catholic Church.

Cardinal Mindszenty is not guilty of any crime nor of any moral wrong. Press reports that he had pleaded guilty or partly guilty did not mean under Hungarian legal procedure that he had admitted criminal guilt, as would have been the case under Anglo-American law. It meant that he had courageously reiterated his defense of Christian principles and his fierce opposition to a philosophy that every right, moral and legal, proceeds from the state. It meant that he proclaimed his unshakable belief in basic human freedoms, freedoms which have given us the priceless heritage of our American civilization. The employment of empty legal forms and a legalistic vocabulary unrelated to the concept of justice will avail the Red terror in Hungary naught.

Like St. Thomas More, St. John Fisher, and other great heroes of old, who fell victims to the ruthless hand of political power, which admitted no higher law than its own unbridled will, Cardinal Mindszenty will stand forth in the memory of mankind, both now and in the future, as a symbol of great moral courage, a champion of justice, and a defender of the faith.

Americans and all lovers of democratic government may well shudder in revulsion at such travesties as this trial. For us Catholics, there remains the practical spiritual duty of lifting up our voices against oppression wherever it may be—and lifting up our hearts in prayer for those who suffer injustice for justice's sake—in prayer for the shamefully disordered world in which such heroism for the love of man and the love of Christ must still be exacted.

Pray then for this magnificent servant of God and the church and mankind. For he is a brave citizen known to all the world, and the world suffers in his silent passion. And remember—as you look upon his face in the daily papers, standing in the dock, while, not far away from him, millions of oppressed people rot in concentration camps, his fellow victims for whom he fought the good fight, remember that he represents in his person, thus dishonored and defamed, human dignity that is crowned with thorns, justice that is scourged at the pillar of infamy, and human liberty that is nailed upon a cross.

And now, Mr. Speaker, under the same permission granted me, I conclude with Archbishop Patrick A. O'Boyle's statement to the press on Josef Cardinal Mindszenty's sentence:

The Hungarian court crucified justice. The craven cowards in the face of world protest were afraid to pursue the premeditated murder of Cardinal Mindszenty. A great champion of human freedom and human rights had no chance with a government that acknowledges neither the majesty of God or the rights of man. May our Divine Lord and His Blessed Mother sustain the cardinal with fortitude in the face of the unknown trials still before him. We shall always remember him in our prayers and we respectfully ask all to pray for him.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, at the outset I extend my compliments to and sincerely thank the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, for his splendid cooperation and prompt work in bringing this resolution to the floor of the House for a vote.

I have been concerned for a long time now with the imprisonment of Archbishop Aloysius Stepinac after a trial which was a travesty on justice and offensive to democratic ideals of freedom and fair play and in complete disregard of the preamble and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations. On the

opening day of the Eightieth Congress, in January of 1947, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 4, expressing disapproval of Archbishop Stepinac's trial, held in Zagreb, Yugoslavia, on October 11, 1946, which resulted not only in the imprisonment of the archbishop for a term of 16 years but of other priests of the Catholic Church for varying terms of years. Although I diligently persisted in trying to obtain action on that resolution during the entire term of the Eightieth Congress I was unsuccessful in my efforts. I cannot help but speculate that if prompt action had been taken at that time we might not be here this evening considering the pending resolution insofar as it applies to the horrible injustice done to Josef Cardinal Mindszenty by the Communist government of Hungary.

On the opening day of the present Congress, January 3, 1949, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 9, protesting the barbarism of the Communist government of Yugoslavia in the case of Archbishop Stepinac and also on the same day introduced a resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 8, protesting the arrest and imprisonment of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty by the Communist government of Hungary.

I am pleased to be able to say that we did not have to wait as long as in the last Congress for action on either of these resolutions. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] was kind enough on January 18, 1949, to introduce a resolution covering both the Archbishop Stepinac and Cardinal Mindszenty matters which was marked House Concurrent Resolution 19 and which is now before us for consideration.

I have discussed this matter with Secretary of State Acheson and commend him for the statement that his Department is fully aware of the significance of the ruthless attacks occurring in Hungary and Yugoslavia against religious and political liberties, which have culminated in the persecution of the two eminent church dignitaries. As far back as October 11, 1946, as Under Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson expressed the concern of our Government over the impairment in Communist Yugoslavia of freedom of religion and worship and other civil liberties, in connection with the trial and conviction of Archbishop Stepinac.

The citizens of America are aroused over what has been done to religion and the religious in these Communist-dominated countries. I have received thousands upon thousands of communications from Protestants, Jews, and Catholics protesting the vicious acts of the murderers and cutthroat gangsters who now rule Hungary and Yugoslavia.

It is apparent that the war between Christianity and atheism is on. I am sure that not a single Member of this House will fail to take up the cudgels against the destruction of religion and the spread of atheism by objecting to unanimous passage of the pending resolution.

The thoughts in the minds of the people of Brooklyn on this subject are reflected in the following editorial which was published in the Brooklyn Eagle of Monday, February 7, 1949, entitled "Reds' Trial of Cardinal Is a Travesty on Justice":

REDS' TRIAL OF CARDINAL IS A TRAVESTY ON JUSTICE

The "trial" of Cardinal Mindszenty in Hungary deserves the impartial attention of every man and woman in the world. From the circumstances of the case and the contentions of reliable sources, the prosecution of this leading anti-Communist leader seems to be little short of diabolical.

The Reverend Gedeon Peterffy, rector of the Hungarian Pontifical Institute in Rome, declared, in a recent dispatch from that city, that the so-called confession of the cardinal is so crude and filled with grammatical inaccuracies that it could not possibly have been written by the prelate except under duress.

The absurd suggestion of the indicted cardinal in the courtroom that the trial should be called off so that he might now work for a peaceful collaboration with the Communist-usurped government lends weight to the presumption that he had been drugged and was still acting under the influence of an abnormal condition.

To assent to such a possibility would under ordinary circumstances seem to be a surrender to the melodramatic in the hope of satisfying one's search for an answer to the riddle. The word will not down, however, that torture and drugs have been used upon the cardinal.

The first reports of his apparently normal appearance and seeming normal responses in the courtroom are not so clear in the light of later dispatches. The correspondent of the New York Times, who was allowed into the trial only in its closing hours on Friday night, did not verify the earlier dispatches. To him the cardinal had deep rings under his eyes and his words were uttered in a listless way like one repeating something memorized and spoken over and over again. Normally he was a man of vigor—almost theatrical in his speech.

Knowing the character and the reputations of the two parties concerned—the Communist judges and the one man who now stands between them and complete subjugation of the Catholic population of Hungary, one cannot casually accept the garbled and confused bits of information so far available as evidence.

This man has stood up against, not only the Communist usurpers, but their Nazi prototypes. He has suffered valiantly under both regimes. He had warned his fellow bishops to discount any confession that might possibly be extracted from him in the future. The Vatican, which undoubtedly knows the true convictions of its Hungarian representative, stands by the original statements of the cardinal and refuses to accept the recantation as anything but a forced, involuntary admission.

On the other hand, there is no evidence that any Communist regime in any of these public trials has ever followed the norms of justice. The verdict is already sealed before the trial begins. The presiding officer is judge, jury, and prosecutor.

From all the accounts of the trial we cannot fail to reach the conclusion that it is a Communist frame-up—and it is certainly in line with the Reds' long record of deceit, barbarism, and injustice. The Mindszenty case is a travesty on justice.

On the same day the Brooklyn Eagle also contained the following article headed "The world after the war," by Constantine Brown, which shows the low degree of depravity to which the officials of the Soviet Union have descended:

THE WORLD AFTER THE WAR

(By Constantine Brown)

POWERFUL DRUG BELIEVED GIVEN MINDSZENTY TO GET CONFESSION

A powerful drug known as actedron is believed to have been administered to Cardinal Mindszenty by the Soviet-organized Hungarian secret police. This drug paralyzes all will power and the person thus drugged says anything he is told to say.

It is definitely established that the people's court set up by Marshal Tito in Yugoslavia used the same drug to make Gen. Draja Mihailovich, the nation's hero, admit that he had been a traitor to his country.

According to the testimony of those who attended the trial—and the Yugoslavs were more liberal with permits for foreigners than the Hungarian Government is—the Chetnik leader stated after a hearing: "I do not know what has come over me. Whenever I want to say 'No,' I find myself saying 'Yes.'"

The Soviet Union's MVD (secret police) takes credit for the development of this drug and its employment in state trials. It became known to the various intelligence services of the Western Powers during the spectacular purge trials in Moscow in 1936, when many of those who helped found the Soviet state worked against the Soviet government and confessed that they worked against the Soviet government and plotted with Leon Trotsky for its overthrow.

The drug was later used with even greater effect by the Gestapo, not in public trials but in obtaining important admissions from its victims.

Cardinal Mindszenty fought openly against Moscow's puppets in Hungary. This he admitted before being taken into custody by the Hungarian secret police. The Hungarian Government—even the present one, which is entirely under the domination of Moscow's agents—hesitated to arrest a prince of the church, against whom there was not the least evidence of treason, in the accepted meaning of the word.

Moscow decided, according to well-founded reports received in Washington, to proceed against the cardinal only after it found that the Cominform had stuck its neck way out in its conflict with Marshal Tito, of Yugoslavia.

The Communist government in Budapest tried to warn him of what would happen to him, in the hope of quieting the eloquent cardinal. But these warnings were answered with the words: "There is no time limit for martyrdom for the faith and well-being of the human race."

Because it was essential, according to the Soviet system of justice, to expose the enemies of the state by confessions from their mouths, the actedron treatment was given the cardinal. The effect has been gratifying to the U. S. S. R. secret police.

With his will power broken by the drug, the cardinal admitted everything he was told to admit and made a number of reservations about his activities in keeping with the wishes of his torturers, who wanted to give the appearance of a fair trial to their masquerade of justice.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, although the pending resolution does not go as far as I would like it to go, I am confident that it is the first worth-while step in a matter in which every American citizen is vitally concerned. I personally feel that we should immediately sever all diplomatic relations with the Communist Government of Hungary. Again permit me to commend the gentleman from New

York [Mr. BLOOM] for his prompt and kindly cooperation and for the time he has given me personally in connection with this matter. When all the Members of this House this evening pass this resolution, as I know they will, they notify all the peoples of the world of their righteous indignation over the barbaric treatment accorded Archbishop Stepinac and Josef Cardinal Mindszenty.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, the farcical trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, Hungarian primate, presents a graphic picture of atheistic materialism ruthlessly challenging every concept of Christian American democracy.

It is factual evidence of a determined, godless assault, by anti-Christian tyranny, against any church or people refusing to accept communistic dictatorship.

This latest outrage appears to be one more example in revelation of a resolute program to either completely extinguish Christianity in eastern Europe or accomplish its ineffectualness, in a moral sense.

For us in America, it should serve as another warning that the survival of personal dignity and human rights, in the Christian tradition, is the question mark of modern world developments. For our own protection we must remain constantly alert to detect insidious communistic undermining in our country and unite, in protest, against their pagan perpetrations abroad.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the voice of the American people rises in its freedom to protest this Communist crime against religion and humanity. Let this be a clarion call for a new international crusade against communism. Were it not for the fact that the results of this despicable trial will echo down through the corridors of time as one of the great infamies in the history of the world, then indeed this stage-managed trial, with all of its ridiculous, but tragic details, would have been truly a farce. Let it be said here and now that the chief, and the first, and the primary object of atheistic communism is the destruction of Christianity. This infamous trial was used by the Russians and their Hungarian satellites as a weapon in a determined effort to intimidate the Hungarian people and to break the power of the Catholic Church in Hungary. Every other means that could come to their perverted minds, having failed to conquer the brave Hungarian people, the Russians now are fully embarked on a campaign of terrorism to destroy their existence.

In this great forum of freedom let me call to your attention once again the great moral and ethical principles that catholicism upholds, and that communism is trying to undermine. Let us tear aside the veil of mystery that has surrounded many of the aspects of the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty. By this disregard of personal, political, and religious liberty in Hungary, the Soviet controlled Hungarian authorities have violated the peace treaty which calls for the observance of human, political, and religious rights and freedom.

It has been written: "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's." But in this Communist-dominated state, this true saying has been tortured to read: "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto Caesar the things that are God's."

There is no reason to ignore what is going on behind the iron curtain, for the evidence is overwhelming.

This evidence is provided not only by the faith of Cardinal Mindszenty, but also by the faith of those who preceded him. By Archbishop Stepinac, of Yugoslavia, by the priests, and pastors of many denominations, not only Catholics, who have been executed or thrown into prison in both states under Communist domination. Additional evidence is given by the numerous diplomats, consuls, and officials, who have resigned their posts abroad in protest against the policies of their home government, including the nine Hungarian officials, headed by the consul general in New York, who this week resigned from their government service. The evidence piles up and increases one upon the other. There is the vast wave of refugees from behind the iron curtain who are now numbered by the hundreds of thousands. They have fled and are still fleeing at the risk of their lives to escape a terror which many of them have experienced in Communist prisons and concentration camps. The democratic world can no longer ignore such evidence.

The Communist Hungarian Government has undertaken to conduct a campaign hoping to cause the people of Hungary and of the surrounding nations to lose faith in their religious leaders and in religion. Trials of this nature are a mockery of truth and justice.

It must be remembered that when Cardinal Mindszenty was free he had warned intimates and members of the clergy not to believe statements that he might make if and when he was arrested. As long as 2 years ago, when on a visit to the United States, the cardinal made this clear, for at that time when asked why he was returning, he declared because it was his duty to his people and his God. The cardinal said further, "I am going back to be crucified." And again, "My enemies can take from me no more than my life and that has already been given to God."

In assurance that we will not be lulled again into a false sense of security or a general apathy, let us not forget that we speak also of the case of Archbishop Aloysius Stepinac, who was sentenced by Yugoslavia in 1946 to 16 years in prison. This action we demand in his behalf as well as Cardinal Mindszenty's. Before the councils of the nations of the world, these sovereign powers must bear full responsibility for their actions. There should be no procedural problem in bringing this question before the United Nations. It should be the privilege of the United States delegation to bring this matter to the attention of the United Nations. This could be done in any one of three ways, in my judgment. First, through reference to the International Court of Justice, although it may be true that Hungary is not a member. Another possibility is reference to the Economic and Social Council or its subsidiary commission on human rights. A third possibility is the General Assembly itself, which meets again this year in April in New York. But regardless of these procedural suggestions, there is still the fact that the terms of the Hungarian peace treaty itself provides the best solution, for that treaty contains specific provisions on guaranties of human rights and democratic processes and the Hungarian Government is under obligation to obey.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege and the high honor of serving for some years in this Congress, and during these years of being of other service to my community, my State, and my country. But may I say that nothing in my private or public life ever incensed me as much as the shameful and degrading action of the Government of Hungary in the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty. The charge involving our own American Minister, Mr. Chapin, is a direct insult to the Government of the United States and is a cause for diplomatic action.

I realize full well that it is not always good diplomacy, and sometimes not advisable for our sources of information, to break relations with foreign nations. However, under the circumstances of this case, so extenuating, the resignation of Hungarian diplomatic officers in this country is evidence to the world that even they cannot stomach the disgraceful and bestial action of their own government for which they are accredited.

These two facts alone should constitute ample grounds for the withdrawal of our representatives in Hungary and the absolute severance of diplomatic relations with that country.

This is not just a problem for the United States. The whole world is shocked and astounded at this unjust and improper trial. This religious persecution is an outrage against people of all faiths everywhere. This is an indication of what may be anticipated in Communist-controlled countries and is a stark warning of the spread of tyranny and oppression among free people.

It it admirable that these men of God are sacrificed as the victims of their faith. Contrast this with the unenviable lot that is doomed to be that of their tormentors. To die before the wrath of Almighty God as rebuke of their own ambition. How great was the set-back for communism in these proceedings is graphically illustrated by the fact that comparatively few knew who Josef Mindszenty was until his arrest and trial. Today his name is a household word, honored and respected as his persecutors are debased and despised. Mr. Speaker, well it can be said "who falls for the love of God shall rise a star."

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

WILKES-BARRE, PA.,
February 6, 1949.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: The following resolution was passed at regular monthly meeting of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, division 37, Wilkes-Barre, meeting at Redington Hotel, Wilkes-Barre, Sunday, February 6, 1949:

"The above-named organization protests violently the indignities suffered by Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, of Bucharest, Hungary, and six other codefendants being tried by a Russian Hungarian people's court. Also we protest the denial by Hungarian Government of the presence of United States official representatives at this said trial."

Kindly employ your potent influence to present this protest in the Congress of the United States.

Yours truly,

JOHN J. KANE,
Secretary.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the mock trial, conviction, and sentence to life imprisonment of Cardinal Mindszenty is without parallel in history. No happening of our time more clearly indicates the determination of the Communists to attempt to obliterate their real enemy—Christianity.

His supposed trial violates every elementary principle of justice. It resembles in all details the purge trials held in the Soviet Union sometime back. The Communist government in Hungary has not even permitted American correspondents or observers to witness the trial. This means that the reports are slanted to suit the Communist propaganda line. However, I was extremely gratified that the State Department instructed the American Minister at Budapest to protest the exclusion of observers. I am further gratified by the strong and straightforward expression of yesterday by the Secretary of State.

No greater contrast between democracy and communism can be found than in this farce trial of a great leader of Christianity and in the trial of the 12 Communists in the city of New York. The latter group, leaders of a movement dedicated to the destruction of our Government, has been afforded all of the protection of the great American system of justice, while an outstanding leader of Christianity is denied the rights accorded a common criminal in our country.

The statements which have been reported through the Hungarian censor give every evidence of the accuracy of the charge that the cardinal has been maltreated. This trial is clear warning of the fate of Christianity under communism.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include editorial comments and news stories:

[From the New Orleans Item of February 8, 1949]

BUDAPEST TRIAL

The pattern for Soviet-land trials of those under charges of conspiring against any Kremlin-controlled regime is by now pretty well fixed. It was set in the middle thirties by the Russian blood purge. It followed the same dreary routine in the cases of Gen. Draja Mihailovich and Archbishop Stepinac in Yugoslavia, or Zoltan Tildy in Hungary.

That Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, of Hungary, would be found guilty of treason was, therefore, a foregone conclusion. The imposition of a life sentence rather than the death penalty may well have been a concession to world opinion, already incensed over so obvious a mockery of judicial procedure.

In this instance suspicion about the conduct of the trial was strengthened by the refusal of Matias Rakosi's puppet government to permit any outside and presumably unprejudiced newspapermen or any foreign diplomatic observers to attend. No such efforts to conceal what is going on are likely to be made unless there is something important to hide.

Much was made of the assertion that the dispatches sent out about the trial by the Budapest correspondent of the Associated Press were uncensored. This correspondent is a Hungarian national, subject to the inexorable discipline of a Cominform-controlled administration. Citing that as evidence of a free flow of information is like boasting that what Ilya Ehrenberg writes from Moscow is uncensored.

We don't know whether Cardinal Mindszenty was guilty or innocent of the charges lodged against him by the Ragosi administration. But we feel certain that his trial was a farcical mockery of judicial procedure, and not a dispassionate inquiry into the truth of the accusations.

[From Time magazine of February 14, 1949]

REBELLION TO TYRANTS

Last Sunday was set aside by American Catholics as a day of "prayer and protest" against the Communists' trial of Cardinal Mindszenty. In Manhattan's St. Patrick's Cathedral, Francis Cardinal Spellman—who received his red hat with Mindszenty at the 1946 consistory—delivered a remarkable sermon:

"'A new god has come to you, my people. His fiery eyes do not flash through clouds of incense or from altar candles. * * * This new god is not a stone statue worn smooth by the kisses of the faithful—he was not born in heaven. * * * The new god is born from earth and blood—he strides ahead, and under the thunder of his steps the globe trembles from east to west. This is the Red god. The Seine shudders at his impact, and tries to break its banks. Westminster trembles before him like Jericho, and across the green ocean his red shadow falls on the walls of the White House. Hosanna! New god.'

"My dear friends, [these] are words of a Hungarian Communist,[1] words that echo the thoughts of men depraved and deranged—men who do not know truth, love, justice, or faith. * * * These lines * * * are taught to the youth of Red-enshackled lands * * * where everybody is afraid of everybody else, where even a son fears his father and fathers fear their own blood-sons, as all become serfs and victims of the relentless god of Baal! * * * They are wild words of warning, and, unless we listen well and realize that we must counteract them by concerted, constant prayer and action, then these words but foretell America's and the whole world's doom.

"May 8, 1945—VE-day! On that day I delivered from this pulpit a prayer of thanksgiving for the victory of the hour, begging peace with justice. * * * The peace that came was not God's peace; and because in the ensuing postwar years men's hearts have not been won back to God, I must this day—as a protest against the crucification of humanity—entreat your prayers for persecuted, tortured, victimized Cardinal Mindszenty.

[1] Arpad Toth, a journalist and music critic.

IT IS FULL TIME

"From the very hour he was taken away in the black of night from his home, his flock, his aged mother, Cardinal Mindszenty became the victim of torturings and druggings that put him beyond the reach or realm of human help. It was he himself who said to me, when he was the honored guest here less than 2 years ago, 'My enemies can take from me no more than my life, and that has already been given to God.'

"No, the physical Cardinal Mindszenty can no longer be saved. It is the spiritual Cardinal Mindszenty in his martyrdom of mind and body that we can fortify by our prayers, that in his soul he may know that in another part of the world other men are holding high God's torch of justice. * * * and in our own dear land each free man * * * must protect and fight to keep his own integrity of conscience, his own God-given freedoms * * * to save America and the rest of the democratic, God-loving world from trickery, torturings, disasters, and defeat. * * *

"I shall never cease to pray and labor to protect America, and warn and work against Communism and all the evils growing from out its rotted roots, for I believe that 'rebellion to tyrants is obedience to God.'

"I [have] witnessed the sufferings of men in a world trapped by fear, famine, and madness called communism * * * I avow that unless the whole American people, without further ostrichlike actions and pretenses, unite to stop the Communist floodings of our own land, our sons, for the third and last time, shall be summoned * * * to bear arms against those who would desecrate and destroy them. Yea, it is full time that a strong and vigilant America unite in prayer and protest.

IF THIS BE TREASON

"Therefore, I beg you, my beloved people, let us not confuse prudence with lack of vision * * * as we watch nation after nation fall victim to communism, for prudence is often but an excuse for silence, procrastination, and compromise. Even today, as we read newspaper releases from the Communist-controlled press of Budapest * * * about a cardinal priest, whom, so little time ago, we took unto our own hearts and homes, millions of Americans refuse to recognize that we ourselves are faced with these same merciless dangers. * * * The Communists believe the American public is * * * willing to be drugged into believing whatever leaves them their own comforts. * * * But are we * * * the tools and the fools for which the Communists take us?

"When the cardinal confessed to treason against the government in Hungary, he but professed his loyalty to his country. If this be treason, to deny allegiance to an atheistic Communist government—then thank God Cardinal Mindszenty confessed to treason, as would I, if this free land of America were ever conquered."

[From the New Orleans States of February 8, 1949]

THE TRIAL OF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

The trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty is over and the verdict has been brought in by the Communist-dominated government of Hungary.

Whether that verdict will ultimately stand will not be known until the appeals are decided.

What is already known is the farcical manner in which the trial was conducted.

Consider these points:

No outsider was allowed to cover the trial. All extra news-service reporters were refused entry. The Associated Press man covering the trial is a Hungarian.

No American observer was allowed to be present. The United States had requested three seats.

Evidence was offered that the cardinal had conspired with Selden Chapin, United States Minister at Budapest, to hire a plane and escape Hungary. Both Mr. Chapin and the State Department have denied this.

The cardinal, while on trial, repudiated a prior letter which warned that if any confession were extracted from him it would be due to "human frailty."

The testimony of the cardinal, as printed here, was obscure even in its self-accusations.

The reports made a particular point of stressing the cardinal's health, well-being, and bearing. Yet as long as 3 weeks ago, this newspaper carried a New York Times exclusive story that the cardinal doubtless would be drugged so that he would be spiritless and malleable.

And just Saturday, a dispatch from John MacCormac, of the Times, reported that listeners in Vienna who were familiar with the cardinal and other defendants "have no doubt that all are under the influence of drugs."

"This," he wrote, "is deduced from the tone of the voices; frequent lapses of memory, faulty grammar used by men who would ordinarily be incapable of it, and by comparison of the cardinal's handwriting as reproduced in the yellow book (the Hungarian charges) with his ordinary script."

Trials such as these are not uncommon in totalitarian lands. During 1936-38, a number of Communist leaders went on trial for treason. Among them was Marshal Tukachevsky, once second in command of the Red army.

They were charged with conspiring with Nazi Germany—with which Stalin himself signed a nonaggression pact in 1939—to overthrow the Russian Government. Most of the old Bolshevik leaders were followers of the exiled Trotsky, later murdered in Mexico. Opinion at that time was that Stalin was simply consolidating his own power by liquidating his domestic opponents.

At the trial, the accused admitted their guilt, upbraided themselves as traitors to Russia and the proletariat. But their manner of confession and self-accusation was completely out of character for these once self-sufficient men. They attempted no defense, they were clay in the hands of the potter.

Even earlier, in 1933, the Nazis tried a Dutch Communist, Van der Lubbe, for firing the Reichstag. During his trial he acted as though drugged. He agreed to everything told him.

There is similarity in all these trials, and a difference. Van der Lubbe's was the German internal warfare between nazism and communism. Tukachevsky's was dissension in Russia. Cardinal Mindszenty's is a bold challenge of the godless to all faiths and all other creeds.

ACHESON HITS CONVICTION OF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

(By John M. Hightower)

Secretary of State Dean Acheson yesterday coldly condemned Hungary's conviction of Cardinal Mindszenty as wanton Communist religious persecution which has sickened and horrified the free world.

The United States, he disclosed, is already considering possible action through the United Nations.

Britain and France are being consulted on the next move.

On Capitol Hill, the House Foreign Affairs Committee formally demanded intervention by the United Nations or by such other means as may be most appropriate.

Later the House unanimously adopted a resolution urging that the United States protest Hungary's treatment of the cardinal either through the United Nations or by other appropriate means.

The resolution goes to the Senate.

Acheson's blunt and angry condemnation of Hungary, setting forth the official American position, came at a news conference.

NOT MEMBER OF UN

Diplomatic officials said it was one of the most extensive indictments of a Russian satellite country ever to come from an American Cabinet member.

Acheson noted that Hungary is not a member of the United Nations. But he said the Soviet-controlled country is definitely bound by the obligations set forth in article 2 of the treaty of peace with Hungary.

And on the basis of this treaty, which guarantees freedom and human rights, Acheson said the United States may bring violation charges in the United Nations.

In a terse 300-word statement, Acheson made these salient accusations:

1. Hungarian authorities are Soviet controlled and are seeking to discredit and coerce religious leadership in Hungary in order to remove this source of moral resistance to communism.

That was one of the strongest charges yet made by responsible American officials that the hand of Moscow is manipulating Hungary's actions behind the scenes.

2. In the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty, Hungarian authorities apparently employed all the usual methods practiced by a police state and therefore carried out not the administration of justice but wanton persecution. That was as close as Acheson came to subscribing to accusations of torture, use of drugs, and other tactics with which the Hungarians have been charged in the Mindszenty case.

3. The Hungarian Government must bear full responsibility for its action in the case. This laid the basis for future, more vigorous action by the United States against Hungary, possibly the appeal to the UN.

4. The Mindszenty case and the cases of other Communist-convicted church leaders fit into a deliberate pattern of the suppression of freedom and the extension of totalitarian controls over the country during the past 2 years.

The Hungarian people "have been divested of any real independence," Acheson said.

SICKENED AND HORRIFIED

"The people of the United States," he continued, "and, without question, peoples of other freedom-loving nations, are sickened and horrified by these developments and fully comprehend the threat they constitute to free institutions everywhere."

Acheson referred also to the recent persecution of Lutheran Bishop Lajos Ordass and other church leaders whom he did not name.

Bishop Ordass was arrested September 8 last year and sentenced 21 days later by a workers' court to 2 years in prison and loss of civil rights for 5 years. He was bishop of the Lutheran Church in Hungary and had been accused of violating currency laws.

Mindszenty, the Roman Catholic primate of Hungary, was accused by the Communist government of treason, black marketing, and other offenses.

Acheson volunteered his statement to State Department newsmen. He read it slowly—a cold, bitter condemnation of one of the final acts in a tragic series which he views as having smashed the freedom of an entire people.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, we are proud of our heritage. A heritage is something we inherit. It descends upon us like an inheritance. Freedom of speech and religion and the right to criticize even our highest officials are part of our priceless heritage. Our Bill of Rights is our inheritance. It was given to us by inheritance, we must preserve it for our descendants as a priceless gift. We often take this gift too much for granted. It is part of our everyday existence. It is unto us like the free air we breathe. We realize its real value when someone or a group bent upon mischief takes it from us. Then we make outcry—as we should.

Upon these rights and freedoms depend our dignity as men. Life would hardly be worth while without them. We would be like serfs without them. We would become slaves of the state or dictator. Even the wealth of a Croesus could not compensate us for bending the knee to the dictator, be he cruel or benevolent.

Are these our precious rights of freedom imperiled if freedom is attacked anywhere? Yes. Anything or anyone anywhere who strikes at freedom of conscience or expression is like a virus that cannot be confined. The plague must be destroyed wherever it may be, otherwise it will overtake us. "Never send to know for whom the bell tolls. It tolls for thee." Therefore, the impact of Hungarian cruelties against Cardinal Mindszenty is felt even in the United States, although the scene of the travesty of justice is far away. Today it is a Catholic prelate, tomorrow a Protestant minister, and the next day a rabbi. All religions are under the pale and the conscience of mankind is threatened. The danger signals are up.

The three great religions cannot fail to take heed. They must defend and attack. We cannot take these blows against faith passively, nor can there be appeasement. I recall the doggerel: "Appease a rascal as you will, he was and is a rascal still." The rascality of the Communist regime that thus imperils these cardinals is quite apparent. The means at hand must be invoked, and I refer to the United Nations. Our Government must not only protest but must induce the United Nations to invoke sanctions. The pending resolution does that, and I am, therefore, whole heartedly in favor of this resolution.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, many people have already protested the treatment of Cardinal Mindszenty by the Hungarian Government, but I want to add my voice to voices of those who are shocked by this flagrant violation of justice and human rights. Americans of every creed are indignant, and many are concerned over the effect of such actions on the world's hope for peace.

From early youth Americans are imbued with the doctrines of justice, fair trials, free speech, and the right to criticize those holding political office. We learn the importance of these civil liberties in assuring that our Government will always deal fairly with its citizens and will always govern with the consent and for the good of the governed. We accept that as the normal and proper procedure. It comes as a shock, then, when we learn that there are countries which regard the rights of their citizens as of no importance whatsoever, and where it is a crime to criticize or oppose in any manner the policies of the rulers.

The effect of such a revelation on American public opinion is tremendous. It makes it difficult for us to think of

ever having friendly relations with a government of this type, and makes the prospect of continued peace seem dim indeed. It tends to focus our minds on the cold war and on the threat of communism rather than on the necessity to continually strive for peace and understanding in the world, no matter how discouraging the outlook.

The effect of the Mindszenty affair on public opinion in the United States should not be allowed to go unnoticed by the governing officials in Hungary. I therefore urge the Secretary of State to inform the Hungarian Government in the strongest possible language of the effect their unjust actions have had on American public opinion, and, since they have had no experience with it, of the importance of public opinion in a democracy. If they realize that a series of actions like these may inevitably bring on a war in which small nations like Hungary will be crushed between the colliding great powers, perhaps they will modify their policies and cease their persecutions.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of the pending resolution.

The trial of Cardinal Mindszenty was obviously an attempt by the Communist-dominated Hungarian Government to suppress freedom of religion. The trials of ministers of religion in Hungary and in Bulgaria, in Slovakia, and in Russia, are a grim warning that American principles of religious freedom have no meaning in the Soviet sphere of influence.

The mockery of the so-called trial is apparent when it is noted that no foreign correspondents, nor official representatives of any of the non-Soviet-dominated countries, were permitted to be present.

It seems to me that the Government of Hungary was either incredibly stupid or absolutely callous to the opinion of the world in permitting this farcical trial to take place.

I join with my colleagues in denouncing the trials of ministers of religion on trumped-up charges.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, the people of our own land and throughout the world have been shocked and grieved at the travesty, called a trial, of Cardinal Mindszenty at Budapest. Catholics, Protestants, and Jews have joined in a world-wide protest of this dastardly and brazen challenge to religion and human freedom. Cardinal Mindszenty is the victim today—who can say where or when this vicious Communist-inspired attack will strike tomorrow?

This infamous trial of a great churchman should bring to the hearts and minds of decent people everywhere the ruthlessness of atheistic communism and the necessity of destroying it wherever and whenever it rears its ugly head.

What happened at Budapest can happen here if we fail to heed the warnings of those countries which have fallen under the heel of Stalin and his criminal gang.

Let there be no mistake about the so-called trial of the cardinal. We must recognize it as a heinous threat to all religions and to free men everywhere. We Americans who have been so abundantly blessed should lead in a world crusade to destroy communism. It should be the responsibility of each and every one of us to preach the gospel of human freedom and the dignity of man—that come what will, God helping us, we will protect this freedom, regardless of the cost.

It has often been said that out of evil sometimes comes good. If this be true, perhaps the cruel, inhuman, physical, and mental tortures suffered by Cardinal Mindszenty may bring to the world a realization of the necessity of crushing this tyranny called communism before it strikes again.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, I strongly approve this resolution. I protest the arrest, trial, and imprisonment of Cardinal Mindszenty. This travesty on justice has dramatized the Communist system for all the world. I stand with a feeling of humility before the martyrdom of this great religious leader.

Having filed an earlier protest with the Secretary of State in this matter, I am proud that, as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I voted to bring this resolution before Congress. It expresses our indignation and asks that the issues raised by the arrest and imprisonment of Cardinal Mindszenty, of Hungary, and Archbishop Stepinac, of Yugoslavia, be raised by the United States either in the United Nations or by other appropriate means. A unanimous vote of the House of Representatives will show that with one voice our Nation condemns this travesty of justice.

The forces of decency cannot be quiet, even though nothing that the Communists do surprises us. This is not the first such trial under a system of slavery. It is a familiar story. In Russia and all the satellite nations, the pattern is the same: torture, public exhibition, faked confessions, perfunctory defense, a judge who does the bidding of the Kremlin. Persecution wears the mantle of justice.

The fight is not the fight of Catholics alone. It is the fight of all decent people of whatever race or creed who believe in God, freedom, peace, the dignity and value of the human being. To hold such ethical concepts under communism is treason.

Out of Hungary and before the world, Cardinal Mindszenty is innocent. This prelate emerges as a man who was willing to sacrifice his life so that right should prevail over wrong, to be a free man rather than a slave, to live with God instead of existing in darkness, to be a martyr rather than allow his people and religion to crumble.

History will show that Cardinal Mindszenty was the victor, Russia the loser. His defiance of tyranny was a clarion call. It awakened humanity to the creeping danger of the Red tide.

Religion is persecuted behind the iron curtain. Six hundred Catholic and Protestant clergymen are now in Hungarian prisons. In Rumania, the Government has decreed to put regulations on all religious groups. Bulgaria has indicted 15 Protestant ministers for espionage. Having taken over economic and political control, the elimination of religion is the next step in consolidating eastern Europe.

We in this Nation who love truth and justice think of Cardinal Mindszenty deeply. It warns us that if decency and justice are to prevail we must always be vigilant against tyranny. This protest of indignation by our country should reaffirm our resolve to never allow communism to get a hold in America. Our stand must be uncompromising. Shall it be justice, decency, and democracy, or slavery, tyranny, and communism? We should speak out for what we believe in and speak out against what we despise.

The Cardinal Mindszenty case is an alarm. The Communist Party is a world-wide organization. Twelve countries are under its complete control. Trained units, blindly following the Kremlin's bidding, are in every other country of the world. Communism is playing for keeps. Let us heed before it is too late.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted to the Honorable SOL BLOOM, of New York, for Members of the House to extend their remarks on the adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 19, I desire to include the following comments and pertinent editorials which express the indignation of the people of my district, who have written me thousands of letters protesting the mockery of the trial and the shocking sentence of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty.

These letters are not only from people of the Catholic faith, they are the letters of all righteous, God-fearing, and fair-minded people who have been schooled in democratic processes of fair play and who respect the rights of man. They are letters filled with pleas and protests against this abhorrent and shocking treatment. And they call for united action against these inquisitors of Cardinal Mindszenty and legitimate action in contrast to the base and godless action of these men of the Communist-dominated Hungarian Government. I am happy to have been privileged to introduce House Concurrent Resolution 27 on February 8, 1949. But I am happier that our House of Representatives, by unanimous vote, showed its united stand against the persecution of and the violation of the rights of man, in adopting House Concurrent Resolution 19, which was introduced by the Honorable SOL BLOOM.

It is indeed of moment that we should not forget that those who would violate the men of God would not hesitate to trample upon the rights of all humans.

And I am certain that an outraged world will raise its voice so high that these men who have no respect for the fundamental rights of man will take heed.

For no matter what subterfuge may have been employed by the men of the Hungarian Government, they could not hide the fact that this action was not against Cardinal Mindszenty, the man, but against Cardinal Mindszenty, a courageous leader in a fight against a system which violates inalienable rights, and against Cardinal Mindszenty, a symbol of democratic beliefs as opposed to Communistic dogma. It is the treacherous action of the false prophets against the prophets of truth, democracy, and God.

The editorials which follow—the first from the Newark Evening News, entitled "Sentence at Budapest," and the other from the Newark Star-Ledger, entitled "They Dared Not," both of February 9, 1949, very ably present the Mindszenty story:

[From the Newark Evening News of February 9, 1949]

SENTENCE AT BUDAPEST

When Archbishop Stepinac, Catholic Church head of Yugoslavia, was sentenced to 16 years' imprisonment at forced labor in 1946, the unofficial Vatican reaction was that Yugoslav authorities had decided to soft pedal the ending of the trial through avoidance of the punishment of death. The principal charge against Archbishop Stepinac was that he had aided the Axis during the war.

The sentence imposed at Budapest on Cardinal Mindszenty is a life sentence. As in the case of Archbishop Stepinac, whatever he possesses is confiscated and his civil rights are forfeited. The general charge against him was treason.

Axis collaboration and treason, these are the most serious charges that it is possible to bring against a citizen, going to the welfare and the survival of the state. Yet in neither case, although conviction was secured according to the predetermined Communist technique, was the death sentence imposed. The motivation of the trial, in both cases, was political; the charges were political, and the sentences bear a strong political impress.

In neither case did the Communist court consider it expedient to order execution. That much did the protest of church authorities abroad and of general western opinion accomplish. Cardinal Mindszenty has appealed the verdict. This means, under Communist court procedure, that the appeals court can impose a more severe sentence, if it wishes, or reduce the sentences of the Hungarian primate and the other defendants who appealed. In the cardinal's case, the prosecutor had demanded death. In actual effect, under the Soviet system, the difference between a life sentence and a sentence of death is negligible.

Communist dogma in all countries derives its form and content from the Kremlin. The Kremlin will not tolerate religion as a practical moral force operating in the lives of men on an equal plane, as it were, with the ideological drive of the Communist state. To discredit religion as a working moral force, communism uses political means, being unwilling or unable to meet the religious impulse in the free competition of ideas or in the field of conscience.

That is the broad background of the clouded legal proceedings conducted at Zagreb, Yugoslavia, in 1946 and now duplicated, on a still more elevated hierarchical plane, at Budapest. The persons of the two prelates can be imprisoned, their voices can be stilled, but no tactic, however clever, however cruel, can seclude or silence the intimations of the spirit that arise in the hearts of men.

[From the Newark Star-Ledger of February 9, 1949]

THE EDITOR'S OPINION

THEY DARED NOT

The Communist rulers of Hungary have not dared to order the execution of Cardinal Mindszenty. They feared to startle world opinion into a clear and unbearable realization of the true nature of the Communist menace.

The Communists' retreat from their goal in the Mindszenty case is spectacularly clumsy. Failure to order the death sentence is explained on the ground that the cardinal, not being a worldly man, could not have understood the full implications of treasonable conduct. Yet the whole purpose of the Communist campaign against religious organizations and leaders is to discredit them and prove them to be worldly conspiracies.

HAD TO SHIFT TACTICS

The Communists have not only modified their plans for the disposal of Cardinal Mindszenty, but have changed their whole position in their assault on the Catholic Church. Afraid that the execution of the cardinal would alert the world as no other act could, the Communists have had to conform their whole campaign against the church to the new premise that the cardinal is not a worldly man. Thus, the cardinal is now represented as a rather foolish dupe of the United States and its diplomatic agency in Hungary, which becomes the chief villain of the piece.

Henceforth, because the Communists hesitated to defy world opinion, they will no longer be able to brand the Catholic Church as an archconspirator. Instead, the Communists will have to content themselves with picturing the church as the dupe of American imperialism.

MAY TRY IT AGAIN

The Communists, in retreating in the Mindszenty case, have not suffered a defeat. It is only a set-back. They may try again. Hitler found that world opinion could be worn down by administering a series of shocks, no single one of them startling enough to make the world fighting mad. The Communists almost went too far for their own safety in the Mindszenty case, and have had to change their tactics for the present.

The propaganda goal of the Communists now may be to render world opinion less sensitive through a long series of dulling treatments. If the people of the free world can remain alive to the moral issue, no matter how deviously clever the Communist psychological campaign, the free peoples will win the battle for the world. If it ever comes to pass that the world is left unexcited by the framing and execution of a great religious leader, then our cause will have died.

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under general leave granted for extension of remarks on the case of Cardinal Mindszenty, I wish to express the horror and indignation of my constituents, of every race and creed, at the threat to religious freedom which his imprisonment and so-called trial represents. The whole world knows, regardless of what the purported charges were, that the cardinal was tried because he was the head of the Catholic Church in Hungary and because he refused to bow down to communism. What has happened to him could happen to any other religious leader.

To us, in this country which was founded because men were willing to risk their lives in order to have the right to worship God as they wished, any threat to religious freedom is especially repugnant. We must show by word and deed to those nations which have been enslaved by communism the great importance which we attach to the persecution of Cardinal Mindszenty and our righteous indignation against this threat to religious freedom. The House has recorded its righteous wrath and the resolution which it has adopted has my wholehearted approval and support.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I am thoroughly in accord with House Concurrent Resolution 19, now before us, condemning the arrest and imprisonment of Cardinal Mindszenty, of Hungary, and Archbishop Stepinac, of Yugoslavia. In voting for the resolution, I do so with a deep feeling of satisfaction, as to me it is an evidence on the part of our own great Government that our voice will be heard wherever and whenever freedom of religion is denied by tyrants. I congratulate the distinguished chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee [Mr. BLOOM] and all the members of his committee who have unanimously reported out this resolution.

I feel that the committee amendment stating that it is "the sense of the Congress that these issues shall be raised by the United States, either in the United Nations or by such other means as may be most appropriate" makes crystal clear the firm determination of our Government in this matter.

It is, of course, most regrettable that men of the high character and extraordinary attainments of these two prelates of the Roman Catholic Church should be made to suffer unspeakable tortures because of their religious beliefs. Yet in this whole picture the scene is not entirely black. Far better it is that two outstanding and heroic priests such as Cardinal Mindszenty and Archbishop Stepinac be the martyrs so that the world will focus its attention, not only upon their martyrdom, but rather upon the evil cause of their persecution.

Thousands upon thousands of Roman Catholics behind the iron curtain are being persecuted because of their religious beliefs, but it has taken the farcical trials and unjust imprisonment of Cardinal Mindszenty and Archbishop Stepinac to at long last arouse not only the governments of the western world, but the average citizen, responsible for these governments, to the dangers of communism.

Although those who are now suffering most at the hands of the various communistic governments today are Roman Catholics, their persecution is only a part of the pattern of the general aggressive atheism that would destroy all religion. Tomorrow it will be the Protestants and the next day the Jews will be the victims. Communism shows no favorites in its persecution of those who believe in God and the natural rights of man. If the sufferings of Cardinal Mindszenty and Archbishop Stepinac will bring the world to a realization of the evil force of communism that is sweeping both to the east and west, and galvanize the democratic nations into united opposition against it, I firmly believe that both Cardinal Mindszenty and Archbishop Stepinac would willingly and uncomplainingly endure their torture.

Mr. Speaker, I have received many communications from my district relative to the unjustified arrest and imprisonment of Cardinal Mindszenty and Archbishop Stepinac. I am glad to so state, for I believe that in the past Americans have been just as apathetic toward communism as have the people of the rest of the world. "It can't happen here," so many people have said.

We know that it can happen here unless the people back home are alive to the situation as well as those of us who are legislating here today. We know that Communists have attained places in our own Government. We know also

that when efforts are made to oust them, they scream for the protection of those laws that were enacted to safeguard the rights of the people who live under them, and not to give refuge to spies, traitors, and conniving, scheming agents of hostile governments. These latter, if they could subvert our Government, would deny the protection of law to those who disagree with them. It is because our democratic form of government is meticulous in its protection under law of all people within our country that these subversive agents and groups, aided by innocent, but misguided individuals, have wormed their way into labor and government.

I have confidence in the sound judgment and good sense of our American people. They are slow to be aroused. They are generous and kindhearted and it is because of these national traits that frequently they have been taken advantage of by those engaged in subversive activities. Once aroused, they follow a straight line, unswerving in their determination. They are now aroused. They will continue to be so until they have removed every trace of the Red peril that threatens our democratic institutions and the great American Government, under which we live and to which the eyes of a despairing world are hopefully turned.

I gladly vote for the resolution.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I trust there will not be a single vote against the pending resolution. The alleged trial of Cardinal Mindszenty is a complete farce and a travesty upon justice as it is understood by all real believers in democracy. The Hungarian Government is guilty of an infamy that can never be erased. People throughout the entire world who believe in justice and fair play will join in condemning the arbitrary actions of the cruel dictators who are now forcing their will upon the Hungarian people.

This latest action in the long list of arbitrary and ruthless steps taken by the Communist dictators of Moscow and its satellite countries is abundant proof that there can be no compromise with those who espouse the doctrines of totalitarianism. I insert with my remarks an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of February 7, which I think clearly expresses the views of the overwhelming majority of the people in my district.

"TRIAL" OF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Cardinal Mindszenty, whatever his fate may be, and whatever activities he may have carried on, is the victim of two forces, both evil. He is a casualty of one of the most ruthless movements in history.

The first force was the seizure of a nation against the will of its people—the coming in of a foreign dictatorship to take over. The second and present force is the desire of that regime, as a part of the plans of Moscow, to strike back at the western powers and the United States.

There was nothing legal in the Soviet-sponsored coup that seized power in Hungary. There is nothing legal in the terror by which the Soviet puppets maintained power. There was treachery, in every sense of the word, in the procedure by which the Soviet puppets took power.

Once again, no matter what the accused cardinal may have dreamed, thought, advised, or done, it is an insulting mockery of justice, as conceived by civilized man, to have the present Soviet-supported regime in Hungary going through the motions of "trying" Cardinal Mindszenty—or of "trying" anyone else.

And for a regime that seized power illegally and by arch treachery to accuse anyone else of being a traitor is nothing more than a manifestation of the duplicity and depravity long characteristic of Communist thought.

"A people's court"—what a mockery! It is not the people of Hungary who are trying Cardinal Mindszenty but the dictators in Moscow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to unanimously.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the resolution just agreed to at the point in the RECORD before the adoption of the resolution on Cardinal Mindszenty.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in extending my remarks in the RECORD on the resolution just agreed to I may include two editorials from the Brooklyn Eagle.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I wish to state that I was unavoidably detained when the roll call on House Resolution 78 was taken. I am a member of the subcommittee that reported this bill out of the committee and voted for it. Had I been here at that time I would have voted "yea" in favor of this resolution.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the resolution pertaining to Cardinal Mindszenty and to include a speech of the archbishop of Washington.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the resolution pertaining to Cardinal Mindszenty and to include a telegram.

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. FLOOD) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permision to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the resolution in reference to Cardinal Mindszenty and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. DOLLINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the New York Times.

Mr. HAVENNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. TAURIELLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks made early today and include two editorials.

Mr. HART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a summary of testimony delivered before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report by Dr. Clark.

Mr. BLOOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by the Honorable James Farley.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in connection with the resolution just adopted, and include the text of a resolution that I introduced in the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in connection with H. R. 1211 and include certain quotations.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include excerpts appearing in the Christian Science Monitor.

Mr. SANBORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a case study of international espionage in the Far East prepared for release by the National Military Establishment, irrespective of the cost. May I say, Mr. Speaker, in explanation, that I endeavored to get an estimate of the cost, but time did not permit.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address delivered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

EXPLANATION

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that official business prevented me from reaching the floor of the House today in time to vote on House Resolution 78, providing

a $200,000 appropriation for the Committee on Un-American Activities.

I am strongly in favor of this resolution, and had I been present I would have voted "aye."

TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, at the outset let me state that in general I favor the principle of the reciprocal-trade agreements. It is my view that both from the standpoint of wholly desirable world improvement, the recovery of world prosperity, world peace, and also our own enlightened self-interest, we should promote by every reasonable means not detrimental or injurious or damaging to our own prosperity and the welfare of our industries and people, trade and commerce between the nations.

As a logical corollary to this principle, I believe that such agreements ought to be entered into only after careful negotiation and impartial, nonpartisan, scientific inquiry, and investigation to determine whether such agreements are injurious or destructive of American industry. In brief, enabling legislation should contain appropriate and adequate safeguards to insure limitations and definite fixed conditions upon the powers of the administrative agencies concerned.

In the first place, it is clear to me that no lasting prosperity in America can be predicted upon the extension of loans and grants to foreign nations in order to enable them to purchase American goods and services. It is obvious that this Nation cannot afford indefinitely, if indeed we can afford it to such a substantial degree, to make loans and grants to other nations over and above our present commitments connected with the fulfillment of the Marshall plan and the national security. I think it cannot be successfully asserted that there is anything more than a fair assurance that outstanding loans can be repaid. Of course there is not enough money in the Treasury, or in fact available from the resources of the people, to warrant continued grants beyond those contemplated by these programs. There may be certain serious questions raised as to how long we can extend even these particular programs without very serious consequences to the economic well-being of our own citizens and financial maladjustments of our own budgets and economic capacity. I mention these points because, like many here and throughout the Nation, I am disturbed about our national finances.

Secondly, the reduction of trade barriers to permit the influx of cheaply produced foreign goods will bring many American industries to stagnation and ruin and will cause widespread unemployment and the loss of our high American standards of wages, living and free opportunity which are understandably the envy of the whole world. Upon these high standards the future prosperity, welfare, and happiness of the American people will surely depend.

Thirdly, in my view, there should be definite restrictions placed upon the power of any agency of this Government to permit foreign producers to pour a stream of cheap goods and commodities into this country and thereby cause the impairment or collapse of our industries and force idleness for millions of worthy and faithful American workers.

Because of the limited time allotted me, I cannot develop extended consideration of the general principles which may be applicable to this particular question. I desire, however, to allude to some pertinent facts of our present industrial situation in my own section of the country as well as in the Nation generally which have definite bearing upon the nature of present and future reciprocal trade agreements. As I scrutinize the list of those appearing before the committee in opposition to unlimited trade-agreement powers, it impressed me as being very much like the roster of all the industries in my district and State, indeed it comprises a cross section of our industry. Great textile industries, cotton and woolen manufacturers, paper and pulp producers, leather, boots and shoes, seafood products, toy manufacturers, wire-cloth producers, publishing concerns, and representatives of a great many other industries appeared to record their opposition to this unlimited bill in whole or in part. The record of the hearing is replete with examples and illustrations of the baneful effects that have already been worked, or that will be worked, by the operation of this law.

Already there are alarming signs of a present recessionary trend in our industrial and economic life. The unemployment rolls have materially increased within the past few weeks. Industry and business has undergone and is undergoing curtailment and retrenchment. A substantial number of concerns are working on part time while others have shut down or liquidated. This situation is a great threat to America, coming as it does at a time when we are beset by foreign troubles and problems and can ill afford to have our economy weakened in any respect. There are undoubted psychological factors of fear, apprehension, and uncertainty concerning the future responsible for the present unwillingness of businessmen, large and small, of every class, to go forward at this time without tangible assurances that they are not going to be overwhelmed and destroyed by oppressive taxation and regimentation. This is a very pronounced and weighty factor in what we hope is but a temporary stalemate of business activity. But, as has been testified before the committee and demonstrated in this debate, the importation of cheap foreign goods which are produced at a fraction of the American competitive cost has in a large number of instances undermined the American market and brought about business collapse and unemployment.

You have all heard the story of the Waltham Watch Co., which is more or less typical of the American watchmaking industry in the effects it has suffered from foreign competition. No history of the financial vicissitudes of this concern can cloak the fact that it patriotically stopped producing watches to take part in the war effort by making time-electronic devices and other delicate mechanisms essential to our large-scale military operations. During this period foreign watchmakers moved in and took over the American market. When victory was gained the Waltham Co. had to start all over again against resourceful and powerful competition which had been set up against it during the wartime. And let me state categorically in this connection that the public interests of that beleaguered concern and its unemployed workers have been admirably represented and advanced in this body and elsewhere by my very able colleague from Massachusetts within whose district this company is located, the able, distinguished, and zealous gentleman, my friend, Congressman DONOHUE. All other Members of the Massachusetts delegation, including our esteemed, able, and beloved majority and minority leaders, have likewise rendered conspicuous service to try to reopen this plant. The voice of the laboring people who are the real sufferers in a situation of this kind because they have lost their jobs and livelihood due to the closing of this great factory, has been powerfully and capably raised by their leaders, particularly the head of their own union, Mr. Walter Cenerazzo, a forceful, able young man who has worked unselfishly and tirelessly to adjust the affairs of this company and make it possible for thousands of fine, faithful, skilled workers to go back to their jobs.

Mr. Speaker, the conditions to which I have referred are steadily growing more serious not only in New England but throughout the Nation. I do not believe that the American Congress can or will remain indifferent to the plight of millions of our workers who are threatened with unemployment and its attendant hardships. We must tackle and solve these great problems or they will surely result in a descending spiral which will plunge the Nation into another depression.

It seems entirely reasonable to me that the Congress should be interested in the peril-point reports which contain the findings of the Tariff Commission. There is nothing complicated or abstruse about this proposal, nothing inconsistent with the trade-agreements policy. It merely requires the Tariff Commission after careful study, to point out the danger signs of our trade-agreements policy in operation so that appropriate action can be taken to stave off and prevent cut-throat competition from abroad injurious to American industry and labor and destructive of our economic system.

It is likewise appropriate that we should adopt the escape-clause provision which will permit readjustment from time to time of our position in foreign trade whenever it becomes untenable because of the type of competition I have referred to above which is working a detriment and threat to industrial employment and stability.

These are minimum safeguards, in my opinion, which we should provide in this

legislation to protect American industry and American workers and American producers against the impact of foreign goods produced under substandard wages and conditions. The need of the hour is a strong, healthy, thriving American economy, a nation adapted and adaptable not only to its peacetime needs, not only to its social welfare which is so vital and important, but also to the emergencies of another and more fearful kind which could well befall us, like a bolt from the blue, in this disordered and chaotic world of ruthless communism, oppression, and unrest.

I hope this bill is amended to provide these safeguards and thus furnish adequate and urgently required protection for our business structure, our industrial prosperity, and the welfare of our faithful workers and producers who, after all, are the very richest resource of the Nation.

The following organizations, all of which represent industrial and employee interests in my district and State, appeared before the committee in support of maintaining the peril-point report of the Tariff Commission:

National Association of Wool Manufacturers.
America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference.
New England Industries.
Massachusetts Fisheries Association, Inc.
Sea Food Producers of New Bedford.
Gloucester Fisheries Association.
Textile Industry of Massachusetts.
Atlantic Fishermen's Union of Boston.
The Cotton Textile Institute, Inc.
Raw Materials National Council.
American Paper and Pulp Association.
Association of Knitted Glove and Mitten Manufacturers.
National Association of Leather Glove Manufacturers.
Crompton Co., textile manufacturers.
National Council Farmer Cooperatives.
International Longshoremen's Union.
American Jeweled Watch Industry.
American Watch Workers Union.
Waltham Watch Co.
The National Federation of Textiles, Inc.
Toy Manufacturers of the United States of America, Inc.
Industrial Wire Cloth Institute.
American Cotton Manufacturers Association.
The National Economic Council.
Pacific Mills.
Lithographers National Association, Inc.
Greater Lawrence Chamber of Commerce of Lawrence, Mass.
The Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN, Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico, appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. NOLAND, for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

To Mrs. NORTON, for the balance of the week, on account of illness.

To Mr. SMITH of Virginia (at the request of Mr. HARDY), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 15. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to prevent purchase and sale of public office," approved December 11, 1926; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 26. An act for the relief of Jose Babace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 27. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 29. An act to authorize payments of claims based on loss of or damage to property deposited by alien enemies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 33. An act for the relief of Milo Jurisevic, Mrs. Jelena Jurisevic, Svetozar Jurisevic, and Radmila Jurisevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 77. An act to repeal section 509 of title 34 of the United States Code, approved June 30, 1876 (ch. 159, 19 Stat. 69); to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 90. An act to provide for the naturalization of Richard Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 278. An act to prevent retroactive checkage of payments erroneously made to certain retired officers of the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 279. An act to authorize the advance on the retired list of Lt. John T. McDermott, United States Navy (retired), to the grade of lieutenant commander; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 315. An act for the relief of Dr. Chung Kwai Lui; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 331. An act for the relief of Ghetel Pollak Kahan, Magdalena Linda Kahan (wife), and Susanna Kahan (daughter, 12 years old); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 335. An act for the relief of Claris U. Yeadon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 372. An act to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Americus, Ga., as the Marcus George Veterans Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 460. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to the Helena Chamber of Commerce certain described parcels of land situated in the city of Helena, Mont.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 485. An act for the relief of Joyce Violet Angel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 629. An act to authorize the disposition of certain lost, abandoned, or unclaimed personal property coming into the possession of the Treasury Department, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 630. An act to amend section 19 of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), so as to remove the upper age limit for appointment to commissioned grade in the Supply Corps of the Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 632. An act to authorize certain personnel and former personnel of the Navy Establishment to accept certain gifts and a foreign decoration tendered by foreign governments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 673. An act relating to the pay and allowances of the Naval Reserve performing active duty in the grade of rear admiral, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 713. An act to amend Public Law 533 of the Eightieth Congress authorizing the construction of a building for the General Accounting Office on square 518 in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. J. Res. 22. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the three hundredth anniversary of Annapolis, Md.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 10, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

193. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report showing withdrawals and restorations of public lands as required by Thirty-sixth Statutes, page 847; — United States Code, section 471; Forty-third United States Code, section 141, et seq.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

194. A letter from the director, national legislative commission, the American Legion, transmitting the final financial statement for the period ending December 31, 1948; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

195. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Commodity Corporation Charter Act with respect to strategic-materials stock piling; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

196. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of certain individuals formerly stationed in the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

197. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill relating to Coast Guard and nonpropelled seadrome ocean station; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 88. Resolution providing for the expenses of conducting the studies and investigation authorized by (h) (1) of rule XI incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; without amendment (Rept. No. 37). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 82. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 22; with an amendment (Rept. No. 38). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 78. Resolution to authorize the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities; with amendments (Rept. No. 39). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 2402. A bill to extend the office of the War Assets Administrator and the War Assets Administration from February 28, 1949, until June 30, 1949; without amendment (Rept. No. 40). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. House Joint Resolution 92. Joint resolution to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 60). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Concurrent Resolution 19. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress with respect to the arrest and imprisonment of Archbishop Stepinac, of Yugoslavia, and Cardinal Mindszenty, of Hungary; without amendment (Rept. No. 61). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 555. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, Northern Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons for reimbursement for damages and losses sustained as a result of a flood which occurred in December 1937 in levee district No. 10, Yuba County, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 41). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 574. A bill for the relief of Fred E. Weber; without amendment (Rept. No. 42). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 575. A bill for the relief of the estate of James Patrick Hackett and Charles L. Stover; with an amendment (Rept. No. 43). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BRYSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 577. A bill to correct possible inequity in the case of a certain application for letters patent of William R. Blair; without amendment (Rept. No. 44). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 576. A bill for the relief of Arthur G. Robinson; without amendment (Rept. No. 45). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 578. A bill for the relief of Carlton C. Grant and others; without amendment (Rept. No. 46). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 581. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court for the Territory of Alaska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim, or claims, of Hilda Links and E. J. Ohman, partners, and Fred L. Kroesing, all of Anchorage, Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 47). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 583. A bill for the relief of the Alaska Juneau Gold Mining Co., of Juneau, Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 48). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 591. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lucille Davidson; without amendment (Rept. No. 49). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 592. A bill for the relief of James W. Keith; with an amendment (Rept. No. 50). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 594. A bill for the relief of Mamie L. Hurley; without amendment (Rept. No. 51). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 595. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Harry W. Sharpley, his heirs, administrators, or assigns, against the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 52). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 596. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of John E. Parker, his heirs, administrators, or assigns, against the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 53). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 609. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mathew C. Cowley, deceased, and the estate of Louisa Cowley, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 54). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 610. A bill for the relief of Lorenzo H. Froman; without amendment (Rept. No. 55). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 611. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of certain property owners adjacent to Fort Knox, Ky.; without amendment (Rept. No. 56). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 697. A bill for the relief of Samuel W. Poorvu; without amendment (Rept. No. 57). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1818. A bill for the relief of Edward Woolf; without amendment (Rept. No. 58). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1870. A bill for the relief of Doris Marie Richard; without amendment (Rept. No. 59). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

ADVERSE REPORT

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. House Resolution 80. Resolution requesting the Secretary for National Defense to transmit to the House a report with respect to the progress which is being made in carrying on the national defense program; (Rept. No. 36). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 2536. A bill to incorporate the Twenty-ninth Division Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio:

H. R. 2537. A bill to amend section 114 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide percentage depletion for limestone, when calcined or when used by metallurgical or chemical industries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 2538. A bill to authorize completion of the land development and settlement of the Angostura unit of the Missouri Basin project notwithstanding the limitation of time; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CAVALCANTE:

H. R. 2539. A bill to amend the act of July 31, 1947, with respect to the maintenance of actions to recover possession of publicly operated housing accommodations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2540. A bill to authorize payment of claims based on loss of or damage to property deposited by alien enemies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 2541. A bill to amend section 3045 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Waya and Means.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 2542. A bill to extend Veterans' Administration benefits to disabled retired enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, without impairment of their right to receive retired pay which they had earned for stipulated service prior to reentry into the service in World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2543. A bill to repeal the tax on transportation of persons and the tax on transportation of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2544. A bill to amend the veterans' regulations to provide increased rates of compensation for certain veterans with specific service-incurred disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2545. A bill to reclassify assistant postmasters and other supervisory positions in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 2546. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish land-based airwarning and control installations for the national security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 2547. A bill to amend section 2883 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2548. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code to permit the use of additional means, including stamp machines, for payment of tax on distilled spirits, modify loss allowances for distilled spirits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 2549. A bill to further amend section 5 of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 by extending the time for making application for unused leave to September 1, 1951; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2550. A bill to exempt from estate tax national service life insurance and United States Government life insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2551. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 so as to permit certain payments to be made to the estates of former members of the armed forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 2552. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that pensioners be paid a minimum pension of $50 per month; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 2553. A bill to provide pay, allowances, retirement, and survivor benefits for members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Public Health Service, the Reserve components thereof, the National Guard, and the Air National Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2554. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act of 1932; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2555. A bill to establish the United States of America Patriotic and Charter Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2556. A bill to establish a commission to promote exchange visits of American and French citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 2557. A bill to extend further the period during which the admission into the United States of alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States may be facilitated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 2558. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, with respect to certain employees of the railway mail service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 2559. A bill to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 with respect to mutual savings banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 2560. A bill to repeal certain miscellaneous excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. R. 2561. A bill to extend and liberalize World War I marriage delimiting date for the purpose of payment of compensation or pension under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 2562. A bill to provide disability and death compensation or pension in the case of members of the Enlisted Reserve of the Army who have received or are receiving training under the Army specialized training program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2563. A bill for the relief of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREHM:

H. R. 2564. A bill to amend and supplement the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653); to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2565. A bill to broaden the cooperative extension system as established in the act of May 8, 1914, and acts supplemental thereto, by providing for cooperative extension work between colleges receiving the benefits of the act and the acts of July 2, 1862, and August 30, 1890, and other qualified colleges, universities, and research agencies, and the United States Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 2566. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 2567. A bill to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act (title VI of the Public Health Service Act), to extend its duration and provide greater financial assistance in the construction of hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2568. A bill to provide credit for salary purposes to carriers advanced from the status of village delivery; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2569. A bill to abolish the village-delivery service of the Post Office Department; to transfer village carriers to the city-delivery service; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 2570. A bill to provide for the naturalization of former citizens of the United States who lost United States citizenship by voting in a political election in Italy after October 12, 1943, and before August 7, 1946; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:

H. R. 2571. A bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 2572. A bill to extend to commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey the provisions of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SANBORN:

H. R. 2573. A bill to promote the general welfare by scrapping the unsound and ruinous monetary policy which is wrecking our domestic economy and creating chaos throughout the world, and replacing it with a sound monetary system in strict accordance with article I, section 8, clause 5, of the Constitution of the United States and the act of Congress of November 1, 1893 (sec. 311, U. S. C. Annotated (ch. 8, 28 Stat. 4)), which will stabilize the currency; prevent economic collapse in the United States; give economic stability to the rest of the world; stop communism and other forms of absolutism; insure peace by eliminating the causes of war; save for the American taxpayers most of the billions of dollars proposed to be spent under the European recovery program; reduce taxes; protect our national sovereignty; preserve the American way of life; raise the American standard of living; quadruple the recoverable mineral wealth of America; make possible the profitable production here at home of 99 percent of our mineral requirements, including strategic minerals; and usher in an era of the greatest prosperity the United States has ever known; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 2574. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to announce the parity price of milk, and to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to announce immediately the support price of milk; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 2575. A bill to amend section 2402 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and to repeal section 2402 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2576. A bill to repeal the war-tax rate on toilet preparations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANBORN:

H. R. 2577. A bill to provide assistance for local school agencies in providing educational opportunities for children on Federal reservations or in defense areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 2578. A bill to provide for salary increases for each officer and employee of the Federal Government, and each officer and employee of the District of Columbia municipal government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2579. A bill to provide for salary increases for employees of the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 2580. A bill to incorporate the Gold Star Society of American War Widows and Orphans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 2581. A bill to repeal the Philippine Trade Act of 1946; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. R. 2582. A bill to exempt from income tax compensation received for service in the military or naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2583. A bill to provide for the advancement on the retired list of certain officers and enlisted men of the military, naval, and air forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 2584. A bill to promote the general welfare by providing funds to assist the several States and Territories in paying adequate salaries for the school year 1948–49 to elementary- and high-school teachers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. R. 2585. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for exemption from duty of certain metallic impurities in tin ores and concentrates when such impurities are not recovered; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 2586. A bill to relieve postmasters and other paying employees of the postal service from accountability for wrong payment of money orders in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. J. Res. 155. Joint resolution making available certain funds for relief of farmers in storm-stricken areas; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GARY:

H. J. Res. 156. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that Congress shall fill any vacancy occurring in the office of Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. J. Res. 157. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution providing for expansion and intensification of public-health research on the family aspects of chronic illnesses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. Con. Res. 30. Concurrent resolution favoring the political federation of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. Con. Res. 31. Concurrent resolution to suspend diplomatic and commercial relations with the Republic of Hungary; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TAURIELLO:

H. Con. Res. 32. Concurrent resolution to express the disapproval of the Congress of the action of the Government of Hungary in sentencing Josef Cardinal Mindszenty to life imprisonment; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. Con. Res. 33. Concurrent resolution favoring the political federation of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. Con. Res. 34. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that the issues raised by the action of the Government of Hungary in arresting and imprisoning Josef Cardinal Mindszenty should be referred to the United Nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. Con. Res. 35. Concurrent resolution protesting against the prosecution and trial of Cardinal Mindszenty by the Hungarian Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. Con. Res. 36. Concurrent resolution requesting Congress to express its disapproval of the arrest, conviction, and imprisonment by the Government of Hungary of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty and of other priests of the Roman Catholic Church; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. Res. 90. Resolution for the relief of Mrs. Emilie C. Read; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DAVIES of New York:

H. Res. 91. Resolution condemning court proceedings in the case of His Eminence Josef Cardinal Mindszenty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H. Res. 92. Resolution to protest the summary arrest and imprisonment of Cardinal Mindszenty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. Res. 94. Resolution providing for employment of two additional laborers, office of the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 2587. A bill for the relief of J. K. Barrington; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 2588. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for certain lands to V. LeBlanc and C. Riccard; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 2589. A bill for the relief of Mary Wachter Peterson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2590. A bill for the relief of Bradford N. Headley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. R. 2591. A bill for the relief of Giovanna Parisi, Michelina Valletta, Yolanda Altieri, Generosa Tamburi, Carolina Picciano, and Giovanna Turtur; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 2592. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to John White Bear a patent in fee to certain lands; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 2593. A bill for the relief of William H. Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 2594. A bill for the relief of Grace L. Elser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 2595. A bill for the relief of Joe Gillespie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois:

H. R. 2596. A bill for the relief of George Eldred Morgan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of California:

H. R. 2597. A bill for the relief of Jerome Medrano, Danise J. Medrano, Daniel Medrano, and Patrick Medrano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 2598. A bill for the relief of Sampson Ross; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2599. A bill for the relief of Lula Hickey Thomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2600. A bill for the relief of Ralph Dunsmore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2601. A bill for the relief of Michael Gladych; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2602. A bill for the relief of John B. Boyle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 2603. A bill for the relief of Anthony (Tony) Di Ina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2604. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret T. Hennessey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 2605. A bill for the relief of John C. Nunes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. R. 2606. A bill for the relief of Reuben J. Solomon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2607. A bill for the relief of Antonio Antunes Martins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 2608. A bill for the relief of C. H. Dutton Co., of Kalamazoo, Mich.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. Res. 93. Resolution for the relief of John F. Schmelzer and Alliance Insurance Co.; to the Committee on House Administration.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

56. Mr. HART presented a petition of Samuel Solomon, of Union City, N. J., urging that rent control be extended for 1 year, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

OATH OF OFFICE, MEMBERS AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

> "I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfuly discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by each of the following Members and Delegates of the Eighty-first Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the Eightieth Congress entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 25), approved February 18, 1948:

ALABAMA

1. Frank W. Boykin.
2. George M. Grant.
3. George Andrews.
4. Sam Hobbs.
5. Albert Rains.
6. Edward deGraffenried.
7. Carl Elliott.
8. Robert E. Jones, Jr.
9. Laurie Calvin Battle.

ARIZONA

At large

1. John R. Murdock.
2. Harold A. Patten.

ARKANSAS

1. E. C. Gathings.
2. Wilbur D. Mills.
3. J. W. Trimble.
4. Boyd Tackett.
5. Brooks Hays.
6. W. F. Norrell.
7. Oren Harris.

CALIFORNIA

1. Hubert B. Scudder.
2. Clair Engle.
3. Leroy Johnson.
4. Franck R. Havenner.
5. Richard J. Welch.
6. George P. Miller.
7. John J. Allen, Jr.
8. Jack Z. Anderson.
9. Cecil F. White.
10. Thomas H. Werdel.
11. Ernest K. Bramblett.
12. Richard Nixon.
13. Norris Poulson.
14. Helen Gahagan Douglas.
15. Gordon L. McDonough.
16. Donald L. Jackson.
17. Cecil R. King.
18. Clyde Doyle.
19. Chet Holifield.
20. Carl Hinshaw.
21. Harry R. Sheppard.
22. John Phillips.
23. Clinton D. McKinnon.

COLORADO

1. John A. Carroll.
2. William S. Hill.
3. John H. Marsalis.
4. Wayne N. Aspinall.

CONNECTICUT

1. Abraham A. Ribicoff.
2. Chase Going Woodhouse.
3. John A. McGuire.
4. John Davis' Lodge.
5. James T. Patterson.

At large

Antoni N. Sadlak.

DELAWARE

At large

James Caleb Boggs.

FLORIDA

1. J. Hardin Peterson.
2. Charles E. Bennett.
3. Robert Sikes.
4. George A. Smathers.
5. A. S. Herlong, Jr.
6. Dwight L. Rogers.

GEORGIA

1. Prince H. Preston.
2. E. E. Cox.
3. Stephen Pace.
4. A. Sidney Camp.
5. James C. Davis.
6. Carl Vinson.
7. Henderson Lanham.
8. W. M. (Don) Wheeler.
9. John S. Wood.
10. Paul Brown.

IDAHO

1. Compton I. White.
2. John C. Sanborn.

ILLINOIS

1. William L. Dawson.
2. Barratt O'Hara.
3. Neil J. Linehan.
4. James V. Buckley.
5. Martin Gorski.
6. Thomas J. O'Brien.
7. Adolph J. Sabath.
8. Thomas S. Gordon.
9. Sidney R. Yates.
10. Richard W. Hoffman.
11. Chester A. Chesney.
12. Edgar A. Jonas.
13. Ralph E. Church.
14. Chauncey W. Reed.
15. Noah M. Mason.
16. Leo E. Allen.
17. Leslie C. Arends.
18. Harold H. Velde.
19. Robert B. Chiperfield.
20. Sid Simpson.
21. Peter F. Mack, Jr.
22. Rolla C. McMillen.
23. Edward H. Jenison.
24. Charles W. Vursell.
25. Melvin Price.
26. C. W. Bishop.

INDIANA

1. Ray J. Madden.
2. Charles A. Halleck.
3. Thurman C. Crook.
4. Edward H. Krause, Jr.
5. John R. Walsh.
6. Cecil M. Harden.
7. James E. Noland.
8. Winfield K. Denton.
9. Earl Wilson.
10. Ralph Harvey.
11. Andrew Jacobs.

IOWA

1. Thomas E. Martin.
2. Henry O. Talle.
3. H. R. Gross.
4. K. M. LeCompte.
5. Paul Cunningham.
6. James I. Dolliver.
7. Ben F. Jensen.
8. Charles B. Hoeven.

KANSAS

1. Albert M. Cole.
2. Errett P. Scrivner.
3. Herbert A. Meyer.
4. Edward H. Rees.
5. Clifford R. Hope.
6. Wint Smith.

KENTUCKY

1. Noble J. Gergory.
2. John Albert Whitaker.
3. Thruston B. Morton.
4. Frank L. Chelf.
5. Brent Spence.
6. Thomas Rust Underwood.
7. Carl D. Perkins.
8. Joe B. Bates.
9. James S. Golden.

LOUISIANA

1. F. Edward Hébert.
2. Hale Boggs.
3. E. E. Willis.
4. Overton Brooks.
5. Otto E. Passman.
6. James H. Morrison.
7. Henry D. Larcade, Jr.
8. A. Leonard Allen.

MAINE

1. Robert Hale.
2. Charles P. Nelson.
3. Frank Fellows.

MARYLAND

1. Edward T. Miller.
2. William P. Bolton.
3. Edward A. Garmatz.
4. George H. Fallon.
5. Lansdale G. Sasscer.
6. J. Glenn Beall.

MASSACHUSETTS

1. John W. Heselton.
2. Foster Furcolo.
3. Philip J. Philbin.
4. Harold D. Donohue.
5. Edith Nourse Rogers.
6. George J. Bates.
7. Thomas J. Lane.
8. Angier L. Goodwin.
9. Donald W. Nicholson.
10. Christian A. Herter.
11. John F. Kennedy.
12. John W. McCormack.
13. Richard B. Wigglesworth.
14. Joseph W. Martin, Jr.

MICHIGAN

1. George G. Sadowski.
2. Earl C. Michener.
3. Paul W. Shafer.
4. Clare E. Hoffman.
5. Gerald R. Ford, Jr.
6. William W. Blackney.
7. Jesse P. Wolcott.
8. Fred L. Crawford.
9. Albert J. Engel.
10. Roy O. Woodruff.
11. Charles E. Potter.
12. John B. Bennett.
13. George D. O'Brien.
14. Louis C. Rabaut.
15. John D. Dingell.
16. John Lesinski.
17. George A. Dondero.

MINNESOTA

1. August H. Andresen.
2. Joseph P. O'Hara.
3. Roy W. Wier.
4. Eugene J. McCarthy.
5. Walter H. Judd.
6. Fred Marshall.
7. H. Carl Andersen.
8. John A. Blatnik.
9. Harold C. Hagen.

MISSISSIPPI

1. John E. Rankin.
2. Jamie L. Whitten.
3. Will. M. Whittington.
4. Thos. G. Abernethy.
5. Arthur Winstead.
6. Wm. M. Colmer.
7. John Bell Williams.

MISSOURI

1. Clare Magee.
2. Morgan M. Moulder.
3. Phil J. Welch.
4. Leonard Irving.
5. Richard Bolling.
6. Geo. H. Christopher.
7. Dewey Short.
8. A. S. J. Carnahan.
9. Clarence Cannon.
10. Paul C. Jones.
11. John B. Sullivan.
12. Ray W. Karst.
13. Frank M. Karsten.

MONTANA

1. Mike Mansfield.
2. Wesley A. D'Ewart.

NEBRASKA

1. Carl T. Curtis.
2. Eugene D. O'Sullivan.
3. Karl Stefan.
4. A. L. Miller.

NEVADA

At Large

Walter S. Baring.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

1. Chester E. Merrow.
2. Norris Cotton.

NEW JERSEY

1. Charles A. Wolverton.
2. T. Millet Hand.
3. James C. Auchincloss.
4. Charles R. Howell.
5. Charles A. Eaton.
6. Clifford P. Case.
7. J. Parnell Thomas.
8. Gordon Canfield.
9. Harry L. Towe.
10. Peter W. Rodino, Jr.
11. Hugh J. Addonizio.
12. Robert Winthrop Kean.
13. Mary T. Norton.
14. Edward J. Hart.

NEW MEXICO

At Large

A. M. Fernandez.
John E. Miles.

NEW YORK

1. W. Kingsland Macy.
2. Leonard W. Hall.
3. Henry J. Latham.
4. L. Gary Clemente.
5. T. Vincent Quinn.
6. James J. Delaney.
7. [Vacant.][1]
8. Joseph L. Pfeifer.
9. Eugene J. Keogh.
10. Andrew L. Somers.
11. James Heffernan.
12. John J. Rooney.
13. Donald L. O'Toole.
14. Abraham J. Multer.
15. Emanuel Celler.
16. James J. Murphy.
17. Frederic R. Coudert, Jr.
18. Vito Marcantonio.
19. Arthur G. Klein.
20. Sol Bloom.
21. Jacob K. Javits.
22. Adam Clayton Powell, Jr.
23. Walter A. Lynch.
24. Isidore Dollinger.
25. Charles A. Buckley.
26. Christopher C. McGrath.
27. Ralph W. Gwinn.
28. Ralph A. Gamble.
29. Katherine St. George.
30. Jay LeFevre
31. Bernard W. Kearney.
32. William T. Byrne.
33. Dean P. Taylor.
34. Clarence E. Kilburn.
35. John C. Davies.
36. R. Walter Riehlman.
37. Edwin Arthur Hall.
38. John Taber.
39. W. Sterling Cole.
40. Kenneth B. Keating.
41. James W. Wadsworth.
42. William L. Pfeiffer.
43. Anthony F. Tauriello.
44. Chester C. Gorski.
45. Daniel A. Reed.

NORTH CAROLINA

1. Herbert C. Bonner.
2. John H. Kerr.

[1] Representative-elect John J. Delaney died Nov. 18, 1948.

3. Graham A. Barden.
4. Harold D. Cooley.
5. Thurmond Chatham.
6. Carl T. Durham.
7. F. Ertel Carlyle.
8. Charles B. Deane.
9. Robert L. Doughton.
10. Hamilton C. Jones.
11. A. L. Bulwinkle.
12. Monroe M. Redden.

NORTH DAKOTA

At large

William Lemke.
Usher L. Burdick.

OHIO

1. Charles H. Elston.
2. Earl T. Wagner.
3. Edward Breen.
4. William M. McCulloch.
5. Cliff Clevenger.
6. James G. Polk.
7. Clarence J. Brown.
8. Frederick C. Smith.
9. Thomas H. Burke.
10. Thomas A. Jenkins.
11. Walter E. Brehm.
12. John M. Vorys.
13. Alvin F. Weichel.
14. Walter B. Huber.
15. Robert T. Secrest.
16. John McSweeney.
17. J. Harry McGregor.
18. Wayne L. Hays.
19. Michael J. Kirwan.
20. Michael A. Feighan.
21. Robert Crosser.
22. Frances P. Bolton.

At large

Stephen M. Young.

OKLAHOMA

1. Dixie Gilmer.
2. William G. Stigler.
3. Carl Albert.
4. Tom Steed.
5. Mike Monroney.
6. Toby Morris.
7. Victor Wickersham.
8. Geo. Howard Wilson.

OREGON

1. Walter Norblad.
2. Lowell Stockman.
3. Homer D. Angell.
4. Harris Ellsworth.

PENNSYLVANIA

1. William A. Barrett.
2. William T. Granahan.
3. Hardie Scott.
4. Earl Chudoff.
5. William J. Green, Jr.
6. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
7. Benjamin F. James.
8. Franklin H. Lichtenwalter.
9. Paul B. Dague.
10. Harry P. O'Neil.
11. Daniel J. Flood.
12. Ivor D. Fenton.
13. George M. Rhodes.
14. Wilson D. Gillette.
15. Robert F. Rich.
16. Samuel K. McConnell, Jr.
17. Richard M. Simpson.
18. John C. Kunkel.
19. L. H. Gavin.
20. Francis E. Walter.
21. James F. Lind.
22. James E. Van Zandt.
23. Anthony Cavalcante.
24. Thomas E. Morgan.
25. Louis E. Graham.
26. Robert L. Coffee, Jr.
27. Augustine B. Kelley.
28. Carroll D. Kearns.
29. Harry J. Davenport.
30. Robert J. Corbett.
31. James G. Fulton.
32. Herman P. Eberharter.
33. Frank Buchanan.

RHODE ISLAND

1. Aime J. Forand.
2. John E. Fogarty.

SOUTH CAROLINA

1. L. Mendel Rivers.
2. Hugo S. Sims, Jr.
3. James Butler Hare.
4. Jos. R. Bryson.
5. James P. Richards.
6. John L. McMillan.

SOUTH DAKOTA

1. Harold O. Lovre.
2. Francis Case.

TENNESSEE

1. Dayton E. Phillips.
2. John Jennings, Jr.
3. James B. Frazier, Jr.
4. Albert Gore.
5. Joe L. Evins.
6. J. Percy Priest.
7. Pat Sutton.
8. Tom Murray.
9. Jere Cooper.
10. Clifford Davis.

TEXAS

1. Wright Patman.
2. J. M. Combs.
3. Lindley Beckworth.
4. Sam Rayburn.
5. J. Frank Wilson.
6. Olin E. Teague.
7. Tom Pickett.
8. Albert Thomas.
9. Clark W. Thompson.
10. Homer Thornberry.
11. W. R. Poage.
12. Wingate H. Lucas.
13. Ed Gossett.
14. John E. Lyle, Jr.
15. Lloyd M. Bentson, Jr.
16. Ken Regan.
17. Omar Burleson.
18. Eugene Worley.
19. George Mahon.
20. Paul J. Kilday.
21. O. C. Fisher.

UTAH

1. W. K. Granger.
2. Reva Beck Bosone.

VERMONT

At large

Charles A. Plumley.

VIRGINIA

1. Schuyler Otis Bland.
2. Porter Hardy, Jr.
3. J. Vaughn Gary.
4. W. M. Abbitt.
5. Thos. B. Stanley.
6. Clarence G. Burton.
7. Burr P. Harrison.
8. Howard W. Smith.
9. Tom B. Fugate.

WASHINGTON

1. Hugh B. Mitchell.
2. Henry M. Jackson.
3. Russell V. Mack.
4. Hal Holmes.
5. Walt. Horan.
6. Thor C. Tollefson.

WEST VIRGINIA

1. Robert L. Ramsay.
2. Harley O. Staggers.
3. Cleveland M. Bailey.
4. M. G. Burnside.
5. John Kee.
6. Erland H. Hedrick.

WISCONSIN

1. Lawrence H. Smith.
2. Glenn R. Davis.
3. Gardner R. Withrow.
4. Clement J. Zablocki.
5. Andrew J. Biemiller.
6. Frank B. Keefe.
7. Reid F. Murray.
8. John W. Byrnes.
9. Merlin Hull.
10. Alvin E. O'Konski.

WYOMING

At large

Frank A. Barrett.

ALASKA

Delegate

E. L. Bartlett.

HAWAII

Delegate

Joseph R. Farrington.

PUERTO RICO

Resident Commissioner

A. Fernós-Isern.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1949

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, all the ways of our direst needs lead to Thee and to Thy everlasting mercy. For this quiet moment before the pressing concerns of a new day move in upon us, wilt Thou lift us from the confusion and bafflement of these desperate times into the unhurried, healing calm of Thy presence. Solemnize us with the responsibility of ability, as we face decisions affecting the lives and fortunes of untold millions who look eagerly to these halls of council for the wise word and the right action. Grant us so to know Thee that we may truly love Thee, and so to love Thee that we may freely serve Thee, to the honor and glory of Thy great Name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 8, 1949, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on February 9, 1949, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 547) to

continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 128) to provide that acreage planted to cotton in 1949 shall not be used in computing cotton acreage allotments for any subsequent year; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and that Mr. COOLEY, Mr. PACE, Mr. POAGE, Mr. HOPE, and Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1211. An act to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 1243. An act to amend the Hatch Act.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 19) to express the sense of the Congress with respect to the arrest and imprisonment of Archbishop Stepinac of Yugoslavia and Cardinal Mindszenty of Hungary, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

TRIAL AND SENTENCE OF JOSEF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I inquire, did not the Senate meet after an adjournment, and are we not in the morning hour?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. There is no objection, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. BRIDGES. Reserving the right to object, I shall not object to the Senator's request, but I should like to point out——

Mr. TYDINGS. I may say to the Senator that the matter about which I desire to make a short statement is one of great public interest at the present time.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not intend to object, but I point out that objection was raised when I made a request a few days ago, and I am not going to see the rule generally violated and then have its enforcement applied to this side of the aisle, particularly to me personally. But I shall not object in the present instance.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wish to say that I agree with the Senator from New Hampshire. I did not object to his request.

Mr. BRIDGES. I know the Senator did not.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator looked at me as though I might have made the objection.

Mr. BRIDGES. Oh, no.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the trial and sentencing of Cardinal Mindszenty makes one of the darkest spots on the pages of history. It is a throwback to barbarism; to human slavery of both the mind and body.

Freedom of thought was put on trial, and one of the world's leading church figures was humiliated because of the exercise of this God-given right.

Freedom of religion was put on trial, and the great prelate was condemned because he would not renounce his God.

Freedom of conscience was put on trial, and this towering pillar of the church was humbled because he would not barter away his sense of right and wrong.

Cardinal Mindszenty made the decision to be a free man rather than a tool; to be a man of God rather than a cog in an evil machine; to be a proud patriot rather than a slinking traitor; to be a martyr rather than let the dark night, with its human bondage, fall upon his people unchallenged.

Before the jury of the civilized world, he stands forth as innocent. In the eyes of the world this courtroom in Hungary will be known, not as a temple of justice, but the temple of shame.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Humphrey	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Ives	Pepper
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Broughton	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cain	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Capehart	Kerr	Schoeppel
Chapman	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Chavez	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Connally	Langer	Sparkman
Cordon	Lodge	Stennis
Douglas	Long	Taft
Eastland	Lucas	Taylor
Ferguson	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Frear	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Fulbright	McGrath	Thye
George	McKellar	Tobey
Gillette	McMahon	Tydings
Gurney	Magnuson	Watkins
Hayden	Maybank	Wherry
Hendrickson	Miller	Willey
Hickenlooper	Morse	Williams
Hill	Mundt	Withers
Hoey	Myers	Young
Holland	Neely	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent on public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

READING OF GEORGE WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under a permanent order of the Senate it becomes the duty of the Presiding Officer to designate some Senator to read the Farewell Address of George Washington on the 22d day of this month. The appointment alternates between the two parties. This year the appointment falls to the Republican side of the Chamber, and the Chair takes pleasure in designating the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] to read the Farewell Address on the 22d.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred, as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF UNITED NATIONS PARTICIPATION ACT OF 1945

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such organizations (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CERTAIN INCREASES IN ANNUITIES UNDER FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System in view of the increased cost of living (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CONSOLIDATION OF PARKER DAM AND DAVIS DAM PROJECTS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to consolidate the Parker Dam power project and the Davis Dam project (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF OFFICE OF UNITED STATES HIGH COMMISSIONER TO THE PHILIPPINES

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Office of the United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands who suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION CHARTER AND STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS STOCK PILING ACTS

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the thirteenth annual report of that Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948, together with lists containing the names, salaries, and duties of all employees and officers in the employ or under the supervision of the Board (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF NATIONAL SOCIETY OF DAUGHTERS OF AMERICAN REVOLUTION

A letter from the secretary, National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that society, for the year ended April 1, 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on personnel management in the executive branch of the Government (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

TASK FORCE REPORT ON FEDERAL PERSONNEL

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report prepared by the Personnel Policy Committee of the Commission on Federal Personnel entitled "Programs for Strengthening Federal Personnel Management" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial 2

"Joint memorial by the Nineteenth Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact specific legislation that will provide adequate assistance to all needy Indians now residing on reservations

"Whereas there are various tribes of Indians within the State of New Mexico who live on reservations under Federal supervision and control; and

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has held that reservation Indians are wards of the Federal Government and, therefore, under the complete jurisdiction and control of Congress; and

"Whereas the relief and welfare needs of these Indians have been generally considered to be the responsibility of the Federal Government in the same manner as the health and education needs of reservation Indians; and

"Whereas many of the needs of some tribes have been so inadequately met by the Federal Government and these tribes have been reduced to such a low level of squalor and misery that rehabilitation and relief will be a very expensive undertaking; and

"Whereas the provisions of the Social Security Act impose upon the State of New Mexico a responsibility to Indians on reservations in spite of the fact that they are wards of the Federal Government; and

"Whereas the State of New Mexico, with a low per capita income, finds it very difficult to provide revenue to meet the current assistance requirements of its needy population; and

"Whereas if New Mexico must provide additional revenue for assistance to reservation Indians, assistance levels for all needy persons in the State could not and would not approach a standard compatible with decency and health: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby memorialized to enact adequate legislation that will provide to needy Indians monetary assistance which cannot be provided through State funds and Federal funds available under the present matching formula of the Social Security Act.

"Approved by me this 31st day of January 1949.

"THOMAS J. MABRY,
"*Governor, State of New Mexico.*"

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Whereas Josef Cardinal Mindszenty is suffering the cruelest persecution of mind and soul for his faith in God and the love of his fellowmen; and

"Whereas his torturers are the enemies of God and all freedom loving men; and

"Whereas his mock trial represents the cruel din of the dirge of infamy calling upon the hapless minions of communism to open warfare against God-fearing people throughout the world; and

"Whereas freedom of religion and its expression are the strongest citadel against the onslaughts of communism; and

"Whereas the eradication of the belief in God is the first order of communistic expansion; and

"Whereas communistic warfare is waged alike against all religion; and

"Whereas this inhuman episode, called a trial, brings out in the open, with all its panoply of barbaric raiment, the destardly, demoralizing, and destructive figure of atheistic communism; and

"Whereas the mockery of this trial has laid bare the sword of Attila which would destroy all who stand in the way of communism; and

"Whereas because of its implications, the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty is of most serious concern to the people of the world, for it is a method to deprive these people of their inalienable right to freedom of worship; and

"Whereas we shrink in horror as we contemplate what further acts of cruelty and vandalism will be perpetrated against those in the world who dare place God above paganism, liberty above tyranny and life above mass slavery; and

"Whereas in our sorrow at the shame inflicted upon this good man, we condemn those in power in that unhappy land of Hungary, the devilish perpetrators of torture of sham trial; and call upon our Government to take appropriate action in response to the will of the greatest majority of our citizens: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved* (*if the senate concur*), That the Legislature of the State of New York call upon our Congress and our President to take immediate and appropriate action to request United Nations to inquire into the reported deliberate and wanton disregard of the freedom of religion, and the torture and drugging of the accused and the denial to the accused of the most elemental rights at his trial; and upon such findings being made, to take such action as shall be appropriate; and be it further

"*Resolved* (*if the senate concur*), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each member of the Congress from the State of New York."

A resolution adopted at a conference of 400 civic leaders and representatives in Greenwich Village, New York, N. Y., favoring an immediate price freeze; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by locals Nos. 1584, 1674, 1717, and 1737, International Longshoremen's Association, of Santiago, Humacao, P. R., favoring the inclusion of Puerto Rico in the provisions of the so-called minimum-wage law; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the United States, praying for the enactment of legislation to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the United States and Puerto Rico, praying for the enactment of legislation providing Federal aid to education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted at a conference of 400 civic leaders and representatives in Greenwich Village, New York, N. Y., relating to national health insurance legislation; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the National Renderers Association, Washington, D. C., favoring exemption of edible and inedible vegetable and animal fats and oils and oil-bearing materials from provisions of export control extension legislation; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. HUNT (for himself and Mr. O'MAHONEY):

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, favoring the enactment of legislation appropriating sufficient money to complete the building of the Eden Valley irrigation project; to the Committee on Appropriations.

(See joint memorial printed in full when presented by the Vice President on February 8, 1949 (p. 933), CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

MAINTENANCE OF PARITY ON BASIC FARM CROPS

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I present a concurrent resolution adopted by the North Dakota State Legislature requesting 100-percent price support, and ask for its appropriate reference, and I request that it be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution A

Concurrent resolution petitioning Congress to enact permanent legislation to maintain a floor of not less than 100 percent of parity on all basic farm crops

Whereas it must be self-evident that if we are to avoid lower living standards and if this national debt is to be serviced and paid, it must be through the production of new wealth from the natural resources of the United States; and

We therefore recommend that the Eighty-first Congress enact legislation in 1949 which will first provide a new parity formula which is fair to farmers and to the consumers of the Nation. We recommend that support prices be established pursuant to this fair parity formula under which farmers shall

be assured not of fractional parity but of 100 percent of the parity prices. These prices should be consistent with the objective of abundant production. We believe that in the new legislation, account should be taken where they have an opportunity for decent living standards, including adequate health protection, good housing, and better educational opportunities for farm children: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the senate concurring therein), That we hereby petition Congress to pass permanent legislation to maintain a floor of not less than 100 percent of parity on all basic farm crops, to protect such floor prices with commodity loans of like amount and to prescribe such import duties, excise taxes, or quotas on competitive imports as may be needed to maintain these price levels and our national income and to equalize the differential between the dollar value of our production and that of foreign countries; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution properly authenticated be forwarded by the Secretary of State to the presiding officer of each House of the National Congress and to each of the United States Senators and Representatives from North Dakota, and the Department of Agriculture and Labor at Washington, D. C.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

RESOLUTIONS OF WOMEN'S PATRIOTIC CONFERENCE ON NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, at the meeting of the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, held in Washington from January 27 to January 29, a number of resolutions were adopted. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 1

Faith in American constitutional government

Whereas the American people have developed under the Constitution of the United States into a most powerful nation; and

Whereas the abandonment of the wise counsel adopted by the Founding Fathers as set forth in Washington's Farewell Address has brought about many evils: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense call upon the membership of its constituent societies for a rededication of effort to restore the pure American doctrine of constitutional, representative, limited government—a government to be supported and controlled by the people in a free economy, independent of foreign ideologies and strict observance of all rights, privileges and immunities guaranteed to the separate States and to the people by the Constitution of the United States.

Resolution 2

Oath of loyalty

Whereas taking the Oath of Loyalty to our Country by anyone holding public office is a privilege which would be welcomed by any loyal American: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense urge the President of the United States and the agencies working under executive order to require the oath of loyalty to be taken by all holding public office.

Resolution 3

National Security Act

Whereas our country has grown stronger during the 18 months since the National Security Act of 1947 became law, and

Whereas substantial progress in the unification of the armed forces has been made in the past year: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense recommend to the Congress of the United States that no radical changes be made in the National Security Act of 1947.

Resolution 4

Army Day

Whereas Army Day is to be officially celebrated on April 6, 1949; and

Whereas this day of the present year is of urgent importance to the security of the Nation and the peace of the world by its effectiveness in making the American people aware of the positive need for a strong armed defense; and

Whereas it is the duty of every American citizen and every American organization to give the fullest possible support to the armed forces, their preservation, their personnel needs, and the maintenance of their equipment: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense endorse the principles and purposes of Army Day and call upon each and every organization represented in the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense to give every possible support to the full success of Army Day, April 6, 1949.

Resolution 5

Universal military training

Whereas the American Legion Auxiliary is and always has been for universal military training; and

Whereas adequate preparedness is the best protection against wars and the needless sacrifice of human lives; and

Whereas a citizenry trained for defense is the keystone of preparedness and can best be assured through the training of the Nation's youth for national security: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we request the participating groups of the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense to instruct their members to urgently request their Senators and Representatives to vote favorably on universal military training; that the participating groups be urged to institute forthwith a program of information and education for the benefit of the American people that they may understand the importance of immediate action on this measure, and the dangers to our homes and to our country which require its enactment without delay; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States and to all newspapers and civic agencies.

Resolution 6

Voluntary enlistment program

Whereas the United States Army and United States Air Force are striving to maintain their personnel through voluntary-enlistment procedure; and

Whereas voluntary enlistment must gain complete and aggressive public support; and

Whereas the women of the Nation can and must be a vital factor in promoting public support of the United States Army and United States Air Force, their manpower needs and their place in American life: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense endorse the voluntary-enlistment program of the United States Army and United States Air Force and call upon all organizations represented in this conference to give full support to that program by disseminating information on Army and Air Force life and by influencing young men and women of the United States to accept the Army and Air Force as honorable institutions in which young men and women can find a worthwhile career.

Resolution 7

Defense of Alaska

Whereas it is admitted by competent and high authority in our armed services that Alaska now is vulnerable to attack by air from bases under Communist control that are only 30 air-miles from the shores of Alaska; and

Whereas this proximity of attack constitutes a great immediate danger: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense petition Congress to give priority to the defense needs and requirements of Alaska in its consideration of any and all appropriations for the stated purpose of checking the advance of communism anywhere in the world.

Resolution 8

Increase in pay for the armed services

Whereas it is essential, if we are to have a sound national defense, that the housing and pay of the armed services be such as to attract the highest possible caliber of men and women for careers as leaders therein; and

Whereas although the cost of living in the United States has increased 71 percent in the last 10 years and the wages and salaries of workers, professional men, and management generally have increased proportionately, the pay schedules of the career personnel of the armed services have lagged far behind with increases varying from 9 percent to 21 percent for commissioned personnel above the grade of second lieutenant and from 36 percent to 75 percent for second lieutenants and noncommissioned officers; and

Whereas the present housing, particularly for married commissioned and noncommissioned officers, is completely inadequate at all stations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense sponsor and advocate an appropriate and adequate increase in the pay for commissioned and noncommissioned officers of the armed services as recommended by the Hook commission; and that further, they sponsor and advocate increased appropriations for the construction of adequate housing for the personnel of the armed services.

Resolution 9

Unions servicing the merchant marine

Whereas evidence establishes the fact that Communists and their fellow travelers control key posts in the unions which service our merchant marine; and

Whereas in case of war this could easily result in the defeat of this country: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense urge upon Congress to enact appropriate legislation to give power to law-enforcement agencies to make such Communist control of unions servicing the merchant marine impossible.

Resolution 10

Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act

Whereas a healthy economy is necessary to a strong national defense; and

Whereas high wages and full employment form the foundation of a healthy economy; and

Whereas the products of other countries made by workers paid much less than workers producing comparable goods in this country can only result in increasing unemployment, a weakening of our economy and our strength for national defense; and

Whereas the reciprocal trade agreements program has removed protection from our high-paid workers against the unfair competition of the low-paid workers of other countries, thereby threatening jobs of workers in industries important to our national defense; and

Whereas as a result the reduction of tariffs incident to the adoption of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, grave injury already has been inflicted upon various industries in this country important to our national defense program; and

Whereas imports into our country should be controlled by the imposition of proper tariffs by the exercise of our own sovereign right to serve as an equalizing balance between the low wages of other countries and the high wages of the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense urge upon Congress the repeal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act as constituting an ever-present menace to our national defense and our economy and an unwarranted encroachment by the executive branch of the Government upon the legislative powers conferred upon Congress by the Constitution of the United States.

Resolution 11

Subversive teaching of youth

Whereas the future of our country rests with those now constituting the youth of our land; and

Whereas many persons with ideals contrary to the Constitution and the principles on which it is based, have managed to obtain places as instructors in many of our educational systems; and

Whereas through the work of these persons and others interested in a government contrary to that of the United States of America, the basic principles of this Government are not clearly understood by many of our young citizens: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense disapprove un-American and subversive teachings and that all necessary steps be taken to prevent subversive teachings of our youth.

Resolution 12

Teaching American history and civics

Whereas the youth of the United States of America may be inducted into military service at 18 years of age under the present emergency draft bill; and

Whereas under the educational system of today youth does not thoroughly understand the functions of our Government and the rights of American heritage: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense recommend that a 4-year course in civics and American history be required in all secondary schools throughout the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the National Director of Education, the director of education in every State, the president of the Parent-Teachers Association and the national presidents of all teachers' associations.

Resolution 13

Text and reference books

Whereas the loose interpretation and even deliberate misrepresentation of true historical facts concerning the integrity of great Americans and of the principles of the Government of the United States is subtly and dangerously implanting un-American ideas in the minds of our children through the use of textbooks, biographies, reference books, and by word of mouth: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense urge the governors of the various States to appoint commissions to investigate textbooks and reference books in use in their respective States.

Resolution 14

Opposition to Federal aid to education

Whereas there has been a bill for Federal aid to education for more than a dozen years; and

Whereas it has always been rejected because it would result eventually in Federal control since the Supreme Court has ruled that whatever the Government subsidizes it may control; and

Whereas it is not needed because the States have large surpluses and few debts, while the Federal Government has debts above $252,000,000,000; and

Whereas these bills purport to equalize education, they give to the rich States equally with the poor States; and

Whereas giving to the rich States might secure the votes necessary to pass these measures, it would bring them all under the same political control: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense oppose all Federal aid to education bills that are now before Congress.

Resolution 15

Defense of constitutional rights

Whereas the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, historically and by convention mandate and policy, has stated its beliefs in the inherent constitutional and equal rights of all Americans; and

Whereas, the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense has decried mob violence, lynching, and religious hatreds, and has unequivocally favored tolerance, human rights, and an end to racial strife; and

Whereas the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense proudly states that great progress has been made, and is being made in these vital and important fields of human relationships: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense reaffirm its policy in regard to tolerance and human rights, and call upon its constituent organizations to support and seriously work toward the accomplishment of the ideals these enumerate.

Resolution 16

Treaty ratification

Whereas the founding fathers wisely provided that all agreements of a treaty nature with foreign nations must obtain the approval of a two-thirds vote of the Senate of the United States; and

Whereas this two-thirds provision was placed in the Constitution by the founding fathers as one of the many checks therein to protect the rights of minorities against the oppression of one-vote majorities; and

Whereas our form of government is the only one in the world today that provides protection and guaranties for minorities; and

Whereas one of the most insidious forms of attack upon our national security is the undermining of the rights of minorities in order that mob rule might prevail as it does elsewhere in the world: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense is opposed to any weakening of our national security by any change in the present two-thirds Senate treaty confirmation requirement of the Constitution.

Resolution 17

Geneva Conference proposals for control of communications

Whereas the United Nations Charter expressly states in article 2, paragraph 7: "Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require the members to submit such matters to settlement under the present Charter"; and

Whereas the proposals made at the Geneva Conference, April 1948, for international control of the press, news sources, and communication systems are un-American in principle and against the public interest, and not in accordance with article 2, paragraph 7 of the United Nations Charter: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense recommend that the Senate decline to ratify any treaty for the international control of press, news, and communications.

Resolution 18

Opposing world government

Whereas the need for understanding and cooperation among nations as developed under the Charter of the United Nations is a matter of immediate concern to all patriotic Americans; and

Whereas this concern in the hearts of loyal Americans, offers an opportunity to those who would destroy our Nation and encourages their attempt to set up a world government which would abrogate national sovereignty; and

Whereas a world government would mean world citizenship and thus the abolition of all our country's immigration laws; and would mean world money and thus reduce our country's money to the level of that of all other countries in the world: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense declare itself as fully supporting the principle of world cooperation through sincere and candid cooperation among all nations; and that it declare itself also as uncompromisingly opposed to a world government with a supreme authority over all National Governments; and be it further

Resolved, That the Conference impress upon its members the urgent need of informing themselves and others as to the vast and vital difference between World Cooperation and World Government.

Resolution 19

Revocation of United States citizenship

Whereas the several proposal plans for "world government" involve surrender of the independence and sovereignty of the United States of America and our ultimate submission to the tyranny of a world-governing bureaucracy under either Socialist or Communist control: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense urge the Congress of the United States to enact legislation under which naturalized citizens working under the cloak of "world government" to undermine our Constitution, shall be subject to revocation of citizenship.

Resolution 20

Un-American activities

Resolved, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense request the Congress of the United States to print 1,000,000 copies of the following six booklets:

One Hundred Things You Should Know About Communism in the United States of America.

One Hundred Things You Should Know About Communism and Religion.

One Hundred Things You Should Know About Communism and Education.

One Hundred Things You Should Know About Communism and Labor.

One Hundred Things You Should Know About Communism and Government.

The Communist Party of the United States as an Agent of a Foreign Power.

Resolution 21

Assistance to Republic of China

Whereas the great nation of China has for many years mutually enjoyed a traditional friendship with our Nation; and

Whereas Chinese Communists are seizing control of much of China as well as Manchuria; and

Whereas the fall of China into Communist hands would constitute an irreparable loss and great defeat for the United States, necessitating large expenditures in defenses for Alaska, Japan, and the Philippines: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense urge immediate aid to China as necessary to insure the future peace of our Nation.

Resolution 22

To outlaw the Communist Party

Whereas the spread of communism is increasing throughout the world and is becoming more evident in the United States; and

Whereas communism is inimical to our form of government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense urge Congress to enact legislation to outlaw the Communist Party in the United States.

Resolution 23

Recognizing and exposing communism

Whereas this Nation was founded upon the principles of freedom under law, private enterprise, and individual responsibility, by means of which it has endured with phenomenal development and security; and

Whereas our Nation now is threatened by the presence of an ideology in the form of communism and Fabian socialism completely contrary to our principles, which ideology seeks to destroy our form of government and our American way of living by subtle infiltration into many American groups; into schools and colleges in the name of youth movements; into women's groups in the name of peace; into labor groups in the name of higher wages and control; and even into church and patriotic organizations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense call upon its entire membership to adopt a policy of informing themselves intelligently on the theory and manner of this threatening intrusion and to dedicate themselves, not casually, but earnestly to the business of recognizing and exposing communism wherever it is seeking to entrench itself or has already done so.

Resolution 24

Un-American Activities Committee

Whereas recent events have demonstrated that national security requires full cooperation from the Chief Executive and the Attorney General in releasing information (other than top military secrets) to congressional committees: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense petition the House to retain and strengthen the House Un-American Activities Committee and grant the committee ample funds to carry on its important work in exposing the obstructionists and enemies within our ranks; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States and to the Secretary of Defense.

Resolution 25

Commendation of Congress

Resolved, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense commend the action taken by Congress in citing for contempt the script and scenario writers who refused to answer questions of the House Committee To Investigate Un-American Activities as to whether they were or had ever been members of the Communist Party.

Resolution 26

Communists employed by Government

Whereas it is a well-established fact that there are many persons now employed in our Government who are members of the Communist Party, or members of Communist-front organizations; and

Whereas it has been proved beyond any doubt that the beliefs and purposes of the Communist Party and these organizations are entirely opposed to the principles on which the laws and ideals of our country are based: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense urge the President of the United States of America, and those in charge of all branches of our Government, to free all Government offices of any and all persons who are affiliated with the Communist Party, or any of the several Communist-front organizations, and that a most careful screening be used in the future to prevent the hiring of such persons.

Resolution 27

State socialism

Whereas all countries which have sacrificed civic freedoms because of false propaganda promising peace and prosperity in exchange for their sovereignty; and

Whereas all countries embracing such socialistic controls have suffered military defeat in war, and misery and starvation in long years of peace, it would be dangerous to submit the United States to similar unsuccessful socialistic restrictions: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the preservation of our institutions, our free economy, and our homes is still our first line of defense; and be it further

Resolved, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense oppose all national or international plans, proposals, or legislation presented as emergency or defense measures, which would convert the United States Government into a form of state socialism.

Resolution 28

Socialized medicine

Whereas great pressure is being exerted on Congress to pass legislation which would place under Government control the health and medical care of the people of the United States; and

Whereas such action would impair or destroy the personal interest, initiative, and private research on the part of the medical profession, and put that profession under the control of a paternalistic bureaucracy with direct socialization as a result: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense express its emphatic opposition to the establishment of socialized medicine and thereby the expansion of bureaucracy in the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the American Medical Association.

Resolution 29

Federal regulation and centralization

Whereas there has been a growing tendency in our Federal Government to centralize power and authority and to usurp the prerogatives and rights of the sovereign States, and to create bureaus and commissions and to endow them with authority to make regulations with the force and power of law: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense record its opposition to any Federal legislation which would tend toward further regimentation and centralization of government, and toward the lessening of the rights of the individual States.

Resolution 30

Unity and tolerance

Whereas it has been the policy of the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense to condemn and oppose all forms of subversive activities, whether they be manifested by an appeal to racial hatreds and prejudices or by attempts to divide this Nation into industrial strife by agitating and fomenting trouble between capital and labor, and economic group against economic group; and

Whereas subversive organizations and individuals are continuing their vicious campaigns of propaganda to disunite and divide the American people, setting class against class, race against race, and creed against creed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense call upon the people of our Nation to oppose any threat to American unity and urge fellow citizens of all races, colors, and creeds to demonstrate that same spirit of cooperation that was evidenced by our armed forces on the battlefronts in the fight against aggression, bigotry, and intolerance, and to oppose every attempt of these un-American forces to destroy the fundamental principles of life, liberty, justice, and freedom guaranteed by our Constitution.

Resolution 31

Immigration quotas

Whereas our present immigration laws, now threatened with change, have restricted immigration to a quota system allocating a definite number to each nationality mentioned, such allocation not to be interchangeable among quotas; and

Whereas millions of our veterans of World War II who are entitled to our first consideration, still desire and need American education, housing, and employment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That for the purpose of protecting the interest of all our citizens, and particularly our veterans, and for the purpose of excluding foreign elements imbued with political ideologies wholly at variance with our constitutional system of government, the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense urge upon the Congress that no immigration over and above the present quota system shall be permitted into the United States, either by special legislation, by unused quotas, or by Executive order.

Resolution 32

Pan-American good will

Whereas the forces of communism are seeking to infiltrate into all the nations of the Western Hemisphere, including the United States of America, thereby striving to injure the spirit of pan-American good will and to weaken the Pan American Union, and

Whereas the 21 independent, sovereign nations of the Pan American Union have, with very few exceptions, maintained friendly relations with one another for over 50 years; and

Whereas the spirit of good will and cooperation was of the greatest value during World War II and is of major importance to the United States of America and to the other nations of pan-America in time of peace: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense recommend to all its members the study of the several nations of pan-America, so that with knowledge of their history, culture, and problems, may come increased understanding and strengthening of hemispheric good will.

Resolution 33

To open United Nations meetings with prayer

Whereas the United States of America was founded on religious freedom; and

Whereas the early Congress, through Benjamin Franklin's wise appeal, was opened by prayer, after which the issues were clarified and the Constitution was ratified; and

Whereas our first line of national defense lies in dependence on God, the Great Commander: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense earnestly request that the United Nations meetings be opened with prayer, and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the United Nations at Lake Success, N. Y.

Resolution 34

Thanking the press

Whereas the press is a great and effective weapon to prevent war and maintain peace: Therefore be it

Resolved, (1) That the twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense call the attention of the editors of local newspapers to their responsibility in connection with the program for national defense;

(2) That the editors be urged to help educate our people as to the condition, size, welfare, strength, and needs of our armed services in relation to those of other nations, to the end that we shall maintain at all times an adequate, well-trained, and strong organization for national security;

(3) That we express our thanks to the press for the splendid support given our armed services in the past, and urge that it continue such support with increasing emphasis and vigor, as an indispensable contribution to the development of a sound, informed, and virile public opinion on the subject of national security, and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to International News Service, the Associated Press, and the United Press.

ADEQUATE LAWS ON COMMUNISTIC INFLUENCES AND ACTIVITIES

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Kiwanis Club of Rehoboth Beach, Del., on November 11, 1948, calling upon the State legislature to enact adequate laws on communistic influences and activities.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the ideology of communism is being vigorously pressed upon the people of the United States of America through misrepresentation, deceit, treachery, and intrigue, threatening our free institutions, and tending to the overthrow of our representative Government; and

Whereas the present critical condition of world affairs, particularly between the United States of America and Russia, has caused an organized cold war, which is being carried on by Russia, its satellite countries, and the Cominform in an endeavor to indoctrinate and foster among our people the ideology of communism; and

Whereas many citizens of the United States—indeed, many public officials—have, as a result of congressional investigations, proceedings of various grand juries, action by the United States Immigration Service and the Department of Justice, been shown to be of questionable loyalty to this country, or easy converts and zealous supporters of revolutionary doctrines, if not out-and-out active agents of Russia or the Cominform, or other alien nations and interests: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Legislature (General Assembly) of the State of Delaware is herewith and hereby called upon to enact adequate laws to protect the citizens of Delaware from these subversive communistic influences and activities; and be it further

Resolved, That as an approach to that end there be enacted public laws providing that no person who is a member of any political party or any other organization seeking the overthrow of the Government of the United States or the State of Delaware by force and violence, by deceit, treachery, and intrigue, and by any other false and treasonable practices or means, shall hold any office of trust or profit in the government of this State or in any county, kindred municipality, or any other administrative subdivision whatsoever.

CHARLES M. ROGERS,
President.

RALPH R. MESSICK,
Secretary.

MVA—PETITION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a petition from Beaver Local, Farmer's Union, Stutsman County, N. Dak., dealing with the MVA, and the 100-percent parity plan, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEAVER LOCAL, STUTSMAN COUNTY,
Alfred, N. Dak.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: We, the 56 members of Beaver local, wish to inform you that we are opposed to the Pick-Sloan plan and 100 percent in favor of MVA. Please consider this when you cast your vote.

Our local is also for 100-percent parity for family-type farms, and so are all the rest of the farmers and Farmers Union members in the State of North Dakota.

Yours truly,

L. C. OVERLANDER,
ALMON A. WILLIAMS,
Resolutions Committee.

SALARIES OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION OFFICIALS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Washington, D. C., relating to the salaries of Rural Electrification Administration officials, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Congress now has under consideration a comprehensive readjustment of the salary structure of the principal executive offices of the Government to bring salaries of the administrative heads of the executive departments and agencies in line with present-day conditions; and

Whereas sound principles of government and effective management require that Government executives be compensated on a basis commensurate with the duties and responsibilities of their offices in order to attract and hold competent executives; and

Whereas the administration of the multibillion-dollar REA program requires the highest degree of executive skill and competence and imposes duties and responsibilities comparable with and, in many cases, greater than those of any Federal agency: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we endorse the making of a complete appraisal and readjustment of the salary structure of the principal executive offices of the Government, in general, and urge upon the Congress that the salaries of the chief administrative officials of the Rural Electrification Administration be adjusted to give full recognition to their duties and responsibilities and to the principle of equal pay for equal responsibilities.

HAND-PICKED JURIES—LETTER FROM MARGARET L. WHEELER

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Margaret L. Wheeler, of Albany, N. Y., relating to hand-picked juries.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALBANY, N. Y., *January 28, 1949.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: I read with a great deal of admiration your remarks on the prevalence of hand-picked juries.

Our jury system as provided in the Constitution is at the heart of the democratic system, and I, as a layman, cannot see how the system about which Judge KNOX boasts can be sustained in the courts.

We are trying to show various other countries what democracy is. A good way to do this would be to try it at home.

Very truly,

MARGARET L. WHEELER.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY BLUE STAR MOTHERS OF DETROIT, MICH.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD resolutions adopted by the convention of Blue Star Mothers of America in Detroit, Mich.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED AT THE NATIONAL CONVENTION IN DETROIT, MICH.

I

Whereas the funds set aside by Congress for the return of our war dead has been found to be insufficient: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States of America be petitioned to increase to meet the added expense.

II

Whereas December 7, known as Pearl Harbor Day, is a day of special memory for Blue Star Mothers of America: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we petition Congress to declare said day a legal holiday, set aside for prayer and appropriate memorial services.

III

Whereas adequate facilities in VA hospitals are not available to many veterans afflicted with tuberculosis; and

Whereas the Blue Star Mothers of America do feel the utmost interest in the welfare of the veteran; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Blue Star Mothers of America, in convention assembled, do hereby petition the Congress of the United States to appropriate the necessary funds to provide accommodations for these afflicted veterans.

IV

Whereas we the Blue Star Mothers of America do feel strongly that in World War II many of our boys were forced to serve without proper military training; and

Whereas, because of the uncertain international situation of today, we feel the necessity of adequate preparation for the future: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we strongly recommend to Congress the adoption of an adequate program of universal military training which will go into effect immediately upon the conclusion of the present emergency draft program.

V

Whereas the youth of the United States may be inducted into military service at 18 years of age under the present emergency draft bill; and

Whereas under the educational system of today he does not thoroughly understand the functions of our Government and the rights of his American heritage: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Blue Star Mothers of America in national convention assembled, recommend that a 4-year course in civics and American history be required in all secondary schools throughout the United States.

VI

Whereas the spread of communistic ideas is increasing at an alarming rate in the United States; and

Whereas these ideas are found to be infiltrating our schools: Therefore be it

Resolved, That all teachers be required to sign a loyalty or anticommunistic pledge before they shall be employed as teachers.

VII

Whereas Public Law 346 provides educational benefits for surviving veterans of World War II which has been of extreme benefit to those seeking to better themselves; and

Whereas the widows and children of service personnel who died in the service of their Nation face an uncertain future, with particular emphasis on the efforts of such orphaned children to secure an adequate education: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Blue Star Mothers of America in national convention assembled do hereby petition the Congress for the passage of legislation amending Public Law No. 346 to provide that such educational benefits as would have accrued to the deceased service person should be vested in the surviving widow or one child.

VIII

Whereas there is a woeful lack of housing for our veterans and their families: Be it

Resolved, That Congress be petitioned to take immediate action on providing adequate housing, financed by the Federal Government; and be it further

Resolved, That houses provided for veterans conform to certain specifications—not less than four rooms, bath, and utility room, and other facilities necessary to the American way of living; and be it further

Resolved, That these houses be made available to veterans at a price within the means of the average veteran; and be it further

Resolved, That where so desired the veteran may be permitted to rent these houses at a fair rental price for a period of at least 3 years with the option of buying, and at the expiration of said rental period all moneys paid as rental may be applied as a down payment for the purchase of said home; and be it further

Resolved, That in cases where the veteran may be the owner of a lot or lots, and wishes to build his own home, the necessary materials be made available to him at the prevailing price, and the cost of said material be covered by an insured Government mortgage at a rate of interest comparable to that of the GI loans, namely, 4 percent; and be it further

Resolved, That we go on record as objecting to the provisions of the 1948 housing bill which would permit an increase to 4½ percent of the interest chargeable on said GI loans; and

IX

Whereas current building costs have placed the acquisition of homes beyond the economic reach of the average veteran and his family; and

Whereas the building industry has found it impossible to build rental housing at a cost within the reach of such veterans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Blue Star Mothers of America urge upon Congress that a minimum of 125,000 rental units per year be constructed by the Federal Government during the next 5 years; and be it further

Resolved, That definite but reasonable income limitation be effected, in order that those most legitimately entitled to such homes may not be crowded out by high-income families.

THE TRIAL OF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY—RESOLUTION OF MARYLAND HOUSE OF DELEGATES

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the Maryland House of Delegates, one of the two branches of the Legislature of Maryland, have adopted a resolution of protest which, through their officers, was ordered forwarded to the National Congress.

The resolution condemns the unjust procedures employed in the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty, and deplores the practices being followed in the Soviet-dominated countries. It is further evidence of the deep feeling of outrage, which is the reaction of the people of Maryland to the Communist injustice perpetrated upon Hungary's beloved primate.

I present the resolution and ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty of Hungary constitutes an attack by atheistic communism upon the freedom of religion; and

Whereas prominent members of various religious groups in this country have characterized this unjust trial as a gross crime against freedom and as a rape of justice, these persons, including Cardinal Spellman, archbishop of New York; the Reverend Daniel A. Poling, president of the World Christian Endeavor Union; and the Reverend Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the Senate of the United States and pastor of Foundry Methodist Church in Washington, D. C.; and

Whereas Cardinal Mindszenty was imprisoned in a Nazi concentration camp during World War II for his efforts in saving 1,500 Hungarian Jews from the clutches of the German Gestapo, thereby proving himself a defender of and a martyr for civil rights and humanity; and

Whereas this trial is part of a worldwide conspiracy of atheistic communism to threaten not only the countries of eastern Europe but also the liberty, democracy, and very life of the United States; and

Whereas representatives of the freedom-loving nations were barred from the courtroom during the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty; and

Senator HERBERT R. O'CONOR has asked the intervention of the State Department of the United States in this matter, seeking to ascertain whether Soviet and Hungarian Governments have violated the basic guaranties of the United Nations as to freedom of worship, fair and impartial trials and freedom of speech: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Delegates of Maryland, That this body, representing a great State, in which toleration and freedom of religion not only are guaranteed by the Constitution but also are part of the very fabric of its citizens, solemnly protests the outrageous crime against religion and humanity now being perpetrated in the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the Journal of the House and that the Chief Clerk be, and he is hereby, instructed to send copies thereof to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State of the United States and to each member of the Maryland delegation in the Congress of the United States.

IMPORTATION OF OIL—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF OKLAHOMA LEGISLATURE

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I present Senate Concurrent Resolution 3, adopted by the Oklahoma Legislature. The resolution asks that the United States Senate call the importation of oil to the attention of the State Department of our Government. I ask that the concurrent resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD, and that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to forward the resolution to the State Department.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, resolutions coming from a State legislature are received and printed in the RECORD. Without objection, the resolution will also be forwarded as requested.

The concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma was referred to the State Department and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 3

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to bring to the attention of the United States State Department the immediate need of drastically curtailing the importation of crude oil from foreign countries to the United States until such time as there is a need for the importation of crude oil to take care of the market demand for crude oil within the continental United States

Whereas it appears that the increase in stocks of crude oil and refined products have increased 105,000,000 barrels during the last year, resulting in a curtailment in production of oil in Oklahoma and in other States of the Union because of lack of storage facilities; and

Whereas above-ground storage of crude oil in abnormal amounts results in great waste of natural resources; and

Whereas the importation of crude oil in the United States during the past year have increased approximately 150 percent, and that approximately 600,000 barrels of crude oil is being imported daily into the United States; and

Whereas such importation of crude oil results in building up of the abnormal amount of the stocks of crude oil and refined products on hand, which has caused Oklahoma to decrease the allowable production of oil approximately 40,000 barrels daily; and

Whereas the importation of crude oil from foreign countries is a direct threat to the stability of the oil industry in Oklahoma and in the other oil-producing States, and to the tax structure in Oklahoma; and

Whereas unless the importation of crude oil from foreign countries is materially decreased, Oklahoma will be forced to curtail the allowable production of oil within the respective producing areas; and

Whereas the importation of foreign oil is a direct threat to the military security of the United States of America in that all initiative for the future development of the oil resources is stifled; and

Whereas the petroleum industry has continually developed new methods of discovering new resources when there is a proper demand for oil; and

Whereas the country is primarily dependent on American oil in time of war and these resources are only discovered when initiative is not stifled: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate of the twenty-second legislature (the house of representatives concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States bring to the attention of the United States State Department the important fact that the importation of crude oil from foreign countries to the United States should be drastically curtailed until such time as there is a need for the importation of crude oil to take care of the market demand for crude oil within the continental United States, and that the congressional delegation from Oklahoma do all within its power to carry out the purpose and intent of this resolution. That a copy of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of the senate to each Member of the congressional delegation from Oklahoma, and to the Honorable Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LUCAS, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 745. A bill to provide for the designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Chicago, Ill., as the Albert A. Sprague Veterans Memorial Hospital; without amendment (Rept. No. 51).

By Mr. MCCLELLAN, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

S. 829. A bill to extend the office of the War Assets Administrator and the War Assets Administration from February 28, 1949, until June 30, 1949; without amendment (Rept. No. 52).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. J. Res. 42. Joint resolution granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Gulf coast and creating the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission; without amendment (Rept. No. 53).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. J. Res. 51. Joint resolution to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 55).

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

H. R. 1252. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 with respect to the eligibility for appointment in the executive branch of the Government of former professional staff members of committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 54).

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 461. A bill to clarify the provisions of section 602 (u) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 50).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. Res. 45. Resolution to investigate certain matters pertaining to the United States merchant marine; with an amendment, and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration;

S. Res. 50. Resolution to investigate the financial condition of the air-line industry; with an amendment, and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration;

S. Res. 62. Resolution to investigate domestic land and water transportation conditions; with an amendment, and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration;

S. Res. 63. Resolution to investigate certain matters relating to radio, telegraph, and telephone communications; with an amendment, and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration;

S. Res. 64. Resolution to investigate the fishing resources of the United States; without amendment, and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration; and

S. Res. 65. Resolution to investigate the Panama Canal and interoceanic canals generally; without amendment, and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

CATHERINE MARSHALL

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I report favorably Senate Resolution 44, submitted by Mr. LUCAS on January 27, 1949, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Catherine Marshall, widow of Rev. Peter Marshall, late the Chaplain of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS RELATING TO INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONSHIPS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I report favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 51, reported by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, on February 3, 1949, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection (g) (2) (D) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period beginning on February 16, 1949, and ending on February 15, 1950, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution (which shall not exceed $15,000 for studying intergovernmental relations with the States and municipalities or $18,000 for studying relations with international organizations) shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee as the case may be.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask the distinguished Senator from Arizona if he will give an explanation of the resolution.

Mr. HAYDEN. The resolution involves two amounts of money for two subcommittees of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; one of $15,000 for studying intergovernmental relations with the States and municipalities, and $18,000 for studying relations with international organizations. These are subcommittees which functioned during the past year and which are being continued. They did not spend all their money. The sum total here is practically the amount which was appropriated last year.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

PRINTING OF HEARINGS OF COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION RELATING TO LIMITATION ON DEBATE (S. DOC. NO. 10)

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I reported an original resolution providing for the printing of the hearings before the Committee on Rules and Administration on the limitation of debate in the Senate, as a Senate document, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated.

The resolution (S. Res. 68) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the hearings held before the Committee on Rules and Administration, relative to limitation of debate in the Senate, be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS RELATING TO GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I report favorably Senate Resolution 52, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 52) reported by Mr. McCLELLAN from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments on February 3, 1949, and subsequently referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, was read, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection (g) (2) (B) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, or any other duties imposed upon it, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period beginning on February 16, 1949, and ending on February 15, 1950, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, in addition to any unexpended balance under Senate Resolution 189, Eightieth Congress, agreed to January 26, 1948, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee as the case may be.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask that an explanation of the resolution be given.

Mr. HAYDEN. This resolution provides for a continuation of the Ferguson subcommittee of last year. It had an appropriation of $125,000. About $50,000 was left over. The committee is asking for another $50,000, so that the total expenditures under this authorization would be approximately $100,000 during the next year.

Mr. WHERRY. Does not the life of the subcommittee expire as of February 15?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the reason for the resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. And it is necessary that an appropriation be made so that the subcommittee may continue its authority under the appropriation for another year.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the subcommittee does not expire. The appropriation expires.

Mr. WHERRY. The appropriation expires as of February 15, I believe.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. It is very necessary that the balance be reappropriated, plus an additional appropriation of $50,000, which makes an annual appropriation of $102,000, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection to the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

ELIGIBILITY OF CERTAIN COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, House bill 1252. The bill is short, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. I ask that the bill be read.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. If the clerk will read the bill, I think it will be self-explanatory.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

The bill (H. R. 1252) to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 with respect to the eligibility for appointment in the executive branch of the Government of former professional staff members of committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 202 (g) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (prohibiting the employment in the executive branch of the Government of any former professional staff member of a committee of the Senate or the House of Representatives for a period of 1 year after he ceases to be such a member), is hereby repealed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask the distinguished Senator from Arizona to explain what is incorporated in the bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Reorganization Act now provides that anyone employed as a clerk or assistant on the professional staff of any of the committees of the House or Senate may not accept employment in a department of the Government for 1 year after he ceases to be connected with a committee. The particular case which I think caused this bill to be acted upon unanimously by the House involved a man detailed to the Committee on Ways and Means from the Tariff Commission. The committee no longer needs his services, and the Tariff Commission wishes to reemploy him, but is prohibited from doing so for 1 year. The bill would permit him to resume his work with the Tariff Commission. I assume there are other similar cases.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, why should not this bill go to the calendar, in the normal course?

Mr. HAYDEN. There seemed to be some desire to expedite the employee's return to the Tariff Commission. Otherwise, I have no objection to the bill going to the calendar.

Mr. LODGE. I voted to report the bill from the committee; but it seems to involve an important question. It goes to one of the important points in the La Follette-Monroney Act. I should like to know what criterion we are to have for considering bills without having them first go to the calendar.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I withdraw the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has asked unanimous consent for the consideration of a bill, to which request any Senator has the right to object.

Mr. HAYDEN. I withdraw the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The request is withdrawn, and the bill will go to the calendar.

REPORTS OF SENATE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I submit five reports from the Senate Small Business Committee. One has reference to steel supply and distribution, being the final report of the activities of the steel subcommittee of the Senate Small Business Committee (Rept. No. 43). One relates to changes in steel distribution, 1940 to 1947, being the result of a survey of steel-distribution practices by 14 major integrated steel companies, which the subcommittee on steel initiated in the fall of 1948 (Rept. No. 44). There is a report on small business finance and taxation (Rept. No. 46), a report on participation of small business in Government procurement (Rept. No. 45), and, finally a report on newsprint supply and distribution (Rept. No. 47), the final report of the Subcommittee on Newsprint and Paper Shortages, of which the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] has been in charge.

I might say that the chairman of the subcommittee on steel has been the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN]. I am submitting these reports in their behalf.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The reports will be received and printed.

COMMUNICATIONS PROBLEMS — REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE (S. REPT. NO. 49)

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I submit an interim report relating to communications problems.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed.

ROUTINE PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably numerous appointments and promotions in the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps, and ask unanimous consent for their present consideration. I see that the minority leader has risen, and in anticipation of what he is about to ask I will say that the purpose in making the request is to save the cost of printing. If these numerous routine promotions should go to the Executive Calendar the names will have to be printed, and the calendar will be a very thick one. It will necessitate the spending of a considerable amount of money for printing the names. I will say that there is no objection to the promotion of any of the officers in question. Most of them are in the lower grades. I make the request only in the interest of public economy.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate the observation and the request made by the distinguished Senator from Maryland. I will say that during the past 2 years similar requests have been made by the former chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], and they have been complied with on both sides of the aisle. As I understand, we will then continue such a procedure; and the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee will ask for the confirmation of routine appointments and promotions, as he has done today, only in order to save printing the names. I understand the Senator will make the requests only with respect to nominations concerning which there are no disagreements, nominations which are unanimously reported.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Nebraska is correct. The Senator from Maryland, who is chairman of the Armed Services Committee, will also state that he will not take advantage of this situation when, to his knowledge, there is any controversy over any of the nominations.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for explaining the position he has taken and will continue to take, and I want to assure him that in order to save printing the names, so as to conserve on the printing bill respecting routine nominations in the armed services, I am agreeable to that procedure, and will not now object to his request.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the routine nominations in the armed services referred to by the Senator from Maryland? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the nominations are confirmed, and, without objection, the President will be notified.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 872. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish land-based air warning and control installations for the national security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 873. A bill to amend the act of August 7, 1946, to authorize relief in cases where the Government has actual or constructive notice or knowledge of certain losses incurred under war contracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 874. A bill for the relief of Elza Friedrych;

S. 875. A bill for the relief of Cohen, Goldman & Co., Inc.; and

S. 876. A bill for the relief of Jozef Omilak and his wife Clara Omilak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. BALDWIN introduced Senate bill 877, to repeal the special taxes on manufacturers of and dealers in oleomargarine, and to repeal other taxes on oleomargarine which is not colored certain shades of yellow, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 878. A bill to provide certain benefits for annuitants who retired under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, prior to April 1, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

S. 879. A bill to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 880. A bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 881. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to announce the parity price of milk, and to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to immediately announce the support price of milk; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McGRATH (by request):

S. 882. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act regulating the retent on contracts with the District of Columbia," approved March 31, 1906;

S. 883. A bill to require the taking and destruction of dangerous weapons in certain cases, and for other purposes;

S. 884. A bill to provide for the killing of starlings in the District of Columbia; and

S. 885. A bill to provide for the removal of weeds from lands in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(Mr. MAYBANK introduced Senate bill 886, authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey a portion of the Charleston Army Base Terminal to the City Council of Charleston, S. C., free from the conditions contained in the act of May 27, 1936, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 887. A bill to provide a temporary immigration quota for Israel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. MYERS introduced Senate bill 888, to provide more adequate and effective rent control until June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 889. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis Aristides Govatsos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 890. A bill to authorize the construction of an office building at Suitland, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 891. A bill for the relief of Ronald Clive Jack; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 892. A bill to reclassify assistant postmasters and other supervisory positions in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CORDON (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 893. A bill to provide for the design and construction of highway bridges near certain dams; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLER:

S. 894. A bill to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to extend financial assistance to homestead entrymen, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 895. A bill authorizing the construction of a multipurpose reservoir on the Pend Oreille River in Idaho for flood control, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLER (for himself and Mr. TAYLOR):

S. 896. A bill for the relief of Carey Act settlers in the Black Canyon Irrigation District under the Payette Division of the Boise Reclamation Project in Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 897. A bill for the relief of William Henry Tickner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 898. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 899. A bill to amend section 2 of the Act of January 29, 1942 (56 Stat. 21) relating to the refund of taxes illegally paid by Indian citizens; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma (for himself, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. THYE, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. HENDRICKSON):

S. 900. A bill to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 901. A bill authorizing the naturalization of Kwang Sup Yum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 902. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer a captured submarine to the Museum of Science and Industry in the city of Chicago; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 903. A bill for the relief of Seweryn Cajtung, Masza Cajtung, Ryszard Cajtung, Stefa Pizyc, and Frania Goldberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. DOUGLAS also introduced Senate bill 904, to provide for research relating to child life and development; to disseminate information as to the practical application of such research by parents, professional persons and others; and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 905. A bill for the relief of John Sewen; and

S. 906. A bill for the relief of John Sewen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 907. A bill to provide for retirement under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, at age fifty-eight in the case of employees who have rendered 25 years of service and who served in the armed forces during World War I or World War II; and

S. 908. A bill to prevent nepotism in appointments to governmental offices and positions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(Mr. LANGER also introduced Senate bill 909, to exempt persons who served in the merchant marine of the United States between September 16, 1940, and June 24, 1948, from induction or service under the Selective Service Act of 1948, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 910. A bill to provide increased retired pay for certain persons who performed active military or naval service during World War I,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 911. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of Gabel Construction Co.," approved July 2, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND):

S. 912. A bill to provide for the transfer of War Housing Project No. Fla-VN-8342 to the city of Sebring, Fla.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. HUNT):

S. 913. A bill to abolish the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., and transfer its functions to the Secretary of Agriculture, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make certain emergency and disaster loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 914. A bill for the relief of Gladys Inez Greenwood;

S. 915. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Johanna Dagnall;

S. 916. A bill for the relief of Ascanio Collodel;

S. 917. A bill to enable children under 21 years of age adopted by United States citizens to enter the United States as nonquota immigrants and to become naturalized;

S. 918. A bill for the relief of Clara Sogor;

S. 919. A bill for the relief of Dr. Leon L. Konchegul; and

S. 920. A bill recording the lawful entry for permanent residence into the United States and authorizing the naturalization of Ellen Rodriguez Moreno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 921. A bill to provide for the retirement of any judge of the United States District Courts for the Districts of Hawaii, or Puerto Rico, the District Court for the Territory of Alaska, the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone, or the District Court of the Virgin Islands, any justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, and any judge of the Circuit Courts of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LODGE. I introduce a bill and ask for a reference of it to the Armed Services Committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and will be referred to the appropriate committee.

Mr. LODGE. That is the appropriate committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not necessary for Senators to ask that bills go to certain committees, if they go there anyway; if they do not go there it is not proper to make the request.

By Mr. LODGE (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 922. A bill providing for the conveyance to the town of Nahant, Mass., of the Fort Ruckman Military Reservation; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

(Mr. O'MAHONEY (by request) introduced Senate bill 923, to promote the development and conservation of certain resources in the submerged coastal lands adjacent to the shores of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MYERS:

S. J. Res. 52. Joint resolution to authorize vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore between United States ports on the Great Lakes during the period from March 15 to December 15, 1949, inclusive; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

COLORED OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, for some time a troublesome issue concerned with the taxation of colored oleomargarine has been before the Senate. Like other Senators I have received a great deal of mail on the subject. It seems clear that housewives, as a whole, are anxious to have the tax on precolored margarine removed. It is my understanding that generally the dairy industry has no objection to the removal of such tax, provided adequate guaranties make sure oleomargarine is not sold as butter and make sure misleading inferences do not confuse the buyer. It is my own humble opinion that——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is compelled to admonish the Senator from Connecticut that debate is not now in order.

Mr. BALDWIN. I am merely making a statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes; but that is debate, and the Chair has no way of knowing how long it would run. Under the rules the introduction of bills and joint resolutions is now in order, without debate and without remarks.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, would it be in order for me to introduce a bill and ask that the statement be inserted in the RECORD?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would be; and, without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 877) to repeal the special taxes on manufacturers of and dealers in oleomargarine, and to repeal other taxes on oleomargarine which is not colored certain shades of yellow, introduced by Mr. BALDWIN, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement presented by Mr. BALDWIN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BALDWIN

Mr. President, for some time a troublesome issue concerned with the taxing of colored oleomargarine has been before us here. Like other Senators, I have received a great deal of mail on this subject. It seems clear that housewives, as a whole, are anxious to have this tax on precolored margarine removed. It is my understanding that generally the dairy industry has no objection to the removal of such a tax provided adequate guaranties make sure that oleomargarine is not sold as butter and make sure that misleading inferences do not confuse the buyer.

It is my own opinion that were the tax removed without any other protective legislation, the price of butter might be reduced somewhat, but the price of oleomargarine would be substantially increased so that the housewife would gain little or nothing in the end.

Oleomargarine is a nutritious food and there appears to be no legitimate reason why it should be taxed so long as unwarranted or misleading claims are not made.

Unfortunately, unless there is some tax provision, the Federal Government would have little or no opportunity to prevent such claims.

I therefore propose, Mr. President, that certain color stipulations be established so that the tax will not be charged on oleomargarine if it is not colored the same shade of yellow as butter. Under this bill, which I am introducing, oleomargarine would be held to be yellow in color and therefore taxable only if it has a tint or shade containing between 1.6 and 15 degrees of yellow or of yellow and red collectively, but with an excess of yellow over red measured in the terms of the Lovibond tintometer scale or its equivalent.

In less confusing language this simply means that butter, which is also sometimes colored, would be a light yellow whereas oleomargarine would have to be colored a sufficiently dark yellow to be clearly distinguishable.

This bill would remove all special taxes on manufacturers of, and dealers in, oleomargarine so long as it is not colored certain light shades of yellow—that color area being left to butter.

CONVEYANCE OF PORTION OF CHARLESTON ARMY BASE TERMINAL TO CITY COUNCIL OF CHARLESTON, S. C.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I introduce a bill, and ask that it be referred to the Armed Services Committee.

I wish to state at this time that section 2 of the bill may conflict with some city ordinances or State laws or Public Law 616, so I ask the Armed Services Committee to hold a hearing on the bill at their earliest convenience.

The bill (S. 886) authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey a portion of the Charleston Army Base Terminal to the City Council of Charleston, S. C., free from the conditions contained in the Act of May 27, 1936, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADEQUATE AND EFFECTIVE RENT CONTROL

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for more adequate and effective rent control, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared explaining the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 888) to provide more adequate and effective rent control until June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MYERS, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. MYERS was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MYERS, OF PENNSYLVANIA, IN INTRODUCING NEW BILL SETTING FORTH ALL RENT-CONTROL LAWS IN ONE MEASURE, SUPERSEDING S. 434, WHICH AMENDED PREVIOUS ACTS

This bill is identical in nearly all provisions with S. 434, which I introduced on January 13. That bill, in turn, had been generally similar to the bill which I introduced in the Eightieth Congress, S. 1741, which was intended to repair the damages to effective rent control caused by the passage of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947.

The Eightieth Congress, however, in passing the Housing and Rent Act of 1948, although making some slight improvements from the 1947 act, had refused to close up the loopholes to effective regulation in the manner S. 1741 would have done, and so, earlier this year, I redrafted S. 1741 to fit present circumstances and reintroduced it as S. 434.

Both of my bills—that in the Eightieth Congress and S. 434—were amendments to existing legislation, just as the Housing and Rent Act of 1948 was an amendment to the Housing and Rent Act of 1947.

This new bill which I am introducing today is a clean bill which, instead of amending two previous acts, as S. 434 and the other Senate bills on rent control would do, sets out for the first time in one measure all of the provisions of law on rent control. The lawyers and the courts will have a much easier time understanding rent control if all of the provisions can be found in one measure rather than in three different acts passed in three different years.

But, I repeat, the major provisions of this new one-package bill are substantially identical with those of S. 434. It had been my intention to have this bill ready for introduction at the start of the session, but that was not possible. Months were spent in preparation of S. 434, in seeking to make it as effective as possible in dealing with the problems of rent inflation, and then additional weeks were necessary to redraft S. 434 into this bill.

I have given a copy of this new bill to Representative DOUGLAS, of California, and she has already introduced it in the House as House bill 2291. I am glad to have her cosponsorship on this measure.

She has called to my attention the fact that in her State there is a very serious problem of rent inflation involving permanent residents of trailer courts and tourist cabins. Under present laws, such accommodations are exempt from rent control. My previous bill, S. 434, would have maintained that exemption. However, inasmuch as this is regarded as a serious problem in certain States and areas, I have agreed to go along with those who are concerned about it and to revise this bill to provide machinery for recontrol of such accommodations wherever such recontrol is necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

That does not mean, of course, that all trailer courts and tourist courts occupied by permanent residents will be recontrolled. The Rent Administrator (as he would be known under this bill) would have the same authority he had in previous years to decontrol or refuse to recontrol any class of accommodations in any defense-rental area if he feels it is not necessary to have them under control.

The rent-control authorities used just such authority to decontrol transient hotels when that was originally done.

There is one other change in this bill from S. 434 and it is very important in a mechanical sense. This bill makes no provision whatsoever—as S. 434 did—for the continuation of present powers of the Housing Expediter (who would become under this bill the Rent Administrator) to require that new housing construction be held available for veterans for certain preference periods.

I want to emphasize that I am not against that provision—in fact, I am very much for it. But I do not think that such powers should be lodged with the agency assigned the duty of administering rent control. It should be, instead, a function of agencies concerned with housing.

I would like to suggest to the members of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, now holding hearings on new housing legislation, that the housing bill reported out of committee be written to include provision for veterans' preference on new housing construction, so that these powers now assigned to the Housing Expediter shall not lapse.

In conclusion, I want to repeat that the purpose of this new bill, superseding S. 434, is to have in one statute all of the provisions of rent-control laws, so that the public will not be forced in the future to refer to the Rent Act of 1949, the Housing and Rent Act of 1948, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 to find the laws on rent control.

RESEARCH RELATING TO CHILD LIFE AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. DOUGLAS. I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for a research program relating to child life and development, and ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the body of the RECORD a short synopsis and explanation of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the synopsis and explanation of the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 904) to provide for research relating to child life and development; to disseminate information as to the practical application of such research by parents, professional persons, and others; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The synopsis and explanation of the bill presented by Mr. DOUGLAS was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In 1912 an act of Congress established the United States Children's Bureau and authorized the Bureau "to investigate and report upon all matters pertaining to the welfare of children and child life." Although fundamentally a research agency ever since, the Children's Bureau today obtains funds for research only as a part of its limited administrative budget, and has no funds available to make grants to research centers or individuals to stimulate research in child life and development.

Purpose: To remedy these deficiencies, the National Child Research Act would establish in the Children's Bureau of the Federal Security Agency a program of research in child life and development. This would enable the Children's Bureau more effectively to carry out its basic functions, and would advance human knowledge of child development and community aspects of child life; new knowledge would then be made available to parents, appropriate professional people, and others so that the health and well-being of children could be improved.

Functions: In consultation with a National Advisory Council on Research in Child Life, the Federal Security Administrator would carry out the purposes of the act through the Children's Bureau which would—

1. Conduct integrated research in such areas of child life and development as stillbirths; infant, childhood, and maternal mortality; the parent-child relationship; the social, cultural, physical, and emotional factors in the development of the normal child; illegitimacy; cause and prevention of juvenile delinquency; and such socially and physically handicapping conditions as cerebral palsy. Such studies, outside the field of medical laboratory research, would involve the biological, medical, psychological, physical, and social aspects of child life and development.

2. Operate a national clearinghouse on child-life research which is in progress or being planned; disseminate information on the practical use of new knowledge gained through research; make grants for child-life research to public and private agencies; establish and maintain fellowships for qualified individual research specialists in the Children's Bureau and elsewhere; provide and maintain traineeships in pediatrics and child development in the Children's Bureau and elsewhere; and secure facilities appropriate to and necessary for these research functions of the Bureau.

National Advisory Council on Research in Child Life and Development: Comprised of 15 members and the Chief of the Children's Bureau and the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, ex officio, the council would represent scientists and the public, with at least half of its members being outstanding scientific authorities in child-life research. The council would review and recommend research projects or programs to be fostered by the Chief of the Children's Bureau through research grants to universities, centers, and individuals; would review applications for such research grants and make recommendations; and advise the Chief of the Bureau on accepting gifts for the research program.

Appropriations: For the first year of operation $7,500,000 would be appropriated to carry out the provisions of the act, with ensuing appropriations being sufficient to carry it out. Funds appropriated for research grants would remain available for 4 years after being first appropriated, if research work was authorized within the year.

General provisions: The act provides for necessary coordination among Government agencies in planning and conducting research in child life, and provides for an annual report to the Congress of activities under the act.

EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN PERSONS FROM INDUCTION UNDER SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT

Mr. LANGER. I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to exempt persons who have served in the merchant marine of the United States from December 1940 until June 1948, from induction in the service under the Service Act, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanation of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 909) to exempt persons who served in the merchant marine of the United States between September 16, 1940, and June 24, 1948, from induction or service under the Selective Service Act of 1948, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. Merchant marine war veterans are specifically not exempted from the present draft and are being drafted.

2. The merchant marine had a higher percentage of men killed in World War II than did the armed forces, Army or Navy.

3. Merchant marine war veterans who completed a required period of service in the merchant marine were issued after the last war discharges similar to the Army and Navy's exempting them from further service. Congress also authorized service ribbons, medals for heroes, and uniforms for merchant marine sailors and in other ways recognized their service to their country. Merchant marine war veterans may well ask precisely what has happened in the period after the shooting ended to now warrant a complete reversal of treatment.

4. Reversing its former position the last Congress specifically voted to draft these war veterans. This law is now in effect and operation. These veterans ask, Were men fools to have fought and died in the merchant marine for the privilege of being treated as less than stay-at-home factory workers? Essential industry, conscientious objection, political office, and even marriage are now considered as greater sacrifices to our country than fighting in the merchant marine in time of war.

5. We can only feel that this action was taken to punish merchant marine veterans for two opinions held in some quarters namely:

A. "Merchant sailors were draft dodgers."

B. "The merchant marine got rich on the war."

What are the facts? In answer to the first charge it can only be said that if one were dodging the draft in the merchant marine, he was a fool as that was the service in which he stood the greatest chance of being killed. The merchant marine first met the German invader, while our armed forces were shocked and helpless. They did not run as attested to by our oil-soaked beaches. The merchant marine fought from then till the last shell of the war was fired. It was neither an easy nor quick victory. Our record of dead speaks for itself.

Did the merchant marine get rich on the war? The facts: The merchant marine man's pay, dollar for dollar, for time in service was equal to or less than the Army or Navy man's. It might be noted here that during the war about half of this merchant sailor's salary was paid by private shipowners and about half by the Government in the form of war-area bonuses. A merchantman receives no family allowance. This in itself is a very considerable item. In addition, the merchant marine war veteran receives no Government loans, Government schooling, free dental care, and other veterans' benefits. The disabled merchant marine war veteran receives no pension. That he gave a healthy body for a maimed, crippled one in his country's hour of need is a just due.

Case by individual case it can be proven that there is no substantial difference between what the merchantman and Army-Navy man received for their war service. The price merchant lives were purchased for was right. This will perhaps please some persons.

6. The current treatment accorded the merchant marine has materially weakened the United States military-defense position at a critical time. It has had the effect of adding aeroplanes and divisions to any potential enemy because:

In the event of the next world war young men and merchant-marine veterans would not sail as a merchantman because it has been proven the most dangerous service. Despite this fact after the war the merchant-marine veteran can expect to spend two additional years training for the Army, over and above the 4 to 5 years or more he has spent fighting on the sea. As a merchant-marine war veteran myself, I can authoritatively state that due to Government policy I will not fight another war in the merchant marine. Since I, like many merchant-marine veterans, was rejected in 1943 by the Naval Reserve and unacceptable except to the merchant marine, it is likely my 4 years of merchant-marine experience will, in event of the third world war, be put to good effect in a victory garden. It is much safer and Government policy to victory gardeners did not change to aversion when the war ended. In the event of world war III, the Government would be forced to draft men and thus extend to them the status of servicemen to sail the merchant ships. This would necessitate fresh training of crews for the merchant-marine War Two veteran will not want to serve as a merchant sailor again or will have by then completed his Army training and have become a soldier. Of course, the soldier could be sent to a merchant ship, but then his Army training would have been wasted. Training men costs millions of dollars in taxpayers' money. Trained men are a war commodity and equally as valuable as the rare metals we are stock piling. More important, a trained man cannot be purchased in dollars alone but must be purchased in time. We are not now able to say how much of this latter commodity we possess. Under present Army manpower quotas the number of men to be drafted is limited and it seems our citizens would be getting more for their tax dollar in the way of protection if this training were given to novices and not to men who are now already fully trained and with actual war experience under their belt and who are able, if ordered, to leave for any point on the globe inside of 24 hours.

I ask you as a Congressman to vote in favor of a fair treatment of merchant sailors when this bill comes up. If this bill does not come up I hope you will introduce it. I ask you to do this for the best interest of the Nation as a whole and as a matter of decency to the men who fought and died in the merchant marine whose fine war record has now been made an object of public scorn and derision. This ridicule from a Nation that owes much to her merchant marine, I'm afraid, will live in the minds of these men as it is not something they can take lightly or easily forget. It is to be hoped this condition can and will be remedied.

Our country vitally needs a strong and intelligently run merchant marine in peace as much as in war. Such a fleet can only come through consistently wise and long-range planning. It is a problem requiring study and mature judgment by competent experts, civil and military. A good merchant marine no more "just happens" than a good fighting Navy "just happens." It is sincerely hoped we shall have both in the years to come.

DEVELOPMENT AND CONSERVATION OF CERTAIN RESOURCES IN SUBMERGED COASTAL LANDS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which was sent to the President of the Senate on February 1, by Secretary Forrestal, Attorney General Clark, and Secretary Krug, for the administration of the submerged coastal lands adjacent to the shores of the United States.

The bill (S. 923) to promote the development and conservation of certain resources in the submerged coastal lands adjacent to the shores of the United States, introduced by Mr. O'MAHONEY (by request), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I now ask unanimous consent that the text of the letter from the three Cabinet members submitting the bill may be printed at length in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., February 1, 1949.

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill "to promote the development and conservation of certain resources in the submerged coastal lands adjacent to the shores of the United States."

This proposed legislation is similar to, but not identical with, the proposed legislation on this subject which we jointly submitted to the Congress on February 6, 1948. The previous proposal was introduced in the Senate as S. 2165, Eightieth Congress, and in the House of Representatives as H. R. 5523 and H. R. 5690, Eightieth Congress.

There is attached to the proposed bill an explanatory statement which summarizes and discusses its provisions in detail. We should like to supplement that explanatory statement in two respects.

The first additional comment relates to the matter of the distribution of the moneys received by the Federal Government from oil and gas operations in the submerged coastal lands. The proposed bill is silent on the subject, and hence, unless it is passed in a form expressly making other disposition of such income, all proceeds derived by the Government under the legislation will be paid into the Treasury of the United States and credited to miscellaneous receipts. In this connection, the Congress may wish to consider whether the States off whose shores operations under the legislation are conducted have equities which justify the payment of some portion of the income to them.

The second additional comment concerns the acreage-limitation provisions of the bill, sections 4 (a) and 6 (a). These sections are identical with the provisions of S. 2165 and H. R. 5528, but a brief explanatory comment seems in order. Section 4 (a) places a ceiling of 64,000 acres on the quantity of land that can be included in a lease at the time of its issuance, and this maximum figure is subject to certain requirements for subsequent reduction in the acreage, so that at the end of the fifth year of a lease the acreage shall not exceed 7,680 acres. Section 6 (a) prescribes an acreage limitation on the leases that can be held per person, the maximum being 128,000 acres under lease to a person (of which not more than 30,720 acres may be held under producing leases) in any one of the following coastal regions: The Pacific Ocean or the Gulf of Mexico or the Atlantic Ocean. The reasons for suggesting in this proposed legislation acreage limitation provisions that are more generous than those under the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U. S. C., 1946 ed., sec. 184) are set out on page 6 of the explanatory statement. We should like to make clear to the Congress, however, that these suggestions as to acreage limitations are matters of judgment and that they are not based on actual experience in the administration of a Federal program of oil and gas development in the submerged coastal lands.

We recommend that the proposed bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration and that it be enacted as soon as possible, with such amendments and modifications relating to the two matters discussed herein as Congress may deem advisable.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed bill to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL,
Secretary of Defense.
TOM CLARK,
Attorney General.
J. A. KRUG,
Secretary of the Interior.

CONDEMNATION OF COURT PROCEEDINGS IN CASE OF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY—AMENDMENT

Mr. IVES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the resolution (S. Res. 57) condemning court proceedings in the case of His Eminence Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, which was referred to the Committe on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed.

FEDERAL AID TO SCHOOLS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on Monday the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and

the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and myself introduced Senate bill 834, to authorize Federal aid to school districts overburdened with war-incurred and defense-incurred school enrollments, for the construction of additional school facilities. At this time I submit amendments to that bill for reference to the Committee on Public Works, the committee to which the bill was referred, and I ask unanimous consent that the amendments may be printed in the RECORD. The amendments are intended to be proposed by the same sponsors of the bill and myself.

There being no objection, the amendments were referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amend title by inserting after the word "enrollments," the words "or by Federal activity in such districts." Amend section 1 by inserting, after the word "establishment", on line 1, page 2, the following: "(3) by reason of the school districts being overburdened, as the result of activities in such district, by any department or independent establishment (including a wholly owned Government corporation) of the Federal Government;".

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 1211. An act to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 1243. An act to amend the Hatch Act; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 19) to express the sense of the Congress with respect to the arrest and imprisonment of Archbishop Stepinac of Yugoslavia and Cardinal Mindszenty of Hungary, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RESEARCH ON FAMILY ASPECTS OF CHRONIC ILLNESSES

Mr. TYDINGS submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 17), which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Whereas the family is a dynamic unit in the maintenance of American educational, social, and economic standards; and

Whereas the family is the fountainhead of hereditary and environmental influences operative on the health of the individual; and

Whereas chronic illness is a significant cause of economic and social disruption of the American family; and

Whereas the greatest public-health problem today is the control of chronic diseases of long duration and insidious onset; and

Whereas the study and treatment of prolonged physical and mental disorders has hitherto concentrated on the individual, usually without consideration of family environment and hereditary proneness; and

Whereas failure to consider the familial aspects of disease may preclude successful health service to the individual and adequate protection for other members of the family unit; and

Whereas certain fundamental research conducted in Hagerstown and Washington County, Md., on the family prevalence, incidence, and mortality from heart disease, cancer, and other chronic diseases reveals an interrelationship between these diseases and family composition and environment; and

Whereas such studies thus far conducted have been on a limited scale, and have not involved integrated action of professional services: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That it is the sense of the Congress that research on the familial aspects of chronic illness and investigation of practical methods of furnishing family health services should be expanded and intensified, and that the United States Public Health Service should extend its activities toward this end.

INVESTIGATION OF RETRIAL OF GREEK MARITIME UNION LEADERS BY GREEK COURTS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I submit a resolution relating to an investigation of retrial of Greek maritime union leader by Greek courts, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanation of the resolution be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 69) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the retrial by the courts of Greece of Antonios Ambatielos, general secretary of the Federation of Greek Maritime Unions; Vasilios Bekakos, president of the Panhellenic Marine Engineers Association; and other Greek maritime union leaders, on charges growing out of the same activities for which they have heretofore been tried by such courts. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations.

The explanation of the resolution presented by Mr. LANGER was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On February 1, 1949, Antonios Ambatielos, general secretary of the Federation of Greek Maritime Unions, and Vasilios Bekakos, president of the Panhellenic Marine Egineers Association, began a new trial for their lives with a group of 34 others, including many Greek seamen, some of whom have already been tried with the two top Greek maritime union leaders. Ambatielos and Bekakos and eight other maritime heads were sentenced to death by a Greek court last November on the same or similar charges on which they are now being retried. A third union leader, Timogiannakis, undergoes his second trial later this month. Even under present Greek laws it is illegal to try anyone twice for the same offenses.

The 10 maritime union leaders were temporarily saved from the firing squad last November as a result of a wave of protests from labor and democrats the world over, including direct United Nations intervention, wherein Herbert Evatt, Foreign Minister of Australia, and then President of the United Nations General Assembly, asked a suspension of execution on the grounds that such an act would lessen the hope of the Greek people for peace and the ending of the civil war. Other protests poured in from the British Trades Union Council and its president, Will Lawther, from Louis Saillant and Leon Jouhoux, leaders of the left and right wings of the French labor movement, from a large group of members of the British House of Lords and Commons, from Harold Laski, of the British Labor Party, and from leading American public figures. Protests came from the World Federation of Trade Unions, from trade unions in Australia, Sweden, Scotland, Canada, Italy, etc., from 14 American international and many local unions and from the CIO maritime committee. The foreign policy resolution of the 1948 national convention of the CIO condemned "the execution of trade-union leaders in Greece and other countries for carrying out their legitimate trade-union activities."

Obviously, the aim of the Greek Government in conducting the illegal retrials is to bypass United Nations and world protests by trying and executing the leaders one by one and two by two with groups of other Democrats, thus hoping to attract less attention.

FACTS ABOUT THE FIRST TRIAL

The original indictment against the 10 maritime leaders and the thirty-odd seamen tried with them covered the activities of the Federation of Greek Maritime Unions since its formation in 1941. Significantly, it made no mention of the fact that, during the war, carrying out its pledge to keep the Allied ships sailing, the FGMU lost a greater percentage of its members than any other Allied maritime or military force, earning the highest praise from American and British statesmen.

The 57-page outline of the indictment was made available to 30 defense attorneys for 2 hours on two occasions during which period the attorneys had to read what they could from a single copy. The chief accused, Ambatielos and Bekakos, encountered particular difficulties in finding defense counsel because of the difficulties and personal dangers risked by lawyers themselves when defending prisoners unpopular with the Athens government.

Five of the accused were women. Three who had given evidence on October 26 repudiated their written depositions at the trial, stating that these were extracted from them by police beatings. One young woman, Mrs. Pandelidou, stated that she will suffer injuries for the rest of her life as a result of the Gestapo tortures. Another, Mrs. Cosmidou, collapsed in court as she muttered, "Stop beating me. I know nothing." After a governmental medical examination, she was found to be too ill to attend proceedings for the next 2 days. The trial went on without her.

Another of the accused, George Frangos, gave evidence which differed considerably from his written deposition. Frangos stated that he had given earlier testimony under duress but that now that he was under oath he was compelled to tell the truth. Denying that money had been sent to the guerrillas by the maritime unionists, he testified that all his dealings with them were strictly of a trade-union character.

During the trial the judge insisted on himself answering questions put to Ambatielos. Upon reading telegrams of protest from Louis Saillant, secretary of the World Federation of Trade Unions and Leon Jouhoux, secretary of the anti-Communist French Force Ouvriere, the judge remarked to the court, "Communists in the guise of trade unionists." One can have little doubt of the fate which would befall the internationally known Saillant and Jouhoux at the hands of this jurist who took the position that Communists should automatically receive the death sentence.

In an effort to insure at least the semblance of a free trial for their leaders, the Greek seamen in the United States and Britain retained attorneys to defend their leaders. William Standard, the American attorney, was denied a Greek visa by the Greek consular authorities here. The British attorney, Simmons, was also denied entry to Greece. Lawyers organizations in the United

States (National Lawyers Guild) and Britain (Haldane Society) protested these exclusions but without result.

WHY THE GREEK GOVERNMENT ATTACKS THE PGMU

In 1943 the PGMU succeeded in winning the first contract ever won by the Greek maritime workers, the Cardiff agreement which was approved by the Greek Government. After the liberation from the Germans, the Greek Government established its own company union, the Panhellenic Nautical Federation which had been founded by the prewar dictator, John Metaxas. In 1947 the PNF signed an agreement with the shipowners annulling many of the hard-won gains of the Greek seamen. The PGMU refused to become a party to such a contract. It was then that the Greek Government arrested Ambatielos and Bekakos and raided and closed the PGMU headquarters in Piraeus, Greece. Soon afterward, the union was outlawed, its newspaper raided and closed. PGMU branches in Alexandria, Buenos Aires, and Antwerp were closed at the instigation of the Greek authorities there.

Government decrees made it illegal to ask for extra pay for extra work (such as the opening and closing of hatches in port which is the job of shore workers and for which American seamen receive a minimum of $1.50 hourly when they have to do it) and the traditional bonus after 6 months of continuous sailing aboard the same ship. Ship (or shop) committees, the kernel of American and other trade-union organizations, were outlawed. Greek seamen signing on Greek ships were asked to sign a yellow-dog contract repudiating the PGMU and abandoning all rights to extra work pay, the continuous service bonus, etc., under penalty of confiscation of their seamen's books and deportation to Greece for court martial if they refused. One thousand five hundred Greek seamen were blacklisted and forbidden to sail on Greek ships for various offenses including complaints of unhealthy food conditions aboard the vessels. A governmental decree ordered seizure of the seamen's papers of 600 seamen and their deportation to Greece for court martial on charges of mutiny for like offenses. A 30-man Greek gestapo, headed by a Greek gendarme, Microulis, who is an officer of the Greek security police, was established on American soil to terrorize Greek seamen sailing from American ports.

HOW AN AMERICAN COURT DECIDED A TYPICAL CASE OF MUTINY

Proof that the attack against the 10 maritime leaders is simply another attempt of the Greek Government to smash a bona fide trade-union and depress the wage and living standards of the Greek maritime workers is evidenced by the attempt to obtain deportation of Greek seamen on American soil that they may share the fate of their leaders in Greece. A case in point is that of four Greek members of the crew of the Greek ship S. S. *Syros* who were charged with mutiny, assault, and disobedience for claiming extra pay for extra work and the traditional bonus.

The four were hailed before the Federal District Court of Eastern Pennsylvania by Andreas Georgakopoulos, Greek harbor master for New York on the above charges. He asked that the men be turned over to him for deportation to Greece to face court martial. In denying the petition of Georgakopoulos, Judge J. Welsh, who heard the case, decided: (No. 421 of 1948, filed January 28, 1949):

"The evidence indicates quite clearly that the principal controversy between the ship owner and the crew in this case arises out of the claims for extra pay for opening and closing hatches on the steamship *Syros* under a custom existing at the time of the collective agreement of 1943 and still prevailing, and the refusal of the crew to perform that work without extra pay. It appears also that three of the respondents, prior to their service on the steamship *Syros*, had asserted claims for wage bonuses for continuous service under the Cardiff agreement while serving on the steamship *Kyvernitis*. Claims of both those classes were in effect outlawed by the Athens agreement of 1947, to which the respondents and their union were not parties, which agreement was adopted and sought to be enforced by the Ministry of Mercantile Marine. * * *

"Without a judicial determination of the rights of the respondent seamen to the compensation claimed, their conduct in refusing to do extra work without extra pay, and in claiming bonuses under an agreement they deemed to be still in force, has been characterized as unlawful disobedience for which they must be deprived of their seamen's credentials, repatriated, and punished. That members of the crew took issue against actions of the Greek Government in a matter in which a large part of the western world took issue (note: protests against the execution of the 10 Greek maritime union leaders), that they collected funds for their union, made some complaint as to the ship's food and concertedly solicited the master to reinstate Zannos, were not of sufficient importance to induce the master to impose disciplinary measures. Nor are they deemed sufficient to change the character of the dispute from one involving claims for compensation, to one involving mutiny or other disorder on the vessel for which this court might provide an aid to punishment."

Thus, while their leaders wait for death and illegal retrials in their Athens dungeons, the Greek seamen who had the luck to be tried in an American court are today free to pursue their calling, earning money to support their struggling families in Greece.

While the *Syros* case was being tried in Philadelphia, members of the Philadelphia Maritime Committee for Public Action headed by William E. Collier of the United Mine Workers and comprised of all A. F. of L., CIO, and independent maritime unions there, condemned the use of the American courts and other institutions by the Greek authorities in the United States to terrorize and intimidate Greek seamen sailing from American ports.

THE GREEK GOVERNMENT ATTACK AGAINST THE GREEK SEAMEN HURTS AMERICAN MARITIME INDUSTRY AS WELL

American maritime workers are already feeling the effects of unemployment and danger to their wage and living standards as a result of cheaper foreign competition. The tactics of the Greek shipowners and Government have made Greek-owned ships the greatest rival to the American industry. For, on the one hand, the Greek Government acts as an agent of the Greek shipowners, imprisoning, executing and blacklisting active union members who ask for their rights and wages (which happen to be considerably lower than those of American seamen). On the other hand, Greek industrialists, complaining that they "do not know how to keep books," have been avoiding the payment of most income and corporation taxes, unlike their American rivals. Moreover, in order to avoid even the few taxes asked by the Greek Government, Greek shipowners have been switching the flags of their vessels to flags of countries asking even lower taxes and whose maritime workers are not adequately protected by trade-unions.

In registering such a complaint, referring to the damage done to Canadian seamen by the Greek shipowners, Eric C. Adams, economic consultant to the Canadian Seamen's Union, wrote to Hoyt S. Haddock, executive secretary of the CIO Maritime Committee, on January 7, 1949: "While a few Canadian vessels have been sold to Panamanian registry the most disruptive influence in the industry is the switching of articles on Canadian registered vessels. Under Canadian law, a Canadian vessel whose articles run out in a foreign port may take on the articles of the foreign port. The Greeks are using this device since they operate as tramps and are thus able to arrange the expiration of 'time' articles for arrival in British, Panamanian, or other foreign ports. The owners then tell the Canadian crews they have the option of signing on foreign articles at lower wages and inferior working conditions, or being shipped home. To date, at least 13 vessels have adopted this device of getting out from under Canadian collective agreements and labor laws."

Thus we are confronted with a situation wherein the Greek Government and shipowners, using funds derived from American aid, are operating on American soil, employing every antilabor device condemned by American labor traditions, to beat down the working and living standards of Greek maritime workers and hurting American maritime workers as well. The operating costs of the Greek ships have decreased, profits have increased, and the Greek shipper thus enjoys a great advantage over the American shipowner, who cannot compete on equal terms. Ironically enough, many of the Greek ship purchases have been underwritten by the Greek Government with American-aid money.

According to figures published in the Naftika Chronika, London magazine of the Greek shipowners, of July 1, 1948, the Greek flag ship fleet consists of 300 ships, totaling 1,283,090 tons. Of these, 96 are Liberty ships purchased from the United States and underwritten by the Greek Government with American-aid money. Greek-owned ships flying foreign flags include 70 British freighters, 191 ships under Panamanian flags, and 19 ships under Honduran flags.

The Greek shipowners make it clear that they fully appreciate the advantages obtained through government intervention. The same issue of Naftika Chronika writes happily: "Our owners, large and small, benefit from the operation of the American ships. Their operating expenses are high, about 40 percent above those of Greek ships, even higher when compared with the Panamanian." The July 15, 1948, issue wrote: "The only encouraging fact for the consideration of the Greek cargoes and the Greek-owned Panamanian fleet is the increasing disappearance from the market of the American tramp steamers. The existing rates, even though higher for the Americans, do not cover the expense of the American Liberty ships. Statistics show that many are being returned to the United States Maritime Commission; 1,500 were chartered last year, today only 650 are in service. Perhaps the number will drop even lower. The fact that the number of American ships decreases facilitates the operation of the Greek cargo industry."

The Greek seamen and their organization, the Federation of Greek Maritime Unions, denounces the attempts of the Greek Government—climaxed by the death sentences against the 11 Greek maritime union leaders (Evangelos Claoudatos was condemned 2 months before the others) and their illegal retrial—to break their bona fide trade-union organizations. They call upon labor and democrats of the entire world to help them in their fight to save their leaders. They particularly look to their American brothers and friends to aid this fight by demanding that the death sentences of the 11 Greek maritime union leaders be commuted and the unprecedented retrials stopped immediately.

PRINTING OF HOUSE DOCUMENT ENTITLED "COMPREHENSIVE REPORT ON CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA FOR FLOOD CONTROL AND OTHER PURPOSES"

Mr. HOLLAND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 70), which, with

the accompanying document, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed for the Senate document room 1,000 additional copies of House Document No. 643, Eightieth Congress, second session, entitled "Comprehensive Report on Central and Southern Florida for Flood Control and Other Purposes."

NOTICE OF HEARING BEFORE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to say that as chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency we have set next Tuesday, at 10:30 a. m., to consider the so-called Murray resolution, the so-called Wherry resolution, and other matters in connection with small business, and we should like to have any Senators testify who desire to do so.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SESSIONS OF THE SENATE

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which is continuing its present hearings, I ask unanimous consent that committee hearings may be held during the sessions of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENT OF OSWALD RYAN AS A MEMBER OF THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement I have prepared with respect to the appointment of Oswald Ryan to the Civil Aeronautics Board.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, it is with the greatest of pleasure that I have this opportunity to rise before the United States Senate and recommend the confirmation of the appointment of Oswald Ryan to another term as a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

A true Hoosier, who was born in Anderson, Ind., Mr. Ryan has displayed that characteristic of public service which has symbolized the growth of America into the greatest Nation in the world.

His record as general counsel for the Federal Power Commission from 1932 to 1938 prompted the late President Roosevelt to select him for membership on the United States Civil Aeronautics Authority when that division of our Government was first formed in 1938.

He continued to give his exceptional services to the Civil Aeronautics Board following the change to that title and in 1943 he was rewarded by reappointment.

Mr. Ryan has again been honored by President Truman through his nomination for further service to the extremely important duty of assisting in the development of aviation in this country.

He attended Butler University in Indianapolis, Ind., before going to Harvard for his law degree.

Later he practiced law in Anderson and served as state's attorney there until he entered the service in World War I.

After the war he served as city attorney of Anderson and again as state's attorney until his selection as general counsel to the Federal Power Commission.

Mr. President, it is indeed a privilege for me to recommend to this Senate the confirmation of Mr. Oswald Ryan.

REMOVAL OF EXPORT LIMITS ON FATS, OILS, AND OIL-BEARING SEEDS

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to read a statement which has just come in on the news ticker. It is as follows:

Secretary of Commerce Charles Sawyer said he is willing to remove export limits on fats and oils and oil-bearing seeds.

However, he will withhold final action until a study of the proposal is made by the International Emergency Food Committee.

The committee previously said it favored continued control over the commodity.

This course, Sawyer said, has been approved by the State Department and the Agriculture Department.

Sawyer said he hoped the committee would take prompt action and that in the absence of early word from it, he would go ahead with his plans.

If he does, he will place fats and oils on an open-end export basis, which requires exporters to obtain licenses from the Commerce Department but which sets no quotas.

Mr. President, I wish to make only one observation, and that is that I am delighted that the Senate of the United States wrote into the export-control bill the provision that the Secretary of Agriculture could make the determination rather than have some bureaucratic committee investigate what the Secretary of Commerce himself says he would like to do. In the meantime the prices of cottonseed, soybean, and other edible vegetable oils and fats from the farms continue to decline.

WOMEN'S PATRIOTIC CONFERENCE ON NATIONAL DEFENSE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Check and Balances—America's Greatest Need," delivered by him on January 29, 1949, in Washington, D. C., before the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense; which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESSES BY SENATOR SMITH OF MAINE AND DR. K. FRANCES SCOTT BEFORE THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUBS, INC.

[Mr. KNOWLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Senator SMITH of Maine and the introductory address by Dr. K. Frances Scott before the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., on January 3, 1949, at Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., which appear in the Appendix.]

LINCOLN DAY DINNER ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR DEWEY

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the Lincoln Day dinner address delivered by Governor Dewey, at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., on February 8, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY THE AMBASSADOR FROM NORWAY AT THE CHRISTMAS CARNIVAL, BIRMINGHAM, ALA.

[Mr. SPARKMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by the Ambassador from Norway, Wilhelm Morgenstierne, at a banquet given as a part of the Christmas carnival at Birmingham, Ala., on November 27, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE BY SENATOR WITHERS TO LT. GEN. SIMON BOLIVAR BUCKNER

[Mr. WITHERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a tribute prepared by him to the memory of Lt. Gen. Simon Bolivar Buckner, which appears in the Appendix.]

WORK OF THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE IN MAINTAINING BERLIN AIRLIFT—STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS

[Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him entitled "Nation Should Honor Air Force for Success of Berlin Airlift," which appears in the Appendix.]

OIL PRODUCTION IN TEXAS—STATEMENT BY ERNEST O. THOMPSON

[Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement concerning the production of oil in Texas, made by Ernest O. Thompson, commissioner, Railroad Commission of Texas, which appears in the Appendix.]

PETER MARSHALL, LATE CHAPLAIN OF THE SENATE

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him in tribute to Rev. Peter Marshall, late Chaplain of the Senate, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S DAY—EDITORIAL FROM THE SHEBOYGAN (WIS.) PRESS

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "President Truman's Day," published in the January 24, 1949, issue of the Sheboygan Press of Sheboygan, Wis., which appears in the Appendix.]

TIME TO STOP, LOOK, LISTEN—EDITORIAL FROM THE KANSAS CITY STAR

[Mr. REED asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Time to Stop, Look, Listen," from the Kansas City Star of February 6, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICANS HAVE SUFFERED THE TORTURES INFLICTED ON CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a press release by the Department of State dated October 7, 1948, depicting the circumstances under which two American officials were forced to sign false confessions by the Hungarian Government, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMPULSORY ARBITRATION—ADDRESS BY DR. GEORGE W. TAYLOR

[Mr. DOUGLAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address, entitled "Is Compulsory Arbitration Possible?," recently delivered by Dr. George W. Taylor, former Chairman of the War Labor Board, and a brief foreword by himself, which appear in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS—ADDRESS BY DR. EDWIN E. WITTE

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Where Are We at in Industrial Relations?," delivered by Dr. Edwin E. Witte, professor at the University of Wisconsin, at the first annual meeting of the Industrial Research Relations Association, on December 30, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

PATRONAGE JOBS—EDITORIAL FROM THE STARS AND STRIPES

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Patronage Jobs," published in the January 6, 1949, issue of the Stars and Stripes, which appears in the Appendix.]

TVA AFTER 15 YEARS—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "TVA After 15 Years," published in the New York Times, January 2, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

ATOMIC DEVELOPMENT—NEWSPAPER COMMENT

[Mr. MCMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD three articles regarding atomic-energy development, two from the Washington Post and one from the Washington Star, which appear in the Appendix.]

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S INTEREST IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF AFRICA—ARTICLE FROM THE COLORADO STATESMAN

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Colorado Statesman concerning the development of Africa, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NATIONAL HEALTH PROBLEM—ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the New York Times regarding the national health problem, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMPUTATION OF COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 128) to provide that acreage planted to cotton in 1949 shall not be used in computing cotton acreage allotments for any subsequent year, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. YOUNG conferees on the part of the Senate.

POSTPONEMENT OF DATE OF REPORTING LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations, I report favorably House Concurrent Resolution 22, and I submit a report (No. 48) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The concurrent resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the date of reporting the legislative budget, as set forth in section 138 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as it may apply to the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, is hereby postponed until May 1, 1949.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I am somewhat confused. Let me address an inquiry to the majority leader. It was my understanding that the business of the Senate today was to be confined to a debate on the District of Columbia daylight-saving-time bill. I did not know that this resolution would be ready for debate today. The chairman of the committee has reported the concurrent resolution, and is asking unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

Mr. MCKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Personally I do not intend to object to the immediate consideration of this resolution, but I want Members of the Senate to know that this is a highly important question. It is a question of placing a ceiling limitation on the budget this year. According to the Reorganization Act, however, the legislative budget must be reported and acted upon by February 15.

Mr. MCKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I am in favor of that. I think the resolution should be considered, but I think we should know what the Federal expenditures are to be. If we do not, the very spirit of the Reorganization Act is circumvented.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to yield the floor in a moment, so that the Senator from Massachusetts may address a question to the Senator from Tennessee.

Personally, I am not objecting to the consideration of this resolution at this time. I think it should be considered. However, I want Members on this side of the aisle to know that this is a very important matter. Some of our Members may not be able to be present, because I informed them that the immediate legislation for consideration would be the District of Columbia daylight-saving-time bill.

However, we are confronted with the dilemma that if we do not consider and act upon this resolution by February 15, we shall be guilty of postponing this question beyond that date. I believe that the resolution should be adopted. We should have the report before us. We ought to know what the appropriations are to be. When I say that, I think I reecho all the observations made by Members on this side of the aisle when this question was before the Senate on a previous occasion.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. Is not this the same question which we had under consideration 2 years ago?

Mr. WHERRY. It was last year.

Mr. BALDWIN. At that time the Republicans asked for an extension.

Mr. WHERRY. They certainly did.

Mr. BALDWIN. Did they ask for an extension for the same reason for which the majority party is now asking for an extension?

Mr. WHERRY. I presume that the end results would probably be the same, except that at this particular time the Democratic Party is in control of the administration and in control of the various branches of government.

Mr. BALDWIN. All I have to suggest is that perhaps it should be stated for the RECORD that we would like to say the same things against extension that the Democrats said a year ago, so that we may be "even Stephen."

Mr. MCKELLAR obtained the floor.

Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. LODGE addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I should like to clear up one point. I believe the Senator from Nebraska may have left that point in question. Last year the Republicans did not ask for an extension.

Mr. WHERRY. No.

Mr. BRIDGES. We complied with the law. It so happened that the Senator from New Hampshire, in presenting the question, pointed out the hardships under which we were laboring in making our recommendation, but we asked for no extension. We complied with the law.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. This is a question of considerable importance. Why can it not be made the unfinished business, so that we may proceed with the morning hour in the normal way?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I shall be glad to answer that question. The reason is that last year a similar resolution failed because of lack of time. The 15th of February rolled around before the two Houses could agree. There was a conference, and there was objection, and therefore no resolution was passed. Yesterday the committee ordered this resolution reported to the Senate. I shall read from the report of the committee, because it was put in, and very properly so, at the request of our Republican friends, and because I think everyone voted for it:

The committee realizing that there should be a complete resurvey of section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, which is the section pertaining to the legislative budget, respectfully suggests to the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget that it carefully study section 138 of the act with a view to making recommendations as to whether section 138 should be repealed, whether it should be amended, or whether in lieu of the method prescribed in section 138 for fixing a more effective control over appropriations and expenditures, Congress should provide for an omnibus appropriation bill as a means of placing before the Congress the over-all appropriation figure and permitting the Congress to have before it for action all the ensuing fiscal year appropriation bills at one time.

That was put in in order to have the joint committee look into the whole matter and make its report to the Congress. I see no objection at all to it, and I think it should satisfy everyone.

All of us realize that in the committee it is impossible in the next 4 or 5 days to arrive at a legislative budget or budget estimate, and the time should be extended so that we can submit a report on the budget estimate.

In view of what our experience has been and in view of what the experience of the Appropriations Committee was last year, I hope all Senators will agree

to the request, and I appeal to Senators to let the concurrent resolution be adopted as the best way out of the difficulty which confronts us, and the only way that is now open to us.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to ask the Senator why it is proposed that the Senate act on this matter during the morning hour. It seems to me it would be a very bad practice to start rushing things through during the morning hour, and would lead to all sorts of confusion. I wonder why we cannot take up this matter after we conclude the morning hour, and then make the concurrent resolution the unfinished business and deal with it today. It seems to me that the practice, which is beginning here, of legislating during the morning hour is most unsound.

Mr. MCKELLAR. If the Senator from Massachusetts or if the Senate thinks that would be the better method of arranging the matter, I am perfectly willing to ask unanimous consent a little later. But it seems to me that it is obvious that there cannot be a report from the committee within the time limit fixed by the law, and so it is our duty to extend the time to a date by which we can have a report from the committee, which is May 1. So I think that should be done.

Mr. MCCLELLAN and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I promised to yield to the Senator from Arkansas, and I now yield to him.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS DURING SENATE SESSION—POSTPONEMENT OF DATE OF REPORTING LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, I do not wish to object to the request for unanimous consent made by the Senator from Tennessee; but I should like to ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments be permitted to meet and to continue hearings this afternoon, while the Senate is in session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas? The Chair hears none.

Mr. FERGUSON. I object.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Did the Chair correctly understand the Senator from Michigan to object?

Mr. FERGUSON. I did.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Then that ends the matter.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I address an observation to the Chair?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan objected to the consideration of this matter.

Mr. WHERRY. I believe it was to the request for the consideration of the concurrent resolution that the Senator from Michigan objected.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I object to having the concurrent resolution taken up during the morning hour.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the Chair ask the Senator from Michigan to what he was objecting.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to propound a parliamentary: What is the question before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. First, the unanimous-consent request propounded by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], to which the Senator from Massachusetts has now objected.

The other unanimous-consent request was made by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and was that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments be permitted to sit and hold hearings during the session of the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, let me make the record clear. I wish to object to having the Senator from Tennessee bring up the concurrent resolution at this time. I thought that was the question before the Senate. I have no objection to the sitting this afternoon of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan objected to the consideration of the concurrent resolution reported by the Senator from Tennessee; is that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] is granted; and on objection the concurrent resolution goes to the calendar; or if the Senator from Tennessee desires to have the concurrent resolution remain on the table until a later hour, he has a right to have that done.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Must I obtain unanimous consent to have that done? I should appreciate it very much if the Senate would allow the concurrent resolution to lie on the table, so that it may be brought up a little later.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I have no objection to having it brought up later. It was merely to having it brought up at this particular time that I objected

Mr. MCKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to propound a parliamentary inquiry to the distinguished occupant of the chair, in reference to what has happened relative to the objection to the request made by the Senator from Tennessee: If unanimous consent had been granted, would not the concurrent resolution have been debatable at that time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly. I merely wished to make the RECORD clear, because it was my understanding that the rule would permit free discussion and debate at that time, either before the morning hour was concluded or afterward.

The VICE PRESIDENT. When the Senate gives unanimous consent, out of order, to take up a bill out of order, during the morning hour, it is debatable.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is during the call of the calendar that the 5-minute rule applies.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

I should like to make one more observation, Mr. President. When the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] asked me whether the Republicans had requested an extension, my observation was that the end point result of the discussion last year was that an extension occurred, but I point out that the debate hinged around the evidence submitted in justification of the estimate, and not on an extension. We did not ask for an extension. The debate was based on the question of whether we could substantiate the amount of the estimate. However, I repeat, we did not ask for an extension. That is why I feel that, in keeping with the spirit of the Reorganization Act, we should not delay, but should see that the matter is taken care of between now and the time set by the Reorganization Act, which is February 15.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. Did the Republicans ask for an extension in 1947?

Mr. WHERRY. No; we did not ask for an extension at any time.

Mr. BALDWIN. In other words, both in 1947 and in 1948 we submitted a legislative budget within the time set by the law; is that correct?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. The debate which occurred centered around the report and the evidence submitted in justification of the estimate.

JOSEF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF SENATE RESOLUTION 57

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on Monday I offered Senate Resolution 57, which calls upon the Senate to condemn the arrest and trial of Cardinal Mindszenty. The resolution was offered on behalf of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senators from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL and Mr. LODGE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and myself. I now ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] be added as cosponsors of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, apropos of the request made by the Senator from New Hampshire, I ask unanimous consent, out of order, to submit at this time an amendment to the resolution which the Senator from New Hampshire has

offered. The resolution says nothing about the conviction of Cardinal Mindszenty. But I think that should be in the resolution, to make it fully effective from that standpoint.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York asks unanimous consent, out of order, to offer for the information of the Senate an amendment to Senate Resolution 57, offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES.] Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Are there any further concurrent or other resolutions? If not, the morning business is concluded.

POSTPONEMENT OF DATE OF REPORTING LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee a few moments ago attempted by unanimous consent to get before the Senate a very important measure. There was some objection to it until the morning hour was concluded. I sincerely hope the Senate will permit the Senator from Tennessee to have this very important resolution considered, because of the time element involved.

That really is the essence of it. If we cannot obtain unanimous consent, the resolution would have to go to the calendar, and on Monday we would have to debate the resolution and try to adopt it, which I think we could do. It simply means that much delay. In view of the fact that a number of Members on the Republican side will be away, it seems to me this would be the proper time to debate the resolution, if there is to be a debate on it. I hope unanimous consent may be obtained.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 22, which went to the calendar a little while ago.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 22, which the Clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 22) as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the date of reporting the legislative budget, as set forth in section 138 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as it may apply to the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, is hereby postponed until May 1, 1949.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not object to its present consideration. I suggest, however, that the majority leader perhaps might request a quorum call before the debate begins, so that all Senators may be present.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall be glad to do that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 22) postponing to May 1, 1949, the date of reporting the legislative budget.

Mr. LUCAS. I was about to suggest the absence of a quorum.

MEETING OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I will yield to the Senator from Wyoming before suggesting the absence of a quorum.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Joint Committee on the Economic Report has been holding sessions all this week in the morning. Today, however, the House of Representatives is not in session. The Senate, of course, will be in session. The Secretary of Agriculture was to appear before the committee this afternoon. In order that the work of the committee and of the House Members may not be interrupted, I ask unanimous consent that the committee may sit this afternoon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LUCAS. I want to say to my distinguished friend from Wyoming, I had the order in front of me and I apologize for not making the request. I was just getting around to it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is no need for apologizing. I may say to the distinguished leader.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Humphrey	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Ives	Pepper
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Broughton	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cain	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Capehart	Kerr	Schoeppel
Chapman	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Chavez	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Connally	Langer	Sparkman
Cordon	Lodge	Stennis
Douglas	Long	Taft
Eastland	Lucas	Taylor
Ferguson	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Frear	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Fulbright	McGrath	Thye
George	McKellar	Tobey
Gillette	McMahon	Tydings
Gurney	Magnuson	Watkins
Hayden	Maybank	Wherry
Hendrickson	Miller	Wiley
Hickenlooper	Morse	Williams
Hill	Mundt	Withers
Hoey	Myers	Young
Holland	Neely	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

POSTPONEMENT OF DATE OF REPORTING OF LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

The Senate resumed consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 22) postponing to May 1, 1949, the date of reporting the legislative budget.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I think that what is being considered is understood by every Senator, and I should like to have a vote on the question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does not the Senator from Tennessee, from his long experience on the Appropriations Committee, agree that ultimately, in order to have before us a decent over-all picture of appropriations, we must have an over-all appropriation bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is a very broad question, and I do not know whether, prior to our investigation of it, we should attempt to decide at this time. I think the present situation obviously is not a good one and that we should have some other method of getting appropriations before the Senate. I hope and believe that the joint committee which has had the matter in charge and which has not had time in which to make a report of the kind the Senate should have before it, will report a resolution or a bill which will enable the Senate to have before it what is known as the legislative budget.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The provision in the La Follette-Monroney Act was inserted in an effort to give the Congress a better picture in the absence of an over-all appropriation bill, was it not?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. By postponing action to the time to which we are postponing it this year we are really nullifying the whole effect of the law; are we not?

Mr. McKELLAR. No. I think by May 1 the committee will make a report which will certainly be a very good estimate of what the appropriations may be and what the revenues may be. I hope it will be helpful, and I think it will be helpful.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Would the Senator be willing to accept an amendment to postpone the time for making the report to March 15 or even April 1?

Mr. McKELLAR. We fought that out in the committee yesterday, and the committee, as the Senator will recall, by a majority of several votes, reported the resolution as it is. The reason for that is obvious. Unless we agree to the resolution in its present form there is no chance to have any resolution regarding the matter go through at this time. It will meet the same fate as that met by the resolution last year. I believe the Senate will get a better result by postponing the making of the report to May 1 than by postponing it to March 15. I do not think we would have time to make a good report before that date.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator assure me that as chairman of the joint committee he will make every endeavor to include a study and a report on an over-all budget?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall certainly do so. I think it is very necessary, and I shall be glad to make every effort possible to lay before the Senate the best view we can present.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to propound a question to the Senator from Tennessee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not a fact that by May 1 practically all appropriation bills will have been passed by the House and will be on their way through the Senate?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think that has been the history in the last 2 years.

Sometimes we get appropriation bills from the House as late as July, and sometimes as late as August.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate that, but I base the question on the fact that I have conferred with some members of the Committee on Appropriations of the House, and they have advised that with the possible exception of the armed services appropriation bill, and one other, they expect the appropriation bills to be out of the way by May 1.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator will recall that the armed services appropriation bill is by far the largest appropriation bill we will have, and, until we find out something about that, we cannot make a very good estimate of what the appropriations will be.

Mr. FERGUSON. One further question, if the Senator will yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Has the joint committee held any meetings?

Mr. McKELLAR. I cannot say that they have held any formal meetings.

Mr. FERGUSON. As a member of the committee I know of no notice I have received.

Mr. McKELLAR. There has been no notice of formal meetings that I know of, but I have talked to Members of the House and Members of the Senate who are on the committee, to ascertain if we could do anything by February 15. I was advised by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who is a member of the committee, and by several other members, that they could not possibly reach a conclusion about the matter by February 15.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. I am sure the Senator from Tennessee will agree that it would be much more convenient for the Senate if the House would get the appropriation bills to the Senate by the first of May.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree entirely with the Senator. Instead of its being a disadvantage, I think it would be an advantage, so that we could discuss fully the action of the House. It would give us more time.

Mr. REED. It would give us more time, and we could do our work better, if we got the bills promptly.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. REED. I do not recall, during my experience, that we have gotten many of the bills in the Senate before the first of May, and most of them come after the first of May, some of them as late as June or July, as the Senator from Tennessee has just said, and some in August.

Mr. McKELLAR. Some even later than that. I agree entirely with the Senator. During the time I have been a Member of the Senate, we have received very few appropriation bills from the House by the first of May.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I concur in what the distinguished Senator from Tennessee has said, and I should like to add a word or two about the armed services appropriation bill. From an understanding I had this morning, I would say to the Senator from Tennessee that 34 cents out of every tax dollar is represented in the armed services bill, and 80 cents out of every dollar in appropriation bills which will come from the Committee on Appropriations this year will represent the cost of wars, including veterans' hospitals, interest on the debt growing out of the deficit during the war, and so forth. So 80 cents out of every dollar the taxpayer pays goes for the armed services, for preparations for war and for activities made necessary by wars, appropriated for, as the Senator well knows has been the case, from 1939 to the present.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not recall the exact figures, but an overwhelming part of our expenditures are for the armed services and related activities.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. What is the Senator's view as to what the Congress meant when it adopted section 138 of the Congressional Reorganization Act, containing this language:

The Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, or duly authorized subcommittees thereof, are authorized and directed to meet jointly at the beginning of each regular session of Congress—

And after due consideration and study to do certain things?

Mr. McKELLAR. I think that language is perfectly clear.

Mr. CORDON. Has there been any such meetings?

Mr. McKELLAR. So far as I recall, there were no such meetings last year, and no such meeting the year before, and there have been no such meetings this year. I am informed by the clerk of the committee that the legislative budget committee met last year, but I must have been out of the city at the time. I recall no invitation to be present.

Mr. CORDON. The record will disclose that the same group met at the first of the session 2 years ago.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad to hear that.

Mr. CORDON. My question goes to this proposition: We have before us a concurrent resolution to extend the date of making the report to the first day of May of this year.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. CORDON. If the committees had been called together, if they had been given an opportunity for an orderly consideration of this matter, might they not have reached the conclusion that if a later date were necessary it certainly would not have to be the first day of May? It might be the first of April or the first of March or the middle of March, so that the report could be what the law intended it to be, a budget estimate and not an accounting.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will recall the language of the act, which I shall be glad to read, he will see that it is very confused. It gives to four committees, the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations of the House, and to the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, certain directions. So far as I recall—and I shall read the act to see whether I am correct or not—it does not instruct which of those committees is to take the lead or which of the chairmen is to take the lead. It is very indefinite and confused—as the Senator will see. It reads:

SEC. 138. (a) The Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate—

Now listen to this language—

or duly authorized subcommittees thereof, are authorized and directed to meet jointly in the beginning of each regular session of Congress—

"To meet jointly in the beginning of each regular session of Congress"—

and after study and consultation, giving due consideration to the budget recommendations of the President, report to their respective House a legislative budget for the ensuing fiscal year, including the estimated over-all Federal receipts and expenditures for such year. Such report shall contain a recommendation for the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year which shall include such an amount to be reserved for deficiencies as may be deemed necessary by such committees. If the estimated receipts exceed the estimated expenditures, such report shall contain a recommendation for a reduction in the public debt. Such report shall be made by February 15.

I should like to ask the Senator, is it the duty of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate to call that meeting together? Is it the duty of the chairman of the Committee on Finance of the Senate to call the meeting? Is it the duty of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House to call the meeting? Is it the duty of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House to call the meeting? The language is, the committees or subcommittees. I believe I will frankly say, that the purpose of the section I read was good, that it was directed along the right line, but the language respecting whose duty it is to take action at the beginning of the year is so uncertain that I think every Senator must concede that some change must be made in the language.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCGRATH in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield further to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Will the Senator agree with me that reason would be on the side at least of the suggestion that all four chairmen, all being members of the majority party, might have gotten together and resolved the question of the date of meeting among themselves? Would that not have answered the purpose?

Mr. McKELLAR. That, Mr. President, is a very uncertain way of legislating. Knowing the Senator from Oregon as well as I do, I am sure he will agree with me that the act is quite uncertain in its

language. It raises doubt as to who is to take the lead. For instance, if the language of the act had provided that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate should call the meeting together, whether it be a meeting of a subcommittee or a full committee, or a part of a subcommittee or a part of a full committee, or whatever it may be, the Senator from Tennessee would have acted as soon as his committee was organized.

Mr. CORDON. Might not the majority have taken a leaf out of the record of the Republican control of the Eightieth Congress and followed a procedure which seemed at least to be sufficient to get the committees together in a meeting?

Mr. McKELLAR. As I recall, the majority in the Eightieth Congress asked for an extension of time, but it was not granted them.

Mr. CORDON. But they did have a meeting, did they not?

Mr. McKELLAR. They did have a meeting. That is to their credit. I will frankly yield them credit for holding a meeting. I do not know who called it. Who called the meeting?

Mr. CORDON. The ambiguity or uncertainty of the statute was not an insuperable obstacle to securing a meeting, was it?

Does the Senator from Tennessee apprehend that the confusion which exists in the statute will be cleared up any more by the first day of May than it was by the third day of January?

Mr. McKELLAR. I certainly do, or I would not have presented the resolution. I believe it will be of very great benefit to wait until the first day of May. We have a part of February, all of March, and all of April, and I believe that in that time we will be able to present a recommendation which will be something more than a guess. I certainly hope we will.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes; I gladly yield.

Mr. CORDON. Does the Senator feel that he needs the time from now until the first day of May to determine which of the chairmen of the several committees shall call the meeting?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I do not. We will have to do as the Republicans did last year, get all four chairmen together. I believe the year before Representative TABER was designated to take the lead. Last year we designated my good friend, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who was then chairman of the Appropriations Committee, to take the lead. Those who met made the best guess they could. But it is my hope that, if the resolution should be adopted, and we would then have a little more than 2½ months to consider the matter, we might agree on something better than a guess and something that will save the American people money. When the Senate and the House know more about how much money will be collected from the people we will then know how much we can properly spend for the same period. I do hope that the resolution will be adopted. I believe its adoption will be a step toward clearing up the ambiguity in the law as to who should have charge of calling the meeting.

Mr. CORDON. I am in agreement with the Senator from Tennessee, let me say—and I usually am——

Mr. McKELLAR. I am very happy to say that that is true.

Mr. CORDON. I am in agreement with the Senator that the presentation of a proper budget carrying the best information available as to anticipated receipts, and the best guess that might be made as to the anticipated or expected expenditures, would be a very great help to the Appropriations Committee and to the Congress in the great task ahead of appropriating money, and finding the money with which we may make the appropriations. But it occurs to me—and I want to ask the Senator from Tennessee a question about it—that that information, to be of value to the Appropriations Committee, of which the Senator is chairman, should be before the committee before it takes final action on any appropriation bill, and should be before the Committee on Appropriations of the House before that committee takes action, and certainly before either House takes action. Otherwise will we not be in the position of blindly making appropriations without the information contemplated in this section of the law; perhaps making larger appropriations than we might otherwise make; on the first day of May finding that we have appropriated too much money in the several bills which have been passed, and then have to pare down on some final bills, the importance of which may be so transcendent that we cannot make any reduction or change whatever? By such action would we not be doing those things which this section seeks to prevent our doing?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, before answering the question I may ask the Senator whether he recalls any regular appropriation bill having been passed during the Eightieth Congress before May 1? I do not refer to a bill making appropriations for incidental purposes. No regular appropriation bill was passed before May 1 during the Eightieth Congress. That has been true for some years past. I have been a member of the Appropriations Committee for a long time, and I do not recall of any regular appropriation bill having come to us from the House, which must originate all appropriation bills of course, in time to be passed by the first of May. So I do not think that will be a matter with which we will be troubled.

Mr. CORDON. I do not have the record. I cannot dispute the Senator's statement. My memory, however, is that the Senate Appropriations Committee has worked on appropriation bills before the first of May, in fact during the full month of April. I may be wrong.

Mr. McKELLAR. Senate Appropriations Committees may have done so, but we do not get any of the regular appropriation bills over here before the first of May. I hope we may receive some earlier this year.

Mr. CORDON. Assuming that that hope is well founded, then the situation the Senator from Oregon has just outlined will be in front of us, will it not, and we will not have the value of the congressional budget to direct us in our considerations and final actions?

Mr. McKELLAR. I think we will have the benefit of it, because all the appropriation bills have to go to conference, and the information which will be obtained by the joint committee, which will be presented to us by the joint committee, will not only be of value to the Senate generally, but it will be of great value to the Senator from Oregon, who is a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield further.

Mr. CORDON. But will not such a report be a budget with reverse English? It will be a report of that which has been done, not of that which we expect to do.

Mr. McKELLAR. I cannot say what it will be, but I hope it will be more than a guess.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, when the Seventy-ninth Congress was in session it passed one of the most important measures ever to come before this great body. I am referring, of course, to the Legislative Reorganization Act, which, despite certain criticisms which we all recognize, accomplished a vitalization and improvement of the legislative branch of the Federal Government.

One of the most important objectives of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 was to strengthen the fiscal controls of the Congress. Advocates of the reorganization proposal stressed the fact that Congress would, for the first time, establish a budget or expenditure ceiling that would permit an over-all analysis of revenues and expenditures and a determination in the early days of a congressional session of the total amount to be appropriated to the executive departments and agencies for the fiscal year immediately ahead. It was thought that such a ceiling on expenditures could rather easily be determined by the Congress within the first 6 weeks of the session and that a recommendation could be made to the two Houses in the form of a resolution that, when enacted, would set the pattern of spending for the succeeding fiscal year.

The Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress was impressed by the number of witnesses who expressed themselves forcibly on this point and concluded that "primary responsibility rests with Congress to improve legislative control over governmental expenditures and that means must be provided to permit a closer scrutiny of them, not only by the committees charged with this duty but also by the individual Members and Congress itself."

The purport of the recommendation that revenues and expenditures be matched is that a ceiling would be placed on estimated expenditures when estimated revenues were insufficient to support a larger spending program and that only the specific action of Congress would permit the creation of additional public debt when revenues were insufficient and when it was decided that additional expenditures were needed. Likewise, when surplus revenues existed Congress could make a determination of how much the public debt should be reduced.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not true that almost every State and municipality has a system by which it has some knowledge of balancing revenues and expenditures? In that respect, is not the fiscal system of the Federal Government considerably behind the times?

Mr. BRIDGES. I believe that is true. In spite of the fact that the Federal Government is the largest, most powerful, and richest agency in the world, it lags far behind municipalities and States generally in the provision for an adequate fiscal system.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So if the joint committee, of which the Senator from New Hampshire will undoubtedly be a member, has the opportunity to make some recommendations by which we can advance toward an over-all appropriation bill, thereby gaining a knowledge of how to balance our expenditures with our revenues, that will be a distinct step forward, will it not?

Mr. BRIDGES. It certainly will.

Two years of operation under the Reorganization Act is too short a period for positive declaration regarding the merits or demerits of most of its provisions. With respect to the legislative budget provision, however, I am prepared and feel qualified to speak out at this time.

From the standpoint of the appropriations procedure, the experience that we had last year with the legislative budget adopted by both Houses clearly indicated that there is no assurance that appropriation reductions will necessarily result in the desired expenditure cuts. To be more specific, the six billions of recommended expenditure reduction for the fiscal year 1948, although never finally acted upon by the Congress, was predicated on a $5,200,000,000 reduction in appropriations. The actual reduction in all appropriations effected by the Eightieth Congress, first session, was slightly in excess of $3,000,000,000. The President's August budget review, however, showed a revision in expenditures for the fiscal year 1948 of slightly more than one-half billion dollars, thus indicating that appropriation reductions affected expenditure reductions in a ratio of 6 to 1; that is, for every dollar of appropriation reduction, only about 16⅔ cents expenditure reduction resulted. The answer to this situation, of course, lies in the fact that the executive branch generally has at its disposal large sums from previous years' appropriations available for expenditure. It was a simple matter for the agencies to accelerate spending from these accumulations of previously unused funds.

It is with these observations in mind that I have repeatedly suggested the desirability of directing our energies toward strengthening the legislative budget provision of the Reorganization Act so that Congress will be better able to discharge its fiscal responsibilities. In consequence, in company with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 182 in the second session of the Eightieth Congress, which would have created a small workable joint committee to investigate Federal expenditures and prepare the legislative budget. This new committee would make a continuing study of all Federal expenditures looking to the elimination or reduction of those determined to be nonessential. The reporting date for the legislative budget would have remained unchanged from the present requirement of a February 15 deadline.

More recently in this Congress I joined several of my colleagues in the introduction of Senate Concurrent Resolution 16, which would require a consolidation of all general appropriations measures into a single or omnibus bill. This resolution would further require a consideration of available revenues and expenditures against such revenues during the fiscal year to which such appropriations apply.

Two years ago and last year I had the responsibility in the Senate of presenting for the Republican leadership the legislative budget as recommended by the joint committee created for that purpose and of which I was chairman. These were the initial efforts of an endeavor to make workable a most complex provision of law. But the Republican Party faced up to its obligation four-square. In good faith, the House and Senate Republican leadership met the deadline even though the first endeavor resulted in a deadlocked conference.

In discussing the report accompanying Senate Concurrent Resolution 42 on February 18 of last year, I admitted that there were doubts in my mind as to the feasibility of actually accomplishing the reduction in expenditures we were recommending for fiscal 1949, modest though the total was.

But the resolution was ready and was introduced on February 9, nearly a week prior to the deadline. Let no one say that there was not a great deal of committee and staff work on the report which went to the Congress.

On both occasions I was denounced by the Democrats despite the fact that every possible means was availed of by the Republican leadership to make a defective provision of law, inherited from the Democrats, a working reality. I have already indicated that the Democratic administration gave no evidence of a willingness on its part to regard the strictures of the Congress as, in any sense, binding on their profligate spending habits. The general attitude was one of ridiculing our sincere and honest efforts.

The Reorganization Act and the legislative budget provision are both a product of a Congress controlled by the Democrats when a member of that party was in the White House. Today the situation is exactly the same as it was in the Seventy-ninth Congress. This is the first real opportunity, therefore, to make the legislative budget ceiling an effective device for preserving the people's money and for guarding against overspending. All of the sources of information essential to the formulation of a legislative budget ceiling—and I am speaking from personal experience—are available to the party in power. Yet the very first thing the Democrats have done is to recommend postponement of the problem to a date when, for all practical purposes, it will be impossible to establish a true ceiling on expenditures because the Congress will have had presented and will have enacted a number of general appropriation bills by the time the reporting date of May 1 arrives.

The resolution which is now before the Senate is, in consequence, a stop-gap measure which avoids the inherent problem, and opens up the floodgates of Federal spending for the fiscal year 1950. The least that the party in power could have done was to endeavor sincerely and conscientiously to formulate a legislative budget, before throwing up its hands and admitting that it could not be accomplished.

I am sure that had the voters decreed otherwise, my Democratic colleagues would be insisting that the February 15 deadline be observed. If the attempt here is to do away with the legislative budget feature of the Reorganization Act, then simple honesty requires a repealing and not a postponing type of resolution. Please remember it was the Seventy-ninth Congress, not the Eightieth Congress, which enacted this provision, which the Eighty-first Congress now seeks to avoid. Mr. President, let us remember that it was the Democratic Seventy-ninth Congress which passed the Reorganization Act. The Republican Eightieth Congress endeavored to live up to it. The Democratic Eighty-first Congress now is attempting to repeal it.

I realize that February 15 is close at hand and that the Democrats have not yet done a thing about preparing and presenting the legislative budget by then; they have not even called together the chairmen of the committees to make preliminary plans to discuss this matter.

Inasmuch as the administration and the Democrats in this body and the Democrats in the House of Representatives have failed completely so far as carrying out this provision of the act is concerned, although we Republicans lived up to it faithfully 2 years ago and a year ago, and inasmuch as the Democrats and the administration now are "up against the gun," with nothing to report, I am going to offer an amendment to the concurrent resolution presented by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, in line 6, it is proposed to strike out "May 1, 1949" and insert in lieu thereof "March 15, 1949."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I hope favorable action may be taken on the proposed change of date, as set forth in the amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, does the Senator from New Hampshire request the yeas and nays on the amendment?

Mr. BRIDGES. I wish to have a quorum call, and then I shall request the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire now suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. BRIDGES. I shall do so later.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the views which have been expressed by the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire in regard to House Concurrent Resolution 22.

It seems to me that there is presented to us today a fundamental question of fiscal policy and of legislative responsibility which, so far as the majority party is concerned, is being lightly dismissed by the resolution currently under discussion.

The spirit and the intent of the legislative budget are abundantly clear. The legislative budget is a charge upon the Congress to face its responsibilities and its intentions with regard to fiscal policy. It operates in the interest of governmental economy. It does not outlaw deficit financing, but it requires the Congress to state that if it intends to condone an unbalanced budget it will make that sentiment a matter of record, and will do so in advance and will not say later that it was compelled, because of appropriations, to go into deficit spending.

The legislative budget is, above all, a prescription for governmental fiscal policy and not a post mortem.

The concurrent resolution which is now pending, however, has the effect of abrogating the letter and the spirit of the Reorganization Act and its provision for the legislative budget. It would return us to a fiscal situation which the democratically controlled Seventy-ninth Congress found unsatisfactory, and sought to correct by requiring the establishment by Congress of a ceiling for Federal expenditures for each and every fiscal year. Senators on this side of the aisle supported that view and supported the passage of the Reorganization Act.

This concurrent resolution, as I see it, would put the legislative budget in a deep freeze. While the proponents of the resolution lack the candor to concede that it will kill the legislative budget, it can emerge as nothing more than a ghost.

At the very best, a May 1 reporting date will mean a mere summation of appropriation grants to that date and a projection of the remaining appropriations, which by that time the House Appropriations Committee will have passed on or at least will have readied for action.

Mr. President, I recognize that the preparation of the legislative budget is not an easy task. We who were in the majority for the first 2 years of the operation of section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act found it difficult to comply with. Obviously, further machinery is desirable to implement it, perhaps through closer liaison between Congress and the executive departments in the formulation of the budget, or perhaps through some device such as that which was submitted for study last year by the then chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

But we who served on the joint committee for the legislative budget in the last Congress also found the principle of the legislative budget sound, and accordingly we strove to submit and did submit an estimated ceiling on expenditures in accordance with the act and the law.

Mr. President, I admit that I am not a master of the sleight-of-hand mathematics which are employed by the administration in handling the people's money and in the formulation of the President's budget. Nevertheless, from my reading of the budget I cannot comprehend why it should be impossible, if one has a genuine desire to observe the purposes and principles or even the form of the Reorganization Act, merely to take the total estimates of receipts of the Government for the coming fiscal year and apply them against the expenditures as recommended by the President.

The Constitution of the United States places in the House of Representatives and the Senate the responsibility of determining what appropriations shall be made and how much the people of the United States shall be taxed to pay for the expenditures of the National Government. Therefore, a legislative budget is a requirement if the elected representatives of the people are to determine how much the Government can afford to spend and how much money it can take from the taxpayers to cover the expenditure.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, or does he prefer to complete his statement before yielding?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. On the point the Senator from Michigan has been discussing, it is interesting to note some of the colloquy and debate between various members of the other party last year.

I quote now from former Senator Hatch, of New Mexico, now a Federal judge. He referred to the President of the United States, and said:

> I assume that the President of the United States submits his budget annually by virture of statutory mandate. The President is required to do that, and he does it.

Then the following colloquy occurred between Senator Hatch and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]:

> Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.
>
> Mr. HATCH. The President did that; did he not?
>
> Mr. O'MAHONEY. He did.
>
> Mr. HATCH. He submitted a budget, whether it was right or wrong; he complied with the law of the land, and he gave to the Congress and the country his best estimate of what that budget should be; is that correct?
>
> Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.
>
> Mr. HATCH. Is it not true that the statute which the Congress itself passed, requiring and commanding a legislative budget, is just as mandatory as the statute making that requirement of the President?

Mr. President, that is very clear. There was no misunderstanding on the other side of the aisle. There were two distinguished Democratic Senators, the then Senator from New Mexico, Mr. Hatch, and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], each one of them very clear in his own mind that this requirement is mandatory, just as mandatory as the provisions requiring the President of the United States to submit his budget. However, instead of that, we now see the majority turning their backs upon this mandatory statutory requirement.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I am glad to have the record of the last session placed in the RECORD now, showing what actually happened; and of course the requirement for the submission of the legislative budget is just as mandatory upon the Congress as is the requirement for the President to submit a budget.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. It would not become mandatory if the Congress were to change the date, would it?

Mr. FERGUSON. No.

Mr. LUCAS. So far as February 15 is concerned, it is mandatory as the statute now stands.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. But in the event the resolution reported by the Senator from Tennessee is adopted, it becomes mandatory according to that date, does it not?

Mr. FERGUSON. On May 1. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. So if we adopt the resolution we are not doing anything different from what we have done in the past, other than merely to postpone the date?

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall answer that a little later.

Mr. LUCAS. Very well. But I assure the Senator we will comply with the law if the date is postponed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Most of the extensive hearings on appropriation bills are conducted in the House. I understand under the present system in the House, hearings on various appropriation bills proceed at the same time. Those who are interested in making up the budget and spending the money are called in for questioning as to how much is needed, and then after all the hearings have been concluded and many of the bills have been passed by the House, they come to the Senate and we conduct our hearings. The question may be asked, Are we then to have a limitation? If the date is fixed as May 1, while we can hardly expect a limitation on the expenditures, at least we shall go through the formality by that date of placing a limitation after Congress has gone ahead and appropriated vast sums of money and perhaps reached the point where it cannot retrace its steps.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. BRIDGES. The distinguished majority leader, the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], I think has an excellent memory. In case he has forgotten, I should like to refresh his memory, and remind him that in February 1947, when the date was being considered——

Mr. LUCAS. What date in February?

Mr. BRIDGES. February 21, 1947. The Senator from Illinois said:

> That committee had an obligation under the act, and they failed, * * * in the performance of that duty and obligation, in not giving to the Senate sufficient information of some kind and character upon which it might intelligently act.

And all through the RECORD I see statements by the Senator from Illinois, who was very active, as he always is, in that debate, and he was very ardently in favor at that time of the Republicans taking action on the legislative budget.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield, in order that I may answer my good friend from New Hampshire?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield. I should like to have the Senator from Illinois answer the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. LUCAS. I was ardently anxious that the Republicans take action. The Republicans could have done the same thing, after the first year's experience, that we are now trying to do. The only thing we on this side of the aisle are attempting to do now is to profit by the experience the Republicans had with section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act during the past 2 years. The Senator well knows that during the first year, 1947, there never was any agreement by the Republican Congress upon the budget. There was agreement in the Senate on a saving of $4,500,000,000, but the House adopted the figure of $6,000,000,000, and told the American people they were going to save that amount. The conferees, during all that year, never agreed upon any amount. Therefore, so far as complying with the provision of section 138 is concerned, the Republican Senators, I must respectfully submit, never complied with it, although they threw the people of the country into quite a bit of confusion with respect to what they were trying to do. That is one of the reasons why the Senator from Illinois desires postponement of the date at the present time, so that perhaps by May 1 the Senate can have sufficient information, after House action on appropriation bills, possibly to make an intelligent guess or approach concerning an estimate. Let me say, while I am on my feet, if the Senator will yield further for another observation.

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I never voted for the $4,500,000,000 savings estimate, as the RECORD will show. I have never been in favor of this provision of the Reorganization Act. I have never thought it workable. I said, and as the Senator will discover if he will look at my remarks in the RECORD, that so long as national defense appropriations were in the condition they were, and nobody knew exactly how much would be needed in 1947 and 1948 for that purpose, I would not vote for any reduction in the budget, because, if I did so, it would be a dishonest vote in my opinion. I think that is what the RECORD will show. I may be wrong about that, but I felt that way about it at the time, and I feel that way at the present time. I hope the committee in making its study of section 138 of the Reorganization Act will reach one of two conclusions, either a conclusion in line with the resolution offered by the Senator from New Hampshire and others, with respect to an over-all budget, or a decision to eliminate this provision in its entirety, because I think it is wholly unworkable.

Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. McKELLAR addressed the Chair.

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield first to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I may say, on May 8, 1947, just 8 days after the resolution which the Senator from Tennessee is presenting and which the Senator from Illinois is supporting, the Senator from Illinois said:

> Every member of the Senate knows, and the country knows, that the people were entitled many weeks ago to some kind of a budget report, good or bad, even though it was based on a speculative guess.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. Evidently the Senator believed that very ardently.

Mr. CAPEHART. Who said that?

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I made the same argument as the one now being made by the Senators on the Republican side, that there should be a compliance with the Reorganization Act, that they were not complying with it at that time, and that the country was entitled to know. I did not mean I was going to support the Republican position. You had not complied with the Reorganization Act up to that time, and I was merely reminding Members on the Republican side, and the country, of the failure to comply with the mandatory provision about which Senators are talking at this moment. That is all I was doing. That argument is hardly germane to the pending issue. Let us postpone the date and the majority will before that time live up to the law.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield, in order that I may answer a question asked by the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does not the Senator believe now that the committee and the Senate and the Congress should have more time in which to prepare the legislative budget?

Mr. BRIDGES. I may say to the Senator from Tennessee that for a long time I felt that the reorganization bill as enacted was not wholly satisfactory, but the point I made was that so long as it was the law, we should go ahead on the first of January and attempt to work it out, and we did so. Now we are within 2 or 3 days of the dead line, and the joint committee of which the Senator from Tennessee is the distinguished chairman, have not even had a meeting to make temporary plans. That is my point.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from New Hampshire has changed his opinion somewhat on all these matters within the past year. I read from the RECORD, if the Senator from Michigan will yield for that purpose——

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. McKELLAR. I read from page 1401 of the RECORD, of February 18, 3 days after the time had expired, and nothing had been done.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will yield in one moment. Let me read what the Senator said then. It is very interesting in view of his present position.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to reply, when the Senator is through.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will yield at the proper time. I do not have the floor, but I am sure the Senator from Michigan will yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire, to enable him to reply.

Mr. McKELLAR. I read from the remarks of the Senator from New Hampshire:

> For these reasons I restate my firm opinion that section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act, dealing with the legislative budget, should be amended as to the date of presentation. Only at a much later date—

The Senator did not fix April 1, but an even later date at that time. Maybe the 1st of July was in the Senator's mind.

> Only at a much later date, after hearings have been held, after we of the Congress have had ample opportunity to weigh carefully the requests of the President's budget, can we in justice to the country, to the taxpayers, to the departments and agencies involved, and to ourselves, judiciously arrive at a sound estimate of the proper relationship between appropriations, expenditures, revenues, and debt reduction.

I agreed with the Senator's statement at that time. He was in the same situation as I am now in asking for additional time. I think the Senator's views then were better than they are today. I think they were sounder, more reasonable, and better for the country. I think there will be a better report if we have more time in which to make it. Under the circumstances, I am wondering how the Senator can vote against the resolution, or how he can offer an amendment to it fixing the time at March 15, when he asked then not only for more time for the committee, but more time for hearings. The Senator knows that when hearings are begun they take a great deal of time. To be perfectly frank, I hope that the time may be extended to May 1. I do not believe extending the limit to March 15 will give sufficient time. I believe it will be more beneficial to every Senator and to the Nation if more time is given. I think it is really remarkable that there should be any opposition to the resolution. That may be due to the fact that I voted against this provision in the original reorganization bill. I doubted its wisdom then, and when I read section 138 I am more doubtful than ever. I do not think any such legislation as section 138 should ever have been passed; but I very sincerely hope that the joint committee, to which the matter is to be referred, may prepare a report which will make the law effective and not let it be ineffective as it has been during the past 2 years.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield so that I

may answer the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Tennessee correctly quoted my remarks from the RECORD, but let me point out to him that the speech he quoted was made on the floor of the Senate on February 18. Why is that date significant? Because on February 9, 6 days before the deadline, the Republican majority of the Congress submitted a resolution to the Senate and the House of Representatives establishing a legislative budget. In other words, we complied with the law. Whether we agreed with all the provisions of the law, we complied with it. I pointed out the defects, and I still stand by my statement. That is why I am today offering an amendment extending the time to March 15, which I am sure will give ample time, when we think of the time the President allowed for the work of the Special Session of the Congress last summer. It might be interesting to note at this time that the President, in calling a Special Session of the Congress last summer, said that within 15 days, Congress could bring about the following program:

1. Reestablishment of an excess-profits tax.
2. Restoration of consumer credit control.
3. Greater authority for Federal Reserve Board to regulate bank credit.
4. Authority to regulate commodity exchange speculation.
5. Authority for allocation and inventory control of scarce commodities.
6. Strengthening of rent controls, and extra appropriations for enforcement.
7. Stand-by rationing authority.
8. Price control authority.
9. Wage control authority.
10. Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill.
11. Federal aid to education.
12. Increase of minimum wage to 75 cents an hour.
13. Fifty-percent increase in old-age pensions, lowering of eligibility age for women from 65 to 60, extension of social security to all not covered now.
14. Amendment of Displaced Persons Act.
15. A United States Government loan for construction of United Nations headquarters.
16. Senate ratification of an international wheat agreement.
17. Extra appropriations for a TVA steam plant and other power projects and removal of certain limitations from the law.
18. Revision of Federal pay schedules.
19. Anti-poll-tax bill.
20. Antilynch bill.
21. FEPC bill.
22. Compulsory health insurance.
23. Repeal of the Taft-Hartley law, and its replacement with another Truman-endorsed labor-management relations law.
24. Additional farm legislation.
25. Additional reciprocal trade agreements legislation.
26. Additional antitrust legislation.
27. Universal military training.
28. A national science foundation.
29. Approval of the St. Lawrence waterway treaty.

The President had great confidence, apparently, in the power of the Congress to pass that program in 15 days. I am sure that if the President had such great confidence that his program could be accomplished in 15 days, even though the Democratic majority has not done anything to date, and Congress has been in session somewhat longer than 15 days—two times 15 days—a very effective job could be done on the legislative budget by the date fixed in my amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. How long ago was it since that message was presented to the Congress?

Mr. BRIDGES. I read the President's recommendations to the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. McKELLAR. How long ago was that?

Mr. BRIDGES. The President said that entire program could be completed in approximately 15 days.

Mr. McKELLAR. Was that in August?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator be good enough to tell the Senate how many of those recommendations have been enacted into law, or whether any of them were enacted into law within the 15 days referred to?

Mr. BRIDGES. Two of them, in part.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of all those recommendations none was enacted into law in 15 days.

Mr. BRIDGES. The President said:

> Things are getting worse every day. We cannot afford to wait until the next Congress convenes.

So he called Congress into special session and outlined the program to which I have just referred. If it was so urgent in the special session, it is very interesting, to me, that the distinguished leadership of the Democratic Party has not done anything about putting into effect the program which was so necessary 7 months ago, for which the country could not afford to wait. It was very urgent in the summer of 1948, but now it goes into the back recesses of our minds—at least, the minds of the Democratic majority.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from New Hampshire has referred to the report of the joint committee last year. I should like to read a resolution to him and ask him a question. I should like to ask him if he thinks it was of any benefit to the Congress in passing upon appropriations:

> *Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That it is the judgment of the Congress, based upon present available information, that revenues during the period of the fiscal year 1949 will approximate $47,300,000,000 and that expenditures during the said fiscal year should not exceed $37,200,000,000, of which latter amount not more than $26,600,000,000 would be in consequence of appropriations hereinafter made available for obligations in such fiscal year.

I am sure the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, the former chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, will not assert that this report he rather proudly boasts of today was of very much value to our committee or to the Congress.

Mr. BRIDGES. What the Senator read was the resolution, not the report. He referred to it as a report.

Mr. McKELLAR. This is the resolution which the Senator made up from the report. There was really no information. The Senator argued then we did not have sufficient time under the La Follette-Monroney Act, and we have not the time today. All we are asking is that we be allowed more time, and I can assure the Senator and the Senate that if we can have this resolution adopted there will be information in the report which will be of value to the Senate in passing appropriation bills.

I thank the Senator from Michigan for yielding.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, one other question. If the President had sufficient confidence that Congress could pass in 15 days all the measures I have enumerated, does not the Senator think that if we give the committee double the time, to March 15, they can really act on this one matter? I do not want to let the President down in his confidence in the Congress. If he thought all these things could be done in so short a time, I am sure this one little thing could be done by the date I have indicated in my amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Whatever the President may have thought about it before, I am quite sure he is convinced by this time, from the action of the Congress, that it takes more time to carry out this very foolish law, against which I voted.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, as a matter of fact the President has already made compliance with the act easy by submitting a budget some $873,000,000 in deficit. The legislative budget could be made up in a few minutes, simply by recommending a reduction in expenditures of $873,000,000 to bring the executive budget into balance. Personally, I think that even greater reductions are possible—the additional savings to be applied to the public debt. But the present leadership does not want to do even so obvious and simple a thing. I confess a suspicion that there is demonstrated here that they are preoccupied in something else—a concern for more and more governmental expenditure with scarcely token acknowledgment of any fiscal philosophy of governmental economy.

I do not propose to be an alarmist with respect to the behavior of certain economic barometers that have been showing storm warnings in the last few days. I submit, however, that the behavior of the commodity market and of the stock exchange and the trend of unemployment in the last few days suggest serious consequences for a loose fiscal policy which any failure to face up to responsibility on the legislative budget represents. I note that already some of the advocates of increased taxation have been brought up short in their thinking by a look at those storm warnings, and the thinking of more sober authorities on taxation has been confirmed and crystallized.

If we in Congress do not set a ceiling upon governmental expenditures according to the purposes of the legislative

budget, we are inviting either deficit spending or new taxes. Either consequence could be the influence to send the state of our economy, which is evidently in delicate equilibrium at this moment, over the brink.

Considering the economic state of the Nation at this moment, it appears to me that the proposal to disregard any limitation on expenditures by the majority party is an admission that the present Government spending will continue, or it is an admission that the majority has come face to face with some of the hard facts of economic life and is baffled, confused, and even badly frightened.

Let me restate my opinion that the President's budget is not airtight. It calls for a number of expenditures in new fields, and increases in others. Elimination of some of those newly projected enterprises, or their limitation, and a cut-back on other expenditures to a maximum over-all total, as contained in appropriations for the current fiscal year, would simplify matters as far as the legislative budget is concerned, and, I am certain, would exert a healthy influence upon our economy.

Let me observe, further, that if the majority leadership finds a problem in placing a limitation on expenditures at this time its problem will be immeasurably complicated next year. It may be expected that by that time new projects, contemplated in the present budget, will be in full flood, and demanding more and more sustenance. At the same time there will exist an aggravated threat of possible decline in national income and governmental receipts.

I am in full accord with the senior Senator from New Hampshire when he observes that while the present resolution is submitted as a stopgap measure it is in effect a repealer of the principle and purpose of the legislative budget. I think it is incumbent upon the majority leadership to admit as much. But I do not think that any such abrogation is wise or justifiable.

The legislative budget requires the Congress to call its shots with regard to fiscal policy. That is a sound proposition, as it was conceived to be by its proponents in the Seventy-ninth Congress. But this is no skeet match, and Senators cannot stand here on May 1 with appropriation measures in their final stages and expect to shoot in all directions. By that time any prospect for limiting expenditures will already be a dead pigeon.

I have been dwelling on these remarks on questions of fiscal policy and legislative responsibility for fiscal policy that are involved in this abrogation of the legislative budget. There is involved here also a grave question of legislative integrity and morality, which should command the attention of every one of us on this floor.

The Reorganization Act, with its provision for the legislative budget, was passed as an act of Congress in 1946. It was as binding upon the Congress as any law is binding upon an individual citizen, and certainly every citizen has a right to expect that Congress will observe its own legislation.

Now, however, we are asked to abrogate that law just 5 days before it is to expire, without any notice, and, moreover, without any attempt or gesture to comply with it. There has not even been a meeting of the joint committee on the legislative budget to explore the possibilities of conforming to the law.

Simply because Congress possesses the law-making power it is being asked to assert that power to absolve itself of an imposed responsibility which some apparently find burdensome.

It is perfectly in order, and I think an impelling question, to ask how we, the Congress, can expect individual citizens to obey our laws and not expect to have those citizens appealing to us for last-minute relief in any and every situation where they find the laws' restrictions burdensome upon them.

Here we are, on the 10th day of February, not having had a meeting of the joint committee, never having tried to follow the law at all, and we are asked to abrogate it when it requires action on the 15th. So I say we are asked to abrogate the law.

Now, with only 5 days left before the law requires something to be done, it is proposed that the law be changed so it will have no effect. Mr. President, I say there is involved the question of legislative integrity and legislative morality, which should concern every Member of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as the Senator who in committee made the motion to advance the date to March 15, the motion which the ranking member of the minority on the committee has made on the floor today, I want to say that I support his motion now made. I made the motion in the committee because I believe that the whole fiscal administrative policy of our Government is far behind the policies which are now common in our States and our municipalities. The States and municipalities, in practically every instance know, when an appropriation is made, where the revenue is coming to pay for it. That is not so in the Federal Government, as its business is now conducted.

The procedure provided for in the La Follette-Monroney Act is a little step forward in an effort to enable Congress to have a better over-all comprehension of the fiscal policy of the Federal Government when appropriation bills are considered. I think it is particularly important this year to have the date set forward, if it is possible to do so, in order that we may have a better idea of the general situation when we come to the huge appropriations we will be asked to make for the armed services and are called upon to determine whether they shall be $15,000,000,000 or more and whether veterans' benefits, shall be increased, and what action shall be taken respecting the new benefits asked for by the President in his state of the Union message.

Furthermore, we confront the problem of housing, and proposals regarding health, education, and other problems. Then, there is the question of universal military training. All these are new proposals. We do not know how much, if provided for, they will cost. We do not know how large the revenues will be with which to pay for them.

So, I think, this year particularly, without any regard to what has been done in the past, that the provision contained in the La Follette-Monroney Act is of great value, and I urge that the date be advanced, and that the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] be adopted.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I want to associate myself as being in full support with the observations made by the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and also my colleague on the Appropriations Committee, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. As one who comes from a State which does not have deficit spending, I believe that the Federal Government should take steps as quickly as possible to place limitations on what it may spend. If we are ever to get away from deficit spending, we should try to place such limitations on our expenditures.

Mr. President, it may be said that we can pick a figure out of the air and shoot at it; that it would be better for us to shoot at such a figure than not to shoot at all. I was on the joint committee which brought out such a report a year ago, a report which was severely criticized because it was said that supporting evidence for it was lacking. I took that criticism rather well, because even though there was not full supporting evidence, yet in the figure submitted to the Congress of the United States we at least had something to shoot at.

I was particularly interested in the argument advanced by the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] relative to keeping faith with the La Follette-Monroney Act. Whether it can be complied with or cannot be complied with, what is now proposed to be done by extending the date to May 1 is to circumvent the intention of the Reorganization Act.

I think all of us will agree—I am sure the majority leader, because of his long service in the Senate, will agree with me—that if the time is extended until May the hearings will have been had in the House on most of the regular appropriation bills. The regular appropriation bills will then come over to the Senate at practically the time when a ceiling is established, and by that time the amounts of the appropriation bills in large measure will have been determined. So in reality what is proposed to be done now is a complete circumvention of what is intended by the spirit of the Reorganization Act.

I followed rather closely what was done last year respecting the ceiling, because I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and it has been a privilege for me to have served under the chairmanship of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] and also the chairmanship of the Senator from New

Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who was chairman for the past 2 years. I followed the proceedings closely in an effort to try to solve this one great problem.

Mr. President, at this point I should like to place in the RECORD a statement respecting appropriation bills, to show what will actually happen if the date is extended until the first of May. On May 5, 1947, the following appropriation bills had been reported in the House. House bill 1968, the urgent deficiency bill. House bill 2436, Treasury-Post Office, 1948. House bill 2700, Labor-Federal Security, 1948. House Joint Resolution 154, hoof-and-mouth disease. House Joint Resolution 159, to supply deficiencies. House bill 2849, first deficiency. House bill 3123, Interior Department, 1948.

House bill 3245, second deficiency, 1947.

House bill 3311, State, Justice, Commerce, 1948.

In other words, there were nine appropriation bills on which the evidence had been taken. The bills came to the House ready for final passage. So the ceiling would not have applied in that instance. Perhaps it would not have been possible to do any better anyway.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. When were those bills passed?

Mr. WHERRY. They were passed afterward, but they had been reported by May 5, 1947.

Mr. McKELLAR. They were passed long afterward, were they not?

Mr. WHERRY. They had to come to the Senate after they were passed by the House, and it was necessary to have conferences. They were all passed after May 1.

Mr. McKELLAR. What percentage of the money appropriations for that year did those bills constitute?

Mr. WHERRY. I did not compare the nine bills with all other appropriation bills.

Mr. President, I have before me a summary on the question asked by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. If there is no objection, I should like to have it placed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Table of appropriation bills, Eightieth Congress, second session

Bill No.	Title	Budget estimates	House				Senate				Public law		
			Date reported	Amount as reported	Date passed	Amount as passed	Date reported	Amount as reported	Date passed	Amount as passed	Date approved	Amount as approved	Law No.
H. R. 5214.	Independent offices	$1,047,606,864	Jan. 30	$991,583,551	Feb. 4	$991,518,551	Mar. 12	$967,705,551	Mar. 15	$967,705,551	Apr. 20	$967,142,551	491
H. R. 5524.	Army-civil functions	737,804,300	Feb. 24	606,558,766	Feb. 26	606,558,766	Apr. 23	708,596,666	May 19	708,596,666	June 25	641,578,666	782
H. R. 5525.	Urgent deficiency, 1948.	131,546,901	Feb. 24	131,015,385	Feb. 24	131,015,385	Feb. 26	137,339,385	Feb. 27	137,489,385	Mar. 4	136,388,385	430
H. R. 5607.	State-Justice-Commerce.	589,417,230	Feb. 27	503,420,263	Mar. 5	503,590,263	Apr. 23	516,029,937	Apr. 26	516,029,937	June 3	511,129,662	597
	State			197,217,463		197,217,463		205,985,477		205,985,477		202,603,862	
	Justice			116,907,600		116,300,700		116,655,700		116,655,700		116,655,700	
	Commerce			171,087,000		171,267,000		174,036,660		174,036,660		172,428,000	
	Judiciary			18,785,100		18,785,100		19,352,100		19,352,100		19,352,100	
H. R. 5728.	Labor-Federal Security.	931,539,169	Mar. 5	905,405,250	Mar. 8	905,405,250	Apr. 23	890,751,440	Apr. 26	890,751,440	June 14	890,159,000	639
	Labor			12,498,200		12,498,200		14,909,990		14,909,990		14,423,700	
	Federal Security			239,170,319		239,788,500		220,072,900		220,072,900		219,946,750	
	Related agencies			653,118,550		653,118,550		655,768,550		655,768,550		655,768,550	
H. R. 5770.	Treasury-Post Office	2,944,949,200	Mar. 9	1,981,722,350	Mar. 11	1,981,722,350	May 24	2,010,601,200	May 28	2,010,601,200	June 14	1,996,313,425	640
	Treasury			334,304,700		290,453,100		308,998,600		308,998,600		299,861,100	
	Post Office			1,710,644,950		1,691,269,250		1,701,602,600		1,701,602,600		1,696,452,325	
H. R. 5883.	Agriculture		Mar. 16	696,412,000		543,283,453	Mar. 18	545,533,453	May 12	580,270,278	May 25	580,403,278	June 19	577,546,953	712
H. J. Res. 355.	Foreign aid—tax refunds.	555,125,000	Mar. 22	555,125,000	Mar. 22	555,125,000	Mar. 25	555,125,000	Mar. 29	555,125,000	Mar. 31	555,125,000	470
H. R. 6055.	First deficiency, 1948	1,002,150,316	Mar. 30	346,678,152	Apr. 1	338,378,152	Apr. 23	780,179,479	Apr. 26	780,179,479	May 10	777,986,045	519
H. R. 6226.	Supplemental national defense, 1948:												
	Cash	964,100,000	Apr. 14	923,100,000	Apr. 15	923,100,000	Apr. 30	958,200,000	May 6	958,200,000	May 21	949,000,000	547
	Contract authorization.	1,453,000,000		1,453,000,000		2,275,000,000		2,275,000,000		2,275,000,000		2,275,000,000	
H. R. 6355.	Supplemental Federal Security Agency, 1949.	993,708,460	Apr. 27	969,050,000	Apr. 29	969,050,000	June 2	983,227,319	June 2	983,227,319	June 16	975,914,700	646
H. R. 6430.	District of Columbia	101,897,283	May 4	101,164,083	May 5	101,164,083	June 2	99,567,983	June 3	99,567,983	June 19	99,729,483	724
H. R. 6481.	Government corporations.	49,644,100	May 7	37,979,061	May 11	37,979,061	June 12	42,062,061	June 15	43,422,061	June 30	38,479,061	860
H. R. 6500.	Legislative	61,379,520	May 11	55,889,600	May 13	55,889,600	June 2	56,362,726	June 3	56,362,726	June 14	56,140,401	641
H. R. 6705.	Interior	474,773,835	May 26	375,677,591	May 27	375,692,591	June 12	422,179,088	June 14	422,179,088	June 29	407,836,974	841
H. R. 6768.	Treasury-Post Office supplemental, 1949:	355,205,375	June 1	248,414,255	June 1	248,414,255	June 12	248,414,255	June 12	248,414,255	June 19	248,414,255	727
	Treasury			196,519,275		190,538,755		190,538,755		190,538,755		190,538,755	
	Post Office			158,695,100		57,875,500		57,875,500		57,875,500		57,875,500	
H. R. 6771.	National Military, 1949.	7,219,392,000	June 2	6,447,689,000	June 2	6,447,689,000	June 17	6,777,426,052	June 17	6,553,426,052	June 24	6,705,418,163	766
H. R. 6772.	Navy, 1949	3,996,738,700	June 2	3,686,733,250	June 3	3,686,733,250	June 14	3,812,170,250	June 15	3,812,170,250	June 24	3,749,059,250	753
H. R. 6801.	Foreign aid, 1949	6,533,710,228	June 3	5,980,710,228	June 4	5,980,710,228	June 14	6,125,710,228	June 15	6,125,710,228	June 28	6,030,710,228	793
H. R. 6829.	Independent offices, 1949.	6,299,909,000	June 8	5,795,048,931	June 9	5,795,048,931	June 17	5,854,783,851	June 18	5,855,308,851	June 30	5,819,699,851	862
H. R. 6935.	Second deficiency, 1948.	761,135,650	June 15	485,196,951	June 16	485,204,240	June 18	605,209,130	June 19	605,792,130	June 25	549,774,876	785

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, let us consider what happened in the case of the appropriation bills for the fiscal year 1948. By May 4, 1948—and if this resolution is adopted, the time will be extended to May 1—the following appropriation bills had been reported to the House—and there were more in 1948 than there were in 1947, reported by May 4.

House bill 5214, independent offices. That is quite a sizable appropriation.

House bill 5524, Army civil functions. The distinguished Senator will agree with me that that is a pretty heavy appropriation bill.

House bill 5525, urgent deficiency, 1948.

House bill 5607, State-Justice-Commerce.

House bill 5728, Labor-Federal Security.

House bill 5770, Treasury-Post Office.

House bill 5883, Agriculture.

House Joint Resolution 355, foreign aid—tax refunds.

House bill 6055, first deficiency, 1948.

House bill 6226, supplemental national defense, 1948.

House bill 6355, supplemental Federal Security Agency, 1949.

House bill 6430, District of Columbia.

The point I wish to make is that before the ceiling could be complied with, if the date were extended to May 1, if we did our work well in the House and Senate, another list of appropriation bills would be either acted upon or ready for action. The evidence would have been heard, and the figures would have been arrived at. There would be no opportunity to cut them, even though the ceiling might require that they be cut. In that respect we would circumvent the spirit of the act by extending the date under this resolution until May 1, when the appropriation bills would come up before the ceiling is established.

I merely make the point to show that if the time is extended in accordance with the pending resolution, the force and effect of the law will be lost. It will be of no particular service, because the appropriations will have been made. We shall have to appropriate the total amount, regardless of the ceiling.

It is my judgment that if this resolution is adopted, and additional author-

izations are provided, we shall have to continue deficit spending. The only way to eliminate it is to establish a figure and say, "This is what we are going to receive, and this is all we can spend," and then keep within that figure. At least we can attempt to do so. By proceeding in the manner which has been suggested, when we pass the various appropriations and add them up, if we do not have the revenue we must resort to deficit spending to pay for the appropriations approved by both Houses, regardless of what the ceiling ought to be, based upon an inventory of income.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is it not true that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee in the House, and each member of the House Appropriations Committee serve on the joint committee? Will they not have all the information by May 1, or whenever the time comes for the passage of an appropriation bill by the House? The House committee will have such information if the joint committee is able to reach a conclusion by that time.

Mr. WHERRY. In answer to that observation by my distinguished colleague, for whom I have the highest respect, let me say that of course there will be more information than we now have. But the point I make is that if the time under this resolution is extended to May 1, there will be no ceiling. The appropriation bills will be passed. Hearings will have been held, and the amounts will have been arrived at, in most cases. Then if we pass additional authorizations, which we might do, additional appropriations will be required, and the very spirit of the Reorganization Act, with which we are pledged to keep faith, will have been violated.

Mr. McKELLAR. Did the Congress follow the recommendation of the ceiling on appropriations last year?

Mr. WHERRY. I believe that the Congress did its level best not only to follow the ceiling but to cut the cost of Government and save as much money as possibly could be saved. In addition, it endeavored to pay as much as possible on the debt. I believe that the Congress kept faith with the figure which was pulled out of the air, whether it could be justified or not. I agree that today we possibly cannot justify each and every figure that might be placed in the budget; but I hope we can adopt a ceiling, and thereby make an effort to place the Federal Government on a sound financial basis.

If I may be indulged for referring to my own State, I wish to pay a compliment to the State of Nebraska, which has a balanced budget. It does not know what it is to have deficit spending. It knows what its revenue will be, and what its expenditures should be, and it keeps within its budget. If we want to protect the financial stability of the Federal Government and keep faith with the spirit of the law, we must keep our expenses within our income. Unless we do so, we must continue deficit spending, which, as it continues to rise, threatens the destruction of the financial stability of the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator's State on having a balanced budget and looking after its finances in the way it does.

The Senator seems to lay great stress on the question of the limit on spending which the committee established last year. Is it not true that the Congress of last year wholly disregarded the limit set, and appropriated far beyond that limit?

Mr. WHERRY. There were additional authorizations, such as that for ERP, and there were other legislative requirements. There will probably be additional requirements this year. We cannot possibly anticipate everything. I have a great deal of sympathy with the viewpoint which the distinguished Senator expresses in that regard. However, that should not prevent us from trying to establish a ceiling and pare appropriations to keep them within what we feel should be the limit of expenditure in the light of the income we expect to receive.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad the Senator desires to pare appropriations. I believe the Senator will joint the Senator from Tennessee in cutting appropriations to the greatest extent possible, and saving as much money as possible for the American people and the American Government.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the resolution as it is presented, and in favor of the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

I wish to be perfectly frank in discussing this situation, with particular reference to the value of section 138 of the Congressional Reorganization Act of 1946.

Of course, the purpose of the section, Mr. President, is perfectly clear from its context. The Congress has directed that the four committees of Congress who deal with the fiscal affairs of the Government shall meet immediately after each Congress convenes; they are authorized and directed to meet jointly and—now I quote from the section—

after study and consultation, giving due consideration to the budget recommendations of the President, report to their respective Houses a legislative budget for the ensuing fiscal year, including the estimated over-all Federal receipts and expenditures for such year.

Mr. President, I call attention to two words there. The first one is "budget"; the second is the word "estimated." Mr. President, a budget is a financial statement of expected receipts and expected disbursements. It is not a summary; it is not an accounting of things already past. It is an attempt to plan for the future so that the fiscal affairs in question may be orderly, so that those in authority may approach their problems with at least some general plan with reference to their solution. That is what the budget is for.

I submit that with reference to the Congress, the type of budget contemplated in this section is not of too great value. I recognize that the estimates may be considerably off from the facts, as they later develop. But, Mr. President, so far as anticipated revenue is concerned, that is not true. Certainly, with all the information available to the Treasury Department and to the joint committees on Internal Revenue taxation, and all available to the four committees, acting jointly, which are directed to proceed under this section, those committees could have followed and can follow the direction of section 138. They could have reported and they still can report to the Congress a close estimate of the income of the Federal Government for the coming fiscal year. That could be estimated. It may be that the committees would have to go somewhat into the realm of guess with reference to anticipated or expected expenditures; but, Mr. President, even there in this Congress those committees should be in a far better position to make that estimate than the corresponding committees in the Eightieth Congress ever were. The majority in this Congress is of the same political faith as the Chief Executive. The majority has access to the leader of its party, who at this time is also Chief Executive of the United States. Certainly, with the close liaison which must exist between the executive department and the legislative department when both are of the same political complexion, we could expect the American people to be given some reasonably sound estimate as to where the party in power expects to take those people. Let me say, Mr. President, that the Eightieth Congress did not have that kind of a break.

Let me call attention, further, to the fact that the Eightieth Congress, even without any information from the Chief Executive except what was contained in his budget, was able to present to the President and to the people of the United States its best judgment as to both expenditures and income for both the fiscal years 1948 and 1949, and to do so substantially by the date called for in the statute, the 15th day of February. Mr. President, I say it can be done if there is a will to do it. It can be done if those in the majority believe that the law should be carried out, even when they differ with it and its wisdom. It can be done because it has been done.

Mr. President, I further call attention to the fact that last year, after the budget had been submitted to the Congress and to the people of the United States, and after the majority had done its best to comply with the section now under consideration, and after the two Houses of Congress had struggled to get together on the question, the Eightieth Congress was faced with supplemental and additional requests for appropriations, totaling $9,947,768,096.79 — appropriations coming to the Congress after the Congress had wrestled with and reached the best conclusion it could as to a budget it believed sound. Of that amount, Mr. President, $8,998,964,595.87 was appropriated by the second session of the Eightieth Congress. Only a part of that amount was in contemplation at the time when the Congress went into session and was handed the President's budget. At that time it was contemplated that there would be an additional appropriation during the year for

the Economic Cooperation Administration, in the amount of approximately $6,000,000,000; but the request for the other $3,000,000,000 came out of the blue sky, so far as the Eightieth Congress was advised when it opened its second session.

As a part of those supplemental or additional requests, there were 586 different items for consideration by the Appropriations Committees. That situation prevailed last year. It should not prevail this year. Certainly there can be a degree of cooperation between the Chief Executive and the administration and the majority in the two Houses of Congress which will at least permit the Congress to be advised by the majority as to what the majority expects from the Congress in a financial way at the present session.

Mr. President, if there be any real value in the type contemplated in section 138 of the Reorganization Act, if there be any value there, it lies in the action being taken by the joint committee early enough in the year to advise the Congress and particularly the Appropriations Committees of what the facts are. If those committees cannot have that information sufficiently early in the year so at least it may be, as the minority leader suggested, a target at which to shoot at least, they had just as well not have it at all. The thought of presenting a budget of anticipated expenditures on the 1st day of May and having any value to it is nonsense.

Mr. President, the majority, when they undertake that kind of delay, seek to present us with a budget with reverse English on it. They are using their future for a bustle; like a wahoo bird that flies backward and has no interest in where he is going but only from where he has come. They say they will present to us an estimate after the fact itself. All that can be presented then, Mr. President, is an accounting, so far as value to the Congress is concerned.

Let us take a look and see if that statement is not borne out by the record. In 1948, first in the month of January, one appropriation bill was reported by the committee on the House side, and in February, was passed by the House. In February three other appropriation bills were reported to the House, two of them passed in February, and the third one, in March. In the month of March, five bills were reported to the House, and of those five, four were passed in March, and one in April. All these bills I have just mentioned, if we may expect at least as much speed and diligence this year as the Republican-controlled Congress gave us last year, if we may expect at least like diligence, all those bills will have been considered by the committees, reported to the Houses, and passed at least by the House long before any consideration whatever is given to a budget which is expected to bring to us anticipated expenditures.

Let us get the rest of the record. In April two more bills were reported to the Houses, one passed by the House and one of those also passed by the Senate; nine bills had been passed by the House and passed by the Senate before the 1st day of May, according to the record. Now, Mr. President, again I say, if the budget can have any value—and certainly there should be some value to a committee working day after day, and night after night, and week after week, on these involved and complex appropriation bills, running into the billions of dollars—certainly there must be some value to it in at least having from the Congress of which it is member, and the Congress to which it must report, some word, some direction as to at least a target toward which it should aim in its consideration of those several thousand items in those estimates. But I say if it can have any value—and that value I contend it does have—then the word of the Congress, as expressed in the committee report required under section 138, and the resolution to accompany it, should be providently made, so the committees may begin their work with at least knowledge at the time they commence as to what the views of the two Houses are. That was the thought when the section was put in the law, and certainly there has been nothing shown to the Senate today to justify the emasculation of the statute in the way that is here suggested. It is utterly impotent, it is meaningless, unless action can be had. And, Mr. President, there is no answer in coming here today and confessing that there has been no diligence on the part of the majority in doing the job, by saying we have only 5 days. It is 45 days, Mr. President, that were available. If there be only five left, and nothing done, then let the responsibility rest where it should rest. Even so, we are faced with a situation, and I accept the confession from the other side of the aisle, and agree nothing has been done, not even a meeting called to discuss the matter—we are faced with that situation, then we must take such action as is necessary to correct the condition that never should have existed. The amendment offered here gives an additional 30 days in which to do the job that should be completed this week. That, added to the 45 that has gone, should have certainly enough time for the job to be done. Better, Mr. President, if we cannot have the legislative budget in time to use it, that we do nothing at all. Better to ignore the section entirely than to come in at the end of the extended time, flying backward, looking where you have been, with no thought as to where you are going.

Between now and the 15th day of March is adequate time in which to do this job. I am under no illusions, Mr. President, regarding the passage of the amendment, but I hope that the people of the United States will be under no illusion as to whether it should have passed. I think that is the point.

There is one other thing, Mr. President, and I am through. The action, or lack of action, to date, has, to me, an ominous implication. The pending resolution was not born, Mr. President, out of the old type of meeting of the majority and the minority which should always precede action in legislative bodies. There has been no attempt even to call the committees together. I am sure my good friend from Tennessee was not serious in attempting to excuse the failure by suggesting that the law did not indicate which chairman should call the meeting. A Republican-controlled Congress got by that objection for 2 years. Whether there be uncertainty or ambiguity in the law or not, there seems to have been found by the other side and the chairmen in question some way of cooperation in determining not to have a meeting and in urging concerted agreement as to a date definite on which to make a report under the same ambiguous and uncertain law.

Mr. President, it would appear clear that there has been no attempt to comply with the rule until the other House acted on the resolution. That was at least acting within the rule by attempting to avoid it by extension. That we have a perfect right to do. The section referred to is a rule of the Senate and a rule of the House, and we may abide by our rules or may amend them by unanimous consent. But until that resolution came in, nothing had been done. I say, Mr. President, that no minority member of the committee, to my knowledge, was consulted at any time with reference to the matter, or ever given an opportunity to present whatever views he may have had on the over-all subject.

I hope, Mr. President, that that action does not carry the implication it seems to carry. I realize that a majority can become so great and remain a majority so long that it can, in reprehensible arrogance, act in utter disregard of the minority. Let us at least carry out the forms of cooperation. Let us give to the minority at least a chance to be heard, no matter what our voting strength may be.

Mr. President, I wish I could hope that the amendment offered by my friend, the senior Senator from New Hampshire, will be adopted. I believe it would be for the best interests of majority, minority, Chief Executive, and the people as a whole, if it should be adopted. I believe that in that way only can we get even a scintilla of value out of a congressional legislative budget. But I have not that hope, more is the pity.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Ives	Pepper
Broughton	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Chapman	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Knowland	Sparkman
Eastland	Langer	Stennis
Ferguson	Lodge	Taft
Frear	Long	Taylor
Fulbright	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
George	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Gillette	McGrath	Thye
Gurney	McKellar	Tobey
Hayden	McMahon	Watkins
Hendrickson	Magnuson	Wherry
Hickenlooper	Maybank	Williams
Hill	Miller	Withers
Hoey	Morse	Young
Holland	Neely	
Humphrey	O'Conor	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The yeas and nays having been ordered on the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] are absent on official committee business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is absent on official business at one of the Government departments.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is paired on this question with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea."

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "nay," and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea."

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is paired on this question with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea."

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay," and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is absent on official business and is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] would vote "yea" and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] would vote "yea" and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is absent on official business and is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] would vote "yea" and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is detained on official committee business and is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] would vote "yea" and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—24

Bridges	Ives	Smith, N. J.
Cain	Knowland	Taft
Capehart	Langer	Thye
Cordon	Lodge	Tobey
Ferguson	Morse	Watkins
Gurney	Saltonstall	Wherry
Hendrickson	Schoeppel	Williams
Hickenlooper	Smith, Maine	Young

NAYS—43

Anderson	Hunt	Miller
Broughton	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	O'Conor
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Douglas	Kefauver	Pepper
Eastland	Kerr	Robertson
Frear	Kilgore	Russell
Fulbright	Long	Sparkman
George	Lucas	Stennis
Gillette	McFarland	Taylor
Hayden	McGrath	Thomas, Okla.
Hill	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Hoey	McMahon	Withers
Holland	Magnuson	
Humphrey	Maybank	

NOT VOTING—29

Aiken	Ellender	Millikin
Baldwin	Flanders	Mundt
Brewster	Green	Murray
Bricker	Jenner	Myers
Butler	Kem	Reed
Byrd	McCarran	Tydings
Connally	McCarthy	Vandenberg
Donnell	McClellan	Wagner
Downey	Malone	Wiley
Ecton	Martin	

So Mr. BRIDGES' amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 22) was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I realize the problems which confront a majority leader in getting legislation before the Senate. I am satisfied that when the majority leader made the announcement, on page 980 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on Tuesday last, that when the Senate concluded its business on that it was planned to adjourn until Thursday, and that he saw no reason why the Senate should be here for any considerable length of time on Thursday, he made it in the best of faith. Many Members on this side, feeling that important business would not be taken up, are not in the Senate Chamber today. I am not complaining at all about bringing up the legislation which has been considered, but I am sure that if Members on this side had known that it was to be considered they would have been present to cast their votes.

DAYLIGHT-SAVING TIME FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in line with what the distinguished minority leader has said, yesterday I called him with respect to the next bill for which I shall ask consideration. He advised me that he thought there would be no objection to taking up the bill at this time. In fact, he advised me that he had conferred with the ranking minority member of the District Committee, who had no objection to the consideration of the bill.

With that understanding, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 135, which is a bill to authorize the Board of Commissioners in the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 135) to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 135) to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District.

ACTIVITIES OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION IN THE COMMODITY MARKETS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, yesterday in his testimony before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry Secretary of Agriculture Brannan made the following statement:

It has been said in connection with wheat that perhaps one explanation of the downward trend in the price of wheat was the withdrawal of the Government from the market. That is an unadulterated fallacy.

Mr. Brannan pointed out that the Commodity Credit Corporation had not pulled out from price support in any manner in the wheat market. At the same time, he announced to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that he was taking steps to investigate the commodity exchanges of the country for speculative accounts.

What Mr. Brannan failed to discuss before the committee was the activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation in the corn market. As everyone knows, the break in the corn market is what precipitated the recent break in commodity prices. I have checked the record of the Commodity Credit Corporation in the corn market, and I find that while it is true the Commodity Credit Corporation did not pull out of the wheat market, it withdrew almost entirely from the corn market. Here are the facts:

During the week of February 4, 1949, the week in which the commodity markets started to break, the Commodity Credit Corporation had cut purchases of corn 93 percent below the average purchases for the four preceding weeks, that is, the month of January. The record of their purchases by weeks through the last 4 weeks' period shows that during the week ending January 14, the Commodity Credit Corporation purchased 5,190,660 bushels, and during the week ending January 21 the Commodity Credit Corporation purchased 16,024,950 bushels of corn.

In the week ending January 28, it purchased 6,644,263 bushels. However, last week, the week in which the commodity markets broke, it cut its purchases back to 512,810 bushels, or a cut back of 93 percent. So Secretary Brannan's statement that the Commodity Credit Corporation had not pulled from under the market is completely out of line.

Breaking this information down from the operations in the markets, I find that on the Chicago market the Commodity Credit Corporation purchased, in the week ending January 28, 3,982,000 bushels of corn. Last week the purchases were reduced to 386,500 bushels.

In Kansas City, week before last, the Commodity Credit Corporation purchased 2,562,263 bushels. Last week the purchases dropped to 126,310 bushels. These figures are a complete denial of Secretary Brannan's statement that the Commodity Credit Corporation had not withdrawn from the market.

The Secretary also failed to discuss operations in flour. In connection with flour, we find that during the week ending January 28, 1949, the Commodity Credit Corporation purchased 20,000,000 pounds, and in the week ending February 4, 1949, the week when the commodity markets broke, their purchases dropped to 4,430,000 pounds, or about 80 percent.

I make that observation merely because in the investigation of these exchanges I think the Secretary should also call for detailed operations on the corn market during the last 2 weeks, particularly to find out who, if anyone, in the Administration profited by this break.

The statement has also been made that perhaps some of this recent commodity break was due to a provision written by the Eightieth Congress—they always come back to that—in the European recovery program. That provision authorized or required the Secretary of Agriculture to maintain a 150,000,000-bushel wheat carry-over. I should like to read that provision for the information of the Senate:

> The funds authorized herein shall not be made available or used to acquire a quantity of wheat, wheat flour, and cereal grain in the United States which, after taking into consideration the amount estimated for export to other countries and the amount needed for domestic consumption in the United States, will leave a carry-over of less than 150,000,000 bushels of wheat on July 1, 1948, unless the estimates of the President after March 1, 1948, justify an increase in the amount available for export to the recipient countries, with full production for domestic needs.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. The provision which the Senator is now discussing is obsolete.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct, but Secretary Brannan yesterday used it as an excuse.

Mr. YOUNG. A former Secretary stated that a 150,000,000-bushel carry-over was too much. I agree with that. The present Secretary believes that we should have 300,000,000 bushels or more, which I believe is a depressing factor on the market.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. How does the Senator explain the fact that two distinguished Secretaries of Agriculture in President Truman's Cabinet disagree? Former Secretary Anderson, who is now a distinguished Member of this body, made the statement under oath before the committees that 150,000,000 bushels was a sufficient carry-over. Now a man who is equally prominent in the Cabinet, and who holds the same position, says that a carry-over of 300,000,000 bushels is necessary. What has occurred in the United States in the meantime to make those two distinguished Secretaries at variance to the extent of 100 percent?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I prefer to yield to the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], former Secretary of Agriculture. Perhaps he would care to reply to the question.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the situation clearly revolves around the needs of other countries. At a time when the people of the world were very much in need of grain, it seemed unwise to have in this country a carry-over of 150,000,000 bushels of wheat. We had found in 1946 and 1947 that from 83,000,000 to 85,000,000 bushels, or approximately those amounts, was sufficient.

The very able Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] protested the requirement of 150,000,000 bushels, and his position was stanchly defended by the then Secretary of Agriculture. Yesterday the Senator from North Dakota read into the records of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry a letter from the then Secretary of Agriculture, a year ago, in which the statement was made that if a carry-over of 150,000,000 bushels were available, plus heavy crops coming in future years, we might see wheat prices break through support prices within a year. It is just about a year from the time that letter was written, and wheat prices did drop through the support prices.

Secretary Brannan in his testimony was saying that 300,000,000 bushels was not an unusually large amount for this country to carry over for national security purposes. The testimony of the former Secretary of Agriculture was that 150,000,000 bushels was not necessary; and the experience of the last year surely proves that to be true, and proves the correctness of the position taken by the very fine Senator from North Dakota in trying to defend the interests of his people. If we had been permitted to send 75,000,000 bushels to people who badly needed it a year ago, those 75,000,000 bushels would not now be plaguing the market.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator a question: Does he really believe that had this provision been left out of the European recovery program legislation, 75,000,000 bushels would have been sent?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am sure that of the 75,000,000 bushels, 30,000,000 or 40,000,000 bushels would have been sent.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then the Senator thinks that additional wheat would have been sent?

Mr. ANDERSON. I know it would have been.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator knows it?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wish to continue to quote from the law, showing that the President had full authority after March 1, 1948, to have reduced this carry-over:

> Unless the estimates of the President after March 1, 1948, would justify an increase in the amount available for export to recipient countries, with full adjustment for domestic needs.

In other words, under the law which the former Secretary of Agriculture supported, and which the present Secretary of Agriculture has criticized, the President had actual authority, after March 1, 1948, to reduce that 150,000,000 bushels.

I ask the Senator from New Mexico, the former Secretary of Agriculture, whether he wishes to deny that the President had this authority.

Mr. ANDERSON. The President of the United States could have tried to survey and certify as to the needs of the various countries; but the shipping schedules for shipments in May are not established in the month of May. One begins to order steamers on berth as early as February, for grain which is intended to be shipped in June, and the program is formed a long time in advance. Once the program is formed and once grain starts to move from the farms and the elevators, it is a long time before it reaches port.

If that provision had not been in effect, until we found out the size of the crop in June—and it is not until June that we know the size of the winter-wheat crop—it would not have been possible to make the exports in June. The planning cannot be done at the last moment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I realize that the planning cannot be done at the last moment; but for 4 months the President of the United States had full authority to cut down the figure as much as he wished.

The Senator from New Mexico and former Secretary of Agriculture now states that they wanted to ship more wheat to Europe, and yet the report of the Secretary of Agriculture shows that on July 1 the carry-over of wheat was, not 150,000,000 bushels, but 196,000,000 bushels, or 46,000,000 bushels more than required by law on March 1. Yet the carry-over was not cut back to 150,000,000 bushels, and the additional 46,000,000 bushels was not shipped abroad.

Mr. ANDERSON. That very fact was pointed out to the committee, and it was stated that it is impossible so accurately to judge the shipments and purchases as to come out with an exact 150,000,000 bushels. So, in order to be safe, we ran beyond that amount, to the extent of the additional 46,000,000 bushels.

The then Secretary of Agriculture pointed out to the Congress more than a year ago that the existence of that limitation would make it extremely difficult to come out exactly at that figure; and that is how the additional carry-over of 46,000,000 bushels arose.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I wish to say that had the former Secretary of Agriculture gone below the limitation, he would have gotten into trouble with many influential Members of Congress at the time.

I believe that the mistake was not too serious a one. It was only a 150,000,000-bushel limitation and probably 100,000,000 bushels would have been carried over anyway. But I think the mistake of the present Secretary of Agriculture is a serious one.

A few moments ago the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] said that Secretary Brannan was holding the 300,000,000 bushels for security reasons. That is almost entirely aside from the argument made by Secretary Brannan before our committee, although he did mention it. His position was that the 300,000,000 bushels was not surplus, and would not have a depressing influence on the market—with which position I did not agree.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. As I understand from what the Senator from North Dakota has said—and, of course, two men of differing views cannot positively be right in every respect—he thinks the former Secretary of Agriculture, the present distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], was correct, and the present Secretary of Agriculture is wrong. Is that the impression he wished to leave?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes. Three hundred million bushels of wheat is a surplus in my opinion and will have a lasting depressing effect on grain prices. There certainly is a difference of opinion on this subject between the present and former Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I should like to point out the fact that the Department of Agriculture did not have to be so cautious about this 150,000,000-bushel figure after March 1. It was purely within the discretion of the President of the United States. Prior to March 1 they did have to be cautious; but for 4 months before July 1 they could have increased their shipments so as to include a substantial part of this 150,000,000 bushels. The Department of Agriculture was at that time reporting that we had a bumper wheat crop coming.

I wish to defend, first, the provision of the 150,000,000 bushels as security. I did go along with the former Secretary of Agriculture in the bill that we cut it to 120,000,000 bushels. The House never acted on this bill since it was found that the President already had ample authority, without any further direction from Congress, after March 1, to ship any amount of wheat he wanted to ship.

I do not wish to say that it is his fault that he did not, but I do not want him to be coming back to Congress and saying that it is our fault, as I have clearly demonstrated.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if any mistakes were made in congressional action as to the amount of carry-over last year, the authorities in charge added to that problem by going to Canada and, with the use of ECA funds, purchasing 151,000,000 bushels of wheat, which has added that much to the problem facing us at the present time, in view of the present high carry-over of wheat.

It seems unreasonable, in my opinion, that after the Congress appropriated funds in support of European recovery, the authorities should take some of those tax dollars and go to Canada and there purchase wheat in the amount of 151,000,000 bushels to supply the needs under the European recovery program, when at the same time we had in our country more than 300,000,000 bushels of wheat, which are depressing our market in the manner in which it has been depressed in the past week.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his observation. I agree with him 100 percent.

I wish to point out that the authorities were buying more wheat from Canada than they were from American sources, under the European Recovery Act, for a limited period.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I hope the Senator is very sure of his facts. Five hundred million bushels was to come from the United States, and 150,000,000 bushels from Canada.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I said "for a limited period."

Mr. ANDERSON. There is no period for which that was true.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Over how long a period was the 150,000,000 bushels spread?

Mr. ANDERSON. It began somewhere in June 1948 and continues to the present time, with approximately 30,000,000 bushels yet to be delivered.

During the same period, more than 400,000,000 bushels have moved from the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, during the month of November there were purchased in this country 14,169,000 bushels of wheat.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is true.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is below the average monthly purchases for the 150,000,000 bushel total, if the total is divided by months. I do not say all of it was done at once; I said it was done in periods.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to say to him that the pattern of purchases of grain depends on the geography of the area in which the grain is being purchased. Some 900,000,000 bushels or more of grain grown in the United States is produced in the winter wheat areas, and that winter wheat is purchased at the time it is ready. The distinguished Senator from Kansas knows that when his great Kansas winter wheat crop, which this year was in excess of 200,000,000 bushels and was a very large crop in view of the crop predictions, became available, it was necessary to move large quantities of it immediately, and that wheat was purchased immediately.

Therefore, from the 900,000,000 bushels or so of the winter wheat crop, a great quantity is purchased in the winter wheat areas by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and stored for later shipment. We then move into the spring wheat area, and the dividing line in Nebraska marks off the spring wheat area. We then move into the area where spring wheat is purchased. The wheat from the State of the Senator from Minnesota and the two Senators from North Dakota is then bought, and when that crop is over, we come into the area where Canadian wheat moves into the market and the Commodity Credit Corporation bought the Canadian wheat when it was available, and not in a regular pattern, month by month.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let me say that is correct; but what I was pointing out is that there are periods in which you are buying more wheat from Canadian farmers than you were from the American farmers during the period of this operation. I do not think the Senator will dispute that. There were limited periods there. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. I gather from what the able Senator says that the present Secretary of Agriculture is blaming the Eightieth Congress. Of course, there is nothing surprising about that. I should likewise suppose he is blaming former President Hoover. But my question is, What are we going to do about the decline in farm prices? Corn, I understand, is below $1 a bushel and wheat is

getting far below $2 a bushel. What are we going to do about it?

I should like to make this comment: It has not much to do perhaps with foreign wheat, but I notice that ECA recently purchased $240,000 worth of potato diggers in the United States and gave them to France. I remember as a youngster when I lived on a farm, I used to dig potatoes by hand, but I notice that our great Government here has just spent $240,000 of the taxpayers' money to buy potato diggers and give them to France. The whole thing is silly. It is ridiculous. The statement the Senator made a moment ago that the prices of farm products have been going up and down, as in direct response to the amount of purchases made by the Government. Do we have in this great Nation a false, synthetic economy where a bureaucrat can sit in Washington and buy or sell grains and push the price up and down and wreck tens and tens of thousands of farmers throughout the United States, and businessmen? Can he sit here in Washington and pull the strings, as the Senator indicated a minute ago, at least for the RECORD, that he had done, and buy, and, if he does not buy, the price goes down? Are 18,000,000 farmers at the mercy now of some bureaucrat who sits in Washington and pulls strings and pushes prices up one month and pulls them down the next month? Is that the sort of economy we have in this country? Is that what we actually have, or am I wrong?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Indiana can answer that about as well as I can, because frankly I do not know what kind of operations they are trying to conduct down there. When we stop to think that on the corn program, getting back to corn, which the Secretary of Agriculture yesterday, before the committee, was very careful not to mention—he talked about wheat; he did not talk about flour, he did not tell them about cutting back the purchases of flour that week 80 percent. He talked about wheat, and what he said about wheat was accurate. He did not tell them that the average purchases for the four preceding weeks on corn was 7,700,000 bushels. He did not tell them that he cut their corn purchases back 93 percent for the week of February 4, the week in which the corn market started this landslide.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am very happy the Senator brought up the fact that the Secretary of Agriculture had stopped his purchases, because I remember quite distinctly that immediately after the grain market toppled on February 6, a year ago, a Senator rose in his place in this assemblage and very sharply criticized the then Secretary of Agriculture for, he said, moving then by purchases to stop the downward price of grains.

Am I to understand the Senator to suggest that the Secretary of Agriculture should have used his purchasing powers in the corn market to stop the decline of corn prices? Will the Senator answer that question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I will answer that question in exactly the same answer I gave a year ago, a copy of which I have with me. If we want to get back to discuss that, we will do that also. I will answer that in the same manner, and that is that the purchases of the Commodity Credit Corporation for foreign relief should not be conducted in any manner to influence the markets.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is entirely correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But we are faced here today with a situation where the purchases for the foreign relief have been conducted in a manner to influence the markets, because, deliberately, somebody gave an order to pull the plugs from under the corn market the week of February 4, when they cut back their purchases 93 percent. That did not just happen; somebody gave that order. Now, who gave it, and why?

Mr. ANDERSON. I may suggest to the Senator that a year ago the same sort of speech was made here, and the time of the Senate and of the House was consumed with investigations of speculations in the commodity markets. The Senate committee that conducted that investigation—I have forgotten now who was chairman of the committee—filed, a short time ago, a report, and it certainly could not have been a report designed to defend the then Secretary of Agriculture, because it came from the Eightieth Congress, which was under the control of an opposite political party. But in a very fine report it was pointed out that after weeks and months of study they were unable to find one trace of evidence that there had been speculation from the inside in that transaction. That is a matter of official record.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator is right—that is a matter of official record, and pretty much the same report will come from the investigation which was suggested by the Secretary of Agriculture yesterday, if it is carried out the way he suggested, and that is to check only the purchases of wheat. I said before, and I repeat, I see nothing wrong with the purchases of wheat. They form a pattern as near on a level as could be expected. I do see something wrong with the purchases of corn, when it is admitted that in 1 week their purchases declined 93 percent below that of the preceding week. There is some explanation coming on that. I wonder if the former Secretary of Agriculture would wish to comment on that? I should also like to point out this, that at the time the criticism was made a year ago—I think he is referring to a criticism which I myself made—at the time that was made, the wheat market was $3 a bushel, or in that neighborhood, and was considerably above the level which it now is, which completely changes the picture.

Mr. ANDERSON. The point that was then made was that there was a difference in the criticisms leveled at the then Secretary of Agriculture. The distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] raised the question as to whether or not there had been a press release designed to bolster the market. At the same time, a Member of the House from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] said that the Secretary was allowing prices to crash. The point the Department tried to make was that when there is a break in the grain market, it is not a function of the Department of Agriculture to use its foreign purchasing program to aid one group of speculators or the other, but the wise course is to stay out of the grain market until prices seem stabilized, and then move back in and resume purchases. Otherwise, it is joining sides with one group of speculators.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I want to refer the statement released to the press yesterday by Mr. Brannan in which he said that as near as his Department could figure without having an opportunity to study the reports of the Chicago board, the break was caused by untrue reports "that the Commodity Credit Corporation had withdrawn from the market."

Does the former Secretary of Agriculture still claim as true the statement made by Secretary Brannan yesterday in which he denied reports that the Commodity Credit Corporation had withdrawn from the market, in the face of the facts which I have given showing that he had cut his purchases of corn back 93 percent?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am pleased to say to the distinguished Senator that I am happy not to know whether the Secretary of Agriculture now is in the market or not. I am happy to be free from that responsibility, and I do not know whether he is buying or whether he is not buying, but I do know that the publication of a report that he had stopped buying would drop grain prices immediately, and that report was a false report.

The satisfying thing in this connection is that a great majority of the farmers have either placed their wheat under loan or have sold it prior to the period when the loan became effective. So far as corn is concerned, I am sure the Senator knows that every farmer who now holds corn which is not of extremely high moisture content can, at any time between now and the 30th day of June, get a corn loan to the full amount of his parity loan, and is not disturbed at all by the dropping price.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, in reply I happen to have in my hand a copy of the so-called false report which was issued, claiming that the Commodity Credit Corporation had withdrawn from the market. This report was published by the Commodity Credit Corporation itself. It says, in part:

> The Commodity Credit Corporation bought 2,466,349 bushels of wheat, 512,810 bushels of corn, 224,927 bushels of grain sorghums, and 50,000 bushels of rye during the period from noon of January 28 through February 4.

This report was issued by the United States Department of Agriculture, through the Production and Marketing Administration itself. I have a copy of the report in my hand.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it a fact or is it not a fact that some one gentleman can

sit in Washington and raise or lower the prices of grains in America?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is a fact that it is being done.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Senator say that that is a fact?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is my opinion.

Mr. CAPEHART. One man can sit here in Washington, then, and govern and set the price which I am to receive on my farm for the grain which I raise. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Whether it is one man or a board I do not know, but it is a fact that the control is in Washington.

Mr. CAPEHART. Who is to blame for the falling grain prices at the moment?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not know. I am merely stating the facts as to the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the past 3 or 4 weeks, which completely contradict the statement which the Secretary of Agriculture made yesterday that the Commodity Credit Corporation had not withdrawn from the market. The Secretary yesterday discussed wheat, and there was nothing wrong with his testimony in that respect. The fault lies in the fact that he did not tell what happened as to corn.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. With respect to the statement that there is one man in Washington who can control farm prices, I think it is substantially true, so far as concerns the price which the farmer receives. The Secretary of Agriculture has that authority under the price-support legislation which was subscribed to by both the Democratic and Republican parties. I do not like to hear the program criticized on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not criticizing the program; I am criticizing the administration of it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have no hesitancy in criticizing the program, because, so far as I am concerned at the moment, prices are going down and the farmers are receiving less. Something is wrong when prices drop as rapidly as prices have dropped in the last few weeks. It is an unsound economy, and something should be done about it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not know where prices are going. My opinion is that they will go lower and lower, unless this "almighty one" who is sitting in Washington decides to intervene by some magic. I frankly do not know what the magic is. I suppose it will be done with the taxpayers' money.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not criticize the principles of the program. I think the administration of it has been handled inefficiently. Perhaps some of the inefficiency has been due to plain ignorance. I know of no other way to put it. Possibly it was deliberate on the part of whoever is handling the matter here. I think it would be most interesting to know who profited by the break. The farmers lost a great deal of money. We know that.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to ask a question of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. I wonder if the Senator did not misspeak himself a few moments ago when he said the farmer could control the loan value of his grain.

Mr. ANDERSON. If I misspoke myself, I thank the Senator for correcting me. Present corn values are below the loan value of corn, and a farmer does not need to sell at the low price. He must have storage, but he does not need to sell his corn below the present loan value.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. The able Senator from New Mexico just said the farmer needs to have storage capacity. So far as I know, every ear of corn has been picked and, as we say in Indiana, has been "shucked." It must be stored somewhere. Why cannot the farmer receive the loan value?

Mr. ANDERSON. Not all storage in the United States is approved.

Mr. CAPEHART. Why can it not be approved?

Mr. ANDERSON. Because certain standards of construction are required. Most farmers have sufficient storage for their corn. When there is a very large corn crop, such as that of last year, there may not be adequate storage for it.

Mr. CAPEHART. In each county there is a committee of local men who themselves establish the standards for loans on corn and other grains. They can either raise the standards so high that no farmer can meet them, or they can lower the standards to the point of storage in an improvised crib or other facilities.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not think that is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is what I have been told by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not think it is quite that simple. I do not think it can be said that open storage is satisfactory in one place and that there must be airtight storage in another place. Most of the farmer committees are trying to safeguard the farm program.

Mr. CAPEHART. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I was told, and I believe it to be true, that they can loan money and can establish any standards they wish, but if a loan is made on a thousand bushels and 200 bushels are spoiled, the farmer himself would have to pay for the 200 bushels that were spoiled. Those are the facts, are they not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to admonish the Senator from Delaware that he can yield for questions, but he cannot yield to other Senators for the purpose of a running debate on his time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I shall conclude by saying that the action taken by the Eightieth Congress did not affect the carry-over, particularly in view of the fact that the actual carry-over was 46,000,000 bushels more than was required on July 1, and therefore there was plenty of opportunity to ship out the wheat. The responsibility goes back to the Commodity Credit Corporation and the statement released yesterday in the press, namely, "that the Commodity Credit Corporation had not withdrawn from the market" was wrong. The Commodity Credit Corporation, according to its own records, did withdraw from the market on corn during the week of February 4 to the extent of 93 percent, thus precipitating the sudden collapse of all commodity prices.

THE FARMER'S PLIGHT—MANGANESE AND AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, relative to the debate which has just taken place concerning farmers, and the prices of farm commodities falling, I wish to say that I have received a great many letters and telephone calls within the past few days inquiring again about the prices of the products the farmer has to buy. After World War I farm machinery prices did not go down one single index point. Between World War I and World War II the prices of farm machinery went up and up, and never down, and although the price of wheat dropped from $2.50 a bushel to as low as 19 cents a bushel, in some sections of my State, the prices of farm machinery nevertheless remained away up.

Mr. President, sometimes it seems to me as though the only time that a farmer is consulted is for a few days before election, so that some party may get the farmers' vote, and then, as soon as the election is over, the farmer is again completely forgotten.

What is the situation today. A short time ago a Massey-Harris combine, 12-foot, self-propelled, cost about $3,300. Today one is lucky if he can find a second-hand combine that is in good shape which can be bought for $5,000 or $5,100. And what is true of combines is true of mowers, drills, binders, and all other kinds of farm machinery.

At the present time there are 23,000 telephone poles for REA, but it is not possible anywhere to get wire to put on those 23,000 telephone poles so that the farmer can get electricity into his home, and the farmer's wife can get some of the comforts which the people in the towns and cities enjoy. When a few days ago we had a hearing before the committee of which I am a member, we got the same old answer, that the kind of steel used in the manufacture of wire was not available. Who is to blame for that? Month after month and year after year I have stood upon this floor calling the attention of Senators to the plight of the farmer, how in one county in North Dakota, the county of Hettinger, the farmers lost over a million dollars from being unable to take off their wheat and their flax because their farm machinery was either obsolete, or because they were unable to get parts for the machinery they had.

Mr. President, Americans could not have a more frightening illustration of how suicidal the Truman foreign policy has been, than is contained in the news that Russia is now shutting off her exports of manganese to this country. We must have manganese if we are to have steel. It is shocking to discover that even after 2 years of the cold war our own statesmen have left our domestic economy and our national security almost completely at the mercy of the scheming politicians of the Politburo and of Russia's brutal slave-labor system.

Today, Mr. President, after 18 years of Democratic rule, after 18 years of Democratic Presidents, the United States is still dependent on Russia for 38 percent of our manganese and 42 percent of our chrome.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. LANGER. I will not yield until I conclude. Then I shall be glad to answer any questions.

It now appears that our diplomats have been so intent on appeasing Russia on the one hand, and savagely determining to destroy the steel capacity of Germany on the other, that their efforts to give away our own resources in order to make up for this economy of planned scarcity have led them into a criminal neglect of our own vital interests.

As proof of this shocking state of affairs, we need only remind ourselves that the American steel industry needs 1,500,000 tons of manganese in the coming year if it is to maintain its present high record and produce 96,000,000 tons next year.

Mr. President, what does the record show? It shows that Russia's embargo on manganese has caught our diplomats flat-footed, with less than a year's supply in the Government's stock pile, and less than a 7 months' supply for the entire steel industry. In addition, experts tell us we will need at least 17,000,000 tons in order to defend ourselves if another war should break out.

In the face of these facts President Truman's demand for power to increase Government-operated steel-producing capacity becomes so much hypocritical drivel, for we cannot produce steel without manganese, and at the present moment we produce only 12 percent of our national requirements.

It is time the American people were given the whole story of how this sorry state of affairs has come to be, and who is responsible.

Mr. President, on September 21 in Denver, Colo., President Truman said:

> I know that all of you recognize the importance of creating new industries in this region, using the resources of the West so as to reduce your industrial dependence on the East.

Again on September 22, in the Mormon Tabernacle he said:

> I stand, and the Democratic Party stands, for rapid and uninterrupted development of the land and forest and water and mineral resources of the West.

If one were to take these statements at the face value he would be compelled to believe that our Government has been developing a policy toward the utilization of our natural resources that would enable us to maintain our high standards of living in peacetime and also a self-sufficiency in vital raw materials so necessary for national defense in times of emergency. But what is the true story?

Let us take just the question of manganese. Manganese is an absolutely essential element in the manufacture of steel. It takes 14 pounds of manganese to produce a ton of steel. Contrary to popular belief, created by propaganda, the United States has tremendous resources of manganese ore, running from 8 to 40 percent, located in at least 27 States. Yet, in spite of the fact that manganese is such a critical item in both our peace and war economies, the record shows that the above propaganda only continues to blind the American people to the fact that for the last 18 years the manganese situation has left us still completely at the mercy of foreign sources of supply in 1948.

Where did Jesse Jones put the $120,000,000 when he developed the great plant to produce manganese? He loaned that money to Canada, and, today, when farmers in Oklahoma want to get a little electricity they cannot get the means for having it brought to them. When they try to buy manganese from Canada they cannot obtain it from Canada. Oh, they can secure it on the black market in Mexico. Canada can ship it to Mexico, and it can be bought there by paying the black-market price.

On November 10, 1930, Mr. Adkerson, president of the American Manganese Producers Association, told its third annual convention:

> Today we are drawing our manganese supplies from Brazil, India, Africa, and Russia.

Mind you, Mr. President, Mr. Adkerson, president of the American Manganese Producers Association, made that public statement 18 years ago. He continued:

> Manganese imports from Russia have increased from 3,284 tons, or less than 1 percent of our imports in 1922, to 330,000 tons, or approximately 50 percent of our total imports in 1929. Our country cannot afford to remain dependent upon foreign sources for its supply of manganese.

Mr. Adkerson continued:

> As far back as 1927 I publicly called attention to the fact that the treacherous hand of the Russian Bolshevik would delight in lulling us to sleep with the ease with which manganese is flowing to our shores, filling Red coffers with American gold and then suddenly close in on the sources of supply, while the United States struggles to develop her own manganese resources after the day of opportunity had gone.

With these facts so well known over 18 years ago, it is utterly incredible that today we should find the same situation confronting us. Yet such is the case.

The Mineral Industry Surveys (of September 22, 1948), released by the United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Mines, reported:

> Manganese ore was being consumed at an annual rate of about 1,500,000 short tons (during the second quarter), a rate slightly in excess of that in 1947. Consumers of manganese ore were obliged to draw heavily on inventories during the second quarter, as receipts at consuming plants amounted to 24 percent of the quantity used. Imports of manganese ore during the second quarter dropped 21 percent from the first quarter. Of this, the U. S. S. R. furnished 38 percent, India and South Africa each 15 percent, Brazil 14 percent.

Mr. President, not only is Russia cutting off 38 percent of our supply, but we are also confronted with an even graver threat by the developments in the Far East, which stem directly from the betrayal of China by American representatives at Yalta. The Russian Communist conquest of China is daily becoming more of an ugly reality. If and when China falls, Korea and the whole southeastern Asiatic area will be next. Yet, we also find that we have been dependent on India for 15 percent of our manganese imports, which is now threatened to be cut off by these Communist advances.

What is even more ominous is the organization of 15 Moslem and southeastern Asian countries, which on January 24 met in New Delhi, India, to protest the policies of our allies toward Indonesia and the Asiatic peoples, policies which we are continuing to underwrite.

Speaking for this group of nations Prime Minister Nehru of India said on January 24:

> A resurgent New Asia, as shown by the conference on Indonesia should be notice to the United Nations that the Far East no longer intends to be satisfied with a minor or secondary role in world affairs.

In addition, Mr. President, this Government is becoming more deeply involved abroad in policies and commitments involving billions of dollars, designed to increase the productive capacity of nations on this side of the iron curtain. It is simple logic that as this industrial capacity is increased, there will be a proportionate struggle for increased allocations of available raw materials, which will cut down our own ability to obtain from foreign sources the materials we so desperately need.

No one has more clearly stated the extent to which our commitments go than Mr. William Philip Simms, who wrote on January 18, 1948, in the Washington News:

> Asia, home of half the earth's population, rapidly is overrun by Reds with little serious opposition.
>
> In western Europe, the battle seems to have reached a stalemate. But the outcome, British and other experts are now saying, depends upon at least another decade of American financial, economic, and military aid.
>
> Those 10 years will cost American taxpayers anywhere from 150 to 200 billion dollars. And 10 years is a long time and $200,000,000,000 is a lot of money.

Meanwhile, this administration continues the insane policy of destroying the steel capacity of central Europe, which could provide to the European nations everything we are being asked to furnish under the Marshall plan and under this prospective 10-year program. The fact that we are determined to destroy this industrial capacity is reflected in the fact

that since we are underwriting the British and French occupation of Germany, as well as our own, we are spending $1,000,000,000 a year to carry on the senseless dismantlement program and to continue to ship behind the iron curtain into the Russian sphere factories we are dismantling. That policy cannot be defended. It is simply the old Morgenthau policy of hate.

Furthermore, as the National Council for the Prevention of War pointed out in its release of January 5, 1949, this policy of destruction is reflected in the implementation of our Marshall plan aid to Germany based on an analysis of Paul Hoffman's report to the ECA of December 15, 1948. The report shows that—

> Germany, with one-sixth of Europe's population and one-third of Europe's industrial potential, is being awarded only one-tenth of Marshall plan authorizations. Only 25 percent of this has been shipped. This compares with 40 percent shipments for Europe as a whole.
>
> Less than 1 percent of the shipments to Germany are classified as industrial or recovery goods, while more than 36 percent of ERP shipments to all Europe fall in that category.

Mr. President, as the facts indicate, the policies to which we are being committed by this administration are a mass of insane contradictions. Here we stand today with the whole cause of human liberty resting on our shoulders, with the defense of the anti-Soviet world dependent upon us, with the continuing prosperity of the United States an absolute must—yet with our vital interests criminally neglected.

Today we are still dependent on the Soviet Union for 38 percent of our manganese, without which we cannot produce steel, while 15 percent of our imports of manganese come from India, which is now threatened by continuing Communist successes in China.

This is the result of deliberate administration policies, as the following record shows. I always like to quote the record. Whose fault is it that today this country is dependent to the extent of 30 percent upon manganese from Russia, and 15 percent from India, not to mention the other countries to which I referred a while ago?

The sad truth is that on March 3, 1933, the Buy American Act was passed as a criterion for public purchasing by the governmental department, title III of which reads:

> Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, and unless the head of the department of independent establishment concerned shall determine it to be inconsistent with the public interest, or the cost to be unreasonable, only such unmanufactured articles, materials, and supplies as have been mined or produced in the United States, and only such manufactured articles, materials and supplies as have been manufactured in the United States substantially all from articles, materials, or supplies mined, produced, or manufactured, as the case may be, in the United States, shall be acquired for public use.

Back in 1933 the Congress took action. It is not because during all these years the necessity for developing our own resources and providing against emergencies had not been discussed and dealt with by Congress, that we are in our present predicament. On June 7, 1939, the bill S. 572 was signed into law as Public Law 117. It has as its purpose:

> To provide for the common defense by acquiring stocks of critical and strategic materials essential to the needs of industry for the manufacture of supplies for the armed forces and the civilian population in times of a national emergency, and to encourage, so far as possible, the further development of strategic and critical materials within the United States for common defense.

Again, on July 23, 1946, the Seventy-ninth Congress passed the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, amending Public Law 117, incorporating title III of the Buy American Act of 1933, and appropriated a total of $600,000,000 to implement it for the same purpose as stated above in Public Law 117.

How well I remember that on the very last night of the special session certain Senators from the eastern section of the country opposed a bill introduced and pleaded for by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] and other Senators who were familiar with the situation, and familiar with the fact that our stock piles of many of these critical materials had dwindled to almost nothing. Yet, when President Truman signed Public Law 520, he stated in his approval message, on July 23, 1946:

> It is only because of the overriding importance of this purpose that I am able to overcome my reluctance to sign a bill which reaffirms the application to stock-pile purposes of the provisions of Title III of the act of March 3, 1933, known as the Buy American Act.
>
> These provisions will not only materially increase the cost of the proposed stock piles but will tend further to defeat the conservation and strategic objectives of the bill by further depleting our already inadequate underground reserves of strategic materials.

Mr. President, so far as manganese is concerned, this is a completely erroneous assumption. I am speaking about a material of which our country may be short. But we have manganese in 37 different States. We have more manganese than any other material. Yet we have the President stating he is against the bill because he says it would deplete our resources.

The President continued:

> Furthermore, there can be serious conflict between these provisions and the foreign economic policy which this Government is actively pursuing.

There we have it. It conflicted with the foreign policy. A thousand times better, the President thought, to take care of foreigners than to take care of the American people and the American taxpayer.

Recognizing the increased necessity for constructive action to protect our own national security, in July, 1947, the Eightieth Congress passed the Premium Price Act of 1947, the purpose of which was "to stimulate the exploration, development, mining, and production of certain minerals and metals by private enterprise to supply the industrial, military, and naval needs of the United States, by providing for the development and conservation of those materials in order to decrease and prevent, wherever possible, a dangerous and costly dependence of the United States upon foreign nations for supplies of such materials."

This bill specifically dealt with increased production of copper, lead, zinc, and manganese. Yet, on August 2, 1947, President Truman vetoed the bill. As a consequence, many of our mines closed their doors, and instead of our getting a stock pile, we wiped out the stock piles on the ground where these mines were producing.

If today we are unable to get manganese, let the President assume the responsibility. If today a farmer cannot get a binder or a tractor, or if the housewife cannot get electricity because there is no steel with which to make wire, they need not blame the Eightieth Congress, because President Truman vetoed the bill passed by the Eightieth Congress.

Even today, in spite of the tremendous amount of money appropriated by Congress to start raising domestic production of these crucial materials, particularly manganese, our Stock-piling Act has remained practically inoperative.

Why, Mr. President, are America's vital interests ignored and neglected? All the facts point to but one conclusion: This administration, and those who are carrying out its policies, are deliberately violating the specific will and intention of Congress as clearly expressed by the statutes the Congress has passed.

On January 25, Chief Donald F. Carpenter, of the Munitions Board, issued a progress report on the stock piling of critical materials. Is it not significant that in this report there is no mention of manganese? Why not? Was he ashamed of what the administration had done with regard to manganese? Did he want to hide what the administration had done regarding manganese? But this vital, critical material, which must be had if we are to be able to manufacture steel, was never mentioned by Mr. Carpenter in the report. Is it not even more significant that in this progress report Mr. Carpenter specifically states that they have embarked on a new policy, totally different from that provided for under Public Law 520—the strategic stock-piling bill—which states that purchases of strategic and critical materials shall "be made, so far as is practicable, from supplies of materials in excess of the current industrial demand"?

Now we are informed that this new policy is one by which materials will be taken from our industrial supplies—whether such action will cut into civilian demands or not.

Mr. President, I wish to repeat that statement, because here is where the poor farmer gets it in the neck again: Now we are informed that this new policy is one by which the materials will be taken from our industrial supplies, whether such action will cut into civilian demands or not. This policy is the result of an Executive order, issued by the President 6 months ago, which countermands the basic intent of Public Law 520.

Of course, the President says, "If you have to sock somebody, sock the fellow who needs the steel." Mr. President, if we do not have manganese, we cannot manufacture farm machinery. So every day the telephone calls come in, asking where the senior Senator from North Dakota can locate a combine or a drill or some other piece of farm machinery the farmers need. The men and women who signed the REA agreements 6 or 7 years ago in my State and in South Dakota and in some portions of Minnesota and Montana are unable to obtain the benefit of electric utilities in their homes, because they are unable to obtain the wire to be put on the poles, to bring to their homes the electric energy to run the various pieces of electric equipment, because Russia has cut off the supply of manganese.

But what is even more disastrous is the fact that Public Law 520, the one the President set aside by his Executive order, specifically directs the Secretary of the Interior, the Director of the Bureau of Mines, and the Director of Geological Survey "to make scientific, technologic, and economic investigations concerning the extent and mode of occurrence, the development, mining, preparation, treatment, and utilization of ores and other mineral substances found in the United States or its Territories or insular possessions, which are essential to the common defense or the industrial needs of the United States in order to determine and develop domestic sources of supply."

Yet the shocking fact is, Mr. President, that up to this moment neither the Department of the Interior nor any other branch of the Government under this administration has taken a single step to implement the specific directive of Public Law 520 to provide for the stimulation of domestic production of critical raw materials. Absolutely nothing of any kind or character, either directly or indirectly, has been done by the administration to carry out the provisions of that act.

As the record now stands, it is simply fantastic to read in an article by the Associated Press, as of January 25, 1949, that instead of developing our own raw materials, the President is coming to Congress to ask for a billion dollars to implement his "bold new program to develop the world's backward areas, and that this money would be available for loans by this Government to foreign countries which join in a plan for coordinated development of their national resources."

In other words, Mr. President, we are being committed to the extension of an international policy which will underwrite the interests and security of everyone but ourselves. In the West there may be all kinds of manganese, but Public Law 520 has been completely ignored by this administration, and nothing has been done to develop the manganese there. I think the time has come, Mr. President, for an investigation of the Department of the Interior, the Bureau of Mines, the Geological Survey—and the administration itself—as to what constitutes their real attitude toward the development of America's own natural resources, upon which we become increasingly dependent with every day that passes.

So, Mr. President, I merely say, in conclusion, that here we have the President and the various departmental heads, who are supposed to carry out the will of Congress as to the stock piling of critical materials, ignoring the direction given to them, not once, not twice, but three different times. They are ignoring those directions entirely and completely, with the result that today we are at the mercy of Russia and at the mercy of India in the matter of manganese, which we need so very much in connection with the production of steel. Yet we find the President saying, "If we do not get steel, we will nationalize the steel industry." That is his reply after three different laws passed by the Congress have been neglected or willfully disobeyed.

DAYLIGHT-SAVING TIME FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 135) to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia is authorized to advance the standard time applicable to the District 1 hour for a period of each year commencing not earlier than the last Sunday of April and ending not later than the last Sunday of September. Any such time established by the Commissioners under the authority of this act shall, during the period of the year for which it is applicable, be the standard time for the District of Columbia.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, the pending measure is Senate bill 135, an act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight saving time in the District.

This bill is unanimously reported by the Committee on the District of Columbia. So far as I know, there is no opposition.

Therefore I shall move the engrossment, third reading, and passage of the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the Senator know of any other Senator, on either side of the aisle, who wishes to debate or discuss this bill?

Mr. McGRATH. No Senator has expressed any interest in debating the bill, or has expressed any opposition to it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I simply ask that question for general information, and to protect any interested Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I strongly support the enactment of this measure. I do not wish to delay its passage by making a lengthy statement.

However, I wish to call attention to two facts: First, that the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia has announced publicly on more than one occasion that he intends to give preferred attention to the creation of home rule, for the people of the District of Columbia, by having that matter brought as quickly as possible before the Senate and the House of Representatives. I fully approve and strongly support him in that position.

I note as well that he has requested the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] to head an able subcommittee to bring as quickly as possible before the full committee, and subsequently before the Senate itself, a home-rule measure for our consideration and, I hope, for passage.

It seems to me that in considering this particular measure it is apparent that the distinguished chairman of the committee is not in any sense violating the commitment he has made and the effort upon which he has entered to bring home rule to the District of Columbia, but, rather, is recognizing the importance of home rule; and it seems to me that insofar as it is possible under the present law, this measure is a home-rule measure, and will delegate to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia more authority than they have ever had under any prior bill on this subject; that is, authority not merely for 1 year but from year to year, to determine for themselves and for their District, and after hearings of any kind that they care to employ, at which their citizens may be heard, whether or not daylight-saving time shall be set up in the District from year to year. I would not support this bill if it were not for the fact that it does leave to the local officials, local citizens who represent the District as members of the Board of Commissioners, to determine the facts as to whether or not daylight-saving time shall be established.

Mr. President, I think this home rule measure and this home rule objective is so important that I am going to take a few minutes to place in the RECORD a brief statement which I made at a recent forum program put on by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith in the District of Columbia, and which was broadcast over Station WOL, on January 27, last. The distinguished junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER] likewise participated in the program, and I am only sorry I do not have his statement to incorporate in the RECORD. At this time, without taking the time of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD the copy of the opening remarks which I made at that time in the effort to answer the question which was being considered at that public forum, "What should Congress do to secure the democratic rights of the citizens of the Nation's capital?" My own answer to the question was and is that there is no other task within the power of the Congress which at all compares in service to the citizens of the District of Columbia, and, I thought, in service to the Nation, in this local field, with the giving of real home rule to the District. Therefore I confined my remarks in that opening statement and generally

throughout the forum to supporting as strongly as I could this home-rule effort.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement by Mr. HOLLAND, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

I am glad to be here tonight to state my answer to the question, "What should Congress do to secure the democratic rights of the citizens of the Nation's capital?"

In my judgment, the first and most important task within the power of Congress, which would secure for the residents of the District of Columbia democratic rights which are regarded as basic democracy everywhere else in our Nation, is the speedy enactment of home rule for the District. Under home rule the people of the District, through representative citizens of their own choice, would have local self-government, comparable to that which is enjoyed by the citizens of every other large urban community in our Nation. This would operate in two fields which are generally kept separate: (1) A locally elected city or District council would handle those functions of government usually exercised by the municipal government of any large city; (2) a locally elected school board would handle those governmental functions under which the public school system operates.

The present thoroughly undemocratic government of the District, under which the citizens of the District have no direct control of any sort over their municipal government and their public school system, is a travesty on the fundamental American principle of representative government.

From the standpoint of the citizens of the district themselves, the present system, with its complete absence of responsibility on the individual citizens, breeds lack of interest, lack of pride, lack of information as to the details of their local government, and too often lack of confidence in and respect for the two local governments which are closest to them and have most to do with their daily lives and with the rendition of those services which mean most to them and to their families. Such services include, among others, police and fire protection, sanitation, public health, public safety, public welfare, and public education. Such a system, to my way of thinking, is very bad for the citizens themselves.

From the standpoint of the attitude of the public employees and the public services, such a system is bad. These employees and services cannot be, and they are not, as responsive to the will and the legitimate requests of the citizens of the district as they would be under a system of representative government which would allow the citizens to select the key officials who would have direct control and supervision over the District employees and services. I wonder if any citizen of the District who is listening to me tonight is so naive as to believe that his reasonable requests receive the same attention from many District employees as do the requests of a Member of Congress?

From the standpoint of giving to the local needs of the District the immediate and careful attention which they deserve and require, the present system is bad because every Senator and Representative has to give primary attention to the needs of the people of his State or district, who elect him, as well as to the needs of the Nation as a whole; and the District and its needs are bound to come last, and too often they come at long last.

There is nothing new in home rule. The founding fathers, as shown by Mr. Madison's clear statement on the subject, did not intend to abolish local selfgovernment in the District. By congressional action, local self-government actually existed here from 1802 until 1874. There is no constitutional question as to the legality of allowing the local election of members of the council and school board—no legal question about giving to the council and school board full administrative power, each in its field—no legal question about giving the council legislative power to enact ordinances covering the customary scope of municipal legislation. The only constitutional question is whether additional legislative power beyond the field of local municipal ordinances can be delegated by Congress to the council. This sole legal question can be solved by the courts through the years, but in the meantime it seems to me to be the imperative duty of Congress to enact home rule for the District and thus secure to the citizens of the Nation's Capital, basic democratic rights which are exercised by the citizens of every other city and town in the Nation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in closing these brief remarks on this subject, I want to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that not only is it an imposition upon the nearly 900,000 citizens of the District to continue a form of government which bans them from having any say whatever with reference to the selection of the officials who preside over them, either the members of their city commission or the members of their school board; not only are they hopelessly deprived of any semblance of any local control over their own affairs in these two intimate governments which have to do so vitally with their happiness and the happiness of their families and homes, but that from the national standpoint it seems to me to be a terrible waste of time and effort and energy for the two Houses of the Congress to have to give their time, hour upon hour, to the consideration of many, many questions which are of such small importance that they do not at all justify any such consideration. I am not speaking of this particular measure, because while it is not a major one it does at least have substantial meaning to the District and to the Nation. But I am talking about such measures as those that we had up in the last Congress, for instance, determining whether or not mixed boxing bouts should be permitted in the District of Columbia, and whether or not the immediate removal of two ancient stone columns in the streets near the White House should be permitted, and whether or not the starlings should be required to roost at other places than upon the cornices of the public buildings in the District of Columbia, and whether or not those who sell bottled beverages and soft drinks within the District should be required to furnish straws to their customers, and whether or not the members of the barber board should have certain powers, and whether or not barbers within the District of Columbia should be permitted to work a certain number of hours, and whether or not the names of streets should be changed, or railroads should be permitted to build needed spur tracks upon alleys within the District. There were numerous other matters of such trivial importance, Mr. President, which consumed in the total, in my judgment, hundreds of Senator hours and hundreds of Representative hours at a time when the problems of the Nation and of the world as a whole are so great and so grave that they certainly offer to the Members of both Houses of Congress a challenge to give their very best efforts for as many hours of each day as they can continue to work.

And so, Mr. President, it is my hope that the occasion of the passage of this measure—and I hope it will be promptly passed—will also serve to point up the necessity for the creation of genuine home-rule government in the District of Columbia, in which again the citizens of the District may have the privilege, which they exercised for many years constitutionally, the privilege of selecting the members of their own governing bodies by their own vote. I strongly hope the distinguished chairman of the District of Columbia Committee of the Senate may persevere in his announced intention to bring to the floor of the Senate shortly a home-rule measure under which the only city in the United States which does not have for its citizens the power of local self-government, the capital of the United States of America, may have that particular blot removed from its escutcheon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill was passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LUCAS. I move the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and withdrawing two nominations, which nominations were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. REED, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

John Monroe Johnson, of South Carolina, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term expiring December 31, 1955 (reappointment).

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Aubrey B. Fennell to be an associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator, if he knows, what business will be coming up Monday, to which

day I understand it is intended to adjourn the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me say to my able friend from Massachusetts, I have an understanding with the minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] that nothing will come up on Monday of importance in view of the fact that Republican Members of the Senate are now on their way, or soon will be, to various places throughout the country to make Lincoln Day addresses, and some of them will not return by Monday; some will not get back before Tuesday or Wednesday. So, with the sort of mutual understanding we have had in the past with respect to the celebration of Lincoln Day, Jackson Day, and Jefferson Day, I can assure the Senator that nothing of importance will come up on Monday, and Senators on the other side may praise the immortal Abraham Lincoln from now until then; and they would not be overdoing it if they should do that, because I think Abraham Lincoln was one of the great men of all time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the Senator include the Presiding Officer who, I understand, will go to Illinois to make an address?

Mr. LUCAS. The Presiding Officer has condescended to go to Springfield, Ill., to make a speech upon Abraham Lincoln; and I prophesy that it will be the best speech that will be made by anyone on that particular day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to suggest that it is not a condescension to go to Springfield, Ill., on any occasion, and especially is that true of this occasion.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until next Monday at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 14, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received February 10, 1949:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Philip C. Jessup, of New York, to be Ambassador at Large.

North Winship, of Georgia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Union of South Africa, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of South Africa.

Myron Melvin Cowen, of New York, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Australia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of the Philippines.

SECURITY COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

John C. Ross, of New York, to be the deputy representative of the United States of America, with the rank and status of Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, in the Security Council of the United Nations.

UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

The following-named persons to be members of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for the terms indicated, to which offices they were appointed during the recess of the Senate:

B. Harvie Branscomb, of Tennessee, for a term expiring January 27, 1951.

Harold W. Dodds, of New Jersey, for a term expiring January 27, 1950.

Martin P. McGuire, of the District of Columbia, for a term expiring January 27, 1949.

Mark Starr, of New York, for a term expiring January 27, 1949.

Edwin B. Fred, of Wisconsin, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for the remainder of the term expiring January 27, 1950, and until his successor has been appointed and qualified, vice Karl T. Compton, resigned.

The following-named persons to be members of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for terms of three years expiring January 27, 1952, and until their successors have been appointed and qualified (reappointments):

Martin P. McGuire, of the District of Columbia.

Mark Starr, of New York.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Thomas C. Blaisdell, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to the position of Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Hawthorne Arey, of Nebraska, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, D. C., for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1950, vice William McChesney Martin, Jr., resigned.

THE TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named persons to be judges of the Tax Court of the United States for terms of 12 years from June 2, 1948, to which offices they were appointed during the recess of the Senate (reappointments):

Byron B. Harlan, of Ohio.

Miss Marion J. Harron, of California.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Lester Luther, of Kansas, to be United States attorney for the district of Kansas. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Alfred E. Modarelli, of New Jersey, to be United States attorney for the district of New Jersey. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

James J. Boyle, of California, to be United States marshal for the southern district of California. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Alfred J. Plowden, Jr., of South Carolina, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of South Carolina. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

UNITED STATES COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following-named employee of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the position indicated:

TO BE ENSIGN

Ateven L. Hollis, effective January 26, 1949.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following officers of the United States Coast Guard to be rear admirals, to rank from June 1, 1948:

Joseph F. Farley
Merlin O'Neill
Ellis Reed-Hill

(Admiral Joseph F. Farley, Rear Adm. Merlin O'Neill, and Rear Adm. Ellis Reed-Hill are presently serving in the Coast Guard, under 4 year statutory appointments, as commandant, assistant commandant, and engineer-in-chief, respectively. Their nominations to be permanent rear admirals in the Coast Guard are not intended to disturb their present incumbency in these statutory offices, nor the rank pay and other emoluments attaching thereto.)

TO BE REAR ADMIRAL, TO RANK FROM FEBRUARY 1, 1949

Louis B. Olson

TO BE REAR ADMIRAL, TO RANK FROM APRIL 1, 1949

Joseph Greenspun

TO BE LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE), TO RANK FROM NOVEMBER 18, 1946

Raymond J. Evans	Allen E. Armstrong
Willis G. Partridge	James McMenamin

TO BE ENSIGN, TO RANK FROM JANUARY 18, 1947

Hardy M. Willis

The following officers of the United States Coast Guard Reserve to be commissioned officers in the United States Coast Guard:

TO BE LIEUTENANT, TO RANK FROM OCTOBER 1, 1943

William R. Sayer

TO BE LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE), TO RANK FROM AUGUST 1, 1944

Lloyd M. Logan

TO BE LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE), TO RANK FROM JANUARY 1, 1947

Charles R. Leisy

The following officers to be lieutenants (junior grade), dates of rank to be computed upon execution of oath in accordance with the regulations governing the determination of precedence as commissioned officers in the United States Coast Guard of Reserve officers, former Reserve officers, and former temporarily commissioned officers:

Dono W. Moore	Robert E. Foley
Bruce N. Jensen	John E. Riddell, Jr.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate Thursday, February 10, 1949:

MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Hon. Aubrey B. Fennell to be a judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia.

IN THE ARMY

CHIEF OF ENGINEERS AND MAJOR GENERAL

Maj. Gen. Lewis Andrew Pick, O8696, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), Chief of Engineers, U. S. Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Eugene M. Foster, O6228, United States Army, Chief of Finance, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

Lt. Col. Walter J. Renfroe, Jr., professor of modern languages, United States Military Academy. (Given recess appointment on December 2, 1948.)

IN THE NAVY

The following-named midshipmen (aviation) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949:

Billy J. Baggett
Robert A. Westropp

John E. Parsons, Jr. (Naval ROTC) to be an ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949:

Robert S. Blake	Thomas A. Kamm
William J. D. Bradford 3d	Adair Miller
	Joseph J. Packo
William W. Davenport	Kenneth F. Pedersen
Benjamin Dillahunty	Neil A. Swartz
Edward J. Francois	Stanford J. Watson

Lek K. Von Kaesborg (civilian college graduate) to be an ensign in the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949, in lieu of ensign in the Navy as previously nominated, to correct date of rank.

James H. Greene (civilian college graduate) to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy (special duty officer).

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, to rank from date indicated after each name:

Erwin L. Aufdenkamp, June 3, 1949.
James H. Breunlin, June 4, 1948.

George L. Moreman (civilian college graduate) to be an ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949, in lieu of ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy as previously nominated, to correct date of rank.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Ferris G. Hodge
Frederick S. Welham

LIEUTENANT

Eldon O. Schnoebelen

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

June V. Alvis	Martha J. Hennessee
Eileen M. Bartels	Laura M. Hoff
Violet E. Bors	Eva M. Jacobsen
Wanda C. Bowman	Louise F. Jakshe
Reba M. Bradford	Marie A. Johncola
Marjorie J. Brumit	Mary-Jeanne Lagano
Edith M. Cadman	Clara J. Leoni
Mary G. Cain	Leslie E. McBratney
Jacqueline M. Camp	Mary P. McCarthy
Mary Cerrato	Betty L. McDonald
Eleanor M. Chapman	Kathleen M. Malloy
Patricia E. Cresap	Marcella A. Micklewicz
Nancy J. Crosby	Constance A. Miller
Dorothy K. Cummings	Doris M. Mortimer
Martha K. Daugherty	Geraldine L. Newstrom
Mary I. Dekenys	Regina M. Olko
Helen M. DeWitt	Celia Olshefski
Vivian M. M. Dicke	Angie L. Pettit
Catherine R. Dupuis	Joan E. Pollick
Virginia C. Faeth	Evelyn F. Przybylek
Mary J. Franco	Muriel E. Ramage
Maurine G. Frederick	Madeleine J. Ruppert
Dorothy L. French	Carolyn J. Shearer
Ina A. Gibson	Katherine Vagenas
Dorothy F. Giorgio	Florence H. Volkering
Rebecca Gomez	Genevieve E. Wagasky
Anna G. Hart	

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

COMMANDER

Richard B. Phillips

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Alexander A. Bolton, Jr.	Carl W. DeOnier
William McG. Craft	William W. Manson

LIEUTENANTS

Sidney D. Bond, Jr.
John A. McAfoos
Carl E. Pruett

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Robert H. Lemmon	Eugene C. Stone, Jr.
John L. Reed	Roger K. Wallace
Anthony P. Rush	

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

COMMANDER

Willard J. Goldring

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Allen L. McInturff
Syrus E. Tand)

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS

Frederick E. Batterson	Ralph A. Sennott
Robert S. Leopold	Carroll M. White

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

William B. Hull
Willard J. Goldring

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS

Ethel J. MacNaughton
Mary J. Wolfe

Otto A. Fennig to be a lieutenant in the Navy, for limited duty only, classification Engineering, in lieu of lieutenant in the Navy, for limited duty only, classification Engineering, as previously nominated, to correct spelling of name.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The below-named officer for appointment to the permanent grade of major general in the Marine Corps:

Franklin A. Hart

The below-named officer for appointment to the temporary grade of major general in the Marine Corps:

John T. Walker

The below-named officer for appointment to the permanent grade of brigadier general in the Marine Corps:

Lawson H. M. Sanderson

The below-named officer for appointment to the temporary grade of brigadier general in the Marine Corps:

Walter W. Wensinger

The below-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of colonel in the Marine Corps:

Wayne H. Adams	Ralph M. King
Elliott E. Bard	August Larson
Nelson K. Brown	Harry S. Leon
Austin R. Brunelli	Richard C. Mangrum
Edward B. Carney	Francis J. McQuillen
John H. Cook, Jr.	Luther S. Moore
Harlan C. Cooper	Ben Z. Redfield
Edward J. Dillon	Charles D. Roberts
Robert E. Fojt	Charles J. Schlapkohl
Edward H. Forney	Walter T. Short
Harry G. Fortune	Clifford H. Shuey
Edmund B. Games	William B. Steiner
Bankson T. Holcomb, Jr.	Samuel G. Taxis
	John A. While
Lewis C. Hudson	Frederic L. Wieseman
Albert J. Keller	

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps:

Thomas J. Ahern	Arthur A. Poindexter
Darrell L. Cool	Bennet G. Powers
George E. Dooley	Charles O. Rogers
Carl V. Larsen	Eugene N. Thompson
David E. Marshall	Vernon O. Ullman
Arba L. Norton	Harry A. Waldorf
Edward L. Peoples	

The following-named officers for appointment to the temporary grade of lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps:

Olin L. Beall	August F. Schonefeld
Robert E. McCook	Rupert E. Stone

The following-named officer for appointment to the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps Reserve:

Donald R. Nugent

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of major in the Marine Corps:

Anthony A. Akstin	George E. Leppig
William E. Baird	Truman K. Lyford
William J. Barnatt	Charles L. McIndoe
John H. Blumenstein	Carl A. Nielsen
Richard L. Braun	Glenn E. Norris
Joseph A. Bruder	William R. Ourand, Jr.
Robert I. Bryan	Albert L. Pope
Lyle E. Buck	Kenneth L. Reusser
Roscoe E. Cole	Thomas H. Rogers, Jr.
Francis P. Dayton	John E. Shepherd, Jr.
Frederic F. Draper	Clyde T. Suttle
Cecil D. Ferguson	Edward C. Thoemmes
Herbert Gomes	Harold Wallace
Robert H. Hammond	Warren E. Whipple
Charles H. Horn	James S. Williams
Roy N. Johnston	Russell L. Young
Bolish J. Kozak	John W. Zuber

The following-named officers for appointment to the temporary grade of major in the Marine Corps:

George K. Acker	James D. Ludvigson
Emory L. Anderson	John W. Mace
Max Beruffy, Jr.	Gilbert McConville
Richard Burgess	Doyle A. New
Charles W. Case	Frederick O'Conor
Eadik Collier	Fulton L. Oglesby
Philip J. Costello	Harry C. Parsons
George R. Eargle	George S. Plantier
John H. Faggert	Lee E. Roberts
Thomas G. Fields	Charles Seller
Harry D. Hargrave	Frederick M. Steinhauser
Johnny Jennings	
Samuel A. Johnstone, Jr.	Reuben S. Stoner
	Vernon A. Tuson
Arthur L. Kent	John W. Webber
Harry E. Kipp	Lloyd O. Williams
Wilfred S. LeFrancois	William L. Williams
Stephen Lesko	William L. Woodruff

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of captain in the Marine Corps:

Arthur H. Ackerman	George C. Knapp
Howard K. Alberts	Alexander Kositch
Philip R. Anderson	George A. Krumm
Stanislaus A. Antos	Eugene F. Langan
Wade W. Atkins	Stewart R. Lauer
James P. Aynes	George E. Lawrence
Billy H. Barber	Harry Lee
Irvin "J" Barney	Claude H. Lewis, Jr.
George F. Bauman	William R. Lobell
Herbert L. Beckington	Edwin B. Long
Louis W. Benjamin, Jr.	Edward "H" Mackel
William C. Benton	John H. Maher
James L. Berard	Norbert C. Manley, Jr.
Albert J. Bibee	Kenneth L. Mann
Richard L. Bland	William S. McCarson
James D. Boldman	James D. McGough
Raymond N. Bowman	Oscar "J" Morel
Lawrence H. Brandon	Robert J. Morrison
William B. Buckner, Jr.	Victor E. Myers
	James R. O'Moore
Robert H. Buettner	Will S. Patee, Jr.
Clarence J. Busick	Uel D. Peters
Warren A. Butcher	Franklin N. Pippin
Raymond J. Butters	Eugene J. Pope
Robert O. Carlock	John G. Prestridge
Nicholas Chernock	Joseph Pultorak
Richard W. Cline	Richard H. Rainforth
Frank R. Collen	Raymond J. Rightmyer, Jr.
Ralph D. Coplan	
Charles E. Crew	David Riley
Calvin K. Currens	John J. Rollins
Eldon E. Davidson	Carroll D. Rowe
Stanley Davis	Leonard L. Schults
William E. Deeds	Robert R. Scott
Charles F. DeKeyser	William A. Shepherd
Gerald T. Dixon	Robert C. Shipp
John J. Doherty	Frank "A" Shook, Jr.
Charles E. Dole	Almond H. Sollom
James W. Donnell	Ira E. Spieker
William R. Duncan	Parks J. Stallings
Richard A. Flanagan	Elmo J. Stingley
James G. Fox	Harold H. Stirling, Jr.
Burnette R. Gallagher	Marvin R. Stout
Baylor P. Gibson, Jr.	John B. Sullivan
George "M" Golleher	Walter E. Sullivan, Jr.
David T. Gooden	Wilson "C" Terry
James B. Graves	Nicholas G. W. Thorne
Joe R. Greene	Eddie C. Torbett
Harold K. Hall	Johnnie V. Townsend
Curtis F. Hamlin, Jr.	Thomas B. Trammell
Merlin L. Hasley	Marion G. Truesdale
Paul B. Henley	Herman L. Ubbins
Thomas R. Hickey, Jr.	Eugene "A" Wailes
Robert W. Hoffman	Herbert R. Waltz
Marvin K. Hollenbeck	Stephen G. Warren
Howard G. Holt	Warren C. Watson
Odia "E" Howe, Jr.	Robert J. Weaver
James O. Huston	Warren E. Weinberg
Joseph N. Irick	Robert M. Wetzel
William C. James, Jr.	James L. Whitaker
George E. Jenkins	Patrick E. Wildman
Charles D. Jones	Frank E. Wilson
States R. Jones, Jr.	James E. Wilson, Jr.
Joseph R. Kapsch	Ray Woods
Theodore A. Kelley	Robert P. Wray
	Frank R. Young

The following-named officers for appointment to the temporary grade of captain in the Marine Corps:

George J. Batson, Jr.
Hersel D. C. Blasingame
Walter E. G. Godenius
Harry D. Hutchcroft
Francis L. Miller
James B. Seaton
Howard B. Smith
Ben W. White
Ellis R. Wright

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

James C. Alison
Eugene J. Ambrosia
Henry G. Ammer
William E. Androsko
Frederick L. J. Ashworth
Guy O. Badger
Lonnie P. Baltes
John H. Barclay
Paul W. Barcus
Wallace C. Barrett
Raleigh E. Barton, Jr.
Richard Bell
George H. Benskin, Jr.
Joe R. Bibby
George G. Blair II
Donald M. Blomgren
Dorsie H. Booker, Jr.
James T. Breckinridge
John C. Breckinridge
Fitzhugh L. Buchanan, Jr.
Edwin B. Bucholz
Lyle W. Bullard
Edwin "A" Burns
Harrison M. Butler
John C. Butner III
Robert W. Calvert
Ira T. Carr
Michael P. Carroll
Frank A. Cassiano
Franklin R. Chambers
William E. Clark
David A. Clement
Stanford Cluggish
Thomas B. Collins
James G. Costigan
Robert E. Cox
Theodore T. Culpepper
Asa B. Culver, Jr.
William J. Cupelo
Clarence G. Dahl
Charles M. Darracott
John G. Demas
Edmund G. Derning, Jr.
Jack N. Dillard
Jack W. Dindinger
Thomas S. Dlugos
Donald W. Dorn
Robert E. Downen
Earl C. Dresbach, Jr.
LeRoy M. Duffy
William F. Dyroff
Edward W. Dzialo
Edward V. Easter
Paul M. Edwards
Harry D. Elms
Donald E. Estes
James D. Feltman
Henry Fischer, Jr.
Joseph R. Fisher
Thomas R. Freeman
Homer D. Frison
Robert W. Frye
Edward D. Gelzer, Jr.
Nolan R. Gibbons
Gerald W. Gibson
Hobson J. Gifford
Ronald L. Glendinning
Melvin K. Green
Richard P. Grey
Leo Gumienny
Arnold J. Hammons
Autrey B. Hammon
Frank W. Harris III
Howard R. Harris
Robert G. Harris
Lester Heinz, Jr.
Clayton V. Hendricks
Russell S. Hibbs
Norman W. Hicks
Joseph J. Holicky
Louis S. Hollier, Jr.
Thomas J. Holt
Frank H. Horn
Kenneth C. Ives
Curtis A. James, Jr.
Robert E. Jochums
Tracy N. Johnson
David G. Jones
Edward H. Jones
George P. Jones
Robert A. Jones
Robert W. Jorn
Timothy J. Keane, Jr.
Jack R. Kearney
John H. Keith, Jr.
Gene S. Keller
James P. Kelly
Edward B. Keyes, Jr.
Edwin W. Killian
Lee A. Kirstein
Harrol Kiser
Herbert J. Korstange
Orin D. Krone
Fred D. Kuhlmann
Robert J. Larsen
Harold V. Larson
Fred Lawton, Jr.
Thaddeus F. Lewandowski
Elmer "M" Lewis, Jr.
Harry M. Lindberg
James E. Machin
Fletcher B. Maddox
Reginald G. Martin
Jan Mason
Donald L. May
John R. McGuigan
Frederick C. McLaughlin
Clare R. McMahon
George C. McNaughton
Robert L. McNeely
Merrill J. Melton
John B. Melvin
George A. Merrill
Jack L. Miles
Frank N. Mitchell
Arthur B. Montagne
Clarence G. Moody, Jr.
Gail A. Newkirk
William J. Nietschmann
Richard F. Noble
Robert G. Parrish
Harold L. Parsons
William H. Peck
Jack B. Phillips
Brockman L. Plauche
Ray D. Pineo
Arthur J. Poillon
Linus F. Pottebaum
Robert G. Price
Elmore F. Ravensberg
James H. Reid, Jr.
Lester F. Reid
Knowlton P. Rice
Alvin R. Rieder
Glenn W. Rodney
Harold E. Roland, Jr.
John J. Roothoff
Maurice Rose
Ted J. Ryder
James R. Schoen
Gerald F. Schultz
Benjamin B. Selvitelle, Jr.
James F. Shea, Jr.
Donald A. Silva
John B. Sims
Frederick D. Singer
Perry T. Smith
Richard E. Smith
Harry A. Spaight, Jr.
Donald E. Spencer
Raymond B. Spicer
Clarence R. Stanley
Richard E. Stansberry
Thomas J. Stevens
Howard D. Stewart II
Hugh W. Stewart
Howard E. Stidham
Charles H. Sullivan
Theodore Summers
William Swanson
William E. Sweeney
Warren G. Tanzler
Alfred C. Taves
David S. Taylor
Jay "J" Thomas, Jr.
Robert J. Thomas
William L. Tipton, Jr.
Charles T. Turpin
Robert A. Underwood
Rollin F. VanCantfort
Robert N. Vance
Jo M. Van Meter
Floyd L. Vuillemot
John A. Wachter
Denzil E. Walden
Charles M. Wallace, Jr.
Henry M. Walter, Jr.
Ralph L. Walz
Alan J. Warshawer
Charles T. Westcott
Howard A. Westphall
Jack D. White
William A. Whitesell
Edward A. Wilcox
Loren K. Wildermuth
Wallace L. Williamson
Ralph C. Wood
Kermit M. Worley
John R. Wyatt, Jr.
Robert F. Young, Jr.
Vance L. Yount, Jr.

The followed-named officers for appointment to the temporary grade of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

George M. Best
Jack F. Boles
Johnny L. Carter
Robert E. Follendorf
Russell T. Gorter
William J. Hamilton
James M. Haney
Raymond E. Logan
John F. McCarthy, Jr.
Kenneth R. Porter
Cluese T. Powell
James A. Tootle
Frank C. Trumble
Wilmon Varnado
Andrew M. Young

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of commissioned warrant officer in the Marine Corps:

Oscar W. Cargile
Thomas J. Chandler
Claude N. Harris
Paul H. Mikkelsen
John F. Pezdark

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of major for limited duty in the Marine Corps:

Walter E. Anderson
Wilbur R. Barnes
Kennard F. Bubier
Ira Brock
James E. Buckle
Hall V. Cartmell
Harry E. Detwiler
Thomas H. Dougan
Frederick Dykstra
Grammer G. Edwards
Frank W. Ferguson
Wallace Henry
Harold R. Jordan
Norman D. Kent
Clyde H. Long
Francis J. Lutz
Edward J. McCabe
Lee Moberly
Eero Nori
Joseph F. Stepka
Samuel M. Trippe
Herman A. Zehngebot

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of captain for limited duty in the Marine Corps:

Herman T. Barbee
Leonard I. Beatty
Paul F. Brandenburg
Richard P. Brezinski
Willie W. Brock
James E. Brown
Good Burleson
Theodore R. Cathey
Frank J. Cermak
Francis L. Churchville
Robert J. Corbett
Thomas H. Cutler
Robert L. Dickey
Walter H. Eastham
Edward E. Eder
James W. Eldridge
Irvin H. Elrod
James P. Evans
Joseph R. Foster
Howard C. Frazer
Elwood E. Gebhart
Cletus K. Gibson
Walter R. Giles
Raymond F. Gotko
John P. Grando
Robert C. Gunsalus
James K. Harris
Milligan G. Hereford
Ralph H. Hobbs
Michael J. Hogan
Arthur L. Jackson
Boyd J. Jackson
George Jones
Albert H. Keith
Beldon Lidyard
Raymond L. Luckel
Floyd M. McCorkle
Thomas W. McNeely
Charles E. McPartlin
Arthur J. Noonan
Ronald J. Nourse
Frederick V. Osborn
Thomas C. Palmer, Jr.
Paul R. Paquin
Howard H. Parker
Frank G. Paul
George T. Perschau
Fred R. Philpot
Paul J. Preston
Caryll A. Price
Joseph J. Reardon
John P. Ricard
William B. Richards
Joseph C. Schwalke
William A. Searight
Frank C. Sheppard
Michael J. Sisul
Samuel L. Slocum
Robert A. Smith
Allen F. Stockdale
Robert G. Straine
James D. Swinson
Max C. Taylor
Harold M. Tupper
Robert E. Wall
William F. Watson
George L. Williams
Adolph Ziegler

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of first lieutenant for limited duty in the Marine Corps:

Oscar A. Bosma
Woodrow W. Brown
Alfred T. Coon
Felix L. Ferranto
Henry G. Goare
Bill E. Grimes
Dudley J. Hagen
Adolph J. Kutilek
Walter P. Landis
Lornie Leslie
Virgil R. Martin
William D. Miears
Adam A. Metz
Warren L. Mobley
Howard E. Morris
William L. Nolte
Bill L. Parham
Gerald L. Pines
William M. Rossiter
Kenneth M. Stayer
St. Clair Tant
Russell Tarver
John H. Tomlinson
Charles M. Whitley

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant for limited duty in the Marine Corps:

Raymond L. Amos
Everett L. Anderson
John T. Bates
Daniel M. Blue, Jr.
Louis J. Caminiti
Robert B. Dowdy
William A. Flander
Allison G. Folsom, Jr.
Thomas F. Ford
Hollis W. Glass
Frank L. Howard
Stevan Jungerich
Lawrence W. Keenan
Homer King
Frederick J. Knack
Richard C. Laubach
Frank Lisi
Michael M. Marks
George M. Mathis
Glenn E. McComas
George E. McKain
John A. Mitchell
Louis A. Murphy, Jr.
Howard W. Pearson
Albert L. Protz
Estes N. Ratliffe
Leon C. Riley
Norman Rubin
Thomas J. Shaw
William H. Shuman
Edward Stallknecht
Clyde H. Stamps
Judson J. Swallow
James V. Valentour
Maurice S. Wahrer
Peter P. Yezierski
Albert J. Zlamal

The following-named woman officer for appointment to the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps:

Katherine A. Towle

The following-named women officers for appointment to the permanent grade of major in the Marine Corps:

Julia E. Hamblet
Pauline E. Perate

The following-named women officers for appointment to the permanent grade of captain in the Marine Corps:

Pauline B. Beckley
Barbara J. Bishop
Margaret M. Henderson
Emma H. Hendrickson
Elsie E. Hill
Helen J. McGraw

The following-named women officers for appointment to the permanent grade of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Kathleen J. Arney
Eunyce L. Brink
Ben A. Day
Frances A. Denbo
Mary J. Fischer
Jeanne Fleming
Mary J. Hale
Margaret S. Ordemann
Pauline F. Riley
Margaret L. Stevenson
Jeanette I. Sustad

The following-named officers (former enlisted men) for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Hugh S. Aitken
Ralph M. Anderson
John R. Bigler
Joseph A. Borowski
Travis D. Brown
George Caridakis
Oliver W. Christianson
Harold L. Coffman
Wallace E. Crowder
Rodger I. Eddy
Robert F. Edgar
Wendall C. Endsley
John C. Fite
Jerry D. Fly
Clarence W. Friesen
John "J" Gates
Tom L. Gibson
Harvey A. Goss
Edward C. Hall, Jr.
Edmund W. Hanlon
Ray Heck
John J. Hess
Frederick W. Hopkins
John W. Hutchinson
Edwin G. Javor
Austin C. Jenson
James E. Johnson
Nicholas Kavakich
David D. Kelley, Jr.
Damon J. Larson
"R" Michael McCarthy
Joseph Mordente
Francis W. Muetzel
Edward S. Murphy

Earle W. Pye, Jr.
Robert O. Risinger
Alexander S. Ruggiero
Stanley J. Seward
Carl F. Shiflette
Emmett B. Sigmon, Jr.
Joseph V. Slawta
Robert H. Starek
Vaughn R. Stuart
Warren H. Taylor
Roy R. VanCleve
Wayne D. Walton
John O. Williams, Jr.
Leslie C. Williams
Henry S. Zdankowski

The following-named officers (former enlisted men) for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Walter G. Ackerman
Harry L. Alderman
Merle W. Allen
Roscoe W. Anderson
Nickolas D. Arkadis
George L. Armitage
Milton S. Ashcraft
Dean C. Baker
John E. Baker
Harvey W. Baron
Donald F. Bays
Elbert "T" Bell
William J. Berlinguette
Frank W. Boules
Donald E. Bradley
Donald R. Brimmer
Dale L. Brown
Douglas L. Brown
Clayton O. Bush
Arnold F. Bynum
John J. H. Cahill
Richard E. Carey
Ray N. Carter
Dana B. Cashion
Charles A. Christiansen
John N. Christolos
William R. Clifton
Edward E. Collins
Orville D. Conney
Manley H. Cosper, Jr.
John D. Counselman
Bert "R" Covert, Jr.
David R. Cowling
Richard J. Coyne
Lamar G. Crawford, Jr.
Ronald N. Davis
Paul E. Denny
Edwin A. Deptula
Richard M. Dozema
William K. Duryea
Raymond S. Eason
William S. Edler
David J. Ellington
Billy J. Elliott
Edward T. Emmelman
Tyler D. Evans
Richard G. Eykyn
Paul R. Fields
Bert Fisher
Basil L. Flannagan
Harry A. Florence, Jr.
Howard O. Foor
William C. Foster
Marvin D. Gardner
Joseph M. Glasgow
Raymond J. Glodowski
Frederic W. Golles, Jr.
Daniel J. Griffin, Jr.
James E. Hannan
Dale M. Henz
Jack M. Hermes
Roy E. Hess
Wallace A. Heyer
Willis T. Howland
John M. Jackson
Spencer H. Jarnagin
Richard M. Johnson
Donald R. Jones
Joris F. Kenyon
Ethmer W. King
John W. Kestnik
Roy E. Krieger
William A. Kronberg, Jr.
Joseph P. Mitchell, Jr.
Arthur R. Mooney
Edward C. Morris
Joseph E. Muir
Richard L. Musselman
Joseph Namesnik
Bud F. Nelson
Joseph A. Nevin
Rollie D. Newsom
Minard P. Newton, Jr.
Jack L. Nolan
Arthur A. Oakley
James P. O'Connell
Marion R. Ozburn, Jr.
Eugene J. Paradis
John M. Patrick
Peter M. Payne
Edward C. Post
Robert J. Post
Frederick K. Purdum
Wallace J. Reid
Patrick C. Roe
Raymond E. Roeder, Jr.
Paul J. G. Roosen
Victor A. Salvo, Jr.
Robert P. Scheunemann
Harold G. Schmidt, Jr
Hugh C. Schryver, Jr.
Kenneth M. Scott
Donald W. Sharon
Stewart A. Shaw
George E. Shepherd
Michael J. Shinka
Van J. Simmons, Jr.
Frederick L. Simons
Donald D. Sisson
Patrick G. Sivert
Louie J. Smith
Robert J. Smith
Taylor B. Smith
James W. Stemple
Gerald H. Stewart
Charles R. Stiles
Ralph E. Sullivan
Russell G. Swift, Jr.
Harold A. Thomas
Carl B. Thompson, Jr.
Robert P. Thomson
Ralph J. Tuley
Leon N. Utter
Edgar W. Wagner, Jr.
Wayne F. Wallace
Joseph A. Ward
Lars R. Wargin
Andrew T. Watt
Joseph R. Wayerski, Jr.
Richard P. Wells
Robert F. Werner
William W. Westphall
Kenneth C. Williams
Goode D. Wilson, Jr.
LeRoy K. Wirth

The following-named officers (civilian college graduates) for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Nate L. Adams II, a citizen of Virginia.
Stanley "G" Alexander, a citizen of California.
Wendell O. Beard, a citizen of California.
Howard G. Blank, a citizen of Maryland.
John S. Carson, a citizen of the District of Columbia.
James L. Crutchfield, a citizen of New York.
Brian J. Cummings, a citizen of New Jersey.
Bruce F. Cunliffe, a citizen of New York.
Jack H. Davis, a citizen of Illinois.
Thomas J. Deen, Jr., a citizen of Florida.
Joseph K. Gastrock III, a citizen of Pennsylvania.
John N. Guild, a citizen of Colorado.
Gordon S. Hosmer, a citizen of New York.
George J. Kleess, a citizen of New York.
Donald J. Krabbe, a citizen of Missouri.
Donald E. Marchette, a citizen of South Carolina.
Donald V. McCloskey, a citizen of California.
Francis E. McDonald, a citizen of Missouri.
Philip T. O'Hara, a citizen of New York.
Joseph R. Owen, a citizen of New York.
Laurence M. Phelps, Jr., a citizen of Florida.
Charles B. Quinn, a citizen of New Jersey.
John A. Reames, a citizen of South Carolina.
Thomas C. Redfern, Jr., a citizen of North Carolina.
Allan L. Reid, a citizen of California.
Edward W. Snelling, a citizen of South Carolina.
William A. Speer, a citizen of South Carolina.
Robert G. Staffney, a citizen of Pennsylvania.
John J. Swards, a citizen of New York.
Phillip F. Thomas, a citizen of Tennessee.
Francis W. Tief, a citizen of New York.
Robert G. Topp, a citizen of Mississippi.
John M. Walker, a citizen of Pennsylvania.
Robert M. Winter, a citizen of California.
Cullen C. Zimmerman, a citizen of North Carolina.

The following-named officers (former contract NROTC students) for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Mayhlon L. Degernes, Jr., a citizen of Minnesota.
Edwin W. Hakala, a citizen of Michigan.
Lawrence W. Hetrick, a citizen of Ohio.

The following-named officer (former midshipman) for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Thomas H. Johnston

The following-named officers (former Regular officers) for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Allan G. Copp
Raymond C. Damm
Billy C. Marks
Wesley E. Strauley
William P. Yerger

IN THE MARINE CORPS

APPOINTMENTS TO PERMANENT GRADES

The following-named officer for appointment to the permanent grade of captain for limited duty in the Marine Corps:

Cecil E. Anderson

The following-named officer for appointment to the permanent grade of first lieutenant for limited duty in the Marine Corps:

William Fellner

The following-named officer for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant for limited duty in the Marine Corps:

William H. Howard

The following-named citizen (contract Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps student) for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Raymond R. Rall, Jr., a citizen of Pennsylvania.

The following-named midshipmen for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Samuel E. Englehart
William F. Saunders, Jr.

The following-named former Regular officer for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Warren J. Skvaril

The following-named officer for appointment to the permanent grade of commissioned warrant officer in the Marine Corps:

Harold K. Jackson

WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate February 10, 1949:

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Hawthorne Arey to be a director of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

TRUCE COMMISSION FOR PALESTINE

John J. Macdonald to be the representative of the United States of America on the Truce Commission for Palestine.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Creator of mankind, we praise Thee for Thy immortal word—made in His image. Give us a courageous strength that we may never defile this blessed endowment.

As servants of the people of whatever section or creed, we pray for thorough cooperation and solidarity and mutual help for all groups. Give us courage to withstand anything that imperils our usefulness. Guarding our influence and example, help us to be worthy champions of those standards which exalt national character.

In all these experiences, work in us to do Thy will and Thy good pleasure. Through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S BOLD NEW WORLD PROGRAM

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, President Truman's bold new world program is not a new thing; it is simply an extension and an expansion of President Roosevelt's Interdepartmental Committee on Scientific and Cultural Cooperation for the development and improvement of the

Latin-American Republics. President Roosevelt's ICSCC has been in operation for 10 years exporting American know-how, American machinery, and American wealth to our Latin-American neighbors. President Truman's bold new world program to raise the standard of living of the world's undeveloped areas therefore is simply an extension to the rest of the world of Roosevelt's Western Hemisphere good-neighbor policy.

President Truman extended aid to Greece and Turkey in 1947 through the Greek-Turkish aid program, and extended aid to the countries of western Europe under the Marshall plan. American aid and help and skill and resources are now to blanket the world through his bold new world program. The question arises, What is back of this ambitious world program, this world WPA? Why is it sprung upon our weary, overburdened American taxpayers at this particular moment?

Mr. Speaker, there is growing concern in Washington today among President Truman's advisers over falling prices, increasing unemployment, surpluses that are beginning to pile up, and an anticipated glutted market. Something must be done to avoid the deflation that lies ahead. American surpluses must be disposed of in order that full employment may be maintained and our national income kept above the $200,000,000,000 mark. President Truman proposes therefore to give away more goods to keep the production machine going, to raise more taxes, to pay for more goods to give away, ad infinitum.

This game of give-away is to be sold to the American taxpayers—who have to pay for it—as a defense measure because a business slump would be playing into the hands of Joe Stalin. It is what he has been waiting for. If a business slump comes Joe Stalin will have won his cold war. So we must tax and tax, spend and spend, give and give, produce and produce to avoid a depression.

Mr. Speaker, America's postwar appetite for consumer goods is finally becoming satisfied; the inflationary effects upon price levels of our huge shipments abroad—$14,000,000,000 worth of scarce goods to Europe last year instead of our normal exports of $4,000,000,000 worth—are now diminishing, so a glutted market with falling prices threatens our economy. Economists, both inside and outside the administration, have known for some time that our high-price, high-income economy must be maintained to keep America solvent, to meet the heavy service charges upon our $280,000,000,000 debt, and to support our extravagant $45,000,000,000 Federal budget.

President Truman's blueprint for world-wide peace and prosperity is bound to develop into a robbing-Peter-to-pay-Paul process, a spend-ourselves-into-prosperity program, where the American taxpayer will be required to pick up the check. How long can this give-away game be kept up?

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS]?

There was no objection.

ORGANIZED BASEBALL

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, organized baseball received a stunning blow yesterday when a court of appeals ruled in effect that the contract of a player is not binding. I certainly do not question the wisdom of the court's decision, but would like to make this observation.

Players, club, and league officials have traditionally had a complete understanding that the particular type of contract under which they operated was necessary to perpetuate our national game.

Now comes a player who jumps his contract to play in Mexico, and when the well runs dry down there, comes back here, and because he is disciplined for jumping his contract, brings this unprecedented action against baseball officials—an action that could well sound the death knell for the sport that has kindled the fires of ambition in the breasts of so many thousands of young Americans.

From the excellent program sponsored by the American Legion, up to the major leagues, baseball has been making splendid citizens out of boys who in many cases, were it not for baseball, would never have had a chance.

Some of these players have made an indelible mark in our sporting history. Their contribution to the youth of America can never be measured in money. I sincerely hope that any player who would destroy baseball for personal gain, will, for the sake of American youth, reconsider his action before it is too late.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] may have an indefinite leave of absence, due to serious illness in his family.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAGEE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a talk made by him yesterday before the Brightwood Lions Club on education and Federal aid.

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM ON OLEO

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the plank in the Democratic platform which proposes repeal of the Federal antimargarine taxes means just what it says.

I think I know what that plank means. I helped write it and heard the discussions which went on concerning it. I was a member of the subcommittee on resolutions at the Democratic National Convention in Philadelphia. My group prepared the first draft of the platform and then submitted it to the platform committee.

The plank on margarine which we drafted meant repeal of Federal antimargarine legislation. There was no thought of substituting a ban on the manufacture and sale of yellow margarine, or of putting any other restriction on margarine in lieu of the taxes.

Naturally, we discussed the matter at some length and decided that sentiment in the country as a whole is for repeal.

The persons who now argue that the administration would be breaking faith with Midwest farmers if it goes ahead with its plans for repeal of the margarine taxes evidently do not know what went on at Philadelphia when the Democratic platform was drafted.

At that time the proposal by the dairy group that the taxes be repealed but that yellow margarine be banned had not been made public. There was no mention of this proposal at Philadelphia.

To say now that the proposed ban on yellow margarine is in line with the platform and the administration's position is to ignore the plain facts.

To repeat, the plank meant outright repeal of the Federal antimargarine laws without reservations. I am hopeful that the House will take speedy action to carry out the platform pledge.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOLLING asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in one to include an address by Howard A. Cowden, president and general manager of Consumers' Cooperative Association, Kansas City, Mo.; and in the other case a quotation from the Hoover Commission task force on natural resources.

Mr. HÉBERT (at the request of Mr. LARCADE) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. ADDONIZIO asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain letters pointing out the difference between the organizations meeting with reference to civil liberties.

Mr. PRICE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the East St. Louis (Ill.) Journal.

Mr. MORRIS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BURNSIDE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

MEETINGS ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, there will be two conferences in this city during the next few days on the subject of civil rights. One, which is scheduled to meet on February 11 and 12, under the name of the Legislative Assembly and Rally to End Segregation and Discrimination, contains the usual list of Communists and Fellow Travelers, with the addition of one or two leading Republicans, plus several innocents some of whom are always unfortunately cajoled into these affairs by the Communists.

The other meeting the National Citizens Conference on Civil Liberties, is being held on February 15 and 16, called by the Civil Liberties Clearing House. This meeting has been given the blessing of the President of the United States who is the most courageous defender of civil rights our country has ever known. He wrote as follows to the chairman of this conference, Mr. E. Raymond Wilson:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington.

MY DEAR MR. WILSON: Please accept my best wishes for a successful gathering of the National Citizens Conference on Civil Liberties which will be held in Washington February 15–17.

We must provide a solid foundation for the future growth of our country. Of great importance to the present and future generations of America is the development of a program of civil liberties guaranteeing to all people the heritage of freedom which we have received from the founders of this Nation. A free system can endure only when there is freedom of opinion, expression, and conscience.

Your conference has a great responsibility in formulating the kind of program which will give added strength to the principles of freedom which have come down to us from the fathers of the Constitution.

Very sincerely yours,
HARRY TRUMAN.

I call these two meetings to the attention of my colleagues so that they may discriminate between the one which is heavily Communist-dominated, and the other which is of interest to those good American citizens who are trying to give statutory meaning to our constitutional guaranties, but who are opposed to cooperation with those who expound totalitarian doctrines.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] has expired.

SHARING OUR MATERIAL PROSPERITY WITH THE WORLD

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the remarks of a few minutes ago, on this floor, by our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], call forth these extemporaneous remarks by me, as he apparently condemns the President of the United States, for the position he took toward sharing our democratic knowledge and advancements with other peoples of the world.

It seems to me that the President of the United States should be instead congratulated upon continuing to emphasize to the people of America, and the people of the world that the heart of America is still warm; that the heart of America is still intelligent and unselfish enough and Christian enough to be willing to share with the people of the world the material prosperity of America, and the spiritual attainments which the people of America have acquired through God's blessings, in part, in the form of our geographic location, climate, natural resources, and other features.

I wish to compliment the President of the United States upon renewing and emphasizing these things which our great President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, now deceased, emphasized in his lifetime. I am not surprised that President Truman has again reiterated those declarations of unselfish and sensible interests in the progress of the world, because I would expect the President of the great American people, with their thoughtfulness and unselfish attitude toward world progress, to reiterate them. In fact, I would not expect the President of the United States to do otherwise, than to be interested in the prosperity of the people of the world. He represents the thinking of the people and heart of America, and the intelligence and heart of America is to be generous and steadfastly helpful toward the progress of the people of the world. I would say that the great mass of American people recognize that only as the world goes forward in prosperity and in spiritualness can America go forward, and I am saying that the heart and mind of America recognizes that the peace of the world depends upon America's being interested in doing something about the advancement of all the people of the world, as well as the people of America. World prosperity is no longer divisible, nor is the peace of the world divisible. Uncertainty for any mass of people in the world spells uncertainty for many people of the world. Economical or social backwardness, or tardiness, for any mass of the people in the world holds back social and economical advancement for all the people of the world. President Harry Truman of the United States, in his inaugural address, in fact, spoke the heart and the mind of the great mass of people in America, when he urged that the people of America help in the material advancement of all of the people of the world.

I again compliment the President of the United States on doing this, again, and again, and again.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

ACQUISITION AND OPERATION OF THE FREEDOM TRAIN BY THE ARCHIVIST OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. COX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following resolution (H. Res. 95) to provide for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train by the Archivist of the United States, and for other purposes, for printing in the RECORD:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. J. Res. 84) to provide for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train by the Archivist of the United States, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments which may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have until midnight tonight to file a report from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article from the Saturday Evening Post entitled "We Could Slip Into Socialism While Hating It."

Mr. D'EWART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a memorial adopted by the Legislature of Montana.

Mr. LOVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a case study in international espionage in the Far East, notwithstanding the fact that the Government Printing Office estimates the cost will be $1,153.75.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes on Monday next following the regular business of the day and any special orders heretofore granted for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

SPECULATION ON THE COMMODITY MARKETS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of congratulating the Secretary of Agriculture in ordering an investigation with respect to the operation of certain manipulators on the board of trade within the last few days that has resulted in an unusual break in the prices of grain.

While I believe the prices of grain are still high, I cannot subscribe to the manner in which a few manipulators and gamblers have acted in making short sales which resulted in such a drop in the prevailing prices.

I have frequently called attention on the floor to the operations of these few hundred speculators and gamblers in grains, as well as in stocks, who have been permitted to bring about breaks in the market which have caused a disturbance in the financial conditions of our country. However, what applies to the board of trade and grain speculators also applies to the stock exchange manipulators, short sellers, and gamblers.

Within the last few months some of these manipulators, taking advantage in the change in the result of the election, began to sell stocks short, which operation they have practiced from time to time whenever opportunity presented. Why should this Government permit a few hundred, or even a few thousand, of these professional speculators, by their operations, dislocate and affect conditions that invariably are destructive and affect the normal operation of business and the economy of our Nation?

None of the few hundred speculators on the Board of Trade grow a single bushel of wheat, corn, rye, oats, and other grain commodities, and still they sell not thousands but hundreds of thousands of bushels of grain a day that they do not own.

A former judge in New York and our former ambassador to Germany, James W. Gerard, made this observation: "He who sells goods that are not his'n, should be sent to prison," and I believe that some day in the near future a law will be passed that will make it a criminal offense for anyone to sell anything that he does not possess or own.

In 1929, and ever since that time, I have made many investigations of the manipulations of the grain and stock speculators and obtained valuable information satisfying me that 95 percent of the sales on the stock exchange, curb, grain, and commodity exchanges are professional deals on the part of a few of these manipulators, including the exchanges dealing in butter, lard, eggs, and other products. Of course, I realize that from time to time these gentlemen having friends on the floor have criticized me for calling attention to the outrageous activities of these brokers, but it has not and will not stop me from insisting and urging the passage of much stricter legislation than I advocated in 1929 which brought about the creation of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

I recollect that 3 years ago I directed the attention of the House to the outrageous boosting of the price of rye on the part of a small group owning about 80 percent of the rye stock which they acquired at 65 and 70 cents a bushel. Through manipulation they forced the price up to $2 and $2.25 per bushel which price was 40 to 60 cents higher than the price obtaining for wheat. An investigation was undertaken by the Department of Agriculture and some of these speculators were suspended but, unfortunately, the infliction of that penalty apparently has not curbed or stopped the unethical and unfair practices as we have observed in the manipulations which have taken place in the last few days. In that connection I wish to say that notwithstanding that the prices of wheat, corn, rye, barley, and other grains have gone down, the flour millers and the bakers have ignored the drop in wholesale prices and the price of bread and all other food necessities have not been reduced or lowered to the consumers.

Mr. Speaker, I also recall in the last Congress when I called attention to the activities of certain professional brokers and manipulators whose short selling brought about a break in the market, I was criticized by a gentleman from Pennsylvania, a former broker, whose defense of their operations indicated to me that he was connected with this coterie of gentlemen. Suffice to say that the gentleman is no longer here. I wonder whether today there may be some gentlemen who do not understand these manipulative stock practices who may come to the defense of these manipulators who are responsible for the recent break in the market.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the Secretary of Agriculture will continue in his investigations and bring to light those who are responsible for these artificially created breaks or upturns in prices.

Investigations should also be made of the stock exchanges and it is my hope that the Securities and Exchange Commission will make public, as I have frequently requested, timely reports on all short sales, what stocks have been sold short and by whom sold, and such reports to be made immediately and not weeks later.

THE WHITE HOUSE AND THE CAPITOL

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Nebraska a few minutes ago to the effect that he was instrumental in having signs taken down in front of the White House that it was being wrecked. That is what I was afraid they were doing. I hope from the reports I get that they do not wreck the exterior of the White House, because it has been a landmark for years and we appreciate it. Enough things have been wrecked; let us do a little repairing and building.

I also see in the newspapers that there is talk about spending $5,000,000 in changing the face of the Capitol. I hope that does not happen. We have not the money, and it is all O. K. as it is. But I do hope that the Architect of the Capitol will do something about the House Chamber. We should find some place where we could meet long enough to give them time to strengthen the ceiling and do away with the unsightly steel scaffolding in this room today. It is a disgrace that we should have permitted this condition to continue for so many years. I have served here for a good many years, and these beams have been here most of that time. I think the proper thing for us to do is to find a place where we could meet temporarily until the interior of this hall can be strengthened and these unsightly iron beams and braces removed. Its acoustics are bad. The steelwork is unsightly. In its present condition it is not a fitting place for the House of Representatives to meet. I hope prompt consideration will be given to this matter. We could move to some auditorium for 6 months so the work could be done, or better still, for the country, adjourn for 1949 the first session of the Eighty-first Congress now.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

COMMODITY AND STOCK MARKET PRICES

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I was not surprised at all to hear the 1-minute speech made a few minutes ago by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] in which he blames the speculators entirely for the slump in commodity- and stock-market prices. Of course, we all know that speculators like other folks are not simon pure, but we also know that when anything happens of this nature the party in power makes a whipping boy, and tries to make a scapegoat of the fellow who has a little money whether he made it by the sweat of his brow, or by legal speculation, or what not.

The thing causing these prices to be depressed today is the attitude and the power of Mr. SABATH's New Deal socialistic administration and the campaign pledges and recent actions of most every member of his party, including the President of the United States, who have said in effect "We are going to take care of the fellows here in America who have some money to invest. Yes, we are going to see to it that they are ground down into the dust." And the people are taking them at face value. The people with a little or a lot of money to invest are not going to invest much as long as you keep up this kind of talk about those who have worked and saved money with which they can buy things or invest in most anything they see fit. That is the trouble, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and every thinking American, including the President, knows it. Facts are, this is the very thing the New Fair Deal party has been crying for during the past several months. What has come over them all of a sudden?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman tell us what the program will be next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am in position to advise the House what the program will be until Wednesday next. It will be remembered that last week I said there would be nothing controversial called up on Monday.

For consideration on Monday I have assigned H. R. 2402, which is a bill extending the War Assets Administration to June 30, 1949. I will see that the gentleman from Massachusetts, also the minority whip, have copies of this bill. I do not think there is any controversy over that bill. It was unanimously reported by the committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If anything should develop we can confer.

Mr. McCORMACK. We can agree to put the roll call over until the next day.

There is also House Joint Resolution 84, the Freedom Train bill, unanimously reported out of the committee and if anything develops there we can have the same understanding.

On Tuesday the first deficiency appropriation bill will be called up for consideration. There are certain controversial items in that bill. I make that statement in order that the Members might be advised of the fact. What the period of general debate will be I am unable to state at this time, however that is a matter of adjustment and determination by the appropriate members of the Appropriations Committee. Whether that will be completed on Tuesday or not, I do not know, but, if not, consideration will be continued on Wednesday.

The next order of business after consideration of the first deficiency bill, which I have tentatively assigned for Wednesday but which in any event will be the next order of business, is House Resolution 66, to authorize the Committee on Public Lands to make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction.

After that we have House Resolution 75, authorizing the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction.

Then there is H. R. 1661, a bill to provide for the continuance of authority for the regulation of exports. I understand that a rule has been applied for on that bill. Of course, this announcement is all dependent upon rules being reported out. A rule has also been applied for on the first deficiency bill.

Coming to Wednesday of next week, there is H. R. 782, a bill to constitute the Federal Security Agency as a Department of Welfare, assuming that bill is reported out of committee and a rule obtained.

I have nothing scheduled for Thursday or Friday, and I reserve the right to announce any program for those days early next week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I will state to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I am filing a report on H. R. 1437, and, if it is convenient with the House leadership, I would like to have it heard either Thursday or Friday, if a rule is granted.

Mr. McCORMACK. I had a talk with the gentleman yesterday or the day before about that. That is a bill relating to the strength of the Army and the United States Air Force. But at this particular time I can make no statement to the House in relation to that bill in reference to programing it. I shall certainly keep in mind the wishes of the gentleman from Georgia and also the talk I had with him, but I cannot make a definite commitment at this time.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, in reference to the bill establishing the Department of Welfare, the chairman this morning agreed to continue hearings until next Tuesday. There are several witnesses that desire to be heard on that legislation and I am just questioning whether you should bring that in on Wednesday.

Mr. McCORMACK. That may be so. I am not pressing it. I am glad to receive the information from the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I have no knowledge about the agreement to continue it until next Tuesday, but if it is reported out and a rule can be obtained, then I shall bring it up in the order in which I stated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the text of a statement made yesterday by Secretary of State Acheson.

WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. McSWEENEY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 96, Rept. No. 63), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2402) to extend the office of the War Assets Administrator and the War Assets Administration from February 28, 1949, until June 30, 1949. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SPECIAL ORDER TRANSFERRED

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I had for Monday, February 14, be shifted to Wednesday, February 16.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a short newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD five short paragraphs by Mr. James Mountain, Jr., a young newspaperman and World War II veteran from my district which I think sets forth in an illuminating, concise, and simple style, the difference between trial procedures in a democracy and the farcical travesty on justice which has just occurred in Hungary. I call this article to the attention of the Members. I realize that we are all busy, and that a lot of things come to our desks every day, but I have read many stories and articles on the dastardly, inhuman, undemocratic, vicious persecution, not only of a man, but of Christianity itself in Hungary and I can recommend this article as being extremely pertinent. If you will take but a few minutes to read it, I am sure that it will give you food for thought for many days to come.

ALONG THE WAY

OHIO VALLEY MERRY-GO-ROUND

The cards were stacked against Cardinal Mindszenty in Budapest from the start. He was getting a crooked deal and everybody knew it. It wasn't the trial of a Catholic cardinal or a pressing of a technical charge of treason. Actually, it was a test of the strength of the Hungarian Communist Party—a test which wouldn't have been made unless the Kremlin was absolutely sure that its quislings are now solidly entrenched in Hungary. It would have been the same if the Protestant Church or the Jewish faith had been the last remaining obstacle in the path to complete subjugation of the Hungarian people.

The Hungarian Commies knew full well that in pressing the trial against Cardinal Mindszenty they were violating the terms of the Hungarian peace treaty agreed to by the Big Four and under which all were entitled to democratic justice. So now, in a major case which has attracted the attention of the world, the Hungarian Commies have thrown down the gauntlet and there are no takers among the democratic nations of the world. Mark up another victory for Russia. They have beaten down, in a farcical trial which was a travesty on justice, not Cardinal

Mindszenty, but the last remaining idea of the Hungarian people that they are entitled to the dignity of human beings.

The goddess of justice now must reinforce her blindfold, and put a clothespin on her nose when she is called to sit on trials behind the iron curtain. Yet these Communists are the people who rave and rant about world peace, who vilify the United States as imperialistic, who deride our trial-by-jury system and who point a scornful finger at our brand of democracy. Compare the trial of the Hungarian cardinal to the trial of the 12 Communist leaders now going on in New York. The cardinal probably will go to his death. The 12 in New York stand a much better chance of living out their allotted span of years.

Here is factual proof, in these two trials, of the basic differences between communism and democracy. The cardinal's trial was prefaced by torture to wring from him a confession, and the man who was named to defend him actually praised the Hungarian court for its conduct of the trial. Following his arrest, the cardinal was thrown into prison while the Hungarian guards softened him up for the trial. The 12 in New York, before and during their trial, are permitted the freedom of the Nation, to enjoy the rights and privileges which they are actually trying to destroy, and their defense attorneys are using the court as a sounding board for propaganda.

The lights are going out again around the world, and not all the words that may be spoken in the court of the United Nations, or that may be written in the free press of the democratic countries, will stay the clubs of the Soviet storm troopers from shattering these lamps of freedom which are winking out one by one in the face of the Communist flood edging out from Moscow in widening circles. What the solution is no one seems to know, but definitely, it is not to be gained by diplomatic notes of protest, ineffective words of condemnation. Hitler is having the last laugh, because Stalin is doing the same things better than the unlamented Nazi louse.

JIMMY MOUNTAIN.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

GOVERNMENT FINANCES

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, we have before us for consideration the Budget Commission's recommendation that we enact legislation to spend approximately $41,900,000,000 in the next fiscal year. This budget recommendation is merely an estimate. It is likely that more requests for appropriations will be made, and this amount increased.

There are some cold and inescapable facts to be looked in the face as we consider, which duty requires us to do, the necessity or lack of it for spending this incomprehensible sum of money in one 12-month period. Unless the necessity actually exists, certainly we should not spend it.

This budget is $4,400,000,000 greater than the budget submitted for 1948, and it is $6,800,000,000 larger than the budget submitted for 1947.

How does it compare with actual spending in previous years?

Twenty years ago, in the peacetime year of 1929, actual Federal spending was $3,739,000,000. That was also about one-twelfth of the budget recommendation we are now considering for the next fiscal year. That was before the idea became current that the duty rested upon the American taxpayer to carry the rest of his world upon his back. That was at a time when the belief prevailed that every capable and able bodied man owed the duty to himself and his family to work and earn a living for them. It was at a time when thrift was considered a virtue and when economy was not considered a vice.

In 1930 Federal Government expenses were $3,789,000,000, a small increase over 1929. It was not until 1931 that Federal Government spending reached the $5,000,000,000 mark.

There followed year by year, almost without exception, a gradual increase in Federal spending. In 1940 it amounted to $9,802,000,000. That was our last normal peacetime year, so far as Federal spending was concerned. In preparation for war, the amount jumped in 1941 to $19,153,000,000.

At the 1929 rate of spending forty-one and nine-tenths billion would have operated our Federal Government nearly 12 years. At the 1940 rate it would have paid all Government expenses for more than 4½ years.

As Federal spending increased annually, so did the number of Federal civilian employees. In 1929 the number of these employees was 589,579. In 1930 they increased to 580,494 and in 1931 to 588,206. By 1940 in 11 years these employees almost doubled the 1929 figure, and had reached 1,014,117. In 1941 the number of Federal civilian employees had grown to 1,370,110.

In 1946 the year after the hostilities ceased there were 2,722,000 Federal civilian employees. In 1947 the number decreased to 1,995,469. It began to rise again in 1948. In 1948, according to the Byrd Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, Federal employees in the executive department increased by 108,987, or a net increase which averaged 297 new employees added for every day in the year. That committee's latest report, issued February 3, 1949, shows the number of Federal employees in the executive agencies in December 1948 to be 2,104,456 and still increasing. Compare this with 559,000 in 1929 and with 1,014,000 in 1940.

More than 3 years have elapsed since hostilities ceased. If we ever intend to begin to practice economy, and to reduce expenses, 3 years is time enough to make a start. It is time to reduce expenses instead of increasing them, and time to cut taxes instead of adding new ones.

I do not believe the resources of the United States are sufficient to support an annual Federal budget of nearly $42,000,000,000, or even $40,000,000,000 on a permanent basis. Many of our natural resources are being rapidly depleted. Instead of continuing to scatter our resources all over the world with a lavish hand, it is imperative that we begin to practice rigid economy in many particulars. I have learned from research completed in 1947 that at our present rate of consumption, if new oil fields are not discovered in the meantime, our known and proved supply of petroleum would be completely exhausted in 12 years.

There will be, I assume, discoveries of some new oil fields in this country. But it is food for thought that the present known supply is sufficient to last us at present rate of consumption only 12 more years.

The National Minerals Conservation Council has published figures procured from the United States Bureau of Mines, calling attention to the critical mineral resources situation in the United States. Their report shows that there are many strategic minerals and metals of which we have an utterly inadequate supply. This council points out that America's mineral resources contrary to the general belief are exhaustible, and that known reserves of every day metals such as lead, zinc, and copper could be completely used up within the life span of the present generation. We have plenty of iron and we have plenty of coal, but these researchers point out that of the known reserve of copper, we have in our mines a supply sufficient to last only 34 years, enough zinc to last 19 years, enough lead to last only 12 years, enough manganese ore to last only 2 years, enough tungsten to last 4 years, and enough mercury to last 3 years, at the present rate of annual consumption.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Listening to the gentleman's discussion now, I just wish we had 300 Members of Congress who would think along the lines that you are talking on now. It would be the best thing that could happen to this country if we could get a little spirit of that kind into the thinking, if we are going to keep a solvent country.

I would like to ask the gentleman this: With a budget of $42,000,000,000, many things that we would like to see happen and many people would like to see happen cannot be undertaken. Does not the gentleman think we had better go a little slow in starting a lot of new things that will require a greater expenditure of funds until we are able to do those things satisfactorily and to the best interests of the country from a financial standpoint?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for his observation, and I concur in his thinking. I intend to deal with that question further along in my discussion.

At the present rate of soil erosion approximately 107,000,000 acres, or about 25 percent, of our cropland is deteriorating rapidly, and the United States Department of Agriculture warns that to prevent irreparable damage this land should have conservation treatment by 1960. They further state that approximately 500,000 acres of former cropland is being ruined each year as the result of erosion and rendered useless for any further practical cultivation.

Investigation into our natural resources shows that we are getting close to the bottom of the barrel with many of them. They are exhaustible, and unless steps are taken to conserve them many soon will be exhausted. We are not in a position to continue to scatter our resources with lavish hand to every corner and section of the earth. Not only is erosion depleting our soil but every crop grown on it takes from that soil just that much of its fertility, which

must be replaced, if the soil is to retain its capacity to produce.

How many generations in the future can be supported by this land of ours if we continue our present course? Are we taking into our consideration any generations except our own in the plans we are making? Do we owe posterity the duty to leave them anything but a huge debt? Have we set any goals, or are we merely drifting, and making no real effort to chart a course and follow it to a definite result? We now have a national debt of approximately $252,000,000,000. This budget of $41,900,000,000 makes no provision for a payment on this debt. It does include $5,450,000,000 to pay the interest on it. This annual interest amounts to more than the total cost of running the Government in 1933, just 15 years ago, and every year prior to that.

The cost of operating our Federal Government has grown at a steady rate and has reached a figure which I think can, without exaggeration, be called alarming. My own home State of Georgia will be called upon to pay, and will actually pay, upon this huge budget the sum of $590,000,000—considerably more than half a billion dollars; in fact, nearly two-thirds of a billion dollars, as Georgia's contribution toward the cost of the Federal Government for this one 12 months' period. This $590,000,000 which will be siphoned out of the State of Georgia to the Treasury at Washington for the fiscal year 1950 is more than four times the amount of the combined capital stock, surplus, and undivided profits of every bank within the State of Georgia, which total is $112,256,000. It is something to think about that the Federal Government is reaching its tax gatherer's hand into the State of Georgia and bringing from our people to Washington to apply on operating expenses for 1 year, more than four times the capital stock, surplus, and undivided profits of every bank in the State.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I made one mistake when I said "300 Members of Congress like the gentleman from Georgia"; I wish we had 435 Members like him. If we did we would save this country of ours.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The budget for the State government of Georgia for the same period is $108,000,000, with conditional increases estimated all the way from $35,000,000 to $80,000,000. If we use the highest estimate of the cost of Georgia's government, namely, one hundred and eighty-eight million, Georgia taxpayers will pay more than three times as much for Federal Government in the fiscal year of 1950, as they do for State government. If the cost of Georgia's State government should be held at the actual budget of $108,000,000, then Georgians would pay more than five times as much for Federal Government as the cost of State government.

In either case, whether three times as much, or five times as much, the respective cost of the two governments is all out of proportion. It is unreasonable. States' rights cannot survive in this atmosphere and under these conditions. Furthermore, the question presents itself, How long can the State of Georgia remain solvent, when the cost to the taxpayers of operating the State and Federal Government is a minimum of $698,000,000 and a possible $778,000,000?

This contribution of $590,000,000 by the State of Georgia to the Federal Government in the year of 1929 would have paid every penny of the cost of operating the Federal Government for approximately 2 months. So greatly has the cost of operating the Federal Government increased in that 20-year period, that this contribution of $590,000,000 at the present rate of Federal spending, will operate the Federal Government only 5 days.

In addition to these huge sums already mentioned, the taxpayers of Georgia must pay the cost of operating all city governments, county governments, and other miscellaneous governmental subdivisions.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that our natural resources and our productive capacity can permanently support these huge governmental expenses, or anything near these sums. I believe that continuous spending on these levels will surely lead to national bankruptcy, State bankruptcy, and individual bankruptcy. We have survived it this long because of an unprecedented period of production, manufacturing and selling, resulting from accumulated shortages of nearly all consumer goods because of the war. But many of these shortages of consumer goods have now been supplied. Shelves and warehouses have been restocked. Already we are feeling the effects of a buyers market. Unemployment is beginning to increase. Production has caught up with demand in many lines, and the market will no longer support the high capacity production which has provided the jobs and the employment so largely contributing to the prosperity of the past few years.

However much we would like for these good times to continue, we are going to have to face facts and realities. One of these realities is that governmental costs are going to have to be reduced. I believe that this is one of the major problems toward which this Congress should direct its efforts. It is a task so tremendous that intermittent and sporadic efforts in that direction will not suffice. The thread of economy must run through all congressional action.

We have made a beginning, and have taken a step toward reduction of Government cost, by passing through the House Monday a bill to authorize reorganization, consolidation, and elimination of Government agencies. This bill, if wisely used, can be the instrument through which overlapping agencies and positions can be eliminated, and efficiency restored where confusion and inefficiency have prevailed. This reorganization bill is not all that could be desired by any means. It does not contain all the provisions I would like to see in it. However, its purpose is good, and if reorganization plans are submitted under it which will be drawn with the good of the country in mind rather than political advantage, billions of dollars can be saved.

Our Constitution was not drawn and adopted with the idea that Congress should be the rubber stamp of the executive department. I have in years gone by felt that Congress has surrendered too many of its functions to the executive department. Our Government was set up to provide three separate, distinct independent departments, namely, the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. It will not remain a balanced government if either of those departments surrenders its prerogatives and functions. It will not remain a balanced government if either of those departments usurps functions and prerogatives which ought to be vested in one of the other departments.

I hope and trust that the majority party, of which I am a member, with the great power belonging to it in the Eighty-first Congress, will not undertake to rush through a program of legislation so fast and so hastily that Congress cannot give adequate consideration to the provisions of every bill we are called upon to enact, merely because it is part of an administration program. To do so would mean actually the surrendering by Congress of the duties and responsibilities which belong to its Members.

No emergency exists now which requires quick passage of speedily drawn and hastily considered legislation.

It is becoming more evident day by day that the American people will find it impossible from our own resources and productive capacity to maintain a high standard of living for the people of every other country on the globe, and at the same time continue to maintain our own high standard of living.

I believe that one of our first considerations should be reduction of our national debt of $252,549,855,401.63. In the past 3 years we have only reduced this debt approximately $6,000,000,000. The time to reduce it is when money is plentiful and times are prosperous. The time may come when we will find it a considerable burden even to pay the $5,500,000,000 interest on this tremendous debt.

I cannot help thinking that the people of the sovereign States of this Nation would do well to begin to think seriously of paying their taxes to their respective State governments and take care of their own functions, rather than send it to Washington and expect the all-wise, omniscient and infallible boards and bureaus here to provide a utopia for them.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The statement the gentleman has made evidences the fact he has made a very careful study and examination of the subjects which he has touched upon. He has given his brethren wise counsel and the statement he has made is extraordinary and worthy of the examination of the Members of this body. I congratulate the gentleman upon what he has produced because it is a statement of high quality and ought to have good effect.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman very much.

Considering the situation merely from the standpoint of my own home State of Georgia, I think it is extremely probable that we could take one-fourth the amount of money we will send to Washington in the next fiscal year, which one-fourth would be $147,500,000, add it to our present State budget, and provide for ourselves far, far better roads, larger pensions and assistance benefits to more people and more adequate public services of every kind, than we are getting now by sending it to Washington and then begging for a portion of it to come back to us, from people who do not have half the interest in our problems that we have ourselves, and whose primary interest necessarily is the maintenance and perpetuation of their own particular agencies, boards, and bureaus.

I know that the time is coming again, and it may not be in the far-distant future, when people are again going to recognize the virtues of thrift and economy, the necessity of paying debts, and of conserving our resources. I think that we in this Congress should devote much time to serious consideration of what agencies, boards, and bureaus can be dispensed with, not only in this country, but in our far-flung outposts and branch offices in other countries all over the world. If consideration is given and efforts made in these directions, I have no doubt but that savings can be made which will run into the billions of dollars. That will mean, of course, that some hundreds of thousands of Federal employees are going to have to leave Government service and get into some other line of work. This will, of course, bring objections and protests. However it is going to have to come sooner or later. I believe the sooner it comes, the better it will be for everyone, including the Federal employees.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I would like to tell the gentleman from Georgia how much I have enjoyed the remarks he has made. He talks exactly the way that the people I represent think. I wish that I could tell it to the Congress in the able manner that he has done it. The sooner we get down to the fundamental principles that the gentleman is talking about, the better off we are going to be.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

If we could operate our Federal Government in 1929 with 559,000 employees, and we did so operate it, it is not necessary to have 2,104,000, 20 years later in 1949, and to continue to increase that number at the rate of 297 per day. It should be going in the other direction at a much faster clip than 297 per day.

We face the necessity of choosing between cutting expenses on the one hand, or raising taxes on the other.

The average wage earner now sees approximately one-fifth his wages go for Federal taxes. In other words, he must work Monday for the Federal Government. He must also work the greater part of Tuesday for the city, State, and county governments. That leaves the other three working days for groceries, shelter, heat, clothing, medicine, education, transportation, and the other necessities of life.

We are taxed almost to the breaking point. An increase in taxes would be a step toward inflation and disaster. This is a time for economy—not for more taxes.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas, the former chairman of my committee.

Mr. REES. I, too, want to commend the distinguished gentleman from Georgia for the very splendid, effective, and informative statement he has just made, and I trust that the Members of both Houses of this Congress will give heed to what he has had to say.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Kansas.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

RADIO BROADCAST

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week, while driving down to the office, it was my privilege and pleasure to tune in on one of the finest radio broadcasts that I have ever listened to. I thought that the choice of words, and the manner of presentation of this speaker, as well as the subject matter, should be brought to the attention of this body and given wide publicity.

On arriving at my office I called the broadcasting station and asked to speak to the gentleman who had spoken over the air. I asked him for a copy of his remarks, and he gladly sent it to me.

I would like to read it to you at this time:

THE ATTRACTIVE MAN FROM GALILEE

(By Rev. Glendale Burton, minister, Wilson Boulevard Christian Church, of Arlington, Va.)

Jesus of Nazareth is the greatest personality ever to appear in the arena of human activity and play His part on the stage of life. No man equals Him in depth of character, breadth of soul, width of interest, or height of influence. He is the most outstanding individual who has ever trodden the dusty highways of life, or trudged up the steep, jagged hillsides of earth.

Jesus Christ of Nazareth is the Great Central Figure of all time. He divides history in two parts—B. C. (before Christ) and A. D. (in the year of our Lord).

It staggers the imagination to realize that a child could be born in an humble home; that home to be situated in an obscure hamlet, that hamlet to be located in a very insignificant small country less than the size of the State of Maryland; and yet from that humble home, obscure village, and small country should come One, the impact of whose personality should change the whole course of history, revolutionize philosophy, upset governments, revitalize religion, and transform men.

He was born in a conquered province of the Roman Empire held by the iron fist of military power, subject to the yoke of a slave—yet Jesus became the great Emancipator, setting free every man and woman of Adam's race.

He was born of a woman of lowly estate, living in the most despised city, Nazareth, from which "no good ever came." But He became the Fountainhead of all goodness.

He was born in a borrowed manger in the little town of Bethlehem. His father was an humble carpenter; but he instilled in his Son the creative genius of building, not a material house, but of constructing a new mansion of human beings called the Kingdom of Heaven. He lived but a brief 33 years. He was despised, lowly, and ignoble. Caesar ruled a great earthly kingdom, but he did not know that One would arise and found a kingdom greater in territory, wider in scope, infinitely richer in purpose which would endure when the stateliest of monuments and costliest palaces of the Roman Empire should crumble in the dust of oblivion.

He was not a general, yet He was to become the Conqueror of the world—not through the brutality of force but by the breadth of His mighty love.

He traveled little, confining His activity to Palestine, a country 45 miles wide and 100 miles long. He possessed no means of high-powered propaganda. There were no railroads, no steamships, no airplanes, no newspapers, magazines, printing presses, radio, or television.

He possessed no influential name, no wealth or position. He had neither training nor education, except that which He acquired at His mother's knee, in His father's carpenter shop, or in the humble village synagogue. He lived and moved among the common people. When He died they placed Him in a borrowed tomb. The estate He left was only a seamless robe which had been the gift of a friend.

He was not a doctor, yet He healed the sick, opened blind eyes, unstopped deaf ears, cleansed the lepers, and raised the dead. He was not a lawyer, yet He knew the law and interpreted it and applied it to the relationships which should prevail among men. He became the fountainhead of righteousness, and His principles are becoming more and more lodged in the hearts and consciences of men. He was not an author. He wrote no books, composed no poems, compiled no documents, edited no papers, contributed to no periodicals. The only sentence He ever wrote was a line in the sand which disappeared the same day.

No letter of it was preserved. He never used a fountain pen or a typewriter. We have no line, word, or syllable from His hand yet more books have been written about Him and His words than of any other man or group of men. He has affected the life of more people than all the authors of all the ages. The story of His life has been translated into more than 1,100 languages, read by countless millions, and is the best selling story every year.

He was not an orator, yet, "no man spake as this man." His discourses have become the theme of thousands of addresses. His thoughts are simple and clear. Very few adjectives are used—yet each sentence abounds with beauty, meaning, and grace. His sayings are hammered into polished marble, chiseled into imperishable granite, wrought into enduring bronze tablets, written in stained glass windows of numberless churches, fashioned in rich mosaics upon temple walls and set in arch domes of colossal cathedrals. They have been burned eternally into the hearts of the truly redeemed who down through the centuries have found comfort, relief, and healing. His words are literary gems. He stands without a peer in the literary field. Shakespeare, Milton, and Emerson must bow their heads in His presence, recognizing a superior. He used every form of speech without diluting the thought or overornamenting the truth. He was not a poet, yet He has inspired thousands of poets to utter their most sublime expressions.

He was not a musician; yet He inspired Mozart, Mendelssohn, Handel, and others. But for Him the great Christian hymns should have remained unwritten. He inspired Lowell Mason in "Nearer My God to Thee," Toplady in "Rock of Ages," Watts in "When I Survey the Wondrous Cross," Charles Wesley in "Jesus Lover of My Soul," and thousands of others.

He was not an artist or a sculptor or a painter. He was a stranger to the canvas; yet He was the inspiration for Raphael, Michelangelo, Hoffmann, and others.

He was not an architect, contractor, or builder. He was a Galilean carpenter—a maker of wooden plows and ox yokes; but He has inspired the noblest, most marvelous architecture known to man. He specialized in character engineering—making men human masterpieces. He took Peter "The big fisherman" and made a saint. He took Saul and made a Paul.

He was not a statesman. He never aspired to official position. He never delved into politics; but He did found a kingdom—the Sermon on the Mount was His constitution. His principles dethrone error, oppression, and tyranny.

At this hour we adore Him:
Beloved Personality,
Lover of the Poor,
Healer of the Sick,
Matchless Teacher,
Incomparable Philosopher,
Ideal of Ideals,
King of Kings;
But beyond all of this, Glorious Saviour.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. SANBORN, for 1 week, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 14, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

198. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting the Commission's report on personnel management (H. Doc. No. 63); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

199. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report and findings on the feasibility of the installation of additional generating capacity at Grand Coulee Dam, Columbia Basin project, Washington (H. Doc. No. 64); to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed.

200. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish land-based air warning and control installations for the national security, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

201. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of the proposed transfer of a motor barge to the central Atlantic area council of the Young Men's Christian Associations for the boys' training camp at Andover, Sussex County, N. J.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

202. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report and findings on the Solano County project in the Central Valley Basin of California (H. Doc. No. 65); to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

203. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 2 of the act of April 28, 1904 (33 Stat. 537, 43 U. S. C., sec. 213), relating to additional homestead entries; to the Committee on Public Lands.

204. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 3, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Mississippi River at Alma, Wis., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 66); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

205. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 26, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on the Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis, with a view to harbor improvement in the vicinity of Hannibal, Mo., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on May 10, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 67); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

206. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 28, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on waterway from Pamlico Sound to Beaufort Harbor, N. C., via Core Sound, in the vicinity of Marshallberg, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on April 1, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 68); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

207. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 13, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Scarboro River, Maine, between Prouts Neck and Pine Point, authorized by the River and Harbor Act, approved on March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 69); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

208. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 27, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and two illustrations, on a review of reports on St. Petersburg Harbor, Fla., with a view to further improvement of Bayboro Harbor, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on June 27, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 70); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

209. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 26, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration on a preliminary examination and survey of Mississippi River at Prairie du Chien, Wis., authorized by the River and Harbor Act, approved on March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 71); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 95. Resolution for consideration of House Joint Resolution 84, joint resolution to provide for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train by the Archivist of the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 62). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McSWEENEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 96. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 2402, a bill to extend the office of the War Assets Administrator and the War Assets Administration from February 28, 1949, until June 30, 1949; without amendment (Rept. No. 63). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1437. A bill to authorize the composition of the Army of the United States and the Air Force of the United States, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 64). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 199. A bill to provide the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence, to make immigration quotas available to Asian and Pacific peoples, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 65). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 97. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 1661, a bill to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 66). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 2609. A bill to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in honor of Clara Louise Maass; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 2610. A bill to include in section 3 of the act of June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1967), the Midwakanton Sioux Indians of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 2611. A bill to provide assistance for local school agencies in providing educational opportunities for children on Federal reservations or in defense areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. COX:

H. R. 2612. A bill to establish an American Mothers Memorial Commission to prepare plans and estimates of costs for the construction in the District of Columbia of a national memorial to the mothers of America; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. R. 2613. A bill to establish principles and policies to govern generally the management of the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. R. 2614. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a

prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H. R. 2615. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to provide that payments be made to survivors for unused leave accumulated by members of the armed forces before their death in service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 2616. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of Alice McLellan Birney; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2617. A bill to authorize Federal aid to school districts overburdened with war-incurred or defense-incurred school enrollments for the construction of additional school facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 2618. A bill to amend subparagraphs (a) and (d) of paragraph 1 of part III of Veterans Regulation 1 (a), as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 2619. A bill to extend the benefits of the annual- and sick-leave laws to part-time employees on regular tours of duty and to validate payments heretofore made for leave on account of services of such employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H. R. 2620. A bill providing a direct Federal old-age pension at the rate of $60 per month to certain citizens 60 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 2621. A bill to amend sections 555 and 556, part 4, Title IV, Administrative Provisions, Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAGNER:

H. R. 2622. A bill to amend the act of July 31, 1947, with respect to the maintenance of actions to recover possession of publicly operated housing accommodations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WALSH:

H. R. 2623. A bill to promote the orderly and fair marketing of essential foods in commerce; to prevent confusion, fraud, and deception in commerce; and to prohibit practices which burden, obstruct, or affect commerce, the free flow of goods in commerce, or the production of goods for commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2624. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended, to grant the Secretary of Agriculture authority to regulate margin requirements with respect to speculative transactions in commodity futures on commodity exchanges; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WHITTINGTON:

H. R. 2625. A bill to authorize the construction of an office building at Suitland, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2626. A bill to amend Public Law 533 of the Eightieth Congress, authorizing the construction of a building for the General Accounting Office on square 518 in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. Con. Res. 37. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Public Lands of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of certain hearings with respect to Alaska; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. Res. 98. Resolution making H. R. 1437, a bill to authorize the composition of the Army of the United States and the Air Force of the United States, and for other purposes, special order of business; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States for the consideration of their Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, recommending that the Congress of the United States amend the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 to permit gold producers of the United States and Alaska to sell their gold in the markets of the world; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 2627. A bill for the relief of Michael Sisto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 2628. A bill for the relief of Auldon Albert Aiken; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2629. A bill for the relief of John P. Kremenezky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 2630. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of Gabel Construction Co.," approved July 2, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER:

H. R. 2631. A bill to authorize the cancellation of deportation in the case of Frank Grimaldi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

57. By Mr. HOLMES: Petition of unlicensed crew members of the steamship *Azalea City*, New York, N. Y., containing 33 signatures, protesting Paul Hoffman's proposal to ship ECA bulk cargoes in foreign ships; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

58. By the SPEAKER: Petition of M. J. Dineen, Jr., city clerk, Omaha, Nebr., petitioning consideration of his resolution asking that the Congress pass the resolution now pending in Congress, which would establish the General Pulaski Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

59. Also, petition of Mrs. Loretta Joyce, secretary, Irish-American Unified Society, Yonkers, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution requesting the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States to continue the House Un-American Activities Committee; to the Committee on Rules.

60. By Mr. HOLMES: Petition of Rainier Auxiliary to Post No. 2289, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Seattle, Wash., containing 28 signatures, urging passage of H. R. 1693; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1949

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, midst all the traffic of our busy ways we are grateful for this noontide sanctuary of the spirit. Be to us a quickening presence, a sustaining power, a refuge from the confusion and tumult of our times. Direct us now to the sources of moral energy, so that Thy completeness may be linked to the limitations of our unaided strength.

We pray for the President and for the Congress, and for all in every land who bear the responsibility of public office.

As we enter upon the tasks of this week make us patient in argument, charitable in judgment, slow to wrath. As Thou givest us to see the right, make us strong to defend and maintain it, yet always seekers after a durable peace with justice and freedom for all mankind. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MYERS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 10, 1949, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred, as indicated:

CONSTRUCTION OF EXPERIMENTAL NONPROPELLED SEADROME OCEAN STATION BY COAST GUARD

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Coast Guard to construct an experimental nonpropelled seadrome ocean station (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF LAW RELATING TO ADDITIONAL HOMESTEAD ENTRIES

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 2 of the act of April 28, 1904 (36 Stat. 527, 43 U. S. C., sec. 213), relating to additional homestead entries (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT AND FINDINGS ON INSTALLATION OF ADDITIONAL GENERATING CAPACITY AT GRAND COULEE DAM

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report and findings on the feasibility of the installation of additional generating capacity (units R-7, R-8, and R-9) at Grand Coulee Dam, Columbia Basin project, Washington (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON WITHDRAWALS OF PUBLIC LANDS IN CERTAIN CASES

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, tabulations showing the withdrawals and restorations of public lands made during the period from January 1, 1948, through December 31, 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF NAVAL MOTORBOAT BARGE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the central Atlantic area council of the national council of the Young Men's Christian Association, of Andover, N. J., had requested the Navy Department to transfer a motorboat barge for use by that council in training boys

at Camp Wawayanda, Andover, N. J.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

TRANSFER OF POMONA STATION OF AGRICULTURE REMOUNT SERVICE

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to transfer the Pomona station of the Agriculture Remount Service, Department of Agriculture, at Pomona, Calif. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF NATIONAL PARK TRUST FUND BOARD

A letter from the secretary of the National Park Trust Fund Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board for the fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

FINAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

A letter from the director, national legislative commission, the American Legion, transmitting, pursuant to law, the final financial statement of the Legion for the period ended December 31, 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT

Four letters from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports of that Commission on Office of General Services—Supply Activities; the Federal Supply System (Appendix B); Records Management (Appendix C); and a detailed report on the Federal Supply System (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Indiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Concurrent Resolution 1

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress

"Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

"Whereas the 11th day of October 1779 is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

"Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Kansas, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union, through legislative enactment designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and

"Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated October 11, 1929, October 11, 1931, October 11, 1932, to October 11, 1946, to be General Pulaski's Memorial Day, in the United States of America: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Eighty-sixth Indiana General Assembly (the senate concurring):

"SECTION 1. That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

"SEC. 2. That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith by the clerk of the house to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and each of the United States Senators and Representatives from Indiana."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 1

"Whereas the prosperity of the State of South Dakota is dependent primarily upon farm prices, nevertheless, it is recognized that successful and profitable operation of our gold mines, and particularly the Homestake Mine at Lead, S. Dak., is a vital factor in a well-rounded State economy; and

"Whereas while in the 1930's, gold mining was at a high level of prosperity and South Dakota farmers were suffering from the ravages of drought, grasshoppers, and low prices, now the situation is exactly reversed with an unprecedented high level of prosperity on the farms of this State and a serious depression existing in the gold industry; and

"Whereas the gold-mining properties of the United States and Alaska, and more particularly the gold properties within our State of South Dakota are confronted by tremendously increased wage and material costs and are unable to sell their products in the markets of the world, but are instead compelled to sell only to the United States Government at the inexorable fixed price of $35 an ounce as set forth in the Gold Reserve Act of 1934; and

"Whereas, for example, since 1934, wage costs have more than doubled and material costs have increased 70 percent at the great Homestake Mine at Lead, S. Dak., during which period of time, there has been no increase in the price of gold; and

"Whereas the gold-mining industry of the Nation is at the present time in a precarious state of depression with practically all gold properties either abandoned, shut down, or with production vastly curtailed except for those mining companies which are fortunate enough to produce gold as a by-product to other metals such as silver, lead, copper, or zinc; and

"Whereas the gold mines of South Dakota do not produce other metals, but are dependent solely upon their production of gold; and

"Whereas the gold mines of this State sustained enormous losses during the compulsory period of the shut-down during World War II, and after reopening on July 1, 1945, have been confronted by declining profits and curtailed production;

"Whereas continuance of the gold-mining industry in the Black Hills, and particularly continuance of the operations conducted by the Homestake Mining Co. is of vital importance to the economic welfare of the State of South Dakota: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota Legislature (the house of representatives concurring), That we do recommend that the Congress of the United States amend the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 to permit gold producers of the United States and Alaska to sell their gold in the markets of the world by removing the present restrictions that prevent our citizens from buying, holding, or selling gold either domestically or in the foreign market.

"We recommend that Congress provide for the appointment of a commission or a committee to make a careful study of the relation of gold to the currency and its proper price in terms of dollars, and to formulate legislation to implement its findings."

Resolutions adopted by the Blue Star Mothers of America, at Detroit, Mich., relating to education, housing, etc.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A memorial of sundry citizens of the State of New Hampshire, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by landlords of Indianapolis, Ind., protesting against the extension of rent control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by a conference of 400 civic leaders and representatives of many groups in Greenwich Village, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation extending the social-security law; to the Committee on Finance.

The memorial of Beatrice Masterson, of Elmhurst, L. I., remonstrating against the persecution of Cardinal Mindszenty; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Mary McDowell, of Hawthorne, N. Y., relating to communism; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the San Carlos Tribal Council, San Carlos, Ariz., protesting against the expansion of the powers of the Phoenix regional office of the Indian Bureau at the expense of the San Carlos Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Resolutions adopted by the City Council of the City of Providence, R. I., the Common Council of the city of Kenosha, Wis.; and the commission of the city of Birmingham, Ala., favoring the enactment of legislation proclaiming October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A telegram in the nature of a petition, signed by E. Reed, executive secretary, Dental Laboratories Institute of America, Chicago, Ill., requesting hearings be held on Senate bill (S. 248) raising the minimum wage to 75 cents; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A petition of sundry members of the Dorton (Ky.) Parent-Teachers' Association, relating to Federal aid to education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Petitions of members of the Dorton (Ky.) Parent-Teachers' Association, and teachers of the Evarts (Ky.) High School, relating to Federal aid to education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the United States favoring the enactment of legislation to repeal the Taft-Hartley labor law; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Memorials of sundry citizens of the United States, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to repeal the Taft-Hartley labor law; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. McGRATH (for himself and Mr. GREEN):

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Resolution requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to insist upon and work for the proper kind of Federal rent control legislation to prevent inflationary prices

"Whereas the extraordinarily high cost of living is making such inordinate demands

upon the family budget our citizens are finding great difficulty in 'making both ends meet' economically; and

"Whereas unless there is in force the proper kind of Federal rent control legislation inflationary prices will result inevitably: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States be and they are hereby requested to use their efforts to be certain that there shall continue to be the proper kind of Federal rent control legislation in order that our people may be protected by statutory control from such inevitable rise in rent prices; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolution requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to use their efforts to amend the Federal Social Security Act with the purpose of extending the coverage and the benefits now authorized by such legislation

"*Resolved*, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States be, and they are, hereby requested to use their efforts to amend the Federal Social Security Act with the purpose of extending the coverage and the benefits now authorized by such legislation; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States."

By Mr. MURRAY:

A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Montana, favoring the enactment of legislation appropriating sufficient money for the immediate construction of Yellow Tail Dam in Big Horn County, Mont.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

(See resolution printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Vice President on February 8, 1949 (p. 934, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Joint Memorial 2

"Joint memorial of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the Congress of the United States, the Honorable Charles F. Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. J. A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior, Hon. James E. Murray, and the Honorable Zales N. Ecton, United States Senators from Montana, and the Honorable Mike Mansfield, and the Honorable Wesley A. D'Ewart, Representatives from Montana, for an act of Congress or such other authority as may be necessary to allow veterans of World War II just concluded, to acquire submarginal lands from the Department of Agriculture or the Department of the Interior which have been acquired under an act of Congress dated June 29, 1934, known as chapter 865 (48 Stat. 1265–1275) and an act of Congress dated July 22, 1937, known as Chapter 517, title III, section 32 (50 Stat. 525–526).

"Whereas under an act of Congress dated June 29, 1934, known as chapter 865 (48 Stat. 1265–1275) and an act of Congress dated July 22, 1937, known as chapter 517, title III, section 32 (50 Stat. 525–526), the Secretary of Agriculture acquired enormous acreages of land in Montana designated as submarginal lands to develop a program of land conservation and land utilization; and

"Whereas a considerable amount of this land was acquired on Indian reservations from the Secretary of the Interior, and a considerable amount from individual land owners in agricultural sections of the State of Montana. Taking this land from private ownership has resulted in a distinct hardship to the political subdivisions of the State of Montana;

"Whereas it is the considered judgment of your memorializers that a great portion of the lands so acquired by the Secretary of Agriculture are not necessarily submarginal lands but are good agricultural lands which may be utilized for agricultural purposes in Montana to good advantage; and

"Whereas veterans of World War II are unable to acquire agricultural lands in Montana, particularly those owned by the United States under the acts of Congress referred to above; and

"Whereas it would be of great advantage to the people of Montana as well as to the veterans of World War II that such agricultural veterans be afforded an opportunity of acquiring such lands: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring)*, That the Montana Legislative Assembly urges the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as shall enable veterans of World War II to acquire agricultural lands owned by the United States Government, in economical units, or a part of an economical unit, under the submarginal program referred to above at valuations deemed reasonable by the United States Government; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the Honorable Charles F. Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. J. A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable James E. Murray, and the Honorable Zales N. Ecton, United States Senators from Montana, and the Honorable Mike Mansfield, and the Honorable Wesley A. D'Ewart, Representatives from Montana."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"House Joint Memorial 5

"Joint memorial to the President of the United States, and to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY and the Honorable ZALES N. ECTON, Senators from the State of Montana, and the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD and the Honorable WESLEY A. D'EWART, Congressmen from the State of Montana, for appropriate action to alleviate the shortage of tubular goods and steel necessary for the development of Montana's oil and gas resources, and for the end of discrimination against Montana by the shipment of steel and tubular goods to foreign countries for the development of oil and gas resources in such foreign countries, and the end of the gray market in steel

"Whereas there are vast undeveloped oil and gas resources as well as vast proven oil and gas fields in Montana; and

"Whereas during the past 3 years explorations for oil and gas in Montana have been seriously curtailed and hampered due to the difficulty, and sometimes impossibility, of obtaining the casing and pipe necessary and required for such development work in proven and wildcat oil areas; and

"Whereas this situation has resulted in what has been termed the gray market and exorbitant prices for steel tubular goods; and

"Whereas the ratio of oil discoveries and development of new production has been in almost exact proportion to the amount of pipe and casing obtainable and used; and

"Whereas the steel industry is unable to furnish tubular goods in sufficient quantity to meet the needs and demands of Montana producers in the ordinary channels of trade because of the desire of certain interests to exploit foreign oil resources at the expense of development within the borders of the United States, and has permitted and caused the exportation of thousands of tons of vital steel for the use and development of the oil fields of Saudi Arabia and in other parts of the world outside of the borders of the United States; and

"Whereas the situation is retarding the explorations and development of Montana oil and gas resources: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Thirty-first Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana (the senate concurring)*, That we respectfully urge the President of the United States and Montana's Representatives in the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to remove any discrimination which may exist against the oil operators of Montana, to the end that an adequate supply of tubular goods be made available in the regular channels of trade, and that conditions be corrected which retard the exploration for oil and gas within the borders of the United States and the State of Montana, so that the gray market in steel will not be necessary or possible; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the chief clerk of the house of representatives to the President of the United States, and to the Honorable JAMES F. MURRAY and the Honorable ZALES N. ECTON, Senators from Montana, and the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD and the Honorable WESLEY A. D'EWART, Representatives in Congress from Montana."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Memorial 2

"Whereas Yellowtail Dam site is located in Big Horn County in southeastern Montana, and Yellowtail Dam will be constructed across the Big Horn River, about three-fourths of a mile above the mouth of Big Horn Canyon—35 miles southwest of Hardin, Montana; and

"Whereas Big Horn Canyon is the passageway of the Big Horn River between the northern end of the Big Horn Mountains and the Pryor Mountains. For more than 50 miles Yellowtail Reservoir will lie within the rugged, inaccessible canyon, the steep walls of which tower hundreds of feet above the narrow and winding river bed, forming a natural damsite of unique splendor that will in future years provide Montana and Wyoming with one of the greatest lake-recreation areas in the Western Hemisphere; and

"Whereas the United States Bureau of Reclamation was authorized by section 9 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, as a part of the Missouri River Basin project to prepare preliminary surveys and construction of Yellowtail Dam; and

"Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation has practically completed preconstruction work at the site of Yellowtail Dam. Design specifications for the dam and power plant have been started. Surveys have been made of the irrigable area, and transmission line location, and plans are ready or completed for construction of access roads, construction camp and other essential base work necessary before actual construction is undertaken; and

"Whereas Yellowtail Dam is being designed to provide for irrigation, hydroelectric power production, flood control, silt retention, conservation of fish and wildlife, recreational development, and other related beneficial uses of value to all mankind; and

"Whereas construction of Yellowtail Dam will make possible the irrigation of 45,000 acres of new land along the Big Horn River from the Big Horn Canyon to approximately 10 miles north of the city of Hardin, and

supplemental irrigation water for large areas now inadequately served will be also provided. Because irrigation of lands along the Big Horn, Powder, and Yellowstone Rivers is dependent upon pumping, a source of low-cost power is a prerequisite. Construction of Yellowtail power plant will make possible the irrigation of many proposed and desirable projects along these three valuable but presently little utilized rivers; and

"Whereas construction of Yellowtail Dam offers a priceless solution for the equitable interstate use of the waters of the Big Horn by the creation of the Yellowtail Reservoir on the Montana-Wyoming State line; and

"Whereas power generating facilities to be constructed at the dam will have an installed capacity of at least 120,000 kilowatts, and will produce about 712,200,000 kilowatt-hours of electrical energy annually. The said power produced at Yellowtail Dam will be used for irrigation pumping, and will serve as a part of the Bureau of Reclamation's power system constructed to provide power for construction of other developments and to supply surplus power to principal load centers to permit its use by new and old industries and residences of the area; and

"Whereas the Big Horn River is the greatest silt offender in the entire Yellowstone River system, retention of silt behind Yellowtail Dam will be of material benefit; and

"Whereas fish and wildlife resources will gain by the dam, fishing and hunting, as well as the many allied recreational opportunities that will follow will be of immense value to Montana and Wyoming; and

"Whereas Yellowtail Dam as planned will be a concrete arch-type structure towering some 499 feet above the river bed, and will have a crest length of 1,480 feet, and will have a storage capacity of 1,366,000 acre-feet; and

"Whereas the construction of said Yellowtail Dam will attract new industries into southern Montana, and thereby be of great benefit to the entire State of Montana, as well as the entire Nation, by supplying cheap electricity for industrial and home use, and this postwar period is the time to develop such industries; Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Montana*, That the Congress of the United States of America be respectfully urged and requested to make sufficient funds available immediately for the construction of Yellowtail Dam in Big Horn County in southern Montana; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this memorial be submitted by the secretary of state of the State of Montana to the Presiding Officers of both Houses of the National Congress—ALBEN BARKLEY and SAM RAYBURN—to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives in Washington, D. C., to the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, the Commissioner of Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Secretary of the Interior, the Governor of the State of Wyoming, and the presiding officers of both Houses of the Wyoming State Legislature; and to each of the Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States from the States of Montana and Wyoming."

PROTEST OF TRIAL OF JOSEF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY—RESOLUTION OF WASHINGTON HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I present a resolution adopted by the Washington State House of Representatives protesting the arrest, trial, conviction, and sentence of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty. I ask that the resolution be carried in full in the body of the RECORD. I myself am in full accord with it.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States:

We, your memorialists, the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

Whereas the arrest, trial, conviction, and sentence of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty has shocked the conscience of all the peoples in all the Nations of the entire Christian world; and

Whereas such occurrence shows the underlying spirit of the communistic attack on religion in all forms; and

Whereas the trial of Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty must be regarded as a forerunner of comparative trials against other branches of the Christian Church and other religions generally: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the House of Representatives of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled, do protest against such trial and do respectfully request your excellency to take every appropriate step to register a protest against the same by whatsoever means you may determine; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Washington.

RECLAMATION, IRRIGATION, AND POWER PROJECTS IN THE WEST

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a letter and resolutions from Herbert G. West, of Walla Walla, Wash., executive vice president of the Inland Empire Waterways Association, whose membership embraces the entire Pacific Northwest. Mr. West's letter covers in detail the attached resolutions which were adopted by the association in regard to our great reclamation, irrigation, and power projects in the West.

There being no objection, the letter and resolutions were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INLAND EMPIRE WATERWAYS ASSOCIATION,
Walla Walla, Wash., January 28, 1949.

Hon. HARRY P. CAIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HARRY: The fifteenth annual meeting of the waterways association, held in Lewiston, Idaho, on December 14 and 15, 1948, adopted many resolutions pertaining to the over-all development program which I would like to discuss with you.

I am enclosing a copy of Resolution No. 1, pertaining to the recent press releases to the effect that the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government will recommend the creation of a new Department of Public Works that would assume jurisdiction over the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers. I do not believe it is necessary to elaborate on the resolution as I think it thoroughly covers the situation from our viewpoint.

Resolution No. 2 relates to the review report of the Corps of Engineers in House Document No. 308. The members of our association feel that this comprehensive multiple-purpose report is very extensive and represents a carefully coordinated plan to provide for present and immediate future needs of the Columbia River Basin. We urge the adoption of this report by the Congress with such modifications from time to time as good judgment and planning may dictate. Hearings are being held by the Board of Army Engineers in the Pacific Northwest on this request, beginning in Spokane on January 31, in Seattle on February 1, in Portland, on February 2, and in Boise on February 4. When this report is submitted to the Congress we sincerely and respectfully urge your earnest consideration to introduce appropriate legislation seeking the authorization of the report as a guide for the multiple-purpose plan of development of the Columbia River Basin within the United States.

Resolution No. 4 recognizes the serious shortage of hydroelectric power in the Northwest and urges a $3,000,000 supplemental appropriation to initiate construction of Ice Harbor Dam, the first dam in the series of four dams on the Snake River to channelize that river from the mouth to Lewiston, Idaho. This project will produce approximately 250,000 kilowatts of power besides being an aid to navigation, flood control, and irrigation in Franklin and Walla Walla Counties.

Resolution No. 5 merely reaffirms our position that the comprehensive development of the Columbia and Snake Rivers for navigation remain undisturbed in the department of the Corps of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, United States Army. We do respectfully request your watchfulness on this subject and your support in behalf of its objectives.

Resolution No. 7 is urging your support in the authorization of The Dalles Dam and the high John Day Dam which will provide slack water navigation from the head of the Bonneville Pool to the foot of McNary Dam. It is our understanding that these two projects have been favorably acted upon by the Corps of Engineers and the document should be before the Eighty-first Congress for consideration.

Resolution No. 8 has been before the Congress and we believe that it is worthy of support of the Northwest congressional delegation in seeking the acquisition of the Hood River and Cascade Locks bridges across the Columbia River. These are now private toll bridges, but have been renovated and raised, due to the increased height of the Bonneville Pool, by the appropriation of money by the Congress. It is our feeling that toll bridges across the Columbia River definitely restrict free intercourse of travel and thus injure the economic welfare of the entire region. We would sincerely appreciate your support of such legislation when introduced as we believe it to be of benefit to the entire Pacific Northwest.

Resolution No. 9 is one of the more important ones and can be classified as probably the most important looking to the future. This resolution requests Congress to appropriate a sum of $40,000,000 for the fiscal year of 1950 for McNary Dam construction. This ties in closely with Resolution No. 10, which respectfully requests the Congress to make available $10,000,000 for supplemental appropriation as early as practicable in order to hasten completion of the McNary Dam and to make power available not later than 1953. I do not believe it is necessary to enlarge upon these two resolutions. They speak for themselves. You are all very well familiar with the statements of private and public utility companies, as well as the Governors of the States of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, the Grange, Farm Bureau, all farm cooperatives, and chambers of commerce, who are unanimous in the need of early completion of McNary Dam.

Resolution No. 11 relates to the regular appropriation in the amount of $12,000,000 for the fiscal year of 1950 for construction of Ice Harbor Dam, the first dam on the Snake River. As related before, planning and design of this dam is completed and contracts can be let immediately upon receipt of appropriation money. It is urged

that you support this legislation for the same reason that we should support legislation for McNary Dam and the beginning of Chief Joseph Dam.

Resolution No. 12 recognizes that the early completion of construction of the dams on the Snake River to provide slack water navigation from the mouth to Lewiston, Idaho, is essential to the economic welfare of the interior of the Pacific Northwest. I therefore believe that it is appropriate to seek an appropriation of $600,000 in the 1950 fiscal budget to complete the advance planning and designing of Lower Monumental, Little Goose, and Lower Granite Dams in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho. Your support of this legislation is respectfully urged.

Resolution No. 15 we only wish to call to your attention at this time. This resolution provides for the change of names of the four dams on the Snake River. The names now employed (Ice Harbor Dam, Lower Monumental Dam, Little Goose Dam, Lower Granite Dam) have no meaning whatsoever other than names employed for navigation purposes. We are asking the State legislatures of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho to memorialize Congress to change these names as follows:

The first dam honoring the memory and work of Dr. Marcus Whitman and to be known as the Whitman Dam.

The second dam honoring the memory and work of Capt. Merriwether Lewis and to be known as the Lewis Dam.

The third dam honoring the memory and work of Capt. William Clark and to be known as the Clark Dam.

The fourth dam honoring the memory and work of the Reverend Henry Harmon Spalding and to be known as the Spalding Dam.

We thought that it was best to have the State legislatures memorialize Congress for these changes of names in order that it would eliminate any possible point of controversy in the Pacific Northwest.

Kind personal regards and best wishes.

Sincerely,

HERBERT G. WEST,
Executive Vice President.

Resolution 1

Now, therefore, be it resolved, The Inland Empire Waterways Association, in regular session this 15th day of December 1948, at Lewiston, Idaho, in light of recent press releases to the effect that the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government will recommend the creation of a new Department of Public Works that would assume jurisdiction over the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers; this association hereby makes known its unanimous and unequivocal opposition to any reorganization proposal to transfer the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers to any other Federal agency, new or old. We firmly believe that the prosecution of navigation, flood control, and other civil works under the Corps of Engineers as prescribed by existing law is efficient; is economical to the Government; is conducted in a thoroughly decentralized manner, giving full voice to State and local groups; is thoroughly coordinated with all other interested agencies, both Federal and State, and is in the best interests of the people of the Nation. Furthermore we believe it would be disastrous to the security of the Nation to take from the officers of the Corps of Engineers, upon whom we depend in time of war, the essential experience and development gained by those officers in large-scale engineering and construction tasks in time of peace. It is, accordingly, further resolved that if and when legislation is introduced to carry out any recommendations of the Commission that this association urge the Congress with all its vigor to include in such legislation phraseology that will clearly exempt the transfer of the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers to any other agency.

Resolution 2

Whereas the Inland Empire Waterways Association, in 1943, urged the adoption of a resolution by the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, to order a review of all reports and surveys by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, with a view to formulating a definite development program embracing the Columbia River system as a future guide for the region; and

Whereas such a resolution was adopted by the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, immediately undertook the organization of such a review and survey by enlisting the cooperation and support of all Federal and State agencies in the Columbia River Basin; and

Whereas after 5 years of field and office surveys and reviews, the Corps of Engineers, North Pacific division, has developed a comprehensive and carefully coordinated plan to provide for the present and immediate future needs of the Columbia River Basin, also for later developments that will be needed as the region expands: Now, therefore, let it be

Resolved, That the Inland Empire Waterways Association, in regular meeting held in Lewiston, Idaho, this 15th day of December, 1948, does hereby adopt such comprehensive plan as the guide for the Inland Empire Waterways Association, with such modifications from time to time as good judgment and planning may dictate; be it further

Resolved, That the Inland Empire Waterway Association respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to immediately authorize the adoption of such comprehensive multiple-purpose plan of development for the Columbia River Basin within the United States; be it further

Resolved, That the Inland Empire Waterways Association respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to specifically designate existing Federal agencies as responsible for construction and planning as their respective existing responsibilities appear in the over-all comprehensive multiple-purpose plan.

Resolution 4

Whereas the Pacific Northwest is experiencing a serious shortage of electric power to meet the needs of an ever-increasing population and expansion of its industrial base; and

Whereas the construction of large hydroelectric projects require several years to complete; and

Whereas the planning and design of Ice Harbor Dam, Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, is for all practical purposes completed: Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That this association respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to appropriate a sum of $3,000,000 by supplemental appropriation in order to initiate construction of Ice Harbor Dam at once.

Resolution 5

Now, therefore, be it resolved, That the Inland Empire Waterways Association, in regular meeting held in Lewiston, Idaho, this 15th day of December 1948, does hereby reaffirm its position that the comprehensive development of the Columbia and Snake Rivers for navigation remain undisturbed in the Department of the Corps of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, United States Army.

Resolution 7

Resolved, In view of the surveys and report on the construction of the Dalles Dam and the High John Day Dam having been favorably submitted by the North Pacific Division, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, the Inland Empire Waterways Association respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to authorize these two projects thus completing the authorization of the slack water navigation program from the head of the Bonneville pool to Lewiston, Idaho, as contained in House Document 704, Seventy-fifth Congress, third session, Columbia and Snake Rivers, Oreg., Wash., and Idaho.

Resolution 8

Be it resolved on this 15th day of December 1948 during the fifteenth annual meeting of the Inland Empire Waterways Association, That the officers of this association continue their efforts in support of the legislation in Congress leading toward the acquisition of the Hood River and Cascade Locks (Wauna Toll Bridge Co.) bridges by the Federal Government for toll-free operations; the construction of all structures of a like kind hereafter with the cooperation of the Federal Government and the highway departments of the States of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho; and toward the maintaining of all such structures as free bridges.

Resolution 9

Resolved, In order to complete construction of McNary Dam and delivery of power by 1953, it is essential that appropriations be increased for the fiscal year 1950. Therefore, the Inland Empire Waterways Association respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to appropriate for the fiscal year 1950 the sum of $40,000,000 for McNary Dam construction.

Resolution 10

Resolved, That a definite power shortage exists in the Pacific Northwest, attested to by both public and private power interests. The urgent need of power from McNary Dam at the earliest possible date is essential to the national welfare and security. Therefore, the Inland Empire Waterways Association respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to make available $10,000,000 by supplemental appropriation as early as practicable in order to hasten the completion of McNary Dam, thus to make power available not later than 1953.

Resolution 11

Resolved, The advance planning and design of Ice Harbor Dam, Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, the first in a series of four dams on the Snake River to provide slack water navigation from the mouth to Lewiston, Idaho, is for all practical purposes completed. Therefore, the Inland Empire Waterways Association does respectfully request the Congress of the United States to appropriate the sum of $12,000,000 for the fiscal year 1950 to begin construction of Ice Harbor Dam.

Resolution 12

Resolved, The early completion of construction of the dams on the Snake River to provide slack water navigation from the mouth to Lewiston, Idaho, is essential to the economic welfare of the interior of the Pacific Northwest. Therefore, the Inland Empire Waterways Association does respectfully request the Congress of the United States to appropriate the sum of $600,000 in the 1950 fiscal budget to complete the advance planning and design of Lower Monumental, Little Goose, and Lower Granite Dams, Oregon, Washington, and Idaho.

Resolution 15

Whereas the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, has favorably recommended the construction of a series of four locks and dams to provide slack water navigation from the mouth of the Snake River to Lewiston, Idaho; and

Whereas the site locations are, namely, Ice Harbor Dam, at mile 10.2 above the mouth of the Snake River; Lower Monumental Dam, at mile 44.7; Little Goose Dam at mile 72.2; Lower Granite Dam, at mile 113.1; and

Whereas the above-mentioned dams are enduring structures constructed for the welfare and security of the citizens of the United States; and

Whereas certain names of early explorers and missionaries, are indelibly linked with the Snake River and honored and respected nationally: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Inland Empire Waterways Association, in regular annual meeting this 15th day of December 1948, in Lewiston, Idaho, does hereby respectfully memorialize the legislatures of the States of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, to in turn memorialize the Congress of the United States of America to authorize and so legislate; so that the names of the dams hereinabove referred to be now named: dam at mile 10.2 above the mouth of the Snake River—Whitman Dam, honoring the memory and work of Dr. Marcus Whitman; dam at mile 44.7 above the mouth of the Snake River—Lewis Dam, honoring the memory and work of Capt. Merriwether Lewis; dam at mile 72.2 above the mouth of the Snake River—Clark Dam, honoring the memory and work of Capt. William Clark; dam at mile 113.1 above the mouth of the Snake River—Spalding Dam, honoring the memory and work of Rev. Henry Harmon Spalding; and be it further

Resolved, That each Member of the Congress of the United States from the States of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho be respectfully requested to support such legislation seeking early and favorable action.

GENERAL PULASKI'S MEMORIAL DAY—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF LOWELL, MASS.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and myself, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the city of Lowell, Mass., relating to General Pulaski's Memorial Day.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress

Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

Whereas the 11th day of October 1779 is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union, through legislative enactment designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and

Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated from October 11, 1929, to October 11, 1946, to be General Pulaski's Memorial Day in United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Lowell and State of Massachusetts—

SECTION 1. That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

SEC. 2. That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, and each of the United States Senators and Representatives from Massachusetts.

GENERAL PULASKI'S MEMORIAL DAY—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF OMAHA, NEBR.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I present a resolution adopted by the City Council of Omaha, Nebr., and addressed to the Congress.

It urges the approval of pending legislation directing the President to officially proclaim October 11 each year as a memorial to Gen. Casimir Pulaski, the great Polish hero, who gave his life in the cause of American independence on October 11, 1779.

When we are bending such great effort to the winning of international understanding and good will I think it is particularly appropriate that we consider the subject and that this petition be noted and given full consideration in connection with the legislation to which it refers.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's memorial day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

Whereas the 11th day of October 1779 is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Kansas, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union, through legislative enactment designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and

Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated October 11, 1929, October 11, 1931, October 11, 1932, to October 11, 1946, to be General Pulaski's memorial day in the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Omaha, Nebr., That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve if passed, the General Pulaski's memorial day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and each of the United States Senators and Representatives from Nebraska.

GENERAL PULASKI'S MEMORIAL DAY—RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY CITY COUNCIL OF PROVIDENCE, R. I.

Mr. MCGRATH. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and myself, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the City Council of Providence, R. I., relating to General Pulaski's Memorial Day.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day, for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

Whereas the 11th day of October, 1779, is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union, through legislative enactment designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day"; and

Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated from October 11, 1929, to October 11, 1946, to be General Pulaski's Memorial Day in United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Providence, State of Rhode Island, and Providence plantations—

SECTION 1. That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

SEC. 2. That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, and each of the United States Senators and Representatives from the State of Rhode Island.

JOSEF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent that there be printed in

the body of the RECORD a telegram I have received from Albert Scavarda, grand knight, Knights of Columbus, embodying a resolution adopted by Kenosha (Wis.) Council, No. 973, Knights of Columbus, at its regular meeting in Kenosha, on February 8, 1949.

This resolution protested, as did hundreds of other resolutions, letters, and telegrams to me and to other Senators, against the outrageous prosecution of Cardinal Mindszenty and other spiritual leaders in Hungary and in other land-controlled Balkan States.

I have spoken on this matter on the floor of the Senate on January 10, right after the announcement of Cardinal Mindszenty's imprisonment, and again on February 8, and I shall continue to express my views along with my brother Senators in opposition to this fiendish persecution of man's spiritual conscience.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KENOSHA, WIS., *February 12, 1949.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The following resolution on the arrest and trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty was adopted by the Kenosha Council, No. 973, Knights of Columbus, at its regular meeting in Kenosha, Wis., on February 8, 1949:

"Whereas the conscience of the American people and liberty-loving people all over the world is shocked and outraged by the imprisonment and trial of His Eminence, Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, primate of Hungary, whose only offense is his courageous espousal of truth and justice and his fearless resistance to the dictates of Red Russia; and

"Whereas Kenosha Council, No. 973, Knights of Columbus, has noted with approval that the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, and the Honorable Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, and the Members of the House of Representatives have voiced their condemnation of the trial and conviction of His Eminence: Be it

"*Resolved*, That Kenosha Council, No. 973, Knights of Columbus, earnestly entreat the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the Members of Congress of the United States to demand the immediate release of this shepherd of millions of Hungarian people and to protest against the repetition of such iniquitous action unparalleled in our jurisprudence and revolting to our civilization; be it further

"*Resolved*, That it is the firm conviction of the members of our council, that failure by our Government zealously to explore all channels through which remedial action may be taken in behalf of the innocent victim of this travesty on justice will damage beyond measure the cause of human liberty everywhere as further evidenced by the persecution of the ministry in Bulgaria of more recent date, and will make a mockery of the affirmation of faith in fundamental human rights which is written into the preamble of the United Nations Charter; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of the resolution be spread upon the minutes of our council and copies thereof forwarded to the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States; the Honorable Dean Acheson, Secretary of State; Hon. Lawrence Smith, Congressman of the First District of Wisconsin; and the Honorable Senators Joseph R. McCarthy and Alexander Wiley."

ALBERT SCAVARDA,
Grand Knight, Knights of Columbus.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 198. A bill for the relief of the city and county of San Francisco; with an amendment (Rept. No. 66);

S. 206. A bill relating to the immigration status of the lawful wives and children of Chinese treaty merchants; with an amendment (Rept. No. 67);

S. 208. A bill for the relief of Ella L. Browning; without amendment (Rept. No. 56);

S. 271. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional district judges for the northern and middle districts of Georgia; with an amendment (Rept. No. 68);

S. 592. A bill for the relief of Edwin B. Anderson; without amendment (Rept. No. 57);

S. 593. A bill for the relief of certain postal employees; without amendment (Rept. No. 58);

S. 594. A bill for the relief of John I. Malarin, former Army mail clerk at APO 932, a branch of the San Francisco, Calif., post office, relative to a shortage in his fixed credit account; without amendment (Rept. No. 59);

S. 624. A bill for the relief of Herman A. Bennink; without amendment (Rept. No. 60);

S. 633. A bill for the relief of Rachel D. Gattegno; without amendment (Rept. No. 61);

S. 634. A bill to authorize payment of certain claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property and personal injury arising from activities of the Army; without amendment (Rept. No. 62);

S. 664. A bill for the relief of Kihei Matsuo; without amendment (Rept. No. 63);

S. 748. A bill for the relief of Charles L. Bishop; without amendment (Rept. No. 64); and

S. Res. 40. Resolution relating to an investigation of the immigration laws and the administration thereof; without amendment (Rept. No. 65); and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 924. A bill for the relief of Doris Marie Richard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 925. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claims of Trent Trust Co., Ltd., a corporation of the Territory of Hawaii, and Cooke Trust Co., Ltd., a corporation of the Territory of Hawaii, as receiver for said Trent Trust Co., Ltd.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 926. A bill to authorize an appropriation in aid of a system of drainage and sanitation for the city of Polson, Mont.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McGRATH (by request):

S. 927. A bill to provide that children be committed to the Board of Public Welfare in lieu of being committed to the National Training School for Girls; that the property and personnel of the National Training School for Girls be available for the care of children committed to or accepted by the Board of Public Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself and Mr. FREAR) introduced Senate bill 928, to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital now being constructed at Wilmington, Del., as the William L. Nelson Veterans Memorial Hospital, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 929. A bill to provide for disposition and use of funds held in trust for Indian tribes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. PEPPER):

S. 930. A bill to provide for the liquidation of the trusts under the transfer agreements with State rural rehabilitation corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 931. A bill for postal employees' longevity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 932. A bill to amend section 334 (c) of the Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1156–1157; 8 U. S. C. 734);

S. 933. A bill to extend the law relating to perjury to the willful giving of contradictory statements under oath;

S. 934. A bill to provide for the detention, care, and treatment of persons of unsound mind in certain Federal reservations in Virginia and Maryland;

S. 935. A bill for the relief of Friederike Strachwitz;

S. 936. A bill to provide for the care and custody of insane persons charged with or convicted of offenses against the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 937. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to effect the payment of certain claims against the United States; and

S. 938. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 939. A bill to remove certain lands from the operation of Public Law 545, Seventy-seventh Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 940. A bill to reaffirm the intent of the Congress with respect to flight training for veterans; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 941. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Barber Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 942. A bill to establish principles and policies to govern generally the management of the executive branch of the Government;

S. 943. A bill to eliminate the maintenance of perpetual accounts for unclaimed moneys; and

S. 944. A bill to discontinue the maintenance of inactive records and custody of unclaimed funds and contents of safety-deposit boxes in possession of the Comptroller of the Currency or the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 945. A bill to provide for the Admiral David Glasgow Farragut Birthplace National Monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs;

S. 946. A bill to permit credit, for purposes of parole, for time served in a Federal penal institution under an illegal conviction or sentence in the case of a person who is subsequently legally convicted and sentenced for the same offense;

S. 947. A bill for the relief of the Baggett Transportation Co., Inc.; and

S. 948. A bill for the relief of Mickey Baine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 949. A bill to amend section 12B of the Federal Reserve Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency; and

S. 950. A bill for the relief of the estate of Luke A. Treacy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 951. A bill for the relief of Joe Greco; and

S. 952. A bill for the relief of Pietro Midulla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. McCARRAN introduced Senate bill 953, to amend the immigration laws relating to stowaways, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. McCARRAN also introduced Senate bill 954, to clarify the provisions of section 8 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 890; 8 U. S. C. 144), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. McCARRAN also introduced Senate bill 955, to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, to preserve the nationality of naturalized veterans, their wives, minor children, and dependent parents, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. McCARRAN also introduced Senate bill 956, to provide for the adjustment of royalties and like charges for the use of inventions for the benefit of or by the United States, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. 957. A bill to permit members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, who have dependents, to occupy on a rental basis and without loss of rental allowances temporary housing facilities under the jurisdiction of any such service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 958. A bill to establish the United States of America Patriotic and Charter Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 959. A bill to authorize certain persons to accept decorations tendered to them by the United Kingdom for services rendered the Allied cause during World War II, and for other purposes;

S. 960. A bill to provide for the construction, rehabilitation, expansion, conversion, and joint utilization of buildings, structures, utilities, and other facilities, including the acquisition of land, for the Reserve components of the National Military Establishment of the United States, and for other purposes; and

S. 961. A bill to provide for the administration of the Central Intelligence Agency, established pursuant to section 102, National Security Act of 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 962. A bill for the relief of Bradford N. Headley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. LANGER introduced Senate bill 963, to provide for determination and payment of losses sustained by individuals as a result of recent storms in the Western and Middle Western States, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. J. Res. 53. Joint resolution to provide for the reforestation and revegetation of the forest and range lands of the national forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

WILLIAM L. NELSON VETERANS MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for designation of the United States veterans' hospital now being constructed at Wilmington, Del., as the William L. Nelson Veterans Memorial Hospital, and I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the body of the RECORD at this point the text of the bill and a statement concerning it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 928) to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital now being constructed at Wilmington, Del.; as the William L. Nelson Veterans Memorial Hospital, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself and Mr. FREAR), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the United States Veterans' Administration hospital now being constructed at Wilmington, Del., shall be known and designated on the public records as the William L. Nelson Veterans Memorial Hospital.

The statement presented by Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself and Mr. FREAR) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY MR. WILLIAMS (FOR HIMSELF AND MR. FREAR)

There is under construction at this time a United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Wilmington, Del., which it is expected will be completed sometime next year, and it is the purpose of the proposed bill to give it the name of William L. Nelson, the only Delaware boy who was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor posthumously during the Second World War. He was a Sergeant of the Sixtieth Infantry, Ninth Infantry Division. He was born at Dover, Del., and entered the military service at Middletown.

He won the Congressional Medal of Honor posthumously as a result of action at Djebel Dardys, northwest of Sedjenane, Tunisia, April 24, 1943. The Congressional Medal of Honor is the highest decoration which is awarded to American soldiers, and is awarded only for conspicuous gallantry above and beyond the call of duty in action involving actual conflict. It is awarded by the President of the United States in the name of the Congress. The following is the citation covering the exploit and description of the action in which Sergeant Nelson paid the supreme sacrifice: "G. O. No. 85, 17 December 1943. For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at risk of life, above and beyond the call of duty in action involving actual conflict. On the morning of April 24, 1943, Sergeant Nelson led his section of heavy mortars to a forward position where he placed his guns and men. Under intense enemy artillery, mortar, and small-arms fire, he advanced alone to a chosen observation position from which he directed the laying of a concentrated mortar barrage which successfully halted an initial enemy counterattack. Although mortally wounded in the accomplishment of his mission, and with his duty clearly completed, Sergeant Nelson crawled to a still more advanced observation point and continued to direct the fire of his section. Dying of hand-grenade wounds and only 50 yards from the enemy, Sergeant Nelson encouraged his section to continue their fire and by doing so they took a heavy toll of enemy lives. The skill which Sergeant Nelson displayed in this engagement, his courage, and self-sacrificing devotion to duty and heroism resulting in the loss of his life, was a priceless inspiration to our armed forces and were in keeping with the highest tradition of the Army of the United States."

It is therefore deemed fitting and appropriate that the new United States Veterans' Administration Hospital, nearing completion at Wilmington, Del., should be given the name of William L. Nelson. Naming this hospital after a deceased World War II veteran, who won the Congressional Medal of Honor, makes it not only a memorial to his gallant exploits, but it is also a distinction and honor to all war veterans.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION LAWS RELATING TO STOWAWAYS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill, which was sent to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary from the Department of Justice.

I ask that an explanation, furnished me by way of a letter from the Assistant to the Attorney General, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, together with the text of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the text of the bill and the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 953) to amend the immigration laws relating to stowaways, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, 39 Stat. 875, as amended (8 U. S. C. 136), is amended as follows: "After the word 'stowaway' strike out the following language: ', except that such stowaway, if otherwise admissible, may be admitted in the discretion of the Attorney General' ".

SEC. 2. Section 16 of the Immigration Act of 1924, 43 Stat. 163, as amended (8 U. S. C. 216), is hereby further amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsections:

"(d) The owner, charterer, agent, consignee, or master of any vessel arriving at the United States from any place outside thereof who fails to detain on board any alien stowaway until such stowaway has been inspected by an immigrant inspector, or who fails to detain such stowaway on board after inspection if ordered to do so by the immigrant inspector, or who fails to deport such stowaway on the vessel on which he arrived or on another vessel at the expense of the vessel on which he arrived when required to do so by an immigrant inspector, shall pay to the collector of customs of the customs district in which the port of arrival is located the sum of $1,000 for each alien stowaway in respect of whom such failure occurs. Pending final determination of liability for such fine, no vessel shall be granted clearance, except that clearance may be granted upon the deposit of a sum sufficient to cover such fine, or of a bond with sufficient surety to secure the payment thereof approved by the collector of customs. The provisions for detention of aliens for examination before

boards of special inquiry and the right of appeal provided for in sections 16 and 17 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, 39 Stat. 887 (8 U. S. C. 153), shall not apply to aliens who arrive as stowaways and no such alien shall be permitted to land in the United States, except temporarily for medical treatment, or pursuant to such regulations as the Attorney General may prescribe for the ultimate departure or removal or deportation of such alien from the United States.

"(e) The owner, charterer, agent, consignee, or master of any vessel arriving in the United States from any place outside thereof which has on board any alien stowaway shall pay to the collector of customs of the customs district in which the port of arrival is located the sum of $1,000 for each alien stowaway aboard such vessel. No vessel shall be granted clearance while such fine is unpaid, except that clearance may be granted upon the deposit of a sum sufficient to cover such fine, or of a bond with sufficient surety to secure the payment thereof approved by the collector of customs. No fine imposed under the provisions of this section shall be subject to refund, but the Attorney General may, upon application in writing therefor, mitigate such penalty to not less than $200 for any such violation for which such penalty is imposed, upon proof satisfactory to him that the presence of the alien stowaway aboard the vessel at the time of its embarkation from the last port outside the United States was not known to and could not have been ascertained by the exercise of reasonable diligence by the owner, charterer, agent, consignee, and master of the vessel aboard which such stowaway arrived in the United States."

The letter presented by Mr. McCARRAN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 17, 1949.

Hon. PAT McCARRAN,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The economic, political, and social conditions prevailing in many parts of the world, particularly in those countries which suffered most heavily as the result of war, have enormously increased the problems connected with the immigration of peoples to the United States. One of the most vexatious of such problems is that of the stowaway. This problem appears to be in the ascendancy. Information available to this Department indicates that the owners and masters of vessels are not exercising proper precaution to prevent the boarding of their vessels by stowaways at points of embarkation of vessels bound for the United States. The provisions of section 2199, title 18, United States Code, provide punishment for stowing away on vessels or aircraft. Additional sanctions seem required, however, to curb this practice, and there is need for some penal provision against the owners and masters of the vessels. This Department recommends the enactment of appropriate legislation.

Stowaways are now excludable under section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (8 U. S. C. 136), but the statute authorizes the Attorney General in his discretion to admit the stowaway if he is otherwise admissible. This language was written into the act of 1917 prior to the enactment of later immigration statutes which made necessary certain documents including immigration visas in order for aliens to enter the United States. At that time there was no numerical restriction on immigration. It was therefore not believed that the fact that an alien was a stowaway should be a mandatory cause of exclusion. Invariably an alien stowaway not only avoids the payment of his passage to this country, but also is lacking any appropriate immigration documents for admission to the United States. The language authorizing the Attorney General to admit stowaways, if otherwise admissible, is therefore usually meaningless and should be repealed.

This Department is convinced that the practice of stowing away on vessels proceeding to this country can best be minimized by legislation placing certain responsibilities, subject to penalties, upon transport lines engaged in transoceanic travel.

Examples of other sanctions of similar nature may be found in sections 9 and 10 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (8 U. S. C. 145, 146), and in sections 16 and 20 of the Immigration Act of July 1, 1924 (8 U. S. C. 167, 216).

Enclosed herewith is a draft of a bill to effectuate the foregoing recommendations. It would repeal the discretion in the Attorney General to admit stowaways and would provide penalties in the sum of $1,000 to be paid by the owner or master of any vessel arriving in the United States with a stowaway aboard and a penalty in like sum for failure to comply with certain orders of immigrant inspectors in relation to such stowaways. The bill would further authorize the Attorney General to mitigate the penalty for bringing a stowaway to this country to not less than $200 each in proper cases.

A similar bill (S. 1450) was introduced in the Eightieth Congress at the request of this Department.

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this recommendation.

Yours sincerely,

PEYTON FORD,
The Assistant to the Attorney General.

CLARIFICATION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE IMMIGRATION ACT OF 1917

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill, which was sent to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary from the Department of Justice.

I ask that an explanation, furnished me by way of a letter from the Assistant to the Attorney General, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, together with the text of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 954) to clarify the provisions of section 8 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 880; 8 U. S. C. 144), introduced by Mr. McCARRAN, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 8 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 880; 8 U. S. C. 144), be and the same hereby is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. That any person, including the owner, operator, pilot, master, agent, or consignee of any means of transportation, who shall bring into or land in the United States, by any means of transportation or otherwise, or shall attempt, by himself or through another, to bring into or land in the United States, by any means of transportation or otherwise, or shall conceal or harbor, or attempt to conceal or harbor in any place, including any building, or any means of transportation, any alien not duly admitted by an immigrant inspector or not lawfully entitled to enter or to reside within the United States under the terms of this act or any other law relating to the immigration or expulsion of aliens, shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $2,000 and by imprisonment for a term not exceeding 5 years, for a violation of any of the foregoing provisions in respect to each and every alien in relation to whom such violation occurs."

The letter of explanation presented by Mr. McCARRAN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 18, 1949.

Hon. PAT McCARRAN,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *United States v. Paul Evans*, decided March 15, 1948, brought into focus the need for an amendment of the immigration laws. The defendant in that case was apprehended in the act of concealing a number of aliens who had not been legally admitted to the United States. The Government prosecuted him pursuant to the provisions of section 8 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (8 U. S. C. 144), which provides that any person who shall bring into the United States or shall conceal any alien not lawfully admitted shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, but the Supreme Court held that the section under which he was prosecuted was inadequate to provide a penalty for concealing or harboring such aliens. The result of the decision was to leave the penalty provided by the section applicable only to bringing into or landing in the United States aliens not entitled to enter but not applicable to the offense of concealing such aliens.

In holding that the statute did not provide an enforceable penalty for the act of concealing, the Supreme Court recognized the uncertainty in the law, referred to the matter of supplying the deficiency, and concluded its opinion by stating:

"This is a task outside the bounds of judicial interpretation. It is better for Congress, and more in accord with its function, to revise the statute than for us to guess at the revision it would make. That task it can do with precision. We could do no more than make speculation law."

In accordance with the above-quoted suggestion, it is recommended that the statute in question be revised. A draft of a bill to effectuate such recommendation is enclosed.

It will be observed that the bill proposes a number of changes in the existing language of the section. This section was enacted prior to the use of many modern means of transportation, and its language was directed principally to the transportation of aliens by water. The bill proposes changes in the language with a view to bringing the section more in keeping with modern means of transportation. The bill also proposes that an offense thereunder shall constitute a felony whereas it is now described as a misdemeanor, notwithstanding the fact that the penalty was fixed at a maximum of $2,000 fine and imprisonment for 5 years. Changing the classification of the offense from a misdemeanor to a felony seems more in keeping with the severity of the penalty. The words "any other law relating to the immigration or expulsion of aliens," at the end of the description of the offenses, were inserted so that the penalties for violation thereof would not be limited to violations of the Immigration Act of 1917, but would also apply to the Immigration Act of 1924, and any other laws which may be enacted of like character. The change of language which is designed to meet specifically the deficiency found by the Supreme Court in the existing section will be found in the last clause at the end of the bill.

Enactment of this measure will greatly facilitate control over the smuggling of aliens and the harboring of aliens who have illegally entered the country.

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this recommendation.

Yours sincerely,

PEYTON FORD,
The Assistant to the Attorney General.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940, RELATING TO NATIONALITY OF NATURALIZED VETERANS, ETC.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill, which was sent to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, from the Department of Justice.

I ask that an explanation, furnished me by way of a letter from the Assistant to the Attorney General, be printed in the RECORD, at this point as part of my remarks, together with the text of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 955) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, to preserve the nationality of naturalized veterans, their wives, minor children, and dependent parents, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (h) of section 406 of the Nationality Act of 1940, approved December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1065; 8 U. S. C. 806), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(h) Who is a veteran of the Spanish-American War, of World War I, or of World War II, his wife, minor children, or dependent parents."

The letter of explanation presented by Mr. McCARRAN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 27, 1949.

Hon. PAT McCARRAN,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This Department invites your attention to the desirability of amending subsection (h) of section 406 of the Nationality Act of 1940 (56 Stat. 1065; 8 U. S. C. 806).

Section 404 of the Nationality Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1170; 8 U. S. C. 804) provides for the loss of nationality by a person who has acquired his citizenship by naturalization if such person resides for at least 2 years in a territory of a foreign country of which he was formerly a national or in which he was born, if he acquires through such residence the nationality of such foreign country by operation of law; by residing for 3 years in the territory of a foreign country of which he was formerly a national or in which he was born; or residing continuously for 5 years in any foreign country.

Section 406 of the Nationality Act of 1940 lists a number of classes of persons to whom section 404 does not apply. Subsection (h) of section 406 exempts veterans of the Spanish-American War and of World War I, their wives, minor children, or dependent parents.

No reason is discernible why this exemption should not be extended to veterans of World War II.

Accordingly the Department of Justice recommends that section 406 of the Nationality Act of 1940 be amended so as to include veterans of World War II. A draft of a proposed bill to effectuate the foregoing purpose is enclosed.

An identical bill (S. 489), which was introduced in the Eightieth Congress at the request of this Department, passed the Senate on January 12, 1948.

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Yours sincerely,

PEYTON FORD,
The Assistant to the Attorney General.

ROYALTIES FOR USE OF INVENTIONS FOR BENEFIT OF OR BY THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill, which was sent to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary from the Department of Justice.

I ask that an explanation, furnished me by way of a letter from the Assistant to the Attorney General, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, together with the text of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 956) to provide for the adjustment of royalties and like charges for the use of inventions for the benefit of or by the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of October 31, 1942 (56 Stat. 1013-1015, 35 U. S. C. 89-96), be, and it hereby is, repealed, and that all agreements in adjustment of royalties or otherwise made thereunder be, and the same hereby are, terminated as to future force and effect: *Provided, however*, That, as to proceedings initiated by and now pending under notices previously issued and as to rights accrued or liabilities incurred prior to repeal thereof, the provisions of such act shall be treated as remaining in full force and effect for the purpose of concluding, settling, sustaining, qualifying, or defeating any pending matter, suit, or claim thereunder.

SEC. 2. Whenever an invention, either patented or unpatented, shall be manufactured, used, sold, or otherwise disposed of by or for the United States, subject to a royalty or like charge therefor believed to be unreasonable or excessive by the head of the department or agency of the Government which has ordered such manufacture, use, sale, or other disposition, the head of the department or agency of the Government concerned, in behalf of such agency and the Government as a whole, shall give written notice of such fact to all known parties having a beneficial interest in such royalty or like charge, whether as payors or payees thereof. Within a reasonable time after the effective date of such notice, and in no event in less than 30 days, the head of the department or agency of the Government issuing such notice shall by order, directed to all parties to whom notice shall have been given, or who shall be found to have an interest in such proceeding, fix and specify such rates or amounts, if any, of such royalties or like charges as he shall determine are fair and just, taking into account all defenses available to a defendant in a patent infringement action and such other conditions as may be determined to be appropriate by reason of governmental procurement as contrasted with nongovernmental procurement, and shall authorize the payment thereof, if any be allowed, by any payor to any payee on account of such manufacture, use, sale, or other disposition: *Provided, however*, That any party to whom such notice is given, if he so requests within 30 days from and after the effective date of such notice, may, at such time as may be fixed by the head of such department or agency, present in writing or in person any facts or circumstances which may, in his opinion, have a bearing upon the rates or amounts of such royalties or like charges, if any, to be determined, fixed, and specified in view of the conditions aforesaid, and any order fixing and specifying the rates or amounts of such royalties or like charges, if any, shall be issued by the head of such department or agency within a reasonable time after such presentation. After the effective date of the notice, any payor affected by the notice may continue to collect royalties or like charges payable by or for the United States on account of such manufacture, use, sale, or other disposition of the invention, but all such royalties or charges shall be segregated and safely kept by such payor and shall not, until issuance of the order herein provided, be paid over to any payee of such royalties or like charges. After issuance of such order, any payor thereunder, unless otherwise directed in the order, may continue to collect royalties or other charges as aforesaid, but shall not pay over to any payee affected by the order any such royalties or other charges in an amount or at a rate in excess of that fixed and specified by the order and shall refund any such excess to the United States in such manner as directed by the order. The payee of such royalty or like charge shall not have any remedy by way of suit, set-off, or other legal action against the payor for the payment of any additional royalties or like charges foreclosed by such order, or for damages for breach of contract or otherwise, but such party's sole and exclusive remedy, except as to the recovery of the amounts fixed and specified in said order, shall be as provided in section 3 hereof. The notice and order provided for herein shall be mailed to the last known address of all parties to whom the same shall be directed and such notice shall be effective upon receipt or 5 days after the mailing thereof, whichever date is the earlier.

SEC. 3. Any party entitled to receive such royalties or like charges, claiming to be aggrieved by any order issued pursuant to section 2 hereof, may institute suit against the United States in the Court of Claims or in the district courts of the United States insofar as such courts may have concurrent jurisdiction with the Court of Claims to recover such sum, if any, as when added to the royalties or other charges fixed and specified in such order shall constitute fair and just compensation to such party for the manufacture, use, sale, or other disposition for the United States of the invention or inventions within the purview of the order, taking into consideration all of the circumstances set forth for the determination of such royalties in section 2 hereof. In any such suit the United States may avail itself of any and all defenses, general and special, that might be pleaded by a defendant in an action for patent infringement as set forth in title LX of the Revised Statutes, or any other defense, general or special, which might preclude the right of such party to claim, or which might limit the rate or amount of, a royalty or other like charge.

SEC. 4. The head of any department or agency of the Government which has ordered the manufacture, use, sale, or other disposition of an invention, whether patented or unpatented, and whether or not an order has been issued in connection therewith pursuant to section 2 hereof, is authorized and empowered to enter into an agreement, before suit against the United States has been instituted, with the owner of, or a party entitled to receive a royalty or like charge under such invention, in full settlement and compromise of any claim against the United States accruing to such owner or party under the provisions of this act or any other law by reason of such manufacture, use, sale, or other disposition, and for compensation to

be paid to such owner or party based upon future manufacture, use, sale, or other disposition of said invention. The head of any department or agency of the Government which has entered into an agreement under the provisions of this act or the act of October 31, 1942 (56 Stat. 1013–1015, 35 U. S. C. 89–96) is authorized and empowered to enter into supplemental agreements modifying, amending, or revoking such agreement as the equities of changed circumstances may warrant, any other law to the contrary notwithstanding.

SEC. 5. Whenever a reduction in the rates or amounts of royalties or like charges is effected by order, pursuant to section 2 hereof, or by compromise or settlement, pursuant to section 4 hereof, such reduction shall inure to the benefit of the Government either by way of a corresponding reduction in the contract price to be paid directly or indirectly for such manufacture, use, sale, or other disposition of such invention, or by way of refund to the Treasury of the United States by the payor of such royalties or like charges insofar as the same may have been foreclosed from payment thereof to the payee.

SEC. 6. The head of the department or agency of the Government concerned is further authorized, in his discretion and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to delegate and provide for the delegation of any power and authority conferred by this act to such qualified and responsible officers, boards, agents, or persons as he may designate or appoint.

SEC. 7. For the purposes of this act, the manufacture, use, sale, or other disposition of an invention, whether patented or unpatented, by a contractor, a subcontractor, or any person, firm, or corporation for the Government shall be construed as manufacture, use, sale, or other disposition for the United States; and for the purposes of the act of June 25, 1910, as amended (40 Stat. 705; 35 U. S. C. 68), the use or manufacture of an invention described in and covered by a patent of the United States by a contractor, a subcontractor, or any person, firm, or corporation for the Government and with the authorization or consent of the Government, shall be construed as use or manufacture for the United States.

SEC. 8. This act shall apply to all royalties or like charges directly or indirectly charged or chargeable to the United States for any supplies, equipment, or materials to be delivered to or for the Government from and after the effective date of the notice provided for in section 2 hereof and shall also apply to all royalties or like charges charged or chargeable directly or indirectly to the United States for supplies, equipment, or materials delivered to or for the Government prior to the date of such notice insofar as such royalties or like charges have not been paid to the payee thereof prior to the effective date of such notice.

SEC. 9. The head of each department or agency of the Government may issue such rules and regulations and require such information as may be necessary and proper to carry out the provisions of this act. The provisions of section 10 (1) of an act approved July 2, 1926 (44 Stat. 787), as amended, and title XIII of Public Law 507, Seventy-seventh Congress, shall be applicable to the payor and payee of any royalty or like charge for an invention, whether patented or unpatented, manufactured, used, sold, or otherwise disposed of for the United States, and the term "defense contract" as used in said act shall mean and include an agreement for the payment of royalty or like charge regardless of the date of such agreement, under or by virtue of which any royalty or like charge is directly or indirectly paid by the Government or included within the contract price for property sold to or manufactured for the Government.

SEC. 10. Nothing herein contained shall be deemed to preclude the applicability of section 408 of Public Law 528, Seventy-seventh Congress, as the same may be heretofore or hereafter amended so far as the same may be applicable.

SEC. 11. If any provision of this act or the application of any provision to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, or if any provision of this act shall be inoperative by its terms, the validity or applicability of the remainder of the act shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 12. This act shall take effect 90 days after approval.

The letter presented by Mr. MCCARRAN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 27, 1949.

HON. PAT MCCARRAN,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: There appears to be a need for the enactment of a permanent statute for the adjustment of royalties and like charges for the use of inventions for the benefit of or by the United States.

Under the act of June 25, 1910, as amended (36 Stat. 851, 35 U. S. C. 68), the Government and its contractors are authorized to use patented inventions upon the payment of reasonable and entire compensation for such use. Defenses of invalidity, etc., are available as in ordinary infringement suits. It has been held, however, that the act of June 25, 1910, does not apply when the Government or a Government contractor is already licensed under a patent. *Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co.* v. *Isherwood* (5 F. 2d 924). The result of this decision is that, despite a declared policy that the United States should be entitled to use patented inventions upon the payment of reasonable compensation, this policy is defeated whenever the Government or a person or corporation having a contract with the Government involving the use of certain inventions has entered into patent-license agreements with the owners of such inventions. As a consequence of that decision the Government has sometimes been forced to pay unreasonable royalties which may have been provided for by the license. Also, it must pay the royalties specified in the license agreement even where the patent may be invalid, or when the licensor for some other reason has no just claim to the royalties.

This situation was temporarily corrected during the war by the Royalty Adjustment Act (October 31, 1942, 56 Stat. 1013, 35 U. S. C., secs. 89–96) whereby the Government was authorized to reduce royalties payable under existing licenses where such royalties were excessive. This act is temporary wartime legislation and will at some early date become ineffective.

In view of the Isherwood decision, it would appear desirable to incorporate the principles of the Royalty Adjustment Act into the law as a permanent measure applicable both in wartime and peacetime. A draft of a proposed bill to effectuate this purpose is enclosed. The proposed legislation represents the consolidated views of the Departments of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Justice.

Enactment of the proposed bill before the termination of the Royalty Adjustment Act is necessary in order to avoid reestablishing the situation which existed at the time of the passage of that act.

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this recommendation.

Yours sincerely,

PEYTON FORD,
The Assistant to the Attorney General.

MYRA M. HARDY

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 71), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Myra M. Hardy, widow of Charles Oscar Hardy, late an employee of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

DEVELOPMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF PUBLIC HEALTH UNITS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on the 17th of January, I, along with certain distinguished Members of the Senate, introduced Senate bill 522, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, to authorize assistance to States, and political subdivisions in the development and maintenance of local public-health units, and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be a reprint of the bill, and that on the reprint the names of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] to be added as cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN, FOUNDER OF THE REPUBLICAN FAITH—ADDRESS BY SENATOR VANDENBERG

[Mr. VANDENBERG asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at the Lincoln Day dinner in Detroit, Mich., February 10, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR WHERRY

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at the Illinois Republican Lincoln Day dinner, at the La Salle Hotel, Chicago, Ill., on February 12, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

A FORWARD LOOKING REPUBLICAN PARTY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MORSE

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject "A Forward Looking Republican Party," delivered by him on February 12, 1949, before the Lincoln Club, Louisville Ky., which appears in the Appendix.]

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR SALTONSTALL

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Lincoln Day address delivered by Senator SALTONSTALL, at the Middlesex Club Dinner, Hotel Statler, Boston, Mass., February 12, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

GOP LIBERALS IN THE SENATE—ARTICLE BY SENATOR MORSE

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "GOP Liberals—In the Senate They Have a Program for Action," by Senator WAYNE L. MORSE, of Oregon, published in the magazine Parade on February 13, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIAL AND SENTENCE OF JOSEF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD editorial comments from Boston newspapers on the trial and sentence of Cardinal Mindszenty, which appear in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL HOUSING POLICY—TESTIMONY BEFORE THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD summaries of the testimony of Mr. Raymond M. Foley, Mr. Tighe Woods, and Secretary of the Interior Julius A. Krug, before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report on February 11, 1949, which appear in the Appendix.]

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION—ADDRESS BY JOHN R. STEELMAN

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by John R. Steelman before the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association on February 1, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

STALIN IS WILLING TO TALK—EDITORIAL FROM THE GREAT FALLS (MONT.) TRIBUNE

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Stalin Is Willing To Talk," published in the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune of February 2, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

HENRIK SHIPSTEAD'S VOTE AGAINST THE UNITED NATIONS—ARTICLE FROM MINNEAPOLIS TRIBUNE

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Henrik Shipstead Is Proudest of His Vote Against the UN," from the Minneapolis Tribune of February 9, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

GOVERNMENT ACTION IN STRIKES—ARTICLE BY WILLIAM H. DAVIS

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Government Action in Strikes," by William H. Davis, from the New York Times of February 12, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

BUILDING CODE REVISIONS

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Building Code Revisions," published in the Fond du Lac (Wis.) Commonwealth Reporter of January 12, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

AN INSTANCE OF INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Nations Pull Together; So Everybody's Happy," published in the Seattle Times of January 16, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

INDUSTRIALIZING AND EXPORTING TO NONINDUSTRIALIZED AREAS—ARTICLES BY GEORGE H. HOUSTON

[Mr. FLANDERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Industrializing Nonindustrialized Areas of the World," by George H. Houston, which appears in the Appendix.]

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF WALTER L. POPE TO BE CIRCUIT JUDGE, UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Monday, February 21, 1949, at 11:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Walter L. Pope, of Montana, to be circuit judge of the United States Court of Appeals, for the Ninth Circuit, vice Francis A. Garrecht, deceased. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The morning business is concluded.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

During the delivery of Mr. DONNELL'S speech,

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to address an inquiry to the acting majority leader. Is it the intention to call the calendar?

Mr. MYERS. No. I intended to ask unanimous consent to dispense with the call of the calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to agree to such a request, so that we may clear the record and pass the call of the calendar, in order that the Senator from Missouri may proceed at his leisure.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSAL TO PLACE STATE LEGISLATORS ON A. F. OF L. PAY ROLL

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, an Associated Press dispatch issued under date of February 12 includes the following quoted language:

The A. F. of L. is considering putting State legislators on its pay roll so labor sympathizers can afford the lawmaking jobs.

This would be part of an extremely broad plunge into national political affairs about to be launched by Labor's League for Political Education, the American Federation of Labor's political arm.

Heartened by its success in helping elect President Truman last fall, the league is stepping up its national activities and planning extensive campaigns on State and local levels.

TO ENCOURAGE CANDIDATES

Details were worked out at the A. F. of L. executive council's recent midwinter session at Miami, Fla.

League leaders decided that union members or people sympathetic with labor's aims could have a great voice, or even control, in State legislatures if more such persons could be induced to run for office.

It was recognized, however, that the pay for State legislators is so low in most States that labor people often cannot afford to run for office or take time out from regular jobs for lawmaking.

Thus, it was proposed and virtually decided that the league will help elect and thereafter augment the salaries of legislators endorsed by labor where they have insufficient funds of their own to get by.

CITE A STATE FUND

The proposal was made by a high-ranking A. F. of L. official in a written statement presented to the labor league's administrative council.

Mr. President, I consider to be exceedingly unwise and highly reprehensible the proposal that the Federation of Labor put on its pay roll members of State legislatures. I should consider to be equally unwise and reprehensible a proposal, were one to be made, to put members of a State legislature on the pay roll of an organization which is or shall be created to promote the interests of management. Were proposals to be made to put Members of Congress on the pay roll of either an organization operated in the interest of labor or of an organization operated in the interest of management I should likewise consider such proposals to be exceedingly unwise and highly reprehensible.

My reason for the views I have stated are:

First. A person who is chosen to membership in a legislative body thereby becomes a part of that governmental unit the laws of which that legislative body enacts, and should under no circumstances allow himself to be placed in a position in which he is subject to the danger of allowing the performance of his official functions to be influenced by obligations to others.

Second. A person who is chosen to membership in a legislative body is thereby selected as an official of all the people within the jurisdiction of that body, and should not in his participation in its affairs accept any gift which is likely to cause or tend to cause him to be responsive solely to the interests of only a part of such people.

Third. For an official to be paid money, as is planned under the current proposal, would strongly tend to cause him to be responsive to the demands or wishes of the donor organization in the performance of his official duties.

Fourth. If the precedent of such proposal to place legislators on the pay roll of an organization formed for the promotion of the interest of one group of the population be established it may reasonably be expected that other organizations, perhaps of industry, such as railroads, or mine owners, or of the learned professional groups or of some other segment of our people, which may consider its members or the public interest to be in jeopardy because of public legislation, will follow the examples of such precedents and by paying either gratuities or salaries to legislators seek to make such legislators either exceedingly friendly to or perhaps virtually agents of the donor organization to carry out its will rather than to perform, free from bias or influence, the duties of the public official positions to which such legislators have been chosen.

Fifth. The proposal approaches closely and may easily lead to bribery of public officials.

Sixth. In addition to the evils which I have suggested which would result from

carrying into effect the American Federation of Labor proposal, it may reasonably be concluded that as a likely result thereof not only would there be an undermining of the character and stamina of the recipients of the gifts, but also a crop of legislation in furtherance of special interests rather than of the general good.

Seventh. No self-respecting legislator could accept money under such a proposal, with the probable resultant feeling of obligation to the donor, with the diminished or extinguished zeal which he would experience in advocacy of a measure designed for the general good but opposed to the desire of the donor organization, or perhaps of entire omission or abandonment by him of such advocacy because of the desire of the donor organization, and with the mortification or embarrassment which he would be likely to suffer—that is the legislator—should he after the receipt of the money from the organization decline or fail to carry out the desire of such organization.

Although larger salaries are frequently paid to judicial and executive officials than are paid to the members of the legislative bodies, and consequently there may not exist in the case of the executive or judicial officer the urgent financial need which in the case of members of legislatures is the reason for the current proposal of the American Federation of Labor, yet, Mr. President, on principle, if it be proper for organizations such as labor unions, or political arms thereof, or manufacturers' associations, to assist by financial contributions during the term of office the members of the legislative branch of any unit of American government, it would be equally justifiable for such organization also to render assistance by such contributions during the respective terms of office to the officers of each of the other two coordinate branches of government; in the executive branch of mayors, governors, and even the President, and in the judicial branch to judges of the courts, from the lowest of them to and including the Supreme Court of the United States.

It is difficult to imagine a plan more violative of the principle that public officials are not to become private agents of special interests, more hostile to the view that no man can serve two masters, more conducive to embarrassment, degradation, and corruption of public officials, and more likely to result in gross disregard of an egregious injury to public welfare than is the proposal set forth in the Associated Press dispatch previously mentioned.

The proposal which is being considered by the American Federation of Labor to put State legislators on its pay rolls, if once placed in effect, may easily be followed by like proposals to place on the pay rolls of labor organizations Members of Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, I hope that this pending proposal will be abandoned in its incipiency.

I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks there be printed as a part thereof the editorial appearing in the Baltimore Sun of this morning, entitled "A Curious A. F. of L. Scheme To Subsidize Legislators."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CURIOUS A. F. OF L. SCHEME TO SUBSIDIZE LEGISLATORS

That is a curious dispatch from Washington which reports an A. F. of L. plan to subsidize State legislators friendly to labor. The plan apparently would be to put lawmakers on a special union pay roll if they bound themselves to see the public welfare through union eyes. The idea is limited so far, apparently, to State legislators.

The reason for the State limitation may be guessed at. A. F. of L. interests suffered a shattering surprise in the Supreme Court the other day on the closed-shop cases. They had attacked State provisions against the closed shop on constitutional grounds. But a normally prounion court found it could not in this case strain the constitutional doctrines enough to come out the labor way.

That returned the unions to the necessity of securing what they want from State legislatures. The proposal to supplement the salary of legislators friendly to labor follows. It is a proposal which wise heads within the labor movement will wish to reconsider and probably in the end to withdraw.

First of all, why should there be any need for this adventure? All State legislators are now paid, some very well. The State legislative sessions run only 40 to 114 days and in a recent year the national average was only 93 days. It is hard to believe that prospective legislators able to judge labor's claims fairly are too poor to meet these requirements without a union subsidy.

There is another consideration which the wiser labor leaders will keep in mind. Grant for the sake of the argument that some State legislatures are relatively conservative, in much the way the National House of Representatives is relatively conservative. But this is not because the members from industrial areas are relatively conservative.

It is because the makeup of many State chambers and the National House gives the rural areas wider influence than they get, say, in the United States Senate. In the Senate, elected by State-wide vote, massed urban population can often outvote rural congressional districts.

It follows that many city legislators now are as friendly to labor as labor could wish. To subsidize labor men running for office in the cities would hardly improve on the situation as it now is in the National House and many of the State legislatures. And to subsidize such men in rural areas would very likely be to kindle the kind of rural sentiment which many times has frustrated labor's legislative plans.

For countrymen would be quick to see the most serious objection of all, the one raising the question of morality and even of loyalty. A proposal by the Association of Manufacturers to subsidize poor men who would vote the NAM way would arouse a roar of outrage, and rightly. It is merely a symptom of our present confusions that the A. F. of L. proposal is made in quarters which would most loudly denounce such an NAM scheme.

It just is not true in the United States that labor can get fair play in legislation only by subsidizing legislators. It is still true in the United States that all groups in the population will fare best when independent men are elected to consider the interests of all groups.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say to the Senator from Missouri that I completely associate myself with his observations on the basic principles of good government which he has risen to defend.

Along the same line, I point out that, of course, one of our difficulties today is that many people feel that our representatives in various legislative bodies, on a State basis as well as on a Congressional basis, do in fact represent special interests, and do in fact sit in their legislative seats not as representatives of all the people, but as representatives of certain forces which exercise tremendous influence on their elections and on their income.

I point out to the Senator from Missouri that I have had pending for a long time in the Senate a resolution which, so far as this body is concerned, would require every Member of the United States Senate to place on record for public inspection all the sources of his income, no matter where the source. If we are going to retain the confidence of the American people in the legislative process, they are entitled to know to what extent, if any—and they are entitled to draw their own inferences—the sources of income of any legislator may affect the votes which he casts, either in the United States Senate or any other legislative body.

Up to date I have not been able even to obtain a hearing on my resolution; but I say that it is fundamental to good government and to the preservation of a sound legislative process. If men do not wish to make the sources of their income public, they do not have to run for office. But if they stand before the American people for election to the United States Senate, then I say that they should be willing to make the record public as to where they get their income, and in what amounts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as bearing upon the very matter upon which the Senator from Missouri has so eloquently spoken today, an article which appeared in a recent issue of This Week magazine, written by a State senator in the Oregon State Legislature. The article is entitled "I Am a $5-a-Day Senator."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I AM A $5-A-DAY SENATOR

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

My ears still burn from the scolding given me by a prominent constituent who visited the capital of our State on urgent business and could not find the senator from his district at any of the leading hotels. He wondered sarcastically where I had been keeping myself in Salem.

When I told him my wife and I had to live in a small auto court on the edge of town because my pay as a State senator averaged only $5 a day, he was flabbergasted.

Millions of other citizens of the United States, I have concluded, must be similarly uninformed. Otherwise, would they let the people who set policy for their schools, highways, courts, and welfare institutions work for lower pay than a baby-sitter or a caddie on a golf course?

I belong to the most neglected lawmaking body on earth—an American State legislature.

Nor is my State, Oregon, out of line with the national pattern. In New England, for example, Connecticut pays its legislators $600 for a 2-year term. The most recent session

went on for 145 days, giving the senators and representatives a daily wage of $4.13. Vermont pays the framers of its laws $750 for one term of office. At the last session this meant $6.88 a day. And New Hampshire doles out just $200 to its legislators every 2 years. The 1947 session lasted 182 days, making the salary of New Hampshire senators and representatives $1.09 daily, the lowest in the Nation.

It's pretty much the same everywhere. The most recent Missouri legislature worked 6 months—which made its daily pay $9.41. West Virginia legislators get $500 a year. Texas pays $10 for the first 120 days, $5 thereafter. Utah musters yearly pay of $300. Tennessee's scale is ¢4 a day, a wage which vanishes after the seventy-fifth day of a session.

LUCKY HANDFUL

In evaluating these wages, remember that the legislators have to leave their homes and live at the capital. A few States—notably Alabama, Arkansas, Washington, Kansas, and Arizona—add modest maintenance allowances to meet the hotel expenses of legislators. But the majority of States still require their lawmakers to eat and sleep in a distant city on wages that the most unskilled laborer would spurn.

As a friend of mine in the Montana Legislature says, "I appreciate the privilege, but I don't know how long I can afford it."

Only a handful of States pay salaries to their legislators which total more than $100 a month for an entire year. These generally are the States which pay an annual salary. New York leads the list with $5,000 a year. New Jersey and Illinois are next with $3,000. Following them are Massachusetts with $2,750, Michigan with $2,400, and Ohio with $2,000. Pennsylvania and Maryland are the only other States above $1,200.

Over all, the average annual pay of each legislator in the Nation is about $900.

The other night my wife and I totaled up how much it will nick our savings to have me serve as an Oregon State senator. In addition to losing my normal income as a writer and journalist for nearly 3 months, we are behind at least $5 a day. And we economize by pooling our groceries and cooking with the family of a young senator in an adjacent auto court. We have a car pool, too. (We get 10 cents a mile expense money, but only for one round trip from home to the capital.)

SECRETARIES DO BETTER

There is one economy I have not yet practiced. Almost half our members try to struggle along financially by listing their wives as their secretaries. The wife then goes on the pay roll at $7 a day (a new bill may raise it to $8). This, combined with the member's $5 or $6 (he gets paid less than the secretary), just about enables these senators and representatives to break even.

Wives of most legislators are not trained stenographers and the business of the State is not exactly expedited by their efforts. As I write this, a senator at a nearby desk is attempting to dictate a proposed statute to his wife. The wife cannot take shorthand. The senator must linger several seconds over each phrase; later the wife will diligently hunt for the right keys on the typewriter for an hour or two. A bill which may change educational policy for Oregon's quarter of a million school children might wind up with a typographical error that will put the State supreme court to work for weeks.

THE CITY GETS A LAUGH

The economies forced upon members of the legislature often give the capital city a chuckle. More than one dignified senator has been sternly reprimanded for preparing breakfast on a hot plate smuggled into his hotel room. And virtually every member picks up a few extra dollars at the end of the session by selling his set of the State's legal code to a bookstore or law library.

"I ought to keep those books," a young businessman in the senate confided, "so I'll know exactly what laws we passed or amended, but, by golly, I'm so far behind I've got to have that extra $50."

It may all sound slightly comic, but there is an aspect to it which rubs away the humor. There are 90 members in our legislature, and for every member and representative a half-dozen lobbyists crowd the capitol cloakrooms and hotel corridors. Armed with liberal expense accounts, they like nothing better than to pick up a legislator's dinner check, provide him with a bottle of liquor or a baked ham, or furnish him with a car and driver. It's gotten to the point where if you're a good lobbyist you can sometimes swing a vote for a steak dinner.

The lower the pay of a senator or a representative, the less well he is equipped to resist such blandishments. A man who would never think of accepting a bribe will let a lobbyist take care of some of his meal checks. It all seems perfectly innocent. But when the time comes for the lobbyist to ask a favor, the member is hard put to turn him down.

The lobbyist's request may be trifling and perfectly proper; he may use his friendship with lawmakers merely to hasten passage of a harmless bill. But then again, the request may relate to exploitation of the State's natural resources. A lumber company may hope to cut timber on school lands without competitive bids. A State may suffer a loss in millions because it is unwilling to authorize the few thousands in legislative pay which would make its senators and representatives self-supporting. It's the old story of penny-wise, pound-foolish.

I know a man who lobbies at State capitals all along the Pacific coast. He admits frankly that it is easier and cheaper to bring his influence to bear in Oregon than in California, where members are paid $1,200 a year plus expenses.

DIME-STORE LOBBYING

"The Oregon legislators are just as honest but less independent," confides this lobbyist. "Their measly pay makes them susceptible to what I call dime-store lobbying. You can get a key committee member indebted to you for the price of eggs and bacon."

In some States reports frequently hint of some senator or representative allowing his hotel bill to be paid by the local utility company. How much independence can be expected of a lawmaker under such circumstances?

In our own legislature I notice an increasing number of members who are openly on retainers from corporations or trade-unions. They do not have to live within their pittance from the State. They are company lawyers or labor officials. But how will the interest of the public fare when it conflicts with that of the private organizations on whose pay rolls these men serve at the same time that they enact the State's laws?

Stunted legislative salaries work adversely in another manner. Members are under intense personal pressure to adjourn speedily and go home. They see their bank accounts melting away.

Put yourself in the place of a young electrical contractor I know, for example, who not only has to pay his living costs in the capital and support his household at home, but also hire a skilled man to carry on his business while he's gone.

FAST WORK

Yet the State's business must be transacted. Taxes must be levied and policies decided. When I served in the Oregon House of Representatives before the war, we rushed through bills in the closing days that not more than two or three of us had read. And they affected such vital matters as Columbia River water power and the commitment of insane persons.

What is the solution? The Council of State Governments, a national organization, recommends that legislators in all 48 States be paid an annual salary in keeping with their responsibilities. This would enable them to spend time on State problems all the year around, rather than only while the legislature is in session. As it is now, many men and women go to our State capitals wholly uninformed on the great issues they must settle.

TIMES HAVE CHANGED

In 24 States the pay of legislators is fixed by the State constitutions. Some of these constitutions were written in pioneer times when a hotel room was 50 cents a night and a chicken-liver breakfast cost a quarter. The Council of State Governments believes legislative salaries should be set by statute so they may be varied with economic changes as they occur.

But, basically, the long-range answer is for the average citizen to take a more immediate interest in the government closest to him and his family, the government of his State. Not only the pay of legislators needs correcting. Seven dollars for a secretary fails to compete with the far higher wages she can receive from the Federal Government. I couldn't get a competent stenographer to go to the legislature until a family friend volunteered to do it "for the experience." Like her boss, she is losing money living at the capital.

Furthermore, virtually all State legislative districts in America require reapportionment. But the citizen, with his eyes on distant Washington, D. C., has failed to see that this is done. Our legislature has not been reapportioned since 1910. As a result, although the State constitution requires that all Senators represent equal numbers of people, I have 78,170 constituents while a member a few rows away has 7,268.

PREP SCHOOL FOR PRESIDENTS

We neglect our legislatures, yet we expect them to furnish our national leaders of the future. Washington and Jefferson were members of the colonial legislature of Virginia. Abraham Lincoln served in the Illinois State Legislature for 7 years. Theodore Roosevelt and Franklin D. Roosevelt graduated from the New York Legislature at Albany. Mention a prominent United States Senator and the chances are he began his career as a State legislator.

Lately Congress has been occupied with raising the pay of the President and other National Government officials, in line with the rise in salaries in private business. But there's been little talk about the far more overdue pay rises for State legislators. A notable exception is Michigan, where legislative salaries have been increased from $3 a day to $2,400 a year. Let's hope this is a straw in the wind.

We often speak glibly of States' rights when we want to express alarm over the encroachment of the Federal Government on local authority. Too often we forget that States' responsibilities are a partner of this slogan.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I greatly appreciate the contribution which my friend from Oregon has made. I had secured, at the moment he asked me to yield, consent of the Senate to the inclusion in the RECORD at that point as a part of my remarks of the editorial appearing in this morning's Baltimore Sun. I desire to emphasize particularly a few sentences which appear in the body of that editorial. It is entitled "A Curious A. F. of L. Scheme To Subsidize

Legislators." One of the sentences in the editorial reads:

The plan apparently would be to put lawmakers on a special union pay roll if they bound themselves to see the public welfare through union eyes. The idea is limited so far, apparently, to State legislators.

A little further along in the editorial I find this sentence with respect to the curious proposal of the A. F. of L.:

It is a proposal which wise heads within the labor movement will wish to reconsider, and probably in the end to withdraw.

Near the end of the editorial is this very clear and pungent statement:

For countrymen would be quick to see the most serious objection of all, the one raising the question of morality and even of loyalty. A proposal by the Association of Manufacturers to subsidize poor men who would vote the NAM way would arouse a roar of outrage, and rightly. It is merely a symptom of our present confusions that the A. F. of L. proposal is made in quarters which would most loudly denounce such an NAM scheme.

It just is not true in the United States that labor can get fair play in legislation only by subsidizing legislators. It is still true in the United States that all groups in the population will fare best when independent men are elected to consider the interests of all groups.

Mr. President, I desire to touch very briefly today upon what is probably even a far greater and more important point than that which I have thus far referred.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Before the Senator leaves the subject which he has been discussing, may I inquire whether he has a copy of the resolution adopted at Miami?

Mr. DONNELL. No, I have not. However, I have in my hand the Kansas City Star of yesterday, February 13, with an extended Associated Press dispatch. Indeed, it is the first article on the front page of the Kansas City Star. It is entitled "A Labor 'Subsidy'." The subheads are, "A. F. of L. would put State legislators on pay roll so that they could 'afford' to run. May pay poll tax, too. This would boost the number of eligible voters in the South. A national newspaper and radio program also proposed to carry political views."

Apparently there is an identical article in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of yesterday.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator think it is quite fair to the A. F. of L. to attack them the way he has done without first getting a full copy of the resolution which was introduced?

Mr. DONNELL. I think it is not only fair, but I think it is imperative. One of the great news services of the country, the Associated Press, without any qualification whatsoever, has carried the dispatch which I have read. It appears in two of the leading newspapers of my State. The St. Louis Globe-Democrat is one among three great newspapers in that metropolis. The Kansas City Star is a great newspaper known throughout the Central West. It is published in Kansas City. I think we are entitled to take the word of the Associated Press, without requiring certified copies or other copies of the resolution, for the purpose of calling attention to the importance of the American Federation of Labor abandoning any such idea as this.

Further in response to the Senator, the fact that a great newspaper such as the Baltimore Sun has printed this interesting and important editorial is in itself indicative of the fact that it is appropriate and timely that this subject be discussed today on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I realize that my distinguished friend has had a great deal of experience in public life. If he is interested, I can show him one quotation after another from the Associated Press which is absolutely false. When I was Governor of my State, newspapers having the Associated Press coverage would leave entire paragraphs out of releases which I had given to the Associated Press.

In other words, if I make myself clear, the excerpts which the distinguished Senator has read from the Kansas City Star and the St. Louis Globe-Democrat may be absolutely true, and yet a part of the release given out by the A. F. of L. may have been eliminated.

It seems to me that we are entitled to have a full copy of the resolution, because the A. F. of L. made a remarkable record during the war for loyalty, and distinguished itself by the vast amount of work which it accomplished during that time. I believe that upon reflection the able Senator will agree with me that the full resolution should be obtained before he goes further.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I may say that I thoroughly agree that we should have in the Senate, and I hope there will be placed before the Senate by any Senator who can secure it, an exact, verbatim copy of what was done.

In this connection I call to the attention of the Senator the concluding sentence which I read from the Kansas City Star article with reference to the proposal. The sentence reads as follows:

The proposal was made by a high-ranking A. F. of L. official in a written statement presented to the Labor League's administrative council.

I call to his attention also the fact that the preceding sentence of the article reads:

Thus, it was proposed and virtually decided that the league will help elect and thereafter augment the salaries of legislators endorsed by labor where they have insufficient funds of their own to get by.

Mr. President, what I am saying is no attack upon the American Federation of Labor. I have a very high admiration for the fine public service it has rendered. I realize, as does the Senator from North Dakota, that during the war the American Federation of Labor made a notable and outstanding contribution to the welfare of our Nation.

What I attack here today is the principle of any such proposal as this one, a principle which is wrong and is a mistake and is reprehensible. If my statement of facts is incorrect, obviously the correct statement of facts should be placed in the RECORD.

Perhaps a mistake occurs here or there, of course, but I submit that in the Senate day after day and week after week we rely, generally speaking with assurance, upon dispatches sent out by the great press services of the country, particularly when they are used by outstanding journals as leading articles of those publications in our various communities.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield for an inquiry.

Mr. LANGER. In the first place, the article does not state who gave the interview. It simply says "a high ranking A. F. of L. official." Furthermore, the article does not say that such an agreement has been made. It simply says that the matter was "virtually decided."

Let me call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Missouri to the fact that I do not have the reliance he has upon the Associated Press. I remember only too well when in this very body, in 1915 or early 1916, I believe it was, the former Senator La Follette, Sr., was criticized by this body when it relied upon an Associated Press dispatch in connection with World War I. At that time the Senate nearly expelled Senator La Follette. But a few months later the Associated Press abjectly apologized for having given circulation to something that did not actually take place at the meeting at St. Paul, Minn., in connection with which the distinguished Senator La Follette was accused of saying something that he actually did not say at all.

So I am sure that the distinguished Senator from Missouri upon reflection will wish to obtain the entire resolution, because I know the fairness in his heart. I know his generosity, and I am sure he would not wish to say anything about the American Federation of Labor until he was entirely satisfied as to the real facts.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. DONNELL. I do.

Mr. MORSE. Is the junior Senator from Oregon correct in his understanding that the Senator from Missouri has made these comments today in the belief that at the American Federation of Labor convention a proposal was made that when men endorsed by the American Federation of Labor for candidacy for State legislatures do not have sufficient financial resources with which to run for the office and serve during the term of the office, the American Federation of Labor should supplement their State salaries with labor money?

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator is precisely correct.

In addition, I have relied upon two further facts, or at least two further statements in the article by the Associated Press. One is as follows:

Details were worked out at the A. F. of L. executive council's recent midwinter session at Miami, Fla.

League leaders decided that union members or people sympathetic with labor's aims could have a great voice, or even control, in State legislatures if more such persons could be induced to run for office.

I also relied, if I may answer the Senator further, upon this additional sentence

of the article appearing in the Kansas City Star, to which I have referred, as carried in the dispatch for the Associated Press:

Thus, it was proposed and virtually decided that the league will help elect and thereafter augment the salaries of legislators endorsed by labor where they have insufficient funds of their own to get by.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Is it the Senator's position today that if such a proposal were in fact made, it cannot be reconciled with good principles of sound government?

Mr. DONNELL. Precisely.

Mr. MORSE. Is it also the position of the Senator from Missouri that if such a proposal in fact were not made, then it is incumbent upon the A. F. of L. to make that fact very clear to the American people and issue a statement as to what the real facts in the matter are?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, without undertaking to tell the A. F. of L. what its duties are, I would say that it is certainly the privilege of the A. F. of L. to make a statement in that connection; and I shall be glad, if that is desired, to carry to the floor of the Senate, when it is furnished to me, anything the American Federation of Labor may desire to say in regard to the premises.

However, the Senator from Oregon is precisely correct. It would make no difference whether it were the A. F. of L., the CIO, the National Association of Manufacturers, the American Medical Association, the Association of Railway Labor Executives, or any other organization, whatever it might be, of either labor or management. Even if it were by mistake, if that were possible, or even if it shall prove to be the fact, which I have no reason to think, the very fact that the proposal is heralded to the public, placed before the Nation, and read by millions of people demands and makes not only important but imperative that the views now being expressed in the Senate be placed before the people of the United States. I take that position, not because they are my personal views or because I am the one who is making this statement, but because sound judgment, political morality, and proper concepts of government and of the proper functioning of a legislative body all demand that clarification be made of the proposal which is said to have been virtually adopted.

REPORT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 74)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 1180.)

REPORT ON LEND-LEASE OPERATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 75)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 1180.)

THE PROPOSED NORTH ATLANTIC SECURITY PACT

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I now desire to address myself briefly to a further proposition which likewise appears in the newspapers, and I assume that the Senator from North Dakota will not be unduly critical of me if I accept the newspaper account, at least tentatively, for purposes of making a suggestion.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Let me say that I would never be critical of the distinguished Senator from Missouri, because 99 percent of the time he is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. I wish to say that the loyalty and good friendship of my esteemed colleague, the Senator from North Dakota, justify a use of the superlative, but the fact is that I am wrong many more times than he so generously indicates.

However, I desire to adopt as the thesis of the further remarks I shall make, a portion of an important article likewise appearing on the front page of the Kansas City Times. Those Members of the Senate who are familiar with the newspapers of Kansas City will recall that the morning Kansas City Star is known as the Kansas City Times. The Kansas City Times of February 12, last Saturday, the day before yesterday, carried an article entitled: "United States Pledges Aid—Norway Is Assured It Would Have Substantial Military Backing—Long Talk on Problems—Oslo Foreign Minister Leaves for London After Meeting With Acheson."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks this article be set forth in its entirety.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, in this article we are told that the United States was reported to have assured Norway on February 11 that it can enter the proposed North Atlantic alliance as a full partner and with assurance of substantial military backing from this and other member countries.

The article then proceeds to recite:

That summary of the basic American attitude toward Norway's defense problems is understood to have been given to the Norwegian Foreign Minister, Halvard Lange, by Secretary Acheson in an 80-minute conference at the State Department this afternoon.

That is, on February 11.

It appears, according to this article, that earlier in the day Mr. Lange had conferred briefly with President Truman. After meeting with the Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, he wound up his week-long visit to Washington with a call on the Republican foreign policy leader, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. The article then continues as follows:

Acheson and Lange issued a joint statement saying that they had held a "full and frank" discussion of the objectives and nature" of the North Atlantic security project.

The article then continues with respect to a further statement by Mr. Lange. Then, further in the article, is this:

Lange first saw Acheson Monday and raised a half dozen major questions regarding the Atlantic treaty proposal and the role Norway might play in it. He presented today a memorandum of the questions he raised in the first meeting and received answers from Acheson.

The article proceeds:

While the meeting was secret, it was understood that in general, Acheson covered these points.

There appear then a number of points, the third one of which is the one to which I address myself. In order that the third one may properly be before the Senate, however, I shall read points 1 and 2. I quote from the article. These are points, "it is understood," so the article states, covered in general by Secretary Acheson.

1. The United States and other North Atlantic countries—seven are now negotiating a treaty draft here—

That is to say, in Washington—

would be glad to see Norway join the group when it is enlarged before the treaty is put into final form and readied for signing. But no official invitation was issued to Norway to join and responsible informants insisted that no pressure was exercised to influence the Norwegian foreign minister one way or the other.

This is in bold type:

2. The United States, subject to Senate approval of the treaty, will make the strongest possible commitment to give prompt and effective aid if any one of the countries in the Alliance is attacked, but only Congress can declare war.

Then, the third of these points, being the one to which the attention of the Senate is specifically invited at this moment:

3. Military action, therefore, cannot be committed in advance. But—

Notice this sentence—

But in joining the Alliance the American Government would subscribe to the principle that an attack on one member nation was an attack on all, and this would be interpreted as a moral commitment to fight.

Mr. President, it is to this language, "this would be interpreted as a moral commitment to fight," that attention is respectfully directed. If the President of the United States of America shall make a moral commitment, the Nation must, and I believe it will be, scrupulously careful to keep that commitment, just as fully as if it were a legal commitment. Our national word, as well as the word of the individual members of this great legislative body, should be as good as our bond. So, Mr. President, if that be true, and again I may say to the Senator from North Dakota, I have not seen the draft—I do not know whether he has—of the proposed North Atlantic alliance pact, but if it be true, as stated in this article from the Kansas City Times,

which in turn derived the information from the Associated Press—if it be true that Mr. Acheson in general covered the point that "in joining the alliance, the American Government would subscribe to the principle that an attack on one member nation was an attack on all"—and I say, if it be true, Mr. President, to read the remainder of the sentence, that "this would be interpreted as a moral commitment to fight," I want to protest, here and now, against our country being made subject to any moral commitment which, in good conscience, would in the ultimate effect require Congress to go ahead and declare war sometime, even though Congress has the constitutional power to determine whether or not war should be declared.

Mr. President, a legal commitment to fight would be, in effect, a promise to declare war. And, of course, any such legal commitment in the North Atlantic alliance pact is recognized to be improper. Yes, the earlier point I read before this third one itself says—and I quote it again, "only Congress can declare war." Of course, section 8 of article I of the Constitution says:

> The Congress shall have power * * * to declare war.

If it be true that the proposed Atlantic pact is to include something which is going to involve, or may be believed justly and reasonably by the other signatories to involve, a moral commitment to go to war, I protest against the inclusion in that pact of any such provision.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am scarcely in a position to speak for the Secretary of State on this subject. I am in position to speak for myself. I think the Senator will find when the pact is available for specific study that that North Atlantic community agreement, which is misnamed when it is called an alliance, because of the connotations which that word involves historically, is based essentially on the theory of the Rio pact, which starts out with the same general assertion of common interest the Senator has quoted in respect to the proposed North Atlantic community agreement. I remind the Senator, however, that under the Rio pact it is spelled out specifically that each signatory power retains unto itself the entire right of decision respecting the implementation of its obligations both as to its individual contribution and as to its collective contribution in respect to an ultimate armed attack.

I repeat, I am not even attempting to respond for the Secretary of State; I am responding only for myself. I am saying to the Senator that inasmuch as this is the outcome and the implementation of the resolution which the Senate adopted late last spring by a vote of 64 to 4, I know at least what was intended in connection with the prospectus, and I should say to the Senator I would expect that the complete right of decision respecting the type of contribution to be made either individually or collectively in the presence of an armed attack would remain exclusively with each signatory, and that this fact would be made plain.

For myself, I may add that in my opinion the mere formal recognition of this community of interest in the event of an armed attack upon the Atlantic community, without another word in the treaty, would be an infinite assurance against world war III. In my opinion, if the Kaiser in World War I and the Fuehrer in World War II had been on notice that an armed attack against any of the friendly nations with whom we associate ourselves would be considered a cause even for us to consider and study and determine whether or not we would enter into the common defense, it would have stopped both those wars before they occurred, and in my opinion that one single designation of a commonalty of interest in the North Atlantic pact, without any implementation at all, is the best assurance against world war III.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator. May I respectfully ask him a question? Am I correct in understanding, or in assuming, that the Senator would not favor including in the North Atlantic pact anything which constitutes a moral commitment to fight on the part of the United States of America?

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator means an automatic commitment, my answer is Yes. Obviously, something is meant by a general assertion that we find common interest in our mutual safety. The implementation, I repeat, of that recognition, so far as the Senator from Michigan is concerned—the able Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] will speak for himself, but I know he agrees—so far as the implementation of any such community of interest is concerned, the decision will remain at home.

Mr. DONNELL. But the Senator would not favor, would he, a North Atlantic pact containing within it a moral commitment on the part of the United States to fight?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Not without its own independent decision to that end.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator, and I appreciate his contribution.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I shall yield in a moment.

Mr. CONNALLY. My name has been brought into the controversy.

Mr. DONNELL. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Texas in a moment.

Mr. President, it was my privilege some few weeks ago to read a very large portion of the very interesting debate which took place at the time when the resolution which was adopted last spring by a vote of 64 to 4 was being considered. I have read over the debate in large part, and I remember that the Senator from Michigan then, in response, as I recall, to vigorous questioning by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], gave assurance, without any shadow of a doubt, that in his opinion, that is, in the opinion of the Senator from Michigan, the adoption of that resolution would still leave it open to this country to determine whether or not it would enter into further commitments.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That continues to be the opinion of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I want to say that I did not hear all the discussion, but I assume it was with regard to the assumed obligations of the United States in the so-called North Atlantic Pact.

Mr. DONNELL. If the Senator would like the precise language which was under discussion, I shall be glad to give it. I had quoted from an Associated Press dispatch appearing on the front page of the Kansas City Times of February 12, in the course of which reference was made to a meeting between Mr. Lange, the representative of Norway, and Secretary Acheson, representing this country. The dispatch says:

> While the meeting was secret, it was understood that in general Mr. Acheson covered these points.

And the third of the points was this, to which I particularly addressed myself:

> Moral action, therefore, would not be committed in advance, but in joining the alliance the American Government would subscribe to the principle that an attack on one member nation was an attack on all.

The portion from there on was what I was particularly addressing myself to.

> This would be interpreted as a moral commitment to fight.

I was protesting, inasmuch as the word of our country, its moral obligation, ought to be, I believe, as good as its bond—against the inclusion of any such moral commitment which would, in effect, mean a legal commitment, if we value the rule of the observance of obligations.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not, of course, approve of any language which may be adopted which could be construed as automatically involving the United States in war.

Mr. DONNELL. Or as a moral commitment to fight?

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course. In the case of governments I do not know the difference between moral commitments and legal commitments. I certainly would not desire the adoption of any language which would morally commit us to fight. I think our morality is worth something in the world, and we would not want to play with a moral commitment, even though we might not be legally bound. But there are many people, and we have found them in government and elsewhere, who would favor automatically going to war, which would mean letting European nations declare war and letting us fight.

Mr. DONNELL. Which would, of course, be entirely contrary to the Constitution of the United States, would it not?

Mr. CONNALLY. Certainly. Congress alone has the power to declare war. Of course individual Senators declare war sometimes.

Mr. DONNELL. But those are only local wars.

Mr. CONNALLY. Seriously, I would not vote for any language of that kind. I have so told the Secretary of State, and I think he knows that I feel as does the Senator from Michigan, that the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations would not approve or adopt any form of language in an international agreement which would commit us to go to war when some other country in Europe might be attacked. We are not responsible for the disagreements which may arise in the countries of Europe. Any European nation might attack another nation, not merely the one country about which we hear so much talk.

I would not attempt to assess all the different ramifications involved but when and if the situation shall arise, the Government of the United States can legally, morally, and constitutionally determine what our course shall be under the given circumstances; that is reserved to the United States. If we think the controversy or situation is of such a nature that we should go to war, we can do so. If we think it is not of such a nature, we shall not go to war.

That is my horseback attitude in regard to the question at the moment.

Members of the Foreign Relations Committee are in communication with the Secretary of State and have conferred with him a time or two, and we shall confer with him again regarding these matters. The Senator from Missouri need not be disturbed about the attitude of some of us, at least, regarding the whole proposition. We are making it very plain to the Secretary of State, and to anyone else who has a part to play in regard to the matter, that that is our attitude.

Some persons cite the Rio treaty. That treaty does not go that far. There is not an exact parallel between the Rio treaty and the proposed treaty. In the case of the Rio treaty, it simply put into legal form that to which we were already committed. We have been committed since 1823 to the principle that if any European power attacked a South American country we would intervene to resist the attack. We did so in the case of Maximilian, in Mexico, in 1867, when we told Napoleon III to remove his army from Mexico. He withdrew his army from Mexico. So we have had that moral, if not legal, obligation for many years. It was much easier to do that in the case of Latin-American attack.

The Rio treaty does not obligate us to go to war; it simply obligates us to consult with and call on the foreign ministers and take appropriate action in the interest of peace, not in the interest of making war.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I shall yield in a moment.

I am greatly pleased at the contribution made by both these distinguished statesmen and members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. As I understand, neither of the Senators desires to put into the North Atlantic pact anything which constitutes a moral commitment on the part of the United States of America to go to war. If I have misinterpreted their statements, I pause now for a statement to the contrary from either or both of them.

I hear no such statement to the contrary.

I now yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Missouri a question. While it is, of course, perfectly clear that this country cannot, of its own volition, become involved in an act of war except by the declaration of the Congress of the United States, does the Senator believe that in our own national interest this Government should be unconcerned at an overt act of aggression by any power upon any of the member states in the United Nations?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I would say that I certainly agree with the tenor of the inquiry, which I judge indicates that the Senator from California means that our country is to be concerned with peace or war anywhere in the world.

The point I am making is that if we sign the North Atlantic pact, I do not believe the Members of the Senate desire to have it understood that this country is entering into what is termed in the article I have read a moral committment to fight, any more than I would want us to enter into a legal commitment to fight.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I believe the Senator from California has not concluded, and I yield to him, then I shall yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to say to the able Senator from Missouri that it seems to me in the day of airplanes and the atom bomb in which we now live, the American people and the American Congress must fully recognize the fact that peace in fact is in jeopardy, and that we can no longer be unconcerned at any overt act of aggression wherever it may occur in the world, because if the United Nations Charter means anything at all, it certainly must mean that the states which are signatories thereto hoped to establish a system of international law and order so that the peace of the world could be preserved for our generation, and for our children.

I do not believe that in this age, when transportation is as swift as it is, we could sit back twiddling our thumbs, so to speak, while nation after nation in Europe was being overrun by an aggressor power. I am sure the Senator from Missouri remembers, and would reply, that Holland was overrun in about 4 days, that Yugoslavia was completely overrun in about 18 days, if my memory serves me correctly, and that Poland was overrun in about 22 days. So, unless this Nation were prepared to take some affirmative action to uphold international law and order, we might find that the iron curtain had not only extended clear out to the English Channel, but perhaps beyond. I do not think the Senator wants to give the impression to the world that this Government would be unconcerned at any such act of aggression; and of course we hope that no such act of aggression will occur.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from California that of course I do not want the world to think that we would be unconcerned with acts of aggression. But neither do I want the countries or the people of the world, either signatory or not signatory to the North Atlantic Pact, to think that if we enter into it, if we do, we have made, not a legal commitment, because we cannot do that under the Constitution, but that we have made a moral commitment to fight. I do not want any such opinion to prevail anywhere. What I want may be stated in this way, that when the circumstances arise, even though they should require quick and immediate and prompt action, the Congress of the United States should have the power then, not as ceded away a few years, perhaps, before the circumstances should arise, and the legal right, and the moral right, unrestricted by any prior moral or other commitment, to determine whether or not we shall fight, whether or not we shall enter upon war.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Regarding the inquiry propounded by the Senator from California, of course we are interested in the peace of the world. But that does not mean that we shall blindfold ourselves and make a commitment now to enter every war that may occur in the next 10 years, and send our boys and resources to Europe to fight.

Mr. DONNELL. I am glad to hear the Senator say that.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is the view some people seem to take of the whole situation. The nations in Europe are not fighting now. All the outrages which have been committed seem to be tolerated by the people of the countries involved. I do not approve of them, of course. But I do not believe in giving carte blanche assurance to these people, "Do everything you want to do, you need not worry, as soon as anything happens, we will come over and fight your quarrel for you. In the meantime you may have a good time, and bask in the sunshine of leadership which you do not deserve."

Mr. President, the mere fact that we associate ourselves with these other governments in a consultative capacity, we will say for the moment, agree to talk with them, advise with them, and talk to their foreign ministers, will of itself have a tremendous moral effect upon any possible enemies who might appear. I do not believe any great power is hunting a war with the United States, and I do not think they look on us with any idea that they could successfully conquer us. But it would have an influence if they knew that we were in favor of democratic governments in other nations, that we are advising with them and talking with them, and possibly would join them, but that such joinder must come after Congress, knowing the facts, viewing the issues, weighing our own responsibilities, determines that we should go to war.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, in my opinion the Senator has spoken sound

words of wisdom, and I am very happy to hear him express himself so forcefully and vigorously on this subject.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I think the Senator from Missouri is to be congratulated for having opened up this discussion, which I think is a very valuable one, and the remarks which have been made by the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Michigan on the legal and moral phases of the subject are, I think, of the utmost importance.

Certainly, if we were to agree to an old-fashioned European type of alliance, in which when one member of the alliance gets into war the war automatically spreads to every other nation, in my judgment that would be a very unfortunate result. I cannot conceive that such a proposal would be submitted to us, or that the Senate would ratify it. To put the war-making power in the hands of other nations, or for us to underwrite nations over whose foreign policy we had no control, would I think be a great mistake. I think the genius of the undertaking under discussion insofar as it has genius, is that it does not attempt to do that.

Mr. DONNELL. I take it the Senator would not favor our going into such a pact which contained a moral commitment on the part of the United States.

Mr. LODGE. I do not see how it is possible to take away from Congress the right to declare war.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator would not be in favor of making a moral commitment, even if it were not a legal commitment.

Mr. LODGE. I am not sure that I know the difference between a legal and a moral commitment, but I think it would be a mistake to attempt to take away from the Congress the right to declare war on the part of our country.

I think a strong argument could be made for the contention of the Senator from Michigan, so dramatically and interestingly developed, that if the Kaiser had known that the United States would take a very special interest in his war-making activities, or if Hitler had known that the United States would take a very special interest in what he was doing, those two wars might not have occurred. But I feel we should always remember, in considering this matter, not only the moral phase and the legal phase, but the phase of practical military implementation. How is such an agreement to be administered, how is it to be implemented? The answer to that question is bound to have a strong effect on any would-be aggressor, because people like the Kaiser and Hitler are never as much embarrassed by words and phrases and good intentions as they are by their knowledge of the actual physical military means that are ready to be used in order to fight. We on our part should always remember in considering matters of this kind that if they are worth anything they are going to involve a military effort by this country in the way of weapons, in the way of manpower, in the way of diversion of human energy from the pursuits of peace, and it would be most unfortunate if in looking at this proposition we do not always bear in mind the question of implementing it from the standpoint of weapons and practical military effort.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield so that I may address an inquiry to the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]? I was sitting in the rear of the Senate Chamber when I heard an observation made by the distinguished Senator from Texas. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Missouri if he will yield so I may propound a question to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DONNELL. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. It is my understanding that the hemispheric security we have enjoyed has been the result of the Monroe Doctrine.

Mr. CONNALLY. I so stated.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. I understood the distinguished Senator from Texas to say that the North Atlantic pact was only an extension of the Rio pact. Is that true?

Mr. CONNALLY. No.

Mr. WHERRY. I was in the rear of the room and did not hear distinctly.

Mr. CONNALLY. I said there were those who were citing the Rio pact as a precedent for the North Atlantic pact, and I cited the Rio pact to show that it did not present a parallel situation at all. I said that since 1823 we had made the Monroe Doctrine our national policy, and that we were ready to fight without any treaty if any country in the Western Hemisphere were attacked, but that principle did not apply to the proposed new pact; that under it we had no moral obligation to go to war, and had not pledged ourselves to defend Europe.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the Senator from Texas if the South American countries have been considered in the formation of the North Atlantic pact, that is, the countries that are associated in the western hempispheric agreement?

Mr. CONNALLY. So far as I know, they have not. They may have been consulted; I do not know; but they are not nations who are supposed to be signatories to the North Atlantic pact.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what I had in mind. I, of course, was asking simply for information. What I was trying to make clear was whether the North Atlantic pact is an extension of the Rio pact. I have now been informed by the Senator from Texas that it is not. The Senator, however, said that some contend it is an extension.

The question I now wish to ask is whether, in light of the security we in the Western Hemisphere have enjoyed because of the Monroe Doctrine, there has been any infringement upon the rights of any countries in this hemisphere, any of the South or Central American countries, in not inviting them to sit in during the consideration of the North Atlantic pact, and would such a situation affect in any way our relationship with them in the defense of the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not think there has been any infringement of their rights. There will be a protocol in the treaty, and the nations signing it will have to make the statement that the obligations they assume in no wise conflict with their own obligations to other countries not parties to the treaty.

Mr. WHERRY. So that they will have an opportunity to join as signatories to the pact.

Mr. CONNALLY. That part has not been completed.

Mr. WHERRY. Will they have to be consulted?

Mr. CONNALLY. I cannot give the Senator that assurance. I suppose they will.

Mr. WHERRY. Should they not be?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know that they should.

Mr. WHERRY. That is all I am trying to find out.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator from Nebraska that the North Atlantic pact or treaty has not been completed. On several occasions the members of the Foreign Relations Committee have been in conference with the Secretary of State concerning it. The Senator is aware of what happened to the Norwegian Foreign Minister. He came to the United States. He went back probably with different ideas than he had when he came. There is still uncertainty as to what the Scandinavian League may do. So that particular point, I will say to the Senator, has not yet been developed. I do not know what will be proposed. But let me say to the Senator that every line of the proposed treaty will be scanned by the Senator from Texas, the Senator from Michigan, and the Committe on Foreign Relations. We have had the pledge of the State Department that they will not sign any treaty until we have had a look at it. We propose to go through it pretty carefully in every respect. We have as much concern for the safety of the United States as has the State Department. We have as much concern about our relations in preserving the peace of the world as has the State Department. We want to preserve the peace of the world and we will do all we can to preserve it. We cannot, however, be Sir Galahads, and every time we hear a gun fired plunge into war and take sides without knowing what we are doing, and without knowing the issues involved. That is my attitude.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from Texas for his observations. I also thank the Senator from Missouri for permitting me to propound the inquiries I did of the Senator from Texas. I wanted to have the point cleared up. It seems to me if we are to preserve the security of the Western Hemisphere it is vital that before the North Atlantic pact is concluded the Nation's signatory of the Rio pact be given an opportunity to set forth their views, so that we may not lose their good will, or the protection that has been accorded the Western Hemisphere by the adoption of the old Monroe doctrine. I do not believe we should conclude action without giving the South American nations opportunity to consider the pact.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say that some of the Nations signatory to the Rio

pact have not yet ratified it, at least they have not filed their ratifications as yet.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it a fact that only two of the countries have ratified the Rio pact?

Mr. CONNALLY. It was a fact some time ago, but I think additional ones have filed their ratifications since that time.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let us not have a misunderstanding on that subject. The Rio pact came into effect only when 14 countries had ratified it. Since the 14 have ratified others have ratified. I think there are some four out of twenty that have not deposited their ratifications.

If the Senator from Missouri will further yield, I should like to make very sure that the Rio pact, as involved in the present discussion, is not misunderstood. I think I was responsible for injecting it into the debate. The reason I injected it was to point out that even under the Rio pact—which certainly has a more intimate traditional obligation on us than any other sort of pact—there is no automatic obligation on the Government of the United States to do anything, and even if a consultation under the Rio pact results in a vote of the signatory powers to go to war, only those who vote to go to war are bound in the consultations.

Mr. DONNELL. So that there is neither a legal nor a moral obligation at this time in the Rio pact, for the United States of America to go to war. Is that correct?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct. And I was pointing out that if that is the attitude we took in respect to our good neighbors in the Western world, obviously we not only could not but should not go beyond that sort of an obligation in dealing with the North Atlantic community.

I should like, however, to add a word further if I may, Mr. President. I am very glad the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] made the interjection he did, because I would not want the debate today to indicate that our sole interest in the peace and security of the North Atlantic community is confined to our ability to avoid any responsibility in connection with it, and I am sure that is not the attitude of the Senator from Missouri. In my opinion there is no obligation contemplated in the North Atlantic community which is not already inherent in our pledge to the United Nations and our membership in it. There will be nothing, in my expectation, in the North Atlantic pact which is not written within the four corners of the United Nations Charter, and will specifically be so confined. Even if there were no United Nations Charter, and even if there never was a North Atlantic community, the sheer reality of the facts of life in this atomic age today present us with a situation in the North Atlantic community which inevitably would challenge our interest if world war III were to start in any such fashion as the other two world wars did. In my view what we are undertaking to do in the North Atlantic pact is nothing more than to acknowledge in writing the facts of life as they are. In my opinion the fact that we have underscored those facts of life will serve a notice upon potential agressors which they will not ignore or overlook, and we will never have to examine anything except the first sentence in the North Atlantic pact in order to have substantially underwritten peace.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his very notable contribution to this discussion.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FULBRIGHT in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator from Missouri that in the case of an outbreak of war or an act of aggression, we shall be following it along in our chancelleries. We shall know the issues involved, and the Congress will be better advised than anyone else as to whether we should take action immediately, or whether we should take action at all with regard to a declaration of war.

As I see it, this pact is more or less an official expression of our interest in peace and of our interest in the nations which are associating themselves together in the North Atlantic pact. We shall consult with them. We shall advise with them. But the pact does not carry any pledge—moral, legal, physical, or any other kind—that we must automatically go to war when some European nation demands that we fight its war.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may address an inquiry to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. DONNELL. If the Senator will bear with me a moment, I cannot very well keep all these observations in mind unless I comment on them at the moment.

With reference to the comments made by the Senator from Texas, of course, I share with him, and I think every other Senator shares with him and with the Senator from Michigan, an interest in peace. I think we all realize the close interdependence of the world at this time. We are living in the atomic age, an age of shortened distances, when a jet-propelled plane can cross the country from the west coast to Washington in a little more than 3 hours. I believe I feel as other Senators do. But the point I have in mind is that I do not want anything in the North Atlantic pact, if we adopt it, to justify the statement that its contents would be interpreted as a moral commitment to fight. I want the power left in Congress to declare war or not to declare war. Even though the words "declared war" or "obligation to fight" be not in the North Atlantic pact, I do not desire, and I do not believe other Senators desire, that pact to contain something which inferentially contains some kind of a commitment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. DONNELL. If the Senator from California will bear with me for a moment, I am not a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I speak with some degree of trepidation by reason of that fact. However, I have understood generally from the press that the North Atlantic alliance or pact—if that is the more correct term, as the Senator from Michigan indicates—is contemplated to be between the United States of America, Canada, Great Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and probably one or more of the other countries of western Europe.

A few weeks ago I observed a certain newspaper report which indicated that such a pact—and I quote from the newspaper report, which is not a quotation from the Secretary of State or from any official source, but which I trust is written in good faith—"will be written in general terms pledging mutual assistance in event of an attack upon any of the signatories, but avoiding any hard-and-fast clause committing them to go to war."

I am not satisfied with merely omitting a hard-and-fast clause committing us to go to war. I do not want in that pact anything that constitutes "the moral commitment to fight" referred to by the writer of this Associated Press résumé of what was understood in general to have been covered by Secretary Acheson.

I now yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to address an inquiry to the Senator from Texas relative to his last statement.

I think all of us have recognized, from reading the press dispatches, that the so-called North Atlantic pact was never contemplated—at least I so understood it, as one Member of the Senate—to bind the United States to support any one of the signatories who might be bent on aggressive war against a neighbor. My concept of this pact is that it is a pact of nonaggression. Therefore I certainly want to reiterate that I believe that under our existing obligations, understandings, or commitments—whatever the proper term may be—under the United Nations Charter, if an act of aggression is committed by some power against one of the other signatory powers, we are vitally concerned about it, without any North Atlantic Pact. So certainly by no stretch of the imagination could this pact be considered as one which would bind us if one of the several signatories should itself engage in an act of aggression. It is merely defensive in character.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I apologize for taking so much of the time of the Senator from Missouri, but he yielded to the Senator from California to permit him to propound a question to me.

Mr. DONNELL. I will permit the Senator from Texas to answer it, if I have that prerogative.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from California has injected a great many controversial questions. What is aggression? We might consider a certain act to be an act of aggression, and some other nation might not think so. Someone would have to determine that question. It is true that the United

Nations Charter deals with acts of aggression. Under article 51 it permits defense, either jointly or separately, against aggression. Article 51 of the Charter provides for the nations, independently of action by the United Nations itself, to adopt defensive measures, either with other powers or alone, against any act of aggression. The Senator's view does not change that situation.

It is possible that there might be a controversy between some of the nations which join this pact. If Germany were admitted as a member, which might well occur under the clause which allows nations to join at a later date, there might be a controversy between France and Germany. The Senator is aware of their divergent views on economics and on past wars, and their bitter nationalistic feelings. Of course we hope that no such controversy will arise. I am simply trying to preserve our own peace and security.

Something was said by the Senator from California about the atomic age. Yes; this is an atomic age. I believe that if the United States is to be a leader in the world or a help to the rest of the world toward preserving peace and restoring their economic life, the United States must remain strong. When it comes to atomic bombs, we must have more of them and better bombs than any other nation on earth, until they are regulated in some fashion under international agreement. We must have the best fleet of airplanes in the world. The Senator from Missouri mentioned jet-propelled planes. We must have better, faster, and harder-hitting jet-propelled planes, not for the purpose of conquest, not for the purpose of aggression, but to protect our own security and the security of our people.

This is not a chauvinistic attitude on my part. God knows, I do not want any more war. We have not demanded any reparations from the last war. We have treated our enemies better than they have treated themselves. We have asked for no territory. We have asked for no reparations. On the other hand, even nations which took up arms against us are today receiving the bounty of this Government through ERP and other relief measures. We are feeding the very people who fought us and killed our sons in various countries of Europe. So we are not out for conquest. We are out for peace. But in preserving the peace we ourselves must be strong. That is why I favor not assuming obligations which we do not intend to fulfill. I favor the Congress and the Executive retaining the right to determine the question of war or peace under the Constitution.

Mr. DONNELL. And under the circumstances at the time.

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course, under the cricumstances at the time, and under our traditions. That is my attitude on this question.

Mr. DONNELL. I am grateful to the Senator from Texas for his continued statement on this subject.

Mr. President, reference was made earlier to the resolution adopted by the Senate by a vote of 64 to 4. I have been pleased to hear today the comment of the Senator from Michigan and to recall the splendid, strong, vigorous assurances he gave on the floor of the Senate at the time when the resolution was adopted. I am not undertaking to cast upon his shoulders the responsibility for an interpretation of that resolution, for each one of us has a duty in that regard which cannot be delegated to the Senator from Michigan, nor can we absolve ourselves from that obligation. Nevertheless, Mr. President, in the course of the debate in which the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from Oregon participated with such vigor and clarity some months ago, immediately prior to the adoption of the resolution, it was made abundantly clear, it seems to me, that the full intent of those who proposed the resolution was that we in the Senate are not in any sense, either directly, indirectly, inferentially, morally, or otherwise, bound to support the North Atlantic pact because that resolution was adopted by a vote, as I have indicated, of 64 to 4—or, for that matter, if it had been adopted by any other vote.

I want it to be perfectly clear—not that it is of any special importance, but because I am one Member of the Senate—that I deem an expression of opinion on my part with respect to entry into this alliance or this pact to be premature at this time, and accordingly I make no such expression today. To my mind it is a subject on which, from its very nature, the most profound and careful thought must be bestowed, before it shall be acted upon by the Senate; and I have confidence that the Senate will devote such profound and careful thought to this subject before deciding what it will do with respect to entry into or refraining from entry into the pact.

In a few days, Mr. President, we shall hear upon this floor the reading, once again, of Washington's Farewell Address. So I take it that it is not out of place for me to mention now that that address contains certain language bearing most pertinently upon the subject now under discussion. Of course, I know it to be true that that address was written, not in the atomic age, but at a time when conditions of travel were very different. Nevertheless, it was written or delivered by a man whose words we regard with veneration and respect. We may not believe that his ultimate conclusions are entirely applicable to the situation confronting us in the year 1949. However, let us observe what he said:

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than to private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But, in my opinion, it is unnecessary and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves, by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Mr. President, it may be of interest to note that John Marshall, who perhaps is not so frequently quoted on the subject of foreign alliances or pacts, when writing about 2 years after the date of the delivery of Washington's Farewell Address, used the following language:

I do not think the interest and prosperity of America at all dependent on the alliance with any foreign nation; nor does the man exist who would regret more than myself the formation of such an alliance. In truth, America has, in my opinion, no motive for forming such connection and very powerful motives for avoiding them. Europe is eternally engaged in wars in which we have no interest, and with which the fondest policy forbids us to intermeddle.

We ought to avoid any compacts which may endanger our being involved in them. * * *

The whole of my politics respecting foreign nations are reducible to this single position. We ought to have commercial intercourse with all, but political ties with none.

Mr. President, of course there arises today the question whether present-day conditions—the atomic age, to which the Senator from California has referred, and perhaps the fact that the Atlantic Ocean, the crossing of which by John Marshall on his mission to France required 48 days, today can be crossed in a few hours—either demand or justify a new policy by the United States respecting foreign alliances. That question, as I have indicated, will require the most thorough consideration by the Senate, and will receive it I am confident.

So, Mr. President, in advance of seeing the pact and in advance of hearing the arguments by the distinguished Members of this body who will be far more familiar with the pact than will I, in my judgment it would be premature for me today to express an opinion as to whether I shall or shall not be in favor of the entry of the United States into the pact. But it is not premature, Mr. President, to my judgment, for me to express today, at this moment, strong dissent against any and all proposals to involve our Nation, by the North Atlantic pact, in any moral commitment to fight; and this I do.

EXHIBIT A

[From the Kansas City Times of February 12, 1949]

UNITED STATES PLEDGES AID—NORWAY IS ASSURED IT WOULD HAVE SUBSTANTIAL MILITARY BACKING—LONG TALK ON PROBLEM—OSLO FOREIGN MINISTER LEAVES FOR LONDON AFTER MEETING WITH ACHESON

WASHINGTON, February 11.—The United States was reported to have assured Norway today that it can enter the proposed North Atlantic alliance as a full partner and with assurance of substantial military backing from this and other member countries.

That summary of the basic American attitude toward Norway's defense problems is understood to have been given to the Norwegian Foreign Minister, Halvard Lange, by Secretary Acheson in an 80-minute conference at the State Department this afternoon.

Earlier in the day Lange had conferred briefly with President Truman, and after meeting with Acheson he wound up his week-long visit to Washington with a call on Senator VANDENBERG, the Republican foreign policy leader.

CALL IT A FRANK SESSION

Acheson and Lange issued a joint statement saying they had held a "full and frank discussion of the objectives and nature" of the North Atlantic security project.

Lange subsequently told the Associated Press, just before he left by plane for New York, that he had had "a very good reception" and a "very good discussion" which had yielded "very frank information." At the State Department he informed reporters he planned to meet Ernest Bevin, British Foreign Minister, in London Monday. His itinerary called for him to stop over in New York tonight, then leave for England tomorrow morning.

As he boarded a plane, Lange said "there is no inkling of truth" in reports the State Department put pressure on him in his stay to link Norway to the North Atlantic alliance.

"The situation has cleared as result of my visit," he said. "And my recommendations will depend on my reflections on the way back."

Lange first saw Acheson Monday and raised a half dozen major questions regarding the Atlantic treaty proposal and the role Norway might play in it. He presented today a memorandum of the questions he raised in the first meeting and received answers from Acheson.

OUTLINE OF DISCUSSIONS

While the meeting was secret, it was understood that in general Acheson covered these points:

1. The United States and other North Atlantic countries—seven are now negotiating a treaty draft here—would be glad to see Norway join the group when it is enlarged before the treaty is put into final form and readied for signing. But no official invitation was issued to Norway to join and responsible informants insisted that no pressure was exercised to influence the Norwegian Foreign Minister one way or the other.

2. The United States, subject to Senate approval of the treaty, will make the strongest possible commitment to give prompt and effective aid if any one of the countries in the alliance is attacked, but only Congress can declare war.

3. Military action, therefore, cannot be committed in advance. But in joining the alliance, the American Government would subscribe to the principle that an attack on one member nation was an attack on all and this would be interpreted as a moral commitment to fight.

ON BASIS OF POWER

4. The objective of the security system, under the United Nations Charter, is peaceful, and not, as the Russians have charged, aggressive. It is based on the principle that aggression by any country would be discouraged by confronting that country in advance with a powerful array of allied nations.

5. Norway, like every other member of the group, would be expected to dovetail its defense plans with over-all western grand strategy for defense, but it would not be required to provide advance bases, a point which the Russians recently raised with the Norwegian Government.

6. The United States is not prepared to say at this time in detail exactly what military arms and equipment it can supply under a mutual-aid program paralleling the alliance. President Truman is expected soon to recommend authorization for such a program to Congress.

On his part, Lange is understood to have taken the line that he was on a fact-finding mission and Norway's formal attitude toward the security project will not be determined until he has reported to the Government in Oslo and the matter has been discussed in the Storting (Parliament).

STRONG OPINION BEHIND IT

However, it is understood that he reported strong sentiment in Oslo for basing Norway's long-range security on the Western alliance rather than on a Swedish-proposed alliance of armed neutrality.

On this point, the State Department publicly has taken the position that because the supply of American military aid is limited, no aid can be promised those western European countries which do not join the alliance.

This, in effect, had already put Norway, Sweden, and Denmark on notice that they could not expect American help if they held aloof from the North Atlantic grouping of powers.

Another question which Lange is understood to have raised with Acheson is that of Norway's security during the period in which the North Atlantic treaty is being negotiated and pending its final ratification by all the nations. Diplomatic officials said the basic United States position on this point—and presumably the position which Acheson stated to Lange—is that the United States is already committed by the United Nations Charter to oppose aggression at any point and intends to live up to that commitment.

CROSS-WIND LANDING GEAR FOR AIRPLANES

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, toward the end of last year there were rumors that the Civil Aeronautics Administration was going to stop its work with cross-wind landing gear for airplanes.

I was much concerned, and on January 8 I wrote to the Civil Aeronautics Administration, asking for a detailed report on the cross-wind landing gear project.

I am happy to say that the report which has been furnished to me indicates that the Civil Aeronautics Administration not only has not stopped and is not planning to stop its cross-wind landing gear project, but, on the contrary, has had very good results to date, considers the project very much worthwhile, and is continuing the work.

For the information of the Members of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the report on cross-wind landing gear which I have received from the Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, consisting of a four-page letter with an enclosure in the form of a summary report prepared by Mr. John H. Geisse, consultant for cross-wind landing gears, and Mr. Lloyd Child, assistant to the Administrator for personal flying development, may be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, February 7, 1949.

The Honorable PAT MCCARRAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: I have your letter of January 8, and I am pleased to be able to give you a detailed report on the cross-wind landing gear project.

Enclosed is a copy of the Summary Report on Cross-Wind Landing Gears of May 1948, which covers the results on the Fairchild PT-19 and the Piper J-3 Cub equipped with the cross-wind landing gear. On pages 6 and 7 of this report are comments quoted from various pilots who have flown the cross-wind landing gear.

As you know, the appropriation which you obtained for cross-wind landing gears made it possible for us to contract with six manufacturers to have cross-wind landing gears designed and installed under CAA supervision. A brief report on these is as follows:

FAIRCHILD PT-19

Covered by enclosed report.

PIPER J-3 CUB

Covered by enclosed report.

ERCOUPE

The Firestone Aircraft Co. installed a cross-wind landing gear on the Ercoupe and delivered it to the CAA on August 12 1947. Various degrees of restraint in the swiveling were tried. Continuous experimentation was carried out with all kinds of schemes to improve the characteristics. It was found that a tie rod between the main wheels was beneficial. The favorable results obtained on this airplane have convinced us that cross-wind landing gears are suitable for tricycle undercarriages. These findings have been borne out by the Beech Aircraft Co. on their Bonanza airplane. At the start, Beech asserted that their Bonanza could land satisfactorily in cross-winds and that a cross-wind landing gear was not necessary. However, the Goodyear Aircraft Co. furnished a cross-wind installation for the Bonanza and have reported that they and the Beech officials are completely satisfied with the results. Apparently the Beech people are convinced that cross-wind landing gear is beneficial on a tricycle undercarriage.

BELLANCA-CRUISAIR

The Bellanca airplane was delivered to the CAA on April 15, 1948; on it the landing gear swiveled in the shock-absorber strut. Dual wheels on the main landing gear were furnished so as to eliminate the necessity for shimmy dampers. The original contract called for our flight testing this airplane for 50 hours. During that time we indoctrinated numerous pilots, all of whom were agreeably impressed by its performance. The airplane was demonstrated to the United States Army, United States Navy, the press, and delegations from England. We displayed it and gave demonstrations at air shows throughout the East. After 50 hours of satisfactory flying, we renewed the contract so as to have 50 more hours available. At the present time we are continuing the demonstrations and pilots' indoctrinations.

TWIN BEECH

The cross-wind landing gear was installed on a CAA twin Beech airplane by All American Airways, Inc., and delivered on April 15, 1948. The castering of the wheels took place in the oleo struts. Shimmy dampers and centering cams were also incorporated inside the struts. The airplane was demonstrated formally to the press, and the United States Army and Navy. After 3 months of flight tests, it was decided that improved shimmy dampers would be desirable. All American Airways was directed to design and install external hydraulic shimmy dampers and centering cylinders. Now the cross-wind landing gear functions satisfactorily. Pilots who have flown it are favorably impressed. At present, the airplane is assigned to our fourth region where flight demonstrations and pilots' indoctrinations are being held in the South and Middle West. We are obtaining an NC license for this installation.

DOUGLAS

The Goodyear Aircraft Co., of Akron, Ohio, was awarded the contract to install a cross-wind landing gear on a CAA Douglas DC-3 airplane. This consisted of castering mechanisms inside the wheels of the airplane similar in principle to those which had been so successful on the Piper Cub. The airplane was delivered to the CAA on March 14, 1948. Exhaustive demonstrations and flight tests have been performed on this airplane, both in connection with obtaining an NC license and in displaying it to the United States

Army and Navy, the United States and Canadian air lines and to the British representatives. All pilots' comments on this have been favorable. The Canadian Airline is particularly interested as they have the problem of snow removal and are of the opinion that the cross-wind landing gear may be worth while because only one runway would have to be plowed. The United States Army officers charged with airport construction were especially interested in the prospects of only having to build one strip because the runways for their big airplanes are excessively expensive. The Army pilots and our own pilots, who are involved in all-weather operations, have stated that the cross-wind landing gear is of great value during blind landings. After we had demonstrated it to the Sperry officials and pilots, the Sperry company ordered a set of similar wheels for their blind-landing DC-3 airplane.

NORTHROP-PIONEER

An order was given to the Northrop company to design a cross-wind landing gear for their Pioneer airplane. Only enough money was available for engineering through the design and stress analysis stages, but the work done by Northrop is of value because it contributed to the engineering art. It is hoped that their cross-wind gear will be installed on future Pioneer-type aircraft.

Increasing interest has been shown in the adoption of this type landing gear by both private and commercial flyers. At present the Goodyear Aircraft Co. has delivered more than 140 sets of cross-wind landing wheels for personal aircraft. Cessna airplanes have received most of these cross-wind undercarriages, but a few have been sold for Stinsons, Cubs, and Goodyear amphibians, all of which have passed their tests and have been approved by the CAA. Goodyear castering wheels have been installed experimentally on Aeronca and Beech Bonanza airplanes. Orders on hand have resulted in production go-ahead by Goodyear on 1,000 sets of cross-wind landing gears for personal aircraft and 20 sets for DC-3 air-line-type airplanes. Enclosed is a copy of the Goodyear report covering these installations.

I quote from a letter received from Mr. C. O. Bell, manager, landing gear and flight operations departments, Aviation Products Division, Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., dated January 6, as follows:

"We are going ahead obtaining approval on all the current light-plane production models of the various manufacturers and will be in a position this spring to supply cross-wind units to all manufacturers of light airplanes. We are in hopes that orders will start developing pretty rapidly because we now have quite a sizeable investment in this development."

In the Federal airport program our office of airports is favoring one-runway airports wherever possible, and not approving more than two runways except where traffic conditions so require.

As a result of the cross-wind landing-gear development, under CAA auspices, funds for which were provided by Congress largely through your efforts, I am happy to report that cross-wind landing gears are increasing the utility of airplanes.

Sincerely yours,

D. W. RENTZEL,
Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.

SUMMARY REPORT ON CROSS-WIND LANDING GEARS BY JOHN H. GEISSE, CONSULTANT FOR CROSS-WIND LANDING GEARS, AND LLOYD CHILD, ASSISTANT TO THE ADMINISTRATOR FOR PERSONAL FLYING DEVELOPMENT, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR, CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

SUMMARY

The Civil Aeronautics Administration initiated an investigation of the possibilities of cross-wind landing gears for airplanes in 1945. The objective of the program was to determine whether the safety and utility of the airplanes could be increased and whether large savings could be made in airport construction costs by the use of such landing gears.

The program was carried out by the award of contracts to manufacturers in the aviation industry to design, construct, and test such undercarriages on airplanes ranging in size from the Piper Cub to the Douglas DC-3 and including an airplane with a tricycle undercarriage.

This report covers the inauguration of the program, description of the modifications to the first two airplanes: the Fairchild PT-19 and the Piper J-3 and the results obtained therewith.

It is concluded from these results that personal type airplanes can be economically modified to enable pilots to take them off and land them across the wind with no more skill than that required for into-the-wind operations and with no more hazard and that the principle appears to be applicable to transport type airplanes.

Other advantages are noted and the opinions of some prominent aviation personalities who have flown these airplanes are given in support of the results reported and conclusions drawn. It is reported that in the tests the airplanes have been flown by over 200 individual pilots.

Heretofore it has been considered necessary that airports be constructed with sufficient runways to enable the airplanes to be landed directly into the wind or not more than 22½ degrees from directly into the wind for all winds in excess of 4 or 10 miles per hour. The lower velocity was accepted practice up to 1944 and since then the higher velocity has been used.

These restrictions were made necessary by the high degree of pilot skill required to make successful landings with a cross-wind. This high skill requirement was in turn due to the noncastering type of landing gear used.

The need of providing multiple runways to cover changes in wind direction has required the use of large areas for airports, thus greatly reducing the number of suitable sites available and materially increasing their initial cost and the cost of maintenance.

In 1946, the Congress passed the Federal Airport Act authorizing the appropriation of $520,000,000 of Federal funds to match State and municipal funds for the construction of new and improvement of existing airports. With the passage of the bill, the Federal Government acquired a prime interest in the costs of airports.

OBJECT

The objective of the development program, of which this report is a part, was to determine whether or not alterations could be made in the airplane landing gears at a reasonable cost in dollars and pounds which would eliminate requirement of multiple runways to accommodate changes in the direction of the wind.

SCOPE OF THIS REPORT

This report covers the inauguration of the program and the results obtained with two personal type airplanes: the Fairchild PT-19 and the Piper J-3. Later reports will be issued to cover modifications of the Ercoupe, the Bellanca Cruisair, the Beech AT-7, the Douglas DC-3 and the effect of this development upon commercial air transportation. All of the latter planes had successfully completed flight tests prior to the preparation of this report, but had not been subjected to the extensive service testing given to the Fairchild and Piper J-3.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Personal type airplanes can be constructed at a reasonable increase in cost and weight to make it possible to land and take off across the wind with the same facility and safety as into the wind.

2. There has been no indication that the principle involved cannot be applied as readily to transport type airplanes.

3. The expressed opinions of well over 200 pilots who have flown either the Fairchild or the Piper have been universally favorable and in most cases enthusiastic.

4. The number of close-in sites for the smaller airports (classes I, II, and III) which would be opened because of the smaller landing areas and the more limited approach areas which would be required is a factor of major importance.

5. This same factor together with aircraft noise abatement would bring aviation within the reach of the potential private flyer in metropolitan areas where the largest unrealized market for personal aircraft exists.

6. The cross-wind landing gear could also bring short haul commercial transportation to these metropolitan areas and to large cities which have a potential air transport market which, to date, has scarcely been touched.

7. Adoption of cross-wind landing gears would reduce pilot skill required for take-off and landing and hence would shorten pilot training time.

8. Adoption of cross-wind landing gears would materially reduce the number of landing accidents.

HISTORY

An undercarriage with castered wheels aiding cross-wind landings was described in the Pinaud patent of 1873. Again in 1910, the first crossing of the English Channel was made by a Bleriot airplane with a similar undercarriage and a United States patent was issued to Bleriot covering this undercarriage in 1911. Also, the earliest airplanes were equipped with the tricycle type undercarriage which incorporated main fixed wheels back of the center of gravity and a castered nose wheel. This type, as compared to later types, might also be termed a cross-wind landing gear.

Prior to the First World War, the castered and tricycle type undercarriages had been almost universally discarded in favor of undercarriages having two fixed wheels ahead of the center of gravity and a castered or steerable tail-skid or V-wheel. With the introduction of this type of undercarriage, ground loops due to landing in a drift became the principal source of landing accidents.

The Bureau of Air Commerce, the predecessor of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, reintroduced the tricycle gear in its small-plane development program in 1934. This led to its adoption by the military and transport air services. The Bureau also had started development of castered main wheels ahead of the center of gravity but the program was discontinued before its completion.

Prior to and during World War II, Mr. O. W. Maclaren carried on developments in England using steerable main wheels which could be set by the pilot in flight to accommodate drift landings. Mr. Maclaren was granted a United States patent on this type of undercarriage in 1940. In 1944 Piper Aircraft Corp. constructed and tested two experimental cross-wind undercarriages on their J-3 airplane but then dropped the project.

In 1945, when it became apparent that the aircraft industry was not inclined to carry on further development work on undercarriages to facilitate cross-wind landings on its own initiative, the Civil Aeronautics Administration was given an appropriation of $150,000 to foster such a development. In 1946 Congress reappropriated the unexpended balance and this was all obligated in fiscal 1947.

METHOD

It was decided at the start of the program that all of the development including design, construction, and tests would be placed in the hands of the industry through development contracts. It was also decided that these contracts should include a provision that, if any patents resulted from the work under the contracts, they would be assigned to the Government.

Contracts with individual inventors or others not in the aviation industry were not considered in the best interest of the program and none were granted. The reason for this was that the major objective of the program was not the development of novel cross-wind landing gears but that of determining the feasibility of the idea and interesting the industry in their adoption.

In line with this policy, the program was first called to the attention of the Aircraft Industries Association with the request that they interest their members in the taking of contracts. When this failed to produce results, individual manufacturers were requested to submit proposals and, as a result, contracts were awarded as follows:

Contractor	Date	Airplane	Amount
Fairchild Engine & Airplane Corp.	Feb. 8, 1946	Fairchild PT-19	$8,413.42
Goodyear Aircraft Corp.	May 27, 1946	Piper J-3	22,885.00
Firestone Aircraft Co.	Dec. 19, 1946	Ercoupe	12,000.00
All American Aviation, Inc.	May 21, 1947	Beech AT-7C	35,000.00
Bellanca Aircraft Corp.	June 12, 1947	Bellanca Cruisair	5,650.00
Northrop Aircraft, Inc.	June 19, 1947	Northrop Pioneer	10,000.00
Goodyear Aircraft Corp.	June 27, 1947	Douglas DC-3	51,800.00
Total			145,748.42

An early decision to include the steerable-type main wheels developed by Maclaren was later abandoned due to the excellent results obtained with the original castered gears and all of the above contracts cover castered gears.

Initial acceptance tests were conducted at the contractors' plants. Thereafter, the airplanes were brought to the Washington National Airport and made available for trial flights by both Government and civil pilots and for demonstrations to others interested. Thereafter, the airplanes were routed to the eight regions of the Civil Aeronautics Administration for further testing and demonstrations under the supervision of the personal flying assistants to the regional administrators. These demonstrations included demonstrations at various aviation meetings, and at the factories of aircraft manufacturers. Forms were prepared on which all pilots operating the airplanes could make a record of their flights and give their experience with an opinion of the modifications.

FAIRCHILD CONTRACT

The Fairchild Engine & Airplane Corp., Airplane Division, Hagerstown, Md., was awarded a contract to modify a Government-owned Fairchild PT-19 trainer in accordance with designs submitted by them.

The first modification consisted of providing an inclined kingpin ahead of the shock strut with hydraulic shimmy dampers and coil springs for centering. The springs were found insufficient to provide static stability and the propeller thrust was found insufficient to straighten the wheels from their maximum castered position. The design was then changed to include cams to provide the required static stability and centering force. A detailed description of the gear is provided in appendix I, page 9.

GOODYEAR CONTRACT

The Goodyear Aircraft Corp. was awarded a contract to determine the practicability of using kingpins mounted within the wheel hubs for airplanes in which external kingpins could not readily be used. The contract called for preliminary investigation on a rig which could be towed and subsequent construction and tests of an undercarriage on a Piper J-3 airplane. The Piper Aircraft Corp. loaned a plane for the initial tests and the Government supplied a Piper L-4 for the final installation.

The towing rig first designed by Goodyear used inclined kingpins to secure the desired caster length. Two tests revealed that the static instability was such that the propeller thrust would be insufficient to straighten the wheels from their maximum castered position. Then the rig was modified to include cams to secure static stability and centering force and the results of the tests were so encouraging that further tests of temporary gears were suspended and wheels incorporating kingpins and cams all within the wheel hubs were constructed and tested on a Piper J-3.

RESULTS

1. The Fairchild PT-19 was landed and taken off by three different pilots in a gusty cross wind with gusts up to 50 miles per hour. The Piper has been taken off and landed by a number of pilots at different times with cross winds of 35 miles per hour. In all cases, the pilots reported that no difficulty was encountered and that no special technique was required.

2. The Goodyear gear is now being offered as alternate equipment on new airplanes and as replacement equipment by the Stinson Division of Consolidated Vultee Corp. and the Cessna Aircraft Corp. Other personal airplane manufacturers are currently considering similar action.

3. Of the approximately 200 pilots who have flown either the Fairchild or the Piper, none has given an adverse report on either landing or take-off characteristics.

4. Some, but far less than the majority, of the pilots who have flown the Piper have been moderately critical of its taxiing characteristics.

5. Only minor mechanical failures have been encountered on the Fairchild and none on the Piper.

6. Total increase in weight was 28 pounds on the Fairchild and 12 pounds on the Piper.

7. The Goodyear Aircraft Corp. has reported that during their extended testing, they observed that the tire wear was noticeably less with the castered wheels than with conventional noncastered wheels.

8. The Piper wheels caster very freely due to low friction and a low degree of static stability. As a result, the airplane taxied in a yawed attitude under the slightest provocation and was yawed to its maximum 25 degrees limit by medium cross winds and medium accelerations in turns. When yawed to the full extent, the minimum radius of turn against the yaw was quite large when using only the steerable tailwheel due to its limited stroke. However, sharp turns around either wheel could be readily accomplished by use of differential braking. This low degree of stability also permitted the wheels to toe in and hamper movement when the airplane was pulled backward; although, this tendency could be eliminated by raising the tail high enough to provide a negative caster length. The Goodyear company later provided a notched cam to restrain the wheels from toeing in when the airplane is pulled backward which has eliminated this difficulty.

9. The Fairchild gear had a pronounced tendency to hold whatever position it initially had due to friction in the kingpins. It therefore had a tendency to taxi just like any conventional airplane once the wheels were straightened. However, the wheels could be thrown over to full caster by a rapid turn; and, thereafter, the airplane could be taxied in the resulting yawed attitude without the wheels straightening. Out on the field, this performance was not objectionable and had some advantages. However, when close to spectators or other airplanes, the high degree of propeller thrust required to return the wheels to neutral from fully castered position was objectionable. Changes in the cams and reduction of friction would eliminate the objection. The combination of high friction and high static stability prevented the wheels from toeing in when the airplane was pulled backward.

10. Most pilots were favorably impressed by the improved vision from the cockpit when the airplanes taxied in a yawed attitude. This improved vision made zig-zagging unnecessary during taxiing.

11. There appeared to be a complete absence of any tendency for the upwind wing to rise in either airplane under any conditions of operation.

12. Both airplanes were tried with and without steerable tailwheels. The majority of the pilots making the tests preferred the operation with the combination of brakes and steerable tailwheel.

13. Shimmy was encountered with both airplanes when they were operated without shimmy dampers.

PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE

Comments on the performance of these airplanes from a few of those who have flown them or witnessed demonstrations have been as follows:

G. R. Price, Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.: "Our own experience with the first wheel on the Piper J-3 has convinced us of the tremendous effect this type of landing wheel installation will have on the future of commercial as well as private aviation."

B. Allison Gillies, prominent private pilot and test pilot: "With the gear there is no special skill required for cross-wind landings and it will, therefore, add real utility to an airplane for the inexperienced pilot and it will save many repair bills."

Oliver L. Parks, president, Aircraft Sales and Service: "I was tremendously impressed with the demonstration—so much so that I have written both Northrop and Boeing suggesting that they take immediate steps to adopt it."

Roger Wolfe Kahn, prominent private pilot and test pilot: "It is undoubtedly one of the most important developments in the advancement of aviation."

Robert M. Love, president, All American Aviation, Inc.: "Landings were intentionally crabbed up to 20 degrees. Remarkable."

John W. Myers, vice president, Northrop Aircraft, Inc.: "Light wind, but attempted to simulate cross wind by skidding, etc. Results excellent. Castered gear on Cub actually helps taxiing."

J. B. Hartranft, general manager, Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association: "I thoroughly enjoyed the demonstration which resulted in making me a convert, and we shall do everything possible to assist the CAA in the further development of this project."

Crocker Snow, director of aeronautics for Massachusetts: "It has long been my opinion that this development is of primary importance to the future of personal flying, at least in this part of the world, and Friday afternoon's experience merely served to confirm this opinion."

T. H. Jordan, Wisconsin Aeronautics Commission: "Excellent. Wings level, no rudder required, excellent control, no swinging; castered gear should be placed on the market as soon as possible."

M. K. Hefty, Hefty Flying Service: "Perfect. Ideal for student training and small two-way fields."

Rex D. Penlong, chairman, San Francisco, A. O. P. A.: "It is my belief that you have shown us the most outstanding single safety development in the history of the airplane."

Rex Hardy, Jr., assistant to the vice president, Northrop Aircraft, Inc.: "The airplane was flown for approximately 4 hours by 10 separate pilots who carried with them approximately 20 rear-seat passengers. All agreed that the principle of the castering landing gear could and should be applied to every airplane in the private flying class, and that it would be very valuable to many types not included in this class. The pilots, in particular, who approached the airplane with traditional reservations were united in their approval."

P. G. Robinson, proprietor, Robbies Wheel Service: "I am thoroughly impressed with the advantages this type gear offers, and believe that it is the greatest development in aviation since the end of the war."

DISCUSSION

The results obtained with the Fairchild and the Piper will be discussed only as they apply to personal type airplanes, leaving to later reports on the larger airplanes the discussion of the application to commercial flying.

First, it should be noted that the objective of this development program was to determine whether it would be practicable to construct airplanes for which it would be unnecessary to provide all-way fields. It was not intended that the Government should develop cross-wind landing gear designs for the industry.

The results obtained are considered ample proof that airplanes in this category can be so modified that cross-wind landings and take-offs can be made as easily, as safely, and with no more skill than into the wind landings and take-offs.

The limited funds available for this project did not permit carrying on the development work which would be required to refine the design to secure maximum performance and to reduce cost. It should be possible to design cross-wind modifications for most of the airplanes now in service which could be sold at a price attractive to the airplane owners.

The general principle, i. e. castered main wheels with castering restraint, can be applied in many ways and the best way for one airplane could very well be entirely unsuited to another. The basic idea is very old, is not patentable, and the field is wide open for the development of other designs. This development should be carried on by the industry.

The major importance of the cross-wind landing gear is in its effect upon airport design and construction. A study of airport costs has indicated that substantial savings could be accomplished; the amount varying with the class of airport and terrain conditions.

The number of suitable sites for airports would be tremendously increased if only one runway were required and this in addition to the cost reduction would have a considerable effect on securing more accessible airports. More airports and more accessible airports have long been known to be essential in making personal flying more pleasant and more useful.

Another important advantage of the cross-wind landing gear is in the reduction in pilot-training time which has been freely predicted by those familiar with both pilot training and with the performance of the cross-wind undercarriage. This reduction can be realized only if the student intends to limit his flying to airplanes not sensitive to drift landings and drift landings may occur without cross winds due to improper use of the airplane controls. However, some reduction might be realized by initial training with a cross-wind undercarriage. This is indicated by the results of a rather extended pilot-training research program which showed that total training time for flying a three-control airplane with conventional undercarriage could be shortened by starting the training in a two-control airplane with a tricycle undercarriage.

The third advantage would be in a reduction in accidents. Close to 50 percent of all accidents in nonscheduled flying are landing accidents and it is estimated that well over 10 percent of these accidents would be eliminated with the adoption of the cross-wind landing gear. Forced landing accidents, which account for another 15 percent of the total, might be still more reduced by the greater latitude made possible in the choice of landing fields by eliminating consideration of cross winds. The improvement in safety with the cross-wind landing gear could be further increased by moving the main wheels further forward, which would be permissible with the great reduction in ground-looping tendency accomplished with castered wheels.

Some simplification of traffic control might result from the use of a single runway and, in locating airports close to communities, the traffic pattern would be made such that flying over the community would be entirely unnecessary either for landing or for take-off.

POINT 4 OF THE PRESIDENT'S INAUGURAL ADDRESS

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in his inaugural address, President Truman gave voice to what has been referred to as a new administration policy whereby aid in the form of American technical knowledge and the opportunity to utilize primarily private scientific skills would be extended to the underdeveloped areas of the earth on a basis of mutual assistance wherever fair conditions for their employment could be enjoyed. This has been referred to as point 4 in the President's message and has attracted much attention. In reality such a policy is novel only in that it gives broader scope to that spirit of cooperative help which took form with the implementation of the Marshall plan.

On January 26 the Secretary of State placed point 4 of the President's address in its setting as a part of American foreign policy. In doing so, he pointed out that there was a great impediment to development in many countries where many people fail to understand the importance of being fair to private investors and he made it clear that proper conditions which would invite the flow of private capital should be created in the less developed areas of the world. Certainly if private investment is to be discouraged, the principal sufferers are the people of relatively undeveloped countries.

In this respect, I am advised, the just and fair treatment of foreign investments in certain quarters in Latin America has for many years been a subject of grave concern. The United States has made many efforts to aid the Latin-American countries and for many years has been careful to refrain from interfering in the protection of its interests, although they were widely recognized as being legitimate.

In this connection, I am told, it is striking to note that last April, the Bogotá Conference in approving chapter IV, which deals with the protection of private investments and the creation of conditions which would be favorable to the investment of foreign capital in Latin America, did so by the slim margin of one vote. And this vote came only after many of the Latin-American states had so weakened the measure as to render it well-nigh ineffectual from the point of view of inducing the flow of private capital, safeguarding the investor, and then raising living standards in these countries.

While, for the most part, the Latin-American countries have not directly participated in the European recovery program, they have, according to reports made to me, frequently made overtures to the United States for loans on a government-to-government basis, and in many instances such financial assistance has not been forthcoming because, according to the normal standards of sound banking, the risk could not be underwritten.

The general character of the language in which the administration's plan was proposed has, according to advices I have received, been a cause of great expectations on the part of Latin America that there would soon be new programs of increased financial aid. Even though the Secretary of State, in his clarifying statement, has stressed the importance of creating conditions for safeguarding the foreign investor, Latin Americans have, so it appears, continued to give a very liberal interpretation to point 4.

But it is to be noted that at the very same time that these expectations flourish, the recent actions of certain of the Latin-American countries with respect to just and equal treatment, nondiscrimination, and the fostering of private capital, might well, it seems to me, disqualify them from any consideration at all under a plan such as the President proposed in his first message.

For example, it is reported that the Argentine Government's current unjustified attacks upon foreign interests in the Argentine runs counter to all normal concepts of international comity.

Certainly the foreign investor, according to all reports, is denied the comfort that his capital will be protected in Colombia where the compulsory arbitration of issues relative to American oil interests, the division of profits, and the expropriation of American-owned utilities are matters of common knowledge.

Another outstanding instance lies in the case of Guatemala, word of which has recently reached me. Here, a new code, supposedly written for the benefit of everyday citizens, has been devised and is interpreted so as actually to discriminate solely against the most extensively invested American enterprise in that country. This large American enterprise in Guatemala has also been denied lawful access to the courts, so I am informed, and is confronted with serious economic break-downs through actions which, I am informed, can be directly traced to Communist influences.

The many fine and responsible people in Latin America should, it seems to me, realize that insofar as point 4 is concerned, actions speak louder than words. Unfortunately, Latin America is often considered as a whole by people in the United States and the overt acts of a few can disqualify those who actually do deserve assistance.

These conditions are well known and the State Department is sparing no effort to point out to the responsible officials in Latin America the jeopardy

in which they place themselves by certain of their policies. But since point 4 is now open for all the world to examine and the aid which it proposes is actually being anticipated, it is appropriate that we speak out beyond diplomatic channels in order that our neighbors in Latin America may be cognizant of that spirit of mutual partnership, cooperation, and responsibility which the good-neighbor policy implies.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD following my remarks the full text of the statement of the Secretary of State concerning point 4, which was made on January 26, 1949.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KERR in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRANSCRIPTION OF EXTEMPORANEOUS REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF STATE DEAN ACHESON, CONCERNING POINT 4 OF THE PRESIDENT'S INAUGURAL ADDRESS, AT HIS PRESS CONFERENCE, JANUARY 26, 1949

First of all, I hope that you all understand the setting of point 4 in the President's inaugural address. It was one of four major courses of action which the President said would be carried out by his administration over the next 4 years, for the purpose of achieving the great objective which he talked about mainly in that address. That objective was to make clear in our own country and to all the world the purpose of American life and the purpose of the American system. That purpose is to enable the individual to attain the freedom and dignity, the fullness of life which should be the purpose of all government and of all life on this earth except insofar as it may be a preparation for some other life.

The President went on to point out that the other theory—of the place of the individual in society—was not a modern theory, was not a radical or a new view, but was reactionary in the extreme. It is a view which goes back to the period before the Renaissance. It is a view which is founded on the basic idea that status is the governing factor in life; that every person is born into the world in a position and that that person becomes a mere cog in a machine. That is a basically reactionary attitude and philosophy. It is not, as I say, modern. It is an attempt to crawl back into the cocoon of history. The American view of life is one which flows directly from the Renaissance and is one which says that the worth and dignity and freedom of the individual are the objectives of government.

Then the President went on to point out courses of action which we were going to take over the next 4 years to try to bring about that purpose of life, not only in this country, but in any other country which wished our help and association in that effort. To me the essential thing about it is that it is the use of material means to a nonmaterial end. It is not that we believe that other people need or wish things for their own purpose merely to have these material objects. It is not that material objects in and of themselves make a better or fuller life, but they are the means by which people can obtain freedom, not only freedom from the pressure of those other human beings who would restrict their freedom, but help in the ancient struggle of man to earn his living and get his bread from the soil. That is the purpose; that is the objective of this program.

Now, the President was not announcing a project to be completed within a few weeks or months. He was announcing in this, as in the other three respects, a long program for his administration. It was a program on which much has been done in the past and on which more can be done in the future. The President pointed out that the United States has no monopoly of skills or techniques. Other countries have vast reservoirs of skill. In almost every country there is some nucleus of skill, some group of people whose technical abilities can be expanded with help from the outside. With all of those people, the Pesident stated, we wish to work. He particularly stated that we wished to work through the United Nations and all those affiliated organizations which are associated with it. He pointed out that in so far as his program is successful and in so far as peoples in less developed areas acquire skills, they may also create the conditions under which capital may flow into those countries. He did not say this was to be governmental capital and indeed, if the proper conditions are created, the reservoirs of private capital are very great indeed. He pointed out that these must be two-way operations. There is abroad in the world an idea that there is a magic in investment. There is an idea that if every country can only have a steel mill, then all is well. There is a failure to understand that it is a long and difficult process to develop the skills which are necessary to operate many of these plants. There is sometimes failure to understand that plants should be located where the natural resources exist and not on purely nationalistic bases. There is also in many places a failure to understand that unless the conditions are created by which investors may fairly put their money into that country, then there is a great impediment to development. It is no solution to say, "Well, the private investors won't do it. Therefore, governments must." So he pointed out that it must be a two-way street.

Now, as I say, much has been done in the past to try to make technological skill and advice available from the United States and from other countries, through the United Nations and through many of its organizations. All of those efforts can be brought together and intensified. The President pointed out that we are willing and anxious to work with every country that wishes to really enter into a cooperative system with the rest of the world to this end and with every country that wishes to help other countries to develop.

Now, that is the broad background of the inaugural address. I have talked at some length about this because it seems to me important that it be put in its setting of American foreign policy.

INVITATION TO ATTEND DEMONSTRATION OF TACTICAL AIRCRAFT AT ANDREWS AIR FORCE BASE

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, the Secretary of the Air Force, the Honorable Stuart Symington, desires to extend to the Members of the Senate an invitation to attend a display and demonstration of tactical aircraft which has been scheduled to be held on February 15, 1949, at the Andrews Air Force Base.

The presentation will show the progress made by the Air Force in the field of combat aviation since the beginning of World War II.

Transportation for those Members of the Senate who may wish to attend will be on hand at the Senate Office Building at 2 o'clock in the afternoon. The presentation will be concluded at 4:45, at which time return transportation will be available.

It will be appreciated if those Members of the Senate who wish to attend will be kind enough to advise the Senate Armed Services Committee to that effect and if they will please arrange to meet with the members of that committee in the committee room, 212 Senate Office Building, at 2 p. m., February 15.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN STORM-STRICKEN AREAS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, during the Eightieth Congress, bills were introduced to provide aid for Greece and Turkey in the total sum of $625,000,000. As I remember, the bills were passed almost unanimously. I was one of the few Senators who voted against them. At that time I stated my reasons. I said, among other things, that nearly one-third of our population was underclothed and undernourished; our teachers were not getting enough money; there was a need of Federal aid to education, for public health, and so on.

Today, I have been informed by Mr. Seward, of the Federal Works Agency, that all through the Middle West not only have people died as a result of the cold and the blizzards, but literally millions upon millions of dollars' worth of sheep and cattle are dead. In the State of Nevada, according to the senior Senator from Nevada, roughly, one-third of all livestock have perished.

I am introducing a bill providing for an appropriation of $150,000,000. It is not an ordinary disaster loan. In fact, it is not a loan at all. Last night, over the radio, Eric Johnston said we ought to guarantee loans made by Americans in foreign countries. It seems to me if we are going into the business, as we have done during the past few years, of practically guaranteeing some of the loans, we should be willing to make good the losses of some of our own people here in America. Certainly it is not the fault of the stockman, farmer, or rancher when the blizzards suddenly come upon him and he is wiped out. I may say that telephonic inquiry develops the fact that the blizzards are today worse than ever.

The bill I am introducing provides that these losses shall be paid in full by the Government, so that a man, for example, who through the years saved his money and finally gathered together a herd of cattle or sheep, will not suddenly become bankrupt because of an act of God such as that which has occurred within the past few days.

I have discussed the bill with other Senators. I ask unanimous consent out of order to introduce the bill. If other Senators want to join me in sponsoring it, I shall be glad to have them do so; or if some other Senator wants to sponsor it, I shall be very glad to join with him.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 963) to provide for determination and payment of losses sustained by individuals as a result of recent storms in the Western and Middle Western States, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ISRAEL AN ACTUALITY

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, although the headlines and the news stories from day to day have been alternately hopeful and pessimistic on the outcome of negotiations in the Near East over Israel,

the fact remains that Israel is now an actuality. It exists; it functions; it will endure.

I am indebted to Mr. Seymour Staiman, secretary of the Williamsport-Sunbury district of the Zionist Organization of America, for a very kind letter in which, on behalf of his organization, he expresses the thanks of his group for what he terms "a quite satisfactory ending" in the Israel saga, and adds:

The United States policy on Israel has, of course, been perhaps the major factor in effecting this satisfactory ending.

I think men of good will everywhere will readily concede that the forthright position of President Truman on this issue has been one of great courage and great humanity, and I am glad to have this expression from a Pennsylvania leader in the Zionist cause in grateful acknowledgment of the United States position in behalf of decency in the Near East and justice for a great cause.

As Mr. Staiman expressed it further, "This is a great moment in history for those of the Jewish faith." In my reply to his gracious letter, however, I emphasized that it is not only those of Jewish faith who consider the successful emergence of this new nation "as a great moment in history."

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Staiman's letter be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILLIAMSPORT-SUNBURY DISTRICT,
ZIONIST ORGANIZATION OF AMERICA,
Williamsport, Pa., January 22, 1949.

Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MYERS: As the situation in Israel seems to be heading for a quite satisfactory ending, we find time to thank those who helped make this possible.

The United States policy on Israel, has, of course, been perhaps the major factor in effecting this satisfactory ending. And we wish to express our appreciation to you for your excellent efforts on our behalf. We know full well that when the support of others was no more than double-talk, your support was in action.

This is a great moment in history for those of the Jewish faith. We wish to thank you from the bottom of our hearts for helping to make it possible.

Very sincerely yours,
SEYMOUR STAIMAN,
Secretary, Williamsport-Sunbury District Zionist Organization of America.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I inquire of the acting majority leader to what time the Senator proposes to have the Senate adjourn or recess?

Mr. MYERS. To Thursday.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the acting majority leader state what legislation he expects to have brought up at that time?

Mr. MYERS. Exactly what the situation will be I do not know. I do not believe there will be anything on the calendar. The cotton acreage report may be brought up.

Mr. WHERRY. Is that all the acting majority leader feels might come up for consideration on Thursday?

Mr. MYERS. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the acting majority leader for the information.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MYERS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Frank C. Bingham, of Alaska, to be United States attorney for division No. 2, District of Alaska;

Harry O. Arend, of Alaska, to be United States attorney for division No. 4, District of Alaska;

George L. Grobe, of New York, to be United States attorney for the western district of New York;

Alfred J. Flowden, Jr., of South Carolina, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of South Carolina; and

Kehoe C. Shannon, of Texas, to be United States marshal for the western district of Texas.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John Monroe Johnson, of South Carolina, to be reappointed as an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term expiring December 31, 1955.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I inquire whether the report on this nomination was unanimous?

Mr. MYERS. I understand it was a unanimous report.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, as in legislative session, that the Senate adjourn until next Thursday at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, February 17, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 14, 1949:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Ernest A. Gross, of New York, now Legal Adviser of the Department of State, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

John Theodore Koehler, of Maryland, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

Dan A. Kimball, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air.

UNITED NATIONS

Stuart A. Rice, of Virginia, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Statistical Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 3 years (reappointment).

Philip M. Hauser, of Illinois, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Population Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 3 years (reappointment).

Arthur J. Altmeyer, of Wisconsin, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Social Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 3 years (reappointment).

CIRCUIT JUDGE

Walter L. Pope, of Montana, to be circuit judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, vice Hon. Francis A. Garrecht, deceased.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the grade of captain in the line of the Navy:

Francis M. Bardwell	Raymond W. Johnson
Charles E. Briner	Warren W. Johnson
Richard R. Briner	Franklin D. Karns, Jr.
Leonidas D. Coates, Jr.	Charles B. Martell
Arthur B. Dickie	Frank P. Mitchell, Jr.
Thompson F. Fowler	Robert L. Moore, Jr.
William E. Gentner, Jr.	William T. Nelson
Donald W. Gladney, Jr.	Richard M. Nixon
George H. Hamilton	Robert J. Ramsbotham
John T. Hayward	Charles M. Ryan
Joseph A. E. Hindman	Richard T. Spofford
Albert E. Hindmarsh	Marion C. Thompson
James H. Howard	Harold F. Traua
William S. Howard, Jr.	John K. Wells
Carl A. Johnson	Ralph E. Westbrook
Frank L. Johnson	

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate February 14, 1949:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

John Monroe Johnson to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term expiring December 31, 1955.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Lord and Shepherd of our souls, give us brave and stout hearts, conscious of Thy wise direction. We are aware that trials and difficulties may await us ere the day is over, yet we would not bemoan our duty.

Grant that we may meet the challenge of any just appeal without prejudice or the spirit of retaliation. O keep us open-minded, and let us feel the tides of emotion and broad understanding, that will defeat the hazards of disunity and failure. We pray in the name of Him who spake as the Son of Man. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 10, 1949, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on February 7, 1949, the President approved and signed a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 136. Joint resolution making a further appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McDaniel, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 22. Concurrent resolution suspending legislative budget until May 1, 1949.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 135. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 128) entitled "An act to provide that acreage planted to cotton in 1949 shall not be used in computing cotton acreage allotments for any subsequent year," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. YOUNG to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CHESNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances, in one to include an article on the Calumet plan for Chicago and in the other a speech he delivered on February 12 at the Thaddeus Kosciusko Monument in Washington, D. C.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three instances, in the first to include an article from the Sheboygan Press, in the second a statement from the American Federation of Labor, and in the third a speech by Bernard Baruch.

GEN. THADDEUS KOSCIUSKO

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I join with my distinguished colleague from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM] and concur in his eloquent remarks with reference to one of America's greatest Presidents, Abraham Lincoln. I direct the attention of the House also to the fact that Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko was born on the same day. It is particularly important that with the desperate and tragic events occurring in Hungary with reference to the persecution of the great Cardinal Mindszenty that America recognize behind this iron curtain the brave people of Poland and that they should receive our tribute again as they have paid tribute to us. Certainly in those years when America needed help brave Poland came forward with a brave man, Thaddeus Kosciusko.

The service of these two great men to their God and to their country is far beyond my poor power to add or to detract. We honor two outstanding champions of freedom from two different countries and from two different generations. As Americans we join with each other in honoring the memory of the Great Liberator, Abraham Lincoln, and as Americans we join again in honoring the memory of a great patriot, Thaddeus Kosciusko.

Today, however, there is deep and special significance when we honor the name of Kosciusko, for as the symbol of freedom and liberty, he appeals to the hearts of men all over the world where there remains a love of justice, freedom, and liberty.

And particularly is this so because in his homeland, once again under the heels of the invader, the oppressor, and the tyrant, the cause of liberty, deep-grained and everlasting, remains.

To the cause of American independence Kosciusko contributed three things, scientific knowledge, most desirable traits of human character, and an unalloyed and unwavering enthusiasm for the cause of liberty. Kosciusko was the first foreign soldier of distinction to heed the call of freedom and cross the stormy sea. He came not because he sought fortune, but simply because he loved freedom.

Kosciusko was an American in spirit through and through. He did not mind beginning at the bottom. Tradition says that when he presented himself to Gen. George Washington, the future President of the United States inquired, "And what can you do?" "Try me; I am willing to do anything," was Kosciusko's reply This is merely a tradition, but well does it speak the truth of the zeal, the enthusiasm, and the courage of a leader of liberty among leaders of that cause since the dawn of history. Today, in this year of our Lord, I stand in the Halls of Congress and pay my tribute. It is interesting to observe that on January 20, 1818, in this same Hall of Congress, William Henry Harrison, then a Representative in Congress from Ohio, later to be President of the United States, when he heard of the death of Kosciusko, introduced a resolution just as I do today, asking for a public expression of respect "for the memory of Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko, formerly an officer in the service of the United States and the uniform and distinguished friend of liberty and the rights of man." At that time, Congressman Harrison had this to say in support of his resolution:

He was remarked throughout his service for all the qualities which adorn the human character. He was idolized by the soldiers for his bravery, and beloved and respected by the officers for the goodness of his heart and the great qualities of his mind.

Such was the man, sir, for whose memory I ask from an American Congress a slight tribute of respect. Not, sir, to perpetuate his name—but our gratitude. His fame will last as long as liberty remains upon the earth; as long as a votary offers incense upon her altar, the name of Kosciusko will be invoked. And if, by the common consent of the world, a temple shall be erected to those who have rendered the most service to mankind, if the statue of our great countryman shall occupy the place of the most worthy, that of Kosciusko will be found by his side and the wreath of laurel will be entwined with a palm of virtue to adorn his brow.

It is, indeed, then fitting and proper that today in walking down the great Pennsylvania Avenue in the Capital City of Washington, opposite the White House, the official residence of the President of the United States, in the beautiful Lafayette Park, there stands the magnificent monument of Kosciusko, a soldier, a scholar, and a gentleman, faithful to one aim—liberty and human happiness. In his aid to the struggling new Nation in America, Kosciusko did not announce himself by any assumed title or name, although that was fashionable. He did not ask for any rank, did not demand any pay. He went from task to task doing this work quietly and efficiently. Being a military engineer, he had no chance for a brilliant personal distinction; his business was to make it possible for the commanding general to win victory and prevent defeat. Washington called him a gentleman of science and merit.

Kosciusko served with the armies, both in the North and the South through the entire war, and served with distinction. It was said that his deeds naturalized him as an American, and they also associated him with that band of chivalrous foreigners De Kalb, Steuben, Lafayette, and the others who left the Old World to uphold the cause of liberty in the New. It is to be regretted, indeed, that today Poland cannot be represented in international affairs by men who have a right to speak for the Polish people. No, today it is another tragedy for—oh, so tragic Poland—that her mouthpieces before the nations are mere passive agents of the atheistic, communistic Kremlin.

And during the days of Kosciusko the Poles saved others. They could not save their national independence and the country after the desperate resistance of Kosciusko and the other patriots, and the nation was partitioned between Russia, Austria, and Prussia in the latter part of the nineteenth century. But the Poles never stopped fighting for their liberty. And their fight was always animated by those ideals of human liberty once again exhibited in the peoples of the western Christian democracies in their declared modern crusade against the dictatorship behind the iron curtain.

It is not easy for us today to look behind the infamous iron curtain and find the true thoughts and feelings of the brave Polish people. But we know Polish history and it speaks eloquently, loudly, and long. And we hear the eternal

truth in the words of the famous Polish patriot, Mochnazki:

When the foreigner's government is gentle the Poles rise up because they can; when it is severe they rise up because they must. Nothing will accommodate them to the ruin of their Fatherland, and moderation no more than cruelty.

The questions are not: Shall Poland's eastern border be shifted westward? Shall she lose her eastern territories or losing them acquire western territories? The question is, Shall Poland exist?

And this answer is "Yes, 10,000 times; 10,000 times yes," for the hopes and dreams of a free and independent Poland no tyrant can ever crush.

And shining as a beautiful star leading the way to their certainty of liberty is the deep and lasting and abiding faith of their fathers beloved by the Poles. Christianity is the companion of liberty in all its conflicts, the cradle of its infancy, the divine source of its fame.

Liberty cannot be established without a proper sense of morality. And morality cannot exist without a great faith. And this the Poles have had since their conversion and in abundance, and to a degree that is a powerful example to the peoples and nations of the world of their own faith and of all others. And this, the evil men of communism will never understand. They forget the teachings of history. They forget the deep love in the Poles of religious liberty as well as political freedom. They forget that religious liberty is made up of the best sense of what is right and the highest conviction of loyalty and duty. Armed with these, the Poles have looked the sternest despotism in the face.

Mr. Speaker, nestled among the beautiful hills and the rolling country in Pennsylvania is the County of Luzerne, the district which it is my high honor to represent in this Congress. And there resides over 100,000 Americans, staunch, faithful, and true, and in their veins flows the proud blood of ancient Poland. But they have won their spurs, they have won their right to the proud name of American, and the best proof in the world of this is to look at the casualty lists of the two past great world wars and there inscribed in letters of blood are the names of Poland. There is a close tie both in blood and faith between the Polish and American people—each has given the other so much national character.

Historically, the two countries have trod much the same path in their search for statehood and national existence. And historically, too, they have sprung to one another's aid when disaster threatened.

The course of democracy in Poland has staggered under almost insuperable odds. Yet the flame of freedom has never died. It will never die. Through the dark, endless years of oppression, when the prospect of a free Poland seemed but the fragile dream of zealots, the one inextinguishable idea has persisted. It persists today.

And today the whole world is plunged in a bitter struggle to maintain those same principles of human decency for which Poland has traditionally searched. The whole world of the millions of people who despise tyranny and who fought nazism now find themselves faced with communism and the kindred doctrine that shall as well be crushed. Old enmities, suspicion and prejudice must now be thrust aside to form one overwhelming, united front.

But, Mr. Speaker, just as Kosciusko and other Polish patriots had concern for America, we should have some concern for Poland's welfare today. A great Christian people like the Poles will never accept the pagan political and social philosophy of the Soviet. There can be no place in Europe or in the world for one people who try to force upon another ideologies in which they have no faith.

As a nation dedicated to freedom, recognizing the blessing of liberty, as we do, the United States of America must continue to exhibit the gravest concern in the welfare and the future of Poland. The great weight of the United States of America must be thrown behind the fight of all true Poles for a truly free Poland.

Two hundred years has failed to dim the luster of Kosciusko's glory achieved in the cause of our freedom. Kosciusko's name will live forever, symbolic of the struggle of man against the forces of oppression.

The United States of America is the leading nation in the world today. There is only one thing for a leader to do and that is to lead. The spirit of Kosciusko will never rest in peace until there is restored to her proper place at the council table of the nations of the world a free and independent and sovereign state, the Republic of Poland. In paying tribute to this hero, Thaddeus Kosciusko, I pay tribute to the brave and gallant Poles who have always shed their blood on the battlefields of liberty all over the world, who have fought for the freedom of almost every foreign nation. The spirit of Poland is the spirit of Kosciusko. It is an unconquerable spirit that will never die.

Mr. Speaker, I sing to the memory of Thaddeus Kosciusko, the immortal Polish song, Jeszcze Polska Nie Zginela.

ST. VALENTINE'S DAY AND BROTHERHOOD WEEK

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, St. Valentine's Day and Brotherhood Week should be an appropriate time for the things that I want to say. I have heard many speeches about deceased Members of Congress; however, I notice that no one gets up and mentions the fact when one of our Members is seriously ill and is confined to a hospital. I sincerely believe that any Member who knows that one of our colleagues is ill should either notify us here on the floor or perhaps we could hand the names in so that it could be listed on the last page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I have belonged to organizations that have tried this scheme of sending get-well cards to members and I assure you it does the patient a great deal of good to know that his colleagues are thinking of him and hope that he will soon be well.

At the present time, our ailing colleagues must feel that their colleagues are hovering over them like vultures hoping that the illness is nothing trivial so that some one of us can edge up a place on some particular committee.

I know that we do not want to give this impression.

While I am on my feet, I would like to remind you that today is PERCY PRIEST'S wedding anniversary. He is a gentleman that the Sixth District of Tennessee can well be proud of and I want to compliment Mrs. Priest on her excellent taste in choosing a husband.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include certain editorials.

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask uanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "Mickey Marcus Memorial Address."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Post.

Mr. LYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a magazine article.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the abuse of regulation W and also to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two other instances and include certain statements and excerpts.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

WILLIAM REMINGTON

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the reversal of the decision of the Loyalty Board, holding that William Remington, a top-flight employee in the Department of Commerce, was not a safe security risk, and the Department's hurried reinstatement of him in a $10,300 job, with above

$5,000 back pay, should be a matter of grave concern to the public, and, therefore, of concern to every Member of this body.

On Friday last I said that if Congress passed up this matter without doing something about it, it would evidence Members' unfitness to be trusted as guardians of the public safety, and that statement I now reiterate.

The hearings conducted by the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments in July 1948, established, beyond the slightest possibility of reasonable doubt, the fact that William Remington, who at the time was chairman of a board in the Department of Commerce screening vital exports to Europe, and particularly to Russia, was a Communist and had formerly, when on the War Production Board, performed as an agent and spy for Russia. The evidence taken on this particular subject is contained in parts 1 and 2 of the hearings of the Senate committee and is available to Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I shall address the House at length on this subject later on.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRIEST asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Mr. Paul A. Strachan, and a copy of a bill he introduced.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper excerpt.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Pope Pius and others with respect to the Cardinal Mindszenty trial.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, even though a Democrat, I have, on more than one occasion, had the honor of being elected president of the Abraham Lincoln Club in my home city of Long Beach, Los Angeles County, Calif.; and the last occasion on which I received this high honor was very shortly after I was defeated for return from the Eighteenth Congressional District to the Eightieth Congress. Perhaps my many friends in my home city, regardless of political affiliation, realizing that, ever since I was a lad, the life of Abraham Lincoln has been the most inspiring life to me in the course of our American history.

Last Saturday, February 12, having been appropriately observed as the one hundred and fortieth birthday of this great citizen of the ages, and the President of the United States reportedly standing for about 10 minutes with bared head while his wreath was being placed at the Lincoln Memorial, I just wish to now call the attention of the Members of this Eighty-first Congress in the history of the United States to the fact that Abraham Lincoln was elected as a Whig to the Thirtieth Congress, March 4, 1847, to March 3, 1849. He first came to Washington to serve, arriving December 2, 1847, for the session of that Congress opening on December 6.

While in Congress, he lived in a boarding house, commonly known as Mrs. Sprigg's boarding house, right here on Capitol Hill where the Library of Congress is now located; and other Congressmen living at the same place were John Blanchard; John Dickey, of Pennsylvania; P. W. Tompkins, of Mississippi; Giddings, of Ohio; and Embree, of Indiana. One of his colleagues in the House was John Quincy Adams of Massachusetts; another was Andrew Johnson, of Tennessee. The United States Senators from Illinois at this time were Sidney Breeze, of Carlyle, and Stephen A. Douglas, of Quincy.

The principal issues of the day were, of course, the war with Mexico; the extension of slavery and the Wilmot proviso; westward migration—which, of course, was increased greatly by the discovery of gold in California; internal improvements by the Federal Government; and our relations with the American Indian.

Lincoln was regularly appointed to the Committee on Post Office and Post Roads and also to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department. Because I think the general impression is that Lincoln was more or less inactive on the floor of the House while here, I asked our very able and cooperative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to furnish me with a memorandum showing the incidents wherein Abraham Lincoln took part in any manner on the floor of the Congress while a Member. I knew this information would be new information to many people and possibly to some Members who have not had time to read in detail of his congressional activities. This information is as follows:

ABRAHAM LINCOLN, MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE, Thirtieth Congress, first session (December 6, 1847–August 14, 1848):

Page 56: Presented petition for State of Illinois praying for an amicable termination of the war with Mexico.

Page 57: Notice of the introduction of a bill to amend an act to raise for a limited time an additional military force.

Page 64: Resolution introduced requesting the President to inform the House more fully regarding his messages of May 11 and December 8, 1846, and December 7, 1848, with regard to the Mexican War, its inception, policy, and the shedding of American blood on American soil, etc.

Page 103: Petition presented in behalf of James Semple and others praying a relinquishment of certain lands.

Pages 107–109: Remarks on the joint resolution concerning the contract for transporting the great southern mails.

Page 119: Remark.

Page 146: Obtained the floor.

Pages 154–156: Remarks upon the President's annual message concerning the Mexican War.

Page 181: Introduction of a bill to amend an act to raise, for a limited time, an additional military force.

Page 197: Reported a bill for the relief of William Fuller and Orlando Saltmarsh from the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Page 449: Reported a bill authorizing postmasters at county seats of justice to receive subscriptions for newspapers and periodicals, to be paid through the agency of the Post Office Department; from the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Page 550: Remarks upon the soldiers' bounty lands bill.

Page 571: Moved to suspend the rules of the House to take up the joint resolution relative to contracts for the purchase of hemp for the use of the Navy.

Page 727: Remarks on bill to pay Texas volunteers.

Page 755: Remarks on bill for the admission of the State of Wisconsin into the Union.

Page 762: Debate of bill for settling the claim of the legal representatives of Richard W. Meade.

Page 857: Delivered speech on the subject of internal improvements. (See Appendix, p. 709.)

Page 878: Remarks upon bill to change the times for holding the district court of the United States in the western district of Virginia.

Page 950: Reported a bill from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads to establish certain post routes.

Page 990: Obtained and yielded the floor.

Page 1006: Delivered speech on politics in general and on the merits of the candidates for the Presidential Office. (See Appendix, p. 1041.)

Page 1027: Remarks by Mr. Lincoln and others in explanation of the bill granting to the State of Illinois certain rights-of-way for railroad connections.

Page 1049: Reported joint resolution for relief of persons incurring disability under section 26 of the act approved July 2, 1836, changing the organization of the Post Office Department.

CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE, Appendix, Thirtieth Congress, first session:

Page 93: Remarks concerning the Mexican War, its inception, policy, etc.

Page 709: Remarks concerning internal improvements by the Federal Government.

Page 1041: Remarks concerning the Presidential question, and the territories ceded to the United States by Mexico.

CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE, Thirtieth Congress, second session (December 4–March 3, 1848):

Page 188: Notice of the introduction of a bill in relation to school lands which have been or may be relinquished.

Page 212: Introduces an amendment to the resolution abolishing slavery from the District of Columbia.

Page 244: Notice of introduction of a bill to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia.

Page 533: Remarks on the bill granting lands to the States to make railroads and canals.

Page 559: Presents certain joint resolutions of the Legislature of Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, I know that we, as Members of the present Eighty-first Congress, cannot sit between these walls on any occasion without realizing that Abraham Lincoln also worked here. This fact must, of necessity, renew our determination to make it literally true that we assume the great task remaining before us and that the honored dead of our wars for democracy shall know that we dedicate an increased devotion to the cause for which they gave their lives and that, in like manner, we at this birthday season, do again highly resolve that they shall not have died in vain and

that we, as Members of the same Congress of the same great Nation which Abraham Lincoln served as a Member of Congress, shall daily dedicate our lives to the proposition that, because of our unselfish service to our Nation, that Nation shall have a new birth of freedom and that we shall make it truer than ever that Government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that one of the outstanding agencies of the Government, and the one Department that has been noted for the administration of its affairs and for its efficiency throughout its organization is about to bog down—I refer to the United States Post Office Department. Mr. Speaker, the population of our country and of most of our cities and towns has increased tremendously, and with the building of good roads and rural electrification, our rural areas have also progressed and have required and now demand extended mail delivery, and besides the services of the Post Office Department have been so multiplied and expanded that, with the recent appropriations sufficient funds have not been made available to the Post Office Department to furnish the personnel and service to meet the needs of the citizens of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, of great importance also is the fact that for many years no appropriations have been made for construction of post-office buildings and Federal court buildings, many of the post offices being housed in shacks which are a disgrace to our Nation, and limited repairs, if any, have been made to provide the necessary space for the handling of the greatly increased volume of all classes of mail, particularly air mail and parcel post, parcel-post mail alone being more than enough to overtax all available room, making it necessary to use basements and any and all rooms in the buildings which should be used for other necessary purposes.

Mr. Speaker, in my district—and I understand the same condition exists in practically nearly all other parts of the United States—many of the present post-office buildings are outmoded, antiquated, and inadequate to handle the mails, and in many instances, as a result, the patrons of the offices are forced to stand in line and wait an interminable amount of time for mail and stamps and other services of the Post Office Department, and while during the war, of course, the citizens of the country were not complaining about these inconveniences and conditions, since the end of the war demands have been made and are now being made upon nearly every member of the Congress for relief.

Mr. Speaker, in addition, with the funds which have been recently appropriated to the Post Office Department, the Department has been unable to provide the necessary personnel and help, not only in the post offices but also on city and rural routes, and I am told that this has been responsible for unnecessary and unreasonable delay in the dispatch of the mails, and which never existed before in the history of the Post Office Department.

Mr. Speaker, I am taking the liberty to call this matter to the attention of the President and administration and the Congress, and especially to the attention of the committees of the House and Senate who are concerned with and have jurisdiction over the authorizations and appropriations in the hope that they will take steps to correct this most unsatisfactory and unpardonable situation, and I trust that they will take such action as they determine best to provide relief to the Post Office Department in order that this fine Department may continue to maintain its service and reputation as it has so well done in the past.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENNINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include editorials in each.

Mr. BURDICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short letter.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. LOVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

[Mr. JENNINGS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

WHY ARE MILK PRICES NOT SUPPORTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LAW?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that the administration is not following the law in regard to the agricultural support program. This is particularly evident so far as milk for manufactured dairy products is concerned. While the New Deal and Fair Deal branch of political agricultural support may be sending out letters attempting to blame the lack of support on the Eightieth Congress, and also saying that there are no funds available for supporting dairy prices, the fact is that the law today provides for 90-percent parity support price for milk and its products.

It appears easier and perhaps more desirable for certain groups to try and blame the Eightieth Congress, than to admit they misled the dairymen of our country into believing President Truman's campaign promises.

It is also a fact that the administration has the power, authority, and the funds to support the price of milk in accordance with the provisions of the law. The cunning, cute, and evasive approach of this administration will not stand the light of day. The President killed the 90-percent parity support price himself—all of the false propaganda notwithstanding.

The cheap politics behind this lack of announced support for milk is beyond doubt a move to let the price of milk become so low that the dairymen will come to Washington on bended knees to ask for relief from the administration. And when it is granted, the administration will then tell the dairymen just how they saved them. This one is too crude and apparent for the administration to get away with. All the dairymen ask, is a support price equal to that provided by law.

This should be a country governed by laws, and not by men, especially evasive politicians. The dairymen of the United States have already been deprived of millions of dollars because of the failure of the Fair Deal to carry out the provisions of the price-support law.

THE AIKEN BILL

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am including in my remarks a copy of a resolution passed by the Winnebago County, Ill., Farm Bureau, whereby they have gone on record in support of the Agricultural Act of 1948, known as the Aiken bill, which provides flexible price supports of 60 to 90 percent of parity.

The Winnebago County Farm Bureau is one of the three largest in the State of Illinois. It pleased me immensely to see the agricultural leaders of the Nation supporting the Republican farm bill, passed by the Eightieth Republican Congress.

RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE TWENTY-NINTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE WINNEBAGO COUNTY FARM BUREAU

I

Whereas farmers want to help develop economic programs which facilitate the best use of land and human resources; and

Whereas farmers want these programs to be in the best interest of public welfare; and

Whereas farmers recognize that too high price supports in any farm program would produce unwieldy crop surpluses with disastrous results such as fixed prices and rigid control and farmer regimentation: Be it hereby

Resolved, That our country farm bureau go on record in support of the Agricultural Act of 1948 known as the Aiken bill which provides flexible price supports of 60 to 90 percent of parity.

XII

Because the welfare of the Nation depends upon the prosperity of all segments of our economy, no segment of our economy has the right to make demands for itself at the expense of the general public. Neither agriculture, labor, nor industry can solve their own problems without giving due considerations to the problems of others, so we urge that agriculture, industry, and labor make a sincere effort to promote harmonious relationships and cooperate for the benefit of all, and in helping to bring about better relationships between the three groups and especially between labor and industry, our Representative in the National Congress, as well as management and labor leaders give careful study and considerations to pending labor-management legislation in order to avoid hasty judgment and actions in the passage of labor-management legislation which might prove harmful to the best interests of our country.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TABER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., Republican leader of the House of Representatives, at a Lincoln Day dinner at Lochhaven, Pa., on Saturday evening, February 12, 1949.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore granted, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a New York Times editorial on housing.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

THE JOHNSONVILLE STEAM PLANT

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the appropriation of funds for the construction of the Johnsonville steam plant should not be made. This proposition has been before Congress on several occasions, and I have always voted against it. I shall expect to vote against it when it comes before the House again. Because of the uncertainty as to the progress of legislation at this time it is uncertain just when the matter will come up for final vote, but I want to be on record as opposed to the project when it does come. But to be doubly sure, I am making this statement and having it inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I am opposed to this project for two very substantial reasons. First, the Government has no right under the Constitution to engage in the power business. It has no right to construct dams for power purposes. Its power in this respect is limited to flood control and navigation purposes. The whole Tennessee Valley project was constructed in violation of the spirit of the Constitution. It was well known that this great project was primarily and principally a power project and not a flood-control or navigation project. Now they come along with the proposition to build a steam plant to produce power, and this plant will be operated by coal and not by water power. It will be directly in opposition to private industry, which is at this time doing a good job in supplying power to the people.

I hope that we will be able to defeat this proposition when it comes up for consideration as we have done on several previous occasions.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on today, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore granted, I may be permitted to address the House of 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOEVEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include certain newspaper articles.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD regarding the persecution of the Bulgarian clergymen and also to include an editorial.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. LYNCH (at the request of Mr. DEANE) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address.

Mr. ZABLOCKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a copy of a speech and an editorial and a resolution.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington (at the request of Mr. HOLIFIELD) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article, and that my remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HOLIFIELD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

COMMUNISTS IN FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we have heard all of these talks by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] criticising the Committee on Un-American Activities. I propose to answer at least a portion of them today.

In the first place, I join the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] with reference to William W. Remington. He ought not to be on the Federal pay roll. If Congress is going to sit idly by and see those men of questionable loyalty returned to the Federal pay roll, then it is time the American people took things into their own hands and changed the Congress.

The gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] gets up here and repeats what some alleged scientists have said about Dr. Edward U. Condon. Many people think that Dr. Condon is one of the most dangerous men on the Federal pay roll today, and that he is in a dangerous position, so far as our atomic security is concerned.

I here and now call upon the new Committee on Un-American Activities to have Dr. Condon come before it, let him make his statement, cross-examine him, and bring out into the open the facts as to the danger that Dr. Condon represents to our atomic security.

When they do that, and publish the letter the FBI wrote about him, then the American people will understand the situation. Remember the safety of our country comes first.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROONEY asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Washington Post.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor may be allowed to sit this week during the time when the House may not be in session and during the time when general debate is under way in the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI]?

There was no objection.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make an announcement that it is impossible to bring out the minimum wage bill within the next week or 10 days. The Committee on Education and Labor has reported out H. R. 858, which deals with the supposed strike of the stevedores, coming on March 1. The bill reported out is the same as H. R. 858, with the exception that we added the words "as applied in the longshoreman, stevedoring, and building and construction industries."

The reason the construction industry is in the bill is because the trades are now bargaining for wages for next spring. So that we may avoid any strikes, this bill has been reported practically unanimously from the committee on last Saturday.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Private Calendar may be dispensed with this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday this week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

REPORT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION (H. DOC. NO. 74)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk and, together with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed, with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the second report of the Economic Cooperation Administration created by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, Public Law 472 of the Eightieth Congress, approved April 3, 1948.

The report covers activities under the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 (title I of Public Law 472) and the China Aid Act of 1948 (title IV of Public Law 472). There is also included a summary of the status of the United States foreign relief program (Public Law 84) and the United States foreign aid program (Public Law 389).

This report is for the quarter ended September 30, 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 11, 1949.*

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TRANSMITTING TWENTY-SEVENTH REPORT OF LEND-LEASE OPERATIONS (H. DOC. NO. 75)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and together with the accompanying papers referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the twenty-seventh report to Congress on lend-lease operations.

This report contains a report on lend-lease fiscal operations prepared by the Treasury Department and submitted to the Secretary of State in accordance with Executive Order 9726. The period covered is from March 11, 1941, through March 31, 1948.

All deliveries under the various pipeline agreements to lend-lease recipient governments have been concluded. The consummation of these agreements constituted one of the first measures of the United States which contributed to postwar economic recovery in countries suffering from wartime disruption and devastation.

An agreement, commonly referred to as a "settlement of settlements," was signed with the United Kingdom on July 12, 1948, and appears in this report as appendix II. This agreement disposes of wartime financial claims and related matters not completely disposed of by the previous agreements with the United Kingdom published in the twenty-second report.

A final lend-lease settlement agreement signed with Yugoslavia on July 19, 1948, appears as appendix III.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 14, 1949.*

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES AND THE CONDON CASE

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. If these objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I listened with considerable interest to the comments of the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Mississippi on the so-called Condon case. As a new member of the Committee on Un-American Activities perhaps I should not say too much; but I do want to make my position clear. In accepting an assignment to the committee, as far as I personally am concerned, I shall feel that members of the executive branch of the service should not have their names used in a manner which casts reflection upon them without giving them an opportunity to be heard. My understanding is that the chairman of the committee has been quoted in the press as saying that he intends to see that Dr. Condon is given an opportunity to appear before the committee. Certainly such a move as that in the committee will have my support.

I know nothing about Dr. Condon, personally; I have no prejudged convictions about him one way or the other; but I do think any man is entitled to be heard in his own defense if he is accused or his loyalty publicly questioned. At the same time, I wish to say that I think such situations as this would be largely avoided and, when they arise, would be more speedily cleared up if the executive agencies were free to give the committee full information from their files. The President's directive of August 5, 1948, effectively puts an iron curtain between the committee and information which is generally important and frequently essential if justice is to be done.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. KERR, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 2632) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 111), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TABER reserved all points of order on the bill.

WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 96, providing

for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2402) to extend the office of the War Assets Administrator and the War Assets Administration from February 28, 1949, until June 30, 1949, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2402) to extend the office of the War Assets Administrator and the War Assets Administration from February 28, 1949, until June 30, 1949. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules letting me present this bill which has for its purpose the continuation of the War Assets Administration for about 4 months. The life of the present administration expires on the 28th of February 1949. We are seeking to have it extended until June 30, 1949. I think those of us who were in the war and saw the tremendous amount of matériel and other things that are still in existence, and should, if possible, be made available for peacetime construction and peacetime promotion of some kind will realize that this additional time is necessary for the Board to act. I believe we may say this is the legislative opportunity for us to in a way carry out the Biblical admonishment of beating our swords into plowshares and our spears into pruning hooks, and to try to get this matériel, as far as possible, into peacetime production.

I am sure the House will realize this is a worthwhile project. The time on this rule has been divided between the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] and myself.

I now yield to my distinguished colleague, the Congressman at Large from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] such time as he may desire. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I add my sentiments to those of my colleagues here and millions of people the world over regarding the unscrupulous, malicious and dastardly crime that was perpetrated on a prince of the Catholic Church and six of his associates by the Hungarian People's Court. The Russians criticized us for meddling in this matter. Well, if that is meddling, then we should add to its meaning for all time to come a practice of resentment and defense against indignities and assaults committed on people everywhere in the world, upon all religions and upon freedom itself.

That unfair trial was not directed entirely to a religious group. It was a direct attempt by a pagan dictatorship to break the very souls of free thinking men and women.

Let us be proud that we are Americans knowing that we not alone have the strength and courage to discern an injustice, but that we have the fortitude to express ourselves freely. We are the greatest democracy in the world today and we can be sure that we shall always maintain that status. It is in the annals of history that every emperor, king, or dictator who attempted to crush his subjects, or conquer the world, was himself crushed. If Cardinal Mindszenty does not win in his appeal, or if his brave spirit is extinguished by torture in the vile prison where his Communist captors have him confined, let it be a warning to the Red dictators that they are only preparing the way for their own downfall.

Josef Cardinal Mindszenty's conviction by a Hungarian court and sentence to imprisonment for life is an affront to liberty-loving people everywhere and an assault upon Christianity, and in truth upon all religion. This was persecution not prosecution. This was the most savage attack of civil power against the dignity of a man of God since the dictator Napoleon arrested and kidnaped Pope Pius VII 140 years ago. The conscience of mankind is aroused; and in the end whether Cardinal Mindszenty dies in the medieval prison where he is imprisoned, whether he is executed or released in response to the demands of outraged citizens and officials of democratic nations, he will be remembered with reverence and his persecutors condemned and forgotten. People who are religious and who love freedom will not forget.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I desire.

Mr. Speaker, first I want to compliment the new member of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Ohio, for the clear way in which he explained the rule now before us. Inasmuch as this comes with a unanimous report of the Committee on Expenditures there is no disposition on the part of any one on this side to oppose the rule, although I understand that members of the Committee on Expenditures will fully explain the bill when we go into committee in order that all will fully understand.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2402) to extend the Office of the War Assets Administrator and the War Assets Administration from February 28, 1949, until June 30, 1949.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2402, with Mr. WHITTINGTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, H. R. 2402 comes before the Congress on a time urgency basis. The supplemental Independent Offices Appropriation bill of 1949 which was passed June 9, 1948, by the Eightieth Congress, contained language which terminated the War Assets Administration and the Office of War Assets Administrator as of February 28, 1949.

Time has proven that this action was premature and ill-advised. The legislative language was placed in the appropriation bill against the advice of every member of the Rizley Subcommittee on Surplus Property Disposal, of which I was the ranking Democratic member. The members of the subcommittee (both Republicans and Democrats) had studied the problem of surplus disposal for 18 months. We were unanimously agreed that a year's extension was needed to liquidate the $4,555,000,000 of surplus property which then remained.

The appropriation committee ignored our recommendation and arbitrarily set an 8-month time limit for termination.

Today's urgency therefore demonstrates again the fallacy of ignoring a legislative committee's recommendation based on long study and justified conclusions, and substituting therefor arbitrary legislative provisions in an appropriation bill.

Now what is the present problem?

The War Assets Administration's authority to function expires February 28 in 10 more legislative days, according to Public Law 862.

The War Assets Administration still has to dispose of approximately $2,300,000,000 worth of real and personal property.

Approximately $2,000,000,000 is the value of real property involved; $300,000,000 is the value of personal property.

The War Assets Administration has, at this time, a smoothly functioning organization with which to continue liquidating this property in the most economical and efficient manner. Under the present Administrator, Mr. Jess Larson, the efficiency of the War Assets Administration has constantly improved. The personnel has been drastically reduced as the property load has diminished. I will refer in a few minutes to some charts which Mr. Larson used before the Appropriations Committee a few days ago, to further illustrate the true record and status of the War Assets Administration.

For the moment let us consider the alternative of allowing the War Assets Administration to expire on February 28:

First. The Government would still have the custody of $2,300,000,000 worth of property, yet to be disposed of.

Second. At the present time there is no central property disposal agency with the experience, personnel, and budget allowance to assume these duties.

Third. Under Public Law 862 heretofore alluded to—the supplemental independent offices appropriation bill of the Eightieth Congress—additional legislative language directed that property remaining in the hands of War Assets Administration on February 28, 1949, should be divided among four separate Government agencies:

(a) Real property to RFC.

(b) Ordinary personal propert, to the Bureau of Federal Supply.

(c) Aircraft component parts—acquisition value, $504,000,000—to the Department of the Air Force.

(d) Administrative property, records, and accounts to the Treasury Department.

During the hearings on H. R. 2402 representatives from these Departments appeared before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments or filed statements and letters protesting any transfer of these properties and duties at this time on the grounds that—

(a) No appropriation is carried in their 1949 fiscal budget to assume these duties.

(b) They do not have the personnel or background of experience to do the job.

(c) The interruption of the present disposal procedure would cost the taxpayers many extra millions of dollars.

Realizing the necessity for continued operation of the War Assets Administration, and by request of the President, an appropriation of $15,000,000 has been included in the present deficiency appropriation bill, which is under consideration by the Appropriations Committee. I understand Judge KERR's subcommittee has approved a slightly reduced appropriation for this purpose, but we are faced with a practical situation. The present appropriations bill also includes several controversial items over which debate will cause delay in final passage until after February 28.

We therefore face the necessity of immediate legislative authorization for this agency.

H. R. 2402 extends the life of the War Assets Administration from February 28 to June 30. The pending supplemental appropriation bill will provide the necessary funds for operational expenses until June 30, or until the functions of the War Assets Administration are absorbed by a permanent property disposal agency, which I understand has been recommended by the Hoover Commission.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will the gentleman advise as to any information he may have as to the amount of money it will be necessary to appropriate for this agency?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. If the gentleman had been listening carefully to my remarks he would have found that I gave the House the following language——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I was listening, may I say to the gentleman, to every single word he said. Perhaps I did not get it.

Mr. HOLIFIELD—

An appropriation of $15,000,000 has been included in the present deficiency appropriation bill.

I later stated that I understand the requested $15,000,000 has been reduced slightly by Judge KERR's subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What does that slightly mean?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I have no official figures, but I understand that it has been reduced $2,500,000, and is now $12,500,000. The gentleman will have to consult the Committee on Appropriations to get verification of that. I only received the information over the phone.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman can readily understand, then, why we do not have the figures, if he does not know himself.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I do know myself.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. How much is it?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I think my previous statement is adequate.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. In the gentleman's further statement this morning will he have the total amount of war surplus property that we had on hand at the end of the war, when it was turned over to the War Assets Administration? Does the gentleman know how much that was?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I believe the charts which I intend to explain will give that information.

Mr. STEFAN. They will show how much they had and what the receipts have been up to now?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. It is my intention now to explain that.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman will also tell the Committee, will he not, that the War Assets Administration has nothing to do with the surplus in foreign countries over which the foreign liquidation has been operating? That is not included in the gentleman's figures?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No, not unless it has been declared surplus and brought home. Some surplus property has been brought home over the past 3 years.

Mr. STEFAN. Approximately $8,000,000,000 of surplus was in the countries of Europe, from which we collected approximately $1,000,000,000. There is now left over there, I understand, around $100,000,000 worth. None of that has anything to do with the War Assets Administration, for which we are legislating at this time? Is that correct?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right. That is in the hands of the Foreign Liquidation Commission and has nothing to do with the War Assets Administration.

Mr. STEFAN. But you have in your figures the total amount that we originally had, the cost and the approximate receipts to date?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I intend to give that information to the House at the present time.

The chart which is presented to the House at this time shows that in May 1945 on VE-day there was a total of $25,000,000,000 of surplus property which would have to be disposed of. This figure of $25,000,000,000 includes the amount that was then on hand and such amounts as have been declared up until December 31, 1948. During that period of time the War Assets Administration has disposed of $14,600,000,000 by sales. It has by scrapping, donations, and transfers to other governmental agencies disposed of $9,700,000,000. It has disposed in the form of leases of $800,000,000. It has realized from this the total figure of $4,140,000,000. Its operating costs have been $95,000,000. It has therefore given to the Government a net return of $3,190,000,000. This sales realization compared to the $14,600,000,000 figure, 28.4 percent of the acquisition cost, if compared to the total amount—and I call attention to the fact here that $9,700,000,000 has been disposed of without income to the Government, but with great benefit to other divisions of government such as States, cities, hospitals, schools, and so forth—would amount to about 17.2-percent recovery. That is, if it is compared to the total amount.

The operating cost shows for the total amount of service which the War Assets Administration has rendered, that it amounts to 6.5 percent of the realized return.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. You say that in 1945 we had $25,000,000,000 worth of surplus property, of which we disposed of $14,000,000,000 worth? That is, you gave away $9,000,000,000?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is approximately correct.

Mr. STEFAN. Does that $14,000,000,000 include the $9,000,000,000?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No.

Mr. STEFAN. Then what did you really collect?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. You add the two together to get the $25,000,000,000, which represents the acquisition cost to the Government of all declared surplus.

Mr. STEFAN. What did you really collect in cash from the $25,000,000,000?

How much did you collect in cash and turn over to the Treasury from the original $25,000,000,000?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Four billion one hundred and forty million dollars.

Mr. STEFAN. That was in cash out of the $25,000,000,000?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. And those figures show that approximately one-quarter of the net return has been used in administrative expenses, is that right?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The relation would be 6.5 percent operating cost to 28.4 percent realization.

Mr. KEATING. That means that out of every dollar collected, approximately 25 cents has been used up for administrative expenses, is that correct?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is true.

Mr. KEATING. Does the gentleman have any chart showing the people who have received this property; how it has been distributed among individuals, municipalities, and so on? The reason I ask that is that I tried for many, many constituents to get some of this property and they simply got the run-around. They would be sent from one place to the other to get it, and when they got

there it would be gone. I have not been able to get any of it for any of my constituents. I would be interested to know who has gotten this property and where it has gone.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The property has been widely distributed among individuals, among States, schools, hospitals, and so forth. I believe you will find a partial breakdown in the last report of the War Assets Administration to the Congress.

Mr. KEATING. Does the gentleman have a chart showing the break-down?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I do not have a chart showing the break-down between the different agencies which have received this property.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] has again expired.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

I might point out that the $9,700,000,000 also includes withdrawals by the armed services of many hundreds of millions of dollars worth of property which was originally declared surplus, but which has since been reclaimed by them, in view of pressing needs which they had in the postwar era. At the present time a great deal of the aircraft component parts are being requested to be used in the so-called Berlin air lift in Germany.

Mr. KEATING. Do veterans now have, under existing law, any preference in procuring this surplus material?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes. There are certain veterans' preferences in real property, but I might point out that the amount of personal property that is left is quite small. It will amount to approximately $37,500,000 as of March 1. The aircraft component parts will total about $504,000,000. I will check that figure and supply the correct one if it is not right.

The veterans have certain rights for such real property as remains. There is not a great deal of it remaining.

Mr. KEATING. Do I understand that if we grant this extension of time we may have assurance that the War Assets Administration will be wound up and that they will not be coming in here asking for a further extension of time?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Here we have a break-down of the work which can be done by this agency in the next 4 months, which is the period of time provided in H. R. 2402. There is still $2,299,000,000 worth of property to be disposed of. According to their present schedule, on the real property they expect to dispose of $468,000,000 worth. There will be left on June 30, $1,269,000,000 worth of real property. Included in that is $800,000,000 long-term leases on aluminum plants and other large facilities. Such leases run from 5 to 25 years.

With reference to aircraft component parts, out of a total of $504,000,000, $210,000,000 is expected to be sold by June 30, and that will leave a balance of $294,000,000.

In all other agencies combined there will be $689,000,000 sold and $1,609,000,000 worth of property left. So they will not be completely finished by June 30.

In the meantime, it is my understanding that the Hoover Commission report, has requested that the Congress set up a central surplus property disposal agency. At that time this residue of real and personal property would be turned over to the central property disposal agency, if the Congress sets up such an agency.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. I wish to ask the gentleman about the disposal activity shown on his chart. In my district there is a big airport that was turned back to the city of Stockton which was utilized by the Army Air Force. I understand that at the time they turned it over they reserved the right to take it back in the event of a national emergency. The city has it on a nominal lease. Is that included in "Leases," or "Donations"?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is included in "Transfers without reimbursement."

Mr. JOHNSON. That also includes all those barracks and things for colleges?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right.

Mr. JOHNSON. Has it been a policy in turning over airports that the right is reserved to demand the return of the airport in the event of an emergency?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. There is a saving clause in all of the leases or transfers, I understand, which is placed in the contracts at the request of the military, where such request is deemed necessary in order to repossess this property in case of war.

Mr. JOHNSON. And the sales are outright sales for cash, are they not?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right. Maybe I should qualify that; in some cases time payments have been arranged.

Mr. JOHNSON. I mean that ultimately the purchaser pays the Government cash.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes; that is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HARDY. I notice on the chart $9,700,000,000 given away. That was entirely in keeping with legislation passed by this Congress; is not that correct?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes; it was.

Mr. HARDY. That includes transfers to other Federal agencies as well as in some cases special acts passed by Congress authorizing the transfer to municipalities or States.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right; it refers to all forms of transfer or donation without reimbursement; and it also refers to the scrapping of many things that had no commercial value.

Mr. HARDY. But that was done in accordance with legislation passed by Congress; and, therefore, any comparison of cash returns must be made between the 4.14 recovered and the 14 that was actually sold.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. From a standpoint of direct return on the amount of cash realized, not from the operational costs; because I have been told that War Assets' cost on handling the $9,700,000,000 worth of property scrapped or transferred without reimbursement was just as great proportionately as on the $14,600,000,000 which they sold.

Mr. HARDY. That is just the point I wanted to bring out. Now may I take the matter of administrative costs which was applied against the cash receipts, actually.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I applied it both ways, I may say to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. I know the gentleman does; but the proper way to apply it would be really to take only that portion and relate it to the cash value of the merchandise disposed of.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield, but my time is running out fast; I have used 25 of the 30 minutes allotted to my side.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Just a question to clear this up. You sold four billion one hundred and forty millions of gross sales, income; and there is nine hundred and fifty millions expense on that gross sales income; is that right?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Fourteen billion six hundred million dollars is the gross total of cash sales.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Four billion one hundred and forty millions received out of fourteen billion six hundred millions of sales.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. War Assets paid out $950,000,000 to sell $4,140,000,000.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Fourteen billion six hundred millions was the total sales figure at Government acquisition cost; $4,140,000,000 was the net receipt figure.

Mr. HARDY. If the gentleman will yield, that is just the point I was trying to make a while ago.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman did not get it very clear. In other words, as far as expense is concerned, the $950,000,000 covered the administration of $9,700,000,000; is that right?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Oh, no; that is wrong, the $950,000,000 is the complete operating cost for the whole $25,100,000,000, which was either sold, scrapped, or transferred without reimbursement.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is what I wanted to clear up.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, in the minute remaining I wish to point out that on June 30, 1947, the War Assets Administration had 41,900 employees. They have been reduced until last June 1948, when we considered the supplemental independent offices' appropriation bill, they had 17,100. At the present time—February 14, 1949—there are 5,000 employees, and this number will be reduced to 2,100 employees by June 30, 1949.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I was pleased to hear the gentleman from California mention that it is contemplated that some new method for disposing of surplus property which we have on hand will probably be recommended by the Hoover Commission. I

certainly hope that we can at long last find some means to put the disposal of this property into the hands of an organization that will administer it without getting into the confusion, the red-tape, the impossible situations that the War Assets Administration have gotten into and I take this time to show you how wound up the War Assets Administration can get with itself.

You have had your attention called to the disposal of some of this property to municipalities, States, schools and so forth. I happen to have a vocational school up in my district in Appleton, Wis., which tried to get a multilith machine, a duplicating machine in other words. They went to the Bureau of Community Facilities who attempted to be very helpful to them in trying to find one of these multilith machines.

Back in the early part of 1948 they had assigned to them by the War Assets Administration what they thought was a machine that would serve the purpose. This was sent out to the school, but in unpacking it they found it had so deteriorated by reason of improper storage it was impossible to use the machine. The company that originally produced the machine said that they could in no way repair the machine. The company stated that it was so bad it had to be junked. So, after a lot more red-tape there came through an order to junk it.

They thought maybe they could find another one some place. The War Assets Administration apparently did find one and so certified it to the Bureau of Community Facilities; but when the time came for delivery it could not be found.

Then finally they said, "Well, now, we have found something for you," and they shipped a box. Supposedly it was a multilith machine and that is what the order called for, but when the school opened it up they found it was a ditto machine, which is anything but a multilith machine. The school has no use for a ditto machine. Now, somebody can use a ditto machine, but this school cannot. The excuse of the War Assets Administration for that situation was that when it was originally declared surplus it was marked as a multilith machine and when they shipped the box up to the school they did not find out what it contained.

In my office we call this case the comedy of errors. We have spent a good deal of time within the last 6 months trying to straighten it out. The Bureau of Community Facilities has been trying to solve this problem, and no doubt other agencies of War Assets have spent a great deal of time to try to straighten out this little multilith-machine transfer which should not have been too complicated in the first instance.

Here is a letter which I received on February 8 from Mr. Carl Bertram, director of the Appleton Vocational School, and I will read a part of it:

February 2, I received a telephone call from Mr. Crain, of the Bureau of Community Facilities in Chicago, who stated that he had received a call from their office in Washington, D. C., and that there were two offset duplicating machines, either of which this school might have. These two machines were items 52 and 53 on the declaration made to the Bureau of Community Facilities. One was a Davidson, model 221, offset printing press and the other a model 2066 multilith. Both machines are in good operating condition.

Mr. Crain said that I should go to Minneapolis at once to determine which machine would best serve our needs. Accordingly, I had a representative of this institution make a special trip to Fort Snelling for the purpose of examining the two items. He visited the Veterans' Administration center where the machines were located on Monday, February 7. I received a call from him, and he stated that neither machine was at the center. The story that was given him was that the duplicator had been disposed of to the Michigan School of Mines at Houghton prior to November 1, 1948, and the multilith, model 2066, which would normally sell for at least $6,000, was not disposed of by December 1, 1948. Since no one made any effort to claim the multilith for anyone wanting it, the instructions were to junk it by December 1. In spite of the fact that this machine had a minimum fair value of $2,500 as stated in their own declaration, they informed our representative that it had been sold for junk.

Well, now, that is what happened in just one small case in this program for surplus disposal. Think of the time and effort that has been consumed not only by men on the pay roll of the War Assets Administration, but in all the other agencies, such as the Bureau of Community Facilities, and by the little communities and schools who are trying to get this material. I certainly hope that the Hoover Commission does come in with a recommendation to provide a reasonable method for the disposal of the property that is remaining today.

I am going to vote for this extension, sure, because we do not have any alternative. But, if there was an alternative, I certainly believe that I would take the alternative, rather than the continuation of the present set-up.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER].

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, as a member of this committee I intend to vote for this legislation. I do not intend to take much time of the Members of this House. I was interested in noting that the number of employees by June 30 will have been decreased to 2,100. I am hopeful, with 2,100 employees rather than the thousands that they formerly had that, we might be able to make more headway in disposing of the rest of the surplus materials that we have and get the job finished. If it is necessary, perhaps, to give more attention to veterans' preference; if it is necessary to make it easier for veterans to buy this material, I would be for it, because I think that the quicker we get it disposed of the less money it is going to cost us. I note that it is going to cost us $12,500,000 for the next 4 months to dispose of this surplus material. I am quite sure that we are not going to be finished with the job at that time; I am sure that we will not.

But, I do hope, Mr. Chairman, that those who have the responsibility of disposing of this material will not, as is so often done, delay the disposal in order to perpetuate themselves in jobs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Expenditures has had this matter before it several times. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union undoubtedly knows as much and probably more about war assets and legislation connected with the congressional effort to dispose of the war assets than any Member of the House. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], who is the chairman of the committee, advises me that we had surplus property back in 1933, property which had been accumulated by the various agencies of the Government, and we had legislation looking toward its disposal at that time. That was before I had the privilege of being here. He also advises me that the committee reported out legislation to dispose of war assets in 1944.

Practically every Member of the House who has ever had any dealing with the War Assets Administration can tell a story similar to that so accurately told by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES]. I notice a gentleman in front here nodding his head. I recall very, very distinctly that I was never able to get from War Assets anything for any veteran; no, never. I tried to get tools for dentists, dental chairs, trucks for veteran farmers; oh, I do not know what all—yes, one time a cabin cruiser for a doctor who was a veteran. I do not know what he wanted of it, but he wanted it. I had it up with the War Administrator for months and was finally advised by someone in the department to just forget it, because "everyone in the Navy has a cabin cruiser, and they use them until they are not worth repairing, so you tell your friend and constituent to forget it." So I did. That was one of my experiences.

My first experience with this kind of legislation arose on a bill that was introduced by the committee. There were members of the committee at that time who wanted to place the property in the hands of some selling agency and get rid of it. Then there was another group of witnesses who came before the committee, and they wanted to junk it, sink it in the sea, because, they said, the experience with the First World War assets had shown it would cost more to administer the selling of the property than we ever got out of it.

We will have to take this extension, because there is nothing else we can do. But what bothers me is this. In the legislation which became law on June 30, 1948, the very first provision that has to do with surplus-property disposal reads this way:

Effective February 28, 1949, the office of War Assets Administrator is abolished and the War Assets Administration shall cease to exist as an agency of the Government.

We put a definite time, a limitation on it. The War Assets agency knew very well that it was the desire of Congress that it should wind up its affairs in February 1949. Did they do it? No; they did not. Now they say June 30, 1949. I recall the other day, when this bill was before the committee, I asked one of the members of the committee, I think it was the majority leader of the House, about this terminal date. One of the members of the committee had asked, "Is June 30, 1949, the date of termination, going to finish it then?"

Well, the majority leader, as I recall it, said he thought it might be, but it was my suggestion that perhaps June 30, 1949, was just a way station on a long, long road, a sort of a whistle stop that they were going to put in there on a road without an end.

I do not know how the Congress can end some of these unnecessary expenses. The Eightieth Congress certainly caught heck all up and down the country during the last campaign because it did not do this, that, or the other thing. But in June of last year, we told the War Assets Administration to wind up its business and end this expense. They did not do it. Now we give them another lease of life, because we are forced into it. I have an amendment which proposes to strike out June 30, 1948, and insert January 1, 1950, and add a provision that they should on that date go out of existence.

Then I looked at the old law, and I said, "Well, we told them that last year, so what is the use of telling them again?"

I shall vote for the extension. There is nothing else that we can do. But I wonder if the majority, come June 30, is going to say to this Department down there, in view of this great economic program that the President submitted to us "You fellows are through." I ask you now. I see the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] wants to give us an answer.

I yield to the gentleman from California, a member of the committee.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I have already stated that the total job of disposal will not be done by June 30. I said that on the floor on June 9, 1948, during the debate on the floor, to set the time limit at February 28, that it was a totally unrealistic approach to the solution of the problem, and did not give to the War Assets Administration enough time to do the tremendous job that they have to do and which the gentleman, if he had been present when Mr. Larson testified, would remember to follow.

Mr. Larson testified that the $25,000,000,000 disposal program was a greater program than the four or five greatest corporations in America rolled into one. They had to do it with inexperienced help and had to do it under restrictive legislation which Congress put upon their disposal problem, the restrictions of priority and procedure, which an ordinary merchandiser in the sale of merchandise would not have to put up with. Therefore, it has delayed the program.

We will always have in Government a surplus property disposal problem.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then I gather from what you say the Congress is to blame because we wrote all these restrictions in?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I will say that I helped to write those restrictions in. I do not place the blame on the Congress because I believe that we were putting those restrictions in from the standpoint of protecting the priority rights of veterans, municipalities, States and other political subdivisions.

But owing to the fact that we did put them in, it made it a more onerous duty of the War Assets Administration to perform their functions in the disposal of this property, because they had certain advertising, periods of time, certain exercises of the priorities, and so forth, which prohibited them from making an outright sale such as a commercial establishment would be able to do.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then to boil it all down, when do you think, or when have you been assured, that the War Assets Administration will be through forever?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I believe that during this session of Congress there will be a central agency, probably the Treasury Department, or some other agency, which will take over the duty of surplus property disposal.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You mean that somebody else is going to take on this job?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I mean to say that I believe one of the reorganization plans of the President will consolidate the problem of surplus property disposal, which is a part of every bureau of Government, into one central agency, and there we will be able to scrutinize it more closely.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. When do you think we will get rid of the personal property that is properly war assets? Let us forget the real estate for a moment.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I think most of the personal property will be disposed of within the following year. I am speaking now of war surplus property.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Why not change this date, then, to January 1 and make it a year? Have you any idea we are ever going to wind up the functions of the War Assets Administration, whether it is administered under the War Assets or some other agency?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has again expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman has seen the chart showing the reduction from around $25,000,000,000 down to $2,000,000,000 in the 3 years in which the War Assets Administration has been functioning?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, at the same rate they ought to be through, then, within a year?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is my prediction.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman has made reference to two kinds of property; first, to personal property, and then to real property. On the whole, I agree with what the gentleman from Michigan has said. However, I do want to make this observation: The condition of the country today, as far as world affairs is concerned, is such that it seems to me we would be doing the country disservice if we required the War Assets Administration to immediately dispose of all of this property that is in its custody. For instance, I have in mind an extrusion plant. Some probably do not know what that is, but it is a big aluminum plant. It cost the Government $13,000,000. It has been declared surplus. They are going to use these new types of airplane that are just now coming to the market. If we dispose of this plant it will be necessary for someone to buy it, to use it, or to convert it into something else. It will be converted. Now if worst comes to the worst, and we should have another war, we would have eighteen or twenty million dollars more and a year or two of extra time required to furnish the very thing we now have. I advocate and urge careful consideration and slow final disposition of real estate and plants and equipment that will be essential and that will be required if we should get into war within the next 6 months or year.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman. That is all very well. My purpose was to call attention to the fact that it is extremely difficult for Congress to do anything about expense, which some of us and some of our constituents seem to think is unnecessary. My folks say, "Why don't you cut out some of these things?" We just heard within the last week about this duplication and unnecessary expense in the departments. Here we are with another one. I am doubtful whether the gentleman's estimate of a year is going to see the end of this.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan and also the gentleman from California this question: If an agency of Government declares any of its property surplus, does that property automatically go to the War Assets Administration?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. May I answer that question?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. At the present time there has been no declaration since 1948 to the War Assets Administration. They were not allowed to receive surplus disposals from any other agency. As a result, in my opinion, we have lost millions of dollars because some of the agencies were not given an opportunity to function on as broad a basis as the War Assets Administration, and they were scrapping material which could have been sold.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Agencies of Government are continually declaring items surplus, are they not?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. CRAWFORD. To what agency do those goods go for disposal?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Some of the agencies dispose of them themselves. If I am in error, the gentleman from California will correct me.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The Treasury Department can dispose, under certain circumstances, of the material, but military agencies in many instances are restricted. They scrap material which could be sold, but they have to scrap it because of certain provisions in the law.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And in some instances they scrap it because the administrative cost of trying to dispose of it is greater than the stuff is worth. The Congress attempts to end some of the agencies but they refuse to quit—that is the fault of the Administration—the executive branch—not the fault of the Congress—but we get the blame.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McSWEENEY].

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I listened very carefully to the hearings on this question. It is astonishing that so much of our war material is being sold as junk; it is a very serious thing. It happened that my colleague from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], and I served together in Italy during the last war. Orders came over there for a tremendous amount of aluminum to be sold as scrap. It turned out, however, to be a source of great income for certain persons in Italy. This material was sold in bulk and not by weight. They made a great deal of money out of what we should have had an opportunity to sell ourselves.

Another thing that interests me is the fact that no matter what you try to do, war, from beginning to end, is waste, a waste of human life, a waste of the matériel of a country, and a waste of the natural resources of a country. To me, this bill is merely an effort on the part of our Government to try to salvage as much as possible and to get it back from war purposes into peace purposes.

Another thing in regard to this bill that I also find of great interest is the fact that if we do have a reorganization plan, and I hope we shall have, the Treasury or some other branch of Government will take over the disposition of this material, then we shall have at the disposal of whatever department takes over this work a trained personnel, part of which could be absorbed by the said department and thereby I believe expedite a work that is very necessary after any great conflict.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio yields back 3 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the paragraph under the heading "Surplus Property Disposal" in the Supplemental Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1949, is amended by striking out "February 28, 1949" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1949."

SEC. 2. The item "Salaries and expenses" under the heading "Salaries and Expenses, War Assets Administration, Special Fund" in the Supplemental Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1949, is amended by striking out "February 28, 1949" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1949."

The CHAIRMAN. There being no amendments, the Committee automatically rises under the rule.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2402) to extend the Office of the War Assets Administrator and the War Assets Administration from February 28, 1949, until June 30, 1949, pursuant to House Resolution 96, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS OF THE THOMAS JEFFERSON MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Resolution 49, Seventy-third Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission the following Members of the House: Mr. SMITH, Virginia; Mr. WHITTINGTON, Mississippi; Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, New Jersey.

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 816, Eightieth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. MAHON, Texas; Mr. BROOKS, Louisiana; Mr. ENGEL, Michigan; Mr. MEYER, Kansas.

MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 16, section 513, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the National Forest Reservation Commission the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. COLMER, Mississippi; Mr. WOODRUFF, Michigan.

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 20, sections 42 and 43, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution the following Members of the House: Mr. CANNON, Missouri; Mr. COX, Georgia; Mr. VORYS, Ohio.

THE FREEDOM TRAIN

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 95 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 84) to provide for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train by the Archivist of the United States, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments which may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of the time on the rule to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the bill which will be before the committee on adoption of this rule is one that I introduced. Its purpose is to assure continuance of the Freedom Train, as provided in the bill, up to July 4, 1951, which will be the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence.

We know the great results that have flown from the operation of the Freedom Train and its journey throughout the country. Roughly speaking, it visited between 550 and 600 cities and communities. The throngs of people who have gone to see the historical contents of that train have been tremendous.

Already there are close to 600 requests from communities in the United States where the train did not pass through for the visitation of the train if this bill should pass and become law. It is estimated that for the next 2 years it will cost about $2,500,000; $1,500,000 for the first year, and $1,000,000 for the second year. It seems to me that in these days when liberty is being challenged it would be an excellent investment for our Government to assure the continuance of this program through governmental appropriation, and bringing to the people and to the children, to the young men and the young ladies of the different parts of the country, these historic documents to intensify in their minds the meaning of liberty.

Down through the ages comes the cry of great statesmen and of countless millions of people that "Where law ceases, tyranny starts." The meaning of that is that where a government of law ceases to exist, tyranny begins, and where there does not exist a government of law, there must exist a government of men. Liberty, in the case of a benevolent dictator, exists in part only through tolerance and sufferance, or in the case of a vicious dictator, by the modern totalitarian or police state, where liberty is completely suppressed and destroyed. We do not want to live under such conditions.

I want to express my appreciation to our friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for introducing the resolution with reference to Cardinal Mindszenty and Archbishop Stepinac, and to congratulate every Member of the House of Representatives for the unanimous passage of this resolution last week. If the Evangelical ministers who have since been arrested had been arrested then, they would have been included, and should be, in the resolution. I think I speak the sentiments of all my colleagues when I say that while they are not specifically included, we intend that they should be. I would welcome a resolution being introduced covering them, and I would do everything I could to bring it out so that this branch of the Congress would place itself on record emphatically in relation to the arrest and future imprisonment, as the newspapers say, of the 15 ministers of the Evangelical faith in Bulgaria, and do it as strongly as we did in the case of the two churchmen of the creed of which I am a communicant that the House acted upon so decisively last week.

The world, in my opinion, is faced with its most serious challenge in the known history of man. Our way of life is being challenged. We Americans, as Members of the Congress, might disagree on this or that bill; we might have our views with reference to a particular piece of legislation or a portion of a particular piece of legislation, but we all agree in the fundamentals that our Government stands for. We all agree in those fundamentals that make up our way of life, and we all recognize that the fundamentals we believe in come from God Himself, and that when any force undertakes to challenge any organized religion, the members of which believe in God, whether Catholic, Protestant, or Jew, it should be resisted by all means at our command.

I was very proud the other day of the strong statement made by Secretary of State Acheson in condemnation of the tactics of the Hungarian Communist Government in the trial and prosecution of Cardinal Mindszenty. That applied to everyone. While directly applicable to the cardinal, the statement made by Secretary Acheson applied to all others past, present, and in the future, who may be the subject of persecution simply because they believe in God.

I was also very proud of the strong statement made by President Truman condemning the Hungarian Communist Government.

The only offense any of these spiritual men, Catholic, Protestant, or Jew, who have suffered, might be charged with is that they believe in the word of God and are opposed to communism or opposed in any way to the modern totalitarian state. The modern totalitarian state is one that would destroy the dignity of the individual. It is where the individual becomes a cog in the wheel of the institution known as the state, and where the state is supreme and ruthless in compelling obedience on the part of the individual.

We have it behind the iron curtain. One day it is a Catholic priest or a bishop or a cardinal who is persecuted, the next day it is ministers of the Lutheran faith. As a matter of fact, one of the great bishops of the Lutheran faith has also been subjected to persecution in Bulgaria. Now it is the Evangelical faith.

The whole purpose is to try to break down the very backbone of our civilization, without which our civilization could not exist, people who believe in one God and who believe in living up to His law.

We have heard a lot of talk recently about Marshal Tito in Yugoslavia having a break with the Soviet Union. Of course we must view that with considerable suspicion. The sincerity of that must be very carefully inquired into in view of the suspicion, which is justifiable. If Marshal Tito is sincere and there is a break between him and his government and Stalin and the government of the Soviet Union, Marshal Tito could give some very strong evidence to the people of the world of that sincerity by releasing Archbishop Stepinac from jail and letting him go back to his people. He could also evidence it by refusing to allow the Communist guerrillas of Greece to receive aid and assistance from any sources within Yugoslavia.

Those are two actions on the part of Tito that would be very strongly indicative of sincerity on his part when he undertakes to say to the world that there is a break between him and his government and Stalin and the government of the Soviet Union.

A year and a half ago I spoke on the floor of this body—and I do not think I am an alarmist; I try to view things rationally—and I said then and repeat now that the Soviet Union is challenging our way of life; that the ideology known as communism is simply used by the Soviet Union as a nation to deceive people and through it to take over country after country and bring them within the orbit of the Soviet Union; and that the Soviet Union is the most reactionary form of government that could exist. Anything is reactionary that suppresses or destroys the proper exercise of the dignity of the individual. . .

The Soviet Union is imperialistically inclined. I said that a year and a half ago. Its imperialism takes the form of an ideology to dominate the world. Ultimately every one of their actions is aimed at the United States of America, I said then, and I say now, that world conditions could easily be improved if the representatives of the Soviet Union entered into the council of the nations of the world with a mind of understanding. But as long as they refuse to approach the solution of international questions with an understanding mind, then this constant pressure on their part is going to continue. Where it will lead, one does not have to look very far into the future to determine. There is a point beyond which we cannot permit the pressure to go.

May I say to the Soviet Union that they had better not misunderstand or underestimate the people who are free in the world today. They had better not underestimate the people of America, because where liberty and law cease tyranny begins. That was translated in terms of our American history by Patrick Henry when he said, "Give me liberty or give me death."

The American people can only stand so much, and if the Soviet Union thinks that they can proceed upon the theory that we are afraid of them, they are likely to wake up some morning realizing that they have misunderstood the mind and temper of the people of America, and the mind and temper of the people of free nations of the world which still exist.

We find in the arrest of the cardinal and the arrest of the archbishop and the arrest of the 15 ministers that they are charged with a conspiracy to overthrow their own government, and that they are accused of being agents of the United States.

Every one of these cases starts out with the charge that they are acting for the United States or for the United States and Great Britain. Then, through cruelty and through actions that human beings physically cannot resist, they obtain confessions. Then they go through their trial, which is a sham affair, for propaganda purposes, not only benind the iron curtain but throughout the rest of the world.

While I am talking about propaganda, I am wondering when the distinguished judge in New York, Judge Medina, is going to stop the Communists and their attorneys in New York from using his court for propaganda purposes throughout the world, and behind the iron curtain as well, and instead of putting our whole constitutional system of government on trial, make those attorneys get down to the legal question of whether or not the grand jury was properly selected in accordance with the law of the United States—and not in accordance with the law of the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, I speak thusly because all religions are attacked. Our way of life is attacked. The people of America have been tolerant, but we cannot afford to see country after country, with their enemies from within backed and supported by the Soviet Union, against their will being taken out of the orbit of western civilization, which means so much to us, so much to them, and so much to the entire world. There is a time when we must act, and act affirmatively. Russia must, in order to bring about peace, make its contribution and must approach the solution of these problems with understanding not only in Europe but in China as well. We cannot let China become subject to Communist government.

By the way, in my opinion a coalition government of China is nothing but a Communist government, and I hope that the Nationalist Government will not capitulate in China. I hope China will not become subject to domination and become another satellite nation of the Soviet Union.

This is a great question, the world question, the question of the ages. Its solution in the main rests with the United States of America. We of this generation appreciate that for which our forefathers fought. The liberty for which they fought is being threatened today.

Mr. Speaker, the remarks that I have made now will be most appropriate in relation to the joint resolution which will presently be before the House, providing for the extension of the operation of the Freedom Train for the next 2 years.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], has made a very important statement. He has emphasized the very great importance of driving out of our lives those prejudices that make difficult people of the Christian faith and of high purposes joining together and making common cause in resisting the threat of communism that hangs over the world.

Mr. Speaker, there are very few of the Catholic faith who live in my district and therefore no political complexion can attach to the statement that I am about to make. The Christian world and all people who love liberty owe a deep debt of gratitude to the Catholic Church. It is the church that has been taking the brunt of the attack that has come from the east. The head of that church, the Pope of Rome, has for a long while and is now making a tremendous contribution to the endeavor to keep this sick and troubled world in balance, and as one who loves the Government under which we live and who loves liberty, I salute him.

Mr. Speaker, there has developed in certain circles, and I might be specific to the extent of saying Government circles, the habit of defending, and in many instances glorifying, people in the Government service who have been charged with disloyalty. I give you the examples of William Remington and Alger Hiss. The records made by committees of Congress investigating those cases establish beyond the possibility of doubt the fact that both were Communists and both, while holding high positions in departments of the Government, performed as agents of Russia.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill which this rule makes in order is to cultivate the love of country and the freedoms that we enjoy. It runs completely counter, however, to what has been the fashion in certain circles as regards the treatment of the Reds who are in and out of Government, all carrying on in the common purpose of undermining and ultimately destroying our whole system of free enterprise, and delivering our country and our people into the keeping of Soviet Russia.

I hope there will not be a single vote against the resolution; and I trust that as a result of the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, there may be forthcoming many Members hitherto completely silent on the question as to whether or not liberty is in danger who will defend the ideals which the gentleman has discussed and join in the determination that liberty shall not perish from the face of this earth.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as me may desire to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD a speech made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to use the time that has been allotted to me to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] one or two questions.

Am I right in understanding the gentleman to state that approximately 500 cities were visited by the Freedom Train during the time it was in operation?

Mr. McCORMACK. I believe I said 500, but the correct number is 325 cities. I understand that about 3,500,000 people visited the train.

Mr. FORD. And about 650 communities have requested that the train visit them?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am informed by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY], chairman of the committee, that the number is 581.

Mr. FORD. Is the gentleman at all familiar with, and if so, will he tell us, how the Freedom Train was financed in the past?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. The Freedom Train was financed by the American Heritage Foundation, a nonprofit foundation composed of businessmen, industrialists, labor unions, and so forth; the Government had nothing to do with financing the train or with its operation. It has operated for 16 months under the sponsorship of this foundation.

Mr. FORD. That was my understanding. My point is this, and it is rather simple: For the last 16 months the Freedom Train has been traveling all over the country. It so happened that I was connected with the committee in my community that went out and raised $7,500 to bring the train to our city. The money was raised for a most worthwhile purpose. I wholeheartedly subscribe to the program. But the Government did not come to our assistance or the assistance of the other 325 communities which over the past 16 months have shouldered the burden of financing the Freedom Train. Today some 650 additional communities want visits by the Freedom Train. My point is that if these communities want the train they should be willing to raise the necessary money among themselves to bring the train to their citizens.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sure the gentleman realizes the difficulty involved as well as he does the importance of having the train visit those parts of the country and those communities it did not visit during the past 16 or 17 months. I think the answer is that the evidence showed it would be very difficult to bring that about because most of the communities that would be visited are the smaller communities of the country, whereas the Freedom Train during the last 16 months or so was visiting the larger communities, among them the great metropolitan centers. I assure the gentleman I respect his viewpoint.

I think the train should visit those parts of the United States that have not been visited before and that it should only revisit those as to which there is some particularly compelling reason why that should be done. I believe further that this train should go into every section of the country that was not visited before. In practical operation, the evidence impressed me it would be very difficult to raise the funds necessary to pay the expense of the train, particularly from communities it will visit, because they are not the large metropolitan centers or substantial-sized cities that the train has visited during the past 16 or 17 months.

Mr. FORD. I am not minimizing the difficulty of raising the money because I am quite familiar with voluntary fund campaigns of this sort. It was a hard job for those who raised the money in the 325 communities and it would be a difficult job for the 650 communities. However, under no circumstances do I wish to have the gentleman or myself interpreted as stating that the communities that now want the train are not patriotic enough to go out and raise the money themselves.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not think that is involved. My friend from Tennessee has another observation which I think is very pertinent.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. The American Heritage Foundation is not willing to sponsor the train any longer. The train has been put in what we might call cold storage in the railroad yards at Wilmington. We are unable to find another private sponsor and if the Government does not sponsor the train its journey will not be resumed.

Mr. FORD. Have you thought that perhaps the Government might underwrite the portion that the American Heritage Foundation underwrote before and still get community participation by the 650 communities that now want the train to come to them so that the cost can be equalized?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. If the Government sponsors this train it should not charge any city anything for the exhibition of that train in the city. It should be free to the people of every community.

Mr. FORD. That is not the way it was in the last 16 months. The people in the 325 communities paid a share of the cost so that the train could visit them.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I see the logic of the gentleman's argument. On the other hand, I think there is logic in passing this bill. The mere fact that during the last 16 months 325 or more cities and communities contributed toward the expense of this train is valid indication of the interest of the people in the train and I do not think they would object where there is no sponsor to be obtained and where the sponsor of the last 16 months does not desire to continue for the Government continuing it where there is such a demand and where so many fine results would flow to the communities which the train will visit, being the beneficiaries of the visitation of the train at Government expense.

I appreciate the thought expressed by the gentleman. It is a very fine one and under no condition would I take any position except that the gentleman is very discerning in addressing that thought to the attention of the Members; but the fact is we could not get the Government to do this 16 or 17 months ago. The history of this matter is that some individuals, prominent Americans, conceived the idea and approached the Attorney General. The American Heritage Foundation sponsored it. As a result of the experience of the past 16 months we know the great benefits that flowed therefrom. The question is whether or not it is a desirable project to extend for the next 2 years so that it may go into other communities in the United States not previously visited. I think it is and under those circumstances none of the cities and communities visited in the past 16 months would feel very much concerned because they made certain contributions whereas during the next 2 years certain other cities and communities will not make any contribution. I make that statement in light of all the facts.

Mr. FORD. Just one word. I think it is highly desirable that the train go on in the future, but I think it is unfortunate that the proposed procedure is to be followed, because I know that in the communities where the train has been within the last 16 months, the mere fact that the citizens of those communities had to go out and individually raise funds to bring that train to their cities made them appreciate what a wonderful opportunity they had. Their contributions made them realize there was a real importance to those documents that were being brought to their communities for the education of their children, their fellow citizens and themselves.

Mr. McCORMACK. I cannot challenge what the gentleman says except to draw the line of differentiation. If this bill does not pass, the Freedom Train will not continue. This is the only way by which it will. I agree that if private sponsors could have continued it, and were willing and felt that they could, that it might be more desirable, and this question would not arise. But, in the exercise of their judgments—and I cannot question their judgment—they feel that they cannot continue it. Now we are faced with the proposition whether to discontinue it, and that is what will happen unless it is provided for in this bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, this resolution, of course, will pass, and we shall authorize the continuance of the Freedom Train with the hope that it will be beneficial to the Nation. It is quite evident that it will continue, even though it was started for 2 years, because it is appreciated by the people, and it coincides with the thought of the American people, and particularly the Congress, that once something is started, we always continue it.

I was interested in the very fine moral philosophy threading through the speech of the Majority Leader. I think his words were forceful and well directed toward the danger of the destruction of freedom, not only in this country but in the entire world. We, in America, who have been taught to love freedom and know what flows from it, want to always extend a bulwark if we can, against the danger of communism encompassing our Nation, and the destruction of the freedom and happiness of our people. If we can spend two or three million dollars to encourage freedom in this country, the Congress cannot do a better job than to extend the Freedom Train.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the fact that notwithstanding we have gone through a great war, notwithstanding the good intent of the principles of the "four freedoms", notwithstanding that the war cost $400,000,000,000 and the loss of a great many lives, the world has probably less freedom today than before we fought the recent war for more freedom.

Just within the past few months it appears that 400,000,000 people will come behind the iron curtain in a country with which we have always had the finest relations, China. When that goes, countless millions more will go. So it behooves the Members of this Congress, the President of the United States, and liberty-loving people of this country to be very serious in our effort to help to hold and secure the foundations of freedom in this country.

I think a spiritual resurgence throughout the length and breadth of this country, starting in the home, which is the most important element of government in our country, and going on up through the churches, is one of the finest things that could happen.

I was interested in the reference to the persecution of the religious leaders in Europe. We all condemn such atrocities.

The point I want to emphasize, and I think it is important, is that if we are finally to fight off Russian communism and the communization of the world it will be because we as Members of Congress, in cooperation with the President, conduct the fiscal affairs of this country in such a manner that we shall remain strong financially.

About 160 years ago there was written into the Constitution the power of the Congress of the United States to finance this country through the levying of taxes. With a debt of $252,000,000,000 hanging over the people today there should weigh more heavily on the minds of every Member of Congress that great responsibility, that mandate, if you please, that was written into the Constitution at Philadelphia; that is, to keep this country in a sound financial condition. To do this we shall have to stop waste, extravagance, cut the cost of Government, and constantly reduce the Federal debt.

I do not know what good the Freedom Train will do, but I do know that the Congress of the United States in passing upon legislation day after day has the opportunity to make the greatest contribution we can make to defeat communism's finally encompassing this country. It lies in the Halls of Congress and with the Chief Executive to render the greatest service to promulgate and perpetuate freedom in this country. If we do that we must fight against the constant approach of socialism, which is only the vestibule, which is only the first long step toward totalitarianism and communism in this country. That is something the Members of this Congress might well turn their attention to. It is more important than the Freedom Train.

Freedom in this country is invaluable to us and invaluable to our prosperity. I am for anything that can sell freedom to the people. I am in hopes that this Congress will so conduct itself in this session and in the next session that we may preserve with all of the strength and virility of the past, the financial solvency of this Government, because in the last analysis that is what we will have to rely upon in order to maintain and perpetuate our freedom, and fight off communism.

May I close by saying, let us give a little more genuine attention to the uprooting of the Communists and the containment of the influence of the Communists in this our own country.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely trust that the resolution which we are now considering will be passed unanimously. In speaking in behalf of the resolution I want to follow a little further along the path which my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], followed in his inquiries to the distinguished Majority Leader. It so happened that during the travels of the Freedom Train, one of the so-called smaller communities of the Nation, which was in my district, desired to have the train go through that section. I had a particularly strong feeling along that line, not only because the particular city was within my district, but because from that city came the second Congressional Medal of Honor man in this war. I speak of Lieutenant Bianchi. We, out in Minnesota, are as deeply patriotic as people in Massachusetts, Tennessee, Texas, or any other part of the country. Although I think the name "Freedom Train" was an attractive slogan, I feel

that it might just as well have been called "The American Train," because that train had as its purpose to call the attention of the people of our great country to the important documents and important events which mean so much to the freedom of the people of America. But whatever the title or name may be, let that train be assigned fairly in going from State to State in calling the attention of all the people of our country to that which the other speakers have so eloquently spoken of, namely the American principles that mean so much to us today and which may be so easily lost tomorrow, if we are not reminded that: "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

So, in the operation and administration of the so-called Freedom Train, I hope, as I am sure the attempt has been in the past, and that efforts will be made to see that not only does the Freedom Train go to the large metropolitan centers, but that it will go out to some of the smaller communities where people will drive 50, 100 and 150 miles to see the train because they, too, deeply love the principles of freedom.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the only thing before the House at the moment is the rule which would make it possible to call up and consider House Joint Resolution 84, a bill to provide for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train by the Archivist of the United States. If this rule prevails, and I am sure it will prevail, then the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will present the merits of the resolution. There will be adequate debate and I am sure that the legislative committee is prepared to answer all questions.

I favor not only the passage of the rule, but also the resolution. All those who have thus far spoken seem to be of like mind, and most of the debate has been on matter extraneous to House Joint Resolution 84. There have been no discordant tones in the debate, and I concur in the sentiments expressed by each speaker beginning with the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]. Surely the tour of the Freedom Train throughout the last few months has quickened patriotism, impressed our people as to just what the American way of life stands for, and on the whole has been a source of inspiration to all of our people.

The district which I have the honor to represent in Congress is composed of four counties in the southeast corner of Michigan, and the Freedom Train visited the three largest cities in the district. It was my privilege to attend meetings in two of those cities incident to the visit of the train. There was no political partisanship. We were all Americans believing in, and ready to fight for, a common cause. The preservation of our Constitution and the guaranty of freedom under our system of government were spectacularized to the end that the Freedom Train left in its wake a reconsecration on the part of the people to those principles for which our forbears had sacrificed, fought, and even died.

Mr. Speaker, I was permitted to participate in two of these celebrations in my district, and I would repeat here Freedom's Pledge, which was presumably used at every city where the Freedom Train stopped, were it not for the fact that the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE] has a copy of the pledge and will include it in the part of his remarks which are to follow.

The committee report accompanying this resolution is most informative and is a concise statement of what the resolution does. It reads as follows:

Under the terms of this resolution the Freedom Train will be continued for a period of approximately 2 years under the sponsorship of the Federal Government. For the past 16 months ending January 22, 1949, the Freedom Train has traveled throughout the United States under the sponsorship of the American Heritage Foundation. The American Heritage Foundation raised privately, through contributions from individuals and business associations, as well as quotas assessed against cities where the Freedom Train was exhibited, funds to cover the operation of the train.

During the 16 months the train operated more than 3,500,000 people visited the train and approximately 45,000,000 persons participated in a week of rededication which preceded the visit of the train to the various cities.

The program of the Freedom Train consisted of three parts. First, there was a continuous campaign of public education utilizing all means of mass communication to persuade the people of the country that "freedom is everybody's job." Second, there was the week of rededication immediately preceding the arrival of the train in each city. And finally, there was the visit of the Freedom Train itself. During the 16 months the train operated it visited 350 cities. It is understood that more than 500 additional communities have requested that they be visited by the Freedom Train.

There is no longer the prospect of a private sponsor or the private financing of the Freedom Train. Under the terms of the resolution the Archivist of the United States would be authorized to operate the Freedom Train. A commission would be established consisting of the following: The President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the minority leader of the Senate, the minority leader of the House of Representatives, the Attorney General of the United States, the Librarian of Congress, the Archivist of the United States, the chairmen of the Senate and House Committees on Post Office and Civil Service, and five members to be appointed by the President.

The Archivist, in carrying out the provisions of the resolution, would be required to formulate specific plans covering the program authorized by the resolution, which would include, among other things, plans for the acquisition, operation, exhibition, and disposition of the train.

In the view of the committee, consideration should be given, in the scheduling of the Freedom Train during the period in which it is to be operated under the sponsorship of the Federal Government, to arranging its itinerary so that it will visit, insofar as possible, cities where people have not had an opportunity to see the Freedom Train. The schedule should also reflect a wide distribution throughout the country, visiting the respective congressional districts.

(Mr. MICHENER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include some excerpts from the committee report.)

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the reference just now made by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] to the pledge of the Freedom Train probably makes it appropriate that I call to the attention of you, my distinguished colleagues in the House, that on the reverse side of my card as Representative in Congress from the Eighteenth Congressional District is printed the pledge of the Freedom Train, as follows:

I am an American, a free American,
Free to speak—without fear—
Free to worship God in my own way,
Free to stand for what I think right,
Free to oppose what I believe wrong,
Free to choose those who govern my country;
This heritage of freedom I pledge to uphold
For myself and all Americans.

And in many letters which leave my congressional office to go back to my congressional district this printed pledge has been and is daily sent, for it fairly accurately and truly portrays the freedoms which I feel we, as Congressmen must increasingly and more emphatically be willing to fight, and, if need be, die for.

Not yet in this worthy debate has anyone mentioned one of the main reasons, in my judgment, why we should this date vote aye on this bill. It is simply this: That the fact is that the last 16 months' trip of the Freedom Train over the railroad tracks of our Nation has given concrete evidence that the children and youth of our Nation are literally hungry and eager for more knowledge of their heritage and for the background of the beginning and the course of our Nation. I am informed that the great majority of those who visited the Freedom Train in the different cities are children or those of teen-age or of the ages of youth. In other words, gentlemen, the most important segment of our Nation, when it comes to talking in terms of the future strength of our Nation as relates to the freedom of our Nation, is the segment which has most largely attended upon the historical exhibits in the train. One reason for this, of course, is that the schools of the Nation have encouraged the school children to visit the Freedom Train. Likewise, it is because the parenthood of the Nation have seen to it that their children have visited these inspiring and informative exhibits. This is as it should be.

Yet in many places, thousands upon thousands of children and young people and adults could not get access to see these original documents and parchments. This is as it should not be. Every person in America who wishes to see these original documents of our forthright and inspiring history should have an opportunity so to do.

But these people cannot come to Washington—it is too costly and they live too many miles away. These documents have not been injured on the 16-months' journey and the fact that they are looking at the originals instead of copies or replicas is a great inspiration. Let us repeat and extend the opportunity to more millions of the children and youth of America as well as the adults to personally see these original documents.

May I remark that during the war, when I was here as a Member of the Seventy-ninth Congress from the great Eighteenth Congressional District of

California, I frequently went across the street to the Congressional Library and there stood in the presence of some of these original documents. It was a great inspiration to stand there quietly for a few minutes and to recollect my reading of the lives and purposes of these great men who participated in the creation of these parchments and in the history leading up to them and following their signatures.

As knowledge is said to always give power, so it must be true that personal observation of these original documents will give to the children and youth of the Nation, as well as the adults, a sense of personally belonging to the Nation. It will give them a sort of feel of what their ancestors did and were trying to do. It will logically result in a thrill of patriotism and resulting devotion to the high purposes for which our Nation was created under God. Our predecessors and forefathers are to be congratulated upon having preserved these documents. But one of the reasons they deserve our congratulations is that they preserved them for posterity; and that part of that posterity is here now in the present generation of the children and youth and adulthood of America.

As only an infinitesimal portion of that population can come to Washington to see these historical documents, we must therefore again send these originals out to the people. This is as it should be. Let us do it cordially and promptly and fully. I congratulate our distinguished majority leader on authoring this bill for this appropriation for the Freedom Train. It is just like JOHN McCORMACK, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, to be thinking of anything and everything which will strengthen the American way of life and which will perpetuate our freedoms and which will help destroy either communism or any other form of totalitarianism which would destroy the freedoms for which our forefathers, who helped write these documents, fought and died.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of the time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McSWEENEY].

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I believe that when every Member of Congress takes upon himself or herself the responsibility of representing the respective districts or States of our country, among those responsibilities is the expenditure of the tax money which is raised by the citizens of our country. One man may feel that his idea of expenditure is better than mine. My idea may differ from that of many Members in the House. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] will feel one way about an appropriation. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] will feel another way about an appropriation. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], who is not only very well informed on, but very much interested in, rural electrification, will feel another way about an appropriation. The gentleman from Georgia, Mr. CARL VINSON, the distinguished leader who is doing so much to provide protection for our country, may feel another way about an appropriation. But I may say I have never voted any of my taxpayers' money with a clearer conscience than I will vote for the extension of the use of the Freedom Train to carry these great documents which represent the fundamental things of our country out to the different sections of America.

I feel this train is, in reality, almost a mechanized Paul Revere, carrying into every Middlesex village and farm the things we want the people of our community to see.

I have been a history teacher much of my life, and I always hoped that every graduating class from the high schools of America could come to Washington and there see the great fountainhead of our democracy and the fountainheads of our freedom.

This bill which has been patriotically introduced by our distinguished leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] makes it possible for us to carry into all sections of our country these actual fountainheads of the things that we in America so love. Were we sending out replicas or copies, I would be opposed to it. I was much impressed by the fact that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] a few days ago said he wanted to retain, even if only the shell, the old White House, because of our traditional association with it. I feel when I go to Mount Vernon and lean against one of the linteis on the doors that probably George Washington himself might have leaned there. When I walk upon those floors I realize they are the actual floors upon which the father of our country may have strode in past generations.

So today we are not sending out copies but we are sending out the originals of these great documents, that fire the imagination not only of our own people but of the people of the world.

When the New England poet Emerson said:

By the rude arch that spanned the flood,
Their flag to April's breeze unfurled,
There once the embattled farmers stood,
And fired the shot heard round the world.

I am frank to say that that shot could not have reverberated very long unless we had given meaning to that shot. So the great American, Thomas Jefferson, did not fire a shot, but he fired the imagination of the people by giving them the cause for firing that shot, in the Declaration of Independence which gave the cause for our revolution, and gave those patriotic men the reason for going out and dying for that cause of freedom.

We are not carrying a replica or copy of that great instrument around through the country. We are carrying the very instrument itself, so every child who goes up to that document and looks at it can realize that he is actually feasting his eyes on the very parchment itself, where the hand of Benjamin Franklin and the hand of the other distinguished signers of the Declaration of Independence may have rested—not a parchment like it, but the actual parchment itself. The men who signed their names there knew not what might grow out of their signing these new expressions of human rights, yet they were not deterred and did not falter. I like to know that the original Declaration of Independence is being carried into every Middlesex and village of our great domain, to every municipality, proclaiming to the world that we Americans still stand by it. I like to think that that great document will be carried now to every Middlesex and village by this Freedom Train which this proposed legislation of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] will accomplish; and I hope that every Member of this House will vote this money for the continuation of this great patriotic Freedom Train as gladly as I do.

May I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that one thing that worried me was the fact that these great documents going out as they do to the various parts of our country and passing rather quickly from one atmospheric condition to another, might in some way be jeopardized; but the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] in his very splendid presentation before the committee, assured us that examination and investigation showed that these priceless documents after this first trip of the Freedom Train are as in good condition as they were before they started; so we have nothing to fear by their being subjected to different atmospheric conditions.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McSWEENEY. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I quite agree with the gentleman in his statement that it is a most excellent thing for us to send out to the children and the people of this country some of these priceless old documents that have meant so much to this country of ours, a great deal more than a lot of things we are sending out to the people of the country today, because the people who lived in the days when the Declaration of Independence was written and signed, and the other great documents we are supposed to be living under, were men who asked Divine guidance and tried to do the things that would be for the best interest of their country; and they did a wonderful job. While I do not like to spend any $2,500,000 that is not necessary, yet when it is realized what patriotism and beliefs these documents can instill in the children of future generations it is probably the wisest way in which the money could be spent.

Mr. McSWEENEY. I remember that back in the days of my earliest service in this House a question we frequently heard raised by the gentleman from Pennsylvania was: "Where is the money coming from?" which is probably not a bad question.

May I answer my colleague from Pennsylvania who spoke about having each community participate in the cost, by saying that in my State, in the thriving, patriotic city of Canton, the largest city in my district, I saw a reverential group standing there waiting for hours for their turn to enter this Freedom Train. There were the rich and the poor man, people from all walks of life, the man of foreign extraction and his family, waiting patiently to see the instruments which made their freedom possible. I

feel that those people of Canton who had to contribute something to bring the train to their city would be very happy to have their Government do something to make it possible for smaller communities less fortunately situated to enjoy the benefits of the train and its inspiration through governmental participation. I am inclined to think that is what the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] had in mind when he spoke of the difficulty of some of the smaller communities in raising the money necessary to bring the train to their district.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McSWEENEY. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What testimony was there before the committee as to the continuation of this train after 1951?

Mr. McSWEENEY. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] spoke about that. I believe there is no desire to extend the time of operation beyond that necessary to meet certain requirements. I believe some 580 cities have made a request for the train.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Children will continue to be born, to grow up and become older and older; and I think this demand will run on indefinitely down through the years. I want to raise this question: Is it to be the policy of this Government to run this train ad infinitum; or is this to be cut off in 1951? And was this $3,000,000 item included in the President's budget? If not, why is this proposition here? Somebody has got to pay for it; in this case the taxpayers pay for it. What information can the gentleman give us on that?

Mr. McSWEENEY. I am not a member of the committee that had the bill under consideration. I would like for some member of the committee to answer the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McSWEENEY. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. The Archivist of the United States came before us asking that this train be continued, but he pointed out that it would be impractical to continue it beyond the approximate period set up in this bill because of the value of the documents and the danger that would come to them by the continuous operation of this train.

Under the circumstances, I do not think there will be any further effort made for that reason. There is the matter of the security of the documents and also the fact that about 25 percent of these documents are not the property of the United States Government. They are privately owned but lent for this occasion. I think that in itself would preclude extension of this matter.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McSWEENEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman states that all of the documents abroad are original documents?

Mr. McSWEENEY. I understand they are all original documents, especially those for which we have reverence, like the Emancipation Proclamation, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the Ordinance of 1787, and so forth.

Mr. GROSS. I think the gentleman will find they are not all original documents.

Mr. McSWEENEY. The ones I have mentioned are original documents.

Mr. GROSS. I understood the gentleman to say they were all original documents.

Mr. McSWEENEY. I think practically all of them are original documents.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McSWEENEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will somebody on that side tell us whether that statement is true?

Mr. McSWEENEY. Is that correct; are they all original?

Mr. MILLER of California. I think practically all of them are original documents.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then, as I understand it, on this train which will travel all over the country, you are taking the original Declaration of Independence, the original draft of the Constitution, and other documents of that nature?

Mr. MILLER of California. That is correct.

Mr. McSWEENEY. I feel that the effectiveness of this train would be gone if copies only were sent out. That is the thing which is very impressive. A question was asked before as to whether it should be continued indefinitely. I do not think so. We have certain contracts with the Pullman Company for use of the train. I think a time like this, right after the war, when we are trying to reinspire our people with patriotic fervor, is the most important time to have the train go out, but I do not think it need to be continued further.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is a source of constant pride to us who are natives of Pennsylvania that those of America who were fortunate enough to visit this train saw the great historical and imperishable documents that existed originally in the city of Philadelphia, then the Capital of the United States of America. It is also a source of gratification to us that our great statesman, Benjamin Franklin, was a signer of both the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. It is true that Roger Sherman, of Connecticut, was the only signer of the four great documents of America. I refer to the Articles of Confederation, the Declaration of 1774, the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution of the United States. But it is to our great fortune and distinct honor that the First Continental Congress met in the city of Philadelphia, and the Second Congress met there also, and from these came first the Declaration of 1774 and the Declaration of Independence, in which every American today is joint heir of their great privileges. Eleven years later, in that same city and in that same hall, there was given to the world the greatest document that ever fell from the hands of man, so characterized by Gladstone, the Constitution of the United States of America, which has guaranteed to us and to every person who has come to these shores the right of imperishable liberty. Then it is also to our great honor that on the field of Gettysburg Abraham Lincoln gave to the world that immortal statement of the rights and freedoms of human mind and human liberty, and therefore we are rich indeed in our heritage. Consequently we are only too glad that those documents have been moved here to our Capital, where all who visit here may view them. It is a matter of record that many people did not get to see them while the Freedom Train was here, but, by the same token, the great railway systems of America, by doing a magnificent job in safely transporting these documents throughout the length and breadth of our great domain, made it possible for millions of people to have an opportunity to see them, which otherwise they would not have had. I think we can allay the fears of those who fear that this will run on interminably, and that the price will be too high if we continue it for some time. Every boy and girl in America who sees these vital documents will be inspired to have greater faith in this country, to believe in its traditions, to be proud of its heritage, to hold up to the world and defend our freedoms that we so richly enjoy. Let us have no fear on the pecuniary side. We are giving to the world at this critical time, a world broken, shattered, distracted, the greatest exemplification of our national unity, of our history, of our determination that this world will survive, that America shall be the land of the free, and here God will bless us all if we carry on in the true spirit and the highest traditions of our forefathers. God bless America.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res. 84) providing for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train by the Archivist of the United States, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 84, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the resolution was dispensed with.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this resolution, introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], providing for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train by the Archivist of the

United States, was reported unanimously for passage by your Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service. It is the purpose of this resolution to provide for the continuance of the Freedom Train under Government sponsorship for a period of approximately 2 years.

The Freedom Train consists of an engine and seven cars. I might say that the engine was donated by the American Locomotive Co. The use of three of these cars for display purposes, and one baggage car, were given free to the American Heritage Foundation, the sponsors of the Freedom Train, by the Pennsylvania and the Santa Fe railroads. The three Pullman cars which house the personnel accompanying the train were leased to the American Foundation at a rental of $25 for each car per day by the Pullman Co. Three of these cars are specially constructed for the security of the priceless documents transported in them.

In all, there are 127 documents, about 25 percent of which are owned by private individuals and about 75 percent of which belong to the Government. These documents concern our American heritage of freedom, and include such priceless documents as the Constitution of the United States, the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights, and President Lincoln's Gettysburg Address.

During the past 16 months the train traveled nearly 40,000 miles and visited 325 cities under the sponsorship of the American Heritage Foundation; 3,500,000 people visited the train and saw these immortal, priceless documents which it contains. More than 45,000,000 people participated in the week of rededication to our American principles, which was a program carried on just prior to the arrival of the Freedom Train in the respective communities.

The Freedom Train and its program came to an end on January 22, 1949, and it will be discontinued permanently unless it is continued under the sponsorship of the Federal Government.

The American Heritage Foundation, which arranged for the financing of the Freedom Train by private contributions, the sale of publications and pamphlets, and quotas raised by the cities which the train visited, has determined that it can no longer continue to operate the train as it has in the past.

You may be interested in a brief statement with respect to the operation of the train under the American Heritage Foundation. The foundation was composed of leaders in business, education, and labor. The foundation made all the necessary arrangements with respect to the financing, scheduling, and setting up of the train. It acquired documents on loan from the Government, principally from the Archives and the Congressional Library, and from private collections. It arranged for the special construction of the train, which placed primary emphasis on the security of these priceless documents.

The program for the Freedom Train consisted of three parts. First, there was a continuous campaign of public education utilizing all means of mass communication to persuade people that freedom is everybody's job. Secondly, immediately preceding the visit of the train to a community there was a week of rededication, wherein special public programs were carried out. And third, there was the actual visit of the Freedom Train itself. The Archivist of the United States stated in his testimony before our committee that he proposed to operate the train in much the same manner as the American Heritage Foundation and within the policy laid down by the Freedom Train Commission as provided for in the resolution.

You will note that our committee has made seven amendments to the resolution. While I will be glad to discuss in detail any one of them, in general these amendments provide for a clearer delineation of the respective authority and responsibility of the Freedom Train Commission and the Archivist. Under the resolution, as amended, the train will be operated by the Archivist of the United States. The Archivist will be required to formulate plans for its acquisition, operation, and exhibition. These plans must be presented to the Freedom Train Commission and must be approved by the Commission before the Archivist can put them in operation.

The Freedom Train Commission is composed of the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the minority leader of the Senate, the minority leader of the House of Representatives, the chairmen of the Senate and House Post Office and Civil Service Committees, the Attorney General of the United States, the Librarian of Congress, the Archivist of the United States, and five members to be appointed by the President.

It is estimated that the cost of operating the train for the next 2 years will be about $2,500,000. However, this amount will naturally depend upon a justification of the expenditures through regular legislative channels. The bill was amended so as to provide that not more than $3,000,000 could be expended in the acquisition and operation of the train.

I might state here now concerning the acquisition of the train that the Government will not buy the train. It expects to get an engine donated by the Army. It has the assurance that the Pennsylvania and Santa Fe railroads will continue to let the Government use the four cars containing these exhibits and the baggage and fire-fighting equipment free of charge. The only expense in connection with the use of the train will be the rental from the Pullman Co. of the 3 Pullman cars for which the American Heritage Foundation had to pay $25 a day each. The many requests that have been received for the exhibition of the train in cities where people have not yet had an opportunity to see it, and the spontaneous and enthusiastic response given the train during the 16 months' tour, when it was exhibited, amply justifies the passage of this resolution.

I might say that the train started its journey at Philadelphia and ended its journey in the same city. When the train visited Philadelphia at the close of its journey, there were more people to see the train then than there were when the train began its journey. The train was here in Washington during the inaugural ceremonies. Five hundred and eighty-one cities have already requested a visit of the Freedom Train.

The Freedom Train under the American Heritage Foundation visited principally large metropolitan cities. It visited few cities of less than 40,000 population. It is the purpose of the Archivist to have the Freedom Train in the next 2 years visit the smaller communities, and the smaller towns and cities of the United States. It is also the plan of the Archivist to have the Freedom Train during the next 2 years visit every one of the 435 congressional districts. The train stands as a symbol of our American way of life, our American traditions, our heritage, our liberty, and our individual freedom. It teaches a valuable lesson in citizenship training and citizenship responsibilities and is a great patriotic contribution. I am so eager for the school children and all other young Americans in the cities where the train has not yet visited to have the opportunity and privilege to visit the train and to see the precious and immortal documents contained in the exhibition on the train.

I trust there will be no opposition to this resolution, as I feel it is most worthy and deserving.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, first, I would like to pay tribute to the distinguished chairman of our committee, Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee, who, I believe, has presented this matter in a most able manner. There is little that I can add which would be of assistance in explanation of this legislation. There are a few things, however, I would like to point out.

Together with other Members of the Committee and House, we hope that a great deal of good may be accomplished by the Freedom Train. Something has been said about the need of this train going to the hinterlands. I am in accord with that view. I want this train to go out where people do not have as much opportunity perhaps of viewing these very valuable documents. But I am inclined to believe that the lessons we get from these documents and the things we expect our people to learn by reason of them could well be emphasized in some of the large places.

I think it is fair to call attention to the fact that this legislation is going to cost an additional $3,000,000. I trust that the hope of the sponsors of this legislation may be realized and that the use of the train may be worth even more than the expenditure involved. I agree, too, it is impossible to measure in monetary terms what may be accomplished by reason of this legislation if complete use is made of it.

I believe, as the sponsors do, that the train should be exhibited in smaller places where people do not have access to opportunities of this kind, and I hope the tour of the train may be distributed so it will go to all parts of the country. I do, however, want to remind you on

this occasion that the need of the teachings to come out of the use of this train is just as important, or more important, in the larger centers than in what have been described as the hinterlands today. I would remind you that you will find the spirit of freedom, liberty, and genuine patriotism running pretty high in the so-called hinterlands as compared with that in some of our congested areas. This statement is not made by way of criticism but to suggest that it is entitled to your sober consideration. That is pretty important right now.

Sponsors of the legislation have directed attention to the need or the value of the Freedom Train being visited by the younger people of our country. I think that is extremely important. I do not believe we realize quite so much as we should the responsibility we are passing on to the coming generation. Those of us in the present generation cannot point with too much pride with regard to what has beeen done in recent years in the protection of what is known as the American way of life. It seems to me we do not quite appreciate as much as we should the fact that when our country is in trouble we depend upon the younger people to get us out. They are the ones who fight the battles and make the sacrifice. They are the ones who come forward in the time of emergency. I trust that the use of the Freedom Train may accomplish the purpose that the sponsors of this legislation believe it will do. There never has been a time when the people of our country needed the rebaptism in the meaning of liberty and freedom than right now.

Again I call attention to the sponsors of the legislation to see that the documents so valuable and so precious may be carefully guarded and protected and safely returned to their proper places when the journey of the Freedom Train has been completed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] has expired.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be no diversity of opinion about the proposition that everything that the Congress can do to familiarize our people with the principles laid down in the Constitution should be done.

We have been told during the last 2 or 3 years, or perhaps longer, about the Communists who were infiltrating into labor unions, into the schools, into the churches, and into the Federal Government itself right here in Washington. Something should be done to counteract the things that the Communists are teaching, to not only our young folks but our older people.

Every time I return to my district I learn that the people at home—and I say this with apologies to my colleagues—seem to have clearer, sounder ideas about patriotism, about the way the Congress should direct the affairs of the Nation than do we here in Congress.

It has always seemed to me that there was a sort of muddled or muddied thinking here in Washington. Before I came here I had heard a great deal about the beautiful Potomac. Well, in Michigan we have clear water running over gravelly bottoms in the streams, and all sorts of bass, trout, and game fish. I notice the gentleman from the northern peninsula has risen to his feet.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. Just where did the gentleman catch his bass?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, that is a long story. If the gentleman from Kansas will give me a little more time I will tell it. First, from the age of, say, 4 on until 16 or 18 in the St. Joe River of Michigan, not in the northern peninsula.

Mr. POTTER. But where did the gentleman catch his good bass?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then later in the Kalamazoo before the industrial plants polluted the waters so you can almost walk on them and never can see down through any more. Then later on up in the gentleman's territory—rather, in the northern part of southern Michigan—trout, you know—my grandson John says, "So long," spreading his hands and keeps watching until I tell him where to stop—wonderful country; and still later up in the northern peninsula, in the district so ably represented by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT] and of course in the Fox, the Sucker, the Hurricane, and other streams in the district of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. POTTER].

But we are not talking about fishing, not clear water, in lakes or streams; but about this Potomac. When I got a look at it I would not think of washing my feet in it, to say nothing of taking a bath. And over the years the thinking, the thinking that you pick up, the idea and the plans that you pick up here in Washington, they are a mess; they are a mess. Muddled thinking—muddied thinking.

I am all for the Freedom Train, anything that will teach patriotism—most of the people know enough in theory about our Government—is all right. But how would it be if instead of spending our efforts and this $3,000,000 to teach our constituents, the poor folks back home who, apparently some of us think do not know anything about this business of freedom and constitutional government, how would it be if we were to run a train—well, you could not run it through the well of the House, bring it in on the Republican side and run it out over there on the Democratic side minus—something maybe of constitutional government—you could not do that exactly; even though we need these lessons on patriotism, this inspiration to follow the old Constitution far more than do our people at home but how would it be if we would put on an amendment to this bill requiring every Member of the House and the other body to go over and read the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights, the Constitution, and then sit down on the porch if he wished in a rocking chair with a pipe and think about what he has read; do a little sober, conscientious thinking about the old Constitution and whether we are not drifting into socialism, and just how far we are today on that road. I wonder if that would help?

How about right here in the Congress, right here from the well of the House, a little adherence to the rules laid down in the Constitution?

All right; when I think about the Constitution and the principles of the Constitution I cannot help thinking sometimes about what we are doing here in Congress; how from day to day, week after week, we, first in one way and then in another, surrender our duties, our congressional duties, to the Executive, to the bureaucrats, to rules and regulations promulgated by them.

If I remember correctly the Constitution states that the legislative power is vested in the Congress, the House and the Senate; yet the other day—there were only nine votes against the proposition; I was away doing some other work; if I had been here I would have voted against it, too, and that would have made ten—yet the other day, notwithstanding that provision of the Constitution that Congress shall legislate for the people, what did we do? We transferred that constitutional legislative power and duty to the President and said that anything he might send down in the way of a plan affecting the executive departments would be all right unless we vetoed it.

These home folks you are thinking so much about and are so afraid they will not know about patriotism and constitutional processes, all of those folks out in the sticks, if I may so refer to the localities in which they live, know that under the Constitution a proposition can only become the law of the land if it receives a majority vote of each House of the Congress. Yet we changed all that and provided anything the President wants done, if it has to do with the executive departments, will become the law of the land unless each House of the Congress vetoes it. So the kids out in the country read the Constitution, but they will say, "Yes, that is all right, but that is not the way they do it nowadays down in Washington. Our Congress has provided that we do it this way. The President suggests and it is the law unless the Congress vetoes."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. A moment ago a question was raised as to whether the original documents were aboard the Freedom Train. I am informed that the original Bill of Rights was aboard the train but neither the Constitution of the United States nor the Declaration of Independence were aboard the train.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. The original drafts of the Constitution and Declaration of Independence are on the train.

Mr. GROSS. Oh, no.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. With the interlineations made in the script.

Mr. GROSS. Oh, no; not the original documents.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. The original drafts of the documents.

Mr. GROSS. No. I just talked to the Archivist about that.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think this is the answer as to the differentiation between the drafts and the original documents. The original drafts are on the train but the original documents are not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, just how much of the people's power entrusted to us have we given away? You will recall that the Congress under the Supreme Court decision and the Constitution has the authority to inquire through committees and obtain information which is necessary to enable it to legislate. There is no question about that provision. Yet in the last session of Congress, when a legislative committee sought information from an adviser to the President of the United States, the committee was twice denied this testimony. A letter came up from the adviser saying that on order of the President he would have to refuse to appear or testify.

The power denied by the President to the Congress he delegates to 14 departments of the Government.

Has that any significance in your mind? I thought of it when I read Executive Order 133 put out on February 8; I began to wonder just how far our power was being taken away from us and just how much of our power the Executive was assuming and delegating to the executive departments and agencies.

EXECUTIVE ORDER 10033—ANOTHER STEP ON THE ROAD TO DICTATORSHIP

As though we were not moving fast enough toward socialism through the centralization of power and its application by the Federal Government to States and local authorities, a step which will hasten that trend is Executive Order 10033 issued by the President on February 8, 1949.

Notwithstanding statutory provisions giving to congressional committees the power to subpena witnesses to obtain information which would enable them to perform their constitutional duty to legislate wisely for the benefit of the people and the Nation, the President twice within the past year directed one of his advisers, John R. Steelman, to refuse to appear before a congressional committee. That committee was seeking to ascertain whether Mr. Truman was throwing his weight behind a labor union which had called a strike in 40 cafeterias serving Government employees. The union's officers had refused to sign the anti-Communist affidavits required by the Taft-Hartley Act.

Philip Murray, president of the CIO, frequently at the President's elbow on legislative matters, also refused to appear before a committee which sought to ask him whether he, as president of the CIO, approved of goon squad raids in connection with strikes and picket lines maintained by CIO locals advised by international CIO officials.

EXECUTIVE ORDER 10033

Apparently, it is a horse of a different color when the President or some of his political advisers seek to pry into the business secrets and production methods of American farmers, businessmen, and industrialists.

The latest drive toward dictatorial power grows out of Executive Order 10033 issued February 8, 1949, by Mr. Truman. Briefly, that order recites that whereas the United Nations and other intergovernmental organizations of which the United States is a member have need for statistical information which can be supplied by the Government of the United States, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget is given authority to determine, in concurrence with the Secretary of State, what information shall be given to official requests received by the United States Government from these other organizations. When that has been determined by the Director, then, to collect that information, authority is given to 14 departments of the Government to—and note this—by subpena or otherwise, require any person to appear and furnish such information.

Now, get that: The power given by the Constitution and by Federal law to congressional committees has been challenged by the President. But the President claims the right by Executive order to require any citizen anywhere to appear before any or all of 14 Government departments or agencies, turn himself and his business secrets wrongside out, and disclose any and all information which those agencies or any one of them may request.

That order, if followed through, turns inside out every production and business agency in the United States and makes available to the United Nations and any intergovernmental organization of which this country is a member the secrets and methods of every individual engaged in any occupation, profession, or business. That information, once in the hands of the United Nations or other intergovernmental organization, will inevitably get into the hands of competitors of our economic system.

Individuals and organizations in other lands in competition with our citizens, partnerships, and corporations, without any return will reap rewards of our initiative, reasearch, and experiments.

Our citizens will be required to give the people of other lands the benefit of everything we have; in return they give us nothing except competition. Through propaganda and rubber-stamp legislation over the past 10 years, the administration has been giving away dollars and materials until there has been created here at home the groundwork for a depression. Now, by Executive order, the President proposes to turn loose upon the citizen a horde of investigators and questioners who will strip us of whatever advantage we may now hold in production because of our efficiency and progressiveness.

We sow, they harvest.

The order is as follows:

TITLE 3—THE PRESIDENT

EXECUTIVE ORDER 10033

Regulations governing the providing of statistical information to intergovernmental organizations

Whereas the United Nations and other intergovernmental organizations of which the United States is a member have need for statistical information which can be supplied by the Government of the United States; and

Whereas the burden imposed on this Government in connection with providing such information to such organizations should be the minimum compatible with adequacy of information; and

Whereas a systematic procedure for furnishing such information will conserve effort and improve the quality and comparability of the data furnished:

Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the statutes, including section 8 of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act (59 Stat. 515; 22 U. S. C. 286f), and as President of the United States, it is hereby ordered as follows:

SECTION 1. Except as provided in section 2 hereof, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, hereinafter referred to as the Director, (a) shall determine, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, what statistical information shall be provided in response to official requests received by the United States Government from any intergovernmental organization of which this country is a member, and (b) shall determine which Federal executive agency or agencies shall prepare the statistical information thus to be provided. The statistical information so prepared shall be transmitted to the requesting intergovernmental organization through established channels by the Secretary of State or by any Federal executive agency now or hereafter authorized by the Secretary of State to transmit such information.

SEC. 2. (a) The National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, hereinafter referred to as the National Advisory Council, shall determine, after consultation with the Director, what information is essential in order that the United States Government may comply with official requests for information received from the International Monetary Fund or the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

(b) The Director shall determine which Federal executive agency or agencies shall collect or make available information found essential under section 2 (a) hereof.

(c) In the collection of information pursuant to a determination made by the Director under section 2 (b) hereof in response to a request under article VIII, section 5, of the Articles of Agreement of the International Monetary Fund, the authority conferred on the President by section 8 of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to require any person to furnish such information, by subpena or otherwise, may be exercised by each of the following-named agencies:

Department of Agriculture.
Department of Commerce.
Department of the Interior.
Department of Labor.
Department of the Treasury.
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.
Federal Communications Commission.
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.
Federal Power Commission.
Federal Trade Commission.
Interstate Commerce Commission.
Securities and Exchange Commission.
United States Maritime Commission.
United States Tariff Commission.

(d) The information collected or made available under section 2 of this order shall be submitted to the National Advisory Council for review and for presentation to the said Fund or Bank.

(e) As used in this order, the word "person" means an individual, partnership, corporation, or association.

SEC. 3. The Director's determination of any matter under section 1 or section 2 (b) of this order shall be made after consulting appropriate Federal executive agencies and giving due consideration to any responsibility now exercised by any of them in relation to an intergovernmental organization.

SEC. 4. This order shall not be construed to authorize the Director or the National Advisory Council to provide, or to require any Federal executive agency to provide, to an intergovernmental organization (a) information during any period of time when the agency having primary responsibility for security of the specified information declares that it must be withheld from the intergovernmental organization in the interest of military security, or (b) information which any Federal executive agency is required by law to maintain on a confidential basis.

SEC. 5. The Director and the National Advisory Council are authorized to prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out their respective responsibilities under this order.

SEC. 6. To the extent that this order conflicts with any previous Executive order, the provisions of this order shall control.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 8, 1949.*

[F. R. Doc. 49-1027; Filed, Feb. 8, 1949; 10:49 a. m.]

Mr. Chairman, our people at home, in my humble judgment, are more familiar with the principles laid down in the Constitution and adhere more closely to constitutional methods and procedure than does the Congress—the Congress all too often amazes the people who would be reached by the Freedom Train by its disregard of simple, clear constitutional provisions.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY].

A DEMONSTRATION OF FAITH

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I think it is a great demonstration of the faith we have in the tradition and history of our country that we are anxious to send through this land a Freedom Train bearing the precious documents which have done so much to make our heritage a glorious one.

It is our hope that this cavalcade of our history will cause men and women and boys and girls everywhere to pause and give thanks for the foresight of our ancestors and that it will inspire them to match this foresight, today, with action and deeds.

BEWARE OF INDIFFERENCE

We so often say that our country is at the crossroads of history. We lay the blame for this period of unrest to the attack of outside interests. We spend a great deal of time voicing our fears that other governments are planning to destroy our country. And yet, I think it can be safely said, that the greatest danger our country would ever have to endure would not be from outside forces of any kind, but from the indifference of our own people.

FOR ALL THE PEOPLE

Present plans for extending the tour of the Freedom Train for two more years call for stops where the train has not yet visited—in the smaller towns and villages of our country. I am glad that the history-laden train would go to these smaller communities, because I think the people of these communities have time and again demonstrated their willingness to be first when there is fighting to be done—to be first when there are taxes to be paid—to be first when there is work to be done for the general welfare of their country. So often it is upon these people that we depend for inspiration and resourcefulness as we grope for the answers to the perplexing problems facing us. It is only right, then, that the Freedom Train should go to the people in these communities.

MEANINGFUL DEMOCRACY

We can perform no greater service for the youth of our land than to make the most of every opportunity available for them to see democracy in action—to see it so that they will grow up understanding and practicing it. As the boys and girls of our land grow into adult citizens they can carry with them the inspiration of having seen an original draft of our Constitution—as well as having studied about it—of having read the original Declaration of Independence manuscript in Thomas Jefferson's handwriting—as well as having memorized it.

THOUGHTS OF OUR TIMES

Many of the documents of the Freedom Train seem to have been written for our own day. When we think of the oppressed people of other lands we like to repeat the words of the first 10 amendments to our Constitution. We feel secure in our own Bill of Rights.

It gives us a reassuring feeling to read the famous letter written by Robert E. Lee when at a time of confusion and turmoil he wrote his answer to the board of trustees who had offered him the presidency of Williams College. He said he felt "the duty of every citizen in the present condition of the country is to do all in his power to aid in the restoration of peace and harmony."

These are but several of the documents that will be on view to the boys and girls of our country when they visit the Freedom Train.

FOR TOMORROW'S CITIZENS TODAY

Perhaps through the inspiration of a visit to the Freedom Train somewhere, somehow, a boy will be imbued with the will to work toward advancing the cause of peace or the rights of mankind. Or, perhaps, a girl will be led into the schoolhouse of tomorrow to impart to the youngsters of her day an enthusiasm and zeal for patriotism greater than has ever before been known.

The Freedom Train leaves a great trail of food for thought behind as it winds its way across the country. It reminds us that we each have the responsibility of being alert, active citizens—not only for ourselves as we face the problems of living today but for our children who will some day be shouldering these same responsibilities.

In less than a score words, Ralph Waldo Emerson gave my thoughts on this subject when he said:

For what avail the plough or sail,
Or land or life, if freedom fail?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT].

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, within a period of 3 minutes I do not have ample time to make a reasonable statement in opposition to the passage of this bill. Of course, it is not popular to stand here and make a speech against a bill that affords so many Members of Congress the opportunity to make patriotic speeches.

Soon after World War I, the only Communist college ever to exist in the United States was established near Mena, in Polk County, Ark., which school was known as the Commonwealth College. It became my pleasant duty during the year of either 1941 or 1942, while serving as prosecuting attorney of the Ninth Judicial District of Arkansas, of which Polk County was a part, to close the college and remove the Communists from that section of our country. We in western Arkansas knew in those early days the Communists whose names have now become so well known throughout the Nation. Even though a few of the national magazines did lend a helping hand, we were unable to, at that time, convince the people just what the Communists were doing and hoped to do in this country. Our story meant but little and few cared to listen until here of late. Being informed as I was, even during the period of time that we were fighting on the side of communism during World War II, I well knew that we could be in no better position than maybe on the side of the lesser of two evils—and, even though I dared not say so, I doubted that we were placing our assistance on the side of the lesser of the two evils.

The Commonwealth College existed in Arkansas for a good many years, and yet the teachings and preachings of that institution, supported by the Communists, did not change the beliefs of the neighbors of that college. The only Communists ever at or near the site of Commonwealth College were the teachers and students of that institution. Since the termination of that Communist school, we have no followers of the communistic belief within that area. I contribute this fact to the proven theory that to actually know communism makes stronger followers of democracy.

This bill is requesting an expenditure of $3,000,000 to further the teachings of democracy in a land of democracy—as though it were necessary to teach democracy in order to encourage the people of the United States to believe in democracy. Were such a bill advocated for the teaching of communism in Russia, we would argue that it had become necessary for the Communists to sell their wares and attempt to propagandize their own people to follow their teachings. It has never been necessary in America to teach democracy because actions speak louder than words and we are sold upon our system of freedom.

Were this requested expenditure to enlighten our people of communism in order that all of us might better appreciate democracy, then I would favor the immediate passage of this legislation. However, this bill purports to do nothing other than to teach the people that which they already know—there not being a school child in this democracy who has not been versed in every document that the Freedom Train carries. The sponsors of this proposed expenditure are advocating same upon the anti-Communist theory, which for the aforementioned reasons, in my opinion, is not sound.

I would hesitate to protest the spending of this enormous amount of money for the continuation of the Freedom Train travels if the project were being advanced for educational purposes which are not mentioned. In answer to such proposal, I might state that as per past experience of the Freedom Train travels, only the boys and girls in the larger cities of the United States of America would receive any benefit from the extended travels. The boys and girls from the forks of the creek and within the hill countries of my State and your State, who are entitled to equal opportunities with the boys and girls from the larger cities of the East and elsewhere for preparation to compete in the battle of life in this great world of competition, will not benefit from a continuation of the Freedom Train travels.

Heretofore, the travels of the Freedom Train have been financed by the interested individual citizens. My people are already sold upon democracy and do not need any Freedom Train to convince them that communism is not sound. It seems to me that New York and other places within that section along the seaboard, where Communists are running at large, most need the services of the Freedom Train, and should be willing to bear the expenses for the continuation of its travels in order to sell their people upon democracy.

This Congress considers $3,000,000 a mere drop in the bucket in face of the billions of dollars that we are now indebted. Perhaps we can stand this expenditure, which is a drop in the bucket compared with the over-all indebtedness. I am certainly at a loss to know how we are to ever reduce our indebtedness by continuously authorizing every proposed mode of spending additional moneys. Even though I am a new Member of Congress and unknown to most of you, I have no doubt that before this session of Congress has ended that you will know that I am not a reactionary in any sense of the word—but, honestly, gentlemen, the manner in which we nonchalantly authorize expenditures would stagger the most devout liberal.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. I am sorry that we cannot make the operation of the freedom train continuous, but for reasons that were stated a few minutes ago that is going to be impossible. I wish it were possible to send this train throughout the length and breadth of this country on a continuous mission, that all children in all generations could see the precious documents that it contains.

In my own experience I hark back to the period shortly after I finished my education, when in 1915 the city of Philadelphia generously lent to the Panama Pacific International Exposition the Liberty Bell. I remember the people who traveled from all over the West to San Francisco to see that historic symbol. It is the one thing that stands out in that great exposition, as far as I am concerned. I have had the opportunity of seeing that Liberty Bell many times since yet I still stand in awe and reverence in its presence.

Perhaps we who live here in Washington become calloused to the value of the documents that go forth throughout the country on the freedom train. To cite an old adage, "Familiarity breeds contempt." We do not appreciate what seeing these original drafts or original documents mean to the people of the United States. I join with my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM] in trying to impress this upon you.

Mr. Chairman, one of the primary purposes of this joint resolution is to augment the citizenship training of our school children. The public, private, and parochial schools through the country already are giving increasing attention to this important program. But as the New York Times reported some time ago after a Nation-wide survey, many persons of school and college age are woefully ignorant regarding many basic facts about American history as well as the rights and obligations of citizenship.

The tour of the Freedom Train to the 48 States and the District of Columbia has done much to stimulate an appreciation of our American heritage. Here are some first-hand reports from various sections of the country that show that the Freedom Train and its patriotic and educational program has more than temporary benefits. I would like to quote part of a letter dated January 19 from Mr. Roscoe Clark, of the Eli Lilly & Co., who served as chairman for the Freedom Train committee during the train's exhibition in Indianapolis last summer. I quote:

You will be interested to know that there are still echoes of the Freedom Train in Indianapolis. The school system has issued a 26-page booklet on the subject as a manual for the teaching profession of this county, numbering some 2,300 teachers.

In Denver, Colo., the city department of education inaugurated a special study program devoted to our American heritage. This program in Denver started as early as the opening of the school year in September 1947, even though the Freedom Train was not scheduled to reach that city until almost 6 months later.

In San Francisco, as a result of the Freedom Train visit and school program, a group of patriotic local citizens created a permanent Freedom Train scholarship fund. This fund will award college scholarships to winners of essay contests among San Francisco school children dealing with the subject of good citizenship.

In New York City the impact of the Freedom Train program was particularly effective. Unfortunately, because of the limited time in which the train could be exhibited in New York City, only a small fraction of the city's school children could view the priceless documents aboard the train. I might add that this has been true of all the larger cities so far visited by the train. Nevertheless, officials of the New York school system made every effort to bring home through mass meetings, class-room discussions, and special assemblies a better appreciation of our political system and the priceless liberties we enjoy as Americans in a world beset with totalitarian philosophies.

Another demonstration of the dramatic acceptance of the Freedom Train took place in Virginia. When the train came to Danville, school authorities from communities 100 miles distant chartered a special train to bring 2,000 youngsters to the Freedom Train. For the great majority of these boys and girls it was the first time they had ever ridden on a railroad train.

I would like to quote from another letter. This was written last October by the superintendent of schools of Bristol, Tenn., Mr. Clement M. Eyler. Mr. Eyler says, and I quote:

Bristol, Tenn., had a genuine rededication week for the Freedom Train. It is my confirmed opinion that this experience in the lives of the children of our public schools was for the best interest of our form of government and that it will carry over with our children as long as they live.

These are just a few of the many typical letters that have come from educators from all over the United States during the past year. In nearly every city where the Freedom Train has stopped on a school day the story has been the same. There have been school pilgrimages with special trains and busses. Many of these children traveled as much as 200 miles to see this historic exhibit.

Throughout every Rededication Week that was staged in the cities along the tour, special stress has been placed on the school children. The freedom pledge has been taken in virtually every schoolroom. In Philadelphia, New York, and Boston the pledge was directed by loud-speaker to every class. School contests on the heritage theme have been held in scores of communities. Prizes have been awarded by newspapers, radio stations, veterans' groups, and other civic organizations.

Most parent-teacher associations have sponsored local school programs on the heritage theme. The Freedom Train study guide prepared with the help of the National Education Association is now being used by hundreds of school systems in classes in English, social studies, and American history.

Truly, Mr. Chairman, the tour of the Freedom Train and its important message has been an overwhelming influence in stirring the patriotism of millions of

American people. But the job is only beginning. The limitations of time and resources that have been at the disposal of the American Heritage Foundation have prevented the spread of this program into hundreds of cities and towns. When the tour started at Philadelphia late in September 1947 it was planned to visit only 300 cities. This finally was increased to 324. In most places the Freedom Train stopped only for 1 day. This meant that only a small part of the school children and the adult population of these communities had the opportunity to go aboard. Hundreds of cities were necessarily bypassed, particularly the towns of 25,000 population or less. I believe that this tour and the patriotic and better citizenship program should be extended so that all these cities and towns that were not included in the train itinerary will have the same opportunity to rededicate themselves to our American heritage.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, this bill interests me. I grew up in the backwoods. I attended a one-room schoolhouse, and had one teacher. I recall what happened to me when I first saw some of these documents that have been referred to. It is something that gives a backwoods boy or girl a great thrill. But we here in the United States have a tax problem, a budget problem, a debt problem. I have great respect for taxpayers and bond buyers. As you have heard many times we have a budget before us amounting to $42,000,000,000. The President is asking for $4,000,000,000 in additional taxes, and $2,500,000,000 in social-security taxes. That brings the deal up to about $48,500,000,000. That is something to think about. I raised the question a while ago as to whether or not this $3,000,000 was in the budget which was submitted. I do not assume that it was. Here is another expense to put on the taxpayers and the bond buyers of this country. It reminds me of something that a great American said within the last few hours. He is a great educator and a great soldier who has been called back to Washington this very week to help the administration get out of some of its difficulties. I refer to Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower. In speaking at a symposium on freedom at the First Annual Columbia College Forum on Democracy just the other night, he had this to say. I am quoting from the press report:

> Eisenhower on leave from his post as president of the university did not refer to his newly assigned duties as presiding officer of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Instead he said, "It is the dictatorship born of a surrender of our own responsibilities and therefore a surrender of our own thought, and of our own ideas and our own right to exercise our vote indicating the policies of this country."

He quoted Lincoln, in which Lincoln said:

> I have been given a job to do for the United States; that job I will do.

Then the general spoke, and he said:

> In sum, these results will come from a constant drift toward centralized Government; There will be a swarming of bureaucrats over the land. Ownership of property will gradually drift into that Central Government, and finally you have to have a dictatorship as the only means of operating such a huge and great organization.
>
> I believe that it is things such as that that we must watch today if we are going to be true to the standards that Lincoln gave to all of us.

Those words are from General Eisenhower, who was called down here at this very moment. He fears that type of dictatorship. He fears the acquisition of ownership and management by the Government. He fears that we will remove the freedoms of our people.

I would like to see this Congress furnish the necessary leadership to our people to have education put into the hearts and minds of our children by State and local finances, and State and local control, to teach those children how American enterprise operates, so that they will know from what source taxes come, with which to finance a Government such as we have in the United States.

To me, that is more essential at this particular moment, than it is to send this train throughout the country.

I think General Eisenhower had something like that in mind when he made his reference the other day to this proposition. If the general did not mean something like that, just why did he make this particular observation at this moment, only a few hours before he comes back to Washington? Why does he fear that private enterprise may pass away in the United States? Why did he issue a warning of that kind? I say, why did General Eisenhower issue that warning at this time? I think the general has got something there.

The President stood here in this House a short time ago and pointed out that of the $46,000,000,000 used in 1948 by our industries in expanding their plants 65 percent of it came from internal funds of the corporations; and you will find that during the last 9 years private individuals in this country have reduced their holdings in private enterprise by $3,000,000,000. That is private individuals, private enterprise stepping out of the picture. If the freedom of our people is preserved it will come from our people having confidence in our own institutions that are operated and taxed to support this Government. That is what will protect the freedom of our people.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Are we not justified in assuming that the reason Eisenhower issued that statement was because he saw the danger of socialism?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think that is exactly why he issued that statement.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. All right. You can go out and teach the children about how this country attained its present position, but when the kids go home and find dad, who is in business, hampered at every turn by executive regulations, where do you get?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Well, the child will say, "You are not following the original principles set up in these documents which they showed me at the train."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, what can dad do to change it?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] has again expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCKLEY].

Mr. BUCKLEY of Illinois. This is a time of very serious thinking. The children of our land are in need of this type of education.

Last night I read in a paper here in Washington that four or five boys had gone to a show and had seen some kind of a western picture, and they went out from that show and robbed a store. It was a great embarrassment to their parents; and today, of course, they are trying to fix it up.

This train is a form of high-class education. The train will visit every place in the country that requests it, so far as that is physically possible. The children passing through the train and seeing those documents for the first time will get a thrill that will probably never be equaled during the rest of their lives.

I have noticed during the proceedings today that a great deal of time has been spent talking about a bill which has already been passed. When a bill has been passed and all of the arguments have been advanced for it and against it, that is the end of the arguments and of that particular bill. What is passed is passed and is a closed issue; it is not a question of what it is, what it is not, or what it may be. Today we are discussing the Freedom Train. We know it is a worthwhile thing. We have seen from past experience the eagerness and enthusiasm with which it has been accepted all over the land; the people are calling for it to come back into their communities again; and certainly it is a thing we should praise all the days of our life. I, for one, hope the vote for this bill will be unanimous.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time on this side.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, as a means of focusing the attention of the American people on a reexamination of their heritage of freedom, fostering the preservation of their liberties, awakening their loyalty to the American tradition, and contributing to citizenship training, particularly of Americans of school age, the Archivist of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to acquire the Freedom Train, and to operate the said train for a period of 2 years.

SEC. 2. In carrying out the purposes of this joint resolution the Archivist is hereby authorized—

(a) to enter into and carry out such agreements with such person or persons, natural or artificial, as may be necessary for the acquisition of the Freedom Train and its equipment and for its relinquishment after a period of 2 years, and to make such expenditures, without regard to other provisions of law, as may be required to carry out such agreement;

(b) to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as he deems advisable without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; to procure services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed $40 per diem for individuals; to accept services and facilities without compensation; and, with the consent of the head of any Government department or agency, to utilize or employ the services of personnel or facilities of any such department or agency, with or without reimbursement therefor;

(c) to obtain printing and binding without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919, as amended (40 Stat. 1270);

(d) to purchase or contract for supplies or services (including printing and binding) without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended;

(e) to obtain and pay for comprehensive insurance coverage, as he may deem necessary, of other than Government property used in connection with the Freedom Train;

(f) to acquire by gift, bequest, loan, or otherwise, personal property for the benefit of, or in connection with, the operation of the Freedom Train;

(g) to cooperate with the governments of the several States and their political subdivisions in promoting the exhibition of the Freedom Train;

(h) to pay per diem to personnel required to travel in connection with the operation or inspection of the train as follows: To civilian personnel at the maximum rate applicable under existing laws or regulations; to officer personnel of the armed services in accordance with section 12 of the Pay Readjustment Act of June 16, 1942, and regulations pertinent thereto; and to enlisted personnel of the armed services a military allowance in lieu of rations and quarters as provided in Executive Order Numbered 9871 and regulations pertient thereto;

(i) to pay in cash for any services, supplies, or equipment not exceeding $50 in cost;

(j) to purchase, print, mimeograph, multilith, photostat, or produce or reproduce in any known manner, pamphlets, brochures, facsimiles, or other material pertaining to the Freedom Train for free distribution or for sale, the proceeds of such sales to be deposited in the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury;

(k) to prescribe such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary for the operation of the Freedom Train.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized and directed to provide a security detachment for the protection of the Freedom Train.

SEC. 4. A commission is hereby created and established, to be known as the "Freedom Train Commission," to consist of the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the minority leader of the Senate, the minority leader of the House of Representatives, the Attorney General of the United States, the Librarian of Congress, the Archivist of the United States, and five members to be appointed by the President. The members of the said Commission shall serve during the period the Freedom Train is in operation, and for 6 months thereafter. Such members shall serve without compensation, but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission. The Commission shall elect one of its members to serve as Chairman.

SEC. 5. The Commission shall advise on the plans formulated by the Archivist and submitted to it for exhibiting the Freedom Train.

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered as read and open to amendment at any section.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the committee amendments, as follows:

Page 2, strike out line 1 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "said train during the period ending July 5, 1951."

Page 2, strike out lines 5 to 11, both inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) to enter into and carry out such agreements with such person or persons, natural or artificial, as may be necessary for the acquisition of the Freedom Train and its equipment, for its operation during the period ending July 5, 1951, and for the disposition of such train and equipment within 60 days after such date; and to make such expenditures, without regard to other provisions of law, as may be required to carry out such agreements."

Page 4, line 7, after the number "9871", insert a comma and the following: "as amended."

Page 4, strike out beginning with the word "deposited" in line 15 down to the semicolon in line 16 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "paid into administered, and expended as a part of the National Archives trust fund."

Page 5, line 4, after "Representatives," insert the following: "the chairmen of the Senate and House Committees on Post Office and Civil Service."

Page 5, strike out lines 16 to 18, both inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 5. The Archivist shall formulate plans to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution, and all such plans shall be subject to the approval of the Commission."

Page 5, line 25, strike out "such sums as may be necessary" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "not to exceed the sum of $3,000,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further amendments, under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 84, to provide for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train by the Archivist of the United States, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 95, had directed him to report the same back to the House, with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FORAND asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the text of a bill he introduced.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 99) for printing in the RECORD:

Resolved, That notwithstanding any rule of the House to the contrary, it shall be in order on Tuesday, February 15, 1949, to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 2632) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies for the fiscal year 1949, and for other purposes, and all points of order against the bill or any of the provisions contained therein are hereby waived. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, we have been commemorating the birthday of one of America's true noblemen, Abraham Lincoln. I am glad that we of the South can join with those of you from the North in paying tribute to this great American. We now see that had he lived many of the unspeakable indignities we had to suffer would not have been our lot.

At one time when some of the more violent men of ill will were urging harsher treatment for the South, Mr. Lincoln replied that he had not suffered at the hands of the South but with the South. Were he alive today I am sure that again he would suffer with the South at the threat of the enactment of force laws that would inevitably bring another tragic era for our beloved Southland.

A few days ago the gentleman from Arkansas, the Honorable BROOKS HAYS, spoke from the well of this House words of such reasonableness and sanity that I wish every one of you would study and heed them. I am not prepared to say that I would agree in every detail with the proposed plan for the settlement of the so-called civil-rights question. But I do commend to you the spirit of good will and understanding that pervades Mr. HAYS' proposals. It is from this approach that a fair and equitable settlement of the issues involved can be evolved.

A few days ago I heard a friend gently chide the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] with the charge that he was "always floating around on a cloud." He admitted that occasionally the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] parked his cloud and came down to earth. In this age of materialism and cynicism I am sure we need more cloud floaters. For "without a vision my people perish." Fortunate are we to have a man in Congress like the gentleman from Arkansas, BROOKS HAYS. His head may be in the clouds where the winds of God's truth can reach him, but his feet are firmly planted upon the ground. His is that rare combination of vision and practicality.

It is in this spirit of good will, of idealism, and at the same time of practical compromise that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] has attacked the problem of race relations that cries out for settlement.

Over the week end I have read several chapters from Lanterns on the Levee, by William Alexander Percy, great southerner and great American. I wish every man in Congress would read chapter XXIII of that book. It was written while Percy stood in the shadow of death, which overtook him a few weeks or months later. Percy was a poet at heart, and maybe a "cloud floater," but he spoke from a deep knowledge of the Negro, in prose that literally sings its way along. I quote a few paragraphs, and suggest that you read the entire chapter at the first opportunity:

The whole atmosphere of America is such as to mislead and endanger the Negro. The sickening adulation paid to Negro athletes and artists, not because of their great abilities, but because they are Negroes; rumors of what the Negro does in Paris, in Moscow, in the northern cities; the promises and bribes of demagogic politicians interested not in his welfare but his vote; the Negro press' hatred of the white man, its demand for social equality, its bitterness, its untrustworthiness—all combine to create about the young southern Negro an atmosphere as dangerous as it is febrile and unwholesome. The work of white sentimentalists is equally perilous. When personal relations with the Negro are too familiar, they are misinterpreted by him. He reasons, plausibly, that if you are willing to dine with him, you are willing and probably anxious to sleep with him. With the genius of the poor for misinterpreting the motives of the rich, added to the Negro's own special genius for suspicion and distrust, it should require little except common sense to deduce what the effects of white sentimentalists may lead to. The noblest of them, such as Mrs. Roosevelt, accomplish their insidious evil quite unsuspectingly and with the highest motives. * * *

I claim only to be one of the vast number of men of good will, who try with indifferent success, to see wisely and act justly. As such, I would say to the Negro: Before demanding to be a white man socially and politically, learn to be a white man morally and intellectually—and to the white man: The black man is our brother, a younger brother, not adult, not disciplined, but tragic, pitiful, and lovable; act as his brother and be patient.

Mr. Percy makes it clear that the southern white man understands the Negro better than the people of other sections who have not had the same long experience with him. And yet it is made equally clear that there is a glass wall so to speak between even the southern white man and the Negro. Patience, good will, and intelligent cooperation with equal educational opportunities for the Negro will break down this wall of racial misunderstanding and prejudice. Force laws, resulting in another tragic era of carpetbagging in the South can only intensify the problem. For example, witness the resurgence of the Ku Klux Klan and violence since the ill-advised political effort to pass the so-called civil-rights program.

The distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] has proposed a sane and calm approach to the vexing problem. I call upon the Members on each side of the aisle to study his proposals, and to approach the problem with the same degree of sanity and reasonableness that characterizes Mr. HAYS' thinking on the subject.

With the Speaker's leave, I include with my remarks an editorial from the Atlanta Constitution commenting on the HAYS' plan, and an article by Gladstone Williams that appeared in the same newspaper:

[From the Atlanta Constitution]

Southerners are planning to introduce in Congress this week their own version of a civil-rights program.

It is being introduced by men of good will and good intent. The plan is to get it before the Congress ahead of any administration bills.

We urge thoughtful southerners to have a look at it. In brief it would do these three things:

1. It would provide for a constitutional amendment to abolish the poll tax. Since 41 States, including Georgia, have already abolished it and others are preparing to do so, there is no doubt but that the poll tax will go and that it would do so without any Federal coercion. Since even the most ardent supporters of poll-tax banning agree there is grave doubt as to constitutional authority to do so, an amendment would seem the most sensible plan.

2. Lynching would come under Federal statute. This newspaper has always opposed Federal coercion, and still does. But there can no longer be any doubt but that failure of local peace officers to enforce laws against such violence properly has created so much national anger and opinion that it is not longer possible to avoid some such measure. We are then, from the practical viewpoint, up against the problem of what sort of legislation we will get, not whether we will have it.

The honest southerner must admit that local law-enforcement agencies, because of the peculiarities of our political methods, frequently are powerless to proceed against a prominent family or one politically powerful when such is involved in a lynching case. This is wrong, but it is a fact. The southerners propose to remove a lynching case from the county where it occurs and try it in a county where the local passions and political blocs would not apply.

3. The southerners plan to introduce legislation which would establish in the Department of Labor a board which would have the power to investigate, conciliate, arbitrate, and recommend in cases involving discrimination in employment. This avoids the Federal police feature, and it bypasses the unconstitutional proposal that a man may be told he must hire someone whether that person is acceptable or not. It was exactly this system which worked so well during the recent World War in cases involving thousands of workers from minority groups. There is no reason to think it will not work even better now when the national conscience is so much more aware of the evils and wrongs of discrimination. A standing army could not enforce the provisions of the FEPC as proposed by the more radical makers of civil-rights legislation.

We recommend this plan to thoughtful southerners as reasonable and as being possible of excellent results. At least it is a starter, and it is a positive action. We will be offering something that we are for, and not appearing as merely against something, a role which has brought the South much of its present trouble.

[From the Atlanta Constitution of February 7, 1949]

HAYS' RIGHTS PLAN A TEST OF GOOD FAITH

(By Gladstone Williams)

WASHINGTON.—In an effort to remove civil-rights legislation from the field of bitter controversy, Representative BROOKS HAYS, Democrat, of Arkansas, has come forward with a well-reasoned compromise program that should appeal to moderates on both sides of the question. Without a compromise there is danger of Congress being split wide open on the issue. The Senate Rules Committee is now wrestling with the problem of strengthening cloture rules in order to give President Truman's civil-rights program a fair chance of passage. Southern Senators are determined to wage a last-ditch fight against any change in the rules which would deny them the right to unlimited debate in discussing controversial legislation of the kind.

What may result is a prolonged filibuster against proposed changes in the rules aimed at ending filibusters. That could tie up Senate proceedings indefinitely, blocking other important legislation that may be pending.

Mr. HAYS, a southerner himself, calls for concessions from extremists on both sides of the racial question. If the moderates on both sides will approach the problem in the spirit of compromise, he believes it will be possible to work out a civil-rights program that will be acceptable to all concerned and generally meet the objectives sought by the President.

Four major items are involved in the President's civil-rights program. They are (1) segregation, (2) anti-poll tax, (3) antilynching, and (4) fair-employment-practices legislation. The compromise Representative HAYS proposes calls for this:

First, he would limit Federal segregation policies to movements in interstate transportation—travel.

Second, he would repeal poll-tax requirements for voting by constitutional amendment, rather than by statute.

Third, he would have enacted a modified antilynching law which would leave primary responsibility for dealing with mob violence to the individual States and local communities, with the Federal Government empowered to step in only when the State and local authorities failed to act.

Fourth, he would abandon all proposals for a Federal law for coercion in employment, and instead would set up a counseling service in the Department of Labor to work for nondiscrimination in industry.

As the Arkansas man points out, there seems no need for further legislation to achieve the President's objective of nonsegregation in interstate travel because of the Supreme Court decision invalidating a Virginia statute requiring the segregation of white and Negro passengers in interstate travel. That decision had the effect of sustaining a nonsegregation policy in all interstate travel.

So far as the poll tax goes, Mr. HAYS is entirely willing to have Congress submit the question to the various States in the form of a constitutional amendment. Other

southern members have taken a similar stand all along. Only seven States still retain the poll tax now, anyway.

On antilynching measures, he reminds that that is an evil that has practically been extinguished, so that it is no longer the issue it once was. He sees no reason why a compromise should not be reached whereby the Federal Government would step in only after local authorities had failed to do something, and with the penalties and fines now proposed being eliminated.

The HAYS program is certainly worthy of careful consideration by all those who honestly would like to see some effective civil-rights legislation enacted. It opens the way for a meeting of minds among the moderates, though the extremists may be expected to raise their voices in opposition on both sides.

It will probably offer the test of whether the extremists are really interested in seeing a constructive program adopted, or whether they merely prefer to keep the issue alive for its political effect.

THE FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I hope everybody appreciates the splendid service of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

On January 1, 1949, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation began its sixteenth year of protecting the depositors in banks of this Nation. During this period a great change has taken place in the thinking of those who own the 90,000,000 bank accounts in the United States. Before deposit insurance was established the slightest rumor of trouble in a bank caused panic among its depositors and resulted in runs that inevitably hastened the closing of the bank. Assets had to be sacrificed to meet the unreasoning demands of depositors, and the consequence was that everyone suffered.

How greatly deposit insurance has changed the picture was demonstrated dramatically by two brief news stories during the past week.

On February 1 it was announced that the cashier of the First National Bank, Dyer, Ind., had admitted sizable defalcations. Before Federal deposit insurance this would have been the immediate signal for panic and a run on the bank. What happened under Federal deposit insurance is well described by Robert A. Vanderpoel, financial editor of the Chicago Herald-American:

FDIC ONCE MORE PROVES WORTH TO UNITED STATES ECONOMY—ONE BANK'S TROUBLES TODAY ARE NOT DISTURBING

Despite a defalcation estimated at $200,000 by its cashier, the First National Bank of Dyer, Ind., is operating as usual.

In the old days an episode of this sort would have caused an immediate run on the bank and the chances are that very quickly it would have closed its doors. There would have followed other more moderate runs on nearby banks and the Dyer bank would have gone through the long and costly process of receivership and liquidation.

At best depositors' money would have been tied up for a long period and business in the whole community would have suffered. At worst depositors would have received only a gradual and partial return of their funds over a period of years. Stockholders would have been assessed their 100-percent double liability and a substantial amount of the assets would have been eaten up with the fees of receivers, attorneys, and what not.

At it was, with deposits insured up to $5,000 by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, there was no fear on the part of small customers of suffering any loss. Consequently there was no run, no frantic efforts to liquidate under unfavorable circumstances.

LOANS WILL BE GUARANTEED

Instead, plans were made for all deposits of the bank to be taken over by the Gary National Bank with the Federal Deposit Insurance Cororation guaranteeing loans up to $1,000,000 and agreeing to assume slow-paying loans at the end of a 6-month period.

This episode recalls the manner in which almost every banker in the country opposed Government guaranty of bank deposits prior to the bank crisis of 1933. Today the bankers recognize this insurance as the greatest blessing that has come to their business. They no longer lie awake nights fearful of runs that sometimes started from rumors that had no basis in fact.

Yes; it was business as usual in Dyer, with the Gary National Bank taking over all deposits and sound assets of the First National Bank of Dyer and Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation putting in cash to make up the difference between deposits and sound assets. There was no panic, no run, no interruption to banking services, and all depositors of the Dyer bank were protected in full.

A story later in the week gave the other side of the picture. Remember that in the old days assets had to be dumped on falling markets to meet depositor demands. How different it is today. On February 4 Chairman Maple T. Harl, of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, announced that liquidation of the affairs of the Peoples Bank of Donalds, Donalds, S. C., had been completed. So what? you say. This is what: Under the orderly procedures of Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which took over when the Donalds bank ran into difficulty in December 1947, assets of the bank were liquidated so efficiently that their proceeds, first, protected all the Donalds depositors completely; second, reimbursed Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation the full amount of its $148,000 advance and all expenses of liquidation; and third, returned to stockholders of the bank cash and miscellaneous assets exceeding the par value of their common stock.

That is the way it works today. If a bank does run into trouble, its depositors go on about their business, secure in the knowledge that their funds are protected by Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. After the Corporation has taken over unsatisfactory assets of the bank in trouble, it liquidates them in an orderly manner, with due regard for credit conditions in the community, and so achieves maximum recovery without strain on business in the neighborhood.

The independence and freedom of action granted to the Corporation by its organic law are the most important factors in the success of deposit insurance. Where aid has been needed by an insured bank, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has not been hampered by budgetary and other fiscal restrictions. As a mutual fund, supported by the banks and sponsored by the Federal Government, it has been able to act promptly in emergencies requiring aid to insured banks and has thus prevented the distress which accompanied earlier bank failures. The flexibility and the efficiency possible under its present organization should certainly be continued if Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is to continue its work as bulwark of our financial stucture.

More than 1,500,000 depositors in the 408 insured banks that Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has helped financially so far know personally how valuable is the work of the organization.

Owners of 90,000,000 bank accounts now sleep soundly at night without fear for the safety of their deposits. No one anywhere should overlook the magnificent contribution the Corporation has made to financial and economic stability by making our banking system secure for depositors.

I feel sure that the people of our country, and especially the Members of Congress, do not want to see this agency consolidated with any other agency of the Government but left entirely independent.

THE UNITED MINE WORKERS WELFARE AND RETIREMENT FUND

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon I called at the George Washington University Hospital to see a former client along with several other coal miners from my district who were all suffering from some form of paralysis to the spinal column, arising out of and in the course of their employment.

These men are all wards of the United Mine Workers welfare and retirement fund and are eligible to participate notwithstanding that some of them were injured before the creation of the fund in 1946. They all require treatment by specialists and their bills are being paid from the United Mine Workers welfare fund, which receives 20 cents for each mined ton of coal. The necessary hospitalization and treatment for these miners would have been utterly impossible for them to obtain but for this welfare fund.

LEWIS RECOGNIZED THE NEED

The United Mine Workers were fortunate to have leadership who were looking ahead for their general welfare, as well as the industry, in the establishment of the health, welfare, and retirement fund. The leadership recognized that both social-security payments to retired miners and workmen's compensation rates for accident and injury are inadequate, particularly in view of the increase in the cost of living.

It was realized that the high accident rates—each year between 900 and 1,250

men lose their lives through accidents and some 50,000 more suffer injuries, some of which incapacitate them for long periods of time—result in a high insurance premium for individual miners, which is difficult for the average miner to pay.

That leadership came along with the idea that the high accident and disease rate are economic costs of the mining industry and therefore should be borne by the industry in exactly the same way that machine repairs and replacement are considered part of the cost of operation, and that such cost should not be borne by the miners and their dependents; and on that base the UMWA bituminous welfare and retirement fund was established.

The president of the United Mine Workers, John L. Lewis, saw these facts and faced them. He was brave and steadfast at a time when it was unpopular to face the facts. His action brought about one of the greatest humanitarian events in history with the creation of the welfare and retirement fund for the coal miners.

OTHER BASIC REASONS FOR HEALTH PLAN

The benefits of such a fund are now apparent to the general public. In many instances isolated conditions of the mining communities have resulted in miners and their families being deprived of many of the advantages of modern community life. At the same time the hazardous nature of the industry and the economic insecurity of the one-industry localities have increased the need of miners for health and welfare and retirement benefits.

Then, too, it is recognized that the advancing average age of miners can only be halted by the entrance of a large number of younger workers into the mines. In addition to wages paid, one of the chief incentives for younger workers to enter an industry is adequate health and accident insurance and a retirement plan. Such benefits weigh heavily in an industry such as mining, in which unfavorable factors are well known. Improvement in the mechanization of the mines will increase productive capacity of the industry but cannot eliminate the need for a continuous supply of younger workers into the industry.

SERVICE TO MINERS

In the first 20 months of administration, or up until January 1, 1949, the UMWA welfare and retirement fund reported a total of 260,123 beneficiaries receiving approximately $63,000,000, which sum was disbursed in the form of disability grants, pensions, death benefits, hospital and medical care.

The establishment of this fund has brought about new interest in the study of diseases in the mining industry and will focus public attention upon the need for expanding research. Centralized administration of the fund makes possible the application of improved medical techniques more rapidly to the various mining areas.

The benefits derived from this fund are immeasurable. The future only will reflect them.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have been keenly interested in some form of crop-insurance protection for farmers. I have seen at first hand the desperate financial plight in which farmers find themselves in years of crop failures. That is why I have followed with considerable personal interest the progress of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, which was created under title 5 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

Insurance is protection. It is man's effort to protect himself against the unknown. I am a strong advocate of all types of insurance. Nearly every risk known to man is insurable. For years our farmers have faced fear of the future in the growing of their crops, not knowing at the time of planting whether or not they would produce even enough to cover their investment of hard-earned savings or borrowed money in the crop. Man has no control over the elements. A flood, a drought, a sudden hail, a windstorm, or the many other unavoidable causes known to you may in a few hours or even in a few short minutes destroy the farmer's labor and investment in his crop.

Recently I had occasion to read the report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for 1948. This report is very interesting to me, as it shows the Corporation is now making real progress in offering to our farmers a program which insures them against the loss of their investment in the crop and assures them of a means whereby they will be in a position to plant a crop from year to year.

Nineteen hundred and forty-eight was the ninth year of active operation of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation. It was the second year since the inception of the crop insurance program that a net profit has resulted from the over-all operations. Of even more significance is the fact that 1948 was the first year in the history of crop insurance that a profit was shown on each commodity insured. The development of the crop insurance program has gone through several very definite stages. For the first 5 years—1939 to 1943—the program was launched on a national basis to insure unavoidable crop losses on wheat for the years 1939, 1940, and 1941, and for both wheat and cotton for the years 1942 and 1943. The program got off to a very bad start and net losses were suffered each year. These losses can be attributed in large part, I believe, to the fact that there was no background experience—no guide whatever—upon which to formulate an insurance program providing protection against all production risks. Up until the time of the enactment of the legislation creating the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, all-risk crop insurance was a virtually uncharted field. True, there had been various attempts—about a dozen I believe—by private insurance companies to write all-risk crop insurance. But each of these attempts was short-lived and ended in bankruptcy. I think we should not underestimate the real problems that confronted the Corporation in establishing actuarial bases and the contractual provisions with the farmer. Considering these problems there is little wonder that losses were incurred until sufficient experience was gained to demonstrate the weaknesses and needed changes in the program.

The second stage of the crop-insurance program began with its reinstatement by the Congress and extended from 1945 to 1947. This legislation provided that wheat, cotton, and flax insurance was to be offered on a Nation-wide basis and also authorized experimental programs for corn and tobacco in a few counties each. A study of the plans adopted would indicate that the first stage of its development enabled the Corporation to establish a better basis for insurance in the second stage.

The third stage in the development of the crop-insurance program began in 1948 with the transition to the limited program which allowed insurance to be offered in only 200 counties for wheat, 56 counties for cotton, 50 counties for corn and flax each, 35 counties for tobacco, and in not to exceed 20 counties for any trial experimental programs which might be instituted.

Additional crops should be covered, I think, especially to include peaches. The county of Spartanburg, in my district, is now the leading fresh-fruit producing county in the world. Records show that the wheat insurance program, which was the oldest of the insurance programs offered and for which there was, therefore, longer experience, began to show considerable improvement. In each of the years 1945, 1946, and 1947 wheat premiums exceeded indemnities. The flax and tobacco programs were also operated successfully. For this 3-year period flax premiums exceeded indemnities by about 3 to 2. The tobacco program showed a profit each year. The corn program showed a slight loss for the 3-year period due principally, I understand, to the unusually poor crop in 1947. Heavy losses on cotton continued, however, for the first 2 years of this 3-year period, and the indemnities on cotton were so large that they offset the favorable experience on the other commodities insured and resulted in a net operating loss on the over-all program. The losses on cotton resulted in amendatory legislation by the Eightieth Congress, which, beginning with the 1948 crop year, limited the scope of crop-insurance operations for all commodities. However, it is interesting to note that in 1947—the last year before reduction in the number of counties in which insurance could be offered—the cotton program operated much more successfully and premiums almost equaled indemnities.

In South Carolina crop insurance for tobacco is authorized in two counties, Horry and Marion; and in three counties for cotton, Greenville, Orangeburg, and Anderson. Since we have 46 counties, it will be observed only one-ninth of the

counties may participate in the crop-insurance program under present authority. Only one county in my district, my own county of Greenville, is authorized to participate in the insurance program.

In view of the splendid showing made by the Corporation during the past 2 years, I am very hopeful that this needed insurance protection may be made available soon to every farmer throughout the country.

Time will not permit me to enlarge on the changes which have been adopted by the Corporation within the last 3 years to strengthen the program and to comply with what I believe was the intent of the Congress. However, it is my opinion that the present management of the Corporation is to be highly commended for the progress that has been made. The favorable experience of the crop-insurance program in 1947 and again in 1948 is due principally to the major changes that have been made both in the program and in its administration. In 1948 the Corporation placed greater emphasis on local responsibility for administraton of the program, took steps to eliminate poor insurance risks, improved its loss adjustment work generally, and took other aggressive action in the development of a sound system of all-risk crop-insurance protection.

The experience of the Corporation in recent years indicated that the program is now operating on the basis that a sound crop-insurance program should. It would be expected that premiums would exceed losses in good-crop years and that in poor-crop years, indemnities would exceed premiums. I think that the availability of crop-insurance protection is a very fundamental part of the well-being of American farmers and I feel that the progress which has been made by the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation justifies an expansion in the program so that additional farmers will have the opportunity of obtaining this protection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. ADDONIZIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BOYKIN (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. McCARTHY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. WHITE of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an open letter addressed to him.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the magazine Marine Progress for January 1949 entitled "Waterway Improvements."

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject The Atomic Bomb and the Panama Canal. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $159.75, but I ask that it be printed, notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

SERVICE CREDIT FOR VETERANS UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill to provide for a service credit for veterans for the purposes of title II of the Social Security Act.

The present social-security law is in need of revision if our Government is to be fair to the veterans of World War II. The present social-security law provides coverage only for those who were covered by the social-security law at the time they entered military service. Those who were not so covered on the date they entered military service were prevented from coverage for social-security benefits throughout their entire service because they had no opportunity to obtain employment that would entitle them to social-security coverage.

My bill will extend social-security coverage to all persons in the military service through the national emergency, commencing September 16, 1940, and extending 180 days from the date proclaimed by the President as the date of termination of World War II. I hope my bill can be made a part of the revision of our social-security law that the Committee on Ways and Means now has under study.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in Human Events, entitled "Flight of Capital."

WICHITA, KANS., IS THE LOGICAL PLACE FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE UNITED STATES AIR ACADEMY

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to establish a United States Air Academy at Wichita, Kans.

I think it is pretty well known that Wichita, Kans., is the air capital of the West and Middle West of the United States. Since the establishment of an Air Academy has been recommended, Wichita, in my judgment, is the ideal location.

Wichita is the home of three large aircraft factories. It is where large and small war planes were built during the war period. It is the manufacturing center of the famous B-29. Right now airplane factories have large contracts with the Government for the production of airplanes and air equipment.

Not only is Wichita well located, being in the center of the United States, it also is in an area where the terrain is adaptable for training. The climate is right because it has the various temperatures for flight training. It is cold in the winter and warm during the summer, and yet there are few days during the year when planes do not fly in that area.

Wichita is well located with respect to transportation facilities, and is easily accessible from various points of the country.

I believe that when all factors are taken into consideration, Wichita is the proper place for the establishment of the United States Air Academy.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK] is recognized for 10 minutes.

OLD-AGE PENSION

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, President Truman is proposing that the benefits paid old-age and survivors' insurance pensioners be increased by 50 percent and that, at the same time, the withholding taxes paid by workers and employers also be increased by 50 percent.

The present pension benefits of old-age and survivors' insurance are inadequate. I favor increasing them by 50 percent. I introduced a bill in January 1948 to accomplish that purpose and I reintroduced that bill on the opening day of this session of Congress. My bill is now known as H. R. 258.

While I favor increasing the pension benefits by 50 percent, I do not favor increasing the withholding taxes at this time by 50 percent. I do not believe there is any need for an immediate increase in these withholding-tax rates.

In the 12 years that old-age and survivors' insurance has been in operation it has collected more than $13,000,000,000 in withholding taxes and in interest on its reserve fund. In those same years old-age and survivors' insurance has paid out less than $2,500,000,000 in pension benefits. In short, of every $6 collected during the past 12 years from the workers in withholding taxes only $1 has been returned to them in benefits. Five dollars out of every six has gone into the reserve fund.

At the present time, this old-age and survivors' insurance reserve fund contains $10,722,000,000. To increase, at this time, the withholding tax rate levied on workers merely would mean that this already huge reserve fund of more than $10,000,000,000 soon would be increased to twenty or forty billion dollars. To increase this reserve to such astronomical proportions will only make easy borrowing easier for the tax spenders and stimulate increased wasteful spending by an already extravagant Government.

The President proposes a 50 percent increase in the old-age and survivors' benefits and a 50-percent increase in withholding taxes. Let us see how this would have worked if applied to the experiences of last year.

If the President's plan for increasing pension benefits by 50 percent had been placed in effect a year ago the total cost

of pension benefits last year instead of being $556,000,000, which it was, would have been $334,000,000.

If the President's plan for increasing withholding taxes on workers by 50 percent had been in effect last year the withholding tax collections instead of being $1,683,000,000 last year, which it was, would have been $2,532,000,000. Thus, under the President's proposal, workers last year to obtain a $278,000,000 increase in their pensions would have been required to pay $844,000,000 in additional withholding taxes, or it would have cost them $3 in increased taxes for every dollar they received in increased benefits.

Higher withholding tax rates, of course, in time will be required to support a higher level of pensions but, it is my opinion, that these increased withholding taxes should not be levied until such time as the pay-out for pensions begins to approach the income from the receipts from withholding taxes.

There is neither need nor wisdom in building up a $20,000,000,000 to $40,000,000,000 old-age and survivors' insurance reserve fund.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a short table giving the year by year collections during the last 12 years of old-age and survivors' insurance from withholding taxes and from interest on the reserve fund and also the year by year disbursements of old-age and survivors' insurance for benefit payments and administration expenses.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the table is as follows:

Fiscal data on Federal old-age and survivors insurance system

[In millions of dollars]

Calendar year	Appropriations to fund [1]	Interest	Total income	Benefits paid	Administrative expenses from fund	Added to fund
1937	$814	$2	$816	$1	(2)	$815
1938	343	15	358	10	(2)	348
1939	566	27	593	14	(2)	577
1940	607	43	650	35	$28	589
1941	780	65	845	88	26	731
1942	1,012	72	1,083	131	28	928
1943	1,276	88	1,328	166	29	1,133
1944	1,316	107	1,423	209	29	1,184
1945	1,285	134	1,420	274	30	1,116
1946	1,295	152	1,447	378	40	1,029
1947	1,458	194	1,652	466	46	1,140
1948	1,638	281	1,919	556	51	1,362
1937–48	12,214	1,142	13,356	2,329	306	10,722

[1] Beginning July 1, 1946, appropriations equal taxes collected, except that after 1948 appropriations include relatively small amounts appropriated to meet benefit costs and administrative costs of the special veterans' survivor benefits of use, 210 (namely, $358,000 in 1947; $700,000 in 1948; and $3,251,000 in 1949). Prior to July 1, 1946, Congress, in accordance with the provisions of the Social Security Act of 1935, annually appropriated funds to the old-age reserve account based on estimates of amounts required to finance the system on an actuarial basis.

[2] Administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and the Treasury Department under title II of the Social Security Act and under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act were reimbursed out of the fund beginning Jan. 1, 1946.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to my friend the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. POTTER. I wish to commend the gentleman on his fine statement. I know he has been a champion of this type of legislation ever since he has been in Congress. I wonder if the gentleman could enlighten the House as to the average benefit received under old-age and survivors insurance.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Under old-age and survivors insurance the average benefit as of the present time is about $28 a month.

Mr. POTTER. Is it not true that in many States the old-age assistance program carries a grant or a benefit much higher than the average benefit under old-age and survivors insurance?

Mr. MACK of Washington. The average pension under State old-age assistance, for which the pensioners have paid no withholding tax for their pension, at the present time is $42.25, or $14 more than is paid to those who pay in month after month and year after year in withholding taxes for their Federal old-age and survivors insurance benefits.

Mr. POTTER. In many, many cases, if the benefits should be increased for old-age and survivors insurance, it will be just a matter of transferring a recipient from the old-age assistance rolls, where they possibly are now, to the rolls where they receive benefits under the old-age and survivors insurance?

Mr. MACK of Washington. That, of course, could be the case if all people were covered by old-age and survivors insurance, which I believe they should be. In that case, eventually we would cut out the tremendous cost of State old-age assistance.

Mr. POTTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I thank the gentleman from Michigan. He is a former administrator of social security in the State of Michigan and is an especially well informed man on social security and pension problems.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to say that since the inception of this program there has been paid into the old-age and survivors insurance fund something like $13,000,000,000, and that approximately $2,500,000,000 has been paid out in benefits, leaving almost $11,000,000,000 in the reserve fund?

Mr. MACK of Washington. The gentleman is correct. There is now approximately $11,000,000,000 in the reserve fund of the old-age and survivors insurance. Not only that, but this reserve fund has been increasing for the past several years at the rate of more than $100,000,000 a month.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Is it not conceivable, then, that if this program should be expanded to include additional people, say $20,000,000, this reserve fund could be and would be increased to almost astronomical figures without an increase in the withholding tax rate?

Mr. MACK of Washington. The gentleman is certainly correct on that.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I have been receiving letters from some small-business men who have asked about their prospects of coming under the protection of the old-age and survivors insurance. Does the gentleman's bill make any reference to such people?

Mr. MACK of Washington. My bill provides for the inclusion of all self-employed persons and for the inclusion of many other groups. It is my feeling that we ought to bring as many of the people of the country as possible under old-age and survivors insurance, to the end that everyone will pay during the earning years of their youth into a fund which will finance the benefits which they receive in old age.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. The gentleman made some reference to State old-age pensions. Can the gentleman enlighten us with respect to the cost of State old-age pensions?

Mr. MACK of Washington. State old-age pensions, which are paid for by the taxpayers of the Federal and State Governments, without recipients paying anything in withholding taxes last year cost $1,093,000,000. For the current year, which ends next June 30, these State old-age pensions, for which those receiving them had to pay nothing in withholding taxes, will cost the taxpayers $1,324,000,000. These State pensions, for which the pensioners pay nothing in withholding taxes, will, during the coming year, which begins next July 1, cost $1,980,000,000. The costs of State old-age assistance to taxpayers are increasing not slowly but by leaps and bounds.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MACK of Washington. And I thank the gentleman for his fine contribution. I know he is a thorough student of the growing pension problem and wants it solved correctly.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman made the statement that there is $11,500,000,000 in the reserve fund.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I said $10,700,000,000 in the present reserve.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Is it in there or is it not in there? Where is the money? Is that actual cash on hand, or is it I O U's?

Mr. MACK of Washington. All the money the Government has borrowed, whether it has borrowed it from the old-age and survivors insurance fund or from the banks, the insurance companies or the savings and loan companies, is in I O U's, which we call bonds. I see nothing wrong with the Government's borrowing from the old-age and survivors insurance fund and replacing it with interest-bearing bonds.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SCUDDER. May I ask the gentleman a question as to the effect of improvements in medical science which have brought about a greater life span for

more people. What is going to be the outcome of this program with the life span becoming greater and greater? Has the gentleman any figures showing the difference between the life span of today and the life span of 5 or 10 years ago? I believe that should be taken into consideration in a program of this sort.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I would say to the gentleman from California that the life span of the average American, thanks to our unmatched and unequaled medical science, is increasing very rapidly. In 1910 in this country there were in the United States approximately 3,900,000 people of 65 years of age or over. They represented 4.3 per cent of the then population of the United States. In 1947, according to the Census Bureau estimate, there were 10,600,000 people in this country 65 years of age or over, representing 7.3 percent of the nation's population. The Census Bureau now estimates that by the year 2000 there will be in this country 21,000,000 persons or about 13 percent of the nation's population who will be 65 years of age or over. The great increase in the numbers of our people who are 65 years of age or older increases the need for a more adequate pension system—and a sounder one.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a table of population growth in the United States of the group which is 65 years of age or older.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks including a table showing the growth, thanks to medical science, on that part of our population which is 65 years of age or older I include the following statement supplied me by the Research Library of Congress.

There are 10,591,000 persons 65 years of age and over in the United States according to the latest United States census estimates—April 1947. This figure represents 7.45 percent of the total estimated population of 142,061,000. The rate at which this percentage is changing is shown in the table set forth below:

United States population and number and percentage, age 65 and over

Year	Total population	Age 65 and over	Percentage 65 and over
1910	91,972,266	3,934,867	4.3
1920	105,710,620	4,968,399	4.7
1930	122,775,046	6,629,352	5.4
1940	131,669,275	8,985,510	6.8
1947	[1] 142,061,000	[2] 10,591,000	[2] 7.45
1950	[3] 145,400,000	[3] 11,208,420	[3] 7.7
1960	[3] 153,275,000	[3] 13,957,125	[3] 9.1
1970	[3] 159,847,000	[3] 16,504,594	[3] 10.2
1980	[3] 163,877,000	[3] 19,099,792	[3] 11.6
1990	[3] 164,588,000	[3] 21,500,635	[3] 13.1
2000	[3] 163,312,000	[3] 21,557,184	[3] 13.2

[1] Official estimate, Bureau of the Census, April 1947. Figures prior to 1947 are taken from the U. S. Department of Commerce, Statistical Abstracts, 1946, table 18, p. 18.

[2] Projected scale 1950–2000 published by the Bureau of the Census in cooperation with Scripps Foundation for research in population problems. Source: New York Times Magazine, Sept. 15, 1946.

[3] Computed from estimates in columns 2 and 4.

This table, I believe, clearly indicates the magnitude of the old-age pension problem which confronts the Nation. We must find a sound and enduring solution of that problem. I believe that old-age and survivors insurance, if benefits are increased adequately and everyone is brought under that system, offers a sound and enduring solution of that problem.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

THE 1950 BUDGET AND THE NORTHWEST POWER SHORTAGE

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague [Mr. MACK] from the State of Washington. I have studied his bill, and I believe that if we are going to extend the benefits of social security, we might very wisely take a good look at his bill. It is a very good measure and should be fully considered by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will have before us the first deficiency appropriation bill for 1949. Under the heading National Military Establishment, Corps of Engineers, and under the subheading of Rivers and Harbors, we have the following comment in the report now before the Congress:

> Rivers and harbors: The amount of $10,500,000, a reduction of $1,000,000 in the budget estimates, is recommended for the maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works. The budget estimate contemplates an appropriation of $8,000,000 for McNary lock and dam; $1,500,000 for Ice Harbor lock and dam; and $2,000,000 for Chief Joseph Dam. With respect to the McNary Dam, which is now under construction, the amount is required to initiate work on the south-shore cofferdam and for earning requirements under existing contracts on the north shore. Both the Ice Harbor lock and dam and the Chief Joseph Dam are new projects which are interrelated to the power development of this area. It was testified that the entire power capacity in the country approximates 53,000,000 kilowatts with the demand approaching 52,000,000 kilowatts. While it is recognized that everything possible must be done to promote as rapid completion of these projects as possible in order to alleviate the power shortage in certain areas and, in order for the Government to sooner realize a return on its investment, it is believed that the amount appropriated will not be entirely needed during the balance of the fiscal year, especially in connection with the two projects being initiated. However, the committee does not wish to earmark funds for either of these three projects and leaves it to the Corps of Engineers to effect the best possible utilization of funds recommended in the accompanying bill.

Mr. Speaker, this report is very inconclusive. It leaves many questions unanswered. It makes it essential that we carefully study the hearings in order to determine how these funds should best be allocated.

In order that the Congress and the House of Representatives may have the benefit of studies that I have made in this particular field, I ask unanimous consent to include some statistics that I have prepared, a letter from Mr. Michael W. Straus, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, and a letter from Major General Crawford, Acting Chief of Engineers. I believe these reports from these men to be factual and that they should aid us in a better understanding of this matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, new electric-power installations in the Pacific Northwest will run at least 186,000 kilowatts behind schedule until 1956, if appropriations contemplated by the administration's 1950 budget are not raised by Congress. At least seven projects intended to help offset the Northwest power shortage by that date will be delayed from 6 months to a year or more, six others will proceed as planned, and three will be pushed ahead of previously announced programs. At the allowed rate of construction, load growth will continue to exceed new installations for six more years and the shortage cannot be met for at least 10 years.

These facts were brought out in answers I received this week from the Chief of Army Engineers and Commissioner of Reclamation to letters I wrote them January 26, regarding the ability of the construction agencies to meet the advance program of the Northwest power pool under the 1950 Federal budget. The answers were based on a comparison of actual Budget Bureau requests for the projects for fiscal 1950 with the generator-installation program outlined in schedule R of the Bonneville Power Administration, issued November 10, 1948. This schedule sets forth the dates on which new power supply could be added to the pool if all projects were constructed at the optimum rate consistent with sound engineering and economical construction practice.

The major deficiency rests in the item for Chief Joseph Dam, on the Columbia River 51 miles below Grand Coulee Dam, which should have three generators supplying 193,000 kilowatts by 1956. The President's budget will delay construction of Chief Joseph Dam one full year. Competent officials have estimated $21,000,000 are needed in 1950 to keep this project on schedule; the budget allows $5,000,000 for next year and $2,000,000 supplemental funds in 1949.

Other new power units in the "delayed" category are Albeni Falls, Roza, Chandler, Hill Creek, Meridian—Lookout Point—and Dexter. Ice Harbor and Big Cliff will be 1 year ahead of schedule and Detroit Dam power units 6 months early. The total first-year generation of these three projects, however, is 40,000 kilowatts less than the initial output at Chief Joseph.

I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today a table showing the status of each Federal power project in the Pacific Northwest, the schedule according to which Bonneville Administration and the Northwest Power Pool (composed of public and private power distributors) had planned new generator installations, and the effect of the actual budget requests on that schedule.

While it is known that even if we built each of these projects as rapidly as

engineering abilities and the supply situations permitted we could not catch up with the Northwest power demand for at least 10 years, these figures will show that the administration requests for construction money fall far below what could and should be done. I intend to ask the Congress to make up the deficiencies in the budget and to authorize the new projects necessary to meet the demand. There are several reasons why these projects should not be delayed:

First. Hydroelectric generation is the cheapest source of new wealth in the Pacific Northwest, putting efficient water to work and saving nearly 100,000,000 barrels of oil yearly and/or 6,000 train loads of commercially important coal yearly for use in areas having no hydro potential. All projects listed are reimbursable, with interest, to the Federal Government.

Second. Domestic demand and security provisions require immediate development of the maximum power potential for mineral, agricultural, industrial, research, and atomic energy purposes.

Third. Construction on a "slow-down" basis increases the net cost of each project.

Fourth. Consistent construction schedules are necessary to intelligent planning by power users. The future of hundreds of small business ventures hangs in jeopardy today because of the "stop-go" planning of these projects from VJ-day, through the President's "freeze order" of August 1946 the budget-appropriations squabbles of the Eightieth Congress, issuance of schedule R in November 1948, and the arbitrary juggling of projects in that schedule by the Budget Bureau in making up the 1950 appropriation requests.

I am also placing in the RECORD the complete text of letters received by me from the Acting Chief of Engineers and the Commissioner of Reclamation, a clear presentation of what must be done if Northwest power development is to go forward on an orderly basis:

COMPARISON OF 1950 BUDGET WITH BPA ADVANCE POWER SCHEDULE

(Compiled by WALT HORAN, Member of Congress, Fifth District, Washington)

RECLAMATION BUREAU PROJECTS

Grand Coulee: Dam complete, 11 generators in, total 18 scheduled for installation by 1952, proceeding on schedule with present funds.

Roza: 10,000 kilowatts power scheduled by 1952, no budget request for power facilities, will fall 1 year behind.

Chandler: 12,000 kilowatts scheduled by 1953, no budget request, 1 year behind.

Hungry Horse: First 104,000 kilowatts scheduled by 1953, on schedule if present request granted in full.

Anderson Ranch: 27,000 kilowatts due in 1951, on schedule.

Palisades: First 17,000 kilowatts due in 1954, can stay on schedule if construction funds granted in 1950.

Upper Scriver Creek: Must be authorized this year to bring in planned 30,000 kilowatts by 1953.

Lower Scriver Creek: 30,000 kilowatts planned by 1953, status same as Upper Scriver.

Garden Valley: 54,000 kilowatts planned by 1954, status same as Upper Scriver.

ARMY ENGINEERS PROJECTS

McNary: First 140,000 kilowatts due 1954, on schedule if all money requests now before Congress are granted.

Lower Monumental: First 60,000 kilowatts due 1956, on schedule.

Chief Joseph: First 192,000 scheduled for 1956, needs $21,000,000 this year to stay on schedule, budget request only $5,000,000, falls 1 year behind.

Ice Harbor: 130,000 kilowatts scheduled for 1955, being pushed 1 year ahead.

Big Cliff: 16,000 kilowatts planned 1956, being pushed 1 year ahead.

Detroit: Fifty thousand kilowatts scheduled 1954, pushed 6 months ahead.

Lookout Point (Meridian): Power features not yet authorized, 115,000 kilowatts planned for 1955, 6 months behind, more if authorization delayed.

Hill Creek: 20,000 kilowatts planned for 1955, project must be authorized immediately if delay of more than 1 year to be averted.

Dexter: 15,000 kilowatts planned for 1955, status same as Hill Creek.

Albeni Falls: 43,000 kilowatts planned for 1955, could be kept on schedule if authorization and initial construction funds granted this year; otherwise 1 year behind.

Hells Canyon: First 170,000 kilowatts planned for 1957, can be kept on schedule if authorized this year and construction begun by 1951.

(Sources: Bonneville Power Administration 1949 advanced program; Federal Budget for 1950; letter of February 4, 1949, from Commissioner, U. S. Bureau of Reclamation; letter of February 8, 1949, from Acting Chief of Army Engineers.)

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, D. C., February 4, 1949.

Hon. WALT HORAN,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. HORAN: I have your letter of January 26 requesting information as to whether the Bureau of Reclamation, with funds made available as requested in the 1949 and 1950 budget, will be able to proceed with new projects in accordance with schedule R of the Bonneville Power Administration, revised November 10, 1948.

The power developments in the Northwest in which the Bureau is directly concerned are Columbia Basin project (Grand Coulee power plant), Yakima project (Roza and Chandler power plants), Hungry Horse project, Hells Canyon project, and the projects in the Upper Snake Basin, power plants of which are listed in schedule R. The status of the power developments on these projects is as follows:

Grand Coulee: Schedule will be maintained if supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1949 and regular estimate for fiscal year 1950 are approved by the Congress.

Roza and Chandler power plants are not included in the present budget and Roza will be postponed to fiscal year 1953 and Chandler power plant to fiscal year 1954.

Hungry Horse project will be maintained on schedule if appropriations now requested are provided.

Hells Canyon project is not as yet authorized so there are no appropriations yet requested.

Anderson ranch project will be on schedule except possibly the transmission line for which appropriations were denied last year. Appropriations are again being requested in the presentation for 1950 in the hope of expediting this construction. If materials can be made available in time, the schedule can be approximately maintained.

The Upper and Lower Scriver Creek and Garden Valley plants are part of the Mountain Home project which is, as yet, not authorized, and, accordingly, there are no requests for appropriations in the present budget presentation.

Palisades project: The budget presentations for 1950 include funds in the amount of $205,000 for preconstruction work on Palisades project so that construction of the dam and reservoir may proceed as soon as agreement is reached with the water users. The present schedule of installation of generating units in the Palisades power plant calls for one unit in fiscal year 1954 and another unit in fiscal year 1955.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Your conclusion that, even if we build these dams as fast as possible, we cannot catch up with the demand for at least 10 years, coincides with my own opinion. This is true not only for the Northwest area but in all areas of the West in which the Bureau is directly concerned. I might even go further and say that it applies to the whole United States. I regret that this fact is not more generally realized, as the most rapid progress practical in developing our potential hydroelectric resources is the only rational one. Not only has our power market overtaken us, but so far as we can foresee now, the market far into the future will be limited only by the available supply of low-cost power and not by natural unrestricted demand. Also, the concentrated development of fuel-electric plants in the past several years and the restricted development of our hydro resources simply mean accelerating the consumption of our irreplaceable resources of oil, gas, and coal, while at the same time a large part of our perpetual water-power resources continues to waste. Such a procedure simply does not make good sense.

If I can assist you further in this matter, please call upon me.

Sincerely yours,
MICHAEL W. STRAUS,
Commissioner.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, February 8, 1949.

HON. WALT HORAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HORAN: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of January 26, 1949, with which you forwarded a copy of the Bonneville Power Administration's schedule R, showing its current recommendations for future generator installations in the Northwest. You inquire whether the Corps of Engineers' projects in the Northwest can be constructed to meet schedule R with the funds included in the President's budget for fiscal year 1950 and in the approved 1949 supplemental estimate. You also request information for comparison with schedule R on when generators can be installed at the various projects with the funds included in the above budgets.

With funds presently included in the approved 1950 budget and 1949 supplemental estimate, and assuming adequate appropriations in subsequent years, generator installations at McNary and Lower Monumental are expected to meet schedule R. At Ice Harbor and Big Cliff, generator installations will be 1 year earlier and at Detroit 6 months earlier, but at Chief Joseph installations will be 1 year later than schedule R.

The construction of Lookout Point Reservoir (called Meridian in BPA schedule) will continue rapidly with funds included in the 1950 budget. Although the power features at this project are not yet authorized, provisions have been made to readily include such features when authorized. The entire projects at Hill Creek and Dexter sites have not yet been authorized. Hill Creek is upstream and will provide supplemental storage to Lookout Point. Dexter is downstream and will regulate the flows from Lookout Point. If the power features at Lookout Point, and the Dexter and Hill Creek projects are authorized for construction by the Eighty-first Congress and funds are appropriated for fiscal year 1951, power installations at these three projects can be expected about 6 months later than called for in schedule R.

Albeni Falls has not yet been authorized for construction. Senate bill 142, introduced by Senator CORDON on January 5, 1949, would authorize construction of this project. The Secretary of the Army forwarded on January 27, 1949, to the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, United States Senate, a report recommending early construction of the Albeni Falls project. If authorized by the Eighty-first Congress and funds are appropriated for fiscal year 1951, generator installations may be expected 1 year later than schedule R. If funds are appropriated for fiscal year 1950, schedule R can be met.

The Hells Canyon project has not yet been authorized for construction. The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors will complete in the near future its review of the report on the Columbia River basin in which the division engineer, North Pacific division, has recommended early construction of the Hells Canyon project. If authorized for construction in this Congress and sufficient funds are appropriated for 1951 and subsequent years, it is expected that generators can be installed at this project to meet schedule R.

To meet schedule R, additional funds will be required in fiscal year 1950 for the Chief Joseph project, and early authorizations and appropriations are required for the Hells Canyon, Albeni Falls, Hill Creek, and Dexter projects and for the power features at Lookout Point.

Sincerely yours,
R. C. CRAWFORD,
Major General,
Acting Chief of Engineers.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the close of the legislative program and after any other special orders previously agreed to, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST]?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. JONES of Missouri, until Wednesday next, on account of illness in his family.

To Mr. O'TOOLE (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for an indefinite time, on account of illness in family.

To Mr. IRVING (at the request of Mr. WELCH of Missouri), for an indefinite time, on account of official business.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 135. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 15, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

210. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting a detailed report on the Federal supply system; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

211. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government transmitting a summary report on the Federal supply system; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

212. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting the task-force report on records management; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

213. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting a report on the Office of General Services (H. Doc. No. 73); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

214. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 21, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Presumpscot River, Maine, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on August 26, 1937; to the Committee on Public Works.

215. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 5, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Waiska River, Mich., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on June 20, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

216. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to transfer the Pomona station of the Agriculture Remount Service, Department of Agriculture, at Pomona, Calif.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

217. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the construction, rehabilitation, expansion, conversion, and joint utilization of buildings, structures, utilities, and other facilities, including the acquisition of land, for the Reserve components of the National Military Establishment of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

218. A letter from the Director, Central Intelligence Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the administration of the Central Intelligence Agency, established pursuant to section 102, National Security Act of 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

219. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a copy of a resolution adopted on January 13, 1949 by the Fono of American Samoa, stating the desire that the administration of the government of Samoa and these islands continue under the United States Navy; to the Committee on Public Lands.

220. A letter from the Secretary, United States Department of the Interior, transmitting a report of the financial status of the National Park trust fund as of June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Public Lands.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KERR, Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 2632. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 111). Referred to to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1945. A bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947 by providing that the Vice President shall be a member of the National Security Council; without amendment (Rept. No. 112). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 967. A bill for the relief of the city of El Paso, Tex.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 113). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1509. A bill for the relief of the city and county of San Francisco; without amendment (Rept. No. 114). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1959. A bill for the relief of the county of Allegheny, Pa.; without amendment (Rept. No. 115). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2049. A bill for the relief of certain postal employees; without amendment (Rept. No. 116). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 2313. A bill to suspend certain import taxes on copper; with an amendment (Rept. No. 117). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 99. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 2632, a bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 118). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 102. Resolution for consideration of House Joint Resolution 92, joint resolution to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 119). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 572. A bill for the

relief of Sylvia M. Misetich; with an amendment (Rept. No. 67). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 618. A bill for the relief of Eugene J. Bearman; without amendment (Rept. No. 68). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 637. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Harriett Patterson Rogers; without amendment (Rept. No. 69). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 659. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth B. Murphy; with an amendment (Rept. No. 70). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 683. A bill for the relief of Louise Peters Lewis; without amendment (Rept. No. 71). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 684. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Gordon; without amendment (Rept. No. 72). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 739. A bill for the relief of Mary Jane Harris without amendment (Rept. No. 73). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 745. A bill for the relief of B. John Hanson; without amendment (Rept. No. 74). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 767. A bill for the relief of Eugene Spitzer; with an amendment (Rept. No. 75). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1036. A bill for the relief of R. C. Owen; with amendments (Rept. No. 76). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1043. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ruth Cameron; with amendments (Rept. No. 77). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1057. A bill for the relief of John Keith; with an amendment (Rept. No. 78). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1061. A bill for the relief of Bernice Green; without amendment (Rept. No. 79). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1066. A bill for the relief of James Leon Keaton; with an amendment (Rept. No. 80). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1076. A bill for the relief of Jennie Olsen Anderson; without amendment (Rept. No. 81). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1093. A bill for the relief of D. Lane Powers, Elaine Powers Taylor, and Monroe W. Taylor; with amendments (Rept. No. 82). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1094. A bill for the relief of Nellie M. Clark; without amendment (Rept. No. 83). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1095. A bill for the relief of Pittsburgh DuBois Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 84). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1098. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Andrew Ferdinand DeWitt, Jr., a minor; with amendments (Rept. No. 85). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1103. A bill for the relief of Miriam Barkle; without amendment (Rept. No. 86). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1137. A bill for the relief of J. W. Greenwood, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 87). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1164. A bill for the relief of the estate of H. M. McCorvey; without amendment (Rept. No. 88). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1169. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marion T. Schwartz; without amendment (Rept. No. 89). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1176. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Leroy Hann; with amendments (Rept. No. 90). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1271. A bill for the relief of Carl E. Lawson and Fireman's Fund Indemnity Co.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1279. A bill for the relief of George Hampton; without amendment (Rept. No. 92). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1280. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Judge E. Estes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 93). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1286. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Rowland; without amendment (Rept. No. 94). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1299. A bill for the relief of Frank J. Patzke, Archie Mitchell, J. L. Shoemaker, Einar Engen, and N. L. Gifford; without amendment (Rept. No. 95). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1300. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hope Irene Buley; with an amendment (Rept. No. 96). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1452. A bill for the relief of A. J. Cromat, Jr.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 97). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1459. A bill for the relief of E. Neill Raymond; without amendment (Rept. No. 98). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1461. A bill for the relief of L. J. Houze Convex Glass Co.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 99). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1471. A bill for the relief of E. La Ree Smoot; without amendment (Rept. No. 100). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1480. A bill for the relief of James I. Matthews; with an amendment (Rept. No. 101). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1490. A bill for the relief of the estates of Arthur F. Saladino, Joseph Spivack, and Irving Weinberg; without amendment (Rept. No. 102). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1501. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Rose Mary Ammirato, a minor; with amendments (Rept. No. 103). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1597. A bill for the relief of Hal W. Cline; with an amendment (Rept. No. 104). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1602. A bill for the relief of Ben Grunstein; without amendment (Rept. No. 105). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1794. A bill for the relief of Cohen, Goldman & Co., Inc.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 106). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1963. A bill for the relief of Edward L. Barreras; without amendment (Rept. No. 107). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2089. A bill for the relief of William Price; without amendment (Rept. No. 108). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2261. A bill for the relief of Eva C. Netzley Ridley, William G. Stuff, Lois Stuff, and Harry E. Ridley; and the estates of Clyde C. Netzley and Sarah C. Stuff; without amendment (Rept. No. 109). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2352. A bill for the relief of Roy Durbin; without amendment (Rept. No. 110). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KERR:

H. R. 2632. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BARDEN:

H. R. 2633. A bill to provide for the free importation of evergreen Christmas trees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2634. A bill to provide transportation of passengers and merchandise on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 2635. A bill to promote maximum employment, business opportunities, and careers in a free competitive economy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 2636. A bill to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital now being constructed at Wilmington, Del., as the William L. Nelson Veterans' Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 2637. A bill to provide for a per capita payment from funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the

Indians of California; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CAVALCANTE:

H. R. 2638. A bill to authorize the employment of executive assistants for Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 2639. A bill to provide an allowance for Members of Congress for duplicate-copy service; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. COTTON:

H. R. 2640. A bill to amend and supplement the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. R. 2641. A bill to create an Office of General Services as a central agency to have jurisdiction and control over certain administrative services in the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 2642. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation for 1 year of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding material; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2643. A bill to amend the act of June 30, 1945 (Public Law 106, 79th Cong.), as amended, to provide true time and one-half for overtime and true double time for Sunday and holiday duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 2644. A bill relating to the promotion of veterans of World War II in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 2645. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to enable States to establish more adequate public-welfare programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 2646. A bill to amend paragraph 1007 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 2647. A bill to amend section 4 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act, approved September 7, 1916; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2648. A bill to establish the Fish and Wildlife Advisory Board; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HEDRICK:

H. R. 2649. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of an experiment station in the Sixth Congressional District of West Virginia, or some other suitable location in the State of West Virginia, for research on the production, refining, transportation, and use of petroleum and natural gas from coal; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 2650. A bill to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JONAS:

H. R. 2651. A bill to terminate the war tax rates on certain miscellaneous excise taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina (by request):

H. R. 2652. A bill to require the use of the Vaughn record of watch comparison by persons subject to the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 2653. A bill to amend chapter 29 of the Internal Revenue Code to allow exporters a refund of taxes paid on tires shipped to foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2654. A bill to provide for the construction of a customhouse building in the Los Angeles Harbor area at Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2655. A bill to provide for the purchase of a site for a customhouse building in the Los Angeles Harbor area at Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LIND:

H. R. 2656. A bill to amend and supplement the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 2657. A bill to terminate the war-tax rates on certain miscellaneous excise taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 2658. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1950, the free importation of lead; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 2659. A bill to increase the amount of wages that may be earned by individuals entitled to old-age and survivors insurance benefits payments under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 2660. A bill to prohibit the parking of vehicles upon any property owned by the United States for postal purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PHILLIPS of California:

H. R. 2661. A bill to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 2662. A bill to grant time to employees in the executive branch of the Government to participate, without loss of pay or deduction from annual leave, in funerals for deceased members of the armed forces returned to the United States for burial; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 2663. A bill to provide for the administration of the Central Intelligence Agency, established pursuant to section 102, National Security Act of 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 2664. A bill to expand coverage for old-age and survivors insurance under title II, Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 2665. A bill to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 2666. A bill to authorize the improvement of La Grange Bayou, Fla., and to provide a turning basin at Freeport, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 2667. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, part III; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2668. A bill to further extend the period of validity of the act to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 2669. A bill to promote maximum employment, business opportunities, and careers in a free competitive economy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

H. R. 2670. A bill to establish a commission on the legal status of women in the United States, to declare a policy as to distinctions based on sex, in law and administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 2671. A bill to establish uniform procedure relative to the proof of age, place of birth, or of death; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2672. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims of military personnel and civilian employees of the War Department or of the Army for damage to or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of personal property occurring incident to their service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2673. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, section 2412, relating to taxation of fees and costs against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2674. A bill providing for the incorporation of the National Camp, Patriotic Order Sons of America, organized December 10, 1847; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE of California:

H. R. 2675. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to announce the parity price of milk and to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to immediately announce the support price of milk; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 2676. A bill to promote the general welfare and to strengthen national security and the common defense of the Nation by authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce potable water from sea water or other liquids, elements, or substances in order to promote and to conserve, develop, and increase the national water resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 2677. A bill to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming:

H. R. 2678. A bill to amend section 5 of the act approved July 10, 1890, as amended, relating to the admission into the Union of the State of Wyoming, so as to permit the leasing of school lands within such State for mineral purposes for terms in excess of 10 years; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2679. A bill to exempt from income tax so much of any Christmas bonus paid to an employee as does not exceed $100; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 2680. A bill to provide Federal funds to assist the States in the acquisition and construction of plant facilities for public schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 2681. A bill to provide pensions for veterans of World War I and World War II based on non-service-connected disability and attained age, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 2682. A bill to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. EVINS (by request):

H. R. 2683. A bill relating to certain disability compensation ratings and to certain ratings for insurance purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 2684. A bill to extend insurance benefits granted by the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to parents of certain deceased veterans of World War II without any requirement as to the dependency of such parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2685. A bill to provide automobiles for disabled veterans of World War I under the same terms and conditions as are now applicable to veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CARROLL:

H. R. 2686. A bill to restore the status quo in respect of certain employment taxes and social-security benefits pending action by Congress on extended social-security coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 2687. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Cowan, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2688. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Watertown, Tenn.; to the Committe on Public Works.

H. R. 2689. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Sewanee, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2690. A bill to provide for the review of certain decisions of the Board of Veterans' Appeals; to the Committee of Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 2691. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bunkruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 2692. A bill to establish a United States Air Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BURKE:

H. R. 2693. A bill to provide for the investigation of discriminations against women on the basis of sex, to establish policies for the removal of such discriminations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 2694. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act, approved January 24, 1934, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BATES of Kentucky:

H. R. 2695. A bill to grant pensions to veterans who served in the Regular Army before 1898; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 2696. A bill to establish a Bureau of Reserve Affairs in the Department of the Army and a Bureau of Reserve Affairs in the Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 2697. A bill to provide for a service credit for veterans for the purpose of title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

H. R. 2698. A bill authorizing the town of Freeport, Tex., to construct a cut-off channel in Oyster Creek, Brazoria County, Tex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 2699. A bill to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the western district of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 2700. A bill to provide for centralizing certain wage rates to the supervision of the Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 2701. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to provide for a term of the United States district court at San Jose, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming:

H. J. Res. 158. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the hundredth anniversary of the founding of Fort Laramie in the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution providing for the observance of October 11 of each year as General Pulaski Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. J. Res. 160. Joint resolution to authorize completion of the processing of the visa cases, and admission into the United States, of certain alien fiancés and fiancées of members, or of former members, of the armed forces of the United States, as was provided in the so-called GI Fiancées Act (60 Stat. 329), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SECREST:

H. Res. 100. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. Res. 101. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1945) to amend the National Security Act of 1947 by providing that the Vice President shall be a member of the National Security Council; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States for consideration of their resolution adopted on February 7, 1949, relating to Josef Cardinal Mindszenty and asking that immediate and appropriate action be taken requesting United Nations to inquire into the reported deliberate and wanton disregard of the freedom of religion, and the torture of the accused; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memoralizing the President and the Congress of the United States for the consideration of House Joint Memorial 3, asking that Congress authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to assist local lending agencies in financing disaster-stricken livestock producers and feeders in the blizzerd areas of the Western States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Indiana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States for the consideration of their House Concurrent Resolution 1, asking for the establishment of October 11 of each year as General Pulaski Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memoralizing the President and the Congress of the United States for consideration of their House Concurrent Resolution C, asking to increase the share of Federal participation and increase the annual appropriation under Public Law 725; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States for the consideration of their Enrolled Joint Memorial 3, asking that Congress consider and pass legislation appropriating funds to complete construction of the Glendo Dam project in Platte County, Wyo.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 2702. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey by quitclaim deed certain mineral rights in certain lands situated in the State of Oklahoma to Alfred A. Drummond and Addie G. Drummond; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:

H. R. 2703. A bill for the relief of Ida L. Funston; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2704. A bill for the relief of Freda Wahler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 2705. A bill for the relief of Martin Kenneth Ikeda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 2706. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Susie Larvie Dillion; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 2707. A bill for the relief of the Lacchi Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILMER:

H. R. 2708. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Joseph DeSouza, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 2709. A bill for the relief of Sadae Aoki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 2710. A bill for the relief of Emma Armstrong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 2711. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helen Doherty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 2712. A bill for the relief of Gardi Sourell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 2713. A bill for the relief of Sell Spigler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 2714. A bill for the relief of Katalin Stamberger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2715. A bill for the relief of Sandor Stamberger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 2716. A bill for the relief of Jose Simao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2717. A bill for the relief of Jose Medalha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER:

H. R. 2718. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Vitelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 2719. A bill for the relief of I. D. Cosson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

61. By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming: Memorial of the thirtieth Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memoralizing the Congress of the United States of America to alleviate the present electric-power shortage and anticipate future electric-power needs to avoid crippling the economic development of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Public Lands.

62. Also, memorial of the thirtieth Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to consider and pass legislation appropriating funds to complete construction of the Glendo Dam project in Platte County, Wyo.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

63. Also, petition of Laramie Rental-property Owners' Association, Laramie, Wyo., objecting to existing legislation on rent control or proposed extension of controls; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

64. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution adopted by Kenosha Council, No. 973, Knights of Columbus, at its regular meeting in Kenosha, Wis., on February 8, 1949, stating that the conscience of the American people and liberty-loving people all over the world is shocked at the trial of His Eminence Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, and voicing their condemnation of such proceedings; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

65. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of Miss Jean Kennedy and 24 other citizens of Jersey City, N. J., petitioning the Government of the United States to send a formal protest to the Hungarian Government for the miscarriage of justice which is evident in the mock trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty; also, petitioning the Government to condemn publicly the fallacy of such a trial and conviction; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

66. Also, petition of Miss Marie S. Crooks and 24 other citizens of Jersey City, N. J., petitioning the Government of the United States to send a formal protest to the Hungarian Government for the miscarriage of justice which is evident in the mock trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty; also, petitioning the Government to condemn publicly the fallacy of such a trial and conviction; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

67. Also, petition of Miss Cynthia Szymanski and 39 other residents of Jersey City, N. J., petitioning the Government of the United States to send a formal protest to the Hungarian Government for the miscarriage of justice which is evident in the mock trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty; also petitioning the Government to condemn publicly the fallacy of such a trial and conviction; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

68. Also, petition of 767 residents of Jersey City, N. J., and vicinity, petitioning the Government of the United States to send a formal protest to the Hungarian Government for the miscarriage of justice which is evident in the mock trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty; also petitioning the Government to condemn publicly the fallacy of such a trial and conviction; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

39. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Petition of the Fall River Clover Club, Inc., and the Massachusetts Mayors' Association, protesting against the trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

70. By Mr. RICH: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Muncy, Pa., in opposition to the construction of steam power plants in the Tennessee Valley Authority or in any other section of the United States with funds provided by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Appropriations.

71. By Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma: Memorial of the Twenty-second Legislature of the State of Oklahoma (Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 3), concerning the immediate need of drastically curtailing the importation of crude oil from foreign countries to the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

72. By Mr. FORAND: Petition of the City Council of Providence, R. I., requesting that the Congress of the United States pass and the President of the United States approve, if passed, the General Pulaski Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

73. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Common Council of the City of Kenosha, Wis., memorializing the Congress to pass and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress, providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

74. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. Charlotte C. Cobb, chairman, resolutions, Blue Star Mothers of America, Inc., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to education, housing, and national loyalty adopted at this meeting; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

75. Also, petition of Fred S. Mansfield, secretary, Dallas Clearing House Association, Dallas, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution urging amendment to Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation law authorizing and directing discontinuance of assessments so long as FDIC capital funds are not less than $1,000,000,000; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

76. Also, petition of Stanley J. Witkowski, city clerk, Milwaukee, Wis., petitioning consideration of their resolution asking for repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

77. Also, petition of A. D. Edmonston, acting secretary, Water Project Authority of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to favorable consideration of H. R. 163 and H. R. 126, which would authorize Sacramento Valley irrigation canals, Central Valley project, California; to the Committee on Public Lands.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of all mercies, we give Thee most humble and hearty thanks for all Thy goodness and loving kindnesses to us. Grant us in all our doubts and uncertainties the grace to ask what Thou wouldst have us do, that the spirit of wisdom may save us from all false choices, and that in Thy light we may see light and in Thy straight path we may not stumble. Grant that this day we may fall into no errors and all our doings be righteous in Thy sight.

Blessed is the man that maketh the Lord his trust. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LANE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may have permission to sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KELLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address by Mrs. NORTON, of New Jersey, delivered over the American Broadcasting Co. on Saturday, February 5, 1949.

CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, the recent farcical trial and subsequent conviction of Cardinal Mindszenty is further evidence of the operation of the Communist system. The Communist philosophy advocates a deliberate debasement of the dignity of the human being to the level of a common beast. How else would such a philosophy survive if each and every individual was not subjected to the domineering will of the state?

That trial was a political trial and had an imperialistic end. Obviously, in order to attain the imperialistic end, the proceedings at the trial had to be served to the outside world in such manner so as to indicate the apparent innocence of the state. Thus the cardinal was presumed to have pleaded guilty. This in itself serves as valuable propaganda for the Communist ends at home, even though it may not necessarily be accepted in a democratic country. But was it actually the cardinal who pleaded guilty? How are we to know whether Cardinal Mindszenty ever appeared at the trial? The trial was certainly not open to everyone and was not a free trial. Some say the cardinal was a victim of chemical treatment; others say he was drugged. The fact is, he is said to have confessed his guilt to some of the charges. But why could not the trial have taken on a Hollywood atmosphere and substituted a double in the cardinal's stead? That would not have been difficult to do, for we have no proof that he was there at all except that the controlled Communist press tells us that he was there. It is very likely that Cardinal Mindszenty never appeared at his trial, that he was either in a prison somewhere or was dead at the time.

It is absolutely necessary that a Communist-controlled government employ

any expedient measure to erase the life of any human being who stands opposed to that government because of its false philosophy, particularly where that government condones the outrageous extinction of Christian doctrine.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, on which I have the honor to serve, has just reported a pension bill for World War I and World War II veterans. In my opinion the bill that has been reported has been reported without proper and due consideration by the committee. In fact, seven members of that committee walked out of the hearings this morning because of the high-handed and arbitrary tactics of the gentleman from Mississippi, chairman of the committee.

This bill provides that an individual, not having an honorable discharge, and ineligible for membership in major veterans' organizations, is still eligible to receive pension under the provisions of this bill.

Bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, that the Veterans' Committee members never saw this bill until it was presented by the gentleman from Mississippi, Chairman RANKIN, this morning. Surely this House does not want to take up a bill that was only considered by the committee for seven brief minutes.

During my service on this committee I have always been sympathetic to legislation designed for the welfare of our veterans and their dependents; however, I cannot support a bill that would ultimately cost over $6,000,000,000 per year, nor would I ask this House to do so unless the Members were sure that ample hearings had been held. If this bill is brought up after the necessary number of days, under the new rules, I sincerely urge that the membership of this House will, regardless of possible political consequences, recommit the bill to the committee for further consideration. If this is done, I can assure the Members that a pension bill will be favorably reported by the committee that will be fair and equitable to both veterans and citizens.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is true that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUBER] walked out on the veterans this morning and that a few uninformed, or I probably should say misinformed, members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs went along with him; but a large majority of the members of the committee remained, went through the entire bill, and voted to report it out.

As to my being arbitrary, as a matter of fact, I put that question to a vote, and the committee sustained me, which put the gentleman on the spot, and that is when he walked out.

I want to say that a majority of the members of the committee voted to raise the age limit to 65 years and voted to follow the Spanish-American War veterans pension law by providing them a pension of $90 a month—just what the Spanish War veterans are being paid now.

Mr. HUBER. Is the gentleman discussing what occurred in executive session?

Mr. RANKIN. I am talking about what the gentleman spoke of here a moment ago.

The gentleman gets up here and misinforms the House, and I am trying to correct him. If the gentleman had stayed there and voted he would not have any "gripe."

We do not intend for our old veterans, when they pass the age of their earning capacity, to have to go to the poorhouse to get a meal ticket.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Mr. Eric Johnston.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a Lincoln Day address delivered by his colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] in Paterson, N. J.

Mr. HALE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one an editorial appearing in the Bangor (Maine) Daily News, and in the other an article by Roscoe Pound on the present situation in China.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by a former Member of the House.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by his colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. RIVERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by his colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., at Charleston, S. C.

Mr. WALSH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one an article appearing in the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Times, February 12, and in the other an editorial appearing in the same newspaper with reference to the celebration of the birthday of John L. Lewis.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it becomes necessary for me to rise in support and corroboration of the statements that have been made by the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Arizona regarding what did happen in our Committee on Veterans' Affairs this morning. I want the House to know that I attended every daily session of the hearings that were held on that bill, and to say that those of us who walked out, as a class, are uninformed is a reflection not upon those Members but upon the way in which those committee hearings have been held. I think that every one of us was justified in leaving a meeting of the committee. It did not operate in accordance with the rules of this House.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I do not have any desire to become entangled in any personal fight or disagreement between Members of this House, but I have been present at all committee hearings on a uniform-pension bill. I have heard the discussions on both sides. It has been fair. It has been an effort to keep faith with the men that have worn the uniform with honor in the defense of this Republic. The American Legion, the VFW, the Disabled American Veterans, and all great veterans' organizations have been given fair and courteous treatment before our committee. I introduced a bill myself, No. 5810. My chief concern is in promoting the welfare of the veterans and the American people. I trust that no veteran who has defended his country will ever be forced upon the charity of others when he becomes ill and disabled.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, I should like to know whether the committees of this House operate under the same rules as the House.

The SPEAKER. The rules of the House so provide.

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, I should like to know further whether this House has a right to appeal from a ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Any Member has the right to appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. CHUDOFF. I should like to know whether, under that ruling, members of the committee can appeal from the ruling of the chairman of the committee.

The SPEAKER. They can.

Mr. CHUDOFF. So that the chairman of a committee who had his ruling appealed from would have no right other than to allow that appeal to go before the entire committee; is that right, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The rules of the House provide that the rules of the House are made the rules of its standing committees so far as applicable. The Members of the House have a right to appeal from a decision of the Chair. That would also apply in a committee.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Suppose a question is raised here and a roll call is asked for, and one-fifth of the Members rise and ask for a roll call, and the Chair holds that a roll call is called for, no appeal from that ruling would be in order, would it?

The SPEAKER. That would be in accordance with the rules of the House.

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly. That is just what happened in the committee this morning. I demanded a roll call and asked for a showing of hands, and more than one-fifth voted for a roll call. One member tried to appeal from the decision, which, of course, was ridiculous. Then a few of them walked out, evidently to keep from going on record.

The SPEAKER. The Chair was only answering the parliamentary inquiry. He does not know what happened in the committee.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and include certain statements and excerpts.

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the general assembly of his State.

Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Chicago Sun-Times.

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a report from a soil conservation district.

Mr. HARE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Emory Alumnus.

Mr. McSWEENEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some statistics he has gathered relative to the Taft-Hartley law.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter. In one instance, the Government Printing Office advises me the cost will be $159.75 and that it will take 2¼ pages of the RECORD, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am a new Member of Congress. I am also an honorably discharged veteran of World War II, having served 5½ years—3½ years of this time overseas. I have a deep and sincere interest in the veteran.

I believe that our Nation owes a great debt of gratitude to the men who served it, and who helped to save our way of life—the great American way.

I deem it a singular honor and privilege to be able to serve on the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Today the Committee on Veterans' Affairs had under consideration a general pension bill for veterans. In my opinion, the people of our country are grateful that these men were able to preserve our democratic processes and they would like to make this feeling manifest through a measure of this kind. However, even while such a measure is under consideration, we must not yield any of our democratic processes. The veteran fought to preserve our democratic way—and as a Member of Congress—it is my solemn duty to continue to fight to preserve that way. And I intend to do so unceasingly.

This opportunity I do not believe was afforded to us because of the objectionable way in which the chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee conducted today's meeting.

The chairman of that committee has charged that seven members ran out on the veterans when considering the general pension bill. I take issue with that remark. My interest in the welfare of the veteran is as great as his—but I am strenuously opposed to what I regard as the undemocratic method he has used in the conduct of today's meeting. I feel that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUBER] who walked out with us, reflected a commendable attitude.

I did not walk out on the veteran. I shall never walk out on the veteran. I shall always fight for the welfare of the veteran. But I shall also continue to fight for the things the veteran fought for—the preservation of our democratic principles.

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, I too am a new Member of Congress. The gentleman from Mississippi would like you to believe that the reason the members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs walked out this morning did so because they are walking out on the veterans. I think that is an unfair statement. I believe the first obligation of the Congress is to the veteran. I think every member that walked out this morning walked out only because the chairman was not adhering to the rules of the House, and was acting in a dictatorial fashion.

AUTHORIZING READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, February 22, 1949, Washington's Farewell Address may be read by a Member to be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments be permitted to sit today during general debate.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand there is important legislation here. Will we be notified when the general debate is over and when the bill is being read for amendment?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will see that that is done. The rule calls for 3 hours of general debate.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman states that the committee will be notified?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will see to it that that is done.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, with that explanation I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 9]

Abbitt	Bloom	Burnside
Allen, Ill.	Bonner	Byrne, N. Y.
Barden	Boykin	Carlyle
Bennett, Fla.	Bulwinkle	Colmer

Coudert	Kennedy	Scott,
Curtis	Linehan	Hugh D., Jr.
Dawson	McMillan, S. C.	Scudder
deGraffenried	Magee	Shafer
Dingell	Mason	Short
Dolliver	Miles	Smith, Ohio
Douglas	Miller, Calif.	Somers
Ellsworth	Mitchell	Staggers
Gavin	Monroney	Stockman
Gorski, Ill.	Morrison, La.	Tackett
Halleck	Morton	Taylor
Heffernan	Nixon	Teague
Herter	O'Toole	Thomas, N. J.
Hinshaw	Pace	Towe
Hoffman, Ill.	Pfeifer,	Velde
Irving	Joseph L.	Weichel
Jackson, Calif.	Poulson	White, Idaho
Jenison	Powell	Whitten
Jenkins	Reed, Ill.	Willis
Jones, Mo.	Richards	Wilson, Ind.
Judd	Richlman	Woodhouse
Kee	Sanborn	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 355 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments be permitted to have until midnight to file a report on the bill H. R. 782.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 99 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, notwithstanding any rule of the House to the contrary, it shall be in order on Tuesday, February 15, 1949, to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 2632) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies for the fiscal year 1949, and for other purposes, and all points of order against the bill or any of the provisions contained therein are hereby waived. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, later I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 2632, the first deficiency appropriation bill. The rule waives all points of order and provides f r 3 hours of general debate, after which the bill will be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. Speaker, the older Members know my position with respect to legislation carried in appropriation bills. However, I think I owe it to the new Members to explain that it is the duty and the function of the legislative committees to bring in legislative proposals.

The regular rules of the House preclude the Committee on Appropriations from bringing in new legislation, its jurisdiction being confined to making appropriations. Notwithstanding the fact that I have been opposed and am still opposed to the Committee on Appropriations reporting legislation in their general appropriation bills, I feel in this instance that this being a deficiency appropriation bill a waiver of points of order should be had and I favor the passage of the bill for the following reasons. Unfortunately the Republican Eightieth Congress went out of its way through waiver of points of order in restricting certain appropriations which have affected and which might affect the efficiency of some departments of government and which even make it impossible for some of the departments to perform their duties and functions as authorized by the Congress. Consequently I feel we are justified in agreeing to this rule which waives points of order on certain items in the bill.

Before I go any further in discussing provisions of the bill which will later on be explained by the chairman and members of the Committee on Appropriations, I am sure to the satisfaction of the House, I want to say that the Committee on Appropriations has filed and there is available to all Members a report showing the various appropriations provided for, including those that would be subject to points of order. I would advise the new Members to familiarize themselves with this report because, while 3 hours of general debate are provided for, a reading of the report will give them an opportunity to know the contents of the bill. I am satisfied that after careful consideration by the membership they will vote for the rule and later vote for the bill. I think the bill has been carefully prepared. There are reductions from the original amounts asked for by the budget to the extent, I believe, of $14,000,000. That shows that the Committee on Appropriations has been careful in passing on this legislation before reporting the same to the House. I urge the members to adopt the rule and vote for the passage of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time and now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has explained, House Resolution 99 makes in order the consideration of H. R. 2632, a bill to make appropriations to supply deficiencies for the fiscal year which ends June 30. The rule also provides for 3 hours of general debate and, in addition, which is very important, waives all points of order on the different sections of the bill.

I wish to say with all the seriousness and conviction at my command that every Member of the House had better look over this bill carefully. I have served for a great many years on the Rules Committee, and H. R. 2632 is one of the most cleverly drawn measures that I have seen in a very long time. When it was brought before the Rules Committee it was not even in printed form. It had not been reported from the committee, and it had not even been introduced in the House. It was practically impossible to get any information as to what the measure contained. Then some of us on the committee began to ask some questions, and we found that there are many provisions and sections in this bill which are actually of a type that the House should consider, as separate pieces of legislation or each item by itself, and decide for itself, after due consideration, just what policy it desires to follow on such widely different important issues.

For instance, no one can find any fault with some of the sections in this bill, such as those taking care of the needs of the Vice President, or the usual payments to widows of deceased Members. I am sure something has to be done for the Capitol Building and the House and Senate chambers. So that is proper legislation in a measure like this.

The section providing additional fees for jurors in the Federal courts can easily be explained. Also the provision to carry out the intent and purpose of the new law relative to the President's salary, and also for the other matters which have been authorized by the Congress.

Then the bill carries some other provisions. For instance, grants to States for public assistance in connection with administration of unemployment compensation. Incidentally I think it might be well for all Members of the House to check rather carefully to find out just what compensation will be given to each State to carry out the provisions of this law. I can say to you frankly that, regardless of political affiliation, the public officials of the State of Ohio are not at all satisfied with the treatment which that great State has received in this connection.

Then I want to refer, please, to page 7, line 19, the item for the Tennessee Valley Authority. I wonder how many of you can read that section just by a cursory reading, and determine that it is a provision to build, to construct, and to put into operation, the Johnsonville steam plant, which this Congress turned down by direct legislative action, when it refused to put the Tennessee Valley Authority and the United States Government fairly and squarely into the business of producing electric power. That, and nothing more nor less, is all this steam plant section of the bill amounts to.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the gentleman will give me additional time, I will be glad to yield to him. Yes, if the gentleman will give me 5 minutes extra, I will be more than glad to yield to the gentleman.

When you vote for this rule waiving these points of order, you will make it so they can put into operation this steam plant down in the Tennessee Valley.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] has expired.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. This steam plant is to be constructed at an expense of $2,950,000 of the taxpayers' money, to do something that we have been told all these years the Tennessee Valley Authority never intended to do; that is, to go into direct competition with our privately owned public utilities.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am sorry; I cannot yield.

I want to go on, if I may. Here in the bill is a provision to continue the life of the War Assets Administration. The House has already passed a bill, just this last week, to extend its life, but we do not know what the Senate or the President may do about it. It might surprise some of you to find that the President may want to do something about liquidating these matters.

I want to go a little further in the discussion of the bill quickly because of time limitation; I want to refer to line 17 on page 16. The entire intent and purpose, force and effect of this particular section is to put Mike Straus and Richard Boke back on the pay roll out in California on the Central Valley project. You and I know that a law was passed by the last session of Congress to require that licensed and properly accredited engineers be named for supervisory work of this type because a situation developed out there which was so scandalous, and the waste of the money of the taxpayers of this country has been so great, that, in the opinion of congressional committees which have been investigating, something had to be done.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I will yield if the gentleman from Illinois will grant me more time.

If you want to put Mr. Straus and Mr. Boke back on the pay roll and permit this same sort of wasteful activity to go on, then vote for this rule; but if you want to stand by the legislation previously enacted by the Congress, then vote against the rule. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that this rule should be voted down. It is time that we bring an end to the waiving of points of order on appropriation bills. Yes, it is time we stop certain committees of this House from legislating by circumvention without permitting the Members of the House to really know what they are voting on. I hope this rule will be voted down. So I ask for a vote of "No" on the adoption of this rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE].

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I concur with my distinguished colleague from Ohio, Mr. BROWN, that this membership should have full information on this measure—indeed, on every measure that is presented to the House. I would not willingly be a party to any procedure depriving the House of information. Appropriation bills are by their nature difficult to draft and difficult to present. Those of us not serving on that great committee must depend upon the report and hearings accompanying each bill and upon the debate. At this moment the provisions of the first deficiency appropriation bill, 1949, are not in issue, nor is the continuing controversy of "legislation in appropriation bills" in issue.

The question is, Shall the House follow the recommendation of its Committee on Rules and consider the proposed deficiency appropriation bill without the privilege of attack upon its many items by the use of points of order?

This procedure for the consideration of such a measure is by no means new or unusual. It is not inconsistent with the customs and practice of this body. The position of the gentleman from Ohio in requesting the House to vote against the adoption of the rule is, however, seemingly inconsistent. During the last Congress and for many, many years before, appropriation bills were consistently considered under similar rules.

It is a good rule. It is a necessary rule, for it permits the expeditious consideration of the many and varied problems and issues arising almost daily before the Congress. For example: The bill we seek to consider provides funds for the widows of two of our deceased colleagues. Should it be necessary to refer such an accepted practice to a legislative committee for authorizing legislation? We think not. But without the adoption of this rule a point of order properly raised would likely be sustained. That, to be sure, would not be done. It is an example, however, of the necessity and correctness of this character of procedure.

This rule is democratic. It permits any Member to challenge any part of the bill with which he disagrees by offering an amendment, and it permits the House, by a majority vote, to effect any change its will dictates.

This rule is fair for it makes in order 3 hours of general debate. During that time any Member who desires can surely inquire fully into any or all provisions.

I, too, regret that the Committee on Appropriations has found it necessary at times to write into its bills legislation. I regretted that in the Eightieth Congress. For instance, the matter discussed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] concerning the Bureau of Reclamation, the hiring of certain personnel, was a provision of an appropriation bill passed by the Eightieth Congress. That appropriation bill came to this floor under a similar rule—one waiving points of order. I have that resolution in my hand. It was House Resolution 615, Eightieth Congress. It was recommended by the Committee on Rules of that Congress. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] was then a member of that committee.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The fact of the matter is that provision was not in the bill as it was reported to the House by the Appropriations Committee. It was put in by amendment. If it was out of order when it was offered, a point of order could have been made against it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Inasmuch as the gentleman has referred to me, I call his attention to the fact mentioned by the gentleman from New York that the item to which he refers was not in the bill at the time a rule was granted. It was placed in on the floor of the House by an amendment offered by a Democrat from California, by the way, a member of the minority at that time. It was the result of legislation which had been introduced and passed in the Senate. It was introduced in the Senate by Senator DOWNEY, of California. That was not partisan. It was just a very, very good American move.

Mr. LYLE. That is the point I would impress upon you. This procedure is not partisan, nor is it restrictive. Under this rule, any germane amendment may be offered and may be adopted.

It may well be that the House in its wisdom will retain the restrictive clause adopted during the previous Congress. Assuredly, it can do so.

Consideration of the bill under this rule by no means insures its passage in toto. A "yea" vote on the rule does not and is not intended to bind any Member in support of the measure in whole or in part. It permits orderly consideration. It permits the issues to be considered by a majority. It prohibits an individual from successfully urging points of order against individual items and provisions of the bill.

The adoption of this rule is consistent with good legislative procedure and is in accord with the custom and practice of the House. The issues—many of them justly controversial—that will be raised during the consideration of the bill on its merits can be resolved in an orderly and democratic way. I urge the adoption of the rule.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire to use.

Mr. Speaker, for some years I have been disturbed about the tendency of the Appropriations Committee to absorb the function of legislating, and I am not criticizing individual members of that committee.

In the bill covered by the pending rule there are something like 10 of those instances. I do not intend upon this occasion to discuss any but 1 of them, which will be found at the bottom of page 16 of the bill and has to do with legislation passed by the last Congress prescribing certain qualifications for the Commissioner of Reclamation, the Assistant Commissioner, and regional directors in the reclamation-project areas.

I think it fair to the House to give the Members, and it must be brief because my time is not long, the background of that legislation. I happen to be familiar with

it because I was a member of a subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments directed by the full committee to investigate publicity and propaganda activities of the executive departments, a field in which we knew at the time the bureaucracy had been engaged over many, many years at ever-increasing expense until the information reached us that a total of $75,000,000 was being spent by publicity agencies of the various departments.

In investigating the publicity propaganda efforts of the Bureau of Reclamation we stumbled upon some exceedingly interesting and, I might say, distressing facts. Those facts were submitted in a report by our committee to the Congress, but I doubt if that report, which was made late in the session, was read by a great many Members in the confusion of the closing days.

Going back as briefly as I can to tell the story—and it is not a very nice story—the budget recommended to the Congress in the early winter of 1947 an appropriation of $30,000,000 to carry on the work in the Central Valley of California project, whose headquarters are at Sacramento. According to the budget estimates there would be an unexpended balance at the end of the fiscal year June 30, 1947, of something like $10,000,000. The budget recommended the reappropriation of that $10,000,000 and an additional $20,000,000 of new money, making a total of $30,000,000. The Committee on Appropriations of the House, and later the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, found that the accounts and the reports of the reclamation district out there in the Central Valley project were most unreliable. When inquiries were made as to how much money they would actually have left to spend at the end of the fiscal year it was found, in the first instance, that they reported they would have $19,000,000 instead of $10,000,000, and then we found in the papers of the Department a report from Sacramento itself to Mr. Straus, the Commissioner of Reclamation, that actually they would have $25,000,000 left unexpended. Mr. Straus withheld this information from the Congress. And finally, in desperation, either the Senate committee or the House committee appealed to the Bureau of the Budget to actually find out how much money they would have left unexpended at the end of the fiscal year, and the budget reported in round figures $21,000,000. So, the Congress, acting in accordance with the recommendation of the budget, appropriated the $21,000,000 unexpended balance, and added $9,000,000 plus in order to make the total expendable in the next fiscal year $30,000,000, almost exactly the figure recommended by the President.

Now, what happened? The Bureau of Reclamation was outraged by this. It began agitating in California against the stinginess of the Congress. We found any number of examples of that. But, let me tell you what that regional office out there did. The man at the head of the regional office was a man named Richard L. Boke. He had never had the slightest experience as an engineer, nor had he ever administered any large undertaking. Under him was a man named Calland, his first assistant. On June 17, 1947, this man Calland sent out a letter to all of the Reclamation officials in the Sacramento Valley region. On June 17 the Congress was just finishing up the appropriation bills, and it was then perfectly apparent that the Central Valley project was going to get $30,000,000. I will read you a portion of that letter, which was dated June 17, 1947:

Subject: Means of effectuating the regional director's responsibilities for construction on programing and execution, region 2

1. For reasons valid or otherwise, the construction program in the region has fallen far behind schedule. Because of failure to meet estimated progress, large amounts of appropriated funds have remained unspent at fiscal year ends. This fact has brought severe criticism upon us from the Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner, from members of congressional appropriations committees, and from others.

2. The heavy carry-over from the current fiscal year (1947) plus an appropriation in the order of amounts recently passed by the Senate and House of Representatives will give us a total of funds available for fiscal year 1948 which is far above that required to meet our current rate of spending. The Secretary and the Commissioner are insistent that 1948 funds be spent early in the year—by January 1, if possible.

There is an order sent out with the approval of the high command, that, despite the fact that the Congress said they should have $30,000,000 to cover an entire fiscal year, they must spend it in half a year; and that was done, under the most peculiar circumstances.

As late as September 1947, after the new fiscal year had started, there was a meeting of the reclamation officials at Salt Lake City, about September 1, at which it was generally understood that there was sufficient money left in the appropriations to go at least until February 1, 1948, at which time the Congress would be in session and a deficiency could be asked for, if necessary. Nothing was said about their going broke, until suddenly, on November 26, 1947, a conference met at Sacramento at the regional office, from which it was announced to California and the entire western coast that there was no money left, that all major contracts had to be suspended. Incidentally, Boke, the regional director, did not attend the conference. He had gone off on a vacation 3 or 4 days before.

Mr. Boke upon the stand said, "Yes," he knew about Calland's letter. He had not heard of it, he said, although Calland was his first assistant, until it had been out for 5 or 6 or 7 days. We asked him if he took any measures to counteract that letter which carried the order to this vast organization. He said, "No," he had not. We asked him why he had not done so. For administrative reasons, he said. That is all the explanation we could get.

I asked him if he thought the Calland letter was in conformity with the intent of the Congress, and he admitted it was not.

What happened? The contracts were closed down. One thousand six hundred employees of the contractors were thrown out of work. The contractors filed claims for damages amounting to $1,900,000. Were any Federal employees suspended from employment? Not one. They kept them all on, although most of the work in the field had stopped.

Senator WHERRY heard of this thing a day or two before it happened. He was completely surprised. The members of our Committee on Appropriations did not hear of it until afterward. They were completely surprised.

The instant that close-down took effect they flooded the California newspapers with violent attacks against the Congress for not having appropriated enough money. Now, that is the fact. There is your propaganda, deliberate, although they had violated all decent rules of financial management in spending in 6 months the amount of money which the Congress said should last them for 12 months. That is the fact.

The committee employed one of the best-known chartered public accountants in San Francisco to look into the books of that office at Sacramento, the regional office.

After a lengthy investigation and auditing he found that instead of their being broke on November 26 there were $7,000,000 still left unspent. That is the kind of administration we had. It did not stop there. I have referred to the meeting at Salt Lake City attended by reclamation officers from the Western States. It was attended by the Secretary of the Interior and by the Commissioner of Reclamation, Mr. Straus, as well as all the regional directors and engineers. In the appropriation bill which was passed applicable to the year commencing July 1, 1948, the Congress had seen fit to reduce the appropriations for their information and publicity services from $150,000 to $50,000. Of course, that was with the intent and in the expectation that the personnel employed in this publicity propaganda business—and we saw a great deal of the publications and many of them were not at all sensible—would be dropped from the pay roll. Did that happen? Not one of them was dropped from the pay roll. In the meeting at Salt Lake City Mr. Straus, the Commissioner of Reclamation, described how they had avoided dropping anybody from the pay roll. He said he changed the name plates of the persons: he transferred them to jobs with different names and left them on the pay roll.

You may be interested to know what the chief engineer of the Reclamation Service said about that. The chief engineer, Mr. Young, made a speech before that gathering, and we obtained transcripts of all the speeches, in which he said—I quote:

There was a legal procedure involved there and we even went so far as to perjure ourselves to get ourselves out of the woods. It didn't amount to anything in money, but the principle is there.

There you have it—he admitted perjury.

Now that is the atmosphere in which this thing has been run by Straus and Boke. I am telling you the truth about it. Another little incident occurred out there which may be of interest. It may not be important, but the Secretary of the Interior was present at that Salt

Lake City meeting and made an address. He was denouncing the Congress, as they all did. This merely indicates the contempt in which certain elements of the bureaucracy hold the Congress. He was denouncing the Congress and he said apropos of his connections and contacts with the Congress:

When you try to explain these matters to some "jass-ack" from across the river who has never had anything to do with such a construction program in his life, why you really got to have an excuse, and then I doubt it will do any good.

"Jass-acks," I greet you!

Well, I asked him in the hearings:

What river did you have in mind, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary KRUG. I do not recall, but I meant the general problem of explaining carry-overs to anyone. * * *

Mr. WADSWORTH. To what river did you refer?

Secretary KRUG. Perhaps the Mississippi—I do not know.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am disappointed. I thought perhaps you were going to say the Hudson.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the facts which were brought out, and many others which I have not related to you—many others—the Congress last year provided, in an amendment to an appropriation bill, to be sure, as a restriction on the expenditure of funds, that hereafter public funds shall not be expended for the salaries of the Commissioner of Reclamation and the Assistant Commissioner of Reclamation or a regional director, unless that officer has had 5 years' experience as an engineer and administrator. That provision took effect on January 1 of this year. I suppose Mr. Straus and Mr. Boke are out of office. Here we have in an appropriation bill a provision to put them back. The Committee on Public Lands has had no chance whatsoever to look into this thing, and as I understand it, it falls rightly within the jurisdiction of that committee. I do not think it is the part of the Committee on Appropriations to bring in an item like this asking a waiver of all points of order, in order that those two men, whose incompetence was demonstrated over and over again, may be reappointed. I am not violating any confidence. It is a matter of public knowledge that a sterling Democrat on our subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] wrote his own report about those people and was just as severe as the report written by the other members on the Republican side. There was no party division on that subcommittee. I am hoping that in view of this situation the Public Lands Committee will be given a chance to look into these things, which they will not have if this rule is adopted.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. As a member of the Public Lands Committee, I want to extend my appreciation to the gentleman for making this information available to me and other members of the committee.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is all in our committee report.

Mr. CRAWFORD. This information has not been before our committee heretofore.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York, [Mr. WADSWORTH] has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, all of the Members who were here in the Eightieth Congress, when the Republicans were in power, remember that that restriction was placed in the appropriation bill then under consideration, stopping the payment to those two men, and also a restriction on expenditures in reclamation. It was passed when only a few Members were on the floor of the House.

This matter had been considered by three committees of the Congress and by the Senate Appropriations and the House Appropriations Committee, and both committees found no reason to take any action against either Commissioner Straus or Mr. Boke. Both committees, by nearly unanimous action, recommended that appropriations be provided for both these gentlemen because the committees undoubtedly realized that while the Reclamation Division employed hundreds of engineers, it was also quite necessary that the Division be staffed with men possessing administrative and executive ability, which both these gentlemen have demonstrated in long years of Government service. These men sought to protect the public interest, and the fight against them were by those who were more interested in the private power interests.

Mr WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SABATH. I am sorry I cannot yield now.

Now, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] has quoted some speeches. We all sometimes make speeches here and there, and sometimes use words that may not be proper or that would not appeal to everyone. Now, the gentleman has paid a great deal of attention to it, and I hope that he is not being misled, as other people have been misled in California, due to the publicity that was given to this matter by the private power corporations that were opposed to the rulings of Straus and the Department of Reclamation, because they were trying to safeguard and protect the efforts on the part of the Government to construct, build, and complete projects in the interest of the public and not in the interest of a few private power interested corporations.

I am informed that a great deal of advertising space in California newspapers was used and paid for by the private corporations opposed to the ruling of the Secretary of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation refusing to yield on the 160-acre limit that Congress established, and because they failed to grant the things the private interests were seeking which would have been against the best interests of the Government and the people in that section of the country.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. HAVENNER. Can the gentleman say whether the Rules Committee was given any information about the very large sums of money expended by the private power companies through the newspapers and advertising agencies in the Central Valley area to persuade the people of California that the Government's program for public control of the power development on the Central Valley project was an evil thing? Does he know that millions of dollars were expended by the private power companies of California through newspapers and other agencies of propaganda to conduct this enormous advertising campaign? And that the power companies charged up to operating expenses the cost of these newspaper advertisements and the other propaganda, and that those operating expenses in turn were charged up to the ratepayers of these private corporations, who are taxpayers of California? Has that information been brought before the Committee on Rules?

Mr. SABATH. No; it was not brought to the attention of the Committee on Rules; but I have received such information from certain sources that have been opposed to the activities of these large private power corporations which are trying in every conceivable way to obtain benefits to the disadvantage of the Government and the taxpayers.

Now, may I say to my Republican friends that an outstanding Republican Member in the last Congress, Mr. Robert Jones, of Ohio, chairman of the subcommittee, insisted on the floor that the money should be expended, that these improvements should be proceeded with in haste, and that if he had the power he would demand, and urge, bringing about still greater speed in the execution of these projects that were criticized by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SABATH. I regret I cannot yield. I have the floor and shall delete anything the gentleman may have said which the reporter may have taken down in his interruption during the course of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, personally, I am satisfied that the Committee on Appropriations that has heard the evidence used good judgment in embodying in the bill before us the various provisions contained therein striking out restrictions put in by the Republican Congress so as to hamstring the various departments in every conceivable way in the performance of their duty in the interest of the country. It was generally recognized then, and it is known now, the American people have spoken and disagreed with the policy of the celebrated Eightieth Congress.

In view of the existing situation I feel that the rule should be adopted and the bill passed.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, upon that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 242, nays 121, not voting 70, as follows:

[Roll No. 10]

YEAS—242

Abernethy	Gore	Noland
Addonizio	Gorski, N. Y.	Norblad
Albert	Gossett	Norrell
Allen, La.	Granahan	O'Brien, Ill.
Andrews	Granger	O'Brien, Mich.
Angell	Grant	O'Hara, Ill.
Aspinall	Green	O'Konski
Bailey	Gregory	O'Neill
Baring	Gross	O'Sullivan
Barrett, Pa.	Hagen	Pace
Barrett, Wyo.	Hardy	Passman
Bates, Ky.	Hare	Patman
Battle	Harris	Patten
Beckworth	Harrison	Perkins
Bentsen	Hart	Peterson
Biemiller	Havenner	Philbin
Blatnik	Hays, Ark.	Phillips, Tenn.
Bloom	Hays, Ohio	Poage
Boggs, La.	Hébert	Polk
Bolling	Hedrick	Powell
Bolton, Md.	Herlong	Preston
Brooks	Hobbs	Price
Brown, Ga.	Holifield	Priest
Bryson	Holmes	Quinn
Buchanan	Horan	Rabaut
Buckley, Ill.	Howell	Rains
Buckley, N. Y.	Huber	Ramsay
Burdick	Hull	Rankin
Burke	Jackson, Wash.	Redden
Burleson	Jacobs	Rhodes
Burton	Jennings	Ribicoff
Camp	Johnson	Rivers
Cannon	Jones, Ala.	Rodino
Carnahan	Jones, N. C.	Rogers, Fla.
Carroll	Karst	Rooney
Cavalcante	Karsten	Sabath
Celler	Kee	Sadowski
Chatham	Kelley	Saseer
Chelf	Keogh	Sheppard
Chesney	Kerr	Sikes
Christopher	Kilday	Sims
Chudoff	King	Smathers
Clemente	Kirwan	Smith, Va.
Combs	Klein	Spence
Cooley	Kruse	Staggers
Cooper	Lane	Stanley
Cox	Lanham	Steed
Crook	Larcade	Stigler
Crosser	Lemke	Stockman
Davenport	Lesinski	Sullivan
Davies, N. Y.	Lind	Sutton
Davis, Ga.	Lucas	Taurielio
Davis, Tenn.	Lyle	Teague
Deane	Lynch	Thomas, Tex.
Delaney	McCarthy	Thompson
Denton	McCormack	Thornberry
Dollinger	McDonough	Tollefson
Donohue	McGrath	Trimble
Doughton	McGuire	Underwood
Douglas	McKinnon	Wagner
Doyle	McSweeney	Walsh
Durham	Mack, Ill.	Welch, Mo.
Eberharter	Mack, Wash.	Wheeler
Elliott	Madden	Whitaker
Engle, Calif.	Magee	White, Calif.
Evins	Mahon	White, Idaho
Fallon	Mansfield	Whitten
Feighan	Marcantonio	Whittington
Fernandez	Marsalis	Wickersham
Fisher	Marshall	Wier
Flood	Merrow	Williams
Fogarty	Miller, Calif.	Willis
Forand	Miller, Nebr.	Wilson, Okla.
Frazier	Mills	Winstead
Fugate	Morgan	Withrow
Furcolo	Morris	Wood
Garmatz	Moulder	Worley
Gary	Multer	Yates
Gathings	Murdock	Young
Gilmer	Murphy	Zablocki
Gordon	Murray, Tenn.	

NAYS—121

Allen, Calif.	Brambletti	Cunningham
Andersen, H. Carl	Brehm	Dague
	Brown, Ohio	Davis, Wis.
Anderson, Calif.	Byrnes, Wis.	D'Ewart
Andresen, August H.	Canfield	Dondero
	Case, N. J.	Eaton
Arends	Case, S. Dak.	Elston
Auchincloss	Chiperfield	Engel, Mich.
Bates, Mass.	Church	Fenton
Beall	Clevenger	Ford
Bennett, Mich.	Cole, Kans.	Fulton
Bishop	Cole, N. Y.	Gamble
Blackney	Corbett	Gillette
Boggs, Del.	Cotton	Golden
Bolton, Ohio	Crawford	Goodwin
Graham	Lichtenwalter	Sadlak
Hale	Lodge	St. George
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Lovre	Scott, Hardie
	McCulloch	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Hand	McGregor	Scrivner
Harden	McMillen, Ill.	Scudder
Harvey	Macy	Secrest
Herter	Martin, Iowa	Short
Heselton	Martin, Mass.	Simpson, Ill.
Hill	Meyer	Simpson, Pa.
Hinshaw	Michener	Smith, Kans.
Hoeven	Miller, Md.	Smith, Wis.
Hoffman, Mich.	Murray, Wis.	Stefan
Hope	Nelson	Taber
James	Nicholson	Talle
Jensen	O'Hara, Minn.	Van Zandt
Jonas	Patterson	Vorys
Kean	Pfeiffer, William L.	Vursell
Kearney	Phillips, Calif.	Wadsworth
Kearns	Pickett	Walter
Keating	Plumley	Werdel
Keefe	Potter	Wigglesworth
Kilburn	Reed, N. Y.	Wilson, Tex.
Kunkel	Rees	Wolcott
Latham	Rich	Wolverton
LeCompte	Rogers, Mass.	Woodruff
LeFevre		

NOT VOTING—70

Abbitt	Gorski, Ill.	Nixon
Allen, Ill.	Gwinn	Norton
Barden	Hall, Leonard W.	O'Toole
Bennett, Fla.		Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Bland	Halleck	
Bonner	Heffernan	Poulson
Bosone	Hoffman, Ill.	Reed, Ill.
Boykin	Irving	Regan
Breen	Jackson, Calif.	Richards
Bulwinkle	Javits	Riehlman
Burnside	Jenison	Sanborn
Byrne, N. Y.	Jenkins	Shafer
Carlyle	Jones, Mo.	Smith, Ohio
Coffey	Judd	Somers
Colmer	Kennedy	Tackett
Coudert	Linehan	Taylor
Curtis	McConnell	Thomas, N. J.
Dawson	McMillan, S. C.	Towe
DeGraffenried	Mason	Velde
Dingell	Miles	Vinson
Dolliver	Mitchell	Weichel
Ellsworth	Monroney	Welch, Calif.
Fellows	Morrison	Wilson, Ind.
Gavin	Morton	Woodhouse

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mrs. Norton for, with Mr. Halleck against.
Mr. Kennedy for, with Mr. Towe against.
Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Riehlman against.
Mr. Monroney for, with Mr. Coudert against.
Mr. Dawson for, with Mr. Smith of Ohio against.
Mr. McMillan of South Carolina for, with Mr. Jenkins against.
Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. Reed of Illinois against.
Mr. Gorski of Illinois for, with Mr. Gavin against.
Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer for, with Mr. Leonard W. Hall against.
Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Taylor against.
Mr. Heffernan for, with Mr. Weichel against.
Mr. O'Toole for, with Mr. McConnell against.
Mr. Byrne of New York for, with Mr. Shafer against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Richards with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.
Mr. Somers with Mr. Sanborn.
Mr. Burnside with Mr. Dolliver.
Mr. Carlyle with Mr. Fellows.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Jackson of California.
Mrs. Bosone with Mr. Judd.
Mr. Bennett of Florida with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Nixon.
Mr. Barden with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Jones of Missouri with Mr. Gwinn.
Mr. Regan with Mr. Jenison.
Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Morton.
Mr. deGraffenried with Mr. Poulson.
Mr. Irving with Mr. Velde.

Mr. HALE changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. ANGELL and Mr. HARRIS changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2632) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the report accompanying the bill, H. R. 2632, does not comply with the so-called Ramseyer rule.

I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that although the resolution which has been adopted waives points of order against the bill by the provisions contained therein it does not specifically waive or exempt the so-called Ramseyer rule which requires that a report accompanying a bill, including appropriation bills, shall set forth in appropriate type the text of the statute it is proposed to repeal.

In this connection I invite the Chair's attention to the fact that on page 8 of the proposed bill, line 6, it is proposed to repeal a title in a previous act of Congress, and again on page 16, lines 15 and 16, the bill carries this language: "and the first, fourth, and fifth provisos under said head are hereby repealed."

I have diligently searched the entire report on the bill and can find no citation of the statute to be repealed in order to comply with the Ramseyer rule.

I make the point of order which, if sustained, as I understand it, would automatically recommit the bill to the committee.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will read the rule:

Notwithstanding any rule of the House to the contrary, it shall be in order—

And so forth—

and all points of order against the bill or any of the provisions contained therein are hereby waived.

The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the Chair indulge me for a moment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will indulge the gentleman.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Under the rule in the House Manual, a citation is made to a precedent in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Seventy-first Congress, second session, page 10595. This citation reads:

Special orders providing for consideration of bills, unless making specific exemption, do not preclude the point of order that reports on such bills fail to indicate proposed changes in existing law. (Cannon's, sec. 9220a; 71st Cong., 2d sess., CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 10595.)

I fail to see any provision in the rule adopted which specifically exempts clause 2a of rule XIII, the Ramseyer rule.

The SPEAKER. The Ramseyer rule is a rule of the House, and this resolution states "all rules to the contrary notwithstanding," it shall be in order to consider the bill.

The Chair overrules the point of order.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2632, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, my remarks at this time will be limited to a brief summary of the bill and the action of the Committee on Appropriations now presented for consideration by this body.

The report before you contains a rather detailed explanation of each item contained in the bill which is, as you are aware, the first appropriation bill reported to the Eighty-first Congress. First of all I wish to express my appreciation to the other members of the subcommittee, all of whom have been very cooperative and pleasant to work with. We are, of course, honored by having the chairman of the full committee the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], as a member of the Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Army Civil Appropriations.

The bill before you contains a total in recommended appropriations of $466,800,000, which represents a reduction of $14,000,000 in the budget estimates. I want to point out, however, that of the total request of $480,800,000 approximately $353,000,000 was requested for items over which neither the administration nor the committee had much control. For example, $151,000,000 is for additional grants-in-aid for public assistance made necessary by the enactment of legislation since the original fiscal year 1949 budget was presented. Almost $103,000,000 is for the postal service, part of which is due to the increased volume of mail and part of which is due to increased transportation rates imposed on the Post Office by the Interstate Commerce Commission and by the Civil Aeronautics Board. An amount of nearly $100,000,000 is included for the veterans' benefits. The net result is that there remained only an amount of something over $127,000,000 in which the committee could effect some reductions, and out of this total the amount of $14,000,000 has been saved.

I wish to call your attention to one item, a recommended appropriation of $2,274,500 for reconstruction of the roof in the House Chamber and for other needed improvements. The Senate made a similar appropriation last year, and it was the thought of the Architect of the Capitol and the committee that considerable savings in the ultimate cost could be effected if the work on both roofs was done simultaneously.

As you read through the report you will notice that many of the deficiency items included in the bill are the result of legislation enacted subsequent to the presentation of the regular fiscal year 1949 estimates. This is the case in connection with the Office of Defense Transportation whose existence was continued until June 30, 1949, by the enactment of Public Law 606, Eightieth Congress.

The Displaced Persons Commission received an initial appropriation of $2,000,000 with a proviso that it could be obligated and expended during the first three-quarters of the fiscal year; hence, the need for this deficiency.

I previously mentioned the grants to States for public assistance. This calls for an amount of $151,000,000 made necessary by the enactment by the Eightieth Congress of Public Law 642, increasing the Federal share of the contributions for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to dependent children.

With respect to grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service, the committee is recommending the full amount of the estimate, or $4,987,000. However, the committee, because of the great divergence of opinion on this item, has instituted a study of the situation by its own investigative staff and will later entertain recommendations for such adjustments as the facts may justify.

For the Federal Housing Administration the committee increased the limitation under administrative expenses from $19,000,000 to $23,000,000 because of the tremendous increase in applications for loans. These administrative expenses, as you are aware, come out of the corporate earnings of the Administration and not out of the general fund of the Treasury.

The Housing Expediter requested $7,450,000. The subcommittee recommends $4,800,000, which will carry the activity through the month of May, prior to which time, undoubtedly, some new legislation affecting this agency will be passed by the Congress.

The bill includes $2,950,000 for the Tennessee Valley Authority, of which $2,500,000 is for beginning construction on the New Johnsonville steam plant. Although this item was left out of the regular 1949 appropriation act after considerable discussion of the matter in committee and on the floor, it is the thought of the committee that, so long as this is a Federal project, it should be made as efficient an operation as possible.

The bill includes nearly $100,000,000 for the Veterans' Administration. This amount is largely attributable to amendments to the authorizing act passed by the Eightieth Congress subsequent to the consideration of the regular fiscal year 1949 estimates.

For the War Assets Administration the bill includes the amount of $12,500,000. Under present law this agency is to go out of existence on February 28. However, in view of the President's recommendation for legislation to establish one over-all disposal agency, it is thought that the War Assets Administration should be continued in existence until the end of this year in order that a more orderly transition may be effected when the new agency is established. The bill (H. R. 2402), extending the life of the War Assets Administration to June 30, was, as you are aware, passed by the House yesterday.

Two items are included for the Department of Agriculture. They are not large from the standpoint of money but are nonetheless important. The first is an amount of something over $9,700,000 for establishing acreage allotments for cotton and wheat as provided for in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. The other item is an increase of something over $3,000,000 in the administrative-expense limitation for the Commodity Credit Corporation. The record crops and the recent drop in prices have trebled the number of loans from that contemplated originally.

There are five items in the Department of Commerce, the most important of which is an amount of $11,000,000, for the census of business authorized by the Eightieth Congress. The census will cover all the retail establishments in the Nation as of December 31, 1948, estimated to number 3,000,000.

Under the Department of the Interior there is an item of $6,000,000 for the Bonneville Power Administration, the amount to be used for extending electrical transmission facilities. Two small items are included for the Bureau of Indian Affairs; one in the amount of $360,000 for the Navajo and Hopi service, mostly for salary increases under Public Law 960, Eightieth Congress, and $335,000 for the welfare of Indians, generally. A number of construction items are included under the Bureau of Reclamation, both from the Reclamation fund and from the general fund. Under the Reclamation fund the bill includes $975,000 for continuing construction on three projects—two in Idaho and one in Utah. Three items are included for construction under the general fund. These also are continuing projects, and the added amounts are made necessary in the main because of contract earnings beyond the availability of appropriations. The total of these three projects is $10,800,000. Also included is an amount of $4,500,000 for the Missouri River Basin project. As most of you gentlemen are aware, this is a development covering 10 States of the Missouri River Basin and includes irrigation, power, navigation, flood control, and water for municipal and other purposes.

A number of items are included for the Corps of Engineers, National Military Establishment. For rivers and harbors a recommended amount of $10,500,000 is to provide for continuing construction on the McNary lock and dam and for beginning construction on the Ice Harbor lock and dam and the Chief Joseph lock and dam, the last two of which are interrelated to the power development in the Northwest area. Under flood control, general, the bill includes $14,000,000 for continuing construction on six projects. The bill also includes $2,500,000 for the emergency fund needed to complete the repair, restoration, and strengthening of levees in the Columbia Basin damaged by floods in May and June 1948.

Almost $103,000,000 is included for the postal service, of which $70,000,000 is for railroad transportation; $17,000,000 for foreign air-mail service, and $13,000,000 for the postal vehicle service. The additional appropriation is made necessary by a temporary increase of 25 percent in rail rates authorized by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and because of a tremendous increase in mail volume. Increased rates were also approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board for foreign air mail.

Three items are included for the Treasury Department. In the case of two of these, no action could be taken by the committee. One is the amount of $2,300,000 for the payment of claims and another is $800,000 for refund of moneys erroneously received and covered into the Treasury. The committee allowed $1,500,000 for the Bureau of Engraving and Printing for the printing of an additional 16,000,000 sheets of currency for replacement, principally in the one-dollar-bill category.

As I indicated previously, while the total of appropriations in the bill is substantial, many of the items could not be reduced. I feel that the committee has done a good job and has reduced wherever reductions could be made without jeopardizing the authorized programs of the various departments. I hope that the House will sustain the recommendations of the committee in full.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and thirteen Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I expect to make no motions with reference to most of the amounts contained in this bill. One exception is the amount for the steam plant at the TVA at Johnsonville, Tenn. I intend to discuss that in a moment.

I will first call attention to two or three of the major items of legislation involved in the bill, to which I am opposed.

At the bottom of page 13 there is an item under "Bonneville Power Administration," and following that on page 14 is an item which repeals the limitation under the head of "Bonneville Power Administration" on the use of funds for force account activities. There is also a limitation on the amount of money that may be spent for propaganda. I am opposed to the repeal of both of those items. They were put in for the protection of the Government.

The force account limitation was put in so that they would have to comply with the rules, and let the jobs to contract and get them done in a reasonable way for a reasonable sum, rather than to fill up the pay roll of the department with a lot of people who were unnecessary, and allow the work to drag and allow the people to work about half time, as they had been doing for a long time.

The idea of repealing the limitation on propaganda activities, allowing them to spend all the funds that are appropriated and made available to the agency for propaganda, has no appeal to me.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I notice that the committee has given the amount for the Veterans' Administration asked for by the budget. Is that correct?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Did the Veterans' Administration ask for any more than the budget allowed?

Mr. TABER. They did not. The item with reference to the Veterans' Administration appears on page 8. There is an item for national service life insurance, $55,000,000. They stated that they thought that would carry them through to the end of the year without any trouble.

The next item is $190,000 for soldiers' and sailors' civil relief, which is a very small item and a very small activity.

The next item is $44,189,000. That is for veterans' miscellaneous benefits. They told us that they thought that would carry them through all right.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Did the Veterans' Administration give any information as to when the accumulated dividends would be paid to the veterans?

Mr. TABER. They did not in these hearings; no. I did not expect, the way they were operating on that, that such a result would come about for 2 or 3 months, in all probability.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thought if perhaps more persons were put on the work the men might receive the dividends sooner.

Mr. TABER. It would be better if they could.

Mr. RABAUT. I should think that would be a matter to be referred to the regular subcommittee having veterans' affairs in charge.

Mr. TABER. That would be an item that would be considered when the regular annual bill came up. We took up nothing in this bill but deficiency estimates; and some of those deficiency estimates were considered in regular committee.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. There would be an appropriation, because they have the authority for it already.

Mr. TABER. If it were necessary to make an appropriation in order to meet what expenditures were required there would be no delay that I know of in anything of that kind by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Could the gentleman give us some idea of what this $44,000,000 item for miscellaneous expenses consists of in general?

Mr. TABER. It is such things as burial allowances and matters of a special character rather than the regular large items of pensions or education aid and that sort of thing; those are not included in it.

Mr. KEATING. It is to cover specialized items?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. If the gentleman from New York will yield, there is a full description of that item on page 7 of the committee report.

Mr. TABER. The next item I expect to take up is on page 15 where there is another force account item under the Bureau of Reclamation. What I said about the force account in the Bonneville item applies equally to this item.

We pass now to page 16 where there is a section repealing the first four or five provisos under the appropriation act for the Interior Department 1949 and repeals the limitation which would throw them out. One of those limitations provides that not to exceed about $7,500,000 shall be transferred out of construction funds to the different administrative funds in the Bureau of Reclamation; in other words, they can spend the whole of the construction funds on salaries and expenses in their offices and agencies rather than have any limitation or any control such as the Congress set up for them.

Another of the provisions repeals the prohibition against spending more than $50,000 for propaganda purposes. It has no merit whatever.

The next item is at line 17 on page 16 where the Mike Straus amendment appears, to put Mike Straus back. He was so incompetent that they want to keep him; and I shall have to admit that that is the chief qualification for a New Deal appointment. But that does not appeal to me, nor does it promote efficiency in government.

These are the major items in the bill with reference to which there will be controversy. I would not say that they were all of them but they are the major ones.

I wish now to discuss for a little while the item relating to the steam plant in the TVA.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. On page 4, under "Appropriations for the judiciary," I have been consulted in my district by the secretary to the district judge regarding the purchase of typewriters. Can the gentleman inform me what the present provision in the Treasury Department Appropriation Act is regarding the typewriter question, or can someone on the gentleman's committee give us that information?

Mr. TABER. There is a limitation, as I understand it, that typewriters may not be purchased at a price above 90 percent of the lowest price quoted a commercial purchaser. I think that is correct?

Mr. KEATING. But under this provision it is intended, as I read it, to permit the purchase now by those who need them in the judicial branch of the United States new typewriters, and not simply have to recondition the old typewriters?

Mr. TABER. They would be confined to the price set forth in the Treasury-Post Office bill. There would be no limitation on their funds for the purchase of typewriters if they could be bought within the limitation which has been prescribed, provided they have the funds appropriated to them for that purpose, and I understand they have.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, with reference to the TVA item on page 7, line 20, I propose to offer an amendment which will reduce the item of $2,950,000 to $450,000. They have asked for $450,000 for a couple of generators, for the initial payments on them anyway, in one of the hydroelectric set-ups, and that I am not going to oppose; but the two and a half million dollars is to start the steam plant, and that I am going to oppose. I will have to offer a similar amendment cutting two and a half million dollars out of the $24,000,000 item in line 24, and I will move also to strike out the part of the limitation which they propose to repeal beginning with the word "and" in line 4, page 8, and going through the rest of the paragraph.

I will also offer an amendment which would prohibit the use of funds for the construction of a steam power plant. What are the facts with reference to that steam power plant?

In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, the Tennessee Valley Authority marketed 12,244,000,000 kilowatts of power. That appears on page 11 of the financial statement of the Tennessee Valley Authority which I have before me. The TVA has had appropriated to it funds which will increase its available power plants, including the steam plants and the ones they already have. They have steam plants at the present time capable of producing 448,000 kilowatts an hour. They have hydro plants capable of producing 2,200,000 kilowatts an hour, or a total of 2,650,000 kilowatts. That means that they have available approximately 18,000,000,000 kilowatts to sell in the course of a year. Of course, they cannot sell all of it because of peaks; that is, they have peak loads during the day. They probably have power available at the present time amounting to about 4,000,000,000 kilowatts to sell if they could sell at all. They tell us that they will have available power projects that are coming in with the funds that are already appropriated, and with the generators that are here provided, amounting to 3,504,000 kilowatts of power-generating capacity. That will produce for sale approximately 18,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year. Now, that is 50 percent above what they sold in the fiscal year 1948.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. It is my understanding that private power companies use about two-thirds of their capacity, while the TVA has only used about one-half of its capacity; that is, if they use their two-thirds capacity like private power companies do, there would be no necessity for this steam plant.

Mr. TABER. There is no necessity for it anyway, because they have got the power capacity to take care of their loads with a margin now. Their steam capacity is plenty to firm up the hydro power that they have or ever will have, because they can run their hydro power or they can run their steam power in the low periods and hold back their water if they have a dry season, and ultimately use their steam or their hydro power effectively.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Was there any testimony produced before the gentleman's committee to show that some of the cities in Tennessee, I will not say had been compelled, but did make contracts with the TVA that they would not build any electric power plants within their cities?

Mr. TABER. There was not before our committee this time, but there has been such testimony before the Committee on Appropriations heretofore. Those contracts are in existence. Those municipalities and cooperatives all would have the right, if the TVA would let them, and the TVA could let them without any trouble, to build all the power plants that they wanted. They should do that if we are going to have the expensive method of providing peak power gone into in the TVA.

Let me give you the general picture of the TVA, because I think people generally ought to understand it. The low rates down in the TVA and for Federal power generally are caused by this fact: The TVA sets up only $2,000,000 for taxes. It has estimated power earnings, according to page 11 of its financial statement, of $48,000,000 a year. This means 4 percent. The private power concerns run 20 to 22 or 23 percent in their over-all tax, and that extra tax is part of the place where they save the money to the power users in their localities.

I checked the record in the manuals in the library, and I know one private power concern right next to this set-up where they have a gross revenue of $125,000,000 and paid taxes of $23,000,000.

Mr. DONDERO. What is the total capitalization of the TVA?

Mr. TABER. The total capitalization of the TVA that is allocated to power is $48,000,000, and they never have paid a cent of interest on that power set-up to the Treasury of the United States. They never paid any money back until this last year, when they paid just a hair under $31,000,000.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. Will the gentleman point out to the Members of the House that there is authorization in the TVA Act for turning into the Treasury each year some $20,000,000?

Mr. TABER. That is so, toward principal, but there is no authorization for the payment of any interest. The taxpayers in the rest of the country are subsidizing the rates in the TVA by the TVA's avoiding the payment of taxes and by the failure to charge enough rates to cover a proper depreciation charge, which should be at least $11,500,000, and interest at the rate of 3 percent, which is what would be fair for the TVA to pay back.

Mr. EVINS. Will the gentleman point out if there is a public power plank in the Republican platform?

Mr. TABER. Maybe there is, but that did not mean a dishonest public power outfit that did not pay its way. It meant having things in such shape that the people of the United States who were not in the power district would not have to pay the electric-light bills and power bills of the folks in that district.

Mr. EVINS. I disagree with the statement the gentleman makes that you are paying the light bills of the people of Tennessee.

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. EVINS. That is not true.

Mr. TABER. There is no question about it. The statistics all bear it out.

Mr. EVINS. Is the gentleman in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway project?

Mr. TABER. No.

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman is not in favor of that project?

Mr. TABER. Not the seaway; no.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present. The gentleman ought to be heard on this important point.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy-three Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 11]

Abbitt	Fisher	O'Toole
Allen, Ill.	Gavin	Pfeifer,
Anderson, Calif.	Gordon	Joseph L.
Arends	Gorski, Ill.	Philbin
Baring	Green	Poulson
Bates, Mass.	Halleck	Powell
Bennett, Fla.	Hardy	Price
Bennett, Mich.	Harvey	Ramsay
Blackney	Havenner	Reed, Ill.
Bland	Hébert	Richards
Bonner	Heffernan	Riehlman
Boykin	Herter	Rivers
Brooks	Heselton	Sanborn
Bryson	Hinshaw	Sasscer
Buckley, Ill.	Irving	Scrivner
Bulwinkle	Jackson, Calif.	Shafer
Burnside	Jenison	Short
Carlyle	Jenkins	Simpson, Pa.
Celler	Jennings	Smith, Ohio
Chiperfield	Jones, Mo.	Smith, Wis.
Clemente	Judd	Somers
Coffey	Kennedy	Stockman
Cole, N. Y.	Kilburn	Tackett
Coudert	Kilday	Taylor
Cox	Lind	Thomas, N. J.
Crosser	Linehan	Towe
Curtis	McCulloch	Van Zandt
DeGraffenried	McSweeney	Velde
Dingell	Mason	Vinson
Doyle	Miles	Welchel
Durham	Monroney	Welch, Calif.
Ellsworth	Morrison	Wilson, Ind.
Elston	Morton	Withrow
Feighan	Moulder	Woodhouse
Fellows	Nixon	Woodruff
Fernandez	Norton	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 2632, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 329 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I stated a little while ago that I believe that according to the evidence the TVA submitted themselves in their own reports, and on pages 40, 41, and 42 of the hearings, they have demonstrated that this item is not necessary for the benefit of

the people in that locality, because they have already in sight a 50-percent margin of power over what they are presently using.

Perhaps it might be interesting to the House if the House were told that some of the smartest corporations of the country have moved into that locality to take advantage of these low, subsidized power rates.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. PATTERSON. Would the gentleman tell the committee the names of the corporations that have gone down South in order to take advantage of this cheap rate that has been subsidized at the expense of the taxpayers, say all those of New England, and in Connecticut especially? Also, will this not in effect invite new industries that might be starting in New England and some older industries to go down South to Tennessee, at the expense of the taxpayers in the North, to start operations?

Mr. TABER. The gentleman is correct. Some of the corporations that have been smart enough to go in there are the Aluminum Co. of America, the Monsanto Chemical Co., the Vickers Chemical Co., and the Pennsylvania Salt Co. There are a great many more of those smart corporations. I do not blame them for going in there and taking advantage of this opportunity, but the taxpayers of the gentleman's territory and those in my territory are carrying that load.

I think it is about time that there be a complete review of this public-power business and that the whole thing be on the basis of fairness, with the power project carrying its share of the load and its share of the taxes. I do not think we should get into this situation and not have these power projects carry their part of the load. I cannot support it, and I feel that I shall have to do everything I can to bring it to the attention of the House and to see that the House has a full opportunity to vote on it.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. I respect the position the gentleman has held on the Committee on Appropriations as a former chairman, but I wish that he would be fair and tell all the facts.

Mr. TABER. I have told all the facts, except this: They charge $9,000,000 depreciation as against $11,500,000, according to the rules of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. They pay no interest. Those are the things I have not told.

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman just stated on the floor that these industries had moved into that area. That is not the truth. These industries have been in this area for some time. The testimony did not show that a single industry had ever moved from the North or the East or the South.

Mr. TABER. It did so.

Mr. EVINS. It did say some branch plants had grown up, and there had been some natural growth, but not a single one had moved from the North.

Mr. TABER. Many have moved into that area.

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman knows that is not true.

Mr. TABER. I know it is true, and the gentleman knows it is true. Let us be honest about it. Let us have the TVA pay to the Treasury of the United States $15,000,000 interest on the $480,000,000 investment. That is our peak interest and that is what it will cost the people of the United States and the taxpayers.

Let us have them charge their depreciation and pay it back every year. Let us have this public-power business put on an honest basis, dollar for dollar, and let the people of the United States understand that it is going to be honest and that it is going to be kept honest.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, this being general debate, I want to make certain remarks before referring specifically to the terms of the bill. I want to say a brief word in regard to the Committee on Appropriations of the House.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—STAFF AND ORGANIZATION

I have been a member of the committee for many years. I have long considered it the most important committee in the House of Representatives. Because of present conditions in the world both at home and abroad I consider it has a tremendous responsibility.

Over the years, Mr. Chairman, it has been the opinion of Members on both sides of the aisle belonging to this great committee that that committee could only do its work properly, in a manner worthy of the confidence of the House and of the country, if by some means or other it could obtain a competent, expert, permanent staff, a staff equipped to make investigations and analyses when the occasion demands.

As I stand here and look back over the years, I can hear Member after Member standing in the well of this House, Members from both sides of the aisle, making an appeal for that kind of staff.

We finally got the necessary authority for that staff, Mr. Chairman. It came in the so-called reorganization bill approved August 2, 1946.

That bill provides that—

> Each standing committee of the House and Senate, other than the Committee on Appropriations, is authorized to appoint by majority vote not more than four professional staff members * * * on a permanent basis, without regard to political affiliation and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the office.

That bill goes further, Mr. Chairman. It provides that—

> The Committee on Appropriations in the House and in the Senate is authorized to appoint such staff as each committee by majority vote shall determine to be necessary * * * and to conduct such studies and examinations of the organization and operation of any executive agency as it may deem meet.

In other words, each Appropriations Committee was authorized to have an unlimited staff, subject only to the judgment of the committee, and essential appropriations.

In my judgment this was one of the most important and most helpful features of the entire Reorganization Act.

What happened, Mr. Chairman? Not long after the Reorganization Act a beginning was made on a real staff for this great committee. Some 8 or 10 permanent employees were appointed, with contemplated expansion. The regular staff was augmented by a group of consultants from private enterprise, who gave generously of their time in the interest of economy. A small allowance for expenses was permitted, and the time and transportation of these individuals was a donation to the cause of good government.

In this manner, skills far beyond the ability of the Government to provide were made available to the committee.

Numbered among these men were 10 of the country's outstanding accountants, picked as a special committee by the American Institute of Accountants. All of these men were, of course, certified public accountants of national standing, and one is currently president of the New York State Certified Public Accountants Society.

The remaining men were business executives and research assistants of considerable standing, many of whom were, and are continuing to be, used as consultants by various Government agencies which have learned to value their counsel and assistance.

There was no partisanship in the activity, as the group was very representative of both political parties, although all were united on behalf of Government economy.

In addition to the day-to-day work of the staff, the major studies completed were as follows:

First. An exhaustive study of the then Federal Public Housing Administration, extending into nine States. The study exposed many vicious illegal practices, and was the basis of corrective legislation. As a result, the agency undertook a real reorganization, eliminating frills, waste, and extravagance.

Second. A review of the Department of Agriculture budget for 1948, including all the bureaus and agencies of that Department, resulting in many recommendations of benefit to the Department. This review also encompassed a particular inquiry into the Rural Electrification Administration.

Third. A study of the Maritime Commission for both 1948 and 1949, which resulted in corrective legislation recovering for the Government hundreds of millions of dollars.

Fourth. Studies of the Veterans' Administration's requirements for both 1948 and 1949, which information has been the basis of a great deal of organizational correction. This study likewise went into the Federal hospital picture in great detail and has formed the basis of continued study by the Hoover Commission as well as the Veterans' Administration themselves.

Fifth. A study of the War Assets Administration for 1948.

Sixth. Continuing studies of the Department of the Interior for 1948 and 1949, including such technical subjects as an analysis of existing Federal power policy and including spot checks of the accounting systems in the various field installations, which were made available to the Department of the Interior and are currently the basis of accounting reorganizations.

Seventh. Detailed analyses of the operations of the United States Employment Service and the Bureau of Employment Compensation, which materially assisted in the reorganization of those agencies and will no doubt be very helpful in the 1950 hearings. This particular investigation required a great deal of field study and resulted in the exposé of especially flagrant violations of the Hatch Act in the State of Tennessee. This information has been forwarded to the Department of Justice and to the United States Civil Service Commission, who are currently investigating the matter, with a view to dealing with the offenders.

Eighth. A detailed analysis of the operations of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, which resulted in the location of widespread abuses and inefficiency. The report has been made available to the Secretary of the Treasury, and studies are now being made and many improvements instituted that were recommended in this report. As a corollary to this investigation, particularly flagrant violations of the Hatch Act in Massachusetts were uncovered. This information was likewise turned over to the Civil Service Commission and to the Department of Justice for their investigation.

The Civil Service Commission has cited for removal some twenty-odd employees in one Massachusetts office of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. I understand the Department of Justice still has the matter under consideration.

Ninth. An exhaustive investigation of the Department of State, which likewise located many flagrant abuses of good administration, and also located a list of undesirable individuals with subversive connections who were then employed by the State Department. Subsequent to the exposé, some 30 to 40 of these individuals were separated from the service. It is also interesting to note that many of the individuals mentioned in the original list were later questioned by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Tenth. A study of the Treasury Department budget for 1948 and 1949.

Eleventh. A study of the Army and Air Force budgets for 1948 and 1949, which formed a basis of rescissions approximating $5,000,000,000 returned to the taxpayers by this committee.

Twelfth. A study of the budget of the Navy for the fiscal years 1948 and 1949, which likewise formed a basis for substantial monetary rescissions and appropriations reductions.

Thirteenth. An executive study on operations of the Government in the Territory of Alaska. It touches upon the activities of almost every Federal agency operating in Alaska and should be of great value to the committee in the 1950 deliberations.

Fourteenth. A report on the study of the subsistence procurement of the Army for use in the 1950 hearings. The report indicates that corrected procedures can save tremendous sums of money.

These are only a few of the more important studies undertaken by the group. In addition, scores of comparatively minor studies were made of specific units of the Government.

The over-all result was that the committee was able to effect savings or rescissions detailed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of some $9,800,000,000 in 2 years, making possible a balanced budget for the first time in 16 years, making possible a reduction in our national debt of some $7,000,000,000, making possible a reduction in our tax burden of $4,800,000,000, 71 percent of which went to those with incomes of less than $5,000, some 7,000,000 persons being removed from tax rolls entirely.

It was a fine start, and I agree with the sentiment of a close friend of mine now on the majority side of this great committee, who said to me shortly after our return to Washington in January, that in his opinion the Republicans of the last Congress had made a fine start with this staff, and that his only criticism was that the staff had not been large enough.

Now, Mr. Chairman, you may be surprised, in view of this record, to know that this staff has been completely abolished. It has been abolished, despite the experience of years, despite the intent of the Reorganization Act, despite the splended record that it made.

The staff has not only been abolished, it is not only a question of relieving those who served on the staff, the whole theory of a staff responsible only to the Appropriations Committee has been, for the time being, abandoned, and we have gone back to the old idea of asking one executive agency to please investigate the actions of another executive agency, whenever an investigation seems necessary.

Mr. Chairman, that plan has been tried. It is better than nothing. But as long as human nature remains what it is, it will never, in my opinion, get fundamental results. In fact it may tend at times to conceal rather than to disclose.

Real results depend on a permanent, nonpolitical skilled staff, responsible to the Appropriations Committee and to that committee alone.

I want to pay my tribute, Mr. Chairman, to the work done by the staff of the Committee on Appropriations during the last 2 years. They made a splendid contribution to the Nation in terms of lower prices, in terms of lower taxes, in terms of a stable economy.

I want also to record for the RECORD, Mr. Chairman, my opinion that the action taken in abolishing the staff and certain other action taken in connection with the organization of the committee for this Congress is most unfortunate.

That action was taken contrary to the views of the minority members of the committee. In fact, it was taken without allowing any minority member of the committee the opportunity to question, to debate, or to offer to amend any one of a half dozen resolutions that were adopted in the full committee.

I regret the manner in which the action was taken. In my judgment, it was unworthy of the traditions of the great Committee on Appropriations.

I regret the action taken, because, in my judgment, it is likely to cost the people of this Nation literally billions of dollars.

THE BILL IN GENERAL

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to speak briefly on the bill under consideration.

As you know, it calls for something less than $500,000,000 of appropriations. The budget sent it up here in the sum of about $480,000,000. The committee has taken off $14,000,000.

If I had my way, there would be further reductions. If I had my way, the restrictions and limitations, which it is proposed to cancel, and which have been referred to first by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], and then by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], would remain the law of the land.

I want to mention in passing that the committee has allowed in full the amount of approximately $5,000,000 for grants to States for unemployment compensation and the Employment Service to give the Service an average of 38,000 employees as compared with an average of 35,000.

This situation has not been satisfactory. It has been charged, among other things, that the allocation to the several States of the over-all sum made available by the Congress has been very inequitable, that State set-ups which have striven to operate with efficiency and economy have been penalized, while others operating on an inefficient and extravagant basis have had more staff than they should fairly have been allotted.

This amount provided, in my judgment, is entirely inadequate. The Bureau of the Budget has ordered a complete investigation. The Appropriations Committee has also ordered a complete investigation.

I have no doubt that further funds will be available for this activity either in this bill or subsequently in the light of the two investigations.

TVA STEAM PLANT

The principal item of controversy in this bill is the one already referred to by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

It is the proposal by TVA that this Congress make available some $3,000,000 as a first installment on a gigantic steam plant to cost ultimately some $54,000,000 and to produce some 375,000 kilowatts, having a capacity sufficient, it has been said, for all of the needs, both commercial and domestic of perhaps a million people; a steam plant requested for the purpose of meeting the prospective power needs of the TVA industrial users.

The identical proposal, Mr. Chairman, was before this House last summer. Exhaustive hearings were held before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Government Corporations. Thorough debate took place on this floor on two

separate occasions. On each occasion the proposal was voted down by a record vote.

I see no reason, Mr. Chairman, for the Congress to reverse at this time the decisions it made at that time.

I do not want to repeat in detail the arguments presented to this House last summer. I do want to say, Mr. Chairman, however, that the decision of the House was based on fundamental grounds which transcend in importance any single steam plant at any single project. I do want to say, also Mr. Chairman, that we are not discussing a theory; that this is an intensely practical question in which there is very great interest.

There is widespread opposition to embarking on the policy implied in the construction of this plant. If proof of this were needed, I may say that I understand that over 90 different organizations of businessmen, taxpayers, and others appeared in opposition to the proposal last summer. I may add that in the course of the very brief hearings conducted in respect to this bill we were confronted by the chambers of commerce of perhaps three-quarters of the States of the Union, by the National Chamber of Commerce, and by representatives of other business organizations who registered their emphatic opposition to the policy implied in the request now before us.

What are the broad grounds of objection, Mr. Chairman?

There are several of them.

In the first place, while it is clear that the TVA Act authorized the generation and marketing of electric energy incidental to navigation or flood control, it is exceedingly doubtful that there is any authority whatsoever for TVA to enter into the generation and marketing of commercial power which has nothing to do with navigation or with flood control.

But for the rule adopted by this House it would be my view that a point of order would clearly have lain against the present requested appropriation for that reason. I regret that the rule was obtained, because, in my judgment, the matter of policy here involved is far too important to be determined in the course of the consideration of an appropriation bill.

In the second place, Mr. Chairman, if the act be construed to give the necessary authority, then there is the further question of whether the act is constitutional. Time does not permit going into that legal question this afternoon. But I would like to quote again Mr. Justice Reed when he was Solicitor General some years ago, in appearing before the United States Supreme Court in a case concerning the Tennessee Valley Authority Act.

Mr. Justice Reed, then Solicitor General, said:

From the bench and at the bar the controversy has come down to a question of this kind: If we assume that this act was primarily for navigation, then it would be valid. If we determine that this act, while stating that it is for navigation, national defense, and flood control, is actually for the purpose of developing power and selling it commercially, the act would be invalid.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, aside from these legal questions there remains the broad question of national policy by which we are confronted.

The TVA could conceivably earn a profit even if it was organized and run like a legitimate business. It could at least eliminate all unfair competition by paying the legitimate costs of operation.

But that is not the case, Mr. Chairman. Here we have the TVA representing an over-all investment of $780,000,000, of which some $480,000,000 represents investment in power alone. Until recently TVA made no proper arrangements for amortization or depreciation. As has been pointed out, its interest burden has been practically negligible and the tax burden which it bears is estimated at between 10 and 20 percent of that borne by a private company in a similar situation.

Its net income of about $17,000,000 is not even sufficient to pay the interest charges and the amortization charges which would be normally borne by a private company operating in this field of industry.

However you figure them, the alleged costs of operation by TVA are far less than the actual costs paid by a private industry in the same field and the difference is paid by all of us in terms of subsidy.

Now until this time TVA has limited itself to dealing with power incidental to its proper functions of navigation and flood control, and it has acted under a statutory provision requiring that insofar as power is available, it should be made available to preferred customers, such as municipalities and cooperatives.

Now we see the TVA coming before the Congress and saying, in substance: "Gentlemen, there is going to be an increase in demand in the TVA area. We are not going to be able to meet that demand. Whether you intended it originally or not, we believe that there is a clear obligation on the shoulders of TVA to meet the total demand from the TVA area, whatever that demand may amount to, and whether or not we have enough power incidental to navigation and flood control to meet that demand. And, if you agree, you must give us the essential steam generating capacity to meet that demand which is in excess of the incidental power that we shall have at our disposal.

That, Mr. Chairman, is a radical departure from the policy heretofore followed. It is a very far-reaching departure, in my opinion, and for one I am opposed to it.

I am opposed to it because from the record it is clear that there is ample capacity available today and for the next 3 or 4 years to take care of the demands of all preferred customers.

If you look at the tables in the record, you will find that those preferred customers only used about 3,300,000,000 kilowatt-hours out of a total of 14,000,000,000 available in the fiscal year 1945; that they only used about 6,050,000,000 kilowatt-hours out of a total of 16,500,000,000 available in 1948, and that it is estimated that they will only use about 9,200,000,000 kilowatt-hours out of a total of about 19,600,000,000 available in the fiscal year 1952. The balance goes to industrial users and to public utilities in adjoining areas which are subject to control.

Were it not for the industrial users there would be more than sufficient to take care of the preferred customers. And, Mr. Chairman, there are vacant stalls today in various dams that are available for additional hydroelectric units.

What TVA is really asking is additional subsidized power to meet the prospective needs of its big industrial users, like the Aluminum Co. of America, the Monsanto Chemical Co., and the Tennessee Copper Co., and others.

That Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, is unfair to the men and women of the rest of the country who, on the basis of present operations, must subsidize the power that is used.

I am opposed to this proposal, Mr. Chairman, because the needs of these industrial users do not have to be met by TVA—they can be met in various ways. If the construction of a steam plant is necessary, the simplest way is to let the industrial users construct and pay for the plant just as they would in any area outside of the TVA area.

Let TVA limit itself to its prescribed role, and the industrial users and the cities concerned will supply the necessary steam-plant construction for other power, in my opinion, in very short order.

Failure to do this is unfair to other sections of the country with and for whose industries TVA-subsidized power under present conditions competes.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this proposal because I believe that Congress never intended that TVA should go into the power business over and above its incidental power, and because I believe if the precedent is established, there is no end or limitation in sight to unfair Government-subsidized competition with private industry.

Why, Mr. Chairman, should the people of the West, the North, and the East, rich and poor alike, be compelled to pay through higher prices and higher taxes for power used by the Aluminum Co. of America, the Monsanto Chemical Co., and other multi-million-dollar plants in or near the TVA territory?

Why, Mr. Chairman, should other parts of the country be compelled to subsidize TVA industry which competes with and for their own industries at home?

Why, Mr. Chairman, should we adopt a precedent which assures a widespread unfair competition with private industry in this field of industry, which may lead to complete nationalization in this field of industry, and which, if proper in this field, may be proper in any other industrial field in America?

I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, that there is any present authority in TVA to generate or market electrical energy not incidental to navigation and flood control, in competition with private business.

If, however, the assertion of that authority, in spite of statutory and constitutional difficulties, is to be approved by this Congress, then let us eliminate the present elements of unfair competition immediately.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the Congress will stand by its position in this matter. I hope that the amendment which the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has referred to, when offered to this House, will be adopted.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, without a doubt, the things the Republicans in Congress are trying to do to bring order out of chaos in many departments of government will fall on deaf ears like a voice crying in the wilderness, but we must never give up the fight. We know only too well by now what is in the back of the minds of the party in power, because we had an excellent demonstration of that in the full committee about 3 weeks ago when the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the full Committee of Appropriations, refused to recognize a single minority member when we attempted and tried our best to get Mr. CANNON's attention. We had some amendments to offer, but, believe it or not, he did not even look our way. They put through their resolutions one right after the other and then immediately ordered the previous question, which shut off debate and when they got all their resolutions adopted they had someone of their own party move to adjourn, and they adjourned without paying the slightest notice to the 18 minority-party members present.

In this America of ours, the minority has always had a voice or a say, or at least had an opportunity to express its opinions in Congress and out of Congress until now. Now they are patterning after Uncle Joe Stalin and his one-party rulers. That is what the gentleman from Missouri is doing, and the gentleman is sitting right here in front of me on the floor of this House. If he does not like it, let him stand and defend himself before his colleagues and the American people.

I am waiting for the answer of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. Then I saw another performance, and it is almost too disgraceful to mention; just last week in a subcommittee meeting, the same gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] muffled one of the finest, most able Representative of the people in Congress and did his voting for him. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] had not heard a word of the testimony that had been given by the departments, but he came in and did the voting for this member of his party. Now, that is something to think about, folks. I want every American to know about this, so they will know the course we are taking. We are taking the direct course to a one-party rule in America like many other nations have, including Russia. Then, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] had the boldness to say that he was going to sit in with every Subcommittee of Appropriations during the marking-up of each bill. He is going to see to it that the program they have concocted to destroy our American liberties is going through regardless of any and all opposition.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I cannot yield to the gentleman at this moment, but I would yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. If he has any defense.

Mr. WHITE of California. I have a defense of the party, if the gentleman will yield to me for just one moment.

Mr. JENSEN. All right then, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WHITE of California. I ask the gentleman if he recalls the time during 1946 when the Gearhart committee of the Ways and Means Committee had star-chamber proceedings and brought out legislation under gag rule and not a word could be heard in committee or on the floor.

Mr. JENSEN. Oh, my dear colleague—gag rule—you accuse the Republican Party of gag rule? Say, the gentlemen on that side of the aisle have for years, without end, gagged the Republican Party or tried to gag us until it became a national scandal. Now, I do not care to hear any more of that kind of stuff from the gentleman who just recently arrived, or from anyone on that side of the aisle, because we know the sad story about them.

Last year the Eightieth Congress saw fit to put a limitation on the amount of money that could be spent for force account. Force account means that the Bureau of Reclamation can hire anyone they see fit, to do any job they see fit, regardless of how large the job is, whether $100 or $50,000,000, without letting a contract or asking for bids.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER). The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and seven Members are present, a quorum.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] is recognized.

Mr. JENSEN. Now, in this bill appears a provision which would strike out all of those limiting provisions which were placed in the bill last year and again let them run wild and do anything they like with the taxpayer's money.

More actual construction work for hydroelectric power, transmission lines, and irrigation has been performed in the last year and a half than has ever been performed in three times that length of time before in the history of this Nation. Why? Because we put their house in order. We said, "Go to work and stop wasting money and time." Now if there is anybody who wants to deny that, let them stand. They cannot do it, because what I have said is the truth. Yet they travel all over the country. Yes, from the President on down—saying that the Republican Party had almost completely destroyed the reclamation program—when the facts are that the Eightieth Congress appropriated twice as much money than had ever been appropriated before for the development of the West.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, at the outset of my brief remarks I wish to express my appreciation for the action of the Appropriations Committee for having approved the amount of $2,500,000 for the beginning of construction of the new Johnsonville steam plant and $450,000 for two additional hydroelectric generating units at existing TVA dams. It is good economy for the Government to make full use of the natural resources of its investment. The existing power facilities in the Tennessee Valley serve a large area, which is rapidly developing, and with this natural progress and development there has been a great increase in the consumption of electric power.

More than 5,000,000 people are supplied by TVA power and are dependent upon this great Federal project for their source of electric power. It has been estimated by the Tennessee Valley Authority and by other reliable testimony that we are facing a power shortage in the entire valley served by TVA. The people of this section of America are confronted with a different situation than that which is generally the case. Here the only source of power is the Government agency. Private utilities voluntarily sold their properties and moved out. There is no other source of power. Industry needs additional power. The great REA program is in need of additional power to supply the applications that are now currently on file. Electric cooperatives have entered into agreements and contracts to furnish rural power to thousands of farmers, but due to the power shortage the Government has not been able to carry out these commitments. I have said on the floor of this Congress on previous occasions that the greatest guarantee that we shall continue as a free and independent people is for the Congress by appropriate action to place on the statute books of this country laws which will build up the rural and farm life of America. The farmers have never failed us in war or in peace, and we must not fail them now.

The development of this great area in America will create good business; the farmers and public generally will increase their use of electrical appliances and equipment in their homes, and will thereby create an outlet and market for electrical appliances and devices and gadgets of every kind, which are produced all over America. This natural market will, therefore, employ idle labor, and will stimulate production, and will in no sense of the word injure our American industry.

In my mind there is a big object, which we may overlook in this bill under consideration. This Congress has been

called upon to appropriate billions of dollars in an effort to stop the onrushing tide of communism, which was calculated by some people to be on the march throughout the Continent of Europe, and on into the far eastern world. With that dark shadow casting its shadows on the lives, happiness and hopes of millions of peace-loving people throughout the world, we as a Congress have a responsibility to preserve the national defense of this country. When we spend billions to help little nations fortify themselves against our common enemy, then does it not follow as a matter of clear logic, that we should spend the necessary amount of money to build the power facilities to supply electric power to insure that the great atomic energy development, which is located at Oak Ridge, Tenn., has the required amount of electric current at all times to run and operate this great project on a full production basis.

The history of World War II shows that we had, and now have great and vast Federal agencies in the Tennessee Valley, which played an important role in the production of war material in the recent war. The Oak Ridge plant, the Alcoa Aluminum Mills, the Tennessee Eastman, the Holston Ordnance, and North American and Bemberg Rayon corporations are some of the big manufacturing concerns that contributed in a large way to our national defense.

In view of the world situation, I believe that this country should have the finest air force on earth. We should have an air force that can circle and police the world if necessary. The record shows that TVA at one time furnished the power that was used to make 51 percent of the aluminum which went into our war planes. The Eightieth Congress voted for a 70-group air force program. We cannot afford to face a situation which would deprive these great facilities of the necessary power during slack seasons to continue the full operation of these vital defense factories, which are a part of our announced preparedness program.

We are not considering a new principle here today. The Government has appropriated the money to build steam plants on a number of occasions. The Watts Bar steam plant built by TVA is an example of a steam plant. In fact when the private companies owned their own plants in Tennessee, they not only sold their water plants, but these companies sold steam plants to the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The Tennessee Valley Authority is a corporation created by act of Congress on May 18, 1933. It was established to improve navigation and to provide for flood control of the Tennessee River; to provide for reforestation and the proper use of marginal lands in the Tennessee Valley; to provide for the agricultural and industrial development of the valley; to provide for the national defense, and for other purposes. The Tennessee Valley has accomplished these purposes by developing dams and reservoirs in the Tennessee River Basin and its tributaries It has engaged in the generation of hydroelectric power.

We should not in days of emergency deny to this great publicly owned utility the same right and privilege that is enjoyed by every private business and utility in America. I mean by this that it is a common practice for our large industries, which make use of hydroelectric power to also have as a secondary source of power, a steam plant. In that way an industry is not wholly dependent upon one source of power. A steam plant will, therefore, guarantee a continuous flow of power during a time when hydroelectric power may be curtailed in production because of dry weather, and because of a drying up of the water power in the dams.

In some quarters the legal power of the Tennessee Valley Authority to engage in the erection of a steam plant has been questioned. Under the Constitution the Congress has the power to promote the general welfare and to promote the common good of the people of this country. We are implementing a great program and are giving it the necessary strength and the necessary appropriation to implement the power program so as to meet the needs of the people in this valley. This is no new departure. The Congress from time to time has appropriated money for the great highways of this country. We have developed the forests and waterways of America. We have developed the rivers and harbors, and have developed the canal service to accommodate the commerce flowing all over this land.

We as a nation have encouraged the development of the great reclamation service of the West, which has produced fertile soil, where fruits and vegetables now grow. A great section of the West is rapidly becoming an agricultural and one of the chief bread baskets of America. This same area was at one time a place of dust and wastelands. This transition and new development has added to the wealth and productivity, as well as to the progress and happiness, of the people. Therefore, I want to say, in conclusion, that I have seen the benefit the people have derived from TVA, and I am happy that the Congress is approaching this subject from a nonpartisan and national point of view. I am happy that we are recognizing the great public interest involved and that we do not propose to place a lid upon the progress and upon the advancement of an area consisting of approximately seven States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, at the very outset I want to be recorded, as I have been in the past, that I am not opposed to the development of power in the river basins of our country by the Federal Government. With the demand that exists all over the Nation for power I think that is essential and necessary. What I am opposed to and where we divide with minds in this body is the projection of the Federal Government into the sale of power as a private distributor and in competition with investment already made by the citizens of this country and already serving the area where these new projects may come into being.

In a hearing before the Committee on Public Works last year and the year before it was developed that if the Federal Government were compelled to pay the taxes, overhead expenses, interest involved in borrowing money, payment of dividends, the Federal Government could not produce 1 kilowatt of power cheaper than private industry and private investment is now producing it in this country. It is because of that unfair advantage by the Federal Government in projecting itself into the power field in competition with private enterprise that sooner or later if the step we are taking today is extended and expanded private enterprise in the power field will vanish from the American scene. That is socialization of industry. If it is so desirable to socialize electric power, will someone get up on this floor and tell the Nation why it should not be projected into all the other activities of American life—communications, transportation, mines, food, clothing, and others. But after we have done all of that, we will have brought to America an ideology that is foreign to the standards and the basic principles upon which this Nation stands, and the Republic of the United States will disappear.

Congress is now confronted with a proposal that the Tennessee Valley Authority construct and operate a steam electric generating plant. This is unusual, and in fact an unprecedented request. The Federal Government in the past has constructed and operated steam plants, but in every such case the legal background for such authorization has been on the basis of national defense. The classic example, of course, is the still existing steam plant at Muscle Shoals, created under the War Powers Act of 1916 and constructed for the purpose of the manufacture of nitrates for ammunition. Similarly, in 1940, a large steam plant was constructed at Watts Bar, Tenn., as a part of the equipment of the TVA for the purpose of augmenting its generating capacity to meet national defense demands. In addition, the Atomic Energy Commission, at Oak Ridge, has one of the largest steam electric plants in the world, wholly devoted to generating power for the manufacture of atomic bombs.

With none of these projects has any objection ever been raised as they obviously follow the familiar pattern necessary to national preservation.

In the case of the pending proposal for the construction of a plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn., the matter of national defense is not used as a justification.

The lack of such justification indicates that the administration is prepared to establish a new precedent: That the Federal Government shall accept as a normal function the business of producing and selling power commercially, not as an incident to the control of rivers, but as an out-and-out business, not incidental to any other necessary and constitutional functions of government. The proposal pending before Congress is unique in other respects.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-two Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 12]

Abbitt	Fisher	O'Toole
Allen, Ill.	Gilmer	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Anderson, Calif.	Gordon	Philbin
Andresen, August H.	Gerald, Ill.	Plumley
Arends	Granger	Poulson
Baring	Green	Powell
Bates, Mass.	Hall, Leonard W.	Price
Bennett, Fla.	Halleck	Ramsay
Bennett, Mich.	Hardy	Reed, Ill.
Blackney	Harvey	Richards
Bland	Havenner	Riehlman
Bonner	Hébert	Rivers
Boykin	Heffernan	Sabath
Breen	Heselton	Sanborn
Brooks	Hinshaw	Sasscer
Bryson	Hoffman, Ill.	Scrivner
Buckley, Ill.	Irving	Shafer
Buckley, N. Y.	Jackson, Calif.	Sheppard
Bulwinkle	Jacobs	Short
Burleson	Jenison	Smith, Ohio
Burnside	Jenkins	Smith, Wis.
Carlyle	Jones, Mo.	Somers
Celler	Judd	Stockman
Chiperfield	Kennedy	Taylor
Clemente	Kilburn	Teague
Coffey	Kilday	Thomas, N. J.
Cole, N. Y.	Lesinski	Towe
Coudert	Lind	Van Zandt
Cox	Linehan	Velde
Crosser	McCulloch	Vinson
Curtis	Magee	Weichel
Davis, Ga.	Mason	Welch, Calif.
DeGraffenried	Miles	Williams
Dingell	Miller, Calif.	Wilson, Ind.
Doyle	Monroney	Wilson, Okla.
Durham	Morrison	Wilson, Tex.
Ellsworth	Morton	Withrow
Elston	Moulder	Woodhouse
Feighan	Nixon	Woodruff
Fellows	Norblad	Zablocki
	Norton	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 2632, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 309 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The committee will resume its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I was saying when I was interrupted a few minutes ago that the proposal pending before the Congress is unique in some other respects.

The proposal pending before Congress is unique in other respects. For example, it is presented as a deficiency appropriation. Until now, deficiencies have always been appropriated only for the continuance of enterprises and projects already previously authorized and for which funds have already been appropriated. In this case the Congress not only has not authorized and appropriated money for the steam plant, but in fact only a few months ago Congress by roll-call votes—two in the House of Representatives—flatly rejected the proposal to construct this very same project. No one has yet explained satisfactorily how a deficiency appropriation could be made for a project never originated and for which no money was ever appropriated.

There is a strong doubt that such an appropriation would be legal inasmuch as there is nothing in the organic TVA Act as amended which permits the construction of new steam plants. Even if the act did so provide, it would be patently unconstitutional. The TVA was created for the purpose of harnessing the Tennessee River so that its facilities for navigation would be improved and so that its floods would be controlled. As Senator Norris once said, "These are the constitutional pegs upon which the Tennessee Valley Authority Act must rest under the commerce clause of the Constitution."

There must be some lurking doubts as to the acceptance of this long step in the direction of socialism in the minds of its proponents. Otherwise the problem would have been approached in the normal parliamentary manner and under normal parliamentary procedure. The atmosphere of candor is lacking in the procedure by which this bill arrives before the House.

On February 3, 1949, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, acting either in that capacity or as chairman of the Deficiency Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, appeared before the Rules Committee and asked for a rule to obtain debate on the bill on February 4. He appeared before the Rules Committee without a bill. The Appropriations Committee itself had not met to discuss the matter. As I understand it there had not been a formal marking up of the bill by the Deficiency Subcommittee—although this may have happened among the majority members. Thanks to the wise decision of the senior Member of this House, both in age and in consecutive legislative experience—the chairman of the Rules Committee—the proposal was given short shrift.

In my long service in this House I recall no incident where the chairman of a committee requested a rule of the Rules Committee before his own committee had even held a meeting to consider the measure.

This is a house of the representatives of the people of the United States. Whether they bear the label Democrat or Republican, every member of this House is sworn to sustain the Constitution and to put flag and country before partisanship. On that basis every member in this House has a right to resent parliamentary tactics that would have been scorned by the so-called, rubber-stamp congresses of the early New Deal.

A century ago Karl Marx published the Communist Manifesto. The past century has been the bloodiest, the cruelest, and in many ways the most catastrophic century in the history of mankind. The forces let loose by this evil dream of Karl Marx are reaping their harvests down to the present day. Only now a cardinal of the Holy Roman Catholic Church awaits his fate at the hands of a Marxian court because he placed God before the Soviet Caesars. For his courage he may hang, or spend his life in a convict's cell, or in the mercy of this Marxian court, his term may be shortened. Marxism in Hungary is no different than Marxism in America, except in degree.

Socialism is a complete word. It needs no qualification. An activity of government is either socialistic or it is not socialistic.

This continent was peopled by men and women whose whole philosophy is a rejection of socialism and the planned state idea as conceived by Karl Marx. It was pioneered by men and women who believe in God, and in America.

This small item in the deficiency appropriation calling for the beginning of construction of a steam plant for the TVA is little in itself, but the potentialities as a precedent can involve enormous sums as the curse of socialized power spreads like a creeping paralysis over the economy of our Nation.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK].

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to stress an amendment which I will present when the bill is read for amendment. It is to page 6, line 24. I shall urge there striking out "$4,987,000" and the insertion in lieu thereof of "$14,000,000."

On page 4 of the committee report, under "Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service," it states that the Budget estimate, $4,987,000, is being recommended for this item. There follows:

> It is believed that the amount herein recommended, together with an increased application of flexibility as between the unemployment compensation and employment services should enable the States to make some headway in reducing the present backlog of work.

The concluding paragraph reads:

> The committee is advised by the Bureau of the Budget that the present estimate is based on work loads as of November 30, 1948—

I stress that date—

> and that it is at the present time reviewing developments since that date.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] earlier today told us that an investigation is pending by the Committee on Appropriations, as it is by the Bureau of the Budget, to ascertain the amount of additional funds that would be necessary in this particular category and to make other pertinent recommendations.

I commend the investigations by the Committee on Appropriations and the Bureau of the Budget; however, it is my desire to bring to the notice of the Committee of the Whole House some facts subsequent to November 30, 1948, which indicate a need for immediate action, and a larger appropriation now. I quote at this time from the Hartford, Conn., Courant of Friday, January 28, 1949. The headline is "State jobless at high point for 10 years—Compensation claims of 44,364 last week up by 4 percent":

> State Labor Commissioner John J. Egan said Thursday that claims for unemployment compensation payments are at the highest point in 10 years with the exception

of the reconversion period at the close of the war.

Claims last week totaled 44,364, about 4 percent above the preceding week and 85.3 percent above a year ago.

New claims total 7,821, a rise of 800 above the preceding week and 107 higher than new claims a year ago.

Bridgeport continues to lead the State in the number of unemployed, with 7,508 claims for unemployment payments last week. Claims in other cities were New Haven, 7,172; Hartford, 4,605; Waterbury, 4,374, and Stamford, 2,933.

About 650 workers were laid off by textile mills in the Norwich area due to lack of orders. Lay-offs were also reported in the casters, electrical parts, turbine, screw machine, metal products, tire, lumber, and carpeting industries.

To bring that a little more up to date, I desire to quote from the New Haven (Conn.) Register of February 9, 1949, which carried this very imposing headline: "City's jobless double in month; now at 7,000—Survey indicates trend to shorter workweek—Smaller shops hardest hit—Uncertainty over future, seasonal lay-offs blamed for mounting idle total." This article is very interesting as much as it is startling and alarming. I sincerely hope it is not the recording of a definite trend of affairs in the days just ahead of us. I ask you to give it your attention:

Unemployment in New Haven has doubled in the last month. There are 7,000 workers unemployed as of today. About 3,500 who were working a month ago are not working now.

My colleagues, I am not reading any dispatches from 1932 or 1933 or any of the so-called depression years. This is February 9, 1949. The article continues:

The round-number figures were made public today by Mrs. Alice Marshall, manager of the New Haven branch office of the Connecticut State Employment Service.

Seasonal lay-offs can account for some of it. Finishing of building jobs without acquiring new construction contracts has left many workers stranded in the city, and that accounts for more.

But a good share of the unemployment, according to Mrs. Marshall, "comes about in lay-offs of from one to a dozen men, not only in the larger plants, but in New Haven's numerous small shops."

WORKWEEK CUT

In addition to swollen unemployment figures working hours showed a trend to cut back from overtime to the 40-hour week. In some places the workweek is under 40 hours.

There are a number of examples given here in this news item and I cite some as I continue reading the New Haven Register:

For example, the New Haven Clock Co., hard hit by importation of cheap Swiss clock movements, February 1 went on a 4-day week. That reduced by 20 percent the income of 1,000 people.

The American Steel & Wire Co., employing 1,000 went on a 4-day week in some departments, affecting 200 men. S. B. Metcalf said, "Business has fallen off, and we are going to cut back on hours rather than lay off men. We will do that until it hits a 3-day week, if necessary."

SMALL SHOPS HIT

Mrs. Marshall said it was in New Haven's numerous small shops that the cut-back was most apparent. "When a firm that employs 15 or 20 men lays off 2 or 3, that adds up. And when a company which employs 500 men lays off 15 instead of a usual seasonal 10, that is 5 men out of a job, and it adds up."

Most men laid off, she said, "hope they will be taken on again soon and the manufacturers do too." But they are not on a definite call-back basis.

Mrs. Marshall cited factors which manufacturers think operate adversely. They included uncertainty in regard to taxes, price changes in consumers' goods, foreign competition in some lines such as the clock business.

To bring the attendant facts still more up to date, I wish at this time to call the attention of the Committee to a release from the Connecticut State Labor Department, which was released on February 9, 1949, for the morning papers of February 10. I read from that release:

Reaching its highest point since the reconversion lay-offs in 1945, the number of jobless claimants for unemployment insurance benefits in Connecticut rose to 49,822 during the week ended February 5, Labor Commissioner John J. Egan stated today. This was 9 percent more than a week ago and 101 percent over the 24,793 who filed a year ago.

Mr. Chairman, I submit to the Committee that this is ample evidence for increasing this particular deficiency appropriation at this time without waiting for the investigations of the Committees on Appropriations and the Budget Bureau, which I am sure will substantiate what I have said not only for my district, which is the entire State of Connecticut, but also throughout the United States. May I ask for your favorable consideration of my amendment when it is offered under the 5-minute rule?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, namely:

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask if there is any appropriation in this bill for the Committee on Un-American Activities?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, so far as I know there is not. The appropriation for the Committee on Un-American Activities comes out of the contingent fund of the House and there is no money carried for that purpose here. I believe that that is correct.

Mr. CANNON. There is no money involved in this bill for that committee.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is very vital that that money should be expended by the Congress for these investigations of subversive activities.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will yield, the money has already been appropriated.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. But I wanted to draw attention to the importance of it.

I want to read to the Congress a letter that came to me this morning. This is one letter. I have received a great many threats recently. This letter begins "Valentine Day." It reads:

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: Here is a valentine for you. Lay off your activities against us now, or we will get you. Who are we? We are the Nazis. We are the loyal supporters of Hitler. Long may he live. Down with the Israelites. Down with the Jews.

Then it reads: Signed "The Nazis."

I bring this letter to the attention of the Members of the House because I have received a great many threats recently. I warn the House and the country that not only communism stalks in the United States today but also nazism and Hitlerism. There are disloyal, subversive persons in the United States. They should be sent from the shores of America. No effort should be spared to remove them. They appear in strange and unexpected places. I believe they will be caught.

This letter will be turned over to the FBI, as well as other information that I have in my possession.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE

Miscellaneous items

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Treasury Department Appropriation Act, 1949, the appropriation for "Miscellaneous items" for the House of Representatives in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1949, shall be available for purchase of new or used typewriters at prices which do not exceed prices established under the provisions of the Treasury Department Appropriation Act, 1949.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to speak for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I desire at this time to call the attention of the committee to page 3 of the bill under the title "Architect of the Capitol, Capitol Building, Senate and House Roofs and Chambers."

I am calling this to the attention of the committee in order that I may give you a brief summary of what has taken place relative to the improvement of these Chambers.

Several years ago a special committee was appointed by the Speaker, with the thought of improving the interior of the House of Representatives. It was my privilege to serve as the ranking member on that particular committee, then as chairman of that particular committee, and today as the ranking minority member of the committee, under the chairmanship of the capable gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM].

We have taken the position for some years that we would hold in abeyance any construction on these Chambers so that we might give to those individuals out in our respective districts the opportunity to obtain building material which is necessary for them to construct homes

which are so badly needed. We also took into consideration the high construction costs and the high material costs, if you please, feeling that possibly at a later date these material costs would be less, and possibly at sometime we might get into a depression and have an unemployment program whereby we would have our plans ready to immediately step into the construction and the remodeling and improvement of these Chambers. That was the policy of your committee prior to the present time. We also objected during that past period of allowing this construction to be done on what is known as a cost-plus basis. Some of us are of the firm conviction that all should be given an opportunity to bid on the project, should be given an opportunity to have their day in court, so to speak, rather than to continue further on that philosophy and method of the Federal Government whereby we are developing a policy of letting contracts on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis. When you go back to your private business I am certain that if you had a house to build or some other structure that you would ask for bids on it; then you would get value received for the dollar you spent. On a cost-plus basis, as set forth in this bill, you seldom know what your costs will be until the project is completed.

The question arises in our minds, just how much the repairs on this building, on this Chamber, will cost if we get into the category set forth in this bill of cost-plus-a-fixed fee. We have heard for quite some time that we who are members of the Legislative Committee should be careful and always protect our rights. Here is an appropriation measure that contains a definite legislative provision. I will quote from the bill:

The Architect of the Capitol is authorized to enter into contracts—

Please note—

including cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts as approved by the Special Committee on Reconstruction of House Roof and Skylights and Remodeling of the House Chamber, and to make such other expenditures as may be necessary for the improvements affecting the House wing of the Capitol authorized by such acts, in such amounts as may be approved by the House committee appointed under section 1 of the act of July 17, 1945, notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 of that act.

I may call to your attention the fact that previously we had authorized and appropriated $585,000 for the remodeling of this Chamber. Approximately one-half of that amount has been spent to date for plans, designs, and specifications; or approximately $292,500. This legislation gives further authorization and an appropriation of $2,274,500; and a contract is to be awarded, if you please, on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis.

We did not have any meetings of the special committee until this morning we were called into session by the chairman of our committee. He presented to us a letter to sign; and I should like to read it to you. This is a letter dated February 15, 1949, today, and on the bottom of it appears this statement: "Members of House committee appointed under Public Law 155, Seventy-ninth Congress," and then there is supposed to be the signature of the House committee. It is addressed to Mr. David Lynn, Architect of the Capitol, and reads as follows:

MY DEAR MR. LYNN—

Mr. Lynn, by the way, is the national architect. He handed us this letter for us to sign, a letter which I believe he had written and addressed to himself. The letter is as follows:

MY DEAR MR. LYNN: Subject to the enactment of the necessary legislation and appropriation in the First Deficiency Act, 1949, you are hereby authorized and directed to enter into contracts and to incur such other obligations as may be necessary for the reconstruction of the roof over the House wing of the Capitol and improvement of the House Chamber, cloakrooms, and other adjacent areas included in the House project as approved by the House committee appointed under Public Law 155, Seventy-ninth Congress, in a total amount of not to exceed $2,567,000.

The contracts may be let on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis to such extent and in such manner as in your judgment is to the best interest of the Government.

You are further authorized to award the general contract for the House project on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis to the Consolidated Engineering Co., of Baltimore, Md., presently employed under contract of October 23, 1948, as the general contractor for the reconstruction of the roof over the Senate wing of the Capitol and improvement of the Senate Chamber, cloakrooms, and other adjacent areas.

Allow me to divert a moment and call your attention to the fact that this is on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis. In this letter we are giving Mr. Lynn the authority to enter into a contract with one individual, if you please, the Consolidated Engineering Co., of Baltimore.

Now, if I may go on with the letter of instructions that the committee received:

The committee authorizes the award of the general contract to the Consolidated Engineering Co., without further competitive bidding, for the following reasons, predicated on the urgency of the time element:

(a) The materials and equipment required for the House project cannot be fabricated and delivered to the site in time to permit the start of construction work on July 1, 1949, unless orders for the same are placed immediately upon the approval of the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949.

(b) Inviting of competitive bids and subbids for the House project, including bid analyses, conferences, and other details necessary prior to contract award, would cause too great a loss of time to permit scheduling, fabrication, and delivery of the required materials and equipment to the site by July 1, 1949.

(c) Utilization, insofar as practicable, of Senate subcontract bids for the House project at the same price levels used for the Senate project, which prices are the result of comparatively recent competitive bidding, will enable the House materials and equipment, which are similar in character to the Senate materials and equipment, to be included in the Senate production schedules, thereby expediting fabrication and enabling the maintenance of construction progress schedule for the House work on the same basis as the Senate work.

(d) Award of the general contract to the Consolidated Engineering Co. will eliminate the time losses that would otherwise be entailed not only by the securing of competitive bids and the possible necessity of having to work out the details of contract negotiations with another general contractor, but entailed also by the details necessarily incident to negotiations with different subcontractors than those employed for the Senate project, and the working out of new production schedules and other procedures.

Then there is a space for the members of the committee to sign.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I am reading this whole detailed report because I firmly believe this committee should know about the whole procedure. I read the letter that was given to us in all fairness by Mr. Lynn, the Architect. It is entirely up to this committee. If you want to let the contract for the remodeling and repairing of this Chamber on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis, it is in this bill. If you pass it as it is then you are giving complete authority and really a directive, to this special committee to enter into an agreement and award the contract to this one company on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Can the gentleman state how many members of the committee have signed that letter?

Mr. McGREGOR. None of the members of the committee have signed it yet because the Member speaking raised the question this morning whether or not we had any authority to bind this Congress to the expenditure of over $2,000,000, without further enabling legislation. It was suggested that we get a letter from the Comptroller General, Mr. Warren, citing his opinion before deciding whether or not we should sign this letter to Mr. Lynn.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. McGREGOR. I repeat, Mr. Chairman, these are the facts and it is up to the committee to decide what they want done.

The Clerk read as follows:

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

CAPITOL BUILDING, SENATE AND HOUSE ROOFS AND CHAMBERS

Capitol Building: For an additional amount to enable the Architect of the Capitol to carry forward the improvements affecting the House Wing of the Capitol authorized by the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act of June 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 629), as amended by the acts of June 8, 1942 (56 Stat. 342), and July 17, 1945 (59 Stat. 72), $2,274,500. The Architect of the Capitol is authorized to enter into contracts, including cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts as approved by the Special Committee on Reconstruction of House Roof and Skylights and Remodeling of House Chamber, and to make such other expenditures as may be necessary for the improvements affecting the House Wing of the Capitol authorized by such acts, in such amounts as may be approved by the House committee appointed under section 1 of the act of July 17, 1945, notwithstanding the provisions of

section 2 of that act: *Provided*, That the amounts so approved by such committee may be obligated in full prior to the actual appropriation thereof.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McGREGOR: Page 3, line 6, strike out all of the paragraph.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, this amendment is offered so that each and every one of you will be given an opportunity to decide whether or not you want the remodeling done which will cost, in addition to what has been allocated, $2,274,500. This amendment would simply strike out that particular section of the deficiency bill which gives an authorization for the remodeling of this chamber and the adjoining cloak rooms. An authorization to be established under the legislation on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis. I am certain that the other members of the committee, on which it is my privilege to serve, will not object to allowing you to decide whether or not you want to continue that procedure in Federal construction.

Again I reiterate my previous statement, if this amendment is turned down, the repairs of this section of the Capitol will, at least, be temporarily delayed. The procedure that we have carried for a number of years is that we should not repair at this time and allow the material, and that which is necessary for the repairs, to go to the individual who is having a difficult time to find material and labor to build a house. I am leaving it for your consideration whether or not you want to authorize a contract being entered into on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis to the extent of $2,274,500 for the repair of these chambers.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Do I understand that neither the gentleman nor the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] agreed with this program?

Mr. McGREGOR. We have not agreed with the program, nor have we disagreed with it, I will say to the gentleman from New York. We gave consideration to it this morning. The question was raised whether or not we should sign the letter to Mr. Lynn, which has been previously referred to. The question was also raised whether or not we should enter into a contract of a cost-plus nature to the extent of $2,274,500. I want to be perfectly fair; a similar arrangement has been made in the Senate. They are following through on a cost-plus basis, but we have always taken the position that we are not going to do it on this side.

Mr. TABER. Frankly, I will not say that it is in the testimony, but I understood when this matter was before the committee that the gentleman's committee had approved it. Now, if that is not so, that is a different picture.

Mr. McGREGOR. I will say to the gentleman that we have not approved it. We had no meeting until this morning, and the statement referred to was handed to us, and we—I think in all fairness to those who have honored us with that responsibility—refused to sign the statement, and that is the reason I am taking the floor here today so that the committee may know what is incorporated in this legislation.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Is the gentleman in a position to state whether there is an emergent condition here which should be cured immediately or as soon as possible?

Mr. McGREGOR. I will answer that by repeating the statement that our good friend, the minority leader, made, "It is unsightly but safe."

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. Just exactly what will be our situation? I am tired of this bandywork being over my head and destroying the symmetry and beauty of this Chamber. I have talked to the Architect of the Capitol and he says this work can be done in 5 months. If you strike out this paragraph, what will be our situation? Are we going to get this work done?

Mr. McGREGOR. May I say to the Speaker that it will require approximately a year to complete the whole project, and it would have to be done in two 5- or 6-months periods, for reasons that I am certain all of us are familiar with. Should we not pass this legislation, it probably would go over until another year, and if you did not decide then to do it then it would go over to another year. It is entirely within our power to authorize its construction at any time.

Mr. RAYBURN. That is just exactly what I think about this. If you strike this out, then no one can tell when this work will be done. Frankly, I do not feel any too safe under this thing. If we are not going to do anything if this is stricken out, then I would certainly be opposed to striking out this paragraph. I think this work ought to be done. I think this Chamber ought to be modernized. I think we ought to have better seats in here.

Mr. McGREGOR. New seating arrangement is covered in the plans.

Mr. RAYBURN. We ought to have a great many other things. I should like to see this gray painted out and put back to gold, that was around here for so many years and that was so beautiful and so attractive to the eye. I do not like coldness when I can have warmth. I just fear that if you strike out this paragraph we are not going to get this job done in 2 or 5 or 10 years.

Mr. McGREGOR. Carrying further the statement of our distinguished Speaker it is incorporated in this legislation or at least the plans that if it goes through there will be a different seating arrangement; the plans have been in the Architect's office for many, many months where all can see them. There is a different seating arrangement being arranged for. The acoustical part is being taken care of. The beam work is taken out. The roof is changed. It will be the privilege of the various Members of Congress to decide what they want to do with the seals of their respective States, because the ceiling will be entirely different.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to my colleague from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. If I understand it, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR] is not opposed to the face-lifting operation but only to the manner in which the operation is to be performed. I agree with the gentleman. Surely there should be no objection to consulting various doctors of architecture. It would be better to consult and successfully operate rather than to operate without consultation and find that instead of effecting a cure, we had only succeeded in deforming.

Mr. McGREGOR. I certainly want this committee to know just what this section of the bill really does. We are most assuredly closing the door to any competitive bidding and closing the door to any other contractor, and allowing that one to construct on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis.

I am certain that the other members of the special committee will join me when I say, "We want you to decide."

My personal opinion is that it should not be repaired now in the face of high prices, critical-material shortages, and I certainly do not like, or do I think it is fair to the taxpayers, a cost-plus construction procedure.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have just this to say. The Architect of the Capitol—and I think everyone else understands this situation—thinks that it would be so much easier to do both these works at the same time. I fear, and let me express the fear again, that if we do not do this as provided in this bill we will not do anything for some years to come. I have talked with the Architect of the Capitol about this. I think it is his idea that these contracts ought to be carried on at the same time. I do not see why we should not look after our business and our comfort here just as the other body or anybody else does. I hope this provision is not stricken out of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I am wondering if something could not be done that would result in an amendment that would perhaps do away with this idea of letting the contract on a cost-plus basis to this one contractor, and leave it to the approval of this committee, composed of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR], before a contract is entered into.

Mr. RAYBURN. I do not like cost-plus contracts. I believe this is the one way we are going to get this job done within a year or two, to be frank about it.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in not to exceed 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. Many of you know of my great concern regarding the danger of possibly destroying valuable American architecture. I have gone all over this problem from its inception. There is absolutely nothing wrong with this ceiling. The original plan was to repair the roof because the Architect and the engineers whom we brought here to Washington at the expense of the Government, to examine the ceiling, found some defects in the iron. Then we feared that a heavy snowfall would cause the roof to cave in because we had an instance where a heavy snow falling on the roof of a theater caused the death of some people some years ago.

We removed the roof over this Chamber and put up the superstructure and these iron supports for additional safety. However, the ceiling is in excellent condition. There is nothing the matter with it. I have seen some of the proposed plans, and I fear that when they are completed, some valuable American architecture, which should be preserved for posterity, would be removed. Your State seals will be removed. When they get through with this program of face lifting the Capitol of the United States, because there is an apparent defect in the dome where the lip hangs over the cornice, you will find that they are going to remove column after column of historical American architecture. The cornstalk pillars designed by Thomas Jefferson will be removed. Many of the statues, I am told, will be farmed out to the States. I, too, do not like to disagree with my distinguished Speaker, but I believe that we should have this matter reviewed in order that every Member of the House will realize his responsibility in voting for something that at some time they may be sorry for—something that will destroy American architecture which should be preserved for posterity.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. If this paragraph is stricken out of the bill, is there any reason in the world why we cannot bring in, if necessary, a special resolution after the other body has considered the matter?

Mr. STEFAN. There is no hurry about it at all. We have many, many new Members here who also believe in preserving American architecture. Let them study this program which is designed to streamline the Capitol; to take away the State seals and put in neon lights and make this historic Chamber look like a modern night club.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. What does the gentleman suggest that we do about this matter? This roof has been condemned. What should we do about it?

Mr. STEFAN. The ceiling is intact and in perfect condition, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RAYBURN. Does the gentleman from Nebraska really think that that is a correct statement?

Mr. STEFAN. That is what I am told, sir. I have crawled over every part of the roof that has been removed.

Mr. RAYBURN. I have been told otherwise. I do not know why, if the ceiling is in good condition, why we should have all this steel framework over our heads.

Mr. STEFAN. I would not debate that point with my distinguished Speaker, but I have gone into this matter carefully and I have been told by the Architect that the ceiling is in perfect condition. I have been told that your State seals, from Kentucky and Maine and Ohio, and every State in the Union, would be removed. They have shown me other designs for changing the appearance of this Chamber.

Mr. RAYBURN. Then why is this steel structure erected over us if the ceiling is safe? Why do we have these steel girders supporting the ceiling?

Mr. STEFAN. For the reason of additional protection, since they removed most of the roof, because we are liable to have a snow that would come down on top of the ceiling. You could make this Chamber safe by putting on the roof that they originally wanted to replace. There has been no change in this historic Chamber from the very time it was constructed, except the seating capacity or arrangement. No other change has been made. And yet overnight, Members of the House, you are participating in a program that some day you will regret.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I was a member of the original committee, together with Senator CONNALLY, to investigate the roofs of the Chambers. We went up there, and we were astonished. This roof is somewhat similar to a bridge construction. It is up beyond this glass ceiling, and, incidentally, what appears to be plaster overhead is cast iron. That is a cast-iron ceiling that weighs either 80 or 120 tons. I am calling this figure from memory. This bridge roof support is of old-fashioned iron construction, with pins holding the two elements together in the brace of the roof. Those pins were bent, each pin going in two directions, proving to anyone who would look at them that the pins were broken somewhere in between. This roof is dangerous. When it was brought to the attention of the able Speaker of this House as a precautionary measure, we proceeded to put in this beamwork, inside of this Chamber, which I want to explain to the new Members of the House does not belong in this room and would not be in this room for this period of time, had it not been for the war which came along, and, of course, set all things of this nature aside by reason of its immensity.

Now, Mr. Chairman, how long is this bridgework to be in this room? How long are we to sit idly by, when people come to the Capitol, and ask them to hide behind posts to take a look at the House of Representatives, that cannot even put their own Chamber in order without debate such as we have had here this afternoon?

Over and above that, the Chamber at the other end of the Capitol, the Senate Chamber, is smaller than this Chamber, and that roof is in a similar condition, because all of the air-conditioning has been hung in these roofs, among other things up there that were not there originally, adding weight to a condition which made it all the more dangerous, both here and over in the Senate.

The Senate has entered into an agreement with the contractors, and they did it in the Eightieth, Republican Congress, for the repair of their Chamber. They are to vacate the Chamber by the 30th of June of this year. Now, do we want trucks and whistles and hoists out in front for 4 or 5 years, to the inconvenience of the American people when they come to the Capital of the United States, or do we want to step on the gas and get this thing over with? I see no reason why we should not proceed to take the bridgework out of this Chamber. It is very nice for my friend the gentleman from Nebraska to talk about moving a statue or moving something else. They have been moving statues and men around this building for a long time; they have moved them out since I have been here; and I was moved with them once.

Many statues were taken out of the rotunda a few years ago, as you older Members will recall, and it is no longer permitted to place them away from the sides of the room, for they have all been moved closer to the supporting walls, because it was discovered there was a danger from the concentrated weight.

This roof is 90 years old; it was built according to the standards of those days. It should be taken off now just like a chap would shed his ancient cap.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, if I understood correctly the description of the structure above us as given both by the gentleman from Nebraska and the gentleman from Michigan, there is a difference between the ceiling and the ironwork that we see, and the roof itself which is or was above the ceiling. Apparently the condition of the roof itself was responsible for the ironwork. I remember that shortly after I came here this ironwork was put in because we were told that if a heavy snow should come, the ceiling might fall on us; but apparently a distinction should be made between the ceiling, including these sections which carry the State seals, and the structure of the roof above.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. We held a brief hearing yesterday. As to the safeness, or the unsafeness, if you choose to call it such, of this ceiling, we have been assured that the roof has been removed. These beams were put in; and as I have said before, and the evidence before our committee will show, it is unsightly but safe.

The gentleman from Michigan said the roof has been here for 80 or 90 years. I might say to my distinguished friend that that section has been moved and was moved when we put in these new beams.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman is not correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Just a minute. If I have time I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Now, personally, I would like to see the seals preserved up here. This morning I read in one of the columns, I think it was in the Washington Post, that under the plan that had been agreed to, if this language should prevail, these seals would be removed.

I should like to know whether the plan as presently contemplated does include the removal of the seals from the ceiling? Could some gentleman of the committee advise me definitely on that point?

Mr. McGREGOR. As a member of the committee I may say that it has been agreed that the seals will be removed and will be taken care of according to the will of the various State organizations.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is if we approve this language.

Mr. McGREGOR. That is right.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Then our only chance to preserve the seals for the House of Representatives is to take the language out.

Mr. McGREGOR. Either that or endeavor to get your committee to change the plans of remodeling so that the seals will be retained; but under present plans and specifications the seals will be removed. That is called for.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I share the desire of the Speaker to see this work done. We should agree upon a plan for the work and go ahead with it; but if the present plans, as they appear to, mean the removal of the State seals from the Chamber of the House of Representatives I shall be compelled to support the amendment to strike this language from the bill. In voting that way, however, I do not want it understood as meaning that I am opposed to getting rid of this ironwork and the unsafe condition of the Chamber, but rather that I want the seals preserved for the House of Representatives.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder how many Members of this body have taken the trouble to go down to the Architect's rooms and see the plans? I wonder if they know that these two doorways will be changed, that the position of the portraits will be changed, that Brumidi's painting of General Washington and Lord Cornwallis will be removed—Why? Because there must be balance in the Chamber and there is no painting in the corresponding corner on the other side of the Chamber. Not only will this ceiling of the State seals be destroyed but also all the decorations will be changed. There will be columns on either side of the Speaker's chair that might bury the Speaker behind them. Columns are formal and cold and out of keeping with this present old room so filled with understanding between the Speaker and those of us on the floor. And these are but the simpler changes.

It seems to me a great pity that we in this young country do not see the value to posterity of this great Capitol. A thousand years hence—and we hope this Capitol will still be here—the young people will not bless us if we remove all evidence of ourselves and our methods and our ways of life.

You know well that in the other countries of the world, in the old countries of the world, it is very wonderful to go into their houses of parliament, or whatever they may be called. Redolent of the past they give dignity to all that there transpires—they are living history.

Let me call attention again to the condition between the ceiling and the roof. If the contractors so lack ingenuity that they cannot find ways of making the roof safe over and above this old-fashioned, traditional ceiling, we had better find another contractor!

I too agree with the Speaker in the matter of the removal of our factory construction—but here under these iron beams we fought a war like no other war.

For myself—and I am certain that I speak for the people of this great Republic—I would rather keep the factory supports a little longer than destroy this atmosphere. By all means let us have new chairs, but not new walls. You have not seen the picture of the dull, arched ceiling, the uninteresting design. If you had, you would not lend yourselves to this destruction.

They say we will be able to hear. If we are quiet, we can always hear. Are you so sure the change will do all you say it will?

To use as an argument the removal of these steel struts to strengthen a roof that can be strengthened up above and so destroy an atmosphere that has seen some of the great of our country, within whose walls vibrates something we cannot afford to lose, Mr. Chairman, will deprive those who come after us of a rich heritage they can ill afford to lose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take 5 minutes. I would like to direct your attention, however, to the fact that before long an analogous situation will no doubt be presented to the Congress. I refer to the situation that involves the historic White House. It is said on good authority that the present structure could be reduced and a new structure be built to meticulous specifications as to present form at a cost of $2,000,000. It is further said that to preserve that historic structure as is, with suitable improvements, will cost from six to eight million dollars, and you are going to have to ultimately decide that when the appropriation for that estimate comes before the Congress.

Now, the walls have gone up all over this country at the very thought of destroying that historic structure, and voices have been raised all over this country to preserve it, cost what it may. Now you will have to meet that issue again a little later on.

I am inclined to agree with the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] and my good friend the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]. I was here when these atrocious supports were put in this room. As a Member of the House of Representatives I have not suffered any by it. I have seen the plans that are proposed. Far be it from me to attempt to assess whether those plans are the best that could be prepared or not. But, let me tell you that if you vote for this proposal you are going to vote to destroy this Chamber of the House of Representatives as we have known it and as the people have known it for the last 90 years.

Maybe we have reached a point where sentiment means nothing, but in my vote it still does mean something. I would hate to have this Chamber transformed in the manner in which it has been suggested and thus for all time destroy the identity of this Chamber with the historic past. It is more than just a mere changing of the roof, Mr. Chairman. There is more to this situation than just the mere expenditure of this money in order to improve the comfort of people who are involved.

Mr. RAYBURN. Right there, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I gladly yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. RAYBURN. Neither the Architect of the Capitol nor anyone else during the next 2 years can make any plans for changing this structure unless they consult with the committee of the House named by the Speaker the other day. That committee is composed of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GOODWIN]. Neither the Architect of the Capitol nor anybody else could do anything without the approval of that committee.

Mr. KEEFE. Now, Mr. Chairman, as I read the language of the bill, it says:

> The Architect of the Capitol is authorized to enter into contracts * * * in such amounts as may be approved by the House committee—

And so on. I understand from the statement of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR] that the Architect of the Capitol has already, before the passage of this act, presented a letter of approval of this program to go into effect, and the whole necessity and urgency is based upon the fact that unless he is immediately authorized to enter into this contract in collaboration with the contract that has been entered into to improve the Senate, that we will not get what we want.

Mr. RAYBURN. The bill goes on to say:

> and to make such other expenditures as may be necessary for the improvements affecting the House wing of the Capitol authorized by such acts, in such amounts as may be approved by the House committee—

And so forth.

Mr. KEEFE. Well, I understand that, but for all practical purposes does not the Speaker realize, and I am sure he does, that if we pass this appropriation this afternoon, the balance of it is merely perfunctory because the plan has already been submitted to the committee? The committee is prepared to go ahead, and the very basis of it all is speed. We must work in cooperation with this firm of contractors that is doing over the Senate. I wish it could be done that way and preserve this historic Chamber.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the statements made on this floor by the gentlewoman from Ohio and the gentleman from Wisconsin. The bill brought before us is a deficiency bill. This is considered so important a matter that we cannot wait for 6 weeks, or whatever the time may be, before an appropriation bill comes before this House in its regular order appropriating $2,274,500.

If the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the Speaker of the House, is correct, and it is necessary for the committee still to approve plans, for plans still to be completed, then it seems to me it is primary evidence that it is not necessary for this item to be in a deficiency appropriation bill. It might very well take its proper order. The committee might consider the plans, vote upon them, pass them, and determine the amount of money, for if the plans have not been approved, how does the committee know the amount of money that is necessary?

However, I call attention primarily to two things. One has already been spoken of by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], and that is that right downtown, at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, we have a house which does not have the historic associations of the Chamber in which we sit today. Here the laws of the United States have been made. In the other house they have only been carried out. This is the body, this is the building, this is the Chamber, in which United States history has been made. Yet when it comes to repairing the White House, at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, we have evidence before our committee that $6,400,000 is to be spent on the White House to preserve the White House as it stands, when a like building, similar in every way, better and more modern, could in the words of the head of the Public Buildings Administration be built for half that amount. It seems to me that here, in this Chamber, is where the historic evidences of the history of this country ought to be preserved.

So let me tell you what England did under exactly the same situation. England during the last war was bombed, bombed thoroughly, bombed as I hope this country may never know what bombing is. The House of Parliament was struck by bombs. The House of Commons was completely destroyed, gutted, nothing left standing except the walls, with everything else open to the air. The chamber of the House of Commons, which goes down in its history and in the hearts of the people of England as this building should go down in the hearts of the people of America, never was big enough, or has not been big enough for generations, to seat all of the members of the House of Commons at one time.

What would have happened in this country? If this is any evidence, architects and committees and Architects of the Capitol and building contractors would immediately have rushed in and said, "Here is our chance. Now let us build a great big room, a great big new room. There isn't anything left. Let us build one that will take all the members of the House of Commons at one time." Did they do that? No. The new House of Commons which is now being built in England is exactly the same size, an exact replica of the room which was bombed during the war.

It seems to me that while this may not be the most important matter to come before this House this session, it is a very important matter. If this Nation is to be preserved, we must look back to some of the principles that were established in this room, and we should be reminded by the room of what those principles were and of their association with the history of the United States.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Am I not correct in believing that this Chamber, this building of our young Republic is the oldest House of Representatives in the world? The British Chamber is younger than this. I think the French Chamber is, and I know of no chamber where the elected representatives of the people meet any place in the world that is as old as this 90-year-old Chamber in which we meet.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thank the gentleman. I am sure we should preserve it.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. I want to supplement what the gentleman said about the House of Commons in England. When I was there the Assistant Speaker told us that the reason they did not enlarge the Chamber, or at least one of the pertinent reasons, was that they always have so many people absent, about 100 or 150, that if they enlarge the Chamber, the absence would be so much more noticeable and that they therefore retained the old size.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Is the gentleman suggesting that, in making this change, we reduce the size of this Chamber?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STEFAN) there were—ayes 74, noes 116.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. RABAUT and Mr. McGREGOR.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 78, noes 122.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WORLEY. In view of the difference of opinion in the House, I wonder if it would be satisfactory if we just repaired the roof on the Democratic side and let the Republican side stay as it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman does not state a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 2632, the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, had come to no resolution thereon.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress, I am not in sympathy with the manner in which the Veterans' Affairs Committee was conducted this morning. A bill of such magnitude was reported out that it might involve as much as $200,000,000,000 in the future, and affects thousands of veterans.

This bill was reported with a total hearing time of 7 minutes, having never been seen by many members of the committee prior to the meeting this morning. I shall always object to conducting a committee hearing in this fashion.

I have a very keen interest in the problems of veterans and I am anxious to see this particular bill be given full and adequate consideration by the Members of both Houses. Certainly a bill affecting the very life and welfare of our veterans should be given every consideration and study. The committee, I feel, was being put in a position to place its stamp of approval upon proposed legislation regardless of its feeling in the matter, and without giving the Members a chance to pursue the details in the bill.

Neither was their help asked or their advice requested on what may or may not be best in this legislation. We believe that, because we are on this committee, we are responsible to the veteran and are his voice on matters pertaining to legislation that concern him as well as the public in general. Therefore, it behooves the chairman, as well as the committee members, to familiarize themselves with any measures that are brought before the committee for its action. My 5 years in the service, with 31 months overseas, justify my belief that I have as great an interest in this legislation and in the veterans and their problems as any Member of this Congress. My continued interest in veterans' organizations since my discharge in 1945 further substantiates this.

It was necessary for the members of the committee to decide in 7 minutes what the minimum age would be for a pension, and to vote to exclude the 62–64-age group without an adequate presentation of background data to substantiate this exclusion. Further, the bill provided for the pensioning of those other than honorably discharged from the armed services and gave consideration to non-service-connected disability veterans below the age of 65. The chairman of this committee did not permit me or any other member of the committee the opportunity to ask questions or discuss these facts, but in an arbitrary manner himself called for a roll-call vote. I consider that he has exceeded his authority as chairman and is not providing adequate opportunity for the problems of veterans to be considered, for members of the committee to be heard, or for information to be distributed and assimilated.

MR. CORBETT DESIGNATED TO READ WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the special order agreed to today, the Chair designates the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] to read Washington's Farewell Address immediately after the reading of the Journal on Tuesday, February 22, 1949.

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, last week I announced that if the bill (H. R. 782) to constitute the Federal Security Agency a Department of Welfare were reported out of committee, that it would be on the program for this week. The bill is still in the committee; and even if it were reported now, the bill could not come up this week.

With that exception the program is the same as heretofore announced.

With the completion of the bill now under consideration there will follow H. R. 1661, the Export Control Act; House Resolution 66, the investigation of public lands; and House Resolution 75, investigation by the Committee on Education and Labor.

There will be a bill out of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House Joint Resolution 92, continuing the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate ships until June 30, 1949.

If these bills are disposed of by Thursday, it is my intention to ask to adjourn over until the following Monday.

REPUBLICAN OBJECTORS ON CONSENT AND PRIVATE CALENDARS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House I wish to state that the Republican objectors on the Consent Calendar will be the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER].

The objectors on the Private Calendar will be the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. LICHTENWALTER].

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter to the editor of the New York Times.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Passaic (N. J.) Herald-News on housing.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'NEILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Times-Leader-Evening News of Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a short statement.

Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE].

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes tomorrow following the legislative program of the day and any special orders heretofore granted for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER TRANSFERRED

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I had for tomorrow be changed to Thursday of this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced House Joint Resolution 161, and my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, ANDREW BIEMILLER, has introduced an identical resolution, calling for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project—a project which has been the hope and dream of the people of the Great Lakes area for over two decades, and one which is necessary to the future prosperity and welfare of the entire Midwest section of the United States. There is no need to present a detailed analysis of the provisions of this resolution on this occasion. The effect of this bill is to authorize the President to approve the 1941 agreement with Canada to permit the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project in cooperation with Canada.

The advantages of constructing the St. Lawrence project are so obvious, so convincing, and so well known that I need mention them only in passing. By building the necessary dams, locks, and canals to remove the obstructions to shipping in the 119-mile bottleneck between Ogdensburg, N. Y., and Montreal, Canada, a great inland seaway of 2,351 miles in length would be made available to ocean shipping. This would mean that the deep-sea vessels from all over the world would be able to steam up the St. Lawrence River from the Atlantic Ocean, and unload their cargoes at the Great Lakes ports of Duluth, Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, and Buffalo.

Such an inland shipping system would mean great savings in transportation costs to consumers and producers alike. It is estimated that the average reduction in transportation costs would be about $3.90 per ton. Automobiles could be shipped from Detroit at a saving of $12.24 a ton. Wheat and flour could be shipped from Duluth at a saving of $1.61 per ton, and could be laid down in Liverpool at 5 to 8 cents less per bushel. Crude rubber could be brought to Detroit at a saving of $8 per long ton. The dairy products of the Great Lakes region could be transported to the Atlantic coast at a saving of $4 per ton. In other words, savings in transportation costs would amount to between $35,000,000 and $40,000,000 per year, which means that the seaway would pay for itself in transportation savings alone in a few years' time.

The seaway would have the effect of stimulating trade between the east coast and the Midwest. Grain, flour, meat, and ores would flow from the Midwest to the East to be exchanged for the manufactured goods of the East. Trade between the two great regions would grow, employment would rise, and living standards in both areas would improve.

The power facilities of the St. Lawrence project would provide enormous amounts of cheap electric power to relieve the power famine now affecting New York and the New England States. It has been estimated that the United States share of electric power generated by the project would amount to 13,000,000 kilowatts per year at the very low rate of 1 mill per kilowatt. According to the New York Power Commission, St. Lawrence-generated power would save the people of New York some $26,000,000 per year in reduced power costs, and and would allow for the expansion of her retarded industries to employ 50,000 additional workers. The New England States would also benefit in a similar degree.

Just as the savings in transportation costs would pay for the cost of the seaway in a relatively short time, so will the electric power obtained from the project also offset in a few years' time the $571,000,000 outlay on the part of the United States for its construction.

The case for construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is so overwhelming that it is a mystery why anyone would be opposed to it—the mystery is, Why was it not constructed years ago? The project has been an issue in the Congress year after year, and each time its supporters have been disappointed. However, the picture has been changing and support has been growing for the project by leaps and bounds.

An unprecedented series of developments have occurred recently to give the project a new and powerful stature and bring close the day when the Congress must recognize its intrinsic merit. President Harry S. Truman recommended the passage of the seaway measure three times during the month of January of this year, and has listed the seaway as an expenditure item in his 1950 budget. The appointment of Dean Acheson as Secretary of State is important, inasmuch as Mr. Acheson headed State Department activity in support of the project in the past, and he was also the former chairman of the Joint Canadian-American Defense Board.

Of equal significance has been the shift in position of the Great Lakes shipping interests. Mr. George Humphrey, of M. A. Hanna Co., has now come out in support of the seaway, and the influential Lake Carriers Association has decided to change its position from bitter hostility to one of neutrality. Shippers and leaders of industry have come to realize that the seaway is essential to the stabilization of the iron and steel industry—the backbone of the American industrial system.

Just as the movement supporting the seaway gathers momentum, we also find the opposition forces now resorting to new stratagems to prevent its realization.

I note from the press reports from Albany, N. Y., that Gov. Thomas E. Dewey is busily engaged in encouraging the passage of resolutions in the New York State Legislature to petition the President and the Congress to build the St. Lawrence power project and defer the seaway. I recall that during the Presidential campaign, when he came to Minnesota, he gave strong assurances that he is for the St. Lawrence seaway project, and if elected President he would vigorously press for congressional approval of the project. But, of course, Albany is not Minnesota, and we hear a different tone now since the Presidential campaign is over.

My friends in both great parties realize, however, that for the first time in the history of the country we have a President elected with the support of the Western States who has unequivocally stood for the development of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project to benefit the whole Nation, regardless of sectionalism. In fact, for the past 25 years no President has been elected to office who has not strongly and unequivocally supported the construction of this project for both power and navigation.

Needless to say, this Congress should not entertain any idea of following Governor Dewey's suggestion to develop power alone, for the following reasons:

First. As proposed by Governor Dewey, if St. Lawrence power alone is developed, the project will cost $49,000,000 more to the people of the State of New York and other Northeastern States, thereby increasing the cost of power developed to industries and consumers. It is not to the interest of the northeastern part of the United States to support this proposition. The Governor has kept this fact from the people of the State of New York.

Second. It is unfair to mislead the public of New York and other Northeastern States with the false hope that they will secure the power project without navigation, as both the Canadian Government and our own Federal Government have commitments and agreements for the joint development of the project. And those arrangements cannot be changed without years of delay and without welshing upon promises made to the people of this country and of Canada. I am sure that the Federal Government will not go back on its word and any false expectations aroused to the contrary merely mislead the public and play into the hands of the minority groups who oppose this great development.

Third. On account of the critical situation arising in the exhaustion of our raw materials upon which the industry of the Middle West and the whole country depend, the St. Lawrence seaway is just as vital to national interest as the power, hence no leader who only recently presumed to represent the country as a whole can, in good conscience and with frankness, propose the indefinite postponement of the seaway in order to satisfy minority pressure groups in New York and other Eastern States.

At a time when the press of the country is applauding the initiative taken by this country in support of democratic principles all over the world through economic and technical assistance, it is inconsistent to close our eyes to the greatest development within our grasp, which will make the North American Continent a strong and a better place in which to live.

Recently, Defense Minister Claxton, of Canada, gave a speech at Sault Ste. Marie, on January 11, emphasizing the importance of the joint seaway power development in the defense of the North American Continent, from which I quote in some length:

THE PLACE OF THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY IN OUR NATIONAL DEFENSE

Here we are, 1,500 miles from the sea at one of the four main junctures of Canada and the United States across the mighty St. Lawrence system. The foresight and cooperation of Canadians and Americans built the locks which opened the waterways system from Fort William to Sarnia and joined Lakes Superior, Michigan, and Huron into the greatest inland area of deep-water transportation on the face of the earth. What this single engineering job at the Sault has meant in profit to the people of Canada and the United States is impossible to calculate. More tonnage passes through the Sault Ste. Marie canals than through the Panama and Suez Canals combined, and this despite the short season.

The way opened here was extended by other canals on through Lakes Erie and Ontario, down the St. Lawrence as far as Prescott, adding 500 miles to deep-water inland navigation.

Now there is only the part from Prescott to Montreal blocking the flow of deep-water trade and travel from Lake Superior out into the oceans of the world.

You will recall that it was during the darkest days of the war that President Roosevelt and Mr. Mackenzie King worked out again an agreement for the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway. The project was advocated as a great contribution to the peaceful life and trade of this continent, and it was planned as a definite line of communication for the defense of our continent.

If it was desirable in 1941 that we should construct the waterways for purposes of transportation and for power, recent events have shown that it is even more desirable today; if it was desirable to proceed with the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway for purposes of defense in 1941, nothing that has happened since has in any way diminished that need.

In the interest of national defense and international security the St. Lawrence waterway project should be started as soon as possible and pressed to completion. General economic benefits, transportation and communication, power, and iron ore are reasons which give the completion of the St. Lawrence urgent priority in joint defense. Let us examine each of these:

1. The completion of the waterways system, like every other major development of transportation and power, would lead to the expansion of the civilian economy, and any expansion in the industrial and economic potential which in peacetime leads to prosperity and a higher standard of living also leads to an increased ability to arm ourselves for our own defense. Here, in this home of steel, there is no need to remind you of what Hanson Baldwin said, that it was "the factories of America, the industrial know-how of America, and the mechanical competence of America * * * that won the war."

2. In the modern war the lines of communication stretch all the way from the battle front to the factories and the full use of the St. Lawrence would bring resources of the interior of our continent closer to any possible fighting front; it would permit the more effective mobilization of the industrial potential of the continent; it would make possible the construction of all but the

largest vessels in the industrial centers of the Great Lakes; it would provide a means of transportation alternative to the railways.

3. We saw in the last war how important an element was water power. You may remember how it led us in 1942 to build at Arvida a plant bigger than Boulder Dam in a little more than a year. The United States and Canada need the full power potential of the St. Lawrence now.

4. The completion of the waterways would make it possible for the great resources of iron ore in northern Quebec and Labrador to be made safely available to the smelters of Canada and the United States.

This matter has already received the attention of the Permanent Joint Board of Defense. Ordinarily its recommendations are not made public, but this was of such interest that the recommendation of the Board in May 1947 was put in evidence by General Marshall at a congressional hearing. The Honorable James V. Forrestal, Secretary of Defense of the United States, gave evidence of the need for the project.

In these circumstances, it is not surprising that the Governments of the United States and of Canada, accepting the advice of their principal military and civilian advisers, are pressing for authority to proceed with the completion of the St. Lawrence waterway as a combined power and navigation project in the interests of prosperity in peace and security in war.

This speech by Defense Minister Claxton indicates the thinking of most Canadians—it shows that our neighbors to the north share the views of most Americans who today recognize the material benefits to be derived from the navigation and power facilities of the St. Lawrence project.

In addition, they agree with most high military officials in America that the seaway is an important link in our joint national defense system. For the seaway would provide both countries with a great inland water route protected against enemy submarine and air attacks in case of war—it would make available new and protected shipbuilding facilities where ocean vessels could be assembled and floated directly to the ocean.

Mr. Speaker, every postponement of the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project robs America of a valuable natural asset. The seaway will open the world's market to Midwest farmers, and stimulate commerce and trade between the east coast and the Great Lakes areas. It will provide vast quantities of cheap electric power to power-starved New England. It will directly benefit half of America, and indirectly the whole Nation. It will contribute to our national defense.

The people of the Midwest have dreamed of the day when the seaway would become a reality. Forty years is long enough to wait for this development which represents their hopes and aspirations for the good life. It is far too long to have permitted the railroad and the power lobby to block a program of utmost importance to the general welfare. It is my hope that the Eighty-first Congress will set aside any narrow sectionalism that may exist, and forget all false fears that seaway will damage any region or any American industry, and take action to enact this resolution into law.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to my colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER].

Mr. BIEMILLER. May I congratulate my colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] on his able and skillful presentation of the case for the St. Lawrence seaway. I find myself in complete agreement with what he has said. I sincerely hope that the resolution which the gentleman has introduced, and which I have the honor to introduce a twin to, will soon be before the House, and that we will have the privilege of bringing to a realization this great dream that so many people have had of a very important means of strengthening our entire St. Lawrence and Great Lakes regions, and at the same time strengthening the national defense of the United States.

Mr. BLATNIK. I thank my friend and colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER]. I am more than happy to welcome his support in the sponsorship of this very important resolution.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include testimony of Dr. John D. Clark before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. BOGGS of Delaware, for February 16, 1949, on account of attendance at funeral services.

To Mr. CARLYLE (at the request of Mr. KERR), for the 15th and 16th, on account of official business.

To Mr. WEICHEL (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR), on account of illness.

To Mr. TAYLOR, for indefinite period, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 16, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

221. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed Economic Stabilization Act of 1949, together with a summary of the proposed bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

222. A letter from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for further contributions to the international children's emergency fund"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

223. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Federal Alcohol Administration Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

224. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1705 of title 18 of the United States Code, relating to destruction of letter boxes or mail; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

225. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 6, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on the coasts of the Great Lakes, harbors of refuge for light-draft vessels, particularly with respect to harbor of refuge at Lester River, Minn., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on October 30, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WHITTINGTON: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 2626. A bill to amend Public Law 533 of the Eightieth Congress authorizing the construction of a building for the General Accounting Office on square 518 in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 120). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Education and Labor. H. R. 858. A bill to clarify the overtime compensation provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, as applied in the stevedoring and building construction industries, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 121). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 782. A bill to constitute the Federal Security Agency a Department of Welfare; with an amendment (Rept. No. 122). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming:

H. R. 2720. A bill authorizing the erection of a monument to Sacajawea; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 2721. A bill to extend certain provisions of Public Law 690, Seventy-ninth Congress, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2722. A bill to amend section 144, title 28, United States Code, with respect to the procedure for transfer of proceedings before United States district court judges by reason of bias or prejudice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 2723. A bill to authorize a temporary program of Federal aid to public-school agencies for the construction of public elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 2724. A bill to provide a decree of competency for United States Indians in certain cases; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2725. A bill to provide for disposition of inherited interests in the estates of deceased Indian allottees; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2726. A bill authorizing the completion of certain works of improvement in the Red River of the North drainage basin, Minnesota, South Dakota, and North Dakota, in

the interest of flood control and allied purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 2727. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of a mining research station in the vicinity of Missoula, Mont., for investigation of methods of mining the ores and other mineral raw materials of the Northwest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 2728. A bill to eliminate any liability of a collector of internal revenue for uncollected taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANBORN:

H. R. 2729. A bill making appropriations for emergency flood relief; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 2730. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the State of Maryland of certain land situated in Greenbelt, Md.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STEFAN:

H. R. 2731. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to announce the parity price of milk, and to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to immediately announce the support price of milk; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 2732. A bill providing a direct Federal old-age pension at the rate of $60 per month to certain citizens 60 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WORLEY:

H. R. 2733. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of the Canadian River reclamation project, Texas; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2734. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 730), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 2735. A bill to repeal certain acts of Congress, known as Indian liquor laws, in certain parts of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2736. A bill to subject Indians and Indian reservations in the State of Wisconsin to the laws of the State, with certain exceptions; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 2737. A bill to establish the decoration Medal for Humane Action for award to persons serving in or with the armed forces of the United States participating in the current military effort to supply necessities of life to the people of Berlin, Germany; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 2738. A bill to amend the Housing Act of 1948; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2739. A bill to promote and maintain amicable relations between the office of the Second Assistant Postmaster General and the employees in the field service of the surface and air postal transport by the establishment of a board of arbitration; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 2740. A bill to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery at or near Millen, Ga.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PRESTON (by request):

H. R. 2741. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide a 20-percent increase in survivor benefits to widows, children, and parents; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 2742. A bill to amend and reenact sections 4F, 4G of title 30, United States Code, act of May 7, 1941, chapter 87, sections 1 and 2, 55 Statutes 178, relative to the appointment of coal-mine inspectors; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 2743. A bill to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privilege he enjoys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H. R. 2744. A bill to provide designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Madison, Wis., as the Richard Bong Veterans Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2745. A bill to extend disability and death benefits to personnel of the Reserve components of the armed services while on active duty or in training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 2746. A bill to provide for a service credit for veterans for the purposes of title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2747. A bill to increase the rates of service-connected death compensation payable to, or on account of, the children of persons who served in the active military and naval service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H. R. 2748. A bill for the relief of Carey Act settlers in the Black Canyon irrigation district under the Payette division of the Boise reclamation project in Idaho; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2749. A bill making appropriations for emergency flood relief; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. R. 2750. A bill to provide free transportation for parents or wives on Government-owned ships and aircraft to the graves of veterans buried abroad; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BIEMILLER:

H. R. 2751. A bill to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. BOSONE:

H. R. 2752. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Weber Basin reclamation project, Utah; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 2753. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of April 28, 1904 (33 Stat. 527, 43 U. S. C. sec. 213), relating to additional homestead entries; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 2754. A bill to provide for the investigation of discriminations against women on the basis of sex, to establish policies for the removal of such discriminations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 2755. A bill to amend and supplement the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 2756. A bill to implement the established national policy of promoting maximum employment, production, and purchasing power, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. J. Res. 161. Joint resolution approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof; expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the negotiation of certain treaties; authorizing the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project for national defense; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BIEMILLER:

H. J. Res. 162. Joint resolution approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof; expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the negotiation of certain treaties; authorizing the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project for national defense; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HART:

H. J. Res. 163. Joint resolution to print the monthly publication entitled "Economic Indicators"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WELCH of California:

H. J. Res. 164. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. J. Res. 165. Joint resolution amending Public Law 49, chapter 87, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, so as to provide that whenever a Federal coal-mine inspector finds that imminent danger to the employees in the mines exists, he shall immediately order the operating manager or his representatives in the mine to cause all employees to be withdrawn from the unsafe area until such imminent danger is removed; and providing a penalty for refusal of such operating manager or his representative to obey such order; and providing that nothing in such amendment shall be construed or operate to nullify any existing contract between mine employees and mine management, or to nullify any existing State statute, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. Con. Res. 38. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress with respect to the disposition of certain Italian colonies; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. Con. Res. 39. Concurrent resolution to protest the arrest of Protestant clergymen by the Government of Bulgaria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. Res. 103. Resolution providing for the employment of an additional expert transcriber in the office of the Official Reporters of Debates; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. Res. 104. Resolution providing for additional compensation for certain employees of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. Res. 105. Resolution expressing the sympathy of the House of Representatives with the victims of the Carbondale Township, Pa., mine cave-in; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Connecticut, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States for consideration of their resolution regarding means of attaining a stronger and more effective world government through the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 2757. A bill for the relief of Salomon Nadler, Vera Nadler, Daniel Nadler, and Robert Nadler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOSONE:

H. R. 2758. A bill for the relief of the Fisher Brewing Co., Salt Lake City, Utah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2759. A bill for the relief of certain officers and employees of the office of United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands who suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 2760. A bill for the relief of certain claimants against the United States who suffered personal injuries, property damage, or other loss as a result of the explosion of a munitions truck between Smithfield and Selma, N. C., on March 7, 1942; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H. R. 2761. A bill for the relief of Angelo Ferrari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 2762. A bill for the relief of Anthony Lazanis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 2763. A bill for the relief of Morris Zucker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2764. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Caroline M. Neumark and Melville Moritz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 2765. A bill for the relief of Reno E. Stitely; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 2766. A bill for the relief of Maria Geertruide Mulders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

78. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 5, not to enact legislation federalizing the National Guard of the several States of the Union; to the Committee on Armed Services.

79. By Mr. HART: Petition of the Board of Commissioners and the mayor and council of the city of Hoboken, N. J., urging President Truman to protect against the communistic travesty of justice and morality such as imposed on His Eminence Cardinal Mindszenty, of Hungary; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

80. By Mr. BURDICK: Memorial of the North Dakota Legislature, requesting increased Federal participation in the construction of approved hospital projects; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

81. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Paul C. Emple, executive director, National Lutheran Council, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to proposed legislation before the Congress affecting the entry of displaced persons into this country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God of compassion and deliverance, we thank Thee for Thy promise: If any man lack wisdom, let him ask Thee.

In this moment of prayerful quietness we would again take the pledge of service we owe our country. We pray Thee to confirm that which is good in us, and rebuke that which is foolish.

While we value the counsel and fellowship of our comrades in service, yet we know that, as individuals in the hands of a good God, we cannot be all things to all men, but true to Thee and our consciences. Free us from the fetters of our old selves, and help us to stand erect for the truth and right. Lead the way, O Lord, and Thine shall be the praise. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SUSPENDING CERTAIN IMPORT TAXES ON COPPER

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2313) to suspend certain import taxes on copper.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I say as a member of the minority of the Committee on Ways and Means that this was considered by the full committee and there was no objection to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the import tax imposed under section 3425 of the Internal Revenue Code shall not apply with respect to articles (other than copper sulfate) entered for consumption or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption during the period beginning April 1, 1949, and ending with the close of March 31, 1950.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "March 31, 1950" and insert "March 31, 1951."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill H. R. 2313 is to continue for another 2 years the suspension of the import tax on copper. In 1947 the Committee on Ways and Means held hearings at which the critical shortages in the supply of copper for American industry were described. The Honorable Oscar B. Ryder, Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, has advised the Committee on Ways and Means that there have been no major developments which would indicate any substantial change in the production of, or the civilian demand for, copper and copper products for some time to come.

We are confronted, therefore, with the identical problem that we faced 2 years ago. Present production of copper in the United States is insufficient to meet the demand. In fact the demand for 1948 was roughly 400,000 short tons in excess of domestic supply. As a result of this critical supply situation not only industry consumers of copper but also the producers have joined in the support of the pending legislation. Continuation of the suspension of the import taxes on copper has been urged by manufacturers of products used in such varied industries as the automotive, electrical equipment and appliances, housing and construction of all kinds, shipbuilding, telephone and public utilities, and other basic industries. A brief submitted to the Committee on Ways and Means on behalf of more than a dozen of the principal domestic copper producers stresses that the present abnormal demand is temporary, resulting from the unsatisfied civilian requirements of the war years and of the requirements of the Economic Cooperation Administration and Government stock-piling for defense. The domestic producers agree it is necessary to suspend the import taxes, but they want a time limit of 2 years placed upon the suspension.

In addition to the endorsement of producers and consumers of copper, the interested governmental agencies have expressed their support not only in the interest of meeting the quantitative requirements of industry and the national defense program but also in maintaining the current price of copper and thereby providing an anti-inflationary effect. The Secretary of Commerce advised the committee that should the import taxes in question be restored at this time, it is certain that the price of copper would rise still further, having an inflationary effect on the American economy.

DIVISION OF WATERS OF COLORADO RIVER

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to call the attention of this House to the unprecedented unity of the Congressmen from my State of California.

For many years California has faced a serious controversy over division of the waters of the Colorado River. We have now proposed that the issues of this conflict be placed before the Supreme Court.

Our economy in California is based on an assured and dependable water supply. Therefore, whatever is the result of this vital controversy is the key to our future.

We have 23 Members from California in this House, and each one of them has introduced a resolution asking the permission of Congress to take the Colorado River controversy before the Supreme Court.

Party lines are invisible in this issue. We, of California, stand together, united without exception. Our strength is the strength of 22 men and 1 woman who, regardless of political beliefs, are working for the common good of our State, its people, and their destiny.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GORSKI of New York asked and was given premission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some articles on the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty.

Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. CROOK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a house concurrent resolution of the Indiana State Legislature memorializing the Congress to enact effective legislation providing for flood control in the Wabash River watershed area and tributaries thereto.

ADOPT THE 70-GROUP AIR-FORCE PROGRAM

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, on invitation extended to me by the Honorable CARL VINSON, chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, it was my privilege, yesterday afternoon, Tuesday, February 15, to attend at Andrews Field, the most spectacular air show or demonstration that I had ever winessed.

The President, his Cabinet, Members of Congress, and other Government officials were present. On exhibition in the huge hangars were the crude planes used by the Wright brothers at the birth of aviation. Alongside these simple machines, the successors of which have changed the very face of the earth, were the modern engines used in the finest types of aircraft. Certainly great strides have been made in aviation during the past 2 decades. It was our privilege to examine the latest jet bombers and fighters. Surely they are the pride of the world.

The tragic truth is we now have the know-how but do not have the planes to protect ourselves. It is hard to realize how much time is required after authorization before planes of any appreciable number are in production. In spite of the accelerated plane production program precipitated by World War II not a single plane participated in combat during the war which was designed after Pearl Harbor Day.

In my judgment, we should adopt the 70-group air-force program without delay because for a truth air power is peace power.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, 31 years ago today, the fine people of Lithuania adopted their Declaration of Independence at Vilnius.

Americans of Lithuanian descent are today observing this anniversary. They are expressing their gratitude to the land of their adoption for not recognizing the annexation of Lithuania and her two small Baltic neighbors, Latvia and Estonia, by the Soviet Union.

In our turn, Americans of all racial origins, all Americans who love freedom and who respect the dignity and the independence of free people, may well rejoice that the heroic men and women of these small Baltic states are resisting the oppressor with every means at their command.

The brave people of Lithuania are determined that they shall not be subjugated. They are determined to be free again. So long as they are impelled by the spirit of freedom, they will never be conquered.

The great darkness which falls behind the frightful iron curtain in Europe will not prevail forever. The tragic fate of nations ground into submission under the heel of dictatorship is gradually awakening all the world.

Communism can rule only with the bloody tools of tyranny. It is at war with every aspiration of free men and women. It is a one-way street to human slavery.

Those who, like the people of Lithuania and the Baltic States, resist the godless advances of world communism, are fighting the good fight of human freedom everywhere. That freedom will be realized only when Lithuania and all other fair lands now under the domination of the Kremlin are restored to their full rights and priyileges in the family of free nations.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, today marks the thirty-first anniversary of the Declaration of Independence by the people of Lithuania, which occurred historically on February 16, 1918, at Vilnius. Lithuanian Americans throughout the United States are observing this day with fitting ceremonies of thanks to this great country for not recognizing Russia's annexation of Lithuania and her two good Baltic neighbors—Latvia and Estonia. Today, Lithuania is isolated by the iron curtain and her people are dying for their belief in God and freedom. An armed heroic resistance is carrying out the will of the people against the oppressor and their attitude of enslavement.

Looking back in retrospect, I recall that on March 17, 1922, I introduced in the House of Representatives the following resolution:

House Joint Resolution 289

Resolution urging the recognition of the Republic of Lithuania by the Government of the United States

Whereas the Council of Lithuania representing all of the peoples of that nation on February 16, 1918, unanimously decided to communicate to the Russian, German, and other governments the following declaration: "The Council of Lithuania, the only representation of the Lithuanian nation, relying on the recognized rights of self-determination for nationalities, and the decisions of the Lithuanian Conference at Vilnius September 18–23, 1917, announces the rebirth of the independent democratic Lithuanian State with the capital at Vilnius, and the severance of all governmental ties of this state with other nations;" and

Whereas for over 4 years a stable government has been maintained by the Republic of Lithuania; and

Whereas the geographical situation of Lithuania is not only a warranty for its survival but for its growth to wealth and power among the nations of the world; and

Whereas in this Nation there are nearly 1,000,000 people of Lithuanian blood who, during the late war with unsurpassed devotion to the cause of liberty and independence, rallied to the assistance of the Government of the United States; and

Whereas England, France, Italy, and Poland have recognized the Republic Lithuania de facto; and

Whereas Czechoslovakia, Holland, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Finland, Estonia, Germany, Russia, Argentina, and Mexico have recognized the Republic of Lithuania de jure: Therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the Government of the United States recognize the Republic of Lithuania.

I am indeed gratified that shortly thereafter the United States recognized the independence of the Republic of Lithuania, whose people have demonstrated to the world that they were capable and deserving of self-government.

Needless to say, I greatly regret that at the present time the people of Lithuania should be denied the freedom and liberty that I personally urged and advocated.

It is my fervent hope and prayer that in the not too distant future, Lithuania

will again be liberated, together with the other unfortunate countries of Europe.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

CARDINAL MINDSZENTY AND BISHOP ORDASS

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will give due consideration to the resolution submitted to us by the general court of Massachusetts memorializing Congress to use all possible means to secure the release of Cardinal Mindszenty and Bishop Ordass.

These flagrant and inhuman outrages against organized Christianity have aroused the righteous indignation of the American people and millions of right-thinking, liberty-loving peoples throughout the world.

I believe it is the duty of this Government to take immediate and unequivocal action to secure the release of these persecuted churchmen and move to prevent the reoccurrence of similar outrages against persons because of their religious convictions and courageous opposition to the godless doctrines and practices of communism.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I shall take advantage of the time allotted me to express my thoughts on this thirty-first anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people of Lithuania. I am proud of the fact that this nation has refused to recognize Russia's annexation of Lithuania and her two Baltic neighbors, Latvia and Estonia. I sincerely pray that we may continue our stand in this regard until the day when Lithuania and the Baltic states become free and independent governments once again.

No finer citizens ever emigrated to these shores than those who came from Lithuania. Today, when these Americans of Lithuanian birth and descent celebrate throughout this Nation the declaration of independence made at Vilnius, Lithuania, on February 16, 1918, they have in their hearts genuine appreciation of our Government's refusal to recognize the Moscow-trained gangsters and cutthroats who have taken over the land they love.

Lithuania is, I hope, only temporarily isolated by the iron curtain. Because of the barbaric treatment accorded them by the Communists thousands of her people have perished while stoutly maintaining their religious convictions, belief in God and right to freedom.

Despite constant persecution and indescribable humiliations suffered by these people in their struggle, they have had the fortitude and courage to carry on a resistance against the oppressors who serve the Soviet Union.

Our forefathers founded our free and liberty-loving country upon the recognition of the existence of a supreme being. I am sure that the people of our Nation, of all religious faiths and creeds, are saddened at heart today by the plight of Lithuania. I am sure they join me in thoroughly denouncing these communistic tyrants of Soviet Russia who, through intimidation and force, have brought about the enslavement of Lithuania and the Baltic states.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include resolutions.

Mr. LANE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement from the Irish Legation.

Mr. ELLIOTT asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. JONES of Alabama asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Atlanta Journal.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts from the Michigan soil-conservation report.

ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to join with the other Members of Congress in paying my tribute and extending my congratulations to the fine, brave people of Lithuania, who celebrate today the thirty-first anniversary of their declaration of independence. Late this afternoon I shall go to the Lithuanian Embassy to convey in person my good wishes and to tell the Lithuanian Ambassador how much we admire the Lithuanians who are in our country and how much they have contributed to America.

As I was listening to the other Members, I could not help but feel the gravity of the situation of these courageous people of Lithuania, isolated behind the iron curtain—people who are dying and suffering because of their faith and their love of freedom. I believe everyone in the world today who wants a free and democratic form of government will join with us here in America in wishing them a future of happiness, and freedom to enjoy it. Those of us assembled here know how hard the United States is working to remove the iron curtain and to secure freedom, independence, and happiness for the world.

VETERANS' PENSION BILL

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Committee on Veterans' Affairs reported out a bill providing $90 a month pensions for the veterans of World War I and World War II after they reach the age of 65.

The press describes this bill as a "hot potato" in the lap of the administration. It is no "hot potato" as far as this particular Member of Congress is concerned.

I am unalterably opposed to this bill. Let me serve notice that if an attempt is made to bring this bill up under suspension of rules, I will certainly object to such procedure.

This legislation is dishonest. It attempts to deceive the veterans into believing they are getting something for nothing when, as a matter of fact, in 10 years our veterans will be shouldering half of the Nation's tax burden, including the tremendous increase this bill contemplates.

Such legislation is unsound. At a time when we are staggering under the impact of our huge war-incurred debt, at a time when all of our resources and ingenuity are pledged to the prevention of another such conflict, it would take us dangerously near the brink of national insolvency.

I want the veteran to be able to look forward to a future in which peace is possible, in which his Government is sound, in which his tax burden is reasonable, in which he can be assured of governmental care based on his need—a future, in other words, which has meaning for him and his children. This bill will seriously jeopardize that future.

In all sincerity I say to you, Mr. Speaker, if we Members of this great legislative body cannot point out to the veterans in our individual districts the dangerous fallacies in this legislation, then we do not deserve to represent our districts in future Congresses.

AN ANSWER TO SHORTAGES AND CONTROLS

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, in view of this morning's newspaper comment to the effect that the majority expect to reinstate controls, it might be interesting to note that 105,000 tons of scrap steel came over from the German Ruhr in December and 150,000 tons in January. These are larger amounts than have come over in previous months and the boats taking over relief have not come back empty to that extent.

While it was urged last year that this operation was desirable, it is also interesting to note that during the fine summer swimming weather, a tight embargo was placed on scrap steel so that the relief boats were coming back empty, for the most part. This was due to interdepartmental and international involvements.

Steel has been recently, and now is being, manufactured in the United States at unprecedented peacetime rates and doubtless had steel scrap come back last summer more finished steel would have started flowing through our domestic markets at an earlier date. This only shows that increasing supplies is a much better answer to shortages than controls, which simply divert scarce supplies into black markets at prodigious advances.

Another result is that steel scrap in the United States has dropped from $50 to $37.50 a ton, which may have an effect not only on the supplies of finished steel but upon the price as well. It would not surprise me if price support efforts would now be made, which would again induce shortages, which would set in motion renewed measures for control.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] may be excused indefinitely on account of official business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the State board of the Illinois Federation of Women's Clubs, December 8, 1948.

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address by Senator IVES.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, commemorating the thirty-first anniversary of the birth of the Republic of Lithuania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by David Lawrence on the Atlantic Defense Pact.

Mr. D'EWART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Montana.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "Know Your Congress." I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $159.75, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mr. Bill Cunningham, of the Boston Herald.

VETERANS' PENSION BILL

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I was very much surprised at the speech of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] who spoke a moment ago, attacking the bill for the pensioning of World War veterans who have reached the age of 65 years. His speech showed that he did not know what he was talking about. That bill merely follows the exact line of the Spanish-American War pension bill, except that the committee voted out of it the provision for pensioning veterans at age 62 and raised the minimum age to 65 years.

You were told on yesterday, that the bill would pension dishonorably discharged veterans. There is not a word of truth in that statement.

You were also told on yesterday that we only had 7 minutes of hearings on the measure. We have been holding hearings on these measures for weeks. There are 186 pages of hearings. We brought in every witness anybody asked for. Yesterday there appeared before our committee the representatives of the Veterans' Administration for the members of the committee to ask any questions they desired.

You have been told that this bill was reported by a minority. There were 19 of the 27 members of the committee present. One distinguished gentleman was unavoidably absent, and I refer to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MEYER]. If he had been present we would have had 20. We had 19 members present and all of them, with the possible exception of 2 or 3, voted to report the bill.

I am filing my report as chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee today, and we hope to bring it to the floor of the House for final passage at an early date.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2632) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 13]

Abbitt	Curtis	O'Toole
Allen, Ill.	Davis, Tenn.	Pace
Allen, La.	DeGraffenried	Perkins
Beall	Dingell	Pickett
Bennett, Fla.	Donohue	Potter
Bentsen	Ellsworth	Poulson
Blatnik	Gilmer	Quinn
Boggs, Del.	Gossett	Reed, Ill.
Boykin	Halleck	Ribicoff
Breen	Heffernan	Sanborn
Buckley, N. Y.	Hoffman, Ill.	Shafer
Bulwinkle	Irving	Smathers
Burnside	Jackson, Calif.	Smith, Ohio
Byrne, N. Y.	Jenkins	Somers
Carlyle	Judd	Taylor
Cheseney	Linehan	Thomas, N. J.
Cole, Kans.	McMillan, S. C.	Towe
Colmer	Mason	Trimble
Coudert	Miles	Weichel
Cunningham	Morrison	Whitaker

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and seventy-one Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2632) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HUBER: On page 3, line 12, before the period insert "*Provided*, That in making such improvements the basic architecture of the House Chamber shall not be altered and the existing skylights of the House Chamber shall be retained."

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, I listened to the debate yesterday regarding the reconstruction of the House Chamber with a great deal of interest. I share the opinion of our esteemed Speaker and others that this structural steel should be removed from the roof of this Chamber.

I am not an architect or an engineer. However, I heard the reference to the amount of cast iron in this roof and it seems to me it would be a very simple matter to take out the cast iron and put in a strong aluminum or other lightweight metal that would carry the load. We do not build airplanes out of cast

iron. I believe the type of construction to which I referred could safely reinforce the roof and make it safe and yet retain the basic architecture of the Chamber as it is.

Mr. Chairman, we are only the temporary custodians of this Chamber. It belongs to posterity and should be preserved. We have over here on the other side the old Senate Chamber. It is regarded as such a holy of holies that they have a fence around it and we are not even permitted to go in and walk around. Yet we would change the architecture of this Chamber overnight.

My amendment will not interfere with the letting of this contract. They can go ahead and make the necessary repairs and do the remodeling of the House Chamber, but it will not be necessary to take out the skylights and change the basic architecture. It is very little consolation to think that the State seals overhead will be taken out and deposited in a certain place in your home State. We are spending a lot of money on other projects and I do not see any reason in the world why we cannot safeguard this historic Chamber and keep it so that generations to come may visit and see it in its historic state. There is no reason, in my opinion, why it should not be preserved.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that my amendment will be agreed to. As I stated, it will not interfere with the letting of the contracts that are proposed. Surely the Architect and the engineers can do this job, yet preserve the building as it is.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, whenever I enter this Chamber I do not necessarily see the faces that are here now. All of us look back into history and we see and think of the great men and women who labored in this room for the preservation of free government on this earth. In these seats have sat and in these aisles have walked the great of America.

These walls and this roof have heard the debates of some of the greatest men this country ever produced. Their labors always have been for the preservation of America and her institutions. To change these walls and to change this roof would be destroying one of the greatest shrines of freedom on this earth. These walls are rich in the traditions of our country and to change them, to make them over or alter them, would destroy that richness of tradition and history it has represented throughout the years.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio ought to be adopted. The Architect, in my opinion, could well change the plans to conform with the object he has in mind, namely, preserving this Chamber, this rich, historic room, in its present form. Reference has been made to the fact we cannot hear each other, but that is perhaps due more to our own fault than to that of the acoustics of the room itself. Now that we have this public-address system anyone can hear who will listen, and there is no need nor necessity for changing or destroying one of the finest shrines and monuments to freedom in the world—the Chamber of the House of Representatives.

I hope that the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. CROOK. In this proposed amendment is it planned to leave this structural work intact?

Mr. DONDERO. No. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio takes into consideration the removal of this steel. If they could build a cast-iron roof 90 years ago, and that is what is in this roof, they can build it with structural steel or aluminum to support it now.

Mr. CROOK. We, over in the great Hoosier Commonwealth of Indiana, do not like this steel construction, where we have to look through a tremendous amount of steel work to find the seal of the State of Indiana. I want to see those seals preserved, but I want to see them put down some place where the public can see them.

Mr. DONDERO. It can be done under the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HUBER. Unless this amendment prevails, you will not see the seal of the great State of Indiana in the ceiling of this building, or the seal of any other State. They will be gone forever.

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, may I ask one more question? How many of these seals were here when this building was originally built?

Mr. DONDERO. We are admonished by scriptural authority to "remove not the ancient landmark which thy fathers have set"—Proverbs 22: 28.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, in the first place, in reply to the gentleman from Ohio, we would like to stay with the old quill pens, but present conditions require the use of many typewriters, and as far as my colleague is concerned, in his devotion to antiquity, why do we not take the Capitol back to Philadelphia?

I discovered yesterday and today a great many architects in the Congress of the United States. They are more informed on the needed improvements to this room than is the Fine Arts Commission and some of the most outstanding engineers of this country.

I have here the report of the Commission of Fine Arts, and I am going to ask, when we go back into the House, to insert it at this point in the RECORD.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS,
Washington, D. C., June 20, 1947.

Hon. DAVID LYNN,
Architect of the Capitol,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LYNN: The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on June 19, 1947, were pleased to consider with you and with your associates the plans and the samples of materials of construction and embellishment necessary for improving the Chambers of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives.

The Commission unanimously approve the plans for these two Chambers, as well as the samples of the materials of construction and embellishment which were presented with the plans.

The Commission gave careful consideration to the suggestion that only those portions of the Chambers above the gallery floor be improved in the first construction contract, and that the lower parts of both Chambers be delayed at least until the construction of the upper portions are completed. While it is practicable to arrange to carry out such a program the Commission respectfully suggest that further consideration be given the reconstructing the two Chambers in a single operation. The inconvenience to the Members of the Congress would be minimized, the total cost would undoubtedly be less, and the completely reconstructed Chambers would present a unity of design which will not obtain in the case where the upper parts of the two Chambers are of one character and the lower parts of another. Of course, the approval of the plans by the Commission is predicated upon the ultimate carrying out of the entire approved plan for each Chamber.

The Commission are exceedingly well pleased with the results obtained by you and by your architects and we believe that the results of the remodeling of the two Chambers will provide meeting rooms for the Senate and for the House of Representatives in keeping with the importance of the deliberations of the legislative branches of the Government.

Please accept our congratulations upon the excellent results you have obtained. We appreciate your splendid cooperation.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:
Sincerely yours,
GILMORE D. CLARK, *Chairman.*

Furthermore, we have the report of the Committee on the Construction of the Roofs, and so forth. The report was issued by that sterling gentleman and former colleague of ours, beloved by every Member of this House, the Honorable Fritz Lanham. What does it say in this report? Here is what it says:

The plans, as submitted, represent designs developed by Francis P. Sullivan, associate architect, and Harbeson, Hough, Livingston, and Larson, consultants, in collaboration. The designs have the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts and the Architect of the Capitol, and they are acceptable to the several consultants on air conditioning, lighting, and acoustics, and to the structural engineers. In their present form, they are the result of the combined efforts and ideas of all concerned with their preparation.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. I might say, as a Member of the committee which has been appointed to go over the plans and

specifications for the remodeling of this Chamber, that if this amendment is accepted, it will mean a complete change of all the plans which will completely take us out of the coordinated efforts of the House and the Senate, so that we then cannot expedite the remodeling which this committee voted for last year.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman is absolutely right, and it is time that we entrust the affairs of this roof to men who have been educated in our institutions in architecture, in engineering, and in design, rather than to constitute ourselves as a group of professionals in the field of architecture.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HUBER. Has the gentleman ever known a contractor or an architect willing to cut down on the size of a job?

Mr. RABAUT. I am not suspicious of every man in his own business, but I should like to ask the gentleman, as well as the Members of Congress, is this a matter of your own personal opinion or does it go back to the people of this Nation? If so, why is it that we have built so many new State capitols and abandoned the old for the new? We are seeking here only to make a renovation of this hallowed room. So let us have no more talk about it. I ask for a vote, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUBER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HUBER) there were—ayes 72, noes 86.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. RABAUT and Mr. HUBER.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 83, noes 109.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For an additional amount for "Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration," $4,987,000.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RABAUT: On page 6, line 24, strike out "$4,987,000" and insert "$10,000,000."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the committee consents, reluctantly, to the introduction of this amendment. The Bureau of the Budget has received an estimate on the item but has not yet had time to process it. The committee itself has had its investigators working on the proposition for the last 2 or 3 days, but they have not yet had sufficient time to complete their investigation.

Enough is known, however, to indicate that there must be some increase in the amount of this appropriation. The amount provided in the last session is not sufficient to meet the needs of the agency.

Enough money is available to take care of the requirements for this quarter, and apparently we have funds available to take care of the situation until another deficiency bill can be brought to the floor.

However, in view of the vital nature of the proposition and in order to be absolutely certain about the matter, we propose at this time in this amendment an increase of $5,000,000, so as to leave no doubt about the matter.

Accordingly, the committee has authorized the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] to offer the amendment, and the amendment has the sanction of the committee.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Is it possible that this money may have been allocated to the States by quarters, in advance, and has already been spent, necessitating the closing of a lot of these offices and branch offices?

Mr. RABAUT. If the gentleman wants an explanation of it, here it is. In the Eightieth Congress their funds were cut $15,000,000. They had an increased load. Now they are feeling the pinch of the condition.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I was not asking necessarily for an explanation of it, but it is a fact that in Indiana there were 72 field offices of the United States Employment Service and they were all closed. We were able to get one of those offices reopened and kept open because the people had to travel about 80 miles. Perhaps a hundred people a week traveled 80 miles in order to sign up, and that created a hardship. So now we have 71 of the 72 offices in Indiana closed, and they say it is because they have already spent the money in the first half, which was necessary to carry through the whole year.

Mr. RABAUT. I may say to the gentleman that I was not here in the Eightieth Congress. The Eightieth Congress curtailed these funds to the point where it pinched the agency; so there is nothing to do except to recognize the condition in which they find themselves. They have money to continue; but they have not money to meet the program as it now faces them.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Then it is possible that the money for this quarter may have been allocated to the State and already spent; is that correct?

Mr. RABAUT. The agency administers these funds under the laws that have been enacted.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Then the gentleman cannot answer my question.

Mr. RABAUT. Not that part of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. SADLAK: On page 6, line 24, after the word "administration", strike out "$4,987,000" and insert "$14,000,000."

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday I talked of the necessity for increasing this appropriation. I gave the total of unemployment claims in the State of Connecticut as being 49,822. I want to submit to the House at this time that the total unemployed in the State of Connecticut has again risen during the past week, and as of this last Saturday, after a telephone call to the Department of Labor this morning, it is now 52,451, an increase of some 2,629 in 1 week.

I want to stress this one point. To process the claims it requires the same procedure for partial or full claims for benefits. It requires the handling personnel which is lacking, especially in local field offices. The individual States operate the unemployment compensation and employment services, they collected for the United States Government during fiscal 1948 some $200,000,000. The States received in return for the administration of these services $130,000,000; in other words, the United States Government made a profit of $70,000,000, and there is no earmarking of these funds. As a matter of fact, remarks were made here on the floor yesterday about contemplated changes and improvements of this Chamber even to the extent of installing neon lights. I submit that the money which has been collected from the employers could even be used for such purposes to the detriment of the growing numbers of unemployed who need expeditious servicing of their claims for checks to which they are entitled and need now.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SADLAK. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to associate myself with the position taken by my friend and colleague, and commend him him for his amendment. It reflects the new necessities brought about by increasing unemployment not only in Connecticut but in the Nation at large.

Mr. SADLAK. I am most grateful to the gentleman for his support. In the district he represents, one of the largest affected cities in the State of Connecticut is the city of Bridgeport, and they have some 10,000 unemployed at this moment.

This matter is nonpartisan, and we want to give the States the tools to work with to do this job properly.

I refer you to the hearings on this particular point and to the statement made by Mr. Harry Kendall, chairman of the Employment Security Commission for North Carolina. He there stressed the fact that we have an obligation to return these funds to the States so that they can do the job for the people who are entitled to this service.

I am told that it is necessary to wait from 5 to 9 weeks for the initial check because of the backlog of these claims in these offices.

I urge you to vote for this amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SADLAK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. What did the gentleman say the number of unemployed in Connecticut is?

Mr. SADLAK. 52,451.

Mr. RANKIN. What is it normally?

Mr. SADLAK. Well, in mid-October 1948, I will say to the gentleman from Mississippi, it was 21,000.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SADLAK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. There are a lot of folks unemployed. Many of those folks are experienced in clerical and office work of every kind. Was any effort made to bring those folks into the offices to expedite the unemployment payments, or are they just standing in line and doing nothing?

Mr. SADLAK. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that with the unforeseen change in employment or rather the loss of jobs and the consequent applications for unemployment claims, the States did not have sufficient funds to put on additional clerical help, and I say that we should have that additional help as soon as possible in order to properly audit these claims and process them in an endeavor to help the jobless who need the money.

Mr. JENSEN. There are all kinds of folks standing in line waiting for their checks, or to sign them, that would be only too happy, I am sure, to go in and work for the good of the cause without any compensation.

Mr. SADLAK. I assure the gentleman that such patriotism is worthy of praise, but it is conceded by both sides of the aisle that the Government now has some $70,000,000 in excess of the three-tenths of 1 percent that had been collected to be used for that purpose, and we ought to send back a larger amount of this money now for the proper administration of this service. With the large number of unemployed and more workers laid off each day as I have shown to you in my remarks yesterday and today and new claims to be made, the $14,000,000 of my amendment should be approved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, far be it from me as a member of the subcommittee dealing with appropriations for this agency to try to take anything away from them, but I think the fairest consideration this agency has ever been given has been given it by the deficiency committee here this afternoon in allowing $10,000,000 instead of the $4,987,000 allowed by the Bureau of the Budget.

I think it would be well if we went back a year ago. The employment services and the unemployment compensation boards of this country requested the Bureau of the Budget for $160,000,000 to run this program in this fiscal year of 1949. The Bureau of the Budget cut the $160,000,000 to $145,000,000. That was the figure we had before us a year ago this time when we were considering the Budget for the fiscal year 1949.

The Subcommittee on Appropriations for Labor and Federal Security cut the Budget request of $145,000,000 to $123,000,000 a year ago. The bill went over to the Senate and they increased the $123,000,000 to $136,000,000. In conference we finally agreed on the sum of $130,000,000 to run this agency for the fiscal year 1949, which was $15,000,000 below the request of the Bureau of the Budget and $30,000,000 below the request of these agencies to the Bureau of the Budget for the fiscal year 1949.

As I recall now, the figures that were presented to the deficiency committee at this time, before they were approved by the Bureau of the Budget, were figures that were arrived at last October or November. They did not take into account the increase in the work load that has developed since the first of the year 1949. As a consequence the Bureau of the Budget cut that $14,000,000 down to $4,987,000.

A year ago we gave a great deal of consideration to the establishment of a contingency fund. I thought a year ago we were going to establish a contingency fund. I think the committee was at that time in full agreement that a contingency fund should be established. It had been represented to our committee that that fund would be established by allowing 10 percent of the grant made; in other words, if we had established a contingency fund a year ago of 10 percent of the the $130,000,000, it would have been $13,000,000, and we would not have any need for this deficiency at the present time.

I hope this year when we finally write up the appropriation bill and report it to the House in the early part of March the subcommittee can agree on the establishment of a contingency fund that would take into consideration some of the things that we, as a committee, cannot foresee a year ahead. I know it is very difficult to look ahead for 1 year or a year and a half and determine what the work load is going to be.

State legislatures at times raise the pay of their employees. That is something we cannot foretell or foresee. It is one of the things we are up against when we make appropriations of this kind. But I do believe that the fair solution is to stick to the $10,000,000 being allowed by the Deficiency Committee at this time and that will serve to accomplish the purposes that we are looking toward at the present time.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Does the State of Rhode Island have the same percentage of unemployment as the gentleman from Connecticut says there is in his State?

Mr. FOGARTY. I did not hear the percentages, but I know that in the State of Rhode Island it is worse now than it has been in the last 10 years, that is, since 1939.

Mr. RANKIN. That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I am glad to note that the gentleman from Rhode Island has brought up this question of the contingency fund. I think it should be made crystal clear that the subcommittee last year was in unanimous agreement, including the gentleman who is now addressing you and who was then chairman of the subcommittee. But you will recall that we were not able to sell that to the other body. That is where the stumbling block was. Right now the subcommittee is considering the establishment of a contingency fund that can be utilized under authorizations from the Bureau of the Budget which will meet these variables found in the administration of these various grants in the States.

But may I ask the gentleman: He is satisfied, is he not, from the testimony that has been given by the administration itself, by Mr. Goodwin of the Employment Service and the people from the Bureau of Employment Security, plus the representatives of the interstate conference, which is composed of the State administrators, that this $10,000,000 will not do the job and that you will have to provide some money in another deficiency appropriation which will be coming along very shortly? The gentleman is satisfied as to that, is he not?

Mr. FOGARTY. I am not definitely decided on that.

Mr. KEEFE. Their story was this morning that they would need at least $20,000,000.

Mr. FOGARTY. But at the same time I am firmly convinced that the additional $5,000,000 which is being allowed by the Deficiency Appropriations Committee would be better than $10,000,000 in another deficiency bill which is to come later, because they need the money and need it now to take care of some of the deficits that arise at the present time in practically every State of the Union.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. SADLAK. According to the gentleman's own statement then, he is unqualifiedly in favor of my amendment to allow $14,000,000?

Mr. FOGARTY. No; I am speaking in favor of the recommendation of the subcommittee, which is found in the bill, for the $10,000,000, because they have gone into that in the hearings. They have heard the Employment Service. They have heard the interstate conference people on this particular item in the bill and I think that they have more knowledge of what is needed at the present time than any of the other Members of the House.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK].

It has been apparent to me all along from the hearings on this bill that the amount carried in the bill is totally inadequate and I reserved specifically in committee the right to support an amendment of this character, should it be offered on the floor of the House.

I think the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], has given the fundamental reason for the difficulties by which we are confronted. I suspect there is another reason. I suspect that the formula for allocation by FSA to the several States of the lump-sum appropriation made available to FSA by the Congress has been so inequitable as to penalize certain States while providing other States with an excess of staff. The formula has certainly been under fire for a year or more, and the record shows that nothing has been done to date by way of changing the formula.

Whatever the reason Mr. Chairman, it is perfectly apparent from the record that important States cannot function with the money now available, and that the amount carried in this bill is entirely insufficient.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, we are confronted by a serious problem arising from the flagrant abuse under this law, an abuse which can only be regulated properly if sufficient personnel is provided.

Some months ago, in October or November, the Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies met and determined that an additional $14,000,000 was essential to the proper functioning of these agencies—an increase of $14,000,000 was in fact recommended by FSA to the Bureau of Budget. So that all this substitute amendment asks for is the amount which the Social Security Administration itself actually submitted for approval to the Bureau of the Budget.

Since that time, as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], has pointed out, there has been a steady increase in unemployment and a corresponding increase in the work load of this agency.

I have a letter from the director of the Division of Employment Security in Massachusetts, a highly competent and conservative official, in which he states that the current work load in Massachusetts, is 43 percent higher as of January 26, than it was a year ago this time, and that he understands the increase in work load in some States runs as high as 200 percent.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. HAND. Prior to the work load being increased, in my State certain offices were being closed because of lack of funds. Is the gentleman satisfied that under the Sadlak amendment there will be sufficient funds, at least for the purpose of this appropriation, to take care of that situation?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am prepared to go along with the Sadlak amendment, in the light of the testimony of the organization to which I have referred; in the light of testimony embodied in letters which we have received from various governors of States, and in the light of the fact that whereas we are collecting about $200,000,000 from the States, we are only returning to the States about $130,000,000.

Mr. HAND. And this is the amount the States are asking?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. This is the amount which the over-all organization representing the State employment security agencies suggested several months ago as adequate, before the recent increase in work load.

In the interest of the unemployed, I urge the adoption of the Sadlak amendment. If that proves to be insufficient, further funds can be made available in the light of the two investigations to which I referred yesterday, one ordered by the Bureau of the Budget and the other ordered by the Appropriations Committee of the House.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I think in this connection it should be made crystal clear that the 1950 budget estimate, which is now pending before the subcommittee for this very purpose, gave to this service the identical amount that the Eightieth Congress gave, plus the amount of the deficiency recommended in this bill. So that the amount that the Bureau of the Budget recommended for these two services for the fiscal year 1950 was in round figures $135,000,000. That is some indication of the lack of consideration that they have received from the Bureau of the Budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] has expired.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the Truman depression is on. That is obvious, and this is one of the first recognitions of that fact.

I did not intend to inject politics into this debate. I simply asked the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] a simple question about the allocation of funds to the States by quarters, because I found that Indiana was extremely short on funds at this time, and 71 or 72 field offices have been closed. Now I want to remind the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] and the Members of this House that when the estimate of funds was made in that Eightieth Congress we had the highest peacetime employment of any year in the history of this country. Also, under that Eightieth Congress labor had the greatest income of any peacetime year in the history of this country. Farmers had the greatest peacetime income under the Eightieth Congress of any Congress in the history of this country. Those may be the reasons why we did not anticipate the need for allocating a lot of funds to take care of the 3,000,000 unemployed people we have today. Had the Eighty-first Congress continued as a Republican Congress, had we elected a Republican President and thereby restored and renewed the confidence of the people in their form of government, private enterprise, the free enterprise system, we may not have had this unemployment today, and we would not have needed any additional funds.

We must take care of these unemployed. We must reopen these field offices so unemployed people do not have to travel 80 and 90 miles weekly to sign up for unemployment compensation and look for jobs. I am willing to vote for whatever funds are necessary; but I do charge the committee with the responsibility of seeing that whatever funds are made available are used for the purpose of helping the unemployed. I recall when we cut the amount of funds for the expenditure of the customs department by 20 percent, and the administration went out in the field and cut off 80 percent of the gagers in the field, the men who collect the revenue. Right in my own congressional district in the little town of Lawrenceburg, a town of 5,000 people, where the Federal Government collects more revenue than it collects in the entire city of Chicago, the Customs Bureau took off 80 percent of gagers in the distilleries there. We cut the appropriations for that purpose 20 percent; but they cut the men who collected the revenue in the field 80 percent and kept the office padded with surplus personnel as they have done ever since the Bureau has been in existence.

The purpose of course was to close the distilleries and thereby bring the wrath of thousands of workers down upon the heads of the Congressman. The workers were led to believe that Congress was closing the distilleries.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am glad the gentleman has referred to the 1948 Treasury-Post Office appropriation and the funds therein for the Customs Service. The aftermath of that is this. When Customs came back for funds in 1949 they asked for $500,000 less than we gave them the prior year, proving our action was proper, and in the taxpayer's interest.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, when I asked a few mintes ago that debate be closed in 15 minutes I had in mind that the Chairman would divide the time for debate evenly amongst those desiring to be heard, or that 5 minutes would be reserved for the committee. I have since been informed that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], desires to speak to this amendment.

Mr. COTTON. I will take only one-half a minute.

Mr. RABAUT. I now ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], be allowed to speak for 5 minutes, and that I be allowed to speak following him for 5 minutes to close the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, it is not our concern here today to determine who is to blame for the unemployment existing in the country. It is very much our concern to see that adequate measures are taken to provide promptly the compensation for those who are out of work.

I rise in support of the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman

from Connecticut that $14,000,000 be included in this deficiency bill for additional grants to States for unemployment compensation administration expenses. This is approximately the amount asked for by the Bureau of Employment Security and was based on detailed reports from the States. The bill has reduced that amount to $5,000,000. The committee on the floor has now, in its own words, "reluctantly agreed to raise this amount to $10,000,000."

Mr. Chairman, I am amazed and appalled at the refusal of the committee to include at least $14,000,000 for this purpose. Last year we collected in this country over $1,000,000,000 from the employers of labor to provide unemployment compensation. The numbers of unemployed are greater than they have been in 10 years and still increasing. In my State the unemployment load for the last week of January was double what it was the last week of January 1948, and indications are that the load will increase. Men and women out of work are not getting their checks because the unemployment service has had to reduce personnel and cannot get them out promptly. The money has been collected from the employers of the country and indirectly from the wages of the workers. They are entitled to receive this help when it is needed.

The explanation given by the committee is that they thought $5,000,000 would take care of the matter until the next deficiency appropriation and that they feel that the proposed $10,000,000 is certain to do so. Some of us have been waiting anxiously for this deficiency bill to appear upon the floor. We have talked with members of the committee; we have telephoned the clerks of the committee. Our people back home have been crying for action. Six weeks have elapsed since Congress convened and at last the bill is on the floor. I am not criticizing the committee for this because we all realize the many details that have to be considered in a deficiency bill, but we all realize also that this is true of every deficiency bill and the next one is likely to be just as slow in reaching the floor.

Mr. Chairman, the most urgent need covered in this bill is this one for unemployment compensation administration. We cannot afford to run the risk of having the service run short of funds before the next bill. We are under an obligation to the States; we are under an obligation to the employers who have paid in the funds; and we are under a special obligation to the men and women who are out of work and who have been assured of this income.

Mr. Chairman, we are furnishing money to half the nations of the earth. We appropriated over $6,000,000,000 for that purpose in the last Congress and are preparing to appropriate 5 or 6 billion more in this one. We are appropriating money right in this bill for all kinds of projects, including an amount for a steam plant to generate power in connection with the Tennessee Valley Authority; power which will be paid for in part by the tax payers of my State to furnish cheap power in the Tennessee Valley to lure industries from my State and the rest of New England, and cause even more unemployment, and yet we are refusing reasonable aid to our own unemployed.

I must say that I resent rather bitterly the situation in which I find myself. I have waited anxiously for this bill. I have begged and urged that it be brought upon this floor that the unemployed whom I represent could be provided with facilities to get their checks. When it finally is brought forth I find only a niggardly and inadequate amount for this purpose and then I find that in order to obtain even that amount I must vote for a project which I think is incompatible with our system of free enterprise and which I know will take the bread from the mouths of some of the workers in my State.

I hope that the substitute amendment of the gentleman from Connecticut will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] is recognized for 5 minutes to close the debate.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, the committee has in mind to do no wrong. The committee seeks to provide this money, $10,000,000 at this time for the unemployment service administration. The committee is not closing the door to calls by this worthy agency for any future sums necessary. The committee is having its own investigators investigate the conditions in this agency at this time. Over and above that, the committee has called before it the budget Director asking why such a small amount was allowed at this time when the necessity appeared to be so great and when the cut in the last Congress was so drastic.

This increase in excess of $5,000,000 above the budget estimate is necessary at this time and as I said in the beginning the door is not closed to the agency for additional funds, the need of which I feel will be further augmented as a result of the investigations now being made.

At this point by special permission I place in the RECORD the telegram from Gov. G. Mennen Williams, of the State of Michigan:

LANSING, MICH., *January 25, 1949.*

LOUIS RABAUT,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Deficiency appropriations for State unemployment compensation administration will come before your committee Wednesday. Michigan, and I believe every other State, has been forced to operate hundreds of thousands of dollars in the red due to inadequate original appropriations. Suggested deficiency of less than $5,000,000 is completely inadequate to meet money already spent by States. Full information may be obtained from the Bureau of Employment Security as to the inadequacy of the Budget Bureau's recommendation. You can do the State of Michigan a good service by getting all the facts before the committee.

G. MENNEN WILLIAMS,
Governor.

The committee has been informed that the budget is having an investigation made.

It becomes apparent that we are trying to do the right thing by this agency. We are not looking into a crystal ball, as one gentleman said, misjudging the future by $15,000,000, and now grabbing the ball and saying that $14,000,000 is the necessary sum. No. That crystal ball was brighter in some folks' minds a year ago than it is today and it was looked into so many times, and so many times the erroneous answer came therefrom, according to the things we are learning now in the Eighty-first Congress, that I hope the committee will be followed in its decision for this sum.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SADLAK) there were—ayes 76; noes 97.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. SADLAK and Mr. RABAUT.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 101, noes 132.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

For an additional amount for "Tennessee Valley Authority," $2,950,000, to remain available until expended; and the limitation under this head in title I of the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1949, on the amount available for capital expenditures, is increased from "$21,689,000" to $24,639,000": *Provided*, That the limitation under this head in title II of the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1949, on the amount available for administrative and general expenses of the Corporation, is increased from "$3,677,000" to "$3,988,000", and the limitation therein on the use for such purposes of funds appropriated by title I of said act is hereby repealed.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER:

On page 7, line 20, strike out "$2,950,000" and insert "$450,000."

On page 7, line 24, strike out "$24,639,000" and insert "$22,139,000."

Strike out "and" at the end of line 4 on page 8, and the balance of the paragraph, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the funds appropriated in this act shall be used for the construction of a steam power plant."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the TVA at the present time has a capacity of 2,650,000 kilowatts per hour. It is selling 12,244,000,000 kilowatts a year. With what they already have coming in without this big plant, they will be able to sell 18,000,000,000 kilowatts a year, an increase of nearly 50 percent, and it is absolutely impossible that they can increase their consumption to that point in 3 years.

At the present time they have steam plants which they can use for firming power with a capacity of 448,000 kilowatts, and that is sufficient to take care of their peak. So much for the needs of the situation. There is no need.

They are not charging in the TVA enough to cover interest on the investment, payment of a reasonable amount

back to the Government, and the equivalent of the taxes they should pay on the basis that private concerns pay.

A similar concern with an investment of $492,000,000 as compared with their $480,000,000 for electric power pays taxes totaling $23,000,000 and as set up here the tax payment is only $2,000,000. The depreciation that they should charge according to the provisions of our internal revenue laws would be about $11,500,000 and they charge off only $9,000,000. They pay no interest on the money that they get from the Federal Government. The total cost of TVA power investment according to their own story is $480,000,000 for the electric power set-up and they have passed a bill here providing that they should only pay back $392,000,000 which is nearly $100,000,000 less than the cost—and with no interest.

This whole thing means that you and I, your taxpayers and my taxpayers are paying for the subsidy that is being given to the people who use the TVA power. Many large corporations are there getting low rates. The figures show that they get 3,472,000 kilowatts or one-third of the total consumption. That is the commercial and industrial figure. Those rates are very low—3.16 mills. I am taking these figures directly from the report of the TVA Authority, which I have before me. It seems to me that it is absolutely unfair on any basis for us to appropriate this money to throw even more money into a socialistic attempt to destroy private business.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by praising the gentleman from Tennessee who stood up here yesterday and defended the building of this New Johnsonville steam plant for the TVA. I think he was representing the folks of his State and coming from the side of the aisle that he does leads me more and more to commend the stand that he took.

I hope this bill can pass without a crippling amendment. I think it is justified. I think it is necessary and meritorious.

I am amazed at some of the arguments that my colleagues on the left side of this aisle bring up every time a piece of forward-looking legislation is proposed on the floor of this Chamber. Of course, they are in opposition to anything that will make TVA better and that will make it work. I want to see TVA extended and coupled in with the White River project in Arkansas and Missouri; connected with the Grand River Dam in Oklahoma, and the Denison project in Texas, and carried on up through my State of Missouri by Southwestern Power Administration, so that Missouri, Kansas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Texas can have a chance to become the great inland industrial empire that they have every right to become.

What makes the argument against TVA and anything that will make it efficient so amusing is because it runs along the same old pattern. Those opposing TVA say it is communistic, socialistic, unconstitutional, and interferes with free enterprise and puts the Government in business in competition with private industry. That cry has been going up from the left-hand side of this aisle ever since Woodrow Wilson was President of these United States. It was said that production credit was all the things I have just mentioned and that it would result in the ruin and destruction of every bank in the rural areas. The exact opposite has been the result. Those banks today have more money on deposit than ever before in their history. They have a larger volume of loans than ever before. They have more customers, whose notes, are good at the teller's window than they ever have had before. A little healthy competition improved the services of the banks to the good of everybody, including the bankers themselves.

Before the day of the Federal land banks, mortgage loans were made on a 5-year basis. Out in my country a farmer paid 7-percent interest and 5-percent commission to secure a loan, and in 5 years the loan was due, and for an additional 2½ percent he might get a renewal for another 5 years. So if he borrowed a thousand dollars and kept it for 10 years, he paid out $775 in interest and commission, and still owed the full $1,000 principal.

The Federal land bank was declared unconstitutional, communistic, socialistic, and all these other "istics" that come from the left-hand side of the aisle whenever legislation of that kind is proposed in this House. That argument is so old that its whiskers drag on the floor of this Chamber every time they bring it out. I am tired of listening to it. So you see their prophesies of dire calamity have failed to materialize in the past, and their predictions have proved wrong so many times that I am sure they will prove untrue in the future.

Let us give TVA, REA, and Southwestern Power Administration a chance to develop. REA brought the blessings of electric lights and power to the American farm, and permitted the hardworking farm woman to throw away her old coal-oil lamp and the farmer to discard his old smoky lantern that only served to make the night a little darker, and allowed them to have the blessing not only of electric light but refrigeration, hot and cold running water, and motors for the milking machine and the washing machine. The job is only partly done. Let us give REA, TVA and Southwestern Power the tools with which to finish the job.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER] has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can reach some agreement as to how much time will be required on this paragraph.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that all debate on this paragraph, and all amendments thereto, close in not to exceed an hour and a half, the last 10 minutes to be reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] is recognized for 4½ minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, and Members of the House, there are some facts in connection with this matter which I think are highly important, which I wish to call to your attention. I hope you will keep them in mind as we consider this matter for they correct certain arguments which have been presented by supporters of this amendment. This is not a question of public power versus private power in that the TVA is already in existence. We are in the public-power business through the national ownership of the TVA. This utility—and that is what it is—is the property of the United States of America; every dollar of its earnings belongs to the United States of America. Some opponents of the proper operation of this Government-owned plant will raise questions here, and I have heard them raised before, that the TVA does not pay interest on the investment the Federal Government has in it. I tell you the TVA must do more than that. It is doing more than that. Under the law which this Congress passed, with my support, the TVA, in a 40-year period, must return to the Federal Government in cash, if you please, the entire cost of the power-producing facilities; and, listen to this: When it does that, in 40 years, when all the cost has been returned, the Tennessee Valley Authority and all its assets still belong to the Federal Government. We are in the power-producing business in the Tennessee Valley; in fact, through law, this is the only public utility in the area. Let me repeat: This utility, the TVA, and all its earnings belong to the Federal Government. At the end of the 40-year period at the rate funds are being withdrawn all that money invested in the power-producing features of the program will be repaid and we still will have the TVA. So do not fall for the fallacious argument that interest is not paid.

The Tennessee Valley Authority primarily produces its electric power from water. Electricity is produced from a series of dams which provide flood control, navigation, and electricity. A few of these dams were purchased, most of them were built with funds provided by Congress. When the private facilities in that area were purchased as provided by law the privately owned utility then operating in the Tennessee Valley was operating steam plants along with its water generating plants because it has always been recognized as the proper way to have available the maximum amount of firm, year-round electricity. These steam plants were purchased by the Federal Government along with the water generating facilities. The TVA Act itself provides for erecting steam plants. Since the Government started operating the TVA, an additional steam plant has been built and its productive capacity integrated in the system to help firm up the water-power production.

You may ask, if they have steam plants, why build another? The answer is that since that steam plant was built, we have built a number of new dams,

which have increased tremendously the waterpower production, the hydropower, and now there is simply inadequate steam production to carry through the lean months, or months of low water supply.

You may ask, if this is a hydro or water-power development, why have steam? There is a real answer, a real reason for the steam capacity. In the fall and winter there is much water in the reservoirs. This will generate great quantities of electrical energy as it goes through those dams. In the summer and dry seasons, however, the water becomes limited, the amount of electricity which can be produced through these dams falls off.

Rural electrification associations, municipalities, and most other users must have dependable supplies of power—it must be available on a year-round basis. If it were not for steam power, the TVA would be limited in supplying such distributors to the electricity they could produce during the summer months. Much of the huge production during the water season would have to be sold to other users, whoever would be willing to take such electricity knowing it would be available for 5 or 6 months, knowing it would play out during the dry season. This would mean the sale of this Government-produced electricity at dump or low rates.

If we want to increase the availability of power for the public users such as the REA, the municipalities, we must firm up this power, produce steam-generated electricity during the dry season in order to bring the low point up, for the low point of production fixes the limit of firm power that can be sold on a year-round basis.

My friend from New York complains that much of the power generated by the TVA is sold to large industrial companies. Too much of it is. Who else is going to buy electricity available only for a part of the year, unless it be the privately owned utilities?

The Tennessee Valley Authority and all its assets belong to the American people.

We all have an interest in its proper operation, with maximum benefit to the people, with the maximum return to the Government which owns it.

In the absence of steam to hold up the total production in the dry months, the high production during the water season is what might be termed an undependable source of power and they have to sell at low rates. But if you permit the TVA to firm up this power and make it available on a year-round basis, the TVA can sell at much higher rates, firm rates, because it is worth more. This is the organization, proponents of this amendment say, they want to return to the Treasury what has been put into it. I agree with them on that. If you want to further increase its value and success as a worth-while financial undertaking beyond the point of its worth today, permit the TVA to firm up its power during the dry seasons and thereby let them sell their power at firm rates. Do not cripple its operation by denying funds for steam generation in the lean months. To deny steam generation is to go counter to the policy of the privately owned utility which served the area before the advent of the TVA. To deprive the TVA of a proper proportion of steam is to force TVA to sell its surplus power at low rates to the big industrial companies, of which gentlemen on the other side of the aisle complain. There is one other outlet for the surplus winter power and that is sale to privately owned utility companies. If they can buy the extra power produced in the water season at dump or cheap rates, they could firm up such power, sell the combined power at firm rates and make a neat profit, some say, of millions of dollars.

If there is profit in taking the high-water season production and firming it up, and thereby selling the combined production at firm rates, do you not think that profit should go to us, the Federal Government, which has put nearly a half billion dollars in this project, not to mention the benefits of having additional firm electricity for the further expansion of REA lines in this time of national shortage of firm electrical power?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is making a very important statement and I desire to yield my time to him.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman. I thank my friend from Tennessee, who I know is vitally interested in this matter. That is the situation in a nutshell. As I said, when we bought TVA it was understood that they had to have steam plants for the purpose of firming up water power. The private utility formerly operating in the area had such steam plant for its small hydro or water-power system. Such necessity has been recognized in every water-power development for the generation of electricity throughout the history of this country. The TVA now operates steam plants. However, since we have had the TVA, we have built new dams.

In the last 4 or 5 years through the action of this Congress we have added five or six new dams which produce hydroelectric power. We have produced more and more electricity by that means and now the steam power capacity for the dry or lean period is lagging behind. The actual production of electricity in 5 or 6 months of the year is away beyond what it is during the remainder of the year.

If we want the TVA to properly operate and to be the best possible investment on the part of the Government, we need to provide funds for the construction of this steam plant to firm up this current so it can be sold on a year-round basis to municipalities, to REA cooperatives, and to the other power users which is required in the basic law and which I wish them to do.

If, on the other hand, you want to take the development that we have developed in the Tennessee Valley at a public expenditure of more than $400,000,000, if you want to take the benefits of that expenditure of Government funds and turn them over to the big industrial companies or private utilities, for that matter, who will buy at dump rates, firm up such power with their steam plants, and sell the whole at firm rates and make the profit, you prohibit the TVA from firming up its hydro power by steam and you will do just that.

I believe the Membership of this House will take no such ill-advised action. You will want maximum service to the people, maximum return on the Government's investment, and I firmly believe that can be attained only by maintaining the proper proportion of steam power to go with the hydro or water power we have provided in the construction of these new dams.

You may say the privately owned power companies could firm up this power for the TVA. I asked that question of them and no offers have been received. They are all having trouble meeting their own needs. No. The power companies say, "We would buy the surplus from the TVA." Of course, they would buy it at bulk rates, cheap rates, forced rates, because in the absence of firming up, the TVA would be forced to sell extra hydro power to such takers as they can find. Some have said this possibility explains the many telegrams which Members of the House have received the last few days opposing this plant. As to that, I cannot say. I am sure that many of the senders have not understood just what issue is involved here and if they did, I believe they, too, would be for the proper operation of this public utility with maximum service to the people of seven States and with maximum returns to the Government.

The senders of many of these telegrams apparently do not understand and many Members here do not seem to realize that to prevent the construction of the steam plant would mean we would not fully utilize the millions and millions of dollars that this Congress put into the development of a great facility which provides all of the electricity for a great part of the people of seven States.

I do not happen to live in the Tennessee Valley. However, I have been for the last 4 years a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations that handles the TVA, and the need for providing this steam plant is so clear in my own mind that I wish I could convince you and point out to you that what this amendment offered by the gentleman from New York would mean is that, after we have already put this money into the TVA, we are not willing to let them run it in a proper way to render the maximum service and to make the greatest return to the Government on its investment, and, again, may I remind you, the minute TVA pays out, returns to the Government every dollar we have put in it, as it will, under the law, the TVA will still belong to the United States of America. So, at the end of 40 years the Government will have an amount of dividends equal to the original cost; in addition to that we will have a going concern, a property worth millions, which will bring in substantial returns in a financial way as well as render a fine service to the people of future generations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi the time reserved to me in order that he may continue.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I have always understood that it was not the practice of this House to permit one gentleman to yield his time to another in a situation of this kind.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no objection, it certainly can be done.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me be yielded to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I do not like to object, but obviously if 15 men stand up on one side of the aisle and all yield to one man——

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to state that the gentleman from Alabama is named on the list. He is entitled to his time.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I understand that.

The CHAIRMAN. He is asking unanimous consent that his time be yielded to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. I deeply appreciate the action of the gentleman from Alabama, who has worked untiringly with members of my committee and whose interest in and knowledge of this subject and problem is great. During this time which has been granted me, I would like to discuss certain provisions of the TVA Act which make steam generation more necessary than would normally be the case.

The Tennessee Valley Authority must generate its hydroelectricity between two water levels. The TVA must first provide flood control, and, secondly, under the basic act the TVA must operate its dams so as to provide navigation, and between those two requirements it must produce electricity. In the absence of these requirements of the law you might say, why not fill all the reservoirs in the wintertime with their 18 or 20 dams, hold all of such water, and let it out gradually so that it will last the year round or until the next rainy season. If it were not for the law itself, from a power-producing angle, that might possibly be done. However, in order to take care of flood control, the primary requirement under the law, when those reservoirs get sufficiently full, the TVA must let the water out so that they will be sufficiently empty to take care of the floods that may occur. On the other hand, you might say, in the summertime why not let all the water out, down to the absolute bottom of the stream, perhaps, and thereby meet their needs of this firming up of power? As heretofore pointed out, under the basic act the TVA cannot do that. Under such law, when the water reaches a certain low level the dams must be closed, for sufficient water must be retained to provide for navigation.

So the TVA is caught, and rightly so, in this multiple-purpose system, of having to produce power while keeping the water low enough to take care of flood-control needs and keeping the water high enough to protect navigation. Hydropower production is "Mr. In Between."

It means that in the wintertime when reservoirs would fill with water, they have to let it out to keep storage space available for flood control, and as they let this water out they must generate electricity, or the chance to develop electricity from that water is gone forever. Electricity so produced is for sale, but who is going to buy electricity which will be available only during the time the water is high and they are letting it out?

As I have said, there are two groups that might buy it. One is the big industrial company down there in the area who may buy it at that time, and figure on firming it up themselves by providing steam during the summertime, and the other is the big utility companies who might buy at these cheap dump rates, and firm it up and pass it on to the ultimate consumer on a firm rate, a high rate as compared to the dump rate at which they would purchase.

But there is another way for the matter to be handled and that is what we are trying to do in this bill. That other way is to let the Tennessee Valley Authority generate more steam power, and I say more, because they already are generating steam power; let them generate more steam power in the dry months so that this hydro power of the high-water months is available to the people of the area on a year-round basis, so that the TVA can extend this service to more and more REA cooperatives and to more and more municipalities, firm power, dependable and valuable. If we defeat this amendment, and provide this steam plant, it means a net income to the Federal Government, the Federal Government that, my friends on the left say, they want to protect. To firm it up, as provided under the original act here through an additional steam plant to go along with the five or six new hydro dams we have built, will mean an income of millions of dollars to the Federal Government, sole owner of the TVA and all its assets, including its profits. Vote down the amendment of the gentleman from New York. Thereby we will help to insure the maximum financial returns to the Federal Government by providing for the proper operation of the Government-owned TVA. We have financed the construction of many dams which provide a huge amount of power for much of the year; let us provide additional steam facilities to carry through the dry months, that the maximum firm, dependable power will be available to the REA, to the municipalities of the area, on a year-round basis.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment to eliminate the item for construction of a steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn.

As I read the hearings I could discern the same persistence of the public-power-minded people to insist in their will to drive private industry into the position of capitulation.

If they cannot achieve their objective in a direct manner, they do it indirectly.

Talk about monopolies. These people have gone so far that they will not permit any community who now uses their power to build a steam plant, should they wish to do so. And, not being content with staying within their own boundary, they are extending their tentacles into other areas.

Their attempt to justify this steam plant—as indicated in the hearings—is indeed the same pattern which is so clear to many of us who listen to the public-power-minded people. They just pound and hammer away at private industry until they so weaken it that there is very little resistance left, if any, in some parts of the country.

I stated last year that the electric power people in my district were building their own power plants. They do not ask our Government for a hand-out. In fact, they are now expanding their property to the amount of $115,000,000. Of course, that is because we are not handcuffed by any TVA, or similar set-ups. We still retain the rights of free people and we want to continue to be free.

But, under the guise of flood control and navigation, the taxpayers of the United States are now asked to pay the power bills of certain sections of the country. It reminds me of a case of paralysis agitans—creeping paralysis. If this thing is not curbed it will slowly and surely paralyze private incentive.

This appropriation to begin construction of a TVA steam plant at New Johnsonville is another step to state socialism.

The Tennessee Valley Authority was originally authorized for the purpose of harnessing the Tennessee River and its main tributaries to promote navigation and control floods. But instead, we see these tax-exempt or Government-owned enterprises in one area resulting in a greater tax burden on the taxpayers in the rest of the country and which will eventually strangulate free enterprise.

Such a steam plant as proposed for New Johnsonville would place the Government outright into a commercial business, opening the way for nationalizing of that business and thus creating a precedent for nationalization of other business.

The Government would be assuming a responsibility that does not properly belong to it by undertaking to supply all the electricity the TVA region may require, without limit, for all future time, thus saddling the taxpayers of the Nation with increased and continued expense for the benefit of a favored area.

Additional Government-subsidized cheap power in the Tennessee Valley can only hinder the efforts of other States to attract new industries and encourage the expansion of industries already there.

Steam-generating plants operated by the Government are alien to the original concept of TVA as a flood control and

navigation project, and will create additional Government competition for our privately operated electric utility companies.

Such projects as the proposed New Johnsonville steam plant is a definite step toward nationalization of industry, and is setting the stage for a gradual or piecemeal transition from our competitive economy to a Socialist state.

There can be no warrant for additional appropriations for a Government project which will mean further competition with private business. A measure of justification might be found in some areas where electric generation is the by-product of flood control or navigation. But when these bounds are exceeded and public funds used to create a steam plant for electric generation, then the sinister figure of Government competition with public business appears.

One is astounded by the figures which show how this competitor with private business is growing and expanding. The Government is contending for business with privately owned concerns. The time has come again for American citizens to ask themselves if they want this trend to continue.

Are industry and all the other institutions which in private hands made this a great country to become nationalized? Do we follow the steps of England, trembling and limited as they are, or shall the United States go the whole way and wrap the blanket of socialism around it and enslave itself to a philosophy which is so alien to our American way of life?

Now is the time to answer the question of Government competition with free American enterprise by stopping in its tracks this movement or any other movement to expand already overexpanded Government competition with private business and industry.

I ask that the appropriation requested for this steam plant be rejected in such a decisive manner that no further attempts will be made by those who try by every means at their command to force upon us another step to state socialism by putting our Government in competition with the American system of free enterprise.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I am going to speak on this amendment because I believe we ought to go through with it and it ought to be passed. I want to serve notice that I am going to vote against other projects elsewhere until I can get satisfaction for my territory. One of the Members said that the TVA would help in flood control. They cannot do a thing for us up on the Susquehanna River. At least they have not tried to and nobody else has tried to. They talk about logrolling. I have seen a great deal of it in the last 10 years that I have been in the House. The shoe is always on the other foot, whenever our area wants anything. The only thing they ever do to us in upstate New York is to roll us, but they never give us any logs. I think it is time that we had some flood control on the Susquehanna River.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], because he has a lot of levees of his own down there.

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman from New York that I have been a constant supporter of the St. Lawrence project to develop 12,000,000,000 kilowatt hours of electricity which is going to waste, and thus relieve his people of high power rates.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman is getting far afield when he gets into the St. Lawrence project. I remember he did that a couple of years ago when I took the floor. That does not have a thing to do with what I am talking about, which is flood control on the Susquehanna River.

Last year we were just about wiped out. Many of the 20,000 Endicott-Johnson shoe workers were left homeless. It took out the power plant in the city of Endicott. It was one of the most devastating floods in history. It took out many of the homes of the workers of the International Business Machines Co. in Vestal and in Endicott. It went on to prove that flood walls are necessary for the protection of that section of the Susquehanna River. I think it is time the House gave us some money for flood control up there, where we so sorely need it.

We are getting ready for our annual flood. I predict we will have an annual flood, because we have always had it, and the same answer has always been given us by Washington, "We are not giving you a penny for flood control up there." I say it is about time that we had it.

I propose to erect flood walls in the Endicott, Vestal, and Johnson City areas to protect some of the largest manufacturing plants in the entire country; plants that are engaged in turning out shoes for the military; shoes for the civilian population; some of the finest shoes that are made. They cannot function if the Susquehanna River is going to wipe out the homes and the cities of Endicott, Vestal, and Johnson City every year. It is time we were given some protection.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The gentleman is expressing the same ambition that we in the valley are expressing and I cannot see how the gentleman can oppose the amendment.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. But you are getting the fruits of it and we up there are out in the cold, as we always have been. You cannot help us a bit except to vote for an appropriation for these flood walls that I am interested in. I would like to see the House appropriate the money so that we can have the flood walls to keep the Susquehanna River from overflowing its banks every year.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The gentleman got the fruits of TVA during the war when half the aluminum in the country was manufactured in that district.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Not in my district. The trouble is the geography is limited to your part of the country, and we get nothing up where we are.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Does the gentleman have a bill in for an appropriation for flood control on the Susquehanna?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I certainly have.

Mr. RANKIN. This is the first time I ever heard of it.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That is not my fault. The gentleman is too busy with other subjects. If the gentleman will read the RECORD he would have seen it.

Mr. RANKIN. Well, I cannot read the RECORD all the time, but I am willing to help the gentleman.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman does a pretty good job of keeping track of things from what I have seen.

Mr. RANKIN. But this is not the way for him to get results.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. If the gentleman can think of a better way, I would like to hear it. Nevertheless, flood control is definitely a part of this program, and I would like to see it brought in for my section.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. PICKETT. Has there been an authorization for a flood-control project on the Susquehanna?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. We are waiting for a report. We have waited a year, which is far too long to have to wait, and we are about to undergo another disastrous flood before anything comes of it. We had better get busy before we have another deluge in my territory.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] has expired.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, in the exercise of our common sense, let us consider the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], to strike out of this bill the $2,950,000 for the Tennessee Valley Authority. Of this amount $2,500,000 is for beginning construction of the New Johnsonville steam plant, and $450,000 for the purchase and installation of two hydroelectric generating units at existing TVA dams.

First, let us get the undisputed facts. The 375,000 kilowatts of power which this steam plant, when completed, will produce, and the 53,000 kilowatts of power which these two hydroelectric installations will produce, are desperately needed by the TVA and by the people of the region which it serves, if this agency is to supply the demand that will be made upon it for power in 1951 and 1952. The undisputed testimony before the Appropriations Committee considering and reporting this bill establishes these facts. These facts are admitted by the private power companies' chief lobbyist, Purcell L. Smith, whose salary is $65,000 per year plus an unlimited expense account, and his witnesses and those who spoke

for him before the Appropriations Committee.

The report of the committee accompanying a similar bill to the one we are now considering, made to the Eightieth Congress which in summing up the testimony and insistences of Purcell L. Smith and his aids in discussing this proposed steam plant disclosed these facts: That unless this steam plant is constructed, and I now quote from said report:

> Although substantial additional power can be generated by installation of new hydro generators, it—

The TVA—

> is approaching the limit of the amount of electricity which can be generated by water power harnessed primarily for purposes of flood control and navigation. The proposal to construct this steam plant is based upon the recognition of these two factors, and is intended to provide additional generating capacity to meet the currently estimated requirements of the foreseeable future for electric power in the Tennessee Valley area (committee report, p. 12).

All the dams, all the hydroelectric generators, all the steam plants, all the transmission lines, all the transformers, all the property of every kind operated by the TVA is the property of the United States Government. The Tennessee Valley Authority is the medium through which the Federal Government, for the benefit of all its people, operates these vast properties.

The Federal Government does not pay taxes to itself on property which it owns, nor does it pay taxes on its property to any State, county, or municipality. The complaint of those opposing the above appropriation that the TVA pays no taxes on the Government-owned property which it operates, therefore, does not rise to the dignity of respectable nonsense.

When the United States Government acquires title to property either by purchase or through its construction by the use of Federal funds, it does not pay interest to itself on the property which represents the money which it has invested in such property. The insistence that the TVA should pay to the Government interest on the Government's investment in these properties is ridiculous.

The TVA was created and has been developed by the Congress for three purposes—first, for flood control. In 1927 there was a devastating flood on the Mississippi and its tributaries which destroyed property of the value of one-half the cost of the entire TVA project.

Second, it is to improve navigation. The Federal Government has the exclusive power under the commerce clause, the general-welfare clause, the national-defense clause, and the property clause of the Federal Constitution to control and improve the rivers, lakes, and harbors of this country in the interest of the general public.

This right of the Government cannot be challenged by a private citizen nor by any private corporation. Until the TVA was created in 1933 and until the dams which it has constructed on the Tennessee River and its tributaries were completed, the Tennessee River, due to the existence of Muscle Shoals and a sharp fall of the river through that area, was not a navigable stream above said shoals. Today this river is navigable the year round from Knoxville, Tenn., to the Gulf of Mexico and to the upper reaches of the Mississippi. And the commerce on this stream runs into millions of tons yearly.

The statement has been made by those opposed to the TVA, and I quote:

> TVA and the Federal Government have neither constitutional nor statutory authority to build this steam plant and that, therefore, the TVA is under no obligation to supply electric energy required by occupants of the Tennessee Valley.

And it is said that the authorization of this steam plant will set a far-reaching precedent. There is no foundation in fact and no authority under the law for these statements on the part of those who seek to defeat the construction of this necessary plant. The TVA Act, passed May 18, 1933, and amended from time to time, clothes the TVA with the right and power not only to construct dams upon the Tennessee River and its tributaries, but also—

> to acquire or construct power houses, power structures, transmission lines * * * and to unite the various power installations into one or more systems or transmission lines.

The TVA is further authorized—

> to provide and operate facilities for the generation of electric energy in order to avoid the waste of water power * * * to assist in liquidating the cost or aid in the maintenance of the projects of the Authority.

The act further provides that in the construction of any future dam, steam plant, or other facility to be used in whole or in part for the generation or transmission of electric power the Board is authorized and empowered to issue and to sell bonds not to exceed $50,000,000. The lawful right and the power of the TVA to construct a steam plant is further recognized by the act of Congress July 31, 1940, authorizing the TVA to begin construction of steam-electric generating facilities with a rated capacity of approximately 120,000 kilowatts.

Under the authority conferred by this act, the TVA constructed the Watts Bar steam plant at a cost of $60,000,000. The Government purchased the properties of the private power companies in this area, consisting of hydroelectric dams and steam plants which it now operates at Hale's Bar, Parksville, and Nashville and also other steam plants.

The TVA has owned them and has been operating them all the time. What is the difference, pray tell me, between the purchase of a steam plant already in existence and the construction of a steam plant? The Government has the power to operate a steam plant regardless of whether such plant is purchased or built by it.

Some of my friends opposed to the construction of this steam plant have made some rash statements and arguments against it. The weaker a man's case is the more rash are the statements he makes. It has been said today that the TVA has more electric power than it knows what to do with. I know that there is a shortage of power now in the TVA area. This is due to the long period of drought which we had in this region during the summer and fall of 1948. As a result of this shortage of power the Aluminum Co. of America at Alcoa, in Blount County, in Tennessee, which operates one of the greatest aluminum plants in the world, was forced to lay off 1,200 of its employees. That a shortage of TVA power is inevitable is admitted by the paid opposition to this steam plant in the person of Purcell L. Smith, his lawyers, and assistants.

Our good friend from New York [Mr. TABER] and he is a lovable man, and is conscientious about this matter, if he succeeds in killing this steam plant he will have succeeded in destroying the ability of the TVA to supply the needs of the present and future enterprises in my district and in my State. And he will, if he succeeds in preventing the construction of this plant, arrest and destroy the prosperity and future development of the people of Tennessee and adjoining States.

Mr. TABER. Oh, not now.

Mr. JENNINGS. Just be quiet. The gentleman has had his say. You are going to take this now, for the doctor says you need it; so just sit down and take it, it is coming to you. I hope that some of these days you will travel some Damascus road and that like Saul of Tarsus you will experience a change of heart, and that the scales will fall from your eyes; that you will no longer walk through the darkness with your headlight out behind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield my time to the gentleman from Tennessee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS] is recognized for the additional time.

Mr. JENNINGS. Some of the opponents of this plant ask: What about the industries of the other parts of the country? Bless your soul. We have not taken a single industry from any other part of the country. We were industrialized when the TVA came. We had the great Aluminum Co. of America, and during the war that company expanded its developments so that it produced enough airplane aluminum to enable this country to build and launch a fleet of planes that darkened the skies and dominated the battlefields all over the world. Not only that, as a result of TVA power in our region the atomic city was built in our midst. You cannot make aluminum without electricity; you cannot make the atomic bomb without an unlimited quantity of electricity. We are furnishing today to that great atomic plant there in my district 200,000 kilowatts of power. Not only that, the makers of atomic bombs are calling for more power. We

stand in the shadow of the third world war. Who is there who would paralyze the ability of this country to produce the aluminum that in the words of our leader and former Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOE MARTIN, "will enable us to raise an umbrella of air power over our own country and to carry the war to any enemy that may attack us." The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] said that during the last Congress, speaking of our effort to prepare for a threatened war.

It is said by the opponents of this appropriation that the Government has not the power to build this steam plant, that to do so is unconstitutional. No lawyer who has ability enough to get into any court of record that has the power to pass on a constitutional question would stand up here and tell this Congress that the Federal Government is without such power. Those who oppose the building of this steam plant cannot even get into court on this question; and they admit it. They brought a lawyer named Jackson down here, and I knew as soon as I saw the brief that was embodied in the report of the committee at the last session of Congress that it came from the office of Newton D. Baker in Cleveland, Ohio. I was on the power companies' side in the litigation when the TVA was attacked, and I, along with other lawyers, did all I could to question the constitutionality of the TVA act. We used the same arguments and relied on the same authorities as are cited in the antique and out of date brief filed in the hearings on this proposal. We were overruled by the courts. The power of the Federal Government to produce, transmit, and sell electric current generated by water power or by steam plants was upheld.

Here is what these fellows who are trying to kill this proposal admit, "Consequently, if your committee rules the appropriation for this steam plant and the Congress ultimately does so appropriate, no one can invoke a judicial determination of whether that action was in excess of constitutional authority." This is the language of Mr. Jackson, attorney for lobbyist Purcell L. Smith, used on the hearings before this committee in 1948.

My learned friend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR] pinned this lawyer's ears back when he appeared before the committee at this session of the Congress and, as we say down in Tennessee, "led him up to the rack and made him stem his fodder," made him admit that he could have no possible standing in a court, that no citizen, no power company or anybody else in this country could challenge the constitutionality of the TVA Act and the power of the TVA to build and operate a steam plant.

Why do we want it? We want it for national defense. We want it because in this country today there are 945 cooperatives that are carrying power to the farmers of this country in 45 States. We want it because in my district and in yours there are thousands of veterans, many of them with arms and legs off who are using and who desire to use TVA power. Many of them with TVA power are able to operate machinery they could not otherwise operate, thereby making a living for themselves, their wives, and their children. The other day I walked across the street from my office to a shoe shop run by two brothers who are veterans. They had all sorts of shoe-repair machinery operated by TVA electric power.

Down in my district and in other districts of the 80,000 square-mile area served by TVA power, within the last 3 years, electric energy has been carried to the homes of 250,000 farmers. More than 200,000 farmers are clamoring for TVA power today. No one in the world works harder than a farmer's wife and God pity Congress or anybody else who would deprive her of electric power in her home. The farmer works from sun to sun but his wife's work is never done. Do not paralyze and kill the future growth and prosperity of this great area in seven States. We are a part of our common country—our prosperity we share with you. Let us vote down Mr. TABER's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, for a fellow like myself, who has never been complimented for his oratorical ability, to follow my good friend, and a great American, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS], schooled in art of oratory, is quite a handicap I will admit. Even though the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS], does not agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and some of the rest of us on this particular issue, without a doubt the next time he speaks on the floor he will tear the hide off of the spending, wasting outfit in power, from the President right down the line. So I take this with a grain of salt. I know he is fighting for his people. But knowing what is deep down in his heart, and knowing what a great American he is, I know he would not knowingly do anything that would eventually destroy America.

Let us look at this picture for a moment. In TVA we have an area of our Nation which has been set aside as a separate and distinct empire within the great United States of America. It is run and controlled and dictated over by three men, and anyone who gets in their way can get in serious trouble.

Now, I shall not present a bill in Congress to abolish TVA, but I would like to go along with this Congress to build a wall around that empire within our empire so high and so strong that that kind of dictatorship as you have in the Tennessee Valley will not spread to any other section of America, because it is so un-American that any schoolboy knows if it is allowed to spread to the other 10 river valleys of this Nation, then 33 men can control the Nation, because he who controls the electric energy of America in this electrical age controls America. I do not want to see anybody, either private utilities or any 33 men control America.

The main pressure back of this steam plant is the cities in the Tennessee Valley that want to get cheap power: Memphis, Knoxville, and Chattanooga. I could go on and name a lot more of them. Yes; we built a steam plant down in the TVA area in 1940 for military purposes. You can read the RECORD and see that is what it was for. If TVA is entitled to this steam plant for the benefit of the towns in that area then most every community in America is entitled to a steam plant built with taxpayers' dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, it is my hope that the House will vote down the amendment to strike out the funds to begin construction of this TVA steam plant at Johnsonville, Tenn.

The object of this plant is to firm up the power now produced on the Tennessee River to the peak of the average year. Unless this is done, you will have a large amount of power produced, we will say for 6 or 8 months in the year, and then a drop for the rest of the year, instead of having a firm supply of the peak amount the year round.

This plant will not be a burden on the taxpayers of the Nation, but will pay for itself through the sale of the power produced, just as the dams on the Tennessee River are now paying for themselves. As every member knows, I was co-author with Senator Norris, of Nebraska, of the bill creating the Tennessee Valley Authority in 1933. We had a terrible battle, but we finally got exactly what we were asking for.

Before I would agree to introduce the bill in the House, I went over it with Senator Norris carefully, and it was agreed that three things, that I insisted on, should be provided.

First. That in addition to building all the dams necessary, the Authority should have the right to build power lines, including rural power lines, to transmit this power to the ultimate consumers.

Second. That preference in distributing this power should be given to States, counties, municipalities, and cooperative power associations, not operating for profit, within the distribution radius.

Third. That the Authority should have the right to fix the maximum retail rates at which this power should be sold to the ultimate consumers.

At that time it was understood that the distribution radius was 350 miles. That is what the Army engineers said it was in their report on the Tennessee River in 1930.

It is admitted by everyone that this power can be generated and transmitted economically at least 300 miles in any direction from any dam or any plant where it is generated in large quantities.

It costs on an average of four-tenths of a mill a kilowatt-hour 100 miles to transmit electricity over high power lines, or 1.2 mills to transmit it 300 miles. This was the testimony of the best electrical engineers in America, representing both sides of the power issue.

This power should be supplied to every cooperative power association within 300 miles of any of these dams in order to supply the farmers of the entire area with TVA power at TVA rates.

In 1921, the year I came to Congress, the electric utility production for the entire country, including both public and private utilities, was only 37,180,123,000 kilowatt-hours.

In 1948 it was 282,594,459,000 kilowatt-hours, or more than seven times as much as it was in 1921.

In 1948 private establishments that produce their own power, such as the Ford Motor Co., generated 53,741,019,000 kilowatt-hours, which added to the 282,594,459,000, made a total for the entire country of 336,335,478,000 kilowatt-hours.

In 1921, when we were trying to get the Muscle Shoals dam finished and the power distributed, we were told by the power interests that we did not need any more electricity—that we had a surplus.

Yet in 1948 we used seven or eight times as much as we did in 1921, and there is a greater demand for additional power today than there has ever been at any time in all the history of this country.

In 1921 there was not one farmer out of 100 who had electricity in his home. Today we have about 75 percent of our farms electrified, and we expect to continue the drive until we reach every farmhouse with a power line that we can reach with the draft in times of war, or that the tax collector can find in times of peace.

In 1933, when Senator Norris and I were carrying on the drive for the passage of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, the electric utility production in this country, both public and private, was only 81,749,000,000 kilowatt-hours, or less than one-third of what it was in 1948.

At that time only 10 percent of our farms were electrified, while Japan had 90 percent of her farms electrified, Germany had 90 percent, and both Italy and France had 94 percent of their farms electrified.

Today, after 15 years of hard struggle, we have 75 percent of our farms electrified, and the demand for this service is greater than it has ever been at any time since rural electrification began.

As I have said before, the TVA has wrought the greatest development of ancient or modern times, and, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], the greatest thing that could happen to the people of Iowa, who are overcharged approximately 100 percent for their electricity now, would be the creation of an authority on the Missouri River to harness that great stream and its tributaries, control its floods, provide navigation, and generate and distribute that vast wealth of electricity that is now going to waste.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Not just now.

Mr. JENSEN. I will fight it to my death.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, yes, the gentleman has fought this power program all along. He and I do not agree on this subject at all.

When I started in this fight, there was not one farmer in Iowa out of a hundred that had electricity in his home. Today they have over 80 percent of the farms in that State electrified.

If the TVA had been in existence in 1927, you would not have had that disastrous flood on the lower Mississippi. A reduction of 8 inches in the flood crest at Cairo, Ill., would have saved the people along the Mississippi untold millions of dollars. The TVA would have reduced that flood crest by at least a foot and a half by holding the flood waters of the Tennessee back and preventing them from synchronizing with the floods on the Ohio, the Missouri, and the upper Mississippi.

Electricity is the lifeblood of our advancing civilization. The cheaper the rates, the more freely it flows; and the more freely it flows the greater are its benefits to mankind.

It is the greatest servant mankind has ever known, and the only one the man or woman of ordinary means can afford.

It is doing more to brighten the homes, lighten the burdens, and raise the standards of living of the American farmer than everything else this Government has ever done.

This steam plant, as I said, is to firm up this power to the peak of the average year. We expect to do the same thing in the Central Valley in California, along the Columbia River, and everywhere else these great streams are harnessed and these plants are found to be necessary.

Oh, somebody says that the TVA is selling that power below cost. Your party was in power in 1930, and you had a great engineer for President. You were selling power wholesale to the private power companies at Muscle Shoals at 1.59 mills a kilowatt-hour and showing the American people that it would pay 4 percent on the investment. Today the TVA is selling that same power for more than twice that price, and you say they are selling it at a loss.

This is not to build up industries in the Tennessee Valley. I am fighting for the farmers and others who want this cheap electricity in their homes and small business establishments for 300 miles around, which is the admitted distribution radius of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

That would reach practically every farm house in Tennessee, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, Arkansas, Missouri, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Kentucky, and a large portion of North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia.

Let me call your attention to the fact that we have 394,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric power now going to waste in our navigable streams and their tributaries every year. If developed, it could be firmed up to the peak of the average year with 116,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of steam power, making a total of 510,000,000,000, which, added to what we are now using, would give us more than 800,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year.

That would be enough to run every industry and every commercial establishment, light every house and every barn, milk every cow, wash every garment, and heat every home in this country for centuries to come.

Then our country could go on down to the future, holding high the torch and lighting up the way for all other nations of the earth to follow, into the greatest era of progress and prosperity the world has ever known.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry that this debate started on a partisan angle. This is not a partisan problem. The differences of opinion go down the middle of both parties. We have men on both sides of the aisle who are very enthusiastic over public power development, and others who are violently opposed to it. This is not a Republican nor a Democrat problem; it is a national problem. Both parties in their platforms have endorsed public power. I point out that one of the authors of the bill creating the TVA was Senator Norris, a Republican. The other was our colleague JOHN RANKIN, a Democrat. Senator Hiram Johnson and Phil Swing, a former distinguished Member of the House, fought for 10 years for the Hoover Dam, which is one of the largest public power projects in the country. They were Republicans.

Let me point out one of the things that I think is important to remember in connection with the development of public power. In the first place, many of these great projects like the TVA, the Hoover Dam, Grand Coulee, and the Central Valley water project of California, would never have been developed by private enterprise. We had to have the public, who can afford to gamble on the outcome of the projects, finance and build these types of projects. It is not that they are not sound in the long run. They will all pay out, and pay big dividends in money and greater dividends in benefits to the people that benefit by them, but over the span of a few years perhaps the income would be insufficient to pay the bonds and the dividends on the bonds that private capital would be required to float to finance such projects. For that reason, we had to get these projects through governmental channels and with Government funds if the projects were to be developed to meet the needs of an expanding economy.

May I point out also that these developments, in my humble judgment, are not socialistic. For instance, the Central Valley project of California was really started on its way by a great banker, Rudolph Spreckels, a very successful banker. In 1916 he got behind what was known as the water power bill in California, which provided in general for the conservation of the waters of that great valley. I heard him after he had lost the battle, make the statement, "I believe in capitalism; but I do think that sometimes the people that are in control of capitalistic wealth overreach themselves."

I also believe that these great natural resources, such as we have in California, are our greatest assets in which the people have perpetual values, and they, therefore, must be developed in the public interest by public agencies. I also want to make the point that the problem being considered here is not confined to the waters of the Tennessee. We have the identical problem in California. You have it in other parts of the Union. To firm the power by a steam plant is common practice in the electrical business. Every private utility that is successful

does that very thing. It only makes the investment of the National Government more efficient by enabling these projects to sell a larger proportion of their power. The investment in this steam plant, which will ultimately be much larger, will bring back every dollar plus interest that is invested in it. That is why I think this amendment should be defeated.

We have heard this charge of socialism time and again in this discussion. Remember, that is a relative term. The world, and especially our country, is not static. We are changing from day to day, and some of the things that were thought to be socialistic 10 years ago are accepted today. Just think—over 95 percent of the cities of America, and every large city of America, owns its own water system. Hundreds of them own electrical distributing systems. In my own State we have 116 irrigation systems. Every one of them was established by a group of ranchers joined together in a semipublic body called an irrigation district to get water for their farms and ranches. Many of them have a by-product of electricity. You might say that that is socialism, but that is not interfering with the private-enterprise system of America, and neither will this project. These great projects, such as TVA, are developing and building mighty economic empires that private enterprise could not build up in centuries. In my State of California we are going to have a population of 30,000,000 people in the next 25 years. Why? Because Federal and State funds are going into the development of our water resources in California which will justify a population of twenty-five or thirty million people. All these empires being developed in the various river basins can only be successful if they are developed and started through the immediate provision of public funds. That is why I am in favor of this appropriation and am against the amendment to eliminate the item for a stand-by steam plant.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to commend those of my colleagues who have spoken heretofore in behalf of the pending deficiency appropriation bill to provide funds for beginning construction of a steam plant to be built by the Tennessee Valley Authority in Tennessee. I want to join with those supporters of TVA in urging the adoption of the pending appropriation to assure that this much-needed facility for the people of the Tennessee Valley be provided, and to urge that the House vote down the Taber amendment to kill this appropriation.

As the Members who were in the Congress during the previous session will recall, funds necessary for the construction of this steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn., failed to get the approval of the Eightieth Congress. Construction of this plant at that time was called vital to the extension of power from the Tennessee Valley Authority for industrial and farm uses and for purposes of national defense.

The modest sum that was asked for this construction was denied by less than 20 votes in this body. When the matter was brought before the Senate it was approved by a decisive vote, not once, but on two different occasions.

The question is before the House again today. I doubt if any legislation ever brought before this body has been the subject of more false propaganda, more misleading information, and more half-truths made in opposition to it than this legislation which we are now considering.

Only yesterday a distinguished former chairman of the House Appropriations Committee made the statement that three or four industries, including the Aluminum Corp. of America and the Monsanto Chemical Corp., had moved from the North and East into Tennessee and the TVA region.

These plants, Mr. Chairman, did not move from the North or East or anywhere. They have been there in the Tennessee area for many, many years. Testimony before the Appropriations Committee on this subject failed to disclose that a single industry has transplanted its plant and facilities from the North or East into the TVA area. The testimony did show that some few branch plants have located there and that there has been a normal and progressive industrial growth in the area. I want to get the truth and the facts in this matter straight.

The gentleman went on to state that the people of New York were paying the light bill for the people of the Tennessee Valley. This, of course, does not represent a true statement of fact. I should like to dispel this impression. Every kilowatt of power is paid for by the consumers. This is no charity operation. There is a provision in the Tennessee Valley Authority Act providing for the amortization of revenue to cover the cost of this great project and each year a percentage sum required by statute is set aside by the TVA and paid into the United States Treasury.

Another speaker in opposition to this appropriation stated that TVA had no constitutional or legal authority for its operations. In support of his statement he went back into ancient history and tried to dig up some old arguments which were used to oppose this agency of the Government in the very beginning.

Mr. Chairman, the constitutionality and legality of the Tennessee Valley Authority and its operations has long been established by the decisions of our courts.

This same gentleman went further to state that it was never intended that the Government should engage in the power business. I should like to ask this gentleman and others who hold this view what they thought was intended when the Federal Government bought out all the private power companies in the area of the TVA. The sale of private power companies to the Government was negotiated by the late Wendell Willkie.

When the Government bought out the property of the Tennessee Power Co. and the Commonwealth & Southern Utilities, it thereby went into the power generating and distribution business and thereby formed a Government power monopoly in that area. By what argument can it thus be advanced that the Government never intended to go into the power business when the Government, by its private power purchases, became the sole source of electric power for the people in the Tennessee Valley?

In these transactions, the private-power interests received the sum of $125,000,000 for their entire operations within the area. Of this amount the Government, through TVA, paid $59,263,122 and the various municipalities and distributors paid the remaining sum. The one single largest transaction was the outright purchase of the holdings of the Tennessee Power Co. and Commonwealth & Southern for the sum total of $44,949,400.

As indicated, the total amount received by the former private-power owners was $125,000,000 from both TVA and distributors. Could it thus be said that it was never intended for the Government to go into the power business after these transactions?

It was further stated on the floor yesterday that the Government is subsidizing the power consumers in the Tennessee Valley. The truth of the matter is that the TVA pays into the Federal Treasury each year large sums of money from its operations. Payments are made in the form of interest on bonds and the retirement of bonds and other receipts in addition to the sale of power.

Section 26 of the TVA Act provides for annual payments to be made to the Treasury from the sale of power. Section 26 payments alone brought into the United States Treasury in 1945 the sum of $7,087,741. In 1946, payments amounted to $7,971,278 and in 1947 $8,000,000 was paid into the Treasury, making a total of $23,059,019 in the past 3 years, which TVA has returned into the Treasury of the United States.

In addition, while the people of our region are being served with cheap electricity, the power-generating facilities of the TVA constitute only one phase of this great development program. TVA is concerned with navigation, flood-control, and conservation programs. These are all worthy and needed functions and alone fully justify the existence of TVA.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, the Democratic Party and, for that matter, both political parties have public-power planks in their national platforms and each party has gone on record as advocating the development and expansion of our natural resources in the interest of all the people. The Democratic Party in national convention last year adopted specific recommendations for the continued development of the Tennessee Valley Authority and the President in his recent budget request to this Congress asked for an appropriation of funds sufficient to start construction of this steam plant by the TVA.

This plant is badly needed, Mr. Chairman, to help relieve the power shortage and to meet the rising demand for electricity in our area and in line with the general economic growth of Tennessee and the South. The sum asked for this expansion work is not large, but the benefits which will be derived there-

from are great—great for our people and also for the prosperity of the people of the entire Nation.

Let me give you some other facts and figures with respect to this great facility in the Tennessee Valley. The Federal Government has an investment of more than $350,000,000 in generating and transmission facilities alone in the Tennessee Valley. These TVA properties and operations are owned by all the people of the United States. The people of the Tennessee Valley—7,000,000 of them, of whom 750,000 are users and consumers of electric power within this area—reside in seven States—Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, Georgia, Mississippi, and Alabama—an area of more than 80,000 square miles.

There is a definite concern, Mr. Chairman, on the part of the people of the area that the senior partner in this vast operation—that is, the Federal Government acting through the Congress—may not make sufficient appropriations to insure consumers an adequate supply of power. This is a partnership, Mr. Chairman, between the people and their Government. At the beginning of this great project—a project which would never have been made possible had the Members of Congress in general adopted a dog-in-the-manger attitude—the Federal Government through the Authority bought out the private power interests serving the region. In so doing the Government thereby became the sole supplier of power in this large region. It thereby also morally obligated itself to supply power for the people of the Tennessee Valley in quantities to meet their needs, both present and future. The Government should not go back on its contract with the people in this instance.

In the TVA the Federal Government—all of the people of America—have a sound investment. Figures prove this to be true. Therefore, from an economic and strictly business point of view this mutually satisfactory arrangement should be continued. From the standpoint of service to the people and the prosperity of the Nation the Congress should take no action which would, in effect, say, "This much progress you shall make and no more; thus far you can go and no farther." The Federal Government should not put a ceiling on power production nor freeze the amount of power which may be produced when electric power is so critically needed for our domestic progress and national defense.

The Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Krug, testified recently before committees of the Congress concerning these needs for additional power for domestic purposes, and also to help carry out the national defense requirements of our country.

Mr. Chairman, it is a matter of common knowledge that a power shortage exists in America today. Although some people want to debate this fact, everyone—even the most ardent advocates of private power—agrees that there is no great surplus or excess of power and they also agree that there is an increased consumer demand and a growing need for additional power for industrial and national defense purposes. All over the Nation power demand is pressing hard upon supply. This growing demand is a testimonial to progress. It is evidence of a growing regional and national strength. It should be hailed as a triumph of democratic achievement.

Mr. Chairman, I desire not only to urge approval of this much-needed appropriation, but also to protest the misleading information and false propaganda concerning the TVA which has pervaded this body like a London fog. Whenever any matter pertaining to the TVA has arisen in the past, this propaganda fog has gathered instantly out of a clear sky to obscure the facts and the truth. Today the smoke screen is denser than ever, and it has the undeniable odor of the private power interests.

From statements which have been made on this floor, Mr. Chairman, it seems one is being asked to believe that the fine and estimable people of the North and East are benevolently paying the light and power bills to save the people of the South from darkness. Need I say that such is not the case.

We have also been asked to believe that because of the alleged abundance of cheap power industries in the North and East are making a mass exodus into the area of the TVA. Mr. Chairman, I not only deny emphatically that this is the truth, but I shall prove my statement—a thing which opponents of this small appropriation measure have failed to do. Extensive hearings, Mr. Speaker, before the House Committee on Appropriations failed to disclose that one single solitary industry had moved from the North or East to the TVA region.

It is true, Mr. Chairman, that new industries have grown up in the TVA area, as I have pointed out before. But this industrial development has not been accomplished at the sacrifice of the industrial prosperity of any other region in this country. The development which has occurred has been a healthy advancement to which every area of this land is rightfully entitled. TVA only made it possible for our region, neglected by private power interests, to grow as the Good Lord meant for it to grow when he bestowed so many rich, natural resources there.

I should also like to dispel the impression that the Government is giving the people of the Tennessee Valley anything. Every kilowatt of power is paid for, Mr. Chairman, by the consumers. This is no charity operation. There is a provision in the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, Mr. Chairman, providing for the amortization of revenue to cover the cost of this great project and each year a percentage sum required by statute is set aside by the TVA and paid into the United States Treasury. In addition, while the people of our region are being served with cheap electricity, the power-generating facilities of the TVA constitutes only one phase of this great development program. There is the navigation program, flood-control, and other conservation programs—all worthy and needed developments within their own right—which of themselves more than justify the existence of TVA.

Members of this body who do not acknowledge the fact of power shortage, the truth of the situation in the Tennessee Valley, are hampering their own progress. What is good for one region is good for all. Opportunities for expansion cannot be bottled up in one region or another. When one region prospers, the entire country is better off for it. I could not bring myself to deny to the eastern regions the development of their natural resources, nor could I bring myself to snipe at efforts of the Northwest to harness the vast resources of its area. Development in those areas promotes general prosperity in all sections of our common country.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that we have too long overlooked the sources of the false propaganda that follows TVA like a haunting ghost. It is very definitely man-made, Mr. Chairman. It can be traced to the private power lobbyists—those masters of the man-made fog. They have been exceedingly industrious in this matter.

In the desperate efforts of the private power propaganda fogmakers, whole page ads have been bought in the daily newspapers. Shout the propaganda from the rooftops, is their theory. Spare no expense. Such magazines as Newsweek, World Report, and others—who certainly do not give away their space—have been utilized to spread the message of the private power interests in full-page advertisements. They have even created a special organization to spread their false gospel. I refer to the National Association of Electric Companies. This organization, Mr. Chairman, has bombarded the Members of Congress with cleverly drawn letters designed to give out a false impression and improper information on this subject. This campaign has been astutely planned to minimize and discount the benefits the public receives from public power through the Tennessee Valley Authority. They have subtly planted the seeds of doubt by insinuations against the TVA.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I believe it will be of interest to point out the National Association of Electric Companies is registered with the Congress as a lobby organization and that its official report to Congress on its activities shows that last year it was the third highest spender for lobbying purposes of any registered agency. They spent for purposes of discounting the benefits of public power, particularly the TVA, the sum of more than $304,000. And, Mr. Chairman, the sum of $65,000 of that avowed expenditure was salary for its No. 1 lobbyist in Washington. Such a salary thereby makes him the highest paid lobbyist in Washington today.

This highly paid private power lobbyist has produced many works of propaganda art. He has authored many fancy and costly brochures and pamphlets with which to educate the public. Let me quote briefly from some of this antipublic power literature:

The New Johnsonville steam plant, it was pointed out would lead to nationalization of other industries. Here is another:

It is the taxpayers in the rest of the United States who will help pay for the steam plant to benefit one privileged area. They subsidize TVA.

TVA is also called an unfair competitor and the charge is made that enlargement of TVA would be injurious to the economic welfare of other sections of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I should also like to point out that in the RECORD of Monday in the Extension of Remarks made by the distinguished former chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, Mr. TABER, of New York, an effort was made to deprecate the fact that he has received many letters and communications from the people of the Tennessee Valley expressing their pride in the TVA and what it has done to bring prosperity and well-being to the people of this area and the South.

I should like to state to the gentleman from New York and to this entire body that those letters which he has received represent a true expression of the feelings and beliefs of the people of the Tennessee Valley toward this great agency.

Mr. Chairman, among the purposes declared by the Congress in passing the TVA Act was to develop the resources of the Tennessee Valley for the benefit of all the people; to promote the prosperity and raise the level of income of the people of the valley; and also to strengthen the entire Nation by making the valley more productive. Progress has been made—progress in the development of our rivers for purposes of navigation and flood control, in the improvement of the fertility of our soil and the prevention of soil erosion through approved methods of conservation. A major portion of this progress is rooted in the blessings TVA has bestowed on the people of this region. Progress has also been made through the extension of rural electrification. Community and farm electrification has been developed and expanded. Our farmers and other individual consumers are making greater use of low-cost electricity. In 1933, when the TVA Act was passed, only 1 farm in 28 had electric service. Today 50 farms out of every 100 are served by electricity through our efficient rural electric cooperatives cooperating with the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Within the Fifth Congressional District of Tennessee, the district which I have the honor to represent, the farms in 1930 were only 5 percent electrified. Today a little more than 51 percent of the farms of the Fifth District are served by electricity. These figures, Mr. Speaker, show the trend of the current program which aims toward further expanded rural electrification within Tennessee and rural America.

In the postwar period alone some 1,400 miles of new power transmission lines have been built within the Fifth District of Tennessee. It is my hope that rural electrification can be extended to farm areas in all sections of our common country, as each strong region makes for a stronger Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I have voted for measures that have been for the benefit of the people of the North, the East, and the West. I have cast my vote for measures which were for the welfare of the people of other sections and regions. I have favored needed and necessary measures for other sections of our common country.

I fail utterly to understand the tragic shortsightedness which keeps men from realizing that prosperity has a chain reaction; that when one section prospers, other sections will reap a harvest of benefits. This Government of people from the North, the East, the West, as well as the South, should not—it cannot—be guilty of putting a ceiling on progress in the South.

Let us not take any action here today which would reverse the trend of prosperity. Let common sense prevail.

Mr. Chairman, it is my hope that Members of this Congress will vote the modest sum requested by the pending amendment to the appropriation bill for the Tennessee Valley Authority. I urge adoption of the amendment not only in behalf of the people of Tennessee, but of all the people of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] is recognized for 4½ minutes.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, the bone of contention concerning the appropriations to construct steam auxiliary power plants appears to be the profits to be made from the sale of seasonal surplus electric power now being generated by the Government-owned hydroelectric plants during the high-water season.

The question here is shall this surplus seasonal Government-produced power be sold at bargain rates to privately owned electric companies to be firmed up for year-round production by supplementing steam-generated power by private interest and sold at a large profit? Or shall the Government firm up this seasonal surplus power by the construction of its own steam auxiliary plants and thereby secure a larger return on its investment by selling this seasonal and steam-generated power on a year-round basis at the current price rate?

I am wondering how the gentleman from New York and his colleagues expect to win the confidence of the American people by opposing good, sound business principles in building these auxiliary plants, and firming up this power and increasing the return on the Government investment.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I yield.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. If the gentleman had been washed out as many times as we have on the Susquehanna, he would worry about it.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. What does steam plants have to do with being washed out by the Susquehanna?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. It has something to do with flood control.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. This is a plain business proposition. I believe no man on the Republican side would hesitate a minute to put in a steam-generating plant to firm up the power and increase the revenue of these Government plants if it were proposed by a Republican administration.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO] is recognized for 4½ minutes.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, I am from Massachusetts; and, of course, that State is not directly affected by this TVA proposition. It does seem to me that the arguments on the Republican side more or less fall by their own weight: On the one hand, we are told this proposition is socialism; on the other hand, we are told that this proposition is in favor of the vested interests, the big corporations down there. It cannot very well be in favor of both. In addition to that, we have, of course, the argument of sectionalism. That, I suppose, comes up more frequently on the floor of this House than any other place in the country. For the life of me, I cannot see how we can look at the TVA or any other public-power project from the point of view of what it is going to bring to our home States. Directly, it is not going to bring anything to Massachusetts; but, looking at the project in the light that I regard it, it is going to bring benefit after benefit to the whole country. We represent all the people of the country, not just the people of one State or district; we represent all the people of this country. I say to you that the TVA is a proven proposition; it is not a matter of prophecy, it is not a matter of experimentation. TVA has proven its merit time after time in industry, in production, in defense, in all the articles that go into the home to make our American standard of living the standard of living that we want for this country and for our children.

It is not a question of what is good for my State or what is good for any other State; it is a question of what is good for the people of this country; and it is the people of this country who own TVA. It is good for all the people, and that includes those in my own State of Massachusetts, which is far removed from Tennessee.

I hope that in the future there will be many other projects similar to the TVA, projects that will reach throughout this entire Nation, projects to which we can point with pride and say we had a hand in their creation. How are you going to do it if you vote against TVA here and now? How are you going to go back to the people of this country when it is something for your State and say: "Oh, yes, I am in favor of that"? We are either for or against projects like TVA, wherever they may be. It is a matter of principle, not sectionalism.

We must go all the way, the whole distance on this proposition. I say to you that power is probably more needed than anything else to improve the American standard of living. We are for or against it; there is no middle ground.

As concerns the statement of the Member who said that if we had 10 such valley authorities 33 men could control the country, let me say this: If 33 men could control the country through the control of power, what greater argument is needed for public power? And what greater argument is needed for the TVA

and every other single proposition that tends along the same line? You are either for TVA or you are against it. I urge you to vote in favor of it by voting down this amendment.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I am from the city of Chicago. I wish to subscribe 100 percent to the sentiments expressed by the gentleman from Massachusetts. As far as I am concerned I believe there is too much sectionalism expressed upon the floor of this House.

The benefits that flow from TVA will affect the entire country. Just as a few days ago we voted funds for the relief of a disaster which affected primarily the people of the West, yet that disaster secondarily affects the entire Nation as well. I believe, along with the gentleman from Massachusetts, that the TVA will do much to benefit and increase the prosperity of the entire Nation.

Mr. FURCOLO. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] is recognized for 4½ minutes.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I am amused, amazed, and disgusted by some of the statements that have been made yesterday afternoon and today relative to the New Johnsonville steam plant. It seems that some of our friends from New York, Pennsylvania, and Iowa have had the same fight going on since 1933. The same reasoning advanced yesterday by the gentleman from New York in opposition to this plant was the identical argument he used in 1932 when TVA was created. He is running true to form in his consistent support of special interests. In my opinion, the philosophy of progressive government advanced by the opponents of this plant, was well defined by the late, lamented, and beloved Will Rogers when he said, "Our policy is simple, nothing is no good."

There has been much talk about the constitutionality of the TVA. The Supreme Court of our Nation has declared the act constitutional. Today the gentleman from New York decries there is no need for this steam plant.

Mr. Chairman, as information for the opponents of this plant, there are in this 80,000-square-mile area some 6,000,000 people who are dependent upon TVA for electric energy. These 6,000,000 people, mostly rural, are in dire need of more power. We have 800,000 consumers of electricity today, within the area of the TVA, and hundreds of thousands more without electric power. These are not the big industries. They are the boys out on the farms who raise the crops that feed us. They have no electricity today. They need it to light up their homes, for washing machines, cream separators, water systems, various and sundry farm operations, and not to produce anything to be manufactured, but to feed the Nation in which we exist and reside.

There is a definite need for this plant unless you wish to segregate these 6,000,000 fine people. It is the obligation of this Government to take care of the people of our Nation and to protect them. By cutting out the appropriation for this steam plant you will say to those 6,000,000 people: "We do not want to have a thing to do with you; we want you to be backward, we do not want you to have any light or any power at all; we do not want any part of your future generation to be educated."

Mr. Chairman, that is not right. There is too much sectionalism brought up here today. I agree with the gentlemen who preceded me and spoke on that point. The gentleman from New York should bow his head in shame when he brings in sectionalism as he did yesterday afternoon.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I never mentioned sectionalism in my life.

Mr. SUTTON. I decline to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, during World War II when we went into the service of our country and when his constituents went into the service of his country, when we went down through the valley of hell fighting for America, we were not fighting for New York, we were not fighting for Tennessee, we were not fighting for Texas or Washington; we were fighting for America.

That is the attitude I take here today. This is not a sectional problem. This is not just for the South. It is for the United States of America. It belongs to the people of America, not to the State of Tennessee. It belongs to everybody in the Nation. I will give the gentleman from New York the best hat there is in Washington, D. C., if he will point out one industry that has moved from the North or Northeast to the TVA area since 1933. TVA is not in competition with the North nor the Northeast. It is strictly an American institution for all the people of our Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

I support it for the reasons which I gave yesterday during general debate. I support it for the reasons as a result of which after thoroughgoing debate on the floor of this House last summer the proposal submitted by TVA was on two separate occasions voted down by record vote.

This is not a question, Mr. Chairman, of being for the TVA or against the TVA. We are all for the TVA in its proper sphere of action.

It is a question of fair play to private industry and to the American people.

The facts are, as has been pointed out, that TVA under present conditions, with the subsidy which it receives, operates in such a manner that no private industry can possibly compete with it on a fair basis.

Until recently it made no reasonable provision for amortization or depreciation. Its interest burden has been practically negligible. Its tax burden has been estimated at somewhere between 10 and 20 percent of what anybody in private business would have to pay. I understand that a person in private industry pays more for taxes alone than TVA collects for the power which it sells. The net income which it earns, of around $17,000,000, is not even sufficient to cover what anyone in private industry would normally have to set aside for interest payments and for depreciation.

However you figure them, alleged costs of TVA are far less than the actual costs of private industry, and the people pay the difference in subsidy.

Until now TVA has limited its power activities to the generation and marketing of power incidental to navigation and flood control, in accordance with the clear intent of the TVA Act.

It now tells the Congress that there is an increasing demand in the TVA area which it cannot meet with its incidental power. It asserts a brand new obligation to meet that demand, and it requests the Congress to put it in a position, by steam-plant construction, to meet that demand, whatever it may prove to be, whatever its source, even though it can only be met by power over and above its incidental power and even though its customers are prohibited from steam-plant construction by so-called binding contracts with TVA.

This is a radical departure from the policy heretofore pursued.

I am against the proposal of TVA for the reasons which I stated yesterday. Limited time prevents any detailed statement.

I am against it because I do not believe that TVA has authority under present legislation to engage in the production and marketing of nonincidental power in competition with private industry, and because I believe that such a question of policy should not be determined in the course of considering an appropriation bill.

I am against it because the record indicates clearly that there is ample power available now and for years to come except for the prospective needs of big business users, such as the Aluminum Co. of America, the Monsanto Chemical Co., and other multi-million-dollar industries in and near the TVA.

I am against it because the prospective needs of big business do not need to be met by TVA. If steam-plant construction is necessary, the simplest solution is to let the industrial users construct and pay for the steam plant as they would in any other part of America. They will do it fast enough if they have to.

I am against it because I am against establishing the broad national policy which the proposal implies.

I can see no reason why the people of America, rich and poor alike, should be compelled to pay through higher prices and higher taxes for the power requirements of big business in Tennessee.

I can see no reason why government should compete with private industry on a basis which is utterly unfair.

I can see no reason for establishing a precedent which means increasing unfair competition and possible nationalization in this field and perhaps in any other industrial field in America.

Let us either limit TVA to its prescribed role or eliminate the present

elements of unfair competition immediately.

I hope the pending amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the matter before the Committee of the Whole now is simply a business one, whether we are going to make the Tennessee Valley Authority throughout all its activities in the distribution of power a real, efficient agency, or whether we are going to permit it to continue in its present ineffective form.

The Tennessee Valley Authority was established 16 years ago. Those of us who were here then remember that dramatic fight, the forces of progress against the forces who look backward. I stood in the well fighting for it then. On various occasions since, when various questions have arisen in connection with the Tennessee Valley Authority I have stood in the well supporting legislation that would make it operate effectively and efficiently. I remember that then the charge of communism was hurled at that project, the inference being that those who supported such a project were inclined in that direction. I do not think any of us who supported it need take a back seat to any of those who opposed it, in our patriotism. It is the basic issue that will exist a thousand years from now, the issue of the forces of progress against the forces of backwardness or the forces of reactionism. That is the issue which is involved in the question before the Committee of the Whole today.

The only purpose of this $2,000,000 plus is to determine whether or not the TVA will be allowed to operate as any other private power company would, with a steam plant to provide a steady flow of power throughout the year. All private companies possess such steam plants now. It is what is called a firm-up plant.

The opponents of the utilization of our natural resources—and that was the basic question involved 16 years ago—are opposed to this just as vigorously as they opposed the Tennessee Valley Authority 16 years ago. They opposed Boulder Dam, they opposed the Grand Coulee Dam, they opposed the Central Valley project, they will oppose a Connecticut Valley Authority, or a Merrimac Valley Authority in New England, which should be given serious consideration, and they will oppose the Missouri Valley Authority. Honest? Yes, I know they are honest in their view, but I sharply disagree with their judgment.

This project has brought benefits to millions of people. Private capital was unable to meet the situation. Tremendous floods, bringing in their wake destruction of property and danger to persons, had visited that great area of the country for countless generations. Were we going to permit that condition to continue? It was primarily a flood-control and navigation project. Then should we waste the tremendous power that could be developed as a result of our flood control and reclamation and irrigation? Common sense tells us that it would be a waste of public funds and a lack of common sense to permit the great power that could be developed as incidental to our flood control to be wasted.

So I say, Mr. Chairman, that this is another illustration of the time-old battle that was going on 200 years ago and 100 years ago and is going on now and will continue in the future—the battle of the forces of progress against the forces of reactionism.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield my time to the dean of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts has called attention to what transpired 16 years ago. I can go a little further back than that. I remember when the same forces that are now fighting this project tried to turn over Muscle Shoals to private industry. I remember when they were trying to turn it over to Mr. Henry Ford for little or nothing. I remember also that 14 years ago, under the leadership of a gentleman by the name of Hopson, forces were fighting the so-called holding-company bill, maintaining that it was a death sentence to the power companies. They spent over $3,000,000 in lobbying in an attempt to defeat that legislation, claiming that its passage would destroy the power companies. Sometime later Mr. Hopson was convicted for giving false information concerning his lobbying activities.

We did pass legislation that sought to relieve the situation to bring about cheaper power rates, but notwithstanding our action, I find today that the power companies which spent over $3,000,000 for propaganda at that time against the measure are also opposed to the construction of the steam plant on the pretense that it would affect the private power industry. The legislation which Congress has enacted in the past has not injured the companies and has proven of benefit to certain sections of the country in the obtaining of expanded and better power service and fair rates.

Mr. Chairman, the power companies are as wrong today as they were then in contending that public power service would seriously affect or destroy them. I have here a statement giving the profits of the private power companies. Not wishing to unduly encumber the RECORD I will list six or seven of the companies showing the profits they derived in 1948 and ask unanimous consent to insert them as part of my remarks:

Pacific Gas & Electric Co	$27,351,000
Electric Power & Light Corp	26,420,926
American Power & Light	23,392,937
Public Service Electric & Gas Co	20,400,912
American Gas & Electric	19,740,816
Ohio Power Co	8,906,893

Those profit figures do not indicate that the private power companies are suffering and in danger of being destroyed. The fact is that their profits increased from 5 to 20 percent in 1948 and the profits of most of the companies are the highest since they were organized.

Consequently, Mr. Chairman, with all this evidence before us as to the operation of the private power companies and being aware that these same interests have been able to influence the Republican side in the past, I regret that the Republicans in the light of full facts should continue now to endeavor to serve private interests as against the interest of the people generally and contrary to the good of our Government. The TVA has not only been of great benefit to that part of the country but also to adjoining States. It has been beneficial to the entire country and has proven that it can produce and furnish power at a much lower cost to the users than the private power companies and to a great extent its operation has served as a yardstick as to the rate to be charged for power service.

For these reasons I am for the appropriation for the plant as reported by the committee which will make it possible for the TVA to reduce the cost of producing the power with a corresponding reduction in cost to the users. I regret that there has been opposition to the provision and in view of the benefits that will follow the erection of the steam plant, I am constrained to say that those who are opposing the provision unfortunately have been led astray by the avaricious power interests.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; I will yield to the gentleman today.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman also add to his statement the fact that the private utilities are paying and have been paying for several years past in local, State and Federal taxes on an average the little sum of $650,000,000? Then, I would like to have you say, as a note to the list that you are going to submit, that we need the money in the Treasury of the United States to help build these projects that you are talking about.

Mr. SABATH. Where did they get the money? They got it from the people, from the consumers, because of the overcharges that they made. Otherwise they never could have made such profits that enabled them to pay the taxes which the gentleman mentions, and I presume the greater portion was for income taxes.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment to eliminate from this bill the item providing for the construction of a steam plant by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The bill provides for $2,950,000 for the Tennessee Valley Authority, of which $2,500,000 is to start construction of the new steam plant. According to the testimony before our Committee last year, the total ultimate cost of the plant, including auxiliary appurtenances for its operation, will be approximately $84,000,000.

My opposition to this proposed project is not based solely on the cost in dollars. By that I do not for a moment mean to imply that I do not consider the dollars to be expended important. In these days of many uncertainties, nationally and internationally, it is most important—indeed, it is imperative—that we concern ourselves about every single item of expenditure, however small. But, judging from what has taken place in committee and the nature of the bill before us, whatever I might say about the absolute need for economy will probably fall on deaf ears.

If this item only cost $10,000, or $1,000, or even $1, I would be opposed to it. There is involved here a fundamental principle. It presents by indirection an issue which we must definitely face. In this proposed new steam plant for generating electricity we are brought face to face with the fundamental question as to whether we intend to have the Federal Government continue to enlarge its operations in competition with private enterprise.

The proposal before us is a notable example of how, once the Federal Government enters some particular field of endeavor, the scope of the program invariably grows and grows. In the process the primary purpose of the program is completely changed, and new and different reasons are presented in support of the program or its enlargement. In the end we arrive at something altogether different from what was originally intended.

Take, for example, the school-lunch program. To be sure, that is not in issue here, but it presents an example of how these various Government programs are completely changed in character. You will recall that we originally entered upon the school-lunch program as a way to use surplus agricultural products. The primary purpose of the program was to help absorb the surplus in agriculture. It was part of the general program of several years ago to raise farm prices. And the subsidizing of school lunches for the children was incidental to that overall objective.

We still have the school-lunch program, and on a much larger scale than when initiated. The primary purpose now is to subsidize school lunches and the matter of absorption of farm surpluses is merely incidental, if it is even a consideration.

I am not debating the merits of the school-lunch program, Mr. Chairman, I am merely trying to emphasize how the character and purposes of programs of the Federal Government can be and are changed, slowly but surely, without the people actually realizing what has taken place. It is this very process that seems to be characteristic of bureaucracy which gives me concern when we have recommended to us such programs as Federal aid to education. I can readily see how that program can in the course of time be converted into something more than mere Federal subsidies to States for education, and instead can ultimately mean a Federal school system.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the item in this bill for the steam generating plant for TVA raises this question: Is the purpose of the Tennessee Valley Authority to generate electricity, or is the purpose to promote navigation and control floods? If you turn to section 9a of the TVA Act, there can be no doubt as to the answer. Let me read that section:

> SEC. 9a. The Board is hereby directed in the operation of any dam or reservoir in its possession and control to regulate the stream flow primarily for the purposes of promoting navigation and controlling floods.

Note those words, Mr. Chairman, that the dams and reservoirs are to be operated "primarily for the purposes of promoting navigation and controlling floods." Navigation and floods constitute the primary purpose. That is why the TVA was originally established. That was the argument made for its establishment.

I read further from section 9a of the enabling act for TVA:

> So far as may be consistent with such purposes, the Board is authorized to provide and operate facilities for the generation of electric energy at any such dam * * * in order to avoid the waste of water power.

There should not be the slightest doubt, from the language of the act itself, as well as from the testimony and debates at the time it was enacted, that the real purpose of TVA was to control floods and promote navigation. And, incidental to that purpose, the TVA was authorized to use such power as may be generated by the dams to control floods and promote navigation. It was logically contended that it would be pure waste to have all this water power without taking advantage of the electric power it produced.

Today we have before us a proposed appropriation for the construction of a steam plant. This is not a proposal for a new dam or a new reservoir. What is proposed here has nothing whatever to do with floods or navigation. It is simply proposed that we appropriate money for the TVA to build a steam plant to generate electricity. In other words, it is proposed that we change the whole purpose of the TVA, that we make it one vast public power project. This is a precedent, if there ever was one, for Government subsidized competition with private enterprise. If we adopt this proposal, we will be saying that a normal function of the Federal Government is to produce and sell commercially electric power.

The American people should bear in mind that they pay the costs for this operation. As has been pointed out, the net income which TVA earns amounts to around $17,000,000, and that is not even sufficient to pay for interest and depreciation. The costs of TVA are misrepresented. It is the people who pay the difference in taxes.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] who has just preceded me spoke about the profits of the private utilities. His figures may be correct. I shall not contest them. But I should like to remind the gentleman that it is out of profits that taxes are paid; and, as the gentleman seems to forget, the rates charged by utilities are subject to Government regulation.

I hold no brief for private utilities. I hold no brief for any particular business. But I believe in private enterprise, Mr. Chairman, and I intend to use all the energy at my command in defense of our system of private enterprise. It is in defense of private enterprise that I have taken the floor this afternoon to urge that the pending amendment be adopted, and that by our vote we declare that we intend to strengthen, not destroy, what has proved to be the greatest productive system in the world.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the committee yields the remainder of the time to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, it shall be my purpose to address my remarks primarily to the approximately 100 Members who are serving their first term in this legislative body, and to whom the TVA is new legislation.

I would like to digress for a moment to say that I have watched this freshman class. I have been made very proud of them today. I am ready to say now that this freshman class is the brightest prospect this Congress has had in the 11 years I have been here.

I regret that you new Members must undergo this baptism of fire and propaganda and pressure politics of vested interests to which you are and have been subjected on this question. It is not new to Members of the Eightieth Congress, nor is it new to Members who have served here in any year since the TVA was created in 1933. This is but a continuation of the same old fight.

Why is it that you are having long-distance telephone calls from people in your districts who are wholly unfamiliar with the TVA and its contribution to national defense and the national economy? Why is it you are receiving telegrams? It is because there are powerful forces arrayed against this proposition, the power trust, with the highest paid lobbyists in the world; Purcell L. Smith, as clever a gentleman as ever tried to destroy a Government project or to slit the throat of progress of 6,000,000 people. Sixty-five thousand dollars a year and an unlimited expense account he receives to propagandize you; and I am informed that in this fight he has contacted between four and five hundred thousand people, all for one purpose, to have them bring pressure to bear upon Congress, seemingly with particular attention directed to the new Members of this Congress. Do not fall prey to such pressure politics.

What is the TVA? It is a great, integrated undertaking to develop an entire river valley. If it is new to you, make no mistake about its being important. Why do I say it is important? Let me reflect just a moment to tell you that had it not been for the two great public power projects in the United States, TVA and Bonneville, neither of the atomic bombs that ended the war with Japan would have been manufactured. Today, the Oak Ridge atomic energy plant is the largest consumer of electrical energy

generated by TVA. It uses more electricity, for instance, than the great city of Memphis with its 300,000 to 400,000 people with all of its houses, shops, stores, and industries.

During the heat of the conflict, when the contest was as to who would dominate the air over Europe, over the Atlantic, and the Pacific, it was TVA power that manufactured 51 percent of the aluminum that went into America's airplanes. Make no mistake about this being an important issue.

Let me go back a little further, especially for the new Members. Before TVA, the Tennessee River was a wild, turbulent stream, racing through its rapids of 650 miles, uncontrolled; floods occurring, not yearly, but sometimes several times during a year, wreaking destruction and ruin. There was a 650-mile stream, surging with unharnessed power, meandering through a region of great natural resources of America, unnavigable because of the hazardous rapids.

So, there was the problem of navigation. There was the problem of flood control. There was the problem of power.

And, most important of all, there was a human problem. In that region, which was a part of America and still is, the people's per capita income was only 40 percent of the national average. Oh. We thrill at the rehabilitation of Europe, and when our great leader mentions in an inaugural address a program to develop the backward areas of the world we all cheer and applaud; but when something is done for an underprivileged, undeveloped area of America with a per capita income only 40 percent of the national average that is socialism. That is an invasion of the prerogatives of private industry.

With what private industry would this proposed steam plant compete? There is no private electric industry in the Tennessee Valley. By act of Congress the TVA was authorized and directed to buy out the private utility interests of that region. Thereby, Congress eliminated the question of competition, and set aside this area of the Tennessee Valley and designated a Federal agency, the TVA, to serve its utility needs, to construct those dams to serve three purposes, flood control, navigation, and the generation of electricity. This will compete with no private industry whatsoever.

Now, in doing this, what did Congress do to the people of that valley? You gave them an opportunity; yes, a wonderful opportunity—and we appreciate it—just as you have given an opportunity to Norfolk, for instance, by improving their harbor; just as you have given an opportunity to the people of the Northwest, of the East, the North, the South, and the West; and I hope much more will be done in that regard. But you also created a monopoly supplier, the TVA, where 6,000,000 people must look to the TVA for their power needs. They have no other agency to look to; no private industry to look to.

All over America there is one phrase that has a familiar sound: "shortage of power." What is being done about it? Purcell Smith testified before the subcommittee—it is in the hearings—that within the next 6 years the private utility concerns—and I applaud them for their efforts—have plans under way to augment their generating capacity by $6,000,000,000 worth of plant capacity. That is well and good, but what about the area of the Tennessee Valley, where you, the Congress of the United States, have said that we must look to this agency for our power? Demands have been growing there, too. When the TVA started, less than 1 farmer in 30 had electricity. We have made progress, yes—1 out of every 2 now has electricity. Five thousand new farmers are receiving electricity every month. Every time a 3-month period rolls around this year we are extending electricity to more farmers than had electricity in the entire Tennessee Valley before the TVA was created. Our power demand has increased by more than 1,000 percent. Now, are you going to place a lid on development? Are you going to stop the rural-electrification program in this area? Are you going to stop the lighting of veterans' homes? Are you going to say to the people, these 6,000,000 Americans, that although they must look to the TVA as the sole supplier of their electricity, we are not going to let the TVA increase their generating capacity—people of the TVA region, we are going to place a lid on your further development? Surely this Congress will not do that. I say "this Congress" because the American people rejected the bus-bar philosophy of the Eightieth Congress.

Before the TVA was created, the people in the Tennessee Valley paid 3 percent of the national income tax. Do you know what we paid last year? We paid 6 percent of the national income tax.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. SANBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. SANBORN. Mr. Chairman, as in the previous Congress, I am opposed to the granting of this appropriation to establish a huge steam-power plant in the TVA. The TVA was established to develop and protect the natural resources of the region but, as has been pointed out by friends of the TVA, its authority has been used to create a monopoly of power development. Today they use that argument to justify the necessity for the Government to go completely into the power business and to develop and furnish power for the territory regardless of the process of such development.

Advocates of the valley-authority idea are urging the establishment of other authorities, the first such proposals being the Columbia Valley Authority, which would include my district—the Second District of Idaho. Step by step they plan to blanket the whole United States with such authorities. Ostensibly these governments are for the purpose of integrating the development of the country on a more rapid and more efficient basis. But this growth of power monopoly in the TVA is a pattern and a warning for the rest of the country as to what a Federal monopoly it will expand.

Many of my colleagues have remarked that this item does not affect their territory, but I insist that it is only another step until their territory will be threatened with similar treatment. It is a fallacy to say that private industry would not furnish its own power if needed, provided it was assured that the Government would stop with the development of the natural resources. We need the Government to help develop our natural resources.

Of course, President Truman has asked the power to build and operate Federal factories where private industry fails to meet an enlarged demand. If it is to be the policy of our Government to crowd in on private industry and socialize it, then this new policy of building steam power plants points the way and accelerates the job. I am so thoroughly opposed to this item in the bill before us that I cannot bring myself to vote the benefits in the bill as long as this item remains. I cannot be a party to such a policy.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 86, noes 171.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. TABER and Mr. RABAUT.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 105, noes 192.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION

CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES

For an additional amount for "Conservation and use of agricultural land resources," for formulating and carrying out programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, including cotton and wheat marketing quota programs, $9,734,500; and the limitation under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1949, on the amount available during the fiscal year 1949 for salaries and other administrative expenses, is increased from "$24,500,000" to "$34,234,500"; and the limitation under said head on the amount available for transfer to the appropriation account "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938," is increased from "$7,000,000" to "$8,284,000."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there are only about 4 more amendments to be considered. We think we can dispose of them with 10 minutes of debate each. I trust everyone will remain on the floor.

Mr. Chairman, I now ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and that amendments to any portion of the bill not yet read be now in order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to make a statement for the benefit of the House. As I stated yesterday, if the program that I have announced for the remainder of the week is completed by tomorrow night, I shall ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjorn until Monday. The next order of business will be the continuation of the export controls. There are also two resolutions with relation to investigations which I do not think will take very long.

Then there is a bill reported out of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries relating to some of the activities of the Maritime Commission. My information is that there is no opposition to it. I make this statement to the membership so that my colleages will know what my intentions are if we dispose of this bill and the remainder of the legislative program.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: On page 14, line 2 to 5, strike out the following: "and the limitations under said head on force account activities and on salaries and expenses in connection with informational work are hereby repealed."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to retain in the present law the limitations on the amount of the appropriated funds that the Bonneville Power Administration can spend for force-account construction. Also the present law provides that only $50,000 can be spent for informational service.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. TABER. If your amendment is not adopted, then they can spend all of it for propaganda purposes; could they not?

Mr. JENSEN. That is right. They can also spend all the money that the Congress appropriates to construct projects by using day labor instead of following the regular governmental procedure of letting all its contracts to the lowest responsible bidder. The law at the present time limits the amount that can be spent by the Bonneville Power Administration for force account to 8 percent of the funds appropriated for each project. We placed that limitation in the law during the last session of the Eightieth Congress to safeguard the taxpayers of America against a program of hiring people by day labor to do these big construction jobs amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars each year. We had indications last year that that much of this work was to be done, more than ever before, by force account.

We felt it right and proper that a limitation of 8 percent should be placed on force account expenditures. In former years an average of only 5 percent had been spent for such construction purposes. The construction program of the Bonneville Power Administration has been going forward at a more rapid rate than ever before, during the last year and a half. Of course, it is a fact that the Eightieth Congress appropriated more money for transmission lines than had ever been appropriated before in the history of the Nation, not only for Bonneville, but also for the Bureau of Reclamation to expend. So it cannot be said that the Republican Party, which was in charge of the Eightieth Congress, was stingy with funds for needed transmission lines to take the power from federally owned and operated plants to load centers where the people, the REA, municipalities, and industries could come and get that power with their own lines, built with their own money as they should do.

The publicity limitation was placed in the bill last year to head off this great propaganda machine that has been built up in the Department of the Interior to such a degree that scores of their employees spent little time at the job they were supposed to do, but spent almost all of their time propagandizing for public power ownership, for a Columbia Basin Authority, for a Missouri Valley Authority, and for things which they were not paid to do, but which the Department permitted them to do. So we felt it right and proper and absolutely necessary to limit that kind of a program to $50,000.

I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] has expired.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] has offered an amendment that relates to two distinct provisions in the bill. One refers to a limitation on the informational work of the Bonneville Administration, and the other refers to the force-account provision. These limitations interfere with the proper management of the agency.

The Bonneville Power Administration has done a real job in marketing the great power resources of the Pacific Northwest. There has been virtually no criticism of the work done by this great agency. We have one of the greatest power-resource areas in the entire United States located in the Northwest. In fact, about one-third of all the potential hydroelectric power in America is in the Pacific Northwest. Obviously they cannot do the job if they are to be hamstrung by limitations.

During the last Congress a limitation of $12,500 was placed on all informational work of the Bonneville Power Administration, which includes all personnel of every kind. The Director of the Bonneville Administration would like additional funds to properly carry on the work commensurate with this vast undertaking. He has the problem of dealing with both private and public utilities. He is trying to do a good job under difficult circumstances. The private utilities today can spend thousands and thousands of dollars, not only here in Washington but throughout the country in propaganda work of all kinds. They have a paid lobbyist here in Washington, D. C., by the name of Purcell Smith, who draws a salary of $65,000 a year. Certainly it is high time that the public interest be adequately and fairly protected.

Let me turn to the other item, the force-account provision. Our committee is agreed that the work being done in the Pacific Northwest by Bonneville Power Administration and the Bureau of Reclamation should be done by private contractors. The truth is that prior to the placing of this limitation in the Bonneville appropriation approximately 5 percent of all the work was done on force account. In the last Congress an 8-percent limitation was written into the bill.

As long as the force-account limitation remains in the bill the private contractors have an unfair bargaining advantage over the Government. With the limitation removed the contractors will be forced to submit reasonable bids, lest the Government undertake to do the work by force account. Our committee feels very strongly that the limitation should be removed. We are not in disagreement regarding the right of private contractors to do the work; the question is, Is this the right approach by placing a limitation on the Administrator? The committee feels it is the wrong approach and not in the public interest.

It is unworkable if we expect a businesslike operation of the Bonneville Power Administration. I hope the committee will vote down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

All time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JENSEN) there were—ayes 63, noes 116.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask permission to extend my remarks. I take this time not to offer an amendment, but to read a telegram which has just been handed me. This is the telegram:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *February 16, 1949.*

Hon. JOHN R. MURDOCK,

House of Representatives:

Navajo schools will close March 15 unless $650,000 for operation approved by Budget Bureau is reinstated in H. R. 2632, deficiency bill now before the House. Urge you take immediate action to avert this calamity, considering only tragic emergency in lives of thousands of Navajo children.

ASSOCIATION ON AMERICAN INDIAN AFFAIRS,

OLIVER LAFARGE, *President.*

Mr. Chairman, this telegram comes too late, under the parliamentary situation, to remedy the defect, if such it be, in the finishing of the present bill. But I do want to comment on the educational situation of these Indians in general for the benefit of the Committee.

The whole public has been aroused with regard to the tragic conditions of the Navajo Indians. Congress appropriated generously a year ago for the relief of the Navajo and Hopi Indians, for which I am grateful in their behalf. But in the last Congress when we were considering authorization and appropriations for the Navajo and Hopi Indians I pointed out that what was even more important was a long-range development program for these sixty-five or seventy thousand Indians. Repeatedly I have called attention to the situation on the Navajo Reservation. Probably 20 times during the 12 years that I have been here, on the floor of this House or in committee meetings, I have called attention to a bad situation which needs remedying.

The Navajo Reservation is as large as the entire State of West Virginia, mostly situated on a high plateau. It has very few roads that are passable 6 months of the year. With 22,000 children of school age, not more than 6,000 of whom have ever been to school, their educational needs are among their greatest needs. Their leaders have repeatedly called for schools and hospitals over and above other petitions on vital matters.

I fear too many serious-minded citizens do not understand the immensity of this educational problem. I hear gentlemen speaking of "turning the Indians loose" and assuming that their children can go to school in the States where they live and that their education will be amply provided. Now, these are full-blood Indians, mostly classified as wild Indians. They have long been neglected by the Government and the appropriations made have been woefully inadequate. Without assessing blame on whoever is to be blamed, I cite a fact. This Navajo case is the most serious problem in connection with the whole American Indian question. The present item, important as it is, is a minor point, but I felt I would be derelict in my duty if I did not call it to your atention.

Mr. Chairman, it is too late in the reading of the bill to make further comment. I do not know the justification the service offered for the full budget amount, but I do know that there is a dire and lasting emergency among those Indian people and I have taken this moment to call it to the attention of the Committee.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, the Bureau of Indian Affairs has asked for an additional amount of $385,000 for welfare of Indians for the remaining months of the current fiscal year. I am pleased to note that the committee has provided the full amount in this deficiency bill.

I wish to point out that this deficiency request was made several weeks ago before the Bureau of Indian Affairs or anyone else was aware of the emergency situation which has been created by the unusually severe January weather in the West. The suffering of Indians on many reservations has been acute as the result of the recent blizzards, and the need for additional welfare funds is much greater now than it was at the time this supplemental request was made.

I am unofficially informed that the welfare account of the Indian Bureau contained $106 as of last Friday. The small reserve which the Bureau had as of January 1 has been exhausted by the allocations required for blizzard areas. Reservations in North and South Dakota have been particularly hard hit. The Bureau has made available a total of $29,800 for the Crow Creek, Rosebud, Pine Ridge, Sisseton, Turtle Mountain, Standing Rock reservations in these States. In addition, the State of North Dakota has made available $12,000 for the relief of the Indians at Turtle Mountain and local citizens and civic groups in the Dakotas and Montana have contributed to the assistance of these Indians.

In addition to these amounts, I am advised that the sum of $50,000 from the President's emergency funds was allocated to Indian relief and has been expended.

Before the January storms began, the Indian Bureau had found that heavy snows in some areas and drought conditions in others had reduced employment opportunities for Indians. In addition, assistance payments have risen due to increased living costs. As a result, the rate of expenditures for welfare of Indians has been considerably higher this year than formerly. The months from January to June usually impose the heaviest burden on Indian relief and assistance funds. It is estimated that 16,000 persons will require assistance during the remainder of this fiscal year. With these facts in mind, it is obvious that the full amount of the appropriation requested by the Indian Bureau is required to fulfill our obligations to the Indians.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Welfare of Indians: "For an additional amount for welfare of Indians, $385,000: *Provided*, That after the approval of this act no payment shall be made from this appropriation to Indians who are eligible for benefit payments under the Social Security Act."

The purpose of this estimate is to provide additional funds for assistance to needy Indans except those who are members of the Navajo and Hopi tribes and those who are eligible for benefit payments under the Social Security Act. Heavy snows and low temperatures in many areas and drought in other areas have resulted in a reduction in employment opportunities for many able-bodied Indians and in hardship to unemployables. In addition, there has been an upward adjustment of assistance payments to meet increased living costs.

For the current fiscal year, Congress appropriated $472,710 for "Welfare of Indians" of which amount $229,756 was earmarked for direct assistance. Our estimate was in the amount of $750,000 with an allowance of $492,367 for direct assistance. The reduction in the appropriation resulted in a cut of $262,611 for direct assistance.

Through November 30, 1948, 10,954 persons have been given assistance at an average monthly rate of $13.81 per person. This is an increase of 4,305 persons in the same period of the last fiscal year, and an increase in the average grant per person of $2.95. It must be recognized that the months of January to June constitute the period of greatest need until work becomes available. During those months in 1948, assistance was given to 33,338 persons. Our superintendents estimate that during the six remaining months of this fiscal year 16,000 persons will require assistance. It should be noted that these estimates were prepared prior to the recent blizzards in the West, and no doubt the number of Indians asking for assistance has increased very materially.

The sum of $297,017 of the appropriation of $472,710 has been expended up to December 31, 1948, thus leaving $175,693 available for all purposes for the remainder of the year. Of the $175,693 remaining, approximately $100,000 will be required to meet certain fixed charges, including payment of boarding home care, care of juvenile delinquents, burials, contracts, and salary and expenses of personnel. This leaves about $75,000 for giving relief or direct assistance which is entirely inadequate to meet the needs of an estimated 16,000 persons for the remaining 6 months of the year. Of the amount expended to December 31, 1948, namely, $297,017, $208,763 was used for giving relief to Indians, and $88,254 for all other purposes.

With few exceptions, the needy Indian is solely dependent on the Federal Government for direct assistance. Funds appropriated by Congress or tribal funds either authorized by Congress or under the immediate control of the tribe are used to give assistance to those physically handicapped, dependent or deserted families, those not yet eligible for old-age assistance, those unemployed for various reasons, and others who must be helped in time of need.

On many jurisdictions the resources are inadequate to support the population. Despite our efforts to induce employable Indians to leave the reservation for outside work, it is and has not been possible to decrease the relief load. Even though work is available, there are times and circumstances when the Indian cannot leave the reservation to accept it because of lack of housing, lack of skills to perform the type of work required, or because the earnings are not sufficient to support the individual or members of his family. Again, most of the work available to the Indians is seasonal, such as harvesting of crops, picking of fruit, road work, etc. Such opportunities usually provide employment for 2 or 4 months, and the earnings and savings are not sufficient to meet the needs of the family for the remainder of the year, especially when the Indian lives in that portion of the country, as many do, where the winters are long and cold, and where work is not available again until late spring. When the average period of employment is less than 18 weeks during the year and the average weekly earnings are about $37, or a total of $666 for the year, many families cannot support themselves on a 12-month basis, and assistance from the Government during the long, cold winter is necessary.

State welfare departments recognize the fact that the cost of living has gone up, and State budgets, which we attempt to follow within the funds available, have been increased upward. Increase in grants in line with State procedures and standards reduces the available funds for giving relief, especially when the amount requested was reduced and the amount initially appropriated is inadequate. A month-by-month comparison of the case load of the larger agencies sharing in this appropriation shows a substantial increase in the number of relief clients, which fact is also responsible for a heavier demand on available funds.

Reports from the field, including newspaper reports, indicate that the Indians in many areas are confronted with severe winter weather, heavy snows, and low temperatures, that work has terminated, and that many Indians had only short periods of employment, and in some areas, due to mechanization of the farm, hand labor has been sharply curtailed. Drought in other areas has seriously affected employment. Consequently demands for assistance have increased and are increasing. Information presented by our superintendents, dependent upon this appropriation, show that during the months from February to June 1949, inclusive, in excess of 13,500 Indians will need to be assisted.

Not only does the Indian Service give direct assistance to the needy but it is called upon to meet the cost of placing Indian children in boarding homes and in institutions, burial of indigents, and to give other types of service and assistance.

Of the amount requested, $10,000 is to cover salary increases due to Public Law 900.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: Page 15, lines 3 to 11, strike out the entire paragraph.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, this is an almost identical amendment to the one we just voted on and I shall not make any further comment upon it after the defeat of the last amendment for I know this amendment will meet the same fate.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: On page 16, line 8, beginning with the word "*Provided*", strike out the provision in lines 8 to 16, inclusive.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have just offered is to keep in the law which was passed last year certain limitations, the first being a limitation of $7,800,000 which we permitted the Denver office of the Bureau of Reclamation to spend for engineering services. That amount provided for over 1,800 engineers. Because of this limitation it was necessary for them to take a few engineers off the pay roll in the Denver office. Of course, as usual they were shifted to some other department of the Department of the Interior. A few of them got good jobs with private industry I am pleased to report.

The next part of the amendment is to strike out a limitation of $41,000,000 which we placed in the law last year, which was the amount that could be spent for administrative personnel hire for the whole Department of the Interior. The year before they had spent $45,000,000-plus for personal service and administrative expenditures. But, we expanded the construction program last year. We thought we were liberal and we limited the Department to $48,000,000. Now they say they must have a lot more, and want no limitation placed on them whatever. If we want to let them run wild and get nothing done, why this is a good way to do it; just turn them loose to spend and waste the taxpayers' dollars.

The next part of the amendment is a limitation which was placed in the law last year of 3,500 employees that could draw salaries above CAF-9 and P-3, salaries amounting to $4,100 or more. We limited them to 3,500 employees who could draw more than that. They had had something like 3,300. So, we thought we were liberal there. Now they say these limitations have almost brought destruction to the Bureau of Reclamation.

I hope the Members who want to get jobs done in the West, like all the rest of us do, who want the departments of Government to carry on in a sound businesslike manner and earn their money and not squander the taxpayers' money, will support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

All time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JENSEN) there were—ayes 62, noes 117.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WADSWORTH: On page 16, line 17, strike out the entire paragraph to and including page 17, line 4.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] and half by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, of course, I will be entirely frank with my friends on the Democratic side and say to them that I expect this amendment will be greeted with a roar of "noes." Yet I desire to call to their attention some facts. I desire to call to their serious attention these facts, and I do it in no partisan spirit whatsoever. I think it will be conceded by a fairly good number of my Democratic friends that I have not been overpartisan in my behavior in this House of Representatives during the last 18 years. The language which I seek to strike out is that found on page 16, and continuing on page 17, which, in effect, states that the Commissioner of Reclamation and the Assistant Commissioner and the regional director shall, each of them, have had 5 years' engineering and administrative experience. That provision was put in the law last year on motion made by Congressman ELLIOTT, a Democrat, from California. Upon yesterday in a talk extending about 22 minutes I attempted to give the background of that legislation. In doing so I made a series of statements with respect to the behavior of the Commissioner of Reclamation, Mr. Straus, and a certain regional director, Mr. Boke. Every one of those statements was founded upon incontrovertible evidence—every one of them. Some of the evidence came from the official correspondence of the Reclamation office; some of it came from the utterances made publicly by officials of the Reclamation Service, and some of it came from the sworn testimony delivered on the witness stand before our investigating committee by those officials themselves. What did the evidence show? Briefly, first, that the Reclamation Service in handling the Central Valley project undertaking deliberately ignored the intent of the Congress. The regional director of that project admitted that the course they pursued did not follow the intent of the Congress.

Secondly, they deliberately deceived the Congress with respect to the financial condition of the Central Valley project, giving the Congress no warning whatsoever, keeping it a secret that they intended to spend the entire year's fund in 6 months, which they did. And, finally, at a meeting of the members of this Reclamation Service at Salt Lake City, the Chief Engineer of the whole Service admitted that in evading the intent of Congress with respect to the discharge of certain employees, they had perjured themselves.

This is, in short, a list of their offenses. I confess that as a member of that committee I was shocked that men in the employ of the Government in positions of high responsibility should behave in such fashion. That is the way they behaved.

As I said a moment ago, the evidence is documentary and incontrovertible.

Now, I am not appealing to this committee on partisan lines. I am appealing to the members of this committee to see to it that a rebuke is administered for that kind of conduct. This provision was put into the law last year at the instance of a Democratic Member and it will have no deleterious effect upon the administration of the Reclamation Service.

I might remind you that in the long, long career of the Reclamation Service, which has been highly creditable until 2 years ago when these people came in, all but one of the Commissioners of Reclamation has been an engineer, and every single regional director, up to this particular point, has been an engineer.

I suggest to my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle that they vote to keep this Government clean.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this language was put into the bill last year at the behest of the chairman of the subcommittee investigating expenditures and propaganda in the Government. The chairman of that subcommittee, Mr. Harness, is not working with us any more. He was defeated last year. The other, a Democratic member at that time, chose not to run.

They tell you in this language that the Commissioner of Reclamation must be an engineer. Let us look into this.

In the year 1923, when the private utilities, if you will, tried to make the greatest steal that was ever attempted in this country, the project then known as Muscle Shoals, Wilson Dam—the Nation was shocked. Why? Because the engineer who at that time was Commissioner of Reclamation, backed up the committee and the people and told the people the truth. The head of the Reclamation Service at that particular time was an engineer, and was recognized as one of the three greatest engineers in America.

That is what you had in 1923. What did they do in this House at that time? They passed a law then discharging that man because he was not an administrator. He was an engineer. Now, what did you do last year? Because the Commissioner of Reclamation defended the public and the American people, the Eightieth Congress passed a law discharging him because he was not an engineer.

Now, what is the truth? You cut the bill 47 percent in the first session of the Eightieth Congress. Of course the funds lasted only 6 months. Anyone knows that and can understand why. The contractors were going to finish it in 6 months. It would not run over a year. I told you that in the committee. I spoke in this House and I said it will come back to haunt you if you cut it 47 percent. They cut it, and they slowed up the work and what I said came true.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Does not the gentleman recollect that the appropriation made for the Central Valley Authority was exactly the same figure as that requested by the President of the United States?

Mr. KIRWAN. Perhaps it was, but I am telling you what went on on this floor. When you cut that bill 47 percent, certainly they ran out of work. Construction had to stop. Now you have got an attorney pressing a claim here against the Government of the United States for $850,000 for stopping that contractor and running out of work, and not living up to the contract. That is what went on in America year before last.

Now, let us look at the Congress. Long before they ever had a President or saw a bureaucrat, the Congress was here; the Continental Congress.

Let us see if they practice what they preach. In the year 1947 there came to this House a man wearing the Congressional Medal of Honor—and others have down through the 165 years or so of this Congress—a graduate of Annapolis, one of the greatest heroes we ever had. Everyone thought he would be placed on the Committee on Naval Affairs; but, no, he went on the Committee on Agriculture. So it has been many times that people were put on committees without reference to their qualification to serve on committees.

But remember, back in 1923 the effort was made to discharge the commissioner who was an engineer because he was not an administrator.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. And also involved last year was the attempt of certain big interests to get rid of these two men because they were fighting for the principles established by Congress.

Mr. KIRWAN. The gentleman is correct.

Yesterday the gentleman from New York complained saying they petitioned the Congress and the press petitioned the Congress for those men. Who would they petition but the Congress? That is provided for in the Constitution. I certainly would have objected had they petitioned the British Parliament.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to tell the House that the present Commissioner of Reclamation, Mike Straus, was inducted into the Blackfeet Tribe in Montana last July 10 and was given the title "Engineer of the Wilderness." I submit that the awarding of this degree qualifies him for the position he now holds.

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes; and he has made a good engineer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

All time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WADSWORTH) there were—ayes 87, noes 136.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITE of Idaho: Page 17, line 9, after the word "Idaho", strike out "$300,000" and insert "$350,000."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of offering this amendment increasing the amount from $300,000 to $350,000 is, in the first place, to insert the amount that was recommended in the budget, and it also carries out a program that has been worked up by the water users of the Lewiston Orchards irrigation district and the Department of the Interior. If we do not add this amount now, it will simply increase the cost and delay the construction of this project.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to read to the Members a statement from the manager of the Lewiston Orchards irrigation district, as follows:

It is going to be a difficult operation to install our new pipe because of the interruption of service to 1,100 houses and small farms. Then we have the problem of trying to maintain the old rotting wooden pipe with heavy equipment working on or near it. Now that we have once started to tear things up, it would be a tragedy to have an interruption in the construction program. But the people here have experienced consistent aid from you, and they are confident that the appropriation will be forthcoming.

It was understood and agreed that the budget amount would be appropriated.

Mr. Chairman, it would be poor economy to cut off $50,000 just as a matter of economy, because now that the work has started, it should be carried to completion.

I wish to read at this time a telegram received from the secretary of the Lewiston Orchards Active Business Men's Association, as follows:

We wish to ask your assistance for reinstating the $50,000 cut from the Lewiston Orchards supplementary appropriations. We feel this cut would delay construction program.

Mr. Chairman, I have another telegram from the manager of the Lewiston Orchards irrigation district, as follows:

Was notified supplemental appropriations for Lewiston Orchards was cut $50,000. This will again delay our project. Please help us get this restored.

Mr. Chairman, to give you a reason for the urgency of asking for this appropriation or that the additional amount be included, I read from a statement of the Lewiston Orchards project, as follows:

When the fiscal year 1949 appropriation requests were made, final designs had not been completed, and therefore an accurate estimate was impossible. All materials, such as steel and asbestos cement, pipe, valves, and other miscellaneous pipe fittings, have considerably increased in cost from a year ago. Construction bids received have been considerably higher than estimated.

All piping and valves have been ordered, and contracts for both the main pipe line and the distribution system have been awarded. In order to continue these contracts to completion without interruption, supplemental funds in fiscal year 1949 are required. Without additional funds, construction of the badly needed water-treatment plant must be postponed until fiscal year 1950.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask the Members of the House to accept my amendment and vote back this small amount in order to complete the program. It is poor economy to cut the amount when it was in the program originally. This money is reimbursable and is to be repaid by these people pursuant to contract entered into with the Bureau of Reclamation. I again ask the Members of the House to support my amendment to add this additional amount, bringing it back to the original sum in the budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have up for consideration today the first deficiency appropriation bill for 1949. This bill contains items for construction, operation, and maintenance for the Bonneville power transmission system in the sum of $7,500,000. Included in these items are sums for the main grid system to carry Grand Coulee power into the coastal load centers of Washington and Oregon, particularly the Puget Sound area and the Portland area, and items for the maintenance of work schedules on facilities for service within the Puget Sound area. These projects have heretofore been authorized and in 1948 appropriations were made for them. However, the actual cost of the construction of the transmission lines and facilities is approximately 20 percent greater than was estimated at the time the appropriations were made. It is apparent, therefore, that it will be absolutely impossible to complete these lines which are under construction, on schedule, with the money which was appropriated last year. If they are to be completed on time additional funds must be appropriated by this bill.

May I say to my colleagues that the completion of these and other key supply lines for the Puget Sound area is a matter of vital concern to the people of my area. During recent months there has been a definite shortage of power in the Pacific Northwest. There has been a considerable voluntary curtailment of use of power by the people. Notwithstanding this fact the demands for power are such that if they are not soon met the entire economy of the area will be seriously affected. Not only is the present situation serious but there is also urgent need for increased power in the months and years ahead. The Bonneville Power Administration is hard-put to keep up with its proposed schedules. If this deficiency appropriation is not granted the whole program will be handicapped and bogged down. May I say parenthetically that if the economy of the Pacific Northwest is affected so will that of the entire country. I trust that the Members will not view this matter as a particularly local issue. This is a Federal project which we in Congress have authorized and is one which we should push to completion according to schedule and as rapidly as possible. I trust that you will vote favorably upon this appropriation.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, now that the Indians have made Mike Straus Engineer of the Wilderness, I want to revert back to the subject of Indians. I am going to make it brief.

Mr. Chairman, in the enactment of this deficiency bill, this Congress is being asked, without being fully advised as to the consequences, to make a most important policy decision affecting three States, the States of New Mexico and Arizona on the one hand, and the "Navajo-Hopi Reservation state," which comprises some 25,000 square miles equal in area to the States of Massachusetts, New Jersey, Connecticut, Delaware, and Rhode Island, all put together, on the other.

Since the enactment of this bill as now written will have serious repercussions in our dealings with the Indians, I hope the House will bear with me if I discuss the situation briefly.

At the outset, I must say that at every turn it has been the Indian Office in charge of these affairs which is responsible for these errors, and that the Congress cannot be blamed except perhaps for our failure to demand and obtain full and complete information. Even in that respect the Congress has done all it can in attempting to so demand information from the Indian Office, as I will point out in the course of my discussion. In the report of the committee on this very bill, the committee has reprimanded the Indian Office in the following strong terms which I quote:

The committee will not here recount its comments on the maladministration in the Bureau of Indian Affairs brought to light in its report on the Department of the Interior appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1949. However, it does wish to serve notice that such testimony and lack of knowledge on the part of officials representing this service will not be tolerated in the future. Present funds available for the education program are adequate to meet requirements until at least the 1st of April and the committee will consider the matter further only when it is able to secure firm data on which to base a judgment.

The committee is fully aware of the responsibilities of the Government to the Indians resident on reservations and is more than anxious to provide every dollar needed to discharge fully not only the recognized legal obligations, but also those obligations which humanitarian instincts dictate. It does not appear, however, that more than a passive appreciation of these problems is manifest by those whose responsibility it is to administer the laws passed by the Congress.

As early as June 1946 I appeared before the Committee on Appropriations to point out the intolerable and shameful situation existing in the Navajo-Hopi Reservation. I explained to the committee that though we understood the need for immediate action, my office had not the facilities to present facts and figures in detail, but that I was sure the Indian Office had done so. I quote a part of the record to show that the Indian Office seemed to be wholly unaware of the necessity for presenting the facts to the committee:

Mr. FERNANDEZ • • • I appear before this committee today not asking anything for the voters of my State. I appear for the voteless and voiceless Indians of the Navajo country and their children. The situation with respect to the education of the children of the Navajo Indians is deplorable. The people of the State, all over the State, not only around the Navajo country but all over the State, are alarmed. I think it has reached, in my opinion, the proportions of a public scandal.

I appear here more with a plea than as a witness. I assume that the facts have been carefully set out before the committee by the Office of Indian Affairs.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Let me say to you right here that the committee has not been fully advised.

Shortly after the clamor for investigations grew so loud that magazines and newspapers sent correspondents to that area, and as a result of the findings made by those writers and by some subcommittees of the House and Senate half a million dollars was appropriated in a supplemental bill in the spring of 1948 to handle the situation until the 1st of July of that year. Added to that appropriation, the Red Cross made available an additional $100,000. Civic and charitable organizations and individual citizens undertook to send charity bundles to the reservation. All of these moneys and all of this help was used within that fiscal year, and it was not enough. Yet, in the face of that experience, when the Indian Office appeared before the committee asking for appropriations for the fiscal year 1949 they requested only $120,000.

When the bill came to this body I called the attention of the Congress to the situation, and I said:

I am duty bound to call attention of the House to the fact that although the committee approved every cent that was asked for the Navajo Indians for welfare work, $120,000, that, in my opinion, is not enough. The Department asked for only $120,000 and I am not blaming the committee for not allowing more; but the fact is that in this Congress year after year the Indian Office has not asked for near enough for that purpose. Consequently, last year, as you will recall, we had to appropriate supplemental funds to the tune of $500,000. That is going to happen again. I hope that by the time the bill gets to conference the committee will have the true facts presented independently of the Indian Office if necessary and that proper provision is timely made. The Indian Office in Washington may not know that they are insufficient—apparently they do not; but the superintendent of the reservation and all those who work in the reservation or have studied conditions out there know that $120,000 is not going to take care of the situation on the Navajo Indian Reservation. It seems that year after year a ceiling is placed on the total they can request, and the Washington Indian Office takes it out on the item of welfare and relief for Indians. It is time that somebody in that Office had the courage to tell Congress what the superintendent out there tells us but is not allowed to tell Congress. I am tired of this, and have come to the conclusion that the reservation should be placed out of the hands of the Indian Office.

That bill went to the Senate and the Senate in its wisdom increased the appropriation for welfare by $750,000, making a total of $870,000, as I understand the record. In conference, the sum of $500,000 was agreed upon for welfare of the Navajo-Hopi Indians and the conference committee said in its report to the Indian Office:

Conferees request that the Indian Bureau submit a report to the Congress early in the next regular session on conditions as to the general welfare of the Navajo and Hopi Indians.

It appears now that this demand on the part of the House through its conferees has been wantonly ignored. So far as I can find, no such report has been made. On the contrary, they came to the subcommittee handling this deficiency bill and they came wholly unprepared to answer the simplest questions. They requested funds for only three main

items: First, $300,000 for increases in salaries under Public Law 900, which is self-explanatory; second, $550,000 to prevent closing of the schools on the Navajo-Hopi Reservation; and, third, $385,000 for the welfare of Indians.

With respect to the item for schools they were so utterly confused and unprepared to answer that the committee very properly, in my opinion, refused to make a guess as to what they should be allowed for that in this deficiency bill. As to the item for welfare of Indians, they were as utterly confused and even more so. A reading of the hearings will convince anyone that the committee was completely disgusted with their presentation. They were requested to come back the next day and did no better. The subcommittee, nevertheless, in its anxiety to prevent human suffering, chose to err on the side of humanity and granted the full $385,000.

At the hearing of the main committee I undertook to congratulate the committee on its wisdom and generosity, notwithstanding the poor showing, in allowing this amount for welfare relief of Indians, and then for the first time, to my dismay and consternation, I found that not one dime of that money goes to either the Hopi or the Navajo Indians; that not one dime had been asked for that purpose and that only $60,000 included in the item designated as "Agency services" had been requested. Turning to the testimony, I find, on page 178, the statement with respect to that request, which is as follows:

Mr. PROVINSE. This is an emergency item which was brought about by the fact that many of the families that we had succeeded in obtaining employment for off of the reservation were cut off of their jobs because of the snow in southern California and southern Arizona. * * *

* * * So this item was put in to cover the needs of those families who are trickling back to the reservation who are employable but who have no resources.

Both the States of New Mexico and Arizona directly and through the press in the months of December and January have been told that all welfare funds appropriated for the Navajo-Hopi Reservation have been exhausted and that they must take care of the Indians under social security. The States of New Mexico and Arizona in an attempt to begin processing cases as best they can, though without funds with which to pay them, agreed early last year to process such applications as were referred to them and to certify them for payments by the Indian Office out of the half-million dollars made available by Congress, and this has been done to date. New Mexico and Arizona, since that agreement was reached, nearly a year ago, have certified 44 cases involving a little over a hundred individuals, on which about $3,800 has been paid. Two or three times that many have been referred back to the Indian Office for further investigation, and, mind you, these were to be paid not by the State but from the half-million dollars made available for that purpose by this Congress. Who has taken care of the rest of the thousands of other indigents, and where has the balance of the half-million dollars gone? If those funds are now exhausted, who is going to process and pay them?

Under date of February 4, 1949, the Secretary of the Interior addressed a letter to me, in which he says:

This is to inform you that due to the exhaustion of available funds, I have been forced to notify our superintendents in New Mexico that no further allotments will be made them to make cash grants to those Indians whose applications for categorical assistance have been approved by the county welfare boards.

If those funds are exhausted, it was the duty of the Indian Office to so tell this Congress. Not one word was said about it to the Deficiency Appropriations Subcommittee.

I have now come to the point which makes this bill so important and so significant insofar as it affects the obligation of the Federal Government toward these unfortunate people.

To the two items of appropriations for the Indian Office on page 14 of the bill there are attached two innocent-looking provisos which appear for the first time in any appropriation bill. They were placed there in conformity with the language requested of the Bureau and followed by that Bureau.

The first item of $360,000 for agency services for the Navajo-Hopi Indians consists of $300,000 for increase of salaries under Public Law 900 and $60,000 for the relief of Navajo Indians. The testimony at the hearings makes it crystal clear that this amount of $60,000 is for able-bodied unemployed Indians who have been discharged from employment in California and elsewhere and are being repatriated, so to speak, to the reservation. The second item of $385,000 is for the welfare of Indians aside from the Navajo and Hopis, but including 20 other reservations in New Mexico comprising 15,000 Indians, and 6 in Arizona, comprising 20,000 Indians. Under the proviso, none of these monies can be made available to the blind, the aged, and dependent children.

I am not going to move to strike out these provisos because as I have repeatedly stated, so far as my State is concerned, it can in one way or another, take care of the 20 reservations other than the Navajos in the State of New Mexico, insofar as social-security payments for the aged, the blind, and the dependent children are concerned.

But I do want to call the attention of this Congress to the fact that these provisos were placed in the bill in a determined and direct attempt to force New Mexico and Arizona to take over the impossible burden of processing and footing all the needs of all the blind, the aged, and the dependent children in the Navajo reservation. Following that extreme and drastic policy, they have not requested any appropriations for the balance of this year to take care of those unfortunate people.

With all the power of the Federal Security Administrator to investigate and to enforce compliance by the States of New Mexico and Arizona, the officials in the executive department concerned have chosen rather this cruel and drastic course. Everyone who has looked into the situation has had to admit that it is a physical impossibility for either of the two States to carry on the processing and paying of social security to these unfortunate people until, by a gradual process which will take months and months and perhaps years, the two States can work out a system for the processing of those cases under the standards set for the balance of the State.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Does the gentleman mean that there is no money in this bill whatever for the aid of Navajo and Hopi Indians?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Absolutely not one dime for the aid of the blind, the aged, and the dependent children. The $60,000 is only for those who were employed in California and were discharged, as the record fully shows, and this proviso makes it impossible to use any of that money for the Navajo blind, the aged, and dependent children; the proviso was placed there specifically for that purpose.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman also knows that this request for funds for the Indians did not come before the regular subcommittee which deals with Indian problems, the Interior Department.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. It did not.

Mr. JENSEN. Consequently, the gentlemen who did handle it did not have all the facts which they should have had in order to appropriate and act properly on this matter.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. That is absolutely correct. This item came before the Deficiency Appropriations Subcommittee. I am not blaming the Deficiency Appropriations Subcommittee or the Committee on Appropriations. I am blaming the people who ought to be blamed, and that is the Indian Office that has again, as in the past it has again and again and again, failed to tell this Congress the true story about the Navajo Reservation.

Mr. JENSEN. Is not the gentleman going to offer an amendment to include the Hopis and the Navajos in this overall appropriation that we are making here today for Indians?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I would not offer an amendment to that effect, because that would be unfair to the other Indians outside of the Navajo Reservation. This money has been appropriated for the other Indians outside the Navajo Reservation, and the Navajo Reservation has been cut off at the pockets in order to punish Arizona and New Mexico. The Indian Office and the Bureau of the Budget, and all those responsible for this shortsighted and cruel policy, are putting this Congress in a most untenable position, one which will go down in history as unworthy of this great House.

The legislature in the State of New Mexico is now in session, but even if it found the money to increase those funds for that purpose, those funds would not be available before the end of this fiscal year. As shown by the number of cases so far certified in the attempt of the two States to take over this burden, the peremptory saddling of this burden on these two States, so far as the Navajo-Hopi Reservation is concerned, will be a

tragedy of the first magnitude for the unfortunate Navajo and Hopi Indians.

New Mexico is and has been at all times able, willing, and ready to undertake that burden as to the 20 other pueblos and reservations within its borders, comprising some 15,000 Indians. I am certain that Arizona is able to undertake that burden insofar as it affects the six reservations, other than the Hopi-Navajo people, constituting approximately 20,000 Indians. It will be an exceedingly heavy burden on these two sparsely settled States with small resources, but it would not be a tragedy to the Indians as in the case of the Navajos.

Insofar as the Navajo-Hopi Reservation is concerned, however, the task is, I repeat, physically impossible. The result will be that only a few of these will be paid, and those cases will probably be situated on the outer edges of the reservation, whereas the Indians who need it most within the interior of the reservation will go uncared for and unnoticed. There are no towns or villages in the 25,000 square miles of reservation, which, as I have said before, is equivalent to the area of Massachusetts, New Jersey, Connecticut, Delaware, and Rhode Island put together. The State has no place for a staff to live in and contact the needy cases within the interior of the reservation, such as the Indian Office necessarily has; the reservation consists of 25,000 square miles of wilderness populated by Indians living in hogans and moving about with their hogans constantly. The Navajo Reservation in point of Indian population, with its 60,000 Indians, is 6 times larger than the largest reservation anywhere in the country. The next largest is the Consolidated Chippewa in Minnesota with 10,570, according to the report of the Department for 1945, page 80. The next in order are in South Dakota, Pine Ridge with 9,029, and Rosebud with 8,532; and the next in population is the Kiowa in Oklahoma with 7,780.

The States of New Mexico and Arizona have absolutely no jurisdiction over the Indian population within the reservation. Marriages and divorces are not subject to the State law. The Indian Office records are inadequate even to check up on the legitimate children, much less on the rampant illegitimacy throughout the reservation. This Government has completely failed these Indians in the most rudimentary of their social needs, and now they propose we slough off the whole mess to the States of New Mexico and Arizona.

This blow is aimed at those States, but it will fall on the Indians. This tragedy may teach New Mexico and Arizona a lesson—and I think that is the purpose—but it will cost the Federal Government far more money than the present arrangement, unsatisfactory as it is, and it will not do the job. The Indian Service of necessity has to have personnel over the reservation in processing the able-bodied and other noneligible indigents, and in its Indian placement services, its health service, its soil-conservation service, and so forth, and, of necessity, has contact, unsatisfactory as that is, with the Indians in the interior of the reservation. It would be far better if the relief to the blind, the aged, and dependent children were administered by them as at present.

This bill is the first nail in the coffin of many hundreds, and perhaps thousands, of destitute, blind, aged, and needy children. It is another big nail in the skeleton closet of the shameful history of neglect and mistreatment of the Navajo Indians which they have consistently endured, notwithstanding the promises made to them when they were released from their imprisonment camp at Fort Sumner.

After the Government has completely failed in rehabilitating the Indians, completely failed in the passage of the long-term program recommended by both the Senate and House committees last year, we are now asked to take the first step in salving our conscience by turning these unfortunate humans over to inadequately equipped States for care.

I want to say at this point that I again lay the blame for the failure of the bill last year to the officials in the Indian Office. This bill, after it had been reported by both the House and Senate and actually passed by the Senate, was killed because of an adverse report from the Indian Office. When that adverse report came before the committee I took the floor and described the situation in language as strong and as clear as my humble efforts could produce. That statement, made on June 8, 1948, beginning at page 7477 of the RECORD for the second session of the Eightieth Congress, is as follows:

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I heartily commend the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH], chairman of the Public Lands Committee, and the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART], chairman of the Indian Affairs Subcommittee as well as the Republican steering committee, for their decision Friday to push enactment of the Navajo Indian legislation before Congress adjourns. Following their action Friday, it was my understanding that the Navajo bill would be called up today under unanimous consent or by a suspension of the rules. Though the primary election is in progress in New Mexico today, I flew back to Washington yesterday, only to find this morning that the Indian Office has filed an adverse report to the D'Ewart bill.

I have heretofore restrained myself because of my affection for Secretary Krug and Under Secretary Warne, who are sincere men, but this action on the part of the Indian Office shocks me beyond further restraint. I must speak out. Is it possible that the Indian Office is more interested in putting this Congress on the spot so that it can be blamed for failure to act? I do not believe in playing politics at the expense of hungry and destitute people.

The bill reported out by the committee is right in line with Secretary Krug's recommendations. It authorizes the full $25,000,000 requested for the construction of schools, school dormitories and other educational facilities. It authorizes $100,000 per year to promote employment of Navajo Indians off the reservation; it authorizes $250,000 per year for the relief of disabled and dependent Navajo Indians; it authorizes $228,000 for health improvement, and $1,000,000 per year for the construction of roads. All of this is right in line with the recommendations of Secretary Krug.

True, this does not at one stroke authorize the entire 10-year $90,000,000 program, and because it does not do so the Indian Office objects to the enactment of this bill. This arbitrary and dilatory attitude is unreasonable and likely to result in no action at all.

Heretofore in the summer of 1946, nearly $1,000,000 was appropriated for the building of two Navajo schools. To this date, not a handful of dirt has been turned and not a nail has been driven in the construction of those two schools. Chicago architects were hired, as if there were none competent in New Mexico and Arizona, and the whole matter is still tangled up by the red tape and dilatory attitude of the Washington Indian Office. Under the circumstances, objection to the House bill on the grounds that it does not authorize the entire program, including airports and modern coal bins and all, comes with poor grace.

The D'Ewart bill should be taken up as promptly as possible. I hope this is done before this week ends, and that it is passed and enacted into law before the adjournment of Congress. I go further and say that either Acting Commissioner Zimmerman and Educational Director Beatty should be discharged for their delay in carrying out the mandate of Congress as expressed in the appropriation bill in 1946, or else the Navajo Reservation should be taken from under their jurisdiction and their inaction. The Congress is not in position to discharge the men responsible for the neglect of this tribe, but it can and should emancipate the Navajo from the lethargy of this Bureau. Congress can pass legislation whereby a man of vigor and action can be selected to administer the long-delayed rehabilitation and education of these people. A bill to do that very thing is now pending in the Senate and I sincerely hope that Mr. D'EWART's bill and the Senate bill are combined and are enacted into law before we adjourn.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make this observation. The gentleman from New Mexico had some very complimentary things to say about the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands and also about the chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. And I say they deserve it, too.

Mr. MURDOCK. They do deserve it, and for that reason I wanted to second what the gentleman said in that respect. I want to say further, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from New Mexico himself has been untiring in his efforts to get the kind of legislation for which he now pleads. That was shown quite eloquently last November when we had temporary legislation before us, and at that time the gentleman from New Mexico time after time stressed the need of a permanent piece of legislation that would rehabilitate this great Navajo Indian Tribe. I am in accord with the gentleman in wanting a proper long-range plan.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I thank the gentleman. I have also been very patient. I have not spoken out, although I did tell the committee what I knew about the details regarding the building of those two schoolhouses. Now they come in here with this report. If they had criticized our committee for not giving them the full amount requested, I would not have anything to say, but when they come in and say, "Do not enact this bill," when they know full well or ought to know full well that if we are not going to enact this bill we will not at this late date get anything, that is the last stroke.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. I want to commend the gentleman for his courageous statement on

this matter. We are all very deeply interested in the welfare of the Indians of the country, and the gentleman from New Mexico has always fought valiantly for the Indians of his State.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BARRETT. In my opinion, our Committee on Public Lands has not had the proper cooperation from the Indian Bureau. I hope that some way may be arrived at whereby we can secure more adequate information and better reports and more active cooperation from the Indian Bureau.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. As far as getting information about the Navajo Reservation is concerned, I do not think we will ever get it until we have a man responsible at the head of that reservation, instead of trying to channel everything through the Indian Office in Washington.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. D'EWART. I in turn want to compliment the gentleman from New Mexico on bringing this matter to the attention of the Congress. Certainly the situation on the Navajo-Hopi Reservation is something that is a disgrace to the Nation. We have made treaties with these people under which we are supposed to do certain things. We have fallen down in the carrying out of those treaties. During this session we have held extensive hearings on the situation in the Navajo Reservation. As a result of those hearings, various bills were introduced. The one to which the gentleman from New Mexico refers is the one that is being pressed for enactment at this time and has been voted out unanimously by our House Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The gentleman will agree with me, I am sure, that it is the beginning of the very program Secretary Krug has recommended.

Mr. D'EWART. That is right. It is not the intention of the committee that this shall be the final word on this problem, but it is a step in the right direction. I think this goes along and is in accord with the recommendations of the Bureau. I regret very much that they have seen fit to send up an adverse report on this necessary legislation. I hope we may not pay too much attention to that report, but can get favorable action in this session on this bill, which will be a step in taking care of this very, very bad situation.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I am sure Congress will do what is right, regardless of the report.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. POULSON. As I recall, when this bill was brought before the full Committee on Public Lands this very statement was made, that this was the first step in the general over-all program and approach to settling this very delicate and serious problem as far as the Indians are concerned.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Yes. I think the committee is very properly putting first things first in this bill. If we authorize the whole $90,000,000, what assurance have we that they will handle that any better than the $1,000,000 we gave them 2 years ago, with which they have done nothing up to date?

Mr. POULSON. I do not believe there is a single committee in the House that works any harder than the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, of which the gentleman is one of the very able members.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I am sorry to say that in this particular matter we have not accomplished very much so far because of the lack of a cooperative attitude on the part of the Indian Office in Washington. What has been done is due to the untiring efforts of men like the gentleman from California, and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the bill now before us, H. R. 2632, contains therein an appropriation of $2,500,000 for emergency flood-control work on the Columbia. Of this amount, $150,000 has been allocated for flood-control work on the Clarks Fork of the Columbia in the vicinity of Orchard Homes, Missoula, Mont.

The Corps of Engineers is cognizant of the extreme danger which faces the Orchard Homes area this winter and spring and has urged that this amount of money be approved. Maj. Gen. R. C. Crawford, Acting Chief of Engineers, has assured me in a letter, under date of February 10, 1949, that if this fund is approved they will proceed promptly with such remedial measures in the vicinity of Orchard Homes as are consistent with existing authority and the funds provided by Congress.

In behalf of the people in the Orchard Homes area, I urge the House to pass this appropriation immediately. I fear, even now, what may happen in the meantime, and I pray that we will not be too late in giving this assistance to the people of my district who need it so much.

The people of Orchard Homes are looking to us for assistance, and as their Representative in the Congress of the United States I urge you to heed their request and pass this appropriation promptly.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2632) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 99, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SADLAK. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SADLAK moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: Page 6, line 24, strike out "$4,987,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$14,000,000."

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. SADLAK. On that, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 148, nays 237, not voting 48, as follows:

[Roll No. 14]

YEAS—148

Allen, Calif.
Anderson, Calif.
Andresen, August H.
Angell
Arends
Auchincloss
Barrett, Wyo.
Bates, Mass.
Beall
Bennett, Mich.
Bishop
Blackney
Bolton, Ohio
Bramblett
Brehm
Brown, Ohio
Byrnes, Wis.
Canfield
Case, N. J.
Case, S. Dak.
Chiperfield
Church
Clevenger
Cole, Kans.
Cole, N. Y.
Corbett
Cotton
Crawford
Dague
Davis, Wis.
D'Ewart
Dolliver
Dondero
Donohue
Ellsworth
Elston
Engel, Mich.
Fellows
Fenton
Ford
Fulton
Furcolo
Gamble
Gavin
Gillette
Golden
Goodwin
Graham
Gwinn
Hale
Hall,
Edwin Arthur
Hall,
Leonard W.
Hand
Harden
Harvey
Herter
Heselton
Hill
Hinshaw
Hoeven
Holmes
Hope
Horan
Hull
James
Javits
Jenison
Jennings
Jensen
Johnson
Kean
Kearney
Kearns
Keating
Keefe
Kunkel
Lane
Latham
LeCompte
LeFevre
Lichtenwalter
Lodge
McConnell
McCulloch
McDonough
McGregor
McMillen, Ill.
Mack, Wash.
Macy
Marcantonio
Martin, Iowa
Martin, Mass.
Merrow
Meyer
Michener
Miller, Md.
Morton
Murray, Wis.
Nelson
Nichols
Nixon
Norblad
O'Hara, Minn.
Patterson
Pfeiffer, William L.
Phillips, Calif.
Phillips, Tenn.
Plumley
Potter
Rankin
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees
Riehlman
Rogers, Mass.
Sadlak
St. George
Sanborn
Scott, Hardie
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Scriver
Scudder
Secrest
Short
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Wis.
Stockman
Taber
Talle
Tollefson
Van Zandt
Velde
Vorys
Vursell
Wadsworth
Welch, Calif.
Werdel
Wigglesworth
Wilson, Ind.
Wolcott
Wolverton
Wood
Woodruff

NAYS—237

Abernethy
Addonizio
Albert
Andersen, H. Carl
Andrews
Aspinall
Bailey
Barden
Baring
Barrett, Pa.
Bates, Ky.
Battle
Beckworth
Blemiller
Blatnik
Bloom
Boggs, La.
Bolling
Bolton, Md.
Bonner
Bosone
Boykin
Breen
Brooks
Brown, Ga.
Bryson
Buchanan
Buckley, Ill.
Buckley, N. Y.
Burdick
Burke
Burleson
Burton
Byrne, N. Y.
Camp
Cannon
Carnahan
Carroll
Cavalcante
Celler
Chatham
Chelf
Chesney
Christopher
Chudoff
Clemente
Coffey
Combs
Cooley
Cooper
Cox
Crook
Crosser
Davenport
Davies, N. Y.
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Deane
Delaney
Denton
Dollinger
Doughton
Douglas
Doyle
Durham
Eberharter
Elliott
Engle, Calif.
Evins
Fallon
Feighan
Fernandez
Fisher
Flood
Fogarty
Forand
Frazier
Fugate
Gathings
Garmatz
Gary
Gore
Gorski, Ill.
Gorski, N. Y.
Granahan
Granger
Grant
Green
Gregory
Gross
Hegen
Hardy
Hare
Harris
Harrison
Hart
Havenner
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Hébert
Hedrick
Herlong
Hobbs
Holifield
Howell
Huber
Jackson, Wash.
Jacobs
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N. C.
Karst
Karsten
Kee
Kelley
Kennedy
Keogh
Kerr
Kilburn
Kilday
King
Kirwan
Klein
Kruse
Latham
Larcade
Lemke
Lesinski
Lind
Lovre
Lyle
Lynch
McCarthy
McCormack
McGrath
McGuire
McKinnon
McSweeney
Madden
Magee
Mansfield
Marcantonio
Marsalis
Marshall
Martin, Iowa
Martin, Mass.
Merrow
Meyer
Michener
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Mills
Mitchell
Monroney
Morgan
Morris
Morton
Moulder
Multer
Murdock
Murphy
Murray, Tenn.
Norrell
Norton
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Konski
O'Neill
O'Sullivan
Pace
Paseman
Patman
Patten
Perkins
Peterson
Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Pickett
Poage
Polk
Powell
Preston
Price
Priest
Quinn
Rabaut
Rains
Redden
Regan
Rhodes
Rivers
Rodino
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney
Sabath
Sadowski
Sasscer
Sims
Smathers
Smith, Va.
Spence
Staggers
Stanley
Steed
Stefan
Stigler
Sullivan
Sutton
Tackett
Taurielo
Teague
Thomas, Tex.
Thompson
Thornberry
Trimble
Underwood
Vinson
Wagner
Walsh
Walter
Welch, Mo.
Wheeler
White, Calif.
White, Idaho
Whittington
Wier
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Okla.
Wilson, Tex.
Winstead
Withrow
Woodhouse
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—48

Abbitt
Allen, Ill.
Allen, La.
Bennett, Fla.
Bentsen
Bland
Boggs, Del.
Bulwinkle
Burnside
Carlyle
Colmer
Coudert
Cunningham
Curtis
DeGraffenried
Dingell
Eaton
Heffernan
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Irving
Jackson, Calif.
Jenkins
Judd
Linehan
Lucas
McMillan, S. C.
Mason
Miles
Morrison
O'Toole
Poulson
Ramsay
Ribicoff
Richards
Shafer
Sheppard
Sikes
Smith, Ohio
Somers
Taylor
Thomas N. J.
Towe
Weichel
Whitaker
Wickersham
Worley

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Burnside for, with Mr. Whitaker against.

Mr. Hoffman of Michigan for, with Mr. Sikes against.

Mr. Shafer for, with Mr. deGraffenried against.

Mr. Jenkins for, with Mr. Irving against.

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Bentsen against.

Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mr. Towe for, with Mr. Bennett of Florida against.

Mr. Smith of Ohio for, with Mr. Abbitt against.

Mr. Weichel for, with Mr. Carlyle against.

Mr. Hoffman of Illinois for, with Mr. Heffernan against.

Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. Colmer against.

Mr. Allen of Illinois for, with Mr. O'Toole against.

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. McMillan of South Carolina against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Worley with Mr. Boggs of Delaware.

Mr. Richards with Mr. Cunningham.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Jackson of California.

Mr. Ribicoff with Mr. Judd.

Mr. Linehan with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Lucas with Mr. Curtis.

Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. LANE, Mr. PHILBIN, and Mr. MARCANTONIO changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 367, nays 19, not voting 47, as follows:

[Roll No. 15]

YEAS—367

Abernethy
Addonizio
Albert
Allen, Calif.
Andersen, H. Carl
Anderson, Calif.
Andresen, August H.
Andrews
Angell
Arends
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Bailey
Barden
Baring
Barrett, Pa.
Barrett, Wyo.
Bates, Ky.
Battle
Beall
Beckworth
Bennett, Mich.
Blemiller
Bishop
Blackney
Blatnik
Bloom
Boggs, La.
Bolling
Bolton, Md.
Bolton, Ohio
Bonner
Bosone
Bramblett
Breen
Brehm
Brooks
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Ohio
Bryson
Buchanan
Buckley, Ill.
Buckley, N. Y.
Burdick
Burke
Burleson
Burton
Byrne, N. Y.
Byrnes, Wis.
Camp
Canfield
Cannon
Carnahan
Carroll
Case, N. J.
Case, S. Dak.
Cavalcante
Celler
Chatham
Chelf
Chesney
Chiperfield
Christopher
Chudoff
Church
Clemente
Coffey
Cole, Kans.
Combs
Cooley
Cooper
Corbett
Cotton
Cox
Crook
Crosser
Davenport
Davies, N. Y.
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
Deane
Delaney
Denton
Dollinger
Dolliver
Dondero
Donohue
Doughton
Douglas
Doyle
Durham
Eberharter
Elliott
Ellsworth
Elston
Engel, Mich.
Engle, Calif.
Evins
Fallon
Feighan
Fellows
Fenton
Fernandez
Fisher
Flood
Fogarty
Forand
Ford
Frazier
Fugate
Fulton
Furcolo
Gamble
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Gillette
Gilmer
Golden
Goodwin
Gordon
Gore
Gorski, Ill.
Gorski, N. Y.
Gossett
Graham
Granahan
Granger
Grant
Green
Gregory
Gross
Gwinn
Hagen
Hall,
Edwin Arthur
Hall,
Leonard W.
Hand
Harden
Hardy
Hare
Harris
Harrison
Hart
Harvey
Havenner
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Hébert
Hedrick
Herlong
Herter
Heselton
Hill
Hinshaw
Hobbs
Hoeven
Holifield
Holmes
Hope
Horan
Howell
Huber
Hull
Jackson, Wash.
Jacobs
James
Javits
Jennings
Johnson
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N. C.
Karst
Karsten
Kearney
Kearns
Keating
Kee
Keefe
Kelley
Kennedy
Keogh
Kerr
Kilday
King
Kirwan
Klein
Kruse
Kunkel
Lane
Lanham
Larcade
Latham
LeCompte
LeFevre
Lemke
Lesinski
Lichtenwalter
Lind
Lodge
Lovre
Lucas
Lyle
Lynch
McCarthy
McConnell
McCormack
McCulloch
McDonough
McGrath
McGregor
McGuire
McKinnon
McMillen, Ill.
McSweeney
Mack, Ill.
Mack, Wash.
Madden
Magee
Mahon
Mansfield
Marcantonio
Marsalis
Marshall
Martin, Iowa
Martin, Mass.
Merrow
Meyer
Michener
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Mills
Mitchell
Monroney
Morgan
Morris
Morton
Moulder
Multer
Murdock
Murphy
Murray, Tenn.
Murray, Wis.
Nelson
Nixon
Noland
Norblad
Norrell
Norton
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Minn.
O'Konski
O'Neill
O'Sullivan
Pace
Passman
Patman
Patten
Patterson
Perkins
Peterson
Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Pfeiffer, William L.
Philbin
Phillips, Calif.
Phillips, Tenn.
Pickett
Poage
Polk
Preston
Price
Priest
Quinn
Rabaut
Rains
Rankin
Redden
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees
Regan
Rhodes
Richards
Riehlman
Rivers
Rodino
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rooney
Sabath
Sadowski
St. George
Sasscer
Scott, Hardie
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Scudder
Secrest
Sheppard
Short
Simpson, Ill.
Sims
Smathers
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Va.
Spence
Staggers
Stanley
Steed
Stefan
Stigler
Stockman
Sullivan
Sutton
Tackett
Taile
Taurielo
Teague
Thomas, Tex.
Thompson
Thornberry
Trimble
Underwood
Vinson
Vorys
Vursell
Wagner
Walsh
Walter
Welch, Calif.
Welch, Mo.
Werdel
Wheeler
White, Calif.
White, Idaho
Whitten
Whittington
Wier
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Ind.
Wilson, Okla.
Wilson, Tex.
Winstead
Withrow
Wolcott
Wolverton
Wood
Woodhouse
Worley
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—19

Bates, Mass.
Clevenger
Crawford
Hale
Jenison
Jensen
Kean
Kilburn
Macy
Nicholson
Plumley
Rich
Sanborn
Scriver
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Wis.
Taber
Wadsworth
Woodruff

NOT VOTING—47

Abbitt
Allen, Ill.
Allen, La.
Bennett, Fla.
Bentsen
Bland
Boggs, Del.
Boykin
Bulwinkle
Burnside
Carlyle
Cole, N. Y.
Colmer
Coudert
Cunningham
Curtis
DeGraffenried
Dingell
Eaton
Halleck
Heffernan
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Irving
Jackson, Calif.
Jenkins
Judd
Linehan
McMillan, S. C.
Mason
Miles
Morrison
O'Toole
Poulson
Ramsay
Ribicoff
Sadlak
Shafer
Sikes
Smith, Ohio
Somers
Taylor
Thomas, N. J.
Thornberry
Towe
Weichel
Whitaker

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Allen of Illinois.

Mr. Bentsen with Mr. Coudert.

Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Burnside with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Towe.

Mr. Irving with Mr. Sadlak.

Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Boggs of Delaware.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. McMillan of South Carolina with Mr. Cunningham.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Curtis.

Mr. Carlyle with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.

Mr. deGraffenried with Mr. Jackson of California.

Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Jenkins.

Mr. Ribicoff with Mr. Judd.

Mr. Linehan with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Bennett of Florida with Mr. Shafer.
Mr. Allen of Louisiana with Mr. Weichel.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Smith of Ohio.
Mr. Bland with Mr. Mason.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LITHUANIA

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, one of the most shameful and least publicized events of the twentieth century was the dastardly conspiracy of the Kremlin against Russia's good little neighbor, Lithuania. The political police of the vast Soviet Union, holding in subjection 180,000,000 people, launched in peacetime a scheme directed at the physical extermination of millions of Lithuanian Christians.

However, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the history and glory of the brave people of that brave nation of Lithuania, nestled on the shores of the Baltic Sea. Never has there been greater proof that the United States of America remains loyal to her friends than the fact that this great leader of democracy still recognizes as a sovereign power the Republic of Lithuania, and denies and refuses to recognize the illegal and outrageous attempt on the part of Soviet Russia to annex Lithuania as a province of the Soviet.

I think it proper at this time that I say a word about the recognition of Lithuania by the United States.

When Lithuania was incorporated into the Soviet Union on July 21 of 1940, we and a large number of western countries felt that this was not done voluntarily, and refused to recognize this incorporation as legal. Thereby Lithuania was allowed to retain her diplomatic representatives in these countries. Two days after Lithuania's annexation to the Soviet Union the then Acting Secretary of State—Sumner Welles—clarified the position of this country in a press release which read:

> During these past few days the devious processes whereunder the political independence and territorial integrity of the three small Baltic Republics—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—were to be deliberately annihilated by one of their more powerful neighbors, have been rapidly drawing to their conclusion.
>
> From the day when the peoples of these republics first gained their independent and democratic form of government the people of the United States have watched their admirable progress in self-government with deep and sympathetic interest.
>
> The policy of this Government is universally known. The people of the United States are opposed to predatory activities no matter whether they are carried on by the use of force or by the threat of force. They are likewise opposed to any form of intervention on the part of one state, however powerful, in the domestic concerns of any other sovereign state, however weak.
>
> These principles constitute the very foundations upon which the existing relationship between the 21 sovereign republics of the New World rests.
>
> The United States will continue to stand by these principles, because of the conviction of the American people that unless the doctrine in which these principles are inherent once again governs the relations between nations, the rule of reason, of justice, and of law—in other words, the basis of modern civilization itself—cannot be preserved.[1]

On March 3 of 1945 the Secretary of State issued a statement indicating that the position of this country had not changed since the enunciation of our policy as stated by Mr. Welles in 1940. This statement, as given in the New York Times, March 4, 1945, page 24, read:

> The Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania still are officially regarded by the United States as independent states, even though they were adsorbed into the Soviet Union early in the war.

Early last year when it was reported that the consular officials of the Soviet Union in this country were claiming to represent the Baltic countries here, the State Department sent letters to the governors of all 48 States, stating that this country has never recognized Soviet annexation of the Baltic States.

> So far as this country is concerned—

Read the letter as quoted in the New York Times, March 30, 1948, page 12—

> the Baltic countries still are independent nations, with their own diplomatic representatives and consuls.

The foregoing statements indicate just how we still recognize Lithuania as an independent country. Our position has not changed since 1940 and the same may be said of other countries which still recognize Lithuania.

The Governments of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been recognized either as de jure or de facto governments by the principal governments of Europe and have entered into treaty relations with their neighbors.

In extending to them recognition on its part, the Government of the United States takes cognizance of the actual existence of these Governments during a considerable period of time and of the successful maintenance within their borders of political and economic stability.

The United States has consistently maintained that the disturbed condition of Russian affairs may not be made the occasion for the alienation of Russian territory, and this principle is not deemed to be infringed by the recognition at this time of the Governments of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, which have been set up and maintained by an indigenous population.

Not only has the United States of America persisted in its recognition of the Republic of Lithuania as a de jure government but likewise it has consistently refused to recognize Russian claims.

Never have I been prouder of the integrity before the nations of the world of my own country than I am in the championing of the cause of the ancient lovers of democracy, the people of Lithuania.

And so today, Mr. Speaker, on this, the birthday of the Republic of Lithuania, I stand in this great forum of freedom, the House of Representatives of the United States of America, and pay my tribute to the Republic of Lithuania on this, the natal day.

The good and brave people of Lithuania, riding under the heel of the oppressor, do not passively sit by and accept without resistance the yoke of slavery.

Fighting for liberty and freedom and for the belief in the church of their ancestors is the tradition of the Lithuanian people. And in this year of our Lord 1949 the Lithuanians hold high the torch of their tradition and do not break faith with their noble ancestors.

Anti-Soviet resistance continues and will continue and continue until once again Lithuania is a free and independent nation.

I want to bring to the attention of the whole world the incessant struggle by patriotic Lithuania against the oppressor day in and day out since the infamous day when her liberty was destroyed by the Communist government from Moscow.

Resistance inside the country and in neighboring Latvia, White Ruthenia, Poland, and Ukraine continues. As a matter of fact, several Lithuanian guerrilla detachments were recently reported active in Silesia.

For this reason, Soviet units with some drafted Lithuanians are stationed far from the homeland—on the Arctic Ocean and in the Far East. A negligible number of units made up of natives are retained for effect in the country—the unarmed uniformed youths, singing in Lithuanian, are paraded on the streets of Vilnius, Kaunas, and several other larger cities. Not a single Lithuanian is entrusted with a plane. Most of the Soviet Army—former Red Army—troops garrisoned in Lithuania are natives of Siberia and Uzbekistan.

Lithuanian guerrillas presently operate in small mobile units. They are armed with captured Russian equipment and dressed, for the most part, in Russian uniforms with prewar Lithuanian insignia of rank. The guerrillas still have motorcycles, motorized light artillery pieces, and small tanks.

The guerrillas retained mastery of the countryside throughout the summer and fall of 1947 and carried their operations into Poland and East Prussia. An active liaison was established with the Polish underground and some operations, as, for example, the occupation of the frontier town of Cypliskes in Sudavia, were carried out jointly.

A legendary leader, a former resident of Kybartai, nicknamed "Zaliasis Velnias"—the Green Devil—is especially notorious.

Mimeographed newspapers, printed appeals, and news sheets are widely distributed. Even the impressed Polish and German laborers are supplied with underground literature. Some 20 newspapers are published regularly. Their titles disclose the spirit of the fighting, freedom-loving people: Laisvoji Lietuva—Free Lithuania, Laisves Varpas—the Liberty Bell, Tevynes Kovotojas—the Patriotic Fighter, Ginkime Lietuva—Defend Lithuania, Kova—the Struggle, Uz Laisve—For Freedom, and so forth.

[1] Department of State Bulletin, July 27, 1940, p. 48.

One of the outstanding achievements of 1947 was the creation of a unified command in the field and propaganda. The Lithuanian Liberation Army, the Freedom Fighters, the Partisan Column, and other formerly uncoordinated units finally created a joint staff and liaison service. This fact was jubilantly announced in a fighting editorial, Lithuania Militans. All political differences were buried in the interest of a united resistance struggle, as existed during the days of the Nazi occupation.

This development brought an immediate reaction from the enemy. The six regular Soviet Army divisions, strong air formations, motorized units, special transport and guard units protecting the railroads, highway bridges, and transport convoys, and 75,000 men of the MVD-MGB troops, the "people's militia," and the organized marauders called exterminators—Istrebiteli—needed reinforcements. Five special MGB air squadrons were brought in to the country in the fall of 1947. Additional armored and infantry divisions were moved to Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia in January 1948.

Large units are presently stationed in county seats. For instance, 3,000 MVD troops equipped with tanks and armored motorcycles are stationed in a small railroad junction town of Mazeikiai. Larger forces are garrisoned in Lithuania than at any time since the occupation of the country in 1940.

There is no appreciable decrease in the armed anti-Soviet resistance, but guerrillas' tactics have changed.

The Russians are making every effort to convert the independence struggle into a civil war. For example, drafted natives are interdispersed in the units dispatched against the guerrillas. On the other hand, the internecine aspect is intensified by the guerrillas, who take a heavy toll of the natives who dare to accept administrative offices under the Russians or who enroll in the Communist organizations.

There were no large-scale battles since the fall of 1946, but individual MVD-NKVD troopers, MGB-NKGB investigators, Communist Party officials, and militiamen are killed daily. Several dozen guerrillas were encircled in the woods near Vilnius and were killed to the last man. Russian operations against another large unit in Utena County failed. When MVD concentrations arrived the guerrillas had vanished. An 18-year-old girl, who had organized medical aid for guerrillas, was detained—and later liberated by a patriot band. She is now in Poland—completely gray, nerves shattered, crippled for life by "interrogation." A guerrilla leader was recently captured, tried, and executed in Poland. His unit continues to operate in both Lithuania and Poland.

Guerrillas are masters of the situation in summer, but they go into hiding in winter. The promises of an "amnesty" were largely ignored. Nevertheless, some men who had merely evaded mobilization surrendered, some sought legitimization by moving to East Prussia, the Memel District, or the largely depopulated areas of the Vilnius district, where they are not known personally.

Railroad stations and towns are still heavily garrisoned. Units of people's militia and exterminators—istrebiteli—are very active in the country. When not engaged in manhunt, these exterminators act as inspectors of produce deliveries. They indiscriminately open fire on persons walking too fast—in their judgment. Their chiefs are Russians, the rank and file contain some native traitors and draft evaders. Lately, the exterminators attempted to popularize their new designation as freedom defenders and activists. However, the people stick to their original derisive nicknames—strebokai, skrebai, stribikaulai—persons with deformed hip bones, and so forth.

After continuous and meticulously effected combing operations, the Russians uncovered a great many bunkers and other hiding places. The forest brethren had to shoot it out with the invaders or look for other hiding places. Life of the guerrilla fighters is extremely dangerous. So is the life of the exterminators—some retire to lunch in privacy and never again appear. This kind of life causes much drinking among the exterminators.

Farmers of the areas where guerrillas show increased activities are indiscriminately deported. No explanations help, even when the people offer explanation: all sorts of armed men, invariably dressed in Russian uniforms, come to look for food and to rob—"to inspect." When a wounded guerrilla, whose tenure of life was spared for questioning purposes, was spirited out of a hospital, several employees of the hospital suffered exile. When a boy who had purchased bandages for the guerrillas in several drug stores was unmasked, all of the druggists suffered.

Every former officer, official, national guard member and independence war veteran had to enlist in the forest fraternity. They had no choice. Their ranks were swelled by draft evaders and by liberated political prisoners.

The guerrillas follow certain established patterns. Women informers, first offenders, are punished by a shave and a token flogging. Men, first offenders, have their seats grated and salted. The second offense merits a bullet.

The desecration of the corpses of the guerrillas continues as a pattern. When a guerrilla is killed, the Russians remove his boots and clothing, bring the body to the nearest town, and dump it on the sidewalk in a prominent place. The Communists passing by spit and kick the corpses. People are forced to watch the sadism of the Russians. The bodies are badly mutilated—legs are twisted and broken, bowels laid open, eyes are gouged out, the crania smashed.

In the past, the Russians permitted the natives to bury the bodies. Since the fall of 1946, decomposed bodies are picked up at night by war-prisoner details, taken out of town and buried in unmarked graves. In some places, bodies are thrown into the quagmire.

Some women dared to approach the martyrs' corpses, to kneel and pray. One mother gained fame when she gently touched her son's hair and firmly stated that this was not her son—to save her other boys. None of the multitude of acquaintances betrayed her.

The Communists killed by the patriots are ceremoniously buried in red-painted coffins—in the desecrated Christian cemeteries. Sometimes the authorities demand that priests accompany the heroes' coffins. One priest refused—and joined the forest fraternity after his liberation from prison.

The alien regime depends on armed force exclusively. One-half of the nominal ministers are Russians, and business is transacted at the cabinet meetings in Russian. The Lithuanian language is a stranger in the MVD—former NKVD—and MGB—former NKGB. Nevertheless, translators are retained in the administrative offices and applications in Lithuanian are accepted. All of the records and tax receipts are printed in Russian and Lithuanian.

The people's commissars are now called ministers. Some of them wear resplendent uniforms. The cabinet is established in Vilnius, in a building on Ciurlionis Street which had formerly housed the headquarters of the Gestapo—a familiar landmark to the natives. The residence of Paleckis is heavily guarded.

Only two Lithuanian conductors were retained in the railroad service. Railroads are serviced by Russian personnel exclusively. All outgoing mails pass through Moscow.

So today, Mr. Speaker, I take this time in the midst of our busy deliberations to focus the eyes of the western Christian world upon this island of freedom and democracy where the tyrant will never succeed in the end.

In the voice of the lovers of freedom and justice throughout the world I say, long live Lithuania.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, I understand the export-control bill will be the first one on the program?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct, followed by two resolutions relating to the giving of two committees the power to investigate; then there will be a bill out of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

It is hoped that we may clean them all up tomorrow and adjourn over until Monday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to include in his extension of remarks certain letters and excerpts.

Mr. FERNANDEZ asked and was given permission to include with the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole an excerpt from the RECORD of June 8, 1948.

Mr. GARMATZ (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include a statement by Mayor D'Alesandro, of Baltimore.

Mr. LUCAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial on the subject of rent control.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement entitled "The College Fraternity Crisis." I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $301.75, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech made at Bridgeport, Conn., by Hon. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

Mr. KEARNEY and Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. FULTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one, editorials appearing in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, the Pittsburgh Press, and the New York World-Telegram; and in the other, a letter from the director of the United Service for New Americans and an article appearing in the New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. HINSHAW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

FILIPINO REHABILITATION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 381, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Filipino Rehabilitation Commission the following Members of the House: Mr. MILLS, of Arkansas; Mr. MURDOCK, of Arizona; and Mr. WELCH, of California.

THIRTY-FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA

Mr. GORSKI of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORSKI of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today free Lithuanians throughout the world are commemorating the thirty-first anniversary of the declaration of independence of the Republic of Lithuania. The enslaved people in Lithuania are denied this right by the despotic occupant of the country. I know that these unfortunate people are not alone in celebrating this day, for there are countless millions who join with them and extend to these freedom-loving people their sympathies on their temporary subjugation and enslavement in which they find themselves, and at the same time wish them a very speedy restoration of their Republic with complete freedom and independence.

The 600-year-old Lithuanian state was first occupied by Czarist Russia in 1795. That enslavement was terminated on February 16, 1918, by the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania. Soviet Russia gave full recognition to this declaration, renounced for all time all rights to the territory of Lithuania, and recognized Lithuania as a sovereign independent state. The United States and other nations also recognized Lithuania's rightfull independence.

The independent Republic of Lithuania in their short space of independence made remarkable progress in every phase of life. Impartial observers acknowledged Lithuania to be one of the most cultured, progressive, and industrious countries of Europe, and her people were happy, prosperous, and self-sustaining.

The outstanding achievements and accomplishments of Lithuania were destroyed when it was occupied for the second time in 1940. Soviet Russia then enslaved and annexed Lithuania by aggression and still rules it by force.

Lithuania is a tragic victim of Soviet aggression. The people of Lithuania have been deprived of their cherished land, of all private enterprises, of human rights, and of fundamental freedoms. They have been converted into chattels of the Soviet state. Over one-half million people of Lithuania have been slain or banished from Lithuania. Genocide by the Soviets threatens to annihilate the Lithuanian nation.

These crimes of aggression and genocide against Lithuania have been condemned by the Lithuanian nation, by the United States and by other democratic countries, which continue to recognize independent Lithuania and its lawful representatives.

In the fight for their rights and freedom, Lithuanians hope and pray that the United States and the western democracies will continue to stand by the principles of right and justice, and that they will actively champion the cause of sovereign rights and self-government for Lithuania and all other victims of aggression and injustice.

It seems to me that the time has come for making a demand upon the Soviet Union: First, to halt genocide in Lithuania and other occupied countries by murder and deportation of innocent people; second, to return deportees from the slave-labor camps in Siberia and other parts of Russia; third, to remove Soviet armies, police, and secret agents from Lithuania and other Baltic countries; and, fourth, to restore freedom, sovereign rights and self-government to the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, who have been forcibly deprived of them by the Soviet Union.

The Lithuanian people want their freedom and they are entitled to it. I hope their ambition to be a free nation is not too far away. There will be no peace in this troubled world, as long as Russia tries to dominate and subjugate small nations. Russia will not only bring an endless trail of troubles upon herself, but will be the cause of world unrest which eventually will bring her own downfall.

The days of tyrants are over. People all over the world are demanding a representative form of government, and this demand will spread from one subjugated nation to another until all mankind has achieved freedom and independence.

I want to extend my best wishes to these great patriotic freedom-loving people, who today are putting up a gallant fight to restore their independence, and throw off the shackles of a ruthless tyrant. The Republic of Lithuania is still recognized by our Government, and I trust we will insist that the principles of the Atlantic Charter be applied to the case of Lithuania, together with Latvia and Estonia.

If Russia desires peace in the world, she, more than any other nation, can bring that about by liberating the people whom she now dominates and unless Russia does that, the everlasting desire of the people to be free and independent, will go on, as it has in centuries past, until tyrants are destroyed everywhere.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORSKI of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I wish to congratulate the gentleman on his splendid remarks and I want to join with him in everything that he has said. The people of America are wholeheartedly with the people of Lithuania, and we are all looking forward to the day when the iron curtain will be rolled back and the people of Lithuania will regain their independence which they so richly deserve, and that our great country will be able to make its most effective contribution toward the regaining of their lost liberties.

Mr. GORSKI of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

REGULATION W CAUSING TROUBLE—FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD WARNED

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have urged the Federal Reserve Board to rescind or substantially change regulation W. Today I sent to the Chairman of the Board, a copy to each member, the following letter:

FEBRUARY 16, 1949.

Hon. THOMAS B. McCABE,
Chairman of the Board of Governors,
The Federal Reserve System,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Nearly 2 months now have elapsed since I began calling attention of the Federal Reserve Board to the widespread damages being caused to our national economy by certain overstringent consumer credit controls.

At that time I pointed out that an utterly needless depression could be created and was being threatened by the Federal Reserve Board's credit squeeze. More proof has kept pouring in since then that the Federal Reserve Board is depriving millions of American families of the opportunity to purchase needed automobiles because your regulation W requires excessively high monthly payments spread over only 15 to 18 months. I urged you in December—and now I again plead—that you exercise the power already vested in your board to extend the payment period to at least 24 months.

While the Federal Reserve Board has taken no action to date to alleviate hardships it is causing the people and to durable goods industries, unemployment is mounting at an alarming rate, production is being cut back, and other soft spots have appeared in our economy.

Consequently I took some heart as I heard you testify on regulation W February 14 before the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report when you promised:

"I can assure you that we will modify these restraints as the economic conditions warrant it and will not hesitate to relax them when they have served their purpose."

Then why don't you act immediately?

Already it is dangerously late.

Already you have thrown countless thousands of workers unnecessarily out of jobs.

Already you have carried too far your deliberate policy of discriminating against our families of moderate means whom you dictate cannot have reasonable installment credit to purchase the durable goods they need.

You are jeopardizing the very business lives of an untold number of small, independent businessmen throughout the country.

By singling out only certain industries, small businessmen, and the mass market of ordinary folks for your unfair and discriminatory consumer-credit measures, you already have carried the country too far toward deflation and depression.

If we have a depression, it should not be called a Truman depression, as the Republicans no doubt will attempt to do; instead it should rightfully be called a Federal Reserve Board depression.

It is not unusual for the Federal Reserve Board to cause depressions. It caused a devastating one in 1920. It contributed to the 1929–30 depression. It started a real depression in 1937, but fortunately our Chief Executive at that time caused changes to be made which put the Government back on a sound economic basis.

Of late there has been an alarming increase in areas of depression in sections of our country and our economy. Certainly we must give credence to such reports as the following, which have appeared in the press in the last few days:

As a sharp index to what's happening to business, Dun & Bradstreet says bank clearings in 25 leading cities during the week ending February 9 were the lowest of any week since September 1.

Unemployment among railroad workers of the Nation passed the 100,000 mark last week. This is around 10 percent of the working force in the industry.

United Air Lines' President W. A. Patterson reports a recession is already here—that he has found evidences of a business slump all over the country and that United has had to lay off 1,300 employees since October.

The Federal Reserve Board reports that department store sales for the Nation were down 4 percent as compared to the same week last year, with New York and Atlanta down 7 percent and Dallas and San Francisco down 10 percent.

Montgomery Ward's January sales were down 10 percent over the same month last year, and Sears, Roebuck sales were down 11 percent.

General Electric cut production 10 percent at its Tiffin, Ohio, plant which makes small motors.

International Harvester will curtail heavy truck production at Fort Wayne, Ind., by 30 percent and light truck ouput at Springfield, Ohio, by 10 percent about March 1.

California factory employment dropped 5 percent in January over December of last year for the sharpest decline since 1939.

Commercial and industrial failures rose 32.4 percent to 192 in the week ended February 10, reaching the highest level since June of 1942, according to Dun & Bradstreet.

This represents just a very small sample of the worker lay-offs and production curtailments which are taking place throughout our Nation today.

All but the upper crust of purchasers are being forced out of the markets for new automobiles, refrigerators, furniture, applicances, and other consumer goods that fall under your regulation W consumer credit curb.

Not 2 out of 10 persons can afford to pay $100 a month or more for new cars, since in general only persons earning $5,000 a year or more—roughly the upper 14 percent—are classed as good credit risks for such installments. Yet simply by extending the credit period to 24 months, such monthly payments could be reduced to approximately $75 a month.

Cars are an absolute necessity for most Americans today, the majority being used in their work or business, and so I am deeply concerned when the little fellow is hit as regulation W is hitting him.

Auto installment credit today is virtually the same amount as it was in 1941, and you surely cannot consider that out of line in view of the fact that the sales value of autos now is much greater. Yet in the prewar era, when cars cost less, purchasers were allowed to spread payments over longer periods.

Thousands of additional workers in durable-goods industries are being laid off each week that you delay modifying Regulation W. This is endangering the Nation's domestic, foreign, and defense programs, which hinge on a continued high level of production and employment in the durable-goods industries.

Some time back I noted Detroit reports that up to then Regulation W was being blamed in connection with the auto industry having to lay off 10,000 workers and with almost all the auto-parts manufacturers being forced to cut back production and employment. Over the week end Walter Reuther, of the United Auto Workers Union, announced that the auto industry in recent weeks laid off 5,000 tool and die makers, "who have little hope for reemployment in the immediate future."

These lay-offs are setting off a chain reaction.

Small business, whose interests our House committee has been charged with looking after, is suffering severely from Regulation W.

Three out of every four auto dealers in the Nation report they are being hurt by Regulation W, according to a poll being taken by the National Automobile Dealers Association among its 35,000 members. The association's membership, representing an important segment of American small business, went on record at their recent national convention in San Francisco as urging immediate extension of the installment period to 24 months.

You no doubt also have received a poll taken by the National Appliance and Radio Dealers Association showing the feeling of these small-business men that you should revise the regulation to permit longer credit terms.

The promises you made before the joint congressional committee to cause the least possible interference with usual business operations and to use your powers to meet deflationary developments lead me to observe this:

Recently the Departemnt of Agriculture stepped in promptly, in the public interest, to stop the sudden, chaotic drop in farm commodity prices. This Government agency felt the need for action and did something about it immediately. Likewise the Federal Reserve Board is empowered and entrusted with the responsibility to act positively and swiftly against needless reduction of production and employment.

As a member of the Congressional Joint Economic Committee and House Banking and Currency Committee, and chairman of the House Small Business Committee I regard it as my solemn duty to call to your attention what is happening to our country, something which I am afraid will not be recognized by your Board until it is too late. I am taking the liberty of sending a copy of this letter to your fellow members of the Board of Governors and I hope that each of you will see the human suffering that continued delay can cause. If you but listen to the reports from the grass roots of the country, I believe you would act at once to safeguard the people's interest.

Sincerely yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN.

(Copies to six other Federal Reserve Board members.)

NADA HAS REPEATEDLY WARNED FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD

Mr. Speaker, the adverse effects of the imposition of regulation W on the retail automobile trade are not new. They first came to the attention of the headquarters of the National Automobile Dealers Association here in Washington on November 30, 1948, in a wire from a member. Some 40 other wire complaints followed shortly.

NADA acted promptly on the dealers' behalf, as we who are familiar with its service know it is accustomed to do. The complaints were referred to the industry relations committee of NADA on December 1, and with its approval went to the executive committee on December 3. Reference of the situation to the Federal Reserve Board was authorized and the Board set December 7 to receive the first complaints from NADA representatives. This action was in accord with the association's regular practice of seeking to settle all matters with Government departments administratively, if possible, before asking for remedial legislation. It is a good practice and one which, I am sure, every Member of Congress will endorse.

The association representatives asked that the period for making monthly payments on cars be extended from 18 to 24 months. No change in the down payment of one-third was asked. Dealers had said that their customers, in general, were able to make the initial payment but found difficulty in meeting subsequent monthly payments. In most cases each of these monthly payments, on even the smallest cars, amount to at least $100. That is a large amount of money for a worker who must use his car to reach his place of employment, or a small-business man who uses his car in trade.

The Board received the presentations with thanks on December 7 and asked that any future information on the matter be submitted to it. Since that time, at regular intervals, on December 17 and

December 19, 1948, and January 14 and February 7, 14, and 15, 1949, NADA representatives have submitted to the Board additional information from dealers substantiating the original complaint that application of regulation W in its present form was slowing up credit sales.

In this connection, a statement of the situation, issued by the executive committee of NADA at its national convention held in San Francisco on January 25–28, 1949, is of interest. It follows:

NADA RELEASE ON REGULATION W

SAN FRANCISCO, January 23.—Reports from throughout the Nation that regulation W is imposing grave hardships on persons of small incomes who must use motorcars in their work or business greatly disturbed members of the National Automobile Dealers Association meeting here today.

So serious did the association's executive committee regard the situation that it issued a special statement strongly urging the Federal Reserve Board anew to take remedial action immediately. The Board is authorized to ease the present time payment terms of one-third down and the remaining two-thirds in 18 months whenever it sees fit. The Board now has before it a request from the association that the time payment period be extended to 24 months.

The statement said:

"The executive committee of NADA has heard with renewed concern from thousands of its 35,000 members attending its national convention here that the application of regulation W is hurting persons of small income who must have cars to help them earn a livelihood. Workers who must travel long distances to their employment and small-business men who use cars for making deliveries and other gainful purposes are being hit especially hard. Most of them are able to make the initial payment but find it impossible in many cases to meet the subsequent 18 months' requirements.

"These payments, even on the smallest cars, now approximate $100 per month. Of course, persons in the low-income brackets simply cannot meet such terms.

"This is not a question of dealers being unable to move all the cars they can get. They can do that because there are enough customers with higher incomes ready and able to buy all available new cars. But the higher income classes generally do not need cars to help them make a living. Therefore, the regulation puts pressure on the segment of car buyers least able to stand it.

"NADA has previously called the attention of the Federal Reserve Board to the situation as reflected by scattered reports and the Board has been investigating this limited number of cases and others brought to its attention. Since arriving here, however, your executive committee has learned from dealers representing all States that complaints against the harsh terms of the regulation are general.

"We, therefore, are again urging the Board to give the small buyers relief immediately."

Informal discussions looking to amendment of the regulation by congressional action in case the Board continues to decline to modify the terms of the regulation have been held. Thus far, however, NADA has made no direct appeal to Congress for legislative assistance.

Shortly before the convention, NADA headquarters here sent a postcard questionnaire to its 35,011 members in all States asking them to report on the current effects of regulation W. To date a total of 19,862 members, or about four-sevenths of the total membership, has replied. A very large majority of them declare that the regulation is slowing down time-payment sales. Not all of the replies have been tabulated, but the ratio of those counted shows that those dealers who think the regulation is hurting sales is approximately 3 to 1 over those who say the regulation has not proved harmful.

As the replies are being received, reports on them are being given to both the Board and interested congressional Members. It is expected that the last of the replies will be received within a week or 10 days and final reports will then be made by NADA to the two groups.

The Federal Reserve Board also is conducting surveys of retail automobile credit sales in different parts of the country. Although the Board has not acceded thus far to the request of NADA and others for a modification of the regulation, neither has it refused finally to do so.

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include statements and excerpts.)

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE ATOMIC BOMB

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, to paraphrase a great statesman of our time—never before have so many known so little about so potent a weapon as the atom bomb. Out of the devastating explosions of Hiroshima, Nagasaki, and Bikini has arisen a vast mushroom of contradictions and confusion.

Millions of dollars have been siphoned from the pockets of the American people for the development of atomic destruction. But how much have these investors in the atom bomb—these stockholders of the Nation's welfare—been permitted to know regarding the potential uses and effects of the atom bomb in a future war?

If the stockholders of a large corporation were handled with similar scorn and disrespect, it would be considered bad business and bad public relations. When the men who are elected or appointed to guide our destinies withhold from the people they represent the facts which are rightfully theirs to know—then I say those leaders are acting dangerously and intolerably.

What are some of the contradictions and muddy statements concerning the atom bomb which have come to our ears in recent months?

I recall, for example, the statement of Rear Adm. William Parsons, the Navy's atomic-defense director, who claimed there had been tremendous overemphasis of the atom bomb. Admiral Parsons said that one or a dozen atom bombs dropped on American cities would be just another Pearl Harbor. He added confidently:

It would cook the goose of any nation doing it unless that nation had hundreds of atom bombs to follow up with.

Fears of radioactivity, Admiral Parsons said, are largely unfounded. Only the Bikini underwater blast, he pointed out, left appreciable amounts of radioactive deposits.

Well, two holes can be shot in that statement right off by the mere layman. First of all, I know of no guaranty that the enemy of the future would not have in his possession hundreds of atom bombs to hurl at our cities. And, second, what does Admiral Parsons mean by only the Bikini underwater blast left appreciable amounts of radioactive deposits? Does he mean to imply that underwater atom blasts will be declared outside the rules of future warfare, and that our potential enemies will only explode their bombs in the air, to spare us the inconvenience of radioactivity?

That is a pet point of the atom-bomb depreciators who would calm our nerves—the tell-'em-nothing and save-'em-from-fear boys. Oh, the radioactive particles of the air-burst atom bomb, they tell us, do their darnedest immediately following the explosion, and then they disappear into the stratosphere where nobody cares what happens to them. The worst sting of the atom bomb, they console us, lies in its explosive power, its terrific heat and fire. After it is all over, and thousands lie dead and mangled, there is nothing further to worry about—unless you happen to be dead and mangled, and then you are beyond worry anyway.

Again, there is this unwillingness to face up to the awful consequences of an underwater bomb.

Unfortunately, Col. James P. Cooney, one of the Army observers at Bikini, belongs to the do-not-let-the-atom-bomb-disturb-your-dreams school of thought. Colonel Cooney, who is chief of the Army Surgeon General's Special Projects Division, called the atom bomb primarily a blast weapon, referring to it casually as a piece of ordnance. An air-burst bomb, Colonel Cooney said, leaves so little radiation that rescue workers can safely enter a bombed area immediately after the blast. And then he warned that unreasoning psychological fears of the effects of radioactivity could well interfere with an important military mission in time of war.

Then why not give the American people the facts about radioactivity so that they can act intelligently in the light of this knowledge? The way to protect people from unreasoning psychological fears is not to keep them ignorant.

The way to avoid hysteria is not to stifle free discussion as was done several weeks ago in San Francisco. A round-table discussion on the deadliness of radiation, which was scheduled by the Radiological Society of North America, was canceled at the request of military authorities in Washington. It was claimed that the discussion would have involved many military angles, although this explanation must be taken with tongue in cheek. This is precisely the type of censorship which can multiply to threatening proportions.

Through this haze of censorship and official hedging has come a dramatic warning, which I believe brings us closer than we have ever been before to the true implications of the atom bomb. It is the account of Dr. David Bradley of his experiences as a radiological monitor at Bikini in the summer of 1946. The title

of Dr. Bradley's book is in itself a warning—"No Place To Hide."

This Geiger monitor whose job it was to guard the Bikini personnel from the unseen dangers of radiation does not look upon the atom bomb as merely another piece of ordnance. Dr. Bradley gives us a far different picture. He views the bomb as—and we quote:

The colossus which looms behind tomorrow.

It was the underwater explosion, Dr. Bradley points out, which left behind it the real atomic menace—the lingering poison of radioactivity. In this test the lethal elements, the most dangerous fission products—including the deadly plutonium, which cannot be detected by the Geiger counter—were held captive in the huge cloud of water which fell back on the atoll.

While others whistle as they pass the atomic cemetery, Dr. Bradley tells us that the Bikini Atoll—an area of some 200 square miles—could not be decontaminated and made habitable for years or perhaps for centuries. Habitable that is, for people, not for fishes or birds. Furthermore, he says the Navy failed completely to cleanse the more strongly radioactive ships which were blasted in the experiment.

Let us not overlook the implications of that statement, as we contemplate the defense budget, and note the construction of a 65,000-ton carrier costing the stockholders—or rather, the taxpayers—$124,000,000. This carrier, and the Navy's request for an increase in its budget, contribute not only to the general confusion but to the national deficit.

Let us pierce the confusion and find out why we cannot devise a more economical and perhaps even more efficient defense. To quote from an editorial in the New York Herald Tribune:

Surely the present level of military effectiveness could be provided for less than $15,000,000,000 a year.

And the New York Times on the same subject:

It is one thing to know what we want to spend our money for; it is another thing to pay too much for what we get. We want an adequate defense, not a race between the services.

The services also appear to be outdoing each other in contradictory and confusing statements relative to our defense needs. Each official pleads the special case of his branch of the service, but no one attempts to define our defense needs in terms of atomic realities. So far I have heard none of our high officials convincingly refute these four conclusions presented by Dr. Bradley:

First. There is no real defense against atomic weapons.

Second. There are no satisfactory countermeasures and methods of decontamination.

Third. There are no satisfactory medical or sanitary safeguards for the people of atomized areas.

Fourth. The devastating influence of the bomb and its unborn relatives may affect the land and its wealth—and therefore its people—for centuries through the persistence of radioactivity.

This, as I have said, is the closest we have yet come to a straightforward statement of atomic consequences. However, it is not a top official report. It comes from a keen observer who has gone as far as he could in awakening us to the possible dangers of the poisoning of land, sea, and air with radioactivity from the atom bomb.

Much of the information the author acquired—Dr. Bradley notes—must remain veiled in official secrecy.

He does not mean that it should remain veiled, but that it must remain veiled under the official mandate.

There is a top official account of Bikini, which from all we can gather, is blotted out with the black ink of censorship. The Joint Chiefs of Staff Evaluation Board on the Bikini tests were charged with the task of writing a separate report on the value of the atom bomb and its place in the war of the future.

According to Mr. Bradley Dewey, a member of the Evaluation Board, and a respected New England industrialist, it was understood that the Board's report was partly for the guidance of public thinking and that all of it except those portions which might jeopardize military security would be made public. The Board chairman, Dr. Karl T. Compton, together with security experts of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, made certain deletions which Mr. Dewey calls entirely proper and expected, and then approved the remainder of the report for publication. It was also approved for publication by the Atomic Energy Commission. Then, according to Mr. Dewey, it was sent to the White House in the custody of Admiral Leahy, the President's Chief of Staff.

Where is this report now—this report which belongs to the public?

An Associated Press dispatch of November 26 quoted the National Military Establishment as saying Secretary Forrestal had recommended that the final official report on the Bikini atom-bomb tests be withheld for reasons of national security.

Mr. Bradley Dewey says:

In the many months this report has been withheld from the public, millions of words have been printed expressing mere opinion and gross speculation, thus fanning the winds of rumor so that they swirl and eddy about the earth. Now serving one propaganda, now another, rumor exaggerates or depreciates the value of atomic weapons, falsifying and distorting public opinion everywhere.

I can foresee grave consequences if this type of dangerous mentality is permitted to keep legitimate information about the atom bomb from the American public. Even during wartime there exists an exaggerated sense of distrust of the public among this section of the military, which would, if permitted, clamp down an all-inclusive censorship on information reaching the public. Their unreasonable actions would be rationalized by befuddled references to military security and maintaining the public morale. This military mentality extended into peacetime censorship is even more dangerous, for it cannot wear the mask of immediate military necessity. It stems basically from distrust of the people and democratic processes of shaping national policy.

Both history and common sense demonstrate that contempt of the public and unjustified censorship are among the first blows against democracy. Unwillingness to take the public into counsels that affect the public welfare is based in good part upon the desire to build and preserve an undue sense of power and omnipotence.

I want to warn you that the seeds of military dictatorship lie in that course. I see great cause for alarm if atomic policy and other national policy is to be made and carried out over the heads of the American people. Powerful military leaders, monopolizing atomic information, can do more harm to our Nation than any truth about the dangers of atomic destruction and radioactivity. Yes; I think we have really to fear the military grab for power—the military who would control our destiny, perhaps laying the pattern of our destruction, rather than serving the interests of the Nation's defense.

I hold that no potential enemy will be served if the American people are told plainly and truthfully the facts about atomic destruction and radiation disease—what the bomb can do and has done to people and to ships and other devices of war.

I believe, in fact, that the more we know about the destructive powers of the atom bomb, the more convinced we will become that atomic warfare may very well mean the destruction of our civilization. Knowing this, I believe it will become more apparent to us that war is not inevitable, any more than voluntary death is inevitable to a person contemplating suicide. There is still a chance that he may be reasoned out of his impulse for self-destruction. That is what I fear the next war may amount to—mass self-destruction.

If the Russian people, as well as the American people, are given the full facts about the destructive potential of the atom bomb, I believe a long step will be taken toward making sure there will be no future war. In the atomic age, this is indeed one world. The atom bomb with its chain reaction, its radioactivity, and its dread byproducts respects no national or ideological boundaries. We cannot build Maginot lines against radioactivity. We cannot suppress or censor radioactivity or cheerfully contend that it does not exist, or even if it does exist, that it is not as bad as it might be.

We must take the guesswork out of national defense and international diplomacy. The diplomats and defense officials in our democracy must serve the interests of the people. But the people cannot decide where those best interests lie unless and until they know the truth. Knowledge banishes fear and provides an intelligent basis for democratic action. Therefore, I recommend—for the sake of the national security and the public welfare—that this body demand a full accounting of the final report of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Evaluation Board on the Bikini tests. Let us give this report to the people, to whom it belongs. I believe

we should also investigate all other possible suppressions of legitimate information about the atom bomb, such as the official silence concerning the later atomic-weapon tests at Eniwetok. Furthermore, let the committees charged with weighing our national defense needs study carefully the justification of all expenditures in the light of the actual necessities of the atomic age.

Practically every American has seen the impressive photograph of an atom-bomb explosion, with its mushroom of smoke or steam. The caption of this familiar photograph has been distorted and blurred. It is up to us to rewrite it clearly and truthfully, so that the atomic explosion may never be blasted out of that photograph to engulf our world in a radioactive doom.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] is recognized for 10 minutes.

TOWNSEND PLAN FOR NATIONAL INSURANCE

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, on February 2, 1949, I introduced H. R. 2135, and the gentleman from Oregon, Representative ANGELL, introduced a companion bill, H. R. 2136, which is the Townsend plan for national insurance, and the following is a condensed version of the bill:

A bill to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys

Be it enacted, etc.—

TITLE I—DEFINITIONS

TITLE II—GROSS INCOME TAX

SEC. 201. In addition to all other excises, duties, or taxes, there shall be levied, collected, and paid a tax of 3 per centum of the gross income of all persons or companies derived from any and all sources, except in personal incomes there shall be an exemption up to $250 per month.

RULES AND REGULATIONS

SEC. 202. The taxes shall be collected by the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

SEC. 203. The Secretary of the Treasury may distrain upon any goods, chattels, etc., for delinquent taxes.

SEC. 204. The Secretary of the Treasury shall designate the manner and place for filing returns and payment of tax.

SEC. 205. The tax shall be computed on the total gross income of all persons and companies at the end of each calendar month.

SEC. 206. All remittances of taxes imposed by this act shall be made to the place designated by the Secretary of the Treasury on or before the 20th day of the second month after they accrue.

COLLECTIONS, ASSESSMENTS, AND APPEALS

SEC. 207. If the taxpayer shall make any error in computing the tax assessable against him, the Secretary of the Treasury shall correct such error.

SEC. 208. If the amount already paid exceeds that which should have been paid on the basis of the tax so recomputed, the excess so paid shall be immediately refunded to the taxpayer.

SEC. 209. If any person having made the return feels aggrieved by any assessment so made upon him, he may appeal from said assessment by filing a petition in the manner provided.

SEC. 210. The Secretary of the Treasury shall enforce the payment of the excises, taxes, or duties required by this act.

SEC. 211. For the purpose of the income tax imposed by title I of the Revenue Act of 1934, the tax imposed by section 201 shall be allowed as a deduction to the taxpayer in computing his net income.

SEC. 212. All provisions of law, including penalties, applicable with respect to any tax imposed by various revenue acts, shall be applicable to this act.

SEC. 213. All Federal officers or agents making contracts on behalf of the United States or its instrumentalities or any political subdivision thereof shall withhold payment in the final settlement of any contracts until the receipt of a certificate from the Secretary of the Treasury or his duly appointed agent to the effect that all taxes levied or accrued under this title against such contractor have been paid.

EXEMPTIONS

SEC. 214. The provisions of this title shall not apply to the following: (1) All moneys received by individuals or institutions and held in custody or as a deposit for others; (2) fraternal benefit societies, orders, or associations, operating under the lodge system, or for the exclusive benefit of the members of the fraternity itself, operating under the lodge system, and providing for the payment of death, sick, accident, or other benefits to the members of such societies, orders, or associations, and to their dependents or beneficiaries; (3) corporations, associations, or societies organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, or educational purposes; (4) business leagues, chambers of commerce, labor organizations, boards of trade, civic leagues, and other similar organizations operated exclusively for the benefit of the community and for the promotion of social welfare, and not for commercial trading in any form, and from which no profit inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual; (5) hospitals, infirmaries, and sanatoria, from which no profit inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual; (6) amounts received by any person as a benefit payment so-called or like payments by virtue of acts passed by the Congress of the United States relating thereto and disbursed to others as such benefit payment; but the Secretary of the Treasury may by regulation require any such deductions to be set forth specifically by the taxpayer in his return: *Provided, however*, That exemptions (2) to (6), inclusive, shall apply only to the gross income received from nonprofit activities.

PENALTIES

SEC. 215. It shall be unlawful for any person to refuse to make any returns provided for in this title; or to make any false or fraudulent return or false statement in any return with intent to defraud the United States, or to evade the payment of the tax, or any part thereof. Any person violating any of the provisions of this title shall be guilty of a felony, and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $5,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding 5 years, or by both. Any corporation for which a false return, or a return containing a false statement, as aforesaid, shall be made, shall be guilty of a felony and shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000.

SEC. 216. The Federal Insurance Contributions Act is hereby repealed.

TITLE III—ANNUITIES

SEC. 301. There is hereby created an account in the Treasury of the United States to be known as the business, employment, and security insurance account (hereinafter referred to as the "account"). There are hereby authorized to be appropriated annually amounts to be equal to the estimated revenue derived under title II of this act. On the twentieth day of the month succeeding the month in which this act is enacted, and on the twentieth day of each calendar month thereafter, there shall be credited to the account an amount equal to the amount of revenue to be collected under the provisions of such title as indicated by the returns filed during the preceding calendar month. Such amounts shall be available for making the payments as hereinafter provided. The Secretary of the Treasury shall submit annually to the Bureau of the Budget an estimate of the appropriations to be credited to the account.

SEC. 302. Amounts estimated by the Secretary of the Treasury to be necessary for monthly expenditures in the administration of this title shall be deducted from amounts credited to the account for each month and all funds not so deducted shall be prorated and paid monthly to the number of annuitants per capita.

QUALIFICATIONS

SEC. 303. Every citizen who is 60 years of age or over shall upon filing an application under oath, be entitled to receive an annuity payable in monthly installments during the remainder of the life of such person.

SEC. 304. Every citizen between the ages of 18 and 60 who is disabled for a period longer than 6 months, every widow who is a citizen and who has the care of one or more children under 18 years of age, shall be entitled to receive an annuity payable in monthly installments so long as their incapacity for employment exists, or so long as they have the care of one or more children under 18 years of age.

SEC. 305. (a) The annuity shall be spent within the confines of the United States, its Territories, and possessions.

(b) Each installment of the annuity shall be spent by the annuitant within 30 days after the time of its receipt.

(c) An annuitant shall not engage in any occupation, business, or other activity from which a profit, wage, or other compensation is realized or attempted, except that nothing in this title shall be construed to prohibit an annuitant from collecting interest, rents, or other revenues from his own investments. No annuitants shall support an able-bodied person in idleness except a spouse.

(d) Any annuitant may waive all or any part of his right to an annuity under this title by filing a notice thereof with the Secretary of the Treasury in such manner as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe. Any such waiver shall not affect the right of any person to apply for an annuity at any time thereafter.

(e) Any sum received by an annuitant which represents the proceeds of a sale of any real property acquired through the use of money received as an annuity under this title shall be expended by the annuitant within 6 months after the receipt of such proceeds of such a sale.

(f) Each annuitant by accepting his annuity agrees to comply with all the provisions of this title and all rules and regulations.

REGULATIONS

SEC. 306. (a) Payments of the amounts due each annuitant under this title shall be made as near the first day of each month as possible.

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury shall furnish application blanks and other necessary forms, etc.

SEC. 307. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury prescribes such rules as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby empowered to call upon now existing

departments or agencies of the United States to aid in the administration of this title.

(c) The Secretary of the Treasury is also empowered to make adjustments with respect to the time in which installments shall be expended in case payments to any person may have been delayed and there is an accumulation of two or more installments.

SEC. 308. The right to receive any payment under this title shall not be transferable or assignable.

PENALTIES

SEC. 309. Whoever in any application or any payment under this title knowingly or willfully makes any false statement of a material fact, or fails or refuses to obey any rule, or regulation, issued by the Secretary of the Treasury under this title, or violates any provisions of this title shall be prosecuted by the United States attorney in the United States district court in the district in which the offense occurred, and, upon conviction, the annuitant shall forfeit each month for the remainder of his life up to one-fourth of the annuity to which he would otherwise be entitled.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. Titles I and II of the Social Security Act, as amended, are hereby repealed.

SEC. 402. All acts or parts of acts in conflict with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed to the extent of such conflict.

SEC. 403. If any part of this act is for any reason held to be unconstitutional, it shall not affect any other part of this act.

SEC. 404. This act may be cited as the "Business, Employment, and Security Insurance Act."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. WICKERSHAM, for an indefinite period, on account of illness in family.

To Mr. BENTSEN, for 1 week, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 17, 1949, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

226. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report of leases in two sections—cumulative report as of June 1, 1948, and additional leases as of December 1, 1948—property outleased under authority of Public Law 364, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

227. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of amendments, requests, and letters of compliance with the amendments and requests to certain voluntary plans under Public Law 395; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

228. A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a letter relative to section 3 (k) of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act, approved August 2, 1946 (Public Law 592, 79th Cong.); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. S. 630. An act to amend section 19 of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), so as to remove the upper age limit for appointment to commissioned grade in the Supply Corps of the Navy; without amendment (Rept. No. 128). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. S. 673. An act relating to the pay and allowances of officers of the Naval Reserve performing active duty in the grade of rear admiral, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 129). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WALSH: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2485. A bill to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the Eighty-third and Final National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held in Indianapolis, Ind., August 28 to September 1, 1949; without amendment (Rept. No. 131). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 2681. A bill to provide pensions for veterans of World War I and World War II based on non-service-connected disability and attained age, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 132). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GORSKI of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2513. A bill to amend subdivisions d and e of section 56 of an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; without amendment (Rept. No. 133). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 652. A bill for the relief of Laura Spinnichia; without amendment (Rept. No. 123). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2463. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Florence Byvank; without amendment (Rept. No. 124). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2474. A bill for the relief of Frank E. Blanchard; with an amendment (Rept. No. 125). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2605. A bill for the relief of John C. Nunes; without amendment (Rept. No. 126). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. S. 279. An act to authorize the advance on the retired list of Lt. John T. McDermott, United States Navy (retired), to the grade of lieutenant commander; without amendment (Rept. No. 127). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. S. 632. An act to authorize certain personnel and former personnel of the Naval Establishment to accept certain gifts and a foreign decoration tendered by foreign governments; without amendment (Rept. No. 130). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 2767. A bill to provide for the national defense through the acquisition of domestically produced manganese ores and concentrates, essential to the manufacture of supplies and material for the armed forces in time of emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 2768. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide certain retirement benefits for civilian marine inspectors, officers in charge, and marine inspection officers of the United States Coast Guard; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2769. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the two hundred fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the first colony in the Louisiana Territory; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. R. 2770. A bill to amend section 77 of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CROOK:

H. R. 2771. A bill to provide credit for salary purposes to carriers advanced from the status of village delivery; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2772. A bill to abolish the village delivery service of the Post Office Department; to transfer village carriers to the city delivery service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FELLOWS:

H. R. 2773. A bill to provide a method of paying referees in those bankruptcy courts where the existing funds are insufficient to pay sums due such referees for services rendered and expenses incurred; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 2774. A bill to amend section 17 of Public Law 134 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2775. A bill to reclassify postmasters, assistant postmasters, and other positions in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 2776. A bill authorizing flood-control works on the Yakima River and tributaries; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 2777. A bill to provide for the national defense through the acquisition of domestically produced manganese ores and concentrates essential to the manufacture of supplies and material for the armed forces in time of emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SANBORN:

H. R. 2778. A bill for the relief of Carey Act settlers in the Black Canyon irrigation district under the Payette division of the Boise reclamation project in Idaho; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 2779. A bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of bulls with intent to use such bulls for bull fighting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 2780. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. R. 2781. A bill to reorganize and simplify the procurement, utilization, and disposal of Government property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 2782. A bill to permit any veteran of both World Wars to elect to have his service in World War I counted as service in World War II for the purpose of determining eligibility for certain benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POTTER:

H. R. 2783. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey a certain parcel of land, with improvements, to the city of Alpena, Mich.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 2784. A bill to repeal a proviso which limits, in certain cases, the amount which may be paid to rural carriers on heavily patronized routes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 2785. A bill to provide for further contributions to the international children's emergency fund; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 2786. A bill to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system in view of the increased cost of living; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2787. A bill to authorize a further preliminary examination and a new survey of the following streams, which are tributaries to the Red River of the North: Snake River, Middle River (tributary to Snake River), Tamarac River, and Two Rivers (including North, South, and Middle Branches), Big Joe and Little Joe Rivers, in the State of Minnesota, for flood control, for run-off and water-flow retardation, and soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 2788. A bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEYER:

H. R. 2789. A bill to establish a United States Air Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 2790. A bill to provide for the improvement of Pennypack Creek, a tributary of the Delaware River, in Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CARROLL:

H. R. 2791. A bill to authorize the appointment of one additional circuit judge for the tenth circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 2792. A bill to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma:

H. R. 2793. A bill to establish a United States Air Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 2794. A bill to incorporate the Legion of Guardsmen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 2795. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Mount Lebanon Township, Allegheny County, Pa., a post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2796. A bill for the purpose of erecting in the Borough of Castle Shannon, Allegheny County, Pa., a post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 2797. A bill to provide that children be committed to the Board of Public Welfare in lieu of being committed to the National Training School for Girls; that the property and personnel of the National Training School for Girls be available for the care of children committed to or accepted by the Board of Public Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 2798. A bill to require the taking and destruction of dangerous weapons in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 2799. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act regulating the retent on contracts with the District of Columbia," approved March 31, 1906; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 2800. A bill relating to certain subsistence allowance overpayments made during 1946 to veterans pursuing courses of education or training; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. J. Res. 166. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. J. Res. 167. Joint resolution to provide for the reforestation and revegetation of the forest and range lands of the national forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. J. Res. 168. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the term of office and qualifications of Members of the House of Representatives and the qualifications of Members of the Senate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. Con. Res. 40. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to have printed for Members of Congress copies of the reports submitted by the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, after said reports have become a House document; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. Res. 106. Resolution to express the gratitude of the House to amateur radio operators; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. Res. 107. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. Res. 108. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2661 to provide pensions for veterans of World War I and World War II based on non-service-connected disability and attained age, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2801. A bill for the relief of J. P. Olsen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY of New York:

H. R. 2802. A bill for the relief of Jerta and Peter Stephan Blumenstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 2803. A bill for the relief of Albert J. Peterson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORDON (by request):

H. R. 2804. A bill for the relief of Manuel DaCosta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 2805. A bill for the relief of John F. Oettl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2806. A bill for the relief of Paul C. Juneau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 2807. A bill for the relief of Loretta B. Powell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORTON:

H. R. 2808. A bill for the relief of Grace G. Walker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 2809. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Mascarin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SOMERS:

H. R. 2810. A bill to authorize the admission of Eliezar Tatz, a native of Israel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

82. By Mr. LeCOMPTE: Petition of members of the Holy Name Society of St. Peter's Parish, Lovilia, Iowa, urging inclusion in the Federal aid to education bill of the well-being of all children, regardless of race, color, or creed, without discrimination; and health and welfare for non-public-school children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

83. Also, petition of members of the Altar and Rosary Society of St. Peter's Parish, Lovilia, Iowa, urging inclusion in the Federal aid to education bill of the well-being of all children, regardless of race, color, or creed; and health and welfare services for non-public-school children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

84. Also, petition of members of the Holy Name Society and the Altar and Rosary Society of St. John's Parish at Hiteman, Iowa, urging inclusion in the Federal aid to education bill of the well-being of all children, regardless of race, color, or creed, without discrimination; and health and welfare services for non-public-school children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

85. By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions passed by the Massachusetts Mayors' Association, New Bedford, Mass., on Februar 10, 1949, protesting the trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

86. By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States to use all possible means to secure the release of Cardinal Mindszenty, of the Roman Catholic faith, and Bishop Ordass, of the Lutheran faith; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308 (b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received for the fourth calendar quarter of 1948.

To carry out the provisions of the Lobbying Act, three forms were printed and used in making detailed statements (Form A), registrations (Form B), and filing quarterly reports (Form C).

Section 308 (b) requires the printing of information received and filed. Forms B and C, upon which this information was submitted, are reproduced as follows:

FORM B

REGISTRATION (IN DUPLICATE) WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SECRETARY OF THE SENATE UNDER THE LOBBYING ACT

(Public Law 601, 79th Cong.)

Name _____

Business address _____

INFORMATION REQUESTED FROM PERSONS REGISTERING

(1) The name and address of the person by whom employed:

(1) _____

(2) In whose interest he appears or works:

(2) _____

(3) The duration of such employment:

(3) _____

(4) How much he is paid and is to receive:

(4) _____

(5) By whom he is paid or is to be paid:

(5) _____

(6) How much he is to be paid for expenses:

(6) _____

(7) What expenses are to be included:

(7) _____

See Form C for quarterly report to be filed.

OATH OF REGISTRANT

[Omitted in printing]

FORM C

QUARTERLY REPORT OF PERSONS REGISTERING UNDER LOBBYING ACT TO BE FILED, IN DUPLICATE, WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

(Public Law 601, 79th Cong.)

Name _____

Business address _____

Employed by _____

Address _____

INFORMATION REQUIRED IN QUARTERLY REPORT

Each such person so registering shall, between the 1st and 10th day of each calendar quarter, so long as his activity continues, file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and Secretary of the Senate—

(1) A detailed report under oath of all money received and expended by him during the preceding calendar quarter:

(1) _____

(2) To whom paid:

(2) _____

(3) For what purposes:

(3) _____

(4) The names of any papers, periodicals, magazines, or other publications in which he has caused to be published any articles or editorials:

(4) _____

(5) The proposed legislation he is employed to support or oppose:

(5) _____

OATH OF REGISTRANT FILING QUARTERLY REPORT

[Omitted in printing]

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were received for the fourth calendar quarter 1948, and filed, using Form B, with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate:

(NOTE.—In order to reduce space, the questions in Form B (see above) are not repeated. Only the answers to questions are printed and are indicated by numbers in parentheses.)

American Citizens Committee To Establish New Immigration Quota for Greece Without Discrimination (short title: Act Now Committee), 4314 Argyle Terrace NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Self-employed. (2) All voluntary members interested in purposes of registrant. (3) Indefinite. (4) Indefinite; supported by voluntary contributions. (5) Voluntary subscribers or donors. (6) Indefinite; for expenses actually incurred. (7) Those actually incurred.

Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The Western Union Telegraph Co., 60 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y. (2) The Western Union Telegraph Co. (3) One year. (4) The employment is an ordinary attorney-client relationship on a retainer basis. The retainer is $25,000. (5) The Western Union Telegraph Co. (6) Actual disbursements are to be reimbursed. (7) Travel, cabs, telephones, miscellaneous.

Barnett, Arthur R., 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Association of Electric Companies. (See attached statement[1]). (3) Indefinite. (4) Salary of $13,500 per annum as secretary, treasurer, and director of research. I estimate that less than 10 percent of my time is spent on legislative matters within the purview of the act. (5) National Association of Electric Companies. (6) Amount incurred. (7) Traveling and expenses incidental thereto and those expenses incurred in the performance of routine work and duties.

Berthelot, Helen, 17231 Lahser Road, Detroit, Mich. (1) Communications Workers of America, Michigan Division, No. 44, 510 Lafayette Building, Detroit, Mich. (2) Communications Workers of America, Michigan Division, No. 44. (3) December 1949. (4) $4,200 per year. (5) Communications Workers of America, Michigan Division, No. 44. (6) $6 per diem plus transportation and hotel. (7) Transportation, meals, hotel.

Blankenship, C. B., Post Office Box 1150, Birmingham, Ala. (1) Communications Workers of America and its divisions, 917 G Place NW., Washington, D. C. (2) In the interest of the organizations whose name appears in (1) above. (3) For the term of office which requires 2 years (November 1948 to November 1950). (4) $4,800 per annum. (5) The organization whose name appears in (1) above. (6) No specific amount authorized. Reimbursed for actual expenses. (7) See answer in (6) above.

Boggs, Maywood, 825 Bowen Building, 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, and Helpers of America, Brotherhood Building, Kansas City, Kans. (2) International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, and Helpers of America. (3) Indefinite; probably while Congress is in session. (4) $700 per month. No segregation is made or is possible as to the portion of this amount which is compensation for legislative activities. (5) International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, and Helpers of America. (6) $15 per diem and actual traveling expenses outside of the city. (7) Per diem to be used for hotels, meals, taxies, entertainment, and other incidental expenses incurred in performing work.

Booras, James A., 4314 Argyle Terrace NW., Washington, D. C. (1) American Citizens Committee To Establish New Immigration Quota for Greece Without Discrimination (short title: Act Now Committee). (2) The committee under (1) and voluntary associate members thereof. (3) Indefinite. (4) Indefinite. (5) The committee as under (2). (6) Indefinite. (7) Those actually incurred.

Bradford, Ira P., 1515 Stafford Street North, Arlington, Va. (1) Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (2) Standard Oil Co. (Indiana). (3) Indefinite. (4) I estimate that not in excess of $1,000 of the compensation received by me will be related to activities coming within the scope of the Lobbying Act. This is for the reason that my duties are to be concerned with the maintenance of an information service for the benefit of my company. It is not intended that lobbying activities will constitute any appreciable part of my work. (5) Standard Oil Co. (Indiana). (6) No specified amount. (7) Not specified.

Brooks, William F., 604 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C. (1) National Grain Trade Council, 604 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C. (2) National Grain Trade Council and its members. (3) Permanent. (4) $10,000, a small and unallocable part of which might be regarded as compensation for services for activities covered by the Lobbying Act. (5) National Grain Trade Council. (6) Reimbursement of actual expenses. (7) Transportation costs, telephone calls, newspapers and periodicals, limited amount of entertainment, luncheons, etc.

Bundy, William P., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Northwest Horticultural Council, Wenatchee, Wash. (2) Northwest Horticultural Council as above; this organization is an association of apple and pear growers of the Pacific Northwest and is interested in legislation affecting the import of apples and pears and the stimulation of exports thereof. (3) Indefinite. (4) This employment is jointly undertaken with Howard C. Westwood. Mr. Westwood's registration gives the amount of the joint retainer, $500 per month. (5) Northwest Horticultural Council. (6) Mr. Westwood's registration states that the joint payment for expenses will cover actual disbursements only. (7) Actual disbursements as indicated in (6). Travel, telephone, telegraph, and similar miscellaneous expense.

Carter, Horace,[2] 209 West One Hundred and Twenty-fifth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) I am not employed by any business or organization. This is my initial application. (2) For the purpose of amending and broadening of social-security benefits, adequate housing program, revising the Railway Labor Act and for legislation pending or contemplated on civil rights. (See amended form.[1]) (3) Indefinite. (4) To be filed accordingly, all money received will be solicited

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[2] Registration with the Clerk only.

and detailed accounts will be outlined, whenever loans, gifts, subscriptions, promises, contributions, and agreements are made. (5) To be outlined accordingly. (6) To be outlined accordingly. (7) To be outlined accordingly.

Chisholm, William James, Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Regular Veterans Association, a membership corporation duly organized under the membership corporation laws of the District of Columbia, 1115 Fifteenth Street NW, Washington, D. C. (2) Regular Veterans Association, the veterans of the World Wars and the service men and women serving in the Regular Military Establishments of the armed forces. (3) Elected national judge advocate and appointed national adjutant of the Regular Veterans Association September 20, 1948, for a period of 1 year, or longer if necessary, until a successor is duly elected and appointed at a national convention. (4) $1,300 per annum as a salary for services as national judge advocate; $3,900 per annum as a salary for services as national adjutant. (5) Paid by the Regular Veterans Association. (6) All expenses to be defrayed from above salary. (7) This will include all expenses in connection with offices of national judge advocate and national adjutant.

Clorety, Joseph A., Jr., 1200 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) American Veterans Committee, Inc., 1200 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) American Veterans Committee, Inc., its members, and all veterans of World War II. (3) As national vice chairman, until next national convention; as national secretary, at the pleasure of the national planning committee. (4) $7,500 salary as national vice chairman, of which not more than 10 percent is attributable to activities under the Lobbying Act, and none as national secretary. (5) American Veterans Committee, Inc. (6) Not more than $5 per month for legislative activities. (7) Taxi fares.

Clovis, Edwards & Reed, Inc.[3] (H. E. Clovis, A. W. Edwards, and Louis Reed, employees thereof), 630 Barr Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Foremen's League for Education and Association, room 603, 11 West Monument, Dayton, Ohio. (2) Same as above. (3) Six months, commencing January 1, 1949. (4) $1,500 per month. (5) Same as (1). (6) Reimbursement of out-of-town travel expenses. (7) Only those in (6).

Russell Coleman, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (2) Employer as indicated in (1). (3) Employed on a year-to-year basis. (4) Russell Coleman is paid a salary as president of the National Fertilizer Association, Inc., and he is informed and believes that when he shall do anything as such president to influence legislation by Congress an allocable part of his salary may be said to be paid as consideration for such activity, and in such event he intends to report the same in his quarterly report. (5) [Blank.] (6) See answer to (4). In addition, Russell Coleman is not to be paid any sum specifically for expenses in attempting to influence legislation. Any expense actually to be incurred in attempting to influence legislation will be paid by him subject to reimbursement by the National Fertilizer Association, Inc. (7) Any such expenses as travel, hotels, meals, taxies, tips, and entertainment are to be included and will be reported when actually incurred by the registrant.

Cooper, J. Milton, 544 Washington Building, Washington, D. C. (1) National Coal Association, Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (2) National Coal Association. (3) Indefinite. (4) This employment is an ordinary attorney-and-client relationship, and is based on a regular retainer. Some of the employment may fall within the provisions of the act. It is impossible, however, to allocate in advance the amount of the remuneration to be reported. (5) National Coal Association. (6) Nothing. (7) None.

Cooper, J. Milton, 544 Washington Building, Washington, D. C. (1) National Lime Association, 927 Fifteenth Street, NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Lime Association. (3) Indefinite. (4) This employment is an ordinary attorney-and-client relationship, and is based on a regular retainer. Some of the employment may fall within the provisions of the act. It is impossible however to allocate in advance the amount of the remuneration to be reported. (5) National Lime Association. (6) Nothing. (7) None.

Cullum, Robert M. (1) Committee for Equality in Naturalization, 300 Fifth Street NE., Washington, D. C. (2) Committee for Equality in Naturalization. (3) July 1949. (4) Part-time. Basic rate, $500 per month. (5) Committee for Equality in Naturalization. (6) Reimbursement for actual expense incurred. (7) Postage, supplies, travel, etc.

Curry, James E., 1016 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant is employed by certain public corporations, instrumentalities of the government of Puerto Rico, for general legal work. On very rare occasions he is or may be called upon to perform work which influences directly or indirectly the passage or defeat of congressional legislation. He has examined the list of registrants and finds no registration for similar corporations, controlled by Federal, State, or Territorial government. It is registrant's very emphatic opinion that the Lobbying Act does not apply to State, Territorial, or Federal agencies or instrumentalities or representatives. This registration is filed merely as a matter of public record. If the Clerk of the House of Representatives or the Secretary of the Senate desire compliance with said act by the undersigned in spite of the circumstances above recited, a notification to that effect is hereby requested. (2) Puerto Rico Communications Authority and others. (3) Indefinite. (4) $10 per hour of work actually done. (5) See (2). (6) Actual expenses. (7) Actual expenses.

Danaher, John A., 1625 K Street, Washington, D. C., and 50 State Street, Hartford, Conn. (1) Revere Copper & Brass, Inc., 230 Park Avenue, New York City. (2) See (1): as an attorney engaged in the general practice of law I represent the above-named client in appearances before Government departments and agencies and, incidentally, may be required to appear before committees of Congress. (3) Indefinite. (4) Indefinite; charges will be made in accordance with appearances required, time expended, professional judgment, and experience relied upon and services rendered. (5) See (1). (6) Indefinite; but as incurred. (7) Necessary stenographic and office expenses, essential travel, telephone charges.

Donnelly, James L., 120 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. (I am advised that my activities do not subject me to the provisions of the act, but I have registered and will file reports pending clarification of the law.) (1) Illinois Manufacturers' Association (for which registrant is executive vice president) 120 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. (2) Illinois Manufacturers' Association. (3) Indefinite. (4) An annual salary for all services rendered as executive vice president of which not over $5,000 per year could reasonably be allocated to activities covered by the Lobbying Act. (5) Illinois Manufacturers' Association. (6) Actual disbursements. (7) Cost of transportation, hotel accommodations, meals, taxicabs, etc.

Drake, John (amended form), 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation. (3) Indefinite; no fixed term. (4) $5,500 per annum to cover all services for the federation including such services, if any, as are rendered in connection with lobbying. (5) National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation. (6) To be reimbursed for all actual expenditures. (7) All expenses incident to the work of the federation.

Edelsberg, Herman, 1003 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 212 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (2) Anti-Defamation League. (3) Registrant is a regular employee of the Anti-Defamation League. (4) Registrant is employed as Washington representative of the civil-rights division of the Anti-Defamation League. Only 5 percent of his activity and time, at most, is devoted to activity within the terms of the act. Approximately $500 per annum is allocatable to his activity under the act. (5) Anti-Defamation League. (6) Actual out-of-pocket expenses for activities under the act will approximate $60 per year or less. (7) Actual out-of-pocket expenses for fares, telephones, postage, meals.

Edwards, Burton E., executive secretary, National Apartment Owners Association, Suite 204-5-6, Portland Building, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., suite 226, Douglas Building, 257 South Spring Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) National Apartment Owners Association. (2) National Apartment Owners Association. (3) Temporary retainer; at will of National Apartment Owners Association's president. (4) $500 retainer, per month. (5) National Apartment Owners Association. (6) Estimated, $4,000 per year. (7) All travel and incidental expenses thereto.

Evans, Walter M., 512 Travelers Building, Richmond, Va. (1) Virginia Associated Businessmen (a Virginia corporation), 512 Travelers Building, Richmond, Va. (2) In the interest of the members of and subscribers to Virginia Associated Businessmen, a Virginia nonprofit corporation, and the said corporation, on a part-time basis. (3) Of indefinite duration, but now specified to terminate on April 21, 1949, unless extended beyond that date by mutual agreement. (4) $150 per month for general office expenses. No other compensation is paid by the association, but the sum of $200 per month is paid on behalf of the association by Messrs. Scott and Schuler of 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (5) The answer to this question is set forth in (4). (6) In addition to the $150 for general office expenses, all expenses incurred in traveling, long-distance-telephone calls, and telegrams, postage, printing, and additional stenographic and clerical hire are paid by Virginia Associated Businessmen to the registrant. (7) In addition to those listed under (6) the $150 stated in (4) includes association's use of basic telephone service, routine stenographic service, and office space in registrant's office.

Farhat, Selma, 1217 West St. Joseph Street, Lansing, Mich. (1) Communications Workers of America, Michigan Division, No. 44, 510 Lafayette Building, Detroit, Mich. (2) Communications Workers of America, Michigan Division, No. 44. (3) December 1949. (4) $13 per day for each day worked. (5) Communications Workers of America, Michigan Division, No. 44. (6) $6 per diem plus transportation and hotel. (7) Transportation, meals, hotel.

Farquhar (Mrs. Norman), Randolph, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) American Parents Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (2) American Parents Committee. (3) Started December 13, 1948. (4) $75 per week and expenses. (5) American Parents Committee. (6) [Blank.] (7) Travel, entertainment, etc.

[3] Registration with the Secretary only.

Foster, Charles E., 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Disabled American Veterans, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) In the interest of service-connected disabled American war veterans and their dependents. (3) Indefinite. (4) $6,480, less withholding and social security. (5) Disabled American Veterans. (6) Any expense incurred, see (7). (7) Taxis, lunches, and other expenses incidental to work at the Capitol. Actual traveling expenses.

Foutz, Dave, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Veterans Organization Council of Altadena, 2302 North Lake, Altadena, Calif. (2) VOCA. (3) Undetermined. (4) $600 per month. (5) VOCA. (6) Actual costs on monthly audited statement. (7) Living in Washington, office maintenance, and guests.

Frackman, H. David, 276 Fifth Avenue, New York City, N. Y. (1) Regular Veterans Association, a membership corporation duly organized under the membership corporation laws of the District of Columbia, 1115 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Regular Veterans Association, the veterans of the World Wars and the service men and women serving in the Regular Military Establishments of the armed forces. (3) Elected national commander of the Regular Veterans Association September 20, 1948, for a period of 1 year, or longer if necessary, until a successor is duly elected at a national convention. (4) $5,000 per annum as a salary for services as national commander. (5) Paid by the Regular Veterans Association. (6) To be paid an additional $5,000 for expenses, as the funds of the organization permit, in connection with personal expenses, transportation, hotel bills, and miscellaneous expenses disbursed in the performance of the duties of the office of national commander. (7) This will include all expenses in connection with office of national commander.

Freeman, Milton V., 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Consumer Mail Order Association of America, Post Office Box 1025, Joplin, Mo. (2) Consumer Mail Order Association of America. (3) One year. (4) The employment is an ordinary attorney-client relationship with compensation to be paid by a retainer of $5,000 and such additional fees as may be earned. (5) Consumer Mail Order Association of America. (6) Actual expenses incurred. (7) Travel, telephones, taxicabs, printing, etc.

Garstang, Marion R., 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation. (3) Indefinite; no fixed term. (4) $7,700 per annum to cover all services as attorney for the federation including such services, if any, as are rendered in connection with lobbying. (5) National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation. (6) To be reimbursed for all actual expenditures. (7) All expenses incident to the work of the federation.

George, J. M., H. K. Brehmer, and C. S. McMahon, constituting the partnership of George, Brehmer & McMahon, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn. (1) National Association of Direct Selling Companies, Winona, Minn. (2) Same as (1). (3) Indefinite but continuous and as general counsel on all legal matters, Federal legislation being merely incidental. (4) General law service retainer of $1,000 per month, payable without regard to any incidental service re Federal legislation, and this registration is made without belief that it is required by the law and facts. (5) Same as (1). (6) Those necessary and incidental to the work. Amount not known but to be reimbursed as incurred. (7) Necessary travel and communications.

Grimes, Weston B., 436 Bowen Building, 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Cargill, Inc., a corporation with its principal office at 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn. (2) In the interest of dealers in and warehousemen and shippers of grains, seeds, and beans, and manufacturers of feed for livestock and poultry, the ingredients thereof, and vegetable oils. (3) See letter attached. (4) $2,083.67 per month, plus bonuses not exactly determinable in advance, plus expenses. (5) Cargill, Inc. (6) Reimbursed in full for all expenses; no fixed limit as to amount. (7) All usual business expenses, including office rent, telephone, etc.

Heiman, Marcus, 234 West Fourty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) E Street Theatre Corp., 234 West Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y. (2) E Street Theatre Corp. (National Theatre). (3) Indefinite. (4) Aside from my regular salary as president of the corporation I receive no further compensation and anything I may do before Congress is purely incidental to, and cannot be segregated from my duties as president. (5) E Street Theatre Corp.; regular salary as President only. (6) Nothing. (7) None.

Henning, William C., executive secretary, 50 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio. (1) American Cemetery Association, 50 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio. (2) American Cemetery Association. (3) Permanently engaged. (4) Salary, $6,000 per year. (5) American Cemetery Association. (6) Exact amount of expenses. (7) All necessary travel and expense in behalf of this organization.

Hermann, Louis F. (amended form), 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation. (3) Indefinite; no fixed term. (4) $7,700 per annum to cover all services for the federation including such services, if any, as are rendered in connection with lobbying. (5) The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation. (6) To be reimbursed for all actual expenditures. (7) All expenses incident to the work of the federation.

Hewes & Awalt (a law partnership, consisting of the following partners: Thomas Hewes, F. G. Awalt, Samuel O. Clark, Jr., Harold E. Mitchell, Raymond Sparks, Henry L. Shepherd, John S. Murtha, Maxwell M. Merritt, and W. V. T. Justis), 822 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 93 Elm Street, Hartford, Conn. (The filing of this registration is not to be taken as an admission that the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act is applicable.) (1) National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Approximately 94 member companies and approximately 7 subscribing companies of the National Association of Electric Companies, located in 39 States and the District of Columbia. (3) Indefinite. (4) No payment has been received but the firm of Hewes & Awalt will be paid an annual retainer of $25,000 as general counsel of the association, with compensation for additional or extra services (not within the regular routine duties of general counsel) to be made the subject of special agreement when the occasion arises. (5) National Association of Electric Companies. (6) Usual out-of-pocket expenses will be reimbursed. (7) Expenses customary in legal work, such as carfare, taxi fares, telephone and telegraph charges, transportation, and traveling expenses.

Hilts, Harry B., 122 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Atlantic Coast Oil Conference, Inc., Empire State Petroleum Association, Inc., 122 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (2) Membership of Atlantic Coast Oil Conference, Inc., and Empire State Petroleum Association, Inc. (3) Elected to serve 1-year term. (4) The registrant does not believe his activities come under Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. The registrant is not employed primarily to support or oppose any specific legislation, nor is any particular part of his salary allocated for this purpose. The registrant's duties are such that, in the course of normal and regular association activities, he is required to report to the association's board of directors the nature of pending legislation which might affect the interests of the association's membership and the petroleum industry in general. Any action taken in connection with pending legislation is done under the direction of the association's board of directors. The registrant's authorized salary is $17,500 annually and covers all duties of regular and normal association activities. (5) Atlantic Coast Oil Conference, Inc., and Empire State Petroleum Association, Inc. (6) Actual out-of-pocket expense for legitimate association work. No specific budget items set up to cover activities under Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (7) Traveling, telephone, telegraph, and such legitimate out-of-pocket expense incurred through regular and normal association activities.

Hobbie, Edgar V. H., 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation. (3) Indefinite. (4) $700 per month. (5) National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation. (6) To be reimbursed for all actual expenses. (7) All actual expenses.

Hood, J. M., president, American Short Line Railroad Association, 1120 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) American Short Line Railroad Association, 1120 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (2) The 317 members of American Short Line Railroad Association listed in detail in the registration of the association. (3) Subject to the pleasure of the board of directors of the association. (4) Annual salary, $20,000, of which an indefinite amount, estimated at $2,000 per annum, is to cover services in connection with legislation. (5) The association. (6) Reimbursement for expenses incurred for account of the association. Amount indefinite, but based on past experience amount for account of legislation estimated at $2,500 per annum. (7) Travel, hotel, restaurant, and entertainment.

Householder, Glen M., 1 Main Street, Brattleboro, Vt. (1) Holstein-Friesian Association of America, 1 Main Street, Brattleboro, Vt. (2) Holstein cattle breeders of America. (3) Indefinite; by the year. (4) $8,000 per annum. (5) Holstein-Friesian Association of America. (6) To be reimbursed for all actual expenses. (7) All actual expenses.

Houston, William J., 716 Washington Loan and Trust Building, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) American Federation of Government Employees, 716 Washington Loan and Trust Building, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Employees of the Federal Government. (3) Permanent. (4) $7,500 per annum. (5) American Federation of Government Employees. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Carfare, taxicabs, meals, and incidentals.

Jackson, Robert C., 301 District National Building, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Cotton Council of America, 165 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn. (2) National Cotton Council of America, an organization of cotton producers, ginners, merchants, warehousemen, cottonseed crushers and cotton textile mills. Sole purpose of organization is to increase consumption of cotton, cottonseed, and the products thereof. (3) Permanent. (4) $12,000. (5) National Cotton Council of America only.

(6) Reimbursement for legitimate out-of-pocket expenditures. (7) Legitimate out-of-pocket expenses such as out-of-town travel, telephone and telegram, cab fares, meals for guests, etc.

Jennes, Ernest W., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Northwest Horticultural Council, Wenatchee, Wash. (2) Northwest Horticultural Council as above; this organization is an association of apple and pear growers of the Pacific Northwest, and is interested in legislation affecting the import of apples and pears and the stimulation of exports thereof. (3) Indefinite. (4) This employment is jointly undertaken with Howard C. Westwood. Mr. Westwood's registration gives the amount of the joint retainer, $500 per month. (5) Northwest Horticultural Council. (6) Mr. Westwood's registration states that the joint payment for expenses will cover actual disbursements only. (7) Actual disbursements as indicated in (6): travel, telephone, telegraph, and similar miscellaneous expenses.

Johnson, Curtis E., 4619A South Thirty-sixth Street, Arlington, Va. (1) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (2) The above committee (3) Terminable at will. (4) $625 per month plus reimbursement of actual out-of-pocket expenses. (5) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons. (6) Actual amount of out-of-pocket expenses. (7) To include such items as railroad fare, travel subsistence, and telephone and telegraph tolls.

Jones, Rowland, Jr., 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) American Retail Federation. (2) American Retail Federation. (3) Permanent. (4) Annual salary, $17,400, of which 10 percent is estimated as being attributable to legislative purposes. (5) American Retail Federation. (6) Indeterminate amounts depending upon legislative activity but limited to taxis, telephones, and telegraph expenditures and meals. (7) See (6).

Kass, Rear Adm. I., Post Office Box 4037, Washington, D. C. (1) On my own initiative. (2) In interests of Southern States government and free liberal government. (3) Not certain. (4) Expect to receive $60,000, but none was arranged nor promised. (5) Southern States governments. (6) Not certain. (7) My professional services and railroad fare, printing and mailing, and similar expenses, and telephone.

Keefe, Thomas J., 1319 F Street, NW., Washington, D. C. (1) American Road Builders' Association, a nonprofit, noncommercial organization which directs its efforts to technical, scientific, and educational work. (2) American Road Builders' Association. (3) On an annual basis. (4) $3,600 per year. (5) American Road Builders' Association. (6) Actual out-of-pocket expenses, but not to exceed $2,600 per year. (7) Taxicabs, luncheons, postage, telephone, transportation, etc.

Ketchum, Inc., 411 Seventh Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) National Competition Committee, room 56, 524 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh Pa. (2) National Competition Committee. (3) Indefinite. (4) Approximately $11,000 per month. (5) National committee. (6) Expenses will be paid directly by the committee. (7) Office rent, travel and living expenses for Ketchum staff members assigned to this client, stenographic salaries, printing, multigraphing, postage and other mailing expenses.

Kleppinger,[2] Robert F., 1720 M Street, NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant will be employed by officers discriminated against under interpretation by the Comptroller General of section 201, Legislative Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1933, upon enactment of correctional legislation enabling such officers to establish and prove the right to payment of pay loss due to such interpretation; and he will be employed by persons the property of whom was seized under the act of 1917 as amended (50 U. S. C. A. App. sec. 1, et seq.) under which employment legislation will be required to enable such persons to establish the right to have such property restored. In this connection, see registrant's statement filed with the Clerk January 20, 1948. (2) See (1) supra. (3) Uncertain; see (1) supra. (4) None for advocating enactment of proposed legislation referred to in (1) supra. If such legislation is enacted, fees will be determined commensurate for services rendered in compliance and conformity with such legislation but not for assistance in securing its enactment. (5) No one; see (1) and (4) supra. (6) None; see (1) and (4) supra. (7) None; see (1) and (4) supra.

Kyle, J. M. DeW., II, 1811 Nineteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The National Defense League of America, 1811 Nineteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) In the interest of national defense as outlined in the attached program of the National Defense League of America. (3) Indefinite. (4) Salary undetermined but will be fixed and reported in quarterly reports. (5) The National Defense League of America. (6) Reimbursement for actual expenses. (7) Local transportation, tips, lunches, and postage.

Lancraft, Robert J., 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Realtor's Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) The Realtors' Washington Committee, and through it the members of the National Association of Real Estate Boards throughout the United States. (3) Two weeks. (4) $6,000 per year. (5) Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards. (6) No specified amount; to be reimbursed upon claim for legitimate out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Transportation, telephone, meals, and similar expenses in connection with my duties.

La Roe, Wilbur, Jr., 743 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Eastern Meat Packers Association, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) The above association. (3) Annual. (4) $6,000 annually mainly for legal advice, being salary as general counsel. No amount paid specially for legislative work which constitutes such a small portion of the total that it cannot be measured. (5) By the association itself. (6) Nothing except actual incidentals such as transportation and meals while traveling. No expenses for legislative work unless there is printing expense. (7) Only incidental expenses as above.

Lee, Thomas A., Post Office Box 2169, South Portland, Maine. (1) Retired Lighthouse Service Employees Association. (2) Retired Lighthouse Service Employees Association to secure sorely needed legislation for the welfare of the retired employees. My position is secretary of the association. (3) Calendar year 1949. (4) Not paid and will receive nothing for pay. (5) Not paid. (6) Travel on actual basis plus $12 per day for subsistence and lodging. (7) Lodging and subsistence.

Life Insurance Association of America, 165 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant is an association composed of 90 legal reserve life-insurance companies. (See exhibit attached[1]). (2) (See exhibit attached[1]). (3) Unlimited. (4) Registrant does not receive funds earmarked for purposes set forth in act. At the end of each quarter, an estimate and report will be made to determine the amount received from members during the quarter which might come within the meaning of the act as interpreted by the Department of Justice. (5) See exhibit attached[1]). (6) Staff members will be paid actual out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Travel, meals, lodging, etc.

Litschert, Robert G., 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Association of Electric Companies. (3) Indefinite. (4) Salary of $9,000 per year. I estimate that less than 10 percent of my time is spent on legislative matters within the purview of this act. (5) National Association of Electric Companies. (6) Amount incurred. (7) Traveling and expenses incidental thereto and those expenses incurred in the performance of routine work and duties.

Locke, Gordon C., 632 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Committee for Pipe Line Companies, 632 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (2) Committee for Pipe Line Companies. (3) Indeterminate period. (4) $13,500 per annum, of which amount, it is estimated that 5 percent or $675 may be a fair apportionment to activities within the scope of the Lobbying Act. (5) Committee for Pipe Line Companies. (6) Only actual expenses which may be incurred but cannot at this time be determined with any degree of accuracy. (7) Personal expenses, such as incidental to travel and other miscellaneous personal expenses.

Love, Richard H., 709 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Judge Advocates Association, 331 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (2) Judge Advocates Association. (3) Indefinite. (4) $50 per week. (5) Judge Advocates Association. (6) Reimbursement of actual expenses incurred approved by president and/or secretary of association. (7) Telephone, telegram, postage, secretarial, office expenses, stationery, supplies, printing, transportation, etc., actually incurred.

Lunn, Dr. Carl E., 1501 West Washington, Phoenix, Ariz. (1) Townsend Plan, Inc., Townsend National Insurance Plan, 6675 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) [Blank.] (3) Temporary, voluntary. (4) No salary; no specified amount; a small commission on dues from members locally for postage, announcements of meetings, never enough to cover; because a humanitarian movement I donate time. (5) Townsend Plan, Inc.; I pay most expenses myself. (6) No set amount; a small commission; never enough to cover local expenses of local mailing of announcements of meetings, etc. (7) Mimeograph occasional news bulletins, postcard notices of local Townsend Club meetings, etc.

Lynn, John C., 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) American Farm Bureau Federation, 109 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (2) American Farm Bureau Federation. (3) Continuing. (4) $8,000. (5) American Farm Bureau Federation. (6) None, except reimbursement of actual necessary expenditures approved by officers of the American Farm Bureau Federation. (7) None, except as noted under (6).

McAdams, William D., Room 521, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West Thirty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (2) Retail Stores which are members of the association. (3) One year. (4) $3,750 per quarter to be received. $2,500 received to date. (5) National Retail Dry Goods Association. (6) Traveling expenses only which are not determined at this time. (7) Traveling only.

McGrath, Thomas Edward, general delivery, Washington 1, D. C. (1) Taxpayers of United States of America, United States Treasury. (2) In interests of taxpayers. (3) Indefinite. (4) Expenses, $165. (5) United States

[2] Registration with the Clerk only.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

taxpayers. (6) No specific amount. (7) [Blank.]

Malone, Robert W., 4314 Argyle Terrace NW., Washington, D. C. (1) American Citizens Committee To Establish New Immigration Quota for Greece Without Discrimination (short title: Act Now Committee.) (2) The committee under (1) and voluntary associate members thereof. (3) Indefinite. (4) Indefinite. (5) The committee as under (2). (6) Indefinite. (7) Those actually incurred.

Margolin,[2] 235 East Twenty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-six Street, New York, N. Y. (2) The above committee. (3) At will. (4) Fee according to services rendered. (5) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons. (6) Actual amount of out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Such items as railroad fare, travel subsistence, and telephone and telegraph tolls.

Marsh, Homer E., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Associated Businessmen, Inc. (3) Indefinite. (4) Not over $1,000 per annum for legislative work (should any be done). (5) National Associated Businessmen, Inc. (6) I am reimbursed for amounts actually incurred and paid by me for travel and other incidental expenses. (7) Transportation, hotel bills, and other incidental expenses.

Masaoka, Etsu M. (Mrs. Mike), 300 Fifth Street NE., Washington D. C. (1) Japanese American Citizens League Antidiscrimination Committee, Inc., Beason Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (2) Japanese American Citizens League Antidiscrimination Committee, Inc. (3) Eighty-first Congress, or until employment is terminated. (4) $100 per month while Congress is in session minus social security and withholding taxes. (5) Japanese American Citizens League Antidiscrimination Committee, Inc. (6) Actual expenses incident to work. (7) Transportation (taxicabs), telephone, telegraph, etc.

Masaoka, Mike M., 300 Fifth Street NE., Washington, D. C. (1) Japanese American Citizens League Antidiscrimination Committee, Inc., Beason Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (2) Japanese American Citizens League Antidiscrimination Committee, Inc. (3) Eighty-first Congress, or until employment is terminated. (4) $200 per month while Congress is in session minus social security and withholding taxes. (5) Japanese American Citizens League Antidiscrimination Committee, Inc. (6) Actual expenses incident to work. (7) Transportation (taxicabs), telephone, telegraph, etc.

Molnar,[2] Joseph, 225 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) [Blank.] (2) The unemployed. (3) Indefinite. (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.] (6) [Blank.] (7) [Blank.]

Morrison, Donald S., 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant is vice president of American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y., by whom he has been employed since 1932 and of which company he has been vice president since 1937. (2) American-Hawaiian Steamship Co. and its subsidiaries. Represents interests of company and subsidiaries with regard to legislation affecting the shipping industry; such representation is only incidental to registrant's general employment. (3) Until otherwise determined by employer or registrant. (4) Current salary of $1,833.33 per month, plus reimbursement for actual expenses. Foregoing compensation is for all registrant's services. (See (2).) (5) American-Hawaiian Steamship Co. (6) Reimbursement for actual expenses incurred as indicated under (7). (7) Actual expenses incurred on behalf of employer, including cost of transportation, communications, stenography, hotel accommodations, meals, etc.

Neuberger, David M., 154 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y. (1) National Coast Anti-pollution and Conservation League. Registrant is president of the league and acts by authority of its executive committee, whose address is 154 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y. (2) The league stated in answer to (1). (3) As long as he is president of the league. (4) Registrant is paid nothing and is not to receive any pay. (5) Nobody. (6) Nothing; registrant as well as other officers pay their own. (7) Answered in (6).

Parker,[2] James P., 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. Former address: 1317 F Street NW. (1) National Association of Private Schools, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Private trade and vocational schools who are members of the association. (3) Indefinite. (4) The amount is undetermined at the present time, but is expected to be compensated on the basis of straight fees for legal services rendered. (5) National Association of Private Schools. (6) The amount is undetermined at the present time, but he is reimbursed for actual expenses incurred. (7) All expenses incurred as Washington counsel for the association such as transportation, communications, entertainment, office and administrative supplies.

Paterson, Chat, 602 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Committee for the Nation's Health, Inc., 1790 Broadway, New York City, N. Y. (2) On behalf of the committee. (3) Indefinite. (4) $15,000 per annum. (5) Committee for the Nation's Health, Inc. (6) Necessary expenses. (7) Travel, taxis, incidentals.

Peoples Voice, 931 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Peoples Voice is incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia as a nonprofit, nonpartisan educational organization. Its three trustees are Frank T. Fuller, Peter C. Cameron, and Richard P. Schulze who serve without pay. The purpose of Peoples Voice is ultimately to petition the Congress of the United States urging the enactment of legislation for a national lottery to be conducted by the United States Government. To this end names of persons in favor of a national lottery and who wish to add their endorsement of the petition are being assembled. The present plan of Peoples Voice for such assembly of names is to distribute postal cards, as identified in exhibit A attached hereto,[1] to individuals throughout the United States and then to prepare such petition from such postal cards which have been signed and returned to Peoples Voice. Voluntary contributions from such individuals comprise the sole source of operating funds. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.] (6) [Blank.] (7) [Blank.]

Pike, Albert, Jr., 165 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant is an employee of the Life Insurance Association of America, an association composed of 90 legal reserve life-insurance companies. (See exhibit attached to registration form of the Life Insurance Association of America.) (2) Life Insurance Association of America. (See exhibit attached to association's registration form.) (3) Unlimited. (4) Registrant does not receive payments earmarked for purposes set forth in the act. At the end of each quarter, an estimate and report will be made to determine the portion of his annual salary, if any, which might come within the meaning of the act as interpreted by the Department of Justice. He is paid an annual salary of $17,000 for many services growing out of the varied functions of the association as described in the exhibit attached to the association's registration form filed this same date. (5) Life Insurance Association of America. (6) Will be paid out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Travel, meals, lodging, etc.

Poston, Robert R., 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The American Legion (national organization), 777 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (2) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, their rehabilitation, hospitalization, reeducation and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense; Americanization, included in which is opposition to all subversive activities and particular attention to our immigration and naturalization laws: child welfare, not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agricultural development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations, the development of sound civil aviation programs and policies; the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discriminations and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services; and all other matters included in the mandates and program of the American Legion as adopted and approved by the national convention of the American Legion and/or by its national executive committee which are the ruling and policy-making bodies of the American Legion. (3) Indefinite. (4) $7,000 per annum. (5) The American Legion (national organization), 777 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (6) Average of $25 per month. (7) Travel and such items as taxi fare, meals, phone calls.

Producers' Council, Inc., The., 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The council is not employed by anyone unless working in the interest of its contributors constitutes being employed. Names and addresses of contributors filed with Form A. (2) In the interest of its contributors. The Producers' Council, Inc., is an organization established in 1928. The purposes as stated by the charter of incorporation are attached hereto as exhibit K.[1] In view of the uncertain interpretation of certain provisions of the regulation of Lobbying Act of 1946 concerning what constitutes principal purpose and the phrase "to influence directly or indirectly the passage or defeat of any legislation, etc.," we are filing this form, giving a full disclosure of the information required under the act. (3) Indefinite. (4) Varying amounts. (5) By the contributors. (6) The amount received from contributions. (7) Offices, staff, fees to consultants, printing, news service, accounting, etc.

Riepma, Siert F., 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (2) National Association of Margarine Manufacturers. (3) January 1, 1947. (4) $7,000 a year. (5) National Association of Margarine Manufacturers. (6) Unspecified expense account, of which none, so far, has been expended regarding Federal legislation. (7) All expenses incident to Federal margarine legislation.

Risser, Donald A., 2404 North Seventy-first Street, Milwaukee, Wis. (1) Communications Workers of America and its divisions, 917 G Place NW., Washington, D. C. (2) In the interest of the organization whose name appears in (1) above. (3) For the term of office which expires November 15, 1949. (4) None per annum. (5) The organization whose name appears in (1) above. (6) No specific amount authorized. Reimbursed for actual expenses. (7) See answer in (6) above.

[2] Registration with the Clerk only.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[2] Registration with the Clerk only.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Russell, Francis M., 724 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Broadcasting Co., Inc., 724 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Broadcasting Co., Inc., Radio Corp. of America, and its other subsidiary companies. (3) Indefinite period of employment as vice president of National Broadcasting Co., Inc. (4) Registrant's compensation is paid entirely by National Broadcasting Co., Inc., and covers all his activities as vice president in charge of Washington office of National Broadcasting Co., Inc., including supervision of the company's Washington broadcasting operations. No specific part of such compensation is allocable to legislative matters. (5) National Broadcasting Co., Inc. (6) Actual expenses incurred in carrying out duties as officer of National Broadcasting Co., Inc., including activities on behalf of Radio Corp. of America and its other subsidiary companies. (7) Membership dues, travel, entertainment, etc.

Sayler, Frances, 1000 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America, CIO, 11 East Fifty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (2) The members of the UER & MWA, CIO, their families and neighbors. (3) Indefinite. (4) $4,000 yearly for all work in Washington office, including legislative work and nonlegislative work with Government agencies. (5) United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America, CIO. (6) $5 per week for expenses in connection with all work, much of which is nonlegislative work described above. On trips into the field, actual expenses of travel, food, and hotel are covered. (7) Transportation and other incidental expenses in Washington.

Shepherd, Bruce E., 165 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant is an employee of the Life Insurance Association of America, an association composed of 90 legal reserve life insurance companies. (See exhibit attached to registration form of the Life Insurance Association of America.) (2) Life Insurance Association of America. (See exhibit attached to association's registration form.) (3) Unlimited. (4) Registrant does not receive payments earmarked for purposes set forth in the act. At the end of each quarter, an estimate and report will be made to determine the portion of his annual salary, if any, which might come within the meaning of the act as interpreted by the Department of Justice. He is paid an annual salary of $35,000 for many services growing out of the varied functions of the association as described in the exhibit attached to the association's registration form filed this same date. (5) Life Insurance Association of America. (6) Will be paid out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Travel, meals, lodging, etc.

Spencer & Louisell, 1712 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Peder Kristian Kristensen, also known as Peter Kristen Kristiansen, also known as Peter Christensen, 13901 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (2) Peder Kristian Kristensen, etc., 13901 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit 15, Mich. (3) The employment is of indefinite duration. See answer to question 4. (4) The employment is an ordinary attorney-client retainer. This law firm represents this client in litigation in connection with his application for suspension of deportation and will seek on his behalf, if necessary, relief by congressional legislation. Payments on account of fee and disbursements in respect to the litigation have been received by this firm. What fee, if any, will be charged in connection with the legislation cannot be estimated at this time. In any event, any fee in connection with the legislation will be calculated at a rate not in excess of $150 per diem. It is believed that Public Law 601 is not applicable to this situation, but this registration is filed in view of lack of authoritative interpretation of such law. (5) Peder Kristian Kristensen, etc. (6) Actual telephone and telegraph expenses incurred. (7) Actual telephone and telegraph expenses incurred.

Stong, Benton J., 300 B Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Regional committee for an MVA (Missouri Valley Administration), 3501 East Forty-sixth Avenue, Denver 16, Colo. (2) Regional committee for an MVA, National Farmers Union. (3) January 1, 1949 to June 30, 1949. (4) $625 per month. (5) National Farmers Union, as a contribution to regional committee for an MVA. (6) Actual. (7) Washington living expenses and actual out-of-pocket expense for committee above.

Sullivan, Francis M., 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Disabled American Veterans, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) In the interest of service-connected disabled American war veterans and their dependents; (3) Indefinite. (4) $9,720, less withholding and social security. (5) Disabled American Veterans. (6) Any expense incurred (see No. 7). (7) Taxies, lunches, and other expenses incidental to work at the Capitol. Actual traveling expense.

Switzer, John B., 70 North Thirteenth Avenue, Beach Grove, Ind. (1) Indiana Divisions No. 1 and No. 56, Communications Workers of America, 27 West Ohio Street, Room 5, Indianapolis, Ind. (2) Communications Workers of America, Legislative League. (3) Unable to determine duration of employment. (4) No compensation. (5) [Blank.] (6) Unable to determine. (7) Transportation, meals, and lodging.

Taggart, Eugene F., 817 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America, 817 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Legislation pertaining to veterans. (3) Permanent. (4) $50 per week. (5) Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America. (6) $140 per month. (7) Postage, meals, transportation.

Taylor, Margaret K. (amended form), 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation. (3) Indefinite; no fixed term. (4) $7,700 per annum to cover all services for the federation, including such services, if any, as are rendered in connection with lobbying. (5) National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation. (6) To be reimbursed for all actual expenditures. (7) All expenses incident to the work of the federation.

Taylor, Russell J., 917 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) United Shoe Workers of America of the CIO, 917 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) United Shoe Workers of America of the CIO. (3) Eighty-first Congress. (4) Salary, $80 per week. (5) United Shoe Workers of America of the CIO. (6) $33 per week. (7) Hotel and incidental expenses.

Thoré, Eugene M., 165 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant is an employee of the Life Insurance Association of America, an association composed of 90 legal reserve life insurance companies. (See exhibit attached to registration form of the Life Insurance Association of America.) (2) Life Insurance Association of America. (See exhibit attached to association's registration form.) (3) Unlimited. (4) Registrant does not receive payments earmarked for purposes set forth in the act. At the end of each quarter, an estimate and report will be made to determine the portion of his annual salary, if any, which might come within the meaning of the act as interpreted by the Department of Justice. He is paid an annual salary of $35,000 for many services growing out of the varied functions of the association as described in the exhibit attached to the association's registration form filed this same date. (5) Life Insurance Association of America. (6) Will be paid out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Travel, meals, lodging, etc.

Updike, Ralph E., 6044 Twenty-second Street North, Arlington, Va. (1) National Customs Service Association, Washington, D. C. (2) In the interest of the officers and employees of the United States Customs Service and of the Federal civil service. (3) Appointed period, indefinite. (4) $1,500 per annum, part-time job. (5) National Customs Service Association. (6) No expense account; see (7). (7) Reimbursement for travel, office supplies, and postage.

Vaughan, Wales, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Veterans Organization Council of Altadena, 2302 North Lake, Altadena, Calif. (2) VOCA. (3) Undetermined. (4) $350 per month. (5) VOCA. (6) Actual costs on monthly audited statement. (7) Living in Washington, D. C., and guests.

Watson, Deneen A., 143 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) American Finance Conference, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill. (2) American Finance Conference. (3) Indefinite. (4) Receives $625 per month as general counsel, lobbying in Washington being only incidental to principal duties. (5) American Finance Conference. (6) Actual disbursements. (7) Cost of transportation, hotel, meals, and all other out-of-pocket expenses.

Webb, William H., 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Big Sandy Valley Association, Inc., Ashland, Ky. (2) Big Sandy Valley Association, Inc. (3) Indefinite. (4) $50 per month beginning January 1, 1949. (5) Big Sandy Valley Association, Inc. (6) Not specified. (7) Not specified.

Webb, William H., 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Robert F. Klepinger, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Robert F. Klepinger. (3) Indefinite. (4) 20 percent of Klepinger's net fee. (5) Robert F. Klepinger. (6) Not specified. (7) Not specified.

Westwood, Howard C., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Northwest Horticultural Council, Wenatchee, Wash. (2) Northwest Horticultural Council as above; this organization is an association of apple and pear growers of the Pacific Northwest, and is interested in legislation affecting the import of apples and pears and the stimulation of exports thereof. (3) Indefinite. (4) $500 per month. (5) Northwest Horticultural Council. (6) Actual expenses incurred. (7) Travel, telephone, telegraph, and similar miscellaneous expenses.

Woodward, Guy H., 605 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Association, 308 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla. (2) Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Association. (3) Annual retainer. (4) Registrant is retained as counsel to advise and consult with the officers, staff committees, and members of the association on all of its activities. Such part of registrant's retainer which may be paid and received in connection with "the passage or defeat of legislation by the Congress" cannot be determined at this time but will be computed and shown in subsequent quarterly reports as required by Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (5) Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Association. (6) No fixed amount is to be received for expenses, but registrant will be reimbursed for all actual necessary expenses incurred in connection with carrying out his duties as attorney for Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Association as above enumerated. (7) Travel, hotel, and such incidental expenses as may be necessary in carrying out duties for which registrant is retained.

Yaden, James G., 716 Washington Loan and Trust Building, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) American Federation of Government Employees, 716 Washington Loan and Trust Building, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Employees of the Federal Government. (3) Permanent. (4) $10,000 per annum. (5) American Federation of Government Employees. (6) Actual. (7) Carfare, taxicabs, meals, and incidentals.

Youngman, William S., Jr., 1016 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Lawyer practicing independently representing persons named in (2). (2) Massachusetts Investors Trust, 19 Congress Street, Boston, Mass.; Massachusetts Investors Second Fund, Inc., 19 Congress Street, Boston, Mass.; Investors Mutual of Minnesota, Roanoke Building, Minneapolis, Minn.; American Business Shares, Inc., 63 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; Affiliated Fund, Inc., 63 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; Union Trustees Fund, Inc., 63 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; and Chemical Fund, Inc., 39 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (3) Until conclusion of effort to clarify Federal Internal Revenue Code provisions relating to distribution by regulated investment companies of stock dividends. (4) Paid to date nothing; promised $2,250 as retainer, and possibly further compensation if work greater than expected. (5) By persons listed in (2). (6) Nothing. (7) Inapplicable.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were received for the fourth calendar quarter, 1948, and filed, using Form C, with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate:

(NOTE.—In order to reduce space the questions in Form C (see p. 1279) are not repeated. Only the answers are printed and are indicated by numbers in parentheses.)

Adkerson, J. Carson, 976 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; self. (1) Receipts: $1,000 from Luna Manganese Co., Deming, N. Mex., on expenses. Expended, $186.64. (2) Various. (3) Incidentals. (4) None. (5) Interested in any legislation having to do with manganese or strategic minerals.

Alifas, Nels Peter, District No. 44, International Association of Machinists, room 303, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $2,000.66. No expenditures; Congress not in session. (2) No expenditures; Congress not in session. (3) Lobbying when Congress is in session; that is, supporting or opposing, as the case may be, legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and incidentally organized labor in general. (4) The Federal Machinist, a monthly periodical, of which he is editor. (5) All legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees, and occasionally organized labor in general.

Allman, Roy G., 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No money received, however expended approximately $100 per month. (2) Transportation, taxis, telephone, cables, postage, entertainment. (3) To promote bills to pay Americans for damages received as a result of war in the Far East. (4) None. (5) To pay Americans for war damages.

American Association of University Women,[4] 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None except salary of registered associate, $1,025. (2) Legislative program associate who is registered under the act. (3) As part of yearly salary. (4) Journal of the American Association of University Women (quarterly); general director's letter (program guide for branch officers, three or four times yearly). (5) Not yet determined for this quarter.

American Citizens Committee to Establish New Immigration Quota for Greece Without Discrimination (short title, Act Now Committee) (and James A. Booras and Robert W. Malone, chairman and secretary, respectively), 4314 Argyle Terrace, Washington, D. C. (1) $1,000, a contribution from James A. Booras; $30, from miscellaneous contributors. (2) Details: Legal charges, $50; printing, stationery, $116; broadcasting recording, $26; Greek language broadcasting, $230; Greek language press, $240; secretarial, $220; telephone, telegraph, postage, and letters, $42. (3) All relating to publicity and public relations. (4) Greek language papers Atlantis and New Herald. (5) To augment and implement existing quotas of Greek immigration.

American Council on Human Rights,[4] Elmer W. Henderson, director, 1139 Sixth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Statement of cash receipts and disbursements for the period April 3 to November 30, 1948: Receipts—Contributions, regular, $10,625; contributions, special (AKA), $500; inaugural dinner, receipts, $880; total receipts, $12,005. Disbursements—$5,524.48. (2) Various. (3) Office equipment, office rent, salaries, printing and stationery, traveling expenses, telephone and telegraph, etc. (4) [Blank.] (5) Civil-rights legislation.

American Nurses' Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) No expenditures. (2) [Blank.] (3) No expenditures. (4) None during period covered by this report. (5) Legislation relating to nurses, nursing, or health, on which the American Nurses' Association has taken a stand, including the extension of social-security coverage and Federal aid to nursing education.

American Short Line Railroad Association, 1120 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Contributed by 317 member lines during fourth quarter 1948, $22,781.62; only a small portion of which is for the purpose of influencing legislation. (2) J. M. Hood, $72.06; A. C. Mellichampe, $2.63; L. W. Hoskins Co., $22.35; Morrison Hotel, $229.40; Superintendent of Documents, Washington, $175; Wilson Epes Printing Co., $239.10; proportion of president's time and supporting secretary and clerks, telegraph, telephone, postage, rent, office supplies, taxes, etc., estimated at $402.15. (3) For salaries, office expenses, printing, and reimbursement of personal expenses in furtherance of the legislative program of the 317 member lines of the association. (4) Proceedings of the 1948 annual meeting (copy attached). (5) Legislation affecting short-line railroads (see report for first quarter for complete text of legislative program).

Aring, Hector M., 826 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.; Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) See original registration form for complete explanation. No other contributions received. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Opposed to appropriation for cotton subsidy under section 32 of the Agriculture Appropriations Act, 1947 tax legislation.

Arnold, W. C., Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc., 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash. (1) None. (2) See above. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) None.

Associated Third Class Mail Users,[5] 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $217.50 income; $2,879.90 expenses. (2) Lobbying activities, none. Nonlobbying activities: Edward M. Kriz, John H. Smith, Jr., Patricia Mortell, Virginia Brenchley, plus miscellaneous operating expenses. (3) The general purpose of the association is to foster more efficient use of third-class mail by those enterprises employing the use of it. (4) None. (5) All legislation relating to postal laws and regulations.

Associated Third Class Mail Users,[5] 1010 Vermont Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,131 income; $4,269.68 expenses. (2) Lobbying activities, none. Nonlobbying activities: Edward M. Kriz, John H. Smith, Jr., Patricia Mortell, Mary Malone, Joseph F. Hinterschr, Robert McQueeney, Lilian Neuner, Mabel O. Hill, plus miscellaneous operating expenses. (3) The general purpose of the association is to foster more efficient use of third-class mail by those enterprises employing the use of it. (4) None. (5) All legislation relating to postal laws and regulations.

Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. The registrant, during the quarter for which this report is filed, was composed of 14 owners of vessels documented under the laws of the United States. (1) No money has been received by the registrant for activities in furtherance of any object necessitating registration under Public Law 601. The registrant did, however, in the regular course of business receive payment of dues from one of its members. No expenditure has been made by or on behalf of the registrant to any person for any amount or value in furtherance of any such object, except that registrant has paid the cost of printing and mailing the articles or editorials referred to in the report of George W. Morgan, its president, and also that registrant has paid salaries to and expenses of said George W. Morgan and Lynn E. Mote, manager of its Washington office. For the extent, if any, to which such expenditures for salaries and expenses have been applied to activities in furtherance of any object necessitating registration, reference is hereby made to the reports being concurrently filed by such officer and employee of the registrant and such reports are hereby made a part hereof. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) See (1). (5) The registrant is not employed to support or oppose any proposed legislation. Reference is hereby made to paragraph 2 of the registrant's registration statement on Form B, which paragraph is hereby made a part hereof.

Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y. (1) See exhibit A attached to Form A. (2) See exhibit A attached to Form A. (3) See exhibit A attached to Form A. (4) The association publishes the Casualty and Surety Journal. Also issues releases to insurance trade press and to papers and periodicals of general circulation, such releases being mainly concerned with accident-prevention problems. (5) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies.

Austern, H. Thomas, Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; British Columbia Packers, Ltd., Vancouver, B. C., Canada. (1) No money received or expended during fourth quarter of 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting Canadian fisheries.

Ayer & Son, N. W., Inc.,[6] a New York corporation, and J. Vance Babb and Raymond C. Baker, employees thereof (collectively herein called registrant), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.; National Association of Electric Companies. (1) N. W. Ayer & Son, Inc. (Ayer) received from National Association of Electric Companies $15,393.20 for compensation and out-of-pocket expenses. (See (2) below.) The only money received or spent by registrants J. Vance Babb and Raymond C. Baker was for out-of-pocket expenses. (2) Traveling and miscellaneous expenses of employees of Ayer, $1,940.08; materials, postage, messages, clippings, telephone, and telegrams, mimeographing,

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.

prints, etc., $1,053.12. (3) The amounts described in (1) and (2) were received or expended by Ayer in the performance of its services in advising on public relations and in connection with publicity affecting the electric industry as described in the amended registration dated April 15, 1948. Neither the services, nor the expenditures involved lobbying within the meaning of the Lobbying Act. (4) None. (5) None, except that Ayer services included publicity on general problems affecting the electric utility industry. This quarterly report is filed subject to the reservations contained in the amended registration dated April 15, 1948.

Ayer & Son, N. W., Inc.,[4] a New York corporation, and J. Vance Babb and Raymond C. Baker, employees thereof (collectively herein called registrant), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y. (1) N. W. Ayer & Son, Inc. (Ayer), received from National Association of Electric Companies $14,638.79 for compensation and out-of-pocket expenses. (See (2) below.) The only money received or spent by registrants, J. Vance Babb and Raymond C. Baker, was for out-of-pocket expenses. (2) Traveling expenses, telephones, telegrams, mimeographing, postage, materials, prints, clippings, messengers, and miscellaneous expenses totaling $2,302.26. (3) The amounts described in (1) and (2) were received or expended by Ayer in the performance of its services in advising on public relations and in connection with publicity affecting the electric industry as described in registration dated April 15, 1948. Neither the services, nor the expenditures involved lobbying within the meaning of the Lobbying Act. (4) None. (5) None, except that Ayer services included publicity on general problems affecting the electric utility industry. This quarterly report is filed subject to the reservations contained in the amended registration dated April 15, 1948.

Babcock, Charles E., Route 4, Box 73, Vienna, Va., National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics of the United States of North America, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) Have an expense account of $600 per year for out-of-pocket expenses. (2) Various, see below. (3) Services at gasoline stations, postage, telegrams, meals, and hotel rooms, transportation to and from Washington. (4) The Junior American, the official organ of the junior order. (5) Immigration, deportation, and naturalization; free public schools; other legislation the national council believes for the general good of the country.

Bailey, C. Lloyd, Friends Committee on National Legislation, 1000 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Gross salary: October, November, December, $1,000; travel expense, $275.62. (2) Various. (3) Travel is for the purpose of attending yearly meetings, quarterly meetings, or conferences of Friends and other groups to interpret developments in national and international policy, with special reference to legislation, and for other committee business. (4) We send a newsletter to a limited number of subscribers and friends about once a month. (5) In general, to support measures leading to peace and humanitarian ends, such as world organization and world economic stability, world disarmament, foreign relief, aid to refugees; protection for racial minorities; support for the rights of conscience; opposition to conscription and the militarization of America.

Bailey, Frazer A., National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1805 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant believes that $450 represents the amount of his salary received from the National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., during the fourth quarter of 1948, which is allocable to legislative activities; $93.91 paid to Waldorf-Astoria, Park Avenue, New York, N. Y., for expenses of luncheon meeting with industry and labor representatives in connection with overtime-on-overtime legislation. (2) No expenditures other than as indicated in (1) except for taxicabs and similar items. (3) See (1) and (2). (4) None. (5) During past quarter supported overtime-on-overtime legislation and certain amendments to Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

Baker, Gibbs L., 1011 Investment Building, Fifteenth and K Streets NW., Washington, D.C.; Charles Niedner's Sons Co., Inc., Malden, Mass.; United States Rubber Co., New York City; Firehose Manufacturing Co., Inc., New York City; Approved Equipment Manufacturing Co., Inc., New Milford, N. J.; and Federal Firehose Manufacturing Co., Inglewood, Calif. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 5608. Since my lobbying activities terminated in the last quarter of 1948, the enclosed report is final.

Baldinger, Mary Alice, 4607 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; American Civil Liberties Union, 170 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Expenses, October 1 through December 31, 1948, $25.82; salary, same dates, $77.70. (2) Expenditures made for transportation, office work, and supplies, etc. (3) Same as (2). (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation affecting civil liberties.

Baldrige, H. M., United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 408 American Building, Washington, D. C., and 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $2,000 per month or $6,000 for the quarter; no money expended on any legislative activity. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) During the year I opposed H. R. 5051; H. R. 6502, and H. R. 425.

Barber, Hartman, room 301, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, seventh floor, Brotherhood Building, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) No money received except regular salary and expenses. Total salary for quarter, $1,320; total expenses for quarter, $157.33. (2) Various. (3) Incidentals. (4) None. (5) All legislation directly or indirectly affecting labor in any manner whatsoever, especially railroad labor.

Barker, Richard B., 306 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; The Haloid Co., Rochester, N. Y. (1) No funds received. (2) Not applicable. (3) Not applicable. (4) Not applicable. (5) Excise tax on photographic materials.

Barker, Richard B., 306 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; Eastman Kodak Co., Rochester, N. Y. (1) No funds received. (2) Not applicable. (3) Not applicable. (4) Not applicable. (5) Excise tax on photographic materials.

Barlow, Joel, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; Northwest Horticultural Council, Wenatchee, Wash. (1) Received, $1,500; expended, $48.04. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $32.38; Western Union, $7.91; miscellaneous expenses, $7.75. (3) Long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, teletype messages, transportation within the District of Columbia, and miscellaneous expenses. (4) None. (5) This employment is an ordinary attorney-client retainer for the purpose of rendering general legal advice and assistance. Considerable time is being currently spent and may continue to be spent in the preparation of materials for presentation to Congress in support of proposed legislation to improve marketing conditions in the fruit industry during the postwar interruption in normal export marketing.

Barnard, Robert C., Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Cox, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Disbursements by registrant and Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Cox during last calendar quarter, $1.50; receipts by registrant and Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Cox from Stapleton Lumber & Piling Co., none. (2) Disbursements, $1.50 notary fees. (3) See (2) above. (4) None. (5) H. R. 6253 and S. 2539, both bills entitled "For the relief of James A. Stapleton, Ruth Burk, and Mildred Ovren, copartners doing business under the name and style of Stapleton Lumber & Piling Co."

Barnett, Arthur R., National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary of $2,152.50 as an officer and employee of the National Association of Electric Companies, and reimbursements of $308.86 of routine expenses incurred in the performance of all duties and assignments, only a part of which salary and expenses were for those purposes described in section 308 (a) or otherwise within the scope of Public Law No. 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) Various hotels, restaurants, railroads, air lines, telephone and telegraph companies, taxicabs, bookstores and stationers. (3) Railroad and transportation, $76.37; hotel and restaurants, $163.10; bookstores and stationers, $7.29; telephone and telegraph, $1.10; gratuities and miscellaneous, $61. (4) None. (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Companies, of which I am an officer and employee, is to provide its members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and take appropriate action on problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters. The association therefore is interested in legislation that might affect its members as going business concerns.

Beirne, J. A., Communications Workers of America, 917 G Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expenses, $656.96; salary, $3,300; total, $3,956.96. (2) Normal living expenses, plus railroad, air lines, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, and other incidental and related expenses. (3) To perform to the normal functions of my positions with the Communications Workers of America. None of which were related to legislative activities. (4) None. (5) Any proposed legislation which would affect the Communications Workers of America or its divisions.

Benson, Ernest H., national legislative representative, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 61 Putnam Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (1) Salary at rate of $9,600 per annum; no expense account. (2) Ernest H. Benson. (3) Activities in connection with legislative matters. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly or indirectly affecting the interests of the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees.

Berckes, Herbert C., secretary, Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 Canal Building, New Orleans, La. (1) Received for services as secretary, $750; expended for travel expense, $1,089.59 (includes transportation and per diem). (2) Various. (3) Legislation. (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation affecting the southern pine-lumber industry.

Bergin, Preston B., American Retail Federation, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $400 salary. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) American Retail Federation informational bulletins to the retailing industry. (5) Legislation affecting retail industry, including tax revision, labor-law revision, social-security-law revision.

Bernard, William S., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None; expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Displaced Persons Legislation, Polish Review, December 1948. (5) H. R. 6369 (Emergency Displaced Persons Act).

Berns, Karl H., Legislative-Federal Relations Division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,895.04, which covers both

[4] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.

legislative and nonlegislative activities; estimated for legislative service, $397.01. (2) Self (salary); expenses, hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash, NEA Journal (articles therein), informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Biorn, Norman E., Minnesota Associated Businessmen, Inc., 520 Endicott Building, St. Paul, Minn. (1) Salary from Minnesota Associated Businessmen, none; received for actual expenses, $160.89; spent for legislative activities, none. (2) Mary Lou Kustelski, $150; United States Government, $4; miscellaneous, $6.89. (3) Stenographic services, postage, miscellaneous phone, travel, railway-express charges. (4) None. (5) Elimination of inequalities in tax legislation.

Bison, Henry, Jr.; Tyre Taylor, Suite 1112 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received $1,581.27; expenditures for living purposes only. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) None. (5) Legislation favorable to the maintenance of the free-enterprise system.

Blankenship, C. B., Post Office Box 1150, Birmingham, Ala.; Communications Workers of America, and its divisions, 917 G Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expenses, $1,200; salary, $1,200; total, $2,400. (2) Normal living expenses plus railroads, air lines, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, and other incidental and related expenses. (3) To perform the normal function of my positions with the Communications Workers of America and/or one of its divisions, none of which is related to legislative activities. (4) None. (5) Any proposed legislation which would affect the Communications Workers of America or its divisions.

Bledsoe, Samuel B., 1730 I Street NW.; Selvage & Lee, 1 East Forty-third Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $4.60. (2) Luncheon, $3.50, taxies, $1.10. (3) Luncheon, transportation. (4) I worked to assure the dissemination and publication of news favorable to margarine legislation desired by our client but I cannot say categorically that I caused any such articles to be published. (5) Margarine legislation.

Bodary, D. A., national legislative and general representative, Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo. (1) Annual compensation of $6,000, and $12 per diem for expenses; hotels, meals, etc. (2) D. A. Bodary. (3) As national legislative and general representative, Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, my duties include handling of legislative matters and handling and progressing of grievances and other activities of my organization. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of the Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America.

Bodfish, Morton, United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LeSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received and expended $341.42. (2) Various. (3) For travel, hotel, and maintenance in Washington, D. C. (4) Only the customary materials found in our trade papers, in our trade association periodicals, and in our trade association bulletins: The Need for Merchandising, by Morton Bodfish, December 1948, Savings and Loans News; Toward the Kind of Country We Want, by Morton Bodfish, December 1948, Directors Digest, excerpt from fifty-sixth annual convention address. (5) Support all legislation favorable to thrift and home ownership and particularly helpful to savings and loan associations and cooperative banks in carrying out their thrift and home-financing objectives and oppose legislation detrimental to home ownership and these institutions.

Bonamarte, Robert Francis, Sr., Fleet Reserve Association, 429 Investment Building, Fifteenth and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C.[4] (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Pay legislation affecting the armed forces; legislation affecting the armed forces and veterans.

Booras, James A.,[4] and Robert W. Malone (jointly and severally and/or separately), 4314 Argyle Terrace, Washington, D. C. (1) Sundry small sums incident to office management and publicity activities, both aggregating, income and expenditure, slightly less than $1,000. (2) Precisely as stated in Form C, this date, for Act Now Committee. (3) As above. (4) As above. (5) As above.

Borkin, Joseph, 1017 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.; Federation for Railway Progress, Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) $526.31. (2) Mimeographing service, Western Union, telephone company, office supplies. (3) Office supplies and services. (4) [Blank.] (5) The above amount represents expenses in connection with the Washington office of the Federation for Railway Progress and was not paid to me for the support of or opposition to any legislation.

Bourg, Clarence J., 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; American Sugar Cane League, Main Office, New Orleans, La.; Farmers & Manufacturers Beet Sugar Association, main office, Saginaw, Mich. (1) The following sums have been received and expended in connection with legislation and other contacts with the Government, of which not more than one-fourth has been expended in connection with legislation, such as taxicab fares about Washington and an occasional lunch when Congress is in session: October 1–15, 1948, $21.20; October 15–31, 1948, $21.10; November 1–15, 1948, $24.10; November 15–30, 1948, $15.20; December 1–15, 1948, $36.60; December 15–31, 1948, $56.40. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Sugar Bulletin of New Orleans, La.; Sugar Beet Journal of Saginaw, Mich. (5) Any legislation affecting the domestic sugar producer.

Bowden, Ray B., National Grain Trade Council (until January 31, 1949), 608 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received as salary $1,968, all used for personal living expenses, none for lobbying; received as expense refunds, $831.36. Railroad travel to meetings; expense of meals, etc., for members of board at quarterly meeting; routine travel expense. (2) Railroads, hotels (Union League Club in Chicago for board meeting), etc. (3) Routine expenses; none spent with direct purpose of influencing legislation, although legislative matters were discussed at board meeting; various legislative subjects were frequently discussed in speeches before trade conventions and meetings, but without direct bearing on lobbying. (4) None so far as known, excepting routine newsletters sent regularly by our office to members informing them on news developments. (5) Not principally employed to support or oppose legislation, but would be interested in any legislation which involves the grain and/or feed trade of the United States.

Boyd, H. B., United States Beet Sugar Association, 1001 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Interested in legislation affecting sugar, but not employed for the purpose of supporting or opposing any legislation.

Boyd, William R., Jr., American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) See attached schedule[1] for answers to (1) to (5). (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[4] Filed with the Secretary only.

Bradley, Otis T., 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.; Guaranty Trust Co. of New York as trustee of the several trusts described as the Frances G. Phipps trust, Herbert Sanford Ward trust, Sarita E. Barclay trust, and Colville Herbert Sanford Barclay trust, under indenture dated December 24, 1913, and various indentures supplemental thereto made by Charles H. Sanford, 140 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) The employment is for the purpose of attempting to secure an amendment to the Federal Gift Tax Acts involving gifts in trust and the effect for gift-tax purposes of the surrender by the grantor of a retained power to alter the disposition of the property but not in any way beneficial to himself, and the employment is expected to continue until such amendment is either secured or rejected.

Brady, Joseph E., Brewery Workers International Union, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Oppose dry legislation.

Breed,[4] Arthur H., 310 Fifteenth Street, Oakland 12, Calif.; Waterfront Employers Association, 16 California Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) July 1, 1948, through September 30, 1948: Salary, $3,614.24; miscellaneous office expense, postage, telephone, and telegraph, etc., and entertainment, $298.71. (2) James D. Hahn, associate, $50 per week plus expenses. (3) Supporting overtime-on-overtime legislation. (4) None. (5) Overtime on overtime.

Breed,[4] Arthur H., Jr., 310 Fifteenth Street, Oakland, Calif.; Waterfront Employers Association, 16 California Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) October 1, 1948, through December 31, 1948: Salary, $3,574.92; miscellaneous office expense, postage, telephone, and telegraph, and travel expense, $191.65. (2) James D. Hahn, associate, $50 per week plus expenses. (3) Supporting overtime-on-overtime legislation. (4) None. (5) Overtime on overtime.

Brewbaker, James M., National Association of Manufacturers, 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts: Salary, $2,125, expenses reimbursed by employers, $658.52. Expenditures, $658.52. (2) Expenses paid to various restaurants, hotels, taxicabs, railroads, and air lines. (3) Traveling, attending meetings to discuss general conditions in Washington of interest to business and industry in particular. (4) [Blank.] (5) National labor policy, wage-and-hour legislation, tax laws, reduction of Federal expenditures, Government controls over production and distribution of manufactured products, or the raw materials going into such products, Federal subsidization of research, patent, and trade-mark legislation.

Bright, O. C., Southern Pine Industry Committee, 1302 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,050; expenses, $56.60. (2) To various hotels, cab drivers, etc. (3) See No. 2 above. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the lumber-manufacturing industry.

Brightman, Melvin H., Dairy Industry Committee, 1112 Earr Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $3,000 salary as executive secretary of Dairy Industry Committee. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) To observe legislation possibly affecting dairy industry.

Brooks, A. E., 2202 Fort Worth National Bank Building, Fort Worth, Tex.; American Chamber of Commerce of Mexico, Cook Building, Mexico, D. F. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) To exempt from income taxes income derived from sources abroad by nonresident United States citizens actively engaged in a trade or business abroad.

[4] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[4] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.

Brooks, William F., National Grain Trade Council, 604 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary and expense received during period amounted to $3,598.58, none of which was spent for any purpose covered by the act. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None other than weekly newsletter published by employer. (5) Legislation affecting agriculture in general and the grain trade in particular.

Brown, Russell B., Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary previously reported plus the following expenses which might be considered within the scope of the act: $20. (2) See (3) below. (3) Taxi fares. (4) My normal duties include periodic reporting to members of the association on pending legislation. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. My duties include that of maintaining surveillance of legislation which might affect the petroleum industry and taking such action with respect to such legislation as directed by the association.

Bryson, Jack, Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary received: $6,260.79. Expended: $6,280.79. (2) To self. (3) For personal and family needs. No sums received or expended in connection with activities covered by act. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the motion-picture industry.

Buck, Mrs. J. L. Blair. Not employed for pay. Elected to office of president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) For October, November, and December, $2,066.79 travel and expense of entertaining in connection with work of the General Federation of Women's Clubs. (2) See question No. 1. (3) See question No. 1. (4) General Federation Clubwoman and State federation magazines. (5) Not employed for pay. The president of the General Federation supports or opposes legislation, and asks the organization membership to do likewise, when authority for such action has been provided through the adoption of a resolution in national convention.

Buckman, Henry Holland, 405 Dorset Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.; Florida Inland Navigation District, Daytona Beach, Fla. (1) Received from Florida Inland Navigation District, Daytona Beach, Fla., for professional services, $750 pro rata expenditures account long distance telephone calls paid during fourth quarter, $3.93. (2) The Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C. (3) Long-distance telephone calls. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation as yet. Interested in any legislation providing for or related to improvement of the Intracoastal Waterway between Jacksonville, Fla., and Miami, Fla., and any legislation relating to inland navigation, flood control, erosion, the use and conservation of water, and agencies of the Federal Government having to do with these.

Buckman, Henry Holland, 405 Dorset Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md., the Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J. (1) Received from the Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J., for professional services, $300 pro rata; for reimbursement for long distance telephone calls, pro rata, $13.41; pro rata expenditures account long distance telephone calls paid during fourth quarter, $20.22. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C. (3) Long-distance telephone calls. (4) None. (5) No specific bill since close of second quarter. Interested in legislation of any kind related to tin or tinning.

Bugbee, George, American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Quarterly salary, $5,374.98; reimbursement for travel $900.54 (2) Various air lines, railroads, hotels, and recipients of miscellaneous amounts for taxicabs, meals, and similar necessary expenses. (3) Necessary traveling expenses as indicated. (4) Hospitals, the official journal of the American Hospital Association; Trustee, the journal for members of hospital governing boards. (5) Legislation which might affect the quality of hospital service to the people of this country.

Building Products Institute, Room 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Expended $6,884.44. The Building Products Institute is an organization devoted to economic research and analysis of trends in construction, disseminating its findings to those interested in the construction industry and to the public. However, in view of the uncertain interpretation of certain provisions of the regulation of Lobbying Act of 1946 concerning what constitutes a "principal purpose" and the phrase "To influence directly or indirectly the passage or defeat of any legislation," etc., we are filing this form giving a full disclosure of the information required under the act. (2) See attached sheet.[1] (3) As indicated by items on attached sheet.[1] (4) Construction trends, press releases and certain economic studies. (5) Proposals which may affect the producers of building materials.

Bulow, William J. Jr., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C., National Postal Committee for Books, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Money received, none; money expended, $12.75. (2) Various transportation, telephone and telegraph companies, and United States Post Office. (3) Customary business expense for transportation, telephone calls, telegrams, and postage. (4) None. (5) Postage rate legislation.

Burger, George J.,[2] 250 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $5,866.19 from operating Burger Tire Consultant Service, publishing National Independent, and acting as director in charge of Washington office of National Federation of Small Business. Expended $4,729.66 for general operating expenses. (2) General office expenses. (3) Publications, weekly bulletin, travel expenses. (4) National Independent, Burger Tire Consultant Service weekly bulletin. (5) Antitrust laws, rubber tires bill; all legislation affecting small business.

Burger, George J.,[4] room 810, 250 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y., self. (1) Received $5,776.02 from operating Burger Tire Consultant Service, publishing National Independent, and acting as director in charge of Washington office, National Federation of Small Business. Disbursements, $4,951.55. (2) For general operating expenses; general office expense. (3) Publications, weekly bulletin, travel, etc. (4) National Independent, Burger Tire Consultant Service weekly bulletin. (5) Antitrust legislation, tire bill, all legislation affecting small business.

Burke, Harold, United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary for 3 months at $708.33 per month equals $2,125. No expenses received or expended on any legislative activity. (2) No one. (3) No one. (4) None. (5) None.

Burnett, Leo, Co., Inc., 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) For National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, $89,927.51. (2) See addendum A [1]—A portion of this sum not definitely ascertainable was for purposes referred to in section 307, Public Law 601 of the Seventy-ninth Congress. The reason for our not being able to specify the exact amount used for so-called lobbying purposes is that we handled advertising generally for the margarine association. Not only is some of our advertising not directed at the affective legislation at all, but individual advertisements may be partially what may be termed "general advertising" and partially an appeal to support the margarine association's position in the legislative matters referred to. (3) See addendum A. (4) None. (5) Generally, legislation favorable to margarine manufacturers; specifically, the Rivers bill (H. R. 2245).

Burrows, Orrin A., International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, A. F. of L., 1200 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,901.64; expenses, $112.10, minus withholding and railroad retirement deductions. The expenses are reimbursable items, such as transportation, hotels, meals, and incidental items. Nothing for lobbying purposes. (2) Railroads, bus companies and taxis for transportation, hotels, motels and restaurants for meals and lodging, telephone and telegraph companies for messages. (3) Transportation, meals, lodging, telephone calls, telegraph messages, and incidental items such as tips. (4) The Electrical Workers Journal. (5) All legislation affecting the electrical worker in particular and labor in general.

Butler, Eugene J., Esq., National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,186.32; salary for 3 months. (2) Eugene J. Butler. (3) Salary for 3 months. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting religious, charitable and educational institutions and organizations.

Caffrey, Charles G., 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Cotton Manufacturers Association, 203A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C. (1) None. (2) No payments were made to anyone by Charles G. Caffrey during the quarter in question (normal expenses excepted). (3) None. (4) None. However, I might state for the record that I spent about $25 for cab fare, lunches, telephone calls and streetcar fare to and from the Capitol, to study bills passed at last session. (5) [Blank.]

Calhoun, Leonard J., Morgan & Calhoun, 412 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; National Rehabilitation Association, 1025 Vermont Avenue, Washington, D. C. (1) $575.65 received from National Rehabilitation Association for all services as Washington counsel for the association and as reimbursement for necessary travel expenses; $125.65 of this amount expended for travel expenses to Madison, Wis., to attend meeting of the association. (2) Travel, Inc. (air ticket), $99.65; meals, taxis, hotel, $26. (3) See (1) and (2). (4) None. (5) No particular legislation. The association is interested in any legislation affecting the vocational rehabilitation program.

Calhoun, Leonard J., Morgan & Calhoun, 412 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) $2,125.75 received by Morgan & Calhoun for all services as Washington counsel for National Tax Equality Association and as reimbursement for necessary expenses. Allocation between legislative and nonlegislative activities is not feasible; $25.75 of this amount represented reimbursement for hotel, meals, etc., in Chicago. (2) The Stevens Hotel, Chicago, $18; meals and taxis, $7.75. (3) See (1) and (2). (4) None. (5) Firm retained as Washington counsel for all legal matters affecting National Tax Equality Association, including legal aspects of various legislative proposals relating to taxation of cooperatives and other corporations enjoying tax exemptions or special privileges.

Carter, Albert E., 1026 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Received $3,000 as compensation; reimbursed $641.55 for expenses advanced—expended $977.93 which will be reimbursed.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[2] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[4] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.

(2) Southern Pacific Railroad; Munsey Real Estate Co.; telephone companies; incidentals. (3) Telephone services, rent, transportation, incidentals. (4) [Blank.] (5) Retained to represent the company before administrative agencies and commissions and on legislative matters affecting company's interest.

Carter, Asa L., 325 Ashland Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.; petitioners and their due successors and joining associates at and after War Department file No. 7040-7 April 1923 (287 U. S. 629); (supra) extended to all abutters on B-lines duly and precisely mapped herein. (1) I received and expended only $142.42 costs and disbursements herein, divided: Petty cash, clerical work, searching records, and addressing mail $85.62 and for postage, printing, telephoning, carfare, bus fare, etc., $56.80. (2) It was paid to postmasters, printers, public service companies, and stand rd clerical help at Pittsburgh, Pa. (3) For the purpose of furthering sentiment for a "Rainhill Prize" for the best B-line electric pipe train locomotive for major heavy freight, maximum ton-miles minimum cost, and on wheels 99.8 percent perpetual motion, one-half pound $_{\varphi}$ absolute (as at 56 minutes elevation) γ_3 speed 3,600 miles per hour, 13-inch diameter pneumatic loaded trains, 2,000-ton burden, 10 miles long 3 minimum head, transocean or nation on hour. Keep out of the air and to wheels at $\frac{1}{20}$ mill per ton-mile and make reasonable effort to pay off the $252,000,000,000 debt accumulated on spectacular air logistics, which is just as destructive as pack-animal logistics—impossible to stave off for 1,500 years dark ages—60 cents ton-mile. (4) I publish nowhere except by first-class mail to abutters and contributors, and their due and immediate representatives. (5) Everything for or against B-line, I include that set forth in last quarter report and that which appears in hereto attached.[1]

Carter, Clarence B.,[3] Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn. (1) $60 for traveling expenses. (2) Clarence B. Carter. (3) Traveling expenses. (4) Railroad Pension Conference Bulletin. (5) Support of S. 2055 and H. R. 4695.

Carter, Clarence B.,[6] Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn. (1) Received $15 for traveling expenses. (2) Clarence B. Carter. (3) Traveling expenses. (4) [Blank.] (5) Support of railroad retirement legislation beneficial to railroad workers.

Carter, Horace,[7] 209 West One Hundred and Twenty-fifth Street, New York City. (1) This is the initial application, thus no expenditures have accumulated. Further, all money received will be solicited, and detailed accounts will be filed accordingly under section 303. (2) To be filed accordingly under sections 302 and 303, Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. (3) For the purpose of amending and broadening of social-security benefits, adequate housing program, revising the Railway Labor Act and for legislation pending or contemplated on civil rights. (See amended form.[1]) (4) To be filed accordingly. (5) Refer to answer in question and answer No. 3 as outlined.

Carter, Jack, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $375 per month as salary minus social security and withholding taxes; $11.99 as expenses for transportation and luncheons in connection with legislative activities. (2) No record kept of recipients of taxicab fares and luncheons. (3) Transportation, social obligations, and normal luncheon requirements. (4) VFW Foreign Service, VFW Legislative Newsletter. (5) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation, and housing; welfare of servicemen of the armed forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration, and naturalization, and combating of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the national encampment and the national council of administration.

Carver, Leslie O., associate general counsel, National Paint, Varnish, and Lacquer Association, Inc., 1500 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary at the rate reported in last quarterly report for performance of regular and usual duties incident to my employment. Expenses for travel, hotel, subsistence, and incidentals totaled $404.57. I engaged in no activity contemplated by the act and none of the money received and expended was for the purpose of work under the act. (2) Paid nothing. (3) Performed no activity under the act. (4) None. (5) None.

Case, Ralph H., National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Three Affiliated Tribes, Fort Berthold Reservation, Elbowoods, N. Dak. (1) Compensation for services rendered under contract, $1,000. (2) $375 for reimbursement of travel, Pullman, and other expenses which is to be allocated to Fort Berthold, Standing Rock, and Cheyenne River Reservations by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. (3) Official business transactions and correspondence with tribal council, Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak.; and travel expense. (4) None. (5) House Joint Resolution 426, Eightieth Congress; House Joint Resolution 33, Eighty-first Congress.

Casey,[4] Joseph E., Committee for Equalization of Tobacco Taxes, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., No. 701, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) H. R. 3912, which provides for a fair and equitable tax on cigarettes depending upon the price at which these cigarettes are sold.

Casey,[6] Joseph E., Committee for Equalization of Tobacco Taxes, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., No. 701, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) H. R. 3912, which provides for a fair and equitable tax on cigarettes depending upon the price at which these cigarettes are sold.

Castiglioni, Paul M., National Federation of Post Office Motor Vehicle Employees, 112 C Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary of $1,500 less withholding and social-security taxes. Expenses for quarter amounted to $900 and includes all expenses incidental to maintaining offices and attendance at national conventions, meetings, etc. (2) Paul M. Castiglioni. (3) To promote the welfare of the motor-vehicle employees of the Post Office Department; covering both legislative and nonlegislative work. (4) Rotor and bulletins called Motor Vehicle News. (5) Supporting all legislation of benefit to motor-vehicle employees.

Cates, Larry, 1185 National Press Building; Air Line Pilots Association, 3145 West Sixty-third Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received, $2,118.36; expended, $243.36. (2) Various companies and business firms for transportation, communications, gasoline, oil, airplane operation, miscellaneous entertainment, meals, hotels, tips, and incidental expenses. (3) Travel and all expenses in connection therewith, taxi, telegraph, telephone, etc. (4) Air Line Pilot. (5) All legislation concerning aviation safety and hours, wages, and working conditions of pilots on our commercial air lines.

Chace, W. E., The National Fertilizer Association, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Of salary received by me during the preceding calendar quarter, $20 may be allocable to attempts to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 869, H. R. 2494, H. R. 3421, H. R. 4552, H. R. 4752, H. R. 4417, and S. 1251.

Chamblin, Walter, Jr., 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Manufacturers, 14 West Forty-ninth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Receipts: Salary, $6,250; expenses in Washington reimbursed by employer, $1,008.04; expenditures in Washington, $1,008.04. (2) Expenses paid to hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, telephone company, trade associations, and clubs. (3) Attending meetings and making speeches to discuss general conditions in Washington of interest to business and industry in particular. (4) [Blank.] (5) Bills affecting: National labor policy, tax laws, reduction of Federal expenditures, Federal subsidization of research, patents and trade marks, control powers, revision of SEC, foreign aid, Federal housing, Government competition with business, and such other matter as may affect industry.

Chandler, E. Lawrence, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (American Society of Civil Engineers). (1) $10. (2) Taxicab drivers, United States post office. (3) Taxicab fares, postage. (4) None. (5) Legislative bills regarding which it is considered that the engineering viewpoint can be constructive.

Church, R. R., 6000 Champlain Avenue, Chicago, Ill.; National Council for a Permanent Fair Employment Commission, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) I receive no salary. Ten ($10) dollars per day allowance, when away from home for hotel and meals only as incurred, plus railroad transportation when necessary. I advance out of my funds paying these expenses, after which I am reimbursed by the National Council for a Permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission. At the present time said council is indebted to me for advancement for hotel, meals, and railroad fare. As of today, January 3, the national council owes me over $400 reimbursement for actual money that I have spent for my maintenance last year. (2) Dunbar Hotel, Washington, D. C.; McAlpin Hotel, New York; B. & O. Railroad and Pennsylvania Railroad. (3) For subsistence of myself when actively engaged for aforesaid council. (4) None. (5) Ives-Fulton bill (S. 984) against discrimination in employment.

Clarke, David R., 120 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.; National Metal Trades Association, 122 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $250. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting manufacturers generally.

Clorety, Joseph A., Jr., American Veterans Committee; American Veterans Committee, Inc. (AVC), 1200 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary of $7,500 per year for position of national vice chairman of the American Veterans Committee plus not more than $5 per month for expenses in connection with legislative work. (2) Joseph A. Clorety, Jr. (3) To execute duties as national vice chairman of the organization of which not more than 10 percent involve activities under the Lobbying Act. (4) AVC Bulletin. (5) Legislation relating to international, domestic, and veterans' affairs in accordance with national platform of the American Veterans Committee.

Clovis, Edwards & Reed, Inc.,[7] (H. E. Clovis, A. W. Edwards, and Louis Reed, employees

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[3] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[4] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed with the Clerk only.

thereof), 630 Barr Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Foremen's League for Education and Association, room 603, 11 West Monument, Dayton, Ohio. (2) Same as above. (3) Six months commencing January 1, 1949. (4) $1,500 per month. (5) Same as section 1. (6) Reimbursement of out-of-town travel expenses. (7) Only those in section 6.

Cohn, Marcus, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Marcus Cohn. (2) Marcus Cohn. (3) During a typical month, the registrant devotes a maximum of 5 percent of his time to matters which may possibly be regarded as embraced in section 308 (a) of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. The figures set forth here for the months of October, November, and December 1948, are based upon that percentage: Salary, $93.75; travel, $2.21; telephone, $9.59; office and miscellaneous expenses, $48.65. (4) I have supplied information to the general press on immigration and other matters in which the American Jewish Committee is interested. (5) Legislation dealing with immigration and other matters in which the American Jewish Committee is interested.

Colborn, Miss Fern M., Presbyterian Board of Christian Education, United States of America, Division of Social Education and Action, 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) Salary, quarterly, $300; personal expenses refunded (i. e.), travel, $69.56; lodging, $18; food, $29; total $116.56. (2) [Blank.] (3) Lobbying in the interest of social legislation on which the Presbyterian General Assembly has taken action. (4) Social Progress magazine, special bulletins. (5) Same as No. 3.

Coleman, Russell, The National Fertilizer Association, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Of salary received by me during the preceding calendar quarter, $100 may be allocable to attempts to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Fertilizer News, Fertilizer Review, Agronomic Notes and Pasture Progress, all published by The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., Washington 5, D. C. (5) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 869, H. R. 2494, H. R. 3421, H. R. 4562, H. R. 4752, and S. 1251.

Coles,[5] Marvin J. 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; Alaska Freight Corp., Pier 50, Seattle, Wash. (1) During the past calendar quarter, registrant has received $3,701.72, of which $3,500 was for legal services and $201.72 represents reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses. (2) Payments have been made to the telephone and telegraph companies, several restaurants, taxies, and Army and Navy Club. (3) Telephone, telegraph, luncheons, dinners, taxies, etc. (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation dealing with Government assistance to Alaska shipping.

Coles,[6] Marvin J., 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; Alaska Freight Express Corp., Pier 50, Seattle, Wash. (1) During the past calendar quarter, registrant has received no money from the Alaska Freight Express Corp.; out-of-pocket expenditures have been under $100. (2) Payments have been made to the telephone and telegraph companies, several restaurants, taxies, and Army and Navy Club. (3) Telephone, telegraph, luncheons, dinners, taxies, etc. (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation dealing with Government assistance to Alaska shipping.

Coles,[5] Marvin J., 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; New York Foreign Freight Forwarders and Brokers Association, 27 Water Street, New York, N. Y. (1) During the past calendar quarter, registrant has received no money from the New York Foreign Freight Forwarders and Brokers Association. (2) Expenditures have been purely for incidental matters, such as telephones, lunches, transportation, and mimeographing, and have been paid to the telephone company, taxicab company, mimeographers, restaurants, etc. (3) Telephones, luncheons, transportation, mimeographing. (4) [Blank.] (5) Registrant has been employed as attorney to present to the Congress and to the governmental agencies concerned information concerning foreign freight forwarders and use of their services under the foreign relief programs.

Coles,[6] Marvin J., 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; New York Foreign Freight Forwarders and Brokers Association, 227 Water Street, New York, N. Y. (1) During the past calendar quarter registrant has received legal fees from the New York Foreign Freight Forwarders and Brokers Association in the amount of $1,000 and reimbursement for expenses in the amount of $42.01. (2) Expenditures have been purely for incidental matters, such as telephones, lunches, transportation, and mimeographing, and have been paid to the telephone company, taxicab company, mimeographers, restaurants, etc. (3) Telephone, luncheons, transportation, mimeographing. (4) [Blank.] (5) Registrant has been employed as attorney to present to the Congress and to the governmental agencies concerned information concerning foreign freight forwarders and use of their services under the foreign relief programs.

Colgan, Howard O., Jr., Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) None. (5) See answer to (1); proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the Chase National Bank of the City of New York.

Colgan, Howard O., Jr., Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) None. (5) See answer to (1); proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

Colorado River Association,[4,8] 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) Contributions, $40,050; expenditures, $17,565.41; see detailed statement attached.[9] (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) Factual material is released to newspapers and magazines generally, inside and outside California; no control of its use by the press is or can be exercised. (5) To support legislation protecting California's established water rights on the Colorado River, and to oppose legislation inimical to California's established water rights.

Colorado River Association,[4,10] 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) Contributions, $49,855; expenditures, $14,802.83; see detailed statement attached.[9] (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) Factual material is released to newspapers and magazines generally, inside and outside California; no control of its use by the press is or can be exercised. (5) To support legislation protecting California's established water rights on the Colorado River, and to oppose legislation inimical to California's established water rights.

Colorado River Association,[4,11] 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) Contributions, $445; expenditures, $22,487.50; see detailed statement attached.[9] (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) Factual material is released to newspapers and magazines generally, inside and outside California; no control of its use by the press is or can be exercised. (5) To support legislation protecting California's established water rights on the Colorado River, and to oppose legislation inimical to California's established water rights.

Colorado River Association,[4,8] 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) Contributions, $51,840; expenditures, $16,516.42; see detailed statement attached.[9] (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) Factual material is released to newspapers and magazines generally, inside and outside California; no control of its use by the press is or can be exercised. (5) To support legislation protecting California's established water rights on the Colorado River, and to oppose legislation inimical to California's established water rights.

Colorado River Association,[4,8] 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) Received from Royal Typewriter Co., $129.39, refund of duplicate payment. Expended $25,072.81. See detailed statement attached.[9] (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) Factual material is released to newspapers and magazines generally, inside and outside California. No control of its use by the press is or can be exercised. (5) To support legislation protecting California's established water rights on the Colorado River, and to oppose legislation inimical to California's established water rights.

Compton, R. T., National Association of Manufacturers, 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts: Salary $3,750, expenses reimbursed by employer, $1,156.07. Expenditures, $1,156.07. (2) Expenses paid to various railroads, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, telephone company, etc. (3) For expenses incurred in course of business, such as travel, meals, and hotel accommodations, and expenses of conducting conferences for discussion of business matters. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation affecting industry, such as legislation relating to national labor policy, taxation, public expenditures, industrial controls, social security, research, patents, and investments.

Comstock, Boyd, legislative assistant, Legislative-Federal Relations Division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,320 which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities; estimated for legislative service, $264, expenses. (2) Self (salary). Expenses: Hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash; NEA Journal (articles therein); informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Cone, D. C., Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, room 307, Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (1) Annual compensation for 1948, $5,700. (2) D. C. Cone. (3) As vice president and part-time national legislative representative of the Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America covering all service rendered, including services entirely unrelated to legislative matters. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of labor generally, employees of carriers under the Railway Labor Act and particularly the interests of the employees represented by the Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America.

Cone, John C., Pan American Airways, 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) During the quarter ended December 31, 1948, I have not participated in any way or received or spent any funds in connection with legislation. (2) None received or spent in connection with legislation. (3) Same as

[5] Filed for third quarter 1948.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter 1948.

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.
[8] Filed for fourth quarter 1947.
[9] Not printed. Filed in the Secretary's office.
[10] Filed for first quarter, 1948.
[11] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.
[8] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.
[9] Not printed. Filed in the Secretary's office.

above. (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose legislation but may be concerned with any legislation relating to aviation which may be pending.

Conn, Donald D.,[6] Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Personal expenses in connection with trip to Washington for conferences with Chairman Wolverton and his staff, $399.74. During the calendar quarter July 1 to September 30, 1948, my salary from the association was $6,250. The time spent in Washington in this period were the days of August 16 and September 24–27. (2) See above. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) None.

Conn,[6] Donald D., Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Personal expenses in connection with trips to Washington for conferences with Chairman Wolverton and his staff, $530.08. During the calendar quarter October 1 to December 31, 1948, my salary from the association was $6,250. The time spent in Washington in this period were the days of October 29, November 18–21, and December 16–19. (2) See above. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) None.

Conroy, Eugene J., The Prudential Insurance Co. of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J. (1) None; no activities during this quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Cooperstock, John, 30 Bellingham Avenue, Revere, Mass.; Veterans Association of Federal Employees, New York Naval Shipyard, Lenruth Hall, Myrtle and Waverly Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y. (1) None this quarter. (2) Self. (3) Travel, hotel, meals, etc. (4) None. (5) Support or oppose legislation affecting veterans' preference in Federal employment.

Corbett, John T., 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, 1118 Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) $2,749.98 as wages, $626.77 as expense account, $200.01 for official rental, telephone $28.78, postage $3.47. (2) "Labor" for office rental, $200.01; Morrison Hotel and restaurants at Chicago, Hollenden Hotel and restaurants at Cleveland, Pullman reservations, $626.77; telephone, $28.78; postage, $3.47. (3) As assistant grand chief engineer and national legislative representative, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, covering all services rendered, including services entirely unrelated to legislation and legislative matters. (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interest of labor.

Cortright, Frank W., National Association of Home Builders, suite 1116, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, October, November, and December 1948, $4,374.94; per diem, October, November, and December 1948, $644; expenses, travel (general), taxis, entertainment, and meetings, $1,770.88; expenses, travel (meetings and conferences), $737.62. Total, $7,527.44. As indicated upon my registration, I have been advised by counsel that I am not subject to the Lobbying Act. Such registration and this report are therefore filed under protest and merely as a matter of personal precaution in view of the indefiniteness of said act and the lack of judicial interpretation thereof. Neither said registration nor this report in any way are intended to constitute an admission by me that I am subject to the act. The payments reported above as my salary and per diem are for general services as executive vice-president of the National Association of Home Builders, and are not dependent upon rendition of services which might be considered lobbying within the meaning of the act. Similarly, expenses reported include substantial amounts for routine association business which could not be regarded as lobbying within the meaning of the act. Expenses reported do not include items of association expense such as travel, secretary's salary, telephone, and rent, which are part of the general administrative budget of the association and do not represent moneys received by me from the association. (2) Paid out in cash to taxis, restaurants, hotels, telephone and telegraph companies, etc. (3) Transportation, telephones, telegrams, tips, etc. (4) News releases are sent to the Associated Press, International News Service, United Press, and other national newspaper wire services by the association for publication in subscriber papers and magazines, some of which releases may contain material deemed to effect legislation directly or indirectly. Neither the association nor I have any means of ascertaining a complete list of the publications utilizing such releases. I also write an article each month for the American Builder, a monthly publication devoted to the interests of the housing industry. The association publishes a weekly news letter called the Washington Letter, and a monthly magazine, the Correlator, containing material of interest to the membership, including information on legislative matters. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any legislation, but I am the executive vice president of the trade association of the home-building industry. In that capacity it is incumbent upon me to supervise, among other things, the work of the association's legislative department. The function of that department of the association is to follow all legislation affecting the home-building industry; to advise the membership of the association of all such legislation; and to make known to the public and to the Congress the opinion of the membership on all such legislation.

Costello, John M., 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.; The American League for an Undivided Ireland, 165–167 William Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received as fees for services, $750; no expenditures. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Congressional Record. (5) Any legislation which may tend to effectuate the unification of all Ireland into a united nation.

Courtney, Paul L.,[4] 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No money was received or expended by me for lobbying purposes during the preceding calendar quarter. I registered as an employee of National Associated Businessmen, Inc., but said employment has terminated so this is the final report that I shall file under Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Am no longer employed to support or oppose legislation. (See answer to (1).)

Covington, J. Harry, 3d, American Smelting & Refining Co. et al., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received $15,000 for legal services rendered in connection with all legal matters for client; expended in connection with all matters for client $145.07. (2) Telephone expense, $67.31; travel expense, $45.12; telegram expense, $7.33; and miscellaneous expense, $25.31. (3) Long-distance-telephone calls, telegrams, transportation, and hotel accommodations. (4) None. (5) Appropriation for continuation of drainage tunnel by Bureau of Mines at Leadville, Colo.

Crampton, Charles J., 700 Insurance Building, San Antonio, Tex.; Texas Tax Association (formerly State Rights Association), Post Office Box 2559, Houston, Tex. (1) Statement attached.[1] (2) Statement attached.[1] (3) Statement attached.[1] (4) None. (5) Statement attached.[1]

Crawford, William A., Railroad Association of Georgia, 536 Hurt Building, Atlanta, Ga. (1) No money received or expended for any lobbying activities. (2) No one. (See reply to (1) above.) (3) None. (See reply to (1) above.) (4) None. (5) None.

Crowley, Leo. J., 922 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.; Colorado Railroad Legislative Committee, 615 C. A. Johnson Building, 509 Seventeenth Street, Denver, Colo. (1) Received compensation of $30 and expenses in the amount of $50 during the month of December 1948, these amounts being the only money received during the period whose expenditure had to do with Federal legislation. (2) Utah Hotel, Salt Lake City, restaurants, Pullman Co., dining cars, taxicabs, tips, etc. (3) $50 expenses was expended in connection with attendance at a meeting in Salt Lake City, at which proposed Federal legislation affecting railroads was discussed. This sum was spent for hotel bill, meals, taxicabs, Pullman fares, tips, etc. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting railroads operating in and having trackage in the State of Colorado.

Cuneo, John C., Post Office Box 1054, Modesto, Calif.; Townsend National Recovery Plan (the Townsend Plan), 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Received from the Townsend Plan, gross for operations in California, $2,012.63 (less deductions at source) $575.55; from California State Council legislative committee for reimbursement for expenses for California legislative campaign (one-half), for use in operations, $1,254.81; amount paid to John C. Cuneo for personal use, $780. Balance to be used for operations in California, $1,912.69. (2) Total disbursements for California operations, $1,214.60. (3) See detailed attached statement.[1] (4) None. (5) The Townsend Plan.

Curran, Roland, Central Valley Project Association, Box 15, Bakersfield, Calif. (1) No change from last report. (2) No change from last report. (3) No change from last report. (4) No change from last report. (5) No change from last report.

Curry, James E., National Congress of American Indians et al., 1016 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation affecting the American Indian.

Curtiss, Ralph E., 111 Kellogg Building, 1422 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; retained by Associated Tavern Owners of America, Inc., 420 Seventh Street, Racine, Wis. (1) Received, $685.07; expended, $55.07. (2) Hotel, railroad company, and telephone company. (3) Travel expense and telephone. (4) ATOA News, monthly publication of the association. (5) Any legislation affecting the tavern industry.

Daley, William L.; 817 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; National Editorial Association, 222 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Receipts from National Editorial Association, $1,065.01; expenses, $240.01. (2) Railroads, telegraph and telephone companies, taxicabs, office-supply companies. (3) Reimbursement for expenses, transportation, and communications. (4) Interpretative articles in official bulletins of national and State publishers' associations; also in trade publications of publishing industry. (5) Measures affecting the press.

Dameron, William V., grand lodge representative, International Association of Machinists, Machinists' Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Damon, Eugene J., St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Co., chairman, Missouri railroad committee, 906 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Daugherty, Paul J., 820 Huntington Bank Building, 17 South High Street, Columbus,

[6] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[4] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[4] Filed with the Secretary only.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Ohio, Ohio Chamber of Commerce, Columbus, Ohio. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation dealing with social security, business, taxation, and other matters of interest to our organization.

Davies,[5] Aled P., American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received salary of $2,076.96. Travel expenses when out of Chicago, including lodging, meals, taxicabs, entertainment, transportation, telephone, and telegraph, $470.67. (2) Various railroads, air lines, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, and telephone and telegraph companies. (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting specifically the meat-packing industry.

Davies,[6] Aled P., American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received salary from American Meat Institute of $1,793.12. No travel expenses during fourth quarter of 1948. (2) No one. See (1). (3) None. See (1). (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting specifically the meat-packing industry.

Davis, John H., National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for October, November, and December 1948, $3,000. Less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) Washington Situation—a weekly mimeographed newsletter of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. (5) Agricultural legislation.

Dawes, Bourbon, Hotel Association of Washington, D. C., Inc., 1331 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,708.32; expenses, $50. (2) (a) Taxies and transportation, $22; (b) miscellaneous lunches and dinners, $16; (c) miscellaneous expenses, $12. (3) Normal operating expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting hotels in the District of Columbia.

Dawson, Clarence E., Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) See (1) Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the Chase National Bank of the City of New York.

Dawson, Clarence E., Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) None. (5) See answer to (1); proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

Day, Mary R., 741 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (lawyer); Massman Construction Co., 20 West Ninth Street, Kansas City, Mo. (1) $1,862.31 received by Mary R. Day as fee for legal services. (2) Mary R. Day, 741 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (3) Fee for legal services. (4) None. (5) Bill for the relief of the Massman Construction Co., H. R. 2192.

Deegan, Thomas J., Jr., 4500 Chrysler Building, New York, N. Y.; Federation for Railway Progress, 1326 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary, $1,249.98; expenses (travel), $78.90. (2) Various hotels and transportation agencies for traveling expenses. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

DeGroot, E. H., Jr., 924 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.; Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State (as treasurer), 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. ((1) The attached typewritten statement[1] is hereby made part of this Form C, an integral part, to the statements of which the oath of the registrant filing same apply without reservation or exception. (2) See statement attached.[1] (3) See statement attached.[1] (4) None. (5) See statement attached.[1]

Denning, William I., 1518 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Magazine Publishers, 232 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) $1,875 was received as retainer for services plus $27.07 reimbursements for personal expenses in connection with work for the association. (2) William I. Denning, 1518 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (3) For general legal representation in Washington, D. C. (4) None. (5) Not called upon during quarter in connection with any legislation.

De Quevedo, Rafael G., 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; Building Products Institute, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,050; expense, $18.35. (2) Taxi, $2.80; restaurant, $15.30; notary, 25 cents. (3) As indicated by items above. (4) None. (5) All legislation which may affect the producers of building materials.

Dickerman, John M., National Association of Home Builders, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, from October 1 through December 31, 1948, $2,500; expenses, October 1 to Jan. 1, 1949, $59.05; reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses incurred on administrative tour of local associations in company with association president, $267.55; total, $2,825.60; the salary and expenses (except for the $267.55 item which is charged as part of the administrative expenses of the association) listed under (1) are charged against that portion of the association's budget allocated to the legislative department, of which I am in charge, which allocation is $26,900 for 1948. Only some of the functions of this department might be deemed as coming within the purview of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. (2) Paid out in cash to taxies, restaurants, hotels, telephone and telegraph companies, etc. (3) Transportation, telephones, telegrams, tips, hotel rooms, etc. (4) News releases are sent to the Associated Press, I. N. S., U. P., and other national newspaper wire services by the association for publication in subscriber papers and magazines, some of which releases may contain material deemed to affect legislation directly or indirectly. Neither the association nor I have any means of ascertaining a complete list of the publications utilizing such releases. The association publishes a weekly news letter called the Washington Letter and a monthly magazine, the Correlator, containing material of interest to the membership, including information on legislative matters. (5) All legislation affecting the home-building industry.

Disbrow, Walter L., Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, October, November, and December, 1948, $1,115. (2) Walter L. Disbrow. (3) To represent members of the Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government. (4) [Blank.] (5) Any and all legislation affecting civil-service retirement laws.

Disney, Wesley E., 434 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (See (1).) (1) Income: Western Oil & Gas Association, 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif., $1,500; Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 I Street NW., Washington, D. C., $1,250; Henry B. Cleereman, Green Bay, Wis., $1,500; expenses: Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (reimbursed), $189.12. (2) Various. (3) Incidentals such as taxi fares, telephone calls, etc. (4) None. (5) Natural Gas Act amendments; attention to legislative matters affecting oil-and-gas industry, family-partnership-tax legislation.

Dodge, Homer, 1244 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $600 salary and $225 expenses. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., the postmaster, the Superintendent of Documents, and others. (3) Telephone service, postage, Government documents, rent and minor office expenses. (4) None. (5) None.

Dorsett, J. Dewey, Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant does not receive funds earmarked for purposes set forth in this act. Registrant has estimated, however, that $75 received by registrant during the fourth quarter of 1948 might come within scope of act as registrant understands act has been interpreted by the Department of Justice. Registrant does not believe he has engaged in any activities in this quarter within the purview of this act. Registrant has expended no money in this quarter. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Article entitled "In the Common Cause," appeared in December 1948 issue of the National Insurance Producer. (5) Registrant doubts that he is employed to support or oppose legislation. However, on very infrequent occasions, he has supported or opposed legislation as it specifically affects capital-stock casualty insurance and surety companies.

Dougherty, John E., Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No activity under the act during the quarter ending December 31, 1948, consequently no part of the salary received during that quarter can be attributed to purposes covered by the act, and, likewise, no expenses were incurred for the purposes covered by the act. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interests of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

Dougherty,[10] Robert E., National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,000; expenses, $196.55. Only part of the sums expended in the course of duties having to do with legislation. (2) Hotels, restaurants, cab drivers, phone calls, tips. (3) Meals, tips, $118.25; cab fares, phone calls, $78.30. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interests of the lumber-manufacturing industry.

Dougherty,[11] Robert E. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $500; expenses, none. Hospitalized for entire period. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Dougherty,[5] Robert E., National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $500; expenses, none. Hospitalized for entire period. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Dougherty,[6] Robert E., National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary $666.66; expenses, $33.55. Only part of the sums expended in the course of duties having to do with legislation. (2) Local hotels, restaurants, cab drivers, phone calls, tips. (3) Meals, tips, $15; cab fares, phone calls, $18.55. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interests of the lumber-manufacturing industry.

Dow, Fayette B., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C., Committee for Pipe Line Companies, care of L. F. Kahle, Box 1349, Tulsa, Okla. (1) The Committee for Pipe Line Companies was organized to represent, as occasion may arise, in Washington, before departments of the Government, including Congress, the petroleum pipe lines that are regulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission under the Interstate Commerce Act.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.

[10] Filed for first quarter, 1948.

[11] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

The committee is not proposing or advocating any changes in existing laws. Deponent believes that in the period covered by this quarterly report he has taken no action that comes within the provisions of the Lobbying Act. Deponent believes that of his total compensation for all services rendered to the Committee for Pipe Line Companies, $500 would be a fair apportionment for any services which might be considered to be within the provisions of the Lobbying Act. In the quarter ending December 31, 1948, deponent received from the committee $2,016.20, representing disbursements made in August and September 1948, as follows: For statistical services to S. J. Elder, $325; office furniture and equipment, $1,613.35 to various local dealers; telephone installations, $16.38; map $13.10; postage, telephone, telegraph, etc., $48.37. Deponent has also expended in that quarter $231.60, covering postage, telephone, and miscellaneous items for which he has not been reimbursed. None of the foregoing items, deponent believes, relate to activities within the scope of the Lobbying Act. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) No legislation is proposed by Committee for Pipe Line Companies, deponent's employer, and there is no pending legislation which deponent has been called upon to support or oppose.

Dowd, M. J., Care Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif. (1) For fourth quarter of year 1948: Salary $960 per month; incidental traveling expenses, $226.30. (2) The salary is regular compensation for my full-time employment as consulting engineer for Imperial irrigation district, on irrigation, power, drainage, and related matters. Expenses represent reimbursement to me for personal travel, hotel, and subsistence expenses. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to the Colorado River and affecting Imperial irrigation district.

Downs, Thomas J., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., Associated Fur Coat & Trimming Manufacturers (now known as Associated Fur Manufacturers, Inc.). (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation affecting the fur industry.

Drake, John, National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expended $4 for taxi fares. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.

Dresie, Grey, 202 Bitting Building, Wichita, Kans; Kansas Independent Business Men's Association, 205 Orpheum Building, Wichita, Kans. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Friendly Dollar. (5) Tax equality.

Drysdale, Robert M., Jr., Federation for Railway Progress, 1326 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary, $2,124.99 as executive vice president of the federation; travel expenses, $772.54. (2) Various hotels and transportation agencies for traveling expenses. (3) Travel expense. (4) None. (5) None.

DuBois, Ben, secretary, Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn. (1) During the last quarter I was in Washington once. Congress was not in session. I discussed banking matters with the banking agencies. During the quarter we have put out a number of circular letters, both to nonmembers and to members. We have been urging upon the independent bankers the need for legislation that will regulate the bank holding company. I do not think that letters of this kind constitute lobbying. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

DuBrul, Stephen M., General Motors Corp., 11-243 General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) Registrant is filing this quarterly report merely to avoid any technical claim of violation of the act for failure to file this report. (4) None. (5) None.

Dudley, Harold, American Council of Commercial Laboratories, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $500 a month for October, November, and December. Total of $235.34 for traveling expenses. (2) Harold Dudley, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D. C. (3) For representing the interests of the American Council of Commercial Laboratories before Government agencies and serving as the council's executive secretary. (4) [Blank.] (5) Revision of Internal Revenue Form 990.

Dunn, William M., Communications Workers of America, 917 G Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expenses, $621.05; salary, $1,999.98; total, $2,621.03. (2) Normal living expenses plus railroads, air lines, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, and other incidental and related expenses. (3) To perform to the normal functions of my positions with the Communications Workers of America, none of which were related to legislative activities. (4) None. (5) Any proposed legislation which would affect the Communications Workers of America or its divisions.

Dwyer, Joseph L., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $12,000 annually; expenses reimbursed by employer, $1,150.11. (2) Various railroads, hotels, restaurants, retail stores, taxicabs, telephone companies, Government Printing Office, Hickey Bros. (3) Administrative, traveling, and incidental expenses; newspapers, periodicals, cigars, cigarettes, etc. Meals and entertainment. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting petroleum and its products, or natural gas.

Echols, Oliver P., Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Nothing received except salary, no part of which was paid for activities covered by Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. No expenditures. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to establish a national air policy.

Edelman, John W., 1031 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.; Textile Workers Union of America, 99 University Place, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $1,499.94; $581.69 to reimburse actual expenses incurred, $74.45 of this amount for expenses incurred in Washington; remainder for expenses outside of Washington. (2) Railroads, hotels, restaurants, cab drivers, bus companies, air lines. (3) Personal expense and travel. (4) Textile Labor, CIO News, Labor Press Associates. (5) Support legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Edelsberg, Herman, 1003 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 212 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) For activities covered by the act—approximately 5 percent of salary—$125. Actual expenses for fares, telephone, etc., approximately $15. (2) To various persons who provided actual taxi, telephone, postage, meals, etc., services. (3) Transportation, telephone, postage, meals, etc. (4) ADL Bulletin. (5) The ADL is an educational organization whose primary purpose is to promote better human relations among Americans. Incidental to this purpose, registrant supports legislation which promotes the civil rights of all Americans and opposes undemocratic discrimination against any Americans.

Edwards, Burton E., executive secretary, National Apartment Owners Association, suite 204, 205, 206 Portland Building, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; suite 226, Douglas Building, 257 South Spring Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) See attached annual statement,[1] general fund, National Apartment Owners Association, and annual statement, president's fund, National Apartment Owners Association. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) All measures affecting the multiple-housing industry.

Eliason, Courtleigh W., General Motors Corp, 11-243 General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) Registrant is filing this quarterly report merely to avoid any technical claim of violation of the act for failure to file this report. (4) None. (5) None.

Elliott, John Doyle, 305 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.; Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary of $60 per week plus average allowance for traveling costs of $30 per week in pursuance of work. (2) Paid for fares, mileage, hotel, and meals while traveling for purposes of work. (3) Contacting Townsend Clubs, other organizations, and citizens relative to promotion of the Townsend Plan. (4) None. (5) Amendment of the Social Security Act to embrace provisions generally known as the Townsend Plan, designated to date as H. R. 16, Eightieth Congress, first session.

Ellis,[1] Clyde T., National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary (3 months ending December 31, 1948), $3,300; expense account, $663.26; total, $3,963.26. (2) To self for salary and reimbursement for meals, hotel, tips, and transportation, $3,963.26. (3) Travel incident to members' meetings, board of director's meetings, etc. (4) Rural Electrification. (5) Legislation affecting the growth and welfare of rural electric cooperative corporations, public-power and public-utility districts, and legislation affecting public-power developments where they would, in turn, affect the rural electric cooperative corporations, public-power and public-utility districts.

Ellison, Newell W., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; Arabian-American Oil Co., 200 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) The firm of Covington, Burling, Rublee, Acheson & Shorb, of which I am a partner, received during the preceding calendar quarter $7,584.33; $7,500 for fee and $84.33 for miscellaneous expenses, including long-distance telephone calls and telegrams and my expenses on a trip to New York. (2) $84.33 to the telephone company for telephone calls and telegrams, and to reimburse the firm of Covington, Burling, Rublee, Acheson & Shorb for my expenses on a trip to New York. (3) Long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, and other miscellaneous costs. (4) None. (5) Proposal to amend provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to United States corporations doing business abroad.

Ellsworth, Charles K., Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 300 Hibbs Building, 725 Fifteenth Street, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $2,400; expenses, $40. (2) Expense money paid out only to hotel, restaurants, and cab drivers. (3) Covered above. (4) Have no records of any such publications. (5) Not employed to oppose or support legislation. Have been assigned by Hill & Knowlton, Inc., to prepare educational information and material showing consequences of measures proposing to repeal the Federal tax on oleomargarine.

Ely, Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; American Public Power Association (as general counsel), 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Services this quarter have not involved the supporting or opposing of legislation. At the request of the association, legal analyses

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[1] Filed with the Clerk only.

and opinions are rendered from time to time on legislation affecting public power.

Ely, Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; Colorado River Board of California and Six Agency Committee (as special counsel), 315 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) $5,846.30, comprising fees for legal services of this office and in California in connection with matters affecting California's interests in the Colorado River. Of this amount $926.30 was reimbursement of expenses; $2,000 of the total figure was paid by the Colorado River Board and $4,846.30 by the Six Agency Committee. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telegraph and telephone companies, suppliers of office materials, etc. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items; but, since this is part of a general law practice, it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telegraph, telephone, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) Work mainly related to conferences with Federal Government departments and agencies of the State government. Conferences with members of California congressional delegation re matters affecting California's right in Colorado River expected to be before new Congress.

Ely, Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; Department of Water and Power, City of Los Angeles, special counsel; Los Angeles, Calif. (1) $1,500, representing legal fees for services of this office and in California in connection with power and water contracts, conferences with Government departments, and litigation, and consultation as to legislation expected to come before the Eighty-first Congress. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telegraph and telephone companies, suppliers of office materials, etc. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items; but, since this is part of a general law practice, it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telegraph, telephone, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) Work done related mainly to litigation and departmental conferences. Conferences were held with California congressional delegation re matters of interest to department of water and power expected to come before new Congress.

Ely, Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; attorney for Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif. (Quarter ending December 31, 1948.) (1) $2,100 as legal fees for services of this office and in California in connection with power and water contracts, conferences with Government departments, etc., and consultation with respect to legislation expected to be considered by the Eighty-first Congress. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telegraph and telephone companies, suppliers of office materials, etc. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telegraph, telephone, office rent and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) Work done related mainly to litigation and departmental conferences. Conferences with California congressional delegation re matters affecting Imperial Irrigation District expected to be considered by new Congress.

Ely, Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; attorney for Water Project Authority of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif. (Quarter ending December 31, 1948.) (1) $1,500, the entire amount of which represents legal fees for services of this office and in California in connection with Central Valley power and water questions. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telegraph and telephone companies, suppliers of office materials, etc. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telegraph, telephone, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) Work mainly related to conferences with Government departments. Conferences with California congressional delegation re Central Valley matters expected to arise before new Congress.

Ely, Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; special counsel for Water Resources Board of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif. (Quarter ending December 31, 1948.) (1) None. Services as special counsel are loaned by the Water Project Authority of the State of California, which pays a fee of $500 per month. See registration under that employment. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) None. (5) None during the quarter covered by this report.

Evans, Walter M., Virginia Associated Businessmen (a Virginia corporation), 512 Travelers Building, Richmond, Va. (1) See sheet hereto attached marked "Schedule A".[1] (2) The answer to this question will be found on Schedule A[1] hereto attached. (3) The answer to this question will be found on Schedule A[1] hereto attached. (4) None. (5) Any legislation relating to the tax exemptions or any governmental subsidies granted the cooperative associations and corporations and other groups or businesses other than religious, charitable, and fraternal groups and organizations.

Fahy, Kathleen M. (Mrs. Jack B.), American Parents Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $256.27; expended $256.27. (2) Various. (3) Entertainment and miscellaneous expense. (4) Parents' Magazine and School Management. (5) National School Health Services Act; National Science Foundation bill; Appropriation for United States Children's Bureau; Federal aid for education bill.

Fakler, Herman, 847 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Millers' National Federation, 300 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) I received $5,500 salary as an officer of the Millers' National Federation. I am not employed specifically to engage in activities described in section 307 of title 3, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. During the preceding quarter I devoted no time to and I made no expenditures for such activities. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Farquhar, Randolph, American Parents Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) Parents' Magazine and School Management. (5) National School Health Services Act; National Science Foundation bill; Appropriations for United States Children's Bureau; Federal aid for education bill.

Farrington, Charles J., The National Coal Association, 803 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $3,147.75. Salary and out-of-pocket expenses. (2) [Blank.] (3) Taxicabs, telephone, lunches, postage, etc. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation affecting the bituminous coal business.

Farshing, Donald D., Management Planning of Washington, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue N.W., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,300 gross salary received; $174.01. (2) Transportation, hotels, and restaurants. (3) Transportation and other out-of-pocket expenses. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Ferguson, Abner H., 1139 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; United States Saving and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) October 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, telephone calls, telegrams, and taxicabs, $48.63; expenses attending annual convention, $154.37; general retainer, as Washington counsel. Less than one-half of work is in connection with legislation, $2,250. (2) American Telephone Co., Western Union Telegraph Co., and taxicab drivers. (3) Charges for services rendered. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting savings and loan associations and general mortgage lending.

Ferguson, John A., Independent Natural Gas Association of America, Room 305, 1700 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. During this period no legislative matters of any character in which this association or its staff were interested. (2) No legislation pending; no expenditures. (3) [Blank.] (4) Natural Gas News Letter, not pertaining to legislation. (5) No legislation pending.

Fernbach, Frank L., United Steelworkers of America, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) Salary, $1,264.98. Expenses covering transportation costs and $10 per diem when out of Washington, D. C. (2) Frank L. Fernbach. (3) Approximately 50 percent of my time is devoted in behalf of enactment of a Labor Extension Service bill and the remainder in behalf of the research and educational activities of the United Steelworkers of America and the Congress of Industrial Organizations. (4) The labor press, generally. (5) The Labor Extension Service bill, S. 110 and H. R. 675 and 61, to establish a Labor Extension Service Division in the United States Department of Labor.

Ferris, Muriel, League of Women Voters of the United States, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $185.42 salary every 2 weeks; received and expended: Carfare to and from the Capitol and travel, $7.20. (2) None expended in carrying on work except for carfare and travel. (3) Carfare and travel only. (4) Trends in Government, member magazine, publications of the League of Women Voters, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (5) I am employed principally to inform league members on legislative matters; secondarily to influence legislation. For legislation, see league platform adopted by national convention, 1948, attached.[1]

Fifer, Russell, American Butter Institute, 110 North Franklin St., Chicago, Ill. (1) For December 1948 only: Travel, $37.52; taxi and limousine, $9; meals, $18; telephone and telegraph, $4.36; total, $68.88. No expense in October and November. (2) To hotels, railroads, etc., for services rendered. (3) Normal business and traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) General farm legislation affecting the butter and dairy industry.

Filer, Harry L., the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn. (1) Salary $5,300 and no expenses, no part of salary chargeable to lobbying work. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting employer.

Finucane, James, National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary at annual rate of $3,600; expenses, $49. (2) Expenses paid to usual suppliers of small commercial items and services. (3) Transportation, periodicals, etc. (4) Newspapers of general circulation carrying news releases of council, also Peace Action. (5) To support any legislation which is internationally unifying in a wholesome sense. To oppose legislation tending to cause excess militarism.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Fisher, Lewis H., 1416 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C.; National Association Retired Civil Employees, District of Columbia, 1246 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Canal Construction Service Committee, Balboa Heights, C. Z.; Dr. Alexander Renner, temporarily, San Marino, Calif. (1) National Association Retired Civil Employees, District of Columbia, $800; Canal Construction Service Committee, Balboa Heights, C. Z., nothing; Dr. Alexander Renner, temporarily at San Marino, Calif., nothing. (2) Various individuals and corporations. (3) Telephone, $25; taxicab and streetcars, $3.40; stationery, $5; postage, $8.50; five meals, $10; office help, $130. (4) Annuitant. (5) Civil annuities and pensions for annuitants and potential annuitants. Assisting displaced persons under provisions of Public Law 774.

Fitzpatrick, F. Stuart, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received, salary, $3,625; expenses, $30. (2) Statler Hotel, lunches, $30. (3) Necessary normal expenses. (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation in the general fields of public works, city planning, urban redevelopment, and housing.

Fleming, Roger W., 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; American Farm Bureau Federation, 109 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $25.05 expended. (See (6) of Form B, filed May 1948.) (2) Taxis and restaurants. (3) Transportation and meals. (4) None. (5) Congress not in session.

Flinn, W. C., grand lodge representative, International Association of Machinists, Machinists' Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Ford, Mrs. J. A., 305 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.; Townsend Plan, Inc., 6675 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Average approximately $42 per week this last quarter due to special itineraries. (2) Hotels, meals when away from my own home, and traveling expenses. (3) As above. (4) Townsend National Weekly. (5) A bill known as H. R. 16 in the Eightieth Congress to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability from whatever cause for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys.

Ford, John B., National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) A fair portion of my salary chargeable to lobbying purposes is $25 per month, $75 for the quarter. I have not expended or received any other money for lobbying purposes. (2) To me. (3) Compensation for personal services. (4) I caused no articles or editorials to be published relating to legislation. (5) Legislation affecting the American merchant marine, specifically legislation amending the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, House Joint Resolutions 377, 398, 412, and 413, and companion bills, overtime-on-overtime legislation, and other legislation affecting shipping.

Ford, Tirey L., Sea-Air Legislative Committee, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to permit steamship companies to engage in foreign and overseas air transportation.

Fort, J. Carter, Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (1) For all services rendered to the Association of American Railroads, of the nature described in Registration Form B, filed December 1946, registrant received salary during the fourth quarter of 1948 at the rate shown in such registration, as amended by the supplement thereto, filed January 10, 1948, and received in addition $758.12 as reimbursement for all traveling expenses in connection with such services while away from Washington and all reimbursable business expenses in Washington, such as cab fares, business meals, etc. Of the salary received, $6,012.48 is estimated to be attributable to legislative activities. Of the expenses for which registrant was reimbursed, $585.34 is estimated to be attributable to legislative activities. The legislative activities referred to include activities with respect to possible legislation which registrant was called upon to consider, analyze, etc., which was neither supported nor opposed by him. (2) The expenses above shown were paid to the Jefferson Hotel, St. Louis; Hotel Claypool, Indianapolis, Ind.; Palmer House, Chicago; Hotel St. Paul, St. Paul, Minn.; Olympic Hotel, Seattle, Wash.; Hotel Mark Hopkins, San Francisco, Calif.; Mapes Hotel, Reno, Nev.; Brown Palace Hotel, Denver, Col.; the Baker Hotel, Dallas, Tex.; Hotel Mayfair, St. Louis, Mo.; Hotel Muehlebach, Kansas City, Mo.; Hotel Fontenelle, Omaha, Nebr.; Chicago Club, Chicago; Atlanta-Biltmore, Atlanta, Ga.; Biltmore and Waldorf-Astoria Hotels, New York; and the Algonquin Club of Boston; and to various restaurants and taxicabs in the cities above indicated and in Washington, D. C., and to dining cars while traveling between such cities. (3) Traveling expenses while away from Washington and such expenses in Washington as business meals, taxis, etc. Passes are used for rail transportation and, accordingly, no expense is incurred in that connection. (4) None. (5) Generally, to support all legislation in the interest of the railroads and of a sound national transportation policy and to oppose all legislation contrary to the interests of the railroads and to a sound national transportation policy. No such legislation was under consideration by Congress during the fourth quarter of 1948. However, during that quarter registrant gave consideration to possible legislation dealing with revision of the Internal Revenue Code, excise taxes, St. Lawrence project, amendments to the Federal Employers Liability Act, the Railway Labor Act, the Interstate Commerce Act, etc.

Foster, Charles E., Disabled American Veterans, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary: October, November, December 1948 (after taxes and social security), $1,654.80 (including semiannual bonus); expenses to New York, N. Y., $52.03; incidental expenses for October, November, December, 1948, $6.40; total, $1,713.23. (2) Charles E. Foster, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (3) See No. (1) above. (4) DAV Semimonthly. (5) Legislation affecting service-connected disabled veterans, their families, and the survivors of deceased servicemen and women.

Francis, Joseph H., National Board of Fur Farm Organizations, Morgan, Utah. (1) No activities carried on during the third quarter. No money received or expended. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Franklin, L. S., director, National Tax Relief Coalition, 2309 Pine Croft Road, Greensboro, N. C. (1) Received $350 for October, November, December, 1948. Paid out $375. (2) L. S. Franklin, director. (3) Salary for October, November, December, 1948. (4) None. (5) Tax reform.

Fredrickson, Fred J., Valley City, N. Dak.; North Dakota Resources Board, 311 North Broadway, Fargo, N. Dak., and State Water Conservation Commission, Bismarck, N. Dak. (1) Quarterly salary for October, November, and December 1948, before deductions for withholding and social security taxes, $1,800; and reimbursed expenses for same period, $691.49, none of which was for lobbying purposes. (2) Hotels, eating establishments, railroad and bus companies, garages and service stations; telephone and telegraph companies, and stationers. (3) Lodging, meals, transportation, communications, and office supplies. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting irrigation, reclamation, water conservation, flood control, land and mineral development and utilization in North Dakota.

Fuller, George M., National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319, Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) October, $158.28; November, $147.48; December, $434.37. (2) Miscellaneous. (3) Entertainment and transportation. (4) None. (5) Oppose any legislation inimical to the interests of the lumber industry and support any legislation which would be helpful to it.

Fyffe & Clarke (David R. Clarke) John Harrington, Albert J. Smith, Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 120 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $250. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting manufacturers generally.

Gall, John C. (law firm of Gall & Lane), 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Electric Companies, 1200, Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received during the preceding calender quarter in payment for all legal services rendered the National Association of Electric Companies, Washington, D. C., $5,000. There were no direct expenses. During the quarter, there were no activities of legislative character and no expenses incurred. The total amount received by way of general legal retainer is reported due to impossibility of determining to what extent, if at all, services rendered might be related to actual or prospective legislation within the meaning and scope of Public Law 601. (2) Retainer paid to firm of Gall & Lane. (3) Retainer for general legal services. See registration form filed October 4, 1948. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation; retainer is for general legal services, advice, and consultation, and may from time to time relate to matters of legislation affecting client's member companies.

Gall, John C. (Gall & Lane), 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., Youngstown, Ohio. (1) Received during the preceding calendar quarter, in payment for all legal services rendered the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., Youngstown, Ohio, $8,024.10. Total expenses, as listed under item (2), $24.19. The full amount received for all legal services is reported for the reason that it is impossible to determine what part, if any, of this compensation is allocable to services within the scope of Public Law 601. (2) Retainer paid to firm of Gall & Lane; total expenses to Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. and Western Union: $24.19. (3) Retainer for general legal services (see registration form filed January 15, 1947; expenses for telephone and telegraph). (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to labor, taxes, and business practices. Primary function in connection with most legislation is to advise client as to status and progress thereof.

Galvin, M. J., 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.; Minnesota railroads, St. Paul, Minn. (1) None (all of the undersigned's clients as listed on his registration have paid the expenses reported herein, and the undersigned's salary, on the ratio of the mileage which they have within the State of Minnesota. Amount paid is the same as that expended). (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None.

Gammons, Earl H., 801 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.; Columbia Broadcasting

System, Inc., Warner Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $325. (2) Restaurants, hotels, and incidental expenses. (3) Entertainment and out-of-pocket expenses. (4) None. (5) None.

Gardner,[4] Fraser S., national legislative chairman, Army and Navy Union, (home) 5410 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Spent $144 personal out-of-pocket moneys for regular duties of office held; attending veterans' meetings; legislative research; cost of sending mail to other national officers and headquarters; lunch; cabs; parking; etc. Received $50 on account, December 19, 1948. (2) Stamps; cabs; restaurants; parking lots; telephone calls, local and long distance; to Del Ankers, photographer, Washington, D. C., for picture of lunch, $16.25. (3) Picture and lunch costs incurred in presenting Army and Navy Union plaque to Watson Miller, United States Immigration and Naturalization Commissioner. Other out-of-pocket items incurred in regular duties of office of national officer of veterans' organization as covered in (1) and (2) of this report. (4) Army and Navy Union News; copy attached (marked). (5) We are expressly anxious to have the present Congress approve a national charter for this organization. On January 3, 1949, Congressman J. HARDIN PETERSON, of Florida, was asked by this writer to drop such a bill in the legislative hopper.

Garstang, Marion R., National Cooperative Milk Produoers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expended $1.20 for taxi fares. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.

Gavitt, Frank,[4] Carl Byoir & Associates, Inc., 10 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Carl Byoir & Associates, Inc., registered in accordance with Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, and retained as public relations counsel for Schenley Distillers Corp., did not, during the fourth calendar quarter of 1948 (the period covered by this report), conduct any lobbying activities. Please note that the name of the firm was changed from Schenley Distillers Corp., to Schenley Industries, Inc., effective January 4, 1949. Future quarterly reports will be filed in this new name. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Geary, Paul M., National Electrical Contractors Association, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No expenses incurred and no money received other than salary originally reported on Form B, filed May 22, 1947. (2) [Blank.] (3) None. (4) None. (5) No special legislation under consideration.

Geaslin, Bon, 1740 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala. (1) No expenditures made during this quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any particular legislation, but as an incident to my position as general counsel of Waterman Steamship Corp., we are interested in all legislation affecting the merchant marine and civil aeronautics.

Gebhard, Mrs. Paul, 1000 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., Division of Social Education and Action, Board of Christian Education, 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) No expenses incurred during this period. (2) [Blank.] (3) Lobbying in the interest of social legislation on which the Presbyterian General Assembly has taken action. (4) Social Progress Magazine; special bulletins. (5) Same as (3).

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.

Geiselman, R. H.,[11] John F. Jelke Co., 759 South Washtenaw Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) No money is received other than salary, incidental to regular employment as legal counsel, and assistant secretary of the company, and reimbursement for transportation, lodging, and meals. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Support of proposals for repeal of taxes on oleomargarine.

Geiselman,[5] R. H., John F. Jelke Co., 759 South Washtenaw Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) No money is received other than salary, incidental to regular employment as legal counsel, and assistant secretary of the company, and reimbursement for transportation, lodging, and meals. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Support of proposals for repeal of taxes on oleomargarine.

Geiselman,[6] R. H., John F. Jelke Co., 759 South Washtenaw Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) No money is received other than salary, incidental to regular employment as legal counsel, and secretary of the company and reimbursement for transportation, lodging, and meals. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Support proposals for repeal of taxes on oleomargarine.

George, Leo E., National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 1510 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, October, November, December, 1948, $2,500.03; travel and general organization expense, $1,443.39. (2) Travel and general organization expenses, including hotels, meals, and minor incidental expense due to attendance at local, State, and National meetings and conventions, plus transportation, as follows: Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, $753.08; American Air Lines, $90.31; total, $1,443.39. (3) Expenditures for hotels, meals, and incidental expenses are an actual reimbursement for cash expended in connection with attendance at meetings and conventions. (4) The Union Postal Clerk, the Federation News Service Bulletin, the Federation Press Service. (5) Support of measures, designed to improve and strengthen the civil service; improve the civil-service retirement system; improve the wages, hours, and conditions of post-office clerks, and to improve the postal service.

Gerrity, Harry J., Oregon-Washington Bridge Co., 1001 Hill Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) S. 569 and S. 570.

Giddings, Ernest, assistant director, Legislative-Federal Relations Division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,445.04, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities; estimated for legislative service, $289, expenses. (2) Self, salary. Expenses: Hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash, NEA Journal (articles therein), informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Gilbert, C. C., Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn. (1) $1,950, as secretary, Southern States Industrial Council. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Such legislation as may be of interest or affecting industry generally.

Gilliam, A. W., 727 National Press Building; American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received salary from American Meat Institute of $2,500. No travel expenses during fourth quarter of 1948. (2) No one. (See (1) above.) (3) None. (See (1) above). (4) None. (5)

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.
[11] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

Legislation affecting specifically the meat-packing industry

Glazier, William,[5] room 521, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; International Longshoremen's and Warehouse's Union, CIO, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Salary, $1,392.82; expenses, $347.98. (2) Expenses include those in Washington as well as air transportation and living expenses while out of town. (3) See (2). The Dispatcher, publication of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, CIO. (5) To support all legislation of interest to American workers and longshoremen and warehousemen specifically; oppose undemocratic legislation.

Glazier, William,[6] room 521, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, CIO, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Salary, $1,235.04; expenses, $363.81. (2) Expenses include those in Washington as well as air transportation and living expenses while out of town. (3) See (2). (4) The Dispatcher, publication of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, CIO. (5) To support all legislation of interest to American workers and longshoremen and warehousemen specifically; oppose undemocratic legislation.

Glazier, William,[8] room 521, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards, CIO, 86 Commercial Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) No salary or personal expenses; $300, or $100 per month, received toward cost of office operations. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) The Voice, publication of the National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards, CIO. (5) To support all legislation of interest to American workers and maritime workers specifically; oppose all undemocratic legislation.

Glazier, William,[6] room 521, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards, CIO, 86 Commercial Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) No salary or personal expenses; $300, or $100 per month, received toward cost of office operations. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) The Voice, publication of the National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards, CIO. (5) To support all legislation of interest to American workers and maritime workers specifically; oppose all undemocratic legislation.

Goddard, Livingston, 4500 Chrysler Building, New York, N. Y.; Federation for Railway Progress, Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Travel expenses, $160.21; salary, $833.21. (2) Various hotels and transportation agencies for traveling expenses. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Goodman, Leo, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,250; expenses, $359.34. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) CIO News; Autoworker. (5) Rent control, housing, and community development and planning.

Goodwin, William J., the Loch, Roslyn, N. Y., and Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; National Resources Commission of China, 111 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Money received, none; money expended, $4,438.25. (See schedule attached.[1]) (2) See schedule attached.[1] The attached schedule of expenses during the last 3 months includes some expenses perhaps not pertinent to the purposes of this retainer. Other expenses, not included, definitely do not pertain to this account, as I have other income and other accounts which do not come under this act. (3) See schedule attached.[1] (4) As stated

[1] Not printed. Filed in the clerk's office.
[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.

before, I have introduced representatives of the Chinese Government to newspaper editors, legislators, businessmen, and others, in order that they would learn the truth about China. Also, for the period ending December 31, I have written letters and made speeches as filed with the Department of Justice. (5) Reference is made to my letter of July 1, 1948, which accompanied my registration statement. Also, I intend to urge Congress to pass legislation providing for substantial military help to China to fight communism in order to establish stability in that country. Naturally, as a prerequisite for the work of interesting American capital in Chinese enterprises, but, far more important, as an American citizen, I will do so for the sake of the common world fight against Red fascism.

Gordon, Spencer, Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; American Institute of Accountants, 13 East Forty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None received or expended. (2) None received or expended. (3) None paid. (4) The Journal of Accountancy and the Certified Public Accountant. (5) Advancing the interests of the accounting profession in reference to bills relating to practice before Government agencies and practice before the tax court.

Goss, Albert S., the National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) I received $1,875 in salary for the quarter which is my total compensation for all my services as master of the National Grange of which legislative activities form only a part. I paid out none of it. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) The National Grange Monthly. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. As master of the National Grange, however, it is my duty to support or oppose legislation in conformity with the policies of the National Grange.

Goss, Bert C., 725 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Received no money other than salary as vice president of Hill & Knowlton plus essential travel and entertainment expenses. I estimate that of my travel and entertainment expenses for the 3 months ended December 31, 1948, less than $50 was expended for purposes that might be interpreted as subject to being reported under this law. (2) Paid to taxicabs and restaurants. (3) For travel to and from the Capitol, for luncheons and dinners for committee personnel and Congressmen, etc. (4) Supervised issuance of numerous press releases. (5) Not employed specifically to support or oppose legislation. Interested in legislation affecting aviation, in proposals to repeal the Federal tax on oleomargarine, and in other legislation affecting interest of clients of Hill & Knowlton.

Gourley, Lawrence L., 902 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) $3,000 retainer. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Bills affecting the public health.

Gray,[5] David G., Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any particular legislation. My duty was to watch the program of legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

Gray,[6] David G., Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston Tex. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any particular legislation. My duty was to watch the program of legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

Green,[8] Angus, American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Receipts: Salary, $1,668.99, plus $400.60, reimbursement of the expenditures referred to in (2) and (3) below. (2) Transportation and communications services, post office, hotels, restaurants, etc. (3) Travel, living and business expenses connected with employment. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting shipping industry which concerns employer.

Green,[6] Angus, American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) No activities in this quarter, and no expenses incurred. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting shipping industry which concerns employer.

Greene, Ernest W., 731 Investment Building; Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, post-office box 2450, Honolulu, T. H. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any legislation.

Griffith, H. McAllister, National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $1,900. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) Economic Council letter; Economic Council action report. (5) To support all legislation promoting the prosperity and independence of the United States, the preservation of our free social and economic system and the kind of government set forth in the Constitution of the United States. To oppose all legislation contrary to the foregoing, including proposals not on their face Communist or Socialist but which are being promoted in the interest of eventual transformation of the United States into a Socialist, Communist, or welfare state.

Grimes, Weston B., 436 Bowen Building, 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Cargill, Inc., 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn. (1) Received: (Includes office, travel, and general expenses totaling $1,619.52), $7,869.54. Expended: (For purposes designated in the Lobbying Act), $9. (2) Restaurants, $5, taxicabs, $4. (3) Meals, entertainment, for purposes designated in the Lobbying Act. Taxicabs to and from the Capitol. (4) None. (5) Legislation concerning commodity exchanges, international commodity agreements, regulation of exports and imports, and taxes.

Grinberg, P. Irving,[7] Jewelers Vigilance Committee, Inc., 17 West Forty-fifth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) [Blank.] (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) National Jeweler, Jewelers' Circular-Keystone, Jewelry, Jewelers' Outlook, Jewelers' Newsletter, Executive Jeweler, ANRJA Bulletin, NACJ Bulletin, Mid-Continent Jeweler, Northwestern Jeweler, Southern Jeweler, Pacific Goldsmith, Trader & Canadian Jeweler, Manufacturing Jeweler. (5) Interested in securing relief from excise taxes as applied to jewelry.

Haas, Frank E., Western Association of Railway Executives—The Association of Western Railways, 204 South Canal Street, Chicago, Illinois. (1) None received or expended for Federal legislative purposes. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the interest of western rail lines.

Haddock, Hoyt S., CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,560 in salary and $130 for expenses. No portion can be charged to legislative expenses as none were participated in. (2) Taxi companies, telephone companies, dispensers of periodicals. (3) Taxis, telephone calls, periodicals. (4) NMU Pilot, Marine Engineer. (5) Support legislation in interest of seamen; oppose legislation detrimental to them.

Hadley, Harlan V., 830 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.; Automobile Manufacturers Association, 320 New Center Building, Detroit, Mich. (1) None, other than one-quarter of the annual compensation of $2,500 as set forth in supplemental registration (Form B) filed April 9, 1948, and miscellaneous expenses not to exceed $15. (2) See above. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) Federal tax (excise) legislation, materials control legislation, and such other legislation as the association may hereafter from time to time indicate.

Haines, Samuel P., 4407 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; 20 percent Cabaret Tax Committee, 171 West Randolph Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) See exhibit A[1] attached. (2) See exhibit B[1] attached. (3) See exhibit B[1] attached. (4) None. (5) Reduction or repeal of the 20 percent excise tax applying to dine-and-dance rooms of hotels.

Hale, William C., Tennessee Eastman Corp., Kingsport, Tenn. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Revisions in the tariff act—draw-back regulations.

Hallbeck, E. C., National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 1510 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,666.65; legislative expenses, $887; transportation expense, $264.19; general organization expense, $356.22. (2) Legislative expense includes meals, streetcar, taxi, hotel, and other traveling expenses incident to attendance at legislative meetings and conferences, except transportation, $887; transportation expenses includes Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, $224.05; Capital Airlines, $26.45; Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railroad, $13.69, $264.19; general organization expense includes expenses incident to attendance at convention of A. F. of L., Cincinnati, Ohio, and other expenses not connected with the enactment of legislation, $356.22. (3) All expenses except transportation expenses are an actual reimbursement for cash expended on account of travel and attendance at meetings, conferences, and conventions. (4) The Union Postal Clerk; the Federation News Service bulletin; the Federation Press Service. (5) Support of measures designed to improve and strengthen the civil service; improve the civil service retirement system; improve the wages, hours, and conditions of post-office clerks and to improve the postal service.

Hamlet, Harry G., Retired Officers Association, 1600 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $500. No part of this sum was received specifically for the purpose of attempting to influence legislative action. (2) Expended, nothing. (3) See (1) above. (4) Retired Officers Association Bulletin. Delivered Newcomen Society of England lecture to cadets, Coast Guard Academy, October 5, 1948; was published by their alumni association not at my request. (5) Legislation affecting retired officers, warrant officers, and nurses of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

Harmanson, L. James, Jr., National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,625. Less than 10 percent of this amount would be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Agricultural legislation.

Harper, Elsie Dorothy, National Board of the Young Women's Christian Associations, 60 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $425; expenses, $280. (2) Elsie Dorothy Harper. (3) Presenting to the President, the Cabinet, and both Houses of Congress (a) the opinion on subjects related to (5) below, of the convention of Young Women's Christian Associations held triennially and (b) the opinion of the National board of the Young Women's Christian Associations in line with actions taken by the convention. (4) None. (5) Legislation related to international security, social and

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed with the Clerk only.
[8] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.
[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

economic justice, education, health, and civil liberties.

Harris, Ronald B., 62 T. W. Patterson Building, Fresno, Calif.; Irrigation Districts Association of California, 932 Pacific Building, Fourth and Market Streets, San Francisco, Calif. (1) I received for services rendered during 1948, for all services, the sum of $2.00. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 3194.

Harris, Winder R., Room 203, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received: office expense, $193; personal expense, $213.23; total $407.08. Expended: office expense, $193.85; personal expense, $213.23; total, $407.08. (2) Various. (3) Office supplies, drinking water, rental of electric water cooler, laundrying of office towels, Christmas gifts to building employees, purchase of Government documents, steel shelving, janitors' services, rail transportation, hotel accommodations, taxicab and streetcar transportation, lunches (not for anyone connected with legislation), dues to Washington Port, Propeller Club of the United States. (4) None. (5) None in quarter for which report is made.

Hart, Merwin K., National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $350; December advance for expenses, $220; total, $570. (2) It is difficult to allocate any money expended by me during the quarter in question to any lobbying activities. However, I spent October 20–22 in Washington at a total cost of $40.95, which included rail and pullman fares, taxis, hotel bill, meals, and miscellaneous. On November 20 I went to Boston to make an address and spent a total of $42.62, which included rail and pullman, plane, hotel bill, meals, and miscellaneous. December 10, I went to Washington for a brief trip and spent $48.62, including rail and pullman, hotel bill; taxis, and miscellaneous. Though I do not believe any of these expenditures are really allocable to any lobbying activity, they are mentioned for what interest they may have. (3) See (2). (4) Economic Council letters. (5) Measures discussed in council letters Nos. 200–205, both inclusive, published during this quarter, and which publications might be considered lobbying, are certain conventions of the ILO which will come before the Senate for ratification this winter, possible appropriations in 1949 for ERP, a general review of certain measures likely to be considered at the coming session of Congress, and the pending controversy over evidence recently produced by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Hart, Stephen H., 350 Equitable Building; National Livestock Tax Committee, Cooper Building, Denver, Colo. (1) During the quarter the National Livestock Tax Committee paid to me a per diem of $50 for office work and $100 out of town for actual time spent in study, advice, conferences, and correspondence concerning general livestock tax questions including the analysis of the present provisions of the Internal Revenue Code and current rulings and decisions concerning Federal taxation of livestock operators. Such activities also included work in connection with proposal of the National Livestock Tax Committee to amend the Internal Revenue Code, recognizing capital gains in sale of breeding livestock and permitting deduction of ordinary recurring ranching expenditures. It is impossible to determine what part of my services related to this problem, but it is my opinion that none of my activity during the preceding quarter could be interpreted as lobbying. During the quarter a total of $510 for legal services was paid to me for all my activities and services. I was also reimbursed $16.39 for out-of-pocket expenses. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Harter, Dow W., 412–14 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; the B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, Ohio. (1) Receive annual retainer from the B. F. Goodrich Co. for all services as its Washington counsel. Allocation of amount paid for my services between legal and legislative activities is not feasible. Amount received during fourth quarter of 1948, $1,575. In addition, receive reimbursement for long-distance telephone, travel, taxicab fares, and out-of-pocket expenses. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) The B. F. Goodrich Co. is interested in legislation relating to the maintenance of facilities for the production of an ample supply of synthetic rubber in the United States for commercial and national defense purposes. It is interested in various proposals now under study by Congress for a long-range rubber program for this country. It is also interested in the repeal of the present exercise taxes on tires and tubes, and in other legislative proposals which come before Congress from time to time.

Hawes, Robert N., 1028 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.; Grays Harbor Industries, Aberdeen, Wash.; Forks Chamber of Commerce, Forks, Wash.; Port Townsend Chamber of Commerce, Port Townsend, Wash.; Sequim Chamber of Commerce, Sequim, Wash.; and Port Angeles Chamber of Commerce, Port Angeles, Wash. (1) From Grays Harbor Industries: $2,499.99, compensation; $98.67, expenses. (2) Out-of-pocket expenses. (3) Telephone, telegraph, travel, entertainment, postage, etc. (4) None. (5) Reference to Olympic National Park.

Hawkins, Paul M., 1405 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York 19, N. Y. (1) Received $2,050, only a small fraction of which was for lobbying activities; $260.27 expenses, only a small fraction of which was expended for lobbying activities. (2) Taxicabs, railroads, restaurants, hotels, air lines. (3) Transportation, meals, rooms. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the hotel industry.

Hayden, Harry Vere, Jr., 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; the American Legion (national organization), 777 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) $250 salary, semimonthly, less withholding and social security taxes; $4.60 incidental expenses for months of October, November, and December 1948. (2) Harry Vere Hayden, Jr. (3) Taxi, carfare, phone calls, meals. (4) The American Legion Magazine, New York City; The National Legionnaire, Indianapolis, Ind.; National Legislative Bulletin, Washington, D. C. (5) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, their rehabilitation, hospitalization, reeducation and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense; Americanism, included in which are opposition to all subversive activities and particular attention to our immigration and naturalization laws; child welfare, not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agricultural development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations; the development of sound civil-aviation programs and policies; the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discriminations and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services; and all other matters included in the mandates and program of the American Legion as adopted and approved by the national convention of the American Legion and/or by its national executive committee, which are the ruling and policy-making bodies of the American Legion.

Haynes, Kit H., National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for October, November, and December 1948, $1,500. Less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) Assist in the preparation of Washington Situation, a weekly mimeographed newsletter of the national council; also prepare farm news releases at irregular intervals and special reports at irregular intervals. Such reports are distributed to members of the national council, news services, radio networks and stations, and miscellaneous persons who have requested inclusion on mailing lists. (5) Agricultural legislation.

Hays, Joseph H., Western Association of Railway Executives, the Association of Western Railways, 204 South Canal Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) None received or expended for Federal legislative purposes. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the interest of Western rail lines.

Hazen, John C., 1003 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West Thirty-first Street, New York City, N. Y. (1) Meals, $300.25; hotel, $63.69; taxis, $49.20; transportation (rail, plane), $210.18; miscellaneous, $15; convention registration fees, $23.50. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) The Special Bulletin of the National Retail Dry Goods Association, published weekly. (5) [Blank.]

Hebert, Felix, Associated Factory Mutual Fire Insurance Co. et al., 702 Turks Head Building, Providence, R. I. (1) Telephone call to Washington: toll, $1.70; tax, $0.43. (2) New England Telephone & Telegraph Co. (3) Telephone call. (4) None. (5) Amendment to Internal Revenue Code.

Heberton, K. W., 1405 G St. NW., Washington, D. C.; Western Union Telegraph Co., 60 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary of $800 per month, which is paid for all services, only a part of which concerns legislation. Out-of-pocket travel and incidental expenses, $85.55. (2) Taxi drivers and restaurants. (3) Transportation and luncheons. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the interests of the Western Union Telegraph Co.

Hecht, George J., 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y.; American Parents Committee (without salary), 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $173.19 for traveling expense, entertainment, etc.; expended $173.19. (2) Various. (3) Railroad fare, miscellaneous expense. (4) The Parents magazine and school management. (5) National School Health Services Act; National Science Foundation bill; Appropriations for United States Children's Bureau; Federal aid for education.

Heiney, Robert B., National Canners Association, 1739 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,625 as one-quarter year's salary as assistant to secretary of association for all work performed. $18.95 has been received as reimbursement for expenses incurred. (2) Taxi fares and miscellaneous expenses, $18.95. (3) See above. (4) National Canners information letter. (5) Opposing marketing orders on commodities for canning.

Henderson,[4] Joseph D., American Association of Small Business, 602 Carondelet Building, New Orleans, La. (1) Salary of $1,500, based on $6,000 per year, received this quarter from the American Association of Small Business; no money expended. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) The Small Business Review, monthly publication of the American Association of Small Business; routine news releases to newspapers and radio stations.

[4] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

(5) To support legislation favorable to small business; to oppose legislation unfavorable to small business, standing always for that which is right for the country and the will of the majority.

Henderson,[4] Joseph D., American Association of Small Business, 602 Carondelet Building, New Orleans, La. (1) Salary of $1,500 (based on $6,000 per year) received this quarter from the American Association of Small Business. No money expended. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) The Small Business Review, monthly publication of the American Association of Small Business; routine news releases to newspapers and radio stations; weekly column to Louisiana newspapers, Minding Your Own Business. (5) To support legislation favorable to small business; to oppose legislation unfavorable to small business, standing always for that which is right for the country and the will of the majority.

Hensel, Robert E., Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) The firm of Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, of the above address, of which registrant is an associate, expended the sum of $5.27 in connection with the proposed legislation described in (5) hereof, for which it was or will be reimbursed by the American Tobacco Co. (2) Various. (3) Postage, miscellaneous carfares, phone calls, and petty cash disbursements. (4) None. (5) Tax legislation extending the 85-percent dividend-received credit to dividends received from resident foreign corporations to the extent that such resident foreign corporations derive income from United States sources.

Herndon, Maurice G., 1001–2 Washington Loan and Trust Building, Ninth and F Streets NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Insurance Agents, 80 Maiden Lane, New York, N. Y. (1) No money received or expended during preceding calendar quarter. Status of registrant the same as stated in original form B and accompanying letter of explanation, filed March 6, 1947. (2) [Blank]. (3) [Blank]. (4) [Blank]. (5) [Blank].

Herrmann, Louis F., National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) [Blank]. (5) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.

Hess, Amiel Edgerton,[1] Oil-Heat Institute of America, Inc., 6 East Thirty-ninth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank]. (4) None. (5) Nothing at present.

Hester, Ewart A., law offices of Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary: October, November, and December, $2,500. No expenses for this quarter. (2) No expenses incurred. (3) None. (4) None. (5) See supplementary statement (2) attached to Form B filed by me January 9, 1948. H. R. 7036.

Hewes & Awalt (a law partnership, consisting of the following partners: Thomas Hewes, F. G. Awalt, Samuel O. Clark, Jr., Harold E. Mitchell, Raymond Sparks, Henry L. Shepherd, John S. Murtha, and Maxwell M. Merritt), 93 Elm Street, Hartford, Conn., 822 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Life Insurance Association of America, 165 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) This registrant received no money or other compensation from the Life Insurance Association of America during the calendar quarter ended December 31, 1948. This registrant made certain out-of-pocket expenditures during the calendar quarter ended December 31, 1948, in connection with its employment by the above-named association for which registrant has not received reimbursement, these being listed in detail: To the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., for long-distance calls, $5.64; to taxicab drivers, $1.40; total, $7.04. (2) See (1). (3) Expenses for transportation and communication. (4) None. (5) Any revision of Internal Revenue Code affecting life insurance and annuities.

Hewes & Awalt (a law partnership, consisting of the following partners: Thomas Hewes, F. G. Awalt, Samuel O. Clark, Jr., Harold E. Mitchell, Raymond Sparks, Henry L. Shepherd, John S. Murtha, Maxwell M. Merritt, and W. V. T. Justis), 93 Elm Street, Hartford, Conn., 822 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The filing of this report is not to be taken as an admission that the Federal regulation of Lobbying Act is applicable. This registrant received no money or other compensation from the National Association of Electric Companies during the calendar quarter ended December 31, 1948. This registrant made certain out-of-pocket expenditures during the calendar quarter ended December 31, 1948, in connection with its employment by the above-named association for which registrant has not received reimbursement, these being listed in detail: To Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for long-distance calls, $9.84; to taxicab drivers, $3.15; total, $12.99. (2) See (1). (3) Expenses for transportation and communication. (4) None. (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Companies, of which this firm is counsel, is to provide the members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and take appropriate action on all problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters. The association, therefore, is interested in any and all legislation that might affect its members directly or indirectly as going business concerns.

Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 300 Hibbs Building, 725 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See attached.[1] (2) See attached.[1] (3) See attached.[1] (4) Have no records of such publication. (5) Not employed to oppose or support legislation. Are retained to prepare educational information and material.

Hinders, Justin, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary, $1,000 (only 50 percent of time, however, is devoted to legislative activities). Expenses incurred, $233.30. (2) Various. (3) Taxi fare, transportation, etc. (4) Attached list[1] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) Legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Hines, Lewis G., American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for October, November, and December, $2,380; expenses for October, November, and December, $184. (2) Taxi drivers, phone company, and messengers. (3) As stated in No. 2. (4) None. (5) Affecting labor.

Hinman, Ray C., Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Money received: Salary, $1,250 (this represents one-quarter of the amount of registrant's annual remuneration which is attributable to the performance of duties which are subject to the Lobbying Act); reimbursement for traveling expenses, $132.80; total, $1,382.80. Money expended (in connection with duties related to the Lobbying Act), $132.80. (2) Railroads, air lines, taxis, hotels, restaurants, telephones, and tips. (3) Normal traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

Hollister, R. F., Independent Bankers Association, Twelfth Federal Reserve District, 802 Failing Building, Portland, Oreg. (1) Money received, salary, $1,800; money expended, none. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Federal legislation controlling bank holding companies.

Holloway, William J., Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. and others, 2816 First National Building, Oklahoma City, Okla. (1) Have neither earned nor received any attorney's fees under United States Lobbying Act during October, November, and December 1948. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Holman, Charles W., the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Miscellaneous expenses, $102.70. (2) Various. (3) Taxi fares, luncheons, etc. (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.

Holmes, George T., Tax Equity Committee of Kentucky, 211 Columbia Building, Louisville, Ky. (1) No money was received or expended for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Hood, J. M., president, American Short Line Railroad Association, 1120 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary received from the American Short Line Railroad Association, $4,125. Expenses incurred for account of the American Short Line Railroad Association for which reimbursement has been or will be made, $948.08. Impossible to accurately allocate either salary or expenses, but carefully calculated estimate is that 5 percent of salary, $206.25, and 10 percent of expenses, $94.81, total, $301.06, expended for purpose of influencing legislation. (2) Expenses paid to hotels, clubs, transportation, and communication companies. (3) For travel and entertainment in connection with the furtherance of the legislative program of the 317 common carriers by rail members of the American Short Line Railroad Association. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting member lines of the American Short Line Railroad Association.

Hooks, Homer E., Canners League of Florida, Post Office Box 1252, Lakeland, Fla. (1) No activity during quarter. Temporary work on specific legislation terminated with adjournment of last session, Eightieth Congress. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Horsky, Charles A., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; P. E. Harris & Co., Dexter Horton Building, Seattle, Wash.; Libby, McNeill & Libby, Chicago, Ill.; New England Fish Co., Smith Tower, Seattle, Wash.; Kadiak Fisheries Co., Lowman Building, Seattle, Wash.; Pacific American Fisheries, Inc., South Bellingham, Wash. (1) Received, none; expended, none. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) This employment is an ordinary attorney-client retainer on a per diem basis for the purpose of assisting in the formulation and presentation of a proposed legislative program, being developed jointly for presentation to Congress by various interested salmon-canning companies and the Department of the Interior, relating to stabilizing certain phases of the Alaska salmon industry. The per diem is computed at $250 a day for each day of legal services rendered.

Hosking, Floyd J., 1329 E Street NW., Washington D. C.; Corn Industries Research Foundation, 3 East Forty-fifth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $2.06 as miscellaneous expenses. (See below.) (2) Notary public, $2; postage, 6 cents. (3) Notarizing quarterly report, postage. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

[4] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.

[1] Filed with the Clerk only.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Howard, Paul, 1709 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.: American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salaries, $3,497.06; rent, $375; postage, $72.88; telephone and telegraph, $95.56; insurance on office equipment, etc., $25.65; travel, $367.01; supplies, $378.65; total expenditures for period, $4,553.16. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). Operation of office. Not more than one-third of expenditures applicable to legislative activity. (4) ALA bulletin; Library Journal; San Antonio Express; New York Times; and any other newspapers or magazines who use material from this office. Since we do not subscribe to a clipping service, we do not know who they are. (5) Any legislation affecting American Library Association members and/or the library profession.

Howard, S. H., 1328 Evergreen Avenue, Millvale, Pa.: Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, 503 Wellington Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary, none; expenses, none. No legislative activities. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Howe, Harold K., 2480 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., American Institute of Laundering, Joliet, Ill. (1) Received $1,500 as salary, and $464.16 as reimbursement for general expenses. (2) Various. (See answer to (3).) (3) Miscellaneous and incidental, including local transportation, lunches, gratuities, committee meeting expenses, and other incidental expenses of Washington office, American Institute of Laundering. (4) Not applicable under section 308 (a). (5) I am interested in all legislation affecting the laundry industry and the members thereof. My primary function as to legislation is to report status, prospects, etc., to my employer, the American Institute of Laundering. (See also letter attached to registration Form B, which is made a part hereof.)

Howe, Robert E., Jr.,[5] United Mine Workers of America, 900 Fifteenth Street NW., and 907 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Since July 1, 1948, there has been received by affiant as salary the sum of $2,125 and as per diem for personal living expenses the sum of $552, a total of $2,677. (2) No sums in any amount have been paid by affiant to any person other than affiant's expenditures for normal, everyday living expenses such as transportation, meals, etc., in the regular discharge of his duties. (3) Answered in (2) above. (4) None. (5) Any and all legislation construed to be directly or indirectly beneficial or detrimental to the United Mine Workers of America and its members.

Howe, Robert E., Jr.,[6] United Mine Workers of America, 900 Fifteenth Street NW., and 907 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Since October 1, 1948, there has been received by affiant as salary the sum of $2,374.96 and as per diem for personal living expenses the sum of $552, a total of $2,926.96. (2) No sums in any amount have been paid by affiant to any person other than affiant's expenditures for normal, everyday living expenses such as transportation, meals, etc., in the regular discharge of his duties. (3) Answered in (2) above. (4) None. (5) Any and all legislation construed to be directly or indirectly beneficial or detrimental to the United Mine Workers of America and its members.

Huff, W. T., 806 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.: Transcontinental & Western Air, Inc., 101 West Eleventh Street, Kansas City, Mo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) To support the program of the Presidential Air Policy Commission and the Congressional Air Policy Board for the advancement of aviation.

Huntress, Carroll B., 17 Battery Place, New York, N. Y.; National St. Lawrence Project Conference, 843 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Carroll B. Huntress, vice president, Republic Coal & Coke Co., 17 Battery Place, New York, N. Y., acting as chairman for the National St. Lawrence Project Conference, without compensation and for reimbursement of expenses of travel and hotel. (2) Railroads, hotels, $53.92. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Senate Joint Resolution 111; House Joint Resolution 192.

Hushing, W. C., American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for October, November, and December, $2,380. Expenses for October, November, and December, $231.60. (2) Taxi drivers, phone company (when away from office), and messengers. (3) As stated in (2). (4) None. (5) Affecting labor.

Hutson, John B., suite 719, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Tobacco Associates, Inc., Raleigh, N. C. (1) Salary at the rate previously reported on Form B, which registrant filed as a matter of information to the Congress, although of the opinion that he does not come within the purview of the act (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.). (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Ingles, William, 1624 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts: Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., $1,020; J. I. Case Co., $900; The Falk Corp., $900; Inland Steel Co., $900. Expenditures: Office salaries, $750; lunches, taxi fares, and incidentals (no individual expense exceeding $10), $360; office rent, $330; telephone, $125.51; office services, supplies, and general expense, $67.65; traveling expenses, $762.44. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). Normal operating expense. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting industry.

Independent Natural Gas Association of America, Room 305, 1700 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Dues payments, fourth quarter, 1948: Tennessee Gas Transmission Co., Commerce Building, Houston, Tex., $3,800; Rio Grande Valley Gas Co., Brownsville, Tex., $200; all other dues to December 31, 1948, $1,940.63; total dues collected for quarter, $5,940.63. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) Regular association publications. (5) No legislation pending.

Jackson, Charles E., general manager, National Fisheries Institute, Inc., 228 Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) NFI Flashes, published weekly (50 issues), mailed to institute membership. (5) None.

Jackson, Robert C.,[5] National Cotton Council of America, 1406 G Street NW. (1) Salary as reported on Form B. No expenses incurred that related to legislative activity. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation.

Jackson, Robert C.,[6] 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Cotton Council of America, Memphis, Tenn. (1) In addition to regular salary from National Cotton Council, as reported on Form B, received expense reimbursements amounting to $97.84 that might be construed as relating to legislative activity. (2) Taxi fares $3.60; travel expense $94.24. (3) Transportation, meals, and lodging. (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. Expenditures reported above relate to plans for efforts to repeal taxes and license fees on margarine.

Jhung, Walter, Post Office Box 1706, Washington, D. C.; Korean-American Trading Co., 105 East Houston Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) S. 152 and H. R. 860 (superseded by H. R. 2932), immigration quota for Korea and to extend naturalization privileges for Korean nationals in United States.

Jobe, William T., National Association of Ice Industries, 1706 L Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Employed on a full time annual basis as general counsel for the National Association of Ice Industries at a salary of $10,800 per annum. I have received my regular monthly salary for the past calendar quarter of 1948 and nothing more. Pursuant to the requirements of Public Law 601, I have expended no money. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Johnson, Curtis E., 4619A South Thirty-sixth Street, Arlington, Va.; Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 6369, Emergency Displaced Persons Act.

Johnson, Elmer, National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1246 Twentieth Street, NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The sum of $743.28 was received during the fourth quarter of 1948. (2) None. (3) Fee, $225 per month; $68.28 to cover transportation, meals, etc. (4) The annuitant. (5) In support of any measure designed to improve the Federal retirement system.

Johnson, Gilbert R., 874 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio; Lake Carriers' Association, 905 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Pro rata of annual retainer as legal counsel (including 8-percent increase effective September 1, 1948) as set forth in my letter of April 9, 1948, amending initial registration dated January 10, 1947. No expenses were incurred during this period. (2) Retainer to self. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) During this quarter I have given attention to legislation relating to Great Lakes shipping as part of my work as legal counsel for Lake Carriers' Association. I do not consider that I am engaged for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation and this report is made without prejudice to that position.

Johnson, Vernon A., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Burbank, Calif. (1) Received a total of $4,405.42, all from the Lockheed Aircraft Corp. $2,750 of this was for salary. The balance of $1,655.42 was for expenses, itemized as follows: $20 for automobile travel, $44.10 for taxicab fares, $982.70 for entertainment, $381.54 for travel tickets, $150 for hotel-room rent, and $77 for meals. (2) Various taxicab companies, hotels, restaurants, transportation companies, etc. (3) For normal business activities and relationships. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting aviation.

Johnson, W. D., room 312, Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Order of Railway Conductors of America, Cedar Rapids, Iowa. (1) January 1949, annual compensation of $8,500. (2) W. D. Johnson. (3) As vice president and national legislative representative of the Order of Railway Conductors of America, covering all services rendered, including services entirely unrelated to legislative matters. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of labor, generally, employees of carriers under the Railway Labor Act, and particularly the interests of various classes and crafts of railway employees represented by the Order of Railway Conductors of America.

Johnson, Walter R., National Association of Attorneys General, 917 District National Building, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary due to July 31, 1948, $3,500; expenses, $266.56. (2) Registrant. (3) Expenses incurred attending meeting American Association of Port Authorities, $109.60; expenses for hotel, meals, taxis, etc., in Washington during December 1948, $164.96. (4) None. (5) To confirm and establish titles in States to land beneath navigable waters within State boundaries.

Jones, J. M., National Wool Growers Association, 414 Pacific National Life Building,

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.

Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) Salary $2,100. (2) [Blank.] (3) No lobbying expense for fourth quarter, 1948. (4) The National Wool Grower, coeditor, J. M. Jones. (5) [Blank.]

Jones, L. Dan, Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary previously reported plus the following expenses which might be considered to be within the scope of the act, $17.10. (2) See (3) below. (3) Taxi fares. (4) None. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. My duties include that of maintaining surveillance of legislation which might affect the petroleum industry and taking such action with respect to such legislation as directed by the association.

Jones, Lyle W., 1737 De Sales Street, NW.; National Small Business Men's Association, Akron, Ohio. (1) $600 monthly salary less withholding tax and social-security tax; $160 personal expenses, October, November, and December. (2) Lyle W. Jones. (3) Luncheons, taxicabs, and miscellaneous expenses. (4) Pulling Together—monthly bulletin, National Small Business Men's Association. (5) [Blank.]

Jones, Walter J.,[5] care of W. C. Hushing, room 607, American Federation of Labor Building, Washington, D. C.; Canal Zone Central Labor Union and Metal Trades Council, Balboa, C. Z. (1) $500 per month for July 1948; none for August or September 1948. (2) Landlord for rent, various groceries for food, service stations for gasoline and oil, cab fare, tips, railroads for fare, and miscellaneous items incidental to living in Washington; boat transportation to Canal Zone. (3) Fares, rent, food, operation of automobile, etc. (4) None. (5) Retirement for Canal Zone employees, pay legislation, increased injury compensation, any others affecting Federal employees.

Jones, Walter J.,[6] care of W. C. Hushing, room 607, American Federation of Labor Building, Washington, D. C. Not employed as representative during this period; employed in regular position with the Panama Canal, Balboa, Canal Zone. (1) None period October, November, December 1948. Returned to regular position with the Panama Canal. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) [Blank.]

Kane, John E., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received regular salary as previously reported in Form B heretofore filed pursuant to act; expenses reimbursed by employer, $384.22. (2) Various taxicab companies, restaurants, hotels, other service establishments. (3) Administrative expenses, transportation, gratuities. (4) None. (5) Matters affecting the petroleum industry and its customers.

Kane, John E., District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $243.90 as treasurer of District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee. The sum of $343.90 expended on behalf of committee during quarter. (2) Various. (3) Incidentals. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the sale and distribution of petroleum products in the District of Columbia.

Kass, Rear Adm. I., Post Office Box 4037, Washington, D. C., and Hotel Princess Anne, Fredericksburg, Va. (1) Expended about $200 since last report; received none. (2) Railroad company, post office, telephones, and similar items. (3) Rail travel, mailing, and telephoning. (4) Pamphlet the States Rights (Dixie Party) and Liberty. (5) Oppose all fair-employment practice laws; promote free liberal government.

Keesling, Francis V., Jr., 315 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.; city and county of San Francisco, City Hall, San Francisco, Calif. (1) $3,000, retainer; $1,646.73, reimbursement for travel, subsistence, secretarial, stenographic, telephone, telegraph, and postage expense. (This also covers services concerning matters before the various executive departments, in addition to legislative matters of interest to the city and county of San Francisco, and includes expenses at Washington, D. C., San Francisco, and elsewhere.) (2) No payments made except as set forth in (1) above. (3) In connection with various legislative matters of interest to the city and county of San Francisco. (4) None. (5) Various bills of interest to the city and county of San Francisco including Army civil functions, housing, surplus property, in-lieu taxes.

Kennedy, Gilbert F., Esq., partner of Breed, Abbott & Morgan, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y., Washington, D. C., and 1 Garden Court, Middle Temple, London, England; Louis Dreyfus, of Chappell & Co., Inc., RKO Building, New York, N. Y., and of Chappell & Co., Ltd., 50 New Bond Street, London, England. (1) Nothing received during the quarter; $2 expended during the quarter. (2) H. W. H. Smith Howard, commissioner for oaths, $2. (3) Commissioner's fees. (4) None. (5) H. R. 5704, Eightieth Congress, second session, being a bill to enable wife (Jeanne Bouchet Dreyfus) to regain her United States citizenship.

Kennedy, Harold L., 605 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.; Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Association, 308 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla. (1) Received 3 months' retainer in the amount of $3,000; expended nothing. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) All proposed legislation that might affect the oil and gas industry.

Kent, Arthur H., 1720 Mills Tower, San Francisco, Calif.; American Contractors Engaged in Foreign Work, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Payment of $33.47 received from American Contractors Engaged in Foreign Work, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y., December 2, 1948. (2) United Airlines (extra fare), Washington to San Francisco, $15.81; Lulu P. Loveland, notarial fees, $4; Standard Photoprint Co., photostats, $8.29; long-distance-telephone tolls, $5.37. (3) Transportation and other out-of-pocket expenses incurred to November 20, 1948, and reimbursed by above payment. (4) None. (5) Support of amendment to section 116 (a), Internal Revenue Code, relating to taxation of earned income of United States citizens from foreign sources.

Kern, George A., Iowa Railway Committee, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Ketchum, Inc.,[6] 1400 Chamber of Commerce Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.; National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received from National Education Association, $1,162.93. (2) Ketchum, Inc., $1,162.93. (3) Services, $800; expenses (living, travel, and incidental expenses), $362.93; total, $1,162.93. (4) News releases sent to the Associated Press, United Press, International News Service, general distribution to Washington news and radio correspondents. (Information also distributed to Members of Congress.) (5) Current educational problems in furtherance of the passage of H. R. 2953 and S. 472.

Ketchum, Inc., National Competition Committee, 1400 Chamber of Commerce Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) $18,850 received. (See attached paper A.[1]) (2) To Ketchum, Inc., to members of management and field staff (McClean Work, Walter M. Megronigle, Harold D. Huycke, Rollin C. Bacher, George Hoeveler, and Marshall Lewis) as salaries, and for traveling expenses for these men, and office expenses. (See attached paper B.[1]) (3) For organizing and implementing committees in various parts of the country (see attached paper C,[1] and directing attendant publicity. (4) One release to Pittsburgh papers, Wall Street Journal, trade press, and press associations, on December 8, 1948 (copy attached).[2] (5) These committees were organized to support legislation to assure the continuance of the delivered-price system of selling. Since Ketchum, Inc., has completed its work of organizing these committees its work has been discontinued as of December 31, 1948.

Ketchum, MacLeod & Grove, Inc.,[5] 411 Seventh Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Main & Co., First National Bank Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) Received from Main & Co., $1,522.87. (2) Various. (3) For type composition for folders descriptive of tax plan; printing of folders; letter shop service; clipping services; postage, telephone, art lay-out, and services. (4) News releases sent to Pittsburgh Press, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph, Wall Street Journal, Associated Press, United Press, International News Service, and general distribution to Washington News and radio correspondents. (Information also distributed to Members of Congress.) (5) The incentive income-tax plan, a program of income-tax revision prepared by Frank Wilbur Main and other partners in Main & Co., certified public accountants, with headquarters office in Pittsburgh.

Ketchum, Omar B., Veterans of Foreign Wars, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,000 per month as salary minus social security and withholding taxes; $62.50 as expenses for transportation and luncheons in connection with legislative activities. (2) No record kept of recipients of taxicab fares and luncheons. (3) Transportation, social obligations, and normal luncheon requirements. (4) VFW Foreign Service, VFW Legislative Newsletter. (5) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation and housing; welfare of servicemen of the armed forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration, and naturalization, the combating of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the national encampment and the national council of administration.

King, Carol, 220 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; acting for American Committee for Protection of Foreign-Born, 23 West Twenty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Repeal of act of October 16, 1918, as amended.

King, Joseph T., National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, suite 302, Ring Building, Eighteenth and M Streets NW, Washington, D. C. (1) $1,800 salary and $585.35 expenses. (2) Restaurants, cab drivers, hotels, railroads, Pullman companies, porters. (3) Meals, taxi fares, and tips while traveling on official business; business luncheons, entertainment. (4) National affairs reports and bulletins. (5) Legislation directly affecting the retail building supply dealers, such as Fair Labor Standards Act, wage-and-hour legislation, housing legislation, tax legislation, freight rates, price and allocation controls.

King, Thomas H., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation for the development of a military policy for the United States which will provide adequate national security.

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[2] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[2] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

King, Willford I., Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) During the past quarter I received an over-all of $2,606.02, including salary and expenses. (2) I am not a disbursing officer and have made no payments for the Committee for Constitutional Government, by whom I am employed. (3) [Blank.] (4) Dun's Review. (5) Not employed for this purpose, but, incidentally, I occasionally oppose legislation which I believe to be antisocial and favor that which I believe to be socially beneficial.

Kitchen, C. W., United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 2017 S Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Various articles have been prepared and published in trade periodicals and association yearbooks on marketing subjects, none dealing specifically with legislative matters. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation.

Kline, Allan B., American Farm Bureau Federation, 58 East Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $254.03 expended. (See (6) of Form B filed January 1948.) (2) Taxi fares, train fares, hotel, and restaurants. (3) Transportation, lodging, and luncheon conferences. (4) None. (5) Congress not in session.

Kline, Robert E., Jr., 322 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; Washington counsel for Kirlin, Campbell, Hickox & Keating, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to permit steamship companies to engage in foreign and overseas air transportation.

Kneipp, Leon F., 3700 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Organization of Professional Employees of United States Department of Agriculture, South Building, Department of Agriculture, Washington D. C. (1) Only money received was compensation for services during months of October, November, and December 1948 at rate of $100 per month; total $300. (2) No money paid to any person, company, corporation, or otherwise. (3) None. (4) None, other than small publication, Opeda, published by organization for issuance to its members; a part of which consists of a letter from the executive officer apprising members of current developments in subjects of interest. (5) Measures relating to interests of Federal professional employees; pay, per diem, classification, retirement, auto mileage, annual and sick leave, disability compensation, civil service, and other like subjects.

Koch, Robert M., National Agricultural Limestone Association, Inc., 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) It is estimated that, as secretary of the National Agricultural Limestone Association, Inc., $500 of my salary represents that part of my time covered by Public Law 601 during the fourth quarter of 1948. This was all disbursed for personal living expenses. In addition, I received $20 for reimbursement for taxis and carfare in connection with legislation of interest to members of the association. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation directly or indirectly affecting the agricultural limestone industry.

Krebs, Alfred U., National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant believes that $53 per month represents a fair allocation of his salary for the fourth quarter of 1948, to the activities referred to in Form B. (2) No expenditures except for taxicabs and similar items. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) Registrant did not support or oppose any legislation during the fourth quarter of 1948.

Kreutz, Oscar R., National Savings and Loan League, 1635 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $4,500 total salary for quarter and $1,743.77 reimbursement of expenses. No portion of either my salary or expenses is allocable to lobbying for this quarter. (2) None of the expenses incurred nor reimbursements received by me in the fourth quarter was chargeable to legislative expense. (3) [Blank.] (4) National Savings and Loan Journal; National Letter. (5) Bills to improve the facilities of savings and loan associations for encouragement of thrift and home ownership are supported, while legislation inimical to the interests of the savings and loan business is opposed.

Krueger, A. H., 847 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Millers' National Federation, 309 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) During the quarter October-December 1948 I was paid $2,149.98 by the Millers' National Federation for various services most of which are not related to the activities described in section 307, title 3, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. Section 307 activities, if any, would be incidental in relationship to my regular employment and no amount of my salary is specifically allocated for such activities. (Effective September 1 my salary as originally reported was increased $600 annually.) No expenditures were made for the quarter. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Activity dependent on my employer's interest with respect to legislation, directly affecting milling industry. No pending legislation.

Kruse, Herman C., Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) No activity during quarter. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Lacques,[6] Paul H., Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received various sums during the quarterly period (July, August, September) at various times a total of $408.19, from Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston. None of such receipts exceeded $100. (2) Railroad companies, hotels, and club. (3) Transportation, accommodations, meals, telephone, and telegraph charges. (4) None. (5) H. R. 4044.

Lacques,[6] Paul H., Bingham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received various sums during the quarterly period (October, November, and December 1948) at various times a total of $81.20, from Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston. (2) Railroad companies, hotels, and club. (3) Transportation, accommodations, meals, telephone and telegraph charges. (4) None. (5) [Blank.]

LaFrance, Francis X., Esq., Swan, Keeney & Smith, 911 Turks Head Building, Providence, R. I.; Narragansett Brewing Co., New Depot Avenue, Cranston, R. I. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2759 and any corelative bill.

Lanham, Fritz G., Woodley Park Towers, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.; National Patent Council, Inc., 1434 West Eleventh Avenue, Gary, Ind.; American Fair Trade Council, Inc., 11 East Forty-fourth Street, New York City, N. Y.; Trinity Improvement Association, Inc., 1308 Commercial Standard Building, Fort Worth, Tex. (1) From National Patent Council as retainer $1,500; from American Fair Trade Council as retainer $1,000 and for expenses of trip to New York $35.65; aside from small sums for postage, etc., no expenditures for either council except as recited; Trinity Improvement Association for rental and other expenses $750 and $250 additional for expenses of trip to Texas on business for the association in meetings at Beaumont, Dallas, and Fort Worth, Tex. (2) Except as recited above, $408 to Woodley Park Towers, Washington, D. C. (3) Rental and garage. (4) None. (5) My employers are all nonprofit organizations, and I was employed in an advisory capacity. Their purposes are principally educational with reference to the objectives of their organizations.

Laugherty, R. R., 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Railway Employees' Department, American Federation of Labor, room 1309, 608 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary, $1,500; expenses, $750. No money expended only for personal maintenance. (2) Annapolis Hotel, taxi fare, postage, telephone and telegraph, cleaning and food. (3) Necessary living, transportation, and communication expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting and detrimental to railroad employees.

Lawrence, John V., American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant received only his regular salary as shown in his registration. He expended a total of $26.05. (2) The money was paid to various taxi drivers employed in taking registrant between his office and the Capitol or House or Senate Office Buildings, and to clerks and cashiers for lunches at restaurants. (3) The money paid taxi drivers was for transportation to and from my office as indicated in (2). (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the trucking industry.

Lawrence, Joseph S., M. D., suite 301, 1302 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Receipts: Salary, October 1 to December 31, 1948, $3,750; retirement savings bonus, $5,000; reimbursement for American Medical Association expenses reported, $827.03; total, $9,577.03. Expenses: Travel, $622.37; hotels, $126.15; meals, $98.50; taxi, $52.35; conferences, $102.75; miscellaneous, $18; total, $1,020.12. (2) Various. (3) Travel, local transportation, hotels, conferences, incidental expenses, and meals. (4) None. (5) Bills relating to public health endorsed or opposed by the section of the house of delegates of the American Medical Association or the principles espoused by that body.

Laylin,[5] John G., American Smelting & Refining Co. et al., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received, none; expended in connection with all matters for client, $115.92. (2) Telephone and telegraph expense, $79.15; travel expense including hotel accommodations, $36.77. (3) Long-distance-telephone calls, telegrams, transportation, and hotel accommodations. (4) None. (5) Appropriation for continuation of drainage tunnel by Bureau of Mines at Leadville, Colo.

Laylin,[6] John G., American Smelting & Refining Co. et al., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received $15,000 for legal services rendered in connection with all legal matters for client; expended in connection with all matters for client, $145.07. (2) Telephone expense, $67.31; telegram expense, $7.33; travel expense, $45.12; miscellaneous expense, $25.31. (3) Long-distance-telephone calls, telegrams, transportation, and hotel accommodations. (4) None. (5) Appropriation for continuation of drainage tunnel by Bureau of Mines at Leadville, Colo.

League of Women Voters of the United States, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant has received no contributions for the purposes designated in subparagraph (a) or (b) of section 307, Public Law 601. Expenditures, $1,119.72. (2) Muriel Ferris, salary and carfare. (3) As indicated in (1). (4) Trends in Government, and Member magazine, both published by registrant. (5) See attached program of the League of Women Voters of the United States.

Lee, Ivy, and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y., United States Cuban Sugar Council. (Registrant disclaims that Public Law 601 has any application to it but is filing this form in the event that the act may be deemed to be applicable to it.) (1) See appended statement I.[1] (2) See appended statement I.[1] (3) See appended statement. I.[1] (4) See appended statement II.[1] (5) Registrant advises the United States Cuban Sugar Council on public-relations matters pertaining to sugar legislation relating to the Sugar Act of 1948.

[6] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.

Leith, W. Gordon, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for October, November, and December 1948, $1,500. Less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) [Blank.] (5) Agricultural legislation.

Letts, David S., 901 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; American Transit Association, 292 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $2,250 salary as attorney for the American Transit Association; received $182.97 for actual business expenses. (2) Railroads, taxicabs, etc., hotels and restaurants, merchants, and others. (3) Traveling and living expanses away from Washington. Expenses in Washington for transportation, fees, dues, entertainment, and miscellaneous. (4) None. (5) In connection with proposed legislation affecting the transit industry, registrant may present the views of members of the American Transit Association.

Levine, Seth, CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,365 salary, $130 expenses. No legislative activities participated in during quarter. (2) Taxi companies, telephone companies, dispensers of periodicals. (3) Taxis, telephone calls, periodicals. (4) CIO News, NMU Pilot, IFAWA Fisherman, The American Marine Engineer. (5) Support legislation in the interest of seamen, longshoremen, fishermen, and allied maritime workers and oppose legislation detrimental to them.

Lewis, George J., Union Station, Lexington, Ky.; Kentucky Railroad Association, Louisville, Ky. (For fuller details see Form B, filed by me June 3, 1947.) (1) No moneys received; none expended. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Employed to support legislation favorable to the railroad industry and to oppose legislation detrimental to that industry.

Libby, Frederick J., executive secretary, National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,149.99; expenses, $149.68; total, $1,299.67. (2) Expenses for railroad tickets, hotels, taxis, porters, telephone and telegraph services, postage, and miscellaneous expenses when away from Washington. (3) Speaking trips, attending conferences, meetings, etc. (4) Peace Action, monthly News Bulletin of the National Council for Prevention of War. (5) Supports, in pursuance of the purposes of the organization, legislation which promotes peace and opposes legislation which, in our judgment, leads to war.

Liljenquist, L. B., 1415 K Street, Washington, D. C.; Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Money received during October-December quarter 1948 was $2,000 in salary plus $751.86 as reimbursement for expenses in operating the Washington office, none of which should be charged as lobbying expense. (2) Various. (3) Taxi fares, postage, entertainment, communications, etc. (4) Trade association bulletins to the members of the Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc. (5) While supporting or opposing legislation is not my principal responsibility I am nevertheless interested in legislation which affects the livestock and meat-packing industries.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Littell, Norman M., 1422 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C.; Navajo Tribe of Indians, residing in Arizona, New Mexico, Utah, and Colorado; address of superintendent, Window Rock, Ariz. (1) For quarter ending December 30, 1948, received $1,875 as legal retainer for services from May 8 to August 7, 1948, and $1,875 as retainer for legal services as general counsel from August 8 to November 7, 1948; and $619.86 for expenses as general counsel (travel and otherwise), and $332.09 to reimburse for fees and expenses paid to expert witnesses. The $619.86 for expenses covers the period May 8 to November 7, inclusive, 1948. (2) To employees of registrant's law office, including stenographers, and to expert witnesses. (3) For legal services in conection with Navajo business. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation, but registrant is to represent the Navajo Indians as requested at any hearings when legislation affecting the Navajos is being considered.

Little, Charles R., 7280 Kenwood Road, Cincinnati, Ohio; Ohio Valley Conservation and Flood Control Congress, Dr. Charles E. Holzer, Sr., president, Holzer Hospital, Gallipolis, Ohio. (1) Total received for salary $900; total received for expenses, $600. Total expenses, $576.94. Actual amounts directly chargeable to lobbying are less than totals shown above. (2) Various restaurants, hotels, vendors, stores, etc. (3) Transportation, $20.98; lodging, $5; meals, $11.02; tips, $1.35; office (communication, equipment, periodicals, supplies, etc.), $538.64. (4) None. (5) Not solely employed for this purpose, but concerned with any legislation (Federal or State) dealing with flood control and allied conservation in the Ohio Valley.

Little, Walter J., 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.; Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, 121 East Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.; Southern Pacific Co., and Northwestern Pacific Railroad, 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.; Union Pacific Railroad, 422 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.; Western Pacific Railroad, 526 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Received from Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, Southern Pacific Co., Union Pacific Railroad, Northwestern Pacific Railroad, and Western Pacific Railroad, for expenses, $113.34. (2) Pullman Co., $59.94; Hotel Utah, Salt Lake City, $53.40; total, $113.34. (3) Pullman, meals, and lodging. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting the railroads.

Locke, Gordon C., Committee for Pipe Line Companies, 632 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) To his best knowledge and belief dependent states that he has not, in the preceding calendar quarter, rendered any services for the Committee for Pipe Line Companies that come within the provisions of the Lobbying Act. Deponent has received total compensation, by way of salary, in the amount of $3,000 for his services during the said quarterly period, none of which should be apportioned for services which might come within the Lobbying Act. Deponent received $672.67 to cover items of expense, such as travel, telephone, and other miscellaneous expenses, none of which related to activities within the scope of the act. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) None. (5) There is no pending legislation which deponent has been called upon by his employers to support or oppose.

Lodge, F. S., National Fertilizer Association, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Of salary received by me during the preceding calendar quarter $75 may be allocable to attempts to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Fertilizer News, Fertilizer Review, Agronomic Notes and Pasture Progress, all published by the National Fertilizer Association, Inc., Washington, D. C. (5) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 869, H. R. 2494, H. R. 3421, H. R. 4417, H. R. 4562, H. R. 4752, and S. 1251.

Lofgren, Charles E., Fleet Reserve Association, 429 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,500. Expenditures none, except personal living expenses. (2) $1,500 salary paid by Fleet Reserve Association to C. E. Lofgren, national secretary, as salary. (3) Salary. (4) Naval Affairs magazine, the official organ of the Fleet Reserve Association. (5) Veteran and naval personnel legislation.

Lord, Day & Lord, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 1216 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; agency of Canadian Car & Foundry Co., Ltd., 30 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) $39,671.39. (2) No disbursements made during fourth quarter of 1948. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation having relation to World War I claims.

Love,[6] Richard H., 709 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.; Judge Advocates Association, 331 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $600; reimbursement of expenses, $264.66. (2) Various stationers, carriers, post office, etc., not related to lobbying activities. (3) Supplies, postage, communications, and travel. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting military justice, the functions, administration and operation of legal departments of the armed forces, and national security.

Love,[6] Richard H., 709 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.; Judge Advocates Association, 331 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,150; reimbursement of expenses, $280.66. (2) Various stationers, carriers, post office, etc., not related to lobbying activities. (3) Supplies, postage, communications, and travel. (4) Judge Advocate Journal, Bulletin No. 1, December 1948. (5) Legislation affecting military justice, the functions, administration, and operation of legal departments of the armed forces, and national security.

Lovelady, Rufus M., care of American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Canal Zone District, American Federation of Government Employees, box 1703, Balboa, C. Z. (1) None (not active from October 1 to December 31, 1948). (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None during period covered by this report.

Lucas, James C., American Retail Federation, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $200. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) American Retail Federation informational bulletins to the retailing industry. (5) Legislation affecting retail industry, including tax revision, labor-law revision, social-security law revision.

Lunn,[4] Dr. Carl E., 1501 West Washington, Phoenix, Ariz. (1) Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Townsend national insurance plan. (3) Temporary. (4) No set salary. No set amount. A small commission on dues from local members, for postage, announcements of meetings, etc.; because a humanitarian movement, I donate. (5) Partially paid out of commission on dues from local members, but am donating more than that myself. (6) No set amount, except small commission, I repeat, as above, for postage and post-card announcements of local meetings. (7) Mimeograph occasional news bulletins, post-card notices of local Townsend Club meetings, etc.

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.
[6] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.

Lyon, A. E. (executive secretary, Railway Labor Executives' Association), 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (1) No money received except regular salary and expenses. No money expended for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation. Total salary for quarter, $2,250. Total expenses for quarter, $596.70. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Incidental to other and varied duties which comprise the major part of work, all legislative proposals of concern to labor and railway labor in particular.

Lyons,[11] J. J., John F. Jelke Co., 759 South Washtenaw Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) No money is received other than salary incidental to regular employment as director of personnel of the company and reimbursement for transportation, lodging, and meals. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Support of proposals for repeal of taxes on oleomargarine.

Lyons,[8] J. J., John F. Jelke Co., 759 South Washtenaw Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) No money is received other than salary incidental to regular employment as director of personnel of the company and reimbursement for transportation, lodging, and meals. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Support of proposals for repeal of taxes on oleomargarine.

Lyons,[4] J. J., John F. Jelke Co., 759 South Washtenaw Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) No money is received other than salary incidental to regular employment as director of personnel of the company and reimbursement for transportation, lodging, and meals. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Support of proposals for repeal of taxes on oleomargarine.

McAvoy,[7] Harold, room 916, 900 F Street NW, Washington, D. C.; president, National Association Post Office and Railway Mail Service Mail Handlers, Watchmen, and Messengers, 1113 Arch Street, North Side, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) $1,520, which must take care of all expenses for the quarter. (2) Harold McAvoy, our legislative representative. (3) Legislation for the benefit of all mail handlers, watchmen, and messengers employed by the Post Office Department. (4) The Mail Handlers Journal. (5) He must support all legislation that will benefit all mail handlers, watchmen, and messengers employed by the Post Office Department.

McBreen, Thomas J., 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Real Estate Boards and its Realtors Washington Committee, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary (60 percent of time devoted to legislative activities), $1,300; reimbursement by employer for travel expenses, incidental expenses, and per diem, $752.23; total, $2,052.23. (2) See attached itemized statement.[1] (3) See attached itemized statement.[1] (4) Attached[1] list shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

McBride, Jonas A., 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary of Jonas A. McBride, vice president, national legislative representative, $2,500; salaries of employees, $1,101.35; printing and supplies, $61.25; rent, $360; personal expenses, $1,066.65; telephone and telegrams, $67.43; postage, $30. (2) Salary to Jonas A. McBride and Glenn C. Russell, stenographer; printing and supplies to various printers and stationery firms; rent to labor newspaper, 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C. (3) For maintenance of office of national legislative representative of Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting the interests of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.

McCarthy, Frank J., Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No activity under the act during the quarter ending December 31, 1948, consequently no part of the salary received during that quarter can be attributed to purposes covered by the act, and, likewise, no expenses were incurred for the purposes covered by the act. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interests of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

McCaskill, J. L., associate secretary, Department of Higher Education, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,631.68, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative services. Estimated for legislative services, none; expense, none. (2) None. (3) No expense incurred. (4) College and University Bulletin. (5) Any and all legislation designed to strengthen education in all areas.

McCloskey,[1] Bryson deHaas, Post Office Box 1657, Washington, D. C. (1) No money has been received or expended during the calendar quarter ending December 31, 1948. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None have been published or written as yet. In preparation are briefs relating to the following proposed legislation which are planned for presentation to the Members of both Houses of Congress early in 1949. (5) Legislation requiring all philanthropies and nonprofit organizations to make yearly detailed public reports of all funds received by them and all expenditures made by them; legislation instigating an investigation of the methods employed by big business and their agents to prevent the manufacture of a low-cost auto for the people aided by Republican administration departments; investigation of philanthropies as Republican-controlled monopolies.

McClure, Warren C., Box 207, Camden, Ark.; Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) None for legislative purposes. (2) None for legislative purposes. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None at the present time.

McDonald, Angus H., 300 B Street SE., Washington, D. C.; Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, old address: 3501 East Forty-sixth Avenue, Denver, Colo.; new address: 1555 Sherman, Denver, Colo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All major pending legislation.

McDonald, E. L., 524 Governor Building, Portland, Oreg.; The Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Total amount received, $937.14. (2) Transportation and living. (3) Travel and living costs. (4) None. (5) H. R. 16, The Townsend Plan Inc.

McFarland, Rev. A. J., 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans.; The Christian Amendment Movement, 209 Ninth Street, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) Salary, $750; expenses, $150; total, $900. (2) Salary to self; expenses for travel. (3) Answered above. (4) The Christian Patriot. (5) A Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

McGough, Richard, 515 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.; Northern Pacific Railway Co., Union Pacific Railroad Co., Great Northern Railway Co., the Milwaukee Road, Seattle, Wash. (1) Salary as stated in original registration; expenditures in connection with Federal legislation, none. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting transcontinental railroads operating in the State of Washington.

McKercher, M. C., The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation effecting the welfare of railroad employees.

McLaughlin, Robert E., AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), 410 Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No expense money drawn or expended except petty cash for taxi fares and actual expenses in connection with attendance at the AMVETS national convention. As national legislative director, I draw a modest per diem for time actually consumed. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) National AMVET and AMVET Letter. (5) To support legislation providing care and assistance for veterans of World War II and their dependents.

McLaughlin, Robert E., Washington counsel for National Association of United States Storekeepers-Gaugers, 805 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received quarterly retainer of $350. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) To support legislation beneficial to this client and civil-service employees in general.

Mahon, John A. M., president, National Association Postal Supervisors, 171 Milton Street, Dorchester Center, Boston, Mass.; National Association of Postal Supervisors, box 1225, Nashville, Tenn. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) The Postal Supervisor, official magazine of the National Association of Postal Supervisors. (5) Legislation involving salary adjustments, working conditions, retirement, all in the interests of the supervisory officials in the field postal service.

McMains, W. H., Distilled Spirits Institute, 1135 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary same as previous report. No expenses have been authorized or incurred for purposes listed under this act. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the industry represented is reported to members.

McMillan, Robert W., Management Planning of Washington, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $2,100, with less than one-twentieth of the time and services for which such compensation was paid being for activities which might conceivably be construed as coming within the purview of any of the provisions of title III of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946; $148.30, reimbursement of expenses allocable to foregoing activities. (2) Taxi drivers and operators of eating and refreshment places. (3) Transportation and other normal out-of-pocket expenses. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

MacCracken, William P., Jr., 1152 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; American Optometric Association, care of Dr. Samuel L. Brown, O. D., 111 East North Street, Fostoria, Ohio. (1) None. (2) During this quarter I expended $4.81 for telephone and telegraph, $1 for notary fees, and $1.20 for taxi expense; total expenditures of $7.01. (3) See (1) and (2) above. (4) None. (5) On behalf of the American Optometric Association, I have contacted various Members of Congress to secure support for a proposed bill to amend the District of Columbia optometry law for the purpose of raising the standards of the profession and providing better visual care for residents of the District of Columbia. I have also discussed with certain governmental officials and Members of Congress the inclusion of the profession of optometry in any legislation introduced by the administration, looking to the establishment of a Health Department in the executive branch of the Government and legislation for the establishment of a national health insurance program.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[4] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed with the Clerk only.
[11] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

[1] Filed with the Secretary only.

Macleay, Lachlan, Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) Total reimbursable expenses in connection with general work done for the Mississippi Valley Association, all reimbursed by association, $1,211.49. (2) Railroads, etc., $644.63; hotels and miscellaneous, $566.86. (3) Travel, subsistence, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) A portion of Mr. Macleay's time was used in regard to legislation relating to river and harbor maintenance and improvement, the American merchant marine, soil conservation, flood control, regulation of domestic transportation.

Macnamee, W. Bruce, National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $150 per month ($450 for quarter) received from the National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., allocable to legislative activities. (2) W. Bruce Macnamee. (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any particular legislation.

Magee, Miss Elizabeth S., National Consumers League, 348 Engineers' Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary, part-time, $583.38. (2) [Blank.] (3) Part-time salary. (4) National Consumers League Bulletin. (5) Supporting minimum-wage legislation, extension of social security.

Marchbanks, Miss Modane, 901 Lincoln Tower, Chicago, Ill.; National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $45.44. (2) Various persons. (3) Cab fares, $7.05; travel expenses, $38.39. (4) None. (5) Any margarine legislation.

Margolin, Mrs. Olya, 1637 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; National Council of Jewish Women, Inc., 1819 Broadway, New York City, N. Y. (1) $1,125 (gross, before income-tax deduction) in salary received from the National Council of Jewish Women, 1819 Broadway, New York City, N. Y., none of which was spent in connection with work; $22.20 received from above spent for carfare, postage, etc. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) [Blank.] (5) Not employed specifically to support or oppose any legislation, but for the purpose of securing information to be transmitted to headquarters for the preparation of educational and other material.

Mark,[11] James, Jr., United Mine Workers of America, 900 Fifteenth Street NW. and 907 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Since April 1, 1948, there has been received by affiant as salary the sum of $2,041.67, and as per diem for personal living expenses the sum of $546, a total of $2,587.67. (2) No sums in any amount have been paid by affiant to any person other than affiant's expenditures for normal, everyday, living expenses such as transportation, meals, etc., in the regular discharge of his duties. (3) Answered in (2) above. (4) None. (5) Any and all legislation construed to be directly or indirectly beneficial or detrimental to the United Mine Workers of America and its members.

Mark,[5] James J., United Mine Workers of America, 900 Fifteenth Street NW. and 907 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Since July 1, 1948, there has been received by affiant as salary the sum of $2,124.99, and as per diem for personal living expenses the sum of $552, a total of $2,676.99. (2) No sums in any amount have been paid by affiant to any person other than affiant's expenditures for normal, everyday, living expenses such as transportation, meals, etc., in the regular discharge of his duties. (3) Answered in (2) above. (4) None. (5) Any and all legislation construed to be directly or indirectly beneficial or detrimental to the United Mine Workers of America and its members.

Mark,[6] James, Jr., United Mine Workers of America, 900 Fifteenth Street NW. and 907 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Since October 1, 1948, there has been received by affiant as salary the sum of $2,499.96 and as per diem for personal living expenses the sum of $366, a total of $2,865.96. (2) No sums in any amount have been paid by affiant to any person other than affiant's expenditures for normal, everyday, living expenses such as transportation, meals, etc., in the regular discharge of his duties. (3) Answered in (2) above. (4) None. (5) Any and all legislation construed to be directly or indirectly beneficial or detrimental to the United Mine Workers of America and its members.

Markham, Baird H., American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) See attached schedule[1] for answers to (1) to (5). (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Marks, Herbert S., 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; The Detroit Edison Co., 2000 Second Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (1) None of registrant's activities or expenditures for client during this quarter were in support of or opposition to any legislation, nor were any receipts from client in payment for any such work. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) General legal services to this client include services in connection with proposed amendment to exempt certain limited electric connections from the Federal Power Act.

Marks, Raymond E., Southern Pacific Co., 43 Sierra Street, Reno, Nev. (1) Nothing to report for the fourth quarter of 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Marran, Donald J., Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) The firm of Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, of the above address, of which registrant is an associate, expended the sum of $5.27 in connection with the proposed legislation described in (5) hereof, for which it was or will be reimbursed by the American Tobacco Co. (2) United States Post Office, $0.27; miscellaneous, $5; total, $5.27. (3) Postage, $0.27; miscellaneous carfares, phone calls, and petty cash disbursements, $5. (4) None. (5) Tax legislation extending the 85-percent dividend-received credit to dividends received from resident foreign corporations to the extent that such resident foreign corporations derive income from United States sources.

Marran, Donald J., Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) The firm of Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, of the above address, of which registrant is an associate, did not receive or expend any sums during the quarter ended December 31, 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Tax legislation proposing to amend sections 116 (a) and 1621 of the Internal Revenue Code, pertaining to United States citizens earning income from sources outside the United States and withholding required on such income.

Marsh, Benjamin C., Peoples Lobby, Inc., 810 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Total receipts, $3,055.48: Salaries and wages, $916; bulletin and printing, $791.50; postage, $387.12; rent, $165; supplies, $55.75; expenses, board meeting, $27.15; representation, Delaware registration, $52; expenses, speakers and conference, $49.40; war tax and social security, $154.31; Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $24.91; incidentals, $50.57. (2) Benjamin C. Marsh, Arlene Ryan, Graphic Arts Press (postage), J. B. Stein, Andrew Walker, Addressograph Corp., Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Delaware registration, Colston Warne. (3) Salaries and wages for publicity and clerical work; other for maintaining office and getting out material. (4) We have not caused any article to be published, but have sent material and releases to hundreds of papers. (5) Support attached program[1] and oppose that against it.

Marshall, J. Paull, 528 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; William J. Goodwin, the Loch, Roslyn, N. Y. (1) $1,250 received from William J. Goodwin; $16.31 expended. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., and taxi drivers. (3) $6.31 for long-distance phone calls; $10 for taxies. (4) None. (5) See letter attached to registration statement of William J. Goodwin, dated July 1, 1948.

Marshall, J. Paull, 528 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; Magothy River Association, 908 St. Paul Street, Baltimore, Md. (1) None received; none expended. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) H. R. 3314, 6341; S. 230, 1675.

Marston, R. B., director, Legislative-Federal Relations Division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary $2,157.54, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities; estimated for legislative service, $431.50; expenses. (2) Self, salary. Expenses: Hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash; NEA Journal (articles therein); informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Martin,[7] Robert F., Vitrified China Association, Inc., 312 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No activities covered by the act. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Masaoka, Mike M., national legislative director, Japanese American Citizens League Antidiscrimination Committee, post-office box 1628, Washington, D. C.; Japanese American Citizens League Antidiscrimination Committee, 406 Beacon Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) All moneys received include only monthly salary and expenses as explained in Form B, filed January 22, 1947, except those listed on attached sheet.[1] (2) Telephone and telegraph companies, taxicabs, export company, and air lines. (3) Information, contacts, transportation, personal season's greetings. (4) News stories in Japanese language and Japanese-American newspapers relating to work here are the only articles known to have been published because of our contacts with them. (See accompanying list.[1]) (5) Legislation affecting persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States.

Maslow, Will, American Jewish Congress, 1834 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $112.50 for services under Public Law 601; in addition, I received for services not under Public Law 601, $2,500. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Law and Social Action, September-October 1948; article in Congress Weekly on Israel draft constitution; pamphlet on Israel draft constitution. (5) Legislation designed to implement the report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights; to keep separate church and state; to liberalize immigration laws; to liberalize Senate rules.

Mason, Walter J., American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for October, November, and December, $2,360; expenses for October, November, and December, $204. (2) Cab drivers, phone company, and messenger services. (3) As stated in (2). (4) None. (5) Affecting labor.

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[11] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[7] Filed with the Clerk only.

Mathews, John Clifford, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans.; Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America for the Christian Amendment Movement, 209 Ninth Street, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) Salary received from J. S. Tibby for October, November, December, $750; preaching fees to be applied on expense account, $167.50. (2) Salary used for personal and family expenses only; preaching fees applied on expense account—railway fare, hotel bills, meals, etc., in necessary travel for Christian Amendment Movement. (3) See above. (4) The Christian Patriot and the Covenanter Witness, 1121 Buchanan Street, Topeka, Kans. (5) In support of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which would acknowledge Jesus Christ as Saviour and King of nations.

Mathews, P. H., Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (1) For services rendered to the Association of American Railroads as described in registration filed October 1948, registrant received salary at rate as reported therein, of which $3,506.38 is allocated for legislative work. Registrant further received $875.46 for expenses, of which $802.32 is assigned to legislative activities, such expenses being described in (2). (2) Expenses above shown were paid to hotels, Pullman Co., dining cars, restaurants, etc., such as necessary when traveling and away from home. (3) As noted in (2). (4) None. (5) Legislation pertaining to railroad industry. No legislation was under consideration by Congress during the fourth quarter, 1948. Consideration was given proposed legislation on taxes and other matters pertaining to the railroad industry.

Maudlin, C. V., 716 Mills Building, Washington, D. C.; Georgia Power Co. and its associate company, Savannah River Electric Co., Electric Building, Atlanta, Ga. (1) All money received and expended during quarter ended December 31, 1948, was for nonlegislative activities. (2) None for legislative activities during quarter ended December 31, 1948. (3) None for legislative activities during quarter ended December 31, 1948. (4) None during quarter ended December 31, 1948. (5) None during quarter ended December 31, 1948.

Mechem,[1] Frank L., P. E. Harris & Co. et al., 603 Central Building, Seattle, Wash. (1) As stated in answer to (4) on Form B, the only money received by registrant is (a) legal fee on per diem basis for services performed and (b) reimbursement for traveling expenses. No money was received during the preceding calendar quarter by way of legal fees and no money was received as reimbursement for traveling expenses. (2) See (3). (3) The only expenditures during the preceding calendar quarter consisted of traveling expenses covering air and railroad transportation, hotel, meals, telephone and telegraph tolls. (4) None. (5) The formulation and presentation of proposed legislative program designed to stabilize certain phases of the Alaska salmon industry.

Meeks, E. A., National League of District Postmasters, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary only, $1,500 for quarter ending December 31, 1948. (2) E. A. Meeks. (3) Salary. (4) The Postmasters' Advocate, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (5) Any legislation affecting postmasters.

Messer, James, Jr., Florida Railroad Association, 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Any legislation in which I might be directed to support or oppose by Florida Railroad Association; generally legislation affecting railroads.

Miles, Clarence R., Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received: Salary, $4,375; expenses, $57.77. Expenses: Transportation, $14.20; telephone, $28.07; meals, $15.50. (2) Meals, taxi companies, railroad, and telephone company. (3) Transportation to and communication with the Capitol; other normal and necessary expenses. (4) None. (5) All legislation of interest to business.

Miles, Harold M., Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) None for Federal legislation. (2) None paid. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None.

Miller, Charles C., 715 Ring Building, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) I have received from my employers, the Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., for the quarter ended December 31, 1948, prorated on the basis of total expenditures for salaries of self and secretary, office expenses, etc., at the rate of 10 percent to cover time spent on legislative work during this period a total of $474.37. (2) The expenditures on this basis of allocation were for salaries $314.80; guest meals, $23.08; taxis, $6.25; tips and miscellaneous expenses, $5.37; printing, $11.08; telephone and telegraph, $31.05; postage, $3.66; rent, $53; dues, subscriptions, and services, $13.13; office supplies, $2.85. (3) [Blank.] (4) Press coverage in daily and financial papers consisted of general news reports on tire and tube production, rubber consumption, and the industry's production achievements in 1948 and its outlook for 1949. (5) Revision of excise tax on tires and tubes; measures pertaining to regulation of transportation of coated fabrics; investigation into effects of recent basing-point decisions on industry.

Miller, Dale, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.; Dallas Chamber of Commerce, Dallas, Tex.; Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, Houston, Tex.; Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N. Y. (1) Received: $2,100, plus $750 expenses, from Dallas Chamber of Commerce; $1,500, plus $119.74 expenses, from Intracoastal Canal Association; $1,500, plus $857.22 expenses, from Texas Gulf Sulphur Co. Expended: $1,726.96; this sum includes all business expenses in Washington, only a small portion of which would apply to activities within the purview of the act. (2) Carlyn Apartments, Mayflower Hotel, United States post office, telephone and telegraph companies, local transportation facilities, printers and stationers, food and beverage establishments. (3) No specific expenditures during last quarter of 1948 for purposes within scope of the act. (4) Monthly article in Dallas magazine, official publication of Dallas Chamber of Commerce. (5) Legislation affecting flood control, water transportation, river and harbor improvement, appropriations, and taxes.

Milton, Charles J., 1 Exchange Place, Jersey City, N. J.; Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J. (1) None. (2) None paid. (3) None paid. (4) None. (5) H. R. 3237 and S. 249.

Mollin, F. E.; executive secretary, American National Live Stock Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo. (1) Have had no special contributions for lobbying purposes. The association finances handled in normal fashion. My compensation as executive secretary of the American National Live Stock Association is $1,000 a month. In addition I received in January of this year a bonus of $1,000 for last year. (2) No payments to anyone in connection with lobbying activities, and I made no trips to Washington during quarter. (3) [Blank.] (4) Our own official magazine, the American Cattle Producer. (5) [Blank.]

Montgomery, Donald E., 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America, CIO (UAW-CIO), 411 West Milwaukee Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (1) Salary, 13 weeks at $100, $1,300 (this amount covers nonlegislative work, as described under (4) in Form B, as well as legislative work; legislative work accounts for less than half of total duties); subsistence, 13 weeks, $819; expenses, 13 weeks, $854.59; total, $2,973.59. (2) Subsistence, transportation, hotel, etc. (3) Subsistence and travel. (4) Auto Worker, Ammunition, and Washington Report (UAW-CIO publications); Economic Outlook (CIO publication); Antioch Review; Labor and Nation. (5) Support all bills favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Mooney, William W., 406 Bernice Building, Tacoma, Wash., The Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Total received during period, $1,167.06, with all withholding tax taken out by national office; out of this $370.57 was spent for travel, hotels, and incidentals in traveling over the States of Washington and Idaho; $796.49 left for personal use. (2) Paid by William W. Mooney for travel on train, bus, and auto, hotels, taxi, and other incidentals needed in travel over the States of Washington and Idaho to carry out duties. (3) To visit the different clubs or units to create interest in the national bill in United States Congress. Subject to call from clubs and by orders from national office and on own arrangement, to build clubs and organize new ones. (4) At times short articles are sent to Townsend National Weekly, printed at 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. Also sent to clubs, bulletins to create interest and give information to help build morale and special meeting arrangements. (5) To support the Townsend Plan, Inc., bills in the United States Congress.

Moore, Chester B., Western Growers Association, 606 South Hill Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) Regular salary as managing director of Western Growers Association, plus traveling expenses. (2) To all regular accounts of my personal and business life. (3) [Blank.] (4) Western Grower and Shipper. (5) Am paid regular salary. Not directly employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. I do oppose or support any legislation of interest to our members.

Moore, Clayton, R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Fourth and Main Streets, Winston-Salem, N. C. (1) None. Salary for full-time services as associate counsel same as amount in last quarterly report and for the purposes more fully set out in registration form. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Tax legislation affecting R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.

Morgan, George W., Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) During the quarter for which this report is made no money has been received or expended by the registrant for activities in furtherance of any object necessitating registration under Public Law 601. (2) Inapplicable. (3) Inapplicable. (4) Copies of the only material in which the registrant caused any article or editorial to be published during the quarter for which this report is filed are annexed hereto[1] and made a part thereof. (5) The registrant is employed as president of the Association of American Ship Owners and is not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. Except to the extent, if any, that publication of the material annexed hereto amounts to support of or opposition to any proposed legislation. During the quarter for which

[1] Filed with the Clerk only.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

this report is filed the registrant did not support or oppose any proposed legislation.

The Morris Plan Corp. of America, 103 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) None received; none expended. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) The corporation in its interests and in the interests of its stockholders opposes the adoption of bank holding company legislation in the forms represented by S. 829 and H. R. 3351.

Morrow, Giles, Freight Forwarders Institute, 1220 Dupont Circle Building (new address), Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary at rate reported on Form B, previously filed, and in addition received $561.17 as reimbursement for expenses incurred in conducting institute business in Washington, New York, Kansas City, Mo., and Los Angeles, Calif. (2) Taxicabs and restaurants in Washington, New York City, Kansas City, Mo., and Los Angeles, Calif.; the Pennsylvania, Baltimore & Ohio and Missouri Pacific Railroads and the Pullman Co.; Eastern and United Air Lines; the Muehlebach Hotel, Kansas City, Mo., and the Alexander Hotel, Los Angeles, Calif. (3) Local and interstate transportation, meals and other traveling expenses, all incurred in connection with meetings and other business of the Freight Forwarders Institute. (4) ICC Practitioners Journal (editor and contributor of legal and technical articles). (5) Any legislation directly affecting the freight-forwarding industry.

Morse,[1] Henry Hoyt, 99 Pearl Street, Gardner, Mass.; Institute of Cooking and Heating Appliances Manufacturers, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C. (1) No money received. (2) No money paid. (3) No work undertaken. (4) Stove Builder. (5) None.

Mosier, Harold G., Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C.; The Glenn L. Martin Co., Middle River, Baltimore, Md. (1) See attached sheet.[1] (2) See attached sheet.[1] (3) See attached sheet.[1] (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting aviation.

Mote, Lynn E., Association of American Ship Owners, 1713 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) During the quarter for which this report is made registrant received only his salary and expenses. The total salary received by the registrant during the quarter was $2,000 and the total expenses received by the registrant amounted to $227.97. Only a small portion, if any, of such salary and expenses is applicable to activities in furtherance of any object necessitating registration. (2) No expenditures except taxicabs, meals, railroads, and similar out-of-pocket expenses. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) The registrant is employed as manager of the Washington office of the Association of American Ship Owners and is not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation.

Mougey, William J., 200 Hill Building, Washington, D. C.; General Motors Corp., Detroit, Mich. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) Registrant is filing this quarterly report merely to avoid any technical claim of violation of the act for failure to file report. (4) None. (5) None.

Munro,[2] Walter J., Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, 130 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) No money received or expended in connection with legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Munro,[2] Walter J., Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, 130 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) No money received or expended in connection with legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Murph, Daniel S., The National Fertilizer Association, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Of salary received by me during the preceding calendar quarter, $25 may be allocable to attempts to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 869, 2494, 3421, 4417, 4562, 4782, and S. 1251.

Murphy, Dr. Emmett J., 5737 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Chiropractic Association, Inc., Webster City, Iowa. (1) None received. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) None specified.

Murphy, Ray, Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant does not receive funds earmarked for purposes set forth in this act. Registrant has estimated, however, that $75 received by registrant during the fourth quarter of 1948 might come within scope of act as registrant understands act has been interpreted by the Department of Justice. Registrant does not believe he has engaged in any activities in this quarter within the purview of this act. Registrant has expended no money in this quarter. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Registrant doubts that he is employed to support or oppose legislation. However, on very infrequent occasions, he has supported or opposed legislation as it specifically affects capital stock casualty insurance and surety companies.

National Association of Real Estate Boards, its Realtors Washington Committee, and its public relations department, Chicago and Washington headquarters. (1) See schedule attached.[1] (2) See schedule attached.[1] (3) See schedule attached.[1] (4) Attached list[1] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) All legislation affecting real estate.

National Association of Stevedores, 140 Cedar Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None received; $21.56 expended. (2) Orco Cameras, Inc., 112 Liberty Street, New York, N. Y. (3) Cost of multilith plates, copy of articles in New York Sun and Journal of Commerce. (4) None. (5) H. R. 6534; S. 2728.

National Postal Committee for Books, room 305, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (See registration for statement of membership of committee.) (1) No receipts during said period. Expenditures, $11.74. (2) American Book Publishers Council, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (3) For preparation and postage on releases and charges covering mailings. (4) New York Herald Tribune Book Review. (5) The committee opposes unfair increase in postage rates and discrimination in postage rates, such as contained in H. R. 2408 and H. R. 3519.

National Reclamation Association,[4] Don McBride, secretary-manager, 1119 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Total receipts for period, $5,449.33 (see schedule I[9]); total expenditures for period, $10,347.37 (see schedule II[9]). (2) See attached schedules I and II.[9] (3) See attached schedules I and II.[9] (4) National Reclamation Association Bulletin (see enclosed[9]). (5) Amendment to the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 and any other legislation affecting resources of the 17 Western States (see sec. 3, purposes, first page, our constitution, which was enclosed in first quarterly report).

National Renderers Association,[7] 945 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts, $4,540; expenditures, $10,637.38. (See attached tabulation.[1]) (2) See attached tabulation.[1] (3) See attached tabulation.[1] (4) None. (5) None.

Nau, Carlton L., American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No expenditures. (2) No expenditures. (3) No expenditures. (4) None. (5) None.

Neal, William S., National Association of Manufacturers, 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No expenditures for purposes under act. General salary, $3,375; expenses, $451.55. (2) Expenditures for attending conventions and meetings, lunches, taxicabs, phones, miscellaneous. (3) As above. (4) Regular contributions to NAM News. (5) NAM program as publicly announced: For reduction of Federal expenditures, reduction and revision of taxation; for voluntary controls and against compulsory controls except in time of war or intense war preparation; for National Science Foundation; in opposition, in part, to Office of Technical Services; for maintenance of regulation of labor unions and general promotion of individual enterprise system; for continuation of ECA.

Neel, Samuel E., 1001 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) I am retained by the Mortgage Bankers Association of America as Washington counsel to the association on the usual lawyer-client relationship. I am reimbursed by the association on an annual retainer basis. Also paid by the association are actual traveling expenses incurred by me while traveling outside of Washington representing the association. Money received, October 1 to December 31, 1948: retainer, $2,750.01; traveling expenses, $457.43; office expenses, $876.39. Money expended: Traveling expenses, $457.43; office expenses, $876.39. (2) The only money expended was that for travel expenses and office expenses. The travel expenses were paid to various railroads, hotels, etc., and the office expenses were paid for postage, office supplies, etc. (3) See (2) above. (4) Washington News Letter, published biweekly by Mortgage Bankers Association of America; Letter to Members, published irregularly by Mortgage Bankers Association of America; The Mortgage Banker, published irregularly by Mortgage Bankers Association of America. (5) Matters affecting the mortgage banking industry.

Nelson, Herbert U., National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Reimbursement by employer for travel expenses and per diem, $1,603.90; salary, 20 percent of time devoted to legislative activities, $1,250; total, $2,853.90. (2) See attached itemized statement.[1] (3) See attached itemized statement.[1] (4) Attached list[1] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Nelson, George R., grand lodge representative, International Association of Machinists, Machinists' Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Noble, William R., National Retail Farm Equipment Association and National Retail Hardware Association, 1028 Barr Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Out-of-pocket expenses, $54.40. (2) Public transportation, telephone company, restaurants, and hotels. (3) Taxi fares, phone calls, luncheons, and hotel. (4) Farm Equipment Retailing: Hardware Retailer. (5) Have taken position on

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[2] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[3] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.
[4] Filed with the Clerk only.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[6] Filed with the Secretary only.
[7] Filed with the Clerk only.
[8] Not printed, filed in the Secretary's office.

[1] Not printed, filed in the Clerk's office.

wage-and-hour legislation, taxation matters, and several minor bills.

Noffsinger, J. S., executive secretary, National Council of Business Schools, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) [Blank.] (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation in the Congress is a very small part of my duties. If legislation should arise so as to affect the above association, I would act in the proper interest as I may be advised.

Noffsinger, J. S., director, National Council of Technical Schools, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) [Blank.] (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation in the Congress is a very small part of my duties. If legislation should arise so as to affect the above association, I would act in the proper interest as I may be advised.

Noffsinger, J. S., director, National Federation of Private School Associations, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) [Blank.] (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation in the Congress is a very small part of my duties. If legislation should arise so as to affect the above association, I would act in the proper interest as I may be advised.

Noffsinger, J. S., director, National Home Study Council, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) [Blank.] (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation in the Congress is a very small part of my duties. If legislation should arise so as to affect the above association, I would act in the proper interest as I may be advised.

Northam,[4] Harry E., 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary, $2,500; traveling, hotel, and subsistence expenses, $400. Only approximately 10 percent is devoted to legislative activities in behalf of my association. (2) Railroads, taxicabs, hotels, etc. (3) Traveling, subsistence, and lodging. (4) Monthly news letter of the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons issued to the membership of the association. (5) About 10 percent of my time is devoted to supporting or opposing legislation which deals with medical care.

Nortman, Walter, Wisconsin Railroad Association, 122 West Washington Avenue, Madison, Wis. (1) None. (2) None paid. (4) See above. None paid. (4) None. (5) All matters affecting the interests of railroads.

Nyce, Peter Q., 1266 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money received and none expended. (2) None paid. (3) None paid. (4) None. (5) Legislation pertaining to lands of the United States.

O'Connor,[1] Edward H., Insurance Economics Society of America, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary received during quarter, $2,500.12; reimbursement for traveling expenses, $1,109.53. (2) Paid out $1,109.53 in traveling expenses to various railroads, hotels, restaurants, and miscellaneous items of personal expense. (3) For personal traveling expenses of the undersigned incurred in carrying out my work for the Insurance Economics Society of America. No moneys expended during this quarter for lobbying activities. (4) None. (5) The Howell bill, H. R. 3150, and its companion bill, S. 670, by Hawkes; S. 1320 and its companion, H. R. 3548; H. R. 6355; Senate Resolution 249.

O'Dunne, Eugene, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) $2,500 compensation; $263.54 on account of expenditures previously reported for which reimbursement had not been made. (2) [Blank.] (3) Taxicab fares, telephone tolls, and telegrams, $169.27; the Public Printer (for copies of S. 2582), $163.27. (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2860, amendment to section 1 (b), Eightieth Congress, second session; House Joint Resolution 131, Eightieth Congress, second session; H. R. 6556, 6379, and S. 2582.

O'Gara, Herrick J., Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $300 per month as salary, minus social security and withholding taxes; $2.54 as expenses for transportation and luncheons in connection with legislative activities. (2) No record kept of recipients of taxicab fares and luncheons. (3) Transportation, social obligations and normal luncheon requirements. (4) VFW Foreign Service, VFW Legislative Newsletter. (5) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation, and housing; welfare of servicemen of the armed forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration and naturalization, the combating of subversive activities, and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the national encampment and the National Council of Administration.

O'Hara, Bart W., Secretary-Treasurer, Colorado Association Businessmen, Inc., 335 Symes Building, Denver, Colo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All legislation that may be designed to bring about tax equality concerning corporations.

Oliver, Fred N., 1106 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; Senior partner, Oliver & Donnally, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., and 1106 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Estimated $262.50 from the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks and an indeterminate part of $1,200 from Railroad Security Owners' Association, Inc. (See appendix.[1]) (2) No expenditures. (3) No expenditures. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation but is to appear before congressional committees on legislation in which the mutual savings banks and railroad security owners have a legitimate interest.

Oliver, John P., Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C. (1) October 1948, $583.33 plus $7.50; November 1948, $583.33 plus $20.30; December 1948, $583.33 plus $15.60. (2) Various. (3) Living expenses for self and family, transportation, taxes of various kinds. (4) The Reserve Officer. (5) Legislation for the development of a military policy for the United States which will provide adequate national security.

Oliver,[1] Stanley W., International Federation of Technical Engineers, Architects, and Draftmen's Unions, 900 F Street NW., room 908, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts: personal salary at the rate of $7,200 per annum, payable semimonthly, less social-security tax and withholding tax, plus allowance up to $75 per month for miscellaneous expenses, etc., incidental to performance of duties. Stanley W. Oliver. (3) Payment of salary and expenses as national president and administrative head of the International Federation of Technical Engineers, Architects, and Draftsmen's Unions. (4) IFTEADU Monthly Outlook and special news letters for dissemination of union information to members and local unions. (5) Legislation affecting technical engineers, architects, draftsmen, and allied workers.

O'Neal, Sam, 211 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; National Council on Business Mail, Inc.; 105 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received fees of $2,500 and approximately $400 for expenses on two trips to New York and one trip to Chicago. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation pertaining to postal rates and regulations.

O'Neal, Sam, 211 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. Power Distributors Information Committee of Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, Chattanooga, Tenn. (1) Received fees of $1,875 from above organization. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation pertaining to private and public power.

Owens, T. R., 717 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; United Rubber Workers of America, URWA Building, High and Mill Streets, Akron, Ohio. (1) Salary, $1,000; expenses, $745. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, taxies. (3) Personal expenses and travel. (4) United Rubber Worker. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Oxholm, Mrs. Theodor, volunteer worker for Spokesmen for Children, Inc., 654 Madison, Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Membership contributions, $10; office maintenance and stationery, $58; travel expenses, $22. (2) As indicated. Travel expenses to Mary H. Oxholm. (3) Trip to Washington, D. C.; October 26, 1948, for research on school lunches. (4) [Blank.] (5) Federal legislation specifically affecting children.

Parel, James Donald, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; American Farm Bureau Federation, 109 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $8 expended. See (6) of Form B, filed December 1946. (2) Taxies. (3) Transporation. (4) None. (5) Congress not in session.

Parker,[1] James P., National Association of Private Schools, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See expenditure schedule[1] attached. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Veterans' education and training program outlined in Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended.

Paterson, Chat, Committee for the Nation's Health, Inc., 602 Pennsylvania Avenue SE. (1) Received $500 of which $36.86 spent. (2) Paid to me for train fare (round trip) and expenses to New York December 26 to 31, 1948. (3) Travel. (4) [Blank.] (5) National health insurance bill.

Patterson, Belknap & Webb,[5] 1 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; The American Jewish Committee, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Money received: $5,000 for professional services; $90.09 for disbursements. (2) [Blank.] (3) $5,000 for professional services in framing and promoting an amendment to the Trading With the Enemy Act, so as to authorize property formerly owned by deceased and heirless persecutees to be turned over to relief organizations; services in connection with introduction of S. 2764 and H. R. 6718; $90.09 for telephone charges and transportation expenses. (4) None. (5) As counsel for the purpose of obtaining an amendment to the Trading With the Enemy Act, whereby alien property in this country formerly owned by persons under persecution by an enemy government, in cases where the owner is dead and left no heirs, may be turned over to the organizations for the relief of survivors.

Patterson, Belknap & Webb,[6] 1 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; The American Jewish Committee, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) No activity during the preceding quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.]

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.
[1] Filed with the Clerk only.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[1] Filed with the Clerk only.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.
[1] Filed with the Clerk only.

(5) As counsel for the purpose of obtaining an amendment to the Trading With the Enemy Act, whereby alien property in this country formerly owned by persons under persecution by an enemy government, in cases where the owner is dead and left no heirs, may be turned over to the organizations for the relief of survivors.

Patton,[1] James G., Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, old, 3501 East Forty-sixth Avenue, Denver, Colo.; new, 1555 Sherman, Denver, Colo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All major pending legislation.

Paul,[5] Randolph E. (a partner in the law firm of Paul, Weiss, Wharton & Garrison); 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Gillette Safety Razor Co., Boston, Mass. (1) Receipts: $1,000 to professional services rendered; expenditures, 50 cents. (2) Notary public. (3) Notarial fee in connection with Form C for preceding quarter. (4) None relating to the subject below. (5) An amendment to eliminate section 131 (b) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Paul,[6] Randolph E. (a partner in the law firm of Paul, Weiss, Wharton & Garrison); 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Gillette Safety Razor Co., Boston, Mass. (1) Receipts, none; expenditures, 50 cents. (2) Notary public. (3) Notarial fee in connection with Form C for preceding quarter. (4) None relating to the subject below. (5) An amendment to eliminate section 131 (b) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Payne, Albert Alford, 1737 K Street NW., Washington D. C.; National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received and expended $240.10. (2) Various. (3) For travel, lunches, taxi fares, etc. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Perry,[1] Leslie S., National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No expenditures. (2) No expenditures. (3) [Blank.] (4) NAACP bulletin. (5) FEPC, antipoll tax, antilynch, minimum wage, Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing, Murray-Dingell health, Wagner-Murray-Dingell social security, and similar social-welfare legislation.

Petersen, William J., Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, 704 Insurance Building, Madison, Wis. (1) Received my regular salary as general manager for the Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, for which I performed my regular duties as chief administrative officer of the chamber, which said duties were related only incidentally to Federal legislation. Aside from my regular salary nothing was received nor spent for the purpose of influencing Federal legislation. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Such legislation affecting business and industry generally, as I may be instructed to give attention to from time to time.

Peterson, Esther, 1034 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.; Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, 15 Union Square, New York, N. Y. (1) Received salary of $376. Received $206.62 to reimburse actual expenses incurred; $41.50 of this amount was for expenses incurred in Washington; remainder of amount for expenses outside of Washington. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers, air lines. (3) Personal expense and travel. (4) CIO News and the Advance. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for the fourth quarter, 1948.
[1] Filed with the Clerk only.

Petty, Don, National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $3,750 received for services as attorney for the National Association of Broadcasters for quarter ending December 31, 1948; $2,651.25 received from the association as reimbursement for business expenses for same period. (2) Various railroads, air lines, taxi companies, communications companies, hotels, restaurants, etc. (3) The amounts set forth in (1) above were received and/or expended in carrying out my normal duties as general counsel handling all of the legal affairs of the National Association of Broadcasters, only a small part of which duties directly or indirectly involved Federal legislation. None of this money was received or expended for the specific purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any Federal legislation. (4) None. (5) None. I am interested in any legislation, Federal or State, which may affect the radio-broadcasting industry.

Pierson, A. T., the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn. (1) Salary, $1,815, and no expenses. And no part of salary chargeable to lobbying work. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting employer.

Place, Henry C., care of Townsend, Elliott & Munson, 1100 Provident Trust Building, Seventeenth and Chestnut Streets, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) The firm received from the National Association of Electric Companies $6,225 for legal services for the quarter and reimbursement of $1,147.85 of routine expenses incurred in the performance of all legal services to the association, only a part of which fee and expenses was for those purposes described in section 308 (a) or otherwise within the scope of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) Various hotels, restaurants, railroads, taxicabs, telephone and telegraph companies. (3) Railroad and transportation, $393.17; subsistence expenses away from Philadelphia, $576.42; telephone and telegraph $67.09; miscellaneous, $111.17. (4) [Blank.] (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Companies, of which our firm is counsel, is to provide its members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and take appropriate action on all problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters. The association therefore is interested in any and all legislation that might affect its members directly or indirectly as going business concerns.

Plumley, Fletcher, 421 Tower Building, Fourteenth and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C.; National Federation of American Shipping, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Gross salary received, $925; expenses, $141.30. (2) Taxis, luncheons, etc. (3) Out-of-pocket expense. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

Pogue, L. Welch, 805 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; the Committee for World Travel, Inc., Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $750 fee received during quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) See memorandum attached to Form B on file in your office.

Pollitzer,[1] Anita, national chairman, National Woman's Party, 144 B Street NE., Washington, D. C. (1) Received from National Woman's Party, $79.71, for traveling and organizing expenses. (2) Reimbursement for expenses to above. (3) Traveling and organizing expenses. (4) Equal Rights. (5) the equal-rights amendment.

Pope, Ballard & Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; California Fruit Growers Exchange and California Walnut Growers Association, both of Los Angeles, Calif.; Northwest Nut Growers of Dundee, Oreg.; and California Almond Growers Exchange, of Sacramento, Calif. (1) Receipts, $96.23 (reimbursement of cash disbursements reported as item 1 (a) of report of October 8, 1948). Disbursements, none. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 6556, Eightieth Congress.

[1] Filed with the Clerk only.

Posner, Stanley I., Ring Building, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Linen Supply Association of America, fees, $1,500; expenses, $227.11. Institute of Industrial Launderers, fees, $1,500; expenses, $138.52. National Council of Technical Schools, expenses, $18.45. National Council of Business Schools, expenses, $27.68. (2) Miscellaneous commercial accounts. (3) Taxis, railroad, mimeographing, telephone, telegrams, and similar purposes. (4) Mimeographed bulletins of Linen Supply Association and Institute of Industrial Launderers; also Linen Supply News. (5) Labor legislation on behalf of Linen Supply Association and Institute of Industrial Launderers; veterans' training programs on behalf of National Council of Technical Schools and National Council of Business Schools.

Poulton,[5] James E., grand lodge representative, International Association of Machinists, Machinists' Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Poulton,[6] James E., grand lodge representative, International Association of Machinists, Machinists' Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Powell, E. Henry, partner, Oliver & Donnally, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., and 1106 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $4,100 is the entire amount received by registrant from Oliver & Donnally for all his legal services rendered during the quarter. A small proportion of this amount (not more than 5 percent) was for purposes mentioned in the Lobbying Act. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Any legislation which the mutual savings banks have a legitimate interest in supporting or opposing.

Powell, W. Royce, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Magothy River Association, Annapolis, Md.; Committee of Americans, 122 East Forty-second Street, New York City, N. Y. (1) Magothy River Association, Annapolis, Md., $1,000; Committee of Americans, New York, N. Y., $400. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Baltimore Sun, Washington Post, Washington News, Washington Star. (5) S. 230, S. 1675, H. R. 6341, and H. R. 3314.

Pray, Kenneth L., 1026 Seventeenth Street, NW., Washington, D. C.; Schenley Distilleries, Inc., and affiliated companies, Empire State Building, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $5,000; expenses, allowance, $1,260. (2) University Club, National Press Club, Statler Hotel, taxicabs, Pennsylvania Railroad, etc. (3) Dues, meals, transportation, etc. (4) None. (5) My services insofar as legislative matters are concerned consist primarily of factually reporting the status and content of proposals affecting Schenley Distilleries, Inc., and affiliated companies.

Prentice, Howard A., 1329 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Corn Industries Research Foundation, 3 West Forty-fifth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $2.06 as miscellaneous expenses. (See below.) (2) Notary public, $2; postage, $0.06. (3) Notarizing quarterly report, postage. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.

Pritchard, E., Anthony, National Lead Co., 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C., and 111 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) All money received by this registrant was for salary and traveling expenses in connection with his usual duties as assistant to the manager of the Washington office of the National Lead Co. and no part of it whatsoever was expended during this quarter in an attempt to influence legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the operation of the National Lead Co. including the manufacture and sale of its products.

Proctor, Harry E., 1110 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C.; Oliver & Donnally, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $3,000 paid the registrant as salary by Oliver & Donnally. No expenditures. (2) No expenditures. (3) None. (4) The registrant contributed articles for the October, November, and December issues of Mutual Savings Banking, a trade publication of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks. (5) The registrant studied and analyzed a number of bills pertaining to banks, savings and loan associations, taxes, railroads, veterans, and housing.

Producers Council, Inc., The, 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See attached exhibits A through H.[1] The Producers' Council, Inc., is an organization established in 1928. The purposes as stated by the charter of incorporation are attached hereto as exhibit K.[1] In view of the uncertain interpretation of certain provisions of the regulation of Lobbying Act of 1946 concerning what constitutes "principal purpose" and the phrase "to influence directly or indirectly the passage or defeat of any legislation," etc., we are filing this form giving a full disclosure of the information required under the act. (2) See attached exhibits A through H.[1] (3) As indicated by items on attached exhibits.[1] (4) Technical bulletin, Producers' Council News, press releases and certain informative, economic, and technical studies. (5) None.

Purves, Edmund R., director of public and professional relations, The American Institute of Architects, 1741 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None, except salary for this period, which amounted to $3,125. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation in relation to the architectural profession.

Putt, C. J., The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans. (1) None preceding calendar quarter. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None preceding calendar quarter.

Pyle, Schuyler Shelby, Fleet Reserve Association, 429 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Quigley,[1] Frank, 725 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) $1,382.56. (2) Detroit & Cleveland Navigation Co., $1,662, Detroit to Buffalo; Hotel Statler, Detroit, Mich., $18.50; Hotel Madison, New York City, $14.60; Beaux Art Hotel, New York, $20.49; Whiteface Inn, Lake Placid, N. Y., $20; Parker House Hotel, Boston, Mass., $24.23; Hotel Roosevelt, New Orleans, La., $21.10; Hotel Atlanta Biltmore, Atlanta, Ga., $37.05; all other items individually amounting to less than $10 cover meals, lodging, garages, and incidental traveling expenses. (3) Conferring with field representatives of American Telephone & Telegraph Co., the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Companys, the Bell Telephone Co. of Pennsylvania, the New York Telephone Co., the Michigan Bell Telephone Co., the New England Telephone & Telegraph Co., the Southern New England Telephone Co., the Intermountain Telephone Co., the Peninsular Telephone Co., the Southern Bell Telephone & Telegraph Co., in connection with general matters of information and public relations. (4) None. (5) None.

Radner & Zito (the firm members and associates are William Radner, Frank J. Zito, J. Franklin Fort, Odell Kominers, Mary L. Schleifer, and William F. Ragan), 523 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; Waterfront Employers Association of the Pacific Coast, 16 California Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) $2,500, representing compensation at the rate of $250 per month from March 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948. (2) Radner & Zito. (3) Compensation for work done by firm members or associates. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting maritime industry, particularly in relation to wage-and-hour law.

Raesly, Leon, Thornton & Taylor, 1218 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $13,121.09 and assigned under agreement to Leon Raesly Organization, Inc. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None at present.

Ragland, Edward F., Associated Tobacco Manufacturers, 109–110 Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None, but am interested in any legislation affecting tobacco industry.

Railroad Pension Conference,[1] postoffice box 798, New Haven, Conn. (1) $520. This is for $1 membership fees into the Railroad Pension Conference. Expended $144.84. (2) Railroad Pension Conference. (3) Membership fees. (4) Railroad Pension Conference Bulletin. (5) In support of railroad retirement legislation beneficial to railroad workers.

Ramsey, Donald J., Silver Users Association, 1612 (formerly 1730) I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, before withholding taxes, $3,000; reimbursement for expenses, $2,233.73; expended, $2,492.77. (2) Various. (3) Railroad and airplane tickets, $366.84; hotels, $157.91; meals, $187.85; taxies; and tips, $82.45; telephone, $341.65; office expenses including supplies, furniture, expenses of employees, and taxes, $1,318; meetings, $38.07; total, $2,492.77. (4) Silver News Letter. (5) Legislation affecting the silver-using industry.

Ramspeck, Robert, Air Transport Association of America, 1107 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received regular salary as previously reported. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation for the proper advancement of the air-line industry in the public interest. Supported the proposed repeal of the transportation tax.

Rankin, J. Lee, Beghtol & Rankin, partnership (Nebraska Tax Equality Committee, Inc.), 714 Stuart Building, Lincoln, Nebr. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All legislation designed to bring about equality of taxation between private business and cooperatives.

Ratcliffe, William O., Baltimore Lumber Co., 1800 New York Avenue NE., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Ray, L. S., 2015 Lanier Drive, Silver Spring, Md., Disabled Emergency Officers of the World Wars, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $300 salary as legislative adviser. (2) Myself. (3) Salary. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting disabled emergency officers.

Reck, Jacob, 1023 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; National Beauty and Barber Manufacturers Association, 270 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Registrant receives annual retainer as counsel of above association, no determinable amount is allocable to lobbying activities. Normally, lobbying activities take infinitesimal part of registrant's activities on behalf of association. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Repeal of Federal retailers' excise tax on toilet preparation.

Reckord,[1] Milton A., 1600 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No money received, and none expended. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Nothing published. (5) Our effort was to add funds to the Army appropriation bill for aid to civilian rifle clubs, and to conduct the national rifle and pistol matches.

Reinhold, James P., 525 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co.; 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received salary for calendar quarter, namely, $1,133.33 per month during October, November, and December for services as representative of president of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co. No money was received or expended by me during this calendar quarter for purposes covered in the act. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interest of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co.

Rhodes, Hubert M., 3808 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1342 East Washington Avenue, Madison, Wis. (1) Registrant is a regular employee of the Credit Union National Association, Inc., and receives no additional compensation for service on legislative work. The amount received and expended by him was $0.50. (2) Notary public, $0.50. (3) Notarizing reports required to be filed under the Lobbying Act for the quarter ended September 30, 1948. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting credit unions.

Richards,[1] D. D., 1230 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Mail Order Association of America, 1061 West Thirty-fifth Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None specifically.

Riepma, Siert F., National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $1. (2) Notary public. (3) Notarizing registration Form B under Lobby Act. (4) None. (5) Any margarine legislation.

Riggle, John J.; National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for October, November, and December 1948, $2,000 (less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation). (2) No one. (3) None. (4) Foreign Trade Memo, a mimeographed résumé of foreign-trade regulations and activities of the Federal Government. Distributed to members of National Council of Farmer Cooperatives only. (5) Agricultural legislation.

Rising, E. W., Western Beet Growers Association, Great Falls, Mont.; National Water Conservation Conference, 1215 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) (a) Western Beet Growers Association, Great Falls, Mont., $558.96. (b) National Water Conservation Conference, $396.08. (2) (a) E. W. Rising, expended for railroad fare, $168.06; postage, $25.37; bulletin, $30.; stenographer, $26.80; office rent, $15; miscellaneous office expense, $23.70; personal service, $270 being for information service to members and attendance at beet growers meetings. (b) E. W. Rising, expended for stenographer, $313.84; postage, $32.06; miscellaneous office expense, $50.18 in connection with information service furnished members. (4) None during fourth quarter 1948. (5) (a) Legislation of interest to sugar-beet growers. (b) Legislation in connection with development and conservation of land and water resources and in preservation of States'

[1] Not printed. Filed in Clerk's office.

[1] Filed with the Clerk only.

[1] Filed with the Secretary only.

[1] Filed with the Secretary only.

[1] Filed with the Clerk only.

rights and control of natural resources, tidelands legislation, regional and valley authority legislation.

Robb, George Mackay, 121 Warner Avenue, Syracuse, N. Y.; Reformed Presbyterian Church, 2517 South Salina Street, Syracuse, N. Y.; denominational headquarters are at 209 Ninth Street, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) No money received during preceding calendar quarter, as I was not engaged in any type of lobbying during this period. (2) No money paid during preceding calendar quarter, as I was not engaged in any type of lobbying during this period. (3) No money paid during preceding calendar quarter, as I was not engaged in any type of lobbying during this period. (4) None. (5) House Joint Resolution 239 and Senate Joint Resolution 150, bills introduced into the Eightieth Congress providing for a recognition of the authority and law of Jesus Christ in the Constitution of the United States.

Robbins, Paul H., National Society of Professional Engineers, 1359 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary, $500, and expenses, $50, for October, November, December 1948, for attention to legislative matters. (2) Regular office and travel expenses. (3) As executive director, National Society of Professional Engineers. (4) American Engineer, Legislative Bulletin, National Society of Professional Engineers. (5) All legislation affecting the welfare of professional engineers.

Rogers, Watson, National Food Brokers Association, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Rowe, Roland H., United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., 837 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money was received or expended by the undersigned for the purpose of influencing Federal legislation except $63 (21 hours estimated at $3 per hour) as part of annual salary of $5,780 received by the undersigned as vice president and secretary of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., allocable to the preparation of the following documents in which Federal legislation was advocated, opposed, or mentioned: News letters; news releases; preparation of the presentation of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association to the Capehart committee on delivered prices including questionnaire and tabulation of results; preparation of the presentation of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association on monopolistic and other unfair methods of competition to the House Small Business Committee; preparation of statement to wholesale grocers on legislation in the Eighty-first Congress. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) Washington news letter of United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc. (5) Any and all legislation that affects the welfare of wholesale grocers.

Rudy, John Forney, National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $35 received as salary from National Federation of American Shipping during fourth quarter 1948, allocable to legislative activities. (2) To undersigned. (3) As salary. (4) None. (5) As director of public relations of the National Federation of American Shipping am not employed to support or oppose any particular legislation.

Rule, Gordon W., Committee for World Travel, Inc., Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $937.50 fee received during quarter, plus disbursements as follows: $39.10 for mimeographing statement on S. 2686, for a total of $976.60. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) See memorandum attached to Form B on file in your office.

Rule, Gordon W., Union Trust Building, Room 427, Washington, D. C.; Gillette Safety Razor Co., Boston, Mass. (1) Received $3,210 fee and $192.48 out-of-pocket disbursements for all work done for the company. Of these amounts approximately $1,400 fee and $87.50 disbursements for train fare, taxicabs, long-distance telephones, etc., are applicable to this registration. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Retained in connection with a proposed amendment to the Internal Revenue Code relating to the foreign tax credit.

Rumely, Edward A., Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City. (1) I receive my salary, commission, and expenses, as reported on earlier Form B. The corporation has reported its disbursements separately on Form A. (2) Disbursements were corporation disbursements and are reported separately on Form A. (3) [Blank.] (4) We never pay to have news articles printed, but issue news releases, some of which are reprinted, and of these I have no record. (5) I am not employed for the purpose of supporting or opposing legislation. Sometimes, the committee trustees take a stand for or against an issue (on legislation) where they think a constitutional principle is involved. Then I distribute educational material on the question.

Rush, Charles J., Washington Real Estate Board, 1417 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $666.66 per month as executive secretary. (2) None paid out. (3) None. (4) [Blank.] (5) Measures affecting the ownership and operation of real estate.

Russell, Francis M., National Broadcasting Co., Inc., 724 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $175 (expended for matters relating to legislation). (2) See (3) below. (3) Telephone and telegraph, taxi fares, entertainment. (4) None. (5) As a part of registrant's duties as vice president in charge of Washington office of National Broadcasting Co., Inc., including operation of the company's radio stations in Washington, registrant may engage in activities relating to legislation affecting radio communication companies.

Russell, Horace, 7 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.; United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received retainer at rate of $11,000 per annum for one-half time, a nominal fraction of which is for legislative work; also received and expended $107.89. (2) Hotels, taxi fares, etc. (2) See (2). (4) Contents of the legal bulletin of the United States Savings and Loan League, Chicago, Ill. (5) Legislation affecting the savings and loan business.

Ryan, M. O., 1405 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary for quarter, $3,550.02. October 1 to December 31, 1948, inclusive, total personal expenses for taxies, lunches, and dinners, phones, etc., in Washington, D. C., were $456.89, of which an insignificant amount was for activities related in any way to lobbying. (2) Taxies, Washington restaurants, and hotels. (3) Transportation, lunches, and dinners. (4) Organizational bulletins for American Hotel Association. (5) Any legislation affecting hotel industry.

St. Clair, Labert, 2633 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Stran Steel Division, Great Lakes Steel Corp., Detroit, Mich.; National Automobile Dealers, Washington, D. C. (1) Received from Stran Steel Division, $1,500; from National Automobile Dealers, $1,250. (2) None. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) Anything of general interest to clients.

Sands, Charles E., 4211 Second Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union, A. F. of L., 528 Walnut Street, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) Quarterly pay at the rate of $7,200 per year. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Support labor and social legislation, oppose antilabor and antisocial legislation.

Sanders,[1] J. T., the National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) I received $1,500 as salary for the quarter as legislative counsel of the National Grange. In addition, I received $62.09 for expenses, as follows: Transportation, $16.30; meals and incidentals, $15.79. (2) Transportation agencies and restaurants. (3) Transportation, food, etc. (4) The National Grange Monthly. (5) Hawaiian statehood; Commodity Credit Corporation, H. R. 6214; selective service; Federal standard time, S. 2041 and S. 2246; meat-inspection bills, H. R. 5675, H. R. 6259, and S. 2256; cattle-grub eradication; agricultural appropriations bill; soil conservation, H. R. 6054; international wheat agreement; mortgage insurance, H. R. 6114; Interior appropriations; Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill; ECA appropriations; Federal aid to schools.

Saylor, Richard D., National Lead Co., 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C., and 111 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) All money received by this registrant was for salary and expenses in connection with his usual duties as manager of the Washington office of the National Lead Co., and no part of it whatsoever was expended in an attempt to influence legislation. (2) Office lease, telephone company, stationers, etc. (3) Rent, telephone service, supplies needed in carrying out duties as manager of the Washington office. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the operation of the National Lead Co., including the manufacture and sale of its products.

Schaeffer, Alexander L., Ancram, N. Y. (1) Total of $15.36 was spent and all contributed by self. (2) To general merchants and sales vendors, and post office. (3) For postage, newspapers, periodicals, and stationery. (4) None. (5) The right to strike and the right to work; abolition of the closed shop; making it unlawful for any individual, organization, or group to levy a royalty tax on any commodity or service.

Schell, S. D., National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C, (1) Approximately $300 of regular salary for the quarter is allocable to services performed on matters relating to legislation. Activities consisted mainly of answering questions of various officials in the Government and others interested in general legislation pending in Congress, with no particular activity on any pending legislation. (2) No expenditures. (3) No expenditures. (4) None. (5) No appearances before Congress or committees; no conferences with Members or employees of Congress during the period on any legislation.

Schoen,[1] Paul W., Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 692, Valdosta, Ga. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None at present.

Schoene, Freehill & Kramer, a law partnership composed of Lester P. Schoene, Joseph H. Freehill, and Milton Kramer; 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (1) None received or expended. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) All written materials are delivered to the client and dissemination is entirely in the client's control. (5) Railroad retirement, unemployment insurance, and employers' liability matters.

Schoenhals, E. L., Tax Equality League of Utah, 915 Kearns Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) Received from Tax Equality League of Utah for use of my law office, stenographic services, traveling, telegrams, air express, secretarial services, phone, etc., $456.40. (2) To my secretary, Jean Powers, for office rent, United Airlines, Western Union, Mountain States Telephone & Telegraph, etc. (3) To maintain my office, received phone calls from members and carry

[1] Filed with the Clerk only.

on correspondence with members of the organization, to travel. (4) Deseret News, Salt Lake Tribune, and Salt Lake Telegram have carried news items only but no paid advertising. (5) To obtain tax equality.

Scott, Jack Garrett, National Association of Motor Operators, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No receipts except annual retainer for general legal services as shown in registration statement. No expenditures for legislative purposes. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Generally all legislation affecting the intercity motor bus industry.

Scott, John W., 1025 Vermon Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None other than salary received at the total monthly rate of $400 from Harvey B. Jacobson, John N. Randolph, and Patrick D. Beavers. No expenditures made. (2) Does not apply. (3) Does not apply. (4) None. (5) As previously stated in my registration statement. (NOTE.—The firms of McMorrow, Berman & Davidson, and Victor J. Evans & Co. are attempting to cancel contracts of employment with me, and they are not currently paying me any sum of money.)

Scott, Vernon, and Loring A. Schuler, constituting the partnership of Vernon Scott and Loring Schuler, organizers and counselors, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Colorado Associated Businessmen, Inc., 335 Symes Building, Denver, Colo.; Indiana Tax Equality Committee, Inc., 549 Warren Street, Huntington, Ind.; Kansas Independent Businessmen's Association, 205 Orpheum Building, Wichita, Kans.; Tax Equality Committee of Kentucky, Columbia Building, 401 West Main Street, Louisville, Ky.; Michigan Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1516 Olds Tower Building, Lansing, Mich.; Nebraska Tax Equality Committee, Inc., 714 Stuart Building, Lincoln, Nebr.; New York Associated Businessmen, Inc., Sherburne, N. Y.; North Dakota Tax Equality Committee, Post Office Box 1954, Fargo, N. Dak.; Ohio Associated Businessmen, Inc., 198 South High Street, Columbus, Ohio; Oklahoma Associated Businessmen, Inc., 135 Northwest Second Street, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Federal Tax Equality League of Texas, 4032 Hanover Street, Dallas, Tex.; Wisconsin Associated Businessmen, Inc., 231 West Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis.; Mississippi Associated Businessmen, Inc., 305–306 Millsaps Building, Jackson, Miss.; Pennsylvania Associated Businessmen, Inc., 112 Market Street, Harrisburg, Pa. (1) The firm of Scott and Schuler received $9,999.97 from NAB as retainer fee in 1948. No money was received or expended for purposes within the scope of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. See above. (2) No one. See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (2). (4) None. (5) Legislation designed to have various types of business corporations taxed on the same basis.

Scott, William C. (report as attorney for National Postal Committee for Books); 40 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; National Postal Committee for Books, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) No money received during said period. Expenditures, taxi fares, $1.75. (2) Various taxicab companies. (3) Transportation. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to postage rates on books.

Sears, W. James, the Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) During this quarter I engaged in no legislative activity nor did I make any expenditures for this purpose. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

See, Harry,[5] Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, 130 Third Street, SE., Washington, D. C. (1) No money received or expended in connection with legislation. (2) [Blank]. (3) None. (4) None. None.

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

See, Harry,[6] Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, 130 Third Street, SE., Washington, D. C. (1) No money received or expended in connection with legislation. (2) [Blank]. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Selvage & Lee (in Washington, Selvage, Lee & Bledsoe); 1 East Forty-third Street, New York, N. Y., 1730 I Street, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Fee $4,500 plus expenses as shown below. (2) Printing, mimeographing, postage, telephone, press clippings, traveling expense, supplementary staff, etc., $3,835.77. (3) Publicity and lobbying activity in connection with repeal of the discriminatory legislation affecting margarine. (4) We did all within our power to disseminate information favorable to margarine and to legislation which would remove unfair restrictions on margarine, but cannot say categorically that we caused any articles to be published or any radio comment. (5) As above.

Shaw, Mark R., 114 Trenton Street, Melrose, Mass.; New England secretary, National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street, NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, including $600 for previous quarter, $1,200; traveling expenses, $90.17; total, $1,290.17. (2) Gas stations, restaurants, railroads, hotels. (3) Travel to speaking dates, conferences, meetings. (4) Bulletins of the NCPW; Boston Herald; Christian Science Monitor; Zion's Herald. (5) Oppose universal military training; favor repeal of peacetime selective service; favor admission of more displaced persons; other measures related to issue of peace and war.

Shields, Robert H., United States Beet Sugar Association, 1001 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Interested in legislation affecting sugar but not employed for the purpose of supporting or opposing any legislation.

Shufelt,[7] Bernard E., 66 Gross Avenue, Richmond, Va. (1) This report is my final report under the Lobbying Act. The period covered is July 1 to 10, 1948, inclusive. During this period I engaged in no lobbying activity; received no money; spent no money. My lobbying activity was terminated July 10, 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Smart, Miss Elizabeth A., 100 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D. C.; National WCTU, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill. (1) Received $221.69 salary; received and paid out $54.25. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.; post office; Woolworth's; Washington Times-Herald; E. Morrison Paper Co.; National Congress Bulletin; Connecticut Liquor; Control Commission; Congressional Record; refill on memo pad 65 cents. (3) Telephone, postage, office supplies, subscription, copy Connecticut Liquor Control Act, copy Congressional Record, refill. (4) The Union Signal. (5) Legislation dealing with alcoholic beverages, motion pictures, radio, children, women in industry, peace and international relations, narcotics, gambling, social hygiene, interracial relations.

Smith, Allen L., Louisiana Tax Equality Association, Inc., Post Office Box 1526, Baton Rouge, La. (1) No money received or expended for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) To support any legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to improve basic taxation principles providing for removal of tax disparities between business competitors.

Smith, Anthony W., Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Portion of salary allocable to legislative employment, $75. This is computed as stated in registration statement at $300 a year. No expenditures. (2) None.

[6] Filed with the Secretary only.
[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.

(3) Compensation as above received for legislative work. (4) CIO News. (5) Forestry legislation; river valley developments; resource conservation.

Smith, Donald W. (report as attorney for American Nurses' Association), 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; American Nurses' Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Receipts, $1,812.02 for legal fees and disbursements, paid to Satterlee, Warfield & Stephens for services by firm as counsel in all capacities. Expenditures: No expenditures during said period. (2) No expenditures. (3) No expenditures. (4) None during the period covered by this report. (5) Legislation relating to nurses, nursing, or health, on which the American Nurses' Association has taken a stand, including the extension of social-security coverage and Federal aid to nursing education.

Smith, Dudley, Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $1,250 monthly from the Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, but not for the principal purpose of influencing legislation, which is a minor part of my activities. (2) None for the purpose of influencing legislation. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Smith, Harold O., Jr., United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., 837 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) During the past quarter I did not have occasion to engage in any activities which I believe would be construed as lobbying. Serving full time as executive vice president of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., my activities are those of a trade-association executive and any contacts with Members of Congress are purely incidental to my many other activities in connection with trade-association work. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) In our association's bulletins and weekly news letters to members, we occasionally report on legislative matters affecting the trade. (5) No legislation in particular; any legislation in general affecting the interests of wholesale grocers. On behalf of our members, I appeared as a witness at a public hearing before the House Small Business Committee and the Capehart committee to express the views of the trade on the need for clarification occasioned by court rulings on delivered prices.

Smith, Howard J., Central Arizona Project Association, 510 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz. (1) October salary, including September, $1,500, plus travel expenses, $367.10; November salary, $750; December salary, $750. (2) Howard J. Smith, executive secretary. (3) Salary, travel expenses, room and board, when engaged in travel in interest of work of the association. (4) The Case for Water in Central Arizona; Work for Water; California's Stake in Arizona's Share of Colorado River; What the Central Arizona Project Means to You. (5) Employed to support Senate bill 1175.

Smith, Hilda W., National Committee for the Extension of Labor Education, 1508 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Occasional articles sent out through Labor Press Associates. (5) Bill for a Labor Extension Service in the Department of Labor.

Smith, Lloyd W., Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.; Chicago, Burlington & Quincy R. R. Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received regular salary for the period October 1 to December 31, 1948, for services as special representative of the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy R. R. Co. in the same amount as for the quarter ending September 30 and reported previously. No money was received or expended by me during this last quarter in connection with any lobbying activities. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting interests of Chicago, Burlington & Quincy R. R. Co. Other duties for said

company comprise the major part of this work.

Smith, Purcell L., National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary of $16,250 as president of the National Association of Electric Companies and reimbursements of $1,195.76 of routine expenses incurred in the performance of all official duties, only a part of which salary and expenses were for those purposes described in the act. (2) Various hotels, restaurants, clubs, railroads, air lines, taxicabs, telephone and telegraph companies. (3) Railroad and transportation, $103.63; telephone and telegraph, $14.34; restaurants and other meals, $464.71; hotels, $190.79; subscriptions, $360; gratuities and miscellaneous, $62.09. (4) I am advised that a correct answer to this question is "none." However, in the interest of a full and complete disclosure, I am calling attention to the attached pamphlet which was recently published by the association for general distribution. (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Companies, of which I am president, is to provide its members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and take appropriate action on problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters. The association therefore is interested in legislation that might affect its members as going business concerns.

Smith, Robert E., Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Association, 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y. (1) December 22, 1948: Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Association, 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y., on account travel expense, $1,007.50. October 28, 1948: Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Association, 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y., loan, $1,000. Expended for travel expense, $1,167.95. (2) Various. (3) Meals and miscellaneous. (4) None. (5) To support legislation which directly or indirectly is believed to be beneficial to holders of life insurance and their beneficiaries; and to oppose such legislation as is believed to be unfavorable to same.

Smith, Russell, 300 B Street SE., Washington, D. C.; Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1555 Sherman, Denver, Colo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All major pending legislation.

Smith, Sylvester C., Jr., the Prudential Insurance Co. of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Snyder, Calvin K., Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received and expended $1,509.74. (2) Various. (3) Traveling expenses, etc. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Snyder, James D., Hotel La Salle, Chicago, Ill.; Illinois Legislative Committee, La Salle Street Station, Chicago, Ill. (1) none. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the interests of the Illinois railroads.

Spence, Hotchkiss, Parker & Duryee, 40 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to establish a national air policy.

Spencer, Lyndon, Lake Carriers' Association, 905 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Stack, Thomas George, National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West One hundred and fourth Place, Chicago, Ill. (1) Was not in Washington, and did no lobbying during the quarter. (2) Thomas George Stack. (3) To get before Congress legislation to improve pensions for railroad employees. (4) Rail Pension News, publication by the National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., for rail workers. One edition September, October, and November 1948. Cost including mailing $950 and another edition December and January cost $1,200. (5) To support any bills in Congress to improve pensions for rail workers.

Starling, Howard M., 837 Washington Building, Washington, D. C., Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant does not receive funds earmarked for purposes set forth in this act. Registrant has estimated, however, that $150 received by registrant during the fourth quarter of 1948 might come within scope of act as registrant understands act has been interpreted by the Department of Justice. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Registrant doubts that he is employed to support or oppose legislation. However, on very infrequent occasions, he has supported or opposed legislation as it specifically affects capital stock, casualty and surety insurance companies.

Stebbins,[1] Frank L., room 1025, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) No money received or expended by me for lobbying purposes. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Any legislation designed to tax like business organizations on a like basis.

Steele, Raymond E., National Fisheries Institute, Inc., Suite 228, Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) N. F. I. Flashes, published weekly (50 issues), mailed to Institute membership. (5) None.

Stein, Margaret I., 602 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.; Committee for the Nation's Health, Inc., 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Received salary, $923.10; travel expense received, $37.82; total, $960.92. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) National health insurance.

Stengle,[1] Charles I., American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $9.60. (2) Taxi drivers. (3) Rides to and from Capitol. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting Government employees.

Stewart, Charles T., 1737 K Street NW, Washington, D. C., National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary (50 percent of time devoted to legislative activities), $3,000; reimbursement by employer for travel expenses, incidental expenses, and per diem, $696.35; total, $3,696.35. (2) See attached itemized statement.[1] (3) See attached itemized statement.[1] (4) Attached list[1] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) Any legislation affecting the real estate industry.

Stoll, Edwin L., 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Expenses incurred, $224.66, for which reimbursement was received. (2) See attached itemized statement.[1] (3) See attached itemized statement.[1] (4) Attached list[1] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publication is not available. (5) Legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Stoudenmire, Sterling F., Jr., 1740 G Street NW., Washington, D. C., Waterman Steamship Corp., Waterman Building, 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala. (1) No money received during the preceding calendar quarter as compensation or otherwise for the purpose of attempting to influence passage or defeat of any legislation or carrying on any work in connection therewith. No expenses incurred in preceding calendar quarter in connection with any activity in connection with attempting to influence passage or defeat of any legislation. (2) Nothing paid to any person during preceding calendar quarter as expenses or otherwise in connection with attempting to influence passage or defeat of any legislation or carrying on any work in connection therewith. (3) Nothing. (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any legislation of any nature during the preceding calendar quarter.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[4] Filed with the Secretary only.
[1] Filed with the Clerk only.

Strachan, Paul A., American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., 1376 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Neither I nor any officer of this federation has paid any sum to anyone, as affecting legislation. The only change in my personal status as president of this federation is that the A. F. P. H. council authorized an increase in salary, or a total salary of $10,000 per year to continue and increase supervisory activities over A. F. P. H., only a part of which is legislative work. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Sponsoring legislation upon behalf of our 28,000,000 physically handicapped citizens. Supporting bills for a Federal Commission on Services for the Physically handicapped; National Cerebral Palsy Institute; National Leprosy Act; National Epilepsy Act, and census (survey) of handicapped.

Strackbein, O. R., America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 601 Carpenters' Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts, October–December 1948, $4,030; expenses, October–December 1948, $4,817.02 (consisting of $4,200 salary and $617.02 in expenses). (2) No payments were made to individuals. Funds were expended for the purposes listed below. (3) Traveling, rent, telephone, taxicab fares, clerical work, duplicating services, a few lunches, and office supplies. (4) Editorials in the Photo-Engraver, a monthly publication of the International Photo-Engravers Union. Also a treatise (mimeographed) entitled "War Debts and the Tariff—a Foreign Trade Fallacy." (5) Tariff legislation and related matters such as ratification of the charter of the International Trade Organization; also other legislation affecting the welfare of the member unions of the conference.

Strong,[5] Arthur D., Upper Mississippi Waterway Association, 1034 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn. (1) Salary, July 1 to September 30, 1948, $825; reimbursement for expenses, $294.84; total, $1,119.84. (2) Arthur D. Strong. (3) Salary and reimbursement for traveling, hotels, entertaining, attending meetings, hearings, and conventions; (4) None. (5) Registrant is employed to support legislation relating to the improvement and development of navigable waterways in the upper Mississippi River, together with legislation relating to flood control, conservation, pollution, recreation, fish and wildlife, including all legislation that has to do with the development of water resources of the upper Mississippi River and its tributaries as this legislation relates to all types of public benefits. He is employed to oppose legislation detrimental to the above.

Strong,[6] Arthur D., Upper Mississippi Waterway Association, 1034 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn. (1) Salary, October 1 to December 31, 1948, $825; reimbursement for expenses, $533.56; total, $1,358.56. (2) Arthur D. Strong. (3) Salary and reimbursement for traveling, hotels, entertaining, attending meetings, hearings, and conventions. (4) None. (5) Registrant

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.

is employed to support legislation relating to the improvement and development of navigable waterways in the upper Mississippi River, together with legislation relating to flood control, conservation, pollution, recreation, fish and wildlife, including all legislation that has to do with the development of water resources of the upper Mississippi River and its tributaries as this legislation relates to all types of public benefits. He is employed to oppose legislation detrimental to the above.

Sturgis, Arthur, Jr., American Retail Federation, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $200; expenses, $17.70. (2) Taxi drivers and restaurants. (3) Transportation and meals. (4) American Retail Federation informational bulletins to the retailing industry. (5) Legislation affecting retail industry, including tax revision, labor-law revision, social-security law revision.

Sturrock, J. E., Texas Water Conservation Association, 207 West Fifteenth Street, Austin, Tex. (1) Salary for October, November, and December 1948, $1,800, less income tax. Traveling expenses for October, November, and December 1948, $384.97. (2) $384.97 traveling expenses paid to various railroad, air line and taxi companies, hotels, and restaurants. (3) Covering transportation, meals, lodging, and entertainment. (4) Texas Water Conservation Association bulletins and pamphlets and various analyses of bills pending in Congress. (5) Employed to support all legislation, both State and National, concerning the development, conservation, protection, and utilization of Texas' land and water resources through existing State and Federal agencies; oppose all legislation creating Federal valley authorities and all legislation seeking to superimpose Federal control over State control in the distribution of the State's water resources.

Sullivan,[3] Francis M., in care of National Association of United States Storekeeper-Gaugers, Suite 408, Central Building, 805 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Legal fee, $250. (2) Francis M. Sullivan. (3) Represent the interests of the association before various Federal governmental departments. (4) None. (5) All legislative duties performed by an associate.

Sullivan,[4] Francis M., Disabled American Veterans, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary (including semi-annual bonus): October, November, December, 1948 (after taxes and social security), $3,480; expenses to Miami, Fla., and return, $256.17; incidental expenses for August, September, October, 1948, $32.50; total, $3,768.67. (2) Francis M. Sullivan. (3) See (1) above. (4) DAV semimonthly. (5) Legislation affecting service-connected disabled veterans, their families, and the survivors of deceased servicemen and women.

Sutlive, Carey R., National Association of Manufacturers, 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts: Salary, $2,125; expenses reimbursed by employer, $556.55. Expenditures: $556.55. (2) Expenses paid to various railroads, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, etc. (3) For expenses incurred in course of business, such as travel, meals, and hotel accommodations and expenses of conducting conferences for discussion of business matters. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation affecting industry, such as legislation relating to national labor policy, taxation, public expenditures, industrial controls, social security, research, patents, and investments.

Swanson, Walter S. J., National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 938 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant received only his regular salary, no part of which is paid him for, nor can be allocated to, the presentation of the views of the constituent members of the National Highway Users Conference or of the conference itself. During the quarterly period just ended, he has expended no money and has made no payments to anyone in connection with any activities coming under the Lobbying Act. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Prepared articles for Highway Highlights and certain bulletins released by the National Highway Users Conference. (5) Within the general responsibility of my office I have carried out the work outlined above. During the past quarter this has been solely confined to reportorial coverage of congressional activities dealing with Federal highway aid and highway taxation, the only legislation in which I am interested. I have conducted no activity during the quarterly period coming within the purview of the Lobbying Act.

Swomley,[4] John M., Jr., 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Travel expenses between Washington and New York plus out-of-pocket expenses in Washington, $55.93. (2) John M. Swomley, Jr., for personal expenses indicated above. (3) Indicated above. (4) Conscription News, biweekly. (5) I serve as director of the National Council Against Conscription on a volunteer basis to promote the achieving of the international abolition of conscription, world-wide disarmament, and the defeat of conscription.

Taylor,[1] Hugh W., 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Inc., 620 South Broadway, Lexington, Ky. (1) Amount received from Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, for salary, less social security and tax, $2,250; for expenses incurred, $151.16. (2) Various. (3) Miscellaneous expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation which affects tobacco production and foreign trade in leaf tobacco.

Taylor, John Thomas, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; the American Legion (national organization), 777 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) $500 salary semimonthly, less withholding and social-security taxes; $543.59 reimbursement for traveling expenses, October, November, December, 1948; $10.05 incidental expenses, October, November, December, 1948. (2) John Thomas Taylor. (3) $543.59 reimbursement for traveling expenses: Round trips to Louisville, Ky.; Indianapolis, Ind.; Columbia, S. C.; Miami, Fla.; $10.05 incidental expenses; taxies and luncheons. (4) The American Legion Magazine; the National Legionnaire; National Legislative Bulletin. (5) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, their rehabilitation, hospitalization, reeducation, and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense; Americanism, included in which are opposition to all subversive activities and particular attention to our immigration and naturalization laws; child welfare, not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agricultural development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations; the development of sound civil aviation programs and policies; the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discriminations and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services; and all other matters included in the mandates and program of the American Legion as adopted and approved by the national convention of the American Legion and/or by its national executive committee, which are the ruling and policy-making bodies of the American Legion.

Taylor, Margaret K., National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) October 1–24, 1948, taxi, $3. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.

Taylor, Tyre, suite 1112, Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Retail Grocers, 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received $2,500 as one-fourth of adjusted annual retainer by National Association of Retail Grocers. Expenditures as follows: Adjusted regular office expense, $784.16; traveling expenses, $73.15. (2) Landlord, secretary, postage, telephone, etc.; Washington taxicab operators. (3) See (1). (4) National Grocers Bulletin. (5) Repeal of margarine license taxes and other legislation of interest to independent retail food distributors.

Taylor, Tyre, suite 1112, Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.; Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn. (1) Received $4,237.50 as one-fourth of adjusted annual retainer by Southern States Industrial Council. Expenditures as follows: Adjusted regular office expense, $484.16; research and technical assistance, $1,581.27; travel expense, $73.15. (2) Landlord, postage, telephone, etc.; Henry Bison, Jr.; Washington taxicab operators. (3) See (1). (4) Semimonthly News Bulletin of Southern States Industrial Council. (5) The general legislative program of the council with particular emphasis on legislation favorable to the maintenance of a free-enterprise system.

Teel, Donald, Michigan Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1516 Olds Tower Building, Lansing, Mich. (1) No money received or expended for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) Legislation designed to have all business corporations taxed in the same manner and on the same basis.

Temple, Marjorie L., American Association of University Women, 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received only salary, approximately one-half of which is for legislative work; no money paid out. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Journal of the American Association of University Women; General director's letter, three or four times yearly as program guide to branch officers. (5) Not yet determined for this quarter.

Terrell, John U., Colorado River Association, 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) Salary, business expenses, including travel, hotels, phones, fares, meals, mail, and other ordinary expenses, total $2,625. (2) Salary for self, travel, hotels, phones, meals, mail, and other ordinary business expenses. (3) Newspaper publicity, etc. (same as (2)). (4) Wire services and California and other western newspapers. (5) House Joint Resolution 3; Senate Joint Resolution 4.

Thompson, Chester C., The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary from The American Waterways Operators, Inc., $5,000, covering October, November, December, 1948. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting domestic water carrier and operator industry of the United States.

Tinney, William H., Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No activity under the act during the quarter ending December 31, 1948, consequently no part of the salary received during that quarter can be attributed to purposes covered by the act, and, likewise, no expenses were incurred for the purposes covered by the act. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5)

[3] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[4] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.

[1] Filed with the Secretary only.
[2] Filed with the Clerk only.

Legislation effecting the interests of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

Tobin, Fred A., 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers Union of America, 222 East Michigan Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) My salary is $1,250 per month or $3,750 for a quarter year. I do not incur any expenses in performance of legislative work. (2) Fred A. Tobin. (3) I am an attorney representing the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers Union and its affiliated locals before the Interstate Commerce Commission and the National Labor Relations Board, and the liaison representative between various Government agencies and international union and the affiliated locals. The above includes general services of a nonlegislative nature pertaining to business and operation of International Brotherhood of Teamsters and its affiliated locals; also for part-time services in connection with legislation, both Federal and State, for the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and its affiliated locals. (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation, Federal and State, which may affect the interests of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and its affiliated locals, particularly in the field of labor law.

Tobler, H. Willis, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; American Farm Bureau Federation, 109 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $4.50 expended. (See (6) of Form B, filed December 1946.) (2) Taxies. (3) Transportation. (4) None. (5) Congress not in session.

Todd,[1] John H., 1037 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.; National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, 586 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn. (1) None for purposes covered by the act. (2) None for purposes covered by the act. (3) None for purposes covered by the act. (4) None relating to the purposes covered by the act. (5) No specific legislation.

Tool Owners Union, Inc., 1802 Massachusetts Avenue, Lexington, Mass. (1) See attached schedule.[1] (2) See attached schedule.[1] (3) See attached schedule.[1] (4) Program for progress (vol. 2, nos. 3 and 4); news release. (5) No specific legislation.

Truitt, Paul T., National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1023 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $66.46. (2) Various persons. (3) Miscellaneous expenses such as taxi fares, carfare, luncheons, etc. (4) None. (5) Any margarine legislation.

Tumulty, Joseph P., Jr., partner of law firm of Breed, Abbott & Morgan, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Louis Dreyfus, president of Chappell & Co., Inc., R-K-O Building, New York City, and of Chappell & Co., Ltd., 50 New Bond Street, London, England. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 5704 (80th Cong., 2d sess.), a bill to facilitate naturalization of Jeanne Bouchet Dreyfus.

Tumulty, Joseph P., Jr., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; John Frederick Firth-Hand, 1744 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) S. 1742 (80th Cong., 1st sess.), a bill for the relief of John Frederick Firth-Hand.

Tumulty, Joseph P., Jr., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Insurance Co. of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia; the Insurance Co. of the State of Pennsylvania, 308 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation for the just payment of French spoliation claims.

Turner, Harold J., Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railway Co. et al., 325 Henry Building, Portland, Oreg. (1) None on Federal legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any particular proposed Federal legislation. (See statement A to my registration, Form B.)

Van Arnum, John R., National League of Wholesale Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Distributors, 512 F. Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Vance, C. W., 10 Independence Ave., S. W., Washington, D. C.; Order of Railway Conductors of America, Cedar Rapids, Iowa. (1) None; no services performed in fourth quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Van Nostrand,[5] George C., American Airlines, Inc., 1437 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) As assistant vice president of American Airlines, on a permanent basis, I received a monthly salary of $1,000, or $3,000 for the quarter for all of my activities. None of my time was spent on activities involving legislation. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting air transportation.

Van Nostrand,[6] George C., American Airlines, Inc., 1437 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) As assistant vice president of American Airlines, on a permanent basis, I received a monthly salary of $1,000, or $3,000 for the quarter for all of my activities. None of my time was spent on activities involving legislation. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting air transportation.

Vernon, Weston, Jr., Milbank, Tweed Hope & Hadley, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) None. (5) See answer to (1). Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the Chase National Bank of the city of New York.

Vernon, Weston, Jr., Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) None. (5) See answer to (1). Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

Versen, Albert F., Missouri Valley Chapter Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, 508 Security Building, St. Louis, Mo. (1) See statement attached.[1] (2) See statement attached.[1] (3) See statement attached.[1] (4) None. (5) None.

Versen, Albert F., St. Louis, Local Meat Packers Association, 508 Security Building, St. Louis, Mo. (1) See statement attached.[1] (2) See statement attached.[1] (3) See statement attached.[1] (4) None. (5) None at present.

Viles,[7] A. L., the Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) No time devoted to legislative work. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Bills pertaining to long-term legislation on national rubber policy, on the transportation of flammable materials, and on proposed revisions of the excise taxes.

Vitrified China Association, Inc.,[1] 312 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No activities covered by the act. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Walker, Jimmie, Mississippi Associated Businessmen, Inc., 305–306 Millsaps Building, Jackson, Miss. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Tax equality among all business.

Waller,[5] Theodore, United World Federalists of Washington, D. C., 1710 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.; United World Federalists, Inc., 7 East Twelfth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received from United World Federalists, Inc., for salary, $250; received from United World Federalists, Inc., for travel expenses, $415.57; received from William Cochran as a gift for the purpose of carrying out the work and program of United World Federalists, $500; grand total, $1,165.57. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) World Government News. (5) Any legislation designed to strengthen the United Nations.

Waller,[6] Theodore, United World Federalists, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Received from United World Federalists, Inc., for salary, $1,187.50; received from United World Federalists, Inc., for travel expenses, $927.83; received from United World Federalists, Inc., as an advance, $500; received from William Cochran as a gift for the purpose of carrying out the work and program of United World Federalists, $500; total of all money received, $3,115.33. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) World Government News. (5) Any legislation designed to strengthen the United Nations.

Walter, Stephen M., National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary of $6,625.02 as an employee of the National Association of Electric Companies, and reimbursements of $1,636.22 of routine expenses incurred in the performance of all duties and assignments, only a part of which salary and expenses were for those purposes described in section 308 (a) or otherwise within the scope of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) Various railroad and airplane companies, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, telephone and telegraph companies, book stores, and stationers. (3) Transportation, $427.40; hotels, $515.57; meals and incidental expenses on account of association members in Washington and elsewhere, $514.15; telephone and telegraph, $44.15; publications, $32.80; miscellaneous, $102.15. (4) [Blank.] (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Companies, of which I am an employee, is to provide its members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and take appropriate action on problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters. The association therefore is interested in legislation that might affect its members as going business concerns.

Walters,[5] Thomas G., Government Employees Council, A. F. of L., room 1008, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) As operations director, receives a monthly salary ($580) minus withholding tax and social-security tax—expended for personal living expenses. (2) Thomas G. Walters. (3) Salary received and expended for personal services as operations director of council; lobbying is minor and incidental. (4) Washington newspapers; international union publications; weekly council bulletin for the dissemination of organizational news, including legislation. (5) Favorable to Federal Government employees and opposition to adverse legislation.

Walters,[6] Thomas G., Government Employees Council, A. F. of L., room 1008, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) As operations director, receives a monthly salary ($580) minus withholding tax and social security tax—expended for personal living expenses. (2) Thomas G. Walters. (3) Salary received and expended for personal services as operations director of council; lobbying is minor and incidental. (4) Washington newspapers; international union publications; weekly council bulletin for the dissemination of organizational news, including legislation. (5) Favorable to Federal Government employees and opposition to adverse legislation.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[2] Filed with the Clerk only.

[3] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[4] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.
[5] Filed with the Clerk only.

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.

Warfel, George L., National Association of Special Delivery Messengers, 112 C Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary (gross—withholding and social security taxes deducted), $1,500; expense vouchers: cab fares, phone calls, luncheon guests, notary fees, hotels, meals and transportation on organization trips for the National Association of Special Delivery Messengers, $382.94; total, $1,882.94. (2) George L. Warfel. (3) To improve the special delivery service and promote the welfare of the special delivery messengers in the United States postal service, including liaison contacts with administrative officials as well as legislative contacts. (4) The Special Messenger; Special News (mimeographed bulletins to membership). (5) Supporting all legislation beneficial to the special delivery service and special delivery messengers.

Warfield, Ethelbert, (report as attorney for American General Corp.), 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; American General Corp., 1 Exchange Place, Jersey City, N. J. (1) No receipts or expenditures during said period. (2) No expenditures. (3) No expenditures. (4) None. (5) To oppose S. 829 and H. R. 3351.

Warfield, Ethelbert (report as attorney for National Postal Committee for Books), 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; National Postal Committee for Books, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) No receipts during said quarter. Expenditures: American Airlines, $5.14 (share); Pennsylvania Railroad, $6.17 (share); other travel expenses, $51.99; telephone calls, $12.95; postage, $1.05; taxi fares, $2.25; carfare, $0.20. (2) Travel expenses ($51.99) paid to American Airlines, Pennsylvania Railroad, Hotel Carlton, and various restaurants; telephone charges paid to various telephone companies; postage to United States post office; various taxicab and transportation companies. (See also (1).) (3) For the purposes above indicated. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to postage rates on books.

Warner, Milo J., 1631 Nicholas Building, Toledo, Ohio; Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J. (1) Received from the Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J., for professional services; conferences with various Members of Congress in regard to legislation for the period July 1 to September 30, 1948, inclusive, $2,250. Expenses for transportation and traveling to and from Washington, hotel, meals, telephone, telegraph, entertainment, and expenses in Washington, $182.52. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Services were rendered in connection with housing, credit, labor, railroad reorganization, and general-welfare legislation, and protective of the interests of the policyholders of the Prudential Insurance Co. of America.

Washington Taxpayers Association, 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Moneys received, contributions from members of the association (none over $500), $2,255. Moneys expended: Management fee of Rufus S. Lusk, $1,300. Reimbursement, Rufus S. Lusk, for clerical services, $1,112.50; rent, $87.50; telephone, $75; postage, $114.43; stationery and printing, $310.19; office expenses and supplies, $271.63; miscellaneous expenses, $160.04; total, $3,431.29. Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to association affairs. Of his time and efforts so devoted not more than 10 percent are applied to legislative activities, therefore the sum of $120 is allocated to those purposes. (2) Rufus S. Lusk in the form of management fee, or in reimbursement of amounts expended by him for the association. (See (1).) (3) See (1). (4) The following are names of papers, magazines, periodicals, etc., to which news releases have been sent (registrant has no information as to the utilization of this material); Washington Evening Star, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Post, Washington Daily News. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation, appropriations, and the efficient and economical operation of the District government.

Watson, J. R., Mississippi Railroad Association, Room 1, Illinois Central Railroad Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss. (1) No reportable receipts and expenditures. No segregation of salary as between principal employment and possible incidental concern with matters of Federal legislation. The registrant is of the opinion that his activities for the period covered by this report do not fall within the scope of the Lobbying Act. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Annual employment, primarily for services not related to Federal legislation. Matters of Federal legislation are other and different from and only incidental to principal employment and purpose, but as an incident thereto, legislation pertaining to railroads in Mississippi. None within the period covered by this report.

Weathersby, Newton Patrick, district No. 44, International Association of Machinists, room 303, Machinists' Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,000; no expenditures, Congress not in session. (2) No expenditures, Congress not in session. (3) Lobbying when Congress is in session, that is, supporting or opposing, as the case may be, legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and, incidentally, organized labor in general. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and, occasionally, organized labor in general.

Webb, William H., 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Big Sandy Valley Association, Inc., 1010 Second National Bank Building, Ashland, Ky. (1) Received $100 on December 23, 1948, being retainer for 2 months from January 1, 1949, at the rate of $50 per month. Nothing expended. (2) William H. Webb. Nothing paid to anyone by him. (3) Retainer fee for 2 months from January 1, 1949. (4) None in connection with this employment. (5) Legislation authorizing the Big Sandy River improvement, Tug and Levisa Forks, Ky. and W. Va., as recommended by the Army engineers.

Webb, William H., National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See attached schedule.[1] (2) Various individuals, corporations, and organizations, as indicated on attached schedule.[1] (3) As indicated in attached schedule, and for miscellaneous office, personal, and traveling expenses. (4) Waterways, Waterways Journal, and the Workboat. (5) All laws and regulations needed to promote the maintenance and improvement of waterways, the development and protection of water transportation, etc.

Weingarten, J. W., 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.; Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) No money received or expended by me during the quarter ending December 31, 1948, on account of lobbying activities. I received my regular monthly compensation described in last report for the duties of my office, but neither received nor expended any money in connection with any lobbying activity. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting railroad business.

Weitzer, Bernard; 3147 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, 50 West Seventy-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Money expended: Railroad fares, $23.16; plane, $29.33; hotel bills (including room and meals), $37.94; taxi fares, $47.35; miscellaneous office expenses, $1.85; postage, $6.22; telephone calls from booths, $5.95; salaries, $1,666.65, received by Bernard Weitzer. (2) Railroads, Pennsylvania plane, American Air Lines, hotels, New Yorker, Park Central in New York, various restaurants, various taxi drivers, various telephone booths, office expenses. (3) As indicated by the nature of expenses in (1). (4) The Jewish Veteran. (5) He is to support such legislation as will carry out the purposes of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America as expressed in the preamble to its constitution which follows and to oppose any legislation which would tend to frustrate the purposes therein expressed: "To maintain true allegiance to the United States of America, to foster and perpetuate true Americanism, to combat whatever tends to impair the efficiency and permanency of our free institutions, to uphold the fair name of the Jew and fight his battles wherever unjustly assailed, to encourage the doctrine of universal liberty, equal rights, and full justice to all men, to combat the powers of bigotry and darkness wherever originating and whatever their target; to preserve the spirit of comradeship by mutual helpfulness to comrades and their families; to cooperate with and support existing educational institutions and establish educational institutions and foster the education of ex-servicemen and our members in the ideals and principles of Americanism; to instill love of country and flag and to promote sound minds and bodies in our members and our youth; to preserve the memories and records of patriotic service performed by the men of our faith; to honor their memory and shield from neglect the graves of our heroic dead."

Welliver, Edward M., American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant received only his regular salary as shown in his registration. He expended a total of $51.80. (2) The money was paid to various taxi drivers employed in taking registrant between his office and the Capitol or House or Senate Office Buildings, and to clerks and cashiers for lunches at restaurants. (3) The money paid taxi drivers was for transportation to and from my office as indicated in (2). (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the trucking industry.

Wenchel, Tannenbaum & Nunan, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) No funds expended. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) To support changes in the Internal Revenue Code with respect to family partnerships.

West, Oscar H., 1001-2 Washington Loan and Trust Building, Ninth and F Streets NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Insurance Agents, 80 Maiden Lane, New York, N. Y. (1) No money received or expended during preceding calendar quarter. Status of registrant the same as stated in original Form B and accompanying letter of explanation, filed March 6, 1947. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Wescott, James B., 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.; Salt Producers Association, Book Building, Detroit, Mich. (1) During the calendar quarter ending December 31, 1948, the law firm of Miller, Gorham, Wescott & Adams, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill., of which firm registrant is a partner, received $7,500 from Salt Producers Association, Detroit, Mich. (2) See (1) above. Registrant made no expenditures. (3) Legal services rendered in connection with H. R. 2717 and H. R. 4211. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2717 and H. R. 4211. (Note.—Registrant performed no services, made no expenditures, and received no money during the calendar quarter ending September 30, 1948.)

White, John C., care of Fulbright, Croker, Freeman & White, 838 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C., American Cotton Shippers Association, Cotton Exchange Building, Memphis, Tenn. (1) No expenses. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Support S. 2202, European Recovery Act; S. 2376, Revolving Fund for Occupied Areas, Reciprocal Trade Agreements Extension. Oppose minimum margin legislation on futures exchanges; tax exemption of cooperatives.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

White, Richard P., American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 635–636 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts of salary, $2,500; expenses reimbursed by employers, $199.60. (2) Expenses paid to various air lines, railroads, hotels, clubs, restaurants, taxis, associations, etc. (3) Attending meetings of association committees, local associations, and payment for miscellaneous publications. (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation affecting the nursery industry.

Whitehall, Albert V., 1634 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Quarterly salary, $2,187.48; reimbursement of travel expenses, $151.65. (2) Various air lines, railroads, hotels, and recipients of miscellaneous amounts for taxicabs, meals and similar necessary expenses. (3) Necessary traveling expenses as indicated. (4) Hospitals, the official journal of the American Hospital Association Trustee, the journal for members of hospital governing boards. (5) Legislation which might affect the quality of hospital service to the people of this country.

Whitlock, Douglas, partner, Sanders, Gravelle, Whitlock & Howrey, Room 1032, Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C., Building Products Institute, Washington, D. C. (1) Total fee, $4,500; allocated $1,500 to legislative, and $3,000 to legal and administrative. Total expenses, $119.81; allocated $5.30 to legislative; and $114.51 to legal and administrative. (2) Notary, $3.50; telephone and telegraph, $7.76; travel, $100; postage, $1.80; restaurant, $6.75. (3) As indicated by items above. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation which may affect the producers of building materials.

Whyte, Louis E., Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. During this period there were no legislative matters of any character in which this association or its staff were interested. (2) No legislation pending; no expenditures. (3) [Blank.] (4) Natural Gas News Letter; not pertaining to legislation. (5) [Blank.]

Wickenden, Elizabeth, 522 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C., American Public Welfare Association, 1313 East Sixtieth Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) $800 (half-time salary). (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) A. P. W. A. Letter to members. (5) Social security amendments and other legislation affecting public welfare administration.

Wiley,[5] Mrs. Harvey W., District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs, 2345 Ashmead Place, Washington, D. C. (1) July, August, and September 1948. Voluntary worker; no money received during preceding calendar quarter. (2) See answer No. 1. (3) See answer No. 1. (4) District of Columbia Federation magazine September and November 1948. (5) A volunteer worker for the District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs.

Wiley,[5] Mrs. Harvey W., District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs, 2345 Ashmead Place, Washington, D. C. (1) October, November, and December 1948; voluntary worker. (2) See answer No. 1. (3) See answer No. 1. (4) [Blank.] (5) Chairman of legislation, District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs, not employed for pay.

Wilkinson, Ernest L., Francis M. Goodwin, and Glen A. Wilkinson, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Klamath Tribe of Indians of Oregon, Klamath Agency, Oreg. (1) Received $2,250, a portion of which is allocable to planning and drafting a legislative program. Expended $602.29 as follows: Travel, $486.60; telephone, $150.13; telegraph, $33.36; miscellaneous, $12.20. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) No activity on pending legislation; some work was done on prospective legislation to be presented to the members of the Oregon congressional delegation for their consideration.

Wilkinson, Ernest L., Francis M. Goodwin, and Glen A. Wilkinson, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Menominee Tribe of Indians of Wisconsin, Keshena, Wis. (1) Received $650 for legal services, of which only a small portion is properly allocable to legislative work. Expended $130.69 for travel, $24.95 for telephone, $1.63 for telegraph, and $1 for notary fees. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) No activity during quarter, except for preliminary preparation of possible legislative program.

Wilkinson, Ernest L., and Glen A. Wilkinson, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Radio Service Corp. of Utah, 10 South Main Street, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) No money received. Expenses consisted of 50-cent notary fee on lobbying reports filed in October 1948. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) No activity during the quarter covered by this report.

Willard, A. D., Jr., National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $6,250 received for services as executive vice president of the National Association of Broadcasters for the quarter ending December 31, 1948; $2,343.34 received as reimbursement for business expenses for same period. (2) Various air lines, railroads, taxi companies, communication companies, hotels, and restaurants, etc. (3) The amounts set forth above were received and/or expended in carrying out my normal duties as executive vice president, acting as administrative officer at the headquarters of the National Association of Broadcasters, only a small part of which duties directly or indirectly involve Federal legislation. None of this money was received or expended for the specific purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any Federal legislation. (4) None. Miscellaneous information is furnished to members through weekly bulletin. (5) None. I am interested in any legislation, Federal or State, which may affect the radio-broadcasting industry.

Willenbucher, Franz Otto, Retired Officers Association, 1600 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $1,500. No part of this sum was received specifically for the purpose of attempting to influence legislative action. (2) Expended: nothing. (3) See (1) above. (4) Retired Officers Association Bulletin. (5) Legislation affecting retired officers, warrant officers, and nurses of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

Williams, Myers & Quiggle (a law partnership, consisting of the following partners: Paul F. Myers, James Craig Peacock, Martin W. Meyer, John E. Skilling, and Robert H. Myers), National Food Brokers Association, et al., 817 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) On October 4, 1948, we received from the Washington Food Brokers Association $21.55 as reimbursement to us for taxi fares and $900 as payment of balance of fee due us for legal services rendered in this matter. No expenditures. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) S. 2469, which became Public Law 509 on May 3, 1948.

Williamson, C. J. S., 901 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; California State Chamber of Commerce, 350 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Annual salary received, $7,260; expense allowance, $1,800. Please note salary base for 1949 will be $8,000. (2) Owing to the fact that Congress was in adjournment during the last quarter of 1948, no portion of my salary or expense allowance was expended under the provisions of Public Law 601, second session, Seventy-ninth Congress, and for that reason no statement is filed. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.]

Williamson, John C., Veterans of Foreign Wars, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $540 per month as salary minus social-security and withholding taxes; $7.60 as expenses for transportation and luncheons in conection with legislative activities. (2) No record kept of recipients of taxicab fares and luncheons. (3) Transportation, social obligations, and normal luncheon requirements. (4) VFW Foreign Service, VFW Legislative Newsletter. (5) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation and housing; welfare of servicemen of the armed forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration, and naturalization, the combating of subversive activities, and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the national encampment and the national council of administration.

Willingham,[6] Carl H., Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; Oneida, Ltd., Oneida, N. Y.; National Association of Chain Drug Stores, 4 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Received, $4,250; expended, $456. (2) Railroads, planes, taxies, meals. (3) Travel. (4) None. (5) Excise taxes.

Willingham,[6] Carl H., Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; Oneida, Ltd., Oneida, N. Y.; National Association of Chain Drug Stores, 4 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Received, $5,000; expended, $546. (2) Railroad, planes, taxis, meals. (3) Travel. (4) None. (5) Excise taxes.

Wilson, E. Raymond, Friends Committee on National Legislation, 1000 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Gross salary (October, November, December), $1,500; travel expense, $201.38. (2) Carfare, room, meals, telephone and telegraph, and miscellaneous. See (1). (3) Travel is for the purpose of attending yearly meetings, quarterly meetings, conferences of Friends and other groups to interpret developments in national and international policy, with special reference to legislation, and for other committee business. (4) We send a newsletter to a limited number of subscribers and Friends about once a month. (5) In general, to support measures leading to peace and humanitarian ends, such as world organization and world economic stability, world disarmament, foreign relief, aid to refugees, protection for racial minorities, support for the rights of conscience, opposition to conscription, and the militarization of America.

Wilson, Eugene E., Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to establish a national air policy.

Wilson, Everett B., Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $750 monthly from Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, but not for principal purpose of influencing legislation, which is a minor part of my activities. (2) None for purpose of influencing legislation. (3) None. (4) Newspapers in Puerto Rico only. (5) None.

Wilson, J. B., Wyoming Wool Growers Association, McKinley, Wyo. (1) No money received for legislative work. The Wyoming Wool Growers Association pays my salary, amounting to $1,500, for the fourth quarter of 1948 and paid me $377.12 for traveling expense. The National Wool Growers Association, during the fourth quarter paid me $113.90 for traveling expense. In addition to

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed with the Clerk only.

the amount paid me by the National Wool Growers Association for traveling expense, they furnished me an air-travel card, and during the fourth quarter I charged air transportation to the National Wool Growers Association amounting to approximately $159.10. None of the money received for traveling expense was expended on legislative work. I was in Washington on October 18, 19, and 20 as a member of the Wool Advisory Committee to the Research and Marketing Administration. I traveled to and from Washington on a Government transportation request and the Government paid me per diem and auto expense from McKinley, Wyo., to Cheyenne, Wyo., and return, which was not sufficient to cover my hotel bill in Washington. No legislative work was done while I was in Washington attending the advisory committee meeting. (2) None. (3) None. (4) J. B. Wilson is editor of the Wyoming Wool Grower, a semimonthly publication published by the Wyoming Wool Growers Association for its members. (5) J. B. Wilson is not employed to support or oppose any legislation, but as secretary of the Wyoming Wool Growers Association he supports all legislation concerning wool, lamb, mutton, public lands, taxes, etc.

Wingert, E. L., Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, 1 West Main Street, Madison, Wis. (1) Received my share of retainer fee paid my firm for general services as legal counsel for Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, involving mainly services unrelated to Federal legislation. Aside from that, received nothing for use in influencing Federal legislation and expended nothing for that purpose. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Such legislation affecting business and industry generally as I may be instructed to give attention to from time to time.

Winston, James H., 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.; Salt Producers Association, Book Building, Detroit, Mich. (1) During the calendar quarter ending December 31, 1948, the law firm of Miller, Gorham, Wescott & Adams, of which firm registrant is a partner, received $7,500 from Salt Producers Association. (2) See (1). Registrant made no expenditures. (3) Legal services rendered in connection with H. R. 2717 and H. R. 4211. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2717 and H. R. 4211. Registrant performed no services, made no expenditures, and received no money during the calendar quarter ending September 30, 1948.

Winter, Everett T., 705 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr., Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) None for legislative purposes. (2) None for legislative purposes. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None at the present time.

Woodrum, Clifton A., president, American Plant Food Council, Inc., 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The registrant, Clifton A. Woodrum, nor his employer, the American Plant Food Council, Inc., neither received nor expended during last quarter any funds for the purpose of influencing directly or indirectly any legislation. (2) Please see letter filed with original registration. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Woodson, George W., 424 North Washington Avenue, Lansing, Mich.; Townsend Plan, Inc., 675 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Received in the past quarter, $1,290.20, which was spent for postage, supplies, printing, lodging, meals, travel, office fixtures, telephone, telegraph, and clerical hire. (2) Mr. Fay A. Bradley. (3) Clerical work. (4) None. (5) The Townsend plan.

Woodul, Walter F., 816 Chronicle Building, Houston, Tex.; Angelina & Neches River Railroad Co., Keltys, Tex.; Burlington-Rock Island Railroad Co., Houston, Tex.; Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co., Fort Worth, Tex.; Fort Worth & Denver City Railway Co., Fort Worth, Tex.; Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railway Co., Galveston, Tex.; Kansas City Southern Railway Co., Kansas City, Mo.; Louisiana & Arkansas Railway Co., Kansas City, Mo.; International Great Northern Railroad, Houston, Tex.; Missouri-Kansas-Texas of Texas, Dallas, Tex.; New Orleans, Texas & Mexico Railway Co., Houston, Tex.; Panhandle & Santa Fe Railway Co., Amarillo, Tex.; Paris & Mount Pleasant Railroad Co., Paris, Tex.; Quanah, Acme and Pacific Railway Co., Quanah, Tex.; St. Louis, San Francisco & Texas Railway Co., Fort Worth, Tex.; St. Louis, Southwestern Railway Co. of Texas, St. Louis, Mo.; Southern Pacific Co., San Francisco, Calif.; Texas Electric Railway Co., Dallas, Tex.; Texas & New Orleans Railroad Co., Houston, Tex.; Texas Southeastern Railroad Co., Diboll, Tex.; Texas & Pacific Railway Co., Dallas, Tex.; Texas Mexican Railway Co., Laredo, Tex.; Union Terminal Co., Dallas, Tex.; Wichita Falls & Southern Railroad Co., Wichita Falls, Tex.; Wichita Valley Railway Co., Fort Worth Tex. (1) Compensation as previously reported, and reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses for months of September, October, and November 1948, $467.85. (2) Pullman Co., $28.39; Southern Printing Co., Houston, Tex., $40.40; Yorks, Houston, Tex., $176.40; various hotels, eating places, and others, amounts less than $10. (3) Transportation, $28.39; hotel, $3.50; printing, $40.40; meals, $19.85; entertaining, $190.80; tips, telephones, taxies, and incidentals, $15.83. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting Texas railroads.

Woodward,[3] Albert Young, Signal Oil & Gas Co., 811 West Seventh Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) The undersigned engaged in no activities for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress during the period July 1 to October 10, 1948, inclusive. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) In addition to general activities unrelated to legislation, undersigned observes, analyes, and reports on items of legislation introduced in Congress affecting oil and oil operations.

Woodward,[4] Albert Young, Signal Oil & Gas Co., 811 West Seventh Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) The undersigned engaged in no activities for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress during the period October 1, 1948, to January 1, 1949, inclusive. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) In addition to general activities unrelated to legislation, undersigned observes, analyzes, and reports on items of legislation introduced in Congress affecting oil and oil operations.

Wootton, Edward W., Wine Institute, 900 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $3,000 quarterly, salary as manager of the Washington office of the Wine Institute, principal offices at 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (2) Received by the undersigned for all personal services rendered as manager of this office, some of which services involve legislative activity. (3) See (1) and (2) above. No expenditures were made by undersigned to any other person for legislative purposes. (4) None. (5) No legislative activity this quarter.

Wozencraft, Frank W., 605 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; Independent Bankers Association, Twelfth Federal Reserve District, Failing Building, Portland, Oreg. (1) $3,000, fees for services; $993.70, reimbursement for traveling, telephone, and telegraph (including that paid to firm of Case & Wozencraft). (2) Air lines, hotels, etc., in connection with travel involved, Western Union, and telephone company. (3) See (2) above. (4) None. (5) Bank holding company legislation.

Wright, Mrs. Leslie B., chairman of legislation, General Federation of Women's Clubs, 4620 Thirtieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) For October, November, and December 1948; for postage, material, and miscellaneous expense $15.40; for expense attending General Federation board meeting, October 1948, $23; total $38.40. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) [Blank.] (5) Not employed for pay. A volunteer worker for the General Federation of Women's Clubs. The General Federation supports legislation which pertains to the welfare of the home and to the general welfare, after given authority through the adoption of resolution by the delegate body.

Yeaman,[5] Addison, Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp., 1600 West Hill Street, Louisville, Ky. (1) Registrant has received no moneys and has expended no moneys except his regular salary and traveling expenses, which were paid without regard to registrant's activities under the so-called Lobbying Act. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) None. (5) H. R. 3912.

Yeaman,[6] [11] Addison, 1600 West Hill Street, Louisville, Ky. (1) Registrant during the quarter ending June 30, 1948, received no moneys and expended no moneys except his regular salary and traveling expenses, which were paid without regard to registrant's activities under the so-called Lobbying Act. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) None. (5) H. R. 3912.

Yeaman,[8] Addison, Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp., 1600 West Hill Street, Louisville, Ky. (1) Registrant has received no moneys and has expended no moneys except his regular salary and traveling expenses, which were paid without regard to registrant's activities under the so-called Lobbying Act. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) None. (5) H. R. 3912.

Yonkers, Andrew J., Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Money received: Salary (this represents one-quarter of the amount of registrant's annual remuneration which is attributable to the performance of duties which are subject to the Lobbying Act), $875; reimbursement for traveling expenses, $495.98; total, $1,370.98. Money expended (in connection with duties related to the Lobbying Act), $495.98. (2) Railroads, airlines, taxis, hotels, restaurants, telephones, and tips. (3) Normal traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

Young, Donald A., Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,375; expended, $5.10; meals, $3.55; transportation, $1.55. (2) Restaurant and taxi companies. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation of interest to business.

Young, Robert R., 4500 Chrysler Building, New York, N. Y.; Federation for Railway Progress, 1326 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Railway Progress (vol. II, No. 5, July 1948; vol. II, No. 6, 1948; vol. II, No. 7, 1948; vol. II, No. 8, 1948; vol. II, No. 9, 1948; vol. II, No. 10, 1948). (5) None.

Zook, John D., 820 Huntington Bank Building, 17 South High Street, Columbus, Ohio; Ohio Chamber of Commerce, Columbus, Ohio. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation dealing with social security, business, taxation, and other matters of interest to our organization.

[3] Filed for third quarter 1948.
[4] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.
[5] Filed with the Secretary only.
[6] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[8] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.
[11] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1949

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, facing decisions which make our wisdom or our folly affect the lives of untold millions, our need of the Divine leading is very deep. As we come to this quiet, noontide cloister of the eternal may we be strengthened for waiting tasks by the far look. Enable us to bear with fortitude the fret of care, the sting of criticism, the drudgery of unapplauded toil; to think clearly, to act kindly, to play manfully our part in the life of our times, to strike our blow for freedom and, keeping to the end of our brief day the unbroken vigil of the inner light, to leave the world better for our sojourn in it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 14, 1949, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2313. An act to suspend certain import taxes on copper;

H. R. 2402. An act to extend the Office of War Assets Administrator and the War Assets Administration from February 28, 1949, until June 30, 1949;

H. R. 2632. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 84. Joint resolution to provide for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train by the Archivist of the United States, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ellender	Jenner
Anderson	Ferguson	Johnson, Colo.
Baldwin	Frear	Johnson, Tex.
Brewster	Fulbright	Kefauver
Bricker	George	Kerr
Broughton	Gillette	Kilgore
Butler	Green	Knowland
Byrd	Gurney	Langer
Cain	Hayden	Lodge
Capehart	Hendrickson	Long
Chapman	Hickenlooper	Lucas
Connally	Hill	McCarran
Cordon	Hoey	McClellan
Donnell	Holland	McFarland
Douglas	Humphrey	McGrath
Downey	Hunt	McKellar
Eastland	Ives	McMahon
Magnuson	O'Mahoney	Thomas, Okla.
Malone	Pepper	Thomas, Utah
Martin	Reed	Thye
Maybank	Robertson	Tobey
Miller	Saltonstall	Tydings
Millikin	Schoeppel	Vandenberg
Morse	Smith, Maine	Watkins
Mundt	Smith, N. J.	Wiley
Murray	Sparkman	Williams
Myers	Stennis	Withers
Neely	Taft	Young
O'Conor	Taylor	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Finance, the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], I ask that the Committee on Finance be permitted to continue its hearings on the reciprocal trade-agreement program this afternoon while the Senate is in session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission is granted.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine asked and obtained leave for the Subcommittee on Home Rule of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia to sit during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, there is pending before the Armed Services Committee the nomination of Mr. Mon C. Wallgren for Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, and a hearing was held on that nomination this morning. The committee unanimously directed me to ask unanimous consent, in the event the Senate were in session at 3 o'clock this afternoon, that the committee may sit and continue the hearing at that time; and I so request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, there is pending before the Committee on the Judiciary Senate Joint Resolution No. 2 proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the election of President and Vice President. As chairman of a subcommittee of that committee, I desire to announce that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, February 23, 1949, at 10 o'clock a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on the resolution referred to. Persons desiring to be heard should notify the committee by Monday, February 21, so that a schedule can be prepared for those who wish to appear.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the Sixty-fifth Annual Report of the United States Civil Service Commission. This report covers the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 17, 1949.*

(The report accompanied a similar message to the House of Representatives.)

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY (S. Doc. No. 14)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Federal Works Agency, amounting to $11,500,000, and proposed contract authorization in the amount of $2,550,000, fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR (S. Doc. No. 13)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of the Interior, amounting to $700,000, fiscal year 1949 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY (S. Doc. No. 12)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Federal Works Agency, amounting to $5,400,000, fiscal year 1949 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS AGAINST FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the settlement of certain claims of the Government of the United States on its own behalf and on behalf of American nationals against foreign governments (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S EMERGENCY FUND

A letter from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for further contributions to the International Children's Emergency Fund (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

GOVERNMENT FOR AMERICAN SAMOA

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a resolution adopted by The Fono of American Samoa, relating to a change in the form of its government (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE RELATING TO DESTRUCTION OF LETTER BOXES OR MAIL

A letter from the Postmaster General of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1705 of title 18 of the United States Code (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED ECONOMIC STABILIZATION ACT OF 1949

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a copy of the proposed Economic Stabilization Act of 1949, together with a summary thereof (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

VOLUNTARY PLANS FOR ALLOCATION OF STEEL PRODUCTS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of amendments, requests, and letters of compliance with the amendments and requests to voluntary plans for allocation of steel products (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON LEASES BY DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of leases, in two sections, (1) cumulative report as of June 1, 1948, and (2) additional leases as of December 1, 1948, under authority of Public Law 364, Eightieth Congress (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF ACT OF JUNE 18, 1929, RELATING TO APPORTIONMENT OF REPRESENTATIVES IN CONGRESS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of June 18, 1929, relating to apportionment of Representatives in Congress (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT OF GOVERNMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the official operations of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT ON HEARINGS ON PUBLIC LOW-RENT HOUSING, ETC.

A letter from the Acting President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, reporting, pursuant to law, on the hearings for public low-rent housing to determine whether administrative or interpretive difficulties or unsatisfactory progress in the provision of low-rent housing requires a modification thereof, and a survey on income of white and nonwhite families in the District of Columbia (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a study, prepared by the Commission's consideration on management, organization, and administration of the Post Office Department (appendix I) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's report on the Post Office Department and, separately, the report of the investigation and recommendation of Robert Heller and Associates, Inc. (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"*To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled:*

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine in the ninty-fourth legislative session assembled, most respectfully present and petion your honorable body as follows:

"Whereas Josef Cardinal Mindszenty of Hungary was sentenced to life imprisonment by the Government of Hungary; and

"Whereas we memorialists feel that such sentence threatens freedom of religion and speech: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we, your memorialists, do hereby respectfully petition and urge the Members of Congress to take whatever action that can be taken to have the sentence imposed upon Josef Cardinal Mindszenty of Hungary removed; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this memorial duly authenticated by the secretary of state, be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state, by air mail, to the proper officers and committees of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, the President of the United States, and to each of the Representatives and Senators representing the State of Maine in the United States Congress."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"House Joint Memorial 3

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to assist local lending agencies in financing disaster stricken livestock producers and feeders in the blizzard areas of the Western States

"Whereas unprecedented and widespread blizzards have recently wreaked disastrous losses on the livestock producers and feeders in the intermountain west to an extent and in an amount never before experienced; and

"Whereas the physical and financial losses suffered by such livestock operators in these storms of catastrophic proportions will seriously hamper, if not entirely preclude, the future operations on a practical basis of many livestock producers and feeders in this region, and will thus seriously affect the meat supply of this Nation for an indefinite period unless financial assistance is made available to them immediately; and

"Whereas the presently established banks and other livestock loaning agencies are fully staffed and prepared to service and pass upon the financial needs of these disaster-stricken livestock producers and feeders: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Thirty-seventh General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the senate concurring herein)*, That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby urged to enact such legislation as it deems necessary to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make its facilities available to the local banks and other lending agencies by way of guaranteeing loans to livestock producers and feeders to the extent of 90 percent of any such loans and budget advances made to them, the local lending agencies in turn to carry 10 percent of such commitments, and otherwise to assist and facilitate the services of such agencies in meeting the local requirements occasioned by the widespread and disastrous losses in the blizzard areas of the Western States; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Colorado in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Joint Memorial No. 4

"*To the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:*

"We, your memorialists, the Forty-fifth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in regular session assembled, respectfully represent as follows:

"Whereas Depoe Bay is located 100 miles south of the Columbia River on the Oregon coast; and

"Whereas there has been recommended the development of said Depoe Bay by the River and Harbor Act of 1945, in accordance with the United States Corps of Engineers' report contained in House Document No. 350, Seventy-seventh Congress; and

"Whereas the United States Corps of Engineers is prepared to start construction of this project immediately upon the appropriation of funds therefor; and

"Whereas the present conditions of said Depoe Bay result in lost time of commercial fishing boats, lost recreation facilities to vacationists and tourists, damage to boats in said bay at low tide and restricted use of said bay for rescue use by the United States Coast Guard motorboat stationed at Depoe Bay; and

"Whereas completion of this project will provide greater income to all commercial fishing boats, increased recreational facilities for tourist trade in the State of Oregon, elimination of damage to boats now using said Depoe Bay at low tide and the unrestricted use of this bay for rescue by the United States Coast Guard motorboat stationed at said bay; and

"Whereas the sum of $462,000 is necessary for the construction required on this project: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the house of representatives jointly concurring therein)*, That the Eighty-first Congress of the United States be and the same hereby is memorialized to further consider and make an appropriation in the amount of $462,000 available to the United States Corps of Engineers for the completion of the authorized Depoe Bay improvement project: Be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this memorial be forwarded to each House of the Congress and to each Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Oregon and to each of the United States Senators from this State, and urge that they individually and collectively give wholehearted support to bring about this appropriation.

"Adopted by senate February 3, 1949.

"Concurred in by house February 8, 1949."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 3

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to consider and pass legislation appropriating funds to complete construction of the Glendo Dam Project in Platte County, Wyo.

"Whereas the construction of the Glendo Dam project has been surveyed and all other preliminary work completed and suitable materials for the construction thereof are available adjacent to the project area; and

"Whereas the dam is to be constructed for the purposes of generating electricity, of which there is a shortage in the area, and also for the purpose of flood control; and

"Whereas the project when completed will have a capacity of 150,000 acre-feet of storage water for power-generating purposes; and will have a maximum capacity of 750,000 acre-feet for flood-control purposes; and

"Whereas construction of the project has been suspended for the reason that funds are unavailable: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of the Thirtieth Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the senate concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States of America be, and is hereby, memorialized to appropriate sufficient funds for the completion of the Glendo Dam project, and that copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives; to United States Senators Joseph C. O'Mahoney and Lester C. Hunt; Congressman Frank A. Barrett; J. A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior; and Michael W. Straus, Commissioner of Reclamation.

"Approved February 5, 1949.

"A. G. CRANE,
"*Governor.*"

A resolution of the Senate of the Legislature of the State of Connecticut; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Resolution memorializing the Eighty-first Congress of the United States of America regarding means of attaining a stronger and more effective world government through the United Nations

"Whereas the youths of the State of Connecticut now under the legal voting age have not had an opportunity by means of a referendum to express their views regarding a stronger and more effective world government through the United Nations; and

"Whereas these youths wish to express their support of a strong United Nations to prevent future world conflicts of major scale by the following means, to wit:

"SECTION 1. That the Security Council of the United Nations be given executive powers to quell disturbances of international peace;

"SEC. 2. That an international police force be established with powers to enforce decisions of the Security Council of the United Nations;

"SEC. 3. That the Security Council of the United Nations be given the right to inspect armament and munitions plants and the right to control the production of weapons of war and destruction within any and all national boundaries; and

"SEC. 4. That no member nation of the United Nations be allowed to resign from or secede from the United Nations: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Connecticut*, That the Eighty-first Congress of the United States of America be memorialized regarding these means of obtaining a stronger world government through the United Nations.

"*Resolved*, That certified copies of the foregoing preamble and resolution be forwarded by the Governor of the State of Connecticut to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, The President of the Senate of the United States, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Concurrent Resolution 5

"Concurrent resolution memorializing and requesting the Congress of the United States to enact a bill to aid the State in the enforcement of the cigarette tax now evaded by use of the United States mails

"Whereas the State of Oklahoma has seen fit to impose a tax on the sale and use of cigarettes within its boundaries, and the revenues so obtained constitute an important portion of the funds available for its functions of government; and

"Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Oklahoma that a large and growing system of evasion of such tax law has developed; that the United States mails are flooded with advertisements and inducements to the citizens of this State to violate the law of this State; that in numerous instances such advertisers entice prospective customers with statements to the effect that the use of the United States mails is sufficient proof of the legitimacy of such business and such a system; that the mails of the United States are constantly flooded with cigarettes in the process of delivery within this State, and on which cigarettes the tax required by the laws of this State have not and will not be paid; that this State is seriously disadvantaged by such use of the Postal Offices and mails of the United States for the purpose of evading the laws of Oklahoma; and that Oklahoma faces and is now suffering serious losses of revenue as a result of such system of evasion; and

"Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the House of Representatives and the Senate of Oklahoma that there is now pending before the Congress of the United States a proposed bill which would aid the States by requiring shippers of cigarettes in interstate commerce to furnish to the taxing authority of the State to which shipped a copy of the invoice on each shipment and the name and address of each person to whom shipped: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma (the senate concurring therein)*, That the Congress of the United States be and the same is hereby memorialized and respectfully urged to enact a bill requiring shippers of cigarettes in interstate commerce to furnish to the taxing authority of the State to which shipped a copy of the invoice on each such shipment; or to enact such other bill to the aid of the several States affected as may be proper; be it further

"*Resolved*, That duly authenticated copies of this resolution be forwarded immediately to the Presiding Officers of the respective Houses of Congress.

"Adopted by the house of representatives the 10th day of January 1949.

"Adopted by the senate the 11th day of January 1949."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Public Works:

"House Concurrent Resolution 3

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to enact effective legislation providing for flood control in the Wabash River watershed area and tributaries thereto

"Whereas each year the overflow of the many rivers, streams, creeks, and tributaries which empty into the Wabash River creates a flood condition imperiling life and causing property damage throughout the entire Wabash Valley, contributing at the same time to similar conditions which exist in the Southern States through which the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers flow; and

"Whereas the specific consequences of such flood conditions are: silting and sedimentation of stream channels, reservoirs, dams, ditches, and harbors; loss of soil and water; and increase in the speed and volume of rainfall run-off, causing severe and increasing floods, which bring suffering, disease, and death, impoverishment of families, damage to roads, highways, railways, buildings, and other property from floods; and losses in navigation, hydroelectric power, municipal water supply, and underground water reserve: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring)*:

"SECTION 1. The Eighty-sixth General Assembly of the State of Indiana does hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to enact effective legislation for the control of floods and the prevention of soil erosion, to preserve natural resources, prevent impairment of dams and reservoirs, assist in maintaining the navigability of rivers, protect and promote the health, safety, and general welfare of the people, and to appropriate sufficient funds for the execution of such legislation.

"SEC. 2. The principal clerk of this house is directed to forward copies of this resolution to the Secretary of the United States Senate, to the Clerk of the National House of Representatives, and to each United States Senator and Congressman from Indiana."

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by Charles W. Holman, of Washington, D. C., relating to the removal of restrictions on yellow oleomargarine (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A letter in the nature of a petition from C. B. Wilson, president and general manager, Taylor-Wilson Chevrolet Co., Paducah, Ky., relating to the construction of a steam-operated power plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from A. L. Marcum, of Louisville, Ky., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for a decrease in Federal expenditures; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Memorials of sundry citizens of the United States, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to provide universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the United States, praying for the enactment of legislation to extend rent control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Memorials of sundry citizens of the United States, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to provide rent control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter in the nature of a petition from John M. Davis, of Arlington, Va., praying for the enactment of legislation to include as war service all military personnel who have served in foreign service campaigns; to the Committee on Finance.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the United States, praying for the enactment of legislation to broaden the provisions of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the United States, relating to social security; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Jessamine County Bar Association, Nicholasville, Ky., favoring the enactment of House bill 1639, Eightieth Congress, relating to venue of trials under Employers' Liability Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Petition of C. H. R. Hovde, of Los Angeles, Calif., praying for a redress of grievances against J. Edgar Hoover, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Gerard Piel, chairman, board of editors, Scientific American, New York, N. Y., on behalf of himself and sundry other citizens of the United States, relating to the general charges against Dr. Edward U. Condon, Director of the United States Bureau of Standards (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen of the City of Chelsea, Mass., favoring the repeal of the Displaced Persons' Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolutions adopted by the City Council of the City of Phoenix, Ariz.; the City Council of the City of Niagara Falls, N. Y.; the City Council of the City of Omaha, Nebr.; the Common Council of the City of Hamtramck, Mich.; and the Board of Commissioners of the City of Bayonne, N. J., favoring the enactment of legislation proclaiming October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the United States relating to the trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Resolutions adopted by the Philadelphia (Pa.) County Council, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, the Massachusetts Mayors' Association, New Bedford, Mass., and the city council of the city of Elizabeth, N. J., relating to the trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Edna Proctor Post, No. 192, Department of Kentucky, Louisville, Ky., signed by Elizabeth Ruf, commander, favoring an interchange of Ambassadors with Spain; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Two telegrams, in the nature of petitions, signed by Cesar A. Toro, governor, Lions International, and Sergio Gelpi, president, Lions Club, both of San Juan, Puerto Rico, requesting that Puerto Rico be included in the bill providing Federal aid to education; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Frank H. Boos, president, State Bar of Michigan, Lansing, Mich., relating to the Taft-Hartley labor law (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Memorials of sundry citizens of the United States remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing socialized medicine; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter, in the nature of a petition, from Juan Miranda and Antonio Sanchez, of Isabela, Puerto Rico, relating to the minimum-wage and social-security laws; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the United States favoring the enactment of legislation providing an increased hourly rate of compensation under the minimum-wage law; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The petition of Lowell K. Bentley, of Fort Dodge, Iowa, relating to the retention by nonveteran postal employees of their seniority and employment; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MYERS:

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Erie, Pa., favoring the enactment of legislation proclaiming October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"House Concurrent Resolution C

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to increase the share of Federal participation and increase the annual appropriation under Public Law 725

"Whereas hospital construction costs have continued to rise to a point where it has become increasingly difficult for communities in North Dakota to finance hospital construction; and

"Whereas many of the communities in the areas of greatest need for hospital facilities find it impossible to meet the financial burden even with the present 33⅓ percent of Federal participation for approved projects under Public Law 725; and

"Whereas this condition tends to defeat one of the primary purposes of Public Law 725, which is to give special consideration to hospitals serving rural communities and areas with relatively small financial resources; and

"Whereas the Federal Government in several grant-in-aid programs pays 50 percent and in some cases 100 percent of the cost; and

"Whereas the increased share of Federal participation is necessary if hospital construction is to go forward in the areas of greatest relative need in North Dakota: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein)*, That the Congress of the United States be and hereby is memorialized and petitioned to amend Public Law 725 by increasing the Federal share of participation in the construction of approved hospital projects from 33⅓ percent to 50 percent and to increase the annual appropriation under said law to meet the added cost of the revised share of Federal participation, and that the provisions be made retroactive so that hospital projects approved on the Federal construction schedules prior to the enactment of these amendments may benefit from the increased share of Federal participation; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Federal Security Administrator, to the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, and to North Dakota's delegation in Congress."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.)

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. LODGE):

Resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to use all possible means to secure the release of Cardinal Mindszenty, of the Roman Catholic faith, and Bishop Ordass, of the Lutheran faith.

"Whereas the whole civilized world and all individuals who believe in God regardless of race, creed, or denomination, and that freedom of religion is necessary in this troubled world have been profoundly shocked by the arrest, imprisonment, and sentence of His Eminence Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, of the Roman Catholic faith, and the arrest and imprisonment of Bishop Lajos Ordass, of the Lutheran faith, by the Communist government of Hungary; and

"Whereas it appears that there is no justification for such arrest, imprisonment, and sentence but that it is actuated solely by the desire to destroy religious freedom and freedom of worship; and

"Whereas Hungary, recently styled 'a people's republic,' a satellite of Soviet Russia, has shown its utter disregard for freedom of religion in making the arrest and causing the imprisonment of these two men of God; Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts desires to register an emphatic protest to the Government of Hungary in causing the arrest and imprisonment of these two churchmen; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts urges the President of the United States and the Secretary of State and the Members of Congress from this Commonwealth to take appropriate action to convey to the Hungarian Government the demand of the people of this country that Cardinal Mindszenty and Bishop Ordass be immediately released; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"In senate, adopted, February 9, 1949.

"In house of representatives, adopted, in concurrence, February 9, 1949."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate resolutions of the General Court of the State of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.)

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A resolution of the House of Delegates of Maryland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Resolution protesting the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty

"Whereas the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty of Hungary constitutes an attack by atheistic communism upon the freedom of religion; and

"Whereas prominent members of various religious groups in this country have characterized this unjust trial as a gross crime against freedom and as a rape of justice, these persons, including Archbishop Keough of Baltimore, Cardinal Spellman, archbishop of New York, the Reverend Daniel A. Poling, president of the World Christian Endeavor Union, and the Reverend Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the Senate of the United States and pastor of Foundry Methodist Church in Washington, D. C.; and

"Whereas Cardinal Mindszenty was imprisoned in a Nazi concentration camp during World War II for his efforts in saving fifteen hundred Hungarian Jews from the clutches of the German Gestapo, thereby proving himself a defender of and a martyr for civil rights and humanity; and

"Whereas this trial is part of a world-wide conspiracy of atheistic communism to threaten not only the countries of eastern Europe but also the liberty, democracy, and very life of the United States; and

"Whereas representatives of the freedom-loving nations were barred from the courtroom during the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty; and

"Whereas Senator HERBERT R. O'CONOR has asked the intervention of the State Department of the United States in this matter, seeking to ascertain whether the Soviet and Hungarian Governments have violated the basic guaranties of the United Nations as to freedom of worship, fair and impartial trials, and freedom of speech: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Delegates of Maryland*, That this body, representing a great State, in which toleration and freedom of religion not only are guaranteed by the Constitution but also are part of the very fabric of its citizens, solemnly protests the outrageous crime against religion and humanity now being perpetrated in the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That this resolution be spread upon the journal of the house and that the chief clerk be, and he is hereby, instructed to send copies thereof to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State of the United States, and to each member of the Maryland delegation in the Congress of the United States.

"Read and adopted by the house of delegates, February 7, 1949."

A resolution of the House of Delegates of Maryland; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress

"Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

"Whereas the 11th day of October 1779 is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

"Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Kansas, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union, through legislative enactment, designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and

"Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated October 11, 1929, October 11, 1931, October 11, 1932, and October 11, 1946, to be General Pulaski's Memorial Day in the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Delegates of Maryland*, That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day Resolution now pending in the United States Congress; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the house be and he is hereby directed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each of the United States Senators and Representatives from Maryland.

"Read and adopted by the house of delegates February 1, 1949."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution of the House of Delegates of Maryland, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.)

PROTEST AGAINST FEDERALIZING NATIONAL GUARD—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF SOUTH DAKOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I present a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of South Dakota urging Congress not to pass legislation which would federalize our State National Guard. I heartily concur in the resolution, and ask that it be appropriately referred and printed in the body of the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 5

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America not to enact legislation federalizing the National Guard of the several States of the Union

Whereas certain proposals and recommendations have been made that the National Guard of the several States be federalized; and

Whereas it is the considered judgment of the thirty-first session of the legislature of the State of South Dakota that to federalize the National Guard of the several States will not benefit the national defense program; that it will be detrimental to the effectiveness of such program in that it will destroy local initiative and relieve the States of their responsibility and duty to the Nation to maintain a military establishment available for national service in time of emergency: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the thirty-first session of the South Dakota Legislature, the House of Representatives concurring therein, do urge and recommend that the Congress of the United States refrain from adopting legislation federalizing the National Guard of the several States; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to His Excellency, the President of the United States, to the honorable the Secretary of War of the United States, to the chairmen of the Committees on Military Affairs of both Houses of Congress, to the Honorable CHAN GURNEY and Hon. KARL MUNDT, United States Senators from South Dakota, and to the Honorable FRANCIS CASE and the Honorable HAROLD O. LOVRE, Representatives in Congress from South Dakota, and to the Presiding Officers of both Houses of the Congress of the United States.

HOSPITAL BEDS FOR VETERANS

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Council of Administration of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the Department of the State of South Carolina, relating to hospital beds for veterans.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas plans for 16,000 proposed Veterans' Administration hospital beds have been ordered by the President of the United States to be canceled; and

Whereas the greatest need of veterans of this great country is for prompt, proper, and adequate hospitalization of those suffering from physical and mental disabilities; and

Whereas it is a matter of common knowledge that all presently available hospital facilities of the Veterans' Administration are being utilized to capacity and there is a clearly demonstrated need for expansion of existing facilities; and

Whereas the President's order has necessitated plans in the Veterans' Administration to cancel plans for 24 proposed hospitals and reduce the size of 14 other hospitals; and

Whereas such curtailment of bed facilities is calculated to increase the suffering of veterans throughout this Nation by causing the Veterans' Administration to be unable to hospitalize many who may be in real and immediate need of hospital facilities; and

Whereas failure to hospitalize veterans promptly will ultimately result in aggravation of injuries and suffering which in turn will result in increased claims against the Government; and

Whereas the policy of present curtailment appears to be a penny-wise-pound-foolish action aimed at present savings which may mean several times the amount saved in future costs; and

Whereas the protection of sick and disabled veterans and their dependents is a primary responsibility of all able-bodied veterans, their organizations, and the people of the United States, and is the main reason for the existence of veterans' organizations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Council of Administration of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the Department of the State of South Carolina:

1. That this body do go on record as opposing, in principle, the said order of the President of the United States.

2. That the Members of Congress from South Carolina be forwarded copies of this resolution along with a list of all facilities affected by the Presidential order noted above with the request that they support legislation which may effectuate the completion of the Veterans' Administration hospitalization program as initially scheduled.

PROTEST AGAINST ARREST AND IMPRISONMENT OF RELIGIOUS LEADERS OF HUNGARY AND BULGARIA

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by members of the P. N. Lynch Assembly, No. 704, Knights of Columbus, of South Carolina, in regular meeting assembled, protesting against the arrest and imprisonment of outstanding religious leaders in portions of Hungary and Bulgaria, and so forth:

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas we have learned from press and radio releases that certain countries allegedly democratically governed, but actually controlled and dominated by atheistic, communistic governments, have without cause, reason, or any sense of justice, arrested and imprisoned the outstanding religious leaders in portions of Hungary and Bulgaria and other Communist-dominated countries; and

Whereas the authorities conducting such arrests and trials have not permitted members of the free press of the United States and Great Britain to be present at any of the hearings or trial; and

Whereas the afore-mentioned religious leaders so falsely arrested, tried, and convicted because of their faith and belief in God and in true democratic government

must of necessity oppose the atheistic, communistic element now in control of the governments of Hungary and Bulgaria: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of P. N. Lynch Assembly, No. 704, Knights of Columbus, in regular meeting assembled, do deplore the mock trial, treatment, and hardships inflicted on our brother Christians and Jews in the afore-mentioned countries; and further

Resolved, That we commend our President, our Secretary of State, and all civil and religious leaders who have unhesitatingly condemned the mockery of justice now prevailing in this section of eastern Europe; and finally

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be inscribed on the minute books of this assembly and that copies of the resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to the Honorable Burnet R. Maybank, to the Honorable L. Mendel Rivers, to the Honorable J. Strom Thurmond, and to the editors of the Charleston Evening Post and the News and Courier.

TRIAL OF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY—TELEGRAM FROM REV. LOUIS R. WILLIAMSON AND REV. ALLAN R. JEFFORDS

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram from Rev. Louis R. Williamson and Rev. Allan R. Jeffords, of St. Mary's Church, Hartsville, S. C., condemning the inhuman trial of Cardinal Mindszenty. I may add that I have already publicly condemned the treatment accorded Cardinal Mindszenty.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARTSVILLE, S. C., *February 16, 1949.*

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
United States Senator from South Carolina, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Respectfully request you make strong public statement for record condemning inhuman trial of Cardinal Mindszenty and urge State Department to take effective diplomatic, economic, and United Nations steps toward bringing Hungarian atheist Reds to senses.

Rev. LOUIS R. WILLIAMSON,
Rev. ALLAN R. JEFFORDS,
St. Mary's Church.

MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY—RESOLUTION OF GERING AND FORT LARAMIE IRRIGATION DISTRICT OF GERING, NEBR.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Gering and Fort Laramie irrigation district of Gering, Nebr., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 555, to provide for a Missouri Valley Authority.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Whereas in the Seventy-ninth Congress there was introduced a bill to provide for a Missouri Valley Authority, known as S. 555; and

Whereas in opposition to this bill we adopted a resolution on July 3, 1945, quoted as follows: "*Resolved*, That we are definitely opposed to a Missouri Valley Authority that would include in its scope the North Platte River and thereby radically alter our irrigation operations in any way, or that would subject our irrigation interests to wide governmental interference and restrictions under the guise of all-out social plans or programs"; and

Whereas our district authorized its president, Kent Lane, of Lyman, Nebr., to appear before the congressional committee of the Seventy-ninth Congress in opposition to the bill on behalf of our district and others representative of stability and welfare of the people of the North Platte Valley as a result of sentiment expressed at a mass meeting held in Scottsbluff, Nebr., on September 6, 1945; and

Whereas it is now reported that a new Missouri Valley Authority bill is being prepared for introduction into the Eighty-first Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the board of directors of the Gering and Fort Laramie irrigation district of Gering, Nebr., That we have not changed our position in this connection and that we reiterate our opposition to any bill of this nature which would place administration in the hands of strangers, deprive local interests of representation, and invade State's rights; and be it further

Resolved, That we favor the continued development of the Missouri Valley Basin under the Pick-Sloan plan, which is now going forward constructively in charge of the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, two well-established governmental agencies of long standing and high reputation.

BAN ON USE OF YELLOW COLORING IN OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, two of the many resolutions which I have received from dairy organizations in my State, urging the banning of yellow color of oleomargarine in order to prevent fraud in competition with butter.

One of these resolutions is from the Farmers Union in Barron County, in my State, a county in which I myself have owned and operated a farm since 1916.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas we, the members of the Barron County Farmers Educational Union, are concerned about the welfare of our members: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we, the Barron County Farmers Educational Union, gathered at our annual convention, this 11th day of December 1948, do hereby respectfully submit the following resolution that we back the program of the National Milk Producers Federation, in demanding a law to ban the use of yellow coloring in oleo or any other substitution by anyone; therefore be it

Resolved, That we send a copy to the Wisconsin Farmers Union State office and to all of our Representatives and United States Senators.

NORMAN FANKHAUSER,
County President.
ALICE LE JEUNE,
County Secretary.

FEBRUARY 5, 1949.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY:

The following resolution pertaining to the oleomargarine legislation was passed and signed by members of the Inter-Breed Association of Wisconsin, which represents all of our State's purebred dairy cattle breeders.

"We will support removal of Federal taxes on oleomargarine and the license fees and reporting requirements controlling manufacturers and distributors of the product, provided adequate legislation is enacted to ban the manufacture and sale in commerce of oleomargarine colored yellow in imitation or semblance of butter."

Mrs. Jack Reynolds, Secretary-Treasurer, Holstein-Friesian Association of Wisconsin, West Allis; Willard R. Evans, President, Brown Swiss Association of Wisconsin, Waukesha; Charles C. Bruce, National Fieldman, Holstein-Friesian Association, Lone Rock; R. J. McCarthy, President, Milking Shorthorn Association of Wisconsin, Cottage Grove; George D. Britts, Secretary, Guernsey Association of Wisconsin, Waukesha; Richard A. Breckett, President, Wisconsin Jersey Breeders Association, Elk Mound; V. L. Peterson, National Fieldman, Jersey Association, Columbus, Ohio; G. B. Price, Secretary, Jersey Association of Wisconsin, Kenosha; M. L. Witz, Director, Guernsey Association of Wisconsin, Mauston; Leonard Seybold, President, Holstein-Friesian Association of Wisconsin, Forest Junction; Thy Johnson, Secretary, American Jersey Cattle Club, Columbus, Ohio.

JOSEF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Lynn, Mass., together with an editorial from the Daily Evening Item, of Lynn, Mass., relating to the trial and conviction of Cardinal Mindszenty.

There being no objection the resolution and editorial were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF LYNN, IN CITY COUNCIL,
February 8, 1949.

Ordered, That the city clerk, as clerk of the city council, be and hereby is requested to forward communications to our Senators and Representatives in Congress protesting and bitterly denouncing the travesty of justice enacted in the Communist-dominated courts of Hungary in the trial and conviction of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty; and be it further

Ordered, That the City Council of the City of Lynn, in the foregoing respect, endorses the editorial in the Daily Evening Item of this date entitled "Budapest's Real Defendant," and orders that a copy thereof be spread upon the records of the city council, and that the city clerk also forward to our Senators and Congressmen LANE and BATES, copies of this editorial.

[From the Lynn (Mass.) Daily Evening Item]

BUDAPEST'S REAL DEFENDANT

As the Cardinal Mindszenty case swiftly approaches its tragic and inexorable climax in Budapest, it is well to remember that the real defendant in the dock in this mock court is not a Prince of the Catholic Church, but organized religion, which the Communists hate with a vehemence surpassing all their other multitudinous hatreds.

Every Catholic, every Protestant, every Jew—all who profess a belief in God and His omnipotence—are Cardinal Mindszenty's codefendants. The Hungarian primate represents a philosophy which is anathema to every Communistic principle. The Kremlin's Hungarian puppets seek to stifle it by dragging its most distinguished exemplar in their country to the prisoner's bench like a common criminal.

This mock trial is strangely reminiscent of another held more than 2,000 years ago when Christ was haled before Pontius Pilate on similarly trumped-up charges. Then, as now, the official charge was treason, but the real indictment was that the Defendant dared to place God above the state. And the modern Pilate—Judge Vilmos Olthys—must at this moment be experiencing some of the uneasy qualms which Scripture tells us beset his notorious predecessor. Like Pilate's, his name will live in infamy, while that of the man he condemns will join the glorious company of religious martyrs.

During World War II, it was a common saying that the Nazis could be counted upon to commit some tremendous stupidity whenever the opportunity afforded. It is becoming increasingly apparent that the Communists are ruled by men of similar mentality because in centering their attack on this blameless Catholic prelate they have provided the spark needed to arouse worldwide organized opposition to their godless rule.

If Cardinal Mindszenty goes to the gallows, no worshiper of God anywhere in the world will be safe. The love of God and the right to worship Him freely are so deeply implanted in the human breast that men will fight to the death to preserve them. The sorry spectacle unfolded in Budapest will become an historic rallying cry that will eventually spell the doom of communism everywhere.

Let those here in America who have ridiculed repeated warnings of the dangers of communism come to their senses now that the Reds have reached the apex of their boldness. Let's have an end to queasy, half-hearted toleration of this serpent whose aim is to exclude Christ from men's lives. Let's have an end to the spineless appeasing and "negotiating" that have marked our official attitude since VJ-day. Communism is our hated and determined enemy and let's resolve from this moment forward to treat it as such. Let's repulse Stalin's "peace" feelers for the treacherous impostures they are. If there was one ounce of sincerity behind them, Stalin would immediately order a halt to the disgraceful proceedings at Budapest.

We are confronted at this moment in history with the greatest threat to human liberty the world has ever known. Let's recognize it for what it is and face up to it. The time for temporizing and half-measures has passed. This is Armageddon.

PREVENTION OF WAR

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the people of Williamsburg, Mass., in town meeting assembled, on February 7, 1949, relating to the prevention of war.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Wheress modern science has now produced means by which mankind can destroy itself; and

Whereas the United Nations was created as an instrument to preserve peace and its Charter is capable of amendment so as to make it effective for the maintenance of world order; and

Whereas disarmament and world peace can only be achieved by world order, world law, and some measure of world government; and

Whereas the people of Williamsburg have since April 24, 1771, been happy to delegate certain functions of government to their town government, other functions to their State government and still other functions to their National Government and are now willing to delegate further limited functions of government to a world government for the purpose of maintaining peace: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the people of Williamsburg, Mass., in town meeting assembled, That they call upon their Representatives in the Congress, in the executive department of the United States, and in the United Nations, to take note of these truths and forthwith to take such steps as may be necessary to have our delegates to the United Nations present or support amendment of the Charter for the purpose of making the United Nations into a world government capable of enacting, interpreting, and enforcing world law to prevent war; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to both Senators from Massachusetts, the Congressman from the First Congressional District, the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the United States representatives in the United Nations.

HOOF-AND-MOUTH-DISEASE PROGRAM IN MEXICO—INTERNATIONAL QUARANTINE STATION ON SWAN ISLAND

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD three resolutions adopted by the California State Board of Agriculture and senate joint resolutions 9 and 10 of the California Legislature relating to the hoof-and-mouth-disease program in Mexico, and the need for laboratories to study the disease, and also senate joint resolution 8 of the California Legislature relative to the proposed international animal quarantine station on Swan Island.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

To the Committee on Appropriations:

CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE,
Sacramento.

On January 17, 1949, the California State Board of Agriculture met in regular session at Sacramento, Calif., and had as its guests and participants in its deliberations, representatives of the California Farm Bureau Federation, California Cattlemen's Association, California Wool Growers Association, California Farmers, Inc., the Agricultural Council of California, and the Agricultural Department of the California State Chamber of Commerce. The following motion was unanimously adopted by the board with the concurrence of all those in attendance at the meeting:

"Whereas foot-and-mouth disease, a major and devastating disease of livestock, is present in the Republic of Mexico; and

"Whereas the Republic of Mexico and the United States of America have joined forces to control and eradicate the disease in Mexico; and

"Whereas the chief instrument for the control of the disease is the Joint Commission established for that purpose and supported by the two nations with financial, scientific, and general ways and means; and

"Whereas great strides are being made in the Republic of Mexico by the efforts of the Joint Commission toward the control and eradication of this disease, which is not known to exist elsewhere in North America; and

"Whereas it is in the general welfare of the two contracting nations to continue the work of the Joint Commission without any slackening of effort or loss of research, program, or planning: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we request the Congress of the United States to approve an appropriation of funds, and to approve such other enactments as are necessary, to continue without interruption the work of the Joint Commission for the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease in the Republic of Mexico, and that we commend the Commission for its excellent work at this time."

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
County of Sacramento, ss:

I, Romain Young, assistant secretary of the California State Board of Agriculture, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of resolution passed on the 17th day of January 1949.

In witness whereof I hereto set my hand this 3d day of February 1949.

ROMAIN YOUNG.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 3d of February 1949.

WILMA WILSON,
Notary Public in and for the County of Sacramento, State of California.
My commission expires October 12, 1952.

Senate Joint Resolution 9

Joint resolution relative to funds for the Joint Commission for the Eradication of Foot-and-Mouth Disease in the Republic of Mexico

Whereas foot-and-mouth disease, a major and devastating disease of livestock, is present in the Republic of Mexico; and

Whereas the Republic of Mexico and the United States of America have joined forces to control and eradicate the disease in Mexico; and

Whereas the chief instrument for the control of the disease is the Joint Commission established for that purpose and supported by the two nations with financial, scientific, and general ways and means; and

Whereas great strides are being made in the Republic of Mexico by the efforts of the Joint Commission toward the control and eradication of this disease, which is not known to exist elsewhere in North America; and

Whereas it is in the general welfare of the two contracting nations to continue the work of the Joint Commission without any slackening of effort or loss of research, program, or planning: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to approve an appropriation of funds, and such other enactments as are necessary, to continue without interruption the work of the Joint Commission for the Eradication of Foot-and-Mouth Disease in the Republic of Mexico, and commends the Commission for its excellent work; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to every Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE,
Sacramento.

On January 17, 1949, the California State Board of Agriculture met in regular session at Sacramento, Calif., and had as its guests and participants in its deliberations, representatives of the California Farm Bureau Federation, California Cattlemen's Association, California Wool Growers Association, California Farmers, Inc., the Agricultural Council of California, and the Agricultural Department of the California State Chamber of Commerce. The following motion was unanimously adopted by the board with the concurrence of all those in attendance at the meeting:

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has enacted legislation providing for a livestock disease research laboratory with particular reference to foot-and-mouth disease; and

"Whereas funds have not as yet been appropriated for such laboratory; and

"Whereas a site for such laboratory has not as yet been selected: Be it

"*Resolved*, That we are in favor and respectfully urge that the Congress of the United States appropriate money for the immediate construction of such laboratory and that the site of the laboratory be determined considering not only the legal requirements as provided by congressional enactment, but also the economic situation as existing Nation-wide.

"It is the belief of this group assembled that because of the great movement of livestock east from the Pacific Coast a laboratory on the Pacific would be the least desirable because of the greater possibility of wide dissemination of the disease in the event of its escape from the laboratory; be it further

"*Resolved*, That it is our opinion that it will take several years to construct and equip a laboratory, during which time research could be greatly furthered by sending young men abroad to work with foreign research laboratories during the interim between the present and the completion of the laboratory in question."

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
County of Sacramento, ss:

I, Romain Young, assistant secretary of the California State Board of Agriculture, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of resolution passed on the 17th day of January 1949.

In witness whereof I hereto set my hand this 3d day of February 1949.

ROMAIN YOUNG.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 3d day of February 1949.

WILMA WILSON,
Notary Public in and for the County of Sacramento, State of California.
My commission expires October 12, 1952.

Senate Joint Resolution 10

Joint resolution relative to the Federal Livestock Disease Research Laboratory

Whereas the Congress of the United States has enacted legislation providing for the Livestock Disease Research Laboratory with particular reference to foot-and-mouth disease; and

Whereas neither a site for such laboratory has as yet been selected nor have funds been appropriated for it; and

Whereas the need for such a laboratory is very great in view of the outbreak of the foot-and-mouth pestilence in the Republic of Mexico; and

Whereas because of the large movement of livestock east from the Pacific coast, the establishment of the laboratory on the Pacific slope would be least desirable because of the greater possibility of wide dissemination of the foot-and-mouth disease in the event of its escape from the laboratory; and

Whereas several years will be consumed before it will be possible to construct and equip a laboratory during such time research could be greatly furthered by sending young men abroad to work with foreign research laboratories: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States immediately to make provision for the construction of a livestock disease research laboratory with particular reference to foot-and-mouth disease other than on the Pacific slope, and during the interim prior to the completion of such laboratory to make provision for sending young men abroad to work with foreign research laboratories in the accomplishment of scientific research with respect to the control of foot-and-mouth disease; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to every Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD
OF AGRICULTURE,
Sacramento.

On January 17, 1949, the California State Board of Agriculture met in regular session at Sacramento, Calif., and had as its guests and participants in its deliberations, representatives of the California Farm Bureau Federation, California Cattlemen's Association, California Wool Growers Association, California Farmers, Inc., the Agricultural Council of California, and the Agricultural Department of the California State Chamber of Commerce. The following motion was unanimously adopted by the board with the concurrence of all those in attendance at the meeting:

"Whereas the Congress in its wisdom enacted certain legislation in 1930 designated as the Tariff Act of 1930 (46 Stat. 689) prohibiting the importation of animals susceptible to foot-and-mouth disease or products thereof from countries in which foot-and-mouth disease exists; and

"Whereas attempts have been made from time to time to break down the provisions of this congressional enactment; and

"Whereas the Seventy-ninth Congress enacted Public Law No. 522, approved July 24, 1946, authorizing the construction of a livestock quarantine station on Swan Island; and

"Whereas regulations for the operation of the Swan Island quarantine station have been proposed by the Bureau of Animal Industry, United States Department of Agriculture; and

"Whereas the proposed regulations provide for importation onto Swan Island of animals susceptible to foot-and-mouth disease from areas in countries in which statement is made by the veterinarians of the country in question that foot-and-mouth disease has not existed in that area 60 days immediately preceding: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we strongly oppose such regulation and point out that it is in violation of the intent of the Tariff Act of 1930 and constitutes a decided weakening of our sanitary embargo; be it further

"*Resolved*, That we urge and recommend, with the greatest emphasis possible, that the terminology of the Tariff Act and the intent of the Tariff Act be incorporated into law and regulations to the effect that animals susceptible to foot-and-mouth disease may not be imported onto Swan Island from any country in which it is determined that foot-and-mouth disease exists."

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
County of Sacramento, ss:

I, Romain Young, assistant secretary of the California State Board of Agriculture, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of resolution passed on the 17th day of January 1949.

In witness whereof I hereto set my hand this 3d day of February 1949.

ROMAIN YOUNG.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 3d day of February 1949.

WILMA WILSON,
Notary Public in and for the County of Sacramento, State of California.
My commission expires October 12, 1952.

Senate Joint Resolution 8

"Joint resolution relative to the proposed International Animal Quarantine Station on Swan Island

"Whereas the people of this State remember with the direst apprehension the outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease in 1924 and 1929 and the paralyzing effect each of these outbreaks had upon the economy and welfare of California; and

"Whereas the bulwark of protection against the introduction of foot-and-mouth disease into the United States or this State has been subdivision (a) of section 306 of chapter 497 of the United States Statutes of 1930, providing that if the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States determines that foot-and-mouth disease exists in any foreign country, he shall officially notify the Secretary of the Treasury and give public notice thereof, and thereafter, and until the Secretary of Agriculture gives notice in a similar manner that such disease no longer exists in such foreign country, the importation into the United States of cattle, sheep, or other domestic ruminants, or swine, or of fresh, chilled, or frozen beef, veal, mutton, lamb, or pork, from such foreign country is prohibited; and

"Whereas restrictions on importations have from time to time been issued pursuant to the authority of Congress and by that means foot-and-mouth disease has been kept from the United States or any part thereof; and

"Whereas chapter 592 of the United States Statutes of 1946 authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture, in his discretion, to establish and maintain on Swan Island, situate in the Caribbean Sea, an international animal quarantine station and permits the Secretary of Agriculture, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, but subject to regulations prescribed by him to prevent the introduction into the United States of communicable diseases of animals, to permit animals to be brought into the Swan Island Quarantine Station from any country, including those in which the Secretary of Agriculture determines that foot-and-mouth disease exists and to permit the same to be subsequently imported into other parts of the United States under the regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture; and

"Whereas on December 7, 1948, the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States gave notice of his intention to issue regulations relating to the Swan Island Quarantine Station, which regulations permit ruminants and swine to be shipped into the quarantine station if they originate in an area in a foreign country which has been free from foot-and-mouth disease for at least 60 days immediately preceding the date of movement of the ruminants and swine therefrom and after quarantine at Swan Island for not less than 90 days may be brought into the United States; and

"Whereas the report on foot-and-mouth disease made to the Senate of California on March 18, 1948, by the senate interim committee on livestock diseases, created by senate resolution 145 of the 1947 session of the California Legislature, shows that 316 Cebu bulls were landed on Sacrificios Island in April of 1946 and were removed from said island to the vicinity of Vera Cruz, Mexico, on the 28th of September 1946, and were thereafter inspected by two veterinarians of the Bureau of Animal Industry of the United States Department of Agriculture and found to be free from foot-and-mouth disease and 3 weeks thereafter foot-and-mouth disease broke out in the vicinity into which the Cebu bulls has been imported; and

"Whereas the regulations for the operation of the Swan Island Quarantine Station proposed by the Secretary of Agriculture can therefore not give any assurance that Swan Island will not become the avenue through which foot-and-mouth disease will be introduced into the United States; and

"Whereas the California State Board of Agriculture at its meeting on January 17, 1949, attended by representatives from the California Farm Bureau, the California Cattlemen's Association, the California Wool Growers Association, California Farmers, Inc., the Agricultural Council of California, and the Agricultural Department of the California State Chamber of Commerce, adopted a resolution with the unanimous concurrence of those in attendance, that the regulations for the Swan Island Quarantine Station should prohibit the importation into the United States of animals susceptible to foot-and-mouth disease from any country in which it is determined that foot-and-mouth disease exists: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President of the United States and the Secretary of Agriculture thereof that no action be taken for the use of Swan Island as a quarantine station with respect to the importation into this country of animals susceptible to foot-and-mouth disease from any country in any part of which exists foot-and-mouth disease, and respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to this effect; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to every Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. O'CONOR, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. J. Res. 31. Joint resolution to provide for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train by the Archivist of the United States, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 71).

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. Con. Res. 10. Concurrent resolution to provide additional funds for the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations; with amendments (Rept. No. 70); and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE
(S. REPT. NO. 69)

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, by direction of the Committee on Rules and Administration I report favorably Senate Resolution 15, relating to limitation of debate in the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent to make a brief statement in regard to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received.

The Senator from Arizona asks unanimous consent to make a brief statement in regard to the report.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I have conferred with the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], who joined with me in submitting the resolution, and we have agreed to recommend to other Senators that no definite action be taken on it by the Senate until Monday, February 28.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Unless the Senate gives unanimous consent, the Chair holds that discussion is not in order.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I fear that if we were to enter into a discussion of this question, the Senator might be taken from his feet, and other Senators might not have an opportunity to ask him questions. I respectfully suggest that this discussion be delayed until the conclusion of morning business, and then if there are any questions, they can be asked without any parliamentary situation interfering.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in connection with the report from the Committee on Rules and Administration which has just been submitted by the chairman, I submit minority views of those who are opposed to the resolution. The minority views are concurred in by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and myself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The minority views will be filed.

Mr. STENNIS. I ask that they be printed along with the majority report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANTS TO COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, by direction of the Committee on Rules and Administration I report favorably a resolution, which I ask to have read, and for which I ask immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the resolution.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 66), as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized, until otherwise provided by law, to employ two additional professional staff members and three additional clerical assistants to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202 (*e*) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and the provisions of Public Law 4, Eightieth Congress, approved February 19, 1947.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, do I correctly understand from the Senator from Arizona that the resolution was considered by the Committee on Rules and Administration, and that the report submitted is the unanimous report of that Committee, allowing two additional professional staff members and three additional clerks in the Judiciary Committee, until otherwise ordered?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct. The situation as presented to the Committee on Rules and Administration by members of the Committee on the Judiciary is serious and urgent. The Judiciary Committee has pending before it some 500 bills. More than a third of all bills introduced in the Senate are referred to the Judiciary Committee. The additional assistants are needed immediately. For that reason, members of the Committee on Rules and Administration approve the request. I hope the resolution will be adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Reserving the right to object, may I ask one more question? In substance, does not the resolution amend the Legislative Reorganization Act with respect to the number of assistants authorized for the Judiciary Committee?

Mr. HAYDEN. It really places the Committee on the Judiciary in the same exceptional position as that enjoyed by the Committee on Appropriations, in recognition of the fact that it has more work to do, since it handles a greater number of bills than do the other committees of the Senate. It therefore requires the additional help.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. But the Committee on Rules and Administration is doing it in this manner, rather than changing the law.

Mr. HAYDEN. It would require a joint resolution to amend the law.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not wish to question the Senator, but I do not think we should let stand the statement that an amendment of a rule of the Senate requires a joint resolution. The act, on its face, clearly states that rules relating to the Senate may be changed as other rules are changed in the Senate, by action of the Senate alone. I do not think there should stand on the record a statement that we cannot change the Reorganization Act except by action of the two Houses.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I was led into that statement by the fact that the proposal was originally presented in the form of a joint resolution which required action by the House. The suggestion was made to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee that it be changed to a simple Senate resolution and be taken care of in that way.

Mr. TAFT. Is this a permanent change, or is it merely for the present Congress?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is a permanent change. Of course, the money will have to be appropriated hereafter by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. TAFT. There is, then, a change in the rule involved?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The resolution says "until otherwise provided by law." It does not seem to me to be a change in the rules.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to read the provision of the Reorganization Act with reference to this point:

The following sections of this title are enacted by the Congress:

(a) As an exercise of the rule-making power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, or of that House to which they specifically apply; and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(b) With full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in

such House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

So that those rules can be changed so far as they relate to Senate committees by a simple Senate resolution, and do not require a joint resolution.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is a correct statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

THE ALUMINUM SHORTAGE—CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN SENATOR BUTLER AND THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD copies of several letters I have exchanged with the Secretary of Commerce regarding the severe shortage of aluminum and aluminum conductors.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 28, 1948.

Hon. CHARLES SAWYER,
Secretary of Commerce,
Department of Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: During recent months I have become increasingly concerned with the severe shortage of aluminum for the manufacture of wire and other electrical equipment because of the way it is holding up our rural electrification program in Nebraska. I believe that this aluminum situation is the worst shortage we have today in this country, bar none.

In my State alone, loans have been approved by Rural Electrification Administration for extension of electric service to beween seventy and eighty thousand consumers but only about 40,000 have been connected up. During the last fiscal year, loans were approved to serve over 12,000 additional consumers but only 7,000 new rural establishments actually received power during the same period. In many cases, farmers are forced to wait years for current after signing up. Orders placed today for aluminum rod simply go into a backlog which will take from 2 to 5 years to work off. If the supply situation in any industry can be called critical, certainly aluminum is that industry.

Under these circumstances, it seems to me of the utmost urgency that some system be worked out to take care of the most essential needs for virgin aluminum. Under the provisions of Public Law 395, passed last year, you have the power to work out, in cooperation with the industry, a program of voluntary allocations to meet such needs. This method has been used with some measure of success for some industries, such as steel, and I am a little surprised that no action has yet been taken to meet the aluminum situation in the same manner. As I understand, some segments of the industry have expressed a willingness to cooperate with the Government in working out such an agreement. Certainly this method is worth a try.

It is my opinion that rural electrification should receive a priority for aluminum second only to our defense program. Under the present situation, the program is certainly not faring very well. REA co-ops and districts are constructing nearly three-fourths of the rural mileage, but I do not believe they are receiving that proportion of the production of rural conductor sizes. Meanwhile, there seems to be plenty of aluminum for all sorts of new nonessential uses. I am advised that 85 percent of all the needs for aluminum could be met just as well with scrap as with virgin metal.

It seems to me it is time to put first things first. This REA program is of the utmost importance to farmers and to our food production effort. Farmers all over the country have been promised electric service for years now, and those promises ought to be kept.

I do believe it is high time that some action be taken on this problem. If you were not aware of the seriousness of this situation before, I hope you will undertake an immediate inquiry and let me have the benefit of your comments on this proposal.

Yours very truly,
HUGH BUTLER,
United States Senator, Nebraska.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
Washington, January 10, 1949.

The Honorable HUGH BUTLER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: Reference is made to your letter of December 28, 1948, expressing your concern over the severe shortage of aluminum for the manufacture of wire and electrical equipment and the adverse effect of this shortage on the construction of rural-electrification facilities.

This Department is fully aware of the difficulties faced by the aluminum industry in its efforts to supply current demand, which exceeds the supply by a very substantial margin. There is attached a statement showing our estimate of supply and demand for the 12 months' period ending June 30, 1949. Our estimate indicates a shortage of 500,000,000 pounds during this period; other estimates run as high as 1,000,000,000 pounds shortage.

You suggest that the requirements for aluminum for rural electrification should receive a priority second only to national defense, and you raise a question as to why the voluntary agreements under Public Law 395 have not or cannot be used for this purpose. Some months ago the Department discussed the possibilities of voluntary allocations with the three producers of primary aluminum. Up to this time, only one of these producers fabricates redraw rod for manufacturing cable and wire. Assuming that this producer had the facilities to increase production substantially of wire rod, the full burden of supplying an increased amount of material for wire making would fall on this one company. Since such agreements are purely voluntary, there is no way in which the objective you mention could be achieved unless the company volunteered to divert its facilities and materials to this particular end use.

Under these circumstances, a voluntary agreement affecting only one producer seems impracticable. If one or both of the other producers would undertake the fabrication of redraw rod, a more equitable basis would be established for a voluntary agreement to increase the output of the raw material for cable and wire manufacture.

I am asking my staff to again discuss the distribution of aluminum with the three producers of primary metal. Any discussion of the possibility of a voluntary agreement will necessarily be exploratory, since Public Law 395 expires February 28 next. If additional facilities are installed by the industry for the fabrication of wire and cable rod and if the voluntary provision of Public Law 395 is extended beyond the present termination date, there is a possibility that the Department will give consideration to proposing a voluntary agreement to increase the supply of aluminum wire and cable.

As you know, the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee held hearings on December 28 to explore the requirements for aluminum for rural electrification and to obtain data from the aluminum industry with respect to production and distribution. When available, the information developed at this hearing, especially with respect to the aluminum industry's attitude toward increasing the production of materials for the manufacture of cable and wire, may be helpful to us in dealing with this problem.

Sincerely yours,
THOMAS C. BLAISDELL, Jr.,
For the Secretary of Commerce.

Percentage distribution pattern of aluminum for fiscal year 1949

	Percent
Building products	30
Transportation	25
Cooking utensils	10
Machinery	6
Household appliances	7
Power transmission	6
Miscellaneous	16
Total	100

FEBRUARY 4, 1949.

Hon. CHARLES SAWYER,
Secretary of Commerce,
Commerce Department,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Reference is made to your reply of January 10, 1949, to my letter of December 28, 1948, regarding the shortage of aluminum.

Your reply contains many useful facts, but for some reason which I cannot understand, you have marked the whole reply confidential. Frankly, I cannot understand at all why this material should be confidential, with the possible exception of the small part relating to military needs. For that reason, I feel I must make a formal request that you indicate to me which parts of this letter may be made available to the public.

Your reply to this request will be appreciated.

Yours very truly,
HUGH BUTLER,
United States Senator, Nebraska.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
Washington, February 16, 1949.

The Honorable HUGH BUTLER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: In reply to your letter of February 4 concerning the confidential letter of January 10 from this office on aluminum, I wish to advise you that the reason the letter was marked "Confidential" was to conceal the demands for national-security programs.

There is no objection to your making public the statements in the body of the letter. However, since the time that letter was written additional information has been obtained, and a new tabulation is attached giving the estimated supply-requirements position of aluminum for the calendar year 1949. You will note that this statement lumps all of the requirements, and in this form the information can be made public.

The new figures on supply and requirements make necessary a change in the second paragraph of the letter of January 10, as follows:

"This Department is fully aware of the difficulties faced by the aluminum industry in its efforts to supply current demand, which exceeds the supply by a very substantial margin. There is attached a statement showing our estimate of supply and demand for the calendar year 1949. Our estimate indicates a shortage of 640,000 short tons during

this period. The estimate, both for supply and requirements, is based upon the continuation of a high level of business activity, with no interruption to supply and the continuation of a high level of demand."

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES SAWYER,
Secretary of Commerce.

Aluminum

ESTIMATED SUPPLY-REQUIREMENTS POSITION
(SHORT TONS)

(Calendar year 1949)

Supply:	
Domestic primary production	625,000
Domestic secondary production	250,000
Imports	85,000
Total	960,000
Requirements: Total demand, including national-security programs	1,600,000
Deficit	640,000

FEBRUARY 16, 1949.

Hon. CHARLES SAWYER,
Secretary of Commerce,
Commerce Department,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: With reference to my previous inquiries regarding proposed action to be taken to handle the aluminum shortage, your attention is invited to the fact that by the terms of Public Law 6 of this Congress your authority to control the distribution of scarce materials, such as aluminum, has been extended until September 30 of this year.

It appears to me that this aluminum bottleneck could be broken overnight and ample aluminum made available for rural electrification if the Department of Commerce would move promptly under this law to work out a system to take care of this vital need with the aluminum industry. It is my understanding that a very small portion of the aluminum output, considerably less than 10 percent, is now made available for the manufacture of aluminum conductor. The entire aluminum shortage could be solved for the rural systems through a moderate increase in this percentage.

Inasmuch as I have previously written you on two occasions and have yet to receive a reply other than some confidential information which I am not permitted to make public, I would appreciate being informed of your intentions in this matter. The authority granted by this legislation has been used very effectively in dealing with the steel industry, and I can see no reason why it could not be equally effective in handling the aluminum situation.

Yours very truly,
HUGH BUTLER,
United States Senator, Nebraska.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, for some time I have been urging that the Department of Commerce proceed promptly to set up a voluntary allocation plan with the aluminum industry, so as to make sure that enough aluminum is found to permit the rural electrification program to proceed rapidly. This aluminum situation is probably the worst shortage we face today. The Department of Commerce has told me that there will be a shortage of 640,000 short tons during the calendar year 1949.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair must admonish the Senator from Nebraska that speeches are not now in order.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I am making a statement in connection with the insertion in the RECORD of the correspondence I have had with the Secretary of Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; we can make no distinction between such a statement and a speech. The Senator may have the statement printed as a part of his remarks if he desires.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my statement may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, for some time I have been urging that the Department of Commerce proceed promptly to set up a voluntary allocation plan with the aluminum industry, so as to make sure that enough aluminum is found to permit the rural electrification program to proceed rapidly. This aluminum situation is probably the worst shortage we face today. The Department of Commerce has told me that there will be a shortage of 640,000 short tons during the calendar year 1949.

Recently we were told at a congressional hearing that an order placed today for aluminum conductor with the Aluminum Co. of America would not be filled until 1953. Thousands of poles have been set in place by rural co-ops, but construction cannot be completed until the aluminum wire is delivered. It is absolutely essential for the Government to take immediate action to break this bottleneck.

Under the provisions of Public Law 395, of the Eightieth Congress, voluntary agreements have been worked out very successfully with the steel industry to provide sufficient steel for essential uses. I believe that rural electrification should have a priority second only to national defense in securing aluminum. It will be noted from one of the tables I introduced that only 6 percent of the aluminum is going into power transmission, and it certainly seems that additional supplies of aluminum could be made available for electrification without injuring any of the other industrial users.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 964. A bill for the relief of Cole M. Shaw and M. M. Hendrix; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOEY (for himself and Mr. BROUGHTON):

S. 965. A bill to extend the time within which suit may be commenced under the Federal Tort Claims Act on the claim of Ulma B. Riggs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 966. A bill to extend Veterans' Administration benefits to disabled retired enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, without impairment of their right to receive retired pay which they had earned for stipulated service prior to their reentry into the service in World War II; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. FERGUSON introduced Senate bill 967, to provide for preference under the immigration quotas, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

S. 968. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Wladyslaw Zachariasiewicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 969. A bill to transfer the Pomona Station of the Agriculture Remount Service, Department of Agriculture, at Pomona, Calif.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 970. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the 191st birth anniversary of Maj. Jean Pierre Chouteau; and

S. 971. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of commemorative stamps honoring 160 years of cotton-textile manufacturing in America; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 972. A bill to amend Public Law 289, Eightieth Congress, with respect to surplus airport property; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 973. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Society of the Colonial Dames of America in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 974. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 with respect to certain mothers of veterans; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 975. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the life and services of P. T. Barnum; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 976. A bill for the relief of Vartan Chamsarian; and

S. 977. A bill for the relief of Jacques Yedid, Henriette Yedid, Richard Emanuel Yedid, and Ethel Danielle Yedid; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 978. A bill to amend the Federal Alcohol Administration Act as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 979. A bill to amend section 9 of the act of May 22, 1928, as amended, authorizing and directing a national survey of forest resources; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 980. A bill for the relief of Toshie Okutomi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 981. A bill for the relief of John Clark Sharman;

S. 982. A bill for the relief of D. A. Sullivan & Sons, Inc., and Thomas F. Harney, Jr., doing business as Harney Engineering Co.; and

S. 983. A bill for the relief of Samuel D. Shanker and the legal guardian of Miriam Shanker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 984 (by request). A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of Joseph Lee, Sr., founder of recreational and civic groups and organizer of recreational activities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McGRATH (by request):

S. 985. A bill for the relief of Eva Friedmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 986. A bill for the relief of Carlos Riggenbach; and

S. 987. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary T. Maloney Preece; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 988. A bill to extend the benefits of section 1 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to employees who were involuntary separated during the period from July 1, 1945, to July 1, 1947, after

having rendered 25 years of service but prior to attainment of age 55; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 989. A bill amending the act approved May 15, 1928, for flood control and improvement of the lower Mississippi River in its alluvial valley, by including the construction of certain works of improvement in the Grand Prairie-Bayou Meto area, Arkansas; to the Committee on Public Works.

(Mr. McCLELLAN also introduced Senate bill 990, to reorganize and simplify the procurement, utilization, and disposal of Government property, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. McCLELLAN also introduced Senate bill 991, to create an Office of General Services as a central agency to have jurisdiction and control over certain administrative services in the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 992. A bill to amend existing law relating to military leave so as to extend the benefits of such law to substitute employees in the postal service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 993. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to permit coverage thereunder of employees of States and their political subdivisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 994. A bill for the relief of Herbert Karl Jabs;

S. 995. A bill for the relief of Irene George Livanos;

S. 996. A bill for the relief of Aron Tejbus Birenbaum; and

S. 997. A bill for the relief of Leon Engel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 998. A bill to provide for acquisition from sources within the State of North Dakota of sand and gravel for use in the construction of Garrison Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 999. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States; to the Committee on Post Offices and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. THYE, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. ANDERSON):

S. 1000. A bill to provide a 1 year's extension of time for the disposition of farm labor camps to public or semipublic agencies or nonprofit associations of farmers; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 1001. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of the Navy, and the United States Maritime Commission to dispose of certain materials to the United States Coast Guard Auxiliary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 1002. A bill for the relief of the county of Allegheny, Pa.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 1003. A bill for the relief of Emory T. Wales; and

S. 1004. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the court of claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of the heirs of William H. Peters and Washington Reed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 1005. A bill to further extend the authority conferred by certain acts pertaining to the admission into the United States of alien fiancées, fiancés, and spouses of persons who served in the armed forces during World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 1006. A bill for the relief of Arthur Woloski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. MARTIN introduced Senate bill 1007, to allow a deduction, for income-tax purposes, of contributions or gifts to volunteer fire companies, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. MYERS introduced Senate bill 1008, to provide a 2-year moratorium with respect to the application of certain antitrust laws to individual, good-faith delivered price systems and freight-absorption practices, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (by request):

S. 1009. A bill to authorize the Coast Guard to construct an experimental nonpropelled seadrome ocean station; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CONNALLY:

S. 1010. A bill to establish the United States Air Academy at Randolph Field, Tex.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1011. A bill authorizing the transfer to the United States section, International Boundary and Water Commission, by the War Assets Administration of a portion of Fort Brown at Brownsville, Tex., and adjacent borrow area, without exchange of funds or reimbursement; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. J. Res. 54. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the period from May 21 to 30, inclusive, 1949, as Park and Recreation Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. J. Res. 55. Joint resolution to print the monthly publication entitled "Economic Indicators"; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

IMMIGRATION QUOTAS

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for preference under the immigration quotas, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill prepared by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 967) to provide for preference under the immigration quotas, introduced by Mr. FERGUSON, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. FERGUSON was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FERGUSON

This measure is a companion bill to H. R. 946, introduced in the House by Mr. HERTER, of Massachusetts. It is identical in language and purpose with the Herter bill.

This bill would amend section 6 of the Immigration Act of 1924 in order to revise the classes of immigrants who are to be granted preferential status in the issuance of quota immigration visas by American consular offices abroad, having particular regard for the national interest in fixing preferences.

It does not alter the presently authorized volume of immigration into the United States. Although operating in the direction of selective immigration it does so within the framework of basic policy as established by Congress in existing law, wherein preferential treatment for quota immigration is prescribed. It acts to relieve an administrative burden imposed by Congress through its failure to make statutory provision for the treatment of quota immigrants who are not accorded preferential status.

In order that the purpose and scope of the bill may be clearly understood it is necessary to review provisions of the present law and administrative procedures thereunder.

Section 6 of the Immigration Act of 1924 provides that each national origins quota (except the quota for India and the quota for China) shall be divided into two halves, which shall be available to certain classes of immigrants commonly referred to as first-preference and second-preference classes.

The first half of the national origins immigration quotas (excepting India and China) is available to first-preference classes which consist of alien parents of citizens of the United States who are at least 21 years of age, the alien husbands of citizens of the United States regardless of age, but who were married on or after January 1, 1948, and, in quotas of 300 or more annually, to aliens who are skilled in agriculture.

The second half of the national origins immigration quota, plus any portion of the first half not required for the issuance of immigration visas to qualified immigrants of the first-preference classes, is available to second-preference classes which consist of the alien wives and the unmarried alien children of aliens who are lawful permanent residents of the United States.

By section 4 (a) of the Immigration Act of 1924 alien wives, the unmarried minor alien children, and the alien husbands of American citizens are entitled to nonquota immigrant status, provided in the cases of such husbands that the marriage occurred before January 1, 1948.

Immigrants who are brothers, sisters, uncles, aunts, nieces, nephews, or nonrelative of American citizens or of lawfully resident aliens are not entitled either to preferential consideration under the quotas or to nonquota status. They are considered to be nonpreference quota immigrants. They may immigrate under the quotas only in the event the demand on the part of qualified immigrants of the preference classes does not exhaust the quotas.

It may be observed that just one occupation class is granted preferential consideration under the quotas. Skilled agriculturists are entitled to first-preference classification provided the quota to which they may be chargeable under the law is at least 300 annually. Otherwise, however, no alien may come or be brought to this country for permanent residence, no matter how highly skilled he may be as a worker, technician, or scientist, unless he happens to be classifiable as a nonquota immigrant, in a preference class, or if as a nonpreference quota immigrant he finds a place high enough on the list of nonpreference applicants to take advantage of any otherwise unused quota.

In administering the quota provisions of the law with respect to nonpreference immigrants the administrative authorities devised a waiting-list procedure. Such improvisation was necessary because Congress did not specifically deal with this category of immigrants in the law, having limited itself in its legislative action to the preference classes.

The waiting-list procedure was soundly conceived by the administrative authorities, in the absence of statutory direction, in accordance with the accepted democratic custom of first come, first served. Faithfully observed by consular authorities, it has imposed a great administrative burden in the face of pressure to grant exceptions. At the same time, it has necessarily operated to exclude numerous aliens whose admission to the United States in permanent status would undeniably have been in the national interest.

It is believed that the time has come for Congress to review the provisions of the Immigration Act of 1924 and its administration so that important considerations of national interest may be brought to bear in fixing preferences and so that orderly and desirable procedures may be effected under which administrative authorities may operate in enforcing the law.

The proposed bill would provide that the first 10 percent of any quota may be used for the issuance of immigration visas to aliens whose immigration into the United States would be desirable from the viewpoint of our national interests. This would be without regard to any relationship, or nonrelationship, such citizens may have to any citizen or resident of the United States.

Appropriate agencies of the government would have to give their approval to the immigration of aliens in this first 10 percent of the quota. This is to establish necessary safeguards against a possible abuse of the privileges to be granted.

The administrative authorities in the Executive branch of the government are being approached regularly by business concerns and others who are interested in bringing to this country aliens skilled as workers, technicians, or scientists who are needed in American business, research, or enterprise. The administrative authorities are helpless to assist, however, when they find the alien concerned is entitled to no preference under the law and is chargeable to a quota which is heavily oversubscribed and in fact would be barred under the contract labor feature of existing law.

In addition to facilitating the immigration of an alien whose services would be a distinct contribution to our economy, the proposed bill would provide for those whom an agency of the government may be anxious to procure for technical or scientific purposes in connection with improvement of the National Defense Establishment. Also, aliens who have been working for the United States in foreign countries, often at the risk of their lives or personal safety and whose immediate immigration into the United States is desirable in the interest of national security, could be permitted to migrate to this country without having to wait for years until their turns as nonpreference quota immigrants are reached on the waiting lists.

One effect of this bill would be to obviate the necessity of having numerous private bills introduced in Congress each year, to facilitate the immigration of aliens whose migration would be highly desirable in the national interest.

Under this bill it is further proposed that the next 50 percent of a national quota would be made available to those immigrants who now fall in the so-called first-preference classes, which would become the second-preference category. The proportion of the total quota allotted to such immigrants is not reduced or changed.

The bill proposes that the next 20 percent of a quota may be available to immigrants who now fall in the second-preference classes, which would become the third-preference category. The proportion of the quota allotted to such immigrants is accordingly reduced from 50 percent under present law to 20 percent. However, experience has shown that uniformly such immigrants rarely use as much as 20 percent of a quota.

The bill also creates a new category, to be known as fourth-preference quota immigrants, to whom will be available the next 10 percent of any quota. This class would include immigrants who have certain close relations in the United States but who are not entitled to any preferential consideration as quota immigrants under the existing law.

A final 10 percent of a quota would be available, under the proposed bill, to what may be termed "new-seed" immigration, or those immigrants who have no close relatives in the United States and who do not fall within any of the various classes of immigrants entitled to preference under the first 90 percent of a quota.

The first preference quota status provided in the existing law for aliens skilled in agriculture would be repealed. It is felt for one thing that since provisions of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 permit thousands of aliens skilled in agriculture to immigrate into the United States there is no apparent necessity for continuing the preferential status for agriculturalists under regular quotas.

One of the most important provisions of the proposed bill from the administrative point of view is that it would provide a statutory basis for the maintenance of consular waiting lists of quota immigrants. Under the proposed bill, visas to preferential quota immigrants in each class will be issued in the order that such preferential status is established. Nonpreference immigrants would be placed on waiting lists in the chronological order in which they qualify and are registered. Thus the integrity of the waiting-list procedure would be established by statute, which would assure protection to quota immigrants awaiting the issuance of visas, would preclude the exercise of administrative favoritism, and provide administrative authorities with a statutory buffer to pressure in the issuance of quota immigrant visas.

This bill is similar to one introduced in the Eightieth Congress, regarding which favorable reports were submitted to the House Judiciary Committee by the Departments of State and Justice, which are the agencies concerned with and responsible for the administration and enforcement of the immigration laws.

FEDERAL PROPERTY ACT OF 1949—OFFICE OF GENERAL SERVICES

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference two bills. One is cited as the Federal Property Act of 1949, and the other provides for the creation of an Office of General Services. I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bills prepared by me may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory statement presented by the Senator from Arkansas will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN were each read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, as follows:

S. 990. A bill to reorganize and simplify the procurement, utilization, and disposal of Government property, and for other purposes; and

S. 991. A bill to create an Office of General Services as a central agency to have jurisdiction and control over certain administrative services in the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. McCLELLAN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR M'CLELLAN REGARDING THE FEDERAL PROPERTY ACT OF 1949 AND A BILL CREATING AN OFFICE OF GENERAL SERVICES

I am introducing today two bills, one of which is cited as the Federal Property Act of 1949, and is similar to a bill reported favorably by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments in the Eightieth Congress (S. 2754). This bill, drafted by the administration and introduced by request, proposes to create an efficient, businesslike system of property management within the Federal Government. The bill would coordinate present property management functions of the Federal Works Agency and the Bureau of Federal Supply, and absorb the activities of the War Assets Administration.

I am also introducing, at the request of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch, a bill to create an Office of General Services. This bill is designed to carry out the recommendations made by the Commission in its report on "Office of General Services—Supply Activities." The primary purpose of this bill would be to coordinate top-level services of the Government in the fields of procurement, disposition of surplus property, supply, and property and records management.

These two bills contain certain features which are in conflict. The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments will examine each of them in detail, consult with officials of the Government agencies concerned with these activities and with experts associated with the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government who have been engaged in task force activities dealing with this subject, with a view to perfecting legislation that will be adequate to meet the needs of the reorganized services; and eliminate existing conflicts.

On January 24, I introduced another bill, S. 597, providing for the more economical operation of the General Supply Fund of the Bureau of Federal Supply, Department of the Treasury, at the request of the Department of the Treasury. This bill deals largely with the simplification and expansion of activities and would expand the General Supply Fund. It is designed to make the operations of the fund more flexible to the needs of any reorganization that might be effected under the above two proposals or under a bill that might be reported by the Committee on Expenditures involving the acceptable features of both measures.

These three bills comprise a general overall program designed to reorganize the purchasing and warehousing functions and effect a unified and efficient program for the distribution of supplies and materials throughout the Government, including provisions for executing utility contracts under a long-range program and make for greater economy and efficiency of operation.

The Committee will direct its efforts toward incorporating the main features of all three of these measures in one over-all reorganization proposal patterned on the recommendations made by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch under its report relating to the creation of an Office of General Services, and on the needs of the various agencies concerned as proposed by the Administration.

DEDUCTION FOR INCOME-TAX PURPOSES OF CONTRIBUTIONS TO VOLUNTEER FIRE COMPANIES

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to allow a deduction for income-tax purposes, of contributions or gifts to volunteer fire companies, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an explanatory statement by me, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill, together with the explanatory statement, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1007) to allow a deduction, for income-tax purposes, of contributions or gifts to volunteer fire companies, introduced by Mr. MARTIN, was read

twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 23 (o) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the so-called "charitable contribution" deduction for individuals) is hereby amended by striking out the word "or" at the end of paragraph (5) thereof, and by inserting at the end of paragraph (6) the word "or", and by adding after paragraph (6) a new paragraph to read as follows:

"(7) a volunteer fire company or association, not organized for profit and no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any shareholder or individual, and operated exclusively for the benefit of the public;".

SEC. 2. Section 23 (q) of such code (relating to the so-called "charitable contribution" deduction for corporations) is hereby amended by inserting at the end of paragraph (4) the word "or", and by adding after paragraph (4) a new paragraph to read as follows:

"(5) a volunteer fire company or association, not organized for profit and no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any shareholder or individual, and operated exclusively for the benefit of the public;".

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall be applicable only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1948.

The statement presented by Mr. MARTIN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MARTIN

The purpose of this bill is to make possible a substantial increase in the effectiveness of the unselfish and praiseworthy service performed by volunteer fire companies and their members throughout the Nation.

It is designed to encourage more generous financial support of the volunteer fire companies by making contributions to such associations deductible for income-tax purposes in the same manner that donations to charitable and nonprofit educational organizations are now deductible.

Volunteer fire companies depend, for the most part, upon contributions from individuals and business concerns in the communities they serve.

The extent to which our communities rely upon volunteer fire companies for protection from fire is shown by the fact that there are upward of 14,000 volunteer associations in the United States with a total membership in excess of 650,000. These figures are most impressive when we consider that there are only 900 full-time paid fire departments, supported by local taxation, in all the 48 States.

In my own State of Pennsylvania nearly 200,000 public-spirited citizens are enrolled as members of about 4,000 volunteer associations. I cannot praise too highly the tremendous value of the civic responsibility they have accepted.

In the case of paid fire companies, supported by public funds, income-tax deduction is permitted for taxes paid by individuals and business firms for fire protection. To my mind voluntary contributions paid by citizens of rural communities should be tax exempt in the same manner.

The bill I have introduced is identical with H. R. 1822, sponsored by the distinguished Congressman at Large from Delaware, the Honorable J. CALEB BOGGS.

Representative BOGGS has given a great deal of thought to the problems of the volunteer fire companies. In discussing this proposal he has pointed out that the volunteer fire associations, to a great extent, are educational organizations. For many years they have conducted campaigns to teach the public modern methods of fire prevention. They have conducted classes among their members to train them in the latest methods of fire fighting and fire prevention that are constantly being developed.

It is most unfortunate that these improved methods cannot be applied in many communities because lack of funds prevents the acquisition of the necessary equipment and apparatus.

My object in offering this bill at this time is to give ample opportunity for its consideration in committee and I ask that it be acted upon favorably. I join with Representative BOGGS in urging that the situation which hampers the work of the volunteer fire companies be corrected by enacting this bill into law.

CONSOLIDATION OF GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILLS

Mr. BYRD (for himself, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. WHERRY) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That, effective on the first day of the second regular session of the Eighty-first Congress, the joint rule of the Senate and of the House of Representatives contained in section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) (1) All appropriations for each fiscal year shall be consolidated in one general appropriation bill to be known as the 'Consolidated General Appropriation Act of ——' (the blank to be filled in with the appropriate fiscal year). The consolidated general appropriation bill may be divided into separate titles, each title corresponding so far as practicable to the respective regular general appropriation bills heretofore enacted. As used in this paragraph the term 'appropriations' shall not include deficiency or supplemental appropriations, appropriations under private acts of Congress, or rescissions of appropriations.

"(2) The consolidated general appropriation bill for each fiscal year, and each deficiency and supplemental general appropriation bill containing appropriations available for obligation during such fiscal year, shall contain provisions limiting the net amount to be obligated during such fiscal year in the case of each appropriation made therein which is available for obligation beyond the close of such fiscal year. Such consolidated general appropriation bill shall also contain provisions limiting the net amounts to be obligated during such fiscal year from all other prior appropriations which are available for obligation beyond the close of such fiscal year. Each such general appropriation bill shall also contain a provision that the limitations required by this paragraph shall not be construed to prohibit the incurring of an obligation in the form of a contract within the respective amounts appropriated or otherwise authorized by law, if such contract does not provide for the delivery of property or the rendition of services during such fiscal year in excess of the applicable limitations on obligations. The foregoing provisions of this paragraph shall not be applicable to appropriations made specifically for the payment of claims certified by the Comptroller General of the United States and of judgments, to amounts appropriated under private acts of Congress, to appropriations for the payment of interest on the public debt, or to revolving funds or appropriations thereto.

"(3) The committee reports accompanying each consolidated general appropriation bill, and any conference report thereon, shall show in tabular form, for information purposes, by items and totals—

"(A) the amount of each appropriation, including estimates of amounts becoming available in the fiscal year under permanent appropriations;

"(B) estimates of the amounts to be transferred between such appropriations;

"(C) estimates of the net amount to be expended in such fiscal year from each appropriation referred to in clause (A);

"(D) estimates of the net amount to be expended in such fiscal year from the balances of prior appropriations;

"(E) the totals of the amounts referred to in clauses (C) and (D); and

"(F) estimates of the total amount which will be available for expenditure subsequent to the close of such fiscal year from the appropriations referred to in clause (A).

The committee reports accompanying each deficiency and supplemental appropriation bill containing appropriations available for obligation or expenditure during such fiscal year, and each appropriation rescission bill, and any conference report on any such bill, shall include appropriate cumulative revisions of such tabulations.

"(4) The committee reports accompanying each consolidated general appropriation bill, and any conference report thereon, shall show in tabular form, for information purposes, for each wholly owned Government corporation or other agency of the Government which is authorized to receive and expend receipts without covering such receipts into the Treasury of the United States and which uses a checking account maintained with the Treasurer of the United States for that purpose (A) the estimated expenditures (other than retirement of borrowing) to be made out of such checking account for the fiscal year, (B) the estimated receipts (other than borrowing) to be deposited in such checking account for such fiscal year, and (C) the difference between (A) and (B).

"(5) The provisions of paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) shall not be applicable to appropriations of trust funds or to transactions involving public-debt retirement.

"(6) No general appropriation bill shall be received or considered in either House unless the bill and the report accompanying it conforms with this rule.

"(7) The Appropriations Committees of the two Houses may hold hearings simultaneously on each general appropriation bill or may hold joint hearings thereon."

INVESTIGATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH-DISEASE PROBLEMS

Mr. THYE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 72), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Resolved, That the authority of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under Senate Resolution 223, Eightieth Congress, agreed to June 12, 1948 (providing for an investigation of all problems related to foot-and-mouth disease and its incidence in neighboring countries), is hereby continued during the Eighty-first Congress; and the limit of expenditures under such resolution is hereby increased to $8,000.

AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT OF 1948—AMENDMENT

Mr. BREWSTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 833) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed.

TRANSPORTATION COSTS IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART) submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 236) to clarify and formulate a consistent and coordinated national policy with respect to transportation costs in interstate commerce; to strengthen the antitrust laws of the United States and to provide for their more effective enforcement; and to promote competition by permitting sellers to have access to distant markets, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. MAYBANK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 526) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and ordered to be printed.

EQUIPMENT FOR USE BY EXAMINATION APPLICANTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. LANGER submitted an amendment in the nature of the substitute intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 86) to provide equipment for use by examination applicants, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED OR ORDERED TO BE PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred, and ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 2313. An act to suspend certain import taxes on copper; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 2402. An act to extend the Office of War Assets Administrator and the War Assets Administration from February 28, 1949, until June 30, 1949; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 2632. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. J. Res. 84. Joint resolution to provide for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train by the Archivist of the United States, and for other purposes; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

ELECTRIFICATION OF RURAL AMERICA—ADDRESS BY SENATOR AIKEN

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the electrification of rural America, delivered by Senator AIKEN before the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association in New York on February 2, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

CURBING THE OCTOPUS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TOBEY

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Curbing the Octopus," delivered by him on February 15, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MR. WINANT I KNEW—ARTICLE BY ETHEL M. JOHNSON

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Mr. Winant I Knew," written by Ethel M. Johnson, and reprinted from the South Atlantic Quarterly of January 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR MILLIKIN

[Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Lincoln Day address delivered by Senator MILLIKIN at Denver, Colo., on February 12, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

SENATOR AT LARGE—EDITORIAL FROM BOSTON POST

[Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Senator at Large," published in the Boston Post of February 16, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE RECLAMATION PROGRAM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BUTLER

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "What We May Expect Out of Washington," delivered by him before the Nebraska Reclamation Association, Lincoln, Nebr., on February 10, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOUNDER'S DAY ADDRESS AT TEMPLE UNIVERSITY BY SENATOR HENDRICKSON

[Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator HENDRICKSON at the founder's day ceremonies, Temple University, Philadelphia, on February 12, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

ECONOMIC FACTS IN RELATION TO TAFT-HARTLEY ACT—STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "Economic Facts Condemn Taft-Hartley Act," made by Senator HUMPHREY before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which appears in the Appendix.]

DISAGREEMENTS AMONG SUPREME COURT JUSTICES—ADDRESS BY MR. JUSTICE WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of disagreements in opinions among Justices of the Supreme Court, delivered by him before the section of judicial administration of the American Bar Association, Seattle, Wash., September 8, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY WILLIAM M. BOYLE, JR., BEFORE TRUMAN VICTORY DINNER AT KANSAS CITY, MO.

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by William M. Boyle, Jr., assistant to the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, before the Truman victory dinner at Kansas City, Mo., on December 7, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CHALLENGE TO WESTERN CIVILIZATION—ADDRESS BY DR. BURTON L. FRENCH

[Mr. BRICKER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix a radio address entitled "The Challenge to Western Civilization," delivered by Dr. Burton L. French, professor emeritus, Department of Government, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, on January 9, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY J. FINLEY WILSON AT RALLY TO END SEGREGATION AND DISCRIMINATION

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by J. Finley Wilson, grand exalted ruler, Improved Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the World, at a rally to end segregation and discrimination, in Washington, D. C., on February 11, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE LAW PROFESSION AND GENERAL EDUCATION—ADDRESS BY J. VELMA KEEN

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Law Profession and General Education," by J. Velma Keen, of the Tallahassee, Fla., bar, which appears in the Appendix.]

MONTE CASSINO—ARTICLE BY ISAAC DON LEVINE

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Monte Cassino," written by Isaac Don Levine, editor of Plain Talk, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOOD FOR EUROPE—ARTICLE BY MASON KOENIG

[Mr. ANDERSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Food for Europe, But With an If," written by Mason Koenig and published in the January 1949 issue of Survey, which appears in the Appendix.]

REPUBLICAN PARTY POLICY—EDITORIAL FROM LINCOLN (NEBR.) JOURNAL

[Mr. BUTLER (for himself and Mr. WHERRY) asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial discussing Republican Party policy and entitled "Who Was a Coward?", published in the Lincoln, Nebr., Journal of February 13, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

BREAK-EVEN POINTS IN FARMING—ARTICLE BY SHERMAN E. JOHNSON

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Break-Even Points in Farming," by Sherman E. Johnson, appearing in the January 1949 issue of the Agricultural Situation, published by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, United States Department of Agriculture, which appears in the Appendix.]

A DEFENSE OF SENATOR TAFT—ARTICLE BY EDWIN A. LAHEY

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article headed "Defends TAFT as No Ogre," written by Edwin Lahey, and published in the January 31, 1949, issue of the Chicago Daily News, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRESLEY D. BOWEN—ARTICLE FROM BALTIMORE SUN

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relating to Presley D. Bowen, Chairman of the Federal Assay Commission, published in a recent issue of the Baltimore Evening Sun, which appears in the Appendix.]

APPOINTMENT OF NEGRO TO RALEIGH (N. C.) SCHOOL BOARD

[Mr. BROUGHTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Negro Attorney Named to Board," published in the Raleigh News and Observer of Raleigh, N. C., of February 16, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, as I was about to say a few moments ago when I reported Senate Resolution 15, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and I are recommending to Senators that no action be taken on the cloture resolution, which we jointly submitted, until Monday, February 28, for what we believe to be good reasons.

The resolution will not appear on the calendar until next Monday, February 21. Under a standing order of the Senate the junior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] has been designated to read George Washington's Farewell Address on February 22. For a number of years it has been customary to hold Jackson Day meetings on the 24th of this month, and a number of Senators intend to travel considerable distances to address various gatherings. They must leave ahead of that date, and it will not be convenient for them to return to their seats in the Senate until over the week end. Under those circumstances I think courtesy requires that there shall be a distinct understanding that no definite action will be taken on this controversial question until they return.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the Senator from Arizona mean that the resolution will be made the unfinished business on Monday, February 28; or do I correctly understand that it will be made the unfinished business on the 24th of February, but no action will be taken on it until the 28th?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I do not think it is important whether such action is taken on one or the other of those dates; but I will say that on Monday, February 28, a motion will no doubt be made to make the cloture resolution the unfinished business of the Senate; and, as one of the Senators who sponsored Senate Resolution 15, I wish now to state that on February 28 I shall seek an opportunity to present an argument in favor of its adoption by the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to say that the Senator's statement is perfectly agreeable, so far as the junior Senator from California is concerned. I know the Senator from Arizona would also wish to point out to the other Members of the Senate that printed copies of the hearings are now available, so that anyone who wishes to study the hearings may have a chance to do so between now and the 28th of this month.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; copies of the hearings on Senate Resolution 15 have been sent to the offices of all Senators.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I think the distinguished Senator from Arizona, who is chairman of the committee, has stated the facts correctly. However, I wish the record to show, further, that the minority leader of the Senate, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], along with the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], met with the Senator from Illinois and agreed upon this program. At that time we agreed not to give any information to the press until the Senator from Arizona had an opportunity to explain the situation on the floor of the Senate, with the further thought that if there were any questions about it, they could be cleared up before the Members of the Senate in the session today.

It is the intention, let me say to the Senator from Arizona, who agrees with me in this position, to take up this matter definitely on February the 28th. There will not be any question about it. So far as I am concerned, that is the schedule which has been agreed upon, and the resolution will be taken up.

I wish to thank my friend, the Senator from California, who has been very much interested in this resolution, for agreeing to that proposition. It is my understanding that all the Republican members of the Rules Committee and a majority of the Democrats of the Rules Committee have agreed to the statement of facts which has been submitted here by the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

EXCERPT FROM HEARING HELD BEFORE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an excerpt from the hearing held before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on February 15, 1949, which includes testimony given by Mr. William Green, the head of the American Federation of Labor, given before the committee.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM HEARING HELD BEFORE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE ON SENATE BILL 249, FEBRUARY 15, 1949

Senator MORSE. I completely agree and if I should be completely wrong in my interpretation of the law—and all lawyers are frequently wrong as to their interpretation of the law, as I have been in the past and expect to be again in the future—but if the future should prove that I am mistaken on this very important point of constitutional law, you will find me out barnstorming this country if the Supreme Court ever rules that this power exists for a constitutional amendment taking it away because I don't want any one man, just as I don't like to give the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board the power you and I are objecting to, neither do I want to give to the President the power to exercise what might be caprice in time of great national stress by seizing the property of this country and moving the Army in, for example, to support him in such a seizure.

Mr. GREEN. I think we join with you in that, Senator.

Senator TAFT. Mr. Green and I perhaps will join you in that barnstorming tour. I look forward to it with a good deal of pleasure.

Senator MORSE. You spoke this morning in your testimony with regard to the limitations of the Taft-Hartley law on the political activities of unions. I make this statement as a foundation for the question I want to ask. I completely agree with you and have said so many times that I think the political-activity section of the Taft-Hartley law should be removed, and hope it will be. However, yesterday on the floor of the Senate there was a discussion by the Senator from Missouri and myself in regard to an Associated Press dispatch concerning a purported resolution that the A. F. of L. had passed to the effect that the A. F. of L. proposed to participate in political activity to the extent of running men for State legislatures and putting them on the A. F. of L. pay roll because they couldn't serve in the legislature and meet the financial expenditures of serving.

The Senator from Missouri and I expressed our complete disapproval of the basic principle of any such resolution. The distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] raised the question as to whether or not we weren't commenting on something without having the official statement. We said that was, of course, true, but it was in the press, it seemed to be a reliable report, and if it wasn't a reliable report, the A. F. of L. most certainly should make its position clear.

I now ask you, Mr. Green, if you can advise this committee because I think it has a direct bearing upon this political-activity section of the Taft-Hartley law, whether it is the position of the A. F. of L. that through its political activities it proposes to run men for the State legislatures and then put them on the A. F. of L. pay roll while they are serving?

Senator DONNELL. Might I interject just a moment for the purpose of absolute accuracy of the record?

Senator MORSE. I want it accurate.

Senator DONNELL. In the discussion on the floor of the Senate yesterday it was not stated that a resolution had been adopted by the A. F. of L. The prese dispatch to which the Senator from Oregon refers was made by a high-ranking A. F. of L. official in a written statement presented to the labor league administrative council. By the labor league is meant Labor's League for Political Education, which is described in the article as the American Federation of Labor's political arm.

The article in the Kansas City Times in which this dispatch appeared also stated:

"Thus it was proposed and virtually decided that the league will help elect and thereafter augment the salaries of legislators endorsed by labor where they have insufficient funds of their own to get by."

Senator MORSE. I accept that. My question, Mr. Green, is: Has the A. F. of L. adopted a policy of supporting candidates for the State legislature in the future with the contemplation of putting the successful candidates on the A. F. of L. pay roll while they serve in the legislature?

Mr. GREEN. I am very glad to answer your question and do so in a very frank way. The American Federation of Labor never took such action. The executive council which met at Miami beginning January 31 and was in session for about 10 days never considered or acted upon any such proposal, and between conventions there is no agency clothed with authority to act upon such a question except the executive council of the American Federation of Labor.

It is clothed with authority to deal with questions of that kind between conventions and only between conventions. No other agency, no other authority, not even the executive officers of the federation of labor is clothed with authority to take action on a question of that kind.

So I can say to you truthfully, and the records of the meeting will show, that no consideration to this question or any action was taken at any sessions of the executive council's meeting.

Now I will tell you where I think the story originated. Shall I tell you?

Senator MORSE. Yes. I want to say I am very glad you are making this statement because I think it was very desirable that the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Oregon raised it yesterday because I can tell you from the reports I have already received that great injury has been done your organization by the story because I think widespread public disapproval would flow from the adoption of any such policy, and rightly so.

Mr. GREEN. Now, I think I am right on this, that the story grew out of a statement prepared by the representatives of Labor's League for Political Education. That league is functioning for educational purposes to acquaint our membership with developments in Congress and in State legislatures and with what is being considered and what is being acted upon, and so on.

Now the question came up as to what we could do or what we might be able to do in bringing about a repeal of these antilabor laws in about 12 or 13 States which were passed by State legislatures. In Maine we repealed one by a referendum vote. In Massachusetts we repealed one by a referendum vote at the last election. In New Mexico, I think it was, we repealed one at the last election.

The Supreme Court in its decision, made recently, upholding the constitutionality of these laws, made it very clear that the only way the workers in these different States could bring about a repeal of these acts was by calling upon the legislature and having enough in the legislature who are members of the legislature, State legislature, to vote to repeal them.

Senator DONNELL. May I ask Mr. Green whether he is referring to the recent decision in the case of *Lincoln Federal Labor Union, A. F. of L. et al.* v. *Northwestern Iron & Metal Co. et al.*, and *George Whitaker* v. *the State of North Carolina*?

Mr. GREEN. Yes; that is right. Many of these States in the different laws make the closed-shop contracts illegal and prevent the workers, just like the Taft-Hartley law, from entering into closed-shop agreements. In the discussion that was brought up about it it was pointed out that there were many workingmen in these different States who could be elected to the State legislatures, but the trouble was that for economic reasons they were prevented from doing so because of the small amount of pay that was paid to the State legislator, which was too small for him to accept and care for his family.

Senator DONNELL. Where did this discussion come up?

Mr. GREEN. I understand it was reported to me that it came up in the discussion of, shall I say, publicity representatives of Labor's League for Political Education.

Senator DONNELL. What is that organization as referred to the A. F. of L.?

Mr. GREEN. That is an organization formed by the American Federation of Labor for educational and political reasons.

Senator DONNELL. Is it correct to call it, as the Associated Press dispatch does, the American Federation of Labor's political arm?

Mr. GREEN. They designate it that. I have never designated it as our political arm. It is Labor's League for Political and Educational purposes. Some one of the representatives there referred to that in a publicity statement only, and no action was taken on it so far as I understand, even by the executive authority of Labor's League for Political Education. I know no action was taken on it by our executive council because it was never brought to the attention of the council, and as a result of it, it was given a wide press play with statements that we were going to do that, and so on.

I can tell you truthfully there is no thought of the American Federation of Labor engaging in any such actions or such a policy. Now there is the story as best I can tell you.

Senator MORSE. I think it is a very important story and I think it is very appropriate that that story go out to the American people today.

Mr. GREEN. Yes.

Senator DONNELL. May I say to the Senator from Oregon that I think it is likewise important, but I should like in due time to examine Mr. Green further with reference to the matter. I don't want to infringe on the Senator's time.

Mr. GREEN. That will be very satisfactory.

Senator MORSE. I wanted to make clear your position because, as I said on the floor of the Senate yesterday, any such reported action by any labor organization in this country in my opinion would be a blow at sound representative government.

Now with that out of the way, I come back to this political restriction section of the Taft-Hartley law. Have you found that the Taft-Hartley law, Mr. Green, has interfered with political activities on the part of A. F. of L. unions because of its terminology?

Mr. GREEN. Oh, yes. It has prevented A. F. of L. unions from using funds—that is, the local organizations—for political purposes.

Senator MORSE. Do you believe that a voluntary organization of workers, namely, a trade-union, should have the right in this country if they wish to exercise it through democratic action within their union to engage in political activity if they so desire?

Mr. GREEN. I do. I believe they should because we always have ever since the organization of the American Federation of Labor, ever since it was formed. No one ever challenged that right heretofore.

Senator MORSE. Has it been the experience of labor, both on a State legislature level and on the Federal congressional level, that the attitudes of men elected to legislative bodies, their attitudes on labor have a direct bearing upon the strength of organized labor in this country?

Mr. GREEN. Certainly. They possess the power, they are clothed with the power and authority to take action which affects very seriously the life of the trade-unions, their very existence. We have found through experience as our organizations grow and expand numerically and otherwise, that we are in a far better position to deal on a more equitable basis with powerful corporations than we are when we are weakened or controlled by Government intervention and Government administration.

That point makes it clear that we are tremendously interested in the action of Congress and of State legislatures because they can take action that will limit, hinder, and weaken the activities of our trade-union movement.

Senator MORSE. In your opinion, has labor come to learn from experience that if it wants to protect its legitimate rights from being damaged by the passage of unwise legislation, it must keep itself in a position where it can support its friends and oppose its enemies in political campaigns?

Mr. GREEN. Yes, sir.

Senator MORSE. And in your opinion the operation of the Taft-Hartley law has greatly restricted labor's exercise of what it considers to be its democratic right as an organization to support its friends and oppose its enemies in political campaigns?

Mr. GREEN. Absolutely, yes, sir.

Senator MORSE. Now I turn, Mr. Green, to the question of the closed shop. Prior to the passage of the Taft-Hartley law the various labor organizations federated with the American Federation of Labor had entered into a great many closed shop collective bargaining agreements with American employers; is that not true?

* * * * *

Senator HUMPHREY. All right, now, the one question that was asked you, and I think it was a very good thing that you gave us the answer this morning, because I was disturbed to hear Senator DONNELL and Senator MORSE speak as they did speak on the floor of the Senate in reference to a statement which supposedly emanated from the American Federation of Labor about placing legislators on the A. F. of L. pay roll. I hope that we will have one of the Senators who will insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or reply to that statement so that we will have a complete record.

Mr. GREEN. I hope so, myself.

Senator HUMPHREY. I shall personally see that it is done.

Mr. GREEN. Thank you.

Senator DONNELL. I wish you would include the further examination of Mr. Green on that same subject.

Senator HUMPHREY. I will be very glad to do that. We will take all that Mr. Green has to say on that subject.

I wonder whether or not, Mr. Green—I personally would be opposed to it, and I want you to know that.

Mr. GREEN. Yes.

Senator HUMPHREY. I feel that it would be a very bad precedent.

I did hear Senator MORSE, however, say that he has asked on the floor of the Senate that every legislator divulge the sources of his income, not just have this business, you know, not just to get this pious look when it gets to be that way, just onesided look, like it is going to be provided with a little sum of money to keep the wolf from the door and keep the bacon and eggs coming home.

Mr. GREEN. Yes.

Senator HUMPHREY. Have you ever heard of any legislators representing any corporations that were ever elected to office?

Mr. GREEN. Well, I cannot name any at the moment.

Senator HUMPHREY. I can. [Laughter.] I mean who have as their clients——

Mr. GREEN. It has been my impression that there have been a good many representatives of corporations in Congress, in the Congress of the United States.

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, all of us have to have a means of income. I think that is perfectly true.

Mr. GREEN. Yes; that is true.

Senator HUMPHREY. Do you think there would be any difference, for example, if the American Federation of Labor put a man on their pay roll, let us say, as an organizer, after he was elected to the legislature, as compared to a man—I am talking about the legislature now; we are not talking about the honorable body of the United States Congress—you think there would be any difference between that and having a man who was elected to the legislature who, let us say, was an attorney for a public utility?

AWARD BY VIRGINIA JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF DISTINGUISHED SERVICE MEDAL TO RICHARD F. PENCE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD a statement of the award by the junior chamber of commerce of the distinguished service medal to Attorney Richard F. Pence, of Roanoke, Va., as the outstanding young man of 1948.

He was nominated for the award by the attorney general of Virginia, the Honorable J. Lindsay Almond, and Mr. Pence is very deserving of the high tribute paid him.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHARLOTTESVILLE, February 19.—The Virginia Junior Chamber of Commerce tonight named Attorney Richard F. Pence, of Roanoke, to receive its distinguished-service

award as the outstanding young man of 1948 at a banquet in the Monticello Hotel here. The presentation was made by Frank Rogers, Roanoke attorney and vice president of the University of Virginia Law School Alumni Association.

The award was given to Mr. Pence, in part, for his service as civil and police justice for Roanoke from which position he resigned in November to resume his law practice. He passed judgment in over 20,000 criminal cases and 3,000 civil cases.

Mr. Pence was nominated for the award by Attorney General J. Lindsay Almond, Jr. In his nomination brief, Attorney General Almond said of Mr. Spence: "He brought his court to a high level of efficiency not heretofore attained and has won an unparalleled reputation for decisions characterized by foresight, practicality, and justice—impartial and equal for every race, creed, and nationality."

Mr. Pence is president of the Roanoke City-County Public Forum, Business Men's Club, and Patchwork Players; chairman of the Roanoke Battalion, United States Navy Organized Reserves; vice president of the Roanoke chapter, Mental Hygiene Association of Virginia, and Mental Hygiene Service; vice chairman of the board of stewards, Green Memorial Methodist Church; a member of the Welfare Conference; YMCA; Roanoke Council, Boy Scouts of America executive board; Community Fund; Kiwanis; Junior Chamber of Commerce; and Roanoke, Virginia, and American Bar Associations.

He is also a member of the board of directors of the American Red Cross, Community Concert Association, Family Service Organization, Travelers Aid Society, Touchdown Club, and the Western Virginia Division of the Automobile Association of America.

He was chairman of the Roanoke Navy Day program last year and is a recipient of the Roanoke Junior Chamber of Commerce Distinguished Service Award.

Mr. Spence received his BA degree from the University of Virginia in 1935 and his LLB degree from Harvard Law School in 1939. He was admitted to the Virginia bar in 1939.

He has been secretary and clerk to Justice H. B. Gregory, of the Virginia Supreme Court of Appeals, and assistant Commonwealth's Attorney for Roanoke. He is now a member of the law firm of Dodson and Pence.

He was in the Navy for 4 years and served as director of the legal department of the United States Navy Military Government on Okinawa. He was discharged in 1946 as a lieutenant commander.

Judges for the award were Dr. Douglas S. Freeman, editor of the Richmond News Leader; William E. Blewett, vice president of the Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock Co., and Mr. Rogers. James V. Creasy, of Charlottesville, was the Jaycee State chairman of the award project. Also on the committee were Charles F. Clark, of Roanoke, and Arthur S. Beauchamp, of Newport News.

Principal speaker at the banquet following the award presentation was Colgate W. Darden, president of the University of Virginia.

PROGRESS OF THE HOOVER COMMISSION

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in common with every other member of the Senate, I have been following with keen interest the remarkable work which has been done by the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch, commonly referred to as the Hoover Commission. My interest is perhaps enhanced by the fact that I was the Senate author of the bill which set up this nonpartisan commission. I have followed its work as closely as is possible without actually being a member. I know the intelligent way in which the work has been subdivided and organized, and I know that the men who made up the various so-called task forces were leaders in their respective fields, and that their names constitute a sort of roster of American ability.

Now the Commission has begun its reports, and of course some of these reports touch on controversial matters. It could not be otherwise. The work of the Commission would be without value if it did not stir some strong emotions.

Congress has a very heavy responsibility insofar as the report of this Commission is concerned because we must give legislative effect to the recommendations of the Commission. There is no doubt that this report will increase the efficiency of the Federal Government very much insofar as service to the American citizen is concerned, and the estimate is made that if all its terms are put into effect there will be a saving of $3,000,000,000 without any curtailment of service. Three billion dollars, Mr. President, is a very large sum, even today.

For all these reasons there is a great responsibility on Congress to give effect to the terms of the Hoover Report. The good results to be achieved and the high caliber of the personnel involved create such a strong presumption in favor of this report that it must be presumed to be right unless definitely proven to be wrong.

The first action which Congress must take is to pass legislation which will enable the President to put this reorganization into effect. This is the only way in which Government can be reorganized, for the very simple reason that by its very nature Congress cannot supervise a multiplicity of detailed reorganization measures. Let it be said that in enacting legislation giving the President the power to reorganize the Congress does not give up its ultimate control over the situation. If the President reorganizes in a way which to Congress seems mistaken, the Congress has a complete opportunity to prevent any harm from being done.

It is, however, of the utmost importance that this limited authority be given to the President without any exceptions being made. If any one agency is exempted from the operations of the Reorganization Act the American people are deprived of the benefit of whatever economies might flow from the reorganizing of the exempted agency, and an invitation is in effect extended to every other agency of the Government to get itself exempted, too. Obviously, if one agency is to be left out, all the other agencies of the Government will feel that they ought to be left out.

For all these reasons, it is very disturbing to note that in the House of Representatives the reorganization bill was amended so as to exempt the armed services from the normal scope of the Reorganization Act. About one-third of our budget today is attributable to the armed services; and it is certain that at least one-third—and perhaps more—of potential economies are to be effected in that field. I understand that a great deal of political pressure was generated in order to amend the bill in the House in this way, and that this pressure came from those who are interested in maintaining the Army engineers in their present status insofar as Federal contracts are concerned. Mr. President, I share the general admiration for the technical proficiency of the Army engineers. Nothing which I intend to say will reflect in any way on their technical proficiency. But it is perfectly conceivable that the statutory directive under which the Army engineers operate could put them in a wasteful relationship with other contract-making agencies, such as the Bureau of Reclamation, and that this might cause a great waste of money.

In any event, there can be no excuse for seeking to exempt the Army engineers from the operations of the Reorganization Act. Yet this is precisely what is being done.

In order to substantiate my assertion, I should like to read a copy of a telegram which was sent to a man whose name I am not at liberty to reveal. It came from Fargo, N. Dak., and reads as follows:

FARGO, N. DAK.

House bill H. R. 1569, Senate bill 526, would eliminate contracts by United States engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, etc., and create Public Works Department who would purchase machinery and do all Government work. This would eliminate distributors and place Government in competition with contractors. House takes this up Monday, Senate Wednesday. Imperative we have immediate action. Suggest you wire opposition to committee members at once. Those from our area on Senate committee: JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Arkansas; KARL MUNDT, South Dakota; HUBERT HUMPHREY, Minnesota; ARTHUR VANDENBERG, Michigan, ANDREW SCHOEPPEL. House members: WILLIAM DAWSON, Illinois; HAROLD G. LOVRE, South Dakota; KARSTEN, Missouri; JOHN BLATNIK, Minnesota; RICHARD BOLLING, Missouri; RALPH HARVEY, Indiana. These are committee members on Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments.

Mr. President, I think it is deplorable and selfish for this type of pressure to be exerted. How can it be denied that this is a crass attempt to put personal selfish interest above public welfare. Frankly, I was shocked when the contents of this telegram were made available to me.

But I have found out that even more reprehensible actions have been taken. I have seen a letter, coming from one of our greatest industrial cities in America, signed by a prominent businessman—I am not at liberty to give his name—which reads as follows:

FEBRUARY 3, 1949.

I know you will be interested that our chamber of commerce was approached by the district engineer of the Army, asking that they oppose the Hoover Commission's proposal to transfer the civil functions of the engineers to the proposed Department of Public Works.

At a meeting of the board of directors today, a motion was made and seconded that we support the Army engineers, at which time I made a statement that while I had the highest respect for the engineers, I did not feel the chamber of commerce should oppose the work of the Hoover Commission, as certainly the Commission was composed of very high-grade men and that Mr. Hoover deserved our every support for the great job which he was doing for our country. I was ably supported by—

Another name which I am not at liberty to mention—

who made a motion that the chamber not oppose any of the provisions of the Hoover report, and this was carried almost unanimously.

Yours very truly,

Mr. President, we are accustomed to witnessing pressure being exerted by private citizens of America, and they have a right to exert this pressure even though one may disagree with what they are trying to accomplish. But when officers of the Army engineers undertake to stir up an agitation against the report of this eminent, distinguished and patriotic Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch, the time has come to call a halt. When an officer in the Army engineers undertakes to exert political pressure on Congress to tell Congress what it ought to do on a broad matter of national policy, that officer is stepping out of bounds and he is guilty of just as much of an impropriety as a Member of this Senate would be if he undertook to go onto a job which an Army engineer was supervising and tell him how he ought to mix the concrete.

The Army engineers have a fine standing in America. I know I have always honored them and regarded them as a shining example of all that is disinterested and patriotic. But they will lose their fine standing very rapidly if they, or any other group in the Government similarly situated, attempt to obstruct these praiseworthy efforts to promote the efficiency of the Government.

I have heard a good deal of talk in the past few years about the dangers of militarism in our Government and I have never paid any attention to it because I have had a life-long contact with military people, and among the ones I know I have never seen the slightest desire to take control of civilian affairs. The instance I have just cited is the first example I have ever seen of the military attempting to dominate the civil functions of the Government. Mr. President, I deplore it deeply and hope that it will not happen again.

ARMY AND NAVY NOMINATIONS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as in executive session, I report numerous routine promotions in the National Military Establishment, and ask for their immediate consideration, and that the President be immediately notified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maryland asks unanimous consent for the consideration of certain nominations as in executive session. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the nominations are confirmed, and the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, my attention was diverted to another matter momentarily. Reserving the right to object, may I inquire whether there was any objection to the nominations?

Mr. TYDINGS. There was no objection. They were unanimously reported, and they are purely routine.

NOMINATION OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. John L. Sullivan, will be absent from Washington for about 2 weeks in connection with the Navy maneuvers in the Caribbean. Several of the important positions under him have not been filled. Among them is the position of Assistant Secretary of the Navy, to which the President has nominated John Theodore Koehler. Mr. Koehler appeared before our committee this morning and made a very creditable showing. I was directed by the committee to ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, to report his nomination, and request that it be confirmed and the President notified, so that he may be on the job while Mr. Sullivan is absent on the Atlantic.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I inquire, does Mr. Koehler come from Wisconsin?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. Koehler came from Pennsylvania originally, and is living in Maryland at the present time. The committee is so advised.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection as in executive session, the nomination will be confirmed, and the President notified forthwith.

EXTENSION OF WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on the calendar, order No. 37, is a bill (S. 829) to extend the office of the War Assets Administrator and the War Assets Administration from February 28, 1949, until June 30, 1949. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House bill 2402.

The VICE PRESIDENT. House bill 2402, which is identical with the Senate bill, has come over from the House. Is the Senator asking that the House bill be considered?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the House bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2402) to extend the office of the War Assets Administrator and the War Assets Administration from February 28, 1949, until June 30, 1949.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the bill H. R. 2402 was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, Senate bill 829 is indefinitely postponed.

THIRTY-FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, 1 year ago today I spoke here on the floor of the Senate on the occasion of the thirtieth anniversary of Lithuania's independence.

On that occasion I noted with profound sadness the unhappy events which have led up to that nation's total disappearance behind the implacable shrouds of the iron curtain. I expressed my fervent hope that the day was not too distant when the sunlight of freedom and the blessings of liberty would again be enjoyed by the people of Lithuania. I voiced my concern that the United States seemed to be shutting its eyes to the conditions which persist in that unhappy small nation.

A year has passed and yesterday marked the thirty-first anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people of Lithuania at Vilna on February 16, 1918. Again there is little cause for rejoicing or celebration. Our loyal Americans of Lithuanian descent, so many of whom fought in World War II to preserve individual dignity and freedom, have every reason to look to the Government of the United States for support and encouragement. They know that in Lithuania men and women are deprived of every possibility to enjoy civil rights, freedom of press, speech, and assembly, the right to express their will in free elections, and their right to worship in accordance with their religious convictions. They can tell you better than I of the mass deportations, the arrests, the quick trials, the reign of terror.

We in this country have rightly joined with other moral peoples in condemning the recent tragic case of Cardinal Mindszenty. But do we realize that in Lithuania there has been a systematic persecution of leading prelates of the church together with their assistants and associates? As part of my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point the statement of the Supreme Lithuania Committee of Liberation dated October 15, 1947, contained in its appeal to the United Nations, describing the treatment to which members of the clergy have been subjected under Soviet enslavement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The wave of arrests has especially affected members of the clergy. On February 19, 1946, V. Borisevicius, Bishop of Telsiai, was arrested and sentenced to death. In the middle of December 1946, his auxiliary, Bishop P. Ramanauskas, was arrested and deported. T. Matulionis, Bishop of Kaisiadorys, was deported at the same time; he had previously endured Soviet imprisonment for 12 years (1920–32) and had been threatened by the Gestapo with confinement in a concentration camp. Recent persistent reports indicate the arrest and deportation of M. Reinys, Archbishop of Vilnius. Thus, at the present time there remains only one bishop in the entire country. Also arrested were the closest assistants of the bishops: Prelates Labukas, Pukys, Olsauskas, and others. That one may appreciate the wide range of arrests in the church, it is enough to mention those in Kaunas alone. Here there are 12 churches. Up to the beginning of 1947, the following Catholic priests of Kaunas had been deported: Canon V. Kleleska, pastor of the Carmelite parish; Rev. J. Dagilis, pastor of Vilijampole parish; Reverend Fabijanskas; Reverend Bubnys, pastor of the Resurrection Church; the Salesian Fathers, S. Gustas and B. Paukstys, of the Igulos Church; the prorectors of the Priests' Seminary, Canon Raudn, and Reverend Kuzmickas; the Jesuit Father Billunas, of the Jesuit Church; Rev. J. Zelvys, of St. Anthony's Church, managed to go into hiding. In the provincial churches, the following were arrested: Reverends Janulaitis, Adomaitis, Ylius, Jonas Grigaitis, Sauklys, Mieldazys, Silumpa, Valsnora, Naguleviciu, Guteravicius, Gaizutis, Cimiella; Franciscan Fathers; Cepulis, Puedstunas, Andraitis, and others—some 70 priests in all. Fearing persecution, about 150 priests have gone into hiding.

Mr. LODGE. These and other reported acts of incredible brutality are so shocking that it seems wholly inadequate merely to stand aside and refuse recognition to the unjustified annexation of Lithuania and the other Baltic countries,

It seems to me that we must do more. We should exhaust every possible means at our disposal to help this brave little nation resume her rightful place among the free and peace-loving countries of the world.

This will take courage, patience, and intelligence. To all Americans who have ties of friendship and family with the people of Lithuania, let me again express my profound hope that a way will be found to restore to that nation the liberty and freedom and prosperity which she deserves. May Lithuania's Independence Day be a day of true rejoicing.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wish to remind the Senate that yesterday, February 16, marked the thirty-first anniversary of a declaration of independence by one of the liberty-loving peoples of the world—the Lithuanians.

Our country and Lithuania are linked by a common devotion to the ideals of freedom. Many thousands of our finest citizens are descended from Lithuanians who came to the United States from their ancient home on the Baltic Sea.

In cities and towns in many parts of our Nation, Americans of Lithuanian ancestry gathered at dinners and mass meetings to celebrate the Lithuanian day of independence. Because Lithuania has been occupied by a Soviet army since June 1940, the people there are not able to participate in open demonstrations. Their relatives and allies in more fortunate countries must celebrate for them.

Our Government has refused to recognize the conquest of Lithuania carried out by the Russian armed forces. We will never recognize the legality of such a conquest. Our diplomatic representatives have repeatedly protested against it to the Soviet Government.

The American people are convinced that the whole civilization of the world rests upon the rule of reason, of justice, and of law. Brutal oppression of a small nation by a large nation strikes at the very foundations of our international relationships.

Through the years of Soviet occupation, the people of Lithuania have never abandoned the struggle to restore their lost liberties. Hundreds of leaders in their flight for freedom have been deported to Siberia. Others have been arrested and executed. Many have been sent to Russian prisons because they would not bow to their Red rulers.

Our sympathies and our friendship go out to the Lithuanian people. We are sure that their gallant fight will have its reward. We know that the forces of liberty will always triumph over the forces of tyranny and terror in the long march of mankind.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by me on the occasion of the thirty-first anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Lithuania.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HERBERT R. O'CONOR

On this, the thirty-first anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Lithuania, all patriots of Lithuanian birth or ancestry throughout the world deserve a heartfelt salute from the people of the United States. The establishment of our own great country stemmed from the determination of our colonial forebears to rid themselves of oppression, and to set up a homeland where freedom would prevail. And our forebears were willing to fight, and die if need be, to realize their heart's desire.

What our forebears dared and suffered has been dared and suffered not for a few years, but for centuries, by the gallant people of Lithuania. They have plumbed the bitter depths of despair and suffering, the like of which the people of America have never known, and, God willing, may never know.

In their darkest moments today, however, every Lithuanian and person of Lithuanian ancestry may recall with pride the glories of Lithuania during the middle ages when, under Vytatus in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, they were the foremost state of all Europe. They can take consolation, too, in the magnificent achievements of the generation that followed the close of World War I and the proclamation of Lithuania as a free and independent state, on February 16, 1918.

No people in all the world have ever given more convincing evidence of their capacity for successful self-government than did the people of Lithuania following their reemergence as a free nation 31 years ago. They succeeded despite all the ravages of that first world war, and notwithstanding the looting of their natural resources during the generations under the Czars. With little opportunity during the several centuries immediately preceding to learn or practice the art of government, they, nevertheless, in the short period between World War I and II, were able to establish their new republic as a stable and enlightened member of the family of nations.

There is no possible ground for self-condemnation on the part of any resident or friend of Lithuania because of the loss of their freedom following the outbreak of World War II. First overrun and overwhelmed by the Russian hosts, then invaded by the Nazis under Hitler, and ruled rigorously for 3 years as a part of a new administrative province, Ostland, the unhappy and unfortunate people of Lithuania and the other Baltic states found even worse horrors in store for them in 1944 when the Russians once again poured over their beloved homeland like a tidal wave and with consequences just as devastating.

No need to detail here the untold horrors visited upon Lithuania under both Communists and Nazis. Suffice it to say that the firing squads never lacked victims, the labor camps were absolutely insatiable in their demand upon the population, the vast reaches of Siberia afforded a dread prison to which literally hundreds of thousands were sent to death or to privations far worse than death.

The joy with which the Treaty of Moscow was received in 1920 by the Lithuanian people turned into the sadness of despair when that treaty was violated so flagrantly and so completely by Russia. In that memorable treaty of 1920 Moscow had agreed to recognize without any prejudices the independence of the state of Lithuania and to renounce for all time all sovereignty rights which she had ever held in regard to Lithuania.

Today, despite her position of slave state of Russia, as the fourteenth Republic of the U. S. S. R., Lithuania has at least this consolation, that our own great nation has consistently refused to recognize the unlawful act of Russia in destroying Lithuania's independence. Our government has never recognized the absorption of Lithuania, or the other Baltic states into the Soviet Union, and continues, instead, to recognize the diplomatic representatives of those countries in the United States. America's attitude was expressed forcibly at the time by the then Acting Secretary of State, the Honorable Sumner Welles, when he said that the people of the United States are opposed to predatory actions no matter by whom they are carried on, and they are opposed likewise to any form of intervention on the part of one state, however powerful, in the domestic concerns of any other sovereign state, however weak.

What this country's official representative said in 1940, is just as true today. One may be sure that it will continue to be our country's principle, until when, in God's good time, Lithuania again regains its cherished independence. As the people of the United States sympathized with Lithuania in its time of anguish and travail, and watched with heartfelt interest the splendid progress in self-government made by this gallant people following 1918, so today all people of good will throughout America sympathize deeply with the sufferings that prevail today in Lithuania and among the many thousands of exiled Lithuanians throughout Asiatic Russia.

With this unhappy people, our prayers go up to Almighty God that the heavy hand of sorrow and slavery which has been laid upon their shoulders will be lifted in the not-too-distant future so that once again we may welcome Lithuania as a free nation of the world, and help its earnest, God-fearing people to a rebirth of national estate.

My own State of Maryland is vastly indebted to the industry and skills of its residents of Lithuanian birth and ancestry. We join ardently with them in cherishing the indomitable spirit of Lithuanian freedom now temporarily banished from their homeland. With them we look confidently forward, to the day when Lithuanian independence again will be a reality, and when February 16, Republic of Lithuania Day, will be a beacon shining brightly aloft, a joyful symbol to all the world that where a people is determined, come what may, not to accept anything less than complete freedom and independence, that noble aspiration will not be denied them by a just and gracious Deity.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, this morning the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and certain other Senators submitted a resolution dealing with a very important policy with regard to foreign relations, and I desire at this time to state my views with regard to the question.

On January 5, 1949, President Truman delivered his State of the Union message to a joint session of Congress. During that address, the President assured the American people as to the essential soundness of both our domestic and our international affairs, when he said:

I am happy to report to this Eighty-first Congress that the State of the Union is good. Our Nation is better able than ever before to meet the needs of the American people and to give them their fair chance in the pursuit of happiness.

Our domestic programs are the foundation of our foreign affairs. We are doing what we can to encourage free states and free peoples throughout the world, to aid the suffering and the afflicted in foreign lands, and to strengthen democratic nations against aggression. We are supporting a world organization to keep peace and a world-economic policy to create prosperity for mankind. Our guiding star is international cooperation. To this concept we have made a commitment as profound as anything in history.

Yet, nowhere, Mr. President, is there a single mention in this State of the Union message of the real state of our international relations, into which this guiding star of international cooperation has led us.

Mr. President, my grave concern for the future continues to grow as I watch the ominous administration strategy unfold following that State of the Union message.

Frankly, I am alarmed by the implications of the President's bold, new, five-point international program which he launched, out of the blue, during his inaugural address on January 20.

Mr. President, is it not a cause of alarm that, in order to put over this bold, new program, President Truman also now finds it necessary to revive the very government-by-crisis techniques by which all the other international programs, for which he now refuses to give an honest accounting, were sold to the American people?

Mr. President, no one is more conscious of the growing gravity of our international relations than I, and I yield to no one in my sincere determination to do my full part in protecting America's interests and strengthening our security at home and abroad.

Yet, as I have reflected on these startling new developments, I have been continually reminded of Tennyson's observation that "a half truth is the worst kind of a lie." It is perfectly obvious to me now that, by announcing this new adventure in international affairs without taking us into his confidence as to just what has happened to all the other international programs on which he so optimistically generalized only 2 weeks previous, President Truman is indulging in the most misleading and dangerous kind of a half truth.

Mr. President, such action not only embarrasses the elected representatives of the American people, it carries far more serious implications. Such action constitutes an expression of contempt for the constitutional prerogatives and duties of the legislative branch of our Government.

No one knows better than President Truman himself that Congress cannot possibly play its rightful role in intelligently evaluating, constructively criticizing, and helping creatively to formulate a sound basis upon which to implement his new international objectives until we know just what has happened to all the other slogans, programs, and principles to which we have committed this country during the war and postwar years.

The distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] gave expression to this obvious truth when, in response to the question, "What are your reactions to the President's speech?" he replied:

I cannot pass judgment on the balance of his new aid programs until I know more concretely what he has in mind.

I suggest, however, that we perfect existing plans before starting any new ones. The President himself says there are limits to our resources. I underscore that warning.

Mr. President, before Congress or the American people can intelligently act on the President's new international program they must find the answers to three of the most crucial questions ever to perplex this Nation.

The first question is, Just what has been accomplished to date by the commitments we have been discharging in support of the whole vast network of international policies and principles to which we have been a party in recent years?

What has been accomplished by discharging our commitments under the Atlantic Charter, the four freedoms, the Moscow Declaration, the Connally resolution, lend-lease, Casablanca, Cairo, Tehran, Yalta, unconditional surrender, UNRRA, the Potsdam Declaration, the Bretton Woods Agreement, the International Bank, the World Monetary Fund, the World Food Organization, the International Trade Organization, the United Nations, the British loan, the Morgenthau plan, the Italian, Rumanian, Hungarian, and Bulgarian treaties, the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall plan, the Act of Chapultepec, the Rio Compact, and all the other slogans and schemes which the American people have loyally supported with their treasure and their blood?

Why is it, Mr. President, that President Truman refuses to take us into his confidence and tell us just where these commitments have taken us? The only answer that is convincing to me, is that President Truman, by his own arbitrary actions, is now seeking to escape responsibility for what has really been happening behind the smoke screen of administration propaganda during these tragic years.

Of course, such a deliberate effort to postpone a day of reckoning makes it all the more imperative that we intensify our efforts to ferret out the real facts ourselves. The American people want to know the facts. We now know from bitter experience that when secret agreements are entered into in our name and kept from us for long periods of time, we learn of them too late to do anything but take the tragic consequences. What is even more tragic is that, in this process, the burden of responsibility for what has happened becomes lost in the mad, face-saving scramble to pick up and put the pieces back together.

No one has more clearly seen this very development coming to a head in our own times than Walter Lippmann, who wrote on January 11, 1949:

It is not healthy in the long run to treat foreign policy as something separate from the normal process of democratic government and of party responsibility. There are no statesmen wise enough, and no experts who are expert enough, to make decisions of life and death, when they are artificially insulated from the give and take of general debate.

An unavoidable result is to thrust excessive power upon men who are not accountable to Congress or to the people, who are often unknown to the public, who decide questions of great moment without having to explain or to justify their actions.

It was Woodrow Wilson, himself, who prescribed the following preventative against such a development in the executive branch of Government, when he said in his book Congressional Government:

The informing function of Congress should be preferred even to its legislative function. The only really self-governing people is that people which discusses and interrogates its administration.

Mr. President, these serious implications of the Chief Executive's refusal to take the American people into his confidence, and President Truman's persistent silence, force us back completely onto our own resourcefulness, to find the answers to these questions.

The second question which we must answer, before we can act intelligently on the President's new program is, "What has become of the bipartisan foreign policy, by which we have sought to implement our international policies and commitments of the past?"

We have been led to believe that it is the bipartisan policy that has kept our international relations free from partisan politics—that has made possible access to information so necessary for enlightenment of public opinion—and that has made possible a genuinely cooperative participation in the formulation and implementation of our foreign policies by majority and minority parties alike.

I now read Mr. Walter Lippmann's observation on what is happening to this bipartisan policy. This appeared in the Washington Post on January 11, 1949:

The bipartisan system of the past 4 years was necessary in the circumstances, but we need not regret that the circumstances have changed. Useful, indeed, indispensable as it was, it had its grave disadvantages. It is one thing to be consulted just before or just after some critical decision is taken; it is quite another thing to share the responsibility from the outset in all the steps which lead up to and may compel the decision.

Yet the effect of the bipartisan system has been to prevent discussion and debate.

Certainly the American people have been solemnly assured, by bipartisan foreign-policy architects of both parties, that this was not the case. Furthermore, we have been continually assured that this bipartisan policy was firmly rooted in, and specifically and adequately designed to protect, the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the traditional American principles upon which, and for which, this Nation has always stood.

On May 21, 1946, the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan, upon returning from his duties as United States representative at the London Foreign Ministers' Council, solemnly assured this body that—

The Council was a complete success in developing at last, and in disclosing a positive, constructive, peace-seeking, bipartisan foreign policy for the United States. It is based at last upon the moralities of the Atlantic Charter and the San Francisco Charter.

There was not the slightest doubt expressed by the Senator that America's vital interests, security, and principles were not completely secure in the hands of the architects of this bipartisan policy. For the Senator insisted that it was—

A policy which now substitutes justice for vengeance in these formulas of peace, which now insists upon ethnic recognitions that no longer traffic in the lives and destinies of helpless peoples, and which spurns expansionism as a plague upon tomorrow's peace and security.

Even as recently as January 5, 1949, in his state of the Union message, President Truman assured us that—

We are following a foreign policy which is the outward expression of the democratic faith we profess.

Yet, nowhere, Mr. President, in his state of the Union message, nor in his inaugural address, nor in any other major speech or statement, has the President honestly told the American people what has happened to the bipartisan foreign policy, which we have been led to believe was an absolutely indispensable medium for the continuing success of our international ventures.

Is it not then, Mr. President, a matter of the gravest concern to find President Truman taking the initiative in deliberately destroying this bipartisan approach to our international problems, by presenting this new version of American foreign policy, without making the slightest attempt to conceal the fact that he had refused to take the Republican Party into his confidence on a single important issue to which he referred?

Is not this fact particularly true when we realize that this bold new adventure carries us even more deeply into the internal affairs of the other nations all over the world?

Yet, in the face of these grave implications, the only sop that has been thrown to the Republican supporters of the bipartisan foreign policy is a deliberate change in the ratio of the Foreign Relations Committee, and the Vice President's ingenious observation that he did not see why five Republicans could not cooperate with this kind of a foreign policy, as well as six.

Mr. President, why would President Truman assume responsibility for thus destroying the bipartisan foreign policy unless he is seeking to cover up the fact that in reality, throughout its operation, it has been making a mockery of constitutional government? Why would President Truman now take this action? It now appears that the bipartisan policy has made both its Republican and Democratic supporters in Congress the legislative goats of an official administration propaganda line—goats who have been effectively barred from access to the real facts of our international life.

Personally, I can reach no other explanation of what has been happening in administration circles. I assure my colleagues that it is no satisfaction for me to find that much as I have wanted to do my full part in protecting America's vital interests, I have never once been taken into the confidence of the architects of the "master plan" by which our over-all international relations have been guided.

Mr. President, I am referring to the master plan which is described in the United States News of February 7, 1947, from which I quote:

During Mr. Byrne's tenure Mr. Acheson's principal contribution was a codification of American foreign policy, the first in many years. This was largely written by the Under Secretary, outlining in detail the United States policy toward every nation and area. In preparing the document Mr. Acheson acquired what some had complained that he lacked; a knowledge of the minutiae of international dealings.

The brochure is, of course, top secret. Only two copies of it exist. One is kept in a State Department vault, the other by the Army's Chief of Staff, so that military and diplomatic policy may be integrated. As former Chief of Staff, General Marshall, of course, was kept up to the minute on foreign policy everywhere. He is now familiarizing himself with developments during his year in China mostly by a study of Mr. Acheson's book. While the Secretary digs into his job and prepares to attend the foreign ministers' meeting in Moscow in March, Mr. Acheson is largely running the Department on the basis of his own guide book.

Mr. President, I would like to ask the members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, if any one of them, whether a Democrat or Republican, has ever seen this "top-secret, master plan" of American foreign policy, or whether he has ever been informed of its basic contents?

I raise this point, Mr. President, because, if, during the operation of the bipartisan foreign policy, we have been made the "goats" of administration maneuvering, it is perfectly obvious what is going to happen in the future after the President himself has abandoned even the pretense of genuine cooperation with both Congress and the American people.

Mr. President, I am convinced that the President's bold, new course of action also means that the alleged "unwillingness to rock the boat of our delicate international negotiations," which has been used during the past years as a convenient excuse for covering up secret diplomacy, and the suppression of honest and open debate, and criticism, has now become a deliberate Presidential strategy.

Let me assure my colleagues that I have no desire to impugn the motives of any man or political party. Yet, in the light of these developments, I do consider it my solemn duty now to see this whole matter through to its ultimate conclusion. I am moved to take this course of action because I believe that no President would so abruptly throw overboard an international program which has been laboriously developed over the years, both on the domestic and international level, nor so flaunt his power in the face of his own bipartisan supporters of both parties in Congress, unless he had become convinced that the real developments, for which he now refuses to account or to be held responsible, have become suicidal political liabilities.

Mr. President, I also know of no other course of action on my part that will answer the third and most crucial question of all, namely: "What has become of the moral principles for which we have been fighting?" These principles are, after all, the greatest stakes that have been involved in this game of international power politics we have been playing. Well, what has become of our American principles?

If I read the signs of the times aright, the optimistic pleasantries with which the administration seeks to put off every serious critic can no longer suffice to explain away the rising chorus of shocking charges that American principles and interests are being betrayed all over the earth, or to hide the frightening developments now taking place on the international scene.

Again may I say that I am not happy to admit that I now am forced to believe what, for a long time, I have more than suspected, that we have been following policies and commitments which have underwritten everyone else's interests but our own.

Mr. President, I have not come to this conclusion easily.

The first real shock to my high hopes for a just and lasting peace came to me when, following the Tehran Conference in 1943, a trusted friend in high-policy-making circles came into my office and said:

For God's sake, don't keep fighting the war on the basis of this agreement or we'll lose our shirts and turn communism loose around the world.

The next shock came when another friend told me that early in the fall of 1945 General Marshall had said to him:

We have got to get Eisenhower out of Europe, because anyone who has had anything to do with Europe is a dead duck.

Then I learned of Gen. George Patton's bitter commentary on what was happening when he said, just before his untimely and tragic death:

We fought the War of 1776 for independence. We fought the war of 1864 to free the slaves. We fought the war of 1917 to make the world safe for democracy. We fought this war to lose for humanity all that we had gained from the other three.

Then came the charges by Gen. Patrick J. Hurley, which I am certain no Senator would now undertake to refute, that—

We began the war with the principles of the Atlantic Charter and democracy as our goal. * * * We finished the war in the Far East, furnishing lend-lease supplies and using all our reputation to undermine democracy and bolster imperialism and communism. The weakness of American foreign policy has backed us into two world wars. We had no part in shaping the conditions that brought about these two wars.

There is a third world war in the making. In diplomacy today we are permitting ourselves to be sucked into a power block on the side of colonial imperialisms against Communist imperialism.

Then came Gen. Clare Chennault's warning, echoing these same charges:

The United States is losing the Pacific war. * * * United States policy toward China is plunging us into a disastrous repetition of the errors that dragged us into World War II. I can hear the time fuze of the third world war sputtering in China, as it burns toward the final powder keg, and I cannot stand idly by without making every effort in my power to snuff it out.

On February 17, 1948, no less a figure than Mr. James Farley admitted to an audience at Colgate University the following reasons for these tragic developments when he said:

I sincerely believe that many of the ills of the world today can be traced to the third and fourth terms, which brought a great mind, but one worn with the weight of years and the cares of state to the all-important conferences of Tehran and Yalta.

There we had a worn leader dividing the world in a series of secret agreements which, having arisen from the Pandora's box of secret diplomacy are now plaguing the world's children with blood, death, and tears.

Then, Mr. President, the Hoover Commission task force, seeking the reorganization of our armed services issued a report which confirmed this whole tragic betrayal of American interests and principles, when it said, in part:

Within slightly more than a score of years, at great cost in life and property, we have won two wars, only to lose the peace both times through lack of a clear and consistent national objective. * * * The bitter lesson does not yet seem to be fully learned—for the committee found that strategic plans, made without clear guidance of long-term peace aims, were based on assumptions that may or may not be true, that the military were planning now to fight the next war, if this tragedy should occur, without knowing what exactly we would be fighting for.

Mr. President, it is obvious that something has gone terribly wrong with our international programs and policies. It is no longer even an open secret that the situation we confront around the world has become too serious for anyone to dare to make political capital out of our predicament.

Our whole American foreign policy is crumbling around our heads, our most vital interests are being forsaken, our prestige is being irreparably undermined, our security is increasingly threatened, and our principles have been trampled under foot.

Since President Truman will not take either Congress or the American people into his confidence and tell us the tragic truth, it has now become our solemn duty to dig out the facts, weigh the evidence, and piece together the picture of what has happened. For myself, I believe it would be a criminal disservice to ignore the challenge of these times for one moment longer.

Therefore, Mr. President, insofar as I have been able to trace it, I want to lay before my colleagues and the American people the true picture of what has been going on during these past tragic, trying years, in the earnest hope that, having once got to the real roots of the wrongs that continue to be committed, we shall then be able to right them.

Mr. President, the American people were promised five basic principles upon which we could build a just and lasting peace, as a reward for their sacrifice and suffering during the war.

First, we were promised that Russia was a great democratic, peace-loving ally, upon whom we could absolutely count for continued genuine cooperation in the just solution of all the economic, social, political, and military problems of the postwar world.

Second, we were promised the realization of the peace aims contained in the principles of the Atlantic Charter, which we were solemnly assured Russia had signed and by which she would abide.

Third, we were promised that the system of sovereign and independent states and the whole system of international law upon which that system had been based would be preserved, and that these nations would also be permitted to join in solving the world's problems as sovereign and independent states.

Fourth, we were promised that the vanquished peoples—Germany, Japan, and Italy—would be rehabilitated and reincorporated into the family of peace-loving nations on the basis of equal access to the trade and raw materials of the world.

Fifth, we were promised that there would be preserved in all the nations stable elements of society with whom we could enter into long-term, social, economic, and diplomatic relations.

Mr. President, what has become of all these promises to the American people, the promises to the soldiers who fought in the fox holes, the promises to the ones who lost their limbs or who now are blind as a result of war wounds? What has become of all these promises, upon the realization of which the success of every single one of our international programs for economic recovery and for maintaining peace have been absolutely dependent?

What has become of the vicious propaganda that Russia was a democratic, peace-loving ally, whom we must not offend by even an honest and open discussion of our own vital interests, and without whose consent we must not dare to take a step even to safeguard those interests?

Here is how Elmer Davis explains what happened to this particular proposition, which he spent hundreds of millions of dollars peddling to the American people. On April 15, 1946, he said:

A year or so ago, most of us supposed that Russian objectives were the same as ours; and extensive concessions were made to them on that hypothesis. We now seem to have been mistaken.

Of course, Mr. Davis' bland admission that our statesmen were the victims of a mistake in this matter is merely another example of the misleading and dangerous half-truth to which I have been referring. After thousands and thousands of our American soldiers and sailors have died while fighting for what they were told were our objectives, this man blandly states we were mistaken.

In the first place, the concessions that were made to Russia, could not possibly have been made on the hypothesis that Russia's aims were identical with our own. Not only were our representatives armed with the whole arsenal of historical facts concerning the viciousness and treacherous designs of Czarist and Communist foreign policy, with which to protect our interests against Russian guile, but they were also armed with the full knowledge that, contrary to the official propaganda, Russia never really signed the Atlantic Charter at all. Behind that half-truth lies the real fact that before Ivan Maisky would sign the Atlantic Charter document in London, on September 24, 1941, he read a long list of Russian exceptions and reservations to the principles of the Atlantic Charter, which constituted Russia's own unique Atlantic and Pacific Charter, all with the full knowledge and consent of our American representatives at that ceremony. But how many Americans knew it?

The question of what happened to the peace aims of the Atlantic Charter is of the utmost significance then, Mr. President, when these extensive concessions were made to Russia on the assumption that she had embraced its principles.

That only a tragedy could follow from policies based on this assumption, is evident from President Roosevelt's own attempt to explain away the embarrassing developments that followed. This is the reason why, on December 19, 1944, he jocularly stated that, so far as he ever knew, there never was a formal copy or document known as the Atlantic Charter in existence, and that, anyway, it was never more than a scrap of scribbled paper. Mr. President, I wonder how the boys who today are almost 95 percent disabled as the result of injuries or wounds they received during the war, feel now about President Roosevelt's statement on that date?

The truth is, Mr. President, that the mistake, to which both Mr. Davis and President Roosevelt referred, is a mistake which now endangers the future of the whole cause of human liberty. This mistake has destroyed the foundations upon which, alone, the success of all the international schemes to which we have been a party could possibly have been, or ever can be, realized.

In a word, the extensive concessions which were made to Russia on the basis of this mistaken assumption transformed the war both in Europe and in Asia from one of limited objectives into a world revolution, and threw onto the ash heap of lost civilizations the principles of the Atlantic Charter. After all, Mr. President, these principles were but the expression of the commonly accepted practices and objectives of civilized nations before the war broke out.

This means, Mr. President, that all the fine phrases about the guiding star of international cooperation by which we have set our course during and since the end of the war, are but more miserable half-truths which serve to cover up the fact that, instead of following that star, we have been plunged into the gathering darkness of a vicious struggle of power politics, which is slowly degenerating into a brutal struggle for sheer self-survival.

It is little wonder then to find that the third basic principle, without which we could not build a just and lasting peace, has also been torn out by the roots. I am speaking of the whole prewar system of sovereign and independent states and the body of international law upon which it was based. Today we find, instead, that those extensive concessions, which have been substituted as a new basis for international relations, are the outrageous and criminal betrayal of American principles which are contained in the secret conferences at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam. The tragic ignorance of what really happened or the utter hypocrisy of the continued peace-loving protestations on the part of those who have been responsible, is nowhere better revealed than in the terrifying contradiction contained in a speech by President Truman himself. On September 1, 1944, Mr. Truman made a campaign speech, as running mate of the late President Roosevelt, in which he told the American people that they had no cause to worry about the peace aims of the United States because, as he said, on the one hand:

This peace was in process many months ago when two men met in mid-Atlantic and drew

up a charter, a set of principles for peace, that have been cited and used as guides by both Democrats and Republicans alike ever since they were first set forth.

Then Mr. Truman went on to assure us that, on the other hand:

This peace was being made at Casablanca, at Moscow, at Quebec, at Cairo, at Tehran. * * * It is a continuing process already years under way, still years in prospect.

The record proves that no man ever uttered a more well-intentioned yet absurd contradiction, for the whole sordid series of secret agreements to which President Truman referred has torn the world in two, turned Russia loose across eastern Europe and western Asia, paralyzed European and Asiatic economies, and placed us in the suicidal position, since 1933, of having built up both jaws of the military monster which is continuing to crush both Europe and Asia between them.

This mistake has resulted in our actually legalizing Russia's aggression by continuing to honor these outrageous secret agreements of Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam. What is more, we now find that we have actually financed Russian aggression over these years. First, we know that billions of dollars worth of lend-lease goods we gave to Russia, with no strings attached, were not used to fight either Germany or Japan, but were used, and continue to be used, to crush all opposition within the so-called liberated countries which we turned over to Russia's tender ministrations in the series of secret conferences.

Then we continued to finance and support Russian aggression both in Europe and Asia by entering into the insane reparations agreements, which gave Russia the right to loot and rape Manchuria, and which have resulted in the withdrawal from Central Europe of at least $14,000,000,000 in loot, all at the subsequent expense of the American taxpayer.

Moreover, we entered into international programs such as UNRRA, knowing all the time that these resources could not help but further feed Russia's gluttonous, expansionist appetite. Then we seem to have confounded the confusion even more by actually ratifying, on the United States Senate floor, treaties with Axis countries, which in effect have forced us to continue to pay indemnities and reparations indirectly to Russia. What is more, the very act of ratification has become a further embarrassment, for, by condemning such a nation as Italy to permanent miserable substandards of living, we have placed an additional and continuing burden on the American taxpayer, which cannot be lifted except we change the treaty obligations, an act which leaves us wide open to charges by the Russian signatories of violating international law.

In the process, Mr. President, every Member of this Senate body can recall how we were consistently urged to recognize Russia's right to surround herself with friendly nations, all during the time when this whole system of sovereign and independent states, and the whole body of international law upon which it was based, were being ruthlessly repudiated in a series of as savage and cruel acts of aggression as the pages of history have ever recorded.

Meanwhile, we have learned to our sorrow that as a result of this shameful division of the world, we have left Russia in possession of the maximum of the raw materials and a minimum of the population of Europe and Asia, while we have been burdened with the task of supporting the permanently bankrupt economies of western Europe and eastern Asia with a minimum of the raw materials and a maximum of the population that has been caught between Russia and ourselves. In undertaking to fulfill this impossible task, we have finally been forced to accept the fact that Russia has been bent on world domination all the time, and that contrary to the official propaganda line, she is determined to undermine our interests, defeat our objectives all over the earth, and destroy the United States in the process.

Yet, Mr. President, when we look at what we have been accomplishing by our foreign policies on this side of the iron curtain, the picture is just as tragic. For instance, by making these mistaken extensive concessions and by following the anti-American political propaganda line which sought to justify them, our American statesmen have carried out a foreign policy on this side of the iron curtain which has also played directly into the hands of Russia's interests and further undermined the basic principles for which this Nation stands.

In the first place, Mr. President, we have repudiated the promise that the vanquished nations would be re-incorporated into the family of nations on the basis of a just and lasting peace. Instead, we have been carrying out the insane commitments entered into at Potsdam, which call for the destruction of the German speaking peoples, and for the destruction of the industrial potential upon which the people, not only of Germany, but of the whole of Europe are absolutely dependent even for a minimum standard of living. We are spending a billion dollars a year, to carry out this senseless process of destruction, even while the President is calling for an additional $1,000,000,000 to help raise the standards of living of industrially underdeveloped peoples in other nations which are dependent on the industrial potential which we are destroying.

This whole program is playing directly into the hands of the Communists, destroying the economic, social, political, and military stability of the European nations, uprooting the whole principle of private property which is protected under the Hague Convention, and paving the way for the collapse of our vital interests in Europe, just as they are collapsing as a result of identical policies in the Far East.

What is more, by following out this pro-Communist policy we are subsidizing other European nations which are determined to use our resources to secure their own individual and selfish interests, no matter what effect such action may ultimately have either on their neighbors or on the United States itself. This explains what has happened to the promise to reincorporate the vanquished peoples into the family of nations.

In the second place, we now discover that we have also continued to play into Communist hands on this side of the iron curtain by following the political division of the world, resulting from the repudiation of the Atlantic Charter and the substitution of the secret agreements which for so long have forced us to permit Russia to carry on her own game of power politics with impunity. I am referring to the fact that following the Tehran Conference the ideological basis of the war, between the Fascist and democratic powers, was transformed into a world revolution between the "democrats" who faithfully followed the Russian line, and the "Fascists," who opposed her.

By following this line—and, oh, how important this is—by following this line the United States continued to attack nations on this side of the iron curtain, such as Switzerland, Sweden, Spain, Portugal, the Argentine, and others, as non-peace-loving nations, and we continued to subject them to economic and diplomatic insults all patterned after the Moscow line. This explains what has happened to the stable elements of society which were to be assured continuing control of their own destinies.

Third, we also fell into the trap, for Communist propagandists to exploit, when we allied ourselves with the Western Powers who were determined to reimpose their system of colonial exploitation over the weaker peoples of the African and Asiatic worlds. Now we know that we have been financing Dutch imperialism, French imperialism, British imperialism, and all the other imperial systems, which have been the curse of so many millions of helpless and weaker peoples around the world. This holds true even of the policies we have followed toward South America.

And so to date, Mr. President, our foreign policy, which has been subsidized by the American people and paid for by the blood of America's youth, has been selling peoples into the slavery of economic and political systems all over the world.

Mr. President, it now begins to appear that we are the first nation in history that has ever become so pathological as to launch on such a cosmic crusade as we now find ourselves in, pouring out our treasure and our blood in two tragic world wars in one generation, only to end up by underwriting a permanently bankrupt imperialist venture, which was doomed at the start.

What other nation in history has made such tremendous sacrifices as have followed these two world wars, only to end up by deliberately subsidizing the very forces of greed, exploitation and tyranny which produced them?

Can it be that we have finally embarked on the fatal course, against which the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] so strenuously warned us over 20 years ago, when he wrote:

A stream can rise no higher than its source. The source of internationalism is and must be nationalism, because the latter

is the inevitable entity upon which the former must build.

Destroy the latter and the former immediately and automatically becomes anomalous.

Just as the home is the basis, sine qua non, of the nation, so in turn, is the nation the basis of world cooperation. The nationalist puts first things first. The internationalists puts first things last.

Thus, while nationalism readily cooperates on its own volition, this latter being the crux of independence, with humanitarian enterprises * * * invoked by the League of Nations or under any other trans-oceanic auspices, it refuses to forget that America has separate and different standards of life and government, and it refuses either to merge these advantages in a general averaging of the standards of other lands, or to expose them by any untoward degree, to the mandate of massed foreign pressure or duress.

That is what they always say, Mr. President, when they find they have gone wrong. Their excuse is that we did not give them enough, or that we gave it to them too late. The excuse they now have is that the American people did not do enough.

The Senator from Michigan went on to utter these prophetic words concerning this great American tradition, which we now seem to have forsaken:

It is a rugged trail of hard-bought freedom. No toll road this—with unwelcome and unbidden mercenaries making alien levies on our liberties and rights.

Reckless adventurers with naught to cherish and naught to lose—soldiers of doubtful political fortune for whom speculation is a trade—may leave this high road for the bypaths and the detours, and the proscribed entanglements of international experiment. High-purposed theorists, scorning the admonitions of yesterday, may clothe their call to other roads in all the habiliments of an evangelical crusade.

But this independent Nation of justly proud Americans will meddle with such vagary, only at its peril.

Mr. President, when a nation forsakes its own traditions and turns over the reins of its destiny to those whose internationalism becomes so pathological as to ignore, or desert, or to betray our own primary national interests and principles, it is time that once more we recalled those words of Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes, who said:

The peril of this Nation is not in any foreign foe. We, the people, are its power, its peril, and its hope.

Mr. President, it is time the American people were fully aroused to the stark tragedy that is now stalking them. While we have been able thus far to weather the tremendous sacrifices that have been imposed upon us during and since the end of the war, these sacrifices have only advanced the cause of imperialist exploitation on both sides of the iron curtain. We have been following a pattern of international cooperation that has not advanced a single cause or principle which is so vital to our own future strength and security.

Instead, the tragic consequences of these sacrifices are rapidly becoming suicidal liabilities.

Would it not be tragic, Mr. President, if now, knowing these things to be true, we should be panicked, or driven, or blindly led to underwrite a permanent extension of this same brand of suicidal internationalism?

Certainly there cannot any longer be doubt of where we are heading. To date, we have been pouring out billions of dollars to carry out these basic programs abroad. Where has all this led us?

Mr. President, it has led us even deeper into the internal affairs of the other nations of the earth, and into ever-heavier financial and economic commitments and controls at home.

Now, we are told that the reason for our present dilemma is that these sacrifices have not been extensive enough, that we did not aid enough countries, and were too stingy in what aid we have given. So that now, Mr. President, we are advised that even at the end of the 4-year program, the Marshall plan cannot possibly get these nations back on their feet, but that we had better plan now for a 10-year program, which, including the additional costs of other incidentals, will cost the American taxpayer from $150,000,000,000 to $200,000,000,000 before it is over.

For instance, we are told that the additional costs will be necessary to put the North Atlantic Alliance into effect, which will involve a revival of military lend-lease, all of which will also be dependent upon implementation of the President's bold, new program for raising the standards of living of the whole world.

Furthermore, we are told that because of the strains on our own domestic economy we must now put the Government into the steel business, extend its functions ever deeper into our economic and social life, continue Government powers of allocation and controls over scarce materials, and submit to a tremendous tax increase to support the whole domestic and foreign program.

In addition, we are headed into increased involvement in the economic affairs of other nations to such an extent that this kind of a program cannot possibly be successful without the destruction, not only of our own economic freedom, but of our whole standard of living.

Nowhere has this picture been more clearly drawn than in the report, Independent Business—Its Struggle for Survival, Senate Document No. 7, in which the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] states:

This policy has already led to the imposition of both mandatory and voluntary controls over many segments of our economy, because of the grave shortages that have already developed as a result of the unprecedented foreign commitments already entered into by this Government.

The dangers of an extension of this policy to free enterprise are increasingly apparent. In proportion as we become involved in international commitments for political purposes, and as we seek to meet those commitments by further involvement, and through increased dependence upon adherence to a wider range of international commodity agreements, the greater will become the necessity for fitting our own economy into this new international pattern of Government-controlled cartel allocation of raw materials and markets.

As we continue to depend on export controls and domestic allocation of scarce materials to meet these commitments we will be compelled by self-interest to force more investments into development of foreign sources of production and supply of these same materials upon which our own economic health depends.

Mr. President, the economic lunacy that underlies the administration programs and propaganda is very simply to be described.

On the one hand, we emerged from the war with a $250,000,000,000 debt which we must finance in order to maintain our own solvency.

In order to carry this burden and increase the production which is so necessary to keep our economy functioning, we, of necessity, moved into a higher price level following the end of the OPA, a price structure which reflects the tremendous inflationary impact of the war and the huge national debt it had incurred.

In order to keep this level of production at this level of 69 percent above 1929, this Government has embarked upon a subsidy program that reaches out into every area of our social and economic life. Shipping, aviation, post offices and post roads, Federal power projects, irrigation and flood control, rural electrification, the price-support program for agriculture, and many other fields.

This means that the American people are spending billions of dollars to keep our economy operating on a price-level unit-production basis, which will enable us to expand our own facilities, develop new sources of raw materials, provide an adequate income for consumption of the goods produced, leave sufficient profit margins to carry business along, and pay for our huge international programs which are all absolutely dependent upon the present high production price and income level of this country, which this Government is trying to protect.

On the other hand, this Government is spending billions of dollars in foreign programs, raising raw-material production and increasing productive capacities among those nations which are increasingly dependent upon American markets for their finished goods or raw-material surplus outlets. Yet the administration insists that a reciprocal-trade program, which cuts tariffs below the American production-cost level, is an absolute essential for the success of their foreign programs.

Of course this means, Mr. President, that the American people, who are absolutely dependent upon our ability to protect the American economy and price structure for their own economic security, are forced to pour our billions of dollars abroad to develop the very competitive forces which this administration insists must be able to find an outlet for their goods in the American market, under trade agreements which undermine the whole American cost-of-production and price structure.

In other words, we are subsidizing our own American economy to keep our price structure sound, and at the same time subsidizing foreign competition, which the Administration insists must have the right to come in and undermine the American standard of living. It simply does not make sense.

Mr. President, aside from the inevitability of its bringing about our own economic and financial collapse, this program is also guaranteed to make the necessity for American subsidy abroad a permanent burden, because it is based on the reimposition of colonial exploitation in those areas of the world which the President insists we must spend billions of dollars out of the American taxpayers pockets to industrialize and develop. How, Mr. President, can these nations ever expect to be able to get back on their own feet, or even improve their own industrial equipment, when we subsidize an economic policy which so exploits them that they can never earn their own way out of the predicament they are in?

Mr. President, such economic insanity cannot possibly lead anywhere except where it has already led us, even deeper into the internal affairs of other nations, at the expense of the American people.

What is more, Mr. President, this whole policy will continue to lead us ever deeper into a permanent war-economy status that will destroy constitutional representative government in this country, and substitute, instead, a Government by executive order implemented by legislative appropriations.

In a recent exhaustive study of the foreign affairs powers that are necessary to carry out this kind of an international program, Professors McDougal and Lans, writing in the Yale Law Review, in 1945 observed:

> It is becoming increasingly difficult to divide effective control over foreign and domestic affairs if we are to have more prosperity and less depression, or to divide effective control over war and peace if we are to have less war and more peace.

Never were truer words spoken.

The tragedy is, however, Mr. President, that, contrary to the propaganda that such a policy is leading to more prosperity and more peace, it is leading us instead into a planned-scarcity depression and a war, the consequences of which no man dares to predict, other than that it will doom our form of Government and our way of life for generations to come.

This means also, Mr. President, that we are rapidly losing not only our own economic and social freedom, but that we are undermining the safeguards of the constitutional guarantees of our personal liberty under law.

It is frightening to learn that this whole legal question regarding the basis of our international relations has confused our own Supreme Court to such an extent that when Mr. William Logan, of New York, argued against the legality of the international tribunal that tried the Japanese War Crimes cases, no less a person than Mr. Justice Frankfurter admitted that as a result of the legal confusion which underlies out international programs and policies, even the Supreme Court was unable to straighten the matter out.

Mr. Frankfurter said to Mr. Logan, who had apologized for his own inability to state his arguments more clearly:

> The trouble is not with your clarity but with your problem. * * * Something may be illegal, and still be international and so be something over which this Court has no jurisdiction.

It is even more disconcerting to find that in its own brief prepared on this case the United States Government states:

> Once it is suggested that American courts may review the judgments of an International Court or pass upon the actions of an international authority's agents, most unhappy consequences can be anticipated in the development of international affairs.

Mr. President, before we permit this whole international program to get completely out of hand, by underwriting a permanent extension of its present legal and economic absurdities, it is time we stopped and reconsidered the lessons of our whole history as a free and sovereign people.

If we are not permanently to embrace an international program which will lead us down the road to destruction by taking us ever deeper into economic, military, and political intervention all over the world, we must retrace our steps out of the international morass into which we have plunged, by following once more the guiding star of our traditional American principles.

Mr. President, America was carved out of the remnants of five ancient empires, the British, the French, the Spanish, the Dutch, and the Russian. From its inception, America was dedicated as a sanctuary for the politically and spiritually oppressed who might reach our shores in their search for liberty and freedom from exploitation and oppression. Our Nation was founded on the belief that the external relations of a people ought always to reflect the internal economic, social, and political needs and the sovereign will of the people themselves.

This is the reason why Washington and Jefferson sought to guard us against embroilment in the internal quarrels of the nations of the Old World, and to preserve our constitutional government "as the sheet anchor of our peace at home and safety abroad."

Throughout our history as a free and sovereign people, we have stood by this conviction that under no circumstances has any nation any right to exploit weaker and helpless peoples either within or outside of its borders.

If we read the Declaration of Independence again, we shall see that the gravest concern of our founding fathers was not that we should ever approve indirect support of exploitation of weaker peoples by stronger nations, but, instead, their primary concern was to create on these shores a form of government which would forever preserve the American people from the brutal exploitation of their own resources, freedoms, and persons by their own Government.

How, then, does the President's bold new program appear in the light of the foregoing facts?

Again we find the American people being made the victims of a misleading and dangerous half-truth, which, if accepted, will only take us farther down the road of exploitation, bankruptcy, and ruin.

Mr. President, in the midst of all the confusion that prevails we are indeed fortunate to be able to contrast clearly the difference between a genuine American program for international cooperation and the pathological internationalism we are now being asked to perpetuate. Indeed, I have in my hand a copy of a communication which reveals the nature of this contradiction down to its very roots. I refer to a communication sent to the late President Roosevelt by Gen. Patrick J. Hurley, from Chungking, China, on September 17, 1944. This communication contains the American plan for international cooperation which was outlined to President Roosevelt by General Hurley in a report of December 21, 1943, which I now wish to read into the RECORD.

Has any Senator on this floor ever seen this correspondence between General Hurley and the late President Roosevelt? Has it been published in any newspapers? General Hurley was sent to China by President Franklin D. Roosevelt. He was sent there at the expense of the American taxpayers. I say that even the members of the Foreign Relations Committee have not seen the correspondence between Gen. Patrick Hurley on the one hand and the late President Roosevelt on the other.

This is what General Hurley wrote to the President on the 21st of December 1943, after he had been in China at the request of the President:

> It is the purpose of the United States to sustain Iran as a free, independent nation and to afford the Iranian people an opportunity to enjoy the rights of man as set forth in the Constitution of the United States and to participate in the fulfillment of the principles of the Atlantic Charter.
>
> The policy of the United States toward Iran, therefore, is to assist in the creation in Iran of a government based upon the consent of the governed and of a system of free enterprise which will enable that nation to develop its resources primarily for the benefit of its own people. Iranian resources are adequate to sustain a program to help Iran to help herself. By this program of self-government and well-directed self-help Iran can achieve for herself the fulfillment of the principles of justice, freedom of conscience, freedom of the press, freedom of speech, freedom from want, equality of opportunity, and to a degree freedom from fear.

In all the history of America, Mr. President, no one has ever expressed anything more clearly than did that great patriot, Patrick J. Hurley, in his letter to the late President. General Hurley continued:

> To accomplish the above the United States will furnish upon invitation of the Iranian Government, experts and advisers in any or all of the fields of government. All experts and advisers furnished to Iran by the United States will be paid—

By whom? By the American taxpayers? No, Mr. President, General

Hurley said, "Let the Iranians pay for the experts sent to their country to help Iran." General Hurley said they—

> will be paid by the Iranian Government and implemented in their operations by authority of Iranian law, and will not be a financial responsibility of the American taxpayer. The United States will not ask or receive any special privileges in return for these services.
>
> American advisers will be fully indoctrinated in the policy of our own Government toward Iran and shall make regular progress reports to our State Department. This indoctrination and requirement of reporting will provide a vital element of coordination which is essential to direction of our policy and protection of our interests.
>
> Modern history of this country shows it to have been dominated by a powerful and greedy minority. The people have also been subjected to foreign exploitation and monopoly. In extending American assistance to the building of an improved society in Iran there must be imposed a sufficient degree of supervision and control over free enterprise and personal aggression to protect the unorganized and inarticulate majority from foreign and domestic monopoly and oppression.

Mr. President, here we come to the difference in theory between those who are following President Truman in what he said in his inaugural address and some of us who believe that when we go into a foreign country we should not go there to exploit it, but should go there to help the common people of that country. Gen. Patrick J. Hurley set a pattern for us in America to follow, and in a few minutes Senators will find out what became of that pattern set for the American people by that great general. General Hurley said:

> Inauguration in Iran of the American pattern of self-government and free enterprise will be an assurance that proceeds from development of Iranian resources will be directed substantially to the building of schools, hospitals, sanitary systems, transportation and communication systems, irrigation systems, and improvement of all facilities contributing to the health, happiness and general welfare of the Iranian people.
>
> This plan of nation building may be improved through our experience in Iran and may become the criterion for the relations of the United States toward all the nations which are now suffering from the evils of greedy minorities, monopolies, aggression, and imperialism.

Where can there be found a finer expression than that contained in the letter by Gen. Patrick Hurley to the late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt? General Hurley continued:

> The American people, single-mindedly devoted to independence and liberty, are fighting today not to have the imperialisms of other nations nor to create an imperialism of our own but rather to bestow upon the world the benevolent principles of the Atlantic Charter and the four freedoms.

How could General Hurley have expressed himself more clearly? He said that the American taxpayer is contributing and the American soldier is fighting, not to keep some discredited king on a tottering throne, but for the common people.

In his Chungking communication General Hurley continued:

> The whole plan is being predicated on your desire—

That is on President Roosevelt's desire—

> to raise the standard of living in other nations as a means of sustaining our own standard of living. The standard of living in other nations cannot be substantially or permanently raised by lend-lease or doles. The American taxpayers would not be able to pay for a continuance of relief for the world on a lend-lease basis. Therefore, as I understood you, our purpose was, as stated above, to establish free governments and free enterprise and to lend expert advice and leadership in developing the resources and the commerce and building up generally the industry of each of the less-favored nations so that the citizens, through their own efforts, could raise their own standard of living.

President Truman said in his inaugural address that we are going to extend our activities all over the world, and what he proposes to do will be at the expense of the American taxpayers, and he asked for a great sum of money for a single year, to begin the work. Yet we are tearing down German industry, even tearing down the German fertilizer plants, thus depriving German farmers of the opportunity to obtain enough fertilizer, and their crops are becoming poorer all the time. The American taxpayers are paying more and more for it all.

General Hurley continued:

> The American agents or experts were to be paid by the nations in which they served and would not be a burden on the American taxpayer. All of this is in conflict with the opinions of those who believe that the American taxpayers can become the Santa Claus to the whole world, and is also in conflict with the opinions of all who favor imperialism, monopoly, and exploitation.

Then General Hurley revealed that he had received President Roosevelt's endorsement of this plan when he recalled that—

> On March 25, 1944, I received a letter from you which is, in full, as follows:
>
> MARCH 25, 1944.
>
> Maj. Gen. PATRICK J. HURLEY,
> *Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.*
>
> DEAR PAT: Your letter of December 21, 1943, concerning Iran contains suggestions of very great interest. I am thrilled with the idea of using our efforts in Iran as an example of what can be done by an unselfish American policy. If we can get the right kind of American experts who will remain loyal to their ideals I feel certain that our policy of aiding Iran will succeed.
>
> You are right that the distribution of lend-lease supplies throughout the Middle East should be taken over by our own people, and I have let the Secretary of State know my views in this matter.
>
> Very sincerely yours,
>
> FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

General Hurley went on to say:

> This letter is excellent. It indicates that you approved and desired to make effective the plan for Iran.
>
> I was permitted also to read in the State Department your memoranda of January 12, 1944, addressed to the Secretary of State, with which you transmitted my report. You expressed to the Secretary your desire to use Iran as an example of what we could do with an enlightened, unselfish American policy. You told the Secretary, as I recall it, that you would like to have a try at making this policy effective in Iran as Iran appeared to present the most difficult situation in the Middle East at that time. You wished to make Iran the testing ground for an American policy based on the principles stated in the Atlantic Charter. You very pointedly stated that the essence of your plan was in the fact that it offered assistance to the so-called less-favored nations in their economic difficulties without creating a burden on the American taxpayer.
>
> On March 2, 1944, I received a very favorable and understanding letter from the Acting Secretary of State, Edward R. Stettinius, copy attached, in which he enumerates the recommendations made by me, in reference to Iran, which had been made effective.
>
> I am justified in assuming that the program for Iran had your approval and the approval of the Secretary of State.

Mr. President, I want at this time to refer to a letter written on April 9, 1945, to the Secretary of War by Secretary of State Stettinius, to prove the assertion of General Hurley that he had also been assured by the State Department that it was putting this policy into effect:

> APRIL 9, 1945.
>
> DEAR MR. SECRETARY: During 1943 and 1944 the War Department was good enough to make available to the Department of State the services of Maj. Gen. Patrick J. Hurley for important and urgent diplomatic negotiations in the Middle East. His duties in the Middle East having been concluded, I wish to express the warm appreciation of this Department for his outstanding services and to report to you, for the record, a statement of his accomplishments.

This is what Stettinius thought of General Hurley at that time:

> Under date of May 13, 1943, General Hurley made a report on Iran to the President, at the conclusion of which he made four specific recommendations: (1) that Iran be assured of American insistence that the principles of the Atlantic Charter do in fact apply to Iran; (2) that Iran be permitted to join the United Nations in the declaration of war against the Axis; (3) that the American and British Legations be raised immediately to the status of embassies; and (4) that American and British Ambassadors who are compatible to each other and are able to understand and promote British-American cooperation in Iran be appointed. All four of these recommendations were accomplished. Subsequently General Hurley was instrumental in having brought before the Tehran conference what is now known as the declaration regarding Iran. The various forms of this declaration which had been considered previously were revised under General Hurley's insistence and a reaffirmation of the principles of the Atlantic Charter inserted for the first time. General Hurley played the leading part in obtaining the adoption and signature of this declaration by President Roosevelt, Marshal Stalin, and Prime Minister Churchill. The declaration has been of material service to the American Government and an inspiration to all of the peoples of the Middle East.
>
> In addition to the foregoing, General Hurley outlined a general plan for our relations not only with Iran but with other Middle East nations, including a recommendation in regard to the administration and distribution of lend-lease supplies throughout the Middle East. Later, on December 21, 1943, he rendered another report on Iran which the President acknowledged in a letter dated March 25, 1944, a copy of which is attached hereto. The

plan outlined by General Hurley in his report of December 21, 1943, is being implemented by this Department.

General Hurley also made an investigation of the oil situation in Saudi Arabia and made an intensive and incisive report on that situation.

General Hurley rendered services of a highly meritorious character, with far-reaching effect on the policies of this Government. I am happy to place on record this evidence of the Department's regard for his achievements while serving in the Middle East in the capacity of special representative of the President with the rank of ambassador.

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

E. R. STETTINIUS, Jr.

I want every Senator to remember that letter, written by the then Secretary of State.

Mr. President, now follows a grim picture of just how this genuine American plan for international cooperation and every hope of salvaging the principles of the Atlantic Charter were undermined. I want now to read this story into the record in order to help the American people understand just where, when, and how the roots of our present predicament were planted.

I am continuing to quote from General Hurley's Chungking communication to the President:

At this point I might state that I have been told that the deterioration of America's position in Iran is due, in large measure, to the fact that you did not call on the Shah after he visited you while you were in Iran. This, in my opinion, is not true. The deterioration in America's position in Iran is due to more deep-seated causes.

Let me examine for you what I believe to be the more deep-seated reasons for the deterioration of America's prestige in all of the Middle East.

Why have the Communists won in that area? Why have the Communists won in China?

They have won because Pat Hurley's advice was not followed. They won, for one reason, because after Roosevelt advised that Mr. Hurley's advice be followed, it was not follow d. There is another reason which I shall point out in a moment.

Mr. President, let us examine briefly what Mr. Hurley considers to be the deep-seated reasons for the deterioration of America's prestige in all of the Middle East. I read further from his letter:

I was shown a memorandum in the State Department which was written by Mr. Rostov and was initialed by Assistant Secretary Dean Acheson and others. This memoranda condemned the Iranian plan and referred to it as "messianic global-baloney."

There we find this man Dean Acheson again, Mr. President. I am very proud of the fact that I voted against confirmation of his nomination when it was before the Senate. Let those on this side of the aisle who voted for the confirmation of his nomination take the consequences.

I continue to read from Mr. Hurley's letter:

My report which you sent to the State Department was circulated in other departments of the Government. It carried with it the "messianic global-baloney" memoranda and was also verbally attacked by men in the State Department to such an extent that the report was discredited. It finally reached the press through a keyhole columnist in a discreditable form. So the basic work of destroying your Iranian plan was accomplished in Washington.

Those who opposed the Iranian plan in Washington have also expressed the same opinion about the Atlantic Charter that they have expressed about the Iranian plan. They are especially opposed to articles 3 and 4 of the Atlantic Charter which are, in full, as follows:

"3. They respect the rights of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live—and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

"4. They will endeavor with due respect for their existing obligation to further the enjoyment of all states, great and small, victor and vanquished, of access on equal terms to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity."

These are men in the State Department who are upholding imperialism, monopoly, and exploitation as opposed to the principles stated in the Atlantic Charter. That is one of the deep-seated reasons for the failure of the Iranian plan.

We come now to consider the experts. You very wisely pointed out, in your letter to me of March 25, 1944, that:

"If we can get the right kind of American experts who will remain loyal to their ideals I feel certain our policy of aiding Iran will succeed."

Here you put your fingers on the second deep-seated cause for the failure of the Iranian plan.

Mr. President, I hope all Senators clearly understand this matter. The Members of the Senate now on the floor should put themselves in the place of the Iranian people at that time. After the Tehran Conference, hundreds of thousands of them were awaiting action by the American experts.

I read further from Mr. Hurley's letter:

After the Tehran Conference, the Iranians awaited action by the American experts. Some of the so-called experts had already been appointed. The American experts in Iran were, at best, faced by a very difficult situation. Britain and Russia had occupied the country and had hired or commandeered nearly all the transportation facilities. They had already consumed a considerable portion of Iranian food. Our General Connolly was operating the Iranian railroad for the purpose of transporting supplies to Russia. American so-called experts were put in charge of food rationing and finance; military reorganization; national and municipal police reorganization and other internal affairs for the reorganization and development of Iran.

Significantly, Mr. President, all those foreigners were brought into Iran to conduct the affairs of the people of Iran for them, instead of letting the people of Iran control their own affairs, and those experts and other foreigners were brought there at the expense of the American taxpayers. I challenge the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate to show any activity on its part at that time to point out the evils and errors in that situation. Not one speech on that subject was made on the floor of the Senate by the Republicans. So it is no wonder that the American people had no confidence in the Republican Party as constituted at the time of the last election. Of course, the people had no confidence in the Republican Party, and they should not have had any confidence in it, Mr. President. It has been said that we had a bipartisan foreign policy. A bipartisan policy to do what? It was a policy to ruin every poor man in every one of the poor countries which was relying upon the United States, as its friend, for help. But the Senate Foreign Relations Committee sat idly by and watched the exploitation go on.

I read further from Mr. Hurley's letter:

The conduct of the occupying nations had deprived Iran of transportation and food to a great extent. The occupying nations had required Iran to issue large amounts of currency which, together with the shortage of transportation and supplies, brought about inflation. The occupying nations publicly condemned the Iranian Government, which they had made impotent, for not taking stronger action. The occupying nations finally condemned the American experts or agents for not bringing order out of the chaos which the occupying nations had created. They have now succeeded in getting the Iranian Government to join them in condemnation of the American agents. In short, Mr. President, America has been made the goat. I am advised that the Shah said recently, during the course of a conference with the British Chargé d'Affaires, that he would be happy if all the so-called American experts would go home. We should frankly face the fact that to a great extent this position, if taken by the Shah, is justified.

Minister Dreyfus was withdrawn by you so that you could appoint a man capable of coordinating and leading the American agencies in Iran. There was great delay in appointing an Ambassador and a commercial attaché. The man who has recently been appointed Ambassador is unquestionably a splendid gentleman. He was in Iceland before being made Ambassador to Iran. He is not familiar with the situation in Iran. His previous experience would not justify anyone in believing that he is capable of handling the most difficult situation in the Middle East. He does not seem to understand your policy, nor does he show any evidence of being able to make it effective.

Dr. Millspaugh, the finance expert, is able and honest but has not been getting along very well. He has not had the support of the other American agencies in Iran.

Mr. President, in the United States the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force cannot get along together very well. Likewise in Iran the Americans who were sent there by the United States have even been quarreling among themselves, so, of course, they do not get very far in the right direction under those circumstances.

Mr. Hurley continues as follows:

The Iranians, the British, and the Russians and our own State Department believe that Dr. Millspaugh has failed. I am not willing to go that far in his case. I think his trouble is that he has not had the proper direction or support.

General Connolly, the American military commander, has certainly been efficient. He has achieved outstanding results in getting supplies to Russia. That was his mission.

Most of the other so-called American experts in Iran are washouts. Some of them have taken no action whatever. There is neither unification nor harmony among them. There has been no enlightened effort to coordinate American experts in Iran. The

experts, sent to Iran, have not been indoctrinated in the fundamental principles of the policy which you have adopted.

Instead of creating a set-up in Iran which would serve as criterion for America's policy not only in Iran but in all the so-called less-favored nations, the American effort in Iran has become a symbol of American inaction, incompetence, and failure.

Mr. President, it is no wonder that the Communists won in China.

I read further from the letter:

This is certainly not your fault nor is it the fault of the Secretary of State. Both of you have, in my opinion, been faithful to the principles of the Atlantic Charter and have reiterated many times the rights of small nations to free government, free enterprise, and the development of their own resources for the purpose of raising their own standard of living.

The deterioration of America's position in Iran and in the entire Middle East and the debacle of the principles of the Atlantic Charter was initiated in Washington. The element in the State Department that made plans for the defeat of your Iranian policy justifies the sale of lend-lease goods by the United Kingdom Commercial Corp. This corporation is a government-owned institution created for the purpose of establishing a trade monopoly in Iran. This corporation is the deep-seated basic reason for the failure of your plan for Iran. Those in the State Department who are opposed to the principles of the Atlantic Charter are cooperating in furnishing lend-lease goods to the United Kingdom Commercial Corp. and its subsidiaries for the purpose of sustaining imperialism, monopoly, and exploitation. These same people wish to prevent the building of free governments and free enterprise and the development of the resources of Iran and other Middle East nations for the purpose of raising the standard of living of the people within the Middle East nations. They are succeeding in subjecting all the peoples of the Middle East and Africa to the principles of imperialism, monopoly, and exploitation. The result of all this is that the United States, having occupied the highest position in the estimation of the Iranian officials and people, now occupy the lowest position of any of the powers represented there.

While I have written to you and spoken to you personally about the United Kingdom Commercial Corp. I am not certain that I have been able to impress upon your mind a true picture of what that corporation is doing. Let me give you here a brief outline of one of the chief reasons for the failure of your Iranian plan.

The United Kingdom Commercial Corp., with the use of American lend-lease goods, is establishing a trade monopoly in Iran. While in Iran I expressed my opposition to the use of American lend-lease goods for this purpose and wrote you suggesting that lend-lease supplies in the categories that were being sold should be stopped or at least the United Kingdom Commercial Corp. should be required to reimburse America for the lend-lease goods which it is selling for purposes that have no connection with the war but have the sole purpose of establishing a monopoly.

Your Minister, Dean James Landis, has told me that, in recognition of my demands, the United Kingdom Commercial Corp. has deposited $15,000,000 in some sort of a suspense account in London which is to be applied on the payment of lend-lease goods which it has sold. In recognition of the principle which I advocated the lend-lease goods are to be paid for as soon as an accounting has been made. While this does acknowledge the principle, the action would not be satisfactory to me if I were representing the United States. In the first place, the amount is not a drop in the bucket compared with the value of lend-lease goods which have been sold by the United Kingdom Commercial Corp. and its subsidiaries. In the second place, even the $15,000,000 will not, in my opinion, be applied. There seems to be a determined effort not to pay the United States for any lend-lease goods whether they are used for war purposes or sold by a corporation for the purpose of establishing a monopoly.

Article 1 of the Atlantic Charter is as follows:

"1. Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other."

Because of the demands made on your time, I do not believe that you have ever fully realized that the money of the American taxpayer is being used in the name of democracy and in the name of the Atlantic Charter to establish an international trade monopoly that has for its purpose the exploitation of the people of the weaker nations throughout the Middle East, Africa, and elsewhere.

I might say, Mr. President, I do not believe a single Senator knew this corporation was selling lend-lease goods which they got for nothing from the United States. I do not believe there is a Senator upon the floor, including any member of the Foreign Relations Committee, who knows the extent of the corporation's operations.

The letter continues:

So that you may have a sketch of the gigantic operations of this monopoly, which we are supporting through lend-lease, I submit here a rough outline of the set-up of the United Kingdom Commercial Corp. and its subsidiaries.

A. The United Kingdom Commercial Corp. is a Government corporation having its headquarters in London. Its subsidiary corporations operate in each of the following nations under the name indicated:

1. UKCC (Egypt) Ltd.
2. UKCC (Libia).
3. UKCC (Sudan) Ltd.
4. East Africa.
5. UKCC (Ethiopia) Ltd.
6. UKCC (Eritrea) Ltd.
7. UKCC (Palestine) Ltd.
8. UKCC (Syria & Lebanon) Ltd.
9. UKCC (Iraq) Ltd.
10. UKCC (Persia) Ltd.
11. UKCC (East Africa) Ltd.
12. UKCC (Algiers) Ltd.
13. UKCC (Turkey) Ltd.

(In addition there are branch offices at Cyprus, Aden, and Jibuti.)

B. Global subsidiary:

14. United States.
15. India.
16. Argentine.
17. Portugal.

Mr. Hurley then expresses the viewpoint, I believe, of those typical, patriotic Americans who willingly sent their sons to fight for our country. It cannot possibly be better expressed than the way it is expressed by General Patrick Hurley—this man whom the President appointed, the man whom he would naturally suppose he could trust, and who up to the present time has always proved trustworthy; a man of ability, patriotic, honest, hard-working, self-sacrificing. In his letter to President Roosevelt, Mr. Hurley continues:

American money and lend-lease supplies are used by this corporation and by its subsidiaries for the purpose of controlling natural resources and trade and exploiting the people in all of the nations indicated. Incidentally, it is being used also for the purpose of defeating America's economic interests in all of these nations.

They are fighting the United States. They are using our lend-lease, selling it and taking the money, and fighting with lend-lease. That is what General Hurley found over there. The letter continues:

I do not say that it is intended to defeat America's interests alone. It is designed to prevent free enterprise, free commerce, free access to raw materials by all nations except Britain. The United Kingdom Commercial Corp. is the antithesis of the Atlantic Charter.

A frank statement of this situation in my letter to you of December 21, 1943, which became public through the State Department, led to the accusation that I am anti-British. I am not anti-British.

Oh, how the British rejoiced when Dean Acheson was appointed Secretary of State. The newspapers here in Washington were filled with their statements the next morning. They said, "We are satisfied with Dean Acheson; he suits us." Is not the fact that they can take our lend-lease, sell it, and then in every one of the countries I have named establish corporations for the purpose of exploiting the common people one reason why his appointment suits them?

Mr. Hurley says—and he uses beautiful language, Mr. President:

I am opposed to imperialism. I am opposed to monopoly. I am opposed to exploitation of weaker people. It is not necessary for me to say this to you as you are fully aware of these facts, but I am stating them here so that if this letter gets into the same channels that my letter of December 21, 1943, got into it will not be as easy for those in our Government who oppose the principles of the Atlantic Charter to put their own estimate on my character and the principles I support. For that reason I am writing down here that I do believe in democracy. I do believe that the people of the world should have equal rights of access to the raw materials of the world. I do believe that the people of small nations should be assisted in the development of their own resources for the benefit of themselves. I do believe that the resources and trade of nations should be developed primarily for the purpose of raising the standard of living within each nation. I am in favor of the principles for which you and Mr. Churchill have stated we are fighting. I am opposed to the British policy of imperialism and monopoly and exploitation in the Middle East and in Africa. I am convinced that this British policy is in conflict with the principles for which you and Mr. Churchill have stated we are fighting. I do believe that the destiny of the English speaking people is a single destiny. I do believe that the United States and Britain should get together on principles. From the facts stated here it is evident that the British do not uphold the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

The failure of your program in Iran is due (1) to incompetence and lack of leadership of some of our own agents in Iran; (2) opposition to the plan in our own State Department; (3) to the determined opposition of British imperialists, and (4) to the strong, intelligent and determined opposition of the United Kingdom Commercial Corp.

My purpose in addressing this letter to you is to call your attention to the deterioration of America's position in Iran and to emphasize the effect of that deterioration on the prestige of America. I have no recommendations to offer other than those stated in my former letter. I do suggest the advisability of taking appropriate action to

correct the situation in Iran; to restate or reaffirm your policy and to retrieve America's prestige.

Respectfully submitted,

PATRICK J. HURLEY,
Major General, A. U. S.

Here then, Mr. President, is the way in which our own State Department representatives helped to plant the roots of imperial exploitation which are now bearing such bitter fruit. The tragic concesions that were made to Russia, already dealt with above, continue to be strengthened by the policies we are pursuing.

Not only have we subsidized the spread of British trading monopolies with lend-lease goods, during and since the end of the war, not only have we been financing British exploitation of weaker peoples in Africa and Asia, not only have we squeezed American business interests out of these areas with our own money, on this side of the iron curtain, but we have been doing exactly the same thing on the other side.

The fact is that for years we have been financing an expansion of British trade and financial interests on the other side of the iron curtain, to such an extent that we are now making a mockery of the cold war, both sides of which we are financing at the expense of the American taxpayer.

At this very moment Britain is moving in and taking over the trading concessions behind the iron curtain, which we are forbidding the American people to touch.

We say to our American business men, "You cannot go behind the iron curtain in order to get business." At the same time, we are putting up money so that the British can go there, and they are going there.

As proof of this fact let me cite a few examples.

First, let us remember that the Russian blockade of Berlin was answered by the United States with a counter-blockade of the eastern zone. Yet, this action has been largely negated by the British, since supplies of almost all the materials the eastern zone used to get from the west are now being shipped in increasing quantities through the British zone. Even in the British sector of Berlin, a profitable trade with the Russians continues in a trading system that involves both outright barter and cash payments in hard currency or gold.

We can keep on flying in materials. We can keep on saying to American business men, "You cannot do business behind the iron curtain"; but Great Britain is doing it every day, every hour, every minute.

It also now develops that Britain is extending her activity further into the Russian sphere in bilateral trade arrangements both with the satellite countries and with Russia herself.

For example, let us look at what is happening under the British 5-year trade and financial agreement with Poland.

This involves such an increased volume of trade that it will definitely cut British imports from Canada and replace them with imports from behind the iron curtain.

We have voted many billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money. But the people told the Republicans what they thought of that policy, and they told them in no uncertain terms. The Democrats said, "We will give them $1,000,000,000." The Republicans said, "Let us make it $2,000,000,000." The vote in the Foreign Relations Committee was unanimous. I, as a member of the farmer-labor branch of the Republican Party, am here alone, and I assure my Republican colleagues that the people of America shall know the record. It is time they found out about it.

As to taxes, the President calls for $4,000,000,000 additional taxes. I am not surprised that there are not more Senators upon the floor; I am not surprised at all. I am the lone member of the farmer-labor branch of the Republican Party in the Senate. I felt flattered a day or two ago when one of the distinguished Republican Senators, who is up for reelection 2 years from now, asked me to come into his State and campaign for him. There is a group of 6, 8, or 10 Senators on the Republican side who feel as I do, as is evidenced by the resolution introduced today by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]. I want to assure the Senate that we do not want to give away America. There may be only a small group of us upon the floor, but it is a group that will fight, bring out the facts for the benefit of the American people, and call a spade a spade, without regard to the distinction between Republicans and Democrats.

Mr. President, I said a moment ago that England was getting this trade away from the United States, going behind the iron curtain and getting it. I mentioned the 5-year trade and finance agreement regarding Poland which England has made. Let us look at what is happening. Already this agreement calls for a tremendous increase in imports over present levels of such commodities as eggs, bacon, and lumber products. Polish shipments of eggs will rise from 435,000 to 1,100,000 boxes annually—frozen eggs from 3,500 to 8,000 tons in 1953. I have here a letter from a North Dakota farmer, which indicates that farmers there are getting 33 cents a dozen for their eggs. The shipment of frozen eggs, as I have said, will rise from 3,500 to 8,000 tons in 1953. 1949's shipments of lumber to Britain will be augmented by over a billion dollars' worth of lumber products.

Britain is already increasing her trade with Russia directly under agreements which are still in force, and she is carrying on negotiations to increase this trade on a permanent basis.

A picture of how this is developing, particularly in the Far East, is contained in the International Statistical Bureau's Foreign Letter of February 4, 1949, from which I quote:

> Hong Kong, for example, has its own currency, but it is also one of the largest trading centers in free- and transferable-account sterling. British and Dutch firms may sell Chinese goods in the United States, acquire dollars, buy transferable-account sterling at a discount of 15 to 20 percent, and with it buy British goods for reexport into China, Macao, or other areas where hard currency can be obtained.
>
> Great Britain's imports from the United States declined about 40 percent last year but Hong Kong's imports from the United States increased by about 27 percent. Hong Kong's exports to Malaya and to the British Commonwealth countries were more or less stagnant but there was a major increase in shipments to China and Macao.
>
> Closer analysis shows that exports from Hong Kong to southern and central China decreased, while shipments to the Communist-controlled north and to such black market centers as Macao rose sharply.

The Communists got more than ever.

> Macao is a Portuguese colony off the China coast, opposite the mouth of the Canton River, having a population of 375,000 and an area of 14 square miles. Exports from Hong Kong to Macao have been almost twice as great as exports to the United Kingdom and not much less than exports to the United States.
>
> Another even more striking example is trade with Russian-controlled Northern Korea via Hong Kong. Northern Korea is practically a forbidden zone for American traders, but Hong Kong's shipments to this area are booming and profits of 100 to 200 percent are not unusual.

Mind you, Mr. President, I am quoting that from the International Statistical Bureau's Foreign Letter of February 4. It proceeds.

> Payments are made in local produce or in goods produced in the U. S. S. R. and shipped especially to Northern Korea for reexport to the Western Hemisphere via Kong Kong.

An even more glaring example of how we are continuing to underwrite everybody else's interests but our own, and to play into the hands of the Communists on both sides of the Iron Curtain, can be found in recent developments in Indonesia.

What about Indonesia? The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] was especially concerned, when he offered his resolution on behalf of himself and a group of other Senators, about Indonesia.

It is strange that the real story of what is taking place there has been so completely suppressed. The fact of the matter is that, in direct violation of our own promises to the Indonesians that we would support their drive for independence when the war ended, we have been supporting Dutch tyranny and aggression with American taxpayers' money ever since.

When the Dutch moved in, just before Christmas, and captured the Republican Nationalist Government leaders, they took that action supported by Marshall plan dollars. It is terribly significant that the expenses of this war do not appear in the Dutch budget as an expense item, but rather as a credit, which they are going to force the new United States of Indonesia Government to assume, when the final arrangements are made to set that Government up.

This means that by the time this takes place, the Indonesians will have become so burdened with the war debt incurred by the Dutch that the representatives of that Government will actually do no more than serve as exorbitant tax collectors for the Dutch, exploiting their own people and their tremendous raw material resources, for the benefit of the

Dutch, who in turn, will exploit America's need for these materials, without making any part of the resulting profits available to the Indonesians who produced them.

What is more Mr. President, these policies are also resulting in the exclusion of American firms from the Indonesian market.

On December 24, 1948, Mr. Thomas Conroy, business editor of the New York Times, wrote:

> The quota regulations set up by the Netherlands Indies Government, it was asserted by exporters here, have almost completely barred the American exporter from enjoying any portion of this business (that is, United States exports of almost $250,000,000 to Indonesia in 1946, 1947, and 1948.)
>
> It is understood that representations on this situation have been made to the State Department, from time to time. Although the State Department has appeared sympathetic to these protests, it has not seen fit to take any effective action to remedy these conditions.

Mr. Conroy went on to charge:

> It was explained for background that a number of Dutch East Indies official, semi-official, and private purchasing missions have been established in the United States through which that business has been channeled.
>
> Moreover, according to the exporting fraternity here, they know of no other country, and many of them have as compelling foreign-exchange problems as does the Netherlands Indies, which monopolizes the trade to such an extent.

Mr. President, the same picture holds true of France in Indochina. All of this is confirmed in a recent pact agreed upon by England, France, and the Netherlands, to the effect that they would stand by each other in their plans to reimpose their systems of imperial exploitation in every possible area around the world.

This then is what has become of the Atlantic Charter principles, and of the genuine plan for American international cooperation drawn up by General Hurley and endorsed by the late President.

It is against this background that we must now project the President's inaugural address, because there are two different worlds here represented.

During his inaugural address, President Truman once more reaffirmed the basic American principles for which this Nation stands, and upon our faithful adherence to which our future is utterly dependent, when he said:

> Our aim should be to help the free peoples of the world through their own efforts, to produce more food, more clothing, more materials for housing, and more mechanical power to lighten their burdens.
>
> Such new economic developments must be devised and controlled to benefit the peoples of the areas in which they are established. The old imperialism—exploitation for private profit—has no place in our plans. What we envisage is a program of development based on the concepts of democratic fair dealing.

Yet, Mr. President, not only is this bold, new program compromised by existing programs which are based on the principles of cruel exploitation, it is also based on a return to the fallacy that American taxpayers must spend the rest of their lives bailing out the peoples whom we are helping to keep in permanent bankruptcy and bondage.

Mr. President, the time has come to hold a complete and honest review of our whole over-all foreign policy, if we are to be able to undo the tragic blunders of the past, and take advantage of our last chance to restore the principles of the Atlantic Charter and of our own magnificent tradition as the basis of our domestic and foreign relations.

If the President fails to meet this challenge of these critical times, and seeks to perpetuate on a permanent basis more of this pathological internationalism that is destroying us as a free and sovereign people, then the United States Senate should rise to the challenge, drag this whole sorry matter out in the open, for all to see, repudiate the blunders and betrayals that have taken place, and rewrite the foundation of a genuine American foreign policy right here on the Senate floor.

If this becomes our only recourse, we shall be doing only what the late President Roosevelt himself recognized to be the sovereign duty of the representatives of the American people to protect their own interests, when he wrote to Stalin on March 24, 1945, to protest Soviet violations of their agreement:

> I am sure you are aware that genuine popular support in the United States is required to carry out any governmental policy, foreign or domestic. The American people make up their own mind and no governmental action can change it.

Mr. President, the time has come to give the American people this last chance to make their own decisions, and to take control of their own destiny back into their own hands once more.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY OF MARITIME COMMISSION TO SELL AND OPERATE VESSELS, ETC.

During the delivery of Mr. LANGER's speech,

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment, with the understanding that my remarks and any further proceedings in connection therewith will be placed at the conclusion of his address, so that it will not be interrupted in the RECORD?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to have called up at this time a joint resolution dealing with the Maritime Commission. I wish to offer an amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 51, which is the same as House Joint Resolution 92.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I did not realize that this question would be raised to interrupt the Senator from North Dakota, and I would not wish to do so. I understood that the joint resolution was agreeable to both sides. I spoke to the minority leader about it, and I understood that it had been cleared.

Mr. KNOWLAND. But I understand that the Senator from Washington has an amendment to offer.

Mr. BREWSTER. The amendment will be offered by me.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Maine has an amendment. The joint resolution is unanimously reported by the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and the House joint resolution has the approval of the House committee.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have been left here as acting minority leader. Because of the small attendance of Senators in the Chamber at this time, I feel that under the circumstances we should have a quorum call.

Mr. LANGER. Then I decline to yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will withdraw the point of no quorum, I will yield the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I withdraw the point of no quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I decline to yield at this time.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 51) to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I withdrew my point of no quorum, on the theory that the Senator from North Dakota would proceed with his remarks.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I decline to yield further.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my request for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

After the conclusion of Mr. LANGER's speech,

SUGGESTION FOR RECALL OF GENERAL MACARTHUR TO PRESENT HIS VIEWS REGARDING THE FAR EAST

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on yesterday I addressed a letter to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], chairman of the Armed Services Committee, as follows:

FEBRUARY 16, 1949.

Hon. MILLARD TYDINGS,
Armed Services Committee,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: In view of recent press dispatches that have cast some doubt upon our Pacific military policy, and the demands that will soon be made upon the Congress for military assistance to western Europe, I believe that it is vital that members of the Armed Services Committee be fully informed on all phases of the entire global situation. For this reason, I strongly urge that the Senate Armed Services Committee extend an invitation to Gen. Douglas MacArthur to return to the United States to present his views of the situation existing in the Far

East and its effect upon the national defense of the United States and its territories.

With best personal regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senator.

Mr. President, it will be recalled that about a year ago the suggestion was made that General MacArthur return to the United States and appear at that time before the Senate Appropriations Committee. The general quite properly declined to do so, first, because of his duties in the Pacific area at that time, and, second, because the United States was then engaged in the preliminaries to a great political campaign. The general apparently felt that his return at that time might be misunderstood. I think his reasons were perfectly valid.

At the present time, however, Mr. President, the situation is entirely different. The Senate of the United States in a short time is going to be called upon not only to make substantial appropriations for the continued support of the ECA program, but is also going to be called upon to make substantial appropriations for military support to western Europe.

I have been concerned of late, as I think a number of other Members of the Senate have been, over recent reports emanating from Tokio to the effect that there perhaps has been a basic change in American policy toward Japan. I hope there has been no basic change in American policy in regard to keeping Japan from falling prey to communism. I can think of nothing, Mr. President, that would do more to undermine the hope of establishing a free democratic government in Japan and retard the economic recovery of that country than for anyone in a responsible position to indicate that the United States might, under present world conditions withdraw from the islands of Japan, or in the event of Soviet aggression might abandon them into the hands of Soviet Russia.

With respect to what has happened in China our policy in that regard should be reexamined. The Yalta agreement made certain commitments to Soviet Russia at the expense of our historic friends, the Chinese National Government. Those agreements which were made at that time certainly have contributed mightily to the problems faced by China today.

At a time when I think all of us agree on the importance of preventing western Europe from going behind the iron curtain to me it simply does not make sense for our nation to sit complacently by while some 450,000,000 of our traditional friends, the Chinese, are taken behind the iron curtain. It does not seem wise to me that there should be even contemplated, Mr. President, the possibility of further retreat in the Far East and out of the islands of Japan.

For that reason it seems to me that it would be entirely fitting and proper for General MacArthur to return to this country and give the Members of the Senate and of the Senate Armed Services Committee, and such other committees as might want to hear his testimony, the benefit of his advice.

This is a matter that relates to the national defense of the United States of America. Perhaps those of us who represent Pacific Coast States, Mr. President, may be pardoned for having a particular interest in this regard, but the waters of the Pacific Ocean wash upon our States. It was not so very many years ago that we had in the State of California, so far as I know, the only enemy shelling of an American State by an enemy submarine. We saw the encroachments at that time of one of the Axis partners coming down through Alaska and establishing enemy bases in that territory. We want no repetition of that kind should the world be so unfortunate as to become engaged in another war at some time in the future.

Mr. President, the members of the Senate Armed Services Committee have a responsibility to themselves, to the Congress, and to the country, to secure as much and as complete information as possible on the entire global situation before we make our final decisions.

Mr. BREWSTER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from California an address delivered by me in Sacramento, Calif., on last Friday night, dealing with the subject of American policy in the Orient, which was the subject which the Senator from California discussed.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY IN THE ORIENT

(Address by Senator OWEN BREWSTER, of Maine, before Lincoln Club at Sacramento, Calif., on Friday evening, February 11, 1949)

California is justly proud of its myriad products but its greatest product is the United Nations.

Here on the shores of the Pacific at the Golden Gate this age-old vision of a united world at last had its dramatic birth.

The child is having a tough time. The iron curtain of communism threatens to clang down on the Open Door in the Orient.

The American doctrine of this century of a free and peaceful Orient is threatened with destruction by the advancing hordes of a modern Genghis Kahn.

Certainly no one on the west coast will have any illusions as to American trade with a Communist-dominated China on any other terms than seem at the time advantageous to the masters of the Kremlin.

As our own Ambassador Philip C. Jessup well said in the Security Council on January 11, 1949; "No one doubts that the Communists in Indonesia like the Communists throughout the world are responsive to and act in accordance with instructions from Moscow. * * * Anywhere in the world when a Communist government climbs in through the window, independence is kicked out the door."

The velvet paws of the present will all too soon disclose their cruel claws when the time seems ripe to strike.

Every consideration of decency and self-interest argues for America to stand firm against Communist domination of the Orient.

I do not say our State Department is under Communist control. I say that if Stalin had been in charge of our State Department for the past 3 years he could not have done a better job to serve the cause of Communist penetration in China.

With the world war ended there was every reason to expect China would be restored to its ancient dominion in accordance with the pledge to Chiang at Cairo by Roosevelt and Churchill.

What happened? Stalin under the secret agreement at Yalta (of which not even General Marshall had been informed) was given control of Manchuria. The vast stores of Japanese war matériel and the even more important munition production of Manchuria were placed at the service of the Communists. Time was necessary to reorganize and mobilize this enormous military potential. Now note the coincidence.

For 10 months all American military aid was cut off to Chiang while the State Department sought to force Chiang to take the Communists into his government. For the following 10 months with the American embargo lifted it proved impracticable for any material shipments to be made.

Vast and insidious agencies of propaganda were operating full blast to discredit the Chiang regime with apparently the full sympathy of the responsible authorities in our State Department.

Chennault, Wedemeyer, Hurley, and Bullitt might warn in vain. Chiang seemed doomed to destruction by the official voice of the State Department even though he was obviously the only challenge to Communist domination.

Why has the Wedemeyer report never yet been released to the American public? Is it because it pointed out the deadly peril of Soviet domination of Manchuria? Is it because it suggested a United Nations' mandate for Manchuria?

Is it not now clearly evident that Berlin was simply a side show to distract our attention while communism engulfed the Orient?

Similarly a republic regime in Indonesia is in process of destruction while the United Nations wrings its hands in vain protest and the United States supplies hundreds of millions of American dollars to the government that defies the United Nations.

Listen to a leader of American communism: "With Chiang liquidated the Soviet member of the United Nations Security Council will announce that he represents more than one-half the population of the globe and Americans will hang their heads in shame."

Two of the five permanent members of the Security Council will be Communists and France totters on the brink.

The Pacific coast owes it to their fellow Americans to make its voice heard.

A Communist-dominated Asia means a menace to everything for which America now stands.

The Republican Party has never left its position in doubt as to the vital importance of a peaceful Pacific to our national security.

What shall it profit us to stabilize Europe and lose all influence in the Orient?

Fifty years of patient cultivation of friendly relations with China seem in danger of destruction in the very hour of our triumph.

With the Japanese menace eliminated, peace in the Pacific, and all that implies, was easily within our grasp. Now we see it turn to ashes in our hands.

Our sons and grandsons may well pay a bitter price for our tragic failure in the very hour of victory.

Once again we have won a war and now proceed to lose the peace.

Mr. IVES subsequently said: Mr. President, I desire to speak for just a moment on the question just discussed by the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. I beg the attention of the Senate while I support as strongly as I

can the recommendation which he has just made to have Gen. Douglas MacArthur come to this country and appear before either the Armed Services Committee of the Senate or such other committees as it may be desirable to have him appear before, for the purpose of obtaining as much knowledge as possible at this particularly important time with regard to the questions now confronting us in the Pacific.

I do not believe that the Pacific coast is the only part of the United States which is interested in having General MacArthur come to this country. Speaking for the State of New York, I know that there is intense interest among many of our citizens in having Douglas MacArthur come to this country to place himself in a position where the vast knowledge which he must have can be made available to our Government and our people. Perhaps other Senators have spoken on this subject prior to the remarks of the Senator from California and myself.

Of course, I assume that certain portions of the Government, such as the executive branch and the armed services, may be obtaining this information, and presumably are obtaining it. But the Congress is not getting it. The rank and file of the people in this country are not getting it. I know definitely that all Americans everywhere undoubtedly would feel a great deal more comfortable if they knew that all the knowledge which that great American possesses—and undoubtedly he knows more about the Pacific and the Pacific problems than any other living American—would be placed at our disposal for our use and our advantage, and for the advantage of the country. So I strongly support the suggestion which I just heard submitted to the Senate by the dintinguished Senator from California.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO MARITIME COMMISSION TO SELL AND OPERATE VESSELS, ETC.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 51, Calendar No. 39.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 51) to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, Senate Joint Resolution 51 is identical with House Joint Resolution 92, which has been favorably reported unanimously by the House committee. The House has granted a rule on the joint resolution, and the resolution is going to be considered in the House today. The two resolutions provide for the extension of the Maritime Commission authority to buy, to charter, to sell, and to operate ships until June 30, 1949. The joint resolution has been unanimously reported from the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The reason we have set the date at June 30, 1949, to correspond with the House committee action is that both committees, the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, hope to have a real review of our maritime plight by that time, with a view of enacting permanent legislation regarding the sale, charter, and operation of ships.

The American flag is rapidly going off the seas. The American merchant marine has disintegrated in front of our eyes, from 1,200 ships operating under the American flag 16 months ago to only about 360 ships operating under the American flag today. The Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce expects to go into the subject. We hope to be able to do something not only with regard to the policies of the Maritime Commission and the establishment of a national maritime policy, which we do not have today, but we also hope to consider the question of ERC, and shipments in American bottoms, as well as the question of the Army and the Navy being in the shipping business.

Paradoxically, Mr. President, the Army's navy today, in competition with the American merchant marine, has more ships operating on the seas than has the merchant marine itself. The Navy is in the shipping business. Several American operators have sought to circumvent American taxation and American rules and regulations by operating under the Panamanian and Liberian flags.

All these things have led to a disintegration in the American merchant marine, and we are finding ourselves in the same position in regard to our merchant marine that we were in after World War I. I think the Congress should take some action about it. Something should be done in all branches of government, and with private operators, labor, and all other groups involved, in an effort to provide a strong merchant marine.

In view of the fact that we intend to give the question an honest review, we have extended the date to June 30, 1948, in the hope that we can report to Congress some permanent legislation, or at least undertake to establish a permanent merchant marine policy. I hope the Senate bill will pass the joint resolution. This authority expires on February 28, and it is quite necessary that we act this week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 51?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 51) to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with an amendment, on page 1, line 9, after the word "date" to strike out "March 1, 1950" and insert "June 30, 1949," so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That (a) the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to continue until March 1, 1949, the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes," approved February 27, 1948 (Public Law 423, 80th Cong.), is amended by striking out the date "March 1, 1949" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof the date June 30, 1949. That joint resolution is further amended by inserting at the end of subparagraph (b) thereof the words "*Provided, however*, That vessels may be chartered to the Republic of the Philippines, or citizens thereof, for use in the interisland commerce of the Philippines in accordance with section 306 of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of April 30, 1946 (60 Stat. 137; U. S. C., 1946 edition, table 50, sec. 1736)."

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say to the Senator that there is a committee amendment first to be considered.

Mr. BREWSTER. I will await disposition of the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Maine will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the joint resolution it is proposed to insert the following proviso: "*Provided, further*, That the Maritime Commission is hereby authorized to approve without condition the transfer of flag or sale foreign under section 9 of the Shipping Act of 1916, of any vessel owned by a citizen or citizens of the United States, which was acquired by the United States pursuant to a determination by the Inter-allied Reparation Agency Shipping Committee and thereafter sold to such citizen by the Maritime Commission, if in the opinion of the Maritime Commission such vessel is not necessary or economically desirable for permanent use in the American merchant marine."

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, this amendment relates only to ships which were acquired from foreign countries by the United States under the reparations agreements. The only ships which I know of that are immediately involved are four ships acquired from German registry, which it has been found entirely impracticable to operate under the American flag. There was some question in the Maritime Commission as to whether or not it had the authority to authorize their transfer. The first opinion was that it did not. Subsequently the Commission has indicated that perhaps it does have the authority, and it has now asked for a hearing on the question, which will be held shortly. However, in order to clear up any doubt as to the authority of the Commission, I am offering this amendment, which I trust will be accepted.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have conferred with the Senator from Maine, and the amendment is perfectly acceptable. However, it should be understood, as the Senator from Maine has said, that this applies only to foreign ships. I think the Congress should know that while this authority is to be continued until June 30, 1949, the Maritime

Commission still adheres to the policy of refusal to sell American-built ships to foreign governments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ENLARGEMENT AND EXTENSION OF THE MARSHALL PLAN

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations is now engaged in hearings upon the continuation of ECA. As a member of the committee I have listened to a great part of the hearings with the greatest of interest. As I announced in the discussions yesterday afternoon in the hearings, I shall support fully the sums requested by ECA authorities and by the State Department and by the President. I believe the Marshall plan, so-called, has achieved great progress, that it has made possible immense strides in the rehabilitation of the war-devastated areas of Europe, and in strengthening democracy in the world. As I said yesterday, I could not but feel some regret, when I heard recitals of how effectively the nations which are the recipients of this aid have worked together, that that pattern could not be the form of cooperation of the whole world.

In the course of yesterday afternoon's hearing Mr. Paul Hoffman stated that not only had the recipient nations, 19 in number, had to work together to better their conditions, but they would have to cooperate in the future to preserve the gains which they have won or shall have won under the ECA program.

I hope, however, Mr. President, that we shall find it possible to continue and enlarge the reach of such a program to other parts of the earth. If it is good for the countries of western Europe to be rehabilitated, to regain their democratic strength, to become more valuable contributors to world commerce and trade, then I think at least with respect to other areas of the world which embrace democracy the same advantages would lie. I have regretted somewhat the specialized motivation for the ECA program, which I think I have discovered in some sources. I regard the ECA program not as merely a program to stop communism or to arrest aggressive nationalism, but as an affirmative program which will contribute to a more prosperous world and therefore to a more prosperous and secure United States of America. And of course my own interest is primarily in the effect which the program will have upon the security and the economic strength and power of our own country.

Mr. President, when we have achieved that level of progress with ECA which will make it possible for us to shift the emphasis to other non-Communist areas of the earth, if the Communist areas show the proper spirit of cooperation and accord, the proper observance of the principles of the international charter, and contribute to making ours a peaceful and prosperous world, then of course they themselves, as General Marshall has said, might also be included in such a program. But I hope we shall recognize, when the program reaches its peak, and when it comes to a conclusion, that it has achieved a measure of success and conferred benefits not only upon other countries but upon ours, which will justify us in attempting to enlarge its beneficence and its munificence to other areas of the world where the need is so crying as it is today. I believe the world must work together, not only to have peace, but to enjoy prosperity, and that those nations that have interrupted world economic cooperation are themselves the greater losers for their obstructive tactics. I hope some day that self-interest, without referring to human obligations, will induce all peoples to bring themselves, through the United Nations, into a truly cooperative world.

Therefore, Mr. President, feeling that way about it I was very much gratified at point 4, which was contained in the inaugural address of the President. There are certain brief passages in that portion of the President's address to which I should like to advert. Said the President:

> I believe that we should make available to peace-loving peoples the benefits of our store of technical knowledge in order to help them realize their aspirations for a better life. And, in cooperation with other nations, we should foster capital investment in areas needing development.
>
> Our aim should be to help the free peoples of the world, through their own efforts to produce more food, more clothing, more materials for housing, and more mechanical power to lighten their burdens.
>
> We invite other countries to pool their technological resources in this undertaking. Their contributions will be warmly welcomed. This should be a cooperative enterprise in which all nations work together through the United Nations and its specialized agencies whenever practicable. It must be a world-wide effort for the achievement of peace, plenty, and freedom.
>
> With the cooperation of business, private capital, agriculture, and labor in this country, this program can greatly increase the industrial activity in other nations and can raise substantially their standards of living.
>
> Such new economic developments must be devised and controlled to benefit the peoples of the areas in which they are established. Guaranties to the investor must be balanced by guaranties in the interest of the people whose resources and whose labor go into these developments.
>
> The old imperialism—exploitation for foreign profit—has no place in our plans. What we envisage is a program of development based on the concepts of democratic fair dealing.

The concluding paragraph in that very conspicuous portion of this very able address was this:

> Democracy alone can supply the vitalizing force to stir the peoples of the world into triumphant action, not only against their human oppressors, but also against their ancient enemies—hunger, misery, and despair.

I am an optimist about the future.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Am I correct in understanding the Senator to advocate that ECA assistance be now extended behind the iron curtain?

Mr. PEPPER. I have certainly said just the contrary. I am glad the Senator gave me a point to leave no possible ambiguity in the minds of any hearer.

Mr. FERGUSON. I merely wondered whether there was any doubt about it.

Mr. PEPPER. Not in the slightest. I laid down the standards, when they would become the recipients. They were the same standards as those promulgated by General Marshall when the Marshall plan was first proposed, namely, their willingness to subscribe to the principles of the United Nations Charter and to become cooperative parts of a peaceful and cooperative world.

Mr. President, I believe the future holds the brightest era of all history for us. With the technology we possess at the present time, with the business genius the world possesses, with the natural resources yet to be exploited and developed, the golden age of all history is with the dawn and not with the sunset, or even the noon.

But it is essential to American prosperity that we help other parts of the earth to be prosperous as well as peaceful. We have a capacity which we cannot consume in this country of ours. We must find markets. Those markets must come either from the alteration of our own economic system, so that we shall provide out of our bounty for those who cannot even buy, or we must stimulate other areas of the world to a fair participation in trade which will make them buyers from us and sellers to us, and we, buyers from and sellers to them. The backward parts of the earth particularly cry out for our technological skill, for the genius of our businessmen, for the assistance of our capital, and for the beneficent influence that our great Government may extend to them in their own effort. That particularly applies to our own hemisphere, where boundless resources are yet to be tapped, and where almost unimaginable progress is a possibility for the future.

That brings me to an observation I particularly rose to make, which is, that it must be understood by those who want American assistance that they must receive it and deal with us in the same way we receive their assistance and deal with them. A foreign corporation operating in the United States, for example, observes only the law of the land. Foreign corporations are not discriminated against in the United States. They receive no special favors. Once they are admitted into the heart of our Nation and life and people, they meet competition just as other entrepeneurs do. They receive the benefits of our blessings, and they must bear their share of our duties and burdens. I am afraid that is not always true according to present practices in some of our sister republics in the Western Hemisphere. I am thinking now of some of the general tendencies we hear about almost daily—instances of coup d'états by military cliques—instances of democratic governments being deposed by military coercion. The American people do not subscribe to

the principles related to such practices. We hear of other cases where legitimately chosen governments are ousted from their authority by anarchy and force of one kind or another. That, too, is strange to the American concept of democracy.

In still other cases, Mr. President, our business enterprises are discriminated against. They are the victims of discriminatory policies which other business enterprises in competition with them do not have to bear. That also is not in accord with our concepts of fair dealing and with the premises upon which we generally extend aid to other peoples of the earth. I have in mind a recent case occurring in Guatemala, where a great American enterprise, the United Fruit Co., in the words of the president of that very country, had been discriminated against by the action of the Guatemalan Government. For instance, President Arevalo himself advised the United States Ambassador, so I am informed, that a certain law was obviously intentionally discriminatory against this American company, and that he, the President, thought it was a machine gun aimed at the head of this American company, and that he, the President, agreed that the discrimination should be removed, and that he would do everything possible to effect its removal. These assurances, so I understand, have repeatedly been given to our State Department in the past few months; and I am informed that it is the policy of the President of that country to try to rid his government of the criticism that she had adopted discriminatory practices and policies toward this very enterprising and highly valued American company.

Mr. President, I do not wish to be misunderstood. I do not desire to see America return to the days of the past, the lamentable past, when American marines stood at the command of the Government of the United States to collect corporate debts and sometimes to enforce corporate preferences in our part of the world. Certainly, I shall to the limit of my ability resist any effort to return to such odious practices on the part of American business or American Government. But, Mr. President, at the same time that I would be the first, if I could, to condemn American abuse of the hospitality of a foreign country by American entrepreneurs by means of attempting to take that which is not fairly theirs, or to enjoy privileges which they have no right to request, I would be equally alert in extending warnings to those who would discriminate against our enterprising investors, against our business concerns, and I would point out that that cannot be the way by which they or their country may obtain or enjoy the greatest cooperation from the American Government or the American people.

Mr. President, I hope that the countries of South America and Central America, our sister republics who hold such close places in our affections, who lie so close to our country and to our hearts, will recognize that they have a collective responsibility to see to it that when American capital and American enterprise venture forth to enjoy their hospitality, they, like all others who enjoy hospitality, shall accept it upon fair conditions; but at the same time, Mr. President, I hope they will recognize intelligently that their own self-interest, as well as hemispheric and world prosperity, are related to their extending the same nondiscriminatory, fair conditions of investment and operation to American investors and entrepreneurs, when they happen to go into those countries, as may be enjoyed either by other foreign interests or by domestic enterprises of the same character which occupy the same relative positions.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to my able friend from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I have listened with much interest to all that the Senator from Florida has had to say. I was also very much interested in the address delivered on this floor on Monday by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. PEPPER. So was I.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Massachusetts spoke along the same lines on which the Senator from Florida has spoken today, giving emphasis to the proposition that there must be mutuality in the matter of aid—that it is a two-way street.

The Senator from Florida has well stated—and in stating his position, he certainly states my position—that we are unalterably opposed to any imperialism or any imperialistic designs; we are unalterably opposed to any return to the lamentable past, as the Senator has so aptly described it, when marines were used, or when anything of that kind occurred in connection with any of our sister republics in Central America or South America.

In fact, I take it that the Senator from Florida and I stand here today, as we speak, in keeping with the spirit of the good-neighbor policy of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Cordell Hull, wishing to extend a helping hand to the people of South America and Central America, particularly those who must live and must work out their existence in the more backward areas. But if we are to extend a helping hand, it must be received in a spirit of justice and of equality and of fair play. There must not be discrimination against the interests of the United States or the interests of United States companies or United States nationals.

The Senator from Florida spoke of the United Fruit Co. That is a great company. As the Senator from Florida well knows, as a native Alabamian, we have in Alabama the great port of Mobile. We are proud of that port as one of the great ports, not only of the Gulf area, but of the whole United States. The United Fruit Co. does much business in that port; it makes many contributions to the business and the success of that port. We like the United Fruit Co., and we do not appreciate the discriminations which now are being practiced against it in Guatemala and perhaps in some other places.

I recall that during the war the United Fruit Co. rendered a very great service to our country. As the Senator from Florida well recalls, before the war our Navy was almost entirely dependent on the Far East for the hemp it had to have to carry on its operations successfully. The United Fruit Co. went into Latin America, and provided the engineering techniques and the agricultural skills for the production of hemp; and thus the United States Navy, in the time of the great stress and danger of war, was enabled to have an adequate supply of hemp it so badly needed.

I understand that that company has been carrying out plans for the production, perhaps, of rubber and other agricultural products which will give us, shall we say, a living, growing stock pile, so as to free us from our dependence upon the Far East for these vital strategic products. We know from our experience in the last war that we can no longer rest easy when we are dependent upon products coming great distances from places located in the Far East. This company has rendered and is rendering today a great service. I would be the last person to ask for any special favor or for any special privilege for it, or for any other company, but surely we have a right to ask that it be treated fairly, that it be not discriminated against, that it have a right to go into those countries to render help and to give aid to them and to their people. That is exactly the idea the Senator from Florida has so well expressed here today. I want to join with him.

Mr. President, I should like to say another thing while I am on my feet. From what we know of the situation in Guatemala, and perhaps in other countries, the labor unions in those countries are completely dominated and controlled by whichever faction happens to be in control of the Government. Those labor unions are used as mere pawns, under the command of the governing clique. They are used against the best interests of the United States.

I simply rose, Mr. President, because I was interested in the remarks of the Senator from Florida, and to associate myself with him. We wish to render aid to Latin America, but we insist that when we do extend a helping hand the people of the United States should be treated with fairness, equity, and justice.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am very deeply indebted to the able senior Senator from Alabama. Whenever he addresses himself to a subject he makes a very great contribution to it. If I, in my feeble remarks, have precipitated the very able utterances which the senior Senator from Alabama has made, I have been successful far beyond my anticipation.

Mr. President, I remember being in a certain part of the world and being told by representatives of a particular government there that another nation, which was the recipient of American assistance, had requested it not to give certain concessions to the United States

which were of a public nature. I do not consider that to be fair dealing. We want to deal as a good neighbor and friend, and as an intelligently self-interested people, with all nations and peoples in the world. The same principle applies where it is not a matter of one nation which is the recipient of our aid asking others to discriminate against us as in instances where the nation itself which seeks and needs American help, as we need its assistance and good will, proposes to discriminate against American entrepreneurs.

I say this with particular interest in and affection for Central and South America. As the able present occupant of the chair knows, we in Florida pride ourselves upon our feeling of kinship as well as upon our geographic propinquity to the people of Central and South America. We often speak of ourselves as representing in friendship the outstretched hand of the United States of America to Central and South America.

Mr. President, I have said what I have said today because I am one of those who will hardly be exceeded by any other Senator in the Chamber in favoring American assistance to those people. I think there are involved immeasurable opportunities for them, for us, and for the world. What I have said has not been intended as being said in any spirit of criticism, of rebuke, or of reproach, but, as best I could, as an interpretation of what I believe to be the general sentiments of our Government and of our people in respect to the matters which I have mentioned.

So let us seek to work more closely together. Let us preserve integrity of property, integrity of person, and integrity of human liberty everywhere in the world, or, at least, let us form a great community of nations and peoples who believe in those principles and who will promote them to the best of their ability. We can bring prosperity and peace to a great part of the world. Some of us are persuaded that by our good example and by what we may be able to accomplish together we may establish a pattern for all the nations of the world.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, no Senator, of course, would quarrel with wanting to help other nations and other peoples or with wanting to help our own people. I do not know of anyone who does not want to help. But we cannot help individuals, nations, or people unless they want to be helped. There is nothing new about our technology, our scientific achievements, and our manufacturing skill. They have always been open to the world. Our great manufacturing facilities have been open to every country in the world. Our businessmen have always been anxious to sell their goods in any part of the world. Our form and type of government has been available to all the nations of the world for 165 years, and for all those years we have been anxious to have them follow our pattern and our type and form of government. We have been anxious to sell them merchandise. We have been anxious to see them do all the things which we have been doing. Our so-called know-how in America is free to all the peoples of the world. Our form of government is free to all the peoples of the world to adopt. There is no mystery connected with it.

Mr. President, if we may go back for a moment to 1933, we heard the same sort of argument and debate on the floor of the Senate when this body was considering the recognition of Russia. At that time it was stated that we should recognize Russia because the Russians were a great people, that Russia was a great nation, and that we should help Russia. We did recognize Russia. We gave Russia all of our technical knowledge and our skills, and our businessmen and engineers went over there by the dozens and the hundreds and helped to build up that great nation. My personal opinion is that one of the unpardonable sins we have committed as a nation was the recognition of Russia in 1933. We should have known at that time that our recognition of Russia was going to enable Russia to become a great nation, or a big nation, or a powerful nation. We should have known at that time that if communism became successful in Russia it would become a threat not only to our own people and our form of government but to peoples throughout the world. Yet, I believe, I am safe in saying that one of the moving factors in the recognition of Russia in 1933 was that there were some 160,000,000 people in Russia with whom we could trade, that by recognizing Russia we would open up a great market for our merchandise, our goods, and our skills, and the recognition of Russia did open up a great market. Our technicians did go over there by the hundreds, as I said a moment ago; we taught the Russians how to build factories; we taught them mass production; we initiated them into our know-how and our skills. What has been the result? The result has been that they have taken our know-how and our skills and built themselves into a powerful nation, with a form of government that is the same as it was in 1933, and now we are faced with the threat of communism, and are spending billions upon billions of dollars trying to stop it.

I am not opposed to helping any nation or any people throughout the world—I think we should do it; but what is always uppermost in my mind is that our skills and our know-how are free to all other peoples, and have been for years and years. The example of our form of government, our society, our high standard of living is free to other peoples. We have been here for 165 years as an example of how a nation and people might live, how they might enjoy a high standard of living. Yet my observation has been that none of the foreign peoples have taken advantage of it. The things in this Nation which are free to all the peoples of the world, they seem to ignore.

If I understand what the able Senator from Florida was discussing, it was that we will again dig into the pockets of the taxpayers of the United States and pour forth more billions and billions and billions of dollars. I have no particular objection to that if it is done on a basis of common horse sense; but I am wondering if we are not trying to force many things down the throats of many peoples of the world who do not want them.

Why should we finance the world? In the first place, we do not have enough money with which to finance the world. Secondly, we had one experience with recognizing a country and giving them our know-how, and I now rather suspect that we wish we had our know-how back; I rather suspect that, if we had to do it over, we would not be so free with our skills and our knowledge, and possibly if it were to be done over, we would not recognize communistic Russia.

We simply cannot go on spending billions upon billions of dollars. If, without bankrupting America, we can help other peoples by giving that which is already free to them, I am in favor of it. I am in favor of lending them some money if it can be done on what we may call the private industry basis, but I certainly shall have to oppose giving any further money to any nation anywhere in the world which is going to use the money to socialize its own industry, as is being done now in England. I do not know how many billions of the dollars we have given England since the end of the war or what percentage they have used, but we do know they have socialized the mines, they have socialized banking, they have socialized the railroads, they have practically socialized the farms; at least, they have a law which permits them to do so. They are now talking about socializing the steel industry. What are we thinking about? We are either opposed to socialism and communism or we are for them. Why should we ever spend one dime of our taxpayers' money, or give it away, to socialize some other nation when we know that if those nations become socialistic or go communistic we will go communistic?

Mr. President, it is not quite fair. It seems to me we should be a little more cautious in what we do, because I believe I could successfully prove that every foreign scheme into which we have entered in the past 25 years—and that goes back even to Republican administrations—has failed to accomplish the purpose for which it was intended. The exception to that might well be the United Nations, which has not yet had a chance. The Marshall plan, it is said, is working well. It remains to be seen whether it will be ultimately successful. But we have had nothing but failure after failure, we have had nothing but one emergency after another. Before we get through spending billions of dollars on the Marshall plan we are now talking about spending further billions of the taxpayers' money in other nations.

The things we are offering are free to all the nations throughout the world, as I said a moment ago. Our know-how and our technical knowledge, and that greatest of all things which is free to them, our type and form of government, and our way of life, they do not seem to be interested in. It seems to me as though the only things in which they are interested are our dollars.

So, Mr. President, I suggest that we go slowly. I suggest that the next move we make in international affairs, the next

scheme into which we enter, we make certain it is going to work, because my observation has been that all the schemes into which we have entered have failed, as I have stated, and each and every one of them has cost the American people billions upon billions of dollars.

If we must go into these schemes and spend the taxpayers' money in order to maintain our own prosperity, then let us be honest enough to call what we pass the American Recovery Act, and not the European Recovery Act. If in this Nation we have arrived at the point where we can maintain our own economy only by taxing our people billions upon billions of dollars in order to give them away to some foreign country, in order to maintain prosperity in this Nation, then we had better stop, look, and listen, because there is something radically wrong with our own economy.

TWO-YEAR MORATORIUM FOR APPLICATION OF CERTAIN ANTITRUST LAWS

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, out of order, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill designed to end, at least temporarily, the present widespread uncertainty and confusion over the application of the Supreme Court decision last year in the so-called basing-point case, involving the cement industry.

This bill would suspend for 2 years any application of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act, as amended, in depriving individual companies—and this is very important—in the absence of conspiracy or combination or other agreement in restraint of trade, of the right to independently use delivered-price systems or to absorb freight to meet competition in any and all markets.

This bill is not designed to countenance contracts, combinations, conspiracies, or monopolistic practices in restraint of trade; the bill, in fact, states that such things are inimical to the public interest. Since the Supreme Court decision in the Cement case concerned itself largely with charges of collusion and conspiracy in connection with basing-point pricing, the bill would not be intended to legalize that sort of a basing-point system.

As we all know, however, all industry, all firms which have over a period of years been following a policy of freight absorption in order to enable them to compete in distant markets with firms located in those market areas, have been exceedingly disturbed by the implications of the Supreme Court decision in the Cement case, and in the case of steel particularly, the companies announced that the basing-point or freight-absorption system was being abandoned in favor of a straight f. o. b. system of pricing out of fear that any other system might violate the antitrust laws.

A special subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce held extensive hearings on this matter late last year and the hearings were resumed briefly this year. Voluminous testimony was taken on the applicability of the antitrust laws to freight absorption and the net result, as I evaluate that testimony, is one of great confusion and continued uncertainty.

A great many of the witnesses who appeared, like most of the businessmen from Pennsylvania who have written to me on the matter, regarded the decision in the Cement case as probably outlawing any type of freight absorption. Unfortunately, we have not been able to get a clear-cut opinion from any authority as to whether it does or does not.

A large number of outstanding lawyers have sought to interpret the decision, but I do not think anyone is really sure of its applicability in cases other than the alleged collusive situation represented in the cement industry.

Spokesmen for the Department of Justice told us at a recent hearing that there is a case now pending before the Supreme Court which would place the issue squarely in focus, the Rigid Steel Conduit case. When that decision may be handed down no one really knows.

Meanwhile, however, there is pending before the Subcommittee on Trade Practices of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce S. 236, introduced by the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], chairman of the subcommittee and also chairman of the parent committee, which seeks to meet the situation by legalizing certain types of freight absorption which many businessmen think, perhaps, may have been outlawed by the decision in the Cement case. There have been some hearings on S. 236, and the chairman has notified us that a further hearing will be held tomorrow, and that that will be the last hearing.

The Johnson bill, S. 236, deals, admittedly, with a very complex issue. The bill itself is complex. The intent behind the bill is to clarify the situation and remove the uncertainties besieging so many businessmen whose firms follow a freight-absorption policy, and to permit them to continue to follow these policies without fear of being held in violation of the antitrust laws.

There is a strong desire on the part of proponents of this legislation for speed in its enactment. I am very much afraid, however, that unless we know exactly what we are dealing with in a matter like this, the speedy enactment of so-called corrective legislation might lead to much worse difficulties than the present uncertainty admittedly experienced by many business firms.

This is why I am introducing this bill. It takes the heat off business, those businesses following what most of us would regard as legitimate freight-absorption practices, it takes the heat off Congress and removes the necessity for hasty legislation which might boomerang on business or on a proper administration of the laws against monopoly and conspiracy.

The 2-year interval provided in this bill would give the Congress an opportunity to have all the facts at hand before drafting permanent legislation, if such permanent legislation is determined finally to be necessary. It will give the Supreme Court an opportunity to rule on the basing-point issue per se.

The bill provides in section 3 that nothing it contains shall affect any proceeding in any Federal court as of February 1, 1949, so that it would not act to prevent the courts from making a final determination on this basic and very fundamental issue.

When the decision comes down, we will then have for the first time—and I repeat that, it will be for the first time—an authoritative, reliable, clear-cut explanation of the applicability of the antitrust statutes to the whole freight-absorption practice.

During the 2-year moratorium provided in this bill on the application of antitrust laws to good-faith delivered-price systems, it may well be that the Congress may want to take a good look at our conglomeration of antimonopoly statutes, with a view toward tightening them up, eliminating the overlapping of agency functions, and otherwise streamlining our whole concept and application of the antitrust philosophy. But that is a long-range problem, and the one the Congress faces right now is an immediate one, the problem of eliminating uncertainty and confusion among businessmen who claim they have already sufficient other problems to keep them occupied without having to contend with possible prosecution under the antitrust statutes for what are generally regarded as legitimate business policies.

The Subcommittee on Trade Practices of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will, no doubt, come to a decision shortly in regard to the Johnson bill, S. 236. At our hearing tomorrow I intend to call attention to this bill I am introducing today as a suggested means of proceeding. I would much rather see any contrary provision of the antitrust laws waived for a period of 2 years—since we have gone along these many years safely enough under delivered-price systems—than to participate in the enactment of long-range legislation which may turn out to be either unnecessary or inadequate to cope with a situation which will arise some months from now when the Supreme Court acts.

This bill would say to the individual steel companies that they are not required to engage in an exclusively f. o. b. system. If the steel corporations were sincere, as they very well might have been, in adopting f. o. b. pricing out of self-defense, out of fear that any other system might subject them to violation of the antitrust laws, then this bill says to them that if the basing-point system is not collusive, if it is a good-faith delivered-price system designed to meet competition in distant markets, carried on independently and not through any combination or conspiracy in violation of the Sherman Act, then they can go back to their own independent delivered-price systems and know that they will not be slapped with an indictment or sued under the antitrust statutes.

If, on the other hand, the individual steel companies decided that this was a good pretext in a seller's market for raising their profits by eliminating freight-absorption costs, we shall know that, too.

If it is true, we certainly would know it. I think some of the steel companies were pretty coy about testifying on the issue even though it is one which affects them directly and intimately.

My mail reflects widespread concern from small- and medium-sized businesses in Pennsylvania over what they consider to be the denial of their right to compete in distant markets because of interpretations of the Cement case decision. My bill gives them the assurance they need that they do not have to revolutionize their method of doing business overnight; it assures them that if their present methods are subsequently found to be violations of the antitrust laws, they have 2 years from the date of the enactment of this bill to revise their procedures in order to comply with the law; it assures them that if the law is changed, it will be done only after careful study and complete understanding of the problem by Congress.

I ask that the bill be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1008) to provide a 2-year moratorium with respect to the application of certain antitrust laws to individual, good-faith delivered-price systems and freight-absorption practices, introduced by Mr. MYERS, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That because of widespread uncertainty resulting from recent administrative and judicial constructions of the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, and the Clayton Act, as amended, the Congress hereby declares that it is the sound and traditional policy of the United States that contracts, combinations, conspiracies, or monopolistic practices in restraint of trade are inimical to the public interest in maintaining a free, private, competitive enterprise system; but that it has not been the intent of the Congress to deprive individual companies of the right to use delivered-price systems or to absorb freight to meet competition in any or all markets, provided such activities are carried on independently and in good faith, and not through any combination or conspiracy in violation of the Sherman Act, as amended.

SEC. 2. Until the expiration of 2 years after the enactment of this act, the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, and the Clayton Act, as amended, shall not be construed as depriving individual companies, in the absence of conspiracy or combination or other agreement in restraint of trade, of the right to independently use delivered-price systems or to absorb freight to meet competition in any and all markets.

SEC. 3. Nothing herein contained shall affect any proceeding pending in any Federal court of the United States on February 1, 1949.

BASING-POINT PRICING

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, last November I addressed a letter to the Governor, of Pennsylvania, the Honorable James H. Duff, asking for a report on the views of the State government or any of its agencies on the matter of basing-point pricing. My inquiry was inspired by a newspaper article quoting some informal comments of the Governor on the effects of the elimination of basing-point pricing on our industrial State.

The Governor subsequently sent me a very interesting letter outlining some of the aspects of this important matter as expressed to him by an industrial leader whose knowledge of the matter the Governor considered to be outstanding.

Since then I have been placed on the subcommittee investigating this matter. Because of the widespread interest in the whole matter of freight-absorption and delivered-price systems, I ask unanimous consent that for informational purposes my letter to the Governor and his reply to me may be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the correspondence referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

NOVEMBER 17, 1948.

Hon. JAMES H. DUFF,
Governor, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Harrisburg, Pa.

MY DEAR GOVERNOR: One of the news services (the United Press) recently quoted you as expressing the belief that the Supreme Court decision in the so-called Cement case involving the use of basing-point pricing will be of great long-range benefit to Pennsylvania by inducing fabricators to move closer to their sources of steel. The article I read declared that in answer to a question as to whether Congress should legalize basing-point pricing, you said that you favored anything "that's good for Pennsylvania" but indicated you believed such action would be contrary to the State's best interests.

As you no doubt know, the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has undertaken an investigation by a subcommittee headed by Senator CAPEHART into this very issue. I am not a member of the subcommittee, but as a member of the parent committee, I have been sitting in from time to time at the hearings and have been seeking to determine the facts in this issue as they affect Pennsylvania. I was, therefore, quite interested in your reported views on this subject and would appreciate any material which you can have State agencies which may be studying the problem forward to me which will bear out the views attributed to you in this newspaper story.

The issue is very complex and is presently being subjected to a great deal of misinterpretation making for great confusion. I am primarily interested in the effect upon Pennsylvania industry of the Supreme Court decision, and although we are having a number of Pennsylvania businessmen appear before the subcommittee to give their views, I think it would be helpful if the State, as such, would submit a report for my review. If officials of any of the State agencies have any documented evidence bearing on the subject from the standpoint of the welfare of the State and of its industries, perhaps it might be advisable to arrange for such officials to appear as witnesses before the subcommittee.

Please feel free to call to my attention any relevant information on this matter which you or your administration may have. The important thing is that the interests of the people of our State be fully protected.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS J. MYERS,
United States Senate.

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
Harrisburg, December 31, 1948.

Hon. FRANCIS J. MYERS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Some time ago you wrote asking in a general way my attitude with reference to the basing-point problem. This subject, following the Cement decision, has excited such controversy, that I was anxious to sound out a number of industrialists in whose judgment I had confidence before replying specifically to the question to my appraisal of this situation.

I should say that the following fairly represents what I take to be a sound industrial thinking in this Commonwealth, that is that the effect of the recent decisions in the long run will be harmful to the American economy and national security.

I am quoting one opinion expressed to me which I believe may be said to be a representative opinion as follows:

"These decisions leave most of American industry in a position of uncertainty where, to avoid possible severe penalties, they must adopt conservative pricing policies, i. e., they must sell their products at uniform f. o. b. mill prices. This is a severe handicap in the competitive marketing of their goods and products. We believe that remedial legislation which would establish the rules of the game for competitive-pricing policies is essential for maximum industrial health in this country.

"We firmly believe that what is good for all of the American economy is, in the long run, good for any particular segment of it. One locality or one industry might easily achieve a short-range advantage at the expense of others. We believe that, in the long run, this is bad, not only for the whole economy but also for the particular segment that gets the short-range advantage.

"From the long-range point of view, industry of all kinds needs a maximum of freedom to meet competition. Such a maximum of freedom will keep industry on its toes, alert and vigorous.

"As a short-range proposition, we could press for the relocation of fabricating industries in the Pittsburgh area in order to obtain a surety of outlets for our steel products. However, for maximum security, a business such as ours (and I believe this is true for other manufacturers) should have wide dispersion of its consumers and a reasonable diversity of products. This is true because, in times of slack business, all parts of the country are not slack simultaneously or, at least, they are not slack to the same degree and, also, all consumers of steel products are not slack to the same degree. Therefore, the more dispersion and diversity (within practical limits) the more security.

"In addition to the foregoing, the ability to meet competitive prices in various parts of the country permits us to shift the direction of our selling efforts with changes in concentrations of industry, shifts in populations, and new industrial developments.

"In other words, we want the right to compete by going into any part of the country with any of our products whenever we find it profitable to do so. We can do this only if we have the freedom to make competitive prices.

"The concentration of fabricating industries around centers of production of raw materials (such as steel) is not good from the national security standpoint, nor is it good from the sociological standpoint. The development of modern offensive weapons dictates the dispersions of industries and, more important, the dispersions of people for maximum national security.

"In summary, I believe that within the boundaries fixed by our antitrust laws which prohibit collusion, conspiracy, and stifling of competition by unfair trade practices, industry should have the maximum of freedom to establish prices which it deems right and proper to meet competition.

"In reply to your question as to the desirable time element in obtaining a clarification of the law with respect to the rights of industry to compete pricewise, it is my firm

belief that much harm will be done, particularly to small business and especially to those small businesses which have only one plant, if the present situation is allowed to drift into a period of slack business. Therefore, I believe that the sooner we have remedial legislation the better.

"While the change in the basis of distribution might force a greater concentration of fabricators in Pennsylvania, it would be many years before such a concentration would absorb a productive class in our territory.

"In such a critical period as this both from an economic and military standpoint, it appears to me that a strict interpretation of this might prove extremely ill advised."

This is for your information in relation to your inquiry.

With best regards.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES H. DUFF.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of the committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Frank C. Bingham, of Alaska, to be United States attorney for division No. 2, district of Alaska.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Harry O. Arend, of Alaska, to be United States attorney for division No. 4, district of Alaska.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of George L. Grobe, of New York, to be United States attorney for the western district of New York.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Alfred J. Plowden, Jr., of South Carolina, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of South Carolina.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Kehoe C. Shannon, of Texas, to be United States marshal for the western district of Texas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified in all cases.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM AND ADJOURNMENT TILL MONDAY

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senate will immediately adjourn over till Monday, and, I may say, there will be no measures of any controversial importance to be taken up by the Senate when it convenes on Monday. However, we will call the calendar. I make the announcement now in order that Senators may have an opportunity to read the RECORD and to be apprised of that fact.

If there is no further business to be considered, I now move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 21, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 17, 1949:

H. Merle Cochran, of Arizona, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Pakistan.

COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

Earl James McGrath, of New York, to be Commissioner of Education.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

John F. X. McGohey, of New York, to be United States attorney for the southern district of New York. (Mr. McGohey is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires February 16, 1949.)

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named person, who was appointed in the United States Air Force under recess appointment provisions during the last recess period of the Eightieth Congress, for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 107, title I, Public Law 810, Eightieth Congress:

To be lieutenant colonel

Charles A. Pursley

The following-named persons, who were appointed in the United States Air Force under recess appointment provisions during the last recess period of the Eightieth Congress, for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 308, Public Law 625, Eightieth Congress (Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948):

To be majors

Alpha A. Adams	Virginia A. Hardy
Marian F. Allen	Alvina K. Hobbs
Irene S. Bragaw	Umbria M. Johnson
Mary H. Bratt	Mary L. Kersey
Betty Clague	Eleanor King
Mary C. Costello	Virginia J. Phelps
Margaret G. Crosson	Marie L. Ray
Marion B. Dockray	Evelyn F. Rees
Corinne E. Edwards	Florence M. Rowand
Gertrude E. Foerster	Dorothea M. Ryan
Margret I. Fullerton	Mary D. Schureman
Emy-Lee N. Gardner	Esther C. Settle
Eloise M. Granberry	Madge R. Shea
Phyllis D. S. Gray	Evelyn M. Way

To be captains

Pauline E. Abell	Ruth L. Blind
Eveline M. Absalom	Katherine F. Bradspies
Della J. Angst	Dorothy P. Brandow
Martha L. Armbruster	Anna L. Briggs
Margaret A. Bacchus	Margaret G. Brown
Laurie M. Ball	Lucille Caldwell
Virginia C. Dietz	Jacquelin M. Mooneyham
Ann Duffy	Ruth A. Nichols
Kathryn G. Ecke	Helen E. O'Day
Frances M. Ellison	Florence K. Olson
Mary E. Elrod	Marjorie D. Parker
Anna M. Frost	Bernice C. Philippe
Wilma R. Hague	Margaret L. Philpot
Helena C. Hendrickson	Bertha Pinckes
Kathleen E. Hoffman	Mildred L. Recknagel
Elaine O. Homan	Emma J. Riley
Marjorie O. Hunt	Charlotte G. Stickel
Margaret G. Jennings	Marion E. Swan
Marguerite A. Johnson	Edith M. Theye
Rachael A. Johnstone	Mildred E. Thomas
Eleanor J. Laing	Janna Tucker
Kathryn M. Ludlow	Frances W. Van Pelt
Margaret E. McEnerney	Margaret M. Werlein
Gladys E. McManimie	Frances L. White
Willa M. Mizell	

To be first lieutenants

Jean D. Armstrong	Winifred E. McAllister
Joan E. Bennett	Ruth McCraw
Virginia M. Blanchard	Muriel M. Moran
Carolyn E. Boatwright	Mary A. Morgan
Virginia S. Bruno	Brooksie E. Netherland
Florence B. Casey	Shirley T. O'Dell
Madelen Cassidy	Rita E. O'Donnell
Evelyn Cherry	Frances Oppenheimer
Alberta M. Courchene	Laura A. Ostrowski
Elizabeth N. Cox	Viola M. Peschel
Doris D. Diamant	Ruth Ramee
Elsie O. Ellingson	Cora E. Sharon
Harriet M. Fivenson	Albina H. Shimkus
Mary E. Flannagan	Mary E. Shull
Elizabeth Guild	Flora M. Smothers
Alice H. Hartley	Mary H. Strong
Verdia M. Hickambottom	Anne W. Tinges
	Lillian R. Tombacher
Marion N. Hunt	Ruth E. Vorkoeper
Bonnie T. Martin	Ruth L. Williams
Virginia E. Martin	Jean S. Wilson

To be second lieutenants

Victoria E. Fox
Katherine A. Humm

The following-named persons, who were appointed in the United States Air Force under recess appointment provisions during the last recess period of the Eightieth Congress, for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

To be second lieutenants

Lyle L. Ahner	Adrian L. Christenson
George L. Ahrens	Ben H. Clements, Jr.
Ralph G. Allen, Jr.	Daryl D. Cole
Thomas I. Allison	Charles Cusworth
Earl M. Amador	John I. Daniel 3d
Hunter W. Anderson	Herman L. DeLaune
Robert E. Anderson	James L. Dick
Franklin E. Ausburn	James F. Donahue, Jr.
Wilson K. Baker, Jr.	Charles A. Downing
John R. Barnard	Walter B. Duff
Martin J. Barnard	Robert C. Eckerlin
James G. Barney	Frederick C. Eckmann
Ernest R. Bartley	Walter H. Escue
Bertram D. Becker	William E. Fedro
William C. Bedott, Jr.	William H. Femmer
Robert E. Bell	Edwin A. Fitz, Jr.
Robert W. Bieber	Bruce R. Foster
Tedd L. Bishop	Willard S. Garwood
Buford C. Blount	James E. Geary
Randolph Blumberg	Clinton G. Gillespie
Warren W. Boone	Richard L. Haggard
Marion L. Boswell	Lloyd L. Hall
William F. Boyle	John J. Harnitchek
Joseph X. Brennan	Almet B. E. Harran
Dick P. Breece	Philip O. Hertzgaard
George G. Brown, Jr.	John K. Hickey
Robert E. Brumm	Harry D. Hink
Ernest L. Buckley	Robert P. Horn
Robert B. Burns	Charles B. Humphreys
Joseph R. Calistro	Richard W. Kane
Donald D. Carlson	Joseph F. Kent, Jr.
John M. Chapman	Orville J. Kvamme

Donald R. Latham
Alfred W. Lundhigh
Herbert A. Lyon
Roy L. Maddox
Kenneth E. Marstad
James C. Martin, Jr.
James I. Mathis
Hugh W. McBride
George C. McCleary
Ernest L. McCollum
Thomas U. McElmurry
Daniel E. McPherson, Jr.
Charles S. Melton
Harold O. N. Mendenall
Jim T. Meredith
William F. Miller
James F. Moir
Bill A. Montgomery
Winston E. Moore
Richard J. Moran
Alfred W. Mullan, Jr.
Harry W. Neville
Robert O'Clock
Arthur E. Oligher
Herman L. Pence
Bert E. Pettitt, Jr.
Leonard W. Pierson
Robert S. Pingree
Edward M. Potter, Jr.
Roland T. Pullen
Thomas S. Rea
William F. Reinecke
Eldon S. Riley
Dean R. Rindy
Robert Rotstan
Joe S. Schiele
Charles D. Schwaller
Charles F. Schwaner
Orville O. Scroggin III
James M. Sharp
John B. Shipp, Jr.
Silvio G. Simplicio
Hassell E. Sims
Robert E. Sizemore
Clark B. Smith
Mart G. Smith, Jr.
Herman F. Son
Paul R. Springer
Roscoe E. Sprinkel
Donald F. Steele
Harold E. Sterling
James R. Stimson
Robert E. Stockhouse
Roger W. Stubblefield
Clarence A. Syvertson
Irvin E. Taylor
Mervin M. Taylor
Alan B. Thomas
George W. Thompson
Thomas E. Thorpe, Jr.
Frank A. Titus
Bobby J. Tooley
Andrew J. Trammell
Jack L. Tunstall
George A. Voris
Marvin M. Watkins
LeRoy L. West
Donald C. Winner
Leonard S. Wissow
Edwin N. York

The following-named person, now serving in the United States Air Force, who was appointed in the United States Army under recess appointment provisions during the last recess period of the Eightieth Congress, for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

To be second lieutenant

Jere J. Lewis

IN THE NAVY

The following-named midshipmen (aviation) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949:

Harry E Aine
Marshall J. Barry, Jr.
Leon T. Bonner, Jr.
Edward N. Bouffard
John W. Brannon, Jr.
Jesse LeR. Brown
William D. Campbell
Charles C. Carter
Harold D. Case
William E. Clark
Jean S. Clauzel
Theodore E. Daum
Walter R. David
Dale E. Davis
Harold E. Dodd, Jr.
John C. Duck
James R. Edixon
Charles E. Engel
James T. Foreman
Marshall L. Foreman, Jr.
Herbert W. Gewehr
David O. Gudal
Donald M. Hegrat
Kenneth G. Heimbaugh
Dennis W. Henderson
Richard S. Hubler
John C. Humphrey
Francis N. Jones
Simeon D. Lowe, Jr.
Thomas H. McCoy
John E. McDonald
Roy W. McLain, Jr.
Dean W. Miller
Jurgen H. Miller
Charles R. Mitchell
William Mohlenhoff
Ronald A. Moore
James B. Morin
Clifton D. Myers
Gordon M. Nonnemacher
Neal C. Phillips
Merle A. Rice
Bertram M. Roeder
George P. Russell, Jr.
Herbert A. Sargent
Charles F. Schled
David L. Schloredt
Mack C. Sellers
David K. Smith
Donald E. Sparks
James R. Stevens
Dennis A. Tuck
Rex J. Vannoy
Jerome K. Waltershirchen
Rodney G. Williams
William R. Wood, Jr.

Edward Stanton (Naval ROTC) to be an ensign in the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949, in lieu of ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949:

Gerald B. Anderson
Charles E. Callahan
Eugene A. Davis
James D. DeLaughter
Arthur C. Derrick
Mark H. Forsthoefel
Loyd F. Galyean
Milburn K. Hemmick
Neal J. Johnson
Donald O. June
Arthur J. Linden
Donald A. McCartin
Robert L. May
Kenneth N. Murphy
Henry J. Nawoj
Frederick W. Nehring, Jr.
David W. Olmstead
Harry J. Post
William J. Reed
Arnold Stein
Lester L. Stoakes
Cordice I. Teague
Marvin H. Warner
Benjamin E. Weeks
Stuckey D. Willson
Robert E. Wilson
John W. Wood

Glenn E. Nippert (civilian college graduate) to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy (special duty officer).

The following-named persons to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Margaret A. Damush
Dorothy K. Erickson
Lorraine V. Feifer

The following-named officer to the grade indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

William R. True

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Arthur R. Scroggins, East Tallassee, Ala., in place of J. D. Hilyer, deceased.

J. Ponder Livingston, Eutaw, Ala., in place of J. J. Harkness, deceased.

James C. Mattox, Guin, Ala., in place of J. N. A. Hulsey, deceased.

James D. Jackson, Horton, Ala., in place of J. T. Mabrey, transferred.

Felton Jones, Kennedy, Ala., in place of Tom Dorroh, transferred.

Marvin T. Davis, Letohatchee, Ala., in place of W. L. Adams, deceased.

Pauline B. Sandlin, Magnolia Springs, Ala., in place of J. W. Sandlin, deceased.

John W. Roney, Newville, Ala., in place of L. J. Brannon, retired.

Oscar Day, Jr., Oakman, Ala., in place of L. W. Richardson, transferred.

Charles H. Eddins, Jr., Peterman, Ala., in place of Marguerite Helton, resigned.

ALASKA

Clarence S. Hollingsworth, College, Alaska, in place of C. E. Bunnell, retired.

Marietta M. Benson, Metlakatla, Alaska, in place of T. E. Benson, resigned.

ARKANSAS

Clinton C. Cook, Buckner, Ark., in place of C. C. Stokes, deceased.

Orval E. Faubus, Huntsville, Ark., in place of Hugh Murphy, transferred.

Charles L. Duncan, Murfreesboro, Ark., in place of H. M. Austin, transferred.

Leo J. Schreick, Osceola, Ark., in place of G. M. Doyle, deceased.

CALIFORNIA

Floyd M. Harvey, Adin, Calif., in place of F. M. Harvey, resigned.

C. B. Childers, Arvin, Calif., in place of O. G. Nance, resigned.

Harry Bergseid, Bell, Calif., in place of C. L. Boren, retired.

Edna Stratton Hamilton, Bolinas, Calif., in place of H. I. Hoirup, deceased.

Anita V. Reid, Burrel, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Florence E. Kahmar, Camino, Calif., in place of E. M. Carsten, deceased.

Cecilia A. George, Castroville, Calif., in place of F. E. Faustino, removed.

Clive B. Hubbell, Challenge, Calif., in place of H. P. Mulock, resigned.

Frank J. Norton, Chula Vista, Calif., in place of R. A. Higgs, resigned.

Frederick G. Zittleman, Cloverdale, Calif., in place of B. A. Williams, resigned.

Catherine C. Schultz, Colfax, Calif., in place of A. D. Scanlon, retired.

Keith L. Tobin, Cutler, Calif., in place of D. M. Tobin, resigned.

Ruth Pugh, Cypress, Calif., in place of M. F. Inskeep, transferred.

June R. Dolcini, Davis, Calif., in place of V. F. Dolcini, deceased.

Lloyette Osborne, Earlimart, Calif., in place of H. O. Adams, resigned.

Edythe Burgett, El Segundo, Calif., in place of Clyde Burgett, deceased.

Evelyn K. Hodge, Florin, Calif., in place of B. V. Eaton, retired.

Viola S. Pambianco, French Camp, Calif., in place of V. F. Gorrell, retired.

Cleo A. Mollring, Galt, Calif., in place of M. B. Bradford, resigned.

Paul R. Todd, Garberville, Calif., in place of D. E. Knapp, deceased.

Beatrice K. Geiger, Herlong, Calif., in place of G. E. McIntire, resigned.

William Howard O'Brien, Hollister, Calif., in place of E. F. O'Donnell, deceased.

Grace R. Aldridge, Joshua Tree, Calif. Office became Presidential October 1, 1946.

John L. McKindley, Lockeford, Calif., in place of J. A. Coil, deceased.

Oscar Ditmanson, Lodi, Calif., in place of C. M. Jones, deceased.

Blanche I. Dunn, Los Alamitos, Calif., in place of L. R. Cloud, transferred.

Walter J. Degregori, Los Banos, Calif., in place of B. A. Wilson, retired.

Lois M. Hartwell, Loyalton, Calif., in place of H. W. Rapp, resigned.

Horace C. Coe, Lynwood, Calif., in place of E. C. Halverson, resigned.

Margaret S. Cooper, McKittrick, Calif., in place of M. O. Quandt, resigned.

Joseph J. Joaquin, Madrone, Calif., in place of N. K. Kirby, retired.

Pearl C. Kehlet, Meeks Bay, Calif., in place of P. L. Kehlet, resigned.

Raymond R. Dingle, Middletown, Calif., in place of F. R. Carpenter, resigned.

John E. Mixer, Midway City, Calif., in place of W. L. Watts, resigned.

Fenton E. Watson, Mira Loma, Calif., in place of C. E. Faulhaber, resigned.

Jared W. Moore, Modesto, Calif., in place of A. A. Fields, resigned.

William J. Wasley, Nevada City, Calif., in place of B. M. West, resigned.

Louise H. Blanchard, Occidental, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Ella A. Dominguez, Olive, Calif., in place of T. H. Mieger, resigned.

Puella E. Forbes, Orcutt, Calif., in place of R. A. Osborn, resigned.

Mary E. Bailey, Piru, Calif., in place of F. E. Cornelius, retired.

Lillie E. Connor, Richvale, Calif., in place of La Verne Friberg, resigned.

Harry H. Lauritzen, Rio Vista, Calif., in place of J. I. Fiscus, resigned.

Kenneth W. Dyal, San Bernardino, Calif., in place of H. P. Thoreson, resigned.

James W. Kern, Santa Susana, Calif., in place of L. R. Riave, retired.

Velma E. Mackey, Santa Ynez, Calif., in place of S. M. Fair, resigned.

Raymond E. Ledford, Talmage, Calif., in place of R. O. Foster, resigned.

Henry S. Fager, Waterford, Calif., in place of Jennie Root, resigned.

LaVerna N. Strawbridge, Westminster, Calif., in place of M. M. Sitzer, resigned.

Ernest D. Robinson, Willow Creek, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Adelaide C. Byrn, Windsor, Calif., in place of G. P. Johnson, retired.

COLORADO

Dorothy F. Mullen, Bayfield, Colo., in place of L. E. Landreth, resigned.

Eldora F. Giberson, Dillon, Colo., in place of Grace Warren, resigned.

R. Terrell Ellington, Grand Junction, Colo., in place of C. D. Moslander, resigned.

Betty R. Ingram, Nederland, Colo., in place of M. C. Shellhaas, resigned.

Raymond H. Talbot, Pueblo, Colo., in place of C. F. Horn, deceased.

Dean S. Hainey, Ridgway, Colo., in place of G. C. Huffnagle, resigned.

Elmer Glen VanScoy, Westminster, Colo., in place of J. M. Hanks, resigned.

CONNECTICUT

Howard Macciocca, Derby, Conn., in place of J. J. Mahony, deceased.

James F. Abbott, Gales Ferry, Conn., in place of J. M. Abbott, deceased.

Margaret H. Burke, Litchfield, Conn., in place of M. J. Donahue, removed.

Frank J. Barboni, North Haven, Conn., in place of C. W. Thompson, resigned.

Mary T. Doyle, Thomaston, Conn., in place of F. C. Flynn, deceased.

DELAWARE

Warren Francis Comstock, Farnhurst, Del., in place of R. R. Veasey, deceased.

Bertha M. Carrow, Saint Georges, Del., in place of G. E. Bright, resigned.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Roy M. North, Washington, D. C., in place of V. C. Burke, transferred.

FLORIDA

John F. Pelot, Belleview, Fla., in place of C. G. Hanson, resigned.

Myrtle Clare Booth, Cantonment, Fla., in place of M. C. Booth, transferred.

Theodore L. Latimer, Deleon Springs, Fla., in place of Flode Jones, retired.

Joseph W. Westmoreland, Jay, Fla., in place of M. V. North, transferred.

Earl L. Williams, Lady Lake, Fla., in place of L. R. Estell, retired.

Billie S. Campbell, Lake Harbor, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Evan D. Mixon, Ruskin, Fla., in place of J. F. Linder, resigned.

GEORGIA

Norwood W. Miley, Hahira, Ga., in place of W. H. Massey, deceased.

Evander L. Raulston, Trenton, Ga., in place of W. H. Brock, retired.

IDAHO

Charles E. Ruger, Bancroft, Idaho, in place of Z. G. Steele, resigned.

Thomas W. Rogers, Glenns Ferry, Idaho, in place of H. H. Tate, removed.

Arthur B. Peck, Lava Hot Springs, Idaho, in place of I. J. Peck, resigned.

ILLINOIS

Kenneth V. Mason, Albion, Ill., in place of J. R. Wick, transferred.

Mabel H. Green, Alvin, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Fred D. Knaus, Arcola, Ill., in place of J. F. Speelman, resigned.

William A. Goetz, Bethany, Ill., in place of H. L. Bone, transferred.

Lloyd O. Huff, Blandinville, Ill., in place of L. C. Mosley, resigned.

Daniel J. Boyd, Blue Island, Ill., in place of A. J. Lagod, resigned.

Clifford A. Walsh, Bourbonnais, Ill., in place of M. F. Senesac, resigned.

Gilbert R. Gish, Buda, Ill., in place of R. V. Westervelt, resigned.

Margaret Carlson, Bureau, Ill., in place of J. F. Frederickson, transferred.

Pearl H. Collins, Catlin, Ill., in place of R. O. Huffman, transferred.

William K. Armstrong, Chandlerville, Ill., in place of G. J. Armstrong, resigned.

Ray B. Brockhouse, Chapin, Ill., in place of W. R. Fisher, transferred.

Eula McCawley, Chesterfield, Ill., in place of Verda Malone, resigned.

Albert J. Buehler, Chestnut, Ill., in place of L. C. Rentschler, resigned.

Donald L. Doan, Claremont, Ill., in place of J. H. Leathers, deceased.

Monroe A. Lawson, Clay City, Ill., in place of C. W. Black, resigned.

Andrew J. Rogers, Jr., Cordova, Ill., in place of L. A. Cooper, transferred.

Louis Sloter, Crescent City, Ill., in place of Gerd Willms, transferred.

G. Stewart Allen, Crete, Ill., in place of D. W. Helme, deceased.

Harry A. Osman, Cypress, Ill., in place of M. E. Osman, resigned.

Marie Little, Dallas City, Ill., in place of Claude Shaffner, retired.

Leland Adams, Dieterich, Ill., in place of R. L. Graham, resigned.

Fred H. Popp, Jr., Dundee, Ill., in place of H. F. Kuettner, resigned.

Joseph J. Holloway, Elmhurst, Ill., in place of J. F. Grogan, deceased.

Ruth Sartain, Fithian, Ill., in place of O. E. Bantz, Retired.

John C. McKinstra, Freeport, Ill., in place of F. H. Gibler, resigned.

Glen W. Seaton, Glen Carbon, Ill., in place of Myrtle Wilkison, resigned.

John J. McCaughey, Gurnee, Ill., in place of W. K. Kimball, retired.

George A. Frazer, Hamilton, Ill., in place of R. A. Wescott, removed.

Lester A. Binder, Hinckley, Ill., in place of H. J. Price, transferred.

Russell M. Shoaf, Homer, Ill., in place of O. P. Dickson, deceased.

Russell E. Snyder, Hull, Ill., in place of F. S. Sprague, resigned.

Mary E. McCarl, Kinderhook, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Richard R. Atkins, Kinmundy, Ill., in place of F. O. Grissom, retired.

Ralph D. Weddell, Latham, Ill., in place of W. C. Howe, retired.

James O. Brown, Long Point, Ill., in place of G. F. Turner, retired.

Albert O. Ledbetter, Marion, Ill., in place of D. C. Moss, resigned.

George M. Farrell, Marseilles, Ill., in place of J. A. Maier, resigned.

C. Lincoln Guernsey, Mechanicsburg, Ill., in place of O. M. Elliott, transferred.

Helen F. Gleich, Menard, Ill., in place of F. V. McNabney, deceased.

Arthur E. Maloney, Mooseheart, Ill., in place of M. D. Davis, resigned.

Evans R. Pratt, Morrison, Ill., in place of J. W. Wilson, resigned.

James T. Malley, Mounds, Ill., in place of H. E. Young, transferred.

Adam A. Munsterman, Nameoki, Ill., in place of J. A. Miller, resigned.

John W. Bosaw, New Haven, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Ellwyn Barnett, Oakland, Ill., in place of W. A. Reeds, retired.

Charles J. Murphy, Oak Park, Ill., in place of J. L. Lynch, resigned.

S. Jay Thomas, Oregon, Ill., in place of Henry Cottlow, transferred.

William H. Watson, Prospect Heights, Ill., in place of H. L. Galbraith, resigned.

Emmett P. Hayes, Rochelle, Ill., in place of F. J. Tilton, deceased.

Charles H. McGough, Secor, Ill., in place of Henrietta Hinds, resigned.

Frank C. Spengler, Shannon, Ill., in place of A. J. Geiseman, transferred.

Hazel M. Wolf, Sidney, Ill., in place of F. B. Drews, removed.

Francis L. Weghorst, South Pekin, Ill., in place of R. C. Morris, removed.

Michael A. Bernasek, Sparta, Ill., in place of J. V. Lessley, retired.

Bessie M. Hewitt, Steward, Ill., in place of T. F. Kirby, deceased.

Frank C. Niemeyer, Stockton, Ill., in place of J. D. Cotter, resigned.

Herbert M. Bowman, Thompsonville, Ill., in place of A. M. Akin, resigned.

Wilbur K. Reader, Thomson, Ill., in place of M. J. Sheridan, resigned.

Orville L. Glasford, Trivoli, Ill., in place of R. A. Swan, resigned.

Beatrice E. Reck, Winslow, Ill., in place of H. M. Dean, resigned.

INDIANA

Bernice Sigman, Castleton, Ind., in place of N. M. Sigman, resigned.

Lloyd B. Helms, Centerville, Ind., in place of P. L. Helms, transferred.

Dale M. Sands, Claypool, Ind., in place of Walter Bouse, transferred.

Adrian M. Morrison, Cloverdale, Ind., in place of R. S. Stwalley, transferred.

George W. Horan, Collegeville, Ind., in place of F. A. Hehn, resigned.

Walter H. Fried, Corydon, Ind., in place of G. C. Rainbolt. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Harry G. Thomson, Danville, Ind., in place of Bertha Higgins, resigned.

Marion E. Maxwell, Darlington, Ind., in place of D. C. Thompson, transferred.

Elizabeth May Reiff, Deputy, Ind., in place of F. A. Anderson, deceased.

Margaret A. Horseman, Dublin, Ind., in place of G. A. Adrion, retired.

Henry O. Kipfer, Grabill, Ind., in place of G. R. Woods, resigned.

Omer D. Hendricks, Hartford City, Ind., in place of Jack Dolan, resigned.

Everett J. Laun, Kingsford Heights, Ind., in place of W. J. Rash, resigned.

Arthur C. Welch, Lapaz, Ind., in place of I. B. Carbiener, resigned.

Geneva K. Gant, Laurel, Ind., in place of B. F. Russell, transferred.

Lowell Odom, Medaryville, Ind., in place of H. A. Rowe, transferred.

Robert D. Long, Millersburg, Ind., in place of W. D. Stoner, transferred.

Henry Claude Steininger, Monticello, Ind., in place of T. V. Koontz, resigned.

Marion L. Garstka, New Haven, Ind., in place of D. A. Blaising, transferred.

Pearl L. Smith, New Market, Ind., in place of Ethel Martin, resigned.

Roy L. Strange, Plainville, Ind., in place of E. J. McWilliams, resigned.

Dow Haimbaugh, Rochester, Ind., in place of H. G. McMahan, retired.

John V. Pinegar, Rockville, Ind., in place of J. C. Hoopingarner, deceased.

Sherman L. Wright, Rushville, Ind., in place of W. L. Newbold, removed.

Joseph C. Renie, Sharpsville, Ind., in place of C. W. Cottingham, resigned.

Frank C. Kettring, South Bend, Ind., in place of B. J. McCaffery, resigned.

Arnold B. Rhodes, Tippecanoe, Ind., Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Sylvia Swanson, Twelve Mile, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

IOWA

Estelle M. Burroughs, Albion, Iowa, in place of B. E. Fraley, retired.

Russell E. Bamsey, Audubon, Iowa, in place of G. W. Oelke, resigned.

Vernon L. Dinges, Avoca, Iowa, in place of Harry Eckhardt, deceased.

John M. McNiel, Batavia, Iowa, in place of W. S. Olexa, resigned.

Charles W. Crees, Bayard, Iowa, in place of O. V. Stevens, resigned.

Vernon M. Zylstra, Bussey, Iowa, in place of Z. P. Way, resigned.

James T. Kisgen, Carroll, Iowa, in place of J. F. Rettenmaier, deceased.

Francis L. Porter, Clarion, Iowa, in place of Richard Tomke, deceased.

Marion W. Palmer, Clearfield, Iowa, in place of J. S. Walton, removed.

William G. Strunce, Creston, Iowa, in place of T. M. Conway, deceased.

Joseph L. Torpey, DeWitt, Iowa, in place of H. L. Smith, transferred.
George W. Kunzman, Douds, Iowa, in place of M. R. Doud, resigned.
Paul Davie, Dunlap, Iowa, in place of J. P. Burke, deceased.
Edward P. Domayer, Dyersville, Iowa, in place of L. C. Smith, retired.
James W. Klaus, Earlville, Iowa, in place of G. E. Faust, transferred.
John R. Bahne, Eldora, Iowa, in place of J. J. Fowler, deceased.
George R. Lewis, Elliott, Iowa, in place of Mabel Kinney, deceased.
Dorris E. Trullinger, Farragut, Iowa, in place of P. K. Kraschel, resigned.
Raymond J. Gilday, Fort Dodge, Iowa, in place of P. T. Vaughan, retired.
Mattison L. Swaney, Garner, Iowa, in place of C. O. Roe, resigned.
Jerome A. Bunkers, Granville, Iowa, in place of R. M. Fischbach, transferred.
Ralph W. Gardner, Humeston, Iowa, in place of W. C. Eaton, transferred.
Robert B. Christopher, Huxley, Iowa, in place of Albert Johnson, retired.
Amy E. Allen, Jewell, Iowa, in place of Y. A. Johnson, transferred.
Elton O. Brill, Kamrar, Iowa, in place of M. J. Torrence, transferred.
Frank E. Orwan, Lorimor, Iowa, in place of N. T. Nixon, deceased.
Mary C. Burns, Neola, Iowa, in place of Grace Ryan, resigned.
Alice L. Pool, New Providence, Iowa, in place of Gladys Hadley, deceased.
Raymond M. Harrold, Palmer, Iowa, in place of W. H. Theisen, removed.
Ernest J. Heatherington, Prescott, Iowa, in place of C. B. Chapman, resigned.
Fred J. Ehrhardt, Sac City, Iowa, in place of C. L. Anderson, resigned.
Stanley H. Nelson, Terril, Iowa, in place of C. C. Lockner, resigned.
Marion C. Retter, Van Horne, Iowa, in place of A. O. Reinhardt, retired.
Oral J. Brown, Washington, Iowa, in place of M. C. DeLong, deceased.
Rex C. Severt, Wellman, Iowa, in place of H. D. MacGugin, deceased.
Wesley B. Neal, Westfield, Iowa, in place of O. M. Sanford, retired.
William J. Newcomb, Williamsburg, Iowa, in place of W. J. Cash, removed.
Pearl L. Smith, Woden, Iowa, in place of V. L. Eaton, resigned.

KANSAS

Albert H. Sauvain, Agenda, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Earle F. Hill, Altamont, Kans., in place of C. H. Kessler, transferred.
Ralph W. Smullins, Burr Oak, Kans., in place of E. J. Callahan, resigned.
Charles G. Persinger, Canton, Kans., in place of Ralph Ganson, resigned.
Francis K. Darr, Centralia, Kans., in place of C. E. Drumm, deceased.
Howard C. Cain, Delphos, Kans., in place of M. A. Cain, resigned.
Frank L. Robinson, Eskridge, Kans., in place of J. O. Warren, transferred.
Harry C. Brooks, Fort Scott, Kans., in place of J. M. Miller, retired.
Harold D. Vernon, Goff, Kans., in place of E. H. Huerter, transferred.
E. Lucille Logsdon, Grenola, Kans., in place of E. C. Logsdon, deceased.
Charles W. Parker, Highland, Kans., in place of W. D. Gilmore, resigned.
Harry Lang, Jetmore, Kans., in place of F. R. Wilson, resigned.
Beatrice H. Howell, Langdon, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Gordon N. Carlisle, Leoti, Kans., in place of G. V. Downs, transferred.
Alvin A. Pfeiffer, Linn, Kans., in place of D. L. McGregor, transferred.
Marlin L. Ames, Long Island, Kans., in place of Loraine Champlin, transferred.
Leslie A. Leochner, Ludell, Kans., in place of A. W. Howland, transferred.
Faye G. Mullikin, Montezuma, Kans., in place of B. W. Wherritt, transferred.
Ola J. Canny, Mound Valley, Kans., in place of C. L. Hinds, transferred.
John F. Buche, Mulberry, Kans., in place of Albert Cameron, deceased.
Una V. Shoemaker, Perry, Kans., in place of Guletta Stark, deceased.
Patrick J. Jolly, Scammon, Kans., in place of D. P. McCormick, resigned.
Richard D. Wiley, Sedgwick, Kans., in place of J. A. Wiley, resigned.
Ruth H. Berrigan, Solomon, Kans., in place of H. D. MacCloughan, resigned.

KENTUCKY

Ernest C. Runyon, Belfry, Ky., in place of K. S. Keesee, removed.
John B. Adams, Berea, Ky., in place of J. E. Moore, deceased.
Edna T. Holman, Cerulean, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Arthur Kelly Hearon, Clay, Ky., in place of P. L. McGraw, deceased.
John M. Magee, Cynthiana, Ky., in place of S. F. Sprake, deceased.
Leland G. Rubarts, Dunnville, Ky., in place of O. L. Ellis, retired.
Lillian Bodenheimer, Freeburn, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Lora C. Birmingham, Hardburly, Ky., in place of Elizabeth Godsey, resigned.
Harold A. Bolin, Irvington, Ky., in place of R. L. Frymire, transferred.
John C. Ryan, Pine Knot, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
John R. Craig, Rockholds, Ky., in place of Stella Creekmore, retired.
Robert F. Gillispie, Sadieville, Ky., in place of W. A. Marshall, transferred.
Hodge J. Slayden, Salem, Ky., in place of Jessie Mitchell, resigned.
Effie M. Volers, South Shore, Ky., in place of Josephine Shepherd, removed.
Mary M. Deaton, Toner, Ky. Office became Presidential April 1, 1947.
Rachel A. Galvin, Waverly Hills, Ky., in place of M. F. Beck, transferred.
George G. Wilson, Whitley City, Ky., in place of B. K. Morris, removed.

LOUISIANA

Miles K. Hartsell, Rodessa, La., in place of M. K. Hartsell, transferred.
K. C. Peterson, Zwolle, La., in place of E. C. Leone, deceased.

MAINE

Howard Mills Martin, Kennebunk Port, Maine, in place of W. F. Goodwin, retired.
Delmar C. Ellinwood, North Windham, Maine, in place of L. H. Hern, resigned.

MARYLAND

Thomas F. Conlon, Cumberland, Md., in place of J. C. Shriver, resigned.
H. Lester Long, Jr., Ellicott City, Md., in place of M. J. Sullivan, deceased.

MASSACHUSETTS

Francis A. Crowley, Boston, Mass., in place of P. J. Connelly, retired.
Maurice R. Savage, Buzzards Bay, Mass., in place of F. C. Small, retired.
Thomas P. Hallinan, Chicopee Falls, Mass., in place of A. E. Roberts, retired.
Donald P. Steele, Gloucester, Mass., in place of G. W. O'Neil, deceased.
Malcolm W. Chase, Princeton, Mass., in place of R. J. Gregory, deceased.
Hazel F. Tenney, West Townsend, Mass., in place of G. H. Tenney, retired.
Thomas J. Gilgun, Winchester, Mass., in place of V. C. Ambrose, resigned.
John A. Marshall, Worcester, Mass., in place of J. T. Sheehan, retired.

MICHIGAN

Perry F. Frownfelder, Adrian, Mich., in place of H. I. Bourns, resigned.
Elias W. Lyons, Armada, Mich., in place of M. E. Shaw, resigned.
Samuel Somora, Sr., Baroda, Mich., in place of M. D. Hartman, resigned.
Gerald D. Swanson, Bear Lake, Mich., in place of H. P. Snyder, transferred.
Frank A. Prais, Belleville, Mich., in place of E. T. McGlothlin, resigned.
James L. Milliron, Benzonia, Mich., in place of M. B. Mills, deceased.
John J. Redmond, Bloomfield Hills, Mich., in place of K. L. Martin, resigned.
Roland F. Duff, Buckley, Mich., in place of W. W. Plank, retired.
Alexander S. Lynch, Carney, Mich., in place of V. R. Moran, transferred.
Archie W. Visnaw, Cedarville, Mich., in place of Edwin Dutcher, resigned.
Franklin L. Erickson, Central Lake, Mich., in place of Evert Van Den Berg, resigned.
Harry T. Dransfield, Channing, Mich., in place of R. J. Tobin, resigned.
Arthur F. Newman, De Witt, Mich., in place of V. W. Halterman, resigned.
Horace J. Lickly, Dexter, Mich., in place of L. W. Rector, transferred.
Leo B. Francisco, East Lansing, Mich., in place of E. E. Young, removed.
Richard L. Price, East Tawas, Mich., in place of C. A. Bigelow, deceased.
Woodrow L. LaLonde, Felch, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.
Keith Adams, Fountain, Mich., in place of J. H. Boehm, resigned.
Clarence F. Allen, Fowlerville, Mich., in place of D. L. Lockwood, resigned.
Mary M. Blower, Grand Blanc, Mich., in place of E. M. Page, resigned.
Clarence F. Goerner, Howard City, Mich., in place of Sidney Reynolds, resigned.
Robert J. Buller, Interlochen, Mich. Office became Presidential, July 1, 1945.
Joseph Thomas Kaderabek, Irons, Mich., in place of E. M. Voorhees, retired.
John B. Seidl, Jones, Mich., in place of R. L. Schell, retired.
Reuben S. Eddy, Lake Linden, Mich., in place of H. E. Penninger, retired.
John E. Dooley, Linden, Mich., in place of J. E. Hogan, resigned.
Emerson E. Dufina, Mackinac Island, Mich., in place of Paul Doud, resigned.
Lovatus A. Butler, Milan, Mich., in place of W. R. Mason, resigned.
Court R. Houghtaster, Millersburg, Mich., in place of F. B. Mills, deceased.
Bruce A. Lee, Millington, Mich., in place of R. P. Lee, resigned.
Otto F. Wormsbacher, Mount Clements, Mich., in place of J. C. Bannow, deceased.
Charles L. Kaltenbach, New Haven, Mich., in place of C. J. Tessman, resigned.
Collins H. Luth, Niles, Mich., in place of F. C. Franz, resigned.
Charles J. Bal, Norway, Mich., in place of Elizabeth Treiber, retired.
Russell C. Scott, Pittsford, Mich., in place of F. B. Wadsworth, retired.
Charles K. Guy, Rapid City, Mich., in place of J. O. Way, resigned.
Clarence F. Bushman, Rochester, Mich., in place of J. M. Stackhouse, deceased.
Darwin H. Van Houten, Sixlakes, Mich., in place of Ward Gibbs, resigned.
Vester E. Mock, Springport, Mich., in place of L. L. Peterson, transferred.
William H. Mullins, Trout Lake, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

MINNESOTA

Alfred C. Howe, Aitkin, Minn., in place of C. C. Young, deceased.
Peter B. Kiselewski, Browerville, Minn., in place of L. F. Masonick, resigned.
Charlotte C. Keniston, Champlin, Minn., in place of H. A. Smith, transferred.
Walter L. Frantl, Coleraine, Minn., in place of J. K. Sloan, deceased.
Bertha H. Avenson, Dorset, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.
Anna C. Hite, Emily, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.
Edna K. Gerding, Greenwald, Minn., in place of H. A. Behnen, resigned.
Joseph F. Ruzek, Hayfield, Minn., in place of Earl Stanton, transferred.

Alfred F. Ess, Hopkins, Minn., in place of F. D. Markham, resigned.
Raymond B. Sullivan, International Falls, Minn., in place of W. V. Kane, resigned.
Max H. Casey, Jordan, Minn., in place of Herman Herder, retired.
Fred J. Peterson, Laporte, Minn., in place of A. E. Child, removed.
Reuel J. Jacobson, Lutsen, Minn., in place of J. C. Bally, resigned.
John J. Jaschke, Minneota, Minn., in place of W. B. Gislason, resigned.
George A. Schultz, Ottertail, Minn., in place of E. H. Albers, transferred.
Alfred A. Nelson, Perham, Minn., in place of J. C. Grimm, deceased.
Grant D. Bergstrom, Pine River, Minn., in place of M. M. Stewart, resigned.
Jerome L. Chmielewski, Princeton, Minn., in place of C. E. Paulson, resigned.
Carl S. Fischer, Sauk Centre, Minn., in place of B. F. DuBois, Jr., resigned.
Fred P. Schroeder, Sauk Rapids, Minn., in place of T. G. Schaefer, removed.
Lyle R. Martinson, Shafer, Minn., in place of R. E. Grandstrand, transferred.
Alban D. Bertrand, Sleepy Eye, Minn., in place of George Glotzbach, resigned.
Evelyn McGivern, Staples, Minn., in place of T. L. Wolf, resigned.
James Monroe Cunningham, Sturgeon Lake, Minn., in place of G. W. Phares, deceased.
Vida B. Adams, Truman, Minn., in place of N. T. True, resigned.

MISSISSIPPI

Charles C. Provine, Big Creek, Miss., in place of J. H. Seale, deceased.
Owen O. Odom, Steens, Miss., in place of S. L. Brewer, deceased.

MISSOURI

Clyde A. Revelle, Advance, Mo., in place of Carl Richmond, resigned.
Maude E. Coburn, Arbyrd, Mo., in place of H. K. Bridges, resigned.
Ida M. Brunnert, Argyle, Mo., in place of F. P. Wulff, deceased.
Cleatus F. Henson, Bell City, Mo., in place of A. J. Henson, retired.
Edna M. Keesling, Belleview, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.
Mary W. Chaffin, Breckenridge, Mo., in place of R. E. Chaffin, deceased.
Waldo E. Malone, Clifton Hill, Mo., in place of E. E. Essig, deceased.
Dudley W. Peters, Crane, Mo., in place of W. L. Wiley, resigned.
Eugene H. Davison, Elkland, Mo., in place of I. F. Davison, retired.
Fred V. Hogan, Flemington, Mo., in place of R. L. Whited, transferred.
Alfred D. Boon, Franklin, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Arthur G. Emmons, Grandin, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Willie L. Anderson, Green City, Mo., in place of V. B. Watt, transferred.
Floyd R. Robertson, Harviell, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Leanora R. Condit, Hayti, Mo., in place of C. O. Raine, Jr., resigned.
Walter H. Bruens, Hermann, Mo., in place of George Petrus, resigned.
Lola E. Frohse, High Ridge, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.
Charles H. Boemler, House Springs, Mo., in place of K. M. Boemler, deceased.
Tom J. Molloy, Joplin, Mo., in place of L. L. Travis, retired.
Carl E. Schreiner, Lamar, Mo., in place of W. G. Warner, resigned.
Elmer H. Temme, Leslie, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Aubrey M. Gooch, Meadville, Mo., in place of W. E. Evans, resigned.
Doris N. Cornine, Nelson, Mo., in place of A. R. White, deceased.
Sylvester Welch, Parnell, Mo., in place of E. J. Echterling, resigned.
Desmond Earl Todd, Pevely, Mo., in place of V. G. Guidicy, resigned.
T. Ray Gourley, Phillipsburg, Mo., in place of F. E. Dennis, retired.
Paul R. Viles, Pineville, Mo., in place of L. D. Smith, resigned.
Jacob E. Fry, Stover, Mo., in place of E. J. Fry, retired.
Mildred F. Parsons, Syracuse, Mo., in place of M. T. Keevil, removed.
Billie B. Cooper, Windsor, Mo., in place of F. L. Stafford, resigned.
Donald H. Lockman, Winona, Mo., in place of J. T. Loyd, resigned.

MONTANA

Dorothy W. Carrigan, Birney, Mont., in place of Dessie Burnsides, resigned.
James Charles McCue, Winnett, Mont., in place of E. V. Leslie, resigned.

NEBRASKA

Irvan S. Renie, Arapahoe, Nebr., in place of A. A. Anderson, transferred.
Arthur Glen Miller, Atkinson, Nebr., in place of A. G. Miller, incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.
Lorin V. Jones, Auburn, Nebr., in place of R. E. Harmon, retired.
Viola Calhoon, Benedict, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.
Audrey Ida Babb, Broadwater, Nebr., in place of Bert Winters, retired.
Donald K. Burklund, Brule, Nebr., in place of E. E. Kampfe, resigned.
Edward J. Pepperl, Burchard, Nebr., in place of A. M. Hart, resigned.
Winton E. Newcomb, Cambridge, Nebr., in place of K. R. Newcomb, transferred.
Cyrus F. McDowell, Chadron, Nebr., in place of R. L. Isham, resigned.
Wayne L. Patras, Clearwater, Nebr., in place of R. E. Flowers, transferred.
John P. Davis, Crawford, Nebr., in place of G. J. Scott, resigned.
Troy Kenneth McCown, Elsie, Nebr., in place of W. O. Troxel, transferred.
Charles Edmond Rock, Geneva, Nebr., in place of G. L. Koshler, resigned.
Gayle K. Conner, Glenvil, Nebr., in place of Walter Kowka, transferred.
Harry L. Dresslar, Grant, Nebr., in place of U. V. Dobbs, resigned.
Henry A. Davis, Louisville, Nebr., in place of E. L. Ossenkop, deceased.
Mary L. Wunderlich, Martell, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
James J. Marshall, Merriman, Nebr., in place of F. C. Johnson, removed.
Adeline L. Breslin, Newcastle, Nebr., in place of J. A. Hoy, resigned.
Raymond R. Stevens, Orchard, Nebr., in place of F. D. Strope, deceased.
M. Belle Bouck, Palmyra, Nebr., in place of M. A. Foreman, deceased.
Robert K. Corn, Papillion, Nebr., in place of G. P. Miller, retired.
Fahy E. Wadkins, Phillips, Nebr., in place of J. W. Spencer, retired.
Rolland L. Winkle, Pickrell, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Calvin Joseph Olk, Pilger, Nebr., in place of O. A. Pilger, transferred.
Leslie W. Niel, Plattsmouth, Nebr., in place of M. W. Price, resigned.
Mae M. Lovell, Potter, Nebr., in place of W. M. Goding, resigned.
Walter A. Aregood, Rising City, Nebr., in place of P. W. Barker, transferred.
Jerry E. Severyn, Schuyler, Nebr. in place of M. B. Farrell, resigned.
Hattie A. Pateidl, Snyder, Nebr., in place of Joseph Kounovsky, retired.
Charles V. Brokaw, Uehling, Nebr., in place of Catherine Honey, retired.
Margaret Linhart, Verdel, Nebr., in place of W. N. McClintock, transferred.
Aura Mae Keckler, Weeping Water, Nebr., in place of R. W. Keckler, transferred.

NEVADA

Renee C. Gibson, Beatty, Nev., in place of C. E. Merkel, resigned.
Teresa A. Mahoney, Beowawe, Nev., in place of F. J. Smyth, retired.
Thelma R. Studer, Gabbs, Nev., in place of G. P. McMichael, resigned.
Edward L. Gregory, Goldfield, Nev., in place of N. W. Wills, removed.
Josephine Roberts, McGill, Nev., in place of E. S. Christensen, resigned.
Beatrice E. Hinds, Smith, Nev., in place of Geraldine Keeley, resigned.
Carolyn W. Parshall, Stewart, Nev., in place of D. E. Larson, transferred.
Alice I. Strieby, Wellington, Nev. Office became presidential—July 1, 1947.
Ray E. Hepworth, Wells, Nev., in place of E. C. Smith, resigned.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Rodney B. Wright, Brookline, N. H., in place of C. A. Morse, deceased.
Walter E. Hill, Fitzwilliam Depot, N. H., in place of S. E. White, retired.
James H. O'Connell, Fremont, N. H., in place of M. A. Willey, retired.
Joseph E. Hurley, Wilton, N. H., in place of J. R. K. Kelley, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Sesto A. Ferretti, Alpha, N. J., in place of R. B. Sokolowski, deceased.
William F. Kuhn, Brigantine, N. J., in place of S. H. Smith, resigned.
Kathryn W. Haines, Browns Mills, N. J., in place of Delbert Bush, resigned.
Stanley John Ryba, Burlington, N. J., in place of R. P. Hughes, retired.
Edmund O. Howell, Cape May Court House, N. J., in place of Jacob Garrison, deceased.
Charles M. Kammerer, Carlton Hill, N. J., in place of F. J. Baker, resigned.
George T. Albrecht, Dover, N. J., in place of Irving Washburn, retired.
Edward J. Breen, Edgewater, N. J., in place of Emery Benoit, retired.
William J. Fricolo, Emerson, N. J., in place of F. E. Schmidt, deceased.
Damon Caccese, Franklinville, N. J., in place of G. W. Karge, retired.
Elizabeth A. Philhower, Gladstone, N. J., in place of Remsen Howard, removed.
Jerome L. Becker, Jr., Hightstown, N. J., in place of J. B. Braun, Jr., deceased.
Henry T. Hopkins, Keyport, N. J., in place of W. H. Hitchcock. Incumbent's commission expired August 23, 1941.
Melvin A. Jolly, Old Bridge, N. J., in place of Luella Brown, retired.
Walter C. Farley, Oldwick, N. J., in place of M. D. Farley, deceased.
John F. O'Donnell, Phillipsburg, N. J., in place of W. H. Fisher, deceased.
Joseph E. Stout, Pittstown, N. J., in place of W. T. Snyder, transferred.
Robert G. Young, Port Monmouth, N. J., in place of M. B. Naughton. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.
Nicholas M. DaPrile, Port Reading, N. J., in place of C. V. Richardson, declined.
William A. Kearns, Ridgewood, N. J., in place of A. W. McNeill, deceased.
Julius B. Scott, Somerdale, N. J., in place of P. F. Whelan, Jr., transferred.
James Abercromby, South Branch, N. J. Office became Presidential October 1, 1947.
Ralph T. Hodge, South Vineland, N. J., in place of Ethel Light, resigned.
Carl L. Roof, Stillwater, N. J., in place of C. M. Garris, retired.
Joseph E. Lyons, Vineland, N. J., in place of T. H. Hall, resigned.
Joseph Carroll Bransfield, Wildwood, N. J., in place of F. J. Shortt, retired.
William M. Danridge, Wortendyke, N. J., in place of Nora Loughman, resigned.

NEW MEXICO

Carl J. Dagostino, Socorro, N. Mex., in place of L. M. Fay, resigned.

NEW YORK

Mary A. Burns, Andover, N. Y., in place of J. D. Chessman, deceased.

David E. Dodge, Apalachin, N. Y., in place of Asa Camp, retired.

Alonzo L. Grasberger, Ashland, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

William A. Clukies, Bellmore, N. Y., in place of A. J. Lee, deceased.

Charles C. Verhis, Brooktondale, N. Y., in place of A. C. VanDemark, resigned.

Chester E. Canniff, Cairo, N. Y., in place of L. A. Timmerman, resigned.

William J. Trombley, Cohoes, N. Y., in place of Michael O'Donnell. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1940.

Dorothy N. Lyke, East Bethany, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Maurice H. Adair, East Meredith, N. Y., in place of F. I. Adair, retired.

Phoebe J. Varney, East Nassau, N. Y., in place of L. B. Pulver, deceased.

Richard A. Stahley, East Randolph, N. Y., in place of S. V. Woods, deceased.

Paul E. Carrigan, East Rockaway, N. Y., in place of A. A. Crary, deceased.

Mary H. Bunt, Elka Park, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Robert G. Sullivan, Gainesville, N. Y., in place of J. J. Hickey, transferred.

Elvira Reppucci, Glenwood Landing, N. Y., in place of F. J. Burns, Jr., resigned.

Elizabeth C. FitzPatrick, Hamilton, N. Y., in place of M. F. Dixon, deceased.

Manuel Fisher, Harris, N. Y., in place of H. A. Monroe, resigned.

Arnold D. Case, Hinsdale, N. Y., in place of D. B. Allen, retired.

Julia M. Conway, Klamesha Lake, N. Y., in place of Henry Karchmer, deceased.

John L. Barrett, Minetto, N. Y. In place of Z. I. Seymour. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Charles W. Schmitt, Montgomery, N. Y., in place of W. J. Devitt, transferred.

Julia C. McManus, Montrose, N. Y., in place of E. C. McManus, resigned.

Frank A. McEvoy, Mount McGregor, N. Y. Office became Presidential October 1, 1946.

Andrew A. Wulforst, New Hyde Park, N. Y., in place of John Flinn, deceased.

Walter J. McCue, North Vellmore, N. Y., in place of Benjamin Lomench, resigned.

Mildred C. Sigrist, North Evans, N. Y., in place of S. M. Waltz, retired.

James P. Byrne, Norwich, N. Y., in place of H. M. Bulger, deceased.

T. Leo Ford, Oak Hill, N. Y., in place of E. E. Ford, retired.

Edward Warner, Point Pleasant, N. Y., in place of E. R. Chaffer, deceased.

Walter R. Cumiskey, Port Washington, N. Y., in place of T. E. Roeber, resigned.

Margaret M. Fox, Purdy Station, N. Y., in place of Rose Bittner, resigned.

Robert L. Simmons, Ripley, N. Y., in place of I. R. Bennett, deceased.

Cornelius S. Ball, Rye, N. Y., in place of T. V. Ball, deceased.

Louise H. Allen, Sandy Creek, N. Y., in place of A. H. Wart, resigned.

Winston R. Reel, Schuylerville, N. Y., in place of D. J. Falvey, deceased.

Mary W. Hally, Sonyea, N. Y., in place of E. J. Hally, deceased.

Mae Carroll, Sound Beach, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Francis A. Brophy, Stony Point, N. Y., in place of Mary Lynch, removed.

Hyman Sasnowitz, Swan Lake, N. Y., in place of Frank Kilcoin, resigned.

Althera Wahl, Sylvan Beach, N. Y., in place of M. M. Rice, deceased.

Arthur J. Kane, Waverly, N. Y., in place of M. G. Baldwin, resigned.

William J. Yaeger, Webster, N. Y., in place of P. J. Smith, retired.

Frederic Francais, Westhampton Beach, N. Y., in place of M. B. Williams, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Evelyn J. Sutton, Dillsboro, N. C., in place of E. B. Monteith, retired.

Belle Q. Cable, Fontana Dam, N. C., in place of M. T. Calahan, resigned.

Claude A. Dry, Misenheimer, N. C., in place of M. C. Peeler, resigned.

A. Garland Pierce, Southern Pines, N. C., in place of P. F. Buchan, deceased.

Gilbert A. Holt, Troy, N. C., in place of G. W. Stuart, resigned.

George H. Ross, Wadesboro, N. C., in place of F. M. Mills, resigned.

NORTH DAKOTA

Mathilda A. Johnson, Adams, N. Dak., in place of N. H. Koppang, resigned.

Ben Ramsland, Almont, N. Dak., in place of Otis Malone, retired.

Donovan J. Dolan, Bowbells, N. Dak., in place of I. E. Schultz, resigned.

John J. Murray, Mandan, N. Dak., in place of F. S. Hudson, retired.

Roy R. Just, New Salem, N. Dak., in place of Carl Jahnke, retired.

Herbert J. Clark, Powers Lake, N. Dak., in place of E. J. Powell, resigned.

Daniel F. McMenamy, Reynolds, N. Dak., in place of H. J. Mealy, transferred.

Byron P. Pulles, Stanton, N. Dak., in place of I. D. Thue, deceased.

Henry Lemke, Wishek, N. Dak., in place of J. H. Case, removed.

OHIO

Ralph C. Bennett, Amesville, Ohio, in place of W. L. Carpenter, resigned.

Willis D. Kay, Anna, Ohio, in place of M. L. Sollmann, transferred.

Ida U. Smeltz, Attica, Ohio, in place of R. W. Senn, resigned.

Anna Gilmer Love, Basil, Ohio, in place of J. F. Shell, deceased.

Norman W. Elsass, Botkins, Ohio, in place of F. J. Lenhart, transferred.

Harry B. Bavis, Bowling Green, Ohio, in place of F. W. Thomas, resigned.

Harley G. Butler, Bryan, Ohio, in place of G. H. Smith, deceased.

Woodrow E. Cecil, Caldwell, Ohio, in place of A. C. Barnhouse, deceased.

Robert S. Keadey, Centerburg, Ohio, in place of R. W. Litzenberg, resigned.

Mary C. Dick, Cleves, Ohio, in place of R. J. Schwing, declined.

Harry F. Schiewetz, Dayton, Ohio, in place of C. N. Greer, deceased.

Willis W. Hill, Dublin, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

William Henry Jenne, Elyria, Ohio, in place of C. J. Sartor, resigned.

Walter L. Bervinkle, Jr., Fort Jennings, Ohio, in place of C. B. Brockman, transferred.

Robert W. Garrison, Frankfort, Ohio, in place of D. P. Briggs, Jr., transferred.

Elmer E. Caldwell, Gallipolis, Ohio, in place of A. K. Merriman, resigned.

Clarence N. Emrick, Germantown, Ohio, in place of R. V. Condrey, transferred.

L. Abram Flory, Granville, Ohio, in place of N. H. Overturf, resigned.

Harold L. LaFountaine, Helena, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

William R. Hapner, Hillsboro, Ohio, in place of E. V. Miller, resigned.

Russell E. Elliott, Jackson Center, Ohio, in place of P. L. Heintz, removed.

Herbert N. Dunfee, Jacobsburg, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Ralph W. Stitsworth, Jamestown, Ohio, in place of H. C. Lieurance, retired.

J. Gilbert Coil, Jeffersonville, Ohio, in place of G. W. Blessing, resigned.

Ivor W. Cowell, Lake Milton, Ohio, in place of O. A. Holzbach, resigned.

Mildred C. Sellars, Little Hocking, Ohio, in place of P. A. Bond, retired.

John B. Panto, Lowellville, Ohio, in place of L. B. Milligan, deceased.

William C. Simon, Metamora, Ohio, in place of E. L. Churchill, transferred.

Homer E. Omen, Millfield, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Forest L. Ayers, Murray City, Ohio, in place of P. E. Surgen, resigned.

Albert D. Borer, New Riegel, Ohio, in place of A. C. Klein, retired.

Russell M. Powell, New Vienna, Ohio, in place of T. H. Rice, transferred.

William J. Gallehue, North Hampton, Ohio, in place of M. K. Lehman, resigned.

Howard B. Acker, Perry, Ohio, in place of M. C. Hickman, resigned.

George J. Stoll, Piketon, Ohio, in place of G. E. Leist, resigned.

Richard P. Hampson, Pleasantville, Ohio, in place of G. R. Daubenmire, removed.

Gail I. Lauer, Prospect, Ohio, in place of C. B. Dix, resigned.

Ella L. Clare, Richmond, Ohio, in place of J. R. Simpson, retired.

Robert E. Erwin, Richwood, Ohio, in place of M. L. Dickason, transferred.

Glenn G. Rex, Rome, Ohio, in place of J. P. Statler, deceased.

Francis M. Myers, Russellville, Ohio, in place of L. E. Harman, transferred.

Charles L. Sparks, Sabina, Ohio, in place of E. H. Barns, resigned.

Eugene Victor Grevencamp, Saint Henry, Ohio, in place of A. J. Beckman, resigned.

Lena G. Konneker, Sawyerwood, Ohio, in place of A. L. Milhoan, resigned.

Philip F. Dickerson, Scio, Ohio, in place of L. H. Duswald, resigned.

Mabel I. Linson, South Solon, Ohio, in place of Emma Duff, retired.

John M. Daly, State Soldiers Home, Ohio, in place of A. M. Speir, removed.

Laura V. Tipton, The Plains, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Roger M. Crites, Tuscarawas, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Roger W. Goertemiller, Verona, Ohio, in place of J. A. Ressler, retired.

Ermel Ward, Vinton, Ohio, in place of H. D. Devore, retired.

Lester Gerber, Walnut Creek, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Elijah H. Jackson, Waverly, Ohio, in place of A. S. Keechle, resigned.

Harry A. Hahn, Waynesburg Ohio, in place of H. C. Brubaker, resigned.

Erwin J. Brause, Westlake, Ohio, in place of E. J. Orvis, deceased.

Edsel F. Rowland, Williamsfield, Ohio, in place of L. W. Spellman, deceased.

OKLAHOMA

Phil Lee Brown, Cherokee, Okla., in place of H. C. Forde, resigned.

Clarence W. Phillips, Coyle, Okla., in place of G. E. Wandell, retired.

Alfred V. Koehler, Manchester, Okla., in place of B. E. Stone, resigned.

Glen H. Newell, Nash, Okla., in place of Roy Rine, resigned.

Robert Anderson, Sperry, Okla., in place of R. T. Holbert, deceased.

OREGON

Ardis E. Bradley, Aumsville, Oreg., in place of V. R. Bradley, resigned.

Farley J. Elliott, Bend, Oreg., in place of R. H. Fox, retired.

Victor Carl Black, Dallas, Oreg., in place of Tracy Savery, transferred.

Joseph Omlin, Jr., Gold Beach, Oreg. in place of Vincent Byram, deceased.

Loyal E. Smith, Sherwood, Oreg., in place of W. P. Fisk, tranferred.

PENNSYLVANIA

Thomas J. Zimmerlink, Allison, Pa., in place of Steve Latsko, Jr., removed.

Robert N. Eisenhart, Aspers, Pa., in place of C. A. Plank, resigned.

Eugene W. Collins, Atglen, Pa., in place of J. H. Baldwin, retired.

Harry E. Grim, Boyertown, Pa., in place of H. L. Breidenbach, resigned.

Chester J. Kukleski, Braddock, Pa., in place of Jennie Moran, retired.

John F. Nally, Carbondale, Pa., in place of F. P. Kelly, retired.

J. Albert Vail, Chester Springs, Pa., in place of K. H. Vail, deceased.

Claude B. Maurer, Colmar, Pa., in place of L. C. Rosenberger, retired.

Clarence R. Tobin, Cresson, Pa., in place of E. C. Bishop, resigned.

Robert A. McNaul, Curwensville, Pa., in place of W. K. Wrigley, resigned.

Ruth B. Nyquist, Dagus Mines, Pa., in place of S. P. Veoni, transferred.

Emerson K. Musser, East Earl, Pa., in place of C. P. Shirk, resigned.

A. Chester Dietrich, East Petersburgh, Pa., in place of E. S. Harry, resigned.

William E. Zedlker, Eightyfour, Pa., in place of W. A. Johnston, resigned.

Wilma S. Walker, Emeigh, Pa., in place of E. M. Krug, resigned.

Leonard R. Devilbiss, Fawn Grove, Pa., in place of L. E. Devilbiss, deceased.

Woodrow W. S. Lehr, Fogelsville, Pa., in place of J. J. Mohr, retired.

Douglas James McHenry, Fort Washington, Pa., M. M. Kavanagh, resigned.

John Allen Habel, Garrett, Pa., in place of L. B. Habel, resigned.

Herbert C. Klinger, Herndon, Pa., in place of J. P. Garrett, transferred.

Frank W. Coughanour, Jr., Hopwood, Pa., in place of A. L. P. Lieb, resigned.

Harry T. Ritchey, Hyndman, Pa., in place of M. D. Rees, resigned.

Richard F. Albright, Kulpsville, Pa., in place of E. M. Stover, retired.

Victor Lescovitz, Midway, Pa., in place of Rebecca Campbell, resigned.

Malcolm A. Young, Monroeton, Pa., in place of E. J. Roof, resigned.

Clarence R. Miller, Mont Clare, Pa., in place of M. H. Wahl, resigned.

Anna L. Splain, Mountville, Pa., in place of J. W. Hoover, retired.

Luther E. Kunkle, Mount Wolf, Pa., in place of L. A. Strayer, deceased.

Steve J. Vrotny, Natrona Heights, Pa., in place of J. J. Roll, retired.

Michael J. Pagani, New Galilee, Pa., in place of Rose Guzzetti, resigned.

Raymond T. Stuckey, Newport, Pa., in place of W. G. Loy, deceased.

Anna V. Eichlin, Ottsville, Pa., in place of H. M. Fabian, resigned.

Kenneth W. Hoag, Ralston, Pa., in place of L. S. Mansuy, resigned.

Winifred C. Brendel, Reinholds, Pa., in place of S. E. Hornberger, retired.

William Debreczeni, Richeyville, Pa., in place of M. B. Williams, resigned.

Wiley C. Hamby, Salona, Pa., in place of C. B. Herr, retired.

George H. Davis, Saxonburg, Pa., in place of A. G. Lassinger, resigned.

William H. Rufe, Jr., Sellersville, Pa., in place of Alexander Alexander, deceased.

George L. Strausbaugh, Seven Valleys, Pa., in place of S. E. Henry, resigned.

Mildred E. Thomas, Shelocta, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Frank W. Thomas, Skytop, Pa., in place of Thornton Raney, resigned.

Walter F. Walsh, Spangler, Pa., in place of M. F. Doran, resigned.

Willis C. Latshaw, Spring City, Pa., in place of R. E. Walley, resigned.

Ida M. Christle, Starford, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Leon D. Kingsley, Townville, Pa., in place of L. L. Childs, deceased.

Robert A. Lanzendorfer, Twin Rocks, Pa., in place of M. E. Ford, resigned.

Grant M. Barrall, Wapwallopen, Pa., in place of C. D. Everard, transferred.

Benjamin F. Sherick, Washington Boro, Pa., in place of R. E. Funk, deceased.

Eugene Patrick J. McMahon, Waymart, Pa., in place of M. L. McMahon, declined.

Eaton T. Hartman, Windsor, Pa., in place of E. C. Smith, deceased.

Thurlow C. Brenneman, York Haven, Pa., in place of M. E. M. Busser, resigned.

PUERTO RICO

Domingo Lopez, Maricao, P. R., in place of L. B. Lopez, retired.

Georgina M. Lamas, Roosevelt, P. R. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Roberto Ortiz Colon, Vega Baja, P. R., in place of V. C. Aviles, transferred.

Josefa G. Lorenzi, Yauco, P. R., in place of L. M. Diaz, transferred.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Jerome R. Rueschenberg, Doland, S. Dak., in place of H. J. Gross, resigned.

George A. Curry, Elk Point, S. Dak., in place of T. H. Ryan, retired.

Joseph F. Krizan, Jr., Gregory, S. Dak., in place of W. J. Gassen, resigned.

Herby J. Bakkehaug, McIntosh, S. Dak., in place of M. W. Funk, resigned.

Wilbur E. Prann, Timber Lake, S. Dak., in place of Agnes Schirber, resigned.

Dayton C. Sebade, Wall, S. Dak., in place of L. T. Dartt, resigned.

Robert R. Davis, White, S. Dak., in place of C. F. Barg, resigned.

TENNESSEE

D. Naomi Anderson, Madison College, Tenn., in place of R. B. King, resigned.

Lewis E. Moore, Sr., Nashville, Tenn., in place of William Gupton. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Edgar W. Marshall, Surgoinsville, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Russell E. Rankin, Union City, Tenn., in place of E. A. Jones, resigned.

TEXAS

Benjamin F. Sullivan, Jr., Bangs, Tex., in place of L. G. Porter, resigned.

Napoleon B. Ballard, Baytown, Tex., in place of E. M. Thomas, resigned.

Robert A. Smith, Decatur, Tex., in place of R. T. Rieger, resigned.

Granville W. Elder, Houston, Tex., in place of John Dunlop, retired.

Thomas G. Sandel, Huntsville, Tex., in place of L. B. Baldwin, resigned.

Robert J. Quinlivan, Idalou, Tex., in place of Baxter Orr, deceased.

Albert N. Pike, Iredell, Tex., in place of C. R. Conley, resigned.

Lance A. Leggitt, Lakeview, Tex., in place of J. D. Durham, transferred.

Jesse B. Strickland, Novice, Tex., in place of M. R. Howard, resigned.

Irvin L. Hergert, Perryton, Tex., in place of M. R. Coffee, resigned.

John O. Bier, Plainview, Tex., in place of J. C. Terry, retired.

Harold Voss, Post, Tex., in place of P. S. Bouchier, transferred.

Miller J. Sweeden, Sweetwater, Tex., in place of A. G. Lee, resigned.

Opal F. Roberson, Temple, Tex., in place of W. N. Roberson, retired.

UTAH

Riley W. Goodfellow, Bountiful, Utah, in place of J. H. Rampton, resigned.

C. Henry Nielsen, Brigham, Utah, in place of Nello Christofferson, resigned.

Ted R. Mower, Fairview, Utah, in place of N. S. Brady, transferred.

Claud M. Glazier, Kanab, Utah, in place of A. C. Ford, resigned.

Edward W. Vendell, Ogden, Utah, in place of R. B. Porter, retired.

John T. Adams, Tooele, Utah, in place of F. G. Eastman, resigned.

VERMONT

Bernard H. Lilley, Hyde Park, Vt., in place of O. N. Campbell, resigned.

VIRGINIA

George E. Mettauer, Annandale, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Carroll E. Burgess, Blairs, Va., in place of C. B. Roach, resigned.

Lemuel W. Houston, Fredericksburg, Va., in place of H. F. Crismond, deceased.

Lewis K. Gathright, Goochland, Va., in place of C. A. Gathright, transferred.

Grace F. Hiehle, Mount Vernon, Va., in place of E. J. Monroe, resigned.

Delia M. Lawson, White Stone, Va., in place of B. N. Hubbard, resigned.

WASHINGTON

Edward W. Schoenholz, Alderwood Manor, Wash., in place of H. L. Parker, resigned.

Charles O. Jackson, Auburn, Wash., in place of A. J. Kralowec, resigned.

Emanuel A. Anderson, Carnation, Wash., in place of J. B. Simons, retired.

Douglas P. Salisbury, Chewelah, Wash., in place of H. S. Storms, resigned.

Emanuel Lindberg, Custer, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Ernest W. Wendelin, Grays River, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Esther L. Coleman, Harper, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Virgel M. Newman, Kingston, Wash., in place of M. R. Joyce, resigned.

Rival S. Moore, Long Beach, Wash., in place of Q. D. Mitchell, transferred.

David N. Judson, Jr., Oak Harbor, Wash., in place of D. N. Judson, deceased.

William Lorin McClure, Oakesdale, Wash., in place of R. V. Browder, removed.

Gladys M. Pearson, Olalla, Wash., in place of M. C. Nelson, retired.

Ronald M. Hinton, Parkwater, Wash., in place of M. G. Rosauer, resigned.

Lonnie D. Leeper, Pasco, Wash., in place of A. A. Barnes, retired.

Clifford Lavender, Portage, Wash., in place of D. L. Armstrong, resigned.

Harley E. Chapman, Prosser, Wash., in place of Paul Hamilton, resigned.

Gerald A. Emerick, Snoqualmie, Wash., in place of O. F. Reinig, retired.

Daniel F. Coulter, South Bend, Wash., in place of H. M. Connor, removed.

Richard K. Morley, Stevenson, Wash., in place of W. H. Lamm, retired.

Lawrence C. Tompkins, Suquamish, Wash., in place of R. I. Matheson, deceased.

WEST VIRGINIA

Frederick C. Page, Beechbottom, W. Va., in place of J. W. Thomas, resigned.

William G. Meredith, Dailey, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Maude L. Copeland, Elk Garden, W. Va., in place of H. T. Williams, resigned.

Clara Marie Hess, Farmington, W. Va., in place of R. B. Mapel, deceased.

Elizabeth L. Williams, Glen Rogers, W. Va., in place of Reuben Williams, retired.

Alice L. Maschal, Glen White, W. Va., in place of E. B. Wray, retired.

Charles H. Callison, Hillsboro, W. Va., in place of G. L. Carlisle, retired.

Hazel O. Harbert, Lumberport, W. Va., in place of W. C. Harbert, resigned.

Athaline H. King, Mabscott, W. Va., in place of E. L. Hedrick, deceased.

Vincent A. Johnson, Man, W. Va., in place of Dewey Ellis, removed.

Henry E. Chapman, New Martinsville, W. Va., in place of J. O. Eakin, resigned.

Andrew J. Nemeth, Osage, W. Va., in place of J. L. Badzek, deceased.

Marietta Walker, Peach Creek, W. Va., in place of A. O. Shelton, resigned.

Marie N. Fox, Prenter, W. Va., in place of M. J. Nutter, resigned.

Josephine G. Bryant, Raysal, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

May H. White, Roderfield, W. Va., in place of H. A. Hetherington, retired.

Jane B. Graham, Thurmond, W. Va., in place of B. M. Gwinn, resigned.

Troy R. Swecker, Valley Head, W. Va., in place of N. S. Wood, resigned.

Walter S. Bembrick, Weirton, W. Va., in place of S. P. Shlanta, removed.

Mary L. Vance, Whitmans, W. Va., in place of Nellie Nix, resigned.

WISCONSIN

Oswald L. Weber, Cedarburg, Wis., in place of G. J. Armbruster, resigned.

James W. Johnson, Cheseburg, Wis., in place of Sam Johnson, deceased.

Robert W. Howard, Cornell, Wis., in place of G. E. Shaw, resigned.

Clarence Keith Hammond, De Soto, Wis., in place of Anna Loftus, resigned.

Ruby C. Bahr, Fairchild, Wis., in place of R. R. Hoffman, deceased.

Claude A. Thomas, Forest Junction, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Hugo J. Quast, Granton, Wis., in place of O. A. Peterson, resigned.

Hazel M. Pfeil, Greenville, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Rudolph C. Trauba, Greenville, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Leone C. Mader, Gresham, Wis., in place of F. J. Mader, deceased.

Donald L. Schulz, Irma, Wis., in place of Henry Magnuson, resigned.

Robert S. Grogan, Kaukauna, Wis., in place of R. H. McCarty, resigned.

Edwin L. Barkally, Lake Tomahawk, Wis., in place of R. H. Wirth, deceased.

Lolita W. Kurth, Neillsville, Wis., in place of L. W. Kurth. Incumbent's commission expired April 26, 1942.

John T. Sullivan, Ojibwa, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Gordon J. Hansen, Oregon, Wis., in place of C. A. E. Manion, removed.

August E. Meckalski, Pelican Lake, Wis., in place of M. A. Whalen, removed.

John H. Hennessey, Roberts, Wis., in place of W. R. Johnston, declined.

Otis M. Rude, Viroqua, Wis., in place of R. L. Graves, resigned.

Otis L. Holman, Westby, Wis., in place of R. M. Grimsrud, resigned.

Hugo Van Winkle, Winter, Wis., in place of A. N. Donnellan, resigned.

WYOMING

Kenneth L. Wingo, Encampment, Wyo., in place of M. C. Corum, retired.

Roxanna M. Smith, Lingle, Wyo., in place of M. N. Hanna, transferred.

Silvio J. Pedri, Reliance, Wyo., in place of Naomi Grove, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 17, 1949:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

John Theodore Koehler, of Maryland, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Frank C. Bingham to be United States attorney for division No. 2, district of Alaska.

Harry O. Arend to be United States attorney for division No. 4, district of Alaska.

George L. Grobe to be United States attorney for the western district of New York.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Alfred J. Plowden, Jr., to be United States marshal for the eastern district of South Carolina.

Kehoe C. Shannon to be United States marshal for the western district of Texas.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Brig. Gen. Hubert Don Hoover, O7924, United States Army, retired, for appointment as major general in the Army of the United States under the provisions of title V, Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The nominations of Robert M. Coats et al., for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade and corps specified, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Army under the provisions of Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress; Public Law 365, Eightieth Congress; and Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress; were confirmed today, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 7, 1949, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Robert M. Coats, which appears on page 867, and ending with the name of Gus A. Wolman, Jr., which appears on page 870.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the grade of captain in the line of the Navy:

Griswold T. Atkins	Peter H. Horn
Oscar M. Browne, Jr.	Frederick J. Haemann
John F. Delaney, Jr.	Leonard T. Morse
Harry B. Dodge	Stanley G. Nichols
Harry W. Englund	Robert E. Perkins
William B. Epps	Manley R. Simons, Jr.
James H. Hoan	Paul B. Tuso, Jr.
Harold M. Heizer	Frank I. Winant, Jr.
Wellington T. Hines	Sanford B. D. Wood
Ephraim P. Holmes	

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1949

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Father Louis W. Cheatham, St. Stephen's Roman Catholic Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God of majesty, creator and sustainer of life, before whom we all bow in profound adoration, graciously accept our humble plea that this day we may obtain Thy enlightenment to discern truth and Thy inspiration to exercise good. Assist these Thy public servants, here assembled in noble body, to voice the sentiments of high-minded citizens, whose special office it is to safeguard this Nation's security and its people's high ideals.

As official representatives of these United States, impart to them, O Lord, in Thy bountiful goodness, the firm impression of their sacred duty to God, to man, and to country. Instill in their minds the lofty principles of Christian life, that they may shine as a beacon before men, governing all decisions by God-fearing prudence and wisdom. Implant in their hearts an unswerving determination to serve the common good of their country with wise forethought, zealous care, and enduring loyalty.

With full acknowledgment of their dependence on Thee, O God of love, we invoke Thy holy name with reverence and awe, and beseech Thee to replenish their souls with Thy heavenly gifts, that in the pursuance of their grave tasks they may engender new hope in the hearts of all men who crave a world of peace and harmony.

Suppliantly, therefore, we look to Thee for divine strength and guidance to uphold Thy standards of justice and charity; and in so doing to counteract the despotic hand of atheism and tyranny that everywhere seems to threaten our democratic mode of life.

Almighty God, permeate this select group with the holy inspiration to seek the accomplishment of Thy will in all things, that through their stanch efforts our country might flourish with new vigor of spirit, as the champion of man's God-given freedom and human rights.

O Father of lights, these blessings we implore Thee to grant this august body through the mediation of Thy well-beloved Son, Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Hon. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., in Huntington, W. Va.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, and in each case to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution passed by the House of Representatives.

Mr. POTTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Gen. Omar Bradley.

Mr. HORAN (at the request of Mr. POTTER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

A CITIZEN'S ARMY

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, last evening I had the privilege of hearing Brig. Gen. C. T. Lanham speak at the small-business banquet. We, who as Americans, are interested in a citizen rather than a professional army and who have often been troubled over what we have felt to be the attitude of the brass-hats, shall be able to feel that there is a new spirit moving among them.

Many in the large audience agreed that they had never heard so fine a portrayal of the ideals and the imperative central force of an army from any Army man.

It is not the same kind of citizen's army as we had in the early days of our

national life, but an army that thinks of the men that compose it as citizens first and soldiers second. It should be the kind of an army that we, as Americans, can feel it is a citizen's army in the deepest sense of the term.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend General Lanham's speech in the Appendix of the RECORD, and hope every member of this House will read it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELLIOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BATTLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. YOUNG asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. JACOBS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter addressed by him to Mr. Charles E. Wilson, of the General Electric Co., in answer to an 18-item questionnaire.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and insert editorials from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and the Paris Post-Intelligencer.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HUBER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a news release from the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. CHURCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech made by De-Witt Emery, president of the National Small Business Men's Association.

LOS ALAMOS PROJECT

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 54) to retrocede to the State of New Mexico exclusive jurisdiction held by the United States over lands within the boundaries of the Los Alamos project of the United States Atomic Energy Commission.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I understand that this land was previously owned by the State of New Mexico.

Mr. MURDOCK. It is correct to say New Mexico had jurisdiction over the land.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Did the United States Government pay any money when it acquired that property?

Mr. MURDOCK. I think not, as it was probably public domain. However, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ] may be able to answer that better.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. When the United States acquired this land, did they pay any money to the State of New Mexico for it?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. No. They paid no money to the State of New Mexico. The money was paid to the owners of the property.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Then the Government actually did pay the money?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How much is involved?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I do not know about the price of the land. It varied according to the land, I suppose, I do not know. I do not think that is involved here. I do not quite follow the gentleman's question.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Well, if the United States Government is giving New Mexico land for which they paid a substantial sum of money, I simply wanted to know it.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Let me explain to the gentleman, we are not giving any land to the State of New Mexico. These are the particulars in the case: At the present time part of the land where the community of Los Alamos is located is under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government. Part of the land is in the exclusive jurisdiction of the State government. That has created a good deal of confusion in the administration of the laws.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The title to the land does not change?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The title to the land does not change at all.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. You are simply changing it back to New Mexico so that the civil law can prevail?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. That is correct, and in order that the legislature may have the right to legislate over that community. The reason for the haste is this: The State legislature is now in session. It will adjourn the first week in March——

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Of course, the consent calendar will be called on next Monday.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. But this has to go through the Senate as well. They are contemplating some legislation, I understand, which will permit the community of Los Alamos, a community of eight or ten thousand population, to organize as a municipality. Of course, there is the question of elective franchise and the right to vote and other privileges that attach to citizens, which they do not now have. But the main reason for haste is that the legislature is now in session, and we should have this bill passed before they adjourn. If the legislature wants to enact legislation to permit that community to incorporate as a municipality, it may do so only after the State acquires jurisdiction. At the present time it has no jurisdiction over part of the community.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is merely a jurisdictional proceeding?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Purely that.

Mr. MURDOCK. May I say further, this bill was reported out unanimously by the Committee on Public Lands. The ranking minority member has been consulted, and, of course, is agreeable to the presentation of this bill, as well as the Speaker, the majority leader, and the minority leader. It was requested by the Atomic Energy Commission; it has the approval of the Members of Congress from New Mexico, and it does not involve any money.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would like to find out if the Federal Government paid good hard cash for this land and it is going to be returned to your State. Certainly if that is the case, then the State of New Mexico will repay the Federal Government for the land if it is any way implicated that they take this land from the Federal Government.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no land going back to the State of New Mexico. The Federal Government owns the land and will own the land under this bill. This bill only places the civil jurisdiction of the laws of the State of New Mexico applicable to the inhabitants of this particular land. In other words, there was a case there of a person living on part of this land who had brought proceedings for a divorce under the State law. The Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico ruled that the State court had no jurisdiction, because it had no jurisdiction over this particular land that was owned by the Federal Government. I think we did the same thing in connection with the airport over here in Virginia, to allow the law of Virginia to become applicable to the airport. This is only to allow the civil law to apply there.

Mr. RICH. Would it not be a good thing in New Mexico if we let New Mexico buy a lot of this land that the Government owns so that they will have something they can operate and they can call their own, instead of the Federal Government doing it?

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, the Federal Government needs this land itself.

Mr. RICH. Oh, we have got more land in New Mexico than the people have themselves.

Mr. McCORMACK. Not for this purpose.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object.

Mr. Speaker, there is one question I should like to have answered. As I understand it this land was acquired for experiments with the atomic bomb.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is right; it is under the jurisdiction of the Atomic Energy Commission, and they have requested this legislation.

Mr. RANKIN. The passage of this legislation will not in any way interfere with the Government carrying on future experiments there if they want to?

Mr. MURDOCK. In no way will it interfere; in fact, this legislation comes at the request of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by Richard Luther.

Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

THE LATE WENDELL WILLKIE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is the birthday of Wendell Willkie. He was born on February 18, 1892. I am inserting in the RECORD which will appear tomorrow an editorial from the Indianapolis News about Wendell Willkie, entitled, "The Torch Still Burns."

Mr. Speaker, today when we are struggling with the problem of civil rights, social-welfare legislation, and the effort to keep the world from being divided by violent war into two worlds instead of the one world which he conceived, the words of Wendell Willkie take on the same permanent and universal significance that we associate with the words of Abraham Lincoln.

Mr. Willkie said:

There are no distant points in the world any longer—our thinking in the future must be world-wide.

We must establish beyond all doubt the equality of men.

The world is awakening at last to the knowledge that the rule of people by other people is not freedom.

Freedom is an indivisible word—we must be prepared to extend it to everyone, whether they are rich or poor, whether they agree with us or not, no matter what their race or the color of their skin.

The only soil in which liberty can grow is that of a united people—we must have faith that the welfare of one is the welfare of all—we must acknowledge that all are equal before God and before the law.

The editorial I refer to follows:

[From the Indianapolis News of October 1946]

THE TORCH STILL BURNS

Two years ago, in the bright beauty of an October afternoon, Wendell Willkie came home to Indiana, to return to the rich earth from which he sprang. On a green hillside over which flamed the tapestry of October, the man whom Indiana gave to the world was laid to rest. On the place where he slept the leaves came drifting down from the hackberry and linden sentinels for his eternal rest.

The great voice that had been raised for freedom was still. But even death cannot quench a dream, and a flaming spirit lives beyond mortality. Wendell Willkie had fired the thoughts of men and touched their hearts, and the world picked up his torch. His words live and his dream moves on toward realization. Greatness does not die.

Symbolic recognition of that truth is afforded, as fully as can be expressed in stone, by the memorial that has just been placed at his grave. This is truly a shrine to freedom. It has the idealism of the cross, the sword of the spirit, the torch of humanity, the book of inspiration, and the laurel of victory.

It is the torch and the book that will carry the message of Wendell Willkie to those who come in the years ahead to the East Hill Cemetery in Rushville, there to pay homage to one who was a friend to all mankind. There is no fire in the granite torch. Rather the flame is in the words graven on the book that all may read as they rest and meditate. They are the words that were Mr. Willkie's creed:

"I believe in America because in it we are free—free to choose our government, to speak our minds, to observe our different religions.

"Because we are generous with our freedom, we share our rights with those who disagree with us.

"Because we hate no people and covet no people's lands.

"Because we are blessed with a natural and varied abundance.

"Because we have great dreams and because we have the opportunity to make those dreams come true."

Mr. Willkie lived those words, as all Americans should live them. And his heritage to his fellow countrymen is contained in these other lines on the book, taken from his speeches and One World:

"There are no distant points in the world any longer—our thinking in the future must be world-wide.

"We must establish beyond all doubt the equality of men.

"The world is awakening at last to the knowledge that the rule of people by other peoples is not freedom.

"Freedom is an indivisible word—we must be prepared to extend it to everyone, whether they are rich or poor, whether they agree with us or not, no matter what their race or the color of their skin.

"The only soil in which liberty can grow is that of a united people—we must have faith that the welfare of one is the welfare of all—we must acknowledge that all are equal before God and before the law.

"Only the productive are strong, only the strong are free.

"It is inescapably true that to raise the standard of living of any man anywhere in the world is to raise the standard of living by some slight degree of every man everywhere in the world.

"Whenever we take away the liberties of those whom we hate we are opening the way to loss of liberty for those we love.

"The moral losses of expediency always far outweight the temporary gains.

"The test of a people is their aim and not their color."

Those words still speak to a world that has yet to know their full meaning. They are as true as the ages. And as long as there are living men to read them, and warm hearts to respond, the spirit of Wendell Willkie will endure. His torch still burns.

THE ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, the President says we must have $4,000,000,000 in new taxes.

Yesterday's paper says:

Boost in tax levies a must, Speaker RAYBURN declares. Four-billion-dollar increase needed to keep Government our of red, he says.

Today the Secretary of the Treasury said we need $4,000,000,000 in taxes.

Is there not somebody in high Government places who is going to say we want to cut down Government spending? Let some one Democrat get some economy in his system. Or are you going to take on this Truman giveaway plan: Bigger old-age pensions, more pay for the idle, to have the Government pay the medicine bill, permanent pay for the sick, Federal aid for the schools, electric power at less than cost, new dams at less than cost, bigger Government aid in the West, bigger Government subsidies, higher wages, and lower prices. For goodness sake, let us get a little common sense into Government and cut the cost of Government.

Stop squandering, stop spending, stop giving our resources away and you will stop taxing. Our people are tired of taxes; our people want economy in Government; I want economy in Government. The way to get it is stop spending. Stop spending and you stop taxing, Mr. Speaker.

THE VETERANS' PENSION BILL

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I see a hideous cartoon of myself in this morning's Washington Post—the uptown edition of the Communist Daily Worker.

You will remember that we chased some of the Communists off the editorial staff of that publication; but they still have a Communist cartoonist.

This publication is doing more to stir race trouble here in Washington than all other forces combined, by its communistic propaganda for wiping out all race segregation and forcing Negroes into the white hotels and white schools of the District of Columbia. Of course they don't give a tinker's dam about the Negroes. They just want to harass the white gentiles of America and force their communistic program on them. But when you turn the spotlight on them they whine "race prejudice."

They do not want our aged veterans taken care of, as this bill provides, for fear it might cost them a few of their ill-gained dollars.

I filed a resolution for a rule on this bill, and I am going to press it as hard as I can. I want to bring this measure to

the floor of the House as quickly as possible.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] on yesterday got excited, and you would have thought from his speech that we were going to break the Government with this bill.

Why, the bill he voted for last year known as the Marshall plan, which was really the Bevin plan, would send to Europe tobacco alone costing ten times as much as this soldiers' pension bill would cost the first year.

The gentleman from Wisconsin can take that side of the question if he wants to—and any of the rest of you can do likewise; but I am not going to let these old veterans, who served their country in time of war, go to the poorhouse in their declining days if I can help it.

If we can spend untold billions of dollars on other countries—as I said, feeding and clothing every lazy lout from Tokyo to Timbuktu—then we can take care of our aged veterans when they get beyond the age of their earning capacity, and are unable to care for themselves.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXPORT CONTROL ACT OF 1949

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 97 and ask for its immediate consideration.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present. If we are going to legislate, let us have the Members present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 16]

Abbitt	Gathings	Pace
Allen, La.	Gwinn	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Bates, Mass.	Heffernan	Powell
Bennett, Fla	Herter	Reed, Ill.
Bentsen	Hoffman, Ill.	Regan
Blatnik	Hoffman, Mich.	Scott, Hardie
Bolton, Md.	Jackson, Calif.	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Boykin	Jenkins	Short
Breen	Judd	Sikes
Bulwinkle	Karst	Smith, Ohio
Burdick	Klein	Somers
Byrne, N. Y.	Lemke	Taylor
Colmer	Lesinski	Thomas, N. J.
Coudert	Linehan	Thomas, Tex.
Cunningham	McMillan, S. C.	Towe
Curtis	Mack, Ill.	Wadsworth
DeGraffenried	Macy	Walter
D'Ewart	Mahon	Werdel
Dingell	Marshall	Whitaker
Douglas	Mason	White, Idaho
Eberharter	Miles	Wickersham
Engel, Mich.	Norton	
Fulton	O'Hara, Minn.	
Furcolo	O'Toole	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and sixty-two Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

REREFERENCE OF BILL

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, by inadvertence, the bill (H. R. 1376) to provide assistance to farmers in securing farm housing and other farm buildings, and for other purposes, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture. I have conferred with the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture be discharged from further consideration of the bill and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered for this day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Gary Post-Tribune.

Mr. THOMPSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address by the national resident of the Marine Corps Reserve Officers' Association.

Mr. HÉBERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial and excerpts.

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "Annual Madison County Soil Conservation District," notwithstanding the fact that the Government Printing Office estimates the cost will be $230.75.

Mr. HARRISON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include sundry editorials.

Mr. GARMATZ asked and was granted permission to include his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the New York Times.

Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and were granted permission to extend their remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD regarding a bill he will today introduce.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. SANBORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the Sixty-fifth Annual Report of the United States Civil Service Commission. This report covers the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 17, 1949.*

EXPORT-CONTROL ACT OF 1949

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 97 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1661) to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, after I conclude my remarks I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. Speaker, several Members have accused me of being responsible for bringing them here this morning by making a point of order that a quorum was not present. I did not make the point of order, but it will not hurt the Members to remain here during the consideration of the bill, especially since it is being considered under the 5-minute rule.

The rule is an open one and provides for 2 hours general debate, after which the bill will be taken up and read under the 5-minute rule for the offering of amendments. It might be well for all of the Members to remain here at that time in order to gain information about the provisions of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the bill is relative to the control of the exportation of products that are vital to the Nation's internal economy as well as to its external security. It provides for the continuation of the President's authority to control this vital link in the chain of the Nation's welfare.

The effect of the legislation will be to safeguard the supply of many of the materials needed by our own country. It is true that it controls the export of goods both to friendly and to so-called unfriendly nations. In this way, it serves a twofold purpose. In the first place, our domestic situation is strengthened, especially through the curbing of inflationary tendencies caused by foreign demand. And in regard to our security, the program will act as a two-edged sword: we can limit the flow of goods to nations that we suspect are unfriendly and we can see to it that the goods we send to the friendly nations do not find their ultimate destination in the hands of our potential enemies. In the past, many valuable materials that have been exported, and even donated, to our friends have found their way to countries that are not so friendly. Even some of the so-called friendly nations are not so friendly. At any rate, I hope that those countries that have engaged in unfair tactics in the past will cease doing so in the future. Nevertheless, the situation is such that our reliance should be placed at home. Thus, we are giving this power to the President.

The people of the country have confidence in the judgment of the President; they have confidence that he has the welfare of the United States uppermost in his mind, first, last, and always. They know that his sane, common sense will safeguard their interests and the interests of our country, seeing to it that scarce materials will not, by devious means, find their way to undesirable destinations. To those that decry the centralization of authority, it may be stated that the situation is a swiftly changing one, with the need for rapid action. Central authority is imperative. Furthermore, the President will be apprised of all the facts through his advisors in the various departments concerned. The action of the President will prove beneficial to American manufacturers, who, in the future, will not be faced with the severe shortages of the past. It may be noted that many manufacturers were obliged to suspend operations due to manipulations on the part of the trusts. They were not able to obtain steel and other necessary materials.

Of course this matter was exploited by my Republican friends. Yesterday, three of them arose and claimed, with a great deal of glee, that we are facing a recession. Well, my friends, that just isn't true. The country is prosperous and will continue to be prosperous and the people will continue to be employed.

Yes, we have a little unemployment. We know that from 8 to 10 percent of our employable people ordinarily are unemployed during peacetimes. Now we have over 58,000,000 people employed, and they will continue to be employed if we retain the raw materials that are needed for production, as contemplated in this bill. Some gentlemen say there are nearly 2,000,000 unemployed. Well, that is not even a quarter of what we ordinarily have in peacetimes, percentagewise. Actually, it may be said that there is no unemployment. Look at the newspapers here, in New York, in Chicago, and in every other city and you will find page after page of help wanted, labor wanted, manpower wanted. There is a demand for more labor, and everybody who desires to work may find employment, and I hope at good wages. Shortly, we will pass the minimum wage bill and that will encourage still greater employment.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I do not oppose the rule making in order the consideration of H. R. 1661, a bill introduced by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] to enact a law for the regulation of exports, and for other purposes, under a 2-hour general debate clause.

I do not oppose the rule because I believe that some sort of legislation to continue export controls is absolutely necessary at this time.

A short time ago I spoke on the floor of the House and perhaps criticized just a little bit some of my friends on the majority side because, while they had been very loud and long in their criticisms of the Eightieth Congress, they had brought in a number of bills which extended legislation that had been passed by the Congress which they have criticized, the Republican Eightieth Congress. They had reenacted legislation which they had opposed and had criticized at the time the Eightieth Congress enacted it into law.

Seemingly my friends of the majority took that criticism of mine to heart, because they have evidently decided that they would not extend the Republican-sponsored law for export control but instead would attempt to write a bill of their own, a substitute measure, as it were.

I hope the Members of the House will listen very carefully to the debate on the bill H. R. 1661 and the explanation of what this new law actually contains, because it goes much further as far as conferring power on the President is concerned than any export-control legislation which has ever been enacted by any Congress in the past. It goes so far as to permit the President or any person he may designate to go into the matter of financing exports, of transporting exports, and of servicing the goods that are shipped overseas. It goes even further than that. It provides that the veil of secrecy can be thrown about these activities, or that, in the discretion of an official, if any particular business or industrial secret should be made public for the benefit of some individual or some group or some organization, it can be done.

It permits the officials in charge of export controls to bring in any individual in the United States, regardless of whether or not that person has any connection whatsoever with the goods being exported, and swear that person and get all the information they want from him about that particular matter or any other matter that he may know something about.

In other words, this legislation is another step in conferring practically—well, let me say not dictatorial, but very, very broad powers on the Chief Executive. It is just another chapter, if you please, in the story of centralizing all power and authority in the Government here in Washington.

Those of you who are interested in the welfare of your own industries and your own districts had better look at this piece of legislation rather carefully and listen to the explanations and give serious consideration to some of the amendments that will be offered during the consideration of the bill in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

May I also add that perhaps it might be wise for our friends of the majority to be giving just a little bit of consideration to import controls as well as to export control legislation, because if the present trend continues it will not be long until many of us here will be seriously concerned with the heavy flow of imports which are coming into this country. I know that in the report on this bill reference is made to the increase in production in foreign countries in many commodities.

I am not unmindful of something that happened in my own State in the last 2 weeks. Up in the great city of Cleveland bids were opened for the purchase of generating equipment to make electricity for that great city, a city of over one million souls.

The low bidder was a Swiss concern with a bid more than a half million dollars below the lowest bid made by any American manufacturer for the same identical equipment, with the result that the workers in the electrical factory in Switzerland will be employed while the workers in some of the electrical factories in America are being laid off. I have every respect and every regard for the distinguished Member from the State of Illinois, my chairman [Mr. SABATH]. Yet as I heard him speak, I could not help but wonder just where he has been recently. Certainly he has not been in the great State of Illinois. Certainly he has not been back home, or he would have found out very quickly that there is unemployment—growing unemployment in the city of Chicago to such an extent, by the way, that it is giving grave concern to his own city and State officials.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. SADLAK. I am positive that the gentleman from Illinois was not in the State of Connecticut.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am sure that the gentleman has been in the never-never land if he still believes that we have expanding employment in this country and that there is a great shortage of workers. If the gentleman from Illinois has all these positions and jobs available that he has been talking about, I believe many Members of the House

could give him names of many, many individuals who have been writing, asking them to help them get employment.

We have even had much correspondence from our own State governments asking for help from the Government in the way of additional employees to process unemployment compensation applications. The House by a motion made by the majority on yesterday adopted an amendment to the deficiency appropriation bill to more than double, as I remember it, the funds to be used for the employment of additional workers in these unemployment compensation offices out in the States, just so that we can take care of the unemployed.

But the gentleman from Illinois insists here in a pious way that such unemployment does not exist at all. The statements made here by the gentleman from Illinois will not help to feed the families of the unemployed in this country or in his district.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. Is the gentleman from Ohio referring to the unemployed among Republicans who have been holding sinecure positions in the formerly Republican state governments? There is certainly unemployment there, of course.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, there is a rather strange thing about public employment. Whenever they do get a really difficult or knotty problem in government, whether it be in the States or in the national government, they always turn to some Republican to solve that problem for them. They have to go where they can to find the ability to do the job. I might add that that seems to apply at every point in our public service, even in the military and naval branches of the Government. I am simply amazed that the gentleman from Illinois would stand in the Well of the House and attempt to tell the Congress and the country that there is not a growing unemployment problem. It is a serious problem. It is one that gives grave concern to every thinking American. I am satisfied it is giving grave concern to the leaders of this Administration—to the President of the United States and to those who advise him—because I understand from rather reliable sources, I may say to the gentleman from Illinois, that plans are already rather well developed for a new type of WPA program. I hope it is not leaf raking. I hope, if we have to do something for the unemployed in this country as a result of the economic and Government mistakes in the past, that what we will do will be constructive. I hope we will not waste our substance on leaf raking and or doles, but instead that the men and women we must aid will have their efforts directed in a constructive way, so that they themselves may pay their own way and feel that they are contributing to the welfare of their Nation and of their community.

I hope that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] will understand that as unemployment grows—and it is growing in the State of Illinois and in the city of Chicago—we will have great sympathy for him and great concern for those individuals out there who have lost their jobs, and that we will join him in doing everything we can to help them, because he will find they are unable to eat speeches made on the floor of the House and they are unable to live on the statistics put out by prejudiced persons and individuals; that, instead, they will need actual help, not only from the Government, but from every other decent-thinking American citizen who wants to see this economy of ours remain strong and safe and sound so that America may be, after all, a strong influence in the world for peace and for prosperity. I hope the gentleman will let us know just what his solution is to continue such high employment in his State.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], relative to unemployment in Illinois, I have been requested to yield 5 minutes to a gentleman who is familiar with labor conditions in Chicago.

I yield 5 minutes to my colleague from Illinois [Mr. BUCKLEY].

Mr. BUCKLEY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we are catering to a program of fear. Illinois, as such, has no worry about unemployment. They have in the past and shall continue in the future to take care of their own problems. Perhaps the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] should concern himself more with the problems in his own State.

I, for one, am getting tired of hearing this talk about a depression and the unemployment that usually follows. The Republican minority is attempting to drive a sense of fear and insecurity into the American people merely because the will of the mass of Americans manifested itself in the last election—and the Democrats were justifiably victorious. Of course, the only thing that the American people have to fear is fear itself. If certain Members of Congress, and others, continue harping on the coming of a depression, they will have their wish. They will succeed—if they continue—by striking fear into the hearts of the American people. The result will be a curtailment in buying, and the logical cutback in production that necessarily follows, with the end result leading to unemployment. When this occurs the Republicans will be exceedingly happy, because it was the Eightieth Republican Congress that attempted to start this vicious economic process.

I firmly believe that there is no reason for such talk today, because we are merely in the process of a peacetime adjustment to our hard-fought victory in the last war. I do not think that it is proper for a Member of Congress to stand up in the House of Representatives and alarm the people by telling them that they are facing a panic or depression. The only motive behind these unwarranted and unjustifiable cries of "slump and depression" is one of delay in order to hamper labor unions who will be seeking new contracts shortly. It is merely a scheme on the part of Republicans to preclude the laboring people from asking for a fourth round of wage increases.

The future outlook is bright. We have great employment in the United States today. Whatever slowing down happens to exist in the employment situation as it occurs today results normally when new labor contracts are being negotiated, and management acts cautiously.

Thank God that we in America are wise enough and courageous enough to have such a great administration and such a truly great leader as the President of the United States. We all have confidence in him. He will, with God's Providence and the aid of the Democratic Eighty-first Congress, dispel all fears of depression and unemployment, to the end that the people of America and their Nation will again be sound and solvent as they have been in the past under Democratic leadership.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAVALCANTE].

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Speaker, I have merely asked for this time in order to obtain information to clear my mind on the conditions of this bill and also to guide me in the manner that I should vote.

Some days ago we passed a bill pertaining to reciprocal trade agreements. I should like to have my mind cleared on the proposition of whether the provisions of those reciprocal trade agreements were excepted from the provisions of the bill which will be made in order by this rule? I may state that I agree with the principle of export control of short supply materials. I also believe in conferring the power to control upon the President. It is because of this that I am concerned in knowing whether the short supply materials that we are here trying to conserve by the provision of this bill may not be exported under the powers conferred a few days ago upon the President by the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I believe this bill is one that the individual Members of the House are going to regret very seriously if it is put on the statute books as it comes to us. It is one of the largest abdications of legislative responsibility since the Blue Eagle Act. I wish you would read the declaration of policy contained in section 2. It is so broad that it covers every piece of export business that can be done in the entire United States in any commodity whatever. Subsection (b) of section 2, the policy section, includes, as policy, the objective:

> To further the foreign policy of the United States and to aid in fulfilling its international responsibilities—

That is just as broad as the world is wide. It covers everything without limit. Under the authority to carry out that

policy contained in section 2, under section 3 this can be done—

To the extent necessary to achieve effective enforcement of this act, such rules and regulations may apply to the financing, transporting, and other servicing of exports and the participation therein by any person—

In other words, in that sentence you do away with or make it possible to change or abolish practically all of the rules and regulations in the transporting and the financing agencies of the United States by giving the power to the President to assign even greater powers to other agencies or officials; and in the last phrase it grants the power to not only completely control the exporters but also to say who can do the exporting, the financing, the transporting, and the servicing, all of which can permit rank political favoritism in the granting of permits and licenses; and there is a penalty provision attached to this bill embracing imprisonment for 1 year, or a $10,000 fine, or both, for violation of a rule or regulation promulgated by an official of the Government.

In the concluding portion of the bill it is stated:

This act shall not supersede any other act.

We have of course a number of acts on the statute books today that are for the purpose of controlling exports; but what this bill means is that in negotiations under the present trade treaty acts you are going to give the President authority to agree with other countries to establish domestic export quotas, or they can just be established. That will mean a complete violation of the freedom in commerce which our country has enjoyed, except in war, since the beginning. It will give, at the same time, free rein to the President to engage in commercial warfare through the export quota system. This is the system applied by authoritarian countries. In other words, instead of this great freedom of trade we have been hearing about in the reciprocal trade agreements debates, we are now about to tie up trade so that nobody can operate except those favored by the administration. The reciprocal trade agreements will not mean anything. You will find that we are going to operate very much as the Nazi and some other European governments operated before the war. We had better be looking forward to freeing the channels of trade and not tying them up, if we want to uphold the great principles of our country.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Referring to the gentleman's statement concerning the declaration of policy, I may say to the gentleman that in the hearings before the committee evidence was produced that this bill was necessary, according to its proponents, to protect the domestic economy from excessive drain. The latter two provisions of the declaration were not given much consideration, whether or not it is necessary to further the foreign policy of the United States and whether it is necessary to conserve the security of the United States, so some of us have had great concern about the continuation of a permanent policy.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman that excessive drain can be stopped by cutting back on gifts to foreign countries, and that so far as the national defense is concerned, I believe it is adequately protected by other law at the present time in existing statutes which may be extended. As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy I know there is plenty of law in the Atomic Energy Act to protect the United States in those respects if it is properly exercised. But to put in this subsection (b), which says, "To further the foreign policy of the United States and to aid in fulfilling its international responsibility," is to grant the most extraordinary power in words just as wide open for interpretation as anything that was ever written into any law or statute of the United States. You can interpret those words to cover any sin or any objective that anyone in authority may want to cover. It vitiates entirely any other limitations that there may be in the bill.

The last subsection, the words "to exercise the necessary vigilance over exports from the standpoint of their significance to the national security," no one will argue with; but that subsection (b) of the policy section is a dilly. May I tell the Members of the House of Representatives that after this act is passed you are going to have everybody in your district coming down here and asking you to go to the Export Control Office to assist them in getting licenses for exports. It will be reflected in less employment in the exporting industries as the direct result of the complicated red tape and licenses required which will disgust the producers of exportable products. It will stifle small producer exports. I am in favor of freeing the mechanics of foreign trade and not tying them up as this bill will do under the regulations that will be issued pursuant to it.

(Mr. SPENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he will make in the Committee on the bill under consideration and include a report.)

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1661) to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1661, with Mr. HUBER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 12 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it seems that the prologue to every bill in the House continuing an authority that already exists is an acrimonious political discussion. It is true that the authority that is given the President under this bill was continued by the Eightieth Congress, but the authority originally was given to the President more than 8 years ago. On July 2, 1940, the President was given practically the same powers that are given to him under this bill, and he has retained those powers ever since. Why is it now, in this Democratic Congress, that they have great apprehension on the other side as to the use of these powers? I know the gentlemen on the other side have not really gotten over the effects of the last election, and I suppose that is natural. But the Bible says:

Let not him that girdeth on his harness boast himself as he that putteth it off.

And I think really there has been too much boasting on the other side, and that they could have foreseen what might have happened to them, for the prophets of old said that "Pride goeth before destruction, and the haughty spirit before the fall." The Prince of Peace said, "The meek shall inherit the earth." And, of course, it has been demonstrated that those that are not meek inherit nothing.

I hope my friends on the other side will read the Good Book and obtain lessons from it. Why should we not give the President these powers? We are not in normal times. Times have not been normal since 1940, when he was given these powers. I do not think it would be good policy for this Government to put shackles on the President in the exercise of these powers, with their international implications. He is dealing with the governments of the world. He is protecting the economy of the United States. In these highly important international affairs he ought to have the same powers granted him as the free elected Executive of a free nation, by free representatives elected by the people, as the executive or dictator has in representing the enslaved people in totalitarian governments. We have got to trust these powers to somebody, and to limit them and restrict them by unnecessary conditions would weaken the very purpose for which they are given to him.

We know what happened before the last war and before this war. I do not say that the great industrial people of the United States are willing to sacrifice their country for profit, but you know and I know that the scrap piles of America disappeared just before we went into the war with Japan. They disappeared because a profitable market was found in which to sell them. Those things were converted into munitions of war, and

caused the death of our boys, no doubt about that.

We do not want that to happen again. The only way we can do that is by restricting exports. There is a short supply of many essential materials, and unless these things that are essential to our own welfare and to our domestic economy are controlled, the inflationary impact of abnormal foreign demand might be destructive of our interests.

We must have authority to control the quantitative amount of exports and to control the destination of these things, and they can be controlled.

Why should you have any apprehension, why should you be so captious about a few words that are in this bill? The President can delegate these powers to any department, agency, or official. I have heard objections made to the word "official." The President has transferred them to an official. He has not transferred the powers to an agency or a department. He has transferred these powers and invested them in the Secretary of Commerce and that, it seems to me, is where they ought to go. He centralizes the responsibility, and he makes it incumbent upon one man to discharge the duties he has imposed upon him.

A great deal of criticism has been made about the word "financing." That does not apply to power that can regulate how exporters shall obtain their money, it merely is an enforcement provision. When an exporter wants a license to ship certain things abroad, the best information the Government can obtain in regard to that license is through him who finances the exporter. He usually knows the amount of the goods that are going to be sent, the consignee, and the ability of the exporter, and it is only to that extent that this word "financing" is placed in this bill. It is an enforcement power that is absolutely essential to carry out the act in the way it should be carried out.

There is a great deal of misapprehension as to the words "standards and criteria." Why should there not be standards and criteria, to give to the exporter knowledge of just what his rights are?

The administration itself has placed this limitation upon it by the formulation of standards and criteria, criteria as to price, destination, end use, and so forth.

In connection with enforcement I remember there was one case where an exporter received an export license to transport glass vials. They found after investigation that the vials contained very expensive drugs which were not mentioned in the application for export. You must have the information if you are going to properly administer this law and you have to get the information from every reliable source from which it can be obtained. You need not have any apprehension about the administration of this act because the President has had practically all these powers under the original act. So it is but a continuation for 2 years of the powers that are now vested in him for a most essential purpose, a purpose that affects not only our domestic economy, but our foreign relations and our national security because it is worked in connection with the foreign-aid plan.

Unless we have some such licensing control as this, we cannot effectively carry out that plan.

Under leave to insert the committee report on this bill, I herewith insert House Report No. 18:

EXPORT CONTROL ACT OF 1949

Mr. SPENCE, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, submitted the following report:

The Committee on Banking and Currency, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1661) to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

1. In section 2 strike out "fulfill" and insert in lieu thereof "to aid in fulfilling."

2. In section 3 (a) strike out "carriage" where it appears therein and insert in lieu thereof "transporting."

3. In section 4 (a) immediately following the word "department" strike out "or" and insert a comma; and immediately following the word "agency" insert ", or official."

4. In the last sentence of section 4 (b) immediately following the word "agency" insert ", or official."

5. In the second sentence of section 6 (a) immediately following the word "court" where such word first appears in said sentence insert "of the United States."

6. In the first line of section 6 (c) immediately following the word "department" strike out "or" and insert a comma; and immediately following "agency" in said line insert ", or official."

7. In section 8 immediately following the word "agency" insert ", or official"; and at the end of said section insert a period.

8. In the second sentence of section 11 immediately following "delegations," insert "rules."

GENERAL STATEMENT

Export controls are being used at the present time to accomplish three important objectives: cushioning the domestic economy from the inflationary impact of foreign demand; influencing the geographic distribution of such quantities of scarce materials as can reasonably be spared from our economy; and exercising the necessary vigilance of exports of industrial commodities significant from the standpoint of the security of the United States.

The bulk of our merchandise in export has not been in short-supply commodities. Only about one-fourth of these exports has been in commodities for which quantitative export control is deemed necessary. Within this relatively limited sphere it has been desirable to temper the inflationary impact of foreign demand. This has been accomplished by limiting the quantities of scarce materials permitted to leave this country and, where feasible, by disqualifying export transactions made at excessively high prices. The supplies of these materials available for domestic use have been sufficient to permit a steadily increasing level of output and consumption in the United States.

Through export controls geographic distribution of commodities has been affected to channel exports into friendly countries, notably those participating in the European recovery program. For instance, in the first 6 months of 1948 uncontrolled exports amounted to $4,850,328,000, of which only 25 percent, or $1,211,056,000, went to European recovery-program countries. However, in the same period, controlled exports amounted to $1,643,210,000, of which over 59 percent, or $977,484,000, went to European recovery-program countries. It is evident that export controls are acting as an effective instrument in assisting the European recovery program.

The imposition of strict controls over shipments to eastern Europe has reduced exports to that area from an annual rate of $400,000,000 in the second quarter of 1947 to an annual rate of only $125,000,000 in the third quarter of 1948. For purposes of export control to eastern Europe, commodities have been classified in descending order of importance from the viewpoint of national security—ranging from materials and equipment which are of direct military significance, or basic importance in the manufactures of the nations, or of great strategic significance from an over-all industrial point of view, to the relatively nonessential commodities which are in abundant supply in this country and which are of slight significance either to the basic industries or to the general economy of eastern Europe. In general, export licensing to eastern Europe has been most restrictive at the top of this scale and least restrictive at the bottom.

The Department of Commerce, under existing law, has been given the principal responsibility in the administration of export controls. In the administration of such controls the Department through its Office of International Trade obtains the counsel and assistance of other Government agencies through the mechanism of formal interdepartmental committees. This mechanism has been used to assure policy coordination of these controls. The Advisory Committee on Requirements has the general function of assuring a coordinated supply-requirements operation by relating estimates of material requirements to estimates of supply available from foreign and domestic sources, by formulating measures necessary to bring supply and demand more closely into balance, and by advising the Secretary of Commerce as to the relative importance of programs and projects competing for materials in short supply.

The rules and regulations governing export controls are published in the Federal Register, including the so-called positive list—the list of commodities requiring specific export licenses for all destinations. It is the practice of the Department of Commerce to publish the quotas for all controlled commodities to which they apply so that exporters may have, in advance, a general idea of the quantities they might individually be allowed to export. Such information, with detailed explanations for the use of the export trade, is published by the Department of Commerce in a quarterly, comprehensive export schedule, supplemented by current export bulletins. To assist in formulating procedures for the various commodities under control, the Department has accelerated and extended its trade-consultation activities. During the past quarter, formal conferences have been held with many different groups of businessmen concerned with the export of various commodities. In order to secure broad representation, the membership includes small, medium, and large firms; merchant exporters as well as producers; exporters in various regions of the country; and trade-association members as well as independents.

These commodity advisory committees have proved helpful in determining the most equitable methods of distributing limited quotas among exporters. These groups have concerned themselves with the following questions relating to quota distribution: The extent to which price criteria should be used; the proportion of the quota to be allotted between traditional exporters and newcomers; administrative techniques for identifying and eliminating applicants whose interest is purely speculative; and the extent to

which foreign government recommendations should be followed in granting export licenses.

These trade advisory activities have yielded immediate and substantial benefits to the export trade community, and the Department has been assisted in the improvement of licensing procedures to meet the varying practical problems involved in the export of different commodities. The result has been not only to facilitate export transactions and shipments of commodities, but also to reduce substantially the administrative burden of licensing control.

At the beginning of 1948, there were 386 separate commodity classifications under export control. This compares with the more than 3,000 such classifications under export control during the war years. For the first 6 months of 1948 exports of commodities on the positive list amounted to $1,643,210,000, or approximately 25 percent of the total value of commodities exported amounting to $6,493,539,000. Major commodities under export control for supply reasons are discussed in the following paragraphs.

Steel

Because of the continuing steel shortages, virtually all steel products are under export control, a significant change from the situation in 1947, when less than half of the steel tonnage exported was under control. Shipments abroad hit a postwar peak in the second quarter of 1947, when they reached an annual rate of 6,900,000 tons or 10.7 percent of the supply. For the year 1947 as a whole, exports totaled 6,500,000 tons or 10.3 percent of the supply. In each quarter of 1948, the downward trend has continued. In the first quarter, exports were at an annual rate of 5,400,000 tons, or 8.3 percent of the supply; in the second quarter, 4,300,000 tons, or 6.7 percent of supply; in the third quarter, the annual rate of exports was down to less than 3,700,000 tons; and by the fourth quarter, the annual rate of exports was 3,300,000 tons, or 4.8 percent of the supply. For purposes of comparison, it may be noted that in the immediate prewar period, exports accounted for 7.6 percent of the supply.

The sharp increases in steel production abroad in 1948 contributed importantly to the reduction of foreign demand upon the United States. This is particularly true of the European recovery-program countries where most of the production increase was concentrated, and which before the war required little steel from the United States. For the most part, increased output abroad was used to satisfy indigenous needs, but a part was also used to fill demands in other countries. Exports of steel from the United Kingdom in 1948 were back to prewar levels, and exports from Belgium and Luxemburg, the chief competitors of the United States in the steel export field, were substantially above prewar.

Aside from the extension of export controls during 1948 to cover almost every form of steel exported from the United States, export licensing restrictions were tightened by reducing the validity period of outstanding licenses from 12 months to 6 months, and by requiring the use of an individual license application for each shipment of each steel product to each country of destination. In addition, the total export quotas established for each steel item under control were divided into fairly rigid subquotas for each country. These country quotas were determined after careful screening of requirements statements submitted by foreign governments and supplemented by United States embassies abroad. Some country quotas for some items were heavily oversubscribed, particularly, as in the case of Venezuela or South Africa, where ample dollar exchange was available and long-term market prospects are good; in no other cases, notably those involving countries of western Europe, the total volume of applications was smaller than the established quotas. The country quota system assists needy countries to obtain steel from United States suppliers by restricting exports to those markets which might otherwise tend to monopolize export tonnages.

An increased share of the steel exported from the United States in 1948 was destined for special-projects operations and activities abroad of such high importance to the United States as to merit special attention to their requirements for steel and other scarce materials. Roughly one-fourth of the total steel quotas were earmarked for these projects, most of which are owned or controlled by American interests. The bulk of the steel moving under special project license was used for petroleum operations abroad, in Venezuela and other countries of Latin America, and in the Middle and Far East. Smaller quantities were licensed for a number of mining operations engaged in the production of strategic and critical materials needed in the United States. Practically all of the casing and oil-line pipe and large portions of the unlined storage tanks, seamless black pipe, structural shapes, and reinforcing bars which were permitted for export were needed to maintain and expand these special-projects activities abroad.

Nonferrous metals

The nonferrous metals—copper, zinc, lead, tin, and aluminum—currently offer the most serious supply problems to the United States. The world-wide scarcity, the immediate needs of the strategic stock pile, the expanded military programs, the high level of domestic industrial activity, and continued foreign demands indicate that the shortage of nonferrous metals will not be overcome in the near future.

The United States has long been dependent on foreign sources to meet a large portion of its non-ferrous-metal requirements. The high level of consumption during the war and in the postwar period has increased this dependence. In recognition of our reliance on imports for these basic metals, the Department of Commerce has made special efforts to stimulate foreign production and increase the volume of shipments to the United States. The non-ferrous-mining operations in the Western Hemisphere are classified as special projects, and receive preference in the allocation for export of short-supply materials from the United States. Virtually all of the requirements of these operations for maintenance, repair, and operating supplies, as well as materials for new development and facilities, come from the United States.

The increasing pressure on non-ferrous-metal supplies during 1948 was reflected in a tightening of export controls. Aluminum plate, sheet, and strip were added to the positive list in August 1948 because of rapidly expanding domestic demand and a relatively high level of exports. The quotas which have been established for aluminum will result in a sharp decrease in the rate of exports. Quotas for other nonferrous metals were also reduced during the year.

The bulk of the exports of copper and zinc have consisted of refined copper and slab zinc produced from imported ores. Much of this material entered the United States for processing and reexport. Although licenses are required for these reexports, it has been the practice to permit comparatively free exports of products processed from imported ore. This policy has been adopted in order to stimulate the movement of ores to this country and to keep United States smelters operating at capacity.

Food

World supplies of cereals are becoming more adequate to meet the minimum requirements of all countries provided they would move into the channels of trade at the proper time and in fair proportions. Because of dollar shortages in most importing countries and price considerations in the exporting countries, these conditions would not be met without certain Government controls. Cereal grains and their products, excluding rice, are not presently controlled for export to the Western Hemisphere countries and the Philippines, licensing requirements having been suspended in the last half of 1948 after good harvests were assured and supplies from the new crops began to come to market. Shipments of wheat, wheat flour, oats, barley, and grain sorghums to Western Hemisphere countries and the Philippines were removed from export restrictions in August 1948. Export-license requirements for corn to these countries were continued until December 1948 in order to protect supplies from the poor crop of 1947 and until grain from the bumper crop of 1948 began to appear on the market. Export-license requirements for rye and rye flour were also continued until December because of the limited supplies of that crop in this country.

While world supplies of meat are only slightly below prewar, the decline has been substantial in the importing countries, and much of the increase in the exporting countries has been retained for domestic consumption. World requirements for meat are far in excess of available supplies, and the pressure of rising populations and the desirability of better living standards point to a continuation of the world shortage of meats for some time to come. In view of the tight meat situation, reflected in record prices in 1948, the Department of Commerce has controlled the exports of meat very carefully. Only token amounts have been allocated for export, and only a fraction of 1 percent of our supply was exported in 1948. A large share of the total allocations have been licensed to special projects, many of which produce critical materials which augment United States supplies. Latin America and the Philippines have been allotted the remainder, and the bulk of the shipments has consisted of pork.

The outlook for fats and oils supplies in 1949 is favorable. Indications are that large oilseed plantings will be made again this spring, and the spring pig crop is reported as 10 percent over the previous season's crop. With favorable weather conditions, a further easing of the fat situation can be expected, although supplies do not appear sufficient to meet total potential demand for both domestic and foreign needs. The improving fat situation in the United States is part of a general easing in the world shortage of fats and oils.

Textiles

Only a few textile items are under export control. Since output of raw cotton and cotton goods is ample to meet all domestic demands, and to provide a substantial surplus for export, these products are free of positive list control. Rayon and other synthetics are exempt from control for the same basic reason. In the case of wool, where the United States is dependent upon imports to meet a major part of its needs, controls are likewise unnecessary because of the general adequacy of world supply and because of the traditionally low level of export demand.

Positive list controls over textiles, are limited to fibers not produced in the United States—jute, manila, and sisal—and to their products, including binder and baler twine. In general, exports of these commodities were higher during 1948 than in the prewar period. As before the war, however, exports have been relatively unimportant in comparison with domestic consumption.

Building materials

Few building materials normally enter the export market to an appreciable extent. Controls, therefore, have been exercised on a selective basis, and materials have been removed from export control as rapidly as permitted by the underlying supply-demand situation. An important action in this field recently was the decontrol of gypsum board and lath, the interior wall materials most widely used in residential construction.

At the present time only a few building materials items remain under export control. These are the items presently in shortest supply, such as water-closet sets, metal window and door frames, cast-iron soil pipe, iron and steel conduit, and woven-wire screen cloth. Exports of prefabricated houses also are subject to individual licensing. Continued selective control is essential in this field in order to prevent excessive drains on the domestic supply which might impede needed construction.

Coal

The coal situation improved materially in 1948, both in the United States and abroad. Increased production in western Europe, as well as the scarcity of dollars, has eased the pressure of demand upon the United States, and domestic production has been adequate to supply both domestic needs and reduced foreign requirements.

The decline in foreign requirements, coupled with continued high levels of production and rising stocks, have permitted a relaxation of export restrictions. Since September 1948, coal has been under open-end quota, and applications have been licensed freely. Controls have been maintained chiefly because of continued shortages of high grades of low-volatile coal. If production continues to increase in Europe and is maintained near current levels in this country, it may be possible to delete coal from the positive list in 1949.

Petroleum

The petroleum-supply position this year has proved adequate not only to meet the seasonally high summertime demands for gasoline, but also to permit the build-up of substantial inventories of heating oils to meet the needs of winter consumption. A careful check has had to be maintained on the volume of exports, however, because petroleum continues to be in seriously tight world supply.

The balance in supply and demand was achieved in this country in 1948 by importing more petroleum than was exported. This is a basic change from prewar when, in 1939 for example, exports were five times as much as was imported. In recognition of the increased dependence of the United States and western Europe upon petroleum supplies from the Middle East and Latin America, the Government has followed a policy of supporting petroleum projects in those areas with such materials as could be made available. About 60 percent of the steel allocated for export for all project purposes—petroleum, mining, transportation, food, and so forth—is being used for petroleum operations.

Chemicals and drugs

The year 1948 was, in general, a peak-production year for chemicals and drugs, by the end of which many of the more acute supply shortages had been overcome. A major factor in the postwar world shortage in this field has been the disruption of the European industry. The increased production in the United Kingdom and Germany during the past year and the expansion of output in Italy, Switzerland, South Africa, Canada, and Australia have lessened the pressure on United States supplies.

The pattern of United States export controls has followed closely the changes in the supply situation and outlook. During the year such important products as soda ash, caustic soda, lauryl alcohol, phenol formaldehyde resins, creosote, insulin, and streptomycin were removed from the positive list. On the other hand, for a few other products it was necessary to tighten controls because of growing shortages of the basic nonferrous metals from which they are derived. These include antimony oxide, the lead chemicals, and the chromates.

Coal chemicals

One of the immediate byproducts of the coking of coal is crude coal tar which, when further distilled, is a source of a large number of chemical products, including benzene, toluene, cresols, creosote oil, and naphthalene. From these in turn are derived such finished products as plastics, dyes, synthetic fibers, pharmaceuticals, insecticides, and explosives. Of the coal chemicals, those still in short supply in the United States—cresols, cresylic acid, benzol, and phenol—are subject to export controls.

Chromium chemicals

Most important of the chromium chemicals is sodium bichromate, which is used directly in the textile and tanning industries, and is also the base from which chromic acid, potassium bichromate, and chromium tanning mixtures are produced. United States supplies are inadequate to meet both the present high level of domestic consumption and unrestricted foreign requirements, and accordingly, reduced export quotas have been imposed.

Caustic soda and soda ash

The alkalies afford excellent examples of the need to keep export control authority flexible to meet changing supply conditions. At the beginning of 1948, the world shortage of these materials was acute and foreign requirements far exceeded established export quotas. During the year, however, increased domestic production and a sharp decline in foreign demands made possible, first, an easing of quota restrictions, and finally, the removal of soda ash and caustic soda from the positive list.

Drugs

The most important recent export control development in this field has been the decontrol of streptomycin. As United States supplies increased it was possible to liberalize the amounts authorized for export. In the third quarter of 1947, the export quota was 825,000 grams; by the second quarter 1948 the quota had been raised to 6,000,000 grams, and for the remainder of the year, streptomycin was licensed under an open-end quota. A review of the situation at the close of the year indicated domestic requirements of less than half of expected supply so that export controls were no longer necessary on that account.

Fertilizers

Fertilizers are composed of three types of primary materials, nitrogenous, phosphatic, and potassic. There is a world shortage of fertilizer material which is particularly serious in the case of the nitrogenous.

Current United States supplies of phosphatic fertilizers are adequate to permit free exports without adverse effect, so they are no longer on the positive list.

Prewar, Germany was the world's major supplier of potash. Approximately 60 percent of Germany's resources are located in the Soviet zones. Potash supplies for western Europe now come mainly from France, Spain, and Palestine, and some from Russia. Shipments of potash from the United States to Western Hemisphere destinations and the Philippines are not subject to export licensing, but exports to all other areas are tightly controlled.

Nitrogenous fertilizers are subject to strict export controls to all destinations. Most of the western European countries produce these fertilizers, but, except for Belgium, Italy, Norway, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom, imports are required to supplement indigenous production. The only other exporting countries, in addition to the United States, are Canada and Chile.

Machinery and equipment

The major machinery items whose exports are controlled in order to protect the domestic supply are railway freight cars and parts. To conserve steel and insure increased domestic freight-car parts, freight cars were placed on the positive list on July 1, 1947. Production has been steadily increasing since the beginning of 1947; but the total of cars in operation has not increased appreciably because of the large number of retirements. To prevent the assembly abroad of complete cars from United States parts, freight-car parts, and air-brake equipment were added to the positive list in February 1948.

While some commodities in the machinery category are still in tight supply, the producers themselves have limited exports, thus obviating the necessity for Government controls. Production of motor vehicles, for example, is still short of demand, but exports in 1948, in the absence of controls, represented a little over 6 percent of production, compared with 7 percent in 1947 and 8 percent prewar. The situation with respect to farm machinery and tractors is essentially the same.

Lumber

The high level of lumber production reached in 1947 has been maintained throughout 1948. While domestic demand for lumber has been large, all requirements including a high volume for housing construction have been met. Imports of lumber, which come chiefly from Canada, have increased even more sharply than domestic production. With these increases in supply, shortages in the common grades of lumber have eased considerably during the past year.

Exports in 1948 represented 1.4 percent of the total new supply as against 3 percent in 1947, and 5 percent before the war. The sharp drop in lumber exports stems chiefly from the contraction of foreign demand. Supplies were ample, but foreign orders were not forthcoming in sufficient quantity to absorb even the limited export quotas established by the Department of Commerce. In line with the policy to retain export controls only so long as there is a clear need for their continuation, virtually all lumber was removed from the positive list as of January 1, 1949. The only lumber items remaining under control are Port Orford cedar (a specialty product used to make separators for storage batteries), railroad ties, and millwork.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

In general the bill would provide for the continuation of the existing export control authority. The scope of the export control program proposed by this bill is for most purposes identical with the scope of the program under existing law. The principal differences proposed by the new bill are concerned with provision for a more effective enforcement program, and making mandatory the requirement (1) for interdepartmental consultation as to specific items to be controlled and the extent of the control, and (2) for consultation with representatives of the export trade concerning licensing criteria and related matters.

Section 1

Section 1 would provide that this act may be cited as the "Export Control Act of 1949."

This section also sets forth findings which justify the necessity for the continuation of export controls.

Section 2

This section would provide that the control of exports shall be used to the extent necessary to effect certain policies of the United States, namely: (1) To protect the domestic economy from the excessive drain of scarce materials and to reduce the inflationary impact of abnormal foreign demand; (2) to further the foreign policy of the United States and to aid in fulfilling its international responsibilities; and (3) to exercise the necessary vigilance over exports from the standpoint of their significance to the national security.

Section 3

This section would authorize the President to prohibit or curtail the exportation from the United States, its Territories, and possessions, any articles, materials, or supplies, including technical data, except under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe in order to effectuate the policy set forth in section 2. To the extent necessary to achieve effective enforcement of this act such rules and regulations may apply to the financing, exporting, and other servicing of exports and the participation therein by any person.

Subsection (b) would provide that the President may delegate the power, authority, and discretion conferred upon him by this act to such departments, agencies, or officials of the Government as he may deem appropriate.

Section 4

Subsection (a) of this section would provide for consultation by the department, agency, or official determining which articles, materials, or supplies shall be controlled and the extent to which exports thereof shall be limited, and the several executive departments and individual agencies concerned with aspects of our domestic and foreign policies and operations having important bearing upon exports. These provisions requiring such consultation, while not contained in existing law, are presently being used to correlate to the fullest extent possible the activities of the departments and agencies responsible for determining export quotas with those departments and agencies concerned with other aspects of our domestic and foreign policies and operations having an important bearing on exports. The provisions of this subsection would make such consultation mandatory.

Subsection (b) would provide that in authorizing exports full utilization of private competitive trade channels shall be encouraged insofar as practicable, giving consideration to the interests of small business, merchant exporters as well as producers, and established and new exporters. To effect this purpose this subsection would require that provision shall be made for representative trade consultation.

This subsection would also provide that in addition to utilizing competitive trade channels insofar as practicable in the authorization of exports there may be applied such other standards or criteria, such as destination, end-use, or price criteria, as may be deemed necessary by the head of such department or agency, or official to carry out the policies of this act. Destination, end-use, and price criteria are presently applied with respect to the control of exports under provisions of existing law.

Section 5

This section would provide for the civil and criminal penalties, which, upon conviction may be imposed for violation of any provision of the act or any regulation, order, or license issued thereunder.

Section 6

Subsection (a) of this section would provide for certain authority which may be exercised by the head of any department, agency, or official exercising any functions under the act with respect to the making of investigations of, the keeping of records by, and the inspection of books, records, and other writings of, any person affected by the provisions of the act to the extent necessary or appropriate to the enforcement of the act. Subpena powers would be authorized to require the appearance of persons or the production of books, records, and other writings, or both, to the extent necessary or appropriate to the enforcement of the act.

Subsection (b) of this section would provide for the application of the immunity provisions of the Compulsory Testimony Act of February 11, 1893, with respect to individuals who specifically claim such privilege.

Subsection (c) of this section would provide that no department, agency, or official exercising any functions under this act shall publish or disclose information obtained thereunder which is deemed confidential or with reference to which a request for confidential treatment is made by the person furnishing such information unless the head of such department, agency, or official determines that the withholding thereof is contrary to the public interest.

Section 7

This section would provide for the exemption of functions exercised under this act from the Administrative Procedure Act, except as to the public information requirements of section 3 of such act.

Section 8

This section would provide for the making of a quarterly report to the President and the Congress by the head of any department or agency or official exercising any functions under the act.

Section 9

This section would define the term "person."

Section 10

This section would provide that the act of February 15, 1936, relating to the licensing of exports in tin-plate scrap is superseded by the provisions of this act. This section further provides that nothing contained in this act shall be construed to modify, repeal, supersede, or otherwise affect the provisions of any other laws authorizing control over exports of any commodity. Some of the commodities presently under export control pursuant to the provisions of other laws and not affected by the provisions of this act are narcotics and gold, ammunition, arms and implements of war, tobacco seed, and atomic energy materials.

Section 11

This section would provide that the act will take effect on February 28, 1949, upon the expiration of the existing export-control law and also would provide that all outstanding delegations, regulations, orders, licenses, or other forms of administrative action under the existing export-control authority shall remain in full force and effect, until amended or revoked, the same as promulgated under this act.

Section 12

This section would provide that the authority granted under this act will terminate on June 30, 1951, or upon any prior date upon which the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 17 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE].

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, it is my judgment that world economic and political conditions make it imperative that our export-control program be extended for two basic reasons:

First, to protect our domestic economy against the inflationary effects of unrestricted foreign purchases of commodities which are still in short supply; and

Second, to channel exports to countries where the need is greatest and where our foreign policy and national security interests will be served best.

I have supported this program since it was introduced in 1940. But I have done so with the understanding that controls would be lifted and normal exporting practices resumed as soon as the supply situation and the national security position permitted.

Consequently, it has been a matter of increasingly grave concern to me that controls have not been removed more promptly when circumstances have warranted such action. Consider for instance, agricultural commodities, and particularly fats and oils. Despite enormous surpluses, controls were not relaxed at all until mounting pressure forced belated action by the Department of Commerce several days ago.

The fats and oils situation, Mr. Chairman, is nothing short of tragic. In the face of tremendous shortages throughout the world, huge surpluses have been permitted to accumulate here in the United States. These huge surpluses have demoralized our domestic markets. I shall discuss briefly a few of the more serious aspects of this unfortunate situation:

First. Lard is selling below cost of production. The present price is from 12 to 15 cents per pound, while the price of the live hog is about 20 cents. The surplus of lard is constantly increasing, and last year's enormous corn crop assures continued high production of hogs this year. Furthermore, the thousands of animals killed in the recent western blizzards will be fit only for rendering. This will add large quantities of fats to the surpluses already on hand.

Second. During the past decade the production of soybeans in the United States increased from approximately 60,000,000 bushels in 1938 to 220,000,000 bushels in 1948. Perhaps no other factor is more responsible for our present self-sufficient position in edible fats and oils. This is in direct contrast to our position 10 years ago, when we were importers of fats and oils and relied on other parts of the world for our supplies. Unfortunately, however, this tremendous increase in soybean production has had a most depressing effect upon the prices of fats and oils. Not only are we now self-sufficient but our surplus is immense. During the past year soybean prices dropped from about $4 per bushel to less than $2.30 per bushel, and soybean oil declined from well above 30 cents per pound to 13 cents per pound.

Third. In May of last year cottonseed oil sold for more than 40 cents a pound at the mills. Less than 6 months later—last November—at the peak of cottonseed marketing, cottonseed oil sold at 20 cents per pound. Currently the price is, I believe, under 14 cents per pound. On January 1 of this year the Bureau of the Census reported 500,000 tons of cottonseed had not yet been marketed. Both the processors, who have bought the bulk of the crop on the basis of 19-cent—not 14-cent—oil, and the cotton farmers, who have not yet marketed their cottonseed, are now faced with ruinous losses. In this connection I may say that my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], during the course of the hearings on this legislation, brought out the point that Brazil is presently selling cottonseed oil and other oils to Canada and to Italy at 20 cents per pound, and more, whereas the price paid to farmers in the United States for the same oil is 14 cents per pound, or less. And please bear in mind that the American taxpayer is paying for the oil which Canada and Italy are buying from Brazil at the higher price.

Mr. Chairman, top officials from the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Commerce testified that fats and oils are in short world supply. And yet huge surpluses have been permitted to pile up in our country, resulting in complete demoralization of our fats and oils markets. The surpluses are so great that we do not even have sufficient tank facilities for storing the oils. During the next 6 months alone, the best available estimates indicate we will have a surplus of edible fats and oils for export in excess of 500,000,000 pounds.

The testimony given in committee throws considerable light on the reasons for this confusion. The export quotas for the various commodities are determined by what is called the interagency committee. This, it seems, consists of so-called "experts" from the Department of Commerce, the Department of State, the Department of Agriculture, the Economic Cooperation Administration, and numerous other agencies. I refer you to pages 16–19 and 121–123 of the committee hearings where you will find pertinent information brought out in replies to my questioning of several witnesses. In other words, even though the Secretary of Agriculture may recommend increased exports of a commodity in surplus, many months may elapse while the various agencies consider what to do, first individually, then collectively. Meanwhile, surpluses pile up and prices collapse. For example, as far back as last November the Department of Agriculture recommended increased exports of edible fats and oils. The harvests were completed; the existence of huge surpluses was evident; world supply statistics were available—and yet actual lifting of controls which prevented the export of these domestic surpluses was withheld by the Department of Commerce until a few days ago, and even then the relaxation was piecemeal.

Then, too, it appears that the production estimates of the Department of Agriculture have been inaccurate. Predicting harvests, supplies, and surpluses is of course a risky and difficult business at best, but it does seem the experts, despite our marvelous past performances in food production, are always inclined to take an overly pessimistic outlook. Be that as it may, officials of the Department of Agriculture have demonstrated a timidity or hesitancy—even when crops have been harvested and surpluses piled up—in acting promptly and forcefully to keep the domestic supply-demand situation in normal balance. This particular problem is, of course, administrative rather than legislative, and I am hopeful that the Department will profit from the current disastrous experience in fats and oils. In all fairness, it must be admitted that the unreasonably long delays which brought on the present crisis in fats and oils is attributable primarily to the slow motion of the so-called interagency setup rather than to inaction by the Department of Agriculture.

All of these facts were brought out in detail in the committee hearings on this bill. Consequently, I offered two amendments in committee: One, proposing that the Secretary of Agriculture should have full jurisdiction over agricultural exports, without review authority by the Secretary of Commerce; the other, proposing to remove fats and oils from export control. Although no one challenged the facts on which my amendments were based, they failed to get majority approval.

I, therefore, decided to offer these amendments on the floor of the House. However, two recent developments have caused me to change my plan somewhat; in the first place, the Department of Commerce has, because of mounting criticism and pressure, at long last placed fats and oils under general license. This action, belated though it be, has the effect of removing them from export control except as to destination; secondly, the Senate has now approved a bill which contains an amendment purporting to provide decontrol of agricultural commodities when in surplus.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the Senate amendment could be improved materially by rephrasing. Roughly, it provides for decontrol when the Secretary of Agriculture makes an affirmative finding that there exists a surplus of an agricultural commodity. In my opinion it would be more satisfactory if the amendment provided that the controls would be imposed only when the Secretary of Agriculture made a finding that there was a shortage of a given commodity.

Nevertheless, because I have come to the reluctant conclusion that it may be the best amendment which it is possible to enact at this time in this Chamber and in order to expedite action on this urgently needed legislation, I propose to offer, at the appropriate time, the Senate amendment, which reads as follows:

The authority conferred by this section shall not be exercised with respect to any agricultural commodity, including fats and oils, during any period for which the supply of such commodity is determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in excess of the requirements of the domestic economy, except to the extent required to effectuate the policies set forth in clause (b) or clause (c) of section 2 hereof.

If this amendment is not enacted, there is nothing to prevent the reimposition of controls at the whim of the Department of Commerce. Legislative action is necessary to assure our producers that abnormal surpluses shall not be permitted to demoralize domestic food markets while world food supplies are pitifully inadequate.

Mr. Chairman, it is my conviction that the Secretary of Agriculture should be given final responsibility and full authority for determining the quantities of agricultural commodities, including fats and oils, which are in excess of our own needs and thus available for export. The Congress cannot, of course, insure that the Secretary will exercise this power well. But, by centering the authority and the responsibility in the Secretary of Agriculture, the Congress will remove some of the cooks who may have spoiled the broth up to now. The enactment of this amendment should serve notice that the Congress will no longer tolerate indecision, inaction, and long delays which impair our national economy. The costly fats and oils tragedy must not be repeated.

Accordingly, I urge Members on both sides of the aisle to support the amendment which I will offer at the proper time.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TALLE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am sorry I was not present when the gentleman started, but is it a fact that the Department of Commerce has removed the restrictions on the exports of fats and oils?

Mr. TALLE. The Department took such action first on inedible fats after hearings on the pending bill were under way. A few days ago controls were relaxed on edible fats. The Department was under great pressure to do so—but of course under present law the controls can be reimposed.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield just for a moment?

Mr. TALLE. I cannot resist yielding to my distinguished friend from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The gentleman from Iowa is a splendid member of our committee. He understands the subject which he is now discussing. He has been in attendance every minute at the committee meetings.

Mr. TALLE. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Georgia very much.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I expect to offer this amendment on page 3 after line 2:

Page 3, after line 2, insert the following new subsection:

"(c) The authority conferred by this section shall not be exercised with respect to any agricultural commodity, including fats and oils, during any period for which the supply of such commodity is determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in excess

of the requirements of the domestic economy, except to the extent required to effectuate the policies set forth in clause (b) or clause (c) of section 2 hereof."

That is practically the same amendment, I think, that was adopted by the Senate.

Mr. TALLE. I propose to offer the Senate amendment, so we are in agreement on that.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TALLE. I yield to my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. First of all, let me congratulate my colleague on his splendid presentation. I understood my colleague to say that unless this amendment was adopted, the authority would still rest in the Secretary of Commerce to determine whether or not these controls should be imposed or removed.

Mr. TALLE. The gentleman is right.

Mr. HOEVEN. It is further my understanding, gathered from reading news reports some days ago, that the White House had assured the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency that hereafter jurisdiction would be lodged in the Secretary of Agriculture and not in the Secretary of Commerce. Would the gentleman care to comment on that? It is my understanding this is one of the reasons why an amendment such as now proposed, was not adopted in the committee.

Mr. TALLE. I may say to my colleague that that was stated at the time I introduced my amendments in the committee for the purpose of doing what I am trying to do now in one amendment.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TALLE. I yield to my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I want to compliment the gentleman on the very fine exposition he has made of this matter, and would like to ask this question: In your opinion, was the break in the price of livestock in the markets, beginning along last fall some time, brought about by the surplus of animal fats and other kinds of fats in this country?

Mr. TALLE. Oh, there is no doubt but that there was a very direct connection.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Would the gentleman explain the connection, please?

Mr. TALLE. Well, I will merely repeat what I said earlier, that the price of lard really determines the price of hogs. Obviously, if you have a stopper to the normal outlet for lard supply that is bound to back up and influence the price of the hogs. The result is the farmer gets a lower price for his hogs. But the packer must get a higher price for the meat on the hog when he fails to get the normal price for lard.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TALLE. I yield to my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to compliment the gentleman on his able presentation, and ask this question: Has anyone in America or in the whole wide world benefited by the piling up of fats and oils in America except the soap manufacturer? Can the gentleman think of anyone, except the soap manufacturers, who has profited?

Mr. TALLE. I will answer that by saying that it certainly has been very harmful to the people who should get the money; that is, the cotton farmers who bring their seed to the crushers, the hog farmers who bring their hogs to market, the soybean people who bring their soybeans to the crushing mills. They are the people who do the hard work. Certainly they should have a just reward for their arduous toil.

Mr. JENSEN. The low price of lard and fats and oils raised the price of meat, did it not, naturally, in order for the packer to make a profit?

Mr. TALLE. He had to, otherwise he could not come out even on his operations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to hear the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE] is in favor of the amendment which I shall offer at the appropriate time. I am glad our minds are together on this amendment. It makes me more sure that I am correct in offering it.

Some time ago the people representing the growers of agricultural commodities and the processors came to my office and told me what they wanted. They wanted the authority in the Department of Agriculture instead of the Department of Commerce to say how much surplus we had, and then to say how much of the surplus we could afford to export to other countries. This is the principal thing they complained about. In the committee it appeared as if most of the members of the committee were in sympathy with the proposal that the Department of Agriculture should have this authority. The President called up our chairman and then called me and said that he hoped I would not offer the amendment. I read him the amendment and he had no objection to it and said I could assure the committee that he would delegate this authority to the Department of Agriculture. Therefore, I did not offer the amendment in the committee.

Since that time the growers and processors have decided that agricultural commodities should be decontrolled when in excess of the requirements of the domestic economy except to the extent required to effectuate the policies set forth in clause (b) or clause (c) of section 2. That is the amendment I shall offer later and is the amendment referred to by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE].

Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of Commerce or his assistant appearing for him at the hearing in behalf of H. R. 1661, said that—

> Generally speaking, the purposes to be accomplished by this bill are to protect the domestic economy by limiting exports of scarce materials, and to channel exports to countries where need is greatest and where our foreign policy and national security interests would be best served.

If this policy is adhered to, there would be little or no objection to it. Generally speaking, export controls do not promote trade and commerce for our products here, and we should have controls only under certain emergency situations. I do not believe that it was ever the intention of Congress to have surplus commodities under controls.

Our policy for years has been to do away with all restrictions which impede commerce, especially with reference to surplus commodities we have to sell.

No one should oppose the export control of critical and strategic metals and minerals.

The testimony at the hearing made it clear there are a number of commodities still in short supply in this country and in the world, such as steel, petroleum, and electrical goods. There are also a number of commodities of high strategic value, particularly special metals, which are in limited supply here and abroad.

I agree that this Government should have the power to control the exports of these items in short supply in order to control inflation at home. For our national security I also believe we should not permit unlimited export of our limited supply of strategic commodities.

Furthermore, it appears prudent from the standpoint of our national security to vest in the administration the power to control the destination of certain strategic and critical items. Also, we are committed to a policy of rehabilitating and assisting the countries participating in the European recovery program. I think the people of this country are in accord with these broad objectives. At least we in the committee have heard no objections to this policy.

In granting such powers, the authority must obviously be rather broad and must contain considerable discretion. The Congress clearly is not in a position to determine which individual commodities should be controlled, to what destination, when, and for how long. For this reason the over-all power is given to the President and he, in turn, is given the right to delegate this authority.

It is the administration of the export-control program that has concerned me. I have not been satisfied with the way the program has been administered in the past. We have endeavored to see to it that the administration will be improved in the future.

The particular complaint in the past has been that controls have been retained longer than necessary. In the case of fats and oils, for instance, strict allocations and individual licenses were still required long after the supply situation had completely changed from one of shortage to one of surplus. This year, for instance, the production of edible fats and oils was about 550,000,000 pounds larger than last. Crop reports indicated this surplus months ago. The market reflected the surplus months ago. Crude cottonseed oil, for instance, dropped from about 40 cents per pound in May of 1948 to 20 cents in November, to 14 cents in January of 1949 and to about 11¼ cents last week, several cents under OPA prices. The storage tanks were overflowing with oil, crushers were refusing

to buy the farmers' seed. Cottonseed prices were halved in a period of weeks from $80 per ton to $40 last week. At the same time, foreign countries still very short of edible fats and oils were clamoring to buy our oils. Our competitors were selling edible fats and oils in world markets for dollars at 30 to 50 percent above our domestic prices. In face of the of the obvious the administration did too little too late.

Upon investigation we found the procedure for making allocations and administering controls cumbersome. Export policies on agricultural commodities were being considered by large, unwieldly interagency committees of such uninterested parties as the Atomic Energy Commission. The bottleneck we found was the Department of Commerce, which had the final authority over all commodities, even agricultural commodities. Many of us felt the Secretary of Agriculture was the only person qualified to determine the exportable surplus of agricultural commodities, and that he, not the Secretary of Commerce, should have the final authority in controlling exports of any agricultural commodities.

To implement the program and improve the administration, I prepared an amendment to the bill to transfer the authority over agricultural commodities from the Secretary of Commerce to the Secretary of Agriculture.

The President called and talked to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] and to me about the amendment, and assured us that he would make such a delegation of authority to the Secretary of Agriculture under the general power conferred upon him by this proposed legislation. I therefore did not offer my amendment.

There was another development that had important influence on the action of the administration on export control of fats and oils. The Senate passed a companion bill on export control, S. 548, with an amendment requiring decontrol of agricultural commodities during any period in which they are determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in surplus, provided such action does not interfere with our international obligations and our national security. This amendment was intended as a guide for the Secretary of Agriculture in controlling exports of agricultural commodities.

Following Senate action and further prodding by Congressmen, the Secretary of Agriculture agreed to the decontrol of edible fats and oils. Commerce supported the position and announced the decontrol under the terms of which allocations are discontinued and individual licenses are discontinued to all countries outside Europe and the U. S. S. R. There individual licenses are still required on fats and oils as they are on all commodities.

I am convinced the transfer of authority over agricultural commodities from Commerce to Agriculture, as the President has assured us he will do, will improve the administration of the program. At the same time, it may also be well to write into the bill a guide for the Secretary of Agriculture to follow, namely, that he will decontrol agricultural commodities when they are in surplus. Writing such a standard into the legislation should prevent the delay in decontrolling other agricultural commodities as was experienced in inedible and edible fats and oils by making decontrol automatic while the surplus exists. This would not interfere with the authority to control shipments to Europe under license.

In this manner the objectives of the bill—controlling exports of scarce and strategic commodities—can be assured and the danger of controls thwarting trade in general commodities can be minimized.

Some people believe that the reason edible fats and oils are selling for much higher prices in Europe than here is because our surplus of oils and fats is being held back.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Did your committee find out why the Department of Commerce would not issue export licenses, in view of the domestic and world situation with reference to fats and oils?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I did my best to find out. I took up about two-thirds of the time of the committee. I practiced law a great many years before I came to Congress. Sometimes a lawyer has to do a little testifying with an unwilling witness. I had to do it in this instance. I think if the gentleman will read the hearings he will find what he wants.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in 1940 the Congress enacted legislation which gave the President authority to control exports. That power has been continued periodically. Last year the power was continued until February 28, 1949. The powers which the President has had have not been materially changed since their inception in 1940. The only change that I recall that has been made was when the extension was enacted last year, the Congress provided that the President might take into consideration price criteria in determining to whom these licenses should be granted. I never quite knew why we gave him that authority. I argued that to give him the authority would perhaps result in certain discriminatory practices which would not be conducive to stability either in the foreign market or the domestic market. Some were unkind enough to charge that under the price criteria provisions the President could invoke control of the prices of commodities of domestic production. I bring that out only to show that during the time that this export control authority has been in existence, from 1940 down to date, covering the period of preparedness, covering the period of the war, covering the 3 years of postwar economic adjustment throughout the world, the President has not asked for any additional authority than that granted him in the original 1940 act, until this relatively inconsequential change was made last year.

We reenacted this legislation last year as an aid to inflation control. There were two basic reasons why we had inflation: One was the loose money policies of the Government; the other was the unusually heavy demand by foreign countries for American goods in short supply. In order that he might balance foreign demand against domestic stability we gave the President almost carte blanche authority to control exports; we gave him the authority to prevent all exports from the United States if he saw fit to do so and if it were necessary to protect the domestic economy. We gave him authority to do anything short of this total embargo against any exports, and for 7 years there has been adequate, there has been sufficient, power to enforce export controls.

This bill is probably the first of a very important series of bills which might be presented to this Congress. This bill and the action which you take on this bill sets the pattern. Here is the importance of it: You build the framework of government for years to come; this is the pattern that you cut out for the future of America. I say that because it is now indicative of a change in policy, indicative of the fact that there are still two forces at work in America; one which prides itself on its zeal, desire, and almost insane ambition to perpetuate all of those things which have made America great and strong and potent in world affairs—we call it the American way of life. As opposed to the American way of life there is a large and ever-growing group in America which teaches that we should abandon the American way of life, which teaches that we should adopt totalitarianism and the socialistic state if America is going to expand economically, socially, and politically in its influences. They teach that we must borrow from the works of Marx in order to perpetuate the prosperity which we have enjoyed throughout the last one-hundred-and-fifty-odd years. The issues are clearly drawn between those who would perpetuate the American system and maintain America as a strong economic, social, and political influence and those who would appeal to radicalism, totalitarianism, collectivism, socialism, communism—whatever you may call it—in any form. That is the basic problem before the American people, and let me repeat, this bill determines what the superstructure of government will be, whether the American system of government is going to be changed from one of free enterprise to one of a managed economy.

It has been asked, Why are these new powers—when production is increasing in western Europe, in the face of the fact that in western Germany production has increased over 100 percent during the last year and when production in the other western democracies has increased anywhere from 25 to 80 percent—necessary to expand the power which the Executive has in respect to export controls if it is not a desire to effectuate

the purposes of those who would destroy the fundamentals of American democracy and substitute therefor totalitarianism or socialism?

It is a serious question and one in which you will have to explore the depths of your own conscience to find the answer.

I do not think anyone will contend that the world economic situation is as bad today as it was 6 months or a year ago. We all like to feel that the help which we have given to foreign countries has resulted in increasing production and a very, very long step toward economic stability in many of the foreign countries. So attention should be given to our own economy and the stabilization of our own economy.

My very honored and dear friend, the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, for whom all of us have great respect, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], asks, "Why be so captious about a few words?" Well, a few words have changed the destiny of the world and the few words he refers to in this bill can cause a change in the very form of government here in America.

He says we should not have any apprehension about the administration or operation of the plan. Well, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE] and the gentleman from Georgia have pointed out that because of the failure of the administration to balance foreign demand against domestic stability, the bottom has dropped out from under the domestic market for fats and oils. So, we must take legislative action to correct the deficiencies in administration in the law already.

The same man who is to administer this law is the man whom this Congress once voted out of office, and is now the subject of a controversy as to whether he leans more favorably toward the American system, or the totalitarian system. He is the man in the Department of Commerce who administers this law. We should have some apprehension about the administration of this law, especially when it presumes to give such broad and unusual powers which are not needed any more than they ever have been needed since 1940 to do an effective job in respect to export controls.

Let us point to one or two of them by way of example.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. I would like to know who the gentleman is speaking about. Is the gentleman speaking about the Secretary of Commerce?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Oh, no.

Mr. SPENCE. Or the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No. William W. Remington.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if you will refer to the bill on page 2, line 19, you will find this language:

To the extent necessary to achieve effective enforcement of this act, such rules and regulations may apply to financing, transporting, and other servicing of exports and the participation therein by any person.

Now, they are to be given under this bill, if this language remains in here, the authority to regulate the financing and transporting of goods for export; and the purpose of the controls of exports found in the declaration of policy is so broad that when you tie that language in with the declaration of policy, you give the administration the power to manage the domestic economy of the United States. Do we now, 3½ years after the cessation of hostilities, in peacetime, even though it is a de facto peace, desire to enlarge the powers, expand the powers, the war powers, which the Government had? Those are the important questions and these are the problems which this Congress, in this bill, have got to solve because, as I said, this is the pattern you are making today. This is the pattern: Do you want to give authority that the Administrator will be able to control over which railroads commodities being sent from the Midwest and the far West to the Atlantic seaboard shall be shipped?

The broad interpretations by the courts on what constitutes interstate commerce are to the effect that anything which affects interstate commerce is subject to the commerce clause of the Constitution. Applying that same logic to export controls, this administration under this act can go into any banking house, any financial institution, and explore into the actions of individuals in respect to financing, the manner in which exports shall be financed. We do not set up any standards limiting the control of the financing, and when we do not set up any standards with respect to control of financing or transporting, of course we give them carte blanche authority—it is very doubtful whether it is constitutional or not—to do what they please in respect to financing and transporting and other servicing. What do they mean by that? Do you know? I do not. What do they mean by "other servicing" of exports? I do not know.

That language, Mr. Chairman, coupled with the declaration of policy, gives the administration the power to control the domestic economy of the United States. Can you now think of giving them the authority to control the economy of the United States or manage the economy of the United States, when you have on such frequent occasions during the cessation of hostilities denied them these powers?

Any official may be designated to administer this act, not any official named by the President and confirmed by the Senate, as we have always written into these laws wherein we transfer and delegate broad executive powers to an official. We have always compelled them to be officials that at least Congress has something to say about appointing. But an official in this instance might be a section head, because they are left to interpret the act as they see fit. It may be a clerk or a stenographer, who becomes an official upon being designated.

In addition to all the other powers they are given under this act, regulations and orders and licenses may be granted under such standards, such criteria, as may be deemed necessary to carry out the policies of the act. Standards or criteria deemed necessary by whom, and within what limitations? No limitations whatsoever, but standards and criteria established by some department, some agency, or some official, without restraint so long as that official holds that a standard is necessary and a criterion is necessary to effect the purposes of this act, which might include the management of the domestic economy. He can make such standards and criteria effective, and effective how? By providing in the act that if any of your constituents being subject to the provisions of any of these regulations set up to control exports or the domestic economy violate any of these standards or criteria promulgated under regulations issued by any official of the Government, they can be sent to prison for 1 year and fined $10,000.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. LYLE. Will the gentleman take a moment to clear up a couple of points? In the hearings and investigation before the committee on this bill did they go into the past history of the administration of this act?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes, there was a good deal of testimony with respect to that.

Mr. LYLE. Did you find any reason then to anticipate that it might be poorly administered and that they might take liberties, as you suggest they can under this act?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No, because the act was so limited that they could not take these liberties. They could not establish standards. The only criteria that they could establish was the one having to do with prices which we provided for last year. Therefore, unless we give them this authority that they are asking for, they have no authority to set up these standards and criteria other than on prices.

I am sorry I cannot yield to the gentleman further.

If you turn to page 4, line 13, you will note that these departments and officials may make investigations and obtain information and require reports for the keeping of records and they may make such inspections of books and records and of other writings or of the property or premises of "any person," and they can take the sworn testimony of "any person." Surely I think that that should be confined to any person who makes an application for an export license because if this provision is enacted into law, then it would apply to any business which is doing a purely domestic business, which might be in competition with another concern doing an export business or another concern doing both export and domestic business because it affects exports. The administration would have the authority under such a law to go into any industry or any business establishment or farm and inspect the property and premises and take the sworn testimony of those persons. This is a new and unusual power which has never been given to the Government even in time of war.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Before the gentleman leaves that point with respect to "any person," would that include, let us say, the books and papers of the gentleman from Michigan who is now in the well of the House, whose records might be necessary or appropriate in connection with the administration of this act? I see no exception so far as Members of Congress are concerned.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I assume that under the Constitution we might have certain immunities which our constituents who are fortunate enough to be in the business, the professions, or agriculture, might not have.

You will recall that throughout the years we have discussed what has been called the snooping clause in bills before us. We have always protected our farmers, wage earners, businessmen, and industrialists from abuses with respect to the power to gather information which has been vested in various departments of the Government. But there is no such protection in subsection (c) on page 5. That section reads:

No department, agency, or official exercising any functions under this act shall publish or disclose information obtained hereunder—

That is fine up to that point. Now, reading that hurriedly, one might say, "Well, they are given protection because the departments cannot publish any of this information." But it goes on to say, "which is deemed confidential." Deemed confidential by whom? The person seeking the information? The agency or official seeking the information? Whether one of those deems it confidential?

Now, it goes on with what looks like further protection:

with reference to which a request for confidential treatment is made by the person furnishing such information—

If you stop there, they are given protection. If the person from whom the information is sought wants the matter to be treated as confidential, up to that point the matter is treated as confidential. But the following qualifies this language:

unless the head of such department or agency determines that the withholding thereof is contrary to the national interest.

There are no standards with respect to what constitutes the national interest, in this act. It is left wholly to the discretion of the official or department or agency as to whether information, trade information, information in respect to competitors, information in respect to patents, trade practices, farm practices, industrial practices, which may be of great value to a competitor—that information is not protected.

Now, the sensible thing to do, in the light of the changes which are now taking place in our economic conditions—and regardless of the details, we all do know that something is happening to our domestic economy now—the sensible thing to do is to continue these controls for a year as is; and then in another year or later in the term, if we have to, we will determine what controls are further necessary to fit them into the new pattern which will be cut after we know what is happening to the American economy.

I am going to offer as a substitute for this bill, at the proper time, a bill to continue these controls as they exist in the present law, for 1 year. I hope that the committee will consider it as a very sensible request and will support it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] has again expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN.]

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I heard the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], who is a very valuable member of our committee, and who was chairman of the committee during the Eightieth Congress, state that this bill sets a pattern; that the American way of life is involved; that we are determining by our votes now whether we will have a socialistic state or that our vote on this bill will determine whether or not we are changing from a free enterprise system to a managed economy or to a totalitarian government. I do not share his views.

After saying all those things about this bill, the distinguished gentleman finished his speech by saying that he was for it for 1 more year.

CRITERIA USED IN EXPORT LICENSING

There is no single criterion which can be used to divide export quotas among all exporters with perfect equity. To carry out the purposes of export controls as authorized by Congress, a number of criteria or standards have had to be established for the approval or disapproval of export applications. The problem varies almost with each important commodity. Experience has also shown that there must be permitted administrative flexibility in determining proper criteria to meet changing supply and market conditions as well as current foreign policy and national security objectives.

The following are the criteria most regularly applied, and the reasons therefor:

ELIGIBILITY OF APPLICATIONS

Except for the requirement that a license applicant must be subject to the jurisdiction of the United States—a requirement of obvious enforcement significance—everyone is eligible to apply for an export license.

However, certain criteria have had to be established in order to make sure that licenses will be properly used, after issuance. An illustration of such criteria is the requirement that applicants must have valid orders for export or contracts or other satisfactory arrangements for the delivery of the goods involved. Another illustration is the requirement with respect to some commodities that the applicant present proof that the goods are available to him for shipment if the license is granted. Criteria of this nature also serve enforcement purposes in that they help to prevent trafficking in licenses and speculation by license holders, as well as waste through failure to use all of the limited export quotas.

To carry out the objectives of export controls, other standards or criteria must be applied in selecting applications for consideration. These include, for example, the intended foreign consignee or destination, and the end-use involved. The pertinence of these criteria in terms of foreign policy or national security is self-evident.

To a limited extent and as an anti-inflationary measure, for which export controls are also intended, some applications may be disqualified for exports proposed to be made at obviously excessive prices.

The last sentence of section 4 (b) of H. R. 1661 provides for authority to employ the foregoing standards or criteria and such others as may be deemed necessary to carry out the policies of the act.

DISTRIBUTION OF EXPORT QUOTAS AMONG QUALIFIED APPLICANTS

This problem arises only when the total quantity of a commodity which can be spared for export is substantially less than the total of qualified applications therefor. Prorating limited export quotas equally among all applicants is not a practical or equitable solution to this problem. It would result in alloting to each applicant very small amounts which could not usually be shipped economically. It would also be manifestly unfair to established firms with long records of supplying a major portion of foreign markets. Therefore, the qualifications of the exporter are taken into account. While licenses cannot be approved for all applicants, each class of applicant—merchant exporters as well as producers, and established and new exporters—is given a share of the export quota. The extent of such shares may vary with the commodity involved and the nature of the trading therein. Accordingly, committees of representative businessmen in each major commodity field have been established to advise the Office of International Trade for this purpose. In this connection, attention is directed to the first part of section 4 (b) of H. R. 1661, providing for the application of such criteria and further requiring that there shall be representative trade consultation in determining the proper distribution of licenses.

I would like to call your attention to the difference between the present law and the bill that we have before us.

First, the policies set forth in this bill are practically the same as the policies set forth in the law that was passed by the Eightieth Congress, when the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] was chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the

House, and sponsored the bill in the House. There is no substantial difference in the policies.

Next, may I invite your attention to the fact that this bill is not opposed by the trade. Further, especially, I desire to invite your attention to the fact that no one has criticized the administration of this law, either present laws or the laws before it. We have had no charges of unfairness in the past, since 1940. Why should we assume that we will not have good administration in the future?

May I invite your attention further to the amazing fact that nine-tenths of the commodities under control during the war have been decontrolled? Putting it another way, only one-tenth the number of commodities formerly under control are now under control, and it is absolutely necessary that some restraints or control be placed over these scarce and vitally essential articles and commodities.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. During the war there were something over 3,000 items under control. Today a little less than 386 commodities are under control.

Mr. PATMAN. That is right; about 10 percent.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Did the gentleman say there has been no criticism of the administration of this act?

Mr. PATMAN. That is right; no criticism has been urged. That is, I mean, no charges of unfair administration. The trade is in favor of it.

Mr. SADOWSKI. None of the exporting or importing companies have criticized the administration of it?

Mr. PATMAN. No; not one.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I have heard and I have received quite a few protests about the administration of the law.

Mr. PATMAN. I am just talking about the testimony before our committee. That is all I have to go by.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I have received and I believe other Members of Congress have received, protests about the administration of the export-import controls.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is giving me the first information I have had on it. I am talking about the information we had before the Committee, the only information I had to rely upon.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I could cite to the gentleman one particular instance.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not want to yield for that purpose right now, if you please; because I am talking about the testimony before the committee and we had a number of witnesses. The trade did not oppose it. There was no criticism of the administration.

REA

There is one group in this country that is vitally interested in the passage of this bill; they are the REA's. More than 600 Rural Electrification Administration cooperatives are vitally interested in the passage of this law. They know that if there is not some control their opportunity to get valuable conductor for electricity will be greatly limited. With proper export control and screening the applications that only permit that to go out of the country that is absolutely necessary, the REA's will get more conductor for electricity. So every REA in this Nation, every one, is vitally interested in the passage of this law.

SMALL BUSINESS

Another group is a small business group. They know that if too much of these scarce items, articles of trade, go outside of the country that the opportunity for small business to get an adequate share of these items will be greatly reduced. The big man can look after himself; he will get plenty through reciprocal trading with the other big concerns of the Nation; he does not want for scarce materials or items; each supplies the other. But it is different with the small businessman. He is the fellow who is first hit when we send out of the country these scarce materials that are needed here to supply the needs of small business. So there are two groups vitally interested in the passage of this law, not weakened like the gentleman from Michigan said, but with good enforcement provisions in it as well. Let me give you an illustration of a law that was passed by the Eightieth Congress that will demonstrate to you why no weak law should ever be passed. If you are going to do anything, do it right with the right kind of provisions for enforcement: The Rent Control Act of 1947, passed during the Eightieth Congress. It gave the tenants no security at all. Oh, the tenant had the right to sue for treble damages, but if he did the landlord had many ways he could evict him; so the result was that the tenant would not dare sue for treble damages, the tenants would not dare resist the landlords if they demanded an increase of 25 or 50 percent. They gladly and willingly paid because they knew they could be evicted under that law. Tenants all over the Nation have paid these illegal rents and the landlords have accepted them. I believe it runs into millions of cases. The law has been generally disregarded for the reason that the tenant has no adequate security if he refused to pay the rent or if he attempted to sue for damages to get it back. He would be put out instantly.

If we vote for a strict and rigid rent-control law it will have the effect not only of rolling rents back but protecting the tenants. You will remember in those illegal cases the awful time we had in the old OPA days. There was no satisfactory way of doing it. So by reason of that weak rent control law we are now called upon to vote not only to roll the rents back in those millions of cases but to arm that tenant with security. He will go to the courts of the country and sue the landlords for treble damages for the past year. He will then be secure. At the present time he is not. That is the result of a weak law not enforced and no adequate means to enforce it. If we are going to have a law let us have one that can be enforced and enforced right.

Much has been said here that the Secretary of Commerce should not be the one to enforce the law. Why, the Eighteith Congress wrote that into the act. It was never there before. Under the law passed by the Eightieth Congress the enforcement of the act was not restricted as it is in this bill to one designated by the President, a department, agency, or official of the Government. Under the old law he could even appoint a clerk or a citizen, one who had never taken the oath and probably would not be required to take it. This restricts it to officials of our Government. So this is a restriction rather than a loose phrase as appears in the existing law.

There are three main provisions in this new bill that will amend existing law which I think are vital.

First, it provides for consultation with industry. When the first OPA bill came up we spent 4 months examining witnesses and interrogating witnesses about price control, four long months, sometimes in the night as well as in the day. At that time I had the privilege of offering the first amendment requiring consultation with industry and that went into the original OPA act. Heretofore, we have not had a compulsory consultation with industry and trade in this law, but our committee in bringing this bill out this time requires it by a provisional on page 3. It is a good one and will protect your REA's and your small businesses and other people who are not a part of the big business interests of our Nation. It protects small business.

The second concerns violations. Heretofore it has been difficult to enforce the law because the penalty was such that a grand jury indictment was necessary before you could proceed in the courts. This changes the penalty so that an information can be filed by the United States district attorney and therefore there should be no delay in the enforcement of the provisions of this act.

Those two provisions are vital—consultation with industry and the penalty provisions changed so that the law can be enforced without being cumbersome as has been the case in the past.

The third is permitting enforcement. They have been hamstrung in the enforcement of this act because they did not have power to go behind the fronts and see who was really making the application for permit. They could not go back and see the people behind him, they could not examine books and papers. This bill, if enacted into law, will give them the enforcement weapons and vehicles that any law-enforcement officer needs in order to adequately enforce a law. It is the usual and customary provision in a law that you really want to enforce. Now, if you want to do it like the Rent Control Act and just make it so weak that it cannot be enforced, just take the teeth out of this provision as stated by the gentleman from Michigan. But, I do not believe that the Members of this House want to do that.

You want a law that can be enforced, and adequately and properly enforced.

The steel situation in this country is still a critical one. We do not have enough steel. We lack 10,000,000 tons of steel this year for maximum employment and production. Do you not think that we should have somebody to carefully screen these applications for export of steel to make sure that it is absolutely necessary that it be exported or that it not be exported at all?

The same is true as to copper, zinc, lead, tin, and aluminum, and especially aluminum that the REA is using now as a conductor.

Then there are certain items of food.

Textiles, I believe, have been taken off the positive list. An item on the positive list is one where it can be exported without a permit to all countries in the world except the R countries, the Russian countries; that is, Russia, her satellites and European countries. They remain on the R list after they have been taken off the positive list, and they should remain there, depending whether or not they can be used for military purposes. That is the object of it.

Some building materials are still critical and we should carefully screen certain items before we permit them to be exported.

The next is petroleum. We have plenty of petroleum now, and that is not a problem, but with certain chemicals and drugs and fertilizers there is. We have some fertilizer that is in supply, but most of the fertilizer generally used in this country is scarce. Certainly we should screen the exportation of fertilizer.

Machinery and equipment and other vital items should be screened in the same way and manner.

Insofar as this bill being a pattern for a socialist state, I notice that the main lobbying organizations now, the National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, and the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., and those big groups that spend more money, each one of them, for propaganda, than either the Democratic or the Republican Parties spend, are trying to sell the slogan to the American people, "socialism, socialist government, trying to change our form of Government under Mr. Truman." Well, you know, it is an old trick to use a slogan or word like "socialism" or "communism" or "end of free enterprise" when they know it will take some time and logic and reason to answer such a slogan and word as used.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. That is an old trick. There is no socialism in this administration. It is in the direction against socialism. I will tell you the direction of socialism in this country, and that is monopoly, concentration of wealth, getting units of an industry all in one package. That is a sure step to Government ownership. They are your socialists. This Government is trying to save our country from socialism, and it is strange that the people who are crying out socialism against this administration never raise their voices to the extent of saying that they are against monopoly. They are not fighting monopoly or concentration of wealth; never a word from them along that line.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WHITE of California. I want to make what appears to me a helpful observation in that philosophy, if I may. I notice the gentlemen who cry "Regulated economy" all the while never object when they have a regulation enacted that suits them. For instance, I refer to regulation W of the Federal Reserve Board, which regulates the credit of the little man in this country to suit big business.

Mr. PATMAN. That is right.

Mr. WHITE of California. Regulation W regulates the credit of the country in a way, which suits those gentlemen who ordinarily do not like regulation. They do not complain about that.

Mr. PATMAN. That is right.

Mr. WHITE of California. They do not call that regulation.

Mr. PATMAN. And that same Federal Reserve Board has almost wrecked our country two or three times.

Mr. WHITE of California. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. PATMAN. In 1932, when the banks and the railroads and the insurance companies convinced the then Administration that an RFC should be passed, it was confined only to those three. Remember that. Banks, railroads and insurance companies; and when the RFC opened its doors the first morning, who was down there with hat in hand to get the first money? The biggest bankers and managers of industry and commerce in our Nation. When we put out billions of dollars to them it was all right, there was no socialism there then, no, not at all, but when you come around helping the little fellows, as we did after the Democrats came into power, we changed that RFC act, we enlarged it, and we changed its powers to help the little fellow. Then they began to say socialism.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LYLE. As I understand the gentleman, the main purpose of this legislation and the necessity for it is to protect the American consumer and American business against the shortages that might result from an unregulated export because of high prices and various other things.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. LYLE. Second, the purpose is to protect our foreign policy so that we may have some control over the geographic distribution of our exports.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is correct. That policy was stated in the bill passed by the Eightieth Congress and it is the policy that is stated in this bill.

Mr. LYLE. Have the investigations of the gentleman's committee convinced him that these restrictions are necessary?

Mr. PATMAN. They are necessary as long as materials are in short supply, like the materials needed by the Rural Electrification Administration and small business groups generally.

Mr. LYLE. Do you automatically decontrol those items when they are no longer in short supply?

Mr. PATMAN. They will be decontrolled by the President, as heretofore. As evidence, he has decontrolled nine-tenths of them. Only one-tenth remains.

Mr. LYLE. It may then be that long before this statute has expired there will be no controls at all?

Mr. PATMAN. That is right; it is possible.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the bill is passed as is, and that none of these devastating, destructive amendments are adopted.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. The Secretary of Commerce did not decontrol fats and oils, did he?

Mr. PATMAN. He was getting to it as rapidly as possible. Does not the gentleman believe he would have been doing the owners of fats and oils and the producers a great injustice to decontrol them if they did not have a market for them? They had to release the supplies as the ECA money was available to the countries that would take them. Suppose he had thrown all that supply on the market at one time, there is no way of telling how far the market would have gone down and ruined the producers. It would have hurt them much more. They were looking at it from that standpoint all the time, too. They were decontrolling it just as fast as the market could take it, which was in the interest of the producers in this country. When they reach the point where they can take the controls off entirely, as they have done with nine-tenths of the commodities, they take them off.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Is it not true that when they did not do it it cost every householder in this country a great deal more money for pork and beef, because of the fact that they had to sell their fats and oils half again as cheap as they could produce them?

Mr. PATMAN. I would have to study that statement a little bit before I would agree or disagree with the gentleman.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Will the gentleman comment upon his statement about monopolies, with reference to the application of this bill, because this bill does permit a Government monopoly, giving certain individuals a privilege to export, a privilege to do business, when other individuals are denied that privilege.

Mr. PATMAN. Certainly, that is right, just as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in 1932 had the power to deal with certain individuals—individuals who made application. The Department here will deal with individuals

who make application, just like under the administration of every law. Certainly there will be no discrimination because none has been pointed out so far.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. There is a decided discrimination between individuals who apply.

Mr. PATMAN. I hope the bill is passed as it is, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE].

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, I feel that the membership of the House should recognize the splendid talents of the chairman of our committee. I have never observed any individual who is fairer to witnesses and who makes a greater effort to hear all of the evidence, as was true during the hearings on this legislation.

The reason I take this time is to point out that I feel not enough time was given to one very important feature involved in this particular legislation during the hearings, and that concerns export controls on critical and strategic materials which we must try to bring together in this country for stock piling for our national defense.

I shall extend my remarks bearing upon these critical materials that we are trying to stock pile in this country. I call briefly to the attention of the House that among the mining operations being supported at the present time under this particular program is a Chilean copper mine, the largest mine in the world, where virtually all of the production from that mine moves into the United States because of the extreme shortage in this country. There are bauxite operations in Trinidad, the entire output of which comes into the United States.

There is a chrome ore concentrating plant in Turkey, the output of which is under contract to the Federal Bureau of Supply. The stock-pile reserve of these materials is still critically short, and unless this legislation is passed without crippling amendments we can render a great disservice to our country.

The Department of Commerce, through its administration of export controls, is very much concerned with protecting the United States position with respect to critical and strategic materials. In general, export controls are used in two ways for this purpose; in the first place, they are used to limit exports of such materials from the United States; and secondly, they are used to channel exports of other essential supplies to certain mining and production operations in foreign countries upon which the United States depends for imports of critical and strategic materials.

The nonferrous metals—copper, zinc, lead, tin, and aluminum—all of which are in short supply in the United States, are subject to individual export licensing control to all destinations. The worldwide scarcity, the immediate needs of the strategic stock pile, the expanded military programs, the high level of domestic industrial activity, and continued foreign demands, all indicate that the shortage of these materials will not be overcome in the near future and will have to be controlled for export.

The increasing pressure on our supplies of these metals during 1948 was reflected in a tightening of export controls. Aluminum plate, sheet and strip were all added to the list of items controlled for export—so-called positive list—in August 1948 because of rapidly expanding domestic demand and a relatively high level of exports. The quotas which have been established for aluminum will result in a sharp decrease in the rate of exports during this year. Quotas for other nonferrous metals are also being reduced.

The United States has become increasingly dependent on foreign sources to meet a large portion of its nonferrous metal requirements. The high level of consumption during the war and in the postwar period has increased this dependence. In recognition of our reliance on imports for these basic metals, the Department of Commerce has made special efforts to stimulate foreign production and increase the volume of shipments to the United States.

Some special operations and activities in foreign countries are directly or indirectly of such high importance to the United States that they receive special attention in the licensing of scarce materials. In many of these cases, supplies obtained from the United States are used for production of strategic, critical, and essential materials for export to this country, or to other countries which would otherwise require such materials from the United States. In others, such as the maintenance of certain railway systems or power-generating plants, the purpose is to provide at least a minimum degree of support to the basic utilities and facilities of countries chiefly or entirely dependent upon us for needed supplies. In still others we are supporting various construction programs essential to public health in the countries involved.

The issuance of a special project license for such operations and activities does not constitute a commitment to meet all of their requirements for controlled materials. What it does mean is that, in view of the special nature of the projects, applicants submit their requirements for all materials under export control on a single form. This eases the administrative burden on the operating companies as well as on the Government, and permits a unified review of these requirements by licensing officials.

Among the mining operations being supported at the present time are a Chilean copper mine, the largest in the world, virtually all the production of which moves to the United States; bauxite operations in Surinam and Trinidad, the entire output of which comes to the United States; and a chrome-ore concentrating plant in Turkey, the output of which is under contract to the Federal Bureau of Supply, the stock-pile purchasing agency of the United States Government.

Much of the copper, lead, and zinc reaching this country from abroad is produced in mines which depend upon the United States for most or all of their material requirements. Tin production in Bolivia, which accounts for about one-third of our total imports, is also supported by materials received under project licenses. Other important metals, produced for shipment to the United States in approved projects abroad, include vanadium, cadmium, tantalum, tungsten, silver, fluorspar, chrome, high-grade iron ore, and bauxite. United States requirements for these metals, both to meet domestic demands and to add to our strategic stock pile, are at record levels. Imports furnish approximately one-third of our primary supplies of copper, lead, and zinc, and 100 percent of our primary tin supply.

In the case of bauxite, imports account for about 60 percent of United States supply. There are two large bauxite production operations in Surinam, and one in the Netherlands East Indies, which are being supported by the United States. The Federal Bureau of Supply has placed orders with these three projects calling for delivery of large quantities for the bauxite stock pile.

As an auxiliary to the bauxite production in Surinam, a recently qualified project covers the installation of an ore transfer station at Trinidad. This project will permit adequate transfer of ore from shallow draft to seagoing vessels.

Another major project under way involves the mining, transportation, and loading of high-grade iron ore in Venezuela. This ore will have an iron content of about 65 percent compared to 51 percent for the ore now being shipped from the Mesabi-Great Lakes region of the United States. This project will require large quantities of steel products in the next three quarters. If these requirements can be met, it is expected that iron ore will begin moving to the United States from Venezuela by mid-1949 at the rate of 2,000,000 tons a year, representing a substantial increase in the United States supply.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Can the gentleman tell us how export controls and exports would have anything to do with imports of copper from Chile?

Mr. DEANE. As I understand the program, the advisory boards advising with the departmental organizations directing the program enter into conference to determine the extent to which it is necessary to control the export of critical materials in short supply.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. The gentleman is speaking of imports of copper and other strategic metals from foreign countries, particularly South America. I cannot understand and I wish he would explain how export controls on exports from this country would have anything to do with the importation of these critical materials from those foreign countries.

Mr. DEANE. The gentleman is asking a good question and it is involved in this discussion. We are in the import business to the extent indicated because we simply do not have these critical materials. But I contend this legislation will protect the important stockpile of these critical materials which are necessary for our national defense program, and the bill should pass without amendments.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee; I am sure that in the remarks made by the gentleman from Michigan, the former chairman of this committee, there are a number of items that certainly ought to be clarified before we go into the reading of the bill and the discussion of the amendments that he has suggested he may offer.

In regard to that phase, in carrying out the purposes of export controls, a number of criteria or standards have had to be established for the approval or disapproval of export applications. The problem varies completely with each important commodity. Experience has shown that there must be permitted certain administrative flexibility in determining the proper criteria to meet the changing supply and market conditions, as well as the current foreign policy and national security objectives. So it is not too easy to lay down a rule.

Experiences in carrying out the provisions of this act by the Department have led us to the point where, in asking for a continuation of this act, certain specific language should be inserted, not with the object of putting the clamps down, but to spell out a little more clearly so that everyone who is an applicant, everyone who is eligible to apply for an export license, may know more clearly just what the rules are and whether or not he is getting a fair deal under the provisions of the act. An illustration to this effect is the requirement in respect to some commodities, that the applicant present proof that the goods are available to him for shipment, if the license is granted. They should be in the nature of certain enforcement purposes, so that they may help to prevent trafficking in licenses, and speculation by license holders. That experience, the Department has had some dealings with. There have been charges and accusations made that the end-use provisions were not being carried out, as well as waste through failure to use all of the limited export quotas because a great many of these allocations were not being taken up. So it has been necessary, in presenting a continuation of this measure, to spell out and clarify, and to write into the act a new section, section 4, dealing with the enforcement provisions; dealing with the provisions of consultation and standards, so that the Department may have a basis or objective other than that which has been in the act at the present time. These matters are very pertinent to a successful operation of a control act of this character.

Another is in the distribution of export quotas among the eligible or qualified applicants. This problem arises when the total quantity of a commodity which can be spared for export is substantially less than the total of qualified applications therefor. Prorating limited export quotas equally among all applicants is not a practical or equitable solution to this problem. It would result in allotting to each applicant very small amounts, which could not usually be shipped economically. It would also be manifestly unfair to establish firms with long records of supplying a major portion of the markets, to deny them export quotas. So it is necessary to carry out the language in that respect.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Is not that the very thing that creates a market and creates prices? If there is competition by these exporters, and one bids above the other, does that not make the price?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Of course, bidding in foreign exchange is different than that insofar as the domestic economy is concerned. I am speaking with reference to large-scale exports.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Does not the scheme that the gentleman has outlined operate as a price-fixing control?

Mr. BUCHANAN. In some instances it might get down to that particular point, where it will have some effect upon the price.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. If we deny one applicant this license, naturally he is eliminated from the market, and his price does not establish the price of the goods.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Of course, as the gentleman understands, the quotas are set and applications are administered in an attempt to be fair and equitable to all concerned.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Is the gentleman cognizant of the press reports of the discriminations and frauds that have been practiced under the provisions of this act in the export business?

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is why we are asking for a spelling out of clarifying language as far as the enforcement provisions of the act are concerned. That is why there may be some objections and some amendments, because the administration is concerned to see to it that the provisions are carried out and the end use of the product reaches the destination which it was intended to.

(Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an inquiry?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. May I preface my inquiry by stating that I am in full accord with export control of materials in short supply. I am also in full accord with conferring the power on the President. With this in mind, I am concerned in knowing whether the materials that we are here trying to conserve may not be exported under the power which we some days ago conferred upon the President by the provisions of the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I may answer the gentleman by saying that there is no direct relationship between the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and the Export Control Act. The reciprocal trade agreements are entered into on a bilateral basis. In the case of the enforcement of the Trade Agreements Act, if it concerns goods in scarce supply they would be regulated under the terms and provisions of the Export Control Act. Cognizance is taken of the existing scarce materials at the time these trade agreements are entered into. In this connection it is interesting to note that in the next 2 or 3 months hearings will be held in continuation of previously existing agreements; and of course at that time, at the time of those hearings, at the time of the consultations for further agreements, these items listed on which export controls are necessary will be taken into consideration.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. To the extent that export controls are used, is it not in direct opposition to the intent of the reciprocal trade agreements program which is principally to lessen the barriers to international trade?

Mr. BUCHANAN. No; I may say to the gentleman, it will augment, supplement, and carry through the successful negotiation.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. The State Department approved the bill. It will not interfere with the reciprocal trade agreements in any way. We cleared everything through the State Department.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time on our side.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Export Control Act of 1949."

FINDINGS

(a) Certain materials continue in short supply at home and abroad so that the quantity of United States exports and their distribution among importing countries affect the welfare of the domestic economy and have an important bearing upon the fulfillment of the foreign policy of the United States.

(b) The unrestricted export of materials without regard to their potential military significance may affect the national security.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: Strike out all after the enacting clause and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"Section 6 (d) of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended, is amended by striking out 'February 28, 1949,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'February 28, 1950.'

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President in the exercise of the powers, authority, and discretion conferred upon him by the act of July 2, 1940, as amended, is authorized to use price criteria in the licensing of exports, either by giving preference among otherwise comparable applications to those which provide for the lowest prices, or, in exceptional circumstances, by fixing reasonable mark-ups in export prices over domestic prices."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, this is offered in substitution of the whole bill and, if adopted, will continue for 1 year export controls exactly as they are at the present time. It will also be noted that in the substitute provision is made for continuance of the authority to use price criteria in determining to whom these licenses should be granted.

Let me reiterate that this law has been in effect since 1940. An export-control program has been necessary and I believe it is desirable to continue export controls as they now exist for what might be considered a reasonable length of time. Probably a year is a reasonable length of time. I wish we might make that shorter because it is our intention, as expressed in a great many acts of Congress, to remove controls just as rapidly as they can be removed and with as little shock to the domestic economy as is possible. So it is advisable to continue export controls until the international situation adjusts itself and we have more stability in international markets than we have at the present time.

If the controls which are requested in the pending bill were necessary to the effective enforcement of the act, of course, someone during the last 7 years would have asked the Congress to expand the export-control powers, during these years. The war is over. It has been 3½ years now since cessation of hostilities. We have expended $5,000,000,000 or will have expended $5,000,000,000 to aid in the rehabilitation of western European countries. We have invested over $2,800,000,000 in a stabilization program for Great Britain and we see a great many favorable results from the investment of those funds in world stability. So we should be thinking of terminating export controls instead of expanding them, the same as we have been thinking since cessation of hostilities that it is better to take these controls off if we are going to preserve the American free-enterprise system than to add to them and add to the uncertainty of the situation.

Already we are catching up with demand in many fields in the United States. We are told that in the leather industry, in the textile industry, in the radio industry, and in certain branches of agriculture we have virtually saturated the markets. Let me make this statement to provoke thought, that with our tremendous capacity to produce in America, were it not for our exports we could not long preserve the American standard of living.

So we must readjust our sights and think in terms of expanding markets for American goods abroad above the normal demand, and we should give encouragement to the production of American goods to meet foreign demands, and there should be no unusual restrictions upon domestic production. It is necessary to meet foreign demands, it is necessary to find new markets abroad for American goods if we are to maintain the American standard of living.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, the purpose of this amendment in striking out all after the enacting clause is to destroy the careful work of the Committee on Banking and Currency in trying to rewrite an old wartime law which has been many, many times amended and changed during the course of years that it was on the books to deal with varied degrees of national emergency and circumstance.

I think the committee did a very good job in bringing out a rewrite of this bill to protect the security and the economy of the United States of America against danger of over exportation of scarce items. It provides a modern version of what is needed in an export control law in the light of postwar experience, based carefully on hearings by the Committee on Banking and Currency and on testimony before us by all interested parties who cared to appear.

The gentleman from Michigan, whose committee under his chairmanship reported a bill designed to effectuate largely the same purposes which this bill seeks to accomplish, does not like the product of this committee's work.

On that he is entitled to have his say, but I think it would be much fairer to the House, it would increase the understanding more of the House, if he would take the bill, as I am sure he intends to do when his amendment this time to strike all after the enacting clause is defeated, and then introduce his separate and individual amendment, to change the specific and individual portions of this bill which he has objection to.

I think the House can vote much clearer upon these specific individual objections of the gentleman from Michigan than we can in taking a wrapped-up package containing six or eight important changes.

I tried to follow during the course of his argument here under general debate the extent of his amendments but I am not certain, even with the experience of the hearings that I have had, that I clearly understand them all.

So, in the interest of good legislative procedure, in the interest of the House being well informed, I think we should vote down this catch-all amendment to strike everything after the enacting clause. We want to enact a bill with due regard to whether it contains the necessary improvements that are dictated by the light of experience and trial and error that I believe this bill provides.

I do not think anyone can question the value that export controls, properly operated and properly handled in an administrative way, have to the security, and to the economy of the United States.

One of the greatest problems we had when we had the Marshall plan before us was the fear largely by many members of the gentleman's own party that we would ruin this Nation's economy because of unregulated exportation of goods in short supply.

Constantly I have heard on the floor of this House the fears that we will export to Russia or to Communist-dominated countries matériel which would be helpful to them in making war against the democracy of this Nation.

Members of the House, the sole purpose of this bill is to protect the security and economy of the United States of America. It seeks to help make the Marshall plan work in the recovery of Europe without devastating our own economy by exporting materials in short supply. We cannot afford to turn to a haphazard system where the highest bidder can withdraw from our American market goods in extremely scarce supply and remain on an even economic keel.

So until we get greater production and a greater abundance of those scarce materials—and this bill applies only to materials in scarce supply—I think you will need adequate export controls.

I think it would be a shame indeed to waste the time of the great Committee on Banking and Currency and the time of the men who have handled this export control so satisfactorily that there were no witnesses appearing before the committee to challenge their work.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman state that this bill can apply only to materials in short supply?

Mr. MONRONEY. It certainly does apply to materials only in short supply or to a war-making end use.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman state that if we have a long supply of any given product in this country the administration cannot impose an export control thereon?

Mr. MONRONEY. It cannot under the terms of this bill. If the gentleman will read the bill, he will find that it is properly guarded in the terms of this bill. No amount of seeing ghosts under the bed, no amount of casting suspicion, can remove the fact that this bill is designed to apply only to items in scarce supply or those which might be useful for war purposes in Communist-dominated countries.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this bill does give the administration the power, based upon the findings of the President, to impose export quotas not alone upon materials which are necessary to our national defense, not alone upon materials in which we are in short supply, but upon any other exportable commodities or products of our industries, regardless of their nonstrategic importance, and even though in great oversupply.

I have read the bill, and certainly do not accord with the interpretation of the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma. I find nothing in the bill which puts a limitation upon the findings of the President. Any findings he makes would justify within the terms of this bill export quotas upon any product of our industry.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman is absolutely correct. There is nothing in the bill which limits the control of exports to goods in short supply. The gentleman from Iowa in committee offered

an amendment to the bill restricting the operation of these controls in cases where goods are in surplus. I think probably the gentleman from Oklahoma is confusing the debate on that amendment with the general provisions of this bill, because at no time since 1940 have there been any restrictions whatsoever upon the commodities upon which the President could levy export controls.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman. Certainly, it seems to me that in this day of our expanding production at home we should not, 3½ years after the close of the war, grant new and greater powers to the Executive, to control our industries' sales.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. TALLE. If the law had been administered in such a manner as to prevent the piling up of surpluses of exportable goods in this country, I would not have gone to the trouble of preparing a speech on that very point. The law has not been so administered. That was the burden of my message in general debate, and that is why I stated I would offer an amendment which is identical with an amendment enacted in the Senate. The House bill and the Senate bill are identical, except that the latter contains an amendment which I stated at the outset of general debate I would offer, so that agricultural products including fats and oils, might get proper consideration.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman's answer is indeed complete. We do have an exportable surplus of fats and oils, yet the quota is applied today, thereby contradicting the gentleman from Oklahoma's interpretation.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. Although fats and oils are taken off the positive list, they remain on the R list, that is, they cannot be exported to Russia or any of her satellite countries without a permit under this law. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. It is. For strategic and military reasons. Last week we saw fit to endorse the activities of our State Department and our Government under the so-called reciprocal-trade-agreements policy with respect to international trade. The principal purpose of that bill, as it has been described to us repeatedly in years past, has been to break down the barriers to trade that exist between the many nations of the world.

After these 14 or 15 years of so-called progress under the reciprocal-trade-agreements program we find ourselves today in a situation where among all the nations of the world there are more restrictions by way of quotas and all kinds of artificial procedures to limit the free interchange of trade. We have more restrictions today than we ever had when the old tariff laws were in effect.

Now the United States Government, which has been the leader of reciprocity in foreign trade, at a time when the war is over, seeks to impose a new barrier against free trade. We find ourselves passing a law today which gives our Government the power to stop the export of any and all products of our industries to any and all nations of the world. Gentlemen, that is not consistent with what we did last week.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON] has expired.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, it has been stated by the gentleman from Texas that edible oils are now on the R list. The restrictions have been taken off as far as the positive list is concerned. That means that edible oils may be sent to the so-called satellite countries, providing certain conditions are met. Just how does that work? Let us see what happens. Last summer Poland was short of cotton. The Polish mills at Lodz were standing idle for 6 weeks. They could not get American cotton. They had to shop all over the world to get some cotton. We had cotton in great supply. The Polish Nation finally obtained American cotton from England. How? By paying 30 percent more than they should have paid if they could have purchased it directly from us and as they should have been able to purchase that cotton directly, since the cotton was used to make overalls and make clothing for children and the people generally. Oil is going to be placed on the same list. Sure, they will be able to buy it. They will need oil, say, in Czechoslovakia, Poland and Yugoslavia. They are behind the iron curtain. They are satellite countries. These products are on the R list, but before you can get an export license here to get even those things that are in short supply and which are not commodities that would be used in war, those restrictions are so great that it is impossible for you to get them in the normal and natural course of business.

So those countries will just have to go to our European brokers, England, Italy, and Belgium. They will have to go to these European countries. They will have to go to our brokers to buy these commodities. What a silly situation for America to be in. It is repugnant to me to see our business being carried on on that sort of basis. I voted for these controls and supported them all the way through during the war. I thought they were necessary. But now the war is over. Sometime we are going to do business on a business basis. Sometime we are going to go out in the world to recapture our own markets and we are not going to be dependent upon England or any other country to say, "You cannot do business with this or that country directly, but I will act as your broker."

I have a great suspicion that somebody is making a lot of money when you have an overage of 30 percent commission that is being paid by these countries in eastern Europe, to buy our goods. Someone is making an awful lot of profit and I think it is an illegitimate profit. I think that business could be carried on directly between the United States and the other countries of Europe which need these commodities.

Let me mention the matter of streptomycin, which is used in the cure of tuberculosis. There is a terrible amount of tuberculosis in Poland which was caused by the war. Poland has seven times as much tuberculosis as they normally have or seven times as great as we have in this country. They need that medicine. I was amazed to find that you must get a permit to ship streptomycin to the people in Poland in order to help them combat the dread disease of tuberculosis.

Some of these restrictions are cruel and inhuman. It is all right to have controls in wartime. It is all right to have controls to protect the national security, but to have such silly controls as we are now permitting the Department to use does not make any sense.

I now yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman would not think of sending munitions of war to Russia?

Mr. SADOWSKI. No.

Mr. PATMAN. Cotton is used to make gunpowder. Gunpowder is used in war.

Mr. SADOWSKI. They wanted this cotton to make overalls and to make clothes for the people of Poland to wear. Their textile mills were closed for 6 weeks.

Mr. PATMAN. But they could make gunpowder out of it.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Well, they did get the cotton. They got it from South America, from Argentina, and from Mexico, and they did not make gunpowder with it. I was told that they will keep on buying cotton there, and we can keep on selling our cotton to England and a few ECA countries in the future. That is not good business for the United States and we cannot do business forever on taxpayers' dollars, with ECA countries only. We should be able to sell our cotton wherever we want to, without using Great Britain as our broker, or any other foreign country.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SADOWSKI. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Is not the gentleman pointing out the very difficulties that are attendant on peacetime economy controls?

Mr. SADOWSKI. Yes. I say we should have controls for the national security, but controls over normal business to be used for the purpose of giving an advantage to foreign brokers and speculators as a result of those controls is un-American. We are subsidizing international thievery and bringing discredit to American business.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI] has expired.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I can well understand the necessity for some export controls at the present time, but it does seem to me that this bill should give us some concern.

I must say I am not altogether clear as to why a bill of this kind emanates

from the Committee on Banking and Currency, because it relates primarily to exports. Certainly, I should think that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce might have something to say about legislation of this kind. I refer to rule XI (k), which gives that committee jurisdiction over foreign commerce generally and over bills relating to the Department of Commerce. The only justification for the reference of this bill appears to be the error in the reference of preceding bills.

Last year the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce did hold some hearings on the actual operation of export control legislation. I can assure you that no more interesting hearings were held before that committee or more revealing, or I might say more disturbing. It seems to me quite apparent that export controls can be very arbitrarily and tyrannically employed in two ways. First, internally, with respect to individual American exporting corporations, or corporations that would like to export: It is possible for a governmental agent, the Secretary of Commerce, to play favorites in all kinds of most subtle ways, and to do great mischief without any relief being afforded to the injured parties.

It is also perfectly possible to employ export controls to nations which are singularly dependent upon our economy, in such a way as to coerce them to do this, that, or the other thing, even in the General Assembly of the United Nations. I have even heard whispers of something of that sort having occurred.

When you get to such very broad powers as are found in section 6 of this act and section 7, which I do not understand—I do not understand why the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act should be excepted from this bill—I am very troubled. I would not vote for a bill which had in it any such sections as 6 and 7.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. The gentleman touched upon the subject I was going to mention in asking the gentleman to yield; that is, the provision in this bill which calls for the exemption from these controls of the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act. With that paragraph in this bill it seems to me that we have done nothing more than give practically an unlimited blanket authority for the control of exports. But if the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act, as was so clearly brought out in the hearings before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, if those provisions were followed, if the Administrative Procedure Act were followed, then many of the objections that we find to the pending bill might be removed. The paragraph exempting a perfectly good law passed in 1946 completely removes the restrictions from the administration of this particular act.

Mr. HALE. I think the gentleman is entirely correct.

I was quite amazed by the statement earlier this afternoon of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] that he had heard no criticism of the actual operation of the present law. I should be very glad indeed to show him a copy of the hearings last spring before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Section 6 relates to enforcement. I cannot understand why the gentleman would be opposed to the effective enforcement of the law. This provision deals with black marketeers. If you want a good law and want to abolish the black market and punish the black marketeers, the only way to do it is through the provisions of section 6, according to my mind.

Mr. HALE. If the gentleman thinks that the powers contained in the last sentence of section 6 (a), in subsection (b), and subsection (c) are normal and salutary powers, I just cannot follow him in any degree. On the contrary, they are sections which confer arbitrary and oppressive power on any department, agency, or official exercising functions under the act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOLCOTT) there were—ayes 73, noes 98.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that it is the policy of the United States to use export controls to the extent necessary (a) to protect the domestic economy from the excessive drain of scarce materials and to reduce the inflationary impact of abnormal foreign demand; (b) to further the foreign policy of the United States and fulfill its international responsibilities; and (c) to exercise the necessary vigilance over exports from the standpoint of their significance to the national security.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 9, strike out the word "fulfill" and insert in lieu thereof "to aid in fulfilling."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word in reference to the shortage of nitrogenous fertilizers in the southwestern part of the United States. I dare say there is not a Representative from any rural area who does not have similar problems to what confront us in the southwestern part of this country.

Mr. Chairman, during the course of the early winter, I received many appeals from farmers for help in obtaining the customary allocations of nitrogen fertilizers needed on the farm. These appeals came from many sources, but I can recall that one appeal came from the Department of Agriculture's Production and Marketing Administration committee. This appeal is so strongly worded that I am setting it forth in detail at this point in my remarks:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Shreveport, La., December 21, 1948.

The Caddo Parish Agricultural Conservation Association Committee at a meeting on December 12, 1948, made the following resolution:

"Whereas the shortage of nitrogen fertilizer in this area is more acute than at any time in the history of this part of the country;

"Whereas in cooperation with Congressman OVERTON BROOKS we have canvassed the distributors and fertilizer manufacturers in this area with reference to the nitrogen fertilizer available: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the Agricultural Conservation Association Committee of Caddo Parish, La.*, That we ask both public and private manufacturers of fertilizer to increase the supply of nitrogen fertilizer to at least the extent of giving the farmers in this area the supply normally available for crop production and that this fertilizer be made available immediately or in ample time for the spring crop, work on which has already begun."

BEN J. HAYGOOD, Jr.,
County Committeeman.
J. C. WILLIAMS,
County Committeeman.
NORMAN D. STEWART,
County Committeeman.
R. L. DURHAM,
Caddo Parish Administrative Officer.

Some time following this, I received a strong letter from the Caddo Parish police jury signed by T. D. Connell, Jr., making a similar appeal.

With these appeals before me, I immediately took this matter up with the Secretary of Agriculture, asking him for this study of the problem and his assistance. In due course, I received from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable A. J. Loveland, a courteous reply. I reproduce this letter herein:

FEBRUARY 3, 1949.

HON OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BROOKS: This is in reply to your letter of January 28, enclosing a letter from Mr. T. D. Connell, Jr., of Shreveport, La., and a resolution from farmers in Caddo Parish pertaining to supplies of ammonium nitrate in northern Louisiana. We also have your second letter of the same date enclosing a telegram from Lion Oil Co. on the subject.

With respect to steps which might be taken to divert supplies to the area in question, there are no governmental control or directive powers applicable to the domestic distribution of nitrogen fertilizers produced at private commercial plants. Proprietors of these plants have the responsibility for choice of market areas they serve, selection of trade channels, and quantities supplied to their customers.

Under the provisions of Public Law 793, a limited tonnage of anhydrous ammonia produced at plants operated by the Army is being distributed by the Department of Commerce to eligible producers of nitrogen materials for conversion to nitrogenous fertilizers suitable for direct application. This arrangement was effected with a view toward increasing the 1948-49 domestic supply of nitrogen for farmers.

The enclosed press release of the Department of Commerce gives details of this program for the first 3 months of 1949. Among the nitrogen producers participating in the

current distribution of the Army ammonia are the Lion Oil Co. at El Dorado, Ark., Commercial Solvents Corp. at Sterlington, La., and Mathieson Chemical Corp. at Lake Charles, La.

Sincerely yours,

A. J. LOVELAND,
Under Secretary.

In due course, I received a telegram from the Lion Oil Co., by N. H. Eason, and I set forth this telegram in detail herein:

ELDORADO, ARK., *January 25, 1949.*

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress:

Retel our production ammonium nitrate fertilizer 1948–49 curtailed approximately 15 percent under last year and approximately 30 percent under 1946–47. Supplies this material insufficient to satisfy demands throughout the southeastern and southwestern territories. We are making allotments to our customers as fairly and equitably as we know how, considering our reduced production. We regret exceedingly our inability to adequately supply your good constituents.

LION OIL CO.,
N. H. EASON.

It is obvious that this company, which normally supplies north Louisiana with much of its nitrogen fertilizer, is not producing the normal amount of ammonium nitrate. According to the telegram, the amount produced is 15 percent under last year and 30 percent under production of 1946–47. I have made similar appeals for more fertilizer for our farmers to the Phillips Fertilizer Co., of Bartlesville, Okla., and to the Spencer Fertilizer Co. The Spencer Co. has apparently withdrawn from serving its normal area in north Louisiana due to the fac that it cannot adequately take care of its customers closer home and my appeal to the Phillips Fertilizer Co. has produced no results.

While I am continuing to work upon this matter, the spring-planting season moves rapidly to an early close. Soon most of the planting will have been completed and the size and type of farm production will have been seriously affected by the failure of an adequate supply of ammonium nitrate fertilizer. I am not unmindful that this country is very short of fertilizers. I, in fact, am informed that the world is short of plant food. I know the problem of the Secretary of Agriculture is not an easy one in this emergency, and I feel that private manufacturers are producing to the limit. But the fact is, Mr. Chairman, a serious shortage exists. In north Louisiana, it is much worse than it was last year.

This bill will soon pass this House and will go to the Senate on its way to become the law of the land. It will give our Government power to control exports of nitrates and thereby make them available for our own people. In this event, the Department of Agriculture and Department of Commerce will have power to help, and I hope will lose no time in helping our farmers solve one of their greatest present problems.

Mr. Chairman, as far as nitrogen fertilizer in the southwest farm country is concerned our farmers are on starvation rations. They need assistance. If this legislation will help prevent the export of fertilizer to foreign countries at a time when we need it so desperately, it could really help our farmers in the southwestern part of the United States.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I concur in what the gentleman has said with reference to the shortage of nitrogenous fertilizer, not only in the southwest but throughout the country. The gentleman has referred to the production of nitrogen fertilizer in my own district, in my own home town, as a matter of fact, by the Lion Chemical Co., and indicated that the production of nitrogen has been reduced during the present year by 15 to 30 percent; but he failed to say that the reason for this reduction in production this year is because there is an expansion program going on at this plant; consequently it is necessary to curtail production until this expansion program is completed. At the end of this year, perhaps in September, this expansion program will be completed and it will then increase production of nitrogen fertilizer by some 35 percent at this plant.

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman has made a very valuable contribution. I might add, too, that the Lion Oil Co. is doing whatever it can to relieve this situation. As the gentleman has indicated one of the plants of the Lion Oil Co. situated in his district is undergoing extensive repairs and is closed down temporarily.

Mr. HARRIS. Not nedessary repairs; it is an expansion program adding to the production of the plant.

Mr. BROOKS. I will accept the suggestion of the gentleman. It also operates a plant in my particular district which is working to capacity, and I think the Lion Co. is doing what it can to relieve the situation. The fact is, however, during this planting season the shortage in ammonium nitrate is most acute.

I have a letter here from the Phillips Chemical Co., of Bartlesville, Okla., in which it indicates it is able to do nothing to relieve this situation either.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

AUTHORITY

SEC. 3. (a) To effectuate the policies set forth in section 2 hereof, the President may prohibit or curtail the exportation from the United States, its Territories, and possessions, of any articles, materials, or supplies, including technical data, except under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe. To the extent necessary to achieve effective enforcement of this act, such rules and regulations may apply to the financing, carriage, and other servicing of exports and the participation therein by any person.

(b) The President may delegate the power, authority, and discretion conferred upon him by this act to such departments, agencies, or officials of the Government as he may deem appropriate.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 21, strike out "carriage" and insert "transporting."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: Page 2, line 19, after the word "prescribe", strike out the remainder of lines 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair believes that that is not a proper substitute for the committee amendment. The gentleman may offer that amendment separately.

The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of Georgia: Page 3, after line 2, insert the following new subsection:

"(c) The authority conferred by this section shall not be exercised with respect to any agricultural commodity, including fats and oils, during any period for which the supply of such commodity is determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in excess of the requirements of the domestic economy, except to the extent required to effectuate the policies set forth in clause (b) or clause (c) of section 2 hereof."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. The committee will accept that amendment.

Mr. TALLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. TALLE. I followed the reading of the gentleman's amendment as closely as I could when the Clerk read it, and I find that it is identical with the amendment which I proposed in connection with my remarks in general debate and which I stated I would introduce at the proper time. It appears to me, therefore, that there is unanimous agreement and that the Brown-Talle amendment should be agreed to.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. Do I understand that the committee has accepted the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Yes, the amendment I offered. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE] stated he expected to offer the same amendment. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE] and I fully agree on the amendment.

Mr. HOEVEN. It is the same amendment that was proposed by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The same amendment as adopted by the Senate.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to learn that the Committee on Banking and Currency has agreed to accept the amendment just proposed by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN]. It is the same amendment heretofore referred to in general debate, which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE] was ready to present. No doubt the Banking and Currency Committee agreed to accept the amendment for fear that a failure to do so might jeopardize the passage of the bill.

The Committee on Agriculture, of which the gentleman from Iowa now addressing you is a member, did much to help create the favorable sentiment for the amendment in question. Taking immediate notice of the critical oil and fats situation some weeks ago, the Committee on Agriculture conferred with representatives of the Department of Agriculture, Department of Commerce, the office of Mr. Paul Hoffman, Director of ECA, and the chairman of the Inter-Agency Committee on Fats and Oils. The net result of these conferences was a resolution unanimously adopted by the Committee on Agriculture on February 8, 1949, requesting the Secretary of Commerce to immediately remove all requirements for individual licenses for exportation of edible fats and oils to any approved foreign destination. A few days later the Secretary of Commerce announced that all export controls had been removed on edible fats and oils. I think Members of Congress should know of the important part taken by the Committee on Agriculture in bringing this matter to a successful conclusion.

The farmers of Iowa have been very much concerned over the decline of lard prices, which, of course, reflects on the price of live hogs. The reason for this decline in the price of lard is the supply. The supplies of lard in cold storage on January 1, 1949, were 112,000,000 pounds as compared with a 5-year average of 105,000,000 pounds on that date. Revised Department of Agriculture estimates indicate that we will produce 683,000,000 pounds for this current quarter. Lard is a cheap source of food and is one of the best commodities the Europeans could purchase since they have a great need for animal fats. The farmers of Iowa and the country will be pleased to learn that the critical situation as it involves fats and oils has been somewhat alleviated by the action of the committee taken today in accepting the Brown-Talle amendment to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: On page 2, line 19, after "prescribe," strike out the remainder of line 19 and all of lines 20, 21, 22, and 23.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the spelling of the word "precribe" in line 19 be corrected.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment was discussed in the general debate. Attention was called to the fact that this language gives the administrators of the act some very new and unusual powers, powers that they have not had since the inception of the authority to control exports was granted to the administration in 1940.

For example, they have never had the authority heretofore to regulate the financing of exports or the transporting of exports or the servicing of exports. Understand that this authority is so broad that the participation in the financing, participation in the transporting, and participation in the servicing of exports may be controlled. I do not think as a matter of sound policy and in keeping with the American system we should at this time, any more than we did back in 1940, grant this unusual power. Servicing of exports? Servicing of financing of exports? Servicing of the transporting of exports? Very new, very far-reaching powers.

Are not you gentlemen on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce interested in the power which is being granted to this administration to service the transporting of exports carried on the railroads, the motor trucks, and in the air? I think you should be.

I think this amendment goes right to the heart of the American system. Surely if these controls were not found necessary during the war, during the preparedness period before the war, and during the 3½ years of the postwar adjustment period, they cannot by any stretch of the imagination be justified at this particular time. Herein lies the core of the argument, that we decide today whether we carry through with the American system, whether we perpetuate the system which has made America as great as it is, or whether we delegate again to the Administration, not in war but in peace, new and unusual powers such as the Chief Executive was not given even in a time of raging war. Powers by which he can control our economy. Why do you want this power? Is it to satisfy a lust, or is it necessary? Well, that question is easily answered. Surely it is not necessary or the administration would have asked for it in the 7 years during which this law has been in effect.

The gentleman from Oklahoma was just a little bit wrong when he said that this law has been amended and reamended, and so forth. This law has not been amended except once since 1940 and that was to add the provision that price criteria might be taken into consideration in the granting of export licenses. These powers are new and unusual and go to the heart of the question as to whether the American system is going to be perpetuated.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think the ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency was serious when he intimated that the majority members of the committee are lustful or seeking power or attempting to vest power where it ought not to be. The purpose of this amendment, like that which was rejected a few moments ago, is to reject export controls. If you adopt this amendment you might just as well forget about the bill. The present bill is a codification of all of the provisions now existing in various sections of the law applying to export controls. Instead of amending the various bills, we have simply taken, with but one exception, all of that and put it into one law, which you now have before you.

The policy is very plainly stated in section 2 and the authority in section 3 says in so many words "to effectuate the purposes" as set forth in section 2, which says "the President may prohibit, and curtail the exportation" of goods.

Then you come to these important words "to the extent necessary to achieve effective enforcement of this act, such rules and regulations may apply to financing, transporting, and other servicing of exports."

If you are not going to have the power to make rules and regulations so that you can enforce this act, then let us not pass it. If we are going to pass it, and I think we are, then we must have rules and regulations which will apply to every phase of exports.

In the hearings before both Houses it was brought out that the purpose of these rules and regulations will be limited to the enforcement of this act and the policy of the act is "to protect the domestic economy," "to further the foreign policy of the country," and, more important, "to exercise the necessary vigilance over exports from the standpoint of their significance to national security."

When Mr. Bell, Acting Director of the Office of International Trade, was before our committee, he was asked this question:

Do you not think it might be sufficient at this time to extend these controls, limiting them to security purposes?

Mr. Bell responded:

In our judgment we could not. There are many items in such short supply that we could not do so. In fact, the trend right here in Congress is to insist that we have been too liberal in the shipment of many items, such as steel, and so forth. The complaint has been that we have been too liberal on allocations, and that some things should be on the positive list that are not on the positive list, and there is equal pressure from domestic interests, particularly, to add things to the positive list.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. Is it not a fact that if this language is stricken, it will encourage the black market and encourage black marketeers?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, not only will it do that, but it will make the enforcement

of the act utterly impossible. If you cannot call upon the banks to give you information as to how these exports are being financed and as to whether or not the declarations on which they are borrowing money to make the shipment are in accordance with the license, how can you enforce the act? The same with transport and the same with servicing of the exports.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. The gentleman will recall that a specific instance was given to our committee, in which an export license was given for the exporting of empty bottles, and because they were unable to get the letters of credit and find out what the true transaction was, valuable material that was not proper to export was contained in the empty bottles. That is one illustration of how this new provision will be effective in carrying out the purposes of the act.

Mr. MULTER. I thank the gentleman for that valuable contribution. That is typical of why we need regulations that will apply to the financing, transporting, and servicing of these export items. The Department must be able to get all of the information relative to these transactions.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. With reference to the word "financing," of course we realize that rules and regulations are necessary but it says, "to the financing of exports." Does not the gentleman believe that is a little broad?

Mr. MULTER. It is not broad if you read together with it the beginning of the sentence, which is, "To the extent necessary to achieve effective enforcement of this act the rule may apply to financing."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOLCOTT) there were—ayes 66, noes 89.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSULTATION AND STANDARDS

SEC. 4. (a) In determining which articles, materials, or supplies shall be controlled hereunder, and in determining the extent to which exports thereof shall be limited, any department or agency making these determinations shall seek information and advice from the several executive departments and independent agencies concerned with aspects of our domestic and foreign policies and operations having an important bearing on exports.

(b) In authorizing exports, full utilization of private competitive trade channels shall be encouraged insofar as practicable, giving consideration to the interests of small business, merchant exporters as well as producers, and established and new exporters, and provision shall be made for representative trade consultation to that end. In addition, there may be applied such other standards or criteria as may be deemed necessary by the head of such department or agency to carry out the policies of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 7, strike out the word "or" after the word "department" and after the word "agency" insert "or official."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Committee amendment: Page 3, line 20, after the word "agency" insert "or official."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: On page 3, line 17, after the word "end", strike out the remainder of line 17 and all of lines 18, 19, 20, and 21.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would strike out the language on page 3, line 17, which reads as follows:

In addition there may be applied such other standards or criteria as may be deemed necessary by the head of any department, or agency, or official, to carry out the policies of this act.

I know how useless it is for me to stand up and argue under this situation, but what we are doing here today might create such uncertainty as to add to the economic dilemma in which we might find ourselves shortly. This Congress can bring on a depression; this Congress, by the creation and maintenance of uncertainty in respect to policy, can discourage the production of goods. You on the left have the responsibility. Historically, this language has been controversial since the act was first passed; historically, you have kept it out, and we helped you keep it out. By the offering of this amendment those of us on this side are merely being consistent with what this Congress has been doing under your leadership for 3 years and under Republican leadership for 2 years since 1940. Now, are you going to reverse your policy of 7 years?

Why do you ask for this power? May I propound that inquiry again? To what use are you going to put this new power? What standards are you going to set up for exports? You never asked for this authority before; what criteria are you going to say should be applied to the export of goods? What standards are you setting up in respect to the standards which the head of a department, or an agency, or an official must set up in his regulations before an export license may be granted? What standards are you setting up for the criteria which must be applied to the granting of export controls?

You have the votes. What is happening here today is almost nostalgic. From 1935 on I have been standing up here getting hoarse, pounding my head against the stone wall now for 13 years to restore to the American people the rights which are constitutionally theirs, and to prevent legislation which would deny them the freedom for which millions of young Americans have fought, and bled, and died. I am willing to carry on the fight. From the day when you tried to get control of the lifeblood of the American economy in the so-called Banking Act of 1935, we have been fighting and fighting and fighting against the socalizing of any segment of American industry; and, as far as I am concerned, the fight has just begun.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, our admiration on this side for the gentleman from Michigan is so great that no member of the committee enjoys taking issue with him, but his amendment would do great damage to the bill. I think the thing he has in mind is to knock out price criteria.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. No, I do not, because I have left that in my motion. It is in my motion to substitute.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. That is, everything but price criteria?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I have adopted all of those except price criteria and continue existing law.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I am glad to have that clarification, of course, but the gentleman will recall that in the debate last year it was made very clear that price criteria is a proper element to be considered along with other considerations. The thing I want to point out is that to adopt the language proposed by the gentleman from Michigan is to also knock out other criteria, such as the end use of the exportable commodity, the country of destination, and matters of that kind. These two criteria are just as important as price, therefore it would be fatal in many respects for his language to be adopted.

The fact of the matter is that we continue in an emergency. The gentleman from Michigan speaks as if we are adopting a permanent policy of export controls. It is sometimes said on the floor in opposition to such controls that in peacetime controls such as this should not be exerted; in other words, drawing a sharp line between war and peace, when, actually, it is not a matter of war and peace so much as a question of normalcy and emergency. Sometimes in a peace period there are emergencies which require just as drastic controls as in a war period and it is because we are determined to protect this Nation's safety that we are willing to adopt controls of this kind.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I concur in what my distinguished colleague from Arkansas has said. Further, may I point out

that this same paragraph that the gentleman from Michigan is seeking to amend provides for representative trade consultation.

In considering exports and the licensing of scarce materials you find many varying degrees and problems in each different line. If we were to limit the bill as his amendment would do only to those criteria which are spelled out definitely in the bill, then we would absolutely vacate and have for no purpose these trade consultations for which the bill provides.

Industrial help and suggestions in the proper methods and procedures for allocation of export licenses will help to prevent disastrous effects on varying lines of trade. The amendment would seriously limit any effective use of other proper criteria so suggested.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Can they do it now? Can they vitiate the criteria that the gentleman from Oklahoma speaks of now? Can they do it at this time? Of course, they can; therefore this language is not necessary unless they expect to expand it. Those are not standards they are talking about and to which the gentleman from Oklahoma referred. If anything, it is in the law now. They are using the law now in that respect and they can use it in that respect without this language.

Mr. MONRONEY. The gentleman overlooks the fact that this is an entirely rewritten law and we are trying to make it workable and make it say what we mean and provide for criteria such as these various trade organizations suggest.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. And the adoption of the gentleman's amendment would put a cloud over the exercise of those criteria.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. To demonstrate the necessity for the end-use provision that the gentleman mentioned, may I refer to cotton, which was referred to a while ago. It would be possible to export cotton for the purposes mentioned by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI], but unless you have the end-use provision there they could make gunpowder out of that cotton instead of using it for making overalls.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. A perfect illustration of the point that you need a combination of criteria at times. Cotton can be put to legitimate uses; it can also be used for the manufacture of things that conflict with our security policy.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. It says that there may be applied "such other standards"—in other words, any other standard. That is what we object to. Why do we not limit it to the standards we are talking about; for instance, end use?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. For the reason that we must in the final analysis leave the determination of specific export requests to an administrative agency. We must leave as broad discretion as possible.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. In other words, the gentleman wants to leave it as broad as possible, but we want to restrict it.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. We must have powers that are not too broad, but not too limited, as I fear the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan would give us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, just to show how broad the powers are that the Department now possesses, I want to bring to your attention one little incident. I could mention many more, but I do want to bring this one out because it illustrates positively just how great are the powers of the controlling body now on commerce and trade. They not only control exports to the greatest extent but they also control imports to an unreasonable extent.

There was a firm in Michigan last year which had purchased some obsolete rifles in England. These rifles had been sold by the British Government to some private company in England. They were war surplus, in other words. They were rifles used in the First World War. Now, this firm developed the idea whereby they could use these old rifles, rebore them, and put another sight on them and make some other improvements on this old rifle, and it could be used as a hunting rifle, such as a deer rifle, for instance. It was a splendid idea. They applied for an import license. They located a bunch of these rifles and had made a contract, and the rifles were to be shipped here. All of a sudden the import license was canceled. The firm wrote to me and asked me to intercede and find out what happened to their import license. So I went down to the Department. They said, "Well, somebody in the War Department has told us that there may be some need for these rifles, and therefore we had to cancel this import license for this firm." Lo and behold, about 4 months later I got a half page ad out of a Detroit paper that was sent to me by this same firm advertising these same rifles as deer rifles, and who do you think had the rifles? Who got them? Sears, Roebuck & Co. Well, the Michigan firm was doggone sore. They had a right to be angry.

Now, some of these manipulations are not just right. These controls just have not been exercised properly. There are so many selfish people in the world, and we have a few of them in this country, who are using these controls to their own particular advantage in order to make a profit for themselves. There is always the suspicion that by making combinations with certain people in our Government they are able to obtain export and import licenses to do business and make money at the expense of other firms. This way of doing business is not the American way, and sooner or later we are going to cut out this foolishness, and we might as well start doing it right now. It was all right to have controls during the war, when we needed it, but when we carry controls on through in peacetime and it affects legitimate business to a point where it becomes repugnant, I say it should be stopped.

I am a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I sat on that committee during long hearings last year, and we heard a great deal of testimony from business people all over the United States on exports and imports, and we have seen how these controls have worked. They have not worked right. Always came that question of somebody making a great deal of money at the expense of other people. The sooner we get rid of these controls the better off the business of the Nation will be.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOLCOTT) there were—ayes 62, noes 96.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of clarification, I should like to inquire about the provisions of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] with respect to rice. Rice is a commodity that was formerly controlled under the provisions of existing law. If I may, I will direct my interrogation to the gentleman from Georgia, a member of the committee, sponsor of the amendment, with respect to the question I had in mind. It is not clear just what this amendment that was adopted, sponsored by the gentleman from Georgia, does with respect to rice. I should like to confirm from the sponsor of the amendment, or from some member of the committee, that rice is included under the provisions of the Brown amendment, and therefore will be decontrolled.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Rice is an agricultural product. It will have the same status as other agricultural commodities. The amendment refers to agricultural commodities and includes fats and oils.

Mr. LARCADE. The gentleman takes the position that in addition to the authority given under the terms of the act for the decontrol of any commodity this specifically takes rice out of the bill, and rice is decontrolled?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I repeat that rice is treated like any other agricultural commodity under my amendment.

Mr. LARCADE. I am trying to get a definite statement from the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I think that is a definite statement.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARCADE. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. There is an international agreement on rice, is there not? How would this affect, if at all, the international agreement?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The amendment is subject to subsections (b) and (c) of section 2 of the bill, but rice still is treated like any other agricultural commodity.

Mr. HARRIS. I agree with the gentleman in his interpretation. I think he is absolutely correct. But we should not overlook the fact that it is subject to the international agreement, in which the Department of Agriculture participated, and, of course, it has the authority to make this determination.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The amendment speaks for itself just as plainly as it can. It is subject to subsections (b) and (c) of section 2.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARCADE. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WILLIS. Answering the inquiry of the gentleman, I call his attention to the language of the amendment, which, after the decontrolling language, provides "except to the extent required to effectuate the policy stated in clauses (b) and (c) of section 2." Those clauses have to do with foreign policy and national security. Therefore, whereas rice, which I understand to be in surplus, would be decontrolled, it would not be so far as national security and foreign policy are concerned. That is my understanding of the amendment. If the gentleman from Georgia disagrees, I should like him so to state.

Mr. LARCADE. I think this clears the matter up.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I think you have the same protection as the others, and I am sure you would not want any more.

Mr. LARCADE. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE] has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time merely to ask a question with respect to the provision of section 3 of this bill. I regret I was not able to be here during all of the debate, due to hearings of the Committee on Appropriations. But I would like to know the meaning of the language in section 3 with respect to the effectuation of policies which reads:

> To the extent necessary to achieve effective enforcement of this act such rules and regulations may apply to the financing, transporting, and other servicing of exports and the participation therein by any person.

For a number of years my attention has been called by people in the export field in my congressional district who have found difficulty in competition with exporters from foreign governments because of their inability to convert exchange in competition with such foreign governments because in the case of some governments they have accepted their exports by agreeing to convert into the currency or exchange of the exporter's country the currency of the country to which the exports are sent. A concern selling motors, for example, to the European Mediterrean area, for example, is to be paid in pounds sterling within the sterling area. That is all right for the British manufacturer selling motors in that area, but the motor manufacturer in America in my district has opportunities also to sell motors, but he finds he cannot sell in competition with the British manufacturer of motors due to the inability to make the conversion or exchange from pounds sterling into dollars.

In other cases it is found that the exporting country assists the exporter by converting and making good the trade acccunts accepted by the exporter in doing business with foreign countries, thus giving a further advantage to the foreign exporter as against the American exporter. I wonder whether or not under the broad language contained in this authority a regulation could be issued by the President that would authorize the export-import bank, or some other department of Federal finance, to discount bills of lading to provide for the exchange of currency to provide dollars for the American exporter?

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I will try to answer his question.

Mr. KEEFE. I shall be very happy to yield. I am seeking information.

Mr. MULTER. I am certain that the rules and regulations that are intended to be promulgated under this section, and which will be promulgated under this section, will lead to the stopping of the kind of complaints that you and I and others have been getting, so that there can be no unfair advantage taken over our merchants because of exchange or by reason of any of the other manipulations that are presently resorted to by some unscrupulous exporters. It is necessary to have permission to make regulations with reference to financing and transporting and servicing only to enforce the act, so that if you call the banks and ask them to reveal to the department what is the story about their exchange, is it going to be against our own merchants, or is it a fair way of exporting these items? They cannot hide behind the foreign exchange, or they cannot send out a declaration which calls for one thing and ship something else.

Mr. KEEFE. I understand that, but that does not answer the question that I have in mind. For example, suppose a British exporter ships manufactured products to an importer in the Mediterranean area, which is a sterling area——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for four additional minutes, in order to get an answer to this question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. That British exporter is doing business with a concern in one of the Mediterranean areas. In certain countries—I do not know whether it is actually true in Britain or not, but in some countries the nation itself, in order to stimulate exports of its own citizens, will guarantee, under certain circumstances, to that exporter that he is going to be paid for the material that he ships; whereas the American exporter, who is going directly into that country, has to carry that account, and due to the operation of exchange problems his funds are actually tied up and he does not get payment for his goods. Payment being guaranteed by the government of the foreign country puts that exporter in that country in a very favorable competitive position. Now it has long been suggested that some agency of government should be set up that could provide dollars to the American exporter and assure him that he is in a competitive position with those foreign countries. I simply want to know, as a matter of information in order that I can intelligently appraise this section, whether it is possible to set up such an arrangement by Government action that would assist the American exporter in promoting his business.

Mr. MULTER. It is not the intent of this bill to regulate finances. This is merely to regulate the enforcement features of the Control Act; not to interfere in any way with the banking situation. That must be a matter of other legislation.

Mr. KEEFE. Then, I think the answer is clear, and I am asking this so that the discussion on the floor, in the interpretation of that clause may be made known, a mere reading of the act itself without the explanation, would not seem to delimit it in the manner in which the gentleman has stated; but I gather from the statement of the gentleman from Michigan, in his opening statement, and on other statements which I have heard, that it is the pure intent and purpose of that language in the bill to enable inquiries into financing in order to carry out the enforcement provisions that are contained in the bill, and to enable the Government agency in charge to police the export trade. Is that right?

Mr. MULTER. The reports of the committees of both Houses so indicate. These are enforcement provisions.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

VIOLATIONS

SEC. 5. In case of the violation of any provision of this act or any regulation, order, or license issued hereunder, such violator or violators, upon conviction, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 6. (a) To the extent necessary or appropriate to the enforcement of this act, the head of any department or agency exercising any functions hereunder (and officers or employees of such department or agency specifically designated by the head thereof) may make such investigations and obtain such information from, require such reports or the keeping of such records by, make such inspection of the books, records, and other writings, premises, or property of, and take the sworn testimony of, any person. In addition, such officers or employees may administer oaths or affirmations, and may by subpena require any person to appear and testify or to appear and produce books, records, and other writings, or both, and in case of contumacy by, or refusal to obey a

subpena issued to, any such person, the district court for any district in which such person is found or resides or transacts business, upon application, shall have jurisdiction to issue an order requiring such person to appear and give testimony or to appear and produce books, records, and other writings, or both, and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.

(b) No person shall be excused from complying with any requirements under this section because of his privilege against self-incrimination, but the immunity provisions of the Compulsory Testimony Act of February 11, 1893 (27 Stat. 443), shall apply with respect to any individual who specifically claims such privilege.

(c) No department, or agency, exercising any functions under this act shall publish or disclose information obtained hereunder which is deemed confidential or with reference to which a request for confidential treatment is made by the person furnishing such information unless the head of such department or agency determines that the withholding thereof is contrary to the national interest.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 4, line 19, after the word "court" insert "of the United States."

Page 5, line 7, strike out the word "or" and after "agency," insert "or official."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: On page 4, line 13, after the word "person" strike out the period and insert the words "applying for an export license."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, as presently worded, the language of section 6 (a) is altogether too broad and far-reaching. It reads:

To the extent necessary or appropriate to the enforcement of this act, the head of any department or agency exercising any functions hereunder (and officers or employees of such department or agency specifically designated by the head thereof) may make such investigations and obtain such information from, require such reports or the keeping of such records by, make such inspection of the books, records, and other writings, premises, or property of, and take the sworn testimony of, any person.

Any person! Any person!

I do not know of any law that has been enacted that is so far-reaching in respect to investigations, reports, and statements incident to its enforcement, there may have been, but I do not think so. I am merely going to propound the inquiry and let it go at that: Do you want to put every citizen of the United States in a position where notwithstanding the fact that he has not made application for an export license he may be subjected to the pains and penalties of this act? Are you going to give any department or agency the authority, on the pretense that it has something to do with exports, to go into any business house, any bank, or onto any farm, or into any factory, examine the premises, examine the records, without any more restraint than the finding on the part of the head that it might be necessary in the interests of enforcing the provisions of this act? It is, of course, fundamental. If you were voting to protect and defend the constitutional rights of the American people against unreasonable searches and seizures; if you were not voting to deny them certain freedoms which in spirit at least are guaranteed by the American Constitution, you would never vote such language as that into any law. All I am asking you to do by this amendment is to at least restrict the language in the application to persons who are applying for an export license, which it seems to me is very, very reasonable.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Chairman, this language on page 4, line 13, at the end of the sentence, adding the words "applicant applying for an export license" would restrict the enforcement provisions of this act to the extent I do not believe it could be adequately enforced. In other words, it would prohibit the department enforcing this law from going to the banker and getting the information, because he is not the applicant; it would prohibit the department from going to the steamship company transporting the goods because the steamship company would not be an applicant; it would prohibit the department from going to any person and requiring any testimony except from the applicant himself. And then, of course, when the applicant was confronted with the enforcement authorities he would refuse to testify on the constitutional ground that it might incriminate him. There would, therefore, be no enforcement of any kind whatsoever. We either want a law with enforcement teeth in it, or we do not want any law at all.

Under the administration of this law we have a voluntary agreement now for enforcement. If this voluntary agreement continues a large part of this law will be unnecessary, but if it does not continue and if it breaks down, then this is the shotgun in the corner that will compel enforcement of the act. I submit the gentleman's amendment restricts the language to the extent where the law could not be enforced.

This section is vital. It is an enforcement provision. It is not in existing law. If the amendment is adopted this will cripple the whole bill and put it back to where the existing law is now, which is entirely too weak at the present time.

One of the greatest evils we have had in this country in recent years has been the black market—people who would buy goods and commodities at the fixed price, then go into the black market and sell them at a much higher price, sometimes several times as much. We will have the same kind of black market probably in this export business if it is not Government supervised and if we do not carefully protect against it in the law. I know that is not intended by the gentleman from Michigan because he does not want to help any black marketeer, but at the same time it will weaken the law to the extent that the black market will be aided and encouraged and will tend to break down entirely the enforcement of the act.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment is defeated.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan. I am amazed in looking over the enforcement provisions of this bill to know how far they go. Of course, I can see a general pattern in what the administration wants to do. The administration that has been in power for some 20 years has been enlarging its activities and becoming larger and larger and getting more and more control over the freedoms of the American people. I say to you gentlemen on my right that when the Government becomes so large, larger year by year through the development of bureaus and governmental powers, then you and I and the folks back home will become smaller and smaller. This bill infringes on the rights and liberties of the American people. I question its constitutionality. It goes much further than any Congress adopted during the war.

We are giving entirely too much power to a Government agency, and I think it will amount to sending out a horde of bureaucrats and snoopers over the land to pry into the affairs of the American people. It is a mistake you are making in this bill to vote such wide powers to any agency of government. I do not think the gentleman from Michigan and the Republicans on the left side of the aisle are going to get very far. You are bumping your heads against a stone wall, because orders have apparently come down from on high to increase the powers of the Federal agencies.

In the Byrd report you read that the number of new Federal employees have increased 289 every day this last year. Why, 20 years ago when you came into power there were about 570,000 Federal employees. Today there are over 2,000,000. At that time it cost less than $4,000,000,000 to run the Government of the United States, and today you are asking for a budget of about $42,000,000,000. You had at that time about 350 Federal agencies. Today there are 1,833 Federal agencies, and growing all the time.

I am saying to you who are supporting this administration bill for a larger and bigger and stronger Federal Government, that it will take from you and those you represent many liberties and rights that should be theirs. My position is that the Federal Government should merely be an umpire, guaranteeing fair play. The rewards or failures should go to the individual. The Government is becoming too powerful, all too powerful at this time. Bills are coming to this Congress for a cradle to the grave security. Bills that give the Federal Government more and more power. I say to you my colleagues that the best government is that which is kept close to home and governs less. I say to you it is time to call a halt on big government, big business, and the authority of government to control the lives of all of us. If we do not we drift to a socialism in which the individual loses both freedom and security.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOLCOTT) there were—ayes 53, noes 93.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Florida: Page 4, line 23, after the comma following the word "both", strike out the balance of section 6 (a) and insert "after a hearing in which the judge of said district court determines that the books, records, and other writings are material and pertinent to such investigation, and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof."

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, my amendment does only this: It provides that before a contempt order can be issued against any person upon the complaint of the party who is investigating the exports a hearing must be had. Let me give you my interpretation of the bill, and if I am wrong I ask the gentleman from Texas to correct me.

Under the bill, if the investigator approaches any person and says, "I want your books, I want your records, I want every writing you have," and the man says, "It is not pertinent, it is not material, and I do not want you to have it," then the investigator can issue a subpena to him and if he does not comply with the subpena, then, upon the investigator's merely making application to the Federal court, without any hearing, without determining whether or not there is any merit to his contention, or without determining whether the books or writings are material or pertinent, the man can be held in contempt of court.

I think it should not be permitted that a bureaucratic agency of this Government can go into a man's business and, relying solely on its own discretion, take that man before a judge and say, "I need the books," and get an order against him without even a hearing. That is not American.

Let us see what the language is in the bill:

In addition, such officers or employees may administer oaths or affirmations, and may by subpena require any person to appear and testify or to appear and produce books, records, and other writings, or both, and in case of contumacy by, or refusal to obey a subpena issued to, any such person, the district court of the United States for any district in which such person is found or resides or transacts business, upon application, shall have jurisdiction to issue an order requiring such person to appear and give testimony or to appear and produce books, records, and other writings, or both, and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.

My amendment adds "after a hearing in which the judge of said district court determines that the books and records and other writings are material and pertinent to such investigation."

When the court determines that, then they ought to be produced, but a contempt order ought never be issued against the man if the books for which the investigator calls are not pertinent and material. I think the Congress ought to protect the American people, to some extent, at least, from such proceedings and actions as this. But how much more time would it take for this agency to go to a judge, after making the application, and show that the books were material and pertinent? Certainly the man who is being investigated ought to have some hearing before he is held in contempt of court.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. The provision in this bill requires that in the event a person refuses to obey a subpena the agent must go before a court. That is the provision the gentleman is attempting to amend. Can we not leave it to a United States district judge to determine whether or not this man complained against should have a minute's hearing or an hour's hearing or 2 weeks' hearing? It is up to the judge.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] has expired.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas this question. Is it the purpose of this committee in reporting this bill to say that before an order of contempt is issued, that the party against whom the contempt is issued shall have a hearing as to the materiality?

Mr. PATMAN. It says so in the language of the bill. It says they must appear before a United States court, and that carries with it the authority and jurisdiction of the judge to determine for himself whether he will have a hearing or not.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Then why is there any objection to putting this language in the bill if that is the intention of the committee?

You know that any judge, though he be inexperienced, can interpret it that way.

Mr. PATMAN. I believe we must assume that a United States district judge will act as he should act. Why should we help a man who wants to use the district judge just for delaying purposes? You would require it in every case, and every case will not need that.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. But you only say "upon application." You do not say "a hearing shall be had." If you put the notice hearing in, then I say it is all right. But let us not give these people that power. You know how some of them act.

Mr. PATMAN. This is only a temporary law.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I do not care how temporary it is. We have no right to barter away the right of the American people to be heard before a contempt order is issued against them.

Mr. PATMAN. As the gentleman from Georgia pointed out, you will harm the people that we are attempting to help.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I do not think that I am harming a person if I ask that he be given a hearing before a contempt order is issued against him. I do not think that is harming anyone. I hope the Congress will afford Americans an opportunity to be heard before a contempt order is issued against them.

You know how some of these bureaucratic inspectors go out and gather up these records in evidence and then they act as prosecutor and judge and in every other capacity possible. I think you have to give the American people some rights. This is not an amendment which is contrary to the purposes of the bill. I hope the Congress will adopt this amendment so that we know it is spelled out in black and white and we will know that before a contempt order can be issued, that the man has had a hearing. That is all I want.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. You want a hearing provided for here, otherwise a bureaucrat will go to a man and read these five lines to him and will say to him, "You do not get a hearing, and you had better behave yourself and produce your books."

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. That is possible.

Mr. CHURCH. That bureaucrat will say to him, "You do not get a hearing, sir, and you had better behave."

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I think that is possible.

Mr. CHURCH. That is the bureaucratic way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] has expired.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, those of us who are supporting this amendment fear that this section seeks to punish contempt of a bureaucrat rather than contempt of court. If there is no hearing, no appearance of the citizen whose books or records are to be examined and produced under compulsion, then how can the judge constitutionally exercise the power to punish for contempt when there is no contempt other than contempt of the bureaucrat who issues the subpena for the books to be produced? It seems to me that the gentleman's amendment particularly, since he says that to write in the word "hearing" is all he wants, is a most reasonable amendment, and necessary to give the section validity. I hope the committee will accept it. Why? The committee should welcome any improving amendment. If you mean what this section says, any district court of the United States "for any district in which such person is found," "upon application"—though by whom is not stated—"shall have jurisdiction to issue an order requiring such person to appear and produce books, records, and other writings," although the case in which the bureaucrat's subpena was

issued is pending 3,000 miles away, and the subpena never was served on anyone, and the man "found" in the new State never heard of the case, without specifying what books, records, or other writings, nor whose, nor where. And any failure to obey such order—even if the man "found" never saw it, never was in that court, or knew any such order had been issued, nevertheless, the man could be punished "by such court as a contempt thereof."

Mr. PATMAN. According to Federal Court Rules of Procedure, could not a litigant get that same relief right now? In other words, if he asked for a hearing under Federal procedure, would not the court give him a hearing?

Mr. HOBBS. Not at all. Under this law, as it reads, and if it means what you contend it means, then there can be no harm done by the pending amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. No harm done?

Mr. HOBBS. Not a bit.

Mr. PATMAN. Except that it will just delay the procedure, and that is what most people have objected to.

They do not want any delay in procedure. They want action such as on fats and oils.

The only criticism we have had against the Department was delay in decontrolling fats and oils. If you adopt this amendment it will be delayed longer and longer, whereas, under existing law, it will be up to the judge, and if he believes they are just using him, he can just say, "It is obvious. I am not going to be a party to this black-marketing. I am going to make these fellows bring these books and records in." Otherwise they could have a delaying action, like they have right now in New York, and perishable products would be destroyed.

Mr. HOBBS. I appreciate the explanation of the gentleman, but to my mind it is simply a misconception of the fact. I have seen 18 contempt cases tried in an hour. There is no delay. All that this amendment asks for is that before you send an American citizen to jail for contempt, you give him notice and a hearing on the merits, whereas your law says that a bureaucrat can insist upon the production of books, or records, or other writings, whether they belong to the man in the toils of the bureaucrat, or not, and if the man fails to obey the bureaucrat he goes to jail for contempt, not of the bureaucrat, but of court, without knowledge, notice, or hearing.

Mr. PATMAN. No. The gentleman is entirely mistaken.

Mr. HOBBS. Then, if we are mistaken, why does the committee object to inserting those words?

Mr. PATMAN. It says, "when the Department calls upon him to produce information and he refuses," then the Department head must go to the court himself and get an order from the United States District Court himself to produce these books and papers. Then, and then only, can he be cited for contempt. The gentleman evidently has not read this language.

Mr. HOBBS. I beg your pardon. I have read it and I have read it very carefully. You do not provide for any hearing as to the contempt of the bureaucrat or of any court. It is made obligatory upon the court to issue an order without notice or hearing—right or wrong—when there has been no contempt, nor even opportunity for contempt, the victim "may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof."

Mr. SPENCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. SPENCE. The citizen has his rights under the law, and stating it in this act would not have any effect. A court certainly would not send a man to jail without a hearing.

Mr. HOBBS. Your bill says that he could do so, sir.

Mr. SPENCE. If it does that it would be clearly unconstitutional.

Mr. HOBBS. I think so too, and that is the reason I am supporting this amendment.

Mr. SPENCE. There is no intention of that kind in the act. A judge would not send a man to jail for contempt of some other administrative agency. The judge would only send a man to jail for contempt of court. The judge could not try that.

Mr. HOBBS. That is exactly the position that I am taking here.

Mr. SPENCE. That is the position I take, and it is not in this bill.

Mr. HOBBS. It is to save your bill from unconstitutionality that we are supporting this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama, [Mr. HOBBS], has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I desire to point out on page 4, commencing with line 14, the officers are employees of the department enforcing this act, and they would have a right to subpena any person to appear and testify and bring books. Then if he refuses, if the party refuses, then and only then, commencing in line 17 and in line 18, will the department through its officers and agents go into the United States District Court in the district where the person resides, into his home district where he resides, and upon application the judge is not required to do anything. But the judge shall have jurisdiction to issue an order, and we must assume that a United States district judge is going to know what he is doing before he issues any such order; then, if the judge issues the order and the party who resides in the United States district represented by the court refuses to obey the judge, he can be cited for contempt. Is not that the way of enforcing law in the United States? It is the way that ordinary laws are enforced. Why should we make an exception?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. We all know that if an applicant said he was being abused by the agency that the United States district judge—imagine that—the district judge—in fact there is no doubt in my mind that he would take that into consideration.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Would the gentleman object adding the phrase "after application and hearing"?

Mr. PATMAN. The language of this bill has been carefully considered. Now the gentleman wants to come in here and without consideration add different language to that which has been so carefully written. That is possibly throwing a monkey wrench into the machinery.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOBBS. Why, if the gentleman in his own words says that "we must assume" does he, then, object to inserting the assumption?

Mr. PATMAN. Because the judge might know they are just using him for a delaying action and he would not want to be used; therefore he would say "no hearing is necessary in this case"; so we leave it to the United States district judge.

Mr. HOBBS. That is exactly the purpose of the amendment, to leave it up to the judge.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEEFE. Has the time on this amendment been limited?

The CHAIRMAN. The time has not been limited.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the Members should read this section very, very carefully. There are a great many lawyers in this House who have had experience in court. What happens under this language ought to be clear to every lawyer in Congress: First, the person whose books and records are sought by an administrative agent of the Government refuses to produce those books at the request of the administrative agent; that agent then goes to a United States district judge and in an ex parte proceeding when the person involved is not present asks that judge for an ex parte order compelling the citizen to produce those books. There is not a lawyer in this Congress who has ever had experience who does not know that such orders are usually signed not only by United States district judges but also by other judges as a pure perfunctory matter. He issues the order in accordance with the language of this legislation directing this citizen to produce those books. Listen to what it states. It states that he "may issue that order upon application."

Not after hearing of the citizen but upon mere application of the administrative officer. After that order has been issued and the citizen still refuses to produce the books and records it states:

> Any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.

After he fails to comply with the ex parte order issued by the court in which he has had no opportunity to be heard,

the court may issue a contempt citation and bring him before the court for contempt of the court, and punish him as the law prescribes.

At no place in that procedure is there any opportunity for the citizen to be heard except at the whim or caprice of the Federal judge who may or may not say: "Sir, I am going to let you give an explanation to me before I send you to jail for your contempt of this court." He clearly is in contempt under this law if he fails to comply with the order of the judge that has been issued ex parte.

It would seem to me it is asking only very little to say to the citizen under those circumstances, "You shall be entitled to a hearing before an adjudication of contempt is entered and before punishment is inflicted."

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Is it not reasonable to assume, in fact, that the Federal judge would accord the citizen an opportunity to explain why he had in the first instance failed to comply with the order of the administrator?

Mr. KEEFE. My dear sir, I would say I have such a deep and abiding respect for the Federal judiciary as such generally and for the judiciary as such generally, I would think most judges would take that position; however, the situation is well known of flagrant abuses of rights by Federal judges and other judges in matters of this character When he has once issued his order directing the production of those books as an ex parte matter in which the citizen has not been heard, then it would seem to me it is only fair to accept the suggestions of the distinguished gentleman from Florida and the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, who is a very highly respected Member of the House Judiciary Committee, and simply assure the citizen by writing the language in there and giving him assurance which you say we ought to assume so that the citizen will have this protection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, with the permission of the committee I would like to offer a substitute that on page 4, line 21, after the word "order" there be inserted "after hearing."

Mr. SPENCE. The committee, I am sure, will accept that amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. I will ask the gentleman to withdraw his amendment, with the understanding that the committee will offer an amendment, after the word "order" in line 21, page 4, to read "shall have jurisdiction to issue an order after hearing." In other words, put in the words "after hearing" requiring such person to appear.

Mr. PHILBIN. He could be heard before a member of the district attorney's office. I would suggest "after hearing and notice to the aggrieved party."

Mr. PATMAN. On application after hearing?

Mr. PHILBIN. Hearing and notice to the aggrieved party.

Mr. KEEFE. Surely what the gentleman is seeking to accomplish, as I understand, by his amendment, is to provide for a hearing.

Mr. PATMAN. Before the judge.

Mr. KEEFE. Before the judge?

Mr. PATMAN. That is right.

Mr. KEEFE. At which the aggrieved party or the citizen may have notice of the hearing and the right to appear and be heard. If you simply insert, as suggested by the gentleman from Massachusetts, the words "after hearing" that could be accomplished by merely having the administrative officer come before the judge. That would be a hearing. We want to assure the citizen the right to a hearing.

Mr. PATMAN. The Committee has gotten along so well today, and we want to try to satisfy the people that do not understand what we are trying to do in this provision, and if we can do it by a simple amendment, we would like to do it. I have no objection to putting that in, if it is all right with the chairman, "after notice and hearing."

Mr. SPENCE. We will accept that.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. What is the purport of the gentleman's amendment at the present time?

Mr. PATMAN. The judge can issue this order only after notice and hearing to the aggrieved person.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Would the gentleman mind putting in there, "after notice to the aggrieved party"?

Mr. PATMAN. That is all right.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. All right, I will accept that.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, it may be involved in that respect. We will not do that.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The amendment offered by the gentleman recognizes the fact that the rights of a citizen should not necessarily rest upon an assumption, no matter how reasonable it might be. I think the amendment that the gentleman has offered meets the objection raised to the original language.

Mr. PATMAN. I offer the amendment which reads, "after notice and hearing."

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Why do you not say, "after notice of hearing to any such person"?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, that would be a little involved there.

Mr. COOLEY. In line 18 you use the language "any such person."

Mr. PATMAN. That is right.

Mr. COOLEY. Then why not put in "after notice of hearing"?

Mr. PATMAN. Does the gentleman mean after the word "application" on line 21, "after notice and hearing to any such person"?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. PATMAN. Now I ask that the amendment be voted on, with the assumption that the gentleman of Florida will withdraw his amendment.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Will the gentleman repeat his amendment?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes: After the word "application", in line 21 insert "after notice to any such person and hearing."

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. PATMAN: Page 4, line 21, after the word "application", insert "after notice to any such person and hearing."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. You surely have got this thing all mixed up now.

Mr. PATMAN. Of course, we want a comma there.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Who do you give it to?

Mr. PATMAN. We can change the punctuation, if the gentleman desires.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not see how you can change the punctuation and make sense out of it.

Mr. PATMAN. I think it makes sense, and others think so.

Mr. WOLCOTT. "Application after notice." Notice to whom, for whom, for what?

Mr. PATMAN. "Application, after notice to any such person and hearing shall have jurisdiction to issue an order." The judge shall have jurisdiction.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, could we correct it if we put the word "and" in?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Of course, you could correct it by recommitting it to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. PATMAN. We have three other bills yet, and if we agree on this, we will get through and adjourn until Monday. If we do not get through here now, we will have to come back tomorrow, and in the interest of trying to get through, I suggest that we adopt this amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I suggest that after the word "application" you insert "and", making it read "and after notice to any such person and hearing." The word "and" would take care of it, I think.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment that after the comma in line 21 there be inserted these words: "and after notice to any such person and hearing."

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. PATMAN: On page 4, line 21, after the comma insert "and after notice to any such person and hearing."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: On page 5, line 11, after "information" insert a period, and strike out all of lines 12, 13, and 14.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I think this has been covered in the general debate. It is very obvious that the person disclosing the information would have no protection whatsoever in respect to confidential treatment of that information except as the head of the department or the official might determine that it was confidential. It is very apparent from the language that whether or not the information is deemed confidential and whether or not it is treated as confidential is wholly within the discretion of the department or official administering the law.

I do think we should be just a little bit careful. This has never been done before. There are four or five precedents in this bill in respect to the delegation of very unusual powers and the denial to individuals of liberties which heretofore seemingly have been guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. If you do not delete this language, it will probably establish a precedent which might come back to bother you for a long time.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is obvious at this stage of the game that the devious purpose is to compound confusion here by attempting to quibble about phrases and to delete proposals in the bill, which have been carefully discussed in committee. This amendment would insert a period at the end of line 11 on page 5 and strike out qualifying language which reads "unless the head of such department or agency determines that the withholding thereof is contrary to the national interest."

I believe that that language should stay in because it qualifies the statement and clarifies it. The experience of the Department in carrying out the provisions of the Export Control Act since its enactment in 1940 and its continuance in 1947 indicates that language of this character is essential.

I do not think that we should concern ourselves too much about a phrase of this sort. I ask that this amendment be voted down and that the language be permitted to remain as is.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I want to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] for the remarks he made on this same bill in a speech on December 15, 1947, when he so eloquently said, and I now want to read what he said:

We have likewise exended export controls in such manner that the President may be given broad authority, broad discretion as to this second reason why we have high prices and inflation. This second reason is the unusually heavy demand of foreign countries for American goods which are in short supply. The President is authorized under this bill so to adjust our exports as to safeguard and stabilize the American economy. We have given the power in this bill to start the job which has got to be done if we are going to have economic stability and lower prices in the United States.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his contribution in referring to the remarks of the then chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency in December 1947 when an extension of this particular section of Public Law 395 involving export controls was up for consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that this section remain as is and ask that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN] has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT.]

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOLCOTT) there were—ayes 85, noes 101.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

EXEMPTION FROM ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

SEC. 7. The functions exercised under this act shall be excluded from the operation of the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 237), except as to the requirements of section 3 thereof.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ELLSWORTH: page 5, line 15, strike out all of section 7.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, in 1946 we passed an excellent piece of legislation, which has proven its worth time and time again since its enactment. The law to which I refer is known as the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946, which requires administrative agencies to give notice, hold hearings, and give due publication to any rules, orders, or regulations promulgated by such agencies.

I can see no reason why the Congress, after enacting a very fine piece of legislation of that kind, which has proven its worth through years of operation, should today enact a law exempting an agency typical in all respects of the agencies which the Administrative Procedure Act was supposed to cover.

I feel that is particularly strange in view of some of the debate we have heard today. It seems to me there are many features of the bill now before us which take us farther down the road toward government by whim and caprice rather than government by law.

I call attention to the fact that the Administrative Procedure Act would only require the Office of International Trade to hear and take testimony from and consult with the various people with whom they deal, various private individuals in our country. The bill attempts to do that very same thing, and all in the world we would do by eliminating section 7 would be to further clarify the language which appears on page 3 and which authorizes "utilization of private competitive trade channels insofar as practicable, giving consideration to the interests of small business." The Administrative Procedure Act, referred to in section 7, not only gives consideration to business people, small and large, but sets up the procedure as to how that consideration is to be given. I think that is a practical principle that has been written out in the law. It can and should be applied to the Office of International Trade the same as any other agency, so that the small merchant and everybody else can know just how he is going to be treated. Otherwise this bill is a wide-open blank-check authority, of the type which would even make the rubber-stamp days of the New Deal look conservative.

All I suggest is that the section which would exempt the Office of International Trade from the Administrative Procedure Act, be eliminated from the bill, and let the law now on the books apply. That does not in any way hamper or hamstring or cripple or defeat the purposes of this bill. It has nothing to do with the intent of the proposed legislation. It merely replaces the possibility of whim and caprice with orderly procedure, as previously spelled out by this Congress.

I would suggest, although I feel certain I will get little support for the idea, that the Committee give serious consideration to accepting this amendment for the reasons I have stated, and because the Administrative Procedure Act does give the common citizen some needed protection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment. The provision suspends certain sections of the Administrative Procedure Act as far as this bill is concerned. All the temporary bills heretofore have had it. The Price Control Act, the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act—all of the temporary legislation has that provision. It is a standard provision in temporary legislation, and it is written into this act.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. I desire to call the gentleman's attention to the Senate report on this bill, on page 6, wherein, in referring to this amendment, it says:

This is in accord with the policy expressed in section 2 of the Administrative Procedure Act itself. Other temporary regulatory activities authorized since that act have been granted comparable exemption. Examples of such are contained in the Sugar Control Exemption, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, the Veterans' Emergency Housing Program, and the War Housing Insurance Act.

Mr. SPENCE. Section 3 of the Administrative Procedure Act is applicable to the act, and that requires the publication of all the rules and regulations in the Federal Register.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

QUARTERLY REPORT

SEC. 8. The head of any department or agency, exercising any functions under this act shall make a quarterly report within

45 days after each quarter to the President and to the Congress of his operations hereunder.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 5, line 21, after "agency", insert the words "or official."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEFINITION

SEC. 9. The term "person" as used herein shall include the singular and the plural and any individual, partnership, corporation, or other form of association, including any government or agency thereof.

EFFECT ON OTHER ACTS

SEC. 10. The act of February 15, 1936 (49 Stat. 1140), relating to the licensing of exports of tin-plate scrap, is hereby superseded; but nothing contained in this act shall be construed to modify, repeal, supersede, or otherwise affect the provisions of any other laws authorizing control over exports of any commodity.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 11. This act shall take effect February 28, 1949, upon the expiration of section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended. All outstanding delegations, regulations, orders, licenses, or other forms of administrative action under said section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940, shall, until amended or revoked, remain in full force and effect, the same as if promulgated under this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 6, line 17, before the word "regulations", insert the word "rules."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

TERMINATION DATE

SEC. 12. The authority granted herein shall terminate on June 30, 1951, or upon any prior date which the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: Page 6, line 3, strike out "1951" and insert in lieu thereof "1950."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal of discussion this afternoon about the power and the authority which is delegated, and the statement has been made—and I believe it has not been successfully contradicted—that the provisions of this bill can give to the Administrator of the bill control over our domestic economy.

It has been said here also that we should not be apprehensive of the powers of this bill, because it is temporary; that we are continuing it for only a temporary period. On almost all occasions that I can recall, where we were dealing with temporary legislation, 1 year was the longest for which we would grant these powers without review by the Congress. If we do not change this date from June 30, 1951, to June 30, 1950, we will establish as a matter of permanent policy, permanent and effective at least for 2 years, these new and very unusual powers and controls over our economy.

I wish that you would think what you are doing, and determine if you as a matter of congressional policy want to establish these powers permanently, because if they can be justified for the next years they can be justified to continue for 5½ years after the cessation of hostilities, then, of course, they can be justified to run 10, 15, 20, or 50 years after the cessation of hostilities. You are in effect setting up this program as a program of permanent Government policy which I do not think you want to do or intend to do.

At the proper time a motion to recommit will be offered to continue export controls for 1 year as they now exist, which means that all of the powers and authority which the President and the Government have in respect to export controls will be continued for 1 year, including the power and the authority to use price criteria in determining to whom the license shall be granted.

In addition to that, the motion to recommit will include the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] to exempt from the operation of the law insofar as specific licenses are concerned agricultural commodities in surplus. So that by adopting the motion to recommit we will continue all of the powers which the Government has had since 1940 to control exports and, in addition, we will protect agriculture from the exercise of these controls in the case of agricultural surpluses.

Let me remind the Members, Mr. Chairman, if we continue this power for 2 years it will take a two-thirds vote of this Congress to ever get the powers back. It will take a two-thirds vote of this Congress to restore to the American people the constitutional rights and freedoms which you are delegating to the administration today under this bill.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact it is not for merely 2 years. It is 2 years and a third of another year.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. Chairman, this apparently is the last of a deluge of amendments that have been attempted to be placed on a bill which I think most of the Members who sat through the hearings regarded as rather noncontroversial.

We have had more bogeymen raised to scare the Congress in connection with a program that has been operating for a great many years, particularly in protecting our national economy and security against the overexport of scarce materials, than I have ever heard raised on the floor of this House.

The pending amendment would seek to reduce the time by 1 year on these export controls which under the bill will go for 28 months.

Mr. Chairman, export controls are a very vital arm of the Marshall plan or the European recovery program. You cannot operate the Marshall plan without export controls. If you want to sabotage the European recovery program which will run for several more years, just extend these controls for 1 year or 16 months, and you will cast a serious doubt on the success of the recovery program.

What has been the record of these export controls? They started out with more than 3,000 items under control. We are down to slightly over 300 at this time. Does that sound like a bureaucracy which is continually grasping and trying to expand its hold on the American economy or destroy the standards of American business or to put the farmers out of business or the little manufacturers out of business? Of course not.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. No. I have not the time.

Mr. TABER. I have a factory that closed up on account of these controls.

Mr. MONRONEY. This agency has attempted to decontrol wherever possible and not extend their coverage and are certainly not expanding their power.

One point has been overlooked in this extension of time. If you extend it only for a short period of time—because these are export controls and the export control business must be done about 6 months in advance of the shipment of these goods; it is not an instantaneous process like local domestic sales—then you are actually going to end this program, in reality, 6 months before the termination date provided for in the act.

Congress can, under this bill, by concurrent resolution—and it is a process that has been put in many bills that have gone through the House—terminate export controls at an earlier date. Now, the law has never been satisfactorily settled whether it requires a Presidential signature or not, but it is the feeling of the members that it does not require a Presidential signature, so the will of a bare majority of this Congress can be respected.

This program has safeguarded the economy of this country, and has stopped the shipment of high-octane gasoline, steel, and other vital war potential supplies to Russia itself.

You relied on this act at that time when you stopped the ships in the California harbors from taking high-octane gasoline to Russia. Without this act, exporters can ship anything excepting actual munitions to any country behind the iron curtain. No screening can be done of these exports—nor no question raised as to their intended use—if this act is killed.

I believe we can extend this act to protect this Nation's safety for 2 years' time, and you will find that with the program under which we are safeguarding American economy and security we will be better off.

I hope the amendment is defeated.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma is about right. There was not

much controversy before the committee. But at the same time, Mr. Chairman, we could have used the same law that we had from 1940 up to the present time. Somebody, evidently, wanted a little more power. So, they stuck a few of these little provisions in the bill, and that is why we have been talking all the afternoon. Regardless of what anybody might say, we are giving too much power to the Federal Government. I heard a gentleman here yesterday say what they did for New England, or what would happen if we needed something. Well, let me say for New England, and especially Massachusetts, that if the Federal Government, and the bureaus that are running the Federal Government, will stay out of Massachusetts, we will be just about ten or fifteen times better off.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the exchairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency has made a fair proposition in asking that this only go into effect for a year, or a year and a couple of months, because the Department of Commerce has already decontrolled about 90 percent of the exports that they had when this thing started. So, there are only about 10 percent left. And, if they will let the people of the country produce and keep producing, you will not need that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOLCOTT) there were—ayes 97, noes 118.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HUBER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1661) to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 97, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOLCOTT moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Banking and Currency with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment in the nature of a substitute: Strike out all after the enacting clause and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"SECTION 1. (a) Section 6 (d) of the Act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended, is amended by striking out 'February 28, 1949' and inserting in lieu thereof 'February 28, 1950'.

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President in the exercise of the powers, authority, and discretion conferred upon him by such act of July 2, 1940, as amended, is authorized to use price criteria in the licensing of exports, either by giving preference among otherwise comparable applications to those which provide for the lowest prices, or, in exceptional circumstances, by fixing reasonable mark ups in export prices over domestic prices.

"(c) The authority conferred by this section shall not be exercised with respect to any agricultural commodity, including fats and oils, during any period for which the supply of such commodity is determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in excess of the requirements of the domestic economy, except to the extent required to effectuate the policies set forth in clause (b) or clause (c) of section 2 hereof."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. WOLCOTT. On that, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 139, nays 222, not voting 72, as follows:

[Roll No. 17]

YEAS—139

Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Andersen, H. Carl
Anderson, Calif.
Angell
Arends
Auchincloss
Barrett, Wyo.
Bates, Mass.
Beall
Bishop
Blackney
Boggs, Del.
Bolton, Ohio
Bramblett
Brehm
Brown, Ohio
Burdick
Byrnes, Wis.
Canfield
Case, N. J.
Case, S. Dak.
Chiperfield
Church
Clevenger
Cole, Kans.
Cole, N. Y.
Corbett
Cotton
Dague
Davis, Wis.
D'Ewart
Dolliver
Eaton
Ellsworth
Elston
Engel, Mich.
Fenton
Ford
Gamble
Gavin
Gillette
Golden
Goodwin
Graham
Gross
Gwinn
Hagen
Hale
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hall, Leonard W.
Halleck
Hand
Harden
Harvey
Herter
Heselton
Hill
Hinshaw
Hoeven
Holmes
Hope
Horan
Hull
James
Jenison
Jensen
Johnson
Kean
Kearney
Kearns
Keating
Keefe
Kilburn
Kunkel
LeCompte
LeFevre
Lemke
Lichtenwalter
Lodge
Lovre
McConnell
McCulloch
McDonough
McGregor
McMillen, Ill.
Mack, Wash.
Martin, Iowa
Martin, Mass.
Merrow
Meyer
Michener
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Morton
Murray, Wis.
Nelson
Nicholson
Nixon
O'Konski
Patterson
Pfeiffer, William L.
Phillips, Calif.
Poulson
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees
Rich
Riehlman
Rogers, Mass.
Sadlak
Sadowski
St. George
Sanborn
Scrivner
Scudder
Shafer
Short
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Wis.
Stefan
Stockman
Taber
Talle
Tollefson
Van Zandt
Velde
Vorys
Vursell
Wadsworth
Werdel
Wigglesworth
Wilson, Ind.
Withrow
Wolcott
Wolverton
Woodruff

NAYS—222

Abernethy
Addonizio
Albert
Andrews
Aspinall
Barden
Baring
Barrett, Pa.
Bates, Ky.
Battle
Beckworth
Biemiller
Bland
Blatnik
Bloom
Boggs, La.
Bolling
Bolton, Md.
Bonner
Bosone
Boykin
Brooks
Brown, Ga.
Bryson
Buchanan
Buckley, Ill.
Burleson
Burnside
Burton
Camp
Cannon
Carlyle
Carnahan
Carroll
Cavalcante
Chatham
Chelf
Chesney
Chudoff
Coffey
Colmer
Combs
Cooley
Cooper
Cox
Crook
Crosser
Davenport
Davies, N. Y.
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Deane
Delaney
Denton
Dollinger
Donohue
Doughton
Douglas
Doyle
Durham
Eberharter
Elliott
Engle, Calif.
Evins
Fallon
Feighan
Fernandez
Fisher
Fogarty
Forand
Frazier
Fugate
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gilmer
Gordon
Gore
Gorski, Ill.
Gorski, N. Y.
Gossett
Granahan
Granger
Grant
Green
Gregory
Gross
Hardy
Hare
Harris
Harrison
Hart
Havenner
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Hébert
Hedrick
Herlong
Herter
Hobbs
Holifield
Howell
Huber
Irving
Jackson, Wash.
Jacobs
Javits
Johnson
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N. C.
Karst
Karsten
Kee
Kennedy
Kerr
Kilday
King
Kirwan
Kruse
Lane
Larcade
Lesinski
Lind
Lucas
Lyle
McCarthy
McCormack
McGrath
McGuire
McKinnon
McSweeney
Mack, Ill.
Madden
Magee
Mahon
Mansfield
Marcantonio
Marsalis
Marshall
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Mitchell
Monroney
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Moulder
Multer
Murdock
Murray, Tenn.
Norblad
Norrell
Norton
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Sullivan
Pace
Passman
Patman
Patten
Perkins
Peterson
Philbin
Pickett
Poage
Polk
Preston
Price
Priest
Rabaut
Rains
Ramsay
Rankin
Redden
Regan
Rhodes
Ribicoff
Richards
Rivers
Rodino
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney
Sabath
Sasscer
Secrest
Sims
Smathers
Smith, Va.
Spence
Staggers
Stanley
Steed
Stigler
Sullivan
Sutton
Tackett
Tauriello
Teague
Thomas, Tex.
Thompson
Thornberry
Trimble
Underwood
Wagner
Walsh
Welch, Calif.
Welch, Mo.
Wheeler
White, Calif.
White, Idaho
Whitten
Whittington
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Okla.
Wilson, Tex.
Winstead
Wood
Woodhouse
Worley
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—72

Abbitt
Allen, La.
Andresen, August H.
Bailey
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Bentsen
Breen
Buckley, N. Y.
Bulwinkle
Burke
Byrne, N. Y.
Celler
Christopher
Clemente
Coudert
Crawford
Cunningham
Curtis
DeGraffenried
Dingell
Dondero
Fellows
Flood
Fulton
Furcolo
Heffernan
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Irving
Jackson, Calif.
Jacobs
Jenkins
Jennings
Jonas
Judd
Kelley
Keogh
Klein
Latham
Linehan
Lynch
McMillan, S. C.
Macy
Mason
Miles
Murphy
Norblad
O'Hara, Minn.
O'Neill
O'Toole
Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Phillips, Tenn.
Plumley
Potter
Powell
Quinn
Scott, Hardie
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Sheppard
Sikes
Smith, Ohio
Somers
Taylor
Thomas, N. J.
Towe
Vinson
Walter
Weichel
Wickersham
Wier

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Latham for, with Mr. Clemente against.
Mr. Dondero for, with Mr. Judd against.
Mr. Fellows for, with Mr. Vinson against.
Mr. August H. Andresen for, with Mr. Dingell against.
Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota for, with Mr. Kelley against.
Mr. Crawford for, with Mr. Klein against.
Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., for, with Mr. Murphy against.
Mr. Cunningham for, with Mr. deGraffenried against.
Mr. Towe for, with Mr. McMillan of South Carolina against.
Mr. Coudert for, Mr. Keogh against.
Mr. Plumley for, with Mr. Walter against.
Mr. Hardie Scott for, with Mr. Sikes against.
Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Furcolo against.
Mr. Jenkins for, with Mr. Bailey against.
Mr. Macy for, with Mr. Quinn against.
Mr. Hoffman of Michigan for, with Mr. Sheppard against.
Mr. Potter for, with Mr. Jacobs against.
Mr. Bennett of Michigan for, with Mr. Irving against.
Mr. Hoffman of Illinois for, with Mr. Celler against.
Mr. Jonas for, with Mr. Burke against.
Mr. Jackson of California for, with Mr. Wier against.
Mr. Norblad for, with Mr. Heffernan against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Bentsen with Mr. Smith of Ohio.
Mr. Bennett of Florida with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Flood with Mr. Fulton.
Mr. Linehan with Mr. Jennings.
Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Weichel.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Curtis.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Phillips of Tennessee.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. SPENCE. On that, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 260, nays, 102, not voting 71, as follows:

[Roll No. 18]

YEAS—260

Abernethy
Addonizio
Albert
Andrews
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Barden
Baring
Barrett, Pa.
Bates, Ky.
Battle
Beckworth
Biemiller
Blackney
Bland
Blatnik
Bloom
Boggs, La.
Bolling
Bolton, Md.
Bolton, Ohio
Bonner
Bosone
Boykin
Brooks
Brown, Ga.
Bryson
Buchanan
Buckley, Ill.
Burdick
Burke
Burleson
Burnside
Burton
Camp
Canfield
Cannon
Carlyle
Carnahan
Case, N. J.
Cavalcante
Chatham
Chelf
Chesney
Chudoff
Coffey
Cole, N. Y.
Colmer
Combs
Cooley
Cooper
Corbett
Crook
Crosser
Davenport
Davies, N. Y.
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
Deane
Delaney
Denton
Dollinger
Dolliver
Donohue
Doughton
Douglas
Doyle
Durham
Eberharter
Elliott
Engle, Calif.
Evins
Fallon
Feighan
Fernandez
Fisher
Fogarty
Forand
Frazier
Fugate
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gilmer
Golden
Gordon
Gore
Gorski, Ill.
Gorski, N. Y.
Gossett
Granahan
Granger
Grant
Green
Gregory
Gross
Hardy
Hare
Harris
Harrison
Hart
Havenner
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Hébert
Hedrick
Herlong
Herter
Hobbs
Holifield
Holmes
Howell
Huber
Hull
Irving
Jackson, Wash.
Jacobs
Javits
Johnson
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N. C.
Karst
Karsten
Kearney
Keating
Kee
Kennedy
Kerr
Kilday
King
Kirwan
Kruse
Lane
Larcade
Lesinski
Lind
Lodge
Lovre
Lucas
Lyle
McCarthy
McCormack
McGrath
McGregor
McGuire
McKinnon
McMillen, Ill.
McSweeney
Mack, Ill.
Mack, Wash.
Madden
Magee
Mahon
Mansfield
Marcantonio
Marsalis
Merrow
Miles
Murphy
Norblad
O'Hara, Minn.
O'Neill
O'Toole
Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Phillips, Tenn.
Plumley
Potter
Powell
Quinn
Scott, Hardie
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Sikes
Smith, Ohio
Somers
Taylor
Thomas, N. J.
Towe
Vinson
Walter
Weichel
Whitaker
Wickersham
Wier
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Okla.
Wilson, Tex.
Winstead
Withrow
Wolverton
Woodhouse
Worley
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—102

Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Andersen, H. Carl
Anderson, Calif.
Angell
Arends
Barrett, Wyo.
Bates, Mass.
Beall
Bishop
Boggs, Del.
Bramblett
Brehm
Brown, Ohio
Byrnes, Wis.
Chiperfield
Church
Clevenger
Cole, Kans.
Cotton
Dague
D'Ewart
Eaton
Ellsworth
Elston
Engel, Mich.
Fenton
Ford
Gamble
Gavin
Gillette
Goodwin
Graham
Gwinn
Hagen
Hale
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hall, Leonard W.
Halleck
Hand
Harden
Harvey
Heselton
Hill
Hinshaw
Hoeven
Hope
Horan
Kearns
Keefe
Kilburn
Kunkel
LeCompte
LeFevre
Lemke
McConnell
McCulloch
McDonough
Martin, Iowa
Martin, Mass.
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Murray, Wis.
Nelson
Nicholson
O'Konski
Patterson
Phillips, Calif.
Plumley
Poulson
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees
Rich
Rogers, Mass.
Sadlak
Sadowski
St. George
Sanborn
Scrivner
Scudder
Short
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Wis.
Stefan
Stockman
Taber
Vorys
Vursell
Wadsworth
Werdel
White, Idaho
Wigglesworth
Wilson, Ind.
Wolcott
Woodruff

NOT VOTING—71

Abbitt
Allen, La.
Andresen, August H.
Bailey
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Bentsen
Breen
Buckley, N. Y.
Bulwinkle
Byrne, N. Y.
Carroll
Case, S. Dak.
Celler
Christopher
Clemente
Coudert
Crawford
Cunningham
Curtis
DeGraffenried
Dingell
Dondero
Fellows
Flood
Furcolo
Heffernan
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Jackson, Calif.
Jenkins
Jennings
Jonas
Judd
Kelley
Keogh
Klein
Latham
Lichtenwalter
Linehan
Lynch
McMillan, S. C.
Macy
Marshall
Mason
Potter
Powell
Quinn
Scott, Hardie
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Sikes
Smith, Ohio
Taylor
Thomas, N. J.
Towe
Vinson
Walter
Weichel
Whitaker
Wickersham
Wier

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Clemente for, with Mr. Latham against.
Mr. Lichtenwalter for, with Mr. Dondero against.
Mr. Judd for, with Mr. Towe against.
Mr. McMillan of South Carolina for, with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., against.
Mr. Sikes for, with Mr. August H. Andresen against.
Mr. Quinn for, with Mr. Macy against.
Mr. Furcolo for, with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota against.
Mr. Klein for, with Mr. Hardie Scott, against.
Mr. Carroll for, with Mr. Taylor against.
Mr. Lynch for, with Mr. Fellows against.
Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Coudert against.
Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan against.
Mr. Walter for, with Mr. Cunningham against.
Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer for, with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois against.
Mr. Kelley for, with Mr. Jonas against.
Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Jenkins against.
Mr. Murphy for, with Mr. Crawford against.
Mr. Bailey for, with Mr. Norblad against.
Mr. Heffernan for, with Mr. Potter against.
Mr. Buckley of New York for, with Mr. Jackson of California against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Curtis.
Mr. Flood with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Phillips of Tennessee.
Mr. Linehan with Mr. Smith of Ohio.
Mr. Bentsen with Mr. Weichel.
Mr. Bennett of Florida with Mr. Jennings.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Fulton.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 548) to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports, and for other purposes, a similar bill to the one just passed by the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Export Control Act of 1949."

FINDINGS

(a) Certain materials continue in short supply at home and abroad so that the quantity of United States exports and their distribution among importing countries affect the welfare of the domestic economy and have an important bearing upon the fulfillment of the foreign policy of the United States.

(b) The unrestricted export of materials without regard to their potential military significance may affect the national security.

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that it is the policy of the United States to use

export controls to the extent necessary (a) to protect the domestic economy from the excessive drain of scarce materials and to reduce the inflationary impact of abnormal foreign demand; (b) to further the foreign policy of the United States and to aid in fulfilling its international responsibilities; and (c) to exercise the necessary vigilance over exports from the standpoint of their significance to the national security.

AUTHORITY

SEC. 3. (a) To effectuate the policies set forth in section 2 hereof, the President may prohibit or curtail the exportation from the United States, its Territories, and possessions, of any articles, materials, or supplies, including technical data, except under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe. To the extent necessary to achieve effective enforcement of this act, such rules and regulations may apply to the financing, transporting, and other servicing of exports and the participation therein by any person.

(b) The President may delegate the power, authority, and discretion conferred upon him by this act to such departments, agencies, or officials of the Government as he may deem appropriate.

(c) The authority conferred by this section shall not be exercised with respect to any agricultural commodity, including fats and oils, during any period for which the supply of such commodity is determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in excess of the requirements of the domestic economy, except to the extent required to effectuate the policies set forth in clause (b) or clause (c) of section 2 hereof.

CONSULTATION AND STANDARDS

SEC. 4. (a) In determining which articles, materials, or supplies shall be controlled hereunder, and in determining the extent to which exports thereof shall be limited, any department, agency, or official making these determinations shall seek information and advice from the several executive departments and independent agencies concerned with aspects of our domestic and foreign policies and operations having an important bearing on exports.

(b) In authorizing exports, full utilization of private competitive trade channels shall be encouraged insofar as practicable, giving consideration to the interests of small business, merchant exporters as well as producers, and established and new exporters, and provisions shall be made for representative trade consultation to that end. In addition, there may be applied such other standards or criteria as may be deemed necessary by the head of such department or agency, or official to carry out the policies of this act.

VIOLATIONS

SEC. 5. In case of the violation of any provision of this act or any regulation, order, or license issued hereunder, such violator or violators, upon conviction, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 6. (a) To the extent necessary or appropriate to the enforcement of this act, the head of any department or agency exercising any functions hereunder (and officers or employees of such department or agency specifically designated by the head thereof) may make such investigations and obtain such information from, require such reports or the keeping of such records by, make such inspection of the books, records, and other writings, premises, or property of, and take the sworn testimony of, any person. In addition, such officers or employees may administer oaths or affirmations, and may by subpena require any person to appear and testify or to appear and produce books, records, and other writings, or both, and in case of contumacy by, or refusal to obey a subpena issued to, any such person, the district court of the United States for any district in which such person is found or resides in or transacts business, upon application, shall have jurisdiction to issue an order requiring such person to appear and give testimony or to appear and produce books, records, and other writings, or both, and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.

(b) No person shall be excused from complying with any requirements under this section because of his privilege against self-incrimination, but the immunity provisions of the Compulsory Testimony Act of February 11, 1893 (27 Stat. 443), shall apply with respect to any individual who specifically claims such privilege.

(c) No department, agency, or official exercising any functions under this act shall publish or disclose information obtained hereunder which is deemed confidential or with reference to which a request for confidential treatment is made by the person furnishing such information unless the head of such department or agency determines that the withholding thereof is contrary to the national interest.

EXEMPTION FROM ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

SEC. 7. The functions exercised under this act shall be excluded from the operation of the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 237), except as to the requirements of section 3 thereof.

QUARTERLY REPORT

SEC. 8. The head of any department or agency, or official exercising any functions under this act shall make a quarterly report, within 45 days after each quarter, to the President and to the Congress of his operations hereunder.

DEFINITION

SEC. 9. The term "person" as used herein shall include the singular and the plural and any individual, partnership, corporation, or other form of association, including any government or agency thereof.

EFFECT ON OTHER ACTS

SEC. 10. The act of February 15, 1936 (49 Stat. 1140), relating to the licensing of exports of tin-plate scrap, is hereby superseded; but nothing contained in this act shall be construed to modify, repeal, supersede, or otherwise affect the provisions of any other laws authorizing control over exports of any commodity.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 11. This act shall take effect February 28, 1949, upon the expiration of section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended. All outstanding delegations, rules, regulations, orders, licenses, or other forms of administrative action under said section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940, shall, until amended or revoked, remain in full force and effect, the same as if promulgated under this act.

TERMINATION DATE

SEC. 12. The authority granted herein shall terminate on June 30, 1951, or upon any prior date which the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPENCE: Page 5, line 6, after the comma insert the following: "and after notice to any such person and hearing."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, this makes the Senate bill identical with the one just passed.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the proceedings by which the bill, H. R. 1661, was passed will be vacated and the bill laid on the table.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McDaniel, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2402. An act to extend the Office of the War Assets Administrator and the War Assets Administration from February 28, 1949, until June 30, 1949.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 51. Joint resolution to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the joint select committe on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of the Army.
2. Department of the Air Force.
3. Departments of the Army and the Air Force.
4. Department of Commerce.
5. Department of the Interior.
6. Department of State.
7. Department of the Treasury.
8. Civil Service Commission.
9. Federal Security Agency.
10. National Archives.
11. Tennessee Valley Authority.
12. Veterans' Administration.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 66 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Lands (now comprised of the six former Committees on Insular Affairs, Territories, Public Lands, Irrigation and Reclamation, Mines and Mining, and Indian Affairs) may make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction. For the purpose of making such investigations the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARITIME COMMISSION

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 92) to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I would like to have the gentleman explain very briefly the resolution he has offered.

Mr. BLAND. The resolution carries into effect the right to charter and operate vessels until June 30, 1949. It was agreed to by all of the members of the committee.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would like to say that the minority have directed me to say that they are in wholehearted accord with the chairman of the committee and the members of the committee on this bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, is it the purpose of the gentleman to bring in new legislation before the 4 months expire, or does he think this will wind it up?

Mr. BLAND. We are considering a bill now, but we thought it needed to be considered a little further in the light of changing conditions.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman does not think then that we could wind this operation up in 4 months?

Mr. BLAND. No, not now.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, etc., That (a) the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to continue until March 1, 1949, the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes", approved February 27, 1948 (Public Law 428, Eightieth Congress), is amended by striking out the date "March 1, 1949" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof the date "March 1, 1950." That joint resolution is further amended by inserting at the end of subparagraph (b) thereof the words ": *Provided, however*, That vessels may be chartered to the Republic of the Philippines, or citizens thereof, for use in the interisland commerce of the Philippines in accordance with section 306 of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of April 30, 1946 (60 Stat. 137; U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 50, sec. 1786)."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "March 1, 1950" and insert "June 30, 1949."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

House Resolution 102 was laid on the table.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, Congress enacted the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, which contained in section 111 (a) a provision that—

> The Administrator shall, in providing for the procurement of commodities under authority of this title, take such steps as may be necessary to assure, so far as practicable, that, at least 50 percent of the gross tonnage of commodities procured within the United States out of funds made available under this title and transported abroad on ocean vessels is so transported on United States flag vessels to the extent such vessels are available at market rates.

In passing this act we believed that Congress intended that at least 50 percent of such traffic should be transported on United States vessels at market rates for United States vessels. The sponsors of this provision in both the Senate and House have stated that such was their understanding, and we believe that this was the understanding of a very large majority of the Members of Congress when they voted its approval. Last autumn the ECA Administrator announced that, based upon the opinion of the general counsel of the ECA, he proposed to interpret this provision so as to limit it with respect to bulk cargoes to instances where United States flag ships are available at world-wide competitive tramp rates.

When Congress enacted the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, it had before it large amounts of dependable data concerning the higher operating costs of American ships.

The Administrator has expressed the desire that Congress should clarify the provision referred to so that there might be no question as to his administering the act in accordance with the desires of Congress and that he is in no manner exceeding his authority thereunder. There is pending before the Merchant Marine Committee of Congress a bill—H. R. 1340—which in our opinion amply clarifies the congressional intent and will. Hearings have been held on that bill, but it is being considered further by the committee and will require additional time for complete consideration and report.

We believe that the Administrator was also motivated by a desire to administer the act in a more efficient and economical manner, and a very substantial amount of misunderstanding has arisen concerning the financial effect of the higher ocean freight rates paid to American ships. Some differences of interpretation exist, and the committee feels that more careful consideration is required to write into law clarification that will carry out the intent of Congress, and provide that efficient and economical administration that is wished by all concerned with this problem.

We suggest that the right of American shipping to participate in the carriage of these cargoes to the extent of at least 50 percent thereof is the minimum consideration which can be afforded this important industry. To suggest that this industry should perform these services at a rate level comparable with low-wage foreign competition would be a great injustice. We hear no suggestion that the producers of other commodities should be required to adjust similarly their prices. Every other industry supplying commodities or services is receiving their full American price. This includes wheat at the guaranteed Government price level, coal, and freight charges to the railroads to bring these commodities to seaboard. Until other industries supplying commodities or services to the ECA program reduce their prices to approximately foreign production cost levels, we see no justification for this discrimination against American shipping.

It is unnecessary to point out the importance of the American merchant marine to transport our commerce to and from our national defenses.

Attention should be called to a statement by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce who recently pointed out the inconsistency of expending appropriately $15,000,000,000 per year upon national defense while at the same time, under the contention of a minor economy, opposing or weakening one of the very important elements of national defense, the American merchant marine.

We submit that the participation of United States ships in the European recovery program is no more an additional subsidy to American shipping than the higher American cost paid to other American industries for commodities or services over and above the price level therefor at a European or world market level based upon the use of cheap labor and low living standards. Unless such a philosophy is adopted as to all other American industries furnishing commodities to the ECA program, we very strongly protest against such discriminatory treatment of United States ships and the creation of a false public impression that an American industry, rather than the Marshall-plan nations is the recipient of substantial portions of the funds appropriated for European recovery.

At the time of a meeting which representatives of the United States Maritime Commission, the United States Senate, our committee of Congress and other interested parties had with the ECA Administrator, he indicated to those present that because of world conditions he would withhold his order for probably another 60 days after February 1, and it is vitally important to act quickly, before another order comes out of ECA.

Senator MAGNUSON said it was thought in the Senate that the provision of the ECA bill was clear but that 50 percent was too little, and that it should have

been 75 or 80 percent, but that it was a compromise then.

Correlated with the same problem of clarification involved in H. R. 1340, for which there is pending a similar proposal in the Senate, there is need to extend the time for chartering ships.

It is necessary to increase American ships available to carry the goods, for if no American ships were available foreign rates would increase to a rate about equal to American rates today, if there were no American ships available to compete for part of the business.

Testimony before the committee was to the effect that the American merchant marine could carry more of the cargoes, but it was somewhat agreed that if we could get 50 percent participation we would be content. We said that we would be content if we got 50 percent of all the cargoes financed by Government aid programs in both directions.

The Administrator for ECA announced in a letter to Hon. STYLES BRIDGES, chairman, Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation, that not later than January 1, 1949, he would no longer require that 50 percent of the ECA bulk cargoes be required to be carried in United States flag ships unless such ships are available at competitive rates.

On December 22, 1948, it was announced that the change of policy would be postponed until February 1, 1949, and later it was postponed for an additional 60 days.

In his letter, the Administrator stated that he was advised by the general counsel of the Economic Cooperation Administration that the provision in question—the second sentence of paragraph 2 of section 111 (a)—did not require the Administrator to insist that 50 percent of ECA bulk cargoes should be carried in United States flag ships unless such are available at world-wide competitive tramp rates.

The Maritime Commission reported to the House committee that it was convinced that the action proposed by the Administrator would not be in accord with the provisions of the intent of the law, is not in accord with the economic factors involved in the administration of the 50 percent minimum participation provisions, and will be detrimental to the national commerce and the national security of the United States.

The Maritime Commission reported that the Commission was convinced that the participation in question was a considered decision of policy by the Congress in favor of giving overriding consideration of protecting and promoting the American merchant marine over the making available of dollar credits to the nations participating in the ECA program.

The Commission said:

The legislative history of the provision contains several statements recognizing that enactment of the 50-percent participation provision would involve increased cost of shipment. The subsidy argument was advanced in opposition to the enactment of the provision. Congress obviously intended to adopt the provision notwithstanding that its effect might be an indirect subsidy to American-flag operation. There are other provisions in the act which evidence an intention to minimize as far as possible the effect of the program upon channels of trade forming a part of the domestic economy of the United States.

The Maritime Commission has examined the economic effects of the participation provision and has given careful attention to the probable effects of a suspension or waiver of the provision as proposed by the Administrator for Economic Cooperation. It has explored the extent of the differential between market rates for United States flag vessels and the world-wide competitive tramp rates. It is clear that the differential is smaller and involves much less cost to the taxpayer than has been alleged. The Commission is convinced that the participation provision is a fair and reasonable requirement in connection with the economic cooperation program. It is beyond question that the relatively minor monetary consideration involved is more than outweighed by advantages to the domestic economy and the national security of the United States. In considering the employment of United States flag vessels at market rates for such vessels, it should be obvious that keeping a substantial portion of United States Government-owned vessels employed and maintained in class at the expense of the charterer is preferable to lay-up of such vessels with the attendant expense and loss of employment together with the loss of taxes on the income from such operations and taxes on the earnings of personnel employed in such operation.

With reference to the matter of contribution by the United States shipping industry to the economic rehabilitation of Europe, attention is called to the extent of the United States assistance in rehabilitating the merchant fleets of ECA nations through sales of Government war-built vessels at low prices, enabling foreign nations competing with the United States in shipping to place their fleets in competitive operation rapidly and under conditions of competition which involve continued detriment to the American shipping industry. There is no doubt that if the proposed ECA policy of using foreign-flag vessels to carry bulk cargoes is carried out, it will, in effect, wipe out operation of an American tramp fleet. This proposed policy means the elimination of American ships, seamen, operators, and shore establishments which are essential to a balanced American merchant marine commensurate with the needs of the United States and adequate for its national security. The lesson of two world wars with respect to the shipping industry is a mandate to avoid in the future the extraordinary expense and the dangerous delays of building a merchant marine in time of war or national danger. In a letter from Charles E. Dewey, general agent of the committee of the House and Senate known as the watchdog committee on this ECA program, he says that he believes that the legislative history of the act, Public Law 472, is such as to establish a "clear congressional intent to assure that at least 50 percent of the gross tonnage of commodities procured in the United States be transported abroad on United States flag vessels."

He said:

While the cost of operating United States flag vessels is generally recognized as higher than that of foreign-flag vessels, the adoption of a market rate determined by the world rate would preclude the attainment of objectives sought to be accomplished by the provision. It must be assumed that in providing this protection for United States flag vessels the Congress was aware of this price differential between United States and nonflag vessels.

It would appear from conversations that in determining the proceedings essential in achieving a workable solution to section 111 (a) (2) the following points require careful attention:

1. At present large numbers of United States maritime chartered vessels are being returned to the Commission for the lack of cargo and the nonprofit rate offered. The rate at which these vessels are being returned indicates that the cargo supply may soon reach a point where the present available United States flag ships will not be in such force as to provide capacity for 50-percent total gross tonnage envisioned by the act.

2. There are not sufficient United States flag privately owned vessels to move 50 percent of the gross tonnage, therefore requiring continued bare-boat charters by the Maritime Commission.

3. National security depends to a degree upon an available maritime industry. Therefore, one of the objectives of section 111 (a) (2) was to provide by this provision maximum employment in this industry. This accomplishment necessarily requires the operation of a maximum practicable number of United States flag ships.

4. It is evident, in view of the world supply of cargo space that as the United States cargo space is diminished, the rate for foreign cargo space will be increased, with the end result that the total transportation cost of this program may increase to an amount in excess of the amount that would be necessary even though the 50 percent tonnage shipped on United States vessels were provided at a rate higher than that prevailing for foreign-flag vessels.

I am sure you will find the facilities of the Maritime Commission available to you to the fullest extent in resolving these problems so that the protection intended for the United States flag vessels may be provided and at the same time rates established so as to protect to the greatest extent possible the expenditures of American dollars.

The necessity for the enactment of House Joint Resolution 92 at once is evident because the Chairman of the Maritime Commission testified that there are not at the present time enough privately owned ships to carry 50 percent of the cargoes required to be carried, and as Admiral Smith said:

With our authority expiring on the 28th of February 1949, operators are reluctant to charter from the Commission more ships because they have to pay the cost of taking the ship out of lay-up. Ships must be preserved and they are preserved, and the cost of taking them out of lay-up is considerable, and they would have only one voyage and they cannot get their money back. It is very important that it be determined whether or not our chartering authority is going to be extended beyond February 28 of this year.

In answer to a question by Mr. BOYKIN, Admiral Smith, Chairman of the United

States Maritime Commission, said that we do have enough vessels to charter to have the entire 100 percent of ECA shipments. He said in answer to a question that if we carried 100 percent, each country would carry 100 percent of its cargoes, and each nation would have its ships going one way in full load and going back in ballast, including ourselves and with a 50 percent rate they will get cargo both ways.

This extension for 4 months of the powers of the Maritime Commission is for the purpose of permitting the committee to examine closely the many and varied problems involved in the extension of the ship sales, charter, and operating authority. In view of the fact that the expiration date of the presently existing authority is February 28, 1949, the committee felt that it did not have sufficient time to permit the necessary consideration of the many questions involved. It is our thought that during this 4-month period the Maritime Commission shall carry on its activities for the sale, charter, and operation of vessels in the same manner as they have been doing and that no changes in policies which might affect sale and charter shall be instituted until the Congress has reached a final decision on the long-range program. In other words, we feel that the status quo should be maintained without the imposition of any restrictions over those which have been in effect for the past several years. Nothing should be done which would adversely affect the power of the Congress to make decisions on the basic questions of sale and charter policy. We have discussed this matter with Admiral Smith, chairman of the Maritime Commission, and have been assured that it is the intent of that body not to impose such restrictions during the period in which this resolution would be in effect, and that changes in chartering policy which had been proposed by his agency will be held in abeyance. Our thought is that during this 4-month period no action should be taken by the Commission which might do irreparable harm to the small operators presently chartering ships. It is our distinct understanding and agreement that the present practices will continue as at present and that no new practices, policies, and regulations shall be put in effect.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON], may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the committee report on House Joint Resolution 92, I should like to add a few comments with particular reference to conditions on the west coast.

The Maritime Commission's suggested program of September 22 and 24, 1948, and certain exceptions already made by the Commission in the administration thereof adequately provide for many companies on the west coast, but they do not make adequate provision for many small companies which are prominently identified with the Pacific coastwise trade. I have particular reference to Coastwise Line, Olympic Steamship Co., W. R. Chamberlin Co., James Griffith Co., and others. The reasons why these companies, whose prewar operation was so important to the economy of the west coast as well as to the merchant marine, have failed to purchase tonnage under the Merchant Ship Sales Act, are shown in the record of the hearings. They are based on the fact that under the existing competitive rail-rate structure, it would be impossible for these companies to operate profitably. The Interstate Commerce Commission has been looking into this problem for some time, and hearings on the subject are about to commence. It is to be hoped that within the near future the situation will be adjusted to permit these companies to return to their prewar status as important vessel owners and operators on the west coast.

It would be most unfortunate if the Merchant Marine Committee or the Maritime Commision should impose a death sentence on these companies prior to such time as they could reasonably be expected to purchase vessels and rehabilitate the coastwise trade. In the meantime the companies must be permitted to operate in the offshore trades in order that they may maintain their valuable experience and efficient organizations intact, pending rehabilitation of the coastwise trade. The 4-month extension provided for by House Joint Resolution 92 will give the Merchant Marine Committee a further opportunity to consider the problems of these carriers. I hope that the Maritime Commission will also give the matter further consideration, and suggest to the committee ways and means by which the peculiar needs and requirements of these carriers are to be recognized in the Commission's administrative policy. Meantime we understand the status quo will be maintained, and these companies will continue to operate to the extent of their present scope, pending final action by the committee.

AGRICULTURAL CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. LYLE, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 110, Rept. No. 145), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2101) to authorize the regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., to make certain disaster or emergency loans and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement he made in connection with the introduction of H. R. 2811 today.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KIRWAN (at the request of Mr. MANSFIELD) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Hon. James A. Farley.

Mr. RHODES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include articles on national health insurance and the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. BROOKS (at the request of Mr. TRIMBLE) was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made earlier today and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper clipping.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. McGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address he made before the American Road Builders Association.

Mr. KEATING (at the request of Mr. HAND) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to extend in the RECORD the joint remarks of Mr. ENGEL of Michigan, Mr. POTTER, and himself, and include a letter and a table.

Mr. WELCH of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial published in the San Francisco News.

Mr. GWINN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on rent control.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article on Dr. Edmund A. Walsh, S. J., vice president of Georgetown University.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from a Minneapolis newspaper.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I was called off the floor during the roll call a few moments ago on the passage of the bill H. R. 1661. I should like the RECORD to show that had I been present I would have voted "yea."

SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House today the Speaker may be authorized to sign any enrolled bills or joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute for the purpose of announcing the program for next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it was the intention to bring up today House Resolution 75, but this will be brought up on Monday next. It will not appear on the program for next week, but since I have been informed that there is some opposition to it, rather than bring it up tonight I am putting it on the program for Monday.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is House Resolution 75 the resolution that deals with investigative powers for the Committee on Education and Labor?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is correct.

This is the program for next week:

On Monday there will be the call of the Consent Calendar. There will also be a suspension on the bill H. R. 2626, if the bill is not passed by unanimous consent. That is the authorization of the General Accounting Office Building. There will also be taken up the bill H. R. 858, known as the overtime on overtime bill, and the bill H. R. 2102, which authorizes the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation to make disaster loans.

Tuesday is Washington's Birthday. There will be no session on Wednesday. We will adjourn from Tuesday to Thursday, and there is no business scheduled for Thursday. There will be no business brought up after Monday of next week, with the exception of that which is brought up by unanimous consent. We know such matters, and there probably will be none, are very carefully screened by both sides before unanimous consent can be obtained.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The majority leader mentioned the bill relating to overtime on overtime and also the bill relating to the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation. Are those coming up under suspension of the rules?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; they will come up under the regular rules of the House.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is recognized for 20 minutes.

GOVERNMENT FINANCES GO INTO THE RED WITH TRUMAN—WE SCATTER OUR TAXPAYERS' DOLLARS ALL OVER THE WORLD

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, on many occasions I have risen in this Chamber to plead with the Members of this House to cut down on the huge appropriations, so that we can balance the budget, bring our financial house in order, and commence to pay off the huge national debt accumulated under the New Deal and the recent World War.

At the close of 1932 the national debt was approximately $19,500,000,000, and a great portion of this debt was incurred by loans to foreign governments during and after World War I, which for the most part never have been paid.

On Thursday, February 10, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] warned the Members that the President's budget request for 1950 exceeds the budget submitted for 1948 by $4,400,000,000 and is $6,800,000,000 larger than the budget for 1947.

Well can I remember, Mr. Speaker, how the people of this Nation reacted to the spendings of the Fifty-second Congress. This was our first billion-dollar Congress. The older Members of this body will perhaps recall the depression, the unemployment and the labor disorders of 1893 and 1894. The country was in a turmoil.

Yet the Fifty-second Congress voted appropriations totaling $507,376,397 during the first session and $519,535,293 during the second session, a total of more than a billion dollars in the 2-year period.

Every succeeding Congress, except the Fifty-third has voted bigger and bigger appropriations which have helped to build up our national debt.

Back in 1893 and 1894 the debt was less than one billion dollars. It averaged about $15 per capita. It did not vary very much even during the period of the Spanish-American War, when it rose to $19.33 per capita. However, by 1916 the debt had ben reduced to $11.96 per capita.

Today with the debt standing at more than $250,000,000,000 it is approximately $1,738 per capita. So I say the Members of this Congress ought to stop, look, and listen, long and carefully, before they vote the full $41,857,777,869 our President has asked for. Now I do not impugn the motives of our President, who has to take his advice from many sources, but I do wish to point out that we have got to cut down on the spending if this Nation is to remain solvent. We cannot continue to scatter our taxpayers' dollars all over the world indefinitely. We have plenty of places for every dollar right here in the United States. And surely no honorable course will lead to foisting our present national debt upon the shoulders and the backs of generations as yet unborn. Now, some will ask how can we cut down on the spending and keep this Nation out of another war.

THE FIRST STEP TO ECONOMY

The first and the prime step, in my opinion, will be the putting into immediate operation the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, created by the Eightieth Congress.

If we can lift, in part only, the load of Federal bureaucrats who have affixed themselves to the Government pay rolls, from the backs of the American taxpayer we will not only move toward economy in Government, but at the same time go a long way toward saving our Republic from the advance of State socialism.

Just think, as recently as 1941 we had 1,292,000 employees on the civilian pay rolls. Last year the number was 2,021,000 and growing rapidly.

As our Federal bureaucracy grew, so did Federal control over taxing. There has been a great change in the tax pattern since 1932. Where the Federal Government used to collect about one-fourth of all taxes in 1932, today the Federal Government collects three-fourths.

The pattern is shown by the table which follows:

TABLE 1.—*Percent of taxes collected by Federal, State and local taxing authorities*

1932:	
Federal, percent	24.0
State, percent	22.6
Cities, percent	24.7
Others, percent	28.7
Total	100.0
1947:	
Federal percent	74.7
State, percent	13.6
Cities, percent	5.7
Others, percent	6.0
Total	100.0

Dollar-wise the collections compare as follows:

1932:	
Federal taxes	$1,790,000,000
State taxes	1,890,000,000
All other taxes	4,468,000,000
Total	8,148,000,000
1947:	
Federal taxes	35,117,000,000
State taxes	5,776,000,000
All other taxes	5,795,000,000
Total	45,688,000,000

In 1948 the Federal Government collected $42,431,000,000 in taxes; the State governments, $7,798,000,000; and the local taxing authorities collected $7,122,000,000. This total taken by the tax collector of $57,351,000,000 is more than one-fourth of the national income at its peak point in 1948.

The Federal Government is siphoning off the peoples earnings by the billions for purposes and enterprises that were never dreamed of in the days of Jefferson and Jackson, the great leaders of the party now in power.

Jefferson foresaw some of the difficulties which confront us now. In a letter to M. Pictet, written during his first term, he said:

> We are endeavoring to reduce the Government to the practice of a rigorous economy, to avoid burthening the people, and arming the magistrate with a patronage of money which might be used to corrupt and undermine the principles of our Government.

In a letter written May 14, 1801, to Mr. Macon, Jefferson outlined his program for economy as follows:

> Levees are done away.
>
> The first communication to the next Congress will be, like subsequent ones, by message, to which no answer will be expected.
>
> The diplomatic establishment in Europe will be reduced to three Ministers.
>
> The compensation to collectors depends on you (Congress) and not on me.
>
> The Army is undergoing a chaste reformation.
>
> The Navy will be reduced to the legal establishment by the last of this month.
>
> Agencies in every department will be revised.
>
> We shall push you to the utmost in economy.
>
> A very early recommendation had been given to the Postmaster General to employ no printer, foreigner, or revolutionary Tory in any of his offices. This Department is still untouched.
>
> The arrival of Mr. Gallatin yesterday, completed the organization of our administration.

Jefferson also said:

> I place economy among the first and most important of republican virtues, and public debt as the greatest of the dangers to be feared.

Members of the Congress, let us heed the wise advice of Jefferson and start economizing before it is too late.

We ought to be able to make a good start on our international-relief programs. The bipartisan foreign policies which we adopted during the late war have now drifted into bipartisan worldwide relief policies.

Our present policies, if long continued, will bring disaster to any political party and to the Nation.

We should realize now that we can never buy peace with American dollars. We tried that approach to world problems before. Our best defense against war with any nation is a strong and solvent America where the citizen supports the Government and does not look to Government for his substance.

During the period we were at war with Germany, Italy, and Japan, our Government made loans, grants, and other relief payments to foreign governments, many who were not in the war, in the amount of over $48,600,000,000. That was before July 1, 1945.

Since July 1945, we have authorized additional loans, grants, and credits to implement our international policies as follows:

United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation	$2,700,000,000
United Nations Organization	41,426,162
Lend-lease (postwar)	2,163,000,000
International Monetary Fund (authorization)	2,750,000,000
International Bank	635,000,000
Export-Import Bank (loans authorized)	2,258,300,000
Loans to Great Britain and Philippines	4,390,000,000
War Department, grants for relief	1,771,926,293
Surplus property sales (credits extended)	1,148,000,000
Greek-Turkish loan (authorized amount)	400,000,000
Relief in occupied areas (Army)	2,230,000,000
International Relief Organization	71,073,000
International Refugee Organization	182,327,468
European Cooperative Administration	4,754,000,000
Other appropriations for foreign or international objectives by Eightieth Congress	300,000,000
Total	25,495,052,923

Although we have obligated our taxpayers to the extent of more than $25,000,000,000 since July 1, 1945, the President now asks for $6,709,000,000 for international affairs in the fiscal year 1950. This request taken alone means an additional tax burden of $46 for every man, woman, and child in the United States. Money that for the most part will be gone with the wind, insofar as any good it will ever do the average taxpaying family. To many families $46 is still a sizable sum of money, even in these days of high prices, and high wages. Forty-six dollars to the average family means shoes for the kiddies, and lots of little things that will have to be done without if we go through with this program as the one-worlders want us to.

The big brain trust that helps operate our Government here in Washington has solutions for all the ills of the world and all its peoples.

I sometimes wonder what will happen when we run out of money, and cannot take care of our own people by providing them with honest employment in all the lines of human endeavor. Who will then come to our rescue? Who will make us loans and grants, and supply our people with food, clothing, and shelter? I wonder.

When that day comes, the planners will take over and have the Government provide us with every social need from womb to tomb. The Government will operate the farms and the factories, give everyone free medical and dental care, old-age pensions, and what not. This is the bait that has been held out to people in other countries for hundreds of years, and it has never worked and never will.

But to get back to the President's request for $6,709,000,000 for international affairs and finance for 1950.

BULK OF MONEY GOES TO ECA

The bulk of the request, that is $4,500,000,000, is scheduled for the Economic Cooperative Administration. Mr. Paul Hoffman, the Administrator, is honest enough to admit that even this huge sum may not be enough for 1950, and he said he might have to come back for more.

Last year after we appropriated funds for the ECA program, the recipient governments got together and signed agreements with our country and each other agreeing to stabilize their currencies and balance their budgets. They have not done so, and we ought to find out why. Britain alone had a budget deficit last year of over $800,000,000. But still her socialization plans go merrily on, and this country and her dominions will have to continue to contribute. Stabilized currencies in Europe are far from being a fact. There are black markets of all kinds, and I am convinced that these black-market deals will persist as long as American dollars flow to Europe.

THE TRADE FACTOR

Some of our businessmen argue that we have to help Europe get on her feet if we ever expect to do business there. Now I want Europe to get on her feet as bad as anyone. However, as one businessman, I want our trade with Europe to be down a two-way street in which European dollars are used for European purchases and American dollars for American purchases. As it is now nearly all of our foreign trade is subsidized with our taxpayers' dollars.

Some claim that ECA is stopping the advance of communism in the European countries outside the iron curtain. But is it stopping the advent of socialism? After all both the Socialists and the Communists believe in the philosophies of Marx and Engels. The only difference seemingly is the approach to the dictatorial state as we know it.

The one-worlders and the free-traders who have been boosting for bigger appropriations for ECA sometimes have something more than sentiment to sell.

For example: A study of the cotton shipments authorized by ECA for the month of August 1948 revealed that the firm of Anderson, Clayton & Co., Houston, Tex., received 71.2 percent of the total cotton authorizations for that month, while 65 other cotton firms received the remainder of the authorizations. Mr. William L. Clayton, chairman of the board of directors of Anderson, Clayton & Co., and a former Under Secretary of State, appeared on January 25, 1949, before the Ways and Means Committee, as

an endorser of the then pending reciprocal trade bill, H. R. 1211. Mr. Clayton at that time stated that under the law as passed by the Eightieth Congress "no worth-while trade agreements would be negotiated" and he added "I still feel that that statement was correct." So Mr. Clayton wants reciprocal trade. Remember his firm got 71.2 percent of the cotton business under ECA in August. A measly 147,639 bales.

TOBACCO AUTHORIZATIONS FOR ECA

To December 31, 1948, European Cooperative Administration approved purchase of tobacco in the amount of $106,400,000. The bulk of the tobacco going to the United Kingdom, Ireland, Bizonia, Denmark and Norway. Forty-nine percent of all the tobacco authorizations were for the United Kingdom, where cigarettes sell for 70 cents a pack. Made principally of American tobacco, supplied by American dollars, the British Labor government ought to be cleaning up in the tobacco business. But are they? Their budgets do not show it. Here in the United States if it were not for the tax a 10-cent pack of cigarettes would be on the market right now. That is the difference between free enterprise and a regimented economy. In a study of the tobacco authorizations for the 6-week period from August 1, 1948, through September 15, 1948, it was found that 34 firms received authorizations for shipments totaling $13,075,101. Imperial Tobacco Co., a British-owned corporation received nearly 81 percent of the business, practically a monopoly, I would say.

COAL

During the summer of 1948, coal was being shipped by the producers and brokers in this country in huge quantities. In fact in one 6-week period 248 cargoes, averaging more than 9,000 tons each left American ports for European destinations. Here again 4 huge corporations supplied 57 percent of the business, while 26 other firms supplied the remaining tonnages.

ALUMINUM

At the very time last fall, when the shortage of aluminum in this country was most severely felt, ECA authorized purchases from the Aluminum Union Limited, Montreal, Canada, of aluminum ingots in huge quantities for the Ministry of Supply, England. From September 16 to 30, 1948, the authorization amounted to more than 72,000,000 pounds, or about 36,000 tons.

At that very time, aluminum was backing up in England, in France, and in Italy, and so-called scrap in sizable quantities was being shipped to the United States where it was grabbed up by hungry purchasers for as high a price as 32 cents per pound. The aluminum which was sold to the British Ministry of Supply cost but 11½ cents per pound on the average. But, remember, our taxpayers paid the freight. There used to be a saying that "Competition is the life of trade." But there can never be any competition in a deal where our taxpayers furnish the funds to buy commodities like aluminum to be shipped to Europe, and where the Europeans can take their gift aluminum for their own uses, and ship their scrap aluminum back to the United States, and sell it in the gray markets for a fancy price. Only the shortages here at home, and the failure of our producers to anticipate the market demand during the past year could have made the aluminum deals possible.

OTHER NONFERROUS METALS

Besides the aluminum shipments financed by our taxpayers, we have been shipping large quantities of brass, copper, lead, and zinc, all for free. These are items which we are supposed to be stocking for strategic purposes. But it seems that strategic purposes and national defense have been temporarily sidetracked so that ECA can help Europe to her feet again.

BRINGING HOME THE BACON

Every now and then the Economic Cooperation Administration issues a report called the commodity supplier data. For October 1–15 this report shows that the British Ministry of Food received authorizations for shipments of more than 120,000,000 pounds of bacon from Canadian packing firms. This is what I call bringing home the bacon, the bacon paid for by the toil and sweat of American labor. Bringing home the bacon for John Bull.

Now I have not much confidence in any figures released by ECA. I think they are all rigged up, and I expect some of Mr. Hoffman's assistants will be quick in explaining that these figures were in error.

However it may be, we will be in error if we do not start watching these appropriations and cutting them down sharply. It is a certainty that 145,000,000 Americans cannot go on indefinitely attempting to feed and clothe people in other parts of this world that cannot do these things for themselves.

Let us start now and pledge ourselves to economy in spending both at home and abroad.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] is recognized for 25 minutes.

RELIEF FROM HEAVY EXCISE TAXES

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to provide some relief from the heavy excise tax burdens imposed during the war. In my speech of last year, in regard to the income tax, I pointed out that rates of tax in themselves do not bring in revenue to the Government. Too high rates may actually decrease the revenue. The soundness of this position was amply demonstrated by the increased revenues from income taxes in the calendar year 1948 after the adoption of the Income Tax Reduction Act of 1948. This position is equally true in the case of excise taxes. Now that we are entering a stage where we have a buyer's market instead of a seller's market, and competition becomes keener between businessmen, it is very important that the tax laws do not hamper or obstruct the production and sale of goods and commodities which are essential to the well-being and comfort of our people.

There are on the statute books today a great many types of selective excise taxes. Some are the backbone of our internal revenue system; for example, the taxes on liquor and tobacco. Others are of a temporary nature which were either imposed during the war period or had wartime rates added to the peacetime rates. It is indisputable that some of these new taxes and increased rates were purposely adopted during the war to discourage civilian production from competing with the war program.

I recall very clearly the testimony of Leon Henderson, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply, before our committee in 1941. In speaking of excise taxes, he said, and I quote:

> Turning first to the proposals for excise taxes, the only case which may be made out for such additional taxation at the present time from a total defense point of view must rest upon its effectiveness in discouraging civilian production which competes with the defense program for men, materials, and machines.

We are now in the fourth year following the end of the war and our efforts, if we desire to make our economy strong and efficient, should be directed toward encouraging civilian production and not discouraging it.

My bill is only a step toward relief from the war excise taxes. It is estimated that the bill will result in a loss in revenue of approximately $440,000,000 for the year 1950. I wish it could provide for greater relief. However, larger reductions, in my opinion, will have to await the action of the Congress in reducing the enormous budget proposed by the President for the fiscal year 1950, which, when figured on the same basis as other budgets, is approximately $44,000,000,000. This is the greatest peacetime budget in the history of our country. If we are ever to get our taxes down to a fair and reasonable level, we must reduce the cost of Government and not continue to increase it. As budget expenditures for fiscal 1950 are estimated at approximately $44,000,000,000, a reduction in expenditures of only 1 percent will take care of the loss in revenue under my bill, and relieve taxpayers of these war burdens.

In the last Congress, the Republicans, with the help of statesmanlike Democrats, succeeded in making important reductions in the budget for the fiscal year 1949.

Former President Hoover has recently made a study of Government reorganization which, if adopted, will result in reducing expenditures by $3,000,000,000. Reductions such as these are essential for tax relief. What the country needs is not tax increase but tax reduction. I hope the budget for the fiscal year 1950 is substantially reduced so that we can provide further tax relief to the country.

I will now discuss the reductions under my bill in accordance with its arrangement.

The first section, dealing with tax reduction, relates to luggage. Under the existing law, the luggage tax includes ladies' handbags, pocketbooks, billfolds, and key cases. These items fall more in the class of necessities rather than luxuries, and impose an undue burden on the

ladies. My bill eliminates the tax on these articles.

With respect to the remaining articles, the retail tax on luggage is reduced from 20 to 15 percent.

Our committee has had quite a bit of complaint about the retail tax on jewelry. There are certain articles which have been construed by the Treasury as coming under the definition of jewelry which are really necessities. I refer to fountain pen gold points and rhinestone buttons permanently attached to articles of wearing apparel. The bill removes such articles from the jewelry tax. It also reduces the rate of tax on jewelry from 20 to 15 percent of the retail sales price.

Another retail tax which is bearing heavily on our economy is the tax on furs. Testimony before our committee has shown that this tax has had a disastrous effect on the fur market. My bill reduces the rate of tax on furs from 20 to 15 percent on the retail price.

Another tax which has been particularly burdensome upon the ladies is the tax on toilet preparations and cosmetics. Testimony before our committee indicated that baby oils, baby lotions, and baby powders have been classed as toilet preparations by the Treasury. My bill completely exempts these items from tax. It also reduces the retail tax on other toilet articles from 20 to 15 percent. We also had considerable complaint about taxing toilet articles sold to barber shops or beauty parlors for use in the operation thereof. A bill passed the House last year exempting from the tax such articles when sold to barber shops or beauty parlors for their own use. This bill was not considered by the Senate. Under my bill, the same exemption is provided.

Under the existing law, the tax on tires has been construed to apply to tires used on children's toys, ordinary lawn mowers and bicycles. I do not believe that the Congress ever desired to collect a tax on articles of this type. My bill remedies this situation by exempting from the tax on tires, tires manufactured, produced or imported to retail at not more than $5 each.

Many witnesses appeared before our committee and protested against the automobile tax applying to house trailers. It was pointed out that to tax such trailers adds to the present housing shortage, discriminates against one type of housing as compared with another, and places a severe hardship on veterans, who purchase for housing a large number of trailer coaches. My bill corrects this inequity by exempting trailer coaches from the automobile tax.

In connection with the tax on automotive parts and accessories, the Treasury rulings have been very conflicting with respect to the taxation of rebuilt, reconditioned, and repaired parts or accessories. These rebuilt, reconditioned, or repaired parts should not be subjected to the tax which is intended to apply only to new parts. The bill corrects this inequity by exempting from the tax on automotive parts or accessories, rebuilt, reconditioned, or repaired parts.

Another wartime tax which has been particularly harmful with respect to schools, churches, and juvenile clubs is the tax on musical instruments. The revenue from this source is not large and musical instruments are used in many cases for educational, religious, and character-building purposes. My bill repeals the tax on musical instruments.

Our committee had brought to our attention an inequity existing in the case of the tax applying to electrical appliances. Under existing law, if a farmer buys a direct motor-driven fan for use in a barn or poultry house or for the ventilation of potato storage, apple storage, or other types of storage, he is required to pay the 10-percent tax applicable to electrical appliances. On the other hand, if he buys a belt-driven fan for the same purposes, no excise tax is applicable. Electric direct motor-driven fans are not luxury items but are used in industry, on the farm, and in commercial establishments for the protection, health, and comfort of workers. My bill corrects this inequity by amending the law to confine the tax to electric direct motor-driven fans of the ceiling, wall-bracket, desk, pedestal, and air-circulator types.

Testimony before our committee disclosed the heavy tax burden on photographic apparatus which is now 25 percent. My bill reduces the tax on cameras and lenses, photographic apparatus, and equipment and any apparatus designed for use in the taking of photographs or motion pictures or in developing, printing, or enlarging photographs or motion pictures from 25 percent to 10 percent. The tax on photographic plates and sensitized paper is reduced from 15 percent to 10 percent. These taxes are typical of those adopted during the war to discourage civilian production.

The war tax on electric light bulbs is extremely burdensome. It is now 20 percent of the manufacturers' price. My bill reduces the rate to 10 percent. Electric light bulbs are a necessity and are used in practically every American home.

The present law imposes a tax of 6 cents per gallon on lubricating oils. Lubricating oil has been construed by the Treasury and the courts to apply to cutting oils, a much cheaper grade of oil than motor oils and which is not used primarily as a lubricant but to carry away chips and cuttings, and to cool cutting machine tools. My bill removes from the tax on lubricating oils, oils designed primarily for use in cutting and machining operations on metals and known commercially as cutting oils.

During the war the exemption from the admissions tax to religious, educational, or charitable entertainments, county fairs and concerts conducted by civilian or community membership associations was removed. The admissions tax from these sources results in very little revenue and is a constant source of irritation to those worth-while and deserving groups. My bill restores the exemptions existing before the war to these groups.

The tax on telephone, telegraph, and radio facilities have been greatly increased during the war period and such high rates are having a very deterrent effect on this type of business. My bill reduces the war rate from 25 to 20 percent for telephone toll and domestic telegraph, cable, and radio messages. It also reduces the rate on wire and equipment service from 8 to 5 percent.

One of the most troublesome taxes imposed during the war is that relating to the transportation of persons. I regret, because of the large revenue yield from this tax, that I am unable to recommend at this time its complete elimination. The tax interferes with travel by rail or bus which are now in competition with automobile travel. My bill reduces the rate of tax from 15 to 10 percent. This should eliminate, to some extent, the poor man's cost of travel and lessen the expenses of the businessman who is compelled to travel.

Another tax which was imposed during the war and which unjustly discriminates against the farmer and the businessman is the tax on the transportation of property. This tax is at the rate of 3 percent upon the price paid for the transportation of the property except in the case of the transportation of coal where the rate is 4 cents per short ton. This is another tax which I would like to see immediately repealed because it is a distinct burden on the farmer, the businessman, and the shipper. However, since the tax yields a very large amount of revenue, it is only possible at this time to reduce the rate. My bill will cut the rate from 3 percent to 1½ percent and in the case of coal, from 4 cents per short ton to 2 cents per short ton.

The relief provided in my bill is made effective on the first day following its enactment. I regard this as important. If the effective date of the bill was postponed until later, buyers might delay seasonable purchases until after the date the tax reduction becomes effective.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

WHY I AM OPPOSED TO THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of repeal of the Taft-Hartley law. I want to explain in some detail why I am in favor of the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law. I believe this law should be repealed because it is bad for labor, bad for industry, and bad for the general public.

The Taft-Hartley Act has been presented to us, most cleverly, as a safe middle-of-the-road approach to labor problems. It is represented as a compromise between the so-called management excesses of the days before Roosevelt and the so-called labor excesses of the Wagner Act.

It is my conviction that this is not a true picture of the act. It is not a middle-of-the-road bill at all; it undermines the fundamental principles of collective bargaining established by the Wagner Act and returns us to the period of potential management dictatorship which existed prior to 1934. And we can all remember that during that period management, unrestrained by vigorous unions, led us straight into the depression of the early thirties. That period, we will all agree, was bad for labor, bad

for management, and bad for the general public.

The labor laws of the 1930's, beginning with the Norris-LaGuardia Act under President Hoover, were designed to permit organized labor and industry to exercise their natural powers under our social system. They forbade industry to use certain unfair powers which prevented the unions from carrying out their legitimate role in our economy. Some of such illegitimate practices of industry in the field of labor relations were dismissal for union affiliation, yellow-dog contracts, use of professional strike breakers, the company spy and agent provocateur, labor injunctions, use of company gunmen, black list of union members, use of State and Federal troops to break strikes, and other such measures.

Of course, Taft-Hartley proponents say that they would never dream of returning to such nefarious practices. If they did not intend to use these provisions of the act, we may be assured they would never have included them. If you legalize roulette, it need not surprise you to find that somebody wants to operate a wheel.

Some people who were skeptical about the Taft-Hartley Act in the beginning have been lulled into acceptance because they feel that no spectacular harm has been done to labor in the past 2 years. This is true in the main, though there have been a few outstanding examples of hardship, such as the Chicago printers, whose long strike has cost over 11 million dollars. And little organizing has been undertaken for fear of the complications of the law.

One of my constituents has written me a series of specific questions about the Taft-Hartley Act based on the experience of the few months of its existence. He asks what specific harm the law has done to labor, to industry, and to the general public, and what specific good it has done to the same three groups.

I can give my friend answers to these questions, but they will not be answers to the main question, Why do I believe the Taft-Hartley law must be repealed? For the real objection to the act lies, not in what it has done so far, but in what it has the power to do in the future, when it will pay management to invoke its destructive clauses. While there is a shortage of labor, particularly of skilled labor, management will not risk antagonizing it by making full use of the powers given by the act. But when management is more anxious to get rid of workers than to keep them, the picture will be entirely different.

The Taft-Hartley Act is based on the labor views of the National Association of Manufacturers. One might almost say it is legislation of the NAM, by the NAM, for the NAM. Its principal proponents have always known this, and given it support on that basis. They agree heartily with the NAM philosophy that the only good union is a dead union.

Loud protests are made that the act does not seek to weaken or destroy unions or restrict their "legitimate objectives." In fact, a great deal is said about how much the proponents of the act love the unions; all they ask is to correct a few little injustices to employers.

But let us remember that when the NAM says it is in favor of unions, it means just what Stalin means when he says he is in favor of democracy. The unions favored by the NAM are without power, without national connections, without influence, without funds and without freedom. Unions of this type, we are assured, will be protected under the act. But this is not what the American people mean when they speak of unions.

One of the most effective opponents of communism in American unions is James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer of the CIO. Jim Carey declared at a recent hearing on the new labor bill that unions of workers in Russia are today being operated under a Communist version of the Taft-Hartley law.

My opposition to the Taft-Hartley Act is based on the conviction that the only good union is a live union, one with power to bargain collectively for its members, to win better conditions through that bargaining, and to see that the employers live up to the conditions agreed upon. Anything less than this is a company-dominated union and not a free association of workers.

Supporters of the Taft-Hartley Act insist that the law during its less than 2 years of operation has by no means wrecked the union movement; that there have been strikes and organizing campaigns and every other manifestation of life and liberty. But the act so far has not been tested by depression conditions. Today labor is in demand and it has not paid industry to crack down on the unions and incur labor's ill-will. But when the demand for labor slacks off, then those who supported the act will use its provisions as a weapon to crush the unions and force their destruction.

This view is not merely that of labor. The conservative and authoritative industry publication, Business Week, made this statement in an editorial a few weeks ago. The editorial said the Taft-Hartley Act must go because it destroyed the equality between labor and management which it considered of major importance. It admitted in its very frank editorial, that in time of depression the Taft-Hartley Act could and would be used to destroy labor.

Let me read you what Business Week, probably the foremost business publication in the country, had to say. The editorial is entitled "Why the Taft-Hartley Act Failed." It appeared in the issue for December 18. This is what this realistic employer organ says:

> Most businessmen are realistic. Few are wasting time deploring the imminent doom of the Taft-Hartley Act. To be sure they worry about the statute which will replace it. But most businessmen are getting ready to work with a new set of labor-relations rules.
>
> A change of rules will bring a host of practical problems. Before that happens, there is some point in considering why the Taft-Hartley Act failed, and what may be the lesson of that experience.
>
> For the Taft-Hartley Act did fail—on one of the most important grounds by which a law must be judged in a democratic society. That ground is consent. Only the police state can enforce a law which is believed to be unjust by the people it affects.
>
> What was wrong was that the Taft-Hartley Act went too far. It crossed the narrow line separating a law which aims only to regulate, from one which could destroy.
>
> Given a few million unemployed in America, given an administration in Washington which was not prounion—and the Taft-Hartley Act conceivably could wreck the labor movement.
>
> These are the provisions that could do it: (1) picketing can be restrained by injunction; (2) employers can petition for a collective bargaining election; (3) strikers can be held ineligible to vote—while the strike replacements cast the only ballots; and (4) if the outcome of this is a no-union vote, the Government must certify and enforce it.
>
> Any time there is a surplus labor pool from which an employer can hire at least token strike replacements, these four provisions, linked together, presumably can destroy a union.
>
> By going that far, the law defeated itself.

I have quoted this statement from Business Week at some length because it comes from a source known to be usually hostile to labor, yet it opposes the act as fundamentally a menace to business and the public as well as to labor.

There are other sources of criticism of the Taft-Hartley Act not from a labor viewpoint. A few days ago I received a copy of a resolution passed by the Common Council of Milwaukee. Since we have nonpartisan election of city officials in Milwaukee, this cannot be construed to be in any sense a labor statement. It reads as follows:

> Whereas in 1935 the Congress of the United States enacted the Wagner Act which gave the workingman the right to organize into free labor unions and to collectively bargain with his employer; and
>
> Whereas this law based upon the American principal of equality of opportunity was thereafter hailed as the Magna Carta of Labor; and
>
> Whereas the enactment of the Eightieth Congress of the Taft-Hartley Act because of its inequities and inequalities tended to disturb if not actually destroy the fundamental gains made by workingmen in their quest for economic justice; Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved by the Major and Common Council of the City of Milwaukee*, That we call upon the Congress of the United States now in session to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act, and in its place reenact the Wagner Act as originally enacted; and be it further
>
> *Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the two United States Senators representing the State of Wisconsin, and the Congressmen from the Fourth and Fifth Districts, and to the clerks of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Another approach to the issue is found in an excellent book by the Reverend George A. Kelly, called The Taft-Hartley Act, a Moral Analysis. Father Kelly develops a moral and ethical argument against the act as class legislation based upon interest and prejudice. He established the moral right of workers to strike or work in other ways for higher wages and better working conditions, and argues that the Taft-Hartley Act is immoral in opposing those rights. And he makes clear that conscious reflection upon basic moral or ethical principles would have, or should have, prevented the adoption of many of the most objec-

tionable provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Many other religious leaders have arrived independently at Father Kelly's conclusions. A group of 642 prominent religious leaders of Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish faith have united in condemning it. They stated that the Taft-Hartley Act was a measure calculated to destroy the real strength of a free labor movement by undermining basic principles of collective bargaining, making the Government of the United States a ready instrument of employer resistance to legitimate needs of workers, and subjecting unions to a process of decimation and frustration under Government control.

The National Catholic Welfare Conference has attacked the Taft-Hartley Act as disruptive and called for the elimination of its cumbersome and obstructive provisions.

Let us return for a few moments to the dangerous objections to the act raised by Business Week. First, picketing can be restrained by use of the injunction. Picketing, of a kind which does not lead to violence, is a primary right of unions in calling attention of nonstrikers and the public to their strike. The use of the injunction in this and other labor situations is a reversion to the bad old days. In the 1920's the injunction was freely used in labor disputes and used invariably to restrain labor from organizing, picketing, striking, or carrying on other legitimate acts of a trade union. Injunctions were issued right and left by the labor-baiting judges under the thumb of local employers.

The Taft-Hartley Act not merely revives the use of the injunction, but actually requires the Government to secure injunctions on behalf of employers where there are alleged violations of the prohibitions against jurisdictional strikes and boycotts.

There are also vague and dangerous provisions for the use of the injunction to protect the right of individuals not to join the union; it is impossible under this provision that many ordinary organizational activities may be restrained. There is also a loose phrase about not causing the employer to pay money for services which are not performed; this may be used to restrain a union from demanding paid vacations and holidays, shifts in work loads, and other perfectly normal demands.

The provision for the use of the injunction in emergency situations is one which has had a good deal of popular appeal. However, the definition of emergency is so wide and so open to interpretations in local situations, that it may be used in practically any strike. If the weapon of the injunction is to be used in protecting the public against strikes which seriously affect the public welfare, then the workers and the public must have better safeguards against misuse of this weapon than the Taft-Hartley Act gives them.

Point two in the indictment by Business Week is that employers can petition for a collective-bargaining election. This means that employers may choose a time convenient to them, or may supplant union men with strike breakers for the mere purpose of holding an election to declare in favor of a company union. Those of us whose memories in the labor movement go back to pre-Wagner Act days know that this can very easily happen. It opens the door for those vicious appendages of the open-shop system, the labor detective agency, and the phony employment bureau which hires out thugs and strike breakers. Such practices invariably lead to violence, loss of life, limb, and property and demoralization of the community, which we should all deplore.

The third point raised by Business Week is that strikers can be held ineligible to vote, while the strike replacements cast the only ballots. This is a further invitation for the development of employer tactics of a nature to injure the unions and the community. I cannot warn too strongly against the development of a class of professional strike breakers, under the protection of the law, to beat down wages and beat up workers. Such a development, which is sure to come sooner or later should the Taft-Hartley Act be permitted to continue, would put labor relations back 20 to 30 years. It would turn us back from the theory of "talk it out" to the discarded idea of slug it out.

The fourth point is that a no-union vote, won on the votes of strike breakers, or in the neat phrase of Business Week, "token replacements," would be enforced by the Government, thus making the Government a party to a strong-arm agreement dictated by the employers. This, of course, is not collective bargaining at all. It removes all basis of equality between the two parties. It knocks labor out on a foul and then certifies industry as the new heavyweight champion.

In addition to these four points raised by the editorial in Business Week, there are a number of other provisions in the Taft-Hartley Act which are fraught with danger.

Unions are made suable for the acts of their so-called agents, even though the union had not approved or ratified the acts in question. What could be easier than for an employer to hire a labor spy, place him in the union to win a position of trust, then have him set off an explosion in a struck plant. The amount of the damage would easily bankrupt the union, as well as arousing the public against the strikers.

The legal complications, requirements, prohibitions, and general confusion established by the Taft-Hartley Act have earned it the epithet of the lawyers' paradise. It is, in my opinion, a very bad thing to remove labor-management relations from the hands of labor and management and turn them over to the lawyers. The delays and expense of continuous litigation, the removal of grievances from the field of prompt and direct action by the interested parties to an uninformed and uninterested court, can only result in deterioration of relations. And the delay and expense is, of course, far more important to the union than to management. That was undoubtedly in the minds of those who drew up the law.

One of the foremost experts on labor law in the country, Dr. William Leiserson, has said that the one thing above all others that rendered the Taft-Hartley Act unworkable and chaotic was its maze of legal rules over every conceivable happening in labor relations.

The law against secondary boycotts is an effort to break down the solidarity of labor. It was part of a definite theory of former Congressman Hartley and a number of other extremists to "break the unions down to the local level." The phrase is Mr. Hartley's, not mine. The idea of separating unions from each other and from their own industry in various parts of the country is, of course, quite in keeping with their general desire to make the unions too weak to be effective. Divide and conquer is as effective a rule in labor relations as it is in the international field.

I have a good deal of experience with the "runaway" shop in a number of fields, and I know that this phenomenon is a bad thing for labor, for industry, and for the community. If those employers working under satisfactory agreements, paying good wages, and having good working relations are to be protected the union must be free to operate wherever competition arises. Many a town has suffered serious economic loss because open-shop competition started up out of range of union activity and drained off their orders. This condition has been lessening recently, however, as would-be sweat-shop operators become convinced that the union will follow them north, south, east, or west, and force them to keep wages up and hours down. This is for the benefit of industries and communities as well as for the benefit of labor.

Many industries are organized on a Nation-wide basis. It is absurd to consider the possibility of operating the steel industry or the auto industry on a plant-by-plant basis. It is equally absurd to propose to conduct labor negotiations on a single-shop basis. The steel worker today is not to be treated as a blacksmith's helper, free to bargain as an individual with the individual boss. He is part of a vast and complicated human organization, every part of which is related to every other part. Only a strong Nation-wide union can establish his rights.

One of the worst provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act is the one which outlaws agreements mutually satisfactory to workers and employers if such agreements call for the closed shop. Much nonsense has been written and spoken against the closed shop. Actually it is a condition which thousands of employers as well as unions voluntarily wrote into their contracts because it was not only beneficial to them but also to the consuming public.

Closed-shop agreements, voluntarily entered into, helped to make America the greatest industrial nation in the world. During the last war the highest records for production were made by plants operating under such contracts, which are advantageous to the employer as well as to labor. The employer derives the advantages of stability, efficiency, and

friendly relations with labor. Where there is a closed shop the workers give their very best because they know that the employer has accepted unionism, wants to live and work in harmony with his employees, and is not scheming to destroy the union at the first opportunity.

Furthermore, it is very difficult to explain to the average union member of long standing why the Government should take such tender care of the nonunion man who is looking for a free ride. The old-time unionist reasons like this: "I joined this union 20 years ago, when pay was low and conditions terrible. I paid my dues all those years, when the dues were a much bigger bite out of the pay check than they are today. I gave up my evenings for meetings and union work, and walked the picket line and went hungry when we were on strike. Now we are doing well, thanks to the work of the union; our pay is good and we have vacations, sick leave, Saturdays off. I helped the union win all these things. Why do I have to share them with some newcomer who is too stingy to spare a few dollars from the good pay I won for him? Why does the Government say it has to protect his right to a free ride on my carfare?" I support the old-timers' contention that he has a right to insist that the newcomers join the union and pay their share of the carfare through closed-shop agreements.

Labor relations, as many a wise employer has discovered, are really human relations. The problem cannot be solved by passing a one-sided punitive law at the behest of the selfish and discredited National Association of Manufacturers. Only by good will, square dealing, and a sincere compliance with a just labor-relations law like the administration's new labor bill can equality in collective bargaining be reestablished and genuine progress be made in the important realm of labor-management relations.

The Taft-Hartley bill must and will be repealed. This is the will of the American people, clearly expressed at the ballot boxes last November 2. I am sure that there are few, if any, Members of this House who could be at ease with their consciences if they failed to carry out such an unmistakable and mighty mandate of the American people.

When we have removed this blot from the statute books, we may rest assured that both the workers and the fair-minded employers of this country will go forward as never before, each recognizing the rights of the other, both dealing with each other as equals, living and working in harmony for their own welfare and for the welfare of the Nation and the world.

Before I conclude, there is just one final point which I should like to impress upon the House. When the Taft-Hartley Act was jammed through the Eightieth Congress and passed over the veto of the President, our friends in Europe—the democratic, freedom-loving peoples of France, Great Britain, and the other countries where human liberty is still prized—were shocked.

The enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act in 1947 gave a tremendous impetus to the Communist propaganda machine. To the peoples of Europe and the whole world, the Kremlin pointed to the Taft-Hartley Act and said, in effect, "Well, if you wanted proof, here is the proof that America is the reactionary country we have been telling you it is—a country that squeezes its workers and throws them into chains."

And then last November, when the news went flashing across the oceans that the people of America had overwhelmingly spoken out for the prompt repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, our democratic friends in western Europe were heartened. They were given new courage to resist the Communists. All this is on the record. It has been fully confirmed in dispatches appearing in the most conservative newspapers of our country. Moreover, it has been fully confirmed by leading American businessmen who have been in Europe and know whereof they speak—such men as Paul Hoffman and Averell Harriman.

There are many, many additional reasons why the removal of the Taft-Hartley Act must receive top priority in the Eighty-first Congress. Within the confines of a single speech it is impossible, of course, to discuss all the dangerous characteristics of this destructive act.

I have indicated some of the major flaws of this vicious law. The facts are known. The Taft-Hartley Act is bad for labor, bad for industry, bad for everyone. We have a mandate from the electorate, and I hope that the Members of this House will act with the utmost promptness to carry out this mandate and put an end to one of the most unfortunate experiments in American history.

A FREE LITHUANIA

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanian people throughout America are today commemorating with heartfelt gratitude the fact that the United States has not recognized Russia's usurpation of the Lithuanian people.

Lithuania for centuries has fought for independence and self-government—for civic liberty and religious freedom. This fight will continue in the hearts and minds of all loyal Lithuanians regardless of the present power of a gigantic oppressor nation. Freedom cannot be exterminated permanently from a nation whose peoples have for centuries refused to submit to religious oppression or slavery.

The people of this great country are fighting every hour, through various organizations, underground and otherwise, and they will eventually be rewarded with victory and the reestablishment of freedom within their borders.

Lithuania is a tragic victim of Soviet aggression. The people have been deprived of their property rights, human rights, and fundamental freedoms. Over a half million people of Lithuania have been slain or transferred away from their native country. The crimes committed against these people have been condemned by the United States and other democratic countries which continue to recognize independent Lithuania and its lawful representatives.

It is the honest desire of the Lithuanian people everywhere that our great country and all free democracies of the world continue to stand by the principles of right and justice and that they will continue to fight for the cause of sovereign rights and self-government for the people of Lithuania.

I want to extend my sincere congratulations to the brave Lithuanian people who are engaging in this fight for freedom to restore their independence and throw off the shackles of a ruthless tyrant.

I know that our President, the Congress, and the Department of State, and all the powers behind our great Republic will be marshaled in the future to aid the Lithuanian people in this battle for righteousness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 21, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

229. A letter from the president, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a report of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

230. A letter from the chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting the Commission's report on the Post Office Department (H. Doc. No. 76); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

231. A letter from the chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting a study on management, organization, and administration of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

232. A letter from the acting president, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act to regulate the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

233. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the settlement of certain claims of the Government of the United States on its own behalf and on behalf of American nationals against foreign governments"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

234. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report of the Archivist of the United States on records proposed for disposal, and lists or schedules, or parts of lists or schedules, covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

235. A letter from the President, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to provide for payment of salaries covering periods of separation and suspension from the Government service in the case of persons improperly removed or suspended from such

service"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

236. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act of June 18, 1929"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

237. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 3552 of the Revised Statutes relating to the covering into the Treasury of all moneys arising from charges and deductions"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 2101. A bill to authorize the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., to make certain disaster or emergency loans, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 142). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SHORT: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2216. A bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to provide for an Under Secretary of Defense; with an amendment (Rept. No. 143). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 2660. A bill to prohibit the parking of vehicles upon any property owned by the United States for postal purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 144). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LYLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 110. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 2101, a bill to authorize the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., to make certain disaster or emergency loans, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 145). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 111. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 858, a bill to clarify the overtime-compensation provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, as applied in the stevedoring and building-construction industries, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 146). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 20. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1947, as amended, to authorize the creation of 10 professional and scientific positions in the headquarters and research stations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; without amendment (Rept. No. 147). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 2363. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) to the Gulf coast and creating the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission; without amendment (Rept. No. 148). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 668. A bill for the relief of Alex Ball; without amendment (Rept. No. 134). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 711. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Gregg Dilnot; without amendment (Rept. No. 135). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1035. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ada M. Ryan; with an amendment (Rept. No. 136). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1041. A bill for the relief of Jeannette and Jesus Esteva and their four children; with amendments (Rept. No. 137). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1079. A bill for the relief of Maria Veitri Magnone; with an amendment (Rept. No. 138). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1460. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Silvia Mapelli; with an amendment (Rept. No. 139). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1508. A bill for the relief of Peter Drozd; without amendment (Rept. No. 140). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1629. A bill for the relief of Kira and Nina Grigorieff; without amendment (Rept. No. 141). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 2811. A bill to provide homes for city and farm families of average income, particularly those of World War II veterans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2812. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain land at South Naknek to the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of North America; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GORSKI of Illinois:

H. R. 2813. A bill to authorize the appointment of one additional circuit judge for the seventh circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 2814. A bill to authorize the appointment of one additional district judge for the southern district of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2815. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to determine the amounts due to and render judgment upon the claims of the employees of the Bureau of the Mint, Treasury Department, for overtime work performed and rates of pay authorized but not granted; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2816. A bill providing for the conveyance to the town of Nahant, Mass., of the Fort Ruckman Military Reservation; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H. R. 2817. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the work of the soil-conservation districts of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 2818. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, entitled "Judicial Code and Judiciary," by adding a new section thereto known as section 1732-b to permit the photographing, microfilming, or photostating of original business records and the introduction of the same in evidence after the destruction of the originals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 2819. A bill to authorize the appointment of two additional district judges for northern district of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 2820. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the purchase of public lands for home and other sites," approved June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 609), as amended; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2821. A bill to amend the act approved June 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 741; 43 U. S. C., sec. 869), entitled "An act to authorize acquisition or use of public lands by States, counties, or municipalities for recreational purposes," to include other public purposes and to permit nonprofit organizations to lease public lands for certain purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 2822. A bill to amend Public Law 289, Eightieth Congress, with respect to surplus airport property; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 2823. A bill to provide additional compensation for widows and other dependents of certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 2824. A bill to provide for the construction, rehabilitation, expansion, conversion, and joint utilization of buildings, structures, utilities, and other facilities, including the acquisition of land, for the Reserve components of the National Military Establishment of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 2825. A bill to provide compensatory time for services performed on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays by clerks in third-class post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 2826. A bill to provide for the construction of flood-control improvements at the city of Quincy, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2827. A bill to provide for the construction of flood-control improvements at the town of Beardstown, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 2828. A bill to provide for the creation, organization, administration, and maintenance of a Naval Reserve and a Marine Corps Reserve, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 2829. A bill to make retroactive section 6 (b) (2) of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), as amended, dealing with the restoration to Government service of persons improperly discharged, suspended, or furloughed without pay under section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 2830. A bill to provide for the payment by the United States of premiums on bonds of Government officers or employees; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 2831. A bill to provide for payment to certain retired Naval and Marine Corps Reserve officers of a lump sum equal to their active-duty pay and allowances for the period during which such officers remained in an inactive status without pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

H. R. 2832. A bill authorizing the construction of flood-control work on the Dyberry River, Wayne County, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. POLK:

H. R. 2833. A bill to amend and supplement the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McKINNON:

H. R. 2834. A bill to authorize the appointment of one additional district judge for the southern district of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 2835. A bill to provide additional compensation for postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 2836. A bill to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 2837. A bill to equalize the physical requirements for admission of a cadet or a midshipman to the Military or Naval Academies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2838. A bill to amend section 1705 of title 18 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 2839. A bill to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. R. 2840. A bill to provide for the investigation of discriminations against women on the basis of sex, to establish policies for the removal of such discriminations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 2841. A bill to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 2842. A bill to provide that certain persons who served in the merchant marine shall not be liable for induction into the armed services under the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 2843. A bill to amend section 2402 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and to repeal section 2402 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. R. 2844. A bill to provide for determination through judicial proceedings of claims for compensation on account of disability or death resulting from disease or injury incurred or aggravated in line of duty while serving in the active military or naval service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 2845. A bill to eliminate or reduce certain excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RICHARDS:

H. R. 2846. A bill to establish the Cowpens Battleground National Military Park; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. J. Res. 169. Joint resolution to provide for a 3-month extension of Federal rent controls in order to give the States time to take such action as they may deem appropriate with respect to rent control in their respective jurisdictions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SANBORN:

H. Con. Res. 41. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing, as a House document, 30,000 copies of the document entitled "Money Makes the Mare Go"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. Res. 109. Resolution making H. R. 2216, a bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to provide for an Under Secretary of Defense, and for other purposes, a special order of business; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to use all possible means to secure the release of Cardinal Mindszenty, of the Roman Catholic faith, and Bishop Ordass, of the Lutheran faith; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maryland, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass the General Pulaski Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Indiana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact effective legislation providing for flood control in the Wabash River watershed area and tributaries thereto; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to further consider and make an appropriation in the amount of $462,000 available to the United States Corps of Engineers for the completion of the authorized Depoe Bay improvement project; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide for the construction of a dam across the Mora River at La Cueva, Mora County, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 2847. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mildred H. Gibbons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2848. A bill for the relief of Leon Nikolaivich Volkov; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 2849. A bill for the relief of Constantinos Dardas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVENPORT:

H. R. 2850. A bill for the relief of Denise Simeon Boutant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McSWEENEY:

H. R. 2851. A bill for the relief of Carl L. Sexauer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. R. 2852. A bill for the relief of the estate of Priscilla Crowley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 2853. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue duplicates of William Gerard's script certificates No. 2, subdivisions 11 and 12, to Blanche H. Weedon and Mattie Ward H. Harris jointly; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. REDDEN:

H. R. 2854. A bill for the relief of Wade H. Noland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 2855. A bill for the relief of Jacobus Van Gangelen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEFAN:

H. R. 2856. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Society of the Colonial Dames of America in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 2857. A bill for the relief of Anton Bernhard Blikstad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H. R. 2858. A bill for the relief of M. L. Brewer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

87. By Mr. CARROLL: Memorial of Colorado State Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to assist local lending agencies in financing disaster-stricken livestock producers and feeders in the blizzard areas of the Western States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

88. By Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER: Resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Buffalo on February 8, urging the Congress of the United States to strengthen the rent-control laws by declaring a moratorium for 1 year upon all evictions for any cause except nonpayment of rent; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

89. By Mr. HART: Petition of the Board of Commissioners of the City of Newark, N. J., urging that our Federal Government use its good offices through diplomatic channels to the end that the unjust punishment inflicted upon Cardinal Mindszenty be revoked; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

90. Also, memorial of the New Jersey House of Assembly, memorializing the President and the Secretary of State of the United States to exercise every power at their command to bring about the release of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty and Bishop Lajos Ordaff; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

91. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Cream City Lodge, No. 1061, International Association of Machinists, Milwaukee, Wis., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting the Eighty-first Congress to repeal the Taft-Hartley law and reenact the provisions of the Wagner Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

92. Also, petition of city clerk, Scranton, Pa., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to requesting the Congress to pass the General Pulaski Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 81st CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 95—PART 2

FEBRUARY 21, 1949, TO MARCH 18, 1949
(PAGES 1413 TO 2804)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1949

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 81st CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1949

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, from the folly, treachery, and frustration, the mental and moral and spiritual confusion of these frightening days, we turn for this still moment to the timeless verities of the unseen and eternal and to the well of faith from which our spiritual strength is drawn.

We thank Thee for the world around us, the work of Thy fingers, the object of Thy love. We thank Thee for the world within us, for the call of duty, for the lure of the lovely, for the sorrow that we fall so far short of the glory; for eternity set deep in our hearts so that we are restless among the things we see and handle and dissatisfied with all save Thyself. In all that we say or do this day keep our hearts with Thee, and lead us in the paths of righteousness for Thy name's sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 17, 1949, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 548) to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 54. An act to retrocede to the State of New Mexico exclusive jurisdiction held by the United States over lands within the boundaries of the Los Alamos project of the United States Atomic Energy Commission; and

H. J. Res. 92. Joint resolution to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 2402) to extend the Office of the War Assets Administrator and the War Assets Administration from February 28, 1949, until June 30, 1949, and it was signed by the Vice President.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred, as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF REVISED STATUTES RELATING TO COVERAGE INTO TREASURY OF CERTAIN MONEYS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 3652 of the Revised Statutes relating to the covering into the Treasury of all moneys arising from charges and deductions (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

READJUSTMENT OF POSTAL RATES

A letter from the Postmaster General transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to readjust postal rates (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SALARIES OF PERSONS IMPROPERLY REMOVED OR SUSPENDED FROM SERVICE

A letter from the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for payment of salaries covering periods of separation and suspension from the Government service in the case of persons improperly removed or suspended from such service (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on foreign affairs (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on foreign affairs (Appendix H) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on its miscellaneous studies pertaining to the Department of State (Appendix VI-A-B-C-D) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on its staff study on executive-legislative relations in the conduct of foreign affairs (Appendix VIII-A) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, its report on miscellaneous staff studies pertaining to the Foreign Service (Appendix VII-A-B-C) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, its report on staff study of the role of the President in foreign affairs (Appendix IV-A) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on its staff study of the interdepartmental aspect of foreign affairs (Appendix V) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	Maybank
Anderson	Hill	Miller
Baldwin	Hoey	Millikin
Brewster	Holland	Morse
Bricker	Humphrey	Murray
Bridges	Hunt	Neely
Broughton	Ives	O'Conor
Butler	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	Reed
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Chapman	Kem	Saltonstall
Connally	Kerr	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Donnell	Knowland	Sparkman
Douglas	Langer	Stennis
Downey	Lucas	Taylor
Eaton	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	McClellan	Thye
Frear	McFarland	Tydings
Fulbright	McGrath	Vandenberg
George	McKellar	Watkins
Gillette	McMahon	Wiley
Green	Magnuson	Williams
Gurney	Malone	Withers
Hayden	Martin	Young

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent on public business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr.

HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

INSTITUTE OF INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives, p. 1440.)

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"To the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, and to the Senate of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas the Honorable Monrad C. Wallgren is a former Governor of the State of Washington; and

"Whereas the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, has recently appointed the Honorable Monrad C. Wallgren as Chairman of the National Securities Resources Board; and

"Whereas such appointment must be confirmed by the Senate of the United States; and

"Whereas the Honorable Monrad C. Wallgren's background as Senator, Congressman, and Governor qualifies him for this most important position: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled*, That we respectfully commend the President of the United States in appointing the Honorable Monrad C. Wallgren to the chairmanship of the National Securities Resources Board and we respectfully urge upon the Senate of the United States that his appointment be confirmed speedily; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, and to each Senator from the State of Washington.

"S. R. HOLCOMB,
"*Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.*"

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Enrolled Senate Concurrent Resolution 4

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to enact effective legislation providing for flood control in the Wabash River watershed area and tributaries thereto

"Whereas each year the overflow of the many rivers, streams, creeks, and tributaries which empty into the Wabash River creates a flood condition imperiling life and causing property damage throughout the entire Wabash Valley, contributing at the same time to similar conditions which exist in the Southern States through which the Ohio and Mississippi rivers flow; and

"Whereas the specific consequences of such flood conditions are: silting and sedimentation of stream channels, reservoirs, dams, ditches, and harbors; loss of soil and water; an increase in the speed and volume of rainfall run-off, causing severe and increasing floods, which bring suffering, disease, and death, impoverishment of families, damage to roads, highways, railways, buildings, and other property from floods; and losses in navigation, hydroelectric power, municipal water supply, and underground water reserve: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring)*:

"SEC. 1. The Eighty-sixth General Assembly of the State of Indiana does hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to enact effective legislation for the control of floods and the prevention of soil erosion, to preserve natural resources, prevent impairment of dams and reservoirs, assist in maintaining the navigability of rivers, protect and promote the health, safety, and general welfare of the people, and to appropriate sufficient funds for the execution of such legislation.

"SEC. 2. The secretary of the senate is directed to forward copies of this resolution to the Secretary of the United States Senate, to the Clerk of the National House of Representatives, and to each United States Senator and Congressman from Indiana."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Concurrent Resolution 8

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day joint resolution now pending in Congress

"Whereas a joint resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

"Whereas the 11th day of October 1779 is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

"Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises on observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative action designated each October 11, from 1929 to 1946, to be General Pulaski's Memorial Day, in the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring)* That the Congress of the United States is hereby requested to pass, and the President of the United States is hereby requested to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That suitable copies of this concurrent resolution be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and each of the United States Senators and Representatives from Michigan.

"Unanimously adopted by the house, January 24, 1949.

"Unanimously adopted by the senate, February 4, 1949."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"House Joint Memorial 2

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States to approve pending legislation concerning the right of domestic producers to sell gold in the markets of the world

"Whereas the Government of the United States has fixed the price of gold at $35 an ounce; and

"Whereas gold is selling upon the world markets at prices much in excess of the price fixed for American production; and

"Whereas cost conditions of all kinds have increased approximately 70 percent since the price of gold was fixed at $35 an ounce, causing great distress among the gold mines of the West and particularly the smaller properties in the State of Colorado; and

"Whereas gold has played a prominent part in the development and maintenance of the economy of the State and the general welfare of the people of Colorado; and

"Whereas many of the citizens of the State of Colorado have invested their meager savings in gold mines, as have citizens in many other sections of the Nation; and

"Whereas the taxpayers of the Nation would be caused no financial loss by reason of the passage of legislation permitting domestic producers to sell gold on the markets of the world at much higher prices than they are now permitted to obtain; and

"Whereas the encouragement of gold mining has always resulted in the uncovering of other metals needed by the Nation; and

"Whereas only recently the largest custom mill in the State was demolished and an attempt will be made to reconstruct it in the Cripple Creek area in an effort to eliminate certain cost factors which were showing their effect upon profitable operation; and

"Whereas because of this other mines in other districts will be deprived of a local market for their ores; and

"Whereas this trend has been going on for some time—reducing the number of operating mines in the State producing gold to one-third of the 1937 total number: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Thirty-seventh General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the senate concurring herein)*, That it respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States and urges the President of the United States to use his good offices to permit the sale of gold produced in the United States from domestic mines to be sold by producers in the markets of the world by amending the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 and removing the present restrictions that prevent our citizens from buying, holding, or selling gold domestically or in foreign markets."

The petition of Sidney H. Scheuer, of New York, N. Y., relating to the agricultural support program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Two telegrams in the nature of petitions from Chief Risingsun, Richmond, Va., and Harold Molenkamp, of Denver, Colo., relating to assistance to Indians in the storm-stricken areas of the West; to the Committee on Appropriations.

The petition of Walter A. Smith, of Bell Gardens, Calif., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide sufficient funds for the operation of House bill 4044, Public Law 896, Eightieth Congress, to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims, and to provide for relief for internees in certain cases; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the Portland Labor-Management Committee, of Portland, Oreg., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide funds for the McNary Dam project on the Columbia River (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

Petitions from Mr. and Mrs. J. Martin, of Indianapolis, Ind., and sundry other citizens of the United States, praying for the enactment of legislation to repeal rent control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from Regina N. Bressler, New York, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to extend rent control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Dr. J. R. Cooper, of New Castle, Pa., relating to the report of the Hoover Commission; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Petitions from E. E. Potter, of Louisville, Ky., and sundry other citizens of the United States, praying for the enactment of legislation to broaden the provisions of the social-security law; to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of Herman Carlisle, of Springfield, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to abolish the so-called nuisance excise taxes; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the eighteenth annual convention of the American Society of Travel Agents, Savannah, Ga., October 18–23, 1948, favoring repeal of the 15-percent passenger transportation tax; to the Committee on Finance.

A paper in the nature of a petition from the Liberal Party of the State of New York, signed by the chairman of the national legislative committee and the State executive director, relating to taxation and the budget; to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of William M. Spaulding, Jr., of Lebanon, Ky., relating to an interchange of Ambassadors with Spain; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Carl B. Humphrey, director, the U. S. A.-Morocco Trade Co., Casablanca, Morocco, relating to aid to American business and the independence of Morocco (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The petition of Luther Parker, of Santa Cruz, Calif., praying for the enactment of legislation to authorize the defense forces to go into instant action to repulse any enemy attack without waiting for a formal declaration of war; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Resolutions adopted by the City Council of the City of Scranton, Pa., the Board of Aldermen of the City of Chelsea, Mass., and the Board of Trustees of the City of Cicero, Ill., favoring the enactment of legislation proclaiming October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the annual meeting of the National Lutheran Council, New York, N. Y., relating to the admission of displaced persons into the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Ann Fetting, national president, Blue Star Mothers of America, Smiths Creek, Mich., praying for the enactment of the so-called charter bill for that organization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by a conference of 400 civic leaders and representatives of groups and organizations of Greenwich, Village, N. Y., favoring the enactment of the so-called civil rights legislation pending in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Petitions from Mary McCaffrey, of Beacon, N. Y., and sundry others citizens of the United States, praying for the enactment of the so-called McGrath-Johnson education bill; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Petitions from Marquise Kidd, of Arcadia, Calif., and sundry other citizens of the United States, praying for the enactment of legislation to repeal the so-called Taft-Hartley labor law; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Memorials from R. Lee Ashton, of Rolla, Mo., and sundry other citizens of the United States, remonstrating against the repeal of the so-called Taft-Hartley labor law; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter in the nature of a petition from John H. Davis, executive secretary, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, Washington, D. C., enclosing a statement of that council relating to the revision of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Two telegrams in the nature of petitions from Joseph A. Getzow, president, Marion Manufacturing Co., of Lebanon, Ky., and George Keuhnlein, president, and Sal F. Crivelli, recording secretary, executive committee of the Machinists Nonpartisan Political League, Long Island City, N. Y., relating to the establishment of minimum wages; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The petition of Gayle C. Norton, of Brooklyn, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to include commissioned officers in the so-called GI bill of rights (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Local No. 4332, National Federation of Post Office Clerks, Beaver Dam, Ky., signed by Geneva S. Williams, secretary, relating to pending legislation affecting postal clerks; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter in the nature of a petition from J. L. Galloway, of Peabody, Ky., relating to the schedule of postal money orders; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from Dr. F. P. Kittrell, of Washington, D. C., and sundry other citizens of the United States, relating to cloture; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

A concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation or take such action as will require and direct the Interstate Commerce Commission of the United States to recede from its rulings and/or reverse its findings in which fresh agricultural commodities when washed and packaged become manufactured agricultural commodities and as such not entitled to exemption when carried in motor vehicles in interstate commerce

"Whereas the Interstate Commerce Commission on December 16, 1947, in case No. MC-107669, issued a ruling that fresh spinach because it was washed and packaged became a manufactured agricultural commodity and became removed from the exempt list as provided for in section 203 (b) (6) of the act which provides interalia as follows: 'Motor vehicles used in carrying property consisting of ordinary live stock, fish (including shell fish, or agricultural commodities (not including manufactured products thereof) if such motor vehicles are not used in carrying other property or passengers, for compensation'; and

"Whereas it is essential that in areas in which farmers in South Carolina grow their products, that these products be washed, waxed, defuzzed, artificially dried, graded, packaged or undergo other marketing processes that do not basically change the raw product and a ruling taking them from the exempt list would not only be arbitrary, discriminatory and of financial loss to the farmers, but would also be contrary to the intent of Congress in providing for the exemptions in the Motor Carrier Act; and

"Whereas following the many protests the United States Department of Agriculture joined by national organizations, including the Farm Bureau, the Grange, Association of Fruit and Vegetable Growers, producers and others have intervened in the ruling; and

"Whereas there is now pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission the so-called Harwood case, known as Investigation for Determination of Exempted Agricultural Commodities Docket MC-C968 in which pending case an adverse ruling in line with the ruling set forth above in respect to spinach would create a situation of great financial hardship on all agricultural commodities grown and shipped by motor vehicle in the State of South Carolina: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, memorialized to enact such legislation or take such action as will require and direct the Interstate Commerce Commission of the United States of America to recede from its rulings and/or reverse its findings in which fresh agricultural commodities when washed and packaged become manufactured agricultural commodities and as such not entitled to exemption when carried in motor vehicles in interstate commerce; be it further further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the South Carolina Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, Hon. Charles F. Brannan, United States Secretary of Agriculture; Hon. Charles B. Bowling, Chief, Transportation Rates and Service Division, Marketing Facilities Branch, United States Department of Agriculture; and the Interstate Commerce Commission of the United States.

"In the house of representatives, Columbia, S. C., February 15, 1949."

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 6

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to make suitable appropriation for the care and support of needy and destitute Indians

"Whereas it appears from press reports and general information that there are in the United States thousands of Indians in needy and destitute circumstances and that the present unprecedented cold wave sweeping over the greater part of the United States has augmented this needy and destitute condition; and

"Whereas recent press reports show that 200 families, representing an estimated 1,000 members in the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma, are in need of welfare relief, previous allowance for this purpose having been exhausted: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the Twenty-second Legislature of the State of Oklahoma (the house of representatives concurring therein)*, That the Congress of the United States be petitioned and memorialized to promptly make sufficient appropriation to provide food, clothing, fuel, and medicine for the thousands of needy and destitute Indians of the United States; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be mailed to the Secretary of the Interior, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and to each Member of the Oklahoma delegation in Congress.

"Adopted by the senate the 9th day of February 1949.

"Adopted by the house of representatives the 7th day of February 1949."

By Mr. MURRAY:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Senate Resolution 2

"Resolution to the Congress of the United States transmitted by the Senate of the State of Montana relative to housing legislation

"Whereas there is certain proposed housing legislation presently before the National Congress known respectively as H. R. 933 in the House of Representatives, and S. 138 in the United States Senate, designed by its sponsors to relieve housing shortages and to improve housing standards in the United States; and

"Whereas the above designated legislative matters incorporate therein—

"First, a provision for the expenditure of $250,000,000 per year of Federal funds over the next 5 years, or a total of $1,250,000,000, to be matched by municipalities with a sum of $625,000,000 to a grand total of $1,881,000,000, for slum clearance; and

"Second, a proposal for the erection of 1,000,000 public housing units over a 7-year period carrying a rental subsidy to occupants of $445,000,000 per year for the next 40 years of the existence of said housing, obligating the Federal Treasury to spend a total of $17,000,000,000; and

"Third, a proposal for an initial appropriation of $250,000,000 for outright grants of $1,000 to $2,000 to individual farmers as a subsidy in the construction of farm homes, together with additional sums for architectural and engineering services; and

"Fourth, that the approximate total of these nonliquidative expenditures probably will exceed $20,000,000,000; and

"Whereas it is the opinion of the members of the Senate of the State of Montana that a more equitable and more economical method of spending these sums for housing assistance should be substituted for the aforesaid described proposals, more suitable to the people of Montana, and particularly to the veterans, many of whom are still in dire need of suitable housing accommodations; therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Montana, Thirty-first Legislative Assembly*, That there be substituted legislative proposals in the Congress of the United States embodying—

"A subsidy of $1,000 for the construction of any new home by any owner-occupant when matched by an equal amount in cash or other equivalent on any new home not exceeding $7,000 in cost, exclusive of land; *provided*, Such home be constructed in accordance with the Minimum Construction Requirements of the Federal Housing Administration in locations conforming to the Administrative Regulations of the said Federal Housing Administration, and providing that the borrower in the event that a commitment for an FHA-insured loan is required in the construction or purchase of such home, meet the accepted standards for such borrowers incorporated in the mortgage risk pattern procedure of the said Federal Housing Administration; *and further provided*, That the owner-occupants be prohibited from, by contract agreement or otherwise, reselling such homes at a higher price than the original cost less the $1,000 subsidy except as the same may be adjusted from time to time for actual replacement cost increases as determined through Federal Housing Administration appraisal procedures; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That it is the opinion of the members of the Senate of the State of Montana in transmitting this recommendation that the cost of such a program would not exceed the cost of the proposals above referred to now before the Congress by virtue of the fact that the total yearly volume of units within this price range would not exceed 300,000, involving a total yearly expenditure of $300,000,000, and it is further the opinion of this body that this type of housing assistance is more in keeping with the American tradition of individual home ownership, and that the opportunity provided this large class of substantial citizens for moving into their own homes will release hundreds of thousands of existing older and still useful, satisfactory housing units for occupancy by those who require the low rentals that these properties afford."

By Mr. McGRATH (for himself and Mr. GREEN):

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Resolution requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to work for the passage of an amendment to the Federal minimum-wage law increasing the present hourly minimum rate to at least 75 cents an hour

"Whereas, the increasing high cost of living is one of the most pressing problems confronting our Nation; and

"Whereas suitable living environment, according to American ideals and standards, should be the portion of every American citizen: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States be and they are hereby requested to insist upon and work for the passage of an amendment to the Federal minimum-wage law increasing the present hourly minimum rate to at least 75 cents an hour; and the secretary of state is hereby authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States."

By Mr. MILLIKIN:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"House Joint Memorial 3

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to assist local lending agencies in financing disaster-stricken livestock producers and feeders in the blizzard areas of the Western States

"Whereas unprecedented and widespread blizzards have recently wreaked disastrous losses on the livestock producers and feeders in the intermountain west to an extent and in an amount never before experienced; and

"Whereas the physical and financial losses suffered by such livestock operators in these storms of catastrophic proportions will seriously hamper, if not entirely preclude, the future operations on a practical basis of many livestock producers and feeders in this region, and will thus seriously affect the meat supply of this Nation for an indefinite period unless financial assistance is made available to them immediately; and

"Whereas the presently established banks and other livestock loaning agencies are fully staffed and prepared to service and pass upon the financial needs of these disaster-stricken livestock producers and feeders: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Thirty-seventh General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the senate concurring herein)*, That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby urged to enact such legislation as it deems necessary to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make its facilities available to the local banks and other lending agencies by way of guaranteeing loans to livestock producers and feeders to the extent of 90 percent of any such loans and budget advances made to them, the local lending agencies in turn to carry 10 percent of such commitments, and otherwise to assist and facilitate the services of such agencies in meeting the local requirements occasioned by the widespread and disastrous losses in the blizzard areas of the Western States; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Colorado in the Congress of the United States."

By Mr. JENNER (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART):

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Indiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Concurrent House Resolution 1

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress

"Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

"Whereas the 11th day of October, 1779, is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

"Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Kansas, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union, through legislative enactment designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and

"Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated October 11, 1929, October 11, 1931, October 11, 1932 to October 11, 1946 to be General Pulaski's Memorial Day, in the United States of America; therefore be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Eighty-sixth Indiana General Assembly (the senate concurring)*:

"SECTION 1. That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

"SEC. 2. That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith by the clerk of the house to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and each of the United States Senators and Representatives from Indiana."

By Mr. MILLER:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Joint Memorial 3

"*To the honorable Senators and Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*:

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent, that:

"Whereas the ever increasing growth of noxious weeds, through the spreading of seeds by irrigation waters of Snake River and other rivers and creeks and valley winds upon private and public lands in the State of Idaho, has become an unusually heavy burden upon private landowners of the State of Idaho and on State lands; and

"Whereas Snake and Bear Rivers in the State of Idaho are interstate streams, originating outside the State of Idaho, and carrying noxious weed seeds in irrigation waters to and upon irrigated lands in Idaho; and

"Whereas noxious weeds cause a substantial reduction in the crop productions of the irrigated lands of Idaho, besides incurring a heavy expense upon landowners in their eradication: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Idaho (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That we most respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States of America, that it appropriate $500,000 to be administered in cooperation with the noxious weed program of the constituted authorities of the State of Idaho, in the treatment and eradication of noxious weeds on federally owned or controlled land in the State of Idaho; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized and he is hereby directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State, and to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America.

"This senate joint memorial passed the senate on the 5th day of February 1949.

"This senate joint memorial passed the house of representatives on the 9th day of February 1949."

PROTEST AGAINST ARREST OF JOSEF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY—RESOLUTION OF RHODE ISLAND LEGISLATURE

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Rhode Island General Assembly, protesting the arrest of His Eminence Josef Cardinal Mindszenty.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution expressing the protests of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations against the action of the Hungarian Government in arresting Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, Roman Catholic Primate of Hungary, upon suspicion of plotting against the government

Whereas the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations was founded upon principles of civil and religious liberty; "to hold forth a lively experiment that a most flourishing civil state may stand and best be maintained with full liberty in religious concernments;" and

Whereas Roger Williams, the founder of this State, fled from religious persecution to set up a State where one was permitted to think as he liked and to say what he thought without fear of persecution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That protests of the members of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations be and they are hereby ardently expressed against the action of the Hungarian Government in arresting upon Monday, December 27, 1948, Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, Roman Catholic Primate of Hungary, who faces trial for alleged subversive activity and for defending the rights of the church and the faithful against unfair attacks of the unscrupulous determined to destroy the religious feeling of the people; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of Rhode Island be and he is hereby authorized and directed to transmit to the Secretary of State of the United States of America a duly certified copy of this resolution for transmittal to the heads of the Hungarian Government.

GENERAL PULASKI MEMORIAL DAY—RESOLUTION OF ENDORSEMENT BY CITY COUNCIL OF PHOENIX, ARIZ.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Phoenix, Ariz., on February 8, 1949, memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 8983

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress

Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as "General Pulaski's Memorial Day" for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

Whereas the 11th day of October 1779, is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union through legislative enactment designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and

Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated from October 11, 1929, to October 11, 1946, to be General Pulaski's Memorial Day in the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Council of the City of Phoenix, State of Arizona:

SECTION 1. That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

SEC. 2. That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, and each of the United States Senators and Representatives from Arizona.

Passed by the Council of the City of Phoenix this 8th day of February, 1949.

Approved by the mayor of the city of Phoenix this 8th day of February 1949.

[CITY SEAL] NICHOLAS UDALL, *Mayor*.

Attest:

JOE S. THUERMAN, *City Clerk*.

DELIVERED PRICING PRACTICES—RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF OMAHA (NEBR.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], who is necessarily absent, and myself, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Omaha, requesting that the Federal Trade Commission clarify its position regarding delivered pricing practices.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

That the Federal Trade Commission should clarify its own position regarding delivered pricing practices at the earliest possible date, clearly and without ambiguity, in order that present uncertainties in the minds of the business community regarding the Commission's attitude on such pricing policies may be eliminated; that the Omaha Chamber of Commerce send the above communication to the Federal Trade Commission, United States Senators and Congressmen from Nebraska.

Therefore it is in the public interest to enact legislation to make certain that a seller in one locality is free to compete with sellers elsewhere despite different delivery costs, and that in order so to compete, the seller is permitted to absorb or equalize transportation costs.

Any legislation to such ends should be designed so as to preserve the fundamental safeguards of the antitrust laws.

TRANSPORTATION SERVICE TO AND FROM ALASKA

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a joint memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, relating to participation of Canadian vessels in the Alaska maritime trade, together with a statement prepared by me.

There being no objection, the statement and joint memorial were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER

The attached joint memorial demonstrates very clearly the importance of liberalizing the restrictions against participation of Canadian vessels in the Alaska maritime trade. Under the present law, vessels of foreign registry are not permitted to transport passengers or freight from one Alaska port to another, in spite of the fact that there may be no alternative means of transportation that is suitable and convenient. The petition points out that service to and from Skagway and Haines by vessels of American registry is very infrequent and unsatisfactory. These ports receive only one voyage north-bound every 3 weeks, and no service south-bound at all.

At the same time, Canadian vessels make regular calls at these ports and provide convenient and frequent transportation. Under the present laws, however, passengers and freight may not be taken to or from Skagway or Haines if they are destined for another Alaskan or American port.

In my judgment, there should be some relaxation of the laws to permit at least minimum transportation facilities to be provided to such Alaskan ports as these, and I have introduced S. 152, to authorize foreign vessels to provide transportation for Alaskans

under certain conditions where the American vessels are not providing sufficient service.

Senate Joint Memorial 3

To the Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN, President of the United States; the Honorable JOHN W. SNYDER, Secretary of the Treasury; the Honorable J. A. KRUG, Secretary of the Interior; the Honorable CHARLES SAWYER, Secretary of Commerce; the Honorable WILLIAM W. SMITH, Chairman, United States Maritime Commission; the Honorable JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Chairman, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; the Honorable EDWIN C. JOHNSON, Chairman, Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; the Honorable HOMER E. CAPEHART, United States Senate; the Honorable HUGH BUTLER, United States Senate; the Honorable SCHUYLER O. BLAND, Chairman, House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries; the Honorable ANDREW L. SOMERS, Chairman, House Committee on Public Lands; the Honorable E. L. BARTLETT, Delegate to Congress From Alaska:

Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in nineteenth regular session assembled, respectfully represents that:

Whereas the ports of Skagway and Haines, Alaska, are so situated as to have no year-round, reliable transportation service except by water, and are thus dependent for their existence upon maritime commerce; and

Whereas these ports are receiving from American-flag carriers only token service of one voyage north-bound every 3 weeks, with no service whatever south-bound; and

Whereas incident to the supplying of the Yukon Territory of Canada, foreign vessels of the Canadian Pacific Coast Steamship service make regular calls at the ports of Skagway and Haines twice a month in winter and three times a week in summer, with south-bound as well as north-bound service; and

Whereas the provisions of section 8 of the act of June 19, 1886, as amended (46 U. S. C. 289) and section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920 as amended (46 U. S. C. 883) prohibit transportation of passengers and merchandise on foreign vessels between Alaska ports or between Alaska ports and those in the United States proper; and

Whereas approximately 1,100 citizens of Alaska of the two ports and surrounding area are thus arbitrarily deprived of the transportation service they require in order to exist, suffering not only inconvenience and commercial disadvantage but also a threat to their health, welfare and life itself; and

Whereas the Congress has seen fit to waive provisions of the acts named to permit the transportation on foreign vessels of passengers between Rochester, N. Y., and Alexandria Bay, N. Y., as well as freight and passengers between Alaskan points on the Yukon River, in both of which exempted areas the need to use Canadian vessels is less pressing than at Haines and Skagway, Alaska: Now therefore

Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in nineteenth regular session assembled, respectfully urges that, without prejudice to Alaska's long-standing request for general exemption from the restrictive provisions of the act of June 19, 1886, as amended (46 U. S. C. 289) and the Merchant Marine Act of 1920 as amended (46 U. S. C. 883), the Congress immediately enact legislation to waive the provisions of these acts as they apply to the ports of Haines and Skagway, Alaska, to the end that passengers and freight may be moved in Canadian vessels to and from the ports of Haines and Skagway, Alaska, freely and without restrictions.

And your memorialist will ever pray.

Passed by the senate January 29, 1949.

Approved by the Governor February 7, 1949.

ERNEST GRUENING,
Governor of Alaska.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. 612. A bill to provide for the payment of a sum not to exceed $10,607,000 to the Swiss Government as partial compensation for damage inflicted on Swiss territory during World War II by United States armed forces in violation of neutral rights, and authorizing appropriations therefor; with amendments (Rept. No. 77).

By Mr. McMAHON, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

S. 152. A bill to retrocede to the State of New Mexico exclusive jurisdiction held by the United States over lands within the boundaries of the Los Alamos, N. Mex., project of the United States Atomic Energy Commission; without amendment (Rept. No. 76).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 30. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims of persons employed in Federal penal and correctional institutions for damage to or loss or destruction of personal property occurring incident to their service; with amendments (Rept. No. 75);

S. 88. A bill to amend section 60 of an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 72);

S. 196. A bill for the relief of James G. Smyth; without amendment (Rept. No. 73); and

S. 732. A bill for the relief of William S. Meany; without amendment (Rept. No. 74).

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. Res. 72. Resolution continuing the authority of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to investigate foot-and-mouth disease problems; without amendment (Rept. No. 78); and, under the rule, referred to the Committees on Rules and Administration.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

David Northon Edelstein, of New York, to be Assistant Attorney General, Customs Division;

Herbert W. Erskine, of California, to be United States district judge for the northern district of California, vice Adolphus Frederick St. Sure, retired;

Joseph W. Kehoe, of Alaska, to be United States district judge for division No. 2, District of Alaska;

Anthony J. Dimond, of Alaska, to be United States district judge for division No. 3, District of Alaska;

Lester Luther, of Kansas, to be United States attorney for the district of Kansas;

Alfred E. Modarelli, of New Jersey, to be United States attorney for the district of New Jersey;

James J. Boyle, of California, to be United States marshal for the southern district of California; and

Walter L. Pope, of Montana, to be circuit judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, vice Francis A. Garrecht, deceased.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. 1012. A bill for the relief of Alfredo Giuseppe Gallo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1013. A bill for the relief of Jean Sutherland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

S. 1014. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to make such act applicable to the officers and employees of the Columbia Institution for the Deaf; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(Mr. BUTLER introduced Senate bill 1015, to provide for the furnishing by Thurston County, Nebr., of hospital services to Indians at the Winnebago Indian Agency, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1016. A bill for the relief of Russell S. Fothergill; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1017. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917, as amended;

S. 1018. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to determine the amounts due to and render judgment upon the claims of the employees of the Bureau of the Mint, Treasury Department, for overtime work performed and rates of pay authorized but not granted;

S. 1019. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claim arising out of personal injuries sustained by Carl J. Freund and Pauline H. Freund, his wife, of Seattle, Wash.; and

S. 1020. A bill for the relief of Dr. Theodore A. Schmidt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1021. A bill restoring to tribal ownership certain lands upon the Colville Indian Reservation, Wash., and for other purposes; and

S. 1022. A bill to exclude certain lands from becoming a part of the Colville Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 1023. A bill to amend section 9 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to grant credit in accordance with such section for service for which, through inadvertence, no deductions from salary are made; and

S. 1024. A bill for the relief of Russell A. DeLong; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1025. A bill for the relief of Golda Elsner Engel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1026. A bill for the relief of Roman Szymanski and Anastosia Szymanski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNER:

S. 1027. A bill for the relief of the Merit Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 1028. A bill for the relief of Ruth Alice Crawshaw; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. WILEY introduced Senate bill 1029, to terminate the war-tax rates on certain miscellaneous excise taxes, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 1030. A bill to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act to increase the time within which claims under such act may be presented to Federal agencies or prosecuted in the United States district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEELY (for himself, Mr. MYERS, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. KERR, Mr. HILL, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. CAPEHART):

S. 1031. A bill amending Public Law 49 (77th Cong.) providing for the welfare of coal miners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. McGRATH:

S. 1032. A bill to authorize the investment of fiduciary and trust funds in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1033. A bill to further amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 1034. A bill for the relief of Lula Hickey Thomas; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1035. A bill to extend the time for filing application for disability retirement under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, in the case of Lillian B. M. Lewis; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

HOSPITAL SERVICE FOR INDIANS AT WINNEBAGO INDIAN AGENCY

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing for hospital service for Indians at the Winnebago Indian Agency, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill together with a statement prepared by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill, together with the statement, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1015) to provide for the furnishing by Thurston County, Nebr., of hospital services to Indians at the Winnebago Indian Agency, introduced by Mr. BUTLER, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That upon request of the Board of Commissioners of Thurston County, Nebr., the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to enter into a contract or contracts for the operation by such county of the Indian hospital at Winnebago, Nebr. Any such contract shall provide (1) for the utilization of the existing hospital building and equipment, (2) for the operation of such hospital in accordance with such minimum standards of service as may be necessary to insure adequate hospital care for Indians, (3) for the payment to the county of such sums as may be agreed upon as reimbursement of expenses incurred in furnishing hospital services to Indians, and (4) for the admission and treatment at such hospital of persons other than Indians, to the extent possible without interference with the carrying out of the obligation of the county under the contract to provide hospital services to Indians. Any moneys appropriated for the furnishing of medical care to Indians shall be available to the Secretary for making payments under any contract entered into under this act.

The statement presented by Mr. BUTLER was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER

I am introducing a bill which authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Interior, upon the request of the Board of County Commissioners of Thurston County, Nebr., to enter into a contract or contracts for the operation by such county of the Indian hospital at Winnebago, Nebr., to provide hospital services to Indians of the Winnebago Indian Agency jurisdiction.

The Indian hospital at Winnebago is a 50-bed hospital fully equipped; and, in my judgment, these hospital facilities are sufficient to serve the entire community, both Indian and other citizens.

In recent years there has been extreme difficulty for the Indian Service to secure competent doctors and nurses, which situation, in my opinion, would be improved by the enactment of this bill. The community as a whole is in a better position to furnish adequate and efficient medical care to Indians than under the present arrangement.

This bill is intended particularly to make it possible that the Department of the Interior should arrange for the handling of certain Indian problems with those States in which the Indian tribal life is largely broken up and in which the Indians are to a considerable extent mixed with the general population. In such States Indian health, for example, becomes a problem so intermixed with that of the general health problems of the community that it is difficult to separate the two. The maintenance of a State health agency and a separate health agency for Indians under these circumstances is found to be uneconomical and contrary to efficient administration. This bill would make it possible for the State and the county health agencies to take charge of Indian health programs in the counties of Nebraska where the Indians are principally located.

TERMINATION OF WAR TAX RATES ON CERTAIN MISCELLANEOUS EXCISE TAXES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing for reduction of certain wartime excise tax rates, such as the taxes on jewelry, furs, telegrams, telephone communications, admission fees, entertainment, photographic apparatus, and so forth. This bill is similar, but not identical, to the measure introduced in the House of Representatives by a great Representative, JOE MARTIN, of Massachusetts.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point the text of a statement which I have prepared, listing the various reasons why I am introducing this bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1029) to terminate the war tax rates on certain miscellaneous excise taxes, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement presented by Mr. WILEY was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY

INTRODUCTION OF BILL FOR CUTTING BACK WARTIME EXCISE TAX RATES TO PEACETIME LEVELS

I am introducing today a new bill to cut back most of the wartime excise tax rates now in effect to their peacetime levels. This bill is similar but not identical to H. R. 2100, introduced by able Congressman JOE MARTIN, of Massachusetts.

Many items that are involved

Thus, the bill would after June 30, 1949, reinstate the lower peacetime tax rates on admission tickets, the tax on cabarets, hotel entertainment, on dues or membership fees, initiation fees, on jewelry, furs, toilet and cosmetic preparations, bowling alleys, electric light bulbs, telegraph and telephone communications, transportation of persons, etc., and it would eliminate the retailer's excise tax on luggage, purses, handbags, etc.

This is not tax repeal, rather tax reduction

This is not a tax repeal bill; it is a tax reduction bill. (The only reason that the retailer's excise tax would be repealed completely in the single instance of luggage, purses, handbags, etc., is that the 1943 tax bill substituted the retailer's tax for the manufacturers' tax in this category. Thus, to revise comparably the 1943 tax law in this category means to eliminate the retailers' excise tax in this field while reducing the wartime taxes which the 1943 bill set up.)

Appeals from Wisconsin for tax relief

From all over Wisconsin, I have received letters and telegrams, pleading for Uncle Sam to keep his promise for tax reduction, and I for one intend to do everything I can to have our Government do just that, without destroying any of the basic revenue sources which it needs in order to meet our problems of national security, veterans' benefits, payments on the national debt, etc.

Purposes of my bill

The purposes of this bill are as follows:

1. Basically, as indicated above, to keep the promise of the United States Government to our people that when peace again came, the heavy wartime burden of these excise taxes would be reduced. Too often, the American Government has broken its promise to the people and has kept various powers and tax levies long after it promised to repeal them. Let Uncle Sam be true to his word rather than welsh on it. Our people should not become disillusioned with the promises of their own Government.

Should Uncle Sam have excise taxes at all?

2. A second purpose of this bill is to raise possibly the whole issue of whether excise taxes on many necessary commodities should be applied at all by the Federal (in contrast to State and local) Government.

I have previously cosponsored S. 810, which would establish a national commission, which would evaluate, among other things, whether the Federal Government should impose excise taxes at all, or whether this area might better be left to the States and localities (if they feel that any excise taxes are at all necessary); thus leaving the Federal Government free rein to tax, if necessary, its own areas rather than duplicate State or local sales taxes.

Many of these items are not luxuries but are absolute necessities

3. A third reason for this bill is that I don't believe Uncle Sam is so poor that he must exorbitantly tax baby powders, baby oils, women's purses, etc.—all of which items are not in the remotest sense of the term luxuries, but are rather absolute necessities.

Put a brake on administration's wild spending

4. Another purpose of this bill is to declare unmistakably to the national administration that the American people will not tolerate an enormous and ever-increasing tax burden up them. Thus, this bill would serve as a brake on the administration's high, wide, and ugly spending. So long as we keep furnishing wartime levels of revenue to the

Federal Government, the administration's wild spenders will be encouraged to tax and tax, spend and spend.

Materials are no longer in scarce supply

5. Still another purpose is to assure elementary justice for the consumers as well as the producers of certain of these commodities who were hit by this tax burden as a wartime measure, because of the then existing scarcity of war materials. Thus, for example, a 20-percent excise-tax level was set in 1943 on all purchases of luggage and personal leather goods, because leather was one of the commodities that America needed in the war effort, not to mention wood, rayon linings, brass, etc. The wartime scarcity of these materials has ended, just as the wartime scarcity of photographic film has ended, and there is no need to penalize these folks any longer.

How will we get tax revenue?

Now, on the opposite side of the ledger, we all recognize that the Federal Government, with its huge overhead, will continue to need a considerable amount of revenue in order to handle its fixed obligations. I am not one of those who believes that we can cut all taxes with a meat ax and without justifiable reasons. We all recognize that it would be foolish to deprive Uncle Sam of the minimum of revenue that is necessary. I feel, however, that the above reduction I am recommending would be financially feasible for Uncle Sam.

My bill would cost comparatively small sum of six hundred and fifty millions

Financial experts have estimated that the total reduction in taxes under my bill would approximate for the 1950 fiscal year around $650,000,000. That sum is comparatively small in these days of mammoth $40,000,000,000 budgets. But anyone who recommends tax reductions should recommend ways and means of meeting the problems raised by such tax reduction. Thus, I am recommending as follows:

(a) Adoption insofar as possible of the Hoover Commission reports on reorganization of the executive branch of Government. Former President Hoover has estimated that if his reports are adopted, several billion dollars will be saved. These several billions in savings will more than completely counterbalance the loss of revenue which would result from my bill.

Reduced foreign spending

(b) Another saving will, I hope, result from reduction in the total amount of foreign spending under the Marshall plan in line with the reduction in prices of agricultural and other commodities.

Tax reduction can actually increase tax receipts

(c) In my opinion, the removal of some sources of tax revenue in the form of excise taxes might well operate not to reduce tax receipts to Uncle Sam on an over-all basis, but may actually help increase them. Thus, by cutting back these nuisance taxes, we are providing additional spending power for our average citizen—needed today in our country—in order to overcome the economic disturbances and rise in unemployment which we have been experiencing. Production has been catching up with demand and adequate purchasing power for our citizens is essential.

Several times we have seen in American financial history how tax reduction along specific lines has actually served to increase, amazingly enough, tax receipts. Last year, the Truman administration gloomily prophesied a Government deficit, if the $4,000,000,000 Republican tax cut were enacted. We have seen, however, that, in spite of that tax reduction, Government revenues actually increased by $3,000,000,000, as shown by the Treasury's own figures. (The United States received forty-two billions in taxes, including eight hundred and eighteen millions from Wisconsin.)

I yield to no man in my opposition to deficit financing—to the idea of the Government being in the "red"—but I have every hope that by sound tax reduction along the lines I have indicated, we will not have a deficit, and we will have more than sufficient revenue to meet the Government's budget.

"Where there is a will, there is a way." Where Uncle Sam determines, as I hope he will determine, that a promise to cut back wartime taxes should be kept, then Uncle Sam will find the way, such as I have suggested above, to fulfill his promise.

Tax on liquor would be left alone

I have not suggested the cutting back of wartime tax rates on distilled spirits, imported perfumes, wines, and similar luxury items, which constitute the bulk of revenue-producing elements in the excise tax program.

A comprehensive bill like this is necessary

Many of my colleagues in the Senate have introduced specific bills to cut out the wartime excise tax rates on isolated items—on toilet preparations, or on photographic apparatus or on this or that item. I feel, by contrast, that a comprehensive approach, including virtually all wartime rates, is a matter of justice to all of the individuals involved and would prevent discrimination between this or that item.

It should be borne in mind, of course, that revenue legislation of the type I am suggesting must originate in the House of Representatives under our Constitution. It cannot be started in the Senate, but I am hoping that by introduction of this bill, added impetus will be given toward an overhauling of our entire excise tax system.

Conclusion

It is just common horse sense that taxes should come down now that commodity prices have come down. It does not make sense that Government should keep ballooning its expenditures recklessly, disregarding the staggering burden of the average man. Taxes which confiscate the income of the private citizen have sounded the death knell of many a free society. We must not and will not allow our citizens to be bled white by a government octopus which drains the financial life blood from its citizens.

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS RELATING TO CERTAIN PACIFIC ISLANDS

Mr. CORDON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 73), which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is directed to make a study and investigation of such matters as it may deem appropriate relating to the islands, groups of islands, or other areas included within the trust territory of the Pacific, or relating to other islands, groups of islands, or areas of the Pacific which are possessions of, or subject to the authority of, the United States, including study and investigation of—

(a) the peoples, customs, laws, economies, resources, and governments of such areas;

(b) the interrelation, and the natural or appropriate integration, of such areas;

(c) measures designed to advance the well-being of the peoples and economies of such areas;

(d) such other matters relating to such areas as the committee may deem appropriate.

SEC. 2. The committee shall complete its study and investigation at the earliest possible date and report to the Senate the results of its study, recommending such organic and other legislation as may be necessary to provide for the civil government of such areas, and to assure to the peoples of such areas justice, peace, and tranquillity, a voice in their civic affairs and government, and the development of their economies, all with due regard to the established customs of such peoples.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of the studies and investigations directed by this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ assistants, to travel, and authorize its assistants to travel, and to utilize such transportation, housing, and other facilities which the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, or Air Force may make available, as it deems necessary.

SEC. 4. The committee or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

EXTENSION OF TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES FROM PRINCE GEORGE, BRITISH COLUMBIA, TO ALASKA—AMENDMENT

Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. BUTLER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 13) relating to the extension of transportation facilities from Prince George, British Columbia, Canada, to Alaska, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION CHARTER AND STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS STOCK PILING ACTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 900) to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, and for other purposes. Matters relating to the Commodity Credit Corporation which have heretofore been referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, since the enactment of the Legislative Reorganization Act, which defines the jurisdiction of the several committees, are now referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Therefore I ask that this amendment be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which is studying this matter. I ask that a statement prepared by me on the matter be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and printed, as requested by the Senator from South Carolina, and without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement ordered to be printed in the RECORD is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAYBANK

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 4 (C) OF THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION CHARTER ACT (PUBLIC LAW 806, 80TH CONG., APPROVED JUNE 29, 1948)

In addition to clarifying language which would make it clear that the exclusive original jurisdiction of the Federal district courts over suits by or against the Corporation is without regard to the amount in controversy, the proposed amendment makes the following changes in section 4 (c) of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act:

1. It provides that suits against the United States as real party in interest, based upon a claim against the Corporation, may also be brought in the Court of Claims, and that no suit against the United States as such real party in interest may be brought in a district court unless such suit might, without regard to the provisions of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, be brought in such court. This would change the present provisions of section 4 (c) which vests exclusive jurisdiction over such suits in the Federal district courts.

2. The proposed amendment also changes the time within which suits may be brought on claims by or against the Corporation from 4 years to 6 years in order to make the period uniform with the statute of limitations generally applicable to claims against the Government. It also incorporates the change proposed in S. 900 respecting the right to set off any claim which would otherwise be barred, if the claim had not been barred prior to the date that the plaintiff's cause of action arose. I understand an explanation of the proposed change accompanied S. 900.

HOUSE BILL PLACED ON CALENDAR

The bill (H. R. 54) to retrocede to the State of New Mexico exclusive jurisdiction held by the United States over lands within the boundaries of the Los Alamos project of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, was read twice by its title, and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR IVES BEFORE MICHIGAN REPUBLICAN STATE CONVENTION

[Mr. VANDENBERG asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Republican Opposition," delivered by Senator IVES before the Michigan Republican State Convention in Grand Rapids, Mich., on February 19, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS AT COLORADO SPRINGS BY SENATOR MARTIN

[Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Lincoln Day address delivered by Senator MARTIN at a Lincoln's Birthday celebration held under the auspices of the Colorado Republican State Central Committee at Colorado Springs, Colo., on February 10, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS AT OKLAHOMA CITY BY SENATOR MARTIN

[Mr. WILLIAMS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Lincoln Day address delivered by Senator MARTIN before the Oklahoma Republican State Central Committee, at Oklahoma City, Okla., on February 11, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

GOOD HIGHWAYS PROMOTERS OF GOOD WILL—ADDRESS BY SENATOR CHAVEZ

[Mr. ANDERSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Good Highways Promoters of Good Will," delivered by Senator CHAVEZ before the American Road Builders Association Conference and forty-sixth annual meeting in Washington, D. C., on February 9, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE STRUGGLE FOR HEBREW LIBERATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR GILLETTE

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator GILLETTE in New York City on February 13, 1949, on the occasion of the departure of Mr. Peter Bergson and Mr. Samuel Merlin to take their seats as elected representatives of the Hebrew people in the Constituent Assembly of Israel, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HAROLD E. STASSEN BEFORE PENNSYLVANIA SOCIETY

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Harold E. Stassen at the fiftieth anniversary dinner of the Pennsylvania Society at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City on December 11, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

MISSOURI BASIN POWER PROGRAM—ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM P. WARNE

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Missouri Basin Power Program," delivered by Hon. William P. Warne, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, before the Nebraska Reclamation Association annual meeeting at Lincoln, Nebr., on February 10, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

HISTORIC SITES AND BUILDINGS—ADDRESS BY DAVID E. FINLEY

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by David E. Finley, Director of the National Gallery of Art, at the annual meeting of the National Council for Historic Sites and Buildings, at Washington, D. C., on November 4, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN TEACHERS AND THE AMERICAN CONGRESS—ARTICLE BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "American Teachers and the American Congress," written by him, and published in the Wisconsin Journal of Education, which appears in the Appendix.]

SUPPORT PRICE FOR MILK—STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by him before the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives on February 10, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CIVIL RIGHTS PROGRAM—LETTER BY SENATOR HUMPHREY TO NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated February 15, 1949, addressed by him to the editor of the New York Times, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONSOLIDATION OF STATE AGENCIES TO SAVE FEDERAL FUNDS

[Mr. WITHERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Hon. Earle C. Clements, Governor of Kentucky, and a telegram from Frank Bane, executive director, Council of State Governments, dealing with the consolidation of State agencies to save Federal funds, which appear in the Appendix.]

RELATIONS WITH SPAIN—ADDRESS AND LETTER BY DR. JOSEPH F. THORNING

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Dr. Joseph F. Thorning regarding relations with Spain, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR SPANISH POLICY—LETTER FROM DR. JOSEPH F. THORNING

[Mr. O CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter published in the Washington Evening Star of October 30, 1949, from Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of the Americas and World Affairs, which appears in the Appendix.]

RELIGIOUS PRESSURE ON TRIAL OF JOSEF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from O. K. Webb, pastor of the Rutledge Avenue Baptist Church, of Charleston, S. C., together with an article entitled "Baptist Ministers Here Attack 'Religious Pressure' on Trial," published in the Charleston (S. C.) News & Courier of February 15, 1949, which appear in the Appendix.]

COMMUNISM—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK ENQUIRER

[Mr. MCMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Advice for Americans," from the New York Enquirer, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ATOM BOMB—EDITORIAL FROM THE BRIDGEPORT TELEGRAM

[Mr. MCMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Momentous Decision," from the Bridgeport Telegram of February 7, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOREIGN POLICY—EDITORIAL FROM GRAND FORKS (N. DAK.) HERALD

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Must Still Guess on Foreign Policy," published in the Grand Forks (N. Dak.) Herald of February 15, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

MIGRATORY BIRD AND GAME TREATY WITH MEXICO—EDITORIAL FROM COLUMBIA (MO.) DAILY TRIBUNE

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Kem Resolution on Ducks," published in the Columbia (Mo.) Daily Tribune of February 7, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT STRUCTURE IN RELATION TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS—EDITORIAL FROM CLEVELAND PLAIN DEALER

[Mr. BRICKER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Time for Good, Hard Look," published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of February 15, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ECONOMIC SITUATION—EDITORIAL FROM KANSAS CITY STAR

[Mr. SCHOEPPEL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Time To Stop, Look, Listen," published in the Kansas City Star of February 6, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR THE REGULATION OF EXPORTS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 548) to

provide for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports, and for other purposes, which was, on page 5, line 6, after "application," to insert "and after notice to any such person and hearing."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina, for the information of the Senate, merely state what the amendment is?

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes; it requires notice and hearings on an application by the Department of Commerce to enforce a subpena, but does not affect the power of the court to enforce a subpena.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It does not in any way change the substantive matter of the bill?

Mr. MAYBANK. No; it does not. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

FEDERAL AID TO CERTAIN SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in connection with Senate bill 834, to authorize Federal aid to school districts overburdened with war-incurred or defense-incurred school enrollments for the construction of additional school facilities, which I introduced last week in company with several other Senators, I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD a statement by me pertaining thereto, together with a report by FWA on its survey of emergency school construction requirements for areas affected by Federal agency activity. Last week this report was submitted by FWA to the chairmen of Senate and House Committees on Public Works. I submit the report in full so the Senators from each of the 39 States affected may have an opportunity to study the bill and relate its provisions to the situation in their own States.

There being no objection, the statement and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON ON S. 834, A BILL TO ASSIST SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN BUILDING CONSTRUCTION—DISTRICTS WHICH ARE OVERBURDENED BY FEDERAL ACTIVITIES IN THEIR AREAS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Our responsibility to our school children makes it imperative to recognize that the Federal Government itself is burdening many of them with handicaps.

The burden is inadvertent. That does not make it lighter. Despite the Federal Government's many efforts to help children, it happens, ironically, that in 38 States, we are doing the reverse.

This is the problem: Federal activities in these areas have boomed school enrollment, and that enrollment has boomeranged. It has hit the school districts concerned and left them dazed.

On Monday, February 7, I introduced a bill which, if enacted by the Congress, will give urgently needed assistance to school districts overburdened by Federal activities in their immediate area. The bill proposes that the Congress appropriate $150,000,000 to help these schools meet their building requirements. Approximately 400 school districts in 39 States of the Union, the Territory of Alaska, and the District of Columbia are involved. The building problem these schools confront has been either seriously aggravated or actually created by Federal activity in the district. In each case the Federal Government has a clear-cut responsibility.

Senators KERR, CHAVEZ, DOWNEY, TAYLOR, MORSE, MCFARLAND, HILL, and MCCLELLAN are cosponsors of S. 834. Together we submitted this proposal as an equitable method of discharging Federal responsibility to the districts involved.

Generally speaking, Federal activity in these school districts has operated in two ways to create a Federal responsibility. I can best illustrate by using two examples in the State of Washington. The Moses Lake school district is located in the heart of the Columbia Basin. One of the largest structures in the basin development is being built in that district. In addition the Moses Lake Army Airfield has been reactivated. As a result of this Federal activity, the enrollment in this school has jumped from an average daily attendance of 176 in 1941 to an average daily attendance of over 800 in 1948.

To provide classroom space for these additional students, a number of shacks have been moved on to the school grounds. These shacks are precisely what the wording implies—frame buildings of the cheapest, flimsiest construction, with facilities of the most primitive character. The district cannot meet the problem out of its own resources. Already it is bonded to the limit and has exhausted its statutory tax assessments. The problem in this case is created by the tremendous increase in enrollment—a direct result of Federal activity in the area.

The second type of problem is illustrated by the situation the Bainbridge Island school district confronts. The total property valuation in this district is approximately $7,000,000. The Federal Government holds, on a tax-free basis, property amounting to over $5,000,000. This leaves the district a tax base of less than one-third of the property within its boundaries. Here, too, the district has made a maximum effort to meet the problem. It has bonded itself to the limit and, through special levies, has exhausted its tax revenue potential. One of the grade-school buildings still in use is over 50 years old. It is completely antiquated, is a firetrap, and represents a real hazard to both children and teachers. The State of Washington is doing everything possible within its current revenues to assist Bainbridge Island. The combined effort, however, of State and district falls about 40 percent short of the total funds required to bring school buildings up to a bare minimum standard.

In the State of California there are 86 schools confronting similar problems, in Texas, 38; in Michigan, 24; in Pennsylvania, 23; in Georgia, 15; in Arkansas, 14; in Virginia, 12; and in Arizona, 11. In my own State there are 34 school districts which find themselves in the predicament I have just described.

Our bill, S. 834, proposes to meet the problem in the following way. The Federal Works Administrator is authorized to make a Federal grant up to 50 percent of the estimated cost of the school facilities needed to bring the 395 schools up to a minimum standard. The Administrator is authorized to cooperate with State and district authorities in determining the building program required. In the event the school district has exhausted its entire bonding and tax potential, and has no cash or income available to meet its 50 percent of the cost, the Administrator is permitted to advance the entire amount required. He is then authorized to enter into a leasing agreement with the school district, calling for a payment by the district of 2 percent per year. This payment will continue until the district has paid its full 50 percent. At that time the Administrator is authorized to give the district a quitclaim deed to the facilities. Thus all districts are placed on an equal basis—each will pay at least 50 percent of the total cost of buildings and facilities constructed under the program.

In conclusion I want to explain the origin of the $150,000,000 authorization provided in S. 834. On June 14, 1948, the chairman of the subcommittee of House Public Works requested the Federal Works Administrator to conduct a Nation-wide survey of schools drastically affected by Federal activity in their districts.

During the summer and fall of 1948, FWA conducted such a survey and determined there are 395 schools in the United States and its Territories where Federal activities have created serious problems. The Administrator then computed the total cost of building programs to bring these schools up to a bare minimum standard. He then determined the total amount the 395 schools can reasonably be expected to produce from their own sources of income. Too, he computed the percentage of the total cost properly assessable to Federal activity. Out of the actual survey and the computations, I have just described, comes the $150,000,000 figure in our bill.

BUREAU OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES, FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY—SURVEY OF EMERGENCY SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION REQUIREMENTS FOR AREAS AFFECTED BY FEDERAL AGENCY ACTIVITIES

During the last session of Congress there was considerable discussion of the serious school construction problem faced by many localities throughout the United States, and particular emphasis was placed on those areas where the problem was doubly complicated because of activities of the Federal Government. Hearings were held on several bills designed to offer aid for school construction to such federally impacted communities, but none were passed. On June 14 Chairman J. HARRY MCGREGOR of the Subcommittee on Buildings and Grounds wrote to General Fleming indicating that it was the wish of the Committee on Public Works that a survey be made of emergency needs relative to construction of school facilities in areas where such circumstances are brought about by the influx of population caused by activities of our Federal departments. The letter concludes: "It is our hope, in the event such an emergency exists, that general legislation can be enacted during the next session of the Congress." This report is based on the survey requested by the Public Works Committee and, in the opinion of the Federal Works Agency, clearly indicates a situation to exist which merits the closest attention of the Congress.

As a first step in instituting the survey, the Central Office of the Bureau of Community Facilities (FWA) conferred with the United States Office of Education (FSA); this agency was most helpful and wrote to all State Departments of Education, asking their support and help for the field investigations to be carried out by the division and district engineers of the Bureau. Working together with the educational authorities, the Bureau's field staff was able to establish a list of areas where Federal activities were known to have placed a heavy burden on local school systems. Each of these school districts was then

surveyed. Data were secured on total immediate school construction needs in these districts. Steps were then taken to ascertain the portion of these total needs attributable to Federal activities, and what part of the total problem the school districts can reasonably be expected to work out for themselves.

NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS SURVEYED

After screening and eliminating reports where the Federal impact was too slight to merit inclusion, information on 422 districts was forwarded from the field to the central office of the Bureau. Here the reports were further screened, resulting in the elimination of 27 more districts. The attached tables therefore relate to 395 school districts. Generally speaking, the Federal action creating a special problem in these 395 districts may be said to be direct in nearly 300 districts, that is, arising from federally owned buildings or installations. In approximately 100 districts the Federal impact may be said to be less direct, that is, arising from defense or war plants not owned by the Federal Government but engaged in work for the Federal Government.

GEOGRAPHICAL COVERAGE

The 395 reporting school districts are situated in 39 States, the District of Columbia, and Alaska. The greatest concentrations are to be found in California (86), Texas (38), Washington (34), Michigan (24), Pennsylvania (23), Georgia (15), Arkansas (14), Virginia (12), and Arizona (11). Ten or less school districts are involved in each of the remaining States. While the geographical coverage is very broad, concentrations in certain States are natural and reflect the concentration of defense and industrial activities during and subsequent to World War II. The reporting areas are very largely those where the Federal Government did help during World War II to some extent in providing housing and community facilities under the Lanham Act.

Table 1 shows clearly the great increase in school attendance in the reporting districts, the greatly increasing percentage of attendance attributable to Federal activities, and the absolute failure of school plant in the areas to keep up with the increasing school attendance. Thus, table 1 lists the number of school districts reporting for each State and the average daily attendance figures for four periods, namely, the last normal year, the 1947–48 school year, the estimated 1948–49 school year, and the estimated 1949–50 school year. Each of these average daily attendance figures shows not only the total attendance but that part of the attendance which is the result of Federal activities. The following national totals show the increase in average daily attendance:

Average daily attendance

	Total	Federal
Last normal year	972,601	78,182
1947–48	1,313,377	318,673
1948–49	1,418,871	375,567
1949–50	1,525,741	449,569

During the last normal year, out of a total attendance of 972,001, in these 395 districts, approximately 78,182, or 8 percent, were due to Federal activities. During the current 1948–49 year, total attendance has increased to 1,418,871, of which approximately 375,567, or 26 percent, are due to Federal activities. Estimated figures for next year indicate not only an over-all increase but a percentage-wise increase in the proportion of enrollments due to Federal activities.

Table 1 also shows that the square feet of floor space available as of June 30, 1948, was 48,347,931. The last two columns indicate the cost of facilities provided from the last normal year through June 1948. It may be noted that the local communities have spent approximately three and one-half times as much as the Federal Government in providing additional facilities during this period. The Federal funds shown are those allocated under the Lanham Act during the war years when schools as well as other facilities were constructed as Federal or non-Federal projects in order to relieve the impact of war migrations to these areas.

VOLUME AND COST OF NEEDED FACILITIES

Table 2 sets forth the recommendations of the division engineers of the Bureau on the volume and cost of facilities presently needed in the reporting school districts to meet their greatly increased enrollments. These recommendations were made after a pruning of the volume and cost estimates submitted by the school districts. The recommendations of the district engineers for the 395 districts include a total of 25,247,947 square feet of space, of which 11,956,485 square feet are needed for enrollments due to Federal activities. The cost of providing presently needed facilities is $348,132,416, of which $171,018,580 is the cost of providing the share of the additional facilities required because of Federal activities.

FUNDS AVAILABLE TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Table 2 also includes a column showing the maximum amount of funds which can be raised by the school districts to meet their immediate school construction needs. These funds include all sources of revenue, including cash on hand, taxes to be collected, and funds which could be raised from bond issues within the legal limit of bonded indebtedness. They also include State aid where such might be provided. A study of the reports received indicates that many of the communities have insufficient funds to construct that part of their presently needed school plant not attributable to Federal activities, let alone that part attributable to such activities.

The final column of table 2 shows the amount still required after all local sources of funds are exhausted. In short, the survey indicates that a total of $136,000,000 is required over and above present and anticipated revenues of the school districts.

TYPES OF FEDERAL ACTIVITIES CAUSING INCREASED ENROLLMENTS

Table 3 analyzes the types of Federal activities which have brought about the increased enrollments in the 395 districts. It will be noted that some school districts are affected by the activities of two or more Federal installations. Generally speaking, the great majority of the Federal impacts noted are occasioned by activities of the Army, Navy and Air Force Departments and defense work in private plants.

CONCLUSION

It should be emphasized that this report and the survey on which it is based are limited strictly to school construction needs in areas especially affected by Federal activities. The 395 districts reporting are those which have an extra school construction problem occasioned by Federal agency activity, over and above the general difficulties in this connection now prevalent in so much of the United States. There may well be many additional school districts in the Nation with similar problems which have not reported their needs.

As is well known, there is a great need for new school plant all over the United States, a need arising primarily from lags in such construction both before and during World War II and the great increase in school population now beginning to hit the school system. We do not know precisely how large the over-all needs for school plant are for the country as a whole. But we do know from various studies made by the United States Office of Education, various State agencies, and our own field activities, that the volume of plant required exceeds $7,000,000,000 and that many localities do not have the fiscal capacity to cope with the problem.

As has been indicated, the 395 districts surveyed are in some respect the most critical of all, for in addition to the difficulties now being generally experienced all over the country, they are subject to the added difficulties occasioned by Federal governmental activities in their midst. Their needs are indeed acute and they have every right to such aid as the Federal Government finds it can give.

TABLE 1.—*Federal Works Agency, Bureau of Community Facilities—the average daily attendance, the square feet of floor space available, and cost of facilities provided from last normal year through June 30, 1948, in school districts affected by activities of the Federal Government as reported by local school officials, by State*

State	Number of school districts	Average daily attendance								Square feet of floor space available June 30, 1948	Cost of facilities provided last normal year through June 1948	
		Last normal year		1947–48		Estimated, 1948–49		Estimated, 1949–50				
		Total	Due to Federal activities	Total	Due to Federal activities	Total	Due to Federal activities	Total	Due to Federal activities		Total	Federal funds
United States	395	972,601	78,182	1,313,377	318,673	1,418,871	375,567	1,525,741	449,569	48,347,931	$178,843,178	$36,726,011
Alabama	9	21,241	20	25,146	4,048	27,286	6,045	28,748	7,597	737,429	2,091,587	951,237
Arizona	11	8,405	160	15,567	3,794	17,799	4,506	19,940	4,994	597,345	2,672,471	932,544
Arkansas	14	23,384	50	29,840	5,075	30,871	5,718	23,600	6,219	827,151	2,275,053	603,780
California	86	101,758	2,156	197,124	65,046	207,150	73,946	233,928	92,796	8,900,801	31,431,807	7,003,802
Colorado	5	9,170	2	10,828	900	12,170	1,280	13,525	1,627	416,344	2,452,033	64,872
Connecticut												
Delaware												
Florida	5	46,922	2,984	57,311	7,408	60,009	8,951	61,660	10,187	1,438,802	5,962,945	1,372,232
Georgia	15	58,831		82,128	11,034	89,976	16,635	96,310	20,515	2,535,995	4,173,023	1,058,116
Idaho	4	6,813	73	8,077	1,052	8,925	1,642	10,300	2,509	393,976	191,746	2,665
Illinois	9	3,182	15	4,595	1,208	4,971	1,479	5,986	2,236	118,265	604,263	292,791
Indiana	6	7,130		12,028	2,707	12,947	3,301	4,329	4,285	199,260	718,779	447,500

TABLE 1.—*Federal Works Agency, Bureau of Community Facilities—the average daily attendance, the square feet of floor space available, and cost of facilities provided from last normal year through June 30, 1948, in school districts affected by activities of the Federal Government as reported by local school officials, by State*—Continued

State	Number of school districts	Average daily attendance: Last normal year: Tota	Last normal year: Due to Federal activities	1947–48: Total	1947–48: Due to Federal activities	Estimated, 1948–49: Total	Estimated, 1948–49: Due to Federal activities	Estimated, 1949–50: Total	Estimated, 1949–50: Due to Federal activities	Square feet of floor space available June 30, 1948	Cost of facilities provided last normal year through June 1948: Total	Cost of facilities provided last normal year through June 1948: Federal funds
Iowa	1	30		69	40	114	85	150	110	2,310	$29,586	$29,586
Kansas	2	20,638		23,006	2,200	24,192	3,200	26,900	5,500	1,657,416	2,271,307	144,703
Kentucky	3	4,615	83	5,121	473	5,502	625	5,800	773	151,632	173,825	78,625
Louisiana												
Maine	6	11,006		13,104	1,717	13,719	1,820	14,486	2,220	380,158	615,265	414,765
Maryland	5	44,843	10,000	64,784	27,791	74,298	33,887	81,988	38,117	1,799,833	21,922,948	554,470
Massachusetts												
Michigan	24	40,673	1,201	54,742	12,333	57,396	15,149	60,683	17,572	2,012,773	5,653,987	2,077,669
Minnesota	2	1,432	274	2,137	232	2,200	235	2,450	255	2,100		
Mississippi	2	1,540		2,191	649	2,385	770	2,485	845	96,552	477,436	8,436
Missouri	4	5,403		6,931	1,270	7,469	1,357	8,661	1,996	350,358	946,136	124,177
Montana												
Nebraska	6	1,383		2,020	416	2,253	648	2,435	780	93,062	75,392	13,000
Nevada	6	1,231	458	3,676	7,686	3,800	2,761	4,379	3,325	140,151	592,059	418,125
New Hampshire												
New Jersey	1	110		215	116	300	200	350	250	9,000		
New Mexico	4	2,490		3,225	855	3,688	1,229	4,284	1,785	88,663	219,626	
New York												
North Carolina												
North Dakota	2	416	4	497	62	587	140	640	165	17,298		
Ohio	9	7,390	550	12,658	4,393	13,447	5,000	14,712	5,765	313,140	1,281,023	519,555
Oklahoma	7	66,844	755	74,442	6,979	78,927	10,248	83,807	12,848	1,180,065	3,622,695	583,419
Oregon	8	2,653		5,305	1,388	5,793	1,544	6,455	1,805	320,032	1,725,803	348,917
Pennsylvania	23	27,708	160	32,739	6,357	35,510	7,290	38,253	8,942	983,877	2,059,549	768,096
Rhode Island	1	849		1,231	381	1,375	400	1,475	450	40,000	646,266	100,000
South Carolina	3	7,930	275	12,759	2,585	13,500	2,721	14,895	3,084	395,888	1,530,672	1,183,032
South Dakota	1	180		275	90	310	130	400	220	9,600	15,000	
Tennessee	5	10,737		12,221	805	12,975	1,136	13,950	1,496	345,488	893,688	189,000
Texas	38	125,639	1,941	169,078	26,230	193,900	30,070	200,932	44,133	7,579,681	14,909,397	2,914,890
Utah	7	34,681		44,116	7,431	46,391	8,583	48,603	10,041	1,663,713	3,703,752	461,288
Vermont												
Virginia	12	61,744	8,993	83,543	30,972	92,273	34,067	98,893	38,241	2,401,778	11,298,714	3,739,887
Washington	34	85,324	5,623	119,946	30,425	135,212	41,155	149,393	47,397	4,916,120	20,945,084	7,153,040
West Virginia	2	25,433		21,005	2,000	29,235	2,000	29,850	1,550	1,084,440	883,000	
Wisconsin	1	867		974	81	1,020	105	1,070	153	60,225	25,481	
Wyoming	5	5,774	12	8,032	654	8,593	758	9,216	845	137,690	1,098,999	15,000
District of Columbia	1	84,050	42,025	85,558	42,779	84,804	42,402	86,000	43,000	4,080,000	18,000,630	1,996,800
Territory of Alaska	6	1,317	366	3,132	1,921	3,561	2,349	4,254	3,037		627,501	180,000

TABLE 2.—*The square feet and estimated cost of floor space presently needed, funds available and funds needed in school districts affected by activities of the Federal Government as recommended by Division engineers, Bureau of Community Facilities, by State*

State	Number of school districts	Square feet of floor space needed: Total	Square feet of floor space needed: Due to Federal activities	Estimated cost of needed facilities: Total	Estimated cost of needed facilities: Due to Federal activities	Funds available to school districts	Funds needed by school districts
United States	395	25,247,947	11,956,485	$348,132,416	$171,018,560	$212,221,326	$135,911,090
Alabama	9	681,443	152,386	6,814,430	1,524,970	1,084,140	5,730,290
Arizona	11	454,580	211,385	4,545,800	2,113,850	1,021,950	3,523,850
Arkansas	14	220,250	205,450	3,303,750	3,081,750	673,050	2,630,700
California	86	9,983,600	4,991,557	100,629,000	49,971,030	54,406,015	46,222,085
Colorado	5	37,000	37,000	555,000	555,000	292,000	263,000
Connecticut							
Delaware							
Florida	5	320,758	288,460	3,207,580	2,884,600	3,144,580	63,000
Georgia	15	622,160	382,720	8,433,000	4,220,200	5,712,181	2,720,819
Idaho	4	94,786	45,594	1,447,540	682,310	885,000	562,540
Illinois	9	36,000	20,000	756,000	440,000	696,000	60,000
Indiana	6	90,000	38,500	1,219,000	809,000	529,500	689,500
Iowa	1	2,250	2,250	45,000	45,000	19,500	25,500
Kansas	2	55,600	55,600	1,112,000	1,112,000	624,000	488,000
Kentucky	3	71,250	59,750	1,339,500	1,129,500	398,500	941,000
Louisiana							
Maine	6	133,640	67,818	1,308,843	679,680	732,443	576,400
Maryland	5	716,310	475,375	19,593,000	10,678,725	12,015,890	7,577,110
Massachusetts							
Michigan	24	456,000	265,000	10,144,000	5,636,500	9,906,500	237,500
Minnesota	2	42,000	10,000	900,000	200,000	209,000	691,000
Mississippi	2	23,088	9,588	234,500	99,500	124,607	109,893
Missouri	4	63,500	52,500	1,270,000	1,050,000	268,700	1,001,300
Montana							
Nebraska	6	38,400	20,900	910,000	500,000	196,465	713,535
Nevada	6	101,310	65,405	887,100	622,550	597,100	290,000
New Hampshire							
New Jersey	1	4,000	4,000	80,000	80,000	4,000	76,000
New Mexico	4	38,700	38,700	570,750	570,750	93,490	477,260
New York							
North Carolina							
North Dakota	2	11,500	6,500	240,600	130,000	118,000	122,600
Ohio	9	95,136	74,256	2,345,980	1,933,980	1,138,718	1,207,262
Oklahoma	7	316,370	161,150	4,745,550	2,417,250	3,023,000	1,722,550
Oregon	8	94,720	45,200	1,386,653	653,300	1,057,475	329,178
Pennsylvania	23	1,850,550	336,450	11,121,000	5,595,000	3,605,000	7,516,000
Rhode Island	1	70,000	40,650	861,500	500,000	861,500	
South Carolina	3	116,222	17,903	1,102,220	179,030	1,033,020	69,200
South Dakota	1	4,200	4,200	84,000	84,000	42,600	41,400
Tennessee	5	42,562	42,562	425,620	425,620	405,340	20,280
Texas	38	3,432,197	1,975,137	51,482,955	16,172,055	41,520,163	9,962,792
Utah	7	166,000	134,000	2,490,000	2,010,000	2,490,000	
Vermont							

TABLE 2.—*The square feet and estimated cost of floor space presently needed, funds available and funds needed in school districts affected by activities of the Federal Government as recommended by Division engineers, Bureau of Community Facilities, by State*—Con.

State	Number of school districts	Square feet of floor space needed: Total	Square feet of floor space needed: Due to Federal activities	Estimated cost of needed facilities: Total	Estimated cost of needed facilities: Due to Federal activities	Funds available to school districts	Funds needed by school districts
Virginia	12	830,108	560,812	$22,545,700	$13,529,000	$8,641,450	$13,904,250
Washington	34	3,100,407	1,502,367	48,502,885	21,599,150	38,254,489	10,308,396
West Virginia	2	22,110	22,110	650,000	650,000	250,000	400,000
Wisconsin	1	3,000	3,000	75,000	75,000		75,000
Wyoming	5	24,800	24,800	372,000	372,000	372,000	
District of Columbia	1	759,000	379,500	28,100,000	14,050,000	14,050,000	14,050,000
Territory of Alaska	6	58,500	48,040	2,235,560	1,887,260	1,723,060	512,500

TABLE 3.—*Federal Works Agency, Bureau of Community Facilities—Number of school districts and major reasons occasioning need for additional school facilities as reported by local school officials, by State*

State	Number of school districts	Major reasons: Total reasons	Federal installations: Tota	Army	Navy	Air	Coast Guard	Interior	Federal Public Housing Administration	Veterans' Administration	Atomic Energy Commission	Civil Aeronautics Authority	Bureau of Census	Federal Security Agency	Tennessee Valley Authority	Miscellaneous	Federal public works	Defense industry
United States	395	576	393	163	72	84	2	13	81	12	14	2	1	1	1	7	19	164
Alabama	9	17	11	4		1			4	1					1			6
Arizona	11	20	14		1	8			3	2								6
Arkansas	14	21	15	6	2	2			3	2							2	4
California	86	110	57	16	17	18			6								2	51
Colorado	5	10	9	2		3			3	1								1
Connecticut																		
Delaware																	1	
Florida	5	6	6		3	2	1											
Georgia	15	24	16	5	1	6			2	2								8
Idaho	4	5	4		1	1		2									1	
Illinois	9	12	7	3	1				2		1							5
Indiana	6	8	2	1					1									6
Iowa	1	1	1	1														
Kansas	2	2	1	1														1
Kentucky	3	3	2	2													1	
Louisiana																		
Maine	6	9	6		1	4			1									3
Maryland	5	15	14	4	4	1	1						1	1		2		1
Massachusetts																		
Michigan	24	29	12	2	3				7									17
Minnesota	2	3	1	1														2
Mississippi	2	2	1	1														1
Missouri	4	7	3	1	2													4
Montana																		
Nebraska	6	6	2			1		1									4	
Nevada	6	7	6		2	1		2	1									1
New Hampshire																		
New Jersey	1	2	2	1		1												
New Mexico	4	4	4			1					3							
New York																		
North Carolina																	2	
North Dakota	2	2																2
Ohio	9	12	10	1		4			3		2						1	3
Oklahoma	7	8	4	3		1											1	
Oregon	8	12	11	3		1			7									6
Pennsylvania	23	35	29	3	4	1			21									
Rhode Island	1	2	2	1	1													
South Carolina	3	5	5	1	1	3												
South Dakota	1	1															1	
Tennessee	5	6	6	2	1				2		1							
Texas	38	55	37	13	3	12			8	1							1	17
Utah	7	16	13	6	3	5												3
Vermont																		
Virginia	12	26	26	8	9	2			3	1						3		
Washington	34	54	36	8	12	5			4		7						2	16
West Virginia	2	2	2	1						1								
Wisconsin	1	2	2	1						1								
Wyoming	5	5	4	1				3									1	
District of Columbia	1	1	1													1		
Territory of Alaska	6	9	9	1				5				2				1		

THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is concluded. The next order of business is the call of the calendar.

The clerk will proceed to call the measures on the calendar. The Chair desires to admonish Senators, and remind them, that during the call of the calendar the 5-minute limitation of debate prevails.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 130) to provide for the demonstration of public library service in areas without such service or with inadequate library facilities was announced as first in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is necessarily absent. I think he wishes to have some discussion of the bill. Therefore, I object to its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN COMPACT

The bill (S. 790) to grant the consent of the United States to the Upper Colorado River Basin compact was announced as next in order.

Mr. DOWNEY. I desire to object, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

Mr. DOWNEY. I should like to state that I have been endeavoring to discuss certain statements to be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in connection with

the passage of this bill. My colleague, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], has been discussing the same language with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], but we have not yet reached any conclusion regarding it. So for the present I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over. The clerk will state the next measure on the calendar.

RELIEF OF PALESTINE REFUGEES

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 36) for the authorization of a special contribution by the United States to the United Nations for the relief of Palestine refugees was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, this is a joint resolution authorizing an appropriation of $16,000,000 for the relief of so-called Palestine refugees. These refugees in the main are Arabs who formerly resided in the territory now in the control of Israel, but because of military operations they left their homes or were driven from their homes, and sought refuge in other parts of the land.

The acting mediator of Palestine, on October 18, 1948, described the plight of these refugees as extremely critical, and urged immediate assistance for them to avert a great human catastrophe.

The General Assembly of the United Nations unanimously adopted a resolution urging member states to make voluntary contributions to raise the $32,000,000 required for the extension of essential relief. Up to the present time, 24 states, members of the United Nations, have made contributions or have indicated their intention to contribute.

The work has been proceeding on an advance; the United Nations made an advance, and that advance is bearing the expenses until the contributions come into the treasury.

The United States delegation in Paris, in accordance with its instructions, examined the possible alternatives and the size of the United States contribution. A small advisory staff has been set up under the Secretary General of the United Nations; and Stanton Griffis, an American, who is United States Ambassador to Egypt, has been appointed director of the program.

Let me say that our delegation agreed on a contribution of $16,000,000. Later on the President of the United States advised the Congress that he recommended that an appropriation of $16,000,000 be made for this purpose.

We believe that this contribution, together with the contributions of other member states, will permit Mr. Griffis to carry on the program through a most difficult winter and spring.

Mr. President, the conditions among the refugees in that area are most acute. The most recent estimates place the number of refugees at above 720,000. About 230,000 of them are in the Gaza area. As of October 1948 it was estimated by Mr. Gower, of the American Red Cross, that 84 percent of the refugees were children, mothers, the aged and the infirm. Deaths among the refugees from exposure, disease, and starvation are almost impossible to estimate. In many areas the refugees bury the dead in secret. The refugees are so constantly on the move that figures regarding the number of deaths cannot be gathered; but both Egyptian and neutral observers estimated in early December that deaths in the Gaza area alone averaged 120 a night. Pneumonia, dysentery, weakness, and malnutrition among the aged account for a large part of the mortality.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have no objection. I merely wished to know the amount involved.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with amendments, on page 2, in line 3, to strike out "it is the desire of the United States to cooperate fully with the United Nations in the establishment and maintenance of peace and stability in the Palestine area and in the alleviation of human suffering in that area, and, in order to effectuate such cooperation"; in line 8, to strike out "Secretary of State" and insert "President"; in line 9, after the word "appropriated", to strike out "the sum of" and insert "not to exceed"; in line 13, after "1948", to insert "providing for the relief of Palestine refugees"; in line 14, to strike out "Payment of this contribution shall be made to the United Nations at such time and in such amounts as the Secretary of State may deem appropriate"; in line 20, to strike out "Secretary of State" and insert "President"; in line 24, after the word "repaid", to strike out "by the Secretary of State"; and on page 3, beginning in line 5, to strike out:

SEC. 3. (a) Upon request of the United Nations for materials, supplies, or services for the purpose of carrying out the terms of the resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations of November 19, 1948, the Secretary of State may transfer sums, as advancements or reimbursements, for the cost and expense therefor, from advances by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under section 2, from appropriations made under authority of section 1, and from funds made available to him by the United Nations for such purposes, to any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government, including any corporation wholly owned by the United States (hereinafter referred to as "Government agency"), and any such Government agency shall furnish or procure and furnish such material, supplies, or services to the United Nations. Sums so transferred shall be available for obligation and expenditure in accordance with the laws governing obligations and expenditures of the Government agency to which funds are transferred and without regard to sections 3709 and 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U. S. C. 5 and 31 U. S. C. 529), or to the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 (Public Law 413, 80th Cong.): *Provided*, That such additional civilian employees as may be required by any such Government agency for the procurement or furnishing of supplies or services under this subsection shall not be counted as civilian employees within the meaning of section 14 (a) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946.

(b) When reimbursement is made under subsection (a) of this section, it shall be credited, at the option of the Government agency involved, either to the appropriation, fund, or account utilized in incurring the obligation, or to the appropriate appropriation, fund, or account which is current at the time of such reimbursement.

So as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, not to exceed $16,000,000 as a special contribution by the United States to the United Nations for the purposes set forth in the resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations of November 19, 1948, providing for the relief of Palestine refugees.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provision of any other law, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed, until such time as an appropriation shall be made pursuant to section 1, to make advances to the President, not to exceed in the aggregate $8,000,000, to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution. From appropriations authorized under section 1, there shall be repaid to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, without interest, the advances made by it under authority contained herein. No interest shall be charged on advances made by the Treasury to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in implementation of this section.

The amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution for the authorization of a special contribution by the United States for the relief of Palestine refugees."

The preamble was rejected.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a brief statement in connection with the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CONNALLY

PALESTINE REFUGEE LEGISLATION

Mr. President, it is well known that, as a result of hostilities in Palestine, well over 500,000 refugees in the Near East are in dire need of food, clothing, shelter, blankets, and medical supplies. On October 18, 1948, the acting mediator for Palestine described the plight of these refugees as extremely critical and urged immediate assistance for them to avert a great human catastrophe.

Confronted with this grave crisis, the General Assembly of the United Nations, earnestly seeking a settlement in Palestine and the Near East, unanimously adopted a resolution urging member states to make voluntary contributions to raise the $32,000,000 required for the extension of essential relief. Up to the present time, 24 states have indicated their intentions to contribute and work has been proceeding on an advance from the United Nations working capital fund.

The United States delegation in Paris, in accordance with its instructions, examined very carefully the possible alternatives for the most satisfactory and economical administration of this emergency program and the size of the United States contribution. A small advisory staff has been set up under the

Secretary General of the United Nations and Stanton Griffis, the United States Ambassador to Egypt, has been appointed director of the program. In order to avoid complex administrative machinery, agreements have been reached with the League of Red Cross Societies, the International Committee of the Red Cross, and the Friends Committee so that these experienced relief organizations will assume responsibility for the actual distribution of supplies and the field operations generally.

The Committee on Foreign Relations examined this entire problem with a great deal of care. While we have recommended certain amendments to Senate Joint Resolution 36 for the purpose of simplification and clarity, we voted unanimously to report the resolution favorably with an authorization for $16,000,000. We believe that this contribution, together with the contributions of other states, will permit Mr. Griffis to carry the program through a most difficult winter and spring.

Now, Mr. President, I do not wish to take the time of the Senate to examine in detail the refugee program. The essential facts are set forth in the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I would like to conclude my remarks by underlining some of the compelling reasons the United States should support this program.

First. The plight of thousands of refugees in the Near East is desperate. Since the resources of the Arab states are inadequate to meet the crisis, starvation and death will be rampant if this program is not approved.

Second. The present program was very carefully worked out by the General Assembly. It is probably the best arrangement, from both an administrative and financial point of view, which could be devised under the circumstances.

Third. It is the established policy of the United States to cooperate fully with the United Nations in carrying out those programs agreed upon under the terms of the Charter. We must stand squarely with the United Nations in this important undertaking.

Fourth. It is generally agreed that a satisfactory solution of the refugee problem will contribute greatly toward an over-all political settlement in Palestine. In view of our deep interest in the Holy Land, and our traditional friendship for the people of the Near East, we are anxious to do everything within our power to bring peace and tranquillity to that unhappy region of the world.

For these reasons, Mr. President, and because of the very pressing time element, I sincerely hope the Senate will give its speedy approval to the resolution before us.

ELIGIBILITY FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF FORMER STAFF MEMBERS OF CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1252) to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, with respect to the eligibility for appointment in the executive branch of the Government of former professional staff members of committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, may we know what is provided in the bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Legislative Reorganization Act provides that any person employed by any congressional committee as a specialist or investigator or in any similar capacity cannot be employed by any Government department within 1 year after he leaves such committee employment. With the change of administration there have been changes in both the House and Senate committees, and, of course, there have been changes in some of these positions. In some instances persons so affected desire to return to governmental departments; but, primarily, the reason for the passage of the bill is, I think, the one stated by Representative REED of New York, who introduced the bill, which has been passed by the House of Representatives. He stated that some of these persons have attempted to go back into industry and have sought jobs in industry. I know some of them have gone to Philadelphia and to New York. They tell their story to industry; but the heads of industry are not too familiar with the situation which exists, and they often say, "Well, your story sounds all right, but there must be some reason why you were let out," thus indicating that their view is, regardless of their efficiency, there is something wrong with their character. Some of these men come back very much discouraged, so Representative REED introduced the bill. It was unanimously reported by the Ways and Means Committee of the House, and was passed by the House.

Mr. RUSSELL. It merely proposes, does it not, to strike from the Reorganization Act the provision which prevented the employment by the executive department of any person who had been employed by the legislative branch of the Government until the lapse of 1 year after the date of the termination of his service?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INTERSTATE COMPACT ON GULF STATES FISHERIES

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 42) granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Gulf coast and creating the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby given to any two or more of the States of Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas to enter into, the following compact and agreement relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Gulf Coast and creating the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission. The compact reads as follows:

GULF STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMPACT

The contracting States solemnly agree:

ARTICLE I

Whereas the Gulf Coast States have the proprietary interest in and jurisdiction over fisheries in the waters within their respective boundaries, it is the purpose of this compact to promote the better utilization of the fisheries, marine, shell, and anadromous, of the seaboard of the Gulf of Mexico, by the development of a joint program for the promotion and protection of such fisheries and the prevention of the physical waste of the fisheries from any cause.

ARTICLE II

This compact shall become operative immediately as to those States ratifying it whenever any two or more of the States of Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas have ratified it and the Congress has given its consent subject to article 1, section 10, of the Constitution of the United States. Any State contiguous to any of the aforementioned States or riparian upon waters which flow into waters under the jurisdiction of any of the aforementioned States and which are frequented by anadromous fish or marine species may become a party hereto as hereinafter provided.

ARTICLE III

Each State joining herein shall appoint three representatives to a commission hereby constituted and designated as the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission. One shall be the head of the administrative agency of such State charged with the conservation of the fishery resources to which this compact pertains or, if there be more than one officer or agency, the official of that State named by the governor thereof. The second shall be a member of the legislature of such State designated by such legislature or in the absence of such designation, such legislator shall be designated by the governor thereof, provided that if it is constitutionally impossible to appoint a legislator as a commissioner from such State, the second member shall be appointed in such manner as may be established by law. The third shall be a citizen who shall have a knowledge of and interest in the marine fisheries, to be appointed by the governor. This commission shall be a body corporate with the powers and duties set forth herein.

ARTICLE IV

The duty of the said commission shall be to make inquiry and ascertain from time to time such methods, practices, circumstances and conditions as may be disclosed for bringing about the conservation and the prevention of the depletion and physical waste of the fisheries, marine, shell and anadromous, of the Gulf coast. The commission shall have power to recommend the coordination of the exercise of the police powers of the several States within their respective jurisdiction to promote the preservation of these fisheries and their protection against overfishing, waste, depletion or any abuse whatsoever and to assure a continuing yield from the fishery resources of the afore-mentioned States. To that end the commission shall draft and recommend to the governors and legislatures of the various signatory States, legislation dealing with the conservation of the marine, shell and anadromous fisheries of the Gulf seaboard. The commission shall from time to time present to the governor of each compacting State its recommendations relating to enactments to be presented to the legislature of that State in furthering the interest and purposes of this compact. The commission shall consult with and advise the pertinent administrative agencies in the States party hereto with regard to problems connected with the fisheries and recommend the adoption of such regulations as it deems advisable. The commission shall have power to recommend to the States party hereto the stocking of the waters of such States with fish and fish eggs or joint stocking by some or all of the States party hereto and when two or more States shall jointly stock waters the commission shall act as the coordinating agency, for such stocking.

ARTICLE V

The commission shall elect from its number a chairman and vice chairman and shall appoint and at its pleasure remove or discharge such officers and employees as may be required to carry the provisions of this compact into effect and shall fix and determine their duties, qualifications and compensation. Said commission shall adopt rules and regulations for the conduct of its business. It may establish and maintain one or more offices for the transaction of its business and may meet at any time or place but must meet at least once a year.

ARTICLE VI

No action shall be taken by the commission in regard to its general affairs except by the affirmative vote of a majority of the whole number of compacting States. No recommendation shall be made by the commission in regard to any species of fish except by the affirmative vote of a majority of the compacting States which have an interest in such species. The commission shall define what shall be an interest.

ARTICLE VII

The Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior of the Government of the United States shall act as the primary research agency of the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission cooperating with the research agencies in each State for that purpose. Representatives of the said Fish and Wildlife Service shall attend the meetings of the commission. An advisory committee to be representative of the commercial saltwater fishermen and the salt-water anglers and such other interest of each State as the commissioners deem advisable may be established by the commissioners from each State for the purpose of advising those commissioners upon such recommendations as it may desire to make.

ARTICLE VIII

When any State other than those named specifically in article II of this compact shall become a party hereto for the purpose of conserving its anadromous fish or marine species in accordance with the provisions of article II, the participation of such State in the action of the commission shall be limited to such species of fish.

ARTICLE IX

Nothing in this compact shall be construed to limit the powers or the proprietary interest of any signatory State or to repeal or prevent the enactment of any legislation or the enforcement of any requirement by a signatory State imposing additional conditions and restrictions to conserve its fisheries.

ARTICLE X

It is agreed that any two or more States party hereto may further amend this compact by acts of their respective legislatures subject to approval of Congress as provided in article I, section 10 of the Constitution of the United States, to designate the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission as a joint regulating authority for the joint regulation of specific fisheries affecting only such States as shall so compact, and at their joint expense. The representatives of such States shall constitute a separate section of the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission for the exercise of the additional powers so granted but the creation of such section shall not be deemed to deprive the States so compacting of any of their privileges or powers in the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission as constituted under the other articles of this compact.

ARTICLE XI

Continued absence of representation or of any representative on the commission from any State party hereto shall be brought to the attention of the governor thereof.

ARTICLE XII

The operating expenses of the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission shall be borne by the States party hereto. Such initial appropriations as are set forth below shall be made available yearly until modified as hereinafter provided:

Florida	$3,500
Alabama	1,000
Mississippi	1,000
Louisiana	5,000
Texas	2,500
Total	13,000

The proration and total cost per annum of $13,000, above-mentioned, is estimative only, for initial operations, and may be changed when found necessary by the commission and approved by the legislatures of the respective States. Each State party hereto agrees to provide in the manner most acceptable to it, the travel costs and necessary expenses of its commissioners and other representatives to and from meetings of the commission or its duly constituted sections or committees.

ARTICLE XIII

This compact shall continue in force and remain binding upon each compacting State until renounced by act of the legislature of such State, in such form as it may choose; provided that such renunciation shall not become effective until 6 months after the effective date of the action taken by the legislature. Notice of such renunciation shall be given to the other States party thereto by the secretary of state of the compacting State so renouncing upon passage of the act.

ALBERT A. SPRAGUE VETERANS' MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

The bill (S. 745) to provide for the designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Chicago, Ill., as the Albert A. Sprague Veterans' Memorial Hospital, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I may say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois I have no intention of objecting—I call attention to the fact that the bill was reported by the Committee on Finance, to whom it undoubtedly had been referred by the Presiding Officer of the Senate. I think the bill really should have gone to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, since that committe has jurisdiction over other matters dealing with hospitals of the Veterans' Administration. In the Eightieth Congress, I know, as a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, that the subcommittee spent a great deal of time on the question of hospitals for the Veterans' Administration. A number of questions are now before our committee relative to the hospitals of the Veterans' Administration. I merely make these remarks in the hope that in the future this will not become a precedent for the sending of bills of this character to the Finance Committee rather than to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, where I think the bill undoubtedly belongs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the proposed United States Veterans' Administration general surgical hospital at Chicago, Ill., shall be known and designated on the public records as the Albert A. Sprague Veterans' Memorial Hospital.

CLARIFICATION OF NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF 1940

The bill (S. 461) to clarify the provisions of section 602 (u) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 602 (u) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, as added by section 9 of the act of August 1, 1946 (60 Stat. 786; 38 U. S. C. 802 (u)), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(u) With respect to insurance maturing on or subsequent to the date of enactment of the Insurance Act of 1946, in any case in which the beneficiary is entitled to a lump-sum settlement but elects some other mode of settlement and dies before receiving all the benefits due and payable under such mode of settlement, the present value of the remaining unpaid amount shall be payable to the estate of the beneficiary; and in any case in which no beneficiary is designated by the insured, or the designated beneficiary does not survive the insured, or a designated beneficiary not entitled to a lump-sum settlement survives the insured, and dies before receiving all the benefits due and payable, the commuted value of the remaining unpaid insurance (whether accrued or not) shall be paid in one sum to the estate of the insured: *Provided*, That in no event shall there be any payment to the estate of the insured or of the beneficiary of any sums unless it is shown that any sums paid will not escheat."

ELLA L. BROWNING

The bill (S. 208) for the relief of Ella L. Browning was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ella L. Browning, Bar Harbor, Maine, the sum of $3,552.50, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for damages to a swimming pool and stone terrace wall situated at Pointe d'Acadie, on Mount Desert Island, in connection with experimental work with ordnance materials conducted by the United States Navy at Bald Porcupine Island, Hancock County, Maine, in and after 1943, while such Bald Porcupine Island was occupied by the Naval Establishment under lease (NOy (R)-33877) executed by said Ella L. Browning, on September 15, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

EDWIN B. ANDERSON

The bill (S. 592) for the relief of Edwin B. Anderson was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Edwin B. Anderson, a city letter carrier in the post office at Newton, Iowa, is hereby relieved of all liability to make refund to the United States of any amount received by him as a result of overpayment of salary from May 1, 1945, the date he was promoted from substitute postal employee to the position of regular city letter carrier by the postmaster at Newton, Iowa, to October 16, 1946, the effective date of his promotion to regular city letter carrier as authorized by the Post Office Department.

Any amount heretofore refunded to the United States by Edwin B. Anderson, or by

any other person or persons on account of such overpayment of salary to Edwin B. Anderson, shall be refunded to him, or to such other person or persons, out of any money available for the payment of salaries to city-delivery carriers. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any postmaster or other designated disbursing officer of the Post Office Department or postal service, the salary payments to Edwin B. Anderson from May 1, 1945, to October 16, 1946, for service as regular city letter carrier shall be considered to have been authorized: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN POSTAL EMPLOYEES

The bill (S. 593) for the relief of certain postal employees was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all employees at first- and second-class post offices who were reduced from the position of regular clerk or regular carrier to the position of substitute clerk or substitute carrier prior to July 1, 1945, or who were formerly regular clerk or regular carrier and were reinstated as substitute clerk or substitute carrier prior to July 1, 1945, and whose compensation was converted to $1.24 per hour effective July 1, 1945, instead of $1.04 per hour as provided by sections 12 (a) and 24 of the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers and, employees of the Postal Service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes", approved July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 435, ch. 274), are hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States any amounts paid to them as a result of such overpayment of salaries from July 1, 1945, until the date their compensation was adjusted to conform to the provisions of the act of July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 435, ch. 274), as amended, and in the audit and settlement of the accounts any postmaster or other designated disbursing officer of the Post Office Department or postal service the amounts paid to such employees from July 1, 1945, as compensation shall be considered to have been authorized. Any amounts heretofore credited to such employees, or refunded to the United States by them on account of such overpayment of salaries shall be repaid to them out of any money available for the payment of salaries to city delivery carriers and clerks at first- and second-class offices: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

JOHN I. MALARIN

The bill (S. 594) for the relief of John I. Malarin, former Army mail clerk at APO 932, a branch of the San Francisco, Calif., post office, relative to a shortage in his fixed credit account, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John I. Malarin, former Army mail clerk at APO 932, a branch of the San Francisco, Calif., post office, the sum of $916.78, the amount refunded to the United States by the said John I. Malarin as a result of a deficiency that developed during February 1943 in his fixed credit account while he was Army mail clerk at APO 932: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

RACHEL D. GATTEGNO

The bill (S. 633) for the relief of Rachel D. Gattegno was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Rachel D. Gattegno, of Salonika, Greece, the sum of $3,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of her husband, David Gattegno, who died on or about July 5, 1944, as the result of a wound caused by a rifle bullet accidentally fired by a guard at a United States Army military camp at Fedhala, French Morocco, on or about July 4, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

HERMAN A. BENNINK

The bill (S. 624) for the relief of Herman A. Bennink was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 404 of the Nationality Act of 1940 (relating to loss of nationality by naturalized citizens), Herman A. Bennink, a naturalized citizen of the United States temporarily residing in Apeldoorn, Holland, shall not be considered to have lost his United States citizenship by reason of any period of residence outside the United States prior to the date of enactment of this act, and any period of residence of the said Herman A. Bennink outside the United States which is occasioned principally by his specialized study in Holland of the growing of American corn shall be deemed to bring the said Herman A. Bennink within the provisions of section 406 (b) of the Nationality Act of 1940.

PAYMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS ARISING FROM ACTIVITIES OF THE ARMY

The bill (S. 634) to authorize payment of certain claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property and personal injury arising from activities of the Army was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Henry W. Brooks, Warren, Vt., $360; to T. N. Carlton, Rural Free Delivery No. 1, Wauchula, Fla., $250; to Melvin B. Clark, Mankato, Minn., $32; to Paul A. Davis, Rural Free Delivery No. 3, Sylvan Hills, North Little Rock, Ark., $255; to Albert E. Drecoll, Libertyville, Ill., $63.25; to E. H. Ferguson, Rantoul, Ill., $64.68; to Harold L. Gavin, 229 Anderson Street, Hackensack, N. J., $24.79; to Francis E. Geagan, Hotel Vereen, Miami, Fla., $50; to John F. Gibbons, Jr., 1507 Robert Street, New Orleans, La., $155.30; to John J. Kutch, 7212 Harrow Street, Forest Hills, Long Island, N. Y., $34.57; to Mrs. Blanche Lebwith, Wyandanch, N. Y., $189.50; to Joaquin Quinones Lopez, Santurce, Puerto Rico, $600; to Mason D. Nesmith, Georgetown, S. C., $40.64; to Isadore Rosinsky, 1820 North Fifty-fourth Street, Omaha, Nebr., $706.50; to A. M. Smith, Rural Free Delivery No. 2, Columbia, S. C., $440; to Mrs. May V. Walsh, Montezuma, Ga., $35; to Herbert Grillmaier, care of Hermann Reitboeck, Clay Products Co., Panama, Republic of Panama, $190.31; and to Peter L. Feller, 125 West Sixteenth Street, New York, N. Y., $227. The payment of said sums shall be in full settlement of all claims of the above-named claimants against the United States for damage to or loss or destruction of property and personal injury caused by military personnel or civilian employees of the Army, or otherwise incident to noncombat activities of the Army, and determined by the Department of the Army to be meritorious, which are not payable either under the provisions of the act of July 3, 1943 (57 Stat. 372; 31 U. S. C. 223b), entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss of destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities, of the War Department or of the Army," as amended, or under the "Federal Tort Claims Act," as codified by the act of June 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 983; 28 U. S. C. 2672): *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent of any claim shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

KIHEI MATSUO

The bill (S. 664) for the relief of Kihei Matsuo was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to grant to Kihei Matsuo (alien registration No. 553367) an extension of stay in the United States for 1 year from the date of enactment of this Act.

CHARLES L. BISHOP

The bill (S. 748) for the relief of Charles L. Bishop was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed (1) to cancel all claims against Charles L. Bishop

for payment of the sum of $350 representing the aggregate amount of money orders erroneously paid by the said Charles L. Bishop in 1944 while acting as assistant Navy mail clerk at the naval air station, Alameda, Calif., to a person then in the armed forces of the United States who had stolen such money orders and fraudulently endorsed them in his own favor; and (2) to pay to the said Charles L. Bishop, out of any money available for the pay of employees in the postal service, an amount equal to any portion of such sum heretofore paid by him pursuant to such claims.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 198) for the relief of the city and county of San Francisco, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 2, line 12, after the word "be", to strike out "said" and insert "paid", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the city and county of San Francisco, a municipal corporation, of San Francisco, Calif., the sum of $9,728.81, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement of expenses incurred in rebuilding and restoring a power-transmission line and loss of power revenue in township 3 south, range 5 east, and township 3 south, range 6 east, San Joaquin County, Calif., south of Tracy and approximately 3 miles from the Navy Vernalis Airfield, which transmission line was demolished by the crashing of a United States Navy plane type SB 2 C-2, bureau No. 18772, on August 6, 1944, at 9:21 post meridian, while the said plane was engaged in making a flight over the area indicated, and on August 30, 1944, at 1:14 ante meridian, by the crashing of a United States Navy plane, type TBM-1, bureau No. 24994, while the said plane was likewise making a flight over the area indicated: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with such claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 206) relating to the immigration status of the lawful wives and children of Chinese treaty merchants was announced as next in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. LANGER subsequently said: Mr. President, may I inquire who objected to the consideration of Calendar No. 52, Senate bill 206?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is advised that it was the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE, MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

The bill (S. 271) to provide for the appointment of additional district judges for the northern and middle districts of Georgia was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. WATKINS. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. McCARRAN subsequently said: Mr. President, with regard to Calendar No. 53, Senate bill 271, I think there is a misunderstanding. It has been stated that the bill was objected to. I do not think there was any objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Some Senator objected; the Chair is not certain who. There was objection made at the time it was called. The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is here. The Chair thinks perhaps he objected.

Mr. WATKINS. I objected.

Mr. McCARRAN. Would the Senator from Utah care to have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. WATKINS. I would rather discuss it with the Senator. I understand there is other legislation calling for the appointment of additional district judges in other States, and I am wondering why it is being done piecemeal.

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask unanimous consent to make an explanation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Nevada is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCARRAN. The reason for the bill is that in the State of Georgia a peculiar situation exists, in that the judge, who has neither the age nor a period of service sufficient to warrant his retirement, has unfortunately lost the sight of his eyes, and is therefore unable to function. This bill would provide a temporary judgeship for that particular district.

Mr. WATKINS. It does not increase the number permanently, does it?

Mr. McCARRAN. It does not. It is a district with a very heavy load of work, where a judge should be active all the time. The present judge, because of physical disability, is unable to perform judicial duties, and therefore the committee thought best to provide a temporary judge.

Mr. WATKINS. Why does not the incapacitated judge retire?

Mr. McCARRAN. If he retired, he would have to do so without the benefit of retirement which the law provides, because he has neither reached the age of retirement nor had a sufficient period of service.

Mr. WATKINS. I withdraw my objection.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the President is authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one additional district judge for the United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia. When a vacancy shall occur in the office of the existing district judge for said district such vacancy shall not be filled.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the middle district of Georgia."

RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 15) to amend the so-called cloture rule of the Senate was announced as next in order.

Mr. HILL and other Senators. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over.

ACQUISITION AND OPERATION OF THE FREEDOM TRAIN

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 31) to provide for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train by the Archivist of the United States, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 2, in line 1, after the word "train", to strike out "for a period of 2 years" and insert "during the period ending July 5, 1951."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, in section 2, after line 4, to strike out:

(a) To enter into and carry out such agreements with such person or persons, natural or artificial, as may be necessary for the acquisition of the Freedom Train and its equipment, and for its relinquishment after a period of 2 years, and to make such expenditures, without regard to other provisions of law, as may be required to carry out such agreements.

And insert:

(a) To enter into and carry out such agreements with such person or persons, natural or artificial, as may be necessary for the acquisition of the Freedom Train and its equipment, for its operation during the period ending July 5, 1951, and for the disposition of such train and equipment within 60 days after such date; and to make such expenditures, without regard to other provisions of law, as may be required to carry out such agreements.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 7, after the numeral "9871", to insert "as amended."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, beginning in line 15, after the word "be", to strike out "deposited in the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury" and insert "paid into, administered, and expended as a part of the National Archives Trust Fund;"

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 4, to insert "the chairmen of

the Senate and House Committees on Post Office and Civil Service."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 16, section 5, after the word "on", to insert "and consent to."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 17, after the word "plans", to insert "and publicity."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 18, after the word "it", to insert the word "him."

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, because of a clerical error, this amendment, as proposed, departs from the intention and the unanimous view of the committee. I suggest that it not be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment just stated.

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment was, in line 18, after the word "Train", to insert "and with respect to its itinerary."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 23, after the word "resolution", to insert "not to exceed $2,500,000 for the period ending July 5, 1951."

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 31), as amended, is as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, as a means of focusing the attention of the American people on a reexamination of their heritage of freedom, fostering the preservation of their liberties, awakening their loyalty to the American tradition, and contributing to citizenship training, particularly of Americans of school age, the Archivist of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to acquire the Freedom Train, and to operate the said train during the period ending July 5, 1951.

SEC. 2. In carrying out the purposes of this joint resolution the Archivist is hereby authorized—

(a) to enter into and carry out such agreements with such person or persons, natural or artificial, as may be necessary for the acquisition of the Freedom Train and its equipment, for its operation during the period ending July 5, 1951, and for the disposition of such train and equipment within 60 days after such date, and to make such expenditures, without regard to other provisions of law, as may be required to carry out such agreements;

(b) to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as he deems advisable without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; to procure services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed $40 per diem for individuals; to accept services and facilities without compensation; and, with the consent of the head of any Government department or agency, to utilize or employ the services of personnel or facilities of any such department or agency, with or without reimbursement therefor;

(c) to obtain printing and binding without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919, as amended (40 Stat. 1270);

(d) to purchase or contract for supplies or services (including printing and binding) without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended;

(e) to obtain and pay for comprehensive insurance coverage, as he may deem necessary, of other than Government property used in connection with the Freedom Train;

(f) to acquire by gift, bequest, loan, or otherwise, personal property for the benefit of, or in connection with, the operation of the Freedom Train;

(g) to cooperate with the governments of the several States and their political subdivisions in promoting the exhibition of the Freedom Train;

(h) to pay per diem to personnel required to travel in connection with the operation or inspection of the train as follows: To civilian personnel at the maximum rate applicable under existing laws or regulations; to officer personnel of the armed services in accordance with section 12 of the Pay Readjustment Act of June 16, 1942, and regulations pertinent thereto; and to enlisted personnel of the armed services a military allowance in lieu of rations and quarters as provided in Executive Order No. 9871, as amended, and regulations pertinent thereto;

(i) to pay in cash for any services, supplies, or equipment not exceeding $50 in cost;

(j) to purchase, print, mimeograph, multilith, photostat, or produce or reproduce in any known manner, pamphlets, brochures, facsimiles or other material pertaining to the Freedom Train for free distribution or for sale, the proceeds of such sales to be paid into, administered, and expended as a part of the National Archives Trust Fund;

(k) to prescribe such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary for the operation of the Freedom Train.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized and directed to provide a security detachment for the protection of the Feedom Train.

SEC. 4. A commission is hereby created and established to be known as the Freedom Train Commission, to consist of the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the minority leader of the Senate, the minority leader of the House of Representatives, the chairmen of the Senate and House Committees on Post Office and Civil Service, the Attorney General of the United States, the Librarian of Congress, the Archivist of the United States, and five members to be appointed by the President. The members of the said Commission shall serve during the period the Freedom Train is in operation, and for 6 months thereafter. Such members shall serve without compensation, but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission. The Commission shall elect one of its members to serve as Chairman.

SEC. 5. The Commission shall advise on and consent to the plans and publicity formulated by the Archivist and submitted to it for exhibiting the Freedom Train, and with respect to its itinerary.

SEC. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution, not to exceed $2,500,000 for the period ending July 5, 1951.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is on the calendar a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 84), the title of which is identical with that of the Senate joint resolution. Textually, however, the two resolutions are not identical. The Chair understands it is desired to take up for consideration the House joint resolution, and to substitute for its language the text of the Senate joint resolution, as amended.

Mr. O'CONOR. That is the desire. I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. LUCAS. The Vice President stated the House joint resolution would be substituted for the Senate joint resolution, did he not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maryland requests unanimous consent that the House joint resolution be substituted for the Senate joint resolution as amended, and that the House joint resolution be considered. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. Without objection, the House joint resolution is amended by striking out all after the resolving clause and inserting the text of the Senate joint resolution as amended. As so amended, and without objection, the House joint resolution will be passed, and the Senate joint resolution will be indefinitely postponed.

That completes the call of the calendar.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I merely wish to announce to the Senate that at the close of business today the Senate will take a recess until tomorrow, which will be the anniversary of Washington's birth. The Senate will be in session tomorrow.

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION OF JOSEF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY AND CERTAIN LEADERS OF THE PROTESTANT CLERGY

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on Monday, February 7, I offered the following resolution (S. Res. 57):

Resolved, That the Senate condemns as unjust the arrest, confinement incommunicado, and trial of His Eminence Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, Roman Catholic Primate of Hungary.

Joining with me in the introduction of the resolution were the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senators from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL and Mr. LODGE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senators from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER and Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senators from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR and Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN].

Our resolution is now before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Expressions of approval of the action we have called upon the Senate to take have come from many Americans of every race, color, and creed. There is in our country a real awareness of the forces of darkness which are now so active in the world. Perhaps most precious of all the liberties of freemen is that which gives to each of us the right to worship in the place and the way of our own selection. We not only treasure that liberty

for ourselves but we have always recognized our responsibility to try to protect that liberty for others. It is fitting that the National Legislature of the greatest of our Christian nations should take note of attacks elsewhere in the world upon those who would worship their God in their own way.

Apparent in the many communications which have come to me since the Senate resolution was offered on February 7 is a desire on the part of the people of our country to indicate to the world in some way as a free people an instinctive distaste for deeds which designed as attacks upon the very heart of freedom everywhere.

It was the Josef Cardinal Mindszenty trial which perhaps more than any other Communist offense against freedom of religion focused the attention of the world upon the fundamental Communist concept of slavery of both mind and heart to the state. But the trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty and his conviction are not the only Communist offenses against freedom of religion. The incident in Hungary is but a small part of the whole Communist effort to eliminate personal liberty wherever possible. Becently America and the other free nations of the world were shocked by the Communist plot against Protestant clergy and leaders in Bulgaria. These localized incidents when placed together picture anew for all mankind to see the systematic plan of Communist Russia and her puppet associates to destroy any religion which dictates to the conscience of its followers the need for speaking out against those who would destroy all religion.

The people of America and other free nations of the world want and should have an opportunity to make some tangible demonstration against those who seem to hate personal liberty. There should be an opportunity for freemen who believe in freedom of religion to show the world that their faith in the principles of their religion still stands firm. I, therefore, have addressed to the Right Reverend John S. Stamm, president of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman, Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld of the Washington Hebrew Congregation, and Rev. W. O. H. Garman, president of the American Council of Christian Churches, letters conveying the suggestion of a way in which the hearts of freemen which still beat in free nations can take new courage to themselves and convey to free hearts which beat within the darkened areas of the world the courage to carry on.

My letter to the Right Reverend John S. Stamm, president of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, reads as follows:

FEBRUARY 21, 1949.

The Right Reverend JOHN S. STAMM,
President, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR BISHOP STAMM: On February 7 I introduced in the United States Senate a resolution reading as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the Senate condemns as unjust the arrest, confinement incommunicado, and trial of His Eminence Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, Roman Catholic primate of Hungary."

The cosponsors of the resolution are Senators TAFT, SALTONSTALL, LODGE, SMITH of New Jersey, FERGUSON, THYE, BALDWIN, YOUNG, TOBEY, O'CONOR, MCCARRAN, TYDINGS, MCGRATH, CAPEHART, MARTIN, IVES, CAIN, and LANGER.

The response of the people of America to the introduction of the Senate resolution has been heartening. There is among many of our citizens an awareness of the concentrated effort on the part of the Communist forces not only to destroy free institutions generally but to undermine these religions of freemen which instinctively stand in opposition to those forces which would enslave the spirit of freemen. They seem to accept the proceedings against Josef Cardinal Mindszenty in Hungary and against the leaders of the Protestant clergy and faith in Bulgaria as symbols of more widespread religious persecutions to come.

The many people who have corresponded with us seem to be seeking for some tangible way by which the American people and the peoples of other free nations can demonstrate their continuing belief in freedom of religion and their opposition to those who would take that freedom from them as they have taken it from so many millions around whom the iron curtain has fallen. I therefore, am taking the liberty to suggest to you that one way by which the spirit of so many millions could be felt around the world in this difficult time is by the tolling of church bells in America and other lands where the people are still free to gather to worship God in the way of their own choosing. This has been discussed with others, and it is thought that if a date and time for the tolling of the bells could be set by a church group such as you lead, in conjunction with organizations sponsored by other religious faiths, there could be across our own land and in the other still-free nations of the world a demonstration of faith which would give courage not only to those who fear what may come to them but to those who suffer from a darkness that has already come.

I am addressing this letter to you as the head of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America for your personal consideration and for the consideration of your organization. I should appreciate it very much if you would direct the thought of your group to the suggestion and advise me of the reaction.

A similar letter is being sent to His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman, Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld, of the Washington Hebrew Congregation, and Rev. W. O. H. Garman, president of the American Council of Christian Churches.

With every good wish.

Sincerely yours,

STYLES BRIDGES.

NOMINATION OF MON C. WALLGREN

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, on Thursday, February 7, I appeared before the Senate Armed Services Committee as a witness in opposition to the proposed appointment of Mr. Mon C. Wallgren, of Washington State, to become chairman of the National Security Resources Board. During this hearing I spoke from a prepared statement which sought to support and justify my opposition, and the statement was designed to include an adequate description of the mission, the activities, and the responsibilities of the National Security Resources Board, and the National Security Council, on which the Chairman of the NSRB automatically sits as a member. Because both the Board and the Council were but recently created by law in 1947, distressingly little is known of either by Members of the Congress and by the general public. I would urge every American to become familiar with the mission and with the function of the NSC and the NSRB, because they are charged so to prepare our Nation that war will become unlikely and to wage total and successful war if it comes. For the reason that my statement as given before the Armed Services Committee describes the Board and Council in detail, and because it defines my conviction that only the most highly trained and able citizens should seek or be appointed as members, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be included in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF SENATOR HARRY P. CAIN, OF WASHINGTON, BEFORE THE SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE REGARDING THE NOMINATION OF MR. MON C. WALLGREN AS CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY RESOURCES BOARD

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I am grateful for the opportunity you have afforded me to be heard on a prevailing public question.

Every State takes pride from those among its citizenry who have been appointed to executive positions by any President. The State of Washington, which I represent, is no different in this respect from any other State. Any qualified citizen of ours who is appointed by a President to a national public office provides the State of his origin with a sense of satisfaction and achievement.

It is, therefore, with the greatest possible reluctance that I appear before your committee today in complete opposition to the President's proposed appointment of Mr. Mon C. Wallgren to the post of Chairman of the National Security Resources Board.

I would obviously wish myself to be in the position of being able to support and recommend the President's nomination. This I am utterly incapable of doing for reasons which to me are constructive, impelling, and sound.

I recognize, Mr. Chairman, that the President is deserving of wide latitude in nominating individuals to carry out his executive desires and responsibilities.

One ought only to oppose a Presidential nomination for reasons which support and protect the public welfare. I think I have such reasons.

The nominee, Mr. Wallgren, possesses surface qualifications which in themselves are deserving of serious consideration by your committee. He is not an unknown private citizen. He possesses the most unusual political record ever written by a citizen of the State of Washington. He entered politics in the early 1930's and since that time has held public office as a Member of the United States Senate, as a Member of the United States House of Representatives, and as the Governor of the State of Washington. No other Washington State citizen has ever filled these three distinguished public offices. I am quite naturally reluctant about raising the question of competence and capacity concerning an individual whose political attainments are so unusual and conspicuous.

But the fact remains, Mr. Chairman, that the nominee's attainments are wholly political and in part because of them the nominee has no justifiable claim to a position of great national importance which demands attainments and training not often to be derived from a background limited to political success.

I want it clearly understood, Mr. Chairman, that my case in opposition to the President's nomination has nothing whatsoever to do with my personal relationship with the nominee. We have never been close friends though we have known each other in a personal but casual way for a good many years. I have known the nominee, while in my presence, to be invariably gracious, agreeable, and congenial.

He is persona non grata to me only because of my conviction that he is unsuited for the portfolio for which he has been nominated. This is to say that I would have raised no question concerning his nomination for a post on scores of other bureaus, commissions, and agencies for which the President might have nominated him. That he is qualified to fill many an assignment quite obviously goes without saying.

My conviction about the proposed appointment is deep-seated. Were I to fail to oppose what is to me the most capricious and potentially dangerous and injurious nomination of the twentieth century I should consider myself to be a complete moral coward and fit only to resign my seat in the United States Senate.

It is clearly apparent to me that very few citizens, including Members of the Senate with whom I have recently talked, possess any awareness of what the National Security Resources Board is or what that Board is empowered by law to undertake and accomplish.

I want to define the duties and responsibilities of the National Security Resources Board. Without this understanding it would admittedly be difficult for this committee, and for others, to appreciate my opposition to the President's nominee for the chairmanship of the Board.

Newspaper writers and the general public have heard so little of the National Security Resources Board that many of them have called it by other than its correct name. In addition, the National Security Resources Board has been confused with other agencies of the Government.

It appears to me that the chairmanship of the National Security Resources Board is one of the biggest jobs, probably one of the two or three most powerful, in the Nation.

The Chairman of this Board automatically becomes a member of the National Security Council, which in turn directs the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency of our Federal Government.

The National Security Resources Board was established by the National Security Act of 1947 (Public Law 253, 80th Cong., 1st sess.), approved July 26, 1947. The Board is composed of the Chairman, who is appointed from civilian life by the President by and with the consent of the Senate and such heads or representatives of the various executive departments and independent agencies as may from time to time be designated by the President as members.

FUNCTION

The function of the Board is to advise the President concerning the coordination of military, industrial, and civilian mobilization including:

1. Policies concerning industrial and civilian mobilization in order to assure the most effective mobilization and maximum utilization of the Nation's manpower in the event of war.

2. Programs for the effective use in time of war of the Nation's natural and industrial resources for military and civilian needs, for the maintenance and stabilization of the civilian economy in time of war, and for the adjustment of such economy to war needs and conditions.

3. Policies for unifying, in time of war, the activities of Federal agencies and departments engaged in or concerned with production, procurement, distribution, or transportation of military or civilian supplies, materials, and products.

4. The relationship between potential supplies of, and potential requirements for, manpower, resources, and productive facilities in time of war.

5. Policies for establishing adequate reserves of strategic and critical material, and for the conservation of these reserves.

6. The strategic relocation of industries, services, Government, and economic activities, the continuous operation of which is essential to the Nation's security.

In the performance of its functions, the Board is authorized by the National Security Act of 1947 and Executive Order 9905, of November 13, 1947, to utilize the facilities and resources of the various departments and agencies of the Government.

ACTIVITIES

The Board's advice to the President is submitted in the form of recommendations or reports dealing with policies, programs, and plans for the coordination of the Nation's industrial, military, and civilian resources for war. The work of the Board is concerned with both current and long-range problems from the standpoint of the national security. The activities of the Board are carried out by mobilization planning staffs, each organized to develop and coordinate matters affecting the mobilization of all resources for which the Board is responsible under the National Security Act of 1947. The staff of the Board makes extensive use of the facilities and resources of other Federal departments and agencies, and of private organizations and advisory committees outside the Government, in connection with its work.

I have referred to the six functions of the National Security Resources Board.

I have carefully examined the past record of the man who has been nominated as Chairman of this Board.

All remarks and speeches of the nominee during his term in the House of Representatives, from 1933 to 1941, and in the Senate, 1941 to January 1945, have been examined for content, subject, and statements which might relate to the congressional intent as to the functions of the National Security Resources Board.

These speeches in the House related mainly to flood control and conservation. Examination shows them to be fairly well prepared, of average length, backed up with statistics.

After coming to the Senate, Mr. Wallgren made very few speeches, confined largely to brief questions on pending legislation. On his record in the Senate it would seem that he was unusually reluctant to express himself.

It is significant, I think, that he was in the Senate 4 years and during that period had so little to say after such long service in the House. He did make one speech in the Senate presenting a report of the National Defense Investigating Committee. This was on December 15, 1942.

Returning to the act setting up the National Security Resources Board and the six prescribed functions of that Board, and bearing in mind the interests shown by Mr. Wallgren in flood control and conservation, it seems that he might be qualified only partly under function No. 2 and function No. 5. These functions relate, in brief, to use of the Nation's natural and industrial resources, and for establishing adequate reserves of strategic and critical materials and for the conservation of these reserves.

But, there is nothing in the record of the nominee's congressional service indicating that he was interested, or had knowledge of functions listed as Nos. 1, 3, 4, or 6. Not a mention can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which relates Mr. Wallgren to these functions, which concern maximum utilization of the Nation's manpower in the event of war, policies for unifying, in time of war, the activities of Federal agencies and departments engaged in production, procurement, distribution, and transportation of military or civilian supplies, materials, and products; the strategic relocation of industries, services, and other economic activities.

Now let us examine the National Security Council of which Mr. Wallgren would be a member.

The National Security Council was established by the National Security Act of 1947 (Public Law 253, 80th Cong., 1st sess.), approved July 26, 1947. Its function is to advise the President with respect to the integration of domestic, foreign, and military policies relating to the national security so as to enable the military services and the other departments and agencies of the Government to cooperate more effectively in matters involving the national security.

ORGANIZATION

The Council is composed of the President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, and such of the following officers as the President may designate from time to time: The Secretaries of the executive departments, the Chairman of the Munitions Board, and the Chairman of the Research and Development Board.

The Council staff is headed by a civilian executive secretary, appointed by the President.

Under the direction of the Council is a Central Intelligence Agency, headed by a Director of Central Intelligence. I will have more to say about this Agency in a moment.

ACTIVITIES

The duties of the Council are to assess and appraise the objectives, commitments, and risks of the United States in relation to our actual and potential military power in the interest of national security, for the purpose of making recommendations to the President, and to consider policies on matters of common interest to the departments and agencies of the Government concerned with the national security, and to make recommendations to the President.

I note with interest, Mr. Chairman, that the Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Acheson, has strong views on the subject of the importance and role to be played by the National Security Council. I quote from the United States News of February 11, 1949:

"As Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson is insisting that the National Security Council be kept as the focal point for blending United States military, economic, and political questions of policy. The Security Council, now criticized by some as being heavily weighted on the military side, probably is to be changed to include the President, the Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, and Chairman of the National Resources Board as its only members."

The Central Intelligence Agency was established under the National Security Council by the National Security Act of 1947 (Public Law 253, 80th Cong., 1st sess.), approved July 26, 1947. The Director is appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. When the Director took office, the National Intelligence Authority ceased to exist.

PURPOSE

For the purpose of coordinating the intelligence activities of the several Government departments and agencies in the interest of national security, the Agency, under the direction of the National Security Council:

1. Advises the National Security Council in matters concerning such intelligence activities of the Government departments and agencies as relate to national security.

2. Makes recommendations to the National Security Council for the coordination of such

intelligence activities of the departments and agencies of the Government as relate to the national security.

3. Correlates and evaluates intelligence relating to the national security and provides for the appropriate dissemination of such intelligence within the Government, using, where appropriate, existing agencies and facilities.

4. Performs, for the benefit of the existing intelligence agencies, such additional services of common concern as the National Security Council determines can be more efficiently accomplished centrally.

5. Performs such other functions and duties related to intelligence affecting the national security as the National Security Council may from time to time direct.

Mr. Chairman, if there are two other jobs in this Nation in the hands of one man which are more important or influential or powerful in terms of the Nation's welfare and security than the chairmanship of the National Security Resources Board and membership on the National Security Council, I don't know what or where they are. No greater tasks have ever been designed and approved by legislation.

These great assignments were obviously created because the Congress and the President were acutely conscious of the pressing need which surrounds us for preparing our Nation to meet and conquer any crisis or eventuality which may arise.

It shouldn't be necessary for me to state that both jobs call for an individual possessed of great character, courage, capacity, and knowledge. They ought to be jobs for which the President would search the land for a man big enough to undertake the monumental responsibilities involved.

Almost above all else the man to be selected must be held in high regard by the average American. He must be totally above suspicion in both his public and private life. His integrity and ability must be above question. He must be respected by everyone, including those who may differ with some of his opinions and policies. He must be a big man in every way. If he is small, or mean or badly trained or held in low regard by many, his appointment would bring everlasting embarrassment to the President, satisfaction to our enemies everywhere, and disappointment and fear of evil consequences to Americans throughout the land.

I shall say of Mr. Wallgren, the man and public officeholder, only what I must say in order to prove conclusively, at least to my own satisfaction, that he conspicuously lacks the requirements demanded by the assignment he seeks.

Mr. Wallgren was born in Iowa 57 years ago. He attended public schools in Everett, Wash., but left high school in his sophomore year. He is reported to have attended an optometry school and a local business school.

He is known in Everett to have operated a pool hall. He was employed by a jewelry and optical business which was run by his father.

This business was heavily mortgaged in 1932.

In that year the Everett Credit Bureau records show that five Everett stores listed bills against Mon C. Wallgren. Three of the accounts were delinquent and two were listed as slow pay.

There is nothing in this record of a man which indicated that prior to 1932 he was training or preparing himself for any segment of the work we have under consideration.

Since 1932 Mr. Wallgren has prospered in and through politics. He owns, I am told, 12,250 shares of common stock in the Queen City Broadcasting Co. of Seattle. If I am not mistaken, the company was offered $17 a share by Marshall Field. Wallgren is said to be a man of means, with property holdings in and out of Washington State. I think the nature of his holdings ought to be determined during this committee's consideration of the nomination.

Mr. Wallgren was defeated in his effort to be reelected as Governor of Washington State in the last election. This is mentioned as evidence that for reasons, good or bad, Mr. Wallgren is badly thought of by thousands of citizens in the State where he lives. It would appear that those citizens pursued a calculated, premeditated, studied course in their successful attempt to retire Mr. Wallgren to private life. Mr. Truman was elected President in Washington State by a majority of 90,000 votes. Mr. Wallgren, whom everybody knew to be a close friend and confidant of the President, was defeated by some 29,000 votes.

This becomes the more strange in that every other elective State office was filled by an elected Democrat, and they were opposed by the finest group of Republicans to have been offered in years.

Whether for just cause or not the citizens of Washington State repudiated Mr. Wallgren, the man whose name is before you for an infinitely more powerful portfolio than that of governor of his or any other State. Charges of mismanagement, inefficiency, and a lack of capacity were registered against Mr. Wallgren by almost 450,000 men and women of Washington State. I share their concern and their distress that one whom they have turned out in a free election is now being nominated for an assignment which will so surely affect their fuure.

Washington State is nearer Russia than is any other State in the Union. Should conflict ever come, it will come first to the State of Washington, and if Mr. Wallgren should be confirmed he would exercise influence in that State which its citizens have so plainly stated he is not entitled to. I am necessarily amazed that the President didn't recognize this obvious fact when he was searching for a job for a close friend.

I know, Mr. Chairman, that I can be charged with political bias, though I wouldn't dare to oppose a Presidential nomination for any such reason. I am interested in what others think of the nomination, and I think you are too.

Mr. Marquis Childs wrote in the Washington Post, February 15, 1949:

"Nothing in Wallgren's past would appear to equip him for this supremely important task. He has been an amiable politician, a good companion on a fishing trip or a party."

The Portland Oregonian had this to say about Mr. Wallgren in an editorial on November 21, 1943, which was entitled "Not Wallgren, Please." The editorial says:

"Were it not for the warm personal friendship between President Truman and Governor Mon C. Wallgren of Washington, dating back to their Senate days, there would be little prospect of the appointment of Mr. Wallgren as Secretary of the Interior.

"Governor Wallgren has no particular qualifications for a position so important to the West. He has been repudiated as governor by Democrats of his own State, who elected Republican Arthur B. Langlie while the rest of the Nation was swinging Democratic. The Alaska Democratic Central Committee has expressed vigorous opposition to Wallgren as Secretary of the Interior.

"Governor Wallgren, a political lightweight, does not have the confidence of the West. President Truman is reported to feel that he should kick out Secretary Julius A. Krug because the latter did not come out swinging for Mr. Truman's election. Should the President appoint Governor Wallgren, it will be warning of another plaque of inept appointments of political cronies such as that in Mr. Truman's early days in the White House."

In my own State, we have another sample of editorial opinion, and I quote from the Centralia (Wash.) Daily Chronicle. It says:

"If he (Wallgren) is the best material President Truman could find to head such an important board * * * if Wallgren is a sample, and we have no reason to believe otherwise, heaven help the United States during the coming 4 years."

Here is another comment from the Olympia (Wash.) Daily Olympian, which reprinted an editorial from the Seattle Argus on Wallgren's nomination. It says, in part:

"We feel nervous about seeing the President do this nice thing for his friend * * *."

The following is an editorial from the Bellingham (Wash.) Herald of February 15, 1949:

"WALLGREN JOB ENTAILS VAST POWER

"Senator HARRY CAIN's opposition to the confirmation by the Senate of President Truman's nomination of Mon C. Wallgren as chairman of the National Security Resources Board has pinpointed the Nation's attention on this important Government agency.

"Senator CAIN denied in a statement to a correspondent of the Seattle (Wash.) Post-Intelligencer that he regarded the former governor of the State as personally obnoxious—as he had been quoted by another source as saying. He said that in a personal sense—and he did not know him well in that sense—Wallgren 'has always seemed amiable, courteous, and agreeable.' But:

"'My opposition to him isn't personal. I just don't think he has ability and capacity to serve in this tremendously vital job in a way that the welfare of the Nation, as I see it, demands.

"'As I read the job specifications, the Chairman of the Securities Resources Board is one of the two or three most powerful men in the world.

"'I just don't think Mr. Wallgren is qualified to run the next war—if there is a next war—or to guide the expenditure of billions involved in building our security.'

"Light on the functions of the Board is shed by an article written for the Wall Street Journal by Ellis Haller. Mr. Haller writes from the National Capital:

"'A group of Washington newspapermen were talking the other day about the relative importance of Federal agencies in Mr. Truman's new term. Someone asked: "What will be the most important single Government unit in months ahead?" The almost unanimous answer was "the National Security Resources Board." * * *

"'As the year goes on the NSRB will play an increasingly important role in President Truman's "fair deal" program. Ostensibly, its job is to advise Mr. Truman on how to coordinate military, industrial, and civilian mobilization so the United States will not be caught short in case of emergency. But in these uneasy times its activities have taken on greater significance.

"'The plans NSRB is drafting for the Nation's defense will mesh with other economic projects the administration has mapped for the next 4 years. The legislation it is about to propose will stir sharp debate in Congress. The policies it will enunciate can affect the future of many businesses and the course of the national economy.

"'In plain terms, this little-publicized Board will become overnight the most powerful agency in our Government if we get into war, or if we approach a state of national crisis. In any case, it is a body that business and industrialists take seriously as nonwar military spending soars and as foreign-policy planners map United States strategy against the spread of communism.

"'NSRB has functioned quietly for nearly a year and a half, seldom making spectacular news. It was created when Congress passed the National Security Act of 1947. This act set up the Board as a permanent civilian agency of the United States Government, responsible only to the President. The Board

may, at any time in war or peace, call into play the facilities and resources of any department, agency or bureau of the Federal Government.

"'If Congress declares war, or if the country is plunged into an emergency at a time when Congress can't act, NSRB would shift at once from a planning to an operating set-up. It would establish temporary agencies to control prices, wages, the flow of raw materials, manpower, transportation, and the conversion of production facilities. * * *

"'Military men generally favor the NSRB set-up, even though it doesn't give them the upper hand in running the country in case of war. They claim they are willing to accept civilian direction in return for the speed-up that will be possible in industrial mobilization. * * *

"'The Budget Bureau has asked an appropriation of $4,000,000 for NSRB for the forthcoming fiscal year. That's an increase of $1,000,000 over the amount NSRB was appropriated for fiscal 1949. Most of the budgeted increase would be spent for hiring more staff members who, in the words of the Budget Bureau, would make "further progress in developing resources and requirements data as a basis of planning mobilization of the Nation's resources in the event of war.'"

"Clearly, the general public has slight conception of the importance and power of this little-publicized Federal agency.

"Senator CAIN deserves credit for bringing the issue into the limelight in connection with President Truman's selection of his Senate crony, former Governor Wallgren, for the vast responsibility the job entails. If the Board Chairman, as Senator CAIN says, is 'one of the two or three most powerful men in the world', the question of Mr. Wallgren's qualifications is of moment to the entire Nation."

As indication of how little known the National Security Resources Board is, is shown by the following comment from the Bellingham (Wash.) Daily Herald, which stated:

"All the prognosticators and know-it-all insiders who boast a near-perfect batting average missed the bus on former Governor Wallgren's job. Of the six spots listed in advance for him one was the right one—the Federal Security Resources Board. Of course, most people did not know there was such a Board, even though its Chairman is in the $14,000 bracket, compared with the $6,000 Washington governorship. It is likely that other forgotten Boards could have been pulled out of the hat if this one had not been located."

The Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review stated editorially, February 9, 1949:

"As it now stands, the situation (Wallgren's nomination) suits us completely. If Mr. Wallgren can keep occupied in an orbit that does not include the Pacific Northwest, there will be little repining here."

Doris Fleeson wrote in her syndicated column, February 10, the following:

"Wallgren is a 'lame duck' Democrat from Washington State, whose good fortune it was to be placed next to Senator Truman when both were freshmen in the upper Chamber years ago. Politicos rate him (Wallgren) an amiable lightweight; the President apparently feels that the loyalty Wallgren will give the White House outweighs other considerations at the time in that place."

Tris Coffin, another widely read columnist, wrote in his column, which appeared in the Times-Herald February 1, 1949:

"Whither Wallgren? The mystery man of Washington is Mon Wallgren, the amiable, poker-playing ex-governor of Washington and former Senate crony of Mr. Truman. The big question blurted out in the Senate cloakroom and between gulps at cocktail parties is, What job will Mon get?

"He has been hanging around the fancy Interior Department Building so much that all the elevator operators know him by sight. But they don't know whether to call him 'Mr. Secretary' or 'Governor.'

"Two other posts have been mentioned for Mon—the White House liaison with Congress, or chief American representative in the Philippine Islands."

Here is another comment, this from page 17, of the February 14, 1949, issue of Newsweek:

"Mon C. Wallgren has many nonpolitical distinctions. Liberal in his use of eau de cologne and shaving lotion, he is known as the best-smelling governor the State of Washington ever had. He is blond, husky, and ruddy. His clothes are always beautifully tailored. He is an all-around indoor and outdoor sportsman, but billiards and golf are his metier. As a golfer, he shoots in the 70's. In 1929 he won the national amateur balk-line billiard championship.

"Politically, his New-Dealish record is good. Elected to the House of Representatives in 1932, he served in the 73d, 74th, and 75th Congresses. In 1940 he went into the Senate, resigning in 1945 to take over the governorship of Washington. Most important of all, he was a good friend of Harry S. Truman. During Mr. Truman's senatorial days Mrs. Wallgren and Mrs. Truman often went shopping together, and there was much visiting between the two families. When the President stumped the Northwest, Wallgren, running again for governor, was at his side.

"Surprise: Wallgren's defeat in November and the President's reputation for taking care of his friends set the press to speculating: What job would the ex-governor get? Armed solely with the knowledge that he had agreed to come to Washington at Mr. Truman's request, forecasters put Wallgren in almost every Government job, from Secretary of the Interior down.

"Last December 15 the resignation of Arthur Hill as $14,000-a-year Chairman of the National Security Resources Board created the ideal opening for a man who had served on the Truman committee investigating war plants and sources of raw materials. The President asked Wallgren if he'd like the job. 'Any job you want to put me in,' the ex-governor answered, 'and I think this one would be fine.'

"While Wallgren moved his household from Olympia, Wash., to Washington, D. C., Mr. Truman named John R. Steelman as Hill's successor ad interim, to work the Board into the alinement with the White House which Hill had discouraged. Last week, with Steelman's job completed and Wallgren comfortably installed at the Wardman Park Hotel, the President announced the appointment to a press corps which, to the last minute, had still been speculating but had never guessed the job Wallgren finally got."

Time Magazine, on page 21 of its February 14, 1949, issue, states that a job had finally been found for Mr. Wallgren. The item stated:

"Last week the President also finally found a job for his old friend and Washington State's ex-governor, Mon Wallgren, Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, at $14,000 a year."

Little more needs be said by me at the moment about the nomination of Mr. Wallgren. If there are those who think him a man of capacity and suited by temperament and training for the job in question let them come forward. They have thus far been conspicuous by their absence.

I know scores of persons who think well of him as a companion at the pool table, in the banquet room, and when the fish run high.

These attributes make life more livable, but they don't save lives, or determine worldwide political and economic policies, and they don't prepare a nation to repell an invader, or take victorious war to the enemy.

If Mr. Wallgren can't be an aggressive and intelligent leader in these fields of survival for our America of the future, I really beg of God and this committee that the nomination be returned for the greatest possible cause to the President. On reflection he can do ever so much better and his public, the average citizen, will be forever grateful.

Mr. CAIN. I have said, Mr. President, that few persons, in or out of public life, know anything about the National Security Resources Board for which Mr. Wallgren has been nominated as Chairman by the President. I hold in my hand a piece of evidence to dramatize this lamentable fact. Shortly after I announced my opposition to the proposed appointment of Mr. Wallgren, the House of Representatives of the Legislature of Washington State approved by voice vote a resolution which favored an appointment for Mr. Wallgren. But the resolution was actually in support of a national portfolio for Mr. Wallgren which simply does not exist. The resolution recommends that Mr. Wallgren be appointed as Chairman of the National Securities Resources Board. I do not know of any such Board, but if there is one or if one is to be established, that Board will have or surely has a primary concern with stocks, bonds, and debentures of one kind or another. Whether Mr. Wallgren would be competent to be the Chairman of such a Board I am not presently prepared to say, because I have no knowledge of what the duties of the Board might be. The Armed Services Committee and then the Senate will consider whether Mr. Wallgren is suited to become the Chairman of an agency whose chief and only concern is preparing our Nation for defense, security, and war needs, requirements and eventualities, of the present and future. The House of Representatives of Washington State has been quite within its rights in complimenting a man, but its resolution clearly indicates that the house of representatives has endorsed a man without reference to or a consideration of the man's qualifications as they are related to the assignment for which he has actually been nominated by the President. I have no criticism to make of the action taken by the house of representatives of my own State, but I do want its members to know the nature and character of the actual position for which Mr. Wallgren has been nominated. This information will permit them to endorse Mr. Wallgren for that actual position if they so desire. Because they were complimentary to Mr. Wallgren and because Mr. Wallgren's capabilities have been questioned by the junior Senator from Washington, I ask unanimous consent to have the Washington State House of Representatives' resolution printed at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, and to the Senate of the United States of America in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in

legislative session assembled, respectfully represent and petition as follows:

Whereas the Honorable Monrad C. Wallgren is a former Governor of the State of Washington; and

Whereas the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, has recently appointed the Honorable Monrad C. Wallgren as Chairman of the National Securities Resources Board; and

Whereas such appointment must be confirmed by the Senate of the United States; and

Whereas the Honorable Monrad C. Wallgren's background as Senator, Congressman, and Governor qualifies him for this most important position: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled, That we respectfully commend the President of the United States in appointing the Honorable Monrad C. Wallgren to the Chairmanship of the National Securities Resources Board and we respectfully urge upon the Senate of the United States that his appointment be confirmed speedily; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the Honorable Harry S Truman, President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, and to each Senator from the State of Washington.

Mr. CAIN. I grant, Mr. President, that every Senator is extremely busy but I hope that each one among us can find that time which is required by the individual Senator to determine if Mr. Wallgren is a wise choice for the Chairmanship of the National Security Resources Board. In a very real way the management of war, if it should come, and the preparing of this Nation to forestall war, the preferred course, will reside in the hands and brain of the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. My only interest is to see that the Chairman, whoever he may be, possesses strong hands, a keen and trained intellect, and a vast knowledge. Anything less than these assets will unnecessarily hold in jeopardy our national hope for peace and contentment for all peoples.

REMOVAL OF TAXES ON OLEOMARGARINE—LETTER FROM W. D. KNOX

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received this morning a very splendid, terse, and a clear communication from a distinguished editor of a great dairy magazine, Mr. W. D. Knox, of Hoard's Dairyman.

Mr. Knox has summarized very succinctly the case for removal of the present excise taxes on oleomargarine, provided—and it is a big proviso—the yellow color of oleomargarine is banned in order to prevent fraudulent competition with butter.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Knox's letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

HOARD'S DAIRYMAN,
Fort Atkinson, Wis., February 18, 1949.
Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: In the future you will be passing judgment on one or more of several bills affecting the dairy and oleomargarine industries. As the only national dairy farm magazine, we feel a deep responsibility to our readers as you feel your responsibility to your constituents. For 63 years we have attempted only to seek out the truth, promote it and defend it, regardless of its popularity.

We have but one request of oleomargarine manufacturers. We ask them to sell their product in its own clothes and on its own merits. They have never agreed to adopt such a policy. In H. R. 1703, we believe you have a most realistic and fair solution to the controversy. All license fees, taxes and other restrictions are removed. The manufacture and sale of yellow oleo is prohibited.

If the manufacture and sale of yellow oleo is not prohibited, we have concrete evidence of the injustice that will be perpetuated upon American consumers and 2,500,000 dairy farmers. In an El Paso, Tex., grocery, butter and yellow oleo are selling at the same price. White oleo is selling 30 cents cheaper. The tax on yellow oleo is only 10 cents. Where did the other 20 cents go? And where in the future will the housewife find a cheap spread for bread? It appears to us that the 28 oleomargarine manufacturers have every reason to justify their $6,000,000 advertising and public relations expenditure for 1948. Their investment may be returned many times.

In a recent spot check by the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture, 78 establishments out of 300 were selling yellow oleo as butter. In another impartial survey 53 restaurants out of 159 in 8 States served yellow oleo as butter when a customer requested butter. Here is clear evidence that the present law is inadequate and that more realistic legislation is needed.

We shall sincerely appreciate your consideration and evaluation of our editorial position. If we can be of any further assistance in providing additional information, please advise us. With kindest regards.

Respectfully yours,
W. D. KNOX,
Editorial Department.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, there is nothing on the Executive Calendar, and I therefore move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 1 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.), the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 22, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 21, 1949:

UNITED NATIONS

Erwin D. Canham, of Massachusetts, to be an alternate representative of the United States of America to the second part of the third session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The following-named persons to be representatives of the United States of America to the third session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, held in Paris, France, to which offices they were appointed during the recess of the Senate:

Warren R. Austin, of Vermont.
John Foster Dulles, of New York.
Anna Eleanor Roosevelt, of New York.
Philip C. Jessup, of New York.

The following-named persons to be alternate representatives of the United States of America to the third session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, held in Paris, France, to which offices they were appointed during the recess of the Senate:

Benjamin V. Cohen, of New York.
Ray Atherton, of Illinois.
Willard L. Thorp, of Connecticut.
Ernest A. Gross, of New York.
Francis B. Sayre, of the District of Columbia.

Benjamin V. Cohen, of New York, to be a representative of the United States of America to the third session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, held in Paris, France, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate, to fill a vacancy created by the absence of Warren R. Austin due to illness.

Dean Rusk, of Virginia, to be an alternate representative of the United States of America to the third session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, held in Paris, France, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate, vice Benjamin V. Cohen.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Hon. J. Frank McLaughlin, of Hawaii, to be United States district judge for the district of Hawaii. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires February 22, 1949.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Virgil B. Stanley, of Oklahoma, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Oklahoma, vice John P. Logan, retired.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment in the Medical, Dental, and Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.) and title II of the act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.):

To be majors

Jeremiah A. Dailey, MC, O324751.
Gordon F. Fisher, MC, O376967.
Charles W. Hoffman, Jr., MC, O356878.

To be captains

Robert O. Emmett, MC, O1775028.
Woodard M. Herring, Jr., DC, O1735285.
Delbert W. Hess, MC, O1703586.
John T. Massey, DC, O473374.
Warren C. Myers, DC, O519451.
Max W. Pegram, MC.
Wayne W. Thornberry, DC, O397916.
John W. White, MC, O1725136.

To be first lieutenants

Archibald M. Abern, MC.
John C. Baber, Jr., MC.
Dexter T. Ball, MC.
Earl M. Bradley, JAGC, O378863.
Hugo M. Cardullo, MC.
Dean R. Dort, JAGC, O954930.
John A. Duggan, MC.
William A. Graber, MC.
William Hausman, MC.
Robert W. Hobson, DC.
Rudolph M. Jarvi, MC.
Richard G. Johnson, MC, O1746311.
Arthur E. H. Knox, MC.
William W. Kramer, JAGC, O805301.
Franklin M. Lockwood, MC.
Donald L. Manes, Jr., JAGC, O433146.
David N. Marine, MC.
Elwin W. Midgley, MC, O1717947.
Arthur J. Moseley, MC.
Joseph G. Murphy, MC, O1705409.
Merrill F. Nelson, MC.
Robert E. L. Nesbitt, Jr., MC.
Lester I. Nienhuis, MC.
George W. Pogson, MC.
Irvin L. Schweitzer, MC.
George W. Shannon, MC, O442647.
Leon Stutzman, MC.
Gilbert A. Varnell, MC.
Leonard J. Wiedershine, MC, O1767504.
Forrest J. Woodman, Jr., MC, O1757064.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Luis A. Becerra.
Charles D. Brohawn.
Charles R. Covell.
John P. McConnell.
Martin P. Moser, O959081.

The following-named person for appointment in the Army Nurse Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress:

Partricia I. Ward, N792135.

PROMOTIONS IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of sections 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (*) are subject to examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion.

To be first lieutenants

Anselin, Frank Belmont, AO56689.
*Bjorgen, Leonard Leroy, AO50530.
Bryant, William Anthony, AO41356.
Davidson, Bernard Clark, AO50532.
Davis, William James, AO56692.
Ferguson, Charles Laird, AO56690.
Gagnon, John Arthur, Jr., AO50527.
Holtorf, Arthur Miles, AO56694.
Kimbel, Joseph Bruce Keirce, AO50529.
Lamb, Charles Melford, Jr., AO38362.
*Marcarelli, John Alphonse, AO56688.
Meyers, Roy Lee, AO50526.
Nave, William Patrick, AO56691.
Neff, Benjamin Groff, AO56697.
Simmons, James Albert, AO56699.
Smith, Charles Ames, AO38528.
Smithson, Daryl Purdy, AO50528.
Stockton, Lyle Edward, AO50531.
Weigelt, Winfred Hamilton, AO56693.
Wortman, John Junior, AO56696.

NOTE.—The officers nominated for promotion to first lieutenant will complete the required 3 years' service for promotion during the month of March. Dates of rank for those officers will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father Almighty, let Thy holy silence sink deep into our hearts, that the truth we know may be the candle of the Lord. Hush all our complainings and discontent; let us rejoice and be glad that we have a part in the world's great work.

Renew the religion of Thy church everywhere; quicken its devotion and passion for the souls of men. O restrain the wayward, relieve the poor and oppressed, and be the toiler's friend. Let all who love the Lord stand for those virtues which build up the human spirit in truth, honor, fidelity, love, and obedience to God. In the name of our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 17, 1949, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McDaniel, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 84. Joint resolution to provide for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train by the Archivist of the United States, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 548. An act to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports, and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VINSON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement by Charles R. Hook, chairman of the Advisory Commission on Service Pay.

Mr. BURTON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

WEDNESDAY EVENING, FEBRUARY 23, ADDRESS BY PAUL HOFFMAN

Mr. NOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. NOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make an announcement to new Members of Congress of a special forum to be held Wednesday evening at 7:30 p. m., in the caucus room of the Old House Office Building.

Paul Hoffman, ECA Administrator, will discuss operational phases of the Marshall plan as it affects operations of businessmen of the United States.

This meeting is primarily for new Members of Congress and their secretaries, but is also open to any Member of Congress.

This program is conducted with the aid of American University, which is sponsoring a series of seminars for Washington businessmen on how to do business under the Marshall plan.

I believe that this meeting will be of special interest to most new Members because it will answer questions which constituents may be asking in the future about the operations of the ECA.

For these reasons it is believed that this meeting Wednesday night, with Paul Hoffman as speaker, will be of special interest.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NOLAND. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Will he be able to tell the American people or the Members present that evening how we are going to get the money to finance this ERA?

Mr. NOLAND. I also wish to qualify this announcement by stating that it will not be a discussion of policy; it will only be a discussion of the operational phases of the plan, how it has worked and how it is contemplated it will work.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CROOK addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CANNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration given before the convention of National Rural Electric Cooperative Associations on February 1, 1949, and also to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter addressed to himself by Mr. WHITAKER, of Kentucky, accompanied by a letter from the Governor of the State.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and to include certain statements and excerpts.

Mr. HÉBERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include extraneous matter and a newspaper article.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include certain appropriate material.

Mr. SHEPPARD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from a Los Angeles newspaper outlining the water problems of southern California.

EMILIE C. READ

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 90) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Emilie C. Read, widow of Burke F. Read, late an employee of the House of Representatives, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death and an additional amount not to exceed $250 toward defraying the funeral expenses of said Burke F. Read.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 2, strike out "of" and insert "to."

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, is this the normal resolution of this character?

Mrs. NORTON. It is.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KARST asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from a St. Louis newspaper of January 9, 1949.

Mr. KLEIN (at the request of Mr. GORSKI of New York) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. GORSKI of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the Evening Star.

Mr. EVINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include a speech and a short newspaper article.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a Lincoln Day speech.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial entitled "Dodging Taxes."

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RICH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

SURPLUS OIL

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this morning in the House Committee on Foreign Affairs we heard some sensational testimony to the effect that petroleum is no longer in world shortage. I quote from a witness:

> Today the world is facing a surplus of oil which is reflected in the United States by rapidly increasing and unneeded imports of foreign oil.

If there is a surplus of oil in the country, why has not the price of oil come down? Why is not the price of gasoline coming down? The consuming public in the United States today is paying a high price for petroleum products. If there is a conspiracy between the oil companies to keep prices high the country should know it. Every consumer of oil products, the man who heats his home, the man who uses it for power, and the man who drives an automobile is entitled to a reduction in the price of oil and gasoline. Here is a job for the Attorney General and Congress.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BURDICK addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on two subjects and include in one an editorial and in the other an article.

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter and an article.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a short article from the Walden Citizen-Herald.

Mr. HALE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Joseph Alsop.

Mr. ELSTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Cincinnati Times-Star.

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include some editorial articles.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include in each extraneous matter.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Arthur A. Ballantine at the annual meeting of the New York State Bar Association on January 29, 1949, on the subject The Place of Psychology in Taxation. I am informed by the Printing Office that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $195.25, but I ask unanimous consent that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

REPUBLICAN WHIP ORGANIZATION OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include in my remarks a short table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit and information of the Republican membership of the House, I am inserting with my remarks a table showing the organizational set-up of the Republican whip organization of the House:

Republican whip, LESLIE C. ARENDS, Illinois.

Deputy whip, RALPH A. GAMBLE, New York.

Eastern regional whip, W. STERLING COLE, New York—Eight States, 47 Members: Maine (3), New Hampshire (2), Vermont (1), Connecticut (3), Delaware (1), A. N. SADLAK; Massachusetts (8), JOHN HESELTON; New York (20), W. STERLING COLE; New Jersey (9), CLIFFORD P. CASE.

East central regional whip, J. HARRY MCGREGOR, Ohio—Six States, 46 Members: Pennsylvania (17), LEON H. GAVIN; Michigan (12), JOHN B. BENNETT; Ohio (11), J. HARRY MCGREGOR; Maryland (2), Tennessee (2), Kentucky (2), J. GLENN BEALL, Maryland.

Midwest regional whip, LAWRENCE H. SMITH, Wisconsin—Eight States, 44 Members: Indiana (4), RALPH HARVEY; Illinois (14), C. W. BISHOP; Wisconsin (8), Minnesota (5), North Dakota (2), South Dakota (2), LAWRENCE H. SMITH, Wisconsin; Iowa (8), Missouri (1), BEN JENSEN, Iowa.

Western regional whip, A. M. CULE, Kansas—Nine States, 34 Members: Kansas (6), Colorado (1), Nebraska (3), A. M. CULE, Kansas; Washington (4), Oregon (4), Montana (1), Idaho (1), Wyoming (1), WALT NORBLAD, Oregon; California (13), GORDON L. MCDONOUGH.

Membership, 171.

DISMANTLING OF PLANTS IN WESTERN ZONE OF GERMANY

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the Krupp war plant in Essen, in the British zone of western Germany, is still in the process of being dismantled and shipped to Soviet Russia.

It is comical, if it were not tragic, to see the American taxpayers planning to spend $5,000,000,000 to rearm western Europe, while our allies are diligently dismantling and shipping the biggest steel plant in that section to Russia.

I suppose someone will say that this is merely carrying out the Potsdam agreement.

According to that infamous treaty, Russia was to receive 25 percent of the dismantled plants in the western zone, but, and here is the real answer, she was to pay for 60 percent of what she received in goods and food from the eastern zone. To date she has only paid for 7 percent of what she has received.

Mr. Speaker, how long is this tragic comedy of errors to continue? When is the Congress going to prevent the spending of billions to defeat communism with one hand, while shipping the sinews of war to Russia with the other?

HOME BUILDERS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the National Association of Home Builders is meeting today in Chicago. I know of no segment of the American private economy which holds a greater responsibility for the success and for the future of our economic system than do the builders. Housing remains America's No. 1 domestic problem. Last year we built less—not more—homes than in 1947. This year the forecasts are that private construction will be even lower.

While we drive for a balanced housing bill to help not only the lowest but also the middle-income groups, we know that it will be in the last analysis still in the hands of the builders to build the 16,000,000 homes America needs in the next decade. The home builders' main attack must be on costs. I urge that they consider at their convention a concerted drive for the mass production of housing as automobiles are produced—there are too few big units in housing—for the greatly expanded use of mass-production methods of prefabrication and assembly, and finally for a smashing attack on the 3,000 antiquated municipal building codes which have the people and the builders tied down like Gulliver.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CASE of South Dakota addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

ECONOMIC STATE OF THE NATION

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure many Members of Congress were not only disturbed but amazed by some of the statements made last Saturday by President Truman's experts who are charged with keeping Congress and the people informed of the economic state of this Nation.

I refer especially to the statement of Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, who, upon leaving the White House Saturday, told news reporters that this country is going through a period of "healthy disinflation."

What kind of new double talk is this? Is it "healthy disinflation" when farmers sustain a loss of approximately $3,500,000,000 in gross income and this, translated into other terms, means a loss of approximately $25,000,000,000 in national income and a loss of $5,000,000,000 in Federal revenue unless these prices recover?

Prices of some farm commodities started to skid last October. Yet in the 4 to 5 months since that time has there been the slightest drop in the price of tractors, combines, overalls, and the multiplicity of products which farmers must buy? Is that what Dr. Nourse means by "healthy disinflation"?

Members of this House will soon be called upon to increase the salary of Dr. Nourse from a present $15,000 a year to an administration asking of $22,500 annually, a jump of $7,500 a year. I say to you that if we are going to pay Government economists any part of $22,500 a year we should employ men who talk understandable English; who know there can be no such thing as a "healthy" depression in this country.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include an editorial and a letter.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced the following resolution, the purpose of which is to seek immediate withdrawal of diplomatic recognition of the Government of Yugoslavia by the United States until such time as that Government, by releasing from imprisonment Archbishop Aloysius Stepinatz, and by demonstrating that their policies and conduct, with respect to the rights of individuals to life, liberty, and freedom of religious and political beliefs are such as to justify resumption of normal relations between the Government of the United States and the Government of Yugoslavia:

> Whereas the existing Government of Yugoslavia has pursued policies which violate the fundamental rights of the individual to life, liberty, and freedom of religious and political beliefs; and
>
> Whereas the arrest, trial, and imprisonment of Archbishop Aloysius Stepinatz, eminent Roman Catholic primate of Yugoslavia, is symbolic of the disregard of the existing Government of Yugoslavia of principles of justice and honor; and
>
> Whereas the continuance by the existing Government of Yugoslavia of policies of oppression and terror make impossible the attainment of the friendship and understanding among the nations of the world so vital to the establishment of a lasting peace: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That it is the sense of the Congress that the President should withdraw forthwith diplomatic recognition of the Government of Yugoslavia by the United States until such time as the Government of Yugoslavia, by releasing from imprisonment the eminent Roman Catholic primate, Archbishop Aloysius Stepinats, and by other appropriate action, demonstrates that the policies and conduct of such government, with respect to the rights of the individual to life, liberty, and freedom of religious and political beliefs, are such as to justify the resumption of relations between the Government of the United States and the Government of Yugoslavia.

(Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include the text of the resolution.)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGLE of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. GREEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an Associated Press article showing the comparative strength of Russia and the United States in manpower, oil and other critical materials.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SABATH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

RANKIN PENSION BILL

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I notice that newspaper commentators are beginning to speculate upon the possibility of the Committee on Rules being used to stop the Rankin pension bill. On this point I would like to say that at the beginning of this Congress the Rules Committee was stripped of the power to hold bills indefinitely. While I opposed the change in the Rules of the House, and I might say I get no pleasure out of the embarrassment that that change has so soon brought to its sponsors, still as a member of the Committee on Rules I shall oppose resorting to any scheme that would defeat this new rule under which the committee operates. I shall favor the reporting of the bill under an open rule in order that all Members may have the opportunity to publicly record their views upon it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the executive council in Fall River.

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Charles D. Mahaffie, Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

THE RANKIN PLAN—PENSION BILL

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and revise and extend my remarks and include some newspaper clippings.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post, whose owner got rich out of the last war, and out of the depression which he helped bring on during the Hoover administration, calls the veterans' pension bill now before the House the Rankin plan.

So I presume that from now on you will hear a good deal about the Rankin plan versus the Bevin plan, which some of you call the Marshall plan.

This Rankin plan would take care of our old veterans when they get too old to work. Of all the misinformation I ever heard spread, it is by those radio commentators, Hans Kaltenborn and Drew Pearson, about this bill.

This measure has been reduced to the irreducible minimum. If the House and Senate do not like it as it is, they have the right to amend it to provide a needs clause, or reduce the amounts paid.

But if we can pour billions of dollars into the sinkholes of Europe and Asia, Africa and Israel every year, we can certainly take care of our old veterans, who fought the Nation's battles in times of war and who now sustain its institutions in time of peace, when they get beyond the age of their earning capacity. That is exactly what this bill does.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

THE MARSHALL PLAN AND COMMUNISM

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is the objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is with great interest that I notice the gentleman from Mississippi from time to time come down in the well of the House and talk about communism; then from time to time come down and berate the Marshall plan. I had the occasion recently, at my own expense, to make a personal survey in eight countries of Europe of what the Marshall plan was doing for Europe, and I can say to the gentleman from Mississippi and the Members of the House that the Marshall plan has stopped communism in its tracks in Europe; and that it is the one thing that has saved Italy, France, and the rest of the democratic nations from going Communist. If the gentleman from Mississippi is sincere and really believes that communism should be stopped, then he has no alternative but to be a supporter of the Marshall plan.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. You have not stopped communism in this country. When we exposed a Communist spy ring in the State Department it was called a red herring.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I voted to give the Committee on the Un-American Activities $200,000 for that purpose.

Mr. RANKIN. All right; help us now take care of the disabled veterans.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Nothing I have said could be twisted by anyone to mean that I would not vote to help the disabled veterans. I was merely pointing out how very inconsistent it is to be against both communism and the Marshall plan, which has given communism its worst set-back in a decade.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—COOPERATION WITH INSTITUTE OF INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the enclosed letter from the Under Secretary of State and the accompanying draft legislation to make possible the continuation and expansion of the cooperative programs in public health, sanitation, education, and agriculture that this Government is carrying on, through the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, in partnership with the governments of other American republics.

The conditions of modern life are drawing the American Republics together in an increasingly close community of neighbors. It is a basic and enduring purpose of the foreign policy of the United States to play the part of the good neighbor in that community.

The United States and the other American Republics have repeatedly proclaimed their common purpose to promote by cooperative action their economic, social, and cultural development, and to work with one another to achieve just and decent living conditions for all their peoples. The United States has given tangible proof of its desire to cooperate in the realization of these aims by assisting its neighbor republics in the development of their basic economics. Our relations have constituted friendly, constructive, and effective partnerships which it is our aim to extend and strengthen.

Since the early part of 1942, this Government has, through the Institute of Inter-American Affairs and its predecessor agencies, entered into bilateral arrangements with the governments of other American Republics under which we have worked with them on programs in public health, sanitation, agriculture, education, and related fields—programs designed to promote the development of the basic economics of the cooperating republics. The present Institute of Inter-American Affairs was chartered by the Congress as a wholly owned Government corporation in an act approved on August 5, 1947, and authorized to continue this cooperative program through the end of the fiscal year 1950. Its exceptional success in realizing this Government's objectives in an increasingly effective manner leads to the conclusion that we should continue it, as a vital instrument of our long-range policy, beyond that limited period. These are programs that, over the years, have been tried, tested, and found good. I therefore request that the Congress authorize a continuation of these programs on a scale that will enable us, more effectively, to help our neighbors help themselves.

I stated recently that we must embark on a program for making the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas. Within the Western Hemisphere we have already built firm foundations for this program, and have already begun to demonstrate the benefits that can flow from such a program. The continuing growth of solidarity, friendship, and close cooperation among the republics of the Western Hemisphere benefits us as well as our neighbors. Each of the American Republics, the United States included, is helped in its own progress by the improvement of economic, social, and cultural conditions in the others. By continuing this international cooperation for raising the standard of living of all the peoples in the Americas, the United States can give further, practical form to the high purposes of our policy.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 21, 1949.*

(Enclosures: 1. Letter from Under Secretary of State. 2. Draft legislation.)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include a statement

THE CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

ALEXANDRIA, VA., COMMEMORATIVE STAMP

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1432) to amend the act approved June 29, 1948, entitled "An act to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved June 29, 1948, entitled "An act to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the

founding of the city of Alexandria, Va.," be amended to read as follows:

"That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to issue, during 1949, a special 6-cent air-mail postage stamp, of such design as he shall prescribe, in commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 492) to amend the act approved June 29, 1948, entitled "An act to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va.," an identical bill, strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H. R. 1432.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved June 29, 1948, entitled "An act to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va.," be amended to read as follows:

"That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to issue, during 1949, a special 6-cent air-mail postage stamp, of such design as he shall prescribe, in commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va."

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DEANE: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the act approved June 29, 1948, entitled 'An act to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va.,' be amended to read as follows:

"'That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to issue, during 1949, a special 6-cent air-mail postage stamp, of such design as he shall prescribe, in commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va.'"

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The proceedings whereby the bill (H. R. 1432) was passed were vacated and that bill was laid on the table.

CHURNTOWN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 164) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the Churntown Elementary School District, California.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish the gentleman would state what these are and whether the lands are of any value and what remuneration we are receiving for them.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, this bill was introduced by my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], but I am familiar with the bill because I reported it.

This is a portion of an area originally reserved for the Reclamation Service but not actually needed now by the Reclamation Service. It should have some degree of protection, however.

There is involved 10.11 acres. It is to be sold at the appraised value and to be used only for school purposes. All mineral rights in the land are reserved to the Federal Government. There is a further provision in the bill that if the land is not used for school purposes it reverts to the United States.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to convey to the Churntown elementary school district, California, for such consideration as he may fix in accordance with its present valuation, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of land in the north half of section 26, township 33 north, range 5 west, Mount Diablo base and meridian, Shasta County, Calif., containing an area of ten and eleven one-hundredths acres, more or less, and described as follows:

Beginning at a point in the westerly boundary of the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter of said section 26, distant therealong south no degrees three minutes forty seconds west six hundred and ninety-four and twenty-four one-hundredths feet from the north quarter corner of said section 26; thence north eighty-nine degrees thirty-six minutes no seconds east four hundred and sixty-seven and sixteen one-hundredths feet; thence south no degrees three minutes forty seconds west eight hundred and thirty feet to a point in the northerly boundary of State Highway 209; thence along said northerly boundary and along the arc of a curve to the right with a radius of one thousand nine hundred and seventy feet (the long chord bears north seventy-six degrees thirty-seven minutes fourteen seconds west eighty-six and seventy-nine one-hundredths feet) for a distance of eighty-six and eighty one-hundredths feet; thence continuing along said northerly boundary north seventy-five degrees twenty-one minutes thirty seconds west three hundred and ninety-five and forty-six one-hundredths feet; thence leaving said northerly boundary north no degrees five minutes thirteen seconds east ninety-eight and ninety-six one-hundredths feet the southwest corner of the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter of said section 26; thence south eighty-nine degrees thirty-six minutes no seconds west one hundred and fifty-five and twenty-two one-hundredths feet to a point in the easterly boundary of State Highway 209; thence along said easterly boundary and along the arc of a curve to the right with a radius of one thousand one hundred and sixteen and twenty-eight one-hundredths feet (the long chord bears north two degrees thirty-eight minutes fifty-three seconds east eighty and seventy-five one-hundredths feet) for a distance of eighty and seventy-seven one-hundredths feet; thence continuing along said easterly boundary north four degrees forty-three minutes fifteen seconds east five hundred and twenty-nine and nineteen one-hundredths feet; thence leaving said easterly boundary north eighty-nine degrees thirty-six minutes no seconds east one hundred and eight and fifty-eight one-hundredths feet to the point of beginning.

There shall be reserved to the United States in the conveyance of the land described all oil, gas, coal, and other mineral deposits in the land, including all materials determined pursuant to section 5 (b) (1) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 761), to be peculiarly essential to the production of fissionable material, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same.

SEC. 2. The land conveyed pursuant to the provisions of this act shall be used only for public-school purposes, and the conveyance herein authorized shall be made upon the express condition that if the land is abandoned for such use for a period of 2 years or more or if the land shall be used for other purposes, the conveyance shall be held to be forfeited and the title shall revert to the United States. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to determine the facts and declare such forfeiture and reversion and such determination and declaration shall be final and conclusive.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOUNT HOPE CEMETERY ASSOCIATION, OF WATERLOO, MICH.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1401) relating to the disposition of certain recreational demonstration project lands by the State of Michigan to the Mount Hope Cemetery Association, of Waterloo, Mich.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding section 3 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the disposition of recreational demonstration projects, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1942 (56 Stat. 326; 16 U. S. C. sec. 459t), the State of Michigan is hereby authorized to convey the following-described lands in Jackson County, Mich., to the Mount Hope Cemetery Association, of Waterloo, Mich.: Block 44, village of Waterloo, section 36, township 1 south, range 2 east, of the Michigan meridian. Any conditions providing for a reversion of title to the United States that may be contained in the conveyance of such lands by the United States to the State of Michigan are hereby released.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PINELLAS COUNTY, FLA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1998) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the conveyance to Pinellas County, State of Florida, of certain public lands herein described," approved June 17, 1948 (Public Law 666, 80th Cong.), for the purpose of correcting a land description therein.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That that portion of the first section of the act entitled "An act to provide for the conveyance to Pinellas County, State of Florida, of certain public lands herein described," approved June 17, 1948 (Public Law 666, 80th Cong.), which describes the lands conveyed by the United States to Pinellas County, Fla., is amended to read as follows: "Lot 1 of section 1, township 33 south, range 15 east; lots 1, 2, 3, and

4 of section 5; lots 1 and 2 of section 6; lots 1, 2, and 3 of section 7; lots 1, 2, 3, and 4 of section 8; lots 1 and 2 of section 9; lot 1 of section 17; and lots 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 of section 18 in township 33 south, range 16 east, together with accretion thereto."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SURVEY OF A PROPOSED MISSISSIPPI RIVER PARKWAY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1997) to authorize the survey of a proposed Mississippi River Parkway for the purpose of determining the feasibility of such a national parkway, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the author of the bill will tell us what this survey will incorporate, who is to do it, and how much it will cost.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this is to authorize a survey of a Mississippi River parkway. The bill was introduced at the request of a number of Members on both sides of the House. Several years ago there was a bill favorably reported actually authorizing the parkway, but the members of the Public Lands Committee and the Department thought we were getting the cart before the horse and that there should not be a parkway until the survey was made.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is only to authorize a survey and coordinate the activities of the Public Roads Administration, the National Park Service, and to cooperate with the State authorities. The survey only is authorized. They must report back to the Congress before the project is started. There has been in the past an overlap of effort of Government departments. This is for an authorization not to exceed $250,000.

Mr. McGREGOR. Will this $250,000 come out of the funds allocated for highways or will it come out of some public land funds?

Mr. PETERSON. They will have to make their justification and get their special appropriation. Oftentimes there are paralleling highways and there are little offshoots and many times in the past there has not been sufficient coordination between the various agencies of the Government. It is hoped that as they plan this, and I refer to the various State authorities and the Federal roads system, this will go along near the river or near historic sites. In the past it has been rather haphazard. It is felt that this survey will finally save money from the various departments.

Mr. McGREGOR. Do I understand the gentleman to say that an authorization is carried in this particular piece of legislation that would authorize the Public Roads Administration to spend $250,000 for a survey?

Mr. PETERSON. The National Park Service, the Federal Works Agency through the Public Roads Administration to enable them to coordinate their efforts. The road is being built now in many instances and recreational areas are being developed, some by the State, some by the road department and in some instances by the National Park Service. But there has been no coordinated plan. The hope of those who live along the Mississippi River is that by having all groups work together they can formulate a plan by which the roads may be near historic spots and go to a point where they can actually see the river. It does not contemplate any more building than would otherwise eventually be done but a coordination of the plans that might otherwise be haphazard.

It is not to exceed $250,000 and they still must make their justification and get the appropriation from the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. McGREGOR. If I understand the gentleman correctly, they can spend $250,000 if they deem it necessary.

Mr. PETERSON. Not unless they make a justification before the Appropriations Committee and the Appropriations Committee actually gives them this amount.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, in all fairness to my distinguished friend from Florida, I realize this means an expenditure of $250,000 of road funds for surveys alone—therefore I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

CITY OF EL PASO, TEX.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 967) for the relief of the city of El Paso, Tex.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the city of El Paso, Tex., the sum of $3,293.95. Such sum represents the amount of a judgment (plus interest and costs) rendered against the city of El Paso, in the case of Francisco Mendoza et al. against City of El Paso, Forty-first District Court, El Paso County, No. 53430, for damages on account of the death on June 9, 1943, of Lionides Rodolfo Mendoza, as a result of falling from a temporary walk on the Park Street Bridge over the Franklin Canal. Such canal and the bridges thereover are owned by the United States, and such temporary walk was constructed and was being maintained by the Bureau of Reclamation in connection with repair work which the United States was performing on such bridge, and not by the city of El Paso.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, after line 7, change the period to a colon, and add the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1509) for the relief of the city and county of San Francisco.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the city and county of San Francisco, a municipal corporation, of San Francisco, Calif., the sum of $9,728.81, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement of expenses incurred in rebuilding and restoring a power transmission line and loss of power revenue in township 3 south, range 5 east, and township 3 south, range 6 east, San Joaquin County, Calif., south of Tracy and approximately 3 miles from the Navy Vernalis Airfield, which transmission line was demolished by the crashing of a United States Navy plane, type SB 2 C-3, Bureau No. 18772, on August 6, 1944, at 9:21 p. m., while the said plane was engaged in making a flight over the area indicated, and on August 30, 1944, at 1:14 a. m., by the crashing of a United States Navy plane, type TBM-1, Bureau No. 24994, while the said plane was likewise making a flight over the area indicated: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with such claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COUNTY OF ALLEGHENY, PA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1959) for the relief of the county of Allegheny, Pa.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I say that this bill has been unanimously reported by the Committee on the Judiciary. And the only reason this bill did not pass the other body last year is because it did not have the time to consider the matter. I am wondering if the gentleman has any real objection to the bill, because it seems to me there is no objection on the part of the War Department. I have studied the claim very carefully; it seems to be a just claim, and I wonder if the gentleman from Wisconsin will withdraw his request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This appears to be the last eligible bill on the Consent Calendar today.

PENSIONS FOR VETERANS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 2681) to provide pensions for veterans of World War I and World War II based on non-service-connected disability and attained age, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not recognize the gentleman for that purpose.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 713) to amend Public Law 533 of the Eightieth Congress authorizing the construction of a building for the General Accounting Office on square 518 in the District of Columbia. I may say that this bill is identical with the House bill, H. R. 2626, on which the Speaker agreed to recognize me for a suspension.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of Public Law 533, Eightieth Congress, approved May 18, 1948, limiting the cost of the General Accounting Office Building to $22,850,000 be, and the same are hereby, amended to increase such limit of cost to $25,400,000.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the bill under consideration increases the authorization for the construction of a building for the General Accounting Office that was authorized by Congress on May 18, 1948, by $2,550,000. The bill passed the Senate unanimously. An identical bill (H. R. 2626) was introduced in the House, considered by the Committee on Public Works, and unanimously reported to the House.

I may say that at the hearings before the House Committee on Public Works it developed that the Federal Works Agency had advertised for bids and that the bids for the building and the escalators and elevators aggregated $22,956,999, the limit of cost as authorized by Congress being $22,850,000, Public Law 533, Eightieth Congress.

General Fleming, Mr. Reynolds, and other representing the Federal Works Agency testified that the bids were quite favorable to the Government, and that it would take an additional $2,550,000 to provide for the construction of the stairways and other necessary items to complete the building. So, in a word, this bill, unanimously reported by the committee, is to increase the existing authorization by $2,550,000. The authorization bill was passed on May 18, 1948. As stated, the limit was $22,850,000. The authorization stipulated that the funds that had been previously appropriated under the deficiency act of October 9, 1940, would be available, and the authorization act, further stipulated that no contract should be made, until appropriations were made or until contract authorizations had been provided therefor.

On June 25, 1948, in the deficiency bill of that date, the Congress authorized contracts to be made, and the authorization further stipulated that the funds that had been appropriated under the Deficiency Act of October 9, 1940, which amounted to approximately $5,041,680 as of May 18, 1946, should be available for the construction of this building. So the fact is that there has been previously appropriated $5,041,860, and contracts authorized to make the total amount $22,850,000.

With the statement of the Federal Works Agency that the bids received are favorable to the Government, this bill is unanimously recommended by the Committee on Public Works.

Before contracts can be let under the bids received, as I have stated, it is necessary for the amount of the authorization to be increased so that the building with stairways and other necessary items may be completed, and so that the bids regarded by the Federal Works Agency desirable by the Government may be promptly accepted. The Federal Works Agency would not have the power to accept the bids unless the authorization is increased so that it may be sufficient to complete the building. Mr. Reynolds, of the Federal Works Agency, stated that if the pending bill passed, the authorization would be sufficient for completing the building without asking the Congress for a further increase in the amount to be expended.

A General Accounting building was authorized with a limit of $9,850,000 in the Deficiency Act of October 9, 1940, in lieu of the remodeling of the Pension Building authorized by the Deficiency Act approved August 12, 1935, with the stipulation that the amount of the appropriation unexpended would be available for constructing the new building. The building was begun and much work on the foundation was done, but work was discontinued on account of World War II, and the inability to obtain materials.

The need for the building has long been recognized but Congress delayed authorizing construction until the costs of both labor and materials became rather stable. After careful hearings in view of the undisputed needs by Public Law 533, Eightieth Congress, the building was authorized within a limit of $22,850,000, of which the unexpended and unobligated appropriations under the Deficiency Act of October 9, 1940, were a part, and they amounted as stated to $5,041,806. The authorizations with a total limit including the said unexpended amount stated that no funds would be appropriated for expenditure during any fiscal year prior to 1950 or until contract authorizations by Congress are provided for. In the Deficiency Act of June 25, 1948, Congress provided for contract obligations, up to the limit of authorization in the sum of $22,850,000 including the unobligated balance of May 18, 1948, amounting to $5,041,806. The Federal Works Agency urges that the pending bill be promptly passed so that the bids that are favorable to the Government may be accepted. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget recommends favorable consideration.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I confirm everything the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], the chairman of our committee, has said in regard to this building. The necessity for it was determined in the Eightieth Congress. For the benefit of those who were not here then, permit me to say that the General Accounting Office is housed in 21 different buildings here in Washington, some of them 4 or 5 miles apart. From that you will get some idea of the difficulty under which the General Accounting Office operates. That was the testimony of our former colleague, Hon. Lindsay Warren, the Comptroller General of the United States. The amount which has been stated in this bill, to increase the amount of authorization is exactly as testified to before our committee recently. I confirm everything the gentleman from Mississippi has said, and I hope the bill will pass unanimously.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. I concur in the statements by our distinguished chairman and the ranking minority member. I call to your attention the fact that this is one project for which contracts will be let, and it will not be on a cost-plus basis. Bids have been received. There were a number of bids. The bidder who will get the contract if this authorization goes through was approximately $800,000 under the next bidder, and there was a variation of approximately $5,000,000 between the low bidder and the high bidder. For that reason, I am in complete accord, and hope this legislation will be immediately passed.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A similar House bill (H. R. 2626) was laid on the table.

CLARIFYING OVERTIME COMPENSATION PROVISIONS OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 858) to clarify the overtime compensation provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, as applied in the stevedoring and building-construction industries and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection (e), to read as follows:

"(e) For the purpose of computing overtime compensation payable under this section to an employee employed in the longshore, stevedoring, building and construction industries—

"(1) who is paid for work on Saturdays, Sundays, or holidays, or on the sixth or seventh day of the workweek, at a premium rate not less than one and one-half times the rate established in good faith for like

work performed in nonovertime hours on other days, or

"(2) who, in pursuance of an applicable employment contract or collective-bargaining agreement, is paid for work outside of the hours established in good faith by the contract or agreement as the basic, normal, or regular workday (not exceeding 8 hours) or workweek (not exceeding 40 hours), at a premium rate not less than one and one-half times the rate established in good faith by the contract or agreement for like work performed during such workday or workweek, the extra compensation provided by such premium rate shall not be deemed part of the regular rate at which the employee is employed and may be credited toward any premium compensation due him under this section for overtime work."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, is it not the rule of the House that in order for a Member to demand a second he must qualify by being opposed to the bill?

The SPEAKER. If there is opposition to the bill, a Member who is opposed to it may claim the right to demand a second.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this bill and I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL] opposed to the bill?

Mr. McCONNELL. No; I am not, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Without objection a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I intend to limit my remarks at this time to a brief summary of the provisions of the bill which is before this body for consideration with an explanation of the reasons for reporting it out at this time.

The bill is intended to clarify the overtime compensation provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 as applied to longshore, stevedoring, building, and construction industries.

It should be understood at the outset that this is a special purpose bill and that its effects are definitely limited to the before-mentioned industries, namely, the longshore industry, the stevedoring industry, the building industry, and construction industry.

As you know, the Committee on Education and Labor has been holding hearings on proposed revisions to the Fair Labor Standards Act. As I stated on the floor the other day, it will be impossible to report out this bill for another week or 10 days.

For the information of the Members, I will briefly outline the situation in the longshore and stevedoring industries, which convinced the committee that special action at the earliest possible time is necessary.

For many years prior to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, under collective bargaining agreements in the longshore, stevedoring, building, and construction industries, work at straight time rates has been limited to specified hours of the day and week. Work outside the specified workday or workweek has traditionally been considered overtime and has been paid for at time and a half or more, as compared with the rate payable during the regular workday or workweek established by contract. Work performed on Saturdays, Sundays, holidays, or on the sixth or seventh day of the workweek was likewise ordinarily made compensable at contract overtime rates amounting to time and one-half or more.

Under the decision of the Supreme Court in Bay Ridge Operating Co. against Aaron, and Huron Stevedoring Corp. against Blue, handed down in June 1948, it was settled that certain premium payments made under these special agreements were not true overtime premiums for purposes of the Fair Labor Standards Act, but were payments for work at undesirable hours. Therefore the existing provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act required that such premium pay be included in computing the regular rate of pay of such employees and that the premium pay could not be credited toward overtime compensation due under the act.

One of the effects of this decision was to make clear that these long-agreed-upon contracts were unworkable under the present provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act. This became one of the factors involved in a serious labor disturbance on the east coast in the longshore and stevedoring industry. The unions wanted this type of contract and the employers desired to give it to them. However, the employers felt that they could not legally do so because they would not then be meeting the requirements of the Wages and Hours Act.

Last fall serious strikes occurred in the longshore industry. Settlement of these strikes was made more difficult by the inability of the employers to grant the traditional type of contract which I have just explained, without, at the same time, incurring liability under the Wages and Hours Act to pay for work over 40 hours a week at time and one-half, a rate which would include premium pay that was considered overtime pay under the contract. Finally these strikes were settled, partially as a result of assurances by the Secretary of Labor that he would promptly support legislation to validate in principle the traditional form of contract in that industry.

When the Secretary appeared before our committee, he advised us that there was a necessity for prompt consideration of the problems raised by the Bay Ridge decision and urged that if general legislation could not be enacted by the 15th of February, the bill now before this body should be enacted as separate and special legislation.

The committee also heard the testimony of the representatives of labor and the representatives of management, both of whom agreed that the present law as interpreted in the Bay Ridge decision is creating serious difficulty in the maintenance of desirable labor standards in the longshore, stevedoring, building and construction industries, and that an amendment was urgently needed.

Representatives of management, representatives of the employees, and representatives of the administration have all stated that the bill before this body is necessary to meet the situation which I have outlined, and that it should be passed promptly.

As I have said before, this bill is limited to the longshore, stevedoring, building and construction industries because of the urgent need which was demonstrated for the committee for immediate relief in these industries. The whole subject of overtime on overtime as it affects all industries will be given careful consideration by the committee in connection with the omnibus bill.

H. R. 858 provides that the following extra compensation shall not be deemed a part of the regular rate for purposes of the Fair Labor Standards Act, and that such extra compensation may be credited toward overtime payments required by such section:

(a) Premium rates for work on Saturdays, Sundays, or holidays, or on the sixth or seventh day of the workweek where the premium rate is not less than 1½ times the rate established in good faith for like work performed during nonovertime hours on other days; and

(b) Premium rates for work outside of the basic, normal, or regular workday—not exceeding 8 hours—or workweek—not exceeding 40 hours—established in good faith by contract or agreement where the premium rate is not less than 1½ times the rate established in good faith by contract or agreement for like work performed during such workday or workweek.

The intricacies of the problems which this bill is intended to solve are carefully outlined in report No. 121, which accompanies this bill. The language in the report has been given most careful consideration by the committee and sets forth in great detail the understanding of the committee as to the intent and purpose of H. R. 858.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL].

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

The enactment of H. R. 858 is necessary to prevent the recurrence of a number of hardships which have arisen under the Fair Labor Standards Act. You will remember that the wage-hour law requires employers to pay "one and one-half times the regular rate for hours of work in excess of 40 a week." But the law does not define "regular rate of pay" as that term applies to payment of overtime. Because of this omission in the Fair Labor Standards Act, the courts have been free to construe the meaning of the terms—and this judicial construction has led to a number of hardship situations which were never contemplated when the act was passed in 1938. These decisions—and particularly the Supreme Court's five-to-three decision in the case of Bay Ridge Operating Co. against Aaron on June 7, 1948—have fallen hard on the stevedoring industry and this bill is especially designed to meet the problem in that industry.

The problem of overtime on overtime arises in the stevedoring industry despite

the most generous union contracts between employers and employees. As an illustration let us take the contract between the International Longshoremen's Association, A. F. of L., and the employers represented by the New York Shipping Association. The conditions of this contract prevail generally in all ports of the Atlantic and Gulf coasts.

Under this contract, longshoremen receive $1.75 an hour for straight time. Now this would ordinarily be regarded as the regular rate of pay. This rate applies to all work performed between the hours of 8 a. m. and 12 noon—and between 1 p. m. and 5 p. m. from Monday through Friday, inclusive. The contract also provides an overtime rate of $2.62½ an hour, which is one and one-half times the straight time rate. The overtime rate is paid for all work performed outside of the hours and the days for which straight time is paid. You will note that this contract specifies an exact 8 hours in each day, and an exact 5 days in each week during which straight time will be paid. It is important to remember this point because it is the crux of the "overtime on overtime" problem. Under the contract, any longshoreman working outside the specified hours—which total exactly 40 per week—will be paid time and one-half. Now it would appear that every employer whose employees were covered by this contract would be in compliance with the overtime provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act. But the courts have held otherwise, and they have based their decisions on judicial construction of the term "regular rate."

Let us look at a specific example of how the problem of overtime on overtime arises. Suppose that a ship arrives in port Monday morning and is ready to discharge cargo at 8 a. m. A longshoreman works at unloading from 8 a. m. until noon, and from 1 p. m. until 5. During these hours he receives straight-time pay under his work contract. But let us suppose that overtime work is necessary to get the ship unloaded in time, and the longshoreman works from 6 until 10 p. m. Under the union contract, these last 4 hours must be compensated at the overtime rate because the work is outside of the specified hours for straight-time pay. Now let us suppose that it is necessary for the longshoreman to work the same hours on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday as he did on Monday. Now, the problem is, How much is the longshoreman entitled to for these 4 days of work? There seems to be a difference of opinion about the correct answer to this question.

A layman, using his common sense, would look at the contract between the employers and the longshoremen. He would find that the contract called for straight-time pay of $1.75 an hour for all hours worked between 8 in the morning and noon, and between 1 and 5 in the afternoon. Taking this figure, the layman would compute that the longshoreman, in our example, had worked 8 hours a day of straight time—and he had worked 4 days during the week. That means he has worked 32 hours of straight time. Under his contract, he is entitled to $1.75 an hour, or $56 for his straight-time work. In our example, the longshoreman worked 4 hours a day outside the straight-time hours on each of 4 days. Under the contract, he is entitled to $2.625 cents an hour for each of these 16 hours. Using his common sense, the layman would compute that the longshoreman is entitled to $42 for his overtime work during the week. In other words, under the union contract, he is entitled to $98 for the 4 days work—$56 for straight-time work and $42 for work outside the straight-time hours. Unfortunately, this common-sense computation used by the layman is not applied to the overtime and regular-rate clauses of the Fair Labor Standards Act, and that fact gives rise to the problem of overtime on overtime.

Now let's look at how the Supreme Court has computed the pay of the longshoreman in our example. During the 4 days the longshoreman worked 48 hours, and he received for his labor $98, as provided in the employment contract. The Fair Labor Standards Act requires the employer to pay 1½ times the regular rate for hours of work in excess of 40 a week. The question now arises as to what is the regular rate of pay for the longshoreman in our example. Is it the $1.75 an hour provided in the contract? The Supreme Court has said "No." The Court says that the regular rate of pay is ascertained by dividing the longshoreman's total wages for the week by the number of hours he has worked during the week. The longshoreman in our example received $98 for working 48 hours. The Court calculated that his regular rate of pay per hour is $98 divided by 48 hours, or $2.04 an hour. If this is the regular rate then under the Fair Labor Standards Act, the longshoreman is entitled to one-half of this amount, or $1.02 an hour—as an added premium for each hour worked in excess of 40 in the week. The layman, after reading the work contract and by using simple computations, found that the longshoreman should receive $98 for 48 hours work. The Supreme Court makes a different finding however. The Court has held that the longshoreman is entitled to $93 under the contract, and, in addition, he is entitled to $1.02 an hour under the Fair Labor Standards Act as an additional premium for the hours worked after 40 in the week. In other words, the employer still owes the longshoreman $8.16 for the 48 hours work.

This bill, H. R. 858, seeks to clarify the overtime compensation provisions of section 7 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 as applied in the longshore, stevedore, building and construction industries. H. R. 858 provides that when an employee is paid for work on Saturdays, Sundays, or holidays, or on the sixth and seventh day of the week at a premium rate not less than 1½ times the rate established in good faith for work performed in nonovertime hours on other days, such extra compensation shall not be deemed part of the regular rate at which the employee is employed, and may be credited toward any premium compensation due him under this section for overtime work.

H. R. 858 also provides that when an employee working in pursuance of an applicable employment contract or collective bargaining agreement is paid for work outside the hours established in good faith by the contract or agreement as the basic, normal, or regular workday, not exceeding 8 hours, or workweek, not exceeding 40 hours, at a premium rate not less than one and one-half times the rate established in good faith by the contract or agreement for like work performed during such workday or workweek; such extra compensation shall not be deemed part of the regular rate at which the employee is employed, and may be credited toward any premium compensation due him under this section for overtime work.

This bill has received very widespread support. Representatives of the Department of Labor, the Army, the stevedoring industry, and various labor unions appeared before your Education and Labor Committee to express approval of H. R. 858.

For example, Louis Waldman, general counsel of the International Longshoremen's Association—A. F. of L.—testified before your committee that—

> The danger to American labor from the Fair Labor Standards Act—
>
> As it is limited by the Bay Ridge decision—
>
> is real and immediate. The very foundations of free collective bargaining are threatened—

He told us.

> I do not believe Congress will want to see this situation continue unremedied. The American labor movement in sponsoring and in supporting the FLSA in 1938 did not intend to have it supplant free collective bargaining. Surely Congress never contemplated that the law should be developed and construed as to hurt labor—

The American Federation of Labor representative said.

The Bay Ridge case is unique in that it shows management and labor fighting side by side through the courts in a vain effort to sustain their collective-bargaining agreements. The president of the International Longshoremen's Association—A. F. of L.—testified as a witness for the defendant employers. The International Longshoremen's Association filed briefs in the Supreme Court supporting the Government's contention that the overtime claims should be thrown out. The American Federation of Labor likewise submitted a brief in the Supreme Court in which they stated that the Bay Ridge decision strikes at the very foundation of collective bargaining.

The immediate enactment of this bill would clarify the term "regular rate," and thereby enable new contract negotiations to proceed in the stevedoring industry which has been operating under a temporary agreement pending legislative action of Congress, and in the building and construction industry where new contract negotiations are expected to start within the next several weeks.

An equally important part of this entire problem is not covered by H. R. 858. I speak of the desperate need for relief to the employers in the stevedoring industry who are faced by an avalanche of lawsuits arising out of claims for overtime on overtime. The liabilities faced by these concerns far exceed their total

assets and yet these concerns complied to the letter with their collective-bargaining contracts. What has happened is this. Certain individual employees urged on by attorneys primarily interested in large contingent fees, have filed claims for overtime on overtime. They have done this in opposition to the wishes of their labor organizations. To permit these claims to be sustained is to grant a windfall to men who are paid all they ever expected to receive for their work. Furthermore, to permit these claims to succeed is to punish the thousands of loyal members of labor organizations who believed in the integrity of contract and who complied with their union's request not to sue. There is absolutely no merit in the claims.

Your committee was advised during the hearings that four lawsuits have now been filed in the building and construction industry. The committee considered the question of making this legislation retroactive and I may say that a majority of the committee members appeared to favor such a move. However, we ran into a parliamentary problem in that such an amendment would be considered not germane to H. R. 858. Accordingly the committee members never had a real opportunity to express their views on retroactivity. I believe that ultimately Congress will wish to extend the necessary relief to these employers who have acted in good faith and I hope that an opportunity may be found for such action in the consideration of H. R. 858 by the other body.

I think it is also appropriate for me to comment on the spirit of nonpartisan cooperation among the members of the Education and Labor Committee in considering and reporting this bill. Our chairman has given a fair and patient hearing to all witnesses, and he has been most cordial in all respects to the members of the minority. Working together, we have turned out a bill which merits the support of every Member of this House.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCONNELL. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Do I understand that representatives of the labor organizations as well as of management and of the Labor Department all appeared in support of the legislation?

Mr. McCONNELL. That is correct.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCONNELL. I yield.

Mr. LYNCH. Do I understand that there is nothing in this bill that is retroactive?

Mr. McCONNELL. That is correct; there is nothing in this bill that is retroactive.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed significant that the very first piece of labor legislation that comes before the Eighty-first Congress, a Congress which was elected as the friend of labor, happens to be a bill which takes thousands and thousands of American workers—longshoremen—from under the protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act. We have here a situation again where propaganda and a repetition of that propaganda is being utilized against the best interests of men who work in what undoubtedly is the most hazardous occupation in this country.

We have heard the term "overtime on overtime" and we have had it repeated here time and time again. If ever there were a misnomer and a distortion of the real situation this is it; we are not dealing with overtime on overtime. We are not dealing with overtime at all.

The average longshoreman is paid under contract a stipulated rate of pay for work between the hours of 8 a. m. and 5 p. m. Then there is an additional rate which is not an overtime at all, but is rather a penalty for time that the longshoreman works after the hour of 5 p. m.

This is not something new. It has existed all the way back to 1872. The reason for this penalty pay is the hazardous conditions under which a longshoreman has to work after dark in either loading or unloading a ship.

There is no light. He is deep down in the hold of the ship. The result has been that the casualties have been enormous and because of the danger of night work there has always been penalty pay. It is this penalty pay which the proponents of this bill and the stevedore and shipping companies are trying to sell the country as overtime pay. It is not.

The Wage and Hour Administration has had this question before it and no one can deny that the Wage and Hour Administrator has warned the companies that this is not overtime pay; that it is a penalty pay and that pursuant to the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act legal overtime pay can be computed only on one basis—that is, on the basis of weighting the average of both the regular day and night rates. That is exactly how the Supreme Court has interpreted the Fair Labor Standards Act.

So, now, after the Supreme Court has acted and after the Supreme Court has decided this matter, and stated that the companies have been improperly making huge sums by robbing these men—a condition which was corrected by the Supreme Court decision—these companies come to Congress, the Eighty-first Congress for relief. And, mind you, under a suspension procedure we have this legislation which deals a very serious blow to the pocketbooks of the longshoremen of this country before us.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Is it not a fact that under the provisions of the bill now under consideration the compensation presently being received by longshoremen will be reduced?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. It will definitely be reduced and these longshoremen will be taking a very definite licking from the standpoint of dollars and cents under this bill.

When the gentleman from Pennsylvania spoke of hardships, he was talking of the hardships of the shipping and stevedore companies. This is a bill to relieve these companies from the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act insofar as it applies to longshoremen. It is a bill that exempts longshoremen from the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act, and, mind you, it is being done in a Congress in which we hear so much talk about extending the Fair Labor Standards Act and revising the minimum-wage provisions upward. That is the talk, but the specific proposition that we have before us is to exempt longshoremen from the act.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I notice that the committee reports that this bill comes before us with the concurrence of the employees. The committee refers specifically to the fact that the employees believe the collective bargaining associations would be complicated by the present situation under the Supreme Court decision. Does the gentleman have any information on that?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I have an observation to make. I wish I did not have to make it, because I do not want to get into personalities. Yes, this bill has the consent of the king of the longshoremen. Mr. Ryan came here and testified on behalf of this legislation. But is it necessary for me to describe the activities of Mr. Ryan to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS]? Is it necessary for me to go into detail with respect to Mr. Ryan's approach on these questions that involve the interest of members of his union who can say nothing? Is it necessary to refer further to Mr. Ryan who had himself elected for life as president of the union? I do not think I have to go into that question and I am not going to go into it further. It speaks for itself.

I may say to the gentleman that if he wants to know how the average longshoreman feels about this legislation, let him go down along the waterfront of our city, and I can assure the gentleman without any fear of being contradicted on this proposition that out of every 10 men questioned he will find every 1 of the 10 opposed to this legislation. The rank and file of the longshoremen are opposed to this legislation, despite what King Ryan has said to this committee. The reference to concurrence on the part of the union is a mighty, mighty weak case. It is the weakest case that can be made for this bill.

Mr. JAVITS. I understand that the CIO representatives have also agreed that this legislation should be passed.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That is not my understanding of it as far as the longshoremen are concerned.

Mr. JAVITS. Perhaps the chairman of the committee can enlighten us on the union's position.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman will have to take his own time on that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The question I wish to ask is to clear in my own mind what is the basis for the overtime. Assuming the rate from 9 to 5 is $1.75 an hour, and the penalty rate after 5 p. m. we will say is $2 an hour, is the overtime proposed by this bill based on the rate during the day or during the so-called penalty time?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Under this bill it would not be permitted to fix overtime as it is now fixed by law.

In many industries you have a rate for penalty time as well as straight time. In such circumstances the overtime rate is based on the weighted average of both rates. It is the weighted average that fixes the overtime rate. That is the law. This bill now says you cannot do this with respect to longshoremen. Why can you not do this with respect to longshoremen? I will tell you why. You have had lawsuits on this proposition. These lawsuits have been determined in favor of the men. Now we have this bill before us. Of course, they tell us that there is no retroactive feature in the bill. But this bill is going to the Senate, it will be coming back, it will be going through various processes, and sometime, somewhere, somehow, you and I know that that retroactive feature is going to be put in it. In fact, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL] in his discussion of the bill was very frank and honest with us. He stated that because this bill comes up under suspension he cannot offer the amendment he desires to offer. It was the gentleman's intention, was it not, to offer an amendment in order to make this bill retroactive?

Mr. McCONNELL. It was the hope of quite a few of us in the committee to have an amendment offered that would make the provisions retroactive. We were informed, however, by the Parliamentarian, that it was not germane and would be subject to a point of order.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Exactly, but if it had not been for the rules of the House it was the intention to make it retroactive?

Mr. McCONNELL. That is right.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Further, it can be done at any time. It can be done in conference. It can be done in the Senate. Then we will have a bill here saving these companies millions of dollars, which the Supreme Court of this land has said rightly belongs to these men, as the result of a correct—I say correct—interpretation of the Fair Labor Standards Act, by using the weighted average of both rates for determining the overtime pay.

What you want to use here is the penalty pay. But the penalty pay is not overtime pay. That is the gimmick in this thing. That is the little trick in this thing. It is being sold to the country under the misnomer of overtime on overtime, which is just sheer bunk and sheer nonsense. It is a device and a distortion to change the Fair Labor Standards Act for the benefit of these companies.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Since the gentleman has further explained, and on reading this language, I would interpret this as meaning that the so-called penalty rate cannot be used as a base for determining the overtime if this bill becomes law.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. But under the law, I again say to the gentleman, and I hope I am making myself clear, under the Fair Labor Standards Act it is the weighted average of both the regular night rate and the regular day rate which is to determine the overtime rate and nothing else.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What I am trying to find out is, what will the situation be if this bill becomes a law?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. If this bill becomes law, then the penalty rate would be considered the legal overtime rate. There would be no real overtime pay for longshoremen. In other words, the longshoremen would not come under the overtime provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I am interested on reading the report to find that the Department of Labor itself approves this legislation. Has the gentleman any comment to make upon that?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. All I can say to the gentleman from Wisconsin is that when powerful influences begin to work they know their way around the halls in Washington. They know them better than the rank and file of the longshoremen.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a minute?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I will not yield for a minute, but I will yield for a question.

Mr. BREHM. I should like to have a minute. I cannot explain or make the point I have in mind in less than a minute or by simply asking a question. I do not want to ask a question. I want to help the gentleman clarify the situation.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman will have to get his time from the people on the affirmative side of this bill.

Mr. BREHM. The gentleman does not know where I stand on this bill. I have not yet had an opportunity to express my views.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I will yield to the gentleman if he wants to ask a question, but if the gentleman wants any time, I will definitely say to him that I will not give any time to anybody who is for the bill, because the chairman of the committee is in charge of the time for the proponents. I am in charge of the time for the opponents of the bill.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield so that I may ask a question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania state whether it is true that if this bill is passed the longshoremen will receive less pay for their hazardous work than they are receiving now?

Mr. McCONNELL. I can only say this in answer to the gentleman. There is a difference of opinion on that question. Some of the labor men before us, as well as the employers, stated that in some cases it would penalize them, and in other cases it would be in their favor. It would be difficult to make a general blanket statement in that respect.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. May I interrupt the gentleman right there to say this to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. What is the situation? The situation is that the Supreme Court has ruled that the weighted average is to be used in establishing the overtime rate. The regular night penalty pay is no overtime pay. Therefore, it is common sense that if this bill is passed the longshoremen will receive less than what the Supreme Court has determined they should receive under the interpretation the Supreme Court has made of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McCONNELL. I think the stevedores made a very significant statement when they appeared before our committee and said that they tried to work out a new contract on the basis of the decision of the Supreme Court, and the employees did not want it that way. They wanted their old contract provisions continued.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Except that these employees have gone to court to obtain these moneys which were withheld from them, and the court has held that they were withheld from them wrongfully.

Mr. McCONNELL. Only a certain small percentage of the employees have filed any claims. With no retroactive features in this bill, you are in effect giving a windfall to certain groups who have not been loyal union members, and who have not gone along with their leaders.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman now is dragging in something which is not relevant at all, but the gentleman's statement, again, is very, very significant. It is obvious that the gentleman aims at what? He is aiming at making this bill retroactive. I do not think there is any doubt in any Member's mind as to the gentleman's contention.

I do not believe I am misstating the gentleman's intention when I state that.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. McCONNELL. The effect of your position would be to penalize thousands and thousands of loyal union members.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. We are not penalizing anybody. In fact we are protecting them. As I said to you before the rank and file, or the average longshoreman will tell you that since 1872 the pay for nighttime work is not overtime pay, but penalty pay, because of the hazardous conditions of the work. That is the history of the longshore industry. To deprive the longshoremen of their overtime as this bill does, is penalizing the

longshoremen for the benefit of the companies.

The gentleman cannot deny it. The committee cannot deny it. It is a fact.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Can the gentleman imagine any reason why longshoremen would be penalized as suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania if this bill were to be defeated.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. If this bill were to be defeated, they would get the benefit of a Supreme Court decision which upholds their contention that the rate for nighttime work is the regular rate for this work and that it is not overtime pay. They would get the benefit of a decision which states that longshoremen are not to be treated any differently from anybody else and that they should be treated in accordance with the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act which provides that the weighted average of both rates is to be used as the determinant of the overtime rate.

Mr LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. LYNCH. And this benefit was so interpreted by the Supreme Court?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Definitely. It has been interpreted by the Supreme Court and that is why you have this legislation here. This legislation, as it is now, first, takes the longshoremen from under the protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act with respect to overtime; and, second, when this bill comes back either from the other body or our of conference, you gentlemen have heard of the desire to put retroactive features in the bill. So that if you pass this bill, you will be first taking the longshoremen out from the protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act and you will also be starting the vehicle which is intended to circumvent the decision of the Supreme Court and deprive these thousands and thousands of men of their just claims, claims which the Supreme Court has adjudicated to be just and in accordance with the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield tc me so that I may propound a question to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes.

Mr. ROONEY. I want to ask, may I suggest to the gentleman, that the chairman state whether or not it is the intention of the majority members of the committee to insert retroactive provisions, should this bill pass, and go into conference?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman knows that that cannot be within the control of any individual. We have heard the position of the ranking minority member of the committee on this. Why take a chance?

Mr. ROONEY. Understand, I am going to vote against this bill.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I understand, but I am simply stating my position.

Mr. ROONEY. I am suggesting that a record be made as to the position of the majority members of the committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITTINGTON). The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] has expired.

(Mr. MARCANTONIO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and insert excerpts from various briefs prepared on this question.)

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may acquire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GOODWIN].

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, following the decision of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals in the cases of Bay Ridge Operating Co. and Huron Stevedoring Corp., I filed a bill in the Eightieth Congress which became known as the overtime-on-overtime bill. The filing of this bill was prompted by the obvious necessity for the Congress to clarify the situation by legislation which would have the effect of a definition of regular rate of pay in the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, to take care of a condition of uncertainty and confusion which had risen among both management and labor, particularly in the stevedoring industry. The subsequent decision of the Supreme Court augmented the need for corrective legislation.

The bill aroused great interest all over the country and was apparently unanimously approved by industry and management and also had the approval of those segments of labor most closely allied with the longshore and stevedoring industries. Through a combination of circumstances the bill never reached the floor of the House for debate. If it had, I am satisfied that it would have passed the Congress by an overwhelming vote.

We now have under consideration H. R. 858 and while it falls far short of the objectives sought in my original bill on overtime-on-overtime I am glad to support it and hope it will pass. I wish it were not confined to the longshore, stevedoring, and building and construction industries. Of course coverage may yet be extended. I understand that the Committee on Education and Labor may later report a main bill which will cover all industries. Of course there is the possibility that H. R. 858 may be amended by the other branch or changed in conference so that the benefit of this legislation may be extended to other industries. I certainly feel that this benefit should be extended at least to every industry where clock-pattern overtime exists.

I wish also that H. R. 858 could have gone as far as the original overtime-on-overtime bill went and contained the feature of retroactivity. It is difficult to see how there could be any logical objection to this procedure because if the principle of H. R. 858 is sound for the future then it ought to be applied to pending litigation. Here again, as in the case of the desirability for extending the benefit of the legislation to other industries, we may hope that the law may be made retroactive by subsequent change. The need for extending the principle of the bill to pending suits is no less urgent in respect to overtime-on-overtime than it was in the case of portal-to-portal pay.

And so even though this bill does not go as far as I feel it should, I still favor and urge its passage. I believe it will result in helping remove a serious threat of burdening and obstructing the commerce of the country by minimizing disputes between labor and management, and will go far toward maintaining the integrity of the principle of collective bargaining.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, of all the remarks that I have ever heard the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] make on the floor of the House, I have never heard him make so many erroneous statements as he has just made here now.

In the first place, let me say to the gentleman that this bill does not remove longshoremen from the benefits of the Fair Labor Standards Act. It defines their rights thereunder.

Second, let me say to the gentleman that it does not reduce the amount of pay which they will receive from their employers upon the passage of this bill. Upon the passage of this bill they will receive more pay. I will tell you why. First, they have to work under a strict 40-hour week because under the Bay Ridge decision employers cannot run the risk of working them longer than the contract the Government provided for under the Fair Labor Standards Act, because they would be subject to penalty and liquidated damages. The employers are willing to work the employees 48 hours a week. The employees want to work 48 hours a week. They want to enter into a contract to permit them to get time and a half overtime over 40 hours. But the employer and the employees cannot agree to that because of this decision of the Supreme Court. Therefore, the employees can work longer hours than 40 if we pass this law. Therefore their compensation will be greater for a week's work.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. LYNCH. The gentleman stated that this legislation defines the rights of longshoremen. May I ask this question of him? Does this legislation in any wise affect any rights or benefits that have already accrued to the employee as interpreted by the Supreme Court?

Mr. LUCAS. No, we have no power in our committee to bring out a retroactive feature. However, I intend to address myself to that subject presently.

Mr. Speaker, since retroactivity has been brought up here, I think the Members of the House ought to have the benefit of the evidenec which was brought before our committee on this subject. It is necessary that the House take some action upon retroactivity. I hope we are permitted to do so later on. The evidence before our committee by the Maritime Commission showed us that there was a likelihood of as much as $375,000,000 worth of claims being brought against the United States Government as a result of our guaranty on these contracts during the war.

The people of the United States are going to lose $375,000,000—or even

more—unless the Congress acts upon retroactivity. It means that a great many employers are going to be put out of business. One witness appeared before the committee from the west coast who said his company was worth $125,000; that he had worked all his life to build it up, but that at the present time suits had been brought against his company amounting to more than a million dollars as a result of this Bay Ridge decision, not as a result of any contract. It is outside the contract. The employees were working under a contract under which the employers were satisfied, and the employees were satisfied. We may assume that or they would not have worked under it. After this decision by the Supreme Court they found they had additional rights, a windfall, which might come to them; and they have brought these suits. The CIO headquarters, the A. F. of L., the International Longshoremen's Union, all favor the passage of this bill.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman from Texas answered the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH] a while ago. In connection with that answer I wish to ask if it is not a fact that if this bill becomes law the amount of award made by the Supreme Court will be taken away from the longshoremen? In other words, they have that additional advantage under the Supreme Court decision; is not that true?

Mr. LUCAS. From now on; yes.

Mr. ROONEY. That is all I wanted to know.

Mr. LUCAS. But not retroactively from the date of the passage of this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. I merely wanted to clarify the matter raised by the question of the gentleman from New York. The gentleman says it would take away certain rights; that is a question of construction, is it not, a construction of what are rights?

Mr. LUCAS. Yet; these are statutory rights granted under the original act of 1938, and the Congress has the power to take them away if it desires. But it is not taking away past rights granted; it is depriving them of exercising those rights in the future.

I should like to add one or two words of explanation to what the chairman has said with regard to this bill, particularly on the subject of retroactivity. The evidence before the House Education and Labor Committee showed that there are a large number of lawsuits involving substantial amounts against businessmen in the stevedoring and related industries, many of them with very small or limited capital. It also showed that suits are now beginning to be filed in other industries, despite the fact that the International Longshoremen's Union, A. F. of L., and CIO, have advised their members not to bring suits for overtime-on-overtime recoveries allowable under the Supreme Court decision. These claims are based on technicalities without any real merit. Collection of such claims would be grossly inequitable as well as ruinous to all industry, particularly the stevedoring industry. For all these reasons the testimony before the committee showed conclusively that retroactive relief along the lines of the Portal-to-Portal Act was fully justified. I believe that a majority of the members of the committee hold the same opinion on this point. However, the committee was unable to act upon the suggestion for adding a provision outlawing such claims because the committee was advised by the Parliamentarian that such provision would not be germane since the bill as originally introduced did not cover the aspect of retroactivity. It is because of this technicality that the committee failed to act on this matter. It was not because of any feeling on the part of the committee that the claims were justified, and their failure to act should in no way be construed as opposition by the committee to protection of industry against such retroactive claims.

In view of the serious threat which these lawsuits hold to the welfare of this important industry, I hope that when the bill is considered on the other side a provision providing equitable relief in this threatening situation will be added.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM].

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I cannot say much in the time allotted, but I would like to give this illustration: Some speakers are calling this penalty time; it is premium time. No one is being penalized, they are receiving a premium for Saturday, Sunday, and holiday work. Say, for instance, a longshoreman works Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, Saturday, and Sunday. He gets regular pay for Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, but he gets premium pay for Saturday and Sunday, and it just so happens that this premium pay is the same per hour as the overtime rate of pay. Now, suppose he continues working the following Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday. Certain elements within the union have said that having worked Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, they were working over 40 hours a week and they therefore should have time and a half for Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, since they were working consecutively more than 40 hours in one stretch.

Mr. Green, president of the A. F. of L., and certain members of the Longshoremen's Union, including their president, have said that it never was intended nor contemplated that this was to be counted as overtime work, that their contract did not so specify and both officers so advised their membership. Nevertheless, a few members of the union have filed suit to collect what they claim are back wages on this type of work. The Supreme Court has ruled that they are entitled to this overtime pay, since it represents work done in excess of 40 hours in any one week. That Mr. Speaker constitutes the only argument there is here between the committee report and what the gentleman from New York is talking about.

This is purely a moral question in the opinion of your committee. If a contract had been arrived at in good faith and all parties to the contract were satisfied and understood it to mean one and the same thing; and then at a much later date someone, anyone, with time on his hands, should discover what he believes to be an oversight in the contract, is this someone justified in filing suit on a percentage basis in behalf of a few members covered by the contract? I am not attempting to answer that question here, nor does this legislation have any bearing on suits already filed. I doubt if we could exercise retroactive jurisdiction over the courts even though we were so minded. The sole purpose in fact the only intent so far as my own position on this particular bill is concerned, is to prevent similar suits being filed in certain industries named in H. R. 858.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 4½ minutes.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I attended the hearings on this bill. I am perfectly frank to say to you that I did not hear one single reason that I regarded as a moral reason for opposing this bill. It was plainly stated to the committee that this bill would enable the longshoremen and the men who had been working under contracts affected by the recent decision of the United States Supreme Court to keep faith with their employers, and would enable the employers to keep faith with them. I recall that at the end of the statement of one witness I made the remark that I just had faith enough in the House to believe that the House would keep faith with both parties.

We have enough trouble in this country where there are differences, and just differences, between employers and employees; but here is a situation in which you are not taking one penny away from the employees who never have regarded it as being a debt due; it is simply on a technicality that someone discovered that they could take something which apparently no one considered is due. This cannot be denied. In addition, we are correcting a situation which will cost the United States public anywhere from a quarter of a billion dollars on up; the War Department told us they did not know how high it would go, they had no way at this time of figuring that.

To me the position of the longshoremen is that they do not wish to change their type of contract and they are not going to change their type of contract. What kind of position would that leave us in? It would leave us in the position of saying to the employer, "You must have so and so in your contract," with the employees saying to us, "We are not going to accept it; we are not going to change our tried and experienced type of contract." Thus we would simply be adding fuel to the fire of labor-management difficulties.

I did not dream there would be any opposition to this bill. I, of course, knew

it was the sentiment of the committee that a retroactive clause should be put into the bill; but when it developed that it would be subject to a point of order on the ground of germaneness, that matter was passed over. But in the hearings before the committee, and they were very complete to my way of thinking, I could not see any just opposition to bring about the very thing that both the employers and the employees were calling for.

Now I will admit there was a group came down from New York and presented their side of the picture, but I confess they certainly did not impress me, and I am inclined to think they did not impress other members of the committee very much, because this lawyer admitted that he had already garnered up some several million dollars, two or three million dollars, of these claims and by some kind of a contract on a percentage basis he naturally was opposed to it. He was the one who testified.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I have an inquiry as to why some provision covering all industry should not have been included in the bill. Would the gentleman care to comment on that?

Mr. BARDEN. I may say to the gentleman that if this bill had been brought out in some other manner than under suspension of the rules I am satisfied that provision would have been included, but this is a rush job to take care of a situation that is before us right at this time. There is no reason in the world why it should not include all contracts and eventually I am satisfied the House will include all contracts.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. If you include all industry you might interfere with contracts already set up. We left that out until the committee had a chance to study the matter further.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. I want to point out that it will be considered in a regular bill. I refer to the matter to which the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] referred. Additional industry will be covered when we bring out the regular minimum-wage bill.

Mr. BARDEN. That is true. As I understand it, there is no real controversy in the committee about the justice, the merit, and the fairness of the type of legislation we are now considering.

The SPEAKER. All time has expired.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred eighty-seven Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 19]

Abernethy	Delaney	Macy
Addonizio	Dingell	Merrow
Allen, Ill.	Dollinger	O'Brien, Mich.
Allen, La.	Donohue	O'Hara, Ill.
Andersen, H. Carl	Doughton	Patterson
Andresen, August H.	Douglas	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Bailey	Ellsworth	Philbin
Barrett, Pa.	Engel, Mich.	Phillips, Tenn.
Bates, Ky.	Fernandez	Powell
Bennett, Fla.	Forand	Quinn
Bennett, Mich.	Fulton	Riehlman
Bentsen	Furcolo	Rodino
Biemiller	Gamble	Sabath
Bishop	Gathings	Scott, Hardie
Bolton, Ohio	Gore	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Bryson	Hand	Secrest
Buckley, N. Y.	Harris	Sheppard
Bulwinkle	Hart	Smathers
Burnside	Hébert	Smith, Ohio
Canfield	Heffernan	Somers
Carnahan	Hoffman, Mich.	Steed
Celler	Jacobs	Tauriello
Chatham	Jonas	Taylor
Christopher	Jones, Mo.	Thomas, N. J.
Clemente	Judd	Towe
Coffey	Kearney	Velde
Cole, N. Y.	Kee	Vorys
Corbett	Keogh	Weichel
Cotton	Klein	Wickersham
Coudert	Lane	Wolverton
Cunningham	Latham	Woodhouse
Davies, N. Y.	LeFevre	Zablocki
Davis, Tenn.	Lichtenwalter	
DeGraffenried	Linehan	
	McKinnon	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 332 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CLARIFYING OVERTIME COMPENSATION PROVISIONS OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WOOD. Under this procedure under suspension is it in order to submit an amendment to make the provisions of this act applicable to all industries rather than to those mentioned in the bill?

The SPEAKER. No amendments are in order under a suspension of the rules.

The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H. R. 858 as amended?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 230, noes 7.

The SPEAKER. So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the bill is passed.

For what purpose does the gentleman from California rise?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. The gentleman has been trying to request the yeas and nays on this bill and I am sorry I was not recognized at the time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized now and, if he so desires, the Chair will withdraw his statement that the bill is passed.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. The gentleman was on his feet requesting the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The bill was passed.

The title was amended to read as follows: "A bill to clarify the overtime compensation provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, as applied in the longshore, stevedoring, building and construction industries."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, House Resolution 111 will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 45 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Rules Committee I call up House Resolution 75 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Education and Labor, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct thorough studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI (1)(g) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, and for such purposes the said committee or any subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

That the said committee shall report to the House of Representatives during the present Congress the results of their studies and investigations with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is identical with the resolution passed by the House last Thursday giving the Committee on Public Lands authority to make studies and investigations. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI], chairman of the Labor Committee, asked the Rules Committee for a rule and it was adopted unanimously, giving the Committee on Labor au-

thority to make studies and investigations not only in Washington but throughout the country.

There is no opposition from any member of the Rules Committee to this resolution, but the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] has requested 5 minutes, which I now yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I cannot refrain from making a comment which I think is relevant to the resolution before us on what occurred a moment ago on the bill that came from the Committee on Labor which excludes longshoremen from the Fair Labor Standards Act. A point of no quorum was strategically made, and it was made for the sole purpose of making it impossible to obtain an automatic roll call.

I just wonder why Democrats do not want to go on record on a labor proposition after they have beaten their breasts in the last campaign telling organized labor how much they are going to fight for it on the floor of this House. Yet we could not even get a record vote. A skillful, strategically skillful, point of no quorum was made at the right time to prevent an automatic roll call and to prevent a record vote.

With regard to the pending resolution, it is nothing new. We had this same resolution in 1947 at the very beginning of the Eightieth Congress that you gentlemen of the Democratic Party so vociferously condemned and which I condemned too. The difference between you and me is that I do not want to repeat what that Congress did, but you are repeating what the Eightieth Congress did and you are repeating it with this particular resolution.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution gives the power of subpena to the Committee on Labor. Do not tell me you need the power of subpena for a study. The power to subpena is the power to destroy.

Why does the Committee on Labor need the power to subpena? We must examine the resolution in the light of the experience of the last 2 years. The Committee on Labor during the last 2 years used this power of subpena to do what? We have seen one-man committees making reports condemning labor organizations throughout the length and breadth of this land. We have seen leaders of labor unions yanked down here to Washington under subpena in the middle of a strike for the purpose of crippling that strike, for the purpose of crippling the legitimate activities of a union.

Oh, you are going to say there is a change in personnel. I do not think that change means much in the light of the fact that this Labor Committee had passed here today a bill taking the longshoremen out from under the protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The issue is fundamental. The issue is that of arming a committee of this House to investigate organized labor and to give that committee the power to subpena. I opposed that in 1947. In the campaign of 1948 I condemned the Eightieth Congress for doing that. I am going to continue to oppose it and stand by what I said to organized labor in the campaign of 1948. The question that now remains is whether or not you are going to stand by your statements that you made to the working people in the campaign of 1948.

This is another test. Let somebody now make another point of no quorum so as to prevent an automatic roll call or record vote. Otherwise, I say, let us go on record, and let us be judged by our actions here. Subsequent events will force leaders of labor to regret having offered little or no opposition to this resolution.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is identical—merely a repetition of the resolution that was passed in the Eightieth Congress. I was a member of the Committee on Education and Labor in the Eightieth Congress, and I admit and believe that the so-called investigations during the Eightieth Congress by this committee were entirely too numerous. Nevertheless, rightfully used, I believe the Committee on Education and Labor can contribute a great deal toward settling and clarifying labor-management disputes by the Congress' extending to that committee the power given it under this resolution.

I have a short excerpt from one of the special hearings that was held in Chicago, Ill., on December 22, 1947, by a special labor committee in the last session, Mr. Kersten, a former member of the committee, was sent to Chicago to hold hearings on the printers' strike. I believe that one witness who testified before those hearings has contributed a great deal for this Congress to consider in connection with the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. This was the testimony of Mr. John O'Keefe, secretary of the Chicago Newspaper Publishers' Association, who went through almost 18 months of a devastating printers' strike in Chicago. Thousands of members of the International Typographical Union, 97-year-old union, have been out of work for a year and a half and are still out of work, caused by the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act. Mr. O'Keefe, representing the publishing employers, gave the following testimony under questioning by Congressman Kersten:

Congressman KERSTEN. Up until now and for a great many years past you had a closed-shop agreement, didn't you?

Mr. O'KEEFE. Yes; we did.

Mr. KERSTEN. How did that feature work out in your previous contracts so far as your closed-shop provision of the contract was concerned?

Mr. O'KEEFE. We never even discussed it. It had been there for years and it has remained there.

Mr. KERSTEN. Did you have any real difficulty with it so far as your union—the ITU—is concerned?

Mr. O'KEEFE. We did not. • • • As a matter of fact, most of the Chicago publishers, or all of the Chicago publishers, I would say, would prefer to continue a closed shop if it were legal.

There was one little piece of testimony that came out by reason of these special hearings that will be very valuable for this Congress to consider in connection with the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KELLEY. I was interested in the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] in which he intimated that the subpena power granted to the Committee on Education and Labor might be used to persecute labor. I believe the gentleman standing before the microphone [Mr. MADDEN] was a member of the Committee on Labor of the Seventy-ninth Congress, when a subcommittee was set up to determine the cause of labor disputes. I had the honor of being chairman of that committee. We had no subpena power. We invited the National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce to send representatives before the committee to testify, and they refused. They refused by saying, "You have enough testimony before your committee that has been accumulated over the years, and you do not need us to testify any more." If we had had the subpena power, they could not have refused.

Mr. MADDEN. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor in appearing before the Committee on Rules stated that he did not intend to use the power given him under this resolution as it was used in the Eightieth Congress, that the hearings would be very limited, and that the expense involved would be about one-tenth of what it cost during the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have yet received no requests for time on this side of the table and desire none for myself.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and nine Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors; the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 331, nays 4, not voting 98, as follows:

[Roll No. 20]

YEAS—331

Abernethy	Bishop	Buchanan
Albert	Blackney	Buckley, Ill.
Allen, Calif.	Bland	Burdick
Andersen, H. Carl	Blatnik	Burke
Anderson, Calif.	Bloom	Burleson
Andrews	Boggs, Del.	Burnside
Angell	Boggs, La.	Burton
Arends	Bolling	Byrne, N. Y.
Aspinall	Bolton, Md.	Byrnes, Wis.
Auchincloss	Bonner	Camp
Barden	Bosone	Cannon
Baring	Boykin	Carlyle
Barrett, Wyo.	Bramblett	Carroll
Bates, Mass.	Breen	Case, N. J.
Battle	Brehm	Case, S. Dak.
Beall	Brooks	Cavalcante
Beckworth	Brown, Ga.	Chatham
	Brown, Ohio	Chelf

Chesney	Jackson, Wash.	Pickett
Chiperfield	James	Plumley
Chudoff	Javits	Poage
Church	Jenison	Polk
Clevenger	Jenkins	Potter
Cole, Kans.	Jennings	Poulson
Colmer	Jensen	Preston
Combs	Johnson	Price
Cooley	Jones, Ala.	Priest
Cooper	Jones, N. C.	Rabaut
Crawford	Karsten	Rains
Crook	Kean	Ramsay
Crosser	Kearns	Rankin
Curtis	Keating	Redden
Dague	Kee	Reed, Ill.
Davenport	Keefe	Reed, N. Y.
Davis, Wis.	Kelley	Rees
Dawson	Kennedy	Rhodes
Deane	Kerr	Ribicoff
Denton	Kilburn	Rich
D'Ewart	Kilday	Richards
Dolliver	King	Rivers
Dondero	Kirwan	Rogers, Fla.
Doughton	Kruse	Rogers, Mass.
Doyle	Kunkel	Rooney
Eaton	Larcade	Sabath
Eberharter	LeCompte	Sadlak
Elliott	Lemke	Sadowski
Elston	Lesinski	St. George
Engle, Calif.	Lind	Sanborn
Evins	Lodge	Sasscer
Fallon	Lovre	Scrivner
Feighan	Lucas	Scudder
Fellows	Lyle	Shafer
Fenton	Lynch	Sheppard
Fernandez	McCarthy	Short
Fisher	McConnell	Sikes
Flood	McCormack	Simpson, Ill.
Fogarty	McCulloch	Simpson, Pa.
Ford	McDonough	Sims
Frazier	McGrath	Smathers
Fugate	McGregor	Smith, Kans.
Garmatz	McGuire	Smith, Va.
Gary	McKinnon	Smith, Wis.
Gathings	McMillan, S. C.	Spence
Gavin	McMillen, Ill.	Staggers
Gillette	McSweeney	Stanley
Gilmer	Mack, Ill.	Stefan
Golden	Mack, Wash	Stigler
Goodwin	Madden	Stockman
Gordon	Magee	Sullivan
Gorski, Ill.	Mahon	Sutton
Gorski, N. Y.	Mansfield	Taber
Gossett	Marsalis	Tackett
Graham	Marshall	Talle
Granahan	Martin, Iowa	Teague
Granger	Martin, Mass.	Thomas, Tex.
Grant	Mason	Thompson
Green	Meyer	Thornberry
Gregory	Michener	Tollefson
Gross	Miller, Calif.	Trimble
Gwinn	Miller, Md.	Underwood
Hale	Miller, Nebr.	Van Zandt
Hall,	Mills	Vursell
Edwin Arthur	Mitchell	Wadsworth
Hall,	Monroney	Wagner
Leonard W.	Morgan	Walsh
Halleck	Morris	Walter
Harden	Morrison	Welch, Calif.
Hardy	Morton	Welch, Mo.
Hare	Moulder	Werdel
Harris	Multer	Wheeler
Harrison	Murdock	Whitaker
Harvey	Murray, Tenn.	White, Calif.
Havenner	Murray, Wis.	White, Idaho
Hays, Ark.	Nelson	Whitten
Hays, Ohio	Nicholson	Whittington
Hébert	Nixon	Wier
Hedrick	Noland	Wigglesworth
Herlong	Norblad	Williams
Herter	Norrell	Willis
Heselton	Norton	Wilson, Ind.
Hill	O'Brien, Ill.	Wilson, Okla.
Hinshaw	O'Hara, Minn.	Wilson, Tex.
Hoeven	O'Neill	Winstead
Hoffman, Ill.	O'Sullivan	Withrow
Holifield	O'Toole	Wolcott
Holmes	Passman	Woodruff
Hope	Patman	Worley
Horan	Patten	Yates
Howell	Perkins	Young
Huber	Peterson	
Hull	Pfeiffer,	
Irving	William L.	
Jackson, Calif.	Phillips, Calif.	

NAYS—4

Durham	Marcantonio	O'Konski
Hobbs		

NOT VOTING—98

Abbitt	Andresen,	Bates, Ky.
Addonizio	August H.	Bennett, Fla.
Allen, Ill.	Bailey	Bennett, Mich.
Allen, La.	Barrett, Pa.	Bentsen
Blemiller	Furcolo	Pfeifer,
Bolton, Ohio	Gamble	Joseph L.
Bryson	Gore	Philbin
Buckley, N. Y.	Hagen	Phillips, Tenn.
Bulwinkle	Hand	Powell
Canfield	Hart	Quinn
Carnahan	Heffernan	Regan
Celler	Hoffman, Mich.	Riehlman
Christopher	Jacobs	Rodino
Clemente	Jonas	Scott, Hardie
Coffey	Jones, Mo.	Scott,
Cole, N. Y.	Judd	Hugh D., Jr.
Corbett	Karst	Secrest
Cotton	Kearney	Smith, Ohio
Coudert	Keogh	Somers
Cox	Klein	Steed
Cunningham	Lane	Taurielo
Davies, N. Y.	Lanham	Taylor
Davis, Ga.	Latham	Thomas, N. J.
Davis, Tenn.	LeFevre	Towe
DeGraffenried	Lichtenwalter	Velde
Delaney	Linehan	Vinson
Dingell	Macy	Vorys
Dollinger	Merrow	Weichel
Donohue	Miles	Wickersham
Douglas	Murphy	Wolverton
Ellsworth	O'Brien, Mich	Wood
Engel, Mich	O'Hara, Ill.	Woodhouse
Forand	Pace	Zablocki
Fulton	Patterson	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Taurielo with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Wolverton.
Mr. Furcolo with Mr. Velde.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.
Mr. Addonizio with Mr. Towe.
Mr. Hart with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Clemente with Mr. Riehlman.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Keough with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. deGraffenried with Mrs. Bolton of Ohio.
Mr. Forand with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer with Mr. Hand.
Mr. Lane with Mr. Patterson.
Mrs. Douglas with Mr. Weichel.
Mrs. Woodhouse with Mr. Macy.
Mr. Heffernan, with Mr. Lichtenwalter.
Mr. Quinn with Mr. Latham.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Corbett.
Mr. Murphy with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Hardie Scott.
Mr. Bennett of Florida with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE FREEDOM TRAIN

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 84) to provide for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train by the Archivist of the United States, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert: "That, as a means of focusing the attention of the American people on a reexamination of their heritage of freedom, fostering the preservation of their liberties, awakening their loyalty to the American tradition, and contributing to citizenship training, particularly of Americans of school age, the Archivist of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to acquire the Freedom Train, and to operate the said train during the period ending July 5, 1951.

"SEC. 2. In carrying out the purposes of this joint resolution the Archivist is hereby authorized—

"(a) to enter into and carry out such agreements with such person or persons, natural or artificial, as may be necessary for the acquisition of the Freedom Train and its equipment, for its operation during the period ending July 5, 1951, and for the disposition of such train and equipment within 60 days after such date; and to make such expenditures, without regard to other provisions of law, as may be required to carry out such agreements;

"(b) to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as he deems advisable without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; to secure services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed $40 per diem for individuals; to accept services and facilities without compensation; and, with the consent of the head of any Government department or agency, to utilize or employ the services of personnel or facilities of any such department or agency, with or without reimbursement therefor;

"(c) to obtain printing and binding without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919, as amended (40 Stat. 1270);

"(d) to purchase or contract for supplies or services (including printing and binding) without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended;

"(e) to obtain and pay for comprehensive insurance coverage, as he may deem necessary, of other than Government property used in connection with the Freedom Train;

"(f) to acquire by gift, bequest, loan, or otherwise, personal property for the benefit of, or in connection with, the operation of the Freedom Train;

"(g) to cooperate with the governments of the several States and their political subdivisions in promoting the exhibition of the Freedom Train;

"(h) to pay per diem to personnel required to travel in connection with the operation or inspection of the train as follows: To civilian personnel at the maximum rate applicable under existing laws or regulations; to officer personnel of the armed services in accordance with section 12 of the Pay Readjustment Act of June 16, 1942, and regulations pertinent thereto; and to enlisted personnel of the armed services a military allowance in lieu of rations and quarters as provided in Executive Order No. 9871, as amended, and regulations pertinent thereto;

"(i) to pay in cash for any services, supplies, or equipment not exceeding $50 in cost;

"(j) to purchase, print, mimeograph, multilith, photostat, or produce or reproduce in any known manner, pamphlets, brochures, facsimiles, or other material pertaining to the Freedom Train for free distribution or for sale, the proceeds of such sales to be paid into, administered, and expended as a part of the National Archives Trust Fund;

"(k) to prescribe such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary for the operation of the Freedom Train.

"SEC. 3. The Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized and directed to provide a security detachment for the protection of the Freedom Train.

"SEC. 4. A commission is hereby created and established, to be known as the 'Freedom Train Commission,' to consist of the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the minority leader of the Senate, the minority leader of the House of Representatives, the chairmen of the Senate and House Committees on Post Office and Civil Service, the Attorney General of the United States, the Librarian of Congress, the Archivist of the United States, and five members to be appointed by the President. The members of the said Commission

shall serve during the period the Freedom Train is in operation, and for 6 months thereafter. Such members shall serve without compensation, but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission. The Commission shall elect one of its members to serve as chairman.

"SEC. 5. The Commission shall advise on and consent to the plans and publicity formulated by the Archivist and submitted to it for exhibiting the Freedom Train, and with respect to its itinerary.

"SEC. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution, not to exceed $2,500,000 for the period ending July 5, 1951."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the Senate amendment?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. There are only two minor changes made in the legislation by the Senate. One of the changes is that the House bill provided a limit on expenditures for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train of $3,000,000. The Senate reduced that amount to $2,500,000, a reduction of $500,000.

The other is a minor one. The House bill, as passed by this body, provides that the Freedom Train Commission should give approval to all plans formulated by the Archivist for operation of the train. The bill passed by the other body provides that the Freedom Train Commission shall consent to the plans of the Archivist which means virtually the same as the language of the House bill. Those are the only two changes in the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Did the gentleman consult in the bringing up of the legislation today with the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I have, and he agrees with me that we should agree to the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KIRWAN (at the request of Mr. MANSFIELD) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Secretary of the Interior, Hon. Julius Krug, or February 2, 1949.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GWINN (at the request of Mr. WADSWORTH) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. Charles Brannon, in New York, on January 31, 1949.

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by a gentleman from Fontanelle, Iowa.

AUTHORIZING REGIONAL AGRICULTURAL CREDIT CORPORATION TO MAKE CERTAIN DISASTER OR EMERGENCY LOANS

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 110 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2101) to authorize the regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, District of Columbia, to make certain disaster or emergency loans and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the Chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield half of that time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]. I now yield myself such time as I may require.

This resolution makes in order the immediate consideration of H. R. 2101, unanimously reported by the Committee on Agriculture. The primary purpose of H. R. 2101 is to remove certain restrictions now in effect on the use of funds of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation so that loans will be immediately available to the farmers and ranchers who have suffered and are suffering unprecedented hardships as the result of storms over a great portion of the Western States. The report of the Committee on Agriculture is an excellent one and, I think, reveals the necessity for this action. The people of that great section of our country have the heartfelt sympathy of every member of this House and we are anxious that every effort be made to assist them in every way possible.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to use anything like the 30 minutes that have been yielded to me. The rule presented to us is the normal rule. I understand there is no opposition to the adoption of the rule. If the rule is adopted, I want to say, however, that I have a certain clarifying amendment to offer to the bill itself.

Mr. Speaker, there are no requests for time on this side and I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2101) to authorize the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, District of Columbia, to make certain disaster or emergency loans and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2101, with Mr. HAYS of Arkansas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], is recognized for 30 minutes; and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUBER].

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, the national winners in the second annual Voice of Democracy Contest for the best 5-minute broadcast scripts on the subject Speak for Democracy, sponsored by the National Association of Broadcasters, the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, and the Radio Manufacturers Association, as a feature of National Radio Week, are today visiting Washington and at this moment are guests in the House Chamber. I am especially proud that one of the winners, Richard Caves, hails from my home district. He is a resident of Everett, Ohio, is 17 years old and a senior at Bath high school.

I feel that we, as legislators, could profit by giving close examination and attention to the essays of these young men, and I take pride in inserting in the permanent RECORD of the Congress of the United States the prize-winning essay of Richard Caves of Everett, Ohio:

The democracy of America has trod a difficult path. Through strife it came into its own and several times since 1775 blood has been spilled in its name. Democracy has stood its trial by fire but now it faces a new test—its trial by jury. Yes, democracy is on trial for its life. The courtroom is crowded, for interest in the case is high. In the box the jury listens intently. Chinese, French, Italians, Brazilians, Greeks, Indonesians, Americans, who will decide upon the fate of democracy.

The prosecutor is summing up his case now. The jurors hang upon his every word. He says that democracy is superficially fine, and idealistically perfect, but a certain human

factor condemns it, for survival of the fittest, rather than cooperation, is still man's deepest instinct. To build the modern, mechanized, mass-production super state, there must be cooperation, and force must maintain it at all times.

Cooperation, not America's strikes and dickering. He goes on to say that the common people are incapable of governing. Rather there must be one ruler who can see the complexities of a modern civilization. So, he says, democracy is outmoded as a form of government. He concludes—how can a man help rule a million others when he cannot rule his own home?

Now, the spotlight switches to you—for you are the attorney for the defense. You are pleading for democracy—on trial for its life. You begin your case by saying that civilization is still a little more than cold steel and columns of figures. You call that little more "humanity." That is, there is something about man which entitles him to happiness and glory more personal than that of nations. Democracy is thus founded on man, the individual, rather than man, the machine.

Man, the individual, who lives where he wants to, does what he wants to, reads what he wants to. Man, the individual, who argues in the corner barber shop against his own government and wakes up in his own bed the next morning. Man, the individual, who through his chosen representatives, makes the laws he lives by. Perhaps man is not the perfect ruler of his nation's destiny, since man himself is not perfect.

It is folly to expect it. He is sometimes lazy in governing, sometimes lax, but his chosen representatives can, through the years, come up with the right answers quite regularly. For in a democracy one man's defects are canceled by another man's virtues, while totalitarianism magnifies one man's faults a million times over.

You've given the jury the facts on democracy, but there is still something they don't know about it—something you yourself cannot classify. Perhaps it's something in men's eyes—democracy buoys up a man's soul, democracy heals over old scars, covers up old wounds. It has moulded the dregs of bitter Europe into a new pattern of righteousness and faith in a flaming ideal.

Somehow, your case for the defense still lacks. You are facing an opponent who is a realist, who puts different values on human life and human enterprise. So you put things real and tangible upon exhibit—great auto factories in Detroit, steel mills in Pittsburgh, rubber plants in Akron, planes in the sky, ships on the sea, coal mines, skyscrapers, the greatest in the world—monuments to democracy.

And though it is naught to take pride in, democracy has won two great wars. There is the realism and the idealism—the case now goes to the jury. If the jury listens carefully, you know the battle is won for democracy.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield briefly to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I am very proud of these boys, one of whom is Charles Kuralt, of the Central High School, of Charlotte, N. C. He is one of the winners. He is just 14 years old, and is son of the superintendent of welfare in our county. He has written a very interesting script, and I ask permission to extend it in the RECORD, and would like for the Members to read it. We are very proud of this young man in North Carolina, and I am especially so because he comes from my congressional district.

We, the people of the United States, the Constitution talking, the United States Constitution, bulwark of the greatest democracy on earth. We, the people, ruling ourselves, running the Government. We the people, 48 States, one Nation. We the people, thousands upon thousands of common men. We made this Nation—a land where anyone, anything, any idea can grow, unchained and free.

Great things have been said and written about this thing called democracy, but democracy is more than a written word or a spoken phrase. It is men created equal. Democracy is very evident. It is written in the faces of immigrants, the people who gave up homes in the old country to try out something new and wonderful. It is written in the very hills and plains that have produced men like Abraham Lincoln. It is written in our lives—our brothers and ourselves, growing up with a chance.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal. That they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—and freedom of thought and speech and from want and fear. Inalienable rights guaranteed in this democracy.

Inalienable right number one is life—something men have cherished from the beginning of the earth, a free life, unfettered by government interference. It's what Americans fought for at Lexington and Bunker Hill and New Guinea and the Solomons. But they were fighting for something more.

Something that we will call inalienable right number two—liberty. That's a big word in the American language—it's the first cousin of another big word—freedom. Liberty is guaranteed in America. It flourishes here as in no other country in the world. The unknown little man mounting to his soap box to speak his piece about how the country ought to be run. The editor of a small-town daily writing as he pleases, condemning or commending the administration freely. The little group of Mormons or Quakers or Jews worshiping God in their own way. The scientist free to search for truth, and the educator free to teach it.

Liberty and freedom and democracy—big words in the language of a people. We take them for granted, they are ours. They build the third inalienable right championed by Thomas Jefferson—the pursuit of happiness. People living everywhere, looking for a good life. People in little towns with funny names, people in the metropolis living beside the water or the highway, looking for a good life.

One people—all races, all stocks. Simple people, but easy to rile up if you talk about taking away their freedom. We know what freedom is in America, and democracy—don't tread on us. It's produced great men—this democratic government, this youngest of the earth's powers—great names like George Washington, and Thomas Jefferson, and F. D. R., and Babe Ruth. And in song and in prose, the men it has produced have expressed their views of the Nation's politics. James Russell Lowell called a democracy a place where every citizen has a chance and knows he has it.

Woodrow Wilson said he believed in democracy because it releases every one of man's powers, and James Pike, putting it into the word of the Louisiana Negroes, said the same thing, in a different way.

"Freedom," he said, "is a patient word, as full of the Fourth of July as skyrockets and roman candles. Freedom is a word, a real showboat word, $8 long and $4 wide."

And so that is my case—I give you democracy—not a word, not essentially a type of government. It is warm rain on Georgia, sun shining on Key West. It's wind blowing over a Texas prairie, snow-capped Massachusetts' hills, the sound coming up from the streets of Manhattan, waves roaring in on California's coast. The names of Michigan and Maryland, of Virginia and Rhode Island and North Carolina. Covered wagons rolled West, with democracy for a dream.

Democracy is a way of life, a living thing, a human thing comprised of muscles and heart and soul. I speak for democracy, and men who are free and men who yearn to be free speak with me.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield briefly to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY].

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I join with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUSER] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] in congratulating the sponsors of this very fine contest.

I wish especially to congratulate Mr. Kerron Johnson, a student at the Wilson High School, in St. Paul, Minn., one of the four winners in this contest.

When we get back in the House I shall ask unanimous consent to extend Mr. Johnson's script in the Appendix.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield briefly to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, one of the winners of the Nation-wide contest "Voice of Democracy" comes from the congressional district which I have the honor to represent. I refer to George Morgan, Jr., of Hutchinson, Kans.

I have had the pleasure of reading the script submitted by Mr. Morgan, and I shall, at a proper time, ask unanimous consent to have the same inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I want to commend the National Association of Broadcasters and cooperating organizations for sponsoring this great contest, which has, in my opinion, done much to stimulate interest in democracy and greater love for our country, and its form of government.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation was established by Congress in 1932, with the broadest possible loaning powers. Under the act of July 21, 1932, establishing the RACC, it was authorized and empowered to make loans or advances to farmers and stockmen, the proceeds of which are to be used for an agricultural purpose—including crop production—or for the raising, breeding, fattening, or marketing of livestock, to charge such rates of interest or discount thereon as in their judgment are fair and equitable, subject to the approval of the Farm Credit Administration.

Note that the only limitation upon the loaning authority conferred by this statute is that loans shall be made to farmers or stockmen, and that they shall be used for an agricultural purpose. Although this was recognized as an emergency-loan program, there was no requirement for certification that loans were not otherwise available to the applicants, nor was there any mention whatever in the statute of the type of security, if any, which should be obtained by the Government in making its loans.

Under this broad authority, more than $331,000,000 was loaned to farmers throughout the United States for general agricultural purposes. By June 30, 1947, almost $329,000,000 of these loans had

been repaid, leaving at that date a net loss on this whole program of only eight-tenths of 1 percent of the money advanced.

The loan authority contained in this bill, H. R. 2101, restricts very sharply the authority contained in the basic RACC legislation. In contrast to the almost unlimited authority originally conferred, this bill limits the authority to make loans to areas or regions where the forces of nature have caused an agricultural disaster, and limits the loan recipients to farmers who have suffered such a production disaster or other economic emergency.

The loan program we are now authorizing will be administered by the same agency which made and collected the loans under the broad basic authority previously referred to. Some of the same men who directed that program will direct this one. It is reasonable to assume that the agency and the men which made loans under unlimited authority so carefully that all but eight-tenths of 1 percent of them have been repaid will administer this emergency program with equal ability and prudence.

On the other hand, we are not proposing to set up here a hard-credit program. The farmers who have suffered the ravages of this winter's storms are, many of them, in a desperate situation. They need soft credit, the kind which the Government alone is in a position to extend and the kind which the RACC was established to extend and did extend for many years under its original loaning authority.

It would not be necessary for the Congress to pass this emergency bill at this time except for restrictions on the RACC loaning authority written into the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act of 1948, which drastically limit purposes to which RACC funds could be put, and incorporated a restriction imposing conditions which would make it impossible to give relief to the farmers in the storm areas under the present law.

Here is the condition imposed by the Agriculture Appropriation Act:

> All loans and advances made pursuant to this section will carry the full personal liability of the borrower (shall be secured by crops or livestock and such additional collateral as is deemed necessary to afford reasonable assurance of repayment) and will be accompanied by a certificate of refusal of the loan or advance by a local bank or the production credit association serving the area.

The language in the appropriation act authorizes loans in "a specific area or region in which the Secretary of Agriculture shall have found that such loans for specified agricultural purposes and for limited time periods are necessary because of economic emergencies or production disasters."

All we have done in this legislation is to continue the same authorization for loans contained in the present act, and to remove the restrictions I have just read to you which would make it impossible to apply the program to the storm areas.

The amount involved in this bill is only about $44,000,000. This may or may not be adequate to do the job and to meet what I consider to be the responsibility of the Federal Government for helping our fellow citizens in the storm areas. With the United States using billions of dollars to help the citizens of other countries who are faced with economic emergencies—an objective of which I thoroughly approve—it seems to me that we can afford to deal as generously with our own farmers as this bill proposes to do.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would like to bring to the attention of the House the fact that the most difficult period as far as we in the West are concerned is ahead of us. Of course, we have lost a lot of cattle and sheep so far, but we are going to have a disaster when the spring floods come and the snows which are in the hills start to flow down. This winter the frost has gotten down so deep that there is very little possibility of the ground taking any of the water off. This means that in practically every Western State there will be an emergency. I strongly urge that the bill introduced by the gentleman from Utah be enacted into law in time so that we can take care of our people out there.

Mr. GRANGER. I thank the gentleman for his fine statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Utah five additional minutes.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. LEMKE. The purpose of this legislation is to help these farmers in the present emergency the same as we have done in the past in connection with floods, storms, earthquakes, and so forth through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, is it not?

Mr. GRANGER. That is right.

Mr. LEMKE. The result of this emergency is of the same nature. It is just excessive snow in the place of excessive rain or water.

Mr. GRANGER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. GOLDEN. Would this be made available to people who suffered a flood disaster and would it permit those individuals to participate in these loans?

Mr. GRANGER. I think it would. This present legislation narrows a little the authority the Secretary had under the original law, but if a flood were great enough in character and widespread enough the Secretary could declare it was an area subject to relief under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. It strikes me that this disaster is not only local, it is Nationwide; it affects the price people will pay for food all over the country. Then, in addition to that, it is a manifestation of that unity that exists among all the people of this country. This is our common country, and, while I live down in a border State, adjoining the South, where we do not have snows and ice like that, we are heartily in accord with the purpose of this resolution and I hope that it passes unanimously.

Mr. GRANGER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. So far mention has been made of excessive snow and rain. Likewise this bill could be made to apply, if it becomes law, to a drought-stricken area if that should prove to be a disaster?

Mr. GRANGER. It could if it were proven to be a disaster and the Secretary would so declare that it was in a disaster area; yes. I do not think there is anything complicated about this legislation; it served a good purpose in the last emergency and will do so in this one.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, just to keep the record straight, the history of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation in making these $400,000,000 in loans has been very satisfactory. These loans have been paid back nearly in full, and it was the only money I know of that Uncle Sam invested that he ever collected at that time.

The situation was changed a little during the war so far as these nonrecourse loans were concerned. They were made for a definite purpose. These soft loans we hear about were made as a means of increasing production at that particular time. The reasoning behind that was that whereas the large operator might be able financially to take care of his own needs, we did have thousands upon thousands, if not millions, of small farm operators who were not in a credit position to extend their production on their farms. That is the reason those soft loans were made during that time, on which there has been some loss. But that has nothing to do with the over-all picture. That was the reason why the organization was criticized, because of the soft loans, even though the Congress itself authorized the nonrecourse loans to be made. If anyone is interested enough to look at the hearings and discussions here on the floor of the House at that time, he can see that it was understood that they were nonrecourse loans, and that they were being made under war conditions, not under normal conditions. Food production was increased.

The loans proposed at the present time under the bill introduced by our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Utah, the Honorable WALTER GRANGER, on the face of it, are not going to be nonrecourse loans. They are going to be loans made with the expectation that the people will pay them back.

These disaster loans apply not only so far as this part of the United States is concerned that is suffering as a result of the weather conditions, snow and rain, and the floods that may go along with them, but I think it should be perfectly clear that this applies in districts that may be subjected to other hazards of nature, like droughts, that have a way of cropping up in certain sections of the country every year.

If you will notice in the report, a little mention is made of the fur-farming industry. This is the organization that is trying to do something, because those people found themselves in an emergency. When $236,000,000 worth of furs were dumped on the fur market of this country in 1 year, 1946, you are liable to cause some dislocation in an industry like the fur industry. This organization today is in a position under this legislation to come to the aid of the fur farmers of this country and they have done so.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. The gentleman, coming from my State, knows of the acute drought situation in northern Wisconsin last year. I introduced legislation similar to this in the last session of Congress, but by the time the Department of Agriculture got to make any kind of a recommendation the special session adjourned and nothing was done.

Can I be reasonably assured that as a result of this bill I need not pursue the passage of my bill, that this will be adequate to extend so-called soft loans to the farmers in drought-stricken areas, if, after the Department of Agriculture makes an investigation, it finds that it meets the specifications of the bill? Am I correct in that assumption?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would say yes, in direct answer to the gentleman's question. I rather doubt if the Secretary of Agriculture would like to have us say that it is a nonrecourse loan when it is made. To be fair I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that during the past few months in his district and all over the State of Wisconsin and many other places in the United States some attempt was made to take care of that drought situation in the allocation of millions of bushels of potatoes in those drought-stricken areas, which, regardless of the potato program, made it possible to feed thousands and thousands of head of cattle. It has been a great help to the people in those particular situations.

Mr. O'KONSKI. That is correct. It alleviated a very tragic situation.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I have received from 5 to 15 letters, from every one of the 38 counties in the district I represent in Nebraska, on this problem of storm losses. There are more cattle in the fourth district of Nebraska than in any other district in the United States. These letters were in reply to my request asking for answers to the following questions:

First. What is the present loss of livestock in your county?

Second. What is the anticipated future loss?

Third. Will financial assistance be needed from some Federal agency, or can the local banks carry the load?

I desire to sum up, briefly, some of the reactions from these letters.

All seemed agreed that the recent storms, beginning in November, and running up to the present time, have been the most severe the territory has ever had. Their over-all losses of livestock in the 38 counties to date will be near 5 percent. There are some individual farmers who do not have available feed, or means of reaching it, who have suffered as much as 40 percent loss. The ranchers, who still had old Dobbin on the ranch, and used him instead of the modern tractors, were able to move feed to the cattle much easier than with the modern equipment. The hay that was piled up in windrows was hard to reach. The rancher who had his hay stacked and was able to reach the feed had smaller losses.

There was a general feeling of satisfaction with the work that the Army and other Federal agencies did in opening the roads. If it had not been for the heavy equipment and assistance from this source, there would have been much heavier losses in livestock and perhaps additional loss of human lives. There was a general note of praise, good feeling, and hospitality toward the men doing this work.

The future losses will depend entirely on future weather conditions. The cattle have lost a tremendous amount of weight. Many are in weakened condition, and a wet, cold storm in March or early April could cause not only a big loss of cows, but a large reduction in the calf crop. It is necessary to feed heavily until grass comes.

There has been a general complaint that the cost of hay and feed has skyrocketed. The cost of hay ranges from 30 to 55 dollars a ton. In many instances it has been difficult to move the hay where it is most needed. Hay has been shipped from as far as Topeka, Kans. The freight rates and other costs naturally add to the expense to the rancher.

It was generally agreed that in most instances the local banks could carry the needed financing. A few letters indicated that the small operator, and the GI who was just getting started, might need some assistance at the Federal level. They felt the local banks might not be able to carry some of this group. These loans should only be made when a local bank is unable to handle the situation. The ranchers and farmers of Nebraska are rugged individualists. They generally solve their own problems at the local level.

Most of the farmers and ranchers were more concerned about the lowering of the price of their livestock and farm products. This has really hurt them far more than the loss from the storm. There is great concern about the price of agricultural products, for what affects the farm prices affects all of us. It has been demonstrated many times that when farm income falls, then the Nation's income falls by a ratio of $7 to $1 for agriculture. If this downward trend in prices of agricultural products continues, it will have a disastrous effect upon our national economy. It looks like the farmer, because of new wage increases, might even pay higher prices for farm machinery, shoes, clothing, and other things he must have. If this is true, he will certainly pull in his horns and not buy anything more than he absolutely needs.

Mr. Chairman, I am absolutely convinced that the decreased income to farmers means decreased business for every one of us. Even in prosperous times, there are limits to what the farm family, which is the largest consuming unit in America, can pay for taxes, labor, manufactured products, and other things he needs for his business.

Mr. Chairman, I understand the $44,000,000 provided in this measure does not call for additional appropriations—that the money is part of the old RACC funds. The evidence shows that the cattle and sheep losses were much heavier in Wyoming, Nevada, and Utah, and that some of the smaller ranchers are unable to get help at the local banks. It is for that reason I support this measure.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. I join with the gentleman in the commendation of the Army since they have been condemned here in Washington by some sources for the things that they have done. I join with him in saying that they have done a remarkable job. There would have been more distress and more disaster if the Army had not moved in as vigorously as they did.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is absolutely right. I have had high praise from every section on the work that the Army did and also what individuals did by pitching in and helping.

They did a great deal, and, if it had not been for them, there would have been much greater loss in livestock and even in human lives.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL].

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, the general purpose of this legislation is pretty well understood, I believe. The storm in the Western States attracted national and even international attention. Some features of this measure, however, are broad enough to cover other disasters in farming sections. Last summer we had a drought in certain counties of western and northern Wisconsin. The gentleman from the Tenth District [Mr. O'KONSKI] has mentioned that disaster on the floor of the House. That drought continues to have its effect on the farmers who are largely engaged in dairying. In the two large districts where they suffered the drought, and in which there was an almost complete failure of the hay crop, there are probably several hundred thousand dairy cows. Ever since last August, the farmers have been buying hay at $30 to $40 a ton in order

to carry the cows through to another season and keep up their production of milk. Unless something is done which will enable the dairymen to meet the situation, some of these farmers, at least, are going to have to sell off their cows and thus will reduce the output of the dairy products in that section of the State. I think certain counties in Minnesota are similarly affected.

This morning I received a telegram which sets forth the situation quite fully, so far as my own congressional district is concerned. I would like to read it into the RECORD. It is as follows:

CHIPPEWA FALLS, WIS., *February 19, 1949.*

CONGRESSMAN MERLIN HULL,
Washington, D. C.

The Wisconsin Farmers' Union, in annual convention at Eau Claire, today voted unanimously for a program which will enable farmers in drought-stricken counties of Wisconsin to borrow money to buy livestock feed to carry their stock through this winter. Said program to apply only to farmers who cannot get credit elsewhere. The situation is desperate and requires immediate attention because hundreds of farmers are running out of hay and credit and cannot borrow money from local banks or any other loaning agency, either public or private. The Farmers' Home Administration which serves this area is unable to relieve the situation because of insufficient funds.

WISCONSIN FARMERS' UNION.

That telegram sets forth the situation quite fully so far as that particular area is concerned.

I think it is time the Congress passed some general act of this kind, not only to relieve the storm-stricken districts of the West, but also to provide for other emergencies which may occur in the future. This bill is broad enough to give the Secretary of Agriculture power to use his various departmental agencies for such relief purposes.

The farmers are not asking for gifts, and are not asking for grants. The sum totals of the loans which they would obtain are small compared to the relief which has been furnished to numerous foreign countries for relief from disaster, and which will never be repaid.

This bill should promptly pass, and the credit facilities it provides for should be immediately made available.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to have for the RECORD a definite understanding as to the coverage with reference to kinds of disasters and emergencies. I have the greatest sympathy, of course, for the tragic experience in the West to which apparently the greater part of this resolution is directed. Recently, as frequently happens to the South, the Southwest, and other sections of the country, there was a tragic and terrible tornado that struck my district in which some 56 people were killed and about 175 or more injured. In Warren, Ark., alone, several hundreds houses were destroyed. In the outlying agricultural area a number of farm homes were destroyed and some people killed, and there were very tragic results. I wish to have the record clarified here as to whether this bill is broad enough to cover the tornado disaster too?

Mr. COOLEY. I assume that if the disaster affects farms or farming, it would be.

Mr. HARRIS. That is what I want to know; if it could be extended to the farmers in the county down in Louisiana who suffered tragic loss because of the tornado and need help, then the Secretary of Agriculture could, after examining the experience, direct that certain funds be allocated to take care of that tragic loss?

Mr. COOLEY. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, in connection with the absolute necessity of their being some available relief to the farmers of my native State of California as a result of the most terrible recent freeze there; I filed in this House House Joint Resolution 155. It was almost identical in text with the bill today before us, H. R. 2101, and I received written communication from the administrative department concerned. So, I am very happy that our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] introduced H. R. 2101 and that it now appears that it should pass this Committee unanimously.

Freezing weather in Los Angeles County, Calif., and other counties in southern California, is literally almost unheard of; so that I wish to urge to your attention and have the record speak clearly that it is the intention of the author of this bill and of the committee in charge thereof, to wit, the Agriculture Committee of this House, that the relief provided for in this bill—H. R. 2101—is also applicable to the needs of the citrus growers and farmers in southern California and also the cotton growers in California and all others engaged in agricultural production who have suffered disaster on account of the forces of nature having caused them to have disaster or emergency losses.

The report of the Committee on Agriculture itself, on page 1 thereof, in paragraph 2, calls attention to the fact that, "since the middle of December, storms of unprecedented fury have swept, one after another, across the Western States from Washington and Nebraska, frequently extending as far south as California, Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas."

This language, therefore, expressly includes the State of California.

And in paragraph 2, on page 2, the same report says:

> There is an urgent and immediate need for credit to be made available to farmers in the affected area who cannot obtain from their present sources of credit the money they need for feed and other farm operations; but who, with such financial assistance, will have a reasonable prospect of repaying their loans.

Then on page 3, in the letter dated February 9, 1949, to the distinguished chairman of our Committee on Agriculture, Charles F. Brannan, Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, in part, said:

> The joint resolution would empower the Secretary of Agriculture to authorize the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., to enter any area or region where the forces of nature have caused an agricultural production disaster and make loans or advances to farmers and stockmen. * * *
>
> This joint resolution would enable the Secretary of Agriculture to make available, through the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation, loans to farmers and stockmen in areas stricken by natural disaster. The joint resolution was designed primarily to make credit available to farmers and stockmen in the western range area * * * and similarly to make credit available to farmers in California and other areas of the Southwest where the recent freeze caused great damage to fruit and other crops.

Therefore, I take it that there is no contradiction of my statement that it is the intention of Congress that the farmers in California, where there has been this great, disastrous damage from the recent freeze, shall be also included in the group who shall have the right and opportunity to make application, so far as they may desire, and can prove their need, to be benefited by the terms of this beneficial bill.

The history of all such beneficial legislation to the people of our country where disaster has held sway from the forces of nature proves that almost 100 percent of such loans are, in time, repaid.

While, naturally, it is to be hoped that the results of the freeze in California are not nearly as extensive as it first appeared, it is, nevertheless, imperative that, to the extent to which Federal assistance and aid may be required, such Federal aid and assistance shall be available to California farmers deserving and needing the same in like manner as Federal aid and assistance is available to farmers or stockmen in any other State suffering disaster from the forces of nature. I feel sure that the farmers of California engaged in citrus culture or any other agricultural pursuit will not ask Federal aid and assistance except in dire need and as a last resort. No doubt the State of California itself will make some reasonable aid available at the earliest possible date; but it is good to have this buttress of additional resources, for those in need, available.

Immediately after the disaster I was appointed one of a subcommittee of the California delegation, in a caucus, to look into the subject matter of ways and means in which the Federal Government might logically and legally assist if the need arose. And this subcommittee of the California delegation, of which I am a member, was immediately active and continuously active in the premises. I immediately got in touch with sources of information in my native State and am pleased to say that my present report is that probably the damage from the disastrous freeze to citrus and other California crops will not be as extensive as previously estimated. However, the nature of the citrus crop and industry is such that the total damage cannot be ascertained, in all likelihood, for many months or even longer.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I am glad this bill is up for consideration today. I favor it, but I am afraid it does

not go far enough, because following this terrible snow disaster in the Middle West and other States the danger of flood is at their doorstep right now. This bill will be of inestimable value to feeders in my district who have lost all the way from $50 to $100 per head in the price of their livestock.

The purpose of this bill is to enable the Department of Agriculture to provide immediate loan assistance to farmers of all types who have suffered from the effects of the unprecedented storm conditions throughout the western United States, as well as to provide basic authority for meeting production disasters or other extraordinary economic emergency conditions anywhere in the United States.

I also take this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to read just a portion of one letter of many which I have received from people in my district who want me to tell the Congress how deeply they appreciate the assistance given them by the Army engineers in the hour of their great peril. This is a portion of one of many letters and it comes from the Reverend Charles J. Oborny, of Verdigre, Nebr. Verdigre is in the heart of the disaster area, in Knox County.

The Army boys are beginning to leave us after having done a wonderful piece of work in this community and throughout the entire blizzard stricken area. Their deeds will never be forgotten; for what they have done to this community and elsewhere shall be passed on to the next generation as a grateful tribute to their inestimable services. They have saved many a life; not only human but also animal.

If it were not for the generous and prompt appropriations made by Congress and Senate, I just fear to think what would have happened to the Middle West. Each and every one in this community is very grateful to you for whatever you have done for them in the most critical situation of life and death.

I read this part of the letter, Mr. Chairman, to indicate to you that there is no reason for the criticism which has been heaped upon the Army engineers, who have done such excellent work in the blizzard area.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I have just returned from Nebraska, and while the area which I have the honor to represent is not in the territory that has been affected the most severely, I want to say that the people resented greatly the criticism made against those of the Army who came in to help the people. They have done a good job, a job that could have been performed by no one else.

This measure before us today should pass. I shall support it as well as other measures to assist those people who have suffered so much. We are apt to have some severe floods, and this Congress should take every step possible to lessen the effects of such floods.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I heard from both sides of the aisle here in this debate something about a soft loan. I have gone through every blizzard we ever had in the Northwest and three dustbowl periods; I have gone through it all and lived at the end of the old Texas cattle trail, where the cattle started from Texas following the Civil War; I have been through it all. I suppose this Congress is doing all it can, but I do want the public to understand that we are not giving the stockmen of the West a windfall. If they get help they shall have to pay for it; they will have to go and make a loan and pay off the loan. Some newspaper accounts report that this Government is about to give the stockmen of the West a windfall or a gift, and that is absolutely untrue. We made those feed and seed loans here a few years ago, and I was one of those who supported the President in that attitude. I was very proud to do so. But, you know, a lot of those farmers lost their farms. They have gone to the towns to work by the day, some of them are on relief, yet this Government has an army of collectors still after those old people to collect the seed loans. I wonder if that is one of the soft loans you were talking abcut this morning?

At one time Congress forgave the Reconstruction Finance Corporation loans to the extent of $100,000,000 on the floor of this House, and at that time I suggested we cancel some of these feed loans where the farmers had been chased off their farms and were living on relief. Do you know what happened to me? I pretty nearly got chased cut of this Chamber because I offered such a proposition. I think it is a good gesture on the part of the Government to make this money available, and that is all you are doing. You are making a certain amount of money available for those people to borrow.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not think the gentleman will ever be chased out of this Chamber by anyone who has a progressive mind, because he is one of the finest and one of the ablest and one of the most courageous, forward-looking legislators I have ever served with. I am proud of the opportunity for the RECORD to show the high regard I have for the gentleman personally and as a legislator. I may say that on many, many dark occasions when I was leading the battle on this side, the gentleman, without regard to his party affiliation, was fighting shoulder to shoulder with me because he was fighting for the interest of the people. The gentleman always fights for the interest of the people.

Mr. BURDICK. I thank the gentleman for those kind words. I hope he cutlives me.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this proposition. I would not oppose it. But I do want to say on behalf of the stockmen of my district that we are not asking for anything as a gift, and I do not want the public to read in the papers that the Congress has given the stockmen all this money. You are not giving them anything. We will take care to pay it back. You say yourself that you have collected 98.2 percent of all loans you made. You expect to collect this, do you not?

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. I certainly expect the United States to collect the loans. As has been said here a time or two, these loans will be made under the same conditions as existed in the original act, which contemplated that the loans would be paid back. There might be security given for the loans or part security, and in other cases the personal note of the individual farmer will be taken. As the gentleman has said, and I do not think it has been mentioned before, this money is available. It is not contemplated that any additional appropriation will be made.

Mr. BURDICK. I think that is right. I just want to correct any impression that this Congress is going to give $44,000,000 away. Of course, that is not very much. There was a time when I did not vote in this House at all unless there was a billion dollars involved. I want the country to understand that we are making money available to these stockmen to borrow. We are not giving them anything.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I listened with great interest to the speech of the gentleman from North Dakota, as I always listen to him with interest. I was also pleased with the remarks of our floor leader in regard to the gentleman's courage. If I were a good football player, as the gentleman himself was years ago, I would want him to run interference for me at any time I was carrying the ball. I too have noticed that the gentleman, regardless of party lines and the presence of this central aisle, has voted for the good of his people, and he has done so courageously. His reply to the floor leader that he hoped the gentleman from Massachusetts would outlive him reminds me of the famous words of Daniel Webster: "Late may you arrive in heaven."

This series of terrible storms has swept over the Mountain States and over the Great Plains region. It swept much farther south than many people realize, so that I know what I am talking about so far as damage done in my own particular State is concerned, which is ordinarily a State of sunshine. Sheep, cattle, and other livestock have been killed. I have listened to several questions being asked as to whether this relief bill applies to other calamities which cut down on agricultural production. It has been explained that it does. The citrus crop has been ruined.

I had a question put to me recently concerning not only sheep and cattle that perished in the snow and blizzards but that wildlife perished too. Deer, elk, and even buffalo died in those storms. I presume there is no provision made whereby we can restock the ranges with wildlife. I wish there were some way of doing that, as do the friends of wildlife out in my part of the country.

Mr. Chairman, I favor the pending legislation, and I will be glad to give it my full support.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, we are now in the eighth week of the most devastating series of storms in recorded history of the Western States. The weather has been below zero most of the time, sometimes as much as 40 degrees below zero. We have had terrific winds which caused ground blizzards that closed the roads and trails as quickly as they were opened.

The statement has been made that in some areas the livestock loss has been 5 percent. That may be true. The information I have from the State of Wyoming is that the loss will be considerably in excess of that. I may say that 5 percent is our normal winter loss, and I cannot conceive that after a period of nearly 2 months of subzero weather, with 40 to 60 inches of snow, that the loss would be only a normal winter loss. My guess is that the loss will be between 15 and 20 percent.

You cannot tell what the loss is going to be today because the cattle and the sheep are in such a weakened condition that there will be continual losses up until the green grass comes. There will be a terrific cut in the calf crop and in the lamb crop, and we are going to lose many of the cattle and sheep that are alive today.

In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, this loan will be repaid in full by the stockmen of the West. The RACC loaned several million dollars in Wyoming some 20 years ago, and every dollar with interest was repaid.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the whole country has a stake in this piece of legislation. Out in the West, we are the people that produce the feeder stock that go into the feed lots of the Corn Belt where the cattle and the lambs are fattened to produce the meat for this country.

We have had terrific losses. Some of the people in my country have incurred so much expense that many of the loans are no longer bankable. The stockmen have had a great deal of difficulty in buying feed. The price of hay has gone up terrifically. It costs from $45 to $55 a ton laid down in town, and it is costing $1 per ton per hour to get it delivered out to the ranches. Sometimes the cost of transportation from the railhead to the ranches is nearly as much as the feed costs in town. So you can see something about what the stockmen are up against.

Just to show you how terrific these storms have been let me tell you the Northwestern Railway, which serves my town, has had its trains in operation from the East on only three different days since January 1. The Union Pacific Railroad, whose main line runs through the southern part of Wyoming, and is, by the way, one of the great transcontinental railroads of the country, has been tied up on two different occasions for nearly one solid week. So this certainly is a disaster. I may say, Mr. Chairman, that I introduced House Joint Resolution 114, which was the first legislation of this character presented during this session of the Congress. The Secretary made his report on this bill, but the bill before us is practically the same as my own, and I am pleased to support it.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. You are not only saving livestock, you are saving people, the farmers, and the livestock raisers.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. That is true. The cattle and sheep that are involved in this area are the breeding stock. They are the livestock which produce the lambs and the calves which in the long run furnish much of the meat to the people of this country. But over and above that, Mr. Chairman, this bill will enable many of our people whose life savings have been jeopardized by the relentless storms of the last 2 months to obtain loans to restock their herds and to continue their operations. Let it be clearly understood they want loans and not grants. They will repay every dollar. I hope this bill passes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, this measure has been rather fully discussed. Apparently it is urgently needed. The bill was unanimously reported by the House Committee on Agriculture, and I hope it will meet with the approval of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Secretary of Agriculture may authorize the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., to enter any area or region where the forces of nature have caused an agricultural production disaster or because of other economic emergency and make loans or advances to farmers and stockmen in conformity with the provisions of section 201 (e) of the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932, as amended (title 12, U. S. C. 1148); and the Corporation is authorized to utilize from the revolving fund created by section 84 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933 (12 U. S. C. 1148a) such sums as may be necessary to make such loans or advances, and not to exceed $750,000 for administrative expenses of the Corporation and the Farm Credit Administration in connection with such loans and advances which amount may be combined for accounting purposes with the administrative expense items made available to the Corporation and the Farm Credit Administration under the heading "Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C.," in the Government Corporations Appropriation Act of 1949 (62 Stat. 1183).

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL: On page 1, line 6, after the word "where", strike out the words "the forces of nature" and insert the words "storms, tornadoes, floods, drought, earthquakes, or other forces of nature."

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to say I am heartily in accord with this measure, because I think it should be approved unanimously by the House. It certainly is much needed legislation and ought to be passed at this time. However, I, for one, am not satisfied with the definition contained herein "the forces of nature."

In 1940, during the Seventy-sixth Congress, I introduced what was then known as the Hall-Hay bill which provided loans for drought-stricken farmers in upstate New York and the Northeast with which to purchase hay and fodder. Yet, when we went down to the Department of Agriculture, we were unable to get a fair definition from Henry Wallace, then Secretary of Agriculture. Nobody in the Department of Agriculture wanted to recognize that drought was a necessary evil and should be dealt with.

Several of the gentlemen here have raised the point about drought. I, for one, want to emphasize the point that they have made. Certainly, we ought to have that included as a force of nature. I think we should take no chances. We ought to see that these various acts of nature are listed. It would be disastrous indeed if the Department of Agriculture, or any of its subdivisions did not recognize that drought or flood or any one of the other so-called disasters, which I have listed were not covered by the measure.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Is the gentleman in doubt as to whether or not a drought might not create an economic emergency?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman certainly is in doubt on the basis of the sad experience my section had from that disaster. The Department of Agriculture did not recognize it as an emergency in 1940. They might not again. Nothing in this bill says they have to. In line with what some of these gentlemen have said here today, they talk plenty about drought and they pointed out that drought may follow the serious storms which you have out in the Middle West.

Mr. COOLEY. May I point out there that floods may follow, but I have never heard the suggestion that drought might follow snowstorms.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Floods will follow storms, and droughts will follow in their wake eventually.

Mr. COOLEY. That is true, but I think it is clearly the purpose of the bill to cover the situation that the gentleman has in mind. I wonder how you can strengthen the bill by enumerating some of the forces of nature and then by inference excluding other forces of nature.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. If the gentleman has any further forces of nature which he wishes to list, I certainly would have no opposition to that.

Mr. COOLEY. We have listed all of the forces of nature.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I certainly want to see these included because tornadoes were mentioned here. Someone else suggested drought, and, again, someone referred to floods. It seems to me that these items ought to be listed. Certainly the Secretary of Agriculture in 1940 paid little attention to an equally

serious situation which we had in the Northeast, where I had asked the Government to lend money for hay which should have been brought into the dairy farms of our section to take care of the tremendous drought that they were then suffering. The losses resulting from the 1939–40 drought were staggering.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. In line 6 we find these words "the forces of nature." Does not the gentleman understand that those four words embrace all of the forces of nature?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Again my answer is, I might understand them, but it may not be convenient or suitable to the desires of some bureaucrat to understand them. We want to make sure they are included here. We have gone through droughts; we have gone through floods and tornadoes and earthquakes; there is no reason in the world why these disasters should not be listed specifically.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. Speaking as a lawyer, may I point out that it is a rule of construction that where you use a general term it is much more inclusive than where you enumerate specific items. And if, having enumerated the specific items, you fail to mention all the items, then it is deemed that those that have not been mentioned have been excluded. Therefore, you would weaken the bill and weaken the effect of it.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. To the contrary, I think it would strengthen it. These five disasters should be listed specifically so there can be no loophole to duck out on them. I hope that the committee will accept the amendment, because these words should certainly be included. I hope the amendment will be approved, because it will materially improve the bill and make it effective, which is what everybody wants.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think the language in the bill is very comprehensive and all-embracing. It refers to all of the forces of nature. The gentleman's amendment is calculated to limit the scope of the bill rather than to broaden it. I agree with the statement made by the distinguished jurist from my neighboring State of Tennessee, because all lawyers know there is a rule which holds that the expression of certain things is ordinarily understood to exclude other things. To limit it in the manner proposed would be rather unfortunate, because it is the purpose of the legislation, as I understand it, to include disasters and economic emergencies resulting from any force of nature.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. BURDICK. I think the gentleman's amendment would be clarified by putting after the words "the forces of nature" a shortage of hay in New York.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Is fire started by nature a force of nature?

Mr. COOLEY. I do not know. I leave it to the gentleman to decide, himself. I am not an expert on the forces of nature.

Mr. MURDOCK. If as the lawyers have said, the language of the amendment would be restrictive, then of course the Secretary of Agriculture could never consider fire started by natural forces as one of these calamities.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Does not the gentleman feel that listing these various disasters will strengthen the bill from the standpoint of future reference to the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. COOLEY. No, I do not think it will strengthen it. I think the legislative history and certainly this discussion clearly indicates to the officials in the Department what we intend by the passage of this legislation.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Is it the gentleman's opinion that they will consider drought and tornado a force of nature?

Mr. COOLEY. If they are of such magnitude as to constitute a national disaster in the field of production, I would say certainly.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Who, in the gentleman's opinion, is qualified to pass judgment on that?

Mr. COOLEY. The Secretary of Agriculture is charged with that responsibility.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. In my experience he did not pass favorable judgment on that.

Mr. COOLEY. I am sorry that the Secretary of Agriculture did not provide the gentleman with free freight on his hay.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Is not the word "emergency" here?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes; and "disaster."

Mr. HARRIS. So it would mean, regardless of the type of economic force that brings on the disaster.

Mr. COOLEY. Absolutely.

Mr. HARRIS. It is an emergency that brings it on regardless of the economic forces that bring it on; is not that true?

Mr. COOLEY. I think that is right.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Most of us who have had some legal training understand the meaning of the phrase "act of God" in law, but here in this bill the phrase "forces of nature" is used. Did the committee at the time they drafted this language have in mind what courts of law have decided as to the meaning of the phrase "act of God"? I can understand an act of God, but an act brought on by a force of nature seems to be rather confusing.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not believe that it is confusing. I think that the forces of nature are controlled by some act of God.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WADSWORTH: On page 1, line 7, after the word "disaster", strike out the remainder of the line; and on line 8 strike out the words "economic emergency" and insert "or an economic hardship arising from such disaster."

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I want it distinctly understood that I do not offer this amendment as the result of the slightest hostility to the objective sought by this bill. I am in complete sympathy with that objective. I realize the terrific damage that has been done and may still be done in the Mountain States, and may be done in any part of the Union at any time as the result of acts of nature.

The language which I desire to have clarified is found beginning in line 6:

That the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation may enter any area or region where the forces of nature have caused an agricultural production disaster—

So far so good—

or because of other economic emergency.

My suggestion is that the phrase "other economic emergency" goes far beyond anything that might be conceived as a disaster as the result of a force of nature. It is going to be almost impossible it seems to me for the Secretary of Agriculture or the administrator of this program to define what is meant by economic emergency. Economic emergency may overtake a region, or indeed a whole nation, although its origin has nothing to do with a disaster coming from an act of nature; it may come from war; it may come from changes in interior economic conditions having nothing to do with weather, or floods, or blizzards, or earthquakes, as has been suggested. My suggestion is that this bill be intended as an emergency measure to take care of these people—and they certainly are entitled to it—and that the language be changed so as to read: "or an economic hardship arising from such disaster."

That in itself would have a broad application, as one or two members have already stated in this disaster that has overtaken the Mountain States. The extent of the disaster may not be evident tomorrow or next month, or even in April; it cannot be measured really in that livestock region until the calf crop or the lamb crop has made its appearance. The danger to these people is not only in the fact that they have lost a good many adult animals, cows and ewes, but that as a result of that loss and as a result of weakening of the survivors in the breeding herds or flocks the calf crop will be exceedingly small. There is your greatest potential disaster, and the disaster comes from an act of nature, and

its effect may be felt clear through next summer on into next autumn; because, unless we are very much mistaken the calf crop and the lamb crop are going to be very severely reduced, and that is the thing those people live on. So my amendment will not in any way prevent them from securing a loan to help tide themselves over the effect, the long-time effect, if you please, month after month, of these acts of nature; but it will make it clear that the Congress in passing this did not intend that it should apply to any economic emergency which might arise anywhere in the country at any time for other reasons completely different from these.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. If this amendment is not adopted it might be that some of this money which is designed to help the people who are suffering out there, as a result of this terrible disaster, might be diverted to something else.

Mr. WADSWORTH. We cannot tell; it depends on who is to interpret the meaning of the phrase "economic emergency" how far he will stretch that meaning. What we are really after is to meet the situation created by disasters caused by acts of nature, and I think my amendment will accomplish that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the basic act under which the RACC's have been operating contains even broader authority than is now contemplated, and there has been no abuse of the broad authority given to the agency. In the law as it exists today we have the very words "economic emergency or production disaster."

The gentleman's amendment would have the effect of striking that language from the law. We only refer to it in the bill now under consideration. There having been no abuse in the past, it is hardly reasonable to suspect that there will be abuse in the future.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I remind the gentleman that the original law was passed in the midst of a Nation-wide depression. There was an economic emergency that had nothing to do with disasters caused by the forces of nature. Those laws were passed in the early thirties.

Mr. COOLEY. No. The original act was passed in 1932, but the language I refer to was added later.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It has been repeated since.

Mr. COOLEY. It was put in first in 1948 by the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Not for the purpose of meeting an emergency such as is intended to meet by this bill.

Mr. COOLEY. It states here:

Provided, however, That the Secretary of Agriculture may authorize the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation to enter any area or region when an economic emergency or production disaster has occurred in conformity with the provisions of section 201 (e) of the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It goes back to the act of 1932.

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Which was passed under completely different circumstances. Since then, may I remind the gentleman, and I ask his pardon for interrupting him, the Congress has enacted a series of acts to protect agriculture from economic emergencies, notably the farm-support program and others. We tried to protect agriculture as best we could from economic emergencies. This bill is intended merely to protect those who suffer from a disaster caused by the forces of nature, and nothing else.

Mr. COOLEY. I think there is no difference between the construction the gentleman places on it and the construction the committee places on it. The economic emergency we have in mind is an economic emergency with regard to production and resulting from some disaster following the forces of nature.

Mr. WADSWORTH. But you go beyond that.

Mr. COOLEY. We go beyond it to this extent, that here we have what we consider to be a disaster in a certain section of the country. When the snow subsides and the floodwaters roll down the valleys and a farmer's production is wiped out hundreds of miles from the snowstorm, he might have an economic emergency in the community in which he lives, and the Secretary, under this broad authority, can move in and make loans.

Mr. WADSWORTH. He can under my amendment also.

Mr. COOLEY. The economic emergency with which he might be dealing might have directly resulted from a national disaster up the river.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. That would apply in California as well. We had a snowstorm which was not comparable to the snowstorm in the Mountain States, nevertheless in California the disaster will be very great. The trees are still in the ground, but we will not know what the snowstorm has done to our citrus crop until the fruit trees begin to bear fruit. There is a place that will completely fit into this bill.

Mr. COOLEY. But if the gentleman's amendment is adopted, it will be difficult for the Secretary to determine that a situation which will exist in 90 days or 6 months from now may be attributable to the disaster.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Exactly, and we will not know in California until our trees bear fruit what the disaster has been.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I think we should all take pride in the record of the RACC. I think it is a very remarkable record. They were authorized to make these high-risk, very hazardous loans, always in an emergency, and though they have loaned a tremendous amount of money the losses were actually negligible. We are faced with another emergency which does not affect my section of the country, yet it is a national emergency. This money is not going to be thrown to the four winds, it is not going to be given away. We are not contemplating any grant. It is only loans. Our information is to the effect that the credit facilities in this immediate section of the country are inadequate at the present time to meet the unprecedented demand.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the issue that has been raised by the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York was one that came up at the time this bill had a hearing before the Rules Committee. At that time there was a very real confusion of thought as to what the bill was actually intended for. The testimony was all directed toward the disasters that have been brought on by nature; but the moment this particular language was questioned, it was very obvious the intent of the Agriculture Committee wished to go far beyond the disasters caused by nature and to set up in this bill economic emergency relief measures entirely apart from the disasters brought on by nature. I think you can find it not only in the language that the gentleman from New York seeks to amend but also in the title of the bill where it is stated that this is a bill "to authorize the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, District of Columbia, to make certain disaster or emergency loans, and for other purposes."

In other words, this is a dual-purpose bill, and I think we ought to be very clear as to what the intent of the Committee on Agriculture is.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not think there is any question about the fact that this is a dual-purpose bill. The thing I want to avoid and which I think the bill does avoid is the necessity of having the Secretary of Agriculture make a determination that the economic emergency with which he is dealing is related to a national disaster.

Mr. HERTER. Then very clearly the intent of this bill goes away beyond the testimony offered before the Rules Committee at the time the rule was requested.

The Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation, as the gentleman knows, is not staffed and is not functioning at the present time. It happens to have in reserve certain money, the $44,000,000 to

which the gentleman referred, all of which it seems to me ought to be made available for disaster relief purposes and not for economic relief purposes. I have nothing but sympathy for taking care of the situation, as has been outlined here today, but I think you are going to have infinite confusion the minute anybody is eligible to apply for a loan under this act as you have it drafted because of an economic emergency. The economic emergency may have been brought about by his own mismanagement.

Mr. COOLEY. Oh, no.

Mr. HERTER. You have broadened the scope of the 1932 act here in the new language you put in.

Mr. COOLEY. I think the gentleman does not fully appreciate the breadth of this program. In other words, the Secretary is not to deal with an isolated farm or an isolated group of farmers in a particular small community, but it contemplates a wide area of such magnitude as to constitute a national disaster.

Mr. HERTER. I fully appreciate that. I am trying to help the gentleman make this amount of money go for that very purpose and not be scattered over an entirely different area which is not really intended by this bill.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not think it will be scattered over a wide area. The purpose of this bill is to lift the restrictions placed upon the RACC functions and finances this Congress recently placed upon it. We have the $44,000,000. We are trying to make it all available.

Mr. HERTER. Clearly this particular lending agency, which was initially created to take care of the economic emergency in 1932, and very properly so, and which had a fine record for recovery of the loans made, was put out of commission because the economic mission for which it had been created no longer existed. For the sake of convenience, to take care of this disaster, it is being revived. It is a matter of convenience to revive it, the shortest way of taking care of this immediate disaster which is facing a great many stock raisers and others who through the forces of nature have been badly injured. What the gentleman is doing is also recreating it to take care of economic emergencies. That should not be the purpose for recreating it at the present time.

Mr. COOLEY. I thought the gentleman stated a moment ago that it was originally the purpose of the RACC to treat with an economic emergency rather than with a national disaster.

Mr. HERTER. That is quite true, but the economic emergency, the over-all national picture, having changed, this particular credit agency was no longer functioning. As the gentleman knows, it has no staff today. It should be recreated only for disaster purposes, and for that I have the utmost sympathy.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I am reluctant to oppose any amendment that might be proposed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] or that might be supported by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER], but it seems to me it would be unwise at this time to adopt this amendment. Of course, the effect of it, if adopted, would be just the same as striking out all the language referring to the economic emergency, because without question any consequence which might flow from a storm or a flood in the way of an economic difficulty would be covered by this bill, if it were within a reasonable time thereafter and could be traced to that cause.

The gentleman from Massachusetts stated that if we leave the language in the bill which is there now we would be broadening the act of 1932. We cannot broaden the act of 1932 because it is just as broad already as the English language can make it.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction there?

Mr. HOPE. Yes, I am certainly glad to be corrected.

Mr. HERTER. The gentleman said I stated it broadened the act. It does broaden the act of 1932 by bringing disaster relief into it. It does not broaden it from the point of view of the economic emergency for which the original act was intended.

Mr. HOPE. I am glad to have the gentleman's statement. However, I still believe that you could in no way broaden the 1932 act because it reads as follows:

> Such corporations are authorized and empowered to make loans or advances to farmers and stockmen, the proceeds of which are to be used for an agricultural purpose (including crop production), or for the raising, breeding, fattening, or marketing of livestock.

I do not know how you could have language that would make the purpose of the loans any broader than that. So we are not broadening the original act but are providing now that where the Secretary of Agriculture finds that there is an area or region where the forces of nature have caused an agricultural production disaster or where, because of other economic emergency, loans or advances should be made, he may go into that region. He is still limited, of course, to going into regions where those situations exist, whereas under the original 1932 act he could have gone into every State of the Union and every county in every State and for any reason he saw fit.

The only reason this proposed legislation is necessary at all is that in the 1948 Department of Agriculture appropriation bill restrictions were put upon the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans under the provisions of the 1932 act. It was also provided in the Government Corporations Appropriation Act for 1949 that not more than $25,000,000 should be available. What this bill does is to do away with those two restrictions. It makes the full $44,000,000 that is now in the Treasury available, and it removes the restrictions upon loans which are contained in the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture. That is all that the language of the bill does in its present form.

It seems to me we are fully justified in leaving the language in the bill. While the primary purpose of the bill is to provide loans to meet situations caused by the forces of nature, there may be some economic situation which may arise in some region which should be relieved in this way.

I am afraid the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Massachusetts are confusing this with price-support programs. There is nothing in this bill that would justify any measures in the way of price support. These are to be loans, not to stabilize prices but to enable farmers to continue in the business of farming, to continue in production. If the record we have had in the past as to loans of this type continues, loans made under this bill will be practically all repaid, because over 98 percent of all the loans, amounting to over $400,000,000, which were made under the original 1932 act have been repaid.

These will not be conventional loans. They cannot be handled by regular financial institutions. That does not mean they will be poor loans however. It simply means that they may have to be made on different terms and for longer periods of time than would normally be the case. If they are made wisely, as I think they will be, they will not only enable farmers to keep in production but will be good loans from a repayment standpoint.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me this language should be left in the bill. I realize the suggestions of the gentleman from New York come with a great deal of force, ordinarily; but in this particular instance, I think this law ought to be broad enough and I believe it is in view of the present language being in the bill, to cover insect infestations. For instance, out in the West we sometimes have disasters caused by harmful insects covering great areas. There cannot be anything more disastrous than to have green bugs eat up the wheat. There cannot be anything more disastrous than to have boll weevils and boll worms eat up the cotton. Those are by way of illustration. There are many economic emergencies that might be caused other than by forces of nature.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Does not the gentleman believe that infestations of grasshoppers and these other insects would be a force of nature?

Mr. MORRIS. I am afraid they might not be so classified. Therefore, I think this clause ought to be left in because I think "forces of nature" might be confined by some one interpreting the term, to windstorms and floods, lightning and things of that kind, and as the gentleman on my right, some few minutes ago, suggested, acts of God, or things called acts of God, in law. I believe that such might alone be defined as forces of nature which would therefore leave out chinch bugs, boll weevils, green bugs, and some of these harmful insects. Quite often those insects out in the West become our greatest enemies and do more damage and destroy crops more completely than floods, windstorms and droughts.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. May I point out to the gentleman that the language we are now dealing with came into the law for the

first time during the Eightieth Congress. Up until that time, as was pointed out by the gentleman from Kansas, the authority was just wide open and there was really no limitation placed upon it. But the language we are dealing with now was brought into the law in 1948 in the nature of a limitation. Certainly there is no reason for us to remove it now when it has been in the appropriation bill since that time. I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be defeated.

Mr. MORRIS. I hope so too, Mr. Chairman. I believe it will be dangerous for us to eliminate this language, and I really believe that those who might need it most might be deprived of the loan set-up here, should the language be removed. I believe that many agricultural disasters might occur in this nation which could not be honestly and truly classified as having been caused by a force of nature where we would be happy to make loans and relief available, yet we would be powerless to do so should we remove this language.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to make any remarks on this bill nor on this particular amendment, but there are a few things which I believe we should emphasize before closing debate on this amendment.

First, we should consider why this bill is before us this afternoon. I know that several Members have given you the details concerning this most devastating and critical storm in all of the history of the West and Northwest. In the memory of no living person has such continued blizzards and subzero weather been recorded in the entire history of the West. It is a most critical catastrophe in any man's language.

In a little time I can give you a few of the details of that most terrible storm where people were within 300 yards of food and could not get to it; where they were close to water but it was impossible to find it. The storms did not stop as they usually do after 12 or 24 hours, but they continued. Storm followed storm, in regular cycles. It seems to me that on almost every week end, on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday, there was another blizzard reported in that territory. Certainly the farmer or the rancher or the producer of great flocks of sheep and cattle in this stricken area deserves attention from those who can assist him. Our hearts should go out to every one of them. Stock producers in this storm area find themselves in financial difficulties. Banks in some of these localities are loaning up to the limit—but additional financial assistance is needed. One producer testified before our committee that it took 10 cents per sheep a day for hay alone to feed a certain flock of sheep. If you have 3,000 to 10,000 head of sheep and are paying 10 cents per day to feed each sheep, I wonder how many days a Congressman's salary would supply the necessary feed. We must consider the type of farmers for whom we are asking this legislation. Here is a bill which says nothing about starting a man in the farming business. Here is a bill which says nothing about a farmer investing or going into some type of farming wherein he can make a great deal of money for himself. No. Here is a bill which says the Government of the United States shall make a constructive financial effort to ease the present burden off their backs. And why? So that they may continue on in the business that they have been in all their lives. The flocks of sheep that they have husbanded for years from which comes 70 percent of the wool produced in the United States. The cattle producers in a half dozen states, all are critically affected by this great storm or series of storms.

Mr. Chairman, the cattle and sheep producers of this stricken area are not requesting a single dime as a hand out, not a single penny for feed. But the funds they need are for financial assistance that allows them to refinance the farming or stock-growing operation of ranches they now own—business hard hit by these continuous storms. This bill does exactly that.

The administrative features of this bill are the result of all the experience we have had in administering agricultural emergencies for the past 15 or 20 years. We have gotten away from the idea that we cannot put the responsibility on the Secretary of Agriculture. Let us remember this. Many Members on my side of the aisle have found fault because we could not put our finger on the person who was to blame for bad administrative policies. If this bill is not administered correctly we know immediately where to place the responsibility.

I am sure no one is going to talk about the need for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. We discussed that from every angle in our committee, and decided that we did not need it and did not want it. Let us not be arguing over the meaning of words. Let us leave the language in the bill as it is and pass the bill as our committee presented it to you this afternoon. There should not be a single vote in opposition to this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WADSWORTH) there were—ayes 15, noes 52.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments? [After a pause.] There being no further amendments, under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HAYS of Arkansas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2101) to authorize the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., to make certain disaster or emergency loans, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 110, he reported the same back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement by Mr. G. L. Nellis.

Mrs. DOUGLAS asked and was granted permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in five separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. McCARTHY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include the radio script written by Kerron Johnson, of St. Paul, Minn., one of the winners of the radio contest I Speak for Democracy.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in four separate instances and in each to include excerpts.

Mr. HOPE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a radio script written by George Morgan, Jr., of Hutchinson, Kans., one of the prize winning essays under the I Speak for Democracy contest conducted by the National Association of Broadcasters.

SPECIAL ORDER TRANSFERRED

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I have for today may be transferred to Thursday next following such special orders as may have been entered heretofore for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes on Thursday next following any special orders heretofore entered for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

RECKLESS MINORITIES IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, with the consent of those Members who have special orders for today, I ask unanimous consent to address the House at this time for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I read yesterday in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks of colleagues about the difficulties which a certain minority of Latin-American countries are creating for all Latin-American countries in their expectations of help for development through point IV of President Truman's inaugural address.

I wish to go further and to be even more frank and vigorous concerning the unfortunate impression about all Latin-American investment that is being given

over our Commonwealth of Massachusetts and over New England by the treatment certain extremists in the Government of Guatemala are attempting to give the United Fruit Co. It is unfortunately true that in the minds of the American taxpayer and voter Latin-American countries are all one, and the reckless actions of a few can have an incalculable effect in raising doubts in the mind of the United States about assistance for all. What I am saying I say as a sincere follower of the good-neighbor policy of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, only to warn that point IV, like good-neighborliness, is, in the language of Secretary Acheson, a two-way street. It would be a pity if the persistent actions of an unthinking minority in any particular Latin-American country gave the American people an impression that good-neighbor relations with Latin America generally were not a two-way street and that Latin America generally was not a two-way street for the application of point IV.

In explaining point IV, Secretary of State Acheson recently made two observations which I hope my good Latin-American friends did not miss.

He said, speaking of the President:

> The President pointed out that insofar as his program is successful and insofar as people in less developed areas acquire skills they may also create the conditions under which capital may flow into those countries. He did not say this was to be governmental capital and indeed if the proper conditions are created the reservoirs of private capital are very great indeed. He pointed out that these must be two-way operations. * * * There is in many places a failure to understand that unless the conditions are created by which investors may fairly put their money into that country then there is a great impediment to development. It is no solution to say, "Well, the private investors don't do it therefore government must." So he pointed out that it must be a two-way street. * * * The President pointed out that we are willing and anxious to work with every country that wishes to really enter into a cooperative system with the rest of the world to this end and with every country that wishes to help other countries to develop.

The New England investor has made a specialty of Latin America. The figures of the Department of Commerce show that over 90 percent of New England's foreign investment is in Latin America. A large portion of that is in the United Fruit Company, one of the largest companies operating out of Boston. On the day after the President's message the people of Boston were naturally proud when the New York Times of January 26th pointed out the United Fruit Company as a particularly good example of the export of American technological skill in the development of under-developed areas of the earth. The people of New England know something of the way in which this particular company has exported American agricultural and engineering skills of the highest order to create new agricultural land where there was nothing before but jungle, and to build crops and wages and livelihood where there could be none without American advanced technology. Thinking in terms of United Fruit Company made us see the feasibility of point IV in Latin America in terms of our own experience and knowledge.

It is therefore with real regret that those of us in New England who would like to be good neighbors of Latin America in the application of point IV have heard of the regrettable and what seems to us foolish tactics of a minority of reckless agitators in the Guatemalan Government in trying to penalize this fine company for being American.

Apparently about a year ago this reckless minority managed to arrange a coup in Guatemala by which all companies were divided into two classes. The American United Fruit Co. was put in one class and all Guatemalan companies in the other class. Then a whole series of discriminatory conditions were imposed upon the operations of the American corporation because, representing American technical skill and success, it employed more workers and gave more livelihood than the Guatemalan corporations. The company responded that it was perfectly willing to abide by all laws of Guatemala that treated American companies in the same way as Guatemalan companies were treated. But it protested being singled out for discrimination.

The American State Department backed the company's protest to President Arevalo in Guatemala. President Arevalo, I understand, himself advised the United States ambassador that the law was obviously intentionally discriminatory; that he, the President, thought it was a machine gun aimed at the head of the United Fruit Co., and that he, the President, agreed that the discrimination should be removed, and that he would do everything possible to effect its removal. Those assurances I understand have been given the State Department many times in the last few months. But President Arevalo who is trying to do the right thing is not as strong in his own country as the vigorous Communist agitator Lombardo Toledano, who having fallen out of power in his own native country of Mexico, is now in Guatemala directing this attack on American companies in Guatemala.

I have no doubt that the better elements in the Guatemalan Government will prevail and that Guatemala will eventually again treat Americans doing business in Guatemala on the same nondiscriminatory basis as we would treat Guatemalans doing business in the United States.

But I do wish to point out to our Latin-American friends that while this foolish extremist agitation goes on for only a temporary period, it can do permanent harm. A generous nation like the United States which has given more economic assistance to other nations than ever was previously dreamed of in the history of man, is always doing its own soul-searching whether its policy of generosity is practical wisdom—or whether its hand that feeds others will eventually be bitten. And to speak frankly it has been disappointed, by and large, in the results in the economic assistance it has already given Latin America. Under these circumstances the reckless actions of the group of Guatemalan agitators who are trying to prevent President Arevalo from carrying out his stated intentions to do nondiscriminatory justice by American technical skill can have repercussions of distrust and suspicion beyond the immediate importance of the incident, for all Latin-American assistance.

By President Truman's own test that "we are willing and anxious to work with every country that wishes to really enter into a cooperative system with the rest of the world," the Government of Guatemala at its best has not been particularly cooperative. Guatemala has made particular difficulty for the United States in all the attempts of the United States to bring concord and economic cooperation between the nations of the Western Hemisphere. Members of the Guatemalan mission made difficulties at the Rio Conference. They also made difficulties in the Bogota Conference. They have undone a great deal of the efforts of better-intentioned Latin-American governments to bring a feeling of the feasibility of economic cooperation between the United States and its sister Republics to the South.

I am glad that some Members of the Congress have spoken out, and in a cautious degree said what is really on our minds. If Latin America is to expect benefits from point IV it will have, as Secretary of State Acheson implied, to set its house in order in the treatment of American technology which we have already sent to assist the development of that continent. It is the concern of other Latin-American nations even more than it is our concern that incidents like that going on in Guatemala today do not come to represent in the American mind a typical Latin-American situation proving that nothing Latin American really qualifies as a two-way street down which the benefits of point IV may move.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 25 minutes.

VETERAN HOUSING PROGRAM IS DEPENDENT ON REACTIVATION OF GI HOME LOANS

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Eightieth Congress failed to pass the legislation necessary for a successful housing program.

It is my sincere hope that the Eighty-first Congress will speedily correct this failure by enacting an over-all housing program which will serve the needs of all the people in the United States who desire to purchase a home or to find adequate rental facilities.

There are three main groups of people who need homes, and, in my opinion, each group requires special legislative approach to its specific problem.

The first two groups are the veteran and the nonveteran who are financially able to rent or buy a house. The third group is composed of both veterans and nonveterans whose annual income is too small to enable them to buy houses at today's inflated prices or to pay today's rents on rental units—rents which are enough to yield a fair return on the investment.

I want to reiterate what I said before—that the legislative approach to the needs

of the three groups requires special consideration. Also I feel certain that this Congress will enact the necessary legislation to meet every demand for shelter, and each demand presents a problem of its own.

In order to concentrate on one facet of the housing problem, I have introduced H. R. 1324, which is titled "Veterans' Home Loan Act of 1949." This bill was drafted primarily to center the attention of this Congress upon the fact that today it is almost impossible for a veteran to secure a home for himself under the terms of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, commonly known as the GI bill of rights. H. R. 1324 provides the machinery for a veteran to buy a modest home under properly financed and adequately amortized monthly payments. It is important that this bill be passed, or that its principles be embodied in the administration's omnibus housing bill. It is the duty of this Congress to solve—and the people expect us to solve—the housing problem as quickly and expeditiously as possible.

Since I believe that the veteran's problem is of paramount interest, I shall therefore confine my remarks to H. R. 1324—its meaning, its objectives, and the conditions which, in my opinion, justify its consideration.

There are four major objectives which will be accomplished by this bill. They are:

First. The creation of a full secondary market in the Federal Government for all loans guaranteed under the GI Act. The Federal Government should back unequivocally any veteran's loan guaranteed by it through the Veterans' Administration at any time. It should put the stamp of approval on its guaranty of veterans' loans and thereby remove the fear of lending institutions that, if they engage in a full GI home lending activity, they would be caught short when they find it necessary to dispose of some of these loans in order to obtain adequate funds for a continuing lending operation. H. R. 1324 would increase the authorized funds of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiary, FNMA, by approximately a billion dollars. This is not an addition to the expenses of the Federal Government in carrying out its duty to veterans, because the net result will be that the RFC will actually make money on any loans that it purchases rather than take a loss.

Second. The bill establishes an interest rate on GI loans which would be acceptable to investors and savings holders under the present-day conditions of the home-loan market. The creation of a proper interest rate would arm the veteran with more than a mere hunting license when he approaches a lending institution for the loan benefits under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. The rate should be adjusted immediately to 4½ percent if we are to attract private money into the veterans' building program.

I do not believe that a ceiling nor a floor should be set for the interest rate, as we all know that the money market fluctuates according to economic demands. To meet this situation this bill provides that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be required to adjust, up or down, the interest rate to the extent necessary to keep in line with the prevailing mortgage interest rate. The veteran must not again be left out in the cold because of an unrealistic interest-rate limitation.

Third. H. R. 1324 extends the maximum term for the amortization of the loan from 25 to 30 years. This simple change will lower the monthly payments the veteran would have to make on his home, making a home possible to the veteran with lower income. It would also offset the increased monthly cost to the veteran resulting from an adjustment on the interest rate from 4 to 4½ percent.

Fourth. I believe that the elimination of second mortgages on GI loans guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration will lift from the veteran the burdensome yoke of dealing with two different lenders and as a result, paying the increased costs, an increase of 11.2 percent on the total interest payments, closing charges, and loss of gratuities guaranteed the veteran under the GI bill of rights.

In further support of these objectives, I want to present the following information.

1. FULL SECONDARY MARKET

The lack of a full secondary market in the Federal Government for loans insured under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act has been largely responsible for the very serious and alarming decline in the GI home loan program.

An analysis of the past and present volume of the veterans' home loans guaranteed under the GI bill of rights clearly indicates the necessity for restoring in the Federal Government a secondary market for this mortgage paper. During December 1948, home loans guaranteed by the VA were approximately one-half of those for December 1947, 1 year earlier. Of even greater significance is the fact that loans in December 1948 showed a decline of 63 percent from those guaranteed during the peak month of October 1946. It is to be noted also that in December 1948 loans dropped off 11 percent from the number in the previous month of November 1948.

The present law restricting the purchase of GI loans by FNMA limits such purchasers to only 50 percent of those loans made after April 30, 1948, and in an amount not exceeding $10,000 each.

It is necessary to restore a full secondary market for VA home loans such as existed in the RFC up to June 30, 1947, when this authority to purchase such loans was abolished by the Eightieth Congress. VA records show that its home-loan guaranties commenced to drop after June 1947 and are continuing to do so at the present time.

Operations of FNMA since it was authorized by Congress, in 1948, to purchase loans of less than $10,000 made since April 30, 1948, reveal that only a small percentage of the available funds in FNMA have gone into the purchase of such GI loans.

There need be no fear that all outstanding GI loans will be rushed into FNMA for purchase.

Its record of purchases of such loans by the Federal Government, even including the period when there were no limitations, shows that this just will not happen.

Out of approximately $8,000,000,000 of GI loans that have been made, only $152,000,000 have been purchases, representing only 1.9 percent of the total. Moreover, by comparison, out of $15,000,000,000 of loans insured by the FHA, which the RFC was authorized to purchase, only $710,000,000 have been bought, representing only 4.7 percent of the total.

Of even more significance is the fact that of the VA loans purchased by the RFC, they still hold $141,500,000, representing 93 percent of those purchased.

Of FHA loans purchased, they still hold only $189,000,000, representing only 26.6 percent of the total purchased.

Further, there should be coupled with this record the fact that original lenders are not able, on a sound basis, to empty their portfolios of such loans and still maintain full investment necessary to their earning requirements. Moreover, regardless of the volume of such loans purchased by the Federal Government, it must be kept in mind that the establishment of a full secondary market releases funds to increase the volume of operations of lenders in the home-building field, which will materially assist the veteran to acquire his own home. Also, it is only reasonable that the Federal Government should stand behind loans guaranteed by it, in order to assure necessary confidence in such loans.

As pointed out heretofore, it is not necessary to appropriate funds to be used for expenses in order to fulfill this obligation to a veteran. It is a matter of record that mortgage loan operations of the Federal Government have actually made money, rather than lost money. GI loans bear a rate of interest far above what it costs the Government for money.

At a time when production of high-priced homes is proceeding at a record pace, it is found that the veteran fails to get a break in acquiring his own home. Mr. T. B. King, Director, Loan Guaranty Service, Veterans' Administration, has told the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs:

> The veteran today is not a very favored fellow in the immediate housing picture.

Recently, Mr. King has further summarized the situation as follows:

> Another principal cause of difficulty in making VA home loans has been the lack of a secondary market. For more than a year prior to the passage of Public Law 864 last July, no Government market for GI loans was available. During this period, furthermore, the private secondary market for GI paper virtually disappeared. As a result, many lending institutions which had cooperated wholeheartedly in the GI-loan program found their portfolios full and could not make additional GI loans unless some kind of secondary market was available. It had been hoped that the new secondary market, established by the Congress in July and altered by Public Law 901 in August, would furnish additional incentive for lenders to make GI loans. But because of the limitations which the act itself features, it is questionable whether the new market, over the immediate future, is likely to exercise more than a moderately favorable effect in

making more GI loans available to veteran home buyers.

II. ADJUSTMENT OF INTEREST RATE

While approximately one and one-third million veterans of World War II have been able, under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, to acquire their own homes, there are millions still seeking homes who find that the law as presently administered gives them no assistance. They are unable to find loans at the present maximum rate of 4 percent interest.

Thus, these home-ownership benefits promised the veteran by the Federal Government in 1944 are now practically denied to him.

The present unrealistic rate, coupled with the lack of a full Federal secondary market, are the two major obstacles to the veterans' getting a home loan under the benefits of the GI Act.

The interest rate must be adjusted immediately to bring it in line with the present mortgage-loan market.

Although the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs was given authority by the Congress to adjust this rate to a maximum of 4½ percent, he has, after several months' delay, seen fit to take action against such adjustment, and has given practically no facts based on the mortgage-loan market, on which he based his decision. It is, therefore, necessary that the Congress set a definite interest rate at this time and, for the future, require the Administrator to make quarter-annual surveys of the prevailing interest rate in the mortgage-loan market and take appropriate action with regard to adjusting the rate upward or downward. This must be done in order to make sure that the veteran will not be left out in the cold again because of an impractical interest rate, and in order to assure that if a lower interest rate becomes feasible the veteran will have the backing of the Federal Government toward getting such lower rate.

The reasons why loans at the present interest rate of 4 percent are not available are as follows: Most lending institutions have cooperated in making these loans, to the extent of some $8,000,000,000, at the present rate. Now many of them, particularly the small ones, find that their portfolios are filled with loans at this presently low rate of interest and, therefore, they cannot absorb any more in the face of substantial changes in the rate of yield on investments and generally increased rates of interest. The over-all cost of attracting savings for the purpose of investment has greatly increased. In this connection, Mr. T. B. King, Director, Loan Guaranty Service of the Veterans' Administration, has stated:

Increasing numbers of lending institutions indicate their unwillingness to make GI loans at 4 percent. Yields on investments alternative to 4-percent mortgage loans, such as government and corporate bonds, have risen very noticeably since the summer of 1947 in spite of a slight and temporary decline during the early months of 1948. At the same time, lenders are cool toward the continuance of diluting net earnings by further commitments at the 4-percent rate in the case of reported increased costs of doing business together with the desire to maintain current interest or dividend rates. These developments, coupled with the opportunity of lenders to make FHA and conventional mortgage loans at interest rates of 4½ percent and higher, have made lending institutions more and more reluctant to invest in lower yield GI loans.

Increases in the rate of interest on various investments are due in large part to governmental financial policy.

The increase on United States Government Bonds from January 1946 to September 1948 was 10.9 percent, and on Treasury Bills, 190.7 percent.

Generally speaking, the percentage of increase in investment yield has increased far more than that which would result if the interest rate on GI home loans were adjusted from 4 to 4½ percent.

It is to be noted also that the present increase in mortgage rates generally prevailing will probably be long-range, with little hope that the increase will be temporary. There is no historical precedent for a sustained 4-percent rate on home loans. Money is a commodity, and its value will seek its own level in a competitive market where supply and demand control. To say the least, the veteran cannot enjoy the benefits under the GI Act if he is unable to obtain a loan, and he cannot get a VA guaranteed loan unless he is allowed to pay a rate which will attract savings funds. It is proven that he is unable to obtain such loans by referring to the figures given previously, showing the serious decline in the number of GI loans.

Granting that the adjustment of the interest rate to a more realistic level would put the veteran in a better position to get a home during this record building period, how would it affect him financially?

From a study sent out in August 1948 by General Carl R. Gray, Jr., Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, there is an answer to this question. The study said:

While it is true that an additional one-half of 1 percent interest would raise financing costs to the veteran by about $2 a month in the average case, it is important to note that the GI loan will still cost the veteran less than will FHA-insured loans at 4½ percent interest under the National Housing Act. Because of the additional cost to the borrower of the one-half of 1 percent annual insurance premium payable by the borrower for FHA-insured loans, both veterans and nonveterans pay an equivalent of 5 percent for FHA financing.

Then, too, there are a number of other advantages of a GI loan, aside from a lower interest rate. The veteran, of course, receives a gratuity payment equal to 4 percent of the amount guaranteed. Other important advantages are (a) the veteran pays no premium or brokerage fee for the GI loan; this reduces closing costs in many cases by as much as $100 below conventional and FHA loans, and (b) the veteran may make prepayments at any time without penalty. Other penalties and closing costs are scaled down or ruled out by regulations.

In other words, even at 4½ percent, GI loans would still offer lower financing costs to the veteran, and in addition, would continue to offer him a number of other advantages which a borrower usually does not enjoy under the terms of an FHA-insured or conventional mortgage loan.

Increasing the rate to 4½ percent would also have the healthy effect of curbing the steady upward trend in the number of second-mortgage loans guaranteed by VA in conjunction with an FHA-insured first-mortgage loan, since lenders would be encouraged to make straight first-mortgage GI loans under section 501 of the GI bill. In recent months the proportion of VA-guaranteed second-mortgage loans has climbed to over 25 percent. This form of second mortgage financing, while attractive to lenders because both the FHA-insured first mortgage and the VA-guaranteed second mortgage are 100 percent insured and guaranteed, is costlier to the veteran than straight GI first mortgage because of the one-half percent premium payable on the FHA-insured first mortgage, and the other factors commented on above.

In a press release of January 3, 1949, General Gray pointed out that now 37 percent of all loans guaranteed by the VA carry the higher type interest rate on loans of the VA-FHA type, involving an interest rate of approximately 4.87 percent, thus forcing the veteran, even on this type of Government combination loan, to pay 0.37 percent more for his home loan than he would be required to pay on a straight GI loan at 4.5 percent. Figures from General Gray's own department show that 41 percent—not 37 percent of the veterans buying homes today are forced to buy FHA-VA instead of straight VA.

Back in the month of October 1946, the peak month of all home loans guaranteed by the VA, less than 2 percent of the total were of the higher interest rate bearing combination FHA-VA type. Now it is known that over 41 percent of the total veterans getting any home-loan benefits under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act are having to take on this high-cost combination type loan.

There is simply no sense in continuing to force the veteran who wants to buy his own home to pay this higher cost for his loan.

I personally believe that veterans who have become acquainted with the present-day situation accept the need for an adjustment in the interest rate, in order to give the veteran a fair break in getting himself a home. None of the major national veterans' organizations have taken action in their official national conventions, since the Administrator was given authority to adjust the interest rate, opposing his establishing the maximum rate at 4½ percent. On the other hand, one major organization, in its last national convention—1948—voted to accept the increased rate as necessary to the continued effective operation of the GI home-loan program.

The statement has been made frequently that veterans are priced out of the housing market. While every effort should be made to bring down the cost of homes to veterans, it is only natural that low-priced homes have disappeared, along with nickel bus rides. Nevertheless figures obtained from the Veterans' Administration show that the average price paid for a home during the year ending May 1948, under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, was $7,600. This situation is to be compared with our present-day volume employment and high increased earnings. Moreover, in order to provide more homes for veterans, it must be made easier for them to purchase homes, thus giving encouragement to the basic American desire to own a home.

Another proposal in this bill extends the term of the mortgage to 30 years. This would actually lower the monthly payments of the veteran to a figure less than that which he must now pay on a 25-year loan at 4 percent.

Every factor leads to the conclusion that the mortgage loan market now demands an adjustment in the interest rate, and provision should be made for the future for mandatory adjustment upward or downward, as prevailing interest rates require. This formula will insure an uninterupted building program.

III. EXTENDING MAXIMUM TERM

It would be economically sound to extend the term of amortization of a GI loan from the present maximum of 25 years to a maximum of 30 years, thus reducing the monthly cost to the veteran. Precedent for the 30-year term for home mortgages is already established in the National Housing Act, and is therefore entirely consistent with Government policy already in effect. Moreover, a longer term mortgage has been supported and advocated by experts in the field of land economics for many years.

On an $8,000 loan for 25 years, at 4½ percent, the monthly payments for principal and interest would be $44.47; whereas on the same loan and at the same rate for a period of 30 years, the payments would be $40.53, or a reduction in the monthly payments of $3.94. While it is recognized that extension of the period of amortization increases the over-all cost of the loan to the veteran for the whole period, he nevertheless has a smaller monthly outlay for his shelter, and it is believed that such an extension of the term as here advocated is sound and economically efficient. With relation to point No. II, covering adjustment of the interest rate to 4½ percent, it is to be noted that a 25-year loan on an $8,000 home at a rate of interest of 4 percent would cost the veteran $42.23 whereas a 30-year loan in the same amount at 4½ percent would cost him $40.53; actually amounting to a reduced monthly outlay of $1.70. To give an illustration, the following table is submitted:

$8,000 loan

Years	Interest	Monthly payment	Difference
25	4	$42.23	+$2.24
25	4½	44.47	
25	4	42.23	—4.04
30	4	38.19	
25	4	42.23	—1.70
30	4½	40.53	

The table indicates that it would be helpful to the veteran, from the point of view of his acquiring a home and reducing his monthly housing cost, to extend the term of the loan and enable him to take advantage of the GI Act and obtain his loan at 4½ percent.

Also, a 30-year loan with its lower monthly payments would make it possible for veterans with lower incomes to become home owners. Today the door is closed to many thousands of GI's who could establish credit if monthly payments were a few dollars lower.

There is already precedent for the 30-year term in the FHA-insured loan under title II, and the VA-guaranteed loan should have the benefit of at least that much term.

IV. ELIMINATE SECOND MORTGAGES

It is unfortunate that in the Servicemen's Readjustment Act any provision was included which would result in the veteran's being required to carry a second mortgage in order to take advantage of the home-loan provisions of the GI Bill of Rights.

Today that result has come to pass.

It has been the policy of the Federal Government since 1934 to wipe out second mortgages as being uneconomical and burdensome to home buyers.

They have never been permitted in connection with FHA loans.

As shown by veteran administration reports, approximately 41 percent of all home loans presently being guaranteed by the VA are of the second-mortgage type. In the above-referred-to study, it is pointed out that—

Increasing the rate to 4½ percent would also have the healthy effect of curbing the steady upward trend in the number of second mortgage loans guaranteed by VA.

Presently the second mortgage type of combination VA-FHA loan costs the veteran 0.87 percent more than the straight GI single mortgage loan. Even at an interest rate of 4½ percent on the straight GI loan, it would cost the veteran 0.37 percent less than the second mortgage combination type. This condition should not be allowed to continue to exist.

The second mortgage has other disadvantages than just the increased interest cost. As pointed out by General Gray in his study cited above in part II:

The veteran pays no premium or brokerage fee for the GI loan; this reduces closing costs by as much as $100 below conventional and FHA loans.

Some of the items which can cause the increased cost of FHA-VA combination are double recording and notarial fees, title policies, and double appraisals.

Another important penalty against the veteran is loss of more than half his gratuity payment by virtue of the second mortgage. For example, on an FHA-VA combination loan for purchase of an $8,000 home, the VA guaranteed portion cannot exceed 20 percent of the total, or $1,600. Under the GI Act the Veterans Administration makes a gratuity payment amounting to 4 percent of this, or $64, which is applied to interest payment on the loan. However, on a straight VA guaranteed loan for the full $8,000, the guaranteed portion is $4,000 and the gratuity payment is $160. Thus, the veteran loses $96 right at the start, on the FHA-VA combination. This, plus the increased closing costs can burden the veteran with $200 or more at the outset.

The irritating delays of the veteran having to deal with two Government agencies, two sets of regulations and double paperwork are hard to evaluate dollarwise. Even if they were, they should not be imposed on the veteran—they are unnecessary.

Support by major veterans' organizations for H. R. 1324, has been expressed to me by the State department commanders of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the AMVETS in my own State of California. Each of the department commanders has wired me as follows:

Rex F. Whittemore, department commander American Legion:

Vets in California are with you in your determined stand to reactivate the Veterans' Administration GI home loan. Please accept my sincere congratulations and keep punching. We are with you.

Alvin F. Kime, commander, department of California VFW:

Department of California Veterans of Foreign Wars as well as national organization supports increase in interest rate from 4 to 4½ percent on GI loans. Feel increase is necessary to interest private capital and create secondary money market. Your support appreciated.

J. J. Kehoe, State commander AMVETS:

Numerous California AMVETS wish you success in getting GI loans back in operation.

Our task is very clear. The veteran expects this Eighty-first Congress to make the GI bill of rights mean what it says in regard to housing. The nonveteran also expects this Eighty-first Congress to provide for housing which the Eightieth Congress denied the people. I have outlined the objectives of H. R. 1324, the Veterans' Home Loan Act of 1949, and again ask that this phase of housing be given speedy action.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as part of my remarks the bill H. R. 1324 at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

H. R. 1324

A bill to expedite the borrowing of funds from established lending institutions, for the acquisition of homes, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Veterans' Home Loan Act of 1949."

PROVISION FOR ADEQUATE SECONDARY MARKET

SEC. 2. (a) The National Housing Act, as amended, is further amended by deleting from title III, section 301 (a) (1), the words "after April 30, 1948" and provisos (C) and (E) (2).

(b) Title III, section 301 (d), of the National Housing Act, as amended, is further amended to read "The association may have a capital stock of not to exceed $30,000,000 and paid-in surplus of $1,000,000, subscribed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation."

(c) Title III, section 302, of the National Housing Act, as amended, is further amended by striking out therein the word "forty" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "sixty."

(d) Section 4 (c) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is further amended by striking out $2,000,000,000 and inserting in lieu thereof $3,000,000,000.

(e) Section 4 (h) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out therein the figure "$20,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "$30,000,000."

GENERAL PROVISIONS FOR LOANS

SEC. 3. Title II, section 500 (b), of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"(b) Loans guaranteed under this title shall be payable under such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon by the parties

thereto, subject to the conditions and limitations of this title and the regulations issued pursuant to section 504: *Provided*, (1) That the liability under the guaranty within the limitations of this title shall decrease or increase pro rata with any decrease or increase of the amount of the unpaid portion of the obligation; (2) that such loans shall bear interest at such rate as may be agreed upon by the parties thereto, but not to exceed 4½ percent per annum; (3) that the maximum rate of interest shall be decreased or increased by the Administrator, on a basis of general applicability, to conform with the normal and reasonable requirements of the generally prevailing mortgage market; (4) that such loans shall be payable in full in not more than 30 years or, in the case of loans on farm realty, in not more than 40 years: *Provided further*, That (1) the maturity on a non-real-estate loan shall not exceed 10 years; (2) any loan for a term in excess of 5 years shall be amortized in accordance with established procedure; (3) any real-estate loan, other than for repairs, alterations, or improvements, shall be secured by a first lien on the realty, and a non-real-estate loan, except as to working or other capital, merchandise, good will and other intangible assets, shall be secured by personalty to the extent legal and practicable: *And provided further*, That the Administrator shall maintain a continuous survey of the mortgage loan market and report quarter-annually to the President of the United States on his findings and determinations on the generally prevailing interest rates on loans for the acquisition of homes and the action he has taken, if any, to change the allowable rate of interest on home loans guaranteed under this act."

ABOLISHMENT OF SECOND MORTGAGES

SEC. 4. Title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is further amended by deleting in section 505 all of paragraph (a) and changing the paragraph "(b)" to read "(a)."

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

FEDERAL AID TO PUBLIC EDUCATION

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important issues before the Eighty-first Congress is that of Federal aid to public education.

Some persons would have us believe that this is a new issue—that the Congress is being called upon to enact a measure radically departing from established Federal policy. Such is not the case. The issue is really one of increasing Federal aid to education, since the Federal Government has been supplying such aid for over a hundred and fifty years. Altogether the Congress has enacted, by actual count, over a hundred and fifty laws providing for some form of aid to education.

About the time of its establishment the Federal Government assumed a share of the responsibility for financing education by providing for the endowment of the common schools with public lands, the income from which is now largely depleted but is still considerable in some of the States.

In later years the Federal Government has participated in the financing of education in several ways, including direct support of agricultural and vocational education in the public schools.

The broad issue before the Eighty-first Congress is whether the Federal Government should directly aid the States in maintaining a fairly high minimum level of general education for the Nation's citizens, and in more nearly equalizing educational opportunity, and if so, how and to what extent.

EQUALIZED EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES INDISPENSABLE FOR WELFARE OF DEMOCRACY

The issue is of paramount importance because of the great need of this Nation for the enactment of such a proposal as that expressed in S. 246 and several other Federal aid bills which have been introduced in the House, including one of my own identical to S. 246. The Thomas bill, S. 246, would strengthen our public-school system upon which the welfare and progress of the Nation depend. I could hardly think of a more important purpose.

I do not need to discuss with you the general importance of promoting education. Evidences of its value to the individual and to the Nation are numerous and readily discernible. Let us be reminded, however, that in the 1920's H. G. Wells predicted that the fortunes of the world would depend upon the outcome of a race between catastrophe and education—democratic education. By 1939 it became clear that catastrophe had won the race. It cost the world 6 years of bitter warfare, 60,000,000 casualties, and hundreds of billions of dollars to give itself another chance to start the race all over again.

Within recent years the great power of education, democratic and totalitarian, has been dramatically demonstrated. It has become more evident than ever before that democratic government and a democratic way of life are possible only to a nation well educated under democratic principles. The public-school systems of this country provide for basic education under such principles; and the proposal expressed in S. 246 would give increased support to the financial structure supporting these systems without altering the principles under which they are administered.

You are undoubtedly aware that within recent years there has been a great hue and cry throughout the Nation that the financial structure supporting our public schools is inadequate. The general alarm has been justified by the facts that have caused it. Since 1941 over 300,000 of our best teachers have left the classrooms for better paying jobs in industry. Many of them have been replaced by teachers having substandard preparation. Over 100,000 teachers have been employed annually on emergency or substandard licenses. In many places throughout the Nation school buildings and equipment have deteriorated while enrollments have greatly increased.

The growing concern over the status of public elementary and secondary education has been evidenced by the appearance of numerous writings on the subject. Outstanding among such publications have been the reports and national surveys made by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the House Subcommittee on Education, of the Committee on Education and Labor, Eightieth Congress, the New York Times, and the Research Division of the National Education Association.

These studies made by responsible groups have pointed out such disturbing facts as these: The youth of our country are citizens of the entire Nation as well as of the States, but the Federal Government is not bearing its share of the responsibility for the education of its future citizens. Vast numbers of American children are receiving a substandard education or none at all. Educational inequalities are prevalent. Democracy cannot function, much less assume its heavy international responsibilities, unless all its citizens obtain the basic education necessary to intelligent participation in the life of the Nation.

A number of governmental advisory commissions, such as the National Advisory Committee on Education appointed in 1931 by President Hoover, and the Advisory Committee on Education appointed in 1936 by President Roosevelt, have recommended Federal participation in the financing of elementary and secondary education in general. Various nongovernmental advisory commissions, such as the National Conference on the Financing of Education, have likewise supported this cause. In several messages to the Eightieth Congress, President Truman asked enactment of Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools. In his first message to the Eighty-first Congress, on January 5, 1949, he urged prompt Federal aid to the States to help them maintain and operate their school systems. In his budget message of January 10, he reiterated this recommendation, declaring that—

> It is therefore urgent that the Congress enact legislation to provide grants to the States in support of a basic minimum program of elementary and secondary education for all children and youth.

S. 246, introduced in the Senate with bipartisan support on January 6, 1949, would provide $300,000,000 per year for this purpose. The bill is identical with the one passed by the Senate last year by a vote of 58 to 22. I do not have time to review all the arguments which might be brought in favor of this bill, but they are convincing. The wording of the bill belies the most outworn and refuted argument that has been brought against such legislation, namely, the argument that its enactment would lead to Federal control of education. Federal control of educational policies is explicitly prohibited in the bill, which is essentially an equalization measure, with the largest amounts of Federal funds apportioned to the neediest States.

STATES' RIGHTS GUARANTEED

The States may use the funds according to the provisions of State constitutions and State laws governing the use of State and local money for current operating purposes. It is right that these provisions should govern the use of the funds.

The proposal advanced by some persons that some of the Federal money should be made available specifically to aid in the support of private or sectarian schools suggests a radical departure from established Federal policy and raises questions of constitutionality. There is, however, no question of the constitutionality of S. 246 in its original form. The

Congress should first provide Federal aid to public schools according to the plan set forth in S. 246. The question as to whether the Federal Government should aid in the support of private and sectarian schools raises another issue which should be considered later on its own merits.

The proposal that the Federal Government provide funds for the construction of school buildings should be separately considered after further study in accordance with the recommendations of the President. It is apparent that a building program for schools is greatly needed, but at the same time we should enact legislation authorizing the construction of buildings on the basis of need. Likewise the national-health program for school children should be separately considered and all children share in the benefits therefrom. This subject is too important to permit substitute or supplemental legislation to be tacked onto S. 246, which could divert interest from the main issue. We must watch the enemies of Federal aid and not permit them to use this strategy to defeat the purpose of this bill.

An argument which has been advanced by some opponents of Federal aid to education in general is that, because the Federal Constitution does not contain a clause specifically providing for the administration of education, the Federal Government has no responsibility for the financing of that function. Such an argument, besides being illogical, shows a lack of knowledge of the history of public education in this country.

At the time of the framing of the Constitution of the United States in 1787, education was almost universally regarded as a matter of church control. However, in America there were many churches and no established state church. Consequently, no church could be recognized by the Constitution as in sole control of education. It would have been impossible to obtain agreement on a Constitution containing provisions for the administration of education by the Government. Even as late as 1825 publicly controlled nonsectarian schools were the distant hope of statesmen and reformers.

If a new Constitution had been written a hundred years later, undoubtedly education would have had a prominent place in it. By that time the vast majority of the population of the United States had accepted two very important ideas. One was the teaching of Thomas Jefferson that education for all the people is essential to the preservation and advancement of democracy. The other was the principle that public education should be under public rather than church control.

The tenth amendment to the Constitution, which became effective in 1791, provided that powers not delegated to the United States would be reserved to the States. Therefore, as tax-supported, nonsectarian schools gradually developed during the nineteenth century they came under control of the States. S. 246 prohibits any interference with this control.

A number of clauses in the Constitution have served as warrants and guides for developing Federal relations to education. The most important provision affecting Federal aid to the States for education is contained in section B of article I which states that Congress shall have power to provide for the general welfare of the United States. Several decisions of the Supreme Court have held that Congress has power to promote the general welfare by the grant of financial aid to the States—including aid to education.

S. 246 proposes a departure from the more recently exercised policy of the Federal Government in giving aid to education in the States—namely the policy of aiding special kinds of education, such as vocational education in secondary schools. S. 246 proposes a return to the Federal policy represented by the early Federal land grants—namely, the policy of giving aid to public education in general rather than to some special kind of education or to education for some special groups or class of persons. It is Federal aid to the States for public education in general that has been recommended by such authoritative bodies as the National Advisory Committee on Education appointed by President Herbert Hoover, the Advisory Committee on Education appointed by President Roosevelt, and other respectable committees which have studied this program. President Truman has joined these distinguished groups in recommending that Federal aid to education take this form.

The advisory committees already named have pointed out that numerous noneducational Federal agencies have for many years administered educational programs. The administration of some of these programs in special fields has inevitably resulted in influences over certain educational policies in the States.

The Federal Government can never be expected in the future to ignore completely the educational needs of the Nation nor to refrain entirely from efforts to meet those needs. In order to reverse the trend toward Federal influence over educational policies in specific areas of education two steps should be taken. First, to the extent feasible, the educational programs administered by noneducational agencies should be transferred to the United States Office of Education as recommended by the Advisory Committee on Education in 1938. Second, additional Federal aid in this field should take the form of direct Federal aid to the States for education in general, as likewise recommended by the Advisory Committee and as proposed in S. 246. The United States Office of Education has had long experience in administering Federal grants in aid to the States, without any encroachment on State and local prerogatives. This Office has been wisely chosen to administer the aid proposed.

It seems to me that the basic reason for Federal participation in the financing of public elementary and secondary education is this: the Federal Government has a fundamental interest in, and is at least partly responsible for, the general education of the national citizenry.

The very preservation of our form of government depends upon an adequately educated population. Democracy cannot function at home, much less carry its heavy international responsibilities, unless its citizens obtain the basic education to permit intelligent participation in the life of the Nation. A high level of political intelligence based upon adequate standards of education contributes most to the safety of democracy.

In case of war the victory has come to depend less and less upon the number of soldiers and more and more upon the capacities, and hence upon the education of the entire population. During World War II the Federal Government found it necessary to spend billions of dollars in educating not only military but also civilian personnel in practically all subject fields. If we continue to leave education almost entirely to the States we may not win the next war, because there will not be time to adequately organize an adequate national program of education.

The provision of adequate standards of education for all is becoming increasingly necessary to the national well-being. With technological advances and specialization in industry, this country has ceased to be composed of self-contained and relatively independent communities. The economic welfare and expansion of the country depend increasingly on trained youth drawn from every section.

The birth rate is highest in those areas of our country where economic conditions are poorest and educational levels the lowest. If we continue to draw each succeeding generation in disproportionately large numbers from those areas, and if we fail to make good the deficit by positive educational measures, the effect on our culture and our representative political institutions will be appalling.

Let not the Representatives of the richer States deceive themselves with the idea that they would contribute more and receive less benefit under S. 246 if it is enacted. The provision of adequate standards of education for all is becoming increasingly necessary to the national well-being. The high mobility of our population makes the educational deficiencies of any locality a national concern. Many thousands of our people migrate annually to wealthy industrial centers from relatively poor areas in which educational opportunities are inadequate.

Mere enlightened self-interest demands that the richer States protect their citizenship and economic security by promoting the level of education in the poorer communities from which they will inevitably draw a part of their population and upon which their prosperity otherwise largely depends.

The bestowing of citizenship upon Negroes created an undischarged Federal obligation to aid the States having large Negro populations. Negro slavery was permitted by the Constitution until it was abolished by the thirteenth amendment. Negroes were made citizens by the fourteenth amendment. But here the Federal Government left the matter. The whole burden of educating the Negroes for citizenship was left to the States having the largest Negro populations—the States whose white citizens had been rendered unable to maintain adequate schools for their own children, much less the Negroes. I do not mean

to reflect on any class, because we are all equal and deserve the same treatment. But I do wish to state that the Federal Government has an undischarged obligation to aid the States having large Negro populations with their educational systems.

The time at my disposal allows me to touch upon only a few of the reasons why a proposal such as that expressed in S. 246 should be enacted by this Congress. One of the reasons which impresses me most is that much of the wealth of some States is controlled by persons or corporations in others. This is true of my own State.

The enormous growth in corporate ownership of wealth has made it difficult for individual States to tax fairly the wealth and income produced within their own borders when much of that wealth and income is controlled and exploited by persons or organizations in other States. It has been estimated that as much as 70 cents out of every dollar produced in some States goes to the people of other States as the result of nonresident ownership.

These facts largely account for the lack of economic ability of some States to support public education. It is obviously a fair proposition that the Federal Government through its taxing power should return a part of the income produced in States thus affected to help pay for the education of their children who are also citizens of the Nation.

Because of these facts and for many other reasons too numerous for me to discuss at this time, the Congress should immediately provide for Federal aid to public elementary and secondary education as proposed in S. 246.

As Members of the Congress of the United States we must consider not only the problems of the people of our own States but also the problems of the Nation as a whole. As recently pointed out by the Honorable John R. Steelman, Assistant to the President of the United States:

> To preserve democracy we must improve it * * * all of us are made aware every day that there are very few problems that are confined to the State governments alone. We must think of Federal, State, and local governments together, for together they make up our American system of government—a system of multiple governments for a single Nation.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. DOYLE, for 5 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. TAURIELLO (at the request of Mr. GORSKI of New York), for February 21, 1949, on account of official business.

To Mr. JONES of Missouri (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for an indefinite period, on account of serious illness of his father.

To Mr. POLK, for the remainder of this week, on account of official business.

To Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED (at the request of Mr. RAINS), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2402. An act to extend the Office of the War Assets Administrator and the War Assets Administration from February 28, 1949, until June 30, 1949.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2402. An act to extend the Office of the War Assets Administrator and the War Assets Administration from February 28, 1949, until June 30, 1949.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 22, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

238. A communication from the President of the United States; transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1950 in the amount of $550,000 for the legislative branch, Government Printing Office, in the form of an amendment to the budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 77); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

239. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation in the amount of $216,200 for the fiscal year 1950 for the Department of Labor, in the form of amendments to the budget for the said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 78); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

240. A letter from the Chairman, the Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia, transmitting a letter urging consideration of a request of the Board of Public Welfare transmitted to the Congress on February 3, 1949, on recommended legislation regarding the full use of the National Training School for Girls; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

241. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional protection for owners of patents of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910, as amended, so as to protect the United States in certain patent suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

242. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of a bill relating to recurring postal deficits entitled "A bill to readjust postal rates"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

243. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 28, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Friday Harbor, Wash., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

244. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government report on foreign affairs (H. Doc. No. 79); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

245. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting to the Congress a study prepared for the Commission's consideration of the organization of the Government for the conduct of foreign affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

246. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting to the Congress in typescript appendix IV-A to the study on foreign affairs offered for the Commission's consideration by the task force as a supplement to their summary report on this subject; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

247. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting to the Congress in typescript appendix V to the study on foreign affairs offered for the Commission's consideration by the task force as a supplement to their summary report on this subject; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

248. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting to the Congress in typescript appendix VI-A-B-C-D to the study on foreign affairs offered for the Commission's consideration by the task force as a supplement to their summary report on this subject; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

249. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting to the Congress in typescript appendix VII-A-B-C to the study on foreign affairs offered for the Commission's consideration by the task force as a supplement to their summary report on this subject; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

250. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting to the Congress in typescript appendix VIII-A to the study on foreign affairs offered for the Commission's consideration by the task force as a supplement to their summary report on this subject; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

251. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 28, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Sag Harbor, N. Y., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on March 19, 1946, and authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved July 24, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 90. Resolution for the relief of Mrs. Emilie C. Read; with an amendment (Rept. No. 149). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 160. Joint resolution to authorize completion of the processing of the visa cases, and admission into the United States, of certain alien

fiancés and fiancées of members, or of former members, of the armed forces of the United States, as was provided in the so-called GI Fiancées Act (60 Stat. 339), as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 150). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRISON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 253. A bill to amend the act of June 25, 1938, relating to the appointment of postmasters under civil service; without amendment (Rept. No. 151). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 729. A bill for the relief of John J. O'Neil; without amendment (Rept. No. 152). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1878. A bill for the relief of Ben Luke Pond, Mrs. Shao Hung Pond, and their son David Yat Wei Pond, aged 11 years; with amendments (Rept. No. 153). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORAND: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 1559. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary T. Maloney Preece; without amendment (Rept. No. 154). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2268. A bill for the relief of Forest L. Weatherly; with an amendment (Rept. No. 155). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2704. A bill for the relief of Freda Wahler; without amendment (Rept. No. 156). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2708. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Joseph DeSouza, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 157). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2859. A bill to authorize the sale of public lands in Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 2860. A bill to authorize additional appropriations for forest-fire prevention and suppression in States in the southern region; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CAVALCANTE:

H. R. 2861. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide a penalty for failure to file certain statements in connection with charges of disloyalty against officers and employees of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 2862. A bill to amend part VIII of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, by adding a new subparagraph (d) to paragraph (3); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GAVIN:

H. R. 2863. A bill to authorize the construction of flood-control works in the Allegheny River basin at Warren, Youngsville, Sheffield, Oil City, and Franklin, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 2864. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to furnish officers and employees within the purview of such act with annual statements relating to their individual accounts in the civil-service retirement and disability fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 2865. A bill to permit certain persons who served in the armed forces of the United States or in the merchant marine in World War II to enter or remain in the United States for permanent residence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 2866. A bill to establish a United States Air Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEEFE:

H. R. 2867. A bill to provide relief from tax on income to be paid or permanently set aside or used exclusively for religious, charitable, or educational purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 2868. A bill to provide for the installation of equipment necessary to enable Members of the House of Representatives to hear, while in their offices, the proceedings in the Hall of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 2869. A bill to authorize an appropriation in aid of a system of drainage and sanitation for the city of Polson, Mont.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MCCORMACK (by request):

H. R. 2870. A bill to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 2871. A bill to provide for the payment by the United States of premiums on bonds of Government officers or employees; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 2872. A bill to protect scenic values along Oak Creek Canyon and certain tributaries thereof within the Coconino National Forest, Ariz.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 2873. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RAMSEY:

H. R. 2874. A bill to protect the rights and privileges of Federal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2875. A bill to provide equal treatment for all employees in the civilian service of the Government with respect to payment of salaries covering periods of separation from the service in the case of persons improperly removed or suspended from such service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REDDEN:

H. R. 2876. A bill to effect an exchange of certain lands in the State of North Carolina between the United States and the eastern band of Cherokee Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. REGAN:

H. R. 2877. A bill to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Big Bend National Park in the State of Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 2878. A bill to exempt from induction or service under the Selective Service Act of 1948 certain persons who served in the merchant marine during World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 2879. A bill to provide a system of transcontinental superhighways; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2880. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 2881. A bill to permit certain displaced persons under 16 years of age orphaned as a result of World War II to enter the United States as nonquota immigrants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2882. A bill to relieve postmasters and other paying employees of the postal service from accountability for wrong payment of money orders in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WHITE of California:

H. R. 2883. A bill to provide price support for honey; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 2884. A bill to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes, relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 2885. A bill to provide for the removal of weeds from lands in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 2886. A bill to provide for the killing of starlings in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ABERNETHY (by request):

H. R. 2887. A bill to amend the Architects' Registration Act for the District of Columbia in order to safeguard life, health, and property, and to promote the public welfare; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:

H. R. 2888. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of Thomas E. Watson; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 2889. A bill to provide for the acquisition of land and preparation of plans for the remodeling and expansion of the main post office building in McKeesport, Allegheny County, Pa., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2890. A bill to provide for acquisition of land and the construction of a post office in the Borough of West Mifflin, Allegheny County, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2891. A bill to provide for acquisition of land and the construction of a post office at Wilmerding, Allegheny County, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 2892. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to enable States to establish more adequate public-welfare programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2893. A bill to extend and improve the old-age and survivors insurance system, to add protection against disability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 2894. A bill to amend and supplement the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 2895. A bill to authorize the sale of select base material at the Fort Benning Military Reservation to Muscogee County, State of Georgia, for use on county roads; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 2896. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, in order to assure the availability of low-cost financing on liberal terms to World War II veterans who need homes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 2897. A bill to authorize the making of grants and loans to the States to assist in providing adequate public elementary and secondary school facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 2898. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide for a 20-percent increase in the survivor annuities and insurance lump sums payable under such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H. R. 2899. A bill to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PHILLIPS of California:

H. R. 2900. A bill to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 2901. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of Dr. Charles H. Herty; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 2902. A bill to amend Public Law 704 to extend terminal-leave benefits to next of kin of those who died prior to separation from service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 2903. A bill to reaffirm the intent of the Congress with respect to flight training for veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 2904. A bill to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BISHOP:

H. R. 2905. A bill to create the Subcommittee on the House Office Buildings of the Committee on House Administration to perform the duties of the House Office Building Commission and to make a study of the needs of Members of Congress and committees as to future office space; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 2906. A bill to provide a 1 year's extension of time for the disposition of farm-labor camps to public or semipublic agencies or nonprofit associations of farmers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 2907. A bill to clarify and formulate a consistent and coordinated national policy with respect to transportation costs in interstate commerce; to strengthen the antitrust laws of the United States and to provide for their more effective enforcement; and to promote competition by permitting sellers to have access to distant markets; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 2908. A bill to provide for the separation of subsidy from air-mail pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2909. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to make special arrangements for the transportation in air commerce at low rates of large shipments of air mail, where such arrangements will result in savings to the public or the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2910. A bill to provide for lower air-mail postage rates to the public; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2911. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to provide for the economic regulation of air carriers engaged in foreign air transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2912. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to exempt persons engaged in overseas or foreign air commerce from certain requirements, including the requirement as to the payment of overtime compensation to customs employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2913. A bill to repeal the taxes on transportation and communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARING:

H. R. 2914. A bill to amend the Taylor Grazing Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 2915. A bill to provide for the review of orders of the Federal Communications Commission under the Communications Act of 1934, as amended and of certain orders of the Secretary of Agriculture made under the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended, and the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2916. A bill to provide for the review of certain orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the United States Maritime Commission and giving the United States courts of appeals jurisdiction on review to enjoin, set aside, or suspend such orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 2917. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish financial assistance to certain blind veterans in obtaining an automobile or other conveyances; to the Committee an Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. J. Res. 170. Joint resolution designating June 14 of each year as Flag Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. J. Res. 171. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H. J. Res. 172. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special 3-cent postage stamp commemorative of the birth and birthplace in Franklin County, Va., of Booker T. Washington, who rose from slave cabin to Hall of Fame; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. Con. Res. 42. Concurrent resolution proposing the withdrawal of diplomatic recognition of the Government of Yugoslavia until such time as the policies and conduct of such Government with respect to the rights of the individual to life, liberty, and freedom of religious and political beliefs justify the resumption of relations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. Res. 112. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Agriculture to make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr LESINSKI:

H. Res. 113. Resolution to provide funds for the Committee on Education and Labor; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred, as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take whatever action is necessary to have the sentence imposed upon Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, of Hungary, removed; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to further consider and make an appropriation in the amount of $462,000 available to the United States Corps of Engineers for the completion of the authorized Depoe Bay improvement project; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Indiana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact effective legislation providing for flood control in the Wabash River watershed area and tributaries thereto; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to approve pending legislation concerning the right of domestic producers to sell gold in the markets of the world; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass the General Pulaski Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 2918. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Joshua Standing Elk a patent in fee to certain land; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2919. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Paul High Horse and Anna High Horse; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2920. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to George Swift Horse; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. DEANE:

H. R. 2921. A bill for the relief of Nicholas O. Kalcoutsakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 2922. A bill for the relief of the State Compensation Insurance Fund of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEEFE:

H. R. 2923. A bill for the relief of Goettmann Printing Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2924. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helen J. Martin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2925. A bill for the relief of Ida Hoheisel, executrix of the estate of John Hoheisel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2926. A bill for the relief of George N. Weaver; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2927. A bill for the relief of Gyorgy Szilas, Anna Veronica Szilas, Sandor Czukor, and Jolan Spitzer Czukor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 2928. A bill for the relief of Dr. Leon L. Konchegul; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'SULLIVAN

H. R. 2929. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy Manicus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 2930. A bill for the relief of Harry M. Caudill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 2931. A bill to provide for the conveyance by the United States to Frank C. Wilson of certain lands formerly owned by him; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 2932. A bill for the relief of Horace J. Fenton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 2933. A bill for the relief of Charles F. Ellis; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 2934. A bill for the relief of Daniel B. Meador; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 2935. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Benjamin Betts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SOMERS:

H. R. 2936. A bill authorizing Henry W. Rodney, a special agent of the Compliance Enforcement Division of the War Assets Administration, to accept the decoration tendered him by the Chinese Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WERDEL:

H. R. 2937. A bill for the relief of Eugenio Maisterrena Barreneche; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McKINNON:

H. J. Res. 173. Joint resolution to provide for the award of a gold medal to Frank Loesser; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

93. By Mr. GORSKI of New York: Petition of Councilman Pete Rybka, relative to rent control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

94. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolutions of the Wisconsin Retail Hardware Association, Inc., at their annual convention held at Milwaukee, Wis., February 3, 1949; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

95. By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States to use all possible means to secure the release of Cardinal Mindszenty, of the Roman Catholic faith, and Bishop Ordass, of the Lutheran faith; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

96. By Mrs. NORTON: Memorial of the New Jersey House of Assembly, memorializing the President of the United States and the Secretary of State to exercise every force at their command to bring about the release of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty and Bishop Lajos Ordaff, who have been incarcerated by the Communist-controlled Government of Hungary; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1949

(Legislative day of Monday, February 21, 1949)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our fathers' God and ours, we lift to Thee our grateful hearts for the national heritage that has come down to us, bought by other toils and other tears than our own. Help us this day with vivid vision to see them of old who feared Thy name and handed on to us the torch of the Nation's righteousness.

Especially do we give Thee thanks for the selfless service and the stainless record of that calm and courageous leader whose spirit and whose sword were Thy instruments in laying the foundation of our state. As we cherish his deeds and recall his farewell warning words, O God of Hosts, lest we forget, repeat in us the faith which shone on his illumined countenance lifted in an agony of prayer from crimsoned ground where patriots bled.

In these desperate days, drive us to our knees for the inner strength that steadied him whose name we reverence on his natal day. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 21, 1949, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 492. An act to amend the act approved June 29, 1948, entitled "An act to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va."; and

S. 713. An act to amend Public Law 533 of the Eightieth Congress, authorizing the construction of a building for the General Accounting Office on square 518 in the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 84) to provide for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train by the Archivist of the United States, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 164. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the Churntown Elementary School District, California;

H. R. 859. An act to clarify the overtime compensation provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, as applied in the longshore, stevedoring, building and construction industries;

H. R. 967. An act for the relief of the city of El Paso, Tex.;

H. R. 1401. An act relating to the disposition of certain recreational demonstration project lands by the State of Michigan to the Mount Hope Cemetery Association of Waterloo, Mich.;

H. R. 1509. An act for the relief of the city and county of San Francisco;

H. R. 1998. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the conveyance to Pinellas County, State of Florida, of certain public lands herein described," approved June 17, 1948 (Public Law 666, 80th Cong.), for the purpose of correcting a land description therein; and

H. R. 2101. An act to authorize the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., to make certain disaster or emergency loans, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hoey	Millikin
Anderson	Holland	Morse
Bricker	Humphrey	Murray
Broughton	Hunt	Neely
Butler	Ives	O'Conor
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	Reed
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Chapman	Kem	Russell
Connally	Kerr	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Knowland	Stennis
Downey	Langer	Taylor
Ecton	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	McCarthy	Thye
Frear	McClellan	Tydings
Fulbright	McFarland	Vandenberg
George	McKellar	Watkins
Gillette	McMahon	Wiley
Green	Magnuson	Williams
Gurney	Malone	Withers
Hayden	Martin	Young
Hendrickson	Maybank	
Hill	Miller	

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on public business.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] is absent because of an engagement to deliver an address at the thirty-fifth annual joint celebration of the anniversary of the birth of George Washington, in Washington, D. C., under the auspices of a number of patriotic organizations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the resolution of the Senate adopted on January 24, 1901, it was ordered that on the 22d day of February each year the Farewell Address of George Washington should be read to the Senate. The Chair, under that order, has designated for that purpose the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] whom he now recognizes.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine advanced to the desk and read the Farewell Address as follows:

To the people of the United States:

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and, every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which not unfrequently, want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism,—the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans, by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquillity at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth, as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth, or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts, of common dangers, suffering and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they addressed themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here, every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The *north*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *south*, protected by the

equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *south* in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the *north*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *north*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The *east*, in a like intercourse with the *west*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The *west* derives from the *east* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the *secure* enjoyment of indispensable *outlets* for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*. Any other tenure by which the *west* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength; or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts, greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union, an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalship alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues, would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind and exhibit the continuance of the union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *geographical* discriminations,—*northern* and *southern*—*Atlantic* and *western;* whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head; they have seen, in the negotiation by the executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were procured? will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliances, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and maintaining within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government.—But the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power, and the right of the people to establish government, presuppose the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency.—They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite, not only that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be involved, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions:—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country:—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion: and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain

all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind, (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit or party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foments occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchial cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasion of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation *desert* the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinion should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes, that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties,) ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessary parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils!—Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens,) the jealousy of a free people ought to be *constantly* awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interests.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little *political* connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith:—Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe; my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without any thing more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it

probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,
17th September, 1796.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred, as indicated:

REPORT ON PROPERTIES LEASED BY NAVY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Navy Department on real and personal property leased by that Department for the period ending December 31, 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Department of Agriculture (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Agriculture Activities (appendix M) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Appendices to Study of Departmental Management" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Study of Departmental Management (pt. III)" (with an accompanying report; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Federal field services (Vol. II Supporting Data by Geographic Entities) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Federal field services (Vol. I, Recommendations) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 4

"Joint resolution relative to shipbuilding on Pacific coast

"Whereas since the termination of World War II shipbuilding on this Pacific coast has been practically discontinued; and

"Whereas there has been allocated by the Maritime Commission over $2,000,000,000 for shipbuilding in these United States, said moneys being directed to be spent in eastern shipyards; and

"Whereas due to the shut-down of this important industry on the west coast billions of dollars' worth of equipment and materials are going to waste and thousands of skilled mechanics are being lost to this most important industry, which had a major part in the winning of the war; and

"Whereas fully realizing the serious situation that confronts the shipbuilding industry on the west coast, there has been organized since December 8, 1948, a west coast labor-management committee consisting of representatives of the 11 Western States, and appointed from that committee to make its status permanent are two members of management and two members of labor; and

"Whereas there has been a caucus called by Congressman WELCH in Washington, D. C., on Friday, January 7, of all west coast representatives for the purpose of stimulating interest and making a determined drive for the resumption of shipbuilding: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Secretary of the United States Navy and the Maritime Commission be, and each of them are, hereby memorialized and urged to have immediate steps taken to have ships built on the west coast so that the shipyards which cost billions of dollars will not deteriorate, and equipment that is now lying idle be used, and that the craftsmen formerly employed in the industry be encouraged so that in the event of war new persons would not have to be trained as skilled mechanics, as the west coast shipyards are recognized as of the most importance in the defense of these United State; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be directed to forward copies of this resolution to the Secretary of the United States Navy, the United States Maritime Commission, the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Resolution 3

"Resolution memorializing and requesting the Congress of the United States for the enactment of legislation to aid the State of Montana in the enforcement of the cigarette tax now evaded by the use of the United States mails

"To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

"Your memorialists, the members of the House of Representatives of the Thirty-first Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana now convened in regular session, respectfully request:

"Whereas the State of Montana has imposed a tax on the sale and use of cigarettes within its boundaries, and the revenues so obtained constitute a substantial portion of the revenues available and needed for its functions of government; and

"Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana, now in regular session assembled, that a large and growing system of evasion of such tax law has developed; that the United States mails are flooded with advertisements and inducements to the citizens of this State to violate the law; that in numerous instances such advertisers entice prospective customers with statements to the effect that the use of the United States mails is sufficient proof of the legitimacy of such business and such system; that the mails of the United States are flooded with cigarettes in the process of delivery within this State, and on which cigarettes the tax required by the laws of the State have not and will not be paid; that this State is seriously injured and damaged in the loss of revenue from this source, and is at a disadvantage in collecting such lawful tax by and through such system; that the mails of the United States are being used for the express purpose of evading such tax and the enforcement of the laws of the State; and

"Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana that there is now pending before the Congress of the United States a proposed bill which will aid the States by requiring shippers of cigarettes in interstate commerce to furnish to the taxing authority of the State to which shipped, a copy of the invoice on each shipment and the name and address of each person to whom shipped; and

"Whereas such legislation by the Congress of the United States will greatly aid this and the other States of the Union in the enforcement of its laws, and the collection of needed revenue: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Montana, That the Congress of the United States be and the same is hereby memorialized and respectfully urged to enact legislation requiring shippers of cigarettes in interstate commerce to furnish to the taxing authority of the State to which shipped a copy of the invoice on each such shipment; or to enact such other legislation as will aid the several States affected as may be proper; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state of the State of Montana to the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Montana and they and each of them be requested to use all honorable means within their power and offices to bring about the enactment of legislation as herein mentioned."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Joint Memorial 7

"To the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully petition as follows:

"Whereas the United States of America has acquired, is now acquiring, and plans to acquire, large areas of land within the State of Washington; and

"Whereas present laws do not enable the various acquiring agencies of the United States of America to pay to public bodies and political subdivisions of the State of

Washington compensation for the damages indirectly resulting from such acquisition; and

"Whereas large acquisitions of land within the State have reduced the tax base for real property taxes in some areas in the State to such an extent that it is no longer possible for such areas to adequately finance their operations; and

"Whereas portions of some irrigation districts are being acquired, with the result that such districts are being reduced in size and being made uneconomic by reason thereof: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, do hereby respectfully memorialize and petition the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to enact and approve at the earliest moment legislation enabling and authorizing acquiring agencies of the United States of America to pay to political subdivisions of the State of Washington and other States in the United States compensation for damages indirectly occasioned by the acquisition of real estate within the boundaries of such local political subdivisions, including authorization for payments in lieu of taxes and payments in lieu of assessments, and authorizing lump-sum payments to such political subdivisions, in lieu of annual payments, in lieu of taxes or assessments; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, and the Secretary of the United States Senate, and the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Washington.

"Passed the house January 21, 1949.

"Passed the senate February 16, 1949."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Utah; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Resolution 4

"Resolution by the Utah State Senate memorializing the Congress of the United States not to pass certain legislation now pending before the National Congress which, in effect, provides for State medicine but rather to encourage private cooperative health insurance

"Whereas there is now pending before the National Congress certain legislation commonly referred to as the Wagner-Murray-Dingell compulsory health insurance bill; and

"Whereas this program of compulsory health insurance is offered to the people as a solution to a supposed problem of inadequate medical attention for the citizens of this country; and

"Whereas it is acknowledged and unquestioned fact that the general health of the Nation is higher than that of any other nation of the world; and

"Whereas free enterprise, individual initiative, and freedom from Government interference are the foundation stones upon which the practice of medicine and all other great enterprises of this country have been developed; and

"Whereas such Government interference and regimentation in the field of medicine will destroy the spirit of research and individual initiative and will eventually result in a break-down of the present high standards of competency now prevalent in the private practice of medicine in this country; and

"Whereas a program of compulsory health insurance as proposed has been in operation in other countries and has proven extremely cumbersome and expensive and has not resulted in a general improvement of the public health; and

"Whereas the proponents of compulsory health insurance continually stress complete medical service without cost to the patient, which statements do not take into account the increased taxation which will result from the inevitable Government bureaucracy that will be established in administering such a program; and

"Whereas the best interest of the people of the United States can be served by continuance of the free-enterprise system with encouragement given to private cooperative health insurance and without Government domination and control in the field of medicine: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Utah State Legislature, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to defeat any legislation introduced into the Congress which provides for socialized medicine or national compulsory health insurance and which will result in a destruction of private initiative and the free-enterprise system in this country and that the Congress be urged to restrict its legislation to measures which will encourage private health insurance in cooperation with the private practice of medicine; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of Utah be, and he is hereby, instructed to transmit forthwith a copy of this resolution to the congressional delegation from the State of Utah and to the Speaker of the House and President of the Senate of the United States."

A memorial of the Senate of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Memorial 1

"Memorial requesting immediate action by the President and Congress with respect to social-security payments to Indians on reservations

"To the President and the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"That the Federal Social Security Administration has threatened to withhold Federal social-security grants to Arizona unless Arizona assumes the obligation of the Federal Government with respect to the payment of indigent assistance to Indians living on reservations within Arizona.

"That Arizona, because of the effect of such threatened action on thousands of its citizens who are now receiving and require assistance, is being bludgeoned into accepting an obligation which it does not have and which it cannot afford to assume.

"That there has been introduced in the current session of the Eighty-first Congress legislation (S. 691) which, if enacted, will afford an equitable solution of the problem for all concerned.

"Wherefore, your memorialist, the Senate of the State of Arizona, requests:

"1. That the President, as head of the executive department of the Federal Government, direct the Federal Social Security Administration to cease and desist from withholding Federal social-security grants to Arizona, pending consideration by the Congress of the problem of assistance to reservation Indians.

"2. That the Congress give immediate consideration to, and enact, such legislation as will eliminate the present situation, assure to Indians living on reservations within Arizona the indigent assistance to which they are entitled, remove from worthy and eligible citizens of Arizona the current threat of hardship and distress, and relieve Arizona from the assumption of an unjustified and undue financial burden.

"Adopted by the senate February 9, 1949."

A resolution adopted by the Propeller Club, port of Nashville, Tenn., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide funds for improvement in the locks and navigation facilities in the lower Cumberland River below Nashville; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the New York City (N. Y.) Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., favoring the enactment of legislation to strengthen and extend rent control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide for payments to cities in lieu of taxes by housing authorities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The petition of Nola Bayer, corresponding secretary, Mothers' Club, New York, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to repeal the excise tax on luxuries, and so forth; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the New York City (N. Y.) Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., favoring the enactment of legislation to repeal the excise tax on luxuries; to the Committee on Finance.

Resolutions adopted by the Bergen County (N. J.) Catholic Youth Organization; the Common Council of the City of Long Beach and the Council of the City of New York, both in the State of New York; and the Board of Aldermen of the City of Chelsea, Mass., relating to the trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Paul Hall, secretary-treasurer, Seafarers International Union of North America, New York, N. Y., praying for the enactment of the so-called Bland-Magnuson bill, relating to the American merchant marine (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Simon Jarosinski, president, Polish-American Congress, Baltimore, Md., relating to the displaced-persons law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by a conference of 400 civic leaders and representatives of groups and organizations of Greenwich Village, N. Y., relating to the trial of 12 Communist Party leaders in New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolutions adopted by the Common Council of the City of Fort Wayne, Ind; the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, Wis.; and the Board of Representatives of the City of Tampa, Fla., favoring the enactment of legislation proclaiming October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A radiogram in the nature of a petition from Union Trabajadores Metalurgicos, of Ponce, P. R., relating to the minimum-wage law; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter in the nature of a petition from E. A. Van Steenwyk, executive director, the Associated Hospital Service of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, Pa., relating to compulsory health insurance (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Benjamin Werne, of New York, N. Y., relating to labor legislation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

RESOLUTIONS OF WISCONSIN RETAIL HARDWARE ASSOCIATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter which I have received from Mr. H. A. Lewis, treasurer of the Wisconsin Retail Hardware Association, Stevens Point, Wis., and four resolutions adopted by that splendid business organization in my State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letter and resolutions will be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

To the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

WISCONSIN RETAIL HARDWARE ASSOCIATION, INC.

Stevens Point, Wis., February 16, 1949.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILEY: We enclose copies of four resolutions all adopted unanimously at the annual convention of this association, held at Milwaukee, Wis., February 3, 1949.

These resolutions set forth the position of our members with respect to: the fair-trade laws, the Wage and Hour Act, delivery pricing, tax equality.

We sincerely hope you will give the views of retail hardware dealers your earnest consideration.

I might point out that existing confusions due to the Administrator's rulings under the wage-hour law are to a large extent nullifying the evident intent of Congress to exempt retail and service establishments from the provisions of this act.

Confusions resulting from the ruling of the Federal Trade Commission and recent decisions of the Supreme Court, make it most necessary that Congress enact clarifying legislation.

We stand firm in our position that any person, firm, or corporation which engaged in business activities in competition with others engaged in similar activities should be taxed on the same basis with profits defined in a like manner.

It is our firm conviction that taxing cooperative corporations in the same manner as private enterprises will not put the cooperatives out of business as some charge. In fact, if cooperatives can succeed only if they enjoy tax favoritism, then they are not doing the job they claim to do.

This Nation needs every dollar of tax income it can collect without killing the incentive to earn. Let's tax those now escaping payment of their just share before we consider adding to the burden of those already double-taxed as all corporations now are.

Very truly yours,

H. A. LEWIS,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Resolution on fair trade

Whereas return of the buyers' market may be expected to bring back the competitive evil of predatory price-cutting by the pirates of commerce whose principal weapon is bait advertising with the lure of low-price quotations on branded merchandise: Be it

Resolved, That we commend those manufacturers who have safeguarded their products against this piracy by the establishment of fair minimum prices under the fair-trade laws; be it further

Resolved, That we urge upon these manufacturers a policy of consistent vigilance in the enforcement of their fair-trade agreements; be it further

Resolved, That we urge other manufacturers of branded merchandise which is subject to price demoralization at the hands of price-cutters to utilize the privilege of price agreements under the fair-trade laws for the protection of their brands and their legitimate distributors and dealers.

Resolution on delivered pricing

Whereas pricing and delivery practices of long standing in the hardware industry, specifically freight absorption, delivered pricing and zone pricing, have come under a question of legality, due to various orders issued by the Federal Trade Commission and decisions of the United States Supreme Court; and

Whereas these orders and decisions have created a condition of grave uncertainty among manufacturers and distributors engaged in interstate commerce and stand as a menace to the orderly and usual trade relationships existing between such suppliers and our members; and

Whereas ultimate enforcement of the policy embodied in these orders and decisions would result in a chaotic confusion of prices; and

Whereas conflicting views among enforcement authorities indicate that the present uncertainty and prospective disruption of business practices can be ended or avoided only through action of the Congress to more clearly define antitrust and other statutes regulating business: Be it

Resolved, That the Wisconsin Retail Hardware Association in convention this 3d day of February 1949, urge our Senators and Representatives in Congress to support such amendments or other bills as will clarify this situation and still maintain healthful competition.

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Resolution on wage-hour law

Whereas the Eighty-first Congress is expected to revise the Fair Labor Standards Act (wage-hour law); and

Whereas the wage-hour law in its purpose and nature is designed to apply to industrial plants engaged in production of commodities for interstate trade and is not designed to apply to local commercial establishments; and

Whereas under the present wage-hour law confusion and uncertainty as to the status and liability of local retailers has persisted, due to interpretations made by the enforcing agency: Be it

Resolved, That we urge upon Congress the importance of drafting the amended law so as to exempt retailers clearly and completely and preclude any interpretation or construction that would attempt to apply the law to retailers.

To the Committee on Finance:

Resolution on tax equality

Whereas this has been called the year of decision on the question of taxing cooperative corporations; and

Whereas this is simply a question of fairness in the collection of taxes by the Federal Government, using the same rules in taxing the profits of cooperative corporations that are used in taxing the profits of other corporations engaged in the same kind of business and in competition with them: Be it

Resolved, That we deplore and decry the efforts of cooperatives, their advocates, and spokesmen to make of this simple question a political issue involving the usefulness of cooperatives to their farmer members as marketing and/or purchasing organizations; be it further

Resolved, That the Wisconsin Retail Hardware Association in convention this 3d day of February 1949, renew and reemphasize its support of tax equality and urge that the Eighty-first Congress by legislative amendment provide that all competing businesses be taxed alike. We insist that Federal tax legislation should embody the principle set forth by the Cleveland congress of the National Retail Hardware Association, as follows:

"1. That no exemption from Federal income tax may be allowed to any person, firm, corporation, or organization of any type or character on its profits resulting from the operation of any business of the same kind and character as that operated by any person, firm, corporation, or organization of any type which does pay Federal income taxes on its profits.

"2. That for the purpose of Federal income taxation, 'profit' shall be defined and construed to mean the difference between the production or purchase cost of a service or commodity plus usual business expenses and the receipts from the sale of such service or commodity."

RESOLUTIONS OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY, COUNCIL OF JEWISH FEDERATIONS AND WELFARE FUNDS, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of two resolutions adopted by the recent annual conference of the member communities of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds representing 263 organizations in more than 800 cities, held in Philadelphia in January with regard to the subject of displaced persons. These resolutions were sent to me by a distinguished civic leader and leader of Jewish organizations in my own State of Wisconsin, Mr. Irving G. Rhodes. Mr. Rhodes is also president of the west central region of the council. In a few days I expect to present a statement which I have personally prepared along the very lines of these resolutions. But, for the present, I ask unanimous consent that these statements be printed in the body of the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution on International Refugee Organization

Whereas the International Refugee Organization has failed to meet its full responsibilities for the feeding, the clothing, the education, and the general care and resettlement of displaced persons; and

Whereas the Jewish voluntary philanthropic agencies, because of their unwillingness to see the survivors of the Nazi programs of extermination suffer further, have been forced to devote large sums of money to meeting the deficiencies of the International Refugee Organization; and

Whereas the International Refugee Organization has refused since May 15, 1948, to participate in the transportation of the Jewish displaced persons to Israel, although Israel is the only country in the world which provides large emigration possibilities to the Jewish displaced persons; and

Whereas the International Refugee Organization has the responsibility for obtaining funds and encouraging mass resettlement projects and has failed to investigate, study, or begin negotiations for developing a mass resettlement scheme in Israel; and

Whereas the United States Government is endeavoring to alter these policies; and

Whereas the present funds available to the International Refugee Organization are adequate to accomplish the primary purposes of care and resettlement of displaced persons: Be it

Resolved, That the general assembly of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, representing the Jewish communities of America, commends the actions and policies of the United States Government has followed in its participation in the administration of the International Refugee Organization and that the President and appropriate committees of the Congress request a study to be made of the extent to which an unjustifiably heavy burden has been thrown upon philanthropic agencies for the care of displaced persons, and that it be further suggested that the appropriation for the fiscal year 1949–50 for the IRO be enacted under such conditions as will insure the proper policies with regard to expenditures of funds,

and that appropriate refunds be made to the voluntary philanthropic agencies for the basic responsibilities of the IRO which they have carried since July 1, 1947, particularly the payment of transportation costs for Jewish displaced persons emigrating to Israel since May 15, 1948.

Resolution on displaced persons

Whereas the Congress of the United States did not correct the unfair provisions of the present displaced-persons law in its last special session; and

Whereas the President of the United States has publicly condemned the act as restrictive and discriminatory: Be it

Resolved, That this general assembly of the Jewish communities of America urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which will eliminate all of the discriminatory provisions with respect to religion, occupation, and nationality. We ask that the fatal cut-off date of December 22, 1945, be eliminated, in keeping with the traditionally liberal policies of our country in affording a haven of asylum for the oppressed and needy peoples of other lands; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives and to the President of the United States acknowledging his enlightened views on this matter.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 45) for the relief of the owners and operators of certain gold mines which were closed or the operations of which were curtailed by War Production Board Limitation Order L-208, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 79) thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1036. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Lavantia Pearson;

S. 1037. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Virginia Pearson;

S. 1038. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Ethel M. Pearson George;

S. 1039. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Lavantia Pearson, sole heir to Helen Pearson, deceased; and

S. 1040. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Leah L. Pearson Louk; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 1041. A bill to authorize the construction of a new Federal building at Petersburg, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1042. A bill relating to the payment of fees, expenses and costs of jurors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. McCARRAN also introduced Senate bill 1043, to amend section 1705 of title 18 of the United States Code, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

PENALTY FOR DESTRUCTION OF MAIL RECEPTACLES

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 1705 of title 18 of the United States Code. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a letter from the Postmaster General, be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill, together with the letter, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1043) to amend section 1705 of title 18 of the United States Code, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1705 of title 18 of the United States Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1705. Destruction of letter boxes or mail: Whoever willfully or maliciously injures, tears down, or destroys any letter box or other receptacle intended or used for the receipt or delivery of mail on any mail route, or breaks open the same, or willfully or maliciously injures, defaces, or destroys any mail deposited therein, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 3 years."

The letter presented by Mr. McCARRAN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., February 14, 1949.

The Honorable ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
President of the United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am submitting herewith, for consideration by the Congress, legislation to amend section 1705 of title 18 of the United States Code.

Section 1705 of title 18 of the United States Code is a penal statute relating to the destruction of letter boxes or mail. It is a revision of the law embodied in section 321 of title 18 of the United States Code (Criminal Code, section 198, amended), which provided as follows:

"Whoever shall willfully or maliciously injure, tear down, or destroy any letter box or other receptacle intended or used for the receipt or delivery of mail on any mail route, or shall break open the same, or shall willfully or maliciously injure, deface, or destroy any mail deposited therein, or shall willfully take or steal such mail from or out of such letter box or other receptacle, or shall willfully aid or assist in any of the afore-mentioned offenses, shall for every such offense be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 3 years."

As revised in section 1705 of title 18, United States Code, by Public Law 772, approved June 25, 1948, the law provides:

"Whoever, having charge or control of any conveyance destroys any letter box or other receptacle intended or used for the receipt or delivery of mail on any mail route, or breaks open the same, or willfully or maliciously injures, defaces, or destroys any mail deposited therein, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 3 years."

The law, as codified in section 1705 of title 18, United States Code, is so phrased that its application is limited to persons "having charge or control of any conveyance." As a result of this limitation, a person who, on October 13, 1948, maliciously injured a rural mail box at Madison, Conn., could not be prosecuted under this law "because there was no conveyance used nor was any of the mail destroyed." It was necessary to request the chief of police of Madison to take prosecutive action under the State laws. A copy of the report of the inspectors who investigated the case is herewith.

It is believed that the Congress did not intend to limit the application of the law in section 1705 of title 18, United States Code, to persons "having charge or control of any conveyance." Accordingly, this Department strongly urges the enactment of the legislation submitted herewith, which, it is believed, will accomplish the purpose desired.

This Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

J. M. DONALDSON,
Postmaster General.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS OF COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE ON LABOR RELATIONS

Mr. THOMAS of Utah submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 74), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That 1,000 additional copies of part 1 and each subsequent part of the hearings held before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on Labor Relations be printed for the use of said committee.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 164. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the Churntown Elementary School District, California;

H. R. 1401. An act relating to the disposition of certain recreational demonstration project lands by the State of Michigan to the Mount Hope Cemetery Association of Waterloo, Mich.; and

H. R. 1998. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the conveyance to Pinellas County, State of Florida, of certain public lands herein described," approved June 17, 1948 (Public Law 606, 80th Cong.), for the purpose of correcting a land description therein; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 858. An act to clarify the overtime compensation provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, as applied in the longshore, stevedoring, building and construction industries; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H. R. 967. An act for the relief of the city of El Paso, Tex.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2101. An act to authorize the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., to make certain disaster or emergency loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

HOOSIER! A WORD WITH HISTORY ALL AROUND IT—ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Hoosier! A Word With History All Around It," from the Washington Times-Herald of February 21, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONGRESS THE SAFEGUARD OF LIBERTY—EDITORIAL FROM LABOR

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Dictators' First Move Is To Wreck Free Legislatures," from Labor for February 19, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

NOMINATION OF MON C. WALLGREN—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a number of editorials commenting on the nomination of Mon C. Wallgren to be Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, which appear in the Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 1252. An act to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 with respect to the eligibility for appointment in the executive branch of the Government of former professional staff members of committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives; and

H. J. Res. 84. Joint resolution to provide for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train by the Archivist of the United States, and for other purposes.

RECESS TO FRIDAY

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no unfinished business before the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate stand in recess until Friday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Friday, February 25, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Give ear, O Lord, unto our prayer, as we hear words of wisdom for the guidance and inspiration of a free people. By the holy ties which bind us together in happy families, by the love of country which inspires us to unselfish devotion, and by the still small voice which bids us go forward, we would exalt and magnify Thy holy name.

In these hallowed moments it is given us to realize the patriotic devotion and character of our forefathers. From the unseen heights Thou didst guide their broken columns as they toiled in sacrificial suffering to bring order out of chaos, service out of selfishness. Inspired by Him whose very soul recognized the sacredness of human freedom, we pray that we may be prophets of a new day, carrying faith into every section; faith in a God whose verities are eternal. In the spirit of our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1252. An act to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 with respect to the eligibility for appointment in the executive branch of the Government of former professional staff members of committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 198. An act for the relief of the city and county of San Francisco;

S. 268. An act for the relief of Ella L. Browning;

S. 271. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the middle district of Georgia;

S. 461. An act to clarify the provisions of section 602 (u) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended;

S. 592. An act for the relief of Edwin B. Anderson;

S. 593. An act for the relief of certain postal employees;

S. 594. An act for the relief of John I. Malarin, former Army mail clerk at APO 932, a branch of the San Francisco, Calif., post office, relative to a shortage in his fixed credit account;

S. 624. An act for the relief of Herman A. Bennink;

S. 633. An act for the relief of Rachel D. Gattegno;

S. 634. An act to authorize payment of certain claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property and personal injury arising from activities of the Army;

S. 664. An act for the relief of Kihei Matsuo;

S. 745. An act to provide for the designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Chicago, Ill., as the Albert A. Sprague Veterans Memorial Hospital;

S. 748. An act for the relief of Charles L. Bishop;

S. J. Res. 36. Joint resolution for the authorization of a special contribution by the United States for the relief of Palestine refugees; and

S. J. Res. 42. Joint resolution granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Gulf coast and creating the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission.

WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 15, 1949, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] to read George Washington's Farewell Address.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, since this is the most important message ever delivered to the Congress of the United States, or to the American people, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present, in order that all the Members may have an opportunity to hear it.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 21]

Abbitt	Beall	Bosone
Addonizio	Bennett, Fla.	Breen
Allen, Ill.	Bentsen	Brooks
Allen, La.	Biemiller	Bryson
Andresen, August H.	Bland	Buckley, Ill.
Bailey	Blatnik	Buckley, N. Y.
Barrett, Pa.	Bloom	Bulwinkle
Barrett, Wyo.	Boggs, Del.	Burleson
Bates, Ky.	Bolton, Md.	Burton
	Bolton, Ohio	Byrne, N. Y.
Camp	Harrison	Potter
Canfield	Hart	Poulson
Carnahan	Havenner	Powell
Carroll	Heffernan	Quinn
Celler	Herter	Ramsay
Chesney	Irving	Rich
Christopher	Jacobs	Richman
Chudoff	Javits	Rodino
Clemente	Jonas	St. George
Coffey	Jones, Mo.	Sasscer
Cole, Kans.	Judd	Scott, Hardie
Colmer	Kean	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Cooley	Kelley	Scudder
Cotton	Kennedy	Secrest
Coudert	Keogh	Simpson, Ill.
Crosser	Kerr	Sims
Cunningham	King	Smith, Ohio
Curtis	Kirwan	Smith, Va.
Davies, N. Y.	Klein	Somers
Davis, Tenn.	Kruse	Steed
Dawson	Kunkel	Stigler
DeGraffenried	Lane	Stockman
Delaney	Lanham	Sutton
Dingell	Latham	Taber
Dollinger	LeFevre	Tauriello
Donohue	Lichtenwalter	Taylor
Doughton	Linehan	Thomas, N. J.
Eaton	Lodge	Towe
Ellsworth	Mack, Ill.	Van Zandt
Fallon	Macy	Veide
Fellows	Mason	Vorys
Forand	Merrow	Vursell
Fulton	Miller, Md.	Wadsworth
Furcolo	Morton	Weichel
Gamble	Murphy	Werdel
Garmatz	Nelson	Wheeler
Gary	Norton	Whitaker
Gillette	O'Brien, Mich.	Whitten
Gore	O'Hara, Ill.	Wickersham
Gorski, N. Y.	O'Sullivan	Wigglesworth
Granahan	O'Toole	Wilson, Ind.
Granger	Patterson	Wilson, Tex.
Green	Perkins	Withrow
Gregory	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	Wolcott
Hall, Leonard W.	Philbin	Worley
Halleck	Phillips, Tenn.	Yates
Hand	Plumley	Zablocki
Hare	Polk	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 260 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] to read Washington's Farewell Address.

Mr. CORBETT read the Farewell Address, as follows:

To the people of the United States:

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no defi-

ciency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and, every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which not unfrequently, want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism,—the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans, by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquillity at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth, as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth, or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts, of common dangers, suffering and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they addressed themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here, every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The *north*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *south*, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *south* in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the *north*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *north*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The *east*, in a like intercourse with the *west*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The *west* derives from the *east* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the *secure* enjoyment of indispensable *outlets* for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*. Any other tenure by which the *west* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength; or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts, greater

strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union, an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalship alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues, would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind and exhibit the continuance of the union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *geographical* discriminations,—*northern* and *southern*—*Atlantic* and *western;* whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head; they have seen, in the negotiation by the executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were procured? will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliances, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and maintaining within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government.—But the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power, and the right of the people to establish government, presuppose the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency.—They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite, not only that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be involved, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions:—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country:—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion: and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind, (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit or party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foments occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchial cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will alv ays be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasion of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation *desert* the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinion should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes, that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties,) ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessary parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils!—Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and

powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens,) the jealousy of a free people ought to be *constantly* awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interests.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little *political* connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith:—Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe; my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without any thing more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,
17th September, 1796.

STILL THE GREATEST

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include the following editorial from today's Times-Herald:

STILL THE GREATEST

Today as we celebrate the two hundred and seventeenth anniversary of the birth of the Father of our Country, the trials and triumphs of George Washington, the patriot, the soldier, and the President will be honored in prayer and reverence, for Washington still is the greatest American yet of record. It is always interesting to speculate on why this is so.

What outstanding virtue did Washington possess? On what cornerstone was this giant among men built?

Was it integrity? Was it tenacity? Was it faith? Or was it character?

Gen. Douglas MacArthur has said George Washington was the outstanding general in United States history. He based his declaration on the fact that although General Washington was beset by defeat, forced to retreat, faced mutiny and desertion in the ranks and traitorous intrigues among his generals, was short on supplies and lacked support from the civilian population, he was still so powerful a leader that he held together an army in being through seven harrowing years, to win the final victory.

HE LED THE GREAT

When Washington became President his troubles on the new plane were just as difficult as the dangers that had threatened his military career.

President Washington had around him at the beginning of this constitutional Government, the ablest group of political thinkers and experts on government that have ever been on this earth, at one place at one time. They were men of such depth and vision that their efforts to form a free government for free people reached a success never equaled.

There were John Adams, Alexander Hamilton, Benjamin Franklin, and Thomas Jefferson, to name a few. Each was an individualist although joined in the movement to create the new Government. And, it was Washington's task to keep them working together. The very existence of this country today is a monument to his success, yet history has yet to put its finger exactly on the single, elusive facet of Washington's many-sided nature that gave him the ability to control these explosive, individualistic geniuses—we just have to sum it all up with a one-word description. He had character.

With that, we pass on to review his greatest single accomplishment, and one which is too seldom mentioned these days by its right name—the Revolution.

George Washington is the only man who has ever directed a successful revolution. We say successful because he made it stick. The Government of the United States of America, that has developed out of the revolution Washington led, has weathered more than a century and a quarter and is alive and stronger today than ever. What has happened to the others?

FRENCH REVOLT A FAILURE

The French Revolution, following closely on the heels of the one in this country, threw off the yoke of kingly tyranny only to lose the battle for a stable permanent government. Its immediate result was the Reign of Terror. Next came Napoleon. Then more revolution. More blood, more horror, until this very day. The Government of France is still weak, subject to instant change and constantly afraid of another blood bath.

CHINA FLOP

At the turn of this century Sun Yat-sen organized one secret society after another and tried 10 times to oust the Manchu dynasty in China. He was successful in 1911. But, like the French, the Chinese were never able to consolidate their gains and reap the rewards.

Sun Yat-sen died before his dream of a national government for his country came into being. His mantle of leadership fell around the shoulders of his young general, Chiang Kai-shek. Only a few weeks ago the news services carried the story of Chiang's retirement. He could not make a go of it even after years and years of civil war.

RUSSIAN DICTATORSHIP

In 1917 the revolutionaries swarmed into power in Russia, through a series of assassinations, mutinies, and riots. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was born, and its advocates promised a new freedom. Thirty years later we find only horror and misery prolonged in their name.

And so history records the hopes and failures of mankind in the revolutions of the world but only one success—the handiwork of one George Washington. He used revolution as a weapon as others had before him and as others have since—but with this distinction: He knew when to stop. And he reached the pinnacle:

"First in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen."

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, without establishing a precedent, I ask unanimous consent that whenever reports are filed with the Speaker by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government pursuant to Public Law 162, Eightieth Congress, as amended, the Speaker may refer the said reports notwithstanding the fact that the House may not be in session.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, as a member of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, I can assure the House that the Commission will be very appreciative of the granting of this request propounded by the gentleman from Massachusetts, because there are quite a number of these reports that must be presented between now and March 15, and it may be possible that the House will not always be in session.

Mr. McCORMACK. I may say that the purpose of the consent request was that so far as the House was concerned there should be perfect understanding and cooperation between the House, the Speaker of the House, and the Commission of which the distinguished former President is the chairman and of which the distinguished gentleman from Ohio is a member.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE FROM THURSDAY NEXT UNTIL THE FOLLOWING MONDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Thursday next it adjourn to meet on the following Monday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER. The Chair designates the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] to act as Speaker pro tempore on Thursday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEEFE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. McCULLOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Muncie Star, issue of February 17.

Mr. SHORT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a recent broadcast over the program Town Hall of the Air.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include certain excerpts.

Mr. BURNSIDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BOLLING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the February 19, 1949, issue of Labor, the railroad labor official weekly.

Mr. NORBLAD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial favoring 4-year terms for Congressmen.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, after disposition of the matters on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. HOWELL), for the period from February 22 to February 24, on account of illness.

To Mr. ADDONIZIO (at the request of Mr. HOWELL), for today, on account of official business.

To Mr. TAURIELLO (at the request of Mr. LYNCH), for today, on account of official business.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 208. An act for the relief of Ella L. Browning; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 271. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the middle district of Georgia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 461. An act to clarify the provisions of section 602 (u) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 592. An act for the relief of Edwin B. Anderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 594. An act for the relief of John I. Malarin, former Army mail clerk at APO 932, a branch of the San Francisco, Calif., post office, relative to a shortage in his fixed credit account; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 624. An act for the relief of Herman A. Bennink; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 633. An act for the relief of Rachel D. Gattegno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 634. An act to authorize payment of certain claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property and personal injury arising from activities of the Army; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 664. An act for the relief of Kihei Matsuo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 745. An act to provide for the designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Chicago, Ill., as the Albert A. Sprague Veterans Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 748. An act for the relief of Charles L. Bishop; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. J. Res. 36. Joint resolution for the authorization of a special contribution by the United States for the relief of Palestine refugees; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1252. An act to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 with respect to the eligibility for appointment in the executive branch of the Government of former professional staff members of committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives; and

H. J. Res. 84. Joint resolution to provide for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train by the Archivist of the United States, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, February 24, 1949.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

252. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting to the Congress the Commission's report on reorganization of the Department of Agriculture (H. Doc. No. 80); to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

253. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting to the Congress a study, prepared for the Commission's consideration, on aspects of agricultural functions and organization in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

254. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting to the Congress, in typescript, the detailed report, by agency, on departmental management which was prepared for the Commission's consideration by the task force as a supplement to their summary report on this subject. This material is a further addition to the supporting data which accompanied the Commission's report on governmental management of the executive branch, filed with the Congress on February 7, 1949; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

255. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting to the Congress, in typescript, the recommendations made to the Commission by the task force which studied the Federal field services. This material is a further addition to the supporting data which accompanied the Commission's report on general management of the executive branch, filed with the Congress on February 7, 1949; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

256. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting to the Congress, in typescript, the appendixes to the study of departmental management offered for the Commission's consideration by the task force as a supplement to their summary report on this subject. This material is a further addition to the supporting data which accompanied the Commission's report on governmental management of the executive branch, filed with the Congress on February 7, 1949; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

257. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting to the Congress, in typescript, the detailed findings presented to the Commission by the task force which studied the Federal field services. This material is a further addition to the supporting data which accompanied the Commission's report on general management of the executive branch, filed with the Congress on February 7, 1949; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

258. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a copy of the semiannual report, for the period ending December 31, 1948, of real and personal property leased by the Department of the Navy under the authority of Public Law 364, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

259. A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting a report on the audit of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (H. Doc. No. 81); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

260. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Public Lands.

261. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 25, 1938, as amended, by providing for the certification of batches of drugs composed wholly or partly of any kind of aureomycin, chloramphenicol, and bacitracin, or any derivative thereof"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

262. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 28, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Nehalem Bay and River, Oreg., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

263. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 28, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on the coast of the Great Lakes, harbors of refuge for light-draft vessels, particularly with respect to harbors of refuge at Braddock Bay and Hamlin Beach State Park, N. Y., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on September 25, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

264. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 28, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Northeast River, Cecil County, Md., from Church Point to Stony Run, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on July 24, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

265. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 5, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Sandy River, Oreg., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on February 8, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLEVENGER:

H. R. 2938. A bill to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 2939. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GAVIN:

H. R. 2940. A bill to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of the ninetieth anniversary of the beginning of the petroleum industry in the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina:

H. R. 2941. A bill to provide Federal aid to the States for the construction of armories and similar training facilities for the National Guard and Naval Militia; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McGUIRE (by request):

H. R. 2942. A bill to provide for cooperation of the Federal and State Governments in the assessment of inheritance taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 2943. A bill to provide for the payment by the United States of premiums on bonds of Government officers or employees; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 2944. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide survivorship benefits for widows or widowers of persons retiring under such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2945. A bill to readjust postal rates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PETERSON (by request):

H. R. 2946. A bill extending certain recognition and rights to temporary members of the United States Coast Guard Reserve, including the Voluntary Port Security Force, and members of the Coast Guard Auxiliary; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 2947. A bill to prohibit the unauthorized use of the name or insignia of the Future Farmers of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2948. A bill to make it a Federal crime to transport in interstate or foreign commerce trailers or semitrailers knowing that they have been stolen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES:

H. R. 2949. A bill amending Pay Act to cover all Sunday, holiday, and overtime duty; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 2950. A bill for the exemption from the educational requirements for naturalization of aliens who are over 50 years of age and have resided in the United States continuously since prior to July 1, 1924; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANBORN:

H. R. 2951. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to announce the parity price of milk, and to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to immediately announce the support price of milk; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 2952. A bill to amend and supplement the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653), and to amend section 9 of the act of May 22, 1928 (45 Stat. 699, 702; 58 Stat. 265; 16 U. S. C. 581h); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 2953. A bill to provide that the pension of a helpless child of a veteran shall not be discontinued on such child's marriage; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 2954. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Gulf coast and creating the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 2955. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at New Iberia, La.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2956. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 2957. A bill to amend the Institute of Inter-American Affairs Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 2958. A bill to amend section 14 of the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 (approved Oct. 14, 1940, Public Law No. 850, 76th Cong., 3d sess.); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. J. Res. 174. Joint resolution for the purpose of erecting adequate Federal office and postal facilities in Tacoma, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. J. Res. 175. Joint resolution to reimburse uncompensated leave to Government Printing Office employees earned during the fiscal year 1932; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. Res. 114. Resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct thorough studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI (1) (e) of the rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 115. Resolution providing for the expenses incurred by House Resolution 114; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relating to their concurrent resolution asking Congress to immediately provide for the continued operation of the Pipestone Indian School at Pipestone, Minn., and the reopening of the hospital at said school; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, relating to their Senate Memorial 1, requesting immediate action by the President and Congress with respect to social-security payments to Indians on reservations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relating to their Senate Joint Memorial 2, urging the Congress to appropriate $500,000 to be administered in cooperation with the noxious-weed program of the constituted authorities of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, relating to their House Joint Memorial 7, relative to land acquisitions and tax base for real-property taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relating to their Senate Resolution 3, asking that national rent control be abandoned; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relating to their Senate Resolution 4, asking Congress not to pass certain legislation now pending before it, which in effect provides for state medicine, but to encourage private cooperative health insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

97. By the SPEAKER: Petition of James W. Patterson, city clerk, Pittsburgh, Pa., petitioning consideration of his resolution asking Congress to enact legislation providing for payments to cities in lieu of taxes by housing authorities, etc.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

98. Also, petition of Ray M. Souder, secretary-manager, Texas Hardware and Implement Association, Dallas, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolutions with reference to the wage and hour law and tax equality; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

99. Also, petition of Maurice J. Fleischman, city clerk, Long Beach, Calif., petitioning consideration of his resolution condemning the conviction and sentence of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty and urging action to secure his release; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

100. Also, petition of Willis Sherrill, secretary, Florida State Townsend Council, West Palm Beach, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution requesting the early passage of H. R. 2135 and H. R. 2136, bills to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance and old-age retirement benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

101. By Mr. RABAUT: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan (H. Con. Res. 17) protesting to the world the ruthless and unjust exercise of autocratic power in connection with the trial and conviction of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

102. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. Marie S. Fogus, secretary, New York City Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution asking the Congress to repeal the excise taxes on luxuries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. McCORMACK.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord of light and mercy, we lift our hearts in gratitude for the spirit that protects us, for the light that lifts the curtain of darkness, and for the tokens of the promise of a new day.

Father, pity us when we put our trust in superficial beliefs and when we boast of our own virtues; purge us of our pride, and deepen the channels of experience that look through the lens of brotherly love. Help us that all may find in Thee a true pattern of self-forgetfulness; here may we build our sacrificial altars and realize that the brotherhood of man is the fatherhood of God. In the name of our elder Brother Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 22, 1949, was read and approved.

ELECTION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 116) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the designation of Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK, a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, as Speaker pro tempore be approved by the House, and that the President of the United States and the Senate be notified thereof.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. As I understand, this is the customary resolution to meet a situation, so that bills may be duly enrolled and presented for signature?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The gentleman is correct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair requests the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] to administer the oath of office to the Chair.

Mr. MANSFIELD administered the oath of office as Speaker pro tempore to Mr. McCORMACK.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 25 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore granted.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article which appeared in Lykes Fleet Flashes on the American merchant marine, and further to extend his remarks and include an article on the subject of subsidies fully repaid and remarks by Commissioner McKeough and himself.

Mr. LOVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one an editorial and in the other Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 8 of the South Dakota State Legislature.

Mr. KEOGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one an address and in the other an editorial.

Mr. TEAGUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous material.

TAX SETTLEMENT BOARD

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill which I have this morning introduced is to establish a Tax Settlement Board which can bring about speedy and inexpensive settlement of controversies between taxpayers and the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

The determination of taxable income and the amount of tax due for a specific fiscal period is a matter on which there can be honest differences of opinion, except in simple cases where income is derived solely from wages or salaries. The Bureau is naturally and properly concerned with obtaining the maximum amount to which the Government is entitled. The taxpayer is naturally and properly inclined to figure the tax in the way which will be least expensive to himself.

When the Bureau decides that the tax liability as reported is too low, and proposes to assess a deficiency, the taxpayer must go to a representative of the Bureau itself to try to effect a settlement. This is as it should be in the first instance, and many cases are satisfactorily settled in this way.

But if no agreement is reached which is satisfactory to the taxpayer, he must either accept the Bureau's decision or undertake the expense of filing a petition with The Tax Court or a Federal district court and preparing his case for trial. Not infrequently taxpayers accept settlements they consider unjust because the amount involved, even though important to them, does not justify the expense of a lawsuit. And even when the taxpayer goes to court and wins his case, he may be out of pocket a substantial sum for legal fees.

The proposed Tax Settlement Board would provide an impartial means of settling the dispute at minimum expense and loss of time to the taxpayer and to the Government.

LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

The Treasury Department early recognized the need for such an informal appeals agency, and recommended its creation in the early 1920's. A bill to carry out this recommendation by creating a Board of Tax Appeals was prepared by the Ways and Means Committee, and passed the House of Representatives. However, the bill was amended in the Senate to give the Board more of the formal characteristics of a court, though it was to be an administrative agency. Shortly afterwards Mr. A. W. Gregg, then Solicitor of Internal Revenue, described the situation as follows in testimony before the Ways and Means Committee:

> The Treasury Department originally recommended a board in the Treasury Department with informal procedure to settle tax cases. It was recognized at the time that there were two needs, one for a board to settle tax cases, and I mean settle them in the case of settling them across the table, and the other a court to establish precedents, the latter (not?) for its value in deciding the cases which would be presented to it, because they necessarily must be limited in number, but for the purpose of establishing precedents to guide the Bureau in the settlement of other cases and to guide the taxpayer in disposing of his case.
>
> The original recommendation of the Treasury Department was for a board to settle tax cases. Congress changed that and gave us the other, which was also much needed: a court to establish precedents for the disposition of other cases pending in the Department.

Since the Board of Tax Appeals was bound by formal rules of evidence and procedure, inevitably it took on the characteristics of a court, and the name was changed to Tax Court of the United States in 1942. In the Eightieth Congress, the House of Representatives passed a bill which would have made it a court of record, and while this provision was deleted by the Senate because of certain controversial features, such a change would do little more than formalize an existing situation.

It is worth noting that while there are more than fifty million income-tax returns filed every year under the present tax laws, The Tax Court receives only about five thousand cases a year, and a much smaller number actually reach trial.

The need for an informal, independent appeals agency therefore remains just as great as it was in 1924, when the Ways and Means Committee recommended and the House of Representatives approved the creation of such a body. The need is in fact much greater, because of the heavy increases both in number of taxpayers and in the tax burden. The number of individual income-tax returns increased from a little over four million in 1926 to over fifty million in 1947.

SETTLEMENT VERSUS LITIGATION

In 1927, the Secretary of the Treasury said in his report to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation:

> The collection of revenue is primarily an administrative and not a judicial problem. As far as the Federal income tax is concerned, a field of administration has been turned into a legal battlefield.

It is neither sound in policy nor correct in fact to assume that every tax return is a potential source of litigation between the taxpayer and the Government. The whole tax structure would collapse if the Government could not depend upon the honest intentions of the vast majority of taxpayers: it would be fantastically expensive to check every return in detail, and the courts would be hopelessly clogged if court action were required for even 5 percent of the taxpayers.

With a budget of over $200,000,000 in the fiscal year 1947, the Bureau of Internal Revenue was able to investigate only 3 percent of the income-tax returns received.

Under these circumstances, the revenues of the Government depend to a very considerable extent upon the honesty and good will of taxpayers. The good will of the taxpayer depends upon his belief that he is being fairly treated, without persecution or discrimination.

Inevitably, as the situation exists today, many taxpayers must feel that in attempting to settle cases with the agents and technical staff of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, they must deal with a judge who is also a prosecutor, unless they are willing to take the time and spend the money to go to court. An advisory group appointed pursuant to Public Law 147, Eightieth Congress, had this to say in its report to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation:

> The emphasis on enforcement techniques which show immediate dividends to the Government often have secondary deleterious effect. The whole enforcement personnel of the Bureau leans in varying degrees away from an objective determination of correct tax liability toward the so-called productive activities. Selection of returns for audit, for example, is dictated by evidences of potential deficiencies; circumstantial evidences of refunds are often ignored. As taxpayers find enforcement activity a one-way street, they rationalize progressively lower levels of tax compliance. This trend must be reversed.

Creation of a Tax Settlement Board, with informal procedures, to which the taxpayer could appeal his case with a minimum of trouble and expense, would go far toward restoring the complete confidence in fair treatment which is essential to a workable tax system. No matter how fair the revenue agents are in fact, the present situation does not give the taxpayer this feeling of confidence that he is receiving impartial treatment.

From all points of view, the amicable settlement of tax controversies is much to be preferred to litigation, which should generally be reserved for cases involving complicated legal questions and interpretations of the statutes to establish precedents. The vast majority of tax controversies have to do with the amount rather than the legality of tax liability, and can better be settled by the techniques of arbitration than by the processes of the courtroom. The present Tax Court does not attempt to arbitrate. Testifying before a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee last year,

Presiding Judge Bolon B. Turner, of The Tax Court, said:

> Our work is pure and simple, the preparation, the trial, and decision of lawsuits.

The Tax Court does not even review the record as established in the Bureau of Internal Revenue, but rather takes up each case de novo on the evidence presented. This is as it should be in a court of law, but it also makes appeal to The Tax Court more expensive and time-consuming for the taxpayer.

There is precedent for an informal agency to settle controversies involving payments to or from the Federal Government in the successful operation of the Contract Settlement Appeal Board, which has very substantially reduced litigation over World War II contracts, as compared with those in World War I.

OPERATION OF TAX SETTLEMENT BOARD

If the proposed Tax Settlement Board were established, a taxpayer failing to reach a satisfactory settlement with the technical staff of the Bureau of Internal Revenue could file a petition for a hearing with the Board and would have his 90-day notice from the Bureau stayed just as it is now when a petition is filed with The Tax Court.

However, instead of having to prepare a complete legal case covering the whole record, the taxpayer would have an informal review of the record by a member or members of the Tax Settlement Board. He could appear for himself, or with his attorney or his accountant, as he chose. An impartially determined settlement would be arrived at promptly. If the taxpayer or the Government were still dissatisfied, and especially if complicated legal questions were involved, either could take the matter to The Tax Court or the district court.

In any case, the taxpayer's rights would be fully protected, and he would have the inestimable advantage of a review by an impartial arbiter at a minimum expenditure of time and money.

THIS OUR CAESAR

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Chicago Daily News.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of every Member of the House an editorial, entitled "This Our Caesar," which appeared in the Chicago Daily News of Monday, February 21.

Every Member of Congress, every citizen of the United States, should read this editorial, for it graphically presents the one great fundamental issue before the country in the Truman program. That issue is whether we are to continue as a free country or whether we are to become totalitarian. It raises the question whether the Democratic Congress will either share Mr. Truman's belief that this drastic program is required, or lack the courage to vote its opposition.

Surely the membership of this House see that in the Truman program for giving him practically all the powers over prices, wages, and production that he had in wartime means the end of American liberty, an end to the American way of life. The Truman anti-inflation bill would authorize the President to fix prices on commodities and manufactures deemed to be in short supply; to control wages in industries operating under fixed prices; to order expansion of production facilities for any product; to make loans to industry for this purpose; and for the Government itself to build and operate such plants.

Read that bill. Reflect upon what the vesting of such powers into the hands of stubborn, economically illiterate, vengeful, and politically unscrupulous men means to the rights and liberties of the people we represent.

If the broad powers sought by this bill are, as contended, for the purpose of combating inflation, then let us ask ourselves why as part of the same program Mr. Truman asks for an increase in Government spending which adds fuel to the fires of inflation. Let us ask ourselves why he asks for power to order an expansion of production facilities, and at the same time proposes to take from the people in taxes and more taxes the very means by which they can expand production facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I again urge the membership of this House to read this editorial, and to reflect upon what all this means to this great, free country—the last citadel of freedom in the world.

When I consider the drastic program which Mr. Truman is advocating, I wonder if he, himself, really understands what he is proposing to be done. Can it be that he is simply being misled or maybe he is being used by those who would revolutionize American life?

If it is, that he really and truly understands the drastic nature of the program he has recommended, then, Mr. Speaker, I ask, "Upon what meat does this our Caesar feed?"

Taken as a whole, the issue today is whether we are to have a free government or a totalitarian government. The question is whether we have the courage to face that issue. If I felt for a moment that I was without such courage, I would resign my seat in Congress. No man is worthy of the trust of representative of the people in a free government if he is willing to sacrifice fundamental principles on the altar of political expediency.

The editorial is as follows:

THIS OUR CAESAR

Clinging to the contention that further inflation will be generated—by its own spendthrift policies—the administration is asking Congress to give the President practically all the powers over prices, wages, and production that he had in wartime.

The representation is that these are merely stand-by powers, not to be used except in cases of grave threat to economic stability. But experience indicates that when authority is granted, occasion is soon found for its use. An instance is the injunctive power to halt strikes which Mr. Truman says he doesn't even want, but which, nevertheless, he used seven times in a year.

The anti-inflation bill would authorize the President to fix prices on commodities and manufactures deemed to be in short supply; to control wages in industries operating under fixed prices; to order expansion of production facilities for any product; to make loans to industry for this purpose; and for the Government itself to build and operate such plants.

Not content with these proposals to give the President the reins of production, he would be empowered to embark upon state trading in the totalitarian manner by direct purchase of foreign raw materials. The program, naturally, would require a coordinator, at $20,000 a year.

John D. Clark, member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, obediently supported the administration proposal with a forecast that inflationary forces are growing stronger. He related pridefully that Mr. Truman "was not afraid to take that final step" if it become necessary for the Government to become a producer of goods.

This bill is a part of the Truman program that calls for extension of rent and credit controls, an additional $4,000,000,000 in taxes, and extension of controls over exports and over bank reserves.

It is, in brief, a program for placing in the hands of a stubborn, economically illiterate, vengeful, politically unscrupulous man almost unlimited power over the welfare of this Nation. It proposes an authority so all-embracing that the mere suggestion would have brought instant and angry repudiation a few years ago, before we became habituated to having our liberties whittled away.

The Eightieth Congress had the judgment and the stamina to ignore Mr. Truman's requests for legislation similar to that now proposed. It was politically damaging, because it gave the President the opportunity to blame the Republicans for the high prices due to the accumulated wartime shortages, vast increase in the money supply, and unprecedented Government spending.

The question now is whether the Democratic Congress will either share Mr. Truman's belief that this drastic program is required or lack the courage to vote its opposition.

Aside from the perils of allowing politicians to tinker with your watch, the sound reasons for opposing new price and wage controls were written by the President himself. It was on November 9, 1946. He ordered the abandonment of all wage control and all controls over prices except those of sugar and rice. He said he was convinced that "with so much of the economy freed from price controls, clinging to the rest would * * * lead to distortions in production and diversion of goods to an extent far outweighing any benefit that could be achieved.

"At best the administration of price control is an extraordinarily difficult and complex business, and it can work successfully only if the people generally give it their support."

Supporters of the new program may contend that no over-all price controls are intended. But in the same message Mr. Truman pointed out that it was impossible to control the price of building materials, for example, without also controlling the products competing for the same raw materials, since fixed prices would drive those materials away from housing.

The truth today is that Mr. Truman and his advisers do not know whether they are going to have to contend with inflation or deflation. If they sincerely believe it is inflation and are sincerely interested in checking it, they need only curtail the madcap extravagance under which the Government is disbursing nearly a fourth of the national income.

Instead, Mr. Truman is asking for a fire extinguisher, apparently hoping that, if need be, he can use it as a blowtorch. We trust that Congress will be wise enough to give him neither in these circumstances.

THE PRESIDENT'S PROGRAM

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Buffalo Evening News.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the Buffalo Evening News of February 22, 1949:

WITH THE SPEED OF A SNAIL

Seven months ago—last July 27, to be exact—President Truman addressed a hastily summoned emergency session of Congress.

"The urgent needs of the American people," he declared, "require our presence here today. Our people demand legislative action * * * first, to check inflation * * * and second, to help in meeting the acute housing shortage * * *. We cannot afford to wait for the next Congress to act."

These were the two emergencies that brought Congress into session. But while it was there, the President also demanded immediate action on aid to education, civil rights, a higher minimum wage, broader social security, a revised Displaced Persons Act, ratification of the International Wheat Agreement, bigger public power appropriations, etc.

That was 7 months ago. Congress didn't do much about either emergency or any of the other recommendations. Three months later, largely on that issue, the Republican Congress was turned out and President Truman was elected, along with a decisively Democratic Congress presumably mandated to act on his program.

The election was 4 months ago, and there was no more talk of emergency. Two leisurely months later, the new Congress convened. It is now in its eighth week.

Inflation, meanwhile, has subsided, and the administration is warning people not to get jittery about disinflation. It has deliberately scuttled the very housing bill it demanded all last year. It has blocked a Republican move to come to grips with the civil-rights issue. It has achieved no final action of any kind with respect to education, minimum wages, social security, displaced persons, the wheat agreement, power appropriations or anything else mentioned in the special session of last July. Yet Mr. Truman had declared that all these items could be disposed of in jig time if the last Congress had really wished to do so.

As a matter of fact, the one and only notable achievement of the Eighty-first Congress to date wasn't even on the emergency agenda last July. That is the handsome raise in pay voted for President Truman.

PROPOSED LABOR EXTENSION DIVISION

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWELL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing into the House today a bill, already favorably reported by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee in the Eightieth Congress and broadly sponsored and supported in the Eighty-first Congress by Democrats and Republicans alike, now known as the Labor Extension Act of 1949.

More than 80 years ago President Abraham Lincoln signed the Morrill Act which, by action of the Congress in 1862, established our great system of land-grant colleges throughout the States of the Nation. These were to be people's colleges serving the agricultural population and the industrial classes with practical and useful information. In supplemental legislation, Congress later provided matching funds to the States to create our famous Agricultural Extension Service through which this instruction would flow directly to persons not attending or in residence in said colleges, on the Nation's farms and in its rural communities.

Since the time of Abraham Lincoln we have become a great industrial country. Millions of wage and salary earners who have not been fortunate enough to become residents at any college want and seek information and instruction about the affairs that affect their daily lives. This is particularly true of thousands of union officers, grievance committeemen, and shop stewards in all of our States who desire knowledge and information conducive to intelligent and constructive labor leadership.

In my own State of New Jersey, both the A. F. of L. and the CIO are eager for learning for their members and to provide it is most certainly a public responsibility. All of American labor has officially and unanimously endorsed the Labor Extension Act of 1949. Prominent educators and leaders from all walks of life have done likewise.

Under its terms, a Labor Extension Division would be established in the United States Department of Labor through which funds and aid would flow to colleges and universities in the States. There, in cooperation with wage and salary-earning groups, instruction services would be set up as they have existed for so many years, and so successfully, for America's farm families.

Certainly, education can and must play a fundamental part in reducing areas of group conflict in American life, whether it involves the labor-management relationship or any other.

We who take pride in our American democracy and our way of life can best preserve it by now making available to all adult citizens the opportunity to be informed and to know—on a parity with all other groups. It is particularly timely and fortunate that organized labor in America comes to the Congress of the United States seeking aid toward the accomplishment of this end. We can ignore this reasonable and constructive request only at the peril of our traditional beliefs and our faith in the equal opportunity of all—to be informed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HÉBERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in one to include an editorial from the New Orleans Item, and in the other to include some extraneous matter.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the Cement case and to include therein a statement on the same subject.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech made by Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

THE NATIONAL GUARD SYSTEM

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks, and include an address delivered by Brig. Gen. Julius Klein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JONAS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, we in the State of Illinois are proud of our State's great National Guard organization. The record of Illinois' sons, especially those who served with the Thirty-third Division in both world wars, is outstanding.

One of the important units of the Guard has its headquarters in the Broadway Armory at 5900 Broadway, Chicago, in the heart of my congressional district. It is the One Hundred and Ninth Antiaircraft Artillery Brigade, commanded by my old friend, Brig. Gen. Julius Klein. It was my privilege to serve as chairman of the citizens' committee that cooperated with General Klein to recruit a fine group of young men from my neighborhood to form the major part of this antiaircraft artillery brigade.

In addition to being a recognized civic and military leader General Klein has earned a great reputation as an outstanding figure in veterans' activities and organization. At the time of his retirement last year as national commander of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States he received many well-deserved messages of commendation, including recognition from the President of the United States, Generals MacArthur, Eisenhower, Eichelberger, and others.

On January 27, of this year, at Bloomington, Ill., the American Legion and the Bloomington Association of Commerce sponsored an event in recognition of National Defense Month. The guest of honor and principal speaker was this distinguished citizen-soldier of Illinois who delivered an interesting and most timely address. Under consent to extend my remarks, I include the speech of General Klein:

Ladies and gentlemen and fellow veterans of our country's armed forces, this is sincerely a great privilege for me to be here as your guest this evening and discuss with you the citizen-soldier's role in our national defense. Your city has received its rightful recognition during these past eventful weeks when Adlai Stevenson, Illinois' new Governor and commander in chief of the Illinois National Guard, a distinguished native son of Bloomington, paid homage to the scene of his earliest experiences. Bloomington has already contributed immeasurably to our great Nation, both in the past and present, and will, I am sure, continue to do so in the future. Your most recent achievement in this respect, the organization, support, and development of the Three Hundred and Ninety-sixth Antiaircraft Artillery Battalion, Illinois National Guard, under command of Lt. Col. Richard T. Dunn, is a vivid example of community spirit and community pride in operation. The people of Bloomington can

be justly proud of this flourishing organization, which in its short period of existence has progressed far beyond all expectations to become one of the finest National Guard units of its kind in our State and Nation today. I need only cite the outstanding records of the Three Hundred and Ninety-sixth at Fort Sheridan last summer and their recent performance as inaugural honor guard for Governor Stevenson as evidence of the fine reputation for efficiency and military excellence these career Regular troops are establishing in the military service. I welcome this opportunity to publicly commend Colonel Dunn for his splendid leadership and my deep appreciation to all those who assisted him in the development of the Three Hundred and Ninety-sixth Antiaircraft Battalion. The National Guard in Illinois boasts an unparalleled record of service and loyalty to its State as well as the Nation, and to our new commander in chief, Governor Stevenson, we pledge our continued loyalty and support without reservation. I am confident that Governor Stevenson will extend the same interest and cooperation to the Illinois National Guard as did his distinguished predecessors, and that he will fight to preserve its integrity and traditions as an agency of the State. It would be well for us to further upon this occasion rededicate ourselves to the mission to which we are committed—that of organizing and maintaining the Nation's finest National Guard organization within the State of Illinois. In its relationship to the executive branch of our Government, the National Guard functions as the military force of the State in time of peace. Available on a moment's notice under the call of the Governor for service in the event of an emergency or disaster, the high standard of efficiency which has always been maintained in the Illinois Guard has been principally due to its immunity from the influence of politics.

Let me assure you that were we able to choose our own commander in chief we could not find, nor ask for a man of finer proven caliber than our own Governor Stevenson. On the other hand we are not judged in our defense activities by the Governor (as has been proven by our own State history) on the basis of politics either. For example, the Honorable Dwight H. Green, former Governor of Illinois, supported our National Guard stalwartly—in fact, he did so much by way of personal initiative and support to further and defend the interest of the guard that he was awarded honorary membership in the National Guard Association of the United States—the only governor of any State to receive such a high tribute. He is responsible that Illinois now has two divisions which were activated by the father of our new National Guard—the very able combat commander, Gen. Charles C. Haffner.

Through the several changes of administration during the long existence of the Guard in Illinois, it has always refrained from taking sides in any political issue and as a result the guard has been allowed to pursue, without interference, the course intended for it by the authors of our Constitution. Hence, the guard must never become a political football either within the State or on a national level. It must remain under control of the State and enjoy the direct healthy influence and support of communities such as yours. Any and all proposals advocating that control of the National Guard be withdrawn from the States and centralized under the Federal Government must be opposed and defeated if we are to have a well-balanced, flexible, and adequate defense for both our State and Nation.

You may say that the national defense is none of your business. Perhaps you feel that national defense is the business of the Army, of the Air Force, and the Marines.

You're right. National defense is the business of the armed forces. But it is not their responsibility alone. It is the responsibility of every man and woman who enjoys the privilege of living in a free country.

There are many ways that a citizen can discharge this responsibility to his country. He can do it by keeping himself informed on the progress of world events and the place of the United States in the world picture. He can meet this responsibility by supporting the measures that he believes will contribute toward the preservation of our democratic way of life. And he also can play a very vital role in the national defense by serving in one of the civilian components of our Military Establishment.

Gen. George C. Marshall, recently retired Secretary of State, who as a colonel was the senior Army instructor of the Illinois National Guard, laid out the pattern for a Military Establishment that would be adequate to our needs just before he retired as Chief of Staff of the United States Army. This pattern for the preservation of peace calls for an M-day, or mobilization-day force of 1,750,000 men, capable of immediate mobilization in the event of aggression by any unfriendly nation.

This Nation has never had a Regular Army and Air Force of this size. We don't believe in a large, standing Army. It's not in the American tradition.

We do, however, believe in preparedness. So, to provide this preparedness, with a comparatively small Regular Military Establishment, our Government has embarked upon a program to develop the civilian components to a degree where they can take their place beside the Regular troops in any emergency.

Under General Marshall's plan, which was adopted by the Army general staff, the M-day force which will be the Nation's first line of defense will be made up of approximately 850,000 men in the Regular Army and Air Force, another 680,000 men in the National Guard and approximately 220,000 men in the Organized Reserve.

The National Guard—which has produced this Nation's crack outfits in the great wars is now organized by the States under the militia clause of the United States Constitution. Without examining the outstanding divisions trained as National Guard units by their States, we need only look to our own prairie division of Illinois—the famed Thirty-third—to find that as an outfit organized and trained by our own State within the provisions of the Constitution, it made noteworthy contributions to our Nation's cause in two world wars.

Actually, the guard is older than the Nation itself. It antedates the Constitution, the Revolution and the Bill of Rights. The oldest regiment in the continental United States is the One Hundred and Eighty-second Infantry of the Massachusetts National Guard, which was organized as a Middlesex County militia regiment in 1636. Incidentally, one of our Puerto Rican regiments traces its history to Ponce de Leon.

You will find that the Constitution recognized the then militia—the present-day National Guard—when it said:

"To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the appointment of the officer, and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress."

The Bill of Rights established a similar policy when it declared:

"A well-regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed."

Thus, through historical precedent, law, and custom, the National Guard rests on the principle that wars are mainly fought by citizen soldiers, and that these must be organized, trained, and made ready in time of peace.

From time to time, powerful groups of individuals have sought to destroy the traditional principles upon which the National Guard was founded and has been maintained throughout our history. They have repeatedly attempted to kidnap the guard from the States and place it directly under control of the Federal Government. The latest assault on the National Guard and the rights of States has been launched under the cloak of so-called unification of the armed forces by the committee on civilian components appointed by Defense Secretary James Forrestal.

A study of their report, more commonly referred to as the Gray board report, reflects the many months of conscientious endeavor, analysis, and study by its members.

Many of the recommendations contained therein are meritorious and will, in our opinion, be given favorable consideration by the Congress, and if enacted into law will be most beneficial to the security of our Nation.

We agree wholeheartedly with the committee in their approach to the problems from the viewpoint of national security alone and not from that of departmental interests or special advantage. We also agree that considerations of partisan or political expedience have no place in an objective study so vital to the Nation.

It is with the national security of our Nation uppermost in my mind that we oppose the recommendation, and I quote, "That the National Guard must be directly under Federal control" in order to accomplish its accepted national role or mission as defined in the approved War Department policies of October 13, 1945.

In his outspoken criticism of the Gray board's proposal, former Governor Green said, "I am sure that I voice the sentiments of the governors of almost all States when I say that we will fight to the last ditch against this proposal. National Guard officers and men have proven themselves superior to the fighting men of the strongest militaristic nations of the world. They are ready for effective action sooner than officers and men in the Federal reserves which were organized after World War I.

"In voicing my opposition, I will not enter into a lengthy discussion of the many defects attributed to the National Guard system in the Gray board report, or the seemingly passed-over defects pertaining to the organization and training of the Organized Reserve Corps, which organization has been under direct Federal control since the end of World War I. I believe, however, that the official War Department records will reveal that in World War II not a single unit of the Organized Reserve Corps was called into Federal service as a unit—a record not conducive to capturing the trust and confidence of the Nation."

I might add further that the Federal Government has also had direct Federal control of the Organized Reserve Corps since the end of World War II and has had the opportunity to make the Organized Reserve Corps as efficient as the National Guard is under State control, but has failed to do so. Thirty years of apparent failure with the Organized Reserve Corps prior to World War II and continued failure since World War II is a poor recommendation. What assurance has the Nation that the Army, with the National Guard under Federal control, will be more successful than the States have been.

In brief, the Gray board report commends the National Guard and the States for the great job that was done prior to and during World War I, the outstanding progress made during the years following World War I, and the acknowledged brilliant record made in World War II. But the board states the present National Guard, under State control, is not capable of accomplishing its mission as an M-day force. In effect, I interpret the

board's report as saying that by just transferring the National Guard to Federal control, the Federal Government, utilizing the same units, in the same communities, occupying the same armories and rented buildings, with the same officers and equipment, with the same amount of armory- and field-training time, and with the same number of Regular Army instructors (or less), will do a much more efficient job than the States in preparing the National Guard as an M-day force.

There is no other conclusion to be drawn in this regard in view of the absence of a definite recommendation, stating how the Federal Government proposes to accomplish these objectives.

We cannot build effectively by destroying.

The question might also be asked, Is the Regular Army and Air Force ready for combat at this time or in the foreseeable future?

The concern of the board over the delay in calling the National Guard into Federal service and the transfer of Federal property can be corrected and expeditious action assured by a simple amendment to the National Defense Act which would automatically place the National Guard under Federal control the instant Congress declares a national emergency. Such a recommendation was submitted to the Department of the Army some time ago.

Significant as the foregoing comments are on this subject, my greater concern is directed to the grave danger to the Nation that the concentration of so much power in the Federal Government may have in the years that lie ahead.

It is not too difficult to visualize that at some future time an ambitious, selfish individual, group or organization would be able to use this great power to continue in control of the Government or endeavor to seize such control. This one possibility alone is enough to condemn forever this great centralization of power, which one day might place this, the last free Nation in the world, in jeopardy of losing the freedom for which so many of our people died.

I support the wisdom and farsightedness of our forefathers and the framers of our Constitution when they wrote the militia clause of the Constitution.

The National Guard system comprising, as it does—citizen soldiers—has always been a bulwark against the concentration of military power in our Federal Government.

I strongly favor decentralization of our military power as exemplified by the National Guard system under the militia clause of the Constitution, particularly during this era of atomic bombs, bacteriological warfare, fast-flying long-range airplanes, guided missiles, fifth-column activities, and many more weapons of destruction which are still in the blueprint stage or enveloped in secrecy.

We need only consider the possibility, and it is not a fantastic one, of the use of atomic bombs or bacteriological warfare, separately or together, on our Nation's Capital at Washington and the city of Chicago at the same moment, to realize fully the tremendous importance attached to decentralization, or if you please, a continuation of the present National Guard system.

If such events come to pass, and we pray to God they will not, judging by the complete devastation wrought at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, where only atomic bombs were employed, we would be a Nation without National Government, either civil or military.

Destruction of the city of Chicago, greatest transportation and communications center in the Nation, would actually divide the Nation in two and over an extended period of time the West and the East would have to be self-reliant. The headquarters Fifth Army would in all probability be out of action. Thus, we would have a Nation without National Government and the 12 States embracing the Fifth Army would be without Federal military authority.

The only remaining recognized authority in such a crisis would be the governors of the sovereign States. If the National Guard were federalized, as recommended by the Gray Board, these governors would be without the legal power to employ the troops.

As commanding general of Illinois' One Hundred and Ninth Antiaircraft Artillery Brigade, I feel that I can best answer the Gray Board report by explaining some of our own missions, then you people of Bloomington can join with the rest of our great State in determining for yourselves whether it is or is not vital to our own security in these days of modern aerial warfare and surprise attack methods to maintain a strong, efficient military force as our own National Guard unit. I will restrict my definition to the primary and secondary missions of the Antiaircraft Artillery Automatic Weapons, which are the type missions for which your own Three Hundred and Ninety-sixth Battalion is being trained right here. The primary role of these automatic weapons is to attack all enemy aircraft within range, particularly low-flying aircraft, to destroy them or cause them to abandon their mission, or to decrease efficiency of their operations. The secondary mission is to attack and destroy enemy mechanized or other ground troops within range; in coast defenses to attack and destroy enemy torpedo boats or other light naval craft; or in support of infantry to act as reinforcing infantry weapons or tank destroyers. We want to and we must see to it that we prepare for our own defense. In doing so we can best contribute to national preparedness and defense programs.

I know of no stronger argument for the retention of the National Guard system, under the militia clause of the Constitution, and I urge all citizens in groups and as individuals to take appropriate action to assure the rejection by Congress of these proposals of the Gray board which would destroy our existing National Guard system of defense.

In closing, I must reluctantly acknowledge the probability of losing from my command the Three Hundred and Ninety-sixth Antiaircraft Artillery Battalion, whose reassignment to the Forty-fourth Infantry Division appears to be imminent. Recognition by the Department of the Army of the tremendous importance of antiaircraft units in any future conflicts has prompted a decision to fill immediately the urgent needs of the infantry division for organic protection against enemy air action. It has been further decided that the division will absorb an organized antiaircraft battalion in their area. The One Hundred and Ninth Brigade will regret deeply the loss of this fine battalion and the close association which has resulted in many intimate friendships between members of our organizations. In gaining the Three Hundred and Ninety-sixth, the Forty-fourth Division, comprising all down-State units, will profit a hundredfold, and should this event become a reality, my personal thanks and appreciation to Colonel Dunn and citizens of Bloomington for the outstanding service you have rendered to my command and the Illinois National Guard. Thank you for the privilege of being here tonight and for your kind attention.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by him before the Fourth District Rural Letter Carriers Association of South Carolina.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time to inquire of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] whether he can inform us as to the program for next week.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on the basis of the information that I have, I am able to say that on Monday the bill H. R. 2363, approval of Gulf State Marine Fisheries compact, will be brought up.

On Tuesday, the Private Calendar will be called and also the bill H. R. 199, a bill having to do with immigration.

On Wednesday the District of Columbia appropriation bill for 1950 will be called up.

On Thursday and Friday, the Treasury and Post Office Department appropriation bill will be called up and also the rent-control bill if it is reported out of committee.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Wednesday is calendar day. That is the day when we call the calender.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Dr. Forrest A. Irwin, president of the New Jersey State Teachers College at Jersey City on some basic meanings of democracy.

Mr. O'NEILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some remarks of Hon. Tom C. Clark, delivered by the Assistant to the Attorney General, Mr. Peyton Ford, at a testimonial dinner for the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include a statement by Henry Taylor, and also a statement from the New York Times.

SAVE THE PENNY POST CARD

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, the proposal of the Postmaster General to double the penny post-card rate is the best way I know of to make the poor man carry the post office deficit. Frankly I am against it.

I suppose they are excusing themselves for making this outrageous proposal by stating this increase is the only way they can give their personnel a raise. That is pure bunk.

Millions of the people save hard-earned dollars each year by resorting to the penny post card for sending their

messages. It is the only reasonable means of communication left. Why should not people be able to save postage?

I say leave the penny post card at 1 cent. It is an American institution. Do not destroy it.

I predict that little additional revenue will come to the Post Office Department if Congress approves this increase. Folks will cut down on the post cards they send by over half.

The time honored service which our Post Office Department has always given will suffer. The greatest good to the greatest number is their motto. Cutting out the penny post card will destroy this motto.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the George Washington Law Review, notwithstanding the fact that the Government Printing Office estimates that it will cost $781.

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances, including in one an editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat.

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. D'EWART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include two separate articles.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes on Monday, after the call of the committees, on a very important subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have until midnight to file a privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have permission to sit during general debate during the session of the House on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SELECTIVE IMMIGRATION

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, in response to numerous requests made by Government agencies, manufacturers, educational and scientific institutions, hospitals and laboratories, I am this day introducing a bill which properly could be described as our first attempt to provide for selective immigration. Under the provisions of this bill 3,200 highly skilled aliens could be admitted annually to the United States without regard to quotas, if their admission will be proved to be beneficial to this country. This, of course, will not mean any great increase in the number of aliens coming to the United States, because we are today and have been since 1946 admitting fewer than 50 percent of the number of quota immigrants authorized by the quotas, but it will allow the selection of skilled artisans and specialists needed in industry, in the medical profession and other scientific fields in which these people can contribute much.

I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point of my remarks in the RECORD a copy of the bill to which I refer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

A bill to authorize the admission into the United States of certain aliens possessing special skills

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the Foreign Skilled Personnel Admission Act.

SEC. 2. When used in this act the term—

(a) "Board" means the Foreign Skilled Personnel Board created pursuant to this act;

(b) "Eligible foreign specialist" means a quota immigrant as defined in sec. 5 of the Immigration Act of May 26, 1924, as amended (43 Stat. 155, U. S. C. 205) who is seeking to enter the United States and whose services are urgently needed in the United States by the United States Government or any of its departments, agencies, or bureaus, or by a commercial, industrial, financial, educational or health institution, firm, or corporation, from the standpoint of national defense, public security, or because of highly skilled technical, medical, or scientific training, experience or ability of such person, such services being prospectively beneficial to the United States.

SEC. 3. A number of special temporary visas not to exceed 3,200 in any fiscal year shall be issued without regard to quota limitations to eligible foreign specialists, and their spouses, and their unmarried children under 21 years of age, if accompanying or following to join them: *Provided*, That the admission of such eligible foreign specialists has been recommended to the Secretary of State and to the Attorney General by the Board.

SEC. 4. Any agency described in section 2 of this act, claiming the necessity of the admission into the United States of an eligible foreign specialist, may file with the Board a petition, in such form as may be prescribed by regulations promulgated by the Board, requesting the permission to import such eligible foreign specialist.

SEC. 5. Upon basis of a finding that there is an urgent and special need for the services of an eligible foreign specialist specifically identified under the provisions of section 4 of this act, and that the same will yield a substantial benefit to the defense, or the security, or the economy, or the health of the United States, the Board shall recommend the temporary admission of such eligible foreign specialists to the Secretary of State and the Attorney General in a manner provided for by regulations to be promulgated by the Board.

SEC. 6. There is hereby created a Board to be known as the Foreign Skilled Personnel Board which shall consist of seven members. The Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor shall each appoint one member of the Board. The members of the Board shall select a chairman from among their number for a term not to exceed two fiscal years.

SEC. 7. The members of the Board shall receive no compensation for their services as such, but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the Board. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums of money as may be necessary to enable the Board to discharge its duties. Within the limits of such funds as may be appropriated to the Board or as may be allocated to it by the President, the Board may employ necessary personnel without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and make provisions for necessary supplies, facilities, and services to carry out the provisions and accomplish the purposes of this act. It shall be the duty of the Board to formulate and issue regulations, necessary under the provisions of this act, and in compliance therewith, for the admission into the United States of eligible foreign specialists and the members of their families. It shall also be the duty of the Board to report, on July 1 of each year, to the Attorney General on the situation regarding the employment of eligible foreign specialists in the United States.

SEC. 8. If, at the expiration of 12 months immediately following the admission into the United States of an eligible foreign specialist, the Attorney General, shall, upon application filed with the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization by the alien, find that such person has maintained the employment with the institution upon which application such person has been admitted into the United States, he is hereby authorized and directed to amend the record of such alien's temporary admission, and the records of admission of the members of his family admitted under the provisions of section 3 of this act, to show admission for permanent residence as of the date of their respective actual entry into the United States: *Provided*: That no change in employment which may occur by the written consent of the agency or institution importing the alien under the provisions of this Act, shall preclude such alien from having his record of admission amended according to the provisions of this section.

SEC. 9. Any person or persons who knowingly violate or conspire to violate any provision of this act shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not less than $500 or more than $10,000, or shall be imprisoned not less than 2 or more than 10 years, or both.

TO IMPROVE LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, our labor-management laws have done little but shift the rules and weapons of industrial combat with every change of the political currents. We need, instead, laws which will encourage harmony and productivity.

I have today introduced a bill to allow corporations to deduct for income-tax purposes 200 percent of the amounts paid to employees as a share of profits. A 100 percent deduction is, of course, already available for such sums as wages paid. The purpose of the bill introduced today is to give an incentive for the establishment of profit-sharing plans as a means of securing greater production and increased harmony between labor and management.

The bill contains safeguards against abuses. Amounts to be credited with such deductions cannot, under this law, have that effect if discriminations are made in favor of employees who are officers, shareholders, or highly compensated employees. In all cases the deductions are limited to so much of amounts paid as does not exceed 25 percent of the compensation otherwise paid during the year. Only amounts paid under plans legally binding upon the employer will be considered.

VOTES IN ABSENTIA

I have today returned from the hospital, where I have been undergoing treatment following an accident on February 2, wherein I broke my leg. In my absence I tried to vote on every issue by the system of pairing, sending to a colleague my desired vote in advance of each voting. However, in some cases only general pairs were available. Therefore, I take this opportunity to designate that if I had been on the floor I would have voted for the bill to reorganize the executive branch; for the continuation of the Committee on Un-American Activities; for the deficiency bill; for the Export Control Act; for the power of the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct investigations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

GUATEMALA AND THE UNITED FRUIT CO.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, on February 17 the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], who is now occupying the chair, made a very able statement in regard to the extreme conditions in which a great American corporation, the United Fruit Co., finds itself in Guatemala as a result of the very arbitrary actions of the Guatemalan Government. Since the time those remarks were made there have been further developments, which I shall cite hereafter so that every Member of the House may know exactly what is being done to an American corporation which has performed a great service in Latin America in what one might call implementing point 4 of President Truman's inaugural message.

In November of 1948 the labor union representing the wharf laborers of the United Fruit Co. at Puerto Barrios and the union representing the banana workers at Banaera, Guatemala, presented the United Fruit Co. with a long list of demands. These demands were heard by a board of conciliation in accordance with the labor law of Guatemala, and the conciliation proceedings were terminated without any agreement having been reached on November 15.

The labor unions then asked the labor judge to pass on the legality of their labor movements as a prerequisite to going on strike. In order for a strike to be legal under the laws of Guatemala, it must be supported by two-thirds of the laborers. Under the law, the judge had 5 days within which to hand down his decision, but, in spite of repeated requests on the part of the company, the judge never handed down his decision. The record shows that the laborers were not able to get a two-thirds majority or even a simple majority, and the strike movement should have been declared illegal, which would have settled the labor controversy.

Meanwhile the wharf laborers at Puerto Barrios led by a small group of agitators, started a slow-down of banana loading. Bananas were loaded at less than half the normal rate resulting in delays and consequent heavy increase in cost. Those bananas which were loaded arrived in the United States in such poor condition that they could not be profitably marketed. Since, technically, there was a labor dispute pending, the company could not discharge the laborers involved in the slow-down and the only thing the company could do was to suspend shipments resulting in heavy loss of fruit.

The company appealed to the Government officials for assistance in eliminating the slow-down, but instead of granting such assistance, the Government suddenly on January 25 issued a decree suspending one constitutional guaranty in the areas in which the company operated declaring the workers of the United Fruit Co. to be engaged in public service and decreeing obligatory arbitration of the labor dispute. Under the constitution the president may suspend constitutional guaranties in case of invasion, grave disturbances of the peace, epidemic, or other general calamity. No such situation existed and the decree was used merely to take the labor dispute out of the hands of the labor court and order arbitration of a labor conflict which should have been promptly settled by a declaration of illegality.

It is worth while noting also that the President did not declare all wharf and banana workers in the area to be engaged in public service but only the workers of the United Fruit Co. Other banana growers and shippers are not affected by the decree.

The laborers themselves have repeatedly approached the company offering to settle the dispute and the company has at all times been willing to make any just settlement. An agreement was reached by the company and the laborers through direct negotiations about a week ago but the workers were not permitted to sign the agreement because of the intervention of Government officials who insisted that the dispute had to be settled by compulsory arbitration.

The company's lawyers advised that the decree suspending constitutional guaranties and ordering compulsory arbitration was unconstitutional and the company appealed to the court for an amparo or injunction. The reaction of the Government to this procedure of the company in asking the protection of the Guatemala courts was immediate and violent. The minister of economy and labor in a press interview published in La Hora of February 10, 1949, said that if the court petition was prepared by a Guatemala lawyer it constituted an act of treason to the country.

The United Fruit Co. admittedly pays the highest wages of any company in Guatemala. It has a long record of fair and equitable treatment of its employees and laborers. It furnishes them with schools, hospitals, club houses, and playgrounds. It sells them the necessaries of life through its commissaries at price below cost. It is now and has always been ready and willing to settle any labor disputes through direct negotiation with the representatives of its laborers and employees. The conflict at Barrios and Bananera which is causing such heavy losses to the company and creating unemployment in Guatemala could be settled if government officials would permit the labor leaders to make settlement with the company.

This kind of discriminatory interference described above must stop in these Latin-American countries and elsewhere in the world against responsible American capital; and when the appropriation for and the extension of the charter of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs comes before this body, I shall offer an amendment to make it obligatory for the Secretary of State to certify that the government of each country had not been discriminating against legitimate American business rights before any money could be used in any such country by this institute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TOLLEFSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

Mr. GILLETTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts from an address by Hon. FRED CRAWFORD given at a Lincoln Day dinner held in Wayne County, Pa.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. TALLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some brief quotations.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain articles and excerpts.

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a memorial on Indian social security.

Mr. DONDERO (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Alfred Hassler.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and that they be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of the special orders for today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 2 OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 2 of the House Committee on Agriculture, of which the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] is chairman, may have permission to sit during the session of the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, apropos of the remarks made by the gentleman from Michigan, I should like to say that courage is not only a proper attribute of power but it is an unmistakable sign of character. The candor and the courage of the President fascinate me.

GREAT BRITAIN'S RECOVERY

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, there appears in this morning's paper the headline "Recovery is realized, Britain says," and the article goes on to say:

ERP AID PRAISED IN REMARKABLE ACHIEVEMENT—TRADE BALANCE IN SIGHT

LAKE SUCCESS, February 23.—Britain told the United Nations today that British factories are breaking all records in production of capital goods and that, thanks to British discipline and American financial aid, British economic recovery is virtually complete.

This optimistic picture, given to the United Nations Economic and Social Council by Christopher P. Mayhew, British Under Secretary of State, contained the revelation that despite a disturbing dollar deficit, Britain is now definitely within sight of balancing her foreign trade.

That remarkable achievement, Mayhew told the delegates, was made possible through economic planning and the voluntary cooperation of labor and industry, and it found British exports last month rising to a figure that was 60 percent higher than in 1938.

Mayhew reported that Britain has built 700 new factories since the war ended, that industrial output was 20 percent higher than in 1938, and that agricultural output was 25 percent higher.

Mr. Speaker, from July 1, 1940, to December 31, 1947, we of the United States gave Great Britain over $30,000,000,000. That country is going to ask for a billion and a half more this year. This year's foreign-aid program calls for $6,098,000,000 hard-earned American dollars. If you give them this money, you are going to tax your people for aid to Britain, a country that now admits it is on its feet. You have no business giving away the taxpayers' money without the taxpayers' permission. Every citizen will be called upon to pay $42 each for this year's foreign program.

Furthermore, you have given to Russia $11,050,000,000, and look what they are doing with that $11,000,000,000. If you do not quit giving away so much money to these foreign countries, you are going to wreck America. Then what will happen to us? Then we are no good to ourselves or anybody else.

Let us keep America sound. Let us keep America in a position so that we can protect ourselves and the people of this Nation and give them the things that they need. It is time that we look after America and stop trying to take care of all the rest of the world.

The President is crying for more taxes. Secretary Snyder says we must tax our people more. The Speaker of the House reechoes our need for greater taxes.

Let us holler loud and long, "No more taxes. No more robbing the thrifty." Let us get up a chorus of "Stop spending; stop squandering. Get some economy in government." Keep out of foreign entanglements, as George Washington advised us to do.

Be wise and economize.

NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the under-water explosion of an atomic bomb in the Potomac River adjacent to this Capitol could kill upward of 100,000 people and could paralyze the functioning of the Federal Government and create millions of dollars of damage.

I have a special order this afternoon which I intend to use, at which time I shall discuss some of the problems of national security in relation to the atomic bomb. I invite the Members to listen to or to read my remarks in the RECORD.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Col. Walter L. Furbershaw. I am informed by the Government Printing Office that this will take three and one-half pages of the RECORD at an estimated cost of $248.50, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in reference to the passing away of Mr. William E. Tate, national director of rehabilitation for the Disabled American Veterans.

BROTHERHOOD WEEK

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this is Brotherhood Week, a week that we do well to consider seriously. The editorial which I am including in my remarks, taken from the Western Réserve Democrat, was written by Oveta Culp Hobby, whom we learned to respect and honor as head of the WACs. As you know, she is a woman of considerable renown, one whose words carry across the country. It is a great pleasure to me to include in my remarks this short editorial by her on Brotherhood Week:

ENJOYMENT OF INDIVIDUALS

This is a time for dynamics—for warm, generous rapport among friends, for enjoyment of individuals by individuals. With the world seemingly threatened by an eternal coldness, human beings need the warmth of human companionship, rather than the poor and tepid comfort of tolerance.

Every man under God deserves the right to be judged as an individual—rather than

as a Catholic, a Jew, a Methodist, or an Episcopalian. Every man is honest or dishonest, charming or annoying wise or stupid, because he is himself—not because he is a member of a particular group.

It is his inalienable right—a right far greater and more universal than any given in the Constitution—to be an individual, to be accepted or rejected as an individual.

His faith is a part of him—he is not a mere characterless unit in the over-all group.

In Brotherhood Week, Americans everywhere need an upsurge of genuine brotherhood, of intelligent, warm friendship for their brothers.

In friendship, in brotherhood, simple courtesy is the straight path toward decent human relations.

POINT 4 OF THE PRESIDENT'S INAUGURAL SPEECH

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the other day the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], made a very interesting and worth-while speech on the application of point 4 of the President's inaugural speech as it applies to countries overseas. I was very much interested in what our distinguished majority leader had to say, not only because of the situation which he discussed but because of the great amount of research he had put into his speech, as indicated by the many important factors which he brought to our attention.

I would like to say on the basis of personal observations that there is a great deal of discrimination going on at the present time against American business concerns in various Latin-American countries. I refer specifically to the situation in Guatemala. In that country a labor code, ostensibly written for the benefit of the laboring class, has been so worded and administered as to discriminate against the largest American enterprise in the country. Under this code a basis is being created which is not only unfair but discriminatory, insofar as it affects the competition between outside and local enterprises. It has been my belief—and I have stated so repeatedly—that American concerns overseas should not be made subject to discrimination, but should be treated on the same basis as the native businesses in the countries in which they are located. I would like to see American business concerns operating in these countries helping in their development, raising the standards of living therein, but, at the same time, being given every opportunity to compete with other businesses on a fair and equitable basis. Foreign countries coming into the United States have not been placed at a disadvantage in their competition with American industry, and it is my contention that, insofar as our American businessmen are concerned, they are entitled to the same treatment as are the industries of the countries in which they are located.

I have been very much disturbed by the trend which has become so evident, not only in Guatemala but elsewhere, and it is my hope that the discrimination which has been practiced down there can be done away with and that the denial of justice and exclusion from legal recourse before the courts of that country can be alleviated at an early opportunity.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 920) authorizing the Secretary of the Army to furnish headstones to mark the actual or honorary burial places of deceased members or former members of the military and naval forces, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the Committee on Armed Services has jurisdiction over this type of bill, and has a number of such bills before it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is this re-reference agreeable to the Committee on Armed Services or the chairman thereof?

Mr. RANKIN. I suppose so. I am sure it is. I can see no reason why it should not be.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

RANKIN PLAN PENSION BILL, H. R. 2681

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include some records with reference to veterans' legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, at my request, the Veterans' Administration has prepared an official cost estimate of H. R. 2681, providing pensions for World War I and II veterans—which the Washington Post has branded the Rankin plan.

This cost estimate has been projected on a 5-year basis, beginning with the year 1950 and continuing through the calendar year 2000.

Bear in mind that this is an official estimate of the Veterans' Administration and it gives the lie to the propaganda which various commentators have been spreading about the cost of this measure.

First-year cost is set at $62,411,000. It will be 10 years, or 1960, before the estimated cost would exceed $1,000,000,000, and it will be beyond 1980 before the estimated cost would reach $2,000,000,000.

When you deduct from this amount the amount some of these veterans would receive under old-age pension laws in the various States and the amount many of them would be receiving under other veterans' laws for various disabilities, the amount would be reduced far below the estimate of $2,000,000,000 for the year 1980—31 years from today.

This is in sharp contrast with what the commentators have been telling you about the cost of this measure.

The public has also been told that 18,800,000 veterans would benefit by the passage of this bill. That, too, of course, is a gross exaggeration.

In 1995 the total number of veterans living, it is estimated, will be only 5,810,000—nothing like 18,800,000 could ever benefit by this legislation.

The peak cost will be reached in the year 1990—41 years from now—when the cost, it is estimated, will be not more than $4,446,000,000. And this is not taking into consideration the deductions just referred to from State old-age pensions and disability compensations.

The total cost of this measure will, of course, nowhere nearly approximate, or begin to approximate, the reckless figure of $150,000,000,000 given by the so-called American Veterans' Committee. That exaggerated estimate appears to have been manufactured for propaganda purposes.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I am inserting at this point a copy of the official cost estimate prepared by the Veterans' Administration on the bill:

Estimate of net cost of secs. 1 and 2, H. R. 2681, 81st Cong., by 5-year intervals, 1950–2000

Year	World War I		World War II		Total cost
	Number of veterans	Cost	Number of veterans	Cost	
1950	69,700	$56,813,000	5,200	$5,598,000	$62,411,000
1955	413,060	330,667,829	11,246	9,296,234	339,994,133
1960	1,270,929	993,832,644	29,271	25,089,622	1,018,922,205
1965	1,915,653	1,472,003,296	132,889	109,775,942	1,582,379,198
1970	1,330,854	1,004,418,166	345,619	280,850,444	1,285,268,610
1975	771,192	555,336,345	970,026	779,337,251	1,334,673,596
1980	347,248	246,495,914	1,919,059	1,508,131,052	1,754,626,966
1985	110,617	79,437,406	3,661,047	2,844,203,127	2,923,640,533
1990	23,240	16,688,484	5,757,437	4,429,358,363	4,446,046,847
1995	2,567	1,842,343	5,807,936	4,389,880,766	4,391,723,108
2000			3,694,425	2,697,919,441	2,697,919,441

Let me remind the House that practically every veteran of World War II who would come under this bill during the next 15 years was also in World War I, and is therefore covered by the first cost column in the above table.

Then let me remind the House again that from these totals must be deducted

the amounts that would be paid these men in old-age pensions in the various states, and also the compensations that would be paid to disabled veterans under other veterans' laws.

In this connection, I call the attention of the Members to a new regulation of the Veterans' Administration known as extension 5 to the 1945 Disability Rating Schedule, which permits a veteran of either World War I or II at age 55 and having a permanent disability of 60 percent or more, single or combined, and who is unemployable, to receive a pension of $60 a month. Under the same conditions, when the veteran reaches the age of 60, the disability requirement is lowered to 50 percent. I believe that this regulation takes care of those veterans who are below the age of 65 and who are not eligible for the provisions of the bill, H. R. 2681.

Do not forget that one of the disabilities from which a man never recovers is that of old age. For my part, I do not intend for these old veterans to have to go to the poorhouse for food and shelter in their declining days.

The analysis of the bill above referred to follows:

PENSIONS FOR WORLD WARS I AND II VETERANS, H. R. 2681

Title: To provide pensions for veterans of World Wars I and II based on non-service-connected disability and attained age, and for other purposes.

Mr. RANKIN (by request). Introduced and referred February 14, 1949.

Analysis: The bill, as reported, authorizes a pension of $90 per month for any veteran of World War I or II upon reaching age 65. In addition, any veteran of these two wars, regardless of age, so helpless as to need the regular aid and attendance of another person, would be entitled to $120 per month. The drawing of compensation, pension, or retirement pay based on own service concurrent with this pension is prohibited.

In addition, the income limitation now set at $1,000 for a widow without child or a child is raised to $2,000, and for a widow with a child or children, the income limitation is raised to $3,000, from the present $2,500. Widows of World War II are placed on the same basis for determining their eligibility for a pension as widows of World War I. The act would become effective on the first day of the second month following approval.

ANALYSIS BY SECTIONS

Section 1: Sets eligibility requirements (1) any person who served in the active military or naval service for a period of 90 days or more during either World War I or II, as now or hereafter defined, who was discharged under conditions other than dishonorable; (2) or having less than 90 days, was discharged for disability incurred in the service in the line of duty, or is receiving, or entitled to receive, compensation for service-connected disability; (3) who is shown to be in active service therein before the cessation of hostilities; and (4) who is or may hereafter be suffering from a permanent non-service-connected disability, or has attained the age of 65 years or over.

Section 2: Sets the rate of pension at $90 per month upon reaching the age of 65, and $120 a month for any veteran of the above-mentioned wars who, on account of age or physical or mental disability, is helpless or blind or so nearly helpless or blind as to need or require the regular aid and attendance of another person.

Section 3: Present law prohibits the drawing of a pension by a widow or a child, of a veteran of either World War I or II, whose annual income exceeds $1,000, or $2,500 in case of a widow with a child or children. This act would increase the limitation for a widow without a child or a child to $2,000, and to $3,000 for a widow with a child or children.

Section 4: The pension, or increase of pension, provided by the act for all eligibles now on the rolls would commence without the necessity of filing a new application, effective the first day of the second month following approval; and original awards would take effect from date of application or first day of second month following approval, whichever is later.

Section 5: Veterans Regulation No. 10, paragraph XIII (as amended by Public Law 144, 78th Cong., sec. 15) prohibits the drawing of compensation or retirement pay concurrent with pension. This bill makes applicable this regulation to the pension provided and prevents so-called pyramiding.

Section 6: Widows of veterans of World War I are entitled to non-service-connected pension based simply on the service of their husbands. Widows of veterans of World War II, however, must show that their husbands were receiving or entitled to receive compensation for a service-connected disability or must have had a service-connected disability for which compensation would be payable if ratable at 10 percent or more at the time of their death in order to obtain a pension. This section of the bill puts the widows of veterans of World War I and II on exactly the same basis.

Section 7: The administrative, definitive, and penal provisions of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, and veterans regulations issued thereunder, when they are not inconsistent with this act, are made applicable thereto.

Pension rates for veterans of all wars

PRESENT LAW

Indian Wars	Civil War	Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, and Boxer Rebellion			World War I and World War II
90 days or more service or through campaign in connection with or in zone of active Indian hostilities	90 days or more service or discharge for disability incurred in line of duty.	90 days or more service or discharge for disability incurred in line of duty.	70 days or more service but less than 90 days.	90 days or more service or discharge for disability incurred in line of duty. In active service before cessation of hostilities.	90 days or more service or discharge for disability incurred in line of duty. In active service before cessation of hostilities.
Rates:	Rate $90	Rates:	Rates:	Rates:	Rates:
1/10 disability $24	Aid and attendance. 120	1/10 disability. $28.80	1/10 disability. $17.28	Permanent and total $60	Permanent and total [1] $60
1/4 disability 30		1/4 disability 36.00	1/4 disability 21.60	Rated permanent and total for continuous period of 10 years or reach age 65 years 72	Rated permanent and total for continuous period of 10 years or reach age 65 years 72
1/2 disability 42		1/2 disability 50.40	1/2 disability 25.92		Age 65 [2] 90
3/4 disability 60		3/4 disability 72.00	3/4 disability 34.56		Aid and attendance [3] 120
Total disability 72		Total disability 90.00	Total disability 60.00		
Age 62 36		Age 62 43.20	Age 62 17.28		
Age 65 72		Age 65 [2] 90.00	Age 65 60.00		
Aid and attendance. 120		Age 68 57.60	Age 68 60.00		
		Age 72 72.00	Age 72 60.00		
		Age 75 90.00	Age 75 60.00		
		Aid and attendance 103.68	Aid and attendance 78.00		
		Aid and attendance [2] 120.00			
				Over age 62 or the amount being paid Mar. 20, 1933, if less 15	
				50 percent disabled 15	
				Aid and attendance None	

[1] No payment if income exceeds $1,000 if single, or $2,500 if married or if person has minor children. Payments of war risk term insurance, U. S. Government life (converted) insurance, national service life insurance. World War adjusted Compensation Act and compensation for overtime performed in Federal Government or District of Columbia employment not included in determining income.

[2] The $90 rate at age 65 and $120 rate for regular aid and attendance are payable to those only who served between April 21, 1898, and July 4, 1902, and are not payable to those who served in the Moro Province between July 5, 1902, and July 15, 1903.

[3] Indicates changes proposed by H. R. 2681.

Effective: First day of second month following date of approval.

Hearings: January 27, February 1, 2, 3, 8, and 9, 1949.

Reported: February 16, 1949. House Report 132. Union Calendar 36.

OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, this is my main speech this session. If you gentlemen who are interested, as I am, and whose hearts cry out for the welfare of the housewives, will remain a little while after the gentleman from California has delivered his able address, I shall point out to you with a master's voice how much the housewives of this Nation spent, 8,000,000,000 minutes, in mixing margarine last year. They spent the equivalent of 13,000 years last year mixing margarine. Not only that, I will tell you how the money has been extorted from the people of this Nation, paying tribute and ransom for the privilege of

eating the poor man's spread. If you will just wait and help me, those of you who are against it, you might want to hear something I am going to say to you. Those of you who have something to add, I advise you to stay, because I believe this is one of the best speeches I have ever written.

OPPOSITION TO THE PENSION BILL

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives should not be politically timid. The Members should express themselves uninhibitedly in opposition to the proposed $90-a-month pension bill for all veterans, millionaire or wage earner, tycoon or tanner, beginning at 65 years of age, who served 90 days or more in either World War. Nor should it be uncomfortable politically for any one of us to follow the dictates of his conscience. We dare not pass the buck--that is, rely on the Senate to act with statesmanlike vigor in killing the bill. We dare not neglect our own responsibility.

I am firmly convinced that the bill offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is against the best interests of the Nation and against the best interests of the veteran.

I wish to offer every constructive aid to the veteran. But the veteran resents charity disguised as a pension grab. I believe in greater benefits, especially for the sick, impaired, wounded, and disabled veteran. Despite the fact that the current expenditures for veterans is running around $6,000,000,000 a year, I am, nonetheless desirous of increasing the benefits to the disabled veteran.

The pensions that exist today grew out of wars that were fought with armies microscopic in number compared with the military units of the last war. When those pensions were passed, there was no over-all Federal security program for the aged and indigent. The Rankin bill would completely put out of kilter our social-security-old-age program. Old age is a universal handicap that descends on all, veterans and nonveterans alike. The cost of the Rankin bill would begin at $125,300,000 a year and rise mountainously to $6,000,000,000 a year as the circle of 65-year-old veterans increased. There are 19,000,000 veterans, who with their families total 40 percent of the population. The veteran and his dear ones would be paying directly or indirectly 40 percent of this $6,000,000,000, because taxes raised to defray the pension costs are always passed on invisibly to all the public. Thus this pension proposal is but a facade to deceive the veteran.

Remember that the alleged benefits of this bill would be in addition to all other veteran compensation allowances, medical and educational services and awards under the GI bill of rights.

It would cloud out the genuine need for real help to the disabled veterans. Veterans would do well to spurn the misguided efforts on their behalf, and concentrate their strength on measures that will truly improve the lot of their fellows, especially of those who are sick and wounded.

I refuse to remain silent and see this hoax perpetrated on the veteran. I name the Rankin bill for what it is—a gold brick.

In addition, this bill would seriously interfere with President Truman's economic and financial program. He has wisely and in statesmanlike manner repudiated this bill.

The first concern of the veteran and nonveteran should be a stable national economy without which no amount of pension can be of help.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] is recognized for 45 minutes.

(Mr. HINSHAW asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include certain information in tabular form.)

THE COLORADO—RIVER OF CONTROVERSY

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, one-twelfth of the land area of the United States is drained by the Colorado River. Down from the highest western mountains, across great plateaus of forest and desert, and through the deepest canyons of the continent, the Colorado flows some 1,600 miles to its delta in the Gulf of California.

Compared to some other American rivers, however, the Colorado is not big, but no other river in this country has been the subject of more legal and political controversies, and no other river means more to the people it serves.

Population of Colorado River Basin States in 1948

Arizona	664,000
California	10,031,000
Colorado	1,163,000
Nevada	142,000
New Mexico	571,000
Utah	655,000
Wyoming	275,000

Agriculture, industry, and both rural and urban households in seven immense Western States depend upon the water and power that comes from the Colorado River. These basic needs have created complicated disputes and lengthy polemic arguments.

The Colorado River controversy has its roots in history, yet it rages today in the legislative halls, the city offices, and country stores of the Colorado River Basin States, as well as in the United States Congress, where it has been debated frequently over more than a quarter of a century.

The Colorado River controversy is more than a fight over water and hydroelectric power that might conceivably be settled by common agreement. It is a fight over American economic policy. Involved are principles and doctrines, conceptions and theories, out of which have come fundamental programs for the expansion and development of the western half of the United States. It is a fight waged by millions of people for their homes and shops, their schools and churches, their own security, and that of their children.

Hundreds of men in the arid West have died fighting to preserve their precious rights to water.

THE WORTHLESS LAND

It was in 1857 that a brave explorer but a poor prophet, Lt. J. C. Ives, took a small Government steamboat 400 miles up the lower Colorado from the Gulf of California, and reported to the War Department:

> The region is altogether valueless. * * * It seems intended by nature that the Colorado River along the greater portion of its lone and majestic way shall be forever unvisited and unmolested.

Today along the lower Colorado stand Hoover Dam, tallest in the world; Davis Dam, Parker Dam, and other monuments to American engineering genius. Across the lone and majestic Colorado the greatest migration in our history has moved on the highways to the Pacific coast within the last 10 years. In southern California alone three and a half million people live in areas served by water from the lower Colorado. In the six other States of the basin other hundreds of thousands are dependent for their very existence on water from the Colorado system.

THE COLORADO RIVER COMPACT

In a state of nature few American rivers were more violent, more unpredictable, more devastating in both drought and flood than the Colorado.

It was imperative that the early developers and leaders of the basin States should seek to reach an agreement for the use and division of the waters of the river, without which all progress would be legally menaced and all investments would be insecure. Control of the river's ravaging floods had to be achieved, and that meant the building of great dams costing millions of dollars. Dependable and indestructible diversion systems were necessary if the rich but arid lands were to be cultivated successfully and growing communities were to be supplied. That meant many costly projects.

The first question was: How was the water to be divided?

It was in 1921 that men from the seven basin States finally sat down together to work out a compact to govern the entire Colorado River system. The Federal Government participated. Herbert Hoover, then Secretary of Commerce, became Chairman of the Colorado River Commission.

For nearly 11 months the commissioners talked, wrangled, and finally came to terms. In Santa Fe, N. Mex., on November 24, 1922, the Colorado River Compact, which is still the basic law of the river, was signed. It was a historic day, memorable in the annals of western development, and especially a vital milestone in the advancement of reclamation.

But as remedial and progressive as the compact was, it did not bring peace to the Colorado River. Chiefly the compact divided the river basin into two parts—an upper and a lower basin—and apportioned waters to each basin. Still

remaining was the all-important task of dividing the water between the individual States in each basin.

Only last year, a quarter of a century later, were the States of the upper basin—Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, and Arizona, the latter with a very small interest in the upper basin and a larger in the lower basin—able to reach an agreement satisfactory to themselves. Their plan for dividing the water among themselves is now before the Congress for Federal approval.

LOWER BASIN CONTROVERSY

In the lower basin—California, Nevada, and Arizona—the controversy over division of the waters continues with mounting fervor.

It rests on the fact that California and Arizona interpret differently the series of documents and statutes that now comprise the law of the river.

There are three main issues in the conflict between Arizona and California, and more than 26 years have been spent in futile attempts to reach an agreement on all or any one of them.

Faced with this apparent stalemate, California and Nevada, two of the three lower basin States, have proposed that all the issues be placed before the United States Supreme Court for final settlement. Legislation to accomplish this has been introduced in both Houses of the Congress by the 23 Members of the House from California and by the Senators from both California and Nevada.

Resolutions for Supreme Court adjudication of the controversy now before this Congress: House Joint Resolutions 3, 38, 41, 52, 55, 64, 73, 75, 95, 96, 100, 107, 113, 126, 128, 133, 135, 146, 148, 150, 152, 153, and 164, authored respectively by every California Member of this House, and Senate Joint Resolution 4, authored by the Senators of California and Nevada.

Because the Federal Government is a necessary party to the proposed court litigation, California and Nevada must obtain permission of Congress to carry the controversy before that highest Federal tribunal. That is the purpose of the joint resolutions. Arizona is fighting passage of any of them on the ground that there is no justiciable issue involved; asserting that despite California's contracts with the Federal Government, California has no right to the water California claims; that the water in question belongs to Arizona, and that Congress can settle the whole controversy simply by giving the water to Arizona.

California has signed contracts with the Federal Government for 5,362,000 acre-feet of Colorado River water available for us in the lower basin. This water is allocated by the contracts among the southern California projects in this way:

For lands in the Imperial and Coachella Valleys, the Palo Verde district and the Yuma project a total of 4,150,000 acre-feet.

For the metropolitan water district 1,212,000 acre-feet.

At stake in this controversy, among other things, is the right to the use of more than 1,000,000 acre-feet of Colorado River water a year.

An acre-foot is the amount of water necessary to cover an acre of land with water 1 foot deep.

The three main issues of the controversy are not difficult to understand, even for those unfamiliar with technical water problems. Yet, settlement of them is vital to future development, and meantime an insurmountable barrier to progress is before the basin States because of the existence of these unresolved arguments.

ISSUE NO. 1

Under article 3, paragraph A, of the Colorado River compact signed in 1922, the lower basin States of the Colorado River watershed are apportioned in perpetuity the exclusive beneficial consumptive use of 7,500,000 acre-feet of river water a year.

The States of the upper basin receive a similar amount under the compact.

This is known as 3-A water.

Article 3, paragraph B, of the compact, states:

> In addition to the apportionment of paragraph A, the lower basin is hereby given the right to increase its beneficial consumptive use of the Colorado River waters by 1,000,000 acre-feet per annum.

This is known as 3-B water, and it is this million acre-feet that is in controversy.

A million acre-feet is a great deal of water. It would cover a million acres of land 1 foot deep. It is sufficient for the irrigation of about a quarter of a million acres of arid land.

Arizona refused to ratify the compact when it was created, but the six other basin States did ratify. Under the law that was a sufficient number of ratifications to put the compact into operation, provided that the State Legislature of California also enacted a limitation act.

The California State Legislature swiftly passed the required limitation act. This is what it says:

> California agrees to limit its use of Colorado River water to 4,400,000 acre-feet of the waters apportioned to the lower basin by paragraph A, plus not more than one-half of any excess or surplus waters.

Thus California agreed to take 4,400,000 acre-feet of 3-A water, and not more than one-half of the excess of surplus waters unapportioned by the compact. California maintains that the term "excess or surplus" includes all 3-B waters.

The question to be settled here is:

Does California share equally in this million acre-feet of 3-B water?

California says "Yes." Arizona says "No."

This is a matter of interpretation of the California Limitation Act and the Boulder Canyon Project Act which the Supreme Court should be asked to settle.

ISSUE NO. 2

In a state of nature the Gila River in Arizona was a wasting tributary of the Colorado. Especially in the last 100 miles before it joins the Colorado its bed is wide, sandy, flat, and subject to the intense heat of the desert.

The Bureau of Reclamation estimates that in a state of nature the Gila emptied approximately 1,100,000 acre-feet of water into the Colorado per year. The Gila River of New Mexico and Arizona is a main tributary of the Colorado, a part of the system, and drains into the main stream a few miles above the Mexican border.

Water from the Gila is used chiefly now in the Phoenix area of Arizona, and there about 2,300,000 acre-feet of water are taken each year from this stream—and used up—consumed, if you please.

The difference between these figures, or about 1,200,000 acre-feet, was, before development of the Phoenix area, lost by evaporation, deep seepage, and other causes, as the Gila flowed in its course from the Phoenix area to the main Colorado River.

The words "beneficial consumptive use," as they are used in the compact, are important in this phase of the controversy, as the compact apportions water for "exclusive beneficial consumptive use."

Arizona contends that Arizona should be charged only for 1,100,000 acre-feet of Gila River water—the amount that emptied into the Colorado from the Gila in a state of nature, before development of irrigation in the Phoenix area and other places.

California contends that Arizona actually takes, uses, and beneficially consumes 2,300,000 acre-feet of water from the Gila, and therefore should be charged with that amount. All of this 2,300,000 acre-feet of Gila River water that Arizona takes is being beneficially and consumptively used in Arizona. California does not question Arizona's right to use this water.

Therefore, the second question to be answered by the Supreme Court is:

Where and how must Arizona measure the amount of water it uses from the Gila River?

California says this water must be measured where it is actually beneficially consumed. Arizona says this water must be measured where the Gila River empties into the main Colorado.

But the Gila does not even flow into the main Colorado, as it did in prehistoric days. Today the Gila is all used up—beneficially consumed—in the Phoenix area.

ISSUE NO. 3

Lake Mead is the immense reservoir behind Hoover Dam.

Under the Project Act, California limited itself to taking 4,400,000 acre-feet of 3-A water, plus not more than one-half of the excess or surplus, of which California claims the 3-B water is a part.

There are large evaporation losses in Lake Mead, as there are in other reservoirs of the basin.

Arizona says that California must deduct these losses from its apportioned water.

California says that the water limited to it is a net amount, and therefore the quantity of 3-A water to which California has limited itself is a net quantity of 4,400,000 acre-feet.

The question to be answered here by the Supreme Court is:

Is the amount of 3-A water to which California is entitled a net quantity, or is it subject to reduction by reason of evaporation and other losses in Lake Mead and elsewhere?

After more than 26 years of attempting to agree with Arizona on these problems, California has turned to the United States Supreme Court. California asks strict enforcement of the compact and the Boulder Canyon Project Act. California is not asking for more water from the Colorado River. It only seeks to protect and preserve the water it believes was awarded to it by the Federal contracts.

Under the Constitution, when two or more States are unable to agree through negotiation or arbitration, the only course available is litigation in the highest Federal court.

That is the American way, and that is the fair way.

EXPERIMENTS

It has been charged by California's opponents in the controversy that California is opposed to experiments which might aid in solving the water problems of the West. Of course, nothing could be farther from the truth.

California is not opposed to any experiment by responsible scientists and engineers which might bring about a swifter settlement of western economic ills, and California institutions and individuals conduct innumerable experiments in all fields.

Propaganda issued by California's adversaries in the Colorado River conflict has sought to mislead the public into believing that sea water—of which California has an abundance—can now be converted into fresh water for domestic, industrial, and agricultural use. Therefore, they say, California's water problems will soon be settled, and Arizona can have the water from the Colorado River at once.

This scheme of Arizona's for fooling both the Congress and the public has stumbled over the facts, and has been exposed. California is not opposed to experiments in distilling sea water, but the best scientific minds and institutions in the Nation report that the cost of converting sea water for large domestic use is absolutely prohibitive, and that in all probability a great many years must pass before the feat can be accomplished at a cost anywhere near the price that the water consumer can afford to pay, if ever.

The best known method, that of evaporating sea water, requires more fuel for the necessary heat than is available. To supply evaporated sea water to southern California now, two-thirds of the State's oil production would have to be used each year. The average southern California farmer can afford to pay only $3.50 an acre-foot for water. Under the present system of converting sea water he would have to pay at least 50 times that much. The householder would also pay a prohibitive cost.

It may be that in distant years to come atomic power will be available for such use, but once more the scientists have stated unequivocably that this accomplishment lies far in the speculative realm of the future. Certainly extremely cheap fuel must be used, and with the world facing shortages, and under present costs, the known available fuels of today must be excluded.

Considerable propaganda has been disseminated with the aim of putting southern California in a bad light before other Western States. For example, it has been announced that California has plans for taking water from the Columbia and other rivers of the Northwest. This also is not true. No responsible State official of California ever made such an announcement. No engineer in an official capacity in California ever advanced such a plan. I understand, however, that the United States Bureau of Reclamation has made such statements.

The fact is that southern California does not need to go anywhere but the lower Colorado River for enough water to meet demands for years to come. And southern California believes that it already has that water under its contracts with the Federal Government. Southern California's main concern is in protecting and preserving the Colorado River water awarded to it by these contracts.

While there should be no slackening in the work of experimenting with water developments, there must likewise be no slackening in the effort to settle the controversy that is halting progress. Without a settlement of the present controversy no new projects can be built on the lower Colorado, and this injures all States, not alone California.

PROPOSED ARIZONA PROJECT

For several years Arizona has sought to take an additional 1,200,000 acre-feet of water from the Colorado River for an enormous new reclamation and power project that would cost about a billion dollars.

There already is a deficit of water in the lower Colorado to meet the obligations already undertaken by the Government in existing and authorized projects. This arises in large part from the guaranty of 1,500,000 acre-feet to Mexico, made over California's objections, in the Mexican Water Treaty. Now, Arizona could get the water it wants only by taking it away from California. That means the breaking of the Federal Government's contracts with California. Nevada stands with California in the conflict.

President Truman has stated that the proposed central Arizona project is not in accord with the administration's program for the western United States. The President also has called for prompt settlement of the California-Arizona controversy.

The Bureau of the Budget, the Department of Agriculture, the Federal Power Commission, and other departments and high officials have expressed opposition to the proposed Arizona project. The Department of the Interior and its Bureau of Reclamation have stated that until the lower basin controversy is settled there can be no assured water supply for the project.

In the face of this situation, Arizona is continuing to fight for the billion dollar central Arizona project, and defiantly has introduced measures in Congress asking for its authorization.

Virtually every Government department, including the White House and the Budget Bureau, has reported the Arizona project infeasible under the reclamation laws. But not even this fact has stopped Arizona. To make the project feasible, Arizona is attempting to have the reclamation laws revised, and has introduced legislation designed to accomplish this.

Here are some facts about the proposed central Arizona project:

The estimated cost, made during 1947, is about $738,000,000. This does not include additional millions of dollars that must be spent for supplemental projects necessary to safeguard both the proposed Arizona development and older developments on the Colorado River.

How the cost of the proposed Arizona project is broken down

Power (interest bearing)	$243,798,000
Irrigation (interest free)	397,693,000
Municipal water supply (interest free)	16,605,000
Flood control (at Government expense)	6,641,000
Silt control (at Government expense)	28,097,000
Recreation (at Government expense)	37,459,000
Fish-wildlife (at Government expense)	3,129,000
Salinity control (at Government expense)	4,986,000
Total	738,408,000

In addition to enormous pump lifts—requiring immense amounts of power—subsidiary dams, reservoirs, and hundreds of miles of tunnels and canals, the Arizona project plan calls for the building of Bridge Canyon Dam, located several hundred miles from the land to be irrigated, at a cost of $265,000,000.

This would be a power dam. It is not needed to regulate the flow of the Colorado River. It is included in the project only to supply power for the pump lifts, and to bring in revenues by selling power to California.

Under the project plan, that power revenue is intended to pay not only the cost of operation, maintenance, interest, and retirement of Bridge Canyon Dam, but it is also to be used to retire the irrigation costs of the central Arizona project.

The available power markets are in southern California, and hence these southern California power users would be called upon to pay through higher power rates as much as $2,400 for each acre to provide water for some privately owned land in Arizona which, when fully irrigated, is worth, according to the Reclamation Bureau, no more than $300 an acre.

The Bureau of Reclamation says that the central Arizona project is needed as a rescue project, and that if additional water supplies are not provided in Arizona there would eventually return about 30 percent of the irrigated land to idleness if irrigation were confined to lands which could be adequately supplied.

About 566,000 acres of land presently are irrigated in the central Arizona project area and might benefit directly or indirectly from the project. Thirty percent of this land would therefore be about 170,000 acres, the amount of land that would be rescued and for which the project would be built.

Therefore, the end result of the expenditure of $397,693,000, the part of the central Arizona project allocated to

irrigation, is for the purpose of maintaining agricultural production on about 170,000 acres at a cost of about $2,400 an acre. This is $2,400 per acre for land worth no more than $300.

Evidently Arizona land speculators sold more land than the available water will irrigate. Consequently, one of two things must happen:

First. They must either let 30 percent of the presently irrigable land return to desert in order to conserve the water supply for the balance; or

Second. They must bring additional water from distant places.

Obviously they have chosen the second course, but not at the expense of the private landowners who would be benefited thereby—no—they have chosen to let the American taxpayers and the power users of California pay the cost of bringing in the water Arizona wants.

The Federal Government is asked to put up the money for the proposed central Arizona project—not Arizona. It must be paid back, and interest must be paid on the loan. Arizona's plan would charge power rates that would write off the power investment in 30 years with interest, through the sale of electricity mostly to Californians, and after that apply the net power income to pay for the cost of the Arizona irrigation project.

The entire cost of the Arizona project would be an obligation of the taxpayers of the United States but the electric power users of southern California would be called upon to repay most of it and Arizona landowners and speculators would get the great development virtually for nothing.

But the Arizona project is not financially feasible under present reclamation laws. To make it feasible the laws would have to be revised; the present system for repaying the Government would have to be changed and extended; revenues would have to be taken out of one Federal pocket and put into another Federal pocket, instead of being returned to the United States Treasury to pay interest on the Federal debt that would be incurred to build the project.

The Bureau of Reclamation says Arizona farmers can pay $4.50 an acre-foot for water, but the cost of delivering an irrigation supply of water to the Arizona project over a 50-year period under the present law would be about $18 an acre-foot annually, or approximately four times the charge of $4.50 as estimated by the Bureau. The price of $4.50 would not even be sufficient to pay the operation, maintenance, and replacement expenses chargeable to irrigation. Even under Arizona's proposed modifications of the reclamation laws, the repayment period for irrigation costs would have to be extended to something like 97 to 114 years, or from 47 to 64 years longer than the 50 years now permitted under the law.

The Bureau of Reclamation recommends a charge of 4.82 mills per kilowatt-hour at the end of transmission lines for power from the proposed Arizona project. The Bureau's power figures are very vague and needed specifications are lacking. But the proposed power charge and the proposed charge of $4.50 per acre-foot for irrigation water are far too low to pay the project costs.

The price of Hoover Dam power at Los Angeles, including steam stand-by, is 3.50 to 3.75 mills.

In order to provide sufficient revenue to secure full repayment in the required 50 years, one of the following alternatives would be needed for the Arizona project:

(a) With irrigation water priced at $4.50, the commercial power rate would have to be increased to 8.14 mills, which is ridiculously high; or

(b) A power rate of 5.17 mills would be required to cover fixed and operating costs chargeable to power, and at this rate for power the charge for irrigation water would have to be $17.80 an acre-foot, which water users could not afford to pay; or

(c) With a power rate of 5.17 mills and a water rate of $4.50 an acre-foot, a subsidy from the United States Treasury of $423,605,000 would be required. The Nation's taxpayers would have to pay this to rescue 170,000 acres of privately owned land in Arizona.

So the Bureau of Reclamation, which would build the proposed Arizona project, states that unless the reclamation laws are changed to meet Arizona's proposals, the project cannot be built. Nor can it be built if California's contentions in the Colorado River controversy are sustained.

It is interesting to compare the proposed central Arizona project with the Hoover Dam project, and also with the proposed St. Lawrence seaway.

Hoover Dam and power plant cost approximately $160,000,000. Before it could be built California's municipally owned and private power companies were required to sign electrical energy contracts at rates sufficient to repay the entire cost, with interest, within 50 years. They are paying, and the American taxpayer is making money on the deal, as the interest rate is 3 percent, which is more than the rate the Government has to pay.

The estimated cost of the St. Lawrence seaway is $720,000,000. Of this amount, $322,000,000 would be allocated to power, and $398,000,000 to navigation. The power would be sold, and toll charges would liquidate navigation costs. The entire project is designed to be self-liquidating at the expense of the beneficiaries, returning the original investment to the Government with interest.

From these facts it may be seen to what extent the American taxpayer would be bilked by the proposed Arizona project.

CALIFORNIA'S STAKE IN THE RIVER

California has a great deal more at stake in the Colorado River than has Arizona, and California would suffer far more than Arizona under an adverse settlement of the controversy between the two States. That is because California has invested immense sums of money in Colorado River developments, and Arizona has invested comparatively small sums. California has many times more people to supply with power and water, and has more industry and agriculture entirely dependent on the Colorado River. Nearly 4,000,000 people have migrated to California since 1940. There are more than 10,000,000 residents of the State. The Colorado does not serve the northern part of the State, but the millions in southern California are now dependent on it.

Only because of the foresight and determination of California's civic leaders do the millions of new residents in the State, the new industries, and the vast national defense plants have an adequate supply of water today.

INVESTMENT OF THE PEOPLE

Altogether the people of southern California have invested or incurred obligations aggregating more than half a billion dollars in projects to bring Colorado River water and power to their farms, homes, and industries. These projects include the Hoover Dam, the Metropolitan aqueduct, the All-American Canal, and many others.

HOOVER DAM

The Colorado River compact was an essential step toward the building of Boulder—now Hoover—Dam, but 6 years passed after it was signed before the battle smoke cleared on Capitol Hill, and the Boulder Canyon Project Act was approved.

As I have said, the dam and power plant, which cost $160,000,000, was not built at the risk of the American taxpayers. Before it was authorized, several public and private utilities signed contracts with the Government agreeing in effect to repay the construction costs, plus interest, within 50 years. This was done through contracts for the purchase of the power produced by the dam. There has been no defaulting on these contracts, and the money which the Government loaned for the dam is rolling steadily back into the United States Treasury with interest at 3 percent.

THE GREAT METROPOLITAN AQUEDUCT

As early as 1923, officials of the metropolitan areas of southern California realized that the water supplies then available would soon be inadequate because of rapidly increasing industry, agriculture, and population.

Distinguished engineers turned to the only source of a new and adequate supply, the Colorado River, even then recognizing it as southern California's last water hole.

These leaders were not visionaries. They were men of courage, conviction, and real vision. They went to the people with their plans, not to the Federal Government. Nor did they propose that the Government and the people of other States pay for their project, as Arizona is doing with the central Arizona project.

The California builders asked the people of California to dig down in their own pockets, to become indebted themselves for general obligation bonds, to have faith and to construct on sound business principles, to stand on their own feet.

Progress came slowly but steadily. By 1932 a group of 13 California cities, including Los Angeles, had created the metropolitan water district of southern California, and work had begun on the

longest and largest domestic water supply aqueduct in the United States. Running from the Colorado River, above Parker Dam, the aqueduct together with its distribution system are 457 miles long. They penetrate mountain barriers and thread across burning deserts. An ultimate supply of a billion gallons of water a day can be delivered to the cities of the California coastal plain. This great aqueduct has cost to date about $220,000,000, and it is being paid for and maintained by the people who receive water from it.

Cities and areas within the metropolitan water district of southern California and their population

Anaheim	14,000
Beverly Hills	30,000
Burbank	78,000
Compton	40,000
Fullerton	14,000
Glendale	104,000
Los Angeles	2,000,000
Long Beach	269,000
Pasadena	110,000
San Marino	12,600
Santa Ana	44,000
Santa Monica	76,000
Torrance	18,000

Coastal municipal water district: Population, 55,000; includes Laguna Beach, Brea.

San Diego County water authority: Population, 480,000; includes San Diego, Oceanside, National City, La Mesa, Chula Vista, El Cajon.

West Basin municipal water district: Population, 156,000; includes El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Redondo Beach, Palos Verdes Estates.

Total population served, 3,510,000.

OTHER CALIFORNIA PROJECTS

In addition to Hoover Dam and the aqueduct, the people of southern California have contracted to pay, and are paying, for the All-American Canal—$78,000,000—which carries Colorado River water to the fertile Imperial and Coachella Valleys; for Parker Dam—$12,400,000—which regulates the flow of the Colorado below Hoover Dam and provides a storage reservoir from which water is taken into the metropolitan aqueduct; for the San Diego branch of the aqueduct—$15,000,000—and for the high-voltage transmission lines which carry Hoover Dam power, $56,000,000.

Contrast these great developments with the plan for the central Arizona project. California has paid its own way, the people putting up their own money to build for their farms, their homes, their industries on sound and fair business principles. Southern California has borrowed large sums of money from the Federal Government, but only under contracts to repay it, with interest. The people of southern California have not asked the Government, or the people of another State, to pay for these projects.

Arizona wants the biggest single reclamation and power project in history, wants the Government and the people of other States to pay for most of it, and wants to leave the taxpayers of the Nation holding the bag.

What would happen if Arizona got this fantastic project it wants? This is what would happen:

First. Water for the Arizona project would have to be taken from the people of southern California, from people who have always paid their own way, from people who invested half a billion dollars of their own money in Colorado River developments, believing their investments secure under contracts for water with the Federal Government.

Second. Although their water, the water southern California needs for any future progress, would be gone if the Congress were to approve the Arizona project, the people of southern California would have to continue to pay off their obligations for their own water projects. They would have to pay these obligations whether they had any water or not, for these are inescapable debts, in part to the Federal Government and the balance to private bondholders. The people of southern California have pledged themselves to pay for Hoover Dam, and all the other projects corollary to it, and from that pledge they cannot turn.

Arizona has asked that the reclamation laws of the Nation be weakened in order to make the central Arizona project legally feasible.

Southern California is proud of the fact that it has asked the Federal Government for nothing that it was unwilling to repay in full.

It has repaid to date $9,500,000 in return of capital investment, and about $41,000,000 in interest to the United States Treasury.

The metropolitan water district taxed the real property of the people to pay over $5,000,000 to the Government for electric power which at the time it was not yet ready to use.

The Government's investment in Hoover Dam is about $142,000,000. When California has completed its payments, the Government will have received back that $142,000,000, and in addition will have paid into the Treasury a replacement fund for the power plant.

After all these sums are paid off, who will own Hoover Dam? Will California own it? No. The Government will still own Hoover Dam and the power plant, and at a profit to the American taxpayers.

Southern California will not boondoggle at the expense of the American taxpayer, and we do not believe the American taxpayer wants any other area to do it.

I repeat that the Colorado River controversy is more than a fight over water. It is a fight being waged by the millions of people in southern California who, believing in the integrity of contracts with their own National Government, have mortgaged themselves for more than half a billion dollars. That is money that comes from the small householder, the farmers, and industry alike.

These questions and problems now before the Congress are questions and problems that must be resolved if western development is to go forward on a sound basis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. O'NEILL). Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 15 minutes.

ATOMIC WARFARE LEAVES MANKIND NO PLACE TO HIDE

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have a terrifying sense that we of the Eighty-first Congress are standing still in the midst of rapidly unfolding events. We are at the bedside of a sick world, which is awaiting the doctor's verdict. Will it survive, or is this the beginning of the end? In the President's state of the Union message to the Congress, these words ring out sharp and challenging:

> We stand at the opening of an era which can mean either great achievement or terrible catastrophe for ourselves and all mankind.

This challenge, as I interpret it, has not yet been answered. It must be answered today. Tomorrow may be too late.

I mean, in the plainest sense, that we, right here and now, in this Congress, must meet the challenge of the atom bomb.

As a member of the Joint Committee of the House and Senate on Atomic Energy and as a Member of Congress who witnessed the Bikini tests as an official observer, I am alarmed at the policy of ignoring the job of educating the Congress and the American people to the real meaning of the atomic discoveries.

There are those who say the atom bomb is in very good hands. We hold the secret. No one can touch us or catch up with us.

But is not this placing a comic-strip simplicity upon the most important and most dangerous problem of our time?

We have received reports from the Atomic Energy Commission. We have heard the pronouncements of men of the Army or of the Navy, and of science and the laity. We have read of atomic developments in America, in Canada, in France, rumors of Russia's part in atomic progress.

But what do we really know of the atom bomb?

What do we have a right to know? Let us face that question squarely. Let us answer it now.

We do not, of course, want any military secrets disclosed to a potential enemy. But most of the secrets of the atom bomb—as we have been told many times—are not actually secrets of scientific fact, but of technical know-how, which other nations can acquire in time.

What we are entitled to know is this: What will the atom bomb do to you and to our children? To our Nation? To our civilization? These are fair questions—questions to which people living in a democracy have a right to demand the answers.

Have the custodians of our defense been entirely frank with us on this subject? I do not think so, and there are many others who do not think so. We believe that secrecy on this subject has been overextended, for one reason or another. And we believe this unjustified margin of secrecy is dangerous to the security of our Nation, not to mention our own personal welfare.

I think it is high time we realize that the days of the simple bomb which causes damage through explosion and

fire alone are over. This is the atomic age, and it can be the atomic age of world destruction or the creative age in which a new world is built. But I am afraid that the minds of many of our leaders are not yet keyed to the New Mexico explosion which blasted us over the borderline of a new era. It is characteristic of preatomic thinking that we are being protected from a truth, which is ours to know, and which may ironically be the very salvation of our civilization.

It is also characteristic of preatomic thinking that our Navy Department is going ahead with the construction of a 65,000-ton carrier at a cost of $124,000,000. This, in blitheful disregard of the fate of the target fleet at Bikini, which was virtually wiped out by atomic explosion, fire, and radiation.

This new bomb which man's inventive genius has devised—this atom bomb—unlocks the energies of the universe. It is a colossal booby trap which, long after it has exploded, can kill and maim and destroy and infect with the most terrible disease yet known to mankind. It is a disease for which there is no known cure. It is the disease of radiation.

Unfortunately, the average human mind cannot conceive of the extent and magnitude of the consequences which may result from radioactivity in the wake of the atom bomb, and the presence of dangerous fission products. Yet it is vital that we think of consequences when we are handling man's most destructive toy.

I should like to direct the attention of this body to a document which I consider of urgent and extreme importance in accenting the challenge of the atom bomb. It is a recently published book which is very appropriately and ominously titled "No Place To Hide." The author, a man with no ax to grind, conveys a message which we cannot, for the sake of life itself, afford to ignore. Dr. David Bradley, the author of this book, was at Bikini, and saw for himself what an atom bomb can do to ships, islands, seaports, harbors. He was able to judge what it could do to human beings. As a radiological monitor with the task force which made the Bikini tests, Dr. Bradley concentrated on the dangers of unseen radiation to living tissue and especially to human beings.

Dr. Bradley deplores the fact that so little of this information has reached the public, who will replace the goats and guinea pigs in a future war. Such censorship, Dr. Bradley holds, is dangerous in that it lulls Mr. Average Man into a false sense of security. It paralyzes any action he might be spurred into taking, so that methods might be found to prevent another war. After all, and these words are mine, it is Mr. Average Man who fights the wars, and in the future he may not even get a chance to fight at all. He may only have an opportunity to die. Therefore, it is Mr. Average Man's right to know the nature of this weapon which hangs suspended over the entire world today.

Let me say it again in Dr. Bradley's words. He was there at Bikini, and he says:

> The Bikini tests have never received much attention. The accounts of the actual explosions, however well intended, were liberally seasoned with fantasy and superstition, and the results of the tests have remained buried in the vaults of military security.

That sort of security is itself a superstition, and a dangerous one—

Says Dr. Bradley who witnessed the realism of the Bikini mushroom. He adds:

> It fosters misconception or, what is worse, indifference, and ultimately results in procrastination, half-measures, and hysteria. There is nothing particularly difficult or mysterious about the scientific principles upon which an atomic explosion is based. Students all over the world are verifying them in the laboratory and applying them to future research. For some reason Americans have found comfort in the phrase "our industrial know-how." This know-how—

Says Dr. Bradley—

> is our Maginot line. Surely our days of grace under this magic symbol are running out.

Operation Crossroads, as the Bikini tests were known, provided the clearest measure yet of the menace of atomic energy, Dr. Bradley writes. He says:

> Less spectacular perhaps than Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the Bikini tests give a far clearer warning of the lingering and insidious nature of the radioactive agent which makes it such an ideal weapon for use on civil populations.

Much that was learned at Bikini, Dr. Bradley points out, has been disguised in the esoteric idiom of the scientist. But the really great lessons of the experiment, he declares, belong to no special group, but to all mankind.

> The atomic era—

He says—

> is now man's environment, to control, or to adapt himself to, as he can.

Man has it in his power to control the use of the atom bomb, but once released there is no force known to man which can check the effects of radioactivity. Dr. Bradley writes:

> I can think of no fact demonstrated by the Bikini tests, which is more important in its widest implications than this difficulty in ridding the habitable surfaces of our world of contaminating fission products.

And here is another significant warning which I believe should be burned into our memories:

> We can't predict—

Dr. Bradley states—

> to what degree the balance of nature will be thrown off by atomic bombs. We certainly have little idea what the long-range effects on our lives would be from an all-out atomic war, devastating our shores, our fish, and our agricultural industries.

Let us not console ourselves that our defense program will keep us safe, and that the fate of being boiled in unseen radiation is reserved exclusively for our future enemies. There is no real defense against atomic weapons. That is the most significant point which Dr. Bradley makes in his book:

> There is no real defense against atomic weapons.

Secondly, Dr. Bradley states:

> There are no satisfactory countermeasures and methods of decontamination.

And the third point of emphasis is:

> There are no satisfactory medical or sanitary safeguards for the people of atomized areas.

Finally, Dr. Bradley states:

> The devastating influence of the bomb and its unborn relatives may affect the land and its wealth—and therefore its people—for centuries through the persistence of radioactivity.

I do not intend to recapitulate all of the Bradley book here although it would be well worth the time. I would like, however, to suggest that it be carefully studied by every Member of this Congress who is seriously concerned with the welfare of the Nation and his own family.

The greatest failure of the Bikini tests, Dr. Bradley points out, has been in apprehending their sociological implications.

Evidently—

He says—

> the bomb has failed to impress more than a few congenital pessimists with the full scope of its lethal potential. This error in publicity—

As Dr. Bradley calls it—

> might be justifiable on the basis of strict military secrecy. In the long run, however, the one thing more dangerous than informed governments abroad will be an uninformed American opinion.

This is not a political problem, Dr. Bradley says, so much as it is a biological problem:

> It is not the security of a political system but the survival of the race that is at stake in the indiscriminate use of atomic energy for political coercion.

In the light of these words, I should like to call for the following action.

I recommend that this Congress demand that the full facts of the Bikini atom bomb tests, insofar as they apply to the destructive effects of the bombs, be laid bare before the American public.

The full report of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the Bikini tests—shorn of legitimate military secrets—has not been given to us. Defense Secretary Forrestal has preferred not to worry us with the bothersome details. If this information is not forthcoming from the military within a reasonable time—and, ladies and gentlemen, in this atomic age there is no time to be lost—then I recommend that the Congress establish its own investigation into the reasons why this vital information is being withheld. I believe the American public is entitled to know the amount of radiation released by the Bikini bombs. This fact will provide a key to determining possible damage to cities and other targets in the event of an atomic war. This, I hold, is knowledge which will help prevent another war. The truth about atomic warfare is perhaps the only real defense we have today against the possibility of such a war breaking out.

When every man understands the consequences of the atom bomb, then he and his leaders can more actively and intelligently assume the responsibility for maintaining world peace. And world peace must be the goal of all of us—or we may not live to achieve any other.

In conclusion, I challenge the Secretary of National Defense to tell the American people the truth about the terrible impact of atomic warfare. Specifically, I think he should tell the people, what the results would be of underwater explosions of atomic bombs at points offshore and upwind from the following centers of population, industry, and key military installations: New York City; Chicago; Baltimore; Washington, D. C.; Seattle; San Francisco—Mare Island; San Diego—Naval and aircraft installations; Norfolk, Va.—Hampton Roads; Honolulu—Pearl Harbor; Panama Canal and locks.

If Mr. Forrestal declines to answer this challenge, I charge the noted scientists who created this Frankenstein at the expense of the American people, to answer my challenge.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the gentleman tell the House how many of the ships which were involved in the Bikini experiment are still afloat?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I cannot give you the exact information, but several of the ships were sunk at the time of the explosion and several of them developed underwater leaks and sank later on. Some of them are still afloat and are being used in experiments in an attempt to find a formula to reduce radiation which still is imbedded in the steel, paint, and metals of the ships.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Then the gentleman says that after all these years, following the experiment at Bikini, some of the ships which were involved in that experiment are still radioactive?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The carrier *Independence* which is now moored in the Mare Island Navy Yard and which was in the Bikini test is quarantined at the present time. People are not allowed to go on the ship for any extended length of time because of the radioactivity that is still in the ship, and it is almost 3 years now since the explosion.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What has happened to the natives who were removed from Bikini? Have they been returned to Bikini, or if they have not, why not?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I believe the natives are on Rongerik Island. They have not been returned to Bikini, and it is the scientific opinion that they should not be returned to Bikini because of the radioactivity which still exists in the lagoon, which is inside the coral atoll of the Bikini Islands.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I just wanted to correct the gentleman's statement insofar as the Bikini natives are concerned. They were moved to Rongerik but the situation was found unsuitable for them there, and they have been moved back to Kwajalein and now a permanent settlement is going to be located for them somewhere in that area.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am glad to hear that they have been moved from Rongerik, because when I visited Rongerik in 1946, the natives complained about facilities there. Kwajalein is an island, I believe, more than 150 miles away from Bikini lagoon.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. POULSON. Is it not true that the military heads of our Government think that by keeping us in the dark about all of these secrets, they can keep us in a state of fear so that we will agree to follow them in every line of their program of defense. As long as we do not know the facts, we cannot discuss them on their merits, and we are unable to form any opinion other than following the program that they lay down.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. It is my calm judgment that the $15,000,000,000 military budget, which is now on the backs of the American taxpayer could be drastically reduced if the facts of atomic warfare were made known to the people of the United States.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD, and to include an address by Senator GEORGE MALONE, of Nevada.

Mr. NORBLAD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the American Legion Post at Belleville, Ill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

REPEAL OF THE TAX ON OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to me to inform the Members of the House, who may not have otherwise been informed, the great Committee on Agriculture has set March 1 for the beginning of the hearings on the many proposals to remove the so-called tax from margarine.

As every Member of the Eightieth Congress and the other Congresses since the Seventy-seventh knows, each year I have introduced a bill to remove the so-called tax from margarine. After 7 years of waiting, begging, and pleading with the membership of this, the greatest deliberative body in the world and after having been summarily turned down by the Committee on Agriculture during the second session of the Eightieth Congress, 218 Members of the former Congress signed my discharge petition and on April 28 of last year, H. R. 2245 passed this branch of Congress with not one single solitary amendment attached thereto, saving and excepting clarifying amendments as to effective dates of the act.

Each of you recalls that the other body failed to consider my bill in spite of the fact that the committee having jurisdiction reported it out unanimously and it took its place on the calendar but was never called up for consideration. Had it been considered, I would not be on this floor again reminding you that this so-called tax, which is nothing but a ransom, an extortion, and a tribute exacted from the housewives of this Nation for the privilege of eating margarine, should be removed and that the American public should not be an unwilling conscious party to a program which penalizes one industry for the benefit of another and at the same time add insult, injury, and endless confusion to one's ability to purchase margarine.

My bill this year is as simple as the ABC's. I read it in its entirety as follows. It has two paragraphs of one sentence each:

That, effective July 1, 1949, section 2301 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the tax on oleomargarine) is repealed.

SEC. 2. Effective July 1, 1949, part I of subchapter A of chapter 27 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the occupational tax on manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers of oleomargarine) is repealed.

My bill simply means that the tax on margarine from the cradle to the grave is removed whether it be on the manufacturer, wholesaler, or retailer; consequently, relieving the consumer from the burden of any hidden tax or ransom.

During the year just passed it has been estimated that between eight hundred million and a billion pounds of margarine was consumed. It has been suggested that at the rate of 10 minutes a pound spent by the housewives of the Nation during the last year in coloring, a conservative estimate of 625,000,000 pounds, the American housewives spent the incredible time of 11,891 years at the task. Again I say to you that this is a conservative estimate. I believe at least 800,000,000 pounds of margarine was colored, in which case at least 13,000 years would have been spent. I tell you this is a disgrace, it is unfair, it is unreasonable, and it is un-American. Is it any wonder, therefore, that every individual in America gets boiling mad when he is compelled to mix a pound of margarine when its competitor, butter, which is far beyond the reach of the poor man to purchase, is permitted to be colored 8 months out of the year every year and is sold without any disabilities and penalties attached to its manufacture, sale, or distribution.

I make the broad prediction that never again will butter be in any position to compete with margarine because the people of this Nation have found margarine to be a wholesome, healthful, and nutritious product. It is produced from pure, refined domestic oils, at least 60 percent of which comes from cottonseed, about 35 percent of which comes from soybean, and the remainder from peanut oils. It is almost impossible to contaminate a refined oil; consequently, no germs are ever transmitted by the touch of the human hand. In addition to all this, every pound of margarine sold contains some 13,000 USP units of vitamin A.

Frankly, to this very day I have no idea what the cost of butter is—it has been so many years since I purchased a pound. But I know this, regardless of its cost at this very moment, I would buy margarine if they both were the same price because I have learned through necessity that it is butter's superior and

not its inferior. And it is un-American, to say the least, to place the strong arm of the United States Government between the humblest citizen in the land and the purchase of margarine.

Many of those who want to continue to bludgeon the American people by retaining this ransom try to bring out the old bogey that this is a fight between the dairy farmer and the Margarine Trust. Personally, I do not know any of the margarine trust. Neither do I know any of the Butter Trust, neither of whom concerns me. But I can state this: Recently it was admitted that less than 1 percent of the dairyman's income was derived in the State of New York from the sale of cream for butter. The dairy farmer sells a lot of milk to the margarine manufacturers. He sells a lot of milk for human consumption. He sells a lot of cream to be processed into ice cream, cheese, and other commodities, and he has found that the Butter Trust takes the profit out of his cream and he gets so little he is now looking to greener pastures for profits. Were the taxes to be removed from margarine it would not affect him in the slightest. I tell you the day will come when butter will be as hard to get as sharp cheese, whose price now is as sharp as its taste.

Let us see just what disabilities are placed on the manufacture, distribution, and sale of margarine. The manufacturer's tax is $600. The wholesaler's tax is $480, if margarine is distributed colored and $200 if it is distributed uncolored. The retailers of colored margarine pay a tax of $48, and the retailers of uncolored margarine pay a tax of $6. These schedules were the result of the Organic Act taxing margarine of 1886 and the subsequent act of 1902. All these, plus those imposed by an excess of 15 States in the Union, run the cost of margarine to at least 10 or 15 cents extra a pound, and I compute that in this way.

The Treasury Department requires an elaborate bookkeeping set-up by the manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers in order to fully comply with the statutes and regulations and schedules promulgated thereunder. Therefore, the cost in maintaining these books, records, and the collection of taxes imposes a great amount of work and expenditure of money from the manufacturer to the ultimate sale of margarine, so that when the final pound is purchased by the consumer all these hidden costs are computed, and it is he who pays the freight.

This is not the whole story. The National Association of Retail Grocers testified last year in effect before the Agriculture Committee that at least half of the retail grocery stores in this country have less than $10,000 annually. Consequently, the vast majority of them fail to stock margarine due to the small profit and because of the Federal tax and the consequent fear of penalties being exacted for failure to follow regulations.

Follow this information, if you will, to the crossroad stores and the stores in small towns where the big chains never go. You know these small grocers do not keep an elaborate set of books, and, from their experiences with the recent contemptible OPA, they live in mortal fear of the Federal Government, and so long as the sword of Damocles hangs over their head they will have nothing to do with anything in which the Government is concerned.

Now add all these things together and conjure in your own minds the countless thousands of people in this Nation who have been deprived of even an opportunity to purchase margarine regardless of the extortion extracted or their abilities to purchase it.

I say to you again and again that the American people are holding us directly responsible for these inequities. I am confident that the Committee on Agriculture this year will be responsive to the will of the American people and I am certain when the record of the Eighty-first Congress is written, the credit will go to us for restoring free competition to a free market in the good old American way.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Does the gentleman take into consideration the fact that the farmers who engage in the dairy industry and the keeping of milch cows depend upon the animals to build up the fertility of his soil?

Mr. RIVERS. Of course. I lived on a farm the greater part of my life; and I will say to the gentleman from Idaho, where they grow the finest potatoes next to South Carolina of any place in the world, that not 1 percent of the income of the farmers of the great State of New York comes from cream processed into butter.

That is the worst bogey ever held before the dairy farmers of this Nation. This does not militate against them. The farmers of this Nation have found out there is no money in cream for butter. That is a losing proposition. The war taught them many other ways to use cream and milk for various processes. They sell milk in the market and they sell cream for ice cream, for cheese, and other products.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RIVERS. The gentleman should listen for a moment. It is a losing proposition to the farmers of this Nation, and I refer to the dairy farmers, to be lulled into that proposition. It is crazy. Why, in the great State of Nebraska they converted their creameries into margarine-manufacturing plants, as the gentleman well knows.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. The gentleman has the floor and I do not want to interrupt him, but I would remind the gentleman from South Carolina that it is not a losing proposition for the manufacturer of these cheap butter substitutes and the use of excess oils and fats in competition with the dairy industry, breaking down the backbone of agriculture.

Mr. RIVERS. The gentleman is always right, but he is wrong today.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. From the gentleman's comment, then, I judge that he is completely in accord with the bill that has been introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WALSH] which would repeal the tax but at the same time would make it illegal to sell oleo in a yellow color?

Mr. RIVERS. I have been in Congress only 10 years. I am like the gentleman, wary of any Greek bringing gifts to me.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Is the gentleman opposed to that bill?

Mr. RIVERS. The authorship is enough for me to stop, look, and listen.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Is the gentleman speaking of the Walsh bill?

Mr. RIVERS. I am speaking for RIVERS. Has the gentleman read my bill?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am asking about the authorship of that bill.

Mr. RIVERS. I do not read every bill introduced, neither does the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am telling you that the gentleman——

Mr. RIVERS. I am telling you, too, I am for the Rivers bill. It is the greatest piece of legislation ever struck off by the hand of man.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentlemen are out of order in using the term "you" to each other. It is contrary to parliamentary principles.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; they ought to say "'you all."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from South Carolina yield for that purpose?

Mr. RIVERS. Certainly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Are any other speakers to follow the gentleman who now has the floor?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There are.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. May I know how many? I wanted to get the gentleman's time extended, if it was not out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Two.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the Chair.

Mr. RIVERS. I have been here about 8 years. I do not think I have ever interrupted the gentleman, and he has made many, many tirades on this floor. I wish he now would permit me to continue with my time. When the gentleman gets his own time, I will be very glad to listen to him.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman misunderstood me.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield any more. Does the gentleman understand that?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No. I just want to know whether the gentleman wants a bigger audience, that is all.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield any more.

I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. In view of the advertising I am sure we have all seen in some chain stores in the southern part of the country, which are advertising yellow-colored oleo and the pure dairy product at exactly the same price, how does the gentleman reconcile that with the statement that he feels that the housewives are being discriminated against by this tax?

Mr. RIVERS. I am so busy looking after my constituents I have not had time to visit all the chain stores in the South or any other part of the country. If the gentleman wants to take the time to do that, I will be very glad to help him get a leave of absence. What about the gentleman's part of the country? How are things coming along up there?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Butter being a superior product——

Mr. RIVERS. I assume the gentleman does not want any of his constituents to eat margarine.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Under the State law, very few of them are permitted to do that. It is not the Federal law that is doing that.

Mr. RIVERS. I am very fond of the gentleman from Wisconsin, but also very fond of my constituents.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I suppose the gentleman also thinks that synthetic cheese is as good as the natural product? Is that his contention?

Mr. RIVERS. The gentleman speaks for himself in tones very eloquent at times.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Would the gentleman advocate carrying this thing through with synthetic butter and synthetic cheese? Would he be in favor of synthetic cheese?

Mr. RIVERS. What about synthetic Idaho potatoes?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. They would be good if you had a way of making them.

Mr. RIVERS. If there were a way of making them, I bet you would find it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Have we not just about got around to the point of using synthetic money?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I was necessarily off the floor a moment and do not have the benefit of all the gentleman's views on this subject, but I understood that he had expressed himself as feeling that this legislation was not properly before the Committee on Agriculture. I agree entirely with that statement. I think that any bill relating to a tax should be before the Committee on Ways and Means. I have introduced a resolution to that effect and have been urging that the Committee on Rules hear me on the resolution. Does not the gentleman agree that anything relating to a tax should be before the Committee on Ways and Means?

Mr. RIVERS. I do, but this is not a tax, this is an extortion. This goes before the Committee on Agriculture. It is not a tax.

Mr. KEATING. That is the reason the gentleman thinks it is before the Committee on Agriculture?

Mr. RIVERS. It is not a tax, it is an extortion, a ransom. Does the gentleman know what a ransom is? If he does not, there are 60,000,000 housewives in the country who do.

Mr. KEATING. What is that word?

Mr. RIVERS. Ransom, not rancid. It would not apply to oleo, and I refer that to the gentleman from Greenville, S. C., who has a fine margarine producing plant in his district.

Mr. BRYSON. That is certainly right. Our people are thriving on it. We have the healthiest, finest children in the country. That is true of the general use of margarine.

Mr. RIVERS. I disagree with the gentleman about the healthiest children. I am glad to hear the gentleman say he favors the repeal of the margarine tax. However, the healthiest children in the United States are in the first district of South Carolina.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include the summary of an address by Kenneth deCourcy. I am informed by the Printing Office that it will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $177.50, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 25 minutes.

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain statements, excerpts, and articles.)

CONCENTRATION OF ECONOMIC POWER THREATENS NATIONAL ECONOMY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am disturbed about the constant concentration of economic power.

I would like to call to the attention of the Members a series of editorial messages paid for by McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., which are appearing periodically in the Washington Post and other leading newspapers. The latest full-page article which was printed in the Washington Post on February 17 is entitled "Now Is the Time To Fight Socialism in Washington." McGraw-Hill Publishing Co.—itself a tremendous organization, which includes not only the publishing company but also McGraw-Hill International Corp. and McGraw-Hill Book Co.—publishes the trade magazines and catalogs for many industries such as aviation, coal, electrical, and textile. It is, of course, to the company's interest to see that big business has unlimited funds for new plants and equipment, and new publications.

These articles are simply and compellingly written and might be very persuasive to a reader not acquainted with the approach big business uses to destroy the laws protecting the consumer, the small-business man, and the farmer against exploitation. This method of attempting to influence legislation is not new.

EFFECTIVE PROPAGANDA POINTED OUT BY PRESIDENT TRUMAN

As President Truman stated last fall in describing the method used by the National Association of Manufacturers to defeat the Office of Price Administration:

> In 1946 the NAM set out on a well-planned and well-financed campaign to destroy price controls. The NAM spent a million and a half on newspaper advertising. They sent their own speakers to make a thousand talks before women's clubs, civic organizations, and college students. A specially designed publication went to 37,000 school teachers, another one to 35,000 farm leaders and still another to leaders of women's clubs. There never was a more vicious or better organized campaign to mislead and deceive the American people.

This McGraw-Hill series is designed to protect big business from increased taxes and defend big corporations that withhold huge earnings from the stockholders. The argument advanced is that if big industries are taxed to any appreciable extent, they will not be able to expand or retool and will deteriorate until—and I quote—"America follows Britain down the economic skids." Using England as an example to America does not seem logical to me. There were special conditions which drove the British to socialization which have no practical application as far as our country is concerned. Facts and figures concerning American industry show that unlike the British, American corporations under Democratic administrations have more than tripled the amount expended on new plants and equipment from 1939 to 1948. The amount spent for plant and equipment increased from $5,200,000,000 in 1939 to about $17,100,000,000 in 1948. As stated in the 1948 report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, "it appears that corporations by and large finance their expansion of fixed-capital facilities in the immediate postwar period by funds generated through their current operations."

RETAINING EXCESS PROFITS

Last year out of over twenty billion net corporate profits, $7,000,000,000 were distributed as dividend payments and thirteen billion were retained by the corporations. If as much as two-thirds of these profits had been paid to the stockholder, then approximately seven billion more dollars could have gone to the individual stockholders. These figures are a clear warning that too much capital and too much power are in the possession of too few corporations. There is your danger of socialism. If the competitive character of our business system is not kept alive by a fair distribution of profits, we shall have to expect: First, an increasing private monopolistic control of American business; and, second, an increasing degree of public regulation and even public operation. Mr. Truman outlined this increasing danger from the control of too much power in too few hands when he said:

> The plain facts on monopoly are these: Two hundred giant industrial corporations own nearly half of all our industrial assets. One hundred commercial banks control one-half of all the bank deposits in the United States. Three steel companies own 59 percent of all the ingot capacity of the United States. Two corporations produce 83 percent of all the tin cans. These facts shout a warning to all of us. They mean that big business can manipulate prices and production at its own discretion, regardless of the public good. That's not healthy for this country—it's the biggest threat there is to our free-enterprise system.

SMALL BUSINESS AND FAMILY-SIZED FARMS

Because of these facts I must disagree with the premise of McGraw-Hill that socialism can be combatted by increasing the profits retained by big business. Let us do fight socialism by reinvigorating the forces of competition, by giving the small-business man an even break, and by making some of the excess profits of corporations available to other groups, such as the farmer. For instance, our Government could well use some of those excess profits to increase the amount of money available through the Farmer's Home Administration for farmers to buy their own homes. Let us restore a balance to our economy now by assisting the small business and the family-size farm. Yes, McGraw-Hill; let us do fight socialism in Washington, by protecting the small business from manipulated prices and unfair competition, by making credit opportunities available to small business and the family-size farm, by assisting in the improvement of health, housing, and education for the average consumer in both urban and rural areas.

COSTLESS CAPITAL

Another article by the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co. recently made astounding disclosures. Those disclosures were that the larger concerns of our country expected in the next 5 years by expending $55,000,000,000 to expand their plant capacity. The alarming and disturbing thing about that is that they were going to get three-fourths of that money not in the market place, not by issuing stocks, not by selling bonds, the traditional free-enterprise method of raising capital, but were going to raise money by increasing prices and make the consumers pay. Three-fourths of that $55,000,000,000 was going to be so raised.

CAPITAL MARKET DRYING UP

In the last few years, that is what has been going on. That is the reason capital markets have dried up. That is another reason why stocks are not selling any better than they are. Since the basing point has been outlawed, there is no reason why we should not have cement plants, for instance, scattered all over the country wherever we have enormous deposits of limestone that can be used for that purpose, and there are many such places. But they have slowed down. There is no available capital. The capital markets have dried up. That is an alarming situation.

HUGE EARNINGS IN 1948

Last year in 1948 the private corporations of our country earned and set aside as profits, after paying all taxes, local, State, and Federal, including income taxes, $21,700,000,000. That is four times as much as they normally earned, or what they earned on an average prior to 1939.

Before 1939 and before World War II it was customary that two-thirds or more of the earnings would be distributed to the stockholders. From 65 percent to 70 percent of all the earnings of a corporation were distributed to their stockholders. Since the war it has changed. They only distribute one-third to their stockholders. They retain two-thirds in the company. To be exact, in figures, it is $21,700,000,000 which these corporations earned last year after the payment of all taxes and they normally would have distributed $14,000,000,000 of that to their stockholders. But they did not do that. They distributed only $7,000,000,000 and retained approximately $14,000,000,000 for themselves. That is under the jurisdiction and authority of the officers and directors of these concerns to use as they want to use that money. That is a serious proposition. That is one reason we do not have capital markets today, because the money is not being paid out. If that extra $7,000,000,000 had been paid out to the stockholders as was done under normal conditions preceding World War II, the stockholders would have had that extra $7,000,000,000 to deposit in their own small businesses, or to buy stocks in large concerns, or to use in whatever way they chose.

A WAY OF TAX AVOIDANCE

There is a reason why these larger concerns did not pay out more now. Many of their stockholders are in the high-income brackets. I suspect that they are the ones who have a great deal to do with the control and manipulation of these concerns. When they received this $21,700,000,000 in earnings, if they paid it out to their stockholders, the stockholders would have to pay income taxes on it, too, which they should under the law and as it has always been, and which is just and proper. But if they can induce the corporation to retain as much as possible of their earnings, and then invest it in plant capacity, or to buy up their competitors, or to invest in new businesses or new concerns, then when they finally get the benefit of it, they do not have to pay in the high-income brackets, 65 percent or 70 percent or 85 percent or 90 percent, and they only would have to pay the limit of 25 percent as a capital gain. So taxwise it helps them, but it is ruinous to the country. It is ruinous to small business. What chance has a small businessman of going in business when he has to borrow money from his friends or relatives or from a bank and pay interest on it in competition with a concern just across the street that is using capital which did not cost it 1 penny? It obtained its capital free from the consumers of America. That is the trend that is so alarming and disturbing to me. If that trend continues and they keep on retaining these earnings and buying up their competitors, they not only keep other people out of business, but they will destroy many of the units of businesses that are now in existence, and eventually they will own and control this country so far as the production and distribution facilities of the country are concerned. It is a dangerous trend, and that is what has caused the capital markets of this country to dry up.

BIG ADS NEVER MENTION DANGERS OF MONOPOLY

When you see these big ads of McGraw-Hill, when you see these big ads of the National Association of Manufacturers, and by the Committee on Constitutional Government, Inc., and by the United States Chamber of Commerce—you see them all the time, there is not one of the last three organizations I have mentioned that does not spend more money every year than the Democratic Party or the Republican Party—they never mention the evils of monopoly; you never hear them say anything about, or you never read anything in their advertisements that we should pay off the national debt; you never read anything about the dangers of monopoly in their statements; they do not mention that at all. They are working along the lines of concentration and more concentration and more economic power.

PLATFORM PROMISES ON MONOPOLIES AND TRUSTS

I have gone back and read the platforms of the different political parties on monopolies and trusts. I asked the Library of Congress to prepare for me a statement of excerpts from the different national political parties' platforms throughout the last 70 years. I just wanted to see what the political parties had said about it. Every political platform has contained something during the past 70 years expressing fear of concentration of economic power, and some very strong provisions against monopolies and trusts. I am going to insert this in the RECORD.

One of the best statements I think was in the Democratic platform of 1888, and the Republican platform of that year contained an equally interesting and constructive party plank on monopoly. The Democratic platform read:

> Judged by Democratic principles the interests of the people are betrayed when by unnecessary taxation, trusts and combinations are permitted to exist which while unduly enriching the few rob the body of our citizens by depriving them of the benefits of natural competition.

The Republican platform of that year stated:

> We declare our opposition to all combinations of capital organized in trust or otherwise to control arbitrarily the condition of trade among our citizens.

That was 61 years ago, and almost every Presidential year since then the platforms of these two major parties have contained a strong declaration. I know one time the National Party platform—that is the name of the party—accused the Democrats and Republicans of carrying on a sham battle, and stated

that they were not really trying to prevent monopolies and trusts. If those splinter parties were in existence today I suspect that their leaders would be able to say "I told you so" by pointing to present conditions.

The party platform contained this declaration—most of them did:

A private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable.

That is contained in many of the party platforms; and one party platform, the Democratic, in 1904, had this declaration which I think is interesting:

Any trust or unlawful combination engaged in interstate commerce which is monopolizing any branch of business or production should not be permitted to transact business outside of the State of its origin.

NATIONAL CHAIN STORES

That is a good declaration. I would love to see the time come when these national corporate chains could not go beyond their State boundaries. Why should one concern in New York own a local retail business in California, Texas, or Washington State? There are enough people in every local community to carry on and conduct the retail business in that locality and it should not be conducted by outside interests.

In 1904 the Democratic platform had something very interesting along that line. Another one in 1908. The Democratic platform suggested that we should have a law compelling such licensed corporations to sell to all consumers in all parts of the country on the same terms after making allowance for the cost of transportation.

That is practically the Robinson-Patman law, almost exactly, excepting the difference in the cost of manufacture, sale, and transportation. They just add "transportation" in here; but many years later a law carrying out that provision was enacted.

REPUBLICAN PLATFORM OF 1936 LIKE DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM OF 1912

In 1912 the Democratic Party platform starting out with "private monopolies are indefensible," stated further:

We, therefore, favor the vigorous enforcement of the criminal as well as the civil law against trusts and monopolies.

In 1936 the Republican platform contained that declaration with two or three phrases changed but not sufficient to alter its meaning—24 years later, and I think the Republican platform was a good platform that year because they copied what the Democrats had to say 24 years before. I invite your attention to this platform, to these different excerpts from platforms, and I especially invite your attention to the 1940 Democratic platform and particularly to the 1948 Democratic platform about what we should do about monopoly and concentration of wealth.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN NEEDS SUPPORT

In view of that platform and in view of the fact that we have a President who believes as we do in favor of independent business as against monopolies, now is the time for Congress to act and actually get something done to stop this dangerous and devastating trend toward complete monopoly.

MONOPOLIES AND TRUSTS

SELECTED STATEMENTS FROM PARTY PLATFORMS 1860–1948

1860 Democratic platform: "No discrimination in favor of transportation lines, corporations, or monopolies." (McKee, p. 184.)

1860 Republican platform: "That no further grants of the public domain should be made to any railway or other corporation; * * * that we deem it the duty of Congress to develop and improve our seacoast and harbors, but insist that further subsidies to private persons or corporations must cease." (McKee, p. 188.)

1880 Greenback platform: "We denounce as destructive to property and dangerous to liberty, the action of the old parties in fostering and sustaining gigantic land, railroad, and money corporations, and monopolies invested with and exercising powers belonging to the Government, and yet not responsible to it for the manner of their exercise." (McKee, p. 192.)

1884 Democratic platform: "While we favor all legislation which will tend to the equitable distribution of property, to the prevention of monopoly, and to the strict enforcement of individual rights against corporate abuses, we hold that the welfare of society depends upon a scrupulous regard for the right of property as defined by law." (McKee, p. 206.)

1884 Greenback platform: "We denounce as dangerous to our republican institutions, those methods and policies of the Democratic and Republican Parties which have sanctioned or permitted the establishment of land, railroad, money, and other gigantic monopolies; and we demand such governmental action as may be necessary to take from such monopolies the power they have so corruptly and unjustly usurped, and restore them to the people, to whom they belong." (McKee, p. 215.)

1884 American Prohibition national platform: "That land and other monopolies should be discouraged." (McKee, p. 218.)

1884 antimonopoly platform: "That it is the duty of the Government to immediately exercise its constitutional prerogative to regulate commerce among the States. The great instruments by which this commerce is carried on are transportation, money, and the transmission of intelligence. They are now mercilessly controlled by giant monopolies, to the impoverishment of labor, the crushing out of healthful competition, and the destruction of business security. We hold it, therefore, to be the imperative and immediate duty of Congress to pass all needful laws for the control and regulation of those great agents of commerce, in accordance with the oft-repeated decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States.

"That no further grants of public lands shall be made to corporations. All enactments granting lands to corporations should be strictly construed; and all land grants should be forfeited where the terms upon which the grants were made have not been strictly complied with. The lands must be held for homes for actual settlers, and must not be subject to purchase or control by nonresident foreigners or other speculators." (McKee, pp. 224, 225.)

1884 Equal (or Woman's) Rights platform: "We oppose monopoly, the tendency of which is to make the rich richer and the poor poorer, as opposed to the genius and welfare of republican institutions." (McKee, p. 227.)

1888 Democratic platform: "Judged by Democratic principles, the interests of the people are betrayed when, by unnecessary taxation, trusts and combinations are permitted to exist, which, while unduly enriching the few that combine, rob the body of our citizens by depriving them of the benefits of natural competition." (McKee, p. 235.)

1888 Republican platform: "We declare our opposition to all combinations of capital, organized in trusts or otherwise, to control arbitrarily the condition of trade among our citizens." (McKee, p. 241.)

1888 Prohibition platform: "For prohibiting all combinations of capital to control and to increase the cost of products for popular consumption." (McKee, p. 247.)

1888 Union Labor platform: "The paramount issues to be solved in the interests of humanity are the abolition of usury, monopoly, and trusts, and we denounce the Democratic and Republican Parties for creating and perpetuating these monstrous evils." (McKee, p. 251.)

1888 United Labor platform: "We aim at the abolition of the system which * * * permits monopolizers to deprive labor of natural opportunities for employment.

"We wish to abolish the present unjust and wasteful system of ownership of railroads and telegraphs by private corporations—a system which * * * builds up enormous fortunes and corrupting monopolies that are becoming more powerful than the Government itself. For this system we would substitute Government ownership and control for the benefit of the whole people instead of private profit." (McKee, pp. 252, 253.)

1892 Democratic platform: "We recognize in the trusts and combinations, which are designed to enable capital to secure more than its just share of the joint product of capital and labor, a natural consequence of the prohibitive taxes which prevent the free competition which is the life of honest trade; but we believe their worst evils can be abated by law, and we demand the rigid enforcement of the laws made to prevent and control them, together with such further legislation in restraint of their abuses as experience may show to be necessary." (McKee, p. 264.)

1892 Republican platform: "We reaffirm our opposition, declared in the Republican platform of 1888, to all combinations of capital, organized in trusts or otherwise, to control arbitrarily the condition of trade among our citizens. We heartily endorse the action already taken upon this subject, and ask for such further legislation as may be required to remedy any defects in existing laws and to render their enforcement more complete and effective." (McKee, p. 272.)

1892 Prohibition platform: "Speculation in margins, the cornering of grain, money, and products, and the formation of pools, trusts, and combinations for the arbitrary advancement of prices should be suppressed." (McKee, p. 276.)

1892 National People's platform: "Transportation being a means of exchange and a public necessity, the Government should own and operate the railroads in the interest of the people.

"The telegraph and telephone, like the post-office system, being a necessity for the transmission of news, should be owned and operated by the Government in the interest of the people.

"The land, including all the natural sources of wealth, is the heritage of the people, and should not be monopolized for speculative purposes. * * * All land now held by railroads and other corporations in excess of their actual needs * * * should be reclaimed by the Government and held for actual settlers only." (McKee, p. 284.)

1892 Socialist-Labor platform: "The United States shall obtain possession of the railroads, canals, telegraphs, telephones, and all other means of public transportation and communication." (McKee, p. 285.)

1896 Democratic platform: "We denounce as disturbing to business the Republican threat to restore the McKinley law which * * * proved a prolific breeder of trusts and monopolies, enriched the few at the expense of the many, restricted trade, and deprived the producers of the great American staples of access to their natural markets.

"The absorption of wealth by the few, the consolidation of our leading railroad systems, and the formation of trusts and pools require a stricter control by the Federal Government of those arteries of commerce. We demand the enlargement of the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and such restriction and guarantees in the control of railroads as will protect the people from robbery and oppression." (McKee, pp. 294, 295.)

1896 People's Party platform: (The planks quoted from the 1892 platform were repeated in 1896 with only minor additions or modifications.)

1896 National Party platform: "Land is the common heritage of the people and should be preserved from monopoly and speculation. All unearned grants of land subject to forfeiture should be reclaimed by the Government, and no portion of the public domain should hereafter be granted except to actual settlers, continuous use being essential to tenure.

"Railroads, telegraphs, and other natural monopolies should be owned and operated by the Government, giving to the people the benefit of service at actual cost." (McKee, p. 321.)

1896 Socialist-Labor platform: "The United States shall obtain possession of the railroads, canals, telegraphs, telephones, and all other means of public transportation and communication: The employees to operate the same cooperatively, under control of the Federal Government, and to elect their own superior officers, but no employee shall be discharged for political reasons.

"The municipalities shall obtain possession of the local railroads, ferries, waterworks, gasworks, electric plants, and all industries requiring municipal franchises; the employees to operate the same cooperatively, under control of the municipal administration, and to elect their own superior officers, but no employee shall be discharged for political reasons.

"The public lands to be declared inalienable. Revocation of all land-grants to corporations or individuals, the conditions of which have not been complied with." (McKee, p. 324.)

1900 Democratic platform: "Private monopolies are indefensible and intolerable. They destroy competition, control the price of all material and of the finished product, thus robbing both producer and consumer. They lessen the employment of labor and arbitrarily fix the terms and conditions thereof, and deprive individual energy and small capital of their opportunity for betterment. They are the most efficient means yet devised for appropriating the fruits of industry to the benefit of the few at the expense of the many, and unless their insatiate greed is checked all wealth will be aggregated in a few hands and the Republic destroyed.

"We pledge the Democratic Party to an unceasing warfare in Nation, State, and city against private monopoly in every form. Existing laws against trusts must be enforced and more stringent ones must be enacted, providing for publicity as to the affairs of corporations engaged in interstate commerce, requiring all corporations to show, before doing business outside the State of their origin, that they have no water in their stock and that they have not attempted, and are not attempting, to monopolize any branch of business or the production of any articles of merchandise; and the whole constitutional power of Congress over interstate commerce, the mails, and all modes of interstate communication shall be exercised by the enactment of comprehensive laws upon the subject of trusts.

"Tariff laws should be amended by putting the products of trusts upon the free list, to prevent monopoly under the plea of protection.

"Corporations should be protected in all their rights, and their legitimate interests should be respected, but any attempt by corporations to interfere with the public affairs of the people, or to control the sovereignty which creates them, should be forbidden under such penalties as will make such attempts impossible." (McKee, pp. 334–336.)

1900 Republican platform: "We recognize the necessity and propriety of the honest cooperation of capital to meet new business conditions, and especially to extend our rapidly increasing foreign trade; but we condemn all conspiracies and combinations intended to restrict business, to create monopolies, to limit production, or to control prices, and favor such legislation as will effectively restrain and prevent all such abuses, protect and promote competition, and secure the rights of producers, laborers, and all who are engaged in industry and commerce." (McKee, pp. 342–343.)

1900 People's Party platform: "Trusts, the overshadowing evil of the age, are the result and culmination of the private ownership and control of the three great instruments of commerce—money, transportation, and the means of transmission of information—which instruments of commerce are public functions and which our forefathers declared in the Constitution should be controlled by the people through their Congress for the public welfare. The one remedy for the trusts is that the ownership and control be assumed and exercised by the people. We further demand that all tariffs on goods controlled by a trust shall be abolished." (McKee, p. 350.)

1900 People's Party (middle-of-the-road) platform: "We are opposed to trusts and declare the contention between the old parties on the monopoly question is a sham battle and that no solution of this mighty problem is possible without the adoption of the principles of public ownership of public utilities." (McKee, p. 355.)

1900 Silver Republican platform: "Combinations, trusts, and monopolies contrived and arranged for the purpose of controlling the prices and quantity of articles supplied to the public are unjust, unlawful, and oppressive. Not only do these unlawful conspiracies fix the prices of commodities in many cases, but they invade every branch of the State and National Government with their polluting influence, and control the actions of their employees and dependents in private life, until their influence actually imperils society and the liberty of the citizen. We declare against them. We demand the most stringent laws for their destruction, the most severe punishment of their promoters and maintainers, and the energetic enforcement of such laws by the courts." (McKee, p. 359.)

1900 Prohibition platform: "We submit that the Democratic and Republican Parties are alike insincere in their assumed hostility to trusts and monopolies. They dare not and do not attack the most dangerous of them all, the liquor power. So long as the saloon debauches the citizen and breeds the purchasable voter, money will continue to buy its way to power. Break down this traffic, elevate manhood, and a sober citizen will find a way to control dangerous combinations of capital." (McKee, p. 364.)

1904 Democratic platform: "We recognize that the gigantic trusts and combinations designed to enable capital to secure more than its just share of the joint products of capital and labor, and which have been fostered and promoted under Republican rule, are a menace to beneficial competition and an obstacle to permanent business prosperity.

"A private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable.

"Individual equality of opportunity and free competition are essential to a healthy and permanent commercial prosperity, and any trust, combination, or monopoly tending to destroy these by controlling production, restricting competition, or fixing prices should be prohibited and punished by law. We especially denounce rebates and discrimination by transportation companies as the most potent agency in promoting and strengthening these unlawful conspiracies against trade.

"We demand an enlargement of the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission, to the end that the traveling public and shippers of this country may have prompt and adequate relief for the abuses to which they are subjected in the matter of transportation. We demand a strict enforcement of existing civil and criminal statutes against all such trusts, combinations, and monopolies, and we demand the enactment of such further legislation as may be necessary to effectually suppress them.

"Any trust or unlawful combination engaged in interstate commerce which is monopolizing any branch of business or production should not be permitted to transact business outside of the State of its origin. Whenever it shall be established in any court of competent jurisdiction that such monopolization exists, such prohibition should be enforced through comprehensive laws to be enacted on the subject." (McKee, pp. 388–389.)

1904 Republican platform: "Combinations of capital and of labor are the results of the economic movement of the age, but neither must be permitted to infringe upon the rights and interests of the people. Such combinations when lawfully formed for lawful purposes are alike entitled to the protection of the laws, but both are subject to the laws, and neither can be permitted to break them." (McKee, p. 399.)

1904 People's Party platform: "We again sound the keynote of the Declaration of Independence that all men are created equal in a political sense, which was the sense in which that instrument, being a political document, intended that the utterance should be understood. We assert that the departure from this fundamental truth is responsible for the ills from which we suffer as a nation, that the giving of special privileges to the few has enabled them to dominate the many, thereby tending to destroy the political equality which is the cornerstone of democratic government."

"A political democracy and an industrial despotism cannot exist side by side; and nowhere is this truth more plainly shown than in the gigantic transportation monopolies which have bred all sorts of kindred trusts, subverted the governments of many of the States, established their official agents in the National Government. We submit that it is better for the Government to own the railroads than for the railroads to own the Government, and that one or the other alternative seems inevitable.

"We call the attention of our fellow citizens to the fact that the surrender of both of the old parties to corporative influences leaves the People's Party the only party of reform in the Nation." (McKee, p. 402.)

1908 Democratic platform: "A private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable. We therefore favor the vigorous enforcement of the criminal law against guilty trust magnates and officials, and demand the enactment of such additional legislation as may

be necessary to make it impossible for a private monopoly to exist in the United States. Among the additional remedies we specify three: First, a law preventing a duplication of directors among competing corporations; second, a license system which will, without abridging the right of each State to create corporations, or its right to regulate as it will foreign corporations doing business within its limits, make it necessary for a manufacturer or trading corporation engaged in interstate commerce to take out a Federal license before it shall be permitted to control as much as 25 percent of the products in which it deals, the license to protect the public from watered stock and to prohibit the control by such corporation of more than 50 percent of the total amount of any product consumed in the United States; and third, a law compelling such licensed corporations to sell to all consumers in all parts of the country on the same terms, after making the allowance for the cost of transportation." (Ellis and Trimble, p. 145.)

1908 Republican platform: "The Republican Party passed the Sherman antitrust law over Democratic opposition, and enforced it after Democratic dereliction. It has been a wholesome instrument for good in the hands of a wise and fearless administration; but experience has shown that its effectiveness can be strengthened and its real objects better obtained by such amendment as will give the Federal Government greater supervision and control over and greater publicity in the management of that class of corporations engaged in interstate commerce having power and opportunity to effect monopolies." (Ellis and Trimble, p. 158.)

1912 Democratic platform: "A private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable. We therefore favor the vigorous enforcement of the criminal as well as the civil law against trusts and trust officials, and demand the enactment of such additional legislation as may be necessary to make it impossible for a private monopoly to exist in the United States.

"We favor the declaration by law of the conditions upon which corporations shall be permitted to engage in interstate trade, including, among others, the prevention of holding companies, of interlocking directors, of stock watering, of discrimination in price, and the control by any one corporation of so large a proportion of any industry as to make it a menace to competitive conditions.

"We condemn the action of the Republican administration in compromising with the Standard Oil Co. and the Tobacco Trust, and its failure to invoke the criminal provisions of the antitrust law against the officers of these corporations after the court had declared that from the undisputed facts in the record they had violated the criminal provisions of the law.

"We regret that the Sherman antitrust law has received a judicial construction depriving it of much of its efficacy, and we favor the enactment of legislation which will restore to the statute the strength of which it has been deprived by such interpretation." (Ellis and Trimble, p. 168.)

1912 Republican platform: "The Republican Party is opposed to special privilege and to monopoly. It placed upon the statute book the Interstate Commerce Act of 1887 and the important amendments thereto and the Antitrust Act of 1890, and it has consistently and successfully enforced the provisions of these laws. It will take no backward step to permit the reestablishment in any degree of conditions which were intolerable.

"Experience makes it plain that the business of the country can be carried on without fear and without disturbance and, at the same time, without resort to practices which are abhorrent to the common sense of justice. The Republican Party favors the enactment of legislation supplementary to the existing Antitrust Act which will define as criminal offenses those specific acts that uniformly mark attempts to restrain and to monopolize trade, to the end that those who honestly intend to obey the law may have a guide for their action and that those who aim to violate the law may the more surely be punished. The same certainty should be given to the law prohibiting combinations and monopolies that characterizes other provisions of commercial law, in order that no part of the field of business opportunity may be restricted by monopoly or combination, that business success honorably achieved may not be converted into crime, and that the right of every man to acquire commodities, and particularly the necessaries of life, in an open market, uninfluenced by the manipulation of trust or combination, may be preserved." (Ellis and Trimble, pp. 183–184.)

1916 Democratic platform: "We have created a Federal Trade Commission to accommodate the perplexing questions arising under the antitrust laws so that monopoly may be strangled at its birth and legitimate industry encouraged. Fair competition in business is now assured." (Ellis and Trimble, p. 192.)

1916 Republican platform: "The Republican Party has long believed in the rigid supervision and strict regulation of the transportation and great corporations of the country. It has put its creed into its deeds, and all really effective laws regulating the railroads and the great industrial corporations are the work of Republican Congresses and Presidents. For this policy of regulation and supervision, the Democrats, in a stumbling and piecemeal way, are undertaking to involve the Government in business which should be left within the sphere of private enterprise and in direct competition with its own citizens, a policy which is sure to result in waste, great expense to the taxpayer, and in an inferior product." (Ellis and Trimble, p. 209.)

1920 Democratic platform: "The Democratic Party heartily endorses the creation and work of the Federal Trade Commission in establishing a fair field for competitive business, free from restraints of trade and monopoly, and recommends amplification of the statutes governing its activities, so as to grant it authority to prevent the unfair use of patents in restraint of trade." (Ellis and Trimble, p. 230.)

1920 Republican platform: "We approve in general the existing Federal legislation against monopoly and combinations in restraint of trade, but since the known certainty of a law is the safety of all, we advocate such amendment as will provide American businessmen with better means of determining in advance whether a proposed combination is or is not unlawful. The Federal Trade Commission, under a Democratic administration, has not accomplished the purpose for which it was created. This Commission, properly organized and its duties efficiently administered, should afford protection to the public and legitimate business interests. There should be no persecution of honest business, but to the extent that circumstances warrant we pledge ourselves to strengthen the law against unfair practices." (Ellis and Trimble, p. 248.)

1924 Democratic platform: "We declare that a private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable, and pledge the Democratic Party to a vigorous enforcement of existing laws against monopoly and illegal combinations, and to the enactment of such further measures as may be necessary." (Ellis and Trimble, p. 267.)

1928 Democratic platform: "Competition is one of the most sacred, cherished, and economic rights of the American people. We demand the strict enforcement of the antitrust laws and the enactment of other laws, if necessary, to control this great menace to trade and commerce, and thus to preserve the right of the small merchant and manufacturer to earn a legitimate profit from his business.

"Dishonest business should be treated without influence at the National Capitol. Honest business, no matter its size, need have no fears of a Democratic administration. The Democratic Party will ever oppose illegitimate and dishonest business. It will foster, promote, and encourage all legitimate business enterprises." (Ellis and Trimble, pp. 310–311.)

1928 Republican platform: "Republican Congresses and Administrations have steadily strengthened the Interstate Commerce Commission. The protection of the public from exactions or burdens in rates for service by reason of monopoly control, and the protection of the smaller organizations from suppression in their own field, has been a fundamental idea in all regulatory enactments. While recognizing that at times Federal regulations might be more effective than State regulations in controlling intrastate utilities, the party favors and has sustained State regulations, believing that such responsibility in the end will create a force of State public opinion which will be more effective in preventing discriminations and injustices." (Ellis and Trimble, p. 328.)

1932 Democratic platform: "We advocate strengthening and impartial enforcement of the antitrust laws, to prevent monopoly and unfair trade practices, and revision thereof for the better protection of labor and the small producer and distributor." (Ellis and Trimble, p. 337.)

1932 Republican platform: "Supervision, regulation, and control of interstate public utilities in the interest of the public is an established policy of the Republican Party." (Ellis and Trimble, p. 355.)

1936 Democratic platform: "Monopolies and the concentration of economic power, the creation of Republican rule and privilege, continue to be the master of the producer, the exploiter of the consumer, and the enemy of the independent operator. This is a problem challenging the unceasing effort of untrammeled public officials in every branch of the Government. We pledge vigorously and fearlessly to enforce the criminal and civil provisions of the existing antitrust laws, and to the extent that their effectiveness has been weakened by new corporate devices or judicial construction, we propose by law to restore their efficacy in stamping out monopolistic practices and the concentration of economic power." (Brandon and Trimble, pp. 368–369.)

1936 Republican platform: "A private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable. It menaces and, if continued, will utterly destroy constitutional government and the liberty of the citizen.

"We favor the vigorous enforcement of the criminal laws, as well as the civil laws, against monopolies and trusts and their officials, and we demand the enactment of such additional legislation as is necessary to make it impossible for private monopoly to exist in the United States.

"We will employ the full powers of the Government to the end that monopoly shall be eliminated and that free enterprise shall be fully restored and maintained." (Brandon and Trimble, p. 379.)

1940 Democratic platform: "We have defended and will continue to defend all legitimate business.

"We have attacked and will continue to attack unbridled concentration of economic power and the exploitation of the consumer and the investor.

"We have attacked the kind of business which levied tribute on all the rest of American business by the extortionate methods of monopoly.

"We have enforced the antitrust laws more vigorously than at any time in our history, thus affording the maximum protection to the competitive system.

"During the past 7 years the Democratic Party has won the first major victories for the people of the Nation in their generation—old contest with the power monopoly." (The TVA is then discussed.) (Brandon and Trimble, pp. 389, 390–391.)

1940 Republican platform: "Since the passage of the Sherman Antitrust Act by the Republican Party, we have consistently fought to preserve free competition with regulation to prevent abuse. New Deal policy fosters Government monopoly, restricts production, and fixes prices. We shall enforce antitrust legislation without prejudice or discrimination. We condemn the use or threatened use of criminal indictments to obtain through consent decrees objectives not contemplated by law." (Brandon and Trimble, p. 406.)

1944 Democratic platform: "We reassert our faith in competitive private enterprise free from control by monopolies, cartels, or any arbitrary private or public authority." (Graf and Trimble, p. 411.)

"We believe in the world right of all men to write, send, and publish news at uniform communication rates and without interference by governmental or private monopoly and that right should be protected by treaty." (Graf and Trimble, p. 412.)

1944 Republican platform: "We give assurance now to restore peacetime industry at the earliest possible time * * * with care to prevent monopoly and injury to existing agriculture and industry.

"Small business * * must be aided * * * by the enforcement of laws against monopoly and unfair competition." (Graf and Trimble, p. 419.)

1948 Democratic platform: "We recognize the importance of small business in a sound American economy. It must be protected against unfair discrimination and monopoly, and be given equal opportunities with competing enterprises to expand its capital structure.

"Our natural resources are the heritage of all our people and must not be permitted to become the private preserves of monopoly.

"We pledge an intensive enforcement of the antitrust laws, with adequate appropriations.

"We advocate the strengthening of existing antitrust laws by closing the gaps which experience has shown have been used to promote the concentration of economic power.

"We pledge a positive program to promote competitive business and to foster the development of independent trade and commerce." (Graf and Trimble, Supplement, pp. 9, 10.)

1948 Republican platform: "Small business, the bulwark of American enterprise, must be encouraged through aggressive antimonopoly action." (Graf and Trimble, Supplement, p. 17.)

Sources: Brandon, Leroy D., and Trimble, South (compilers), Platforms of the Two Great Political Parties, 1932–40. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1940.

Ellis, George D., and Trimble, South (compilers), Platforms of the Two Great Political Parties, 1856–1932, inclusive. Washington: 1932.

Graf, William, and Trimble, South (compilers), Platforms of the Two Great Political Parties, 1932–44. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1944.

Graf, William, and Trimble, South (compilers), Supplement to Platforms of the Two Great Political Parties, 1948. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1948.

McKee, Thomas Hudson, The National Conventions and Platforms of All Political Parties, 1789–1905. Baltimore: The Friedenwald Co., 1906.

STOP SOCIALISM

What are the real dangers in this country? I notice McGraw-Hill advocates the stopping of socialism. They say that, "Now is the time to fight socialism in Washington."

Last year the Committee on Small Business had an investigation and one of the witnesses, a prominent university professor, said one of the greatest scientists in this country worked for the General Electric Co. He was their greatest engineer. One time he was asked, "Doctor, you are a Socialist. You are making speeches for socialism all the time. You are writing articles on socialism. You attend Socialist meetings and gatherings and help write the Socialist platform. How do you reconcile your advocacy of socialism with working here in the biggest monopolistic plant in the United States, the General Electric Co.?"

His reply, substantially, was that the best way to attain socialism is to have the units of industry in one package, then it is easy for the Government to take it over. After they get a few of the different industries, each one in a single package, the phrase "private monopoly" is indefensible and intolerable, is irresistible. So the Socialists say, "Let the Government own the trusts" and there will be but a very short step from monopoly to socialism. That is the best way, it is claimed, to attain socialism in the United States.

He was in favor of monopoly because he was a Socialist and he knew that was the quickest and the shortest step. Who are the big Socialists in this country today? They are not the little loud-mouthed Socialists on the street corner on top of a soap box talking about socialism. They are not so very dangerous. It is the big people who are putting these units of industry together by mergers, consolidations, purchase, and otherwise until they have all the steel companies, for instance, under the ownership practically of one, two, or three; then it is a quick step over to Government ownership like in Great Britain, where six companies controlled the production and owned the production of all the steel in Great Britain. That is the quickest way to socialism.

So, if we believe in our private-enterprise system, and we do believe in it, we should work against these monopolies and trusts which make it so easy to attain socialism.

SOCIALISM, COMMUNISM, OR FASCISM

If we permit this trend to go on, we will have a totalitarian state in one form or another. It will be irresistible. It will either be communism, socialism, or fascism. First, it will probably be socialism. That is what we will come to first. Then there will be a knock-down-drag-out fight between the Communists and Fascists to determine which shall control in this country—the Communists or Fascists. So I maintain monopoly is in the direction of a totalitarian state.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Does the gentleman know that the price of common barbed wire that we used to buy for $1.40 a roll of good galvanized No. 40 wire is now selling for $11.50 a roll?

Mr. PATMAN. I am not surprised at that.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Everything that the farmers use in the way of binders, planters, hay machinery, and other things is three times as high as it used to be.

Mr. PATMAN. It is very high.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. If we do not maintain some kind of a support price and keep up the purchase price for the farmer, we will go into the same tailspin we went into back in 1929 and 1930.

Mr. PATMAN. I agree with the gentleman 100 percent. In 1920 this country went into a tailspin because of a restriction of credit. That caused it at that time. In 1929, 1930, 1931, and 1932 we had hard times again, as many of us remember. In 1937 there was another depression—all man-made.

There is no reason why we should have these depressions, and if we go ahead and let a few people get control of the country and own the production and distribution in it, we are going to have a totalitarian state. I insist that it will be one or the other—communism or fascism.

WATCH FASCISM AS WELL AS COMMUNISM

In Italy and in Germany the people were taught to hate communism to the extent that they gladly embraced fascism. They were glad to take any other form of government except communism and socialism. Let us not make that same mistake here. Let us be on our guard, let us be on the alert against any socialistic or communistic trend. Let us fight with all of our power and might, but let us not overlook an equally devastating enemy that overran those great countries of Europe—fascism. Let us watch both sides and let us prevent this trend which is in the direction of monopoly and a totalitarian state.

MERGERS

I have before me a report of the Federal Trade Commission on the merger movement. I call your attention to this report which was gotten out in July 1948, and I suggest you get one from the Federal Trade Commission. It gives you all the information about mergers involving steel, cement, and many other different kinds of production, including horizontal acquisitions and vertical acquisitions and all other types. It gives a wonderful argument in favor of legislation that will prevent the mergers that are going on and those in contemplation in this country today which if not prevented will result in the little man not having a chance in the world. A few people will own and control the business of the entire country. I therefore invite your attention to that little book and ask you to read it carefully, look at the charts, the maps, and the diagrams. I believe you will find it to be very revealing.

Let us take cement, for instance, that caused this book to be gotten up. The basing system—that is, where you pay freight from 300 miles away, although you are getting the cement produced right there in your home town—over a period of almost 25 years permitted the different cement companies to bid identically the same on the furnishing of

cement to the Government, involving millions of dollars, and to the States or to the cities. They have been submitting for almost 25 years exactly the same bids on every contract, with no competition. They were permitted to make those identical bids by using the basing point as a vehicle.

The Federal Trade Commission outlawed the basing point in the cement industry and other industries, and the cases went to the Supreme Court of the United States. The Supreme Court affirmed the decision of the lower court, which of course affirmed the Federal Trade Commission. Efforts are being made to change that decision to permit them to go ahead as they were.

Think of all the false information that is put out. I have never seen as much false information as is put out daily about that decision. The truth is that the Supreme Court decision does not outlaw the basing point unless it is used for the purpose of fixing prices as I have described to you—the cement industry fixed identical prices down to the fifth decimal point everywhere in the United States—or unless it is used to create a monopoly. Who would oppose a decision like that? Yet an effort is being made to write into the law some more weasel words and phrases so they can go to the Court again for another 25 years to finally get another decision favorable to the people.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I know the gentleman has heard something about the request for a moratorium in regard to the effective date of the decision. Would the gentleman care to comment on what effect that might have?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not believe a moratorium should be granted. I know people who are urging the passage of that bill are very sincere. They believe they are working in the public interest. However, I do not believe it will be insisted on until the steel conduit case is decided in the Supreme Court, which is expected pretty soon. When it is, I think the law will be so plain that this moratorium will not be necessary. I do not see any reason why people should be given a moratorium who are conspiring against the public interest. Why should we be tolerant and patient with them at all? If they are not conspiring against the public interest and they are not trying to create monopoly, the decision does not touch them in any way, shape, form, or fashion. So let us be on the alert against these monopolistic mergers and threats.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Let me give an instance of the operation of a basing point. In the great State of Montana the people were fortunate enough to be refining petroleum and gasoline, but they got some kind of a law through the State so that you could pay the same price as in Oklahoma. The basing point is Oklahoma. We in Montana have to pay the same price at the refinery that you would have to pay in Oklahoma. If you will go into the State of Nebraska, you can buy gasoline refined in Montana 2 cents cheaper than you can right where you refine it in Montana. That is the way it is working out in Montana. We are based on Oklahoma and have to stand the freight charges for gasoline that is produced right there in the State of Montana.

Mr. PATMAN. You are paying phantom freight.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Phantom freight is what we are paying.

LET US SAVE THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning's Washington Post quoted President Harry S. Truman, commenting upon certain radio broadcasts of Drew Pearson, and referring to Pearson, as saying:

> If any S. O. B. thinks he can get me to discharge any of my staff or Cabinet by some smart-aleck statement over the air, he has got another think coming.

People who are familiar with Drew Pearson's methods and utterances, with his meanness and his lack of decency, with his pursuit of the dollar and sensationalism, which cause him to ignore all the admirable attributes possessed in some degree at least by humans and animals, can understand the President's feelings and sympathize with his desire to let the people know Pearson's true nature.

It is regrettable that the President felt compelled to use the words attributed to him, rather than to, in some effective way, silence this detractor who, for reward, so often falsely accuses public officials and individuals of prominence of disreputable conduct.

Perhaps the President felt that no terms other than those he used to describe Pearson could convey to the public anything new.

We recall that President Roosevelt described Pearson as a "chronic liar."

Cordell Hull, then Secretary of State, once charged that Mr. Pearson was a teller of "monstrous and diabolical falsehoods."

Senator TYDINGS once said of Mr. Pearson, "In the last war the only powder this scoundrel ever smelled was the presence of ladies who might have adorned the windward side of the parade ground; a perpetual, chronic revolving liar."

On another occasion President Truman, speaking of Mr. Pearson, said, "I had thought I wouldn't have to add another liar's star to that fellow's crown, but I will have to do it."

Then on another occasion Senator MCKELLAR spent a good part of 30 minutes pillorying Mr. Pearson, among other things describing him as, "An ignorant liar, a pusillanimous liar, a pewee liar, a paid liar, a natural-born liar, a liar by profession, a liar for a living, a liar in the daytime, and a liar in the nighttime, a 'revolving,' constitutional, unmitigated, infamous liar, a scoundrel."

In today's Washington Daily News columnist Tully reports that during the campaign in California, the President, speaking of a Member of Congress who was a Republican candidate for reelection, after publicly calling for his defeat muttered, "I wish I hadn't said that, I probably reelected the S. O. B."

But the President's difficulty in finding new language to adequately describe Drew Pearson and his activities is no reason why he should popularize the words he used.

The most casual examination of recent books will show that there is a tendency to an ever-increasing use of profane and obscene language and expressions. Undue emphasis is time and again placed upon ordinary, unimportant, uninteresting happenings, apparently in an effort to gain attention or perhaps to cover up the author's lack of interesting information.

A recent example will be found in the book Eisenhower Was My Boss. Opening the book at random, it appeared from the few pages I examined that the personal habits of the Scottie dog, Telek, were of equal if not of more importance than what Eisenhower said or did.

Words, no matter how true, no matter by whom used, nor how accurately descriptive of Pearson, will never make him human or charitable. He will probably continue, in pursuit of the dollar, to use his venomous tongue and pen to gain public attention.

The President of the United States is the most powerful individual in the world, his office the most exalted office within the reach of a human being. The President should set an example, both by his conduct and his language. Any little boy repeating language heard in some low dive and similar to that used by the President on this occasion would promptly get a spanking from his mother and perhaps have his mouth washed out with soap.

When the President of the United States, in public and before a mixed audience, adopts a technique of the rowdy, the tough, and the gangster, there is an indication that he is not fit for the high office which he holds. A man who cannot control his temper or who, in public, before women, makes use of the language the President used, lacks something which every public official should have—a sense of common decency, a sense of fitness and propriety.

Yes, it goes deeper than that—a man who feels compelled to resort to such language as that used by President Truman is not the kind of a man who should hold the office honored by Washington and Lincoln.

It is discouraging, it is disheartening, to know that an occupant of the White House will set so bad an example—not only for the youth of the land, but for some of us older folk.

Mr. Truman seems quite provoked because Mr. Pearson criticized one of Mr. Truman's appointees, but Mr. Truman should remember that he pulled no punches, minced no words, in his references to the Eightieth Congress when he was campaigning for the Presidency.

Perhaps Mr. Pearson felt that he, too, had the privilege of exercising his right to free speech, and perhaps Mr. Pearson did not realize that Mr. Truman had the more comprehensive vocabulary.

Perhaps the President's description of Pearson may even induce the company which manufactures the Lee hat to increase his compensation. He will probably continue to announce over the radio each Sunday night, "Don't take less than the best; don't take less than a Lee," even though the manufacturer of the Lee hat is undoubtedly aware that President Roosevelt described Pearson as a "chronic liar."

People, knowing that Pearson is so often in error, may in ever-increasing numbers begin to speculate as to whether it is worth while to purchase a Lee hat. Perhaps folks may begin to believe that the Lee hat, whatever its quality, is as big a fraud as are some of Pearson's statements, because they know he is unreliable.

Pearson takes a lot of credit to himself for rehashing and claiming as his own news gathered by the Associated Press, the United Press, International News Service, and other collectors and disseminators of news. He, like some other radio commentators and columnists, claims to be the first to have discovered news which has previously appeared in the daily papers or been carried over news wires.

Pearson should not be permitted to follow his avocation of vilifying individuals and public officials. He speaks over the air. He has no exclusive right to use the air. The Congress has given the Federal Communications Commission authority to regulate the use of radio. Without a license issued by FCC, no radio station can operate. The station over which Pearson operates is a licensee of a Federal agency.

Section 303 of title 47 of the United States Code empowers and authorizes the Federal Communications Commission to promulgate and enforce such rules as the public convenience, interest, or necessity requires.

Can it for one moment be contended that Pearson or the licensee over whose system he operates, the American Broadcasting Co., should be permitted by false statements to follow the practice of challenging the integrity of public officials?

The President, in addition to describing Pearson and his broadcasting activities in more accurate and acceptable language, should call upon the Federal Communications Commission to revoke the license of the American Broadcasting Co.

The Court has held that—*Trinity Methodist Church, South* v. *Federal Radio Commission* (62 Fed. Rept. (2d) 850), and I quote:

> If it be considered that one in possession of a permit to broadcast in interstate commerce may, without let or hindrance from any source, use these facilities, reaching out, as they do, from one corner of the country to the other, to * * * inspire political distrust and civil discord * * * then this great science, instead of a boon, will become a scourge, and the Nation a theater for the display of individual passions and the collision of personal interest * * * appellant * * * may not, as we think, demand, of right, the continued use of an instrumentality of commerce for such purposes.

If it be said that a cancellation of the license of the company which permits Pearson to broadcast is a denial of the right of free speech, let me answer in the words of the United States Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, spoken in the case just cited. In that case, the court, referring to the refusal to renew a radio license, said:

> This is neither censorship nor previous restraint, nor is it a whittling away of the rights guranteed by the first amendment, or an impairment of their free exercise. Appellant may continue to indulge his strictures upon the characters of men in public office. He may just as freely as ever criticize religious practices of which he does not approve. He may even indulge private malice or personal slander—subject, of course, to be required to answer for the abuse thereof—but he may not, as we think, demand, of right, the continued use of an instrumentality of commerce for such purposes, or any other, except in subordination to all reasonable rules and regulations Congress, acting through the Commission, may prescribe.

That decision the United States Supreme Court refused to review, and it is today the law of the land.

The American Broadcasting Co. is not a new offender. Over its system, Walter Winchell for years, for hire, used his talents for mean and sordid purposes.

It might be well for Pearson's sponsors to take a look at the law governing broadcasting, at some of the court decisions.

Let the sponsors and the attorneys of the licensee, under which he broadcasts, read the cases of *Sorenson* v. *Wood* (123 Nebr. 348); *Miles* v. *Louis Wasmer, Inc.* (172 Wash. 466).

In the first case, the Court held that—

> The Federal Radio Act confers no privilege to broadcasting stations to publish defamatory utterances.

The United States Supreme Court refused to review the decision.

In the second case the Court held that privilege ends where falsity begins and held that the station licensee along with the other defendants was absolutely liable under the doctrine of defamation.

There is another effective remedy which the Congress might well give to one who is attacked over the radio by a conscienceless commentator. Some years ago a bill was introduced by me giving a person who was slandered or libeled over the radio the right to sue his detractor in the Federal judicial district where the person assailed lived and where the broadcast was heard.

There would seem to be nothing wrong with the proposition that if a radio commentator is to throw defamatory, untrue charges at a citizen over the air and into the district where one resides, the commentator, the station over which the words were uttered, and the sponsor should be liable to legal action in the district where the words were heard, where the injured individual resides.

The bill never got out of committee, never received a hearing.

If President Truman feels as deeply as his word indicates, if he is in earnest about giving the people real relief from one he described in such uncomplimentary terms, he will ask the Department of Justice to cancel the license of the station or stations which sponsor Pearson; recommend to the House the passage of legislation giving individual citizens an opportunity to obtain legal redress.

WHY NOT A MARSHALL PLAN FOR THE AGED OF AMERICA?

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCORMACK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, on February 2, 1948, I discussed H. R. 16 of the Eightieth Congress, introduced by me for affording adequate social insurance for our aged in which I posed the question, Why not a Marshall plan for the aged of America? On February 2 of this year I introduced in the Eighty-first Congress H. R. 2136, a bill similar to H. R. 16, and our colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] introduced a companion bill on the same day, H. R. 2135.

The purpose of this legislation is to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys.

On February 16 the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] included in remarks he made in the House a condensed version of this legislation which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 1276 of that date.

Mr. Speaker, under the social-security program provided by existing law we are at the present time providing old-age security benefits to a number of groups of our citizens. However, these benefits are restricted to special groups and the payments are wholly inadequate to meet the needs of the recipients. While the social-security tax is levied for unemployment security, charged to both employers and employees, the ultimate cost is reflected in the cost of products produced in the industrial employment with which they have to do and therefore is in the long run paid by the ultimate consumer, the public.

Pay-roll taxes imposed under existing law to maintain the social-security program are 1.5 percent for unemployment coverage and 2 percent for other social security, totaling 3.5 percent. However, in the program presented by the President, to cover which legislation has already been introduced, it is proposed to increase the rates of taxation for social security by 6 percent, making a total levy of 9.5 percent, estimated to provide $9,410,000,000 in taxes for this purpose.

Legislation is also pending in this Congress to provide pensions of $90 per month, at age 65, for all veterans of

World Wars I and II. Some financial experts estimate that this would entail a cost to the United States of $7,000,000,000 when the peak of expenditures under it is reached. There are many other Federal laws as well as State laws providing pensions for aged citizens.

Those of us who are sponsoring H. R. 2135 and H. R. 2136 believe that in the interest of economy as well as to provide justly for all aged citizens a Nationwide law should be enacted which would embrace all aged persons desiring to receive annuities under its provisions. Under this legislation all American citizens would be required to contribute who receive more than $250 per month. At the present time there are millions of American citizens who are in want and who are not sharing in any of the social security or other pension programs provided by the Federal Government, but who are entitled to consideration by a grateful Nation for the maintenance and preservation of which they have contributed throughout the years.

As I remarked on a previous occasion, we should not be unmindful of the fact that these senior citizens were the workers of yesterday. They helped build our cities, our roads, our industries, and helped to clear our lands. They were the trail blazers, the pioneers. They built for us. Now that they are old, we cannot pass them by. They do not seek our charity. They only ask simple justice—a modest share in the fruits of American industry, to the production of which their labors in the past have contributed. Let us prove to the whole world that these aged American citizens are entitled to, and shall have vouchsafed to them by their country, "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Let us prove that humanity is still on the march here in America by enacting an old-age annuity plan that will provide for all of our old people, not only a selected few, annuities sufficient to maintain them in decency and health.

Mr. Speaker, the enactment of a Nation-wide Federal security of the type embraced in this legislation is long overdue and the Eighty-first Congress should take steps at once to enact such legislation. As shown by the figures recently made public under lend-lease United States military aid to the Allies aggregated $50,205,229,788 between March 1, 1941, and the end of March 1948. We have sent overseas subsequent to the ending of the war over $30,000,000,000 in money, supplies, and services for the aid of foreign nations. We are contemplating providing many additional billions for similar purposes during the ensuing fiscal year. If the Federal Government is able to expend these many billions of dollars for the aid, rehabilitation, and protection of the peoples of foreign nations, is it too much to ask that we have a Marshall plan for the old folks of America who are in need which will provide, at least, a minimum for shelter, food, and protection in their declining years? Why not a Marshall plan for these old people of America?

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely urge that all of my colleagues who are interested in old-age security join with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] and myself in sponsoring this legislation, H. R. 2135 and 2136, and doing everything within our power to secure its enactment into law at the earliest time possible.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. RIVERS, for 1 week, beginning February 28 through March 4, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan (at the request of Mr. CASE of South Dakota) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include certain excerpts.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 492. An act to amend the act approved June 29, 1949, entitled "An act to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va.";

S. 548. An act to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports, and for other purposes; and

S. 713. An act to amend Public Law 533 of the Eightieth Congress authorizing the construction of a building for the General Accounting Office on square 518 in the District of Columbia.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on February 23, 1949, present to the President, for his approval, a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1252. An act to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 with respect to the eligibility for appointment in the executive branch of the Government of former professional staff members of committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives; and

H. J. Res. 84. Joint resolution to provide for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train by the Archivist of the United States, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 28, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

266. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting its report on budgeting and accounting in the executive branch (H. Doc. No. 84); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

267. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting to the Congress a study prepared for the Commission's consideration of the role of the statistical agencies in the Federal Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

268. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting to the Congress a study prepared for the Commission's consideration of fiscal, budgeting, and accounting methods and systems in Federal Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

269. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting to the Congress, in typescript, an appendix, the Report on the Accounting Needs of the Federal Government, which was prepared for the Commission's consideration by the task force as a supplement to their summary report on this subject; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

270. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting to the Congress, in typescript, the appendices to the report of the Personnel Policy Committee as a supplement to their summary report on this subject. This material is a further addition to the supporting data which accompanied the Commission's report on personnel management, filed with the Congress on February 10, 1949; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

271. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting to the Congress a study prepared for the Commission's consideration of departmental management in Federal administration; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

272. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of a bill to amend the act approved September 7, 1916 (c. 458, 39 Stat. 742), entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

273. A letter from Chayhin Martinez, agent and representative, Moro war-damage claimants, Province of Sulu, Philippines, transmitting a communication inviting attention to the basic communication of the Philippine War Damage Commission, Manila, Philippines, dated March 19, 1948, regarding 25 private war-damage claims; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

274. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 to provide that claims under section 17 must be filed within 6 months to be allowable, to stop further accrual of such claims, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

275. A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report and recommendation concerning the claim of Mrs. Sarah J. Miller, Pittsburgh, Pa., as mother of Marion Miller, deceased, Army Serial No. 10690851, private, first class, Army of the United States, on account of an amount due his estate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

276. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on views and recommendations of the State of California on proposed report of the Secretary of the Interior on the central Arizona project in reference to a letter dated September 16, 1948, when the Secretary of the Interior filed his report and findings on the central Arizona project; to the Committee on Public Lands.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1741. A bill to authorize the establishment of a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 158). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2546. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish land-based air warning and control installations for the national security, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 159). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SASSCER: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2663. A bill to provide for the administration of the Central Intelligence Agency, established pursuant to section 102, National Security Act of 1947, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 160). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARTLETT: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 942. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to amend section 9 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 512)" (Public Law 593, 80th Cong.); with amendments (Rept. No. 161). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LYLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 44. Resolution to prescribe tolls to be levied for the use of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 163). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 121. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 199, a bill to provide the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence, to make immigration quotas available to Asian and Pacific peoples, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 164). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARING:

H. R. 2959. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and the Federal Alcohol Administration Act, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 2960. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act to provide for rural telephones, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 2961. A bill to allow a corporation to deduct, for income-tax purposes, 200 percent of amounts paid to employees as a share of profits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 2962. A bill to provide for the presentation by the United States of a statue of George Washington to the people of Uruguay; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 2963. A bill to provide for the settlement of certain claims of the Government of the United States on its own behalf and on behalf of American nationals against foreign governments; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 2964. A bill to authorize the acquisition of a site for a national cemetery in northwest Louisiana for the burial of members of the armed forces of the United States dying in the service, of former members whose last discharge therefrom was honorable, and certain other persons as provided for in United States Code, title 24, section 281, as amended; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2965. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional protection for owners of patents of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910, as amended, so as to protect the United States in certain patent suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 2966. A bill providing tax incentive for the creation of additional farm storage facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEANE:

H. R. 2967. A bill to amend and supplement the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 2968. A bill to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. R. 2969. A bill to provide for the coverage of benzedrine under the Federal narcotic laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2970. A bill to provide a 1 year's extension of time for the disposition of farm labor camps to public or semipublic agencies or nonprofit associations of farmers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H. R. 2971. A bill granting, in the case of income and estate taxes, deductions for contributions or gifts to volunteer fire companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 2972. A bill to enable veterans who are civil-service employees to take advantage of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 2973. A bill to broaden the cooperative extension system as established in the act of May 8, 1914, and acts supplemental thereto, by providing for cooperative extension work between colleges receiving the benefits of this act and the acts of July 2, 1862, and August 30, 1890, and other qualified colleges, universities, and research agencies, and the United States Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 2974. A bill to amend and supplement the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KARST:

H. R. 2975. A bill to provide pay increases for employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 2976. A bill to prevent the use of tax-exempt organizations and charitable and educational trusts for tax-avoidance purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LODGE:

H. R. 2977. A bill to further amend section 5 of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 by extending the time for making application for unused leave to September 1, 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 2978. A bill to extend the time within which the Motor Carrier Claims Commission may receive the claims against the United States of certain motor carriers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McKINNON:

H. R. 2979. A bill to authorize use of rental and operating income from defense housing facilities of the National Military Establishment for payments in lieu of taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 2980. A bill to extend the coverage of Federal old-age and survivors insurance to self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 2981. A bill to protect the rights and privileges of Federal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 2982. A bill to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 2983. A bill to establish a Tax Settlement Board; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 2984. A bill to consolidate the Parker Dam power project and the Davis Dam project; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 2985. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to suspensions of employees of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. POTTER:

H. R. 2986. A bill to increase the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 2987. A bill to provide a civil government for the island of Guam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. REDDEN:

H. R. 2988. A bill to provide for a Resident Commissioner from the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2989. A bill to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 2990. A bill to amend title X of the Social Security Act, as amended, so as to provide for the encouragement and stimulation of aid to the blind recipients to become wholly or partially self-supporting; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. R. 2991. A bill to provide for the acquisition of site and preparation of plans and specifications for a new Federal building and post office in West Hartford, Conn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2992. A bill to provide for comprehensive planning, for site acquisition in and outside of the District of Columbia, and for the design of Federal building projects outside of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 2993. A bill to provide a 1 year's extension of time for the disposition of farm labor camps to public or semipublic agencies or nonprofit associations of farmers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 2994. A bill to amend certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARDIE SCOTT:

H. R. 2995. A bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to complete the requirements for the positive identification of yellow oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 2996. A bill to provide for raising and strengthening the levees of the Hunt and Lima Lake drainage districts, located in the State of Illinois, in the interest of providing additional flood protection; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMITH of Kansas:

H. R. 2997. A bill to establish a United States Air Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. R. 2998. A bill to amend the act of July 24, 1946, with respect to the multiple-purpose plan of improvement for the Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 2999. A bill to exempt admissions to agricultural fairs from the Federal tax on admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 3000. A bill to provide for lump-sum payment for certain Army and Navy nurses of World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 3001. A bill to authorize the admission into the United States of certain aliens possessing special skills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER (by request):

H. R. 3002. A bill to provide for review of military and naval records in World War I, and issue of decorations, medals, and awards in deserving cases; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WHITE of California:

H. R. 3003. A bill to transfer the Pomona station of the Agriculture Remount Service, Department of Agriculture, at Pomona Calif.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3004. A bill to provide price support for blackeye beans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H. R. 3005. A bill to regulate subsistence expenses and mileage allowances of civilian officers and employees of the Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. J. Res. 176. Joint resolution to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell and operate vessels, to impose certain conditions on the chartering of vessels by the Maritime Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. J. Res. 177. Joint resolution to repeal the joint resolution of July 24, 1946; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. Res. 117. Resolution providing for compensation for one special messenger for the House Foreign Affairs Committee, effective April 1, 1949; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. Res. 118. Resolution making H. R. 1741, a bill to authorize the establishment of a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles, and for other purposes, special order of business; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. Res. 119. Resolution making H. R. 2546, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish land-based air warning and control installations for the national security, and for other purposes, special order of business; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. Res. 120. Resolution making H. R. 2663, a bill to provide for the administration of the Central Intelligence Agency, established pursuant to section 102, National Security Act of 1947, and for other purposes, special order of business; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide recreational facilities in the Lake Mead national recreational area; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, requesting that legislation be enacted immediately abolishing fish traps from the waters of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, through appropriate budgetary and legislative action, to continue a plan of expansion of local service air transportation facilities as recommended by the President's Air Policy Commission and the Congressional Air Policy Board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, requesting the Eighty-first Congress to pass legislation with reference to the Veterans' Economic Development Act, which was embodied in the bill H. R. 521 of the Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide sufficient funds and grant such assistance as may be necessary adequately to aid in a modern way toward the improvement of the Indian's economic well-being; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to discontinue the Federal gasoline tax and Federal lubricating-oil tax as soon as possible and refuse to reenact such taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the charter of the Commodity Credit Corporation to provide for ample storage bins and facilities for corn, wheat, and other basic grains; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to oppose any modification of the existing sanitary pact providing for embargo against the importation of fresh and frozen meats from countries known to be infested with foot-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in relation to repealing the transportation tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, requesting the enactment of legislation to aid the State of Montana in the enforcement of the cigarette tax now evaded by the use of the United States mails; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, urging the undertaking and immediate study of the need for legislation for revision of repayment contracts of Federal reclamation projects and urging that committees of both the House and Senate of the United States Congress request the Secretary of the Interior to submit a report with recommendations on the projects where revision is desirable; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider and pass resolution appropriating money to commence the building of certain irrigation projects in the Powder River Basin and the Tongue River Basin; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of West Virginia, urging enactment of legislation that will extend and liberalize the benefits of the present Federal social-security program to include States and their instrumentalities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H. R. 3006. A bill for the relief of Helmuth Wolf Gruhl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 3007. A bill for the relief of Harry C. Goakes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3008. A bill for the relief of Andrew M. Hanson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 3009. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ali Reza Bassir; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 3010. A bill for the relief of Walter E. Parks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. R. 3011. A bill for the relief of Veronica Putala, known in religious life as Sister Mary Gisella, and Julia Block, known in religious life as Sister M. Vincentia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 3012. A bill for the relief of Max L. Finklestein, as trustee in bankruptcy of the estate of Preston C. Sherman, doing business under the firm name and style of Sherman & Associates, bankrupt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 3013. A bill for the relief of Julia E. Vail; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 3014. A bill for the relief of Roger Sanford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 3015. A bill for the relief of Miss Carmela Troiano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3016. A bill for the relief of Sieh Tsai Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE of California:

H. R. 3017. A bill for the relief of Ramon G. Hunter and Arthur Nancett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H. R. 3018. A bill for the relief of Camilla Fabris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

103. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Memorial of the State Legislature of South Dakota, memorializing the Congress of the United States, the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, and Bureau of Animal Industry of the Department of Agriculture to oppose any modification of the existing sanitary pact providing for embargo against the importation of fresh and frozen meats from countries known to be infested with foot-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Agriculture.

104. By Mr. MAHON: Petition of farm bureau organizations of Crosby, Dawson, Dickens, Haskell, Hockley, Howard, Scurry, and

Stonewall Counties in Texas, regarding proposed farm legislation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

105. Also, petition of 16 west Texas citizens, views of 6 secretaries of county agricultural conservation associations, the ACA committee of Floyd County, the agricultural committee of the Dawson County Chamber of Commerce, and others in regard to proposed farm legislation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

106. By Mr. WHITE of Idaho: Memorial of the Legislature of Idaho, urging an appropriation of $500,000 to be administered in cooperation with the noxious-weed program of the constituted authorities of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Appropriations.

107. By Mr. MURDOCK: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the Arizona State Legislature, requesting decentralization of war industries and calling attention to the advantages of Arizona as a location for war industries; to the Committee on Armed Services.

108. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Memorial of the State Legislature of South Dakota, memorializing Congress to amend the charter of the Commodity Credit Corporation to provide for ample storage bins and facilities for corn, wheat, and other basic grains; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

109. By Mr. HILL: Petition requesting that Congress authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to assist local lending agencies in financing disaster-stricken livestock producers and feeders in the blizzard areas of the Western States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

110. By Mr. MURDOCK: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the Arizona Legislature, proposing decontrol of rental housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

111. By Mr. SULLIVAN: Memorial of the Missouri House of Representatives, protesting the trial, conviction, and sentencing of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, of Budapest, by the Communist-controlled Government of Hungary and the arrest and prosecution of 15 Protestant clergymen on charges of the same general nature as those preferred against said cardinal; denouncing such tactics and persecutions; and commending the Department of State for its alert interest in the matter to the end that right and justice prevail; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

112. By Mr. HART: Petition of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, Hudson Country Chapter, Jersey City, condemning the Communist-dominated proceedings which resulted in the sentencing of Cardinal Mindszenty to life imprisonment and calling upon the Congress of the United States to express the indignation of the American people through the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

113. Also, petition of certain residents of his congressional district, urging that the United States formally bring the case of Cardinal Mindszenty to the attention of United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

114. By Mr. SASSCER: Memorial of the Maryland House of Delegates, protesting the arrest and conviction of His Eminence Josef Cardinal Mindszenty which recently shocked the Christian world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

115. By Mr. MANSFIELD: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana, requesting appropriate action to alleviate the shortage of tubular goods and steel necessary for the development of Montana's oil and gas resources; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

116. By Mr. LOVRE: Petition of Jerry Flaick, age 5, and 25 other little citizens of Ferney, Groton, and Verdon, all in South Dakota, petitioning the United States to create a Federal-aid health program to conquer and control such dreaded diseases as polio, rheumatic fever, tuberculosis, cancer, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

117. By Mr. MURDOCK: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the Arizona State Legislature, requesting Congress to provide recreational facilities in the Lake Mead national recreation area; to the Committee on Public Lands.

118. By Mr. HESELTON: Resolution of the Common Council of the City of Holyoke, Mass., providing for a proclamation each October 11 as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

119. By Mr. SASSCER: Memorial of the House of Delegates of Maryland, memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

120. By Mr. MANSFIELD: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, supporting legislation to allow veterans of World War II to acquire submarginal lands from the Department of Agriculture or the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Public Lands.

121. By the SPEAKER: Petition of H. C. Curtis, secretary, West Palm Beach Townsend Club, No. 1, West Palm Beach, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to immediate action on the consideration and enactment of the proposed legislation known as the Townsend plan, introduced in the Eighty-first Congress as H. R. 2135; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

122. By Mr. MANSFIELD: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana, requesting the enactment of legislation to aid the State of Montana in the enforcement of the cigarette tax now evaded by the use of the United States mails; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

123. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Memorial of the State Legislature of South Dakota, memorializing the Congress to discontinue the Federal gasoline tax and Federal lubricating-oil tax as soon as possible and refuse to reenact such taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1949

(Legislative day of Monday, February 21, 1949)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father who art in heaven and in the earth, and in the hearts of men: Hallowed be Thy Name.

To our dear land of the free in Thy providence has been given a place of awesome responsibility in this supreme hour of destiny. We would exercise that stewardship of power with anxious care and deep humility. May those who serve the public weal be wise interpreters of Thy eternal law, the brave spokesmen of Thy will and of the truth which sets men free from ancient wrongs.

Make our America a nation Thou canst trust and bless. May our democracy purged of its failings and confessing its failures be an inspiring, emancipating power for world security and stability, and a flaming light of liberty for all the earth. We ask it in the Name that is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 22, 1949, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, had been designated Speaker pro tempore of the House of Representatives.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 492. An act to amend the act approved June 29, 1949, entitled "An act to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va.";

S. 548. An act to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports, and for other purposes; and

S. 713. An act to amend Public Law 533 of the Eightieth Congress authorizing the construction of a building for the General Accounting Office on square 518 in the District of Columbia.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	Murray
Anderson	Hoey	Myers
Baldwin	Holland	Neely
Brewster	Hunt	O'Conor
Bricker	Ives	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Broughton	Johnson, Tex.	Reed
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Byrd	Kem	Russell
Cain	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Chapman	Knowland	Schoeppel
Chavez	Langer	Smith, Maine
Connally	Lodge	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Long	Sparkman
Donnell	Lucas	Stennis
Downey	McCarran	Taft
Ecton	McCarthy	Taylor
Ellender	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Flanders	McKellar	Thye
Frear	McMahon	Tydings
Fulbright	Magnuson	Vandenberg
George	Malone	Watkins
Gillette	Martin	Wiley
Green	Maybank	Williams
Gurney	Miller	Withers
Hayden	Millikin	Young
Hendrickson	Morse	
Hickenlooper	Mundt	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS],

the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH] are absent on public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

CONFIRMATION OF ROUTINE NOMINATIONS IN MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, out of order, and as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent to have considered and confirmed some routine promotions in the Military Establishment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Maryland whether the nominations were unanimously reported by the committee?

Mr. TYDINGS. The committee was unanimous in its report. No objection was made to any of the nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

Mr. TYDINGS. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF DAN A. KIMBALL TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY FOR AIR

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as in executive session I ask unanimous consent that the nomination of Dan A. Kimball, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air be considered. The report of the Committee on Armed Services was unanimous.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and the President will be notified forthwith.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask permission to be absent from the Senate from March 9 to 11, inclusive, in case of a filibuster.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred, as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE (S. Doc. No. 17)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revised supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Commerce, involving an increase of $76,000, fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATIONS—CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES, ETC. (S. Doc. No. 15)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriations for the several departments and independent offices to pay claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments rendered against the United States, as provided by various laws, amounting to $22,638,857.65, together with an indefinite amount as may be necessary to pay interest and costs (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

AGREEMENT RELATING TO RESOLUTION OF CONFLICTING CLAIMS TO GERMAN ENEMY ASSETS AND RELATED PROTOCOL

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation approving an agreement relating to the resolution of conflicting claims to German enemy assets and related protocol and authorizing the President to enter into the agreement or other agreements similar in character with certain countries (with accompanying papers); to the Commitee on Foreign Relations.

AMENDMENT OF CONTRACT SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1944

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, to provide that claims under section 17 must be filed within 6 months to be allowable, to stop further accrual of such claims, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, withdrawing the name of Karel Krajsky or Charles Krjsky from a report relating to aliens whose deportation he suspended more than 6 months ago, transmitted by the Attorney General to the Senate on January 15, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 25, 1938, as amended, by providing for the certification of batches of drugs composed wholly or partly of any kind of aureomycin, chloramphenicol, and bacitracin, or any derivative thereof (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION ACT OF 1916, AS AMENDED

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act approved September 7, 1916 (c. 458, 39 Stat. 742), entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," as amended (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AUDIT REPORT OF FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INC.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION ON CLAIM OF SARAH J. MILLER

A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report and recommendation concerning the claim against the United States of Mrs. Sarah J. Miller (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF ESTABLISHMENT OF SEAT OF GOVERNMENT IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the executive vice chairman of the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission to proceed with plans for the celebration and commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the seat of the Federal Government in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on fiscal, budgeting, and accounting activities (appendix F) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on statistical agencies (appendix D) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on budgeting and accounting (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the personnel policy committee, Commission on Organization (appendixes) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, an appendix to a report on the accounting needs of the Federal Government (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Memorial 1

"Memorial requesting Congress to provide recreational facilities in the Lake Mead national recreational area

"To the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"1. Through bureaus of the Department of the Interior, the Lake Mead national recreational area, in Arizona and Nevada, has been created, and by the appropriation of moneys for the maintenance and improvement thereof Congress has signified its approval.

"2. There are still opportunities and substantial need for additional facilities for recreation in the area thus provided, among which might be mentioned: (1) A road from Pierce Ferry to Fredonia, via Pipe Spring National Monument, connecting with the north rim of Grand Canyon near Tuweep; (2) a paved road from a point on United States Highway 93, within the recreational

area, to Temple Bar; (3) truck trails along Lake Mead, particularly between the Temple Bar road and Hualapai Wash, to open the area to fishermen; and (4) sewer, airport, and other facilities at Temple Bar and Pierce Ferry.

"3. The further opening of this splendid area will not only be of great benefit to Arizona, but will render its beauties and recreational advantages available to the people of the whole United States and cause it to take a high place in the great national-park system, which exists for the enjoyment and benefit of the people of the United States.

"Wherefore, your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, respectfully requests:

"1. That the Congress provide for the further development and improvement of the facilities of the Lake Mead national recreational area.

"Adopted by the house this 22d day of January 1949.

"Filed in the office of the secretary of State, January 24, 1949."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Joint Memorial 2

"To the Honorable Senators and Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that:

"Whereas the ever-increasing growth of noxious weeds, through the spreading of seeds by irrigation waters of Snake River and other rivers and creeks and valley winds upon private and public lands in the State of Idaho, has become an unusually heavy burden upon private land owners of the State of Idaho and on State lands, and

"Whereas Snake and Bear Rivers in the State of Idaho are interstate streams, originating outside the State of Idaho, and carrying noxious weed seeds in irrigation waters to and upon irrigated lands in Idaho; and

"Whereas noxious weeds cause a substantial reduction in the crop production of the irrigated lands of Idaho, besides incurring a heavy expense upon landowners in their eradication: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Idaho (the house of representatives concurring), That we most respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States of America, that it appropriates $500,000 to be administered in cooperation with the noxious-weed program of the constituted authorities of the State of Idaho, in the treatment and eradication of noxious weeds on federally owned or controlled land in the State of Idaho; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized and he is hereby directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the Senators and the Representatives in Congress from this State, and to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America.

"This senate joint memorial passed the senate on the 5th day of February 1949.

"This senate joint memorial passed the house of representatives on the 9th day of February 1949."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Joint Memorial 6

"Joint memorial to the President and Congress of the United States, requesting the introduction and enactment of appropriate legislation for appropriation of funds by the first session of the Eighty-first Congress for the building of the Custer Battlefield Museum at Custer Battlefield National Monument, Mont.

"Whereas the Director of the Bureau of the Budget has recommended the sum of $96,000 be appropriated in the 1950 fiscal year funds for a memorial museum to be erected on the site of Custer Battlefield National Monument; and

"Whereas Custer Battlefield is one of the most prominent patriotic shrines in American history, the site where General Custer and 262 men of his gallant regiment were slain at the Battle of the Little Bighorn River, June 25–26, 1876, also known as Custer's Last Battle; and

"Whereas the purpose of the Custer Battlefield National Monument is to preserve for all time the memorable ground of this great conflict and to present for public benefit the chapter it has to tell in the story of the westward advance of our settlements in the Northwest. It is necessary that a museum be erected on this battlefield site to properly care for, display, and maintain the many valuable historical artifacts, relics, and mementos pertaining to the battle that are now in storage awaiting the opportunity of proper care and display that only a museum can offer: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Thirty-first Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana (the senate concurring), That we respectfully urge the Congress of the United States that the act of August 10, 1939, 'To provide for the erection of a public historical museum in the Custer Battlefield National Cemetery, Mont.' (Public, No. 362, ch. 634, 76th Cong., 1st sess.), signed by the President of the United States, to pass legislation for funds as mentioned in the 1950 fiscal year estimates for the erection of this museum; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the chief clerk of the house of representatives to the President of the United States, to the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY and the Honorable ZALES N. ECTON, Senators from Montana, and the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD and the Honorable WESLEY A. D'EWART, Representatives in Congress from Montana."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"House Joint Memorial 4

"Joint memorial to the Congress of the United States of America, to the honorable United States Senators JAMES E. MURRAY and ZALES N. ECTON, and to the honorable Representatives in Congress MIKE MANSFIELD and WESLEY A. D'EWART, requesting the Eighty-first Congress introduce and pass the Veterans' Economic Development Act which was embodied in H. R. 521 and S. 1652 in the Eightieth Congress

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

"Whereas the Eightieth Congress of the United States had in mind legislation which would help both the veteran and nonveteran and which if passed would have brought new business to the State of Montana but which said legislation unfortunately was not passed: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the Thirty-first Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana (the senate of said assembly concurring) does most respectfully urge the Eighty-first Congress of the United States that the said Congress cause necessary action to be initiated whereby the Veterans' Economic Development Act which was embodied in H. R. 521 and S. 1652 in the Eightieth Congress will be again introduced as an act and passed by the Eighty-first Congress of the United States; be it further

"Resolved, That duly attested copies of this memorial be transmitted to both Houses of Congress, to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY and the Honorable ZALES N. ECTON, United States Senators for the State of Montana, and the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD and the Honorable WESLEY A. D'EWART, United States Representatives in Congress for the State of Montana."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Joint Memorial 1

"To the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States; to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States; to the Honorable E. L. Bartlett, Delegate to Congress for the Territory of Alaska; to the Honorable Julius A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior; and to the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in regular session assembled, respectfully represents that:

"Whereas the people of Alaska in a free expression of opinion at their general election on October 12, 1948, did by the unprecedented majority of 19,712 to 2,624 vote to abolish fish traps from the waters of this Territory; and

"Whereas this expression of the people of Alaska was made after the fullest discussion ever given any issue in the history of the Territory; and

"Whereas fish traps have been abolished by the respective States and the Province of British Columbia from all coastal waters of the Pacific coast except in Alaska; and

"Whereas repeated attempts to gain a transfer of authority for regulating Alaska fisheries from the Federal Government where it now resides to the Territorial government have been unsuccessful; and

"Whereas Alaska's salmon fisheries, particularly in the areas where fish traps are common, have been depleted to a dangerous extent requiring immediate remedial action;

"Now, therefore, we, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in nineteenth regular session assembled, respectfully request that legislation be enacted immediately, abolishing fish traps from the waters of the Territory of Alaska.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Approved by the Governor February 7, 1949.

"ERNEST GRUENING,
"Governor of Alaska."

Petitions of M. L. Breing, of Louisville, Ky., and James Walker, of Grindstone, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to extend rent control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Memorials of George W. Beard, of Louisville, Ky., and sundry other citizens of the United States, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to continue rent control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Petitions of George W. Langford, of Miami, Fla., and sundry other citizens of the United States, relating to rent control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Holyoke, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation proclaiming October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from the Electric Plant Board of the City of Bowling Green, Ky., praying for the enactment of legislation providing sufficient funds for the construction of a TVA steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Petition of Theodore Wysvki, of West Hartford, Conn., relating to electronic equipment and other devices for disabled veterans; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Petition of May Elkins Fraser, of New York City, N. Y., relating to the establishment of

a federation of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Petition of Sarah M. Cobb, of Atlanta, Ga., relating to Federal aid to schools; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Michael S. Soltmene, of San Bernardino, Calif., relating to tax legislation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of Mr. and Mrs. Bill Nelson, of West Prestonsburg, Ky., favoring the enactment of legislation to repeal the Taft-Hartley labor law; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A telegram in the nature of a petition signed by Willard E. Goslin, president of the American Association of School Administrators, and sundry other citizens, of San Francisco, Calif., praying for the enactment of legislation providing Federal aid to education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Jefferson County Fiscal Court, Louisville, Ky., relating to a reduction in personnel in the Navy Ordnance Plant, located in Jefferson County, Ky.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Petitions of the Florida State Townsend Council and the West Palm Beach Townsend Club No. 1, both of the State of Florida, praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan providing old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter in the nature of a petition signed by C. W. Johnson and sundry other citizens of South Bend, Ind., praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan providing old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter in the nature of a petition from E. Glen Wilder, executive director, Alaska Housing Authority, Anchorage, Alaska, relating to housing legislation (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the Common Council of Boise City, Idaho, favoring the enactment of legislation providing local service air-transportation facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A telegram in the nature of a petition signed by Samuel R. Quinones, president of the Senate of Puerto Rico, San Juan, P. R., expressing appreciation for the approval of the act which granted to Puerto Ricans the privilege of electing their Governor; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A telegram in the nature of a petition signed by Samuel R. Quinones, president of the Senate of Puerto Rico, San Juan, P. R., praying for the inclusion of Puerto Rico in the provisions of the so-called Federal aid to education bill; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Kansas Hospital Association, Topeka, Kans., protesting against the enactment of the so-called compulsory insurance bill; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Fern-Washburn Grange No. 629, Wisconsin, favoring the fixing of a support price on butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Petitions of Margaret R. Monahan, of Columbus, and sundry other citizens of the United States, relating to the trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A paper in the nature of a petition from Thomas A. Della Penna, of Holyoke, Mass., relating to the claim for old-age assistance of Walter E. Atkinson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

A petition of Edwardo Soto Modesto, and sundry other citizens of Salinas, Puerto Rico, praying for the inclusion of Puerto Rico in the broadening of the social-security law; to the Committee on Finance.

Petitions of Helen M. Ryan, of Chicago, Ill., and sundry other citizens of the United States, relating to tax legislation; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. McGRATH):

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress

"Whereas a resolution providing for annual proclaiming by the President of the United States of America of October 11 as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski is now pending in the present session of the Congress of the United States of America; and

"Whereas the 11th day of October 1779 is the date in American history of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; an'

"Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union, through legislative enactment, have designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day, believing it fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in honor of this great hero of the Revolutionary War; and

"Whereas from October 11, 1929, to October 11, 1946, by congressional enactment, October 11 has been designated as General Pulaski's Memorial Day in the United States of America; Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations hereby memorializes and petitions the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States and to each of the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.)

By Mr. MURRAY:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Resolution 3

"Resolution memorializing and requesting the Congress of the United States for the enactment of legislation to aid the State of Montana in the enforcement of the cigarette tax now evaded by the use of the United States mails

"*To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:*

"Your memorialists, the members of the House of Representatives of the Thirty-first Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana now convened in regular session, respectfully request:

"Whereas the State of Montana has imposed a tax on the sale and use of cigarettes within its boundaries, and the revenues so obtained constitute a substantial portion of the revenues available and needed for its functions of government; and

"Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana, now in regular session assembled, that a large and growing system of evasion of such tax law has developed; that the United States mails are flooded with advertisements and inducements to the citizens of this State to violate the law; that in numerous instances such advertisers entice prospective customers with statements to the effect that the use of the United States mails is sufficient proof of the legitimacy of such business and such system; that the mails of the United States are flooded with cigarettes in the process of delivery within this State, and on which cigarettes the tax required by the laws of the State have not and will not be paid; that this State is seriously injured and damaged in the loss of revenue from this source, and is at a disadvantage in collecting such lawful tax by and through such system; that the mails of the United States are being used for the express purpose of evading such tax and the enforcement of the laws of the State; and

"Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana that there is now pending before the Congress of the United States a proposed bill which will aid the States by requiring shippers of cigarettes in interstate commerce to furnish to the taxing authority of the State to which shipped, a copy of the invoice on each shipment and the name and address of each person to whom shipped; and

"Whereas such legislation by the Congress of the United States will greatly aid this and other States of the Union in the enforcement of its laws, and the collection of needed revenue: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Montana*, That the Congress of the United States be and the same is hereby memorialized and respectfully urged to enact legislation requiring shippers of cigarettes in interstate commerce to furnish to the taxing authority of the State to which shipped a copy of the invoice on each such shipment; or to enact such other legislation as will aid the several States affected as may be proper; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state of the State of Montana to the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Montana and they and each of them be requested to use all honorable means within their power and offices to bring about the enactment of legislation as herein mentioned."

By Mr. BUTLER (for himself and Mr. WHERRY):

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Legislative Resolution 14

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass Senate File No. 362

"Whereas the Federal Government owns one-fourth of the total area of the United States which is about 500,000,000 acres; and

"Whereas most of this is tax exempt irrespective of 46 separate provisions of law providing for payments in lieu of taxes in as many specific and isolated circumstances; and

"Whereas in many localities the Federal Government owns more than one-half of the total real property and in some counties it owns as much as 90 percent of the total acreage, and this situation has disrupted the tax bases of local governments and has imposed an unfair burden on the remaining real property which is taxable; and

"Whereas there is now pending in the Senate of the United States Senate File No. 362 which calls for payments in lieu of taxes on Federal-owned real property so as to reimburse to States and local governments, bringing about substantial equity between local and Federal taxpayers with respect to Federal-owned real property: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in sixty-first session assembled:*

"1. That the Legislature of the State of Nebraska respectfully request the Senate of the United States to enact into law Senate File No. 362 now before the Senate of the United States.

"2. That copies of this resolution, suitably engrossed, be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to the Vice President of the United States as Presiding Officer of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress of the United States from Nebraska."

By Mr. GURNEY:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 8

"Concurrent resolution relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States in relation to repealing the transportation tax

"*Be it resolved by the Senate of the Thirty-first Legislative Session of the State of South Dakota (the house concurring)*:

"Whereas for the purpose of meeting wartime emergency necessity, the Congress of the United States enacted as excise taxes a 15-percent levy upon the transportation of persons and a 3-percent levy upon the transportation of property; and

"Whereas one of the principal purposes of of levying such tax upon the transportation of persons was to discourage unnecessary wartime travel, the need for which no longer exists; and

"Whereas it is the opinion of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota that excise taxes should not impose an unfair burden on the long-distance shipper and the long-distance traveler as does the present tax on the transportation of property and persons; and

"Whereas it should be a principle of Federal taxation to levy taxes in such a manner as to prevent them from falling as an unequal burden on citizens residing in different areas of the country; and

"Whereas the distances to, from, and within the West impose an unfair burden on the western traveler and shipper; and

"Whereas the present transportation tax on property is unfairly burdensome upon the State of South Dakota, as it adds what is in effect an additional tariff on the goods shipped from South Dakota to the eastern markets, with the result that those goods are not able to compete freely with the goods originating in more closely adjacent southern areas; and

"Whereas the State of South Dakota is particularly interested in preserving the eastern market as an open market in which the agricultural products of South Dakota, in particular, may compete freely with southern produce without the hindrance of artificial barriers such as the present transportation tax; and

"Whereas the State of South Dakota is particularly interested in protecting and developing its vacation and tourist travel on an equal basis with other vacation travel areas; and

"Whereas the transportation of both persons and property plays such a vital role in the economic life of this country to the extent that the costs of transportation should always be kept at the lowest possible level; and

"Whereas transportation is in no sense a luxury, but is a vital necessity, and there is, therefore, sound reason for distinguishing between the transportation taxes and other excise taxes that are imposed upon luxury items; and

"Whereas it is the opinion of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota that the best interest of the country, and particularly the Western States, who are now discriminated against by the present transportation taxes, would be served by repeal of those taxes; and

"Whereas there is presently pending before the Congress of the United States, H. R. 205, which would repeal the tax on transportation of property, and H. R. 208, which would repeal the tax on transportation of persons: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Legislature of the State of South Dakota respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact into laws H. R. 205 and H. R. 208, or any other bill or bills which would accomplish the same purpose; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States and to each Senator and Representative from South Dakota in the Congress of the United States."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

(Mr. MUNDT presented a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

By Mr. MILLER:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Joint Memorial 4

"*To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:*

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, as assembled in its thirtieth session, do respectfully represent that

"Whereas a highway known as Idaho Central Highway extending from Trude, near Yellowstone Park, in the State of Idaho, to Mountain Home, Idaho, and there connecting with U. S. Highway 30, has long been projected and parts of which have been constructed for and used for local travel; and

"Whereas the route of such highway extends through United States public domain and serves a vast area devoted to and used for agricultural, mining, and stock raising, which industries greatly need to be developed for the benefit, welfare, and economy of the people of the State of Idaho and the United States; and

"Whereas a large part of the area through which said highway will extend is remote from railway transportation and highway facilities and badly needs such facilities, for the lack of which its development has been greatly retarded; and

"Whereas such highway would, if constructed, shorten the distance by many miles between Yellowstone Park and eastern Idaho and northern Wyoming, and western Idaho and the States of Nevada, Oregon, and Washington; and

"Whereas there is great need for such a highway for military purposes as it passes near the United States Navy's proving grounds; and

"Whereas such highway would be tributary to the primitive area of the State of Idaho, held by the United States Government; and

"Whereas said highway would connect at Mountain Home, Idaho, with U. S. Highway 30, thus completing an integrated highway system for the southern part of the State of Idaho: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the Thirtieth Session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho (the house of representatives concurring)*, That we most respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States of America immediately to make available the sum of $2,500,000 for the construction of the Idaho central highway and from Trude, Idaho, to Mountain Home, Idaho; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to send copies of this joint memorial to the President of the United States, to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives of the State of Idaho in the United States Congress.

"This senate joint memorial passed the senate on the 9th day of February 1949.

"This senate joint memorial passed the house of representatives on the 15th day of February 1949."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.)

By Mr. HUNT:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Enrolled Joint Memorial No. 2

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to alleviate the present electric-power shortage and anticipate future electric-power needs to avoid crippling the economic development of the State of Wyoming

"Whereas the population of the State of Wyoming, in contrast to that of the majority of the Missouri River Basin States, is rapidly increasing; and

"Whereas the consumption of electric power in the State of Wyoming is increasing at the rate of approximately 25 percent per annum, more than doubling every 4 years; and

"Whereas the economic development of the State of Wyoming, as well as the comfort and convenience of its citizens, will be greatly curtailed unless the present electric-power shortage is alleviated and future electric-power needs anticipated; and

"Whereas it is known that a number of private industrial enterprises, interested in locating in the State of Wyoming, have been discouraged from locating there because of the present electric-power shortage; and

"Whereas the prosperity of the citizens of the State of Wyoming depends to a large extent upon development of industry in Wyoming to balance its economy; and

"Whereas not only will the prosperity of the citizens of the State of Wyoming be reflected in added prosperity of the citizens of the other States, but also the strength of the national military defenses depends to a considerable extent upon the development of the Rocky Mountain States to form a strong link, binding the Nation together; and

"Whereas the bountiful hydroelectric resources within the boundaries of the State of Wyoming are largely controlled by the Federal Government of the United States of America, upon which is dependent the development of such hydroelectric power resources; and

"Whereas the construction of hydroelectric power projects cannot be accomplished overnight but require considerable time for their proper planning, as well as for their construction: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the Thirtieth Legislature of the State of Wyoming, the senate concurring, that

we hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States of America to consider not only the present electric-power shortage crippling the economic development of the State of Wyoming but also to anticipate its future electric-power needs by appropriating sufficient moneys for the planning and construction of adequate hydroelectric power plants and by directing the proper agencies of the United States of America to facilitate such planning and construction; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That certified copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, and to United States Senators Joseph C. O'Mahoney and Lester C. Hunt, Congressman Frank A. Barrett, to the Honorable J. A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior, and Michael W. Straus, Commissioner of Reclamation.

"HERMAN D. MAYBANK,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"GEORGE BURKE,
"*President of the Senate.*

"Approved February 5, 1949.
"A. G. CRANE,
"*Governor.*"

Two joint memorials of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 2

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to consider and pass resolution appropriating money to commence the building of certain irrigation projects in the Powder River Basin and the Tongue River Basin

"Whereas there are 11 proposed irrigation projects in the upper Powder River Basin and the Tongue River Basin, in the State of Wyoming, which are mentioned and described in more detail in Senate Document 191, Congress of the United States of America; and

"Whereas the building of these projects will make arid lands fertile and provide additional farm homes, will provide additional electric power, and will provide additional facilities for flood control; and

"Whereas unless funds are provided so that this project may be started immediately, settlers on the project will lose priority in their rights to water of the Powder River by reason of the construction of the Moorhead Dam: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the Thirtieth Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the house of representatives concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby, memorialized to appropriate sufficient moneys in order to commence construction of such irrigation projects; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the United States Senators JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY and LESTER C. HUNT and to Congressman FRANK A. BARRETT.

"GEORGE BURKE,
"*President of the Senate.*
"HERMAN D. MAYLAND,
"*Speaker of the House.*

"Approved February 12, 1949.
"A. G. CRANE,
"*Governor.*"

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 3

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to consider and pass legislation appropriating funds to complete construction of the Glendo Dam project in Platte County, Wyo.

"Whereas the construction of the Glendo Dam project has been surveyed and all other preliminary work completed and suitable materials for the construction thereof are available adjacent to the project area; and

"Whereas the dam is to be constructed for the purposes of generating electricity, of which there is a shortage in the area, and also for the purpose of flood control; and

"Whereas the project when completed will have a capacity of 150,000 acre-feet of storage water for power-generating purposes; and will have a maximum capacity of 750,000 acre-feet for flood-control purposes; and

"Whereas construction of the project has been suspended for the reason that funds are unavailable: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of the Thirtieth Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the senate concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States of America be, and is hereby, memorialized to appropriate sufficient funds for the completion of the Glendo Dam project, and that copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to United States Senators Joseph C. O'Mahoney and Lester C. Hunt, Congressman Frank A. Barrett; J. A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior, and Michael W. Straus, Commissioner of Reclamation.

"HERMAN D. MAYLAND,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"GEORGE BURKE,
"*President of the Senate.*

"Approved February 5, 1949.
"A. G. CRANE,
"*Governor.*"

By Mr. MUNDT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 2

"Whereas the problems of our Indians in South Dakota are such that they need our attention; and

"Whereas while the State of South Dakota through its share in the old-age-assistance, aid-to-dependent-children, and aid-to-the blind programs is helping the Indians substantially at the present time, there are areas of need which these programs do not include; and

"Whereas the primary responsibility for the Indian rests with the Federal Government through treaty agreements; steps should be taken requesting the Federal Government to offer assistance and aid to the Indians to help their present condition, both on the reservation and off the reservation, as they endeavor to adjust themselves to the white man's economy: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the house of representatives concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to provide sufficient funds, and grant such assistance as may be necessary, to adequately aid in a modern way toward the improvement of the Indian's economic well-being, the utilization of his resources, and the training of the young and the adult in a greater range of technical and managerial skills pointed straight at their economic and social betterment and stability.

"REX A. TERRY,
"*Lieutenant Governor,*
"*President of the Senate.*
"A. E. MUNCK,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*"

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.)

(Mr. GURNEY presented a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.)

By Mr. MUNDT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Concurrent Resolution 3

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to discontinue the Federal gasoline tax and Federal lubricating oil tax as soon as possible and refuse to reenact such taxes

"*Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Thirty-first Legislative Session of the State of South Dakota (the senate concurring)*:

"Whereas the Congress of the United States did during the session of the Seventy-sixth Congress increase the Federal gasoline tax one-half cent per gallon making such tax now a total of 1½ cents per gallon despite the fact that every State in the Union now imposes a substantial sales tax on gasoline; averaging in excess of 4 cents per gallon; and

"Whereas such Federal gasoline tax during the past calendar year of 1948 has taken from the people of the State of South Dakota in excess of $8,000,000 which largely comes from the producers and from agriculture of South Dakota; and

"Whereas such tax at 1½ cents per gallon amounts to approximately 10 percent retail sales tax on such product which is a necessity of the residents of this State; and

"Whereas the Federal lubricating oil tax is 6 cents per gallon, and is likewise an enormous retail sales tax upon a product necessary to the production of food for the country, and is an unfair and unreasonable imposition upon such necessity; and

"Whereas it is the sense of this legislature that it is inequitable and unfair to impose such an enormous sales tax upon a single commodity of this type which is a necessity to persons engaged in agricultural and producing pursuits; and

"Whereas such gasoline tax is a revenue measure peculiarly adapted for the individual States for the purpose of construction and maintenance of adequate highway systems and means of transportation, and administrative machinery is well established in every State in the Union: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States should discontinue the Federal gasoline tax and Federal lubricating oil tax at the earliest possible time, and should refuse to reenact the same upon their expiration, and should thus leave the field of revenue entirely to the individual States for use in construction and maintenance of the various States' highway systems; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Members of the Congress of the United States from the State of South Dakota be, and they are hereby urged by the legislature of this State to use their best efforts in opposing the reenactment or continuance of said taxes; be it further

"*Resolved*, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to each Senator and Representative of the State of South Dakota in the Congress of the United States and to the President of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives to be by them presented to the proper committee in Congress considering or determining such aforesaid legislation."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

(Mr. GURNEY presented a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A memorial of the Maryland State Poultry Council, remonstrating against the present farm price parity program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

JOSEF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference, and to have printed in the body of the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of Missouri regarding the trial and conviction of His Eminence Cardinal Mindszenty.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Josef Cardinal Mindszenty of Budapest, has recently been tried and sentenced to life imprisonment on charges of treason preferred against him by the Communist-controlled Government of Hungary; and

Whereas the circumstances surrounding the presentation of the charges, and the peculiar and arbitrary conduct of the trial have aroused the moral indignation of freemen throughout the world; and

Whereas since the conviction of Cardinal Mindszenty the same intolerant forces are seeking to convict 15 Protestant clergymen on charges of the same general nature as those preferred against said cardinal; and

Whereas such indefensible tactics and persecutions are designed to destroy the dignity of mankind by crucifying Christ and individual freedoms upon the hammer and sickle of communism: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-fifth General Assembly of Missouri, That we commend the State Department for its alert interest in this matter, and that we urge upon it the transcendent importance of taking every peaceful action possible to bring before the world the actual and true facts of these notorious prosecutions and to see that right and justice prevail; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the State Department by the chief clerk of the house of representatives and to each Congressman and Senator from the State of Missouri.

PIPESTONE INDIAN SCHOOL — CONCURRENT RESOLUTION BY MINNESOTA STATE LEGISLATURE

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD the text of a concurrent resolution adopted by the Minnesota State Legislature memorializing the President of the United States and Congress to immediately provide for the continued operation of the Pipestone Indian School at Pipestone, Minn., and the reopening of the hospital at said school.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and, under the rule, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution memorializing the President of the United States and Congress to immediately provide for the continued operation of the Pipestone Indian School at Pipestone, Minn., and the reopening of the hospital at said school

Whereas the number of persons of Indian blood has been increasing in the State of Minnesota at a relatively rapid rate; and

Whereas the State of Minnesota and many of its counties has for the past several years found it necessary to assume all or the greater portion of the cost of maintaining needy persons of Indian blood; and

Whereas the financial burden to the State of Minnesota and its counties is becoming increasingly serious; and

Whereas it has been found exceedingly difficult to find a sufficient number of foster homes to care for dependent and neglected children of Indian blood, most of whom come from broken homes and many of whom are, in fact, orphans; and

Whereas the Pipestone Indian School, operated at Pipestone, Minn., by the Bureau of Indian Affairs of the United States Department of the Interior, does perform a real and needed service in providing care for dependent and neglected children of Indian blood who otherwise would become the financial responsibility of the counties and State of Minnesota; and

Whereas by continuing to operate the Pipestone Indian School the Federal Government is providing an indispensable social service and, to a certain degree, assuming the financial responsibility toward said children of Indian blood that is rightfully and justly a Federal Government problem; and

Whereas the Bureau of Indian Affairs has indicated that it plans to close the Pipestone Indian School on July 1, 1949, and has, in fact, already closed the hospital previously operated in conjunction with said school: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Minnesota (the house of representatives concurring herein), That it is absolutely essential that immedite recognition be given this problem by the President and the Congress of the United States, to the end that the United States Department of the Interior, through the Bureau of Indian Affairs, not only continue to operate the Pipestone Indian School to its full capacity but also expand the same as need thereof becomes apparent, and that the hospital in conjunction with said school be reopened at once to serve and care for all needy persons of Indian blood; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Presiding Officers of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Minnesota.

Passed the senate the 9th day of February, in the year of our Lord 1949.

H. Y. TOBEY,
Secretary of the Senate.

Passed the house of representatives the 14th day of February, in the year of our Lord 1949.

G. H. LEAHY,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

Approved February 17, 1949.

LUTHER W. YOUNGDAHL,
Governor of the State of Minnesota.

Filed February 17, 1949.

MIKE HOLM,
Secretary of State.

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.)

MEMORIALS OF LEGISLATURE OF UTAH

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference three resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Utah, which were forwarded to me by Heber Bennion, Jr., Utah's secretary of state.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolutions will be received, appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD.

To the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Memorial to the Congress of the United States urging that national rent control be abandoned and that the jurisdiction of the same be returned to the people at the earliest possible date, and that during the interim action be taken to restore some degree of economic justice to the owners of rental property

Whereas the National Rent Control Act as originally passed was intended as a war-emergency measure, and save for the Emergency War Powers Act this legislation would not be valid under any peacetime functioning of constitutional government; and

Whereas if there is an emergency now existing in the housing industry, there is likewise an emergency in food and clothing and other commodities which are even more vital to life than shelter; and

Whereas the American way of life is founded on the proposition that there shall be free commerce among and between all our people and to freeze any one segment of our economy is a violation of the basic principles of the free-enterprise system; and

Whereas the Congress' attention is respectfully called to the fact that other industries are now being subsidized by the Government through general taxation, and to force one segment of the population to subsidize another individually and directly, as is now being required from landlord to tenant, is unfair and grossly discriminatory; and

Whereas the right now exercised by the Federal Government to control the property and income of one group of our citizens, carries with it the implied right to extend the same controls to other groups; and

Whereas rent control, dealing as it does with the rights to our homes and personal property, is by its very nature a local or community problem and should be dealt with by local government; and

Whereas the continual extension of this law under the guise of emergency is cause for alarm by the people as to the good faith of the Federal Government; and

Whereas the Congress' attention is respectfully called to the fact that rent control was one of the first stepping stones used by nations of the world now experiencing state socialism and that rent control is one of the salient planks of the Communist Party here in America; and

Whereas aside from all matters of law and discrimination it is contrary to the spirit of good American sportsmanship to take advantage of one segment of our population because of a numerical advantage held by the others: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Utah, That the Congress of the United States be urged in behalf of local government and in the interest of preserving the free-enterprise system that national rent control be abandoned at the earliest possible date, and that the rights of citizens of this country to control their own property be restored forthwith, and if the Congress is fearful that such a sudden and drastic action would result in undue hardship and inconvenience to the renting population, that legislation be enacted to gradually remove these Federal restrictions and that during the interim action be taken to restore some degree of economic justice to the owners of rental property; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of Utah be, and he is hereby directed to send forthwith copies of this resolution to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of the United

States Congress and to each member of the congressional delegation from the State of Utah.

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution of the Senate of the State of Utah, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.)

To the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Resolution urging the Congress of the United States to undertake immediately a study of the need for legislation for revision of repayment contracts of Federal reclamation projects, and urging that committees of both Houses of the United States Congress request the Secretary of the Interior to submit a report with recommendations of the projects where revision is desirable, that a special committee be set up to consider the report and report thereon and that upon the report of the special committee of the United States Congress enact legislation authorizing repayment contract revision where such revisions are deemed necessary

Whereas because of changes in economic conditions, largely a result of the Second World War, repayment contracts on some existing Federal reclamation projects contain inequities which need immediate adjustment; and

Whereas existing laws providing for renegotiations of repayment contracts are inadequate to meet the need for contract revision and default in the payment of annual repayment installments in some projects is imminent unless new legislation is enacted for that purpose: Be it

Resolved by the house of representatives:

SECTION 1. That the house of representatives urges the Congress of the United States to undertake immediately a study of the need for legislation for revision of repayment contracts on projects in financial difficulties and, for that purpose, recommends that the appropriate committees of both Houses of Congress forwith request the Secretary of the Interior to submit a full and complete report, with his recommendations, on all existing projects where such revisions of repayment contracts are desirable; that upon the submission of such report a special committee composed of Members of both Houses of Congress be estalished to consider such report and the recommendations of interested water users; and that, upon the report of the special committees, the Congress enact legislation authorizing repayment contract revisions where such revisions are deemed necessary.

SEC. 2. That the secretary of state be directed to send a certified copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative of the United States Congress from the State of Utah.

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Utah, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.)

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Resolution by the Utah State Senate memorializing the Congress of the United States not to pass certain legislation now pending before the National Congress which in effect provides for State medicine but rather to encourage private cooperative health insurance

Whereas there is now pending before the National Congress certain legislation commonly referred to as the Wagner-Murray-Dingell compulsory health insurance bill; and

Whereas this program of compulsory health insurance is offered to the people as a solution to a supposed problem of inadequate medical attention for the citizens of this country; and

Whereas it is acknowledged and unquestioned fact that the general health of the Nation is higher than that of any other nation in the world; and

Whereas free enterprise, individual initiative, and freedom from Government interference are the foundation stones upon which the practice of medicine and all other great enterprises of this country have been developed; and

Whereas such Government interference and regimentation in the field of medicine will destroy the spirit of research and individual initiative and will eventually result in a break-down of the present high standards of competency now prevalent in the private practice of medicine in this country; and

Whereas a program of compulsory health insurance as proposed has been in operation in other countries and has proven extremely cumbersome and expensive and has not resulted in a general improvement of the public health; and

Whereas the proponents of compulsory health insurance continually stress complete medical service without cost to the patient which statements do not take into account the increased taxation which will result from the inevitable Government bureaucracy that will be established in administering such a program; and

Whereas the best interest of the people of the United States can be served by continuance of the free-enterprise system with encouragement given to private cooperative health insurance and without Government domination and control in the field of medicine: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Utah State Legislature, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to defeat any legislation introduced into the Congress which provides for socialized medicine or national compulsory health insurance, and which will result in a destruction of private initiative and the free-enterprise system in this country, and that the Congress be urged to restrict its legislation to measures which will encourage private health insurance in cooperation with the private practice of medicine; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of Utah be, and he is hereby, instructed to transmit forthwith a copy of this resolution to the congressional delegation from the State of Utah, and to the Speaker of the House and President of the Senate of the United States.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS OF SOUTH DAKOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, as I am compelled to be in committee at 2 o'clock, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD three concurrent resolutions from the South Dakota Legislature.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolutions will be received, appropriately referred, and, under the rule, printed in the RECORD.

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

House Concurrent Resolution 2

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States, His Excellency the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Department of Agriculture of the United States to oppose any modification of the existing sanitary pact providing for embargo against the importation of fresh and frozen meats from countries known to be infested with foot-and-mouth disease

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the senate concurring therein):

Whereas, were it not for the Federal embargo, foot-and-mouth disease would be the greatest disease menace to the livestock industry of South Dakota and the Nation; and

Whereas from time to time a movement has developed to import fresh and frozen meat products from countries infested with foot-and-mouth disease; and

Whereas an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease would be an incalculable menace to the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That all Federal authorities be urgently requested to oppose any modification of the existing embargo against the importation of fresh and frozen meat products from any and all countries known to be infested with foot-and-mouth disease; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to His Excellency the President of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Department of Agriculture of the United States; to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of both Houses of Congress; to United States Senator CHAN GURNEY; to United States Senator KARL MUNDT; to Congressman FRANCIS H. CASE; to Congressman HAROLD LOVRE; and to the presiding officers of both Houses of Congress.

A. E. MUNCK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
R. A. TERRY,
Lieutenant Governor.

House Concurrent Resolution 6

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to amend the charter of the Commodity Credit Corporation to provide for ample storage bins and facilities for corn, wheat, and other basic grains

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Thirty-first Legislature of the State of South Dakota (the senate concurring):

Whereas the house of representatives, the senate concurring, deems it essential that farm prices be supported at the level of full parity; and

Whereas the house of representatives, the senate concurring, is cognizant of the fact that the support of farm prices at full parity cannot be achieved in an effective manner unless the United States Government provides permanent storage facilities for corn, wheat, and other basic grains; now therefore the house of representatives, the senate concurring, does petition the Congress of the United States to amend the charter of the Commodity Credit Corporation to authorize the provisions of permanent storage facilities for the storage of at least 1,000,000,000 bushels of corn and 500,000,000 bushels of wheat on the farm and at terminals in the farm area, and adequate storage facilities for all other basic grains; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of Agriculture, and to each South Dakota Senator and Member of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

A. E. MUNCK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
REX A. TERRY,
Lieutenant Governor.

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate two resolutions of the Legislature of South Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.)

(Mr. MUNDT presented two resolutions of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.)

INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted at a mass meeting on the thirty-first anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, February 13, 1949, at the South Boston (Mass.) High School Auditorium. This is a sample of many I have received. For that reason I am asking that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED AT THE MASS MEETING OF THE THIRTY-FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA ON FEBRUARY 13, 1949, AT THE SOUTH BOSTON HIGH SCHOOL AUDITORIUM, SOUTH BOSTON, MASS.

In commemorating the thirty-first anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, the citizens of Greater Boston of Lithuanian descent, numbering over 20,000, in solemn sorrow, recall their native land which, centuries ago, extended from the Baltic to the shores of the Black Sea, and whose recorded history, dating back to the thirteenth century, endures to this day, despite the temporary deprivation of her independence by Czarist Russia and the present third occupation.

We know, as do all free people, that as the result of the violation of the Stalin-Hitler Pact of September 20, 1939, our country is suffering extreme brutality under the Bolshevik rule; our countrymen are being continually exiled to forced-labor camps in the far corners of the Russian Empire, sacrificing not only their own lives but those of their children and their relatives, bearing the throes of hunger and hardship.

In consequence of this terror, the remaining youth of Lithuania is carrying on, as partisans, an open battle to the death against their invaders, the Bolsheviks, in the dense forests of Lithuania.

Nevertheless, we are obliged to constitute the fact that all diplomatic assurances relating to the continued existence of our nation seem to lose their force in the light of our apprehension that by the time our late President Roosevelt's words uttered to the American Lithuanian Council on October 20, 1943, that "Lithuania has not lost her independence; it has only been temporarily suspended," are fulfilled, Lithuania will be left a land without people.

Today, when the Atlantic Charter can be applied only to those countries within the imperialistic Russian orbit and not to those countries which have been deprived of their independence; when independence has been recognized to Asiatic lands like Burma and Java; when Israel has been established, it is exceedingly painful to acknowledge that Lithuania, which in the Middle Ages held back wild Mongolian hordes forcing their way through western Europe, thereby preserving western civilization, which through 22 years as an independent nation showed outstanding progress and so effectively opposed two dictators—in German concentration camps alone 29,500 Lithuanians were slaughtered—has been forgotten with other eastern European nations.

It is clear to us today that our loyal Americans, including those of Lithuanian parentage, shedding their blood on the altar of liberty, sacrificed too much if the only result is to have one dictator replaced by another even more barbarous.

We certify the fact that the land of our forefathers up till now has not been visited by delegates of relief organizations, despite the fact that Lithuania was most ravaged and plundered, both by the Nazis and the Bolsheviks. At the same time, millions of dollars have been channeled into enemy countries such as Austria.

We also certify the fact that until the present time the iron curtain has not been lifted; that no emissaries have gone to Lithuania to ascertain why her voice has been stilled; why only terror, executions, exile, and the most glaring want and hardship reign supreme in a country engulfed in blood and tears.

Although an awakened and discerning world is being more and more convinced of the horrors and destruction wrought by Bolshevik dictatorship; although many times we heard the words of righteousness from a free and humanitarian world confirming to our suffering Nation and others similarly suppressed; yet, up until the present we have not heard that our Nation's tragedy has been brought before the world forum, the United Nations, publicly exposing the Red invader, and showing the world what threatens all liberty-loving people.

Therefore, we appeal to the Government of the United States of America that they restore in some small measure that which has been lost and for which Lithuania is suffering and heroically fighting:

1. That the question of the independence of Lithuania be presented in the appropriate sessions of the United Nations and there be supported in the manner required by the United Nations Charter,

That the Red army and bloody Bolshevik police (NGB) be withdrawn immediately from Lithuania and the other Baltic areas such as Estonia and Latvia;

2. That all Lithuanian refugees who are starving in a devastated Europe because of the Nazis and Bolsheviks be permitted to enter the United States of America at the earliest possible date;

3. That the wholesale exile and execution of Lithuanian people, which, according to authentic sources, is again going on in mass proportions, be stopped immediately;

4. That the Marshall plan be applied to eastern Europe, including Lithuania.

A copy of this resolution shall be transmitted to the President of the United States of America, to the Secretary of State of the United States, to the Members of the Congress of the United States, to the United Nations, to the legations of Estonia, France, Great Britain, Latvia, and Russia, and to the press.

BOSTON COMMITTEE FOR LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE,
CHARLES J. KALINOUSKAS, *Chairman.*
V. V. RAUZAS, *Recording Secretary.*

RESOLUTION OF PLATTE COUNTY (NEBR.) BOARD OF SUPERVISORS RELATING TO RELIEF OF STORM-STRICKEN AREAS OF MIDWEST

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and myself I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Board of Commissioners of Platte County, Nebr., expressing their appreciation to the Federal Government for the aid rendered during the recent emergency caused by heavy snowfalls in the Midwest.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the President and Congress of the United States made it possible for the Fifth Army to move into Nebraska to use whatever money and other resources are appropriate to relieve storm-stricken areas to aid isolated humans and farm animals; and

Whereas Gov. Val Peterson declared Platte County as part of Nebraska's emergency storm area; and

Whereas at the request of this board of supervisors, Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, United States Army Engineers, Omaha, Nebr., sent into Platte County Government dozers and set up an area substation in Humphrey, Nebr., to assist in the opening of roads and clearing operations; and

Whereas the Platte County Board of Supervisors have adopted a motion declaring the emergency completed at 6 o'clock p. m., February 21, 1949; and

Whereas in accordance with the reports turned into the county clerk's office, by the respective board members and their representatives in the townships the following are the results of the road opening and clearing operations:

Name of township in Platte County:	*Miles of road opened*
Creston Township	58
Sherman Township	0
Grand Prairie Township	26
Bismark Township	0
Granville Township	51½
Humphrey Township	33
Burrows Township	36
Walker Township	80½
St. Bernard Township	59½
Woodville Township	27½
Joliet Township	31
Monroe Township	12
Shell Creek Township	20
Lost Creek Township	26
Oconee Township	0
Loup Township	23½
Butler Township	4½
Columbus Township	0
Total miles of road opened in county by Government dozers	489
Total miles retracing by reason of snow fall and drifting	98
Total number of people liberated by Government dozers	2,289
Total number of cattle liberated by Government dozers	11,571
Total number of other animals liberated by Government dozers	10,404

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Platte County Board of Supervisors express their appreciation for the Government dozers and other resources sent into Platte County during the emergency to assist in the opening of roads and clearing operations, and to relieve the need of food for humans and feed for farm animals, be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be mailed by the county clerk to President Harry S. Truman, Senators Kenneth S. Wherry and Hugh Butler, Congressman Karl Stefan,

Governor Val Peterson, Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, and Col. Louis W. Prentiss.

ED WOLLBERG,
EDWARD LISIKE,
HERMAN W. MEYER,
JULIUS RUDAT
JOHN BRAUN,
ERNST A. KOEHN,
E. C. JOHNSON,
Platte County Board of Supervisors.

INDEPENDENCE OF PEOPLE OF LITHUANIA

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a resolution adopted by citizens of New York in recognition of the thirty-first anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people of Lithuania, which occurred on February 16, 1949. I also request to have inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of this resolution my own message to the Lithuanian-American Council of Societies, marking in turn the occasion of the thirty-first anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people of Lithuania.

There being no objection, the resolution and message were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Citizens of New York gathered on the 13th day of February 1949 at the Capitol Hotel under the auspices of the Lithuanian American Council of Societies to observe the thirty-first anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people of Lithuania, after due deliberation and vote resolved:

"1. Recalling the solemnly underwritten wartime obligations of the powers associated in the late war to respect the principles of the Atlantic Charter, four freedoms, Yalta declaration to liberated European peoples, and membership obligations under the United Nations Charter; and

"Noting that several years after the end of hostilities in Europe, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and a number of other central and eastern European countries lie subjected under the most oppressive Soviet Russian occupation in violation of the aforesaid solemnly assumed wartime declarations.

"To appeal to the President, Secretary of State, and Members of Congress of the United States to retrieve the honor of the victorious democracies by demanding, in approaching the Soviet Union directly and in an international forum, that the Russian armed forces and the nefarious political police network be withdrawn from Lithuania and other similarly situated sovereign nations whose integrity had been violated by the Nazi-Soviet conspiracy of August and September 1939.

"2. To express their admiration for the liberty-loving people of Lithuania who continue to wage an armed and passive struggle against the Soviet occupation in the defense of their basic human rights, their democratic Christian traditions, and their violated sovereignty, in an unwritten fraternal alliance with the Latvian, Estonian, Ukrainian, Polish, and other underground resistance movements seeking a liberation of their peoples and homelands and a resumption of their rightful place in the family of free sovereign nations of Europe.

"3. To call on the American free press to devote more attention to the disclosure of the insufferable persecution of Christianity in all of the Soviet-dominated countries, beginning with the vile persecution of the Roman Catholic Church of Lithuania since 1940 and extending to an attempted annihilation of all Christian faiths—in the Baltic States, Poland, Hungary, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, and the Balkan States.

"While the travesty of justice perpetrated by the Kremlin against an individual archbishop or cardinal is spectacular, the martyrdom in silence of the millions of Christians in the Baltic States and the Ukraine deserves a more active protest from the Christian communities remaining free thus far.

"4. To express their gratitude to the Senators and Representatives who dedicated congressional speeches and messages of encouragement to the people of Lithuania on the occasion of the present sad observance of the thirty-first anniversary of their declaration of independence.

"Attested:

"LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL OF SOCIETIES,
"JOSEPH GLAVECKAS, *Chairman.*
"DANIEL J. AVERKA, *Secretary.*"

MESSAGE FROM SENATOR IVES

Upon the thirty-first anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people of Lithuania, which was proclaimed on February 16, 1918, I extend to my fellow citizens of Lithuanian descent in this country warm greetings and felicitations and congratulations upon their patriotic endeavor in behalf of the people of Lithuania.

Although the world outlook at the present time is not a happy one and freedom and independence for many peoples may seem sometimes remote, their attainment is, nevertheless, always a definite possibility—even a probability. As long as we who still possess freedom and independence are able to protect and preserve our own freedom and independence, we can continue to exercise our influence effectively in behalf of those less fortunate than ourselves and there is still hope for the small and the weak, the persecuted and oppressed, in the world. Right now the most important task for all Americans is to keep our own country strong and free. By this process we can be best able to help others.

So, recognizing our American responsibility, I urge the people of Lithuania in the United States, who would help to bring freedom and independence to their friends and kindred in Lithuania, to be firm in their determination and unyielding in their endeavor. In this way the ultimate goal can be realized.

IRVING M. IVES.

CABARET TAX—LETTER FROM WISCONSIN STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a letter which I have recently received from the distinguished president of the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor, Mr. George A. Haberman, and from the able secretary-treasurer of the organization, Mr. William Nagorsne. This letter recommends repeal of the 20-percent wartime cabaret tax which has been contributing to unemployment among union musicians and other folks in the entertainment and related industries.

Under my bill which I introduced last Monday, S. 1029, this and other wartime tax rates would be cut back to their peacetime levels. I am hoping, therefore, for early action on this or similar legislation to straighten out the problem that Mr. Haberman mentions and to handle the urgent need for reducing the tax burden on our people.

There being no objection, the latter was received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Milwaukee, Wis., February 9, 1949.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Information has been conveyed to us by organizations of service crafts and entertainment groups affiliated with the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor, advising that the 20-percent cabaret tax is creating a problem which, if continued, will have serious implications in the way of unemployment and future employment opportunities for these groups.

Because of the excessive tax placed upon these institutions, business opportunities are beginning to reflect themselves in patronage of these places. We are fearful that unless some relief is given to these establishments and those who serve directly or indirectly, we shall find considerable unemployment and many business establishments closing their doors due to the excessive cabaret tax.

We trust that you, through your good office, will use your influence in bringing about an equitable adjustment to stave off the serious implications that this tax presently places upon the owners and service people of these establishments.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE A. HABERMAN,
President.
WILLIAM NAGORSNE,
Secretary-Treasurer.

COMPULSORY HEALTH INSURANCE—RESOLUTION OF COLUMBUS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Columbus, Ohio, Chamber of Commerce.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That the Columbus Chamber of Commerce be opposed to the enactment of any proposed Federal legislation in regard to compulsory health insurance in any form for the following reasons:

(a) Compulsory health insurance is a definite step in the direction of communism and totalitarian rule. It will destroy the independent relationship which now exists between practitioner and patient.

(b) Regimentation of medical practice will tend to destroy the incentive for promising young men to enter the medical profession. It will also take away the incentive from the practitioner to become specialized and to persevere within his own field.

(c) Experience with socialized medicine in other countries has proved that the costs of carrying such a program are enormous. To impose this additional cost on the United States economy at present would be ruinous.

(d) Surveys made show that our present health program is serving well. There is no evidence that anyone in real need of medical service or medical care is not receiving it. (Present medical care in the United States compares favorably with that which existed in other leading countries prior to the Second World War.)

(e) Experience has demonstrated there is a tendency on the part of insured persons to often make unnecessary and unreasonable demands upon the medical-care services, thus adding to its cost.

(f) The adoption of a compulsory health-insurance program would not immediately

make available adequate service for all. It is recognized that in some localities hospital facilities and laboratory facilities are inadequate for present times as well as an insufficient number of trained and experienced physicians, dentists, nurses, and other medical personnel. Medical schools and hospitals are filled to capacity in training such personnel. The improvement in the adequacy of the available service will thus result from a program based on the present high standards, whereas there would undoubtedly be a tendency under a compulsory health-insurance program to speed up by short cuts and inadequate training the time required for the graduating of trained personnel; be it further

Resolved, That the officers and executive committee of the chamber be authorized to take any and all action needed to defeat any program of socialistic compulsory health insurance that is proposed.

INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA—RESOLUTIONS OF FEDERATED AMERICAN LITHUANIAN SOCIETIES AND CLUBS

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD resolutions adopted by the Federated American Lithuanian Societies and Clubs, on the occasion of the commemoration of the thirty-first anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Lithuania was declared a free and independent republic on February 16, 1918, in accordance with the sovereign right of all peoples to choose for themselves the form of government under which they wish to live; and

Whereas the United States of America and Great Britain proclaimed certain principles of freedom and justice to all nations, large and small, and expressed this in the Atlantic Charter and four freedoms, to which the U. S. S. R. officially subscribed; and

Whereas in violation of these principles Soviet Russia continues to deprive the Republic of Lithuania of her freedom and is carrying out a policy of genocide, the extermination of a cultural group by ruthlessly annihilating her people through merciless deportation into Siberia, through relentless destruction of her government, industry, culture, and educational system, through wholesale murder and imprisonment of her people: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Lithuanian people of Lowell, Mass., do most vigorously protest and condemn the predatory occupation of Lithuania by Soviet Russia, the continued liquidation, deportation, and dispersion of the Lithuanian people in order to destroy the Lithuanian national entity;

And further, that the Lithuanian people of Lowell, Mass., petition the Government of the United States to maintain and uphold its present policy of nonrecognition of Russian absorption of Lithuania and use its influence to bring about the positive restoration of the violated sovereignty of Lithuania;

And further, that the Lithuanian people of Lowell, Mass., petition that the Government of the United States of America, through its representatives at the United Nations, demand that the General Assembly of the United Nations take proper measures to make Soviet Russia conform and abide by the agreements and covenants of the United Nations Charter;

And further, that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States of America, His Excellency Harry S. Truman; to the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean G. Acheson; to the Senators from Massachusetts, the Honorable Leverett Saltonstall and Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.; and to the Representative of the Fifth Massachusetts Congressional District, the Honorable Edith Nourse Rogers; and to the local press.

AMERICAN LITHUANIAN SOCIETIES AND CLUBS OF LOWELL.

PULASKI MEMORIAL DAY—RESOLUTION BY THE BOARD OF ALDERMEN OF THE CITY OF CHELSEA

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen of the City of Chelsea, Mass., memorializing the Congress to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski Memorial Day Resolution now pending in Congress.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pas , and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress

Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11th of each year as "General Pulaski's Memorial Day" for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

Whereas, the 11th day of October, 1779 is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union, through legislative enactment designated October 11th of each year as "General Pulaski Memorial Day;" and

Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated from October 11, 1929 to October 11, 1946, to be General Pulaski's Memorial Day in United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Aldermen of the city of Chelsea and State of Massachusetts:

SECTION 1. That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day Resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

SEC. 2. That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, and each of the United States Senators and Representatives from Massachusetts.

Joseph E. Thornton, President; David Newman, Joseph B. Greenfield, Andrew P. Murphy, Harry Coltun, Robert H. Brown, Daniel E. Carroll, George J. Gallant, Joseph Margolis.

MVA—RESOLUTIONS BY THE WILLISTON COOPERATIVE CREDIT UNION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD resolutions adopted by the Williston Cooperative Credit Union, on January 29, 1949.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We, the stockholders of the Williston Cooperative Credit Union, assembled in annual meeting on this 29th day of January 1949, recommend the following resolutions:

"1. The forming of a Missouri Valley Authority patterned after the Tennessee Valley Authority.

"2. Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation and Army engineers are not in accord with proposed projects and their construction, which often delays this work for months, that these agencies be put under the same head, preferably the Department of Agriculture.

"3. Higher corporation tax and higher tax on individuals in the higher income groups; also higher exemptions for those in the low-income groups.

"4. The resignation of Forrestal as Secretary of Defense.

"5. The repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act.

"6. We realize the necessity of streamlining our governmental bureaucracies, but feel the Hoover plan should be carefully studied by our Senators and Representatives before any action is taken as streamlining can give way to dictatorship.

"7. The passage of the Full Employment Act of 1950, sponsored by the National Farmers Union and endorsed by JOHN J. SPARKMAN (Democrat from Alabama) and JAMES E. MURRAY (Democrat from Montana) in the Senate and in the House of Representatives by WRIGHT PATMAN (Democrat from Texas), which provides for a revolving $15,000,000,000 to avert future depressions and to stimulate industry in undeveloped areas.

"8. As agriculture is the backbone of our Nation's economy, 100 percent parity on all farm products.

"9. The passing of a bill to make appropriations for creating an 'ever normal granary.'"

We further recommend that copies of these recommendations be sent to President Truman and to our national Senators and Representatives.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. REED, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 255. A bill to amend section 205 of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to joint boards; without amendment (Rept. No. 81);

S. 256. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 82); and

S. 257. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide limitations on the time within which actions may be brought for the recovery of undercharges and overcharges by or against common carriers by motor vehicles, common carriers by water, and freight forwarders; with an amendment (Rept. No. 83).

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 32. Resolution authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; with an amendment (Rept. No. 85); and

S. Res. 40. Resolution relating to an investigation of the immigration laws and the administration thereof; with an amendment (Rept. No. 86).

MYRA M. HARDY

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably Senate Resolution 71, submitted by Mr. O'MAHONEY on the 14th instant, and I submit a report (No. 80) thereon. I request its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the resolution for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 71) was read as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Myra M. Hardy, widow of Charles Oscar Hardy, late an employee of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I understand that is one of the usual 6 months' gratuities.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE PROBLEMS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 72, submitted by Mr. THYE on the 17th instant, and I request its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 72) was read as follows:

Resolved, That the authority of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under Senate Resolution 223, Eightieth Congress, agreed to June 12, 1948 (providing for an investigation of all problems related to foot-and-mouth disease and its incidence in neighboring countries), is hereby continued during the Eighty-first Congress; and the limit of expenditures under such resolution is hereby increased to $8,000.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. HAYDEN. The amount available to the committee at the present moment is about $6,000. They think it will cost about $8,000 to make a trip to Mexico City, where we are spending large sums of money. I think the resolution should be agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS OF COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE ON LABOR RELATIONS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 74, submitted by Mr. THOMAS of Utah on the 22d instant, and I request its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 74) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That 1,000 additional copies of part 1 and each subsequent part of the hearings held before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on labor relations be printed for the use of said committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, February 25, 1949, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 492. An act to amend the act approved June 29, 1949, entitled "An act to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va.";

S. 548. An act to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports, and for other purposes; and

S. 713. An act to amend Public Law 533 of the Eightieth Congress authorizing the construction of a building for the General Accounting Office on square 518 in the District of Columbia.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1044. A bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to provide for an Under Secretary of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1045. A bill to exempt articles purchased for the use of volunteer fire companies from the manufacturers excise tax imposed by chapter 29 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1046. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional protection for owners of patents of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910, as amended, so as to protect the United States in certain patent suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 1047. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of George M. Vaughan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 1048. A bill for the relief of Saul Phillips; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 1049. A bill for the relief of Amy Alexandrovna Taylor and Myrna Taylor;

S. 1050. A bill for the relief of Prospero Honore Latour and his wife, Maria Luisa Lee Latour;

S. 1051. A bill for the relief of John Splingaerd, his wife, and two children; and

S. 1052. A bill for the relief of Jules Maurice Lotode, his wife, and three children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNEY (for himself and Mr. KNOWLAND):

S. 1053. A bill to authorize use of rental and operating income from defense housing facilities of the National Military Establishment for payments in lieu of taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEM:

S. 1054. A bill for the relief of Northwest Missouri Fair Association, of Bethany, Harrison County, Mo.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. WILEY introduced Senate bill 1055, to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 1056. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mary One Goose;

S. 1057. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Kathleen Doyle Harris;

S. 1058. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to June Scott Skoog; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs;

S. 1059. A bill for the relief of John W. Wagner; and

S. 1060. A bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 to include within the immigration quotas for Germany and Austria certain persons of German ethnic origin who were born in the Soviet Union; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 1061. A bill to prohibit the Reconstruction Finance Corporation from making loans to business enterprises which propose to use such loans for the purpose of relocating industries; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1062. A bill to provide for the cancellation of certain obligations arising out of the repatriation of United States citizens who after December 7, 1941, were prevented from returning to the United States as a result of enemy activity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. McCARRAN introduced Senate bill 1063, to provide economic, financial, and other aid to China, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 1064. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Mrs. Iris Huebner Marak a patent in fee to certain land; and

S. 1065. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Charles Short Step a patent in fee to certain land; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. HILL, Mr. MCFARLAND, Mr. HOEY, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. MYERS, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. NEELY, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. MCCARTHY) introduced Senate bill 1066, to establish a Federal commission on services for the physically handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 1067. A bill to amend sections 44 and 38 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. MARTIN introduced Senate bill 1068, to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the death of Albert Gallatin, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 1069. A bill to amend section 3552 of the Revised Statutes relating to the covering into the Treasury of all moneys arising from charges and deductions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(Mr. ELLENDER (for himself, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. WAGNER, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. MYERS, Mr. HILL, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. LONG, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FREAR, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. TAFT, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. LODGE, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. IVES, Mr. THYE, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine) introduced Senate bill 1070, to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 1071. A bill to amend the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CONNALLY:

S. 1072. A bill for the relief of the Trust Association of H. Kempner; to the Committee on the Judiciary;

S. 1073 (by request). A bill to amend the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such organization; and

S. 1074 (by request). A bill to provide for the settlement of certain claims of the Government of the United States on its own behalf and on behalf of American nationals against foreign governments; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (by request):

S. 1075. A bill to provide that the United States shall aid the States in fish restoration and management projects, and for other purposes;

S. 1076. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451; 16 U. S. C. 718b), as amended; and

S. 1077. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to provide a more equitable method of paying for the transportation of mail and for subsidizing essential aircraft operation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1078. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to contract with certificated air carriers for the transportation of large shipments of air mail; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1079. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hope Irene Buley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1080. A bill for the relief of James A. Gordon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina also introduced Senate bill 1081, to repeal the Canal Zone Retirement Act, and to extend the Civil Service Retirement Act, with amendments, to employees affected by such repeal, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1082. A bill for the purpose of erecting adequate Federal office and postal facilities in Tacoma, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

(Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma introduced Senate bill 1083, to foster the cooperative agriculture education work of the Extension Services; to free the Extension Services from the performance of nongovernmental functions and political activity; and to promote economy in the expenditure of public funds for the conduct of cooperative agricultural extension work, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BALDWIN (for himself and Mr. MCGRATH):

S. 1084. A bill to incorporate the Gold Star Wives of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STENNIS:

S. 1085. A bill to authorize Federal aid to school districts overburdened with war-incurred or defense-incurred school enrollments or by Federal activity in such district for the construction of additional school facilities; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 1086. A bill for the relief of the Dixie Margarine Co., a Tennessee corporation, of Memphis, Tenn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 1087. A bill for the relief of Leon Nikolaivich Volkov; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 1088. A bill for the relief of Milton Buechler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1089. A bill to amend section 8c of the Agricultural Adjustment Act relating to marketing agreements and orders, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to issue orders under such section with respect to filberts; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr McFARLAND (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado):

S. 1090. A bill to amend certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 1091. A bill for the relief of E. R. Ensey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. SPARKMAN) introduced Senate bill 1092, to provide for aid in industrialization of underdeveloped areas, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. MURRAY) introduced Senate bill 1093, to encourage fuller participation by small business concerns in soundly expanded foreign trade through Government insurance for United States exports, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. O'CONOR:

S. 1094. A bill authorizing and directing the United States Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to undertake a continuing study of the shad, alosa sapidissima, of the Atlantic coast with respect to the biology, propagation, and abundance of such species to the end that such Service may recommend to the several States of the Atlantic coast through the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission appropriate measures for arresting the decline of this valuable food fish and for increasing the abundance and promoting the wisest utilization thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado introduced Senate bill 1095, to establish a Federal Traffic Bureau, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. VANDENBERG (for himself and Mr. FERGUSON) introduced Senate Joint Resolution 56, extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1956 Olympic Games at Detroit, Mich., which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF DISPLACED PERSONS ACT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948. Under this bill the present cut-off date of eligibility for admission of displaced persons to our country will be revised from December 22, 1945, to January 1, 1949. This will make eligible some 175,000 persons now excluded from the law.

As a background to this bill, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD the text of a statement which I released Wednesday afternoon on major revisions in the present statute. As stated in my release, I intend shortly to introduce or cosponsor a bill which will apply all of the principles set forth in my comments. This will be done as soon as the technical problems in the drafting of this bill are resolved.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1055) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

PRINCIPLES IN HUMANITARIAN REVISION OF DP LAW

Liberalizing amendments which I propose

At this time I should like to set forth what I believe might well be the basic principles in revision of the present inadequate Displaced Persons Statute. I feel that a statement on these principles is most appropriate now amidst the celebration of National Brotherhood Week. During this week, members of America's three great religious faiths will reconsecrate themselves to the ideals of religious harmony and unity. As I have previously stated, no greater demonstration of such harmony and unity can come than from the further agreement of these faiths on fundamental provisions for the new DP law which they have recently in substance concurred in. Thus, we would be removing for all time, misunderstandings and differences which have developed among the faiths over this law. We would be clearing the atmosphere, cleansing the fears, antidoting some of the synthetic thinking which has arisen over this much misunderstood issue.

This issue should be above partisan politics; above the question of personalities; it is a topic meriting our highest, clearest, most sympathetic thinking and action.

New amendment being introduced to change cut-off date

By way of specific action, rather than mere words or principles, I am going to introduce immediately in the Senate a bill to revise the "cut-off date" of eligibility of the present displaced persons statute. The present date set by the act—December 22, 1945—is unfortunately inequitable in that it bars 135,000 persons who are displaced persons under the classification of the International Refugee Organization.

The amendment which I am introducing, therefore, sets a new cut-off date of eligibility

at January 1, 1949. This date, which is later than that proposed by all other amendments now pending to the DP law (most of which provide for a cut-off date of April 21, 1947) will, I believe, be completely satisfactory to all groups in that it will take care of all legitimate displaced persons, many of whom, incidentally, will want to emigrate to countries other than the United States. I understand that there are some 40,000 to 45,000 eligible DP's, meeting IRO qualifications who have entered the Allied occupied zones of Germany and Austria between April of 1947 and December of 1948. These individuals should not be excluded from provisions of the law.

Now, with regard to other revisions of the law, I should like to spell out the basic principles as I see them. These principles supplement those I have already endorsed publicly.

Basic ideas for law's revisions

1. The date of eligibility in the statute for DP's should be late enough, i. e., January 1, 1949, in order to handle adequately the needs of all rightful DP's. There should be no discrimination because some individuals fled or were expelled at a later date than others. Assuming individuals pass an appropriate screening test, they should be treated fairly and equally, regardless of date.

2. The period of operation of the DP law should be extended to 4 years in order to permit a thorough handling of this problem. We are hoping that it will be disposed of well before the end of the 4-year deadline, and we have every assurance that it will be, but the law should be specifically amended to so provide.

3. There should be no mortgaging of future quotas in the DP law. Such mortgaging is inconsistent with the humanitarian principles of the law.

Cut out red tape; speed admissions

4. We should eliminate needless red tape in connection with the law by substitution for the present specific job and housing assurances an adequate provision that the DP would not become a public charge. This would be entirely satisfactory and in line with the provisions of our general immigration law.

5. As recommended by all the religious faiths, the total coverage under the act, which is now 205,000 persons, should be broadened to upward of 400,000 persons, with some additions for orphans, etc., outlined below.

Fair nondiscriminatory treatment for all groups

6. There should be implicit in the revision a thorough understanding that in the operation of the law there would be no discrimination based upon race, religion, or national origin, and that all groups and elements in the DP category are fairly treated.

7. As indicated above, additional orphan children (than those presently provided for) should be taken in under the law, and the age limit, which is now 16 years of age, should be raised.

8. There should be adequate provision so that political and religious refugees fleeing from communistic persecution in Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Estonia, Germany, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, etc., could be brought in within the numbers under the DP law.

9. We should provide so that the DP's who are both inside IRO camps and outside IRO camps should be included within the over-all total under the law. Persons working and living outside these camps should not be penalized, as under the present statute.

Eliminating rigid percentage preferences

10. There should be repealed the specific preference for Baltic groups contained in the present law, which preference only serves as a handicap to efficient work under the law.

11. Provision should be made so that, insofar as administratively possible, priority should be given to agricultural workers who are DP's, thus preventing overconcentration of DP's in our already overcongested cities. However, in order to minimize red tape, this agricultural preference should not be expressed, as in the present law, on a rigid 30-percent basis or on any rigid percentage basis at all.

12. The 15,000 DP's now in the United States should be permitted permanent residence on action by the Attorney General rather than have the Congress bog itself down with specific private immigration bills for each of these persons.

13. If found financially feasible, loan arrangements should be made to facilitate the inland transportation of DP's, making sure the areas distant from ports of entry are not discriminated against. This arrangement should, however, not come in the form of a grant, but rather in the form of a loan if found feasible.

Arrangements for expellees

14. Provision should be made so that persons expelled from Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Poland, etc. (to our areas in Germany and Austria) should be granted admission to our country in necessarily limited numbers. These numbers should not, however, compete with:

(a) eligible displaced persons, or,

(b) with individuals who might come in under the German and Austrian quotas (which competition is in the present statute).

It would be unfair to all groups concerned if the stricken group of expellees were admitted in such a way as to "bite into" the numbers assigned to DP's or to the quotas assigned to Germans and Austrians eligible to enter our country under regular quota provisions.

15. Provision should be made so as to screen out not only those individuals who might favor the overthrow of the American form of government, but those individuals who actively participated in political, racial, or religious persecution.

Applying these principles specifically in a new bill

I don't believe that I or any other Senator or Congressman could try right now to spell out finally exactly how all these principles should be written into law. They will become the topic necessarily of comprehensive hearings. But I believe that if these principles are generally followed, we will be assuring justice and equity for these refugees in full keeping with the humanitarian traditions of our country. In addition, there will be other needed provisions which will come up.

In order to assure fair treatment for each of the groups involved and for individuals, each of those additional revisions should, and I am sure will, receive the sympathetic and careful attention of Congress.

Later on, as soon as technical drafting problems are resolved, I shall be happy to introduce or cosponsor a bill applying these principles specifically.

These changes which I have recommended would, I believe, be in line with the finest principles of Brotherhood Week and the best traditions of the American way of life "holding up a standard to which the wise and honest might repair."

Clarification of the so-called and misnamed Wiley bill

I am delighted to make these suggestions, particularly because my own name has sometimes been mistakenly identified with the present DP statute. As my brother Senators stated on the Senate floor:

(a) The present law represents largely the work of the Immigration Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate.

(b) I personally did not write a word, a clause, or a line of the present law.

(c) The bill (S. 2242) was introduced in my name solely because I happened to be chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee at the time. Literally hundreds of bills during each Congress are introduced in chairmen's names merely as a matter of legislative convenience.

(d) My own committee handled one-third of all bills in the Senate—around 1,500 in all. Necessarily, as a chairman who had appointed subcommittees to work on the DP and other bills, I had to respect insofar as possible the conscientious work of our able subcommittee members who reported recommendations to the full committee on this vast number of bills.

CONCLUSION

But the present issue before us, as I have stated, is not a question of personalities, of individuals identified or not identified with the original bill or its amendments. The issue is only one of America's humanitarian obligations to herself, to displaced persons, and to the world.

The present statute was only a compromise stop-gap mechanism; we had the alternative of setting up such a mechanism or doing nothing at all. Now, the time is overdue for an overhauling of the stop-gap mechanism along the lines laid down above.

AID TO CHINA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide economic financial and other aid to China, and I request that an explanatory statement of the bill prepared by me be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1063) to provide economic, financial and other aid to China, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN, was received, read twice, by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR M'CARRAN

The bill would authorize this Government to embark upon a policy in the Far East that is a real policy. It proposes aid that will achieve real results. On April 3 of this year, the present China Aid Act of 1948 expires. The objectives sought by that act have not been accomplished, not through any lack of desire on our part but because of conditions with which the Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration was not properly armed to cope. It is incumbent upon us to provide the necessary legislation to make a real foreign policy in Asia. I believe this bill is a long step in that direction. It provides generally three types of aid—economic, financial, and military. The economic aid would be provided along the same lines that have been instituted by our present economic program. The bill also provides financial assistance so that the government of China may restore confidence in itself by necessary monetary reform. Finally, the bill provides what I believe is an adequate amount for military equipment, supplies, and matériel, including proper supervision of the acquisition, distribution, and use thereof. It provides assistance on a realistic loan basis, with collateral security.

I am not naive enough to believe this bill is a panacea for the many troubles with which the present Chinese Government is confronted. It will, however, provide a vehicle by which, if we in the United States are sincere in our desire to aid the Chinese people and to prevent the spread of Communism, we may effectively aid in securing these objectives.

Events in Asia are daily emphasizing the cold hard truth of the motivating power behind the Chinese Communists. No longer can even the most optimistic believe that the war in China is a mere revolt of an oppressed people. The tenacity with which the Communists hold on to the olive branch they claim to have extended is indicative of Moscow's determination to exercise its complete control over this prostrate nation, not by a peaceful settlement, but by complete surrender of those forces who would, if given the opportunity, oppose the international expansion of Communism.

Secretary Acheson stated to the Congress on March 20, 1947, when it was considering the Greek-Turkish aid program, that such a program was more necessary for Greece than for China at that time because the Greek Government was approaching collapse and it was threatened with defeat by the Communists. Such a time has now come to China. It is no answer to say that it is too late. The state of our future security is in the balance, and we cannot escape our responsibility by thus dismissing the choice with which we are faced.

Flushed with recent victories, the real hand behind the Chinese Communists is making itself known in Asia today. Korea is a powder keg, ready to explode in our face if we are pushed out of China as a force in opposition to communism. Reports already indicate the situation approaches outright war between the southern portion, which we recognize, and the northern or Communist portion, which the Soviets recognize.

Make no mistake, if the Communists are not stopped in China, the next step will be Korea and do not forget that in Korea we still maintain occupation troops and if trouble becomes serious in that country our boys must fight or get out and admit to the world that we are losing our battle for the survival of freedom.

I am firmly convinced that the greatest mistake we make today is underestimation of the ability of the Communists to succeed in their objectives. Many people believe that because the basic philosophy and history of the Chinese people is diametrically opposed to the Communist doctrine, we do not have to fear Communist success in China. Such thinking is not realistic; it fails to take into account the numerous previous successes of communistic policy in similar cases. Surely, by this time, history has proved that today's Communist leaders are not motivated by a philosophy, but rather by a hard, cruel determination to enslave the world; and they do not hesitate to adjust the party line to meet all circumstances necessary to achieve any objective they believe worthy of pursuit.

Surely the record has been made clear to anyone that our way of life cannot exist except in conflict with that of the so-called Communists. All that we have accomplished in China in the way of religious advancement, political democracy, and friendship will certainly and surely be lost unless we maintain those elements in China who will not compromise with communism. Certainly the nationalist government has made mistakes. It has not been the most efficient government in the world, but our own Government makes mistakes; nor are we always completely efficient. However, those policies, those principles for which this Nation was founded cannot be compromised anywhere, and to attempt to compromise them in the Far East is tantamount to surrender and retreat.

In 1899, our then Secretary of State, Mr. John Hay, said, and I quote, "The storm center of the world has gradually shifted to China. Whoever understands that mighty Empire socially, politically, and economically and religiously, has a key to politics for the next 500 years." That statement made 50 years ago is just as true today, if not more so. Let us not underestimate the foe with which we are dealing. He is an intelligent, smart, and aggressive opponent in the struggle for world domination. If we are not his superior in planning, in strategy, then we will find ourselves under his domination.

Let us turn our eyes for a moment to Europe. We are all saddened by the recent events in those satellite countries where the Communist masters have undertaken to destroy by the foulest means man's only hope for real progress, that is, belief in God, and religious freedom. Surely, those men who directed this attack upon christendom anticipated the effect of their action upon world opinion. No one having come as far as the Communist leaders have come could fail to have considered the world repercussion to such action and yet, why was it undertaken? To institute war? No. If the men in the Kremlin had desired war, there have been many more previous incidents upon which they could have started a war. No; the real objective must have been to center the attention of the world again upon the heart of Europe. The Berlin blockade having faded into the back seat of attention, why was it necessary for the world to have its attention directed to events in this part of Europe? A new provocation was necessary if world attention was to be focused in any one new direction. I am convinced that these despicable events were designed for one purpose only—to divert the attention of the world from the events that have been happening so swiftly in China in the past few months. The successes of the Communists in China had been more than had been hoped for. They had been so spectacular that the attention of the whole world was being attracted to China. Thought was being given as to the future of the Orient. This attention had to be diverted. The Communists needed time to consolidate their gains before resuming their southward push. If they can succeed in keeping our attention, and that of the rest of the world, centered in Europe, they may well succeed in their plan to overrun all of China.

I, for one, do not propose to be blinded by this tactic. While I deplore the degrading and un-Christian action the Communists have taken in Hungary, I cannot forget that similar action has been taking place in China. There also, men of God have met death because they would not compromise their principles with the Godlessness of communism. If we do not recognize the implications of the present situation and take immediate action to stop this thrust in the Orient, all that we have done for the peoples of Asia religiously, politically, and economically will go by the board and we will stand judged by history as having failed our Christian duty to the world. I commend this bill that I have introduced to the study of the Members of the Senate, and hope that it receives their support; for, as of today, we are still at the crossroads, but we cannot delay the decision much longer. To delay it means having it made by others, and surely we cannot afford that.

FEDERAL COMMISSION ON SERVICES FOR THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], my colleague, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish a Federal commission on services for the physically handicapped.

The bill is the result of a long, evolutionary process, and incorporates many of the suggestions of experts and specialists who have testified before various congressional committees in recent years, including the House Labor Subcommittee To Investigate Aid to the Physically Handicapped, the Senate Subcommittee on War-Time Health and Education, and other hearings and studies by the committees of Congress. The bill was formulated after consultations with representatives of many organizations, and represents, in my judgment, a needed, practical approach to solution of the very difficult problems of many of our 28,000,000 physically handicapped citizens. In its present form, the bill meets requirements which previous measures with which I have been associated, H. R. 5206, and S. 2896, upon hearings and study, indicated were necessary.

The principles of the bill have been strongly endorsed by many organizations and individuals representing business, industry, labor, veterans, farm, women, educational, civic, fraternal, scientific and professional and other groups, approximating representation of some 30,000,000 people. I urge the Congress to take early and favorable action upon this measure.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement by Mr. Paul A. Strachan, president of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, and an analysis of the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill, together with the statement and analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1066) to establish a Federal Commission on Services for the Physically Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. HILL, Mr. MCFARLAND, Mr. HOEY, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. MYERS, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. NEELY, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. MCCARTHY), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and

Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby created and established an agency of the United States, to be known as the Federal Commission on Services for the Physically Handicapped, which shall administer the provisions of this act, and all activities outlined under the following titles:

TITLE I. PURPOSES

SEC. 101. The purposes of this act, in furtherance of the general welfare of the United States, are (a) to provide for maximum extension of medical services, education and training, vocational guidance, and full-employment opportunities to citizens handicapped by physical or mental disability; (b) to provide for a more effective coordination of the functions of the Federal Government relating to the rehabilitation and employment of the handicapped; (c) to establish a Federal Interagency Committee on Rehabilitation and Employment of Handicapped; (d) to establish a National Commission on Employment of Handicapped, composed of organizations and individuals outside of Government, to encourage employment of handicapped; (e) to provide for cooperative enterprises for the handicapped; (f) to provide financial grants to handicapped who are totally and permanently disabled; (g) to provide educational grants to handicapped who require home or special training; to establish the Federal Services to Handicapped Revolving Loan Fund, from which fund States may borrow money at such times as their own funds for vocational rehabilitation are exhausted, and to appropriate an initial sum of $10,000,000 for such revolving loan fund; (h) to establish a Division for Handicapped in the United States Civil Service Commission; (i) to promote public safety programs designed to eliminate and prevent conditions which tend to promote injuries and disease in public buildings, institutions, parks etc.; (j) to provide for reports on the handicapped from the United States Public Health Service, United States Bureau of Mines, United States Coast Guard, Interstate Commerce Commission, and Civil Aeronautics Administration, and other Federal agencies which may now receive, as a part of their functions, reports upon persons disabled through accidents or disease, and for other purposes.

TITLE II. ORGANIZATION

SEC. 201. The Federal Commission on Services for the Physically Handicapped (hereafter termed the Commission) shall be headed by an Administrator, who shall be appointed for a term of 4 years by the President, by and with advice and consent of the Senate. The Administrator shall be paid a salary of $15,000 per annum, and, after consultation with the Advisory Committee on Affairs of the Handicapped (hereinafter described), is hereby authorized and directed to perform all duties, functions, and powers vested in him by this act. He shall have power to issue such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act, and to fix the pay of officials and employees in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. He may also employ such specialists and consultants as may be required, without reference to civil-service laws. Whenever practicable, persons appointed shall be drawn from otherwise qualified, but physically handicapped applicants.

SEC. 202. The functions of the Federal Security Administrator, relating to vocational rehabilitation, and the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation are hereby transferred to the Commission, together with all funds, personnel, and records. Hereafter the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation shall be abolished, and the Federal Commission on Services for the Physically Handicapped shall administer the Federal Vocational Training acts heretofore administered by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, retaining the present personnel of that agency, and maintaining the present relation with the States, with such additional functions as may be granted by this act.

SEC. 203. There is hereby established an Advisory Council on Affairs of the Handicapped, to be responsible to the Administrator in the formulation of administrative policies, and to advise him on any matters relating to promoting the purposes of this act. The Council shall consist of nine members, who shall be selected by the Administrator, as follows: Two to be chosen as representatives of the public; two, as representatives of employers; two, as representatives of bona fide labor organizations, and three who are themselves physically handicapped, from bona fide organizations of the physically handicapped. The Administrator shall be ex officio Chairman of the Advisory Council, which shall act in an advisory capacity to the Commission and shall meet not less than twice yearly or oftener, on call of the Chairman. Appointed members shall serve for a period of 3 years and shall be paid traveling and other necessary expenses, and a per diem of $50 per day for each day of actual service.

SEC. 204. There is hereby established a Federal Interagency Committee on Rehabilitation and Employment of Handicapped, which shall comprise qualified representatives to be chosen by the heads of all Federal departments or agencies which now or in future may have a substantial and significant participation in activities dealing with problems of the handicapped.

(a) The Administrator shall serve as chairman of the Federal Interagency Committee; shall prepare agendas therefor, and shall effectuate, insofar as may be possible, the programs and policies developed by the committee.

(b) The purpose of this committee shall be to develop and effectuate more economical and efficient methods for the administration of activities relating to the handicapped, and to perform and coordinate functions, including research, to develop advanced programs for the blind, deaf, hard of hearing, cardiacs, tuberculous, arthritics, epileptics, poliomyelitics, cerebral palsied, amputees, diabetics, and any other large or distinct group of handicapped, such programs to comprehend the following activities:

(2) To collect, tabulate, and make public statistics pertaining to the physically handicapped.

(3) To ascertain what fields of employment are available to the physically handicapped and make such information public at least once yearly.

(4) To acquaint employers in private industry with the special capabilities of the physically handicapped, and encourage their employment, where feasible and practicable, on an equal footing with the nonhandicapped.

(5) To cooperate with public and private agencies, organizations, and individuals, in the medical and vocational rehabilitation and placement in suitable employment of handicapped persons.

SEC. 205. There is hereby established a National Commission on Employment of Handicapped, to consist of organizations and individuals outside of the Federal Government, representing industry, business, labor, veterans, farm, women, welfare, educational, religious, civic, fraternal, scientific and professional, and other groups and individuals which, upon invitation of the Administrator, acting for the President of the United States, may voluntarily cooperate in advancing employment of handicapped persons.

(a) This Commission shall have the right to establish its own rules of procedure and to designate, by proper election, its chairman and other officers, and the small staff required to carry on its work, as well as quarters, equipment, and so forth, shall be furnished by the Administrator.

(b) The sum of $250,000, or such part as may be necessary, is hereby authorized to be appropriated each year, out of the Treasury, from moneys not otherwise appropriated, to carry on the work of this Commission on Employment of the Handicapped, and all funds shall be cleared through the Administrator of the Federal Commission on Services for the Physically Handicapped, upon proper certification by the duly elected head of the National Commission for Employment of the Handicapped.

TITLE III. COOPERATIVE ENTERPRISES FOR HANDICAPPED

SEC. 301. The sum of $10,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year 1950, and $5,000,000 annually for each of the 5 years thereafter, for establishing and maintaining special industries for physically handicapped persons.

SEC. 302. Out of the foregoing sums, the Commission is authorized and empowered to make loans, through its State agencies and affiliates, to persons, corporations, States, Territories, or subdivisions or agencies thereof, and to limited dividend associate organizations organized under the laws of any State or Territory, for the purpose of financing work projects for physically handicapped persons, primarily drawn from the group regarded as "unfeasible for rehabilitation" who require special conditions of employment and training, such as is now afforded in a very limited way by various so-called handicapped persons' industries, sheltered workshops, etc. No single loan shall exceed $20,000, and not less than 25 percent in amount of all loans shall be granted in rural areas.

SEC. 303. Such loans shall be made on such terms and conditions as the Commission shall determine: *Provided*, That, except as provided in section 304, all loans shall be self-liquidating in not to exceed 25 years, and shall bear interest at a rate equal to the average rate payable by the United States on its obligations having maturity in 10 years or more after the dates thereof, issued during the last preceding fiscal year in which any such obligations were issued: *Provided further*, That no loans for the purchase, construction, enlargement, or operation of any plan shall be made without the consent of the State authority having jurisdiction in the premises first being obtained.

SEC. 304. The Commission is hereby authorized to make loans to finance projects which are not self-liquidating as provided in section 303, upon receiving the written findings of the Administrator that (1) such project cannot be operated at a profit, (2) any loss will be caused by the physical handicaps of the persons employed on the project, (3) such loss will not exceed per centum of the gross income of the project, (4) the persons employed on the project will derive substantial nonmonetary benefit therefrom, and (5) no other project has been found which is feasible for such person or persons and which will contribute to their well-being.

TITLE IV. GRANTS TO STATES FOR AID TO THE TOTALLY DISABLED, UNFEASIBLE FOR REHABILITATION

SEC. 401. Appropriation:

For the purpose of enabling each State to furnish financial assistance to needy individuals who are physically or mentally handicapped to such a degree that they are certified by the State agency representing the Commission as being unfeasible for rehabilitation, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, the sum of $, and there

is hereby authorized to be apropriated for each fiscal year thereafter a sum sufficient to carry out the purposes of sections 401–405 of this act. The sums made available under this section shall be used for making payments to States which have submitted, and had approved by the Commission, State plans for aid to the totally disabled.

SEC. 402. State plans for aid to the totally disabled:

(a) A State plan for aid to the totally disabled must (1) provide that it shall be in effect in all political subdivisions of the State, and, if administered by them, be mandatory upon them; (2) either provide for the designation or establishment of a single State agency to administer the plan, utilizing present State agencies for vocational rehabilitation, as provided for in section 202 of this act, or provide for the designation of a single State agency to supervise administration of the plan; (3) to provide for payment of $60 per month to each individual certified by the State as totally and permanently disabled, unfeasible for rehabilitation, and without means of livelihood and support; (4) provide that the State, through appropriate agencies, subject to the regulations of the Commission shall at least once each year make a thorough medical examination of all nonfeasible cases to determine whether they are capable of rehabilitation; make a report of all cases found to be capable of rehabilitation to the Commission, discontinue payments to such cases and apply to them the regular processes of rehabilitation, pursuant to the act of June 2, 1920, case 219 (41 Stat. 735) as amended: *Provided*, That if any of such cases, determined to be potentially capable of rehabilitation, after treatment or training are found to be incapable of taking care of themselves or earning their own living, then, upon examination and certification by the States' agency or agencies representing the Commission, the State shall re-enter such unfeasible cases upon its registers and the monthly payment of $60 shall be immediately issued; (5) provide for granting to any individual whose claim for aid is denied an opportunity for a fair hearing before such State agency; (6) provide such methods of administration (including methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, except that the Commission shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods) as are found by the Commission to be necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the plan; (7) provide that the State agency will make such reports in such form and containing such information as the Commission may, from time to time require, and comply with such provisions as the Commission may, from time to time find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports; (8) provide that the State agency shall, in determining need, take into consideration any other income and resources of an individual claiming aid to the totally disabled; (9) provide safeguards which restrict the use or disclosure of information concerning applicants and recipients to purposes directly connected with the administration of aid to the totally disabled.

(b) The Commission shall approve any plan which fulfills the conditions specified in subsection (a), except that it shall not approve any plan which imposes, as a condition of eligibility for aid to the totally disabled under the plan—

(1) any residence requirement which excludes any resident of the State, who has resided there for 1 year immediately preceding the application; or

(2) any citizenship requirement which excludes any citizen of the United States.

(c) The lack of requirement in this title for financial participation by the States in plans for aid to the totally disabled shall not preclude individual States from paying additional benefits to such persons, nor shall applicants for such aid to the totally disabled be debarred from applying for, or receiving other benefits, if such are necessary and justified to provide living expenses, medical costs, care by attendants, and so forth.

SEC. 403. Payments to States:

(a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan for aid to the totally disabled, for each quarter, beginning with the quarter commencing ----------, (1) an amount, which shall be used exclusively as aid to the totally disabled, equal to the multiple of $60 times the number of monthly payments made during each quarter to individuals certified by the State agency representing the Commission, pursuant to section 402 (not including any individual who had been reported by the State to the Commission as capable of rehabilitation unless such individual has been subsequently found to be incapable of rehabilitation) and (2) an amount equal to the total of the sums expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Commission for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan, which shall be used for paying the costs of administering the State plan or for aid to the totally disabled, or both, and for no other purposes.

(b) the method of computing and paying such amounts shall be as follows:

(1) The Commission shall, prior to the beginning of each quarter, estimate the amount to be paid to the State for such quarter under the provisions of subsection (a), such estimate to be based on (A) a report filed by the State containing its estimate of the total sum to be expended in such quarter in accordance with the provisions of such subsection, and stating the amount appropriated or made available by the State and its political subdivisions for such expenditure in such quarter, and if such amount is less than the State's proportionate share of the total sum of such estimated expenditures, the source or sources from which the difference is expected to be derived, (B) records showing the number of handicapped individuals in the State, and (C) such other investigation as the Administrator may find necessary.

(2) The Commission shall then certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount estimated by the Commission, (A) reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum which he finds that his estimate for any prior quarter was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to the State under subsection (a) for such quarter, and (B) reduced by a sum equivalent to the pro rata share to which the United States is equitably entitled, as determined by the Commission, of the net amount recovered during a prior quarter by the State or any political subdivision thereof with respect to aid to the totally disabled furnished under the State plan; except that such increase or reduction shall not be made to the extent that such sums have been applied to make the amount certified for any prior quarter greater or less than the amount estimated by the Commission for such prior quarter: *Provided*, That any part of the amount recovered from the estate of a deceased recipient which is not in excess of the amount expended by the State or any political subdivision thereof for the funeral expenses of the deceased shall not be considered as a basis for reduction under the clause (B) of this paragraph.

(3) The Secretary of the Treasury shall thereupon, through the Fiscal Service of the Treasury Department, and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, pay to the State at the time or times fixed by the Administrator the amount so certified.

SEC. 404. Change in or failure to comply with plans; stopping payments:

In the case of any State plan for aid to the totally disabled which has been approved by the Commission, if the Commission, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering or supervising the administration of such plan, finds that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any provisions required by section 402 of this act to be included in the plan, or that the plan has been so changed or administered as to impose any residence or citizenship requirement prohibited by section 402 (b), The Commission shall notify such State agency that further payments will not be made to the State until the Commission is satisfied that such prohibited requirement is no longer so imposed, and there is no longer any such failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied the Administrator of the Commission shall make no further certification to the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to such State.

SEC. 405. The Commission, upon compilation of reports received from State agencies administering this program, shall report to the President and to the Congress each year upon the number and type of unfeasible cases, and the disposition made thereof.

TITLE V. EDUCATIONAL GRANTS FOR UNFEASIBLE CASES

SEC. 501. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000,000 for the fiscal year 1950, and $2,000,000 annually, thereafter, and from the amounts hereunder appropriated, the Commission is authorized and empowered, through its State agencies, to make outright grants to local nonprofit educational groups, including local school boards providing special services to handicapped, organized with the objective of affording a means of teaching and training physically handicapped persons, commonly known as shut-ins, whose disabilities confine them to their homes, or beds. Grants shall be made pro rata on the basis of population: *Provided*, That not less than 25 percent of all grants in any fiscal year shall be made to groups located in rural areas.

TITLE VI. FEDERAL SERVICES TO HANDICAPPED REVOLVING LOAN FUND

SEC. 601. There is hereby established the Federal Services to Handicapped Revolving Loan Fund, which, upon application by States, shall provide loans to States at such times as State funds for vocational rehabilitation are exhausted, to replenish such State funds for vocational rehabilitation and enable such work to be carried on without interruption.

(a) Loans shall be made on pro rata basis of population, and not less than 25 percent of such loans must be used by States obtaining loans for vocational rehabilitation, in rural areas.

(b) The sum of $10,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of the Treasury, from funds not otherwise appropriated, to establish said fund, and loans may be made from the fund by the States immediately after the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1949.

(c) States obtaining such loans shall pay interest at the rate of 2 percent per annum to the Federal Government, to amortize cost of operation of the revolving loan fund.

(d) States subscribing to such loans shall repay, in full, within 30 days after adjournment of State legislatures which have met following consummation of such loans.

(e) The fund shall be administered by the Administrator of the Federal Commission on Services for the Physically Handicapped, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe.

(f) The Administrator is hereby authorized and directed to appoint such staff and assistants as may be required to operate the fund, and report, in detail, upon operation of the fund, including a statement of all

receipts and disbursements, to the President and to Congress, at the beginning of each regular session of the Congress.

TITLE VII. UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

SEC. 701. There is hereby established in the United States Civil Service Commission a Division for the Physically Handicapped, with a chief, and such staff as may be required. It shall be the duty of the Division to deal with problems attendant upon the recruitment, examination, and appointment of physically handicapped applicants for employment in the Federal civil service. It is declared to be the policy of the Congress that no citizen, otherwise qualified, shall be denied the right to examination and appointment, by reason of physical disability.

SEC. 702. The expense of the operation and administration of the Division for the Physically Handicapped shall hereafter be included in the regular appropriations for the Civil Service Commission. Such sums as are necessary for the establishment and operation of the Division are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

TITLE VIII. AID TO THE BLIND

SEC. 801. Operations under this act shall continue present aids to blind, through commissions, bureaus, or divisions for blind now established. Benefits now received by the blind shall not prejudice nor debar the blind from seeking or receiving such additional benefits as may be made available under this act, nor shall anything in this act be construed as abolishing or limiting any benefits now received by the blind.

TITLE IX. PROMOTION OF PUBLIC-SAFETY PROGRAMS

SEC. 901. The Commission is authorized and directed to cooperate with all Federal agencies in devising and arranging proper safeguards to life and limb in public buildings, public institutions, and public parks, and assisting in the development of programs to eliminate conditions tending to promote disease or cause injury, on Federal properties.

(a) The Commission shall collaborate and cooperate with the Public Buildings Administration, and assist in planning proper assignments of safety engineers and sanitary engineers, who may, with the consent of the agency having jurisdiction, at the direction of the Public Buildings Administration, inspect and report on any and all buildings used by the Federal Government.

(b) The Commission may also cooperate with the American Institute of Architects and other interested groups and individuals, with a view to having public and other buildings constructed or remodeled, with ramps, in addition to stairs and/or elevators, and with railings to facilitate the free and safe movement of lame and crippled persons.

TITLE X. REPORTS ON HANDICAPPED FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES

SEC. 1001. The United States Public Health Service, United States Bureau of Mines, United States Coast Guard, Interstate Commerce Commission, Civil Aeronautics Administration, and other Federal agencies which may now receive, as a regular part of their functions, reports upon persons disabled through accidents or disease, in local, State, or regional epidemics of disease, or in disasters in mines, sinking or disabling of ships, railroad accidents, aviation crashes, shall transmit to the Federal Commission on Services for the Physically Handicapped a report upon such epidemics, or accidents, and, as far as may be possible or practicable, submit the names and addresses of those severely disabled by reason of such epidemics or accidents, as soon after such occurrences as may be possible.

TITLE XI. GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 1101. The term "States," as used in this act, means any of the States of the Union; also Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia.

SEC. 1102. For the purpose of administering this act and for the purpose of making the investigations, studies, publications, and reports herein provided for, including cost of personal services in the District of Columbia, and elsewhere, stenographic recording and translating services, including such services rendered on a contractual basis, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; traveling expenses for attendance at meetings when specifically authorized by the Administrator, supplies and equipment, purchase and exchange of medical and reference books, directories, periodicals, newspapers, and press clippings; purchase, operation, and maintenance of motor-propelled vehicles; printing and binding (in addition to that otherwise provided by law), and for all other necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of this act, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such sums as the Congress may determine to be necessary.

SEC. 1103. The provisions of this act shall not apply and the Government shall not be liable for claims in the cases of persons who are adequately provided for financially, by means such as the following:

(1) Recovery of large amounts on suits for damages in personal-injury cases.

(2) Payment of special compensation for injury or disease, covered by State laws, or by special Federal enactment.

(3) Other conditions under which disabled persons are provided adequate compensation and assistance.

SEC. 1104. If any provision of this act, or the application thereto to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provisions to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 1105. This act shall be known as the "Federal Aid to the Physically Handicapped Act."

SEC. 1106. All laws or parts of laws in conflict with this act are hereby repealed.

SEC. 1107. This act shall be effective 90 days after date of enactment.

The statement and analysis of the bill presented by Mr. SPARKMAN were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF PAUL A. STRACHAN, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED, INC., ON THE BILL TO ESTABLISH A FEDERAL COMMISSION ON SERVICES FOR THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

How many of our citizens are physically handicapped? No one knows the exact number, but selective service rejected one out of three, in the draft, and it should be considered that these were in the age limits of from 18 to 45, and, thus, presumably persons in the prime of life.

A summary of testimony of experts appearing before the House Committee To Investigate Aid to the Physically Handicapped, of which Hon. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, Pennsylvania, was chairman, estimated a total of not less than 38,000,000 of our people, in some degree physically disabled. The Retraining and Reemployment Administration, under Maj. Gen. Graves B. Erskine, USMC, Administrator, conservatively estimated at least 26,000,000.

This poses a tremendous question for every citizen, "What are we doing to enable our millions of handicapped to be rehabilitated and placed in suitable employment?" The problems and difficulties of these millions of disabled citizens are growing more acute each day. These are specialized problems which can only be dealt with successfully, by specialists in a specialized way. Hence, it is time for the Federal Government to take leadership in this field by establishing a Federal Commission on Services for the Physically Handicapped, to function solely in their interest.

Administration of such an agency should be independent of other phases of Government activity, although, of course, it should be properly based where its functions are understood and given sympathetic consideration. The President, the Congress, the public, and particularly the handicapped themselves are entitled to know what is being done for the disabled; by whom it is being done; the cost, and the results. Today, agencies dealing with these matters are scattered widely; they have little or no coordination and there is bound to be duplication of effort and consequent waste of time and taxpayers' money, to say nothing of the fact that present services, facilities, and personnel are wholly inadequate to the needs of the handicapped.

As cited, requirements of our millions of handicapped are growing more acute, each day, particularly those who are civilians, and they cannot be adequately dealt with on any other than a basis of special service. If the transportation interests are serviced in the Government by the Interstate Commerce Commission; banking interests by the Federal Reserve Board, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and several other agencies; farmers and cattle raisers by the Department of Agriculture; working people by the Department of Labor; Veterans by the Veterans' Administration; those of road builders and construction groups by the Federal Works Agency, and many other special groups having their interests represented by special services of the Federal Government, then, in justice and equity, to say nothing of conservation of lives and human values, as well as strengthening the national security by improving the welfare of our people—the handicapped, who have no such services, and few real champions, are fully entitled to a special agency in their own interest—properly manned by experts, and equipped with facilities and means sufficient to do a real job, instead of merely scratching the surface, as is now the case.

Rehabilitation is a meaningless term, because, only a few understand what it is supposed to mean, and because of the prevailing confusion as to the objectives it should accomplish. For example, to the physician or surgeon, it means, medical treatment, surgery, or therapy. To the educator, it means education and training, or retraining. To the vocational guidance expert, it means counseling, and, to the placement officer, it means, placement in suitable employment. To the handicapped, it is our experience that at least 80 percent of them do not know the meaning of the word rehabilitation, and, consequently, it has no significance to them, or bearing upon their problems.

Therefore, to clarify and improve the understanding of the public, we propose changing the present Office of Vocational Rehabilitation to the Federal Commission on Services for the Physically Handicapped, so that all people, and especially the handicapped, themselves, who, after more than 30 years of attempting to sell the term to them, are still in ignorance of what rehabilitation stands for, will know exactly what the agency means, and what it is supposed to do for them.

Such a Commission would be able to cope more successfully with the multiple requirements of handicapped than any office or bureau. It should have independent powers because it will deal with many subjects heretofore not part of the rehabilitation concept but which are necessary if the job is to be done right.

After more than 30 years' observation, study, and practice in this field, we firmly believe passage of this bill to be essential to the proper development of a program for the handicapped, and for the welfare of the Nation itself. We feel that Congress can thus express its long-publicized desire and intent to afford better services for the disabled, and, by so doing, concentrate sufficient of the present forty-odd activities under one head, so that better administration and more economy will produce greater results.

Obviously, Congress cannot be expected to be familiar with all details of a field which is now covered by these forty-odd Federal agencies, each of which has a part of the handicapped program. Neither is it the intent of this bill to arbitrarily uproot all of these agencies and pitch them into one pot, but, rather, take one agency and build around it, and from time to time such agencies as are shown to be within its defined area could be properly integrated in the Commission until a well-proportioned whole is achieved. In one sense, the proposed Federal Commission is not a new agency, but simply a present one, under a new name, and with adequate powers and means to deal with these great problems of the handicapped.

We stress that the Commission would provide important and necessary services which are not now provided, and because of their lack, make present operations of the program incomplete, awkward, and in many instances wholly unworkable—all of which is a detriment to the Nation's welfare and particularly the welfare of the millions of handicapped who require such services.

TITLE I. PURPOSES

This briefly outlines the scope of the act.

TITLE II. ORGANIZATION

This outlines and defines the functions of the Commission and the administrator thereof. Under this title, it is pointed out that much of the present duplication and waste of effort and money could be eliminated, because the prime objective here is to coordinate many functions now scattered through various agencies. Also, present agencies lack requisite powers to educate the public, particularly employers; as to the value of handicapped as workers, and this title confers such powers upon the proposed Commission.

This title transfers the functions of the Federal Security Administrator, relating to vocational rehabilitation, and the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation to the proposed Commission, and henceforth all Federal vocational rehabilitation acts shall operate under the Commission. The present staff of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation would be retained, and the Federal-States relationship continue, as under the present law.

It establishes an Advisory Council on Affairs of the Handicapped, composed of experts in this field, as a policy-developing unit; the need for which is very clear.

It provides a base for, and outlines the functions of, the Federal Interagency Committee on Rehabilitation and Employment of Handicapped, as a coordinating body, to bring order out of the present chaos, wherein approximately 40 agencies go in different directions at the same time. The proposed commission is the logical place to coordinate such activities, and its composition would, doubtless, thus be the means of effectuating greater efficiency and economy in the operations of the various agencies involved.

It establishes a National Commission on Employment of Handicapped, to consist of representatives of national organizations and individuals, outside of Government, to function voluntarily, on a year-round basis, to encourage employment of handicapped. This would provide a necessary and logical base, for example, for the activities of the present "President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week," which has no present legal status and which should, logically, be based in the Commission. Since the "President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week" has no funds to project and expand educational campaigns to promote employment of handicapped, this provides a relatively small sum for that purpose.

TITLE III. COOPERATIVE ENTERPRISES FOR HANDICAPPED

The Congress should remedy the present situation, wherein submarginal public assistance to handicapped does not provide them means to live, be treated, and trained, so that they may earn their own living, and thus make substantial contributions to the national economy, if possible to do so, by learning trades or occupations, under conditions wherein their handicap is not a factor, or, at least, is properly evaluated and provided for.

Cooperative enterprises for handicapped offer great opportunities for such vitally needed functions. Among other activities they would permit establishment and operation of sheltered workshops, which are not a new concept, but have already proven of great value in many respects. Yet, they are too limited in number, have inadequate facilities, personnel, and means, and in many instances lack proper business management. They offer a practical solution for the lack of training schools, as well as a means of affording income for otherwise capable, willing, and ambitious handicapped people, who have never had opportunity to earn a living, especially when pitted against nonhandicapped in our rigid, competitive employment system.

TITLE IV. GRANTS TO STATES FOR TOTALLY DISABLED, UNFEASIBLE FOR REHABILITATION

Nearly 5 years ago, the Social Security Board estimated that there were, then, conservatively, 3,600,000 totally and permanently disabled people in the United States, and since that time, unquestionably, there has been a very material increase, and today's estimates would probably run to as high as 7,000,000 thus severely disabled. These, for the most part, are termed "unemployable, and nonfeasible for rehabilitation." Many of them are bedfast, confined to wheel chairs, or on crutches, and a considerable number are destitute and wholly dependent upon uncertain charity to sustain even the barest necessities of life.

In the light of continued improvement in medicine, surgery, and therapeutics, as well as discovery and application of new drugs and new types of treatments, it is reasonable to believe that many such cases, rated unfeasible yesterday, or today, may, within a week, a month, or a year, or even longer, because of some new discovery, become entirely feasible of rehabilitation.

On the other hand, when only superficial medical examinations or treatment are given, or, because of the extremely serious condition of the patient, the expense of such treatments as might be given are deemed too expensive to be met under present budgets of rehabilitation and social agencies, as, no doubt, in many instances has been the case when the applicant is termed unfeasible, there is room for considerable margin of doubt, if not positive error, in such diagnosis and findings, and no medical examination should be accepted that is not thorough in every respect, and such examinations should be given at reasonably frequent intervals, as a means of proper determination, in any case.

The only practicable, just, and humane way to deal with this matter is to see to it that such persons are afforded thorough diagnosis by qualified physicians, and, if the findings show such persons to be totally unfeasible for rehabilitation, then, if such persons are destitute, or wholly dependent upon others for livelihood, who, themselves, are unable to bear the expense of providing a living for such unfeasibles, then, such unfeasibles should be certified by the Commission as being wholly unemployable, and provided, initially, with a Federal grant—the modest sum of $60 per month.

Operations under this title would act as a double check, most effectively, and would reveal, over the long run, a more accurate picture of the so-called shut-ins, and provide for their needs, however meagerly, by recognizing the Federal obligation to them, by a small grant, if they are disqualified for rehabilitation, and cannot support themselves.

Rehabilitation agencies would have the responsibility of periodically giving medical examination to such unfeasible cases, so that the real objective would be carried out—rehabilitation, and not grant, or pension, unless the latter is absolutely necessary. But, as an alternative, there would be provided a means of meeting, and routing, the fear of poverty, illness, and the misery of being wholly dependent upon others who lack means themselves, in the minds of destitute and totally disabled handicapped citizens.

Moreover, this would afford a means to put the Nation on record that, hereafter, the first consideration of its disabled shall be to get them well and back to work, if possible, rather than leave them to charity, in the guise of public assistance, or hold the false hope of pension in front of the noses of such handicapped people.

This title also provides an outline for States' participation, and administration thereof, and we strongly urge upon Congress the great need and desirability of approving this title.

TITLE V. EDUCATIONAL GRANTS FOR UNFEASIBLE CASES

Many handicapped, especially those in rural, sparsely settled areas, are denied access to educational facilities. In many cases, schools are located considerable distances from the homes of persons where, for example, there are handicapped children, and it is not practicable for such handicapped children, or even adults, to attend such schools.

This title provides a modest beginning on development of a great and essential program—that of teaching the home-bound handicapped. In the case of shut-ins, it would provide a godsend, indeed, as development of this program, within the next few years, would, doubtless, bring the priceless boon of all latest and most scientific means of learning right to the bedside, by radio, motion pictures, television, sound recordings, etc.

TITLE VI. FEDERAL SERVICES TO HANDICAPPED REVOLVING LOAN FUND

Under this title, there would be established a revolving loan fund, with an initial sum of $10,000,000, from which States which have exhausted their own funds for vocational rehabilitation may borrow, so that this important work could be carried on without interruption.

Operations of the present Federal-State vocational rehabilitation system has shown that, periodically, under the stress of continually increasing applications for service therefrom, States frequently go broke, and are unable to give the full service to handicapped. Such a condition today exists in some 28 or more States, where, although administrative costs are paid, for officials and employees, very little or no real services to handicapped can be performed, for lack of other money.

Establishment of such a revolving loan fund is, therefore, a necessity, if the program is not to be subjected to continual break-downs for lack of money at critical times.

TITLE VII. UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Growing requirements of Civil Service, dealing with physically handicapped people, necessitates establishing a regular division within the Civil Service Commission for that express purpose. The expense would be nominal; examination and placement facilitated; the effects far-reaching and beneficial, and operations under this title would implement the declaration of congressional policy, exemplified in H. R. 4236 (80th Cong., 2d sess.), which provides that no handicapped person, otne wise qualified, shall be denied examination or appointment to positions for which they may be fitted.

TITLE VIII. AID TO THE BLIND

This continues and expands present assistance and rehabilitation to the blind. It provides additional means of training, over the present set-up, of which blind may avail themselves, if they so desire.

TITLE IX. PROMOTION OF PUBLIC SAFETY PROGRAMS

This title provides for collaboration and cooperation with Federal and private agencies, to develop inspection services not now in general use, but badly needed, both from the standpoint of conserving the health of employees of the Government, and the public using Government buildings, but actually saving money for the Government by eliminating causes of accident and disease to Federal workers and others.

It is manifest that the Federal Government should take steps immediately to prevent accident, or disease, in the erection or reconditioning of buildings, institutions, and parks, and the equipping thereof, to provide such safeguards as may be necessary, upon recommendation of qualified safety and sanitary engineers and other specialists at interest.

TITLE X. REPORTS ON HANDICAPPED FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES

With but rare exceptions, diseases and accidents, leading to physical handicap, are not static, but dynamic. They get better, or worse, as the case may be, but they should be immediately treated, if the individual is to have a fair chance of full recovery.

Unquestionably, it would expedite these matters if Federal agencies at interest, the Public Health Service, Bureau of Mines, Coast Guard, Interstate Commerce Commission, Civil Aeronautics Board, and other Federal agencies, would provide full reports to the Commission as soon as such accidents or diseases occur, so that no time would be lost in getting remedial activities under way. Such agencies already receive such reports from their field staffs, and there is no good reason why the field representatives of the Commission could not, after such reports had been transferred to them, make investigation to determine whether the Commission's services could and/or should be utilized advantageously.

TITLE XI. GENERAL PROVISIONS

This title provides for the appropriations which may be necessary to operate the Commission, shows what type of persons would not be eligible for the benefits administered by the Commission, etc.

ISSUANCE OF SPECIAL STAMPS COMMEMORATIVE OF ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF DEATH OF ALBERT GALLATIN

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the death of Albert Gallatin, and I request that a statement prepared by me may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1068) to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the death of Albert Gallatin, introduced by Mr. MARTIN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MARTIN

On August 12 of this year will occur the one hundredth anniversary of the death of Albert Gallatin, a great American statesman who gave a lifetime of distinguished service to the country of his adoption.

Unquestionably one of the most brilliant men of his time, Gallatin's fame rested securely on his outstanding achievements in the field of public finance, diplomacy, and statecraft.

Albert Gallatin came to this country from his native Switzerland in 1780 at the age of 19. He established himself in the wilderness of western Pennsylvania, near Uniontown, Pa. In later years he built the splendid mansion Friendship Hill, which has been preserved as a historic shrine. Today it recalls to visitors the courage and determination of the freedom-loving pioneers who crossed the Allegheny Mountains and pointed the way for the westward growth and progress of our Nation.

The section of Pennsylvania in which Friendship Hill is located has another claim to historic importance. Within a radius of 20 miles of Albert Gallatin's home were born a number of men who achieved distinction in the affairs of our Nation.

Three served as Secretary of State: James G. Blaine, once Republican candidate for President; Philander C. Knox, who served also as a Member of the United States Senate; and that distinguished soldier and statesman, George C. Marshall.

Two former Members of this body representing the State of Iowa were born in the same area: Albert B. Cummins and Jonathan P. Dolliver. Former United States Senator William E. Crow, of Pennsylvania, is another on this impressive list.

A great American in the field of science, John A. Brashear, author, astronomer, and philosopher, was born in the same section of western Pennsylvania. His pioneering work in the development of the telescope opened the way to greater knowledge of the universe.

Albert Gallatin won early recognition as a leader in financial legislation while serving as a member of the Pennsylvania Legislature, 1790–92. He worked for the full payment of the State debt, for the extinguishment of State paper money and other sound fiscal policies.

In 1793 he was elected to the United States Senate. He took his seat in the Third Congress, but his eligibility was questioned on the ground that he had not been for 9 years a citizen of the United States.

Deprived of his seat in the Senate, Gallatin returned to western Pennsylvania, where the power and authority of the new Federal Government was being tested for the first time in the Whisky Rebellion. Gallatin's part in restoring submission to law has been credited with helping to save western Pennsylvania from civil war.

In 1794 he was elected to the Federal House of Representatives and served three terms. Again he gained eminence in the field of finance, fighting against overwhelming political odds for sound fiscal policies which he later put into effect as Secretary of the Treasury under Thomas Jefferson and James Madison. He opposed oppressive taxation and insisted upon an orderly reduction of the national debt, which on January 1, 1806, was slightly over $80,000,000.

Gallatin turned from finance and legislation to diplomacy with his appointment as a member of the peace commission which negotiated the Treaty of Ghent in 1814. On his return to America he accepted the post of Minister to France and spent 7 years, 1816–23, in Paris.

Returning once more to the United States, Gallatin anticipated retiring to Friendship Hill, but another call to duty sent him to England, where he won new honors as Ambassador to the Court of St. James.

Anniversaries of our great men should be observed as important milestones in American history. In tribute to the memory of Albert Gallatin and in grateful recognition of his part in the building of our Nation, I have introduced a bill authorizing a special series of commemorative postage stamps to be issued in August, the month in which he passed away 100 years ago.

I sincerely hope that this legislation in honor of the greatness of Albert Gallatin will meet with the approval of the Members of this Congress, and I urge that it be acted upon favorably.

INTRODUCTION AND REPORT OF HOUSING BILL (REPT. NO. 84)

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, for the past 3 or 4 weeks the Committee on Banking and Currency has been diligently considering a housing bill, and one has been agreed to by the committee. I have been authorized to introduce that bill on behalf of myself and the following Senators: Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. WAGNER, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. MYERS, Mr. HILL, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. LONG, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FREAR, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. TAFT, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. LODGE, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. IVES, Mr. THYE, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1070) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ELLENDER (for himself, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. WAGNER, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. MYERS, Mr. HILL, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. LONG, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FREAR, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. TAFT, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. LODGE, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. IVES, Mr. THYE, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably, without amendment, the bill just introduced by the Senator from Louisiana, for himself and others. The Committee on Banking and Currency has considered many bills in connection

with various housing bills, and has unanimously ordered this bill reported.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. MAYBANK. I now ask unanimous consent that the committee may file its report today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPEAL OF CANAL ZONE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to repeal the Canal Zone Retirement Act, and so forth. It is designed to repeal the Canal Zone Retirement Act of March 2, 1931, as amended, and merge that act with the general civil service act by extending the benefits of the Civil Service Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, with minor exceptions, to employees affected by such repeal.

This bill would merge one of the several separate retirement systems now in effect for comparatively small groups of Government employees, and is prompted in part by the statement made on this floor on January 23, 1948—page 488 of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—with regard to the desirability for eliminating these separate retirement systems where such can be done without detriment to those affected.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1081) to repeal the Canal Zone Retirement Act, and to extend the Civil Service Retirement Act, with amendments, to employees affected by such repeal, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

FREEING OF EXTENSION SERVICES FROM NONGOVERNMENTAL ACTIVITIES

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to free extension services from nongovernmental activities, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement prepared by me, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1083) to foster the cooperative agriculture education work of the extension services; to free the extension services from the performance of nongovernmental functions and political activity; and to promote economy in the expenditure of public funds for the conduct of cooperative agricultural extension work, and for other purposes; introduced by Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last proviso in section 3 of the act entitled "An act to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture," approved May 8, 1914, is amended to read as follows: "*Provided further*, That no payment shall be made in any fiscal year after June 30, 1949, to any State until an equal sum has been appropriated for that year by the legislature of such State, or provided by State, county, college, local, or other public authority, for the maintenance of the cooperative agricultural extension work provided for in this act, and that the matching of any Federal funds provided under authority of this act by funds obtained from sources other than public sources is specifically prohibited."

SEC. 2. Section 3 of such act of May 8, 1914, is amended, effective July 1, 1949, by adding at the end thereof the following: "No funds provided under authority of this act shall be paid in any year to any State or agency thereof, which, through the operation of State law or informal arrangement, (1) establishes, requires, or permits a farm bureau, county farm-aid association, or other organization or association as an official cooperating or sponsoring agency for the Extension Service, (2) requires the organization of farmers as a prerequisite to the conduct of cooperative agricultural work in any county or locality, or (3) provides for furnishing to or accepting from any private organization or association any housing, publicity, telephone, clerical, or other services in connection with cooperative agricultural extension work; and no funds provided under the authority of this act shall be paid in any year to any State or agency thereof in which any employees performing cooperative agricultural extension work are employed or housed or jointly employed by or housed with a private agricultural organization or association, or in which any such workers act as organizers for farmers' associations; conduct or assist in membership campaigns; solicit memberships; edit organization publications or handle organization publicity; manage cooperative business enterprises; engage in sale of insurance, serums, or other commercial activities; act as financial or business agents, or take part in any of the work of farmers' organizations or of an individual farmer; or in any way give preferential treatment among farmers or to any farmers' organization or organizations. None of the funds appropriated by or under the authority of this act or any of the acts mentioned in this act shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to any State or Territory, or agency thereof, until the director of agricultural extension work in such State or Territory shall certify to the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Director of the Extension Service and of the United States Department of Agriculture and the Civil Service Commission shall find, that there is compliance with this act, and that no portion of such funds may or will be used by such State or Territory to pay all or any part of the salary, wages, or expenses of any person who, during the preceding fiscal year, while employed to carry out the purposes of this act or any of the acts mentioned in this act, has assisted in the conduct of membership, publicity, commercial, organizational, or social programs of a farm organization, or violated any of the provisions above; and that no portion of such funds may or will be used in any way to provide preferential services to any farmers' group or organization, or to free State funds, directly or indirectly, for use for such purposes. Nothing in this act shall be construed to prevent (said Extension Service) such workers from appearing before farmers' meetings as extension educators to advance agricultural knowledge in accordance with projects governing their work which shall be approved by the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the provision of section 21 of the Hatch Act, as added October 24, 1942 (18 U. S. C. 61u, 1940 ed.), none of the funds appropriated by or under the authority of this act or any of the acts mentioned in this act shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to any State or Territory, or agency thereof, after the Federal fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, until the Director of the Extension Service of the United States Department of Agriculture and the Civil Service Commission shall have found, and the director of agricultural extension work of the State shall have certified, that regulations have been promulgated and are being strictly enforced applying the provisions of the act of Congress known as the Hatch Act to all workers for said State extension service.

SEC. 4. Any sum withheld pursuant to the provisions of the preceding sections shall be reported to the President, retained in the Treasury, and disposed of in accordance with the provisions of section 6 of the act of May 8, 1914, hereinbefore mentioned.

SEC. 5. The fifteenth paragraph under the heading "Miscellaneous" in the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920," approved July 24, 1919 (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 563), is hereby repealed.

The statement presented by Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR THOMAS OF OKLAHOMA UPON INTRODUCTION OF A MEASURE TO FREE THE EXTENSION SERVICES FROM NONGOVERNMENTAL ACTIVITIES

About 3 years ago I introduced a similar measure intended to bring this problem to the attention of the Congress and the administration. Shortly after the measure was introduced, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, Mr. CLINTON ANDERSON, who was then Secretary of Agriculture, proposed to the Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities that their association and the Department of Agriculture set up a joint committee to study Agricultural Extension Service operations. This was agreed upon, and the Commission was created in the fall of 1946.

The joint committee was composed of the most eminent educators and citizens. Walter Coffey, president emeritus of the University of Minnesota; President Herman L. Conovan, of the University of Kentucky; President Roy M. Green, of Colorado A & M; President John A. Hannah, of Michigan State College; and Chancelor John R. Hutcheson, of Virginia Polytechnic Institute, were appointed to represent the land-grant colleges and universities on the joint committee. Dean H. P. Rusk, of the College of Agriculture at the University of Illinois, later replaced President Green, of Colorado, who became ill.

The Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. ANDERSON, appointed an equally distinguished group, including Edmund de S. Brunner, professor of Rural Sociology at Columbia University, in New York; David Meeker, director of education for Dearborn Motors Co., of Detroit; Thomas E. Wilson, chairman of the board of Wilson & Co., of Chicago; and P. V. Cardon and W. A. Minor, of the United States Department of Agriculture.

This joint committee issued its report on September 1, 1948, after nearly 2 years of study. In that report they found, with a single dissent, that the Extension Service should be freed of its preferential relationships with the Farm Bureau in many States, saying:

"This committee expresses its conviction that it is not sound public policy for Extension to give preferred service to any farm organization or to be in a position of being charged with such actions. The committee is further convinced that it would be in the public interest for any formal operating relationships between the Extension Service and any general farm organization such as

the Farm Bureau to be discontinued at the earliest possible moment."

Following the issuance of this report, a survey which was made by the Federal Extension Service during the existence of the joint committee has become public. This survey reports on the results of a questionnaire sent to State extension directors. From the State directors' replies, it was shown that more than 1,100 situations exist out in the counties of the country which are preferential to the one farm organization and contrary to proper standards of relationships between a Government agency and a private group.

The existence of such a situation is, in the opinion of the joint committee, extremely harmful to the Extension Service. It has subjected that Service to charges of improper conduct in its relationships which have reflected upon it and been hurtful to it. It has tended to limit Extension's contacts to the members of the private organization in scores and possibly hundreds of our counties, when it should serve all farmers equally. It has caused men and women on the public pay roll to give their time to the work of the private organization, constituting an enormous subsidy from the Public Treasury. The situation is as unjustifiable as for the Department of Labor to organize, maintain the membership records, and do the work of one of the labor organizations.

The bill which I have just introduced would permit the withholding of Federal matching funds from State extension services where preferential arrangements are not ended and the Extension Service free to devote its full time to its educational work, serving all farm people without any discrimination. It will put into effect the recommendations of the joint committee, which I have named.

This act should in my opinion be passed in this session of the Congress. The Department of Agriculture in 1922 established standards of proper relationships between the Extension Service and private farm organizations. The survey to which I have referred was made 25 years later—ample time for corrections to be made—but shows more than 1,100 abuses. It is obvious that a minority of the State extension services are continuing practices which reflect on this splendid agency totally, to its detriment and harm.

Since the issuance of the joint committee report, there has been only one move to correct abuses in any of the States. I am advised that the extension director at Kansas State College has asked the legislature of that State to enact measures to free his agency from its present entanglements with the Farm Bureau. I cannot learn of any other move toward separation of the public agency and the private organization in other States. It is obviously necessary to enact the legislation I have proposed to accomplish the end which is now recommended to us by the joint committee and nearly everyone concerned with the problem. In those States where abuses are the most prevalent, and correction is most needed, there has been no move to bring it about. In those States where there are no abuses, and proper relationships are being maintained—and that is a majority of all of them—there can be no objection in my opinion to this bill for it will not affect them, except to relieve them of the odium of criticism arising from other States.

AID IN INDUSTRIALIZATION OF UNDERDEVELOPED AREAS

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide aid in industrialization of underdeveloped areas, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that a press release by me be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the press release will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1092) to provide for aid in industrialization of underdeveloped areas, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. SPARKMAN), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SIX DEMOCRATIC SENATORS URGE FEDERAL AID TO RAISE INCOMES, EMPLOYMENT, AND PRODUCTION IN AMERICAN UNDERDEVELOPED AREAS

"President Truman in his inaugural address, advocated a broad program of help to economically underdeveloped countries all over the world," said Senators CLAUDE PEPPER, Democrat, of Florida; JAMES E. MURRAY, Democrat, of Montana; WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington; OLIN D. JOHNSTON, Democrat, of South Carolina; GLEN H. TAYLOR, Democrat, of Idaho; and JOHN SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama. "We believe that we should do the same thing for the economically underindustrialized sections of the United States. We should set an example for the rest of the world in raising the living standards of the rural and other underdeveloped areas of America," said the six Senators.

They introduced in the Senate today a bill to provide Federal aid to State and local agencies, public and private, to encourage and aid the expansion of established private businesses and the development of new private enterprise and industry in regions and areas of the United States which are not adequately industrialized. These regions and areas would be those where workers over an extended period of time are in excess of the number that can be employed efficiently on farms or in existing enterprises, where there is insufficient industrial, commercial, and service businesses to provide stable employment for these workers, and where the prospects of expanded or additional private firms would be successful and would raise production, employment, and income levels for the particular area and for the Nation as a whole.

Under the bill, it would be possible to develop local industries of value to farm people. It would permit a broader use of the resources of the economically retarded sections of the Nation. It would make available to farmers, businessmen, civic organizations, and other groups, technical aid and assistance, technical and economic information, advice on adequate financing available from local or governmental capital, cooperation with public utility and transport systems to expand their facilities and other means to encourage the maximum expansion of private enterprise. It would be possible to work toward the elimination of unfair and discriminatory freight rates.

The Secretaries of Agriculture, Labor, Interior, and Commerce would be authorized to make available their facilities and services most useful to public and private agencies in each region, area, or community in solving the problems of economic development. The bill provides for the joint coordination of the work of the four departments under the Secretaries.

AID TO SMALL BUSINESS IN FOREIGN TRADE

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to aid small business in foreign trade, and I request that a press release by me be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the press release will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1093) to encourage fuller participation by small-business concerns in soundly expanded foreign trade through Government insurance for United States exports, introduced by Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. MURRAY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATORS PEPPER AND MURRAY ASK FOR AID TO SMALL BUSINESS IN FOREIGN TRADE

In introducing a bill to enable greater participation of small business in our foreign exports, Senator CLAUDE PEPPER (Democrat, of Florida) and Senator JAMES E. MURRAY (Democrat, of Montana) said, "Our small business is one of the great pillars of our democracy. We should do everything possible to strengthen it. It is high time that American small-business enterprises had a fair share of American foreign trade. An analysis of ECA authorizations on shipments in 1948 shows an overwhelming preponderance of them going to American big business."

The Export-Import Bank now makes loans to exporters. A very small number of them receive such loans, and then only those who are very large and who do not have very much need for the kind of aid contemplated by the bill get them. Financial institutions which are willing to help small exporters have charged up to 10 percent for their services. Many small exporters have a profit margin not over 5 percent. On occasion, therefore, banking firms have taken over foreign accounts in which they had an interest through such loans.

The Export Insurance Act of 1949 would facilitate through a system of insurance the granting of sound credit terms to foreign customers of America. There is no subsidy involved. The Export-Import Bank would be able to insure an exporter, particularly small- and medium-size firms, against the risk of nonpayment by the foreign customer because of the foreign government prohibition against payment in dollars, in which case insurance can be issued up to 100 percent of the amount then due. An exporter can be insured in the case of a customer who is unable or unwilling to pay the amount due (with insurance up to 90 percent of the amount due). Only loans on sales with the usual sound terms would be made. The Export-Import Bank would issue insurance capital stock of $100,000,000 subscribed to by the United States. The funds from such sale would finance the insurance operations of the Foreign Trade Insurance Division of the bank.

FEDERAL TRAFFIC BUREAU

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing for the establishment of a Federal Traffic Bureau. Such a bureau would handle all freight transportation matters for all agencies and departments of the Government of the United States.

Similar legislation was introduced in the Seventy-eighth Congress but the press of other legislative proposals made final consideration of this bill impossible. However, it is a subject which some of us who have been members of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce are familiar with and concerned about. The Government is probably the largest single shipper in the United States, expending annually in excess of $1,000,000,000. This sum is one-tenth of the total revenue derived annually by all common carriers for the transportation of property. Yet, the activities of the Government dealing with these transportation matters is scattered literally among scores of agencies and departments; there is little or no uniformity about methods of shipment or even knowledge of the cheapest and most efficient forms of transportation or routes to be used. If any large private business in this country conducted its shipping operations in such a haphazard and slip-shod manner, it would go bankrupt.

Centralization of shipping activities in a single bureau competently staffed and empowered to make final decisions with respect to shipments as well as to secure the most economical transportation should result in the saving of many millions of dollars annually to the Government.

It may be significant that the Hoover Commission only a week ago in one of its reports recommended the creation of a Traffic Management Division in the proposed Bureau of Federal Supply, emphasizing the need for centralized control of the Government's transportation activities. While the bill that I am introducing proposes the creation of an independent agency to supervise such matters, I am not too much concerned about the manner in which this proposal should be handled. What I am concerned about is that there should be centralization of these activities. I hope that our committee will be able to give prompt consideration to this legislation in the interest of saving the taxpayers some money.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1095) to establish a Federal Traffic Bureau, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

DETROIT'S BID FOR THE 1956 OLYMPIC GAMES

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and myself I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference a joint resolution extending an invitation for the holding of the Olympic games in Detroit in 1956.

In connection with the joint resolution I present a letter from Mr. Avery Brundage, of Chicago, who is president of the United States Olympic Association, of which President Truman is the honorary president, indicating that Detroit has been chosen by the American committee as the city in which the 1956 Olympic games are to be held.

I also present a letter from the mayor of Detroit indicating that the extension of this invitation on the part of the Federal Government will involve no fiscal expense.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution and the two letters be printed in the RECORD at this point, and that the joint resolution and the letters be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the joint resolution and letters will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 56) extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1956 Olympic games at Detroit, Mich., introduced by Mr. VANDENBERG (for himself and Mr. FERGUSON), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the United States Olympic Association will invite the International Olympic Committee to hold the Olympic games in the United States at Detroit, Mich., in 1956: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the Government of the United States joins in the invitation of the United States Olympic Association to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1956 Olympic games in the United States at Detroit, Mich.; and expresses the hospitable hope that the United States may be selected as the site for this great enterprise in international good will.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is directed to transmit a copy of this joint resolution to the International Olympic Committee.

The letters presented by Mr. VANDENBERG were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OLYMPIC ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., February 1, 1949.

The Honorable ARTHUR VANDENBERG,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR VANDENBERG: At the request of the Olympic Committee of the City of Detroit I am writing to inform you of the present status of its invitation to stage the games of the XVI Olympiad in 1956. Detroit has been seeking to act as host city for the olympic games for the last 10 years. The Detroit commitee first submitted an invitation for the 1944 games (which were never held because of the war) in 1939. After the war Detroit renewed its invitation, but it was felt that London, which had been promised the 1944 games had first claim on the games held last year, and Helsinki, which had been awarded and had made all necessary preparations for the 1940 games (also not held because of the war), claimed priority and was given the 1952 games.

At the meeting of the International Olympic Committee in Stockholm in 1947, when the 1952 games were awarded to Helsinki, invitations were presented by four other United States cities in addition to Detroit.

After the Stockholm meeting it was suggested that if the United States wished to have the games it would be much better if there was one official candidate. In any event, it was quite apparent that they would never come to the United States if we had several cities dividing the votes. At the next meeting of the United States Olympic Association a resolution was adopted that led to the appointment of a special committee to investigate the situation. After the report of this committee, which visited the various cities concerned, was made to the executive committee of the United States Olympic Association, it selected the city of Detroit as the official United States candidate and this was confirmed at the next meeting of the association. Other United States cities were asked to withdraw for the time being in favor of Detroit. The United States Olympic Association as you will note from this letterhead, includes practically all the amateur-sport governing bodies in this country.

At my first meeting with the Detroit Olympic Committee some 10 years ago I was told that it had survived the field and decided the Olympic games were the most important of all international events. It therefore concluded that they would do more to establish Detroit's position as one of the great cities of the world than any other event. Despite economic, financial, and transportation difficulties, 60 countries sent delegations to London last summer, turning with relief from the horrors of war and the chicanery of politics to the fresh, clean, and honest atmosphere of amateur sport. The games were a tremendous success and every one left with a renewed faith in humanity and a revived hope for a peaceful world. With the conditions that exist throughout the world at present, I think the reasons for holding the games in the United States are fairly obvious.

The meeting of the International Olympic Committee, at which the venue of the 1956 games will be established, will be held in Rome in April. Any action on the part of the Government should be taken promptly. I shall be happy to appear before the Foreign Relations Committee if it wishes further information.

With appreciation for your interest, I am,

Sincerely,

AVERY BRUNDAGE.

FEBRUARY 22, 1949.

Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR VANDENBERG: With further reference to our conversation of a few days ago when I saw you in Washington regarding Detroit's bid for the 1956 Olympic Games, we would like to present the following facts:

As stated to you at that time, our Olympic Invitational Committee feels that it would help our cause materially if our Federal Government would assist us to the extent of verifying our invitation to the Olympic world to come to Detroit for the celebration of the 1956 games. Our reason for believing this to be a fact is because in most every other country of the world where there is an interest in the Olympic games, the national government exercises considerable influence and interest in the conduct of this activity. Particularly is this true in the European countries where there is a great interest in the Olympic movement.

As you may know, there have been several cities competing for the privilege of organizing the games on the next occasion when said games are to be held in the United States. The fact that several United States cities, as against only one city from other countries of the world, were competing for the games weakened the position of the

United States candidates. In order to correct this situation, the United States Olympic Association appointed a committee from their executive committee to select and recommend from the several cities their choice of the United States city to act as host on the occasion of the games next to be held in this country. This procedure resulted in the city of Detroit receiving the designation of the site of the Olympic games when they were next held in the United States, to the exclusion of all other United States cities, and the International Olympic Committee has been so advised. I mention this point so that you may feel no fear of discriminating against any other United States city in supporting Detroit's invitation.

Under the circumstances as noted above, we would like to see Congress pass a joint resolution supporting Detroit's invitation to the International Olympic Committee for permission to organize the 1956 games.

I have discussed this matter thoroughly with members of our Olympic committee, and we wish to assure you that it has never been the intention of anyone connected with the movement to bring the Olympic games to Detroit to seek financial aid or assistance from our Federal Government in order to accomplish this purpose. We wish to point this out in order that you may have no fear of a request for financial assistance coming from our organizing committee provided our Congress adopts a resolution inviting the athletes from the nations of the world to participate in the 1956 Olympic Games.

Sincerely,

EUGENE I. VAN ANTWERP,
Mayor.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PRAYERS OF PETER MARSHALL, LATE CHAPLAIN OF THE SENATE

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution providing for the printing, for the use of the Senate, 5,000 additional copies of Senate Document No. 170, Eightieth Congress, second session, entitled "Prayers Offered by the Chaplain, the Reverend Peter Marshall, D. D., at the Opening of the Daily Sessions of the Senate of the United States During the Eightieth Congress." I have received an estimate from the Public Printer as to the cost.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 19) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed, for the use of the Senate, 5,000 additional copies of Senate Document 170 (80th Cong., 2d sess.), entitled "Prayers Offered by the Chaplain, the Reverend Peter Marshall, D. D., at the Opening of the Daily Sessions of the Senate of the United States During the Eightieth Congress."

CONDEMNATION OF TREATMENT OF CERTAIN RELIGIOUS LEADERS OF BULGARIA AND HUNGARY

Mr. IVES (for himself and Mr. WAGNER) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 20), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas 15 Protestant clergymen have been arrested by the Government of Bulgaria; and

Whereas Lutheran Bishop Lajos Ordass and other respected church leaders have been arrested by the Government of Hungary; and

Whereas widespread belief exists throughout the democratic world and among people everywhere who believe in justice, that the charges against these clergymen are simply a cloak for political and religious persecution and a violation of the fundamental rights of man; and

Whereas this action of the Government of Bulgaria has been taken at substantially the same time as the arrest and imprisonment of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, Roman Catholic Primate of Hungary; and

Whereas there is evidence of an underlying conspiracy to violate the declarations and purposes stated in the Charter of the United Nations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the arrest and imprisonment of these religious leaders of Bulgaria and Hungary (a) constitute persecution on account of political and religious beliefs, (b) violate the declaration in the preamble to the Charter of the United Nations, namely, "to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men * * *," and (c) violate the third purpose stated in article I of the Charter of the United Nations, namely: "To achieve international cooperation * * * in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion." It is further the sense of the Congress that the issues as to such violations shall be raised by the United States, either in the United Nations or by such other means as may be most appropriate.

OUTRAGEOUS PROSECUTION OF PROTESTANT MINISTERS

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, today there begins in Bulgaria the trial of 15 Protestant ministers and church leaders. All freedom-loving people are shocked and horrified at the implications in this undertaking of a Communist-dominated government.

On the surface, these representatives of the Methodist, Baptist, Pentecostal, and Congregational Churches are charged with treacherous acts against their Government and with currency manipulations. Actually, the crime with which they are charged is that they refuse to summit to domination by a government which does not recognize freedom of worship. To the undying credit of these ministers it can be said that they courageously stand as advocates of religious principles in which they sincerely believe.

Such a right of expression and of freedom of worship is guaranteed by the treaty between the United States and Bulgaria; but, despite the pledge of their sacred word to the United States to protect the liberties and freedom of all people under their rule, Bulgaria and the other Russian satellite countries apparently have no intention of abiding by their pledged contracts.

A striking instance of this shocking disregard of treaty obligations was furnished yesterday. Official announcement was made of the publication by the Bulgarian Government of a booklet containing the trumped-up evidence against the Protestant ministers. In the official pronouncement their guilt was already proclaimed. In other words, the Bulgarian Government has convicted them and determined upon their guilt even before they are placed on trial.

Further indication of the concerted action of Russian-dominated countries to suppress news to the world and information concerning these prosecutions was given a day or so ago. An Associated Press representative reached the Russian border on his way to Bulgaria to report the trials of the Protestant religionists. After being stopped and made to undergo search, he was subjected to indignities, and then was held prisoner for several hours before being reluctantly released by the Russians.

The American people are deeply concerned for the welfare of human beings in foreign countries at all times. When, however, not only are the rights and freedoms of these Protestant churchmen denied them but, in addition, they are charged with having conspired with citizens and representatives of the United States against the peace of Bulgaria and, therefore, of the world, it becomes doubly our duty to register the most vigorous protest and to call for any sanctions that can be employed to impress the Communist leaders.

I know that our State Department is presently devoting its energies and its thoughts with a view to taking effective action in the matter, and I commend the Department. Time is of the essence, however; and it is our obligation, because of treaty commitments, to convince Bulgaria and other Russian satellite countries, and to drive home to the Moscow leaders themselves, that the United States is determined to expose such ruthless infringement of human rights.

Under the specific terms of the Bulgarian treaty with the United States, it is stipulated that Bulgaria shall take all measures necessary to secure to all persons under Bulgarian jurisdiction, without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion, the enjoyment of human rights and the fundamental freedoms, including freedom of religion. A formal protest delivered by the United States Government was handed back peremptorily and insultingly, without the courtesy of a formal reply stating any particulars. The defiant statements of Bulgarian officials in this case demonstrate that they will not live up to their treaty provisions by direct negotiations with the United States.

There remain, however, additional steps which our country can take to keep the world informed of just what is transpiring behind the iron curtain. Unquestionably this latest incident, which is but a sequel to other persecutions occurring in neighboring Russian satellite countries, might well constitute a threat to the peace. It is a violation of the human rights provisions of the United Nations Charter. It would be highly effective, we think, if this matter could be formally brought to the attention of appropriate councils of the United Nations. Such action would focus the attention of all participating nations upon the persecutions being practiced by the Russian satellite countries, all of which are approvingly reported in the Russian press.

Mr. President, it is significant that the trial of the Protestant ministers is beginning at the very time when our Minister to Hungary, Mr. Selden Chapin, is

nearing American shores after being expelled from Budapest. The action of the Hungarian Government in his case was based upon unfounded charges and trumped-up allegations, all of which constitute an insult to the United States of America.

All of these incidents show the pattern of Communist thinking with regard to the practice of religion and the exercise of the freedom of speech and of worship. America can and should assume the leadership in arousing world opinion and in order to impress upon the people and the leaders of the Russian satellite countries how thoroughly the freedom-loving people of the world disapprove of their actions.

Based upon these reasons, Mr. President, I have prepared, and now send to the desk and I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference, a resolution urgently requesting the President to take the necessary steps to bring before the United Nations the matter of the prosecutions of the 15 Protestant ministers by the Bulgarian Government, and to pursue such steps as may be expedient and necessary to expose all facts and information showing the falsity and the absurdity of the accusations against these religious leaders. Further, the resolution requests that the President consider employing such sanctions against the Bulgarian Government as may be possible and warranted under the circumstances.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 75) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved, That the President is requested to cause the United States representatives to the United Nations to take such action as may be necessary (1) to bring before the United Nations the matter of the prosecution of the 15 Protestant ministers and leaders by the Government of Bulgaria, (2) to expose all facts showing the falsity and absurdity of the accusations upon which such prosecution is being maintained, and (3) to secure the imposition by the United Nations of such sanctions against the Government of Bulgaria as may be possible and warranted under the circumstances. The President is further requested to cause the Department of State to take such action, independent of the action of the United Nations, with respect to the prosecution of these 15 Protestant ministers and leaders as may be possible and warranted under the circumstances.

AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT OF 1948—AMENDMENTS

Mr. TYDINGS and Mr. DOWNEY each submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (S. 833) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the senior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and myself, I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference an amendment intended to be proposed by us to the bill (S. 833) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, on which bill hearings are now being held before the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and printed.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. STENNIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2632) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 10, line 20, to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,350,000."

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HON. J. FRANK McLAUGHLIN, OF HAWAII, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF HAWAII

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, March 4, 1949, at 11:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of the Honorable J. Frank McLaughlin, of Hawaii, to be United States district judge for the district of Hawaii. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 22, 1949. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

INDEFINITE POSTPONEMENT OF A BILL

On motion of Mr. LANGER, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 741) to place certain restrictions upon the transfer of generating plants and electric transmission and distribution lines financed in whole or in part through loans made pursuant to the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, and it was indefinitely postponed.

ORDER FOR REFERENCE OF REPORTS OF COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, without establishing a precedent, I ask unanimous consent that whenever reports are filed with the President of the Senate by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, pursuant to Public Law 162 of the Eightieth Congress, as amended, the President of the Senate may refer said reports, notwithstanding the fact that the Senate may not be in session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT BEFORE THE PENNSYLVANIA MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Senator TAFT, at the fortieth annual meeting of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association, Philadelphia, February 22, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXCERPTS FROM JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR McMAHON

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from the address delivered by him at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner at New Haven, Conn., on February 24, 1949, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE NATIONAL SECURITY RESOURCES BOARD—NOMINATION OF MON C. WALLGREN

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address prepared by him for delivery to the people of the State of Washington relating to the responsibilities of the National Security Resources Board, the National Security Council, and the Central Intelligence Agency, and to his opposition to the appointment of Mr. Mon C. Wallgren to be Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROSPECT OF NATIONAL BANKRUPTCY—CORRESPONDENCE WITH SENATOR THYE

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD correspondence between Marx Campbell, of Simpson, Minn., and Senator THYE with reference to the suggested bankruptcy of the United States, which appears in the Appendix.]

EFFECT OF STEEL SHORTAGE ON DEVELOPMENT OF WESTERN OIL INDUSTRY

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Cedor B. Aronow on the subject of the critical effect of the steel shortage on the development of the western oil industry, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED REPEAL OF TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a transcript of the broadcast of a radio discussion regarding repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act participated in by Senator TAFT and Senator DOUGLAS on the People's Platform program, which appears in the Appendix.]

ON ACQUIRING A REPUTATION—ADDRESS BY RICHARD L. EVANS

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject On Acquiring a Reputation, delivered by Richard L. Evans on January 16, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPHECY OF REV. FOUNTAIN E. PITTS

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Charles Parmer relative to a prophecy made in 1857 by Rev. Fountain E. Pitts, which appears in the Appendix.]

"SAVING OUR FUTURE"—AN EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON STAR

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Saving Our Future,"

published in the Washington Star on February 3, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

"IS CVA-MVA-TVA LEGISLATION SOCIALISTIC?"—ARTICLE BY PACIFIC NORTHWEST DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION

[Mr. ECTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Is CVA-MVA-TVA Legislation Socialistic?" by the Pacific Northwest Development Association of Portland, Oreg., which appears in the Appendix.]

"PRACTICE PATRIOTISM"—EDITORIAL FROM THE TULSA TRIBUNE

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Practice Patriotism," from the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune, February 19, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

"DRIFT TOWARD DICTATORSHIP"—EDITORIAL FROM THE YOUNGSTOWN VINDICATOR

[Mr. BRICKER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Drift Toward Dictatorship," published in the Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator, February 15, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

ESTABLISHMENT OF WAGE SCALES—STATEMENT BY DR. GEORGE W. CRANE

[Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article quoting Dr. George W. Crane, of Chicago, regarding the establishment of wage scales, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE RANKIN VETERANS' PENSION BILL—ARTICLE FROM ARMY TIME

[Mr. BALDWIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an analysis of the so-called Rankin pension bill, which will be published in Army Time, and which appears in the Appendix.]

THE TAFT-HARTLEY LAW AND THE PRESIDENT'S JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY ADDRESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I did not have the pleasure of attending the Washington Jefferson-Jackson banquet last night nor to hear the distinguished President of the United States. I was not invited. I want to say to my Democratic friends, however, that if I had been invited and they had bought a ticket for me I think I would have gone. I am not so sure but that such an invitation would have been a gracious act on their part for nonpartisan services rendered by me in the past. Nevertheless, I was not in attendance at the banquet at which the President made certain ad lib remarks on which I wish to comment. My attention has been called this morning to the President's prepared speech, as printed in the New York Times. My attention has also been called to certain ad lib remarks the President is reported to have made; at least some of those who attended the banquet have advised me in regard to those ad lib remarks.

Of course I would not think, Mr. President, on this occasion of attempting to quote the President, particularly in regard to ad lib remarks which I did not hear, and so I will comment only on what I understand was the nature of those remarks. I understand that the President in his speech last night made certain remarks about the Taft-Hartley law. In his formal speech he said, as reported in the New York Times of this morning:

Right now the special interests are using every trick they can think of to defeat our labor policy.

After the election, hardly anybody had a good word to say about the Taft-Hartley Act.

But now, when I ask the Congress to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act, exactly as I said I would in the campaign, there are great outcries from the special interests.

"He can't mean it," they say. "Repeal the Taft-Hartley Act? Repeal that beneficent, charitable, kindly old statute—the charter of labor, and the workingman's friend. Why, it's unthinkable."

TAFT LAW "AN INSULT"

And they keep this up night and day in an effort to convince the people that the Taft-Hartley Act is a good law. But it's no use.

All the oratory in the world won't change a bad law into a good law.

When the Taft-Hartley Act was before the Congress, a Republican Senator called it "a device for making unions so weak they cannot carry on effective collective bargaining."

Now I digress, Mr. President, to say that I hope it is not presumptuous on my part to infer, as many of those present at the dinner apparently did infer, and as many of my friends here in the Senate in the cloakrooms this morning have inferred, that our good President was referring to the junior Senator from Oregon in his reference to a Republican Senator. It is true, Mr. President, that during the debate on the Taft-Hartley law that is exactly the language I did use in opposition to the Taft-Hartley bill. And I repeat it now. I not only repeat that language by way of incorporation by reference, Mr. President, but I incorporate also every other criticism I made at the time of the debate on the Taft-Hartley bill. Subsequent events have proved those arguments to be sound. It was apparently at this point in his speech, if I am correctly advised—and I certainly mean no injustice to the President—that the President digressed from his manuscript to ad lib. I highly approve of ad libbing as a matter of speech form. I enjoy most of the President's ad lib remarks. I think he is most effective, and is most colorful, too, in his ad lib remarks. I do not mean that I approve of all his ad lib remarks or their implications, Mr. President. But nevertheless I like a free and easy speaker, and I enjoy having a President of the United States speak out of his own mind, because I am sure then, if he is not speaking from manuscript, I am getting his own thoughts and not those of somebody else. Now, returning to the President's speech of last night, I understand he said:

When the Taft-Hartley Act was before the Congress a Republican Senator called it "a device for making unions so weak they cannot carry on effective collective bargaining."

That is exactly what I did say. The President then ad libbed to the effect—and I do not quote him; I only quote the meaning he left, at least with those who heard him and who have reported to me—that this same Republican Senator is now doing all he can, apparently, to prevent repeal of the Taft-Hartley law. At least I understand the President gave the impression that he apparently is laboring under the illusion and delusion that the junior Senator from Oregon is doing what he can to prevent the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law.

Now, as a matter of service to the President of the United States, because I always want him to have the facts on any issue he discusses, I take this opportunity to give the President the facts as to the position of the junior Senator from Oregon on the Taft-Hartley law. But first let me finish the quotation from his speech of last night in regard to the Taft-Hartley law, because I think the points which were in his prepared remarks on the Taft-Hartley law were very good, in these few paragraphs at least. He said:

That was true then, and it is true now.

I agree with him. He further said:

The Taft-Hartley Act is an insult to the workingmen and women of this country, and they will not rest until it is destroyed.

I agree with him.

After the election I thought we would have the cooperation of our Republican friends in this effort. I felt sure that the Republican Party would be anxious to throw the Taft-Hartley Act overboard faster than the sailors got rid of Jonah. I am beginning to think that maybe I was wrong about that.

No matter what the Republicans do, the course our party should follow is clear.

I emphasize that last observation of the President's for my good friends on the other side of the aisle.

No matter what the Republicans do, the course our party should follow is clear.

The Democratic Party, in its platform, is solemnly committed to work for repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act.

We are working for its repeal, and with the support of fair-minded Americans, regardless of party, we will continue to work for its repeal until it is replaced upon our statute books with a labor law that is fair and decent.

I commend the President for the expression anew of his desire to repeal the Taft-Hartley law; and I particularly commend him also for the statement that he is going to work toward that end "until it is replaced upon our statute books with a labor law that is fair and decent." That is all the junior Senator from Oregon seeks to accomplish.

It was because of my great interest, I may say to the President of the United States, in trying to have enacted a labor law which would be fair and decent, that I urged public hearings on the so-called Thomas bill, and insisted that such hearings last for a sufficient period of time to assure their fairness and to afford opportunity for a reasonable presentation of available evidence on the working of the Taft-Hartley law.

I am sure that the President is aware of the fact that we had a great deal of difficulty in getting such hearings. There was a time when many Democrats on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare were apparently of the opinion that we should proceed to repeal the Taft-Hartley law with practically no hearings at all. I want to advise the President that as a result of the action which the Republicans on the committee took, and our

insistence that there be a fair extension of the hearings, there resulted an agreement to extend the hearings until February 23.

I should like also to say to the President of the United States that as a result of the extension of the hearings from the steam-roller date of February 10, which the Democrats first sought to impose upon us, to the date of February 23, we were able to build up a record of evidence which I recommend to the Democrats for reading, if they are truly interested in the passage at this session of Congress of a piece of legislation which the President refers to as "a labor law that is fair and decent." But I think the President ought to be aware of the fact that when the Democrats first started discussing the labor issue in the Senate in this session of Congress it was their obvious intention to rush through a measure known as the Thomas bill, without adequate hearings on that bill or on the Taft-Hartley Act. They sought to force upon us a time schedule which would have made it impossible for us to judge, on the basis of evidence, whether or not the Thomas bill should be adopted without change.

I should like also to refresh the President's recollection as to some of the floor strategy at the time the Taft-Hartley Act was passed in the first place. Members of this body know that on the Taft-Hartley bill there was in the Senate a lasting, historic debate for many days. This body was composed of two groups of men who had honest, sincere, conscientious differences of opinion as to what ought to be in the labor legislation passed by the Congress. The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare reported, by a vote of 11 to 2, the so-called committee bill generally referred to as the Ives-Morse bill. I took the position then, and I take it again today, that it was a great mistake that we did not adopt on the floor of the Senate the committee bill without change. I take the position today that had we done so there would have been some great differences in the trends of American politics from the date of passage of the Taft-Hartley bill to November 2, 1948.

I distinctly recall saying from my desk on the floor of the Senate to my Republican colleagues, "If you pass this bill in this form, you will hear about it at the ballot boxes of America on November 2, 1948." We heard about it all right. So I repeat that I think we made a great mistake in changing the committee bill by amendments on the floor of the Senate and in conference into the Taft-Hartley bill.

I am sure that the President's memory will enable him to recall that after his veto message on the Taft-Hartley bill was sent to the Senate there was an attempt on the part of a coalition of Republicans and Democrats in the Senate to force immediate action that Friday afternoon on the President's veto message. I am sure the President will recall that a group of us organized a prolonged debate in opposition to the attempt to force a vote by way of a demanded unanimous consent agreement which the leadership then sought to get some of us to accept, for a vote that Friday afternoon or the following Saturday afternoon. Some of the leaders finally said to me in the cloakroom, "Unless you agree to vote Saturday at 5 o'clock, you had better start talking." As I stated on the floor of the Senate later, I am not very easily intimidated, and we started talking after the leadership refused to accept our offer that the vote on the President's veto message should be postponed until Monday afternoon at 3 o'clock. I said to the Republican leadership, "I will go along with such a unanimous-consent agreement."

I repeat now what I said at that time, that a vote could not have been had before that Monday afternoon even if a cloture petition had been filed that Friday afternoon. If such a cloture petition had been filed, it would have had to lie over Saturday, and it could not have been voted upon until Monday. Then, assuming that no Senator wished to exercise the right of debate, the earliest time it could have been voted upon would have been Monday afternoon, at or about the time when those of us who were opposed to an immediate vote on the veto offered to vote.

I do not wish to recall all of that argumentative battle other than to say that all we asked for was a reasonable postponement of the vote on the veto message from Friday or Saturday until Monday. I am sure the President recalls the fight which I put up in an endeavor to sustain his veto. I am sure that the President also will recall that no evidence was given to us at any time that the President made any effort to try to get the Senate to sustain his veto. In fact, I believe the record is clear that the President went to a baseball game during the time when some of us were making a fight on the floor of the Senate for due deliberation of his veto message. It was our hope that over the week end, through the reaction of the people of the country, this body might see the advisability of sustaining the President's veto and then proceeding immediately with a reconsideration of the bill which came out of the Senate committee. The record shows that I said I would offer to the Senate a proposal to reconsider the Senate committee bill if the Senate sustained the President's veto of the Taft-Hartley bill.

There would not have been adequate consideration of the President's veto message if at the time it reached the Senate floor he had not received assistance from the Republican Senator to whom he apparently referred in his speech last night.

I wish to say further, Mr. President, that I have made a consistent fight in my public life for the protection of the legitimate rights of organized labor. I have refused to go along with organized labor when I thought it was seeking to use pressure devices to obtain advantages to which it was not entitled. I have to go back only a few days, Mr. President, in order to testify from experience as to what labor pressure may mean when labor groups are displeased with a Member of the Senate for following a course of action which they do not like. Organized labor, as represented by some of their major leaders, did not like the fact—and do not like it yet—that I was responsible, at least in part, for carrying on the fight in this body for a reasonable extension of the hearings on labor legislation so that various groups would have adequate opportunity to present their case for or against the Thomas bill, for or against the Taft-Hartley law.

Mr. President, when I say that I have followed a consistent policy in seeking to protect the legitimate rights of labor and the legitimate rights of management and the legitimate rights of the public in the very controversial field of industrial relations, I am very glad that I have never taken the position that it is good government to propose at any time that strikers be drafted into the Army of the United States. If the present President of the United States feels that such a proposal—which he made at one time to the Congress of the United States—would constitute fair and decent labor legislation, I must respectfully dissent from that point of view. Bad as the Taft-Hartley law is in certain of its provisions, yet there is nothing in that law so destructive of the basic freedoms of American workers as the proposal of the President of the United States to draft strikers into the Army of the United States. I wish to recall to American labor that it was from the Republican side of the aisle on that historic day that the first protests came against the President's proposal to draft strikers and make the Army a strikebreaking force. It was on the Republican side of the aisle that day—both on the floor of the Senate and over the radio, within a few minutes after the President's message proposing to draft striking railroad workers into the Army of the United States—that the movement started to stop the President in his attempt to violate what I consider to be precious and legitimate rights of American labor.

The President is entitled to his fair share of mistakes, as are the rest of us. That was a serious mistake on his part, just as it would be a serious mistake on his part if he followed the advice of the Attorney General of the United States that in the case of an emergency dispute he has inherent power, not expressed in the Constitution, to proceed to ask the courts to issue an injunction. When we get into the debate on the Thomas bill and the debate on the emergency disputes section of that particular bill, there will be discussed at some length on the floor of the Senate the Attorney General's letter which was filed before our committee and the startling proposition, set forth in that letter, that there is an inherent power, without congressional sanction, in the President of the United States to proceed to seek an injunction in an emergency dispute. I wish to say that any attempt on the part of any President of the United States to exercise any such power in regard to a peacetime problem of labor relations would be clear usurpation of authority under the Constitution of the United States.

I call the President's attention to these matters today because I am afraid that last night his memory was a bit short, and also because I want him to know that if his advisers had attempted to advise him in regard to the position the junior Senator from Oregon has

taken consistently throughout the hearings on the Thomas bill, they would not have been able to cite to him a single bit of evidence that the junior Senator from Oregon has changed his view one whit from the view he expressed throughout the campaign, namely, that the Taft-Hartley law should be repealed. I say once again that I think it should be repealed, but I do not think the Thomas bill should be put in its place. I think we should enact legislation which will be truly fair and decent to all parties to industrial disputes in the United States, including management. In due course of time, and apparently we are now going to have plenty of time, Mr. President, I propose to offer, either in committee or on the floor of the Senate—and I hope I shall be able to do so with the joint endorsement and authorship of a good many of my Republican and my Democratic colleagues—what I consider to be some needed amendments to the Thomas bill. Such amendments will be needed if we are to have the type of fair and decent legislation for which the President pleaded last night.

Mr. President, let me now be somewhat presumptuous for a moment, if I may, and indulge in a little gratuitous advice to my friend in the White House, for whom I have great respect—the President of the United States. I should like to advise him today—because apparently he was not aware of it last night when he delivered his speech—that his real problem in the Eighty-first Congress, is not, after all, the Republicans. His real problem is with the Democrats. We Republicans are outvoted. He should be able to ignore us, I should think. But why cannot he ignore us? He cannot ignore us, Mr. President, because I think it is perfectly obvious that as of this hour he simply cannot get any unanimity of opinion among the Democrats, either in the Senate or in the House of Representatives. He did not seem to recognize, in his speech last night, that there is a great split in the Democratic Party on most of the major issues of his program, including the labor issue.

Mr. President, in the Eighty-first Congress, as in Congresses gone by, most of the legislation is going to be passed or rejected, as has always been the case, by coalitions of Members of the House or the Senate who cross party lines out of a firm and deep and sincere personal conviction that their primary responsibility is to vote on the merits of issues, as they see those issues. I think that is good government, and I believe it is good legislative practice. Although undoubtedly I shall be found time and time again opposed, on the merits, to the position taken on specific legislation by coalitions of ultra conservative Republicans and Democrats in the Senate of the United States, yet at the same time the fact is that undoubtedly I myself shall be a party to another coalition, namely one with liberal Democrats and liberal Republicans. It is such coalitions which determine the final legislation passed by the Senate in connection with most issues.

Neither the Republicans nor the Democrats can be expected to vote as a solid group on most major issues and I see no reason for surprise over that political reality. In the interest of those political realities I think it wise to point out to the President that the great problem which confronts his legislative program in the Eighty-first Congress is a Democratic problem, a problem of the Democratic Party, not of the Republicans at all. Many Democrats I feel sure will not support his labor program without change.

Mr. President, I hope that in the days immediately ahead a coalition will form on labor legislation which will provide a preponderant majority of Republicans and Democrats in support of the type of amendments which I intend to offer. My amendments will result in the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law and the substitution therefor of a fair and decent piece of legislation which will protect the legitimate rights of all parties to labor problems including the public. I say I hope that in the days immediately ahead that coalition will be formed between Republicans and Democrats providing such a preponderant majority so that in relatively short order, consistent with full and fair debate, we can end once and for all the growing resentment in American industrial life against the Taft-Hartley Act. However, we are going to have plenty of time to form such a coalition, because I understand, subject to the calling of a special meeting of the committee, that it is not contemplated by the Democrats on the Labor and Public Welfare Committee to hold an executive session on the labor legislation until 1 week from today. I believe that probably will result in the saving of time in the long run. Nevertheless I think it is not unfair for me to say, if that proves to be the program—and I think it is the program—that it fortifies the position I first took on this matter, namely there never has been any need for the great steam-roller rush that was attempted by the Democrats in the beginning of our discussion of labor legislation. If I am correctly advised, the House has not even started hearings on labor legislation. The Democrats appear to have bogged down over there on this issue. Therefore I invite, and I hope they will welcome the invitation, the Democratic Senators to proceed to study, along with the Republican Senators, the very carefully prepared reports as presented in our hearings on labor legislation. I am confident that if they do so there will not be anywhere near a majority vote in the Senate for the Thomas bill, there will not be anywhere near a majority vote in the Senate for the continuation of the Taft-Hartley law, but there will be an overwhelming vote in the Senate of the United States for the adoption of a middle-course piece of legislation which will preserve such good as there is in the Taft-Hartley and Wagner Acts, but will be mainly a new bill known as the national labor relations bill of 1949.

I close by saying I hope this gratuitous counseling on my part will not be offensive to the President, because—and I am very sincere, and not facetious at all when I say this—I mean no affront to the President. I mean only to try to correct him factually on his statements. I suggest that if he wants fair labor legislation he should direct his attention primarily to his Democratic colleagues in both the Senate and the House.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to refer briefly to the feast of Belshazzar, last night, to which the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] also referred.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I yield for insertions in the RECORD and routine requests.

POSITION OF UNITED STATES AS TO ESSENTIAL RAW MATERIALS

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in June of 1943 I made a speech which developed in some detail the fact that the United States had become a have-not nation in terms of essential raw materials. Since that time, the situation has grown worse and is causing concern to all students of the problem. I wish that something could be done to arouse public sentiment to the dangers of the situation. If we lose our sources of material strength we will in many ways have dealt a real death blow to our country. In an effort to inform the Senators as to the sad march of events in the field of the depletion of our resources, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two clippings.

There being no objection, the clippings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the San Francisco News of February 16, 1949]

UNITED STATES NOW A HAVE-NOT NATION IN MANY STRATEGIC MATERIALS—A SOUND MINERAL POLICY MUST BE INCORPORATED IN UNITED STATES FOREIGN PLANS

(By Alex Streloff)

Whether or not we are to hear the drums of war roll again in the foreseeable future, the United States has become a have-not nation with respect to a long list of strategic minerals. Thus, a broad program of action is called for if we are to avoid military disaster or at least a declining standard of living.

This was the grim message of a symposium on national mineral policy held at the Mark Hopkins Hotel late yesterday during the annual convention here of the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers.

Emphasizing that we are approaching a crisis in our mineral situation, a paper by Alan M. Bateman, chairman of the department of geology at Yale University, emphasized that we have changed from the role of abundance to scarcity in copper, lead, and zinc, for example.

ONLY 25 YEARS' RESERVE

Mr. Bateman cited an official Government survey which stated that estimated reserves of 23 out of 41 principal metals and minerals in this country have an indicated life of less than 25 years. Of these, 9 have a life of less than 10 years.

While personally taking a more optimistic view of the mineral reserves, particularly if suitable incentives are given mining companies for development, Mr. Bateman said it is idle to bicker about a few years, when there is no doubt of the shortage in the longer period.

We must look abroad for new sources of raw materials, he observed, and that will require the incorporation of a sound mineral policy in our foreign policy in order to assure an adequate supply of minerals to meet the industrial and security needs of the Nation.

STOCK-PILING PROGRAM

Discussing the history and future of the stock-piling program, Richard J. Lund, supervisor, engineering economics division, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, Ohio, indicated that the program's objectives are between $3,400,000,000 minimum and $8,000,000,000 maximum, which apparently is based on an assumed 5-year period of war.

As of the end of 1948, he reported virtually the entire $800,000,000 of cash and contract authority authorized had been spent or committed, leaving nothing for new purchases. President Truman has asked for supplemental authorization of $310,000,000 for the remainder of fiscal 1949, together with $525,000,000 for new obligational authority in 1950.

Mr. Lund was critical of the diversion of stock-piled materials to industrial use, and he underlined the view that the stock pile is not a marginal program nor a residual claimant for resources but is actually a high-priority program, a vital part of the pattern for national security.

PROCESS MATERIALS NOW

He urged the processing of materials into a form ready for use by industry. This, he pointed out, would have the effect of stock piling labor, power, and materials used in converting raw materials.

In conclusion, Mr. Lund emphasized:

"Money spent on this program is a wise investment in national security and even though some measure of harm or inconvenience may be suffered by segments of the mineral industry in the program speed-up, such sacrifices should, and undoubtedly will, be made in the national interest."

Otto Herres, vice president of Combined Metals Reduction Co., touched on a series of possible actions, which he said would strengthen the domestic mining industry.

TAXATION INCENTIVE

He recommended that taxation for mining operations should make allowance for all costs, expenses, and losses and permit a return adequate to yield the recovery of capital. No Federal tax should be assessed on new ventures until the original investment is repaid.

Discussing tariff reductions on minerals and metals may have gone too far. Foreign economics are being industrialized, he observed, and eventually they must export or die.

"We cannot compete," Mr. Herres said, "with the low wages and cheap prices of South America, Asia, and Africa in products of agriculture and mining now."

In dealing with subsidies and other incentives, he argued, "the more realistic perhaps feel that in case the economic planners in Washington are going to divide our wealth with the less privileged nations of the world and support mines in foreign countries, it might just as well try to salvage something for the domestic mining industry."

[From the San Francisco Chronicle of February 16, 1949]

INSTITUTE OF MINING—UNITED STATES APPROACHING MINERAL CRISIS, SPEAKERS WARN

(By Sidney P. Allen)

We are approaching a crisis in our mineral situation. It is inevitable that more and more the United States will have to depend upon foreign sources and minerals. Our need for future foreign minerals indicates the desirability of reviewing international affairs with respect to how major political developments may affect sources of mineral supplies.

This warning was sounded by Alan M. Bateman, of Yale University, in a symposium on the national minerals policy at yesterday's session of the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers. His conclusions were based on two points.

First, we had to turn to 53 different countries for our mineral supplies to feed our war machine. We were dependent upon foreign sources entirely for 27 minerals, and we imported some 60 varieties of mineral commodities.

Second, studies of the mineral resources of the United States indicate that our domestic reserve of many minerals are very limited, that for eight there are no reserves here. Moreover, our accelerated industrial development plus population growth is eating up supplies at an increasing tempo.

Consequently, it will be necessary for Government to help maintain an adequate flow of essential minerals. Industry will have to lean more heavily on Government, and Government will have to learn to support industry. This points to the necessity of establishing a national mineral policy as a part of our foreign policy, Bateman declared.

STRENGTH AT HOME

Another speaker on the symposium, Otto Herres, vice president of Combined Metals Reduction Co., declared that self-preservation requires the strengthening and protection of our mineral resources if we are to weather a new era charged with conflict. This we are not doing, in his opinion. For nearly a generation private initiative has been handicapped by restrictive legislation and confiscatory taxation, he said.

Present tax practices discourage exploration and development. No Federal income tax should be assessed on new ventures until the original investment is repaid, for mines should be permitted to develop and prosper in order to yield good tax returns, he stressed. And tax regulations should permit a balancing of losses against profits from year to year.

Herres said that there are far greater barriers to world trade today than the little that remains of the American tariff system. So, where lowering of tariffs jeopardizes domestic productive ability it cannot be considered in our best interest. A large stock pile is important for emergency, he noted, but for national security it must be supported by adequate domestic production.

Richard J. Lund, of Battelle Memorial Institute, speaking on stock piling, said that stock-pile deliveries by the end of fiscal 1950 should be about $1,600,000,000 of a total objective of $3,700,000,000. He, too, stressed that along with stock piling our laws should encourage exploration for and development of domestic sources. This is certainly of equal importance, Lund noted, and that means urgent.

PETROLEUM

Two petroleum talks, one in the morning and the other last evening, were pertinent. Austin Cadle of Standard Oil of California noted that the energy requirements of the Far West economy largely are provided by oil. In fact, about 70 percent, or double that in the rest of the country, comes from natural gas and oil in this region.

Oil production here has risen to about 950,000 barrels daily from 700,000 barrels in 1941. Cadle declared that California should be capable of meeting its needs for several years to come as possibilities for developing new production here are by no means exhausted. He particularly noted vast supplies of oil and natural gas through West Texas, New Mexico, the Rocky Mountains, and Alberta, Canada, as assuring the power destiny of this Western region.

Reese H. Taylor, president of Union Oil Co. of California, warned against the pitfalls of extreme specialization in an entertaining dinner address. Methods, he emphasized, must not become more important than objectives. The real objective is not just oil, but power and heat and roads and the other things oil products can help provide for people.

With this in mind, Taylor suggested that the mining engineers develop at least a speaking acquaintance with other branches of the industry. For one of the dangers of specialization, one of the great challenges that faces our civilization, is the problem of helping the individual to see the significance of his contribution to society.

PARITY PRICES FOR FARMERS—LETTER FROM HARRY ZIMMERMAN AND AN EDITORIAL FROM THE DAKOTA FARMER

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter written to me by Mr. Harry Zimmerman, of Cleveland, N. Dak., together with an editorial which he enclosed from the Dakota Farmer, dealing with the matter of parity prices for farmers.

There being no objection, the letter and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLEVELAND, N. DAK., *February 16, 1949.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR BILL: Am enclosing a clipping from the Dakota Farmer that I think clears up the parity question pretty well. Another thing, does any Government official think we farmers can pay taxes at the present rate if our income is cut to 60 percent of parity or help furnish food and money to keep Europe on its feet if we have to operate at a 40 percent loss?

With best wishes,

HARRY ZIMMERMAN.

P. S.—You might show this to Senator YOUNG.

WHOSE FREEDOM IS IT?

Arguments are flying thick and fast against high support prices for farm products. Most of these arguments state that farmers will face the possibility of losing their freedom if they submit to these price supports. The folks who think we should have either low or no price supports also wave the danger flag and ask if farmers are willing to submit to Government controls on acreages in order to obtain high price supports. Now, when we say that these folks ask if farmers are willing to submit to acreage controls, what we mean is that they make those statements in the speeches they make and the articles they write. We don't mean that they ever go out in the country and actually ask any farmers what they think about it. It might be a pretty good idea if they did ask a few farmers. We believe that they would get some different answers than when they answer the questions themselves.

There is a lot of talk about possible loss of political and economic freedom if farmers accept high-price supports. We might ask if any farmer you know lost any of his freedom the past few years when price supports were in effect; when price supports assured enough production so that prices of food remained reasonable. It used to take 30 hours of work each week for a factory worker to earn enough for food to feed his family—in 1914. Today, 12 hours of work each week will buy the family food for a week. Does that sound like farmers are getting too much for what they produce? Doesn't that show that price supports have kept food prices down, at a time when other prices and wages increased? In fact, wages went up about 500 percent when food costs rose only 150 percent.

What freedom would any farmer lose if he accepted high-price supports? Maybe the folks who talk against high support prices are worried about the fact that farmers may be told to reduce the acreages of some crops. We wonder if farmers are too much worried about this possible reduction. We wonder if the experts know that a farmer would rather plant 90 acres of wheat, and be guaranteed $2 a bushel, than he would plant 120

acres and have no guaranty of what he would get for his crop when he hauled it to the elevator.

Yes, the folks who worry about farmers losing their freedom should get out and talk to some of them. Then they might realize that most folks are more concerned about prices than they are afraid of losing liberties. It rather reminds us of the story of the fellow who didn't believe in conservation. However, he was a strong believer in grasshopper control. His land kept eroding, and he continued to fight the hoppers. The day he killed the last hopper the last inch of his topsoil washed away. Looking at his lost farm, he exclaimed, "Well, thank goodness, I at least got rid of the hoppers."

We are just wondering if a fellow who believed in freedom so strongly that he didn't care about prices, might not be in the same predicament. As he saw his farm mortgage foreclosed, his bank account gone, and his family in need, he might say, "Well, thank goodness, I at least kept my freedom."

Last December, in the Dakota Farmer, we stated that we believed the law permitting price supports to go as low as 60 percent would be changed. We also stated that price supports would remain near 90 percent—in a new law to be passed by the present Congress. We further remarked that we didn't believe farmers would object to some acreage control if assured at least 90 percent of parity. We still believe those statements are correct and that you'll agree with us. Maybe the experts, who are so wrought up about farmers losing their freedom, should be just a little quieter and let the farmers speak for themselves. After all, whose freedom is it?

THE FARM-PRICE SITUATION—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, there appeared in the Washington Post of February 19, 1949, an editorial giving a far better than average analysis of the farm-price situation.

The Post is indeed to be congratulated for its straight thinking and its fair viewpoint on the over-all problems of agriculture—not only as it affects the farmer, but the Nation as a whole.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, together with a statement by myself be inserted in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of February 19, 1949]

FARM PRICES

A year ago a violent break occurred in prices of wheat, corn, and other farm products, bringing with it predictions of a general business recession. But despite the 1948 February collapse the wholesale price index for all commodities continued to advance, reaching its peak last August. Furthermore, the wholesale-price index for farm products was close to the January level by June, while the wholesale food index was well above its January level by the end of July. Thereafter farm and food prices began to decline and by the end of 1948 wholesale prices of farm products were about 10 percent lower than a year earlier, and December wholesale food prices were 5 percent below the level of December 1947. However, averages of this kind cover up erratic fluctuations in prices of particular commodities. Prices of grains, for instance, were 35 percent below the level of the previous year at the end of 1948, and since then there has been another sharp drop. To be more specific, wheat sold for immediate delivery brought $2.08 a bushel last week in Kansas City compared with $3.10 in 1947, while corn sold in Chicago for $1.19 per bushel compared with $2.83 a year ago.

The gyrations of the speculative market can be discounted to some extent; but the downward trend of cash prices for basic crops cannot be dismissed as a temporary phenomenon. On the contrary, it points to a relaxation, if not a disappearance, of inflationary pressures in an important segment of the economy. We would not venture to predict whether the declines that have occurred in the prices of basic farm commodities are a prelude to a general price deflation. Nor would it be safe to hazard a guess as to the future course of farm prices. For the Government will undoubtedly make strenuous efforts to prop sagging farm prices through loans and stepped-up buying of grain for export.

It seems fairly certain, however, that the strong particularistic inflationary trend that lifted prices of farm products and food to dizzy heights has run its course. Export demands for grains and foodstuffs, made all the more pressing by a succession of poor European crops, coupled with high domestic demands sustained by inflated consumer incomes, encouraged American farmers to step up production in response to high and rapidly rising prices. Favored by good weather, bumper crops have been harvested, with the result that supply has overtaken and exceeded demand at existing price levels.

The high prices that have prevailed for food—and still prevail in retail markets—have also been a powerful influence in accelerating inflationary price increases in other areas of the economy. For example, the high cost of food has given impetus to the drive for wage increases and these wage increases have in turn increased production costs and raised prices of nonagricultural commodities. The upward price adjustments in nonagricultural commodities have so far largely offset the effect on the general price level of agricultural price deflation. Divergent price trends of this sort help to explain why some economists, notably the President's Council of Economic Advisers, conclude that inflationary influences are still dominant and back the President's demands for legislative anti-inflationary curbs.

The question that is now being debated is whether the drop in farm prices will spread to other lines of production and bring about a general business recession or should simply be regarded as a needed corrective adjustment of a badly unbalanced price structure. The answer to that question lies in the realm of prophecy because psychology as well as economics are involved. More light will be thrown on the situation when there has been sufficient time for the drop in wholesale food prices to be reflected in comparable declines in living costs, which so far have been negligible. If lower living costs remove the pressure for wage increases, one of the major obstacles to industrial expansion will be eliminated. At the same time, relieved from the pressure of excessively high food costs, effective consumer demand for the products of industry will be strengthened.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR YOUNG

While farm prices have declined from 20 percent to as high as 60 percent in the past year, the things that the farmer has to purchase in the everyday operation of his farm have increased tremendously in the past 6 years. Even worse, during this past year when farm commodity prices were dropping, the prices of the industrial goods the farmer has to purchase have increased at an accelerated rate. Even at this time farmers are producing practically at cost and there is no indication that the things he must buy will drop in price. Indeed, there is every indication that they will continue to increase.

As a result of accumulating surpluses in almost every farm commodity, there is little likelihood that the price of farm commodities will increase in the near future or, perhaps, for years except for occasional rises in the price of certain commodities for which there may at times be a temporary increased demand.

Since last April there was made available to European nations $1,180,000,000 in Marshall plan funds for the purchase of United States farm commodities. Had it not been for these purchases, agriculture today would be in even worse condition than it is. At the same time, however, that ECA made this $1,180,000,000 available for the purchase of United States food supplies, they also and, in my opinion, unwisely and directly contrary to the ECA authorization, bought $617,000,000 worth of food supplies in other countries. During approximately this same period, the Army Quartermaster Corps made food purchases in foreign countries in excess of $50,000,000 for use of the armed forces in the occupied areas.

If this total of approximately $667,000,000 had been made available for the purchase of additional farm commodities within the United States, there would not have been this drastic decline in farm commodity prices, especially in wheat and all other grains.

ECA and the United States Department of Agriculture officials used an escape clause in the ECA authorization which permitted them to buy in off-shore countries if supplies were not available in the United States. Both contended that there was a shortage of shipping facilities which made wheat, for example, not available in the United States beyond the amount which they purchased.

Secretary of Agriculture, Charles Brannan, even went so far as to say that the expected 300,000,000 bushel carry-over as of July 1 next would not be a surplus. Yet, at the same time that these heavy purchases were being made in off-shore countries, he asked the American wheat farmer to reduce his acreage.

In the last 4 or 5 years, February and March have been the months when Europe was in greatest need of food and during these years the United States Government made its greatest effort in this period to export the greatest amount possible of wheat and other foods. It should be noted that in April of 1946 the United States Government even offered a bonus of 30 cents a bushel to secure additional supplies of wheat for European aid. And the Office of Defense Transportation, at President Truman's request, issued an emergency order to make available more cars to get wheat to the seaboard.

It is rather strange indeed that during this period of greatest need and when both ECA and the United States Department of Agriculture claim that shipping facilities are not available, that I should receive a letter this week from John Haw, a high official of the Northern Pacific Railway Co., which entirely refutes this claim of a shortage of shipping facilities. I quote one paragraph from his letter as follows:

"Just a word of comment on 'lack of sufficient shipping facilities to handle ECA grain purchased in this country.' The railroads are starving for business. We have good grain box piled up on every siding. Our first worry is to get foreign box made empty on line, off line as promptly as possible to cut down the per diem. Currently our business is off about 20 percent from a year ago, and, as you know, it was bad during the early part of 1948."

Of great importance, too, is the fact that during this period when we were accumulating great farm commodity surpluses in the United States and not taking full advantage

of ECA funds for European needs, the United States Department of Agriculture, which has the responsibility of supporting farm prices under the laws of Congress, has been spending tremendous sums for this purpose. Only this week top officials from the United States Department of Agriculture gave out the information that by July 1, 1949, the Commodity Credit Corporation will have committed approximately $2,500,000,000 of its $4,750,000,000 revolving funds made available for the price support program. Since July 1 is only the beginning of the heavy marketing season, it is estimated by the most authoritative officials that in all probability the entire $4,750,000,000 will be committed in support of farm prices under present support price levels.

While all of these commitments may not result in losses, many of these commitments of United States funds would not have been necessary at all if the Administration had taken full advantage of the appropriations for ECA by purchasing in the United States rather than foreign countries all over the world.

It should be noted that since last April ECA authorized the purchase of $354,000,000 worth of wheat in Canada alone. While meat prices have declined drastically in the last few weeks, we are still continuing to purchase beef in the Argentine and other countries for Army requirements.

Of great importance to American agriculture, too, is that while more than $200,000,000 has been spent to support the 1948 potato crop, more than 5,000,000 bushels of Canadian potatoes were imported.

There is yet another Government bureau which has had considerable to do with limiting the exports of United States farm commodities while farm commodity prices were collapsing. The Commerce Department, which has complete authority to control exports, has during this same period, and even today, limited through license control the export of many farm commodities. It is most difficult to understand why during these past many months they have been refusing to grant export licenses for wheat and other grains, fats and oils, etc.

Their restricting of exports of fats and oils has materially and adversely affected the price of such commodities as peanuts, flax, hogs, and grains.

On October 27 last I protested by telegram the action of the Department of Commerce in refusing to grant export licenses for fats and oils. Their answer to my telegram follows:

OCTOBER 28, 1948.

To Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
La Moure, N. Dak.:

In Secretary's absence I am replying to your telegram of October 27. Export allocations of scarce commodities are increased or export controls relaxed as warranted by improvements in the world supply situation. We have already removed controls from exports of grains and grain products to Latin America and the Philippines, our major markets. Further relaxations on exports of these commodities to certain destinations are under consideration. Fats and oils remain in extremely short supply on a world-wide basis. We have the responsibility for protecting the domestic economy against further inflation and possible short crops next year as well as maintaining adequate stocks against other possible emergencies. As part of our foreign recovery program, we must see that exportable supplies of these commodities are directed to the proper destinations. Continued exercise of export controls is essential to fulfill these responsibilities. It should be noted as well that exports of industrial items in short supply are under allocation and control.

I. P. W. STOKES,
Acting Secretary of Commerce.

These two sentences from the telegram from the Commerce Department are of more than passing interest: Fats and oils remain in extremely short supply on a world-wide basis. We have the responsibility for protecting the domestic market against further inflation and possible short crops next year as well as to maintain adequate stocks against other possible emergencies.

It is clear from this statement that the Commerce Department was exercising price control of American farm commodities probably in an even more effective manner than the OPA itself.

Again, this has been in a period when there were surpluses and their action, in my opinion, was largely responsible for our present demoralized market situation.

It is difficult for me to understand why on the one hand this Government is attempting to support farm prices and on the other hand it is doing everything it can to hold farm prices down.

With this type of administration of our Federal Government, the outlook for the future prosperity of farmers does not look too bright. The situation could become even worse in future years when foreign countries with their low standard of living and thus cheaper production costs again have surpluses which they undoubtedly will dump in the United States at prices far more favorable than their own. Frankly, I cannot see how any high level price support program can be maintained in this country under that type of policy. Farmers have not forgotten that period from 1932 to 1940 when prices were low for agriculture commodities and commodities were stored in every city and hamlet in the United States in large quantities. And at the same time, this, the greatest agricultural Nation in the world, actually imported more farm commodities than it exported.

It is abundantly clear that without an adequate price support program in the future and favorable action by every department of our Government, this Nation will face an even worse depression than the last.

CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN AUTHORITY OF THE MARITIME COMMISSION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to call up House Joint Resolution 92 and to ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the joint resolution for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 92) to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I understand it is the same resolution which passed the Senate, and this is a means of expediting action. I am advised that the objection offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] has now been withdrawn.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to have the record clear. In the Senate there was an amendment attached, on my motion. I am not offering it at this time, as I am advised by the Maritime Commission that the power conferred by the amendment which I proposed is now possessed by the Commission, so that there is no need, as I understand, for such an amendment.

There being no objection, the resolution (H. J. Res. 92), to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE FROM CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN BILLS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, among the bills now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary are Senate bills 571, 572, and 573, introduced on January 18 by the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]. The history of action on prior, similar bills shows that——

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BREWSTER. It has been my purpose to yield simply for the purpose of insertions in the RECORD. I am very sorry to interrupt the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, may I say that my remarks are not to be regarded as a speech; they are merely an explanation of a motion to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from consideration of certain bills.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am sorry, but I cannot yield under the circumstances. I have declined to yield to other Senators for the same reason. My speech will take only 5 minutes. The speech of the Senator from Nevada will not be delayed very long.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE—NOMINATION OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POSTMASTER

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I report a number of postmaster nominations, including the postmaster for the District of Columbia, 10 in Alabama, 6 in North Carolina, 6 in North Dakota, 13 in Texas, 2 in Missouri, and 2 in Maryland.

Concerning the nomination for the District of Columbia postmastership, the Post Office Department has asked that it be given immediate consideration because of the fact that they want him to take over on the 1st of March.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will there be any discussion in connection with the nomination?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. No; there will be no discussion. The committee was unanimous in requesting that I ask unanimous consent to have the nomination considered at this time, as in executive session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the various nominations will be placed on the calendar, with the exception of the one regarding the postmaster for the District of Columbia.

Is there objection to the present consideration, as in executive session, of the nomination of the postmaster for the city of Washington?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, is the Senator reporting this nomination

today and asking unanimous consent that it be acted upon today?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the purpose of the request.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. May I ask the reason for the request in the case of a postmaster?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Because of auditing reasons it is desired that the postmaster take office by the 1st day of March. It will make it much easier if that is done.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is the report of the committee unanimous?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The report is unanimous, and the committee asks that I make the request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the nomination.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Roy M. North to be postmaster at Washington, D. C.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and the President will be notified forthwith.

THE DEMOCRATIC VICTORY DINNER

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I wish to speak for a few moments, and I think my intention does not justify the apparent fear of Senators as to whether I might occupy the entire lunch hour in this discussion, as I do not propose to do. But I felt that before any of us went to lunch it might regale us if we did have an opportunity to turn over on our tongues the delightful and apparently very delicious feast of Belshazzar with which some of our friends were regaled last night at the price, I am advised, of a hundred dollars a plate.

It is estimated that there are from two to four million unemployed in this country at the present time. It is estimated that about 9,000,000 are working part time. I apprehend that these ten or twelve million, together with the twenty or thirty million of their dependents, will not be able to gather much enjoyment from this $100 dinner with which many of the faithful were regaled last night, as well as some others. I say that because I noted that the President, in discussing them, referred not only to the September and October Democrats, not only to the Monday and Tuesday Democrats, but, apparently not as an afterthought, he added also the Wednesday-morning Democrats, who have been the subject of much delightful comment during recent weeks. But I think this is the first time they have been officially recognized by the President and welcomed to the ranks. I suppose those who were willing to expend $100 for the dinner paid enough to cover their attendance and have gratified their desire for a remission of sin and a plenary indulgence.

Now I think we should consider the menu, because I assume it will be read with great delight by the twenty or thirty million who are the forgotten men, and who, according to the President, should have received the relief to which they were entitled. I say that because last summer the President told us that 15 days would be the entire time required to pass what we were told was necessary legislation. Sixty days will have passed by next Tuesday, four times the period he referred to last summer. So I take it that in his speech the President was indicating his irritation at the delay in the Senate and in the House. I think that is a fair inference. He even delicately suggests that later perhaps he may have to take to the road again and travel over the country to tell the people what is happening.

Far be it from a humble member of the minority to stand up here in defense of the procedures of the Eighty-first Congress. Whether it is going to run a close race with the Eightieth Congress on the record it will write is a matter on which apparently the President has some doubt.

Without violation of protocol or propriety, I should like to ask unanimous consent that the text of the President's address last night, as reported in the New York Times, be inserted in the RECORD at this point, unless before the end of this day some Member on the majority side of the aisle decides he desires to offer the President's address for this purpose. If so, I should not care to take away from him that privilege.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S ADDRESS TO THE JEFFERSON-JACKSON DINNER

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, this is a happy occasion for the Democratic Party. I know that all the gatherings of our party, throughout the country, are as cheerful as this one, and, I give all of them greetings.

I am happy to be here talking to you once more from the same old stand.

Incidentally, this is where I expected to be.

What I feel tonight is not personal pride or elation; it is a deep satisfaction that our party has served its country so well that the people have endorsed it for the fifth consecutive time.

I am aware that this was something of a surprise in certain quarters. I am told that some persons were even making elaborate plans, with considerable relish, to bury the Democratic Party and all that it stands for.

These persons were like certain friends of Andrew Jackson, whose memory we are honoring tonight.

Once upon a time, there were a number of citizens who thought that Andrew Jackson ought to have a suitable coffin. At great expense, they went to Syria and purchased a marble sarcophagus. A sarcophagus, as you know, is a tomb, a big marble coffin with a marble lid. These citizens then shipped this marble box to Washington, which was quite a job as it weighed 4 or 5 tons.

At last, they thought, a suitable resting place had been provided for Andrew Jackson.

The only trouble with the project was that Andrew Jackson was not dead. Moreover, he wasn't ready to die. He did not intend to be hurried to the grave.

Courteously but firmly he wrote to those well-meaning citizens and said, "I must decline the intended honor."

And they never did get Old Hickory into that thing. You can still see it, if you're interested, out in front of the Smithsonian Institution.

A STORY WITH A MORAL

I think that this little story has a moral in it. It is this: Before you offer to bury a good Democrat, you better be sure he is dead.

There is another lesson you can derive from the more recent past: You cannot bury the Democratic Party as long as it is working for the welfare and the advancement of the people of this Nation.

The central issue of the campaign last fall was the welfare of all the people against special privilege for the few.

When we made it clear where the Democratic Party stood on that issue, the people made it clear that they stood with us.

The Democratic party has had a long and glorious history. Through its founders and leaders, whom we honor tonight, its roots go back to the American Revolution. But however ancient and glorious it may be, our party is not and never has been an end in itself. The only justification for the Democratic Party is its usefulness to the American people in achieving the government they desire.

I am proud to say that never before has the Democratic Party been more firmly dedicated to a program in the interest of all the people. The platform adopted at the Democratic convention of 1948 is clear and forthright.

Our job now is to enact into law the programs that the people need and deserve.

That is exactly what we are doing.

We are meeting determined opposition. The special interests are fighting us just as if they had never heard of November second. For them, campaigns and elections are just preliminary exhibition matches—the fight in Congress is the main bout.

SAYS PEOPLE ARE AROUSED

The special interests are on the job year in and year out—7 days a week, and 24 hours a day. They work through their lobbies and pressure groups, through the editorial pages and the columnists and commentators they control. They twist and misrepresent the measures the people voted for. They are again trying to frighten the people with the old, worn-out bugaboo that socialism is taking over in Washington.

This one-sided barrage of propaganda seems overwhelming at first. There are no full-page ads on our side. In fact—all we have on our side is the people.

But that is enough—because the people are aroused.

I did a lot of traveling around the country last fall, and I found that the people were vitally interested in what their Government was doing. Make no mistake about it, there has never been a time when the people were so well informed about Congress, and the President, and the records of their Representatives and Senators as they are now.

This concern on the part of the people is a fine thing for the growth of democracy and responsible government. I propose to do all I can to help it along. In fact, I may even get on the train again and make another tour around the country to tell the people how their Government is getting on.

If we keep the people fully informed, I am confident that they will support the Congress and the President in our fight against the special interests.

It is important that the American people should be aware of the tactics that the special interests are using to obstruct our programs.

Right now the special interests are using every trick they can think of to defeat our labor policy.

After the election, hardly anybody had a good word to say about the Taft-Hartley Act.

But now, when I ask the Congress to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act, exactly as I said I would in the campaign, there are great outcries from the special interests.

"He can't mean it," they say. "Repeal the Taft-Hartley Act? Repeal that beneficent, charitable, kindly old statute—the charter of labor and the workingman's friend? Why, it's unthinkable."

TAFT LAW AN INSULT

And they keep this up night and day in an effort to convince the people that the Taft-Hartley Act is a good law. But it's no use.

All the oratory in the world won't change a bad law into a good law.

When the Taft-Hartley Act was before the Congress, a Republican Senator called it "a device for making unions so weak they cannot carry on effective collective bargaining."

That was true then, and it is true now.

The Taft-Hartley Act is an insult to the working men and women of this country, and they will not rest until it is destroyed.

After the election, I thought we would have the cooperation of our Republican friends in this effort. I felt sure that the Republican Party would be anxious to throw the Taft-Hartley Act overboard faster than the sailors got rid of Jonah. I am beginning to think that maybe I was wrong about that.

No matter what the Republicans do, the course our party should follow is clear.

The Democratic Party, in its platform, is solemnly committed to work for repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act.

We are working for its repeal; and with the support of fair-minded Americans, regardless of party, we will continue to work for its repeal until it is replaced upon our statute books with a labor law that is fair and decent.

The same die-hard reactionaries who want to cripple labor unions have also started a campaign of confusion against all our other measures for the welfare of the people.

They say they are for extending and improving social security—but they call our proposals a bureaucratic system that will destroy the character of every American.

They claim to be in favor of housing—but they say our low-rent housing program is a mistake because it does too much for low-income families.

They make speeches about the American home—but they encourage landlords to lock out their tenants until rent control is repealed.

They say they are in favor of good wages—but they argue that the minimum wage should be held down to a starvation level.

They claim to be in favor of developing our great river basins—but they raise the old cry of "super state" against every practical step we propose.

We will not be deceived by their propaganda. Despite their efforts to confuse, we will enact the programs to which we are committed.

"BETTER LIFE" PLEDGED

We can and we will provide a better life for our people.

At the heart of our program lies our determination to preserve the health of our economy. We know that the welfare of the whole Nation depends upon keeping our economy well balanced—seeing to it that each group gets its fair share of the goods we produce.

The special interests have attacked every governmental measure we have devised to keep our economy on an even keel.

As an example, last year some selfish groups tried to destroy our farm price-support program.

It is a good thing for the country that they failed.

These farm-price supports are actually supports for our entire economy. In the twenties the collapse of farm prices brought on a depression in agriculture which ultimately spread to the whole economy and dragged the country down to bread lines and bank failures.

But this time the farmer and the economy are protected from such a collapse by the farm price-support program. I ask you to remember these facts when the special interests begin to raise their usual hue and cry about the cost of price supports.

In further support of Nation-wide prosperity, I have submitted to the Congress proposals for maintaining full production and full employment.

The proposals I made are designed to aid business in increasing production and eliminating bottlenecks; they are designed to keep price movements balanced, and to prevent shortages from driving certain industrial prices higher while farm prices are leveling off.

These proposals are bringing attacks by those special interests who are making excessive profits out of present shortages. And the usual outcries about regimentation are now filling the air.

It is easy to be misled by a small group of special interests engaged in a campaign of misrepresentation. We must not let the selfish demands of special groups blind us to the common good.

The success of every business enterprise depends upon the prosperity of the whole country. Your Government is pledged to use all its resources to maintain the economic health of the country and to prevent depression. To do this means that Government must act—wisely and judiciously—but it must act.

A government able and willing to act in the interest of the whole economy is a better friend of free competitive enterprise than a do-nothing government ready to let the economy slide into a depression.

PROBLEM OF THE DEMOCRACIES

The great problem of the free western democracies is the problem of boom and bust. The future of the world depends upon our ability to master that problem. During the last 16 years this country has made great progress toward finding the solution. This progress has been made over the protests of selfish and short-sighted people. We have not let them stop us in the past.

We will not let them stop us now.

In his first inaugural address, 148 years ago, Thomas Jefferson said that this country was in "the full tide of a successful experiment." He called our Government "the world's best hope." Today we are again in the full tide of a successful experiment—the experiment of achieving economic abundance and basic human rights in a society of free institutions and freemen.

Today this experiment is again the world's best hope. Today it is the hope of a world confronted by greater dangers and greater possibilities for good than were dreamed of a century and a half ago.

Great as our responsibilities are, we have nothing to fear if we rely upon the energy, the resourcefulness, and the common sense of the American people. So long as the people understand the issues of the day, the special interests cannot prevail against the general welfare.

With the understanding and energy of this mighty people, our Nation can move confidently toward the goals of prosperity and peace.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I insert this address in order that anyone who desires may read its text. I shall not refer to the interpolations, since I think the President was honored with the degree of "doctor of profane letters," which, as I recall, was given to him by a news commentator recently. But I believe we should have the menu of this $100 victory dinner. Apparently the President did not consider it a victory dinner, because he indicated very clearly that, considering their record to date, up to the middle of February the Eighty-first Congress was not getting better than the Eightieth Congress.

Shakespeare says:

How sharper than a serpent's tooth it is
To have a thankless child!

I shall not presume to defend the Eighty-first Congress, although there would seem to be aspects of ingratitude in the President's condemnation, when we consider that practically the only action of the Eighty-first Congress to date has been to increase the Presidential salary by $75,000 a year. I say that advisedly because the proposal from the other side was to call it "compensation." I suggest rather delicately that it would be unfortunate to use that term. But that was the way they considered it. And $50,000 was exempt from any taxation. How long the President should treat Congress gently, in view of this generosity in his direction, is of course another matter I could not suggest, perhaps, with political propriety. I notice he did not refer to it in his discussion of the record of the Eighty-first Congress last evening.

Included in the menu are some words with which I have a little difficulty. I am sure most of our constituents would find even greater difficulty. But this is the menu as reported in the New York Times:

This is what the diners ate for $100 a plate at the twin Jefferson-Jackson dinner tonight.

I should be interested to know what Andrew Jackson would say about that, if he could be here to give us his comment. The first course was:

Diamond-back terrapin soup with Madeira.
Celery, olives.
Lobster—

I hope it was Maine lobster.

Lobster and crabflakes saute Americaine.
Old-fashioned corn bread.
White wine.
Broiled filet mignon Rossini, sauce Bordelaise.
New string beans Forestiere.

I do not know whether that is "Forrestal" or not.

Potatoes Dauphine.

I do not know whether those are Maine potatoes or not. I did not know we raised Dauphine potatoes.

Mixed green salad with endive and avocado, Lorenzo dressing.
Brown bread.

That is the first item which anyone in Maine would recognize.

Brown bread and Liptauer sandwich.
Champagne.
Coupe chocolate mousse with black cherries.

The last item is entirely outside of my experience in Washington, and I should be glad to be enlightened as to what it is. I spell it, because I do not even know the pronunciation, "a-n-i-s."

Anis Madeleines.

Finally:

Moka.

More than 3,000 contributors to the Democratic Party campaign fund had the meal.

Which, according to the records, would result in a $300,000 banquet. I am sure that if that banquet involving such great expense could be given to the forgotten men of this country, and to the twenty or thirty million persons now affected by very serious unemployment, they would be profoundly grateful.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Does not the Senator from Maine think credit and thanks should be given to our splendid friends in Puerto Rico for furnishing the very fine cigars that were given out at the banquet? I have one of them here. I feel sure the Senator would be glad to include them.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am sure they should be included.

Mr. ROBERTSON. We have many good friends in Puerto Rico.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am sure you should leave them outside the operation of the wage-and-hour law so they can continue to pay the poor people of Puerto Rico about 10 cents an hour. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, apropos of the banquet held last night, which has been called to my attention by the reference made here this afternoon by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], I am not so much interested in the menu or the particular portions of the President's speech to which the Senator from Oregon referred as I am to some very fundamental concepts which are apparent from the perusal of the speech and the character of the banquet held last night.

First of all, we seem to be in a name-calling era. The dinner was called the Jefferson-Jackson Day banquet. I think that is a misnomer. I think it is rather a reflection upon the memory of those two great Americans. Thomas Jefferson repeatedly throughout his public life and in his private writings referred to that government as best which governs least. And Jackson, as I remember, made a record of paying off the national debt. So I hardly think that the name of the meeting was consistent with its character or with the administration of the Federal Government by the party that held the banquet.

I desire now to refer to Washington's Farewell Address, which was so beautifully read in the Senate this week by the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]. I read for the purpose of the RECORD one short paragraph:

> It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those entrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism.

America in my judgment is faced with a threat of the very thing that the immortal Washington referred to in his Farewell Address.

I wish that the President in speaking to the assembled multitude last night and over the air might have been specific in his reference to special interests. I think he was inspired, no doubt, by the lack of support on the other side, by his own party, in the program which he has proposed, and which in good conscience I grant they cannot accept. As a result of that frustration or disappointment he began to set up a lot of straw men and bat them all around two hotel dining rooms and over the air.

Whatever the special interests may have been, and we are in the dark as to whom the President referred, there is one that I want to give a little attention to at this hour. It seems that every special group is represented here in Washington, many of them in the Cabinet. Labor has its representative in the Cabinet and he appears before committee hearings. Commerce has its representative in the Cabinet, and he appears before committee hearings. Various sections of the country and segments of our society have special representatives here, and in the various boards and bureaus. I understand that the doctors are now asking that a doctor be placed in the President's Cabinet especially to represent their interests. So it seems that everyone is represented in Washington in the President's Cabinet and in the various boards and bureaus in the presentation of evidence before the committees of Congress, except the taxpayers of the country.

I specifically refer to a bill which was reported this morning by the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency. We had before that committee in the consideration of the housing bill representatives of labor, representatives of the building industry, representatives of various sections of the country; but by far the largest amount of the testimony that was adduced before our committee in the hearings on the bill came from the representatives of the various boards and bureaus of the Government and from public-housing officials. Those representatives talked not in terms of the taxpayers' interests. There was very little regard given to the taxpayers at any time in the statements made before the committee or in the presentation of testimony.

The evidence shows that the bill will cost an amount ranging from $15,000,000,000 up, and loans in addition to that.

The bureaucrats appeared before the committee asking us to vote favorably upon the bill, which was, as I understand, largely written in the department which will administer the bill, and they did not talk about millions or hundreds of millions of dollars. They talked about billions of dollars. When mention is made of a billion dollars, what may be called Potomac fever takes on a new glow. When reference is made to $10,000,000,000, as it was in connection with the bill, these individuals take off with a swish like one of the jet planes we saw the other day, and they rise into the stratosphere. They never get beyond the supersonic barrier, however, because they are always vocal in their own interests.

The Constitution of the United States, as referred to eloquently by the first President, was built as a barrier against power, against the power of classes, against the power of the mob, against the power of the church, against the power of the majority, or of an organized aggressive minority, and against the power of concentrated wealth as well, but most important of all, Mr. President, it was founded as a barrier against the power of government itself, which this year is costing the taxpayers in the national field alone in excess of $42,000,000,000—one-fifth of our national income going to the cost of government.

The taxpayer needs representation in Washington. Unless the Congress arises to defend him in his interest, under the impact of the power of government, the aggressiveness of the bureaucrats, he will become a peon, a subject of his government, and lose the proud citizenship that has built the mightiest nation of all time.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I merely wish to state in reply to my distinguished friend the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] that the bill reported favorably today from the Banking and Currency Committee was introduced by the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], as a clean bill, and the committee, by unanimous consent, authorized me to file the report today.

I may say to my distinguished colleague, who authorized me to report the bill, although he did not vote for it, that sponsoring the bill were approximately 11 Democrats and 11 Republicans. It was our aim, in the Committee on Banking and Currency, to keep politics out of housing and to bring about such a situation that the people of the United States would benefit from housing legislation. We were not and are not now interested in political credit for housing legislation, and I know that sentiment is shared by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

It is not necessary for me to repeat the names on that bill, but one was referred to by the Senator. Some of the Senator's remarks may or may not be in order; but I want to remind the people of the United States that it was my desire, and certainly the desire of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and other members of the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency, to have before the Senate a bill which would be in the best interest of the people of the United States.

Mr. President, I have nothing further to say except that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who was the first witness before the committee, pleaded for a nonpartisan housing bill. He read the names of the sponsors of the bill. I reported the bill, and I hope the Senate will forget party politics, and that Members on both sides of the aisle will vote for housing, including public housing.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I merely wish to say that I think the committee made a real effort to compromise the differing views.

Mr. MAYBANK. I will say to the distinguished Senator that we considered every bill before us, including the bill which was introduced on the other side of the aisle, as well as the bill which was introduced from this side of the aisle. The bill which was reported was a compromise in what was considered to be the interest of the people.

Mr. TAFT. While I joined in reporting the bill, and will vote for it as it is if necessary, I did reserve the right to offer two or three amendments dealing with amounts. I believe that the number of houses is somewhat large. I am somewhat concerned about the permitted cost of housing, up to $2,500 a room, which would make apartments in certain metropolitan areas cost nearly $15,000. Moreover, I have some doubt about the provision with respect to rural housing. I wish only to make it clear that in voting to report the bill I reserved the right to offer amendments, although if the amendments are rejected I intend to vote for the bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. Let me say to the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio that certain amendments may be offered by Democrats too. Nevertheless, the purpose of the Committee on Banking and Currency, after weeks of hearings, was to bring before the Senate a measure which would benefit the people of the United States.

There have been statements in the newspapers to the effect that Congress has done nothing in 50 days. We have passed the allocation bill, which was alleged by our friends to be a continuation of a Republican measure. We have passed the export control bill, extending export controls for 2 years. We bring before the Senate today the housing bill, after weeks of study and deliberation. By the 15th of March there will be before the Senate, reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, Senate bill 529, known as the veterans' RFC, introduced by the distinguished former Democratic leader, now the Vice President of the United States. There will also be in the Senate the rent-control bill, which has been discussed to such a great extent.

I wish to make the record perfectly clear. We have worked since inauguration, and even during inauguration, beginning at 10 o'clock in the morning and continuing until very late many evenings. We are working for nothing but the interests of the people. If there ever was a bipartisan housing bill for the good of the poor people of the United States, and for low-income families, this is the bill.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I had no thought of raising any partisan consideration at this time, or debating the housing bill. We will debate that when the time comes.

Let me say that the opposition to the bill was also bipartisan, just as was the support of the bill in the committee. What I asked was that there be a clarification as to what the President meant last night when he attacked what he referred to as special interests. In my judgment the real special interests before the committee in the consideration of this bill were the representatives of government itself. During the executive session—and I have no criticism of this, because we wanted the facts—when we were writing the bill and considering amendments, considerable discussion occurred off the record, because no record was made. A representative of the department which will administer the law, and which will be built up to large proportions by it, sat with the committee and practically dictated some of the terms of the committee bill. I have not checked closely, but I understand that under the terms of a bill soon to come before the Senate he himself will receive an annual increase in salary. It is that influence of bureaucracy in government, power feeding upon power, and dominating another branch of the Government, to which I object.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, while it is possible though I doubt it that someone in the Government at some time may have dictated to some member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, as inferred by the Senator from Ohio, certainly no one in the Government has ever dictated or will ever dictate to the present chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Before the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] leaves the Chamber, I should like to say that, first of all, there is absolutely no provision in this bill relating to a salary increase for anyone.

In the second place, I was serving as chairman of the subcommittee. The able chairman of the full committee was with us. Had there been any idea that there was objection to the counsel of the Housing Authority being present, we certainly would have excluded him from the room. He was there at our invitation.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President——

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, if I may be allowed to complete my statement, early in the hearings I expressly requested of the Housing Agency that it permit the general counsel to sit with us, because there were a great many technical questions arising, and we needed to consult someone. He was at the meeting at our invitation and our request. I can say with assurance that at no time did he dictate to anyone. He simply responded to questions which were propounded to him.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. In response to what was said by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. SPARKMAN], it will be remembered that I stated that I had no objection to the counsel of the Housing Authority being present. I welcomed his presence, because we wanted to get all the facts.

However, I am impressed by the tremendous impact of bureaucracy on the legislative branch of the Government.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to remind the able Senator from Ohio that the salary increase to which he refers was carried in the bill which was passed last year. It may be that some increase was carried in the bill which was reported by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, of which I am not a member. I do not know.

Mr. MAYBANK. I may add that when the bill was reported last year by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, providing for increases in a number of high salaries, I was the first to oppose it. I shall oppose such action again if it is proposed to raise salaries which are already high.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it is rather amazing to listen to the addresses of my distinguished friends across the aisle upon divers and sundry subjects, attacking directly and indirectly the Democratic Party and its activities over the past few years. Especially is it amazing to me to learn from the lips of the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] his righteous indignation about bureaucrats in Washington, D. C. Mr. President, during the past 14 years since I have been a Member of the Congress I have listened to the same arguments by those on the opposite side of the aisle against the Democratic Party and those who administer the Democratic program. They argue either against bureaucracy in government or regimentation in government or dictatorship in government or socialism in government or communism in government, or they make some other derogatory and puerile argument against those who have been entrusted on five different occasions, now, to conduct the governmental affairs of the United States of America. I predict that just so long as that kind of argument is made and until the Republicans find some new idea somewhere along the line to supplant the progressive, liberal program which has been put into effect for the American people for the past 16 years, the Republican Party will continue to decline in the estimation of the people as it has been declining throughout the recent years.

Mr. President, 2 years ago the Congress was controlled by the Republicans. They then had the opportunity to cut off the heads of the bureaucrats in Washington; they had the power and they had the votes at that time to cut President Truman's budget to the bone, if they so desired, and to give the taxpayers the opportunity for which the junior Senator from Ohio has been pleading on the floor of the Senate. However, in both the House and Senate, they merely proposed a "phony" budget cut, and never lived up to the obligations they imposed upon themselves when they told the American people what they were going to do. They had the necessary votes and the necessary power; they could have arbitrarily cut the President's budget 25 percent, 30 percent, or 40 percent, if they dared do so. But after a careful consideration of all the evidence

submitted before the respective committees of the Senate and the House, they did little or nothing about the very thing of which they are complaining today, here in the second month of the Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. President, it is also amazing and rather fantastic to hear my friend the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] talking about the Democratic dinner which was held in the city of Washington last evening in memory of Jefferson and Jackson. The great trouble is that the gentlemen on his side of the aisle are still smarting under the defeat they received at the hands of the American people at the polls on November 2; it is a little difficult for them to "take it." The Senator from Maine rises on the floor and reads a long menu as though that might be of some interest and some news to the American people; he attempts to tell the American people that the money we raised to carry on the principles of Jackson, Jefferson, Cleveland, and Franklin D. Roosevelt is put to wrong uses; and he implies that much of that money should have gone to a few people who are on relief or now are out of work.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Might not the menu referred to by the able Senator from Maine be evidence of the fact that, although when the Republicans were in power there was hardly anyone eating well except the special interests' crowd, yet when the Democrats have been in power for 17 years, even the Democrats are eating well? [Laughter.]

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida is entirely correct. I wish my friend the Senator from Maine could have heard the remark just made by the Senator from Florida, because last night, as the Senator from Maine well knows, the greatest number of people in the history of any political party in the United States, since the beginning of this great Republic, attended Democratic banquets throughout the United States, and were glad to pay $100 a plate to hear the President of the United States, the Vice President, and other distinguished Democratic speakers who went throughout the country spreading the Democratic gospel, which was so ardently and so vociferously and so honestly presented to the American people last night by the President of the United States in the able address he made.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I should like to have the Senator's opinion, because I value it very highly: If a political party has to raise campaign funds to carry on its activities and for its campaign purposes, so as to try to acquaint the people with the facts in which they are interested, is it better for that party to receive its contributions $100 a person, or to receive its contributions from the special interests of the country?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the answer is obvious. That is the only way we can raise our money to carry on the Democratic Party in the United States. We do not have many millionaries, who represent the special interests in this country, to make contributions by the thousands upon thousands of dollars; but we go to the people, and the people respond. I thank God that we live in such a time and the country is in such a position, from the standpoint of the standard of living that so many of the people can attend banquets of that kind. Any Member of the Senate who, in speaking here, in the Senate of the United States, attempts to ridicule the idea of having a Democratic banquet; any Senator who can do nothing better than read the menu of that banquet, is plainly demonstrating that he is utterly without realistic arguments to make against the Democratic Party.

Mr. President, I think the real trouble is that Maine lobsters and Maine potatoes were not listed on the menu and served at that dinner. Had they been listed on the menu and served at the dinner, the Senator from Maine would not have made the unusual and uninteresting speech made today.

Furthermore, with respect to the argument that the Congress of the United States has done nothing, up to date, at this session, let me say to my Republican friends that if we do not do anything but pass appropriation bills during this session, we shall have done as much as the Eightieth Congress did; that is a certainty. If we simply do nothing, so far as any productive, progressive legislation affecting the interests of the greatest number of the people in the United States is concerned—if we do not do a single thing of that sort—we shall have accomplished all that the Eightieth Congress did; and that is what the people said when they voted last November.

Mr. President, we have accomplished something, and, as majority leader, I am not ashamed of the record the Democratic Party has made up to date, notwithstanding objections and criticisms to the contrary by Republican leaders and some segments of the press of the country. We do not expect to receive any cooperation from most of the press which was opposed to Harry Truman, and still is opposed to him and to his party principles and the Democratic platform adopted in our national convention. But I will read for the benefit of the Senate an editorial which appeared recently in the Washington Evening Star:

IT MAKES HASTE SLOWLY

It is a permissible wisecrack, for it is based on the sort of sardonic ridicule of the high and mighty that Americans relish, to say that this Congress, completing its first 2 months, has done nothing but give Mr. Truman a raise in salary.

I heard the distinguished Senator from Maine say a moment ago that that was all we had done. The Senator had better go back and compare the record of today with what he and his group did 2 years ago, during the first 2 months they were in power. The editorial continues:

But it is far from an accurate or fair statement. The congressional leaders who called at the White House yesterday were justified in their defense of a Congress that has been pretty busily at work ever since it got here. The delay in getting measures to the floor is no sign of inaction.

"The delay in getting measures to the floor is no sign of inaction."

I see my friend from Oregon present in the Chamber. He has been busy in committee work. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] has been busy in committee work. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] has been busy in committee work. In fact, all Members have been busy. I do not know of any committee that is not working at the present time. The American people, notwithstanding statements to the contrary, understand what time is required in the beginning in the organization of the Senate, in the appointment of committees, in the introduction of bills, in the consideration of bills. While we are chastised for not taking action, yet the moment action is attempted to be taken upon the labor bill, then we are damned and criticized as we were this morning by the distinguished Senator from Oregon for attempting to steamroller something through, so we "get it" going and coming. But we have been taking it for 16 years, and we can still take it going and coming, and we will be on top when the votes are counted again.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I shall be happy to yield for a question.

Mr. BALDWIN. I did not hear what the distinguished Senator from Maine had to say.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator missed a great treat.

Mr. BALDWIN. I shall read it in the RECORD, and shall enjoy doing so.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sorry the Senator missed it.

Mr. BALDWIN. I arrived in time to hear my distinguished friend from Illinois raising certain questions about Maine lobsters and Maine potatoes. Each State of the Union is noted for the food products it can produce in one form or another. It might be a fair question as to whether or not Maine lobsters and Maine potaoes are not to be preferred to the corn in all forms we get from Illinois. [Laughter.]

Mr. LUCAS. In view of the fact that the Senator comes from the Nutmeg State of Connecticut, I can understand how a "nutty" question of that kind would be asked. [Laughter.]

The editorial continues:

No Congress in recent years has been confronted with a stiffer program of "must" but highly controversial legislation. And thinking Americans will find more comfort in watching their legislators "make haste slowly" than if the rapidity of action suggested rubber-stamp procedure.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. LUCAS. In a moment. This is a very important editorial, and I want the Senator to understand its full significance.

Mr. BALDWIN. I shall listen very carefully. If the Senator will give me a sign when he is ready, I will propound my question.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall be glad to do that.

Any new Congress requires a certain amount of time for its organization, the assignment of new committee members, the preliminaries which enable them to become familiar with new responsibilities. And the leadership of any Congress, new or old, must take the time planning for the strategy that cannot risk any save unpreventable defeat. The leadership of this Congress, in spite of the large amount of tall talk about mandates from the people, must be sure that those mandates have been properly delivered to Members of Congress—if delivered at all. And the Members themselves want to be sure that they are correct in translating mandates at the polls last November correctly, and distinguishing correctly between mandates pro and con.

I read this merely to substantiate my position and I thank the Evening Star for the editorial, because it coincides with my personal knowledge of what is going on in the Senate. All committees are active, all committees are working with a view to bringing legislation to the floor as soon as possible. I can assure my friends across the aisle that once this proposed legislation reaches the calendar, they will have plenty of time to discuss it, because we are going to sit rather consistently and for rather long hours in order that we will not be charged with doing nothing when this legislation is ready for consideration; and if my distinguished friend from Connecticut will take a look at the calendar, he will find that up to date all legislation on any important subject that has been reported favorably by any of the committees, has been passed. I now yield to my friend.

Mr. BALDWIN. My question is whether or not my friend from Illinois believes we should follow a policy of making haste slowly at this time.

Mr. LUCAS. I have made my statement, and the Senator may draw any conclusion he desires.

Mr. BALDWIN. Unfortunately, I am sorry to say I was not present to hear all the remarks of the Senator from Illinois. I heard the Senator was speaking, and I always enjoy hearing what he has to say, and——

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator rushed right in.

Mr. BALDWIN. I came in as soon as I could. I wanted to ask the Senator whether or not he thinks we should proceed now along the lines suggested by the editorial, of making haste slowly?

Mr. LUCAS. I may say to my friend, the editorial speaks for itself. I subscribe to it thoroughly.

Mr. BALDWIN. The Senator subscribes to the editorial.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. BALDWIN. I take it the Senator means that he thinks we should make haste slowly.

Mr. LUCAS. I accept exactly what the editorial says.

Mr. BALDWIN. I remember 2 years ago when the Eightieth Congress first assembled. The Eightieth Congress, under the Reorganization Act, was faced with setting in motion a legislative reorganization that was new in the history of the United States. We had to come here and work with new tools. I remember that my distinguished friend from Illinois at that time was extremely critical about the haste or the lack of it that was, he claimed, apparent at that time. I should like to ask my distinguished friend, what is so different now from the situation that existed in January 1947? Where is the great difference? We were given to understand in the campaign that the country was on the verge of ruin, that a Democratic administration must be returned forthwith in order to save the Nation from disaster, and we were told in the middle of 1948 that Congress should meet in a special session to enact a long list of legislation. It was beyond the capacity of any deliberative legislative assembly to do it, and yet we have been here 8 weeks, and I ask my distinguished friend, what are the great earth-shaking, country-saving, highly patriotic measures that have been passed by the present Congress up to date?

I ask him to remind us, so we may all know the full list of them. I mention two of them. Two of them are the continuation of Republican measures dealing with the problem of inflation, the reenactment of Republican measures that were passed in 1947, dealing with the problem of high prices. Those are two; and let my friend mention more, if he can think of them.

Mr. LUCAS. Is the Senator going to continue on my time much longer?

Mr. BALDWIN. No; I do not want to take any of the Senator's time.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator. I usually yield to my good friend for questions, and he comes along with one of these spread-eagle speeches every time I yield to him for a question.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield for a question, not for another speech.

Mr. BALDWIN. I was listening to a spread-eagle speech, and I thought that any aerie ought to have at least two eagles in it.

Mr. LUCAS. That may be true, but the Senator is so concerned about what we are going to do and about what we have not done. If I were in the Senator's chair, with the record which is behind the Republicans in the Eightieth Congress, I do not believe I would ever rise on the floor of the Senate and chide the Democrats, in the first 2 months of operation, regarding what they have or have not done. I should think the Senator would still be more or less bemoaning the fact that the Republocans did not do more in the Eightieth Congress, in view of what occurred last November. I know what the Senator said in the campaign, and I know what has been said since the campaign.

Mr. President, much has been said with respect to the Democratic Party being split. I have had occasion to mention this once before on the floor of the Senate. The Senator's friend, Mr. Dewey, came here to Washington to speak at a banquet—not a banquet as sumptuous as that which the Democrats had, and not as entertaining or as enthusiastic as the one which the Democrats gave last night. I do not know whether or not my friend attended that Republican banquet honoring the memory of Abraham Lincoln. Several Members of the Senate on the opposite side did not attend the banquet at which Mr. Dewey spoke. The rumor went around that certain Republican members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare insisted that the committee by all means hold a night session that particular night so that they would have a good excuse not to attend the banquet at which Mr. Dewey spoke. I do not blame them for that, in view of what he said. He said that the Republican Party was split wide open. I never saw the Senator from Connecticut rise to deny that statement on the floor of the Senate. He never either defended or agreed with Mr. Dewey after that statement was made. I understand the Senator from Connecticut has been in the Dewey camp almost from the beginning; but not one word did the Senator say about that great speech that Dewey made on Lincoln's birthday about the Republican Party being split wide open.

The Republican Party is split. The irony and the sad part of the whole thing was that Dewey knew his party was split when he was going around the country, and, with intellectual dishonesty, telling the American people that there was unity in his party.

We had disunity in the Democratic Party, but it was honest; it was not a phony unity such as that which was attempted to be foisted on the American people by the Republican candidates and orators who went around the country trying to elect Mr. Dewey. The people knew it. That is one of the reasons why they returned the Democrats to power. They could not stand the hypocrisy.

Harry Truman was honest in what he said to the American people throughout the campaign. Many people did not like what he said, and they do not like what he said last night. The mere fact that Senators on the other side of the aisle have talked all afternoon about it indicates that they are disturbed. His speech was effective, and it hurt.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. Certainly I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BALDWIN. I wondered when the Senator was going to reach the point of the question which I propounded a few moments ago as to the major pieces of legislation passed by the Democratic Congress.

Mr. LUCAS. If we had passed the county-fair amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut we would have had a good record.

Mr. BALDWIN. That is true. When it comes to exempting taxes on small balls and county fairs I think we have something to talk about. My amendment should have been agreed to. The good folks in Illinois would have been in favor of it. That is a great rural and farming community. I was surprised that my distinguished friend from Illinois was not in favor of that amendment, because I know the people in his State would like to have seen it adopted. Every time I have an opportunity, in connection with any appropriate bill in the Senate, to get

the matter before the Senate, so that my distinguished friend from Illinois can vote for it, I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is going to insist on maintaining his position even though this might defeat him for reelection.

EXHIBITION OF PAINTINGS ORIGINALLY IN THE KAISER FRIEDRICH MUSEUM IN BERLIN

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, late in the war against Germany, our Army found a large group of fine paintings, which had originally been in the Kaiser Friedrich Museum in Berlin, but which were then held by the Germans for storage in a large salt mine near Merkers, Germany. The paintings, while from a German collection, were not created solely by Germans. They are the product of the genius of the Dutch, the Flemish, the French, and the Italians, more than of the Germans. Indeed, I think it can be said that they are truly representative of the best art produced by our western civilization.

Because of the impossibility of providing proper storage conditions in Germany for these paintings, it was determined that those which could be moved without too great risk of damage in shipment, should be brought to the United States for safekeeping. Two hundred and two paintings were packed and shipped to this country, arriving in Washington on December 7, 1945. The paintings were stored in the National Gallery of Art for 3 years. On March 17, 1948, the paintings were put on exhibition at the National Gallery of Art.

I know that most Senators and Representatives saw them at that time. About the same time it was announced by the Army that they would be returned to Germany upon conclusion of the exhibition.

During their exhibition at the National Gallery they were seen by approximately 1,000,000 people, a response which amazed critics and experts, and which was, I was told, unprecedented. These people came in ever-increasing numbers, because they got a spiritual lift, an inspiration from the experience. These people, hungry for a glimpse of something more beautiful, more satisfying than the synthetic emotions of their daily lives in this troubled world, were reminded that there were enduring values in life beyond the materialism of everyday activities.

On April 2, 1948, I introduced a bill, Senate bill 2439, which would have provided for recognition of German ownership, temporary retention in the United States of these paintings, and placing them on tour for showings throughout the country previous to their return to Germany. On April 16, 1948, a subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee, with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] as chairman, held hearings on this bill. As a result of this bill, and the hearings of the subcommittee a plan was worked out by the Army, the National Gallery of Art, and museums over the country, for a Nationwide tour of those paintings which were in sound enough condition to withstand shipment without serious damage.

Because of the effect of my bill, and because the tour will conclude in the next few weeks, I think it appropriate that a report of its success be made.

The costs of shipping the paintings from one city to another are being borne by the participating museums, so that the maximum amount of the funds received from admissions and contributions may go to the benefit of German children in the United States zone of Germany. Supervision of the expenditures for this program will be exercised by the Council of Relief Agencies licensed to operate in Germany. Ten thousand dollars has been earmarked for the Danish Red Cross to continue a children's vaccination program in the United States zone in Germany. The remainder has been allocated on the following percentage basis: 10 percent for bedding for children's institutions in the western sectors of Berlin; 47 percent for winter clothing for 20,000 refugee children in Bavarian camps; 19 percent for clothing and bedding for the children of Wuerttemberg-Baden; 21 percent for clothing for 4,000 children, 3 to 16 years old, in Greater Hesse; 3 percent for carpentry tools and machinery suitable for vocational training for the children of Bremen.

This is the interesting part of it. I want to explain that this did not cost our Government a nickel. There were no appropriations whatever. These sums were all contributions.

To date approximately $255,000 has been raised for this fund by admission fees, or by voluntary contributions of those seeing exhibitions, in cases where museums are not permitted to charge admission. From three additional exhibitions—at St. Louis, where the paintings have most recently been on view, and at Pittsburgh and Toledo, where the tour ends—it is estimated that an additional $60,000 will be raised for a grand total of approximately $315,000 for relief of German children.

Of perhaps more importance than the amount of money raised by the tour is the great number of persons who have seen the paintings. As I have said, approximately 1,000,000 people saw the paintings in Washington at the National Gallery. In addition, through the Los Angeles exhibition, 1,226,000 people saw them, and it is estimated by the remaining museums that 385,000 more people will view them, for a grand total of approximately 2,651,000 people.

I think this tour, and the fact that the paintings will have been seen by over two and a half million people, is a very great contribution to better relations among the peoples of the Western World. Many Americans, because of the political and economic difficulties of the European peoples, have tended to minimize their accomplishments and their character. These exhibitions, I believe, will result in a better understanding of our European cousins and will promote that unity of purpose and action which is, I am sure, the real solution to our principal troubles.

The American people have made, and are continuing to make, enormous sacrifices in human effort and human lives, in defense of the lands from which these paintings came. I can think of no medium which more eloquently or persuasively expresses some of the true values for which these sacrifices are really made than these magnificent paintings.

These paintings are symbols of all that is good in our western Christian civilization. They have a spiritual value for civilized human beings, which few objects in this world today possess. They are an expression in a form which all people can understand, of the fundamental values of Christianity. They are the symbols of that better life for which humanity throughout the ages has aspired.

It is gratifying that the tour has been such an enormous success. That success is proof of the yearning of the American people for those higher values which these paintings represent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at the end of my remarks a short statement by Huntington Cairns, of the National Gallery of Art, expressing his estimate of the value of the paintings.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To estimate the cultural value of the Nation-wide exhibition of paintings from the Berlin museums, attendant circumstances, as well as the quality of the paintings themselves, must be taken into consideration. First of all, consider the rarity of the opportunity. Most people who saw the paintings could have no hope of even one trip to Europe. The exhibition offered them an opportunity never to be repeated, an opportunity that fires the imagination like the appearance of a comet that will be seen but once in a lifetime. So people came to the exhibition prepared to concentrate, eager to see and understand, keyed to the highest pitch of receptivity.

Secondly, the wartime vicissitudes of the paintings appealed to the imaginations. Just when threats of a new war combined with accounts of devastated Europe to prophesy the end of civilization, the attention of our whole country was called to these fragile paintings. Here were concrete elements of that civilization for whose preservation we had entered the war. Suddenly people realized that something of highest significance had been saved after all. While all the complicated mechanism of living, all the comforts and conveniences, had been left to the chances of war, works of art had been preserved with infinite care in enemy and allied country alike.

So the crowds that flocked to the exhibition had a heightened awareness of the importance of things for which their everyday life had left them little leisure. They approached the paintings with a kind of reverence. Guards soon found that even accidental injury to the exhibits was little to be feared. Each visitor seemed to feel a share in the custodianship.

The recent perils from which the collection had been saved spurred the imagination to travel back over the centuries which the little panels had survived. Even if vaguely, the visitor experienced an expansion of his own life into the past and into foreign lands. And even if vaguely—seeing Flemish, German, Dutch, Italian, and French paintings hanging side by side without a jarring note—he felt the essential unity of western civilization, and he came away with some measure of belief in its worthiness to survive.

RETROCESSION TO THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO OF JURISDICTION OVER CERTAIN LANDS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 152.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 152) to retrocede to the State of New Mexico exclusive jurisdiction held by the United States over lands within the boundaries of the Los Alamos, N. Mex., project of the United States Atomic Energy Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair suggests to the Senator from Illinois that there is on the calendar a bill passed by the House, namely, House bill 54, which is identical with the Senate bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Then I withdraw my previous motion, and move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 54.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 54) to retrocede to the State of New Mexico exclusive jurisdiction held by the United States over lands within the boundaries of the Los Alamos project of the United States Atomic Energy Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, before the motion is put to a vote, I have been asked to inquire if the bill has the unanimous approval of the committee. I understand that it has. Can the Senator from Illinois advise me?

Mr. MCMAHON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I shall say that it does have the unanimous approval of the committee.

Mr. GURNEY. With that information, Mr. President, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (H. R. 54) to retrocede to the State of New Mexico exclusive jurisdiction held by the United States over lands within the boundaries of the Los Alamos project of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 152 is indefinitely postponed.

THE DEMOCRATIC VICTORY DINNER

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] a few moments ago referred to the Democratic dinner last evening as the "feast of Belshazzar." I thought my memory was fairly vivid about the feast of Belshazzar, but in order to keep the record straight, I turn to the Scriptures and I read from the fifth chapter of the Book of Daniel. This is the first verse:

Belshazzar the king made a great feast to a thousand of his lords, and drank wine before the thousand.

Now I skip to verse 4:

They drank wine, and praised the gods of gold and of silver, of brass, of iron, of wood, and of stone.

Mr. President, I felt sure the recollection of the Senator from Maine was growing dim about the feast of Belshazzar. Obviously Belshazzar was a Republican king. [Laughter.] We never would have heard of a Democratic King of Babylon drinking wine before a thousand of his lords. We never would have heard of a Democratic king praising the gods of gold and of silver, of brass, of iron, of wood, and of stone. Obviously the last time there was really a feast of Belshazzar in Washington was when the Republicans were in power.

Mr. President, last night the President did not have the lords gathered around, the hierarchy of the American nobility, the favored few of fortune or birth or education.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PEPPER. I am sure of what the Senator is about to say, but if he will permit me to interrupt myself even in the middle of a sentence, I am going to make the sacrifice just to hear what he has to say.

Mr. BALDWIN. I am somewhat familiar with that part of the Scripture myself——

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator agree that it must have been a Republican King of Babylon?

Mr. BALDWIN. Does it appear there that Belshazzar charged his guests anywhere from a hundred to a thousand dollars a plate? [Laughter.]

Mr. PEPPER. As a matter of fact, the thousand lords who were gathered at Belshazzar's feast were obviously the special interests of Babylon, who already had been enjoying the bounty of the king's munificence; there is no telling. They probably should have been required to contribute about a million dollars, because I am sure as the favored lords of this Republican King of Babylon, they had gotten a great deal more than that out of the government.

But last night the President was not praising the gods of gold, he did not praise the gods of silver, he did not praise the gods of brass, of iron, of wood, and of stone. The President of the United States last night was talking about the people who are the symbols of those evidences of wealth, the modern lords, who got the bounty and enjoyed the favors in the past. He was pleading for economic justice for the plain people. We did not hear of any of those being included in Belshazzar's speech. They would have been thrown out if they had gotten within sight or hearing distance of that banquet. That was not a people's feast. Last night the President of the United States, in the spirit of Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Wilson, was pleading for economic justice and for political fairness for the people of America, without injustice to any part of our citizenship.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. I understand that whether a man is a Republican or a Democrat is best demonstrated by whether or not his name is on a given caucus list. Is not that correct?

Mr. PEPPER. On a given caucus list?

Mr. BALDWIN. Yes; or primary list, or what have you. Is not that the best evidence?

Mr. PEPPER. I do not know what the criteria are. I know that in my part of the country the first thing a man does, if he gets rich, is to buy himself a double-breasted suit, and the next thing is that he wishes he were a Republican.

Mr. BALDWIN. That does not divide one Republican from one Democrat, at least, because the Senator from Florida has on a double-breasted suit, and I have also. [Laughter.]

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; I got up in the world, but although I am wearing a double-breasted suit, I have not forgotten the poor people from whom I came. I wish more of us could say that.

Mr. BALDWIN. Nor have many of us forgotten them. My question is, Is not the best proof of whether one belongs to a political party the fact that his name is on a primary list or a caucus list?

Mr. PEPPER. I am not familiar with the criteria the Senator is trying to indicate.

Mr. BALDWIN. In the Senator's State would not one's name have to be on a primary list?

Mr. PEPPER. In that area many Republicans slip into our Democratic primary. I wish we could stop them, because in a democracy it is a bad influence to have Republicans in the Democratic primary.

Mr. BALDWIN. They are not bothered about that in certain parts of Florida, because they have just elected two Republican county commissioners in one of the Florida counties and also Republican county assessor.

Mr. PEPPER. Everyone makes a mistake now and then. But it is such a negligible error on the part of our people it is hardly worth mentioning.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I come back to my question. In Florida, in order to vote in a Democratic primary, one's name must be on the Democratic primary list. Is that not correct?

Mr. PEPPER. I suppose one must be a registered Democrat just as one has to be a registered Republican, to vote either Democratic or Republican.

Mr. BALDWIN. That shows party affiliation, does it not?

Mr. PEPPER. I do not know what the Senator desires to show.

Mr. BALDWIN. I want to find out where my distinguished friend from Florida found the name of Belshazzar on a Republican caucus list?

Mr. PEPPER. Oh, it is obvious. A man is judged by the company he keeps and by what he does. Obviously it would not have been a Democratic King of Babylon who had the thousand lords

present at the banquet, who were praising their gods of gold and silver and brass. If Belshazzar had been a Democratic King of Babylon he would have gathered into his banquet hall people from the highways and the hedges, as we are told in the Scriptures was done by the man who held a wedding feast. The man who held the feast did not say to his servants, "Go out and bring in to the feast a thousand lords, and get me some gods of gold, gods of silver, gods of brass, and of iron and stone." He said, "Go out in the highways and the hedges and bring in the people." Obviously that was a Democratic wedding feast.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, my question is this: If such people as the Senator from Florida says were called in to the wedding feast, had been called in to Mr. Belshazzar's feast, would that have resulted in Mr. Belshazzar being authorized to vote in the Democratic primary in Florida?

Mr. PEPPER. He would not be permitted to vote.

Mr. BALDWIN. No. Before he would be permitted to vote, he would have to be on the caucus list or the primary list. I want to know how the Senator knows Mr. Belshazzar was a Republican.

Mr. LUCAS rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not like to disrupt such an interesting colloquy, but there are certain rules we ought to try to follow in the debate. My friend, the Senator from Connecticut, who has been a governor of that State knows parliamentary law. My friend is really a very engaging gentleman and I must confess that I enjoy hearing him. Yet I state categorically that he is one of the worse violators of the rules of the Senate. He seldom asks a Senator who has the floor to yield to him. He simply carries on the debate without observing the rules. Sooner or later, when we really get down to debating legislation, I hope the Chair will enforce the rules, and I will say that as majority leader I shall endeavor to have some order and decorum, thereby curtailing useless conversation and speeches.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. I wish first to make a brief statement. If I have transgressed the rules of the Senate I am profoundly sorry, and I apologize to my senatorial friends. However, I came here only 2 years ago and, unfortunately, I have taken upon myself the habit of a good many distinguished Democratic Senators in the matter of debate. It seems to me they have been quite successful in the way they have conducted debate. I am sorry that I may have imitated them, but on the other hand, Mr. President, imitation is the sincerest form of flattery.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I will make one further reference as to why I felt confident that the King of Babylon was a Republican king. Senators will remember that in the fifth chapter of Daniel we are told about the handwriting which appeared upon the wall while the feast of Belshazzar was in progress. I read the twenty-fifth verse:

> And this is the writing that was written, Mene, Mene, Tekel, Upharsin.

Then I read the twenty-sixth verse:

> This is the interpretation of the thing: Mene; God hath numbered thy kingdom, and finished it.

The analogy is obvious—that the people had numbered the days of the Republican reign and they had practically finished it. At least, for more than 16 years they had.

Now we come to verse 27:

> Tekel: Thou art weighed in the balances, and art found wanting.

Now, can there be any doubt at all that it was a Republican Party of Babylon they were talking about at that time? "Weighed in the balances, and art found wanting" in five different elections.

I read verse 28:

> Peres; Thy kingdom is divided, and given to the Medes and Persians.

In this case the party is split, as the distinguished titular head of the party advised his party representatives. "Thy kingdom is divided. It is taken away from you and is given to the Medes and the Persians." Of course, in this case, the analogy is obvious. The Scriptural significance is clear. The people, in their sovereign power, took away the kingdom from the Republicans whom they had weighed in the balances and found wanting and gave it to the Democrats.

Now, Mr. President, it has been said here that the Democrats have not done anything in the present Congress. Everyone knows that it takes time for the Congress to get into motion. I was reminded the other day about the trial of Lord Hastings. Every time Lord Eldon, who was the lawyer for Hastings, would make an objection, I recall that the Members of the House of Lords would solemnly rise, pull their raiment or robes of office about them, and walk out of the chamber, and go into another room, where they would discuss the objection, and, having finally decided it, emerge from the room and file back into the trial chamber, whereupon the trial would proceed until another objection was made, and then the same procedure would be repeated. Some years later, when the case was still in progress, having not yet been decided, some wag said, "The court moves, but the case stands still."

Mr. President, it may be that some people throughout the country do not understand that it takes time to organize Congress, to appoint committees, to designate our leaders, such as the majority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and for congressional work to get under way. Of course this year we had to inaugurate our President. That took time. But I am proud that the United States could show to the people of the world how our democratic processes work, as illustrated by the inauguration ceremonies, which can be witnessed by all people through the medium of the records which were made of that event.

Mr. President, it takes time for hearings to be had. Hearings have been in progress. Now the flood of legislation is just about ready to pour upon the floors of the Congress. Good evidence of that is the fact that today the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency reported from that committee a very significant piece of legislation to deal with the problem of housing, which was not dealt with by our honorable opponents in the Eightieth Congress. A housing bill was passed by the Senate last year, a very creditable bill, but it was not passed by the other body, which was under the control of the Republican Party. Committee after committee is approaching the time when it will report to the Congress measures which are ready for consideration. I venture to say that it is only a matter of days now until we will have a full calendar in both Houses of the Congress. We are going to get legislation through if Members of both bodies do not impede or obstruct its passage.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. I wish to ask the Senator a question, but I should like to preface it with a brief statement. As I understand, my friend from Florida has said that it takes time for Congress to organize and begin to operate. With that statement I heartily agree. My question is this. Was it not a more difficult task for the Republican-controlled Congress in 1947 to become organized, since it had to proceed under the new Congressional Reorganization Act, than it has been for this particular Congress to get organized?

Mr. PEPPER. I am willing to concede that it may be true that the Eightieth Congress did have to face a reorganization act. Of course we have had some problems ourselves in changing the dominance of one party to another in the Congress. Then we found also the necessity for making certain other changes in the Reorganization Act, of which experience has shown the wisdom. Granting the fairness of the Senator's observation, let me say that our criticism of the Eightieth Congress was not as to what it did in the first 30 days, or in the first 45 days, or in the first 60 days, or in the first 90 days. The President's complaint was respecting what the Republican Party did in the Eightieth Congress, which the Republican party controlled. His complaint dealt with the whole Congress in its two sessions.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PEPPER. Permit me to finish my sentence and I shall yield. It was the whole product of the regular sessions and of the special session against which we complain—its performance and its omission.

I now yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. At that particular point I ask my friend if it is not true that from the very beginning criticism

was directed at the Republican-controlled Congress from his side of the aisle. Was not the statement made that it should get down to business and accomplish things?

Mr. PEPPER. It may have been felt that the Republican Party, which was in power, had not proceeded as rapidly as it might have done.

Mr. BALDWIN. Does not my friend remember that one of the most troublesome things we had to deal with was something entirely new, namely, the question of the legislative budget? As I recall, the deadline was February 15. My friend recalls, does he not, that the Republicans met that deadline, after a fashion. The House and Senate did not agree, but the Republicans did meet the deadline.

My friend will also recall that in the present Congress we were asked to continue the date until the 1st of May, and we did so continue it. So in the first instance the Congress met the first deadline which was set for it.

Mr. PEPPER. I am very glad that the able Senator from Connecticut added the modification "after a fashion," because it was only after a fashion that the Republicans met the budget requirement. The statute contemplated that the Congress, not the Senate and the House separately——

Mr. BALDWIN. Will my friend yield for a question?

Mr. PEPPER. I do not want this to become a debate of volume. The legislative budget which was contemplated by the Reorganization Act was a congressional budget, and the Senator well knows that the Senate fixed one figure and the House fixed another, and they were unable to agree. So it was only "after a fashion" at best that the Republican Party met the requirements of the Reorganization Act.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. PEPPER. Let me complete this thought. As a matter of fact, it did not meet the requirements of the Act, because it did not fix a legislative budget. The Senate adopted one figure and the House another. The Senator well knows that if the Senate passes a bill in one form and the House passes it in another form, it is not legislation of the Congress.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. My friend remembers that in 1948, when we were faced with the same deadline, we did meet it, with a measure which was agreed upon in both Houses.

Mr. PEPPER. Is the Senator talking about the legislative budget?

Mr. BALDWIN. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. When the House fixed one figure and the Senate another?

Mr. BALDWIN. That was in the 1947 session; but in the 1948 session the Republican Congress did meet the dead line, did it not?

Mr. PEPPER. It is not my recollection that it did, although I could be in error.

Let me ask the able Senator from Connecticut a question. Did the Republican Party oppose in the Finance Committee the resolution to extend the time to April 1 for fixing the legislative budget?

Mr. BALDWIN. I am not a member of the committee; but I do not recall that it did. Although the Republicans recognized the difficulties which confronted them, they made the dead line, notwithstanding the Democratic opposition a year ago. But realizing how difficult it was, they were somewhat more generous than my friends on the other side of the aisle were in dealing with this important and difficult problem.

Mr. PEPPER. It is my very clear recollection that it was reported by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance that the Republicans did not oppose the resolution to extend the time until April 1, because both sides in that committee, Republicans and Democrats, in struggling with the problem of fixing a legislative budget by the 15th of February, had discovered that the hopes of the authors of the Reorganization Act were too optimistic, and that the Congress could not effectively fix a legislative budget by the middle of February. So the Democratic leadership recommended that the date be extended to April 1, and the Congress was asked to concur, and I believe the Congress has concurred in the recommendation.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct. We have concurred; and it was agreeable to members of the Finance and Appropriations Committees. There was no objection to it, although there was some brief debate on the floor about it.

Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another brief observation?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. What the Senator from Connecticut is talking about is the first year's budget. We did not complain in 1947 about meeting the dead line. What we were complaining about was the failure of the two Houses to reach any agreement on the budget itself, in line with the Reorganization Act. That was our chief complaint.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is very clearly correct.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. It is my recollection—and I think the RECORD will bear me out—that a great deal was said on the other side of the aisle about whether or not the Republicans were going to meet the requirement. We were asked if we were going to meet it, and we were asked if we were going to wait until the last day. Nevertheless, we did meet it; the first time "after a fashion" and the second time to the letter of the law.

My point was that this time the Democrats asked for a continuance and the Republicans concurred because they recognized that it was a difficult thing to do. I think that is a little more generous than we have sometimes been dealt with.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish to pass on to another matter——

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I am very much interested in the Senator's statement comparing the two dinners, the Democratic dinner and the Republican dinner. The Senator stated that he judged a man by the company he kept. It so happened that I attended the Republican dinner. Nowadays we have an instrument known as television. Last night over the television, at the dinner which the distinguished Senator said was for poor people, and to help those in the lower economic brackets, I saw present John Nicholas Brown, the richest baby ever born in Rhode Island.

I saw there Vanderbilt Whitney. Everyone knows about the wealth of the Whitneys. I saw there, sitting in the fourth place from the President, Mr. Forrestal, the fabulously wealthy president of Dillon, Read & Co., the great brokers of New York, who live off the fat of the land.

I saw there Hon. Nelson Rockefeller, who for a long time held an office under the late President Roosevelt, and still holds office under President Harry Truman.

I saw there Averell Harriman, the man who had $100,000,000 before he was ever appointed by a Democratic President.

I saw there Jim Bruce, a man who I think is still Ambassador to the Argentine, a man worth many million dollars, which he got by combining 300 small dairies into a great trust which raised the price of milk and ice cream to families and little children.

I saw there Pierre DuPont, of the great powder trust——

Mr. PEPPER. Is the Senator sure that DuPont had a ticket?

Mr. LANGER. I should like to finish, if I may.

Mr. PEPPER. I yield. I wanted to ask the Senator if he was sure Mr. DuPont had a ticket.

Mr. LANGER. The third person on the President's right was one of the very finest, most charming, and wealthiest women in America, who owns great castles in Newport and beautiful homes in Florida.

I saw there, over the television, Representative Otto Bremer, of St. Paul, who comes from the great Northwest, a man who, in my territory alone, owns not only the largest brewing company, but also 40 banks.

I saw there last night, over the television, Cornelius Vanderbilt. Certainly no one would say that he represented the people in the lower brackets.

I am not certain, because the range of the television picture was not wide enough, but, I would almost swear that I saw Vincent Astor there. He is the man who used to take Mr. Roosevelt on his yacht.

I wish to make it plain to my distinguished friend and colleague that I think he is in the wrong party. I think he ought to join the farmer-labor branch of the Republican Party, to which I belong.

Mr. PEPPER. How many members has that branch?

Mr. LANGER. The farmer-labor branch of the Republican Party will have no truck with those fellows whether they are Republicans or Democrats.

Mr. PEPPER. How many members has the farmer-labor branch of the Republican Party in the Senate?

Mr. LANGER. I am not going to divulge our secrets [laughter]. I know the Senator will be delighted to know that last night two very distinguished Members on this side of the aisle joined me. We now have three Senators on this side of the aisle.

Mr. PEPPER. That is an increase of 300 percent.

Mr. LANGER. We want the Senator from Florida to join us. [Laughter.]

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the first thing I marvel at is the familiarity of the Senator from North Dakota with all these rich men. He can see their faces on the television one evening and name a dozen of them the next day in the Senate. I wonder whether the Senator from North Dakota has been keeping private company with these men, so that he recognizes them so readily. I did not see all the men he mentions. I was sitting in the gallery, and I had a fine view, although I was up on the second story. I saw the television, but I did not see those men. How the Senator from North Dakota could have been looking at one television set and still have seen all those persons, and not have been there himself, is difficult to understand, unless he has been consorting with them so much that he can recognize them upon quick sight. Otherwise, I cannot understand it.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. Does my friend mean that the Democratic Party did not know they were there, but that they just sneaked in of their own accord?

Mr. PEPPER. It might be that they finally realized that they should be there, even though we may not have been aware of it.

Mr. BALDWIN. I wonder whether the Democratic Party was comfortable with them there.

Mr. PEPPER. I mean that it may be that after listening to some of the wise men and prophets of the Democratic Party, those men have been able to "hit the sawdust trail" of democracy. Does not the Republican Party remember the Biblical references to seeking lost sheep and strayed lambs? If our democracy has been so effective that it has converted some of those erring gentlemen and has brought them from the Republican fold into the ranks of Christian democracy, then I thank the political gods that our doctrine is working and that our preachers are getting converts.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The extreme familiarity the Senator from North Dakota shows he has with the men he has named may indicate that those men are leaving his party—the Farmer-Labor Party—and are coming into the Democratic Party.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The reason I know them is that we are fighting them all the time. We do not want them in our party, so we are willing to let the Democrats have them. That is why I know them.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota is a very able and honorable gentleman. Although a few of those men may have been there because of the fact that they have been converted to good political doctrine and have hit the political sawdust trail, nevertheless, if that had been a Republican banquet, for instance, the Republican banquet that the Republican King Belshazzar had; let me see how they are described:

> Belshazzar, the king, made a great feast to a thousand of his lords.

It is obvious that none but lords were there.

However, last night, even the eagle eye of the able Senator from North Dakota was not able to pick out more than a handful among the 3,500, and that is about the correct proportion in the Democratic Party—about one dozen of those who come in that category, among the 3,500 ordinary folks who were there.

I am glad my friend has told me that there has been a 300-percent increase in the ranks of liberals in the Republican Party. He said there was once only one, and many of us have known that for a long time the able Senator from North Dakota was ofttimes the only one on his side of the aisle who seemed to recognize where the sawdust trail of democracy lay and was able to follow it up to the altar with the right kind of a vote. So I am certainly encouraged; I do not know of anything I have heard lately that encourages me as much as does the information he has given us that 2 of the 42 Republicans have associated themselves with him, after all the years he has been preaching to them. So now there are three, over on the Republican side of the aisle.

Of course, that is not the same proportion that we have, when compared to the total membership; 3 out of 42 is not anything like the proportion existing in the Democratic Party, when we consider that among the 3,500 folks who were dining with the Democrats last night, there were only a dozen rich ones. Nevertheless, that represents so much progress, so far as the Republicans are concerned, that I am immensely heartened, and I am delighted to have the Senator from North Dakota tell me now that his vote has tripled, over on the Republican side of the aisle. It gives me great confidence as we on this side of the aisle are preparing to pass some of the Democratic legislation which we shall attempt to pass in the next few days. I believe it will be very helpful when we get those three votes from the Republican side of the aisle for our labor legislation to repeal the iniquitous Taft-Hartley law, when we pass the liberal bill on housing with their aid, and when we pass the minimum wage bill a little later and are able to have those three Republicans with us. So that news heartens us more than a little, and I am certainly grateful to the Senator from North Dakota for telling us about it.

Mr. President, I upbraided the able Senator from Oregon one day for using the plural pronoun when he spoke about "we liberal Republicans" and when he kept on using the pronoun "we"; and I asked him if he could properly use the word "we" in talking about liberals on the Republican side of the aisle. However, instead of quarreling about the accuracy of the grammar he used, I wish to say that the Senator from Oregon offered himself to the Senate earlier today as a Moses to lead us out of the bondage of our present confusion, into the promised land of the Morse bill. He did not refer to the Taft bill, although the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is the head of the Republican Policy Committee; neither did the Senator from Oregon refer to the Thomas bill, although the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. But this righteous and somewhat isolated Moses is going to gather together all the confused hosts of Democrats and Republicans and lead them down the Morse trail to Republican salvation. I appreciate the invitation; but so far as I am concerned, I am going to follow Brother THOMAS. I like the Democratic doctrine Brother THOMAS preaches. When they call for the ones who want to hit the sawdust trail, I am going to go down at the invitation of Brother THOMAS; and I believe that most of the other Democrats will, as they have in the past, do the same thing.

I do not know what my able friend is going to be able to do with the Republicans on his side of the aisle, whom he is going to try to rescue. There is no doubt they need rescuing; it is merely a question whether they are going to take Moses MORSE or Moses TAFT or whether these former antagonists are going to be able to reconcile their differences, which I daresay will result in having one of them get a little bit farther on one side of the aisle than he has previously been, and the other a little bit farther on the other side of the aisle than he has previously been.

However, the important thing is that we Democrats want it known that we are going to keep our pledge and our platform, and we have already started on it in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. We have already resolved that we are going to recommend a bill which will repeal the Taft-Hartley law, and a bill which will restore the Wagner Act—on which the Taft-Hartley law was an uncongenial grafting when it was enacted by the Congress of the United States—with the simple modifications which were in substance recommended and have been recommended repeatedly by the President of the United States.

Mr. President, why are we proposing to do that? It is because it has been made unmistakably clear by men like William H. Davis; Dr. Feinsinger, of the University of Wisconsin Law School; and Dr. William Leiserson—men whose experience and objectivity cannot be seriously questioned—that the Taft-Hartley

law was an alien graft upon the Wagner Act stock of liberal legislation. It was a departure in theory and in philosophy and in principle. That is the reason why we are not talking about taking 10 points out of the Taft-Hartley law and eliminating 15.

Mr. President, the Wagner Act was a simple measure which made simple requirements of management. It allowed free collective bargaining between management and labor. It was a milestone in industrial progress in America because it guaranteed political and economic democracy to the workers. It protected them in organizing into unions so they could obtain the strength of unity. All it said to the employer was, "You must bargain collectively with the chosen representative of labor." It laid certain prohibitions to management, saying to them, "You must not interfere with labor's elections of their own leaders and representatives; you must not discriminate against your employees because of union or nonunion membership; you must bargain collectively with those whom they have duly chosen as their representatives."

That was a simple bill designed to preserve democracy, to try to equalize the inequities between management and labor. In referring to mangement it is not out of place to recall that 2 percent of the big corporate employers employ 60-odd percent of the industrial workers of America, and that there are millions of dollars or a billion dollars on one side of the bargaining table, and mere men individually on the other side, unless the men can organize themselves into effective associations that are called unions.

So I think by the end of next week the country will see that the Democratic Party is redeeming its pledge, bringing to the floor of the Senate a measure wisely considered, ably thought out, and very conscientiously devised, which we shall confidently offer to the Senate as the best way to insure industrial peace and to promote economic as well as political democracy in America and the well-being of its people.

Mr. President, I desire to refer to but one other matter. We have been having hearings on the proposed labor legislation. At an earlier time there was some intimation we were not giving ample opportunity for hearings. That was at a time when we set as the opening date of the hearings January 31, although we were prepared to begin January 29. The time actually allotted was from January 31 to February 10. During nearly all that time the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare sat in session for 8½ hours a day—3 hours in the morning, 9:30 to 12:30, 3 hours in the afternoon, 2:30 to 5:30, and then 2½ hours in the evening, 7:30 until 10 o'clock. In any one period we were devoting more time to the hearings than would ordinarily be called a day in the course of ordinary hearings; so that the total time, if we had not extended the time, would have been far beyond the ordinary 30 days' sitting of a committee holding public hearings. We thought, in view of the volumes of testimony previously taken, that those 11 days, with that long hearing and sitting schedule, would have been a fair allotment of time for public hearings. Later on, upon the insistence of Republican members of the committee, after debating the matter, it was agreed unanimously we would extend the hearings nine additional days; and at 5:30 last Wednesday afternoon the extended period expired.

What did we do in those total hearings? I have had one of the clerks give me the data, and here they are. We took 5,277 pages of testimony, whereas in all the time of the Taft-Hartley hearings, only 3,809 pages were taken. We had fair public hearings, 5,277 pages, on the Thomas bill this year, by our committee, whereas the total number of pages taken under the Taft-Hartley bill hearings was only 3,809. Have we given a fair opportunity for the public to be heard?

One other thing. In time consumed——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I do not desire to shock the Senator from Florida, but I join with him in saying that I think the final result of our hearing was to give the public full and fair opportunity to be heard. I believe the Senator is quite right that we condensed into the hearings, because of the long hours we sat, more time than is usually given by any committee of the Senate perhaps in two months of ordinary hearings.

Mr. PEPPER. As a member of the Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare which arranged all these details, I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Oregon. He contributed greatly to the efficiency and effectiveness of the hearings.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will allow me one second more, I will yield. I have given the number of pages of testimony we took in the Thomas bill hearings this year, as compared to the Taft-Hartley hearings—5,277 pages on the Thomas bill, to 3,809 on the Taft-Hartley bill.

Now I want to give the figures as to the time consumed in the hearings. The clerk who kept the records for us tells me the committee was in session and them. Seven thousand one hundred and fifteen minutes was consumed in ally we divided the time equally between the two sides. The time devoted to each side was kept in terms of minutes, so we would fairly divide the time between them. Hearings on the Thomas bill consumed 7,115 minutes, whereas the total time estimated by the clerk to have been consumed in the hearings on the Taft-Hartley bill was 6,204. Nearly 1,000 more minutes were actually devoted to the hearings on the Thomas bill than were devoted to hearings on the Taft-Hartley bill.

So I felt it might be appropriate to bring these facts to the attention of the Senate, in order that the Senate might know, whether we come out of one mind or have differences of opinion, as we conscientiously do in the committee, that when we come to the floor of the Senate with a bill that represents the view of the Democratic majority, or a bill that represents the view of the Republican minority, or whether there are different views expressed, it is not something the committee has precipitously or unthoughtedly devised for the consideration of the Senate, but it represents conscientious, laborious and faithful inquiry into the subject with an idea of trying to make the right decision for the progress and security of the whole country.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield, if the Senator wants to ask me a question.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I should like to address a few remarks to what my distinguished friend from Florida had to say. I remember when the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, controlled by a Democratic majority, first announced what it was going to do with reference to hearings, how vigorously and how ably and how persistently our distinguished colleague from Oregon attacked the proposal of the Democratic majority of that committee to limit the time of the hearings. I remember myself asking my distinguished friend from Florida whether or not there was going to be any time devoted to public hearings on the question of whether or not the Taft-Hartley Act should be repealed outright. My distinguished friend said "No, we have already had a hearing on that, on the second day of last November. There is no need of devoting any time to it."

It is a heartening thing to me, as it must be to my distinguished friend from Oregon, now to see our friend and colleague from Florida come and tell how much time has been devoted to the hearings, as indeed time should be devoted to the hearings. I am glad my good friend from Florida has finally been brought around to the Republican point of view that here was a matter of such grave importance to the people, to everybody in the country, that adequate time should be given for all points of view to at least have a chance for their expression.

Mr. President, I close these remarks by saying that it is not my friend from Florida who is entitled to credit for extending the hearings to a reasonable length and giving the people an opportunity to be heard. The credit is due entirely to our colleague from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is very kind of the Senator to make those remarks, but the Senator from Oregon is entitled to only one-fifth of the credit, because there were five members of the committee on the Republican side who consistently insisted upon adequate time for the hearings.

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the Senator for his comment, and it is consistent with his generous spirit that he would make it. But I know that he was the most active one in urging the point.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I want the Senator to reassess the credit of which he has spoken. He said he was glad we had been brought over to the Republican point of view. With all due respect and all honor—and I honor and admire him as much

as I honor and admire any Senator in this Chamber—the Senator from Oregon proposed March 1, and until there was final agreement in the committee he never changed his demand. The hearings quit on February 23. There were other Senators who wanted them to continue until April 3. Of course, the Senator from Connecticut is not a member of the committee and is not informed of what happened in the committee. Eight Democrats and five Republicans were leaning over backward in trying to be fair. Even when it was thought there were some who felt that the Republicans were needlessly taking the time of the committee with protracted cross-examination which was drawn out hour after hour—even then, Mr. President, the Democratic majority, leaning over backward to try to be fair and to give the utmost of opportunity for inquiry, finally agreed to February 23, not to March 1, not to March 15, and not to April 1. But, Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Connecticut that even if we had stopped with our first allowance of time, when we doubled it, as we did, it was the equivalent of more than 30 days' actual hearing time, which we felt would have been fair, in view of the long and laborious hearings had in the past.

With all credit to the Senator from Oregon, we think the Democrats are also entitled to some credit.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I would be the last one to detract from any contribution which my friend from Florida has made, but he is commenting on something now which is at marked variance with the position which he took on the matter previously.

I should like to read briefly from page 585 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 27, 1949, when this matter was under discussion. At that time, I said:

> Mr. President, am I right in the assumption that it was apparently the intention of a majority of the committee to hold no hearings whatsoever upon the question of whether or not the Taft-Hartley Act should be repealed?

My friend from Florida said:

> The Senator is explicitly correct. We have already made up our minds to get rid of the Taft-Hartley law, and we do not need any additional testimony on that issue.

Then the committee went into the hearings with a closed sign, and it was the pressure of the Republican members of the committee that gave the American people an opportunity to be heard on this most important issue. The committee heard all the witnesses. I thank my distinguished friend from Florida for making his contribution to bringing that about and making it possible. I am glad he has explained how much time was actually given.

I now yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. The Senator from Oregon asked me to yield, first.

Mr. MORSE. I shall be glad to wait.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I do not want any confusion or misunderstanding about the matter. There were many people who wanted us to go into the Taft-Hartley law. We adopted a resolution in the committee by a vote of 8 to 5 that, so far as we were concerned, we had already concluded, from all the knowledge we had on the subject, that the Taft-Hartley law should be repealed and the Wagner Act should be restored in the form of the Thomas bill, with certain amendments recommended by the President. That is the general area of the President's recommendations. I think I am speaking pretty well the sentiment of the majority of the committee when I say that we were just as firmly of that opinion when the hearings concluded as we were when they began. If the Senator will note the record he will see that the hearings were on the Thomas bill, not on the Taft-Hartley law. We considered the question of whether the Thomas bill was adequate, and we allowed witnesses, who came in great numbers, to express their views upon the question. Some said that certain segments of the Taft-Hartley law should be included in the Thomas bill. But we did not hold hearings on the Taft-Hartley law; we held hearings on the Thomas bill.

Mr. BALDWIN. The fact remains that generally the committee held good and extensive hearings on the question of labor-management legislation. I am not a member of the committee, but I want to commend the committee for its type of approach to a very important legislative problem.

I now yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to join with the Senator from Connecticut in thanking the Democrats for their cooperation in extending the hearings. It is true that the junior Senator from Oregon thought that the hearings should be extended to March 1. When we went into executive session on the matter, the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] proposed that they be extended only 2 more days, from February 10 to February 12. That offer of the Senator from Florida alone shows the great cooperation we received from the Senator from Florida, because the final result of the bargaining agreement among us was to extend the hearings not 2 days, but to February 23. I think that was a pretty fair sort of a collective-bargaining agreement—or shall I say horse trade?

But I do want to make this comment on the statement which the Senator from Florida has made concerning the cross-examination by the Republican members of the committee. I am rather proud of the cross-examination engaged in by Republican members of the committee. The printed record will speak for itself as to whether it was good-faith cross-examination. It was designed to elicit from the witnesses the facts and the evidence which we believed should be made of record for the use of our colleagues on the floor of the Senate before final labor legislation is passed.

I think the Senator from Florida is quite correct about one thing. Certainly the Senator from Florida and most of his Democratic colleagues never changed their opinion on anything from the beginning to the end of the hearings. They passed a resolution at the beginning of the hearings to repeal the Taft-Hartley law, and I think their minds were closed to any evidence we might bring to bear indicating any possible good which might be developed from retaining any phase of the Taft-Hartley law. Interestingly enough, even the Thomas bill, which my good friends on the other side of the aisle are going to ask the Senate to approve, has many of the principles of the Taft-Hartley law in it.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I want to say to my good friend from Florida that, so far as I am concerned, he will not get by with the idea that he is proposing something in the form of the Thomas bill which represents no feature at all of the legislation of 1947 known as the Taft-Hartley law because when we get into the debate we shall see that quite a few principles of the 1947 legislation are still in the Thomas bill. But, after all, it becomes pretty much a quibble, it seems to me, whether we are repealing or not repealing the Taft-Hartley law. When we get into the debate we are going to have to come to grips, it seems to me, with certain fundamental issues in regard to what type of labor legislation we should have. What are we going to do about emergency disputes? What are we going to do about jurisdictional disputes? In what way are we going to modify secondary boycotts? I wish to say that in my judgment the Thomas bill does not solve the secondary-boycott problem any more than the Taft-Hartley law solves it. What are we going to do about the matter of injunctions? On this point I think the Senator from Florida, if he will permit me to say so, would say I was accurate if I stated that he was surprised to discover in the hearing that possibly one wing of the administration thought that an injunctive process would be available to it, whereas I am sure the Senator from Florida thought, when he was supporting the Thomas bill, that we were getting rid of the injunctive process. I said in the hearing, and I repeat now, that it seems to me the position taken by the Democratic administration in regard to this injunctive matter is that they are trying to work both sides of the political street. They are trying to say to labor, "Oh, no, we are not going to authorize the issuance of injunctions, because here is the Thomas bill, and we do not authorize an injunction in the Thomas bill. But the Democrats are not telling labor at the same time, "But we believe the President has inherent power to get an injunction, and he says he is going to use it."

I want to know where the Democrats are actually going to stand on this injunctive power. I will tell the Senator from Florida where the junior Senator from Oregon is going to stand, and I hope he will join me in it. I am against the use of injunctions in any phase of labor relations in this country, because I do not believe it is possible to bring into a court of common law the social and economic problems of labor relations, and have them equitably adjudicated by way of an injunction. I believe we

can handle all these labor problems, including the emergency-dispute problem, without the use of the common-law court injunction. I hope the Senator from Florida will help me make that point of view prevail as both the Democratic and Republican policy.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I have the floor. I yielded for a lengthy statement, but I am glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I think it should be made clear that the Senator from Oregon is not accurate in saying that we Democrats are trying to work both sides of the street. We are not trying to imitate any Republican practices. What the Taft-Hartley law did was to provide machinery for the injunction in the legislation itself sponsored by the authors of the Taft-Hartley bill and enacted by Congress. We propose to take that out of the law. There is nothing in the Thomas bill about injunctions, and I can assure the Senator from Oregon that the eight Democratic members of the committee will not let anything go into the bill about injunctions.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

Mr. PEPPER. In a moment I will yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, if I lose the floor by yielding to this extent, I should like to finish, briefly, what I have to say.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut has the floor. He yielded to the Senator from Florida. The Chair will protect the Senator in his rights.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator from Connecticut have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut has the floor.

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. May I finish my statement?

Mr. BALDWIN. Certainly.

Mr. PEPPER. What I was saying was that it was not the eight Democratic members on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare who proposed any injunctive power. While we were conducting the hearings the Attorney General sent down an opinion that under the Constitution of the United States the Chief Magistrate of the Nation, the President of the United States, as a part of his inherent power, in a moment of great crisis which threatened the security or safety or health of America could resort to a court for an injunction. I do not know whether he can or not, but I know that the Democrats are not going to put any such power in the law as the authors of the Taft-Hartley law put in that measure.

I know furthermore, Mr. President, as a lawyer, that if it is within the constitutional power of the President, in a moment of grave national emergency and crisis, to resort to an American court to protect the health, safety, and security of America, we could not take the power away from him by an act of Congress. So I wish to make it very clear that the Democrats are not imitating the Republican practice of working both sides of the street.

Mr. IVES. Will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me for the purpose of asking the Senator from Florida a question?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I believe the Senator from Florida very likely recalls the various discussions which took place in 1947 in the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare during our consideration of the committee bill, which finally was reported by the Senate committee. Am I correct?

Mr. PEPPER. I recall that there were discussions. I do not recall all their details.

Mr. IVES. I am not trying to pin the Senator down to any detail of a very technical nature. What I should like to recall and to bring to the attention of the Senator is in the way of a question. Does not the Senator recall that he himself voted in favor of the Senate committee bill in 1947?

Mr. PEPPER. I think that if the Senator will look at the record——

Mr. IVES. I have done so.

Mr. PEPPER. If my able friend will look at the record, he will find that the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the Senator from Florida were the two members of the committee who voted against the bill. It was some of the others, some of those who have been somewhat critical of the law, who voted for it. I voted against it in the committee, to answer the Senator's question.

Mr. IVES. The Senator voted against it in committee?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes. So did the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. IVES. I do not question the Senator's statement regarding his vote on the bill itself in committee, but the record I happen to have, which I have taken the opportunity to have verified, is apparently incorrect, though it seems to stand as the official record. It shows that the two negative votes were those cast by the former Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL]. Theirs were the two negative votes. I am not in any sense of the word questioning the Senator's statement that he and the Senator from Montana were the two who cast negative votes, but I should like to point out that what I have stated is the official record, apparently, because I have looked it up.

Mr. PEPPER. Not only that, but the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the senior Senator from Florida, myself, filed minority views against the bill. The Senator will find that in the RECORD. We filed a written report, and voted "no" on the bill.

Mr. IVES. I should like to point out that that is rather a strange situation, not that I question in any way, shape or manner the statement of the able Senator from Florida, but the record itself of the vote, as I recall, does not show any such vote as that. The record shows an 11 to 2 vote. I think the Senator from Florida will recall that.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. IVES. Eleven to 2, out of a committee of 13, so that that does not quite coincide with the position indicated by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I think the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Montana had been against the bill from the beginning, that we and the Senator from Utah filed minority views, which will speak for themselves. They were filed in the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield so that I may ask the Senator from Florida a question?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Florida agree with me that in 1947, when we were considering the committee bill in committee, so far as the major provisions of the bill were concerned, we passed on the provisions section by section, usually by a vote of 7 to 6? Does the Senator from Florida recall that?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes. There were a great many votes that way. I remember it, because ofttimes the vote of the Senator from Oregon was the decisive vote.

Mr. MORSE. It is kind of the Senator from Florida to say that, but I was about to ask him if it was not true that on all those 7 to 6 votes the Senator from Florida was with the seven.

Mr. PEPPER. No, sir; he was with the six.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Florida means that he voted with the—well I might as well say it—that he voted with most of the Republicans in the committee on those major provisions?

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator from Oregon has evidently forgotten that it was the Republicans who were sponsoring the legislation, not the Democrats. I voted with the Democrats who, as a general rule, were opposing the Taft-Hartley legislation, except it was called the Morse bill primarily. I think the Senator from Oregon had his bill considered, but it became the Taft-Hartley law, and the Senator from Ohio was one of the leaders in the advocacy of the matter. The Senator from Oregon is evidently not considering that this was a Republican bill, not a Democratic bill, which we are talking about. I think I am pretty generally on the Democratic side when it comes to questions between the Democrats and the Republicans.

Mr. MORSE. I want to say to my good friend the Senator from Florida that he has an interesting surprise coming to himself, because at a future date I am going to present to him the roll call of the committee on issue after issue where he will find that the Senator from Florida joined with the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] time and time again to give us the 7-to-6 vote which we needed in order to get the committee bill adopted section by section. However, when we came to the final vote——

Mr. PEPPER. Oh yes.

Mr. MORSE. When we came to the final vote, after the Senator from Florida had joined with the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and the junior Senator from Oregon on section after section of the bill, the Senator from Florida for the first time voted against the bill in its totality.

Mr. PEPPER. Oh, well, the Senator from Oregon has now clarified the matter. I thought he meant I voted with the Republican majority. He will note, of course, that there were many instances when we had to vote with the more progressive element of the Republican majority to keep the bill from being worse than it was; and when it is a question as to whether to get something that has a little taint on it or something with a great deal, we will take the little. Sometimes, you know, politics makes strange bedfellows, and we had to associate ourselves with our more progressive Republican friends. That was the best we could do, because the Republicans had a majority in the committee. Of course, this time the Democrats have a majority, and while we welcome the Senator from Oregon, we will not have to associate ourselves with any of the Republicans to get a good liberal Taft-Hartley repealing labor law. But the Senator from Oregon will recall, and I am sure he will agree, that while I had to resort to this expedient of keeping the best company I could get when we were considering amendments, on final passage, Mr. President, when there was no choice except to vote for or against the bill, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the Senator from Florida voted against the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I want to thank the Senator from Florida for this very frank explanation of his voting strategy in committee. I want to express to him the hope that the next time he joins with me in a measure he will join with me because he believes I am right, because I would not want his vote on any other basis.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, we still have hope for the Senator from Oregon, because we always hope that the wanderer will return to the fold.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, hope seems to spring eternal in the human breast, and there seems to be a great deal of hope around here. We have come a long way from what my distinguished friend from Florida talked of when he first rose, and that was the feast of Belshazzar. My friend claimed that Belshazzar was a Republican, but he has not yet been able to produce a primary or caucus list to prove the fact. However, all his efforts to demonstrate that the company which was present was of a different character than might possibly attend a Republican gathering backfired a little, or considerably, I might say, Mr. President, after the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

Mr. President, I should like very seriously, since we are discussing Belshazzar's feast and the great lesson the fifth chapter of the Book of Daniel teaches us, to address myself for a moment to the important part of that story, which is the handwriting on the wall.

Our country faces grievous and dangerous times. It faces a situation which requires the highest patriotism, the most sincere and earnest thinking and acting that Americans, certainly Americans in the Congress and who hold high office in the Government of the United States, can possibly produce. It seems to me that we might ask the question whether or not the handwriting on the wall we are speaking of here by way of analogy is not made up of words appealing to hate, distrust, disunity, and the abuse of Americans with whom one American or one group of Americans might not agree.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that the kind of handwriting on the wall we should have now should convey the idea that "The campaign is over. The Congress is in session, as the representatives of the people, to do their will, to meet the Nation's problems both here at home and in the wide fields of the world." In order to meet them we must appeal to the things that bind us and hold us closer together, and not emphasize the things calculated to divide us and make us suspicious of one another, and result in the breeding of disunity. So, Mr. President, I appeal to the kind of thinking and action—and as a humble Member of the Senate I hope I will be capable of producing it myself—that is designed to secure the greatest unity among us, to find the widest ground that will attract the largest numbers of us to stand upon, and with a united front support, to meet the great issues of the day and support a combined program. That it seems to me is what the handwriting on the wall should mean to us today and in the troublesome and toilsome days that lie ahead.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I sincerely wish that my colleague had begun the debate which started some 2½ hours ago on the note on which he has now ended it. I would remind him for the sake of the RECORD that it was started by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], who made what has come to be more or less of a standardized speech over the past 16 years. I do not pretend to be any great student of the Bible, but I recall the biblical saying, "By their fruits ye shall know them." We can cast recriminations here from one side of the aisle to the other, but the American people will judge by the fruits of this session, a session, Mr. President, which need not end on July 31, 1949. I think it is not too soon to say to the Senate that there are some of us who believe that the pledges which we made to the American people in the campaign last November are to be fought for and carried out to the best of our ability.

So when the final roll call is had and this Congress adjourns, the test of it will be not what my colleague says about it today, nor what the Senator from Florida has said about our intentions. It will be in the cold record of the votes which are taken—not in our discussions, but in our results. We might as well face up to it. We might as well acknowledge it.

Mr. President, last night I addressed one of the Democrat dinners in my own State, in the city of New Haven. There were approximately 850 persons present. It was the largest dinner which the Democratic Party has ever held in our State. The gathering was very enthusiastic.

The Governor of the State of Connecticut addressed that gathering, as did I. I have his address before me; and I think it particularly appropriate, in view of the address which was made by the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] that I make brief references to Governor Bowles' address.

The distinguished Governor of Connecticut, Chester Bowles, suggested that the Republican Party change its mascot from an elephant to a dinosaur. The Governor suggested that he realized that the Republican Party probably would not pay much attention to his suggestion, because the Republican leaders in the State of Connecticut are not paying much attention to his recommendations on housing, public health, education, and taxes—I suppose no more attention there than the leaders of the Republican Party will pay to the national program on those subjects. But the Governor earnestly pointed out that he hoped the Republican Party would not reject his suggestion without some thought. He stated that it was no ordinary idea, because he said that the dinosaur was a splendid animal—massive, streamlined, and powerful. The largest species, the brontosaurus, was more than 80 feet long. It lived in bogs and ate vegetables and green stalks. It had a long neck, which was continually stuck out. Instead of bringing forth its young alive, it laid large eggs, which some authorities claim reached a circumference of more than 2 feet.

It is quite true, he said, that the dinosaur had a very limited brain capacity. In fact, its mental capacity was so limited that it was totally unable to keep up with its changing environment. Eventually, of course, it died out completely, and today we know about it only through bones which are dug up in many parts of America and Asia. However, its life, while it lasted, is well worth the careful study of our more thoughtful Republican friends.

If the record which is made in this Congress by some of our Republican brethren continues to be that which was made by them in the Eightieth Congress, then truly they will have to give serious thought to changing their mascot and, as the Governor of Connecticut suggests, embrace the dinosaur, because that, and that alone in the animal kingdom, will truly represent its ideas as to social progress, as to progressive government, and as to the needs of the American people.

But, like my colleague, I entertain hope that the great issues which are to be presented and which we must decide at this session of Congress will be decided with a minimum of partisanship and with a minimum seeking of partisan advantage.

Mr. President, we are considering in the Foreign Relations Committee probably one of the most important moves that has ever been contemplated in the

conduct of American foreign policy. I am one of those who believe that we should come forth—and undoubtedly will come forth—from that committee with an approval of a strong pact for the defense of the United States against external aggression.

It is issues such as these which will test the wisdom and patriotism of this Congress, and it is issues such as these which demand the utmost of our ability for the protection of our beloved country. So, Mr. President, I hope that while we may toss arguments back and forth across the aisle, we can keep the debate in good faith and not make it unnecessarily bitter and abrupt. I join with my colleague in the hope which he expresses, that we can unite in measures for the best interests of the United States. Perhaps if we can do so, we can forget about the dinosaur, and can pass housing, education, and health legislation. Perhaps we can get together on the things which this country desperately needs.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I am glad that my colleague from Connecticut struck the note which he struck in the last part of his address. I know that when the distinguished Governor of Connecticut was talking about the dinosaur he was talking in humorous vein.

Mr. President, I find it increasingly difficult to lend cooperation in the light of some of the things which have been said and some of the things which have been done. The previous Congress has been called a do-nothing Congress and there has been no lack of effort to impress that upon us many, many times by many, many speakers. But, Mr. President, if the Eightieth Congress had a housing problem to deal with it was because a Democratically-controlled Seventy-ninth Congress, Seventy-eighth Congress, Seventy-seventh Congress, Seventy-sixth Congress, Seventy-fifth Congress, and Seventy-fourth Congress failed to deal with it. If it had a problem of high prices and inflation to deal with, it was because the Seventy-ninth Congress, the Seventy-eighth Congress, the Seventy-seventh Congress, the Seventy-sixth Congress, and preceding Congresses back to 1932 had either failed to deal with it or had failed to appreciate it, or had failed to take adequate measures to anticipate it, and consequently have a solution ready when the problem was at hand.

The same thing can be said about many issues which faced the Eightieth Congress. When we are discussing the history of the past few days, in which our respective parties have memorialized their great leaders of the past, I should like to say, in behalf of the Eightieth Congress, that when the record of the Eightieth Congress is written, at least that part of it which deals with the handling of foreign affairs, it will receive high commendation and praise because never before in peacetime, and rarely in wartime, had the Congress, and particularly the Senate, reached such a high degree of unanimity as it reached in dealing with problems of foreign affairs.

We were beset with great difficulties, because when the Eightieth Congress met in Washington in 1947 the situation in western Europe was disintegrating very fast. The whole fabric was raveling out at the edges, and we were indeed in a dangerous situation. But we united and worked out our problem. The Republican leadership on the floor of the Senate, in the person of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and other Republicans, as well as the Democratic leadership in the person of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and other Democrats, cooperated and formulated a plan. I regret, Mr. President, that not a single word has come from the other side of the aisle or from downtown commending us for that cooperation. I remember the occasion when the Greek-Turkish loan was before the Senate. It was all but lost on both sides of the aisle. It was a program which was very close to the heart of the administration, because the administration, knowing the intimate facts, appreciated its great importance. At that particular time it was not a Democrat who saved it; it was a Republican, the distinguished Senator from Michigan, who rose to its defense, who proposed the amendment which represented the most generous, gracious gesture of international good will and cooperation that has come forth from Congress or from any other body in the United States for a long time. It was that amendment that saved the measure.

So, Mr. President, when we appeal for cooperation and for unity, let us do so in a real spirit of cooperation, in a genuine spirit of unity all along the line. I know that back in the State of Connecticut when a man is driving an ox team and wants to get the oxen to pull together, or when a man is driving a team of horses and wants to get them to pull together, he does not stand out in front of them and beat them over the head with a whip and call them names.

Mr. President, I say now is the time for us to seek unity and to find it. That does not mean that we must always be in agreement; but it does mean that we must seek, among many minds here in the United States Senate and in the House of Representatives, the contribution which each and every one of us can make to the solving of the difficulties which beset us. Mr. President, as I said before, I hope the handwriting on the wall will not be words that threaten our unity in the future, but will be words that will bring about a high spirit of collaboration and cooperation in bringing us through these troublous times.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing a nomination, which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

NOMINATION OF EDWARD A. DENT AS MEMBER OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the nomination by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, pursuant to law, of Edward A. Dent, to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Steven L. Hollis, to be ensign in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Stuart A. Rice, of Virginia, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Statistical Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 3 years;

Philip M. Hauser, of Illinois, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Population Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 3 years;

Arthur J. Altmeyer, of Wisconsin, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Social Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 3 years;

Benjamin V. Cohen, of New York, to be a representative of the United States of America to the third session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, held in Paris, France, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate, to fill a vacancy created by the absence of Warren R. Austin due to illness;

Dean Rusk, of Virginia, to be an alternate representative of the United States of America to the third session of the General Assembly of the United Nations held in Paris, France, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate, vice Benjamin V. Cohen;

Warren R. Austin, of Vermont, to be a representative of the United States of America to the third session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, held in Paris, France, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate;

John Foster Dulles, of New York, to be a representative of the United States of America to the third session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, held in Paris, France, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate;

Anna Eleanor Roosevelt, of New York, to be a representative of the United States of America to the third session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, held in Paris, France, to which office she was appointed during the recess of the Senate;

Philip C. Jessup, of New York, to be a representative of the United States of America to the third session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, held in Paris, France, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate;

Benjamin V. Cohen, of New York, to be an alternate representative of the United States of America to the third session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, held in Paris, France, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate;

Ray Atherton, of Illinois, to be an alternate representative of the United States of America to the third session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, held in Paris, France, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate;

The following-named person, Willard L. Thorp, of Connecticut, to be an alternate

representative of the United States of America to the third session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, held in Paris, France, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate;

Ernest A. Gross, of New York, to be an alternate representative of the United States of America to the third session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, held in Paris, France, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate;

Francis B. Sayre, of the District of Columbia, to be an alternate representative of the United States of America to the third session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, held in Paris, France, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate;

Gerald A. Drew, of California, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Special Balkan Committee established by the General Assembly of the United Nations October 21, 1947;

James Grover McDonald, of New York, to be special representative of the United States of America to the Provisional Government of Israel, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate;

Mark Foster Ethridge, of Kentucky, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Conciliation Commission for Palestine which was established by resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations December 11, 1948;

Henry F. Grady, of California, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Greece, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Chief of the American Mission for Aid to Greece, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate;

Sarah Blanding, of New York, and sundry other persons, to be members of the Public Advisory Board;

Ernest A. Gross, of New York, now legal adviser of the Department of State, to be an Assistant Secretary of State;

Philip C. Jessup, of New York, to be Ambassador at Large;

Myron Melvin Cowen, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Australia, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate;

Laurence A. Steinhardt, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Canada, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate;

Joseph E. Jacobs, of South Carolina, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Czechoslovakia, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate;

Stanton Griffis, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Egypt, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate;

Richard C. Patterson, Jr., of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Guatemala, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate;

Loy W. Henderson, of Colorado, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to India and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Nepal to which offices he was appointed during the recess of the Senate;

Edward S. Crocker 2d, of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Iraq, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate;

Robert M. Scotten, of Michigan, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to New Zealand, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate;

Waldemar J. Gallman, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Poland, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate;

George Wadsworth, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Turkey and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Chief of the American Mission for Aid to Turkey, to which offices he was appointed during the recess of the Senate;

North Winship, of Georgia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Union of South Africa, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Union of South Africa;

Myron Melvin Cowen, of New York, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Australia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of the Philippines;

J. Rives Childs, of Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Saudi Arabia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia; and

Edward R. Dudley, of New York, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Liberia, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of David Northon Edelstein, to be Assistant Attorney General in the Customs Division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Walter L. Pope to be a circuit judge of the ninth circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Joseph W. Kehoe to be judge of Division No. 2, in the District of Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Anthony J. Dimond to be judge of Divison No. 3, in the District of Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Herbert W. Erskine, to be a judge in the northern district of California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Lester Luther to be United States attorney for the district of Kansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Alfred E. Modarelli, to be United States attorney for the district of New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of James J. Boyle, to be United States marshal for the southern district of California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of all nominations this day confirmed.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, February 28, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 25 (legislative day of February 21), 1949:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

James Grover McDonald, of New York, whose recess appointment as special representative of the United States of America to the Provisional Government of Israel is pending confirmation by the Senate, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Israel.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Cornelius Vanderbilt Whitney, of New York, to the position of Under Secretary of Commerce.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Michael J. Galvin, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary of Labor.

COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

Earl James McGrath, of Iowa, to be Commissioner of Education.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following-named employee of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the position indicated:

Lorin F. Woodcock to be lieutenant effective February 3, 1949.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance:

Charles U. Culmer
Lewis H. Hoyle

To be senior assistant surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance:

Willie G. Simpson

To be scientist (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance:

Howard M. Kline

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

Pursuant to the provision of section 4 (a) of Public Law 592, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia nominate the following-named person for reappointment as a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency:

Edward A. Dent, for a term of 5 years, effective on and after March 4, 1949.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE OFFICERS' RESERVE CORPS OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. James Bell Cress, Officers' Reserve Corps, Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Hanford MacNider, Officers' Reserve Corps, Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Robert Wilbar Wilson, Officers' Reserve Corps, Army of the United States.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. William Andros Barron, Jr., Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Wallace Harry Graham (first lieutenant, Medical Corps Reserve), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Telford Taylor (colonel, Military Intelligence Reserve), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Thomas Edison Troland, National Guard of the United States, Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Courtney Whitney (major, Staff and Administrative Reserve), Army of the United States.

Col. Frank Brown Berry, Medical Corps Reserve, Army of the United States.

Col. Robert Hunter Clarkson, Transportation Corps Reserve, Army of the United States.

Col. Clyde Emerson Dougherty, Corps of Engineers Reserve, Army of the United States.

Col. John Bettes Dunlap, Armored-Cavalry Reserve, Army of the United States.

Col. James Calvin Frank, Field Artillery Reserve, Army of the United States.

Col. Charles Lyn Fox, Infantry Reserve, Army of the United States.

Col. Thomas Rodman Goethals, Medical Corps Reserve, Army of the United States.

Col. Harold Leroy Goss, Medical Corps Reserve, Army of the United States.

Col. Robert Dinwiddie Groves, Field Artillery Reserve, Army of the United States.

Col. William Rodes Jesse, Field Artillery Reserve, Army of the United States.

Col. Henry Kirksey Kellogg, Corps of Engineers Reserve, Army of the United States.

Col. Richard Leeson McNelly, Field Artillery Reserve, Army of the United States.

Col. Henry Carlton Newton, Armored-Cavalry Reserve, Army of the United States.

Col. Francis J. Reichmann, Field Artillery Reserve, Army of the United States.

Col. James Thomas Roberts, Armored-Cavalry Reserve, Army of the United States.

Col. Carl Ferdinand Steinhoff, Medical Corps Reserve, Army of the United States.

Col. Arthur Elsworth Stoddard, Transportation Corps Reserve, Army of the United States.

Col. Carl Thomas Sutherland, Infantry Reserve, Army of the United States.

Col. Frederick Marshall Warren, Armored-Cavalry Reserve, Army of the United States.

Col. Richard Seabury Whitcomb, Transportation Corps Reserve, Army of the United States.

Lt. Col. Clement Bates Ellery Harts, Field Artillery Reserve, Army of the United States.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be major generals of the line

Maj. Gen. Ronald Cornelius Brock, New York National Guard, to date from July 27, 1948.

Maj. Gen. Brendan Austin Burns, New York National Guard, to date from October 25, 1948.

Maj. Gen. John Uberto Calkins, Jr., California National Guard, to date from April 27, 1948.

Maj. Gen. Karl Frederick Hausauer, New York National Guard, to date from October 25, 1948.

Maj. Gen. Daniel Harrison Hudelson, California National Guard, to date from April 27, 1948.

Maj. Gen. Ralph Andrus Loveland, Michigan National Guard, to date from July 27, 1948.

Maj. Gen. Alexander Gallatin Paxton, Mississippi National Guard, to date from July 27, 1948.

Maj. Gen. William Irwin Rose, Massachusetts National Guard, to date from February 9, 1948.

Maj. Gen. Richard Smykal, Illinois National Guard, to date from September 27, 1948.

Maj. Gen. Daniel Bursk Strickler, Pennsylvania National Guard to date from July 27, 1948.

To be brigadier generals of the line

Brig. Gen. H. Miller Ainsworth, Texas National Guard, to date from September 27, 1948.

Brig. Gen. William Seiler Bailey, Pennsylvania National Guard, to date from February 5, 1948.

Brig. Gen. Frank B. DeLano, California National Guard, to date from April 28, 1948.

Brig. Gen. Alfred Halleck Doud, New York National Guard, to date from October 26, 1948.

Brig. Gen. Homer Oliver Eaton, Jr., California National Guard, to date from April 28, 1948.

Brig. Gen. George Francis Ferry, Illinois National Guard, to date from April 27, 1948.

Brig. Gen. William Murray Hamilton, New York National Guard, to date from February 5, 1948.

Brig. Gen Walter Jones Hanna, Alabama National Guard, to date from July 28, 1948.

Brig. Gen. Thomas Linus Hoban, Pennsylvania National Guard, to date from October 25, 1948.

Brig. Gen. William Dolphas Jackson, Oregon National Guard, to date from March 12, 1948.

Brig. Gen. Gordon Alexander MacDonald, Michigan National Guard, to date from October 26, 1948.

Brig. Gen. Jesse Eschol McIntosh, Indiana National Guard, to date from February 6, 1948.

Brig. Gen. Neil Robert McKay, Washington National Guard, to date from July 28, 1948.

Brig. Gen. John Webster Naylor, Texas National Guard, to date from April 28, 1948.

Brig. Gen. Carl Lawrence Phinney, Texas National Guard, to date from July 29, 1948.

Brig. Gen. Joseph Alsop Redding, Louisiana National Guard, to date from April 28, 1948.

Brig. Gen. Ralph Ferdinand Schirm, New York National Guard, to date from July 29, 1948.

Brig. Gen. Patrick Elihu Seawright, Georgia National Guard, to date from February 6, 1948.

Brig. Gen. Edward Devlin Sirois, Massachusetts National Guard, to date from February 6, 1948.

Brig. Gen. Wint Smith, Kansas National Guard, to date from June 8, 1948.

Brig. Gen. Paul Edward Warfield, Illinois National Guard, to date from October 26, 1948.

Brig. Gen. Edward Otto Wolf, New Jersey National Guard, to date from September 8, 1948.

Brig. Gen. Warren Claypool Wood, Nebraska National Guard, to date from June 11, 1948.

To be major generals, Adjutant General's Department

Maj. Gen. William Henry Harrison, Jr., Massachusetts National Guard, to date from March 5, 1948.

Maj. Gen. Curtis Dion O'Sullivan, California National Guard, to date from February 4, 1948.

To be brigadier generals, Adjutant General's Department

Brig. Gen. Murdock Alexander Campbell, Vermont National Guard, to date from October 26, 1948.

Brig. Gen. George Milton Carter, Maine National Guard, to date from October 26, 1948.

Brig. Gen. Raymond Frederick Huft, Louisiana National Guard, to date from November 1, 1948.

Brig. Gen. Richard King Mellon, Pennsylvania National Guard, to date from April 27, 1948.

Brig. Gen. George Clifford Moran, Michigan National Guard, to date from July 28, 1948.

Brig. Gen. Frederick Gates Reincke, Connecticut National Guard, to date from July 28, 1948.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named persons for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

To be second lieutenants

Milton I. Aalen
Grey L. Adams
James R. Adams
James D. Alexander
Theofelos A. Aliapoulios
Fred C. Allen
Herman D. Allshouse
George B. Ashby
Roy E. Bach
Linford B. Bachtell
David J. Baer
Richard M. Bagley
George F. Barker
Glen E. Barrington
George W. Beale
Vaughn L. R. Beals, Jr.
John C. Beeley
Rowland H. Bemis
John J. Berky
LeRoy W. Berry
William J. Beaaw
Rufus L. Billups
Tommy F. Blackstone
Sylvester F. Blakely
Rudolph Bonapace
Harold K. Boyd
Lester T. Brannon, Jr.
Joseph S. Breeden
Jerome G. Bricker
Frederick A. Bristol, Jr.
John E. Brooke
Earl C. Brown
John D. Brown (ROTC)
John D. Brown (Aviation cadet)
Marvin L. Brown
Robert R. Buckley, Jr.
Lawrence K. Bulen
Marshall E. Burbank
David D. Bush
Irwin C. Cairns, Jr.
William G. Cameron
Matthew J. Campanella
Lucian C. Cantin
Avril B. Carter
Robert P. Chadeayne
William R. Chapin
William I. Chenault
John E. Chrisinger
Carl E. Christenson
Gilvin L. Claypool
Douglas R. Clifford
David B. Cloud
Robert E. Clyburn
Joseph W. Cohen
W. Frank Cole, Jr.
Mitchell E. Coleman
James D. Collums
Malcolm K. Condie
James E. Conlon
Clyde A. Cook
Randolph D. Cook
Arthur Cooper
Kenneth J. Costa
Harris E. Coutchie
John R. Crane
John S. Croswell, Jr.
Joe W. Cunningham
James A. Cushman
Jacques C. Dastillung
Robert A. Davidson
Harold A. Davis
Kenneth E. Davison
Thomas J. Devanny
Douglas C. Dowell
Earloyde Edmonson
Clinton W. Edinger III
Raymond Elliott
James T. Ellis
Morley L. Emery
Ferd B. English Jr.
Paul J. English
Howard A. Fagen
Howard F. Hamill
Darwin R. Hamilton
Richard J. Hamilton
Robert L. Hamilton
Lloyd G. Hamlett
Victor W. Hammond
John I. Hammonds, Jr.
George E. Hansen
Richard O. Hansen
Byne D. Harris
Thomas R. Harrison
Don M. Hartung
James E. Harvey
Robert A. Haun
Robert W. Hazlett
James G. Henry
Paul J. Hesketh, Jr.
Edward A. Hinkle
Robert C. Hinrichs
Richard H. Hittle
Gerald J. Hogenmiller
Walter A. Hogge, Jr.
Francis X. Holbrook
Paul J. Holgren
Clarence W. Holloway
Arley R. Hombaker
Robert M. Horsky
Albert F. Howell
Virgil R. Huddleston
Bennett W. James
Robert D. Erickson
Francis P. Farrell
Kenneth W. F. Feltham

William P. Fey
Milo H. Fields
Edward F. Fisher
Charles M. Forbes
Dean W. Forbes
David L. Fort
Karl W. Forward
Thomas L. Foster
James E. Francy
Bobby G. Franklin
James D. Freeman
Robert E. Fullerton
Tom L. Gabbard
William H. Gallup, Jr.
James W. Geiger
John L. Gerwig
Kay G. Glenn
Jack D. Gooding
Robert A. Gray
James F. Green
Philip D. Greenwood
Robert E. Gross
David F. Guess
George C. James
Jake Jenkins
Evan L. Jensen
Gordon I. Jensen
Harold M. Jensen
Prentice E. Jones
Robert B. Jones
Robert C. Jones
Walter G. Jones
Robin A. Julien
Wilbur C. Kaiser
Eugene C. Karr
Alfred R. Kattar
Willis G. Kearl
David K. Keeler
Richard C. Keller
Howard F. Kempsell
Larry M. Killpack
William H. King
William M. King
James W. Kirk
Gilford W. Koopmann
Victor H. Kupferer
Robert J. Lacey
Robert H. Laier
Harry W. Lambe
Maximilian Lamont
Leonard C. Langdon, Jr.
Robert L. Larsh, Jr.
Robert W. Lauer
Norbert D. LaVally
Lawrence L. Lavanier
John H. Lawson
James E. Ledlie
Elmer K. Lile
Allen J. R. Longstreet
George A. Lowes
Robert T. Lowrance
William T. Luke
James V. Lukey
Benjamin C. Luna, Jr.
Richard J. Lyman
Paul E. Maguire
Samuel Mansbach
Lester P. Martin, Jr.
Richard L. Martin
Charles M. Mason, Jr.
Robert F. Maxwell
Bobby N. McAllister
Charles R. McAllister
Robert M. McAllister
Jerome M. McCarville
John C. McClure
Murray M. McColloch
Chester E. McCollough, Jr.
Clayton L. McDowell
William J. McElroy III
Wilson A. McEveen, Jr.
Leon McGoogan
Cleon F. McGraw
William D. McMullen
Harold W. Meade
Wayne A. Melendrez
David K. Merrill
Joseph Meyer
Harold L. Meyers
Harris E. Miller
Joseph N. Miller, Jr.
Wallace G. Minich
Joseph R. Mitchell
Robert E. Mitchell, Jr.
Willard L. Mitchell
John K. Moberly
Leonard A. Mobley
Rufus M. Monts III
Bruce H. Moore
Harold W. Moore
Robert E. Morey
Harold J. Mosher
John M. Musterman
Gordon G. Neal
Franklin W. Neff
Howard O. Neff
Harold D. Nelson
William R. Nelson
Norton H. Nickerson
Melvin H. Nuechterlein
Clair H. Oberdier
Eric F. O'Briant
Daniel J. O'Brien
Thomas S. O'Brien
Edward W. O'Leary
Francis J. Oles
William A. Owings
John T. Palmer
Walter G. Palmer
William M. Palmer
Robert B. Parker
Benton K. Partin
Robert B. Patton
Thomas E. Pearsall
Robert C. Perdzock
Charles H. Perin
Gerald Perselay
Ralph T. Peterson, Jr.
Duane M. Phillips
Lowell G. Phillips
Richard L. Pierce
William E. Pilcher
Lew L. Pilkington
Edgar H. Pittman, Jr.
John W. Plantikow
John S. Quinn
Luther T. Quinn, Jr.
Carmen D. Ragonese
Merle R. Rauscher
Pat A. Restaino
Donald E. Rice
Charles R. Riley
Allen W. Ripley III
Charles R. Ritchie
William J. Ritts
Harry E. Roadman
J. Lee Robbins
George A. Roberts
Gerald B. Robertson
William E. Robins
Louis Robinson
Arthur R. Ross
Jack R. Rotzien
Berry W. Rowe
Gene V. Rowland
Grant C. Rowland
John A. Rubino, Jr.
John H. Rule
Joaquin A. Suavedra
Robert J. Sagwitz
James L. Sanders
James C. Scheuer
James D. Schneider
Robert J. Scott
Earl H. Seibert
Albert Shabalkowich
Elwood M. Shaulis
Robert J. Sheldon
Bernard L. Sherline
Guy J. Sherrill
Vernon P. Shockley
Alonzo M. Shoemaker, Jr.
Thomas D. Shortridge
Robert W. Slack
Edmund G. Smith
Glenn C. Smith
Richard B. Smith, Jr.
Roberts C. Smith, Jr.
Ronald E. Smith
Billy J. Smoot
Earl F. Spencer, Jr.
Manning M. Stair
Adolph J. Stampfl
William R. Stapleton
Robert A. Stefanik
Kenneth L. Sterne
Billy E. Stewart
Leslie M. Stewart
Joseph E. Stockwell
William A. Suiter
Edward J. Sullivan
Roland H. Swartzlander
Robert E. Swett
Henry L. Swift
Luther A. Tarbox
Theodore K. Taylor
Willard D. Tease
Hagop H. Terzagian
Doyle Thigpen
Donald O. Thompson
Joseph C. Thompson
Richard W. Thompson
Stanwood Thompson
Lawrence E. Till
Archie W. Tucker
Donald B. Tuttle
Maurice O. Van Emon
Arthur C. Voudouris
Charles H. Wade, Jr.
Jack O. Wade
Arnold M. Walkow
Ernest C. Walley
Gerald L. Waterman
Ernest P. Watras
Robert L. Watson
Thomas M. Watson, Jr.
Richard A. Weil
Robert F. Wenger
James W. Wheat
Gene R. White
Gwynne W. White
Ralph W. White
John E. Wolter

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 25 (legislative day of February 21), 1949:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Dan A. Kimball to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Hon. David Northon Edelstein to be Assistant Attorney General, Customs Division.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

Walter L. Pope to be circuit judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Hon. Joseph W. Kehoe to be United States district judge for division No. 2, district of Alaska.

Hon. Anthony J. Dimond to be United States district judge for division No. 3, district of Alaska.

Herbert W. Erskine to be United States district judge for the northern district of California.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Lester Luther to be United States attorney for the District of Kansas.

Alfred E. Modarelli to be United States attorney for the District of New Jersey.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

James J. Boyle to be United States marshal for the southern district of California.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The nominations of Charles A. Pursley et al., for appointment in the United States Air Force, which were confirmed today, and which were received by the Senate on February 17, 1949, may be found in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Charles A. Pursley which appears on page 1367 and ending with the name of Jere J. Lewis which appears on page 1368.

POSTMASTER

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Roy M. North, Washington, D. C.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the grade of captain in the line of the Navy:

Francis E. Bardwell
Charles E. Briner
Richard R. Briner
Leonidas D. Coates, Jr.
Arthur B. Dickie
Thompson P. Fowler
William E. Gentner, Jr.
Donald W. Gladney, Jr.
George H. Hamilton
John T. Hayward
Joseph A. E. Hindman
Albert E. Hindmarsh
James H. Howard
William S. Howard, Jr.
Carl A. Johnson
Frank L. Johnson
Raymond W. Johnson
Warren W. Johnson
Franklin D. Karns, Jr.
Charles B. Martell
Frank P. Mitchell, Jr.
Robert L. Moore, Jr.
William T. Nelson
Richard M. Nixon
Robert J. Ramsbotham
Charles M. Ryan
Richard T. Spofford
Marion C. Thompson
Harold F. Traua
John K. Wells
Ralph E. Westbrook

The following-named midshipmen (aviation) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949:

Harry E. Aine
Marshall J. Barry, Jr.
Leon T. Bonner, Jr.
Edward N. Bouffard
John W. Brannon, Jr.
Jesse LeR. Brown
William D. Campbell
Charles C. Carter
Harold D. Case
William E. Clark
Jean S. Clauzel
Theodore E. Daum
Walter R. David
Dale E. Davis
Harold E. Dodd, Jr.
John C. Duck
James R. Edixon
Charles E. Engel
James T. Foreman
Marshall L. Foreman, Jr.
Herbert W. Gewehr
David O. Gudal
Donald M. Hegrat
Kenneth G. Heimbaugh
Dennis W. Henderson
Richard S. Hubler
John C. Humphrey
Francis N. Jones
Simeon D. Lowe, Jr.
Thomas H. McCoy
John E. McDonald
Roy W. McLain, Jr.
Dean W. Miller
Jurgen H. Miller
Charles R. Mitchell
William Mohlenhoff
Ronald A. Moore
James B. Morin
Clifton D. Myers
Gordon M. Nonnemacher
Neal C. Phillips
Merle A. Rice
Bertram M. Roeder
George P. Russell, Jr.
Herbert A. Sargent
Charles F. Schied
David L. Schloredt
Mack C. Sellers
David K. Smith
Donald E. Sparks
James R. Stevens
Dennis A. Tuck
Rex J. Vannoy
Jerome K. Waltershirchen
Rodney G. Williams
William R. Wood, Jr.

Edward Stanton (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be an ensign in the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949, in lieu of ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949:

Gerald B. Anderson
Charles E. Callahan
Eugene A. Davis
James D. DeLaughter
Arthur C. Derrick
Mark H. Forsthoefel
Loyd F. Galyean
Milburn K. Hemmick
Neal J. Johnson
Donald O. June
Arthur J. Linden
Donald A. McCartin
Robert L. May
Kennth N. Murphy
Henry J. Nawoj
Frederick W. Nehring, Jr.
David W. Olmstead
Harry J. Post
William J. Reed
Arnold Stein
Lester L. Stoakes
Cordice I. Teague
Marvin H. Warner
Benjamin E. Weeks
Stuckey D. Willson
Robert E. Wilson
John W. Wood

Glenn E. Nippert (civilian college graduate) to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy (special duty officer).

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Margaret A. Damush,
Dorothy K. Erickson,
Lorraine V. Feifer.

The following-named officer to the grade indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy.

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

William R. True.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate February 25 (legislative day of February 21), 1949:

COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

Earl James McGrath, of New York, to be Commissioner of Education.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1949

(Legislative day of Monday, February 21, 1949)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God our Father, whose will is our peace and in the white light of whose presence our consciences are made sensitive and our pride humbled: We come unfilled to Thee. We come in deep need, for the responsibilities of public office are heavy. Our concern for our own dear land and for those who love liberty and yearn for it around the world haunts our minds day and night. The circumstances of our times are dismaying and the resources of our souls inadequate unless Thou replenish them. Give us intelligent perspective, the courage to follow the gleam of human brotherhood, a vision of Thy kingdom on earth and faith to push out its frontiers of good will.

We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On February 25, 1949:

S. 492. An act to amend the act approved June 29, 1948, entitled "An act to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va."

S. 713. An act to amend Public Law 533 of the Eightieth Congress authorizing the construction of a building for the General Accounting Office on square 518 in the District of Columbia.

On February 26, 1949:

S. 548. An act to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 54. An act to retrocede to the State of New Mexico exclusive jurisdiction held by the United States over lands within the boundaries of the Los Alamos project of the United States Atomic Energy Commission; and

H. J. Res. 92. Joint resolution to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators be excused from attending the sessions of the Senate until Thursday of this week, as they are engaged on official committee business: The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from the session of the Senate on Friday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken
Anderson
Baldwin
Brewster
Bricker
Broughton
Butler
Cain
Chavez
Connally
Cordon
Donnell
Douglas
Downey
Eastland
Ecton
Ellender
Flanders
Fulbright
George
Gillette
Hayden
Hendrickson
Hill
Hoey
Holland
Humphrey
Hunt
Ives
Jenner
Johnson, Colo.
Johnson, Tex.
Johnston, S. C.
Kefauver
Kem
Kerr
Kilgore
Knowland
Langer
Lodge
Long
Lucas
McCarran
McCarthy
McClellan
McFarland
McGrath
McKellar
Magnuson
Malone
Martin
Maybank
Miller
Millikin
Morse
Mundt
Murray
Myers
Neely
O'Conor
O'Mahoney
Pepper
Reed
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Schoeppel
Smith, Maine
Smith, N. J.
Sparkman
Stennis
Taft
Taylor
Thomas, Utah
Thye
Tobey
Tydings
Vandenberg
Watkins
Wherry
Wiley
Williams
Withers

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent on public business; the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Mr. LUCAS and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Before the Chair recognizes any Senator he wishes to lay before the Senate certain executive reports for printing, under the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred, as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY (S. Doc. No. 18)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Federal Works Agency, amounting to $3,000,000, fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED PROVISION PERTAINING TO EXISTING APPROPRIATION FOR UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION (S. Doc. No. 19)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation of the United States Maritime Commission, fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

HOURS OF DUTY AND PAY OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE COAST GUARD

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to regulate the hours of duty and the pay of civilian keepers of lighthouses and civilians employed on lightships and other vessels of the Coast Guard (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AUTHORIZATION TO CERTAIN PERSONNEL OF COAST GUARD AND PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE TO ACCEPT CERTAIN GIFTS BY FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain personnel and former personnel of the United States Coast Guard and the United States Public Health Service to accept certain gifts tendered by foreign governments (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 42 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Service under the authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TOURIST AND OTHER PUBLIC FACILITIES IN CONJUNCTION WITH ALASKA HIGHWAY

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation relating to the development of tourist and other public facilities in conjunction with the Alaska Highway and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ROADS AND TRAILS UNDER JURISDICTION OF BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS IN ALASKA

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for roads, trails, and other aids to transportation serving lands and facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in Alaska (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RESIDENT COMMISSION FROM THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed

legislation to provide for a resident commissioner to the United States from the Virgin Islands (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

INFORMATION ON BANKRUPTCY CASES ADMINISTERED IN UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, statistical tables and charts containing data in regard to bankruptcy cases administered in the district courts of the United States in the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the National Security Organization (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the National Security Organization (appendix G) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the National Security Organization (vol. II) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the National Security Organization (vol. III) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO INVESTIGATE IMMIGRATION LAWS

Mr. LUCAS obtained the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair wishes to announce to the Senate, for the benefit of all Senators, that when a Senator is recognized and has the floor he can yield to another Senator only for a question, except by unanimous consent.

Mr. McCARRAN. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate may proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution No. 40. The reason for my request is that the work of investigating the immigration laws and the administration thereof was assigned to the Committee on the Judiciary by the Eightieth Congress by Senate Resolution No. 137. The time for such authorization expires tonight. Extension of time has been approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration and by the Committee on the Judiciary. Unless the time can be extended by the Senate today the entire investigation will cease tonight, the committee will lose its staff, and the work which has been under way for the past 7 months would be lost.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 40.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada has asked unanimous consent that the Senator from Illinois may yield to him for that purpose. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to make an inquiry of the Senator from Nevada? Does the authorization of Senate Resolution 137, adopted in the Eightieth Congress, terminate tonight? Senate Resolution 40 also asks for an appropriation, does it not?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the authorization under Senate Resolution 137 terminate tonight?

Mr. McCARRAN. The authorization under that resolution terminates tonight, that is, it terminates the 1st day of March, which will be tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. Was the resolution for which the Senator now asks consideration reported favorably from the committee and is it now on the calendar?

Mr. McCARRAN. The resolution (S. Res. 40) was reported favorably by the Committee on the Judiciary. It was then referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and has been reported favorably from the Committee on Rules and Administration and is now on the calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. Was the resolution reported unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. McCARRAN. It was.

Mr. WHERRY. So there is a unanimous report by the Committee on the Judiciary and a unanimous report by the Committee on Rules and Administration?

Mr. McCARRAN. I am advised by the chairman of the latter committee that the report was unanimous.

Mr. WHERRY. What appropriation is asked for in the resolution?

Mr. McCARRAN. The request is for an appropriation of $135,000.

Mr. WHERRY. Is that about in keeping with the amount which was expended during the life of the committee in the Eightieth Congress for the purpose in question?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; it is. The resolution would extend the authorization to the committee for 1 year, or until the 1st of March 1950.

Mr. WHERRY. Was the total amount authorized by the resolution adopted last year used during the life of the last Congress?

Mr. McCARRAN. Not exactly. But the balance is contained in the total of $135,000.

Mr. WHERRY. So the amount requested for this year is practically the same, is it not, as the amount requested for last year, and whatever was saved from last year will be applied in the $135,000 asked for in Senate Resolution 40?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have no objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the Senator from Nevada in the request he has made. I think it is exceedingly important that the request be granted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request that the Senator from Illinois be permitted to yield to the Senator from Nevada for the purpose of the present consideration of Senate Resolution 40?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Nevada. Does the investigation include also the question of displaced persons?

Mr. McCARRAN. It does not, unless as it may indirectly do so. Another subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary is handling that subject specifically. But Senate Resolution 40 does take up another matter I have not mentioned and to which I now refer. The Eightieth Congress adopted a provision that the subject of all deportees who had been retained in this country for a period of 6 months by order of the Attorney General should come to this committee for investigation. There are approximately 15,000 such deportees, as we are advised. So the committee must deal also with that question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So the committee is going into the long-range immigration question, but is not concerning itself actively with the subject of displaced persons during the next 2 years? That subject is being handled by another subcommittee, as I understand.

Mr. McCARRAN. Except as it might be incidental to the work of the particular subcommittee. The displaced-persons question is entirely in the hands of another subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. On the subject of displaced persons, will the full committee receive a report which will be available to the individual Members of the Senate during the next couple of months?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes. I am hopeful of getting such a report much earlier than that. It is my hope that the committee will take action and bring something before the Senate even within the next couple of months.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Nevada.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request for the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 40) relating to an investigation of the immigration laws and the adminis-

tration thereof, which had been submitted by Mr. McCARRAN on January 27, 1949, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, reported by that committee without amendment, thereupon referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and reported from that committee by Mr. HAYDEN on February 25, 1949, with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the word "continued", to strike out "during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-first Congress" and to insert "until March 1, 1950", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under Senate Resolution 137, of the Eightieth Congress, agreed to July 26, 1947 (providing for a full and complete investigation of our entire immigration system), is hereby continued until March 1, 1950, and the limit of expenditures under such resolution is hereby increased by $135,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] has the floor. The Chair suggests to him that, in order to facilitate action upon ordinary routine matters, he ask unanimous consent that he may yield to Senators for routine matters and for insertions in the RECORD.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I make such a request.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, there is no objection to such procedure. That would be the proper way to handle requests for insertion of matters into the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were presented, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. MILLIKIN:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

"Senate Joint Memorial 1

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for the creation of a department of natural resources, the establishment of regional or branch offices of that and other Federal departments and agencies, and for the location of a United States military academy of the air in Denver

"Whereas the Honorable Herbert Hoover, Chairman of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, has recommended the reorganization of the Department of the Interior and the incorporation of its functions and related functions concerned with the conservation and development of natural resources into a new department of natural resources; and

"Whereas it would be highly desirable that regional offices of that and other Federal departments and agencies be established in order to bring the Federal Government and its activities closer to the people; and

"Whereas consideration is being given to the establishment of a United States military academy of the air;

"Whereas the members of the thirty-seventh general assembly wish to commend the Department of the Interior, Reclamation Service, and the Corps of Army engineers for their splendid record of accomplishment and the Hoover commission for its needful accomplishment in devising a complete reorganization plan for the executive branch of our National Government: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the Thirty-seventh General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the house of representatives concurring herein)*, That the Congress of the United State be, and it is hereby, memorialized to approve legislation for—

"1. The creation of a new department of natural resources;

"2. The location of a regional office of that department and of other important Federal departments and agencies in Denver; and

"3. The location of the United States military academy of the air likewise in Denver; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Colorado of the United States."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Joint Memorial 5

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to make Indians citizens of the United States in order that they may be able to vote

"Whereas there are approximately 400,000 Indians in the United States for whom the Bureau of Indian Affairs, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, exercises a trusteeship, in accordance with treaties made between the United States and the Indians and with the statutes enacted by the Congress; and

"Whereas the Bureau of Indian Affairs provides educational facilities for Indian children or they are otherwise educated in public schools; provides medical care and health programs; supplies social services for the needy, the sick, and the disabled; provides agricultural and industrial guidance for the conservation and improvement of approximately 56,600,000 acres of Indian land; administers tribal and individual Indian moneys held in trust by the United States, and furnishes credit to individuals and groups for educational, industrial, and agricultural projects, and in general works for the economic, educational, social, and civic advancement of the Indians to the end that they may become independent of special Federal aid or regulation; and

"Whereas notwithstanding all of these services to the Indians, they are not citizens of the United States and as the result they are denied the privilege of voting in general elections—national, State, and local—including elections in the State of Colorado, unless and until they are emancipated and given the right of citizenship by special acts of the Congress; and

"Whereas it is the opinion of the General Assembly of the State of Colorado, and the widespread opinion of citizens throughout the country, that Indians should be made citizens of the United States without further delay to right a grave and long-standing injustice, and to assure them their inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Thirty-seventh General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the senate concurring herein)*, That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized and urged to enact legislation immediately to emancipate all Indians to the extent of making them citizens of the United States and eligible to vote in all elections to the same degree as are other citizens of the United States; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be forwarded to the Secretary of the Interior, the Director of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Colorado in the Congress of the United States."

By Mr. LANGER:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"House Concurrent Resolution C

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to increase the share of Federal participation and increase the annual appropriation under Public Law 725

"Whereas hospital construction costs have continued to rise to a point where it has become increasingly difficult for communities in North Dakota to finance hospital construction; and

"Whereas many of the communities in the areas of greatest need for hospital facilities find it impossible to meet the financial burden even with the present 33⅓ percent of Federal participation for approved projects under Public Law 725; and

"Whereas this condition tends to defeat one of the primary purposes of Public Law 725, which is to give special consideration to hospitals serving rural communities and areas with relatively small financial resources; and

"Whereas the Federal Government in several grant-in-aid programs pays 50 percent and in some cases 100 percent of the cost; and

"Whereas the increased share of Federal participation is necessary if hospital construction is to go forward in the areas of greatest relative need in North Dakota: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the senate concurring therein)*, That the Congress of the United States be and hereby is memorialized and petitioned to amend Public Law 725 by increasing the Federal share of participation in the construction of approved hospital projects from 33⅓ percent to 50 percent and to increase the annual appropriation under said law to meet the added cost of the revised share of Federal participation, and that the provisions be made retroactive so that hospital projects approved on the Federal construction schedules prior to the enactment of these amendments may benefit from the increased share of Federal participation; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Federal Security Administrator, to the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, and to North Dakota's delegation in Congress."

By Mr. McGRATH (for himself and Mr. GREEN):

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress

"Whereas a resolution providing for annual proclaiming by the President of the United States of America of October 11 as General

Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski is now pending in the present session of the Congress of the United States of America; and

"Whereas, the 11th day of October 1779 is the date in American history of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

"Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union, through legislative enactment have designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day believing it fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in honor of this great hero of the Revolutionary War and

"Whereas from October 11, 1929, to October 11, 1946, by congressional enactment, October 11 has been designated as General Pulaski's Memorial Day in the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations hereby memorializes and petitions the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, and to each of the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States."

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

A petition of sundry citizens of Bristol, Tenn., and Bristol, Va., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of liquor advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ENFORCEMENT OF CIGARETTE TAX—RESOLUTION OF IOWA STATE LEGISLATURE

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I present a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Iowa, favoring the enactment of legislation to aid the State in the enforcement of the cigarette tax now evaded by use of the United States mails.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 11

Concurrent resolution memorializing and requesting the Congress of the United States to enact a bill to aid the State in the enforcement of the cigarette tax now evaded by use of the United States mails

Whereas the State of Iowa has seen fit to impose a tax on the sale and use of cigarettes within its boundaries, and the revenues so obtained constitute an important portion of the funds available for its functions of government; and

Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the senate and the house of representatives of the State of Iowa that a large and growing system of evasion of such tax law has developed; that the United States mails are flooded with advertisements and inducements to the citizens of this State to violate the law of this State; that in numerous instances such advertisers entice prospective customers with statements to the effect that the use of the United States mails is sufficient proof of the legitimacy of such business and such a system; that the mails of the United States are constantly flooded with cigarettes in the process of delivery within this State, and on which cigarettes the tax required by the laws of this State has not and will not be paid; that this State is seriously disadvantaged by such use of the postal offices and mails of the United States for the purpose of evading the laws of Iowa; and that Iowa faces and is now suffering serious losses of revenue as a result of such system of evasion; and

Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the senate and the house of representatives of Iowa that there is now pending before the Congress of the United States a proposed bill which would aid the States by requiring shippers of cigarettes in interstate commerce to furnish to the taxing authority of the State to which shipped a copy of the invoice on each shipment and the name and address of each person to whom shipped: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house (the senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be, and the same is hereby, memorialized and respectfully urged to enact a bill requiring shippers of cigarettes in interstate commerce to furnish to the taxing authority of the State to which shipped a copy of the invoice on each such shipment or to enact such other bill to the aid of the several States affected as may be proper; be it further

Resolved, That July authenticated copies of this resolution be forwarded immediately to the presiding officers of the respective Houses of Congress and to the Senators and Congressmen from Iowa.

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY—RESOLUTION OF MINNESOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a concurrent resolution adopted by the Minnesota State Legislature memorializing the Congress to take prompt action to ratify the agreement between the Government of the United States and the Dominion of Canada for the development of the St. Lawrence waterway.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and, under the rules, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to take prompt action to ratify the agreement between the Government of the United States and the Dominion of Canada for the development of the St. Lawrence waterway

Whereas representatives of the Governments of the United States and of the Dominion of Canada in 1941 consummated and signed an agreement for the development of the St. Lawrence River, both for navigation and power purposes, so as to permit free passage of ocean-going ships from the Atlantic Ocean to the head of the Great Lakes and into the heart of the American Continent, and make available the development of this great potential source of electric energy for necessary public use; and

Whereas the agreement was under consideration by the Congress of the United States at the time of the Japanese attack at Pearl Harbor, and shortly thereafter we were at war with the Central Powers in Europe, as a consequence of which action on the agreement was advisedly deferred; and

Whereas world developments since 1941 have made it increasingly apparent that the securing of a permanent and just peace will inevitably be attended with vastly increased commerce with foreign nations, and particularly with the European and Asiatic nations, and the great industries located on the Great Lakes and the agriculture of the Northwest States will benefit as a result of the opening of the St. Lawrence as a shorter route for ocean commerce to deliver to foreign nations the products of our industries and agriculture, and more than ever before the development of the power to be generated by the St. Lawrence is recognized as a vital economic necessity; and

Whereas the agreement is now again being submitted to the Congress of the United States for approval, the Presidents of the United States for the past 29 years have committed themselves to the development of the St. Lawrence, and President Harry S. Truman has characterized the St. Lawrence project as of economic value comparable to the Panama Canal and a vital necessity as a defense measure; and

Whereas, the State of Minnesota, through its legislature, for the last 29 years has affirmed its continued support of this project, and through the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Tidewater Commission of Minnesota has continuously promoted the development of the St. Lawrence River, believing that the project is a vital necessity for the stimulation and development of the resources of this State and of the entire Northwest, as well as a great economic advantage to the Nation, and that the project has already been too long delayed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the house of representatives, the senate concurring, commend and support the President of the United States in his steadfast, consistent, and energetic support of this project, and urge the Congress of the United States, without further delay, to approve and ratify the agreement already concluded with the Dominion of Canada, and provide the necessary funds for the speedy completion of this great project as a vital, economic, and defense necessity; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to send copies of this resolution to the President, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Minnesota.

GERALD T. MULLIN,
President of the senate.
JOHN A. HARTH,
Speaker of the house of representatives.

Passed the senate the 14th day of February, in the year of our Lord 1949.

H. Y. TORREY,
Secretary of the senate.

Passed the house of representatives the 17th day of February, in the year of our Lord 1949.

G. H. LEAHY,
Chief clerk, house of representatives.

Approved February 23, 1949.

LUTHER W. YOUNGDAHL,
Governor of the State of Minnesota.

SEDALIA AIR FIELD AS SITE FOR PROPOSED UNITED STATES AIR ACADEMY—RESOLUTION OF KANSAS CITY (MO.) CITY COUNCIL

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the City Council of Kansas City, Mo., requesting Congress to give careful and complete consideration to the facilities offered by the Sedalia Air Field as a suitable site for the proposed United States Air Academy.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on

Armed Services and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 12512

Whereas there is now pending before Congress in both the Senate and House bills that propose the establishment of a United States Air Academy for the educational training of officers for the Air Corps, both Army and Navy, that would be comparable to the long-established Academies at West Point and Annapolis; and

Whereas the United States Government now owns 2,500 acres of land known as Sedalia Air Field, located 10 miles east of Warrensburg and 19 miles west of Sedalia, Mo.; and

Whereas this site is already adequately equipped with a water supply, sewage disposal, surface drainage and storm sewers, four concrete runways 7,200 feet long and 150 feet wide with 2,400,000 square feet of parkway aprons, railroad switch tracks from the main line of the Missouri Pacific Railroad, Federal Highway No. 50 and other connecting highways, 13 miles of black-top streets, electric power facilities, and a pipe line system connecting a supply of natural gas; and

Whereas this location has the strategic advantage in time of war of being situated equidistant from our east and west coasts and our north and south borders; and

Whereas this location is within 60 miles of Kansas City, making the metropolitan area easily accessible; and

Whereas the recreation facilities of the famous Ozark region are easily accessible: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the City Council of Kansas City, Mo., does recommend to the Members of the United States Congress that careful and complete consideration be given to the facilities offered by the Sedalia Air Field as a suitable site for the proposed United States Air Academy; and be it further

Resolved, That members of Missouri's congressional delegation be furnished with a copy of this resolution and asked to exert their best efforts toward securing congressional action for the selection of the Sedalia Air Field as the location for the United States Air Academy.

Authenticated as adopted this February 21, 1949.

W. E. KEMP,
Mayor.
FLORENCE QUIRK,
City Clerk.
By E. L. STONE,
Deputy City Clerk.

GENERAL PULASKI'S MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution dated January 18, 1949, of the Wilkes-Barre, Pa., City Council, and a resolution dated February 11, 1949, of the Scranton, Pa., City Council, urging establishment of October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 8923

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress

Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

Whereas the 11th day of October 1779 is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Kansas, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union, through legislative enactment, designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and

Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated October 11, 1929, October 11, 1931, October 11, 1932, to October 11, 1946, to be General Pulaski's Memorial Day in the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Council of the City of Scranton, Pa., in session assembled:

SECTION 1. That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

SEC. 2. That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and each of the United States Senators and Representatives from Pennsylvania.

Approved February 11, 1949.

JAMES T. HANLON, *Mayor.*

Resolution 16386

Resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Wilkes-Barre at a meeting held January 18, 1949

Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

Whereas the 11th day of October 1779 is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir, Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Kansas, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union, through legislative enactment designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and

Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated October 11, 1929, October 11, 1931, October 11, 1932, to October 11, 1946, to be General Pulaski's Memorial Day, in the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Wilkes-Barre and the State of Pennsylvania in session assembled:

SECTION 1. That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States, to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

SEC. 2. That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and each of the United States Senators and Representatives from Pennsylvania.

Attest:

LUCIUS K. ELDRIDGE,
City Clerk.

RESOLUTIONS BY CORN BELT LIVESTOCK FEEDERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD resolutions adopted by the Corn Belt Livestock Feeders Association on February 24, 1949, at Kansas City, Mo.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE CORN BELT LIVESTOCK FEEDERS ASSOCIATION, FEBRUARY 24, 1949, AT KANSAS CITY, MO.

1. We urge officialdom in Washington to take whatever steps are practical to restore American exports of lard to as near the 1930-39 average of 500,000,000 pounds as possible and to use all governmental powers to aid American business in recapturing this export lard trade.

2. We urge hotels and restaurants to reduce the prices of their meat course dinners in conformity with the break since last summer in wholesale meat prices, and to endeavor to expand meat consumption in their places of business to former levels in which they took about 25 percent of the total meat production.

3. We recommend to Army buyers that they buy, bone, and deep freeze a huge quantity of the surplus meat that has been coming to market, against the time this summer when supplies will be much more short. We also call to the attention of owners of lockers and deep freezes units that conditions point to much smaller supplies of meat later on and recommend that they accumulate supplies during this time of heaviest marketing.

4. We demand that America be protected from imports of goods or products manufactured or produced by peasant or slave labor. We demand that the American farmer be given the same protection against the competitive oils and fats produced by cheap foreign labor as industry is granted through the tariffs or labor through the immigration laws.

5. We call upon the Congress to enact and maintain a labor law that will prevent the closing of the packing houses and other businesses affecting public health and safety, through strikes. While we grant the right of any laborer either to work or not to work at a given place or at a given wage or under given conditions we dispute most violently the right of any group to force the closing of industries such as the packing establishments on which the farmers depend for their markets for livestock, and from which the public expects to receive the most vital product in its diet, and that is

meat. We are opposed to repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and call upon Congress to see to it that no organized very small minority group is permitted, through staging what virtually amounts to a civil revolution but is called a strike, to cause acute distress and anguish to a majority of the people of a city or an industry and through this distress force wages or other conditions that are not in keeping with the best interests of all of the people.

6. We oppose most emphatically the Spence bill, H. R. 2756, which would grant to the President stand-by powers to institute price controls. We know from past experience that price controls are not necessary when supply exceeds demand. We also know from past experience that in times of scarcity price controls are dangerous in that instead of increasing supplies they decrease them; they cause chaos, confusion, and losses to producers and black markets on which consumers are gouged for the decreasing supplies that the price controls bring. We call on Congress to forget politics and study the history of the result of price controls. As farmers we reject most emphatically the glib statements that the last election was a mandate to enact any such controls. History shows that there is only one means of bringing about a balance between supply and demand for any product, agricultural or otherwise, that is not a natural monopoly, and that is through a free price in a free economy. We instruct our officers to oppose with every vigor the renewed shackling of producers with any such controls.

7. We call upon the President to declare that the emergency in livestock is ended, and to raise the import duty on Canadian cattle to 2½ cents per pound as he is authorized, and to reopen negotiations with Canada on this whole subject of importations of Canadian cattle. We ask the President to take the lead in building a strong America and consider a strong livestock situation as a prime step in this course.

8. There is agitation for infliction on the American farmer of a method of rail grading in sale of hogs and other livestock. We believe this will eliminate the cash market for livestock and greatly delay returns to the farmer; greatly increase the expenses of the packers, and widen the margin between what the farmer receives and the consumer pays for meat; eliminate competition in the sale of meat, dragging the markets down instead of raising them; and subject the farmers to incompetence of Federal meat graders. We are opposed to it and call for a halt in the misdirected propaganda to bring it about.

9. We commend the organized livestock-market interests for the active steps they have taken during recent demoralized markets in trying to expand demand, in regulating the flow of livestock to market to numbers that could be cleared, and for using their time on the radio to assist and direct livestock marketing in a way that would alleviate a bad situation. We affirm once more that we need these organized central markets as our best places on which to market our stock and ask their continued cooperation in placing the livestock-feeding business on a firm foundation mutually beneficial.

10. We demand that if Federal control of the exports of agricultural products are necessary that this control be lodged in the Department of Agriculture, to be managed by a commission appointed by the President and approved by the Senate.

11. We are opposed to reciprocal-trade treaties that will bring into this country manufactured goods or raw products which are produced by industry, labor, or agriculture of this country and on which the people of this country depend for employment or markets that will give them a livelihood.

12. We call on manufacturers and labor to reduce their prices in conformity with the decline in agricultural commodity prices that there be maintained a balance between the various component parts of the producers of all products in this Nation.

13. We call upon the Department of Agriculture, in making the announcement of the support prices on hogs, to specify exactly what weights and grades are to be supported, at what specific price, and how and during what period of time those supports are to be made effective.

14. We also call upon the Department of Agriculture to adjust the hog-support prices between Chicago and river markets such as Kansas City, Omaha, St. Joseph, and Sioux City to the spread that existed during 1948. The fact that population has moved westward has resulted in the prices of hogs on the river markets averaging 5 cents of Chicago. Accordingly, we feel that the support prices should reflect the existing difference rather than the difference that existed years ago.

15. We thank the livestock interests of Kansas City for their aid in making our stay in their city a most delightful experience.

16. We call on livestock feeders everywhere to join with us in endeavoring to work out the steps that will make livestock feeding as safe a business, free from the hazards of speculation, as is practical.

17. We commend the efforts of the Corn Belt Livestock Feeder to bring to us information of value both from a market and a feeding standpoint, and promise it our full and enthusiastic support. And we call upon the interests from whom we purchase our supplies of livestock feed and/or other farm necessities and through whom we sell our finished products to lend their advertising support to this, our official publication.

TAX ON ADMISSIONS—RESOLUTION OF LEAGUE OF MINNESOTA MUNICIPALITIES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the League of Minnesota Municipalities, University of Minnesota Library, Minneapolis, Minn., relating to tax on admissions.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution on Admissions Tax Enabling Act

Whereas the financial plight of some municipalities is more acute than that of others and only enabling authority for municipal taxes will provide the flexibility in local revenue systems necessary to take account of this divergent revenue need; and

Whereas an admissions tax is among the taxes best adapted to local administration because it is fair and easy to administer, because it provides for a minimum of intermunicipal competition, and because it is being increasingly and successfully used by municipalities throughout the country; and

Whereas such a tax may be imposed without additional burden on the taxpayers when the Federal Government reduces or abolishes its tax on admissions; and early reduction in the Federal tax has been recommended by congressional committees; Be it

Resolved, That the League of Minnesota Municipalities recommend to the 1949 legislature the enactment of legislation authorizing the council of any city or village, irrespective of charter requirements, to levy a tax on admissions when the Federal admissions tax is reduced or abolished, such local tax not to exceed the amount of the reduction in the Federal tax.

Resolved further, That the league urge Congress to repeal the Federal admissions tax so as to leave that field of excise taxation for appropriate State and local action; and request the 1949 legislature to memorialize Congress to the same effect.

PROTEST AGAINST RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION IN HUNGARY

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and myself, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by local union No. 261, United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum, and Plastic Workers of America, Fall River, Mass., calling on the Secretary of State to enter a diplomatic protest to Hungary because of religious persecution.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas this executive board being composed of true, loyal Americans, it wishes to go on record, protesting the recent trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, prince of the church and primate of all Catholics of Hungary; and

Whereas the results of this so-called kangaroo trial was known to the prosecutors and the whole Christian world even before said trial took place; and

Whereas another foreign government is also persecuting ministers of the Protestant faith; and

Whereas these governments being inside the iron curtain, controlled by orders of the Communist Party; and

Whereas the ideologies of the Soviet Government toward God and religion are known to the Christian world; and

Whereas these arrests and trials have been held in foreign countries where our great, free, independent Government has representation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this country through its State Department head enter a diplomatic protest to Hungary and all foreign powers who are persecuting religion on false pretense; therefore be it further

Resolved, That a protest also be made to the Security Council of the United Nations.

GENERAL PULASKI'S MEMORIAL DAY—RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF ALDERMEN OF HOLYOKE, MASS.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and myself, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen of Holyoke, Mass., memorializing the Congress of the United States to approve the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress

Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

Whereas the 11th day of October 1779 is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union, through legislative enactment designated October 11 of each year as "General Pulaski's Memorial Day"; and

Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great America hero of the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has, by legislative enactment, designated from October 11, 1929, to October 11, 1946, to be General Pulaski's Memorial Day in the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Holyoke and State of Massachusetts:

SECTION 1. That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

SEC. 2. That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, and each of the United States Senators and Representatives from Massachusetts.

A true copy of resolution adopted at a regular meeting of the Board of Aldermen of Holyoke, Mass., held February 15, 1949.

Attest:

[SEAL] JOSEPH JUBINVILLE, Jr.,
City Clerk.

JOSEF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY—RESOLUTION OF SEVILLE COUNCIL, NO. 93, KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS, BROCKTON, MASS.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and myself, I present for appropriate reference a resolution by the Seville Council, No. 93, Knights of Columbus, Brockton, Mass., memorializing the Congress of the United States to investigate the unjust imprisonment of Cardinal Mindszenty.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas at a meeting of Seville Council, No. 93, Knights of Columbus, in Brockton, Mass., on Sunday, January 9, 1949, it was unanimously voted by the membership of 1,200 members; and

Whereas the Communist-controlled Government of Hungary did arrest and imprison unjustly his eminence, Josef Cardinal Mindszenty; and

Whereas the entire Christian world looks on this action by said Communist-controlled Hungary Government as a sacrilegious action: It is thereby

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States of America be memorialized to investigate the unjust imprisonment of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty and to seek his immediate release; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Ambassador of Hungary to this country at Washington, D. C.

RESOLUTIONS OF AMERICAN TRANSIT ASSOCIATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received from P. H. Pinkley, president of the Milwaukee Electric Railway & Transport Co., two important resolutions. They were adopted by the executive committee of the board of directors of the American Transit Association. This association represents practically all of the important local, urban, transit operators in the United States, and the resolutions pertain to the Taft-Hartley law.

I endorse the sentiments in these resolutions and I ask that they be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and referred thereafter to the Senate Labor Committee for its careful attention.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The American Transit Association includes in its membership more than 300 urban transit companies, which employ nearly 200,000 workers and serve some 325 municipalities, with a total population of approximately 50,000,000. The vast majority of the employees of those companies are organized into local unions affiliated with A. F. of L. and CIO.

Local transit service is essential to the personal and economic well-being of the people of the communities served, so that the public welfare requires every reasonable effort to prevent interruptions thereof resulting from labor controversies or any other cause.

The Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service can do much in assisting to alleviate or adjust labor controversies in the transit industry, but only as long as it remains above suspicion of partisanship and prejudice.

No matter how high may be the caliber and ideals of the men administering the Department of Labor, yet in the last analysis that Department is labor's spokesman in the Government, constituted for and dedicated to advancing the cause of labor. It is not expected by labor to be without partisanship, and it cannot in fact be without partisanship and effectuate the policies for which it is designed.

To place the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service—now an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government—under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor, will inevitably lay it open to suspicion by management and the general public as to its nonpartisanship in fact and will largely serve to nullify its effectiveness. If the Service is in reality intended to be impartial and unprejudiced as between management and labor, then management can fairly question the motives inducing its transfer to the Department of Labor with equal reason that labor could question a proposal to transfer the Service to the Department of Commerce. Either such transfer would be equally bad.

Therefore, the American Transit Association respectfully urges that, in the public interest, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service be continued as an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government and that, accordingly, the proposal to place same in the Department of Labor be rejected as definitely detrimental to the cause of national unity.

Dated February 7, 1949.

The American Transit Association, as the national organization of the transit industry, embracing some 300 companies employing nearly 200,000 people and serving more than 325 American communities with a total population of approximately 50,000,000, respectfully petitions the Congress to proceed with due deliberation, without preconceived prejudices and only after full and open hearings, to the enactment of new national labor laws.

In support of its position, the association invites attention to the following:

The Wagner-Connery Act was admittedly partisan and partial in its conception, adoption, and administration. Not even its most ardent advocates have ever sought to defend it as in accord with the American spirit of fair play and equality before the law. It was a constant cause of bitterness and resentment by business, a fruitful source of controversy between labor and management, and an open invitation to oppression of the general public as the innocent victims of the disunity thereby caused.

The Taft-Hartley Act was enacted in response to public demand for improvement of the then-existing situation. A substantial number of the Democratic Members of the Senate and House voted therefor and again voted to override the Presidential veto thereof. Whatever may be its faults—and no one insofar as we know has claimed perfection for it—it at least attempted to restore equality before the law and to correct some of the demonstrated and admitted abuses which had arisen under the prior act.

The new labor law to be enacted by the Eighty-first Congress will defeat its purpose if enacted in a spirit of vindictiveness or partisanship. Now, as rarely before in our history, is national unity more vitally essential. Now, as never before, do we need the full cooperation of labor and management, working together under fair and equal laws, to produce the goods, services, and funds required for continuation of our national safety and economic well-being. The trend of the labor-legislative program in the Eighty-first Congress, to date, would appear to disregard those factors.

We ask that the Congress proceed with due deliberation in the important task of adopting a new labor law; that it provide for full and open hearings, at which those directly and indirectly affected may have reasonable opportunity to be heard; that those objecting to the various provisions of both the Wagner-Connery and Taft-Hartley Acts be required to come into the open and make their objections and their reasons therefore a matter of public record; and that the end result be a new labor law fair and impartial as to all concerned and with the general public interest treated as paramount. Any other treatment of this vital issue will be contrary to the basic principles upon which this Nation was founded, upon which it has grown great and upon which it must continue to stand if the American people are to remain prosperous and free.

Dated February 7, 1949.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR VETERANS—RESOLUTION OF MILWAUKEE FRATERNAL ORDER OF EAGLES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received a resolution from the New Milwaukee Aerie, No. 0137, of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, on the vital subject of adequate appropriations for our Nation's veterans.

This resolution comes from a great organization and from a particular aerie which is the pride of our State and Nation—representing as it does 14,000 citizens of Milwaukee County. This aerie has drawn Nation-wide attention by its magnificent contributions to the

community and to its parent organization.

I ask unanimous consent that this important resolution which was sent to me be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Government of the United States has indicated an intention of curtailing expenditures for veterans' benefits; and

Whereas one of the announced plans of curtailment is in hospital facilities and especially in the number of additional beds which Veterans' Administration surveys show are necessary to meet the full requirements of the disabled veterans and those in need of adequate hospitalization: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That New Milwaukee Aerie, No. 0137, Fraternal Order of Eagles, composed of 14,000 citizens of Milwaukee County, protest any curtailment of expenditures necessary for the proper care and rehabilitation of the men and women whose personal efforts and sacrifices preserved our American institutions, and made the continuance of our American way of life possible; and be it further

Resolved, That we protest any attempt to revert to conditions such as existed in 1933, especially when our Government finds money for the rehabilitation of other nations of the world, at the expense of our sick veterans at home; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senators WILEY and MCCARTHY and Congressmen BIEMILLER and ZABLOCKI so that they may be apprised of our position on this matter and be governed accordingly.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, from the Committee on Public Works, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 714) to provide for comprehensive planning, for site acquisition in and outside of the District of Columbia, and for the design of Federal building projects outside of the District of Columbia; to authorize the transfer of jurisdiction over certain lands between certain departments and agencies of the United States; and to provide certain additional authority needed in connection with the construction, management, and operation of Federal public buildings; and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 87) thereon. I am not asking that it be taken up at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing a nomination, which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, as in executive session, I report favorably the nominations of Albert M. Cristy, of Hawaii, to be an associate justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, vice Emil C. Peters, and Willson G. Moore, of Hawaii, to be fourth judge of the first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii, and I submit a report (Ex. Rept. No. 3) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received, and the nominations will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred, as follows:

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 1096. A bill for the relief of Abe Lincoln and Elena B. Lincoln; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 1097. A bill for the relief of Phyllis Hertzog; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1098. A bill to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of the ninetieth anniversary of the beginning of the petroleum industry in the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1099. A bill to authorize the construction of flood-control works in the Allegheny River Basin at Warren, Youngsville, Sheffield, Oil City, and Franklin, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 1100. A bill to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1101. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Montana to Nick Langager; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1102. A bill to amend section 6 of the War Claims Act of 1948 with respect to compensation payable to individuals who went into hiding in order to avoid capture as prisoners of war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. LANGER) (by request) introduced Senate bill 1103, to readjust postal rates, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 1104. A bill to amend the River and Harbor Act of 1948 to provide for reports by the Chief of Engineers with respect to national-defense values of river, harbor, and waterway improvements; to the Committee on Public Works.

(Mr. MALONE introduced Senate bill 1105, to repeal the joint resolution of July 24, 1946, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 1106. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, as amended, so as to provide assistance to the States in furnishing certain medical aid to needy and other individuals; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1107. A bill to provide for the award of decorations to former members of the Army in certain cases; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1108. A bill for the relief of Lula Hickey Thomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1109. A bill to provide for the Admiral David Glasgow Farragut Birthplace National Monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 1110. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Suzanne Wiernik and her daughter;

S. 1111. A bill for the relief of Rutgers University; and

S. 1112. A bill for the relief of Arthur Toffler and his wife, Lily Toffler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCARRAN:

S. 1113. A bill to provide for the appointment of committees to conserve the assets of persons of advanced age, mental weakness, or physical incapacity; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1114. A bill to provide a correctional system for youth offenders convicted in the courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. MCFARLAND, Mr. DOWNEY, and Mr. KNOWLAND):

S. 1115. A bill authorizing appropriations for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the western land boundary fence project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself, Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. CAIN, Mr. LODGE, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MILLIKIN, and Mr. THYE) introduced Senate bill 1116, to grant travel and subsistence allowance to the next of kin attending group burials of remains of known individuals returned to the United States for interment, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MCCARRAN:

S. 1117. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of a rare and precious metals experiment station at Reno, Nev.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(Mr. WILEY introduced Senate bill 1118, to encourage the prevention of stream pollution by allowing amounts paid for plants for the treatment of industrial waste as a deduction in computing net income, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JENNER:

S. 1119. A bill to authorize settlement for certain inequitable losses in pay sustained by officers of the commissioned services under the emergency economy legislation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1120. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to require an accounting for the expense allowance payable to each Senator, Representative in Congress, Delegate from the Territories, and Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. MCGRATH:

S. 1121. A bill to provide for a service credit for veterans for the purposes of title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MCGRATH (by request):

S. 1122. A bill relating to children born out of wedlock;

S. 1123. A bill to amend section 1537 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended, so as to provide for service of process on agents or employees of a nonresident individual, partnership, association, group, organization, or foreign corporation, conducting a business in the District of Columbia;

S. 1124. A bill to provide for the appointment and compensation of counsel to impoverished defendants in criminal cases in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia;

S. 1125. A bill to amend section 16-415 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, to provide for the enforcement of court orders for the payment of temporary and permanent maintenance in the same manner as directed to enforce orders for permanent alimony;

S. 1126. A bill to amend the Boiler Inspection Act of the District of Columbia;

S. 1127. A bill to amend sections 130 and 131 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, relating to the notice to be given upon a petition for probate of a will, and to the probate of such will;

S. 1128. A bill to amend the Act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia";

S. 1129. A bill to amend section 16-416 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, to conform to the nomenclature and practice prescribed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure;

S. 1130. A bill to amend sections 356 and 365 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, to increase the maximum sum allowable by the Court out of the assets of a decedent's estate as a preferred charge for his or her funeral expenses from $600 to $1,000;

S. 1131. A bill to amend sections 260, 267, 309, 315, 348, 350, and 361 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, to provide that estates of decedents being administered within the probate court may be settled at the election of the personal representative of the decedent in that court 6 months after his qualification as such personal representative;

S. 1132. A bill to amend section 137 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, relating to the time within which a caveat may be filed to a will after the will has been probated;

S. 1133. A bill to amend section 16-418 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, to provide that an attorney be appointed by the court to defend all uncontested annulment cases;

S. 1134. A bill to amend section 13-108 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, to provide for constructive service by publication in annulment actions; and

S. 1135. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, to provide a family allowance and a simplified procedure in the settlement of small estates; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1136. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes; and

S. 1137. A bill to revise and codify laws of the Canal Zone regarding the administration of estates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1138. A bill for the relief of John W. Crumpacker, commander, United States Navy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 1139. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Robert P. Horrell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYDEN (for himself, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. MCFARLAND, and Mr. KNOWLAND):

S. 1140. A bill to authorize credits to certain public agencies of the United States for costs of construction and operation and maintenance of flood protective levee systems along or adjacent to the lower Colorado River in Arizona, California, and Lower California, Mexico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 1141. A bill providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States; and

S. 1142. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mrs. Pearl Scott Loukes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. J. Res. 57. Joint resolution extending the time for completion of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

READJUSTMENT OF POSTAL RATES

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on February 21 the Postmaster General addressed a letter to the Vice President—a companion letter was sent to the Speaker of the House—calling attention to the fact that the President in his budget message referred to recurring postal deficits and urged that the Congress promptly enact an adequate revision of the postal rate structure.

With this letter, the Postmaster General submitted a suggested bill which the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and I are introducing by request of the Postmaster General, reserving the right to favor or disagree with any or all portions thereof. I may say that this proposed legislation has been discussed by the committee as a whole, and that is the position of each member.

However, it is felt that this bill should be promptly introduced and properly referred so that the subcommittee may start immediately hearings and other consideration of the important provisions proposed therein, and those favoring and opposing this proposed legislation may have ample opportunity to be heard.

By request of the Postmaster General, on behalf of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and myself, I introduce the bill.

The bill (S. 1103) to readjust postal rates, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. LANGER) (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

TRAVEL AND SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCE TO NEXT OF KIN ATTENDING CERTAIN GROUP BURIALS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and myself I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to grant travel and subsistence allowance to the next of kin attending group burials of remains of known individuals returned to the United States for interment, and I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the body of the RECORD the text of the bill and a statement concerning it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill together with the statement, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1116) to grant travel and subsistence allowance to the next of kin attending group burials of remains of known individuals returned to the United States for interment, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself, Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. CAIN, Mr. LODGE, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MILLIKIN, and Mr. THYE), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services; and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide for the evacuation and return of the remains of certain persons who died and are buried outside the continental limits of the United States," approved May 16, 1946, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 10. In the case of group or mass burials of the unidentified remains of one or more known individuals, the Secretary shall pay to each next of kin of each such individual attending such burial (1) the actual traveling expenses of such next of kin from his place of residence to the place of burial and return, and (2) a per diem allowance, in lieu of actual expenses for subsistence, at the rates prescribed in the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926 and in conformity with regulations promulgated thereunder, for each day such next of kin is necessarily engaged in traveling to and from, and in attendance at, such burial. As used in this section the term 'next of kin' includes (1) both the spouse and children of a decedent, if the next of kin is a spouse, (2) all children of a decedent, (3) both parents of a decedent, if the next of kin is a parent, and (4) all persons standing in loco parentis to a decedent, if the next of kin of a decedent is a person standing in loco parentis."

The statement presented by Mr. WILLIAMS was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILLIAMS

This bill would amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the evacuation and return of the remains of certain persons who died and are buried outside the continental limits of the United States," approved May 16, 1946, as amended, so as to provide travel and subsistence allowances for the next of kin attending group burials of the unidentified remains of known individuals returned to the United States for interment.

The need for this legislation was first brought to my attention when a Delaware mother appealed to me for assistance in connection with the return of her deceased son to the United States for interment. The facts are these: her son, together with two other Air Force servicemen, had crashed to death in a Belgian field during the war. The bodies, badly mangled, were interred in a single grave. The Army located the grave but could not distinguish the bodies and a mass burial at Arlington National Cemetery was finally decided upon as the wisest course.

Recently it was learned that the mother of one of the other sons, who lives in Colorado, because of age and financial circumstances, was compelled to request a delay of funeral services until arrangements could be made to meet the necessary financial outlay. It is apparent, in the circumstances under which these boys were killed, necessitating a group burial, that each son cannot be interred in the home area of the respective families. This fact necessitates long travel by two of the mothers who must come from Colorado and Minnesota, respectively, and under the present law, if they come, it must be at their own expense.

I introduced this same legislation during the Eightieth Congress which was not considered by the Committee on Armed Services apparently because the Departments of the Army and Navy reported to the Bureau of the Budget recommending against its enactment on the ground that it would be discriminatory to furnish travel and subsistence to one group and to deny it to others.

I am unable to follow this reasoning inasmuch as the facts concerning the mass burials of the unidentified remains of more than one individual leaves no choice to the next of kin as to the location of burial sites, whereas in the case of attendance at burials of individual servicemen, the respective next of kin has the choice of burial in the family cemetery.

I have been advised by the appropriate official of the Army that there are at least 1,000, and possibly as many as 4,000, cases in which bodies buried in temporary mass graves, often after plane crashes, cannot be identified or separated, and when returned to this country must be reinterred in mass graves in a national cemetery more often located some considerable distance from the home or homes of the next of kin. Under these distressing circumstances, I feel sure that no Senator would desire the next of kin to carry the heavy financial burden entailed in long travel which burials under these circumstances necessitate. Without this legislation many a mother or wife, because of financial circumstances, will be compelled to accept charity or be denied the opportunity of attending the last rites for her son or husband. This legislation, therefore, is the least we can do for such mothers.

PREVENTION OF STREAM POLLUTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to permit businessmen who build facilities to take care of industrial waste and thus prevent stream pollution, to deduct their expenses for these capital improvements as regular business expenses for income-tax purposes. This is a form of accelerated depreciation designed to cope with the extraordinary problem presented by stream pollution in my own and just about every other State in the Union.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a statement which I have prepared on this bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1118) to encourage the prevention of stream pollution by allowing amounts paid for plants for the treatment of industrial waste as a deduction in computing net income, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement presented by Mr. WILEY was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTION OF BILL PROVIDING THAT CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS AGAINST STREAM POLLUTION BE TREATED DEDUCTIBLE AS BUSINESS EXPENSES

I am introducing today a bill providing that capital improvements made to end stream pollution be treated as deductible business expenses for income-tax purposes. This bill is an identical measure to H. R. 1343, already introduced by my friend and able colleague, the Honorable JOHN BYRNES, of Wisconsin. I feel that Congressman BYRNES is to be congratulated for his pioneering along this line.

PROVISIONS OF BILL

The bill amends section 23 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to deductions allowed in computing net income) by adding a new subsection reading as follows:

"'(bb) Cost of plants for treatment of industrial waste.—In the case of a taxpayer discharging (either directly or through public sewage systems) industrial waste into rivers or streams in the United States, amounts paid during the taxable year for the construction of facilities (approved by the applicable State or interstate authority having jurisdiction with respect to stream pollution) for the treatment of such waste, including amounts paid for plans for such construction and treatment.'

"SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall be applicable only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1948, and before January 1, 1955."

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT ENDORSES, TREASURY OPPOSES

During the previous Eightieth Congress, other legislation was introduced to accomplish this objective. That legislation was endorsed by the Department of the Interior, but opposed by the Treasury Department.

Generally speaking, the Treasury's position has been based upon the fact that if businesses making capital improvements to treat industrial wastes and end stream pollution were allowed to charge off their costs to ordinary expenses in the year of construction, they would have somewhat of a tax advantage over other taxpayers who are allowed to deduct only depreciation charges on their capital improvements.

The Treasury may have a certain technical validity to its point, but I am afraid that its position is hopelessly blind to the fact that stream pollution represents one of the most critical problems in our entire Nation. Meeting of that problem has strained the resources of American States, localities, and of countless American industries. It is an extraordinary situation and it requires extraordinary steps if we are to preserve intact the water heritage of the Nation and our wildlife and fishery resources.

TESTIMONY BY ISAAK WALTON LEAGUE

Just recently, the Wisconsin division of the Isaak Walton League held a meeting in my State in Milwaukee, and at that time Mr. James Spindler, of Manitowoc, chairman of the Isaak Walton Water Pollution Committee, stated that:

"Pollution exists all over the State. If you mark pollution areas in red on a State map, the map would be entirely red. Pollution is so bad in Green Bay that it exists for 25 miles out into the mouth of the bay from Green Bay. Even if it is stopped tomorrow, it would take years for it to clear up by itself."

In addition, I have had correspondence with the able president of the Wisconsin division of the league, Mr. A. D. Sutherland, of Fond du Lac, and other conservation leaders who have generally endorsed this legislation which I am introducing today.

I feel that the pollution problem represents one of the greatest single challenges to American industry today in cooperation with conservation groups throughout the Nation. We should recognize the terrific expenses involved to industries in trying to meet the pollution problem; and that is one of the reasons why I am introducing this bill in order to be of help to these industries.

MY INQUIRY ON ANTIPOLLUTION RESEARCH

Along a somewhat related line, I am inquiring with various Government agencies (like the Department of Agriculture) how we of the Congress can cooperate toward further research into utilization of waste products. For example, a recent newspaper issue in my State—the very same one that reported Mr. Spindler's comments—reported on a development by which wastes of paper mills are being converted into yeast in a new experimental plant recently set up. I feel that if we in the Congress can help to stimulate expanded research by the Madison Forest Products Laboratory and other research institutions, we will be on our way toward a partial solution of the pollution problem. It is such a vast problem, however, that it must be attacked on many fronts. But the basic principle behind the attack should, at all times, be cooperation between Federal, State, and local governments, between industry, agriculture, conservation groups, and other parties involved in this critical subject.

INTERNATIONAL ANIMAL-QUARANTINE STATION ON SWAN ISLAND

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing for the repeal of the joint resolution of July 24, 1946 (60 Stat. 633), establishing an international quarantine station on Swan Island, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with a statement prepared by me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and without objection the bill and statement presented by the Senator from Nevada will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1105) to repeal the joint resolution of July 24, 1946, introduced by Mr. MALONE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to provide for the establishment of an international animal quarantine station on Swan Island, and to permit the entry therein of animals from any country and the subsequent importation of such animals into other parts of the United States, and for other purposes," approved July 24, 1946 (60 Stat. 633), is repealed.

The statement presented by Mr. MALONE was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, the Advisory Committee to the Secretary of Agriculture on the foot-and-mouth disease at their meeting in Washington on February 16 and 17 recommended that the Swan Island Quarantine Station be abolished.

The recommendation was unanimous after a full review of the history of the importation of the foot-and-mouth disease into Mexico and of the results obtained through treatment of the disease by an organization set up through appropriations by the Congress of the United States.

PRESSURE ON DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

It is reported that there has been continual pressure on the Department of Agriculture, presumably through the breeders of the Zebu cattle in the United States for the importation of breeding stock from Brazil via Mexico after having been held on Sacrificios Island off the coast of Mexico for a quarantine period, and more recently through the established quarantine station of Swan Island.

The impracticability of such a station for importation of infected cattle into this country after a period of 60 days' quarantine is borne out by the fact that the second shipment of bulls from Brazil which brought the foot-and-mouth disease into Mexico were in that country almost 6 months before the disease became apparent.

It is reported that these cattle were unloaded on the Island of Sacrificios in the harbor of Vera Cruz about May 5, and were moved to the mainland on September 28, and the disease broke out, according to the best information we can get, about October 18, 1946.

PRESIDENT OF UNITED STATES LIFTS BAN

Incidentally, October 18 happens to be the very day that the President of the United States lifted the ban on imports from Mexico into the United States which had been imposed when these bulls were unloaded.

INFORMATION ON FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE SUPPRESSED

It is understood now that the knowledge that the foot-and-mouth disease existed in Mexico was suppressed until the late part of December 1946.

In that connection then I submit a bill to repeal a joint resolution of July 24, 1946, which provided for the establishment of an international animal quarantine station on Swan Island and which would then permit the entry therein of animals from any country and the subsequent importation of such animals into other parts of the United States.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, on January 31, 1948, a letter containing certain recommendations was addressed to the Secretary of Agriculture, signed by the following members of the advisory committee to the Secretary of Agriculture; Albert K. Mitchell, Albert, N. Mex., chairman; J. Elmer Brock, Kaycee, Wyo., vice chairman; Wayland Hopley, Atlantic, Iowa, secretary; C. E. Weymouth, Amarillo, Tex.; Fred Earwood, Sonora, Tex.; Horace H. Hening, Albuquerque, N. Mex.; E. Ray Cowden, Phoenix, Ariz.; Carlos Ronstadt, Tucson, Ariz.; R. E. Boyle, Fontana, Calif.; C. U. Duckworth, Sacramento, Calif.

The recommendations were as follows:

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROGRAM—FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE ERADICATION IN MEXICO—SUBMITTED TO SECRETARY ANDERSON BY INDUSTRY ADVISORY COMMITTEE, DECEMBER 6, 1947

1. Immediate renegotiations between this country and Mexico at highest ranking levels. The purpose of the negotiations to develop a practical and efficient program along recognized and accepted lines for the complete eradication of foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico.

2. The appointment of an Administrator of unquestioned ability with complete authority over all operations, reporting directly to the President and the Departments indicated by him.

3. The appointment of the most competent scientist available to the Secretary of Agriculture to coordinate and conduct field operations; working always in close cooperation with the Administrator where the technical work involves questions of policy.

4. The employment of personnel best qualified to carry on the work regardless of rank, civil service rating, or length of service.

5. Assurances that during the negotiations and at all times thereafter until the disease is completely eradicated the program will have the full unqualified support of all departments of Government.

6. The development of a research program outside the continental United States to study the disease and the use of vaccines. The preparation of vaccines, not harmful in spreading the disease, to be used solely as an aid to control during and in conjunction with the eradication program.

7. A study of the economic impact on the Mexican Government and the Mexican people.

8. The construction of a fence on the international boundary at the earliest date possible. The immediate construction of an adequate fence along the present quarantine line within Mexico.

9. The continuation of the canning program in the clean states of northern Mexico and all technical help necessary to implement the completion of plants now under construction.

10. A request be made of Congress for authority to do all things herein recommended and that funds be provided to carry on the operations of the program in all of its phases.

I also ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks certain excerpts from the partial report of the Senate interim committee of the California State Senate on livestock diseases. This committee was created by Senate Resolution 145, in 1947. The excerpts are from pages 12, 29, and 37 of the report.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

2. TARIFF ACT OF 1930

On the 17th of June 1930, the President of the United States approved an act of Congress (ch. 497, title 3, par. 306, 46 Stat. 689; title 19, U. S. C., p. 1746, par. 1306) section 306a of which provided: "If the Secretary of Agriculture determines that rinderpest or foot-and-mouth disease exists in any foreign country, he shall officially notify the Secretary of the Treasury and give public notice thereof and thereafter, and until the Secretary of Agriculture gives notice in a similar manner that such disease no longer exists in such foreign country, the importation into the United States of cattle, sheep, or other domestic ruminants, or swine, or fresh, chilled, or frozen beef, veal, mutton, lamb, or pork, from such foreign country, is prohibited."

Section 596 (b) of that act provides: "If any person fraudulently or knowingly imports or brings into the United States, or assists in so doing, any merchandise contrary to law, or receives, conceals, buys, sells, or in any manner facilitates the transportation, concealment, or sale of such merchandise after importation, knowing the same to have been imported or brought into the United States contrary to law, such merchandise shall be forfeited and the offender shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $5,000 or less than $50, or be imprisoned for any time not exceeding 2 years, or both."

* * * * *

3. ACTUAL OUTBREAK OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

As heretofore related 318 of the 327 Cebu bulls that were landed on Sacrificios Island in April of 1946 were removed from said island to the Mocambo Rancho of Carlos Serrano near Veracruz on the 26th of September 1946, where between that time and the 14th of October 1946, they were inspected by two veterinarians of the Bureau of Animal Industry of the United States and by two veterinarians of the Mexican Government in accordance with the recommendations of the Mexican-American Agricultural Commission and found to be free from foot-and-mouth disease, as evidenced by their certificate dated October 18, 1946 (Exhibit Y).

Within 2 weeks thereafter foot-and-mouth disease broke out on the Mocambo Rancho. In The Summary of Developments in the Mexican Outbreak of Foot-and-Mouth Disease, prepared January 28, 1947, and issued by the Bureau of Animal Industry, on page 6, this outbreak is reported as follows:

"According to the history of events as reported to Bureau officials the disease first appeared near Veracruz in the State of Veracruz about November 1, 1946, on the ranch where the second importation of the Brazilian bulls had been placed. The disease soon appeared in the adjoining states of Puebla, Hidalgo, Mexico, Tlaxcala, and the Federal District. By the latter part of January the infection appeared also in the states of Oaxaca, Guerrero, Morelos, and Aguascalientes * * *."

Apparently for some 6 weeks the existence of the foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico was not known to the American authorities. On page 5 of The Summary of Developments in the Mexican Outbreak of Foot-and-Mouth Disease, prepared January 28, 1947, and issued by the Bureau of Animal Industry:

"The first report of a vesicular disease in Mexican livestock was received by the United States Department of Agriculture December 18, 1946. Immediately on invitation of Mexican authorities the Bureau of Animal Industry sent two experienced veterinarians, Dr. M. S. Shahan and Dr. A. E. Wardlow, to Mexico to participate in the steps being taken to arrive at a diagnosis. Foot-and-mouth disease is one of several vesicular diseases having somewhat similar symptoms.

"Animal inoculation tests, requiring several days, are necessary for positive diagnosis. These were made by the Mexican authorities and the Bureau's representatives. The diagnosis of foot-and-mouth disease was confirmed by Dr. Shahan, who is the Bureau's specialist on virus diseases, and who also participated in the field work that suppressed the outbreak of that disease in southern California in 1929. Mr. Wardlow and the Mexican veterinarians concurred in the diagnosis."

The official report of the finding of the existence of foot-and-mouth disease by the veterinarians of the Bureau of Animal Industry and of the Mexican Government was about December 28, 1946.

On learning by telephone December 30, 1946, that foot-and-mouth disease existed in Mexico officials of the Bureau of Animal Industry stopped inspection of all ruminants and swine offered for importation from Mexico into the United States which had the effect of stopping their entry. A formal order prohibiting such importations was issued in accordance with the governing statute and was signed by the Secretary, dated December 30, 1946, effective January 3, 1947, the day it appeared in the Federal Register. (Exhibit Z1.) This had the effect of establishing an embargo upon the importation of ruminants and swine from Mexico into the United States and under the provisions of section 306a of the Tariff Act of 1930 made it illegal to import cattle from Mexico into the United States. This embargo has since continued in effect.

From the foregoing recital of facts your committee is forced to the conclusion that with the connivance of representatives of the State Department of the United States of America, activated by hostility to the provisions of section 306a of the Tariff Act, and

with the supine acquiescence of the Bureau of Animal Industry, a gamble was taken and the gamble was lost. Since that time approximately $45,000,000 of American taxpayers' money have been spent in fighting foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico in an unsuccessful attempt to eradicate the disease. The northern Mexican cattlemen have lost a market, the American market, for their cattle and the American consumers of meat have been deprived of that supply, and that is only a small portion of the losses that have yet to be paid.

* * * * *

Other importations into the United States from countries in which foot-and-mouth disease existed

While in Mexico your committee was advised by representatives of the Mexican press that when Henry Wallace was Secretary of Agriculture, he had imported swine from Denmark—a country in which foot-and-mouth disease had been found to exist—by order of the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States (Exhibit G), using the Virgin Islands in the same manner as importers of the Brahma bulls into Mexico which finally landed in the United States used Mexico. Your committee requested Dr. C. Duckworth, its technical adviser, to ascertain from the Bureau of Animal Industry whether or not such importation had been made. Under date of January 30, 1948, Dr. S. O. Fladness, assistant chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, replied to an inquiry by Dr. Duckworth as to the matter (exhibit Z-8), stating that in 1934 some Landrace hogs had been shipped via the Virgin Islands and imported into the United States.

It is to be noted that Dr. Fladness justifies the importation under section 104 of title 21 (the act of 1890), which prohibits the importation of cattle, sheep, other ruminants or swine which are diseased or have been exposed to disease within 60 days prior to exportation because of the fact that the swine were held in the Virgin Islands for a period of 60 days or more after they had been imported there from Denmark. (Exhibit Z-9.)

We again call attention to the language of the opinion of the legislative counsel of the State of California (exhibit Z-2):

"If it could be established that the original intent was to bring the cattle or swine to the United States from a country in which foot-and-mouth disease existed, the fact that they were temporarily held in some place where foot-and-mouth disease did not exist would not necessarily make the transaction legal, and if the same individual purchased the cattle in the country in which foot-and-mouth disease existed, had them transported into a country in which foot-and-mouth disease did not exist, and thence into the United States, and if it were found as a fact that it was at all times intended that the ultimate destination was to be the United States, that a conviction under our criminal laws would be sustained."

It appears to your committee that it is highly questionable whether or not the provisions of section 104 of title 21 (The act of 1890) prohibiting the importation of cattle, etc., which have been exposed to disease within 60 days prior to exportation, is not superseded or controlled by the provisions of section 306 (a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 prohibiting all importations of cattle, etc., from countries in which foot-and-mouth disease has been found to exist. The tariff Act was passed 40 years after the act of 1890. Section 306 (a) dealt with two specific diseases—rinderpest and foot-and-mouth disease. It provided that when such diseases were found to exist in any foreign country it should be illegal to import cattle, etc., from such country.

It is believed that this would supersede and control the more general provisions of the act of 1890. Surely Congress, in enacting section 306 (a) of the Tariff Act and seeking to protect the livestock industry of the United States from the dread diseases of rinderpest and foot-and-mouth disease, did not intend to permit importations from foreign countries in which such diseases were found to exist, by the use of executive orders of the Secretary of Agriculture, to give to the cattle of such country naturalization of a nondisease existing country by the use of such latter country as a quarantine station for 60 days. (See the opinion of the legislative counsel of the State of California, exhibit Z-2.)

It is true that Dr. Fladness, before the subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives on February 4, 1948, indicated a different attitude on the part of the Bureau of Animal Industry. On page 171 of the hearings of the subcommittee appears the following:

"Senator HATFIELD. Mr. Chairman, might I ask through you another question, and that is this—whether or not the Bureau has ever had any legal opinion as to whether or not the 60-day provision of the law of 1890 was affected by section 306 and 306 (a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 which prohibited the importation of animals from any country in which the Secretary of Agriculture found foot-and-mouth disease to exist.

"In other words, I want to know whether or not that section passed in 1930 would not have the effect of overruling or repealing or nullifying that portion of the law of 1890 which referred to the 60-day period?

"Mr. GILLIE. I will have to ask the Bureau of Animal Industry to answer that.

"Senator HATFIELD. I am wondering if they ever had any legal opinion on that point.

"Dr. FLADNESS. We do not have a direct legal opinion on that, but informally we have had that opinion. We have had no formal written opinion on that specific point. It has been held in a number of other cases in connection with section 306 (a) that the importation is from the country from which they are shipped to the United States. That is what is prohibited by section 306 (a).

"For instance the Canadian situation. By agreement at an Empire conference in 1930, the Canadians agreed to accept breeding cattle from Great Britain, nothwithstanding that they were not 100 percent clean but under control, provided certain special restrictions were placed on them, like quarantine. They are the ones who issue the permits. If our people want to get animals of British origin, we do not have a thing in the world to do with it. They get their permits from the Canadian authorities. They import them into Canada, and under the combination of the two laws when they later wish to import them into the United States with proof that those animals have been there in Canada and have been accepted by the Canadians so that it fully meets the 60-day freedom-from-exposure clause, they are eligible for importation into the United States."

Sufficient to say that if the act of 1890 can be used in the method suggested to circumvent the provisions of section 306 (a) of the Tariff Act, your committee recommends that Congress should so amend the act of 1890 and any similar act to prevent such circumvention and effectively bar the importation of all cattle, etc., and meat products thereof from countries in which foot-and-mouth disease exists. Your committee recommends that Congress enact any needed legislation to prevent the use of a third country as a naturalization agency of cattle, etc., coming from countries infected with foot-and-mouth disease. Our experiences in Mexico prove the danger in any other course.

Your committee also notes that in the January-February issue of the Jen Sal Journal, published by the Jensen-Salsbery Laboratories, Inc., Kansas City, Mo., on page 68, a picture of a purebred Jersey cow, a Red Sindi Brahma bull, and a calf, bearing this inscription:

"First Jersey-Red Sindi calf: This little calf is the first of his kind. His mother is a high-producing pure-bred Jersey. His father is a Red Sindi, a milking strain of the Brahman breed. Last year the United States Department of Agriculture imported two bulls of the Red Sindi breed from India as part of a long-time program to develop a heat-resistant dairy cattle for the South. The calf weighed 76 pounds when born, heavier than the average Jersey bull calf. Except for the large ears and start of a hump, he looks more Jersey than Sindi."

It is to be noted that India is one of the countries in which the Secretary of Agriculture found foot-and-mouth disease to exist (exhibit G). Your committee cannot understand by what process of legal legerdemain the United States Department of Agriculture could import two bulls from India into the United States in view of section 306 (a) of the Tariff Act.

Your committee strongly recommends that a congressional investigation should be had as to these two importations above mentioned, to wit, the Landrace hogs from Denmark by way of the Virgin Islands into the United States, and of these two Red Sindi bulls from India by the United States Department of Agriculture, together with any other similar shipments from any other points. If our laws are inadequate or offer a loophole through which the purposes of section 306 (a) of the Tariff Act are circumvented Congress should pass legislation concerning the matter.

Mr. MALONE. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief excerpt from a report prepared by Robert J. Kleberg, Jr., president of the King Ranch, Kingsville, Tex., and Thomas R. Armstrong, of the Armstrong Ranch, Armstrong, Tex.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISEASE CONTROLS FOUGHT

For years the United States Government has been urged to ease restrictions on cattle and meat imports. This would be one way to get the foot-and-mouth disease fastened on our continent. Then there would be no further need of restricting imports, since the disease would be inside our gates.

A sanitary convention or agreement with Argentina was signed by our State Department in 1935. This was designed to change section 306-A of the Tariff Act of 1930, which banned importation of meat products from any country where the foot-and-mouth disease existed. The proposed convention would permit admission of such products from zones declared to be free of the plague.

The proposal was submitted for approval to the Senate on June 5, 1935. Advocates of the change contended it would prevent the use of sanitary regulations as a disguised means of restriction of importations for protective purposes. This attempt to overthrow controls was not approved, but not until April 8, 1947, was the sanitary convention withdrawn, temporarily at least, by the President from Senate consideration.

Efforts to break down our sanitary embargo have been based wholly on economic grounds and pursued with disregard of grave consequences. Persons uninformed as to the nature and effects of the foot-and-mouth disease say that Argentina lives with it successfully, so why can't we do likewise? Also, since England buys Argentine beef, why should we be afraid of it?

Such remarks do not take into consideration the tremendous annual expenditures Argentina makes to fight the disease, short of eradication, nor the cost to England of coping with the constant outbreaks there because of the importation of Argentine beef.

The disease would be more devastating here than in the Argentine. There the grass is lush and the cattle do not have far to go for water. In this country most of our beef is raised on the southern and western ranges, where the forage is dry for months and cattle generally are not near water. Under such conditions the losses here would be far greater.

Most of the beef cattle in the United States are moved from the home ranges to the Corn Belt for fattening on either grass or grain. Cattle with sore mouths would not be able to eat grain. There also would be a disruption of marketing because of State quarantine lines that certainly would be established. The indirect losses sustained by our economy would be greater than the direct losses.

DISEASE BARRIERS BROKEN DOWN

Another attempt to break down disease barriers was in October 1945, when Mexico received 130 head of Zebu cattle from Brazil, a country where the disease is prevalent. The animals were landed on Sacrificious Island in Vera Cruz Harbor and in December 1945 were brought to the mainland.

According to a United States Department of Agriculture bulletin dated January 28, 1947, the United States Government protested that this importation endangered the livestock industries of both countries. But no restrictions were placed on movement of cattle from Mexico to the United States and 18 of these Brazilian cattle that endangered the livestock industries of both countries were allowed by the United States Government to come into this country.

Following another ineffective protest, 327 more cattle from Brazil were landed on Sacrificious Island on May 9, 1946. These were brought to the mainland on September 28, 1946. Special United States restrictions were placed on the importations of livestock from Mexico on June 6, 1946, but these were lifted on October 13 of that year, after an inspection of the cattle in the first shipment from Brazil.

At that time the cattle of the second shipment had been out of Brazil only about 6 months and still were potential carriers of the disease. Soon afterward the foot-and-mouth disease broke out in the area to which the second group of cattle had been shipped.

On December 26 the United States Government reimposed restrictions on cattle shipments from Mexico to this country. The United States Government on January 27, 1947, negotiated with Mexico a program to combat the disease. It did not provide for complete slaughter and burial in the zone of greatest infestation and thus it set up the seedbed for reinfection, which eventually would lead to its spread to the United States.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, it will be noted that outstanding representatives of the livestock industry, representing eight States from Iowa to California, are members of the advisory committee—advisory to the Secretary of Agriculture; and that following more than a year's study of the foot-and-mouth disease situation in the Western Hemisphere and the danger of infection in the United States—that their recommendation for the repeal of the 1946 joint resolution establishing an international quarantine station on Swan Island be repeated.

RETIREMENT PRIVILEGES OF CERTAIN SENATE RESTAURANT EMPLOYEES

Mr. HILL submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 77), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That any person who shall have served as an employee of the Senate and House of Representatives for 51 years or more and who shall be an employee of the Senate shall be entitled, upon making application to the Secretary of the Senate, to be retired and to receive retirement pay at a rate equal to the rate of the basic compensation he was receiving at the time of his last active service as such employee: *Provided*, That this resolution shall not apply to any person while he is receiving an annuity under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended. Such retirement pay shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate shall determine eligibility for retirement pay under this resolution on the basis of records or secondary evidence. For such purposes, actual service in the Senate Restaurant shall be deemed to be service as an employee of such restaurant whether or not the person performing such service was carried on the Senate rolls as such an employee during the time such service was performed, and any person performing such service for the major part of the time during which the Senate was in session in any calendar year shall be deemed to have performed a year's service as an employee of the Senate Restaurant during such calendar year.

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANTS TO COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 78), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection (e) (2) "The status of officers and employees of the United States including their compensation, classification, and retirement"; and subsection (e) (3) "The postal service generally, including the railway mail services and measures relating to ocean mail and pneumatic tube service" of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is authorized, during the period beginning March 1, 1948, and ending December 31, 1949, to make such expenditures and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000) shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE OF CERTAIN BILLS

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I submit a resolution to refer to the Committee on the Judiciary certain bills which have heretofore been referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The Parliamentarian has suggested that this should be in the form of a resolution rather than in the form of a motion. Therefore we have prepared it in the form of a resolution. I should like to have it acted upon at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read, for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 76), as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be discharged from further consideration of the bill, S. 236, to clarify and formulate a consistent and coordinated national policy with respect to transportation costs in interstate commerce; to strengthen the antitrust laws of the United States and to provide for their more effective enforcement; and to promote competition by permitting sellers to have access to distant markets, and the bill, S. 1008, to provide a 2-year moratorium with respect to the application of certain antitrust laws to individual, good-faith delivered price systems and freight-absorption practices, and that said bills be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SEC. 2. That there shall be transmitted to the Committee on the Judiciary an interim report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on said bills and the same shall be printed as a Senate document.

SEC. 3. It is understood the Committee on the Judiciary will give such prompt attention to the bills as will permit early consideration of the subject matter by the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me inquire why this is proposed to be done by resolution?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It is handled in this way at the suggestion of the Parliamentarian. He stated it would be a much better way, for in this way a record is kept of the matter. Such matters are customarily handled by motion, but the Parliamentarian suggested that we proceed in this way.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. Probably one motion would be inadequate to take care of all the matters involved, in any event; is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I assume so.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well; I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 76) was considered and agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE—AMENDMENT

Mr. MYERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the resolution (S. Res. 15) amending the so-called cloture rule of the Senate, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

MRS. LORRAINE MALONE—AMENDMENT

Mr. CHAVEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 507) for the relief of Mrs. Lorraine Malone, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES—AMENDMENT

Mr. TYDINGS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 526) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes, which was referred

to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT TO DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. TAYLOR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2632) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 17, line 9, to strike out "$300,000" and insert "$350,000."

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORT ON WINYAH BAY, S. C. (S. DOC. NO. 21)

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated June 14, 1948, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of the report on Winyah Bay, S. C., and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed as a Senate document, with an illustration, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORT ON UPPER ALLEGHENY RIVER IN AND AROUND BRADFORD, PA. (S. DOC. NO. 20)

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated April 16, 1948, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of a report on the upper Allegheny River in and around Bradford, Pa., and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT—HEARINGS BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE OF JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, a hearing before a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee will be held Wednesday, March 9, 1949, at 10 a. m., in the Judiciary Committee room for the purpose of taking additional testimony on Senate Joint Resolution No. 2, and which said resolution proposes to amend the Constitution by abolishing the electoral college as now constituted and providing a substitute therefor.

All interested parties are urged to attend said hearing.

PENSIONS FOR VETERANS—LETTER FROM KENNETH L. MYERS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have inserted in the body of the RECORD a letter written to me by Mr. Kenneth L. Myers, a prominent citizen of Nebraska, on the subject of veterans' pensions.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROKEN BOW, NEBR., *February 24, 1949.*

Senator HUGH BUTLER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: As a World War II veteran who went from the grade of private to captain in 4½ years of service of which over 2½ years were overseas, I offer the following criticisms:

1. Because it is not only a duty but a privilege to defend a country like ours, the concept of pensions for non-service-connected disability in its essence negates the very sense of patriotic duty. Payment of non-service-connected disability pensions would constitute a mockery of the sacrifices of those who lie dead or those who are service incapacitated. I am a war veteran simply through the historical accident that I was of the age, occupational, and dependency status to be able to serve in the armed forces. I honestly believe that I am no more deserving of a non-service-connected disability pension than would be the loyal factory and farm workers without whose productive efforts I could not even have fed and clothed myself let alone engage in military operations;

2. If the concept of pensions as a reward for war service is just, then it is just that such pensions be proportionate to the period for which such service was rendered. To grant the same pension rewards to those who served only 90 days (and who probably never heard or saw a shot fired in anger) as to those who served 5, 10, 15, or 20 times 90 days is to actually place a premium on minimum of service. If this bill is passed, I can hear the shouts of "I told you so, sucker" throughout the land. And this shout will be made by the boys who sought every possibility of avoiding service to the many who answered the call by volunteering or joining units which would be called long before they otherwise would have had to serve. Surely no one could contend that such an evaluation of service is in the interests of either national defense or justice.

It is my sincere hope that the Congress will refuse to be misled by the professional lobbyists who pretend to represent the voice of American veterans.

Sincerely,

KENNETH L. MYERS.

FARM PRICES AND NATIONAL PROSPERITY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BUTLER

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Farm Prices and National Prosperity," delivered by him at the annual banquet meeting of the Corn Belt Live Stock Feeders' Association at Kansas City, Mo., on February 23, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

JEFFERSON'S CONTRIBUTION TO RELIGIOUS FREEDOM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERTSON

[Mr. ROBERTSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Jefferson's Contribution to Religious Freedom," delivered by him at the Pi Kappa Alpha banquet at Williamsburg, Va., on February 26, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LANGER AT UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA FOUNDERS DAY DINNER

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him on February 26, 1949, before the Alumni Association of the University of North Dakota, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MEANING OF INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Meaning of Intellectual Freedom," delivered at the thirty-fifth annual meeting of the American Association of University Professors, at Washington, D. C., on February 26, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

TAX REDUCTION, REVISION, AND REPEAL—INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the text of a radio interview with him relating to tax reduction, revision, and repeal, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ROLE OF THE LAWYER IN GOVERNMENT—ADDRESS BY THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Role of the Lawyer in Government," delivered by Hon. John W. Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury, before the Federal Bar Association in Washington, D. C., on February 16, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROGRESS IN ISRAEL—ARTICLES BY ALFRED A. STRESLIN

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD three articles by Alfred A. Streslin, engineer and industrialist, relative to the industrial progress being made and the program being considered for the new State of Israel, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE RECIPROCAL TRADE ACT—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by him before the Senate Committee on Finance on House bill 1211, a bill to repeal the act of 1948 extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for only one year in modified form and to reenact the previous Reciprocal Trade Act for 3 years from June 12, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

FARM PRICE SUPPORTS AND ECONOMIC STABILIZATION—STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him entitled "Farm Price Supports and Economic Stabilization," which appears in the Appendix.]

PROGRAM FOR DEMOCRACY BY FARMERS UNION GRANGE TERMINAL ASSOCIATION

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a report of the Resolutions Committee adopted at the eleventh annual stockholders meeting of the Farmers Union Grange Terminal Association, at St. Paul, Minn., relating to a program for democracy, which appears in the Appendix.]

MILITARY ORDER OF THE CARABAO—EDITORIAL FROM MAGAZINE BATAAN

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Order of the Carabao," published in the February 1949 issue of Bataan, which appears in the Appendix.]

ONE HUNDRED DOLLAR DINNERS FOR PRIVILEGED FEW—ARTICLE BY JOHN M. CUMMINGS

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "One Hundred Dollar Democratic Dinners Bring Out 'Privileged Few'" written by John M. Cummings and published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 27, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL AID TO DELAWARE—EDITORIAL FROM WILMINGTON (DEL.) JOURNAL

[Mr. WILLIAMS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Wilmington (Del.) Journal of December 9, 1949, on the subject of Federal Aid to the State of Delaware, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ADMINISTRATION'S LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—EDITORIAL FROM PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER

[Mr. WILLIAMS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The President Can't Shift the Blame," published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 26, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

NOMINATION OF MON C. WALLGREN—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD several editorials relating to the nomination of Hon. Mon C. Wallgren to be Director of the National Security Resources Board, which appear in the Appendix.]

FILIBUSTER IN THE SENATE—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD editorials from the New York Times and the Washington Post of February 28, 1949, commenting on filibustering in the Senate, which appear in the Appendix.]

HEALTH INSURANCE FACTS—EDITORIAL FROM THE OREGON TEAMSTER

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Health Insurance Facts," from the Oregon Teamster of January 27, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

COOPERATIVE HEALTH PLANS IN TAMPA—ARTICLE BY ANGUS LAIRD

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Cooperative Health Plans in Tampa," by Angus Laird, reprinted from the July 1942 issue of Medical Care, which appears in the Appendix.]

FILIBUSTER—EDITORIAL FROM CHARLESTON (W. VA.) GAZETTE

[Mr. NEELY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Filibuster," published in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette of February 19, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN POLICY IN THE FAR EAST

[Mr. ECTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Harvard Law School Record of February 9, 1949, being an analysis of Chinese-American relations by Prof. Roscoe Pound, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on February 17 of this year the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported a resolution amending the so-called cloture rule of the Senate. That resolution is now on the calendar, and is known as Senate Resolution 15. The authors of the resolution are the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and the chairman of the committee the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Before moving that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the resolution, I wish to make a short statement on the proposed amendment to the cloture rule. As majority leader, I desire to make my position very clear. After long study of this problem, I have come to the conclusion that we must grapple with it firmly and must reach a definite decision at this session of Congress.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, may we have order? I have been endeavoring to hear, but I cannot hear.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has been endeavoring to obtain order and to keep order. If Senators must converse, they must retire to the cloakroom. The Senate is about to enter upon an important discussion, and the Senate will be in order. The Chair feels sure that Senators will cooperate in the attempt to preserve order.

The Senator from Illinois may proceed.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, after a careful examination and consideration of the resolution which has been reported, it seems to me that the supporters of the proposal for limitation of debate are advocating only a very reasonable step. No one wishes to choke off debate without giving every Senator an opportunity to be heard; but no one who is supporting this move wishes to see the dignified process of normal debate degenerate into an endless contest of speech-making.

I agree strongly with Alexander Hamilton, who declared that—

> The public business must in some way or other go forward.

I agree with the late Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, surely an advocate of free debate, who once asserted that—

> If there is a conflict between debate and a time for voting, action is a higher duty than debating.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Georgia for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the Senator whether he is reading a statement he has prepared or whether he is reading from the remarks of someone else. There is so much confusion in the Chamber that it is difficult for me to tell.

Mr. LUCAS. No; this is my own statement, I may say to the Senator from Georgia. I merely quoted what Alexander Hamilton said and what former Senator Henry Cabot Lodge said with respect to limitation of debate.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the Democratic leader whether he cannot quote some Democrats on that point. [Laughter.]

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to do so; but I am sure that in the course of the debate the Senator from Georgia can cover more territory than the Senator from Illinois is attempting to do, and no doubt the Senator from Georgia will present a long list of distinguished Democrats who have said what he now anticipates will be stated.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Democrats are in favor of free speech; they are opposed to gag rulings.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, this is about all I have to say at this time about the proposed amendment of the cloture rule. As time goes on I may have more to say, during the course of the debate.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois, who has just said that the proposed rule is a very reasonable one, if he has not publicly declared that he is in favor of amending the rule, if it should come before the Senate of the United States, so as to provide that cloture or gag rule might be invoked in this body by a simple majority of those voting.

Mr. LUCAS. I may say to the Senator from Georgia that I have made a statement that I favor cloture by a constitutional majority of 49 Members of the Senate, if such an amendment is ever presented here on the floor for consideration, debate, and finally a vote.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the Senator if he does not know that an amendment of that sort will be offered; and has not he had notice served by a distinguished leader on the other side of the aisle, the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], that he will present such a motion; and does not the Senator from Illinois also understand that the distinguished majority whip, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], has also stated that if this resolution comes before the Senate, an amendment providing that debate may be closed by a simple majority will be offered?

Mr. LUCAS. It is my understanding that both the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] will propose amendments of the nature described by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. And supported by the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. LUCAS. And supported by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois be kind enough to yield to me again?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator for another question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the Chair state that the Senator can yield only for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, does the Chair invoke that rule before the motion to take up the cloture resolution is made, so that we may not have a brief discussion of the matter in advance? No Member of the Senate has invoked the rule as to yielding only for questions; and in this brief preliminary discussion, before we embark upon consideration of the motion which I assume the Senator from Illinois will make, it does seem that we might be permitted some brief latitude for a moment or two in developing what I consider to be some very important facts.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate rule does not apply only to this situation. It is frequently violated, more or

less by unanimous consent; but under no circumstances during the consideration of a measure is a Senator permitted to yield to another except for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the distinguished President of the Senate intend to invoke that rule during the proceedings generally?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will endeavor to do so.

Mr. RUSSELL. If it is to be applied in all cases I shall endeavor to confine my remarks to questions.

I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois if I have been correctly informed by representatives of the press associations that the Senator from Illinois on leaving the White House this morning stated to the press that the President of the United States was insisting that the Senate keep before it until it is disposed of and adopted the proposal to amend the cloture rule of the Senate?

Mr. LUCAS. I may say to my friend from Georgia that the President of the United States is wholeheartedly behind this resolution and hopes the Senate will act with expedition and dispatch in disposing of it. He certainly supports those who now seek to amend the cloture rule.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator whether the President of the United States favors cloture by a two-thirds vote, or whether he favors applying cloture by a majority vote, as is advocated by the Americans for Democratic Action, the PAC, and other minority groups who are putting pressure upon the Senate to impose cloture by a simple majority vote?

Mr. LUCAS. I cannot answer the Senator from Georgia upon that question, because I have not discussed it with the President. I do not know what the President's position is with respect to whether he favors a constitutional majority, a majority, or whether he favors a two-thirds majority as is proposed by this amendment to the cloture rule.

Mr. RUSSELL. But the Senator has stated that as majority leader and as a Senator from Illinois, if this matter is brought before the Senate he proposes to vote for the imposition of cloture by a constitutional majority of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. That means a constitutional majority rather than a majority of those voting, does it not?

Mr. LUCAS. That means 49 Members, commonly called a constitutional majority.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania for a question.

Mr. MYERS. I wonder if the Senator knows that, before the Committee on Rules and Administration, I offered an amendment providing for the adoption of cloture by a constitutional majority and not by a simple majority. Does the Senator know that?

Mr. LUCAS. I am aware of the fact that the Senator from Pennsylvania offered such an amendment.

Mr. MYERS. I wonder if the Senator is aware that only this morning I sent to the desk an amendment which I intend to propose providing for a constitutional majority, not a simple majority.

Mr. LUCAS. I was not aware of that fact.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator for another question.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Illinois. The distinguished majority whip states he will offer to the proposal to amend the so-called cloture rule of the Senate by providing that gag rule may be imposed by a simple majority, an amendment providing that cloture may be invoked by a constitutional majority. I wonder if the Senator from Illinois would permit the Senator from Pennsylvania to tell us whether or not that embraces the views of the President of the United States with respect to the change in the Senate rule.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania, if he desires to answer that question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator cannot yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania for any purpose except for the asking of a question.

Mr. LUCAS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Pennsylvania be permitted to answer the question of the Senator from Georgia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair hears no objection, and the Senator from Pennsylvania may proceed.

Mr. MYERS. I may say to the majority leader, I have never discussed this problem with the President of the United States. I do not know whether the President of the United States favors a two-thirds or a constitutional majority. However, I think the Senator from Georgia should know that, at the first opportunity I had before the Committee on Rules and Administration to secure a vote, I amended my original resolution so as to provide for a constitutional majority, and the committee voted that down, I believe, by 10 to 2, or 9 to 2, or something of the kind. I repeat, I propose at the very first opportunity to offer to the pending resolution an amendment providing for a vote by a constitutional majority.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 15.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 15) amending the so-called cloture rule of the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Before recognizing the Senator from Arizona, chairman of the committee, the Chair wishes to make a statement for the information and advice of the Senate in regard to procedure in debate.

In the first place, a motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill or resolution cannot be amended by a motion to take up some bill in lieu of the one which is the subject of the pending motion.

During debate on a motion of this sort, which is debatable, or on any other motion or matter which may be pending, the rules of the Senate provide that a Senator can yield to another Senator only for a question. He is not required to yield for any purpose. He may yield only for the purpose of permitting another Senator to ask him a question. If he yields for any other purpose and running debate ensues, which frequently happens, more or less by unanimous consent, and in violation of the rules, he may be taken from the floor by reason of the violation of the rule.

The Senator having the floor cannot yield for the purpose of allowing some other Senator to make a point of no quorum and having a roll call, without losing the floor, and when the Senate is proceeding under the rule, in which there is a limitation of two speeches on any subject, if a Senator loses the floor by reason of such procedure, and is again recognized, he is speaking the second time on the pending proposal.

The Chair makes that statement because Senators are entitled not only to know their own rights, but they are entitled to know the rights of other Senators and the limitations which are imposed by the rules of debate, which are supposed to be universally observed and enforced, but which are frequently violated by unanimous consent because the matter involved is not important or may not require long discussion and therefore the objection is not made that the rule is being violated.

The question as to the function of the Chair in enforcing the rules of the Senate without a point of order being made by another Senator is one to which the present occupant of the chair has given considerable consideration. The present occupant of the chair feels it is his duty and his function in part to facilitate the prompt transaction of the Senate's business. The Chair recognizes that frequently one Senator may dislike to make a point of order against another Senator who has the floor, even though he may be violating the rule or may be yielding for a general running debate, or for other purposes, because of personal relationships or other reasons. The Chair feels he is obligated to the Senate insofar as he can in observance of the rules and in protection of the Members of the Senate in the enjoyment of their rights, to observe and enforce the rules wherever he feels they are being violated.

The Chair feels certain the Members of the Senate will cooperate in the matter of keeping order in the Senate and in observing the rules. The Chair wishes in no instance to have it understood that any ruling he makes is directed to any particular Senator who at the moment may be occupying the floor or any Senator who may be seeking to interrupt another Senator who occupies the floor. For that reason the Chair has felt it his duty to make this preliminary statement in order that it may apply to all Senators, and not to any particular Senator.

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield for a parliamentary inquiry, in order that we may understand clearly what the Chair proposes to invoke?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will recognize that by unanimous consent the Senator from Arizona may permit the Senator from Georgia to ask the Chair a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of the Chair the effect of a Senator's yielding in order that another Senator might propound a unanimous consent request. We saw this morning, when the Chair first served notice of his intention, of his own volition to enforce the rule with respect to a Senator's not yielding except for a question, that Senators might yield in order that insertions might be made in the RECORD. I should like to know what effect it would have upon the right of a Senator holding the floor if another Senator should rise and ask unanimous consent that he might be permitted to insert matter in the RECORD, or that he might be permitted to submit a unanimous-consent request of any kind.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois asked unanimous consent of the Senate that he might yield to the Senator from Nevada for the purpose of bringing up a resolution.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the point I make is this: Is it necessary for the Senator having the floor to ask unanimous consent to be permitted to yield to another Senator——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, strictly observed, a Senator can yield only to permit a Senator to ask a question of him. If he desires to yield to a Senator for another purpose it is necessary, under the rules, to secure unanimous consent to do so.

Mr. RUSSELL. So it would be necessary for the Senator holding the floor himself to submit a unanimous consent request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It can be done by another Senator, who seeks to interrupt the Senator having the floor, by unanimous consent.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Chair has expressed the very clear determination, where points of order are made, to see that the rules of the Senate are strictly applied during the debate. I desire to make an inquiry. If Senator A has the floor and Senator B rises and asks Senator A to yield in order that he may submit a unanimous-consent request, in the event the Senator in possession of the floor yields for that purpose, does it affect his right to the floor?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator who has the floor may protect himself in that situation by himself asking unanimous consent that the interrupting Senator may do what he seeks to do. Under the rule, the Senator who has the floor can yield only for a question. He cannot yield for a running debate in the guise of a question. He cannot yield for the transaction of other business, and he is not required to yield even for the making of a point of order or of a parliamentary inquiry. He can be taken from the floor only by a point of order being made that he himself is out of order because of a violation of the rules of the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Chair hold that if the Senator in possession of the floor yields to permit another Senator to submit a point of order or a parliamentary inquiry he thereby loses his right to continue?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under a strict interpretation of the rule, that is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no question that the rules will be strictly interpreted, if the statements of the Chair are any indication of his intent. But the Chair has stated that no running debate in the guise of a question can be permitted by any Senator having possession of the floor. Is the Chair to undertake to decide whether or not any statement or remark by a Senator is a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is hardly a function of the Chair to determine whether a question is being asked or a statement is being made. Of course, each situation will have to stand on its own merits.

Mr. RUSSELL. I realize that that is true; but some of us are very much interested in knowing our rights, if we are to have any rights, on the floor when discussion starts on this proposed Pandora's box, opening up the rules of the Senate. I wish all my colleagues would read in the RECORD tomorrow what the Chair has said, so as to be perfectly clear and sure that only questions are asked. If there is any doubt about it, as I understand, they will be summarily required to take their seats and will lose possession of the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to yield for a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in view of the statement made by the Presiding Officer, I desire a bit of further information. Do I correctly understand the Chair holds that any motion to lay aside the resolution amending the cloture rule, or a motion to take up another measure, would be out of order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No motion to proceed to the consideration of another bill, either as an amendment or substitute to the pending motion, is in order. That applies to all bills or resolutions, regardless of their character.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield for a question.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona request unanimous consent that I may be permitted to propound a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HAYDEN. I so request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DONNELL. The Vice President referred to the rule in regard to speaking twice upon any one question. My parliamentary inquiry is this: In rule XIX it is provided as follows:

> No Senator shall speak more than twice upon any one question in debate on the same day without leave of the Senate, which shall be determined without debate.

Does the term "day," as so used, mean a calendar day or a legislative day?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It means a legislative day.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Chair.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished Senator from Arizona if he will ask unanimous consent to permit me to propound a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if I correctly understand the observation made by the distinguished Vice President, if Senator A is requested by Senator B, Senator B having the floor, to yield for the purpose of a quorum call, unless Senator A protects his rights by yielding only for the purpose of the quorum call, if the request is not made, Senator A is taken off his feet.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, which is of long standing and interpretation, the yielding by a Senator of the floor for the purpose of another Senator making a point of no quorum takes him off the floor. He may be recognized, following the quorum call, to continue with his remarks, but that would be his second speech on that day, unless the Senator receives consent to proceed otherwise.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona be gracious enough to ask unanimous consent for me to submit a further remark?

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask unanimous consent for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. If I correctly understood, the Chair has ruled that no Senator can even make a point of order while another Senator is in possession of the floor, without the consent of the Senator who has the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct, except in one instance, and that is where the Senator having the floor has himself violated a rule of the Senate in debate, in which case he can be called to order by another Senator and required to take his seat until the Senate permits him to proceed in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator having the floor cannot yield even for a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair stated that he could not yield for a quorum call.

Mr. RUSSELL. But I should like to get the matter clear as to a point of order. I should like a ruling as to a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the Chair understand the Senator's question.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understood the Chair to rule that if the Senator who is in possession of the floor is interrupted by a point of order and does not make every effort to protect himself and prevent the point of order from being made by another Senator, it would constitute a speech, and the Senator in possession of the floor would lose the floor. I want to be perfectly clear about that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair cannot possibly anticipate every situation which may arise that would offer an opportunity for Senators having the floor to yield for some purpose. The question would be entirely whether a parliamentary inquiry is a question within the meaning of the Senate rules. The Chair might interpret it to be a question within the meaning of the rules, and thereby a Senator could yield without losing the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. It may be that there are conditions in which a point of order can be made without compelling the Senator in possession of the floor to lose the floor. Otherwise, there are given to the Senator in possession of the floor rights he does not have under some of the rules of the Senate at the present time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is entirely possible. Therefore the Chair must reserve the right to pass on each question as it arises, depending upon the circumstances.

Mr. RUSSELL. In this instance the Chair took it upon himself to serve notice on the Senate as to the ruling in certain instances. Some of us who are interested in discussing the subject before the Senate are entitled to know, I think, what the Chair is going to rule on points of order when they are submitted by Senators on the floor; just how far the Senator having the floor shall go to protect his rights; whether he shall invoke the assistance of the Chair, or undertake to prevail on the Senator making the point of order or whether he will determine that no point of order can be made while he has the floor. Some of us would regret to be interrupted in the course of our remarks and taken off our feet, placed in our seats, and lose the floor, because a point of order was made by some other Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was attempting to advise the Senate with reference to the rules governing debate as he has understood them to be a part of the rules of the Senate for many years, though violated frequently, as the Chair has said, under proceedings which might be regarded as under unanimous consent. Obviously the Chair cannot anticipate every decision he would render under every possible circumstance. But the Chair felt that he should make some statement, inasmuch as the Senate is entering upon an important debate, in order not only that new Senators, but others who have not, probably, participated in a controversial debate of any length, might know what their rights are and what the rights of their colleagues are.

Mr. RUSSELL. Some of us are exceedingly anxious to know what our rights will be under the rulings of the Chair, and are jealous to protect rights we know we have heretofore enjoyed. I was therefore trying to get the Chair to elucidate his point-of-order ruling, because I had never before understood that a point of order in all cases could be controlled by a Senator having the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. So long as a Senator having the floor is debating under the rules of the Senate, he cannot be interrupted by a point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope the Presiding Officer will remember that pronouncement during the course of the debate. I know there are times when efforts are made to interrupt Senators who have the floor by interposing points of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona has the floor.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I now grant myself unanimous consent to proceed. [Laughter.]

The issue now before the Senate is not partisan. The proof of that is that the minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], joined with me in the presentation of the pending resolution, and the resolution was reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration by the votes of members of both political parties who recommended that it do pass.

Every Senator on both sides of the aisle completely agrees that the Senate should remain a place where he will have the right freely and adequately to express his ideas as to what is best for his State, for the Nation, and for the world. The sole issue is whether there should be any limitation at all upon that right, and, if so, what is a reasonable limitation.

Those of us who favor the adoption of the pending amendment to the Senate rules are convinced that every legislative body has an inherent right to bring debate to a close in order that it may perform the principal function for which it was created, namely, the enactment of laws. I have heard no Senator say he favored the adoption of the "previous question," which is a method used in the House of Representatives whereby a simple majority of those present cut off debate at any time. Neither have I heard any Senator say that it would be wise to adopt the procedure which prevailed in the Parliament of old Poland, whereby no law could be enacted except by unanimous consent.

It is of record that 32 years ago 88 Senators were in favor of the adoption of rule XXII, which provides that by a two-thirds vote of those voting debate may be brought to a close. It is also of record that only three Senators voted against the adoption of that rule. The decision was reached only after due and careful consideration, and the pending resolution does not propose to change the rule except to make it effective. Unfortunately the rule as adopted in 1917 has proved in later years to be of no practical value. The two principal defects in it are, first, that it does not prevent indefinite debate on motions to amend the Senate Journal; second, that it is not applicable until a bill or other measure has been made the unfinished business of the Senate.

It was 5 years after the rule was adopted that the first breach was made in it. On November 27, 1922, Senator Samuel Shortridge, of California, moved that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 13, the Dyer antilynching bill. The motion was, of course, debatable, but no Senator made any inquiry at that time as to whether a petition could be filed to bring to a close debate or that motion. Another device was used when, on the following day, Senator Pat Harrison, of Mississippi, moved to amend the Journal, and proceeded to discuss his motion.

I am advised by Mr. Watkins, the Senate Parliamentarian, that Senator Harrison came to him the morning after the proposal to take up the Dyer bill was made and inquired with respect to rule III of the Senate, which provides that a motion to amend or correct the Journal shall be deemed a privileged question, to be proceeded with until disposed of. The Parliamentarian advised the Senator from Mississippi that a motion to amend the Journal would have a privileged status, and that was the way, on November 28, 1922, it was determined to proceed to prevent the enactment of the Dyer antilynching bill. Similar motions were made and debated during the succeeding days, until on the 4th of December the majority leader, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts, gave notice that no further effort would be made to pass the bill during the life of that Congress.

In my opinion it was unnecessary for Senator Harrison to adopt the method he chose to prevent the enactment of that bill. I believe he and his colleagues could have relied upon the two-thirds vote provided for in rule XXII. I say that because I am satisfied that more than one-third of the membership of the Senate at that time would not have given approval to a bill to authorize the Federal Government to permit judgments in damages against counties within a State as a result of the occurrence of a crime within county boundaries. My opinion is fortified by the fact that after 16 years of continuous agitation for similar legislation, the Senate twice refused to adopt cloture.

In January and February 1938, petitions to bring debate to an end on an antilynching bill were defeated, one by a vote of 37 to 51, the second by a vote of 42 to 46. In neither instance could a simple majority be obtained.

The offering of filibustering on amendments to the Journal was the only method used until very recent years, when another way of getting around rule XXII was discovered. The new method was to have prolonged debate on whether a bill should become the unfinished business of the Senate. I believe it was the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], who, as President pro tempore, first decided that a cloture petition could not be filed until after a bill or resolution had been made the unfinished business. That decision was strongly reenforced last year by a ruling made by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who, as President pro tempore, was compelled by all the precedents of the Senate to hold that the Senate would first have to make a bill the pending measure before any steps could be taken to bring debate to a close.

The resolution now pending before the Senate will close those two loopholes, and it proposes to accomplish that result, first, by providing:

> If at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate—

I may interpolate that rule III relates to the approval of the Journal, and rule

VI relates to the approval of credentials, motions with relation to both of which are declared to be highly privileged.

> If at any time notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion.

The present rule merely states: "To bring to a close the debate upon any pending measure."

The words to be added by the resolution now before the Senate are:

> Any measure, motion, or other matter • • • or the unfinished business.

Your committee is of the opinion that such a change in the text will completely plug up all the loopholes and make rule XXII effective under any and all circumstances.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield for a question.

Mr. HOLLAND. I note among the statements made by the distinguished Senator from Arizona, the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, at the time of the beginning of the hearing upon this matter now being debated by the Senator, this remark:

> Even if someone who is then occupying the chair as Presiding Officer should be so exasperated by continued talks that he would violate the well-established precedent by ruling that a cloture petition may be filed upon a motion to proceed to the consideration of a Senate resolution, there is no certainty that his ruling would be sustained by the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. What is the Senator's question?

Mr. HOLLAND. The question is: Am I correct in my understanding from that statement, that the distinguished Senator from Arizona agrees with the ruling made by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] when serving as President pro tempore, and the ruling made last year by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] when serving as the President pro tempore?

Mr. HAYDEN. I must candidly reply that I cannot conceive how they could have arrived at any other conclusion.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HAYDEN. Any Member of the present Senate will, quite naturally, want to know why the Senators who drafted rule XXII in 1917 did not realize that it was faulty, and so faulty as to be wholly ineffective. The answer is that up to that time, in all the previous history of the Senate, every extended discussion, every filibuster, had been conducted to prevent the enactment of some particular piece of legislation which was regularly before the Senate for consideration.

Whether it was a bill or a resolution it was always a pending measure which every Senator had a perfect right to discuss for any length of time which suited his convenience. Up to that time it was unnecessary for any Senator to seek an indirect way of delaying the passage of any bill to which he was opposed. He could always make a direct attack and keep it up so long as he had the physical strength to stand on his feet and talk. It probably never occurred to any Senator that amending the Journal or debating a motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill was a good way to use up the time of the Senate. If either of those courses of action had ever been an established practice in the Senate, we could be sure that the Senators who drafted rule XXII would have known about it and would have found a way to put an end to any such practice.

What the authors of the rule sought to correct was the evils with which they were all very familiar, and that is exactly what rule XXII does. The Committee on Rules and Administration 2 years ago, and again very recently, has reached the conclusion that rule XXII is basically sound and, with the changes that have been recommended as to its wording, it should remain and will remain a most valuable standing rule.

The history behind the rule I have found to be interesting, and with the permission of Senators I shall review what occurred for a period of 2 years before the rule was adopted.

An examination of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD discloses that changing the rules of the Senate was a subject of consideration during the year 1915. The first definite action taken by the Senate that year was on a point of order by Senator Hitchcock, of Nebraska, that a two-thirds vote was required to suspend the rules. Rule 40, as it is still written, merely requires that 1 day's notice in writing shall be given of the rule to be suspended. In submitting the matter to the Senate, Vice President Marshall stated:

> The present Presiding Officer believes that the Senate has reserved to itself the exclusive right to say what the rules are, how they may be adopted, and how they may be abrogated or temporarily laid aside. The present Presiding Officer does not believe that it is within the province of the present occupant of the chair to determine whether Rule XL should be strictly construed in accordance with the literal language thereof, or whether the Senate of the United States proposes to construe the same in accordance with well-known parliamentary procedure. The Chair therefore submits to the Senate the determination of the question as to whether or not it requires a two-thirds majority to adopt the report of the Committee on Rules providing for a suspension of a certain rule.

The vote was taken on January 11, 1915, and after debate, the point of order of Mr. Hitchcock was sustained by a vote of 41 yeas to 34 nays, since which time all Presiding Officers have held that a two-thirds vote is required to suspend a rule.

The reasoning which led the Senate to that conclusion is that the rules are adopted without reference to any particular bill and that a simple majority should have the right to lay them aside in order to secure the passage of a controversial measure.

The same line of reasoning would imply that the concurrence of two-thirds of the Senators should be obtained in order to amend a long-standing rule of the Senate.

Shortly afterward, in the same year, Senator John Sharp Williams, of Mississippi, submitted the following resolution, which was referred to the committee on February 11, 1915:

> *Resolved*, That rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate be amended as follows: Insert after the words "to lay on the table" in rule XXII the following:
>
> "Any Senator arising in his place and asserting that, in his opinion, an attempt is being made on the floor of the Senate to obstruct, hinder, or delay the right of the Senate to proceed to a vote, the Chair shall, without permitting any debate thereon, put the question to the Senate, 'Is it the sense of the Senate that an attempt is being made to obstruct, hinder, or delay a vote?' And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative, then it shall be in order, to the exclusion of the consideration of all other questions, for any Senator to move to fix a time for voting on the pending bill or resolution and all amendments thereto; and the said motion shall be decided without debate: *Provided, however*, That the time fixed in said motion for taking the vote on the pending bill or resolution and all amendments thereto shall be at least two calendar days after the day on which said motion is made."

On the following day the resolution was reported adversely from the Committee on Rules and no further action was taken on it. The effect of the rule would have been to make it possible to adopt the previous question on any bill or resolution to take effect two or more days thereafter.

It must be remembered in this connection that for the 6 years immediately preceding his arrival in the Senate Senator Williams had served as minority leader in the House of Representatives, and was, therefore, accustomed to assist in the prompt disposal of legislation. He was, no doubt, irked by extended debate and proposed that it could be brought to an end after 2 days' notice.

It is difficult to believe that at any time there could have been two Senators from Mississippi who favored cloture by a majority vote, yet such was once the case. I have shown that the senior Senator from that State, Mr. Williams, submitted a resolution to that effect, and I now quote extracts from the remarks of the junior Senator, Mr. Vardaman, made on the day that the present rule XXII was adopted:

> I wish to say in the outset that there is no greater necessity for cloture in the Senate today than has existed for the last quarter of a century. Certainly not since I became a Member of this very honorable body. I am for this resolution not because of anything that has happened in the immediate past, nor because of anything that has been done or has been left undone by the last session of Congress. I am for it because I am of the opinion that there should be a rule limiting debate—a rule by which questions can be brought before the Senate for final determination whether it meets the approbation of all the Senators or not.
>
> I think this resolution ought to pass—
>
> Referring to rule XXII.
>
> It guarantees ample time for full and complete discussion, and after that is had there ought to be the vote. I have always been in favor of cloture, but I would prefer that the rule would provide for the invocation of the cloture by a majority rather than by a two-thirds vote. I believe in majority rule. I have been ready to vote

for such a resolution ever since I came to the Senate, but would prefer to make it just a little bit more radical and easy of application. I am willing, however, to take this modified form, because it seems to suit pretty nearly everybody.

But to return to what happened in 1915, on February 18, Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska, submitted the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Standing Rules of the Senate be amended by adding a new rule, as follows:

"RULE 41. It shall be in order during the morning hour to make a motion that any bill or resolution then on the calendar shall be considered under the terms of this rule. Such motion, when made, shall lie over 1 day and shall then be decided without debate. No Senator shall be allowed to vote on a motion to consider a bill or resolution under this rule who is bound by any caucus or conference of Senators to vote in any particular way on said bill or resolution, or any amendment thereto, but when any Senator's right to vote upon such motion is challenged, such Senator shall be allowed to determine for himself whether he is disqualified from voting on said motion.

"When it has been decided to consider a bill or resolution under this rule, the same shall first be considered in general debate, during which time no Senator, except by unanimous consent, shall be allowed to speak more than 3 hours. At the close of general debate the bill or resolution shall be read for amendments, and on any amendment that may be offered no Senator, except by unanimous consent, shall speak for more than 15 minutes: *Provided*, That any Senator who has not spoken for 3 hours in general debate shall, in addition to said 15 minutes, be allowed additional time, but in no case shall such additional time or times, including the time used by such Senator in general debate, exceed in the aggregate 3 hours: *Provided further*, That if unanimous consent for additional time is asked in behalf of any Senator, either during general debate or when the bill or resolution is being considered for amendment, and the same is refused, it shall be in order by motion to extend the time of such Senator for a time to be named in said motion, which motion shall be decided without debate. When the bill or resolution is being read for amendment all debate shall be confined to the amendment which is then pending."

The resolution was debated and laid upon the table on February 19. The Norris resolution provided for cloture by majority vote but the interesting part of it is that the Senator recognized that pursuant to a binding caucus or conference agreement an actual minority of the Senate could control the enactment of legislation.

Senator Warren G. Harding, of Ohio, stated the case very well when he said:

Domination by a majority in conference or caucus whereby a minority of this body could determine the proceedings of the Senate.

Early in the following year, 1916, several amendments to limit debate were submitted, two of which were referred to the Committee on Rules. The resolution submitted by Senator Robert L. Owen, of Oklahoma, reads:

Resolved, That the standing rules of the Senate be, and they hereby are, amended as follows: At the close of rule XXII, add the following: "*Provided, however*, That when any 10 Senators, in writing, move that the debate should be brought to a close, the Chair shall, without permitting any debate thereon, put the question to the Senate, 'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate should be brought to a close?' and if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a two-thirds vote of those voting, then the pending question, bill, or resolution shall be in order, to the exclusion of all other questions and business. And thereafter, the motion being so carried, no Senator shall be entitled to speak more than 1 hour in all on the question, bill, or resolution or amendments thereto, or on any motion affecting the same.

"No dilatory motion shall be in order, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to declare such motion out of order when the question of order is raised by a Senator or to immediately submit the question without debate to the Senate."

About the same time Senator Hoke Smith, of Georgia, submitted the following:

Resolved, That the standing rules of the Senate be, and they hereby are, amended as follows: At the close of rule XXII, add: "*Provided, however*, That if 32 Senators present to the Senate before the reports of standing and select committees, provided for in the order of business during the morning hour, a signed motion to bring to a close the debate upon a bill which is the unfinished business, thereupon at the hour of 2 o'clock the Chair shall, without debate, put the question to the Senate:

"'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate should be brought to a close?'

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a two-thirds vote, then said bill shall be in order to the exclusion of all other business.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak more than 1 hour on the bill, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Chair to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Until the bill is disposed of no dilatory motion shall be in order, and appeals from the decision of the Chair shall be decided without debate."

The Smith and the Owen resolutions were given careful consideration for over a month by the Committee on Rules, which, on May 16, 1916, unanimously recommended the adoption of a substitute resolution (S. Res. 195) which was reported to the Senate by Senator Smith of Georgia and is as follows:

Resolved, That the standing rules of the Senate be, and they hereby are, amended as follows: At the close of rule XXII add: "*Provided, however*, That if 16 Senators present to the Senate at any time a signed motion to bring to a close the debate upon any pending measure, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate and at the close of the morning hour on the following calendar day lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Chair shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by an aye-and-nay vote the question:

"'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a two-thirds vote of those voting, then said measure shall be in order to the exclusion of all other business, except a motion to recess or adjourn.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak more than 1 hour on the bill, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Chair to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. No dilatory motions shall be in order, and all points of order and appeals from the decision of the Chair shall be decided without debate."

It will be observed that the addition to rule XXII as reported to the Senate fixed the number of signatures to a cloture petition at 16, or one-sixth of the total membership of the Senate, instead of 32, or one-third of the membership, as proposed by Senator Smith, or by 10 Senators as proposed by Senator Owen.

The Owen resolution referred to cloture on "the pending question, bill, or resolution" while the Smith resolution mentioned only "a bill which is the unfinished business of the Senate." The committee resolution used the term "any pending measure" and later refers to "the bill and amendments thereto."

The substitute resolution was placed on the Senate Calendar on May 16, 1916, and there was discussion in regard to it on two different occasions but no further action was taken during the Sixty-fourth Congress.

The present rule XXII was adopted on March 8, 1917, at a special session of the Senate held at the beginning of the Sixty-fifth Congress. The rule was drafted by a committee of five Senators from the Democratic conference and five Senators from the Republican conference. There is no record of their names, but there is no doubt that among the 10 there were Senators who had been members of the Committee on Rules during the previous Congress. To clearly indicate that the resolution reported to the Senate on May 16, 1916, was used as the basis for rule XXII as adopted on March 8, 1917, I ask leave to insert in the RECORD a copy of the rule with the differences between it and the 1916 resolution printed in italics.

There being no objection, the copies were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

RULE XXII

2. If at any time a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any pending measure is presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and one hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by an aye-and-nay vote the question:

"Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?"

And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a two-thirds vote of those voting, then said measure shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on *the pending measure*, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. *Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time.* No dilatory motion, *or dilatory amendment*, or *amendment not germane* shall be in order. Points of order, *including questions of relevancy*, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, it may interest present Senators to know something about the men who unanimously agreed to report to the Senate an amendment to rule XXII on May 16, 1916. At that time Lee S. Overman, a Senator from North Carolina, was chairman of the Committee on Rules. Experience had given him a thorough understanding of parliamentary procedure. He had been elected five times to the North Carolina Legislature and had served a term as speaker. In 1916 he had been a Member of this body for 13 years, and consequently was familiar with its customs and traditions.

The next ranking member was John W. Kern, of Indiana, a very successful lawyer, who was the candidate for Vice President when William J. Bryan was the Democratic nominee for President in 1908. He was elected to the Senate in 1910, and served as chairman of the Democratic conference and as floor leader in 1914 and 1915.

Next on the committee was Senator James A. O'Gorman, of New York, who came to the Senate after 10 years' service as a justice of the supreme court of his State. He had been a Senator for 6 years when the resolution to amend rule XXII was reported.

Another committee member was John Sharp Williams, of Mississippi. He had been a Member of the House of Representatives for 16 years, the last 6 as minority leader in that body. Elected to the Senate in 1910, he had then been here for 6 years.

The Senator who reported the resolution was Hoke Smith, of Georgia. As a compartively young man he served as Secretary of the Interior under President Cleveland and had been Governor of Georgia for 4 years when he came to the Senate in 1911.

The ranking Republican on the Rules Committee was Jacob H. Gallinger, of New Hampshire. He had been President of the New Hampshire State Senate and had served two terms as Representative in Congress from that State. He first came to the Senate in 1891, and was in his twenty-fifth year of service, having previously been the Republican minority leader.

Following him on the committee was Francis E. Warren, of Wyoming, another veteran Republican who had been in the Senate continuously since 1895. Previously he had been three times Governor of Wyoming.

Next came Knute Nelson, of Minnesota, who had served terms in both the Wisconsin and Minnesota Legislatures, who had been Governor of Minnesota, and, like Senator Warren, had been a Member of the Senate for 21 years.

Last on the list of members of the then Committee on Rules was Albert B. Cummins, of Iowa, who, after being Governor of his State for 6 years, was elected to the Senate in 1908, and later served for 6 years as President pro tempore of the Senate.

One remarkable fact is that four of the members of that committee—Gallinger, of New Hampshire; Warren, of Wyoming; Nelson, of Minnesota; and Overman, of North Carolina—before completing their service were each elected to five continuous terms as a United States Senator. Anyone who can do that is not a political accident.

In truth, every member of that committee was a man of ability and possessed of ample experience as a Senator to qualify as being entirely competent to determine what kind of a rule should be adopted to limit debate in the Senate.

In 1916, as a Member of the House of Representatives, I was acquainted, though not intimately, with every one of the Senators to whom I have referred. There are three others in this Chamber today who likewise were serving in the House in 1916: The Vice President, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. I am sure that each of them will bear witness with me in saying that every member of the then Senate Committee on Rules was a noted Senator for whose judgment other Senators had high regard. The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], who came to the House of Representatives in 1917, also knew most of them as being at that time among the leaders of the Senate.

Two other Senators had much to do with the adoption of the cloture amendment to rule XXII in 1917. The first was Thomas S. Martin, of Virginia, the majority leader, who obtained unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. He had then been a Senator for 12 years.

The other was Charles Curtis, of Kansas, the Republican whip, who later became Vice President during the Coolidge administration. Both of those Senators knew all of the ins and outs of how the Senate does its work. Each of them was highly respected for his political common sense.

Mr. President, knowing those men and the reputation they bore for integrity and fair dealing, I do not believe they helped to write a rule, and urged its adoption, which they knew was defective, and which time has proved to be valueless.

In view of the repeated assertions that the requirement of a two-thirds majority to close debate in the Senate is unfair and undemocratic, I beg leave to quote from a statement that I made to the Committee on Rules and Administration on January 24, when the hearings began on the several cloture resolutions which had been referred to that committee. At that time I said:

In any event this committee must always remember that under the most favorable circumstances a two-thirds majority will be necessary to amend the existing rule. From a practical standpoint the burden of proof rests heavily upon those who advocate majority cloture. They must not only demonstrate why it should be done but how it can be done.

In connection with permitting the majority to rule on all measures pending before the Senate there is a significant fact which this committee cannot afford to overlook. Unlike the House of Representatives, representation in the Senate is wholly without reference to the total population of the United States or to the population of any State. This is a situation that cannot be changed by an act of Congress since the Constitution provides that "no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."

The Senate was created as a curb upon hasty action by the House of Representatives. It is a continuing body with only one-third of its membership to be elected every 2 years. Being solely responsible to the voters in their own States, tenure of office of Senators has no direct relation to the will of the majority of voters throughout the Nation.

In connection with the application of the two-thirds rule, I should like to point out that it is necessary that only one more than one-half of the Senators present shall vote for a measure in order to assure its passage by a majority. The two-thirds rule requires that there shall be at least two Senators in favor to each one who is opposed when the roll is called. The difference between the votes of 49 and 64 Senators is not just 15 votes. It is much more than that, because the actual effect is to transfer the balance of power to influence the result from 1 Senator to 15 Senators, thereby making it 15 times more difficult to secure favorable action. With but 66 Senators present and 30 absent, the difficulty is at least tenfold, because the majority of 34 must be expanded to 44.

Whatever the number of Senators who may be present when a vote is taken, the two-thirds rule places a sufficient handicap upon precipitate action.

To show that the requirement of a two-thirds majority is not unreasonable or unprecedented, I beg leave to direct attention to the fact that the organic law under which our Federal Government functions imposes that same requirement in eight different instances. To demonstrate that fact, I quote from the citations made by the late Senator John H. Overton, of Louisiana, at the cloture hearing held 2 years ago. I read from his statement:

A two-thirds vote is not an uncommon procedure in the Congress of the United States. The Constitution, as well as amendments thereto, impose the rule of a two-thirds majority in quite a number of instances. I shall refer to those instances briefly:

No person shall be convicted on impeachment without the concurrence of two-thirds of the Senators present (art. 1, sec. 3).

Each House, with the concurrence of two-thirds, may expel a Member (art. 1, sec. 5).

A bill returned by the President with his objections may be repassed by each House by a vote of two-thirds (art. 1, sec. 7).

The President shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur (art. 2, sec. 2).

Congress shall call a convention for proposing amendments to the Constitution on the application of two-thirds of the legislatures of the several States (art. 5).

Congress shall propose amendments to the Constitution whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary (art. 5).

When the choice of a President shall devolve upon the House of Representatives, a quorum shall consist of a Member or Members from two-thirds of the various States of the Union (amendment 12).

A quorum of the Senate, when choosing a Vice President, shall consist of two-thirds of the whole number of Senators (amendment 12).

The Constitution, therefore, does not give recognition, in all cases, to the right of the majority to control.

At the time when rule XXII was adopted, there were 34 Members of the Senate who had had previous service in the House of Representatives. Frequent reference is made to the great differences

which exist between the rules that have been adopted to regulate procedure in the two bodies at either end of the Capitol. It is obvious that time will not permit 435 Representatives to have the same freedom of debate as can be accorded to 96 Senators. Of the 96 Senators at that time, 34 of them, as I have said, were former Members of the House of Representatives. I have no doubt that many of them felt as I did when I first came to this body from the House of Representatives. I must frankly confess that I did not like the way the Senate carried on its business. I had been for 15 years in the other body, and I had come to rely upon its very able leadership, which took care of what was to happen. Afterward, in thinking it over, I reached the conclusion that I must have arrived at the same state of mind as did the German people when the result of the First World War relieved them of domination by the Kaiser. They had become so accustomed to being told what they could do and what was "verboten" that they did not know what to do with the liberty and freedom which had been thrust upon them; and when Hitler came along to tell them that he was the one to do their thinking for them, they welcomed him with great relief.

That situation is similar to the one in which I found myself; and it took me some time to realize the freedom which I had as a United States Senator. I would come upon the floor of the Senate expecting to offer an amendment to a bill, but would find some other Senator occupying the floor for an hour or two before I could have an opportunity to say anything or do anything about what I had in mind. Perhaps I would even have to wait a day. That could not happen in the House of Representatives. But as time went on, I became firmly convinced that I was mistaken, and that there is value in the rules here in the Senate.

In his argument before the Committee on Rules and Administration, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] indicated his firm conviction that the custom of courtesy and consideration for the rights of all Senators which became well established during the long period of time when there was no limitation of debate in the Senate will remain unimpaired as a strong bulwark to protect the opportunity of any minority in the Senate to fully and freely state its position before a vote is taken on any pending legislation. Therefore, he favors a majority rule. It does not require much imagination to determine how that custom of senatorial courtesy and consideration was originally established and why it has remained in effect down to this day. More than a century ago, when a new Senator came into this body, it did not take him long to learn that there were other Senators who not only had the ability to point out what they deemed to be flaws in his reasoning and errors in his statement of the facts upon which his conclusions were based, but, above all that, the other Senators could take whatever time they thought was necessary to fully expose the flaws in his reasoning and the errors in what he had presented as the facts. There was no way available to him to stop the criticism of his ideas by other Senators so long as they desired to do so. That was a right that they possessed, which he was compelled to respect, and from it there very naturally followed respect and consideration for all Senators, each of whom had that right. It is inherent in human nature to have respect for power. The new Senator also soon found out that he also had the same right as other Senators to use whatever time he might need to express his own opinions and to discuss contrary opinions, and that he had their respect because he possessed that right.

That is undoubtedly how the custom of courtesy and consideration upon which the junior Senator from Oregon relies was originally established in the Senate and is now so old as to be looked upon as fixed tradition in this body. The question is whether, with the destruction of the basis upon which it was founded, that custom or tradition will continue to prevail in the Senate during the years to come.

If the 25 to 50 Senators who happen to be present may at any time determine that they want to hear no more talk and can compel a vote to be taken then and there, will courtesy and consideration for the minority continue to prevail in this body? A parliamentary procedure of that kind automatically reduces the power and the influence of every individual Senator. It takes nothing but common sense to know that there will inevitably be a corresponding reduction in the courtesy and consideration which Senators will extend to each other.

In conclusion, let me repeat what I said in the beginning that all the Committee on Rules and Administration recommends is that the present rule XXII be made effective. It is not criticizing the principles upon which that rule was founded. Members of the committee agree to the wisdom of the Senators who wrote the rule. That they made an error in 1917 by not making it broad enough to cover all situations is obvious. That is all we are trying to do at this time—to make a rule applicable under any and all circumstances. But it will be a two-thirds rule; it will be a rule that will permit any Senator, even after cloture is adopted, to express his views upon any question before a final vote is taken.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say the Senators who were responsible for the rule realized its ineffectiveness at the time they adopted it?

Mr. HAYDEN. There is no question about it. I have demonstrated that over and over again—to my own satisfaction, at least—that they thought they were adopting an effective rule.

Mr. LUCAS. At the proper time, I shall challenge that position. I should like to ask the Senator this one question, if I may, on the Senator's time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Illinois for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield for the question he is asking.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to ask the Senator this one question: Former Senator La Follette was one of the three Senators who voted against that resolution; was he not?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. Senator La Follette said:

> So far as I am concerned, I will never by my voice or vote consent to a rule which will put an end to the freedom of debate in the Senate.

Does the Senator believe that Senator La Follette knew what he was talking about when he made that statement?

Mr. HAYDEN. My argument, in that respect, as set forth in the committee report, if the Senator will permit me to read it to him, is:

> That such a result was not intended—

That is, the result, which Senator VANDENBERG has declared to be in final analysis, that the Senate has no effective rule at all—

> That such a result was not intended is further substantiated by the fact that no statement by any Senator who was a Member of the Senate in 1917 has been found which would indicate that he supported the change made at that time in rule XXII because he was aware that the rule had loopholes in it which made it of no value as a means of bringing debate to an end. Upon the contrary all of the arguments advanced by Mr. La Follette, of Wisconsin, Mr. Sherman, of Illinois, and Mr. Gronna, of North Dakota, the three Senators who voted against the adoption of the resolution offered on March 8, 1917, by Mr. Martin, of Virginia, were all based upon the assumption that the adoption of that resolution would result in effective cloture, and no other Senator indicated to them that such a change in rule XXII would not accomplish that purpose.

It was perfectly clear to me that Senator La Follette thought, at that time the Senate of the United States was adopting a cloture rule, it would be applicable on all occasions.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. There can be no doubt about that at all.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Massachusetts for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator stated in the early part of his argument that he believes rule XXII, with the amendment as proposed, is basically sound, if I remember his words.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator then went on to a considerable discussion of the two-thirds rule. Of course, the committee makes no recommendation of a change in the two-thirds part of rule XXII. My question is, Does the Senator believe that the rule, with the amendment, leaving the two-thirds vote as it is, is basically sound, or does he recommend that proposal because he believes it is the practical thing to do?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think that rule XXII is basically sound. There is no question about that, if we stop to consider the problem. Senators do not represent population. The popular vote is cared for at the other side of the Capitol. Senators represent States, large States, small States. There could not have been a Union, had not each State been given an equal representation in this body. It is easy to conceive the time when one more than one-half the Senate, representing a very minor fraction of the population, would be in a position to do serious injury to the most populous parts of the country.

For all those reasons it is sound that the rule should be two-thirds. It should be a two-thirds majority in order to protect the interest of Senators themselves in their freedom of debate. I believe in the rule as written, the way it was reported by the committee. It should be adopted without any change. I mean by that to say that it is basically sound in all its features.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the able Senator from Arizona, the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, whether, if the Senate adopts Resolution 15 as reported from the committee, he feels satisfied that that will close all the loopholes that may exist in rule XXII? In other words, this is a question that, had it been asked in 1917, might at least have prevented us from getting into this difficulty. Does the Senator now feel that this closes all the loopholes?

Mr. HAYDEN. We have consulted the best parliamentarians that were available, and as I understand it, at the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the words "or the unfinished business" were inserted for good measure. The way the rule is written, it is tight enough and strong enough to do the work expected of it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question that perhaps he has already answered but which I should merely like to emphasize for the purposes of the record?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield for a question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the Senator feel that the present suggested change should be tried out because he believes that by the application of the cloture rule in that form the ability of the Senate to act will be legitimately furthered?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do. Suppose some measure, some motion, some subject, is pending before the Senate. The Senate has the right, upon the filing of a petition signed by 16 Senators, to determine by a two-thirds vote whether debate shall be closed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I tried to bring that out in order to emphasize that the Senator believes that it is a basically sound rule, rather than the constitutional majority rule, and that he voted for it not only in theory, but because he believes that it is the right thing to do rather than merely the practical thing to do.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senators who took the time and trouble, after 2 years of study, to devise rule XXII in 1917 were wise legislators and they did a satisfactory piece of work, except that they did not look beyond the difficulties which had theretofore confronted them. Necessity is the mother of invention. After that action had been taken, someone else found that in order to accomplish his purpose and permit unlimited debate he could use other means. We are trying to produce a good, sound rule under which in no circumstances will it be possible to prevent the filing of a cloture petition for the purpose of closing debate.

Mr. WHERRY obtained the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I will yield with the understanding that I shall not lose the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair cannot guarantee that.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, it was my purpose, if permitted by action of the Senate, to call for a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator having the floor cannot yield for that purpose.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the Senator ask for unanimous consent of the Senate to permit me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. WHERRY. I believe I will not yield for that purpose, for the reason that the distinguished occupant of the chair has laid down the strict rules, and I think we should proceed with the debate accordingly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska decline to yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I do, Mr. President. I thank the Senator from Florida, however, for his effort.

Mr. President, the Senate of the United States is the strongest citadel for freedom in the whole world. It is a great honor to be a Member of the Senate, and it is also a great responsibility.

The Members of the Senate have a glorious heritage to carry forward; and I am sure that the Members of this Congress are fully aware of our responsibilities, and fully appreciate the many burdens that are being thrust upon us.

Certainly, in the last few years, the duties of a United States Senator have been greatly increased. The growth of our country from within, and the place it has taken in leadership among the nations of the world, have brought up many vital and complex problems to solve. While I do not wish to infer that Senators back in history had little to do, yet, certainly, all can agree that during the last quarter of a century there has been a large increase in the work of the Senate. Much of this has been self-made by expanding the powers of the Federal Government.

With Congress now in session most of each year, as compared to the length of the sessions in past years, when for many months the Congress was not in session, it requires no elaboration to point out that the duties of a United States Senator, and of the entire membership as a whole, have been vastly increased.

It is quite obvious, too, that our responsibility in helping to shape a lasting peace for the world has greatly expanded our duties.

Mr. President, I make reference to the greatly expanded activities of the Senate as part of the background for the observations I desire to make in support of the motion by the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] now pending before the Senate; that is the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 15 to amend subsection 2 of Senate standing rule XXII, relating to cloture.

There are those who say there is nothing new that can be said on the subject of cloture. That is an observation which is usually made by observers as they are on the run.

I am sure my colleagues will agree with me, when I say that the pressure upon the Senate for decisions during recent years has been increasing at a tremendous rate. Certainly as the acting majority leader for the past 2 years, I know something about that pressure.

Regardless of these pressures, it would be tragic beyond description if this body ever adopted a rule of procedure that would deny to any Senator an opportunity to be heard on any matter brought before the Senate. I would never be in favor of that.

The Senate has been frequently referred to as the greatest deliberative body in the world. I know I speak the sentiments of every Senator when I say we all hope that it shall forever maintain that reputation. In no legislative body in the whole world is that right to deliberate more fully protected and guarded than it is in the Senate.

The minority has rights that are just as inviolable as are those of the majority. The truth of that statement goes to the very form and substance of our republican system of government.

We can cite many instances in our way of life to support that statement. Great reforms or great steps forward for our people often begin through the advocacy of small minorities that gradually, through the years, swell into majorities. In time, ideas for advancement that were almost universally frowned upon in years past come to be taken for granted as right and proper.

There have been notable instances in which waves of enthusiasm for legislation or actions by the Senate have given way to waves of enthusiasm for their rejection after the proposal had been thoroughly debated, thoroughly discussed, and understood by the people.

Therefore, plainly, we should take no action for revision of the rules that would in any way foreclose wholesome and necessary debate and thorough exploration of controversial questions that come before us. Upon that proposition I feel sure every Member of this body fully agrees.

I do not want the Senate rules to permit the odious steamroller to crush the right of minorities to be heard and to be given the opportunity to persuade others to conversion to their views. In recent years we had a striking example of how the freedom of debate and freedom of deliberation in the Senate serve as a bulwark against revolutionary changes in our Government. I refer to the so-called Supreme Court-packing proposal was made in 1937.

It was not my honor and privilege to be a Member of this body at that time, but that great moment in our history is fresh in all of our minds. It is conceivable that similar proposals disastrous

to our republican way of life, may be made in the future. Some of them are on our doorstep today. But I remind Senators that the most unfortunate Supreme Court-packing proposal never reached the stage in the Senate where resort to cloture was invoked.

The historic processes of the Senate committee hearings and full publicity, worked so well that that threat to our form of government was averted by utter rout of the forces that had advocated the proposal.

I have an abiding faith in the confidence and wisdom of the Senate to adhere to its traditional character. Ours is a unique body as governments are constituted.

It has been said time and again, and I believe it is true, that the framers of the Constitution of the United States were divinely inspired.

The drafters of the Constitution gave to the Senate, a vital part in the making of our Nation's foreign policy. It is quite apparent to all of us that the work of the Senate in connection with foreign affairs has been greatly increased in recent years, until today its ramification and impact dominates largely what we do in regard to domestic matters.

In discussing Senate Resolution 15, the so-called Hayden-Wherry resolution, my views are in no way influenced by partisan considerations. We are considering now rules of procedure, to provide fair and equitable consideration and action, upon matters that come before the Senate for determination. We are considering rules of the game—so to speak. These are rules for fair play like the ethics of conduct for citizens in our Republic and like the rules that govern in the field of sport.

We are now considering rules to be handed down through the years, and I believe that the more we exclude partisan consideration, the better will we do our work. It was with that thought in mind, after 2 years of searching investigation by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, I joined the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] in sponsoring Senate Resolution 15.

This matter of amending the cloture rule transcends all party considerations. Partisanship went out the window when the Senate, in 1917, as has already been stated by the majority leader, adopted standing rule XXII. It was a committee of Republicans and Democrats who drafted the rule. It was adopted by a vote of 76 to 3, March 8, 1917, with Senators from every section of the country voting for it—from the North, the South, the East, and the West.

Much will be said during debate upon the pending motion pro and con, on the wisdom of application of the cloture rule at various times since its adoption. Statistics will be given to prove or disprove arguments. The melancholy history of filibusters will be retold; precedents will be cited, and there will be disputes over their bearing on present circumstances.

For my part, I should like to consider Senate Resolution 15 in connection with conditions today—now—and with thought to the future.

Today, we do not have any effective rule to invoke cloture on any legislation or treaty that may come before the Senate for its determination. I make that positive, affirmative statement, we do not have an effective cloture rule today. Standing rule XXII, the so-called cloture rule, is now a dead letter. It is utterly ineffective in view of the ruling made by the President pro tempore [Mr. VANDENBERG] in the Senate on August 2, 1948.

The senior Senator from Michigan made the ruling according to his lights. He ruled as he saw the precedents and as he construed the language of standing rule XXII—those two little but decisive words—pending measure. That was his duty and he honorably carried out his responsibility, regardless of his personal opinion, on any legislation that might be affected by his ruling. Some of us may differ with his ruling that the present cloture rule cannot be invoked to terminate debate upon a motion to consider legislation, but the ruling that a motion to consider is not a pending measure, and therefore not subject to the present cloture rule stands and we are confronted by a condition and not a theory.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska if he does not recognize that the ruling of the distinguished Senator from Michigan was in accord with all the precedents, and that there was no precedent to the contrary.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; I just stated that in my remarks.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator indicated that he differed with the Senator from Michigan in his ruling.

Mr. WHERRY. No; I did not say I differed with him. I said that with his own lights, and with the precedents before him, I could not see how he could make any other ruling. I certainly did not mean to criticize the ruling. But I do say that since he has handed down the ruling, we have no effective cloture rule in the United States Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the Senator whether or not he is familiar with the statements made from time to time by Senators who were present when the cloture rule was adopted, which clearly demonstrate that they never intended that the rule should apply to a motion to take up a measure.

Mr. WHERRY. In answer to that question, I am glad to tell the Senator—and I shall refer to it a little later in my remarks—that he can have his own viewpoint about it, but my view is that those Senators did not contemplate the loopholes. If they had, they would have taken care of them in 1917.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the Senator, then, if he has read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for November 19, 1919, wherein it is shown that Senator Underwood, who was present when the rule was adopted, stated that it was a poor excuse for a rule because it did not apply to everything, and where Senator Hitchcock of Nebraska is reported to have made the statement that in his opinion the proposed cloture rule did not even apply to a treaty which might be pending before the Senate. In those two instances Senators who were present when the rule was adopted clearly indicated that they did not intend that it should apply to anything but substantive legislation.

Mr. WHERRY. My answer to the Senator from Georgia is that I think at some time I have read the complete RECORD. I know that as chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Rules and Administration I considered the matter, and we studied all the discussions we could find, and my positive statement is that, in view of the ruling of the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], we have no effective cloture rule.

My further thought on the question asked by the Senator from Georgia is that it was the thought of those who adopted the cloture rule by a vote of 76 to 3 that they were adopting an effective cloture rule, but situations have arisen, such as motions to amend the Journal and the precedent now established that it is not possible to invoke cloture on a motion to take up a measure, which have nullified their intent. It is to meet such conditions that the resolution was offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and myself, so as to close those loopholes, and make it possible to have an effective cloture petition not only upon pending legislation, on the subject matter, but on any motion, regardless of rule III or rule VI.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. Did I understand the Senator to say that he believed the Vandenberg ruling to be correct?

Mr. WHERRY. I say that in light of the precedents I do not see how he could have made any other ruling. But in making that ruling, I should like to say to the distinuished majority leader, the Senator from Michigan absolutely set up a precedent, so that unless we change Rule XXII we have not any effective cloture rule, and that is what we are debating here today. The question is not one of majority vote or of freedom. I am just as much for freedom as is any other Member of the Senate. The question is, do we want an effective cloture rule If we do, let us have one. If we do not, let us continue as we have been proceeding, because under the Vandenberg ruling, we have no effective cloture rule. That is the whole story in a nutshell.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Did the Senator feel the same way about the Vandenberg ruling

7 months ago, when he signed a petition for cloture?

Mr. WHERRY. I was as much in favor of terminating debate under cloture as any other Member of the Senate, but that does not indicate that because I signed the petition I was going to be in agreement or disagreement with what the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], as President pro tempore, ruled. I was for a cloture petition to shut off debate on the then pending measure. That is why I signed the cloture petition.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I correct in my understanding that when the Senator signed the cloture petition he had definite reason to believe that his position was correct, and that the debate could be shut off by a cloture petition?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. On a motion to take up a measure?

Mr. WHERRY. I signed the petition for that reason. That was the first time there had been a decision on the question, although it had been raised many times in the Senate. Statements had been made about it. I remember the very fine statement made by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] in 1946, when his opinion was that on a point of order he believed the precedents existed, and his answer would be that the rule did not apply to a motion, that it applied only to pending legislation. But when the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] made his ruling, that was the first precedent we had, through a decision by a Presiding Officer, that cloture did not apply to a motion, but only to pending legislation. I say again, I do not see how he could have ruled otherwise, in the light of what had been said in years gone by with reference to the loopholes to be found in Rule XXII.

Let me say once again, and I say it in all sincerity, that the ruling made by the Senator from Michigan, whether one agrees with it or not, has definitely established a precedent under which we today do not have an effective cloture rule. That is all there is to that. We simply do not have an effective cloture rule today. Unless we amend the rule we can file a cloture petition today, but cloture will not be invoked because of the loopholes existing in the rule.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, Mr. President, I wish to continue.

Mr. RUSSELL. Very well, if the Senator prefers not to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield, Mr. President.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska if he does not think his statement is in error in saying that the Senator from Michigan was the father of this ruling? I thought the Senator from Michigan made it very clear that had the matter been presented to him de novo his ruling might have been different, but that he found himself bound by the rulings which had been made by a number of distinguished Presiding Officers who had preceded him.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I said that in the light of the precedents cited by the Senator from Michigan, and in the light of the observations he made on the subject, I could not see how he could do otherwise than decide as he did on the appeal. That does not mean that the Senator from Georgia or I agree with him. I gained the impression from what the Senator from Michigan said when he made his decision that he would have liked very much to have the Senate decide the question; that he would rather have the Senate decide it than have the President pro tempore decide it at that time. I shall come to that point later in my statement. I think the question should be decided by the Senate itself. Instead of placing the responsibility on the present occupant of the chair, I believe what we ought to do is to debate the question and vote on it, and if we want to amend the rule let the Senate vote to amend it, and let us not have an interpretation of the rule by the Presiding Officer.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator makes his points with such rapidity that, even though he speaks with clarity, it is a little difficult to keep up with him. Did I understand the Senator from Nebraska to say that the sole issue before the Senate now was the question of the two-thirds cloture?

Mr. WHERRY. No. What I said was that the sole issue before the United States Senate this afternoon is: Do we want a cloture rule or do we not? The present cloture rule is inoperative, it is ineffectual; made so by the precedents I have just cited. We do not have a cloture rule today. It is impossible to invoke cloture, in my opinion, under the present rulings. If we want a cloture rule, I think the Senate should debate the subject, vote on the question, and adopt such a rule. It has already been nullified. We might as well wipe it off the books. The present cloture rule is of no avail, in my opinion.

The question of a majority or a two-thirds vote might be raised. I shall deal with that subject later on in my discussion. Personally, I favor a two-thirds vote. I think the Senator knows I do. I wish to make my position on that point clear and positive. But, so far as cloture is concerned, we do not have an effective cloture rule today. The real question is not whether we believe in cloture by majority vote or by two-thirds vote; the real question is whether we want a rule at all.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wonder if the Senator from Nebraska would be good enough to explain to the Senate how he would prevent the adoption of majority cloture rule if the resolution under discussion is laid before the Senate and a majority of the Senators present support an amendment to gag the Senate when a majority of Senators desire.

Mr. WHERRY. I cannot guarantee to the Senator from Georgia that at any time during the debate, if the resolution finally comes before the Senate and amendments to it are offered, an amendment providing for cloture by majority vote will not be offered in place of a two-thirds-vote provision. The Senator from Georgia knows I cannot guarantee any such thing. But I think that the Members of the Senate are so sensible and so reasonable, as I shall expect to point out later on, that they would be glad to adopt the two-thirds rule if they can close up the loopholes which now make the rule ineffective, and thereby give us a cloture rule which would be effective on vote of two-thirds of the Members of the Senate. That is all we are trying to do by the resolution. That is the only issue before us. We do not want to be distracted from it.

There are those who believe in cloture by majority vote. Those who do have a perfect right so to believe. But there are those of us who believe in cloture by a two-thirds vote, and we have a perfect right to our belief. It does not make any difference whether one believes in vote by majority or by two-thirds. If we do not place an effective cloture rule on the books we will not have a chance to invoke cloture anyway.

Mr. RUSSELL. If I understand the Senator's position correctly he is for a cloture or a gag rule; it makes no difference whether it is by two-thirds vote or majority vote.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Georgia is one of the finest men I know. He has always been very reasonable. But I believe he is going out of his way when he calls this a gag rule, and so forth, and so on. When the time comes when two-thirds of the Members of the Senate feel that a specific matter of legislation has been so thoroughly debated that the two-thirds are willing to terminate debate, I do not believe that if they vote their convictions at such time their action should be designated as a gag rule. I believe the Senator from Georgia is hurting his own case when he says it is a gag rule when those of us who believe in cloture by a vote of two-thirds of the Senators, after a thorough debate has been held for days on an issue, after an exhaustive and complete debate has been had, vote to adopt a rule. It is not gag rule. In other words, it would be placing something sensible into a rule which will permit a vote up or down on an issue, whereas if we continue as we are now going, it will mean merely action after sheer exhaustion of physical effort by reason of the existence of a filibuster.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the Senator if he did not misunderstand me. The Senator from Nebraska, despite the powerful position he occupies, will not be in control of the action of the Senate, or of any other vote than his own, whenever a majority cloture provision is offered. If such a rule is adopted in the Senate, it would undoubtedly be a gag. Although the Senator may be in favor of a two-thirds rule, if the measure comes before the Senate for us to vote on it, the Senator could not guarantee, as he well knows, that an

amendment in the nature of a gag rule would not be adopted. In my own view, cloture could be adopted by such a rule without the minority ever having a chance to speak, because a cloture petition could be filed, a motion could be made to adjourn until 5 minutes before the time that the vote is to be had on the cloture, and then just a mere majority here, if they were so disposed, could wipe out and obliterate completely the opportunity of any Senator to rise up on the Senate floor and make a speech against a proposition.

Mr. WHERRY. I might answer that question by asking the Senator from Georgia a question, if I do not thereby lose the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to admonish the Senator from Nebraska that he can yield only for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Then, if I obtain unanimous consent not to lose the floor thereby, I should like to answer the question asked by the Senator from Georgia by asking him one.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Very well.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the Senator from Georgia this question: Would the Senator be in favor of closing up the two loopholes I have spoken of if he could be sure that a two-thirds-vote provision would stay in the measure?

Mr. RUSSELL. I will be perfectly frank with the Senator from Nebraska and say no, I would not, because I think that the Senate of the United States is the last forum of free discussion on earth, the last citadel of individual rights, the last hope of the rights of the small States, the last refuge of oppressed minorities, and that there should be a right here to discuss matters before cloture or a gag rule can be applied. In my opinion, these loopholes have never hurt in any way. The Senator cannot refer to any case wherein they have done harm.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia is not now asking a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska asked me a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not want to lose the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Nebraska asked unanimous consent that he might answer me by asking me a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the interpretation of the rule which the Chair would make, the Senator who has the floor has no right to ask questions of another Senator while he is making his speech.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I asked unanimous consent that I might be permitted to ask the Senator from Georgia a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. And it would be quite queer, it seems to me, if, when under such circumstances the Senator from Nebraska asked me a question I would not be permitted to answer him.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair did not understand the situation to be such as the Senator has described it.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not object to the Senator from Georgia making his statement, if I do not lose the floor thereby.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Every Senator who has the floor can protect himself if he wants to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, as I said, I do not object to the Senator making a statement providing I do not lose the floor thereby.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska runs the risk if he yields for any other purpose than for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Then I shall continue.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to be allowed to ask the Senator from Georgia a question, and that the Senator from Georgia may answer it, the Chair will put the question. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, before this parliamentary discussion arose I was pointing out that despite all the talk concerning the great loopholes in the rules of the Senate——

Mr. WHERRY. Two loopholes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Which would prevent the Senate from acting, that there are only two cases in all the history of the Senate of the United States——

Mr. WHERRY. I will cover that in my speech. If the Senator will allow me to cover that question in my time, I will tell him all about it. The Senator asked a question, and I answered it.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Nebraska asked a question——

Mr. WHERRY. I asked the Senator from Georgia if he would fold up if it could be guaranteed that the two-thirds vote would be protected, and the Senator said no.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes——

Mr. WHERRY. It is desired by some to preserve the loopholes. That is what we want to get at. As the Senator from Georgia well knows, with the present privilege of debating an amendment to the Journal, against which a cloture petition cannot lie, it is impossible to bring debate to a close in the Senate. Under the ruling by the Senator from Michigan, the only way we could have an effective cloture rule would be to adopt the Hayden-Wherry resolution, which closes the two loopholes but still preserves the right to every Senator to vote for the two-thirds rule if he so desires. He should have that right. The Senator from Georgia well knows that I believe in the two-thirds rule.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska asked me a question and then undertook to answer it. I assume that he has answered it to his own satisfaction, but it certainly is not to my satisfaction.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. First I yield further to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, am I to be permitted, under the unanimous consent obtained by the Senator from Nebraska, to answer the Senator's question? The Senator from Nebraska asked unanimous consent to ask a question, and that I be permitted to answer it. The Senator from Nebraska asked the question and then answered it himself. I should like to be permitted to fulfill my part of the unanimous-consent agreement and answer the question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has no control over the Senator from Nebraska. He can permit the Senator to answer his question or not.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Nebraska asked unanimous consent that I be permitted to answer the question.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

Mr. RUSSELL. I heard no objection interposed.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not objecting.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair heard no objection, and so stated.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, the Senator can cite hypothetical cases in which great injury might result from this rule. As a matter of fact, actual experience in the period since 1917, when this rule was adopted, reveals that, with the exception of one or two occasions, there has never been a time when a motion to amend the Journal was debated or when a motion to take up a bill was debated, when we did not eventually come to a vote on cloture. Therefore I submit that the experience of the Senate shows that a motion to take up a bill, or a motion to amend the Journal, when used as a device by the minority who wish to get their case before the country, has not been abused. Under the proposed change in the rules, of which the Senator is a coauthor, the minority might be rendered absolutely helpless, and prevented from being heard, because a motion might be made to take up a bill, a cloture petition might be filed, and then the majority leader might say, "I move that the Senate adjourn until day after tomorrow at 12:55," and we would be confronted with a vote on cloture without any Senator having had an opportunity to speak.

That is the reason why those who drafted this rule did not make it apply to anything except pending legislation before the Senate. They had some respect for the rights of the minority. They had some proper concept of the dignity of the Senate in our scheme of government. They knew that free debate in the Senate would be the last hope of preserving this country in the form in which it was handed down to us by the founding fathers.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I appeal to the Senator and ask him if he does not think he has taken sufficient time to answer the question?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I will subside if the Senator desires. I would not like to cause him to lose the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Georgia completely evades my question. The question is this: If the Senator were assured that the two-thirds vote would be preserved, would he fold up and permit us to amend rule XXII so as to close the loopholes? His answer was "No."

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator asked me one of those "Have you stopped beating your wife?" questions, and did not let me complete my answer.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I submit in all sincerity and reasonableness that many of the reasons why we could not obtain a vote on a cloture petition are to be found in the rules themselves. The Senator from Georgia well knows that even though at times we have endeavored

to invoke cloture, the opponents used the device of a motion to amend the Journal, so that it was impossible to obtain a direct vote on the subject matter. The only thing that can be accomplished after a long filibuster is make arrangements to withdraw this or that, and then proceed with the work of the Senate.

If we close the loopholes and provide that cloture shall be made applicable to all motions, as well as pending measures, then we shall have an opportunity to terminate debate after the question has been debated on the floor of the Senate, under the remainder of the rule, which provides for a vote on cloture on the second day after the filing of the petition, and that each Senator shall have an hour. Debate on the question may continue, and the minority is not cut off at all.

The only thing we seek to do is to close the two loopholes which now render the cloture rule, rule XXII, ineffective. I ask Senators to bear that point in mind and not be confused by the question of a majority vote or a two-thirds vote, or any other issue. Today we have no effective cloture rule.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In view of the Senator's answer to the question asked by the Senator from Georgia, I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska this question: The Senator is familiar, is he not, with the fact that there is a considerable body of opinion in the Senate to the effect that cloture does apply to a motion to take up a bill?

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think there is ample justification for the Senate itself determining that rule XXII, adopted in 1917, was intended to mean that the Senate should have an effective cloture rule.

Mr. WHERRY. That is my position exactly. I have already stated it. I do not know whether the Senator was in the Chamber at the time. I invited the attention of the Senate to what was intended in 1917.

I also stated that at the time the Senator from Michigan handed down his decision, there were Senators who felt that cloture should apply to a motion as well as to a pending measure. So strongly did I support that argument that the Senator from Georgia thought I was taking exception to the ruling of the Senator from Michigan. However, I went further and stated that in view of the precedents I could see no other ruling that could be made than that which was made by the Senator from Michigan on the point of order last year.

I agree that there are Members of the Senate who are just as serious about a constitutional majority vote or a simple majority vote to close debate as are those who believe in the two-thirds rule. However, I think the Senator from California will agree with me that that question is not involved in this resolution. What we are seeking to do is close the loopholes. If we are to reduce the vote from a two-thirds vote to a majority vote, that is another question. It is entirely outside the resolution before us.

It is to correct that loophole and others in standing rule XXII that Senate Resolution 15 is directed. From a reading of the debate on standing rule XXII back in 1917, when it was adopted by the Senate, there is no doubt in my mind that the Senate deliberately intended that when two-thirds of the Members of the Senate present are agreed that ample debate has occurred and an issue has been thoroughly developed, two-thirds of the Senate should be able to terminate the debate and bring the issue to a vote. Whether it is a motion to take up or whether it is a piece of legislation, or what not, I am satisfied that that was what was in their minds when they adopted the rule.

That was the tenor of the remarks made by Senators who spoke upon the cloture resolution when it was pending before the Senate in March 1917. That appears to have been the understanding of the three Senators who voted against adoption of the rule. They thought it was effective. They said, "If this proposal is adopted, it will cut off debate." They knew what they were talking about.

It is quite plain from the remarks of illustrious Senators during debate on the cloture rule at that time that they understood the purpose of the rule to be a termination of any debate, on any subject or motion, when two-thirds of the Senate present and voting so determine.

I thank the Senator from California for bringing that point to my attention.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it the Senator's view that the country has suffered great harm and damage because of this loophole?

Mr. WHERRY. I am quite satisfied that the Senator from Arkansas has been present during my entire discussion. The basis for my remarks in supporting this resolution is the fact that the work of the Senate has multiplied to such an extent that unless we can adopt the two-thirds rule and have a firm, positive, effective cloture, it is my opinion that legislation will be held up which ought to be passed, not only to meet our domestic needs but to implement our foreign policy and solve great problems across the water.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, let me say that I know he is deeply interested in having the Congress pass legislation putting into effect the program of the administration, but I was thinking more of the past. Does the Senator feel that great injury has been done in the past, and does he have in mind any instances or illustrations to show the Senate why this rule has been such a great evil?

Mr. WHERRY. As I said at the beginning of my remarks, instances both pro and con can be cited.

One of the finest statements I ever heard made on this subject was made 2 years ago, I believe, during the debate on the proposed FEPC legislation, by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. As I recall his words, he said: "Finally, all good legislation is passed."

I may not quote the Senator exactly, but that is an approximate quotation of what he said. In other words, he was pointing out that possibly it is a good thing to have some legislation held up by minorities.

Yet the Senator from Arkansas will agree with me, I am sure, that after legitimate debate is had and after the issue is joined and the various points at issue have been thoroughly discussed, then the proponents, even though they may be in the minority, have a right to have a vote taken. Some of the finest suggestions ever made have come from minorities.

Let me mention here the statement made by the late Senator Overton, of Louisiana, relative to the provisions of the Constitution requiring two-thirds majorities.

By way of illustration, let me say that if the proposed oleomargarine legislation were before the Senate, I am sure the Senator from Arkansas would wish to have a vote taken on that measure, and not have it put aside because of some loophole in the rule. However, under the situation existing today, a vote could not be obtained on that proposed legislation because of the lack of an effective cloture rule. Does not the Senator agree with me as to that?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in the first place, I do not think the oleomargarine legislation is finally killed.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not say it is killed. But my judgment is that, with the cloture rule we now have in the rule book and with the precedents which have been established, a vote could not even be obtained on that proposed legislation, because advantage would be taken of these loopholes and a vote on such proposed legislation would never be reached.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if I may be permitted to interrupt, let me say I do not agree; I do not think that measure is of the type of legislation which people feel so strongly about that they——

Mr. WHERRY. Very well; I thought the Senator from Arkansas was intensely interested in that measure. He asked for an illustration of what I have in mind, and I gave him one.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am intensely interested in it. I think perhaps the greatest injury that has ever come to the country from this rule is the delay in the enactment of the oleomargarine legislation.

I think it is pertinent to have the Senator cite to those of us who are very deeply interested in his reasoning just what injuries have come to the country from this rule, because I think we can cite some great benefits which have come from it.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator's own President has said the change must be made. The Senator asks me to discuss the importance of the matter, but the President himself has said—just today, I believe—that unless something is done about the rule, the Administration's program will be seriously handicapped, if not held up entirely.

In this connection, I remember a statement by the late President Wilson. When the armed-merchant-ship resolution was before the Senate, President Wilson said that it would be impossible

to get that measure passed, because there was no effective cloture rule in the Senate. However, because he found another device by which he might arm the merchant ships, he did not have to rely upon the cloture rule. Later he said that if the cloture rule were to be effective, this proposed step must be taken.

Let me say that if President Truman has any effective, strong program—and after 60 days, I am beginning to doubt that he has—then this proposed change must be made if his program is to be made effective.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let me inquire whether the Senator from Nebraska thinks any proposed legislation was ever of sufficient importance to justify the invoking of cloture.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator is repeating and repeating that question. If that is all he has in mind in questioning me—in other words, to delay me and to interrupt my remarks—then I refuse to yield further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGRATH in the chair). The Senator from Nebraska declines to yield further.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am glad to yield for relevant questions; but if all the Senator from Arkansas intends to do is to ask me again and again whether I have in mind any legislation of sufficient importance to warrant the invoking of cloture, I shall decline to yield further. If the Senator wishes to know what legislation has been of sufficient importance in that connection, let him consider the various pieces of legislation himself.

It is now quite apparent to all of us that according to the ruling of the President pro tempore last August, the Senators of 1917 left loopholes as wide as a barn door—loopholes that in the future would strike down their high purposes in the interest of orderly government. Certainly, those Senators had no intention to leave such loopholes, because when the cloture rule was adopted the Senate had just been held tightly in the grip of a filibuster. That is exactly what happened. That filibuster caused the defeat of President Wilson's so-called armed-merchant-ship resolution, which was brought up in the Senate only a few hours before the adjournment of the Congress sine die. Senators who had bitterly opposed that resolution, and had joined in the filibuster, later voted for the cloture rule, and the support came from every section of the Nation.

The device of filibustering against a motion to consider is a recent development, a recent discovery.

Students of Senate procedure running back through the years, say that prior to the discovery of the motion-to-consider loophole, it was not the practice to filibuster against a motion to consider a bill or a resolution. The marathon talking was applied after a bill or resolution was formally before the Senate. That was the procedure at that time.

The Hayden-Wherry resolution would close the loophole permitting filibusters against motions to consider, and it would permit two-thirds of the Senators to apply cloture, notwithstanding Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, which provides that a motion to amend or correct the Journal shall be deemed a privileged question and proceeded with until disposed of. The Hayden-Wherry resolution, it will be noted, also provides that a motion signed by 16 Senators to bring debate to a close may be presented at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule 6, which provides that all questions and motions arising or made upon the presentation of credentials shall be proceeded with until disposed of.

In other words, the Hayden-Wherry resolution would permit cloture to be invoked against any motion as well as any measure that may be pending before the Senate. That is the end result of what we wish to achieve by the proposed change in the rule.

Another defect in standing rule XXII that was overlooked by the Senators of 1917 is the loophole allowing filibusters to be made on the question of approval of the Journal. That became apparent in November 1922, when motions to amend the Journal were debated for several days, and thus consideration of an antilynching bill was prevented, and the bill was finally laid aside.

There have been suggestions that the Senate should have a cloture rule which could be applied only during a national emergency. There has been a great deal of talk about that for the last 3 or 4 weeks. Such a situation is difficult to define for the purpose of classifying the bills and other measures that come before the Senate.

The thought is entertained by some persons that a small group of Senators—perhaps 5 or 10, or some such small number—might at some time in the future conduct a filibuster long enough to prevent emergency action by the Government necessary to the life and security of the Nation.

Mr. President, it seems to me that a state of national emergency as a condition precedent to the application of cloture would be virtually impossible to define in these days of crises and emergencies and pressures for world-affecting decisions.

Under those circumstances, every bill introduced would be labeled "For the National Emergency." Who could define what a national-emergency bill would be; who could say exactly where the line should be drawn in that connection? I think it is not only impracticable but impossible for much of our legislation these days to be handled in such a way. Much of our legislation on foreign affairs these days comes under the heading of emergency to stop the threat of onrushing communism. Practically any bill can be said to relate to a national emergency.

It is my belief that should the day ever come—God forbid—when our national security is suddenly threatened by imminent attack, the force of public opinion would be so unanimous and so strong and the danger so obvious to all that no Senator, having sworn to uphold and defend the Constitution, would resort to action that would amount, to my mind, to treason. That is my answer to that particular argument.

The Hayden-Wherry resolution simply and sufficiently would cover such a remotely possible situation by enabling two-thirds of the Senate to close debate on a pending measure or any motion before the Senate of the United States. In other words, it would help, not hinder, if we did have a national emergency.

The right of Senators—the right they now have—to obtain the floor of the Senate and speak as long as they desire and even until they drop from sheer exhaustion, is a right, I believe, that has been overemphasized. It is a right that can be carried to the length of absurdity when one realizes that we live in a republic. As a practical matter the Senate, and the American people are fully aware of the importance of thorough discussion of issues in the Senate before they are voted upon. Both sides, all sides, under our republican system of government have a right to be heard, but when legitimate debate on the merits of an issue has been exhausted, the ends to be sought through argument have been attained.

When the outright filibuster stage is reached, the Senate no longer is a legislative body. It is the springboard for a mockery of republican processes.

I think the time has come when it should be altered.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator see any emergency requiring a change in the rule at this particular time?

Mr. WHERRY. I think it is necessary to have an effective cloture rule, not only for one piece of legislation but for many others that might come up. The very things the Senator has in mind today, on which he possibly thinks it unnecessary to have a cloture petition filed might not be at all what he would want a cloture petition for tomorrow. Certainly if there has ever been a need for a cloture rule, there is a need now, for we have much more legislation than has ever heretofore been brought to the Senate or to the House. If there ever was a need, there is a need now, more than ever before.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator think it fair to change the rules of the Senate for the purpose of passing one or two particular pieces of legislation?

Mr. WHERRY. No, I do not. I shall answer that. I have it in my speech. I shall come to it in a few moments. That is a very good question, and one that should be answered. Usually these things come as a result of pressure in connection with some particular piece of legislation. I agree with the Senator that what we are doing is adopting a permanent rule, a rule which should function not only in national emergencies, but which should work in years to come, not for a particular piece of legislation, but for all legislation.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator realize that at the time the rule to which he is referring was adopted in 1917, there was no controversy before the Senate as to which a cloture petition was submitted,

and that therefore all Senators could easily agree that the rule was not to be used in such a manner that one group or another could take advantage of it?

Mr. WHERRY. If I am correct as to its history, it was probably in the interest of the national emergency, or growing out of it, that the cloture rule finally was adopted.

That is, it started in 1916, but it culminated in 1917, as the Senator knows. I am inclined to agree with the Senator on his premise that we should not change a rule merely for the sake of making it possible to pass one particular piece of legislation; and I am not trying to do that. I am advocating a permanent cloture rule which will be effective, no matter what legislation may come before the Senate.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator know there are in this country very powerful groups who are desirous of having this rule changed for the express purpose of making possible the passage of substantive legislation, obtaining to themselves an advantage thereby?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. I suppose that is true. I may say to the Senator I am glad he is present because the responsibility is going to be upon his shoulders. I like his approach, and I compliment him upon it. The pressure groups are here. We have big business, we have big labor organizations, we have big government, and believe me, the time is here when we must stand up and defend the principles of good government and the interests of the American people. For that reason, I think a permanent cloture rule is needed in order to head off pressure groups, if possible, in some of the outlandish pieces of legislation they are attempting to force upon the Senate. I, for one, am not suggesting this resolution with the thought in mind that it will permit the passage of any particular piece of legislation. What I want is a permanent rule which will work fairly to the advantage of all Senators—a rule of the game applicable every minute, every hour, every day of the week, as we debate matters on the Senate floor. That is all I am asking.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator not realize that such a rule as he proposes would in effect play right into the hands of pressure groups, by enabling them to force at almost any time a vote on any measure in which they might be interested?

Mr. WHERRY. I think, directly to the contrary, it will work in exactly the opposite way. I think with the existing loopholes, a small minority can use the procedure to further the desires of the minority to a greater extent than would be possible under the permanent rule I advocate. That is my opinion. I certainly am not referring to legislation of particular interest to the South or to the North. I am making that positive, general statement. The situation must be cleaned up. We do not have an effective cloture rule today. We cannot end debate in the Senate. We must adopt some other rule if we are to terminate what appears to be endless debate, which becomes at times a mockery.

The Senator knows that on important questions under debate I should not favor cutting off debate by anybody; I do not believe in that. I believe in letting everyone have his say. But the Senator will agree with me that when a matter has been thoroughly discussed and debate has been concluded, both minorities and majorities have a right to a straight up-and-down vote on whatever legislation is proposed. That is all I am asking this afternoon as I urge clarification of the rule.

It may be argued that even the extraneous droning that prevails when a filibuster is in full bloom serves a useful purpose by halting action so as to give the people more time to deliberate upon an issue and make known their matured will to the Senate.

However, the practical effect of having available a cloture rule such as standing rule XXII, with the amendments provided by Senate Resolution 15, would not be a sudden move for termination of debate because of the deeply embedded traditions and reasonableness of the Senate.

During the 32 years that rule XXII has been in effect it has been invoked only 19 times. On only 4 occasions has the two-thirds necessary for closing debate been obtained. Cloture was applied by the Senate on the Treaty of Versailles resolution, World Court, and branch banking resolutions, and on a resolution referring to creation of a Bureau of Customs and Bureau of Prohibition. So it is plain from the infrequent times that cloture has been resorted to, and the few times it has been actually applied by the Senate, that it is an instrument even an overwhelming majority of the Senate is loath to use, except in the most extreme circumstances, when it is generally apparent, that the legislative process is being hamstrung through filibuster tactics by a small minority. That is my position. Certainly it is plain. We must correct it, and the only way that can be done is to do what we started out to do with the pending resolution.

So deeply appreciated by the Senate is the right of free speech that cloture has never been resorted to until filibusters have been well established beyond anyone's reasonable doubt.

I give no weight to the argument that the Hayden-Wherry resolution would become an entering wedge for cloture to be applied by a simple majority of the Senate. I do not say that will not be attempted, but I say I do not give any weight to it. Cloture by a majority of the Senate could be accomplished only by an agreement to that end, under existing rules, among two-thirds of the Senators, were rule 22 amended by adoption of Senate Resolution 15.

This is my opinion.

It is true that only a majority vote of the Senate is necessary for a change in the rules, or for adoption of an entirely new rule. But the only way that debate on such a proposal could be limited, would be by applying the cloture rule, and that would require a two-thirds majority. What could be fairer than that?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator explain to me why a minority should be required to have the agreement of an entire one-third of the Senate, in order to guarantee themselves the right to be heard on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. WHERRY. Because we have the two-thirds requirement laid out in so many rules, in order to protect constitutional processes under our republican form of government. I was convinced of that fact by the late Senator Overton, and I am going to insert in the RECORD, references to such matters as the two-thirds vote required on a treaty. Certain requirements and reservations were made, amply so, and which should have been made. I shall come to that in a few minutes, if the Senator will permit me. He is anticipating what I intend to say.

As I see it, that is the practical answer to those who look with dread upon cloture by a two-thirds vote as an entering wedge for cloture by a rough-shod majority.

And permit me further to point out that under rule XXII, as it is now proposed to amend it by Senate Resolution 15, there would still be opportunity for further debate that could run for days. I refer to the language that permits any Senator a maximum of 1 hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, after cloture has been applied.

The practical experience is that after cloture has been applied few Senators have availed themselves of the privilege of speaking another hour. The issue under dispute by that time has been thoroughly explored, and minds have been made up.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. It has been called to my attention that there are possibly three pieces of proposed legislation before the Senate in regard to which cloture may be applied. It has also been called to my attention that we shall have changed the rules and violated our traditions three times in one session.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not believe it would be a violation of the rules. I think the very spirit of the rule which was adopted in 1917 was that when the Senate had reached a point at which two-thirds of the Senate wanted to vote, they had a right to vote on any pending measure before the Senate of the United States. It is my opinion that they did not see these loopholes which have been disclosed. It was not their intention that cloture could be defeated by the use of the device of amending the Journal or other motions to which cloture petitions do not apply. My feeling is that, in their wisdom, in full reflection upon the freedoms of other people and upon the constitutional process, each and every Senator who voted in 1917 for the measure voted with the idea in mind that the Senate was being in no way jeopardized in its right to a two-thirds vote, and it

was not whittling away, little by little, our freedoms, which some people contend will happen if the rule be adopted.

I have changed my mind about some things since I have come to the Senate of the United States. That is one of the reasons why I am in favor of the two-thirds rule. If the Senator will permit me to say so, I think the Senator will change his mind on a few questions if he remains in the Senate for a while, as I hope he will.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator realize that 2 years after rule XXII was changed it was called to the attention of the Senate, in regard to a treaty before the Senate, that the rule did not apply except to the pending measure before the Senate?

Mr. WHERRY. A point of order was made.

Mr. LONG. The fact that 88 Senators did not see fit to change the rule must have made some impression on the Senator from Nebraska that the rule was not intended to apply to preliminary motions.

Mr. WHERRY. I think that is a pretty strained interpretation of what was thought at that time. I do not think those Senators thought they were leaving the rule incomplete at all. My opinion is that they voted their convictions, that they felt, when they voted as they did, that they had adopted a cloture rule which would be effective for years to come. It is my opinion that they did not anticipate motions to amend the Journal, or any other loophole, such as those which have sprung up through the action of some very smart Members of the Senate since that time.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. I am not filibustering.

Mr. LONG. Does it occur to the Senator that those Senators voted for the change in the rule because of the imminence of war at that time, and possibly, except for that fact, they would not have voted for it?

Mr. WHERRY. That is another interpretation which the Senator can make if he wishes. But that is merely an instance of why they changed the rule, just as the legislation now before us makes it important to change the rule. What I am trying to do, after 2 years of research, is to do the least possible and at the same time have a cloture rule which is effective and operative and yet which preserves the rights which Senators in 1917 thought they were preserving when they voted for rule XXII.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The Senator has stated that the Senate now has before it legislation which makes a change of the rules imperative.

Mr. WHERRY. No. The Senator misunderstood me. I said that when changes are suggested to the rules they are usually occasioned by legislation——

Mr. LONG. Did not the Senator say the legislation before the Senate?

Mr. WHERRY. I do not think I said that. But that is all right; I will accept the amendment. Much of the legislation proposed by Mr. Truman will have to have the cloture rule applied, or it will not be passed, judging from what the President is reported in the press to have said this morning.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WHERRY. I refuse to yield further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska declines to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator is going to proceed on that line, I shall not yield. I believe the rule is for the good of both parties. If I did not so believe I should never have joined in the resolution. I believe it is good in the interests of the East, West, North, and South.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I refuse to yield further.

Mr. President, I want to discuss what I believe to be the vital importance of adopting the pending motion by the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] for direct action upon the Hayden-Wherry resolution. I believe that the question of perfecting rule XXII so that it will be effective in carrying out the purposes for which it was adopted is of paramount importance to the Senate, to our country, and to the world.

We live in fateful, crucial times. The problems that confront us are of tremendous importance to us and to our children. The course that we take as a Senate on many matters that are clamoring for our determination depends very largely upon the action that we take upon the motion before the Senate today. Failure to adopt this motion may have a vital bearing upon the course of legislation, the course of our country upon paramount foreign affairs. Thus, the action we take or fail to take in the responsibility that now confronts us may shape the course of history around the world.

Much is said of the right of free and unlimited speech in the Senate; much is said about protecting the rights of minorities, but let us also bear in mind that an overwhelming majority of the Senate, such as two-thirds, also have rights, and so do the people whom they represent. Much is also said about the Senate as the world's foremost forum for debate, but let us also remember that the Senate has the constitutional duty, the responsibility to legislate. That is our job. I do not mean that I shall be in favor of every proposal which comes before the Senate, but I think the time is here when every Senator should have an opportunity to vote on the question.

It should also be borne in mind in considering the rights of minorities against actions by an overwhelming or two-thirds majority of the Senate, that minorities are protected in large measure in the Constitution by the powers of the Supreme Court to pass upon the constitutionality of acts of the Congress. Of course, every 2 years there is an election in which the people pass upon the record of the expiring Congress.

I do not support the Hayden-Wherry resolution with any thought of trampling upon the rights of even one United States Senator when his actions square with the principles of our Constitution and our republican way of life.

I know there are among us Senators who believe that in order to have the procedure of the Senate in line with majority rule, that we should have rules which would permit a simple majority of our 96 Senators to effectuate their will, which the Senator from California has mentioned.

However, that argument of majority rule, complete and absolute, in the Senate, in my opinion, has its defects from a governmental standpoint, because we all know that under the Constitution of the United States there are matters specified that can be done only by a two-thirds majority of the Senate.

In the report from our Committee on Rules and Administration, Report No. 69 (h), as submitted by the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] with my concurrence, it will be noted that there is cited several matters that require for adoption approval by two-thirds of the Senate. The list was concisely prepared by the late Senator John Overton, of Louisiana. It will be found on page 4 of our committee report. I wish Senators would get it and read it.

Instead of reading the list, I ask unanimous consent that the observations made by the late Senator John Overton relative to the two-thirds requirement be printed at this point in my remarks as a part of the statement I am making.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A two-thirds vote is not an uncommon procedure in the Congress of the United States. The Constitution, as well as amendments thereto, impose the rule of a two-thirds majority in quite a number of instances. I shall refer to those instances briefly:

No person shall be convicted on impeachment without the concurrence of two-thirds of the Senators present (art. I, sec. 3).

Each House, with the concurrence of two-thirds, may expel a Member (art. 1, sec. 5).

A bill returned by the President with his objections may be repassed by each House by a vote of two-thirds (art. I, sec. 7).

The President shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur (art. II, sec. 2).

Congress shall call a convention for proposing amendments to the Constitution on the application of two-thirds of the legislatures of the several States (art. V).

Congress shall propose amendments to the legislatures of the several States (art. V).

Congress shall propose amendments to the Constitution whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary (art. V).

When the choice of a President shall devolve upon the House of Representatives, a quorum shall consist of a Member or Members from two-thirds of the various States of the Union (amendment 12).

A quorum of the Senate, when choosing a Vice President, shall consist of two-thirds of the whole number of Senators (amendment 12).

The Constitution, therefore, does not give recognition, in all cases, to the right of the majority to control.

Mr. WHERRY. Thus it will be noted, Mr. President, that the principle of majority rule is not absolute.

The stipulation requiring two-thirds majorities in these various matters obviously was made to make doubly sure that far-reaching actions would not be taken by the Senate without the most careful weighing of their consequences. This is an aspect of the great design of checks and balances in our Republican Government. The suggestion is made that since a simple majority is all that is required to declare war, the most fateful action that can be taken, that therefore all other matters being of less gravity certainly can be decided by a majority vote of the Senate. I have heard that argument many times.

With that line of reasoning I disagree. My disagreement is based upon the glorious record of our country when the issue of war has been presented to the Congress. Not a single Member of Congress voted against the declaration of war in the Second World War and in the First World War only six Senators voted against the declaration that a state of war existed. And they did not filibuster.

Declaration of war can be safely left to a majority, because we know that the American people always have been extremely patient and considerate and desirous of invoking every possible alternative to war before they have resolved there was no other way left than resort to arms in defense of our country.

In fact, the two-thirds principle is woven through our Congressional procedure on so many vital, far-reaching matters that no one, I believe, is suggesting in this body that the two-thirds principle be abolished in the instances cited by the late Senator Overton, which have now been printed in the RECORD, as I requested a moment ago.

So, Mr. President, we are today confronted with conflicting opinions on what should be done. Some philosopher has observed that perfection is a combination of opposites. It seems to me that philosophy applies to our present situation and that we should be practical.

It all boils down to a question of whether the Senate shall have its constitutional power to legislate, or whether we shall continue with a filibuster club poised at us from a closet, and from time to time find ourselves emulating woodpeckers and beating our arguments from tree to tree in a forest of clatter.

I hasten to emphasize that I cast no aspersions upon any Senator who avails himself of the filibuster club while the Senate rules permit him to do so. He acts honorably and within his rights as a Senator. But it is up to us, who believe that a two-thirds cloture rule is a conservative application of Republican principles, to see that a small minority shall not become more powerful than an overwhelming majority and, at critical times, make the Senate about as useful as half a pair of scissors.

With standing rule XXII shot through with loopholes, the Senate today can be controlled by a small handful of Members who through their veto power can absolutely and effectively thwart any action on legislation that may be demanded as reasonable and just by more than two-thirds of the Senate. According to the argument advanced by the Senator from Georgia and just a moment ago by the Senator from Louisiana, it works exactly that way.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. WHERRY. I prefer to finish my statement, and then I shall yield, if that is satisfactory to the Senator.

The question before the Senate today should be answered in the affirmative, before the Senate proceeds to the consideration of any other matter save, of course, such emergency matters as can be quickly disposed of and not serve to perpetuate the present void in our rules of procedure.

Since my party is temporarily in the minority in this body I could take the road of obstruction and seek to preserve the present chaotic situation, in which a few men can tie Senate procedure into knots. That could be a useful opportunity were I so blind to my duty and responsibility as a Senator representing not only my State of Nebraska but, in a sense, the whole Nation.

I am trying to be objective, and view the matter of cloture as a permanent Senate fixture that shall be available down through the years and be available for whatever situation may arise—situations that now only can be imagined. That is my purpose in joining in offering the new rule.

It seems to me that our guiding purpose should be to see that we have rules of procedure that facilitate the consideration of matters that are properly brought before us—to consider rules for sensible and fair expedition in the disposal of those matters. It has often been said that great issues are usually decided by compromise and that none of us has his own way completely on any far-reaching legislation. We must give a little in order to take a little, but it has always been my purpose, as a Senator and servant of the people, to adhere to what I believe to be principles, and I shall endeavor never to compromise so as to violate those principles.

Senate Resolution 15 violates no principles of good government. It adheres to the principle that the Senate should have a rule, a workable rule, that can be applied when necessary to effectuate the will and desires of an overwhelming majority of its Members.

A two-thirds majority for application of cloture, in my opinion, is fair. It affords wholesome protection against pressure groups that seek to railroad legislation through the Senate and protection against unsound proposals concocted in waves of hysteria.

I hesitate to use the word "railroad" because, knowing Members of the Senate as I do, I know that they have the wisdom and the ability to expose any such tactics, and I also know how quickly the American people respond, once the facts become known to them.

Mr. President, I could speak at considerable length upon the possibility that our present Vice President, the President of the Senate, whom we all respect most highly, is eager and willing to reverse the ruling made by the President pro tempore of the Senate on August 2, 1948. I do not say he is; I say I could speak at more length of the possibility. That ruling was made, of course, by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

It seems clear from the remarks made by the Vice President when he was majority leader of the Senate that he did not agree with the ruling by the President pro tempore on August 2, 1948. However, I see no profit in speculating on what the present President of the Senate would say, if the question were presented to him for official action. The Rules and Administration Committee in reporting the Hayden-Wherry resolution has accepted the fact as it stands today. Adoption of Senate Resolution 15 is imperative if standing rule XXII is to be an effective instrument against rule by a small minority.

I am hopeful that Senators, all of us, will conclude that the merit of Senate Resolution 15 to enable our Senate to function, and to act upon the many problems that are confronting us, will heavily outweigh all other considerations.

Let us debate the Hayden-Wherry resolution. Let us hear the arguments. And then let us vote. That is the American, that is the Republican way.

Matters of tremendous importance are crowding the Senate for decision. We should be free to dispose of them and not be gagged and tied by any small minority. The question before the Senate at this moment transcends all others. It should be answered by the yeas and nays in order that the way may be paved for free consideration of important matters that are in the offing.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall oppose any attempt to sidetrack this paramount issue of cloture, except for some contingency that requires swift action. Let us get a vote on what is before the Senate.

I disagree with the reported policy of the majority leader [Mr. LUCAS] to treat this vital cloture as a stepchild, to be put on and off the Senate stage, as time rushes by and the flood of appropriation bills and other measures to keep the Government going pours in upon us. In that I humbly disagree with the distinguished majority leader, whom I highly respect, if what I have read as a statement by him was correct.

If I read the report correctly, I got that impression. I want the distinguished majority leader, whom we all respect, to know that, so far as I am concerned, I think we should debate the pending question, and, after it is fully debated, we should have a vote on it, and that it should not be sidetracked by anything, unless a dire emergency should arise which would make that necessary.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes, I am glad to yield to the majority leader. I have refused to yield to two or three other Senators before concluding my statement, but I will yield to the Senator from Illinois, because I think the point now being made is an important one.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator's statement is partially correct and partially incorrect. There was a statement given out by the majority leader with reference to the necessity in the future of moving to set aside the cloture amendment in order to act upon vitally important matters. I had in mind those matters concerning which there is a deadline when existing legislation expires. But insofar as the Senator from Illinois is concerned, I agree with the Senator from Nebraska that we are going to stay here from now on until we finally get a disposition of this rule. And it is going to be a successful disposition, in my judgment.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois, the majority leader, for his observation. I might not have interpreted correctly all of his statement, but whether I did or did not is beside the point. We now have the positive statement made by the majority leader that except for some dire emergency requiring legislation, or legislation necessary to be enacted by reason of the approach of a deadline, or something of that kind, we will proceed with this debate until it is concluded, and I want to compliment the Senator from Illinois in advocating such procedure.

Mr. President, there is a difference between the resolutions that have been presented to the Rules and Administration Committee from time to time, attempting to close up the two loopholes which made rule XXII inoperative. I am speaking about the Knowland resolution, the Saltonstall resolution, the Ives resolution, the Myers resolution, and other resolutions.

The resolutions that were considered by the Rules and Administration Committee in 1946 and in 1947 all contained not only the attempt to close up the loopholes but in addition required that the two-thirds vote be reduced to a majority vote.

And it is my feeling that those who introduced the resolutions were just as anxious then as they are now to reduce the vote from two-thirds to majority as they were to close up the loopholes.

Their resolutions were over-all, inclusive, and attempted to make rule XXII operative by not only closing the loopholes but also they desired to reduce the vote on a cloture petition to end debate on a majority vote.

Therefore, the difference between what is up for consideration this morning and that which has been introduced in resolutions that have been considered by the Rules and Administration Committee in the past simmers down to this one point in issue. I stated it in the beginning and wish to restate it, and I hope the Senate will not get away from this one issue.

Does the Senate want an effective cloture rule or does it not? It is not a question of whether the two-thirds vote shall be reduced to a majority. It is simply this one issue. Does the Senate want an effective cloture rule? And I say that because the decision of Senator VANDENBERG, found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 2, 1948, at page 9602, sums up all the precedents, reasoning, and discussion relative to accomplishing this result.

I quote from that decision:

> There has been no direct ruling upon the specific question whether a motion to take up a bill is subject to cloture. It has been recognized and understood that such is not the case, on the ground that a motion cannot be reasonably construed to be a pending measure within the meaning of the cloture rule.

Certainly that is final. Certainly we have no cloture rule today. That is my opinion, Mr. President.

And, so, as this issue is debated today, it should ever be kept in mind that all the Rules and Administration Committee attempted to do 2 years ago and is attempting to do now is to close up two loopholes, and make rule 22 effective.

One is to apply cloture to a motion as well as a pending measure and the other is to do this regardless of rule 3 or rule 6 of the Senate Rules.

If this can be accomplished, then cloture can be invoked on the subject matter provided two-thirds of the Senate feels that debate should be limited and the subject matter should be brought up for debate and finally for a vote or for a limitation of debate.

WHETHER OR NOT THE RIGHTS OF THE MINORITIES ARE BEING WHITTLED AWAY BY CLOSING UP THESE TWO LOOPHOLES

By considering that this is a first step to accomplish that, it seems to me to be begging the question. Because if the Senate which adopted cloture rule 22 in 1917 meant what they said, they simply meant that at that time the Senate felt that a cloture rule should be or might be invoked when and if the two-thirds of the Senate felt the time had come to limit debate and the loopholes have grown up since that time, such as amending the Journal or the precedents that now have been established by the decisions of Senator VANDENBERG on August 2, 1948, that a cloture petition does not lie on a motion but only on pending legislation. This makes it mandatory that this Senate decide whether or not they want an effective cloture rule or do not want it.

As it stands today we have no effective cloture rule. It can be circumvented by amending the Journal. It cannot be had on the subject matter up for consideration. Therefore rule 22 is nullified.

As the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules and Administration and as one who had this under consideration for the past 2 years, it is my opinion that the Senate and not a Presiding Officer should make the decision as to whether or not a cloture rule should be one of the rules of the Senate. The Senate alone should make that decision and not the presiding officer through an appeal.

The precedents that have been established have been precedents that have been laid down by rulings of Presiding Officers and not precedents that have been established by the vote of the Senate itself.

For that reason, more than ever, we should not rely on technical proceedings involving the Chair in decision after decision that might change the precedents. The Senate should literally take the bull by the horns and make its own decisions and decide now whether or not it wants an effective cloture rule. That can be decided here by a vote and by debate. If two-thirds of the Senate feel it should have such a rule, it should be adopted. If two-thirds feel it should not be a rule, we should wipe rule 22 off the books and proceed without any cloture rule at all.

Mr. President, I agreed to yield first to the Senator from Connecticut for a question.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, the question is this. In order properly to put the question I may seem to be violating the rule that I can rise only to ask a question, but the question does require somewhat of a previous statement. I notice in the hearings of the committee, and I remember from the history of my own State, that on one occasion the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, Frank B. Brandegee, raised a very interesting point in connection with cloture, and I quote from him briefly—

> So I say that this—
>
> Meaning the Senate—
>
> is the forum of the States. This is a federated government, in which the States reserved the right of equal suffrage in the Senate of the United States, and made that the only provision of the Constitution which never should be subject to amendment.

And that clause of article V does indeed provide that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

I now ask the Senator from Nebraska, what is the answer to the question: Does the proposed cloture rule deny the States the equal right of suffrage in the Senate? Is there any way that it impinges upon that right?

Mr. WHERRY. I will say to the Senator from Connecticut that I do not think it does. Cloture has been invoked four times. In the times it was successfully invoked, if I remember correctly, the smallest number of Senators voting was 85, and the greatest number of Senators voting was 94. I believe when a vote was taken on the question cloture was not invoked seven times. On four of those seven occasions the number of Senators voting was from 70 to 82. On the other three occasions the number was slightly greater. I believe every State of the Union was represented by Senators who voted on the question of cloture, when that question came to a vote. Each State was represented in the vote. Therefore I contend that the people of all the States were represented in such votes.

Mr. BALDWIN. I may say that I am very sympathetic with, tremendously interested in, and inclined to favor, the proposed change in the rule. But is it fair to say that this particular change in the rules applies equally to all the States?

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, yes.

Mr. BALDWIN. So it does not deprive one State or another of the same opportunity on the floor of the Senate. Every State is subject to the same rule.

Mr. WHERRY. That is absolutely correct. I thank the Senator for bringing up the point.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the Senator a question relating to the point which was raised earlier regarding the possibility that either the present Presiding Officer or a future Presiding Officer might reverse the precedents of the Senate. Is it not the opinion of the Senator from Nebraska that even if a subsequent ruling should reverse the prior precedents of the Senate, it would still be desirable to amend the rules and close these loopholes?

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with the Senator. That is one of the things for which I have been pleading. Ninety-six Senators ought to make the rules. I am not saying that the Presiding Officer might not be just as forceful. However, instead of having a difficult situation, with the decision to be made by the Presiding Officer, the Senate itself should make the rules.

I do not know how the Senator from Michigan felt about the appeal from his decision, but I got the impression from what he said when he made his decision that he would like to have the Senate vote on the question, rather than be obliged to make the decision himself, for the very reason which the Senator from California has suggested. We are the ones who should make the rules.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, around the world America stands today as the last sanctuary of human decency and freedom. It must be obvious to all Americans why we still stand against the forces of tyranny and degradation as a free and sovereign people.

It is because we have always been jealous to defend and protect our magnificent American traditions and those Christian principles of decency, justice, and human liberty in which our American traditions are rooted.

Therefore during the recent anniversary of that great statesman, soldier, and patriot, our first American President, we have acted wisely in recalling once more the profound wisdom which arises ever new in each succeeding generation from Washington's magnificent Farewell Address.

There is one particular admonition contained therein to which I want to call the attention of my colleagues during these dangerous and trying days. This warning, which runs throughout George Washington's final counseling with his fellow countrymen, is pointed up in the following words:

> Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence * * * the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government.
>
> But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it.
>
> Excessive partiality for one foreign nation, and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other.
>
> Real patriots who may resist the intrigues of the favorite are liable to become suspected and odious, while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people to surrender their interest.

In keeping with the spirit of this magnificent advice I want to present a very brief account of exactly what has been happening for the past 3½ years following the end of the war, because this administration has completely forsaken George Washington's counsel.

I refer to the outrageous Morgenthau plan, which calls for the destruction of the German-speaking peoples in central Europe, a plan which is still the basic policy of this Government, a plan which continues to operate because the vicious and perverted minds of the hate artists in this country have suppressed the real truth and immediately attack anyone who demands that America repudiate this policy of vengeance—a plan which plays directly into the hands of the Communists all over the world, a plan which betrays American interests and principles—indeed, our whole Christian heritage—and a plan which, while it is peddled to the American people as a great boon and blessing, actually impoverishes and exploits our country, for the benefit of others who seek to destroy us.

Mr. President, I hope that every Senator on the Democratic side of the aisle who is now advocating the continuation of the Marshall plan and the giving away of more billions of the taxpayers' money will listen carefully to the two succeeding pages.

As conclusive proof of the impartial basis of fact upon which these charges rest, I want to present the following objective analysis of the way in which we, the American people, are being exploited to further the destruction of our own vital interests, by those who claim to be serving our interests and strengthening our security by following this senseless policy of destruction.

Mr. President, what would George Washington think of the following impartial picture of how we are being betrayed, which shows the direct consequences on the economy of Europe of the deliberate American policy of destroying German industry?

These facts, while they deal with Italy and Denmark exclusively, give a grim picture of how the other European countries are also directly affected.

Mr. President, the following facts indicate that the value of the food lost to Germany from Italy, and manufactured articles lost to Italy, as a result of our planned destruction of German industrial plants, is costing American taxpayers an estimated $100,000,000 a year.

In 1936, commonly used as a standard for the proper level of industry in Germany, she imported 400,000 tons of food from Italy, valued at $27,290,000. At today's values, this would be worth at least $55,000,000. Now after 3 years of military government, Bizonia imported from Italy for the first 8 months of 1948, goods, all goods including food, valued at $6,917,000, or at the rate of about $10,000,000 annually. Since western Germany is the big food-deficit section, it is reasonable to assume that all Germany would not import much more, possibly 50 percent more, or, for all Germany, $15,000,000 against a 1936 tonnage which would be worth $55,000,000. That leaves a food deficit of $40,000,000, a large part of which must be supplied from the United States.

But that is only half the story. In 1936 Germany exported to Italy 420,000 tons of manufactured articles valued at $50,000,000. That today, especially if replaced in the United States, is equal to a minimum of $100,000,000. I ask any Senator who voted for the Marshall plan the following question: Against this, what is Germany supplying Italy today under the military government regime? For the first 8 months of 1948, total exports from bizonal Germany to Italy, almost entirely coal, amounted to only $12,867,000. For 12 months that would be some $20,000,000, and one might add another $5,000,000 in order to compare it properly with prewar Germany. Thus, total exports are running at the rate of about $25,000,000 a year, against a volume for 1936 equal to over a hundred million dollars just for manufactured goods. Thus, the total exports are running at the rate of about $25,000,000 a year, against a volume in 1936 equal to over $100,000,000 for manufactured articles alone. The difference—$75,000,000—represents Italy's deficit in manufactured goods due solely to the destruction of the German industrial machine. The threats to Italy's standard of living and its political repercussions were largely responsible for the Marshall plan. In the first year's allocations, ECA is giving to Italy, at the expense of the American taxpayers, industrial goods worth $59,300,000, made in America, in place of what Italy formerly bought from Germany and paid for. Italy used to pay for that which she now is receiving at the expense of the American taxpayers.

Moreover, Italy gets $82,400,000 worth of coal from the dwindling coal supplies of the United States of America. How closely this allocation of industrial machinery replaces German exports may be shown even in individual items. Under ECA, $1,700,000 is allocated for agricultural machinery, as against $800,000 supplied by Germany. In electrical equipment, under ECA, $7,000,000 is allocated, as against Germany's $5,336,000. In chemicals, under ECA, $10,000,000 is given, as against Germany's $7,800,000.

But, Mr. President, at the same time we are furnishing Italy the means to increase her production we are engaged in ruining her best customer for the surplus, namely, Germany. Eighty percent of the food furnished Germany by Italy—more than 300,000 tons—was made up of perishable fruits and vegetables. When these seasonal perishables are available for export—oranges, tangerines, lemons, and so forth—the domestic consumption has already reached the saturation point, beyond which the people will not and cannot eat such foods. People cannot live solely on oranges or cauliflower. Unless the surplus can be exported, it largely becomes sheer waste.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I yield for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. Can the Senator tell me what the calorie intake of the German population is at the present time?

Mr. LANGER. It is less than 2,000 calories.

Mr. EASTLAND. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. LANGER. I yield for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is there any starvation in Germany at the present time?

Mr. LANGER. There is, especially in the part which contains the so-called Sudetenland, and also among the 15,000,000 expellees who came from the neighboring countries when Stalin entered them. The result was that 15,000,000 of those persons went into the American, British, and French zones of western Germany. Some 5,000,000 of those persons are dead. The remaining 10,000,000, the reports show, are in a starving condition.

Mr. EASTLAND. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Why was it that the Displaced Persons Commission did not approve the entry of some of those persons into the United States, as provided under the Displaced Persons Act which the Congress passed last year?

Mr. LANGER. I had quite a consultation, lasting several hours, with Mr. Carusi and Mr. O'Connor, of the Displaced Persons Commission. They maintain that under section 12 of the Displaced Persons Act they have no jurisdiction whatsoever so far as expellees are concerned; they maintain that that is entirely a matter for the Department of State.

I then took up the question with the Department of State, and I quoted some letters written by some of the Department's legal counsel. Their legal staff had written that under the IRO constitution, persons from the Sudetenland are not included. However, the Department of State later wrote me a letter stating that those persons are included. But at the present time, very few, if any, of those persons have come to the United States under the Displaced Persons Act.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I am interested in the Senator's statement relative to the Displaced Persons Commission's saying that such persons are not eligible to enter the United States under that act.

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. EASTLAND. Did not the Senator's amendment provide that they should be admitted to this country under that act?

Mr. LANGER. I certainly thought that section 12 of the act permitted them to enter, because I used the same language which was used in the IRO Constitution—namely, "Germans of ethnic origin." Frankly, I cannot agree at all with the Department of State, which has been excluding them.

Mr. EASTLAND. Will the Senator kindly tell me the reasons the State Department had and the reasons Mr. Carusi had for taking that position?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. Carusi maintained that he was entirely helpless, and that under section 12 the State Department was directed to take care of the expellees. On the other hand, the State Department gave the reason that there is no legal definition of "Germans of ethnic origin."

Mr. EASTLAND. He could not read the English language; is that the case?

Mr. LANGER. I do not know whether he could read the English language or not, but that is the excuse they gave.

Mr. EASTLAND. Do I correctly understand from the Senator that no persons of German ethnic origin who were expelled from areas now behind the iron curtain have been admitted to this country under that act, even though Congress authorized their admission?

Mr. LANGER. Very few, if any, have been admitted.

Mr. EASTLAND. If I correctly understand the Senator—if he will yield for another question——

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I understand that even though the United States Congress ordered it, Mr. Carusi and certain officials of the State Department have refused to carry out the mandates of that act.

Mr. LANGER. That is exactly correct, except that Mr. Carusi claims he has no jurisdiction, and that the matter is one for the State Department to handle, and that he and the other two members of the Displaced Persons Commission are helpless.

At the present time the Department of State is looking around for a defense.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it the Senator's opinion that the will of Congress is being flouted by Mr. Carusi?

Mr. LANGER. Not by Mr. Carusi, but by the Department of State, because section 12 directs that 27,000 of those persons immediately be brought to this country.

Mr. EASTLAND. Can the Senator tell me the population of the three western zones of Germany before the war?

Mr. LANGER. About 80,000,000.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is, of all Germans?

Mr. LANGER. Yes. Later that was increased somewhat; but in the American and British zones today the population is larger by some 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 than it was before the war.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it not 12,000,000?

Mr. LANGER. It is at least 5,000,000 or 6,000,000. The 12,000,000 figure includes the population of the French zone.

Mr. EASTLAND. Can the Senator tell me whether the three western zones of Germany before the war produced about 60 percent of their food requirements?

Mr. LANGER. They produced 80 percent.

Mr. EASTLAND. That was the case for all of Germany?

Mr. LANGER. No; the three western zones of Germany produced 80 percent of all the food that Germany produced.

Mr. EASTLAND. Today, with five or six million more persons, as the Senator has said—or, in reality, I think the records will show that there are 12,000,000 more persons there—and with a tremendous shortage of fertilizer, and with the land being depleted of humus matter and plant food, can the Senator tell me about what percentage of their food requirements those persons are able to produce at this time?

Mr. LANGER. I regret that I cannot do so, but I know it is much lower than it was before the war.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. LANGER. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator realizes that Germany is primarily an industrial nation, and must export industrial materials, and must use the funds thus obtained to buy food, on the basis of dollar exchange or sterling exchange or whatever may be the monetary unit applying to the funds thus received for the industrial goods manufactured in Germany. Will the Senator state the postwar standard of living of the people if they are held to the industrial level of 1936, when at this time there are living there several million more people than lived there before the war?

Mr. LANGER. There could be only one result if that situation continues, and that is starvation and more suffering.

Mr. EASTLAND. The effect would be to starve the people.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. Will the Senator not say it is more gruesome than that? People are not going to starve, with Russia and communism standing by with welcoming arms to take them behind the iron curtain.

Mr. LANGER. Of course. There can be no doubt of the fact that if this situation continues, the German people who are there will embrace communism.

Mr. EASTLAND. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. If the German people should embrace communism, does not the Senator believe that if Germany were Communist all Europe would go Communist?

Mr. LANGER. There is not the least doubt of it in my mind.

Mr. EASTLAND. In fact, is it not the Senator's opinion that the battle for Germany is the battle for the European economy?

Mr. LANGER. I think that is stated exactly right.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it the Senator's opinion France could defend herself?

Mr. LANGER. France could not defend herself, in the opinion of the military experts with whom I have discussed the matter.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. If Europe were Communist, the United States, in the light of what reasonably may happen on the Asiatic continent, would be isolated, would she not?

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. Then the only choice we would have would be to fight; is that correct?

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does not the Senator think the policy of holding a great people to the industrial level of 1936, when their standard of living was not so

high, at a time when there were millions more mouths to feed, is brutal and inhumane?

Mr. LANGER. I agree that that is true, and I do not think words are strong enough to express it.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does not the Senator feel that our Government, in pursuing such policies, sacrifices the best interests of the American people?

Mr. LANGER. There can be no doubt about it.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does not the Senator believe that American blood at some time must pay for blunders in our foreign policy at the present time?

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question, if the Senator from Mississippi is through?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to correct what the Senator has said, as it seems to me. Perhaps I misunderstood him. The Senator has said the State Department and the Immigration Department are not living up to the terms of the Displaced Persons Act.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not true that in the immigration report, Mr. Carusi, the Displaced Persons Commissioner, said the terms of the act make it practically impossible to carry it out?

Mr. LANGER. No. The Commission said they had nothing to do with section 12, referring to the so-called expellees, that that was solely a matter within the jurisdiction of the State Department.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. But the feeling is that the law must be amended, in order that we may really bring in the people we want to bring in under the terms of the act. Is that not true?

Mr. LANGER. If we are to bring in more than the 13,500 expellees, that would simply be necessary.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Will the Senator please explain how it would be possible to express a thought clearer in the English language than the Senate expressed it in section 12 when we authorized the admission of expellees to this country?

Mr. LANGER. In my opinion, the language could not be more explicit.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I could not hear what the Senator said. Will he kindly repeat it?

Mr. LANGER. In section 12 the Department of State is directed immediately to open the quotas to Germany and Austria, which would be 27,000 a year, and it was further directed immediately to make one-half of those available to the so-called Volksdeutsche, or expellees.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. But only under the terms of the Displaced Persons Act; am I not correct in that?

Mr. LANGER. It amended the immigration law.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator said "under the terms of the Displaced Persons Act." What are those terms? I do not understand.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand, the person to be admitted must be assured a home, he must have an occupation, and so on.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator did not understand those terms to apply to expellees; did he?

Mr. LANGER. They do not apply.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I did not understand they do not apply.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts, for so long as he is involved, we southerners will not be accused of engaging in a filibuster. If I understand the Senator correctly, Mr. Carusi takes the position that the Displaced Persons Commission has nothing to do with the admittance of expellees. Is that correct?

Mr. LANGER. That is exactly correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. He takes the position they should receive a visa from the State Department in the regular course; is that correct?

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. President, the threat to Italy's standard of living and its political repercussions were largely responsible for the Marshall plan, under which in the first years' allocation ECA is giving Italy industrial goods worth $59,300,000, made in America, in place of what she formerly bought from Germany and paid for. That is, Italy used to pay Germany the $59,300,000. Now, instead of doing that, the taxpayers of the United States pay the $59,300,000. Furthermore, Italy gets $82,400,000 worth of coal from our dwindling coal supplies.

How closely this allocation of industrial machinery replaces Germany's exports may be shown even in individual items. Under ECA $1,700,000 is allocated for agricultural machinery against $800,000 supplied by Germany. In electrical equipment, ECA $7,000,000 against Germany's $5,336,000, in chemicals ECA $10,000,000 against Germany's $7,800,000.

But at the same time that we are furnishing Italy the means to increase her production, we are engaged in ruining her best customer for this surplus, Germany. Eighty percent of the food furnished Germany by Italy, more than 300,000 tons, were perishable fruits and vegetables. When these seasonal perishables are available for export, oranges, tangerines, lemons, vegetables, and so forth, the domestic consumption has already reached a saturation point, beyond which people cannot and will not eat. People cannot live solely on oranges or cauliflower. Unless this surplus can be exported it becomes largely sheer waste.

A surplus fruit and vegetable region in north Africa, strikingly similar to Italy, faced with the loss of exports, has reduced its production drastically, changing, in one season, from a territory which exported hundreds of thousands of tons of food, into a region not raising enough vegetables even for local consumption.

On the other hand, no such control can be exercised over fruits such as oranges.

In Italy and Sicily oranges were going begging in 1944 because the central European countries were cut off. We face a similar condition now with Germany out of the market in large measure. Such a situation permits England to buy the Sicilian orange and lemon crop for prices ruinous to the producers, principally because German demand is cut off. So when we keep Germany down we are injuring much of the rural economy of Italy and creating the very dissatisfaction which the Marshall plan set out to correct.

All these things hold true of a country like Denmark, on the other side of the Continent. In 1936 Germany imported from Denmark food alone valued at $42,000,000, worth today at least $85,000,000. Under the military government administration of western Germany all imports from Denmark, not only food, are running at the rate of only $3,000,000 annually. That deficit of more than $80,000,000 is made up by the United States, or in a reduced German diet and resulting reduced production. To make myself clear, let me say that before we entered upon this program Denmark sent to Germany $85,000,000 worth of food. Today she sends only $3,000,000 worth, and the American taxpayer is paying the difference.

But this is the other half of the picture. German exports merely of manufactured goods were valued at $51,000,000, which in today's values would be some $100,000,000. What is bizonia doing now under military government? For the first 8 months of 1948 total exports, including coal, amounted to $14,558,000, which for 1 year would be equivalent to about $10,000,000. Subtracting the value of the coal, it leaves $6,600,000. To make it comparable to the above figures for the whole of Germany, we might add about 50 percent to this figure, arriving at an outside figure of $15,000,000, leaving $85,000,000 as Denmark's deficit in manufactured goods, which she formerly obtained from Germany.

Again ECA has come to the rescue, allocating Denmark $47,800,000 of manufactured goods from America.

The German shortage in food and the Danish shortage in manufactured articles add up to a figure well over a hundred million dollars which America is asked to give as a bonus to those who have so skillfully destroyed the industrial potential of Germany. This is merely to handle the deficit in the interchange between Germany and a little country of 4,000,000 people.

Of course, production in Denmark follows the usual economic laws and declines. It gives Great Britain a chance to buy more. But this itself presents a critical problem for Danish producers. In the year 1937, for example, Germany

imported 206,503 tons of food from Denmark against 357,113 tons imported by Britain. The loss of this huge German market has a serious effect on farmer's prices and consequently on Danish food production. The British were the principal buyers of Danish surplus foods. Eliminate one large buyer and it more or less puts the producer at the mercy of the other. The farmers have only one answer to this—reduce production. And again the United States makes up the difference, not only for Germany but for many other European countries.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I should like to finish my statement, first. Then I shall be glad to yield.

On the other hand, Danish businessmen point out that now they have to pay more for everything that goes into production. England's prices, even before the war, were commonly higher. Now with her principal competitor gone, she can charge all that the market will stand. So Denmark is getting the short end two ways. She has to pay higher prices and even then is not able to get the manufactured articles that she needs.

For more than 3 years now, leading European economists, studying the situation in Germany, have been pointing out that the destruction of Germany's production would drastically reduce the standard of living of most of the European countries. We are proving they are right when we appropriate the ECA billions as a gift to a Europe whose reduced living standards invite communism.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at that point?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator spoke of the way Germany and Denmark have been affected. Does the Senator realize how the United States has also been affected?

Mr. LANGER. Certainly.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator realize that our own country has sold more farm products to Germany than we have sold to Latin America of both industrial and agricultural products combined?

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. And it is very necessary that we have greater production and economy on American farms. Does the Senator agree with that statement?

Mr. LANGER. There can be no doubt about that.

These facts have covered only two countries of Europe. Between them and Germany they are presenting a bill, just for 1 year, of $200,000,000. It is an outrageous penalty that we are paying for the privilege of seeing Germany and the German peacetime production potential reduced to its present state.

By pushing coal exports and drastically reducing the export of manufactured articles, we are magnifying enormously Germany's foremost problem of getting foreign exchange to meet her dire need for food and raw materials. If we compare the present with 1936, this is clearly brought out.

I hope the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, interested as he is in agriculture, will listen carefully to this, and I hope that every other Senator upon the floor, and those who are in favor of the Marshall plan, will also listen carefully.

In 1936 a ton of manufactured articles shipped to Italy averaged $119 a ton compared with $3.70 for a ton of coal. Germany obtained from Italy 32 times as much for a ton of manufactured goods as for a ton of coal. On exports to Denmark she got 34 times as much.

But this is nothing to many of the great export items for which Germany was world famous. German skilled craftsmen took coal, worth for export to Denmark only $3.58 per ton, and iron plates worth $88 a ton and, out of these materials, made machine tools for Denmark worth $818 a ton, electrical machinery worth $1,439, precision and optical instruments worth $3,608, hardware worth $245 a ton, and watches and clocks worth $2,157 a ton.

In 1936, of these five items alone, she exported to Denmark 17,878 tons worth $8,167,800 with which she bought her high protein foods. The same amount of coal would have given her $64,100, not even one-hundredth as much.

This same thing is going on with all countries from which Germany got her food supply. These same five items which were exported to Italy in 1936, bought food worth $14,568,000. The same number of tons of coal brought $123,757, again less than a hundredth as much. These items would have paid for 200,000 tons of food. The coal would have paid for less than 2,000.

Mr. President, these facts alone are sufficient to prove the economic insanity that underlies our outrageous policy toward these defeated peoples. There is no quicker way in the world to spread a festering cancer in the heart of Europe than to continue to ignore the desperate need for a complete about-face in our German policy.

Not only is this economic insanity undermining the whole social structure of central Europe, not only is it contributing directly to permanent unemployment and unrest, but it is also playing directly into the hands of the Communists who are directing their assault on these United States from the Politburo in Moscow.

The following figures ought to be sufficient to silence those who continue to demand that we go through with this savage, senseless policy because we have made agreements which must be honored. These agreements, Mr. President, which have been deliberately removed from the jurisdiction of the Congress of the United States, now amount to nothing less than a criminal betrayal of our national security, a criminal betrayal which borders on treason.

Oh, how I wish, Mr. President, that every GI, every veteran, could know those figures and realize how America has been betrayed.

Recent figures released by the British themselves in Berlin reveal that of the 598,000 tons of machinery and other equipment which has been dismantled in the British zone, 162,896 tons have been shipped to Russia, 18,618 tons have been shipped to Czechoslovakia, 45,135 tons have been shipped to Yugoslavia, and 2,799 tons have been shipped to Albania.

Oh, yes; our Department of State is fighting Russia, but the Secretary sat in the Committee on Foreign Relations without lifting his voice and said that 162,896 tons have been shipped to Russia!

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at that point?

Mr. LANGER. Let me complete this thought, and then I shall be glad to yield. But, Mr. President, in a special report to the London Times on December 20, 1948, it was revealed that the British are still dismantling and shipping to Russia the Borbeck plant of the Krupp steel works.

The report in the Times reads as follows:

> The Borbeck plant was the most modern steel plant in Europe. It started production in May 1929. In 1945 it was awarded to the Soviet Union. Under the direction of a Russian commission especially stationed in Essen for that purpose, the dismantling was accomplished at the greatest speed by several hundred German workmen. The Berlin blockade and the differences existing between West and East Germany have in no way halted dismantling of this Krupp plant. For many months freight train after freight train, loaded with parts of the plant, has left Essen in the direction of Hamburg, where the equipment was transshipped on Russian ships. The destination in Russia is unknown. A further allocation of Krupp plants by the Interallied Reparations Agency has taken place in favor of Yugoslavia. This country will receive a 15,000-ton steel press, the largest in Europe, from Krupp.

I now yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator have the figures about the dismantling in the French zone?

Mr. LANGER. I have them in my office; I do not have them here.

Mr. EASTLAND. Would the Senator be kind enough to place those figures in the RECORD?

Mr. LANGER. The following figures show what is going on in the French dismantlement program. According to the Allied allocations for the French zone, 84 plants were marked for dismantlement, of these 62 plants have been dismantled, 4 have been sent to Russia, 58 have been delivered to the Interallied Reparations Agency and 22 await delivery to specific consignees.

The value of these plants has been determined at the figure of 150 to $200 millions. This figure was based on the 1938 replacement value, less war damage, and less depreciation, which means that the actual value is at least 10 times as great as the figure that has been set by the French.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator understand that the French Government, in the French zone in Germany, are taking title to business and industry?

Mr. LANGER. That is my understanding.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator understand that the French Army stationed there is consuming a large part of the food produced in the French zone?

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator think that there is any justice in the

United States giving hundreds of millions of dollars, under a Marshall aid plan, to France or to any other country, and permitting that country, by unjust means, to beat down the people there, which in the long run will harm the United States?

Mr. LANGER. It is bound to harm the United States.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator think we should place strings on the Marshall plan aid which we give France, and make them follow a more humane policy in regard to their zone in Germany?

Mr. LANGER. It is my belief that the United States should be withholding money from any country pursuing that sort of policy over those they have conquered.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator think the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations should go into those questions?

Mr. LANGER. I do. They should go into them very carefully, and I have not the least doubt they will, under the leadership of the able and distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], who is chairman of that committee.

On top of all of these facts, Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the Members of the Senate, of the American people, and particularly the American farmers, to what is happening to the agricultural resources of central Europe as a result of the criminal deforestration program that is being carried on both by the British and the French, supported by the American taxpayers' dollars. It is a fact that Great Britain owns or controls 27 percent of the world's forests and timber reserves. It is also a fact that in the whole of Germany there is only fourtenths of 1 percent of the world's forest reserves. Yet since the end of the war, this vicious deforestation program is making a mockery of all the claims that Germany can become a self-supporting agrarian people.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand five pictures of the tragic consequences which are following this deforestation program. I call the attention of my colleagues to the erosion in the Luneburger Heide in Germany, in the British zone, which is destroying the fertility of the soil upon which the German people are more absolutely dependent than ever before in their history.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. On how many acres have trees been cut too closely in Germany?

Mr. LANGER. I have the figures here, and in a moment will give the Senator the information.

The following figures reveal how far this deforestation program has gone when we realize that these figures are based on 100 as the base figure of the timber cutting program of 1936:

	1946	1947	1948
United States zone	169	201	188
British	405	368	227
Total bizone	225	248	199
The French zone	181	293	379

100=1936 100 percent index.

Mr. President, how could facts more conclusively prove that this senseless policy, this Morgenthau plan, this scorched-earth madness, this pro-Communist betrayal of America's principles and security, is the direct consequence of our having forsaken George Washington's warning that foreign alien interests and influence are the greatest foes of republican government and that—

> Excessive partiality for one foreign nation, and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other.

And now, Mr. President, this senseless policy of destruction and vengeance has led us into an impasse where these outrageous facts finally are being recognized for what they are.

On February 17, 1949, Mr. Stewart Alsop revealed in the Washington Post that the question of what constitutes the real objectives of American policy in Germany has now become the most significant and crucial issue before us. Mr. Alsop further revealed that—

> It is highly significant that at long last the United States Government is now making a serious effort to find an agreed and intelligent answer.
>
> An attempt is now being made to draft a whole series of agreed policy papers dealing with all aspects of American policy in Germany. The preliminary drafting is being done by a four-man committee, which is now quietly meeting two or three times a week in the State Department.
>
> Chairman of this committee is George Kennan, brilliant chief of State Department planners. Richard M. Bissell, able deputy ECA Administrator speaks for the ECA, which has a vital interest in the German problem. Robert Blum, special assistant to Secretary of Defense Forrestal, represents Forrestal and the Defense Department. The Army and Gen. Lucius Clay, American commander in Germany, are represented by Assistant Secretary of War Tracy Voorhees, who may succeed William Draper as Under Secretary of War and chief Washington spokesman for Clay.

So the Senator will see that at long last the problem is being recognized, but the dismantling is still continuing.

In order to answer the question of the Senator from Mississippi, I refer to figures which I wish to call to his attention. It is my understanding that fourtenths of 1 percent of the world's reserve is held by Germany, against 27 percent held by Great Britain. While I have not the figures as to the number of acres, roughtly three-fourths of the deforestation area is now subject to erosion.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Which country is responsible for that, Great Britain or France?

Mr. LANGER. I blame America for it.

Mr. EASTLAND. Why?

Mr. LANGER. I blame America, together with Great Britain and France, because the committee over there agreed to this policy.

Mr. EASTLAND. Which committee.

Mr. LANGER. The Interallied Committee on Reparations which has charge of all three zones.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does not the Senator think that the matter is of such grave importance that it should be investigated by the Foreign Relations Committee?

Mr. LANGER. Yes, I do; and I do not have the least doubt that the committee will investigate it. Governor La Follette has just returned from Germany. He was in New York last week and there addressed 150 of the leading men in New York City. I understand he is on his way to Washington, and intends to appear before the Foreign Relations Committee and to give that committee a full and complete report of what is going on in Germany.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. What became of the timber that was cut from the land?

Mr. LANGER. Most of it was shipped out of the country.

Mr. EASTLAND. Shipped to other countries?

Mr. LANGER. Shipped to other countries.

Mr. EASTLAND. Was it done in order to use the proceeds to buy food for Germans?

Mr. LANGER. I do not know why the timber was shipped away. It was simply taken as dismantled plants have been taken.

Mr. EASTLAND. Am I to understand from the Senator that three-fourths of the forest lands are in the condition as shown by the pictures exhibited by the Senator?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator does not mean three-fourths of all the land in Germany?

Mr. LANGER. No. Germany has four-tenths of 1 percent in forest reserves, and of that three-fourths is as represented by the pictures.

These four men will not, of course, make German policy independently. The policy papers they draft will be referred back to the organizations and individuals they represent, including General Clay. Moreover, each preliminary paper will be sifted through another higher committee. This committee consists of Secretary of State Acheson, as chairman; ECA Chief Paul Hoffman; and Secretary of War Royall. If Acheson's committee approves a paper, it will be referred in turn to the National Security Council and the President for final decision.

What this means is simply that the period of improvising policy in Germany is coming to an end.

Mr. President, welcome as these new developments are to every American who is interested in decency and justice, it would be tragic indeed if the policies of the past, in the formulation of which the United States Senate has been ignored, should be continued. I believe the time has come when the Congress of the United States, rather than leaving the future to chance, as we have left the past, ought to stand up on its own feet and put an end once and for all to this senseless, outrageous policy of destroying not only the peacetime industrial potential

but the agricultural resources of the German-speaking peoples as well.

Mr. President, I now yield the floor.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. LUCAS to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 15, amending the so-called cloture rule of the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I dislike to suggest the absence of a quorum, but if it is proposed that the Senate continue the present debate, I shall feel obliged to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia suggests the absence of a quorum. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ives	Murray
Anderson	Jenner	Myers
Baldwin	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Brewster	Johnson, Tex.	O'Conor
Bricker	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Broughton	Kefauver	Pepper
Butler	Kem	Reed
Cain	Kerr	Robertson
Chavez	Kilgore	Russell
Connally	Knowland	Saltonstall
Cordon	Langer	Schoeppel
Donnell	Lodge	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Long	Smith, N. J.
Downey	Lucas	Sparkman
Eastland	McCarran	Stennis
Ecton	McCarthy	Taft
Ellender	McClellan	Taylor
Flanders	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Fulbright	McGrath	Thye
George	McKellar	Tobey
Gillette	Magnuson	Tydings
Hayden	Malone	Vandenberg
Hendrickson	Martin	Watkins
Hill	Maybank	Wherry
Hoey	Miller	Wiley
Holland	Millikin	Williams
Humphrey	Morse	Withers
Hunt	Mundt	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not know how long the majority leader wishes to hold the Senate in session tonight. I dislike to speak at this late hour, although I do not intend to discuss this question at great length at this time.

Mr. President, I think this is a memorable debate. Of that I have not the slightest doubt. No one has the capacity to look very far into the future; but the issues here raised and the methods here adopted are bound to have repercussions hereafter. It is simply inevitable. Immediately the work of the Congress is slowed down, because it is impossible to attend committee hearings and to conclude committee hearings which are in their final stages, and also meet the demand to be present on the floor at all times. So, Mr. President, I am conscious of the fact that this is a memorable debate. No man can quite see at this time the results which may flow from it.

I wish to begin my address with a further statement. In my judgment the ordinary rules of parliamentary procedure do not and should not apply in the Senate of the United States. I know that the Senate is a legislative body in part. I know that it must handle legislative matters which come from the House, or which originate here and go to the House. But the Senate is a distinct institution within itself, a continuing body, only one-third of the membership of the Senate being elected every 2 years. It is not a body which expires. Its primary function is not legislation in the strict sense. Its primary and main function, indeed, in certain important matters, partakes of the nature of conference and negotiation between sovereignties.

Be it remembered, Mr. President, that the Federal Government did not create the States. On the contrary, the States created the Federal Government. They gave it all the power it has, except such power as has subsequently been given by the people under amendments to the Constitution, or certain powers which perhaps have resulted, let us say, from unavoidable decisions of the courts of the land.

Not only is the Senate a continuing body, but under the Constitution the Senate is to be composed of an equal number of Senators—two—from each State, wholly without regard to the population of the State, wholly without regard to the ratio of the population of the State to the total population of all the States. Not only is that so, but under the Constitution no State can be deprived of its equal representation in the Senate, save by its own consent—not by a two-thirds vote, not by the majority that is always infallible, in the judgment of many of our good friends here; but no State can be deprived of equal representation in the Senate, save by its own consent. In other words, the Constitution cannot even be amended—short of a revolution—in regard to that provision which gives to the Senate a distinct character.

Now let us suppose, if we can do so, that before the formation of the Constitution the several States which formed the Union had met in conference to decide some important matter affecting all of them, and let us suppose that someone had suggested a limitation on debate. How long would that conference have lasted under those circumstances? The representatives of those States would have marched away, and there would have been a dissolution of the whole effort to reach any agreement whatever.

Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] that Senator Frank Brandegee, a Senator from Connecticut from 1905 to 1924, in a debate in the Senate some years ago very nearly covered this whole case when he made this statement:

> Mr. President, I look at this right of debate not as a right, much less a privilege, which we are conferring upon ourselves as a matter of favor. I look upon it as a right which attaches to the sovereign States of this Union, each of which is represented here by two Senators, and whose sole method of putting its case before the people of the United States and before this body is through the voice of its two Senators.
>
> So I say that this is the forum of the States. This is a federated Government, in which the States reserved the right of equal suffrage in the Senate of the United States, and made that the only provision of the Constitution which never should be subject to amendment.

Yet, Mr. President, Senators here debate whether we should adopt a rule which will shut off debate by a so-called constitutional majority or by an actual majority and before this debate ends, the Senate will have an opportunity, no doubt, to vote upon such a proposal. If we begin the whittling-away process, we may be certain that we shall whittle away the substance of the rights of the States in a federated union with respect to many of their most important functions and powers.

Mr. President, our Constitution is a direct limitation on the power of the majority. If there was anything the framers of the Constitution really understood, if there was any principle ever practiced by government anywhere which they thoroughly despised, it was the doctrine of absolutism. We can have absolutism in a legislative body; we can bring about an absolutism in the Congress, if by a gag rule and by whittling away the rights of the representatives of the States to be here heard and here make themselves felt, we reduce this body to the level of a simple legislative body, with no power except that of a simple legislative body and without any necessity to do so, because there are only 96 Senators, and that is not an unreasonably large number to confer together and to debate at great length on any subject of importance.

Senate Resolution 15 is a grant of power. It is a grant of power to stop debate or to foreclose resistance so as to bring before this body any measure the proponents of which wish to bring before it. Of course we must assume, as has been said by a distinguished Senator on a previous occasion when the amendment of the rules of the Senate was under consideration, that a grant of power will be used. It may be used many times without doing harm. It may be used many times in such a way as not to result in unnecessary harm to the freedom of full debate. But it may be used on occasion in a way to do a great deal of harm. If we grant the power, we assume its use; and ultimately it will be used, and ultimately it will also be used to perpetrate a great wrong.

But it is said, "Why cannot the majority here bring any subject before the Senate"—any measure that is on the Senate's calendar, of course—"and have it heard"? Why, Mr. President? Because the smallest State in this Union has an equal place in this body; of right it is here, and of right it can say what it wishes to say, at least if it can make its voice heard in accordance with such rules as the Senate itself has lived under for almost a century and a half, with but few particular exceptions, and they arising out of special circumstances.

We cannot close our eyes to what this motion means. This proposed grant of power affects a series of bills which have been proposed by group interests and have entered into the politics of this country, to the enactment of which the political parties have pledged themselves. Therefore, Mr. President, when the curtain which shadows the driving power behind this proposal to grant power over the minority of the States represented in this body is so transparent, we have a right to look behind it and see the power that is sought to be conveyed.

Mr. President, I do not favor cloture in the Senate of the United States; I do not favor the closing of debate in the Senate, but I can conceive—indeed, I know—that unlimited and abused privileges of debate often result in very great hardship to Senators, and, of course, in some hurt, in public opinion, to the Senate and its reputation. I understand that, and yet I undertake to say that I am entirely justified in filibustering against—and I have never made any lengthy speeches in this body; I do not now intend to do so—and in speaking at length and voting against a proposal to close debate on the merits of a question, if that question is so revolutionary as to shock the sensibilities of a decent Senator. In that event any Senator is justified in resisting every effort to bring such a question before the body.

What proposed legislation would be affected? One is a proposal to abolish the poll tax, in the teeth of the textual provisions of article II of the American Constitution. No political party can bind any honorable man to vote for a measure which he conscientiously believes to be contrary to the Constitution of his country. There must be majority cloture, or something closely approaching it, in order to push through the poll-tax measure, the poll tax having disappeared in all but six States, as I recall, and it is on its way out even in those States. Yet the power the Senate is asked to exercise is textually in the very teeth of the American Constitution, in the second paragraph following the preamble where the standard is fixed. It is not so much a matter of States' rights nor reserved rights; it is a matter of an express provision in the Constitution which fixes the standard for voting qualifications for representatives in the Congress. Likewise, subsequently, in the seventeenth amendment, in the same identical language, with respect to the election by the people of Senators the same standard is fixed, namely the standard adopted in each State for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. May a Senator who is conscious that that is a constitutional provision not say he has a right to resist the bringing forward of a proposal which would fly in the face of the Constitution?

What is the next? Antilynching legislation. With all the vigor of my soul I deplore mob violence in any form; I have stood against it all my life, even when it hurt. But the Federal Government cannot be given power to prevent the commission of crime by mob violence in the States, unless it be asserted that the Federal Government possesses total and absolute police power. Do Senators want to say that? If a man's soul recoils from such a proposition as that, is he not justified in saying that, so long as he can prevent it, it shall not even be submitted to the Congress of the United States for decision, either by a simple majority vote, or a constitutional majority vote. There are some persons in this country—I am sure there are none in the Senate—who would repeal the Bill of Rights by a simple majority, or a constitutional majority, if they had the power to do so, when basically the Bill of Rights is nothing but the assertion by the States themselves, when they created the Federal Government, of the existence and retention and full right of enjoyment of those immemorial rights of freemen which are above all governments, State as well as Federal. Yet there are those who would repeal the Bill of Rights, who would abolish the Declaration made by the representatives of the States in creating the Union itself, or in formulating its Constitution, which subsequently was ratified by the people of the United States as provided in the Constitution.

The States knew and the representatives of the States there present knew that they could trust themselves not to violate the immemorial rights of freemen in America, because they had been respecting those rights—freedom of speech, abstention from the making of any law that would prohibit religion in any form or its free exercise; the denial to the Government of the power to quarter troops in the homes of the humblest citizens in times of peace without their consent; the preservation inviolate of the homes and persons of the freemen in America from unreasonable searches and seizures; and all the rest. Yet there are some who would repeal them, and they would do so by mere majority vote, if they could; I have no doubt about that. They would certainly bring them here and submit them to the Senate and ask the Senate, under a reformed rule of procedure, to exercise its power to cut off debate, and let us have done with this thing. The Constitution is a direct limitation upon the power of government and upon the power of the Congress itself to take away the fundamental rights of the people.

Let us look at another of these so-called civil rights which constitute the things immediately back of this movement for cloture. The American people know what it means. The so-called FEPC bill is another one. There is a plain effort to say to a man, "You shall not select your personal associates nor your business associates." That represents a complete undercutting of the most fundamental liberty the American people have ever enjoyed. As Donald Richberg says, it is like saying to a Christian publishing house issuing tracts and Bibles, "You must employ an atheist to peddle your goods." Every man under the American Constitution has the right to choose his associates, the men and women with whom he will meet and associate daily. Do not say to me, "You are unduly alarmed, and you are overstating it." Within a fortnight an independent judge in the State of Kentucky has said that he would not give sanction to the right of certain petitioners to join social clubs and take membership in golf clubs, because these are rights that each citizen has the power to determine for himself.

So, Mr. President, I have not the slightest doubt, so far as I am concerned, of the absolute unconstitutionality of the so-called anti-poll-tax bill, of the so-called antilynch bill, and of the FEPC bill, if it be carried beyond the mere machinery for the adjustment of differences which may arise in business organization itself. Having no doubt of the unconstitutionality of these measures, I assert my right, as one Senator from a State which has the absolute right of having two Senators in this body and can be deprived of that right only by its own consent, to vote against taking up measures which I feel, beyond peradventure of a doubt, so far as I am concerned, are offensive to the American Constitution. I am, therefore, opposed to amending the rule so as to enable a temporary majority in the Senate, which, under the shifting tides of political emotionalism, if I may use that term, may be a majority today and may be a minority tomorrow. There is no more stability in it than that. The appeal to me that the majority has the right to shut off debate in order to legislate simply does not address itself to my reason and to my judgment.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall vote against any amendment to the rule. I shall vote against it because I am convinced that in this high, deliberative body, when a measure possesses any real merit, there will never be a filibuster against its consideration, and there may or may not be any prolonged debate against final vote upon it. The only instance, in my recollection at least, in which opposition has been raised to the taking up of a measure for consideration is the class of measures which I have been discussing—measures which must address themselves to many of us as being entirely repugnant to the Constitution which we have sworn, with no reservation whatever, to uphold and to defend so far as in our power lies.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I have long been of the opinion that some things in America cannot be settled by legislation. I have long been of the conviction that one of the great fallacies in America is that anything can be settled if only some legislature will pass an act to that effect. That cannot be true. In all proposed legislation which is even akin to the so-called fair employment practice measure, the effort is made to control the judgment, the emotions, the choice, and, if you please, the prejudices of our people. Prejudices may be ugly; they may be regrettable; but they cannot be controlled in that way. If they could be so controlled, the distinguished gentleman whose name once marked the masthead of the prohibition legislation enacted in this country would have controlled them. Mr. Volstead would have ended all question about obedience to the law. Prejudice, desire, wish, and choice would have had nothing to do with it.

That is not comparable with this situation at all, because here is the bald assertion that the American in business and even in his social affairs is not free to choose his associates, the persons with whom he wishes to visit, the persons with whom he wishes to associate, the persons with whom he wishes to carry on his business. I warn the Senate that the real driving force back of FEPC is complete social rights, not merely the right to hold a job in business. Are we to sit here and vote to place a gag in our own mouths at the will of two-thirds or a constitutional majority or a bare majority of Senators on measures of this kind?

The greatest service we could render to these United States would be to make the bold and unqualified declaration that we will not shackle the States which are here represented on the basis of absolute equality, with respect to matters which offend against not merely tradition, but all their cultural institutions and all their deep convictions. That would be what we could say. We should say that, regardless of pressure groups, we would follow that course.

We had read here on the 22d day of this month the Farewell Address of George Washington. Let my colleagues read it, and see if he did not stress, perhaps as his final entreaty and appeal to his countrymen, that they guard against the baneful influences of parties.

Take this step, put the whole head of the camel under the tent, if you will, and you will come to majority rule in the Senate of the United States. That would mean that the political party which had one majority, or two, would be able to do as it pleased, and that at a time when human governments were undergoing rapid and fundamental changes, when civilization indeed was unsteady in every part of the globe. It would mean that a bare majority here, a party majority, whether Democrat or Republican, or some other party which obtained temporary advantage, could stop debate, write the laws, and do much as it pleased. Is that what is desired? Do Senators wish to gamble on that? I do not.

Mr. President, I think I know the drift that has been going on in this country for many years. It is a definite, a certain, a decided and almost irresistible drift toward a larger and larger concentration of power in the Federal Government. Now the desire is to give to the Federal Congress the right to regulate the suffrage of the States. Now it is desired that the Federal Government be given the power to exercise absolute police power within the States. Now some Senators wish to give to the Federal Government the power to say to the men and women of America, "You have not any right to choose your own associates and business partners upon any other basis than the basis which we shall prescribe as a condition for your choice."

Mr. President, I do not fear great corporations. They are often vulnerable, and there are hundreds of agencies operating always to control them. There are influences in America always ready to control them and to prevent finally their doing great harm to America. But if the Federal Government is builded so strong as absolutely to take over the primary and fundamental functions of the State and local governments, if the Federal Government shall step beyond the bounds of the Constitution which undertook originally to limit its power, to properly direct it—if that happens, then there is nothing that can save America from the tyranny so many other people, one time free, have suffered in this world.

Mr. President, here is a proposal to grant the power, and here is the plausible plea, "Why fear taking up in the Senate the measures to which I have referred?" The answer is that these proposals are outrageous. If they are essentially revolutionary, then we have the right to resist the grant of power to muzzle and to manacle the representatives of the States in this body who come here with equal rights, under the guaranty in the common Constitution which makes it impossible, except through revolution, in my opinion, ever to take away the equality of representation in the Senate.

So, Mr. President, we resist. Not only do we resist, but we might as well be perfectly candid about it, and say that what is done here in this debate and at the end of it will have its influence on the politics of America. That is not a threat; I do not make threats. It is a plain declaration of what may be expected.

I, myself, greatly regretted to see my own party, which through a long period in the Nation's history stood for economy and for rigidly honest administration of government, thereby commanding the respect if not the majority vote of the people at the polls—I, myself, have very keenly felt that the very leadership of the party to which so many of us have given allegiance through all the years should take the initiative and undertake to undo that which is vital to so large a part, though it be a minority part, of the United States.

Let me repeat, in closing, the language of Washington, which we all heard read here but a few days ago, when he earnestly pleaded to his countrymen, through all generations to come, to avoid the baneful influence of party spirit, particularly formation of political policies along sectional lines. He used the language north and south, and east and west. Why is it not possible for freemen, representing free States in this distinctive legislative government, to say that we will not, by any additional grant of power, put the emphasis upon political divisions in the United States along sectional lines?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from California for a question?

Mr. GEORGE. I will yield for a question. I beg the Senator to be brief with his question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall be. I should like to invite the attention of the able Senator from Georgia, who has made an excellent presentation relative to the danger in majority cloture—and I want to say that on that phase of the matter I agree with him—to page 114 of the hearing on Tuesday, February 18, 1947, before the subcommittee of the Committee on Rules and Administration which was held on the subject of amending the Senate rule relating to cloture, and to ask if the Senator recalls this statement which he made during the course of his testimony:

> At the outset I concede that the rule may properly be made applicable to any pending motion, question, or measure. This, of course, involves a change in the rule and a substantial change in point of fact, but, nevertheless, it is a change which I think should be made in the Senate rules.

In view of the statement made by the able Senator from Georgia during the Eightieth Congress before the Committee on Rules and Administration, I should like to ask him in all sincerity, if he felt assured that Senate Resolution 15 would be adopted by the Senate in precisely the form it is now before the Senate, and that there was no danger of it being amended so as to provide for majority cloture, would he feel today as he felt during the time he testified before the subcommittee of the Rules Committee in 1947?

Mr. GEORGE. I would feel very much better if there were anybody who could give the assurance that we will not be called upon to vote upon the resolution offered by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the resolution offered by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and upon other proposals which even go beyond theirs. But I realize that nobody can give me or give the country such assurance.

Therefore I reiterate the position which I took when I appeared before the committee, I believe it was 2 years ago, or some years back. The primary burden of my statement and the primary purpose of appearing before the committee then was to oppose a majority cloture rule.

I recognized, of course, that the Senate could, by amending the rule, have brought forward, at least for debate, any of these controversial matters. But I may very respectfully suggest that many things have happened since that time. We have had an election in these United States. We have had tremendous pressures from minority groups. Certainly I do not need to remind Senators of that fact.

Therefore, Mr. President, my conclusion now is that it would be dangerous and unwise to extend the cloture rule as proposed in the resolution which is now under debate.

PROGRAM FOR SENATE SESSIONS—RECESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does any Senator desire recognition?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a number of Senators desire to address themselves to this question. It is customary on occasions of this kind for the majority leader to make some announcement as to the length of time he proposes to have the Senate remain in session; whether we are to have night sessions, and how late we are to be in session today.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I made no announcement at the beginning of the debate as to how late we would sit. Some Senators expected to leave between 5 and 5:30. Under the circumstances I think I shall move that the Senate now take a recess until tomorrow. From now on, I may say, we are going to remain in session until 6 o'clock every afternoon and, as the debate proceeds from day to day, we may sit even later than that, I may say to the Members of the Senate and to the President of the Senate.

I now move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 1, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 28 (legislative day of February 21), 1949:

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

William E. Davis, of Huntsville, Ala., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Alabama, to fill an existing vacancy.

IN THE ARMY

Maj. Gen. Herman Feldman, 05724, United States Army, for appointment as the Quartermaster General, United States Army, under the provisions of section 9, National Defense Act, as amended, and title V, Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate Monday, February 28 (legislative day of February 21), 1949:

POSTMASTER

Robert W. Garrison to be postmaster at Frankfort in the State of Ohio.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Almighty God, from whom we come and to whom we return, grant that we may go forth today, not in criticism nor despondent mood, but in faith, sharing our sympathies in common service. With understanding minds we would realize our opportunities and our duties which we owe our country and our brother man.

We pray that in this complex world we may ever be free and loving hearts, copartners in a great cause; walking not in selfish ways nor forgetting the ties which bind us one to another like the moving waves of the sea, yet bound by the shore lines that unite them. Let every door which is barred by hate and revenge open to the living forms of cooperation and fellowship. Through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 24, 1949, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McDaniel, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 54. An act to retrocede to the State of New Mexico exclusive jurisdiction held by the United States over lands within the boundaries of the Los Alamos project of the United States Atomic Energy Commission; and

H. J. Res. 92. Joint resolution to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

FEBRUARY 23, 1949.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: A certificate of election in due form of law, showing the election of the Honorable LOUIS B. HELLER as a Representative-elect to the Eighty-first Congress from the Seventh Congressional District of the State of New York, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the Honorable John J. Delaney, is on file in this office.

Very truly yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. HELLER appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article written by J. Carson Adkerson, which appeared in the November 1948 issue of Made in America Monthly, entitled "Wanted! A Manganese Policy."

MANGANESE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks by including a tabulation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, manganese is the "starch" in steel. There is no substitute for manganese in the manufacture of steel. Without manganese our steel mills will close down.

Dependence on Russian manganese is leading the United States into an increasingly dangerous situation. During the year 1948 the United States consumed approximately 1,500,000 tons of manganese ore. Domestic production was 116,000 tons. Imports into the United States during the year totaled 1,256,646 short tons from foreign sources as follows:

	Tons
U. S. S. R.	427,230
Union of South Africa	216,576
India	213,455
Gold Coast	132,971
Brazil	143,916
Mexico	61,614
All other countries	60,894

Instead of building up on our stock piles, we are digging into industry stocks to meet current demands.

It is estimated that we have in stock pile in the United States little more than a year's supply of ore—just enough to fill our lines leading to the steel mills. A year without imports or domestic production and we scrape the bottom of the barrel.

The press recently announced that shipments from Russia are being tapered off and threatened with extinction. More recent reports indicate that no increase in shipments can be expected from Brazil. They will conserve their own manganese for their own needs.

We are allocating scarce steel to Canada to build railroad cars to carry manganese-bearing ores from South African mines to tidewater—and more scarce steel to build mining machinery to help develop manganese production in other foreign countries; production which may or may not come forward years from now.

We are talking of putting our Government into the steel business when we have no guaranty that we will have sufficient manganese to supply the furnaces now in operation.

We are spending many millions of dollars through the ECA to develop mines abroad with little or no assurance that ores will be delivered to the United States for some years to come, and even should ores in time be delivered, then at an overall cost probably greater than the cost of domestic ores.

According to testimony before the Public Lands, Mines, and Mining Subcommittee of the House, the United States needs to build up a stock pile of 8,638,000 tons for emergency needs.

We should get every ton possible from foreign sources with utmost speed and stock-pile it in the United States, but we must likewise speed developments within the United States.

We have an abundance of manganese ores in the United States, with deposits in 27 States. The properties are undeveloped and milling plants are required to concentrate the ores. No money is yet available for domestic developments.

Far-reaching steps are needed to insure us adequate and dependable sources of supply of manganese without delay. Time is essential.

To help solve this problem I have introduced H. R. 2767, which proposes the purchase of domestic ores containing 15 percent or more of metallic manganese and provides for the concentration or beneficiation of the ores, if necessary, to meet any specifications desired by the Munitions Board. I have every reason to know that immediate enactment of this bill will greatly relieve our impending shortage of manganese ore. I know of no other solution for the immediate future.

The schedule of prices provided in H. R. 2767 is indicated in the following table:

Schedule of manganese ore prices

Percentage of manganese content in ore	Price per unit of manganese	Price per long ton of ore	Price per pound of manganese contained in ore
15	$1.00	$15.00	$0.0446
16	1.02	16.32	.0455
17	1.04	17.68	.0465
18	1.06	19.08	.0473
19	1.08	20.52	.0482
20	1.10	22.00	.0491
21	1.12	23.52	.0500
22	1.14	25.08	.0509
23	1.16	26.68	.0518
24	1.18	28.32	.0527
25	1.20	30.00	.0536
26	1.22	31.72	.0545
27	1.24	33.48	.0553
28	1.26	35.28	.0562

Schedule of manganese ore prices—Continued

Percentage of manganese content in ore	Price per unit of manganese	Price per long ton of ore	Price per pound of manganese contained in ore
29	$1.28	$37.12	$0.0571
30	1.30	39.00	.0580
31	1.32	40.92	.0589
32	1.34	42.88	.0598
33	1.36	44.88	.0607
34	1.38	46.92	.0616
35	1.40	49.00	.0625
36	1.42	51.12	.0634
37	1.44	53.28	.0643
38	1.46	55.48	.0652
39	1.48	57.72	.0661
40	1.50	60.00	.0670
41	1.52	62.32	.0679
42	1.54	64.68	.0687
43	1.56	67.08	.0696
44	1.58	69.52	.0705
45	1.60	72.00	.0714
46	1.62	74.52	.0723
47	1.64	77.08	.0732
48	1.66	79.68	.0741
49	1.68	82.32	.0750
50	1.70	85.00	.0759
51	1.72	87.72	.0768
52	1.74	90.48	.0777
53	1.76	93.28	.0786
54	1.78	96.12	.0795
55	1.80	99.00	.0804
56	1.82	101.92	.0813
57	1.84	104.88	.0822
58	1.86	107.88	.0830
59	1.88	110.92	.0839
60	1.90	114.00	.0848
61	1.92	117.12	.0857
62	1.94	120.28	.0866
63	1.96	123.48	.0875
64	1.98	126.72	.0884
65	2.00	130.00	.0893
100	2.70	270.00	.1205

Note basis of long tons—unit of manganese 22.4 pounds

Mr. Speaker, these and not lower prices will develop production of domestic manganese ores in quantities essential to civilian and defense needs.

THE TAFT-HARTLEY LAW

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, Fulton Lewis, Jr., has brought to poll taking a new technique—a technique infinitely more accurate than Dr. Gallup's.

He radios 19 Taft-Hartley questions to the people. They are asked to write their answer, "Yes" or "No," to their Congressmen.

I have received 91 answers, 70 of which answered "No" to question 14, which reads as follows:

Do you believe it should be unlawful for a worker to be prevented from performing his job, by the use of violence, force, or intimidation?

In short, the fact that 70 out of 91 people said "No" the law should not forbid violence, proves that the poll takers are deadly accurate and crystal clear.

Perhaps that was a mock election we had last year and the poll takers were right after all.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRYSON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Mr. Field before the American Patent Law Association.

Mr. HÉBERT asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution from the New Orleans Property Owners Association; also, to extend his remarks in two separate instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials.

Mr. LANE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances; in one to include a letter, in another to include an interesting article from the Boston Sunday Post, and in the third to include an address which he made before the Lithuanian Society.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, upon the completion of all business on the Speaker's desk and any previous special orders granted, I may address the House today for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE]?

There was no objection.

RESERVE COMPONENTS OF THE ARMY, AIR FORCE, AND NAVY

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which is intended to place the Reserve components of the Army, Air Force, and Navy on a footing more in keeping with their great services to this Nation.

First is a bill to create additional secretaries of the armed services for Reserve components.

The purpose of this bill is to create an additional Assistant Secretary for Reserve affairs in each of the departments in the armed services, to wit, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force.

Within the history of our country no such proposal has ever been accomplished. Perhaps the principal reason for this failure has been the lack of emphasis on the importance of strong and well-trained Reserve forces. In the past the major emphasis has been placed on maintaining an adequate force of Regulars and even in this instance the lethargy of national thinking permitted the Regulars to deteriorate to less than 130,000 troops immediately prior to the outbreak of World War II.

There can be no question that, in the incurrent thinking of the general public, the Congress, and even the responsible officials of the National Defense Establishment, it is imperative to establish and maintain an adequate Reserve strength, both as to numbers and competency, for each of the armed services.

On the basis of past history and particularly in view of the unfortunate attitude of some responsible members of the armed services, it is considered highly unlikely that any plan for the creation of adequate Reserves will succeed unless the plans receive the consideration and dignity which would result from the appointment of Assistant Secretaries as contemplated in the proposed legislation.

Next is a bill to establish a committee for Reserve components within the Department of the Army and the Department of the Air Force.

This bill is for the purpose of creating a Reserve advisory committee to the Secretary of the Army, comparable to the Reserve committee of the Department of the Navy.

At present a committee authorized under section 5 of the National Defense Act, operates on the General Staff level. It is considered that the Reserves, who compose 98 percent of our forces in time of war should be represented on the policy level of the Secretary of the Army and to the Secretary of the Air Force.

Only by maintaining a Reserve force, available in time of war or national emergency, can our national security be insured.

Only by having available to the Secretary of the Army, and to the Secretary of the Air Force, the advice based upon the study and experience of mature Reserve officers, can an adequate Reserve program be prepared and executed.

This proposed legislation would make available this valued counsel.

Finally, there is a bill to establish a bureau of Reserve Affairs in the Department of the Army and the Department of the Air Force.

The purpose of this legislation is to create a bureau for Reserve Affairs similar to that of the National Guard Bureau.

This bill would provide an operating agency necessary for a sound Reserve program.

It is a matter of public knowledge that the Reserve program of the Army and Air Force are close to failure at this time.

By having an operating agency such as a Reserve Bureau, the Reserves can be made effective.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. EVINS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GOLDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address delivered by Hon. Carroll Johnson, a former Member of the House.

Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Post of February 23.

Mr. BURDICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include some figures on the profits of large corporations.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD regarding a bill he is today introducing.

Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. MICHENER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD concerning Siena Heights College, an article by Jane I. Collins.

Mr. JENKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article written by one of his constituents.

HEART DISEASE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a magazine article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, heart disease continues to be the No. 1 killer of our people. In hearings recently held before the Subcommittee on Appropriations dealing with appropriations for public health we conducted long hearings on the subject of funds to implement the National Heart Act. I know that due to the impetus given this subject by the passage of the National Heart Act in the Eightieth Congress and the campaign that is going on all over this country under the direction of the National Heart Association, the people of America are aroused to this great menace. One of the dangers is that many people will perhaps become morose and distracted on the subject, and many will worry over symptoms that do not always indicate serious heart involvement.

One of the best witnesses before our committee was Dr. Paul D. White, one of the founders of the National Heart Association, a professor of medicine at Harvard University, and a world-renowned authority on disease of the heart. Yesterday there appeared in the magazine section of the Sunday Star an article by Dr. Paul White entitled "Good News About Your Heart." I think this is one of the best articles that has been published. It should be read by every Member of Congress and every citizen of the United States. I hope you will read it. It will do you good to know that something is being done to thwart and stop this No. 1 killer of mankind.

The article referred to follows:

GOOD NEWS ABOUT YOUR HEART

IT MAY BE SOUNDER THAN YOU THINK, SAYS THIS WORLD-FAMOUS SPECIALIST—HERE HE EXPLODES SOME MYTHS THAT CAN CAUSE NEARLY AS MUCH AGONY AS HEART DISEASE ITSELF

(By Dr. Paul D. White, as told to John E. Pfeiffer)

There is no sure-fire symptom of heart disease. But try telling that to amateur experts—people who preserve old-fashioned notions and pass on these notions to worried friends as sage advice. A person may have pain in the chest, palpitation or shortness of breath—or even all three—and the chances are still heavily in his favor.

It would be foolishness to dodge the fact that heart disease accounts for more deaths in the United States than any other single cause. But that's no excuse for clinging to hair-raising myths which frequently produce the worst of all suffering—the agony of gnawing, unvoiced fear. Silly ideas about heart disease have worried thousands of persons. Men and women who were too frightened to visit their doctors have endured years of needless anguish—even died before their time.

Take the case of Joe Brown, a New England chicken farmer. At 3 o'clock one morning he turned off the alarm clock and dragged himself out of bed. He groped his way to the incubators and started turning the eggs over to make sure they'd be heated evenly on all sides. Then he noticed a pressing, slowly mounting pain in his chest, just behind the breastbone. The attack lasted half a minute or so, but Joe finished his chore and went back to bed.

An hour or two later the eggs had to be shifted again and Joe got up fearing a second spell. When nothing happened he heaved a sigh of relief and forgot about the incident. But a few weeks later he had another pain in the same place and a fortnight or so after that still another.

That worried look

Finally he came to my office with the worried look of a man who's convinced he has heart disease.

But there was nothing the matter with Brown's heart. A careful examination revealed that spasms of the esophagus, the 9-inch tube leading from the vocal cords to the stomach, were causing the pain in his chest. This sort of muscle cramp may come from any irritation of the nerves at the base of the neck—it can be caused by excessive smoking, indigestion, or even too much coffee, tea, or alcohol. In Brown's case it was simply overwork. After he hired a man to do the night work, the pain disappeared.

Such cases are familiar to all heart specialists. The idea that every pain in the chest means heart disease ignores the facts of everyday medical experience. Actually, in more than 8 out of 10 cases it's a sign of an entirely different illness, generally not a serious one.

Unfounded fears can conceivably hurt a patient more than his sickness. Shortness of breath is a good example: the odds are about nine to one that it's asthma, a lung ailment, or any one of a dozen other troubles rather than heart disease. One retired businessman went South during the winter and on one of his early morning walks, gradually found himself panting as if he'd just run half a block. When the shortness of breath continued, he visited a busy local physician who listened to his heartbeats and, since the sounds were unusually faint, quickly concluded he had a weak heart, prescribed digitalis.

Complete check-up

Now thoroughly scared, the patient did what he should have done in the first place—he had a complete medical check-up by his own doctor. It turned out that his shortness of breath was a result of bronchitis. Penicillin proved more helpful than digitalis.

The heart-murmuring myth is even more prevalent. A mother came into my office, leading her reluctant 8-year-old son. They had traveled more than a thousand miles because he had "noises in the heart." As things turned out, I didn't have to do anything for the child—he had a perfectly healthy heart. But the mother was a problem. I had to spend a good deal of time with her, so that the boy wouldn't develop a morbid fear of a heart disease he didn't have.

Palpitation, dizziness, faintness, swollen feet—these possible heart symptoms are more often than not signs of other ailments. In fact, we see many people who have nearly every possible symptom on the list, and they are almost always suffering from "anxiety neurosis." These patients are worried and high-strung. We don't yet know just what's wrong with them, but their heart muscles are all right.

Not that you should go to extremes and ignore the way you feel. It cannot be overemphasized that, although the odds are against it, any one of the symptoms mentioned above may be a sign of heart trouble. Any delay in going to a doctor and finding out is foolish, especially when you consider that the average car owner can't hear an unfamiliar wheeze in the motor without dashing to the nearest garage.

New techniques

Specialists have developed new techniques to help spot heart trouble. There's the ballistocardiograph, a "table" on which the patient lies and which is suspended so delicately that it recoils with the force of the heartbeat and spurt of blood through the arteries. This instrument provides a rough indication of the heart's output. A much more important device is the electrocardiograph, which picks up the tiny electrical currents that accompany heart action and represents the impulses as wavy lines on graph paper. Such records have to be interpreted carefully, and unusual patterns are not always signs of heart trouble. These and other recent techniques are never substitutes for a thorough examination, and are used only to supplement other evidence.

The three most prevalent causes of heart trouble are high blood pressure, rheumatic fever, and coronary artery disease. The last condition results from thickening of the wall of the heart arteries, and a characteristic symptom is angina pectoris, pain in the chest, coming as a result of effort. The pain may be confined to the breastbone region or radiate to one or both arms, usually the left arm.

It's an interesting fact that the heart muscle itself is not commonly injured directly. Angina pectoris and many other symptoms are caused by damage to the arteries that lead to the vital organ and its valves. The heart is probably the strongest muscle in the body. It has to beat 2,500,000,000 times during a 70-year lifetime and pump 5 to 10 tons of blood a day. No emotion, however intense, has ever broken a healthy heart—not even love.

Even when the heart does behave abnormally, it's not always dangerous. It used to be thought that an unusually slow pulse always indicated damage to the nervous or muscle fibers regulating the heart rate. But at the time he was breaking records in the mile run, Glenn Cunningham had a pulse in the low forties. And the Navy was doubtful about Leslie MacMitchell, New York University's star miler, because his heart beat only 36 times a minute. (He was later accepted after careful study.)

A rest cure

At the other extreme, a 50-year-old housewife had occasional attacks of tachycardia, a condition in which the heart may jump from a normal 70 to 160 beats a minute. She was so worried that, to hide her trouble from the rest of the family, she tried to keep on working. Result was that the attacks lasted 3 or 4 hours. When she finally saw her doctor, he told her to drink less coffee and lie down whenever spells came. The rest alone reduced the attacks to half an hour. Also, she had fewer of them and is in good shape today.

When unusual symptons actually mean major heart disease, however, the patient naturally has to modify some of his habits more radically, depending on what he's suffering from. He may have to smoke less or cut tobacco out entirely; cocktails now and

then are usually perfectly safe, but it's wise to reduce his alcohol intake if he's a heavy drinker.

The diet treatment

High-blood pressure is sometimes treated by low-salt diets and fewer calories; overeating should be avoided in the case of hypertension or diseases of the heart arteries. In all cases, a patient should lose weight if he's carrying extra poundage.

But the idea that a person has to stop all work, retire and die quietly is wrong. Moderate activity is just as necessary for a heart patient as it is for anyone else. It keeps the circulation active by maintaining good muscle tone throughout the body. Well-exercised legs, for example, help squeeze the blood back up through the veins to the heart and lungs. If we could keep the muscles and blood vessels functioning properly, heart disease might be less of a problem.

Another fallacy

The dread of climbing stairs is another fallacy that ought to be set straight once and for all. Actually, walking, not running, up stairs is usually good for the heart, as long as you don't place such a strain on it that failure might occur. Most people who have elevators installed in their homes to avoid the exertion are wasting their money. Often they would be smarter to go on fishing trips, take occasional hikes, and keep working at their jobs.

Golf is an ideal game for many heart patients, despite the scare publicity that tells all about the man who dropped dead the other day on the seventh fairway. Just as likely as not, he would have died 10 years earlier if he'd stayed at home in his easy chair.

How to invite trouble

What can a healthy person do to avoid heart disease? For one thing, a moderate amount of activity is always important. But that doesn't mean overdoing it. High-pressure businessmen and others who are always on the go are inviting trouble. The head of a large corporation once said that he paid his executives $100,000 a year to compensate for the fact that their jobs would probably kill them within 10 years. The same risk holds for anyone who works so hard that he neglects his health.

The man who plows through the week's work, eats heavily at lunch and dinner, and then expects to make up for the strain on his days off may very well be visiting a heart specialist sooner or later—and probably sooner. Relaxing isn't simply a matter for week ends, and the go-getter usually can't take it easy even then. He's likely to play golf the way he works, going around the course as if he had a $10 bet on every hole.

Most of us take our vacations at the wrong time. The traditional 2 weeks in the summer don't make much sense from a medical standpoint, because business naturally slackens during the hot weather and you need rest most when work loads are heavy. According to Mayo Clinic studies, deaths from heart failure are most frequent in December, January, and February in the North—and if you have only 2 weeks, the cold-weather months are the best time to get away from it all. Furthermore, it's better to take a few days off every now and then than to use up the entire 2 weeks or more in one trip.

When it comes to diet, the big problem in the United States is overeating. Many office workers develop bay windows because they eat as much as they used to when they played college football 20 or 30 years ago. There's accumulating evidence that extra weight injures the heart. It puts a greater strain on the circulation and is certainly bad for general health.

Fat can hurt you

What may actually initiate certain heart trouble is too much fat in the diet, whether it stays on the body or not. Fats may filter into the walls of the blood vessels and, after chemical break-down, form calcified deposits on the inside. Such deposits may not only lead to hardening of the arteries but actually narrow them to a point where important organs, including the heart, fail to obtain enough blood. One reason that women get less heart disease than men is possibly because their metabolism is different and retards the formation of deposits in the arteries.

But for a person who does develop heart trouble—and such conditions are often a matter of simple aging—the outlook is anything but hopeless. I'll never forget one patient who came to see me a few months after he'd had a coronary thrombosis, a clot in one of the arteries of the heart. He was 53 years old, and ran a silver-fox farm on Prince Edward Island off the coast of Canada. He fully expected to die within a year or two.

The only thing to do was to keep him under observation. We knew that a clot had blocked a branch of one of the arteries that nourished the heart muscles, cutting off the blood supply to a small portion of tissue. We hoped that the heart would establish a "collateral circulation" on its own—in other words, that the damned-up blood would find "space" blood vessels and thus detour the clotted artery and set up new supply lines.

A turkey every year

That's actually what happened, as it does in most cases, although we didn't understand the process so well in those days. The patient wanted to know whether he could go back and run his fox farm. I told him he might shorten his life if he didn't. Privately I thought he'd live 5 or 6 years if he followed my advice, and perhaps not so long if he stopped work completely. Before the patient left the hospital he shook hands and said: "Dr. White, I'm going to send you a turkey every year as long as I live." That was in 1924. I received turkeys from that man for 24 consecutive years.

Of course, many people with heart trouble don't live 20 years longer (or send me turkeys when they do). After all, heart disease often comes in the late 50's or 60's. But I have seen over 30,000 patients since I started treating heart disease in 1920, and such long-lived cases are far more common than they once were thought to be.

The road ahead

We've learned a good deal since then. For example, we used to think that the intense chest pains of angina pectoris meant a life expectancy of only about 4 years. Now we know that it's more than double that figure.

Research to discover more about the fundamental causes of heart disease is steadily increasing. It gives promise of leading in the next generation to the prevention of much of the heart disease which is still too prevalent among young and middle-aged persons.

THE LATE WILLIAM E. TATE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, everyone who has had close contact with veterans' affairs and with the representatives of the veterans' organizations here in Washington was shocked and grieved on Thursday morning to learn of the sudden death of William E. Tate, the national director of claims for the Disabled American Veterans.

Those of us who have served as members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs learned to depend upon Mr. Tate's wide knowledge of the veterans' problems, especially in the field of rehabilitation and compensation claims. Few men had a closer touch with the veteran suffering from service-connected disabilities. He knew without reference the complex regulations of the Veterans' Administration and in his frequent testimony before our committee his judgment was invariably called upon and accepted.

Thousands of veterans will mourn his passing, for he had given more than 30 years of his life in service to them. He was the national commander of the Disabled American Veterans in 1927 and served as assistant national adjutant of the organization for many years.

The Disabled American Veterans has been singularly unfortunate in the past few months in the loss of competent, able personnel. Only a few weeks ago the organization sustained a heavy blow in the passing of Dr. Clayton E. Wood, its national medical director, a veteran who, also, gave of the most of his life to service for disabled veterans. With the loss of Mr. Tate the Washington office of the DAV will carry on with other disabled veterans who give cheerfully of their strength and time to further the cause of those who sacrificed their health to preserve our country. Theirs is a real service.

The following information shows the many years of loyal active service given by William E. Tate for our disabled veterans:

WILLIAM E. TATE

Born in Mullens, S. C., in 1893. Was educated in the public schools and later was graduated from the School of Pharmacy, Furman University, Greenville, S. C.

Bill enlisted in the Medical Corps of the Army. Served for 1½ years during World War I. Shortly after discharge was hospitalized for disabilities incurred during his service for a period of some several years in Government hospitals in North Carolina.

During this period of hospitalization he became interested in the activities and program of the Disabled American Veterans and the American Legion. During his ambulant hours he devoted the greater part of his time to assisting his buddies in hospital cots in the preparation of their claims for Government benefits, in matters of insurance, vocational training and compensation. From this voluntary unselfish hobby, Bill Tate developed into one of the outstanding best-informed advocates for disabled veterans and their dependent benefits in our country.

His physical circumstances were such that his doctors had little hope of his surviving the early twenties. While on the other hand, the newly formed veterans groups in North Carolina called more and more on him.

He is one of the few veterans' leaders in the Nation who have served as State Commander of the DAV in two States, North Carolina and Georgia. Before attaining State leadership he had been an adjutant and commander of the largest American Legion Post in North Carolina and secretary of the first 40 and 8 organization in that State. While still a patient, in the hospital at Oteen, N. C., Bill represented his State at the national convention of the DAV held in Salt Lake City, where he won for himself the first platoon of what, down through the years, has developed into an army division of disabled veteran friends and admirers. Shortly thereafter he moved to Atlanta and became the first national service officer of the DAV in the fifth district. He was the general chairman of the sixth annual national convention held in Atlanta, Ga., in 1926, and the following year the delegates in attendance at the national convention held in El Paso, Tex., elected him as the seventh national commander of the organization.

As national commander, Bill Tate demonstrated his devotion to the cause of the disabled man, not only with his natural ability but with an unselfish devotion that saved the organization from floundering into bankruptcy. As a chief executive of the Disabled American Veterans, he traveled much of his time at his own expense, was personally responsible for the financing of the national activities to the point that at the close of his year it carried the organization out of the red and into the black.

Bill Tate was one of the founders of the DAV service foundation and has served during its twenty-odd years of existence as a continuous officer and has been its president for the past some several years. After having received the highest honors a veterans' organization could bestow on him, he retired to the ranks of the organization and continued continuous and constant activities, having been called upon from time to time to again serve in various expert and executive capacities.

During one short period he left the active duties of the DAV to become an executive of the State of Georgia's Veterans' Welfare Department and was then drafted again to serve as a national service officer in Atlanta, Ga. Later he became assistant national adjutant at national headquarters in Cincinnati, where he served until his health made it necessary for him to retire for a short period of time, when he was again drafted to become an assistant to Millard W. Rice, in charge of the Washington office of the organization. With the reorganization of the Washington office by the Chicago national convention, Bill Tate became director of claims and has been more responsible than any other man in the development of the organization's outstanding service officer and claims division activity.

Bill was married to Mrs. Myrtle Baggett on March 5, 1930, in Atlanta, Ga.

COMMUNISM IN EUROPE

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, when the Herter committee visited Europe in the fall of 1947 we had occasion, of course, to give special study to communistic activities in the various countries over there. I visited most of the countries except those behind the iron curtain.

In Italy we met the man who is considered to be the most astute Communist leader operating outside of Russia. In my opinion, he must have graduated at the head of his class in the school in Moscow that gives training to persons wishing to become Communist leaders. I refer to Palmiro Togliatti.

A few days ago Maurice Thorez, who is head of the Communist movement in France, and Palmiro Togliatti, the head of the Communists in Italy, both declared that if it should develop that Russia should need any assistance from the Communists in France or Italy, Russia can depend upon the full support of all Communists in those two countries.

In other words, these two agents of Joe Stalin lay down the challenge to us and they want us to know what we can expect in case we get into trouble with Russia. And these two leaders no doubt have supervised the distribution of millions of dollars of relief money furnished by the United States while they have not had one dollar from Stalin for distribution. The American people do not like this situation. It is strange how the Communists can permeate our country and all the countries of the world while we have difficulty even in distributing our own relief in these countries dominated by Communists and in many countries not dominated by Communists such as France and Italy.

As a part of my remarks I include the following editorial on this subject:

A QUESTION FOR COMMUNISTS

Palmiro Togliatti, the Communist leader in Italy, now joins Maurice Thorez, his opposite number in France, in stating that in event of a war in which Soviet Russia was engaged it would be the duty of Italian Communists to aid the Soviet Army if it appeared on Italian soil. Both Communist leaders qualified the conditions under which they said loyal Communists should act—pursuit by the Red Army of an aggressor across the borders of their countries—but the connotation of their remarks is clear. It is that a Communist's first loyalty is to Moscow and not to his own country.

Now that the two leading Communist leaders in west Europe have spoken, it seems in order to address a question to the leaders of the Communist Party in the United States and in other countries. In the case of the American Communists the question might be put this way: What would be your attitude if Soviet Russia should charge Canada with aggression, land an army there and pursue Canadian forces across the border of the United States; would American Communists have the evident duty, as Signor Togliatti put it, of aiding in the most efficient way the Soviet Army? The event is, we hope, wildly improbable, but we have a right to know the answer.

What the purpose was of the French and Italian Communists leaders in making their statements at this time is not clear. Some cantonal elections are coming up in France and the Italian Communists have been called out to make a nation-wide demonstration today. The statements may have been intended as an incitement to militancy on the part of present party members. Surely they could not have been intended to persuade any non-Communists to join the party. The normal effect on the normal Frenchman or Italian would seem to be the opposite. It is doubtful even if the rank-and-file Communists in either France or Italy would like to see their countries occupied by the Red Army. And what aggressor are Thorez and Togliatti thinking of? A new Hitler in Germany or Marshal Tito?

Whatever the purpose of the statements, Frenchmen, Italians, and Americans who are loyal to their own governments, to their democratic ways of life, who prefer what they have to what they would get under Red Army occupation, should welcome this clear drawing of the lines. It neatly disposes of the theory that British Communists, say, could ever comprise His Majesty's Loyal Opposition, that American communism is only twentieth-century democracy. If this is not the proper interpretation of the remarks of M. Thorez and Signor Togliatti, then it would seem incumbent of the leaders of Communist Parties elsewhere to clarify the situation. In the absence of a forthright explanation, the assumption must be that the two European Communists have stated the clear intent of Communists everywhere.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. D'EWART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two memorials adopted by the State Legislature of Montana and an article of his own regarding rural electrification.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a resolution passed by the Board of Supervisors of Outagamie County, Wis., and in the other to include a progress report on the cooperative sea lamprey investigation on the Great Lakes prepared by Dr. John Van Costen, chairman, Great Lakes Sea Lamprey Committee.

Mr. REES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article upon farm support prices.

Mr. HOEVEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement by a prominent constituent in his congressional district.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on socialized medicine and also to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article on the progress of health insurance in England.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial and in the other a letter.

Mr. SANBORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a memorial from the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S STATEMENT AS REPORTED UNBECOMING TO THE DIGNITY OF THE OFFICE OF PRESIDENT

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that the President saw fit to utter

the statement he is reported to have made at a public gathering on Tuesday evening.

Regardless of his reasons for being irked, and irrespective of the individual involved, it is unbecoming and beneath the dignity of the office of the President of the United States to use such language. The least the President should do is to make an apology to the people for having permitted himself to give vent to the statement charged to him.

I had hoped that on his Nation-wide hook-up Thursday night he would make such apology, but no such statement was forthcoming. Mr. Truman still has an opportunity to make a public expression of regret. Not to do so is a reflection upon the highest office in our land. The stigma attached to his statement should be removed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COX asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by the Attorney General.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary on matters relating to the District of Columbia be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Speaker, religious freedom—you may worship your own God—are these rights being eliminated from the face of this earth? Are we going back to the dark ages of religious persecution? What is occurring in this modern century makes me wonder. The list of suppression of religious freedom is growing from day to day. Where will it stop?

The bigoted heads of communism have attacked the Protestant, Catholic, and Jew. The present slogan of the Communists is to purge, and to continue to purge, until the last minister, priest, and rabbi is imprisoned or exterminated.

This brutal attack upon Cardinal Mindszenty, Bishop Ordass, and the Protestant clergyman in Bulgaria is an unerasable blot upon humanity. These unjust and imposed trials are not exceptional instances, it is not only in Hungary, Yugoslavia, Poland, and Bulgaria that the Communist form of justice is intended for—others will follow. The present situation is even more menacing than the worst of our past ordeals.

It is foolish to dream of progress and peace for the world when a dark shadow overcasts the international horizon. The trouble is that in our lifetime everything that came to be an appalling reality seemed a hoax and a fable only shortly before it came to pass. It is only natural that human minds assess the future in terms of past experiences. They fail to see even the present. Thus by sheer force of habit we have pretended to see things as they were and not as they are.

This attack upon religious freedom is a warning to every American to protect his moral and spiritual values. May we stand firmly and rebuke the encroachment of our freedom—and above all guaranties of religious worship.

VETERANS' PENSION BILL

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, within the last few days I have received many communications from Members inquiring when hearings on the so-called Rankin veterans' pension bill will be held. I wish to announce now that the Committee on Rules will start holding hearings on that bill this coming Wednesday. I have been unable to answer all the inquiries that have come in by mail, so I take this opportunity to make the announcement in order that the Members will be informed.

COMMUNISM WINNING ITS "COLD WAR" HERE IN WASHINGTON

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include excerpts from speeches I made in the past.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, communism may be losing the "cold war" in Europe, but it seems to be winning its "cold war" here in Washington, especially against the white people of the District of Columbia.

Beginning with the nauseating spectacle of a mixed dance of whites and Negroes at the so-called Inaugural Ball, the Reds have moved on to other conquests.

Just a few days ago Mr. Julius A. Krug, head of the Department of the Interior, capitulated to their demands and issued an order driving the white children from the tennis courts in the public parks of the District of Columbia.

He called it wiping out segregation, but he, and everyone else, knows that it simply meant driving the white children out of the 18 tennis courts they have been using, and turning them over to the Negroes.

Stalin must have smiled behind his mustache when he read of that communistic order.

Again this morning we are told by the press that Secretary of Labor Maurice J. Tobin has taken another lengthy step along the communistic line with a recommendation advocating the passage of the infamous FEPC bill which Joe Stalin fathered in 1920.

I wonder what the next step is going to be.

What nonsense it is to pour American money by the billions, and tens of billions into the sinkholes of Europe, Asia, Africa and Israel under the pretense of fighting communism abroad, and then permit these communistic drives against the white people of America including the white children of the District of Columbia, right under our very noses.

The truth is, this whole alleged civil-rights program is simply a communistic movement to destroy the white man's civilization, to wreck this country, and to drag America down into the mire of race amalgamation, financial bankruptcy, and internal chaos.

God save our country from such a fate.

Remember that this FEPC monstrosity was set up by Executive order, and when it was exposed on the floor of the House, the Congress killed it as dead as a door nail by refusing to appropriate money to continue its vicious persecution of the white businessmen of America.

I participated in that debate, and read into the RECORD a list of individuals that composed this economic gestapo.

Under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am going to insert that speech, together with the names of the parties selected to operate this communistic outfit, which I hope every Member of Congress will take the time to study carefully.

The matter referred to reads as follows:

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, the passage of a law at this time legalizing this so-called FEPC would be a betrayal of the white people of the country. If every individual in the United States could understand just what it means, there would be such a roar of protest coming from every State in this Union that it would never see the light of day.

If every Member of Congress would screw his courage to the sticking place and vote his convictions on this so-called FEPC, it would not get 50 votes out of the entire membership of 435.

It is a most dangerous and brazen attempt to fasten upon the white people of America the worst system of control by alien or minority racial groups that has been known since the crucifixion.

When I read the names of the personnel of this outfit you will understand what I mean.

To sanctify this organization by law would give the lie to everything we have told our American boys they were fighting for. Instead of coming back to liberty, freedom, and democracy, they would find themselves sold into this bondage, herded, humiliated, and regimented by alien influences directed by a foreign comintern representing the deadly doctrine of Karl Marx that is based upon hatred for Christianity and for everything that is based on Christian principles.

It is a manifestation in legislative form of that infidelity that has closed thousands of Christian churches in Europe and has been

responsible for the murder of untold millions of Christian human beings.

This measure is not directed altogether at the white people of the South. If it were, you folks in the North would not have so much ground for alarm. We in the South know how to combat subversive elements. As Henry Grady once said, we wrested the South from such domination "when federal drum beats rolled nearer and Federal bayonets hedged closer to the ballot box of the South than it ever will again in this Republic."

But you people in the North have not had that training, and this FEPC is likely to bring grief, strife, hatred, race riots, and chaos in your northern cities if this vicious agency is perpetuated and sanctioned by your votes.

Do not forget that the returning servicemen know what this thing means, and they are going to call you to account next year—beginning with the primary. They are not going to wait until the general election.

Do not forget that every businessman, every farmer, every professional man, and every other independent individual whose blood glows with the instinct of American liberty, is going to join these men, and those other patriotic forces that are fighting to save American institutions for which these boys have been fighting and dying upon every battlefield in the world.

If every man and every woman in the United States could just read the list of individuals that compose the personnel of this crazy FEPC, and its subdivisions throughout the country, I dare say there would not be enough of you left who vote for it, even if nominated in the primaries next year, to form a corporal's guard.

For your information, and for the information of the American people generally, I am going to read you the official personnel as it exists today. Remember, this list is taken from the official record. This is the group that wants to nose into and control every business in the United States. Remember, they can search the files and records of every business establishment in America where some disgruntled individual is willing to trump up a charge of discrimination. They can drag them all over the country and try them, and in that way destroy any ordinary business concern.

The next thing they are going to try to do is get control of your schools and force their communistic henchmen into the schools and teach your children their subversive doctrines.

Read these lists carefully, which, as I said, are taken from the official records here in Washington, and you will see that not 1 out of 10 on these rolls is a white gentile American.

Here is the official list:

Committee on Fair Employment Practice, Washington, D. C., Office of the Chairman

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Ross, Malcolm	Chairman	White	$8,000
Johnson, George M.	Deputy Chairman.	Colored	8,000
Hubbard, Maceo	Hearings examiner.	do	5,600
Bloch, Emanuel	do	White	5,600
Copper, Evelyn	do	do	5,600
Berking, Max	Assistant to Chairman.	do	3,800
Alexander, Dorothy	Secretary to Chairman.	Colored	2,600
Clifton, J. Jeanne	Secretary to Deputy.	do	2,000
Brooks, Mary	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800
Banting, Myra	do	White	1,800

You will note that in this office of the chairman, consisting of 10 people, there are 5 Negroes and 5 white people, most of whom have foreign names. One of the whites is a stenographer who receives the smallest salary of anyone on the list.

Remember that the members of this group preside over the destiny of every business enterprise in America, and are using their assumed powers to harass white Americans out of business.

This is the organization Members of Congress are being asked to perpetuate by the passage of this bill.

FIELD OPERATIONS

Here is the Division of Field Operations:

Field operations

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Maslow, Will	Chief	White	$6,500
Mitchell, Clarence	Principal fair-practice examiner.	Colored	5,600
Davidson, Eugene	do	do	5,600
Beall, W. Hayes	Senior fair-practice examiner.	White	4,600
Mercer, Inez	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,800
Rogers, Eleanor	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,800
Saito, Otome	do	Japanese-American.	1,800
Thompson, Mildred	do	Colored	1,800
Cornick, Emma	do	do	1,620

You will note that it consists of nine people—five Negroes, one Japanese, and three others—two of whom have records of affiliations with Communist-front organizations, according to the reports of the Dies committee.

Imagine this group going about over the country riding herd on the white American businessmen of the Nation, telling them whom they shall employ, whom they shall promote, and with whom they may associate.

It would be interesting, and probably enlightening, to check up on these people and see how many of them are native-born Americans.

Members of Congress had better do this now, before they get caught in this trap, because this question of un-American activities is going to be an issue in every congressional district next year, beginning with the primaries.

The people are not going to wait until the general election for someone who holds a commission as a result of the pernicious activities of Sidney Hillman and his gang to wrap the party cloak about him and shout to the people of his district that "I am a Republican" or "I am a Democrat."

More than 2,000,000 young men have already been discharged in this war, and they are organizing now to try to save America for Americans. They are going to read your records, and they are likely to ask you some very embarrassing questions when you get home.

REVIEW AND ANALYSIS DIVISION

Now look at this list and see who reviews all these records of racial discrimination when they come to Washington, and you will understand how the editor of the Dallas News felt and how other white gentiles feel, including Cecil B. DeMille, the great American movie producer, when they are harassed out of business.

Here is the list:

Review and Analysis Division

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Davis, John A.	Chief	Colored	$5,600
Lawson, Marjorie	Research analyst.	do	3,800

Review and Analysis Division—Continued

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Golightly, Cornelius.	Compliance analyst.	Colored	$3,200
Hempbill, India	do	do	2,600
Coan, Carol	do	White	2,600
Davis, Joy P.	do	Colored	2,600
Hoffman, Celia	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800
Spaulding, Joan	do	Colored	1,800

You will note that it consists of six Negroes and two white people, one of whom is named Carol Coan and the other Celia Hoffman, a white stenographer receiving the lowest salary on the list.

Now, if you sign the petition to bring out this bill or vote for this monstrosity, do not forget that when you get home those white American businessmen who help to sustain this Nation in time of peace and whose sons are fighting its battles in time of war are going to want to ask you some questions that you may not be able to answer.

LEGAL DIVISION

But if you want a real laugh, look at this legal division.

Legal Division

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Reeves, Frank D.	Attorney	Colored	$4,600
Stickgold, Simon	do	White	4,600
Gordon, Jernevive	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,800

You will note that this so-called Legal Division consists of two Negroes and a Simon Stickgold.

INFORMATION DIVISION

Now we come to the Information Division. If you want information about this outfit, write to this Division:

Information Division

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Bourne, St. Clair	Information specialist.	Colored	$3,800
Whiting, Margaret	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800

You will note that it consists of two Negroes, one registered as an information specialist and the other as a clerk-stenographer.

BUDGET AND ADMINISTRATION

Now we come to the Budget and Administration Division. This Division not only makes up the budget but administers the regulations. Here is the list:

Budget and Administration

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Jones, Theodore	Chief	Colored	$5,600
Jeter, Sinclair	Assistant administrative officer.	do	3,200
Baker, Vivian D.	Clerk-stenographer.	do	2,000
Jackson, Rosales A.	Clerk-typist	do	1,620
Paynter, Minnie A.	do	do	1,620
Hollomon, Irving	Clerk	do	1,440
Selby, Ralph R.	Chief, fiscal	do	2,600
Ross, Sylvia B.	Voucher auditor	do	2,000
Nelson, Otelia	Accounting clerk	do	1,620
Carpenter, Elizabeth.	do	do	1,620
Brent, Pearl T.	do	do	1,620

This outfit, which is composed of 11 Negroes, and no whites at all, not only makes

up the budget for financing this aggregation, but it seems to have the power of administration. I hope you will read this list to your white businessmen, farmers, and ex-servicemen at home when you get back and ask for renomination in the primaries next year.

MAIL AND FILES DIVISION

Now, here are the ones that have control of the mails and filing system:

Mail and Files

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Douglas, Lela	Chief, Mail and Files.	Colored	$2,000
Welch, Selena	Docket clerk	do	1,800
Gamble, Jessie	File clerk	do	1,620
Phillips, Rose	do	do	1,440
Reed, Charles	Messenger	do	1,380
Mitchell, Regina	File clerk	do	1,440

You will note that this Division is composed entirely of Negroes—six Negroes, and no whites at all. I wonder why they discriminated against the white race in setting up these two powerful branches of this most dangerous agency?

REGIONAL OFFICE, NEW YORK

Now, let us turn to the regional offices and see who is going to harass the business people back in the States. Here is the list for the State of New York:

Regional office, New York

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Lawson, Edward H.	Regional director.	Colored	$5,600
Jones, Madison S.	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,800
Jones, Robert G.	do	do	3,800
Donovan, Daniel R.	do	White	3,800
Irish, Miriam	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	2,000
Asepha, Tillie	do	White	1,620
Schwartz, Sonia	do	do	1,620

This is the list that is going to help Governor Dewey harass the white American businessmen of the Empire State. You will note that it is composed of four Negroes and three white people. Please read the names of the three white people and see if you can figure out their antecedents.

Businessmen of New York are going to have a hard time after this war without having all this communistic conglomeration to deal with, to say nothing of the one which Governor Dewey and his political henchmen have now heaped upon them.

REGIONAL OFFICE, PHILADELPHIA

Now, let us turn to Philadelpia, the birthplace of the Constitution—the City of Brotherly Love. At the risk of causing glorious old Benjamin Franklin to turn over in his grave, I read you the list:

Regional office, Philadelphia

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Fleming, G. James	Regional director.	Colored	$5,600
Greenblatt, Mildred.	Fair-practice examiner.	White	3,800
Manly, Milo A.	do	Colored	3,800
Risk, Samuel R.	do	White	3,800
Grimnage, Willard	do	Colored	3,200
Gorgas, Helen	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800
Klinger, Karyl	do	White	1,800
Brown, Grayce	do	Colored	1,440

You will note that it is composed of eight individuals—five Negroes and three whites, Mildred Greenblatt, Samuel R. Risk, and Karyl Klinger.

Don't you know there will be some brotherly love when that crowd gets going on the businessmen of the Philadelphia area?

REGIONAL OFFICE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Now, here is the regional office in Washington, D. C., the National Capital, where there has been so much persecution of white gentiles in the last few years. Here is the list:

Regional office, Washington, D. C.

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Evans, Joseph	Regional director.	Colored	$5,600
Houston, Theophilus.	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,200
Kahn, Alice	do	White	2,600
Chisolm, Ruby	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,800
Urback, Dorothy	do	do	1,620

You will note it consists of four Negroes and Alice Kahn. Just what chance a white gentile will have with this group is entirely problematical, to say the least of it.

REGIONAL OFFICE, CLEVELAND

Now, let us move out where the West begins and take a look. Here is the list in the Cleveland regional office:

Regional office, Cleveland

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
McKnight, William.	Regional director.	Colored	$4,600
Abbott, Olcott R.	Fair-practice examiner.	White	3,800
Glore, Lethia	do	Colored	3,200
Kelley, Berniza	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,620
Wasem, Edna	do	White	1,800

You will note that this group is composed of three Negroes and two whites, Olcott R. Abbott and Edna Wasem.

"Don't you know the white people of Cleveland will enjoy being dominated by them?"

CINCINNATI REGIONAL OFFICE

Cincinnati seems to be largely under the jurisdiction of the Cleveland office since it only has two people:

Cincinnati

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
James, Harold	Fair-practice examiner.	White	$4,600
	Clerk-stenographer.		1,800

DETROIT REGIONAL OFFICE

Now let us move on to Detroit, Mich. Here is the regional office for Detroit:

Detroit

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Swan, Edward	Examiner in charge.	Colored	$4,600
Sese, Doris K.	Clerk-stenographer.	Japanese-American.	1,620

You will note that it is composed of one Negro and one Japanese. I know the businessmen of Detroit are grateful for this consideration.

I should like to hear some of the comments they will make to you gentlemen from Detroit when you get home next summer, if you support this vicious measure.

REGIONAL OFFICE, CHICAGO

Here is a list of the regional office in the Windy City:

Regional office, Chicago

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Henderson, Elner	Regional director.	Colored	$5,600
Gibson, Harry H. C.	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,800
Schultz, Joy	do	White	3,800
Williams, Le Roy	do	Colored	3,200
Zeldman, Penny	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800
Ingram, Marguerite S.	do	Colored	1,620

You will note it is composed of four Negroes, Joy Shultz, and Penny Zeldman. I am told that a representative of this group went into the office of Swift & Co. and asked how many Negro members they had on their board of directors. The answer was, "We have no Negro members on our board of directors." Then the question came back, "Why haven't you?" This just shows what this supergovernmental set-up is driving at. They want to communize America and destroy everything which our glorious ancestors have left us and for which our boys are now fighting and dying all over the world.

REGIONAL OFFICE, ATLANTA

Here is a list of the Atlanta office:

Regional office, Atlanta

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Dodge, Witherspoon.	Regional director.	White	$4,600
Hope, John	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	3,800
McKay, George D.	do	White	3,200
Chubb, Sally	Clerk-stenographer.	do	2,000
Ingram, Thelma	do	Colored	1,800

You will note that it consists of two Negroes and three whites; the most important post in this office, that of examiner, is held by a Negro. I wonder how the people of Georgia enjoy the domination of this group. I may have more to say about them later.

REGIONAL OFFICE, KANSAS CITY

Here is the list of the Kansas City office:

Regional office, Kansas City

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Hoglund, Roy A.	Regional director.	White	$5,600
Ormabee, Eugene	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,800
Jones, Mildred	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,620
Sehlien, Helene G.	do	White	1,620

You will note that this office force consists of three whites and one Negro. You can read the list of whites yourself and then judge how many of them really represent the people of that area.

ST. LOUIS REGIONAL OFFICE

Here is the list of the regional office at St. Louis:

St. Louis

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Theodore Brown	Examiner in charge.	Colored	$3,800
Morris Levine	Examiner	White	3,200
Armatha Jackson	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,620

You will notice that it consists of two Negroes and Morris Levine. Just how they came to select these particular individuals to preside over the destiny of the white businessmen of the great State of Missouri I cannot understand.

REGIONAL OFFICE, DALLAS, TEX.

The members of the regional office at Dallas are as follows:

Regional office, Dallas

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Castenada, Carlos	Regional director.	White	$4,600
(Vacancy)	Fair-practice examiner.		3,200
Gutleben, Willetta.	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800

You will note there is one vacancy. Last year that position was held by a Negro, namely, Roy V. Williams. The other two members, Carlos Castenada, the regional director, and Willetta Gutleben, seem to be in charge of the office at the present time. This is the regional office that attacked the Dallas News last year for carrying an advertisement for a Negro janitor. This fellow Castenada, the director, held the same position that he holds now. If this set-up is made permanent, then I presume the rest of the white American businessmen in Texas may expect to be harassed just as the Dallas News was.

REGIONAL OFFICE, NEW ORLEANS

The regional office at New Orleans consists of the following members:

Regional office, New Orleans

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Ellinger, W. Don	Regional director.	White	$3,800
Morton, James H.	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	3,200
Ronning, Evelyn	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800

You will note that there are two whites and one Negro in this office. As the Negro is the fair-practice examiner, just what the decent people of Louisiana may expect at the hands of this outfit is romething to contemplate.

REGIONAL OFFICE, SAN FRANCISCO

The San Francisco office consists of the following individuals:

Regional office, San Francisco

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Kingman, Harry L.	Regional director.	White	$5,600
Rutledge, Edward	Fair-practice examiner.	do	4,600
Ross, Bernard	do	do	3,800
Seymour, Virginia	Administrative assistant.	do	2,000
Marren, Jewel	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800

This is the only office we have found yet that consists entirely of white (?) people. Just what the background of each one of them is, I am unable to say.

LOS ANGELES REGIONAL OFFICE

The Los Angeles regional office consists of the following:

Los Angeles

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Hunt, A. Bruce	Hearings examiner.	White	$5,600

Los Angeles—Continued

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Brown, Robert E.	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	$3,600
Lopez, Ignacio	do	White	3,800
Vetter, Vera G.	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800
Lerna, Marie	do	do	1,620

You will note that there are four whites and one Negro in this office, the Negro being the fair-practice examiner. I do not know what consideration the white businessmen of Los Angeles are receiving at the hands of this group, but from what I can hear there is considerable gnashing of teeth over the situation.

Mr. Chairman, this FEPC is a supergovernment of commissars, with more power for evil than any other agency that has ever been created in this country. If Congress should ratify it and make it the law of the land, then we will have sacrificed and destroyed that sacred freedom for which our brave men are now fighting and dying on every battle front in the world.

We have no right to pass such a drastic, revolutionary measure that literally changes our way of life, as well as our form of government, while these boys are away from home in uniform, fighting to sustain American institutions.

As I said before, we are going to carry this battle against such un-American activities into every congressional district in the United States next year, in the primary, so that no one can crawl behind the party cloak and claim immunity at the hands of any segment of our people.

This is a battle for the survival of free constitutional government, for the survival of the American way of life, for the survival of free enterprise, for the survival of American liberty itself.

It is a battle to save America for Americans.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one an editorial and in the other an article.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BATTLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial and some other information on the Atlantic Pact.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

PANAMA CANAL

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 44 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Whereas it is the responsibility of the Congress of the United States to establish the policy to be followed in prescribing the tolls that shall be levied for the use of the Panama Canal; and

Whereas there have been substantial changes in economic conditions since Congress last established such policy, including the effect of such tolls upon American shipping: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized to make a full and complete study and analysis of the financial operation of the Panama Canal with particular reference to the proper accounting and allocation of costs attributable to—

(a) the transit of the Canal by commercial, governmental, and military vessels of United States and foreign nations;

(b) military activities of the United States in and connected with the Canal Zone;

(c) United States civil government, including, but not limited, to sanitation, public schools, playgrounds, hospitals, and so forth;

(d) business operations conducted under the supervision of the Governor-General of the Panama Canal by the various business units of the Panama Canal and Panama Railroad Company;

and to recommend to the Congress concerning what elements of cost should be properly used in the future as the basis of a policy to be followed in establishing and levying tolls for the use of the Panama Canal for transit purposes.

The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable to the House at the earliest practicable date, but not later than June 30, 1949.

The committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within or without the United States whether the Congress is in session, has recessed, or is adjourned; to hold such hearings as it deems necessary; to employ such consultants, specialists, clerks, or other assistants; to travel and authorize its assistants to travel; to utilize such transportation, housing, or other facilities as any governmental agency may make available; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths; to take such testimony; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $15,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House upon vouchers authorized by the committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration; and be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States be, and hereby is, requested to defer until after submission of the committee's report any change in tolls currently levied for the use of the Panama Canal.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. How much general debate will there be on the bill after the rule is adopted?

The SPEAKER. This is not a bill, this is a resolution. There will be 1 hour of debate.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the resolution be subject to amendment?

The SPEAKER. Not unless the gentleman from Texas yields for that purpose.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield for a question.

Mr. RANKIN. I have a bill pending to abolish the Canal tolls for coastwise trade. No foreign country can engage in our coastwise trade. The American people paid for this Canal, and are keeping it up. I think they ought to be permitted to use it without being put on the same footing as foreign countries, which have nothing invested in it.

Our people should be permitted to use our own Panama Canal without having to pay tolls.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. BLAND. It would appear that the gentleman has shown the reason for this resolution which we are now considering. That is one of the things that will be taken into consideration by the committee.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I was not criticizing the committee, I will say to my distinguished friend the gentleman from Virginia. I was just asking for information.

Mr. BLAND. The gentleman from Virginia is not sensitive as to that at all.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, perhaps it will be helpful to the House if I explain briefly the resolution before us.

In March 1949, pursuant to, as and authorized by, section 411, title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, the President issued a proclamation which would have effected changes in the toll rates levied by the Government of the United States for use of the Panama Canal. Those changes would have become effective October 1, 1948—Proclamation No. 2775 of March 26, 1948. In September 1948, the President by further proclamation prescribed that such changes in the toll rates would not be made effective until April 1, 1949, thereby permitting the Congress to investigate and make recommendations concerning the entire question of operations at the Canal. I quote the pertinent sections of the latter proclamation:

Whereas it now appears that the Congress may be called upon to give consideration to the entire question of the cost of operation of the Panama Canal and the tolls to be levied for the use thereof; and

Whereas it appears consistent with the public interest to postpone the effective date of the said Proclamation No. 2775 until April 1, 1949, so as to permit continuance of the present tolls until the Congress shall have had opportunity for such consideration.

Following these proclamations the Chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries introduced House Resolution 44. The committee was of the opinion that the subject matter was of such importance, involving as it does a national policy on the operation of and tolls to be charged for use of the Panama Canal, that the House should have complete and up-to-date information before any changes were made. This resolution permits the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to make a full and complete study and analysis of the financial operation of the Panama Canal. It grants them the power to request by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and documents as are required. The entire purpose of the resolution is to provide helpful and factual informaton in a report to the House so that we may approve a general policy for the operation of the Panama Canal that is consistent with good management.

I thought it particularly timely that this resolution should come before the Congress. A very interesting article appeared February 19, 1949, in the Saturday Evening Post, prepared by Ernest O. Hauser and entitled "Richest Ditch on Earth." It was a story of the Suez Canal. I commend it to you for study and thought. Perhaps, even, it will be useful to the committee or subcommittee making the investigation authorized by the resolution. I was rather startled to realize how little I, as a United States Representative, knew about the operation of the Panama Canal, a canal that has played such a vital part in the development of our country and which looms so important in the future. I am sure that the committee report will be useful and will result in helpful changes.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Will the committee, in submitting their information to the Congress, include therein, for the purpose of our guidance here, any information that is obtained pertaining to the Suez Canal, as to what tolls are charged at that canal, and the way it is managed when our shipping wants to go through the Suez Canal?

Mr. LYLE. While I am not a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, as the gentleman knows, I am sure that the committee will bring to the House a helpful and full and useful report.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. BLAND. While I do not know that I will head up the subcommittee, I have no doubt that every fact that is connected with the imposition of tolls will be brought to the attention of the House, and certainly any matter which any Members of the House desires to bring before the committee will be considered by the committee.

Mr. LYLE. I am sure that the gentleman and his committee will bring in, as I said, a useful and helpful report which will enable the House to make an intelligent decision on this important matter.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. BLAND. May I say that the committee has had jurisdiction of the Panama Canal since 1935. At that time the jurisdiction of the Panama Canal was transferred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries by action of the House, after an agreement that had been worked out between the Speaker of the House, who was then chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and myself as chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The committee, as such, has not made any study of the Panama Canal tolls, because at that time, as will appear from the first order of the President, a law had been passed fixing the tolls. I have been trying to find out if there was any investigation made by the committee. I do not think so. I certainly doubt whether the question of tolls was gone into very carefully by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which our distinguished Speaker was then chairman.

We want to go into all of these matters and determine them finally.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The high character and general standing and patriotism of the chairman of the committee that would do this job ought to be enough insurance that it will be well done. I understand that there is not any opposition whatever to the resolution. If there be none, why can we not move forward and make a determination of the problem?

Mr. LYLE. The gentleman is correct. However, the resolution must be amended to comply with the rules of the House. I will offer an amendment to strike out certain portions later.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. As usual, when the gentleman from Texas presents a resolution for consideration here, he gives very careful study and consideration to the resolution and to what it intends to accomplish and the ends to be met. Consequently, being prepared as he always is, I feel that he should not be deprived of the opportunity of explaining more fully the provisions of the resolution, because I know it will be of value to the Members and at the same time it will be an example to others to prepare any resolutions or bills that they may present to the House.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. COX. I must disclaim any intention of shutting the gentleman off, because I know he knows what he is talking about. He has examined this whole question very carefully, and he is prepared to give information to anyone who may be in doubt as to the position they should take on the matter.

Mr. LYLE. I am grateful to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] for their statements.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LYLE. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there is no objection to this resolution at this time, provided the prerogatives of the Committee on House Administration are protected by amendments, whereby the Committee on House Administration decides as to the amount of expenditure to be made.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LYLE. At what time would an amendment be proper? Now, or after the previous question has been ordered?

The SPEAKER. An amendment to the body of the resolution should be offered now.

Mr. LYLE. I offer an amendment, Mr. Speaker, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LYLE:

On page 3, line 6, after the word "oaths" and the semicolon, insert the word "and."

On page 3, line 7, after the word "testimony", strike out the semicolon and the words "and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable."

Page 3, line 8, after the word "advisable", strike out the period and the remainder of the paragraph down to and including the word "administration" in line 14.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LYLE: Page 1, strike out the preamble of the resolution.

The amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KILBURN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a resolution and two editorials.

Mr. COLMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, today I want to briefly discuss the possibility of the enactment of labor legislation in the Eighty-first Congress. I say "possibility" because after all of the noise and campaign promises, nothing has yet happened.

The Congress has been in session 57 days. The administration has a majority of 91 Democrats in the House and 12 Democrats in the Senate. The committee handling labor legislation in the House has a majority of 16 Democratic members to 9 Republican members. The Senate Committee on Labor has 8 Democrats and 5 Republicans.

In the campaign the President and some big labor leaders who joined him promised the laboring men they would repeal the Taft-Hartley law. I rise to ask the question: Why have they not done it by now? They have not even written a bill for consideration.

Mr. Speaker, the House and Senate committees have enough Democratic votes on each committee to report a bill at any time to the floor of the House or Senate to repeal the Taft-Hartley law. There are enough Democrats in the House and Senate to pass this legislation without a Republican vote, and thus keep the campaign promises they made to the laboring people, if and when they want to do it.

Their excuse now is that the Republicans are blocking this legislation. That is nothing less than a conspiracy on the part of the labor leaders and administration leaders to dodge their own responsibility, and to deceive the laboring men.

Tell me—are the Republicans so much smarter, or so much more powerful that a small minority of them can prevent a heavy Democratic majority from reporting out, or passing labor legislation?

The Republican Eightieth Congress, with a much smaller majority than the Democrats now hold, was held responsible for the passage of the Taft-Hartley law, even though a majority of the Democratic Members of the House and Senate joined with the Republicans to override the President's veto. Certainly, the laboring men who have been promised by the labor leaders and the party in power that they would repeal the Taft-Hartley law forthwith will now blame the administration for not making a real attempt to repeal the law. They have the ball now, and plenty of players on their team. They cannot blame their failure on us few Republicans.

Mr. Speaker, the real reason is that they are beginning to hear from the rank and file of labor, and from the people back home generally, who now begin to realize that the Taft-Hartley law is a good law, under which labor and everyone has prospered as never before; a law that has brought labor and management into a more harmonious relationship than at any time in the past 16 years. The general public of over 80,000,000 people also know that this law helps to protect their rights, and has been in part responsible for the greatest production and the greatest prosperity in the past 2 years this Nation has ever witnessed.

There is another reason why they have not rushed a bill out to the floor of the House to keep their promise to repeal the Taft-Hartley law. That reason is that they have offered nothing worth while in its place. They know the people will not accept nothing in a law for something that has worked well for the past 2 years. The proposed new law recommended to the committee, if enacted, would be worse than no law at all.

The representatives of the people, both Democrats and Republicans, by a majority in the House and Senate, will not go back to the one-sided Wagner Act, and will not turn the wheels of government back to the former strikes and chaos they know will result, unless legislation is provided to follow the Taft-Hartley law that will be fair and helpful to all—to the rank and file of labor, to business, agriculture, and to all of the people of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the laboring men themselves are beginning to realize that the Taft-Hartley law contains many essential provisions for the protection of the individual laboring man—protection from management on the one hand and protection from some dictatorial labor bosses on the other hand.

Many laboring men would prefer that from 13 to 18 of the principal provisions of the Taft-Hartley law be written into any legislation that takes its piece.

Mr. Speaker, in an effort to sample the opinion of the laboring men in two of the strongest unionized cities in my district as to what they would like in labor legislation, I mailed out 2,000 questionnaires recently to card-carrying union men representing shop workers, railroad men, members of the buildings trades, shoe-factory workers, and so forth, and asked them to fill out the questionnaire and give me any suggestions as to other legislation they think should be written into the new labor bill. I must admit that I was a little surprised when the questionnaires began to come back to me on the 16 provisions contained in the Taft-Hartley law.

Approximately 90 percent of the returns urged that all of the 16 provisions now in the Taft-Hartley law be retained in any legislation the Congress may write.

I do not contend that if all persons contacted had replied that the percentage ratio would show such a heavy majority. In fact, one could hardly hope even a majority would so express themselves when for 2 years the labor leaders and labor papers have every week told them the Taft-Hartley law is a slave-labor law, and should be repealed. I think the returns do indicate that possibly a majority who understand the law would want most of the provisions of the act written into any new legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I make this statement because several magazines during the past 2 years have made general Nation-wide polls among union men, asking their opinion on most of the provisions I have listed. The general consensus of these polls, including a poll made by Look magazine, show that 60 to 78 percent generally approved these provisions in the Taft-Hartley law. Their prejudice had been built up much more against the law, than against its actual effect on the workers as contained in its provisions.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include the questionnaire as a part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I have deleted the name; however, here is the way about 90 percent of the laboring men filled out the questionnaire:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 19, 1949.

DEAR FRIEND: The present Taft-Hartley law will either be repealed or rewritten. It is my hope that the new legislation enacted

will be fair and just to both labor and management, and in the best interest of all the people of the Nation.

As your Representative in Congress, I am anxious to have your opinion on the following provisions which were written into the present law for the sole purpose of protecting the rights of you individuals of the rank and file of labor. If you want them continued in the new legislation, write "yes" after each provision. If you do not, write "no" after each provision.

PROVISIONS IN PRESENT LAW

1. Recognizes your constitutional right to quit your job at any time. Yes.

2. Protects you against being forced out of your job by union officials so long as you pay your dues. Yes.

3. Protects you against discrimination or threats by your employer or your union officials. Yes.

4. Helps to drive Communists out of union leadership by requiring union officials to make sworn statements that they are not members of the Communist Party. Yes.

5. Prohibits your union officers from spending your dues by making donations to political candidates. Yes.

6. Gives you the right to vote secretly on all union questions. Yes.

7. Prohibits "check-off" of dues from your pay without your written consent. Yes.

8. Prevents waste of your dues by compelling union officials to give each member at the end of each year a financial statement showing the amount of money taken in, how spent, and to whom. Yes.

9. Gives you the right to ask for an election to determine if union continues to represent a majority of the employees. Yes.

10. Protects you from personal financial liability through any judgments rendered against your union. Yes.

11. Protects you from loss of pay by prohibiting secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes. Yes.

12. Gives you the right by secret ballot to determine whether or not a strike shall be called. Yes.

13. Provides for a union shop, but requires that any employee, within 30 days, must become a member of the union if a bargaining agreement is in effect between the employer and the employees. Yes.

14. Gives you the right as an individual to appeal to the National Labor Relations Board for protection of your rights and privileges. Yes.

Not one of the above provisions which now give the individual members of a union more freedom and greater protection was contained in the Wagner Act. You can now express yourself fully on the floor of your union without fear of being discriminated against or being forced out of a union by any union officer. These provisions are for the protection of the rank and file of labor in the locals.

15. In view of these facts, do you favor the outright repeal of the Taft-Hartley law and that the old Wagner Act containing none of these provisions for your protection be instituted in its place? No.

Please give me your opinion on the following provisions also contained in the present law by writing in "yes" or "no":

1. The present law provides that the Government, on a recommendation of the President, can obtain an injunction for a period limited to 80 days against strikes which would imperil the health and safety of the Nation. Should we retain this provision? Yes.

2. The present law gives the employers the right of free speech in labor-management disputes, so long as they do not threaten or promise anything. Do you believe management should continue to have this right that was denied them under the Wagner Act? Yes.

If you will check the above provisions and mail this letter back to me, giving me your opinion, it will be helpful, and I will appreciate it. Your name will be held in strict confidence and not disclosed.

I shall be glad to have any other suggestions you care to make with reference to this legislation. Please feel free to write me.

Sincerely yours,

C. W. VORSELL,
Member of Congress.

Please sign here: _____
(Name)
_____
(Address)

Practically every labor paper since the day the Taft-Hartley bill was passed, and many of the big labor leaders who saw their power slipping away from them and being given back to the rank and file, and to the little locals of the Nation, kept up a drumfire for months that the Taft-Hartley law was a slave-labor bill.

LABOR'S IRON CURTAIN

Can it be that the real reason the labor leaders have tried to hold down the "iron curtain" to keep the laboring men from knowing what was in the bill was because for the first time in 16 years the rank and file of labor was being given protection and freedom from the dictatorial power of some labor bosses?

Mr. Speaker, I am not interested in the name of Tafty-Hartley bill. I do not care what you may call the act that succeeds it. I am interested in the combined welfare of labor, agriculture, little and big business, because I know, and everyone should know, that any legislation that is passed should be fair and just to all of these great segments of industry, and it should be in the interest of over 80,000,000 people that are not classified as either employers or employees.

I know, and every right-thinking person knows, from the laboring man up to the big-business man, that all of these groups must be encouraged with fair and just legislation to work together in an effort to keep wages at a high level; business at a high level; agriculture at a high level; and that we cannot have continuous prosperity in this country unless all of these objectives are achieved.

Mr. Speaker, there are some sections of the Taft-Hartley law, in my judgment, that are not necessary. There are some amendments that should be written into the law that follows it. I am only interested in legislation that will be beneficial to all of the people.

Mr. Speaker, I am equally against any law that will give business too great power or control, and I am against any legislation that will put into the hands of a few labor leaders of this country the power to choke the Nation to its knees, and slow down and endanger the entire economy of the Nation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in each an article.

Mr. MONRONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Christian Science Monitor regarding Hon. BROOKS HAYS' proposal on civil-rights legislation.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

HELP WANTED: A UNITED STATES FOREIGN SERVICE ACADEMY

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, why do we win the wars and lose the peace? The losing of which breeds more wars. Because we train men—career men—in the military arts, but leave our diplomacy to amateurs.

Take a recent trend.

A man has become a successful soldier, a several-starred general. He has learned how to command. Then we appoint him to a diplomatic post where he must exercise the flexible and understanding talent of a conciliator.

It just does not work.

Might as well put a bull in a china shop.

Or a man has wealth, social connections, or political pull. And these are supposed to invest him overnight with an intimate knowledge of international affairs, and all those other special qualities of a profession which requires years of study and experience.

Diplomacy is a vocation, not an avocation. A serious matter. In the United States, however, we have come to regard it as a delayed-action Cook's tour.

We pick a man who is successful and a regular fellow. We put him in charge of an embassy, which is like an island of the United States put down in the strange sea of some foreign country. He knows nothing of the language, customs, political organization, history, or policies of that country. He blunders—unintentially, of course—and ruins the good will we have built up through the sacrifice of many American lives and the expenditure of much American wealth. Then he is transferred. And the people back home begin to suspect that something is lacking in such an arrangement.

It could be special training for the particular job. The State Department is not entirely to blame for this failure of American diplomacy to grow up. Nor is any President to blame. The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, under date line of February 21, 1949, pointed to the trouble, which only the Congress can start to remedy by legislation. The Commission recommended broad revision in this country's machinery for dealing with foreign relations. Among other things, it said President Truman should have a freer hand in directing such relations, and a better set-up for getting sound advice. In calling for a major shake-up of the State Department, the Commission declared that the Department has fallen to a level of low esteem with Congress, the public, the press, and many of its own officials. The State Department's organic statute of

1789 is still its basic charter. Then we were a small, isolated Nation.

Today we are one of the two major nations to whom more than half the world looks for a consistent policy of leadership.

Consistent? The Commission reports that—

> Today the coordinated activities of the State Department and the 45 other units of the executive branch is sine qua non for the effective conduct of the various and numerous foreign-affairs activities.

But the most striking present-day feature of the organization of the Government for the conduct of foreign affairs is the participation in all its phases by other departments and agencies.

First, we need an overhaul of the Department itself, with the insertion of the missing link, namely, the establishment of a United States Foreign Service Academy for the instruction and training of diplomatic cadets in preparation for service as officers in the Foreign Service of the United States.

A bill to this effect, identified as H. R. 471, was introduced by me in the United States House of Representatives on January 3, 1949.

Without the cadre of officers trained at West Point, Annapolis, and the postgraduate war colleges of the respective services, our civilian armies would have been without adequate leadership in World War II, with serious consequences for our Nation.

In fact, this core of highly trained personnel, more than counterbalanced the professional armies and the universal military training of such countries as Germany, Italy, and Japan.

In fact, the British were so impressed with the efficiency of our officer-training academies that they are planning to copy our methods.

Recently, no less an authority than Gen. Carl Spaatz, United States Air Force, retired, in the February 21, 1949, issue of Newsweek, recommends broadening the scope of instruction at West Point and Annapolis so as to train men for interchangeable service in the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

He contends that this would promote unification of the armed forces.

Officers so broadly trained would be of greater value to the country in this age of expanding world responsibilities.

There is also the clue to a solution of our problem in the field of diplomacy.

In this age of expanding world responsibilities we need, in the civilian sense, officers so broadly trained as to be of greater value to the country.

Their basic training shall be in foreign languages, not isolated as such, but woven into a thorough knowledge of the traditions and the outlook, the hopes and the fears of the Russian, the Mexican, the average person in China, or the citizen of Canada, for example.

At the same time they should be careful and objective reporters of the ideologies being forced upon certain unfortunate peoples of this world.

They should be able to help us preserve American security while we work toward world understanding and world security.

What are the chief functions of a Foreign Service officer?

To represent American interests abroad, to report, and to negotiate.

Mind you, we call them "officers" and we refer to them as a "corps."

By the very nature of their duties, they spend most of their lives outside of the United States.

This has created the problem of re-Americanization.

One of the objectives of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, was to insure that it was broadly representative of the American people and fully informed in respect to current trends in American life.

This can be achieved by the medium of a Foreign Service Academy which will make certain that such officers receive a thorough training in the traditions, the history, and the performance of our way of life, as well as that of the countries to which they are assigned.

How many times have we felt that our colleges and universities, as such, were taking the United States for granted, and were failing to provide that awareness of American culture and civilization, with all its accomplishments and its shortcomings, which must serve as the basis of their occupations and their lives?

I submit that we cannot leave our Foreign Service to men and women who are not specially trained in Americanism first.

How many people know that our State Department and the Foreign Service are two distinct organizations, each with its own personnel, appropriations, and administration?

This dual structure makes the United States today the only major power with its foreign affairs organization divided into two segments and often alienated, one from the other.

Our Foreign Service personnel, to keep in touch with their fellow-Americans and the viewpoint of Americans, must serve in the United States for longer periods than actually is the case today.

Does not this signify, in part, lack of a unified, basic training for the Foreign Service.

In this one-world atomic age we cannot rely upon cloistered scholars nor upon those who have acquired most of their formal education in foreign countries to provide the personnel to represent us in diplomacy.

Our own colleges and universities do not offer complete professional training in Foreign Service as a career.

Furthermore, they are limited in their approach because such training is a primary function of the Government and should be provided by the Government.

It is within the permanent structure of the Government, as distinguished from the changing administrations of Government, whether they be Democratic or Republican.

As yet, this concept has not taken root and form through the establishment of a United States Foreign Service Academy which will provide the trained officers necessary to measure up to our new responsibilities as one of the two major powers in world affairs.

To fill this gap, my bill would authorize the Secretary of State to establish or maintain, in or near the District of Columbia, an academy to train men and women for careers in our Foreign Service.

In prescribing the curriculum, the Secretary shall provide that special emphasis be placed on the study of the history, culture, customs, folklore, and language or languages of the nations which the trainees select as a major subject of study.

They shall not only be versed in the ability to understand and report the viewpoints of the governments and the people of the countries to which they may be assigned; they must be able, also, to explain the United States and its people to foreigners.

They must be competent and tactful in the presentation of our informational program and in the art of promoting, in spite of difficult barriers, the development of international understanding and good will.

This will require special talents and special studies.

The opportunity to attend the academy will be open to all Americans of good character who pass the competitive examinations, limited only to that number of the highest marks which may fill a yearly quota.

While in attendance at the academy, tuition, quarters, subsistence, and other necessary expenses shall be paid for by the Government.

In making original appointments of permanent officers in the Foreign Service, preference shall be given to graduates of the academy, after they have served 2 years as temporary employees at foreign stations.

There shall be appointed each year a board of visitors to the academy, which shall consist of five members from the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and five members from the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the respective chairmen of such committees.

The board of visitors shall exercise the same functions as is provided in the case of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy.

The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of our Government has recently charged that the intelligence unit is the weakest and least effective in the State Department, and that its relationships with the Central Intelligence Agency partake of rivalry rather than cooperation.

The State Department's relationship with the press and other media of public information are extremely weak, the report added.

The Congress, should it authorize a Foreign Service academy, will insist on adequate training of personnel to remedy these deficiencies.

United Nations in swaddling clothes, Truman Doctrine, Marshall plan, cold war, Russian expansionism, satellites, the cancer of communism, propaganda, the stirrings of independence among colonial peoples, in this welter of swiftly changing events, the United States will need the best men to represent our interests.

Diplomacy in the atomic age must grow up.

In the world assembly of the future, men and women who are thoroughly

schooled in the American way of life and in the relationship between our Nation and other nations will be among the most distinguished leaders that our country has produced or will produce.

And I am sure that many of them will be graduates of the United States Foreign Service Academy.

To this end, I ask your support of H. R. 471.

The time to prepare for the future is today.

PULASKI MEMORIAL HOUR ON MARCH 4

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, Friday, March 4, 1949, will be the two hundred and first anniversary of the birth of the renowned Polish-American hero, Gen. Casimir Pulaski. I feel it would be proper and fitting in recognition of his services to our country and in respect to his memory that we pay tribute to him in the House on his birthday anniversary.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that immediately upon the conclusion of legislative business on that day that I be recognized for 1 hour for that purpose.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WAGNER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

CINCINNATI AND THE COMMUNISTS

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I happened to have been born and raised in the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, which city has been known throughout the world as the Queen City of the West and as a place of which we are all justly proud.

Our city has an excellent reputation for progressiveness, peace, and quiet. Our community is made up of different groups, such of which have been banded together to help make this the greatest Nation in the world. We have an excellent record with reference to brotherhood, racial and religious relations, and all of us meet together periodically to discuss our problems and work out the same. Class hatred is an unknown quantity in our community.

Commencing on Saturday, February 26, 1949, and throughout the week up to and including Saturday, March 5, we are celebrating Brotherhood Week, a time when we rejoice and are glad that turmoil among groups has never existed in our community.

However, on last Saturday, February 26, 1949, certain individuals who call themselves the Hamilton County Communist Party came out of their hiding places and attempted to disrupt the peaceful people of our community. They attempted to stir up unrest among our people by appealing to religious prejudice through mimeographed sheets which were distributed in certain sections of our fair city. Like rats coming out of sewers they poked their ugly heads out into the open just long enough to attempt to accomplish their purpose and then immediately went back into hiding. None of them had the courage to affix his or her name to the scurrilous literature which they circulated.

In our community also we are very fortunate in having several civic-minded radio stations, among which one of the most informative is WCPO which is owned and operated by one of our city's best newspapers, the Cincinnati Post. Mr. Robert Otto, the news commentator on radio station WCPO, was the person who first brought to light this despicable attempt to inflame our people, and I quote from the broadcast made by Mr. Otto at 4 p. m. on Saturday, February 26, 1949, over radio station WCPO:

> Communists came out of hiding in the Cinti area today in a move obviously designed to inflame members of the Jewish community against Catholics.
>
> Mimeographed letters bearing the heading, "Mindszenty anti-Semite" were circulated among passersby at prominent corners in Avondale. The inflammatory letters ironically were being passed out at the climax to the local observance of Brotherhood Week, on the Jewish Sabbath and on the eve of the Catholic observance of Sunday.
>
> The letters referred to the Catholic primate of Hungary, Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, who now is behind bars in that Communist-dominated land following a so-called trial. The letters through which the local Reds hoped to set Jew against Catholic bear this sentence at the bottom, and we quote: "Hamilton County Communist Party, Avondale Branch, Post Office Box 1483."
>
> Following our broadcast of the Avondale incident, Second District Congressman EARL T. WAGNER, who heard the newscast, said he was going to request the FBI to arrest and prosecute the composers and circulators of the missives. Cinti detective headquarters is also investigating. District 7 police told us that circulation of political or defamatory circulars in the manner used by the Reds is prohibited by city ordinance, but no one was cited in Avondale, however.
>
> The Communist letter attempts to brand Cardinal Mindszenty an arch enemy of the Jews. Yet during the so-called trial of the cardinal the Post carried an interview with an internationally known Jewish figure, Bela Fabian, who said that he personally knew the cardinal and worked with him to save Jewish people from the terror of Hitler and the Reds. Fabian branded as an outright lie any attempt to link the cardinal with anti-Semitism.
>
> The Hamilton County Communists obviously have established a link between themselves and the Red persecutors of Catholics in Europe. Their mimeographed letters, of which we have a copy, are apparently designed to steer Americans from any course critical of Russia.

Needless to say, our people in our community could not be swayed nor influenced in any fashion by this despicable smear and their observance of Brotherhood Week is going forward bigger and better than ever and our record of good fellowship remains unblemished.

In my humble opinion, people of the type who attempt to stir up class and religious prejudice such as this are a dangerous menace to the peace and quiet of this country. If they love the Communist ideals and its methods of treachery, deceit, and law of force, may I respectfully recommend to the State Department that we give them an immediate passport for a one-way trip to the land they love from a distance but which I know they do not want to return to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. FENTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. ADDONIZIO (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. TEAGUE (at the request of Mr. PICKETT), for this week, on account of attendance on the joint maneuvers by the Army, Navy, and Air Force in the Caribbean Sea.

To Mr. DAGUE (at the request of Mr. GRAHAM), for this week, on account of death in family.

To Mr. WALSH (at the request of Mr. JACOBS), for 4 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. BURNSIDE (at the request of Mr. RAMSAY), for 3 days, on account of death in family.

To Mr. GATHINGS, for 3 days, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 54. An act to retrocede to the State of New Mexico exclusive jurisdiction held by the United States over lands within the boundaries of the Los Alamos project of the United States Atomic Energy Commission; and

H. J. Res. 92. Joint resolution to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 1, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

277. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting revised estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1950 involving a decrease of $44,882,000 for the Veterans' Administration in the form of amendments to the budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 85); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

278. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting to the Congress a study prepared for the Commission's consideration on the national security organization in the Federal Government (H. Doc. No. 86); to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed.

279. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting its report on the national security organization and, separately, as appendix G, a part of the report of the task force assigned to examine this segment of the executive branch; to the Committee on Armed Services.

280. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting to the Congress, in typescript, volume II to the study on the national security organization offered for the Commission's consideration by the task force as a supplement to their summary report on this subject; to the Committee on Armed Services.

281. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting to the Congress, in typescript, volume III to the study on the national security organization offered for the Commission's consideration by the task force as a supplement to their summary report on this subject; to the Committee on Armed Services.

282. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide a continuing fund for the payment of claims allowed by the General Accounting Office chargeable to lapsed appropriations"; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

283. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to redefine the units and establish the standards of electrical and photometric measurements; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

284. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed joint resolution approving an agreement relating to the resolution of conflicting claims to German enemy assets and related protocol and authorizing the President to enter into the agreement or other agreements similar in character with certain countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

285. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting statistical tables and charts containing data in regard to bankruptcy cases administered in the district courts of the United States in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

286. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of John W. Crumpacker, commander, United States Navy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

287. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for a Resident Commissioner to the United States from the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Public Lands.

288. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize certain personnel and former personnel of the United States Coast Guard and the United States Public Health Service to accept certain gifts tendered by foreign governments; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

289. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to regulate the hours of duty and the pay of civilian keepers of lighthouses and civilians employed on lightships and other vessels of the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

290. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 26, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on, and a preliminary examination and survey of, Cape Fear River at and below Wilmington, N. C., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on July 24, 1946, and also requested by a resolution of the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, adopted on February 7, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 87); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

291. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 19, 1948, submitting an interim report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of Brazos River and tributaries, Texas, covering Leon River, a secondary tributary, authorized by the Flood Control Acts approved on June 22, 1936, and August 28, 1937, and by the River and Harbor Act approved August 26, 1937 (H. Doc. No. 88); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with three illustrations.

292. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 19, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Warroad Harbor and River, Minn., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives adopted on June 19, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

293. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 4, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Saw Mill River, N. Y., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

294. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 19, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Cedar Bayou Pass, Corpus Christi Pass, and pass at Murdock's Landing, Texas, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

295. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting lists or schedules, or parts of lists or schedules, covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

296. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the construction and equipment of a radio laboratory building for the National Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

297. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service suspending deportation, as well as a list of the persons involved; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

298. A letter from the assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to repeal section 8 of the act of March 3, 1893; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

299. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to revise and repeal certain acts relating to rules of survey to permit departures from the system of rectangular survey when necessary on all public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

300. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize appropriations for roads, trails, and other aids to transportation serving lands and facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

301. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill relating to the development of tourist and other public facilities in conjunction with the Alaska Highway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

302. A letter from the President, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend section 4 (b) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 165. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 157. A bill authorizing the Attorney General of the United States to recognize and to award to outstanding courageous young Americans a medal for heroism known as the Young American Medal for Bravery, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 166). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WHITTINGTON:

H. R. 3019. A bill to provide for comprehensive planning, for site acquisition in and outside of the District of Columbia, and for the design of Federal building projects outside of the District of Columbia; to authorize the transfer of jurisdiction over certain lands between certain departments and agencies of the United States; and to provide certain additional authority needed in connection with the construction, management, and operation of Federal public buildings; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 3020. A bill to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STEFAN:

H. R. 3021. A bill to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 3022. A bill to transfer the Pomona station of the Agriculture Remount Service, Department of Agriculture, at Pomona, Calif.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 3023. A bill amending Public Law 49, Seventy-seventh Congress, providing for the welfare of coal miners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 3024. A bill to provide for the discharge from the armed forces of persons who were married at the time of their induction; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 3025. A bill to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act (title VI of the Public Health Service Act), to extend its duration and provide greater financial assistance in the construction of hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 3026. A bill to incorporate the Legion of Guardsmen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORSKI of New York:

H. R. 3027. A bill to provide pay increases for employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CAVALCANTE:

H. R. 3028. A bill to provide for a new post-office building in Windber, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3029. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to remove racial barriers to naturalization with respect to spouses and children of United States citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 3030. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3031. A bill to grant travel and subsistence allowances to the next of kin attending group burials of remains of known individuals returned to the United States for interment; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming:

H. R. 3032. A bill to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 3033. A bill to extend the coverage of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system, to increase certain benefits payable under such system, to reduce the retirement age, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:

H. R. 3034. A bill to authorize the improvement of the Savannah River below Augusta, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H. R. 3035. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 with respect to the terms "brother" and "sister"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 3036. A bill to regulate oleomargarine to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3037. A bill to amend section 2680 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3038. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to repair and remodel the Belasco Theater and rent it out to the performing arts; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 3039. A bill to amend section 302 (c) of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FURCOLO:

H. R. 3040. A bill to provide for a comprehensive survey to promote the development of hydroelectric power, flood control, and other improvements on the Merrimack and Connecticut Rivers and such other rivers in the New England States where improvements are feasible; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 3041. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide parity for tung nuts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 3042. A bill to provide relief for the sheep-raising industry by making special quota immigration visas available to certain alien sheepherders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3043. A bill to assist in bringing about a more sound agricultural economy through diversification of its productive resources by providing for research into the basic laws and principles relating to domestically raising fur-bearing animals; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. R. 3044. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a condition precedent to voting or registering to vote in an election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KEEFE:

H. R. 3045. A bill to regulate the registration, manufacture, labeling, and inspection of fertilizer and fertilizer materials shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 3046. A bill to authorize the expansion of facilities at the Cape Vincent, N. Y., fish-cultural station; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KRUSE:

H. R. 3047. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Albion, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3048. A bill to provide that the next of kin of certain persons who died while serving in the armed forces of the United States shall be furnished with monuments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 3049. A bill to amend Public Law 702, Eightieth Congress, to extend assistance to certain veterans with wartime service-connected disability involving the loss or loss of use of certain extremities in acquiring specially adapted housing which they require by reason of the nature of their service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3050. A bill to amend Public Law 702, Eightieth Congress, to extend assistance to certain veterans with wartime service-connected blindness in acquiring specially adapted housing which they require by reason of the nature of their service-connected disability; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 3051. A bill to reduce to 10 percent the rate of withholding of tax on wages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 3052. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to announce the parity price of milk, and to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to immediately announce the support price of milk; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3053. A bill to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 3054. A bill for the purpose of erecting an adequate terminal annex post office in Seattle, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

H. R. 3055. A bill to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PHILLIPS of California:

H. R. 3056. A bill to provide for disposition of lands on the Cabazon, Augustine, and Torres-Martinez Indian Reservations; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. POTTER:

H. R. 3057. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to provide that certain chronic and tropical diseases becoming manifest within 2 years after separation from active service shall be presumed to be service-connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SANBORN:

H. R. 3058. A bill to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 3059. A bill to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 3060. A bill to create additional Secretaries of the armed services for Reserve components; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3061. A bill to establish a committee for Reserve components within the Department of the Army and the Department of the Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 3062. A bill to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 3063. A bill to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 3064. A bill to authorize waiver of statutory and regulatory limitations in meritorious cases; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3065. A bill to authorize Secretary of the Army to enter into certain contracts for sale of electric power, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3066. A bill to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3067. A bill relating to full-time institutional trade and industrial training for veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 3068. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the Lake Washington Floating Bridge; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3069. A bill to enable certain former officers or employees of the United States separated from the service subsequent to January 23, 1942, to elect to forfeit their rights to civil-service retirement annuities and to obtain in lieu thereof returns of their contributions with interest; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WERDEL:

H. R. 3070. A bill to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SECREST:

H. R. 3071. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to purchase certain property in Morgan County; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 3072. A bill to establish a Bureau of Reserve Affairs in the Department of the Army and in the Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. J. Res. 178. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1956 Olympic games at Detroit, Mich.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. J. Res. 179. Joint resolution for the approval for Atlantic Defense Pact; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States for consideration of their House Joint Memorial 6, requesting the introduction and enactment of appropriate legislation for the appropriation of funds for the building of the Custer Battlefield Museum, at Custer Battlefield National Monument, Mont.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to make available the sum of $2,500,000 for the construction of the Idaho Central Highway from Trude, Idaho, to Mountain Home, Idaho; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass Senate bill 362, which calls for payments in lieu of taxes on federally owned real property so as to reimburse States and local governments, bringing about substantial equity between local and Federal taxpayers with respect to Federally owned real property; to the Committee on Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 3073. A bill for the relief of Loretta Ann Perry and Helen Claire Cherry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 3074. A bill to provide for the relief of Elsie Noot; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 3075. A bill to provide for the renewal of patent No. 1,846,542, issued February 23, 1932, relating to carrying bags; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 3076. A bill for the relief of Jerome Hendrik Boogerman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 3077. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rebecca Levy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3078. A bill for the relief of John A. Watson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 3079. A bill providing for the renewal of design patent No. D-95922, issued June 11, 1935; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 3080. A bill for the relief of Earl L. Doss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WERDEL:

H. R. 3081. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy M. Evans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

124. By Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma: Memorial of the Oklahoma Legislature, asking Congress to make a suitable appropriation for the care and support of needy and destitute Indians; to the Committee on Appropriations.

125. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Memorial of the State Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide sufficient funds adequately to aid in a modern way the improvement of the Indian's economic well-being; to the Committee on Appropriations.

126. By Mr. PATTEN: Memorial of the State of Arizona, requesting the decentralization of war industries and calling attention to the advantages of Arizona as a location for war industries; to the Committee on Armed Services.

127. Also, memorial of the State of Arizona, proposing decontrol of rental housing in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

128. By Mr. MANSFIELD: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, requesting the Eighty-first Congress to introduce and pass the Veterans' Economic Development Act as embodied in H. R. 521 and S. 1652, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

129. By Mr. HART: Petition of the Hudson County Federation of Holy Name Societies, Jersey City, N. J., severely condemning the action of the Moscow-governed satellite and protesting the effort to destroy religion and liberty throughout the world and calling upon the President and Congress of the United States to disaffirm any recognition of those governments which seek to destroy the God-given liberties of men; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

130. Also, petition of Catholic Youth Organization, Hudson County Catholic Youth Center, of Jersey City, N. J., protesting the unjust, unwarranted, and cruel sentence imposed by the Communist-controlled Hungarian Government upon Josef Cardinal Mindszenty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

131. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, Hudson County Chapter, Jersey City, N. J., condemning the Communist-dominated proceedings which resulted in the sentencing of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty to life imprisonment as a travesty upon justice and an affront to all freedom-loving peoples; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

132. Also, petition of the Hudson County Federation of Holy Name Societies, New Jersey, condemning the action against Josef Cardinal Mindszenty by the Hungarian Government and calling upon the President and Congress of the United States to disaffirm any recognition of those governments which seek to destroy the God-given liberties of men; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

133. By Mr. PATTEN: Memorial of the State of Arizona, requesting Congress to provide recreational facilities in the Lake Mead National Recreational Area; to the Committee on Public Lands.

134. Also, memorial of the State of Arizona, requesting immediate action with respect to social-security payments to Indians on reservations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

135. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Frank W. Cronin, secretary, Nebraska Committee for MVA, Omaha, Nebr., petitioning consideration of their resolution urging immediate creation of a Missouri Valley Administration, patterned after the successful Tennessee Valley Authority, also urging congressional investigation of water-development and lobbying organizations, their membership, and financing; to the Committee on Public Works.

136. Also, petition of Mrs. Ella Adams, secretary, Boynton Beach Townsend Club, No. 1, Boynton Beach, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution requesting immediate action, consideration, and enactment of the proposed legislation known as the Townsend plan, H. R. 2135, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

137. By Mr. HILL: Memorial of the State of Colorado, requesting that Congress enact legislation providing for the creation of a Department of Natural Resources, the establishment of regional or branch offices of that and other Federal departments and agencies, and for the location of a United States Military Academy of the Air in Denver; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

138. Also, memorial of the State of Colorado, requesting the Congress to enact legislation to make Indians citizens of the United States in order that they may be able to vote; to the Committee on Public Lands.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 1, 1949

(Legislative day of Monday, February 21, 1949)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Thou knowest our frame and rememberest that we are dust. Thy patience outlasts all the dullness of our apprehension and the dimness of our vision.

Today we come for light enough to walk by. Save us from the futile repetition of old errors and the restoration of old evils. Let not ignorance nor mean partisanship nor selfish greed nor the temptations of privilege block the way to a new order in the world with hope of lasting peace, enlarging bretherhood and increasing opportunities for all Thy children. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

MEMBERSHIP AND PARTICIPATION BY UNITED STATES IN CERTAIN INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmiting a draft of proposed legislation amending certain laws providing for membership and participation by the United States in certain international organizations and authorizing appropriations therefor (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CONTINUING FUND FOR PAYMENT OF CLAIMS ALLOWED BY GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide a continuing fund for the payment of claims allowed by the General Accounting Office chargeable to lapsed appropriations (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hunt	Myers
Anderson	Ives	Neely
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Bricker	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Broughton	Kefauver	Reed
Butler	Kem	Robertson
Cain	Kerr	Russell
Chavez	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Connally	Knowland	Schoeppel
Cordon	Langer	Smith, Maine
Donnell	Lodge	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Long	Sparkman
Downey	Lucas	Stennis
Eastland	McCarran	Taft
Ecton	McCarthy	Taylor
Ellender	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Flanders	McGrath	Thye
Fulbright	McKellar	Tobey
George	Magnuson	Tydings
Gillette	Malone	Vandenberg
Green	Martin	Watkins
Hayden	Maybank	Wherry
Hendrickson	Miller	Wiley
Hill	Millikin	Williams
Hoey	Morse	Withers
Holland	Mundt	
Humphrey	Murray	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is necessarily absent.

The senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent attending the funeral of a close personal friend, Mr. Ivan C. Morgan.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in view of the fact that there probably will be some requests for submissions of petitions and memorials, introduction of bills and joint resolutions, and other matters, which will be presented without debate, I ask unanimous consent that such procedure be allowed without in any way interfering with the present parliamentary situation upon the pending question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if unanimous consent is granted at this point it is my understanding that it is only for the purpose of the insertion of matters into the RECORD. Does it involve long statements?

Mr. LUCAS. It must not involve long statements.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The unanimous-consent request was that Senators be permitted to present petitions and memorials and introduce bills and joint resolutions, and present other routine matters, without debate.

Mr. WHERRY. Without debate, and with only short observations, if any are made at all?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes; that is the understanding.

Mr. LUCAS. And without in any wise involving the present parliamentary situation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, does the request include reports of committees? I think it should.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Does the request include the extension of remarks?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The request includes, as the Chair understands, the transaction of ordinary routine business without debate. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I ask if the permission sought to be obtained would apply only for this particular time in the legislative day, or does it apply at any time during the day?

Mr. LUCAS. It applies only for today, I will say to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. That is, any time during today?

Mr. LUCAS. No; just at this particular time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands the permission would apply only to the presentation of matters that are ordinarily presented during the morning hour.

Mr. WHERRY. There is no morning hour today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; there is no morning hour today.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The request is made for permission for Senators to present matters that would be presented ordinarily during the morning hour.

Mr. WHERRY. And when the Senate proceeds to the consideration of the motion to take up Senate Resolution 15, then the time will have gone by for the submission of any further petitions and memorials or any other matters covered by the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Nebraska is correct, and that is the way I hope the request will be acted upon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois has made a unanimous-consent request. Is there objection to his request?

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, favoring the enactment of legislation providing voting privileges for Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. MILLIKIN on February 28, 1949, p. 1571, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Legislative Resolution 14

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass Senate File No. 362

"Whereas the Federal Government owns one-fourth of the total area of the United States which is about one-half billion acres; and

"Whereas most of this is tax exempt irrespective of 46 separate provisions of law providing for payments in lieu of taxes in as many specific and isolated circumstances; and

"Whereas, in many localities the Federal Government owns more than one-half of the total real property and in some counties it owns as much as 90 percent of the total acreage, and this situation has disrupted the tax bases of local governments and has imposed an unfair burden on the remaining real property which is taxable; and

"Whereas there is now pending in the Senate of the United States Senate File No. 362 which calls for payments in lieu of taxes on Federal-owned real property so as to reimburse to States and local governments, bringing about substantial equity between local and Federal taxpayers with respect to Federal-owned real property: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in sixty-first session assembled:

"1. That the Legislature of the State of Nebraska respectfully request the Senate of the United States to enact into law Senate File No. 362 now before the Senate of the United States.

"2. That copies of this resolution, suitably engrossed, be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to the Vice President of the United States as presiding officer of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress of the United States from Nebraska."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Joint Memorial 2

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to consider and pass resolution appropriating money to commence the building of certain irrigation projects in the Powder River Basin, and the Tongue River Basin

"Whereas there are eleven (11) proposed irrigation projects in the upper Powder River Basin, and the Tongue River Basin in the State of Wyoming, which are mentioned and described in more detail in Senate Document No. 191, Congress of the United States of America; and

"Whereas the building of these projects will make arid lands fertile and provide additional farm homes, will provide additional electric power, and will provide additional facilities for flood control; and

"Whereas, unless funds are provided so that this project may be started immediately, settlers on the project will lose priority in their rights to water of the Powder River by reason of the construction of the Moorehead Dam: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Thirtieth Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby, memorialized to appropriate sufficient moneys in order to commence construction of such irrigation projects; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the

United States Senators JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY and LESTER C. HUNT, and to Congressman FRANK A. BARRETT.

"GEORGE BURKE,
"President of the Senate.

"HERMAN D. MAYLAND,
"Speaker of the House.

"Approved February 12, 1949.

"A. G. CRANE,
"Governor."

A joint memorial of the legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Joint Memorial 4

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United State of America to abolish the Jackson Hole National Monument

"Whereas the creation and existence of the Jackson Hole National Monument is contrary and inimical to the inherent rights and interests of the citizens of the State of Wyoming. Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of the Thirtieth Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to adopt legislation abolishing the said Jackson Hole National Monument and that copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, United States Senators JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY and LESTER C. HUNT, and Congressman FRANK A. BARRETT.

"HERMAN D. MAYLAND,
"Speaker of the House.

"GEORGE BURKE,
"President of the Senate.

"Approved February 19, 1949.

"A. G. CRANE,
"Governor."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"House Joint Memorial 3

"To the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States; to the Congress of the United States; to the Honorable J. A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior; and to the Honorable E. L. Bartlett, Delegate from Alaska to Congress:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in nineteenth regular session assembled, respectfully represents:

"Whereas the housing shortage in the Territory of Alaska has assumed dire proportions, and is impeding the speedy and orderly settlement and growth of the Territory; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States, and the Chief Executive of the Nation, His Excellency, the Honorable Harry S. Truman, have expressed great interest in the need for the development of Alaska's vast natural resources; and

"Whereas there is a vital need for the development and settlement of Alaska in connection with the ever-expanding national defense program in the Territory; and

"Whereas the Honorable E. L. BARTLETT, Delegate to the Congress from Alaska, has introduced in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, now in session, H. R. No. 2122, being a bill entitled 'To promote the settlement and development of the public domain in the Territory of Alaska by facilitating the construction of necessary housing therein, and for other purposes'; and

"Whereas the provisions of this bill would encourage and promote the construction of housing facilities in the Territory, would aid in relieving the substandard living conditions under which the citizens of the Territory are now forced to live, and would promote and encourage the development, settlement and growth of Alaska:

"Now, therefore, your memorialist respectfully and earnestly requests the Congress to pass and the President to sign H. R. No. 2122 introduced in the Eighty-first Congress by the Honorable E. L. BARTLETT, Delegate to Congress from Alaska;

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house February 5, 1949."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Joint Memorial 6

"To the Congress of the United States, the Chief of Staff of the Army of the United States, and the Commanding General of the Army in Alaska, and the Honorable E. L. Bartlett, Delegate to Congress from Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska in nineteenth session assembled, respectfully submits:

"Whereas, the people of Alaska are desirous of bringing the Territory to a high state of development and making it self-supporting and our transportation system is of prime importance in the development of the Territory; and

"Whereas, the defense of the Territory is vital to the security of the United States, and an adequate transportation system is necessary to such defense:

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully urges that a highway be built connecting the interior highway system with the year-round port of Cordova, this being a low-level route approximately 90 miles long measured from Chitina on the interior highway to the end of the airport road running 13 miles east of the port of Cordova;

"And furthermore, your memorialist respectfully wishes to call attention to the feasibility of such a route and the economy of its construction, since use could be made of the present roadbed, bridges and trestles of the abandoned Copper River Railroad which is now owned by the United States Government, and that another route from the coast to the interior would be of greatest importance in case of a national emergency.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

Three joint resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial 2

"To the President of the United States of America, the Congress of the United States, and the members of the Civil Aeronautics Board:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in nineteenth regular session assembled, respectfully submits:

"Whereas all forms of transportation are of vital interest to the people of the Territory of Alaska, a country of great area and small population, and the development of transportation by air is of paramount interest to the residents of the Territory; and

"Whereas the air transportation industry within Alaska had developed to a point where the Territory had more aircraft per capita, and more miles were flown per capita, than any other country in the world, all of which had occurred before the year 1938, and without benefit of the Civil Aeronautics Board; and

"Whereas the Civil Aeronautics Board moved into Alaska in 1939, forcing some air transportation companies out of business, giving others monopolies, raising the cost of operating said companies by requiring them to add to their clerical force for the purpose of filling out numerous statistical forms and reports, by restricting the number of flights made and thereby reducing their incomes, and by holding hearings on applications for certificates of public convenience and necessity at which it is necessary to be represented by expensive attorneys, and which hearings have been drawn out for months and even years; all this is in effect curtailing the operations of the small operators of aircraft, and restricting competition as well as the natural growth of the industry to such an extent as to prevent the lowering of rates, and thereby the now exorbitant cost of living to the residents of the Territory; and

"Whereas no notice has seemingly been taken of like petitions and resolutions passed by the various chambers of commerce, the Alaska Development Board, and other organizations within Alaska;

"Now, therefore, your memorialist prays that the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, and the members of the Civil Aeronautics Board do cause such action to be taken as to abolish the powers of the Board in respect to Alaska; specifically that operators of small commercial aircraft serving the remote areas of the Territory be freed of the cumbersome and hampering requirements of the Board, and, furthermore, that any Alaskan air carrier with sufficient and proper personnel, equipment and experience, be permitted to engage in unlimited transportation of mail, cargo, and passengers between the Territory of Alaska and various points in the United States proper.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

"Senate Joint Memorial 5

"To the President and the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Delegate from Alaska:

"Your Memorialist the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in nineteenth session assembled, respectfully submits:

"Whereas Alaska as the continental corridor to Asia is of vital strategic importance to the United States; and

"Whereas expansion of utilities and other services in Alaska with consequent acceleration of settlement would strengthen the Territory as a buffer area in the interest of national defense, in keeping with the present progress of the Department of the Interior, the Army and the Navy and other Federal departments; and

"Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation, through its Reclamation fund, operating since 1902 in the Western States, has played a great part in developing those States in the fields of land reclamation and irrigation projects and has further developed those States, with augmented activity since 1939 in the field of hydroelectric power; and

"Whereas projects handled through the Reclamation fund (which is a revolving fund) have been self-liquidating, as would hydroelectric and land utilization projects in Alaska, if Alaska were allowed to participate under the Bureau of Reclamation program; but,

"Whereas Alaska has never been included under said program (except for a recent survey) for lack of statutory authorization by Congress; and

"Whereas development of Alaska through participation in the Reclamation fund would even inure to the long-range benefit of the Western States which look to Alaska as an expanding market for their products, not to mention improvement of their position from the national security standpoint;

"Now, therefore, your memoralist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska convened in nineteenth regular session, respectfully urges that Alaska be included in the Bureau of Reclamation program with participation under the Reclamation fund, and submits that such inclusion of Alaska would be to the benefit of all concerned.

"And your memoralist will ever pray."

"Senate Joint Memorial 4

"To the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, the Congress, and the Delegate from Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in nineteenth regular session assembled, respectfully submits:

"Whereas gold mining, as the second largest industry in Alaska which produced approximately $25,000,000 in each year prior to the war, was closed down during the war upon order of the War Production Board; and

"Whereas national defense contractors have absorbed the bulk of available labor in Alaska at such high rates of pay that the mine operators cannot successfully compete in the labor market; and

"Whereas high cost of equipment and other operating expenses contribute to the difficulty of putting gold mining in Alaska back into production; and

"Whereas the sum and substance of all of the factors above mentioned is that the gold miner is caught between high production costs and existing ceiling on the price of gold which blocks reestablishment of said industry as a principal economic asset of Alaska; and

"Whereas the Territory is going to need a fully reconstructed mining industry to fall back upon when the national defense construction program has come to an end;

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska in nineteenth regular session assembled, respectfully submits that it would not only be to the interest of the Territory of Alaska to provide an incentive for the return of full-scale mining operations, but to the interest of the Federal Government in looking ahead with an eye to sustaining the Territory as a strong buffer State, and that provision of a bonus of $15 per ounce on all gold mined in Alaska would be an adequate and well-advised measure.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

A letter in the nature of a petition signed by James Cox, president, Mercer County Farm Bureau, Harrodsburg, Ky., relating to the repeal of the sliding scale on farm crops from 60 to 90 percent; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A letter in the nature of a memorial, signed by J. N. Naas, president, F. L. Penfield, secretary, of the Lions Club of Poplar, Mont., remonstrating against the enactment of the so-called compulsory health insurance bill (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by District No. 4 Convention, United Mine Workers of America, Marshall Hall, Uniontown, Pa., favoring the enactment of legislation giving Federal inspectors the right to enforce their recommendations on safety; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The petition of Raymond Bottom, of Russell Springs, Ky., praying for an increase in subsistence allowance for veterans attending school under the GI bill of rights; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Petitions of Frank Recchia, of Brooklyn, N. Y., and several other citizens of the United States, favoring the repeal of the Taft-Hartley labor law; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Petitions of Stephan S. Nisbet, of Fremont, Mich., and sundry other citizens of the United States, praying for the continuation of the Taft-Hartley labor law; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Petitions of Frank Hood, of San Jose, Calif., and sundry other citizens of the United States, praying for an increase in railroad pensions; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Jefferson County and southern Indiana CIO-PAC, in the State of Indiana, relating to the repeal of the Taft-Hartley labor law, etc.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Petitions of Lee Moore, of Thorsby, Ala., and several other citizens of the United States, relating to Federal aid to education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Petitions of Chas. S. Roller, Jr., of Fort Defiance, Va., and W. L. Shaddix, of Birmingham, Ala., relating to the wage-hour law; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Chicago Dental Society, of Chicago, Ill., protesting against the enactment of the so-called compulsory health insurance program; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Petitions of Abraham Epsten, of New York, N. Y., and Alvhild V. Holmes, of Oxford, Mass., favoring the enactment of the so-called compulsory health insurance program; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The petition of Hathrude B. Hughes, of Phoenix, Ariz., relating to the need for water development in the Southwest (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Interstate Oil Compact Commission, Wichita, Kans., relating to so-called tidelands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The petition of Aurora Chestnut, of Richmond, Ky., praying for the enactment of legislation to legalize wire tapping; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolutions adopted by the Council of the City of Hamilton, and the Council of the City of Youngstown, both in the State of Ohio; the City Commission of the City of Muskegon, Michigan, and the City Council of Baltimore, Maryland, favoring the enactment of legislation proclaiming October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The memorial of Frank Fox, of Brooklyn, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to increase the quotas under the Displaced Persons Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Floyd M. Freppon, sales manager, Newport Auto Service, Newport, Ky., relating to regulation W in the sale of automobiles; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Petitions of Vera I. Newcomer, of Santa Ana, Calif., and several other citizens of the United States, relating to rent control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The petition of M. F. Peterson, treasurer, United States Envelope Co., of Springfield, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to repeal the tax on telegraphic messages; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Women's Guild of the Evangelical and Reformed Church, signed by Mrs. E. Roy Corman, president, Cleveland, Ohio, and sundry other members, relating to the Federal Budget for 1949–50; to the Committee on Finance.

Petitions of Harvey B. Garrett, of Louisville, Ky., and sundry other citizens of the United States, relating to the broadening of the provisions of the social-security law; to the Committee on Finance.

Petitions of Phil Gernert, of Louisville, Ky., and Oswald C. Ludwig, of San Diego, Calif., praying for the enactment of the so-called Rankin bill providing pensions for veterans of both world wars; to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of Guy L. Dickinson, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for an interchange of ambassadors with Spain; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Lions Club of Prestonsburg, Ky., favoring a navigation system of locks and dams on the Big Sandy River, Ky. and W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Works.

The petition of Eli D. Beard, of Fayetteville, Ark., praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the benefits of retired Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The petition of Rose M. Cupp, of Seattle, Wash., relating to pensions for widows of deceased postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLER:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial 3

"To the Congress of the United States of America:

"We your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent, that:

"Whereas section 5 of the act admitting the State of Idaho to the United States (26 Stat. at Large 215, C. 656) limits the authority of this legislature in leasing granted school lands to a term of 5 years; and

"Whereas there is now in prospect development of wells producing oil, gas, and/or other hydrocarbons, upon some of these lands and the limitation heretofore referred to makes impossible the granting of leases sufficiently long in term to attract upon such school lands developmental exploration and drilling: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Idaho, That we urge the Congress of the United States to amend section 5 of the Idaho Admission Act to provide that oil, gas, and/or hydrocarbons leases may be made upon school lands for an initial period of 10 years and for as long thereafter as oil and/or gas or other hydrocarbons are being produced; and that for all other purposes leases may be made for an initial period of 10 years; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of Idaho is hereby directed to forward a copy of this memorial to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and the President of the Senate of the United States and to each Senator from Idaho and each Representative from Idaho in the Congress of the United States."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Joint Memorial 5

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that:

"Whereas the Corps of Engineers, pursuant to resolutions of the Committee on Commerce of the United States Senate, adopted April 6, 1937, and September 24, 1943, have completed a report on the Albeni Falls project, located on the Pend d'Oreille River, Idaho; and

"Whereas the Albeni Falls project recommended therein would be a multiple-purpose project accomplishing the following, among other purposes:

"1. Flood-control protection, both downstream and in the Pend d'Oreille Lake area.

"2. Protection and enhancement of the valuable recreation benefits of Pend d'Orielle Lake by regulating the level of the lake.

"3. Improvement of the navigable reaches of the Columbia River by virtue of increased channel depths during low-water periods.

"4. Addition of 251,000 kilowatts of firm power from the Federal Columbia River power system by the use of stored water in the hydroelectric installation at the project and at downstream plants; and

"Whereas this power is urgently needed to relieve in part the critical power shortage in the region and offers one of the earliest forms of relief which could be made available; and

"Whereas the other benefits which would accrue are needed both in the State of Idaho and the entire Columbia River Basin: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the Senate of the State of Idaho (the house of representatives concurring), That we most respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States of America that the report of the Corps of Engineers be approved, that the project be authorized, and that funds be made available for its construction at the earliest possible date; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized and he is hereby directed to immediately forward certified copies of this memorial to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, and to the Senators and the Representatives in Congress from this State."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Joint Memorial 7

"To the Honorable Senators and Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent, that:

"Whereas Bear River is an interstate stream, with its source in the State of Wyoming and flowing through the States of Idaho and Utah, and

"Whereas valuable farm lands and irrigation pumping systems in Frankin County, Idaho, and in Cache County, Utah, are constantly being destroyed by the action of the waters and flow of sand in the Bear River: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Idaho (the house of representatives concurring), That we most respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States of America that it appropriate the necessary funds and that the Army engineers and/or the Department of Agriculture, proceed at once with such works on the interstate stream of Bear River, as will effectively prevent the destruction of lands and irrigation pumping systems in Franklin County, Idaho, and Cache County, Utah; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized and he is hereby directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the Senators and the Representatives in Congress from this State, and to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America."

CONTRIBUTIONS TO STATES AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTAL UNITS IN LIEU OF TAXES ON REAL PROPERTY—RESOLUTION OF NEBRASKA ASSOCIATION OF COUNTY OFFICIALS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Nebraska Association of County Officials, Board of Directors, and its legislative committee in joint session, at Lincoln, Nebr., on February 16, 1949, favoring the enactment of Senate bill 362, providing for contributions to States and local governmental units in lieu of taxes on real property held by the Federal Government.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution endorsing and in support of S. 362 and H. R. 1356

Whereas federally owned and held real property is exempt from taxation and is therefore deleted from State and local tax rolls; and

Whereas burdensome and disproportionate hardship is thereby imposed upon the localities in which such property is located, as well as upon our entire State; and

Whereas alleviation of these hardships and their inequities may be achieved by providing for payment in lieu of taxes of equitable sums to State and local governmental units approximating actual tax loss sustained by them as a result of said Federal ownership or acquisition of real property: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Nebraska Association of County Officials, Board of Directors and its Legislative Committee in joint session duly assembled:

That we endorse and declare our support of S. 362 and H. R. 1356, introduced in the Eighty-first Congress by Hon. HUGH BUTLER, senior Senator from Nebraska and by Congressman ENGLE from California, respectively, and we urge every member of our Nebraska congressional delegation to work and vote in favor of this proposed legislation.

That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each member of Nebraska's delegation in both Houses of Congress.

Done at Lincoln, Nebr., this sixteenth day of February 1949, being the time and place where this resolution was adopted.

ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
Secretary, Nebraska Association of County Officials.

AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS AND PRICES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, from February 18 to 21 there was held the nineteenth annual Wisconsin Farmers Union Convention in Eau Claire in my State.

Previous to that convention I had been happy to meet with a delegation of Farm Union members and to discuss with them our agricultural policy.

At this time, I send to the desk and ask to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excerpt from the 1949 Action Program adopted by the Convention and dealing with agricultural problems. Space does not permit me to include the full text of the program, and I ask that this excerpt be carried and that it be appropriately referred for consideration by the Senate Agriculture Committee.

Following the printing of the excerpt, I ask that there be printed an illuminating brief editorial from the February 19, 1949 issue of the renowned magazine, The Wisconsin Agriculturist and Farmer, which is owned, edited, and published in my State. This editorial cites some illuminating facts regarding the relatively small take of the farmers in relation to food costs. It shows, for example, that if a farmer gave away his wheat, that is, donated it free, a 16-cent loaf of bread would still cost 14.7 cents. That is certainly a far cry from the picture that some folks try to present about the alleged high take and alleged profiteering of the American farmer.

Incidentally, as was pointed out in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, the average farm income per person was $909 in 1948, which hardly compares with the average city income per person, which was $1,569. Back in the depression days, persons living on the farms received $243 per capita annually compared to persons living off the farms who received $603 per capita annually.

There being no objection, the excerpt and the editorial were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

The Wisconsin Farmers Union, as an organization of working farmers, reaffirms its commitment to our historical and fundamental principle that family-type farming must be the basic pattern of American agriculture. We pledge all of our energy and resources to carry on the fight for the preservation and extension of family-type farming against the encroachments of monopolies.

Family-type farming, with security on the land for the farm family, is the only sound and lasting base for rural democracy. It is one of the keystones of democracy for all Americans; and it must be preserved as the standard farm production unit.

1. As a part of our long-time agricultural program we urge enactment of the National Farmers Union Family Farming Act. We urge that all local unions contact their representatives to vote for this measure.

2. We favor adoption of the graduated land tax as one means of discouraging corporation farming, or the grabbing of land by large landholders.

3. We urge the adoption of Federal legislation for the purpose of supporting floor prices on all farm produce at 100 percent of a modernized parity formula. We believe that farmers should have parity of income with all other groups in society.

4. We urge the rapid expansion of REA power and transmission facilities in areas now unserved so that more farmers may enjoy the benefits of electric power, and thus raise the general standard of living for rural America. We favor greater appropriations by Congress for the building of REA plants and the expansion of transmission lines.

5. We favor expansion of the work now done under the Farmers Home Administration, and we urge that Congress appropriate adequate funds to carry out this program.

6. We support and endorse the work done by production credit associations, and we urge that all possible aid be given for the expansion of this work.

7. We urge all Farmers Union members in regions not now under Soil Conservation districts to work for the creation of such districts, and to speed up conservation practices.

8. We are opposed to the efforts of certain private interests to destroy the United States Soil Conservation Service as an independent agency within the Department of Agriculture.

9. We support the continuation and democratic expansion of the Production Marketing Administration as a farmer controlled program, and we urge the continuation of its soil practices program. We are opposed to transferring the work of this agency to Extension Service.

10. We favor continuation of the Farm Credit Administration under the Department of Agriculture.

11. We support the program of area vaccination for the control of Bang's disease.

12. We urge that our Federal Government expand its road building program to bring all-weather roads to every family-type farm in America. We also urge that the State of Wisconsin cooperate with the Federal Government in this program by matching funds to secure the highest type of farm-to-market roads.

DAIRY PROGRAM

The Wisconsin Farmers Union is deeply alarmed over the fact that our dairy industry has fallen into the hands of monopolists.

We favor a thorough investigation and prosecution of the dairy monopolies by the Federal Government.

We favor the principle of making milk and all dairy products a basic agricultural commodity under Federal support price programs at 100 percent of parity.

The Wisconsin Farmers Union favors the idea of a centralized and federated marketing organization for dairy products similar to the cooperative marketing organization of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association. We also believe that a parallel development should take place for the establishment of consumer dairy cooperatives so that a unified program can be developed between the producers' cooperatives and the consumers' cooperatives for the marketing of dairy products with greater efficiency at a minimum cost.

We favor State and Federal legislation to provide for a joint State and Federal sponsored warehousing program for cheese products.

The Wisconsin Farmers Union is opposed to the principle of lowering protective tariffs on butter imported from foreign countries.

As stated elsewhere in our program, we are opposed to the repeal of State and Federal taxes on oleomargarine, or the use of yellow color in butter substitutes.

EXPANSION OF COOPERATIVES

The need for organized bargaining power for farmers has been met in part by the development of cooperatives. Recognizing this fact, we urge the building of more cooperatives within farmers union territory to provide needed services.

With the help of organized labor, we urge increased expansion of cooperatives in the cities so that the farmer-producer will be able to take his products directly to consumer outlets—thereby eliminating unnecessary labor and profits.

We cannot urge too strongly that our Farmers Union membership divert all of their patronage to Farmers Union cooperatives. We also urge our members to take a more active interest in their cooperatives by attending their annual co-op meetings.

We recommend that all Farmers Union cooperatives and all dairy plants in Farmers Union territory, be urged to check off dues and to pay a 5 percent educational fund to the State and county Farmers Union for the purpose of disseminating the benefits and philosophy of cooperation.

We believe that the ties of Farmers Union cooperatives to their own organization are paramount to any other affiliation because such activities have been built by Farmers Union people as component parts of an organization of, by and for farm families.

THOUGH FARM PRICES FALL, LIVING COSTS ARE HIGH

Consumers are waiting with bated breath for dollar-a-sackful grocery days.

But their wait has been fruitless so far. Retail prices have been slow to reflect farm price drops.

HCL still stands for high cost of living—and high cost of living still stands.

A congressional committee is considering an investigation. Like consumers, they wonder about the apparently static retail price level.

But while the committee is investigating, here are some figures that may or may not prove a point:

If a farmer gave away his milk, a 20-cent quart of milk would still cost the consumer 12 cents. If he gave away his wheat, a 16-cent loaf of bread would still cost 14.7 cents.

And if he gave away his hides, a $10 pair of shoes would cost the consumer $8.63; if he gave his wool away, a $50 suit of clothes would still cost $44.30.

Even if he gave away tobacco, that pack of smokes would still cost 17.3 cents.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2101) to authorize the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, District of Columbia, to make certain disaster or emergency loans, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 89) thereon.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT (S. REPT. NO. 88)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, from the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, I desire to file, in strict compliance with the statutory requirement, the report which the committee approved this morning on the President's economic report. The Employment Act of 1946 provides that this report should be made to the Congress on or before March 1. I am happy that the committee has been able to meet that requirement.

I may add that there is also presented a dissenting report signed by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Representative from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER]. Other minority members were granted permission to file any statements they may care to make.

This is the third report of the kind which has been filed by this committee, but it is the first report prepared after a broad study of the President's recommendations. This year, for the first time since the Employment Act of 1946 was enacted and the President was required to file an Economic Report to Congress, the committee has conducted open public hearings at which opportunity was afforded for a thorough review, not only of the President's recommendations, but also of the Annual Economic Review of the Council of Economic Advisers, which was made available to the Congress together with the President's Report, on January 7, 1949.

Vacancies upon the joint committee were not filled until after the inauguration on January 20 and it was not practicable to consider the President's report prior to that time. Public hearings began on February 8 and were not concluded until the evening of February 18. Testimony in support of the President's recommendations was submitted to the committee by numerous persons in the executive branch. Transcripts of this testimony were then made available to a group of well-known economists and experts of varying points of view, and on February 16 the committee adopted a new device in the presentation of testimony by inviting these experts to participate in a round-table discussion before the committee. This plan, I think I may properly say, had the effect of eliciting much more information in a much shorter time than is usually the case. The concluding day of hearings was given over to a round-table discussion by representatives of agricultural, business, and labor organizations.

It may be said, therefore, that the fullest opportunity was afforded for a thorough review of the contents of the President's Report, of the views of the Council of Economic Advisers, and of the views of business, finance, and industry.

I invite the attention of all Members of Congress to the report, and its contents. It was intended to be an objective appraisal of the current economic situation and the presentation of the reasons why the Government should not postpone effective action to maintain a high level of employment, production, and purchasing power, in order that the American economy may continue to support the essential program of world peace upon which this Government is launched.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received and printed, with illustrations.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in relation to the report just filed by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] for the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, I find myself unable to join in the report, and respectfully request permission to file a minority report of my individual views within a reasonable time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio has asked permission that he be permitted to file a minority report within a reasonable time?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; within a reasonable time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD my statement relating to the report, which explains the reasons why I do not sign it at this time.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR ROBERT A. TAFT, MEMBER OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT

The distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] has today filed a report for the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. I find myself unable to join in this report and respectfully request permission to file a minority report on my individual views within a reasonable time. The report was prepared by the able Senator from Wyoming, Theodore Kreps, senior specialist with the Legislative Reference Service, and the staff of the joint committee. It was submitted to the committee Monday morning of this week and considered at two meetings, Monday and Tuesday mornings, so that we have not had time to study in detail the findings of fact and the economic theories on which the conclusions are based. A number of changes were made by the chairman in accordance with casual suggestions made at these meetings.

At this point, I am not prepared to submit detailed criticisms of the report, but I make the following observations:

First, the report appears to be an economic brief in support of the social and economic recommendations made by the President in his state of the Union and economic messages. The statistical material and the arguments made therefrom seem to have been fitted to the President's conclusions instead of providing a basis from which the committee could reach its own conclusions. The report does not contain any objective study

or consideration of the many highly controversial points involved in the policies recommended, or any adequate statement of conflicting points of view.

The report accepts the basic philosophy that the Government can and should control the economic machine in great detail; that it can and should determine whether prices are too high or too low in each important field and take action to correct the conditions in accordance with the judgment of Government experts; that the Government can and should determine whether capacity is sufficient in any industry and take steps to discourage or expand that industry in accordance with the judgment of Government experts. In its demand for new powers, it lays little emphasis on the broad existing powers to guide the general direction in which the economy is moving

The report lays great emphasis on the difficulty of reducing expenses in order to support a plea for increased taxes, emphasizing correctly the necessity of a balanced budget.

A complete reading of the report shows that it endorses directly or indirectly the following requests of the President for additional powers:

1. Increase in corporation taxes.
2. The power to fix prices.
3. A greatly watered-down power to fix wages.
4. Extension of export and import controls.
5. Increased power over bank credit and consumer credit.
6. Increased power to fix rents.
7. Power to allocate and ration commodities on a compulsory basis.
8. Extension of Federal social-welfare assistance to those suffering from permanent disability, temporary disability, or no disability at all.
9. Other Federal aid to health, education, and welfare which may be highly desirable, but does not have much relation to the general problem of preventing depressions.
10. Forced expansion of the steel industry and the electric-power industry.

Some of these purposes are highly desirable, but others, in my opinion, are definitely unnecessary and harmful. Taken together, they create executive powers which could bring about a completely regimented economy and a completely regimented people. Certainly, they involve many vital questions of political and social policy which cannot be dealt with intelligently by any committee after 2 days' study.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 1143. A bill for the relief of Vit Komarek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1144. A bill to amend sections 812 and 861 of the Internal Revenue Code so as to allow the deduction of the amounts of bequests, legacies, devises, or transfers to or for the use of veterans organizations in determining the net estates of decedents subject to Federal estate taxes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TOBEY:

S. 1145. A bill for the relief of Persephone Poulios; and

S. 1146. A bill for the relief of Francis W. Dodge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1147. A bill to designate the dam now under construction near Peterborough, N. H., as Edward MacDowell Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1148. A bill to reaffirm the intent of the Congress with respect to flight training for veterans; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 1149. A bill for the relief of John F. McKenney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY (for himself, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. TAFT):

S. 1150. A bill establishing a procedure by which the Administrator may assure veterans full educational and training opportunities commensurate with the tuition charges by educational and training institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITALS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. PEPPER) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 614) to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act (title VI of the Public Health Service Act), to extend its duration and provide greater financial assistance in the construction of hospitals, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed.

HEALTH INSURANCE COSTS—EDITORIAL FROM THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

[Mr. ROBERTSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Health Insurance Costs," from the Christian Science Monitor for February 26, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE TALE OF TWO TRIALS—EDITORIAL FROM HURON (S. DAK.) DAILY PLAINSMAN

[Mr. MUNDT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Tale of Two Trials," published in a recent issue of the Huron (S. Dak.) Daily Plainsman, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMPULSORY HEALTH INSURANCE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in a recent debate with Mr. Oscar Ewing, Federal Security Administrator, in the Town Hall in New York, on the subject of compulsory health insurance, I urged strongly that the approach to this problem should be through Federal grants in aid to the 48 States.

As I see this matter, it is not a question of States' rights, but State responsibility. It is distinctly a challenge to the States to assume the responsibility for the medical care of their people. I am convinced that no national compulsory plan can possibly work in a great country such as ours, and particularly no plan can work that is blueprinted in Washington and administered by a Federal bureau.

As a part of my remarks, I ask unanimous consent that my opening statement at the Town Hall meeting be inserted in the RECORD at this point, and also an editorial from the Newark Star-Ledger of Sunday, February 27—one of our most important New Jersey dailies—entitled "A State Medical Program," commenting on my proposal.

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When I hear Mr. Ewing tell about compulsory health insurance, I think of a man who lives in a fine big house with a leaky roof. The man says: "This is horrible, there's a leak in the roof. We must tear down the house and go build a wonderful new jail and live in the jail instead."

The house I am talking about is the whole medical-care system of the United States. What I propose is that we should all get busy and fix that leak in the roof. I have no enthusiasm at all for Mr. Ewing's jail. Here are my three main reasons:

First, the over-all Federal service which Mr. Ewing promises so freely—at a cost of somewhere between four and fourteen billion dollars a year, raised by additional taxes—simply cannot be delivered. With free care guaranteed for everybody, doctors' offices and hospitals would be flooded with patients. Doctors would have to adopt a kind of assembly-line medicine in order to get through their load of work. They would have to abandon the American high standards of medical practice; they would have to turn this country into one vast dispensary of pills and plasters.

Second, the system would require a tremendous machine of Federal regulation and control. There would be such inspection and investigation and filling out of forms as this country has never seen. It would mean an abdication of immediate State responsibility.

Third and last, compulsory national-health insurance would ignore all the great forces—voluntary health insurance, industrial welfare plans, the progressive and responsible State programs, the splendid promise of preventive medicine—which are working today for better, more widespread medical care. It simply says to the American people, just follow instructions from Washington and don't ask any questions, and we here will solve all your problems. That is the wrong kind of advice for free, self-reliant Americans.

I am not urging the Federal Government to keep hands off entirely. But it must plan for an evermore effective role. In the 4 years I have been in the Senate, we have started a tremendous hospital survey and construction program; we have established a new pay and promotion system for the public health service; we have greatly increased appropriations for cancer research; and we have set up new national research institutes in mental health, in heart ailments, and in dental health. These are legitimate areas for Federal aid.

However, that is only a part of the over-all picture. I envisage a positive five-point program of health legislation, by which the Federal Government will work with States and cities and private groups to cover the whole range of our health needs:

1. More medical research stimulated and coordinated by a national science foundation.

2. Full-time public-health services supported by the Federal Government throughout the Nation, to prevent and control disease.

3. More hospital construction—a great extension and improvement of our present program.

I am already a sponsor of bills to carry out those three points. We expect very soon to introduce bills covering the following two as well:

4. Training of more health personnel—doctors, dentists, nurses, and technicians—through scholarships to students and grants to medical schools.

5. And most important—aid to the States to assume their full responsibilities for the medical care of their people. What is needed is vigorous action by the States, aided and encouraged not only by Federal dollars but by all the knowledge and experience of our Federal experts. The 48 States must be challenged to take stock of their widely varying needs and resources and to develop their own experimental programs. In that way we will have 48 experimental laboratories in this country, all working toward the goal of good

medical care for everybody. And by this method the States will keep in their own hands this vital operation, which is clearly a State responsibility.

With certain of my Senate colleagues, I am proposing to offer this five-point program as a goal to challenge inventive Americans everywhere.

The issue presented by this debate is clear and stupendous: Are the 48 States going to accept their clear responsibility for the immediate medical care of their people, or are they going to abdicate and surrender this responsibility to the Federal Government?

No central government by itself can plan and achieve the good life for free Americans. But with the benefit of American inventive and organizing genius everywhere, we, through our 48 States, can repair and expand our mansion of health until it is big enough and good enough for all of us; we can make American medicine more than ever the envy of the world.

[From the Newark (N. J.) Sunday Star-Ledger of February 27, 1949]

THE EDITOR'S OPINION—A STATE MEDICAL PROGRAM

Senator SMITH is taking leadership in championing a Federal health program that would have as its keynote grants-in-aid to States for medical programs they adopt. He stresses the value of having each of the 48 States serve as a laboratory for its own approach to the problem of improving medical care.

What programs could or would the States venture upon? Obviously that would depend upon their special needs. Thus Mississippi's great need would be to attract more doctors, by some effective expedient such as a subsidy, to its rural areas where doctors are not now able to find enough fees to provide them with reasonable incomes.

PROBLEM VARIES IN JERSEY

In New Jersey, the problem of Mississippi exists, if at all, only in a negligible degree. There are few communities in the State so poor as not to offer a doctor a reasonable opportunity to earn a livelihood.

In New Jersey, the problems are far different in character. A pressing problem is the lack of medical educational institutions in the State. With institutions throughout the Nation over-crowded and entrance opportunities drastically limited, New Jersey students wishing to enter medical institutions find themselves frustrated in too many instances.

The lack of a medical college in New Jersey victimizes no group more cruelly than the Negroes of the State. Since so many of their number are on the lower rungs of the economic ladder, they do not command as high quality medical care as the more fortunate segments of the population, yet their needs may be greater. This cruel dilemma is further aggravated by the circumstantial exclusion of Negroes from opportunities for medical education.

A State medical college, in combination with a system of free scholarships for students chosen on the basis of merit and aptitude would inevitably ease the medical problems of underprivileged groups by turning out young doctors sympathetic to the problems of those groups.

PROJECT LONG NEEDED

Another project that would answer a long-felt need in New Jersey would be the extension of preventive medicine in the schools. No system of rigid paternalism need be created, and parents who prefer the family doctor to the school doctor should be permitted to follow their inclination. But the school doctor should be available, and all grade-school students should be required to have thorough medical and dental supervision periodically.

With a program of sickness benefits in business and industry already being carried out in New Jersey, it would be logical to consider a parallel system for providing medical care for the families of those who are unemployed either because of layoffs or sickness.

These and other thoughtful projects that may be desired could not be financed by the State of New Jersey unless it either received liberal grants-in-aid from the Federal Government or a return of taxing fields now preempted by the Federal Government.

There is no doubt, however, that New Jersey along with other States could march forward rapidly toward better health care without regimenting the medical profession into a system of socialized medicine.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. LUCAS to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 15, amending the so-called cloture rule of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 15.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] delivered such a strong and convincing argument yesterday that I feel somewhat timid about undertaking to discuss this question at the present time. However, I am so strongly opposed to the invasion of the freedom of debate in the Senate of the United States that I lose no opportunity to express my opposition to changes in the rules of the character now being pressed upon us.

According to my conception, the Senate of the United States is the last great forum for debate in the world. It is the last great retreat for freedom of discussion of all public questions. It is free from the dictatorship of totalitarianism. It is free from the tyranny of partisan and group pressures upon the public opinion of the world.

The Senate of the United States ought to remain one place where public servants may stand and assert their views and their opinions for the benefit of their constituents without impairment and without invasion.

But it is said that we must limit debate; we must have speedy action; we must have efficient action. Mr. President, let Senators not delude themselves with the idea that what we are doing here will affect only three or four little bills on the calendar. If we adopt this rule we shall adopt it for all the days of the future. We shall adopt it with reference to every bill which may be presented. Let me suggest to Senators who are so zealous in behalf of the present proposal that when the shoe is on the other foot this rule will be in effect, if we adopt it, and will enable groups and partisan majorities, perhaps of a temporary nature, but, nevertheless, in control, to foist upon us and upon our constituents obnoxious and harmful legislation under the pretext of freedom of action in the Senate.

Mr. President, this amendment is being urged so that the Senate can more quickly and expeditiously act upon three measures. Those questions were ably and fully discussed by the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

First, it is desired to pass an anti-poll-tax bill. My State is now taking steps to abolish the poll tax. Personally I strongly support the repeal of the poll tax as a requisite for voting. While I was a member of the Texas Legislature more than 40 years ago—a mere lad—I voted to submit the question to the people. When the vote came in the general election I voted not to impose any tax or restriction upon the right of citizens to vote.

Of course, a Federal poll tax law is absolutely unconstitutional. I undertook to demonstrate that in a rather elaborate speech which I made in this Chamber. There should be no doubt about it. Anyone who can read, anyone who knows what the Constitution means, should have no doubt about the unconstitutionality of such a proposal.

I cite section 2 of article I of the Constitution:

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Under that constitutional provision every person who votes for a Member of the House of Representatives must have the same qualifications that are required of those who vote for members of the State legislature. That does not mean anything except the same qualifications. It does not mean more qualifications. It does not mean less qualifications. It does not mean qualifications of a different kind. It means the same qualifications that are required by the State law or constitution.

But Senators say, "We want to abolish that provision of the Constitution to the extent of passing an anti-poll-tax measure." Why should Senators want to do that? Most of the States—all but seven, I believe—have already abolished it; and in the remaining States measures are being taken to abolish it.

Senators say, "We are satisfied with the law in our own States, but we are not satified with the law in some other States. We have a bill which we want to pass, and we cannot pass it comfortably, easily, and expeditiously unless we get rid of this obstacle. We want to regulate suffrage in other States."

Under the Constitution, of course, each State is empowered to regulate its own suffrage, and enact its own domestic laws. Senators should bear in mind that the Constitutional Convention which acted upon the Constitution was not a mass meeting; it was not a city-hall caucus. It was a meeting of representatives of the States who assembled at Philadelphia to write the Constitution of the United States. That fact must always be borne in mind. It was not an act of individuals as such, but the act of representatives of the States of the Union.

Mr. President, we are reminded that in that convention the States were jealous of their rights. They were anxious not to surrender their sovereignty and their rights, and they carefully guarded against merging all the States into one conglomerate mass.

Mr. President, I shall not trespass upon the time of the Senate. So far as I am concerned, what I have said disposes of the anti-poll-tax proposal. If Senators will allow the constitutions of the various States to operate a little longer, if they will allow the people of the various States to conduct their own affairs a little while longer, the poll tax will vanish as a regulation for voting. I am reminded that when the Constitution was first adopted, practically every State in the Union had limitations upon the right of suffrage. At that time voters had to be taxpayers, they had to own real estate, they had to do this and do that and do the other thing in practically every State of the Union. It was not unconstitutional then. When did it become unconstitutional? Did it become unconstitutional as a result of the recent election or of some other election? Did that change the Constitution? Of course not. The New England States, for which I have a high regard, had limitations upon the right of suffrage, including the requirement of the payment of a poll tax. I understand that even today New Hampshire has some sort of an arrangement of that type, in city elections, at least.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I would not have the Senator in error; but——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield for a question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield for a question; that is all I can yield for.

Mr. TOBEY. Is it the Senator's conception of New Hampshire law that New Hampshire law requires the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting? Is that his understanding?

Mr. CONNALLY. I had so understood, but I do not assert it as a fact.

Mr. TOBEY. I know the Senator spoke in all sincerity; but I wish to disabuse his mind. There is no such prerequisite for voting in New Hampshire. That is a misnomer and a misstatement that was made on the floor of the Senate last year, and I take pleasure in correcting it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well; I accept the Senator's statement. He should know the laws of his own State.

Mr. TOBEY. I should hope so.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not care to take up the time of Senators by discussing the antilynching bill. Of course, it is unconstitutional. Oh, some Senators may smile at that statement; indeed, they may smile at anyone who lifts up his voice in behalf of the ancient document that is the outline and the basis of organization of this Government of ours. Some will say, "Oh, we hear the old cry, 'It is unconstitutional.'" But, Mr. President, I do not think it is improper for a Senator, standing in his place in this great Chamber, to remind other Senators that there is still a Constitution, that it is still the Nation's Constitution, which we are sworn to uphold and defend.

The antilynching bill is not really an antilynching bill. Some persons attempt to pick out a particular kind of offense and make it a Federal offense. I am as much opposed to lynching as is any other Member of this body; and as a prosecuting attorney I contributed somewhat in my State to the propagation of a movement to suppress lynching. Yesterday the newspapers were filled with reports of a terrible murder which occurred across the river in Virginia; a man murdered his wife and buried his own child alive in a shallow grave; he took two human lives. But where is he to be tried? He will be tried in the courts of Virginia. The Federal Government does not want to take over the prosecution of cases of that kind. It was just as much murder as the crime involved in many so-called cases of lynching, and was, in fact, more heinous in character. But Senators who favor the antilynching bill would have the law provide that the particular crime of lynching shall be handled in the Federal courts, whereas the lynching of a man's wife and his infant child must still be tried in the State courts.

O Mr. President, the reasons are transparent. There is only a little veil of supposed reason for the so-called antilynching measure. Of course, we are opposed to lynching. Lynching is murder; and as murder it should be punished in the proper tribunals, in the proper courts. Whether it is mass murder or individual murder, it is still murder. Why does not the Congress pass a Federal law taking jurisdiction over all cases of murder? Why do not Senators vote for such a bill? One reason, Mr. President, is that it would not be a politically popular thing to do. We are concerned here with something that will catch the fancy and imagination of the man who goes to the ballot box to cast a ballot. Why do not Senators go back to the fundamentals? If we are going to take over police powers of the States, we shall necessarily be forced into the position, ultimately, of taking over prosecutions against theft and forgery and all the long catalog of crimes. Oh, no; those two conflicting positions cannot be reconciled; no one can show any consistency between the position of making one particular act a Federal offense, and making another act, of similar gravity, a State offense, to be tried in another forum.

Mr. President, how many lynchings occurred during the last year? Only one, according to my information; only one case of lynching occurred in the entire United States of America in the last year. Yet, as I just related, yesterday, very close to the city of Washington, two murders were committed in a single day, but as to them the Federal Government has said, "Oh no; we cannot prosecute the murderer. That case is out of our jurisdiction. We shall not pass any law providing that the Federal Government shall prosecute a crime of that kind. That is beyond our jurisdiction." But in the next breath, those who make such statements also say, "But if for political purposes and political reasons we can frame up a Federal prosecution in some other instance, we shall do it; and if it is necessary to change the rules of the United States Senate in order to bring about such a result we shall do so."

Mr. President, I do not care to discuss in any detail the so-called FEPC bill. The distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has done that forcefully and well. All these bills are of the same pattern. Those who are interested in the passage of such bills are confronted with the statement, "We cannot pass this bill; it is not in accordance with the rules. It is not constitutional, and is not in accordance with our practice." Whereupon the proponents of such bills reply, "Well, if it is not in consonance with the rule, we will change the rule. We are going to pick out three or four bills which we want passed; and in order to pass them we are going to change the rules of the United States Senate. After all, what is a rule of the Senate, as compared to a comfortable margin at the ballot box? We are going to change the rule, in order that we can pass two or three bills."

Mr. President, the rules of the Senate have endured for a great many years. They were adopted for the orderly procedure of this body. What is this body, after all? It is more than a city council. It is the Senate of the United States; and in the formation of the Union, it is my belief that the Senate was devised as a check and balance against the House of Representatives, and the House of Representatives in a measure was designed as a check and balance against the Senate of the United States. The basis of the selection of Senators and of Representatives of the House of Representatives is different. One is based upon population; the other, upon State sovereignty, regardless of population, regardless of riches, regardless of any other consideration except the sovereignty of the individual State.

The function of the Senate is something more than that of voting yea or nay upon a given measure. Formerly, the Senate was a place for deliberation, for discussion. It was the place where great public policies were hammered out upon the anvil of discussion for the guidance and direction of the people represented in the Senate. In our school days, when we read about the Senate of Rome and the Assemblies of Greece, did we ever read of the occurrence of a yea-and-nay vote in those bodies? I have no recollection as to how any particular question was voted upon, but I recall the great discussions in the Senate at Rome on questions that have vitally affected the future and destiny of the entire world.

Senators remember discussion by Roman Senators, Cato, Cicero, and others. Those discussions are a part of the history of Rome. They made Rome. They were woven into the very fabric of its existence. Yet it is not said of them, "Well, they passed an appropriation bill yesterday, to increase the prestige of the Senate." It is not said, "They changed the rules yesterday in the Roman Senate so they could bring up a bill without proper discussion and without due consideration, in order that they might have it ready for the next election."

Even in our own time the Senate has been a great forum for the discussion of public issues. As we read the history of our Republic up to 1850, as we read the debates that took place in this Chamber, we observe the unfolding history of the United States. We read in those debates

the cogent arguments and profound reasoning of the great men who fashioned and shaped the destiny of the Republic. I want to preserve the Senate as a body of that kind. I want to preserve the Senate as a place of debate before the people of the United States.

I observed in the course of hearings before the committee some days ago that freedom of debate in the Senate is more imperatively needed today than ever before. With the growth of newspapers, the development of radio, television, and other modern inventions, public debate in the Senate is needed more than ever before. There are those who may say, since we have all those media of publicity, so much debate in the Senate is unnecessary. The reason more debate is needed in the Senate is that the radio is filled frequently with propaganda put forth by special groups. People listen to the radio; it appeals to them; they are misled. Unless, somewhere in the Government, there is a place where a Senator or a Member of the House may stand and speak his views and lay before the people of the United States the facts involved in any great issue, the people are apt to be misled, and the Senator or Representative himself misjudged, because the facts are not adequately laid before them. The Senate is the place for that sort of thing. This is the place officially designated in which the man who speaks upon governmental questions ought to stand.

Newspapers are somewhat partisan, as are Representatives, Senators, and other individuals. Very little defense is possible against a newspaper article. If an article is published that misrepresents or attacks a Senator or a Representative, what can he do? He cannot answer it in a way that will reach all those who first read the attack upon him, or the attack upon the Government, as the case may be. Freedom of debate, unhampered debate on governmental problems in the Senate, is vital to the integrity and maintenance of the rectitude of public servants of the people.

I point out that there is no great danger to those who profess that they must have this change in the rules in order to get prompt action in the Senate on bills and on other matters. Under the rules of the Senate, no filibuster that is without a just basis, no filibuster that is not supported by large sections of the public, can ever succeed over determined opposition and leadership by those who want to suppress it.

In the first place, there is a rule providing that no Member may speak more than twice in any legislative day upon any question pending before the Senate. The leadership can make the legislative day 1 month or 6 months, if they desire, and during that time no Member of the Senate may speak more than twice. Furthermore, under the rules of the Senate, if a motion is made to take up a bill and there is resistance to the motion, the Senate leadership may adjourn the Senate until some other day, and in the morning hour, on motion without debate, the question of the consideration of the bill that was objected to some days before may be brought up. That is a complete answer to the plea that dilatory tactics can prevent action by the Senate.

Mr. President, what are the theories upon which the Senate and the Government are founded? They are not founded upon the basis of numbers. The Constitution is replete with prohibitions against governmental invasion of the rights and privileges of citizens of the Republic. I shall cite a few of them. First, the Constitution prohibits majorities, it prohibits two-thirds rule, it prohibits caucuses of a majority, it prohibits partisan movements of special groups and organizations to coerce and drive the Senate or House into precipitate action. The first 10 amendments to the Constitution were submitted by the first Congress. When the Constitution was before the assembly in Virginia for ratification, the question was there raised as to the failure of the Constitution to include a bill of rights. After discussion, a sort of gentlemen's agreement was arrived at, providing that if Virginia would ratify the Constitution steps would be taken at the first session of the new Congress to submit amendments which would embody a bill of rights.

Mr. President, many Senators will not even listen to arguments of this kind. Many Senators will not honor us with their presence. Many Senators on the other side of the aisle—I can hardly count them on my two hands—refuse to open their ears and to open their minds to arguments which we advance on this side of the Chamber. But, Mr. President, we cannot control that situation. If the legislative machinery of the United States were based purely upon numbers, without certain attributes of the two Chambers, we would have, no doubt, a unicameral legislature. There would be no use having a House and Senate. We would have one body, and act by majority vote, through instructions from a caucus held somewhere and somehow.

But, Mr. President, that was not the theory of the makers of the Constitution. They recognized the difference between the two bodies as finally provided. Unicameral legislatures have never been adopted in this country, except in the State of Nebraska. The United States is not now and never has been a pure democracy. It is a democracy of federated States, not a pure democracy such as the democracy of ancient Greece, in which the citizens of Greece were called into convocation and enacted rules and regulations and caused the exile of prominent Greeks by a simple vote, by voice, or by counting or showing of hands.

That is not the kind of Constitution we have. That is not the kind of government we established. We established a government of delegated powers, a government of federated States, and the Constitution outlined the limitations and the powers of the two legislative bodies as well as the rights of the people.

I recall the historic example of Themistocles, who was chairman of the executive committee of Athens. He decided that he would like to get rid of Aristides. Aristides was a troublemaker; he would make a point of order every once in a while, and he did not "go along." So Themistocles said, "The way to avoid difficulty is to get rid of him." He was like Senators who now say that the way to correct the situation is to change the rules. "Just get rid of the rules that stand in our way. We have three little bills we must enact. Therefore, we must do away with the rules."

Themistocles had Aristides brought to a mass meeting, and it was voted to exile him. The story relates that Aristides was wandering around incognito and observed a man with a shell in his hand getting ready to write the name on it of the man he wanted to exile. Aristides looked over his shoulder and saw that he had written the name of Aristides on the shell. He patted the man on the shoulder and said, "My friend, why do you vote to exile Aristides?" The man replied, "I am tired of hearing him called 'Aristides the just.'" So, Aristides was exiled. Later on Themistocles, when he got into difficulty in a war, had Aristides brought back to Greece to aid him in defense of his country.

Mr. President, why should I introduce into the debate a story of that kind? I do so simply to illustrate arbitrary power.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Let us see if we can get together on that story. Possibly the Senator had a different history book from the one which I read. As I recall the story, Aristides was asked by an ignorant man to write his name, and Aristides was such an honorable man that he wrote his name on the shell. If he had not done so, the ignorant man would not have known his name.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is done now in certain instances, when someone else writes out a ballot. I thank the Senator from Louisiana. I am a little rusty on ancient history.

Anyway, Mr. President, it illustrates the point I was endeavoring to make as to the tyranny of arbitrary power. That is what it was. Arbitrary power. That is what we are opposing here today. It is said, "We are going to revoke this rule. Does such action impinge upon the Constitution? Well, it may, but we must pass these bills, regardless of the Constitution and regardless of the precedents of the Senate."

That is what we are opposing, Mr. President. I was endeavoring to bring out the point that the Constitution of the United States limits the rights and powers of the Congress in many ways, not subject to the control of caucuses, groups of policy committees, and things of that kind.

Mr. President, the freedom of debate runs all through the legislative processes and the legislative machinery of the United States Government. Why do I say that? The Constitution is filled with restraints. For instance, the President can veto an act of Congress, but Congress, by a two-thirds vote, can override the veto. Yet, here is one man, the President of the United States, exerting a power which anything less than a two-thirds vote cannot overcome. Some say, "We want a two-thirds vote of the Senate to change a rule." Others say, "We want

a majority vote of the Senate to change a rule." It is contrary to the very spirit and the genius of the Constitution of the United States. Under the Constitution of the United States a two-thirds vote is required to ratify treaties. Why not do it by a simple majority vote? Why not hold a little caucus in some room upstairs or downstairs and decide the question, regardless of the Constitution and the rules? No, Mr. President; the people of the United States will never be content with that sort of conduct in the Senate—disregarding the rules which have been enriched by years of observance and by years of precedents, and arbitrarily taking action contrary to the course previously followed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield for a question only.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the able Senator from Texas how he would enable the Senate to bring debate to a close under the present rules of the Senate, in view of the statements which he made before the Committee on Rules and Administration during the session of the Eightieth Congress, when he said:

> Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the present cloture rule is sufficient for all practical purposes to enable the Senate to force a vote whenever two-thirds of the Members desire it.

Then he went on to say:

> Now you have got a rule. I will not go into it; you know what it is, that upon the signature of 16 Members of the Senate following 1 day over, it shall be set down and a vote had, and if two-thirds of the Senate, after 1 hour debate per Senator, if two-thirds of those present vote that they do not want any more debate, the debate is cut off.

I should like to ask the able Senator how he can square the present parliamentary situation, in which we cannot even get a resolution before the Senate to be voted on, with his statement that at any time two-thirds of the Senate can cut off debate.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am very glad to answer the Senator from California. I have observed him here in the Senate. I have observed that he follows a man's record wherever he speaks. On yesterday he had the record, undertaking to pillory the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] on what he said before the committee. Today he has the record of the committee—I suppose he has the record, he talks as if he has it—as to what the Senator from Texas said. I have already explained how it can be done under the present rules, if the Senator from California and his group would exercise the same ingenuity in getting action which they exhibit in trying to embarrass someone. His group have the votes. They can adjourn the Senate on this question, withdraw the question from present consideration, and when the Senate meets on the following day, in the morning hour, the Senator can make a motion to take up a bill and it can be voted upon without any debate whatever, and if he has the votes, he can bring it up for the consideration of the Senate. Then, if he has the votes, it can pass the bill. If he can get 16 Senators to sign a petition for cloture, and can have the cloture petition adopted, every Senator then will be limited to 1 hour. Does that answer the question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I reckon so.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the Senator if it is not true that under the rules of the Senate anything that is taken up during the morning hour is still subject to discussion, and if the discussion lasts beyond the morning hour, the measure will then go to its regular place on the Senate Calendar, where it will be subject to unlimited debate. There is no procedure I know of in the morning hour—perhaps the Senator knows—under which it is possible to get a vote in the morning hour.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the Senator from Texas if conditions have not completely changed since the statements were made upon which the Senator from California now dwells so earnestly. In the Eightieth Congress the question of amending the rules was brought up as an abstract proposition. In the Eighty-first Congress we are told that the measure to be brought up is the first of a series of sectional bills which are a political issue in other sections of the country, but are real problems to those who live in the section the sponsors propose to crucify with this proposed legislation.

I am asking the Senator whether conditions have not completely changed since the statements to which the Senator from California referred were made. Then Congress was dealing with an abstract question. Today we are dealing with a political issue, in connection with which about three-fourths of the country proposes to impose upon one-fourth of the country a measure which we insist is unconstitutional.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think the Senator from Georgia has answered the Senator from California.

Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia made a suggestion which should be remembered, which should be put down in this debate, namely, that the Senate, supposedly the Senate, really a group in the Senate, are seeking by the resolution under discussion, and by the action that is to follow if it shall be agreed to, to crucify a certain section of this Republic in order to gratify the ambitions and the political desires of some of those living in other sections. That is what it means. They want to select out the South and press to its lips this nauseous potion which they do not press to their own lips.

I suppose I am prejudiced in favor of the South, but I am not an agitator and a radical with regard to the South. However, I am wondering when Members of the Senate and Members of the House of Representatives of the United States are going to let men from the South rest in peace regarding some of these questions which they continually agitate, not for the welfare of their own constituencies, except for voting purposes, but to aggravate and to humiliate those of us who come from the South.

Mr. President, the South has suffered under many burdens. It lost its appeal to arms, as all Senators know, at Appomattox. But following Appomattox it was oppressed with a form of tyranny and outrage never equaled in the history of the human race.

We hear talk today about the sufferings of nations that were conquered in the last war. They do not compare with the sufferings borne by and outrages practiced among the people of the South following Appomattox.

Mr. President, my father was a Confederate soldier, and I honor and respect his memory, but when the war was over he laid down his arms and went back to a poor little farm, a farm overgrown with sprouts and in ruins. He applied his toil to mother earth, with no government bounty, with no farm aid, with no social-security benefits, with no benefits except the strength of his arm and the stoutness of his heart to fight against the misfortunes that crowded upon him. He won. He conquered. Through the years he established his economy, and became a rather prosperous and prominent citizen without ever receiving a thin dime from the Treasury of his country.

Mr. President, we of the South have suffered political discrimination all through the years since the War Between the States. I have heard old men in my section of the country relate that when they went to the ballot box in the days of reconstruction they had to march between lines of bayonets in the hands of hostile soldiers.

So, Mr. President, may the day sometime come when Senators and Representatives, despite their greed for little groups of voters, and their anxiety to gratify their own petty ambitions, will remember that there are some sections of the country other than the particular localities in which they live. I submit that the men of the South, following the War Between the States, contributed mightily to the economic rebuilding of the Union and to the growth of brotherhood and friendship and rehabilitation in this Republic.

I remember that in the war with Spain the boys from the South donned the blue uniform and went forth to fight the enemies of their country side by side with the boys from the North. The volunteers of the day asked no questions as to the States from which their comrades hailed. They were brothers. But the politicians at home would not permit that sort of feeling to spread throughout the ranks of their political followers. So, Mr. President, I ask when may the Southern Representatives and Senators expect to be treated with equality, to be treated upon the same plane with Senators and Representatives from other States? When may we expect that the constitutional rights which the Constitution gives us will be observed with respect to our States as well as they are observed with respect to other States?

Most Senators have read the Constitution. Most Senators know that the

bills hoped to be passed because of change in the rules are unconstitutional. I heard the late Senator Borah and the late Senator Norris on the Republican side of the aisle vote against two of the bills which some Senators hope to have passed, on the ground that they were unconstitutional, unwise, and ought not to be passed.

Mr. President, I hope I may be pardoned for this interjection in my remarks, which may not be considered by some Senators to be pertinent at this particular point.

I wish to remind Senators that in the case of a constitutional amendment a two-thirds vote of this body is required even to submit the amendment to the States. Why do not Senators propose that a change be made in that rule, so as to get a little more speed when such a proposal comes before us, and we may be a little more efficient in that respect? After a constitutional amendment has been submitted to the States, favorable action is required on it by three-fourths of the States, in order that it may be adopted as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Some Senators might say "That is too slow. It should be possible to ratify an amendment to the Constitution more quickly and more speedily than that. The present procedure is too slow."

Oh, no, Mr. President. I will say to the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], if he desires to discuss the rules, that under the rules of the Senate we cannot even suspend the rules except by a two-thirds vote of this body. The Senate rules cannot be suspended for a day, cannot be suspended for an hour, cannot be suspended for 1 minute unless two-thirds of the Members of the United States Senate vote in favor of such suspension. That is not a change of the Constitution, it is simply a change in the rules of the Senate, and the change cannot be made by this body unless two-thirds of the Members vote to make the change in the rules.

Mr. President, the effort now being made simply illustrates that if it should succeed America would not be a free democracy. If successful, it would result in placing restraints and handicaps upon the actions of State governments.

I am so devoted to preserving the freedom of debate in this body that when I was first nominated as a candidate for the United States Senate I placed in my platform a plank to the effect that I would not vote to limit the freedom of debate in the United States Senate, and I discussed that plank in many places throughout my State. The people of my State want freedom of debate in this forum preserved. They want to hear our voices; not the voices of some paid propagandists over the radio or in the news columns. They are willing to hear both sides, but they want the truth from their representatives so as to counteract the cruel misrepresentations which are often foisted upon them.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Georgia for a question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the Senator from Texas what effect a gag rule such as proposed here would have had upon the history of the Senate and the great men whose remarks have not only illuminated the records of this body but have gone into the classics of this country? I will ask the Senator if it is not true that Daniel Webster, James G. Blaine, and others who are outstanding statesmen, overshadowing many of those who are demanding a gag rule here today, occupied from 6 to 8 hours in making their great speeches here upon the floor of the Senate? If they had been subject to any such rule as is proposed here now, and a majority had been willing to work its will, they would have been lucky to find 1 hour to speak after the gag had been applied. I ask the Senator from Texas if he does not believe such would have been the effect of application of a gag rule.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Georgia. He has placed his finger upon one important aspect of the whole matter. As I said a while ago, the history of Rome and of Greece is not built on yea-and-nay votes taken in their governmental assemblages. Who knows how the members of such assemblages voted on any question? Their histories were built upon the discussions of great governmental principles in the public forum where the citizens of Rome could listen and become aware of the issues, and in the public forums in Greece to which its citizens could flock to hear the discussions on public issues.

So it is with the history of our country. The great debates held in the Senate for 50 years absolutely dominated the life of our Republic. The Senator from Georgia suggested Daniel Webster as one great Senator who debated important public issues. Hayne was another. A great many other famous names occur to me, such as Henry Clay, Calhoun, and others. Their debates were sometimes extended over more than a day's session, because the subjects they discussed were all-embracing and vital and intertwined with the destiny of the Republic.

Here in Congress is where the history of the United States should be made. It should be made here where all citizens may look and listen and see what is transpiring with respect to their government, rather than what is going on in the caucus room of some political organization, into which the boss may come and say, "We must pass this bill, or we will lose the third ward in the next election." The Senator from Georgia is eminently correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Texas if the trend to cut off debate in the Senate and to gag Senators in full and free expression on the floor of this body is not likely to result in completely obliterating the importance of the legislative body in our scheme of government? As we have whittled away the right and the prestige of the Senate as one of the equal and component parts of our government, the executive branch has continued to expand and increase in power, and if we impose a gag rule here on this body it will not be long before the pronouncement of some little grade 10 clerk in the executive department of the Government will be of more importance than the futile efforts of a United States Senator to find a way to evade the gag rule and express himself on the Senate floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. We already know there is a trend toward executive centralization of power. Whenever the strength of the Senate is undermined—and its strength arises large / by reason of the right and ability of Senators to rise in their places, if they so desire, and declaim against an outrage, a wrong, or advocate openly the passage of legislation or the correction of errors resulting from legislation adopted in the past—whenever the power of the Senate to do those things is struck down the power must be placed somewhere else, and it will result finally, if the trend is adhered to, in the establishment of centralized power in the Executive. There will be a demand to take certain action. It will be said, "It cannot be taken in the Senate because the Senate rules are a clog, and partisan groups are in the way, partisan groups are interfering." But the people will say, "We want action," and the result will be that the executive power will expand, the power residing in the Senate and in the House of Representatives, in the people themselves, will decrease, and the Executive will take over the power to regulate all the vast concerns of a mighty people.

Mr. President, we do not want that kind of a government. Irrespective of who may be the Executive, that is not the concept of the founders of the United States of America. The concept of the framers of the Constitution was that the great masses of the people should be represented by Representatives in Congress, based upon population, and that the sovereign States should be represented in the Senate, not on the basis of population, but on the basis of the integrity and the individuality of the States. There were to be two Senators for each State. That is our conception. The functions of the Executive, while ample to perform the duties which are imposed upon him, should not exceed, should not trample upon, should not interfere with the prerogatives of the Senate or the House of Representatives, or the rights reserved to the people by the Constitution of the United States.

The Senator from Georgia is eminently correct in the conception that the brushing aside of debate, hasty consideration, and lack of proper consideration, will inevitably result in a whittling away of the authority and power of the Senate and of the House of Representatives as well, and the substitution of a tyrannical executive power.

Mr. President, one of the articles in the Bill of Rights relates to the protection of the individual in the freedom of religion. No matter how humble he may be, the Bill of Rights guarantees to every individual the right to freedom of religion. That right cannot be taken away

by all the minions of groups in the United States. A majority vote cannot take away from him his right to religious freedom. A two-thirds vote cannot deprive him of that sacred privilege. It is guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. He does not require anyone to sponsor him. He stands on his own feet, in his own right, and says, "The Constitution is my authority. I am entitled to freedom of religion; and if I do not get it I shall go to a Federal court where that right will be asserted, and I will be protected."

I cite these things to show that it is the genius of the Constitution of the United States to have prohibitions and limitations, and to have all these fundamental rights guaranteed by the Government of the United States.

Another clause in the Bill of Rights relates to the right of every citizen to bear arms. That is a right which cannot be taken away by any majority. It cannot be taken away by a two-thirds vote of the Senate. It cannot be taken away by a unanimous vote in the House of Representatives. The rights of an individual citizen of this Republic cannot be taken away from him in any such manner. He can wrap the Constitution about him and say, "This is my protection; this is my defense."

No soldier can be billeted in the house of any citizen of the United States except in time of war, and then only upon the payment of adequate compensation.

These are fundamental rights. I cite them to show that there are some things which cannot be controlled by majorities, which cannot be wiped out by a two-thirds vote, which cannot be negatived by a group meeting in some caucus room or by a policy committee in the chambers of the Government of the United States.

The Bill of Rights protects citizens against unreasonable searches or seizures. I shall not elaborate upon that question, because Senators know what that means. It means that all the king's armies cannot put upon a citizen an unreasonable search of his private possessions. It is done sometimes, but when it occurs it is in violation of law, and in defiance of the law.

Another right guaranteed by the Bill of Rights is the right of freedom of expression. How are we to have freedom of expression if we limit the representatives of the people and tell them how little they can say and how seldom they can say it in this Chamber? There should be more freedom of debate in the Senate than in any other agency of the United States. When we speak we are not speaking for ourselves. We are speaking for the people in the States whom we represent. When my colleague speaks in this Chamber, it is the voice of my State. It is the voice of Georgia when the Senator from Georgia speaks in this Chamber. That right ought not to be limited. Should we limit an entire State which wants to speak upon some public question through its representative and advise other Senators what the position of that State may be? Shall we say, "No; you cannot do it. We have heard a great deal of talk, and we are not going to hear any more. We have already heard the boss' voice, that this bill must pass, and that is the only voice we are going to listen to."

No, Mr. President; if we are to preserve the freedom of a citizen's opinion, we should also guarantee the freedom of expression of his opinion. An opinion locked within the privacy of a man's bosom does not do his fellow citizens any good. But if he has convictions and views, and speaks them through his representatives, they will impress the world, and leave their influence upon the action which may be taken.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator see any reason why a minority should be required to have one-third of the membership of the Senate in order to be heard on this floor, as is proposed in the two-thirds cloture rule?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that I do not favor any limitation on the right of debate. This is not a question with respect to which reason is being invoked. This is a question in which politics is the motive. The question is, "How are we going to get the votes? How are we going to corral the votes and keep them corralled? We can not do it under the present rules or laws. We must have some new laws or lose our old voters." They do not think about getting some new voters, instead of new laws. They want to get some new laws so that they can corral the voters and hold them in line.

The Bill of Rights requires a unanimous verdict of the jury in a Federal court. A man cannot be sent to jail by a majority vote. He cannot be sent to the penitentiary by a two-thirds vote. There must be a unanimous vote. The accused has the right to be heard in his trial. He has the right to be represented by counsel. He has the right to face his accusers and deny the charges brought against him. Yet I suppose there are those who would say, "That takes up too much time. There is nothing involved but a man's life. We cannot put up with this tomfoolery. We are going to bring in a cloture rule limiting the accused to one witness, and limiting his lawyer to 30 minutes. We want to get some action and dispose of these cases."

No, Mr. President. That is not the genius of our country. That is not the genius of our courts. That is not the genius of our people, and ought not to be the genius of any group in our Republic.

The Constitution requires that the accused be confronted by his accusers. I am amazed that someone has not suggested a rule limiting the accused to two witnesses, and limiting their testimony to 30 minutes. I am surprised that someone has not said, "We are going to cut him off. We are going to have action. We are not going to let the minority of a jury keep us from executing the law. We were elected last fall, and we have some pledges to keep, and we must put them into effect. We must find some short-cut to fulfill our pledges."

A citizen cannot be indicted except by a grand jury. That is another impediment to quick action. Why not let the caucus indict him? Why bother with a grand jury? No, Mr. President, he is entitled to a civil jury trial in matters involving $20 or more. Of course, nearly everyone has $20; but if some have not, they had better look out. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I happen to have observed in two particular instances that the freedom of debate and unlimited debate in this Chamber have had a tremendous effect. A few weeks ago Mr. Dean Acheson was nominated to be Secretary of State. A radio commentator in Washington, with a grudge, I suppose, against Mr. Acheson, or at least with bitterness against him, went on the radio and declared him to be a Communist and an associate of Alger Hiss, and denounced and accused him. I received telegrams from distant points in the country denouncing Mr. Acheson and advising me, "Do not vote to confirm that man; he is a Communist." The senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] approached me and said, "I am getting a bucketful of telegrams against this man, telegrams saying, 'Do not confirm him; he is a Communist,' and many other citizens have advised me to the same effect." What could Mr. Acheson do? He could not go on the radio and answer his accuser; the people who heard his accuser would not hear him.

We adopted the method of having an open, public hearing in the committee, which is unusual in the case of the consideration of nominations of Cabinet officers. We called a meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee; and we had Mr. Acheson there, and we put him on the stand and let him testify about the facts in the case. He absolutely dissipated the suspicions which had accumulated and been poured upon him, and the committee unanimously voted to confirm his nomination. The members of the committee branded as falsifications the charges that had been leveled against him. That could never have happened except for the freedom of debate in the Foreign Relations Committee. If Mr. Acheson had not had that place from which to speak he could not have accomplished the results which were thus attained.

Now let me relate the second instance I have in mind: Some years ago we had here in the Congress of the United States what was known as the Supreme Court reorganization bill. I wish to discuss it for a moment, without any bitterness or any antagonism toward anyone who supported that bill. When that measure was first introduced in the Congress, I believe that if an election had been held at that moment the Supreme Court reorganization bill would have carried by a margin of at least 3 to 1. I was opposed to that measure, and announced my opposition 2 or 3 days after the bill was sent to us. If there had been an immediate election, I would have been defeated, I am sure, by a margin of 3 to 1. But that bill was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. I happened to have been a member of that committee; and those of us who were members of the committee sat through

long days of hearings, long days of discussion, long days of press reports of the hearings and comments of Senators upon that measure in the press. After the expiration of months, during which time the public was taking more and more interest in the measure and was learning more and more about it from the public debates and hearings in the committee, the bill was rejected on this floor by a considerable majority—not upon a direct vote, but upon a vote to recommit the bill, which, of course, meant its death. That action was taken by a very substantial majority.

I cite those instances, not in a spirit of bitterness or in a desire to revive any of those issues, but because they occurred within my own personal observation, and it seems to me they illustrate the wisdom and necessity and desirability of maintaining here in the Senate a forum in which Senators may voice their views and may let their constituents know their position upon the great questions which will be considered here as the years go by.

Mr. President, I wish to say that as time goes on, the influence of the United States upon the world and upon the governments of the peoples of the world will, I feel sure, continue to grow and increase in strength. Accordingly, I believe that what happens in the United States will be observed with more and more interest and will serve more and more to be a model, at least for the countries which wish to preserve free government and free institutions. The real democracies of the world will be impressed more and more by what transpires in the United States. So, Mr. President, I would deeply regret to see our fundamental system changed or modified, under the influence of pressure groups, in such a way as would react abroad most unfortunately.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. HOEY. I ask the distinguished Senator from Texas whether rule XXII as it now stands has been in force and effect in the Senate for the past 32 years, and whether during that time any ill effects have arisen from the application of the rule as it is now constituted?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from North Carolina is speaking of the cloture rule; is he not?

Mr. HOEY. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator from North Carolina that although I was not a Member of the Senate at the time of the adoption of that rule, I recall that time very well. So far as I know, the business of the Senate under that rule has operated without difficulty, and with remarkable smoothness and flexibility. I know of no harm that has sprung from the rule to which the Senator refers.

Does that answer the Senator?

Mr. HOEY. Yes.

Let me ask the Senator a further question, if he will permit.

Mr. CONNALLY. Certainly.

Mr. HOEY. Let me inquire whether during these 32 years there have been 20 attempts to invoke cloture, and whether only 4 of those attempts have succeeded.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is absolutely correct. The reason why they have not succeeded and why cloture was not adopted has been the conviction deep down in the bosoms of Senators that cloture is not necessary and was not necessary in those particular cases. They saw no necessity for deviating from the orderly procedure of discussing measures here on the floor of the Senate, and so the Senate refused to adopt the rigid and inflexible procedure proposed by the pending resolution.

Mr. HOEY. Let me ask further if it is true that no cloture petition has succeeded during the last 22 years in this body.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think that is correct, but at the moment I am not advised as to just how many years it has been. I know there have been many changes. I know of many distinguished Republicans who were opposed and still are opposed to cloture. I remember the beloved Senator McNary, of Oregon, who was leader of the Republican side of this body. He was always opposed to cloture. He would not vote for any limitation of debate in the Senate. I remember that on one occasion when I was engaged in a discussion of a particular question—and some persons might have thought my discussion was dilatory or obstructionist—Senator McNary sat right where the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] now is sitting; and as he went out of the Chamber he made it a point to walk by me, and he whispered words of encouragement and good will. He was opposed to the limitation of debate by cloture. Senator Borah also voted against cloture on occasion. I am unable to recall a particular measure or a particular date, though I hope I shall not be held responsible for that. Senator Norris, a great liberal Republican, voted against cloture on several occasions, I recall. If there is any question about this, I shall look up the dates and the occasions and place them in the RECORD; but I recall the facts. Why did those men vote against cloture? Because they had been here for a great many years. They knew the history of the Senate and the kind of legislation that comes before the Senate. They knew the character of the men who sit in the Senate. They realized the importance of preserving the right of freedom of debate and discussion in the Senate. They were not afraid to hear the truth. They were not running to cover every time they heard a discordant note in precinct No. 4. No, Mr. President, they were great men—in mind, in character, and in performance. They wanted the Senate to remain the Senate of the United States; they did not want it to become a ward meeting across the tracks.

We owe a duty to the people of the United States and particularly to the young people of America who are to come after us, to preserve the integrity of the Senate as a forum for the free expression by Senators of the public issues that may confront this body.

Mr. President, I shall not consume more of the time of the Senate, except to say I realize, as I am sure other Senators realize, that the influence and impact of the United States upon the history of the world in years to come will be tremendous and powerful. Many European nations now subjected to totalitarian influences are blinded by the necessity of observing rules enforced by Red armies. I want such nations to retain the concept of the United States of America as a great Republic, a great Federalist Nation representing the people of the Republic under constitutional processes, limitations, and guaranties. I want them to conceive of the United States of America as a land of law and order, ruled by the people through constitutions and courts, not by an organization such as the Politburo, or by a totalitarian master whose edicts are enforced by the sword and by other weapons of war.

Free government cannot be maintained without freedom of discussion. It is impossible to enlist the aid and sympathy of citizens of a republic unless they feel they have a voice in the government under which they live. They cannot have such a voice unless they know the issues presented and the determinations made by those who represent them in the Congress.

Mr. President, let us not destroy the forum in which Calhoun thundered. Let us not wipe out this particular place where Daniel Webster became known to history as one of the greatest orators and statesmen of all time. Let us not wipe out the platform upon which many other eminent, distinguished, and able Senators lifted their voices in behalf of the people, in behalf of constitutional government, in behalf of freedom and constitutionalism, and in behalf of legislative and particularly congressional rule over this land.

No, Mr. President, I shall not vote to wipe out, to strike down—for that is what it means—the freedom and liberty of debate in the Senate, in order to obtain a handful of paltry votes, some of them covered with slime and corruption. I shall not vote to surrender one of the loftiest prerogatives of the Senate, the right to freedom of debate, for any such low and mean and selfish purpose as to attract to my party votes, patronage, and prestige. No citizen of our Republic is denied the right to vote; of course not. Let him vote. But I shall not surrender the most precious privileges of the Senate in order to lure any voter into the particular fold in which I desire him to remain. I shall vote against the motion to take up the resolution, and, if it is taken up I shall vote "No," on the motion to limit freedom of debate in the Senate of the United States. Do not do that. You cannot do that—there are not enough of you. [Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair admonishes the occupants of the galleries that it is against the rules of the Senate to give any expressions of approval or disapproval. I hope those in the galleries will observe that rule.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hunt	Myers
Anderson	Ives	Neely
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Bricker	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Broughton	Kefauver	Reed
Butler	Kem	Robertson
Cain	Kerr	Russell
Chavez	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Connally	Knowland	Schoeppel
Cordon	Langer	Smith, Maine
Donnell	Lodge	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Long	Sparkman
Downey	Lucas	Stennis
Eastland	McCarran	Taft
Ecton	McCarthy	Taylor
Ellender	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Flanders	McGrath	Thye
Fulbright	McKellar	Tobey
George	Magnuson	Tydings
Gillette	Malone	Vandenberg
Green	Martin	Watkins
Hayden	Maybank	Wherry
Hendrickson	Miller	Wiley
Hill	Millikin	Williams
Hoey	Morse	Withers
Holland	Mundt	
Humphrey	Murray	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

THE TAFT-HARTLEY LAW

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to make a few brief comments on an interesting editorial I read this morning in the Washington Post entitled "What's His Name?" It reads as follows:

In his Jefferson-Jackson Day address President Truman embellished his attack on the Taft-Hartley Act with a quotation credited to a Republican Senator, who called it "a device for making unions so weak they cannot carry on effective collective bargaining." We wish the President would reveal the name of that Senator, for whoever made such a remark is disqualified by sheer stupidity for responsible office.

That was a harsh criticism, Mr. President. I think fair-minded critics will think the editor is wrong in that blanket condemnation. The editorial proceeds:

Presumably the unknown was a firm supporter of the act.

Wrong again. It continues:

In that case, he should have realized that the best defense of the act lay in affirmative assertion that it would make for more effective, less one-sided collective bargaining. Even if he secretly doubted the validity of the argument, he should have been sufficiently aware of the state of public opinion to pay lip service to the cause of collective bargaining. Finally, anyone who so misjudged the purpose and workability of the Taft-Hartley Act, as shown by subsequent experience of its working, is discredited as a critic even though the President takes satisfaction in citing him as an authority.

Mr. President, in my opinion the Washington Post on the whole is a pretty good newspaper, particularly in its news columns. But, oh my, its editorials sometimes are awful. By and large it has been a fairly liberal paper. I think it is one of the more liberal and progressive papers in America. But frequently it appears to have an editorial writer or two who do not read the newspaper itself, because often its editorials are completely out of line with the very excellent news stories published in the paper. In other words, the reporters are better informed than its editors.

I want to relieve the President of the chore of naming the Republican to whom he referred in his speech. I shall take that responsibility off the President's shoulders and plead guilty here and now as having been the Republican Senator whom the President quoted the other night. I plead guilty to saying in a speech on the floor of the Senate on June 5, 1947, during the debate on the Taft-Hartley bill that the Taft-Hartley bill is "a device for making unions so weak they cannot carry on effective collective bargaining."

I repeat that charge today, Mr. President, and I hope that the editorial writer on the Washington Post will read the hearings just completed on the Taft-Hartley law and judge for himself, from the testimony of management witnesses themselves, as to what the ultimate aims of many employers are under the Taft-Hartley law. As one reads that testimony he finds management witnesses confessing, under cross-examination, that the most restrictive uses of the Taft-Hartley law will come when unemployment becomes widespread in America.

What appears to have happened on the Washington Post editorial staff is that some editorial writer sold the Post a bill of goods early in the days of the debate on the Taft-Hartley bill in the form of a program calling for the editorial support of that unfortunate law by the Post. Thus that great newspaper on this issue left its liberal course of journalism and has over the months been carrying editorials trying to rationalize the great mistake which the Congress of the United States made in 1947 when it passed the Taft-Hartley law.

Mr. President, I desire to refresh the memory of this editorial writer with a few other comments I made during the debate, because when the historic debate on labor legislation starts in the Eighty-first Congress I intend to carry this body back to some of the statements which were made in the 1947 debate. I intend to carry Senators on this side of the aisle back to some of the warnings which were issued in 1947, when I said to the Republicans in the Senate of the United States, "If you pass a piece of labor legislation as unfair as the Taft-Hartley bill you will hear about it at the ballot boxes, because millions of independent voters, yes and Republican voters, will not in 1948 support a party which passes such a bill." The 1948 election returns proved that they did not. In 1948 we lost not only millions of independent voters, but we lost several million Republican voters, because of the serious mistake the Congress made in passing the Taft-Hartley bill.

Let us look at a few of the paragraphs contained in some of the arguments I made in 1947. I said on June 5, 1947:

I supported the Senate committee bill, which was a fair, reasonable, constructive, and enforceable bill, and I opposed the amendments that were made on the floor of the Senate because they seemed to me to strike serious blows at the rights of labor and to impair the efficient administration of the law. The amendments which have been made in conference not only infinitely aggravate and multiply every serious vice of the Senate amendments but they add such restrictive and administratively unfeasible provisions of their own that even if I believed the bill we passed was sound and helpful, I would be compelled to vote against the conference bill, because of the inevitably disastrous effects I am sure it will have on industrial peace in this country. I say with every emphasis at my command that this bill will be causative, not preventive, of labor difficulties.

I say on the floor of the Senate today, Mr. President, that in my opinion no piece of legislation passed by the Congress of the United States in the past 25 years has been so causative of class consciousness and growing class conflict in America as the Taft-Hartley law. One cannot move in labor circles in America today, one cannot talk, as I have, to the rank-and-file workers of America, by the thousands, without fully appreciating the fact that the men in overalls in the ranks of organized labor have unfortunately developed to a serious degree a spirit of class consciousness as a result of the Taft-Hartley law. This growing class conflict must be eliminated if we are going to keep our country secure and democratically strong—and I use the small "d" in the expression "democratically strong." If we are to make our capitalistic system work for the common good and thereby preserve the individual liberties offered by that system and not available in any other economic system, we must repeal the Taft-Hartley law by way of a substitute law which will be fair to all groups involved in labor disputes.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCGRATH in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. IVES. Does not the able Senator from Oregon also believe that the injection of the Taft-Hartley Act into partisan politics is provoking an increased amount of class consciousness and bedeviling the whole situation?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from New York is correct, Mr. President, but neither the Senator from New York nor the junior Senator from Oregon can keep the Taft-Hartley law out of partisan politics. The Republican Party put it into partisan politics when it assumed chief responsibility for the law and passed it. Until the Republican Party takes off the antilabor label which was put on it by the Taft-Hartley law, the Taft-Hartley law will stay in partisan politics. I say to the Republicans on this side of the aisle that the Taft-Hartley law has had more to do with increasing union activities in politics in this country than any other thing that has occurred in the past 20 years. Labor is determined to fight it politically. It is determined to fight the Republican Party politically until it repeals this bad piece of legislation.

We cannot ignore the fact that the Taft-Hartley law is part and parcel of American politics today. I shall continue to fight, as I did in 1947, for a piece of labor legislation which I believe will be fair to all groups concerned, so the issue may be taken out of politics.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. MORSE. I will yield in a moment. But, Mr. President, for an editorial writer of a great liberal newspaper in America to be so apparently blind as to what is happening under the Taft-Hartley law simply exceeds my powers of comprehension.

I now yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I was very much interested to hear the remarks of the able Senator from Oregon. He knows that I share with him all the views he has expressed respecting the Taft-Hartley law. In view of the Taft-Hartley law having had such an unfavorable and detrimental effect, I was wondering whether, whatever we may eventually agree upon, the desirable approach to the situation would not be first to repeal the Taft-Hartley law and build upon the Wagner Act whatever structure might be desirable and might be agreed upon by the Congress?

Mr. MORSE. If I can secure the support of the Senator from Florida for a substitute bill which I think will be fair to all groups concerned, we will thereby repeal the Taft-Hartley law. However, the Thomas bill which the Senator from Florida is sponsoring is not a fair bill. It is slanted in favor of labor in a similar way that the Taft-Hartley law is slanted in favor of management.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, perhaps some of us observe some of the same contradictions in the position of the able Senator which have been publicly noted. It is difficult for me to reconcile some of these deserved denunciations which the Senator has heaped upon the editor, and his willingness to embrace any part of the Taft-Hartley law.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Florida that if I were to follow a blind partisan attitude upon this matter I would have a very consistent record. If the Senator from Florida is interested in consistency, based upon biased support of the Thomas bill without amendment then his support of that bill can be justified. But I am interested only in standing for a piece of legislation which I think will protect the legitimate rights of both labor and management, and I say to the Senator from Florida that the legislation he is sponsoring and backing in the present session of Congress will not produce that result any more than the Taft-Hartley Act produced it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I do not want to ask a question. I do not want to take the Senator off his feet. I merely want to make one observation, and I hope that no Senator will object to it.

Mr. MORSE. Just a moment until I protect my rights.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. WHERRY. Just a minute.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I will yield to nothing except a question, unless I secure unanimous consent to yield for something else without such yielding affecting my rights. I take that position in order to protect my rights.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I will yield for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator protect himself from now on with respect to the parliamentary situation?

Mr. MORSE. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator from Oregon protect himself from now on with respect to the parliamentary situation?

Mr. MORSE. I shall do my best.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has not been out of order. He has yielded for questions, and only for that purpose. If the Senator from Illinois wishes to ask a question of the Senator from Oregon, the Chair understands the Senator from Oregon has indicated he is willing to yield for that purpose.

Mr. LUCAS. I merely wanted to ask the Senator from Oregon that one question.

Mr. MORSE. I shall do the best I can to protect myself. I assure the Senator from Illinois. I remember that for 10 hours and some minutes I succeeded in protecting myself on one occasion, and I think I am as able to do it now as I did then, if I want to follow that course of action. But being completely opposed to prolonged debate merely for the purpose of extended oratory or to prevent a vote from ever occurring, I want to assure the Senator from Illinois, if he has any doubt about it, that I am not participating today in any filibuster. I am merely trying to get the record straight concerning an editorial appearing in the Washington Post, with respect to my record on the Taft-Hartley law.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, would the Senator from Oregon be willing to yield to me for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Georgia for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I am always happy to yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Oregon if he does not think it would be somewhat difficult for anyone to have the appellation filibusterer applied to him unless he happened, unfortunately, to be one of the despised southern Democrats? I wanted to ask——

Mr. MORSE. No. I may say to my good friend from Georgia that the appellation was applied to me because I spoke at some length in an attempt to prevent what I considered to be hasty action in the Senate whereby the leadership refused to postpone a vote on the President's veto of the Taft-Hartley bill from a Saturday afternoon at 5 o'clock to a Monday afternoon at 3 o'clock.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, that was a very unusual situation in that the Senator spoke for several hours. I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon if he read the article appearing in the Washington Post this morning which said that a number of speeches were made in favor of imposing cloture in the Senate, but filibuster did not start until 4:14, when the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] arose to oppose the motion. I should like to ask the Senator if he does not know that Senators can speak by the hour on the floor of the Senate in favor of imposing any kind of a gag without being criticized, but when and if any southern Senator rises in his seat at 4:14 and says, "I protest," the newspaper then states that "all was calm and tranquil and statesmanlike in the Senate until 4:14, when one of those southern Senators got up and rudely started a filibuster?" If we are so bold as to speak at all it is always a filibuster. [Laughter.]

Mr. MORSE. I should like to say, Mr. President, that although I think the Washington Post is usually correct in its news stories, on this particular occasion it was wrong, both in its editorial and in its news story.

Mr. RUSSELL. I agree with the Senator about that.

Mr. MORSE. I am certainly of the opinion that no filibuster has started in the Senate on the pending issue. In fact, I want to say most sincerely that I think the speeches which have been made thus far in the debate by the southern Senators who have participated in the discussion have been exceedingly able and have presented their points of view clearly and raised questions which, in my judgment, must be answered by those who have a different point of view. Before the debate on the issue now pending before the Senate is over, I expect to attempt to answer a few arguments made thus far in the debate which I think are not sound from the standpoint of constitutional history. I believe they cannot be buttressed with adequate support by reference to the great constitutional debates had at the time the Constitution was adopted.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the Senator if he does not know that the Senator from Georgia hopes to address himself briefly to this question, and that the Senator from Georgia hopes that the Senator from Oregon will do him the honor of listening to his remarks.

Mr. MORSE. I most certainly shall.

In fact, I do not know of any major speech the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has made on the floor of the Senate that I have not made it a point to hear. That is the high respect in which I hold the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does not the Senator think that the Senator from Georgia should be exceedingly gratified by that statement?

Mr. MORSE. I hope it pleases him, because I mean it.

Returning to my remarks on the Taft-Hartley discussion, I should like to read another paragraph from the speech which I made on the floor of the Senate on June 5, 1947:

> I have always thought that these provisions, even as they appeared in the bill we passed last month, so plausibly worded and giving the impression that those who oppose them are in favor of coercion or improper strikes and boycotts, were a great trap for labor unions, because they gave antiunion employers, of whom we still have many, very effective devices to weaken unions, to slow up organizational work, and to delay certifications by endless ligitation. The amendments made to the bill in conference, however, multiply this danger many times. They constitute open invitations to every employer to litigate out of existence every union treasury.

Let me digress for a moment. A great fallacy is being muttered in America today about the effect of the Taft-Hartley law on unions. Statistics are advanced to show that there has been a great increase in union membership. The union-shop election provision is chiefly responsible for that. It boomeranged against the proponents of the bill. The real test is what has happened to the creation of new locals. That is the test as to whether or not unionization in America is really advancing. The sad fact is that the Taft-Hartley law has been a great impediment to organizational drives in this country. It has been such a great impediment in the Southern States that, although the labor leaders may not admit it, the fact is that since the passage of the Taft-Hartley law the organizational drives of the CIO and the A. F. of L. in the Southern States in large measure have been failures. Why? Because of the Taft-Hartley law. The very warnings which some of us tried to bring to the attention of the Senate about the potential effects of the bill on organizational activities of unions have proven to be right. The legalistic, dilatory provisions of the Taft-Hartley law make the law a great handicap to the spread of union organization among the workers of this country.

There again the editorial writer of the Washington Post ought to go to the record of the hearings. Many very interesting things were brought out by management witnesses in those hearings. Under cross-examination they made points which I am sure they had no real intention of making, in the sense that they did not realize the full implication of what they were saying. Thus, we find management witnesses admitting that in those areas of the country in which there is an extremely short supply of labor, but high profits and a great demand for maximum production, many employers are following the same hiring practices which they followed prior to the passage of the Taft-Hartley law, even though such hiring practices are in violation of the law.

As I predicted on the floor of the Senate during the Taft-Hartley debate, the act leads to labor-contract bootlegging practices in employment policies. The evidence is overwhelming in support of the prediction which I made. One can go into sections of the country in which the anti-closed-shop sections of the Taft-Hartley law are being defeated and circumvented by employers who are following subrosa, and by bootlegging methods as far as hiring workers is concerned the same closed-shop arrangements which they had with labor prior to the passage of the Taft-Hartley law.

That is one of the bits of evidence which I shall enlarge upon in weeks to come in this debate. It shows why I think the anti-closed-shop sections of the Taft-Hartley law ought to be repealed. They are highly conducive to what I consider are bad practices from an ethical standpoint, within labor-management relations today.

I recall that on one occasion I was called by an employers' association for advice after passage of the Taft-Hartley law, as to whether or not I thought they ought to enter into a clear circumventing procedure for getting around the anti-closed-shop section of the Taft-Hartley law. As they put it to me, "We are opposed to that section of the Taft-Hartley law. Why should we have visited upon us the type of labor dispute which will result if we insist upon compliance with the anti-closed-shop section of the law?"

My response to them was the response I shall always give once a law is passed. So long as it is on the books, the junior Senator from Oregon will take the position that both management and labor must comply with it. If it is not a good law, the thing to do is to repeal those sections of the law which are leading to bad results. In this instance I think the anti-closed-shop section is leading to unethical practices on the part of both management and labor in circumventing the Taft-Hartley law.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

Also some of the witnesses—I think quite thoughtlessly from their partisan standpoint—brought out the point that conditions will change when the labor market is not quite as tight as it is now, when jobs are not as plentiful as they are now, and when there is a general recession in our whole economic program. That is why I say to the Republicans in this Congress that if they really want to demonstrate that we are a party fair to labor, so far as the rights of labor are concerned—and I think we mean to be—now is the time to correct those features of the Taft-Hartley law which will work havoc upon the legitimate rights of labor come hard times. Those provisions are still on the books in the form of various sections of the Taft-Hartley law.

I now yield to the Senator from New York for a question.

Mr. IVES. In order to make the record clear, I should like to ask the able Senator from Oregon if it is not a fact that the anti-closed-shop provision was in the Taft-Hartley bill which was reported from the Senate committee in 1947. It is not something which was added in the conference or on the floor during the debate.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from New York is absolutely correct. That provision was one of the provisions on which we reached a compromise in committee in order to bring out from the committee a bill with which we thought at least we could live, and we could live with the committee bill. In my opinion, had this body not changed the committee bill, we would have been in a position where we would have had a piece of legislation which, taken in its totality, would have been fair and workable. As the Senator from New York and I said at the time, it would need in the future some changes as we gained experience under it, but the committee bill generally referred to as the Ives-Morse bill was a fair bill.

In my opinion, there were men sitting in the United States Senate in 1947, and men sitting in the House of Representatives in 1947 on the Republican side, who still would be in the Congress had we not passed the Taft-Hartley bill. Had we stuck to the Senate committee bill, I think the results of the 1948 election would have been greatly different than they were. The leaders in my party can rationalize that election all they please, but I think it is perfectly obvious that we lost a large number of seats in the Senate and in the House because of the passage of the Taft-Hartley law. Furthermore, millions of votes were cast against the Republican nominee in the Presidential election because, as a party, we did not make crystal clear in the campaign in what respect we proposed to amend or modify the Taft-Hartley law.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. That is politics; but this is a political democracy. I say now that this is the time, long before 1952, for the leaders of my party to start talking and thinking in those political terms which win and lose elections. Before I yield, let me say to the Republicans in this Congress our party will not win in 1952 unless it removes from itself the anti-labor label which the Taft-Hartley law has pinned on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. PEPPER. I was about to ask the Senator if he thought probably that same strong feeling which he said was manifested in 1948 would probably carry over to 1950 and 1952 if such a thing as the Taft-Hartley law were not eliminated?

Mr. MORSE. Let me say to the Senator from Florida that I think I can give him assurance that by 1952 the Republican Party will not be split on this and other major issues to anywhere near the extent to which the Democratic Party, in the few short months since November 2, 1948, has become split. The present debate in the Senate on the pending matter of cloture shows how deep—and I think irreconcilable—that split is.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. PEPPER. I ask the Senator to yield for a question.

The Senator has predicted to us—and naturally the country is interested in predictions from so responsible a source and author—that the disjointed nature of the Republican Party will disappear by 1952. Will the Senator be able to enlighten the Congress and the country as to which end is expected to absorb the other? [Laughter.]

Mr. MORSE. I say to the Senator from Florida that I am perfectly satisfied as to why a great coalition producing a liberal party is going to occur within the Republican Party, and that is because we are able to learn from past experiences. But judging from the pending debate in the Senate of the United States, I am inclined to believe that the Democratic Party still has to learn the lesson of how to learn from past experiences.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. PEPPER. Would the Senator say that a political party which has not learned anything in 20 years is an apt student? [Laughter.]

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I always enjoy debating with the Senator from Florida, because the false assumptions he usually throws at me I find very intriguing. The one he has just indulged in is a typical false assumption, and I am sure he will take no offense when I say "a la PEPPER" [laughter] because there simply is no evidence to support the false assumption that the Republican Party, if he means to refer to it, has not stood for many sound issues in the public interest during the past 20 years.

I wish to say that if we go back through the Republican record in the Congress, I know it will be found that on issue after issue it has had to be the Republican leadership, over on this side of the aisle, which has had to protect basic American freedoms and rights on a great many issues—including, for example, Mr. President, a great issue which now splits the Democrats in the Senate, the issue of civil rights. I remember that in 1945 we led in the fight against the proposal to pass a law which would have made it possible for the Manpower Commission to move free workers in this country from job to job at the direction of American employers. Oh, yes; the proposed law might operate under the guise of having a Government agency, known as the Manpower Commission, give the orders and directions but the result was to place the workers of the country under orders to work where, when, and in accordance with private employers' directions. Republicans beat it. I recall that it was not so long ago that it was on the Republican side of the aisle, as I said the other day, that the fight was made against the proposal by a Democratic administration to draft into the Army free men on strike. I wish to hear the Senator from Florida, some day, on his own time, discuss that question; but I do not wish to have him discuss it on my time, because I do not think he could discuss it in the form of a question, and I do not propose to lose the floor until I conclude these few brief remarks.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. PEPPER. I wonder whether the Senator from Oregon is forgetting the fact that, I think, the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Florida arose simultaneously to object to the proposal to which the Senator from Oregon refers? Furthermore, does the Senator recall that probably earlier—I wish to refresh the Senator's recollection——

Mr. MORSE. Oh, my memory is very good.

Mr. PEPPER. Probably earlier the Senator from Florida had spoken in the radio room of the House Press Gallery, saying that such a proposed law was unwise; and does the Senator from Oregon also recall that some persons thought the Senator from Florida was cut off the radio because of the fact that he was speaking in opposition to the proposal? Does the Senator from Oregon further recall that the Senator from Florida has said that although the President has learned a better approach to this question, the Republican Party has apparently been incapable of learning anything in this field, as evidenced by its continued advocacy of the Taft-Hartley law?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there is no doubt about the fact that on that occasion, as is so frequently the case, the Senator from Florida was one of the lone voices on the other side of the aisle raising strong objections to the striker-draft proposal. But, Mr. President, on this side of the aisle Senator after Senator stood up in protest of the President's proposal to draft strikers. We welcomed the Senator from Florida then, as we always do, when he joins us on the right side of an issue. There is no doubt about the fact that on that particular occasion he was on the radio at the same time when some of the others of us were in the Senate Radio Gallery speaking on the radio against the President's proposal. In fact, before we returned to the floor of the Senate several of us on the Republican side went to the radio, on a Nation-wide hook-up, to protest the President's proposal.

Mr. President, I do not wish to take much more time. In fact, I think I shall close with a reference to some remarks I previously made in opposition to the Taft-Hartley law. I had marked out a number of other predictions and warnings which I gave to my party in 1947 during the debate on the Taft-Hartley law, but I shall refer to only one now—remarks made by me on June 21, 1947, and I close with this:

> Because a majority of men in my party in the Senate may not share my predominant points of view on various issues does not change the fact, Mr. President, that millions of Republicans in this country do, and they are being heard from more and more, month by month. I think they are going to make clear—pretty clear in 1948 and very clear in 1952—that if the Republican Party wants their continued support, it had better move over into the middle of the road and follow the course I seek to follow.

Mr. President, I recommended to the writer of the Post editorial—boring as he may find it, but in the interest, at least, of apprising himself of the facts—that he go to the RECORD of 1947 and learn the arguments which those of us opposed to the Taft-Hartley law then made, and then check for himself, on the basis of the evidence in the hearings just closed, whether we were right or wrong.

Mr. President, as to the hearings which have just closed, I wish to point out that the Republicans had to make a fight for those hearings; we had to make a fight even to have hearings long enough so that we could make a record in regard to the experiences and practices which have developed under the Taft-Hartley law. We finally won that fight, in the face of the opposition of the Senator from Florida, who, as will be recalled, wished to close those hearings on February 10, which would have given us a most inadequate time in which to present the evidence, even on the bad practices which have accumulated under the Taft-Hartley law. But, having won that fight for adequate hearings, Mr. President, when the debate on the Taft-Hartley law opens we shall present what I consider to be a fine record of the pros and cons on the various sections of the Taft-Hartley law and the facts concerning the experiences which have accumulated under its administration.

Mr. President, I close by saying in all seriousness that I hope that when we get into the debate on the Taft-Hartley law this year, it will not be a Democratic and Republican debate, but will be a debate by a group of 96 Senators trying to find out what are the facts in regard to the type of legislation needed in order to have fair legislation for management, labor, and the public. If that is our motivation, then, Mr. President, we shall get rid of the Taft-Hartley law by the passage of a substitute bill for the Democratic proposal known as the Thomas bill. We shall then pass a substitute bill which will protect, as the public wants protected, the legitimate rights of labor to organize, to bargain collectively, to be protected from the unfair practices of employers; and equally, Mr. President—and I underscore the word "equally"—we shall pass a bill which will protect employers from the unfair-labor practices of unions. I indict the Taft-Hartley law as a law which is slanted in an unfair, discriminatory way in favor of American employers, and against the legitimate rights of American workers. I hope Republicans in and out of Congress will cooperate in making it Republican policy to get rid of the Taft-Hartley law by passing a substitute bill which is fair to the rights of all parties to labor disputes.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. LUCAS to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 15, amending the so-called cloture rule of the Senate.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, has the Chair recognized the Senator from Mississippi?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has recognized the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I desire to discuss the question pending before the Senate from the viewpoint of one of the newer Members of this body and also from the viewpoint of one who was on the Committee on Rules and Administration and attended the recent hearings and heard all the testimony on this important matter. In discussing the Senate

rules I am quick to say I know the so-called freedom of debate in the Senate has been abused in the past. It may be abused to some extent now, and it will probably and most likely be abused to some extent in the future. Such considerations are, I think, beside the point. They are merely attendant circumstances.

I wish to say also it is entirely possible some harm can come from the abuse of the Senate's rules and it may be that some harm will come from their abuse, but I am certain in my own mind that far less harm will come from any probable abuse of the rules than will come from going too far and changing the rules and thus entirely altering the nature of the United States Senate. As one who attended all the hearings and as one who has been in close contact with the subject especially for the past 60 days, I want to warn all Members of the Senate, if they already do not know it, that the real fact is that the strife is on now to make a majority cloture rule the rule of the Senate. That is the big issue. That is what is on the minds of the groups that are particularly interested in having the rules changed. That is primarily on the mind of a great number of the Membership of the Senate that are sponsoring the changes. That is what is on the mind of the majority leader on this side of the aisle, who stated on the floor of the Senate yesterday that he would support such a proposal. That, according to the record, is what is on the mind—and I say this with great deference—of the assistant floor leader on the Republican side of the Senate [Mr. SALTONSTALL], when he testified before the Committee on Rules and Administration, saying in substance that resolution 15 was merely a short step in the right direction, and that what he really favored was majority cloture. That is what is primarily on the mind of the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], according to his testimony before the committee. The question of Senate Resolution 15 merely plugging up the loopholes, so-called, is not the real issue. What is on his mind is majority cloture, according to his own statement. At the time that statement was made in the hearing, the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], a deep student of this very question, said that he associated himself entirely with the thoughts and statements and impressions of the gentlemen who had preceded him—the Senator from Michigan, whom I have mentioned, and the Senator from Massachusetts, whom I have mentioned. At that very same time, at the same hearings, and in the same record, the very able junior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] said what he really favored was the majority cloture rule and that he was supporting the two-thirds rule merely because it was a step in the right direction. The assistant floor leader on the Democratic side [Mr. MYERS] announced on the floor yesterday he would renew his previous motion, which had been rejected by the Committee on Rules and Administration, so as to provide for cloture by a constitutional majority. The able junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has already announced his purpose and intention of offering an amendment to provide majority cloture.

Mr. President, let not the membership of this body be deceived. Here, now, today, the issue largely revolves around the question of majority cloture.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I believe the Senator mentioned my name as favoring a majority cloture rule, but as stating that a two-thirds rule was a step toward it.

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I said that at the hearing. Putting it in the form of a question to the Senator, would it change his point of view if I were to say that, so far as I personally am concerned, as one Senator who made that statement, I should hope the two-thirds rule would be adopted this year, and that I would not vote in favor of a simple majority cloture rule or a constitutional majority rule, because I believe the other step to be the best? Would it change the Senator's point of view in any way to have one Senator make that statement? I put that in the form of a question, in order to come within the rule.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate entirely the most honorable Senator's sentiment and his statement as to his position. But, Mr. President, neither the Senator from Massachusetts, nor any other Member, nor even a group of the Senate, can guarantee to anyone what might happen here tomorrow, or what might be someone's attitude in changing the rules tomorrow, or at the next session, or at any other time, any more than they can assure us whether or not it will rain on March 15. I say again the issue now before the American people—not merely before the United States Senate, but before the American people—is, Shall the rules of the United States Senate be so changed as to provide for cloture by majority vote? That is the question. I think we might as well meet that issue now, and in my feeble way I want to inform the people of the United States that that is the real issue here. That is what is on the minds of those on the outside of this body who are seeking to have the rules changed, and that is the primary idea in the minds of those who are most active and insistent within this body that the rules be changed.

On that point I want to refer to a former very distinguished Member of this body, who served here for a long number of years, whom I shall perhaps mention more than once in the course of my presentation, Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge, Sr., from the State of Massachusetts. I notice statements were filed in the hearings by both sides, so to speak, from this distinguished gentleman, and I endeavored to find out the reason for it. I find he changed his mind on this most important subject. I cite him now very briefly on one point, from a statement he was making in 1915 in this very Chamber. He was referring to the fact that he had once been in favor of the cloture rule. Speaking with reference to the character of the United States Senate, he said:

> To me this matter of a change of the rules of the Senate which have been in force in this respect for 109 years is a matter of very grave moment indeed. I think if a change from our present system to the previous question, like that of the House, is put in operation it is going to alter completely the character of the Senate.

My point is that that is the real question before the Senate and before the people of the United States, and here is the opinion of that eminent statesman, on that very question, expressed in open debate. I am reading from a statement which he made as found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 15, 1915. He went on to say:

> Now, without arguing the merits of the question at this moment, this is a change so serious that it ought to have the most thorough and the fullest consideration of every Senator on the floor.

Those are not my words. Those are not the words of a gentleman who comes from the area of this great Nation from which I come. They are the words of the late Senator Lodge, of Massachusetts. He said further:

> Every Senator ought to think well before he makes a change of this sort in the very constitution of the Senate for the sake of passing, in a moment of heat and passion over a single bill, a measure which strikes at that quality which has been more distinctive of the Senate than any other body in parliamentary history and which today is the only refuge the people of this country have who desire to know something about the measures before their Representatives. The people of this country have the right to know the reasons for and against every important measure, for in no other way can they rightly judge.
>
> At this moment, as an illustration of the evil I refer to, they are proposing to take up this great measure in the House of Representatives and dispose of it in 4 hours.
>
> Surely that is an illustration of the evil in the other direction—the evil of putting through great measures under drastic rules and without discussion. I believe this to be a much worse evil than that which these efforts to introduce the previous question here are designed to remedy.

The previous question, of course, meant cloture by a majority vote.

Mr. President, I think the same thought can be expressed in another way. The question before the Senate is, Shall the Senate abdicate its historic role—not its temporary role—as a forum for negotiation and understanding of differences, economically, politically, socially, and otherwise? Shall it abdicate its historic place as such a forum and become merely another legislative body? I should not like to think that any Senator wants it to become merely another legislative body. I think our difference of opinion comes honestly, in connection with the idea of what would be the effect of a change in this rule. As for myself, based on what I have heard since becoming a Member of this body a little more than one short year ago, I have no idea where we are heading or that the Senate will soon become merely another legislative body; but the test will come on the floor of the Senate before Senate Resolution 15 is disposed of.

It makes no difference what the wording of the resolution may be, how far it goes, or how moderate, or how mild it may be. The issue is already made. Hearings have been held, and the opposing forces have joined in the battle. Regardless of how long a Senator may remain a Member of this body, I believe he will never cast a more important or a more far-reaching vote than he will cast on the very issue which is now before the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield only for a question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator this question. Based on what he has just stated, does he not think that the men who drafted rule XXII in 1917 believed they were doing what we are now attempting to do by the resolution in its present form?

Mr. STENNIS. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts that I have been able to find very little light and very little information that would shed light, upon what those men intended, except that they intended exactly what they said. What they said has been subsequently interpreted by eminent and able Members of the Senate. I have no way of judging what they meant except by what they said. I have not been able to find any additional light on the subject. I have to judge them by what they said, and particularly I have to judge by what able men, versed in the law have said, under the responsibility of their oath, as presiding officers of the Senate. I have to follow their rulings. That is the law.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. On the basis of what the late President Wilson said at that time, if my memory is correct, and on the basis of how the present rule XXII was framed at that time, would it not seem to be fairly obvious that they were attempting to accomplish what we are now attempting to accomplish by Senate Resolution 15?

Mr. STENNIS. My conclusion is absolutely to the contrary.

I think a great deal can be said to sustain that position. I think some plausible points can be made to sustain the other position. But the overwhelming point in my mind is that they said what they meant, they meant what they said, and there is no evidence to the contrary. I shall discuss, before I conclude, the emergency situation which existed at that time. For instance, the distinguished gentleman I quoted just a few moment ago, the then Senator from Massachusetts, Henry Cabot Lodge, Sr., voted for this amendment to rule XXII in 1917. I think it was under circumstances of emergency control; but I shall discuss that later.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield for a question?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Mississippi if he has had occasion to read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 19, 1919, when the first effort was made to apply cloture under rule XXII, which was adopted in 1917. The Senator knows that at that time Senators were present here in the Senate who had participated in the drafting of the rule, and that the first effort was made to apply cloture in November, 1919. If the Senator has read the debate he will know, further, that two distinguished Members of this body who were Members of the Senate and participated in the drafting of the rule clearly indicated by their remarks, at the time of the attempt that was first made to apply it, that they did not think the rule applied other than to a bill or resolution that was pending before the Senate.

I have sent for the RECORD, but it has not yet been brought into the Chamber. But on the date to which I have referred Senator Hitchcock, of Nebraska, who was a Member of the Senate in 1917, stated that in his opinion rule XXII did not apply to a treaty that was pending before the Senate. Senator Underwood, of Alabama, who was present in 1917, also stated that rule XXII was a poor excuse for a rule, but that it was the only rule the Senate had ever adopted in all its history that would tend to shut off the right of free and unlimited debate by a Member of the Senate.

I should like to ask the Senator if the best evidence as to what was intended by those who drafted the rule is not the words which fell from their own mouths when the first attempt was made to apply the rule in the Senate.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Georgia is evidently correct, and those were the same men who were present when the rule was adopted. They were conspicuous in the adoption of the rule. But I could not find anything in the debate at the time the rule was adopted in 1917 to throw any particular light on the question. It really was not debated very extensively. The first time it was interpreted was in November 1919, when it was held, as Senators will doubtless recall, that the rule did not apply to the reservations to the treaty as I believe they were called. That was the time when Senator Hitchcock made the remark quoted.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. For a question only.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is it not a fact that the debate which was criticized by President Wilson as imperiling our safety was on the ship-arming bill itself, and not on the motion to take up the bill?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Did not the majority leader, Senator Martin, of Virginia, then propose the amendment to rule 22 which was adopted, to meet the specific issue which had previously been faced, that is, unrestricted debate on a bill?

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Therefore they used the words "pending measure" instead of "pending business," or whatever might have included a motion, as well as a measure.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is entirely correct and I do not believe the claim, which I know is made in great good faith, that the resolution now being discussed is proposed to carry out the original 1917 intention, is sustained by the record or the reasoning or the rulings.

Mr. President, I know there have been great urges and movements throughout the years to change the rules of the Senate in regard to unlimited debate. This is not a new question. But except in the great emergency in 1917, when we were facing an immediate war, every time this question has been considered in the calmness of free deliberation, the will of the Senate has been to reject the proposal to limit debate.

In 1925, as I recall the year, there was a great movement, in all good faith, engineered by the then Vice President of the United States, Mr. Dawes, which evoked a good deal of comment in the press, but the almost unanimous expression of the Members of the Senate at that time, so far as they expressed themselves, can be summed up in a few words to the effect that the then Vice President and Presiding Officer did not have the experience in a legislative body, especially this body, which they had had, which taught them that they had better leave the rules on the point under discussion as they were.

As I said a moment ago, I wish in all good faith to extend a most solemn challenge to those who propose to change the rule. It has been extended to them before; but I challenge them again to show before an impartial jury that the people of this great Nation have ever been injured or harmed in any substantial way at all because of the so-called filibuster. Some of the membership of the Senate may have been inconvenienced, some man's ambition may have been temporarily thwarted, there may have been some delay which seemed costly at the moment, but, by and large, in the history of this rule and in the history of the Senate, I challenge anyone to show that the great mass of the people have ever been really injured by the operation of the great rule of unlimited debate.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. EASTLAND. Cannot my colleague show that, on the contrary, the American people have been greatly benefited by the rule of unlimited debate in the Senate?

Mr. STENNIS. I think that point is well raised, the question is well put, and on examination the evidence on that point, I submit, will be found to be overwhelming as to the benefits which have flowed from the operation of the rule of unlimited debate. I shall take up at a later time in the discussion some of the illustrations of that idea.

The second point of the challenge which I wish to extend to the proponents of the resolution under discussion is this: After all, where is the demand, where is

the request, on the part of the great body of the people, for the alteration of the present rule? I know there is request within the Democratic Party. I know there is a great urge and a request within the councils of the Republican Party, I know there are great requests, in fact, demands, from specially organized groups, throughout some areas of the country. I believe there is also some request from some of the uninformed public. But I go back to the real question. Where is the urge and where is the demand and where is the request coming from the impartial rank and file, the breadwinners of America?

I can illustrate my idea on that point. I believe we can find the true sentiment of the people if we go into the great State of Pennsylvania, for instance, and collect on the street of some small town 100 citizens of all age groups, of all political faiths, including some farmers, some butchers, some white-collar workers, and get them to go to their community school house, sit down there in its auditorium and have someone clearly explain each side of the proposition. Assuming that they are of average intelligence, I believe their verdict would be unmistakably that we had better leave things alone. I believe they would say, "It looks like we are getting along pretty well."

I believe the result would be the same in the great State of Ohio, or in Minnesota, or Colorado, or California, or in any other State. If one were to go to any rural cross-roads area, or any small town, or any city, and pick out 100 individuals of the same classes I previously mentioned—I am not proposing the taking of a poll now; I am proposing that a sampling be made of their thinking—I believe if the question were explained to them from the one viewpoint and then explained to them from the other viewpoint, the opinion of the rank and file of the breadwinners, the butcher, the baker, the candlestick maker, the farmer, the white-collar worker, the so-called small earner, would be, not unanimous, but overwhelmingly in favor of leaving things alone. In other words, I believe their verdict would be that the Senate should not abdicate its position as being the last major forum in the world wherein any group, however small, can seek and secure protection.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Does the Senator believe that if 48 States had a poll tax there would be an overwhelming demand for a Federal law to outlaw the poll tax? Does the Senator believe that if 48 States had antilynch laws, such as Virginia has, there would be an overwhelming demand to pass a Federal antilynch law? Does the Senator believe that any States would poll an overwhelming majority for so unconstitutional an undesirable a law as a Federal FEPC law?

Mr. STENNIS. I certainly do not, I will say to the Senator. I am convinced in my own mind as to what the answer would be if the questions were submitted to the people and they understood them. I refer to the people by and large, not organized groups, not partial groups, not those who think their special interests lie with the passage of certain bills, but the great body of the people. I have no doubt in my own mind as to what their answer would be.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. ROBERTSON. If the Congress passes bills which we can demonstrate are clearly unconstitutional, does the Senator think that the majority of the people of the Nation will feel assured that we will stop there and never again pass an unconstitutional act that affects them in some other way?

Mr. STENNIS. That is the great trouble, I will say to the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia. As I see it, and I say this with all deference, if we pass such laws, then we shall have proved that, so far as we are concerned, we do not feel the restraint of constitutional government, and if that trend should continue I fear we would not long have it.

Mr. President, I want now to try briefly to refer to the atmosphere in the Constitutional Convention as indicating how and why some of these ideals were born. I go back now to Philadelphia, to a little room barely 50 feet square, almost bare. There was one long table at the end. The Presiding Officer, George Washington himself, sat in a very ordinary chair. James Madison, a youth comparatively speaking, sat at the Secretary's position. Alexander Hamilton was at that table as was Benjamin Franklin. They called him Dr. Franklin—revered and respected by them all. They were trying to formulate an organic law. They had been there for 6 weeks, and failure was written on their faces. With respect to membership in the upper body the smaller States said, "We will have equal representation or we will go home and there will be no Constitution." The larger States said, "We demand representation based on population." That was the final word from both the large and small States. Dr. Franklin moved that they take a recess for 3 days. He made two suggestions, both of which were followed. One was that when they reconvened they open their sessions with prayer, and the other was that during the 3-day recess those of opposite views mix and mingle with each other in social and intellectual intercourse.

When they returned at the end of the 3 days and reassembled the venerable Dr. Franklin, then 81 years of age—and in my opinion, he possessed what was perhaps the greatest and most fertile mind America has ever had—said that he had come to realize fully that any possible Constitution would have to be based somewhat on compromises so that it would reflect in part at least the sentiment of all areas, and perhaps would have more wisdom in it after all, and therefore he was willing to yield his point and surrender to the smaller States upon the question of representation in the Senate. At that very moment, Mr. President, the United States Senate was born. At that very moment began the real birth of the Constitution as a whole.

Aside from the provision that "Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings," there are no words in the Constitution respecting the rules of the United States Senate, but the breath of life was blown into the Senate at that moment in the section dealing with representation in the Senate, so that all areas would have equal representation; in other words, that there would be a recognition of States rather than people. Let us not forget that—a recognition of States rather than of people.

What did the late Senator Henry Cabot Lodge of Massachusetts, say on that point? What did he call the rules of the Senate? He called them the constitution of the United States Senate. Yet an attempt is now being made to change the rules of the Senate, the constitution of the Senate, so that a majority can shut off debate. Is that in keeping with the spirit—I am not talking about the letter—of what Benjamin Franklin said at the Constitutional Convention, to which all the other members acceded? Let us search our souls and see, apart from any clamor, apart from the calendar which is facing us, and apart from the desire of any of us, if we can honestly say that we are willing to go against the spirit of that memorable compact, based upon compromise, from which a great nation has grown.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LUCAS. Does not the Senator from Mississippi feel that he is treading upon rather dangerous ground when he talks about Henry Cabot Lodge, Sr., and Alexander Hamilton, in view of what the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] said yesterday about those two men?

Mr. STENNIS. I am sorry, but I do not know that I heard what the Senator from Georgia said but I do not know that I would rest my case solely on what the junior Senator from Georgia or the senior Senator from Illinois might say about those personalities.

Mr. LUCAS. I congratulate the Senator on corroborating the Senator from Illinois in discussing both Alexander Hamilton and Henry Cabot Lodge, Sr.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi if he does not know that my question addressed to the distinguished majority leader was predicated upon the fact that he is the majority leader, on the Democratic side. He is supposed to be the spokesman of the President of the United States, who was formerly a Democratic Member of this body. It seemed to me that a majority leader attempting to carry out the policy of the party, as he announced it—though I deny that—would have been able to find some Democrat somewhere

of sufficient prominence to have been mentioned with those two able and distinguished Republicans who favored gagging the Senate and preventing Senators from representing their States on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Before the distinguished Senator from Mississippi leaves his comment on the contribution of Franklin to the formation of the Constitution, I should like to ask a question. The Senator commented on the most troublesome issue which had to be resolved, namely, the protection of the rights of minorities, which he said Franklin finally solved by a proposal for equal representation in the Senate. Is it not true that when the Constitutional Convention broke up Franklin was asked, "Dr. Franklin, what have you done?" and he replied, "We have given you a republic if you can keep it."

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is exactly correct.

I submit that there is no more important rule anywhere than the rule under which the Senate so admirably operated for more than a hundred years. In fact, I think that in some ways it is even more important than the very terms of the Constitution itself in preserving the Republic.

Mr. ROBERTSON. It is the antithesis of totalitarian government, which rides roughshod over the rights of any minority on any issue.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. President, I wish to repeat that, in my humble opinion, the Senate will not have before it at this session, or any other session, a measure that transcends in importance the measure which we are discussing today, because it goes to the fundamentals of our system of government.

I do not believe that this body occupies a superior position because of the wisdom of its Members, their intellectual capacity, their patriotism, or any other virtue. Certainly those virtues are equaled, if not exceeded, by Members of the body which sits at the other end of the Capitol. I believe that the thing which has made this body great is the rules of the Senate, the very thing to which the late Senator Lodge referred. I should like to read his statement again, because I do not believe the majority leader was present when I read it before. Speaking on the subject of cloture generally—any kind of cloture, two-thirds or a majority—Senator Lodge said in 1915:

> Every Senator ought to think well before he makes a change of this sort in the very constitution of the Senate for the sake of passing, in a moment of heat and passion over a single bill, a measure which strikes at that quality which has been more distinctive of the Senate than any other body in parliamentary history and which today is the only refuge the people of this country have who desire to know something about the measures before their representatives.

Those words were spoken in 1915, long before the currently operative amendment to rule 22 was adopted.

SENATOR LODGE'S VIEWS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the Senator if in his study of this question he has not found that many Senators have changed their minds about the issue of free debate in the Senate and as to the obnoxiousness of applying a gag rule. I ask the Senator if it is not true that many Senators, when they first came to this body, were irked and irritated by its apparently inability to act promptly, and were in favor of gagging the Senate, restricting debate, and limiting the right of free discussion; but in their more mature years, after they had served for a long period of time in the Senate, did not many of them publicly proclaim the fact that they had changed their views? I ask the Senator if the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] did not give the immature views of Senator Lodge, Sr., whereas the Senator from Mississippi has now read the views of Senator Lodge after he had served in this body for a considerable period of time. When Senator Lodge first came to this body he made several speeches, in 1890, in favor of imposing cloture; but after he had been here a number of years he wrote several articles and made a number of magnificent addresses in which he expressed regret for the errors of his youth. He had attained the maturity and wisdom which come from many years of experience. In his later years he defended the right of full and free discussion in the Senate with an eloquence surpassed by few men.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct.

One of the most interesting and revealing points in this entire study is that men have come to this body under the great impulse of impatience, with a desire to change the rules; but many of them, after serving in this body for a number of years, have become the strongest advocates of the rules under which the Senate operates. I shall give the record, briefly, of a few of them.

HISTORICAL BASIS

I should like to say a few more words about the historical basis and background. On one of our public buildings there is an inscription which admonishes our youth to study the past. Let us study the past for a moment.

From the year 1789, which was the year this body first met, until the year 1806, there was a rather strict rule cutting off debate by a majority vote. That was a period of 17 years in the formative stage of our Nation's history.

In 1806 the Senate deliberately and intentionally dropped all reference to any limitation on debate, and thus began a bold experiment which, at first glance, would appear to be subject to many objections.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi if in his reading on this subject he has not ascertained that the previous-question rule to which reference has frequently been made was a debatable question in the first Senate. It did not in any wise impose any restraint upon the right of any Senator to rise on this floor and speak. During the first few years of the Senate there was a previous-question rule, but the rule itself was debatable. It was in no wise a restraint upon the right of any Senator to express himself. For a long time I was under the impression that the previous-question rule operated as it does in the House of Representatives at the present time; but I happened to read a speech by Senator Carlisle, of Kentucky, who at one time was Speaker of the House. I ask the Senator if he has read that great speech, in which Senator Carlisle showed that the previous-question rule in the First Senate was merely a parliamentary device, and was in itself debatable. It was in no sense a restraint or curtailment upon freedom of speech in the Senate. It was not a gag rule, such as is proposed here today.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is eminently correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is it not true that in the first 17 years before Jefferson prepared the rules which were adopted in 1806, there were only four efforts in the Senate to move the previous question, and only one of them was adopted?

Mr. STENNIS. I did not know that. I thank the Senator from Virginia for his very fine information on that subject, and I am glad to have it in the RECORD.

ROMAN HISTORY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator has referred to the fact that after 1806 there was an experiment under which there was no rule whereby debate could be brought to an end. Does the Senator know that in the Roman Senate there existed for 450 years the right of unlimited debate; that Cicero, at the very height of Rome's power, said in the Roman Senate that if a change of that rule were ever made, it would mark the decline of Rome; but that after 450 years a great clamor arose to divide the land among those in Rome and those in the provinces who had no property; and that a dictator, Julius Caesar, caused a mob—such as we see around the Capitol from New York and other eastern cities—to bring pressure to bear to change the rules of the Roman Senate so that the land and property of Rome could be divided; and that as Cicero had predicted, that change did mark the destruction of the Roman Republic and the beginning of a dictatorship?

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for his very fine contribution. I was not familiar with that circumstance of history.

Mr. President, beginning in 1806, this body proceeded for 111 years without any kind or semblance of limitation on

debate; and that period of 111 years was one of great growth and development. In 1806 there were, as I recall, only 14 States, or perhaps 15 States, in the Union; and the total population did not exceed six or seven million. By 1917, at the end of that period, there were 48 States in the Union, with a population well over 100,000,000. We had developed the territory obtained through the Louisiana Purchase, and we had fought a war with Mexico. Texas had come into the Union, after its existence as a Republic, and many other additions of territory had been made. A most unfortunate war—and, considering the number of persons engaged in it, perhaps the bloodiest war in all history—had been fought, the War Between the States. The entire West had been settled, and the war with Spain had been fought. The entire continent had been linked with ribbons of steel. The telegraph, the electric light, and the automobile had been invented and developed; and we had become the leading manufacturing nation in the world. All during that period the Senate was still operating under the rule of unlimited debate. During that golden century of American development, Jefferson, Jackson, John Quincy Adams, Abraham Lincoln, Grover Cleveland, Theodore Roosevelt, and Woodrow Wilson had served as Presidents of the United States. John Marshall, Joseph Story, and Oliver Wendell Holmes had made their contribution as members of the United States Supreme Court, and had interpreted the Constitution along the lines of strong, sound, constructive government. During those 111 years the Senate of the United States had risen from an obscure body with a little more than 30 Members to a body with a membership of 96, and had taken its place as the greatest deliberative body in the world, under the far-sighted, forceful leadership of such men as Clay, Calhoun, Webster, Benton, and many others.

In that connection, I wish to refer to an illustration given by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. He said: "Who looks to see what the vote was on the great matters that Daniel Webster discussed? What did the vote matter, after all? Who looks to see how long they debated?"

The big point, Mr. President, is that in some of their memorable addresses those men were molding the Nation; they were establishing for the Nation a pattern which was later settled, in a way, on the battlefields. Who remembers what the vote was? The big thing is that the rules allowed Webster to debate freely, and I understand he sometimes spoke for more than 8 hours.

RULE SERVED WELL

But during this golden century of remarkable growth and development—greater growth and development than has been enjoyed by any other nation in the world—this rule served the Senate well; and the Senate repeatedly refused to change it, until in 1917, when acting in a great emergency, with war imminent, with war already on the surface of the waters, so to speak—a war with a nation across the water—the Senate did make a change in the rule. The same men who previously had opposed a change in the rule, by almost unanimous vote, and without any appreciable debate on the floor of the Senate, amended rule XXII and invoked the present so-called cloture rule. That was done purely during an emergency; we cannot escape that fact. Members of the Senate who had previously been opposed to cloture then voted for it. They voted for it at that time without debating it to any extent. But later the same men, on every occasion when the question came before the Senate, so long as they were Members of the Senate following 1917, vigorously and effectively opposed the extension of that rule. They said, "It goes far enough."

It was not 2 years before it was interpreted in effect to mean what it means today. The same men not only failed to try to amend it, but they opposed the proposals further to amend the rule, and voted them down, here on the floor of the Senate, every time they came up.

AN EMERGENCY MEASURE

So, Mr. President, looking at the picture before the rule was changed in 1917, looking at the picture when the rule was changed in 1917, and looking at the picture subsequent to 1917, it seems to me that any impartial mind must find overwhelming proof that the change made in 1917 was purely an emergency measure, adopted to meet a condition existing during that war; and, incidentally, the proposal was made during the war of 1917–18 to limit debate for the duration of the war—only to that extent; it was merely a temporary rule.

The same man who had helped adopt the rule in 1917 opposed its extension, even when the physical safety of the Nation itself was in grave peril. That further proves the atmosphere, the spirit, and the sentiment. So, Mr. President, how in the face of those facts, in the face of those developments, and in the face of the language they used—certainly they were versed in the use of the English language—in the face of all those things, how can it be said now, "Oh, they did not intend to say what they did say; they did not intend that the rule should mean what it said; they meant something else, and we will have to correct them on that point now"?

Mr. President, I wish to refer further to the past and call the Senate's attention to certain matters. There is much repetition. I shall omit some of the items I have here in regard to the constitutional requirement for a large vote before certain measures can be passed or before certain steps can be taken. Those are matters of repetition; I shall pass over them and refer to the first amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I did not want to interrupt the Senator earlier, but I should like to propound to him this question: If 70 Members of the Senate out of 96 desire merely to plug the loopholes in the existing rule XXII, so that, at least in their opinion, it would do what the rule was intended to do in 1917 when it was adopted, and they are not interested in amending it so as to provide for cloture by majority vote, how can they express themselves if they are not allowed to vote against any amendment providing majority cloture which might be presented, under the existing parliamentary situation now confronting us?

Mr. STENNIS. How can they vote for a resolution providing majority cloture? The only way I know is merely to offer such an amendment, and if it can be gotten on the floor where it is possible to have a yea-and-nay vote, Senators may vote as they see fit.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does not the Senator agree, in answer to the question, that Senators will never have a chance to express themselves against majority cloture if the parliamentary situation is such that an amendment of that kind cannot be presented to the Senate?

Mr. STENNIS. A Member can always express himself on the floor of the Senate and let his remarks go into the RECORD; but those of us who believe such a measure to be unsound are certainly under no obligations to sit idly by and see the matter gain momentum step by step and perhaps finally force its way through the legislative Chamber.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to another question?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If a majority of the Members of the Senate should publicly state on the floor of the Senate that they would not vote for an amendment providing majority cloture, but would support only the closing of the loopholes, would the Senator from Mississippi then be prepared to join in support of Senate Resolution 15?

Mr. STENNIS. I may say to the Senator from California, he can bind himself, but he cannot bind his successor; neither can any other Member of the Senate. If it is assumed that if the rule is changed according to Resolution 15 there will be no further change, I may say the Senator can no more give such assurance than he can give assurance that it will not rain on May 1. It is a matter over which the Senator has no control whatever. It is a matter over which a majority of the Members of the Senate have no control whatever. I have been in the Senate only a little more than a year, and I think 19 men have come into this body in that brief span of time; which illustrates to my mind the shifting sands and the rapidity with which changes take place. In the absence of such assurance, I could not follow the Senator's reasoning.

THE FIRST AMENDMENT

Mr. President, I want to call the Senate's special attention, in this historical study respecting the operation of our form of government, to the first amendment. Skipping over all the other amendments for the sake of brevity, the first amendment to the Constitution provides:

> Congress shall make no law * * * abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press.

"Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press." Is that great privilege abused? Of

course it is. Did the framers of the first amendment and those who adopted it know it would be abused? Of course they did. But did they refrain from writing it into the Constitution because of their knowledge of its possible abuse? They certainly did not. Did they realize that injury to some persons would be inflicted because of the rule—injuries for which there would be no practical remedy? If they were practical men, and I assume they were, they certainly knew there would be such injuries and such harm, and that people would be helpless so far as a practical remedy was concerned.

I may digress here to say, Mr. President, that my brief experience in the Senate has caused me to have a tremendous appreciation of the very fine patriotic service rendered to the people of the Nation by the press and radio under this form of guaranty. I know it is abused to some extent, but I am convinced—and this is certainly not a bid to the fourth estate, but I think the RECORD should show it—that it is absolutely necessary to have these great channels of information kept open; otherwise a government of our kind would never survive. The press, the radio, and other channels of information render a very fine patriotic service, most aptly and reliably performed it seems to me, particularly in Washington. They make the difference between our form of government being able to operate and the reverse. I wish the rank and file of people throughout the Nation really had a greater appreciation and knowledge of the service rendered through press and radio channels. I know I did not have that appreciation until I came to Washington and saw the complexity of government and realized how the press and radio turn on the light.

But getting back to the first amendment, the men who wrote it and adopted it knew that the good which would come from it would far outweigh any possible harm or injury which might ensue. They therefore absolutely forbade the Congress doing anything about abridging that great right. They did not even say, "Congress shall not make any unreasonable abridgement," as they did in relation to searches and seizures; but they said, "Congress shall make no abridgement." Their wisdom has certainly been fully justified. It has grown to be a great bulwark of strength against any would-be tyrant, be it legislative, judicial, or executive. Time has proven its wisdom.

I repeat that, even though, except for the general provision, there is nothing in the Constitution of the United States regarding the Senate rules, I believe time has caused those rules to grow into an institution whereby they mean just as much for the freedom and integrity of the republican processes as do most of the provisions of the Constitution itself, and far more than many constitutional provisions mean.

I should like to call attention to another provision of the Bill of Rights——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to call to the Senator's attention the fact that the first sentence of article I of the Constitution states:

> All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

The Senator has been discussing the freedom-of-speech amendment, but if the legislative process is to be put into effect, the time does come, does it not, when the legislative body must act?

Mr. STENNIS. I do not say that the provision of the Constitution which I was citing is controlling, but it is a background showing that in some fields the Constitution has absolutely prohibited any legislative action at all. So the absolute rule—if we have an absolute rule here—of freedom of debate, would certainly find some precedent in the Constitution itself.

Another provision of the first amendment is that Congress shall make no law prohibiting the free exercise of religion.

These constitutional provisions are all right so long as they are obeyed; but I have found out, particularly since coming to the Senate, that there is a great difference of opinion regarding the mandates of the Constitution, and there is a great difference of opinion regarding what I thought were plain words with unmistakable meaning.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

In Biblical days, if I remember correctly, it was Abraham who was told that if he would go into the city of Sodom and find 50 persons who were pure in heart, the city would be saved from destruction. The number was later changed to 40, then to 30, then to 20, and finally to 10. The Constitution of the United States says that so long as one person may be found engaged in the free exercise of religion—not my religion, but his religion—so long as just one person can be found so engaged, then no law shall be passed prohibiting it. Thus is the one protected from the other 146,000,000 persons. But how secure is that provision in the Constitution? How secure are we in that regard? We know that in this Nation less than 100 years ago there was a political party of sizable proportions, which was strictly antireligious, so far as one denomination was concerned. We hope that will never occur again: but even 25 years ago there was a great antireligious movement in this country which took the form of a secret organization. It was not confined to any particular area. Its members went into politics and into the churches; they played a very conspicuous part in political campaigns for the Presidency of the United States and for Members of this body and of the House of Representatives. The organization was antireligious, so far as a certain denomination was concerned. Who knows when there may be a stronger wave of antireligious sentiment as to particular denominations? If there is, where will be their last place of refuge? Where will they come for protection? Where will be the spot in which they will make their last stand? It will be here, on the floor of the United States Senate. They are not on the list at this time. But change the Senate rules, Mr. President, and put the power of this body into the hands of a majority, and the whole complexion of this Government will be changed, and I believe the time will come when even religion will be attacked and have no place to which it can go for refuge.

PARTISAN POLITICS

That brings me to this point: I see the matter becoming more and more a question of partisan politics. I think partisan politics is having a very conspicuous part in the battle at this time. What the late Senator Lodge, of Massachusetts, called the very constitution of the Senate itself has already got into the field of major political parties and has taken part in the recent political campaign. I believe, Mr. President, that once we find ourselves in that position, we can relegate ourselves to the point where cloture rule will be used as a regular, usual, and customary weapon in the hands of the majority leadership.

I wish to refresh the recollection of the Senate as to the words which were read so admirably here on George Washington's birthday. I wish to read an extract from Washington's Farewell Address, as quoted on page 8 of Report No. 69 on the resolution which we are discussing:

> I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the State with particular reference to the founding of them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.
>
> This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind. It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed, but in those of the popular forum it is seen in its greatest rankness and is truly their worst enemy. Without looking forward to any extremity of this kind, which nevertheless ought not be entirely out of sight, the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit of party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

Mr. President, that is one point upon which the Father of his Country is generally thought to have been wrong in his advice, because we have had a party system almost since that day, which has worked with comparatively conspicuous success. For almost a century now two major parties have been fighting the battles of government, with more success at some times than at others, but each serving, when in the minority, as a rather loyal opposition. We could, therefore, dismiss the first President's advice by saying it was a point upon which he was mistaken.

I believe, Mr. President, we will overlook the major point unless we dig deeper and discover why these parties have been able to battle during this century of time, each sustaining its viewpoint, but neither being obliterated by the opposition, even in a time so recent as 1937–38, I believe it was, when there were 76 Democratic Members of the Senate and only 16 Members of the other major party. There has been a weapon, not so often used, but whichever party was in the majority knew that the weapon existed. The weapon the opposition had

was free debate. That was always in the calculations of the majority party, and I believe if the battle to resist a change of this rule is lost today, then as certainly as night follows day, within the brief span of less than 10 years, or perhaps 5, it might be only 4, we will have absolute majority cloture in this body. Let us not forget, that is the real battle, that is the real issue before the Senate, whether or not we are going to have, within a few years, majority cloture. I believe that if that does come, in the course of a few more years, the great weapon which the loyal opposition party has always been able effectively to use will be blunted, and finally destroyed, because a majority leader, finding himself hard-pressed in putting over the party legislative program, will be greatly tempted at every turn to resort to cloture. He may not yield to that temptation very frequently at first, but if he fails to make use of it, he will be blamed by those who might be specially interested.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. RUSSELL. What assurance has the Senator that if this resolution comes to a vote we will not have majority cloture within a matter of 4 or 5 days? The Senator refers to 4 or 5 years. There are a number of Senators who have expressed themselves as favoring the imposition of gag rule by majority vote. The Senator named several. I saw in the press an article which I think was issued by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, of West Virginia, which quoted both the distinguished Senators from that State as having assured them of a vote in favor of majority cloture.

The Senator knows that very powerful forces are at work to intimidate Senators to vote for majority cloture. It seems to me that the consequences which the Senator suggests, which I think are likely to be even more dire than he has predicted up to now, are much nearer upon us, if this trend continues, than a matter of years. It may be a question of days.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator, and his thought is certainly most excellently stated. My expression was that, even granting that nothing should actually happen now except the adoption of Senate Resolution 15, let us not forget that the real issue before the Senate is majority cloture. I take that from the record, from the men who sponsor and propose these changes in the rules and the supporters who insist on their adoption.

Returning to the party matter, the floor leader finding himself hard-pressed would feel a personal inclination at first, because of the great traditions of the Senate, not to yield to the need of seeking power through invoking cloture, but in extremity he would yield, and as time went on he would yield more and more frequently, and soon the system would be built up, and it would be expected of him as a matter of duty. If he did not act in putting over a party program, he would be held derelict, and would soon be replaced by one who was more willing to use the majority-vote process to impose cloture.

Mr. President, that brings to mind a point which was most admirably mentioned by the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] in the hearings. I know he is going to develop it, but I wish to call attention to it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield for a question?

Mr. STENNIS. For a question only.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The question arises in my mind because of the suggestion made by the junior Senator from Georgia. What I am about to say I say very sincerely, and I know the Senator will take it in the same spirit.

The Senator agrees with me, does he not, that those on the other side of this question from himself have just as strong feelings for the traditions of the Senate, for the traditions of the Constitution, and for the background of our Government, as have the Senators on his side of the question? The difference is one's point of view as to whether there should be legislative action. Is not that true?

Mr. STENNIS. I know the Senator's sincerity and his devotion to the traditions of the Senate is 100 percent, but I make the further point that traditions are not sufficient. We operate under rules, after all, and rules give power, and such power constantly dangled before a majority leader will eventually overcome all traditions, it makes no difference how long it took to build them up.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi if he does not believe that what we here refer to as tradition and courtesy in the Senate of the United States did not grow out of the fact that every Member of this body has a right to stand upon this floor and express his opinion? We are no more courteous than are Members of the other body, and it may be said we have no finer traditions than have the Members of the House of Representatives, where Members go to those in charge of a bill and implore the right to speak for 5 minutes on the floor of the House. There is merely a nice question of the power, as the Senator has said, which is now possessed by every Member of the Senate since it was instituted as a very peculiar parliamentary body. Strike down the rules of the Senate which have fed these traditions and nursed them, and have brought about this senatorial courtesy, strike them down, and we will see that we have neither tradition nor courtesy that will stand us in stead when the effort is made to gag Senators on the floor. Senators will be just as silent as if the Senate never had a tradition, as if it never had any spirit of courtesy. If the power is there, the power will be used, and let no man delude himself with a contrary opinion.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, that is certainly well said. The rules are the mother of the traditions upon which Senators are now able to rely, but power when granted is always used, and if the rules are changed it will not be an abuse of privilege, nor an abuse of tradition, if the power placed in the hands of the majority is used. They will be forced by outside pressure to use this power, and will be charged—and in a way rightfully so—for failing to use the power that is in their hands to put over their program.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Perhaps it is reiteration of what I have already said to the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to admonish the Senator from Mississippi that he is yielding for questions. Senators who are interrupting him are making statements rather than asking questions.

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question only, and I ask the Chair to protect me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is anxious to do so, but the Senator must always remember that a question is a question and a statement is a statement.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I may say that I have been keeping up with the line of thought of the Senator from Massachusetts, and I think his questions are very pertinent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would ask the Senator—and my question, as I said, is perhaps reiteration—if what he has just said is true, does he not realize that it is very difficult for me to get away from the feeling that what the Senate did in 1917, when it amended the rule, was to try to accomplish just what the pending resolution is trying to accomplish? I think it is very difficult for the Senator to answer that question satisfactorily. Does he himself not think so?

Mr. STENNIS. I went over that a while ago. We can only judge men by what they say and what they do, and by the record they make. The Senate for more than 100 years had turned down all proposals to amend the rules of the Senate on that point.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator again yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question; yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Keeping the debate on the high plane on which the Senator from Mississippi has kept it, is not that the point which the Senator's side of the question must answer satisfactorily?

Mr. STENNIS. I think it is a point which is certainly involved. I have answered the question to my own satisfaction, and I hope my answer is based on logic and reason. I believe there is some logic in the Senator's position, as it is viewed at first blush, before we examine the record, and look into the picture as it existed before the present rule was adopted, when it was adopted, and subsequent to its adoption. Until all those things are considered I will say there is

some logic in the Senator's position. But, in my humble judgment, the contrary is overwhelmingly proved by other facts.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to ask the Senator if he will ask unanimous consent for me to ask a question of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Arkansas may be permitted to ask the Senator from Massachusetts a question, provided I do not lose my place on the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The rule provides that the Senator can yield only for a question, but the Chair supposes that by unanimous consent the Senator can yield to a Senator to ask another Senator a question, although that is not the practice.

Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts if it is not the implication of his statement that in some way he feels that the legislative process of our Government has been a failure? I have heard several of the Senator's questions. I go back to the one asked a moment ago with regard to the proposed amendment to the rule. It seemed to be the thought that the legislative process of our Government has in some way fallen down and is inoperative, and that therefore there is pressure for and reason for the amendment. Does the Senator really feel that the Senate has not discharged its duty properly in the last 160 years of the history of the country?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair interprets the unanimous consent to include the right of the Senator from Massachusetts to answer the question within reasonable limits.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I shall try to answer the question of the Senator from Arkansas in this way. I believe that the Senate was constituted as one of the legislative bodies of the Government. I believe that the problems of the Federal Government have enormously increased. I believe that the duties placed upon Members of the Senate, as the Senator from Arkansas well knows, are very much greater in scope than they were in days gone by. I believe that the legislative process implies action, and without going into the question of any of the bills which may be involved, and which are constantly being referred to in the debate, I believe that the Senate should have the ability to act. I have publicly stated on the floor today that I do not believe that we should change the two-thirds-vote provision. I believe there should be a plugging up, if you will, of the holes by which legislative action can be pushed aside and delayed. That is my feeling on the whole subject. I believe the weakness of the point made by the Senator from Mississippi lies in the fact that we are not trying to do any more now than Senators tried to do or thought they were doing in 1917. That is the point I have tried to make in my very small way in the questions I have asked.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator's answer then is, yes, that the Senate has failed, and is failing in its duty now.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not think the Senate is failing in its duty, but I believe that the business of the Senate has so enormously increased that the Senate must work faster than it did when the rules were originally put into effect. I believe the business of the Senate has increased, just as the business of the State Department has increased.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does not the Senator admit that a considerable part of the increase in Senators' duties comes about by reason of personal errands constituents require them to run, and the personal contacts they are required to make for their constituents, rather than increase of the work on the floor? There is plenty of time for Senators to work on the floor provided they are present and stay here and discharge the business of the Senate. One reason for delay in action is because Senators do not remain on the floor at times, just as there are not now many Senators on the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should not want the Senator from Arkansas to believe for 1 minute that I admit that our legislative process has failed. That is not the reason for the demand for a change in the rule. I would rather put it on the ground that we are trying to improve the present rule. We are constantly seeking improvement. That is what accentuates my feeling on the whole subject.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I know the Senator is very conscientious about the matter. That is why I wanted his view particularly. I am not able to see, and I do not think the Senator has given an example of or presented an illustration of how we have failed. We have failed to pass early certain bills, but I do not think a clear majority wanted such action.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the opinion of the Chair the object of the unanimous consent has been fulfilled. The Senator from Arkansas has asked the question, and the Senator from Massachusetts has answered it.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, resuming on the question of partisanship and the party in the majority taking over matters under a majority cloture rule, I simply wish to add that it is a well-known fact that many matters come up which all the members of a party do not particularly favor; they are not sold, so to speak, on the soundness of the idea, or the wisdom of the measure, or the step, whatever it may be, but still they go along with it as a party matter. I think that is another serious hazard we would encounter were we to liberalize in any way the rules which have served the Senate so well and so long and so profitably.

PARTISANSHIP

I ask the question in all seriousness. Can any opposition party survive if both Houses of Congress have a majority-cloture rule? That system has never been tried. Particularly in this day of organized, well-financed, and intelligently led pressure groups, be they farmers, organized labor, school teachers, small business, big business, Government employees, or whoever they may be, and with a growing trend in the direction of such movements, I ask the question again, Can parties continue to live if the opposition has majority cloture in both Houses of Congress? That question cannot be answered "Yes" or "No." Such a situation has never existed in American history. However, to the impartial mind it is a very serious question, which we should most carefully weigh before we take what might be a fatal step. Personally I do not believe that any opposition party can or will live long in the United States if both Houses of Congress operate under majority cloture or gag rule.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am trying to keep the debate and my questions on the same high plane on which the Senator is arguing. Is he not taking a very pessimistic view of the future? Must we not take an optimistic view of the future if our country is to progress as it has progressed in the past? Daniel Webster and all the other great leaders who have been mentioned always took an optimistic view of the future in considering the possibility of abuse of power by those who might come here to succeed them. It seems to me that we must take an optimistic view or we can never get ahead.

Mr. STENNIS. Such optimism never caused the Senate to change the rule about which we are now talking. Caution and wisdom always came to the forefront, rather than mere optimism, and caused our predecessors to desist from any such attempt. That is particularly true in the case of many men who came to this body favoring majority cloture, and who finally changed their minds and were against all cloture. If I may make the suggestion, it may be that the very able senior Senator from Massachusetts is changing his mind, in part, about the majority-cloture rule.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi if it is not true that in the wreckage of other democratic governments which we see about the world today we have reflected unmistakable evidence that the unrestrained power of the majority leads to despotism and totalitarianism.

Mr. STENNIS. That is unmistakably the trend of the times, Mr. President. I appreciate the very timely and wholesome suggestion.

JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LUCAS. Can the Senator tell me why it was that two great Senators from

his own State, namely, John Sharp Williams, one of the greatest men who ever served in this body, and Senator Vardaman, another Senator from Mississippi, advocated majority cloture instead of what the Senator is now advocating? I was a little surprised to hear that those Senators, coming from Mississippi, had adopted such a view, but that is the record.

Mr. STENNIS. I respect their record, whatever it may be. It illustrates that a man never knows what the position of his successor may be. I have no special knowledge about those two distinguished men that I could give the Senator. However, I believe that Senator Williams was acting under the emergency of war. The record shows that Senator Vardaman had previously favored cloture, but I cannot throw any special light on the subject.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. EASTLAND. Was not Senator Williams' position based upon the contention that the rule should apply only in times of grave national emergency, and not in normal times? At that time we were about to enter war against Germany.

Mr. STENNIS. As I understand, it was based upon the emergency situation. As I have understood his thinking, he was opposed to cloture.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In view of the earlier discussion relative to the Constitution, does not the Senator from Mississippi believe that it is rather strange that from 1787, when the Constitution was adopted, until 1805, when the present rules were adopted, those who were closer to the period when the Constitution came into effect than were their successors had actually adopted, in the rules of the Senate, the previous-question rule? In the early days of the Republic the previous-question rule, which was a much more rigid rule than the rule under which we now operate, was a part of the rules of the Senate. The Senator recognizes that fact, does he not?

THE EARLY CONGRESS

Mr. STENNIS. Originally the previous-question rule was a part of the rules of the Senate.

The other day I was reading about the First Congress. When the day came to count the votes for President of the United States under the Constitution, only 12 or 14 Members were present in New York. They waited. Day followed day and week followed week. George Washington was either there or waiting to be notified that he had been elected. Everyone anticipated his election. Finally, by a special effort, they were able to get a quorum. The Members came straggling in. I believe they got a quorum about the 25th of April, and they counted the votes and declared George Washington elected. He was

notified, and was sworn in on the 30th of April, as I recall.

Hardly anyone could be persuaded to run for Congress. After some of the men were elected they resigned to take more honored positions on their State courts or in other branches of State governments. As I say, with great difficulty a quorum was finally mustered. The President was sworn in about 4 weeks late.

I go into detail to show what an infant, struggling organization the Government was in its very early days. I do not think it is imagination to say that the Government struggled along in that fashion for several years. Senators will recall the history of the growth of the Supreme Court. Finally a man named John Marshall came along. He wanted to give power and impetus to the Court in interpreting the Constitution. Things became more interesting. Members of the Senate began to learn things by experience, just as so many of their successors have done. They decided that, the United States Senate being the agency of government that it was, there was no place for limitation on debate, and therefore they dropped the previous-question rule. My statements are accurate as to the first year or two, and I use my imagination to supply the others. I think it is reasonable to say that when this body took on serious importance, when it was passing on foreign treaties, after it had gone through a war, and was becoming a real power, the rule was dropped.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does not the Senator believe that the power which this rule gives to minorities, as the rule is now constituted and as it has operated, serves as a deterrent to the executive branch of the Government and the Chief Executive of the Nation, in that he is thus more restrained in his efforts to dominate the legislative branch of the Government, since he knows that this power reposes in the minority of the Senate, and therefore he is more restrained in the requests he may make of the Congress, whenever he wishes to have some measure passed by it?

Mr. STENNIS. I think that would be the operation of the rule, unmistakably. It is not so much that the power is used, as the fact that the power is here and must be dealt with and taken into consideration in connection with plans and calculations. It is a most powerful factor in the minds of those who would seek to have bills passed by the Congress of the United States. I feel that if we change the rules of debate in this connection, in practical effect we shall take away more power from the people, and shall make it more likely that in many instances there will be a further usurpation of power.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I ask the Senator whether the present request of the administration to have this rule changed is for the very purpose of trying to get a part of the President's legislative program enacted?

Mr. STENNIS. I think that is the announced purpose, or one of the purposes, as I understand the announcement.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If we grant this power or, rather, if we surrender this right of the minority, as a result of this so-called modest modification of the existing rule, will not such action prompt a further request, whenever the occasion arises that it may be needed in order to carry out a program, to further modify the rule and to reduce it to a simple majority, instead of the two-thirds as now required?

OTHER VIEWS

Mr. STENNIS. I think that is entirely correct.

Mr. President, particularly for the benefit of the new Members of the Senate, I wish to refer briefly to a few of the former distinguished Members of this body who in the light of experience have changed their minds about this important subject. The first I shall mention is one whom I quoted near the beginning of my remarks, the late Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Sr., of Massachusetts. I shall read a part of his statement, as appearing now at pages 215 and 216 of the hearings before the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Eighty-first Congress, on Senate Resolutions 11, 12, 13, 15, and 19. The hearings were held from January 24 through February 1, 1949; and they include extracts from a speech made by the distinguished Senator Lodge, Sr., on February 15, 1915, on the floor of the Senate. In his speech in 1915 he referred to previous statements he had made on this subject; and then he said:

> Mr. President, I have been here since then for 10 years. In a very short time after my coming into this body, within a year or two, in fact, I came to the conclusion that the practice of the Senate was on the whole a wise one—

He was talking about the practice of the Senate when it had no rule whatsoever on cloture; and he said:

> In a very short time after my coming into this body, within a year or two, in fact, I came to the conclusion that the practice of the Senate on the whole was a wise one—

Mr. President, he came to the Senate with the announced intention and purpose of getting the rule changed, after he had served several years in the House of Representatives, as Senators will recall.

I quote further:

> and though hard at times to bear when we are interested in passing a bill and grow naturally impatient, that it was the safest system for the country and for the general interest of government.

In 1917, just 2 years later, he voted for the amendment to rule XXII—which further proves, I respectfully submit, that the amendment to rule XXII was nothing in the world but the response of those men to an overwhelming

emergency with which they found themselves confronted.

I quote further:

Mr. President, I have seen in that short time both parties in control of the Senate, and I do not remember that any measure desired by an actual and true majority of the Senate has ever failed of a vote.

Mr. President, I hope I do not violate the rule if I repeat that statement, quoting again:

Mr. President, I have seen in that short time both parties in control of the Senate, and I do not remember that any measure desired by an actual and true majority of the Senate has ever failed of a vote.

At the Rules Committee hearing we had testimony along the same line from men who have served for many years with distinction and honor on this very floor.

I do not wish to take up too much time on this point, but I shall read a little further from the remarks of the late Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Sr., who had this to say about one of the bills which was killed by a so-called filibuster; it is one of the few that was prevented from coming to a vote, and never did reach a vote, and never did become the law. It is the so-called force bill, to which I shall refer somewhat later. But here is what the late Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Sr., said about it:

I was deeply and profoundly interested in the force bill, as it was called, which has been alluded to here. I had it in charge in the House of Representatives—

Think of that, Mr. President; he was the leader on the floor of the House of Representatives in charge of the force bill.

I quote further:

and I saw it defeated on this floor by methods of obstruction, which resulted finally in the change of votes which has been here alluded to. But, Mr. President, I had much rather take the chances of occasional obstruction than to put the Senate in the position where bills could be driven through under rules which may be absolutely necessary in a large body like the House of Representatives or the House of Commons in England, but which are not necessary here.

Mr. President, let us remember that those words were spoken when there was no cloture rule in the Senate of the United States. They were spoken by a gentleman who had led the fight in the House of Representatives in favor of a bill which later was defeated on the floor of the Senate by a so-called filibuster. He was originally strong in his belief in a movement to get the rules of the Senate changed. Remember there was absolutely no cloture rule. He had served and matured in the Senate, and his conclusion was that whatever harm, inconvenience, or disappointment he may have suffered, it was far better to suffer those inconveniences and harms, however great, than to change the rules of the Senate. Said he:

I had much rather take the chances of occasional obstruction than to put the Senate in the position where bills could be driven through—

The Senator from Georgia yesterday was quoted as calling this a gag-rule proposition. Former Senator Lodge said we should beware of being put into a position where bills could be driven through this body, as they can be in the House of Representatives and in the House of Commons in England. The House of Commons then represented perhaps the most conservative large nation on the face of the globe. These words of former Senator Lodge were spoken in 1915 and they are being repeated here this afternoon, 34 short years later; and what does the House of Commons now represent? It represents a nation that has gone socialistic. What kind of rules did they operate under? The kind of rules under which the late Senator Lodge said it is dangerous to operate. If we relax the rules of the Senate I believe we shall follow the same path, at least it will be a step in the direction of following the same path. When by implication we destroy certain guideposts and certain guards and certain protections of the Constitution, I believe we are on the same course.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator recall that in the committee hearings, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] stated in a speech that even though we destroyed the rule, conditions are such that the great United States Constitution will protect us from any steamroller action in the Senate? Does the Senator recall that statement being made in the committee hearings?

Mr. STENNIS. I recall it.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. LONG. I ask the Senator if what has been proposed by many people is done, namely, if we change our rule so that a simple majority or a two-thirds majority could place cloture into effect any time they saw fit, and we should then proceed to let the majority use the new rule by invoking cloture, first, to pass an antilynching law; second, to pass an anti-poll-tax law; and, third, to pass an FEPC law, does the Senator think that under that condition the Constitution would afford the protection referred to by the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. STENNIS. No; I do not.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for his observation.

Reading further from this same distinguished author, the late Senator Lodge, from Massachusetts, from the same book cited a while ago, and from the same statement made on the floor of the Senate:

Mr. President, that is all I desire to say today. To me this matter of a change of the rules of the Senate which have been in force in this respect for 109 years is a matter of very grave moment indeed. I think if a change from our preeent system to the previous question, like that of the House, is put in operation, it is going to alter completely the character of the Senate.

Let me repeat that: "It is going to alter completely the character of the Senate."

I read further:

Now, without arguing the merits of the question at this moment, this is a change so serious that it ought to have the most thorough and the fullest consideration of every Senator on the floor. Every Senator ought to think well before he makes a change of this sort in the very constitution of the Senate for the sake of passing, in a moment of heat and passion over a single bill, a measure which strikes at that quality which has been more distinctive of the Senate than any other body in parliamentary history and which today is the only refuge the people of this country have who desire to know something about the measures before their representatives. The people of this country have the right to know the reasons for and against every important measure, for in no other way can they rightly judge.

Mr. President, I apologize for the repetition involved in reading that again, but it was necessary to cite again from the late Senator Lodge that paragraph as an illustration of those who have changed their minds.

Reading from page 227 of the same report, an argument that was made by Warren Harding, then Senator from Ohio and later as we all know President of the United States, when the same question of cloture was before the Senate, he had these words to say:

I have been hearing about the reformation of the Senate since I first entered politics; and it was rather an ironical thing the other day that one of the most emphatic speeches made in favor of the adoption of this rule was uttered by the very latest arrival in this body.

I have been observing the Senate at close range now for 3 years. I came with the notion that the Senate fiddled away a great deal of valuable time in debate, and I am still of that opinion; but the debate that needlessly consumes the time of the Senate is not reached by the proposed rule.

I want to feel that the Senate still controls its own destinies. Moreover, the new cloture rule is ample.

The remarks were made in 1918. When he said "the present cloture rule," he meant the one that had been adopted of course in 1917.

Moreover, the new cloture rule is ample. I am opposed to the so-called reformation of the Senate in the name of a war measure.

At that time it was proposed to have a special cloture rule during the war.

But the reformation of the Senate has long been a fad. I came here myself under the impression that there ought to be cloture and limitations on debate; and the longer I sit in this body the more convinced do I become that the freedom of debate in the United States Senate is one of the highest guaranties we have of our American institutions.

Mr. President, before I take my seat I wish to say that the length of a speech is not the measure of its merit.

While the Senate may not listen, because the Senate does not listen very attentively to anybody, I discover, though Congress may not be apparently concerned and though the galleries of this body may not be filled to add their inspiring attention, I charge you now, Mr. President, that the people of the United States of America will be listening. This is the one central point, the one open forum, the one place in America where there is freedom of debate, which is essential to an enlightened and dependable public sentiment, the guide of the American Republic.

Proceeding further, I wish to quote from the late George F. Hoar, at one time a Senator from the State of Massachusetts. I read from page 133 of the hearings before the Committee on Rules and Administration which were held in January and February 1949:

There was a time in my legislative career when I believed that the absence of a cloture rule in the Senate was criminal neglect and that we should adopt a system of rules by which business could be conducted.

But the logic of my long service and observation has now convinced me—

Mr. President, those are strong words, uttered by a man who said he once thought that the absence of a cloture rule in the United States Senate was what? Did he say "neglect"? No; that is not what he said. He said he at one time thought the absence of such a rule was "criminal neglect." That is something for which a man can be put into the penitentiary—criminal neglect of an official duty. That is the way he termed it. He thought it was criminal neglect. What did he say further? I wish there were more Senators present—not to hear me, but I wish there were more, honestly, sincerely, and studiously to consider this subject. I note that the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] has not gone. He is very thorough in his application.

SENATOR HOAR

The late Senator Hoar said:

But the logic of my long service and observation has now convinced me that I am wrong in that contention. There is a virtue in unlimited debate, the philosophy of which cannot be detected upon surface considerations.

Let me read that again to the American people. It is something which I do not believe they understand. I believe if we could take any hundred of them who are fairly intelligent and impartial, anywhere in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Kansas, Massachusetts, Connecticut, California, or any other State, the breadwinner, the butcher, the baker, the candlestick maker, the farmer, and explain this matter to them, what it means and what the implications of the rule are, and explain both sides of the subject, they would see the logic of it.

There is a virtue in unlimited debate, the philosophy of which cannot be detected upon surface considerations.

People who cry for a change in the Senate rules have never been in the Senate or have served only a short time.

Mr. President, I think there is present a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration. I shall not try to speak for him, but there is present one of the newcomers to this body who, on mature consideration of the subject, after hearing the presentation by both sides, searched his soul, his conscience, and his intellect, and saw the matter in an altogether different light. I shall not try to speak for him; he can speak for himself. If he does, he will follow through the point that this is a subject upon which there are things not to be seen on the surface; that after a man understands the underlying factors and principles, the underlying sentiments, the underlying plans, purposes, and problems of party politics, the threat to free government which arises from various sources, the difficulty in keeping open the channels of information, the extreme difficulty, at times of exposing the fallacy of a plausible-sounding argument, and exposing the fallacy of things which seem to be almost necessary for the welfare of the people—once he has searched into those problems and becomes more mature on the subject, more experienced, and understands the overwhelming logic and demands of the situation, then, not every time, but many times, he changes his mind.

I commend these sentiments especially to the newer Members of this great body so that they will be fully informed thereon when they take a final position on the matter.

FILIBUSTERS

Mr. President, if I may, I desire to discuss briefly some of the bills which are said to have been defeated by so-called filibusters. This list was quite helpful to me, and quite surprising. Let us consider the fate of only a few of the bills which are said to have been defeated by filibusters. Incidentally, Mr. President, in reading these records one has to be careful or he can be very easily misled. I do not charge that it is intentionally so. But some reports have been circulated among the Members of the Senate listing a group of bills which have been defeated by filibusters. Two of those bills are on the list through error. I know it was an honest mistake. I refer to the Glass banking bill and another bill. But it is far from the whole picture to say those bills were defeated by filibuster, because, on examination, it will be found that all except four or five, which I shall mention in a few minutes, finally became law. They were passed within a short time, most of them within a few years, after the so-called defeat.

There are to be found in the record many statements of Members of this body to the effect that they have never known a worthy bill, for the welfare of the people, to be finally killed by debate, and that if it had any merit in it, it always had the capacity to return.

I shall read briefly from page 42 of the hearings before the Committee on Rules and Administration, held in January and February of last year. Page 42 lists 35 bills which are said to have been filibustered. The orginal list did not show in the second column, as page 42 shows, just when those bills finally became law. The first one listed is the bill for the reconstruction of Louisiana, filibustered in 1865, and passed in 1868. I know nothing about that law.

Next on the list here are the election laws proposed and filibustered in 1879. Of course, as Senators know, that was immediately following, as I said awhile ago, the most unfortunate war, in my opinion that has ever been fought. Those bills were defeated, and finally passed 30 years later, in 1909, but they have all been repealed. I could not be certain as to just when they did pass, but the point is that they have been repealed. They have been found to be in error. They have been stricken off the books. They were not the right kind of legislation.

The third item is the force bill, before the Congress of the United States in 1891. I shall not go back into that at all, except to state, for the benefit of those who might not understand the term, that the force bill was a bill to control elections with armed soldiers. That was a bill of which the late Senator Lodge was in charge on the floor of the House of Representatives. He said in a statement I read a while ago that he later lost that bill on the floor of the Senate, but he had come around to the conclusion that whatever loss there was in the defeat of that or any other measure was far outweighed by the benefit of the rule of the United States Senate. That bill never did become a law, and, incidentally, Mr. President, I do not believe that bill could get a corporal's guard on the floor of either House of the Congress now.

I shall not go into all these items. I shall merely refer to some of them.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Is it not a fact that a year or two after the force bill was brought up an attempt was made to change the rules of the Senate in order to push the force bill through, just as an attempt is now being made to force legislation through the Senate?

Mr. STENNIS. That is very true, and I am glad the Senator brought out that point.

Mr. LONG. Was it not true that probably largely because that effort was backed by political considerations, in undertaking to pass a particular bill, the attempt to change the rule at that time failed?

Mr. STENNIS. I think that is correct. Summing up, Mr. President, there was a ship-subsidy bill that was fought on the floor of the Senate and a so-called filibuster was applied to it. It finally became a law, but after the lapse of 13 years.

There is another bill listed as the tri-State bill, which pertained to the admission of Arizona, New Mexico, and Oklahoma as States of the Union. Of course, those States later became members of the Union, and, as I understand, with better constitutions, when they were admitted, and to the satisfaction of all parties.

There is listed a migratory bird bill, which was off and on the calendar, and finally became a law in 3 years' time.

There was the ship-arming bill of 1917, which never did become a law, but the President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson, armed the ships under another law. There was a long debate which did lead to the adoption of rule XXII, the present so-called cloture rule.

This leaves a few other bills, all of which have become law, either the same year of the filibuster or the year following, except the following bills which have not become law, namely, the so-called civil-rights bills, the anti-poll-tax bill, the anti-lynch bill, and the FEPC bill.

I shall not go into those to discuss them on their merits, except to say they are certainly bills as to the constitutionality of which many of the most eminent legal authorities and professional men of the Nation have most serious doubt. They are bills which I think a great majority of our legal thinkers believe to be absolutely beyond the Constitution. They are bills which a great number of the Members of this body do not think they have the authority to pass. That is the greatest impediment those bills can possibly have, and changing the rules of the Senate will not change their situation one iota. I believe that when it comes right down to the merits of voting on those measures, the great number of the membership of this body will be compelled to back off. At least they are bills as to the validity of which there is serious question, and they are bills to which great segments of our country are opposed, and not confined to one area, either, because we all know that wherever, as I understand, the FEPC bill has been submitted to the people, they have voted in unmistakable terms an emphatic "No."

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. For a question only.

Mr. LONG. It has been suggested that some Members of Congress have possibly voted for unconstitutional laws, leaving up to the Supreme Court of the United States the responsibility of declaring such laws unconstitutional. What would the Senator's attitude be in regard to that type of suggestion?

DANGEROUS TREND

Mr. STENNIS. I think it is one of the most dangerous trends of thought there is in the Congress today. I think it is very definitely a trend, and I think it is one of the major reasons why the present rule should not be altered or tampered with. Such action would take another prop out from under the Constitution; it would give another chance to whittle it away bit by bit, indirectly, which is something the great majority of the people of the United States do not want done, but which a great number of organized pressure groups do want done, because that is the only way by which they can reach their objectives. They cannot attain them before the forum of the people of the United States, and they seek to attain them by indirect methods, not on logic or plausibility, but by sheer political strategy and intimidation.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator feel that it is just as much a duty of the United States Senate to interpret and uphold the Constitution as it is a duty of the United States Supreme Court?

Mr. STENNIS. Just as much. We are under the same oath as that taken by the Justices. They are charged with greater knowledge with reference to law than we, but the integrity, the character, the principle, is all the same, and if we consciously fail to follow the Constitution, then we are just as guilty as they are if they fail to follow it.

Now, Mr. President, coming back to the circumstances under which the present cloture rule was adopted, in 1917, I wish to emphasize that a study of the conditions of that time demonstrates overwhelmingly the unmistakable existence of an emergency. It had never been possible to get the Senate of the United States to alter the rule, but in view of the facts with which the administration was faced then, the Senate agreed to rule XXII, not after debate, not after thrashing out the arguments on the floor, but each party met in caucus, and the majority party, under the majority leader, Senator Martin, of Virginia, proposed that they appoint five from their group, that the Republicans appoint five from their group, and that they work out a rule. Those 10 men met in a strictly nonpartisan approach and worked out the rule and brought it to the floor of the Senate. Some Senator offered an amendment, and he was immediately challenged by the majority leader and by Members of both sides who contended that the amendment was contrary to the gentlemen's agreement respecting the working out of the rule. The proposal dealt absolutely with an emergency matter. It was designed to meet the emergency. It did meet the emergency.

AMENDMENTS REJECTED

Later, floor leaders brought in an amendment during the war, and asked that the provision be extended for the duration of the war—I am speaking of World War I—and the Senate turned them down cold.

I have already read quotations from the arguments made against the proposal by some Senators who had been parties to formulating the rule.

Then in 1919, when the first interpretation of the rule was made, the very men who helped write it maintained that it did not apply in the particular instance at hand. There was some agitation, there was some comment, respecting amending the rule after that ruling or interpretation, but there was nothing done because there was not much sentiment for it. Every time such a proposal was made it was opposed vigorously and was defeated, and such proposals have been defeated from that time until now.

So I emphasize, Mr. President, as the evidence shows, the rule was adopted in an emergency. It was voted for by men who were opposed to it. Even the then President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson, who recommended its adoption in such urgent terms, can be quoted to show the truth of what I say. I shall not take the time to quote the President now. His statement is to be found in the RECORD. The President said that the "informing function of the United States Senate should be preferred even to its legislative function," and he was opposed to cutting off debate. The President in 1917 recommended the action which was then taken in an extremity, purely as an emergency matter.

NATIONAL EMERGENCY

Something has been said on the floor of the Senate, Mr. President, about two or three or four or five or six Senators being able to hold up important measures during an emergency, when the Nation was in peril, in physical danger. There is no proof that we have ever suffered because of such a condition, but it is possible it could happen. In order to cover that situation an amendment was prepared and presented to the Committee on Rules. It received four votes in the committee. That amendment provided that when 86 of the membership of the Senate should sign a petition to cut off debate, debate could be cut off in 2 hours. It did not provide for the delay of a day, but a delay of only 2 hours.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. Was there any testimony in the hearings or any proof at all that this rule had interfered with the public defense of the United States?

Mr. STENNIS. That is a very timely question. That question was gone into. The question was asked of some who appeared before the committee on both sides. No one offered any evidence at all that the war effort, war plans, or the conduct of the war were delayed for one moment because of the rules of the Senate or because of debate in the Senate.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for another question.

Mr. EASTLAND. Was there any proof or any testimony at all that the rule had prevented the passage of legislation necessary for the national welfare of the United States?

Mr. STENNIS. That question was asked, and no one could point out anything tending to show any injury whatsoever or any delay from which injury could have flowed.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for another question.

Mr. EASTLAND. Did the proponents of the resolution cite one instance where legislation beneficial to the people of the country has been defeated by reason of the rule?

Mr. STENNIS. They were called upon to make such a showing, but could not produce any proof, and did not even contend that there had been any injurious delay.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for another question.

Mr. EASTLAND. If what the Senator says is true, what reasons were given for the adoption of the resolution? Was any necessity shown?

Mr. STENNIS. Does the Senator mean Senate Resolution 15?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes. Was any necessity shown for its adoption?

Mr. STENNIS. The main contention, as I understood, was that provision should be made so the Senate could function.

Mr. EASTLAND. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for another question.

Mr. EASTLAND. Had there been any testimony that the rule prevented the functioning of the United States Senate?

Mr. STENNIS. There was no testimony at all along that line, but there was a general contention that the Senate could not function, could not dispose of its business.

Mr. EASTLAND. But no reasons were given?

Mr. STENNIS. No reasons were given.

On that point I might bring out that it was said by someone in the hearings that under the present rules of the Senate one afternoon during the war the Senate appropriated $59,000,000,000 inside of 2 hours' time without having a roll call. I am sure the action was justified. But that is transacting business at a rapid rate.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for another question.

Mr. EASTLAND. Do I understand, then, from my colleague that there was no proof by the proponents of the resolution for the necessity for its adoption?

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct. That is the way I interpret the evidence. It was contended that there was great need for its adoption, and that the Senate could not function without this amendment to the rule.

Mr. EASTLAND. But no facts were shown?

PROPOSED AMENDMENT

Mr. STENNIS. No facts were shown.

Mr. President, further in connection with the proposal respecting a motion to be signed by 86 Senators, I ask unanimous consent that the proposed amendment, which was offered as a substitute in the committee, and voted down by a vote of four in favor and nine against, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That the following paragraph, to be known as paragraph 3, shall be added to rule XXII of the standing rules of the Senate:

"If at any time a motion, signed by 86 Senators, is presented to bring to a close the debate upon any measure on the Senate Calendar (and a Senator having the floor may be interrupted for this purpose), the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and declare the measure the unfinished business of the Senate. Two hours after the motion has been stated (unless the motion itself as filed shall specify a longer time for debate, which specification, if any, shall control), the Senate shall proceed to vote on the passage of the measure by a yea-and-nay vote. At least one-half of the full time allowed for debate shall be allotted to Members who do not sign the motion. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the motion has been filed. No dilatory motion shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have made several references to what has been said on this momentous subject by the late Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Sr., of Massachusetts. It is easy to make the accusation that one is trying to mislead the Senate by quoting from him on some of these measures without calling attention to other statements he has made. I shall not argue the matter further, but I wish to place in the RECORD references to his record on this subject, so that anyone who wants to trace the matter down will have the benefit of what I have found. On page 42 of the hearings, as conducted by the Committee on Rules and Administration in 1949, will be found statements by the late Senator Lodge. On page 214 of the same record will be found his statement of January 15, 1915.

In 1917 he voted for the present cloture rule, as found in rule XXII of the present rules of the Senate.

In 1918 he voted against the proposal to limit debate to 1 hour during World War I.

I cite these references merely for the benefit of anyone who may be interested, and to avoid the seeming idea of having quoted him in part and misleading the Senate as to what he might have said with reference to the same subject on other occasions.

Mr. President, I now wish to discuss very briefly a few of the practical aspects involved in the adoption of this resolution. I shall not go into detail. I shall not try to discuss the resolution on its merits.

FIRST VICTIM

If this resolution is adopted, who will be the first on the list to feel its wrath? Who will be the first victim of the change in the rule? It will be the South. We know what the newspapers have been saying. They have been saying that the civil-rights bills will be the first measures to be pushed if the rule is changed. They have been saying that southern Senators are opposing this change merely because of the civil-rights bills. That is what we read in the magazines and newspapers, and what we hear in the cloakrooms and corridors of the Capitol. That is what we hear from the party councils on each side of the aisle. Taking that statement as being correct—and I think it is correct so far as the civil-rights bills being the first to be urged under the new rule is concerned—who is going to be next on the roll call?

It is said that we are defending our position from a sectional standpoint. Some of the newspapers say it. Some arguments are made here to that effect. But who is to be next on the roll call after the rule is changed, if it is, and after the civil-rights bills are passed, if they are to be passed? Who is to be the next victim? Let us think that over.

Is it to be the small-business man? Is it to be the large corporations? There will be others on the list. Are we going to crush the small-business man? It will be much easier to do it under the new rule. Are we going to permit monopoly to crush him? It will be much easier under the new rule. Is he going to be next? I raise the question, and I want Senators to weigh it.

Is big business next on the list? There is such a thing as legitimate big business. When it is right, I certainly favor it. Its bigness has done a great deal of good. If big business is properly controlled, as every citizen ought to be controlled, it can do a great deal of good. Is it to be next on the list? Who is to be second on the roll call?

WHO IS NEXT?

Is it to be organized labor? There has been a great deal of sentiment against organized labor. Is it to be next on the roll call? Where does it come in? There is an element of thought in this Nation which would wipe organized labor off the map. Is it to be number 2? We have agreed as to who is going to be number 1, but who wants to be number 2? I call for volunteers. Who wants to be second on the list? The South is going to be first. An attempt will be made to destroy its social order. It will be very difficult to destroy that social order, but the South is first on the roll call following the change in the rule.

Who will be second? What about organized labor? Does organized labor wish to take a chance? It has had a long, hard fight. It has never won anything without a battle. It has brought about a great deal of improvement in this country. It ought to be regulated and restrained, just as every citizen is regulated. There are some regulations and restraints on it today, as there are upon doctors, dentists, lawyers, farmers, and every other class. But what about taking away some of the rights which organized labor has already won? Is it ready to take its place on the list? Does it want to be number 2? Those who oppose it will be in a much better position to gag it than they now are. Those who want to take away its rights will be much more effective in their efforts than they are now if this rule can be changed. The Senate will not be able to protect organized labor to the same extent it now can. Does it want to be second?

What about some of the great areas in the West? I wish I were more familiar with them. I have listened to discussions about irrigation and water rights in the great West. In Mississippi we try to get rid of water. In the West they pray for it. There have been great battles over water rights in the Western rivers. Does the West want to be second on the list? Does the West want to have a reconsideration of the question of water rights in Arizona and other States? How would the West fare under a majority-cloture rule?

What about the great mining areas in the West? I do not know enough about that question to discuss it on its merits, but I understand that there have been great battles over mining rights. Do those interested in mining want to come back to bat? Do they want to take their place in the number two spot? Are there any volunteers?

What about the great religious thought of this Nation—the Protestants, the Catholics, the Christian Scientists, the Presbyterians, the Methodists, and the Baptists? Do any of them want to be second? Their great place of refuge now is the floor of the United States Senate.

What makes the Senate great is not the men who sit here. We are no better than other men. What makes it great is the fact that it is the greatest forum of free debate in the world. It is not ethics that makes the Senate great. It is not the generosity of one Member toward another. It is the rules, the power that is not given to the majority. That is what makes it great.

NO FEAR OF MINORITY

I am not afraid of any power that a minority has in this body. I am not afraid of any law that a minority will pass. That is not going to hurt me or my people. I am afraid of a hasty majority. They are the ones who can pass laws. They are the ones whom the founders of this great Nation, the framers of the Constitution, feared.

These limitations were imposed by majorities themselves, to protect the people from majorities. They are the ones who wrote in the two-thirds provision. I am not afraid of any power that is vested in a minority in this body. I am afraid of the majority powers. Who wants to be second on the list?

GRAVE ISSUE

Mr. President, I come back to my original statement, that this is the gravest and most far-reaching question that we shall consider during this session. These are the most serious and far-reaching votes that we shall take at any time during the entire session. It is not the civil rights measures alone; it is not just religious freedom or freedom of the press; it is not just big business; it is not just little business; it is not just the poor man or the rich man or the laboring man—not those things alone—that are at stake; but it is all of them wrapped in with the proposition. What are to be the nature and character of the United States Senate; what kind of a forum is it going to be? Mr. President, debate is the greatest governmental and political invention man has ever been able to make. A gag rule limitation and restriction is its natural enemy. The two cannot survive together.

On this question we vote upon the character of this body. Will it continue to be the greatest legislative body in the world, or will it be just another legislative body subject to the pressure, whims, caprice, emotionalism, or the demands of whoever happens to be in the majority for the time being?

God forbid that in a thoughtless moment we surrender one of the great fundamental structures of our great government of freedom, liberty and justice.

Mr. KEM rose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should like to say a few words in support of the amendment to the Senate rule proposed by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], which has the purpose of plugging the loophole in the existing rule.

From my point of view, Mr. President, this is not a question of States rights; it is not a question of whether the Senate will or will not, should or should not, pass certain proposed "civil-rights" laws. The only question here involved is orderly procedure in the Senate.

In my opinion, the right of so-called "unlimited debate" has been abused to the point where the Senate has upon occasion made itself ridiculous not only in the eyes of our own people, but in the eyes of the world.

It is common knowledge that when one of these so-called filibusters starts, the orderly course of discussion and action is disrupted for the duration of the filibuster, with the effect that consideration of important legislation can be, and has been, delayed. It is possible under the existing rule, Mr. President, to delay legislation involving even the very safety of our country itself.

The filibuster exists only because of a technical loophole which has been found in the sincere and conscientious attempt of the Senate in the year 1917 to invest itself with the power to place a curb on debate when in the opinion of two-thirds of its members it is desirable to do so.

I should like to emphasize that there is nothing in the proposed amendment that would prevent full and proper discussion of the merits of any measure, which might come before the Senate. Its only effect will be to enable the members of this body, after all the arguments for or against a measure have been exhausted, and only then by a two-thirds vote, to curb obstructive tactics, and proceed with its business in an orderly fashion. I shall not vote for any rule which undertakes to end the discussion by less than a two-thirds vote.

The Hayden amendment is designed to plug this loophole in the Senate rules, and I shall give it my wholehearted support.

COOPERATIVE HEALTH PLANS IN TAMPA—ARTICLE BY ANGUS LAIRD

Mr. LUCAS obtained the floor.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to make an insertion in the RECORD?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an estimate from the Government Printing Office in respect to an article on cooperative health plans in Tampa, which I previously submitted with a request that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

[The article appears in the Appendix.]

THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, evidence is accumulating that, contrary to the propaganda being spread by the American Medical Association in an effort to stop President Truman's health insurance legislation, the British medical program is a tremendous success.

The AMA has been trying to convince this country that the British program is a flop, and a forerunner of what would happen here if we adopt national health insurance. Now that the British program obviously is a success, and so much of one that even the doctors and the Conservative Party accept it, I wonder if the AMA will admit that it might be the forerunner of a similar success here if the President's program is adopted.

The latest evidence of the success of the British program came from the newspapers over the past week end. On Sunday the Washington Star printed a story by Margaret Stewart, correspondent of the London News Chronicle, asserting that "despite the difficulties" which Miss Stewart frankly acknowledged, "the national health service scheme has worked remarkably well in its initial stages."

In a parallel column, the Star ran a story on the British program by Dr. Reginald Hale-White, who presumably represents the viewpoint of the British doctors most hostile to the program. But even Dr. Hale-White did not condemn the program as a whole. He merely asked for some changes in the plan, and conceded the principle of "State medical services covering the entire population."

Even more convincing evidence of the success of the British plan is found in yesterday's Washington Post, which carried an AP dispatch from London saying the leaders of the Conservative Party are talking about ditching Winston Churchill as party policy maker, partly because of his recent attack on the medical program. In other words, the medical program is so popular in Britain, after 6 months' trial, that it is dangerous even for the great war leader Churchill to criticize it. The AP dispatch said:

> Churchill's threat to seek a vote of censure against the Labor government over soaring costs of the popular national health service was described by many as a preelection blunder that lost votes in Hammersmith (site of a recent byelection).

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD Margaret Stewart's story in the Washington Star of February 27, and the AP story from the Post of February 28.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star of February 27, 1949]

GREAT SOCIAL CHANGE HAS FEW TEETHING TROUBLES—BULK OF DOCTORS AND DENTISTS COOPERATE TO SERVE 95 PERCENT OF PEOPLE WITH FREE MEDICAL CARE

(By Margaret Stewart)

LONDON.—Nearly 40 years ago, in his preface to The Doctor's Dilemma, Bernard Shaw wrote: "Until the medical profession becomes a body of men trained and paid by the country to keep the country in health, it will remain what it is at present—a conspiracy to exploit popular credulity and human suffering."

This calculated exaggeration, of course, was all part of the Shavian campaign to shake the complacency of the Edwardian upper classes, and to rouse the national conscience to the evils of social inequality and ignorance.

It would be ludicrous to apply the same strictures to the medical profession today, or to belittle the important advances that have progressively raised the standard of public health in Britain.

But, by and large, the health measures taken between the two wars were little more than patchwork and plumbing. The inequalities persisted, and the more lucrative forms of private practice tended to attract the best brains and skills of the medical profession. There was a steady drift of Britain's best medical men into the fashionable square mile around Harley Street, in London, which Dr. A. J. Cronin in his famous book calls the citadel.

DOCTORS PAID BY STATE

The first attack on the citadel was made before World War I, when Lloyd George breached the ramparts with his famous Health Insurance Act.

It has been left to another Welshman, ex-Miner Aneurin Bevan, to invade the citadel itself, and to translate into reality the idea of a truly national health service, with doctors paid by the state to keep the country in health.

Aneurin Bevan, Britain's Minister of Health, was brought up in the poverty-scarred valleys of South Wales, and as a boy he watched his miner comrades coughing their lungs out for want of proper treatment. He resolved to sweep away the class distinctions in medicine, with its separate standards for those who could pay and those who could not.

July 5, 1948, the day on which his National Health Service Act came into force, marked the start of a social revolution in Britain, not a mere paper or propaganda revolution, but a real transformation in the lives of millions of citizens.

It was another Welshman, Jim Griffiths, Minister of National Insurance—like Bevan, a miners' Member of Parliament—who introduced the National Insurance Act, which provides an umbrella of social security for every man, woman, and child in Britain from the cradle to the crematorium. This act also came into force on that memorable July 5, 1948.

These two acts are the twin pillars of Britain's postwar social legislation.

ALL-EMBRACING SERVICE

Under the National Health Service Act, everybody in the country is entitled to free medical treatment. This includes the services of general practitioners, surgeons, and specialists; out-patient and in-patient treatment at hospitals; drugs, medicines, and surgical appliances; dentures, spectacles, and deaf aids; maternity and infant care; and treatment for mental sickness. On top of all this, more than 2,500 hospitals have been transferred to the state, which has put them in the charge of the regional hospital boards. The regional hospital boards vary in size from 23 to 32 members. All are unpaid and there are 378 members altogether.

This is not something for nothing. Of the 4 shillings 7 pence (about 95 cents) contributed weekly to national insurance by a man over 18, 8½ pence (17 cents) is allocated to the National Health Service, while a woman over 18 contributes 6½ pence (13 cents) out of her weekly payment of 3 shillings 10 pence (about 80 cents). In addition, 1½ pence (3 cents) of the employer's contribution goes to the Health Service. Self-employed and nonemployed persons pay 10 pence (20 cents) if they are men, 8 pence (16 cents) if they are women. But every man, woman, and child is entitled to use the service, whether in the insurance scheme or not, and every citizen contributes to the common pool, directly or indirectly through rates and taxes.

The health service scheme has now been functioning less than a year, and, as was only to be expected in so great a social change, it has had its teething troubles.

BULK OF DOCTORS JOIN

Mr. Bevan's chief difficulty has been the shortage of doctors and nurses, and there has also been an acute shortage of hospital beds. The pressure on dentists and eye specialists has never been so great, while the rush to get dentures and spectacles has been such that many people, who have for years neglected their teeth and eyes, have had to wait for weeks for supplies. Surgery and hospital facilities have not been adequate, but while new housing has first claim on building resources, many important health projects have had to wait.

Nevertheless, despite the difficulties, the National Health Service scheme has worked remarkably well in its initial stages.

Mr. Bevan has, of course, been lucky, for the winter 1948–49 has been exceptionally mild and the influenza epidemics which swept France and Italy have fortunately bypassed Britain.

On the whole, few serious criticisms of the health scheme have been voiced in the press or in Parliament, although its opponents originally predicted that the health services would be strangled in cocoons of red tape.

The medical profession in Britain, once it had bowed to the inevitable and accepted the state scheme, has cooperated well with the government. By the new year of 1949, 87 percent of a total of 21,000 doctors in England and Wales had joined the scheme and 90 percent of the 10,000 dentists and practically all the country's 14,000 chemists. The proportion in Scotland has been even higher.

About 42,000,000 people—95 percent of the population—have already enrolled on the doctor's lists. This compares with the 20,000,000 or so insured wage earners who received free medical attention before July 5.

This high figure of registered patients indicates that the scheme is popular with the public and that any attempt to desocialize the health services would be opposed. Indeed, no political party would seriously suggest this.

The 5 percent of the population who have remained outside—apart from those who are too lazy or apathetic to obtain the simple form—are mainly the well-to-do or the elderly, who believe they will get more attention if they remain private paying patients with their doctor.

Middle-aged hypochondriac dowagers, for example, naturally dislike the idea of being treated on a level with the working-class housewife. But there is no compulsion on the dowager. If she wishes to waste her money paying privately for what she could otherwise get under the scheme, the act does not stop her. There is no objection to private practices continuing—both general and specialist—it is entirely for patient and doctor to decide. The middle income groups generally have joined the scheme.

A recent article in the Lancet, journal of the medical profession in Britain, reports that both doctor and patient are pleased with their new and easier relationship.

Fears that the patient's freedom of choice would be limited, or that the old, essentially personal, relationship between doctor and patient would be undermined, have proved groundless.

PATIENT CAN CHANGE DOCTOR

If anything, patients now have a wider choice of doctors. The buying and selling of practices which led to many abuses has been stopped. Instead of a patient being allowed to change his doctor only at specified dates, after 1 month's notice—as under the old national insurance scheme—he can now change whenever and as often as he wishes, without notice.

The only difference is that the doctor is now paid out of public funds, instead of by the patient.

A maximum of 4,000 patients has been fixed, but the number aimed at is between 2,000 and 3,000 per doctor. There are more than 18,000 National Health Service doctors to look after 42,000,000 patients—an average of about 2,300 each.

For some doctors, the scheme has meant a considerable drop in earnings, but taking the profession as a whole, incomes have increased by over 60 percent, compared with before the war.

There have been complaints from doctors about the time spent in filling forms, signing certificates, dealing with trivial complaints, and prescribing medicines and drugs which people would formerly have bought at the drugstore or gone without. But most of this form-filling went on before, because of rationing and priorities, and on the whole, the doctors report that the public has been sensible and that there have not been serious abuses.

For the 20,000,000 insured people who were already on some doctor's panel, the scheme has not meant much change, but it has enormously increased the scope of benefits, and has, for the first time, brought in their wives and families.

Hitherto it depended on the funds of a man's approved society, whether he received free dental and eye treatment, and for specialist and hospital treatment he was charged according to his means. Now all these benefits are automatically included—and are equally available to his wife and children.

For the salaried and professional classes, who were formerly outside the insurance range, the health service has been a revolution. Nobody need worry about doctors' bills—the nightmare of so many parents—nor about the cost of a hospital bed or an operation.

But undoubtedly the people who benefit most from the new service are the housewives and mothers who have always been the last to complain about their own ailments.

The Lancet article, quoted above, also states that, "The start of the service has brought to light untreated illness in the old; in children, and in women. The amount of hitherto undisclosed illness is particularly large in women; many of whom have suffered for years from chronic disorders * * * without referring to a doctor."

MATERNITY BENEFITS

The maternity provisions of the scheme are comprehensive, and financial worries are removed through free hospital, medical, and midwife care. Expectant and nursing mothers also get extra milk, fruit juices, and special infant foods under the welfare foods scheme. A network of prenatal and postnatal clinics and infant welfare centers has been built up, and schemes for home helps, run by the local authorities, assist the mothers in getting back to normal when the baby has been born.

The basic aim of the National Health Service is to prevent, rather than to cure, sickness, and that is why so much importance is attached both to safeguarding the health of mothers and children, and to the project for health centers. These will eventually be set up in every main center of population, though they will be delayed by lack of building material. Doctors and dentists will be more readily "on top" for family consultations, and they will see their patients in greater comfort and convenience than in the now overcrowded surgeries and clinics. The hospitals, too, will be relieved of many of the more trivial cases which now come to them.

One long-term objective of the scheme is to bring about a more equitable distribution of doctors. Some areas are overcrowded, some are underdoctored. Before the war, the industrial town of South Shields, in the north of England, had only one doctor to every 4,100 of the population, whereas the prosperous seaside resort of Hastings on the south coast had less than 1,200 per doctor. Then, there are not enough doctors, or good enough ones, in most rural areas.

But this adjustment will take time. Maldistribution cannot be corrected until there are enough doctors to go around, and in any case there is no question of compulsion on a doctor to practice in any particular area.

The charge most frequently leveled against the National Health Service is that it costs the taxpayer too much. The cost in the first 9 months was estimated at 180,000,000 pounds sterling. This is certainly a colossal sum, but the country believes that it is not too high a price to pay for the improvement of the nation's health and productive capacity.

[From the Washington Post of February 28, 1949]

TORIES VOICE DISSATISFACTION WITH CHURCHILL

(By Robert Hewett)

LONDON, February 27.—Some of Britain's worried Conservative leaders are talking privately about easing Winston Churchill out of his roll as the party's prime policy maker.

The Conservative defeat this week in the crucial South Hammersmith Commons by-election was a hard blow to party leaders. In backstage post mortems, insiders say, there is a rising demand for a drastic shake-up in Conservative campaign strategy before next year's general elections.

Tory tactics in 31 byelections (special elections to fill Commons vacancies) have failed to win back a single district carried by Labor in 1945.

Churchill's threat to seek a vote of censure against the Labor government over soaring costs of the popular national health service was described by many as a preelection blunder that lost votes in Hammersmith.

Second-guessing Conservatives have also criticized Churchill for his campaign speeches in Hammersmith—a departure from his practice of remaining aloof from byelections. Some claimed his slashing attack on the Labor government failed to outline constructive counterproposals.

The 75-year-old Churchill is still the party's unchallenged No. 1 figure.

But can he draw the middle class and working class votes?

"They cheer for Churchill but they vote for Labor," was the private comment of one upper level Conservative official recently.

The undercurrent of criticism broke into print, significantly, in Lord Rothermere's conservative Daily Telegraph.

The Telegraph's political correspondent said there is "serious unrest among Conservative members of Parliament. The Telegraph editorially urged a "chief of staff" for Churchill to draft parliamentary and election strategy.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Florida has just made a brief statement. Do I correctly understand that in the parliamentary situation under which we are operating at present, that will be counted as one speech which the Senator from Florida has made on the pending question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would, because under the rule, no matter what a Senator talks about, he is talking on the pending question, and that would count as one speech.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. At the beginning of each day's session, as I have understood, Senators have been permitted to make insertions in the RECORD. Probably the Senator from Florida erred in not waiting until the beginning of the session tomorrow.

I doubt very seriously that I shall take more than one occasion to address myself to this matter. I wonder whether it might be appropriate or possible for me to ask unanimous consent that, inasmuch as the insertion I have just made in the RECORD is a very brief one, and inasmuch as we have been permitting such insertions to be made at the beginning of the session each day, my presentation of the data I have just submitted for the RECORD might not be counted as a speech on the pending question. I ask such unanimous consent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. At the beginning of the session today, the Senate gave its consent to permitting Senators to make insertions of matters in the RECORD, without speeches, and also to permit Senators to introduce bills, submit resolutions, or make reports of committees. However, such consent was granted only for that limited period of time.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, since my remarks were merely in connection with an insertion in the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that they not be considered as one of my speeches on the pending question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say personally I am not going to object to the request made by the distinguished Senator from Florida; but I submit that after the suggestion of the absence of a quorum was made today, and after a quorum call was had, I did not wish to take action which would set a precedent in violation of the rule, after the announcement had been made by the distinguished occupant of the chair, and so I withheld such requests, on the understanding that if such requests were continued, they would coristitute a violation of the rule.

The unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Florida is all right with me. I hold the Senator in highest respect, as he knows, and I do not want in any way to jeopardize his time or rights on the pending question. It merely shows the futility of establishing a rule as to routine matters, if they may be presented at any time. When insertions were made at the beginning of the session, I was very careful to ask the majority leader how long insertions could be made in the manner suggested. Not only the majority leader but the distinguished occupant of the chair stated it would be at the beginning of the session, and that thereafter anyone desiring recognition would have to be recognized in his own right, and it would be considered a speech on the pending question.

The distinguished Senator from Florida, who is very busy on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, possibly did not hear the earlier remarks and observations, but I submit once again, while I shall not object, because I feel this was an insertion, and that the Senator, possibly, if he had been unaware of the ruling made, might not have made the request, yet I submit to the majority leader that if any exception is made once, it is going to be very difficult to adhere to the rules laid down by the present occupant of the chair immediately before debate upon the pending motion began.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to state that he did not lay down the rules. He merely stated what they were.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. I stand corrected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate made the rules. The Chair is attempting to observe and enforce them. In the case of morning hour business, debate is not in order. Speeches are not in order in regard to insertions. It is done by unanimous consent at times, but without such consent, they are not admissible.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I do not want to embarrass my able leader in any sense of the word. I was not on the floor when the statemant was made today, or I should not have made the request. If I might have unanimous consent on this occasion, I shall "go, and sin nor more."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. LUCAS. I shall not object to the unanimous-consent request made by the able Senator from Florida, because I am satisfied he did not understand the rule entered into today when we began the debate. However, I merely call attention to this in order that Senators may have an opportunity to read the RECORD and understand exactly the kind of parliamentary procedure under which we are operating, so we may get along without having someone come in at a late hour and do what the Senator from Florida has done. It means one speech upon his time. The Senator from Florida acted in good faith without knowing what the parliamentary situation was. Therefore, I shall not object, but I am serving notice on the Senate that the rule is going to be observed and that tomorrow I shall follow the same procedure. Senators must observe the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair hears no objection, and the request of the Senator from Florida is granted.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Sundry postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED NATIONS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Warren R. Austin to be a representative of the United States of America to the third session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, held in Paris, France, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John Foster Dulles to be a Representative of the United States of America to

the third session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, held in Paris, France, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Anna Eleanor Roosevelt to be a representative of the United States of America to the third session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, held in Paris, France, to which office she was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Philip C. Jessup to be a representative of the United States of America to the third session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, held in Paris, France, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Benjamin V. Cohen to be an alternate representative of the United States of America to the third session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, held in Paris, France, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Ray Atherton to be an alternate representative of the United States of America to the third session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, held in Paris, France, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Willard L. Thorp, to be an alternate representative of the United States of America to the third session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, held in Paris, France, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Ernest A. Gross, to be an alternate representative of the United States of America to the third session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, held in Paris, France, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Francis B. Sayre to be an alternate representative of the United States of America to the third session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, held in Paris, France, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Benjamin V. Cohen to be a representative of the United States of America to the third session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, held in Paris, France, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate, to fill a vacancy created by the absence of Warren R. Austin due to illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Dean Rusk, to be alternate representative of the United States of America to the third session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, held in Paris, France, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate, vice Benjamin V. Cohen.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Stuart A. Rice, to be representative of the United States of America on the Statistical Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 3 years. (Reappointment.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Philip M. Hauser, to be representative of the United States of America on the Population Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 3 years. (Reappointment.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Arthur J. Altmeyer to be representative of the United States of America on the Social Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 3 years. (Reappointment.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

CONCILIATION COMMISSION FOR PALESTINE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Mark Foster Ethridge to be representative of the United States of America on the Conciliation Commission for Palestine which was established by resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations December 11, 1948.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

SPECIAL BALKAN COMMITTEE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Gerald A. Drew to be representative of the United States of America on the Special Balkan Committee established by the General Assembly of the United Nations October 21, 1947.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

PUBLIC ADVISORY BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nominations of the following persons, to be members of the Public Advisory Board: Sarah Blanding, of New York; James Barron Carey, of the District of Columbia; Jonathan W. Daniels, of North Carolina; Albert S. Goss, of Washington; Robert Henry Hinckley, of Utah; Eric A. Johnston, of Washington; Allan Blair Kline, of Iowa; Herbert H. Lehman, of New York; Arlon Everett Lyon, of Illinois; George Houk Mead, of Ohio; George Meany, of New York; James George Patton, of Colorado.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations to the Public Advisory Board are confirmed en bloc.

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Ernest A. Gross to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

AMBASSADOR AND CHIEF OF MISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of George Wadsworth to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Turkey and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Chief of the American Mission for Aid to Turkey, to which offices he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

CHIEF OF AMERICAN MISSION TO AID GREECE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Henry F. Grady, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Greece, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Chief of the American Mission for Aid to Greece, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

AMBASSADOR AT LARGE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Philip C. Jessup to be Ambassador at Large.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

AMBASSADOR AND MINISTER

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Loy W. Henderson to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to India and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Nepal. (Appointed during the recess of the Senate.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

AMBASSADORS EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Myron Melvin Cowen to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Australia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Laurence A. Steinhardt to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Canada.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Joseph E. Jacobs to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Czechoslovakia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Stanton Griffis, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Egypt.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Richard C. Patterson, Jr., to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Guatemala.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Edward S. Crocker 2d, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Iraq.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Waldemar J. Gallman, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Poland.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Robert M. Scotten, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to New Zealand.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Myron Melvin Cowen, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of the Philippines.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of J. Rives Childs, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of North Winship, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Union of South Africa.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Edward R. Dudley to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Liberia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of James Grover McDonald, to be special representative of the United States of America to the Provisional Government of Israel. (Appointed during the recess of the Senate.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Steven L. Hollis to be an ensign.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

SUPREME COURT, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Hon. Albert M. Cristy to be Associate Justice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Willson G. Moore to be fourth Judge of the first circuit.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and, without objection, the President will be notified immediately of all nominations this day confirmed.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 2, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 1 (legislative day of February 21), 1949:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major general

Maj. Gen. Stanley Lonzo Scott, O4439, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Albert Pierson, O11838, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Williston Birkhimer Palmer, O12246, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Robert Miller Montague, O12261, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of section 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Vernon Edwin Prichard, O3882, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Francis Henry Lanahan, Jr., O12735, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Roy Charles Lemach Graham, O4971, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. William Kelly Harrison, Jr., O5279, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. George David Shea, O5465, United States Army.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Frank Leo Howley, O299977, Army of the United States.

Col. Edward Caswell Wallington, O3838, United States Army.

Col. Kirke Brooks Lawton, O6805, United States Army.

Col. Harry Reichelderfer, O7547, United States Army.

Col. Emmett James Bean, O12361, United States Army.

Col. Wesley Tate Guest, O14654, United States Army.

The following-named officers for appointment to the positions indicated under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

Lt. Gen. Henry Spiese Aurand, O3784 (major general, U. S. Army), to be Commanding General, United States Army, Pacific, with the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Thomas Bernard Larkin, O3785, United States Army, to be Director of Logistics, United States Army, with the rank of lieutenant general.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the line of the Navy:

Frank T. Watkins
Wallace R. Dowd
Tom B. Hill

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

Carl A. Broaddus
Joseph B. Logue

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

Frank C. Dunham
Stephen R. Edson

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the grade of captain in the line of the Navy:

Stanley M. Alexander	Bruce D. Kelley
William C. Butler, Jr.	Herman N. Larson
Rex S. Caldwell	Nicholas Lucker, Jr.
Marshall E. Dornin	William B. Moore
Walter M. Foster	Marvin C. Parr
John J. Greytak	Louis F. Teuscher
Frederick V. H. Hilles	John L. Wilfong

The following-named officer for temporary appointment to the grade of captain in the line of the Naval Reserve:

Edward R. Anderson

Luther F. Duncan, midshipman (aviation), to be an ensign in the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949, in lieu of ensign in the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed, to correct date of rank.

The following-named civilian college graduates to be ensigns in the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949:

John M. Andersen	Dale W. P. Krehmeyer
Robert G. Anderson	Bernard F. Kritzmacher
Alex L. Baldwin	Lewis S. Lamoreaux
Joseph E. Bores	Oren A. Peterson
John P. Cooper	James K. Staud
David E. Dearolph	Winston J. Taylor
James E. Feely, Jr.	James A. White
Richard L. Gribling	William DeW. Wingfield
Hughen G. Halliburton	
Robert R. King, Jr.	

Worthen A. Walls (civilian college graduate) to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

Robert W. Didion
Louis M. Ellis

Frederick S. Welham (civilian college graduate) to be a lieutenant in the Dental Corps of the Navy, in lieu of lieutenant commander as previously nominated and confirmed.

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Marilyn A. Blasio.	Etha M. Horngren
Willidean Blazier	Estelle Korol
Eleanor F. Bresnahan	Rosalind C. Light
Dolores T. Burns	Mary L. Lower
Mildred C. Cannaday	Alice T. McCarthy
Clare P. Cooney	Rose E. McCluskey
Georgia J. Donnelly	Katherine M. Merrill
Mary V. Doyle	Margaret C. Oleyar
Hope M. Estey	Mary R. Remski
Frieda C. Galipp	Margaret Shaker
Elizabeth A. Geary	Alice L. Spence
Freda M. Hawkins	Frances C. Whitlock
Violet C. Haydel	Dorothy Zulick

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

COMMANDER

William S. Lawler

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Wendell A. Butcher
Hermann J. Lukeman

LIEUTENANTS

Gustave T. Anderson
Charles E. Weber

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Victor G. Benson	Edward Martin, Jr.
Cyril J. Honsik	Gerald A. Martin

The following-named officer to the grade indicated in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT

George LeR. Baker

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Helen E. Crabtree
Pauline R. Uhorczuk

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following officers of the United States Coast Guard Reserve to be commissioned in the United States Coast Guard, dates of rank to be computed upon execution of oath in accordance with the Regulations Governing Determination of Precedence as Commissioned Officers in the United States Coast Guard of Reserve Officers, Former Reserve Officers, and Former Temporarily Commissioned Officers:

TO BE LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Gordon L. Bates	George C. Steinemann
Ray J. Campbell	Jack S. Thuma

TO BE ENSIGN

Samuel R. Early

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, March 1 (legislative day of February 21), 1949:

UNITED NATIONS

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE THIRD SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS, HELD IN PARIS, FRANCE, TO WHICH OFFICES THEY WERE APPOINTED DURING THE RECESS OF THE SENATE

Warren R. Austin
John Foster Dulles
Anna Eleanor Roosevelt
Philip C. Jessup

ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE THIRD SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS, HELD IN PARIS, FRANCE, TO WHICH OFFICES THEY WERE APPOINTED DURING THE RECESS OF THE SENATE

Benjamin V. Cohen	Ernest A. Gross
Ray Atherton	Francis B. Sayre
Willard L. Thorp	

REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE THIRD SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS, HELD IN PARIS, FRANCE, TO WHICH OFFICE HE WAS APPOINTED DURING THE RECESS OF THE SENATE, TO FILL A VACANCY CREATED BY THE ABSENCE OF WARREN R. AUSTIN DUE TO ILLNESS

Benjamin V. Cohen

ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE THIRD SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS, HELD IN PARIS, FRANCE, TO WHICH OFFICE HE WAS APPOINTED DURING THE RECESS OF THE SENATE, VICE BENJAMIN V. COHEN

Dean Rusk

REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ON THE STATISTICAL COMMISSION OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS FOR A TERM OF 3 YEARS

Stuart A. Rice

REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ON THE POPULATION COMMISSION OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS FOR A TERM OF 3 YEARS

Philip M. Hauser

REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ON THE SOCIAL COMMISSION OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS FOR A TERM OF 3 YEARS

Arthur J. Altmeyer

CONCILIATION COMMISSION FOR PALESTINE

REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ON THE CONCILIATION COMMISSION FOR PALESTINE

Mark Foster Ethridge

SPECIAL BALKAN COMMITTEE

REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ON THE SPECIAL BALKAN COMMITTEE

Gerald A. Drew

PUBLIC ADVISORY BOARD

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ADVISORY BOARD

Sarah Blanding
James Barron Carey
Jonathan W. Daniels
Albert S. Goss
Robert Henry Hinckley
Eric A. Johnston
Allan Blair Kline
Herbert H. Lehman
Arlon Everett Lyon
George Houk Mead
George Meany
James George Patton

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Ernest A. Gross to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

AMBASSADOR AND CHIEF OF MISSION

George Wadsworth to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Turkey and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Chief of the American Mission for Aid to Turkey.

CHIEF OF AMERICAN MISSION TO AID GREECE

Henry F. Grady, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Greece, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Chief of the American Mission for Aid to Greece.

AMBASSADOR AT LARGE

Philip C. Jessup to be Ambassador at Large.

AMBASSADOR AND MINISTER

Loy W. Henderson to be Ambassador Extraordinay and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to India and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Nepal.

AMBASSADORS EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE COUNTRIES INDICATED

Myron Melvin Cowen to Australia.
Laurence A. Steinhardt to Canada.
Joseph E. Jacobs to Czechoslovakia.
Stanton Griffis to Egypt.
Richard C. Patterson, Jr., to Guatemala.
Edward S. Crocker 2d to Iraq.
Waldemar J. Gallman to Poland.
Robert M. Scotten to New Zealand.
Myron Melvin Cowen to the Republic of the Philippines.
J. Rives Childs to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.
North Winship to the Union of South Africa.

ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO LIBERIA

Edward R. Dudley

SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT OF ISRAEL

James Grover McDonald

SUPREME COURT, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Hon. Albert M. Cristy to be associate justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii.

CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Willson G. Moore to be fourth judge of the first circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Steven L. Hollis to be ensign, effective January 26, 1949.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Arthur R. Scroggins, East Tallassee.
J. Ponder Livingston, Eutaw.
James C. Mattox, Guin.
James D. Jackson, Horton.
Felton Jones, Kennedy.
Marvin T. Davis, Letohatchee.
Pauline B. Sandlin, Magnolia Springs.
John W. Roney, Newville.
Oscar Day, Jr., Oakman.
Charles H. Eddins, Jr., Peterman.

MARYLAND

Thomas F. Conlon, Cumberland.
H. Lester Long, Jr., Ellicott City.

MISSISSIPPI

Charles C. Province, Big Creek.
Owen O. Odom, Steens.

NORTH CAROLINA

Evelyn J. Sutton, Dillsboro.
Belle Q. Cable, Fontana Dam.
Claude A. Dry, Misenheimer.
A. Garland Pierce, Southern Pines.
Gilbert A. Holt, Troy.
George H. Ross, Wadesboro.

NORTH DAKOTA

Mathilda A. Johnson, Adams.
Ben Ramsland, Almont.
Donovan J. Dolan, Bowbells.
Herbert J. Clark, Powers Lake.
Daniel F. McMenamy, Reynolds.
Byron P. Pulles, Stanton.

TEXAS

Benjamin F. Sullivan, Jr., Bangs.
Napoleon B. Ballard, Baytown.
Robert A. Smith, Decatur.
Thomas G. Sandel, Huntsville.
Robert J. Quinlivan, Idalou.
Albert N. Pike, Iredell.
Lance A. Leggitt, Lakeview.
Jesse B. Strickland, Novice.
Irvin L. Hergert, Perryton.
John O. Bier, Plainview.
Harold Voss, Post.
Miller J. Sweeden, Sweetwater.
Opal F. Roberson, Temple.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 1, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou who art the living bread upon which we must feed, and the Good Shepherd who leads the way into green pastures, grant us wisdom adequate to know our duty, and as we hear Thy call, give us the will to obey.

We thank Thee that Thy providence abides through every change. Pity us

if from our hearts no prayers arise and no thanks are returned for the bounties which Thou dost bestow upon us.

Do Thou bless all our homes; keep all our families under the wings of Thy love and mercy, and grant that they may be the citadels of our future comfort and assurance. In the name of our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1950

Mr. BATES of Kentucky, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 3082, Rept. No. 167) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CHURCH reserved all points of order on the bill.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1950

Mr. GARY, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 3083, Rept. No. 168) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CANFIELD reserved all points of order on the bill.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. RANKIN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

PERMITTING MOTOR VESSEL "FLB-5005" TO ENGAGE IN THE FISHERIES

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H. R. 579) to permit the motor vessel *FLB-5005* to engage in the fisheries, and that the bill be rereferred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement of the mayor of the city of Newark before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. PASSMAN and Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KELLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address.

Mr. JAMES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an item by John M. Cummings appearing in the Philadelphia Inquirer commemorating St. David's Day.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I sought and obtained permission to include in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Invention Through the Years." The Public Printer estimates that this will exceed the ordinary amount permitted and will cost $195, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a great address delivered by the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, my fellow Missourian, on the occasion of the Jackson-Jefferson Day dinner last Thursday night.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by one of Cleveland's most important and able columnists.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

LABOR EXTENSION SERVICE PROGRAM

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing into the House of Representatives a bill to aid in the orderly and constructive solution of industrial relations problems and to generally advance the public welfare which is called the Labor Extension Act of 1949.

Understanding based upon knowledge is a fundamental objective of a democratic society. Conflicts between various groups, including management and labor, cannot be resolved unless the tools of fact and reason are made available to all of the people. Therefore, the establishment of a Labor Extension Service program, through which American wage and salary earners would receive educational services from our universities and colleges through short courses and extension classes, is a necessity in a nation dedicated to democratic processes. We are traditionally devoted to education, but while we have established the great Agricultural Extension Service program, and have provided opportunities for the education of businessmen and professionals, we have overlooked the growing needs of our wage earners. The bill I am introducing, which is already broadly sponsored by members of both parties, seeks to give parity to labor with other groups in the provision of these educational opportunities.

It is a great credit to the entire American labor movement that it is urging unanimously and officially the establishment of a Labor Extension Service in the United States Department of Labor. Here is an awareness on the part of workers and their organizations that they need and desire more facts and instruction so that labor's increasing influence can be used wisely and well. Certainly, the Congress of the United States cannot fail to meet its responsibility in helping our wage and salary earners gain access to the world of education through which a knowledge of their rights and responsibilities as American citizens will be broadly extended. Eighty-seven years ago, President Abraham Lincoln affixed his signature to the Morrill Act, which established our great system of land-grant colleges out of which emerged the Agricultural Extension Service program. 1949 can be memorable as the year in which the Labor Extension Act became law, as an expression of our devotion to the rights of all citizens to have access to the facts and knowledge which are essential to understanding and constructive action in the twentieth century.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes on social security.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

TAX REFUNDS

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I am impressed by recent news items regarding tax refunds—particularly income-tax refunds—amounting to over $2,000,000,000.

Under the authority of section 3771 of title 26, United States Code, the Government is paying interest on these refunds, for varying periods, at the rate of

6 percent per annum. That interest item alone cost us $56,000,000 this last year. The Treasury Department has estimated that the interest on over-payments for next year may run as high as $82,000,000.

There is something wrong with this picture. Government bonds yield between 2 and 3 percent, and the short-time securities considerably less. I know of no place where money can be invested with a guaranteed return of 6 percent—which is pretty good interest in these days. Of course, all of us can make mistakes in the preparation of tax returns, but no place else can one collect 6 percent interest on his mistakes.

MISTAKES SHOULD BE PENALIZED, NOT REWARDED

The big taxpayers—the recipients of the heavy refunds—surely must employ the best accounting talent in the country and get the best tax advice obtainable. One cannot help but wonder if these are mistakes, or whether some might be by design. Under existing circumstances they are at least hard to understand. In fact, Mr. Speaker, if overpayments of taxes carried no interest there would be far fewer of them. This reduction would eliminate much work in the Bureau of Internal Revenue and permit Revenue employees to turn to revenue-producing work.

I am therefore today introducing a bill to eliminate the payment of interest on tax overpayments. There is no thought here of depriving the taxpayer of a full refund of any overpayment, but why should my tax dollar, and yours, and those of millions of workers, go to reward someone for his mistakes by guaranteeing him this return of 6 percent interest. It is wrong, indefensible, and should be stopped.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to adress the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial appearing in this morning's Washington Times-Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RICH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances: in one, to include an editorial from the Connersville (Ind.) News-Examiner, and in the other to include an editorial from the Shelbyville (Ind.) News.

Mr. CLEVENGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Ohio State Journal.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include newspaper articles.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a table on the school-lunch program.

Mr. TOLLEFSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

VERMONT SAGE CHEESE

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have sent a letter to all Members of the House calling their attention to the fact that tomorrow, if they are smart enough, they can get something that they have never had before and that is a piece of real old Vermont sage cheese.

I am sure that the Members do not know anything more about what I am talking about, than the fellow who went up to the bar and asked one standing there if he had ever had delirium tremens. The fellow addressed said "No." Then the first man said, "Then you have never been anywhere, you ain't never seen nothing, and don't know nothing."

So, get a piece of that cheese tomorrow for until you do you qualify as suggested by the one who spoke as indicated as having had delirium tremens.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances: in one, to include an editorial which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor, and in the other to include an address made by him before the Massachusetts Society of Old Age Pensions.

Mr. BATTLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include three resolutions by the Alabama State Board of Public Welfare.

Mr. McCARTHY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include editorials from the New York Post and Home News.

Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two newspaper articles.

Mr. MACY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some editorials.

VETERANS' RELIEF VERSUS LEND-LEASE TO EUROPE—STRAINING AT A GNAT AND SWALLOWING A CAMEL

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, so much misinformation is being spread in the press and over the radio about the veterans' pension bill that I desire to call your attention to one phase of it that they have overlooked.

We have 37,063 service-connected veterans in hospitals, and 72,714 non-service-connected veterans. Many of these non-service-connected veterans have gone to the hospital because they have nothing to live on at home. It costs $360 a month to hospitalize one of them, or four times as much as his pension would amount to under the Rankin bill that is now pending before the Committee on Rules.

The enemies of this measure howl to high heaven about the cost of pensioning our old veterans, but support the waste of American money by the billions in foreign countries. Financially speaking, they strain at an American gnat and swallow a foreign camel. My attention has been called to an article in the current issue of the United States News and World Report magazine, describing the high cost of a proposed new lend-lease to Europe. This article describes in some detail the cost of proposed rearmament plans which evidently are now in the formative stage in the administrative departments of the Government. The article estimates that the minimum cost for the first year would be $1,200,000,000, and if the plan is finally approved, the cost will range between four and eight billion dollars per year. The magazine estimates that the maximum outlay may approach the figure of $50,300,000,000.

I hope that the Members who have been glibly opposing my bill for pensions for veterans at age 65, and complaining about the small cost of $62,000,000 for the first year's operation, will ponder the figures which I have just given. If we can now begin to undertake a program which will double the cost of the Marshall plan and send funds to all parts of Europe, then it seems to me that we can at least provide for the welfare of our aged veterans in the sunset period of their lives.

The figures for this proposed rearmament program and new lend-lease mean, as any Member must know if he pauses to consider it, preparations short of war. It has been the history of the past that such preparations often lead to armed conflict. In other words, the gentlemen who support this program are creating veterans and at the same time they are denying veterans already in being the right to a comfortable old age after they have borne the brunt of armed conflict.

I think we should consider first our duty to the veterans who have already defended this country in wars now over before we begin any gigantic spending on the scale envisioned by this report and make commitments which may lead to another world conflict, with our boys doing the fighting, and our country paying the bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include certain extraneous matter.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Lowell Sun.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

MRS. SHIRLEY LEINWAND

The Clerk called the first bill on the Private Calendar, H. R. 669, for the relief of Mrs. Shirley Leinwand.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Mrs. Shirley Leinwand, who entered the United States in May 1938, shall, upon the payment of the required head tax, be considered for purpose of immigration and naturalization laws, to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of the date of entry. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Polish quota for the first year the Polish quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENGEBERT AXER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 773) for the relief of Engebert Axer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate 307 be substituted for the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General of the United States shall record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Rev. Engebert Axer, Society of Jesus, as of September 26, 1937, the date on which he was originally admitted to the United States as a student.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table; and a similar House bill (H. R. 773) was laid on the table.

LAWRENCE G. McCARTHY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1052) for the relief of Lawrence G. McCarthy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 136 (e)), Lawrence G. McCarthy, a native and citizen of Toronto, Canada, whose wife is a citizen and resident of the United States, may be admitted for permanent residence under the Immigration Act of May 26, 1924, if he is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EZRA BUTLER EDDY, JR., ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1700) for the relief of Ezra Butler Eddy, Jr., and wife, Marie Claire Lord Eddy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill, H. R. 1700, be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

SAMUEL FADEM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1993) for the relief of Samuel Fadem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

FLOOD IN YUBA COUNTY, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 555) conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, Northern Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons for reimbursement for damages and losses sustained as a result of a flood which occurred in December 1937 in levee district No. 10, Yuba County, Calif.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, Northern Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment, respectively, upon the claims of all persons against the United States for damages alleged to have been sustained as a result of a flood which occurred in December 1937 in levee district No. 10, in Yuba County, Calif., on the easterly side of the Feather River, when the said Feather River breached the district's river levee at a point about 3 miles from the south end of the district on December 11, 1937, which damage, if any, it is alleged could have been prevented by the exercise of reasonable care and diligence on the part of the Engineer Department of the War Department. In the determination of such claims the United States shall be held liable only to the extent to which a private person would be liable under like circumstances.

SEC. 2. Suits upon which such claims, respectively, may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statutes of limitations, and proceedings for the determination of such claims, appeals therefrom, and payment of any judgment, shall be in the same manner as in cases over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of paragraph twentieth of section 24 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., title 28, sec. 41 (20)).

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this act, the word "persons" shall be interpreted to mean any person or persons, individual or individuals, copartnership, firm, or corporation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRED E. WEBER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 574) for the relief of Fred E. Weber.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Fred E. Weber, Bradley Beach, Monmouth County, N. J., the sum of $4,226. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Fred E. Weber against the United States on account of personal injuries, medical expenses, property damage, and loss of earnings sustained by him when the automobile which he was driving on Central Avenue, in the borough of Bradley Beach, was in collision with a United States Army truck on January 1, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF JAMES PATRICK HACKETT AND CHARLES L. STOVER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 575) for the relief of the estate of James Patrick Hackett and Charles L. Stover.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $6,265.70 to the estate of James Patrick Hackett and the sum of $6,275.78 to Charles L. Stover, East Keansburg, N. J. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of personal injuries, and medical and funeral expenses sustained when they were struck by a United States Army vehicle while they were walking on Route 35, Middletown, N. J., on January 21, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$6,275.78" and insert "$4,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: "Page 1, line 9, after the words 'United States', insert 'and Sgt. William A. McQueen'."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM R. BLAIR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 577) to correct possible inequity in the case of a certain application for letters patent of William R. Blair.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That nothwithstanding any provision of existing law, the application for United States letters patent of William R. Blair, serial No. 598,167, filed June 7, 1945, for Object Locating System, shall not be rejected nor shall any patent granted on said application be held invalid by reason of the fact that the invention disclosed in said application was patented or described in a printed publication in this or any foreign country, or was in public use or on sale in this country, unless the effective date of such patent, publication, public use, or sale, is prior to the date of said invention by the said William R. Blair.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARTHUR G. ROBINSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 576) for the relief of Arthur G. Robinson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $3,000 to Arthur G. Robinson, of Keansburg, N. J. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of personal injuries, medical services, loss of earnings, and future loss of earnings sustained when the bakery truck driven by Mr. Robinson was involved in a collision with an Army truck on Route 35, in Middletown Township, N. J., on August 18, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARLTON C. GRANT ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 578) for the relief of Carlton C. Grant and others.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any provision of law to the contrary, all claims of Carlton C. Grant, Rudolph Hobbs, Clarence W. Grant, Gordon W. Grant, Margaret S. Grant, W. P. Grant, J. Perry Grant, A. A. Everett, E. J. Lewis, E. J. Lewis, Jr., Mrs. E. J. Lewis, J. Stacy Grant, H. L. Grant, J. Rufus Yopp, Murray Guthrie, Liston T. Yopp, Lonnie T. Everett, the estate of James B. Grant, I. S. Thompson, all of Sneads Ferry, N. C.; D. T. Millis, A. T. Horne, R. E. Sanders, L. D. Hobbs, Major Davis, M. Donald Davis, D. D. Justice, Wade J. Everett, Millie C. Everett, D. V. Justice, T. R. Murphy, Vance Howard, Kater Howard, Harry Moore, G. C. Hansley, Strickland Hobbs, Corbett Hansley, C. R. Bush, R. D. Everett, Austin Hobbs, J. W. Everett, C. S. Everett, J. R. Hobbs, Sherman R. Edens, O. S. Edens, L. M. Davis, Guy L. Everett, C. C. Hines, L. W. Bishop, of Holly Ridge, N. C.; L. E. Coleburn, of Morehead City, N. C.; Mary Shepard, of route No. 1, Jacksonville, N. C.; E. B. Smith, of Jacksonville, N. C.; or the heirs, administrators, or executors of either or any of said persons who may now be dead or hereafter die, against the United States for damages for injury to property resulting, at any time on or before May 1, 1941, from dumping of sewage and laundry waste from Camp Davis, N. C., into Goose Creek, Barlow Creek, and King Creek.

SEC. 2. Proceedings for the determination of such claims shall be had in the same manner as in cases of which said court has jurisdiction under the provisions of section 145 of the Judicial Code, as amended: *Provided*, That suits hereunder shall be instituted within 4 months after the enactment of this act: *Provided further*, That this act shall be construed only to waive immunity from suit of the Government of the United States and to confer jurisdiction upon said court to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the persons named in section 1 hereof, and not otherwise to affect any substantive rights of the parties.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HILDA LINKS ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 581) to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court for the Territory of Alaska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim, or claims, of Hilda Links and E. J. Ohman, partners, and Fred L. Kroesing, all of Anchorage, Alaska.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court for the Territory of Alaska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim, or claims, of Hilda Links and E. J. Ohman, partners, and Fred L. Kroesing, or any of them, all of Anchorage, Alaska, for any losses and damages sustained by Hilda Links and E. J. Ohman, partners, and Fred L. Kroesing, in the mink-ranch business and occupation, conducted by them or any of them, at Anchorage, Alaska, arising out of air flights or maneuvers of the United States armed forces, or by virtue of any acts, or actions, of any and all officers, agents, or employees of the United States in connection with the operation of military aircraft or with the establishment and maintenance of military posts or bases in Alaska, or by all of said flights, maneuvers, acts, or actions: *Provided*, That the action in the District Court for the Territory of Alaska to establish such losses and damages may be instituted within 1 year from the date of the approval of this act, and the same right of appeal to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit from the judgment of the District Court for the Territory of Alaska shall be had as in other causes in that court.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALASKA JUNEAU GOLD MINING CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 583) for the relief of the Alaska Juneau Gold Mining Co., of Juneau, Alaska.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

MRS. LUCILLE DAVIDSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 591) for the relief of Mrs. Lucille Davidson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,075.40 to Mrs. Lucille Davidson, Merrison, Va., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained and medical and hospital expenses incurred as the result of an accident involving a United States Army vehicle which occurred on March 14, 1944, in Newport News, Va.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES W. KEITH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 592) for the relief of James W. Keith.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $337.89, to Mr. James W. Keith, 212 Hurley Avenue, Hilton Village, Newport News, Va., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage sustained as the result of an accident involving a United States Army vehicle which occurred on November 25, 1943.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, add the following: ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAMIE L. HURLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 594) for the relief of Mamie L. Hurley.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

HARRY W. SHARPLEY ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 595) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Harry W. Sharpley, his heirs, administrators, or assigns, against the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Harry W. Sharpley, of Greenbackville, Va., his heirs, administrators, or assigns, against the United States for alleged damages caused by the sewage emanating from the naval auxiliary air station at Chincoteague, Va., and the flow of such sewage over and across certain oyster grounds located in Mosquito Creek, Va., which grounds had been leased by the said Harry W. Sharpley.

SEC. 2. Proceedings for the determination of said claim shall be had in the same manner as in cases of which said court has jurisdiction under the provisions of section 145 of the Judicial Code, as amended: *Provided*, That suit hereunder shall be instituted within 4 months after the enactment of this act: *And provided further*, That this act shall be construed only to waive the immunity from suit of the Government of the United States with respect to the claim of said Harry W. Sharpley, his heirs, administrators, or assigns, and not otherwise to affect any substantive rights of the parties.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN E. PARKER ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 596) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of John E. Parker, his heirs, administrators, or assigns, against the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of John E. Parker, of Hilton Village, Va., his heirs, administrators, or assigns, against the United States for alleged damages caused by the alleged wrongful allowance by the United States Army authorities in charge of Camp Patrick Henry, Va., of the flow of sewage from said camp over and across certain oyster grounds situated in the Warwick River, in Warwick County, Va., which grounds had been leased by the said John E. Parker.

SEC. 2. Proceedings for the determination of said claim shall be had in the same manner as in cases of which said court has jurisdiction under the provisions of section 145 of the Judicial Code, as amended: *Provided*, That suit hereunder shall be instituted within 4 months after the enactment of this act: *And provided further*, That this act shall be construed only to waive the immunity from suit of the Government of the United States with respect to the claim of said John E. Parker, his heirs, administrators, or assigns, and not otherwise to affect any substantive rights of the parties.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF MATHEW C. COWLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 609) for the relief of the estate of Mathew C. Cowley, deceased, and the estate of Louisa Cowley, deceased.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

LORENZO H. FROMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 610) for the relief of Lorenzo H. Froman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

CLAIMS OF CERTAIN PROPERTY OWNERS ADJACENT TO FORT KNOX, KY.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 611) to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of certain property owners adjacent to Fort Knox, Ky.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

SAMUEL W. POORVU

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 697) for the relief of Samuel W. Poorvu.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $6,288.45 to Samuel W. Poorvu, of Boston, Mass., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for expenses incurred in connection with the leasing of quarters for Wellesley branch of the post office at Boston, Mass.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWARD WOOLF

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1813) for the relief of Edward Woolf.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Edward Woolf, Boston, Mass., the sum of $1,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Edward Woolf against the United States arising out of his being struck, on November 9, 1942, on Brattle Street in Boston, Mass., by a vehicle in the service of the Army of the United States: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "Woolf", insert "451 Shawmut Avenue."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DORIS MARIE RICHARD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1870) for the relief of Doris Marie Richard.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Doris Marie Richard, of Dorchester, Mass., the sum of $934, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries, property damage, and loss of earnings sustained by her and for reimbursement of hospital, medical, and other expenses incurred by her as a result of an accident which occurred when the automobile in which she was riding was struck by a United States Army vehicle at the intersection of Beach Street and Billings Road, in Quincy, Mass., on June 10, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SYLVIA M. MISETICH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 572) for the relief of Sylvia M. Misetich.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Sylvia M. Misetich, of Portland, Oreg., the sum of $7,300, in full

satisfaction of her claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by her, and for reimbursement of hospital, medical, and other expenses incurred by her, as a result of infection from a vaccination for smallpox administered to her pursuant to orders of her supervisor at the Portland subport of embarkation, Portland, Oreg., on January 10, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$7,500" and insert "$5,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EUGENE J. BEARMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 618) for the relief of Eugene J. Bearman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Eugene J. Bearman, of Memphis, Tenn., the sum of $642.60. The payment of such sum constitutes a refund of payments heretofore made by the said Eugene J. Bearman to the United States on account of the loss by theft of a United States Army vehicle on August 10, 1944, in Rome, Italy, while said vehicle was in his custody and control as an officer in the United States Army and the said Eugene J. Bearman is hereby relieved of all liability to the United States by reason of the loss of said vehicle by theft: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. HARRIETT PATTERSON ROGERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 637) for the relief of Mrs. Harriett Patterson Rogers.

Mr. LICHTENWALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

MRS. ELIZABETH B. MURPHY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 659) for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth B. Murphy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to credit the accounts of Mrs. Elizabeth B. Murphy, postmaster at Beacon, N. Y., from any liability to refund or pay to the United States the sum of $8,089.90, such sum being postal funds embezzled by Earl H. Cochrane, former postoffice clerk at Beacon, N. Y., embezzlement taking place while Mrs. Elizabeth B. Murphy was acting postmaster.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out lines 6, 7, and 8 and insert "in such amount as will equal the balance determined by the Comptroller General to be due in such accounts as the result of various embezzlements."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOUISE PETERS LEWIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 683) for the relief of Louise Peters Lewis.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

BENJAMIN GORDON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 684) for the relief of Benjamin Gordon.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Benjamin Gordon, Chelsea, Mass., the sum of $750, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, and loss in salary sustained when claimant was struck by a United States Coast Guard motor vehicle while alighting from a taxi at or near the intersection of Saratoga and Prescott Streets, East Boston, Mass., on December 6, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARY JANE HARRIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 739), for the relief of Mary Jane Harris.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mary Jane Harris, the widow of Richmond Glenn Harris, Sr., the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for compensation for the death of her husband, Richmond Glenn Harris, Sr., as a result of an accident involving a United States Army vehicle, on December 11, 1943, about 10 miles west of Cookeville, Putnam County, Tenn., on United States Highway 70, North: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

B. JOHN HANSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 745) for the relief of B. John Hanson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to B. John Hanson, Jamestown, N. Y., the sum of $500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said B. John Hanson against the United States on account of personal injuries received by him on April 19, 1941, when the automobile in which he was riding was in collision with a Civilian Conservation Corps truck on Highway Route No. 18, 2 miles south of Cattaraugus, N. Y.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EUGENE SPITZER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 767) for the relief of Eugene Spitzer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Eugene Spitzer, of Lake Placid, N. Y., the sum of $1,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement of bond declared breached August 13, 1940, because of his failure to depart from the United States on or before December 11, 1939.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

R. C. OWEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1036) for the relief of R. C. Owen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to R. C. Owen, Gallatin, Tenn., the sum of $8,437.98. This sum represents the amount which the said R. C. Owen paid to the United States for internal revenue tobacco stamps, which stamps were completely destroyed on December 24, 1945, when a fire destroyed the said R. C. Owen's tobacco factory (registered as "Tobacco factory No. 102, district of Tennessee"), together with the equipment, tobacco, and tobacco stamps therein: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the name "Owen", insert "R. C. Owen, Jr., and Roy Owen, former partners, doing business as R. C. Owen of."

Page 1, line 6, after the word "which", strike out "the" and insert in lieu thereof "they."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "said R. C. Owen."

Page 1, line 11, strike out "said R. C. Owen's."

Page 1, line 11, after the world "factory", insert "of said partners."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of R. C. Owen, R. C. Owen, Jr., and Roy Owen."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. RUTH CAMERON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1043) for the relief of Mrs. Ruth Cameron.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Ruth Cameron, of Los Angeles, Calif., the sum of $54,722.37, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for missing and damaged equipment which she had stored at the Los Angeles County Fairgrounds at the time it was occupied by the United States Army: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, after the word "Mrs.", insert "Mrs. Wesley Berk, formerly."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$54,722.37" and insert "$34,704.49."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Wesley Berk (formerly Mrs. Ruth Cameron)."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN KEITH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1057) for the relief of John Keith.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John Keith, Los Angeles, Calif., the sum of $9,000. Such sum represents the loss sustained by Mr. Keith with respect to a contract entered into with the Federal Works Agency in 1944 for the construction of the Frontier Elementary School in San Diego, Calif. An error in transposing estimate figures to determine bid resulted in contracts drawn up for a sum lower than had been intended by the contractor. However, the correct sum of the bid was much lower than that submitted by any other contractor on this project.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill insert: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BERNICE GREEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1061) for the relief of Bernice Green.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Bernice Green, the sum of $2,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical, hospital, and other expenses, and losses sustained by her as a result of an Army truck striking the automobile in which she was riding at the intersection of Pico and Sepulveda Boulevard in the city of Los Angeles, Calif., on January 24, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "to", insert "Mrs. Wesley Berk, formerly."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$54,722.37" and insert "$34,704.49."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Wesley Berk (formerly Mrs. Ruth Cameron)."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN KEITH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1057) for the relief of John Keith.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John Keith, Los Angeles, Calif., the sum of $9,000. Such sum represents the loss sustained by Mr. Keith with respect to a contract entered into with the Federal Works Agency in 1944 for the construction of the Frontier Elementary School in San Diego, Calif. An error in transposing estimate figures to determine bid resulted in contracts drawn up for a sum lower than had been intended by the contractor. However, the correct sum of the bid was much lower than that submitted by any other contractor on this project.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill insert: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES LEON KEATON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1066) for the relief of James Leon Keaton.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to James Leon Keaton, Angie, La., the sum of $500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said James Leon Keaton against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained on August 29, 1942, at Biloxi, Miss., in an accident involving a United States Army service car.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JENNIE OLSEN ANDERSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1076) for the relief of Jennie Olsen Anderson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Jennie Olsen Anderson, of Brooklyn, N. Y., the sum of $5,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of her husband, Carl Edward Anderson, sustained as the result of an accident of an elevator on December 3, 1943, in the building at 213 Washington Street, Newark, N. J., which was occupied by and under the control and supervision of the Public Building Administration, Office of Dependency Benefits: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

D. LANE POWERS ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1093) for the relief of D. Lane Powers, Elaine Powers Taylor, and Monroe W. Taylor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $992.90 to D. Lane Powers, to pay the sum of $4,337.12 to Elaine Powers Taylor, and to pay the sum of $500 to Monroe W. Taylor, all of Trenton, N. J., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage, personal injuries, hospital and medical expenses sustained as the result of an accident involving a United States Army vehicle along a highway in East Windsor Township, Mercer County, N. J., on June 10, 1945, said vehicle at the time of the accident being controlled and operated by an employee of the Government who was not acting within the scope of his office or employment: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the name "Powers", strike out the bill down to the colon on page 2, line 5, and insert in lieu thereof: "of Trenton, N. J., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage sustained by him as a result of a collision between his automobile and an Army vehicle parked at night without lights on State Highway No. 33 in East Windsor Township, Mercer County, N. J., on June 10, 1945, and to Elaine Powers Taylor, of Trenton, N. J., the sum of $2,117, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage, personal injuries, pain and suffering and disfigurement sustained and medical and hospital expenses incurred as a result of said accident."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of D. Lane Powers and Elaine Powers Taylor."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NELLIE M. CLARK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1094) for the relief of Nellie M. Clark.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,000, to Nellie M. Clark, of Lyndhurst, N. J., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, and loss of earnings sustained as the result of an accident involving a United States Army vehicle at the intersection of Central and Passaic Avenues, East Newark, N. J., on July 17, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PITTSBURGH DUBOIS CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1095) for the relief of Pittsburgh DuBois Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $24,987.76 to Pittsburgh DuBois Co., in full and final settlement and satisfaction of all claims for damages and loss growing out of War Department contract No. W-650-cws-887, as amended and modified, dated April 27, 1943, for the furnishing of 60,000 incendiary bomb packing boxes and release bars: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the presentation of this claim to the proper committees of Congress, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANDREW FERDINAND DEWITT, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1098) for the relief of the legal guardian of Andrew Ferdinand DeWitt, Jr., a minor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal guardian of Andrew Ferdinand DeWitt, Jr., of route 21, Alexandria, La., a minor, the sum of $10,000 in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of his father, Andrew Ferdinand DeWitt, Sr., in an accident caused by a United States Army vehicle, near the city of Alexandria, La., in the parish of Rapides, State of Louisiana, on March 15, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out ", Junior" and insert "III."

Line 7, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$6,000."

Line 10, strike out "Senior" and insert "Junior."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Andrew Ferdinand DeWitt III, a minor."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MIRIAM BARKLE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1103) for the relief of Miriam Barkle.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Miriam Barkle, Pacific Grove, Calif., the sum of $5,450.50. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Miriam Barkle against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained on February 10, 1933, when the automobile in which she was riding was in collision with a United States Coast and Geodetic Survey truck on Del Monte Avenue in Monterey County: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

J. W. GREENWOOD, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1137) for the relief of J. W. Greenwood, Jr.

Mr. LICHTENWALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

ESTATE OF H. M. McCORVEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1164) for the relief of the estate of H. M. McCorvey.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretry of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal representative of the estate of H. M. McCorvey, deceased, late of Moultrie, Ga., the sum of $836.59. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of such estate against the United States on account of personal injuries, property damage and loss of wages sustained by the said H. M. McCorvey as the result of a collision on April 16, 1944, between the automobile owned and operated by the said H. M. McCorvey and a United States Army truck, approximately 1 mile from Spence Field near Moultrie, Ga.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent

thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. LEROY HANN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1176) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Leroy Hann.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. and Mrs. Leroy Hann the aggregate sum of $10,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the personal injury, the hospital and medical expenses, pain and suffering, loss of earnings, and property damage incurred by reason of the injuries and the property damage sustained by them as a result of being struck by an Army vehicle operated by Army personnel on Route 40, one-half mile north of Pennsville, N. J., on March 3, 1943, and said injuries and damage having been caused by the negligent operation of said Army vehicle so as to cause it to turn into the vehicle in which said Mr. and Mrs. Leroy Hann were riding: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$2,500."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "injury, the hospital and medical expenses, pain and suffering, loss of earnings, and property damage" and insert "injuries."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARL E. LAWSON AND FIREMEN'S FUND INDEMNITY CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1271) for the relief of Carl E. Lawson and Firemen's Fund Indemnity Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000 to Carl E. Lawson, of San Mateo, Calif., and to pay the sum of $1,038.79 to the Fireman's Fund Indemnity Co., of San Francisco, Calif., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and medical and hospital expenses sustained by Carl E. Lawson, and for reimbursement to the Fireman's Fund Indemnity Co. for expenditures as the result of an accident involving a United States Army vehicle on a pier of the water front, San Francisco, Calif., on September 30, 1942: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury shall make such payment only after the receipt of evidence satisfactory to him that the judgment in the sum of $5,000 entered by the Superior Court of the State of California in and for the city and county of San Francisco, Calif., in case numbered 322,295, minute book 671, page 403, in favor of Carl E. Lawson and against Joseph A. Rice, has been satisfied and discharged of record: *And provided further*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE HAMPTON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1279) for the relief of George Hampton.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to George Hampton, 566 Campbell Street, Wilkinsburg, Pittsburgh 21, Pa., the sum of $12,361.23, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and property damage sustained when he emerged from the entrance of the Union Trust Building, Pittsburgh, Pa., and while crossing Grant Street was struck by a vehicle driven by William E. Wagner, who was employed by the United States postal service, on November 24, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. JUDGE E. ESTES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1280) for the relief of Mrs. Judge E. Estes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Judge E. Estes, the sum of $7,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by Mrs. Estes when the automobile in which she was riding was struck by an Army vehicle on June 16, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $7,500.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$7,500" and insert "$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELIZABETH ROWLAND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1286) for the relief of Elizabeth Rowland.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Elizabeth Rowland, of route 1, Fosterville, Tenn., the sum of $2,212.50, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of loss of wages and personal injuries sustained by the said Elizabeth Rowland when the car in which she was riding was struck by a United States Army ambulance on United States Highway No. 241, 1 mile south of Murfreesboro, Tenn., on December 24, 1943. No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANK J. PATZKE ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1299) for the relief of Frank J. Patzke, Archie

Mitchell, J. L. Shoemaker, Einer Engen, and N. L. Gifford.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to each of the following persons the sum specified with respect to such person, in full settlement of all claims of such person against the United States on account of the death of the person or persons indicated who were killed in an explosion of a Japanese bomb near Bly, Oreg., on May 5, 1945:

Frank J. Patzke, Grand Forks, N. Dak., the total sum of $6,000 for the death of his minor son, Richard Joe Patzke, and his minor daughter, Ethel Jean Patzke;

Archie Mitchell, Bly, Oreg., the sum of $5,000 for the death of his wife, Mrs. Elsie Mitchell;

J. L. Shoemaker, Bly, Oreg., the sum of $3,000 for the death of his minor son, Sherman Shoemaker;

Einar Engen, Bly, Oreg., the sum of $3,000 for the death of his minor son, Edward Millan Engen; and

N. L. Gifford, Bly, Oreg., the sum of $3,000 for the death of his minor son, Jay Gifford: *Provided*, That no part of any sum appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the claim satisfied by the payment of such sum, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. HOPE IRENE BULEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1300) for the relief of Mrs. Hope Irene Buley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Hope Irene Buley (formerly Hope Irene Dotseth), Bozeman, Mont., the sum of $23,912.50. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Hope Irene Buley against the United States on account of personal injuries, loss of wages, and medical, hospital, and other expenses sustained by her as a result of being wounded, on December 25, 1942, in the Oasis Night Club, Black Eagle, Mont., by a bullet discharged from the gun of a member of the military police who was acting within the scope of his authority with respect to a disturbance in such night club: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$23,912.50" and insert "$7,912.50."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A. J. CROZAT, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1452) for the relief of A. J. Crozat, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to A. J. Crozat, Jr., New Orleans, La., the sum of $15,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said A. J. Crozat, Jr., against the United States on account of permanent physical disability resulting from the withdrawal of blood, to be used in the treatment of members of the armed forces of the United States, at a Red Cross blood donor center in New Orleans, La., on December 13, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$15,000" and insert "$7,026.88."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

E. NEILL RAYMOND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1459) for the relief of E. Neill Raymond.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to E. Neill Raymond, examiner, Farmers Home Administration, Denver, Colo., the sum of $130.78, which represents the cost of transporting his immediate family from Washington, District of Columbia, to Denver, Colo., on August 21, 1946: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE L. J. HOUZE CONVEX GLASS CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1461) for the relief of the L. J. Houze Convex Glass Co.

Mr. LICHTENWALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. LICHTENWALTER]?

There was no objection.

E. LA REE SMOOT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1471) for the relief of E. La Ree Smoot.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $7,000 to E. La Ree Smoot, of Kennewick, Wash., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for permanent disfigurement of the face and hands sustained as the result of injuries on November 13, 1943, while employed as a junior clerk-stenographer, post engineers, Army air base, Madras, Oreg.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES I. MATTHEWS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1489) for the relief of James I. Matthews.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to James I. Matthews, New York, N. Y., the sum of $2,812.65. Such sum represents the amount (exclusive of the amount which would have been deducted for subsistence) which the said James I. Matthews would have received for the period February 6, to October 19, 1946, both dates inclusive, if he had been continued during such period in an active-duty status as a lieutenant in the United States Naval Reserve. The said James I. Matthews was admitted to the United States Naval Hospital, St. Albans, N. Y., on January 29, 1946, while on terminal leave which expired on February 5, 1946, and was discharged from such hospital on October 20, 1946. A dispatch of the Secretary of the Navy known as Alstacon 222258, dated March 18, 1946, provided for the continuance on active duty of naval officers hospitalized while on terminal leave, but such dispatch was not made retroactive and, therefore, did not include the said James I. Matthews.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, add the following: ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARTHUR F. SALADINO ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1490) for the relief of the estates of Arthur F. Saladino, Joseph Spivack, and Irving Weinberg.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Arthur F. Saladino, of Brooklyn, N. Y., the sum of $4,700, to the estate of Joseph Spivack, of New York, N. Y., the sum of $4,700, and to the estate of Irving Weinberg, of Brooklyn, N. Y., the sum of $4,700 in full satisfaction of the claims of each estate against the United States for compensation for the death of the said Arthur F. Saladino, Joseph Spivack, and Irving Weinberg as a result of personal injuries sustained by them when the taxicab in which they were passengers was struck by a United States Army vehicle on Route 5, near Clinton, Prince Georges County, Md., on February 21, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provision of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and up conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF ROSE MARY AMMIRATO, A MINOR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1501) for the relief of the legal guardian of Rose Mary Ammirato, a minor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000 to the legal guardian of Rose Mary Ammirato, a minor, of Brooklyn, N. Y., for personal injury on August 30, 1944, by reason of the negligent driving of a post-office truck which resulted in certain injuries: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$3,500."

Page 1, line 7, after the word "New York", strike out the balance of line 7, all of line 8, and line 9 down to and including the word "injuries" and insert "in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical, hospital, and other expenses sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States mail truck, at the intersection of Fourteenth Avenue and Sixty-first Street, Brooklyn, New York, on August 20, 1944."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HAL W. CLINE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1597) for the relief of Hal W. Cline.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Hal W. Cline, Atlanta, Ga., the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Hal W. Cline against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by him on October 1, 1943, when he was knocked down by several soldiers while performing his duties as passenger-train conductor of the Atlanta & West Point Railroad Co.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BEN GRUNSTEIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1602) for the relief of Ben Grunstein.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby remitted the unpaid balance of $1,500 upon a judgment on a forfeited bail bond of Ruben Finn, on which Ben Grunstein was surety, which judgment in the sum of $2,500 was entered against the said Ben Grunstein in the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey, as of record December 6, 1940, and on which judgment the sum of $1,000 has already been paid to the United States and the United States attorney is authorized and directed to enter satisfaction of the judgment. The said Ruben Finn was subsequently located and arrested in Houston, Tex., in January 1942, removed to the southern district of Indiana, where he pleaded guilty and was sentenced to a term of imprisonment for 3 years.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COHEN, GOLDMAN & CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1794) for the relief of Cohen, Goldman & Co., Inc.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER]?

There was no objection.

EDWARD L. BARRERAS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1983) for the relief of Edward L. Barreras.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Edward L. Barreras, Canoga Park, Calif., the sum of $6,100. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Edward L. Barreras against the United States on account of personal injuries received by him on March 3, 1944, as a result of a collision between the car in which he was riding and a United States Army vehicle at the intersection of Manchester and Avalon Streets, Los Angeles, Calif.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM PRICE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2089) for the relief of William Price.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to credit the accounts of William Price, of River Edge, N. J., in the sum of $3,280.18, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for services rendered as acting postmaster at River Edge, N. J., from October 1, 1945, to August 19, 1946: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EVA C. NETZLEY RIDLEY ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2261) for the relief of Eva C. Netzley Ridley, William G. Stuff, Lois Stuff, and Harry E. Ridley; and the estates of Clyde C. Netzley and Sarah C. Stuff.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Eva C. Netzley Ridley, of Naperville, Ill., the sum of $1,000; to the administrator of the estate of Clyde C. Netzley, deceased, late of Naperville, Ill., the sum of $5,000; to William G. Stuff, of Mercersburg, Pa., the sum of $1,000; to William G. Stuff, as administrator of the estate of Sarah C. Stuff, deceased, late of Mercersburg, Pa., the sum of $2,000; to Lois Stuff, nee Greenawalt, of Mercersburg, Pa., the sum of $3,500; and to Harry E. Ridley, of

Naperville, Ill., the sum of $168.85; in all, $12,668.85, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, death, and property damage sustained in a collision with a National Park Service truck, operated in connection with the Civilian Conservation Corps, on August 24, 1935, at the intersection of Thirty-first Street with Illinois State Highway No. 54, near Hinsdale, Du Page County, Ill.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROY DURBIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2352) for the relief of Roy Durbin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Roy Durbin, of Winchester, Ind., the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement of hospital, medical, nurses, and other expenses incurred by him, as a result of an accident which occurred while he was riding in a bus from Winchester, Ind., to Fort Harrison, Ind., operated by the United States Government and delivering inductees to Fort Harrison, which is near Indianapolis, Ind., and while so being transported the driver carelessly ran the bus into a wagon, causing a collision, and causing great injury to said Roy Durbin. That said collision and accident occurred on June 9, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAURA SPINNICHIA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 652) for the relief of Laura Spinnichia.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Laura Spinnichia, of 299 First Street, Rochester, N. Y., the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by her and for reimbursement of medical, hospital, and other expenses incurred by her as the result of her having slipped and fallen on a dangerously slippery floor in McDonald Hall at the United States Naval Academy on or about the 26th day of September 1938: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. FLORENCE BYVANK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2453) for the relief of Mrs. Florence Byvank.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

FRANK E. BLANCHARD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2474) for the relief of Frank E. Blanchard.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Frank E. Blanchard, of Fort Pierce, Fla., the sum of $10,000, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States on account of personal injuries resulting from a gunshot wound inflicted on November 2, 1943, by Gerald T. Tansey, seaman, first class, United States Coast Guard Reserve: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$5,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN C. NUNES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2605) for the relief of John C. Nunes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John C. Nunes, the sum of $500 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical, and hospital expenses sustained by his minor daughter Virginia Nunes when she was struck by a Navy vehicle on September 21, 1944, in Taunton, Mass.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LT. JOHN T. MCDERMOTT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 279) to authorize the advance on the retired list of Lt. John T. McDermott, United States Navy, retired, to the grade of lieutenant commander.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, Lt. John T. McDermott, United States Navy, retired, shall be advanced to the grade of lieutenant commander on the retired list effective for all purposes from the date of his retirement.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING ACCEPTANCE OF CERTAIN GIFTS AND A FOREIGN DECORATION

The Clerk called the bill (S. 632) to authorize certain personnel and former personnel of the Naval Establishment to accept certain gifts and a foreign decoration tendered by foreign governments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

ALEX BAIL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 668) for the relief of Alex Bail.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LICHTENWALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

MRS. MARGARET GREGG DILNOT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 711) for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Gregg Dilnot.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) Mrs. Margaret Gregg Dilnot, a natural-born citizen of the United States born in New York, N. Y., on November 19, 1874, who lost citizenship of the United States by voting in the British election in 1945, may be naturalized by taking, prior to 1 year from the enactment of this act, before any naturalization court specified in subsection (a) of section 301 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 335 of the said act.

(b) From and after naturalization under this act, Mrs. Margaret Gregg Dilnot shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ADA M. RYAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1035) for the relief of Mrs. Ada M. Ryan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 15, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 136 (e)), Ada M. Ryan, the wife of a citizen of the United States who served honorably in the armed forces of the United States during World War II, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence under the act approved December 28, 1945 (Public Law 271, 79th Cong.), if she is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, after the word "residence", strike out the balance of line 9 and all of line 10 down to the word "if."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JEANNETTE AND JESUS ESTEVA AND THEIR FOUR CHILDREN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1041) for the relief of Jeannette and Jesus Esteva and their four children.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Jeannette and Jesus Esteva and their four children, as of August 13, 1945, the date on which they arrived at the port of San Francisco, Calif. From and after the date of the approval of this act, Jeannette and Jesus Esteva and their four children should be deemed to be lawfully admitted residents of the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

On line 10, substitute a comma for the period as it appears after the words "United States" and add the following: "upon payment of visa fees and head tax."

Add section 2, to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct six numbers from the nonpreference category of the first available immigration quota of the Philippine Islands."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIA VELTRI MAGNONE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1079) for the relief of Maria Veltri Magnone.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration laws, relating to the issuance of immigration visas for admission to the United States for permanent residence, and relating to admission at ports of entry of aliens as immigrants for permanent residence in the United States, the provision of section 3 of the act of February 15, 1917 (39 Stat. 875), as amended (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 136 (a)), which excludes from admission into the United States "persons who have had one or more attacks of insanity at any time previously" shall not hereafter be held to apply to Maria Veltri Magnone; that the Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to grant to said Maria Veltri Magnone permission to reapply for admission into the United States for permanent residence, after deportation; and the said Maria Veltri Magnone, who is the wife of Peter Magnone, a citizen of the United States, if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, may be issued an immigration visa and may be granted admission to the United States for permanent residence upon application hereafter filed.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That notwithstanding the provisions of the second category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (8 U. S. C. 136 (a)), or any provisions of the act of March 4, 1929, relating to entry after deportation (8 U. S. C. 180), Maria Veltri Magnone, the wife of a citizen of the United States, and the mother of a United States citizen daughter, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence, provided that she is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. SILVIA MAPELLI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1460) for the relief of Mrs. Silvia Mapelli.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 4 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, or of section 404 of the Nationality Act of 1940 (relating to loss of nationality by naturalized citizens), Mrs. Silvia Mapelli, a naturalized citizen of the United States temporarily residing in Italy, shall not be considered to have lost her United States citizenship by reason of any period of residence outside the United States prior to the date of enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That Mrs. Silvia Mapelli, a naturalized citizen of the United States, who lost citizenship by voting in an Italian plebiscite, may be naturalized by taking prior to 1 year from the enactment of this act, before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 335 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended.

"SEC. 2. From and after naturalization under this act, Mrs. Silvia Mapelli shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PETER DROZD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1508) for the relief of Peter Drozd.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the immigration laws Peter Drozd shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on the date on which he entered the United States, upon the payment by him of the visa fee and head tax.

SEC. 2. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any warrants of arrest or orders of deportation which may have been issued, and to discontinue any deportation proceedings which may have been commenced, in the case of the said Peter Drozd. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that said quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KIRA AND NINA GRIGORIEFF

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1629) for the relief of Kira and Nina Grigorieff.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding section 303 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (54 Stat. 1140; 8 U. S. C. 703, 57 Stat. 600), and section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 161–162; 50 Stat. 165; 48 Stat. 581; 8 U. S. C. 213 (c)), Kira and Nina Grigorieff, the stepchildren of Paul D. Kalv, a major in the United States Army Reserve, shall be deemed to be admissible to the United States for permanent residence, provided they are otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. Under the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall authorize the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the Japanese quota for the first year said quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN J. O'NEIL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 729) for the relief of John J. O'Neil.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John J. O'Neil, 16 Arlington Street, Leominster, Mass., the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said John J. O'Neil against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by him on February 5, 1944, when the automobile he was driving was struck by a United States Army truck, vehicle No. W-254973, at Washington Street and Merriam Avenue, Leominster, Mass.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$2,344."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BEN LUKE POND ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1878) for the relief of Ben Luke Pond, Mrs. Shao Hung Pond, and their son, David Yat Wei Pond, aged 11 years.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to record the lawful admission into the United States for permanent residence of Ben Luke Pond, his wife, Mrs. Shoa Hung Pond, and their son David Yat Wei Pond, aged 10 years, as of September 14, 1946, the date on which they last entered the United States, provided they are otherwise admissible under the immigration laws of the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "aged 10 years" and on page 2, line 1, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct three numbers from the quota for Chinese persons for the first year that such quota numbers are available."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Ben Luke Pond, Shao Hung Pond, and David Yat Wei Pond."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MARY T. MALONEY PREECE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1599) for the relief of Mrs. Mary T. Maloney Preece.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the time limitation for execution of applications for retirement under section 6 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is hereby waived in favor of Mrs. Mary T. Maloney Preece, of Newport, R. I., formerly employed at the naval torpedo station, Newport, R. I., and her application for retirement on account of disability under such section 6 shall be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if she files such application with the Civil Service Commission not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOREST L. WEATHERLY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2268) for the relief of Forest L. Weatherly.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Forest L. Weatherly, Minneapolis, Minn., the sum of $2,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Forest L. Weatherly against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, and loss of earnings which he sustained as a result of being struck, on March 11, 1944, at the intersection of Fourth Avenue South and Ninth Street South, Minneapolis, Minn., by an automobile operated by an employee of the Post Office Department engaged in the performance of his duties as a special-delivery mail carrier for the United States post office at Minneapolis: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$2,500" and insert "$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FREDA WAHLER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2704) for the relief of Freda Wahler.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF JOSEPH DESOUZA, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2708) for the relief of Joseph DeSouza, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $15,000, to the legal guardian of Joseph DeSouza, Jr., of 630 Enloe Street, El Monte, Calif., formerly of Honolulu, T. H., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and medical and hospital expenses incident thereto, sustained as the result of an accident involving a United States Army airplane on Dillingham Boulevard, Honolulu, T. H., on June 8, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That completes the call of bills on the Private Calendar.

AUTHORIZING CERTAIN NAVAL PERSONNEL TO ACCEPT CERTAIN GIFTS AND A FOREIGN DECORATION

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to the bill (S. 632) to authorize certain personnel and former personnel of the Naval Establishment to accept certain gifts and a foreign decoration tendered by foreign governments, No. 74, and its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has the gentleman secured the consent of both objectors?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes. I spoke to the objectors. There was some confusion as to whether it should be on the Consent Calendar or Private Calendar.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What does this bill do?

Mr. BROOKS. It simply authorizes 38 officers and 20 enlisted men in the Navy to accept small decorations and small gifts that have been tendered them by foreign governments and now on deposit with the Secretary of State.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. These men are still in the service of the Government?

Mr. BROOKS. Some of them are former servicemen.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Are they in the service at the present time?

Mr. BROOKS. Not all of them, as I understand. There are a few who are out. They were tendered these decorations and gifts over a period of 15 years and they are now on deposit with the Secretary of State.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I think I shall ask the gentleman to withdraw his request at this time.

Mr. BROOKS. Very well, Mr. Speaker.

MAKING IMMIGRATION QUOTAS AVAILABLE TO ASIAN AND PACIFIC PEOPLES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 121 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 199) to provide the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence, to make immigration quotas available to Asian and Pacific peoples, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute

rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution No. 121 makes in order the consideration of the bill (H. R. 199) to provide the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence, to make immigration quotas available to Asian and Pacific peoples, and for other purposes.

The bill has been reported unanimously from the Committee on the Judiciary, and should receive your earnest consideration.

The real objective of the bill is to eliminate all racial barriers in existing naturalization laws, and to make it possible for Asian and Pacific peoples to enter the United States as quota immigrants.

The bill extends to the peoples of other Asian and Pacific countries the opportunity to emigrate to the United States as has been done formerly by special legislation for the Chinese and to the peoples of India. The total number of such Oriental peoples who would be admitted thereunder, would equal less than 1 percent of the sum of all the present quotas.

The bill creates a so-called Asia-Pacific triangle which embraces that section of the world which hitherto has not been included in our immigration scheme. A special quota for this section has been provided for. The increase effects a horizontal level merely, for a special quota will be obtained by subtracting small amounts from the now extant eligibility lists of other countries. Racial barriers will no longer exist in United States immigration policy. Strict standards are set forth, yet they will allow families of those men of Japanese and other denominations within the triangle to enter the United States under the quota set forth. Japanese men who fought in American military units may now bring their loved ones to the United States, and rightly so. These Japanese soldiers who fought in American uniform, and on behalf of the great cause of American democracy, and who have demonstrated and proven themselves extremely courageous, received the highest of American military honors. The stories of their deeds will go down in history as living testimony of the will and desire to exemplify American ideals and principles. They should now have an opportunity to bring their families and dear ones to America—the land of the free and the home of the brave.

All immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence will have the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States. This right was fought for by young, courageous men, and we are now rewarding them, in part, for their deeds on behalf of Americanism.

I have before me the report of the Committee on the Judiciary. I have read it carefully and I am satisfied that the committee has given real study and understanding to this legislation.

I urge your support in the adoption of this resolution and in the passage of the bill.

I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, there has been no requests for time on this side of the aisle for debate on the rule itself.

Mr. SABATH. In that event, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 199) to provide the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence, to make immigration quotas available to Asian and Pacific peoples, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 199, with Mr. HART in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] is recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to the gentleman from Michigan that he yield to the author of the bill at the inception of the discussion of this bill?

Mr. MICHENER. I appreciate the gentleman's suggestion, although it is a little unusual, in that he is attempting to arrange the allocation of time for the minority.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is technical and lengthy. The members of the subcommittee to which it was referred held hearings and conferred with the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization, the Department of Justice and the Department of State, which departments have to do with the administration of our immigration and naturalization laws. The author of the bill, by reason of his background and his long experience in the Far East, is especially well qualified to father such a measure.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call to the attention of the membership the committee report accompanying the bill. It was written by the able gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT]. In that report can be found most of the answers to the questions that will be asked here today. Special reference is called to the map on page 9 of the report. I call particular attention to that part of the report which reads as follows:

THE PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is (1) to provide without racial restriction the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence; (2) to make immigration quotas available to Asian and Pacific peoples in accordance with the national origins provisions of the 1924 Immigration Act, under specific provision that persons indigenous to an Asia-Pacific triangle described therein shall be charged to the quota for the quota area to which they are by ancestry indigenous, wherever born; (3) to place in quota status the alien husbands, wives, and unmarried children of United States citizens who are chargeable to a quota area having a quota of less than 200; (4) to provide a priority of up to 75 percent for aliens immigrating to the United States chargeable to quota areas within the Asia-Pacific triangle who were born and are resident therein; (5) to simplify the mechanics of computing quotas by providing that the annual quota for any quota area shall be one-sixth of 1 percent of the number of inhabitants in the continental United States in 1920 attributable by national origin to that quota area; (6) to provide an annual limit of 100 immigrants from each colony, chargeable to the quota of the governing country.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Twice within the past 5 years Congress has amended the Nationality Act of 1940 and the Immigration Act of 1924 to extend the privilege of naturalized citizenship and of immigration to the United States under national origins quotas to peoples indigenous to countries of the Far East. By the act of December 17, 1943 (Chinese) and that of July 2, 1946 (Filipino persons and persons of races indigenous to India), the Congress covered countries accounting for approximately three-fourths of the 1,130,000,000 previously ineligible inhabitants of Asia. At the same time, under direct application of the national origins provisions of the Immigration Act of 1924, total quota immigration of the peoples indigenous to these countries was limited to 305 annually.

The bill states nothing new in terms of basic policy, but merely extends to the one-fourth of the population of Asia and adjacent islands (about a third of whom live in Japan) the same naturalization and immigration privileges as Congress has already applied, in laws that are working well, to the Chinese and to the peoples of India and the Philippines.

The bill under consideration will carry this policy to completion, while the possible annual number of immigrants from the Far East remains less than 1 percent of total authorized immigration.

Effect on nationality law

The most immediate effect of enactment of this bill will be to make eligible for naturalization those legally permanent residents of the United States who have hitherto been ineligible because of race.

According to the United States census of 1940, there were resident in the United States and its Territories 84,658 aliens of Japanese descent, 3,139 of Korean descent, and 145 who were listed as Polynesians and other Asians.

Because of the provisions of the Immigration Act of 1924, which prohibited entry for permanent residence after July 1 of that year, these persons have been resident in the United States for at least 25 years, with the larger proportion having been here 35 years or more.

During public hearings held April 19 and 21, 1948, on H. R. 5004, introduced by Representative WALTER H. JUDD, of Minnesota, later amended and perfected as H. R. 6809, with which the present bill is identical, Representative GEORGE P. MILLER, of California, offered the following testimony:

"While serving as a member of the Immigration and Naturalization Committee in the Seventy-ninth Congress, I learned of the many disabilities to which these persons who are ineligible to citizenship are subjected. Most of these alien residents of the United States who are ineligible to citizenship are,

of course, those of Japanese ancestry. I have many of these Japanese aliens in my district.

"From my long experience with them and their children, first as a student, then as an engineer, and later as executive secretary to the California Division of Fish and Game and a State assemblyman, I have come to know them for the fine, thrifty people that they are. They are law abiding, believe in higher education for their children, and contribute generously to such community projects as the Red Cross, community chest, and other local drives. * * *

"They (the first-generation Japanese), although subjects of Japan because they could not become American citizens, served the United States in every way possible. Many of them helped in vital war services, such as were brought out during our hearings on various bills to prevent the deportation of certain Japanese aliens who had aided our war effort in the Seventy-ninth Congress. They served as map drawers and makers, as interpreters and translators, as documentarians, and even in counterespionage. Their real loyalties were with the United States and they helped defeat the country to which they owe technical allegiance.

"Moreover, the records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Army and Navy Intelligence show that there was not a single case of espionage or sabotage by a resident alien or Japanese-American before, during, and since the attack on Pearl Harbor.

"Certainly, people like these who have lived in the United States for almost half a century should be allowed to become citizens of the land they love so well."

(Legislation identical with H. R. 199 was introduced in the Eighty-first Congress by Mr. MILLER as H. R. 90. In addition, identical legislation was introduced by Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, of Pennsylvania (H. R. 308), Delegate JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, of Hawaii (H. R. 1214), and Representative SIDNEY R. YATES, of Illinois (H. R. 1444).)

The committee has been impressed by the record of loyalty and dependability of these people during World War II, when the native country of the largest segment was at war with the United States. All authorities are in agreement that there was no sabotage or espionage by a person of Japanese ancestry resident in the United States or Hawaii, either before, during, or after Pearl Harbor.

The demonstration of loyalty given by the Nisei, American-born children of Japanese immigrants, who volunteered for military service from behind the barbed wire of relocation centers is well known. They served with great distinction in both the European and Pacific theaters of war. Among the testimony presented during the open hearings held April 19 and 21, 1948, was that of Mike Masaoka, himself a veteran of the fighting in Italy and France with the Four Hundred and Forty-second Regimental Combat Team. Speaking of this unit, he said:

"I say this not to brag about our outfit—although I think it is an American trait to brag about a good outfit like that—but I say it simply to indicate that here you had a great number of American soldiers of Japanese ancestry who believed in America, who so believed in it that even though they were incarcerated in virtual prisons they saw behind and beyond the barbed-wire fences; they saw beyond the watchtowers manned by armed MP's; they saw America, just and fair-minded, willing to give them and their parents a decent break.

"And that is why, even though they were suspected by their own Government, they went out and fought as well as they did.

"Amazingly enough, right in the fox holes before battle we would talk about a lot of things; but the No. 1 topic was this: Sure, we wanted America to win the war, but we also wanted America to be the kind of America that it professed to be, and that kind of America would not discriminate against people like my mother, who came here early in the 1900's. When she had eight children, dad died leaving us practically penniless. Yet my mother saw every one of us through school, a number of us through college, and when the test of supreme loyalty to this country came it was my mother who first said, 'Boys, your job is to go out and fight for these United States, because it is my country.'

"Well, there were lots of other mothers and fathers like that, and, as I say, their sons and I knew each other overseas, and over and over again they insisted that my job was to come and tell you, the Congress of the United States, what their loyalties were—loyalties which could not be questioned.

"I am very full on this subject. I could go and talk on and on, because I know these people (the noncitizen parents of the Nisei), as I say, and I wish I had the opportunity to tell you more about them. I am sure that no one can deny one fundamental fact: These people are Americans by every standard of conduct that you can think of except that of technically 'belonging.'

"I, as an American soldier, fought, with the thousands, millions, of other American soldiers, for the right of all people to be recognized as individuals, and that is all we are asking, not to be judged or classified on the basis of race.

"I plead with you not to make my promise to some of the boys overseas in vain. I can still remember them * * * on the field of war, on the field of battle, when race and nationality count for nothing and the worth of a man counts for everything, I think we children of these people who are ineligible for citizenship proved that we belonged. We now want our parents to belong."

The validity of this record was backed by outstanding military and civilian testimony. The following written testimony was presented at these hearings on behalf of Mark W. Clark, general, United States Army, who could not personally appear:

"The supreme test of citizenship is the willingness of a man to risk his life so that our country may live.

"Under my command in Italy the Four Hundred and Forty-second Infantry Regiment and the One Hundredth Infantry Battalion, composed of Nisei, fought the Nazi combat forces with the valor and skill characteristic of the young Americans that they are.

"One of the brave number, Sadao S. Munemori, of Los Angeles, member of the battle-famous Four Hundred and Forty-second Infantry, symbolizes the gallantry of these Americans of Japanese ancestry in fighting for the liberty of our beloved country. In Italy he wiped out two enemy machine-gun nests and saved the lives of two of his companions by throwing himself on a hand grenade; this resulted in his death. He was awarded America's highest combat award—the United States Congressional Medal of Honor—and an American transport today bears his name.

"Surely his parents and those of the other Nisei, through the loyalty of their offspring, have earned the right to citizenship in the world's greatest nation—a nation that distinguishes not at all between race, creed, or color.

"As I recall the outstanding feats of valor in combat of the members of the Four Hundred and Forty-second Infantry and the One Hundredth Infantry Battalion, the number of Purple Hearts awarded to them because of wounds received in battle, and their extremely low hospital rate because of their eagerness to return to the line after having been wounded, I can only urge that the rights of citizenship in our great America be given to the parents who furnished us with such outstanding young manhood, men who willingly gave their all that America could live.

"The parents of these heroic Nisei should have the privileges of the democracy their sons helped to preserve."

Concerning those who served in the Pacific theater, former Brig. Gen. Bonner Fellers, who during the entire campaign in the Pacific was psychological warfare officer and military secretary to Gen. Douglas MacArthur, entered written testimony as follows:

"I have first-hand, intimate knowledge of the service rendered by the Nisei in General MacArthur's headquarters during operations against the Japanese. The loyalty of the Nisei was absolute, and their willingness to go to the front where capture, even their presence, meant risk of their lives. I have the highest regard for the Nisei and feel the United States owes them a debt of gratitude for the magnificent service which they rendered in the Pacific."

To this testimony was added that of the honorable John J. McCloy, wartime Under Secretary of War:

"I believe legislation such as this, at least as it affects the interests of the Japanese-Americans, is only an appropriate form of recognition for the loyalty which Japanese-Americans as a whole evidenced to this country during the war.

"As you perhaps know, I was very much involved in the movement of the Japanese-American population from the west coast in the early days of the war. The measure which was taken was harsh and very difficult to carry out. It was done, I believe, in the best interests of the country and of the Japanese-Americans themselves. Every effort was made that could be made to soften the impact on that population of this forced movement, but, with all the precautions and all the considerations that were given, at best it was an unfortunate necessity and worked many hardships.

"During this difficult period I came in contact with the leaders of that population and visited the camps on several occasions. The behavior of these people made it possible to carry out the measure without, I should say, any serious incident. They were cooperative and their conduct, barring a very few who I believe would not be involved in the benefits of this legislation, was exemplary and provoked my admiration as it did many others who came in contact with them.

"Subsequently I took an active part in urging the Army to form the Japanese-American battalions and followed their organization very closely. There is nothing I did in my service in the War Department in which I took greater satisfaction than this. The record of the Nisei battalions is one of the most spectacular of all our military units. They endured many hard and even bitter campaigns. Their record shows that they won at least as many, if not more, decorations for bravery as any unit of the same size in the entire Army.

"In every respect they performed their fullest duty to the country. Their casualties were heavy, and I think that their conduct and the conduct of the Japanese-Americans in Hawaii and elsewhere throughout the United States is the strongest evidence one could ask for of their full loyalty to the country.

"As I have said at the beginning, it would seem to me that your proposed legislation would be a most fitting acknowledgment of the service and conduct of the Japanese-Americans during the recent war."

In this record of outstanding devotion to the highest principles of Americanism, the committee finds conclusive grounds for admission of the qualified members of this small group to the priceless privileges of United States citizenship. It is a matter of simple justice to do so.

In addition, the committee strongly feels that those who are permanent residents of the United States should be placed in a position to assume the responsibilities of citizenship while permitted to enjoy the opportunities and privileges which living here bestow. Ample evidence has been presented that those persons resident in the United States covered by this bill are most anxious

to assume the responsibilities of citizenship while permitted to enjoy the opportunities of citizenship, and that only the provisions of our present nationality law prevent them from doing so.

The committee is of the opinion that it is sound public policy that all aliens permanently resident in the United States should be urged to become naturalized citizens if able to meet the individual tests of citizenship, and that all barriers to naturalization, based on race, should be removed.

Effect on immigration law

The second part of this bill deals with immigration. The committee is impressed with the careful manner with which this matter has been worked out. The maximum number of possible immigrants from the Far East who might enter the United States under this bill would be entirely in keeping with the principle embodied in the national origins provisions of the Immigration Act of 1924, which seeks to preserve the ethnic and racial composition of the United States.

The committee believes that enactment of this bill will strongly benefit the foreign relations of the United States. Direct testimony of the Department of State in the 1948 hearings included the following statement:

"For many years the maintenance of normal friendly relations between the United States and oriental countries has been impeded by racial discrimination present in our immigration and naturalization laws. * * * Mr. JUDD's bill (H. R. 5004) has the hearty endorsement of the Department of State. It very much hopes that Congress will act promptly so that it may be passed at this session, for it is of key importance to our relations with the great peoples of the Orient."

On the same day, the Honorable Joseph C. Grew, former Ambassador to Japan, personally appeared to testify in favor of the bill. He said:

"I believe the present to be an exceptionally favorable time to take a step of this nature. * * * It seems to me to be the height of folly to ask the support of democratic elements in these countries (Japan, Burma, Indonesia, and others), yet at the very point where our democracy comes to test, to back away. If we want to hold our friends, we must support them. The ending of exclusion now would provide concrete proof of American good faith at a time when it is most important that new leadership be oriented in our direction."

It is significant that among the strongest supporters of this measure are organizations and Members of the House from the west coast. In the testimony noted earlier, Representative MILLER summarized the factors underlying this support as follows:

"And, as for immigration, we in California who look to the new Pacific era realize that the good will of the Asiatic and Pacific peoples is essential to our welfare and development. By eliminating the patent discrimination against these peoples, we would gain their good will and friendship at a time we need real friends all over the world. At the same time, because of the very limited numbers that would be allowed to enter the United States under the annual quotas set out for these peoples, we would not, in any way whatsoever, endanger California or any other State in the Union or jeopardize existing conditions."

The Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles and of the City and County of San Francisco unanimously passed resolutions favoring enactment, which resolutions were presented to the committee by Members from the coast.

The committee has before it a number of bills which attack this problem in piecemeal fashion, as well as many private bills, the necessity for which would be eliminated if this general measure is enacted. Much time, both of this committee and of the Congress, will be saved by enactment of this measure.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], the author of the bill, who will explain the bill section by section.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Minnesota yield before he goes into the discussion of the bill?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. There is a most unusual section in this bill, appearing on page 11, in lines 6 to 17. This section is directly aimed at the British West Indies. It discriminates against the immigration of Negroes from the West Indies. This now limits the immigration from that colony of Great Britain to 100. Can the gentleman explain why this language is in the bill, and who put it in there?

Mr. JUDD. This language was put in the bill to bring the provisions with respect to colonies, all the colonies that exist throughout the world, into a uniform and universal pattern. As the gentleman knows, under present law it is possible for persons who are of the white or the Negro or the American Indian race, and who were born in British possessions, to come into our country under the British quota, about 66,000 a year. In order to make eligible for immigration persons from the colonies in the Far East or elsewhere, who have heretofore been completely excluded because of their race, it was necessary to set up a uniform pattern. A limitation of 100 from each colony was established. That was the reason for the language. It was not in any sense to discriminate against anybody.

It was brought to our attention that it places these people of whom you speak under a limitation they have not had before. Heretofore, if they qualified as individuals, conceivably up to about 66,000 of them could come in from the British West Indies under the British quota, assuming none of the quota was used by immigrants from Britain. However, the gentleman will agree, I am sure, that that was not the intention of the Congress which passed the Immigration Act of 1924, setting up the national origins quota principle. It was not the intention, for example, when a quota of 66,000 was given to the British, because they were the dominant nationality in the settling and building of this country, that their quota could therefore be used by non-British peoples from their possessions all over the world, including their colonies. The language merely brings the whole pattern for colonies into uniformity.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman will have to admit, however, that in the operation of this language, if it ever becomes law, you are now limiting immigration from the British West Indies to 100.

Mr. JUDD. We are not limiting it any more from there than from other areas which did not have enough immigrants in this country in 1920 to entitle them to more than the minimum quota of 100, for example, British South Africa or New Zealand.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. But immigrants from the British West Indies have been coming to the United States by simply qualifying under the public charge or health provisions.

Mr. JUDD. They can still come in on a basis of equality with the other peoples of the world. This bill also reduces the number who can come from China, because Chinese wives of American citizens have been eligible as nonquota immigrants and are not under the bill. It also reduces the number that will be able to come from the Philippines. I regret these limitations, although I think they are necessary to get equality for all. We have had no complaint from them because for the first time in decades the bill puts all individuals on a plane of equality.

Surely the gentleman from New York wishes in this as in so many other matters that all should be accorded equality.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I do not think that you accomplish equality by discriminating against any group.

Mr. JUDD. There is no discrimination against them as a group. They are eligible under exactly the same principle and the same formula as all other people from colonies throughout the world.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. This definitely discriminates against the British West Indies. The reason, may I say to the gentleman, that you have had no complaint from them is that they do not know anything about this.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I am indeed grateful to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], for granting me the privilege of presenting this bill, which is very near to my heart. I am deeply grateful to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], for his fairness and nonpartisanship in reporting out my bill, for which I have been working so long. I first proposed before the Committee on Foreign Affairs on February 17, 1943, that such a change in our immigration laws be made. I had been a Member of Congress only 6 weeks. In May 1943, I proposed it specifically in testimony before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

My concern grew out of experience during the many years I lived in the Far East. In our efforts to help people there to understand Christian democracy, and to influence them to move in that direction themselves, frequently our biggest obstacle was the fact that in our so-called exclusion laws we had branded and stigmatized as inferior human beings the brown and yellow races, on the basis of the color of the pigment in their skin; something they were not responsible for and could not do anything about. This is an attempt to remove that totally unnecessary insult and injustice and to establish equality in our immigration laws, not in numbers, but in principle—the same principle that applies to other peoples.

Let me give you a bit of the history of how this problem developed. When gold was discovered out in California in 1848, and white men flocked to the west to get rich quick, there was immediate need for a lot of cheap labor. The best place to get it was across the Pacific, in China. When the transcontinental railroads were being built, especially the Southern

Pacific, to hook up the west coast with the rest of the Nation, they needed laborers who were able to endure great hardships and would work for small returns. So there was unlimited immigration of Chinese laborers to this country. They did not come at their request. We went over there and recruited them. Steamship agencies did an active business signing them up and bringing them in large numbers to this country. By 1876 there were 110,000 of them on the Pacific coast. It became obvious that a real problem was being created because the white population was still small and there was fear that it would be overwhelmed by people with lower standards of living and different social patterns. The so-called national origins quota principle for regulating immigration had not yet been evolved. So our Government did the natural thing. It passed increasingly strict exclusion laws between 1882 and 1913 whereby all Chinese were excluded as a group. The action was in violation of a treaty that we had with China guaranteeing most-favored-nation treatment—but we took the action nevertheless.

For many years we had the so-called gentlemen's agreement with Japan whereby she volunteered to limit the number of Japanese coming to this country to an agreed number.

Then in 1924 the national origins quota formula was devised and enacted into law. The countries of the world were divided into three main areas. First, the independent countries of the Western Hemisphere, Canada and the Latin-American countries. Persons born in those countries of the Caucasian, Negro, and American Indian races can come into the United States without any limitation at all. Those are the so-called nonquota countries.

The second group includes Europe, western Asia, and Africa. Persons born in those countries can come to this country under annual quotas whose size varies in proportion to the number of immigrants from those countries who were in the United States in the 1890 census.

Then there was a third group which included all the countries and possessions in a certain geographical area in the Far East comprising eastern and southern Asia and most of the islands of the Pacific. Persons of the yellow or brown races born in these areas or anywhere else in the world were excluded entirely.

Now, I have no quarrel with the national origins principle. I favor it. What I want is not to destroy it, but to extend it so it applies to the peoples now excluded entirely—those in group 3.

The 1924 law was understandable. There was the competition of cheap labor from the Orient, which was unfair to our American laborers. There was a genuine problem. If we had given as our reason the economic factors, which was where the real grievance lay, we would not have had any complaint from any oriental country. They know we have a perfect right to regulate our own immigration. But we cannot insult them just because of their race and still expect them to be favorably disposed toward us. That is what we did. We adopted a formula which said in effect, "Members of only three races are good enough to be eligible for naturalization in the United States: White people, persons of African descent, and persons of races indigenous to the Western Hemisphere. But persons of other races are, because of their race, ineligible for naturalization in the United States."

Then, having determined that definition of eligibility for naturalization, the immigration law set up quotas for those countries whose citizens were eligible for naturalization. Or rather quotas were established for all countries, but they could be used only by persons born in those countries of the three specified races. There was a quota for China, for example, but the Chinese could not use it, only the whites or Negroes born in China. There was a quota for India, but the Indians could not use it. Only the white, black, or red could use the quota—not the yellow or brown.

Under that arrangement, any alien, wherever born, who happened to be half yellow or brown, or more, by race, was permanently and irretrievably branded under our laws as an inferior human being, no matter what his or her personal character or attainments or charm or skill or ability might be.

At the time that law was being discussed in Congress, the Japanese Ambassador to the United States, Mr. Hanihara, made a statement which was diplomatically unwise but which has proved tragically accurate. He warned that if the United States passed that bill, it would have "grave consequences."

He should not have said it, because it sounded like a threat and only increased support for the bill. But the 4,000,000 Americans who fought in the Pacific will agree that it did have "grave consequences." It did more than any other single thing to turn Japan against us and toward militarism. Up to that time Japan had been moving definitely toward democracy. Baron Shidehara and many other leaders of great influence were favorable to the west.

Then, all of a sudden, their best friend, the United States, slapped them in the face. It discredited the growing democratic and liberal forces in Japan and turned leadership over to the militarists, who from that time on could say, "There is no hope of getting a decent deal for Asiatics from the white races. The only way we can get freedom and independence for Asia is to arm and eventually unite all of its peoples to throw the white man out."

As a result, Japanese militarism grew by leaps and bounds in the succeeding years, and it led right straight to Pearl Harbor.

One of the things I vowed when I saw the understandable resentment of the people of Asia against this totally gratuitous insult and its bad effects for our own country was that if I ever had a chance I would do my best to get that injustice removed. If I never got anything more through Congress than this, I would feel my service here worth while for my country.

Over in the other body a debate is going on as to whether we should pass a so-called civil-rights program seeking to compel justice in relations between races. There is a difference of opinion as to whether it is possible or wise to try to compel justice; but certainly it is possible and wise to remove an injustice that exists in the law. Surely nobody will disagree with that.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. I have in mind a specific case of an American soldier who, while in service in Japan, married a Japanese woman. Later he was discharged in the United States and then undertook to have his wife come to the United States. He has had very serious difficulty. Does this bill answer that question, and in what respect?

Mr. JUDD. This bill will make his wife eligible to go to an American consul in Japan and apply for a quota number to come to this country as an immigrant. At present she is permanently excluded because of her race.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. The bill does solve that problem, then?

Mr. JUDD. It will. It would not allow any large number of such cases to come in. She will still have to await her quota number. She cannot come in automatically as the wife of an American; but racially, she is no longer ineligible.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. But will this bill permit her preference as the wife of an American citizen?

Mr. JUDD. Yes, half the quota for Japan is reserved for wives, husbands, dependent children, and parents of American citizens. The woman you describe is in the group given preference.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. HAND. I think the gentleman has been clear, but will not the gentleman say quite specifically that this unnecessary insult to the Japanese people was a major cause of the war between Japan and the United States in 1941?

Mr. JUDD. Psychologically, it was the major cause, because it was the thing that first set modern Japan on the road of uncontrolled militarism which led straight to Pearl Harbor.

Mr. HAND. And the gentleman's bill, although it permits very few immigrants of Japanese birth, would nevertheless remove the great insult we gave them of excluding them entirely in the past.

Mr. JUDD. That is right; it removes at one stroke those racial insults for Japanese and all other previously excluded peoples. We started the process during the war when we granted a quota to the Chinese, partly because of the necessity of keeping China fighting and on our side. We took a similar step in 1946 for persons of races indigenous to India under a bill by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee [Mr. CELLER]. And we did the same for the Filipinos after they attained their independence. This bill completes the process, extending the quota principle to all persons still excluded, about a fourth of the people of Asia.

The bill does not remove our immigration barriers; it removes racial discrimination from the barriers.

Mr. HAND. And in order to make even better citizens out of those Japanese who are now citizens of this country.

Mr. JUDD. Yes, I was just coming to that. In the war of ideas that is going on all over the world today, the fierce contest for people's loyalties, this is a step of the utmost importance. We are so committed in Europe that many feel we cannot give as much material or military help to Asia as we should like; that only makes it all the more important that we give as much moral support as possible to our friends in Asia and help build up their will to fight with us and the free nations of the world against the glacier of tyranny moving out of the Soviet Union over parts of Asia as well as Europe.

Now let me get into the main provisions of the bill before I use up all my time in discussion of the general reasons for it. The bill does three major things: First, it removes race as a bar to eligibility to American citizenship. That is right at the bottom of the first page. We changed the old word "right" to "privilege" because it is a privilege, not a right, for an alien to become an American citizen.

The privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States shall not be denied or abridged because of race.

That makes it possible for all persons of whatever race, who have been legally admitted to this country for permanent residence, to become American citizens if they desire.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Thank you. The persons affected by this provision are those who remain of the approximately 86,000 persons of Asian origin, whom the 1940 census showed to be in this country and who were admitted prior to the passage of the 1924 act. They are here perfectly legally; they will be here as long as they live. They pay taxes. They are good law-abiding members of our communities, but they cannot now be naturalized because of their race, they cannot become American citizens. More than 95 percent of them are Japanese. There was not a case of sabotage among them during the war, although we will have to admit that we suspended the Bill of Rights in our Constitution by uprooting them from their homes and putting them in concentration camps for 3½ years. They had a right to feel bitter and hurt and aggrieved because their adopted country, which was taking their boys to fight for it, put them in concentration camps instead of letting them stay where they had established themselves. But instead they gave a demonstration of loyalty and genuine understanding of true Americanism that has never been surpassed and seldom equaled. They proved themselves as good or better Americans than we who wronged them. They gave 33,000 of their American-born sons as volunteers to the American armed forces. The Four Hundred and Forty-second Regimental Combat Team received more decorations and more casualties than any other outfit of comparable size in the whole American Army.

This bill gives the parents of those boys a chance to become respectable citizens of the country to which they gave so much instead of remaining as a sort of foreign body in our society. I cannot believe there is a single person who will oppose that feature of the bill. It is both rectification of an injustice and a token of the Nation's appreciation.

The second major feature of the bill is that it gives to all countries and dependencies in the world immigration quotas except those in the Western Hemisphere, which are on a nonquota basis, and there is no reason to change that. The bill makes the quota of each quota area usable by all those born in the area or who are attributable by as much as one-half of their ancestry to a race indigenous to the area. Japanese, for example, will be able to use the quota for Japan, as they cannot under existing law.

The third major feature of the bill is that, while establishing the principle of equality under a universal formula, it does not make possible any flood of oriental immigration, which was the fear that led to the original exclusion acts.

Only 185 additional quota numbers are granted—85 to Japan and 100 to the Asia-Pacific triangle. The total number available for persons of Asiatic ancestry will be only 1,890. Of these, 405 are already authorized in existing law. So, if every single available quota number were to be used by persons of races heretofore excluded, the total of such persons that could come in per year is only 1,485.

Many of the quota numbers will be used by Caucasians born in those countries, and it is inconceivable that any sizable number of persons will come from several of the quota areas, particularly Bhutan, Nauru, Nepal, New Guinea, Samoa, and the former Japanese mandated islands, each of which areas has a quota of 100. For instance, the Island of Nauru has only about 3,000 inhabitants. Obviously, they will never use a fraction of their quota. Out of those 600 quota numbers, it is inconceivable that more than 100 or so would ever be used in a given year.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. WALTER. I would like to point out to the gentleman apropos of what he has just said that Afghanistan has had a quota of approximately 1,000 for the last 10 years and only 14 people have come into this country under that quota.

Mr. JUDD. Yes; the highest estimate anyone has made of the number of Asians likely to enter this country as immigrants under this bill is less than 1,000 a year. I do not know anything else we might do in the field of foreign relations whereby for so little we can accomplish so much. On one hand, it cannot hurt or endanger in the slightest degree the United States as each of the immigrants will have to meet the regular physical, educational, financial, and moral qualifications. On the other hand, it will do more to strengthen the influence of the United States and her friends and defenders among half the people of the world than anything else I can think of. It undercuts the powerful propaganda against us, because it brings our deeds into harmony with our words. When our Government resists or condemns the imperialistic actions or aggressions of any other country toward peoples of other races, it gives our position moral stamina and integrity, it enhances our prestige, it produces confidence in our sincerity and will influence greatly the battle for men's minds and hearts that is going on between the two philosophies of life and government that are locked in mortal struggle in our world.

There are three or four more provisions I would just like to mention. The bill simplifies the manner of computing quotas by changing from the old fraction carried to the twelfth decimal point to one-sixth of 1 percent of the number of immigrants from a given quota area in the United States according to the 1920 census. That will reduce all quotas, above the minimum of 100, by a very small degree, amounting in toto to 635 less numbers available per year to all the world.

Some of the technical language in the bill is merely to repeal or modify existing law where superseded by or in conflict with the provisions of this bill.

One most important device, which is the heart of the mechanism, is the so-called Asia-Pacific triangle, to which is assigned a separate Asia-Pacific quota. If you will look in the committee report, you will find a map of the triangle which was worked out for us by the geographers of the State Department. Every immigrant from a country or dominion or trust territory under the United Nations, lying wholly within the Asia-Pacific triangle, must come in under the quota assigned to the given quota area, such as China, India, Japan, Siam, the Philippines, and so forth. Those from the colonies or other dependent areas within the triangle will come in under the Asia-Pacific quota of 100 a year. This solves, among other things, the extremely complicated problem of the persons of mixed blood, of which there are many. If one is attributable by as much as one-half of his ancestry to a people indigenous to a separate quota area, he is chargeable to that quota area. But if he is perhaps one-half Caucasian, a quarter Filipino, and a quarter Chinese, he is chargeable to the Asia-Pacific quota. Thus there is set up a carefully devised mechanism whereby it is possible to get every person, no matter how scrambled his ancestry, chargeable to some quota area or other, and thus make every person in the world eligible for immigration to the United States as far as race is concerned. He must, of course, qualify as an individual and wait his turn for a quota number.

These are the main features of the bill. There is only one change made by the committee which does not satisfy me, the provision in section 3 which prevents wives, unmarried children, and husbands of American citizens from coming in as nonquota immigrants, if the quota of their quota area is less than 200. I hope the Congress will see fit later to correct what I regard as a discrimination against those areas with the smaller quotas. But the bill is far better than seemed

possible only a few years ago. It does establish racial equality, and that is the overriding consideration. I hope it will be adopted unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to emphasize the fact that there is nothing partisan in this legislation. The bill under consideration was reported unanimously by a subcommittee of the Eightieth Congress, of which our distinguished friend from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS], was chairman. This bill is the result of a very careful consideration of a number of similar bills introduced during the last session and was reported only after extensive hearings.

As a matter of fact, during the closing days of the Eightieth Congress the House of Representatives from the Unanimous Consent Calendar approved one of the more important provisions of this bill, namely, that section which makes eligible for citizenship the parents of men who were killed or wounded while serving in the armed forces. So I shall not direct my brief remarks to that part of the bill because I am assuming that if it was passed once, when it was on the Unanimous Consent Calendar, there cannot be very much objection to the same proposal now.

I shall briefly discuss the second phase of the bill, which makes eligible for immigration and naturalization those people who have heretofore been ineligible for admission to the United States. I do that for the reason that perhaps we do not realize the importance that is placed on our acts here in the House of Representatives by foreign governments.

Just a few weeks ago when the Committee on the Judiciary by unanimous vote reported this bill, there appeared in a Japanese newspaper a very significant article commenting on the action, and I shall read it at this point:

Japanese sources said the United States House Judiciary Committee's approval of the Judd bill, revising the Oriental Exclusion Act, is winning friends here for America at the time when the United States and Soviet Russia are engaged in a cold war to win support of Japan and other oriental nations.

I think, if for no other reason, the good will that will be brought about through the enactment of this legislation should cause this body to vote as unanimously as possible for its enactment; that this action will prove conclusively that when we in America talk democracy we actually mean it; and that it is our purpose to eliminate whatever stigma has heretofore been placed on any other peoples of the world. This bill is fair.

In closing I would like to call your attention to just this one thing, that under this bill there will be practically no more people admitted to the United States than is the case under existing law.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the Delegate from Hawaii.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I would like to have the chairman of the subcommittee clarify the status of the Samoans and the Guamanians under this legislation.

Mr. WALTER. If they are not American nationals, they will have a quota. Under the table that the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] just called your attention to, it can be very readily seen that their quota will be the same as for the other people in this Asia-Pacific triangle, namely, 100 annually.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Would the gentleman say a word about the objection that is made to page 11 with respect to the exclusion of West Indian Negroes heretofore admitted?

Mr. WALTER. That question was raised last year, and the committee took the position that for reasons of equality of all colonial areas this provision should stay in the bill, but it is not an exclusion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT].

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Committee, I think if you will read the first and perhaps the second page of this report you will get a more comprehensive understanding of this somewhat technical bill. This bill endeavors to iron the kinks out of our immigration laws, at it were. It does not lower immigration barriers. It changes them to the extent that it removes race as a bar to immigration and treats all people equally within the standards of the immigration laws.

The first provision of the act and the one that I am most interested in removes race as a bar to naturalization, a thing which, it seems to me, we should have done long ago. In other words, people who are legally resident in this country, who have a right to reside here, who are going to live out their natural lives as bona fide legal residents of this country, should have a right to become naturalized if they can qualify under our naturalization laws notwithstanding their color. In other words, Japanese, Chinese, Polynesians, and so forth who have been living here under the old law may become naturalized citizens if this law passes and if they can meet character and intelligence standards.

During the war we observed the heroism of many of these people. The most decorated outfit in our Army in World War II was the Four Hundred and Forty-second Regimental Combat Team, made up entirely of Japanese-Americans. At great cost this regimental team at one time rescued a battalion of the Thirty-sixth Division, made up of Texans. They lost 200 men in rescuing 189. They never gave up a foot of territory throughout the war, and they never failed to take an objective assigned to them. Now, you have to take your hats off to folks who perform in such a manner. The fathers and mothers of these boys, many of whom gave their lives for this country, cannot become naturalized citizens under existing law. So in this bill we simply once and for all get away from the charge of discrimination on the basis of race.

We do not permit many to come in. Under the Asia-Pacific triangle, set up as a matter of geography, the very maximum that could ever come in from about one-fourth the earth's area during any one year would be 5,000. It is estimated that only a few hundred will come in from this area.

Again, we tie this bill down by providing as to countries having a quota of less than 200 that the wives and minor children of the people entering under those quotas do not come in as nonquota immigrants. So there can be no flood of immigration from these small-quota countries. That is not discriminatory because minimum quotas are given to people who would have had practically no quota if the formula were applied to them literally. The formula is one-sixth of 1 percent of the people of a race who were in this country in 1920. You take Samoa, for example. I do not know how many Samoans were here, but they probably would not have over 10 or 15 if the one-sixth of 1 percent quota were applied to them, whereas under the Immigration Act they would have 100.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. FARRINGTON. On the point of Samoans and Guamanians, I think there should be a clear statement as to how this law applies to Samoans resident under the American flag as distinguished from the western Samoans, who are now under the New Zealand flag. The same also should be stated for the people of Guam. The American Samoans and the Guamanians are American nationals. Am I to understand that under this bill they are free to come to this country only under a quota?

Mr. GOSSETT. There are no quotas on American nationals.

Mr. FARRINGTON. But they have the privileges of naturalization when they are residents of this country rather than Samoa and Guam?

Mr. GOSSETT. Under this bill any legal resident who can meet character and intelligence tests may become a naturalized citizen.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I think that point should be clarified.

Mr. CELLER. If the gentleman will yield, on the question of Samoa, the political question of Samoa is still fluid. We do not know exactly what the status of any of the Samoans is. A Samoan legally in the United States can become a naturalized citizen under this bill.

Mr. FARRINGTON. That is the point.

Mr. GOSSETT. Last year we reported out a bill relating to Siam. I think it passed the House, but it never became law. It was advocated by the State Department, and one of the reasons was that at that time we were negotiating with Siam for tin. The Russians were trying to buy tin from Siam. It was embarrassing to our people to go over there and try to do business with the Siamese

when they could say, "None of us can ever come to your country."

Instead of doing these things by piecemeal, a bite at a time, this bill does a complete job. It will take the place of the Siamese bill, the Indian bill, the Chinese bill, and a number of bills which my good friend the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. FARRINGTON] has introduced from time to time. The purpose of the bill is once and for all to remove these so-called inequalities based on blood alone. I believe the bill does that as well as it can be done. There is no way to write a bill to which some people will not object. Certainly we are not going to let the bars down to all people who want to come here in the numbers they would like to come. But this settles once and for all the question of color and the question of race, both in naturalization and in immigration. I feel that immigration laws should be tightened, made more restrictive, and should be better enforced. However, there should be no specific discriminations based on blood lines.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to further state for the record that certain provisions of this bill do not have the endorsement of the Department of State, although that Department did recommend the enactment of a previous draft, H. R. 5004, which contained the principal features of the present bill.

The particular portions of the two bills, to which I desire to make specific reference, are those which relate to the classification of the alien wives and the unmarried minor children of citizens of the United States. While H. R. 5004 provided that nonquota status should be accorded all alien wives and unmarried minor children of citizens of the United States, regardless of their ancestry or race, the present bill in effect provides that the alien wives and unmarried minor children of citizens of the United States shall be classified, as first-preference quota immigrants if they are chargeable to quotas of less than 200. This means that all Asian wives and unmarried minor children of citizens of the United States, and all those wives and unmarried minor children of the white or black race, who were born in countries such as Australia, South Africa, or Palestine, or any other country having a quota of less than 200 annually, would not be granted nonquota status, but would be entitled to consideration only as first-preference quota immigrants. The alien wives and unmarried minor children of citizens of the United States who are chargeable to quotas of more than 200 would be granted nonquota status as in existing law.

The committee made this change in the bill because of the fear of a large influx of oriental immigrants as the nonquota wives and unmarried minor children of persons of oriental races who will be permitted to become naturalized under the bill. The change does not have the approval of the Department of State, which, I understand, would prefer to treat all alien wives and unmarried minor children of citizens of the United States on a basis of parity, regardless of race or the size of the quota to which the aliens would ordinarily be chargeable.

Under existing law the Filipino wives and unmarried minor Filipino children of citizens of the United States, and the Chinese wives, but not the alien Chinese children, of citizens of the United States are entitled to nonquota status. Under this bill those aliens would lose that status. The committee felt, however, that there should at least be parity among all Asian wives and children of American citizens, and these classes are being placed in the first-preference portion of the quota, so that if any quota numbers are available they may come to the United States. The minimum quota for any quota area is permitted to remain at 100, which is a liberal allowance when it is considered that many countries would have no more than 5 to 10 as an annual quota, except for the minimum quota rule. Requiring the wives and children of American citizens to use these small quotas is therefore less discriminatory than if the minimum quota rule were abolished. However, the Department of State, for reasons affecting our foreign relations, which all of us can appreciate, would prefer the provisions of H. R. 5004 to those of the present bill.

In my judgment, however, this bill is fair and in the best interest of our country. After all no foreign person has any right to come to this country. It is a privilege which we extend and we have the right to extend such privilege on any terms we desire.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary for giving me these few minutes. I want to ask the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] a few questions. I want to know why on page 11 there is the section limiting immigration from colonies and other dependent areas. I am asking you this question because the members of the committee are not clear on it themselves. I have asked them privately. Under this provision, immigration from the British West Indies to the United States will be definitely limited for the first time, is that correct?

Mr. JUDD. They will have a quota limitation placed on them along with every other colony, whereas at present they can come in, if they are racially eligible, under the quotas of the mother countries.

Mr. POWELL. So until this bill, people from the West Indies could come in as British subjects under the quota of their mother country?

Mr. JUDD. If they are white, black, or red.

Mr. POWELL. That does not matter; as long as they meet our requirements?

Mr. JUDD. Yes.

Mr. POWELL. Now you want to limit them to 100 per year?

Mr. JUDD. All the British colonies in the world are put on that same quota basis.

Mr. POWELL. Yes; 100 per colony.

Mr. JUDD. That is right.

Mr. POWELL. I am talking strictly about the West Indies.

Mr. JUDD. It is true of the British and the Portuguese and the French and the Dutch and any other colonies. They are all on the same basis.

Mr. POWELL. That is right. I want to ask you why and how this section was written into a bill of this nature? This is a good bill. I am in favor of this bill, but how did that particular angle get into a bill which is definitely aimed at helping oriental peoples?

Mr. JUDD. It was necessary to put on limitations when making people from all colonies eligible for immigration by removing the racial restrictions heretofore existing. We merely put the same principle of limitation on the colonies that has been on every country since the 1924 law was passed. If there were enough immigrants in this country in 1920 from that quota area, figuring it on the basis of one-sixth of 1 percent, to make a quota of more than 100, then they were given that quota. The Japanese figure out at 185, and the Chinese 105 a year. All of the other areas figure out at less than 100, so they are given a minimum of 100, as in the 1924 law.

Mr. POWELL. Yes; I see that. But I am asking why and how did the West Indies get into the picture when they do not fit into the picture at all?

Mr. JUDD. We did not bring them in. They qualify under the formula, that is all.

Mr. POWELL. Subsection (c) on page 11 has nothing to do with the balance of your act, does it?

Mr. JUDD. Oh, yes; it does. Under the national origins principle we could not establish these quotas for areas in the Pacific, without putting on a limitation. The limitation applies to all colonies in the Western Hemisphere and other parts of the world as well.

Mr. POWELL. In other words, you are bringing about equality for the Eastern Hemisphere by discriminating against the Western Hemisphere? That is a gross injustice.

Mr. JUDD. No; we are not discriminating against them, we are putting them on a basis of equality. If you say we are discriminating against them now by putting them on a basis of equality, then you must admit that there was discrimination in their favor previously.

Mr. POWELL. That may be true, but it was because the peoples met our requirements.

Mr. JUDD. Now all will be equal and on the same basis. As I said before, this equality principle takes away certain privileges previously existing. Under the Chinese Wives Act, which was passed in 1946, the Chinese were given certain concessions which this bill takes away. It takes away certain privileges which were granted to the Filipinos in the act applicable to them, which was also passed in 1946. It puts them all on a plane of equality. I am sure the gentleman from New York is as anxious as anybody else that everybody everywhere in the world be treated on the basis of equality.

Mr. POWELL. Not when equality is based on discrimination. I am not in favor of that because it is definitely not equality.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. It seems to me the gentleman from Minnesota is ignoring the facts of life. Heretofore immigration from the British West Indies was chargeable to the quota of Great Britain. The annual quota, I believe, is approximately 66,000, so that all that a British West Indian had to do was to meet the qualifications as to health and demonstrate that he would not become a public charge, and he could enter the United States as he has been doing. Now, the language of this section, on page 11, provides that only 100 British West Indians can come in. If that is equality, then I think it is an extreme distortion of the meaning of the word "equality."

Mr. POWELL. I am prepared to offer an amendment to strike out this section.

This may be bringing about a lot of good will with our far-off neighbors in the Eastern Hemisphere, but with our nearby neighbors, 2½ hours from Miami, you are stirring up a lot of trouble. I can assure you about that. You can talk to our colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT]. We were in the West Indies together this past fall. We need to do everything possible to stimulate helpfulness and good will with our nearby neighbors who are 2 hours from the tip of Florida. This bill will do a lot of harm. It is a flagrant, deliberate effort to discriminate against a great and good people who have come here and became great citizens.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention to the fact that if there is an area in the United States that would be opposed to this type of legislation, where it affects Chinese and Japanese, it might be the State of California. But, on the contrary, it is just the reverse there.

I have resolutions from the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, which endorsed the bill when it was before the committee a year ago, who reassert their same feeling about it at this time, and recommend that this bill be passed.

Similar resolutions have been passed by the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, which represents the business interests of the community, endorsing the bill, and endorsing it in the belief that, under the present restrictions, Japanese who are not privileged to become citizens of the United States are working under a very severe handicap, and that this legislation would relieve that situation.

I just wanted to impress that on the committee, from an area of the United States which felt the impact of Pearl Harbor perhaps more than any other section of the United States. Where we had to resort to reallocation of some 36,000 families of Japanese origin, into relocation camps, and then, out of those camps, many of those boys born in the United States, born of Japanese alien parents, entered the United States armed services and came out of the war with fine records and have now returned to their homes and are seeking to relieve their parents of the embarrassment of denial of citizenship, which this bill would provide.

The fact that these people are racially ineligible for citizenship automatically denies them many privileges. In California these aliens are barred from such occupations as law, real estate, insurance, teaching in public schools, and civil service. They cannot become doctors, dentists, public accountants, pharmacists, or registered nurses. The most controversial of these restrictions are those of the California Alien Land Law that prevents these aliens from owning or leasing real property. This law was difficult to enforce and has been the center of much controversy. On January 19, 1948, the United States Supreme Court rendered a decision involving one of these land cases—Oyama against State of California—that has made it virtually impossible to enforce legally strict compliance with the California land law. The attorney general of California has announced that, as a result of this decision, the State will not proceed with other similar cases. In the Oyama case the alien Japanese provided the money, but his citizen son took title to the land. However, California's attorney general has stated that the decision of some of the Supreme Court Justices was such that he doubts the wisdom of prosecuting cases even if title were taken by a stranger on behalf of the alien.

This development naturally minimizes the practical effects this proposed bill would have in relation to our alien land laws. Representatives of a large local title company concur in this view.

In conclusion, it appears that this bill, as it relates to the aliens now in this country, would not have any serious effects on our community.

At the last regular session of the Eightieth Congress, legislation was introduced designed to remove racial discrimination from our naturalization and immigration laws without abandoning the national origins quota principle established by the Immigration Act of 1924.

The practical effect of this bill is twofold: First, it would permit aliens now in the United States who are ineligible for citizenship solely because of race—primarily Japanese—to become naturalized if they meet all other qualifications; and, second, natives of Japan and other Asiatic countries could use their token immigration quotas and would no longer be excluded solely because of race. In a word, the principles of the 1943 act ending racial discrimination against the Chinese would be extended to the Japanese and all other Asiatics.

A subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee held hearings last April on this legislation as originally proposed in H. R. 5004. In principle, the legislation was widely supported, but as a result of the hearings some structural changes were made and H. R. 6809 was substituted, the national origins quota principle, which provides basic protection. The enactment of this legislation will remove an affront to the Asiatic race that has provided Communists and others with material with which to criticize America. We made a step in this direction in 1943 in the case of China, and see no reason why it should not be extended to all peoples.

I herewith submit the favorable resolution adopted by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors:

RESOLUTION OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, LOS ANGELES, CALIF., INTRODUCED BY SUPERVISOR JOHN ANSON FORD, APRIL 13, 1948

The board met in regular session. Present: Supervisors Raymond V. Darby, chairman, presiding; William A. Smith; Leonard J. Roach; John Anson Ford; and Roger W. Jessup, and Earl Lippold, clerk, by Ray E. Lee, deputy clerk.

IN RE H. R. 199, PROVIDING NATURALIZATION PRIVILEGE TO ALL IMMIGRANTS HAVING THE LEGAL RIGHT TO PERMANENT RESIDENCE, AND MAKING QUOTAS AVAILABLE TO ASIATIC AND PACIFIC PEOPLES; RESOLUTION OF ENDORSEMENT, AND MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO GIVE EARLY PASSAGE

On motion of Supervisor Ford, unanimously carried, it is ordered that the following resolution be and the same is hereby adopted:

"Whereas over 33,000 persons of Japanese ancestry made a distinguished record during the late war as American soldiers in the armed forces while members of their families and of their race shared with unmistakable devotion the privations and hardships incident to the successful operation of the war; and

"Whereas within the last 5 years Federal naturalization and immigration laws have been amended to enable the citizenship and entry of Chinese (supported by this board of supervisors), and a few others, small in number; and

"Whereas permanent American residents of Japanese ancestry, residents in Los Angeles County for over a quarter of a century and longer, are still excluded from the privilege of becoming American citizens under present laws; and

"Whereas residents of Japanese ancestry have over half of a century made important contributions to the agricultural development and cultural richness of Los Angeles County; and

"Whereas this measure maintains the basic national origins quota system which underlies the Immigration Act of 1924; and

"Whereas it is the American way of life to encourage immigrants to become American citizens: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles hereby extends its endorsement to, and memorializes the Congress of the United States to give early passage to, H. R. 199, which gives naturalization to these persons heretofore not eligible for citizenship; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be forwarded to Senators KNOWLAND and DOWNEY, Congressmen NIXON, POULSON, DOUGLAS, McDONOUGH, JACKSON, KING, BRADLEY, HOLIFIELD, HINSHAW, and SHEPPARD, to the chairman of the Senate and House Subcommittees on Immigration and Naturalization, to the United States Conference of Mayors, and that they be urged to do everything in their power to secure the enactment of this urgent and desirable legislation."

I hereby certify that the above is a full, true, and correct copy of a resolution which was adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, on April 13, 1948, and entered in the minutes of said board.

[SEAL] EARL LIPPOLD,
County Clerk of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, and ex officio clerk of the board of supervisors of said county.
By RAY E. LEE, *Deputy Clerk.*

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH] has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, certainly all of us who are interested in democracy, not only in the United States, but in the world, would agree that the provisions of this bill affecting Asia and the Pacific at last let us deal realistically with discrimination on a global basis instead of just discrimination within the United States, now being contested in the United States Senate. The enactment of this fundamental aspect of the bill is essential to our position in world affairs, and to the integrity of our foreign policy. I am troubled, however, about those provisions of this bill which appear to be extraneous to its basic purpose, and which deal with colonies. It seems to me that colonies could very well have been left just exactly as they are while this problem dealing with the question of Asia and the Pacific triangle was dealt with. I hope the committee will see fit in the course of the debate, and before the final vote, to clarify what seems to me to be an imperfection in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I take great pride in supporting this legislation. I believe it will end a wrong against a fine segment of our national community, a wrong which had no foundation in fact at its inception, and which certainly now has no excuse for existence.

I have many Japanese within my district, the parents who are aliens, and their children born in this country who are citizens of the United States. I never knew a more hard-working, thrifty, social-minded group. They contribute generously of their time and money to the charity and welfare drives of the community, and participate in every respect with its best elements. I know of no single instance in which any of them has become a public charge, and I can remember no case at any time of any of them having been involved with any criminal segment of the community. Nationally I know that they have contributed much to the welfare of our community.

I would recommend, Mr. Chairman, that the Members read the very eloquent and moving statement of Mike Masaoka, who is a representative of the Japanese-American Citizens League, as it appears in the hearings. He states just what contributions have been made, not by citizens of this country, but by those whom we did not consider fit for citizenship. For example, he talks about Dr. Hideo Noguchi, one of the greatest names in American medical history, who gave his life in the research for a yellow fever cure. He could not become an American citizen. Neither could Dr. Jokichi Takamine, discoverer of adrenalin, whose son today is conducting experiments seeking a process for the production of penicillin.

There are others whom he names—10, 12, or 15 others of Japanese extraction, who cannot become American citizens today because of the present status of the law. There is Harry K. Shigeta, whom I know personally to be one of the outstanding commercial photographers in the Nation; yet he cannot become a citizen under the present law.

S. I. Hayakawa, who is a leading authority on semantics and a distinguished author, cannot become an American citizen.

There is Yasuo Kuniyoshi, who has been recognized as one of our greatest painters, the only living artist privileged to hold a one-man exhibit in the Whitney Art Museum in New York City. He cannot become an American citizen.

Hizi Koye is renowned throughout the country for playing the title role in Madam Butterfly. She is the only one in the cast of the San Carlo Opera Co., principal or member, who cannot become an American citizen. There are so many others who should be mentioned but must be omitted because of the shortage of my time.

In the last World War, no individual group in the entire United States Armed Forces distinguished itself more than the Four Hundred Forty-second Regimental Combat Team, which was comprised entirely of Japanese. It received more citations and medals, including the Congressional Medal of Honor and all other distinctions given to individuals for valor, than any other comparable unit—and I am informed it sustained as many casualties in killed and wounded as any other unit. Certainly its heroes, both living and dead, looked to the day when their country, and I mean the United States, would recognize the fact that above all else they are loyal Americans, fighting as Americans against the enemies of this country. These included, of course, their ancestral homeland, Japan.

It is a cynical paradox that these people should be designated aliens. They are Americans. Too long have they carried the unwarranted and discriminating burden of being a people apart from the remainder of the country. Just as they assumed the obligations of citizens by giving their blood, their lives, and their substance to protect our democratic ideals, so, comparably, are they entitled to the benefits which citizenship bestows. They are entitled to take their place in the community; to practice the professions which in many States are now denied to them because of their alien status; to vote, which is the ultimate recognition of citizenship, and to own property, which in many States as aliens they cannot do.

These people live here—they are as much a part of our society as you and I, and their ideals, their practices, their lives are in nowise alien or foreign to the greatest American democratic traditions. In this bill we are only doing that which we should have done long ago. We are extending the warm handclasp of friendship to a deserving group who make up a fine and necessary part of our community.

I hope sincerely that the bill will pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. FARRINGTON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Hawaii is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, there is no community under the American flag to whom this legislation means more than to the people of the Territory of Hawaii. There are several reasons for this; one is that we have living in Hawaii the best part of the people in this country who will be immediately affected by this legislation. There are more people of the Japanese race, the Korean race, Chinese race, the Filipino race, and of the Polynesian races situated in Hawaii than in the rest of the country put together, and I might say that most of them are American citizens already by reason of their birth in this country.

I wish to express on behalf of the people of the Territory our very deep appreciation to the members of this committee for the prompt manner in which they have reported this legislation. This will become an historical day in the Territory of Hawaii, and the adoption of this legislation will be something that will be heard on all sides of the Pacific. I say this advisedly because I have spent a lifetime among those people. I do not believe you can realize how much you will contribute to the good will of this country among people living in and around the Pacific by the adoption of this very constructive piece of legislation. It will greatly enhance the position of this country among them.

We of Hawaii are not opposed to the present law restricting immigration; on the contrary, we believe in the quota system; we do not believe in any leniency in the application of the naturalization laws; on the other hand, we believe they should be extremely strict. But we do believe that it is a great mistake from the standpoint of national policy for race to be a determining factor in immigration and naturalization policies, and our whole record exemplifies the soundness of that point of view.

Much has been made in the hearings and in the discussion in the House of the record of the Four Hundred and Forty-second Regimental Combat Team and the One Hundredth Infantry Battalion. I wish to point out, Mr. Chairman, that all of the members of the One Hundredth Infantry Battalion, the first Americans of Japanese extraction to be called into service, were natives of Hawaii. They were the product of the system of racial relationship that prevails in our Territory. They carried the torch and led in the great sacrifices which proved such an inspiration to the balance of their fellow citizens on the American mainland and won the praise and respect of all the people of the country.

It may be appropriately pointed out again, as it has been pointed out before, that on December 7, 1941, we had more than 160,000 people of the Japanese race,

both citizens and aliens, in Hawaii. Only those of us who were there during that tragic day and the period which followed it realized that the opportunities for sabotage and espionage were innumerable. You could scarcely walk down a street in the principal cities of the islands without finding them. And yet the records of the Army and Navy show there was not a single act of sabotage. Those people were loyal to this country. That was the reason for the record. I think that is one of the most dramatic demonstrations in the history of the proposition that citizenship is a matter not of race but of conscience and loyalty.

This act extends beyond that. It covers the people of Polynesia. We have had a large segment of the Polynesian people under the American flag ever since Hawaii was annexed. The native Hawaiians are Polynesians and the record attests to their ability to assimilate and become good American citizens.

To the south of the Hawaiian Islands, we have the Samoans, more Polynesians under the American flag. They are still nationals, and not citizens. And then there are the Guamanians. We have in Hawaii a considerable number of Samoans and Guamanians who can be given the privilege of citizenship under this bill, and they are certainly entitled to it.

One of the most distinguished scholars of Polynesia is Dr. Peter Buck, head of the Bishop Museum. Dr. Buck's father was Irish and his mother was a Maori of New Zealand. Dr. Buck could not become an American citizen because of the racial restrictions in our naturalization laws. That is but one of the innumerable illustrations of the unfairness of the present system.

I think that in the days immediately in front of us there is nothing we can do in the Pacific that will strengthen our position more than the adoption of this particular bill. This action will have far more attention in Manila, Tokyo, Canton, and Shanghai and the great cities of the Pacific than it will have in New York and in the East. We are on the Pacific frontier, we are in the current and cross-current of our relations with the people of that part of the world. May I say that the people will hold our country in a new and better regard as a result of this very constructive legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Hawaii has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has the approval of all departments interested, to wit, the State Department, War Department, Navy Department, and the Department of Justice. It has the unqualified approval of the White House. It does simple justice to all peoples who are legally resident in the United States.

The President in this Chamber on February 2 last had the following to say with reference to the naturalization features of this bill:

> All properly qualified legal residents of the United States should be allowed to become citizens without regard to race, color, religion or national origin. The Congress has recently removed the bars which formerly prevented persons from China, India, and the Philippines from becoming naturalized citizens. I urge the Congress to remove the remaining racial or nationality barriers which stand in the way of citizenship for some residents of our country.

We follow the advice of the President in that portion of the bill whereby we extend naturalization opportunities to all persons who are legally resident in this country, regardless of race, color or creed or national origin.

The bill offers nothing new in our basic policy.

We extend to all Asiatic peoples, as to immigration and naturalization, what we heretofore have done for China, India and Pakistan, and the Philippines. It is a good-neighbor policy for Asia. All Asiatics, here legally or who come here subsequently are eligible for naturalization, and to all Asiatics within the so-called Asia-Pacific triangle, we extend immigration quotas of 100 for each sovereignty, as we did for India and China.

Simple justice requires removal of these racial barriers.

Many of those benefited, that is, Japanese and Polynesians have been here legally for decades. They came before 1924, the date of the National Origins Immigration Act. Many of these gave their sons to our armed forces. Many of their sons died in the war effort. Yet their stigma of alienage cannot be removed. They cannot become citizens. It is unjust to withhold it any longer.

The ending of racial exclusion will provide concrete proof of American good will to all Asia that is awakening and is advancing in the modern spirit.

This bill does not increase the over-all totals of immigration that is possible. The total remains the same. About 1,400 will come in yearly and some 675 quota numbers are deducted from other quotas. That is, the quotas from Great Britain, France, Germany, Poland, Italy, and so forth, are each slightly reduced to compensate for the increased number of Asiatics that may enter.

As each new nation is proclaimed in the Asia-Pacific triangle a quota—token quota of 100 is set up by Presidential proclamation.

I was the author of the bill that removed the so-called India exclusion, and there was given the privilege to many Indians in this country to become naturalized citizens. In addition we set up a token quota of 100 to those persons born in India. The results from that bill have been startling and to our great advantage. Trade with India has been quickened; there has been a great improvement in cultural, political, and economic relations between the great Dominion of India and the United States. A treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation will soon be consummated with India. Today there is not only a token quota of 100 from the people of India, but as the result of the declaration of independence of Pakistan, as the result of the truncation of Pakistan from India, Pakistan likewise gets a quota of 100. Prior thereto we removed the Chinese exclusion from our naturalization and immigration code, and we granted a token immigration to China. There was contained in the India immigration and naturalization bill a similar provision for the Philippines. What we have heretofore done for China and India and Pakistan and the Philippines we now seek to do for other Asiatic countries whose sovereignty or independence may be carved out of this so-called Asia-Pacific triangle. We do simple justice then to the Indonesians, to those of Siam, Ceylon, Korea, Burma, Japan, and so forth.

I am quite sure that with the great awakening in the Asiatic countries, countries which modern civilization has disregarded and passed over, as it were, in the past two centuries, there will come great good to the United States. Our relations from an economic and commercial standpoint, from a political standpoint, and from a spiritual standpoint will be greatly improved with all and sundry of those nations which will benefit by this act.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

NO DENIAL OR ABRIDGMENT OF NATURALIZATION BECAUSE OF RACE, SEX, OR MARITAL STATUS

SECTION 1. That section 302 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (60 Stat. 416; 8 U. S. C. 702), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 302. The privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States shall not be denied or abridged because of race or sex, or because a petitioner for naturalization is married."

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill. This bill knocks in the head the theory of superior races. This bill is opposed to the theory advanced by Hitler's Germany and the war lords of Japan, and accepts the American theory of equality. It puts into effect the Christian principle of the dignity of man. Man was made in the likeness of his Maker, and the Christian theory does not teach that the pigments in a man's skin or his racial origin are a basis of judgment.

This is a good bill. It is a bill that will make for better understanding and peace, a better understanding of the peoples of the great Pacific Basin, whose good will we must cultivate and have. We on the Pacific coast know these people. We know the Japanese particularly. We are proud of their service to this country during the war. They were given the acid test and were not found wanting. I think the best evidence of that was established last year when the Board of Supervisors of the City of San Francisco passed a memorial urging the

adoption of the predecessor of this bill. An editorial later appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle, one of the oldest and foremost papers on the Pacific coast, urging the adoption of this bill.

I think this marks a new era in legislation of this type and character. That era commenced with the passage of the bill that set up the token Chinese quota. It was enhanced by the passage of the bill that set up the token quota for the East Indian people. We now complete it by removing immigration restrictions on the people of the Asia-Pacific triangle. This is a bill that, if enacted into law, will bring great good to this country in the future.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. I take this opportunity, and I am sure I am voicing the sentiments of the other members of the subcommittee of which I happen to be chairman, to say that we deeply appreciate the tremendous amount of work the gentleman has done on this measure and the great help he has been to the subcommittee in perfecting its provisions.

Mr. MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that the entire bill be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The remainder of the bill is as follows:

REPEAL OF RACIAL RESTRICTIONS UPON NATURALIZATION

SEC. 2. Section 303 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (60 Stat. 416; 8 U. S. C., Supp. 703), and section 2169, United States Revised Statutes, are hereby repealed.

AMENDING NONQUOTA PROVISIONS

SEC. 3. Section 4 (a) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended (43 Stat. 155; 44 Stat. 812; 45 Stat. 1009; 46 Stat. 854; 47 Stat. 656; 8 U. S. C. 204), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) An immigrant otherwise chargeable to an annual quota of 200 or more, who is the unmarried child under 21 years of age, or the wife, or the husband, of a citizen of the United States: *Provided*, That the marriage shall have occurred prior to the issuance of the immigration visa and, in the cases of husbands of citizens, prior to January 1, 1948."

ENUMERATION OF PREFERENCES WITHIN QUOTAS; TIME FOR GIVING OF PREFERENCE; PERCENTAGE OF PREFERENCES

SEC. 4. Section 6, subdivisions (a) (1) and (c), of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended (43 Stat. 155–156; 47 Stat. 656; 45 Stat. 1009; 8 U. S. C. 206), are hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) Immigration visas to quota immigrants shall be issued in each fiscal year as follows:

"(1) Fifty percent of the quota for each quota area for such quota year shall be made available in such year for the issuance of immigration visas to the following classes of immigrants, without priority of preference as between such classes: (A) Quota immigrants who are the fathers or mothers of citizens of the United States who are 21 years of age or over, or who are the husbands of citizens of the United States by marriages occurring on or after January 1, 1948, or who are the wives, unmarried minor children, or husbands, of citizens of the United States, such immigrants being chargeable to an annual quota of less than 200; and (B) in the case of any quota area the quota for which is 300 or more, quota immigrants who are skilled in agriculture, and the wives, and the dependent children under the age of 18 years, of such immigrants skilled in agriculture, if accompanying or following to join them."

"(c) Within the preference and nonpreference classes provided within an annual quota, a priority up to 75 percent of the quota of any quota area to which aliens immigrating to the United States are chargeable under subdivision (b) of section 12 of this act shall be given to persons born and resident therein."

SEC. 5. Section 11 of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 159–160; 8 U. S. C. 211 (a)–211 (g)), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"NUMERICAL LIMITATIONS: ANNUAL QUOTA BASED UPON NATIONAL ORIGIN; MINIMUM QUOTAS

"SEC. 11. (a) The anual quota of any quota area, for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1948, and for each fiscal year thereafter, shall be one-sixth of 1 percent of the number of inhabitants in continental United States in 1920 attributable by national origin to that quota area, which shall be ascertained as hereinafter provided in this section, but, notwithstanding the repeal of sections 2 and 3 of the act approved December 17, 1943, as amended (57 Stat. 600), the existing quotas for China and Chinese persons shall not be disturbed, and the minimum quota for any quota area shall be 100.

"DETERMINATION OF NATIONAL ORIGIN

"(b) For the purpose of subdivision (a) of this section national origin shall be ascertained by determining as nearly as may be, in respect of each quota area provided for under section 12 (except the countries specified in subdivision (c) of sec. 4), the number of inhabitants in continental United States in 1920 whose origin by birth or ancestry is attributable to such quota area. Such determination shall not be made by tracing the ancestors or descendants of particular individuals, but shall be based upon statistics of immigration and emigration, together with rates of increase of population as shown by successive decennial United States censuses, and such other data as may be found to be reliable.

"INHABITANTS IN CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES IN 1920

"(c) For the purposes of subdivision (a) the term 'inhabitants in continental United States in 1920' does not include (1) immigrants from the countries specified in subdivision (c) of section 4 or their descendants, (2) the descendants of slave immigrants, or (3) the descendants of American aborigines.

"DETERMINATION OF NATIONAL ORIGIN: PRESIDENTIAL PROCLAMATION OF QUOTAS

"(d) The determination provided for in subdivision (b) of this section shall be made by the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Attorney General, jointly. In making such determination such officials may call for information and expert assistance from the Bureau of the Census. Such officials shall, jointly, report to the President the quota of each quota area, determined as provided in subdivision (a), and the President shall proclaim and make known the quotas so reported. Such proclamation shall be made on or before June 1, 1949, or as soon thereafter as may be feasible. Quotas proclaimed therein shall take effect on the first of the month next following the expiration of 30 days after the date of the proclamation. After the making of a proclamation under this subdivision the quotas proclaimed therein shall continue with the same effect as if specifically stated herein and shall be final and conclusive for every purpose, except (1) insofar as it is made to appear to the satisfaction of such officials and proclaimed by the President, that an error of fact not affecting the total of all quotas has occurred in such determination or in such proclamation, or (2) in the case provided for in subdivision (d) of section 12.

"IMMIGRATION VISAS LIMITED TO QUOTAS: MONTHLY ISSUE

"(e) There shall be issued to quota immigrants chargeable to any quota area (1) no more immigration visas in any fiscal year than the quota for such quota area, and (2) in any calendar month of any fiscal year no more immigration visas than 10 percent of the quota for such quota area.

"ISSUE OF VISA TO NONQUOTA IMMIGRANT AS QUOTA IMMIGRANT

"(f) Nothing in this act shall prevent the issuance (without increasing the total number of immigration visas which may be issued) of an immigration visa to an immigrant as a quota immigrant even though he is a nonquota immigrant."

SEC. 6. Section 12 of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 160–161; 8 U. S. C. 212 (a)–212 (e)) is hereby amended to read:

"DETERMINATION OF QUOTA TO WHICH AN IMMIGRANT IS CHARGEABLE

"SEC. 12. (a) For the purposes of this act, the annual quota to which an immigrant is chargeable shall be determined by birth within a 'quota area,' treating as a separate quota area each independent country, self-governing dominion, mandated territory, and territory under the international trusteeship system of the United Nations, and attributing to 'quota areas' all other inhabited lands other than those of the United States and its possessions and the countries specified in subdivision (c) of section 4, in a manner consistent with the intent of this act and approved by the Secretary of State, except that—

"(1) the quota area to which an unmarried child under 21 years of age not born in the United States or its possessions, accompanied by its alien parent or parents not born in the United States or its possessions, is chargeable may, in order to prevent the separation of the child from its parent or parents, be determined by the quota area of either parent if such parent is entitled to an immigration visa;

"(2) if a wife is chargeable to a different quota area from that of her alien husband and the entire number of immigration visas which may be issued to quota immigrants of her quota area for the calendar month has already been issued, the quota area to which she is chargeable may be determined by the quota area of her husband if she is accompanying him and he is entitled to an immigration visa, unless the total number of immigration visas which may be issued to quota immigrants chargeable to the quota area of the husband for the calendar month has already been issued. An immigrant born in the United States who has lost his United States citizenship shall be considered as having been born in the country of which he is a citizen or subject, or if he is not a citizen or subject of any country, then in the country from which he comes; and

"(3) notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subdivision, any alien who is attributable by as much as one-half of his ancestry to a people or peoples indigenous to the Asia-Pacific triangle defined in subdivision (b) of this section, unless such alien is covered by subdivision (b), (d), (e), or (f) of section 4 of the Immigration Act of 1924, shall be chargeable to a quota as specified in subdivision (b) of this section.

"QUOTA AREAS WITHIN AN ASIA-PACIFIC TRIANGLE

"(b) With reference to determination of the quota to which shall be chargeable an alien immigrating to the United States who is attributable by as much as one-half of his ancestry to a people or peoples indigenous to the Asia-Pacific triangle comprising all quota areas and all colonies and other dependent areas situate wholly east of the meridian 60 degrees east of Greenwich, wholly west of the meridian 165 degrees west, and wholly north of the parallel 25 degrees south latitude; except for those classes of aliens specified in subsection (3) of subdivision (a) of this section—

"(1) there is hereby established, in addition to quotas for separate quota areas comprising independent countries, self-governing dominions, and territories under the international trusteeship system of the United Nations situate wholly within said Asia-Pacific triangle, an Asia-Pacific quota of 100 annually;

"(2) such alien born within a separate quota area situate wholly within said Asia-Pacific triangle shall not be chargeable to the Asia-Pacific quota, but shall be chargeable to the separate quota area in which he was born;

"(3) such alien born within a colony or other dependent area situate wholly within said Asia-Pacific triangle shall be chargeable to the Asia-Pacific quota;

"(4) such alien born outside the Asia-Pacific triangle who is attributable by as much as one-half of his ancestry to a people or peoples indigenous to not more than one separate quota area, situate wholly within the Asia-Pacific triangle, shall be chargeable to the quota of that quota area;

"(5) such alien born outside the Asia-Pacific triangle who is attributable by as much as one-half of his ancestry to a people or peoples indigenous to one or more colonies or other dependent areas situate wholly within the Asia-Pacific triangle, shall be chargeable to the Asia-Pacific quota;

"(6) such alien born outside the Asia-Pacific triangle who is attributable by as much as one-half of his ancestry to peoples indigenous to two or more separate quota areas situate wholly within the Asia-Pacific triangle, or to a quota area or areas and one or more colonies and other dependent areas situate wholly therein, shall be chargeable to the Asia-Pacific quota.

"LIMITATION UPON COLONIES AND OTHER DEPENDENT AREAS

"(c) Any alien immigrating to the United States born in a colony or other dependent area for which no separate quota has been established, unless a nonquota immigrant as provided in section 4 of the Immigration Act of 1924, shall be chargeable to the quota of the governing country: *Provided*, That not more than 100 persons born in any one colony or other dependent area shall be chargeable to the quota of its governing country in any 1 year, and except that such alien, if attributable by as much as one-half of his ancestry to a people or peoples indigenous to the Asia-Pacific triangle, shall be chargeable to a quota as provided in subdivision (b) of this section.

"PROVISION OF QUOTAS TO HAVE NO POLITICAL SIGNIFICANCE

"(d) The provision of an immigration quota for a quota area shall not constitute recognition by the United States of the transfer of territory from one country to another, or recognition of a government not recognized by the United States.

"REVISION OF QUOTAS NECESSITATED BY TERRITORIAL CHANGES

"(e) After the determination of quotas has been made as provided in subdivision (d) of section 11, revision of the quotas shall be made by such officials, jointly, whenever necessary, to provide for any change of boundaries resulting in transfer of territory from one sovereignty to another, a change of administrative arrangements of a colony or other dependent area, or any other political change requiring a change in the list of quota areas or of the territorial limits thereof, but any increase in the number of minimum quota areas above 50 shall result in a proportionate decrease in each minimum quota in order that the sum total of all minimum quotas shall not exceed 5,000."

ALIENS INELIGIBLE TO CITIZENSHIP NOT TO BE ADMITTED, ETC.

SEC. 7. Section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 161–162; 46 Stat. 581; 8 U. S. C. 213 (c)) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 13. (c) No alien ineligible to citizenship shall be admitted to the United States unless such alien (1) is admissible as a nonquota immigrant under the provision of subdivision (b) of section 4, or (2) is not an immigrant as defined in section 3."

AMENDING SECTION 321 A OF THE NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

SEC. 8. Section 321A of the Nationality Act of 1940 (60 Stat. 417) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Certificates of arrival or declarations of intention shall not be required of persons who were noncitizen nationals of the United States and were also citizens of the Commonwealth of the Philippines on July 3, 1946, and who entered the United States prior to May 1, 1934, and have since continuously resided in the United States."

GENERAL DEFINITIONS

SEC. 9. Section 28 of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 168–169; 8 U. S. C. 224) is hereby amended by amending subdivision (c) and adding a new subdivision (o) to read as follows:

"(c) The term 'ineligible to citizenship', when used in reference to any individual, includes an individual who is debarred from becoming a citizen of the United States under section 306 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (54 Stat. 1141; U. S. C., title 8, sec. 706), or is or was so debarred under section 3 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended (55 Stat. 845; U. S. C., title 50, App. Supp. III), or under any law amendatory of, supplementary to, or in substitution for, any such sections, or any other law which may disqualify aliens from citizenship;

"(o) The term 'nationality' relates to the quota area to which an immigrant is chargeable."

REPEAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 10. That portion of section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended, which excludes aliens merely because they are natives of certain Pacific islands and of a portion of the continent of Asia from admission to the United States (8 U. S. C. 136 (n)); sections 2 and 3 of the act approved December 17, 1943, as amended (57 Stat. 600); sections 1, 4, and 5 of the act approved July 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 416); the act approved August 9, 1946 (60 Stat. 975); and all other acts or parts of acts inconsistent with this act are hereby repealed.

TIME OF TAKING EFFECT

SEC. 11. The provisions of this act which are considered by the Secretary of State and the Attorney General to be dependent upon the issuance of a new quota proclamation shall not take effect until such proclamation becomes effective.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 22, strike out lines 22, 23, 24, and 25, and insert in lieu thereof:

"SEC. 4. Section 6 of the Immigration Act of 1924 as amended (43 Stat. 155–156; 47 Stat. 655; 45 Stat. 1009; 8 U. S. C. 206) is hereby amended by amending subdivision (a) (1) and adding a new subdivision (c) to read as follows:"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last seven words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few words on behalf of this bill. We have had a long history of irritation and conflict with oriental peoples in California which I believe this bill will solve. As the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] mentioned a short time ago, we first had it during the gold-rush days and during the railroad construction days in the sixties and seventies. It finally culminated in 1893, I believe, when Mr. Geary, a Member of Congress from the First District authored the anti-Chinese legislation which was passed. Later on we had the Japanese problem. They were coming to California in great numbers prior to the First World War. We were fearful that because of their rapid increase in population, they would overwhelm the white race in California because of its low birth rate. I am frank to say that I was one of those who had that fear. In 1920 I was a member of the delegation from California which went to the national convention of the American Legion. The delegation was instrumental in having a resolution passed by the national convention of the American Legion providing that in the future no more immigrants should be allowed from those countries whose nationals were not eligible to become citizens. Later the 1924 Immigration Act was passed which excluded orientals from citizenship. But, curiously, time and evolution have solved the problem that worried us, which was based on the Japanese birth rate. In 1920 we projected the birth rate of Japanese forward about 50 years, and thought that in that period, due to their large families they would equal the white population. The result that followed, as far as the American-born Japanese were concerned, was that the Japanese became thoroughly Americanized. The best proof of it was that they began to have small families with 1, 2, or 3 children just like the white Americans. As they were educated and lifted their standards of living, they became more American in every way. Their birth rate decreased. For instance, Paul Scharrenberg, a great labor leader in California, advocated that they be given a quota and that we recognize that they were people who were worthy of becoming Americans, and that they had the capacity of becoming thoroughly Americanized in every way.

With the small quota provided in this bill we need have no fear that any of the group involved will flood our country. We will have to admit, I think, that this is a one-way street.

There are no Americans who want to migrate to Japan or to the islands of the Pacific, but those people will want to migrate to our country where they will have better opportunities for a broader and freer life.

We are trying to build good will around the world. I say to you like the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], my

predecessor in the well of the House, that you cannot do it by picking out certain races because of their color, nationality, or other reasons and barring them from the privileges that we accord to other peoples throughout the world. That is the merit of this legislation. By this legislation we are recognizing that this group of people are human beings just as we are. They are human beings just like the Germans, the Italians, the Scandinavians, and the Irish, who came to America and who have had a big part in making America what it is. If we accord this new group equal treatment, we hope that we will plant the seeds of friendship and the seeds of good will which will help us to build this world into a peaceful world. That is the all-important problem before our country, namely, to find some way to get stability in the world. We want to find some way to get peace in the world, and this is one step in that direction. That is why I favor this legislation. This step by us will give hope and happiness to many people in all parts of the world.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 199. I believe that this bill is a worthy one, and that its passage is long overdue. It seems to me that it is a matter of basic justice that we give to the permanent alien residents of the United States the right to become naturalized citizens. I am also in agreement with the principle that immigration quotas should be established for the people now excluded in the Asian and Pacific areas.

This bill will make it possible for the fathers, mothers, and other relatives of boys who served in the American armed forces in the recent World War II, to become American citizens. In my particular district, the largest racial group which will be effected will be those of Japanese ancestry. There are, at this time, living in my district, many of the Japanese-American veterans who won undying fame in the famous Four Hundred and Forty-second Regiment. There are also buried in the cemeteries of my district many of the Japanese-American soldiers who gave their lives in defense of our country.

Surely these boys have demonstrated their loyalty to the Government of the United States. Surely it is a matter of plain justice that their relatives be allowed to put on the cloak of citizenship of the country for which their sons fought and died.

I am personally acquainted with many of the Japanese-Americans who live in my district, and I want especially to mention the East Los Angeles Chapter of the Japanese-American Citizens League. I have met with these young people and have discussed their problems with them. I know that they are worthy citizens of our great country. Their loyalty and their ability to contribute in the years to come will aid greatly in carrying out the principles of our democracy. I am proud to have them as constituents of the Nineteenth Congressional District of California, and I am proud to stand on the floor today and ask my colleagues to vote for H. R. 199, which allows their relatives now residing in the United States to become naturalized citizens and establishes immigration quotas for other individuals from the land of their racial origin.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I want to compliment the gentleman for pointing out the real issue in this legislation. He has mentioned these men who fought so valiantly in the Four Hundred and Forty-second Regiment. It is significant that on last June 4 an impressive array of Army high brass, Members of Congress, and other Washington big league gathered at Arlington National Cemetery where they buried two of the so-called doughboys. It is one thing to array at the national cemetery, and it is another thing to pass legislation such as this which will give full faith and credit to the services of those splendid men. I commend you for your fine presentation.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. The number of the people affected in my district probably would not amount to over three or four hundred. There might be 500 in my congressional district. So they are not a great political factor in any election in my district. I do not come here to plead their cause from that standpoint. I plead their cause because I think that a principle of real democracy is involved in this question.

Historically, the people of the State of California have shown a great antipathy toward the Japanese people. A great deal of this antipathy goes back to the early gold-rush days, and more recently it was caused by their economic competition in the field of vegetable, fruit, and flower growing. Farm organizations and farmer groups were against the Japanese people because they could outproduce and outcompete in the field of agricultural production. But after the war was over and the Japanese-American people in California proved their loyalty to the country, that feeling began to die down. Now there are only just a few individuals here and there, and one or two rock-ribbed reactionary groups that are against this particular bill. Our great Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce is in favor of this particular bill with the limits of the committee amendments.

I am glad to support the bill at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], has expired.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POWELL: On page 11, line 7, after the words "dependent area", insert "except those in the West Indian Archipelago."

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, to rise in the midst of this atmosphere and propose an amendment does not sit well on my conscience, because, frankly, I have never seen such a fine atmosphere of good will and brotherhood in terms of race relations since I have been in Congress, and I want to compliment everyone. I was just saying to one of my colleagues that 20 years ago a bill like this introduced in this body would have torn these seats up. I want to congratulate everyone for his wholehearted endorsement of this excellent bill.

But there happens to be inserted on page 11 of this bill a section which not only will perpetrate a rank injustice on a group of people who have proven themselves worthy of being United States citizens, but also it will have very grave repercussions in regard to our Western Hemisphere protection.

The chairman of our Judiciary Committee, and I am sure other members of the committee, including the author, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], did not realize just what this section (c) really would accomplish. Section (c) takes people—and I am speaking just about the West Indies now—who have been coming into our country under the Empire quota and limits them to 100 per year.

Let me say that in the West Indies we have a group of people, stretching from Jamaica in the northern part to Trinidad in the south, who look more to the United States than they do to their mother countries. Last November and December I made an official tour of the West Indies and I know whereof I speak.

It so happens that in New York City alone during the past 25 years some 80,000 of these men and women from the West Indies have come and become outstanding citizens. The first Negro judge to be elected in New York City was a West Indian, Justice James Watson. Three of the leaders of the Democratic Party and two of the Republican Party in New York City are West Indians. The Commissioner of Housing of New York City is from the West Indies; the deputy commissioner of correction in New York City is a West Indian; the Civil Service Commissioner of New York City is a West Indian, and scores of others hold outstanding positions. Yet under this bill these people who have come in without any quota except under the quota of the British Empire are now limited to 100 per year.

Section (c) has no place in this act.

This act is designed to bring about good will with our neighbors in the Pacific; it is to remove an injustice we perpetrated against the orientals. Why bring in the West Indies? They have no place here. Mr. Chairman, we are bringing about good will in the Pacific, but we are breeding ill will right next door to ourselves, right off the coast of Florida, amongst our West Indian neighbors. This will stir up all kinds of resentment against our country. Whether a man be considered a Jamaican, a Dominican, or whatever island of the West Indian Archipelago he may come from, he is beginning to look increasingly to America more than he does to the country that may control his island. I say to you that we will do ourselves immense harm by retaining section (c) in this bill. These people are looking to this country for leadership and for opportunity. They are our neighbors; they live right next door to us. They are the same kind of people that we are. These islands can be jumping-off places for any type of ill will that a foreign nation would like to

bring against our Nation. These islands are bastions of defense. Would you tear these down with this ill-considered travesty on justice?

I am asking that you strike out section (c), for it has no place in the bill.

It is shocking that the Department of State specifically asked for this exclusion of Negro people. Maybe the Democratic Party, the White House, and the State Department do not know that the campaign to support Mr. Truman was led and financed to a great degree by people of West Indian descent. Is this their reward? I predict a wholesale desertion of West Indian Democrats if this clause is retained. It is an uncalled for slap in the face. It will break up the family life of hundreds who are here and are expecting to bring their loved ones. I place the blame today squarely on my party if it refuses to pass my amendment.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Do I understand that the present English quota is predicated upon the population of the entire British Commonwealth?

Mr. POWELL. That is right; the whole commonwealth.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. If this section is accepted will it increase the quota of the British?

Mr. POWELL. Oh, no, indeed. All this amendment would do would be to hold the status quo, let it remain.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. The gentleman misses the point. The present quota that has been established for England includes the West Indies.

Mr. POWELL. That is right.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Whatever they are allowed is chargeable to the British. All of the immigration from the West Indies is chargeable to the present quota.

Mr. POWELL. It used to be that way.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Under this bill it is still chargeable to it.

Mr. POWELL. No. That is what some members of the committee did not understand.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. But if the gentleman's amendment is agreed to the present British quota will stand?

Mr. POWELL. It will stand.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. And you add some more.

Mr. POWELL. Oh, no. The gentleman is wrong.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. No. That is where you are wrong. If this bill is passed England will still have the same quota but no longer will people of the colonies be able to use that quota. In other words, more Englishmen will be able to come in, in fact, they will be the only people who will be allowed to come in outside of the quota from each colony. That is not even fair to take a colony like Jamaica with 1,500,000 people and another one with a population of 15,000 and give to each 100. Why have a quota of 100 for a colony with a population of 1,500,000 and also a quota of 100 for a colony with a population of only 15,000? That is not right.

I ask for support of my amendment.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York is in error when he takes the position that the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was not aware of what the situation was when this particular section was included in the bill. We were well aware of what the situation was and in writing a bill providing for equality under our naturalization and immigration laws we certainly did not think that that was being carried out where the West Indies could use the largest quota, and are using, according to the statement of the gentleman from New York, the largest quota provided for any nation in the world, the quota for Great Britain. The British quota is approximately 66,000. The gentleman from New York stated a moment ago that in recent years about 80,000 people have come to New York City from the West Indies. The Committee on the Judiciary does not think that is equality and in writing this legislation we were trying to devise a formula that would provide equality, not a very distinct advantage for any group of people in the world.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be voted down.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. POWELL. The 80,000 who now live in New York City have come in over a period of 25 years, since World War I. You never can get equality by discrimination. You are definitely discriminating against a group of people who are coming in to give equality to others.

Mr. WALTER. It certainly is not a case of discrimination when you treat that group in the same manner as you treat every other group in the world.

Mr. POWELL. Yes; it is.

Mr. WALTER. That is not discrimination.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] has stated the case on behalf of his amendment. I now point out the realities of the language on page 11. The people from the West Indies have been migrating to the United States by simply qualifying as to health and public-charge provisions of the immigration law. Their entrance into the United States has been chargeable to the quota of Great Britain, which is approximately 66,000 a year. This has been the situation under the Immigration Act of 1924 and the result has been that thousands of Negroes from the West Indies have been immigrating to the United States. The language of the bill on page 11 definitely puts a halt to this immigration and limits the immigration from the West Indies to 100 annually. This is rank discrimination against immigration of Negroes from the West Indies.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] has told you of the achievements of these people in our city. They have made fine citizens. Now in a bill in which you say you are adjusting the inequalities that exist against people in the Asia-Pacific triangle, under the pretext of an equality which is false, you say to the Negro people of the British West Indies, "No longer will we permit thousands of you to enter, but only 100 of you a year can come to these United States." This is not equality. It is foul discrimination sold to this Congress with devious, sanctimonious, and hypocritical double talk about equality. You can double talk about equality all you want, but you will not convince the American people that equality means the revision of the standards downward or the limitation of the existing rights of any people. Equality is achieved by revising upward and equalizing upward of those groups that are far below the standard. Here you are revising downward and you are practically abolishing immigration from a country without reason.

The language of equality that you use here is artificial; it is strained, and it is a clear distortion to bring about what certain elements within the State Department, and elements right here in the House, want, and that is to prohibit the entrance of Negroes into the United States.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Does not the gentleman feel that under the language of this amendment there would be no quota whatsoever on these West Indians? If the amendment were down on line 12, after "dependent area," then the situation would be met by what the gentleman from New York is talking about.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Would the gentleman agree to such an amendment?

Mr. POWELL. I agree to that.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the committee agree to such an amendment at that place in the bill?

Mr. POWELL. Will the committee agree to it?

Mr. CELLER. I do not think the committee can express itself now, but individual Members might express themselves. Putting that language after the word "area" and before the word "shall" on page 11, line 12, would have the effect of removing quotas from those from the West Indian Archipelago. They would come in as nonquota, and they would not be chargeable to the 100 token quota or the quotas from other countries.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. In other words, you would add by the adoption of this amendment all of these nonquota emigrants to

the 66,000 already provided for in the British quota.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Does the gentleman from New York want to make a unanimous-consent request in order to make certain that the objective of his amendment will be carried out; to keep the status quo with respect to immigration from the West Indies and not to add to the British quota?

Mr. POWELL. Through you, I would like to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his observation, and ask unanimous consent to change my amendment, as follows: Page 11, line 12, after "dependent area", insert "except those in the West Indian Archipelago."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, on a point of order I think the right way to proceed would be to have the gentleman withdraw his amendment and offer a new one.

The CHAIRMAN. That may be done, I will say to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, the point of order should be overruled. The gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] need not withdraw his amendment. I submit that the unanimous-consent request has been agreed to, and therefore all that has to be done now is for the Clerk to carry out the directions of the unanimous-consent request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct, but the Chair does not see that the unanimous-consent request is in conflict with the right to ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman is not withdrawing his amendment, and his amendment has been modified, pursuant to the directions contained in a unanimous-consent request.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modified amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modified amendment: On page 11, line 12, after "dependent area", insert "except those in the West Indian Archipelago."

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, the arguments made in support of the amendment before the change was made are equally applicable to the amendment as modified. The situation has not been changed by the change of the place in this bill where the amendment is to be inserted. In other words, the amendment as it now reads prevents discrimination against Negro immigration from the West Indies. So if we want to adhere to the alleged spirit of the bill, to remove discrimination with respect to citizenship because of race, color, or creed, let us adopt this amendment and thereby remove that language from this bill, which is intended, and I repeat intended to, and will discriminate against the Negro people in the British West Indies and the Negro people in the United States.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in order to address a question to the chairman of the subcommittee which considered this legislation, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who is a distinguished lawyer and very well able to answer regarding the legal problems involved.

Is it not a fact that if Great Britain or France or Portugal or any other country is affected in its judgment adversely by the utilization of its quota in the West Indies or any other colony which it possesses, it could, by denying to its people in the colonies or in the homeland passports, effectively control the utilization of its own quota? Hence, by doing what we are trying to do here, are we not really depriving the government of that country of the ability to determine the disposition of the quota allocated to it as a nation intra its own homeland and its own colonies?

Mr. WALTER. As to the first part of the gentleman's double-barreled question, there is no doubt that that is a fact, but as to depriving other nations of their rights, there certainly is nothing in the immigration laws of the United States giving any nation the right to state how many people can or cannot come to the United States. However, as to withholding exit permits, we see that done every day, particularly in the countries behind the iron curtain.

Mr. JAVITS. In other words, the gentleman does agree that any nation, including Great Britain, could regulate the outflow of immigration to the United States from the West Indies or any other colony without any such provision as this in our law?

Mr. WALTER. There is no question about it.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, it has been said here that this bill is merely an oriental act to remove an injustice with respect to peoples in the Far East. That is not an accurate statement. It is a bill to provide for equality under our immigration and naturalization laws.

I may say that the provision this amendment seeks to change was not in the bill when I originally introduced it. It does limit the number of people who can come in from the area under discussion. But there are also other limitations in the bill now that were not in it when I originally introduced it. One of these reduces the number of people who can come from China, and I do not think anybody would accuse me of being anti-Chinese. Another reduces the number who can come from the Philippine Islands.

The bill takes away certain special privileges that we gave to the Chinese in the Chinese Wives Act of 1946. It takes away certain special privileges given to the Filipinos in the bill passed in 1946 granting them a quota. I do not like those limitations. They take away part of what we gave only 3 years ago. But they are fair. As I got deeper into the subject, I decided that the matter was bigger than just an oriental act. The first and most important objective is to make it an act, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania well said, to establish equality. If the amendment of the gentleman from New York were to carry, it would provide a special privilege for a certain group of immigrants and you would have to strike out the word "equality" from the phrase "a Bill providing for Equality under Naturalization and Immigration Laws." The bill does provide some limitations not in existing law, just as it removes some restrictions. You perhaps can use words to make it appear that it is a discrimination against those people in the British West Indies. But I cannot agree.

It does not take them below the level of equality. It takes away certain special privileges that they have had, and thereby brings them to the level of equality. This is an attempt to establish what I know the gentleman wants with all his heart, genuine equality, under law for all people in the world. Therefore, I must ask that his amendment be defeated.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. If the amendment were adopted, what really would happen would be that the people from the West Indies would be given a preference over all other people under the bill. Is that not correct?

Mr. JUDD. Precisely.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas who has done so much to develop and promote this bill.

Mr. GOSSETT. If this amendment were adopted, it would throw the whole bill out of kilter, so to speak, and destroy the basic philosophy of this act, would it not?

Mr. JUDD. That is right. The gentleman will remember that on line 9 of my original bill there were the words "other dependent areas except the Philippine Islands." We had an exception for the Philippine Islands. That was in my original bill because I assumed the right thing was to maintain the status of all those who had immigration privileges while extending them to those who were denied them. But I agreed with the committee that the truly fair thing was to put all on a basis of equality under a uniform formula. Therefore, as the gentleman knows, I rewrote the bill, and among other things struck out that section which continued certain special privileges for Filipinos and the Chinese. Probably the Filipinos will not like it. Probably the Chinese in this country desiring wives from China on a nonquota basis will not like it. Probably the Jamaicans will not like it. I do not like it myself, but it is fair and equal and our first job is to establish equality.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. As a matter of fact, was it not the State Department's suggestion—the very language that we have put into the bill?

Mr. JUDD. Yes; it was, and it was approved by both the State Department and the Department of Justice, who administer our immigration and naturalization laws.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. GOSSETT. If we are going to destroy the equality which runs through this bill, then I must be against it. I have been in favor of the bill because it sets up equality, but when you take that out, I am against the bill.

Mr. JUDD. I feel strongly that this amendment should be defeated. I recognize the hardship in the individual cases of which the author of the amendment speaks the same as I recognize the hardship in the cases involving Chinese and Filipinos. But I am sure that if the gentleman will go to his own Jamaican immigrants, or the people from the West Indian Archipelago areas and explain to them the total situation, they will see that exactly what the bill does is to remove a historic injustice, and for the first time since 1924, make every human being on earth equal with other human beings under the laws of the United States with respect to immigration and naturalization.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. POWELL. Under this amendment which I have offered, if it is passed, we do not let the people from the West Indies come in willy-nilly.

Mr. JUDD. No.

Mr. POWELL. They all have to meet personal qualifications. Furthermore, the government of that particular island will be in charge of how many leave, or do not leave, and if the British Government does not want anyone to leave, they cannot leave.

Mr. JUDD. I do not think that is wholly true.

Mr. POWELL. That is true.

Mr. JUDD. I am surprised that the gentleman is advocating the totalitarian system of forbidding people to leave an area who want to leave it, for whatever reason, perhaps political persecution. A truly free country does not prevent any noncriminal from leaving it, although it may not give him a passport permitting reentry.

I am surprised that the gentleman should advocate the police state system. I am not in favor of a system whereby people who want to leave a country should be prevented by the country in power from leaving.

Mr. POWELL. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. JUDD. One of the glories of America is that she has been a haven for political refugees. But I do not want the limitations on immigration to our country to be determined by the country from which they come. That is the principle involved here. I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. POWELL) there were—ayes 19, noes 118.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, under permission granted me, I include the following telegrams:

IDAHO FALLS, IDAHO, *February 28, 1949.*
Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

We request your support of H. R. 199, naturalization and immigration bill, coming out on House floor Tuesday March 1. We heartily endorse this legislation as we strongly oppose racial discrimination in present naturalization and immigration laws.

JOE CALL,
President, Chamber of Commerce.

IDAHO FALLS, IDAHO, *February 28, 1949.*
Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Endorse and support H. R. 199, naturalization and immigration bill.

DEON S. SEEDALL,
National Democratic Committeeman.

IDAHO FALLS, IDAHO, *February 28, 1949.*
Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

We understand H. R. 199, naturalization and immigration bill, will come on House of Representatives floor for debate, Tuesday, March 1. We urge your support of this bill as we believe it will eradicate present discriminating in immigration laws which is against our democratic principles.

Mayor E. W. FANNING,
Idaho Falls, Idaho.

NAMPA, IDAHO, *February 28, 1949.*
Congressman COMPTON I. WHITE, of Idaho,
House of Representatives Office Building:

Please give earnest support toward passage of H. R. 199, naturalization and immigration bill.

M. YAMADA.

IDAHO FALLS, IDAHO, *February 28, 1949.*
Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

As members of the League of Women Voters in opposition to racial discrimination, we urge the passage of bill H. R. 199.

Mrs. K. D. Rose, Mrs. John M. Homer, Mrs. Henry Bennett, Mrs. George G. Harris, Mrs. A. J. Christensen, Mrs. Fred Ochi, Mrs. Parley Rigby.

MIDDLETON, IDAHO, *February 28, 1949.*
Representative COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives Office Building:

We ask your support of House bill 199.

IRVING W. CORNELL.

POCATELLO, IDAHO, *February 26, 1949.*
Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge your support of H. R. 199 naturalization and immigration bill. Over 60 Americans of Japanese ancestry from this community served in World War II on every battlefront. Seven boys made the supreme sacrifice. These services were rendered and lives given in defense of principles that stand for democracy among which is the right to equality.

POCATELLO JAPANESE AMERICANS CITIZENS LEAGUE.

NAMPA, IDAHO, *March 1, 1949.*
Congressman COMPTON WHITE,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Reference H. R. 199 would greatly appreciate your personal efforts toward successful passage. In respect to the 33,000 Japanese-Americans who served with distinction in our armed forces as well as the good citizenship and loyalty displayed by their parents. Feel that the traditional American spirit of equality and fair play should be upheld by passage of H. R. 199.

BOISE VALLEY CHAPTER, JAPANESE-AMERICAN CITIZENS LEAGUE,
GEORGE ISHIHARA, *President.*

IDAHO FALLS, IDAHO, *February 28, 1949.*
Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

We have information that H. R. 199 naturalization and immigration bill will come on House of Representatives floor Tuesday, March 1. We express our hearty endorsement of this legislation which provides for equality of races in our immigration and naturalization laws the only step consistent with democratic principles. We urge your support.

PARLEY RIGBY,
Postmaster, Idaho Falls, Idaho.

PARMA, IDAHO, *February 28, 1949.*
Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

I personally believe that H. R. 199 deserves your vote. Japanese that will come under it, that I know are of the type that will make good citizens.

GUY A. DOUGLAS.

NAMPA, IDAHO, *March 1, 1949.*
Congressman COMPTON WHITE,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the members of the Boise Valley Chapter, Japanese-American Citizens League request your earnest support and personal efforts toward passage of H. R. 199 naturalization and immigration bill. We feel our parents are entitled to these rights because of their display of good citizenship and also for our boys of the Four Hundred Forty-second and One Hundredth Battalion who fought so courageously believing that their parents would eventually obtain rights of citizenship guaranteed by our Constitution.

BOISE VALLEY CHAPTER, JAPANESE-AMERICAN CITIZENS LEAGUE.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HART, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 199) to provide the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence, to make immigration quotas available to Asian and Pacific peoples, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 121, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I am, in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MARCANTONIO moves to recommit the bill, H. R. 199, to the Committee on the Judiciary, with instructions to report the bill forthwith, with the following amendment:

"Page 11, line 12, after the word 'area', insert 'except those in West Indies Archipelago.'"

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and ninety-two Members are present; not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 39, nays 336, not voting 59, as follows:

[Roll No. 22]

YEAS—39

Addonizio	Granahan	Pfeifer
Barrett, Pa.	Hand	Joseph L.
Blatnik	Heller	Philbin
Buckley, N. Y.	Javits	Powell
Burdick	Keogh	Quinn
Cavalcante	Klein	Rodino
Christopher	Lynch	Rooney
Chudoff	McCarthy	Sadowski
Clemente	McGrath	Taurielo
Crosser	McSweeney	Wagner
Davies, N. Y.	Marcantonio	Wier
Dawson	Morris	Young
Dollinger	O'Brien, Mich.	
Gorski, N. Y.	O'Hara, Ill.	

NAYS—336

Abbitt	Bonner	Combs
Abernethy	Bosone	Cooley
Albert	Boykin	Cooper
Allen, Calif.	Bramblett	Corbett
Allen, La.	Breen	Cotton
Andersen, H. Carl	Brehm	Cox
	Brooks	Crawford
Andresen, August H.	Brown, Ga.	Crook
	Brown, Ohio	Cunningham
Andrews	Bryson	Curtis
Angell	Buchanan	Davis, Ga.
Arends	Buckley, Ill.	Davis, Wis.
Aspinall	Burke	Deane
Auchincloss	Burleson	Denton
Barden	Burton	D'Ewart
Baring	Byrne, N. Y.	Dolliver
Barrett, Wyo.	Byrnes, Wis.	Dondero
Bates, Ky.	Canfield	Donohue
Battle	Cannon	Doughton
Beall	Carlyle	Durham
Beckworth	Carnahan	Eaton
Bennett, Fla.	Carroll	Eberharter
Bennett, Mich.	Case, N. J.	Elliott
Bentsen	Case, S. Dak.	Elsworth
Biemiller	Celler	Elston
Bishop	Chelf	Engel, Mich.
Blackney	Chesney	Engle, Calif.
Bloom	Chiperfield	Evins
Boggs, Del.	Church	Fallon
Boggs, La.	Clevenger	Feighan
Bolling	Cole, Kans.	Fenton
Bolton, Md.	Cole, N. Y.	Fisher
Bolton, Ohio	Colmer	Flood
Forand	Kunkel	Potter
Ford	Lane	Preston
Frazier	Lanham	Priest
Fugate	Larcade	Rabaut
Furcolo	Latham	Rains
Gamble	LeCompte	Ramsay
Garmatz	LeFevre	Rankin
Gary	Lemke	Redden
Gillette	Lesinski	Reed, Ill.
Golden	Lichtenwalter	Reed, N. Y.
Goodwin	Lind	Rees
Gordon	Linehan	Rhodes
Gore	Lodge	Ribicoff
Gorski, Ill.	Lovre	Rich
Gossett	Lucas	Richlman
Graham	Lyle	Rogers, Fla.
Granger	McConnell	Rogers, Mass.
Grant	McCulloch	Sabath
Gregory	McDonough	Sadlak
Gross	McGregor	St. George
Gwinn	McGuire	Sanborn
Hagen	McKinnon	Sasscer
Hale	McMillan, S. C.	Scott,
Hall,	McMillen, Ill.	Hugh D., Jr.
Edwin Arthur	Mack, Ill.	Scrivner
Hall,	Mack, Wash.	Scudder
Leonard W.	Macy	Secrest
Halleck	Madden	Shafer
Harden	Magee	Sheppard
Hare	Mahon	Sikes
Harris	Mansfield	Simpson, Ill.
Harrison	Marcalis	Simpson, Pa.
Hart	Marshall	Sims
Harvey	Martin, Iowa	Smathers
Hays, Ark.	Martin, Mass.	Smith, Kans.
Hays, Ohio	Mason	Smith, Va.
Hebert	Meyer	Smith, Wis.
Hedrick	Michener	Spence
Heffernan	Miles	Stanley
Herlong	Miller, Calif.	Steed
Herter	Miller, Md.	Stefan
Heselton	Miller, Nebr.	Stigler
Hill	Mills	Stockman
Hinshaw	Mitchell	Sullivan
Hobbs	Monroney	Sutton
Hoeven	Morgan	Taber
Hoffman, Mich.	Morrison	Tackett
Holifield	Moulder	Talle
Holmes	Multer	Thomas, Tex.
Hope	Murdock	Thompson
Horan	Murphy	Thornberry
Howell	Murray, Tenn.	Tollefson
Hull	Murray, Wis.	Towe
Irving	Nelson	Trimble
Jackson, Calif.	Nicholson	Underwood
Jackson, Wash.	Nixon	Van Zandt
Jacobs	Noland	Velde
James	Norblad	Vorys
Jenkins	Norrell	Vursell
Jennings	Norton	Wadsworth
Jensen	O'Brien, Ill.	Walter
Johnson	O'Hara, Minn.	Weichel
Jonas	O'Konski	Welch, Calif.
Jones, Ala.	O'Neill	Welch, Mo.
Jones, N. C.	O'Sullivan	Werdel
Judd	O'Toole	Wheeler
Karst	Pace	White, Calif.
Karsten	Passman	White, Idaho
Kean	Patman	Whitten
Kearns	Patten	Whittington
Keating	Patterson	Wickersham
Kee	Perkins	Wigglesworth
Keefe	Peterson	Williams
Kelley	Pfeiffer,	Wilson, Tex.
Kennedy	William L.	Wolcott
Kerr	Phillips, Calif.	Wolverton
Kilburn	Phillips, Tenn.	Wood
Kilday	Pickett	Woodhouse
King	Plumley	Woodruff
Kirwan	Poage	Worley
Kruse	Polk	Yates

NOT VOTING—59

Allen, Ill.	Fernandes	Richards
Anderson, Calif.	Fogarty	Rivers
Bailey	Fulton	Scott, Hardie
Bates, Mass.	Gathings	Short
Bland	Gavin	Smith, Ohio
Bulwinkle	Gilmer	Somers
Burnside	Green	Staggers
Camp	Hardy	Taylor
Chatham	Havenner	Teague
Coffey	Hoffman, Ill.	Thomas, N. J.
Coudert	Huber	Vinson
Dague	Jenison	Walsh
Davenport	Jones, Mo.	Whitaker
Davis, Tenn.	Kearney	Willis
DeGraffenried	McCormack	Wilson, Ind.
Delaney	Merrow	Wilson, Okla.
Dingell	Morton	Winstead
Douglas	Poulson	Withrow
Doyle	Price	Zablocki
Fellows	Regan	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Staggers with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Davenport with Mr. Poulson.
Mrs. Douglas with Mr. Hardie Scott.
Mr. Walsh with Mr. Gavin.
Mr. Richards with Mr. Fellows.
Mr. Green with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Huber with Mr. Short.
Mr. deGraffenried with Mr. Smith of Ohio.
Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Jenison.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Anderson of California.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Teague with Mr. Dague.
Mr. Price with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Merrow.
Mr. McCormack with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.
Mr. Regan with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.

Mr. ADDONIZIO changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. CLEMENTE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. CROSSER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Lands may have permission to sit tomorrow during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, following the regular business of the day and any special orders heretofore granted, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I have a number of telegrams in support of the bill just passed. I ask unanimous consent that they may be inserted in the RECORD just before the Committee rose.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. CARROLL asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and insert two editorials.

Mr. MULTER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOLLING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include three editorials.

Mr. HEFFERNAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include excerpts from newspapers.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from Mr. Omar R. Ketchum, legislative director of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, explaining the veterans' pension issue.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and to include extraneous matter; also to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances and in each to include an article.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution introduced in the New York State Assembly by Assemblyman Richard H. Knauf.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. ELSTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Cincinnati Inquirer.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three separate instances and in each to include excerpts.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow and on Friday, after the other special orders, I may address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday this week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of S. 198, for the relief of the city and county of San Francisco. This is identical with a similar House bill, H. R. 1509, which passed a week ago last Monday.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not, but simply for the record—this is being done because the other body is not functioning very easily these days.

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am not too sure about that. Nevertheless, this is to pay the city and county of San Francisco $9,728.81.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the city and county of San Francisco, a municipal corporation, of San Francisco, Calif., the sum of $9,728.81, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement of expenses incurred in rebuilding and restoring a power-transmission line and loss of power revenue in township 3 south, range 5 east, and township 3 south, range 6 east, San Joaquin County, Calif., south of Tracy and approximately 3 miles from the Navy Vernalis Airfield, which transmission line was demolished by the crashing of a United States Navy plane type SB 2 C-3, bureau No. 19772, on August 6, 1944, at 9:21 p. m., while the said plane was engaged in making a flight over the area indicated, and on August 30, 1944, at 1:14 a. m., by the crashing of a United States Navy plane, type TBM-1, bureau No. 24094, while the said plane was likewise making a flight over the area indicated: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with such claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on February 28, 1949, present to the President, for his approval, a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 54. An act to retrocede to the State of New Mexico exclusive jurisdiction held by the United States over lands within the boundaries of the Los Alamos project of the United States Atomic Energy Commission; and

H. J. Res. 92. Joint resolution to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 2, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

303. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revision of the budget for the fiscal year 1950 involving a decrease of $22,442,000 in an estimate of appropriation and an increase in contract authority of $29,300,000 for the United States Maritime Commission in the form of amendments to the budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 90); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

304. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of a bill to designate the Air University Library, the Air University, United States Air Force, as a public depository for Government publications; to the Committee on House Administration.

305. A letter from the Commissioner, District Unemployment Compensation Board, transmitting the thirteenth annual report of the District Unemployment Compensation Board, covering the period from January 1 to December 31, 1948; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BATES of Kentucky: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 3082. A bill making appropriations for the Government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 167). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARY: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 3083. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 168). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HART: Joint Committee on the Economic Report. Report of the joint committee on the President's economic report; without amendment (Rept. No. 169). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REDDEN: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 220. A bill to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to revise the Alaska game law," approved July 1, 1943, as amended (57 Stat. 301); with amendments (Rept. No. 170). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REDDEN: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 1337. A bill to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the Alaska Council of Boy Scouts of America for recreation and other public purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 171). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 29. An act to authorize payment of claims based on loss of or damage to property deposited by alien enemies;

without amendment (Rept. No. 172). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McCULLOCH: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1950. A bill for the relief of certain consultants formerly employed by the Technical Industrial Intelligence Committee of the Foreign Economic Administration, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 173). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Senate Joint Resolution 36. Joint resolution for the authorization of a special contribution by the United States for the relief of Palestine refugees; without amendment (Rept. No. 174). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 585. A bill for the relief of Jacob A. Johnson; without amendment (Rept. No. 175). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEATING: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 650. A bill for the relief of George A. Kirchberger; without amendment (Rept. No. 176). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEATING: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 681. A bill for the relief of Mario Generazzo; with an amendment (Rept. No. 177). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 709. A bill for the relief of the General Engineering & Dry Dock Corp.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 178). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 738. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Minerva C. Davis; without amendment (Rept. No. 179). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1116. A bill for the relief of Mexican Fibre & Twine Co., Inc.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 180). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1121. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Adolphus M. Holman; without amendment (Rept. No. 181). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1276. A bill for the relief of the heirs of Ida Londinsky; with amendments (Rept. No. 182). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2249. A bill for the relief of Al W. Hosinski; with an amendment (Rept. No. 183). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2353. A bill for the relief of Joel W. Atkinson; with an amendment (Rept. No. 184). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2922. A bill for the relief of the State Compensation and Insurance Fund of California; without amendment (Rept. No. 185). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PETERSON: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 2653. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue duplicates of William Gerard's script certificates No. 2, subdivisions 11 and 12, to Blanche H. Weedon and Mattie Ward H. Harris, jointly; with amendments (Rept. No. 186). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEATING: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 580. A bill for the relief of the Bank of Kodiak, Kodiak, Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 187). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 634. An act to authorize payment of certain claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property and personal injury arising from activities of the Army; without amendment (Rept. No. 188). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 633. An act for the relief of Rachel D. Gattegno; without amendment (Rept. No. 189). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 594. An act for the relief of John I. Malarin, former Army mail clerk at APO 932, a branch of the San Francisco, Calif., post office, relative to a shortage in his fixed credit account; without amendment (Rept. No. 190). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 592. An act for the relief of Edwin B. Anderson; without amendment (Rept. No. 191). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES of Kentucky:

H. R. 3082. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 3083. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana (by request):

H. R. 3084. A bill to amend certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 3085. A bill to amend the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 3086. A bill to provide for the advance planning of public works; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 3087. A bill to provide for the deduction from gross income for income-tax purposes of expenses incurred by farmers for the purpose of soil and water conservation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 3088. A bill to increase the compensation of certain employees of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 3089. A bill to extend the coverage of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to the self-employed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 3090. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the founding of Malden, Mass.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3091. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the raid by the British Army on the Old Powder House at Somerville, Mass.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 3092. A bill to amend the act to regulate the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3093. A bill to amend the Boiler Inspection Act of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 3094. A bill to pay certain substitute postal employees time and one-half overtime, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KELLEY:

H. R. 3095. A bill to establish a Federal commission on services for the physically handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 3096. A bill to broaden the cooperative extension system as established in the act of May 8, 1914, and acts supplemental thereto, by providing for cooperative extension work between colleges receiving the benefits of this act and the acts of July 2, 1862, and August 30, 1890, and other qualified colleges, universities, and research agencies, and the United States Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 3097. A bill to provide compensation for excess hours of work by certain employees of the United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 3098. A bill to provide additional compensation for employees of the Federal Government and of the government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3099. A bill to provide additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3100. A bill to provide for salary increases for each officer and employee of the Federal Government and each officer and employee of the District of Columbia municipal government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3101. A bill to provide for salary increases for employees of the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3102. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Barber Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3103. A bill to promote the general welfare through the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in providing more effective programs of public kindergarten or kindergarten and nursery-school education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 3104. A bill to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LESINSKI (by request):

H. R. 3105. A bill to extend the benefits of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 to the

Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H. R. 3106. A bill to amend the Water Pollution Control Act to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for making loans to States, municipalities, and interstate agencies for the construction of treatment works and for the preparation of engineering reports, plans, and specifications in connection therewith; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 3107. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code to provide for a minimum wage; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. R. 3108. A bill to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3109. A bill to amend and supplement the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 3110. A bill making an appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, to carry into effect the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 3111. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; and to repeal subdivision b of section 64, subdivision h of section 70, and section 118 thereof and all acts and parts of acts inconsistent therewith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3112. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3113. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," and incorporate therein provisions relating to the United States Tax Court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 3114. A bill to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. R. 3115. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, relating to the compensation of employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3116. A bill to amend Public Law 702, Eightieth Congress, to provide assistance to certain veterans with paralysis resulting from brain injury in acquiring specially adapted housing; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 3117. A bill to eliminate the payment of interest on overpayments of taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VURSELL:

H. R. 3118. A bill to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WORLEY:

H. R. 3119. A bill to authorize the erection of additional facilities at the existing Veterans' Administration facility at Amarillo, Tex.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 3120. A bill to increase the income-tax exemptions from $600 to $750; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIES of New York:

H. R. 3121. A bill to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HART (by request):

H. R. 3122. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McKINNON:

H. R. 3123. A bill to conserve and increase the Nation's water resources, to strengthen the national security and common defense by authorizing research and demonstration of practical means of producing from any saline waters, sea or otherwise, water suitable for beneficial consumption use, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 3124. A bill to amend title 18, Criminal Code, to declare certain papers, pamphlets, books, pictures, and writings nonmailable, to provide a penalty for mailing same, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 3125. A bill to amend the jurisdictional act of August 30, 1935, affecting the Chippewa Indians of Lake Superior; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BARING:

H. J. Res. 180. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of Kansas (by request):

H. J. Res. 181. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEEFE:

H. J. Res. 182. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim June 20, 1949, as Emblem Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. Res. 122. Resolution authorizing expenses of conducting the study authorized by House Resolution 44, Eighty-first Congress, incurred by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. Res. 123. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct thorough studies and investigations of all matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for the creation of a Department of Natural Resources, the establishment of regional or branch offices of that and other Federal departments and agencies, and for the location of a United States Military Academy of the Air in Denver; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to make Indians citizens of the United States in order that they may be able to vote; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, relating to their house concurrent resolution expressing confidence in the Honorable A. M. Christy and in the Honorable Willson C. Moore, judges of the Circuit Court, First Circuit, Territory of Hawaii, and the integrity of the judiciary in Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend section 5 of the Idaho Admission Act to provide that oil, gas, and hydrocarbons leases may be made upon school lands for an initial period of 10 years and for as long thereafter as oil and gas or other hydrocarbons are being produced; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact remedial legislation for protection of the States with regard to sales tax on cigarettes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to support the President in his steadfast support of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway project; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to make provision for payment of the exact equivalent of taxes to the States and other lesser political subdivisions whenever the tax base of such taxing units is depleted by withdrawals of lands for the use of Federal agencies; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to abolish the Jackson Hole National Monument; to the Committee on Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 3126. A bill to provide for the extension of patent No. 1,866,197 issued July 5, 1932, to W. G. Cunningham, relating to vehicle-washing apparatus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 3127. A bill to authorize the admission into the United States of Jacob Gross, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 3128. A bill to grant permanent residence in the United States to Jadwiga Pulaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEEFE:

H. R. 3129. A bill for the relief of Jean Bizzio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3130. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Katherine Dorn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLEY:

H. R. 3131. A bill for the relief of Roza Grunfeld Moskovics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3132. A bill for the relief of Sergio and Mara Lamberti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3133. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Steingesser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 3134. A bill for the relief of Wilfred A. Croteau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

H. R. 3135. A bill to provide for the extension of certain patents which were not fully utilized due to emergency conditions existing

during World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 3136. A bill for the relief of Anthony Lazanis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. R. 3137. A bill for the relief of Manuel Perez Lloss and Jose Perez Lloss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee:

H. R. 3138. A bill for the relief of Arthur Holbert, the estate of Ernest L. Gass, deceased, and the state of James L. Thomas, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REDDEN:

H. R. 3139. A bill for the relief of James B. DeHart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3140. A bill for the relief of James Gordon Burgess; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 3141. A bill for the relief of Samuel T. Poness, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SOMERS:

H. R. 3142. A bill for the relief of Demetre Anastassopoulos and Aspasie Anastassopoulos and their minor children, Marie and Karin and Ira and Ellen Anastassopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

139. By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming: Memorial No. 2 of the Thirtieth State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to consider and pass a resolution appropriating money to commence the building of certain irrigation projects in the Powder River Basin and the Tongue River Basin; to the Committee on Appropriations.

140. Also, memorial of the Thirtieth Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to abolish the Jackson Hole National Monument; to the Committee on Public Lands.

141. By Mr. BREEN: Memorial of the City Council of Hamilton, Ohio, memorializing the Congress to pass the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

142. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of Jersey City (N. J.) Council, No. 137, Knights of Columbus, petitioning the Government of the United States, as a signatory to the peace treaty of 1947 with Hungary, to investigate the entire case involving Josef Cardinal Mindszenty and expose all violations of the said treaty affecting the arrest, charges against, and trial of Cardinal Mindszenty, and take all necessary steps to compel enforcement of the said treaty; also petitioning the United Nations to investigate the entire case involving Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, and expose all violations of the Declaration of Human Rights, as enacted and promulgated at Paris, December 1948, affecting the arrest, charges against, and trial of Cardinal Mindszenty, and take all necessary steps to compel enforcement of the said declaration; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

143. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Ruth Barnhart, executive secretary, Texas Hospital Association, Lubbock, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution commending action of the past and requesting that further study of the problem of integrating and coordinating all of the hospitals of the Nation can result in further improvements in the quality of hospital care available to citizens of this Nation; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

144. Also, petition of E. Lumen, of Mexico, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to opposing action of the United Fruit Co. in blockading maritime transport in Guatemala; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

145. Also, petition of Jesus Sauza Gonzalez, secretary general, National Union of Newspaper Editors of Mexico, petitioning consideration of their resolution opposing action of the United Fruit Co. in Guatemala; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 2, 1949

(Legislative day of Monday, February 21, 1949)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and eternal God, grant that this Lenten season upon which we have entered may be glorious in the culture of our souls.

May it be a season of honest self-examination and a time of cleansing of heart and consecration of purpose. May we heed the words of insight and inspiration:

"By all means use some time to be alone.
Salute thyself! See what thy soul doth wear."

Give us that confidence which is the reward of quiet waiting upon God, for we so often allow our faith to become eclipsed by doubt and fear.

Help us to believe in the need and power of prayer. We know that prayer may never remove our problems and difficulties, but it will give us strength to meet them courageously.

In Christ's name we bring our petitions. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 198. An act for the relief of the city and county of San Francisco;

S. 279. An act to authorize the advance on the retired list of Lt. John T. McDermott, United States Navy (retired), to the grade of lieutenant commander; and

S. 307. An act for the relief of Engebert Axer.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 199. An act to provide the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence, to make immigration quotas available to Asian and Pacific peoples, and for other purposes;

H. R. 555. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, Northern Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons for reimbursement for damages and losses sustained as a result of a flood which occurred in December 1937 in levee district No. 10, Yuba County, Calif.;

H. R. 572. An act for the relief of Sylvia M. Misetich;

H. R. 574. An act for the relief of Fred E. Weber;

H. R. 575. An act for the relief of the estate of James Patrick Hackett and Charles L. Stover;

H. R. 576. An act for the relief of Arthur G. Robinson;

H. R. 577. An act to correct possible inequity in the case of a certain application for letters patent of William R. Blair;

H. R. 578. An act for the relief of Carlton C. Grant and others;

H. R. 581. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the Territory of Alaska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim, or claims, of Hilda Links and E. J. Ohman, partners, and Fred L. Kroesing, all of Anchorage, Alaska;

H. R. 591. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lucille Davidson;

H. R. 592. An act for the relief of James W. Keith;

H. R. 595. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Harry W. Sharpley, his heirs, administrators, or assigns, against the United States;

H. R. 596. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of John E. Parker, his heirs, administrators, or assigns, against the United States;

H. R. 618. An act for the relief of Eugene J. Bearman;

H. R. 652. An act for the relief of Laura Spinnichia;

H. R. 659. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth B. Murphy;

H. R. 669. An act for the relief of Mrs. Shirley Leinwand;

H. R. 684. An act for the relief of Benjamin Gordon;

H. R. 697. An act for the relief of Samuel W. Poorvu;

H. R. 711. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Gregg Dilnot;

H. R. 729. An act for the relief of John J. O'Neil;

H. R. 739. An act for the relief of Mary Jane Harris;

H. R. 745. An act for the relief of B. John Hanson;

H. R. 767. An act for the relief of Eugene Spitzer;

H. R. 1035. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ada M. Ryan;

H. R. 1036. An act for the relief of R. C. Owen, R. C. Owen, Jr., and Roy Owen;

H. R. 1041. An act for the relief of Jeannette and Jesus Esteva and their four children;

H. R. 1043. An act for the relief of Mrs. Wesley Berk (formerly Mrs. Ruth Cameron);

H. R. 1052. An act for the relief of Lawrence G. McCarthy;

H. R. 1057. An act for the relief of John Keith;

H. R. 1061. An act for the relief of Bernice Green;

H. R. 1066. An act for the relief of James Leon Keaton;

H. R. 1076. An act for the relief of Jennie Olsen Anderson;

H. R. 1079. An act for the relief of Maria Veitri Magnone;

H. R. 1093. An act for the relief of D. Lane Powers and Elaine Powers Taylor;

H. R. 1094. An act for the relief of Nellie M. Clark;

H. R. 1095. An act for the relief of Pittsburgh DuBois Co.;

H. R. 1098. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Andrew Ferdinand DeWitt III, a minor;

H. R. 1103. An act for the relief of Miriam Barkie;

H. R. 1164. An act for the relief of the estate of H. M. McCorvey;

H. R. 1169. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marion T. Schwartz;

H. R. 1176. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Leroy Hann;

H. R. 1271. An act for the relief of Carl E. Lawson and Fireman's Fund Indemnity Co.;

H. R. 1279. An act for the relief of George Hampton;

H. R. 1280. An act for the relief of Mrs. Judge E. Estes;

H. R. 1286. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Rowland;

H. R. 1299. An act for the relief of Frank J. Patzke, Archie Mitchell, J. L. Shoemaker, Einar Engen, and N. L. Gifford;

H. R. 1300. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hope Irene Buley;

H. R. 1452. An act for the relief of A. J. Crozat, Jr.;

H. R. 1459. An act for the relief of E. Neill Raymond;

H. R. 1460. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sylvia Mapelli;

H. R. 1471. An act for the relief of E. La Ree Smoot;

H. R. 1489. An act for the relief of James I. Matthews;

H. R. 1490. An act for the relief of the estates of Arthur F. Saladino, Joseph Spivack, and Irving Weinberg;

H. R. 1501. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Rose Mary Ammirato, a minor;

H. R. 1508. An act for the relief of Peter Drozd;

H. R. 1597. An act for the relief of Hal W. Cline;

H. R. 1599. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary T. Maloney Preece;

H. R. 1602. An act for the relief of Ben Grunstein;

H. R. 1629. An act for the relief of Kira and Nina Grigorieff;

H. R. 1813. An act for the relief of Edward Woolf;

H. R. 1870. An act for the relief of Doris Marie Richard;

H. R. 1878. An act for the relief of Ben Luke Pond, Shao Hung Pond, and David Yat Wei Pond;

H. R. 1983. An act for the relief of Edward L. Barreras;

H. R. 2089. An act for the relief of William Price;

H. R. 2261. An act for the relief of Eva C. Netzley Ridley, William G. Stuff, Lois Stuff, and Harry E. Ridley; and the estates of Clyde C. Netzley and Sarah C. Stuff;

H. R. 2268. An act for the relief of Forest L. Weatherly;

H. R. 2352. An act for the relief of Roy Durbin;

H. R. 2474. An act for the relief of Frank E. Blanchard;

H. R. 2605. An act for the relief of John C. Nunes; and

H. R. 2708. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Joseph DeSouza, Jr.

REPORTS OF EXPENDITURES UNDER UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION (H. DOC. NO. 94)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth quarterly reports of expenditures under the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration Joint Resolution, Public Law 267, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved March 28, 1944. These reports cover the quarters ended June 30, 1948, September 30, 1948, and December 31, 1948.

As a consequence of the substantial closure of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration's activities on June 30, 1947, the present reports are limited to statements of the status of United States appropriations as of the dates indicated.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 2, 1949.*

(NOTE.—The report accompanied a similar message to the House of Representatives.)

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred, as indicated:

REVISED SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY (S. DOC. NO. 23)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revised supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of the Army, amounting to $22,500,000, fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REVISED SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, PAYMENT OF CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES, AUDITED CLAIMS, AND JUDGMENTS (S. DOC. NO. 24)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revised supplemental estimate of appropriation, amounting to $61,713.42, for the payment of claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED PROVISION PERTAINING TO AN EXISTING APPROPRIATION FOR DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (S. DOC. NO. 22)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the Department of Agriculture (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on veterans' affairs (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to that Commission (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Veterans' Administration (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Humphrey	Mundt
Anderson	Hunt	Murray
Baldwin	Ives	Myers
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Bricker	Johnson, Tex.	O'Conor
Bridges	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Broughton	Kefauver	Pepper
Butler	Kem	Reed
Cain	Kerr	Robertson
Chavez	Kilgore	Russell
Connally	Knowland	Saltonstall
Cordon	Langer	Schoeppel
Donnell	Lodge	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Long	Smith, N. J.
Downey	Lucas	Sparkman
Eastland	McCarran	Stennis
Ecton	McCarthy	Taft
Ellender	McClellan	Taylor
Flanders	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Fulbright	McGrath	Thye
George	McKellar	Tobey
Gillette	Magnuson	Tydings
Green	Malone	Vandenberg
Hayden	Martin	Watkins
Hendrickson	Maybank	Wherry
Hill	Miller	Wiley
Hoey	Millikin	Williams
Holland	Morse	Withers

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the junior Senator from Indian [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent attending the funeral of a close personal friend, Mr. Ivan C. Morgan.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I desire to make the same request I made yesterday. I ask unanimous consent that Senators who desire to submit petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and present other matters such as are usually presented during the morning hour, be permitted to do so without in any way interfering with the parliamentary situation in the consideration of the pending question.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, does the request include reports of committees?

Mr. LUCAS. It does.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator's request include the condition

that presentations shall be made without debate?

Mr. LUCAS. That, Mr. President, is understood. As I understand, during the morning hour such presentations must be made without debate, and I include that in my request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to say that as I understand the unanimous-consent request is the same as the one which was entered into yesterday. The request is a blanket one that Senators may make insertions in the RECORD and file committee reports, so long as debate does not arise in connection therewith, and that the present is the only opportunity during this calendar day when such requests and insertions may be made? Is that correct?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Reserving the right to object, I wish to say I do not know that that would impinge on the right of any Senator to ask unanimous consent later in the day to have something printed in the RECORD, if the Senator did not accompany such request with a statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not think so, for the reason that one unanimous-consent request can be modified by another one later.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Chair.

Mr. LUCAS. The only point I make at this particular time is that we have had a quorum call, and bills and joint resolutions and other matters ought to be presented to the Senate now. I do not want to be dictatorial in the enforcement of the agreement, but yesterday the situation arose that one Senator attempted, at the close of the session, to insert into the RECORD a great deal of material, and I called to the attention of that Senator at that time the agreement previously entered into. The Senator asked unanimous consent to do the very thing that the Senator from Georgia says could be done, and we yielded to that Senator to do what he requested. The majority leader and the minority leader both agreed that we ought to try to follow as closely as possible the procedure we are now trying to have agreed upon, in order to have continuity in the debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to be absent from the session of the Senate on Thursday next.

STRENGTHENING OF UNITED NATIONS—RESOLUTION FROM TOWN OF EAST PEPPERELL, MASS.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. LODGE] and myself, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, a resolution of the town meeting of the town of East Pepperell, Mass., relative to strengthening the United Nations.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF TOWN CLERK,
East Pepperell, Mass., February 23, 1949.

Hon. Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SALTONSTALL: Annual town meeting, February 21, 1949, article 31, voted that the town will address the following resolution to each of our United States Senators from Massachusetts and to our Representative in Congress:

"Whereas it is our belief that the United Nations should be so strengthened that it shall become adequate for the preservation of world peace; we therefore earnestly recommend your support for all measures tending toward this end; and whereas we have the deepest confidence in the Federal system of Government, devised by our fathers, under which the United States has prospered for 160 years: We specifically recommend your support for such changes in the United Nations Charter as shall make it a limited world federal government, with full power over all matters vital to the preservation of peace."

A true copy.

Attest:

[SEAL] JOHN F. CULLINAN,
Town Clerk.

JOSEF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution of the Scranton Council, Knights of Columbus, at Scranton, Pa., protesting the mock trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, and urging that the United States take immediate action to effect the release of the cardinal, to uphold the sanctity of our treaty with Hungary, to appeal the cardinal's sentence to the United Nations, and to mobilize world opinions against all perpetrators of such an infamous trial.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Josef Cardinal Mindszenty has been sentenced to life imprisonment following the travesty of a mock trial staged by Moscow's communistic henchmen in Hungary:

Whereas the conscience of the entire world has been shocked by this blow against freedom of religion and the independence of churches;

Whereas during the course of the trial, the ambassador of the United States was maliciously accused of interfering in Hungarian domestic affairs;

Whereas the trial flaunted an open defiance of the peace treaty between the United States and Hungary which obligates the signatories to assure to all persons under their jurisdiction all fundamental religious, political, and human freedom: Be it

Resolved, That the Knights of Columbus, Scranton Council 230, protests against this flagrant insult to religion, human freedom, and our Government; and be it further

Resolved, That President Truman, the Department of State, the United States Congress, and the United States delegates to the United Nations be requested to take immediate action to effect the immediate release of the cardinal; to take whatever action is necessary to uphold the sanctity of its treaty with Hungary; to appeal the cardinal's sentence to the United Nations; to mobilize world opinion against all perpetrators of such an infamous trial; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to Secretary of State Dean Acheson, United States Senators Francis J. Myers and Edward J. Martin and United States Representative Harry P. O'Neill.

JOSEPH A. MADDEN,
Chairman, Resolutions Committee.
JOHN D. BRESLIN.
PATRICK MURPHY.
FRANK RADER.

AMERICAN BUTTER INDUSTRY—LETTER FROM MILTON H. BUTTON

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received this morning an important communication from the able director of the Wisconsin State Department of Agriculture, Milton H. Button.

This eminent agricultural leader has summarized very carefully what we of the Midwest feel are some of the crucial issues involved in the proposed legislation which would lay open the American butter industry to fraud and deception by an artificial product.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Button's letter be printed in the RECORD at this point and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN STATE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Madison, Wis., February 28, 1949.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Efforts now being made to repeal all restrictions on the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine present extremely serious implications to the consumer, to the dairy industry, and to all citizens of the Nation.

Those who are interested in the long-range aspect of the matter, question the logic of a Congress that appropriates many millions of dollars for a program designed to preserve the priceless heritage of soil fertility, and simultaneously considers the adoption of legislation that will change our Nation's agriculture from a grassland animal-husbandry structure, to a row-crop soil-depleting type of agriculture that will inevitably destroy our irreplaceable top soil. The problem is basic and serious, and it must be given major consideration by all statesmen of Congress.

The Wisconsin Department of Agriculture is charged by statute with the duty of protecting consumers against fraudulent advertising and imitations. In this capacity it is our contention that the advertising of yellow oleomargarine with pictures of cattle, dairy barns, and pasture scenes, accompanied by phrases and slogans designed to make the consumer believe oleomargarine is a dairy product is a direct, intentional, and flagrant violation of the fraudulent advertising statute.

The United States Food and Drug Administration and the Federal Trade Commission have refused to give attention to this problem or are powerless to cope with it.

The oleomargarine industry has sought and received permission to imitate, synthetically or otherwise, the desirable qualities of butter. They are now imitating the distinctive butter flavor and texture, they are adding synthetic vitamins, they are packaging their product in cartons similar to those used by the butter industry, and have appropriated for themselves the age-old butter

trademark, its yellow color. These facts indicate that oleomargarine was developed and is being marketed as an imitation product. Historically, this Nation has protected consumers against such deceptive imitation.

For many years new legislation has been designed to provide additional protection against fraud and imitation to the consumer. This policy has been extended to include the interests of the producer and manufacturer.

Now great forces are at work to destroy this protection that we have taken for granted. The oleomargarine industry is asking that the controls against imitation and fraud that now exist in other industries be removed from its particular product.

In the main, other nations of the world maintain the consumer controls that the oleomargarine industry is attempting to avoid in the United States. Some nations maintain a tax or fee as we do. Some enforce the statutes relating to fair-trade practices in labeling and advertising. Some require the addition of ingredients that will make identification immediately possible for the consumer. Some have controlled the matter through the establishment of a state monopoly which has removed the opportunity for unreasonable profits. Some do not permit the manufacture of yellow oleomargarine. Still others protect the consumer by rigid and arbitrary price-fixing schedules.

To summarize, the methods vary but other nations do afford consumer protection. We are looking to you and your associates in the Eighty-first Congress for legislation that is in keeping with the principles and traditions of consumer protection.

Sincerely yours,
MILTON H. BUTTON,
Director.

INCLUSION OF CERTAIN SCHOOLS IN FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION LEGISLATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point several letters and resolutions which I have received from spiritual leaders in my State, including a distinguished clergyman and editor, Rev. Anthony P. Wagener, of La Crosse, and Rev. John K. Mueller, of Green Bay, Wis., plus various laymen and laywomen, urging the inclusion of private and parochial schools in Federal aid to education legislation.

I ask that these letters and resolutions be appropriately referred to the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee for its careful attention in connection with this vital subject.

There being no objection, the letters were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REGISTER, LA CROSSE EDITION,
La Crosse, Wis., February 7, 1949.

United States Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: It is with keen interest that we are watching the progress of the Thomas bill providing Federal aid to education. In the light of the activity of current anti-American pressure groups which would deny constitutional rights to nonpublic schools and students who attend such schools, we have cause to fear that such unconstitutional pressure may be brought to bear on this Federal aid to education bill by which these nonpublic schools would be deprived such aid.

As the editor of the Register, we represent some 35,000 families in Wisconsin with a total of 150,000 of the State's population. We feel from your past record of supporting measures guaranteeing the welfare of the general body politic that as the lawful representative of these 150,000 people from your State you will be true to the vote of confidence they have given you by doing all in your power to support only a fair Federal aid bill which would guarantee that Federal funds will be available to furnish health and welfare services for nonpublic school pupils as well as public school pupils. The innate parental right to choose a nonpublic school for the education of their children is one of the glorious features enunciated by our Constitution. Records have shown that nonpublic school pupils become ideal and loyal American citizens, conscientious American voters, and worthy taxpayers. To exclude them from such a bill would be depriving them of their natural and constitutional rights.

We have cause for alarm in trends to use a "pincher movement" on the great American nonpublic school institutions. We feel that this movement, as exemplified in the now infamous McCollum case is fostered by a small minority group, consisting of avowed bigots, and dangerous un-American and godless individuals.

We refer you in your support of a Federal aid bill guaranteeing aid to nonpublic schools to the 1947 Everson decision in which case nonpublic school transportation was involved when Justice Black, writing the majority opinion, stated, "obviously it is not the purpose of the first amendment to cut off church schools from services separate and indisputably marked off from their religious function." We feel it is beyond dispute that bus rides and health and welfare services are indisputably marked off from the religious function of these nonpublic schools which are conducted under religious auspices.

It is our wish, therefore, and we feel it is yours, that your voice in the Senate be raised in support of a just Federal aid to education bill which will safeguard the rights of all loyal Americans.

With warmest personal regards.

Yours most sincerely,
Rev. ANTHONY P. WAGENER,
Editor.

GREEN BAY DIOCESAN UNION OF HOLY NAME SOCIETIES,
Green Bay, Wis., January 25, 1949.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: As the diocesan director of the 30,000 men in our Holy Name societies, I am very much interested in the proposed bills for Federal aid to education. Rumor has it that the Thomas bill, S. 246, will be reported out favorably and will be on the Senate Calendar soon. In the interest of justice, I think that our Representatives in Washington ought to point out that the Thomas bill gives aid to the States on the basis of the total child population and not on the basis of the enrollment in public schools. Having based the amount of Federal aid on the total child population, the bill goes on to state that some of these funds be used for health and welfare services in public schools and nothing in the bill guarantees that non-public-school children will receive similar services. According to my understanding of the matter, a place like Green Bay, where one-half of the children are in parochial schools, allotments will be given based on the total child population regardless of school, but the expenditures of the moneys for school health and welfare services would be for public schools only. This seems unfair.

I think it is about time that we make it very clear that parents have a basic right to select nonpublic schools for the education of their children and that any fair bill ought to provide and guarantee that nonpublic schools be assisted along with the others in regard to health and welfare services such as checking teeth, examination for tuberculosis, etc., which in no way conflict with the so-called separation of church and State. Besides, since the Government is being so sympathetic with the States and cities with regard to costs of education, someone ought to point out that great financial assistance is being given now to the public schools by the parochial school system which is saving millions of dollars in taxes in every State where they exist.

Thanking you for your attention to this important matter and hoping that you will consider well the isues involved, I remain,

Sincerely yours,
REV. JOHN K. MUELLER,
Diocesan Director.

STANLEY, WIS., *February 7, 1949.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILEY: As president of our local unit of the Diocesan Council of Catholic Women, my attention has been called to the discussions now in progress before the Senate Education Committee on the Thomas bill, which we understand proposes to eliminate nonpublic schools from participation in Federal aid to education.

We are deeply concerned about this matter, and earnestly appeal to you to give this matter your thorough consideration in the interests of fairness and justice.

Both public and nonpublic school systems are solid partners and coordinated components of our American educational system. Both systems comply in every respect with all compulsory education laws. The graduates of both systems have the inalienable right to hold public office, and the right to serve in the defense of their country in times of national need. That is the American educational system, guaranteed by our Constitution, and we strongly protest any suggestion to deny essential privileges to one or the other.

We believe a fair Federal aid bill should contain a provision that Federal funds will be made available to furnish health and welfare services to nonpublic as well as public schools. These services are absolutely essential. They are not religious in any sense, and any attempt to cloud the issue in this respect is manifestly unfair and unjust.

Our Constitution gives us the right to send our children to either a public or nonpublic school. Be honest. Let all children participate in the essential health and welfare provisions of such Federal aid.

We represent more than 300 mothers in this community, and we earnestly hope we can rely upon your sense of fairness and justice to give us the working tools to provide decent educational standards for all our children.

Yours very truly,
Mrs. FRED ZAIS,
President, St. Mary's Guild.

FAIRCHILD, WIS., *February 3, 1949.*

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator from Wisconsin,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: President Truman recently recommended the early passage of a Federal aid to education law. Congress is now working on such a law. One of the bills proposed and now under consideration by the Senate Education Committee is called the Thomas bill. This Federal aid bill does not provide for the participation of nonpublic schools in any form of Federal aid to education. Any just and equitable Federal aid should contain a guaranty that Federal funds will be made

available for health and welfare services of non-public-school pupils as well as for the public-school pupil.

We have always recognized the right of parents to choose any school, whether public or nonpublic, for the education of their children, and in compliance with the compulsory education laws of the State. The nonpublic school has served its country well by instilling in its pupils the love of country, the necessity of fulfilling their duties as good citizens, and by providing a high standard of education. Graduates of nonpublic schools have taken a prominent place in politics, business, labor and every profession beside the graduates of our public schools. They have rallied to the defense of their country in her every hour of need. They have shed their blood and given their lives that we might enjoy the blessings of our democratic way of life. Both the public and nonpublic schools are part of the American way of life, and so are eligible for a share in any Federal aid to education. Our nonpublic schools have done their work well and can justly claim a share in the greatness of our country. Why, then, should they not also share in the benefits which our Government has to offer? Why should they be discriminated against in any Federal aid to education?

The funds to support this Federal aid to education come from the taxes of all American citizens, and all in justice should receive a fair share. Should our parents have the right to send their children to the school of their choosing and then be penalized for their choice? Should parents be asked to pay the school tax and then receive no benefit from it? In justice, nonpublic schools are entitled to Federal funds because they, like the public schools, serve the public interest.

As our representative in the Congress of the United States, we beg of you to use your influence to see that the nonpublic schools receive a just share of the funds provided for any Federal aid to education.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. LOUIS HAENEL,
President of Catholic Women's Sodality.

ST. JOHN'S RECTORY,
Bloomer, Wis., February 4, 1949.

United States Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE AND DEAR SENATOR: In regard to the Federal aid to education bill which may soon be enacted into law, we, the Diocesan Council of Catholic Women of your district, are humbly submitting our views in this very important measure.

First, we wish to stress very emphatically that the family supersedes the state and the family has the basic parental right to select a nonpublic school for the education of their children.

The American Bill of Rights is sufficiently broad and eminently fair; let it not be twisted and distorted by new interpretations.

We just emerged from a total war against an omnipotent state as exemplified in the ambitions of Hitlerism. In this conflict students and graduates of public and nonpublic schools played an active role. Today we are faced with the ghastly prospect of another similar conflict, may God avert it, in which the students and graduates of public and nonpublic schools will again be subject to the call of their country.

Now if they are eligible and subject to the call of duty, both the public and nonpublic schools in terms of justice are entitled to Federal aid for the very reason that they both serve the public interest.

Both the public and nonpublic schools are integral elements of the American educational system.

In both types parents may comply with their duty under the compulsory educational system and the laws of the State.

In view of the foregoing it will only be just and a Fair Deal as promised by our President, that pro rata of funds be allocated for health and welfare service for nonpublic school pupils.

We, the undersigned, will greatly appreciate your interest in this forthcoming bill.

May God bless you and we humbly pray that justice may prevail.

OFFICERS OF THE DIOCESAN COUNCIL OF CATHOLIC WOMEN, COOKS VALLEY, WIS.

Mrs. BERNARD STOFFEL, *President.*
Mrs. WM. STOFFEL, *Vice President.*
Mrs. HERMAN SCHINDER, *Secretary.*
Mrs. RICHARD PECHA, *Treasurer.*

INVITATION FOR HOLDING OF THE 1956 OLYMPIC GAMES AT DETROIT, MICH.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, from the Foreign Relations Committee, I report unanimously Senate Joint Resolution 56, extending an invitation for the Olympic games to be held in the United States in 1956. The committee which makes the decision internationally meets in Rome the first week in April.

May I inquire of the able Senator from Illinois if it would violate the rule which has been adopted if I were to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I think it would violate the agreement. However, the Senator from Michigan can make the request and see what happens.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I have nothing to lose by trying it. It is very important that this governmental invitation should issue. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I would like to say that I feel the joint resolution is so important that the Senate is justified in setting aside the question under discussion in order to consider Senate Joint Resolution 56 immediately.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I want it distinctly understood that if the request of the Senator from Michigan is granted, it will not set aside the pending question, as suggested by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, may the joint resolution be read by title?

Mr. VANDENBERG. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 56) extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1956 Olympic games at Detroit, Mich.

The invitation is extended by the United States Olympic Association, of which the President of the United States is the head.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 56) extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1956 Olympic games at Detroit, Mich., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time and passed, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Government of the United States joins in the invitation of the United States Olympic Association to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1956 Olympic games in the United States at Detroit, Mich.; and expresses the hospitable hope that the United States may be selected as the site for this great enterprise in international good will.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is directed to transmit a copy of this joint resolution to the International Olympic Committee.

The preamble was agreed to.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ERICKER:

S. 1151. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(Mr. McCARRAN introduced Senate bill 1152, for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Office of United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands who suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 1153. A bill for the relief of certain Latvians; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 1154. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Liebermann Gordon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1155. A bill for the relief of Fernando Gerassi, Estefania Maria Gerassi and John Gerassi;

S. 1156. A bill for the relief of Salomon Nadler, Vera Nadler, Daniel Nadler, and Robert Nadler; and

S. 1157. A bill for the relief of Olga Konciukiewicz Simonson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1158. A bill to designate the Air University Library, the Air University, United States Air Force, as a public depository for Government publications; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND):

S. 1159. A bill to amend Public Law 805, Eightieth Congress, chapter 813, second session; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. WAGNER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HILL, Mr. LANGER, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. DOUGLAS):

S. 1160. A bill to establish a Missouri Valley Authority to provide for unified water control and resource development on the Missouri River, its tributaries and watershed, to prevent floods, reclaim and irrigate lands, encourage agriculture, stimulate industrial expansion, develop low-cost hydroelectric power, promote navigation, increase recreational possibilities, protect wildlife, strengthen the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1161. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alice T. Thabit; and

S. 1162. A bill to remove the limitation upon the time within which application may be made for lump-sum death payments under section 202 (g) of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. MYERS introduced Senate bill 1163, to amend the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 1164. A bill to provide for more effective conservation in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1165. A bill to provide relief for the sheep-raising industry by making special quota immigration visas available to certain alien sheepherders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. TOBEY):

S. J. Res. 58. Joint resolution providing for a rehearing in the matter of the Bellows Falls Hydroelectric Corp. (project No. 1892), known as the Wilder Dam project, and a review of any order of the Federal Power Commission therein; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION ACT OF 1924

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, in order to permit the immigration outside of quota allowances of parents of American citizens who are otherwise eligible for admission, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an explanatory statement I have prepared be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1163) to amend the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, introduced by Mr. MYERS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (a) of section 4 of the Immigration Act of May 26, 1924, as amended (8 U. S. C. 204 (a)), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) An immigrant who is the unmarried child under 21 years of age, or the wife, or the husband, or the mother or father, of a citizen of the United States: *Provided,* That the marriage shall have occurred prior to issuance of visa and, in the case of husbands of citizens, prior to January 1, 1948."

SEC. 2. Section 6 (a) (1) (A) of the Immigration Act of May 26, 1924, as amended (8 U. S. C. 206 (a) (1) (A)), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(A) Quota immigrants who are the husbands of citizens of the United States by marriages occurring on or after January 1, 1948."

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. MYERS was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MYERS, OF PENNSYLVANIA, ON BILL TO AMEND THE IMMIGRATION ACT TO FACILITATE THE ENTRANCE INTO THIS COUNTRY OF PARENTS OF AMERICAN CITIZENS IF THE PARENTS ARE OTHERWISE ELIGIBLE FOR ADMISSION

This bill merely extends to fathers and mothers of American citizens the same opportunities for reasonably expeditious immigration into the United States which are now accorded to minor children and to wives of American citizens, and, in certain cases, to husbands.

The present statutes permit the immigration outside of quotas of minor children and wives and, in marriages occurring before January 1, 1948, of husbands, providing these relatives are otherwise eligible for admission to this country. The present statutes also provide a preference status for parents to come to this country, but the preference, of course, is under the quota regulations.

According to testimony of high officials of the State Department's Visa Division before a staff committee on immigration and naturalization last July, the parents of citizens residing in a number of foreign countries which have low quota allowances, even with their preferential status, are required to wait 7 or 8 years before they can be reached.

This situation has been made even more acute by virtue of the fact that during the war immigration virtually ceased, and even the few quota numbers provided under present laws were not used and subsequently expired, thus extending for additional years the period of delay so agonizing to those who yearn to join their families in this land of freedom.

From the testimony taken at that committee staff hearing on July 15, 1948, I am inclined to believe that the State Department would be willing to support legislation of this sort.

I have been urged, as I know many other Members of Congress have been urged, to introduce legislation to increase the quota of a particular nation. The desire is based primarily on the difficulties of American citizens in bringing to this country various categories of close relatives, but particularly fathers and mothers.

Due to the pattern of our immigration experience over the past few decades, I believe this bill would accommodate a reasonable number of worthy cases so as to serve a meritorious cause without causing any strain on the housing or employment opportunities for American citizens.

Most of those who would be eligible to be admitted under this bill would undoubtedly live with their sons or daughters in this country, and it is a safe assumption, I believe, that many would be at that stage of life where they would not be competing for employment with Americans. It is taken for granted, of course, that there would be full provision made for their care by the families involved.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Office of United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands, and ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a letter received from the Secretary of the Interior in connection therewith, be printed in full in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1152) for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Office of United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands who suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is authorized to be appropriated and there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the following sums of money for payment to the following-named officers and employees of the Office of United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands, which sums represent the value of reasonable and necessary personal property lost by them, while in the course of their respective duties, as a result of war conditions:

Helen Burke, $4,779.16; Claude Buss, $3,355; Donald L. Cochran, $1,558; William H. Cropper, $117.50; Gordon W. Ells, $3,119.82; Elise Flahavan, $1,268; Charles W. Franks, $5,532.50; George O. Gray, $445; Bertha T. Greusel, $834; Grace Jurgensen, $392.50; Ruth P. Lovell, $1,217; Edward L. Mack, $540; James Moses, $3,335.97; Anna Belle Newcomb, $790; Frederick H. Noble, $700.50; Margaret Pierce, $265; Mona Raymond, $852; Ervin C. Ross, $3,056; Francis B. Sayre, $2,037; William J. Stumpf, Jr., $1,251; Woodbury Willoughby, $2,434; James D. Wilson, $1,045; Mrs. Marie F. Wolff, $1,070.

SEC. 2. If any of the beneficiaries under this act shall have died before the payment herein provided for is made, said payment shall be made to the estate of such beneficiary.

SEC. 3. The acceptance of any payment herein authorized shall constitute a complete discharge of the United States of all claims and demands touching any of the matters involved in section 1 of this act.

SEC. 4. That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The letter presented by Mr. McCARRAN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, February 7, 1949.

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
President of the United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is attached a draft of a proposed bill which would appropriate the total amount of $40,074.96 for the relief of a number of individuals formerly stationed in Manila as employees in the office of the United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands. The proposed bill is designed to provide reimbursement for the loss of personal property as a result of war conditions.

I request that this measure be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and I recommend its enactment.

Most of these employees were captured and interned by the enemy and were not released until 1945. A few escaped by submarine or otherwise, but they lost all their personal possessions except for such small articles as they were able to carry on their persons.

This matter has not been submitted to the Congress heretofore for several reasons. The employees were in bad physical condition; they had lost contact with Manila; and most, if not all, of their records were missing. In addition, there was a question as to which agency of the Government should present their claims to the Congress—the Department of the Interior, the Department of State, or the United States High Commissioner. The High Commissioner undertook the responsibility in the first instance, but by the time the data were collected and the claims had been investigated, reviewed, and audited by the staff members to whom he assigned that task, the Philippine Islands had become independent and the Office of High Commissioner had ceased to exist. On July 26, 1947, the Department of the Interior assumed the responsibility for the liquidation of the Office of High Commissioner.

All the claims involved in this proposed bill have been carefully scrutinized and reviewed, and reimbursement has been recommended to cover only such personal property as it was reasonable and necessary for an employee to have at his post for the proper discharge of his duties. The Department believes that the claims recommended for reimbursement are meritorious, and that the amounts recommended to be paid are reasonable.

Many of these employees had long and creditable periods of service with the United States Government in the Philippine Islands, and it was not possible for them to return to the United States just prior to the outbreak of hostilities. Those who were captured suffered extreme hardship by internment under the most primitive conditions for a period of almost 3 years, and those who escaped were able to reach safety only after the most trying experiences.

It is the understanding of this Department that all Foreign Service officers and Army officers and most civilian employees of the United States who lost personal effects under similar circumstances have been reimbursed under private relief bills enacted by the Congress. It is believed that this group is equally deserving of consideration.

The former High Commissioner, the Honorable Paul V. McNutt, has expressed his willingness to appear in support of this proposed legislation if requested to do so by the committee to which this proposal may be referred. The former members of his staff who passed on the claims are available to answer such questions as may arise, and their records are at hand for examination.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised me that there would be no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

J. A. KRUG,
Secretary of the Interior.

PRINTING OF REPORT OF NATIONAL SOCIETY OF DAUGHTERS OF AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. HAYDEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 79), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the fifty-first annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended April 1, 1948, be printed as a Senate document.

CHANGES OF REFERENCES

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, Senate bill 974, to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, with respect to certain mothers of veterans, was inadvertently referred to the Senate Finance Committee. I am advised by the Parliamentarian that the bill should go to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee be discharged from further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Georgia is granted.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE].

Some time ago there were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary Senate bill 571, to prohibit interstate common-carrier pipe lines from transporting commodities in which such carriers have any interest; Senate bill 572, to divorce the business of producing, refining, and transporting of petroleum products from that of marketing petroleum products, and Senate bill 573, to prohibit producers, refiners, and marketers of petroleum products from operating tankers and barges. The able Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is the author of these bills. I have discussed the matter with him, and I have the authority of the Committee on the Judiciary to request that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of these bills, and that they be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. GILLETTE. That is agreeable to me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Committee on the Judiciary will be discharged from further consideration of the bills, and they will be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 199. An act to provide the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence, to make immigration quotas available to Asian and Pacific peoples, and for other purposes;

H. R. 555. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, Northern Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons for reimbursement for damages and losses sustained as a result of a flood which occurred in December 1937 in levee district No. 10, Yuba County, Calif.;

H. R. 572. An act for the relief of Sylvia M. Misetich;

H. R. 574. An act for the relief of Fred E. Weber;

H. R. 575. An act for the relief of the estate of James Patrick Hackett and Charles L. Stover;

H. R. 576. An act for the relief of Arthur G. Robinson;

H. R. 577. An act to correct possible inequity in the case of a certain application for letters patent of William R. Blair;

H. R. 578. An act for the relief of Carlton C. Grant and others;

H. R. 581. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court for the Territory of Alaska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim, or claims, of Hilda Links and E. J. Ohman, partners, and Fred L. Kroesing, all of Anchorage, Alaska;

H. R. 591. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lucille Davidson;

H. R. 592. An act for the relief of James W. Keith;

H. R. 595. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Harry W. Sharpley, his heirs, administrators, or assigns, against the United States;

H. R. 596. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of John E. Parker, his heirs, administrators, or assigns, against the United States;

H. R. 618. An act for the relief of Eugene J. Bearman;

H. R. 652. An act for the relief of Laura Spinnichia;

H. R. 659. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth B. Murphy;

H. R. 669. An act for the relief of Mrs. Shirley Leinwand;

H. R. 684. An act for the relief of Benjamin Gordon;

H. R. 697. An act for the relief of Samuel W. Poorvu;

H. R. 711. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Gregg Dilnot;

H. R. 729. An act for the relief of John J. O'Neil;

H. R. 739. An act for the relief of Mary Jane Harris;

H. R. 745. An act for the relief of B. John Hanson;

H. R. 767. An act for the relief of Eugene Spitzer;

H. R. 1035. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ada M. Ryan;

H. R. 1036. An act for the relief of R. C. Owen, R. C. Owen, Jr., and Roy Owen;

H. R. 1041. An act for the relief of Jeannette and Jesus Esteva and their four children;

H. R. 1043. An act for the relief of Mrs. Wesley Berk (formerly Mrs. Ruth Cameron);

H. R. 1052. An act for the relief of Lawrence G. McCarthy;

H. R. 1057. An act for the relief of John Keith;

H. R. 1061. An act for the relief of Bernice Green;

H. R. 1066. An act for the relief of James Leon Keaton;

H. R. 1076. An act for the relief of Jennie Olsen Anderson;

H. R. 1079. An act for the relief of Maria Veltri Magnone;

H. R. 1093. An act for the relief of D. Lane Powers and Elaine Powers Taylor;

H. R. 1094. An act for the relief of Nellie M. Clark;

H. R. 1095. An act for the relief of Pittsburgh Dubois Co.;

H. R. 1098. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Andrew Ferdinand DeWitt III, a minor;

H. R. 1103. An act for the relief of Miriam Barkie;

H. R. 1164. An act for the relief of the estate of H. M. McCorvey;

H. R. 1169. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marion T. Schwartz;

H. R. 1176. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Leroy Hann;

H. R. 1271. An act for the relief of Carl E. Lawson and Fireman's Fund Indemnity Co.;

H. R. 1279. An act for the relief of George Hampton;

H. R. 1280. An act for the relief of Mrs. Judge E. Estes;

H. R. 1286. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Rowland;

H. R. 1299. An act for the relief of Frank J. Patzke, Archie Mitchell, J. L. Shoemaker, Einer Engen, and N. L. Gifford;

H. R. 1300. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hope Irene Buley;

H. R. 1452. An act for the relief of A. J. Crozat, Jr.;

H. R. 1459. An act for the relief of E. Neill Raymond;

H. R. 1460. An act for the relief of Mrs. Silvia Mapelli;

H. R. 1471. An act for the relief of E. La Ree Smoot;

H. R. 1489. An act for the relief of James I. Matthews;

H. R. 1490. An act for the relief of the estate of Arthur F. Saladino, Joseph Spivack, and Irving Weinberg;

H. R. 1501. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Rose Mary Ammirato, a minor;

H. R. 1508. An act for the relief of Peter Drozd;

H. R. 1597. An act for the relief of Hal W. Cline;

H. R. 1602. An act for the relief of Ben Grunstein;

H. R. 1629. An act for the relief of Kira and Nina Grigorieff;

H. R. 1813. An act for the relief of Edward Woolf;

H. R. 1870. An act for the relief of Doris Marie Richard;

H. R. 1878. An act for the relief of Ben Luke Pond, Shao Hung Pond, and David Yat Wei Pond;

H. R. 1983. An act for the relief of Edward L. Barreras;

H. R. 2089. An act for the relief of William Price;

H. R. 2261. An act for the relief of Eva C. Netzley Ridley, William G. Stuff, Lois Stuff, and Harry E. Ridley; and the estates of Clyde C. Netzley and Sarah C. Stuff;

H. R. 2268. An act for the relief of Forest L. Weatherly;

H. R. 2352. An act for the relief of Roy Durbin;

H. R. 2474. An act for the relief of Frank E. Blanchard;

H. R. 2605. An act for the relief of John C. Nunes; and

H. R. 2708. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Joseph DeSouza, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1599. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary T. Maloney Preece; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ADDITIONAL SCHOOL PLANT FACILITIES—LETTER FROM GEORGE H. FIELD

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, recently I had occasion to call the attention of the Senate to the urgent need, throughout the country, for Federal aid for the construction of school plant facilities.

I have introduced a bill, S. 39, to provide for such aid.

Since my previous reference to this subject on the Senate floor, I called upon the Federal Works Agency for information respecting the extent of this need.

I hold in my hand a letter from Mr. George H. Field, Commissioner of the Bureau of Community Facilities of the Federal Works Agency, replying to my request. This letter, I think, makes it perfectly clear that there can be no reasonable question about the fact that an emergency does exist, that it is widespread, and that unless some such legislation as I have proposed to provide for Federal aid for school construction is enacted by the Congress, schools throughout the Nation will be unable to perform adequately their function of providing education to American youth.

I call particular attention to the statement, almost at the end of Mr. Field's letter, that "unless some provision is made to furnish school facilities thousands of American children will be deprived of essential educational opportunities."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY,
BUREAU OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES,
Washington, February 24, 1949.

Hon. PAT McCARRAN,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR McCARRAN: Reference is made to your letter of February 8, 1949, requesting information on the need for additional school plant facilities throughout the country.

The large volume of information now available shows a need in the immediate future for a minimum of $7,000,000,000 of additional public elementary and secondary school plant facilities in the United States. This need arises primarily from the accumulated backlog caused by deferred school plant construction during the depression and war periods and the greatly increased birth rate during and since the war. Contributing factors are improvement and extension of the educational program, increased school attendance and reorganization of administrative districts.

During the period from 1930 to 1940 the financial condition of State and local governments and the economy of the country generally prevented the construction of sufficient school plant facilities for the normal needs of the population. The volume of school building construction during this period averaged less than three-fourths of the volume of school building construction during the period 1920 to 1930. During the war period when all available manpower and materials were directed toward production for prosecution of the war, the Federal Government sharply curtailed the amount and type of school-building construction that could be undertaken. The average annual rate of public school construction during this period was about one-fourth the average annual volume during the twenties. If the rate of public school construction during the period from 1920 to 1930 had been continued during the depression and war periods we would today have an additional $5,500,000,000 (in terms of 1947 costs) worth of public school plants.

The sharply increased birth rate during the war has greatly aggravated the strain on the existing school plant facilities and has further emphasized the protracted period of underbuilding. Before the war the annual birth rate averaged from 2,200,000 to 2,500,000. During and since the war it rose to 3,500,000, and in 1947 reached the all-time high of 3,900,000. This means that each year for the next decade at least school enrollments will increase. In 1947 there were, roughly, 24,550,000 children enrolled in elementary and secondary grades. The United States Census Bureau estimates that this number will increase by three-fourths of a million to a million and a quarter each year for the next 5 years, when total enrollment will reach 31,000,000, or 6,500,000 more than at present. By 1958 it is expected that total enrollment in elementary and secondary grades will reach 34,000,000. This is an increase of 9,500,000 children, or 39.9 percent in the 10-year period beginning in 1948.

The increased birth rate is general throughout the Nation. But the problem is more severe for some States than others and for some communities in some States because of extensive migration. Communities all over the Nation are not only faced with the urgent need for modernizing existing schools, completing the repair and renovating of school buildings neglected during the war years and constructing new schools deferred during the depression and war periods, but also they have the tremendous problem of building new schools for the extra millions of children born during and since the war.

Examples of this widespread and urgent need are supplied by data recently reported by various States. A survey just completed by the State Department of Education and State Education Association of California shows a need this year for $708,000,000 for additional school plant facilities. By 1954 this need is expected to be $1,338,000,000. The agricultural and development board in Georgia reports a need in the next 5 years of $132,428,000 for building 17,500 new classrooms and remodeling 11,780 rooms. A recent study in Indiana shows a need for 5,000 new classrooms by 1950 and 2,000 additional rooms by 1962 to take care of an additional 160,000 elementary school children and 71,000 additional high-school children. Florida's needs as reported on the basis of a recent State-wide study are $123,950,000 at present, and increased enrollment will bring this amount to $192,672,000 in the next 5 years.

In January of this year the Governor of North Carolina said that the educators were requesting $150,000,000 of State funds to help the districts construct needed school plant facilities within the next few years. The director of the State Department of Education in New York reports a need for $1,000,000,000 for new construction and repair of school facilities by 1950. Virginia counties reported to the State Department of Education in December 1948 an accumulated need for $396,014,000 in the next 10 years. A county-by-county report from Utah shows an immediate need for $56,526,200 for new construction, repair, and replacement, and an additional $24,900,000 by 1952 to take care of an expected 60-percent increase in school enrollment. The Maryland State Department of Education reports a need within the next few years of $139,800,000; South Carolina's needs are reported at $90,000,000; and in Washington State the increased birth rate and immigration have resulted in an estimated need for $600,000,000 in the next 10 years.

Cities and rural areas in many parts of the country also show an exceedingly critical need for additional facilities. For example, Arlington County, Va., needs $13,000,000 by 1953 to provide for 10,000 additional children that will be enrolled in the schools by that time. Additional funds are needed for facilities to take care of further increases in enrollment beyond that date. School district No. 1 of Livingston Parish, La., needs $190,000 to replace their 15-room school building which was recently destroyed by fire. Casper, Wyo., reports a need for $4,000,000 for additional school facilities within the next few years. Manatee County, Fla., reports a need for $2,021,300 for a school building program. The need for Uintah County in Utah is $1,514,000 and in Salt Lake City it is reported to be $15,000,000 by 1954.

Reports from six school districts in various parts of the State of Nevada show a need for a little over $2,100,000 to construct 65,000 square feet of floor space to meet immediate urgent needs. Boulder City union school district in Clark County reports a need for $1,220,000 to provide school facilities for a 100-percent increase in population since 1940. In Carson City there is a need for $350,000 to provide school facilities for the increased population that has occurred during the past several years. School district No. 7 at Hawthorne, Mineral County, reports a need for additional school facilities costing $350,000 and the high-school district in the same county reports a need for $110,000 to provide facilities for the greatly increased school population. You may have additional information regarding the needs in other areas in Nevada or in the State as a whole.

A recent study made by the Bureau of Community Facilities, Federal Works Agency, at the request of the House Committee on Public Works of the need for additional school-plant facilities in areas affected by activities of the Federal Government shows a current need in 395 local school districts for $348,132,416. These districts will experience an increased enrollment within the next several years which will result in an increased need for school plants. There are thousands of other school districts in the country affected in a manner similar to those described above. In many of these areas children are attending school only half a day, hundreds of buildings now in use are unsafe and many thousands more are obsolete and not suitable for present-day educational programs.

Most local school districts are exerting strenuous efforts to meet this problem with their own resources. Many have increased property assessments, many are bonded to the legal limits and many others are seeking

legislative changes that would authorize additional bonding power. In addition, some of the States are providing State funds to assist local districts to construct school facilities and other States have legislation pending which will help to meet the existing need. In view of the fact that this urgent need is the result of the economic condition of the country during the depression period, Government restrictions on construction activities during the war period and the increased birth rate during and since the war, it is believed that the Congress may wish to consider the advisability of Federal assistance to the school districts. Unless some provision is made to furnish school facilities thousands of American children will be deprived of essential educational opportunities.

If you desire additional information on this matter we will be pleased to furnish it.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE H. FIELD,
Commissioner.

LOSS OF MINK COAT AT MAYFLOWER HOTEL

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a news item which appeared in the Washington Star of Tuesday, March 1. I call the item to the particular attention of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], in view of the statement he made several days ago respecting the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner.

There being no objection, the news item was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star]

TRUMAN AIDE'S SECRETARY LOSES $4,500 COAT

Mrs. Estelle Fredericks, secretary to David K. Niles, administrative assistant to President Truman, reported the loss of a mink coat valued at $4,500, police said today.

Mrs. Fredericks told police the coat was lost in the lobby of the Mayflower Hotel Thursday.

ARMISTICE NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN EGYPT AND ISRAEL—STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONOR

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by me regarding the part played by Dr. Ralph Bunche, acting United Nations mediator, in the recent armistice negotiations between Egypt and Israel, which appears in the Appendix.]

CIVIL FUNCTIONS OF ARMY ENGINEERS—STATEMENT BY SENATOR LONG

[Mr. LONG asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him with reference to the civil functions of the Army engineers, which appears in the Appendix.]

SAM RAYBURN, THE UNTALKATIVE SPEAKER—ARTICLE BY WILLIAM S. WHITE

[Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "SAM RAYBURN, the Untalkative Speaker," written by William S. White and published in the New York Times of February 27, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

AXIOMS OF GLOBAL POLICY—ADDRESS BY DOROTHY THOMPSON

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Axioms of Global Policy," delivered by Miss Dorothy Thompson at a meeting sponsored by the United Service to China at the United States Chamber of Commerce on February 27, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

WASHINGTON'S BIRTHDAY ADDRESS BY WILLIAM E. LEAHY

[Mr. McCARRAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by William E. Leahy, of the Washington, D. C., bar, on the occasion of the celebration of Washington's birthday at the annual meeting of the Society of the Oldest Inhabitants of the District of Columbia, February 22, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

ESSENCE OF CURRENT CRISIS IS POLITICAL, NOT ECONOMIC—ARTICLE BY WILLIAM G. CARLETON

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Essence of Current Crisis Is Political, Not Economic," written by William G. Carleton, professor of political science, University of Florida, and published in the December 1, 1948, issue of Vital Speeches of the Day, which appears in the Appendix.]

HARRY S. TRUMAN—MAN OF THE PEOPLE, MAN OF THE YEAR

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Harry S. Truman, President, Man of the People, Man of the Year," written by George M. Harrison and published in the North American Labor magazine for January 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ROLE OF INTELLIGENT POLITICS IN PARTY TRIUMPHS—EDITORIAL FROM THE HARRISBURG (PA.) PATRIOT

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Smarter Politics," published in the Patriot of Harrisburg, Pa., of the issue of February 21, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADMISSION TO UNITED STATES OF 2,500 EUROPEAN PHYSICIANS — ARTICLE FROM THE HAZLETON (PA.) PLAIN SPEAKER

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "State Vets Ask for Admission of 2,500 European Doctors," from the Hazleton (Pa.) Plain Speaker, of February 8, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

ASSESSMENT BY AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION TO COMBAT COMPULSORY HEALTH INSURANCE — NEWSPAPER COMMENT

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the New York Herald Tribune of March 1, 1949, and an article from the Washington Post of March 2, 1949, dealing with the assessment by the American Medical Association to combat compulsory health insurance, which appear in the Appendix.]

NOMINATION OF MON C. WALLGREN

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Kelsonian Tribune, of Kelso, Wash., and a number of letters addressed to him, all bearing on the nomination of Mon C. Wallgren to be Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, which appear in the Appendix.]

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. LUCAS to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 15, amending the so-called cloture rule of the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD three editorials dealing with the question of cloture, one from the New York Times, another from the Washington News, and the third from the New York Herald Tribune.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of February 28, 1949]

NO TIME FOR COMPROMISE

If present plans are carried out, a score of United States Senators at noon today will attempt to paralyze the legislative branch of our Government until this small minority, representing a small minority of the Nation's population, many of its Members elected by a small minority of the adult citizens of their constituencies, has enforced its will. This group proposes to stop all legislation, to hold up all authorizations and appropriations, including those for the national defense, and to hinder all Executive action which depends on congressional approval.

For what purpose will these gentlemen rise? What is the justification for the incalculable harm they may do their country? Let us look back into Senate history. Twenty-two years ago a little group of willful men, as President Wilson called them, talked to death a bill to arm American ships against submarine attacks. The resulting scandal led the Senate to adopt rule XXII, which stipulated that by a two-thirds vote debate on any pending measure could be limited to an allowance of 1 hour for each Senator. Under this rule, cloture has been applied four times. Last August Senator VANDENBERG, then Presiding Officer, reluctantly decided that even this feeble weapon could not be used on a motion to take up a measure. The Senate will have before it today an amendment designed to fill this gap. Even if this amendment is adopted, or if Vice President Barkley holds that rule XXII can be applied to motions, a minority of one-third plus one of a quorum present can still keep a motion or a measure from being put to a vote.

If this modest step is a limitation on freedom of debate, as Senator RUSSELL and his followers insist it is, what of the freedom of Senators who wish to get on with the business for which they were elected? What of the freedom of both great parties to keep their campaign pledges? What of the freedom of the public to get done what it wants done?

No amount of specious reasoning, not even the presence of men of character and intelligence among the prospective filibusterers, can conceal the real nature of what seems to be about to take place. This is a plain case of a minority arrogantly assuming, as it has done before, the right to veto legislation—in this case, Mr. Truman's civil-rights program.

Compromises have been proposed. No less a person than the Democratic leader, Senator LUCAS, has indicated an amiable willingness to suspend the battle occasionally in order to pass needed legislation. We believe the vast majority of the American people will agree that this is no time for either compromise or defeatist postponement. The question is whether we are to have some approximation of majority rule on Capitol Hill. More than that, it is whether our national legislative system can be made to work properly in a time of crisis. That issue had better be settled now.

[From the Washington Daily News of March 1, 1949]

THE FILIBUSTER FIGHT

Acting on orders from President Truman, administration leaders in the Senate have started a finish fight to curb the filibuster.

This fight, in our opinion, should be won. A small Senate minority should not have power to thwart the will of a large majority.

When as many of two-thirds of the Members wish to close debate and vote on a bill which has come before the Senate, they should have—and, under a 32-year-old rule, do have—the right to do that.

But, under an interpretation by Senator VANDENBERG when he was Presiding Officer this rule cannot be invoked to close debate and so end a filibuster against a motion to bring a bill before the Senate.

Mr. Truman wants the rule amended so that his civil-rights bill can be brought before the Senate despite the opposition of southern Democrats who threaten to filibuster against a motion for the purpose.

The southerners, 20 or so in number, say they are determined to talk indefinitely, if necessary, to prevent such a motion from coming to a vote. Meanwhile, the Senate could transact no other business, and the whole machinery of Congress would be paralyzed by a filibuster to preserve filibustering power.

The President, having decided to meet the issue head-on, is risking a great deal in this fight. His whole program could be delayed for weeks or months, and the southern Democrats could become so embittered that they would join with Republicans to defeat most of it.

The battle might end suddenly in victory for Mr. Truman if a majority of the Senate, voting on a ruling expected late this week from Vice President BARKLEY, the new Presiding Officer, should reverse the Vandenberg interpretation. But the prospect is for a long, bitter struggle.

We have grave misgivings about some aspects of Mr. Truman's civil-rights program. Certainly the Senate should not pass any part of it without debating it thoroughly.

But we do not believe that the Senate should be prevented from even considering this or any other proposed legislation if two-thirds of the Senators wish to consider it. Use of a filibuster for that purpose, would be dangerous and undemocratic. It would create a precedent which, in some time of crisis, could enable a handful of Senators to block legislation absolutely and urgently essential to the Nation's safety.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of March 1, 1949]

THE ISSUE IS JOINED

In the Senate yesterday the Democratic party faced up to its most severe test. When majority leader SCOTT LUCAS moved for a consideration of a proposal to curtail filibustering, he took the step which is an indispensable prerequisite to enactment of the President's civil-rights program. At the same time he challenged the concerted anger and the deep-rooted prejudices and convictions of the Southern wing. A fateful battle is thus in progress, of which the immediate outcome and long-range implications are alike uncertain, and which will determine whether or not the Democratic Party can act as a functioning, responsible organ.

The party's leadership has been greatly tempted to compromise or postpone the issue. Labor's insistence upon immediate repeal of the Taft-Hartley law put the civil-rights issue second in precedence; in the intervening weeks there has been strong pressure to let other portions of the President's program receive consideration, rather than risk complete bogging down and prolonged delays as the result of a filibuster. But it was realized that the time to modify the cloture rule is early in the session, and that the way to do it is with an all-out, unwavering assault upon it. All other business in the Senate accordingly will cease, while the southern Senators grind out their talk.

The prospect of a few men intrenching themselves behind a technicality in the rules, wielding their disproportionate power to bring legislation to a halt and thwart an overwhelming majority of their colleagues, is hardly an example of democracy at its best. A party divided in this way, able to fulfill a basic pledge only at the cost of protracted and bitter internal strife, does not appear the most fitting instrument for expression of the people's will. It would be easy in the circumstances to derive a grim satisfaction from the Democrats' discomfort. But the present battle is one from which only a perverted partisanship could seek advantage. Republicans have over a far longer time than the Democrats been preoccupied with civil rights, and their program today is clear. They committed themselves, moreover, to pressing at the earliest possible moment for a change in the Senate cloture rules. There is no choice but to go forward, whatever the immediate inconveniences, determining that a few men cannot deny to their party and to the Nation the ability to act according to settled policy and deep convictions.

REPAYMENT TO UNDERWRITERS OF COST OF INAUGURAL

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Underwriters of Inaugural Will Not Lose," published in the Washington Post of March 2, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNDERWRITERS OF INAUGURAL WILL NOT LOSE

Subscribers to the inaugural guaranty fund of $258,405 will be repaid in full, Melvin D. Hildreth, committee chairman, announced yesterday.

Repayment to 500 individuals and firms underwriting the cost of the event was made possible by the "tremendous success of the forty-first inaugural," Hildreth stated.

Meanwhile, Hildreth revealed, the Bureau of Internal Revenue has under consideration a request that inaugural tickets be exempted from the Federal amusement tax.

Proceeds of a tax exemption, if allowed by the Internal Revenue Bureau, would be directed as charity contributions to such institutions as Children's Hospital, Florence Crittenton Home, the Community Chest, Police Boys' Club, etc., he said.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, is it in order now to make a brief statement with reference to this article?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not, except by unanimous consent.

Mr. BALDWIN. I ask unanimous consent to make a few brief observations in connection with the article.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

CONTROL AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE MISSOURI RIVER

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have just introduced a bill providing for the control of the waters of the Missouri River and its tributaries and the development of the resources of the potentially rich land areas of that river basin.

This proposed legislation is designed to solve a problem which has been before the country for a number of years and has come to be regarded as one of vital importance not only to the area involved but to the Nation.

Associated with me in the sponsorship of this vitally important legislation are distinguished Members of this body from both political parties.

Mr. President, there are few more important subjects before the Eighty-first Congress than this proposal to harness the mighty Missouri River, stop the periodical ravages occurring in the territory, and put the river to work for the benefit of all the people. Control and development of the Missouri River is not a local problem; it is a national problem. That great river and its tributaries drain the greatest inland empire in the world. The waters of this river system course through Montana, Wyoming, North and South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Missouri, Colorado, Minnesota, and Iowa, in a main-stem distance of 2,500 miles from southwestern Montana to a meeting with the Mississippi just above St. Louis. Within this vast region is found our largest undeveloped and substantially underdeveloped stores of rich cropland, forests, minerals, fertilizers, and hydroelectric power; a wildlife and recreational wonderland area of unsurpassed marvels.

We are indeed fortunate in the farsighted development of the hydroelectric potentials of the Tennessee and the Columbia Rivers through Federal legislation establishing the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Bonneville Power Administration. Those great Federal undertakings enabled us to generate the tremendous hydroelectric power requirements essential in our successful war effort. Likewise, in any future emergency, the proposed Missouri Basin development will provide the great arsenal of power and essential resources which may be required to defend democracy.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BALDWIN. As I understand, the question before the Senate is the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 15, amending the so-called cloture rule of the Senate. A few moments ago I addressed the Chair and asked permission to make a few brief observations——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. BALDWIN. I asked permission to make a few brief observations with reference to an article which I had inserted in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MURRAY. I decline to yield for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana declines to yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I am merely making a brief statement in support of a bill which I have introduced. I do not expect to take very long in presenting the matter I have in mind.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I am simply inquiring as to how we are proceeding.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana declines to yield.

Mr. MURRAY. In order to be certain of having the great resources and power potentials of the region put in form for use in time of need, it is imperative that we act promptly to establish a carefully planned, unified program such as envisaged in this proposed legislation, related to the total needs of the area. Under such a program we will witness not only a huge expansion of hydroelectric power, the development of valuable mineral and other natural resources, and an expansion of industrial and business growth; but we will also prevent the terrifying floods which annually cause losses mounting into the millions of dollars. Under this unified, integrated program we will reclaim and irrigate large areas of land, increase agricultural and livestock production, promote an economically sound expansion of navigation, protect wildlife, conserve and expand our forests, increase our recreational facilities, and bring many thousands of new settlers to the area.

Not only is this great river basin our last remaining untapped reservoir of raw resources needed for defense, but its potentialities for the development of vast amounts of essential civilian products are so great as to offer a new economic frontier for the use of our capital, our unused manpower, and the utilization of our great genius as optimistic, enterprising Americans.

Mr. President, this bill for the unified and balanced development of all the resources potentialities of the Missouri Basin will provide the foundation upon which a virile American free-enterprise system can expand and develop with an assured future. It will create great new wealth, attract new populations, raise the standard of living. It will do much to stabilize our economy at full-employment, full-use-of-resources levels, which alone will satisfy our people. Here is the effective and silencing answer to those false prophets who would create despair of our future, and spread the deadening blight of communistic dissension amongst us. Here is something big, worth working together to accomplish.

This great program for the unified and rapid development of the resources of the Missouri Basin will cost much money. But this sum will not be required, nor can it be invested, all at once. The program will start small, and will develop gradually. But not a single dollar of the amount needed is a charge on the taxpayers of this Nation, to be consumed without return. On the contrary, this is a capital investment; and even before the heavier amounts are required for the larger projects contemplated, returns on that investment will appear.

This investment will call forth such economic activity from private sources as to greatly expand our wealth and reverse our losses in population. Even more important, it will control the mad rampages of the Missouri River, which already have cost more in lives of humans and animals, suffering, disease, and destruction of valuable property than the total prospective money investment in this vast undertaking.

Mr. President, unless this Missouri Valley Authority is enacted into law and implemented at once, the losses I have described will continue to occur with every seasonal flood or drought. I say this because no adequate measures thus far have been taken, or contemplated in any plans now before this Congress, to prevent such destruction. On the contrary, we have spent hundreds of millions of dollars in dyking the river, straitjacketing it in levees that do little more than narrow its channel and add to its destructive force. Today, after years of such efforts, the Big Missouri is less tamed than ever before. She sweeps away millions of dollars in one season's flood. The floods of the last 2 years have been exceedingly severe. This year, with its tremendous snowfall, promises to keep alive this annual avalanche of destruction.

This program is not deferrable. We cannot order the weather to suit our purposes. Raging storms and floods, parching droughts, and scorching suns will continue to take their heavy toll until engineering projects of flood control, irrigation, forestation, soil conservation, and hydroelectric power development are welded into a single system based upon holding the rain where it falls, storing surplus water, and directing its flow for the beneficial purposes enumerated. In such a vast area as the Missouri River Basin, only a unified attack on the manifold problems of resources development and control will accomplish what is essential to the future of the area.

Throughout this proposed legislation runs one guiding principle, one which it is not possible to obtain under any other method so far advanced to meet the Missouri Valley situation. Where there is one river system, having different problems over its course, conflicting claims upon its waters, and freighted with so many separate desires and hopes of the people, there must be one center of responsibility, one authority, acting under principles of equity, in touch with and guided by the interest and welfare of all sections, and acting, also, only after securing the best advice obtainable from all groups and sections in the area. This principle has been tried out in the TVA, and has proven sound. It is the democratic way to find a solution for a complex problem which is vexed by conflicting interests and demands. The people will always have a check on the program because it can continue and its plans can be put into effect only as a result of annual appropriations.

One thing has been made abundantly clear during the past year by the work the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation have done, and as a result of independent research by competent engineers and economists: A unified program and administration of the Missouri Valley resources must be established by law without delay for between these two great Government agencies there is an irreconcilable and dangerous conflict which is based on a physical condition that they are completely powerless to remove, namely the fact that the navigation-flood control program of the Army engineers depends on impounding and holding a large amount of water for downstream use, while the Bureau of Reclamation requires an ever-increasing amount of water for upstream area irrigation and power generation. Latest engineering studies reveal that there simply is not enough water over wet and dry cycles to meet both needs. Neither agency has ever squarely faced this fundamental problem. Each is intent upon securing as much of its program through congressional authorizations and appropriations as speedily as possible to protect and enhance its own particular program. But the Congress can no longer ignore this situation, or appropriate great sums from the people's treasury to further cement a false and self-defeating program into the very dams which these two agencies are building.

We have had much experience with the efforts of the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation to get together and work out a single program for the Missouri Valley ever since the highly dramatic shotgun wedding of these antagonistic agencies in the passage of the Flood Control Act of 1944. But all the facade of amiable relationships which they have erected, all the nice job of smooth public relations which has been done by them in the Inter-Agency Committee of which they are the ranking members, all the moneys spent by contractors and power lobbies to confuse and baffle the people, fail to answer the insoluble questions and differences between them.

The O'Mahoney-Millikin amendment presumably gives first priority to the upper-basin States on all waters. Yet the Army engineers' program, already authorized, and some of it already being built, requires a tremendous proportion of that very water belonging to the upper-basin States. So the farmers who have been led to believe in the strength of the protection afforded them by this worthy, fair-sounding amendment are apparently putting their faith in an illusive fortress built on sand. If the Pick-Sloan program goes through, then the primary use of water for irrigation will suffer so greatly as to defeat a chief purpose of a sound regional resources-development program. Such a result will not merely injure the upper-basin States, it will be an irreparable damage to the Nation.

That is why it is imperative that the Missouri Valley Authority bill be passed by this Congress, so as to correct, while yet there is time, the mistakes being made, and to prevent any costly delays in constructing the flood control dams, power installations, soil conservation and forest works, and irrigation canals so badly needed.

Mr. President, let me point out here that this is not simply a conflict between the interests of the Upper Basin States and the States to the south. There is another factor in the background. The great power monopoly operating in the area is exercising a powerful influence to block this program which involves the question of public power development. The private power interests are working

both sides of the fence. They seek to misrepresent the facts and confuse the people to the north, as well as the people to the south, with a view of keeping alive this issue between the Upper Basin States and the States to the south, and thus preventing the extension of the policy of public power development which is so essential to that area and the Nation.

Mr. President, the bill which embodies the practical details of this legislation for the unified resources development of the Missouri River is necessarily long and complicated, because the subject of which it treats is not simple. The bill we have introduced today is the result of tested experience and study over a period of several years. It is premised on the successful program of the TVA. Previous MVA bills, designed to present this program, have been carefully scrutinized by committees of the Congress and by experts in the various subjects involved, including some of our outstanding engineers, conservationists, economists, and public administrators. In its present form the bill obviates many criticisms leveled at it at previous congressional hearings, and by individuals and groups in the area who are interested in providing sound legislation to meet the complex problems involved.

The grass roots have spoken on this bill. The issue of a unified program of resources development through the establishment of an MVA was a major factor in the campaigns of many persons seeking election to the House and Senate, to the governorships of the Missouri-Basin States, and even to the highest office in the land, the Presidency. On November 2 last, the people declared in no uncertain terms for an MVA.

My colleagues the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and I visited with President Truman recently to discuss the matter and found him enthusiastically supporting this most beneficial legislation. It was one of the issues upon which I campaigned in the recent Montana elections. It was one of the important issues in my campaign. In State after State of the Missouri Basin, the MVA issue was raised during the recent elections, and in State after State the candidate who espoused that cause was elected. Powerful support for this legislation has developed not only in the region but in the Nation as well; and in the forthcoming hearings on the bill it will be supported by outstanding authorities.

Moreover, Mr. President, the persistent need for this legislation as the only way to secure an adequate and unified program for the control of the river and development of the valley has become quite evident to those Government agencies which, over the years, have had independent administrative responsibility for parts of this program. I refer to the Departments of Interior and Agriculture, where those responsible for policy in both Departments are on record as favoring the MVA to overcome the shortcomings of the piecemeal approaches they are now forced to apply. They favor it because they know that none of their accumulated wisdom and none of their technical ability will be lost and none of their current program will be cast aside by the establishment of the MVA. These Departments of our Government, which have brought great credit and renown to our country, know that an MVA will furnish a medium through which, in collaboration with each other, they can achieve ever greater beneficial results for the Nation.

Mr. President, at this point, I wish to discuss briefly the outstanding features of this bill.

This legislation establishes a Government corporate agency described as the Missouri Valley Authority. As a basic conception, it recognizes that much which now is being done by existing agencies in the area—local, State, and National—should continue to be done by these same agencies while they are fitted appropriately into a coordinated and unified plan designed to achieve the utmost economies, while at the same time carrying out the coordinated program of river control and regional resources development. Recognizing these facts, the bill proposes that these existing agencies which have been engaged in the various activities in the area—reclamation, irrigation, flood control, soil erosion, forestation, wildlife, power development, and so forth—will be utilized in an integrated plan under the supervision of the Authority in carrying this program into effect. Under this unified and coordinated plan each of the existing agencies of the Government which I have enumerated will be used to carry out the particular part of the program they are respectively equipped to perform. That is a guiding principle upon which this proposed legislation has been built—in other words, to conserve all the efforts of a constructive character that now are being made, and at the same time to fix responsibility, so that waste and duplication are eliminated, and so that the engineering soundness and success of agreed-upon plans can be appraised and realized.

The headquarters of the MVA will be in the region itself. A head office and conveniently located regional offices will be there where the program is being carried out and where the people affected by it can reach those in charge readily and without great cost of time and money. This decentralization of Federal Government activities is sound. It seeks to achieve the great benefits of Federal financing, planning, engineering, and high-grade administrative personnel, while making the work in the field subject to day-by-day scrutiny, participation, and evaluation of the people in the region, so they may have prompt contact with those supervising and carrying the program into effect.

The MVA will be administered by a board of directors of five American citizens, three of whom must have had a residence of at least 5 years in the Missouri Basin before taking on their duties as directors. They shall employ a general manager who will act under policies and plans approved by the board. Here is a well-tried and proven method of corporate administration by which our public and private business institutions have achieved outstanding and enviable success.

The MVA shall proceed immediately upon being established to develop and present to the President and the Congress as expeditiously as possible a comprehensive plan for the unified development of the Missouri Valley region in accordance with the purposes and policy of this act. No plan shall be effective, and no funds made available or works begun until the Congress shall have approved that plan in all its details and particulars.

Moreover, no plan can be presented to the President and the Congress until after it has had the careful examination and comment of an advisory board. That board will be composed of 12 citizens who represent in equal numbers the interests of agriculture, commerce and industry, labor, and wildlife and recreation in the Missouri Valley. In addition, it will have as members the principal officer of each of the following Federal Departments: Agriculture, Interior, Commerce, Justice, War, Labor, the Federal Power Commission, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Bank, and the governor of each of the 10 States in the Missouri Basin. The governors shall also be constituted a special committee to advise and cooperate with the MVA on all matters involving Federal-State relationships.

Through this advisory committee, the States and localities and the diverse interests of the region will be fully aware of all proposals of program and policy, and be able to assist in their solution. Here is democracy in action.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'CONOR in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I decline to yield. I have but a few moments left. I wish to conclude my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana declines to yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I wish to stress the fact that no existing program, no flood control or other works already authorized and for which funds have been appropriated, will be delayed 1 day by the passage of the bill. For the bill provides that all such authorized projects shall go forward toward completion and be incorporated into any over-all plan developed by the MVA and approved by the Congress. I wish also to point out that no delay or waiting period is contemplated under this measure before a comprehensive plan can be submitted to the Congress. It is recognized that so much work of an engineering nature has already been done by the separate Government agencies on important phases of the regional program that the comprehensive program which is contemplated should be forthcoming within a reasonable period after the bill becomes law.

Moreover, quarterly reports of progress are required of the MVA, so that at all times the Congress and the people to be benefited or affected will be acquainted with the proposed plans, the work under way, the accomplishments, and the progress of the program. Here is a decentralized, carefully planned, and efficient administrative policy designed to get a unified program of river development carried out without costly delay.

The bill specifically provides that the plans and projects shall be carried out in such manner as to protect the interests of the States in their watersheds and water rights. In this way, a considerable body of law in these Western States, which has received the sanction of the courts since earliest statehood, and whose value in protecting the rights of citizens to this primary need of water has stood the test of time, will be recognized and continued in force and effect. Moreover, the passage of the MVA bill does not carry with it any transfer of such moneys as have been accumulated over the years for specific purposes in the reclamation fund.

The MVA bill recognizes the existence of an important body of law affecting the public lands, irrigation, reclamation, grazing, geological survey, national parks and monuments, mines and mineral holdings, and forest land that must not be affected in any manner. The bill expressly prescribes that these laws must be taken into full account in the plans and programs under the proposed legislation.

It is the intention of those sponsoring the measure that the existing Government agencies shall be drawn upon to the fullest extent of their capacity. Consequently, the bill provides that they may be contracted with to perform that part of the program for which they have particular ability and experience.

The bill provides that in any program developed the O'Mahoney-Millikin amendment to the Flood Control Act of 1944 shall determine the use of waters, protecting the rights of the semiarid regions of the Northern States to a primary claim for irrigation and kindred uses of such waters.

Lands to receive irrigation produced at taxpayers' expense in the Missouri Basin are limited to the intent of the reclamation law which was put on the statute books during the administration of President Theodore Roosevelt in 1902. A single ownership can receive such irrigation water on 160 acres of irrigable land, plus not to exceed a minor fraction of a second 160 acres which may be required to round out the irrigated part of a family-operated farm. Of course, in addition thereto, the operator may own and use as much nonirrigated land as he sees fit.

This bill restricts the MVA to the wholesaling of electric power, with the exception that it can sell at retail to farms and rural communities which are not adequately served by existing utilities at reasonable rates.

All funds for carrying out the purposes of the proposed act must be authorized and appropriated by the Congress. Profits made from its operations must go into the United States Treasury. No sums from such profits can be used in further construction unless specifically so authorized by the Congress. The businesslike conduct of the MVA is further insured by provision that the General Accounting Office shall prescribe the exact forms of accounting to be followed and shall audit these accounts.

Of vital importance to the States and political subdivisions is the provision relating to removal by the MVA of taxable property from their rolls. In any such action, the local and State govrnments do not lose a single tax dollar. On the contrary, the greatly increased wealth created by the works of the MVA will add much taxable wealth to the tax rolls. And, so far as the particular taxable property taken over by the MVA is concerned, the local and State governments will gain, also in that respect; for the bill provides that a sum not less than the revenue lost to the States and political subdivisions shall be paid upon their appraisal to the local taxing authorities. As MVA increases wealth and property values, so tax reappraisals of its property will result in larger revenues to the localities where the property is located.

Such are the main provisions of the bill. They have been developed as a result of the thorough testing and rigorous application of the legislative process, through several congressional hearings involving previous bills for this purpose.

Mr. President, during the Eightieth Congress I introduced a resolution calling attention to certain startling facts which had been developed by independent engineering and economic studies indicating that our continued appropriation of public moneys to carry out the so-called Pick-Sloan plan of the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation was wasteful and injurious to the best interests of the region and would not accomplish its main purposes of flood control, navigation, and reclamation.

No one has denied these charges. The agencies referred to have chosen to dodge them completely. They rely, apparently, on the easy credulity and forgetfulness of the people. The passage of time is expected to erase any lingering memory of the doubt these charges have cast upon the ability of the much-advertised Pick-Sloan plan to produce all the water needed for irrigation in the upper reaches of the Missouri and all the water needed for navigation in the lower part of that river. They hope, apparently, that the people will forget about dams silting up and levees failing to provide flood control; that people will not know about the plan's inability to generate a maximum of low-cost hydroelectric energy to ease the burden of irrigation costs on farmers.

But cold facts will not die. They keep on coming to the surface in the minds of men who give thought to these matters. They prove there is not enough water, over wet and dry cycles, to accomplish all these purposes. These facts therefore warn us that a blind continuance of the Pick-Sloan plan through further vast appropriations this fiscal year will without doubt prove to be wasteful and self-defeating. The situation has disturbed many of us, including some of the leaders from the Missouri Valley on the Republican side of the Senate who have urged me to reintroduce my resolution with the promise of their support.

But a study of the Pick-Sloan operations is no final answer to the great needs of the Missouri Valley. What we propose under the bill is to give a properly constituted board the authority to examine all plans, programs, and efforts being made, including those of the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, known as the Pick-Sloan plan, report back to the Congress with the utmost expedition on their soundness and usefulness in a unified and adequate program, and proceed under authorization of Congress to carry such a program into action. To this approach I invite the support of all my colleagues who are at present concerned over the Pick-Sloan plan.

I now invite attention to a brief examination of the major needs which the MVA will satisfy.

POPULATION

The Missouri River drainage system encompasses an area of 500,000 square miles—almost a fifth of the land of the United States. But in 1948 its population was only 15,866,000, or a tenth of our people. This vast area of great economic resources and tremendous potential wealth has been declining in population for several decades in comparison with the country as a whole. And with the decline has come an inevitable decline in agriculture and industry.

Four States—North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Nebraska—actually lost in total population from 1940 to 1948.

Every year, whole families and vigorous single workers leave these States. Migration, in and out, resulted in a net loss of population for the 10 Missouri Basin States of 6 percent from 1940 to 1947. North Dakota suffered most—a net loss of a fourth of her people from in-and-out migration. Montana was a close second. Only Kansas broke even through migration; every other State losing people in this movement.

AGRICULTURE

In 1930 the United States census was taken in the 430 counties included in the 10 States drained by the Missouri and its tributaries. Another census was taken of the same counties in the highly prosperous war year 1945. During the intervening 15 years the number of farms operated had declined by more than a tenth—12.2 percent. When 1 out of every 10 farms disappeared, the remaining farms increased in acreage almost a sixth—15.7 percent. But this does not mean that farmers and city consumers are the gainers thereby. For the cropland actually harvested in 1944 was 7 percent less than 15 years earlier.

Here is an area whose problems are so serious as to warrant the attention of Congress. Some 90,000 families gave up their lifelong stake in farming. People abandoned farms whose acreage was absorbed by adjacent farms, much of it being taken out of cultivation and allowed to go back. In the recent 15 years the money value of all farms and farm buildings in the Missouri Valley declined more than a fourth. Those who still owned farms in 1945 had suffered a money loss of more than two and a third billion dollars in the value of their farm properties.

INDUSTRY

Only a balance between agriculture and industry will ever reverse the loss of population trend that has fastened upon the Missouri Valley States, and

give them that standard of living to which their natural wealth entitles them. Only a greatly broadened industrial base will free them from the status of colonial bondage to the money and industrial centers of the East who have enriched themselves for so long by bleeding the Missouri States of their raw materials. Only when the raw materials are processed on the ground will a soundly flourishing industry be established.

In all this vast area covering 10 States, there were only 20,000 manufacturing establishments operating in the highly prosperous year 1929. They employed less than 600,000 wage earners, fewer than are employed by a few large manufacturing concerns in the industrialized East. By 1939, despite a very substantial degree of national economic recovery, the number of factories still operating in the Missouri area had fallen to 17,000 and the number of wage earners had declined a fifth.

There was a pick-up in the Missouri region, as elsewhere in the Nation, to higher levels of industrial activity due to the unusual efforts made during World War II. Here is positive proof of the drawing power of industrial employment so badly needed in the Missouri Valley. For example, in Wyoming the State's population trend was reversed in the 1940–48 period by the addition of 20,000 people, most of whom came in to man industrial plants in the war.

But the power to attack and hold industry in the Missouri region depends on the development of low-cost hydroelectric power, the lifeblood of industry. Here was the key to the amazing development of the seven States of the Tennessee Valley whose industrial growth has exceeded substantially the national average since 1940. The relatively high cost and low output of electric power is the principal reason for the continued industrial stagnation of the Missouri Basin States. Yet in this very region is located the greatest potential supply of low-cost hydroelectricity still to be generated in this country.

RECREATION

Many people in these United States know the Missouri Valley States because of their superb offering of natural wonders, such as the great parks and monuments. Many others know them because of their abundance of wild game, birds, and fish. Still others know them because of the remaining primitive cultures of Indians. Some know them because of the great forests and the infinite variety of wild flowers.

But all would be greatly disturbed to know of the inroads civilization is making despite our efforts to preserve and make these wonders of Nature available in abundance for present and future generations. The drying up of ponds and waterways and the pollution of streams are destroying birds and fish. The cleancutting of forest areas is ruining our timberland. The overgrazing of grasslands is endangering the open range. Modern means of transportation that make even the most inacessible places no safeguerd against the airplane threaten our recreational offerings. The rich natural heritage of our Nation's wonderland is being jeopardized. In this, each and every one of us has an all-time stake.

Mr. President, in this all-too-brief high lighting of the major needs which an MVA will meet directly—needs of population, agriculture, industry, and recreation—I have been forced to neglect others which are of great importance. I am not unaware of them, however, and would direct attention to the fact that an MVA will seek to answer all those important needs of the valley which can be met best through an integrated program of regional resources development. Thus, reforestation, reseeding, and sustained-yield forestry practices will be of concern to the MVA, as will an adequate program of transportation.

But an MVA will be known as well for what it does not administer directly in its many-sided, wide-fronted program. For example, all of the activities now being carried on by the sovereign States of the Missouri Valley will be continued and strengthened and still operate as State activities once the MVA has been established.

The MVA will seek to unify interstate resources problems to the end that the utmost benefits accrue to the region as a whole, without unfair treatment of any State. The MVA will, in addition, step up the program of Federal activities within the Missouri Basin States. The MVA will administer those regional resource matters which require one central agency controlling the flow of the river and the storage and use of its precious waters.

Mr. President, we are already paying a big price, an unnecessary price, for the continued misuse of our resources which creates scarcities and raises costs. Expressed in dollars, economists tell us we lost approximately $40,000,000,000 in the single year of 1948 from the scarcity of essential materials. Lumber and oil scarcities are today costing us over $1,500,000,000 a year, and we have hardly entered upon the era of real scarcity in those commodities. We are losing land at a rate that will cost us $1,000,000,000 a year for the next 20 years to retrieve and put into full cultivation.

We must bring into production and use, on a continuing basis, all of our natural resources essential to the maintenance of a high standard of living for our people. The Missouri Basin States are a major key to this accomplishment. I have only to cite their prospect in the production of synthetic gasoline from Colorado, Montana, and Wyoming shale and sand; their abundance of high-grade mineral fertilizers in Idaho and Montana, their offering of iron, clays for aluminum, coal, manganese, and chrome, to point the way to an increase in the supply of resource products and a lowering of their costs.

But the development and use of any one of these essential resources is tightly bound up with the development and use of others. For example, water with power, power with gasoline refining, water with synthetic fuel production—to mention a chain of relationships. No great resource gains can be made on a wide front except in a unified way.

Mr. President, in presenting this important legislation, I am speaking on behalf, not only of the citizens of my own State of Montana, but, as the cosponsorship of this bill indicates, on behalf of many people in many States. The Missouri Basin is a part of the Nation well worth this investment. Here is raised nearly half of our foodstuffs, with a potential production of the essentials of life far in excess of the present rate. Here is the greatest river basin in the United States. Here are seemingly boundless deposits of coal and phosphate, vast reaches of timberlands, great mineral deposits—all little explored and awaiting intensive commercial development.

But here, too, is a seasonally swift-flowing river rushing away to the sea in floods annually destroying thousands of acres of rich lands and other irreplacable natural resources. Here are dry spells so severe as to sap the vitality of man, animal, and plant. Here are dust storms which take so much of nature's nutriments from the soil that only cactus plants can be used for reseeding purposes. Here are vast hydroelectric possibilities, and here exist alongside of them a greater need for electricity for farm, home, and industrial use than anywhere else in the Nation.

Here we have spent, and are now spending, millions of dollars annually in a wasteful and fruitless effort to bring about balance and unity between these forces of Nature. But our outmoded, piecemeal methods will not accomplish these purposes. Only an MVA whose very purpose is the unified and balanced development of the region's resources will accomplish this great task. That is why my colleagues and I have offered this bill for your consideration.

Mr. President, I have reviewed in this statement the broad outlines of the MVA bill and sketched the needs which prompt the bill's introduction. It remains for two of my esteemed colleagues, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], to develop in more detail certain phases of the regional resources problem which this bill is designed to meet.

Few measures before this Congress have such important purposes, or such widespread national interest and appeal. For in creating the Missouri Valley Authority we are answering a long-felt national need that will be expressed in great new opportunities for all our people.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I am very happy indeed to be associated with the able Senator from Montana, who has just taken his seat, and with the other cosponsors of the bill which was introduced this morning.

On August 22, 1944, I introduced a bill in the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress to create a Missouri Valley Administration.

It was apparent then, as it is increasingly apparent today, that it is imperative that we have a single planning and administrative agency dealing with the Missouri River.

Four and a half years have elapsed since that introduction. The Congress

has reorganized and merged many committees to handle its own business more efficiently. The Hoover Commission has been established, and is already making periodic reports to us on merger and reorganization of executive bureaus and branches of the Government. One is on our desks this morning. There has been recognition that our Topsylike governmental structures must be realined, with many bureaus merged to end overlapping functions, bureaucratic jealousy and conflicts, and more nearly to attain economy and efficiency.

In spite of the emphasis that has been given this movement in the Federal Government, out in the Missouri Basin the agencies of the Federal Government have been going in exactly the opposite direction. Out there, the Army engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Departments of Agriculture and Commerce, the Federal Power Commission, and at least a score of their lesser agencies, have created a supercouncil of bureaus, designed to protect the powers, prerogatives and prerequisites of each in the basin, instead of following the sound sort of merger and realinement of authorities and responsibilities which is going on everywhere else in the Government.

Let me give my colleagues a little history of this supercouncil of the bureaus.

Following the floods of 1943, the Army engineers rushed together a plan for the lower Missouri River and presented it to the Seventy-eighth Congress. The Washington Post, in a recent story concerning Gen. Lewis A. Pick, said that General Pick developed the plan in 90 days. It was not quite that speedy. As a matter of fact, the Army engineers had done years of work on the lower Missouri, charting its channel and studying its behavior—and hauling gravel back and forth—so the claim that the general did this stupendous job in just 90 days is about as exaggerated as the premature report of Mark Twain's death.

However, there were those, including the Bureau of Reclamation, who apparently thought the plan reflected only about 90 days' study. When the Pick plan was submitted to Congress, the Bureau of Reclamation attacked it vigorously. W. Glenn Sloan told a committee of the Senate, as spokesman for the Bureau, that the gigantic Garrison Dam in North Dakota "is unnecessary in any plan for developing navigation or any other purpose. We recommend the elimination of Garrison Dam because we think it is unnecessary and not worth the expenditure."

That dam was then estimated to cost around $130,000,000. The estimates run around $200,000,000 today.

Sloan also testified, still for the Bureau of Reclamation, that the $15,000,000 Gavins Point Dam "is a very expensive dam for the benefits to be derived from it. As a power proposition, the cost per kilowatt-hour for the development there is 30 to 40 times the cost of power at any of these other dams."

Mr. Sloan had been assigned the task of developing a Missouri River plan for the Bureau of Reclamation. It was apparent to the Bureau that the Pick plan for a flowing navigation channel would require all the river's water, and that there would be none left for irrigation if the Army got priority. So they opposed the Army before Congress and offered their own Sloan plan.

We were told at the time that the Sloan plan would not work, that some of the projects proposed were fantastic and uneconomic. We were told that the giant Souris irrigation project in North Dakota would cost many times what farmers could afford to pay, and that it was an engineering fantasy. We were told that the James River irrigation project in South Dakota was not needed—that the area had plenty of water except 2 or 3 years out of 10.

It was at about this time that both the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and I introduced bills to create a Missouri Valley Authority.

The effect on these two bickering, battling agencies was almost electric. Within 60 days after our bills were introduced—on October 16 and 17, 1944—the Army and the Bureau of Reclamation held a joint meeting in Omaha, Nebr., and in those 2 days claimed that they had completely integrated their conflicting plans. Let me quote from a joint statement to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of Interior which went out a week after that conference over the signature of the Army and Bureau participants:

> The committee met at Omaha, Nebr., on October 16 and 17, 1944, discussed the feature of both plans, examined the supporting data for each plan, and prepared the enclosed joint engineering report. The joint engineering report points out that by making appropriate modifications it is possible to eliminate existing differences between the two plans.
>
> It was possible to bring into agreement the plans of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. President, it would take both hands and arms to hold the supporting data which were allegedly examined at that brief joint conference. One thick volume contains 1,245 pages—a report on the Missouri River by Army engineers, printed as House Document No. 238, second session of the Seventy-third Congress. Another, of larger page size, contains 212 closely printed pages, plus maps and illustrations, and is the Bureau of Reclamation report on the Missouri Basin, which was printed as Senate Document No. 191 of the Seventy-eighth Congress. Those two documents alone would take days to examine, and they are not nearly all of the supporting data, nor is the examination of the supporting data all those gentlemen did on those two historic days. Theoretically, at least, they had enough discussion to decide upon, and then write out—and I quote their own press release of November 8, 1944:

> The best practical plan for the development of the Missouri River Basin for navigation, flood control, irrigation, reclamation, power, and all other beneficial uses of the waters of the Missouri River and its tributaries.

Mr. President, at the time when those occurrences were taking place I considered the allegations an imposition on the credulity of the people of the Missouri Basin and of this Congress.

The things claimed for the combined Pick-Sloan plans—this 2-day engineering wonder—were simply incredible. One did not have to be an expert on all the projects, and there are more than a hundred of them, to know that those claims were not well-founded.

It quickly became obvious to those following the situation that the Omaha conference had developed neither a single unified plan nor the best practical plan. Nor had it even taken account of all the beneficial uses of the waters of the Missouri and its tributaries.

Instead, it became apparent that the Army and the Bureau had simply laid maps of their two conflicting plans side by side, and wherever they were both trying to put a dam at about the same location on the river, they gave and took, eliminating conflicts which would be visible to the public and the Congress.

There was no actual setting down and developing a full river plan, with the best practical plan for irrigation, the best practical development of electric power, the best practical plan for navigation and for flood control. The Bureau simply yielded the Army the right to build two or three main-stem dams that it had planned, and the Army got out of the Bureau's irrigation field. Then they agreed to quit criticizing each other, lest Congress create an MVA.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the backers of the proposed Missouri Valley Authority quickly contended and demonstrated that there was still not enough water in the river for both plans; that the basic conflict continued. They were treated as partisans, and the Eightieth Congress paid no heed to their warnings. But now we have reports from the other side, from men who have been opposed to the valley authority plan, and it is in total agreement with what the Senator from Montana and others have been warning.

I want to read a few excerpts from the report of the Hoover Committee's task force on natural resources development, which was published in the Denver Post of January 26. That report is quoted directly as follows:

> Present estimates are that the construction of projects for the development of the Missouri River will cost nearly $6,500,000,000. One of the unanswered questions concerning development plans is whether there will be sufficient dependable water for purposes of navigation, flood storage, irrigation, water supply, and power development.
>
> It is nothing short of a calamity that there should be grave uncertainties on this score at this late date.
>
> After sharp clashes over plans for the development of the Missouri Basin, the Corps and Bureau announced complete agreement on the Pick-Sloan plan. Analysis of that plan reveals the fact that it contains many projects which previously had been subjected to devastating criticism by one or the other agency. The compromise consisted for the most part of a division of projects, each agency agreeing to forego the privilege of criticizing projects assigned by the agreement to the other.

That is the end of the quotation carried by the newspaper. That was the

natural resources task force of the Hoover Commission speaking. It was not a group of partisans for a Missouri Valley Authority, but a task force appointed by our Republican ex-President, Mr. Hoover.

Mr. President, the tragic deficiencies of the Pick-Sloan plan are now recognized in every quarter. The deficiencies of the superagency which was set up to follow up on the Omaha compromise are just as marked.

The superagency was officially known as the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee. It included Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation as the principal participants, but with the Federal Power Commission and the Departments of Agriculture and Commerce, representing all their subordinate bureaus, holding memberships.

After two or three meetings, it became apparent that this continuing agency was not going to do the real, fundamental job of coordinating and integrating the basin plans, which they claimed they had done at Omaha. At a meeting in Topeka, Kans., when there was effort to go to the merits of some of the competitive projects, so much heat was generated that the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation packed his briefcase and started to walk out for good. I understand that another compromise was then reached whereby the participants promised to forego engineering arguments and simply tell each other, at the meetings, what new projects they had in mind.

This would give the public an impression of agreement simply because the participants did not argue or disagree about anything.

Someone has suggested that the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee should be renamed the Missouri Basin Adding and Subtracting Society.

Seriously, that is not a bad description of the way this group operated after their first few meetings. Under the arrangements which grew up, the various agencies now come into the meetings and report the projects they plan to undertake, give an estimate of their cost, and the amount needed each year from Congress. There are no arguments, no discussion of conflicts, feasibility, or the manner in which each project fits into an over-all development and operating plan. The figures are simply put down. When the Department of Agriculture was slow in claiming some money, they were coaxed to get a request in the pot. When every agency has put in its sums, the group adds them up and they all come down here to Washington to subtract the grand total from Congress and the Treasury.

A careful examination of the meetings and the operations of that group will show that that is the total real limit of its functioning. It has served the participants as a public front. It has met at a different State capital each month, hearing speeches from the various agencies about what they are doing, and adding up totals to be subtracted from the public till.

As the Hoover Commission has pointed out, this interagency committee has never yet tackled the real problem of allocation to various uses of the supply of water actually in the Missouri Basin. It has never tackled the elimination of conflicts in plans and the development of an ultimate, over-all water-operation plan which will give the Missouri Basin the most of irrigation, of electric power, of navigation, and flood control.

It has been demonstrated here in the United States that a truly integrated river-development plan envisions the ultimate operation of the plan, and the dispatching of water for various uses after the dams are all built.

An integrated program requires sufficient hydrological data that allocations of water to irrigation can be known in advance, storage and flow plans can be envisioned in advance for hydroelectric power generation, navigation, and flood control, with capacities reserved for the unusual thaws and rainfalls which inevitably occur in a long cycle of years.

Mr. President, there is no such great, over-all plan for the Missouri Basin in existence. The planning for the river is now recognized as piecemeal, with probable enormous wastes of money going on today for construction of uncoordinated, piecemeal projects.

Even if I believed that there was a total plan—a splendid plan—for the development, control, and operation of the Missouri River within the existing set-up, I still would advocate a Missouri Valley Administration.

The Pick-Sloan plan, in its total concept, is but a fraction of a total basin plan. It deals with the river. It does not deal with the problems of the land, of soil conservation, of the development of land and mineral resources, and of the human resources of the valley. It has no plan for stopping the loss of 300,000,000 tons of topsoil annually. It does not provide for the development of the plant-food resources on the western rim of the Missouri watershed, to make conservation practices economic for farmers, who would then help to stop erosion and floods back on the land. It does not contain any forestry plans, to help stop floods as well as protect and restore our forests and our soil.

The Pick-Sloan plan does not include the coordination of power and navigation developments with the establishment of new industries, which are so greatly needed.

The Pick-Sloan plan does not include any plans for development of basin-wide recreational facilities, for preservation or increase of wildlife, for industrial research and stimulation, for the development of other facilities which make life for people in the Missouri watershed richer and better.

The Pick-Sloan plan is only a fraction of the total basin development—in all its phases—which is needed in our great watershed. We need an over-all agency which will relate the problems of the land and the water, and then the problems of the people to those of developing the land and water, so that the basin may become the source of strength to the Nation which it should be.

The Tennessee Valley Authority has been a tremendous success.

It has been combed over and over by critics and to this good day there has not been any startling disclosure about it except that it has tremendously improved the economy and the life of the people of that valley. Certainly there have been some minor criticisms, though they have been surprisingly few. But there is nothing startling about a reasonable number of mistakes. It would be startling if there were none.

The valley administration proposed in the bill that has been submitted is patterned after the TVA, with modifications to fit the peculiar needs and the great size of the Missouri Valley. Our valley has the resources, the people, and the material things needed to rival or surpass the progress made in the Tennessee Basin, where the Federal investment is paying off.

We have invested about $800,000,000 in the Tennessee Valley development. The returns from electric power are liquidating the costs at Government interest rates, or the cost of money to the Government. Books are not kept in accord with those of a private utility, because it is not a private utility and it has no parent company management fees, no preferred-stock and no common-stock dividends to pay. It merely pays to the Government whatever it has in margins at the end of the year.

Accountants have had quite an argument about whether or not the TVA is paying out. The argument revolves around the TVA bookkeeping practices versus those of a private utility. That argument seems to me wholly beside the point.

The TVA has already paid for itself more than once.

When the Congress of the United States established the Tennessee Valley Authority, the seven affected States were paying 3.4 percent of the total income taxes collected by the United States Treasury. In 1947, the same area was paying 6.3 percent of the total income-tax payments made in the United States. Today, after 15 years of TVA, with improved agriculture, 2,100 new factories and other growth, the valley is paying almost twice as much of income tax, percentagewise, as it did before TVA.

On a cumulative basis, the increase in income-tax collections from 1933 to 1947 has been more than $2,000,000,000—about two and one-fourth times as much as this Nation has invested totally in the Tennessee Valley Authority.

I want to be clearly understood. That is not the total gain in income-tax collections. The gain has been much more than that. The $2,000,000,000 represents the gain resulting from the proportionate increase in payments by that area—the excess over 3.4 percent of the national total.

At the present time, TVA is paying for itself at least every 2 years on this basis.

No one can question that the Tennessee Valley is more prosperous for having an integrated resources-development program which has related industrial development and agricultural development to the harnessing of the water of the area. No one can deny that the lag between that southern area and the rest

of the Nation is being shortened, that the waste of land resources is being stopped—that greater gains have been made there than in the Nation as a whole as a result of TVA stimulation.

I have been impressed by the annual report for 1948 recently made available to the Congress, which analyzes the Tennessee Valley progress.

They have 2,100 new industries in the Tennessee Basin itself, which is a gain of 163 percent since TVA's creation. In the seven States of the valley, including areas of those States outside the basin, the gain has been 132 percent in number of industries. The national gain has been 95 percent in the same period—much less than the valley authority's area.

In agriculture, there are now 1,000,000 acres of terraced land in the valley and pasture acreage has increased 800,000 acres, reflecting a tremendous gain against the problem of erosion. Livestock has increased 9 percent. Dairy cattle numbers are about the same, but milk production is up 22 percent. Farm tenancy went down 38 percent in the valley from 1935 to 1945, compared to a 25-percent decline in the Nation. Value of farm property and farm production show similar gains in excess of national average gains.

Individual incomes, as indicated by the income-tax figures, I have cited, are very much closer to the national average. The Tennessee Valley is no longer a problem area. Its problems have been and are being met. It is an area that contributed great strength to this Nation in wartime, and continues to contribute strength in peacetime.

The Missouri Valley has some problems that are different from those of the Tennessee Valley. The Missouri Valley is bigger and involves the problem of irrigation.

Foes of a Missouri Valley Administration contend that such an agency was designed only for the Tennessee Valley or an area exactly like it.

It is a transparent, specious argument of the sort used when valid arguments are not at hand.

The core of the valley administration idea is centralized administration and responsibility for efficiency and better results. It is the basically same core—the same objective—we have had in congressional reorganization and reorganization of the executive departments.

The MVA bill gathers together responsibilities for development now scattered through 30 or more bureaus of Government and consolidates them in a single Government corporation with headquarters and final responsibility out in the valley among the people who are concerned by its work and its decisions. It is as essential to development of the Missouri Basin and proper administration as is centralized responsibility in the Ford Motor Co. or General Motors.

Every Member of this body would, I am sure, agree that it would be absurd for Ford Motor Co. to divide itself into 20 or 30 autonomous departments, with the body department and the motor department competing for iron and steel, and producing parts to the limit of their acquisition of metal without regard for the other, or the final assembly of total, finished automobiles.

That is almost exactly what we have in the Missouri Basin today. The Army and the Bureau of Reclamation are competing for the basic resource—the river's flow—and each proposes to use all it can get of the water without regard to the final assembly—a developed and prosperous valley.

The MVA bill is a proposal to use an accepted business pattern to administer existing Federal powers and functions in the Missouri Basin so that expenditures will be dynamic and productive, as those in the Tennessee Valley have been.

It is not a change in our basic philosophy of government. It is nothing more than typical American common sense, tested and successful in the Tennessee Valley, and now ready for application in the Missouri Valley.

Mr. President, I want to say just one more word, and that is about the desire of the people out in our valley for a Missouri Valley Administration. This is almost another of those cases where everybody is against it except the folks themselves.

In my observation, the opposition to a Missouri Valley Administration is almost entirely professional, or guided by the hands of professionals. The matters which my colleagues have discussed or will discuss concerning the anti-MVA lobby should be investigated. I hope that if the Kilgore resolution is passed there will be such inquiry. I am sure that it would establish the accuracy of what I have just said.

A great majority of the people of Iowa who have given study to the problem are for a Missouri Valley Administration; and in the western area, where they would be directly affected, they are aggressively for it.

The returns from the last election strongly indicate to me that the same is true in other Missouri Valley States.

There is general recognition now that the Pick-Sloan plan is not adequate. At the same time, there is anxiety about getting ahead with the Missouri Basin development as rapidly as possible. The tremendous snows lying in the basin right now are a threat and a reminder of the enormous dangers and damage of Missouri River floods, and of the necessity of pushing forward with work in the basin as speedily as is humanly possible.

I deeply hope that the Congress will not take any partial action, or adopt half-measures. It would be tragic if, recognizing the shortcomings and infeasibility of the Pick-Sloan plan, we simply slowed or stopped it and failed to enact a constructive alternative.

The MVA bill is the one way to meet the full situation. Its immediate establishment would permit the most expeditious development of a truly full and coordinated plan for valley development with an absolute minimum of delay in actual development work.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point, following the address by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], copy of a brief filed with the United States Army Engineers Board, by the major public power committee of the Puget Sound region.

There being no objection, the brief was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MIMEOGRAPHED COPY OF BRIEF FILED WITH THE UNITED STATES ARMY ENGINEERS BOARD BY THE MAJOR PUBLIC POWER COMMITTEE OF THE PUGET SOUND REGION

INTRODUCTION OF COMMITTEE AND SUBJECT

Having given considerable study to the Army engineers' 308 report of Columbia River Basin Development, the public power committee of the Puget Sound region, desires to file this brief at the public hearing to be held in Seattle, February 1, 1949, on this 308 report. Our organization has for more than 2 years been a coordinating committee of State-wide and regional organizations vitally interested in the development of our natural resources, particularly public power. Some of our committee members have more than a quarter of a century of active and prominent public power crusading experience in the Puget Sound and State of Washington region, among them the chairman of our committee. So much for introduction.

REVIEW OF REPORT AND ENDORSEMENT

We wish to say that our knowledge of the 308 report consists of reviewing summaries of it, hearing it explained at public meetings by Army engineers, and through personal contact with people who also have studied it, etc. We have not been able to make a detailed study of the large document embracing this 308 report, but have tried to get all the information possible in any way, short of reviewing this 308 report itself in detail.

We therefore feel that we should be able to intelligently voice our opinion on certain phases of it at such a public hearing as this, admitting in advance that there is much contained therein with which we are not very familiar. And so we shall confine our opinions to that part of the report which we do understand quite clearly.

We wish to say that we take pleasure in endorsing such a comprehensive plan for the development of the natural resources of the Columbia Basin region and for all the other beneficial work outlined in this report. It is hoped that regardless of what kind of agency might be created by the Congress to carry forward this great work; as outlined in this report, that it will serve as the guide and blueprint for execution of this all-embracing project plan. Certainly, the Congress will compel using it as such, whether through existing agencies, or through a Columbia River Basin Authority, or whatever agency might be created to execute this plan.

FISH INDUSTRY AND OTHER INTERESTS PROTECTED

As we understand this 308 report, it provides that during the next 10 or 12 years due consideration will be given to our valuable salmon-fishing industry, and other interests, in the lower Columbia River Basin and its tributaries. We feel that this is a very wise provision, providing that it is possible to build enough dams in the upper regions of this river and its tributaries fast enough to amply provide for the power needs of the Puget Sound and Western Oregon regions, during this 10- to 12-year period.

It is our understanding that this 308 report anticipates that during this interval, while dams are built in the upper regions of the Columbia River, that a satisfactory solution for saving most if not all of this salmon industry will be found. We very strongly feel that this will be the case, and that these fishing interests are doing an undue amount of worrying about the effect which these dams in the lower Columbia Basin will have on the salmon-fishing industry. As to most other types of fish, our extensive study of the experiences of the Tennessee Valley Authority, convinces us that these large water basins behind these dams increases rather than diminishes the fish supply. Propagation of fish is carried on so much more extensively in these larger dam basins, than in the former normal river channels, that the fish life is thus greatly increased. The same thing can surely be done here.

POWER MOST IMPORTANT OF ALL RESOURCES

However, from more than a quarter of a century of intensive research and study of the power question on this entire continent, particularly in the Pacific Northwest, we are convinced that ultimately the needs for power in this Puget Sound region should compel the construction of all the dams outlined in this 308 report, for power purposes and for the other uses outlined in this report. We consider these dams of vastly greater benefits to the region than any other conceivable assets which the construction of these dams might diminish or even destroy.

We consider that the wealth which will be created from these dams when they are all ultimately built simply staggers the imagination. The experiences from the two dams so far constructed by the Federal Government on the Columbia convinces us that the benefits from these dams will be considerably greater than that outlined in this 308 report, and which we feel is based upon very conservative estimates of power production, stream flow, and other factors which enter into this ultimate wealth production from these dams.

PROPER AGENCIES TO CONSUMMATE 308 REPORT PLAN

We are not very well informed as to what particular agency, commission, authority, or body is recommended in this 308 report, for the execution of the plan outlined in it, except as to the construction of the dams and other major construction projects of the plan. We have been informed that it is expected that existing agencies will execute this 308 report plan.

We do not want our endorsement of this 308 report to be construed that we will not at some future date endorse Federal legislation creating a commission or authority, such as is now in the making, and as is commonly referred to as the Columbia Valley Authority.

OUTSTANDING RECORD OF TVA

We have throughout the entire history of the Tennessee Valley Authority made a very thorough and extensive research and study—getting all their reports, etc.—of the entire operations of this outstandingly successful Federal project throughout this TVA region. From this study, we are convinced beyond any question of doubt that the Tennessee Valley Authority projects are the best managed and most beneficial major Federal projects in all this Nation, except possibly our much misrepresented Post Office Department.

No major Federal project has been misrepresented and lied about so much by its enemies as this Tennessee Valley Authority, and has at the same time given such vast benefits in so short a time to all the people of the vast region in which it operates. However, the people and State officials in that region are no longer deceived, as are most of the people in the rest of this Nation, through this gross misrepresentation of this wonderful TVA project.

DIVIDED INTERESTS HAMPER OUR DEVELOPMENT

Right now, while this hearing is being conducted on this 308 report, we are experiencing the devastating, conflicting work of those leaders who should be unitedly leading us forward in the development of the vast natural resources of this Pacific Northwest. We have too many men of little vision.

Despite the fact that progress has been made in bringing about the vast benefits of our Bonneville Power Administration, the Columbia Basin project, our public utility districts, our municipal light plants, all these projects were vigorously opposed by the same selfish interests who are now opposed to the Tennessee Valley Authority, or to any Columbia River Authority. It is to be regretted that some of those interests must be named, if we are ever going to overcome this opposition, and really go forward in unity, as has been the case with the Tennessee Valley Authority, for the good of that region and mankind in general. We must eventually adopt a similar program in this region if we are ever going to reap the most benefits from all our resources.

As we write this report, we are told in the press in glaring headlines and over the radio, that our Governor and our Seattle Chamber of Commerce, and other powerful interests, are vigorously opposed to any Columbia River Authority. On the other hand, in equally blazing headlines we are told that our Secretary of State, our Seattle Congressman, and our President of the United States, and many others like them, are just as vigorously fighting for a Columbia River Authority, modeled after this outstandingly successful TVA.

OPPOSITION TO PROGRESS MUST CHANGE ATTITUDE

For more than a quarter of a century, some of us who are framing this report for this hearing, and have been prominently and actively crusading for these beneficial public power projects, have experienced this same kind of powerful opposition, from these very same interests—private power companies, chambers of commerce, governors, legislatures, press, and others. And here are some of the results:

For some weeks now, this Pacific Northwest region has been suffering the worst power shortage in our entire history, despite the fact that we have in our midst the greatest potential reserve of water power in all this Nation. Those interests, mostly private power companies, who are now "crying the loudest" for power, and unjustly blaming the Bonneville Power Administration for this shortage, are the very interests who just a few years ago opposed most of the necessary appropriations for the Bonneville Power Administration. Oh, what foolish, foolish people.

It is our candid opinion that under a Federal system modeled after the Tennessee Valley Authority, that most of this opposition to progress would soon dissipate itself and disappear, to the vast benefit of our wonderful region.

The only redeeming feature in this long and bitter struggle for human progress, in the development of the greatest of all our natural resources in this Pacific Northwest—our water power—has been the small measure of cooperation which we have from time to time been grudgingly given from certain factions of our press. However, may we add, that most of the powerful papers in this State have always been against our Bonneville Power Administration and public power in general, while some of them have assisted in this crusade from time to time.

CONCLUSIONS FROM LONG EXPERIENCES

In conclusion we wish to say that we are proud to have played a part in creating legislation which has enabled the creation of our public power projects, from the humblest municipal light plant up to the wonderful Bonneville power project, and which still would be only in the "dream stage" if these powerful, retarding opposition interests had not been overcome. Most of the pioneers of these projects are now gone to their reward or retired, but others among us have tried to carry forward the banner of progress which these pioneers have so boldly outlined for us.

It is our opinion that these potential water-power resources of this region are the greatest "gold mines" that a kind providence has given to this region. It is therefore hoped that at least the Federal Government will have vision and foresight enough to preserve and develop them for the benefit of all the people of this region, and to a lesser extent for the Nation as a whole.

We regret to say that too many of our own State of Washington so-called leaders have not had such vision. This is why we still have devastating floods, power shortages, and other evils, which better leadership might long ago have remedied.

THANKS FOR HEARING

We thank the Army engineers for having given us this opportunity of expressing to them, and through them, to other Federal officials, our brief opinion of the needs of this region, if these wonderful natural resources are to be developed to serve all our people, rather than to merely enrich a few special-interest groups or individuals. Thus we serve posterity. Thus is real progress made.

Respectfully submitted.

PUBLIC POWER COMMITTEE, PUGET SOUND REGION,
J. C. UNGER, *Chairman.*
TILLMAN K. GARRISON,
Assistant to the President, Washington State Federation of Labor.
ROY W. ATKINSON,
Regional Director, Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise today to address the Senate for the first time. I am especially honored that I have been asked—and I gratefully accepted—to join the great and courageous senior Senator from Montana and the honorable junior Senator from Iowa in introducing this bill. This is a fitting issue and an appropriate moment for my first address on the floor of the Senate of the United States.

I rise today to speak for the Missouri Valley Administration—an integrated, soundly conceived and carefully planned program for the prosperity of the Nation and the development of the basin of the Missouri River.

I feel that this is the right time to speak out; it is an essential issue to speak for. The Missouri Valley Administration is vital to the Midwest. It is vital to my birthplace in South Dakota. It is essential for the progress of my present home, Minneapolis.

Our people in the Midwest have been looking at the miracle of the Tennessee Valley. They have seen cheap electric power created from the river's flow; they have seen industries grow up near the cheap power and they have watched the great atom plant working in the Tennessee Valley for the progress and peace of the world. They have seen irrigation and soil conservation, flood control, and navigation improve constantly in the Tennessee Basin. They have wondered, and they have every right to ask, Why cannot the same be done for our valley, for the Missouri Valley?

The Missouri Valley can prosper. As the Tennessee Valley grew under TVA, the Missouri can grow under MVA.

I speak now for my friends and neighbors in Missouri, the Dakotas, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, Colorado, Montana, Wyoming, and Minnesota. I speak for our citizens who live amidst great potential wealth, surrounded by wealth that is

locked up and going unused. This is the story, the fable of Croesus who had all the wealth he might want, who instead was destroyed by his wealth. So it is with the Missouri. Wealth is locked in its stream, unused; and every year that potential wealth flows over its banks and destroys and does not build.

The issue of a Missouri Valley Administration is not a sectional issue alone. The MVA is a vital program for the entire Nation. It is a national issue; it is a liberal issue. MVA will mean more and cheaper production from more and cheaper electricity. It means more diversified agriculture, providing crops in demand rather than crops in surplus. It means cheaper finished products because it will bring cheaper transportation of raw materials out of the valley. MVA can make a great contribution to food security for the world, because its soil-conservation provisions will improve and extend the conservation practices of the basin. MVA can strike a blow for free enterprise against monopoly in such fields as light metals and fertilizer where big business controls supply and controls price. New business growing from MVA's cheaper electric power can break the monopoly control.

Politically, MVA is a symbol, a symbol of liberalism to the large majority of Americans who voted liberal last November and in other Novembers. It is a symbol of progress and prosperity to the valley; a symbol of cheaper production and better distribution to the whole Nation.

In the debate which has arisen over the Missouri Valley, the same forces that have lined up in the other battles over liberal legislation are lined up again. On the one hand we have high-priced lobbyists for special interests, sniping constantly behind the scenes, lobbyists who have beaten MVA for several years. We have the large power companies, the railroads, the water-rights attorneys, and the general dissenters who want reaction at any cost.

On the other hand there is a familiar line-up, too. First, we have the inhabitants of the valley itself, people who every day are losing the wealth that can be created from the now destructive Missouri. On this side we also have the consumers of the whole country, looking always for cheaper and better goods. And on this side of the picture we have the same spokesmen for the interests of the people who have constantly, throughout their long and statesmanlike service, represented honestly what all the people want and deserve. I am humble and I am honored to join these great statesmen in support of this bill—in particular, to join the fearless, stalwart, and great liberal, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and his equally distinguished colleague the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE].

The Missouri Valley Authority to me is just another section of the same battle that liberals have been waging throughout our generation. It is a fight for the rights of the people of the Missouri to the natural resources God has granted to all of them. MVA stands against the monopolistic control of those resources by a few. MVA is economic liberty. It is individual rights. These are the goals for which I shall always fight.

Now let us look a little more closely at the line-up on this bill. Let us look at the opposition, at those who are fighting MVA.

First is the power lobby, whose rates in and near the Tennessee River were cut drastically by TVA.

Behind the power lobby, comes a fake development association formed of the contractors to the Army and the Bureau of Reclamation who now are engaged in a hodge-podge of contrary maneuvers in the Missouri Valley today.

Next come the railroads, who no longer believe in the competitive system. Last spring the Eightieth Congress eliminated any vestige of competitive action in the railroad industry with the Reed-Bulwinkle bill. Now the railroads are out to prevent MVA from opening up the ways to healthy competition from river transportation.

Finally come the water-rights attorneys who stand to lose their constant, sterile litigation over ownership of the resources of all the people, namely, water.

Monopolists are holding their breath all over the country. They are fighting MVA because MVA would successfully fight them. Besides the railroads and electric-power monopolies, MVA will challenge the Big Nine of the fertilizer industry and squeeze out monopoly profits and lower the price of fertilizer to our farmers. Financiers whose capital is tied up in eastern industries, have a big stake in keeping the Midwest from its most prosperous development—a development that would mean a higher standard of living for the entire Nation. Finally, light-metals industries could grow up around the new generators, to challenge the nearly complete one-firm monopoly in that field.

What we are asking, Mr. President, is not a subsidy or gift for the Missouri Valley. We are asking, rather, for a loan. That money will come back to the people in many ways. One way is cheaper electric power. Let me compare the rates that REA cooperatives were paying in the Missouri Valley in the fiscal year 1947 with what they would have paid under the TVA rates the same year. While TVA electric rates are not the lowest in the Nation, TVA's price of 5.53 mills per kilowatt-hour is 3 to 8 mills lower than the rates in the Missouri Valley.

I shall send to the desk a table showing the difference in electric rates for Missouri Valley electric consumers had they lived under the TVA. The Federal Power Commission reports show that in total electricity used in the MVA States, consumers pay $100,000,000 a year more than they would have paid for the same electric service in the TVA area.

It is little wonder, then, that the electric-power lobbies are fighting MVA, just as they fought TVA some years ago. Let us look for a moment at the fight MVA's opponents are waging.

Public pressure for development of the valley is too great for the power interests to flatly oppose any development. While the sons and daughters of valley residents continue to move out of the valley, seeking greater opportunities, the power lobby cannot expect to speak against any and all development programs for the Missouri. So they support a totally inadequate development plan. They could not defend do-nothingism when floods alternate with drought, and power shortages plague the valley.

The plan they champion is called the Pick-Sloan plan, named for a general in the Army engineers and an employee in the Bureau of Reclamation.

The engineer's part of the plan is a great, flowing navigation channel from Sioux City, Iowa, to the mouth of the Missouri on the Mississippi. The channel is wide open. It will never generate any electricity for the unlighted sections of the valley. The Federal Power Commission has pointed out that there is a potential of 10- to 15-billion kilowatt-hours of electricity a year in the lower river. In technical terms, the river from Gavins Point, near Sioux City, to the mouth of the Missouri has a fall of 770 feet. The engineers are digging a navigation channel, and the electric power potential is overlooked. But the power potential is there, and MVA can produce electricity for the people of the valley. This potential is now being wasted.

That is the picture in the lower Missouri Valley. We have the words of Mr. Lester C. Walker, engineer of the Federal Power Commission, describing power development under the Pick-Sloan plan. Mr. Walker made the following remarks at a meeting of the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee at Cheyenne, Wyo., on January 14, 1947:

> In our examination into the ultimate hydroelectric potentialities of the Missouri River Basin, we find with our as yet unfinished investigation that the 1,600,000 kilowatts provided by the Pick-Sloan plan of development is less than one-half of the total potential power of the basin. We consider 5,000,000 kilowatts with an average annual potential generation of 25,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a somewhat conservative estimate of the potential hydroelectric power of the basin.

What about the upper Missouri Valley? We have Mr. Walker's words as to it, also:

> The Bureau of Reclamation has approved sites in the Yellowstone Basin which will provide a total of 2,620,000 acre-feet of usable storage. The aggregate gross power head available at the project is 5,630 feet and it is proposed to install 315,000 kilowatts of generating capacity which will be capable of producing on the basis of estimated stream flow about 1,740,000,000 kilowatt-hours of energy per year.
>
> In addition to these approved projects, the Army engineers have investigated storage sites in the Yellowstone Basin as reported in published 308 report capable of storing approximately 2,000,000 acre-feet. The aggregate gross power head at these sites investigated by the Army engineers is about 315,000 kilowatt-hours of installed capacity which could generate about 1,390,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year on the basis of present estimates. In addition to the projects approved for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation, and the storage site investigated by the Army engineers, the Federal Power Commission staff has given consideration to 16 additional sites with storage possibilities of about 4,000,000 acre-feet, combined power heads of 10,000 feet, installed capacity of 1,400,000 kilowatt-hours, and a possible average output of 7,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. The staff recognizes that if the potential head between Billings, Mont., and Glendive were developed it would provide about 1,000,000 kilowatt-hours of installation and approximately 5,000,00,000 kilowatt-hours of average annual energy.

Mr. President, the meaning of Mr. Walker's remarks is that more than 60 percent of the electric potential of the Yellowstone River, a tributary of the Missouri, is being ignored. Mr. Walker's remarks further show that present plans overlook the real possibilities of the Yellowstone. His remarks show that neither the Army engineers nor the Bureau of Reclamation have even made a full study of the Yellowstone and do not have anything like a full plan for that tributary. The present plans for power plants on the Missouri show that there are no over-all plans.

W. Glenn Sloan, Administrator of the Bureau of Reclamation's work in the valley, testified at a congressional hearing in 1944 that the enormous Garrison Dam, estimated to cost $130,000,000 in 1940 and now probably costing $200,000,000, was unnecessary and not worth the expenditure. In regard to Gavins Point Dam, he testified:

> As a power proposition, the cost per kilowatt-hour for development there is some 30 to 40 times the cost of power at any of these other dams.

We might ask them then why those particular dams were built at all, and why the power lobby, usually concerned about Government economy, is pleased as Punch with the Pick-Sloan plan that built these wasteful projects. The only answer we can gather is that the private-power monopolies want public power to fail. Electricity at Gavins Point will cost several cents a kilowatt-hour, many times what it should. We have that on the record and on the word of Mr. Sloan himself.

We can say then at the outset, without fear of contradiction, that the present Pick-Sloan plan is not what the proposed Missouri Valley Administration will be—an all-purpose, integrated program for democratic planning and democratic use of all the resources of Missouri. One of the most needed and most prevalent of the Missouri's resources, electricity, is not being tapped to any degree. Where it is planned, it is planned so poorly as to discredit the whole project. The Pick-Sloan plan as a producer of needed, cheap electricity is failing. A healthy Missouri Valley Administration must replace it.

This is not to say that Pick-Sloan is a deliberate failure, that it is a careful plan by the power monopoly to maintain the electric shortage and the sellers' market in power. The failure of Pick-Sloan is rather a demonstration of the impossibility of planning for the best use of the Missouri Valley through two separate agencies. One agency is a necessity, and the answer obviously is the MVA.

Standing shoulder to shoulder with the power lobby against MVA, and against a sane plan for using the Missouri to its fullest extent for the benefit for all, are half a dozen other lobbies. About 4 years ago 31 organizations, supposedly interested in land and water development, were joined together in a coordinating committee, dedicated to the defeat of the Missouri Valley Authority. The National Reclamation Association, a lobby representing a variety of vested interests, joined with the so-called water councils and development associations, including the Propeller Club, the Pittsburgh Coal Exchange, and the American Power Boat Association, to see that MVA should not pass Congress. This group distributed 60,000 copies of a propaganda pamphlet by Mr. Clifford Stone, director of the Colorado State Water Conservation Board and vice president of the National Reclamation Association. Mr. Stone goes unregistered as a lobbyist because he is a Colorado public official. It was this coalition of "anti" lobbies that bore the real fight for an undeveloped and underdeveloped Missouri Valley.

While this coalition tried to pass itself off as an unbiased civic-minded group, those who know the National Reclamation Association were not fooled. About 50 of the association's members are private power company representatives. At least another 50 are railroad people. The West knows the National Reclamation Association for its constant fronting for special interests.

I cannot imagine what the Propeller Club and the American Power Boat Association are or what their interest in MVA might be. Nor am I acquainted with the Pittsburgh Coal Exchange, though I do know of a few towns in the 10 valley States that are named Pittsburg. None of them seems to have a coal association, however, so I must assume the anti-MVA lobby is from Pittsburgh, Pa., a thousand miles from the nearest bank of the Missouri. I should further suspect from the organization's title that the group has coal to sell. In their opposition to MVA lies a magnificent argument for an MVA. Obviously a pressure group outside the valley, especially one with coal for sale, is interested in the kind of development of the valley which would result in the least amount of water power. That is not MVA. MVA will produce cheap water power and will compete with expensive coal. It will make possible constructive industries and will compete with vested industries of the East who have cheaper coal than the Midwest can get. I rather welcome the Pittsburgh Coal Exchange into the fold of our opposition on this issue. They make our case for us.

While this small group of Pennsylvanians on the Pittsburgh Coal Exchange is opposed to MVA, their grass roots are planted somewhat outside the valley. What seems to be more important is that the grass roots in the Missouri Valley are for MVA. I suppose it still is not too safe to talk about public-opinion polls, but I think we can rely on this one because of the large majority that MVA had in its favor in a Roper poll of last November. At that time 76 percent thought TVA and similar projects were good; only 6 percent opposed them. As to the valley itself, I cannot speak for all its people, but I can say the overwhelming majority of the men and women I know in the valley favor MVA without a doubt. I am supported in that opinion by one of the few successful public-opinion polls of last November, the Minnesota poll that actually predicted Minnesota would carry for President Truman. In November 1947 the Minnesota poll showed that three out of every four Minnesotans who had heard of the MVA proposal were in favor of it.

But the handful of willful men who have financial interests in the electric power industry, or who have coal interests or eastern industrial interests or railroad interests, have fought to a standstill the overwhelming majority of Missouri Valley residents and the best interests of the entire Nation. The water lobby coordinating committee has constantly fought the interests of western development. While these lobbyists have attempted to appear innocent of any evil intent toward the West, the National Reclamation Association let its position against sound reclamation come out in the open after it succeeded in defeating the first MVA bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. LANGER. Is the Senator familiar with the poll taken by the Farmers Union, covering 8 States?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; I am not.

Mr. LANGER. That poll showed the vote in favor of MVA to be over 90 percent among the members and among others living in the 8 States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very grateful to the Senator from North Dakota for his remarks, because the families of the men who represent the Farmers Union, are living on the family-sized farms. They are desperately in need of electrical power and of the benefits which MVA could provide for the people of the Midwest.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I was very much interested in what the Senator had to say. I cannot refrain from remarking that the people in the Senator's area seem to be having the same trouble we had in the Pacific Northwest. I hope they will continue their fight. We did, and as a result of doing the very thing the Senator from Minnesota is attempting to do, we succeeded in obtaining cheap electric power.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Washington. I may say that those of us from the Midwest stand in full support of the even greater hydroelectric power and land reclamation projects the far West is developing.

The adverse position of the National Reclamation Association became clear in a fight over irrigation funds for the West. Dams are used for both irrigation and electricity. Both are important for the farmers of the Midwest, and they are, therefore, important for all Americans—and all the world. Electricity is purchased from public power dams and paid for by its users, and their payments eventually cover all the costs on the electricity and on the interest of the investment. Irrigation costs are often greater than can be paid by the farmer. It has been the practice of the Bureau of Reclamation to apply the interest paid on the power investment to the amortization of excess irrigation costs. The Reclamation Association supported a bill that would raise electric rates high enough to pay for the excess irrigation costs. So it became obvious to everyone at last that the pretended friend of western reclamation—the National Reclamation Association—was much more the friend of the power trusts than the friend of reclamation.

This plan of the association, called the Rockwell bill in the Eightieth Congress, for a gentleman who is no longer present in the House of Representatives, would have done just the job the Reclamation Association had in mind: It would have raised power costs of the Colorado-Big Thompson diversion project in Colorado a few mills higher than power was selling for at the nearby Colorado Public Service Co. This, remember, was only possible by adding costs that had nothing to do with electric output to the electric bills of valley home owners and REA members. The Rockwell bill, which never did pass the Senate of the United States, was only one prong of a two-pronged attack on low electric rates. The other half was more successful. It involved adding meaningless costs to the Colorado-Big Thompson project. The charge has been publicly made and never denied that millions of dollars have been added to the cost of this dam, without adding one acre-foot of irrigation or one kilowatt of electric power. So even without the Rockwell bill, cheap power has been sabotaged on the Colorado.

There are numerous other examples of reclamation where public-power potential is ignored, always with the effect of maintaining high private-power rates where lower rates are possible. The private-power interests are at work on every project. The ceding, for instance, by the Bureau of Reclamation to Army engineers of three large power-producing dams in the original alinement of the Pick-Sloan plan has had ruinous effect on the Bureau's power program. This maneuver reduced the power capacity of Bureau of Reclamation dams from 3,809,000,000 kilowatt-hours to 1,620,000,000 kilowatt-hours, 42 percent of what those dams could produce. And while the dams did provide improved flood-control and navigation facilities, electricity costs actually went up. The Public Affairs Institute has figured that the shift of the dams from the Bureau to the Army will cost valley farmers half a billion dollars in additional costs and will raise wholesale electric rates perhaps as high as the unheard-of level of 2 cents a kilowatt-hour. That simply means that the Missouri Valley can never develop as it should develop for the best interests of all the people. That is the present policy in the Missouri Valley. It must be changed.

Mr. President, my interest in the Missouri Basin has many facets. I directly represent a small portion of it. I was reared in a State lying totally in the Missouri River watershed—South Dakota. My residence is in a city which will prosper or decline to a considerable degree with the great northwestern portion of the Missouri Basin. The Twin Cities are the market place of that area. I am also interested in the welfare of every area of this Nation. Surely, as a Member of the National Senate, I sincerely feel that all of these will benefit from unified development of the valley.

Historically, forces of development have twice passed around or over most of the Missouri River Valley, the Great Plains, and the mountain areas. This was true in the original development of the Nation. Covered wagons moved from the eastern areas directly to the west coast in the 1850's and largely bypassed the Great Plains area. It was true a second time when our country expanded during the world wars. Development occurred in the East, the South, and the Pacific Coast States, but there has been little development in the Missouri Valley section. But this valley, I repeat, can be developed.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] has told us today of resources in the valley which our Nation needs. He has described rich agricultural lands, phosphate deposits, manganese, metals, and fuels.

Low-cost electric power is essential if these industries are to be developed; if the ores and the fertilizer are to add to the strength of our Nation. Low-cost power is important to farmers, whose REA cooperatives are short of power and are today being bludgeoned into long-term wholesale power contracts to take them out of the market when public power becomes available. Low-cost power is especially important to farmers who have to pump water for irrigation, but it is also important to every farmer who wants relief from drudgery, a better living, and attractive surroundings for his children, who now move away.

I am also interested in the irrigation possibilities of the Missouri. There has been no agricultural justification for hundreds of thousands of acres of the proposed Sloan irrigation projects, and these malpractices might bankrupt tens of thousands of our farm people. It is now obvious that the Pick flowing channel will take millions of acre-feet of water away from much needed irrigation.

I am interested in conservation of the land, in controlling floods from the point the water touches the ground. This kind of planning has been largely ignored in the present Pick-Sloan project for the Missouri Basin.

I am deeply interested in the conservation of our forests, in the development of recreation facilities, in the preservation of wildlife—in all the creative, constructive programs which a truly integrated plan for Missouri River development could bring, benefits which the Pick-Sloan plan are denying to the Valley.

I am concerned that the Pick-Sloan plan will not finally provide reliable navigation.

All of these situations are of grave concern to me, but I have devoted myself to the power phase because that is where the strong opposition is found.

Our effort to get an MVA is a fight of political powers.

It is a contest to see if the people of the United States may cooperate through Government to build a better economy and a better life.

Mr. President, numerous committees of this Congress will soon deal with matters vitally affecting regional valley developments. The Appropriations Committees and the Army will review requests for tremendous sums for Pick-Sloan projects. The committee which studies the bill we have introduced today ought seriously to investigate the whole subject of regional planning. Reports indicate that the Hoover Commission criticizes sharply the inefficiency of the myriad agencies now involved in resources development. The Joint Committee on the Economic Report has a report from the Council of Economic Advisers suggesting complete examination of river-basin plans, especially the Missouri Basin and the Columbia.

Enormous sums are being spent in the Missouri Valley today on the Pick-Sloan plan, which I have partially described. There is increasing danger that those expenditures may become a strait-jacket and may prevent honest full-scale development for many years to come.

It is urgent that this Congress, and every committee involved, deal with every phase of MVA and investigate it thoroughly. I cannot urge too strongly that this be done. If full investigation is made, a Missouri Valley Administration, today proposed, will be assured. The people once more are ahead of their leaders. America in every corner and in every region wants to get its people together to make full and better use of the rich resources at our command. We need these resources now. A Missouri Valley Administration must come out of this Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement showing comparative costs of REA wholesale power.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparative costs of REA wholesale power

[Missouri Valley States' actual cost compared to the Tennessee Valley Authority average charge of 5.53 mills for year ended June 30, 1947]

State	Rate in mills actually paid	Sum actually paid	Cost at TVA rate	The difference
Colorado	10.8	$654,427.18	$335,996.21	$318,430.97
Iowa	11.4	2,038,291.10	991,243.91	1,047,047.19
Kansas	10.8	412,909.96	211,299.75	201,610.21
Minnesota	12.8	2,387,020.49	1,030,011.13	1,357,009.36
Missouri	10.0	1,717,177.87	949,897.07	767,280.80
Montana	8.6	235,805.33	151,321.19	84,484.14
Nebraska	8.4	588,224.75	389,478.03	198,746.72
North Dakota	11.1	204,979.75	101,923.18	103,056.57
South Dakota	12.3	179,888.96	81,925.54	98,963.42
Wyoming	10.4	162,628.02	86,841.09	75,786.93
Total	----------	8,581,333.41	4,329,037.10	4,252,316.31

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Minnesota a question. I wish to compliment him, particularly, on his very fine maiden speech, I believe it is.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. I think it is an honor and credit to the State of Minnesota to have a representative who speaks out so frankly on a matter of such great importance. My question is this: Does not the Senator believe that when money has been appropriated to build a great dam, such as the Garrison Dam, originally estimated to cost $130,000,000, and which will very likely cost $200,000,000 before it is completed, the Congress should appropriate sufficient money to enable the Government to build a distribution system and own it, so that the farms, the little villages, the cities, and the towns in that area can get their power at cost?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall answer the Senator by saying that, so long as that project has been started, it would be folly, so far as I can see, for the Government not to complete the work, which should be done by providing power facilities which that dam could readily provide.

Mr. LANGER. And distribution facilities?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; and the necessary distribution facilities, federally owned and federally operated.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. LUCAS to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 15, amending the so-called cloture rule of the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bricker	Cain
Anderson	Bridges	Chavez
Baldwin	Broughton	Connally
Brewster	Butler	Cordon
Donnell	Kerr	O'Conor
Douglas	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Downey	Knowland	Pepper
Eastland	Langer	Reed
Ecton	Lodge	Robertson
Ellender	Long	Russell
Flanders	Lucas	Saltonstall
Fulbright	McCarran	Schoeppel
George	McCarthy	Smith, Maine
Gillette	McClellan	Smith, N. J.
Green	McFarland	Sparkman
Hayden	McGrath	Stennis
Hendrickson	McKellar	Taft
Hill	Magnuson	Taylor
Hoey	Malone	Thomas, Utah
Holland	Martin	Thye
Humphrey	Maybank	Tobey
Hunt	Miller	Tydings
Ives	Millikin	Vandenberg
Johnson, Colo.	Morse	Watkins
Johnson, Tex.	Mundt	Wherry
Johnston, S. C.	Murray	Wiley
Kefauver	Myers	Williams
Kem	Neely	Withers

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 15.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, it is with very mixed emotions that I arise to address the Senate this afternoon. In these first formal words I have to utter before this body, I say in all earnestness that I would very much prefer to speak to my colleagues initially on some substantive legislation; I would prefer to be advocating some measure designed to help all our people, or certainly large portions of them, some legislation calculated to unify and benefit the great masses who look to us for guidance and for relief from their oppressions.

We are told that Nero fiddled while Rome burned; and I paraphrase to say that while our laboring people cry out for removal of shackling Federal laws, we are here to consider legislation which would destroy one of the greatest balances of our republican form of government; while our farmers throughout the Nation plead for assistance in the face of fading markets, we would take action which might some day place them under tyranny; while my desk is burdened with letters from the poor, the disabled, and the sick importuning for broadened social-security benefits and for welfare laws, I must come here in an effort to protect those unfortunate people from a change in our own rules which might well serve hereafter as the vehicle which some future oppressive group could use to grind them to dust. The resolution we are now considering, if adopted, would serve as the entering wedge in the destruction of the most precious heritage we retain in the United States Senate, namely, the right of unlimited debate.

I must confess that I was quite surprised during the course of the debate when my very good friend, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], declared, in effect, that he was unimpressed by the argument that the Hayden-Wherry resolution serves as an entering wedge for eventual destruction of free debate in this body. My surprise was predicated on my knowledge of the Senator's long experience and service here as a legislator, which experience I would have assumed had resulted in an awareness of the fact that the entire legislative process is evolutionary, and that in practically every function of our Government the legislature has granted authority step by step.

The history of rule XXII further bears out the fact that it is extremely rare for this body to adopt legislation which stands forever safe from attack or from change, just as rule XXII itself today is under attack.

I predict that, if the Hayden-Wherry resolution is adopted, those Senators desiring majority cloture will be right back in the next Congress with their proposals, pushing and pressuring them just as steadfastly as they have been and now are doing. Yes, Mr. President, the Hayden-Wherry resolution is an entering wedge, one with which we dare not trifle if we hope to maintain the force of this great deliberative body.

Since 1807, the right of unlimited debate has continued, serving, in season and out, as a protection to those in the minority at times when they were confronted with legislation which would have destroyed large segments of the economic, political, or cultural life of our Nation. And yet, in all those years, the practice of unlimited debate has resulted in no legislative harm. Perhaps the only legislation failing ultimately of enactment because of extended debate was the force bill of 1890. I venture the assertion that today very few Senators would advocate such legislation as the force bill of 1890. We find that in later years those who proposed it came to the conclusion that its failure worked for the common good.

Those who labored to bring the American Government into being very carefully provided a system of checks and balances which have served to keep the Republic alive and vigorous as governments elsewhere around the world collapsed into ruin. The framers of the Constitution worked long weeks in Philadelphia to reconcile the conflicting interests and the divergent views of the 13 States. The system of government they conceived, which still remains unique, was predicated on liberty and justice for

all—not liberty and justice for the majority; not liberty and justice for the minority; but liberty and justice for all the people, regardless of section, economic interest, or political views. In numerous instances, that great document testifies to the interest of the delegates in forming a government which would prevent the rebirth in America of the tyranny against which the founding fathers themselves had so recently rebelled. The interests of manufacturing New England were delicately balanced against those of the agricultural South. The rights and privileges of the more populous States had to be balanced against those of the less populous States. Problem after problem confronted those men; and their solution, in the whole, was found in a system of government which, rather than giving the bridle to the majority, actually is constituted to restrain the majority. To say that this is a pure democracy or that our forefathers ever intended that it should be is to fly in the face of the facts. The existence of the Senate itself speaks eloquently of the intent of the founding fathers not to have a pure majority rule. They wanted certain restraints on the majority for the protection of minority rights. The constitutional provisions which require substantial majorities in certain cases are still further testimony that the founding fathers feared the rule of a majority in some respects and provided protection for the minority—whatever that minority—against the tyranny which too often results from the machinations of a majority.

In speaking of these restraining provisions in the Constitution, Gouverneur Morris, who sat as a delegate at Philadelphia, said:

> There remain three cases in which two-thirds of the whole number are required. These are, first, the expulsion of a member; secondly, the passage of a law disapproved of by the President; and, thirdly, amendments to the Constitution. In these three cases, a provision is carefully made to defend a people against themselves, or, in other words, against that violence of party spirit which has hitherto proved fatal to republican government.

When this great document, the American Constitution, was framed, and before it was ever ratified, certain States began to feel that there was not yet enough restraint on majority rule in the new nation they were forming. They felt that it was necessary to insist that a bill of rights be inserted in our Constitution, a bill of rights which could not be changed except by constitutional amendment approved by three-fourths of all the States in the Nation, and passed by two-thirds of the Members of the Congress.

When I think of the quotation from Gouverneur Morris I am impressed with the eloquence with which he speaks to us at this moment. He and his colaborers at Philadelphia had recognized the need of protecting our "people against themselves" and had acted, insofar as they could, to afford the necessary protection for all time to come.

Is it any wonder, then, in those times of great men, in those days before the violence of party spirit had so gripped us and when men of great ability had given of their best to form a great Republic, that free and unlimited debate was instituted in the Senate?

I digress to say that in my study of this question I was originally of the opinion that the great freedom of debate which the Senate once enjoyed began in 1807. I was interested to note during the course of these debates that even though originally in the Senate the previous question could be invoked, the previous question itself was debatable. So, in effect, from the founding of our American Government up until 1917, complete freedom of debate was enjoyed in the United States Senate.

In those days of molding and shaping a nation those great men foresaw the need for legislative restraints to keep us from pitfalls which could doom to failure that which they, with the help of God, had wrought.

Mr. President, mistake you not, those men knew what tyranny was. They knew, from bitter experience, about taxation without representation. They knew what it was to live at the point of an oppressor's sword, for they had lived in such an atmosphere. They knew how precious was the right of free speech, for they had been denied it. They knew in reality the bitterness of a denial of property and the rights of a man in his own home, for such rights had been too often transgressed by a cruel overlord. Oh, Mr. President, have we so long been accustomed to these principles for which those very men shed their blood that we would, by a single stroke, remove one of the great cornerstones which has so long supported them? May God forbid; but if we change this rule we are in effect saying to some substantial minority of the future, and we are saying to the minority which I am presently representing in the Senate, "You have no rights. The majority rules as and when it sees fit." We could, in effect, impose taxation without representation, for we would gag the representatives of the minority here. We could, by the passage of certain iniquitous measures which already are before us, say to a great minority that their destiny no longer is theirs—that their way of life and liberty must be cast aside in the pursuit of a transient political advantage by a majority.

Mr. President, the protection of minorities is the purpose of article after article of the Constitution of the United States. It is the purpose of the Bill of Rights and many other amendments to the Constitution.

This very body, the Senate of the United States, was created for the purpose of protecting the small States from the power of Members of the great States. Senators found early in our history that this great purpose of protecting the rights of the minorities should be further implemented by the right of unlimited debate, and for 110 years this forum had the most complete freedom of debate.

It was only in 1917, when the Nation was on the verge of war, that freedom of debate was in any wise limited by the rules of the Senate. At that time it was intended that in case of national emergency debate could be ended on a pending measure. In my opinion, and I believe in the opinion of the majority of Members of the Senate, that limitation was intended to be used only in case of national emergency, so that debate could be ended on a measure which might involve the security of the United States.

When the committee was acting on proposed amendments to rule XXII the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] proposed just such an amendment in order that there might be no doubt as to where southern Senators stood on this issue. However, that amendment was voted down by a large vote. Every new member of that committee—and there were four of us—who had never heard this question thoroughly discussed before saw fit to vote for that amendment, which at least would have protected a minority of 10 or more. But it was voted down, because it was seen fit not to require that a minority have as many as 10, but to require that a minority have almost half, or at least a third, in order to guarantee that it could be fully heard on the floor of the Senate.

If I may go back historically, let me point out that the rule was finally changed in the face of a national emergency. Subsequently, in the year 1919, when a filibuster developed over certain reservations to the treaty of Versailles, it was decided that this change of the rules applied only to a pending measure, meaning a pending bill, and not to motions or other questions before the Senate.

Until this day, no one has seen fit to provide a method for completely preventing unlimited debate. Such debate has served a useful purpose. The right of unlimited debate has made the United States Senate the foremost protector and defender of minority rights. There was a time, Mr. President, when the Supreme Court laid heavy stress upon the tenth amendment to the Constitution, which provides that—

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

This maxim long served to protect the States and the people from wanton Federal power. But nimble minds have practically read that amendment out of the Constitution in our day, Mr. President. According to much present thinking, the tenth amendment stems from a fallacy that there was any possible power not given to the central Government. I regret to say that today great numbers of persons, some of high station, believe that the tenth amendment was not at all necessary, because they feel that the framers of the Constitution intended to give the Federal Government every conceivable power when they formulated the Constitution of the United States. I cannot agree with that line of reasoning, Mr. President; but I tell you that, judging from some of its decisions, I believe that point of view finds a great deal of support in the United States Supreme Court today. I regret to say that the present Supreme Court seems to be in accord with such a line of thinking. However, I cannot control the judgment of the

members of that Court. Under such a line of decisions, no longer does the Constitution of the United States with its Bill of Rights stand in the way of virtually unlimited exercise of power by the Federal Government. In view of the tendency of the decisions of the Supreme Court, I am inclined to believe that today the United States Senate is the last forum and the last stand for the great minorities in the United States today.

I myself am strongly inclined to believe that the United States Senate would protect a minority it felt should be protected, and would do so even more than would the great Supreme Court of the United States. That is why I should like to see the rules of the Senate remain in such state that minorities can be fully protected and can be heard in the United States Senate. I should like to have the rules of the Senate stay that way.

As I have said, today the United States Senate stands as the last great protector of the rights of the minority. Why is that true? It is because of the right of unlimited debate in these halls. A mere handful of men, armed with sincere conviction, can hold off the majority for days on end. The minority, through its right of unlimited debate, may test the determination and the conscience as well as the endurance of the majority.

Mr. President, some Senators have suggested to me that a filibuster in the Senate cannot be broken if a substantial number of the Members of the Senate participate in it. However, judging from what I could learn of the matter and the best I could determine after studying it, I have always felt that any filibuster can be broken if the majority has the same determination and the same conviction of righteousness that the minority possesses. But there is where a question arises. Senators cannot do here in the Senate what can be done today in the State legislatures. The Members of the Senate cannot have this issue come up and have the majority end the debate by moving the previous question if they feel that the debate is cutting away their majority and that they are losing vote after vote because Senators are becoming convinced that they are wrong on the issue. That cannot occur in the Senate today. Here we do not have the situation existing in State legislatures, where the floor leader may move the previous question—a motion which is not debatable—because he feels that he will lose the issue if the debate goes on indefinitely.

Oh, no, Mr. President, the rules of the Senate give the minority the right to test out the majority and to see how convinced they are of their own righteousness, and whether they are attempting to play petty politics at home. The present rules of the Senate preserve the soundness of the system under which we operate in the United States, but that system will be destroyed by making a change in this rule.

Mr. President, all of us are human. All of us, besides being statesmen, are politicians; we have to be politicians if we are to win elections from time to time. Certainly the time may come when a Senator who is facing an election may feel that some piece of legislation should be forced through the Congress because its enactment will help him obtain reelection to the Senate. Mr. President, the right of unlimited debate is the greatest weapon we can have against having a Member of the Senate cast a vote which may not be wise or correct in the light of his own conscience.

Today we of the South are in the minority, Mr. President. We insist that the rules designed to protect the minority remain unchanged. Would not any minority do the same thing? Suppose the Senators from New England were in the minority? Would not they wish to see the rules stay as they are, so as to protect them? I know some persons will say, "The Senators from New England want to change this rule." But, Mr. President, the Senators from New England do not see legislation expressly drawn with peculiar application to their section of the country being forced upon them, as we of the South see legislation of that sort being proposed against us. If their minority were under attack and if their section of the country might be greatly harmed by some proposed legislation, if it were passed by the Congress, they would not wish to have this rule changed; but, on the contrary, they would be insisting that the rule remain unchanged, just as we of the South insist that it remain unchanged.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield for a question.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to ask a question of the distinguished Senator, since he has mentioned that the proposed change of the rule is designed to permit the enactment of some proposed legislation aimed at his section of the country, for instance, the antilynching bill, although there is practically no lynching today. Suppose some Senator proposed legislation directed at the metropolitan cities of the East and North, where there are gangster killings; and suppose that piece of proposed legislation provided that where a gangster killing occurred, the parents and other relatives of the victims would have the right to sue the city and the county and the municipality, as is proposed against the South in the case of lynchings. In that case, in the opinion of the able Senator from Louisiana, would not the representatives of the northern and eastern cities be pleading for the preservation of this rule?

Mr. LONG. I would not be at all surprised if that were the case. Certainly if innocent people in the North were to be prosecuted or found guilty of something with which they had nothing to do—as is proposed in the case of the people of the South—I believe that the representatives in Congress of the northern cities and Northern States would be just as much against such a proposal as are today the representatives of the Southern States.

Mr. President, we know that pressure groups have a never-ending store of laws designed to overhaul and disrupt the social pattern of our States. We know that this proposal to change the rules of the Senate stems primarily from the desire to prevent the Southern Senators from having the opportunity of a full defense, under the rules, against proposed legislation expressly designed to affect their States. It stems from the difficulty of pressure groups to endlessly hold prisoner the Senators who may have pledged their support. It stems from the inability of pressure groups to pop a whip over the heads of the Members of this august body. This proposed change in the rule is being forced upon us, Mr. President, because of that situation; it is being forced upon us because it is difficult for pressure groups to hold Senators in line over a period of time. This measure is not forced upon us on its merits alone.

But, Mr. President, we of the South are not the only minority in this great country. It merely happens that we are the whipping boy today. Actually, every American is both a member of the majority on some issues and the minority on others. Certainly, we should expect fair play and respect from others who may later find themselves in the minority on issues on which we may be in the majority at a later date. It is the American concept that one should fight fairly and according to the rules. Americans have a reputation for fighting that way. I say that it is not right to change the rules merely to have the upper hand in passing proposed legislation before the Senate.

I expect to participate in this Congress in the opposition to legislation which I consider especially harmful to my particular section of the Nation. Certainly we should be entitled to the defense provided by the rules of the Senate and 151 years of tradition for the protection of minority rights. That is what we ask for.

I say, Mr. President, that every move to obstruct free debate in this body undermines the very foundation of the American Government. The stability and durability of this Government were founded upon restraints to protect minorities and even the individuals. We must preserve these restraints, but leave not the other undone. Do not permit the violence of party spirit against which George Washington warned us to be the undoing of our great Nation.

Today I ask for the right of unlimited debate in the defense of my people, in the defense of their customs, traditions, and society, from ruthless dictation and control by a sovereignty that heeds too much the voice of pressure groups from afar. Some day there will be other minorities just as much in need of the precious privilege of the Senate rules as today are we of the South. In Germany the Jews learned what it was to be denied minority rights. I am glad to see that that minority has the support of a majority in the United States Senate, wherever their interests are involved. Today no one in this body would seek to harm the Jewish minority. Although they constitute a racial minority, they are safe at least from unfair legislation in the United States Congress. The same is true of the Catholics and of all other minorities. Yet all these people constitute minorities who may some day need the protection of the very provision which some now propose to abolish.

We cannot always rely on the majority's meaning to do and doing the right thing by minorities. If the day should ever come when the majority fails in this respect, how grateful would be the defenders of such groups that they had the rule to use, just as we in the South propose to use it to defend our rights.

It is possible some day, Mr. President, that even the people who claim to be Protestants may be in the minority in this country, although they are today a substantial majority. It is possible that some day even the men who worship God may be in the minority in the United States, although I hope certainly that will never be the case. Suppose it should happen, and suppose laws should be introduced in the Senate imperiling the right of religion or discriminating against it in some way. Suppose there should be judges sitting in the United States Supreme Court who might feel the guaranty of religious liberty to be a very weak provision, and that there were a great number of modifications or a great number of different points of view regarding religious rights. Certainly those who wanted to protect minority rights, certainly those who wanted to protect the religious freedom of the people of America, if they found themselves in the minority, would be glad the rules of the Senate had been preserved just as they are.

If the rule of unlimited debate is to be destroyed by the Eighty-first Congress, there is little need of speculating as to whom the destruction of the shield may affect. This is the last great forum of unlimited debate in the world. I say to you, Mr. President, this forum does not need improvement. Certain Senators stand in the Senate and talk about people criticizing us and laughing at us because of the way in which we conduct the Nation's business. Most of those who cast such slurs upon this august body have never been here to see it in operation and have never seen how the laws of America are enacted. But I say any student of government who understands the provisions they make to protect the rights of the individual and of minorities certainly must admire the rules of the Senate permitting free and unlimited debate.

One hundred and eight years ago, William King, of Alabama, stood in this forum during the debates on the banking bill and said he would defend even unto death the right of unlimited debate, which was then 35 years old in this forum. Senator King and men of his caliber who succeeded him preserved that great right for another 108 years, and it has been preserved to us until this very day.

I tell you, Mr. President, far greater harm would come to the United States of America and to our Government through changing the rule than would be done to us of the South by adopting every proposal conceived by the minds of the northern agitators for ruling the Southern States. They could do us only a limited amount of harm; but ultimately the loss of the right of free debate in the Senate might mean the destruction of our republican form of government. Difficult as it is to acquire freedom, it is easily sacrificed. Once a majority has in hand the convenient weapon of gag rule, it would not be human nature to expect the majority to surrender it or not to use it.

There is very little control in our laws. With new ideas and new concepts, judges having what might be called the modern point of view may see things in a different light from the way their predecessors did. I tell you, Mr. President, when the rule permitting unlimited debate in the Senate is abrogated, and when, in the present session, cloture petitions are submitted time after time to limit debate and to put the Senate under gag rule, first in the case of an antilynching bill, then an anti-poll-tax bill, then an FEPC bill, there will have been destroyed not only the rule, but also the tradition of the Senate. Even though I am in the minority today, seeking protection of the Senate rules, I am only human, as I believe most other Senators will admit they are. So, after the rules have been changed so as to take unfair advantage of the people of my section of the country, and after we have been subjected to cloture three times in the present session and have had rammed through the Congress laws for which no one from my section would vote, laws designed to govern our local affairs to which we would have to submit unwillingly, being human, after that had been done to me a few times, the chances are I should be looking for a chance to do the same thing to somebody else. So I say, Mr. President, the same people who would change the rule and impose cloture upon those of us defending the rights of our people had better watch out. They had better be sure they cannot conceive of some time in the future when the same thing might be done to them.

Mr. President, it has been my experience that usually a man lives what he says. The statement applies to most interests and groups. When the thing that is being undertaken today is directed against those of us from one section of the country, the day may very well come when it will be popular in our section of the country to do what would be considered an equal injustice to some other section of the country, for the political advantage of our section. Mr. President, I say anyone who is in the majority today should realize he may be in the minority in the future, and he may want the same consideration, the same rights those of us from the South expect for our section of the country.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield for a question.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator just made reference to the proposed change in the rule, saying it might work adversely to those who are now sponsoring it. Do we not have a present example of that in the sudden change of the rules in the House of Representatives at this session of the Congress, whereby the rule is about to work adversely to those who sponsored the change?

Mr. LONG. Yes, we do, Mr. President. I am glad the Senator asked that question. As a matter of fact we see already that those who changed the rules of the House are not too sure they did the right thing; they feel that perhaps the old-established traditions of the House are better than the new rules they recently adopted.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the able Senator from Louisiana whether he is familiar with the statement of Herbert Spencer, who was considered in his day a noted philosopher and sociologist, that "the theory upon which the practical politician proceeds is that the change caused by his measure will stop where he intends it to stop. He contemplates intently the influence his issue will achieve, but thinks little of the remoter issues of the movement his act sets up, and still less of the collateral issue"?

Mr. LONG. That is very true.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the Senator whether it is true that often times the practical politician, in looking no further than the end of his nose to some temporary advantage he may gain, sets in motion forces which later will boomerang and destroy him?

Mr. LONG. That is very true. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator asked the question. As a matter of fact our distinguished majority leader pointed out the other day that a previous Senator from Mississippi had once advocated cloture and gag rule in the Senate. I say the two Senators from Mississippi today certainly are showing more judgment than the previous Senator, who could not foresee the day when attempts would be made to legislate especially for his section of the country and to impose laws that everyone in his section opposed. Certainly, Mr. President, he never thought that would be the case. He could not have had that foresight. But I say Senators who today would impose gag rule cannot see what is going to happen in the future.

How do we know but that some day there will come before the Senate a proposal depriving, let us say, the great State of Illinois of some of her industries and some of the great advantages she enjoys today? Certainly if that should come to pass, the Senators from Illinois in the Senate at that time would take a different position. They would be apologizing for the position of our great majority leader today.

Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration which reported the Hayden-Wherry resolution, I am grateful for the opportunity given me there to study this question in all of its ramifications. I am grateful to the Democratic majority of the committee for the fact that we were given opportunity to have hearings to discuss the subject. I believe the Members of the Senate know that when hearings were originally proposed the entire minority of the members of the committee, representing the minority party in the Senate, voted to have no hearings whatsoever. There were four new Members on the majority side, and it was proposed that there be no hearings held whatsoever, and the four new members of the committee, including myself, would have to vote on a change in the Senate rules, to vote for a change of a rule, without having the benefit of hearing witnesses, discussing it, and going thoroughly into the subject. We did not have an opportunity to have as many days of hearings as we would like to have had. The witnesses whom I heard were limited to Senators, but I did have an opportunity to hear some witnesses, and I had a few days in which to study the question. Mr. President, that certainly is in violation of what I believe to be sound legislative practice.

I heard on the floor of the Senate, a few days later, a proposal that only short hearings be held on the Taft-Hartley labor legislation. I heard some very brilliant arguments regarding what an awful thing it would be to bring up that measure without free and full hearings.

Day after day in the Committee of Rules and Administration we were pressed, rushed, and pushed. I believe every new member of the committee was impressed with what he heard there. New Members came to me and, I believe I can say without violating a confidence, said that what they had heard in the hearings had changed their point of view on the question. If the measure had come to a vote without hearings or debate of any sort, there would have been only two Senators on the committee who would have voted against the proposal. The way it turned out, the able junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], after he had heard all the witnesses and the discussions, concluded that the right of unlimited debate was a great and fine enough thing to preserve in the United States Senate. There was a Senator who was open-minded. He was entitled to think entirely for himself, and he reached the conclusion which I have stated.

The able junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] came to the committee hearings completely convinced that we ought to have cloture. But after he had heard the witnesses he was strongly inclined to believe that it was proper to vote for the proposal which provided, in effect, that 90 percent of the Senators could cut off debate at any time. But there was another Senator who felt there was more to the protection of minority rights than ordinarily meets the eye. They were about the only two Senators who came there with completely open minds.

Some have come to me and said that we should have majority cloture, but when they had heard the discussions and arguments by both sides they were convinced that there should be restraints for the protection of minority rights. Many of them were inclined to think that we should have free and unlimited debate such as we have always previously had.

I think it was a wonderful thing that those hearings were held. I know that much of enlightenment has gone into the committee's report. I believe that if every Senator on the floor would open his mind, just as did those two men who came to the hearings with open minds, and if they would study the question, completely without prejudice and without pressure, they would conclude that the right of unlimited debate on the floor of the Senate is something worth preserving in the American Nation from now on.

Mr. President, I feel very much as did the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], when he stated that he was not concerned about what the minority will do; he was not much worried about that, because the minority cannot pass any legislation. All it can do is to restrain the majority. It is the majority which does the damage under our American form of government. It passes legislation. It is the majority that should be restrained.

Mr. President, I say that if we adopt the Hayden-Wherry resolution it will be an entering wedge which will soon mean the complete abolition of free debate and discussion in the United States Senate. Even now there are great numbers of persons who say that we should have majority cloture, and this would arm them with the further ability to get it, because it would make it more simple to close debate in order to get it. It is a tremendous temptation to a majority, a tremendous temptation to a floor leader, and a tremendous temptation to an administration, to feel that they do not have to bother with the minority. They can simply move the previous question and put desired legislation through.

We have seen legislation which, if passed, could do more harm to the Nation than it would do good. Consider, for a moment, the proposal for drafting manpower during the war.

Consider, also, the proposal to pack the Supreme Court. I heard a Senator say that he was of the opinion that if that proposal had come to a vote when it was originally made, it would probably have been agreed to; but after extended debate, it did not pass.

If we destroy unlimited debate in the Senate, future majorities will take advantage of the rules. They will not take the chance of losing their majority by seeing, day after day, first one vote and then another, have the majority. When they see their votes getting away, they will move the previous question, and we shall have much harmful legislation passed.

Mr. President, why is there all this rush, hustle, and bustle? Why is it that the United States Senate, which has been functioning under the present rules for 32 years, cannot proceed a while longer under them? Is some foreign enemy knocking at our gates in such an imperative manner that such action is necessary? Suddenly, like a bolt from the blue, everything else must be laid aside and a substitute rule be provided. Why is there this emergency which requires a change in the rules? Why must we, at this time, in violation of the tradition of fair play, in which all Americans believe, change the rules in the middle of the game?

We all know what the answer is. If there were not pending certain proposals dealing with the so-called civil-rights program, the Senate would now be proceeding to the consideration of other legislation in an orderly, systematic way.

I do not care to dwell on the proposed measures at the present time, but I am constrained to say that this great land of ours has indeed reached a sorry day when, in an effort to satisfy the clamorings of paid propagandists and professional purveyors of hate, we must put aside all else, change the rules, and ram through legislation which a large segment of our country does not want and will never tolerate.

Mr. President, I should like to submit for the consideration of my colleagues this question: Could all these civil-rights laws be passed with free debate? It might be possible to muster sufficient votes to put through the antilynching bill, possibly sufficient votes could be secured to put through the antipoll tax bill, even though those two measures are unconstitutional, but could the so-called FEPC bill be forced through without gag rule? That is an important question to consider.

The able Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], distinguished statesman that he is, stated in a meeting of the committee that similar legislation was proposed in his State, and that after it was proposed it was submitted to the people for a vote and overwhelmingly defeated in every county throughout the State. I understand the same sort of thing has been happening throughout the country, 15 times the proponents of FEPC have been so foolish as to give the people a chance to be heard on the matter, and every time the people have been heard from they have voted the proposal down.

I ask, could a national FEPC law be forced through Congress if it had to be subjected to prolonged and extended debate, when the people of the United States would get a chance to find out what was going on here, and call on their Senators and Representatives and make their wishes known?

Mr. President, I assert that the weapon of unlimited debate is the greatest protection the rank and file of our people in the United States enjoy. It guarantees them a chance to know what is going on in the Senate before something that would do great harm to them is passed. This is the only House of Congress which has such a rule. No other parliamentary body in the world has free and unrestrained debate, which is the greatest protection of our liberty. That is one of the reasons why the American Government, made up of people with so many divergent views, and so many different classes and kinds of people, has been able to survive for more than 150 years, while all other nations throughout the world have crumbled, with the possible exception of the British democracy, where there is a different situation, in many respects, because of the stability caused by the existence of the monarchy, and because in that nation there are not the great racial differences and the divergencies of viewpoint found in other nations.

When I first began to study this question as a new Senator, I believe I undertook that study with an open mind. I sought light, for all my life I had heard of the evils of filibuster. Perhaps unconsciously I may have rebelled at its

use because I had heard how it had so often been used to throttle the majority. I say "so often;" but it has been used about every other year. I believe that out of the last 48 years it has been used about 20 times.

As a textbook proposition, it seemed plausible enough that we should abolish the filibuster, that we should let the majority go on its way and do what it desired. But as the hearings before the committee progressed, and as I had other opportunities to study the question, I became convinced beyond question that here in the Senate we were about to trample underfoot one of the most precious liberties guaranteed to us by the Constitution of the United States—the right of free speech.

Where once there was doubt in my mind that one-third of the members of this body should be allowed to prevent enactment of legislation, I now am of the opinion that cloture, in any form, is an evil, a termite gnawing at our very vitals, an instrument of which we would be well rid. Our course, I believe, is in the wrong direction. Rather than tightening rule XXII, we should be headed the other way.

Why should so large a group as one-third be necessary to insure the rights and liberties of our people? Why should not four or five Senators, sincerely convinced of their course, be allowed to utilize the privilege of free debate to protect their people against the wrongs they believe are about to be committed against them? Why should rights, why should liberty, why should freedom, be counted in numbers? Why should any Senator or small group of Senators find it necessary to gain the support of 33 Senators before they can undertake the defense of their people? Why should they, few though their number be, be denied the right to protest to the limits of their physical abilities? I believe that this rule should be changed so that even smaller minorities could be protected by having the full right of hearing on the floor of the Senate.

Some seem to believe, and I have heard some say, that in this day of enlightenment the tactics and proceedings incident to full and extended debate constitute what they call a trial by combat, and they say that should have no place in the American system of government. The junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] came to our committee hearings and said the procedure of delaying consideration by prolonged debate should not be the way to settle matters in the United States Senate. He said we should have ways of forcing action on measures sooner. Mr. President, 108 years ago Senator King, of Alabama, stood here and made the statement that he would defend the right of free and full debate with his life if necessary. At the same time in the same debate other Senators rose and said they would be willing to stake their political existence on the right of free and full debate in the Senate, and during that debate some of the Senators made the statement that if free debate were to be abolished in the Senate, they would not run for public office again, and would not care to serve here. Certainly those men understood and appreciated the fact that a man should be entitled to stand and speak and be heard in the Senate.

I might ask, Mr. President, when did it become unenlightened to protect our people from tyranny? When did United States Senators reach such a stature that it is beneath their dignity to defend to their utmost those they represent here? Can we not give a small measure of devotion to those liberties to which so many have given their lives? If that be "trial by combat," then let it be.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield for a question.

Mr. McKELLAR. The first amendment of the Constitution, adopted shortly after the Constitution was ratified, contains this provision:

> Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech.

Is it not remarkable that while we are prohibited by the Constitution from passing any law abridging the right of free speech, it should be claimed by anyone that here in the United States Senate we cannot have that right ourselves?

Mr. LONG. The Senator is entirely correct in his implication. While we are on that subject, I might say that it is my understanding that when the Constitution was first proposed it did not contain that amendment. The first ten amendments, what we call the Bill of Rights, were missing. Virginia, North Carolina and certain other States would not ratify the Constitution until the Bill of Rights was inserted, and they ratified only on condition that that Bill of Rights would later be made a part of the Constitution. I know that at that time there were probably many who said, "This is not necessary. No one here in America will ever propose to destroy these rights"—the right of religion, the right of free speech, and various and sundry rights protected in the first 10 amendments.

It never even occurred to them that anyone would want to destroy these rights. But, Mr. President, there were certain sovereign States which insisted that these rights be included before they would ratify the Constitution. When I heard the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] speak on that subject yesterday I was inclined to wonder, if the great State of Texas had been one of the original 13, whether we would not have had another 10 articles in the Bill of Rights in the Federal Constitution. I am strongly inclined to think we would, knowing how greatly freedom is respected in the State of Texas, and how strongly its people want to preserve it.

Mr. President, the muttering of those who seek to change the rules of the Senate for selfish ends should not lead us to put aside these cherished liberties in which we take such pride. We are told that certain things will never happen here. We are told that there never will be the danger that men speaking in the cause of righteousness will be denied the right fully to be heard in the United States Senate. How can anyone give such a guarantee? So surely as the Senate changes the rule, and does what is now proposed by the majority in the Senate, as surely no such guarantee can ever be given, because the precedent will have been set for the further destruction of the rules of the United States Senate.

We are urged to believe that traditions and senatorial courtesy will continue to stand guard for the downtrodden and the oppressed. Perhaps today that may be true, although I doubt it, for I know too well what the proposed change is designed to do. In any event, we know not what tomorrow may bring forth, and no one knows what will be done by way of further change, if the change now proposed is made.

Certainly that great American, James Madison, counseled wisely when he suggested that "Enlightened statesmen will not always be at the helm." He and others who have gone before us have through the years urged upon the evils of great power, either in the hands of a few or in the hands of many. This democracy of ours, these traditions of ours, these rights of ours, these liberties of ours, should never be left to mere senatorial courtesy and the whim of the majority.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum so that I may make a statement at this point?

Mr. RUSSELL. I withdraw my suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

SALE OF LIMESTONE TO FARMERS AT EXCESSIVE PRICES

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have always suported the principle of soil conservation. This was one program launched by our Agriculture Department which had my wholehearted endorsement. I consider that it is highly essential for the future welfare of our country that we should always conserve our soil as one of our most valuable natural resources. Therefore it is somewhat embarrassing for me today to find it necessary to call the attention of the Senate to certain irregularities which have taken place and continue to take place under this program.

Under the protection of the popularity of this program certain Government officials and irresponsible contractors have entered into agreements which have robbed the farmers of many of the advantages which Congress intended them to receive.

As proof of this charge I shall cite specific cases where in the distribution of lime under the agricultural-conservation program certain favored contractors have been allowed margins ranging as high as 300 percent over the original cost of the product, by allowing them to deliver an inferior product at prices established for good lime. I shall mention only three cases involving one contractor, but at the same time I wish to state that this represents only a small part of the fraud under which several thousand tons of low-grade limestone are being sold as good lime, with the consent and assistance of the Government, to the farmers in Delaware, Eastern Shore, Md., southern New Jersey, and some parts of New York. The extent of such questionable sales during the past 2 years in these areas is estimated around 250,000 tons divided principally between Delmarva Peninsula and New Jersey. The extent of loss to the farmers through these overcharges runs into the hundreds of thousands of dollars.

As an example of how this program has been operating, I point to the following transactions in my own State of Delaware: In 1946 Charles W. Diliberto, of Fornance and New Hope Streets, Norristown, Pa., arranged with the Government officials conducting this program in Delaware for the sale of 4,804 tons of lime to be distributed in Sussex County. The record shows that Mr. Diliberto purchased this 4,804 tons of material from a limestone quarry owned by the Bethlehem Steel Corp. in Bridgeport, Pa. Proof that this material was considered an inferior product by the shipper is borne out by the fact that it was classified and shipped as common sand and sold to Mr. Diliberto for the low price of $1 per ton. The freight rate to lower Delaware was then $1.58 per ton, making a total delivered cost f. o. b. sidings in lower Delaware of $2.58. This material which was purchased under the classification of common sand was invoiced to the Federal Government as lime at $7.55 per ton.

The farmers in this case were required to pay as their proportional share $3.05 per ton, which amount, by the way, actually exceeded the entire cost of the product including all freight charges delivered to the railroad siding. The Government put up an additional $4.50 on each ton used under this program, which was paid direct to the contractor.

This lime was represented to the farmers by the Government agents as a good grade of limestone with no mention made of the fact that they could have purchased this same material direct from the quarry in Pennsylvania for $2.58 delivered, without going through the Government hands at all.

The record further shows that another sale of 2,417 tons was made by Mr. Diliberto in 1946 for delivery to the farmers in Kent County, Del., at a price of $6.68 per ton. This cost was divided between the farmers of Kent County and the Government, with the farmers paying $2.43 and the Government paying the additional $4.25 per ton to the contractor. The material furnished under this contract was purchased from the same source under the classification of common sand for $1 per ton f. o. b. and invoiced to the Government as lime at $6.68 per ton.

All of this material carried an excessively high rate of moisture ranging from 10 percent to 12 percent. The material was unloaded by the contractor and spread on the farms, the cost of which is estimated at $1.50 per ton, although the farmers were allowed but $1 per ton in instances where they spread it themselves.

In 1947 the record shows that Charles W. Diliberto sold in Delaware 9,439 tons of the same grade of material as follows: 854 tons in Kent County, $6.46; 1,135 tons in New Castle County, $5.87; 7,450 tons in Sussex County, $6.50. The cost again was apportioned between the Government and the farmers with the farmers' contributions averaging $2.65 per ton while the Government's contribution to the contractor ranged from $3.20 in New Castle County to $3.70 in Kent County, to $3.80 in Sussex County. This 9,439 tons was purchased from the Pennsylvania quarries under the classification of common sand at $1 per ton and invoiced to the Government as lime at the exhorbitant rate of profits above outlined.

Again this year the same grade of material is being delivered to the farmers in Delaware as good lime through the Government purchase program, and again the amount of the farmers' contributions alone exceeds the total cost of the material plus all freight charges.

It is only fair to say that as far as the original sale of this product by the Bethlehem Steel Corp. is concerned, I offer no criticism. The record indicates that for years they have been offering and selling this byproduct from their limestone quarry at $1 per ton under the classification of "common sand." This material does have some agricultural value and was recognized and used by the farmers as a low-grade limestone. The criticism of these transactions lies in the fact that this limestone is being represented to the farmers as a good grade of lime and priced accordingly.

I have cited these specific cases of sales in my own State as current examples of irregularities, but at the same time I point out that this represents only a small fraction of the excessive overcharges being made by the favored limestone interests under the popularity of this soil conservation program.

It is true that many small limestone dealers throughout Delaware and the other areas affected have operated at a small margin of profit and delivered to the farmers a good grade of lime, but those dealers have received but a small fraction of the total volume of business since they were unable to compete in price with the low-grade materials being furnished and approved.

I became interested in this program and suspicious of its operations last year when a large propaganda campaign was launched by the limestone interests to arouse the farmers because Congress dared suggest a cut in the 1948 appropriations. Many farmers in Delaware and on the eastern shore of Maryland forwarded to me letters which they had received from Mr. Robert M. Koch, Washington, D. C., criticizing both Hon. J. CALEB BOGGS, Representative at Large from Delaware, and Hon. EDWARD T. MILLER, Representative from the First District of Maryland, for voting to cut their appropriation. At the same time I was advised by some of the farmers that the top-ranking AAA officials themselves were telling the farmers how unfriendly the Republicans were to their interests in that we had dared even to suggest any curtailment of the AAA program. I decided then that there must be some ulterior motive for their frantic interest, so I began making a few inquiries.

I found that Mr. Robert M. Koch, who was mailing these letters to the farmers denouncing the proposed cut in this program, was a former employee of the Department of Agriculture, having served for 10 years in the limestone branch of the AAA. Mr. Koch recently resigned from the Agriculture Department to take a position as "lobbyist" for the National Limestone Association, Inc., the organization which has been receiving the bulk of the orders placed by the Agriculture Department for lime.

The record of the sales which I have examined under the limestone program as being administered by the Department of Agriculture indicates that at least one-half of the appropriations by Congress have gone into the hands of the favorite limestone interests as excessive overcharges, and the farmers themselves have derived little, if any, additional benefits from this program, since, as described in this report, their cash contributions have in many instances, actually covered the entire value of the products being used, and the funds which have been appropriated by Congress have been dissipated in payments to the favorite contractors.

I suggest that the Senate Appropriations Committee, in conducting hearings on the Department of Agriculture appropriations, examine this program for abuses. For example, it would be interesting to identify the employees in the Department of Agriculture, if any, who have participated in the division of these overcharges as inducements to obtain their approval for the delivery of "common sand" as good limestone.

Last year I had occasion to point out irregularities in another Government department, and I repeat what I said on that occasion, that I think it would be well for the Government to consider diverting some of the investigators who are now investigating the American citizen toward the long-neglected task of investigating these Government bureaucracies themselves.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. LUCAS to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 15, amending the so-called cloture rule of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ANDERSON in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 15.

Mr. RUSSELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hoey	O'Conor
Anderson	Holland	Russell
Connally	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Donnell	Lucas	Vandenberg
Eastland	McClellan	Wherry
Ellender	McKellar	Wiley
Gillette	Maybank	Williams
Hayden	Miller	
Hill	Mundt	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'CONOR in the chair). Twenty-five Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. The

clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The legislative clerk called the names of the absent Senators; and Mr. BROUGHTON, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. HUNT, Mr. IVES, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KERR, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MYERS, Mr. NEELY, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. TAFT answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-three Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present.

Mr. MYERS. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CAIN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CORDON, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. ECTON, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KEM, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LODGE, Mr. LONG, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCFARLAND, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. REED, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. THYE, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. WITHERS entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 198. An act for the relief of the city and county of San Francisco;

S. 279. An act to authorize the advance on the retired list of Lt. John T. McDermott, United States Navy (retired), to the grade of lieutenant commander; and

S. 307. An act for the relief of Engebert Axer.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. LUCAS to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 15, amending the so-called cloture rule of the Senate.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to the resolution now pending, relating to the amendment of rule XXII of the Senate to permit cloture to be applied to a motion or other proceedings before the Senate, the same as it can now be applied to pending measures.

For a century and 11 years, from 1806 to 1917, there was no cloture rule applicable to debate in the Senate. In 1917 the present rule XXII was adopted. The demand for the rule arose because toward the end of a session, a resolution or bill to authorize the President of the United States to arm merchant ships was filibustered until the Senate adjourned, and the bill was not passed. After the adjournment of the Senate there was found a method by which the effect could be realized and the ships armed without legislative enactment. Nevertheless, as the result of the agitation, discussion, and delay, the Senate adopted rule XXII, which has been in effect for the past 32 years.

I think it is interesting to note that during 32 years there have been 20 attempts to apply cloture to measures pending in the Senate, 16 of which failed. Only 4 were successful. I may say, furthermore, that in the past 22 years no measure has had cloture applied while pending in the Senate. It seems to me if the Nation was able to conclude all the matters relating to World War I, to go through the great period of depression in peacetime, to pass all the legislation necessary or essential for World War II, and to complete rehabilitation through postwar legislation without the necessity of a change in the rule, it is rather remarkable and wholly unusual that we should now have the urge to change the rule.

No emergency now exists. No crisis is at hand. There is no great development in government requiring application of the rule or the changing of the rule in its application to measures before the Senate. What is the explanation of the demand at this time for a change of the rule? I think all Senators understand it. It has been very clearly set forth that the sole purpose is to enable those who are pressing for passage of the civil-rights program to undertake to get those measures enacted by the Congress. I submit neither one of those matters involves an emergency. They have been before the Senate at various times through the years. Several of them have been submitted to the Senate and the Senate has refused to apply cloture to them.

The proposition has been made at this time that we adopt a rule providing cloture even by a majority vote. I wish to commend the members of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, and particularly the very discriminating and able chairman of the committee. The committee has not adopted that proposal. The chairman of the committee did not support it. The same tribute should be paid to the very splendid minority leader in this body who is likewise a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and who has not supported the majority cloture idea but has joined in the proposal to require a two-thirds majority in order to apply cloture to any measure. I do not believe, however, that that, merely of itself, gives us any assurance as to what the future may bring forth, if there can be worked up a sufficiently strong surge of opinion on the part of the pressure groups to demand in ordinary times the adoption of a two-thirds rule applicable to any measure or any motion pending in the Senate. Suppose we should have a stress of circumstances whereby the pressure groups were unusually anxious to have cloture applied. Would they hesitate for a moment to work up the same sort of enthusiasm on the part of many of their adherents and demand that the Senate adopt a majority cloture rule? The Senate is very well within its rights in adopting a purely two-thirds vote in order to require cloture of any kind or character.

There are many questions that come before the Senate with respect to which a two-thirds majority is required. I should like briefly to call the attention of the Senate to just a few of those questions.

First, a Senator cannot be expelled unless two-thirds of the Senators vote for his expulsion.

Second, no official can be impeached except by two-thirds of those voting.

Third, the President's veto can be overridden only by a two-thirds vote.

Fourth, all treaties must receive a two-thirds vote before they can be ratified.

Fifth, no amendment to the Constitution can be submitted to the several States for ratification until two-thirds of the Senators voting have approved, and then it is required that favorable action shall be taken by three-fourths of the States before a proposed constitutional amendment can become effective.

Sixth, no person shall be convicted on impeachment without the concurrence of two-thirds of the Senators present.

Finally, when the choice of President shall devolve upon the House of Representatives, a quorum shall consist of the Member or Members from two-thirds of the various States of the Union. Furthermore, a quorum of the Senate, in choosing a Vice President, shall consist of two-thirds of the whole number of Senators.

It is manifest from this that the founders of our Government and the framers of our Constitution thought it essential and necessary that two-thirds at least of the Senate should give their approval to any matter of vital importance before action could be concluded. Certainly there could be nothing of greater importance to either the Senate or to the country than the right of free and unlimited debate in the Senate. I am wondering what the Senate would be like if we should take away the right fully and freely to discuss measures pending before this body.

Mr. President, I need not repeat that the United States Senate is the only open forum in the world, the only place in which there is free and unlimited debate, the only place in which the rights of people may be adequately presented and endlessly proclaimed. I do not believe we should sacrifice that power of the Senate. I do not believe we should liquidate its prestige.

In the discussion of this matter it seems to me that we should very earnestly inquire as to why the necessity for this change of the rule. Can anyone point to any important public measure which has been denied adoption by virtue of the existence of this Senate rule? Can anyone point to any measure which would be in the interest of the American people which has been defeated because of the existence of this rule? Is the purpose of the proposed change in the rule to make the Senate more efficient

in the transaction of its business? Is it the purpose to expedite the business in the Senate? If so, it will fail miserably in the accomplishment of that result.

The reason why I say that, Mr. President, is that very little time of the Senate has ever been consumed by filibusters. The time of the Senate is wasted by reason of numerous discussions over trivial matters, extended from day to day, to which the proposed rule would have no application.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOEY. I yield for a question.

Mr. CONNALLY Mr. President, in connection with what the Senator is saying, have we not, every day, including this day, seen the time of the Senate consumed, not with the matter which is supposed to be immediately pending, but with a large amount of extraneous discussion, for many hours? So the adoption of the proposed rule would not remedy that situation. Is it not also a fact that one of the chief functions of the Senate is the discussion, the debate, and the consideration of questions which come before it, and would not anything which lessened such consideration vitally impair the utility of the Senate itself?

Mr. HOEY. The Senator is absolutely correct. I was thinking, while he was asking the question, of the fact that this debate opened last Monday. Since that time four speeches have been made by opponents of the measure. The first speech was made by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. Yesterday the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] made magnificent addresses in opposition to the adoption of the rule. Today my able young friend from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] made a most effective speech in opposition. Those have been the only four speeches made in the past 3 days. Yet, if we read the newspapers, we find them saying that the southern Senators are killing the time of the Senate in a filibuster. The time of the Senate has not been consumed by a filibuster. I say, without any fear of successful contradiction, that some of the most vociferous advocates of a change in the rule, one in particular, have consumed more of the time of the Senate than has been consumed by all the filibusters we have ever had.

Moreover, I say that the passage of measures would not be facilitated in any fashion by the adoption of this proposed rule. The time which is consumed in the Senate is consumed by Senators discussing matters of their own choice, and sometimes they prove to be of great public benefit; but such matters are brought up from day to day and would not be, under the provisions of the proposed rule, affected.

Therefore, I submit that the adoption of the resolution would make no contribution to the efficiency of the Senate or to the expediting of the Senate's business.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOEY. I yield for a question.

Mr. ROBERTSON. On the contrary, when there is presented to us a bill which we are convinced is clearly unconstitutional, as well as highly undesirable, should we not have the fullest opportunity to inform our colleagues and the public concerning the meaning of such a measure?

Mr. HOEY. I thank the Senator from Virginia. I was just coming to that. How are we to acquaint the American people with the legislation proposed here which we think is vicious in character and which would be destructive of the rights, liberties, and freedom of the American people unless we can fully and freely discuss it? This is the only forum we have, the only forum that any people have, the only forum that a minority has. It is for the protection of minorities; it gives an opportunity to voice the sentiments, the opinions, and the views of minorities. That is the reason those rights have been and are now preserved.

I said a few moments ago, Mr. President, that the Senate is a great forum. I should not like to see the Senate of the United States reduced to a second-rate assembly. If we should adopt this rule we would rob the Senate of its invincible power, its prestige, and the high position it occupies among deliberative bodies of the world and open assemblies in which men can be heard in behalf of causes.

I think there are a great many vital subjects to be considered by the present Congress, but I submit that, with all those questions, no one has suggested that the cloture rule should be invoked except to deal with one group of measures. No one would suggest that we should adopt it in order to pass a tax bill, a public-housing bill, a rent-control bill, or a reciprocal trade agreements bill. The rule must be changed because, forsooth, there are certain elements in this country that want to force on the American people a civil-rights program, and they do not believe they can do so unless the rules of the Senate are changed.

What is involved in the civil-rights program? I do not want to discuss the subject as a southerner, although I am an intense southerner, but I wish to discuss it as an American citizen, because I am more intense as an American.

I know something about the proposals recommended by the President's Civil Rights Committee, and recommended by the President. The four proposals are known to the American people in general, but their implications are not well known, and their dangers have not been fully presented; the viciousness of the measures has not been sufficiently discussed, so that the people can understand fully just what is involved.

Let us consider, first, the poll tax, which has caused considerable comment and discussion. It is a very insignificant matter when it is analyzed. The Constitution of the United States provides that the States shall have the right to prescribe the qualifications of electors. That was one of the rights reserved by the States when the Constitution was formed. There has never been any challenge of that authority. Each State has the right to regulate and prescribe the qualifications of its electors. That is subject to one single exception, and that is that we cannot deny the voting privilege to anyone because of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. The poll tax does neither of those things. It applies to every voter. Therefore, there is nothing offensive in the payment of a poll tax as a requirement for voting, so far as race, color, and previous condition of servitude are concerned.

Presently, there are only seven States which have poll taxes as a requirement for voting. Practically all States have poll taxes levied on the citizens, but ordinarily they go to support the public-school funds. In my State a poll tax is levied from the time a man becomes 21 years of age until he is 50 years of age. The tax is levied on male citizens. For 29 years it has not been required in North Carolina that a tax be paid in order to vote, but the tax is still collected. It is from $1 to $2 a year. Yet, from the hue and cry heard regarding the discussion of the matter, it would be thought that it is a great and exorbitant tax which is being levied upon persons to deny them their right of franchise.

There is no citizen in any one of the States who cannot pay $1 or $2 a year if he wishes to vote. It does not require 2 hours' work to pay a $1 poll tax. It would take only 4 hours' work of the lowest paid citizen to pay a $2 poll tax. So that when out of 365 days it takes only 2 or 4 hours' work to enable one to pay a poll tax, certainly it could not be considered an exorbitant or oppressive tax, especially when the tax goes to educate the voters' own children.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. HOEY. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not a fact that many are exempted from the poll tax because of age and for various other reasons?

Mr. HOEY. All over 50 years are exempted; all who are disabled in any form are exempted; and where special disabilities exist citizens do not have to pay the poll tax. Therefore this talk about preventing the exercise of the elective franchise because citizens cannot pay a poll tax is a great bugaboo about nothing.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. HOEY. I yield to the Senator from Virginia for a question.

Mr. ROBERTSON. In Virginia, where we have a poll tax of $1.50, there are a great many who pay the poll tax because they desire to make that contribution of $1.50 to the maintenance of the schools. Does the Senator know that in Virginia it takes a tremendous effort, and the expenditure of some money, to get to the polls even 50 percent of those who are qualified to vote?

Mr. HOEY. I am sure that what the Senator from Virginia has said in the form of a question is correct. We hear a great deal said about the fact that in the Southern States only a small vote is cast in general elections, and that is attributed to the fact that the voters have to pay a poll tax, and therefore it is said many are disqualified from voting. That is not the cause at all. Why are only a small number of votes cast in many Southern States? It is because one political party is dominant in those States,

and because every voter knows that every candidate for whom he would vote will be elected without regard to whether the voter goes to the polls or not. Therefore there is no incentive for a man to go to the polls. If he belongs to the minority party it is hopeless for him to go to the polls, and he does not do so.

I am supporting a joint resolution sponsored by the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and others to provide for a constitutional amendment to abolish the electoral college, and to let each State's vote be counted according to the proportionate number of votes cast in the State. If that amendment to the Constitution should be ratified, I think it would go a long way toward solving the very problems being discussed about the small vote in the States where one political party is predominant, because then there would be an incentive for every man, of either the majority or minority party, to cast his vote, since his vote would be effective in determining how many votes the President of the United States should receive from each State.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. HOEY. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator has referred to some persons who are exempted from payment of the poll tax. I do not know the provision of the law in North Carolina, but in South Carolina all women are exempted, and I think that is true in many other States.

Mr. HOEY. That is true in North Carolina, and, as the Senator has said, in other States. Ordinarily the law applies only to male citizens.

The poll tax, then, is an inconsequential factor. Why take up the time of this body, and why have this great hue and cry raised, about the passage of a measure which is of insignificance compared with other measures which should be engaging the time and all the attention of this body?

On the question of the poll tax, three of the seven States which now have it are preparing to do away with it. In the course of another year or so that question will therefore be settled. Should Congress and the Senate undertake to invade the rights of the States, and say, "You are not getting rid of this thing as quickly as we would like to have you, therefore we are going to exercise the sovereign power of the Federal Government to determine what sort of law you should have in prescribing the qualifications of your electors."

Our opposition to that is on the ground that it is unconstitutional. Moreover, we take the position that if the Federal Government has a right to enter a sovereign State and to say what qualifications it should prescribe with reference to the payment of a poll tax to entitle one to vote, then the same government has the right to go into a State and undertake to prescribe other qualifications for its voters and electors, and that very soon we would reach the point where the Federal Government would undertake to dictate the qualifications of the electors of all the sovereign States, and the reservation of that power which was made to the sovereign States when the Constitution was adopted would be trampled underfoot.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. HOEY. I yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the able and distinguished Senator from North Carolina if there are not a great many indications that the argument to which he has just referred as to the danger of complete Federal control of elections in the Nation is not the true objective back of this drive to abolish the poll tax by statute, and has not the poll tax issue been blown up all beyond any true proportions? It is referred to as an onerous burden on the voter. Of course, it is ridiculous in this day and time to refer to a tax of a dollar a year as an onerous burden.

I had the Library of Congress work out a schedule showing the percentage of the total taxes in the United States the poll tax comprises, and there were so many decimals and ciphers in front of the figure that I have forgotten it. It was an infinitesimal fraction, the poll tax of a dollar a year. My State does not have it, nor does the Senator's State, but it was less than 2 cents a week the voter would be required to pay, and that amount would go to the school fund. So, all the talk about it being an onerous burden on the taxpayer is merely a smoke screen to hide the desire to have the Federal Government assume the power to control the ballot box within the State and station an officer at every ballot box, thereby threatening the perpetuity of our free elections and free government.

Mr. HOEY. I thank the Senator from Georgia. Following what he has said, I should like to submit the reason I presented a few moments ago, that this would be an opening wedge by which the Federal Government would lay claim to the right to prescribe the qualifications of electors in the several States. We who believe that the Federal Government should not encroach any further upon the power and sovereignty of the State should certainly not open the way and invite them to come and control and supervise our elections.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOEY. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Was it not the purpose of the "force" bill, which passed the House of Representatives and was blocked in the Senate, to provide for supervision of the counting of the ballots? If the Congress had the right to say how many ballots were going to be cast, would not the next move be to say whether they were counted to suit them?

Mr. HOEY. That would be the natural step, and that is why I think it is a dangerous policy to start, because certainly we could not tell where it would end.

With reference to the question of the poll tax, it is remarkable how the groups which are advocating the proposed action do not care anything about constitutional processes. Last year when this question was before the Senate the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] placed in the RECORD a telegram which he had received from Walter White, who, as Senators know, is the head of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. This was a telegram asking the Senator from Ohio and those in charge in the Senate not to accept the suggestion made by certain Democrats that a constitutional amendment be submitted, a matter which had been presented by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], to determine this question in a constitutional way. He said it was not necessary and that we ought not to take that course. But here is the meat in the coconut, and this is why he did not want it done:

> The abolition of the poll tax by constitutional amendment would require ratification by 36 State legislatures. We have grave doubt whether ratification can be obtained since the specious States'-rights arguments will be made against the constitutional amendment.

In other words, the head of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People wants the Congress to rape the Constitution and to pass the measure because he does not believe that the sovereign States of the Union would amend the Constitution to do that very thing and to give the power to the Federal Government. That is an additional reason why we should not for 1 minute consider the matter of the Federal Government, in violation of the Constitution, exercising the power to regulate and control elections to the extent of prescribing the qualifications with reference to the payment of a poll tax and say, "You may vote regardless of what the States provide in that respect."

The next proposition to which they give so much allegiance and which pressure groups urge so strongly is the antilynching bill. Of all the measures which have been presented to the Congress I cannot conceive of a more useless one. Even the Washington Post, liberal as it is in many of its inclinations—and certainly it cannot be said to be pro-South—published an editorial last year when such a measure was under consideration and said that it was ridiculous at this stage to undertake to pass a bill against lynching. We have now good antilynching laws in every one of the 48 States. These laws are the best enforced of any criminal statutes on the books.

We have 145,000,000 people in America. Last year there was only one lynching. There have not been more than six lynchings in any 1 year in the past 10. Yet last year, when there was but 1 lynching—and that was more of a murder than a lynching—13,000 murders, 12,000 rapes, and 1,500,000 other felonies were committed in the United States. But the people who are so anxious to protect the 1 person who may be lynched, have no concern for the 13,000 who were murdered and the 12,000 who were raped and the 1,500,000 who committed other felonies. They do not suggest even that the Federal Government should do anything about that.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOEY. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. If lynching is such a prime issue, is there anything that would prevent any State that wishes to

do so from emulating the State of Virginia, which has put an antilynching law into effect which provides a $10,000 fine on any community that permits a lynching? Could not any State that wishes to do so take care of the situation in that way?

Mr. HOEY. Practically every State in the Union has a good strong law against lynching, and such laws are enforced and observed. Following that up—why pass a law to stop a crime that already is practically extinct? Why do the useless thing, unless it is merely to assuage the pressure-group forces who undertake to dictate what the American people shall do and what the American people shall suffer? Is there any virtue in passing an antilynching law? Lynching is not an interstate act. It does not have anything to do with interstate commerce. The only way it could have any connection with interstate commerce would be if one were to cross the line of one State into another State to lynch someone. Therefore there is nothing at all about the crime of lynching to make it essentially different from the crime of murder.

Every good citizen of America, white, colored, Indian, or of any other race, is definitely opposed to lynching, and every good citizen is doing all he can to stop the crime of lynching. Now why should the Federal Government, in violation of the right of a State to patrol its own internal affairs and to exercise its own police powers in the control and the punishment of crime within its borders, undertake to invade a State and say, "We take no notice of all the murders and all the rapes and all the other felonies, but we are going to take charge of this one matter of lynching, and because one person has been lynched we are going to handle the whole situation"?

The argument may be made that if there were a Federal statute on the subject there could be better enforcement of the law, but why could better enforcement of such a law be secured? The Federal court would have to try the case in the State in which the lynching occurred and would have to try it under the law with the same people as witnesses and jurors that the State court would have. The individual persons might not be identical, but they would be in the same State, living in the same atmosphere, entertaining the same ideas. How could there be any better enforcement of the law against lynching than there would be in the State court, especially since lynching has been practically eliminated?

It may be of interest to the Senate to know that in 1892, 255 lynchings occurred in the United States. One hundred of these were of white people and 155 were of either Negroes, Indians, or persons belonging to other races. This number was reduced in 1920 to 64. There has been a gradual reduction every year, until in the past 10 years no more than six have been lynched in any one year. Last year only one person was lynched, and that case was more of a murder than a lynching.

Therefore I pass from the consideration of the antilynching bill to another measure, namely, the antisegregation measure. What is the necessity for passing such a measure? To begin with, the Congress has nothing in the world to do with segregation within the limits of a State. The Federal Government has no power or authority to override the law of a State and say what shall happen with reference to segregation within the confines of a State, with the sole exception of transportation that may involve interstate commerce. The Supreme Court of the United States has already decided that question. The Court said that the States have no power and no authority to legislate about interstate commerce, and therefore, State segregation laws applying to interstate commerce were null and void. Now what more can be done? Why pass any more segregation laws?

Do we want the Federal Government to say what shall happen with reference to the internal affairs of a State? The Constitution of the United States does not say that segregation is discrimination. That is where many persons make a mistake. We hear many talk about segregation as if it were discrimination. The fact is that it is not discrimination. The Supreme Court of the United States has gone far afield in deciding a great many of these questions, but it has never yet held that segregation is discrimination. In reality it is just the reverse. Why, then, undertake to have Congress pass a law in the teeth of the Supreme Court, in the teeth of the Constitution, and say, "We are now going to undertake to say what shall happen with reference to segregation within the boundaries of the several States?" We, of the South, say, of course, that is one of the measures which is advocated and pressed solely because of the people who are anxious to have enacted some sort of measure directed against the policies, the customs, the habits, and the traditions of the South.

I come next to the fair employment practice bill, which is the pièce de résistance of the whole list. Every single one of these measures is directed against the South. Is it not rather remarkable that in this country, 80 years and more since the War Between the States closed, a great solemn legislative assembly is having its time occupied with measures sectional in character and vicious in their conception, directed against a great section of this Nation? I am wondering, if we should pass all four of these measures today what would their sponsors ask for next? When, if ever, will the South have a surcease from the assaults made upon her customs, her traditions, her social fabric, and, indeed, her life? Are all the offerings, all the loyalty, and all the blood and treasure which the South has given to the Nation to be of no avail? Has the time come, and is it now here, when there shall be a continual persecution, a continual effort to destroy the basic fabric of our civilization in order to gratify those who wish to serve some special purpose, and who have some selfish end in view?

There are four classes of people who have supported these measures. The first class, I would say, are good people who have been misled, but who feel that discrimination should be abolished, and that by some sort of means equality should be brought to everybody. I have sincere regard for them. A great many church people, a great many of the best people in the country, are included in this group. And it is to this group that I should like to address some remarks I shall make hereafter.

In the second group are those who are motivated by political expediency. That is quite a large group. A great many in both political parties are in that group. They are motivated by political expediency for their own party and political expediency for themselves. Of course, it is idle to argue with the man who proceeds on that basis, because the only argument that would appeal to him would be an argument based upon the premise that it is not good political judgment to endorse such measures.

The next category are those belonging to the various pressure groups who wish to achieve some special benefits to their groups by virtue of having these laws enacted. I think they are misadvised. I think they will be deceived about the results if they achieve them. Nevertheless, that is their purpose, and, of course, we cannot do much with them.

The fourth group comprises the Communists and Socialists. Every Communist and every Socialist in America is in favor of all four of these measures. Every Communist favors them because he wants to disrupt the Government. He wants to create all the disorder, strife, and turmoil possible. The Socialist is for them because he wants the Government to absorb the power and authority of every State and the rights of every citizen, so that the Federal Government will be the dominating force and power. So we cannot do anything with that group.

We come back to the first group, to whom we might appeal with some idea of having consideration given to these arguments. I submit that segregation is not discrimination. I said that a moment ago, but I wish to repeat it. God could have been charged by some of these people with discrimination because He gave to one man one talent, to another two talents, and to a third five talents. He did not make everyone alike. He did not give to us all the same talents, the same abilities, the same capacities, the same ideals, the same hopes, and the same purposes. At any rate, God made the different races, but He did not combine them. He did not consolidate them. He did not mongrelize them. I cannot conceive that He would want policies adopted in this world to effect a purpose which He himself did not adopt; and there is no evidence that it would be pleasing to Him.

When we come to consider the results of this program, let us see where it would lead us. The last proposal, the Fair Employment Practices Act, is the one upon which the greatest emphasis is placed, and it is the most vicious of the lot. I should like to enumerate some of the things this bill would do if it were enacted. I am wondering if Senators have read the bill. If they have not they should do so. The bill so fully and completely destroys the right of the individual citizen that I cannot understand how anyone familiar with it would be willing

to see it enacted and become the law of the land.

It is a matter of record that this proposal has been submitted to 20 different States for adoption. Sixteen of those States have rejected it absolutely. Not a single one of those States is located in the South. New York, Massachusetts, and New Jersey have adopted it, and probably one or two other States. As was stated here today, in the State of California the proposal was submitted to popular vote, and more than one million majority of votes were cast against it by the people of California. I dare to assert, without fear of successful contradiction, that if the Fair Employment Practices Act were submitted to any single State in America, if it were fully explained and the voters understood it, not a single State would vote its adoption. The people are not in favor of it. But the pressure groups are behind it. The voice of the people is not heard. Their case is not presented. Their views are not expressed. The pressure groups so fill the air with clamor for this program that they induce other organizations to pass resolutions, many of which organizations are not familiar with the program at all, but they endorse it.

The fair employment practices bill would do what no law ought ever be permitted to do. It would compel a man to employ someone whom he did not want, and would compel him to keep him in his employ when he wanted to discharge him. It would oblige him to promote him when his merits did not justify a promotion, and would refuse to let him dispense with his services. I would not vote for any bill which would require any person of any race or color to work for another man against his will. Therefore I would not vote for any bill which would require another person to employ someone to work for him against his will. The contract of employment certainly should be reciprocal, and there should be some sort of justice in it.

I wish to call attention specifically to the things which this bill would do:

First, it would deny freedom of contract.

Second, it would deny the employer the right of selective judgment in procuring his employees.

Third, it would deny to employees the right of selecting their associates.

Fourth, it would deny to labor unions the right to determine their membership or to regulate their own affairs.

Fifth, it would deny to the employer the right to hire, promote, or discharge employees upon the basis of their efficiency, merit, or faithfulness.

Sixth, it would give to a Commission the power to compel the employer to pay persons who were never in his employ, and then force him to hire them.

Seventh, it would subject the employer to investigation, harassment, fines, and penalties, to be determined by a Commission located in Washington.

Eighth, it would deny the employer the right of trial by jury, and give him no right to a review of the facts found by the Commission.

Ninth, it would compel the employer to give testimony against himself, and expose his private letters, books, and papers for the inspection and investigation of a horde of employees of the Commission.

Tenth, it would compel the employer to hire a person whom he did not wish to have in his employ, and deny him the privilege of selecting an employee of his own choice.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOEY. I yield for a question.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Does the bill not violate the fifth amendment to the Constitution, under which we are supposed to have freedom of contract?

Mr. HOEY. Absolutely. That is one of the first things I mentioned. It denies freedom of contract.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Does it not violate the guarantee in the Constitution of freedom of assembly?

Mr. HOEY. It does.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Does not the bill attempt to create a right which does not now exist, and then give Congress the power to enforce it? Can Congress give itself a right which the Constitution never has conferred on the Federal Government?

Mr. HOEY. No.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Does not the bill start by saying that there shall be a certain right, and then say how it shall be enforced? Is not that provision in the FEPC bill?

Mr. HOEY. Absolutely.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Has the Senator ever previously heard of any bill which would give Congress the right to go into a State and interfere, not with what the State is doing in an unfair way to its citizens, but in the adjustment of difficulties between individuals in a State?

Mr. HOEY. That is the purpose of the bill; and I think it violates the Constitution in every single provision it contains.

In addition to all these nefarious things contained in the bill, the most vicious provision of all is the concluding provision, that the Commission shall have the power and authority to make rules and regulations which shall have the effect of law, and that they shall be the law unless the Congress enacts a bill to nullify them. In other words, in addition to all the power given the Commission to take charge of the business of the citizens of America and to interfere with all their internal affairs if they employ as many as 50 persons, the Commission would have power and authority to make any other rules and regulations which suited it, to enable it to harass, annoy, fine, and punish citizens. There would be no redress unless the Congress should enact a law to nullify the rules adopted by the Commission. I submit that such a measure ought not to be considered seriously by any great free legislative assembly.

I am wondering what the American businessman, the American industrialist, the American employer of labor, or anyone else in America has done to justify the idea that the Federal Government should take charge of the affairs of citizens in this fashion. We boast about free enterprise. There would be no free enterprise if this system were in effect. There could be no free enjoyment of any of the privileges and rights guaranteed by the Constitution if this bill were to be enacted. I cannot see how any businessman in America should be calm or content in the exercise of his rights and the conduct of his own business with this sort of thing hanging over him.

What is the excuse for this? What is the reason for it and what is its purpose? It is nothing more than to meet the demand of pressure groups who seem to feel that if they had such a law they could exact from businessmen and employers demands which they might not be able to enforce otherwise.

What is to be done about all of this? A few moments ago I said that I am opposed to discrimination. I differ in my interpretation of discrimination. I do not believe any man should be discriminated against in his rights under the law, in his right to an education, in his right to have everything the law gives him, in his right to advance and progress; but I do not believe that discrimination is practiced merely because we do not wish to associate with some people or because we do not wish to have them in our employ or because we do not wish to have other people, no matter what their race may be, conducting our affairs. It seems to me that there should still remain in America some freedom of choice with respect to the conduct of one's affairs and the associates whom one chooses. The other afternoon the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] well said that the highest right known to man is the right to choose his associates; and certainly that right should exist. Working men should have something to say about the persons with whom they must coordinate in their work; that should be of some concern to them.

Of course I realize that most of the discussion about discrimination is directed against the South; but let me call attention to the fact that that is not where it exists. For instance, yesterday I noticed in the newspapers a report from the mayor's committee of Minneapolis, Minn. The report said that of 525 firms in that city, only 3% had in their employ any Negroes or any Jews or any Japanese-Americans. It also said that 63 percent of the firms in that city would not employ any member of these groups. That is not a southern city, Mr. President; it is Minneapolis, Minn.

All over the North we can cite one example after another showing discrimination similar, and in greater degree than exists in the South.

Now let me talk for a moment about southern matters.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOEY. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. I wonder whether it has ever come to the attention of the Senator from North Carolina or whether the Senator has ever heard of cases of the violation of the FEPC laws in the northern part of the country. Has the Senator ever heard statements such as I have heard made by people who have large businesses to the effect that they find it very simple to avoid those laws and State statutes. Has the Senator ever heard such statements?

Mr. HOEY. Yes. I think such laws have been evaded rather largely in the Northern States. None of the people of those States have ever voted for that arrangement, and I do not believe they would.

Now let us consider the matter of discrimination. I maintain that in the South we do not discriminate against the Negroes. I would not say that there are not some evidences and some cases of discrimination here and there, because that would happen anywhere at any time. But I am talking about the great, overall picture.

I shall take North Carolina as a typical example, because it is a typical Southern State. I maintain that we do not discriminate against the Negro in North Carolina, but we give him every opportunity. We start in with his education; and we give him the same facilities, the same length of school term, paid for by the State; we furnish the same transportation to carry him as a student from his home to the consolidated school. We provide his teacher, and pay the teacher the same salary the white teacher receives. In North Carolina we provide five colleges, maintained and paid for by the State, all for the benefit of the Negro race. We have at Durham, the North Carolina College for Negroes, which is the fine arts college or university, and is known as the University of the Negroes of my State. We have at Greensboro the agricultural and technical college, which is a very splendid institution, and now has more than 3,000 Negro students. It ranks alongside of Fisk and Howard and Tuskeegee in the training of Negro youths, men and women. We have in North Carolina three teachers' colleges, maintained by the State, in which we train and teach Negroes and prepare them to qualify to teach in their public schools. More Negroes are employed by North Carolina in teaching in Negro schools than are similarly employed by all the other States north of the Mason and Dixon's line, combined.

Mr. President, New York is often cited as a State in which the Negroes have many privileges. According to the census of 1940, New York had a Negro population of 570,000. According to the best figures which I could obtain, in 1945 the Negro population of New York State was much larger. Nevertheless, New York had only 610 Negro school teachers. In New York State the Negroes are permitted to go to the white schools, but Negroes are not permitted to teach in those schools to any large extent; only 610 Negroes out of the vast number of Negroes who reside in New York State were permitted to teach. If New York State had the same number of Negroes North Carolina has—which is a little less than a million—and if New York State permitted Negroes to serve as teachers according to the present proportion of the Negro teachers to the Negro population in New York State, the number of Negroes teaching in New York State would be 1,120. However, in North Carolina we have 7,407 Negro school teachers. I repeat that that is a greater number of Negro school teachers than is to be found in all of the States north of the Mason and Dixon's line, combined.

Another point in that respect is that in our State we have a school for whites, a school for Negroes, and a school for Indians; and the members of each group go to their several schools. They do better than if they were intermingled; it is more satisfactory; they progress more in their work. In North Carolina, the Negro child, from the time when he enters school, at 6 years of age, until he graduates from his high school, and then until he graduates from his State university, Negro university or college, is taught by members of his own race. All along the way he is instructed by members of his own race, because every teacher and professor, and even the president of every one of those institutions, is a Negro.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. HOEY. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Has the Senator from North Carolina in his experience had the colored school teachers or colored people of his State request that they be admitted to the same schools that the whites attend in North Carolina?

Mr. HOEY. The only time that ever occurred was when one man, engineered by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, started to bring a suit in order to be admitted to one of our institutions; but that suit was never actually brought.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator yield for a further question, Mr. President?

Mr. HOEY. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. I had especially in mind the situation in the elementary and secondary schools.

Mr. HOEY. Never that.

Mr. LONG. In other words, I had in mind what we call the grammar schools and the high schools. Has the Senator had any number of colored people there appeal to be admitted to the same grammar schools and the same high schools with the whites?

Mr. HOEY. Not one; never in all the years of the administration of the public school system in North Carolina have we had a request of that sort.

I may say that in North Carolina we do not believe in race prejudice, but we undertake to cultivate and develop race pride. We do not believe in race amalgamation, but we believe in race integrity. We do not believe in social equality, but we believe in equality of opportunity; and undertaking to furnish these things in their relative fashion and form meets the requirements and the needs and the wishes of the great body of the Negroes in my State.

I wish to pay this tribute to the Negro people of North Carolina: I think they are about the best Negroes in the world. I say that advisedly, for I know them well; I have lived among them all my life. I know their weaknesses and I know their strength. I know their frailties and I know their virtues. They are patriotic; they are loyal; they are good Americans. I think about the finest tribute that could be paid to them is to refer to their action in the last election. Henry Wallace came to North Carolina, accompanied by some of his Negro escorts, and went to Durham to speak. While there, he stayed in the home of a Negro citizen, as a guest, sleeping in that home. He went to the Negro hotel to attend a banquet, with Negroes constituting two-thirds or three-fourths of the persons present. He constantly associated himself with, and carried with him in the campaign, Negro lieutenants as co-equals. He had his picture taken with all of them. Of course, his purpose was to obtain the Negro vote in North Carolina. He had his electors on the ticket, and every effort was made by his organization in North Carolina to obtain the Negro vote.

About 75,000 Negroes voted in that election, out of a total of 800,000 votes cast. Of the total of 800,000 votes, Henry Wallace received only little more than 3,000 votes. The Negroes were not willing to vote for him. They did not like his policies; they did not like his customs; they did not like his habits; and they did not like the things for which he stood. Coming into North Carolina and associating himself with Negroes, he and those promoting his candidacy had the idea that that would appeal to the Negroes. But the Negroes did not relish that; they did not like that sort of conduct and association.

I think it might be of interest to the Senate to say that when I was Governor I had the privilege of visiting the North Carolina College for Negroes at Durham, where they dedicated five fine new buildings erected by the State of North Carolina. At that time a great American Negro, Dr. James E. Shepard, was president of the institution. He had been such from its inception, from its organization. He died last year. He was a great man, a great soul, a great spirit. I recall well today that educators from all over the United States were present for the dedication of these splendid buildings, and Dr. Shepard made a magnificent address, in the course of which he said:

> The thing that warms my heart today is that my own people of North Carolina, this great State, have provided for me and for my race these buildings and this great institution. I, of course, appreciate the contributions made by people of other States. I appreciate the help they have given to my race in North Carolina. But the thing that has made my race strong and has enabled us to grow and develop and progress, has been the spirit of cooperation and helpfulness on the part of the white people of North Carolina. And today—

He said—

> I pay tribute to the generosity and the magnanimity of the people of North Carolina, and I shall continue to serve them as I have in the past.

That is the spirit actuating the Negroes of my State and the white people of my State.

Today I have in my hand a copy of the Greensboro Daily News, containing a report of the legislative committee, and containing the pictures of a number of the new buildings to be erected and which have been erected at the Agricultural and Technical College at Greensboro for Negroes. $5,000,000 was expended recently for those buildings. A

legislative appropriation is being asked in the amount of $3,000,000, to operate the institution for the ensuing year. That is the character of service we are undertaking to give the Negroes of North Carolina.

I should like to digress long enough to say that the figures I gave about Negro teachers in New York would apply to the teachers of Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Michigan, and to every one of the States that have any considerable Negro population. I have them all here. Not a single one of them is more favorable than the figures shown by the State of New York. I emphasize again that in these States the State permits the Negro to go to the white school, but does not give the Negro a position of dignity in the community by permitting him to teach in the school. We do that in every single community in North Carolina.

With further reference to the situation in North Carolina and the progress and growth and development of the Negro race, I may say that there is at Durham a man named C. G. Spaulding. In the Reader's Digest there recently appeared a very fine article about his achievements, his rise to prominence and influence, his acquisition of wealth, and the fine service he has rendered both to his State and to his race. His career was discussed at some length in the article. He is the head of the largest Negro insurance company in the world, a company located in North Carolina. He is head of the largest Negro bank in the United States, a bank located at Durham. He is on many important boards. He has served his State with distinction in all the relations of life, and has the admiration and respect of all the people of all races in the community.

We have in North Carolina a large number of Negro lawyers, doctors, and dentists who are leaders of their race, filling high positions. Furthermore the Negro farmers in North Carolina have made a great record. I read only day before yesterday, in an article published in a newspaper in my own town, that 18 Negro farm families had come there to hold a sort of celebration. They belonged to the Farmers Home Loan Organization and were paying for their farms through that organization. Every single one of the 18 families had not only made their payments but had paid for 3 years in advance. It showed the average earnings of the Negro families for last year to be $2,300 over and above the things they consumed on the farm. Statistics show that in North Carolina the Negro ownership of farms increased 23 percent from 1940 to 1945. Constantly more Negroes are owning their own farms, are building their own places in society and in the community, and are contributing their full quota to the great progress our State is making. In addition to that, I may say we have scattered all over the State farm demonstration agents and home demonstrations for Negroes. All sorts of industries have been established, and all kinds of means afforded by which the Negro is getting a chance to develop himself and improve his condition materially, educationally, and otherwise.

I need not refer to specific cases, but the other day a very fine article appeared, written by Mr. Davis, and I should like to read just a few extracts from the article. I think it gives a very fine conception of what has been done and what will be done along this line. He is telling about the difference between situations in the North and North Carolina or other sections of the South. He gives the items and occurrences. I do not see the clipping here, but I remember the facts. He shows the difference between conditions in the North, in Newark, N. J., where he lives, and where he publishes this Negro paper. He made a visit all through the South, and he contrasted conditions there and in New York, with those in my State and in Georgia, and in vaarious other Southern States. He said in effect that in Winston-Salem, N. C., a Negro man has a bus franchise and operates 100 busses. He said a Negro cannot get a franchise in New Jersey; he can drive a cab, but he cannot get a franchise. He may apply for it, but there is always some reason why he does not get it. He gives illustrations of what developed in Atlanta, Ga., and he said:

> My race there owned millions of dollars worth of property, and they have many public utilities of one kind and another. They serve the public in their own right, in their own busses, unmolested, and yet that sort of thing does not happen in my State of New Jersey, or in the States of the North.

He went through a whole category, citing things which are of vital concern, and which I think are worthy of consideration. He is a Negro, but he is stating the facts as he has found them in a visit to the South. I would that many of the people who are so concerned about the way Negroes are treated in the South would make a visit there for a while. I wish they might, day in and day out, see the relationship existing between the whites and the Negroes in their daily contacts and service and work in a cooperative spirit.

I might mention an incident which is illustrative of the thing I am talking about. In Goldsboro, N. C., last year the junior chamber of commerce decided to have a contest for those who could sing or give a musical program. They invited representatives of Negro schools of the city to participate. Before a white audience, all the girls sang, and the white audience voted to give the first prize to a Negro girl from the Negro school in that city. She was awarded the prize and given a scholarship in music, contributed by the white people of Goldsboro.

In Raleigh, a short time ago, in the early part of last year, I believe it was, there was a young man named Shayhee. He and his Negro companion, both about 14 or 17 years of age, went out to a pond near town and went in swimming. It was very soon developed that the Negro boy had either suffered some sort of attack or was in trouble. The white boy went to his rescue, and in his supreme effort to try to save the life of his comrade, he went down to a watery grave. That is illustrative of the spirit of association and interest of individuals, one toward another, that crosses over the lines of color and emphasizes the great heart action of people who know each other.

I was thinking a few days ago of an instance which occurred in my own county. Some persons seem to entertain the idea that in the South we get up early in the morning to see how much we may oppress the Negroes on that day, and study how many things we can do to discriminate against them. Yet one will search in vain to find discrimination against any worthy, honest Negro. He will say the same thing.

Let me give one illustration. In my county there is a Negro named Jim Camp. This is a wonderful success story. He is the son of a former slave. He is now 62 years of age. When he reached 19 years of age he married a Negro girl and settled down on a rented farm. He was industrious and energetic; he worked hard. They had a family of 10 children. They educated all the children. Only recently, being the owner of 524 acres of fine land in that county, having bought one tract after another and paid for it all, he decided to buy another tract of 226 acres adjoining his farm. He paid $23,000 in cash for the land. He had money in the bank. There was no oppression, no discrimination, no injustice there. The same thing can be duplicated all over the South.

Mr. President, I would that those who cry out so loudly, so long, and so vociferously against the treatment accorded Negroes in the South might visit North Carolina and see for themselves the sort of conditions which exist, the mutual respect and concern each race has for the other, and the consideration given to each other in all walks of life.

We do not attend the same churches. We do not attend the same schools. Each race is better off in its own school. It can make more progress, have more satisfaction and greater pride in the facilities which are provided and the services which are rendered. The Negroes go to their own churches. They have a happy time there. The Negro enjoys his religion. Some white persons take religion as if it were a dose of medicine. The Negro can have a better time when he goes by himself. He can express himself. He can enter into the service very wholeheartedly by his "amens" and his shouts of approval. He is not embarrassed. He enjoys his religion a great deal, and he knows a good deal about religion.

I was impressed by a story which Arthur Brisbane used to tell. He was visiting in Montgomery and stopped to talk with everyone with whom he had an opportunity to talk, because he could learn something from them, white or black, educated or uneducated. One day he stopped a Negro in Montgomery and said, "Uncle, do you read the Bible?" The Negro replied, "Yes, sir." Mr. Brisbane said, "Do you believe in eternal life?" The Negro said, "Yes, sir; I believe in eternal life." Then Mr. Brisbane said, "I want to ask you if you believe in eternal hell fire." The old Negro dropped his head for a moment and then looked up and said, "No, sir;

I do not believe in eternal hell fire." "Why?" asked Mr. Brisbane. The Negro said, "Because I just naturally don't believe a man's constitution can stand it."

That is a very good illustration of the Negro's theology.

To me it is most remarkable that good people, some of them church people, seem to have some sort of complex that there is constant discrimination, oppression, and punishment visited upon the Negroes in the South.

I practiced law for 49 years. I represented as many Negroes as did any other lawyer, I think, in my section of the State. I can say without any hesitation that I was able to get a fair trial for every Negro I represented. I have never seen any white jury, if the evidence showed that a white man was trying to take advantage of a Negro in any sort of contract, that would not vote in favor of the Negro against the white man, because they revolt against the idea of taking advantage of a Negro man or a Negro woman. That is the sort of administration of law we have in my State.

I served as Governor for 4 years, as did my distinguished colleague who succeeded me. I am sure he would say that of the petitions which were presented for clemency in capital cases there was always the greatest consideration given to those in behalf of Negroes. The Governor of the State, when it came to passing upon the question of extending clemency, would take into consideration the condition of the Negro, his environment, the circumstances under which he lived, and would know of his limitations, his frailties, as well as being acquainted with his virtues. He would go as far as possible in extending clemency to those who had been convicted and who came within the purview of the law.

The same thing applies to all the judges of the courts of my State. The Negro receives justice in North Carolina, as he does throughout the South.

I mention these matters, Mr. President, because so often it seems that a very confused idea is in the minds of persons in other parts of the country. They seem to have no appreciation of the conditions which exist in the South. They think that all the time we are undertaking to profit at the expense of the Negro.

In my section of the State there is not a Negro who cannot go to any white neighbor and get assistance in time of trouble. I will say, for the benefit of the Negro, that I do not know any Negroes in my section who would not respond readily to help a white neighbor who was in trouble. It is not a matter of not having a sympathetic consideration for and interest in each other; it is that each recognizes the sphere in which we move and the things which we have been accustomed to and which we like. There is no disposition to break over the race line or to destroy the color line. We should like to see racial integrity maintained, and, along with it, the race pride which goes to the service which one renders, the character, tone, and fragrance of his own devotion.

That is the situation which exists in North Carolina and throughout the South.

Why, Mr. President, should we undertake to disturb that condition? Why should we undertake to inject foreign elements? Why should we think that this great body, the Senate of the United States, should exercise its plenary power to send emissaries all over the South to stir up strife and turmoil and to create difficulties which do not now exist? Why should it be thought necessary to undertake to do the very thing which would play into the hands of the Communists in this country? We all know that communism thrives only in an atmosphere of turmoil, strife, and disorder. We who believe in the righteousness and justice of the people of the South and are anxious to go forward to the attainment of still greater objectives in the service we render to the Negroes in our section pray that we not be disturbed in our great undertaking, and that we may have, instead of objections or interference, the cooperation, the approval, and the encouragement of people throughout the Nation. I could wish for nothing better than that those who entertain these wild ideas about conditions existing in the South might spend some time there and might see conditions as they are.

Mr. President, I return to the proposition I mentioned in the early part of my speech, and that is this: Suppose all four of these measures should be adopted; suppose Congress should exhaust its power in enacting measures punitively directed toward the South. Nothing would be accomplished; but would we then be through? Would that be the end of it? Or would the next session of Congress find some new means to harass, annoy, and still further to oppress and interfere with the orderly processes of life in the South? Does it have to be an everlasting thing that Members of this body shall, year in and year out, bring up such measures and direct them against a great section of the Nation? Have my colleagues ever thought that no Senator from the South has ever presented any measure of a punitive nature directed against any other section of this great Republic? We love America. We have been loyal to her finest traditions. We love the Constitution of the United States. We believe in its provisions. We are willing to sacrifice life, liberty, everything, in order that liberty and life may be preserved. In every hour of this country's peril the men who have represented the great southern section of the country in this body and in the House of Representatives have stood as loyal as American could stand for every measure which has meant the protection, the safety, and the security of the Republic.

We rededicate ourselves to the common task of making America an even greater republic than she now is. We would preserve every thought of liberty and every idea of patriotism and of freedom which we now enjoy and which may continue to exist. We covet for other nations of the earth somewhat of this liberty and freedom which we enjoy, but, as we covet it for them, we want to be very sure that we do not lose it for ourselves.

I am willing to join any member of this body in going just as far as possible to meet all the reasonable needs and expectations which might be directed toward America in aiding other nations of the world, but as we do that I think we should be very sure that we do not undermine and destroy the very basic fabric and foundation of our own liberty and freedom, and that we do not undermine the greatness of our people, and run the risk of wrecking our civilization.

This is a great and solemn hour in the Nation's history. This is an exceedingly solemn hour in the history of that great part of the Nation which lies south of the Mason and Dixon's line.

I covet for the Senate the consideration of all these measures upon their merits, and my reason for opposing the proposed rule is not inherently because of what the rule itself contains, but the implications which it bears, the purpose for which it is offered, and the intent which is back of it. We see just ahead of us the spectacle of the things we may expect to have rammed down our throats and down the throats of the free people of the Nation and of the South. As I said a few moments ago, I do not think a single American State would vote for these measures if they were submitted to a popular vote, because every one which has been submitted they have rejected overwhelmingly. The million majority rendered against the Fair Employment Practices Act submitted in California would be duplicated in every State in America if the people themselves were informed as to the provisions of the act and the ulterior purposes which would be effectuated if the law were passed.

I oppose the step proposed because I think it is an opening wedge. I think it is not necessary in order to make it possible to transact the business of the Senate expeditiously. I do not believe it would increase the efficiency of the Senate. I know it would not save the time of the Senate. I repeat what I have previously said, the time of the Senate is not wasted by filibusters, but it is wasted by a continuous volume of talk, sometimes about trivial things, many times about things not at issue in the Senate, but foreign to what the Senate is considering, and which would not be affected and reached by the new rule if it should be adopted.

If for a century and eleven years this great body was able to proceed effectively without any cloture rule at all, if for 32 years we have been able to meet the various problems which confronted us without having applied cloture except four times, if we have passed through 22 years without applying cloture at all—and those have been years of emergency and crisis, of peace and depression and war at its worst—if we could pass through all those 22 years without applying cloture at all, why is there a necessity now and why is there an urge now to change the rule and adopt a method to close debate?

I repeat, I do not want to sacrifice the power of the Senate and I do not want to liquidate its prestige. I came to the Senate with a high and exalted opinion of this great body, and my opinion of its Members, by reason of my association with them, has been greatly enhanced.

I should like now to see them as Americans act with wisdom and foresight, and not undertake to make the Senate a second-rate legislative assembly, but let it remain the one and only great deliberative forum in the world.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, am I permitted to address an inquiry to the majority leader? I should like to ascertain his intention about recessing the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I may say to the Senator from Georgia that I had hoped we could proceed until 6 o'clock tonight. That is what I had told Senators.

Mr. RUSSELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Humphrey	Mundt
Anderson	Hunt	Murray
Baldwin	Ives	Myers
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Bricker	Johnson, Tex.	O'Conor
Bridges	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Broughton	Kefauver	Pepper
Butler	Kem	Reed
Cain	Kerr	Robertson
Chavez	Kilgore	Russell
Connally	Knowland	Saltonstall
Cordon	Langer	Schoeppel
Donnell	Lodge	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Long	Smith, N. J.
Downey	Lucas	Sparkman
Eastland	McCarran	Stennis
Ecton	McCarthy	Taft
Ellender	McClellan	Taylor
Flanders	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Fulbright	McGrath	Thye
George	McKellar	Tobey
Gillette	Magnuson	Tydings
Green	Malone	Vandenberg
Hayden	Martin	Watkins
Hendrickson	Maybank	Wherry
Hill	Miller	Wiley
Hoey	Millikin	Williams
Holland	Morse	Withers

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 15.

(Mr. HOLLAND addressed the Senate. After having spoken for about 45 minutes he yielded the floor under a unanimous-consent agreement to proceed tomorrow. His speech will be published entire after it shall have been concluded.)

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield without losing my place on the floor or any right in connection therewith.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ANDERSON in the chair). The Senator from Florida asks unanimous consent that he may yield without losing his right to the floor. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. LUCAS. The hour of 6 o'clock having arrived——

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he moves a recess?

Mr. LUCAS. I am not going to move a recess just yet. I want to have the parliamentary situation made clear. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate shall convene tomorrow the Senator from Florida be permitted to continue his address.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LUCAS. I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ANDERSON in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Erwin D. Canham, of Massachusetts, to be an alternate representative of the United States of America to the second part of the third session of the General Assembly of the United Nations;

Edward F. Bartelt, of Illinois, to be the United States member of the Fiscal Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 3 years, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate;

H. Merle Cochran, of Arizona, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Good Offices Committee of the Security Council of the United Nations on Indonesia, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate;

W. Averell Harriman, of New York, the United States special representative in Europe, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as the representative of the United States of America on the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate;

H. Merle Cochran, of Arizona, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Pakistan;

B. Harvie Branscomb, of Tennessee, and several other persons, to be members of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange;

Edwin B. Fred, of Wisconsin, and several other persons to be members of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange; and

Dr. H. van Zile Hyde, of New York, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Executive Board of the World Health Organization, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc, and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

That concludes the consideration of the Executive Calendar.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 2, 1949, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 198. An act for the relief of the city and county of San Francisco;

S. 279. An act to authorize the advance on the retired list of Lt. John T. McDermott, United States Navy (retired), to the grade of lieutenant commander; and

S. 307. An act for the relief of Engebert Axer.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, March 3, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 2 (legislative day of February 21), 1949:

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Frank C. Squire, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board for a term of 5 years from August 29, 1948, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate (reappointment).

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

George F. Garrity, of Massachusetts, to be United States attorney for the district of Massachusetts, vice Hon. William T. McCarthy, elevated.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance:

Lawrence Kilham

To be senior assistant surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance:

Gerald R. Clark

To be sanitary engineer (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance:

John D. Faulkner

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 2 (legislative day of February 21), 1949:

POSTMASTERS

ALASKA

Clarence S. Hollingsworth, College.
Marietta M. Benson, Metlakatla.

ARKANSAS

Clinton C. Cook, Buckner.
Charles L. Duncan, Murfreesboro.
Leo J. Schreick, Osceola.

FLORIDA

John F. Pelot, Belleview.
Theodore L. Latimer, Deleon Springs.
Joseph W. Westmoreland, Jay.

GEORGIA

Norwood W. Miley, Hahira.
Evander L. Raulston, Trenton.

IDAHO

Charles E. Ruger, Bancroft.
Thomas W. Rogers, Glenns Ferry.
Arthur B. Peck, Lava Hot Springs.

LOUISIANA

Miles K. Hartsell, Rodessa.
K. C. Peterson, Zwolle.

MONTANA

Dorothy W. Carrigan, Birney.
James Charles McCue, Winnett.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Jerome R. Rueschenberg, Doland.
George A. Curry, Elk Point.
Joseph F. Krizan, Jr., Gregory.
Herby J. Bakkehaug, McIntosh.
Wilbur E. Prann, Timber Lake.
Dayton C. Sebade, Wall.
Robert R. Davis, White.

TEXAS

Granville W. Elder, Houston.

VIRGINIA

George E. Mettauer, Annandale.
Carroll E. Burgess, Blairs.
Lemuel W. Houston, Fredericksburg.
Lewis K. Gathright, Goochland.
Della M. Lawson, White Stone.

WYOMING

Kenneth L. Wingo, Encampment.
Roxanna M. Smith, Lingle.
Silvio J. Pedri, Reliance.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 2, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, on this day of humility and prayer as marked in the calendar of Thy church, we humbly bow in the spirit of penitence and confession. We are reminded of the end of all things of earth, when we too shall pass and be forgotten. O Divine One, forgive us and nourish us with a faith that is larger than patriotism, deeper than life and braver than death. So guard and direct us that our labors shall bear no reproach in the hearts and minds of those who follow on.

O Thou, unto whom all hearts are open, all desires known and from whom no secrets are hid, cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of Thy holy spirit, that we may perfectly love Thee and worthily magnify Thy holy name. In the name of Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, March 1, 1949, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On February 21, 1949:

H. R. 2402. An act to extend the office of the War Assets Administrator and the War Assets Administration from February 28, 1949, until June 30, 1949.

On February 24, 1949:

H. R. 1252. An act to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 with respect to the eligibility for appointment in the executive branch of the Government of former professional staff members of committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

On February 28, 1949:

H. J. Res. 92. Joint resolution to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes.

NONSTOP FLIGHT AROUND THE WORLD

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives and the people of the United States will be thrilled to read in the afternoon papers and learn there about the United States Air Force B-50 four-engined bomber which this morning, at 10:18 a. m., returned to Fort Worth, Tex., after a nonstop flight around the world. This bomber left Fort Worth, Tex., 4 days ago. It flew 23,452 miles in 94 hours and 1 minute. It was refueled four times in the air. That is a perfectly remarkable accomplishment. This is the first time in the history of the world that such a flight has been made, and I know that the United States will be thrilled, while some other people we know in the world will be given something to think about. It is comforting to know that we have the ability to make such a flight.

TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, like many other Members of the House, I am presently receiving many signed questionnaires wherein my constituents are voting their opinions on How Would You Revise Our Labor Laws? To me this activity on the part of the average citizen is an indication that there is great interest throughout the country for maintaining fundamental and beneficial provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, which act, since its origin and under test, has proven helpful not only to employee and employer but likewise has reflected to the best public interest.

Today I received a letter from a workingman in my district, and, for the benefit of the House, I quote his letter, which reads as follows:

Just a line in regard to the attached questionnaire I have filled out. I received it in my mail today. The way I have answered the questions is my own belief. I have worked at Caterpillar plant in Peoria 20 years and my observation on unions is, the worst enemy a union has is another union. Seems to me they are more interested in dues than the wishes of rank-and-file members. Unions have done some good, but there must be a way to make them responsible and more responsive to membership.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this honest, frank statement from an average patriotic American workingman hits the nail right on the head. This individual emphasizes his belief that labor leaders are more interested in themselves than they are in the rank-and-file membership. Likewise, this man's plea that unions be made more responsible and more responsive to their membership is exactly how I feel about the matter. Any labor legislation written by the Congress dare not be a one-way street. Both the problems of the employee and employer must be considered with fairness and justice.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may have permission to sit today during general debate in the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Newcastle Courier-Times.

Mr. COLE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an article.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. KILDAY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Hon. James A. Farley.

Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include articles appearing in the Chicago Sun-Times.

Mr. RIBICOFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the town council of New Britain, Conn.

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a report.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CROOK addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a recipe and two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LANHAM addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs be permitted to sit this afternoon during the session of the House during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include newspaper articles by Fergus Hoffman. I am informed by the Public Printer that these will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $159.75, but I ask that they be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

DEBT REDUCTION

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, Congress has spent considerable time in the study of expenditures and tax reduction, but has left the matter of debt reduction to the whims of chance. We have been like the ne'er-do-well who, although heavily indebted, buys every luxury offered and pays his creditors if any money is left over.

I have, therefore, reintroduced a measure which I proposed to the last Congress. My proposal is simple:

The establishment of a sinking fund of $10,000,000,000 each year to pay upon the interest and principal of the public debt. The interest on the public debt always has been considered a fixed charge, which must be paid each year. My proposal would place in the same category a payment on the principal of the debt. Thereafter, neither the Executive nor Congress could ignore the policy of debt reduction.

Future budget planning in the executive department and in Congress will thus always be confronted with an automatic reduction of $10,000,000,000 in expendable revenue. This announced policy, firmly established, would then be altered only in extreme emergencies.

Government finance has been a field for many imaginative schemes promoting some philosophy or way of life. I simply propose that we recognize a debt as a liability to be paid.

Adoption of such a policy will maintain confidence in our financial structure. Future bond issues will be sold more easily and at less cost. Assurance of repayment has always been the open sesame of credit.

Today, we enjoy the benefits of this great Nation because of the farsighted and intelligent plans of our predecessors in government. I am sure this Congress will keep faith with future generations by not only assuming responsibility for our own debts, but by maintaining the framework of a sound and solvent economy.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a petition.

Mr. WELCH of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article published in the San Francisco News.

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a table showing the taxes paid by the States and Territories.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow and also on Monday and Tuesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes on each occasion, to encourage Mr. Truman to take a train and explain about the Eighty-first Congress to the people.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

SIXTEENTH, SEVENTEENTH, AND EIGHTEENTH QUARTERLY REPORTS OF UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION EXPENDITURES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 94)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and together with the accompanying papers referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth quarterly reports of expenditures under the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration joint resolution, Public Law 267, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved March 28, 1944. These reports cover the quarters ended June 30, 1948, September 30, 1948, and December 31, 1948.

As a consequence of the substantial closure of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration's activities on June 30, 1947, the present reports are limited to statements of the status of United States appropriations as of the dates indicated.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 2, 1949.*

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1950

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3082) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue not to exceed 2 hours and that the time be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BATES]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3082, with Mr. KEOGH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

On motion of Mr. BATES of Kentucky, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia Appropriations, as I understand it, has only been beaten once in the time in which we could finish hearings on the bill. We consumed six and a half days in completing our hearings. We are very proud of that record. That record is due, in a large part, to the cooperation of the members of that committee with the chairman. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO], though young Members serving their first term in the Congress, grasped the situation very readily and worked diligently and wholeheartedly with the chairman in getting something done. Of course, the minority Members, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH] and the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN], likewise cooperated. We think we have done an excellent job.

Gentlemen, you have before you the bill and report making the necessary appropriations for the District of Columbia for 1950. You will find the report to be fully explanatory of the committee's action on the budget estimates for the District. The budget submitted was in the amount of $103,321,427. The committee recommends a reduction of $4,397,806, leaving a total appropriation of $98,923,621. It also recommends a rescission of previous appropriations for the Spingarn Senior High School in the amount of $1,187,399, to be covered into the general fund. Due to a serious financial situation, the District Commissioners were forced to submit a budget to the committee containing a deficit in the amount of $8,077,627. I would like to point out that the revenues and expenditures of the District are divided into three funds; namely, the general fund, the water fund, and the highway fund. Moneys from the water and highway funds are not transferable to the general fund. This entire deficit exists in the general fund items. The cuts made by the committee, together with the rescission, have reduced the deficit to $2,534,071. The Commissioners are directed by law to raise the necessary funds to operate the District government by increasing real-estate and personal-property taxes when necessary. The deficit mentioned above can be secured by merely increasing these taxes approximately 15 cents per $100 of assessed valuation. At the present time the tax is at the minimum set by law, $2 per hundred. The major cuts made in the budget estimates were in allowing increased personnel only when a denial would work an extreme hardship on the department concerned, in reducing the amounts requested for increases due to anticipated price increases, and in holding capital outlay and repair items to the minimum. The action of the subcommittee was unanimous.

A total cut of $4,356,157 has been recommended in the general fund items. The committee has allowed increased personnel only in highly meritorious cases. The general fund agencies requested a total of 156 new positions. The majority of these were teachers and maintenance personnel for newly constructed schools and 49 additions to the police department. The committee has recommended a total of 82. Of these it has allowed the full request of 16 new teachers and 2 new principals. The requested increase in the maintenance force of the public schools has been cut from 37 to 27. The committee believes that such a decrease will result in a saving in the public-school expenditures and will in no wise affect the efficiency of this force.

In the police department the bill contains funds for the filling of 11 new positions. This is a cut of 38 from the original request. At the present time there are approximately 220 vacancies for policemen in the department. Accordingly the committee has denied the request for 30 additional men and has pointed out to the commissioners that they should join with the police department in a concerted effort to fill these vacancies as quickly as possible. The 11 new positions allowed will free 7 policemen for duty elsewhere. The total decrease in personnel represents a cut of $210,500 from the amount requested.

In view of the severe financial condition existing in the general fund revenues the committee feels that the capital outlay items chargeable to this fund should be held to a minimum, it has accordingly recommended a decrease of $1,827,739 from the original budget estimates of $7,673,650. These cuts are reflected chiefly in the sewer division and Gallinger Hospital.

The committee has recommended a cut of $1,149,200 in the capital outlay items of the sewer division. The committee feels that the estimates in many instances were excessive in view of recent trends in housing development in Washington. For the past several months the permits issued for constructions in the District have shown a marked decline. Information from various builders indicate that the peak of residential construction in the District has passed. The committee, therefore, believes that a reduction can be made in these estimates at a saving to the District government. For example, in 1948 74,000 linear feet in sewers were constructed to provide sanitary service for abutting property. It is estimated that 114,750 feet will be constructed in 1949. The committee feels that the estimate of 175,000 feet for 1950 is excessive in view of the above-mentioned data. Other items of increase in this Division were for storm water, relief and replacement sewers, and sewers in advance of highway paving. The same is true of these types of sewers as in those mentioned in the preceding paragraph. There is an estimated increase in this work from 45,200 feet in 1948 to an estimated 56,720 feet in 1949, to 75,300 feet in 1950. In view of the serious fiscal difficulties in the general fund revenues the committee feels that this work should be held to a minimum and present sewers continued in use wherever possible until such time as the necessary funds are available for this work.

Following this same line of reasoning, the committee feels that the purchase of new equipment should be curtailed as much as possible. It has recommended a total cut of $454,800 in the equipment items. This decrease is represented chiefly in the policy of the committee in allowing new automotive equipment only in such instances as when it is essential to the welfare of the citizens of the District and the efficient operation of the various functions of this municipality. For example, the committee has allowed a requested $4,000 for a new prison van for the police department. This will replace a van now in use that is top-heavy, which deficiency resulted in the death of one of the policemen operating it. On the other hand, it has denied a request of $1,300 for the purchase of an automobile for the use of the director and the members of the Board of Public Welfare. The committee feels that these individuals can utilize other automobiles now available in the District government until such time as the general-fund revenues permit the purchase of the separate car for their use.

Another portion of the increases requested over the 1949 amount was based upon an increase in the cost of the various supplies and materials and anticipated further increases. The committee does not believe that such anticipations are justifiable in view of the economic conditions of the country at the present time, and the general economic outlook for the future. Accordingly, it has recommended a cut of $366,700, and the requested increases for supplies and materials. This cut is spread throughout the budget. In connection with this decrease, for example, the committee did not feel that the requested increase of $75,000 to increase the ration cost 10 cents per ration at Gallinger Hospital was justifiable in view of the condition of the District's finances, and in view of recent food-cost trends. It has recommended a cut of $50,000 in this item, which will provide $402,947 for such use. This will enable the cost per ration to be increased approximately 3⅓ cents.

In the department of correction the committee has recommended a cut of $29,425 for a similar item and a cut of $14,000 of the requested increase for inmates, clothing and footwear.

I would like to call your attention next to the Board of Public Welfare and its various agencies. The committee is quite sympathetic with the problems of the Board. At the same time it would like to point out that the $14,295,277 requested for welfare work represents approximately 16 percent of the total budget for the general fund. Seven million dollars of this is needed for payment to the federally owned St. Elizabeths Hospital for the care of insane persons from the District committed there voluntarily or by the courts. The committee has approved a cut of $233,655 from the budget estimates, which was requested by the St. Elizabeths officials. It believes, however, that a further saving can be effected by a more diligent adherence to the language of the 1949 appropriations act which prevents the above-mentioned funds being available to any person who has not lived in the District of Columbia for more than 1 year immediately prior to the application for voluntary admission. The committee has also denied an increase of $289,908 for public-assistance grants. No increase in the number of grants has been requested over the 1949 amount. Rather the increases mentioned above would be used to increase the amount payable to each grant. The committee heard testimony to the effect that a considerable portion of the public assistance money was being used by those not qualified to receive it. While the committee does not feel that there is any large scale error in the use of this fund it does believe that a more diligent study of the persons to whom the grants are given and a strict adherence to the standards for qualifying for assistance will allow the requested increases to be made from the $2,150,364 allowed for this work without the additional increase.

These represent the major decreases made from the budget estimates.

The bill, as submitted, is a decrease of $838,813 from the general fund appropriations of 1949. Of this amount $287,100 is from nonrecurring items such as the inaugural ceremonies and the survey of public schools. The 1949 amount was the largest in the history of the District government. Surely an almost similar amount is entirely sufficient today

when the finances of this fund are in such severe straits. The measure before you is adequate to provide for the efficient operation of this city. The decreases made will work no severe hardship on any division of this municipal government. It is a workable budget and will require no additional revenue-raising measures—merely the use of those already on the statute books. I urge favorable consideration and adoption in order that this city, which is a foster home to us for several months of the year, will be provided with the continuance of an efficient government within its revenue-raising abilities.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I regret that it has not been possible for me to appear before the gentleman's committee, but there is one matter that I want to offer to the consideration of his committee for their future study, and that is the fact that the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia has no outdoor pistol range on which they may practice pistol shooting. The Park Police and the White House Police both have very good ranges supplied to them by the Government. The White House Police range particularly is good; it is over in the arboretum of the Department of Agriculture bordering the Anacostia River. I suggest to the gentleman that one matter for consideration by his committee in the future is giving these fine policemen of the Metropolitan Police Department an opportunity to do some real practice with the weapons which they are not infrequently called upon to use in protection of the public in the metropolitan area.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. I thank the gentleman from California, and I agree with him that the Metropolitan Police is a high-class outfit.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. First, I want to commend the gentleman and his committee for the very fine and outstanding work they have done in preparing this budget for the District of Columbia. We all recognize that over the past few years there have been some very important considerations and problems before that committee in preparing appropriations for the District of Columbia. The gentleman will recall that a year ago the Federal employees throughout the United States, with the exception of those working for the District of Columbia, received an increase in salary of $330 a year to offset the increased cost of living. There was a bill that passed the House a year ago that provided the same amount for the District of Columbia employees, but for some reason or other it was stopped over at the other end of the Capitol. Quite a lot of consideration is now being given to going back and correcting this inequity so far as the District of Columbia employees are concerned. I wonder if the gentleman's committee had this matter presented to it, and if they did come to any resolution thereon.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. I believe the gentleman from Arkansas is a member of the legislative committee, and we took the position that that was their problem and not ours.

Mr. HARRIS. The reason I am asking the gentleman is because we are wrestling with that problem right now. It will mean $5,000,000 additional to the budget for 1950 and another $5,000,000 additional to take care of the retroactive feature, if this is ultimately agreed to. That would mean a total of about $10,000,000 that would have to be added to the budget that the gentleman brings to the House today, that is, if it is provided for, and I think it would be helpful to our committee in working on this problem to determine if the gentleman's committee really did go into it.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. We did not. We took the position that it was not a function of the Committee on Appropriations, and we tried to bring on this floor a bill that would enable the District of Columbia to live within its income in case no new income legislation was brought about. It was our thought that it was none of our business.

Mr. HARRIS. I appreciate the position of the gentleman, and I certainly do not quarrel with him. I assume then it is indicated that the position of the committee is, if this problem can be worked out in due course of time to take care of these employees to correct this inequity regarding the teachers, the policemen, the firemen, and other District of Columbia employees, and if funds can be provided as the bill progresses through the Congress, that supplemental appropriations would have to be made to take care of it if it was so provided.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. I think I will have to let the gentleman draw his own conclusions on that.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to take only a few minutes on this bill. The statement just made by our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BATES], together with the committee report, gives the Members a more or less complete picture of what this bill proposes to do with respect to the budget of the District of Columbia for the next fiscal year. There are, however, one or two things I should like to emphasize and emphasize again with regard to the fiscal affairs of the District.

But, first of all, I want to commend the chairman of the subcommittee which has had charge of this bill. He has been eminently fair throughout the hearings, and under his direction the subcommittee has worked in the most cooperative spirit.

And I should like also to say a word of commendation for the officials of the District of Columbia. Too few people, in and out of Congress, have any real understanding of the problems with which they are confronted, and without that understanding too few have any appreciation of the excellent job they have done. I might say here, and I think the committee will agree with me, that the officials of the District of Columbia should serve as an example to some of the officials of the departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

At no time have the District officials sought to mislead the committee as to the actual situation. At all times they have presented the committee with all the information it desired, fully and accurately, frankly and honestly. I regret that as much cannot be said for some of the officials of the Federal Government in their efforts to prevail upon Congress to give them more and more money.

The District of Columbia officials are an example to others in another respect, which I believe worthy of mention. You will recall last year the deficit in the bill of over $1,500,000. The Congress failed to enact the proposed sales tax to give the District adequate revenues. Under the law the District is required to keep its budget in balance, and when a deficit occurs the Commissioners are obliged to increase the rate of taxation on real and personal property.

What did the Commissioners do? They did not promptly raise the tax rates to meet the deficit. On the contrary, they set about to absorb the deficit by a careful cutting of costs here and there. In other words, they determined to live within their existing revenues. They determined to live within their means.

I mention this, Mr. Chairman, as I think it bespeaks an attitude toward government finance that is somewhat refreshing in these days of appeals for new and bigger government expenditures to be met by increases in taxes. I wish that some of our Federal officials would adopt somewhat the same attitude, that they would make a real effort to live within their budget instead of following the free and easy way of asking for deficiency appropriations.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words concerning the bill itself. As I stated at the outset, I believe that on the whole the committee has done a good job. It has been a difficult job, a most difficult job, because of the present lack of a sound over-all fiscal policy for the District, and this lack is due to the failure of the Congress. We have yet to relate the revenues to the necessary expenditures.

While the committee has reduced the amount to be appropriated in this bill by $4,397,806 under the budget estimates, and while the bill appropriates about $1,000,000 less than was appropriated for the fiscal year 1949, there will still be a deficit in the budget of $2,534,071.

Where is this $2,534,000 to be found? Of course, certain savings can probably be made in an item here and an item there in operating expense, but the only place that any substantial savings can be made would be in those items that represent capital outlays.

A very large item in this category, for example, is the $2,366,000 carried by this bill for the construction of new school

buildings, and for furniture and equipment for the new buildings.

I do not believe there is a single Member of this body who would not agree that money spent on modernizing our school facilities, in providing the children with adequate facilities for obtaining a proper basic education, is money well spent. The question is not as to the need nor as to the merits of the proposed expenditures to construct new buildings and supply them with necessary equipment. In certain sections of our Capital City there is a decided need for additional facilities. That need should be met.

But, Mr. Chairman, how are we to meet it? Are we not here, as in the whole governmental machinery, faced with the practical question as to how we can afford it? There are many things that each of us as individuals could use to improve our standard of living but we cannot afford them. There are many families in the United States who would send their boy or girl to college, but they cannot afford it. There are many families who now live in cramped apartment quarters who would buy, and really need, a home in which to raise their children, but they cannot afford it.

My point is, Mr. Chairman, that the practical problem which faces us in the District and in the Federal budget is not what is needed, not what we would like to have, not what would make our work and life easier, but the practical question is what we can afford. Perhaps what we cannot afford today may be within our budget means tomorrow.

I have no intention of offering an amendment to the pending bill to reduce the amount carried in this bill for the construction of new school buildings. Before I would do that I would review again and again every other item in the budget. But I wish to urge upon the Commissioners of the District the importance of postponing any new construction unless it is absolutely essential. I urge upon them the importance of making a distinction between what would be an improvement over the existing situation, what we would like to do and what is absolutely, unconditionally necessary.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, I believe that new projects should temporarily be postponed, at least until we are in a better financial position to bear the cost. There are certain projects where this can be done without serious injury to anyone but with benefit to everyone in the long run. And I might add that I believe that at some future date, not too distant, new construction can be undertaken at much lower costs than at present and at a time when we will undoubtedly be needing new projects to absorb unemployment.

There are other ways by which this deficit in the District budget can be met. First and foremost of these is by the imposition of a sales tax. Unless such a tax is enacted, I can see no way by which the District can meet its budget needs, for remember that in this bill we have cut over $4,000,000 from the budget and still have a deficit of $2,000,000.

To be sure, the Federal Government should make a larger contribution to the District than it is presently making. At the present time the Federal Government contributes $11,000,000 to the general fund of the District, and $1,000,000 to the water fund. In my opinion, this is inadequate, considering the amount of real property in the District that represents Federal Government buildings and considering the services which the District renders to the Federal Government as such and the employees who have residence elsewhere. I am not prepared at the moment to say what that amount of contribution should be, but any examination of the revenue situation for the Nation's Capital should convince one that the Federal Government owes a greater contribution to the community than it is presently making.

After all, Mr. Chairman, the District of Columbia belongs not solely to the people who live here and do business here. It belongs to the people of the United States. This is the Nation's capital, not just the city of Washington. It is a city that is governed by the people of the United States and not by the people of the city of Washington, for here the people have no present voice in their government. It is a city from which flow benefits to all the people of the United States in every State of the Union. Surely the Federal Government, representing all the people, has a great responsibility to the District, and surely we ought to be willing to see that we meet that responsibility on a fair and just basis. We are not doing that today, as I see it, for the Federal Government is not bearing its fair and just costs for the government of this beautiful and most important city in the whole world.

As I have already indicated, it is my firm conviction from a study of the fiscal affairs of the District that we can never expect to meet the District needs as the seat of our national government unless we provide additional revenue. The personal income-tax law that we have in the District has proved itself to be wholly inadequate. The only fair, just and sound way to raise the revenue is through a sales tax.

I say again that this city belongs to the whole Nation. Thousands of people come here each year on business or as sightseers. Some are here for only a few days. Some stay several months. They all enjoy the benefits which the city offers them. By a sales tax they would in some measure be paying for these benefits.

It is not my intention here to enter into a detailed argument about the merits of a sales tax and the necessity of it to meet the very apparent revenue needs of the District. It is not within the province of the Appropriations Committee, on which I serve, to decide how the revenue should be raised, and that question is not in issue here. But, at the very least, I want the record to show that insofar as I am personally concerned I do not intend to disassociate the question of what should be spent from the question as to how we shall get the money to be spent.

By this bill we are asking the Commissioners of the District to do the tremendous job of saving over $4,000,000 more than they estimated was needed for the next fiscal year. We are asking them to do more than that. We are asking them to meet a deficit of over $2,000,000.

I feel confident they will cooperate with us to that extent. But cooperation in its true sense does not come from one side. It is for us to cooperate with them, and it is for us to meet courageously this difficult fiscal problem that the affairs of the District of Columbia present. I, for one, am prepared to do that.

And I sincerely hope, Mr. Chairman, that in considering each and every appropriation bill that comes before us the members will not simply argue whether a particular program is meritorious, but will ask themselves: what can we afford?

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. CROOK. What is the present real-estate tax in the District of Columbia?

Mr. CHURCH. The rate for 1947 was $1.75 per 100, and it was raised by statute to apply to the fiscal year 1948 and 1949, not to be less than $2 per $100 on the valuation of personal property and real estate. If that rate for 1947 is not correct, I will correct it and inform the gentleman. I think it was $1.75 per $100. Our very able clerk checks me and says it is $1.75.

Mr. CROOK. How does that tax rate compare with the average tax rate over the United States on real estate?

Mr. CHURCH. Well, that would be a subject for long discussion.

Mr. CROOK. It is something that is of interest to me.

Mr. CHURCH. Let me suggest to the gentleman that we do not want to go into that here, because that is entirely a legislative matter. The witnesses who came before us—and their testimony is in the hearings—testified, I believe, that it was comparable with the rates and valuations throughout the United States.

Mr. CROOK. I notice the tax rate in many places runs $3, $3.50, and $4; I just wondered how the District of Columbia real-estate and personal-property tax compared with the average throughout the country.

Mr. CHURCH. As the gentleman knows, many States and counties have so-called equalization practices; they try to equalize their valuations throughout the State because there are involved the actions of different counties in determining assessments.

It has been said that probably an increase of 15 cents in the present tax rate of $2 per $100 on the valuations that will be placed on the properties this year—and we appropriated more money to the Assessor in order to do that—may go a long way toward raising the deficit I have referred to; but remember we must think about a lot of school requirements and the dire need of funds for school purposes.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. YATES. I respect the very able presentation the gentleman has made. The gentleman and I both come from

Cook County, Ill., and our districts embrace both city and suburban areas. I believe the gentleman will agree with me that the tax rate for the city of Chicago and for Cook County on the basis of 100-percent valuation is in excess of $4 per hundred.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO].

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to make a few remarks, this being my first experience on my committee; and they are not so much for the benefit of the membership as for the benefit of the residents of the District who are interested in the congressional attitude toward their affairs. My impression of all those who represented the District at the hearings was that they were able and of extremely high caliber, very competent, very capable individuals. I also realize that probably many residents of the District feel that Members of Congress are not particularly interested in what goes on in the District. During the short time I have been on this committee I have come to have the greatest respect for our chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BATES]; and I can say without any reservation that he is as competent, hard-working, and conscientious an official as I have ever seen. I do not have to tell that to the membership of the House, because I know, of course, they are familiar with his efficiency and with the excellent representation he has given to his district in Kentucky; but I do feel that perhaps the residents of the District of Columbia may like to know that in the chairman of the subcommittee they do have a man who at all times, as I see it, acts in their best interests and represents them as completely, thoroughly, and conscientiously as I myself would want to be represented were I a resident of the District. I am sure the committee agrees with my appraisal of the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield.

Mr. YATES. I, like the gentleman from Massachusetts, am serving for the first time on the Committee on the District of Columbia. I wish to subscribe entirely to the statement he has made. I am very sure he feels as I do, that our work on this committee has been an amazing, a refreshing, and a completely new field of approach to the problems with which the municipalities of this Nation exemplified by the District of Columbia are confronted. The problem was not an easy one, and I agree entirely that our chairman did a most able job in conducting the hearings, in listening to the testimony, and in analyzing it. I want to congratulate him along with the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FURCOLO. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his contribution; as a matter of fact, the experience to me was in the nature of an education. I confess I did not contribute a great deal to the committee, but it has been very, very helpful to me from an educational standpoint, and I enjoyed the experience. Let me add that the subcommittee's secretary, Frank Sanders, should also be complimented for his hard and efficient work.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I listened with great interest to the statements made on the floor of the House in support of the pending appropriation bill, and, of course, it is my intention to vote for this measure. I also listened with great interest to the statement of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH], and with a portion of his statement I completely agree.

With that portion of his statement regarding the imposition of a sales tax upon the people of the District of Columbia, or upon people anywhere, I am in complete disagreement. A sales tax, particularly a sales tax upon the necessities of life, is the most atrocious of all taxes. It is a tax that weighs heaviest upon the poorest people. In my State of Ohio we have a 3 percent sales tax when you buy clothing when you buy food in restaurants, when you buy medical supplies, and things of that sort. In fact this obnoxious sales tax is levied upon all purchases of 40 cents or more except purchases of groceries and meat. In Ohio we have found that this tax, which was imposed upon us in the first instance as an emergency tax, has become a permanent cancerous growth in our State and it truly bears down hardest upon the poor people. Taxes should be levied according to ability to pay.

The other day a soldier friend of mine from Illinois came to Cleveland and visited me. He had just purchased a cane, having sustained an injury in North Africa where we had served together. He purchased this cane for $3 and instead of reciving back two $1 bills, as he had expected, he received a one dollar bill and some change, then a little receipt for a sales tax. He could not understand the hospitality of the State of Ohio toward a visitor from Illinois who because of his service to his country found it necessary to buy a cane for his own use and then had to be imposed upon by paying a sales tax. Neither could I justify imposition of such a tax. Therefore, I want the gentleman from Illinois to know that I repudiate from my very soul any assertion that we should impose a sales tax in the District of Columbia, and particularly a sales tax upon the necessities of life. I intend to oppose such a tax at the proper time.

In another particular the gentleman made a statement with which I completely agree. He said, "the District of Columbia belongs to the people of the United States." That was brought home to me just recently when here in the Capital of our Nation two very orderly and respectable people from my city attempting to purchase tickets to enter the Capitol Theater, a movie house here, were barred from seats in that theater because of their color.

Mr. Chairman, the loyalty of Negroes to this Government and its institutions has never been questioned by anyone. The fact that in the Capital of this Nation respectable, orderly, and well-behaved persons because of their birth by reason of their race, may be barred from theaters, from participating in such facilities as hospitals and our schools, is something that at a proper time should be considered very seriously by all Members of this House. This discrimination is unjust and un-American. Let us end it.

Crispus Attucks, a Negro, was the first American patriot killed in the War for Independence. He fell on Boston Common, shot down by an English Redcoat.

Near Fort Stotsenberg, Philippine Islands, early on December 7, 1941, Pvt. Robert H. Brooks, a Negro soldier, was killed by a Jap bomb. He was one of the first American soldiers to lose his life in World War II. His father and mother are sharecroppers, living near Sadieville, Ky. The parade ground at Fort Knox has been named Brooks Field. Nine generals of our Army stood at attention in tribute to Private Brooks when the Stars and Stripes were lowered to half staff in an impressive ceremony.

In Italy it was my privilege for a period of some weeks to serve in the combat area with the Ninety-second Infantry Division, a division composed of Negro troops. You know the facts, but let me reiterate here again that the Ninety-second Division won an enviable record in Italy.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TACKETT. What has the Negro question got to do with this bill?

Mr. YOUNG. This is an appropriation bill I will say to the gentleman, for the District of Columbia, the Capital of our entire Nation. I am not offering an amendment here or injecting this except to say that I agree with the gentleman from Illinois that this is the Capital of the Nation. Negroes have offered their lives to maintain the American way of life.

Mr. TACKETT. Well, there is no Negro question involved here, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. YOUNG. There may not be, but some respectable and worthy people from my State were denied facilities here, and were denied the courtesy of attending a picture show here in the Nation's Capital, and it seems to me that such an assault upon a segment of our citizenry, whose loyalty to this Nation has never been questioned, is a matter of sufficient concern so that it is proper for a Representative from a sovereign State to bring it to the attention of the House.

Mr. TACKETT. The only thing I am trying to get at is that the gentleman and I do not agree on that question, and I wanted to be sure it was not in this bill.

Mr. YOUNG. Evidently the gentleman and I do not agree on that.

As I was saying, soldiers of this fine Ninety-second Division, a Negro division, are buried in Italian soil in American military cemeteries, near Futa Pass and elsewhere.

May I say to the gentleman from Arkansas who interrupted me a minute

ago, and to you, Mr. Chairman, and to other Members of this House, that we are the Nation which chiseled on our Statue of Liberty these words:

Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free;
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed to me;
I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that anyone can serve on this subcommittee for 4 years, as I have—two of which I was chairman of this subcommittee—without having certain convictions. In the first place this is not a Federal budget, because less than $20,000,000 of this $100,000,000 is Federal money, and, secondly, that this is our hallowed Nation's Capital, one that your constituents and mine love to come to. They are here in body daily. I feel just a little bit put out, may I say, that we rush through the consideration of the fiscal affairs of 840,000 people, who have no vote.

As I have mentioned, during the Eightieth Congress I was chairman of this committee. I felt that it was my responsibility to make the hearings as full as possible. Where else, I said, do the people of the District, who have no vote, find a chance to participate in the fullness of their fiscal and their civic and municipal affairs? There is no record that proves that that approach was appreciated, yet in the absence of a modicum of home rule I think it is the safer approach within the framework of those things that we like to call American. So today I have taken 5 minutes to point out to you some of the things that should have been considered in the drawing up and the presentation, here, of this bill.

We will not consummate anything here. I have no amendments to offer. I do hope, however, that I may have a small part in a full consideration of the weaknesses of this present bill on the Senate side, and I trust that my colleagues will bear with us sufficiently so that in conference that which is weak in what we do today may be corrected. We owe that to the people whose money, 80 percent of it, we are congressionally appropriating today.

There still are tax problems here in the District. May I remind you that had it not been for a filibuster on the Senate side we would have gone far by the action of this House in the Eightieth Congress to the correction of one of the fiscal difficulties of the District of Columbia, the Nation's Capital, your Nation's Capital and my Nation's Capital.

There is a fragmentary authority here. This District and this Government have grown like Topsy until today we find that the only place where some thirty-and-odd separate authorities meet and shake hands together here in the District of Columbia is across the hearing table of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia. That is the only place. I shall not recite them here, but that fragmentation of authority has been long recognized. The retiring Engineer Commissioner, Gen. Gordon Young, in my book a fine official, recognized that in a speech he made to a group of engineers the other day. He said in effect that this fragmentation of authority is something to deplore, but that apparently Congress was slow to recognize that fact and slower still to correct it.

So who are we to hasten any consideration of other people's business when we fail and refuse to recognize their problems? I trust full consideration, such as we gave this bill in the Eightieth Congress, can still be had in this the inaugural session of the Eighty-first Congress.

The man who preceded me here in the well of the House spoke about civil rights and the rights of minorities. I shall not belabor nor criticize the remarks he made, but I will tell you that this Nation's Capital of ours is the mecca of every minority group not only in the United States but in the entire world. Can you have, as we had last spring, thousands of people who subscribe to the Communist doctrine coming to the Nation's Capital of ours without paying some consideration to the needs of an adequate and an able police force here in the District of Columbia? Why, of course, you cannot.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. YATES. I am very cognizant of the justice and validity of what the gentleman states with respect to the demands and needs for the District of Columbia. I should like, however, to correct an impression which I, at least, received from the gentleman's statement. As a member of the subcommittee I do know that I, as well as most of the other members of the committee, were completely cognizant of our duty to give everybody who requested a chance to be heard, that opportunity to be heard. I know of no individual, whether he was associated with the District government or in any private or public capacity who requested an opportunity to be heard, who was not accorded that right.

Mr. HORAN. I agree with the gentleman. I want to refer to something that I read in the paper regarding the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES]. I think it is to his credit that he inquired into the difficulties that Major Barrett has in obtaining an adequate police force here. I was late in arriving, but unless you have already brought to the attention of the Congress some of the difficulties you encounter when you consider an appropriation bill, I must say that you should have done it. There is no question but that we will have to consider the things that make it difficult to keep an adequate police force here. The effect of the bill does not work in that direction because the effect of the bill tends to dilute and to weaken even the retirement phases of our present police force, by the sum, as I read in the papers, of some $400,000.

Mr. YATES. I would just like to answer that question about the matter of the police force. I did make an inquiry as the gentleman has suggested. Lieutenant Truscott, who was testifying in response to a question which I had asked, stated that they had extreme difficulty in filling positions on the police force at that time and that he himself felt while 2,500 policemen were necessary to fulfill the complete needs of the District, yet they had had 220 positions which they had not yet been able to fill, and for which an appropriation had been granted.

Mr. HORAN. I am aware of that. I am responsible for having made available, or rather the subcommittee of which I was chairman making the funds available for that increase in the Police Department. I am not here to belabor the small items for our consideration. I am here to tell you that we in the Nation's Capital, with all of the fermentation on both sides of minority disturbances, which well might gather around our ears at any given time, when that time is ripe, should not now be considering anything that will weaken a progress toward the best police force in the world.

I might say that in another body on the Hill today they are considering a matter that deals with minority rights. I think it is being very well aired over there. I have enjoyed listening to the debates. Let us not forget that the very essence of America means the protection and the liberation of minorities with all of the troubles that that can bring on. But in doing so, let us remember that law and order must be maintained at all times and that means police.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us get to another item which I do not think has been properly taken care of. I refer to the schools. I want, later, to deal specifically with a little incident that happened, affecting our schools a while ago. But first let us remember that we have had a shifting of population. We have had a tremendous increase in the birth rate. We have people of the ages of 16 and 18 and 21 years getting married and moving away from their ancestral homes or where their parents lived and going into a new area where bulldozers, perhaps 2 or 3 weeks before, went in and cleared the ground for a new housing unit. Those people are having children. They are at that age. Now I do not care how many empty schoolhouses there may be where their grandparents, or parents, are living. We need schools where these folks are now living. We found that greatly augmented by the war, when the birth rate stepped up.

Two years ago, when I took over the chairmanship of this subcommittee, we found a tremendous situation in our school needs, and we took steps to correct that. I took part in a fight to bring a bill to this floor that was $4,000,000 over the President's estimate. Most of those schools, let the record show, were for the colored people who live in the District of Columbia. They had a case. Who am I to stand up and oppose a minority that may have a case? They had one. That bill was passed and contracts were let to build schools.

Then one of the great Americans in this country, Dr. Garnet Wilkinson, a colored man, probably better educated than most of us, humble and far-seeing,

and a great constructive leader among the colored people of the United States, got together with the superintendent of schools in Washington, D. C., Dr. Hobart Corning, and together they planned transfers of students in the overcrowded schools so that they might make room and vacate buildings to be razed, and build new ones for the colored school population.

Naturally, when anybody is moved there is unrest. A Communist colored agitator came here from Chicago. You may recall a little over a year ago we had a school strike on the part of certain individuals purporting to represent some of the colored PTA's in the District of Columbia. They thought they had a case, and that strike went on for about 6 weeks. They picketed the schools. There was unrest and police problems.

But Dr. Wilkinson was not a party to it. He was busy working constructively for the good of the colored people, he assured them that new schools were on the way and because this Congress, through this subcommittee, had made provision for badly needed schools on the part of our colored population, that strike finally came a cropper.

Now we can anticipate trouble, if we study any problem fully. We can and we should try to avert trouble. I make the suggestion that what is allowed for the public schools of the District of Columbia be closely scrutinized, to make sure that justice to a growing population, to those of our population who are subject to delinquency if they have to be on part-time instruction, or on the streets, to see that that portion of our population is adequately cared for.

Enough for schools. But I think it ought to be reviewed on the Senate side and in conference.

Now we come to sewers. According to Ed Ryan's article in the Post this morning, that item has been cut over a million dollars. Sewers are important not only for the new residential districts that I have mentioned—sewers are also important as an integral part of our street construction. You gentlemen must realize every night when you drive home between 4:30 and 5:30 and see the congested traffic in the District of Columbia that our street patterns are not adequate. How do these sewers tie into that picture? The sewers have to precede any revamping or enlargement of our District traffic pattern. Sewers, by their very nature, are laid where the streets are laid. They have to, or should be, laid first. So it was our concern to provide for sewer laying now. We were not only thinking of the problems that we have today, but the problems of next year, and especially the problems of 2 years from now, when we anticipate an invasion of our Nation's Capital, by your constituents or mine, of some fifteen or twenty million additional visitors, when we celebrate the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of our Nation's Capital.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] has expired.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman six additional minutes.

Mr. HORAN. You can complain about the District of Columbia being on our bounty, aspiring to hold a national celebration here; but take it up and counsel with those who like to come here and see this hallowed ground, if they would agree with that objection. I look forward with a great deal of pleasure to a rebirth of the things that made this Nation great when we have the sesquicentennial celebration here in 1950, and I submit that we had better be about the business of correcting some of the traffic snarls here in the District of Columbia, not only for the good of the people of the District, but for the good of the people of the Nation who are pretty apt to be milling around our environs on that occasion.

Now, we shall do nothing today; I have already said I shall offer no amendment, but I would have felt derelict in my duty if I had not pointed out some of the shortcomings of this measure as it passes this body. I shall vote for it. I have no complaint nor any criticism of the members of this subcommittee, but I shall have a criticism of the Congress if they do not adequately take care of the just needs of the people of this District, not only in appropriations but in an honest forthright forward-looking attention to their tax problems; and I, personally, I might say in passing, should like to have some consideration given to some sort of local autonomy for this people.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, a very valuable and a very able member of the District of Columbia Legislative Committee.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I fully appreciate the gentleman's remarks. I think sometimes—and I am sure the gentleman agrees with me—that the Federal contribution to the District of Columbia has not always been fairly made, and I do not know that it is fairly made today. How does the gentleman feel about that?

Mr. HORAN. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for reminding me of that because I hurriedly compiled these notes. It has often been said that the Commissioners are empowered by law to raise real-estate taxes to take care of any deficits or deficiencies. Let us keep in mind one thing, that while we have 840,000 people in the District of Columbia proper, that if this were like any other city in the United States the environs of Washington would be included within the city, and that would encompass a million and two or three hundred thousand people, and their residences and their property would be taxable and the returns would go into the coffers of the Nation's Capital; but by the Constitution the District of Columbia ends at Western Avenue, ends at Eastern Avenue, and at the Potomac River. This should make us cautious about any off-the-cuff suggestion that we could increase real-estate taxes here and meet all our needs. I submit also that probably no other city in the United States, save possibly New York, has as great a transient population as the city of Washington, D. C. I submit, therefore, that if we are going to suggest that property here in the District of Columbia bear all the expense, we had better work out a formula such as the Auchincloss bill suggested. Or we could consider the one that I personally introduced 2 years ago, whereby the Federal contribution is stepped up in exact ratio as property taxes are raised in the District.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. The gentleman recalls quite well within the last 2 years we increased taxes on real estate, as I recall it, by 30 or 32 percent.

Mr. HORAN. The gentleman is correct, and this bill will mean an increase of better than 20 percent, if I recall my figures correctly. So I say that we are achieving nothing here today as we go through the shadow boxing of passing this appropriation bill. The responsibility is still ours, and it will remain ours until the Senate has acted, until our District of Columbia Legislative Committee has recognized these responsibilities and acted, until the Senate again has acted, until the conference report has been considered in conference, and the President has signed the bill.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FURCOLO. I want to ask the gentleman as a former chairman of the subcommittee, is it not true that most of these matters he has mentioned here today in connection with increased taxation, in connection with home rule for the District; and matters of that nature, are things that this subcommittee, strictly speaking and officially speaking, has nothing whatever to do with?

Mr. HORAN. The gentleman misses his main responsibility as a member of the Appropriations Committee. The Congress passes policy laws, an administration is created, and that administration is charged with the responsibility of carrying out the project or projects which were in that policy bill passed by the Congress. That administration comes before you as a member of the Appropriations Committee. You have a dual function to consider what the will of the Congress was in passing the original legislation; and secondly, to see that the justifications are either too great or too little to achieve the known objectives that that policy embraces.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, no other Member of Congress save a member of the Appropriations Committee reviews the work of the administration as the gentleman and I do as members of the Appropriations Committee. We see the failures or we see the glories of the work of the administration. If we notice that there is something deficient in that administration or if we see that any action of the Congress has impaired them, it is our duty and our responsibility to call that to the attention of the Congress as forcefully as we know how at the time when the appropriations bills are before this body. We cannot pass the buck. That is going on too much in Washington, D. C.

Mr. FURCOLO. Will the gentleman agree that if the subcommittee tried to

in effect put in home rule for the District, it would have nothing whatever to do with the subcommittee's business or report? Is that correct?

Mr. HORAN. I mentioned that as a personal conviction, which has nothing to do with the items to which I referred.

Mr. FURCOLO. The gentleman went into it completely as far as home rule is concerned and I wanted to find out about that.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further. I am not here to debate home rule. I mentioned in passing that I personally would like to see a modicum of economy for the District. What I came here to talk about and the thing I want to have attended to are the fiscal items as they bear upon a wise and adequate administration for this great Capital of ours. I do not want to be led off on any side street and debate with the gentleman on home rule, which has nothing to do with the body of my argument, which specifically deals with the fiscal items before us at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, several weeks ago it was my privilege to discuss with Major Barrett, who heads the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia, the subject of a pistol range for the Metropolitan Police Department. I do not think that there is a police department of this quality and character in the world that does not have a decent place to practice using that weapon which it sometimes is called upon to use in the defense of those who live in the District of Columbia and the visitors to this area. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BATES] was kind enough to yield to me a while ago on that subject, and I appreciate very much his interest.

Mr. Chairman, the Congress should know that there is no such pistol range where the 1,700 members of the Metropolitan Police Department can practice shooting. They have the privilege of using the indoor range of the FBI when they can get to it. It is a limited space. There is also one other small indoor range which they can use, but there are a great many police officers in the District of Columbia, far too many, to obtain proper practice on these smaller indoor ranges.

I would like to call the attention of the Members of the Committee on the District of Columbia—I see several of them in the room, including my good friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA], and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], to the fact that there is land along the Anacostia River, title to which is held by the Department of Agriculture, and a very large arboretum where the White House Police, much smaller in number, if you please, have a very large outdoor pistol range. Over by the B. & O. tracks in northeast Washington is another and much smaller pistol range now being improved for the use of the national park police force. But the Metropolitan Police do not have such a place.

I happen to know, for example, that the Twelfth Police Precinct members obtained the privilege of installing, out of their own time and funds, if you please, a range in an old brickyard along the B. & O. tracks in Northeast Washington, and there with their own hands and their own money they built a small clubhouse. In order to carry on the practice of the use of that weapon they have taken into membership in the Twelfth Precinct Pistol Club some 450 nonpolice persons of the city of Washington. They are being driven out of their present location in the brickyard. I believe that it has been closed to them now, and they have had to go way out in Montgomery County, Md., and purchase a piece of land with money which they have to raise by subscriptions, by giving dances, and all that sort of thing.

It is perfectly ridiculous, gentlemen, that the Metropolitan Police of the city of Washington, who are here for the purpose of protecting not only the residents of Washington, but the many hundreds of thousands of visitors, had to dig down into their own pockets to supply themselves with an outdoor pistol range where they could practice the use of that very necessary sidearm. They even have to supply nearly all of the ammunition used in their practice.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman that the condition which he has outlined is perfectly ridiculous. I hope that the gentleman will feel free to offer any kind of a bill that will provide the police here with the type of pistol range which they should and must have. So far as I am concerned I will do everything I can to help the gentleman get it passed.

Mr. HINSHAW. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota. But I would suggest this, if I may be privileged to do so, that if the subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia having charge of the Metropolitan Police would conduct an investigation to find out where such a pistol range might be located, preferably, of course, on land owned by the Government—I have in mind, perhaps, the arboretum of the Department of Agriculture where the White House police range is presently located—where sufficient land with sufficient protection for wild shots, and occasionally there are wild shots among the best of pistol shooters, can be obtained where such a range might be erected without land cost. Otherwise, if no such land is available within the District, then, of course, there must be some place in the nearby countryside on land either owned by the Government or which could be acquired by the Government. I have no opportunity of making that investigation, but I suggest that the Committee on the District of Columbia do make it, so that when it is made they will be able to come in with the proper legislation authorizing the purchase, the building, and the equipping of a pistol range for the Metropolitan Police of the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the bill be dispensed with and that the bill be open to points of order or amendment at any place.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object, for the purpose of propounding a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. If this request is granted, Mr. Chairman, can a point of order be made at any time to the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. If the unanimous-consent request propounded by the gentleman from Kentucky is granted, all points of order will be disposed of before amendments are considered. Points of order will not be received after amendments are considered.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. So that a point of order must be made immediately after the granting of the request?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language beginning on page 8, concerning all appropriations for public schools, on the general ground that there is no authorization. To be more specific, I mean the following:

The public schools in the District of Columbia are segregated schools. Nowhere in the law is there any authorization for appropriations for general administration, supervision, operation of, and instruction in segregated schools. Since this section of the bill makes appropriations for segregated schools, and since there is no authorization in the law for segregated schools, I submit that this is an appropriation without authorization and these appropriations for segregated schools are not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I cannot find anything in this bill which provides that segregation must be practiced in the District of Columbia. As a matter of fact, I look on that as an administrative matter which is handled by the superintendent of schools in the District of Columbia.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Any such provision as the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] is contending for would be legislation on an appropriation bill and would be out of order.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. Therefore, the point of order made by the gentleman from New York is not well taken.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BATES] concluded his statement?

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. I have, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have read every word of this bill, and there is not a word in the bill which even refers to segregation.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. KEOGH). The Chair is ready to rule. It is the opinion of the Chair that the appropriations provided in this section of the bill are appropriations which are authorized by law; and since, in the language of the bill before us, there is no reference to the basis upon which the gentleman from New York has predicated his point of order, the Chair, therefore, overrules the point of order.

Are there further points of order? Are there amendments to any paragraph of the bill?

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SASSCER: On page 16, line 14, strike out lines 14, 15, 16, and 17.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment that has been offered from time to time through the sessions of the Congress and which has been adopted from time to time and has been rejected from time to time. The language in the appropriation bill to which the amendment is directed nullifies statutory law. There is on our statute books, following action by the Congress, a law providing that a child who lives beyond the borders of the District of Columbia whose parent is employed in the District is permitted to attend schools in the District of Columbia. That is the law. Now the appropriation bill comes along and attempts to nullify that law by providing in substance—I do not have the act before me—that no part of these funds shall be used for the education of children who do not reside in the District of Columbia. We may approach it from two angles. First, as a matter of fairness, great sums of Federal money are appropriated for the District of Columbia for its current expenses. As one of the considerations for that appropriation nonresident children of parents who are employed by the Federal and District Government have been permitted to attend District of Columbia schools. From another angle we may consider that as long as that is the law in the District of Columbia and so long as that is a positive action which has been taken by the Congress, would it not be the proper procedure to nullify that previous legislative action of the Congress by a legislative bill rather than each year coming up with nullifying provisions which, in reality, is legislation on an appropriation bill?

Mr. Chairman, I earnestly urge that the amendment be adopted.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I dislike very much to disagree with my good friend from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER]. But we have found in our hearings that many of these people living in Maryland and working in the District of Columbia actually claim to be residents of the District when their children want to go to school; but when it comes to the matter of paying the District income tax, then they are not residents. If they are residents for one purpose, they ought to be residents for all purposes. The District is having a difficult time making both ends meet.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment is not adopted.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. SASSCER. If there are persons evading the District income-tax law, the better procedure would be by enforcement of that law, rather than nullification of an existing law permitting these children to go to school.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. I do not think it would be right for people from Kentucky or Maryland or Virginia or Iowa or any place else to attend the schools of the District of Columbia without paying their share of the expense.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is an old battle. We had it in this House for many years. The District of Columbia lives off the Federal pay roll. Many of those people have to live outside the District of Columbia because they cannot find a place to live in the District of Columbia. Many Army people are forced to live outside the District. Many Members of this Congress live outside the District of Columbia.

Why should their children be deprived of the privilege of going to school in the District of Columbia, which as a whole is largely supported by the Federal Government.

I hope the gentleman's amendment will be adopted. I have no children to send to school. I have only one child and she is grown. I have lived within the District of Columbia ever since I have been a Member of Congress, except what time I have been at home in Mississippi.

However, I think it would be a terrible mistake not to pass an amendment of this kind, because you will drive from the public schools of the District of Columbia probably hundreds of thousands of children whose parents are working in the District of Columbia and whose income and whose property is taxed to keep up the District.

I sincerely trust that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER] will be adopted.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. As the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has said, this is a very old subject. Up until 2 years ago, people from the surrounding areas, in certain instances, were permitted to attend the public schools of the District of Columbia. There was and there is a very sound reason for that. Let us take Virginia, for instance, with which I am quite familiar. Let us take Arlington County as an example. The population of that county since the last World War has increased threefold. It has increased because people came to Washington on Government business. They did not come here because they wanted to live in Washington or because they wanted to live in Virginia. They came here because they were Government employees, and not finding suitable places in the District of Columbia in which to live, they moved into Virginia and Maryland. Naturally, few of them pay any taxes to amount to anything in either of those States, but they are here because the Government needs them here. That has always been recognized by this Congress until about 2 or 3 years ago when this limitation upon an appropriation bill was put into effect.

For instance, in my district there is Fort Myer, a purely Government institution, Army officers, Army sergeants, Army privates, whose children have to go to school. If you do not let them go to school in Washington they go off of the Government reservation into the schools in Arlington County, which are terribly overcrowded already, and the State of Virginia is placed under the obligation of educating those children who come off of a Government reservation. The same thing applies to Fort Belvoir, which is 9 miles farther down the road, where there are many thousands of soldiers. They have children, and they go to the public schools over there.

It is not just and it is not right. I assume from my offhand knowledge, judging from those who I know live in Virginia, I would say at least 25 Members of Congress live in Virginia. Will any one of you Members who happen to live in Virginia tell me why the State of Virginia should educate the children of a Member of Congress, who comes to Washington on official business and has no connection with Virginia, other than the fact that he likes the atmosphere, and we like to have him live there; and if we have to educate their children, we are willing to do it. Why should we have to do it? It is a matter that ought to be left as it always has been left for the many, many years that this situation has existed, and I hope the Committee will support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. YATES. I am very much aware of the situation in Virginia and Maryland, and I would not want my remarks to be interpreted in any respect to indicate any opposition on the part of the committee toward free public education, nevertheless, as a member of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, I became very much aware of the overcrowded condition of the schools within the District, and it strikes me that here we have two bad conditions: We have an overcrowded condition in the surrounding States and we have an overcrowded condition in the District of Columbia. Students who are residents of surrounding States are now permitted to attend schools within the District of Columbia by paying a proportionate share of the

cost of their tuition. As a matter of fact, I am told that as much as $200,000 was collected by the District for the last year in order to offset the necessary costs of having to take care of these students.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I get the gentleman's point. I cannot yield further.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I wish to reply to the gentleman's remarks. The gentleman says the schools of this District are overcrowded. He does not know anything about overcrowded schools. Come over to Arlington and Alexandria where our population has increased 3 to 1 during the war, and you will find out something about overcrowded schools.

Yes; those children can come over here if their father happens to be a Congressman living in Virginia here on Government business, he can send his children to the Washington schools if he pays tuition for them.

I believe Virginia should not have to pay that tuition to the District nor should the individual have to pay it; I think it is an inherent part of this whole picture of the Federal Government here and I think it ought to come out of District revenue.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The schooling of these children of Army people and others who work for the Government and who have to live outside of the District of Columbia, should be taken into consideration when we pass the enormous appropriations for the District of Columbia out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. And do not forget—I failed to mention it—that we now have the Navy Department over on the Virginia side. We have the War Department on the Virginia side. If they are going to put more of the Federal Government over on the Virginia side and give us all these kids to educate—and we want to do all we can for them—the Federal Government should help us bear part of the expense. If they are going to put this additional burden on us let them give Virginia an appropriation for that purpose as they do the District of Columbia, let them give the State of Maryland an appropriation as they do the District of Columbia to help pay for these things. We will go along with it.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. SASSCER. I may say to the gentleman that in some of these suburban schools bordering upon the District there are two and three shifts, whereas I understand that due to the shifting of population from the city out into the suburbs there are some schools in the District that are not running to capacity.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I think that is true.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Chairman, the authority and responsibility of the District of Columbia to educate children whose parents are employed officially or otherwise in the District is found in the District of Columbia Code. District of Columbia Code, 1940 edition, title 31, section 301, page 863, provides:

All pupils whose parents are employed officially or otherwise in the District of Columbia shall be admitted and taught free of charge in the schools of said District. (Mar. 3, 1915, 38 Stat. 910, ch. 80, S. 1.)

The authority to teach the children of the military free in the schools of the District of Columbia even though they are not residents of the District is provided in sections 304 and 305 of title 31 of the Code and may be found on the same page as the above. Those provisions, however, originated in different acts, namely, the acts of March 28, 1918, fortieth statute, section 470, and May 10, 1926, forty-fourth statute, section 433.

We find that this law was actually tested in the District of Columbia courts in the case of *Ballou* v. *Kemp* (68 App. D. C. 7, 92 Fed. (2d) 556), which holds that the statute is mandatory and clear and that the duty of the Superintendent of Schools to admit the pupil in that case was purely ministerial and that mandamus is the proper remedy to compel such action. The court held that, the section being mandatory, it was the duty of the superintendent to admit the pupil even though hardship would come about due to insufficient funds to take care of resident pupils.

The District of Columbia is a small area of 70 square miles. It is almost impossible for all the people employed by the Government to live in the District and some of them must live out in Maryland and in Virginia. We are very glad to have them, of course, but we do think they should have the right to enjoy the privileges of the District schools. I hope this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SASSCER) there were—yeas 29, noes 38.

Mr. SASSCER and Mr. RANKIN demanded tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in the discussion which we have just had with respect to the point of order on the appropriation for public schools in the District of Columbia, we would be unfair to the issue if we missed the main point.

The main point is, whether this bill says so or not and whether a point of order will have been sustained or not, that it is a fact that in the Nation's Capital public schools are under segregation, and we are asked to appropriate $23,018,838 for segregated schools. It is a fact, too, that we are asked to appropriate $1,253,878 for a Recreation Department in the District, and, as I understand it, recreation facilities are segregated, too.

We in the Congress of the United States either mean what we say or we do not. The Congress of the United States must stand fast for the whole principle of equal rights for all and equal opportunities for all to enjoy the facilities of the District and the facilities of the Nation.

We cannot in one breath say we believe in all the fine principles and in the other legislate, and appropriate money with exactly the contrary effect.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a question of the custom of a particular locality. There have been many arguments. I know, on that issue, but that is not the issue which is presented here. This is a question of what the Congress shall do in the locality under its direct administration—whether in the very center and heart of our Nation which all the world sees, where our deeds should match our words, where our protestations should not be empty, where our Constitution should be unqualified and in full force and effect—we shall or shall not obey, not alone that Constitution, but the very dictates of the religious teachings of the great faiths.

I think the issue is a very profound one. It is possibly too much to expect that the issue can be settled in connection with this appropriation; but I think it would be a disservice to the country if the issue of segregation of facilities that has been raised here today by my colleague from Ohio and by other Members is not clearly brought out and laid upon the table so that there will soon come a time when we will fairly and courageously settle the issue as it affects this, the showcase of the Nation, the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POWELL: Page 2, line 10, after the colon, insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this bill shall be used for any of the purposes therein mentioned by any agency, office, or department of the District of Columbia which segregates the citizens of the District of Columbia in employment, facilities afforded, services performed, accommodations furnished, instructions or aid granted, on account of the race, color, creed, or place of national origin of the citizens of the District of Columbia."

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. POWELL. May I be heard, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. POWELL. This proposed amendment does not legislate. It proposes negative limitations which are in accord with parliamentary usage in appropriation bills. It has been ruled in order in past Congresses, the Seventy-ninth and the Eightieth, to be exact. It does not legislate. It proposes negative limitations only.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard.

Mr. Chairman, I submit the amendment is in order. We had the same question before this House, I believe, 2 years ago in the Seventy-ninth Congress. I believe it was the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] who was in the chair. I refer the Chair to his decision. This type of an amendment is offered time and time again to appropriation bills. It limits the scope of the appropriation. It limits the use of the funds appropriated. It does not set up any additional duties. It does not legislate any new legislation. It is definitely a negative legislation. It does not violate the Holman rule.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard if the gentleman from New York is through.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman from New York concluded?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. The ruling of the Chair a while ago on the point of order raised by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] was correct. This amendment would simply destroy the schools of the District of Columbia, and certainly an amendment to destroy the public schools of this great city and its suburbs is legislation on an appropriation bill and not in order on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] offered an amendment which reads:

> Amendment directed to page 2, line 10, of the bill, which reads as follows: "*Provided*, that no part of any appropriation contained in this bill shall be used for any of the purposes therein mentioned by any agency, office, or department of the District of Columbia which segregates the citizens of the District of Columbia in employment, facilities afforded; services performed, accommodations furnished, instructions or aid granted, on account of race, color, creed, or place of national origin of the citizens of the District of Columbia."

To this amendment a point of order was made on the ground that it proposed legislation on an appropriation bill. The attention of the Chair has been called to the fact that on April 5, 1946, during the consideration of a bill making appropriations for the District of Columbia a somewhat, and, in fact, similar amendment was offered. The then Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, after hearing those who desired to be heard on the point of order, ruled that the wording of the amendment, reading as the Chair has read it, does not raise an issue concerning the well-known Holman rule of the House, and after serious consideration the Chair stated then that the amendment was a proper limitation of the appropriations provided in the bill and overruled the point of order.

Therefore, the Chair overrules the point of order and recognizes the gentleman from New York for 5 minutes.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, this is the first time this Congress has had an opportunity to discuss and go on record as regards the campaign promise which was made to the people of this Nation during the month of October leading up to the Presidential election, the campaign promise which was made by both sides of the aisle, by all of the parties that had candidates in the Presidential campaign, the campaign promise which has boiled down to two words, "civil rights."

The gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS], who preceded me, made a very fine statement concerning this situation in our Capital and I should like to amplify it. May I say first to all of my colleagues that this amendment does not strike at your States' rights theory. This amendment does not tell you how your particular town, or village, or county, or State shall treat its citizens. This is an amendment which is aimed at the Capital of the United States of America, a place where the best of our American life should be on exhibition, not the worst, where our best attitudes, our best laws, our best practices should be on exhibition.

There is not a gentleman here who does not realize that in your particular town, village, and State they are trying to make progress toward a more democratic concept of life. I am sure no one is going to stand and say that is not true. Now, here in our Capital we have an opportunity to raise up what should be an ideal for all of our Nation to struggle toward. Here in this Capital loyal citizens of the United States are forbidden not by law but by practice, practice condoned by the Congress of the United States, to enjoy equal facilities as regards education, employment, accommodations, recreation, and health—not by law but by practice, and that practice has been condoned by us of this Congress. The passing of legislation appropriating Federal money to a segregated system is not holding up the best of our American life.

Here it is before you. Here is our first test. Many of you did not talk about civil rights during the campaign because you oppose them, but our President openly campaigned on the platform of civil rights. So did the other Presidential candidates. Here now is the opportunity before the eyes of our Nation to stand up and be counted, to let America know whether we campaigned on the basis of hypocrisy or on the basis of sincerity and honesty.

This issue does not need to be explained any more. We are fully aware of it. It is the No. 1 problem of our Nation; it is the No. 1 problem of the world. The world is judging America on the basis of its practices, not just its lip service, its practices. Here is an opportunity to let the world know that what our Presidential candidates stand up and loftily proclaim during an election campaign is not a sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal but is really words that come from their hearts and from their minds. Here is an opportunity for us to stand up and be counted. I ask for your support of this amendment.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I believe in everybody being treated alike, especially the people in America. I am deeply interested in that because I think we want to treat the Americans to everything that the American people might want to enjoy, as long as we can afford to do it. But when I think of what we are doing now to try to take care of all the people in all the world, I wonder whether we are treating the American people right, both whites and blacks and any other color that we might have, or any other nationality that might be living here, all Americans. When I think that we are asking that this appropriation be cut down millions in order that we might have money enough to send billions to foreign countries, I wonder whether we are doing the right thing. I feel certain we are not.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I cannot yield to the gentleman right now. I want to get this across, because this is very important. You will be called on to vote on billions of dollars for these foreign countries and I want you all to think of what you are doing before you do it. You are being asked here to cut down on the appropriation for the District of Columbia. Well, who wants to cut down on an appropriation any more than I do, where it is necessary? But I am more anxious in cutting down the appropriations for all these foreign countries, especially where some of these people in high government position from the foreign countries come here and say that their countries are getting in good shape.

Let me show you what they are talking about giving away:

To Great Britain	$940,000,000
To France	875,000,000
To Italy	550,000,000
The British and United States German zones	404,000,000
The French-German zone	155,000,000
To Holland	355,000,000
To Luxembourg	200,000,000
To Austria	197,000,000
To Portugal	105,000,000
To Greece	170,000,000
To Denmark	109,000,000

And that goes on and on for millions and millions of dollars and yet we cannot give $100,000,000 to the District of Columbia, the Capital City of the United States of America. Does that not seem kind of bad when we are putting the screws on the District of Columbia and yet leaving the doors wide open for these foreign countries? I tell you to stop, look, and listen.

The other day I had something to say about the agencies of the Government that lend money. I said that we had 29 agencies of Government lending money. I made a big mistake. I have made a good many mistakes in my life. I made one here not too many hours ago. But the fellow who has never made a mistake never has done anything. When I said 29 agencies in the Government are lending money, let me show you what kind of a mistake I made. There are 42 agencies of the Government lending money to everybody who wants to come to this great Government of ours with his hand out. This should be stopped.

Mr. Chairman, I asked the Library of Congress to give me a list of those agencies that lend money. Here is the list that they have compiled of Government corporations lending money:

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT AGENCIES HAVING LOANS RECEIVABLE AS OF JUNE 30, 1947

GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

Banks for cooperatives.
Commodity Credit Corporation.
Export-Import Bank of Washington.
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.
Federal Home Loan Banks.
Federal Intermediate Credit Banks.
Federal Public Housing Authority.
Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.
Home Owners' Loan Corporation (in liquidation).
Production Credit Corporation.
Reconstruction Finance Corporation.
Tennessee Valley Authority.
Others:
Defense Homes Corporation.
Department of State Inter-American Corporations.
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.
Federal National Mortgage Association.
Federal Prison Industries, Inc.
Inland Waterways Corporation.
Panama Railroad Company.
R. F. C. Mortgage Company.
Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C.
Smaller War Plants Corporation.
United States Commercial Company.
United States Spruce Production Corporation.
Virgin Islands Company.
War Damage Corporation.
Warrior River Terminal Company, Inc.
Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc.

BUSINESS-TYPE ACTIVITIES

Farmers Home Administration.
Federal Housing Administration.
Federal Works Agency.
Rural Electrification Administration.
United States Maritime Commission functions.
War Shipping Administration functions.
Others:
Agricultural Marketing Act revolving funds.
Federal Public Housing Authority—homes conversion program, Farm Security Administration program, public war housing program, and veterans' reuse housing program.
Federal Security Agency loans to students.
Indian loans.
Navy Department, guaranteed loans (World War II) and sale of surplus supplies (World War I).
Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration.
Treasury Department, miscellaneous loans.
War Department, guaranteed loans (World War II).
Veterans' Canteen Service.

Twenty-nine Government corporations and fifteen business-type activities are listed in the latest available annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury. Some of the agencies listed had very small loans receivable and others were in the process of liquidation.

Source: Secretary of the Treasury, Annual Report on the State of the Finances for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947, Eightieth Congress, second session, House Document No. 447, pages 464–467.

Mr. Chairman, what I am trying to put across here is that if we are going to cut down on the District of Columbia $4,000,000, then it is all right with me, because while they may want to squander a few dollars, I want to save every dollar that I can for the American taxpayers. I know that the Members on my side of the aisle are trying to save every cent they can for the Federal Treasury, because last year the Eightieth Congress—look what the Eightieth Congress did—that good Congress—cut $8,400,000,000 from the national debt. The year before we cut off about $1,000,000,000. I take my hat off to the Republicans for doing that. But what are you doing now? Wait until we get through with this Eighty-first Congress, and you will find out how much money you are spending here. You will go in the red—real red. You Members are going to have to account for that to your people back home. They are going to say, "Oh, you Democrats of the Eighty-first Congress, keep your eye on the indicator, because you are going in the red so far that you will not know how to ever get out."

You are swamping this country of ours. You will be a squandering, spending, reckless Congress, especially if you put the President's program on the books. His program, to me, is suicide for American freedom, American liberty. You are getting a taste of his driving power for his unsound program at a time when our finances will not permit. He would and will wreck us if he keeps on—that is, if you help him. So I say to you stop, look, and listen.

Mr. POWELL. Does the gentleman realize that if segregation is abolished $10,000,000 will be saved in the District of Columbia?

Mr. RICH. That will be fine. I want to save wherever we can.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this Powell amendment.

It is nothing in God's world but a communistic effort to stir up race trouble in the District of Columbia. I hope the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is listening. He joined in this fight against segregation in the District of Columbia a while ago, which is a communistic program for stirring up race trouble here and throughout the country.

The supporters of this amendment are simply making war on the white people of the District of Columbia. If you mention the word "Jew" in this House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] hits the ceiling and howls to high heaven. Yet he is joining here in making war on the white gentiles of the District of Columbia when he knows it will do the Negroes infinitely more harm than good to stir up race trouble by forcing them into the white schools of Washington.

In my opinion, the advocates of this crazy proposition do not give a tinker's dam about the welfare of the average Negro, here or elsewhere. If they did, they would not be trying to stir race trouble throughout the Nation in this way.

The statement made here that President Harry Truman was in favor of wiping out segregation in the public schools of the District of Columbia is ridiculous. I do not believe a word of it. The people of his State have the same system of race segregation in the public schools they have here and throughout all the Southern States, as well as the border States.

He never favored forcing Negroes into the white schools of Washington when he was a Member of the Senate; and I do not believe he favors it now.

He knows, and we know, that instead of doing good, and promoting race harmony, it would do infinite harm, bring about race riots, and probably mob violence, if it did not result in destroying the public school system of the District.

Oh, I know the Communists throughout the country will applaud with delight if this amendment is adopted. Even Joe Stalin will no doubt chuckle at the progress communism is making in America in stirring up race trouble in the Nation's Capital.

If you are going to adopt this amendment, you might as well kill the public schools in the District of Columbia and be done with it.

I appeal to every white, patriotic American in this House to vote this vicious amendment down.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the issue raised by the Powell amendment is an issue that should have been resolved by this Congress many years ago. The reason we have this undemocratic situation in the District of Columbia is simply because the Congress has failed to discharge its responsibility to the American people.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] must take his share of that responsibility. He has been one of those who has consistently used every parliamentary device at his command to thwart what has definitely been established in the last elections to be the will of a majority of the American people. The civil-rights issue was an issue in the last campaign, and the people spoke on that issue. I can safely say that a majority of the Members of the Congress campaigned in favor of civil rights.

The Powell amendment now will determine whether or not a majority of the Members of the Eighty-first Congress meant what they said last October. If we vote down the Powell amendment, then what was said last October was merely campaign oratory and never intended to be effected. The issue here is twofold. First is the issue of the sincerity of this Congress on the question of civil rights; and, second, the basic issue of democracy. There can be no democracy as long as there is discrimination. There can be no democracy as long as there is segregation. There can be no

democracy as long as equality in education is denied, as long as equality in facilities is denied, as long as equality in employment is denied. There can be no democracy, particularly when that denial is based on race, color, or creed.

We have had this debate time and time again. It is not a debate from which conscientious Members of the House should shrink. It is an issue which every Member of this House should meet, particularly in the light of the people's decision on this issue in the last elections.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi talks about race riots. Race riots are not caused by democracy; the conditions that cause race riots are cured by an application of democracy. This amendment would apply democracy in the Capital of these United States. The District of Columbia is not Tupelo, Miss; the District of Columbia is the Capital of all of the people of the United States.

Are we asking too much in the year 1949, following the election of 1948, when the people spoke out in favor of civil rights, to ask that now we carry out the mandate of the people and bring democracy, the benefits of democracy, to the Negro population of the District of Columbia? I say we are not asking too much; I say our request is an elemental one, and it is in keeping with decency. In the name of decency I hope that the majority of the Members of this House, and particularly those who declared for civil rights in the last campaign, will stand up and remove for all time segregation and discrimination in the Capital of the United States.

The Republicans in the Eightieth Congress failed on their promises for civil rights. The issue is here again before you. Let us see what the Democrats of the Eighty-first Congress will do.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, at the last Democratic National Convention it was my privilege, along with Mr. HUBERT HUMPHREY, now Senator from Minnesota, and Mrs. Esther Murray, of California, to propose the plank on civil rights which was adopted by that convention. As long as I have been in politics I have always believed that people who adopt platforms should live up to them in their political life and in their political action. I agree with the sentiments that have been previously expressed here today that this is the first test as to whether or not we mean business when we write political platforms, campaign on those platforms, and are elected on them.

The same thing is true of the Members on the Republican side of the House; their platform also carried a civil-rights plank, not as strong a plank as the Democratic one, but a clear-cut statement of intention. President Truman and Governor Dewey both spoke in favor of civil rights during the campaign and spoke in no uncertain terms.

I think it has long been a disgrace to our country that our National Capital has followed segregation, a principle that is not among the mores or customs of most of the United States. This is the capital of all the people of the United States; it is the place that foreign nations particularly look to as the symbol of America. If we Americans mean what we have always said we believed, that men are created free and equal, then certainly in our Capital City we should have the intelligence and the foresight to establish true liberty for all people in Washington.

I am for the Powell amendment to ban segregation in Washington because, I repeat, I think that all it does is to establish in the National Capital the customs and mores that prevail throughout the greater part of our Nation. I do not believe the Declaration of Independence was ever intended to say that all white men are created free and equal; it states, "All men are created free and equal." From the time I was a little child at my mother's knee I have been taught that fact, and I believe it sincerely, and I think that is what all of us should believe in.

As for this ridiculous idea that nonsegregated schools start race riots, may I testify I have not seen race riots in the schools that I have attended. Every school that I have attended from grammar school through high school, through college, has had Negro students in it; there has been no difficulty between Negro and white students where they were in classes together and learned to respect each other as human beings. I generally find that when Negroes and whites come from areas where there has been no segregation in schools, both races understand each other better and have little difficulty getting along with each other.

As one who believes deeply in the Christian tradition—I believe in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man—I respect the dignity of human personality—I believe we are all equal in the eyes of God.

That means that if you show discrimination you are not living up to your religious principles. Discrimination and segregation are immoral and cannot be squared with the religion. So on both the ground of our religious principles and on the ground of our American political traditions I implore the Members of this House to vote for the Powell amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment do now close.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TACKETT) there were—ayes 94, noes 34.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 60, noes 96.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. BATES of Kentucky and Mr. POWELL.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 64, noes 106.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3082) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TABER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

THE LATE JOHN T. WOODRUFF

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to one of Missouri's greatest citizens, Mr. John T. Woodruff, of Springfield, Mo. He was one of the outstanding lawyers of that section of

the country. A man who for years represented the Frisco Railroad. He was a promoter. A man who took great interest in civic affairs. The man who did more for Springfield, Mo., and the Ozark region in general, than any other one man during or prior to his time. Mr. Woodruff constructed the building in Springfield that bears his name. He was responsible for the building of the Frisco shops at Springfield. He promoted the Frisco Office Building and the Kentwood Arms Hotel and every forward movement in Springfield had his untiring support. When he passed away, the Ozark region lost one of the greatest and most valuable men it has ever produced. No doubt his immediate relatives will place an appropriate marker at his grave. But he has erected monuments in Springfield and throughout the Ozark region that will continue through many years to bear testimony to the public-spirited service he rendered to his community, his city, and his State.

I include the following editorial from the Springfield (Mo.) Leader and Press as a part of my remarks:

Springfield today is a city in which its inhabitants, new and old, take pride, and with reason. Modern development of a crossroads village, it is therefore still a transportation center, operating center of the Frisco Railroad, a trade and tourist center on transcontinental highway 66, and with modern airport facilities; a city of modern office buildings, fine hotels, an excellent State college, an attractive country club, two large government institutions.

The thousands of new Springfieldians who have swelled the city's population in the past decade share the civic satisfaction in all these things and many more. But they never can realize, as the older residents cannot fail to realize, how all of these things were so largely the result of one man's efforts, one man's vision and energy.

That man was John T. Woodruff, who, lying dead today, will be brought back home to Springfield for burial later this week. Though he had not lived here for the past several years, Springfield was where his heart was.

And if ever any city needed anything, Springfield today still needs his soul to go marching on. Mr. Woodruff always could see about 20 years ahead of anyone else, and Springfield desperately needs that sort of vision now. But so far as we can observe, there is no one to take Mr. Woodruff's place as our civic seer and prophet. Yet he was not only a prophet. He was an evangelist, too; and with a tireless combination of exhortation, energy, and incredible industry, he made his visions come true. Nobody ever worked harder, as if by the very force of his own spirit he made his visions come true. They didn't come true by themselves. Mr. Woodruff was a great believer, he had great faith; he trusted his faith, and supported it with works.

But other men have had vision, too, and believed in it, and then have been discouraged and defeated by opposition and indifference. The unique thing about Mr. Woodruff was that nothing ever defeated him. He could lose and fail and be beaten down over and over, and he always came back with his faith just as shining as ever, just as optimistic, just as confident. He would seem defeated, but he never seemed to know it; so in the end, he never was.

Perhaps the one quality that distinguished him most from other men was that marvelous ebullience, that amazing ability to come back and come back and come back undiscouraged, and to keep faith and good spirit in spite of all punishment, no matter how repeated. And that was a quality of greatness. His interest wasn't confined to Springfield, nor was his vision. They took in the whole Ozarks, in a tremendous way; he foresaw and worked toward a regional development that included all sorts of industries: tourist and sports industries, agricultural and mechanical industries, and especially dams and power. Dams were, if anything, his special hobby, along with roads and resorts and anything else that would promote the country he loved so wholeheartedly.

He had retired of late years, because of age and frailty; now he is gone. "A failure," we heard someone say. A failure? Because he didn't make a million dollars for himself? This man who did more single-handed than a hundred others together to build Springfield and promote the Ozarks?

Oh, no. Personal acquisitiveness is not the measure of a man's success—at least, not after he's dead, it isn't. Mr. Woodruff did for his city and his region what he didn't do for himself—he helped to make it rich. His success could no more be measured in dollars than would Doctor McClung's or Doctor Riepma's or Doctor Meador's.

His success was in service, in giving, and he won it by sacrificing his own chance for a personal fortune. He could see, through and beyond the trees, the whole forest. He could see, through and beyond the present, the whole future. He could see, beyond the immediate pennies, vast wealth and growth and prosperity, comfort and good life for thousands, and passionately he devoted himself to working toward that, beyond any simply personal ambition. Mr. Woodruff's success wasn't concentrated in $1,000,000. It was diffused to add to the well-being and the progress of others—thousands of others—you and me and our children to come.

He had the vision of a better world and the faith to believe he could help make it come true. And he did.

FISHERIES OF THE GULF COAST

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 124, Rept. No. 200), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2363) granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) to the Gulf coast and creating the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and the amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. DELANEY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 107, Rept. No. 201), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction: For the purpose of making such investigations the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND CHEMICAL FOOD SUBSTITUTES AND FERTILIZERS

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I trust that nothing I shall say this afternoon may be construed as indicating any attitude on my part in opposition to the continuation of scientific research and the utilization in the public interest whenever the results of that research disclose the utilization of the products of research for the use and benefit of humanity. There are some things that are occurring in your country and mine today, however, that I believe should be called not only to the attention of the Congress but to the attention of the American people. Only too often do we read in the newspaper headlines, as one which appeared recently, "AMA ascribes four deaths to lithium salt substitutes."

I understand seven people have to date lost their lives with the use of salt substitutes which have been manufactured by certain manufacturers in order to meet a demand on the part of certain people afflicted with certain diseases who cannot use organic salt in their diet. Yet manufacturers and pharmaceutical houses and some druggists are using substitutes without adequate research having been made to determine whether or not the use of those substitutes is deleterious to human life. The whole field is an enormous one. My attention has recently been directed to some research that is being carried on in one of the great research institutions of the country where their scientific men have been asked to pass upon the character of certain insecticides that are being used indiscriminately to kill insects throughout the country. Manufacturers wanted the seal of approval on their product and they wanted to know, as a result of scientific research: "Does this insecticide do what we claim it will do in the killing of insect pests?"

As a collateral matter in connection with that research, one of the great scientists I happen to know found a very interesting subject of research, namely: "What is the toxic residue left on food products as the result of the indiscriminate use of certain insecticides?" He has disclosed that in certain areas, in the use of certain insecticides which are not subject to control by the Government, residuals are left on the product which find their way into the food and he

has very clearly demonstrated the deleterious effect upon children. He has shown the effects on the food in prepared baby foods. This has opened up a tremendous field of research to determine whether or not people's avarice to make a profit out of the sale of insecticides is in reality giving to the public a product that may be deleterious to human beings.

It has also been called to my attention as a result of some research in this field that the researchers are now being led into the field of fertilizers which are being sold to the farmers of this Nation indiscriminately throughout the country. Only one State in the Union, as I understand it, South Carolina, has a law that requires the manufacturers of fertilizer to tell the farmers of the Nation what is in the bag that the farmers buy. Yet recent experiments have disclosed that in the continued use of fertilizer containing a large proportion of solid nitrogen content, plant diseases have been discovered to be growing boundlessly, especially in the tobacco-raising industry; and recent research has disclosed that in the use of such fertilizer, residuals are found again in the food grown as the result of such use. Many people in the scientific field are of the belief that the development of arteriosclerosis and other physical afflictions that are affecting human beings may have its origin and contributory effects to be found in the result of the use of fertilizer containing a tremendously overpercentage supply of cheap soluble nitrogen products.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. BURDICK. I am very much interested in the gentleman's remarks. He is always interesting. However, on the question of fertilizer that is being sold to the people raising tobacco all over this country, demonstrations have proven that the gentleman is right, and that the great disease of blue mold has increased boundlessly during the last 7 or 8 years. The reason has been found to be that they have not used enough animal products in the fertilizer, and too much of the solubles.

Mr. KEEFE. I think there is no question about that. I propose to discuss that question specifically before the House before long, in connection with a bill which I have introduced to bring that subject under control by legislation, to require as we do now in the woof and fabrics law that manufacturers of fertilizer shall indicate to the consumer and the public what their product may contain.

I am trying to bring to your attention the fact that the efforts of human beings all over the world down through the years to find substitutes for nature's product are developing some very serious residual consequences.

There are those who say that coal and coal tar and natural-gas derivatives will ultimately supplant the cow. Scientists are making butter in Germany out of the derivatives of petroleum and coal and natural gas. They claim they are able to synthetically produce milk that looks and tastes like milk and has all the appearance of regular cow's milk. So the results of that scientific investigation and the utilization of those chemical compounds in the diet of the American people is growing and growing and growing.

This afternoon I want to call your specific attention to a threat to the people who raise cottonseed and produce cottonseed oil; to those who produce peanut oil; to those who produce vegetable oils of any kind. I call your attention to the threat to the livestock industry; to the use of animal shortening and animal fats, lards; to those producers of poultry who produce eggs that are used in tremendous quantities in the baking business, and to those who are interested in the protection of the dairy industry in this country when they use hundreds of thousands of pounds of dried milk in the baking industry.

What am I talking about? Is it something we pull out of the air or is it something real, and is the threat real?

Hearings are now being conducted before the Committee on Agriculture with respect to the removal of the tax on oleomargarine. I am not going to discuss that question this afternoon. That will be discussed at great length before that question is solved, but the potentialities for substitution of chemicals to ultimately replace vegetable oils and fats in the human diet is going on right now before the Pure Food and Drug Administration.

The hearings have been conducted there for a long time; it is expected that they will be carried on for weeks or maybe months before they are concluded. What is the purpose of those hearings upon which the big chemical industries of this country are devoting so much of their money, their time, and of their scientific talent? Why are they conducting these hearings? They have gone on now for years, and intensely since the war have been going on for weeks down before the Pure Food and Drug Administration. What are they asking for? What are they trying to do? Have you kept yourself advised on that subject? Do the Members of Congress know what the potentialities are in the ultimate decision that may be made by the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency with respect to the hearings that are now going on? Do you know what the potential effect upon your southland in the use of cottonseed oil may be? Do you know what the effect may be upon the production of soybeans and soya oil? Do you know what the effect may be on the dairy industry? Do you know what it will be on the poultry industry? Do you have any idea what the ultimate effect may be upon human beings who may be forced ultimately to eat bakery products with chemical substitutes for nature's products therein?

Specifically, what is happening down before the Pure Food and Drug Administration is an effort to establish standards for bread and related products. That is a tremendous industry in America; bread is a staple item of diet to millions of people in America; bread has always been looked upon as the staff of life, and you can well recall as I can the magnificent bread that used to be baked in the American home. I remember how as a kid I loved it. We knew what such bread was made of because mother made it. What are they now proposing to do? They are proposing that the Pure Food and Drug Administration prescribe standards for bakery products, bread being the basic one, that will permit the use of a wide range of chemicals produced basically by three of the great chemical companies of this country that their own literature, which I have before me, says may ultimately supplant the necessity for the use in bakery products of shortening, of eggs, of powdered milk, and all of the things that now go to make a nutritious product.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. BURDICK. The fact is that they have wheat just about out of a loaf of bread. When wheat is $3 a bushel, bread is 14 cents. When wheat goes down $1.03, bread is 15 cents; and, inquiring why that was, they said there was not any wheat content in bread any more.

Mr. KEEFE. I may say to the gentleman that I am not going to stop the wheels of progress, or scientific invention, or achievement, but I am rather astounded to find that today, due to the competition that exists in the baking industry and the desire for profit that is uppermost in the minds of all of us and all of them who are in that industry, ways are constantly being achieved and devised by which they may be able to produce an article which appeals to the taste, appeals to the eye, and appeals to the sense of touch and smell of a prospective buyer but from which the nutritive values have largely been lost. Do you think I am talking about something that is not real? I have in my hand the advertising material that recently appeared in a bakers' magazine advertising one of these chemical products.

This is what the promoter says right out openly:

> We have proved beyond question that sales will go up if we will stop for a moment and consider the human side of this picture. By the human side we refer particularly to human nature and the eating habits of human beings, because, after all, we must deal with just plain humans and their desires in regard to food. We believe that every person—man, woman, or child—eats and drinks only that which appeals to the sense of taste, with little or no thought of nutritious value. So we emphasize again that higher quality bakery goods, in our opinion, are attained by balancing formulas to a point where they are not overburdened with rich substances which, in the end, tend to discourage and decrease consumption.

What they say in this article is that if you, Mr. Baker, will use these chemicals that we have discovered, which are the products of coal and petroleum principally, mostly the result of the work of the chemists of the I. G. Farben Co. in Germany, if you will use these chemicals as a substitute for lard, for shortening, for the yolks of eggs, for butter, for milk or milk products, you can produce an article that will appeal to the eye, that will appeal to the sense of smell, to the sense of taste, and to the sense of feel; you can keep this product so it feels fresh for weeks after you bake it, when the housewife comes in the store and feels of the loaf of bread to see whether it is soft or

not in order to determine whether it is fresh or stale. In other words, you can fool the American people into buying a product that has practically no nutritional value, and you can do it with impunity because, they say, the American people do not care anyway; all they are interested in is getting something cheap that looks all right, smells all right, and tastes all right.

What about the children who need the nutrition contained in the cereal products which you and I have known in the past?

I am going to insert as a part of these remarks some material that I have had assembled, giving the historical and accurate background of this whole situation and which points definitely to the threat that exists to our economy if we are going to proceed down the line of substitution for established products of nature in food and the continued debasement of our food supply.

When you buy an ice-cream cone today to give to your kid, do you know what is in that ice-cream cone? When you go to the store and buy a doughnut and you eat it for breakfast, do you know what is in it? If you buy a loaf of bread, do you know what is in it? When you give your kid an all-day sucker, do you know what is in it?

Oh, they say, there may be nothing injurious in it, but the nutritive values have been taken out and through the use of these new chemicals a much smoother ice cream can be developed that tastes wonderful, looks wonderful, and smells good, which they say is all the general public thinks about anyway.

Thank God the Pure Food and Drug Administration is on the job. I have had a number of letters back and forth with Dr. Dunbar, the head of that bureau, than whom there is no finer man in the public service; Dr. Dunbar is in charge of the scientists and the people who are conducting the necessary research.

Now here is the point. They are using these chemicals now. They are being used here and there now. They want to fix them as standards for use of the entire baking industry so that they can bake all their bakery products without the public being advised as to what is in them. You may think you are eating a nutritious piece of bread, and all you are eating is some ruffage to fill your stomach, or something that does not have any nutriment at all.

The scientists of this country have never yet been able to determine whether the inclusion of these chamicals in our diet is harmful or harmless. They cannot tell, because scientific research has not progressed to that point, and yet the fact is today that these very chemicals are being used by certain industries in this country when I am advised that scientifically it is impossible to say what the effect will be upon the human system if used for extended periods of time.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. The great trouble and the great tragedy about that is that the laboratory in which the test is being made as to the harmful effects of these synthetic, artificial products is in the stomach of a child or in the stomach and the physical make-up of a grown person, and by the time the experiment is completed, death may have ensued, just as happened with these people who were using this substitute for salt.

Mr. KEEFE. Why, I could go on and give illustration after illustration out of the experiences that have been demonstrated by the Pure Food and Drug Administration, and how deleterious many of these substances are, but it is difficult to keep up with it.

Now just listen to this. This is from Dr. Dunbar's letter. I want to quote a paragraph of that letter dated February 17, 1949:

> The actual composition of the chemicals used, both the derivatives of polyoxyethylene glycol and the mono- and di-glyceride concentrates—

That is a pretty heavy word. That is a $64 word. You, as the average citizen will know exactly what is in it, will you not? Continuing, he says:

> can be established without great difficulty. Whether these products are harmful in themselves and whether they may be deleterious ingredients in the amounts used in bread is much more difficult to establish. Where new chemicals are introduced into foods it often requires many years of tests to determine their effect upon the human organism. As you readily realize when there is a commercial demand there is a tendency on the part of the producers to take chances and begin the use of the product before adequate tests are completed.

That is exactly what these people did with these saline solutions that they put on the market as substitutes for salt, and at least seven people are dead tonight through the use of those substitutes.

I want to quote something more. Further quoting Mr. Dunbar's letter:

> This appears to have been the case in the present instance with respect to the polyoxythylene derivatives. They have been sold and used in bread for a period of 2 years, and so far our investigations have not established anything which would indicate that they have caused injury. We realize, of course, the weakness of this kind of evidence and we are continuing to trace out some leads to try to find whether they may show that some conditions which were ascribed to other causes should have been ascribed to the ingestion of this type of product. Since these products have been used in bread, a few investigators have used them for other purposes and have noted that one of them at least is quite reactive when injected into the blood of certain animals. Our scientists are following up this problem to determine if there is any basis for considering the products to be inherently dangerous.
>
> There are two other points in connection with the use of these products in bread which have given us great concern. One of these is the possibility that the softening effect derived from the use of these products may be used to deceive consumers into believing that such soft bread is fresh. We have circulated a questionnaire to a number of consumers in various parts of the United States trying to ascertain what they expect in bread.

There is the point, the possibility of deception on the American consumer, the same type of deception that is found in the oleo business. It is being applied in a manner that, in my opinion, is much more destructive, perhaps, in the ultimate to the dairy industry in this particular instance.

Let me call your attention to the fact that these people right in their advertising and in their literature about this stuff boast of the fact that they can do away with shortening, "eliminate all milk and other so-called bread improvers, reduce the shortening content at least 50 percent—reduce the shortening content 50 percent in all coffee cakes and all sweet yeast foods," and so on. "Egg yolks are preferred in all sweet yeast goods. It is our opinion that egg yolks should be reduced from 20 to 50 percent."

All the way through, in the entire baking industry, if they ultimately get their program over, you will have a substitute in the bakery goods for nature's products, a new synthetic chemical to take the place of animal and vegetable oils as shortening and take the place of milk and egg products in the bread industry.

What is that going to mean? Now let me tell you, these very products are now being used in bread, cake, doughnuts, cereal mixes, peanut butter, ice cream, candy, salad dressing, milk drinks, synthetic whipping cream, pickles, flavors, and many others. Two food-processing industries, baking and cereals, consume 1,350,000,000 pounds of lard and shortening annually. If the use of these chemical emulsifiers is approved by the Government, it is estimated that the consumption of animal fats and lards will be reduced by 500,000,000 pounds a year.

It is estimated that the bakery industry consumes upward of 225,000,000 pounds of powdered skim milk, which is equivalent to 1,800,000,000 pounds of fluid milk, and nearly 200,000 pounds of dried eggs, which is the equivalent of 167,000,000 dozen eggs annually. If the trade is to substitute these chemicals under Government authority and protection by setting forth these products as within the proper scope of the pure food and drug law in their definition of bakery products, then, can you not see the threat that exists not only to the producers of these animal and vegetable fats and oils and poultry, and can you not see the threat that exists to the consumers of this country, who are going to be placed in the position of having a great deception practiced upon them?

That is indeed a very, very important question which must be determined. It is just another indication of the problems facing the various segments of our economy. Are we at long last going to come to the point in this country when for each meal we can take a pill out of a small bottle as a result of scientific research by scientists who are producing that pill out of coal or petroleum or the byproducts of natural gas? What sort of race of people are we going to raise? Do these people who are foisting these products upon the people of the United States know what the effect upon the people is going to be? I have put together in the statement which will be part of these remarks the best information that I have been able to find with respect to the possibility of the reaction on human beings of the continued use of

has very clearly demonstrated the deleterious effect upon children. He has shown the effects on the food in prepared baby foods. This has opened up a tremendous field of research to determine whether or not people's avarice to make a profit out of the sale of insecticides is in reality giving to the public a product that may be deleterious to human beings.

It has also been called to my attention as a result of some research in this field that the researchers are now being led into the field of fertilizers which are being sold to the farmers of this Nation indiscriminately throughout the country. Only one State in the Union, as I understand it, South Carolina, has a law that requires the manufacturers of fertilizer to tell the farmers of the Nation what is in the bag that the farmers buy. Yet recent experiments have disclosed that in the continued use of fertilizer containing a large proportion of solid nitrogen content, plant diseases have been discovered to be growing boundlessly, especially in the tobacco-raising industry; and recent research has disclosed that in the use of such fertilizer, residuals are found again in the food grown as the result of such use. Many people in the scientific field are of the belief that the development of arteriosclerosis and other physical afflictions that are affecting human beings may have its origin and contributory effects to be found in the result of the use of fertilizer containing a tremendously overpercentage supply of cheap soluble nitrogen products.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. BURDICK. I am very much interested in the gentleman's remarks. He is always interesting. However, on the question of fertilizer that is being sold to the people raising tobacco all over this country, demonstrations have proven that the gentleman is right, and that the great disease of blue mold has increased boundlessly during the last 7 or 8 years. The reason has been found to be that they have not used enough animal products in the fertilizer, and too much of the solubles.

Mr. KEEFE. I think there is no question about that. I propose to discuss that question specifically before the House before long, in connection with a bill which I have introduced to bring that subject under control by legislation, to require as we do now in the woof and fabrics law that manufacturers of fertilizer shall indicate to the consumer and the public what their product may contain.

I am trying to bring to your attention the fact that the efforts of human beings all over the world down through the years to find substitutes for nature's product are developing some very serious residual consequences.

There are those who say that coal and coal tar and natural-gas derivatives will ultimately supplant the cow. Scientists are making butter in Germany out of the derivatives of petroleum and coal and natural gas. They claim they are able to synthetically produce milk that looks and tastes like milk and has all the appearance of regular cow's milk. So the results of that scientific investigation and the utilization of those chemical compounds in the diet of the American people is growing and growing and growing.

This afternoon I want to call your specific attention to a threat to the people who raise cottonseed and produce cottonseed oil; to those who produce peanut oil; to those who produce vegetable oils of any kind. I call your attention to the threat to the livestock industry; to the use of animal shortening and animal fats, lards; to those producers of poultry who produce eggs that are used in tremendous quantities in the baking business, and to those who are interested in the protection of the dairy industry in this country when they use hundreds of thousands of pounds of dried milk in the baking industry.

What am I talking about? Is it something we pull out of the air or is it something real, and is the threat real?

Hearings are now being conducted before the Committee on Agriculture with respect to the removal of the tax on oleomargarine. I am not going to discuss that question this afternoon. That will be discussed at great length before that question is solved, but the potentialities for substitution of chemicals to ultimately replace vegetable oils and fats in the human diet is going on right now before the Pure Food and Drug Administration.

The hearings have been conducted there for a long time; it is expected that they will be carried on for weeks or maybe months before they are concluded. What is the purpose of those hearings upon which the big chemical industries of this country are devoting so much of their money, their time, and of their scientific talent? Why are they conducting these hearings? They have gone on now for years, and intensely since the war have been going on for weeks down before the Pure Food and Drug Administration. What are they asking for? What are they trying to do? Have you kept yourself advised on that subject? Do the Members of Congress know what the potentialities are in the ultimate decision that may be made by the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency with respect to the hearings that are now going on? Do you know what the potential effect upon your southland in the use of cottonseed oil may be? Do you know what the effect may be upon the production of soybeans and soya oil? Do you know what the effect may be on the dairy industry? Do you know what it will be on the poultry industry? Do you have any idea what the ultimate effect may be upon human beings who may be forced ultimately to eat bakery products with chemical substitutes for nature's products therein?

Specifically, what is happening down before the Pure Food and Drug Administration is an effort to establish standards for bread and related products. That is a tremendous industry in America; bread is a staple item of diet to millions of people in America; bread has always been looked upon as the staff of life, and you can well recall as I can the magnificent bread that used to be baked in the American home. I remember how as a kid I loved it. We knew what such bread was made of because mother made it. What are they now proposing to do? They are proposing that the Pure Food and Drug Administration prescribe standards for bakery products, bread being the basic one, that will permit the use of a wide range of chemicals produced basically by three of the great chemical companies of this country that their own literature, which I have before me, says may ultimately supplant the necessity for the use in bakery products of shortening, of eggs, of powdered milk, and all of the things that now go to make a nutritious product.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. BURDICK. The fact is that they have wheat just about out of a loaf of bread. When wheat is $3 a bushel, bread is 14 cents. When wheat goes down $1.03, bread is 15 cents; and, inquiring why that was, they said there was not any wheat content in bread any more.

Mr. KEEFE. I may say to the gentleman that I am not going to stop the wheels of progress, or scientific invention, or achievement, but I am rather astounded to find that today, due to the competition that exists in the baking industry and the desire for profit that is uppermost in the minds of all of us and all of them who are in that industry, ways are constantly being achieved and devised by which they may be able to produce an article which appeals to the taste, appeals to the eye, and appeals to the sense of touch and smell of a prospective buyer but from which the nutritive values have largely been lost. Do you think I am talking about something that is not real? I have in my hand the advertising material that recently appeared in a bakers' magazine advertising one of these chemical products.

This is what the promoter says right out openly:

> We have proved beyond question that sales will go up if we will stop for a moment and consider the human side of this picture. By the human side we refer particularly to human nature and the eating habits of human beings, because, after all, we must deal with just plain humans and their desires in regard to food. We believe that every person—man, woman, or child—eats and drinks only that which appeals to the sense of taste, with little or no thought of nutritious value. So we emphasize again that higher quality bakery goods, in our opinion, are attained by balancing formulas to a point where they are not overburdened with rich substances which, in the end, tend to discourage and decrease consumption.

What they say in this article is that if you, Mr. Baker, will use these chemicals that we have discovered, which are the products of coal and petroleum principally, mostly the result of the work of the chemists of the I. G. Farben Co. in Germany, if you will use these chemicals as a substitute for lard, for shortening, for the yolks of eggs, for butter, for milk or milk products, you can produce an article that will appeal to the eye, that will appeal to the sense of smell, to the sense of taste, and to the sense of feel; you can keep this product so it feels fresh for weeks after you bake it, when the housewife comes in the store and feels of the loaf of bread to see whether it is soft or

not in order to determine whether it is fresh or stale. In other words, you can fool the American people into buying a product that has practically no nutritional value, and you can do it with impunity because, they say, the American people do not care anyway; all they are interested in is getting something cheap that looks all right, smells all right, and tastes all right.

What about the children who need the nutrition contained in the cereal products which you and I have known in the past?

I am going to insert as a part of these remarks some material that I have had assembled, giving the historical and accurate background of this whole situation and which points definitely to the threat that exists to our economy if we are going to proceed down the line of substitution for established products of nature in food and the continued debasement of our food supply.

When you buy an ice-cream cone today to give to your kid, do you know what is in that ice-cream cone? When you go to the store and buy a doughnut and you eat it for breakfast, do you know what is in it? If you buy a loaf of bread, do you know what is in it? When you give your kid an all-day sucker, do you know what is in it?

Oh, they say, there may be nothing injurious in it, but the nutritive values have been taken out and through the use of these new chemicals a much smoother ice cream can be developed that tastes wonderful, looks wonderful, and smells good, which they say is all the general public thinks about anyway.

Thank God the Pure Food and Drug Administration is on the job. I have had a number of letters back and forth with Dr. Dunbar, the head of that bureau, than whom there is no finer man in the public service; Dr. Dunbar is in charge of the scientists and the people who are conducting the necessary research.

Now here is the point. They are using these chemicals now. They are being used here and there now. They want to fix them as standards for use of the entire baking industry so that they can bake all their bakery products without the public being advised as to what is in them. You may think you are eating a nutritious piece of bread, and all you are eating is some ruffage to fill your stomach, or something that does not have any nutriment at all.

The scientists of this country have never yet been able to determine whether the inclusion of these chamicals in our diet is harmful or harmless. They cannot tell, because scientific research has not progressed to that point, and yet the fact is today that these very chemicals are being used by certain industries in this country when I am advised that scientifically it is impossble to say what the effect will be upon the human system if used for extended periods of time.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. The great trouble and the great tragedy about that is that the laboratory in which the test is being made as to the harmful effects of these synthetic, artificial products is in the stomach of a child or in the stomach and the physical make-up of a grown person, and by the time the experiment is completed, death may have ensued, just as happened with these people who were using this substitute for salt.

Mr. KEEFE. Why, I could go on and give illustration after illustration out of the experiences that have been demonstrated by the Pure Food and Drug Administration, and how deleterious many of these substances are, but it is difficult to keep up with it.

Now just listen to this. This is from Dr. Dunbar's letter. I want to quote a paragraph of that letter dated February 17, 1949:

> The actual composition of the chemicals used, both the derivatives of polyoxyethylene glycol and the mono- and di-glyceride concentrates—

That is a pretty heavy word. That is a $64 word. You, as the average citizen will know exactly what is in it, will you not? Continuing, he says:

> can be established without great difficulty. Whether these products are harmful in themselves and whether they may be deleterious ingredients in the amounts used in bread is much more difficult to establish. Where new chemicals are introduced into foods it often requires many years of tests to determine their effect upon the human organism. As you readily realize when there is a commercial demand there is a tendency on the part of the producers to take chances and begin the use of the product before adequate tests are completed.

That is exactly what these people did with these saline solutions that they put on the market as substitutes for salt, and at least seven people are dead tonight through the use of those substitutes.

I want to quote something more. Further quoting Mr. Dunbar's letter:

> This appears to have been the case in the present instance with respect to the polyoxythylene derivatives. They have been sold and used in bread for a period of 2 years, and so far our investigations have not established anything which would indicate that they have caused injury. We realize, of course, the weakness of this kind of evidence and we are continuing to trace out some leads to try to find whether they may show that some conditions which were ascribed to other causes should have been ascribed to the ingestion of this type of product. Since these products have been used in bread, a few investigators have used them for other purposes and have noted that one of them at least is quite reactive when injected into the blood of certain animals. Our scientists are following up this problem to determine if there is any basis for considering the products to be inherently dangerous.
>
> There are two other points in connection with the use of these products in bread which have given us great concern. One of these is the possibility that the softening effect derived from the use of these products may be used to deceive consumers into believing that such soft bread is fresh. We have circulated a questionnaire to a number of consumers in various parts of the United States trying to ascertain what they expect in bread.

There is the point, the possibility of deception on the American consumer, the same type of deception that is found in the oleo business. It is being applied in a manner that, in my opinion, is much more destructive, perhaps, in the ultimate to the dairy industry in this particular instance.

Let me call your attention to the fact that these people right in their advertising and in their literature about this stuff boast of the fact that they can do away with shortening, "eliminate all milk and other so-called bread improvers, reduce the shortening content at least 50 percent—reduce the shortening content 50 percent in all coffee cakes and all sweet yeast foods," and so on. "Egg yolks are preferred in all sweet yeast goods. It is our opinion that egg yolks should be reduced from 20 to 50 percent."

All the way through, in the entire baking industry, if they ultimately get their program over, you will have a substitute in the bakery goods for nature's products, a new synthetic chemical to take the place of animal and vegetable oils as shortening and take the place of milk and egg products in the bread industry.

What is that going to mean? Now let me tell you, these very products are now being used in bread, cake, doughnuts, cereal mixes, peanut butter, ice cream, candy, salad dressing, milk drinks, synthetic whipping cream, pickles, flavors, and many others. Two food-processing industries, baking and cereals, consume 1,350,000,000 pounds of lard and shortening annually. If the use of these chemical emulsifiers is approved by the Government, it is estimated that the consumption of animal fats and lards will be reduced by 500,000,000 pounds a year.

It is estimated that the bakery industry consumes upward of 225,000,000 pounds of powdered skim milk, which is equivalent to 1,800,000,000 pounds of fluid milk, and nearly 200,000 pounds of dried eggs, which is the equivalent of 167,000,000 dozen eggs annually. If the trade is to substitute these chemicals under Government authority and protection by setting forth these products as within the proper scope of the pure food and drug law in their definition of bakery products, then, can you not see the threat that exists not only to the producers of these animal and vegetable fats and oils and poultry, and can you not see the threat that exists to the consumers of this country, who are going to be placed in the position of having a great deception practiced upon them?

That is indeed a very, very important question which must be determined. It is just another indication of the problems facing the various segments of our economy. Are we at long last going to come to the point in this country when for each meal we can take a pill out of a small bottle as a result of scientific research by scientists who are producing that pill out of coal or petroleum or the byproducts of natural gas? What sort of race of people are we going to raise? Do these people who are foisting these products upon the people of the United States know what the effect upon the people is going to be? I have put together in the statement which will be part of these remarks the best information that I have been able to find with respect to the possibility of the reaction on human beings of the continued use of

such chemical products to replace nature's products. It has ultimately got to be determined by the physiologist, the anatomist, and the scientist. But there are many splendid investigators in that field today who believe that the use of these substitutes increases the virulence of certain bacteria—for example, the bacteria that causes tuberculosis. Another group of investigators have indicated that the continued use of these chemicals for a long period of time might alone produce an increased tendency to vascular diseases, such as arteriosclerosis. Who knows? Has anybody given us the answers up to date? They have not. We are in the realm of speculation. Yet these chemicals are being placed in the food of the Nation without the consumer having notice that when he consumes this food he is consuming a synthetic product which might be deleterious to his health.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I am sorry that so few Members are here to hear a talk which is so vital concerning food. I am sorry for that. I want to compliment the gentleman on the remarks that he has made. I want to say further, with your permission, sir, that if these synthetic products are not detrimental to health and stamina of the people of the United States why is it that in the past year we consumed millions of pounds of vitamin pills and tens of millions of pounds of aspirin to ease the pain in our aching joints and our throbbing heads when we should have obtained the food that we need in the course of our natural diet?

Out on my farm I lime and fertilize a piece of grass and my cows eat it into the ground and in the same pasture the grass grows a foot high on untreated soil, proving without a doubt that the cow knows more than her owner—and I am he.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman for his fine contribution. I appreciate that the Members of Congress are exceedingly busy, and it is very rare that on a special order, regardless of the importance of the subject under discussion, that there are many Members on the floor. I hope they will have an opportunity, however, to read in full the remarks as they will appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because I believe this is a matter of supreme importance and we are going to have to meet it sooner or later.

Is there a person within the sound of my voice who has not had the experience of seeing vegetables produced in virgin soil that have a taste and nutritive value, with natural elements contained therein, that very clearly and easily distinguish them from synthetic vegetables that are produced through the utilization of so much high-powered nitrogen fertilizer? I do not believe there is a person who does not know that. I do not believe there is a person who does not realize that in certain areas of the United States where they can grow potatoes on virgin soil they are getting a potato yield that is far superior to that of any other place in the United States where they have to use a high-nitrogen content fertilizer, with the result also that diseases have appeared in those areas that were unknown and are unknown where natural humus has been used to fertilize the soil.

What are the answers to all this? Do we know? Where are we going in this food supply of the Nation? Are we going to continually debase our food supply until human beings in this Nation do not know, when they go into a store, whether the thing which they are buying contains nature's products or are the products of a chemical laboratory? Not know whether it contains the nutrition which they learned from use to find in a particular product, in a synthetic product feeling just as good, smelling just as good, and tasting just as good, but produced from nonnutritious substances in the form of chemicals?

I think it is an important question. I do not have the answers, but I will tell you right now I want those who are interested in this subject to know and understand that there are people in the Congress of the United States who are alert to this problem and intend to watch it very, very closely, to the end that no product may come upon the market to be sold as food to the American people that does not meet the standards of nutrition and safety that any food ought to meet.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. You asked where we are going. In my humble opinion, we are following the course that the nations of antiquity followed, because as the things we eat deteriorate in value so will the health of our citizens deteriorate in value. My father never heard of rickets amongst his livestock. He never heard of pigs being born hairless. He never heard of Bang's disease. He never heard of mastitis. Our soil is sick, and our livestock are sick because they eat the products of a sick soil. Our human beings are sick because they eat animal products that grow on the grain and grass produced on a sick soil. Now they are going to make it worse by giving us chemicals along with our eats that have already deteriorated because our soil has deteriorated. We are going to have to save the soil of our land and eat less chemicals in our diet, or else we will have less than a hundred years of national virility left to our country.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman again for his contribution to this argument. I am not here to predict what the future may hold, but I do know that the scientific thought of the Nation is aware of this problem and that there are some men who are more interested in science and in the promotion of human welfare than they are of money, who are devoting themselves to an attempt to find a solution and an answer to this problem of the constant, ceaseless increase in the amount of synthetic products that are finding their way into the food of the Nation.

The question is, What is the effect going to be upon our total economy? What is the effect to be upon the dairy industry? What is the effect to be upon the livestock industry? What is the effect to be upon human beings? I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is a subject worth discussing and worth understanding; and so far as I am concerned, I propose to see to it that these hearings that are being conducted are very carefully watched, analyzed, and surveyed to the end that anything that is done may be done in the light of known, proven, scientific experience; and that will promote an administration by those who would substitute for natural food, would promote by scientific demonstration, that the use of those foods is not only nutritious but not deleterious to public health.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. I wish to commend the fine address the gentleman has just made. He has been thinking about this matter; he has explored a question that is of supreme importance to the agricultural interests of this country, to the health and vitality of the people of this country, and has opened up a field that if his investigation is pursued—and I know he will pursue it, and I think he started the chain of thought that is in the minds of all of us—will result in incalculable good to the people of this country.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. I wish to compliment the gentleman on his timely discussion and the nice way in which he presented his subject. I believe, however, that he has just scratched the surface.

I had occasion last year to listen to a scientist lecture to a group at the Te Deum International in Nebraska. This scientist went on to explain all of the substitutions that would take place in the future as far as food was concerned. He said that he was prepared—of course at great expense—to make any kind of meat you wanted, veal, chicken, beef, or pork from sawmill refuse and things that were not nutritious in the first instance; and he rather glowingly and with a great deal of pride pointed out the fact that we would not need vegetable life or animal life, or anything else in the years to come except fine, pure, synthetic foods. He did not seem to be a bit abashed about it; he thought it a great accomplishment and that perhaps in the end when we ate all of this fine scientific food we would discover the sweet mystery of life.

Mr. KEEFE. Perhaps that may come in the gentleman's lifetime or in mine; however, I doubt it. We may ultimately become a race of people without teeth, and without hair, and maybe without brains; I do not know; it looks as though we were headed in that direction pretty rapidly.

But the point is that in the short period of time available for this discussion I, of course, have not had an opportunity to go into all of the ramifications of the utilization of cellulose products, wood products, chips, shavings, and sawdust which I know are being converted and can be converted into various substitutes; I am relating it solely and clearly to the proceedings that are now appearing before

the Pure Food and Drug Administration and the proceedings involved therein.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. The gentleman from Wisconsin has rendered a very valuable service in bringing this matter, as he has done so well, to the attention of the House. As a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce I have been familiar through the years with the gentleman's interest in such matters, in health legislation, and in legislation to protect the American people as nearly as possible. He has appeared before that committee a number of times. I appreciate his interest and I hope we may give a little more attention to the hearings that the gentleman has discussed this afternoon.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman very much for those kind remarks. Of course, I am interested in the public health. Every Member of this Congress knows that. I am devoting myself to that phase of legislative activity. I am devoting my time to this subject because I conceive of nothing that is of greater importance to the people and this country than the preservation of the health and the welfare of its people.

I am proud of the progress that we have made by which we are allowing people to grow old gracefully, to live longer, and to live a more full and richer life. I do not want to see come into the picture anything that is going to change and debase that program until there has been a full scientific exploration of the subject that will demonstrate the possibility of the effects on human life and human welfare by the constant and everlasting debasement of our food supply through the substitution and use of chemicals instead of nature's products.

Mr. Speaker, to supplement my remarks I ask unanimous consent to include this statement which I have had prepared dealing with the development and use of the chemical compounds to which I have referred; also two articles on the subject which have appeared in the periodical press:

THE DEVELOPMENT AND USE OF SURFACE-ACTIVE COMPOUNDS (POLYOXYETHYLENE STEARATE)

I. HISTORICAL

Throughout history natural surface-active compounds have been used both as foods and for industrial purposes. As an example, egg yolk is used in foods to produce smooth and stable emulsions such as mayonnaise, ice cream, baked goods, etc. Natural fats containing mono and di glycerides are also valued ingredients for baked goods because of their dispersing qualities, as well as their nutritive value. In the industrial field, soap represents perhaps the earliest surface-active substance and continues to this day to be utilized for a wide variety of purposes. Specifically treated oils such as sulfonated oils (turkey red oil) have been used throughout industry for highly specialized lubrication purposes.

Increased knowledge of surface activity led chemists to the development of many highly specialized chemical agents of surface-active properties more specific than those found in products existing in nature. Leading this development were several German chemical manufacturers, most notably the I. G. Farben Co. One of the early developments of this company was the sulfonation and hydrogenation of fatty acids in the production of synthetic detergents. Continued research on the part of the Farben Co. produced a wide variety of chemical compounds, some of which were made from either natural fats or fatty acids and some from entirely nonbiological sources. Among the Farben developments prior to the war was the utilization of the gas, ethylene oxide, obtained from natural gas, petroleum and from brown coal, in the production of long-chain polymers known as polyoxyethylene glycol.

The synthesis of the polyoxyethylene glycols was introduced in the United States shortly before the beginning of the war and commercial exploitation started at about the same time. The first exploitation was made by Carbide & Carbon Co. in the production of polyoxyethylene glycols for industrial usage under the trade name Carbowax. This firm has marketed many grades of Carbowax, differentiating between them by means of their molecular weights. These products have found use in the detergent field, in preparation of defoaming agents, in the textile field and elsewhere.

In 1945 the Atlas Powder Co. began the application of the ethylene oxide synthesis to products designed for us in food. Their first products consisted of a series known as the Tweens made originally for use in cosmetics, but later extended to use in foods. In the production of Tweens the polyoxyethylene glycol was produced as a portion of a product known chemically as polyoxyethylene sorbitan monostearate. The stearate portion of the compound comes from stearic acid produced from natural fat; the sorbitan portion is produced by the hydrogenation of corn sugar; and the ethylene oxide portion is produced as above outlined. The percentage of fatty acids used in the manufacture of Tweens varies over a wide range from a low of 12 to 14 percent to a high of approximately 40 percent. It is therefore apparent that the bulk of the Tween molecule is produced from products other than fat.

In 1946 the Atlas Powder Co. also introduced a series of compounds known as the Myrjs. These compounds consist of the reaction product between fatty acids and polyoxyethylene glycols of varying molecular weights. The fatty acid portion of the Myrjs ranged from a low of 6 percent to a high of approximately 44 percent. It is apparent that the Myrjs contain but a small fraction of natural fat in their makeup.

Prior to the introduction of the Tweens and Myrjs the Atlas Powder Co. developed a third line of emulsifying agents under the trade name Spans (1935). Spans consist of fatty acids and sorbitan but do not contain the ethylene oxide polymers. These compounds have been used for many years in the preparation of cosmetics, in textile manufacture, and to some extent in foodstuffs.

In 1947 the Glyco Products Co., as well as several smaller chemical manufacturers, began the manufacture of compounds similar to Atlas Powder Co.'s Myrjs by reacting the polyoxyethylene glycols produced by Carbide & Carbon Co. with fatty acids purchased from manufacturers of industrial fatty acids. Dow Chemical Co. has recently entered the field with the production of polyoxyethylene glycols for use in the preparation of Myrj-type or Tween-type materials.

The patent situation regarding many of these compounds and processes for their manufacture is very complicated, with quite a few of the basic patents originating with I. G. Farben in Germany. For that reason, manufacturers find it easy to enter this business by making satisfactory arrangements through the offices of the Alien Properties Custodian.

Products now sold for food use are many. They are marketed under such trade names as Myrj, Tween, Sta-Soft, Ever-Soft, Tops-kor, Emulgene, etc. Nearly all of the various brands are sold by sales agencies other than those of the primary manufacturer. Nearly all are made from products produced by Atlas Powder Co., Glyco Products Co., Dow Chemical Co., Carbide & Carbon Co., or by various combinations. With the exception of the Atlas Powder Co. no organization seems to do a complete manufacturing job from start to finish.

II. ECONOMICS

Ethylene oxide is a gas produced from petroleum and natural gas at a very low cost per pound. It is reacted with water in the production of polyglycols as previously mentioned. Since both of these raw materials are in bountiful supply and are cheap, it is obvious that the quantity of polyoxyethylene glycols which can be produced in this country is unlimited and that the unit production cost represents a negligible figure when comparisons are made with natural food fats. The fatty acid portion of the various compounds is usually a commercial product produced from inedible fats by companies specialized in fatty acid preparation. It could also be made at increased cost from edible fats. Since the fatty acid portion of these compounds is small, however, availability is not much of a problem.

As previously indicated, these products are distributed through numerous sales agencies such as bakery supply houses, chemical distribution firms, private laboratories, and even by private individuals. They are also distributed by certain specialists who blend them with flour, soybean meal, whey, sugar, and water. The number of blends now on the market is quite large, but most make use of some cheap carrier—for example, water or flour—in order to widen the profit margin. It should be emphasized, however, that some companies are selling the products in their concentrated form and are not attempting to dilute them with such carriers. In all cases the profit margin—the difference between production cost and sales price—is extremely wide, far beyond anything known on a large scale in the food business. For example, a fair cost estimate for a Myrj-type product is approximately 11 or 12 cents per pound and current selling prices for this item range between 45 and 55 cents per pound. Since the quantity used in food manufacture is small, and since its use eliminates the need for many other ingredients—fats, and to some extent milk and eggs—the high cost can be more than compensated through reduced usage of these natural food products.

III. PURPOSES OF PRODUCTS AND RECOMMENDED USAGE

These chemical emulsifying agents serve a useful purpose in food manufacture in that they produce more finely divided emulsions than can be achieved by other means. For example, ice cream containing such materials will be found to have a smoother texture than other ice cream—particularly if the control ice cream does not contain egg yolk. Bread will be found to be softer and more tender because of the use of these chemical emulsifiers, particularly if the bread with which comparisons are made contains little or no shortening. If the bread contains a normal amount of fat, however, these agents often will produce inferior bread because of resulting gumminess and excessive fragility. It is therefore almost axiomatic that once the baker decides to include chemical emulsifying agents in the bread formula the fat content will be reduced to a point where the use of the chemical is made possible. Such a reduction in fat content will produce a net saving to the baker over and above the cost of the chemical emulsifier. This reduction can be carried to the point where the entire quantity of fat can be eliminated from baked goods, including both bread and cake, and such recommendations have been made by

many of the sales agencies in charge of distribution of these chemicals.

Products of the Span, Tween and Myrj type are now being used in a wide variety of foods, namely: Bread, cake, doughnuts, cereal mixes, peanut butter, ice cream, candy, salad dressing, milk drinks, synthetic whipping cream, pickles, flavors, many others.

It is apparent that such usage will grow as price competition invariably created through the nutritional debasement of the original food is developed. These conditions will force other manufacturers to adopt similar questionable practices. It may be claimed by some that these chemical emulsifying agents improve the physical properties of certain foods. However, the possibility of nutritional debasement and deception is so great that these factors should not be ignored when evaluating the true purposes behind the use of these materials.

IV. NUTRITIONAL ASPECTS

These products were sold to food manufacturers long before their harmlessness in foods had been investigated. This shows the character of the manufacturers. Investigations now in progress do not indicate clearly that harmlessness to the general welfare can be established. In fact, this is one of the most controversial aspects of the problem now facing the physiologists and nutritional experts throughout this country. Some investigators believe that there compounds increase the virulence of certain bacteria, for example mycobacterium tuberculosis. Another group of investigators have indicated that their ingestion over a long period of time might also produce increased tendency to vascular diseases, such as arteriosclerosis. This is a matter, however, which must be settled by experts in the field of physiology.

The nutritive value of the products is also an unsettled question. It is claimed by the proponents of these products that they are part foods. It is claimed that the fatty acid portion is assimilated in the same manner as is other fat, and that the polyethylene glycol portion is excreted by the body as waste material. Since the polyethylene glycol portion makes up by weight from a high of 92 percent to a low of 56 percent of the entire weight of the emulsifier, it is obvious that the true nutritional value cannot be great, even if the theory that these things are part food is accepted. Accepting the part-food theory, 1 pound of polyoxyethylene stearate will produce at best 1,700 calories and at worst 280 calories. (There are many types—hence the great difference.) As a basis of comparison, 1 pound of shortening or lard produces 4,200 calories. Since 1 pound of the emulsifying agent replaces from 3 to 6 pounds of shortening or lard in actual practice, it is evident that the caloric intake will be reduced far beyond the figures indicated by a direct pound for pound comparison.

Accepting the part-food theory as fact and also accepting the tendency of the competing food producers to lower production costs through substitution and reduction of fats, it is evident that the ultimate consumer will be victimized by a direct deception in that he has no convenient way of measuring real nutritional values. It is believed that the best possible nutritional evaluation which can be made will lead directly to the possibility of deception.

Some nutritionists doubt that certain of the emulsifying agents furnish any food value whatsoever, and feel that the materials should be classed as nonnutrients. There are many examples in the food and drug records concerned with the use of nonnutrients in food products, either direct or as replacements for nutrient materials. The use of saccharin in soft drinks, etc., is a good example concerned with the use of a nonnutrient capable of replacing a nutrient. Precedents exist for the definition of such practices as adulteration and it is believed that these precedents apply whenever such materials are used to replace fat, milk, eggs, or other nutrients commonly used in food products.

It is well known that the consuming public depends more and more on food processors for their total food intake. Food preparation in the home has declined over the years until food manufacturers have become so important in the supply of finished food products that it is clearly a matter of public interest. This theory has been recognized by the Federal authorities and efforts are now being made to develop minimum standards of identity for many basic food products. For example, hearings for the definition of mayonnaise and salad dressings were concluded before the Federal Security Agency early in 1948. It was proposed by the manufacturers of these chemical emulsifying agents that they be approved for use in those products. It is also well known that they have been proposed or will be proposed for use in cheese preparations, ice cream, and a host of other food products whenever such products are defined.

V. STANDARDS OF IDENTITY FOR BREAD, ROLLS, BUNS, AND RELATED PRODUCTS

Hearings are now in progress before the Federal Security Agency, Food and Drug Administration, for the development of standards of identity for bread, rolls, buns, and related products. The entire series of chemical emulsifying agents described herein have been proposed for inclusion in these standards. It is evident from the intense effort being made by the proponents of the chemical emulsifying agents that they consider the bread-standards hearing to be the crucial test concerned with Government approval for use of these materials in all foods. The amount of effort being expended is most unusual for a hearing of this type. The subject already has been discussed in the bread hearing for more than a month and will likely continue for an additional 1 or 2 months. It is evident that the financial expenditure concerned with the inclusion of these materials in bread has been extremely large.

The proponents of the compounds deny intent to defraud the consumer through a reduction in fat content and milk content of bread, but they do not deny the allegation that the use of their material will make such reduction possible. It has been admitted that some of the sales agencies handling these materials have recommended such reductions in fat content and milk content of bread. The proponents of these materials have also claimed that the nutritional value of bread would be decreased by the exclusion of shortening from the formula, but their experts have contended that such a decrease in nutritive value would be of little or no importance to the American consumer. They do not appear to realize that bread and other baked products convey to the consumer over 40 percent of the total shortening and lard intake. Their claims concerned with lack of importance of nutritive value are invariably based on the caloric value of one slice of bread or some other extremely small unit. The fallacy of such an argument may be easily understood if consideration is given to the fact that cereal foods such as bread and other baked goods furnish more than one-third of the total energy consumed by the public. In fact, some nutritionists have estimated that 38 percent of the total food of this country is consumed in the form of cereal products. It is well known that the percentage is even higher among members of the low-income groups, children, and the aged. A reduction in the food value of bread would prove a calamity for this group.

Although only bread and related products are being discussed in the current hearings, cereal mixes and even household baking will likely be affected by the decision. It is apparent that the total effect of these compounds on the consumption of fats and other valuable foods will not be limited to the reduced usage within the bakery field.

VI. EFFECT ON AGRICULTURE

These chemical emulsifiers have been used in a limited way in the manufacture of food products since their development. To the extent of their use as a substitute, the consumption of agricultural commodities has been reduced. A great many manufacturers of food products have been reluctant to use them until their harmlessness or harmfulness has been definitely established. If, as a result of hearings now in progress before the Federal Security Agency, their use is sanctioned by Government approval, the extent of their usage will become widespread in the manufacture of a great many processed foods. Some of the foods in which these chemical emulsifiers are used are listed elsewhere herein. Their approval by the Government poses a serious threat to agricultural commodities for which they are used as substitutes. The extent of this threat is indicated when consideration is given to the fact that bread, cereal mixes, and bakery products now account for over 40 percent of the domestic consumption of lard and shortening. These two food processing industries alone consume about 1,350,000,000 pounds of lard and shortening annually. It is estimated that the use of these chemical emulsifiers, if approved by the Government, will reduce this rate of consumption by at least 500,000,000 pounds. The extent to which the chemicals are used will of course determine the amount of the reduction. It is possible for their use to almost completely replace the use of fat by these industries.

The literature of some suppliers of chemical emulsifiers recommends a reduction of both milk and fats in the manufacture of bread. In other bakery products such as cakes, a reduction of milk, eggs, and fats is recommended. The baking industry consumes upward of 225,000,000 pounds of powdered skim milk (equivalent to 1,800,000,000 pounds of fluid milk) and nearly 200,000 pounds of eggs (167,000,000 dozen) annually. The United States Department of Agriculture in one of its publications stated that 10 percent of the farmer's income is derived from fats and oils. The combined effect of these reductions in the use of agricultural commodities constitutes a very serious threat to the American farmer.

[From Newsweek Magazine of February 14, 1949]

SYNTHETIC LARD

American farmers, already plagued by falling prices, face more and more competition from synthetic products. Before the war cotton and wool growers had to fight underselling by synthetic fibers. Now producers of fats and oils, both animal and vegetable, are moving into a market war with synthetics. Sales of war-developed detergents are cutting domestic consumption of soaps made from natural fats. The newest threat is a synthetic substitute for lard for use in bread and other baked goods. Developed by the Atlas Powder Co., it already is being used by some bakers. Packers have protested use of the synthetic to the Food and Drug Administration, asserting that it reduces the food value of the baked goods. The outcome depends on whether the administration's forthcoming decision classifies the synthetic as a standard ingredient of bread.

[From the New Leader of January 15, 1949]

IS THIS YOUR DREAM BREAD?

(By James Rorty)

Hurry, hurry, write now, or you'll eat polyoxyethylene monostearate and like it.

Our millers and bakers are not devils. Hence when they are sick—and they have been sick for over two years, ever since a British nutritionist discovered that agene, their favorite bleach, gives dogs fits—they do not aspire to sainthood.

Instead, they go into a kind of howling dog-in-the-manger hysteria. Being unable or unwilling to provide the American people with a decent loaf of bread, they are determined to freeze the American bread formula so that in effect nobody else will be permitted to do so.

That's exactly what will happen, too, unless the customers are heard from loudly and numerously during the next few weeks while the bread hearings are on in Washington and before the Food and Drug Administration promulgates a new standard of identity for white bread.

Do you know what white bread is? Did you think it was a comely brown-crusted something, fragrant and pleasantly edible, made of wheat flour, water, salt, sugar, shortening and yeast?

That's what grandma thought too, but you and she are both wrong.

Bread—take it from the lawyers and baking technologists of the milling and baking industries—is a bloated and starched phony that tastes like wallpaper paste. It is composed of the above ingredients plus chlorine dioxide (instead of agene, which must be discontinued after August 1, 1949), benzoyl peroxide, sodium alum, potassium bromate, polyoxyethylene monostearate, etc., etc., etc. Food and Drug permits use of about a score of such chemicals without declaration on the wrapper in its proposed standard of identity for white bread.

That's your dream bread. All these chemicals, none of which adds anything to the nutritional value of bread and some of which may eventually be proved dangerous, as agene was proved dangerous, are necessary to achieve the consumer's concept of white bread. I quote the language of the Food and Drug Administration.

Understand, that's allegedly your idea of white bread. But you mustn't be permitted to know that it is your idea—that these chemicals are part of the white bread concept. Because if you did know it you might not wish to buy this dream bread of yours.

Excuse it, please. I know it sounds crazy, but that's the way it reads in the book. If you don't believe it, get the Federal Register of October 14, 1948, and see for yourself.

All these dubious chemicals may be used in white bread without declaration on the wrapper. On the other hand, it is not permitted to add good, wholesome, nutritionally valuable ingredients such as wheat germ, soya flour, dry yeast, and corn germ, except in quantities too small to affect appreciably the nutritional value of the bread; more cannot be used without so changing its characteristics that it will not meet the consumer's concept of white bread.

That, again is the language of the Food and Drug Administration in a letter to this writer. Of course it is strictly Alice-in-the-Wonderland nonsense—but lawyer's nonsense, deliberate nonsense calculated to make money for chain bakers, not to make blood and bones in children.

The baking industry's lawyers cook up this metaphysical gurry about a consumer's concept of white bread, and seemingly the Food and Drug Administration feels obliged to swallow it. So that when you prod them they spit it out right into your hand.

It is easy to cut through this nonsense. Dr. Clive M. McCay, Cornell nutritionist, cut through it at the bread hearings a month ago, contemptuously, and with not a word of effective comeback from the industry lawyers who fretted and fumed around him.

"What's the matter with open formula labeling?" asked Dr. McCay. That's the way we feed cows and dogs: measured and tested nutritional quantities, with the amounts of the ingredients and the analysis printed on every bag. Standard of identity? What's the matter with unbleached flour, water, shortening, salt, sugar and yeast? These ingredients make bread, although it is a lot better if we add 2 percent of wheat germ, 6 percent milk solids, and 6 percent high fat soya flour. Bread made to this formula is baked for and sold by the Ithaca (N. Y.) Cooperative. It has been bioassayed in the Cornell laboratories. It promotes the growth of rats; seven brands of commercial bread sold in Ithaca, all satisfying that lawyer-concocted consumer's concept of white bread, do not promote the growth of rats; you have to add to these commercial breads 10 percent of dry yeast before the rats begin to grow.

By this time the industry lawyers were frantic. They demanded that Dr. McCay qualify himself. They should have known better. In the first place, McCay is one of the top-ranking nutritionists of the country, a professor in the school of nutrition at Cornell, and for 3 years during the war nutritionist for the Navy. In the second place, he has done more practical work with bread, in all probability, than any other nutritionist in America. In the third place, he chose to enrage the industry lobbyists by testifying, not as a university professor but in behalf of the highly successful Ithaca Cooperative, of which his wife is a director.

In response to heckling, Dr. McCay testified that 40 percent of the bread sold by the Ithaca Co-op is Co-op bread, in spite of the fact that it sells for a 3-cent premium over competing breads. The Co-op baker can't bake enough of it and commercial stores are clamoring to be supplied.

Recently Dr. McCay, with the energetic cooperation of the Republican administration at Albany, has introduced an excellent bread made to approximately the same formula, into New York's State insane asylums. A well-known chain baker would like to bake it and sell it but is waiting for the results of the lawyers. If the bakers' lobby wins and the Ithaca Co-op bread and similar bread can't be sold as bread in interstate commerce, New Yorkers will still have one chance left of getting to eat a decent loaf of bread. They can get themselves committed to the nearest mental hospital.

But the baker's lobby doesn't have to win. A show of force by consumers would change the climate of the hearings overnight. Write Mr. Oscar Ewing, director of the Federal Security Administration in Washington of which the Food and Drug Administration is an arm. Write him that you are a consumer and that your concept of white bread is unbleached wheat flour, water, salt, sugar, shortening, and yeast; that any level of a selected list of ingredients such as dry milk solids, dry yeast, wheat germ, and soya flour may be included, and that these ingredients and their amounts must be listed on the wrapper along with all the chemicals used in the bread mixture; that these open-formula declarations on the wrapper must include any and all bleaches and improvers used as substitutes for agene; that softeners, such as polyoxyethylene monostearate should be prohibited since their only purpose is to cheat the housewife by preventing her from telling whether bread is stale or not.

If you are a farmer, point out that the proposed standard of identity permits fortification of bread with synthetics, but freezes out the farmer's products; that not until the American people are given a decent loaf of bread will bread begin to recover its slipping place in the American dietary—something to think about in view of looming wheat, soya, and milk surpluses.

If you are an organized worker, make the same point, plus the fact that since low-income families use a relatively large percentage of bread in their diet it must be good bread that promotes the growth of both rats and children.

Write Mr. Ewing today. He is reported to have a rather sensitive political ear, and he just might listen.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FURCOLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Springfield Union.

Mr. SANBORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] is recognized for 10 minutes.

OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, that this Congress can fully understand just how the old-age assistance operates, in North Dakota at least, and probably elsewhere as well, I desire to submit an actual case for its consideration.

In my files there is a letter from a North Dakota man, 74 years of age. He had never asked for any assistance until this past winter. However, the long, hard winter forced him to seek relief. He applied to his county welfare board, expecting that aid would be forthcoming within a reasonable time. He felt this way about it because he had never asked for any assistance before, and that fact, together with his age, seemed certain to guarantee a decision in his behalf.

You can imagine how he felt when he received the answer from the county welfare board. In typewritten form, on a document called Notice of Decision, it read:

This is to inform you that your application for old-age assistance has been denied inasmuch as the county welfare board feels you are still able to work, and, therefore, ineligible for assistance.

The printed body of the notice gives him 30 days in which to appeal from the decision of this board. With all the facts before that board including the age of the applicant, a rehearing before the same board would be a useless matter.

Just how old an applicant must be before he can qualify, the board does not say; nor do they explain just what physical infirmities must be present in order to qualify the aged. I am led to presume that if the old man in this case can still drag himself around, he cannot obtain any relief. The fact that this citizen is 74 years of age makes no impression on his welfare board; the fact that this applicant has not asked for assistance before also falls on deaf ears.

This case brings forcibly to our attention the fact that our present old-age assistance program is nothing more or less than a straight poorhouse plan, and under some of the welfare boards a man could not even get to the poorhouse if he was able to drag himself around.

I have advised this old man of 74 to wait until he is 94 and then try this county welfare board again. In the next 20 years they may change their minds or maybe the complexion of the board will

change; or better yet, this Congress may pass a system of pensions that come to the aged as a matter of right and not through a pauper's oath. I do not know how all Members feel about this case, but the action of this particular board was a shameful performance, and from the letters I get, such practices are widespread throughout the Nation.

I do not know to what extent my influence may go, but I serve notice right here that I will not vote for a dollar to be sent to Europe or to any foreign country—not one dollar—until the aged, the crippled and the blind, and other unfortunate people here in these United States are taken care of first.

This part of the President's program is the right program, and regardless of party, I will support it.

The great majority of this House wants a better program for the aged, but there are so many plans, and each has a following, that our forces are split. As you all know, I have supported the Townsend plan for 10 years in Congress. I have seen this movement force a little aid to the aged, but the time has come when we must get a full and just pension for the aged. While striving for their own preferred plans of a pension system, the liberal forces of this House must get together on some one plan, regardless of what plan, what author, or what political party is behind the move.

Can we command the respect of the nations of the world, can we be proud of our participation in international leadership, when these nations know how we treat our own people?

When we are striving to establish world peace—when we are striving to demonstrate to the world that a democracy is a better system of government than communism—when we are before the equity court of the world, seeking only justice and equality for all, we should come into that court with clean hands. Unless our hands are clean, how can we expect to ask justice for others? I say to you our hands are not clean when we are forced to admit that there is no help for the unfortunates of this democracy except through charity and alms-giving. We have to face the cold, hard fact that before we aid the aged in the United States they must be reduced to a condition of pride-killing pauperism and even then, our welfare boards may still turn them away.

As the richest nation on earth, as a nation seeking to lead the world in peace, we must change our course of action if we wish to convince others that here in this great democracy every citizen is not only guaranteed the three cardinal principles of the Declaration of Independence—namely, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—but also that here every citizen, old or young, enjoys those rights. If we actually lived, day by day, the principles we preach, how easy it would be to present to people everywhere the blessings and advantages of a democracy over any other form of government operating in the world today. Our example would foster belief—a conviction that cannot be bought alone with our billions of Marshall-plan dollars.

It is a noble ambition to bring the "four freedoms" to people everywhere, but still a more noble ambition to bring those "four freedoms" to our own people. One of these freedoms is the freedom from want. Let this Congress grant that freedom to our aged, our crippled, and our other unfortunates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, on February 15 I introduced House Joint Resolution 161, which approves the Canadian-American agreement for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. Since this project is international in scope, the resolution which I have offered confines itself purely to the approval of this international agreement, leaving for later determination such domestic administrative problems as the charges of tolls on the waterway and the management of the power project.

The New York Times in an editorial on February 23 takes exception to my bill on the grounds that it contains no provision to turn over to the control and management of the New York State Government the power project which is to be built with Federal funds.

POLITICAL DOUBLE-TALK

First let me say that I would be more inclined to take seriously the New York Times' expression of concern if its past record toward the St. Lawrence project showed anything but constant and continual opposition to it in any shape or form. When the Senate was considering Senate Joint Resolution 111 last year the New York Times was vigorously opposed to its passage, even though this specific proposal contained provisions to transfer the power project to the State of New York. At that time the Times was following a consistent line expressed by others from New York—the record will show that one of the reasons why Senate Joint Resolution 111 was returned to committee in 1948 was the opposition of the junior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

There are several other St. Lawrence bills now before the Congress which contain provisions for transferring the power to New York. Just as the record shows no particular evidence of support for Senate Joint Resolution 111 in 1948, neither does it show any support for these other measures today from the New York Times, the Governor of New York, Mr. Dewey, and his party's Representatives from New York in the House, with the notable exception of my friend and colleague the gentleman from New York, Representative KILBURN.

If the New York Times, and particularly the Governor of New York, and any representatives and spokesmen of the State, in and out of Congress, are really interested in securing the St. Lawrence project and in controlling the power phase as a State-managed project, all they have to do is to express their support for these various other St. Lawrence bills introduced by Representatives KILBURN, of New York; DONDERO, of Michigan; and O'BRIEN of Illinois. Such support would be proof of their good intentions; and their complete silence concerning the support of these other bills containing provisions for the transfer of power to New York is indicative of the fact that they are more interested in obstructionist arguments than in constructive cooperation for the realization of the joint project.

Their lack of good faith is also proved by the fact that the Republican leadership in the New York State Legislature is at this very time promoting a resolution to memorialize Congress for the construction of the power project alone. As this is an impractical, uneconomical, and unfeasible proposition, one cannot help but come to the conclusion that again the Governor of New York is busily engaged in manufacturing campaign issues for his future use instead of cooperating honestly with the Federal Government in the construction of the dual-purpose project. Any practical person would know that if the Governor of New York and the Representatives of New York in Congress want the St. Lawrence project construeted all they have to do is express their support for a bill of their own liking. Their silence on this point and the diversionary activities in Albany cast serious doubt upon the sincerity of their intentions.

NATURE OF AGREEMENT WITH NEW YORK

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words on the nature of the existing arrangements or agreements between the State of New York and the Federal Government concerning the transfer of the power project to the jurisdiction of this State.

First, it must be made an unmistakeable part of the record that there is no agreement with any validity or force of law.

Secondly, decisions of the Supreme Court have established beyond any shadow of doubt that the authority of the Federal Government is supreme in navigable waterways. The St. Lawrence is not only a navigable waterway but it is an international stream, controlled by agreements between the United States Government and Canada. Therefore the Federal Government's rights in this river are beyond question.

Thirdly, the St. Lawrence project in accordance with the Canadian-American agreement, will be constructed in part by the United States Government and in part by the Government of Canada. The provision contained in many St. Lawrence bills to transfer the power project to New York, is a proposal to sell Federal property to that State. This can only be done by an act of Congress. No other agency in the Federal establishment can sell, dispose, or transfer such Federal property to any party without congressional approval.

Fourth, since there has never been any such congressional approval of the transfer of the St. Lawrence power to New York, any understandings that have been expressed in the past have been informal

expressions of willingness to come to an agreement by the various officers of the Federal Government and of the State of New York.

Finally, even the moral effect of such informal understandings and expressions of willingness to reach agreement has been destroyed by the actions of the Governor of New York in proposing the development of the power project separately. This is because these earlier understandings were based upon the premise of dual-purpose development of the river and allocations of cost based upon such dual-purpose development. The proposals of the State of New York to develop the power project alone, and to defer the seaway, have not only destroyed the validity of any informal understandings between Federal and State officials but they even threaten to destroy the Canadian-American agreement, which is also based on a dual-purpose development.

JOINT SEAWAY-POWER DEVELOPMENT ONLY FEASIBLE PLAN

Mr. Speaker, I realize, as do many of my colleagues, that it is not a feasible or profitable undertaking to give advice and counsel to the Governor of New York, who is still intent upon running the affairs of the Federal Government and the United States Congress from his vantage point in Albany. But I cannot refrain from expressing the hope and wish that my friends from New York will realize that if they want the St. Lawrence power project at all, and if they want to control the project in any manner, then the only way they are going to realize their often-expressed desire is to support the dual-purpose project now before Congress. Any other approach, no matter how plausible, will merely manufacture profitless argument and campaign issues of dubious value which may serve the ambitions of those who do not give up the rainbows of political preferment very easily. Any other approach will certainly not give the people of New York and New England the power they so desperately need, nor will it serve the needs of our great midwestern industry and agriculture—these needs for the St. Lawrence navigation facilities so important to our future prosperity and economic development.

In connection with the distribution of St. Lawrence power, I will make one more point which is seldom mentioned. It is the duty of the Federal Government and Congress to concern itself with the interests of New England as well as that of New York. In its February 23 editorial, the New York Times lays claim to all the St. Lawrence power for the State of New York. It is a fact, however, that the States of Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Connecticut are suffering from power shortages as severe as that existing in New York. Although the Governor of New York and the New York Power Authority have given lip service to sharing the power of St. Lawrence with their neighboring States, this arrangement to equitably distribute this power will take time and work.

It merely complicates the approval of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project with endless argument about domestic policy, and obstructs the construction of the project to insist that all the problems regarding the distribution of St. Lawrence power be settled before this international agreement is approved.

I wish to call upon the House at this time to cast aside all narrow sectionalism and partisanship, and take action at the earliest possible time to approve the agreement with Canada for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project which is so necessary to our national defense and the economic welfare of our country.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial from the New York Times of February 23. This is the editorial to which I have just referred, and which is self-explanatory, reflecting the approach and the thinking of so many enemies of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project:

ST. LAWRENCE POWER

Since the United States and Canada in 1941 agreed formally to carry out the St. Lawrence seaway and power project more than 20 bills in approval have been introduced in Congress. All stipulated that the hydroelectric power plant to be constructed was to be turned over to the State of New York, provided the State paid its share of the cost. Now comes Representative BLATNIK, of Minnesota, with a resolution that flies in the face of State ownership and calls for federalization. His is the first bill that repudiates a Federal-State accord which has been endorsed by every President and by every government of the State since 1933, as well as by the Corps of Engineers, the Federal Power Commission, the State Department, and every other Federal agency concerned with the development of the St. Lawrence.

If a St. Lawrence hydroelectric plant generated an excess of power that could be utilized in New England a case for federalization might be made out. But there has long been a shortage of electric power in upper New York. Even in the New York City area the demand for electric power exceeded the assured supply in 1947. Such is the demand for power that the public-utility companies of the State are prepared to install new generating capacity of 280,000 kilowatts in the New York City area alone and 354,000 kilowatts elsewhere. If we now had both St. Lawrence hydroelectric and the planned public-utility steam power the State could utilize it all.

Since the American portion of the St. Lawrence plant will lie within the boundaries of the State and since the State needs all the power that it can obtain there is no need of federalization. Representative BLATNIK's bill can serve no other purpose than that of granting the Federal Government rights for which it has never asked and for which there is no justification.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial appearing in the New York Times.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 25 minutes.

LOBBYING GROUP—UNITED STATES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE HITS NEW LOW ON GALLUP-TYPE POLL—SMALL-BUSINESS MEN MISLED INTO VOTING AGAINST THEIR OWN INTERESTS AND IN FAVOR OF THEIR MONOPOLISTIC COMPETITORS IN ANSWER TO TRICK QUESTIONS—BIG-BUSINESS INTERESTS FIGHTING FOR BASING-POINT SYSTEM TO FIX PRICES, CREATE MONOPOLY, AND DESTROY SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, big business and monopoly took an awful licking in the Portland Cement case. The basing-point system, this time in its multiple form—a very handy instrument, as the Court called it, for stifling competition and compelling identical pricing at delivery points—was discredited and barred for such illegal purposes. In this case, the illegal activities were carried on through the Cement Institute and its 74 corporate members, all of whom were respondents or defendants.

REPEAL BY INDIRECTION ASKED

The decision was made by the Supreme Court of the United States, not by a 5-to-4 decision either, but with only one judge dissenting. Under these decisive circumstances, what could the monopoly boys think of, except to run to Congress to obtain a law designed to curb the Supreme Court from making such decisions? Of course, these people could not ask the Congress point-blank to change the Federal Trade Commission Act or the Robinson-Patman amendment to the Clayton Act. They could not ask for repeal of antitrust and antimonopoly laws, or even directly ask for modification of these laws. However, they could do the same thing by indirection.

CALL IT CLARIFICATION—FALSE ISSUE

How? Why, they would simply give it another name. What name? That was easy. They would simply call it clarification. That is why we hear so much about clarification of antitrust and monopoly laws. Having decided upon the false issue of clarification, they had to decide on various springboards for projecting this false issue. I say false issue because not only do I believe that the issue is substantially false, as a matter of fact, but it is also clear from a reading of the laws and decisions of the Supreme Court thereunder, that Congress, in passing these laws, deliberately chose to set forth general standards and principles, leaving it to the courts to fill in any necessary clarification, which is a traditional function. Any other legislative approach would have been an invitation to the resourceful to find countless evasions and loopholes not expressly interdicted by specific legislative wording.

MISLEADING POLL CONDUCTED

One of the methods decided upon to obtain support for so-called legislative clarification was to get a rubber-stamp approval from supposedly representative businesses. How would they do that? Easiest thing in the world. Conduct a poll. A poll will prove anything—as the whole country found out a few months ago. How would this poll be conducted?

Not, of course, among big business concerns, which might immediately be accused of being partial to a basing-point system. The best and safest way to conduct such a poll would be through some old and conservative association of business, such as the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, which boasts that the larger part of its membership, at least in numbers, is composed of what it regards as small businesses.

BASING-POINT QUESTION AS SUCH NOT TESTED BY POLL

But business concerns, even in such a respectable organization, could not be expected to get publicly excited about the possible demise of the multiple-basing-point system designed to keep alive monopolistic and unfair trade practices. What was the use, therefore, of putting such a question to the test of even a chamber of commerce poll?

Right. But the solving of this difficulty was easy. They did not put the basing-point question, as such, to the test of the poll. What question would they put? That problem was pretty easy, too. The basing-point system necessarily involves delivered prices, rather than f. o. b. prices, and it necessarily involves, in some cases at least, freight absorption. This is because equal pricing, even to a fraction of a mill—as happened in some instances in the portland-cement combine—can be accomplished best by equal prices at delivery point, and because equal delivery-point prices necessarily means that some of the firms in the plan must absorb freight costs.

POLL SHIFTED TO PHONY ISSUES

Of course, we all know that there can be a delivery-price system without a basing-point system. And we all know that there can be freight absorption without a basing-point system. Delivered pricing and freight absorption are part of traditional American business practices. However, the basing-point boys thought it was clever to pretend that delivered pricing and freight absorption was under attack, rather than the basing-point system. Accordingly, it fitted their plans on any poll conducted among businessmen, to avoid completely the basing-point issue, and to shift to the phony issues of delivered pricing and of freight absorption. This is the old shell game, if you ask me. First, they shift from the issue of repeal or radical modification of the law, and call it "clarification." Then they shift from the issue of basing point to the issue of delivered pricing and freight absorption.

In any event, on the 15th day of January, 1949, there came out a beautifully printed 12-page booklet, with oversized pages, and with a cover featuring in prominent type, the following caption: "Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, Referendum No. 91 on the Report of the Special Committee of the Board of Directors on Delivered Pricing."

This impressive looking document was mailed to organization members of the Chamber of Commerce.

The pamphlet contains a 3-page double column report entitled: "Delivered Pricing—Report of Special Committee." There is noted on the inside front cover the names of members of the special committee, each of whom is described as a chairman of a specified committee of the Chamber of Commerce.

Now all of these men, even though they may not be fully typical of what most people regard as small-business men, are no doubt honorable and fine gentlemen. James W. Baker is president of a Chicago wholesale grocery chain; William Hartz is president of a substantial concern; Evans Nash is president of Yellow Transit Co. in Oklahoma City; George West is president of First Federal Savings and Loan Association in Atlanta, Ga.; Dechard Anderson Hulcy, chairman of the committee, is from good old Dallas, Tex., where he is president of the Lone Star Gas Co.

Now, I do not know whether these gentlemen got up the report themselves; or whether it was first drafted by a staff member of the chamber or some allied organization. The presentation, by reason of the shifts from the real issue, is plausible enough for almost anybody to sign, if not examined into too deeply. It is altogether a beautiful set-up.

This little document, presented as the report of the special committee, makes the most of its three or more nice big pages and creates just the right effect:

First. That the law is uncertain and requires clarification by the Congress.

Second. That this uncertainty is in regard to delivered pricing and freight absorption; basing-point is hardly mentioned.

NEGATIVE SIDE FEEBLY PRESENTED

But do not let me give you the impression that only the special committee's views are presented and only one side of the question is given. Heaven forbid. There is also appended a one page—not counting headings—"Arguments in the negative"—written, perhaps, by some miserable devil's advocate, hidden in a back room or perhaps in the basement. However, this statement of negative arguments is concocted in such a cryptic style and so deftly placed at the very end of the pamphlet that you may be sure that not much harm was done to the grandiose affirmative arguments of the special committee.

BALLOT PRESENTED

Now, at the very front, page 1 proper of the pamphlet, is the ballot, to be detached along a perforated line. This ballot is the best job of all in the entire pamphlet. It is such an interesting and self-selling document that it seems almost designed to deter anyone from reading any further, even from reading the report of the special committee itself. One can vote "yes" or "no" by marking "X" in the proper box and when I saw it I almost voted "yes" myself.

The ballot is in bold type. It contains relatively few words and these are spread over the entire page. The heading, in caps, is "Delivered pricing." This is followed by the declaration to be voted on, which in its entirety reads as follows:

Judicial and administrative rulings have created uncertainties as to the legal status of delivered pricing practices.

Therefore it is in the public interest to enact legislation to make certain that a seller in one locality is free to compete with sellers elsewhere despite different delivery costs, and that in order so to compete, the seller is permitted to absorb or equalize transportation costs.

Any legislation to such ends should be designed so as to preserve the fundamental safeguards of the antitrust laws.

HOW COULD ANYONE OPPOSE ON THE FACE OF IT

Now, I ask you, who on the face of it could vote against delivered pricing, particularly a businessman? It would be like voting against mother, home, or against "honesty is the best policy," or against free enterprise.

Let us look at this so-called declaration again and examine the three statements contained therein.

No. 1 is the statement "Judicial and administrative rulings have created uncertainties as to the legal status of delivered pricing practices." This really is a statement of fact or of basic declaration rather than an opinion or conclusion to be voted on. Once the voter accepts this, there is really nothing for him to do except to vote for No. 2 which is the real question put to him. In other words, No. 1 is ingeniously inserted for the purpose of raising the false clarification issue.

Sentence No. 2 puts squarely the question as to whether legislation should not be enacted to clarify this situation. Having accepted No. 1, a voter would be very ornery indeed not to vote "Yes" on the real question as stated in No. 2. Let us note that No. 2 is very carefully worded so as to apply only to delivered pricing and to freight absorption, just as the ballot is entitled "Delivered Pricing." Nothing is said about basing-point, which, I maintain, is the real interest of people behind this type of propaganda.

Then comes sentence No. 3, stating:

Any legislation to such ends should be designed so as to preserve the fundamental safeguards of the antitrust laws.

This is just the right kind of platitude to elicit that "yes" vote covering all three sentences.

There is no separate voting for each sentence. It is a variation of the time-honored salesman's device of getting a customer to think "yes" on one or two unimportant things so as to get him to say "Yes" on the whole thing.

I may be prejudiced, but I doubt that many people reading such a ballot go on to read the special committee report at all. They simply vote "yes" and that is the end of it.

But suppose some voters were really conscientious and studied the report and suppose the report was even thrown open for discussion. What would they find in the report?

REAL ISSUE SUBMERGED

The report, as we have seen, is frankly entitled "Delivered Pricing." The real issue relating to basing point is automatically excluded.

The first part of the report is called Introduction, and makes the following salient statement:

Delivered pricing methods used in some industries have recently been declared illegal by the courts, largely on the ground that these methods were utilized as a means of fixing prices. * * * Directly, as well as by implication, the opinions in these cases

have suggested certain interpretations of the law which can be invoked to invalidate virtually all forms of delivered pricing.

PURE HOKUM

You will note that there is not the slightest intimation in this statement of the special committee that the legal decisions referred to are basing-point decisions, in which the delivered pricing aspect was merely incidental. I will also tell you that the declaration that these legal opinions "can be invoked to invalidate virtually all forms of delivered pricing" is pure hokum. However, after establishing this false premise, and concealing the basing-point origin of the question the conclusion is stated:

Clarification of the laws involved is needed in order that buyers and sellers may be able to distinguish between legal and illegal delivered pricing practices, and to prevent * * * a requirement that all selling be on a uniform f. o. b. plant price basis.

NO REFERENCE TO CEMENT DECISIONS

The special committee report then has a section entitled "Legal Background," where again there is no reference at all to the Portland Cement decision, made by the Supreme Court, or, for that matter, to any Supreme Court decision at all. Instead, the entire discussion centers around the Federal Trade Commission, and the Commission is singled out for attacking delivered pricing practices, particularly basing-point and zone-pricing systems. The report then gratuitously imputes to the Commission by roundabout reasoning the conclusion that "whenever goods are sold on a delivered price" there is "a discrimination in price"—I am quoting the report—a most absurd straw-man argument.

FTC POLICY STATEMENT NOT QUOTED CORRECTLY

The report even goes so far as to quote out of context, and also incompletely, a clause contained in a recent statement of policy issued by the Commission. The quotation is that the courts "have not adjudicated the question whether a single concern not engaged in an effort to create a monopoly by destroying competitors may systematically reduce its prices to meet competition in localities where it habitually encounters such competition."

In the original, there are three more lines to this sentence. Moreover, it is immediately preceded by a sentence reading as follows:

The courts appear to have assumed, though the point has not been squarely decided, that a single seller has a substantive right in good faith to meet the equally low price of a competitor in individual transactions.

And it is immediately followed by this sentence:

In approaching these questions, the Commission sees no public interest and has no legal authority to proceed against the practices of a single seller except where probable or actual injury to competition appears in that seller's pricing practices.

REPORT ON POLL

The Legislative Daily, published by Governmental Affairs, for the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, February 18, 1949, reported as follows:

DELIVERED PRICING

Milton A. Smith, assistant general counsel of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, outlined to a commerce subcommittee the results of a referendum vote of the chamber's membership on a declaration of policy advocating legislation to clarify the legal status of delivered pricing practices.

Of the votes cast, 3,110 favored the proposed declaration and 54 opposed it.

The declaration states that it is in the public interest to enact legislation to make certain that a seller in one locality is free to compete with sellers elsewhere despite different delivery costs, and that in order to compete, the seller is permitted to absorb or equalize transportation costs.

"Any such legislation should be designed so as to preserve the fundamental safeguards of the antitrust laws," the declaration says.

Mr. Smith said that one point brought out by a special committee of the chamber's board of directors which made a study of this situation is that the lack of clear-cut rules by which businessmen may test the legality of any delivered pricing policy, is, of itself, an obstacle to successful business management and planning.

"When this uncertainty is coupled with the threat of institution of a requirement that all selling be on a uniform f. o. b. price basis, it becomes a serious deterrent to business growth and development," he said.

It will be noticed that the basing-point system was not mentioned although that was the main issue.

SURPRISED THAT 54 OPPOSED IT AS PRESENTED

Is it any wonder, in view of this type of presentation, that of the votes cast in the referendum, 3,110 were in favor of the proposed declaration and 54 were opposed. My only surprise is that the vote was not 3,164 in favor and none opposed.

SNIDE ATTACKS THAT ARE TYPICAL

It may be felt by some who are listening to me here, that I have gone into this matter too fully and that this particular referendum of policy did not merit the incisive analysis I have tried to give it. I cannot agree. This referendum, although a single instance, is typical of the kind of propaganda which has been deliberately utilized in the cold war which has been unofficially declared against the basing-point decision of the Supreme Court in the Portland Cement case. I am not contending that the Supreme Court has said the last word on basing point and on delivered pricing or freight absorption. On the contrary, I expect, as Congress itself has planned, that the courts will continue to supply clarification as cases arise. I do object, however, to snide attacks on honest judicial decisions, honestly arrived at for the purpose of effectuating the intent of Congress to outlaw unfair trade practices and discriminatory pricing designed to stifle competition.

REA HOUSING PLAN FOR BOTH URBAN AND RURAL HOMES ENDORSED BY AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a statement concerning H. R. 2811, the REA housing plan for both urban and rural homes, including questions and answers on the proposal; also a press release by the American Legion endorsing the bill:

LEGION BACKS PATMAN CO-OP HOUSING BILL

WASHINGTON, February 18.—A new cooperative housing bill designed to serve middle- and low-income families and providing special consideration for World War II veterans was endorsed today by the American Legion.

The measure, H. R. 2811, introduced in the House of Representatives on February 17 by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, Texas, would facilitate the establishment and financing of housing cooperatives and authorize direct Government loans at 4 percent interest if financing could not be obtained from private sources. The entire program would be managed by a new Federal agency known as the Cooperative Housing Administration, operating under the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

John Thomas Taylor, legislative director of the Legion, described the bill as the first sound answer to the housing problem of the average veteran family. Taylor said the legislation would carry into effect one of the major housing mandates adopted by the American Legion at its 1948 national convention at Miami, Fla.

"This bill would enable the veteran in the middle-income group to obtain adequate housing at a price he can afford to pay," Taylor stated.

The Patman bill would give additional Federal assistance to three types of cooperatives: (1) the cooperative that builds houses to sell; (2) the mutual home-ownership type, in which families occupy multiple-type units with each family sharing ownership of the entire project; (3) rental cooperatives which build single- or multiple-family units to rent to members of the group and nonmembers who are veterans.

Under the bill, an authorized cooperative could obtain a development loan amounting to not more than 5 percent of the estimated total cost of the project. This money would be used for preliminary planning and organization required before the cooperative qualifies for a constructions loan.

The Federal Housing Administration would be directed, under the measure, to insure loans made to cooperatives up to 90 percent of their value. The bill provides for a sliding scale of insurance, with the 90-percent maximum for homes or units costing $8,000 or less; 75 percent for those costing between $8,000 and $10,000; and 50 percent for those costing between $10,000 and $12,500.

Loans to veterans belonging to the cooperative would carry an additional 10 percent of insurance. This means that veterans buying homes in the $8,000-and-under class would have the advantage of 100-percent insurance. The measure also provides a waiver of indebtedness in the case of veterans who contract for dwellings as members of a cooperative and find it necessary to leave the community before completing purchase.

A provision for technical advice to co-op members is included in the Legion-supported bill. It further provides that a membership fee of $100 would be charged all members. The dues would be credited as part of the down-payment on a family unit.

EXPLANATION OF H. R. 2811, THE AMERICAN CITY AND FARM HOME ACT

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to make home ownership a reality for millions of American families who would otherwise be compelled to accept the insecure and unsatisfactory status of tenants, or to risk their life savings in unwise purchases. Heretofore the Federal Government, in the effort to increase the available supply of housing, has provided security to everyone connected with the housing industry except the occupants of the housing. This bill extends that security to these occupants, and at the same time actually increases the protection afforded to nonspeculative private investors.

Ownership, widely distributed among our people, is necessary to the development and maintenance of civic responsibility. It is the best conceivable antidote

for communistic propaganda. Home ownership, of all forms of ownership, is the most dearly cherished and the most zealously guarded. It is essential for the protection of the family as a social institution, and for the protection of the Nation as a democratic political entity.

This bill, which might also be called the Federal Home Security Act, provides assistance and encouragement for modern homeseekers in both the city and the country.

The provisions for city families would be made available through three types of cooperative associations—mutual home ownership associations; cooperative home building associations; and cooperative rental housing associations. These provisions would be administered by a newly created Administration within the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

The provisions for farm families would be extended through two types of cooperative associations—cooperative farm home ownership associations and cooperative farm labor camp associations. The Secretary of Agriculture would be charged with responsibility for administering the farm home provisions.

VETERANS BENEFITS

The assistance provided in the bill for veterans is substantial and enduring. This assistance would apply to every type of housing, whether in cities or on farms. Veterans buying homes outright would get increased mortgage insurance thus requiring less down payments. Equivalent reductions would apply to veterans participating in mutual home ownership associations. Veterans renting their homes would pay lower rents.

The method of assisting veterans is simple and direct. Aid would be made available to them as individuals rather than as groups. It would not be necessary for them to band together to the exclusion of other citizens.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Since the introduction of the bill a great many inquiries have been received with respect to it. These matters will be explained in detail when hearings are held before the House Banking and Currency Committee, but, in order to provide a better general understanding of the bill before hearings are started, the following answers have been prepared to some of the more important questions propounded:

CITY HOUSING PROVISIONS

1. Question. What's new about H. R. 2611? What does it do for city dwellers?

Answer. (1) It provides a new means of home ownership for millions of families who would otherwise have to live as tenants. (2) It provides for economies in construction and merchandising for families who wish to buy individual homes outright. (3) It provides for nonprofit rental housing to serve low-income families who are either ineligible for subsidized housing or for whom subsidized housing may not be available.

2. Question. How are these provisions made available to home seekers?

Answer. Through three different types of cooperative associations—mutual home ownership associations, cooperative home building associations, and cooperative rental housing associations.

1. Mutual home ownership associations

3. Question. What are mutual home ownership associations?

Answer. They are associations whose members combine their resources, with Government help, to purchase or construct large numbers of dwellings in one community, and which lease these dwellings to members under nonprofit proprietary lease contracts.

4. Question. What is a proprietary lease contract?

Answer. It is a contract between an association and a member under which the member is guaranteed continuous right of occupancy as long as the monthly charges and other conditions set forth in the contract are met.

5. Question. Are these proprietary lease contracts transferable?

Answer. Yes. Ownership of such contracts may be sold, assigned, or otherwise transferred (subject to such restrictions as may be prescribed by associations and set forth in the contracts).

6. Question. What are the principal advantages of mutual home ownership associations to members?

Answer. Members obtain and maintain their homes on a wholesale rather than a retail basis, thereby saving from 25 to 50 percent. They do not have to assume burdensome, long-time debts. They can sell or otherwise transfer their equities (proprietary lease contracts) much more easily and less expensively than they could sell their equities in homes purchased outright.

7. Question. How are these 25 to 50 percent savings effected?

Answer. First costs are reduced through volume purchase of materials and mass construction methods; lower advertising costs, commissions, closing charges, and other fees produce further savings, and speculative profits are eliminated. In addition to these savings on the purchase price, carrying costs are reduced by reason of lower interest rates, longer periods for repayment, and more efficient maintenance and repair. Combined lower first costs and lower carrying costs will bring about the net, out-of-pocket savings to members of from 25 to 50 percent.

8. Question. Are these claims of savings real, or just theoretical estimates?

Answer. The actual operating experience of mutual home ownership projects which have been in existence for a number of years amply substantiates such claims.

9. Question. Does the bill provide for Government subsidies to these mutual home ownership associations?

Answer. No. The mortgage insurance provisions of the bill are substantially the same as those that have previously been extended to investors and speculative builders. This bill makes these provisions available and meaningful for the first time for occupants of housing, as well as to builders.

10. Question. Do members contracting for dwellings have the same kind of security as if they had purchased them outright?

Answer. They have even more security of tenure because their monthly charges are less and because they are constantly accumulating reserves in addition to their progressively increasing equities.

11. Question. How do members' monthly charges compare with normal rental charges for similar accommodations?

Answer. Inquiries made of several associations now operating show charges to members to be substantially less than rents in the same area; notwithstanding the fact that charges to members include reserves and payments on principal indebtedness and the further fact that residential rents are subject to rent control.

12. Question. How much would members have to pay to obtain homes from associations?

Answer. An initial membership fee of $100 would be required of all members. After costs of dwellings are determined, the cash payment, including the $100 initial payment, would depend upon the cost of the dwelling unit desired. For example, nonveterans would pay in cash 10 percent of actual costs below $8,000; for a $10,000 dwelling they would pay in cash $1,300 and for a $12,500 dwelling they would pay $2,125; veterans would be required to make no cash payments, other than the initial $100, on dwellings costing $8,000 or less; they would pay $300 and approximately $1,375 on dwellings costing $10,000 and $12,500, respectively.

13. Question. Would individual members be subject to foreclosure, or to personal responsibility for an association's debts, if the association should not be able to meet its mortgage indebtedness?

Answer. No. As members or stockholders their personal responsibility would be limited to the amount of their investment in the association.

14. Question. How would projects be financed if private investors should not participate?

Answer. Provision is made for direct loans from the Federal Government, but this provision is to be utilized only if private capital should not be attracted by the investments offered.

15. Question. What inducements are there for private capital to invest in such projects?

Answer. (a) Projects are more economically maintained than rental housing projects.

(b) Lower first costs and lower operating costs afford more sound long-range security.

(c) There is no strife between landlords and tenants.

(d) Perpetual upkeep prevents "neighborhood blight."

(e) Pride of possession insures responsible care and prompt payment of interest and amortization charges.

(f) Provisions for reserves increase stability.

(g) Mortgages are insured by the Federal Government, and so afford final and complete protection.

2. Cooperative home building associations

16. Question. What are cooperative home-building associations?

Answer. These associations would require, through construction or purchase, individual dwellings to be sold outright to members at cost.

17. Question. What would be the advantages to members?

Answer. Members would be able to make the same savings in first costs as have been set forth for members of mutual home-ownership associations. They would also be able to save a part of the merchandising costs.

18. Question. What about down payments for homes built by cooperative building associations and sold to members?

Answer. The same scale would be used for down payments on such houses as for the cash payments scheduled for members of mutual ownership associations. Veteran members would receive the same preferences.

3. Cooperative rental housing associations

19. Question. What are cooperative rental housing associations?

Answer. These associations would provide rental housing on a nonprofit basis to members who may not at that time wish to assume the obligations required for either mutual or outright ownership. Veterans are not required to become members in order to occupy accommodations provided by such associations.

FARM HOUSING PROVISIONS

20. Question. Why is it necessary to have separate provisions for farm housing?

Answer. Farm homes are usually integral parts of the farms on which they are located; and consequently it woud be impracticable to utilize the same form of governmental assistance to farm families as that provided for city dwellers. Provisions must be made to take care of the needs of farm tenants and share croppers as well as those of farm owners. Because of this integration of farm homes with farm economy, it has been considered desirable that the farm home provisions be administered under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture.

4. Cooperative farm home ownership associations

21. Question. What are cooperative farm home ownership associations?

Answer. They are nonprofit associations organized to provide farm homes, either for rent or sale, to farm owners, farm tenants, sharecroppers, and other farm workers. These associations would provide homes for our farm population just as REA has provided the benefits of electricity.

22. Question. Could farm homes built by these associations be sold outright to members?

Answer. Yes. Home ownership for as many families as possible is the ultimate objective of the entire bill. Members of cooperative farm home associations can build up equities and these, together with annual subsidies, can be used to purchase homes outright.

23. Question. Could a farm owner contract with the association for more than one dwelling?

Answer. Yes. He may contract to lease as many dwellings as would be required to house the families working on his farm. But he could not sublease these dwellings at a price higher than he had contracted to pay the association. He could contract to buy outright only one dwelling, and that one only for his own use and occupancy.

24. Question. Who would get the subsidies provided for in the bill?

Answer. Subsidies would be paid to associations to be credited exclusively to the accounts of occupants of dwellings, whether or not such occupants might be members of the association.

25. Question. How are subsidies for low-income farm families provided under this bill?

Answer. Subsidies to farm families are supplementary to the farmer's own cash income. The amount of subsidy, if any, depends upon the sum required, in addition to cash income, to provide living accommodations meeting prescribed minimum housing standards. No income limitation would be placed upon farm family occupants of housing owned by associations, but only families whose incomes fall below a certain point receive any subsidy. This subsidy would increase with the ratio of the deficiency of each family's individual income.

26. Question. Would farm-owner members of associations, as well as tenants, sharecroppers and laborers, receive subsidies?

Answer. Yes, if their incomes should fall below the prescribed limit.

5. Cooperative farm labor camp associations

27. Question. What are cooperative farm labor camp associations?

Answer. They are local associations, organized in farming areas under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture, to provide living accommodations for migrant and other seasonal farm workers.

28. Question. How would rents for these facilities be determined?

Answer. They would be fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture, and would be based upon the amount required to pay interest and amortization plus operating expenses.

29. Question. Who would operate these associations?

Answer. The regularly elected members of the board of directors of associations would be responsible for their operation under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture. Inspections, audits and other supervisory procedures would be utilized to assure adherence to such regulations.

30. Question. What special benefits would be extended to veterans desiring to participate in the farm-housing program?

Answer. Lower down payments would be required, similar to those provided for in the case of low-income city housing. Subsidies paid to cooperative farm ownership associations for credit to the account of veterans would be substantially greater than those credited to nonveterans. Subsidies paid to farm labor camp associations for the account of veteran occupants would be 50 cents per day as compared with 25 cents per day for nonveterans.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain statements, excerpts, and quotations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. POULSON (at the request of Mr. ALLEN of California), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 198. An act for the relief of the city and county of San Francisco;

S. 279. An act to authorize the advance on the retired list of Lt. John T. McDermott, United States Navy (retired), to the grade of lieutenant commander; and

S. 307. An act for the relief of Engebert Axer.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 3, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

306. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting its report on veterans' affairs (H. Doc. No. 92); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed.

307. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting to the Congress, in typescript, the report of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs which was prepared for the Commission's consideration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

308. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting to the Congress, in typescript, the study of the Veterans' Administration which was prepared for the Commission's consideration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

309. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 and prior fiscal years in the amount of $561,513,601.67 and contract authorizations in the amount of $301,606,000, together with certain proposed provisions and increases in limitations pertaining to existing appropriations (H. Doc. No. 93); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

310. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation amending certain laws providing for membership and participation by the United States in certain international organizations and authorizing appropriations therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 534. A bill to provide for the construction, extension, and improvement of school buildings in Hoopa, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 197.) Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 994. A bill to provide for disposition and use of tribal funds of the Navajo Tribe of Indians; without amendment (Rept. No. 198). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 1755. A bill to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 199). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 124. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 2363, a bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) to the Gulf coast and creating the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission; without amendment (Rept. No. 200). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 107. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 201). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 834. A bill to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 so as to authorize the payment of fair compensation to persons contracting to deliver certain strategic or critical minerals or metals in cases of failure to recover reasonable costs, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 202). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 26. An act for the relief of Jose Babace;

without amendment (Rept. No. 192). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 27. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 193). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 90. An act to provide for the naturalization of Richard Kim; with an amendment (Rept. No. 194). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 315. An act for the relief of Dr. Chung Kwai Lui; without amendment (Rept. No. 195). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 335. An act for the relief of Claris U. Yeadon; without amendment (Rept. No. 196). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:

H. R. 3143. A bill to establish a Federal Commission on Services for the Physically Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CHRISTOPHER:

H. R. 3144. A bill to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COLE of Kansas:

H. R. 3145. A bill to establish a sinking fund for the payment of Government obligations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 3146. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding material; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 3147. A bill to give employees of religious, charitable, scientific, literary, and educational institutions the benefits of coverage under the Social Security Act, the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, and the Federal Insurance Contributions Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 3148. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 3149. A bill to facilitate the repayment of certain loans or advances made by the Federal Works Administrator to assist the States and their agencies and political subdivisions in making advance provision for public works; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 3150. A bill to revise and repeal certain acts relating to rules of survey to permit departures from the system of rectangular survey when necessary on all public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 3151. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 25, 1938, as amended, by providing for the certification of batches of drugs composed wholly or partly of any kind of aureomycin, chloramphenicol, and bacitracin, or any derivative thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 3152. A bill to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital for Negro veterans at the birthplace of Booker T. Washington in Franklin County, Va.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REDDEN:

H. R. 3153. A bill relating to the development of tourist and other public facilities in conjunction with the Alaska Highway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SANBORN:

H. R. 3154. A bill to authorize extension of time for payment of income taxes for the taxable year 1948 in the cases of those farmers who expect carry-backs from the taxable year 1949 as a result of losses in their cattle-raising operations which they have suffered due to blizzards and subnormal temperatures during the calendar year 1949; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 3155. A bill to amend Public Law 885, Eightieth Congress, chapter 813, second session; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 3156. A bill to amend the act of December 22, 1944 (relating to the construction of public works for flood control), to permit the sale of land in reservoir areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 3157. A bill to provide relief for certain officers of the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 3158. A bill to revise and codify laws of the Canal Zone regarding the administration of estates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 3159. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3160. A bill to repeal section 8 of the act of March 3, 1893; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 3161. A bill providing for veterans' rehabilitation, preventing unemployment, chaos, and confusion, and promoting individual, productive enterprise by enabling the returned veterans to engage in such enterprises and employ themselves in place of asking for jobs that may not exist; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 3162. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide limitations on the time within which actions may be brought for the recovery of undercharges and overcharges by or against common carriers by motor vehicle and freight forwarders; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 3163. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army in certain cases to undertake small river and harbor improvement projects not specifically authorized by Congress; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 3164. A bill to provide disability benefits for persons who performed uncompensated services in the administration of the selective training and service system and the emergency price-control and rationing program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 183. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in 1949 in commemoration of the fiftieth aniversary of the founding of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. Res. 125. Resolution for investigation of lobbies and lobbying activities; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, requesting the passage of H. R. 2122, relative to the construction of housing facilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, requesting a bonus on gold mined in Alaska; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, requesting limitation of the powers of the Civil Aeronautics Board with respect to Alaska; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, urging the inclusion of Alaska in the Bureau of Reclamation program; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, urging the building of a highway connecting the interior highway system with the port of Cordova, Alaska; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ENGEL of Michigan:

H. R. 3165. A bill for the relief of Allison W. Ind; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 3166. A bill for the relief of Harold J. Keeley, colonel, United States Army (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3167. A bill for the relief of Jennie S. Gilliland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FELLOWS:

H. R. 3168. A bill for the relief of Ella L. Browning; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 3169. A bill for the relief of Agustín Cortés Martínez, his wife Guillermina Díaz de Cortés, his children Santiago Cortés Díaz, Agustina Guillermina Cortés Díaz, and Guillermo Agustín Cortés Díaz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3170. A bill for the relief of Ruperto Varela Canosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3171. A bill for the relief of Víctor Cuquerella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3172. A bill for the relief of Leandro Pérez Urría; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3173. A bill for the relief of Rafael Troyano de los Ríos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

146. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress to insist upon and work for the proper kind of Federal rent-control legislation to prevent inflationary prices; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

147. Also, resolution of the Representative Council of the City of Newport, R. I., urging upon the Rhode Island Members of Congress, the Navy Department, and all other Federal agencies engaged in establishing, maintaining, and operating housing projects the need of acting speedily on measures that will provide adequate housing for men of the United States Navy on land in the city of Newport, R. I., owned by the Navy and at present not in use and undeveloped; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

148. Also, resolution passed by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress to work for the passage of an amendment to the Federal minimum-wage law increasing the present hourly minimum rate to at least 75 cents an hour; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

149. By Mr. SADLAK: Petition of the Lithuanian-American Council of New Haven, Conn., to the Government of the United States to use all means in its power to compel Russian troops and police forces to withdraw from Lithuania's territory; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

150. By Mr. SASSCER: Resolution of the Council of Lithuanian Societies of Baltimore, Md., commemorating the thirty-first anniversary of the proclamation of the independence of Lithuania and urging that measures be adopted in accordance with the President's statements that the American people desire to work for a world in which all nations are free to govern themselves, and that these principles be applied to the Lithuanian situation before the planned liquidation, deportation, and dispersion of the Lithuanian people by Soviet Russia destroys the national entity of Lithuania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

151. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution entitled "Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress," passed by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations at the January session, 1949, and approved by the Governor February 15, 1949; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

152. By Mr. SADLAK: Memorial of the Common Council of the City of New Britain, Conn., requesting the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

153. By Mr. WHITE of Idaho: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, requesting the Congress to amend section 5 of the Idaho Admission Act; to the Committee on Public Lands.

154. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, recommending the authorization by the Congress of the Albeni Falls project; to the Committee on Public Works.

155. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress to use their efforts to amend the Federal Social Security Act with the purpose of extending the coverage and the benefits now authorized by such legislation, passed by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 3, 1949

(Legislative day of Monday, February 21, 1949)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Edward L. R. Elson, D. D., minister, the National Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, the same yesterday, today, and forever, deliver us now from the clash and clamor of our day, from the pressure of duties, the competition of interests, and the confusion of voices, that we may hear once more the still, small voice. Beyond all speech, yet ever speaking may we behold the Living Word—Son of Man and Son of God. Hearing Him, may we be quick to obey Him and ready to serve Him. Turn us back to the truth that He that is greatest amongst us shall be the servant of all, and whosoever loseth his life for the truth shall find it again, through Him, whose name is above every name. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3082) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPEAL OF CERTAIN ACTS RELATING TO RULES OF SURVEY

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to revise and repeal certain acts relating to rules of survey to permit departures from the system of rectangular survey when necessary on all public lands, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

VOLUNTARY PLAN FOR ALLOCATION OF STEEL PRODUCTS FOR GAS PIPE LINE TO ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION PLANT

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, the voluntary plan for the allocation of steel products for gas pipe line to Atomic Energy Commission plant, and the request and the letter of compliance to the plan (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the work of the General Accounting Office for the fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 4 (B) OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

A letter from the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, recommending legislation to amend section 4 (b) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

DEATH OF MR. A. T. CAPEHART

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I announce to the Senate that Mr. A. T. Capehart, father of my colleague the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], died suddenly at 2 p. m. Wednesday in Washington, Ind., following a heart attack. He was stricken on the street in his home city and died before aid could reach him.

The senior Mr. Capehart was born October 20, 1866, in Pike County, Ind., and spent most of his life there and in Daviess County. He is survived by his widow and four children: Senator Capehart; Mrs. Byron Haskins, of near Washington, Ind.; and Ivan and Paul Capehart, of Louisville, Ky., and De Kalb, Ill., respectively; 13 grandchildren and 9 great grandchildren. Senator CAPEHART's mother died in 1921.

Funeral services will be held Friday at 1 p. m. in the Gill mortuary in Washington, Ind., and at 2 p. m. in the Iva Church near Otwell, Ind. Burial will be in the IOOF cemetery in Otwell.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the session of the Senate on Saturday next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from the session of the Senate on Saturday, if there is to be a session on Saturday, in order that I may attend the Virginia Day exercises at Valley Forge the next morning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from sessions of the Senate this afternoon and tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, leave is granted.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold the suggestion long enough to enable me to ask unanimous consent that the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] be permitted to present a matter for insertion in the RECORD, and make a 2-minute observation about a certain event in Minnesota which is very interesting to him?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not see how, under the rules, I can do that.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest to the distinguished majority leader that yesterday I granted unanimous consent to the Senator from Florida for the same purpose. Inasmuch as a quorum call has not been had, there would be no abuse of the general rule we have entered into, and it would be an appreciated courtesy if the Senator would agree.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into yesterday, the Senator from Florida is entitled to the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. There is no dispute about that; but if unanimous consent

is to be asked for insertions in the RECORD, I ask that at that time, then, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota be granted that courtesy, without prejudicing the right of the Senator from Florida at all relative to his parliamentary status.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll for the ascertainment of a quorum.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	Murray
Anderson	Hoey	Myers
Baldwin	Holland	Neely
Brewster	Humphrey	O'Conor
Bricker	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Ives	Pepper
Broughton	Jenner	Reed
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Chapman	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kem	Smith, Maine
Connally	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Kilgore	Sparkman
Donnell	Knowland	Stennis
Douglas	Langer	Taft
Downey	Lodge	Taylor
Eastland	Long	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	McCarran	Thye
Flanders	McCarthy	Tobey
Frear	McClellan	Tydings
Fulbright	McFarland	Vandenberg
George	McGrath	Watkins
Gillette	McKellar	Wherry
Green	Magnuson	Wiley
Gurney	Malone	Williams
Hayden	Maybank	Withers
Hendrickson	Miller	Young
Hickenlooper	Millikin	
	Mundt	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is necessarily absent because of the death of his father, Mr. Alvin T. Capehart.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement of yesterday, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield in order that I may make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Illinois, the majority leader, in order that he may propound a unanimous-consent request, with the understanding that I shall not thereby lose my place on the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to say that I do not object, but I desire to withdraw the unanimous-consent request I made prior to the calling of the roll in behalf of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], who will seek the floor for himself sometime later during the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida that the Senator from Illinois may propound a unanimous-consent request for the presentation or introduction of routine matters? The Chair hears none.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may be permitted to file with the clerk bills and joint resolutions, petitions, and memorials, and other matters which are ordinarily presented during the morning hour, without thereby interfering with or jeopardizing the parliamentary situation on the question now pending before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the request of the Senator from Illinois that Senators may file such matters with the clerk, or that they be permitted to make their presentations on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. LUCAS. I make the request that they be permitted to make the presentations on the floor of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without debate?

Mr. LUCAS. Without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, favoring creation of a new department of natural resources, and so forth; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

(See joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. MILLIKIN on February 28, 1949, p. 1571, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, favoring the enactment of legislation to aid the State in the enforcement of the cigarette tax now evaded by use of the United States mails; to the Committee on Finance.

(See concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. GILLETTE on February 28, 1949, p. 1572, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho approving the report of the Corps of Engineers of the Army on the Albeni Falls project, located on the Pend d'Oreille River, Idaho; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. MILLER on March 1, 1949, p. 1626, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, favoring an amendment to section 5 of the Idaho Admission Act to provide that oil, gas and/or hydrocarbons leases may be made upon school lands for an initial period of 10 years, etc.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. MILLER on March 1, 1949, p. 1628, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, favoring appropriation of necessary funds to proceed with work on the interstate stream of Bear River, as will effectively prevent the destruction of lands and irrigation pumping systems in Franklin County, Idaho, and Cache County, Utah; to the Committee on Appropriations.

(See joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. MILLER on March 1, 1949, p. 1629, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; ordered to lie on the table:

"House Concurrent Resolution 7

"Concurrent resolution expressing confidence in the Honorable A. M. Cristy and in the Honorable Willson C. Moore, judges of the circuit court, first circuit, Territory of Hawaii and the integrity of the judiciary in Hawaii

"Whereas the President of the United States has nominated the Honorable A. M. Cristy to serve as associate justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, and the Honorable Willson C. Moore to succeed himself for another term as judge of the circuit court, first circuit, Territory of Hawaii; and

"Whereas the confirmation of the Honorable A. M. Cristy and the Honorable Willson C. Moore is now pending before the Senate of the United States; and

"Whereas, a concerted attempt has been made by certain local groups to discredit the judges and to prevent their confirmation by conducting a campaign of vilification, fact distortion, and baseless accusations; and

"Whereas the functioning of a fearless, independent, and impartial judiciary in Hawaii is imperiled by such attacks by groups seeking to attain their own selfish ends; and

"Whereas the preservation of an independent judiciary presided over by able, fearless, and independent men is a matter of grave concern to the people of the Territory of Hawaii; Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-fifth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the senate concurring)*, That the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii hereby express its implicit confidence in the fairness, integrity, and honesty of the Honorable A. M. Cristy and the Honorable Willson C. Moore and the high integrity of the judiciary in Hawaii and further express its desire that favorable action on their nominations may be taken by the Senate of the Congress of the United States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That duly authenticated copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Interior, the Attorney General of the United States, and the Delegate of Congress from Hawaii."

A resolution adopted by the Methodist Federation for School Action, New York, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation providing statehood for Alaska and Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the central committee of the Democratic Party of the Territory of Hawaii, relating to statehood for Hawaii, and so forth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolutions adopted by the City Council of the City of Stevens Point, Wis., the Common Council of the City of New Britain, Conn., and the City Council of the City of Kankakee and the City Council of the City of Centralia, both in the State of Illinois, favoring the enactment of legislation proclaiming October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A telegram in the nature of a petition signed by John J. Pilch, chairman, and John W. Austin, secretary-treasurer, Hearst chain conference of Typographical and Mailer Unions, Chicago, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to repeal the Taft-Hartley labor law; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Kentucky Petroleum Marketers Association at its twenty-third annual meeting in Louisville, Ky., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide for the commencement of the Big Sandy lock and dam project; to the Committee on Public Works.

The memorial of the Electric Utility Workers Union, Indianapolis, Ind., signed by R. C. Benson, president, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for a TVA steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the Nebraska MVA Committee, Omaha, Nebr., favoring the enactment of legislation creating a Missouri Valley Administration; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the Nebraska MVA Committee, Omaha, Nebr., favoring an investigation of water-development and lobbying organizations, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. HUNT):

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Joint Memorial 4

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to abolish the Jackson Hole National Monument

"Whereas the creation and existence of the Jackson Hole National Monument is contrary and inimical to the inherent rights and interests of the citizens of the State of Wyoming; Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of the Thirtieth Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the senate concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to adopt legislation abolishing the said Jackson Hole National Monument and that copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, United States Senators JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY and LESLIE C. HUNT, and Congressman FRANK A. BARRETT.

"HERMAN D. MAYLAND,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"GEORGE BURKE,
"*President of the Senate.*

"Approved February 19, 1949.
"A. G. CRANE, *Governor.*"

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY—RESOLUTION OF MINNESOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, favoring development of the St. Lawrence waterway.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to take prompt action to ratify the agreement between the Government of the United States and the Dominion of Canada for the development of the St. Lawrence waterway

Whereas representatives of the Governments of the United States and of the Dominion of Canada in 1941 consummated and signed an agreement for the development of the St. Lawrence River, both for navigation and power purposes, so as to permit free passage of oceangoing ships from the Atlantic Ocean to the head of the Great Lakes and into the heart of the American Continent, and make available the development of this great potential source of electric energy for necessary public use; and

Whereas the agreement was under consideration by the Congress of the United States at the time of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, and shortly thereafter we were at war with the Central Powers in Europe, as a consequence of which action on the agreement was advisedly deferred; and

Whereas world development since 1941 have made it increasingly apparent that the securing of a permanent and just peace will inevitably be attended with vastly increased commerce with foreign nations, and particularly with the European and Asiatic nations, and the great industries located on the Great Lakes and the agriculture of the Northwest States will benefit as a result of the opening of the St. Lawrence as a shorter route for ocean commerce to deliver to foreign nations the products of our industries and agriculture, and more than ever before the development of the power to be generated by the St. Lawrence is recognized as a vital economic necessity; and

Whereas the agreement is now again being submitted to the Congress of the United States for approval, the Presidents of the United States for the past 30 years have committed themselves to the development of the St. Lawrence, and President Harry S. Truman has characterized the St. Lawrence project as of economic value comparable to the Panama Canal, and a vital necessity as a defense measure; and

Whereas the State of Minnesota, through its legislature, for the last 30 years has affirmed its continued support of this project, and through the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Tidewater Commission of Minnesota has continuously promoted the development of the St. Lawrence River, believing that the project is a vital necessity for the stimulation and development of the resources of this State and of the entire Northwest, as well as a great economic advantage to the Nation, and that the project has already been too long delayed; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the house of representatives, the senate concurring, commend and support the President of the United States in his steadfast, consistent and energetic support of this project, and urge the Congress of the United States, without further delay, to approve and ratify the agreement already concluded with the Dominion of Canada, and provide the necessary funds for the speedy completion of this great project as a vital, economic and defense necessity; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to send copies of this resolution to the President, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Minnesota.

GERALD T. MULLIN,
President of the Senate.
JOHN A. HARTLE,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Approved February 23, 1949.
LUTHER YOUNGDAHL,
Governor of the State of Minnesota.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS OF INDIANA LEGISLATURE

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, certified copies of enrolled Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 4 of the Legislature of the State of Indiana favoring the enactment of legislation to enact effective legislation providing for flood control in the Wabash River watershed area and tributaries thereto, and enrolled Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 11 of that legislature, protesting against the federalization of the National Guard of the United States and the National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia in whole or in part.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolutions will be received, and appropriately referred, and, under the rule, printed in the RECORD.

To the Committee on Public Works:

"Enrolled Senate Concurrent Resolution 4

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to enact effective legislation providing for flood control in the Wabash River watershed area and tributaries thereto

"Whereas each year the overflow of the many rivers, streams, creeks, and tributaries which empty into the Wabash River creates a flood condition imperiling life and causing property damage throughout the entire Wabash Valley, contributing at the same time to similar conditions which exist in the Southern States through which the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers flow; and

"Whereas the specific consequences of such flood conditions are: Silting and sedimentation of stream channels, reservoirs, dams, ditches, and harbors; loss of soil and water; an increase in the speed and volume of rainfall run-off, causing severe and increasing floods, which bring suffering, disease, and death, impoverishment of families, damage to roads, highways, railways, buildings, and other property from floods; and losses in navigation, hydroelectric power, municipal water supply, and underground water reserve; Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring)*:

"SECTION 1. The Eighty-sixth General Assembly of the State of Indiana does hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to enact effective legislation for the control of floods and the prevention of soil erosion, to preserve natural resources, prevent impairment of dams and reservoirs, assist in maintaining the navigability of rivers, protect and promote the health, safety, and general welfare of the people, and to appropriate sufficient funds for the execution of such legislation.

"SEC. 2. The secretary of the senate is directed to forward copies of this resolution to the Secretary of the United States Senate, to the Clerk of the National House of Representatives, and to each United States Senator and Congressman from Indiana."

"CERTIFICATE

"I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution is a true and complete copy of senate concurrent resolution No. 4 as the same appears on file in my office as secretary of state of the State of Indiana, such office being the duly designated repository of all original acts and resolutions of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana; that said resolution was duly adopted by the eighty-sixth session of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana (1949) and that the signatures appended thereto by the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Governor of the State of Indiana are the true signatures of the presiding officers of said houses of said General Assembly and of the Governor of the State of Indiana.

"Witness my hand and the seal of the State of Indiana this February 16, 1949.

[SEAL] "CHARLES F. KEMMING,
"*Secretary of State of the State of Indiana.*"

To the Committee on Armed Services:

"Enrolled Senate Concurrent Resolution 11

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to oppose the federalization of the National Guard of the United States and the National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia in whole or in part

"Whereas the Secretary of Defense brought into being in 1947 the Committee on Civilian Components, commonly known as the Gray board, and which committee was directed by said Secretary of Defense to make a comprehensive, objective, and impartial study of the armed forces; and

"Whereas said Committee on Civilian Components on June 30, 1948, in its report to the Secretary of Defense, recommended, among other things, that national security required that all services have one Federal Reserve Force which should be accomplished—

"(a) by establishing the Reserve forces of the Army under the Army clause of the Constitution;

"(b) by similarly establishing the Reserve forces of the Air Force under appropriate legal authority;

"(c) by incorporating the National Guard and the Organized Reserve Corps into the Army Reserve force under the name of The National Guard of the United States;

"(d) by incorporating the Air National Guard and Air Reserve into the Air Force Reserve under the name of the United States Air Force Reserve; and

"Whereas on December 15, 1948, the Secretary of Defense recommended to the President of the United States, among other things, the federalization of the Air National Guard; greater Federal control over the personnel, equipment, facilities, allocation of money to the States; and

"Whereas federalization of the National Guard, in whole or in part, by the organization of a single Federal Reserve force under the Army clause of the Constitution instead of under the militia clauses of the Constitution, as the National Guard is now organized, and under which the sovereign States retain the authority for the appointment of the officers of the National Guard and the authority for the training of the National Guard in time of peace in accordance with the discipline prescribed by the Congress; and

"Whereas such federalization would violate the principle of States' rights in that the framers of the Constitution contemplated a standing army as the only Federal force is clear from the arguments advanced by Hamilton, whereby he persuaded the States to accept the principle of a standing army, large enough to accomplish the immediate purpose of the Congress only; its size to be controlled by limiting appropriations to a period of 2 years only with the further agreement that the States would maintain no troops in time of peace, other than with the consent of Congress, in exchange for the provision that the Congress would have power to provide for the organizing, arming, and disciplining (training) the militia and reserving to the States only the power to appoint officers and the authority to train the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress; and

"Whereas complete federalization would violate the principle upon which the States bargained, as above explained, by giving to the Federal Government, in addition to its own standing army, a part of the militia over which the States would have no control or power whatsoever, instead of the control provided in clause 16, section 8, article I of the Constitution; and

"Whereas nowhere in the Constitution is there any power given to the Federal Government to do other than raise and support armies and standing armies only were contemplated with no power ever given to the Federal Government to organize and support a Federal militia and none exists; and

"Whereas federalization of the National Guard as now constituted under the militia clauses of the Constitution, in whole or in part, would not only violate the principle of States' rights but would violate existing agreements between the Federal Government and the sovereign States whereby the States accepted in good faith the allotments made by the War Department in 1945, and have completed the organization of such allotments, insofar as authorized by the Congress and for which funds have been provided; and

"Whereas federalization of the National Guard, air or ground, as recommended by the Secretary of Defense and the Committee on Civilian Components, would destroy at one blow the National Guard as it now exists and which has rendered exceptional and valiant service to the Nation in two world wars and in time of peace would impose fantastic costs beyond the ability of the Nation to meet and would seriously jeopardize our national security and would result in the centralization of all military power in the Federal Government and ultimately in the hands of a few, and thus pave the way for the establishment of a dictatorship, military or otherwise, in this country; and

"Whereas the States would be left without an internal security force and would be compelled to organize and maintain State troops at great cost to the States with the result that there would thus be maintained a Federal Reserve and State military force, creating a great duplication of effort and expense while the National Guard, as it is now constituted and controlled, not only furnishes the necessary internal security for the States but, in addition, serves as a component of the Army of the United States and a first line of defense thereof as provided by the National Defense Act: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana (the house of representatives concurring):

"SECTION 1. That the Congress and the President of the United States are hereby memorialized to retain intact the National Guard of the United States, ground and air, as it is now organized under the militia clauses of the Federal Constitution and thus reserve to the States the controls provided by the Constitution in time of peace and ensure that it will be at the disposal of the State in time of peace and that there will be unity in the armed forces of the Nation at a time when unity is so essential.

"SEC. 2. That copies of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the chairman of the Armed Services Committees of the Congress, and Members of the Indiana delegation in Congress."

"CERTIFICATE

"I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution is a true and complete copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution 11 as the same appears on file in my office as secretary of state of the State of Indiana, such office being the duly designated repository of all original acts and resolutions of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana; that said resolution was duly adopted by the Eighty-sixth session of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana (1949) and that the signatures appended thereto by the president of the senate, the speaker of the house of representatives, and the Governor of the State of Indiana are the true signatures of the presiding officers of said houses of said general assembly and of the Governor of the State of Indiana.

"Witness by hand and the seal of the State of Indiana this March 1, 1949.

[SEAL] "CHARLES F. FLEMING,
"Secretary of State of the State of Indiana."

RESOLUTION OF KNOX COUNTY (NEBR.) BOARD OF SUPERVISORS RELATING TO ASSISTANCE DURING RECENT DISASTROUS STORMS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a resolution unanimously adopted and signed by the Board of Supervisors of Knox County, Nebr., expressing the appreciation of the people of that county for the assistance rendered them during the recent disastrous storm conditions that prevailed for several weeks throughout that area.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the blizzard conditions of this past winter, from November 18, 1948, marooned and isolated Knox County, Nebr., from the rest of the State with a blanket of 71 inches of snow on our 1,800 miles of roads, 2,500 farms, and 9 towns; and

Whereas the repeated and unprecedented high winds accompanying our 9 blizzards caused huge drifts to envelope the highways, towns, farmsteads, and haystacks, which conditions made it impossible for traffic to move and thereby brought about the acute possibility of human suffering to 18,000 or more persons as well as to 200,000 or more head of livestock; and

Whereas the enormity of the task of clearing the snow from the highways, farms, and towns was far beyond the financial means of the county, and, in addition, the necessary volume of snow-clearing equipment to do the task was unavailable locally; and

Whereas such conditions prompted us to appeal for aid, and, after our urgent appeals were answered, we were able to clear our highways of snow and make available to our citizens access to the much-needed feed, food, and medical attention to alleviate the desperate conditions that existed; and

Whereas the measures made available to us to relieve our disasterous predicament were swift and complete, the cases of human tragedy and livestock losses were slight; and

Whereas the people of Knox County feel a deep sense of appreciation to all of those persons and governmental agencies who made Operations Snowbound available to us; and

Whereas the County Board of Supervisors of Knox County, as the local governmental body representing all the people of our county, desires to express for all of our citizens appreciation of the splendid work done: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the County Board of Supervisors of Knox County, Nebr., That those persons and governmental agencies responsible for Operations Snowbound be informed of our appreciation of their efforts in our behalf, and as a token thereof that a copy of this resolution be delivered to each of the following persons and governmental agencies, namely, the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman; the Governor of the State of Nebraska, Val Peterson; the Congress of the United States; the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; Gen. Lewis A.

Pick; Corps of Engineers of the United States Army; the Fifth Army of the United States; the National Red Cross; the National Guard.

Dated at Center, Knox County, Nebr., this 21st day of February 1949.

COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
OF KNOX COUNTY, NEBR.,
JOHN D. FORSYTH, *Chairman*,
P. T. MALONE,
T. E. TIKEDSKY,
CING BOELTER,
ALFRED HARM,
RUEBEN E. ANDERSON,
ERICK RISNESS, *Supervisors*.

Attest:
[SEAL] GEO. W. PETERSON,
County Clerk.

DEVELOPMENT OF ST. LAWRENCE HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT—LETTER AND RESOLUTION OF NORTH CAROLINA RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from Clayton Moretz, secretary-treasurer of the North Carolina Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Sanford, N. C., enclosing a resolution adopted by that association, favoring the so-called St. Lawrence hydroelectric project. I ask that the letter and resolution be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTH CAROLINA RURAL ELECTRIC
COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
Sanford, N. C., March 1, 1949.

Senator AIKEN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed herewith is a copy of a resolution adopted by the North Carolina Rural Electric Cooperative Association at their regular meeting held at Winston-Salem, N. C., February 23 and 24, 1949.

It is the aim of the cooperatives in North Carolina to help in every way possible to further rural electrification all over the United States. Therefore we are behind the St. Lawrence hydroelectric project 100 percent.

Cooperatively yours,
CLAYTON MORETZ,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Whereas the northeastern area of the United States is suffering economically and socially from an acute electric-power shortage; and

Whereas a tremendous potential of electric power is available by the development of the St. Lawrence hydroelectric project; and

Whereas making sources of electric power available for the public and industry is a program requiring years from the drafting board to the busbar; and

Whereas present programs for the availability of electricity will not meet future requirements for the economic, social, and agricultural welfare of the Northeast as well as the national security: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the North Carolina Rural Electric Cooperative Association, representing 30 electric membership cooperatives, serving 130,000 members, unanimously support the immediate development of the St. Lawrence hydroelectric project by either Federal or State agencies.

WAGE-HOUR LEGISLATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, two of the most controversial bills now pending before the Senate and House Labor Committees are those which would revise the present wage-hour laws. I have received many communications and resolutions from innumerable enterprises throughout my State, indicating their reactions to various provisions of these bills.

I send to the desk, therefore, and ask that there be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD at this point some of the many letters from prominent individuals and groups in my State, pointing out some of the implications of these bills.

I commend these communications to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate and House.

There being no objection, the letters were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAUNDRYOWNERS' ASSOCIATION
OF MILWAUKEE,
February 14, 1949.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The members of the Laundryowners' Association of Milwaukee, comprising all of the major laundry plants of Milwaukee, are unanimously opposed to the Lesinski-Thomas bill, No. 653, which drastically changes the wage-and-hour law to affect the local laundry-service business. Said bill if enacted into law would be destructive to the commercial laundry industry, which should be exempt from any laws involved in interstate commerce.

We request that you do all in your power to have the laundry-service industry exempt from laws governing interstate business.

Sincerely yours,
V. A. SMITH,
Secretary.

HAYWARD LAKES RESORT ASSOCIATION,
Hayward, Wis., February 14, 1949.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Member of Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Under legislation, known as the Fair Labor Standards Act, the minimum-wage hour scale of 75 cents and the 40-hour week will affect a majority of the members of our association. In most cases they will have to employ two shifts, to make it possible to comply with the requirements of this act. This will be a definite hardship on them. Total membership, 194.

At a meeting duly assembled on the 7th day of February it was the majority opinion of the members present that this proposed legislation be opposed.

Please use whatever means are necessary to help defeat this legislation.

Yours very truly,
JACK ECKL,
Secretary-Treasurer.

WISCONSIN STATE
TELEPHONE ASSOCIATION,
Madison, Wis., February 2, 1949.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Our attention has been directed to a bill introduced by Chairman LESINSKI, of Michigan, of the House Labor Committee, to amend the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act. Among other provisions of the bill is one which would change the present exemption of telephone switchboard operators employed in small telephone exchanges serving 500 stations (telephones) or less.

There are over 700 small independently owned and operated telephone companies which serve the rural communities throughout Wisconsin. Many of these companies are financed on a cooperative basis, each subscriber being limited to ownership of one share of stock, and are operated not as a commercial enterprise on a profit basis, but rather as a community effort to afford a necessary protection. Over two-thirds of all the central offices in the State serve less than 500 telephones and render 24-hour service every day in the year. Many of these exchanges serve less than 100 telephones. This requires three operators each working an 8-hour shift every day, together with relief operators for rest periods, vacations, absence due to sickness and other causes.

If the present exemption under the Fair Labor Standards Act is reduced or eliminated and the minimum hourly wage rate is increased to 75 cents per hour, as proposed by Chairman LESINSKI's bill, it will be impossible for these small exchanges to meet operation expenses. In most cases, the farmers pay $2 or less per month for multiparty service and the proposed changes would necessitate charging from $6 to $10 or more per month, which their limited usage, coupled with the small number of other subscribers with whom they may communicate, would raise the cost far beyond the value of the service to the rural public.

The only alternatives left the small companies would be either:

(a) Reduce service to 8 hours for a 5-day week to cut operating costs and pray that no fires, floods, accidents, robberies, births, deaths, sickness of humans or cattle or other emergencies requiring outside aid will occur during the hours the community is without telephone protection, or,

(b) Install a dial-operated automatic switchboard and discharge the present switchboard operators.

If either of these alternatives is followed, the proposed legislation, instead of increasing the wages of employees in these small exchanges, will cause most of them to lose their jobs.

* * * * * *

We earnestly solicit your aid and support in defeating the proposed amendment to reduce the present exemption from the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act, as it definitely would work an unwarranted and undue hardship on the employees, management, and rural public.

Respectfully submitted,
J. E. BYRNE,
Recording Secretary.

RICHLAND CENTER
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Richland Center, Wis., February 9, 1949.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: As the Committee on National Affairs of the Richland Center Chamber of Commerce, we have been asked to write you concerning the organization's views on the bill to raise the minimum wage. It is the feeling of the majority of the members of this organization that the amount proposed as the new minimum wage would in many cases represent an intolerable burden on the small-business man, which class makes up a large part of our membership. In many cases, particularly those of veterans who have recently started small businesses, a minimum wage of this nature would mean it would be impossible for them to continue operations, since in many cases the amount of the proposed minimum wage would represent an amount far in excess of the earning capacity of the employed to the business. It is economically impossible to pay a man an amount greater than he is capable of producing. The necessity of so doing would frequently result in such businesses being unable to continue.

We feel, therefore, that it is important that the position of the small-business man be considered in fixing a minimum wage, and that they be given every opportunity to be heard before such a minimum wage is arrived at. It is especially important since a great many of the small businesses which would be so affected represent the life savings and future hopes of many veterans whose sacrifices cannot be forgotten. We would appreciate your doing everything in your power to see that Congress does not take any action that would have such serious results.

Yours very respectfully,
JAMES G. ROSS,
Attorney at Law,
ROBERT J. BORGENSON, M. D.,
LEO P. LOWNIK,
Attorney at Law,
O. D. BLACK,
Attorney at Law,
Committee on National Affairs,
Richland Center Chamber of Commerce.

WISCONSIN CANNERS ASSOCIATION,
Madison, Wis., February 7, 1949.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The Wisconsin canning industry is, of course, very much concerned about the proposals to amend the wage-hour law. We note in your weekly news letter of February 3 that you question the administration's steam-roller tactics in attempting to jam through a complete revision of the wage-hour law and that you have protested the reckless speed and dictatorial efforts of the administration in this matter. Your position is thoroughly sound and we want to commend you for your efforts to see that this matter is given thorough study and careful consideration.

We are enclosing a copy of a letter we have just addressed to Representative LESINSKI, chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, setting forth our position with reference to H. R. 2033. The statements contained therein also apply to bills S. 248 and S. 653. The former of these Senate bills, like the House bill, would eliminate all overtime exemptions for the canning industry. The latter of these Senate bills would eliminate the existing exemptions and substitute therefor one 14-week exemption during which overtime would be required for hours in excess of 10 per day or 50 per week. This substitute exemption is so restricted that it would still require canners to pay time and a half for a great portion of the hours during the active canning season.

At the present time the canning industry has two periods of exemption from the overtime requirements of the wage-hour law. Under section 7 (c) of the present law the industry has an unlimited hours' exemption during weeks of active canning, but not exceeding 14 weeks per year; under section 7 (b) (3) the industry has an exemption up to 12 hours per day and 56 hours per week for another 14 weeks per year. The second exemption was grafted onto the law by administrative interpretation in the hope that it would be a substitute for an adequate definition of "area of production." While this latter exemption has been helpful to the industry, it is the unlimited hours' exemption under section 7 (c) which is really vital. It applies only during weeks in which the plant is actually processing the perishable crop and therefore when the maximum is 14 weeks per year, most Wisconsin canners use it for a fewer number. For instance, a pea canner is likely to use the section 7 (c) exemption only for about 4 weeks, since that is the normal period of the pea pack. However, it is very important to the industry that the canner does retain this exemption for his actual canning period lest his labor costs and in turn the price for his finished product skyrocket.

We will greatly appreciate your continued attention to these matters affecting the wage-hour law and will keep you advised of any further developments in this matter, particularly affecting the Wisconsin canning industry.

Very truly yours,
MARVIN P. VERHULST,
Executive Secretary.

WISCONSIN CANNERS ASSOCIATION,
Madison, Wis., February 5, 1949.

Hon. JOHN LESINSKI,
Chairman, House Committee on Education and Labor, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LESINSKI: The Wisconsin canning industry is very much concerned about certain proposals to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act now being considered by your committee. Of greatest concern are the proposals to raise the minimum wage and to eliminate the overtime exemptions applicable to this industry.

We agree that the present statutory minimum wage of 40 cents per hour is unrealistic today and an upward adjustment is in order. However, if the minimum wage is now set too high, the entire economy of the country may suffer great harm. The country has just now, it appears, passed the peak of inflation, and many prices including food prices are turning downward, but if too high a minimum wage were established by Congress, the effect would again be definitely inflationary. Such a consequence would benefit neither workers nor any other group in our country.

You have not considered Wisconsin to be a low-wage State but even in Wisconsin the establishment of a 75-cent-per-hour minimum wage would mean an average increase of at least 10 cents per hour for canning-factory employees. This is so because if the wage rate for the lowest paid employees is raised, other wage classifications will have to be raised accordingly. And the objective of a universal minimum wage rate of $1 an hour, when translated into living costs and property values in rural communities where most canning factories are located, involves such a degree of inflation as to threaten our entire economy.

The second point we wish to call to your attention is the effect of eliminating the overtime exemptions applicable to the canning industry. From the worker's standpoint, the situation during the active canning season is vastly different from year-round employment in other types of industry. Most cannery employees work for only a few weeks or months of the year. In Wisconsin most of the canning of perishable or seasonal fresh fruits and vegetables occurs during the school vacation period in the summer. Long hours during any one week are likely to be offset in succeeding weeks by a slack period caused by weather or crop conditions. In general, canning-factory employees want to put in as many hours as possible while the crop is fit for canning, and object to attempts to restrict their hours of employment during the active canning season.

From the employer's standpoint, elimination of the overtime exemption will generally mean a further and very substantial increase in wage costs because second shifts of workers are not obtainable in the smaller communities where canning factories are generally located. Likewise, there is no possibility of regulating the flow of perishable crops into the plant to maintain anything like a 40-hour-per-week operation.

We are not concerned with the area-of-production exemption and have no objection to its elimination. However, the elimination of the overtime exemptions, particularly the section 7 (c) exemption, will have very serious consequences for the canning industry and for the consumers of this industry's products, and we strongly urge your careful consideration of this matter. The consequence of legislation such as is proposed in H. R. 2033 will be to raise consumer prices of canned vegetables and fruits much higher than they have ever been before and reinfect our entire economy with the inflation disease from which it appears to be just recovering.

Very truly yours,
MARVIN P. VERHULST,
Executive Secretary.

FARMER-LABOR UNITY—RESOLUTION OF TENTH CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION OF CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the tenth constitutional convention of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, at Portland, Oreg., on November 25, 1948, relating to farmer-labor unity.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 10

Resolution on farmer-labor unity

In response to the Nation's demands for food to win the war and to save the peace, the farmers of America have consistently broken production records throughout the war and postwar years.

In 1948 they raised the greatest crops of all time, but already they are being penalized for this large production by serious price declines.

Since last January the price of wheat at the farm has fallen 84 cents a bushel, or 30 percent; the price of corn has fallen more than a dollar a bushel, or 40 percent; and other grains have suffered similar declines.

These reductions in farm prices have found little reflection in retail food prices, and in most cases none at all. The retail price of bread is 10 percent higher than a year ago, although wheat at the farm has been selling for 20 percent less.

The Government's farm-price-support program has not been, and is not now, responsible for the high cost of food to city consumers. All meat animal prices are far above parity, and for most of them there is no price-support program. For the foods in the typical market basket of a city family, with the exception of meats, dairy, and poultry products which have not yet reflected the effect of record crops, the return to farmers has dropped back to within 4 percent of the returns they were receiving under price control in June 1946. But the retail cost of these foods to city consumers is 17 percent greater than in June 1946, due to the fact that the margin taken by processors and distributors is nearly 30 percent greater than in that month, and today accounts for nearly 70 percent of the money which the housewife pays for these foods.

To encourage increased farm output during the war, Congress gave a guaranty to farmers that prices of basic commodities would be supported, by Government loan or purchase, at 90 percent of parity until 2 years after the end of hostilities. This guaranty has been renewed for the crops of 1948, but due to refusal of the Eightieth Congress to implement its guaranty with suitable provisions for storing grain under Government loans, farmers are being forced to sell grain below the guaranteed price floors. This failure of the Eightieth Congress to provide adequate protection to farmers was due to pressure exerted by the lobbyists of the organized grain trade. Their campaign will

continue in the Eighty-first Congress in the hope of wrecking the Government program of farm price supports, thereby delivering farmers into the hands of the speculators whom these lobbyists represent. Meanwhile, prices of steel, lead, zinc, building materials, and other industrial products continues to rise.

Thus farmers are faced with the prospect of further declines in grain prices and corresponding reductions in prices of livestock at a time when industrial prices are still rising and the cost of things that farmers buy is increasing.

Farmers and city workers are interdependent. They will prosper together, or not at all. The threat which now takes shape against the prosperity of American farmers is at the same time a threat against the welfare of industrial workers.

Industrial workers have a direct and personal interest in the maintenance of reasonable stability in the prices and incomes which farmers receive, just as farmers have an interest in the maintenance of high purchasing power among city workers. Farmers are consumers of the products which industrial workers produce, just as city workers are customers of the farmers' products. Industrial workers want continued high output of farm foodstuffs, but this will not be forthcoming if farmers are to be penalized for maintaining output at a high level. Furthermore, any serious decline in farm income will again, as always in the past, undermine industrial employment and force down city workers' income along with the drop in farm incomes.

Soil conservation is another aspect of the farm program which affects all of us. The fertility of our soil is a national asset. Our future as a strong and vigorous Nation depends upon continued improvement in land use and in saving the soil. Soil fertility will be restored and preserved only so long as farmers collectively can carry out programs for the wise use of land, can have adequate assurance that they will not be penalized for adhering to soil practices which, though they may not enrich them as individuals, will preserve the land for the future, and only so long as farmers generally are protected against the ruinous competition of the minority who mine their soil for immediate gain without thought for the generations to follow.

Rural electrification is another example of cooperative farmer-Government action which benefits the entire Nation. The effort of private-power interests to destroy this program by prohibiting use of Government loans for the cooperative development of power generation threatens once again to make farmers the victims of these private-power interests.

Farmer cooperatives benefit both consumers and producers by providing more efficient distribution of farm products. The present attack of private merchandising interests upon these cooperatives, through manipulation of Federal tax laws, is an additional campaign which aims to inflict injury upon the farm population and upon the farmers' customers in the cities.

The Congress of Industrial Organizations believes that all of these threats to the welfare of farmers are of direct and immediate concern to industrial workers: Therefore be it

Resolved:

1. Congress should maintain its guaranty to support farm prices at reasonable levels with relation to the level of industrial prices and to the prices farmers pay for the things they buy.

The price of major farm products, such as wheat, corn, cotton, and hogs, should be supported by flexible price supports which can be adjusted to reflect trends of industrial prices and employment and which, under present high industrial prices and at present high levels of industrial employment, should approximate 90 percent of parity. To avoid waste of foodstuffs and to avoid excessive Government purchase of price-supported farm products, the administration should be empowered by Congress to substitute direct parity payments to farmers in lieu of Government loans or purchases so that market prices may be allowed to fall below the support level when this is necessary to move exceptionally large supplies into consumption.

In the event national policies fail to maintain full employment and deflation ensues, a national food-allotment plan should be promptly put into effect for the purpose of maintaining a safe minimum of food consumption by every family and to assure ample markets for the continued high production of foodstuffs by farmers.

2. The Government soil conservation program, with the costs of conservation shared between Government and farmers and with democratic planning and participation by farmers, must be maintained and improved for the purpose of preserving and rebuilding the fertility of our soil, and to achieve best use of farm land and ranges to meet the Nation's present and future needs for food and fiber.

3. The attack of special interests against the rural electrification program and against farm cooperatives must be resisted and defeated and those programs must be carried forward.

4. People who work on farms and in factories should undertake jointly to consider their common interests in the maintenance of high real purchasing power for both groups, and in national policies to maintain prosperity on farms and full employment and high wages in cities. Farmers and workers must not be divided by the monopoly interests which seek to set one against the other, nor by the profiteering middlemen who rob both the farmer and the city worker of their rightful share of the fruits of their labor. Every opportunity for the mutual exploration and discussion of the common problems and programs of farmers and industrial workers should be sought out by the members of CIO unions and by State and county councils, so that the barriers which selfish private interests seek constantly to erect between them shall be removed and the two groups can move forward together in a spirit of mutual understanding and cooperation in the interest of the Nation as a whole.

TENTH CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION
OF THE CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL
ORGANIZATIONS.
PORTLAND, OREG., *November 25, 1948.*

THE HOUSING SITUATION IN SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two telegrams, one from the Housing Authority of the City of Charleston, S. C., of which E. D. Clement is executive director, and the other from S. L. Lattimer, Jr., of Columbia, S. C. This shows the fair and just treatment accorded the races where harmony exists.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHARLESTON, S. C., *March 9, 1949.*

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Senate Office Building:

Regarding your telegram, 1,343 units operated by the Housing Authority of the city of Charleston, 55 percent white, 45 percent colored.

HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF
CHARLESTON,
E. D. CLEMENT, *Executive Director.*

COLUMBIA, S. C., *March 3, 1949.*

Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Senate Office Building:

Reply your Government day letter Columbia has 646 housing units divided 318 Negro, 328 white or approximately 50 percent each. This does not include war housing Army Air Base pending housing applications 1,100 units divided 700 Negro, 400 white.

S. L. LATTIMER, Jr.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 2313. A bill to suspend certain import taxes on copper; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91).

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 247. A bill to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 90).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

William E. Davis, of Huntsville, Ala., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Alabama;

James S. Lamb, of North Dakota, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of North Dakota; and

Harris Walthall, of El Paso, Tex., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 24, with headquarters at El Paso, Tex.

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Jeremiah H. Dailey, and sundry other persons for appointment in the Medical, Dental, and Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army of the United States; and

Frank Belmont Anselin, and sundry other officers for promotion in the United States Air Force.

By Mr. McGRATH, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

Edward A. Dent, to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, for a term of 5 years, effective on and after March 4, 1949 (reappointment).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 1166. A bill for the relief of Toriko Tateuchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1167. A bill for the relief of the estate of Marion Miller;

S. 1168. A bill to amend section 2680 of Title 28, United States Code; and

S. 1169. A bill for the relief of Christina Shalfeieff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. O'MAHONEY (by request) introduced Senate bill 1170, to provide for a Resident Commissioner to the United States from the Virgin Islands, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. JENNER introduced Senate bill 1171, to prevent unauthorized acceptance or wearing of foreign decorations by officers of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. 1172. A bill to increase travel allowances under the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. BUTLER) introduced Senate Joint Resolution 59, providing for a comprehensive observance of the one hundredth anniversary of the creation of the Department of the Interior as an executive department of the Federal Government, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for a Resident Commissioner to the United States from the Virgin Islands, and I ask unanimous consent that a letter from Under Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman, recommending the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1170) to provide for a Resident Commissioner to the United States from the Virgin Islands, introduced by Mr. O'MAHONEY (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The letter presented by Mr. O'MAHONEY was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., February 23, 1949.

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
President of the Senate.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed herewith is a draft of a proposed bill "To provide for a Resident Commissioner to the United States from the Virgin Islands." I request that this proposed bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and I recommend that it be enacted.

The proposed bill provides for a Resident Commissioner to the United States to be elected by the people of the Virgin Islands every 2 years.

The Congress has long recognized the justice and value of affording representation to the territories and possessions through locally elected delegates entitled to sit and to speak in the House of Representatives. In keeping with this principle, Alaska and Hawaii are represented in the Congress by delegates and Puerto Rico is represented by a Resident Commissioner, all paid by the Federal Government in the same manner as the Members of the Congress. The Philippines were represented, prior to the establishment of the Commonwealth Government, by two, and during the life of that government, by one Resident Commissioner. There is, in my opinion, no valid reason why similar representation should not be extended to the United States citizens who reside in the Virgin Islands.

The creation of the proposed resident commissionership would not only permit the people of the Virgin Islands to make known directly to the Congress their views on matters which affect them, but would also be a concrete demonstration of this Nation's determination to promote democratic principles and practices in areas under its jurisdiction. As a practical matter, moreover, such representation would serve to relieve governors of the Virgin Islands from the necessity, under existing conditions, of making frequent and sometimes prolonged trips to the mainland to attend to legislative matters of importance to the Islands.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised me that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,
OSCAR L. CHAPMAN,
Under Secretary of the Interior.

PROHIBITION AGAINST ACCEPTANCE OR WEARING OF FOREIGN DECORATIONS

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to prevent unauthorized acceptance or wearing of foreign decorations by officers of the United States, and I request that a statement prepared by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1171) to prevent unauthorized acceptance or wearing of foreign decorations by officers of the United States, introduced by Mr. JENNER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. JENNER was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JENNER

Section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States provides:

"No title of nobility shall be granted by the United States: and no person holding any office of profit or trust under them, shall, without the consent of the Congress, accept of any present, emolument, office, or title, of any kind whatever, from any king, prince, or foreign state."

The people of the United States were aroused and, I might add, incensed recently by the proffer and acceptance of a gift by the President of the Argentine Republic to Maj. Gen. Harry Vaughan, military aide to the President of the United States.

The gift consisted of a medal, which apparently will be worn by this high-ranking officer of the United States Army.

Acceptance of the gift with the apparent full knowledge and consent of the President is in direct violation of the article and section of the Constitution which I quoted.

This action seems to be in line with other actions of the present and previous national administrations, to which apparently the Constitution is but a scrap of paper to be disregarded and flaunted at its whim.

Because of this flagrant disregard of the basic law of our country, I am introducing a bill which will make it a criminal offense with adequate punishment for any person holding an office of profit and trust in our Government to accept any such present, emolument, office, or title from any foreign government or official thereof.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF CREATION OF DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution providing for a comprehensive observance of the one hundredth anniversary of the creation of the Department of the Interior as an executive department of the Federal Government, and I ask unanimous consent that a release issued today by the Information Service of the Department of the Interior entitled "Summary of 100 Years of Achievement by Interior" be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred and, without objection, the release will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 59) providing for a comprehensive observance of the one hundredth anniversary of the creation of the Department of the Interior as an executive department of the Federal Government, introduced by Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. BUTLER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The release presented by Mr. O'MAHONEY was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF 100 YEARS' ACHIEVEMENT BY INTERIOR

Summarizing 100 years of Interior Department progress in resource development and conservation activities in the United States, Secretary of the Interior J. A. Krug today called attention to the following accomplishments:

1. Through Interior's Bureau of Reclamation—

(a) Over 5,000,000 acres of arid and semi-arid lands in Western States have been made fruitful with irrigation water.

(b) Hydroelectric plants with installed capacity of over 2,500,000 kilowatts, 18 percent of the Nation's total utility hydroelectric supply, have been built.

(c) Value of crops grown on federally irrigated land last year was over $555,000,000 and power revenues another $26,000,000.

2. Through Interior's Bureau of Mines—

(a) Federal mine-inspection and mine-safety program have brought death rate in coal mines down to 1.56 per million tons of coal mined. In 1910 when the Bureau of Mines was established the rate was 5.62 per million tons of coal mined.

(b) Methods of making synthetic liquid fuels out of coal and shale have been developed and proven practical at costs approaching present natural liquid fuel costs.

(c) Developed the exclusive production of the national supply of helium in this country which is one of the few known supplies in the world. New and important peacetime utilization of helium was developed by the Department. These include medical use, arc welding, and tracing of underground petroleum. Total helium production last year was more than 63,000,000 cubic feet.

(d) Extensive metallurgical research essential for industry and military purposes has been completed on hundreds of metals. Typical of the achievements is the development of metallic titanium, which, by a Bureau process, can be now used for construction equipment, machinery parts, and other uses. It is half as heavy as steel and twice as strong.

3. Through Interior's Geological Survey—

(a) Initiated the conservation work in irrigation, forestry, and minerals which resulted in later creation of the Forest Service of the Agriculture Department and the Bureau of Reclamation and Bureau of Mines of Interior.

(b) Prepared the topographic and geologic maps which have served as the basis for virtually all important detailed surveys in this country, and for important construction—public and private.

(c) Developed aeromagnetic surveys as a precise, high-speed and low-cost method of geophysical surveying.

(d) Performed the basic geologic studies for the armed forces in World War II.

(e) Maintained accurate records for approximately half a century on stream flow

which allows prediction of flood conditions and planning of dams and levees. Over 5,000 stream-gaging stations are now maintained by the Survey. Ground-water studies have permitted cities and industries to locate and construct work for adequate water supplies and have warned of possible disaster in certain areas from a lowered water table.

(f) Evaluated domestic resources of radioactive materials, including research on their geophysical and geochemical properties.

4. Through Interior's Bureau of Indian Affairs—

(a) Administered the affairs of 400,000 Indians on more than 200 reservations. Improved education so that today about 62 percent of Indian children are in their proper school grade compared with 20 percent in 1928. Built and operated 227 schools and 72 hospitals. Developed Indian training and self-reliance in advanced areas so that they could take over management of their own affairs, as has been done in California.

5. Through Interior's National Park Service—

(a) Has acquired and developed 28 national parks, with 11,347,269 acres which are being preserved for their beauty and public interest and recreation.

(b) Has acquired and is operating for public benefit 146 national monuments, historic sites, and recreational areas.

(c) Has increased the number of visitors to National Park Service areas from 120,000 in 1904 to over 30,000,000 last year.

6. Through Interior's Fish and Wildlife Service—

(a) Has acquired and developed 282 wildlife refuges of 18,000,000 acres for protection of wildlife and birds which were in danger of extinction. The number of licensed duck hunters has increased rapidly in recent years (it was 1,722,677 last year). Yet with the refuge system, the duck population decline has been stemmed and is now held at an estimated 54,000,000.

(b) Has built and operates 25 field laboratories and 97 fish hatcheries.

(c) Administered the $100,000,000 Alaskan salmon-industry research so that future salmon runs would not be damaged.

(d) From 1910 to date so managed the fur-seal herd on the Pribilof Islands as to increase it from 132,000 animals to more than 3,380,000.

7. Through Interior's Bureau of Land Management—

(a) For many years managed the existing public domain so as to make a profit for the Government over its own costs of operations. In the 1947 fiscal year receipts from leases on public lands brought in $21,000,000 against Bureau expenses of $6,000,000.

(b) Disposed of approximately 285,000,000 acres of public lands in Western States under homesteading laws which permitted wide settlement and later development of the western country. Peak disposition under homesteading laws was in 1915, when 10,000,000 acres were transferred.

(c) Made cadastral surveys of 1,300,000,000 acres of public lands.

(d) Administered the grazing activities on western public lands through 58 grazing districts which permit orderly use of 154,000,000 acres of public land by private stockmen.

(e) Now administer 190,000,000 acres of public land in the United States and 344,000,000 in Alaska.

8. Through Interior's Division of Territories and Island Possessions—

(a) Act as the Federal Government liaison and adviser for the nearly 3,000,000 American citizens who live outside the borders of continental United States.

(b) Helped to secure equality of legislative treatment for residents of Territories and insular possessions.

(c) Sponsored election of own governor for Puerto Rico and statehood for Alaska and Hawaii.

9. Through Interior's Bonneville Power Administration—

(a) Built and operated 3,284 miles of transmission lines and distributes 10,272,257,000 kilowatt-hours of power annually. Provided the electric distribution network which permitted great industrial expansion in Pacific Northwestern States, particularly in light-metal industries essential to the war.

10. Through Interior's Oil and Gas Division—

(a) Provided a Government-wide coordinating and advisory board on petroleum problems and established effective cooperation between the Government and the petroleum industry.

ACTIVITIES IN NEXT HUNDRED YEARS

Secretary Krug also outlined the Department's goals and activities for the beginning of its second century, including:

1. Land

(a) Basin-wide development of western rivers to add 17,000,000 acres of irrigated land and increase yields on 9,000,000 more by supplement water. The Columbia, Missouri, and Colorado offer the best possibilities on this.

(b) Restore and increase grass and other vegetation on western range lands.

(c) Reseed 22,000,000 acres and greatly improve moisture- and water-spreading work.

(d) Develop western phosphate-fertilizer production so that fertilizer will be available at lower costs to western farmers.

2. Minerals

(a) Complete the geologic mapping of the 90 percent of country still unmapped.

(b) Redouble exploration and research on metals and minerals and extraction, processing, and mining methods.

(c) Greatly increase study and search for substitute materials and means of using those in long supply.

3. Forests

(a) Develop adequate perpetual reserves for commercial cutting.

(b) Replant and reseed hundreds of thousands of acres of forest lands under Interior supervision.

(c) Increase fire and disease protection.

(d) Expand sustained-yield agreements between the Government and private forest owners for intermingled lands.

4. Energy

(a) Urge and encourage private and public construction of 80,000,000 kilowatts of additional power capacity by 1970.

(b) Of this, 30,000,000 kilowatts should be hydroelectric capacity built by the Federal Government.

(c) Encourage research in long-distance power transmission.

(d) Help expand total supply of liquid fuels.

(e) Push the construction of experimental commercial size plants for synthetic-liquid fuels from coal and shale.

(f) Develop oil reserves on public land including submerged land along coasts.

5. World development

(a) Assist in sharing technical knowledge with other peace-loving countries and pressing for development of other areas of the world to help them to develop balanced economies and use of their own resources.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3082) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

REHABILITATION OF ALCOHOLICS—CHANGE OF REFERENCE OF A BILL

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, Senate bill 692, to provide for a grant to the Prisoners Relief Society for use in the rehabilitation of chronic alcoholics, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. The bill contains in its title the word "relief." As a matter of fact, the whole purpose of the bill is the appropriating of $5,000,000 for the purchase of farms to set up a curative process for alcoholics. The Committee on the Judiciary is of the opinion that the bill does not come under the jurisdiction of that committee, and has recommended that the bill be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair suggests that he consult the parliamentary situation before determining to what committee it should be referred. However, the Senator asks unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be relieved of jurisdiction.

Mr. McCARRAN. I modify my request accordingly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT subsequently said: The Chair desires to make an announcement regarding the reference of Senate bill 692. It was taken from the Judiciary Committee earlier in the session today. The Chair has examined that bill and it seems to be a matter of public health and welfare, and therefore it is referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thank the Chair.

PROTOCOL RELATING TO NARCOTIC DRUGS—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive H, Eighty-first Congress, first session, a certified copy of the protocol, opened for signature at Paris on November 19, 1948, and signed on behalf of the United States of America on that date, bringing under international control drugs outside the scope of the convention signed at Geneva July 13, 1931, as amended by the protocol signed at Lake Success December 11, 1946, limiting the manufacture and regulating the distribution of narcotic drugs; and that the protocol, together with the President's message be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed, and the protocol, together with the President's message, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the message from the President will

be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of the protocol, opened for signature at Paris on November 19, 1948, and signed on behalf of the United States of America on that date, bringing under international control drugs outside the scope of the convention signed at Geneva July 13, 1931, as amended by the protocol signed at Lake Success December 11, 1946, limiting the manufacture and regulating the distribution of narcotic drugs.

I transmit also for the information of the Senate the report of the Secretary of State, regarding this protocol.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 3, 1949.*

(Enclosures: 1. Certified copy of protocol, opened for signature November 19, 1948, bringing under international control drugs outside the scope of the convention signed at Geneva July 13, 1931; 2. Report of the Secretary of State.)

HOME FOR EVERY FAMILY—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. THYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Home for Every Family," published in the Washington Post of March 3, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABRADOR-QUEBEC IRON ORE

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from an advertisement of the M. A. Hanna Co. which appeared in the Washington Post of March 1, 1949, under the heading "Labrador-Quebec iron ore," which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Mrs. Theodor Oxholm, chairman of Spokesman for Children, Inc., dealing with the school-lunch program, which appears in the Appendix.]

ASSESSMENT BY AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Doctors' Revolt," published in the Washington Post of March 3, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

TAX-FREE MARGARINE—ARTICLE FROM THE COLUMBIA STATE

[Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Consumers Aware of Need for Tax-Free Margarine," by J. M. Eleazer, published in the Columbia (S. C.) State for February 27, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

NOMINATION OF MON C. WALLGREN TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY RESOURCES BOARD—STATEMENT AND LETTERS BY SENATOR CAIN

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD copies of letters which I addressed to the President of the United States and to Mr. John R. Steelman on Monday of this week, together with a statement of summary on the Wallgren confirmation question which I filed with the Senate Armed Services Committee on February 28. Copies of this statement were attached to the letters which were posted to the President and to Mr. Steelman.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 28, 1949.

The Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: For your attention and consideration there is attached a copy of a statement covering the Wallgren confirmation question which I submitted today to the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Shortly after your election as President of our United States, I wrote to you personally to wish you success. That wish was completely sincere. I said that I would look for ways in which to support those portions of your programs with which I could logically agree. I meant that. I added that when I found it necessary to oppose your recommendations I would try my best to do so on the basis of facts rather than on political prejudice. I continue to be so minded at this time.

The attached statement is a recitation of what I believe to be fact, not prejudice. I am unalterably opposed to your nominee because I do not think him qualified for the work which lies ahead. In my considered opinion the record supports this position.

I have no personal interest in any choice you may make for any executive portfolio, but if your selection will affect the security of every American citizen, and for as long as the Senate of the United States is charged with the responsibility for confirming your appointments, I am on the soundest possible ground in raising a public question regarding the character, capacity, and knowledge possessed by any nominee.

My opposition to Mr. Wallgren is both firm and honest. In the problem before us I respectfully suggest that the nominee, while perhaps possessing virtues required by some assignments, is singularly lacking in what you require from advisers and assistants whose sole objective is that of keeping our Nation free at home and secure against aggression from abroad. The attached statement which bears on this subject is, I believe, deserving of thoughtful study by you, our President.

Should you wish to talk with me personally about any aspect of the Wallgren nomination, I shall be privileged to sit with you at any time.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY P. CAIN.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
February 28, 1949.

Dr. JOHN STEELMAN,
Assistant to the President,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR JOHN: I think you will want to thoughtfully read the attached statement which I submitted this afternoon to the Senate Armed Services Committee. It supports my point of view and that of thousands of conscientious, patriotic citizens.

When last we met some days ago for the purpose of having the President brief the Public Works Committees about the need for remodeling the White House I told you that my objection to the appointment of Mr. Wallgren was very deep-seated, and that I would fight his appointment as best and as long as I could. Since our conversation I have found no possible reason to change my mind covering Mr. Wallgren's fitness for his intended post.

I don't care who the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board is, provided he is intelligent, informed, and completely above suspicion and reproach. Mr. Wallgren must be judged by his past conduct and associations and he is found wanting when examined against the requirements of any reasonable standard.

To fight the President is neither pleasant or easy. It is in fact wholly unpleasant and extremely difficult but I shall very willingly continue my opposition in hope that the President will come to understand that his appointee is not the man to protect America against war, or the man to win it if it comes.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY P. CAIN.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE HARRY P. CAIN BEFORE THE SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE FEBRUARY 28, 1949

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Senate Armed Services Committee, on Thursday, February 17, I began my opposition case to the appointment of Mr. Mon C. Wallgren, of Washington State, to the chairmanship of the National Security Resources Board by maintaining:

(a) That the future security requirements of our Nation demands that any individual who is to become the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board must be unusually gifted in training, knowledge, background, character, courage, capacity, and loyalty, and that the general public must believe him to be possessed of these assets.

(b) That the nominee, Mr. Wallgren, does not possess in sufficient degree most of these qualities which are demanded of the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board.

In summarizing my case against Mr. Wallgren in this statement I shall attempt to prove that his confirmation would run counter to the best interests of our Nation, and that it would in fact materially weaken any chance of successfully accomplishing the mission and responsibilities which have been assigned by the Congress to the National Security Resources Board.

I. IS MR. WALLGREN HIGHLY REGARDED AND RESPECTED BY A MAJORITY OF THE CITIZENS IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON?

It is important that this question be considered by the committee, for the established reputation the nominee bears in his own State is one of the factors bearing on his fitness and suitability for the post of Chairman of the National Security Resources Board.

Since the Armed Services Committee began its Wallgren hearings I have received hundreds of letters and telegrams from citizens of Washington State and from elsewhere.

The bulk of the letters and telegrams have opposed Mr. Wallgren's confirmation for a variety of reasons. As appendix A I am offering 100 of these letters and telegrams, selected very generally at random. They represent the cross-section views of many American citizens. You will note that the letters and telegrams have been forwarded from cities, towns, and hamlets in every section of Washington State, and that they are from Democrats, Republicans, and independents who profess allegiance to no political party. Most of them were written in longhand, which is strong evidence of the sincerity and conviction of the writer.

It is an unusual fact that as of today not more than 25 have written to me in support of Mr. Wallgren, and none of these have given any reasons to support their contention that he ought to be confirmed for the position in question. These letters and telegrams have vigorously abused me personally for opposing Mr. Wallgren. The documents referred to will be made available to the committee should it wish to read them.

I hope that the completed record of the Wallgren hearings will carry many of the communications which the chairman and the committee must have received. Senators not on the committee, and interested citizens all over the country, will want to know, and I think they ought to know, what is thought of the nominee by those among whom he has lived in recent years. Should Mr. Wallgren be confirmed every American citizen will be directly affected by his activities. The more they know about him now, the better for all concerned.

II. AN ANALYSIS OF THE EXISTING RECORD, AND THE INTRODUCTION OF NEW EVIDENCE

During the Wallgren hearings, I have presented to the committee a sufficient volume of evidence to prove the basic contentions I have made.

1. Mon C. Wallgren is incompetent to fill the office of Chairman of the National Security Resources Board.

2. His appointment would represent a distinct danger to the security of the United States because of his continued association with persons whose loyalty is subject to doubt and because of his complete inability to recognize the manifestations of communism.

In order to bring the evidence clearly before the members of the committee I would like to take this opportunity to summarize, from the existing record, the facts as they have been developed thus far and to point out the inconsistencies, contradictions, and uncertainties in the record that have an important bearing upon this case. I have, therefore, taken the liberty of preparing statements on the individual issues that have been brought up. In addition, I would like to present some items containing new material which have come to my attention since the hearings have been in progress. I would like to add that my research will continue and that I will endeavor, with the limited facilities at my disposal, to keep the committee informed on all matters pertinent to its deliberations. May I, with all respect, state, however, that the committee itself should open a thorough investigation of the background of the nominee, bringing before the members some of the persons whose names have been brought up in the hearings and those with whom the nominee has had relations in the past.

It is not necessary to remind the committee that an investigation of this nature requires facilities and powers which are not available to me as an individual Senator. I cannot, for example, require witnesses who might have pertinent information to appear before me and testify. The Congress has seen fit, and wisely so, to reserve the powers of subpena and punishment for contempt to committees of the Senate.

The issue at stake is much too important to permit us with partisan bias to dismiss the serious allegations which have been made against the nominee, Mr. Wallgren. A comprehensive investigation is in order if for no other reason than to reassure the people of the United States that persons named to the highest security offices are of a caliber which makes them the best guardians of the public interest and public safety.

If there is nothing which might reflect unfavorably upon the nominee there can certainly be no objection to making a thorough investigation. Nothing would be lost. On the contrary we would have given a demonstration to every citizen of this land that the man whom the President has selected is above reproach—is endowed with the highest ability.

From the volume of letters which the citizens of Washington have sent to me, it is clearly evident that a large segment of our population—at least those who have had first-hand experience with Mr. Wallgren—look upon him rather as a discarded politician who is being "paid off" with an official appointment at the expense of the taxpayers. Would it not, therefore, seem wise on the part of this committee to make an exhaustive investigation so that they might disprove the statements which those of us who oppose the appointment have made and to dispel the unfavorable opinion which is held by so many.

In line with this philosophy I would like to respectfully present to the committee for their consideration the following facts:

The case of John Caughlan

Shortly after his inauguration as Governor of the State, Mr. Wallgren appointed John Caughlan as the third member of the social-security committee. The appointment was made without any interview or consultation with Mr. Caughlan. Under questioning, the witness admitted that he had no conversations with Caughlan, had no investigation made of his background, and merely informed him of his appointment by letter (p. 423).

During the hearings of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the State of Washington, John Caughlan was identified under oath as a member of the Communist Party by 11 different witnesses (p. 241). Their testimony was paralleled by findings that Caughlan had been publicly associated with a number of prominent Communist friends. This information did not deter Mr. Wallgren from making the appointment. Even after this derogatory information became a matter of public knowledge, John Caughlan was not removed from his office, but was permitted to continue therein and to retain all the dignity of a high official of the State of Washington.

Among the excuses offered by the witness for his failure to remove John Caughlan were four principal statements: (1) That the social-security committee was a meaningless institution and John Caughlan performed no function. (2) That the appointment was made at the request of the Washington Pension Union as a sop to the old folks. (3) That no derogatory information was available until the beginning of the Un-American Activities Committee hearings. (4) That he was waiting for a determination by the courts of perjury charges brought against Caughlan.

Let us examine each of these points to see whether or not these contentions are valid. Page 357 of the transcript of the hearings there appears the following:

"Senator JOHNSON. Governor Wallgren, did Caughlan ever perform any official acts as a member of that committee?

"Mr. WALLGREN. No, and he never would. I would not have stood for it.

* * * * *

"Senator JOHNSON. From the time this information became available in February until you went out as Governor, Caughlan discharged no responsibility in your administration in the State Government at Washington, did he?

"Mr. WALLGREN. He discharged no responsibilities at any time, even from the time we put him on the board."

I would like to call the attention of the committee to the fact that Mr. Wallgren asserted that John Caughlan "never performed any official act and he discharged no responsibilities at any time even from the time we put him on the board." I have produced already before the committee the hearings of the United States House Committee on Ways and Means before which John Caughlan appeared as a witness on March 8, 1946 (pp. 503 et seq.). In a statement to the committee Caughlan pointed out that he "represented the State Social Security Committee of the State of Washington," and was speaking "on behalf of the Honorable Mon C. Wallgren, Governor of the State of Washington whose representative I am in appearing before this committee."

When this information was brought before the committee the witness immediately claimed that he was not apprised of the Washington trip at any time, but had learned of it first when it was brought up in the hearings (pp. 471 et seq.). It seems rather impossible that an important State official should come to Washington, testify before a major committee of the House on behalf of the State and its Governor, and draw compensation from the State treasurer without any of this information coming to the attention of the chief executive. In this connection I would like to quote a telegram received in my office from a member of the Washington State Legislature:

"Counsel for Governor informs me that it would be impossible for Governor as chairman of social-security committee not to know of a member's trip nor approve of his expense voucher."

Information has also come to my attention from an unimpeachable source in my own State that "Jack Gorrie, assistant to Governor Wallgren, personally telephoned the department of social security requesting that John Caughlan be sent to Washington, D. C."

It would seem that if this fact were verified it would impeach the entire testimony of the witness. Certainly the investigation is warranted, and I shall be happy to submit my own source of information to the committee in executive session.

On pages 282, 285, and 353, and elsewhere, the witness admitted that the appointment of John Caughlan had been made at the behest of the Washington Pension Union. I would like to point out to the committee that the Washington Pension Union is one of the most notorious Communist-front organizations in our State and its entire high command has been identified as belonging to the Communist Party before the Washington State Un-American Activities Committee. Thus the appointment of John Caughlan is culpable on two scores: He is a member of the Communist Party; the organization which brought about his appointment is a Communist front.

When asked whether or not the Washington Pension Union was a "Communist-front organization," Mr. Wallgren replied, "I am beginning to think it is" (p. 353). Is it not reasonable to assume that if there had been any suspicion in the mind of the Governor, he would have been compelled by his own conscience to make an investigation of any persons appointed to office.

The third defense offered by the witness was that he had no knowledge of John Caughlan's connections with any subversive organizations. This confession, which appears throughout the testimony, is one of the most damaging admissions made before this committee. The ability to recognize and to avoid persons whose loyalty is subject to doubt is one of the prior qualifications of the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. It is impossible for me to believe that this information was never brought to the attention of the Governor. His own assistant, Jack Gorrie, who appeared before the committee on February 24, admitted that Caughlan's affiliations were generally suspected prior to the hearings of the Committee on Un-American Activities (p. 478).

Even if it had been true that Caughlan did not perform any significant function in behalf of the State of Washington, it is certainly contrary to the public interest that such a person should be appointed to office or invested with the dignity of the State.

When pressed for his reasons for not removing John Caughlan from office after the findings of the Washington Un-American Activities Committee were made public, Mr. Wallgren claimed that he was withholding any action in abeyance until the perjury case involving Caughlan was settled in the court. This excuse is at best a very poor one, because the responsibility for the executive department of the State does not rest

with the Federal courts but with the Governor. Caughlan was his appointee, he was responsible for his elevation to office and his activities. It is rather an indication of his indifference and incompetence that he should try to place the responsibility where it could not possibly belong. Furthermore, as Senator KNOWLAND pointed out, the case revolved around a charge of perjury and not around Communist Party membership. It has also been brought to my attention that the case was designed on the question of whether or not Mr. Caughlan had been properly interrogated when he committed the alleged perjury rather than a charge on whether or not he was a member of the Communist Party.

The case of Hugh DeLacy

In my testimony to the committee I presented concrete evidence that Hugh DeLacy, a leader of the Democratic machine in Washington as well as a candidate for Congressman, was a member of the Communist Party and has had a public record of more than 10 years, linking him with at least 30 Communist-front organizations.

I charge further that Hugh DeLacy had the support and endorsement of Mr. Wallgren. The witness was questioned on the subject by Senator KNOWLAND (pp. 365 and 366):

"Senator KNOWLAND. Did you, in November of 1944, at a public meeting in the State of Washington, appear on the same platform with Congressman DeLacy, or at least then candidate for Congressman, DeLacy, and there publicly endorse him as a candidate?

"Mr. WALLGREN. I do not recall having done so but I presume that he was there with other candidates on the Democratic ticket."

* * * *

"Senator KNOWLAND. Well, if he had picketed you then in 1940, would you not recall that in 1944 you attended a large public rally in the city of Seattle on which he was also on the same platform, whether you had publicly endorsed him by name at such a meeting just 4 years after he had picketed you?

"Mr. WALLGREN. I recall that we had such a meeting. I do not recall his being present on the platform."

I have made some inquiries on the subject and have consulted newspapers of that period published in Washington, the evidence shows beyond any doubt that the witness not only appeared on the platform with Hugh DeLacy but openly and directly endorsed and lauded him.

Mr. Wallgren makes the following statement (p. 390):

"Mr. WALLGREN. At that time in our State we could vote a straight Democratic ticket, and the slogan of our party was 'Vote the straight Democratic ticket,' and if he was a candidate—and I believe he was—I will admit that I endorsed the whole ticket."

Similar statements appear in other parts of the testimony.

The New World of October 19, 1944, page 3 (a photostatic copy of this page is attached as exhibit 1), carries a picture showing Mr. Wallgren together with Hugh DeLacy greeting Senator KILGORE, one of the speakers at a political rally. On the same page there appears an advertisement announcing a Democratic election mass meeting. The ad exhorts the populace to come and meet the candidates: Mon C. Wallgren, Warren Magnuson, and Hugh DeLacy. On October 14, 1944, a Democratic rally was held at the Seattle Masonic Temple to which both Mr. Wallgren and Hugh DeLacy were featured speakers. The Seattle Post-Intelligencer, October 15, 1944, page 1. On October 19 the Democrats held a gala mass meeting. Again Messrs. Wallgren and DeLacy appeared on the platform together—Seattle Post-Intelligencer, October 20, 1944. A special supplement to the New World of October 19, 1944, published pictures of all the Democratic leaders who have openly endorsed Hugh DeLacy, among them is the picture of Mr. Wallgren (a photostatic copy of this page is attached as exhibit 2).

The Text of Mr. Wallgren's Endorsement of Hugh DeLacy

There are two statements which are of particular interest to this committee's deliberation in the light of the fact that the witness did not remember making any specific endorsements (New World, November 2, 1944, p. 4):

"And I want you also to elect Hugh DeLacy. He is needed in the Congress and will give you and I the kind of representation we want and need."

Mr. Wallgren made a special point of defending Hugh DeLacy against charges of Communist activities which had been leveled against him in the campaign stating:

"And there are more cheap tricks and lies like they just tried to pull on Hugh DeLacy."

He defended Hugh DeLacy against charges of Communist activities made by Governor Langlie with this statement:

"Yet this governor has the effrontery to question the patriotism of a man like DeLacy."

I would like to point out to the committee that in his entire testimony Mr. Wallgren gave the impression that he did not know of DeLacy's record. Why, may I ask, did he defend the man if he knew nothing about him.

On page 637 of the hearings, Mr. Wallgren was questioned as to whether or not he knew that Hugh DeLacy was a member of the Communist Party. His reply was:

"I do not know that it has been established at all."

On page 403 Mr. Wallgren makes the following statement:

"I did not know anything about Mr. DeLacy."

On page 483–484 Mr. Wallgren admits stating that he does not believe DeLacy is a Communist.

The case of Jerry J. O'Connell

During the political campaigns of 1944, one Jerry J. O'Connell took an active part in campaigning for the Democratic candidates, including Mr. Wallgren, who was running for Governor. O'Connell's participation was both through his connection with the Democratic Party and as a result of his appointment as Assistant Regional Director of the CIO-PAC by Sidney Hillman. I have already submitted to the committee sufficient evidence to prove that Jerry O'Connell has for a number of years been a member of the Communist Party—that he has a known public record of Communist-front affiliations—for more than 10 years.

Despite this fact, Candidate Wallgren admittedly did not raise any protest against the participation of Jerry O'Connell in his campaign. In his testimony of February 24, 1949, he admits that he expressed no opposition until after he took office as Governor. From the testimony it is apparent that this opposition did not relate to O'Connell's membership in the Communist Party but only because of his desire to assume certain prerogatives which the newly elected Governor considered his own. On page 421 of the hearings the nominee admits that he said "I am running the State of Washington, not O'Connell, and he ought to get out."

Although O'Connell received an appointment as an official of the Democratic Party of the State of Washington—of which the Governor was presumably the titular head—Mr. Wallgren did not try and take steps to have the man removed (p. 422).

Despite this supposed opposition of the Governor to Jerry O'Connell one of the appointed officials, Mr. Rogan Jones, apparently conspired with Jerry O'Connell to control State patronage (p. 343). Letters were written to 39 county Democratic chairmen urging them to participate in this patronage scheme. When confronted with this fact the nominee asserted that he put a stop to the plan but uttered no public opposition. It would seem, however, that the matter in question would be of sufficient public importance to stir the Governor of a State, whose name and party had been supposedly misused by a Communist, to publicly disavow this act and seriously consider the dismissal of his own appointee who had conspired, in spite of the claimed attitude of the Governor toward Jerry O'Connell. In reply to a question put to him by Senator KNOWLAND the witness admitted that nothing was done because he did not want the public to know anything about it (p. 348). It is difficult to see how the public would fail to know about 39 letters written to 39 county chairmen on an issue as important as this.

The principal reason advanced by the witness for his leniency and lack of vigor in opposing Jerry J. O'Connell was the claim that derogatory information about him was not available until 1948, when the matter was brought to public attention by the Washington State Committee on Un-American Activities.

On page 348 of the hearings there appears the following statement in reply to a question by Senator KNOWLAND concerning O'Connell's activities:

"Mr. WALLGREN. I might have had my suspicions but I did not have that kind of information."

On page 352 the following appears:

"Mr. WALLGREN. The information that you give here was only available last year. They did not know—these things were not known; they were brought out in the un-American activities investigation in Seattle."

It is surprising to me that a candidate for the governorship of a State should accept among his campaign workers and should permit without public denunciation the appointment of a man like Jerry O'Connell. It is even less understandable that Mr. Wallgren should be so completely unfamiliar with this man's background. The contention that derogatory information of the nature presented by me was not available until 1949 is completely untenable.

Actually, of course, the record of Jerry J. O'Connell's affiliations with Communist enterprises has been a matter of public knowledge for over 10 years.

For example, a copy of the Daily Worker of June 23, 1937—this issue of the official organ of the Communist Party carries a statement addressed to its business manager by none other than Jerry O'Connell. Mr. O'Connell speaks in these eulogistic terms of a Communist paper:

"I feel that the Daily Worker is America's outstanding daily labor paper and has done much during these past crucial labor years to bring true and accurate accounts of labor conditions throughout the entire country to the attention of the public."

It is a little difficult for me to conceive of anyone speaking such high praise of a newspaper which admittedly is advocating the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence. I have here a copy of the Daily Worker of July 8, 1947, in which it is reported that Jerry O'Connell was a speaker from the same platform with Earl Browder, the man who was at that time head of the Communist Party in the United States and was later put in prison for passport fraud.

The magazine, New Masses, November 23, 1937, and February 22, 1938, carried material contributed by Jerry O'Connell. New Masses was, until its demise, an official publication of the Communist Party. It was listed as a Communist periodical by the Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Francis Biddle, and you will find his exact statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 24, 1942, page 7668, when Mr. Wallgren was in the United States Senate.

Similar references have appeared in the public press continuously since that time. Such information was available to the Governor of Washington just as it was available to the Committee on Un-American Activities, the FBI, and the press. It is possible that Mr. Wallgren did not wish to consult these original sources of information which would have required a certain amount of study and analysis. I would, therefore, like to point out that the same information has been made available during that same period of time by the House Committee on Un-American Activities and other official legislative investigative committees, during periods when Mr. Wallgren was in Congress.

Volume 1 of the hearings of the House Un-American Activities Committee published in 1938, begins the story of Jerry O'Connell's affiliation with the Communist Party. This story is continued throughout the many volumes which have been published during the past decade. On page 262 of this first volume is recorded O'Connell's salutation "Live the Communist Party" which was presented for the record on February 21 (p. 175).

In 1944 the Committee on Un-American Activities issued a special report on the high command of the CIO Political Action Committee. Two and a half pages of this report were devoted to the activities of Jerry O'Connell. Less there be any question of the accuracy of this information each item is properly referenced. For example on page 147 of House Report No. 1311, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, the Committee on Un-American Activities states that Jerry J. O'Connell was connected with the International Labor Defense—which was branded by the Attorney General of the United States as and I quote "Legal arm of the Communist Party." The committee offers three references to known publications from which its information was obtained and which can be verified by anyone interested in Jerry O'Connell.

I will not take your time to present any more of these publications. I would like merely to state that I have on my desk some 15 or more volumes of published reports on Communist activities including those on Jerry O'Connell available for more than a decade to any Member of Congress or any Governor of Washington.

If the committee should desire it I would be more than happy to present to all the complete file of evidence both in the form of original sources and reports of legislative agencies.

Mr. Wallgren has maintained stoutly, vigorously, and repeatedly that the State Democratic organization, of which Jerry J. O'Connell was an official, never had anything to do with his administration or with patronage. On page 299 of the hearings for example he makes this statement:

"Mr. WALLGREN. The State organization had nothing to do with my administration. I would not have anything to do with them as long as O'Connell was there, and you cannot bring up one instance. This fellow O'Connell, as I say, has really been a boil on my neck, and the neck of the Democratic Party."

I have obtained a copy of a clipping from the Seattle Post-Intelligencer which bears on the subject. Since the material speaks for itself I will merely quote here the pertinent paragraphs:

"December 18, 1944—Ellensburg, December 16—In a letter and personal message delivered to a meeting of the Democratic State Central Committee here today, Governor-elect Mon C. Wallgren made it clear he wants the help of the State and county organizations in the hundreds of appointments that will be made under his administration.

"Harry C. Huse, Spokane, unanimously reelected State chairman, outlined the procedure to be followed. He said it would be mandatory upon the organizations to accept and screen applications and that prompt action is expected.

"Thus it was made clear that Wallgren, a strict organization man, intends to follow the shrewd political procedure of giving his organization, down to that of the smallest precinct, a direct voice in the appointment of every office within the power of the Governor to make.

"While such a procedure might bring its temporary headaches, it pays off in party solidarity and at election time because it gives the organization workers a direct personal interest in the administration of the State government.

"Huse said the policy would be followed even up to the naming of Wallgren's successor in the United States Senate for the 2-year unexpired portion of his term. Huse declared the State executive committee still to be named, will be prepared to mak- recommendations for this post.

"The procedure, while followed more or less loosely in the past by winning candidates for State office, is distinctly an innovation in coming as a specific request from the Governor-elect. It found the State committee highly enthusiastic. * * *

" 'The policy,' Huse explained to the committee, which consists of 2 representatives from each of the State's 39 counties, 'is indicative of the democratic way in which Wallgren intends to make appointments. One of the purposes of the plan is to have the organizations which know the applicants screen them for competency and loyalty. Wallgren is looking ahead—he wants to get the most efficient men and women he can into the service of the State.' * * *

"Huse announced that the State organization will establish permanent headquarters in Seattle by January 1. It will be in charge of Jerry O'Connell as aid to Huse. O'Connell who served as Democratic Congressman from Montana, 1939–41, took an active part in the State campaign. He served as liaison man between the Democratic State organization here and the CIO Political Action Committee, working out of the office of Roy Atkinson, Pacific Northwest regional director for the CIO.

"O'Connell demonstrated his political acumen as soon as he was introduced to the committee by Huse. He headed off a group of resolutions, some of them controversial, by asking that their sponsors refrain from introducing them at the committee meeting and instead, refer them to the educational committee which, he declared, 'will be in a position to give them careful consideration.' 'None of us,' he explained, 'would want to embarrass the new governor by bringing in resolutions that might not have the benefit of thoughtful consideration and counsel.'

"The resolutions included one on the sale of liquor by the drink, another suggesting basic changes in the blanket primary law, still another urging that in selecting his successor in the Senate, Wallgren name an East Side man."

The case of the five FBI men

When confronted with the evidence presented by me that he had associated with an appointed Communists in office, the witness made the following statement (p. 280): "When I became Governor of the State of Washington I hired five FBI men to come with me. I have the utmost respect for the FBI and the methods by which they train their men. I hired those men to come with me to help me make a study of or a survey of everything I had to deal with in my State administration, and if that is being a sop to communism, let us have more of it."

It was implicit in this reply that these five ex-FBI men had been appointed for the principal purpose of investigating communism, of checking communistic affiliations of State employees and of advising the Governor on his appointees. This impression was conveyed to the committee, yet, when more closely questioned on the subject, the witness admitted that the five FBI men were brought in merely to "assist me in conducting investigations as to the operation of certain departments" (p. 541). I will let the record speak for itself; on page 541 the following statement is made:

"Mr. WALLGREN. These men, I brought them down, because of their ability to assist me in conducting investigations as to the operation of certain departments.

"In our public utilities department we had some problems there in respect to rate-making, and so on, that had not been touched, apparently, by that department in a period of years, so I hired A. J. Zimmerman, who was a very capable accountant, and he was an FBI operator and had quite a record as an accountant, to help me in that respect."

On page 542 we find:

"Senator KNOWLAND. Did they check when the Governor was ready to make an appointment of some official, did they run a loyalty check of any kind?

"Mr. WALLGREN. No, we had nothing like that.

"Senator KNOWLAND. I see."

Treatment of veterans

The witness made a particular point of his treatment of war veterans. On page 288 of the hearings he states as follows:

"This talk about war veterans that has been mentioned here, I have appointed 2,400 war veterans in the State of Washington after this war, employed them in the State administration."

Again it is necessary only to let the public record speak for itself. The Spokane Spokesman-Review contains the following article which has a bearing on the subject:

"Wallgren said that in the employment of veterans by the administration the only ones who won't be hired are those who have actively identified themselves with the Republican Party.

" 'Of course we aren't going to hire active Republicans,' he replied to a question. 'Who expects us to?' Let them wait for the Republicans to get back in. We aren't Republicans.'"

It is clear, therefore, that the witness was not really concerned with the welfare of veterans but with the welfare of the Democratic Party. It made no difference to him that on the battlefield there were no Democrats or Republicans, only Americans. It made no difference to him that Japanese bullets did not differentiate between political parties. It made no difference to him that Americans fought, suffered, and died together. To him a worthy veteran was only a member of the Democratic Party.

The case of the Longview Bridge

During the hearings Mr. Wallgren was asked a number of questions concerning the Longview Bridge. The answers which he provided were neither adequate nor in some cases accurate. After I brought the correct facts to the attention of the committee on February 21, additional questions were asked of Mr. Wallgren on the subject. He produced a prepared statement in which he attempted to offer an explanation. I would like to point out to the committee that although the witness was Governor of the State and chairman of bridge authority, he could not answer the questions asked but had to obtain the information from a friend.

On page 326 of the hearings the admission is recorded as follows:

"Mr. WALLGREN. I am glad that I anticipated that question, Senator, because we called up the highway department the other day—I had a friend of mine call up and get the information, and I will give you the report as he submitted it to me."

He goes on to say that, on page 143 of the hearings of the record:

"There is a certain statement of supposed facts and inferences which were made by Senator CAIN with reference to the purchase of the Washington Toll Bridge Authority which I, as Governor, was the chairman of the bridge authority, and the property occupied by it and known as the Longview Bridge."

Knowledge of Communist policies

One of the important qualifications of the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board is thorough familiarity with the foreign policy of the Soviet Union and the manifestations of that policy among Communists in the United States. It is impossible to expect anyone who does not know the essential features of Soviet propaganda and Soviet policy to be able to take any intelligent part in the management of American affairs today, particularly those involving the national security. Throughout the entire testimony the witness gave not one indication that he was at all familiar with the subject and in fact admitted that he knew very little about it. On page 364 there was this significant discussion between Senator KNOWLAND and Mr. Wallgren:

"Senator KNOWLAND. Just to refresh your memory a little, was it not true that in and about 1940 at the time you were being picketed, or perhaps a little earlier than that, the American Peace Mobilization so-called was then following the Communist Party line, because you will recall that at that time Soviet Russia was in bed, so to speak, with Nazi Germany. That was before the Nazi attack on Russia, and therefore the Communist Party line at that time was to do anything they could do to hamstring the mobilization of this country, anything they could do to undermine lend-lease or assistance to the western allies, and anything that they could do to obstruct selective service or embarrass the President; that was the party line at that time.

"As soon as Russia was attacked by Nazi Germany, then the party line took an immediate shift in another direction. Is that not correct?

"Mr. WALLGREN. You are better acquainted with that than I am, Senator."

I do not need to point out to the committee that the "peace offensive" during the "Communazi" period was the keystone of Russian foreign policy and the policies of every Communist Party throughout the entire world. Our own country was flooded with this type of propaganda. Rallies were held throughout the country and those of us who advocated the strengthening of our defenses were abused. Even the office of Mr. Wallgren was, according to his own admission, picketed by Communist "peace" propagandists. The policy then was similar to the Soviet policy today and its purpose as it was then is to weaken us in any possible future conflict with Soviet Russia.

It would certainly inspire one with greater confidence in the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board if he at least showed that he had superficially reviewed Soviet world policy with which he must cope.

III. NEW MATERIAL

Since the beginning of these hearings I have endeavored to procure for the committee all possible information on the subject. The new information which I present herewith opens up broad new avenues of investigation which the committee should in all fairness examine. The material which I am submitting here confirms the charges that I have repeatedly made that the nominee has catered to Communists and has appointed them to important offices. I submit the following information:

In the case of Nick Bez

One of the associates of Mr. Wallgren in his political and personal life is Nick Bez, owner of a fishing fleet on the west coast. The noted columnist, George E. Sokolsky, described Nick Bez (Washington Times-Herald, March 26, 1946, p. 9) as a "leading Democrat in the State of Washington and associate of Governor Wallgren and Senator MAGNUSON, a factor in State politics." I am enclosing a copy of the article as exhibit 4 and ask that it be printed in the record at this point. The closeness of Nick Bez to Mr. Wallgren is further evidenced in an article appearing in Time magazine, November 4, 1946, from which I quote as follows:

"That operator (Nick Bez) was recently hunched over a tumbler of bourbon in Seattle's exclusive, leather-lined Rainier Club. In his Sunday best, he looked very uncomfortable. He became more uncomfortable when told that the club's whisky deliveries were smaller than those of some newer clubs. 'G——— it,' he roared, 'I go and talk to Mon (Gov. Mon C. Wallgren).

"A Seattle industrialist playing dominoes turned and frowned disapprovingly until someone whispered; 'That's Nick Bez. You know, fishing.' The frown promptly dissolved into an understanding smile."

On June 24, 1945, Wideworld Photos Inc., released the following:

"President trolls for salmon: President Truman stands while trolling for salmon with Gov. Mon Wallgren, Democrat, in Washington State's Puget Sound, June 21. They caught only a couple of dogfish and accepted a gift of salmon from more successful fishermen on the sound. Left to right: Costa Lazzaretti, Seattle fish packer; (Nick Bez); President Truman; Governor Wallgren and George Drescher of the Secret Service."

Nick Bez is known to have been one of the most important financial angels in the Yugoslav Communist movement in this country, organizations which have issued the sickening propaganda about Dictator Tito. Bez has also been one of the backers of the Democratic Party in Washington State and is reputed to be a close friend of Mon Wallgren. Bez has been connected with a number of Communist fronts and his connections with these organizations has been a matter of public record for some time.

The most important Communist-dominated group with which Bez has had connection is the American Slav Congress and his name is listed on page 60 of a leaflet entitled "Slavic Americans" written by George Pirinsky, as an official publication of the American Slav Congress. I might add that Hugh DeLacy is also connected with this front.

It will interest you to know that Pirinsky, whose real name is Zykoff, was arrested last fall as a dangerous alien advocating the overthrow of the Government by force and violence. It is no exaggeration to say that the American Slav Congress is one of the most important Communist fronts in the United States or perhaps in the entire Western Hemisphere, since related fronts exist in our neighboring states. The Slav congress was formed pursuant to the call of the all-Slav committee in Moscow which directs it today for the purpose of undermining the loyalty of the approximately 10,000,000 Americans of Slavic descent. The importance of the Slav congress and its unflinching adherence to the party line is adequately proven by the fact that its pro-Soviet utterances are repeatedly quoted by the Russian radio and press. As a matter of fact on November 18, 1943, the Moscow overseas propaganda radio network inaugurated a special series of radio broadcasts beamed at Slavic Americans in the United States for the express purpose of assisting the Slav congress in its propaganda work. If the committee so desires I will be happy to submit for the record copies of some of these broadcasts.

During its entire existence the American Slav Congress has had associated with it a number of known Communists and fellow travelers and again I am in a position to supply the committee with all the necessary facts if it should desire them.

The top-ranking Tito front in North America is the United Committee of South Slavic Americans which is also cited as a Communist front by the Attorney General. Nick Bez has been closely associated with this front and is listed in its literature—significantly enough—as treasurer. The United Committee has for a number of years been busily publishing pro-Communist and pro-Tito booklets. Among them are such unabashed pieces of tripe as the following:

National Tito and His Gallant Bands, Tito's Yugoslav Partisans Movement, Tito Speaks, Incredible Tito, Man of the Hour, and many, many others.

I am submitting for the record the entire history of the United Committee of South Slavic Americans as it appeared in the February 1948 issue of the National Republic, exhibit 5, and I ask that it be printed in the record at this point.

I would like particularly to call to your attention this fact. Peter Grigoroff, one of the organizers of the United Committee, and other members of it have been identified as Comintern agents in this country. Among them are several persons who have returned to their homelands—now behind the iron curtain—to assume important government positions under the Communist dictatorships.

Bez was also named treasurer of the war-relief fund of Americans of South Slavic Descent, later renamed the American Committee for Yugoslav Relief. This front has also been cited by the Attorney General of the United States. I have in my possession the official bulletin of the United Committee of South Slavic Americans for November 1944, the back page of which shows the office held by Nick Bez. If the committee so desires I shall be glad to have that page photostated and submitted as an exhibit for the record.

Another front with which the name of Nick Bez has been connected is the American Committee for Free Yugoslavia. He held the office of president of this front, which, like the other things to which the name of Bez has been linked, was a propaganda front for Dictator Tito.

His name was listed on the letterhead of the organization and his office was mentioned in the Daily Worker of March 4, 1942, page 62.

Significantly the Communist-controlled American Committe for a Free Yugoslavia endorsed Mr. Wallgren's candidacy for the governorship. The endorsement followed statements by Mr. Wallgren in support of Tito, as indicated in the following quotation from the Post-Intelligencer of October 6, 1944, page 6:

"Because of their speeches denouncing the royal exile government of Yugoslavia and asking for recognition of the Tito 'government of liberation', United States Senator Mon Wallgren and Congressman WARREN MAGNUSON, 'have been endorsed for governor and United States Senator, respectively, by the American Committee for Free Yugoslavia."

In the case of William J. Pennock

One of the charges which I have made against the nominee is that he has appointed Communists to important offices. In support I cited the case of John Caughlan. I have since that time been able to identify another Wallgren appointee as a member of the Communist Party. He is William J. Pennock, who, light Caughlan, was connected with the notorious Washington Pension Union. The Associated Press carried the announcement on April 14, 1945 (I offer the clipping as exhibit 6 and ask that it be printed in the record at this point). In the New World of April 19, 1945, page 2, presents the same information. Like so many of Mr. Wallgren's colleagues, William J. Pennock has been identified conclusively and repeatedly as a member of the Communist

Party before the Washington Un-American Activities Committee.

The hearings of the committee contain approximately 150 references to William J. Pennock. He is identified under oath as a Communist Party member by a large number of witnesses including Mr. Louis Budenz, whose credibility as a witness has been fully established by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, United States Department of Justice, and the Federal courts. Rather than burden the committee with the complete record I will cite only the sworn statement of Mr. Budenz (hearings of the Un-American Activities Committe of the State of Washington, 1948), it appears on page 29 of the first volume. If the committee shall so desire, I would be more than glad to submit the entire record on William J. Pennock for its examination. I am satisfied and I am sure the committee will be satisfied that his record is so extensive that he should never have been appointed to any position by Mr. Wallgren.

In the case of George Hurley

Another person with communistic affiliations was appointed to a position by Mr. Wallgren while he was governor is George Hurley, inspector in the department of transportation, appointed April 17, 1946, at $300 to $350 a month. George Hurley has also been identified under oath as a member of the Communist Party by a number of witnesses before the Un-American Activities Committee of the State of Washington. Ward F. Warren made the following statement under cath:

"I knew George Hurley for approximately 10 years. He is a member of the Communist Party—a Communist at the same time that I was, and still, up to as late as the last campaign. My observation as a former Communist is that he is still following the Communist Party line."

Jess Fletcher and other witnesses confirmed his identification, and if the committee so desire I shall again be glad to submit the pertinent information.

CONCLUSION

In my opnion the case in opposition to confirming Mr. Mon C. Wallgren as Chairman of the National Security Resources Board is by no means completed. I have reason to believe that additional information will come to my attention which ought to be submitted to, and examined by, the Senate Armed Services Committee. I am hopeful that the committee will find it both proper and necessary to examine fully the charges which are covered in this brief. I shall be available to the committee at any time when it may wish to interrogate me further or to suggest that I introduce additional data in support of the many contentions which have been made. If it develops that Mr. Wallgren is possessed of a full measure of character, capacity, and knowledge, then I shall agree that he ought to be confirmed. If he is lacking in any of these requirements then it would be a disservice to him, to the President, and to the Nation to confirm his appointment. My only concern has been and remains that of making certain that a completely qualified individual is confirmed for a position which is and will continue to be as important as any portfolio in the Government.

APPENDIX A

ONE HUNDRED CHARACTER AND CAPACITY REFERENCES WRITTEN BY AMERICAN CITIZENS, MOST OF WHOM RESIDE IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON. THESE REFERENCES ARE SUPPORTED BY SEVERAL THOUSAND SIMILAR REFERENCES WHICH WILL BE MADE AVAILABLE IF REQUESTED OR REQUIRED

REDMOND, WASH., *February 19, 1949.*

United States Senator HARRY P. CAIN:

We the undersigned voters, Lake Sammamish area, heartily endorse your stand against Mon Wallgren. We concur that he is not the man to be entrusted with our resources.

CLARENCE BREEDMAN,
W. S. QUACKENBASH,
L. W. MAGNUSSEN,
Republicans.
GUY SPRINGSTEEL,
CLAUD UNTEIDT,
JOE P. GERON,
DALE P. GILBERT,
Democrats.

SEATTLE, WASH., *February 22, 1949.*

Senator HARRY P. CAIN:

I am a registered Democrat for over 40 years, yet I would vote against Mon C. Wallgren for NSR Board for three reasons. He left the State of Washington in debt, he left a no good boat, and he is a lame duck turned down by the people of the State of Washington.

H. M. SAULSBERRY.

SPOKANE, WASH., *February 15, 1949.*

Senator HARRY CAIN:

Wallgren was repudiated by the voters of this State last November. Why give him an office of greater responsibility?

J. W. BIRCHFIELD.

EVERETT, WASH., *February 15, 1949.*

Senator HARRY P. CAIN:

Wallgren dissipated 140 million of Washington State funds. Don't turn him loose on the national budget.

Mrs. SIG BERG.

SPOKANE, WASH., *February 18, 1949.*

Hon. HARRY CAIN:

Wonderful. Have you told them about the Capitol Club where each employee had to kick back a percentage causing many to resign their positions rather than to conform?

MARION SCHULTE.

TACOMA, WASH., *February 18, 1949.*

Senator HARRY P. CAIN:

Rank and file Tacomans thrilled at aggressive manner in which you are carrying the same fearless fight you waged locally for honest, clean government to our national scene. Let's leave the corrupt Wallgren stench buried.

J. K. STRACHAN,
Member, Teamsters Union, Local No. 581.

SEATTLE, WASH., *February 19, 1949.*

Senator HARRY CAIN:

May the Lord help you keep Wallgren out of Washington, D. C., and we will keep him out of Washington State.

JIM K. TYRELL.

YAKIMA, WASH., *February 18, 1949.*

Senator HARRY CAIN:

Our organization together with the majority of people in Washington are solidly behind you in your stand on Wallgren.

YAKIMA SHEEP CO.,
A. R. BOHOSKEY,
DON BOHOSKEY,
WOODWARD BOHOSKEY.

SEATTLE, WASH., *February 22, 1949.*

Senator HARRY CAIN:

Your position on Wallgren appointment supported by every person I have talked with. If friendship demands position recommend secretary of billiards where national resources will not be jeopardized.

LOAR MANSBACH,
Mercer Island.

SEATTLE, WASH., *February 22, 1949.*

Senator HARRY P. CAIN,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: As a Democrat of long standing I wish to commend you on your stand with regard to the appointment of former Gov. Mon C. Wallgren to chairmanship of the National Security Resources Board.

This appointment is obviously an error on the part of our President and it is to be hoped he will find men of greater ability for future appointments and avoid the outcome of the Harding administration.

Yours truly,

KENNETH HITCHINGS.

SEATTLE, WASH., *February 11, 1949.*

Senator HARRY CAIN.

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: I am a Democrat, but I want to commend most heartily your position in challenging the fitness of Mr. Wallgren to fill the position to which he has been appointed. He has demonstrated while Governor his unfitness for any post and should be returned to private life.

I express the opinion also of the other three voters of our family.

Sincerely,

CHARLOTTE B. HUGHES
(Mrs. M. J. Hughes.)

SEATTLE, WASH., *February 11, 1949.*

The Honorable SENATOR CAIN.

DEAR SENATOR: I hope you succeed in keeping Mon C. Wallgren from being appointed chairman of National Security Resources Board. I am a Democrat and I voted for President Truman but I didn't vote for an extravagant man like Mon C. Wallgren. I think that's a dirty way for the President to treat the Democrats of our State after we voted him out of office for getting us into some ferry deal. He would probably buy the Pacific Ocean for us or something equally as bad.

Sincerely,

Mrs. E. M. GRADY.

OLYMPIA, WASH., *February 19, 1948.*

The Honorable Senator HARRY P. CAIN.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to thank you for the fight you are making against the Senate approval of Mon C. Wallgren's appointment to the chairmanship of the National Security Resources Board. There are many citizens of this State who are anxiously hoping that you will succeed in preventing the appointment. We have had enough of his inefficiency and corruption during the past 4 years, and certainly do not want to pay for more of it in our Federal administration.

If the Senators who must settle the matter had been citizens of Washington during Mr. Wallgren's administration, and had seen him wasting our State funds on such fiascos as the purchase of the Longview Bridge, while they paid the highest taxes imposed by any State, I know how they would vote. If the Senators had to drive, as we do, over our disintegrating State roads, and knew the story of Mr. Wallgren's dismissal 4 years ago of our 10 senior highway engineers—each having more than 25 years in the State's service—I think I know how they would vote on the appointment.

If the Senators had been living here in our State capital and known the disgrace of Wallgren's "2-percent club," I hope they would not vote for giving this great responsibility to such a corrupt leader. When a man has shown himself inefficient and corrupt in State administration, wasting millions of our State's dollars, shall we promote him to Federal responsibility to waste billions?

As one who loves our country, I hope and pray that you will be able to prevent it.

Sincerely yours,

JACKSON L. WEBSTER.

FEBRUARY 23, 1949.

Hon. HARRY CAIN.

DEAR SIR: Wish to congratulate you upon your effort to require proof of eligibility of

our defeated past governor, Mon C. Wallgren, to the proposed appointment by the President. Would like to express our heartfelt thanks and approval of your stand.

Living in a tiny island county of the State of Washington, San Juan, we have had a personal display of petty selfishness in the fish and game laws by Mr. Wallgren in the closing of one of our three lakes to "fly fishing only." It has come to be called "Mon Wallgren's lake." This lake has always been used by fishermen with any tackle. It included many island children with small hooks and worms who spent hours fishing "belly down" on the dock at Mountain Lake, on Orcas Island. Mr. Wallgren closed it to all except fly fishermen in spite of and against the will of the taxpayers of this county because he chose to use it while a repeating visitor at the estate of Don Rhoem, Rosario, Orcas Island, Wash. The island people protested bitterly without success. A small matter, but indicative of the manner in which Mr. Wallgren used his governorship of the State to further the whims and fancies of his own rather than the will and benefit of the people.

Please continue your efforts in what we feel is a matter of momentous import.

Very sincerely yours,

KARL P. MORAN, M. D.

SEATTLE, WASH., *February 23, 1949.*

Senator HARRY P. CAIN.

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: We are only one family among the multitude, but since the case of Wallgren versus a job in Washington, D. C., has come to a head we feel that our gratitude for your stand on the matter warrants this letter.

The average individual is helpless to do anything about the ever-growing policy of the administration in Washington, D. C., to place old time friends or politically beneficial persons in lush positions without discretion or consideration of its responsibility to the people, except to sit at home and read about it from day to day and cringe. Therefore, when there is someone like you in Washington who is awake to what is happening and courageous enough to stand up for what is right, it compels us to at least write a letter making known the fact that what you are doing receives our whole-hearted approval and thanks.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. G. J. FOSTER.

TACOMA, WASH., *February 23, 1949.*

MY DEAR SENATOR CAIN: My family have always voted Democratic.

I admire your courage in opposing President Truman's appointment of Wallgren. Wallgren is so completely unqualified that this appointment would be a national tragedy.

Sincerely yours,

ELLEN JONES HOOKER.

SEATTLE, WASH., *February 18, 1949.*

SENATOR HARRY P. CAIN.

DEAR HARRY: I am late to supper and my wife is already sore as hell at me for staying down in Olympia all last week kicking legislative shins, but I've got to write this before I go home.

I am glad somebody is doing what you are doing in the Wallgren hearing. Honest to gawd, the thought of bumbling Monrad sitting in a spot like that, in times like these, chills my guts. Better we have Shirley Temple, yet.

Maybe you won't get anywhere—from here it looks like the committee is about to slip you the business. But thanks for trying, anyway. If Mon gets that job I daresay we will have a repeat on the housewife pot and pan collection that drug up tons of no-good aluminum to oxidize on railroad sidings last time.

Good luck.

Regards,

BOB WARD.

SEATTLE, WASH., *February 14, 1949.*

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: Do not let the fact that the Democratic members of the house of representatives, in Olympia, voted in favor of the appointment of Wallgren stop you in your efforts to do a great service to this United States. Not one paper has come out with a statement in favor of his appointment. It is quite evident they just can't do so and be honest with the public.

It is a well-established fact that Wallgren told some of his buddies, when they asked him why he was taking a step backward in his political career he said, "There is no money in being a Senator." I would like to see his income tax for 1945, 1946, 1947, 1948, and 1949, for I am sure it would tell the story.

As a Democrat, I am not very proud of the situation in this State. With the help and advice of his good friend Harry he was able to set up an organization and make a clean-up here. He did not do this in Alaska where he settled his labor claims for 10 cents on the dollar. As an old-time Alaskan I know this story in full. That is why I wrote a letter to Ickes and Drew Pearson when I read he might be appointed to be the Secretary of the Interior. They would lynch him if he ever went up there.

I have evidence in my files to show that he ran out on the disabled veterans of this State. I was employed to manage a project to give employment to disabled veterans and he and his group—Corrie, Garten, Slavensberg, Joe Adams, and others—abandoned the project when Dave Beck refused to let them set it up as a State institution. It did not fit in with their plans of some fat jobs for some professional veterans and pet political friends—there was no place for graft or special jobs in my plan. Read the enclosed carefully and you will see that I set up a plan for the disabled veteran—100 percent for him alone.

My old friend John J. Sullivan can tell you, as he was my attorney and agreed to do the work for the project without compensation—Joe Adams was appointed at a nice salary, he was the first favored son to get a place in the project. It is a very nasty picture, Senator, and I offered to make a statement during the last campaign. I am glad I was not called on to do so as I have always wanted to keep this out of politics. If you can arrange for a story in the Times I will be very glad to cooperate. Please return the enclosures as I want them for my files. Don't weaken—you are right and the good Democrats of this State will back you up.

Yours very truly,

JAMES C. GAFFNEY.

FEBRUARY 13, 1949.

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: Don't compromise with your conscience even though you go down in political defeat. You get the picture—what they are trying to do with this Government. Everyone who has spoken in the defense of our American life has gone down in defeat. The smear brigade has seen to that. The Government has too many so-called Americans with their roots in no country in the world. They would sell out their own grandmother and they are doing an excellent job—tearing down the very foundations. Termites that have gotten into every phase of our American life. What I cannot understand is Mr. Herbert Hoover's recommendation for more power to be given President Truman. God knows what he would do with the extra power. He hasn't done so well with what he has. He frightens one with one saboteur after another. Wishing you a successful New Year, I am,

Cordially,

MRS. ARTHUR SAYRES.

FEBRUARY 17, 1949.

Senator MILLARD TYDINGS.

DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: As Senator CAIN said, Mr. Wallgren's only qualification is his friendship with Mr. Truman, and that is frightening. Mr. Wallgren could never be found when he was Governor, he was in Palm Springs, Calif., or Washington, D. C. We had a saying here, "If Wallgren can be kept from selling city hall before he gets out." The terrifying thing is President Truman's disregard for incompetence in the most crucial days of our lives and his seemingly lack of knowledge as to really what is going on. The extent of communism and the transfer of these revolutionists to the United States brought in by land, sea, and air these past 8 years under the guise of displaced persons and entering every phase of our American life and destroying it with their own twisted philosophy. If it doesn't stop soon, we will be the displaced persons, but that, I understand, is their aim and they are doing an excellent job, because everyone in the Government who defends America and Americans is eventually out. This Congress and House will be pressured as never before in history because we have entered an era that Mr. Roosevelt started of something for nothing and it is crippling and decaying our very foundations.

Very cordially,

MAE V. SAYRES.

P. S.—This is a worried citizen here from 1710 watching her country being destroyed from within and helpless to do anything about it. This is the second letter I have ever written to any Senator or Representative.

MRS. ARTHUR SAYRES.

PLEASANTVILLE, N. Y., *February 22, 1949.*

The Honorable HARRY P. CAIN.

DEAR SENATOR: More power to you for your fight to prevent the appointment of Mon C. Wallgren.

It is time that the Senate does it's utmost to protect our country from such as are unfitted. It is not a question of courtesy to the President, but of fairness to our citizens.

This is another of the many nominations (including certain appointments?) in which the nominee both by his record and disposition seems utterly unfitted.

Like many, or perhaps most New Dealers, Wallgren, if not a Communist, seems to have been at least friendly to Communists, and to have failed to recognize the danger of appointing such to be public servants.

May I hear from you?

Very cordially,

JOHN W. ARNOLD.

SEATTLE, WASH., *February 24, 1949.*

Mr. HARRY P. CAIN.

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: I have been following the news items recently on the subject of the President's appointments, including that of one Mon C. Wallgren, to a very important board chairmanship affecting our national security.

It seems to me this man has been pretty thoroughly repudiated by the citizens of Washington State and from what I can learn, for very good reasons. When he gave up a United States Senatorship to move into the Governorship of Washington on a left wing wave, he probably did so with his eye on the lush condition of the State treasury, built up by a former competent incumbent, and could not resist the temptation to get his fingers in the pie.

It is said when he came to Olympia he was broke and the Treasury had a large surplus. In any event, when he left he was headed for the millionaire class and the State was broke. As soon as Mr. Langlie arrived at the Capitol, Wallgren took the next train or plane to Washington, not even waiting to attend the inauguration; which reminds one of the tenant who wrecked the apartment house furniture and equipment and then ran away out of bounds before the landlord arrived to survey and investigate the wreckage.

This morning's paper displays a photograph of a new $60,000 residence nearing completion for Mr. Wallgren in the southern California desert, which would make a nice hideout for himself and the President to put on some poker parties, etc., during vacations.

You know of some of the shady deals conducted out here, including the bridge purchase, which would permit siphoning off overpayments through a set of dummies, and I think these deals should be thoroughly investigated. I hope you will enlist all the assistance you can from people in the know, in order to expose and block this playboy from doing further damage.

I read the news item from Washington yesterday telling of Jack Gorrie and the other two henchmen who are already feeding at the national public trough in a big way, in the new department of which Mr. Wallgren aspires to be the head.

More power to you in your endeavors to be a good public servant.

Very sincerely yours,

A. NISONGER.

LAKEVIEW, WASH., *February 23, 1949.*

Senator HARRY P. CAIN.

DEAR SIR: You have a quality which is so rarely found today and which is so urgently needed, that of having the vigilance, the ability (let's just say guts) to rise and defend this Nation from impostors seeking high places. You did it once when you turned the light on John Coffee and you are doing a good job now in contesting the appointment of ex-Governor Wallgren as head of the Committee for National Defense. Win, lose, or draw, I am for the stand you have taken. I admire you so much for this because I know how much easier it would be to be a "yes man" as 9 out of 10 men are. We have many misfits in our pulpits, our schools, and colleges as well as in key political positions who are a menace to our national safety and welfare. We need more men like you.

Very sincerely,

T. H. ALGIO.

PULLMAN, WASH., *February 24, 1949.*

Senator HARRY P. CAIN:

I'm a 4-year veteran 100 percent against Mon Wallgren. Veterans want honest men. Keep up the fight.

R. D. LOWE.

SEATTLE, WASH., *February 22, 1949.*

Senator HARRY P. CAIN.

DEAR SENATOR: Your stand on the Wallgren appointment is to be highly commended. I hope you will keep up the good work despite the tremendous amount of abuse you will undoubtedly be subjected to because of your opposition.

It seems to me that, if the United States is going to survive as a free republic, men of courage will have to stand up and be counted as the individual issues arise.

There has been too much acceptance of opportunism in high places both locally and nationally. The only method the electorate has of stopping abuses is for their representatives to have enough guts to take the obvious right stand irregardless of friendship, party loyalty, political opportunism, polls, pressure, etc.

It might even be that the man who is willing to stick his neck out will find favor with the voters—who can tell?

Respectfully,

J. A. DOUGAN, Jr.

BELLINGHAM, WASH., *February 22, 1949.*

The Honorable HARRY P. CAIN.

DEAR SIR: I have been reading and listening with utmost interest to your stand against the appointment of Mon C. Wallgren to the position of chairman of so important a national defense board as that of National Security Resources Board.

Wallgren never made anything secure in his life unless it was for himself. I am one of hundreds of people who cannot understand why anyone upon whom there is any doubt of integrity should be appointed to such important positions.

I might also say that I happened to live in the south part of Seattle when there was so much discussion of Wallgren and his Communist friends, most of whom you have mentioned.

Why in God's name do we have to stand for appointments of such men when there are plenty of real good men in this country upon whom there is no auspicion of un-American activity.

Keep up the good fight and may you be the winner. This is my sincere hope.

Very truly yours,

MERLE L. SEYLAR.

YAKIMA, WASH., *February 23, 1949.*

The Honorable HARRY CAIN.

DEAR SENATOR: In your fight to block confirmation of Mon Wallgren to the high position to which he has been appointed you have the support of every right-thinking citizen of the State of Washington.

Opposition to this appointment cannot rightly be classed as political as we know a Democrat will be confirmed for this position and we also know that the President will see that Mr. Wallgren is cared for at public expense.

As governor of this State it was evident that he had no desire to be a servant of the people but rather to be "Your governor" and to profit by the opportunities it offered.

Is there any way that I may assist?

Very truly yours,

CLARENCE W. KEEN.

WENATCHEE, WASH., *February 22, 1949.*

Senator HARRY P. CAIN.

MY DEAR CAIN: I just want to add my 10 cents' worth to your fight against the confirmation of that man Wallgren.

Press dispatches last evening told all about how he is building a $60,000 home near Palm Springs, and the obvious question arises as to where he got that kind of money.

The pay which a Congressman receives to say nothing of the governor's salary, presented no opportunity for boosting a man into the glamorous state which he now seems to possess.

You are doing your country a real service in trying to put a stop to the ambitions of one of the worst upstarts this country has been cursed with.

More power to you.

JOHN A. GELLATLY.

BREMERTON, WASH., *February 22, 1949.*

Senator HARRY CAIN.

DEAR SENATOR: As a voter and taxpayer I wish to commend you for the stand you are making against the appointment of Mon C. Wallgren as head of the National Security Resources Board. Even the Democrats in this State seem to regard him as an incompetent "boob" and it is tragic that a man of his obvious incapabilities should hold such an important position.

I think you are tilting at a windmill but perhaps the enclosed will provide you with some fresh ammunition. Good luck.

Most sincerely,

MISS KATHLEEN BRIGGS.

BELLINGHAM, WASH., *February 22, 1949.*

The Honorable HARRY CAIN.

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: Please accept my congratulations on your objection to the appointment of ex-Governor Wallgren.

There is little to be gained by my repeating to you contempt that I, and obviously many other thinking people of Washington have for Mon Wallgren. Many of us are wondering when and where funds were derived for him to build a $60,000 mansion at Palm Desert which the newspapers report is being rushed to completion.

It is my considered opinion that such appointments, which are little more than personal gifts from the President—of the people's money, is more dangerous to our democratic system than foreign ideologies. If men without capacity, without training, perhaps without honesty, are to be placed in top positions by some "divine right" how in the name of common sense can good and efficient government ever result? If, by the way we practice democracy, we ignore the public, invite mismanagement, confusion, perhaps graft, if we support individuals just for personal friendship and ignore the welfare of the people only complete lack of confidence and trust in the central Government can result.

The cry against excessive tax is loud—and justly so—but I can see little hope of correcting the terrible inefficiencies we all see by placing such political mistakes as Mon Wallgren in administrative posts. Government must, I repeat, must take a good look at itself and resolve to so organize and operate that Mr. and Mrs. John Q. Citizen will not begin to mutter or swear as we do now when politics is mentioned. I think perhaps you will agree that no business could ever exist if it were conducted with comparable efficiency. Washington, D. C., is the home office of the greatest business in the world and it is long past time when waste and expense is cut. I consider that the appointment of Wallgren discredited the President. I wish you all the success possible in your fight against this man.

Very truly yours,

A. MARVIN ALLYN.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., *February 22, 1949.*

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON.

DEAR MR. MAGNUSON: I wish to enter an emphatic protest against the confirmation of Mon C. Wallgren as Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. I am a Democrat and voted for him when he ran for governor in 1944. I do not know the man personally, but I have long since come to the conclusion that he is wholly unfit to hold any public office. My reasons are as follows:

1. He has had no business experience whatsoever and is wholly without training along this line. This naturally disqualifies him from holding a position demanding any knowledge of the practical business principles.

2. When elected Governor of the State of Washington the first thing Mr. Wallgren demanded was cocktail bars. Even if the proposal had had merit that certainly was not the time to bring it up. We were still at war and any measure that would contribute to disunity among the people obviously should have been avoided. Knowing the liquor question to have been highly controversial its injection at that particular time was ill-advised to say the least.

3. The moment he was sworn in as governor he demanded control of every commission in the State, political or nonpolitical. He

even demanded control of the State board of education and the board of pardons and paroles. He also demanded that the State Game Commission, which had been taken out of politics in 1932 by means of an initiative measure sponsored by the sportsmen of the State of Washington, be returned to political control. This, of course, meant that they would be returned to the control of Mon Wallgren.

4. As you will no doubt recall, during his first legislative term he worked hand-in-glove with that bunch of cronies out of Seattle. As you also know, these men were repudiated in the next election. During his first legislative term they were Wallgren's fair-haired boys.

5. In a year when the voter was hell-bent on voting the Democratic ticket throughout the United States, Wallgren, the nominee of the Democratic Party, was repudiated at the polls by his own party.

6. When President Truman visited Washington shortly after Wallgren was elected Governor he took Mr. Truman on a fishing trip in his palatial yacht. The only other person invited to go on the trip was Nick Bez. Why was that? At best it certainly had sinister implications. The normal thing would be to invite important members of the Democratic Party, and especially those occupying high public office.

7. The same yacht was bought by the State allegedly for the fisheries department but was used solely for Wallgren's pleasure. Before his term was over he even discarded the pretense and called it the Governor's yacht.

My candid opinion is, Mr. MAGNUSON, that opposition to Wallgren's confirmation will increase your stature in the eyes of the voters of the State of Washington.

Sincerely,

I. P. CALLISON.

PALM SPRINGS, CALIF., *February 22, 1949.*

Hon. HARRY CAIN.

DEAR HARRY: More power to you in your fight over Wallgren. If there was ever an unsuitable and incompetent appointee he is it, and I hope you will be able to kill off the appointment. I have been wiring and writing various ones that I thought would have influence, and if there is anything more I can do let me know. I expect to be here for several weeks more.

We came down from Aberdeen about a month ago and seem to have chosen the right time to miss the worst winter Washington has had in many years.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

EDWARD K. BISHOP.

SEATTLE, WASH., *February 22, 1949.*

Senator HARRY P. CAIN.

DEAR MR. CAIN: Permit me to compliment you upon your courageous refusal to accept the name of Mon C. Wallgren to the office, the President, in a moment of friendliness appointed him.

The President surely did not have access to the undisputed facts regarding the conduct, associations and local political policy of Mr. Wallgren, from the days of his pool hall activities in Everett to his revealing purchases as governor, not to mention his defeated attempts to bring pressure in regard to certain leases.

We in Washington State do not look upon this timely investigation only as the proving that a discarded politician is totally unfit to hold such a vitally important office, but rather does it prove that the so-called gentlemen's agreement as previously put into practice, requires more study and careful consideration as to the fitness, loyalty, integrity and ability of an appointee, particularly at this period of national crisis when the world is looking to us for leadership and guidance.

It is indeed time to take stock, to face the real issue of whether we are to look to loyal citizens for leadership or be influenced, even led by theorists who have leaning tendencies toward doctrine that are so diametrically opposed to the traditions and fate that has made our country great.

At this time when we are beset by doubts and fears within and without the portals of our own individual lives, may God bless you and keep you and guide your good efforts to establish a better record of statemanship than has been displayed by one of your predecessors.

Very truly yours,

FLORENCE MITCHELL BOHL.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., *February 21, 1949.*

Hon. HARRY P. CAIN.

DEAR SIR: I hope your committee will not recommend approval of the appointment of Mon C. Wallgren for chairman of the National Security Resources Board (or any other office). Being a friend of the President is not a qualification and Mr. Wallgren lacks the essential qualifications, among them a knowledge of and experience in (a) business, (b) production problems, (c) military affairs, (d) international affairs.

Sincerely,

C. H. KERR.

MARYSVILLE, WASH., *February 14, 1949.*

Senator HARRY P. CAIN.

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: Congratulations to you on your firm stand opposing the appointment of Mon C. Wallgren by President Truman to the chairmanship of the Federal Security Resources Board.

Your action in this matter has my fullest approval.

Sincerely,

G. A. DUDLEY.

GARFIELD, WASH., *February 14, 1949.*

DEAR SENATOR: That man Wallgren deserves more than you gave to the Senate. The Internal Revenue people could do some work there, but will not.

His record in the State, when known, will make Huey Long look like a piker.

Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

ROBERT P. BENSON.

OLGA, WASH., *February 14, 1949.*

The Honorable HARRY P. CAIN.

DEAR SIR: Please let me congratulate you on your efforts to block Mr. Truman's appointment of Wallgren as head of the National Securities Resources Board. I sincerely hope he can be kept from holding any political position.

When the bill to broaden the Social Security plan comes before the Senate, I shall appreciate your consideration of the possibility of making it workable for the individual. As matters now stand, it is practically impossible for those of us who live in rural communities to make payments or have employers make payments into our Old Age and Survivors Insurance Accounts.

Thank you.

Respectfully,

J. S. GOLITHON.

EDMONDS, WASH., *February 17, 1949.*

Senator HARRY P. CAIN.

DEAR SIR: My husband and I wish to commend you—very highly—for the courageous stand you have taken against the confirmation of the appointment of Mon C. Wallgren as head of the National Security Resources Board.

We are hoping that at least some of his most notorious political misdeeds committed during his term as governor of our State can be held up for searching scrutiny so all may know just what a tricky, double dealing, greedy, grasping, publicity hunter our auave Mr. Wallgren is. Whoever coined the term "Corrupt Politician" must have been thinking of someone just like Mr. Wallgren.

Good luck to you, Senator Cain. It is comforting to know we still have some true, blue Americans—believing in Constitutional government, to represent us "the people", in Washington, D. C.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGIA A. WICKERSHAM.
D. R. WICKERSHAM.

GIG HARBOR, WASH., *February 17, 1949.*

Senator HARRY P. CAIN.

DEAR SIR: May I congratulate you on your protest of the appointment of our former Governor Wallgren. I certainly hope that your efforts will be rewarded with success.

It has made us sick here to find that when a man in high public office does not prove himself worthy of one job he is given another, an appointed job by none other than our President whom of course we should have all respect for.

Surely all the detrimental things said can not all be false.

With best wishes for your efforts in your crusade for better men in public office.

Sincerely,

MRS. C. ALLISON.

CAMAS, WASH., *February 18, 1949.*

The Honorable HARRY P. CAIN.

SIR: Congratulations on your most timely and forceful opposition to the appointment of Mon C. Wallgren as chairman of the National Security Resources Board. We worked hard to remove him from Washington State as Governor so please do not let him exercise his influence upon us from a higher level.

GEORGE F. HENDERSON.

NEWPORT, WASH., *February 11, 1949.*

Senator HARRY P. CAIN.

DEAR SIR: Matters being what they are, we wish to state our position in several matters, with the hope that future legislation will correct these black marks.

Citizens of Washington State canned Mr. Mon C. Wallgren from his governorship because he conducted State affairs in his own interest instead of the interests of the people. If the citizens of the State did not want him in State affairs, we are sure that they did not want him in Federal affairs either. Mr. Wallgren has proved himself a spendthrift. We want an end put to waste in the Government, and do not want Wallgren put in any responsible Government position having any authority or dealing with spending. As citizens and taxpayers, we feel that we have the right to ask that Mr. Wallgren be denied any administrative work. Senator CAIN, you should be lauded for standing up for your convictions.

Sincerely,

G. M. TROWBRIDGE.
C. M. TROWBRIDGE.
L. S. TROWBRIDGE.

EDMONDS, WASH., *February 16, 1949.*

Hon. HARRY P. CAIN,

DEAR SENATOR: Everyone I have talked to is proud of the stand you have taken on M. Wallgren. It may be an uphill, losing fight, but it is well to let the Senate know what kind of a wastrel he is.

Here is a man repudiated by his own party, in his own State, who has wasted seventy million of our State's reserves, and left the State in a financial mess.

There are several shady deals which point the finger of graft at him. One of which is the purchase of the Longview Bridge. His appointment should be held up until this mess is investigated.

Wishing you the best of luck in your courageous stand.

GEORGE G. SMART.

VASHON, WASH., *February 11, 1949.*

HONORABLE SIR: I see by the Seattle Times you intend to oppose confirmation of ex-Governor Wallgren.

Here is another voter hoping that for the good of the country you succeed in keeping this gentleman out of any position of public trust and confidence.

Very truly yours,

HERSCHEL HART.

CLE ELUM, WASH., *February 10, 1949.*

Mr. HARRY P. CAIN.

DEAR SENATOR: We just had a report—via radio that you were going to try to block the installation of our former Governor Wallgren, into a high office with a huge salary. God grant, that you will be able to do it. Our State of Washington is as you know bankrupt, due to his crafty dealings, and we think it would be detrimental to our country as a whole to have him in any office whatsoever.

Our congratulations on your attempt to block Wallgren. Hope you can do it and sincere thanks for any efforts on your part for better government.

MRS. WILLIAM A. WEISEMAN.

SUNNYSIDE, WASH., *February 31, 1949.*

Senator HARRY P. CAIN.

DEAR SENATOR: We have been reading in the papers about your revelations on Mon C. Wallgren's character, and from the chaos he has left behind him in Washington, think you are well within bounds and sincerely hope his appointment is not ratified. He has left the State of Washington away in the red what with his private yacht, etc. I imagine his Communist friends had some hand in it, too. And now this clipping about a $80,000 home makes me wonder how much of the Washington taxpayers' money is in it.

Yours truly,

MRS. MELVIN POYER.

KELSO, WASH., *February 10, 1949.*

Senator HARRY CAIN.

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: Good for you. Too many Presidential appointments are being rushed through before the country gets a chance to protest. I do hope this Wallgren appointment can be blocked.

Senators from other parts of the country probably have no idea what sort of a record Wallgren made as Governor of Washington. Nor, of course, do Senators pay much attention to voters outside their own States. But just the same I'm spending this week end writing to as many as I can manage, to urge them to listen to what you have to say about Wallgren before they vote to approve his appointment.

Good luck to you.

Yours very truly,

JANE LITTELL.

SEATTLE, WASH., *February 11, 1949.*

Hon. HARRY P. CAIN.

DEAR SIR: You are to be commended for your stand on Mon C. Wallgren. When the people of Washington State so carefully and painstakingly voted him out of office because of his record as governor I resent our President flaunting him in our face again. He could cost the taxpayers of the United States untold amounts of money in the position the President seeks for him. He just about put the taxpayers of Washington State in the hole for keeps.

It is my opinion the people of this State are behind you in about the same proportion we voted him out of office and put in a good governor.

Sincerely,

MAC C. TAYLOR,
President, Oregon-Washington Fertilizer Co.

BELLINGHAM, WASH., *February 11, 1949.*

Hon. HARRY P. CAIN.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have noted from the press that you are opposing the confirmation of M. C. Wallgren, in the United States Senate, and your reasons therefor.

As a citizen of the State of Washington I wish to commend you for your stand, and to say that an unbiased opinion from both Democrats and Republicans in the large majority would agree with you. I cannot believe that very many people of either party think that Mr. Wallgren possesses any particular qualifications for the position to which he has been appointed.

Very truly yours,

BLANTON LUTHER.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *February 19, 1949.*

Hon. HARRY P. CAIN:

Congratulations on your fine stand in the proposed Wallgren appointment. It is gratifying to know the people have at least one man who has the courage to oppose the vicious spoils system. All success in your fight.

TOM CURRAN.

PESHASTIN, WASH., *February 14, 1949.*

Hon. HARRY P. CAIN.

DEAR MR. CAIN: I would like to compliment you on your stand referable to the qualifications of Mr. Mon C. Wallgren for the strategic position to which Mr. Truman has appointed him.

We, the people of Washington, withdrew Mr. Wallgren from the leadership of our State because of his lack of qualifications for such a position; we therefore cannot understand the President's attitude in selecting Mr. Wallgren from the many capable men which he has at his disposal. Certainly the people of his own State can and do recognize a man's capabilities.

Let us assure you, Mr. CAIN, we, the people of Washington, stand back of you 100 percent since we do not feel Mr. Wallgren has shown, through his private experiences as well as his public leadership, any qualifications such as are necessary for key positions in our United States Government.

Yours truly,

H. D. COUCH.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 18, 1949.*

Senator HARRY CAIN.

MY DEAR SENATOR CAIN: I wish to thank you for your splendid effort to block the appointment of that person, Mon C. Wallgren, to the Chairmanship of the National Securities and Resources Board.

It would be a tragedy if he were to be confirmed in this appointment. There are far too many persons of his stripe already holding responsible offices in Washington.

It is my opinion that the man is not only incompetent, but he's quite unscrupulous as well. He was a sorry excuse for a Governor of Washington; he'd be a greater farce as chairman of the securities board; I would believe, a dangerous one.

My sincere thanks for your efforts to stop him. I might add right here that I feel that you, Senator CAIN, have been a credit to your State and that we could use more men like you down in Washington. The best o' luck to you.

Sincerely,

MURDOCH MACDONALD.

PULLMAN, WASH., *February 18, 1949.*

The Honorable HARRY P. CAIN.

DEAR MR. CAIN: As a long-time resident of the State of Washington, vitally interested in the welfare of our State and of our national Government, I wish to congratulate you upon the stand you have taken opposing the nomination of Mon Wallgren as chairman of the National Security Resources Board.

Every Washingtonian who can read is aware of the miserable job Wallgren did as Governor of the State of Washington during the 8 years he held the position, and it was with the most profound rejoicing that we were able to oust him in the last election in favor of Arthur B. Langlie. Your courage in opposing the President's express wish in having this incompetent playboy in a position of such responsibility merits the admiration of every citizen of the United States.

Thank you, Senator CAIN, for so aptly demonstrating your vigilance in guarding the welfare of our country.

My husband asks me to add that he will personally be very pleased if you will "chase Wallgren back to the poolroom where he belongs."

Sincerely,

MRS. E. F. LEONARD.

CENTRALIA, WASH., *February 19, 1949.*

Senator HARRY CAIN.

DEAR SIR: Congratulations on your stand against Wallgren's appointment. It is downright simple to select a man for such a job when it is so apparent that the people who know him have no faith in him.

Why a political career should be considered any qualification for this position I cannot see and as a businessman Wallgren would make a good caddy except he is too soft.

Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

FRANK P. SCHRADER.

P. S.—Don't forget the Longview Bridge deal, the difference between appraised and purchase price.

MORTON, WASH., *February 17, 1949.*

Senator HARRY CAIN.

HONORABLE SENATOR: As a voter in the State of Washington, who has followed your career through the years and has been a supporter of yours, I earnestly request you to oppose Mon C. Wallgren's appointment as Chairman of the National Security Resources Board.

His qualifications for such a position are certainly not indicated by his formed administration of our State's affairs while governor.

The voters of this State indicated their lack of confidence in him at the polls here in November, by rejecting him.

We note you stated you would do everything in your power to block Wallgren's confirmation. Please realize we voters are behind you all the way.

Sincerely,

MRS. BERNICE WINSLOW.

ELMA, WASH., *February 20, 1949.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: Your criticism of the opposition to the Wallgren nomination as Chairman of the National Security Resources Board shows that you have not properly analyzed the case.

The taxpayers of the State of Washington are still staggering from the effects of Wallgren's pool-hall level of administration. If you doubt this, compare the financial condition of this State at the beginning and close of his administration.

You are quoted, "We can't stop these appointments, but we can hold the Democrats responsible for what they do." In my opinion, we can't afford to have a man of mediocre qualifications in such an important position, even if it is just to discredit the Democrats. A minority that quits as easily as you indicate is not doing its duty to the Government.

Senator CAIN's frank statement of facts will draw a great deal more support from Congress and the entire Nation than your wavering attempt to sit on the fence.

Very truly,

MILES H. PULLEN.

ISSAQUAH, WASH., *February 23, 1949.*

Hon. HARRY P. CAIN:

We commend your stand in opposing the appointment of Mon Wallgren to the National Security Resources Board. Wallgren's record as Governor of the State of Washington proves him to be thoroughly unfit for such an important post.

E. E. BRAMBLE,
Publisher-Editor, Issaquah Press.

SEQUIM, WASH., *February 15, 1949.*

Senator CAIN.

DEAR SIR: Allow me to commend you for your protest against appointment of Wallgren.

This from one who voted for Roosevelt four times and Wallgren once. He was certainly obnoxious to many people, who once thought him governor material of a high order, but did not make the same mistake twice.

Also, let Harry Truman, the "miracle man," who recently got a substantial raise, pay his friendships off out of his own pocket. Why should all of the people of the United States be saddled with the keep of this Wallgren, when the people who know him best would not retain him in the job he so elaborately failed in.

If I was Wallgren, I would never hold up my head again, knowing that I was such a lousy governor; that the good folks of Washington put in one that they had discarded before rather than see him in office again.

Thank you,

ROBERT P. BIERLEY.

P. S.—Yes; you may use this letter and my name.

ENUMCLAW, WASH., *February 17, 1949.*

Hon. HARRY CAIN.

DEAR MR. CAIN: Please accept my congratulations for your action in the matter of the appointment of Mon Wallgren by the President to the chairmanship of the National Security Resources Board.

Mr. Wallgren's record as Governor of this State and the results of the last election should leave no doubt in the minds of those who will be responsible for his confirmation. There are many more of us in Mr. Wallgren's home State who share the same opinion as you. His record and political tactics have made him personally obnoxious to all people with any degree of decency and a sense of, and a desire for, the preservation of sound business methods in this branch of our Government.

Let us hope that more of your colleagues will have the courage to vote their honest convictions in the matter of this appointment and not just for the sake of political expediency.

Sincerely yours,

C. A. STEWART.

LANGLEY, WASH., *February 19, 1949.*

Hon. HARRY P. CAIN.

DEAR SENATOR: You are to be commended, indeed, for the stand you are taking on the Wallgren appointment. It has been a source of chagrin to all those who knew the score that the people of our State would have been so taken in as to send a fellow of his caliber into public office in the first place. That was in 1932, on a political shuffle, and I know the inside story when the committee named him to run as Congressman the first time. Once in, the rest was easy, for this person who had no moral scruples against selling his own State down the New Deal river. He has always represented the perfect type of lackey to do the bidding of the inner ring, and it has been during his time as public servant in capacity of Congressman, Senator, and finally Governor that our State became dubbed "the Soviet of Washington." And no wonder, with the likes of Jerry O'Connell and all the rest of that flock of gamblers and crooks who flocked here to make Washington State a stepping stone for Bolshevist Russia.

I got wise early in this instance, for back in 1928 an old fellow (a Mr. William Riley Engle) came to live near us who had worked for members of Wallgren's family. He knew the inside story on the Mon C. Wallgren character, and his good old-fashioned Americanism was utterly shocked at the rise in political fortune of this amateur card and billiard sharper. So was I, but seeing the same play on all sides, and knowing the forces behind the so-called New Deal, I came to expect the Wallgren type.

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN METCALF.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 17, 1949.*

To the SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

You now have for approval the name of Mon Wallgren to be Chairman of the National Security Resources Board.

This nomination is obnoxious, not only to Senator CAIN, but to thousands of ordinary citizens who do not think Mr. Wallgren is qualified for the job.

President Truman was reelected for a number of reasons, one of which was his promise to see that our dwindling natural resources were utilized wisely for the benefit of all the people. This promise implied that he would choose capable men to administer the Federal interest in these resources. The nomination of a political hack like Mr. Wallgren violates this promise.

It is admitted that there are relatively few men in the United States with sufficient capabilities and vision to fill this job, one of the most important ever created by our Government. A few of this group have worked, or are now working, for the National Security Resources Board. The President would have been wise to have selected one of them in preference to nominating a man who, if approved, will do everything in his power to reduce the influence of these men by replacing them with pip-squeaks of his own.

Such a situation will not arise if the Senate places national security and the economic welfare of all the people above political friendship and rejects this nomination.

A. D. EONSEB.

RENTON, WASH., *February 20, 1949.*

DEAR SIR: I am a veteran of 4½ years in the Army Air Corps. I was a captain flying P-38's. I am a property owner here in this area and a voting registered voter. I stand behind you 100 percent in your condemnation of ex-Gov. Mon C. Wallgren.

Please endeavor to exercise the same type of initiative, fight, and deep thinking to stem the Government's socialistic tendencies. My wife and I would support any measure to take Government out of business. Give the Government back to the people.

Sincerely,

OTHEN N. CARLOS.
SHIRLEY G. CARLOS.

POULSBO, WASH., *February 23, 1949.*

Hon. HARRY P. CAIN.

DEAR SIR: I want to highly commend you on the action you have taken concerning Senate approval of the appointment of Mon. C. Wallgren as Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. I agree with you that this position is so important that a really qualified man should receive the appointment, and Mon C. Wallgren is not that man. As one of your constituents may I offer my complete moral support of your actions. Thank you.

Sincerely,

THOMAS HOVET, Jr.

STANWOOD, WASH., *February 18, 1949.*

Senator HARRY P. CAIN.

DEAR SENATOR: I have just finished reading your statements before the Senate Armed Services Committee. I would like to say, "Well done, Senator." I think some job that our billiard expert could do should be found for him there, say street department, or don't they have horses there any more?

Sincerely,

HAROLD S. RUSSELL.

ABERDEEN, WASH., *February 22, 1949.*

Hon. HARRY P. CAIN.

DEAR SENATOR: Hurrah for you. Let the good work go on. It is certainly gratifying to find a public official with courage enough to come right out in public and call the big crook just what he is. We have all been calling him by some of his right names under our breath and among ourselves for the past 12 years or more and it sounds good to us to hear our words echoed, amplified, and emphasized in the United States Senate by our own Senator.

I don't guess you need any coaching or any more information on the guy than you have already; his whiskey steal, his Capital Club, his ferry steal, to mention a few. You are probably aware also of one of the first steals he put over when he was a freshman in the United States House of Representatives; the Park steal. A group of parlor conservationists in New York and New Jersey headed by Mrs. Edge and backed by her husband's millions found in this brand new Congressman from Washington a ready accomplice in botting up the Olympic Peninsula.

What he received for any of these deals we may never be able to learn. But the Members of the United States Senate can plainly see what kind of a guy he is when he goes to Congress worse than broke, quits the United States Senate for the Governor's job at less salary and at the end of 4 years starts building Palm Beach houses.

The easiest thing for you would have been to let the appointment go through. But you had the guts to take the hard way and to bring out plainly before the Senators and to let the whole world know that you had spread out before them, just what kind of a grafter this guy is. Now every Senator knows what every one of his constituents knows. Each vote to confirm will brand that voter as approving the Truman-Wallgren type of political graft. I don't believe they will do it. Senator, you are to be congratulated.

Yours,

O. R. AUSTIN.

SEATTLE, WASH., *February 21, 1949.*

The Honorable MILLARD TYDINGS.

DEAR SENATOR: Since I have been of age to vote—1932—I have, until the last election, been an avid Democrat. The main reason I became an independent voter is a man named Mon C. Wallgren, former Representative, former Senator, and former Governor. The title "Former Governor" is by the grace of the Democratic Party in the State of Washington, because it was the members of his own party that defeated Mon Wallgren and elected the rest of the State ticket and Harry Truman. Isn't the proof enough to show what the people of his own State think of his ability. If he is rammed down the throats of the citizens of this State by being appointed to a position for which he is so incapable of holding, the national administration will have lost this State in the next election.

Why is it that Mr. Wallgren's home in California wasn't started before he lost the election? How much property does he own in the State he served as Governor of? Why doesn't your committee go into the inside workings of his administration as Governor? Can he explain how a man virtually bankrupt in 1932 can own stock in a radio company for which he refused in the neighborhood of $125,000, can build an expensive home in California and have extensive other business interests not normally held by a man of Mr. Wallgren's education and proven business failures.

We here in the State of Washington are awakening from the complacency we have had politically for the past several years and we are beginning to look at the records of our candidates instead of the party label. In the main I am not in accord with Senator CAIN and have never voted for him, but in this matter I know there are several thousand of us that are wholeheartedly in agreement with him. I am speaking for Democrats.

The next election will prove to others in high positions from this State that the voters are looking into the records and not a lot of "malarkey" at election time. Certain of these so-called servants of the people have served several years in the Halls of Congress and believe they are still on the pinnacle but they are destined to find out that the pinnacles have slipped and the voters are awakening to the true facts. Certain of these men have been very closely associated with Mr. Wallgren and in the eyes of the voters this is evidence enough to discredit them.

Respectfully yours,

L. K. PENNINGTON.

CHEHALIS, WASH., *February 22, 1949.*

Senator HARRY CAIN.

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: On June 7, 1947, we had a special election to supplant Representative Fred Norman of this district upon his death.

On June 5, I think that it was, the P. I. (Seattle Post-Intelligencer) printed a statement by Wallgren endorsing the candidacy of Charles Savage as against Russell Mack. I have misplaced the clipping, but if you are interested further you will find it in the 4th, 5th, or 6th of June. Wallgren stated that Truman desired the reelection of Savage; they needed him in the Congress.

I made a little talk as a Democrat supporting Mack on the 5th of June.

There is no doubt that Savage followed the Communist line at the time, his record in the Congress, commencing January 3, 1945, showed that to be the fact, and Wallgren no doubt knew of the fact.

I enclose here a copy of the talk I gave on June 5, 1947. If it may help as a key to facts as to the record of Savage and the knowledge by Wallgren it might help a little.

It is apparent that Wallgren then, and ever since would support any man or thing, which might help corral votes. I then considered him, and all of his ilk as a source of great danger in American political life.

I repeated the performance in the election against Savage in the fall of 1948 and given a degree of credit for the fine vote received by Mack upon his reelection in Lewis County.

More power to you.

Very truly yours,

JAMES A. STINSON.

EVERETT, WASH., *February 15, 1949.*

Senator HARRY P. CAIN:

Congratulations your brave fight to keep Wallgren out of any important Federal position. His father supported him before 1932. Ask Dun & Bradstreet his financial present rating. Good luck.

EDWARD H. MCKEE.

PORT ANGELES, WASH., *February 18, 1949.*

HARRY P. CAIN,
United States Senator:

We commend your actions furthering the good of the Nation by opposing former Governor Wallgren.

E. R. JOHNSTON.

CAMAS, WASH., *February 18, 1949.*

The Honorable HARRY P. CAIN.

SIR: Congratulations on your most timely and forceful opposition to the appointment of Mon. C. Wallgren as Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. We worked hard to remove him from Washington State as Governor, so please do not let him exercise his influence upon us from a higher level.

GEORGE P. HENDERSON.

OLYMPIA, WASH., *February 11, 1949.*

Hon. HARRY P. CAIN:

Our State senate now investigating Wallgren's purchase of Longview Bridge. Apparently paid $1,000,000 more than estimates, with result toll bridge authority account is now showing $634,000 deficit.

JOHN H. HAPPY,
Chairman, Investigating Committee.

WENATCHEE, WASH., *February 20, 1949.*

Senator HARRY P. CAIN:

In complete agreement with your philosophy regarding appointment of Wallgren. Keep up the good work. Regards.

Mrs. MCMANN,
Miss HASKINS,
Miss WENGER,
Mrs. STACH,
Wenatchee teachers.

SEATTLE, WASH., *February 22, 1949.*

Senator HARRY P. CAIN:

Along with a million or more other Washingtonians, we are with you 100 percent in your position against Wallgren. Normally Democrats, we feel like all good citizens that Wallgren does not belong in any position of responsibility. You might call the committee's attention to his new $60,000 home in Palm Beach, Calif., which certainly was not built from the salary of a Governor of this State.

VIOLA AND HAROLD PORTER.

SEATTLE, WASH., *February 22, 1949.*

Senator HARRY P. CAIN:

Although we have voted a Democratic ticket most of the time for the last 20 years, we are of the opinion that Mon Wallgren is a political misfit in any job that calls for intelligence and integrity. The last is proven, we think, by his ability to build a sixty to seventy thousand dollar home in California.

CARL R. SORENSEN.

MARYSVILLE, WASH., *February 14, 1949.*

Senator HARRY P. CAIN.

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: We wish to congratulate you on your courageous stand against the appointment of Mon Wallgren as Chairman of the National Securities Resources Board. We who are familiar with his infamous record as a public officer feel that this appointment would be a grave error. The important duties involved in this office call for a man of the highest integrity and ability, qualities that obviously are lacking in the former Governor.

With heartiest wishes for your success in this and all other patriotic undertakings, we are

Very sincerely yours,

MARY BARTHOLOMEW.
CLARENCE BARTHOLOMEW.
H. R. BROOKS,
G. L. DUNDEE.
E. J. HAMMON.
ELEANOR HAMMON.
T. W. GALLAGHER.
Mrs. T. W. GALLAGHER.

PROSSER, WASH., *February 17, 1949.*

Senator HARRY P. CAIN.

DEAR SIR: Today on the radio a commentator said that you did not approve of the position that President Truman has offered to former Gov. Mon C. Wallgren.

You are perfectly right, Mr. Wallgren does not have the ability for the job. Being a housewife with four children makes me very interested in what is happening in this Government of ours. What happens now will surely affect them in the future. The ups and downs of politics overwhelms me at times. You have a great responsibility, may you do your best. Don't forget the folks in your State keep track of what goes on. We're all for you. At the same time you know how very critical they can be.

Please do continue to speak out against the wrongs in Government affairs.

Sincerely,

Mrs. THOMAS HILDRETH.

P. S.—Mon Wallgren left the State of Washington in a hell of a shape when he left office. Governor Langlie will have to do a lot of mending to get it back on its feet.

TOM HILDRETH.

PORT ANGELES, WASH., *February 18, 1949.*

Hon. HARRY P. CAIN.

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: As a veteran of two world wars and the father of one who did not return from the last war, allow me to commend you for your stand regarding the appointment of Mon C. Wallgren to the position of chairman of the National Security Resources Board. I agree with you wholeheartedly that Mr. Wallgren's past records contain nothing to recommend him for this, or any other, position of national importance.

It is very gratifying to know that there are some who still have the moral courage to insist that only men of the highest caliber and qualifications be appointed to such positions of national security. And let me assure you that, locally, I have heard nothing but favorable comment on your stand.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH L. HARLEY.

BELLINGHAM, WASH., *February 18, 1949.*

Senator HARRY P. CAIN.

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: Out here we are highly incensed at Wallgren's nomination for chairmanship of the highly important National Security Resources Board. We welcome your attack upon this possibility. More power to you.

Wallgren possesses no qualifications for such a highly important post, as we out here know, to our sorrow. He lived here in Bellingham, where his father set him up in business once more, after repeated failures elsewhere. He spent most of his time in poolhalls, as usual, until it was necessary to sell the business. His successors made money. He is as wholly incapable of performing honestly and reliably any public service, as he was to conduct a business.

Yet, in a Democratic year, on Roosevelt's coattail, he became our State Governor. He succeeded Governor Langlie, who found the State treasury several million dollars in the red after 8 years of Democrat administration, but who paid off that debt and left a treasury surplus of several million dollars when Wallgren took over. Wallgren, as you know, dissipated this surplus and left the State millions in debt.

As Governor, Wallgren indulged in expensive yachts, golf courses, long luxurious California trips, etc. He also wasted State funds building a park—at more than a million dollars—to enhance his dude ranch, and building half-a-million-dollar Seattle downtown office and club for the State patrol, whose headquarters are in Olympia. He also spent more than half-a-million dollars for a huge unnecessary warehouse, when schools were sorely needed.

Wallgren also destroyed the morale and efficiency of State employees by requiring them to pay a 2 percent kickback to the politically inspired Capitol Club—as job insurance. Dave Beck was a close adviser of the Governor, who appointed him a regent of the University of Washington.

It is intolerable to think of Wallgren as chairman of the National Security Resources Board.

Patriotically yours,

CHARLES B. SEARS.

OLYMPIA, WASH., *February 18, 1949.*

Senator HARRY P. CAIN.

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: I am sending you a copy of the letter just written to President Truman, which speaks for itself, further than the hope that others like myself who seldom engage in dictating the affairs of state may consider grave enough for doing what I am doing, writing a letter of protest. Surely you are a man of rare courage when you take the spotlight in a matter which concerns the United States so gravely as your published statements declare.

I hope you will use every effort and resource at your command in order to prevent the appointment of former Gov. Mon. C. Wallgren from an appointment to this almost extraordinary opportunity for handling resources without having first put his house in order here in Olympia.

Very truly yours, and just a citizen and a school teacher,

MRS. LULU J. CHEESMAN.

OLYMPIA, WASH., *February 18, 1949.*

President HARRY S. TRUMAN.

DEAR PRESIDENT TRUMAN: I wish to add my voice in agreement with Senator HARRY CAIN when he urges the rejection of ex-Gov. Mon C. Wallgren for the high honor to which you have nominated him. Senator CAIN has thus shown himself to be a man of conviction and unusual courage by his fearlessness in speaking out in a time like this.

Having lived in this State of Washington for many years, and being a resident of the capital city of Olympia, I believe I am stating the opinion of most of my friends and neighbors when I say that we have never considered the former Governor as a man with the high mentality, the superior qualities, and the astute discernment that this tremendously important position at the head of our Government demands. While Governor of our State, he was absent from his post of duty so frequently that it was a standing joke, and yet it was not a matter for joking. Instead of being off on pleasure trips, as often assumed or stated, it should have been his duty to be in his place attending to duty.

Another thing is the fact that he left his successor, Gov. Arthur Langlie, in a terrible financial crisis by overestimating the incoming revenue to be expected and underestimating the amount of current expense, thus leaving a tremendous sum of discrepancy which the present legislature has as yet found no way of meeting. Oh, yes; evidently he made a great mistake in his estimates, but after all, he had at his disposal all the facilities which Governor Langlie has for fact-finding. This puts the State in a dilemma which rests heavily upon the lawmakers and the taxpayers. Much of this responsibility results from the deficit left over from Governor Wallgren's administration.

Another thing is the condition of State financial extravagance and profligate spending in some of the departments, notably in the State park system whereby Lt. Gov. Victor A. Myers had full and uncontrolled spending powers in which he engaged without any check of accountability to anyone, apparently without objection or correction from Governor Wallgren, who must have known, or should have known, of such irregularity. If he pleads ignorance to this state of affairs, it would only be necessary for Senator CAIN to contact the members of the State appropriations committee or the interim committee for fuller information which has not yet reached the general public, but is under investigation.

This is written in the hope that the record of ex-Gov. Mon C. Wallgren will be given full investigation before he is put in charge of such an important post.

Sincerely yours, and just a citizen.

MRS. L. J. CHEESMAN.

WALLA WALLA, WASH., *February 14, 1949.*

Senator HARRY P. CAIN.

DEAR SIR: I wish to commend you for your stand regarding the appointment of ex-Gov. Mon C. Wallgren to a Federal position. The people of Washington rejected him as their governor, and it is an insult and a betrayal to force them to help pay his salary of $14,000 a year.

Of course, not all men who lose a political contest are incompetent, and, perhaps the President does not realize just what the consensus of opinion is here in Washington concerning Mr. Wallgren.

We hope that you will be successful in persuading the Senate to disapprove this appointment.

Yours very sincerely,

(MRS. RALPH) EDNA JUSTICE.

ROSEBURG, OREG., *February 18, 1949.*

Mr. HARRY P. CAIN.

DEAR SIR: As I am a registered voter of Thurston County, Little Rock, Wash., I feel that I am safe in saying when the people of Washington and especially the Democrats voted for Mr. Arthur Langlie for Governor instead of Mr. Wallgren it showed without a doubt what they thought of him, and I think it will be a great mistake to put Mr. Wallgren in any office of importance. I have voted Democrat for 30 years but this last fall's election I voted against Mr. Wallgren as I do not think that he would make a good dog catcher let alone anything else, and I cannot understand why our President Mr. Harry Truman would even think of putting such a man as Mr. Mon C. Wallgren has proven himself to be to the people of Washington State in such an important office as he intends to do. As far as the voters of Washington State are concerned, Mr. Wallgren is done and we do not want nothing more to do with him. And I wish you would please show this letter to our President, Mr. Truman, after you have read it. That way he will also know what we the people of Washington State think of Mr. Wallgren and he may change his mind about giving Mr. Wallgren the important job and give him a job bellhopping instead, at least we hope so.

Thank you and please excuse my poor writing.

Yours truly,

SEYMOUR P. KING.

KANSAS CITY, MO., *February 17, 1949.*

Senator HARRY P. CAIN.

DEAR SENATOR: This is to compliment you on your fight against confirmation of ex-Gov. Mon C. Wallgren, of Washington, as Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. As a former long-time resident of the State of Washington (1907-43) I know something of this man and his background. In my humble opinion he might qualify as chairman of a pool hall—but certainly not as chairman of a very important Federal agency.

I met you once when you talked before the Seattle Rotary Club and you have my best wishes for your continued success.

Yours respectfully,

CORWIN D. SMITH.

TACOMA, WASH., *February 22, 1949.*

Hon. HARRY P. CAIN,

Senator:

It is gratifying you evidently refuse to compromise your oath of office to bow down to some Presidential appointment which you and I believe to be ill-advised and in poor taste. May you muster the needed courage and strength to carry on this fight to a successful finish to the end that this country can return to clean government.

ROBERT J. LLOYD.

YAKIMA, WASH., *February 23, 1949.*

Senator HARRY CAIN:

As a veteran, I heartily commend your stand against Wallgren.

DON W. MCNEICE.

SPOKANE, WASH., *February 14, 1949.*

Hon. HARRY P. CAIN,

Senator:

I am personally heartily in accord with your opposition to Mon Wallgren for any important position in Government set-up. I will never forget how Jerry O'Connell and his cohorts cavorted around in Olympia during Wallgren's administration to detriment of organized labor.

PAUL MUELLER.

EVERETT, WASH., *February 15, 1949.*

Senator HARRY P. CAIN:

Wallgren repudiated by his home town and State. Should not be promoted to important national position. Your stand 100-percent O.K.

HELEN HAGERMAN.

SPOKANE, WASH., *February 18, 1949.*

Senator HARRY P. CAIN.

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: We have been following your opposition of Mon. C. Wallgren's appointment in the local papers, and would just like to tell you that we admire your stand very much.

You receive a lot of letters asking you to push this movement, or fight some other bill, and thought it might be a change to get one saying you're doing fine, and we're well satisfied, and one containing no requests except to keep on as you are. You must get a good deal of mail stating the contrary as human nature finds it easier to fight than to praise.

We in Washington State demonstrated we did not want Wallgren in a responsible position when we went to the polls, and do not understand Truman's appointment in the face of it.

Sincerely yours,

MABLE LOU BARTLETT.
F. A. ANDREWS.
BRYAN C. KENNEY.
D. J. MILLER.
H. SPROULL.

SPOKANE, WASH., *February 18, 1949.*

Senator HARRY P. CAIN.

MY DEAR SENATOR CAIN: The morning paper gave an account of your combat with Mon C. Wallgren in regard to his appointment for the post of Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, by President Truman. I want to congratulate you on the glorious fight that you made yesterday before the Armed Services Committee, relating to Wallgren's appointment.

I am at a loss to understand why the President would even consider such a man as Wallgren for that very important post.

It was not the Republicans who defeated Wallgren in the November election, but his own Democratic Party, and it was common talk on the street here among his own party that if he were reelected Governor for another 4 years he would own the State.

My wife, who is a member of Pro-America and who also realizes the importance of good

appointments in national affairs, joins me in congratulating you on the stand you have taken.

Yours very truly,

H. H. BECKLEY.

SEATTLE, WASH.

Hon. HARRY P. CAIN.

MY DEAR SENATOR CAIN: I am happy to note from this morning's Seattle Post-Intelligencer that your stand with respect to the appointment of Mon C. Wallgren as Chairman of the National Security Resources Board is receiving the support of a substantial group of other Senators.

It should be a matter of the greatest concern that a man with the very highest qualifications and ability should be selected to fill this vital post. While Mr. Wallgren is doubtless a very personable gentleman, his recent release from the obligations of public responsibility formerly held by him as Governor of the State of Washington indicates that the citizens of this State do not feel him qualified for such office. The Chairman of the National Security Resources Board is without question a position of even greater responsibility and importance to the national welfare than the governorship of a State, and it is hoped that no man will be confirmed for that position who does not bring the highest measure of ability and public confidence.

Very truly yours,

H. B. JONES, Jr.
E. A. NIEMEIER.

SEATTLE, WASH., *February 21, 1949.*

The Honorable HARRY P. CAIN.

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: In reading of your opposition to the appointing of Mon C. Wallgren, I feel it my duty to express myself against his appointment also.

I have followed Mr. Wallgren's record in office quite closely and there appears to have been many shady dealings approved by him which involved the taxpayers' money. One case of this being the Longview Bridge. I was in doubt that this bridge would be standing when the deal was closed. You undoubtedly have knowledge of many others.

Simple arithmetic will show that Mr. Wallgren has more assets than the amount of money he could have earned in public office. His record of high living makes one wonder where money was appropriated for this item.

Of all my acquaintances, I do not know of anyone who is for the appointment of Mr. Wallgren. Keep up the fight against him because you have plenty of support here in Seattle.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH R. SWARTZ.

TACOMA, WASH., *February 21, 1949.*

HARRY P. CAIN.

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: You have certainly dug into a weak spot. I am referring to the opposition put up, by you, to the appointment of one Mon C. Wallgren, ex (thank goodness) governor of our State. A chain is only as strong as its weakest link, and here they would have no link at all.

Frankly, I know nothing of Mr. Wallgren's civilian life. Just what he did while in Olympia is enough though, I believe, to convince anyone but a die-hard Democrat that Mr. Wallgren is definitely not the man for a job where a little misapprehension could affect so many people.

Maybe it's a losing battle trying to stop the appointment, and maybe it isn't. But at any rate we want you to know that we do appreciate your efforts to stop the appointment. If only more of the people in Washington, D. C., knew what happened here in Washington State while Mr. Wallgren was in office, you would not have much opposition in stopping his appointment.

More power to you. With all best wishes.

Sincerely,

WILLARD C. MILLER.

SEATTLE, WASH., *February 16, 1949.*

Hon. HARRY P. CAIN.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Although I have been disappointed in your performance in a number of occasions since you have been in the Senate, more specifically so because I supported you so enthusiastically in 1944 and 1946, nevertheless I want you to know how heartily I support your action on the President's contemplated appointment of Mon C. Wallgren to be chairman of the National Securities Resources Board. You are absolutely right this time, and I hope you will make a determined fight to block his nomination. To my way of thinking, the President's action in this case is nothing short of scandalous.

Yours very truly,

WALTER T. GUTHRIE.

EVERETT, WASH., *February 16, 1949.*

Hon. HARRY P. CAIN: Admire your stand against Wallgren appointment. He is absolutely unqualified basis education, experience, native ability, or record as Governor for such an important post. I shudder at thought our national security in such incapable and dishonest hands.

BILL HULBERT.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 15, 1949.*

Senator HARRY P. CAIN: It is our carefully considered opinion that the appointment of Mon Wallgren to a high post in NSRB will thoroughly discredit that organization in the eyes of many important industries. Patently reputation frequently does not represent the true character of a man but in as important a post as Mr. Wallgren is nominated to occupy we believe that his reputation, whether or not deserved, should thoroughly disqualify him. We have consulted several other Food Trade Association executives and find that none of these views Wallgren's appointment with anything short of a feeling of disgust.

JOE R. CAVANAUGH,
Executive Director,
National Food Institute.

SEATTLE, WASH.

Hon. HARRY P. CAIN:

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: I am glad to note from this morning's "P. I." that you are going to oppose the Wallgren appointment. I have nothing whatever against Senator Wallgren personally, and in fact have always found him most courteous and agreeable, and I am sure he is very agreeable as an individual. He has, however, no qualification, either by training or native ability, for the handling of such a tremendously important job. The fact that his handling of State business was disproved by the majority of the voters at the last election in spite of the preference shown by his party, should in itself be sufficient to prove, at least in the minds of the electorate, his lack of capacity.

To take a stand of this kind, of course, is embarrassing and distasteful, and I feel you are to be commended for being willing to do so.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) H. B. JONES.

YAKIMA, WASH.

Hon. HARRY P. CAIN.

MY DEAR SENATOR CAIN: Yesterday's paper mentioned that you are opposing the appointment of Mon Wallgren to a position which affords opportunities in connection with our public domain.

Permit me to state that in my opinion you will confer upon the citizens of your State and the Nation generally a contribution of lasting merit and value if you can prevent his appointment. There are a number of us in Washington who are quite worried over this appointment. We feared for a time that he was to be appointed Secretary of the Interior, but seemingly this is not to occur. I hope you will be successful in preventing his confirmation by the Senate, and trust that you will let me know if there is any assistance I can render you in this battle.

Thanking you for what you have done regarding this already, I am,

Yours very truly,

IRA D. CARDIFF.

EVERETT, WASH., *February 13, 1949.*

Hon. HARRY P. CAIN.

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: I am enclosing a copy of letter sent to President Harry S. Truman, on December 31, 1948, denouncing his intentions to give former Gov. Mon C. Wallgren an appointment.

Since you, Senator, have come out against his appointment to one or two of the most powerful jobs in the Government, and no doubt being unqualified to fill this important position.

All Mr. Wallgren was known for before the Democratic landslide in 1932 was a pool shark.

I want to let you know the voters are with you in opposing Mr. Wallgren's appointment.

CLYDE T. STALLINGS.

TACOMA, WASH., *February 21, 1949.*

The Honorable HARRY P. CAIN,

Senator.

MY DEAR HARRY: I congratulate you on your signal efforts to prevent the confirmation of a man to a very high and important office for which he undoubtedly did not have, nor could have acquired in his political career, the necessary broad and ramified qualifications. It occurs to me, however, that it need not be proven that he lacks the necessary qualifications but rather that he prove that he does have them. It is like the piccolo player—it isn't a question of the piccolo player being a —— —— but rather whether the —— is a piccolo player.

It is gratifying to me as a citizen that some effort is being made to put men in positions that qualify for them because of ability and experience rather than because they are staunch party members or good fellows. Let's try to run the largest business in the world a little like any other business insists on operating in order to survive and progress.

Sincerely,

MARCO HEIDNER.

EVERETT, WASH., *February 21, 1949.*

The Honorable HARRY P. CAIN.

DEAR MR. CAIN: I admire your fight in trying to prevent Mon Wallgren from being appointed to such a high position. I hope for the good of our country that you block his nomination.

I am enclosing a clipping from this evening's edition of the Everett Herald, which is self-explanatory. It shows you that he is a wealthy man today and all of us wonder how he made it in such a short span of time. There is certainly something rotten in Denmark there.

I am sick and tired being taxed to death to support such dumb parlor pink politicians such as this fellow and there are many others here in Everett that feel the same as I. It is rather disgusting to have such a dumb person repudiated by his own State go back to Washingon and receive $14,000 per year of our money. It is rotten to the core.

I do hope that you will continue this fight to the finish. There are a lot of people in the State of Washington who are watching this very closely. They admire your spirit. Keep up the fight. With best wishes, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

JACK PEARSON.

SHELTON, WASH.

Hon. HARRY P. CAIN.

DEAR SIR: I have in my political file at my ranch in Shelton more details and supporting data re what I am about to say regarding

this man; however, I am temporarily in Seattle and as speed seems desirable am giving you what I know regarding him for what it is worth in the hearings being held.

After the death in office of Congressman Norman, representative from the Third Congressional District of Washington, a special election was held to elect his successor. Present Congressman MACK, Republican and ex-Congressman John Savage, Democrat, of Shelton, were nominated for the run-off. In the last days before the finals the Shelton paper reported, or advertised, that a motor caravan with Wallgren and Savage in it would, as I recall it, speak on the street corner in behalf of Savage's candidacy. As I recollect it, they were headed up the peninsula and toured the Third Congressional District in such a manner in behalf of and arm-in-arm so to speak together, in the hopes that Wallgren's more conservative (?) reputation would offset the communistic affiliations accredited to Savage and which evidently had them worried. Congressman MACK can doubtless fill in more data. At this election Savage was actively supported by Seattle's official Communist newspaper and a copy of it, a special Savage copy, was sent the voting list of the Third District.

Anyway, if you don't know the history of John Savage you should, for I believe Sheriff Harlan Callahan, Republican sheriff of King County, would on request confirm what I have heard, that Callahan's records show him to carry a Communist card. When Savage was in Congress I remember a quote appearing in the Shelton paper credited to Savage in which he was supposed to have said, "The entire Senate and House is made up of imperialists and tools of the big interests, except just a handful of us," including himself, of course. Hugh DeLacy, from Seattle, was in Congress then, also Marcantonio from New York and, I believe, a few others of their ilk. This is all mentioned to show Wallgren was right in there pitching, trying in every way to get these Communist and communistic followers elected to office at a time when they, the Communists, were bragging they were about ready to make of Washington State a model Communist-run State for the rest of the States to emulate.

Another question. Where has Wallgren gotten all his money? Pictures of his new $60,000 home at Palm Desert, Calif., have been appearing in our papers. Also, of late years, word has been around that he owned part of our largest radio station, KIRO. Latest reports were that he had acquired enough stock for a controlling interest in KIRO. These two things represent a lot of money and still, when he was first elected to Congress from Everett, people in on the know say he was a plain, poor fellow. As he has been in office all this time, where did the money come from?

Governor Langlie should be of some use in finding out.

Yours truly,

C. B. COSELMAN.

MR. TRUMAN IS RESPONSIBLE FOR IT—EDITORIAL FROM THE BALTIMORE SUN

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. Truman Is Responsible for It," published in the Baltimore Sun of March 2, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

MR. TRUMAN IS RESPONSIBLE FOR IT

The filibuster by the southern Senators goes into its third day today. There is always the chance that a filibuster may stub its toe on some technical obstacle and collapse. But the 22 Senators from the 11 Southern States are in dead earnest, and fully aware of this danger. Hence collapse on the basis of some technical parliamentary error is unlikely.

If past experience is any guide, we may expect rising indignation that a handful of Senators (a large handful, it is true, representing one-sixth of the area of the United States) should be able to bring the legislative process to a halt. Many pressing questions require decision. To mention only two, the Marshall-plan appropriation must be renewed by April 2 and Congress must soon act if rent ceilings are not to be abolished by default. It is wrong (we shall be told) that a minority should be able to hold up the legislative processes as it is now doing.

But we must remember that this substantial minority did not choose to hold up the legislative process at this time.

President Truman chose to hold it up. It is he, with his legislative advisers, who decided to force the issue right now on his civil-rights program. The southern Senators had given ample warning that they would fight when compelled to. It was Mr. Truman who determined that this particular fight, this nonurgent fight, should have priority over all other legislative business, however urgent it might be.

Insofar as this filibuster creates a legislative log jam, Mr. Truman—not the southern Senators—must take the blame.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. LUCAS to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 15, amending the so-called cloture rule of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 15.

[Mr. HOLLAND resumed and concluded the speech begun by him yesterday. His speech entire is as follows:]

Wednesday, March 2, 1949

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I greatly regret the necessity of beginning my address at this late hour in the afternoon. However, the majority leader advises me that he expects to hold the Senate in session until about 6 o'clock, so I shall endeavor to cover a portion of my remarks prior to that time.

In the first place, before beginning my own remarks, I wish to say that in my judgment the speech to which the Senate has just had the pleasure of listening, delivered by the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] a former Governor of that State, one known for his love of mankind, regardless of the question of race or religion, or any other question, should be an inspiration to all who heard it. I know that it was an inspiration to me. I only regret that more Members of the Senate were not present so that they might have heard, in those words of incontestable truth, about the kind of relations which actually prevail as between the people of the colored race and those of the white race in the great State of North Carolina. I think it is correct to say that such relations prevail in varying degree in every other State of the South.

Those of us from other States in the South not only pay tribute to the Senator from North Carolina and to his State for its greatness in many other fields, but we recognize his State as having done most toward the establishment of kind, cordial, and lasting relations of mutual friendship, generosity, and understanding between the peoples of the two races. I wish to say to him that I believe that the lesson which has been taught by the people of his State is being followed closely by the good people of both races in every other State in the South. I only hope that it is being followed just as closely by the good people of the States in other parts of the Union.

No one could possibly have listened to that great, inspiring, and sincere address without realizing that there is in the South, as between the right-thinking people of both races, a feeling of kindness, understanding, courtesy, and mutuality which is getting results and will continue to get greater and greater results in the effort to bring the utmost measure possible of happiness, progress, and prosperity to all the people who reside in that great portion of our Nation, regardless of what their color may be.

I wish to talk for a little while technically, and then for a while not so technically, upon the great subject which is now occupying the attention of the Senate. First, briefly, with reference to the history of limitation of debate in the United States Senate, no cloture in debate was provided under the Senate rules from the very first session of the Senate in 1789 to the adoption of the present rule, XXII, in 1917, except in 1862, when a special rule was adopted limiting debate on subjects pertaining to the War Between the States, subjects which were being considered in secret session. There were other minor special departures, such as a limitation of debate on appropriation bills for short periods; but it is strictly true to say that no general cloture whatsoever was provided under the Senate rules from 1789 until 1917, during 128 fruitful years in the establishment, preservation, and growth of this great Nation.

Since there is some confusion as to what was the situation from 1789 until 1806, during which time rule IX, the previous-question rule, was in effect, it seems desirable to clear up this confusion in the beginning of my remarks by making it completely clear that the previous-question rule, as it existed from 1789 until 1806, was not a rule of limitation of debate or of cloture in any sense, but quite the contrary. I have noted, in the various reports and records of testimony of hearings this year and in former years upon proposed changes in the rules, confusion in thinking upon this point. It is for that reason that I ask the indulgence of the Senate to set that confusion at rest once and for all by reading from the two most authoritative sources that can be found as to the meaning of the rule of the previous question, rule IX as it existed in the Senate rules from 1789 until 1806.

I read first from a text by Stidham entitled "Origin and Development of the United States Senate," a recognized authority upon this subject. I read briefly from that text portions found on pages

59 and 60 thereof, under the subject Limitations of Debate. Stidham says:

In the early days of the Senate, debate was practically unlimited, the restraints placed upon it being slight and seldom enforced. They were, that no motion should be debated until seconded, that the decision of all questions of order should be made by the President without debate, and that no Member should speak more than twice in any one debate on the same day without leave of the Senate. The previous question, which was provided for by the rules but rarely used, and was omitted in the revision of the rules in 1806, was not used to limit debate, but as in the Continental Congress and the Parliament of England, where the previous question was used to avoid a vote on a given subject. The proper occasion for its use was, according to Mr. Jefferson, to get rid of subjects "of a delicate nature as to high personages, etc., or the discussion of which may call forth observations which might be of injurious consequences." He, however, says that its use had been extended abusively to other cases; and by reference to the cases in which it was used in the Senate it would seem probable that its use there was, as in England at the present time, to enable the body to dispose of the subject without a direct vote upon it. The previous question was debatable and was used in both legislative and executive session and in the trial of impeachments, but not on amendments or in the Committee of the Whole.

The other text which is most recognized upon this subject is the book entitled "The Senate of the United States," by Haynes. I read briefly from that text under the heading "Limitation of debate—The previous question," from pages 393 and 394:

To one familiar with the frequent present-day use of the previous question in the House of Representatives as an effective form of cloture, this rule gives an entirely erroneous impression of the Senate's original practice. For the Senators who framed that rule intended that the previous question should serve—as it had in the Parliament of Great Britain, and as they had themselves known it to serve in the Continental Congress—as a device for removing from consideration a question which might seem to the majority undesirable to discuss further or act upon. Asher C. Hinds, author of the monumental Precedents of the House of Representatives, commented on the rule of 1784, on which the previous-question rules of the House and Senate were modeled 5 years later, "There was no intention of providing thereby a means of closing debate in order to bring the pending question to an immediate vote," and Senator Lodge declared: "It was not in practice a form of cloture, and it is, therefore, correct to say that the power of closing debate in the modern sense has never existed in the Senate." The previous question was but rarely used in the Senate. In his farewell address to the Senate, Vice President Aaron Burr recommended the discarding of the previous question, saying that in the preceding 4 years it has been taken but once, and then upon an amendment. He regarded this as proof that it could not be necessary, and in his opinion all its purposes were much better answered by the question of indefinite postponement. In the revision of the Senate rules of March 26, 1806, the previous question was dropped and has never been restored.

Mr. President, I have read those two quotations in order to make it crystal clear what is known by all of us who are familiar with the conditions under which the Constitution was framed, and particularly the arguments for the creation of the Senate as it exists. My purpose is to show that those who framed that Constitution and intended to set up a Senate of the type which they planned, could not possibly have adopted a rule of cloture which they must have known would have operated absolutely to preclude the functioning of the Senate in the way in which they had intended to have it function. In other words, a rule of cloture would have been so thoroughly inconsistent with, and would have so thoroughly negated the high purposes for which the Senate was created, that to my mind it was always anomalous to hear statements to the effect that there had been a rule of cloture in the early days of the Senate.

Mr. President, it is perfectly clear, not only from reading the two texts from which I have just quoted but also from each of the references made by those two texts, that no such inconsistent thing was done by those who constituted the first Senate of the United States, but, to the contrary, in the setting up of the rules of the early Senate, there was not even an approach to any sort of cloture or of any limitation of debate whatsoever.

Mr. President, I think this point is significant because I believe it is important for the Senate to realize what I believe was the fact, namely, that at that time and during all the time of the existence of the Senate of the United States up until 1917—when, on the very verge of war, and after considerable abuse of the lack of limitation of debate, rule XXII was adopted—it was in the minds of the majority of the Members of the Senate, I believe, that any rule of cloture would inescapably operate to defeat and deny the carrying out of the objectives which were had in mind in the setting up of the Senate and in providing for the peculiar function which it was designed to fulfill.

Mr. President, it is not hard to understand the reason why during the first 128 years of its existence the Senate steadfastly refused to adopt any general limitation of debate. Such refusal grew out of the fact that the Members of the Senate had a clear understanding of the reason for the existence of the Senate as a separate body, and they realized that the adoption of a rule limiting debate would be repugnant to and in contravention of the objectives which lay behind the creation of the Senate by the founding fathers in the Convention of 1787.

The Senate was created at the insistence of the small States, who demanded that the upper House of the legislative branch of the new Government should give to every sovereign State—large or small—equal voice and equal representation. The provision was, of course, that each State should have two Senators, and that provision was reinforced by the unusual safeguard imposed in article V of the Constitution, reading as follows:

That no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

There is no provision of the Constitution perpetually limiting the Constitution against later amendment other than this one—designed, as it was, to protect the sovereign rights of the individual States as such.

Furthermore, Mr. President, it was not mere chance that the particular House to which the provision was made applicable for the protection of the small States was the more powerful of the two Houses, the one to which was given not only a full participating share in all legislative matters but also the power to check upon the executive branch of the Government by passing upon treaties with foreign nations negotiated by the Executive and by passing upon the persons nominated by the President to fill high executive and judicial offices. By the peculiar set-up of the Senate, which gives perpetually equal suffrage and equal representation to each sovereign State, the small States were protected against the large, the weak against the strong, the poor against the rich; and that was the deliberate intent of the founding fathers. The sovereignty of all States was recognized; and to each sovereign was given equal representation and equal protection. The protection of minority rights and of the small States, the weak States, and the poor States was the peculiar reason for the existence of the Senate as a separate body.

Mr. President, we have heard so many statements to the general effect of what I have just said with reference to the fact that the Senate is a conference of the States, is the place where the States are heard as such, is the place where the States are guaranteed perpetually equal treatment, that it is hardly necessary to place in the RECORD any of the many statements so made by distinguished statesmen of this Nation; but I should like to place in the RECORD at this time at least three brief statements, all emanating during the consideration of this particular matter and bearing upon this question.

First, I quote from the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], chairman of the committee which conducted the hearings upon the matter in question. I quote from page 5 of the printed hearings. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] said:

The Senate was created as a curb upon hasty action by the House of Representatives. It is a continuing body with only one-third of its membership to be elected every 2 years. Being solely responsible to the voters in their own States, tenure of office of Senators has no direct relation to the will of the majority of voters throughout the Nation.

The distinguished senior Senator from Arizona is exactly right in his conception of the reason for the setting up of the Senate and of its history and of the objectives which are to be secured by its functioning.

The second quotation, Mr. President, and Senators, which will be made, is a very brief one, but I think I should make it in order to enforce this point. It is from the very fine address made by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] in opening the debate on the proposed change in the so-called cloture rule. I wish I might read more freely from the debate of the Senator,

but I am reading now from the bottom of the first column of page 1606 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of this year, only a few lines, because they state so tersely what that distinguished statesman and jurist thinks of the real function which the Senate of the United States performs and how it must be regarded. He says:

> But the Senate is a distinct institution within itself, a continuing body, only one-third of the membership of the Senate being elected every 2 years. It is not a body which expires. Its primary function is not legislation in the strict sense. Its primary and main function, indeed, in certain important matters, partakes of the nature of conference and negotiation between sovereignties.

I repeat the last sentence, quoting from the Senator from Georgia:

> Its primary and main function, indeed, in certain matters, partakes of the nature of conference and negotiation between sovereignties.

The third quotation I should like to place in my remarks at this time is from the statement of the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon at the time of the hearing of this matter before the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration. Turning to page 64 of the printed record of the hearings, I shall read briefly from his statement, made in answer to a question propounded to him by the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. The question was:

> What do you think contributed mainly to the historical traditions of the Senate? What is there which sets it off from the House of Representatives? I am not talking about individual Members now.

The Senator from Oregon, replying, stated:

> I think from the very beginning of the history of the Senate up to the present date, if you study that history, you will see a very brilliant thread running through it, a thread that binds the thinking of the Senate together on the proposition that minority rights and minority points of view must always have their day in court in the Senate.

And then a little farther down, continuing the quotation:

> It is stronger than any rule you can write, and it is based on something else. It is based, in my judgment, on what I think is a recognition on the part of Members of the Senate of the fact that the American people expect the Senate to protect minority rights.

So spoke the junior Senator from Oregon, and he stated it as his conviction that the quality, the function, the attribute, which in his mind marked out the Senate as peculiarly different from the House—and which has remained with it throughout its existence as being that quality which best showed its individual character and worth—was "the fact that the American people expect the Senate to protect minority rights."

And so, I submit that it is clear that, from the very beginning, the Members of the Senate in adopting rules for the government of this great body have realized that the idea of cloture, of stopping debate by compulsion, of taking away or limiting the freedom of speech and freedom of expression and freedom of advocacy by Senators of the cause of their States, was wholly inconsistent with and repugnant to the carrying out of the principal reason and justification for the existence of the Senate as a separate functioning body with important legislative powers and responsibilities and other nonlegislative powers and responsibilities of vast importance. The idea was to give protection to the small, the weak, the poor, and those in minority influence, but not to give to any group of States—whether small or large, weak or strong, poor or rich—the right to arbitrarily control the other States in matters vital to them by simply getting lined up one more than half of all the States or any other majority grouping to ruthlessly press through any chosen course of action or to snatch away from any State or group of States, regardless of their size or strength, the right to fully press, through their Senators, to the limits of their power of expression, their vital interests, which they realize cannot be overridden without doing to them and to their people grave injustice or perhaps irreparable harm.

Mr. President, what point would there have been in creating a Senate, in which there was opportunity to be given and assurance to be given that the rights of the States would be safeguarded and that the rights of the weak and the poor and the small States would be peculiarly safeguarded, and at the same time have provided a rule under which either mere majority action or any other majority action beyond a mere majority might operate to take away the protection which was sought to be given? There is no question that it would have been thoroughly repugnant in those early days, and it is still thoroughly repugnant to the original conception and meaning and ideal which lie behind the creation of the Senate and its existence as a separate body. It would have been repugnant to establish a cloture rule which in a brief space of time or even in a somewhat longer space of time, would have operated to cut off freedom of expression, to cut off the power of advocacy, to cut off the chance for thorough representation, which was given alone in the Senate and in the free and unlimited discussion in the Senate which was necessary if that objective was to be carried out.

Mr. President, Senators are talking about two entirely inconsistent and repugnant things when they talk in one breath about a Senate constituted with equal representation for weak and strong States and with peculiar devotion to the ideal of protecting the weak, and in their next breath speak of setting up a cloture rule which operates to bring either speedy or slow and delayed cloture that cuts off from the minority that opportunity for consideration and advocacy which was fought for so strenuously by the representatives of the small States in the Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia, and which was such a prime purpose and such a prime objective in creating the Senate that for 128 years of its existence there was no cloture rule adopted by the Senate.

From 1789 to 1917 there was no rule of cloture, when, for 128 years, our Nation was growing and stretching out from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from Canada to the Gulf, increasing from 13 States to 48 with many and frequent changes taking place during the period, changes of the number of States, of their relative area, population, and importance, of the balance between strong, populous, and wealthy States and others whose people were few and whose developed wealth was small.

Clearly, the reason why there was no rule of cloture during those 128 years was that the great majority of the Members of the Senate, in each and every Congress, had a clear understanding of the peculiar importance of the place of the Senate in our national structure, and steadfastly refused to follow any of the frequent suggestions advanced in support of cloture, which would weaken, either wholly or in part, the ability of the Senate to fulfill its principal function as the defender of State rights, the defender of the small, the weak, the poor, the minority, against the onslaughts of the large, the strong, the rich, the majority. They saw that cloture would inevitably operate to impair and destroy the effectiveness of the Senate to carry out its principal objective and the principal reason for its creation and separate existence. They saw that cloture would inevitably tend to make it more difficult for State sovereignty or State rights or minority rights to be adequately represented, defended, and safeguarded.

So, Mr. President, until 1917 there was no cloture in the Senate. I think the reason why there was no cloture is abundantly clear. I shall not try to describe here, or to take the Senate's time in mentioning, the tremendous growth and development which took place in those critical 128 years, except to remark that the peculiar structure of the Senate not only proved adequate during that time, but from 1789 the prestige of the Senate grew and continued to grow until now in these later years in the history of our Nation, this body, peculiarly distinguished from the other, because of the lack of limitation of debate, occupies a position of unique prestige which is recognized all over the world.

In 1917 there arose a peculiar circumstance and peculiar conditions which made it possible, and I regret that it did become possible at that time, for the present rule XXII to be adopted as a beginning of cloture in the Halls of the Senate of the United States.

It is unnecessary to recite the reasons which existed at that time. They have already been stated ably by the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] this afternoon, and by other Senators in preceding arguments. I do not wish to be repetitious, but the Senate knows full well that except for the fact that there had been great abuse of the lack of limitation of debate in a matter affecting the essential welfare and defense of our Nation, when we were poised on the brink of what was the most serious threat of war which had ever confronted us, rule XXII would never have come into existence.

By reading the debates in the Senate at that time and reading all the available

literature, reflecting light upon what happened at that time, it should certainly be clear that that was the reason for the adoption of rule XXII at that time, and that without the existence of that reason there is no doubt that it would not have been adopted.

Mr. President, it is now proposed to amend rule XXII in a way which is well known to all of us. It is now proposed to amend that rule under a resolution reported and sought to be taken up by the pending motion. I am one of those who object to, and will oppose strongly, the adoption of the motion by which it is proposed that the resolution shall be taken up. I object to it for at least three different reasons, which I want to mention, beginning with this one: In my judgment, it is crystal clear that if the resolution be taken up for debate by the adoption of the motion, making it the unfinished business of the Senate, there is every reason to fear that there may be substituted for it a resolution which proposes majority cloture in the Senate.

What reason have we for thinking that course is possible? In the first place, we have the fact that the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], stated frankly to the Senate on the day when the debate began that he knew there would be a proposal, if this measure could be taken up, to substitute for it a proposed cloture rule which would effect cloture by constitutional majority. He frankly said he would actively support that proposal.

I call to the attention of the President and Senators the fact that he speaks not simply as an individual Senator, but as the majority leader, who has much control as to what will be done. It is to him that I have to accord the responsibility for speaking at this late hour, when I should have much preferred to begin in the morning. There is no feeling about that. It simply illustrates the fact that we know in advance that the majority leader is for majority cloture and not for the rule which has been reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Furthermore, we know, Mr. President, that the majority whip, the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] is in favor of constitutional majority cloture. In fact, he only became converted to that conservative an approach to this subject in the hearing held by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, because the record shows that the Senator from Pennsylvania is the introducer and sponsor of Senate Resolution 11 which, by its terms, prescribes cloture by a majority of a quorum of the Senate, or by 25 Members of the Senate. On the opening day of the debate the Senator from Pennsylvania gave notice that he was sending to the desk to have printed an amendment which he proposed to offer. He at that time followed that course, and the printed amendment is, of course, upon the desks of all Senators. That shows, in addition to the majority leader, we have at his right hand the majority whip who is also actively supporting the adoption of a majority cloture rule rather than the rule reported by the committee.

The matter goes further than that, Mr. President. In addition to those two distinguished Senators, we have a list of approximately 10 other Senators, all of them of influence, all of them of prestige, in the halls of this body who have taken similar positions. There is a group of 10 or 12 who have put themselves on record, in one way or another, in favor of the adoption of majority cloture and not of the cloture rule suggested by the committee.

Let us see who some of these distinguished Senators are. First, let us go back to the hearings of 1947, when, before a committee comprising many of the same Senators now serving on the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, Senators offering resolutions to amend the cloture rule were heard by the committee. Upon looking at the printed record of the hearings I note that Senate Resolution 25, offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], provided for a cloture rule under which a majority of a quorum, or 25, would be sufficient to effect cloture in the Senate. I note also that the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] offered, and came to the committee to support, Senate Resolution No. 30 by which it was proposed that a constitutional majority of 49 should be given the power of cloture.

I note that under Senate Resolution 32, introduced by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], it was proposed that a majority of a quorum, or 25 Senators, should be given the power of cloture. I may say that both those distinguished Senators appeared and testified before the committee in 1947 and that, at that time, they strongly supported the plan that a majority of a quorum of the Senate should be given the power of cloture, or that 25 Senators should be given the power to cut off debate.

In the same printed hearings of 1947 it appears that my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], also was the author of a resolution, Senate Resolution 39, by which a majority of a quorum, or 25 Senators, would have been allowed to shut off debate.

At this point, I will say, in fairness to my colleague, that he has presented at this session of the Senate another resolution, Senate Resolution 19, under which the two-thirds rule is proposed rather than a majority rule of cloture. I am happy that this is the case, but he is the only one, I believe, who in the last Congress submitted a resolution providing for a majority of a quorum to close debate, who has so changed his views, at least insofar as appears from the record of the hearings this year, as now to turn back firmly to the old rule of cloture only by two-thirds vote.

The debate has already brought out that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who offered cloture by a majority of a quorum in 1947 under Senate Resolution 25, is now one of the supporters of the proposal reported by the committee. But I notice that upon testifying during the course of the hearings this year, with his customary candor, the Senator from Massachusetts made it perfectly clear—at page 82 of the record—that he is still for majority cloture, and that he regards his present course as simply "a short step forward," taken in the hope that more can be done later. What his intention is as to his vote when the majority cloture rule is offered as a substitute for the resolution reported, I do not know. I am mindful, however, of the influential position which he occupies as minority whip.

[At this point Mr. HOLLAND yielded to Mr. LUCAS, who asked and obtained unanimous consent that Mr. HOLLAND be permitted to hold the floor and to resume his speech tomorrow.]

Thursday, March 3, 1949

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in case there are some Senators present today who were not here last night when I began my remarks in this debate, I should like to state briefly for their information the subjects which I had covered up to the time of the recess taken yesterday afternoon.

As the first subject, I showed, by giving the real meaning of the previous-question rule which existed in the Senate from 1789 to 1806, that it was not in any sense a rule of cloture or of limitation of debate, and that it is a determined fact that for the first 128 years of the existence of the Senate, from 1789 to the adoption of the present rule XXII in 1917, there was no general cloture rule adopted by the Senate.

I also stated my belief that the reason no general cloture rule was adopted by the Senate during those vital 128 years of the existence of this Nation was that a majority of Senators in every Congress remembered and were fully conversant with the fact that any cloture rule would have been inconsistent with and thoroughly repugnant to the principal objectives which were in the minds of the founding fathers in providing for a Senate constituted as this body is constituted.

I showed that beyond peradventure of doubt the Senate, constituted with equal suffrage, with equal representation from every State, large and small, and covering, as it does, not only an equal part of legislative responsibility, but two very important other fields of responsibility, namely, the field of foreign affairs and the field of approval of Executive appointees for high judicial and executive positions, was constituted after a fight, and upon the demand of the small States, which insisted upon having this forum created as a bulwark and safeguard of their liberties and their sovereignty, because of the feeling and conviction that their sovereignty was just as vital, just as important a feature in the American Government as was the sovereignty of the largest or the richest or the most populous State.

I pointed out that it would have been wholly inconsistent in 1789, or at any time until 1917—just as it was in 1917, when the present rule was adopted—with those vital objectives that the

Senate should be the bulwark of the minority, to say with one breath, "Here is where the small States, the poor States, or the minority groups, can stand until they fall, to see that their sovereignty is protected," and to say with another breath, "We shall set up cloture to limit that right of expression, that right of advocacy, so that the sovereignty of the small or of the weak or of the minority may be left without advocacy and without representation when the time comes for a vote."

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Was it not a fact that in setting up the American Government no provision was made to guarantee that each State would be represented on the Supreme Court, although provision was made to guarantee that each State would be represented in the United States Senate? Therefore, the only way the minority could be sure that their point of view was represented was to constitute the United States Senate in the way in which it was constituted.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is of course correct in the statement which is embraced in his question. He might have gone further and reminded the Senate that this is the only provision embodied in the Constitution in which the founding fathers were so careful that that there should never be any upsetting force to come along later to deprive the small, the weak, and the minority of the representation and the advocacy which was given them here on the floor of the Senate, that in article V of the Constitution there was provided the single prohibition to be found in the Constitution upon the power of amendment to the Constitution, the provision that no State, without its own consent, could ever, by the amendment of the Constitution, be deprived of equal suffrage in the Senate.

So it seemed to me, and it still appears to me, to be wholly true that for 128 years—and in the early days, of course, Senators were closer than we are now to those who created the Constitution, and were even more jealous and zealous than we are now in regard to safeguarding States' rights and the sovereignty of the respective States—refused to permit any cloture because they knew that any such provision would be inconsistent with and repugnant to the major objective lying behind the creation of and the functioning of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, after mentioning the facts known to all of us—that this particular proposal comes here now primarily as a result of political maneuvering—I stated that I had three general objections which I would attempt to state as the reasons for which I oppose the adoption of the motion under which, if agreed to, would make the unfinished business of the Senate the resolution on cloture which has been reported by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration.

The first of my reasons, as stated yesterday afternoon—and I had just begun the argument then—was that it seemed to me perfectly clear that not only are we confronted here with the resolution reported by the committee, which is a resolution to make more effective the coverage of the present rule XXII, but we are undoubtedly faced with the knowledge that there will be a strong effort upon this floor to substitute majority cloture for two-thirds cloture as suggested in the report of the committee. In support of that statement, I had mentioned to the Senate facts which I think are known to most of us, but I have endeavored to assemble them. I had shown that the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], had stated openly upon the floor of the Senate that he knew that an effort would be made to substitute majority cloture for two-thirds cloture, and that he was going to support actively that effort. I reminded the Senate that the distinguished majority whip, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], had with equal clearness stated his position as not only being in support of majority cloture, but also, as appears from the record, that he had offered a resolution which suggested cloture by only a majority of a quorum, or 25 Senators; and it appeared that his conversion to the idea of requiring 49 Senators for cloture, or a constitutional majority, had occurred as late as the time of the hearings on this measure before the Committee on Rules and Administration.

I reminded the Senate that the majority whip had, upon the first day of the debate on this matter, offered and sent to the desk a proposed amendment to his resolution, in which he came out in favor of majority cloture, and that that proposed amendment had been printed and was on the desks of all Senators.

But, Mr. President, going further, and in order to show how thoroughly those of us who fear all cloture, but above all, majority cloture, have the right to be apprehensive that this is a drive or will become a drive for the adoption of majority cloture, I had begun to mention some of the things that are shown upon examination of the report of the hearings on this subject by the Committee on Rules and Administration, both in 1947 and in 1949. For instance, I had shown that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], joined by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], in 1947 had offered a resolution which would have provided for cloture by a majority of a quorum of the Senate, or by 25 Senators. I had shown that not only was that true, but that both Senators had strongly supported that position in the hearings before the committee. It is also true that this year the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has offered another resolution on the same subject, this one being a resolution proposing cloture by a majority of a quorum, or by 25 Senators. So he is unconverted, although I believe he has now stated that he proposes to support majority cloture, meaning a constitutional majority or cloture by the votes of 49 Senators; but he has made it very clear that that is as far as he will go.

I had also pointed out the fact that the distinguished minority whip, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], in 1947, was the author and sponsor of a resolution proposing cloture by a majority of a quorum, or by 25 Senators. I had stated in my debate that all of us knew from inspecting the record this year that the Senator from Massachusetts has this year joined in cosponsoring the proposal which has been reported by the committee, or an identical proposal; but we are also given full warning by the candid statement and admission made by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts at the hearings before the Senate committee that he still believes in cloture by a majority of a quorum only, or at least cloture by a majority of the entire Senate, and that that is what is his final objective. I believe he stated that he was supporting the pending resolution, which he regarded as one short step—and I think those will be found to be the words of the Senator from Massachusetts—toward the objective he hoped to attain, which was majority cloture; but I think it is fair to say that the Senator from Massachusetts will now support, not cloture by a majority of a quorum, but cloture by a constitutional majority of 49. However, he is clearly on record in the hearings this year; and I call attention to the fact that while we shall have against us the majority leader and the majority whip in the consideration of and voting on this question, we may likewise have against us the minority whip in this battle to substitute a majority cloture provision for the provision reported by the committee.

Furthermore, Mr. President, when I quit the floor last night under the unanimous-consent agreement that I could resume my statement this morning, I had just come to mention the fact that other Senators are likewise shown, although now supporting the resolution which has been reported by the committee, as nevertheless having the same convictions on this subject that were so candidly stated by the Senator from Massachusetts. For instance—and I shall not take time to read from the RECORD—the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] stated that he is now and has been heretofore in favor of majority cloture, and he made it very clear that that was his position.

Likewise the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], at the hearing, as shown by the printed record, made the same statement, that while he thought it better to take a half loaf rather than none, he was still in favor of majority cloture and did not want anybody to misunderstand that fact. Moreover, yesterday afternoon I was about to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], in 1947 offered a resolution calling for amendment of the rule so as to provide for cloture by a majority, though he would have required a constitutional majority.

I likewise want to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that there are other distinguished Senators, whom I shall not attempt to name except as to those whose position is shown by the committee record, who are in favor of majority cloture. I think it only proper,

however, to call attention to the fact that in the consideration of the proposal in 1947 by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, the three Senators who have not appeared as advocates of any particular form of resolution, insofar as making an offer of one in 1947 is concerned, cast their votes in committee for majority cloture; those three Senators being the distinguished minority leader [Mr. WHERRY], the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. President, with all this showing of the fact that the leadership on both sides of the Senate is either now actively engaged in or pledged to the voting of majority cloture rather than the approval of the resolution which has been reported favorably by the committee, and with further knowledge of the fact there is an active working group moving toward that end, and with a leadership which apparently will be fighting for that objective, there can be no assurance whatever that majority cloture will not be substituted for the report of the committee if ever the report of the committee be made the unfinished business of the Senate. It seems to me crystal clear why Senators should have fear and aversion with respect to majority cloture—and I believe that takes in a good deal more than half the membership of the Senate.

So, Mr. President, it seems to me we are placed upon notice that there is a strong and active and well led effort to substitute majority cloture for two-thirds cloture, and that if the Senate should agree to the motion to take up the report of the committee, it will be at once confronted with a determined and perhaps an effective effort to substitute majority cloture for the two-thirds cloture provided by the pending resolution.

Mr. President, and Senators, it is my strong conviction that majority cloture would mean the virtual end of free debate in the Senate and would reduce vastly the prestige and standing of the Senate as a whole and of every Senator now a Member and all those who may ever become Members of the Senate from this time forth.

I want to call the attention of the Senate to the colloquy between the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate [Mr. HAYDEN], and the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] on this particular point, which colloquy occurred during the hearings on the resolution before the Senate committee. I think every Member of the Senate realizes how candid and how frank and how fearless is the senior Senator from Arizona and how completely willing he is to state his views and convictions upon vital questions. While he is one of those who offered the resolution which it is now proposed to take up, nevertheless the chairman of the Rules Committee did not hesitate to state clearly his aversion to and apprehension of the operation of a majority cloture rule in the event such a rule were adopted. It was during the testimony before the committee of the Senator from New York. I shall read the questions and answers far enough from the record to show clearly what was the opinion of the chairman of the Rules Committee who served for so many years and so ably in the House of Representatives before he came to grace the floor of the Senate:

> The CHAIRMAN. If there is a majority in the Senate determined to carry out the policy and do it in a hurry, the rule could be amended on one day and the policy put into effect the next.

He was speaking of a rule for majority cloture, if it existed.

> Senator IVES. But the situation you were citing would indicate a preponderant majority and a very violent shift in political attitude in the country. The ordinary majority is something else. The ordinary majority, even under Senator MORSE's proposal, would grant to the minority, the opposition, should grant to them ample opportunity to get their case over to the country.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. If the Senator had served as long as I have in the House of Representatives, which was some 15 years, he would have seen a majority of both political parties execute their will without permitting the opposition to make any protest.

I shall reread that, Mr. President and Senators, because I want to have every Senator on the floor of the Senate know that in voting to take up this measure he is voluntarily inviting a battle in which majority cloture will be submitted and strongly advocated, he is inviting the situation as spoken of so potently in these words of the Senator from Arizona, which I reread:

> If the Senator had served as long as I have in the House of Representatives, which was some 15 years, he would have seen a majority of both political parties execute their will without permitting the opposition to make any protest.

Then the Senator from New York broke in:

> If the able Senator will permit me—

For once, Mr. Chairman, the able Senator from Arizona, would not even permit the Senator from New York to state his full case, for he continued his own statement:

> The CHAIRMAN. I do not want to see that kind of rule adopted in the Senate.
>
> Senator IVES. I, too, served in a legislative body where that could be done, and I am not in favor of it. I am just as much opposed to that situation as is the Senator from Arizona. But this proposal will grant or should grant a legitimate time for debate.

And then the clincher, from the chairman:

> The CHAIRMAN. That grant of legitimate time for debate could be taken away by a mere majority of the Senate at any time.

Mr. President, do we need any more of a red flag or any more of a danger signal than these words of wisdom spoken by the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, based upon his 15 years of able service in the House of Representatives, wherein he so strongly voices his complete objection, and I believe I could use the word "aversion," to any rule by which majority cloture would be adopted for the government of the Senate? Particularly do I feel that such a rule would completely change the character of the Senate in that it would largely destroy the ability of the Senate to protect and defend the interests of the small States and the interests of any and all minorities.

I again call to the attention of the Senate the fact that the destruction of the ability of the Senate to protect and defend the interests of the small States and the interests of any and all minorities means the destruction of the principal effectiveness of the Senate to do the job for which it was created—and created only after a long battle and after insistent debate and insistent demand coming from the small States of the original 13 States.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. I should like to ask the Senator, is it not a fact that even if the rules were amended, it would still be possible for one-third of the Senators to apply cloture at any time they saw fit, and if the pressure groups who are pressing for certain legislation to put through under cloture found that the two-thirds majority would not get them everything they wanted, for example, if they found it would not get them the FEPC bill, or would not get them some other idea they had dreamed up meanwhile, would not those same pressure groups be back here demanding that we again change our rules so as to make the rules such that they could get everything they wanted from the Senate?

Mr. HOLLAND. In answer to the Senator's question, I would say that it is my opinion that is exactly what we should expect, upon reading the many statements now appearing in the press, listening to those made over the radio, and those being carried to the office of every Senator, showing the fact that various minority groups are not satisfied with the rule as reported to the floor of the Senate, but, instead, are demanding the adoption of a majority cloture rule.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Is it not a fact that the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the CIO have already indicated that they would be completely dissatisfied with a two-thirds cloture rule, and that any Senator wanting to humor those pressure organizations must realize that he could not completely discharge his obligation to those persons if he voted for a two-thirds cloture rule?

Mr. HOLLAND. While I have not heard directly from either of those two groups, I have seen repeated references in the press to the fact that their position and present demand are exactly as stated by the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Has not the Senator from Florida seen pamphlets sent out by those organizations strongly urging each Senator to vote in favor of majority cloture?

Mr. HOLLAND. Since the Senator has called my attention to it, I believe I have seen one such pamphlet which

was sent to my office by one of those organizations. But I have seen repeated references in the press to the fact that both those organizations have taken actively the position stated by the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. President and Senators, I noted in the Evening Star of March 2 an excellent statement on this subject by David Lawrence, with whom I frequently disagree. I suppose every Senator on the floor has that privilege and has that experience. But I find him to be exceedingly well-versed in the traditions of this Nation and soundly steeped in true and real Americanism, and I like to read his columns, in which I usually find many words of wisdom and worthwhile ideas. So, Mr. President, I ask at this time that there be incorporated at this point in my remarks a clipping from the Evening Star of March 2, 1949, which covers the column of that day by Mr. David Lawrence, and which is entitled "Future United States History Seen Affected by Fight Over Filibuster Curb, Battle Now Depends on How Republicans Will Vote on Rules Change."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FUTURE UNITED STATES HISTORY SEEN AFFECTED BY FIGHT OVER FILIBUSTER CURB—BATTLE NOW DEPENDS ON HOW REPUBLICANS WILL VOTE ON RULES CHANGE

(By David Lawrence)

The debate over the right of a majority to cut off discussion in the Senate has implications that can affect the future of American history, as they have in the past.

Behind the right of a minority of Democrats to talk down any measures seeking to impose racial segregation upon the South is an armed truce which has existed in Congress virtually since the time of the Civil War.

Again and again efforts have been made, as far back as the nineties, to impose on the South a strict enforcement of the letter of the constitutional amendments which prohibit racial discrimination. Always the power of a small group of Senators to prevent a motion from being voted on has been interposed to kill such measures as would employ the Federal authority to secure civil rights within the States.

The South for a long time held its power in national party politics by means of the so-called two-thirds rule, whereby candidates at the Democratic National Conventions could not get the nomination and if elected could not obtain renomination unless the veto of the bloc of one-third was removed.

The late President Roosevelt secured the abolition of the two-thirds rule at nominating conventions. Another Democratic President is now behind the drive to abolish the veto by the southern Democrats on civil-rights measures.

CIVIL-RIGHTS ISSUE

Unfortunately, the controversy over possible changes in the Senate rules has become entangled with the civil-rights question. Hence, a vote to abandon the present right of a few Senators to filibuster a motion to death is considered a vote for civil rights, and a vote to retain the rules is considered to be an action opposed to an equitable settlement of the civil-rights question.

The issue goes deeper, however, than civil rights and racial problems. It goes to the heart of minority rights on all questions. The right of unlimited debate has kept the Senate from becoming a rubber stamp for the Executive on matters of domestic as well as foreign policy.

In times of economic stress an intolerant majority can ride roughshod over the rights of the minority. In the Senate it has been possible for unlimited debate to be checked only by the processes of public opinion when the debate privilege was abused.

While some filibusters have done real damage by delaying important measures till the next session, the real evils of the filibuster have been largely cured by the passage of the constitutional amendment which requires a new Congress to convene in January, virtually as a consecutive session, so that filibusters cannot be as effective as in the old days when Congress had to adjourn on March 4 and could not be brought into action again before December except by a special session.

SAFEGUARDS AGAINST ABUSE

There are safeguards against abuse of the debating privilege. The Republicans are split on the issue, as are the Democrats. In a few days Vice President BARKLEY is expected to reverse a ruling by Senate President pro tempore VANDENBERG in the last Congress. That ruling originally held that motions to take up measures were subject to unlimited debate and that a cloture or gag rule could not be applied.

When Mr. BARKLEY rules, as is expected, that a motion to take up a bill can be subjected to the debate limits of cloture procedure, then the Senate itself can by a majority vote uphold or reverse Mr. BARKLEY's ruling.

Will the Republicans vote to repudiate Senate VANDENBERG's historic ruling? If they do, then it is only a question of time when the present cloture rule will be changed to apply to all motions and then debate can be cut off on any motion or measure by a vote of two-thirds of the Senate.

The battle depends now on what the Republicans will do. They scarcely will get the credit for changing the rules, as President Truman and the Democratic leaders are forcing the issue. In the end, the Republicans probably will wind up by depriving themselves of the most important weapon they could use to prevent the inroads of state socialism wherein all civil rights would in the long run probably have to be sharply curtailed anyway.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if this were a filibuster I would proceed now to read this column from one end to the other, and I would have very ample precedent for doing so. As a matter of fact, there is not a word in it that is not of importance and is not germane to this discussion. But I am not anxious to consume a tremendous amount of time of the Senate, so I shall read briefly from this clipping, which will appear in its entirety in the RECORD, so that anyone who has not seen it will have the opportunity to inspect it in full. I want to read three paragraphs which, in my opinion, at least, state the gist of this problem as seen by Mr. David Lawrence and as stated by him in his column. The first paragraph which I quote reads as follows:

The issue goes deeper, however, than civil rights and racial problems. It goes to the heart of minority rights on all questions. The right of unlimited debate has kept the Senate from becoming a rubber stamp for the Executive on matters of domestic as well as foreign policy.

Mr. President, let me digress for a moment to mention one phase of that particular paragraph which I do not think has been mentioned up to the present time in this debate, namely, the portion of the paragraph which calls attention to the fact that the Executive has not been able to make a rubber stamp out of this body; and, further, that it would be extremely hurtful to the Nation if that were permitted, because, in addition to sharing full responsibility with reference to all legislation, the Senate is the forum in which is determined whether the President has wisely discharged his responsibility to the Nation in the field of foreign affairs. The Senate is also the forum in which it is determined whether the President has proceeded effectively, patriotically, and capably in selecting men for very high posts in the Government of the United States, such as members of the Supreme Court of the United States, ambassadorships all over the world, and numerous other positions of great and vital importance which will occur to all Members of this body.

It seems to me that undoubtedly the founding fathers must have had in mind that such a heavy responsibility could be safely entrusted only to a body which was so established that the sovereignty of each State would be protected and perpetuated, so established that without the consent of any State its equal suffrage and equal right to vote and to be heard could never be interfered with by amendments to the Constitution.

I enlarge, therefore, upon this paragraph merely by pointing out that Mr. Lawrence has placed his finger upon a very important matter when he suggests that it is of tremendously vital importance that the right and ability of the Senate to keep from becoming a rubber stamp for the Executive on matters of domestic as well as of foreign policy is a consideration which should engage the attention of the Senate and the people of the Nation during the days of this fateful debate.

The second paragraph of Mr. David Lawrence's column, which I wish to read, is as follows:

In times of economic stress—

What potent words those are, Mr. President. That means times when fathers are having to see their children go unclothed, unfed, and unschooled. It means times when there are bread lines, an uncertainty, and the insecurity of judgment which manifests itself always when hard times are upon us.

Mr. Lawrence says:

In times of economic stress an intolerant majority can ride roughshod over the rights of the minority—

Mr. President, I wonder if it is not well for us to remember that, although this is a period of great prosperity and high employment, nevertheless, those who are in the best position to know admit that there is something which indicates and suggests a recession, and everyone admits that there is something which exists just now which gives us cause for concern as to the economic events which lie immediately ahead of us. It seems rather clear to me that Mr. Lawrence wanted all who could read, and certainly all of the Members of the Senate, to

remember that in times of economic stress an intolerant majority can ride roughshod over the rights of the minority—

In the Senate it has been possible for unlimited debate to be checked only by the processes of public opinion when the debate privilege was abused.

I note that this distinguished columnist reminds us and reminds the country that there is a check, that there is a court of last resort, that there is a point beyond which a filibuster, or abuse of the right of unlimited debate, cannot go, and that point is the point which will be approved by the public opinion of this Nation. He speaks of it in these words:

It has been possible in the Senate for unlimited debate to be checked only by the processes of public opinion when the debate privilege was abused.

I now come to the third paragraph which I wish to read, and I am sorry there are not more of my friends on the other side of the aisle present to listen. All I can do is to hope they have read this column, and that they have taken unto themselves the words of advice, which certainly do not come from me, because I have no right to advise them, or to pretend to do so, but which come from a distinguished American with a background of knowledge and information and service in connection with our governmental affairs which is equaled by few and surpassed by none of our citizens. This is the third paragraph:

The battle depends now on what the Republicans will do. They scarcely will get the credit for changing the rules, as President Truman and the Democratic leaders are forcing the issue.

Mr. President, let me digress to remind my colleagues again, we do not know just how far the President and the Vice President are forcing this issue. We do know that the majority leader and the majority whip are for majority cloture; but, insofar as I have had the chance to observe, I have not seen any indication anywhere as to whether the support, and I almost used the word "direction" or "mandate," because the press reports use the word "direction" when speaking of what happened at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue the other day—I do not know how far the direction or the mandate goes, how far the majority leader and the majority whip may go and properly represent the opinion which is now entertained by the distinguished President of the United States, and the distinguished Vice President, the presiding officer of this body. But it is perfectly clear that the Democratic leaders are forcing the issue, and I only wish we might know just what issue it is they are forcing, whether they are really trying to get majority cloture, or the perfected two-thirds cloture as embraced in the committee report.

I continue reading from the article:

In the end, the Republicans probably will wind up—

I do not know how remote an end he means, for he uses rather indefinite words here—

In the end, the Republicans probably will wind up by depriving themselves of the most important weapon they could use to prevent the inroads of state socialism wherein all civil rights would in the long run probably have to be sharply curtailed anyway.

I am glad the distinguished columnist made that reference to state socialism. It is no secret to Members of the Senate, it is no secret to the country, that there are serving in high positions, and there are present on the floor of the Senate public officials representing this Nation who do see state socialism as one of the objectives for which they are working, and to which they think we should now soundly go. I do not know where we could find wiser voicing of a timely caution, Mr. President, than is stated here by Mr. Lawrence in the concluding words of his column, in which he reminds the Republicans that probably they "will wind up by depriving themselves of the most important weapon they could use to prevent the inroads of state socialism wherein all civil rights would in the long run probably have to be sharply curtailed anyway."

Before proceeding to the next quotation, I should like to say that as we approach the time when issues much more Nation-wide in scope than the ones which are just ahead of us, the civil-rights issue, will be heard discussed here, we will then need and we now need to remember that tremendous bipartisan and nonpartisan efforts will be made to ward off from this Nation threats toward a socialism which would tend to destroy all the finest things in free America for which we have such high regard and for which we would give our lives, whether it be in civil service or in any other way our country might demand.

So, Mr. President, I think it is timely, and I am glad Mr. Lawrence has in these few words reminded the Senate and reminded the country, that there are more important issues lying ahead; there are battles already appearing over the horizon fearful to contemplate by those who do not want to see this Nation, devoted to liberty and to freedom, and to protection of the rights of the individual, drift into that state socialism so ardently desired by many who think they have us started soundly on the road in that direction.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. In connection with what the Senator has been saying about the position of the executive branch of the Government in invading the province of the Senate and telling us what rules we should have, and the order in which our business should be transacted, I should like to ask whether or not the Senator thinks that if the President is to insist on a course in connection with a matter that is of peculiar concern to the legislative branch of the Government, the President should tell the Senate before it further restricts its powers, exactly where he does stand on the rules issue, as to whether he does insist on majority cloture, or whether he is willing to permit the Senate to adopt a rule which would be more liberal in allowing Senators to speak. It seems to me that if the President is to take a hand in framing the rules of the Senate he should tell us just how long he is willing to let Senators speak.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the question of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, and while I can voice only my own feeling in connection with the answer, I must say, in complete candor, that I think the Members of the Senate are entitled to know just what is meant when the majority leader rises on this floor and says that the President of the United States is behind this effort, and when he later says that he, the majority leader, is for majority cloture. I think that raises a peculiarly close and critical question on which every Member of the Senate has the right to request and require him to give us information from the Executive, as to just what is his intention and just what is his insistence, just how far he is asking and expecting the Senate to go in abandoning rights which have existed since 1789, rights under which real and great service has been rendered this Nation to make it strong and prosperous and to attain its present position of being the greatest power in all the world. I think the Senator is right, and that we are entitled to know just how far the Executive means to go in undertaking to have us curtail and abandon privileges which do not belong to us, but which are reposed in the Senate as the custodian of the very precious objectives worked out by patriotic men in 1787.

For one, I do not propose to give up any of those privileges. We should safeguard them, not for ourselves, but for the Nation, and particularly for the States of the Nation. I do not propose to give up those assets without knowing where we are going.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Florida if he noted the numerous headlines in the press of the Nation which proclaimed to the Nation and to the world—the word "order" was used in three or four cases, including the article in the New York Times and the Washington News—that "Truman orders" certain procedure in the Senate of the United States to the exclusion of all other business. I should like to ask the Senator what he thinks would have been the effect in years gone by if any past President had ordered the Senate of the United States to take this or that step in those days when the giants of yesterday sat here, before we began to follow the supine course of abdicating our responsibility as a coequal and coordinate branch of the Government.

Mr. HOLLAND. In answer to the Senator's question, I think that if the people of the Nation took seriously and literally those headlines and press notices they would come very properly to the conclusion that our Nation has deteriorated to a great extent from the Nation which was erected in 1789, and from the Nation which has continued to

exist through the last crucial days of the Second World War, and that it has become a Nation in which the executive department has superseded in its importance, in its responsibility, in its obligations to take care of the people's rights, in its answerability to the individual citizens for their freedom, both the other coordinate branches of Government; that is, the Congress and the courts.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to ask a further question, if the Senator will yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Georgia for a further question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the Senator if we can justify our existence as a legislative body and continue to draw our compensation from the Federal Treasury if the Senate completely abdicates and becomes wholly subject to orders from the executive department of the Government?

Mr. HOLLAND. My answer to the distinguished Senator from Georgia is that I think any Senator who should put himself in the position of abdicating wholly to the executive department of the Government would find out, regardless of what the press may think about interpreting the President's release, that the people of the country do not expect the Members of the Senate to lie down and take dictation from a coordinate branch of the Government as to matters lying within our jurisdiction and responsibility; and I believe the Senator from Georgia would in such case find that the people to whom we are answerable would expect Senators, in their sound conscience, and doing the best they can, to stand up and defend, just so long as they can defend, these fundamental rights and obligations which are reposed tenderly here in the laps of the Members of the Senate of the United States to be safeguarded, not for ourselves, but for a great Nation comprising 140,000,000 citizens.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from South Carolina for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Does the Senator remember that a few years ago the United States Senate had before it the question of packing the Supreme Court, and does the Senator further remember the attitude the newspapers were taking at that time, when the President was strongly urging that change in our system of government?

Mr. HOLLAND. In answer to the Senator I will say that the Senator compliments the junior Senator from Florida. I am not quite old enough to remember that far back. I really do not recall. I have not heard exactly what the position of the newspapers and the columnists was at that time.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to get——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Just a minute. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from South Carolina for a further question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to ask a question. I am quite sure the Senator from Florida remembers the question raised at the time, respecting a change in the number of members of the Supreme Court. The Senator remembers that, does he not?

Mr. HOLLAND. In answer to that question I will say yes, I remember that very clearly.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. But the Senator does not remember what attitude the newspapers were taking then?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yielded for a question only, Mr. President, and in reply to the question I will say that I do not recall what position the newspapers took. In my part of the country the newspapers were divided about as the citizens were divided on that subject.

Mr. President, I should like now to explore a little more fully into the philosophy of Mr. David Lawrence, if I may, by offering for the RECORD at this time a column written by Mr. Lawrence and published in the Washington Star of January 28, 1949, and which is now embraced fully in the printed record of the hearings of the Committee on Rules and Administration on the subject of limitation on debate in the Senate, on pages 170 to 172, inclusive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from Florida asking that the designated pages be incorporated in the RECORD at this point?

Mr. HOLLAND. Not fully, Mr. President. I ask only that the quotations from Mr. Lawrence's column, which comprised his complete column of that day, paragraphs or portions of which have certain intervening questions by other Senators, and answers by the junior Senator from Florida, be printed in the RECORD. In other words, I ask that the complete column, as it appears on the pages I gave, may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

The Republicans in the Senate are about to make a mistake which will rise to plague them for years to come and may make such a fundamental change in congressional government as to bring forth a demand for a single instead of a two-House system.

The Republicans have lined up behind a move which will permit a majority to shut off debate. Some Republicans favor a simple majority and others favor two-thirds to apply cloture on those procedural points not covered by the present rule whereby debate is limited in part. But in either event, it would be possible for the minority to be deprived of its right to be heard.

For decades the United States Senate has been the one place in the world of free governments where the minority could not be shouted down and its chance taken away to be heard fully and comprehensively.

Now it is asserted that even the present rule which applies cloture in certain instances but does not really prevent extended debate if Members choose to make use of the procedures available to them has been rarely invoked. But if all motions and procedures are to be covered by a two-thirds cloture, it would be a simple matter later on to change it to a majority of those present. The Senate then would become almost identical in its procedure with the House of Representatives, thus making it logical to call for a unicameral or single-House system. Such a plan would place the Western States and others with a small population at a serious disadvantage and would abolish the sovereignty of the States for all practical purposes.

ENCOURAGES TYRANNY

The real objection to the adoption of any absolute rule to cut off debate is that it encourages the formation of arbitrary and intolerant majorities which can become tyrannical.

The argument that recourse can be had at the polls against such a majority falls to the ground, because two-thirds of the Senate Members do not come up for election each congressional year, and it is possible for a majority of two-thirds to invoke cloture and not be held accountable for as many as 4 years.

If cloture is adopted, then logically the people must have some quicker means of redress than they have today. In the democracy of Canada and other English-speaking governments, the people can overrule their national legislative body at any time. An election can be held to determine whether a majority misinterpreted or correctly interpreted the will of the people.

In the sense that the adoption of cloture may hasten the day when a constitutional amendment is adopted calling for the removal of a President when he fails by a two-thirds vote to retain the confidence of both Houses of Congress and calling for replacement of Members when they have lost the confidence of the people, the step can be welcome. But to adopt cloture without at the same time giving the people an instantaneous check on an arbitrary majority is illogical and inconsistent.

The Republicans are playing bad politics when they join with the northern Democrats to change the rules governing debate. Already this week they have an example of how an intolerant majority functions when it wishes to cut off hearings in an important committee considering labor-management legislation of far-reaching importance to the people.

HYPOCRITICAL MANEUVER

To find the Republicans anxious to make political capital out of the discomfiture of the Democrats who are divided on the civil-rights issue is regrettable, because on its face the maneuver is hypocritical. The sponsors of civil rights for Negroes presumably are not yet ready to support a measure to protect the civil rights of the white man.

There are more instances each year of violence on the picket line in labor disputes, more instances of cars overturned as workers seek to get into factory parking lots, and more instances of intimidation in the homes of workers by strong-arm men than there have been lynchings in the last 10 years. The proposal to put the police power of the Federal Government behind the civil rights of Negroes would be widely acclaimed if it were broadened to include all manner of violence in which citizens have not been given protection by the local authorities. If any Republican or any southern Democrat sought the passage of any such all-inclusive law, the northern Democrats would never support it and would back away from the issue.

The antifilibuster movement is really tied up with a movement by the Republicans to win the Negro vote in the North, though, to be sure, a large part of it has gone Democratic for several years notwithstanding the fact that the late President Roosevelt never attempted to force the members of his own party from the South to give up their rights to unlimited debate and to jam through Congress any civil-rights legislation.

The Republicans are the minority party in Congress and filibustering is a weapon of the minority. That's why it seems strange that the Republican leaders are willing to give up the one method left in congressional procedure by which the arbitrariness of any majority in either party can be held in check.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, again stating with all diffidence that I do not pretend to be able to advise other Senators on this side of the aisle, or Senators on the other side of the aisle, and more particularly the latter, I think I am justified in calling to the attention of the distinguished Senators of the minority, fine patriots and good Americans as they are, the additional column in which Mr. Lawrence expressed much of his philosophy on this particular question. I shall not read each and every paragraph of Mr. Lawrence's column, but the whole column appears as part of my remarks, and any Senator who wishes to read it in full may do so.

The first paragraph reads as follows:

The Republicans in the Senate are about to make a mistake which will rise to plague them for years to come and may make such a fundamental change in congressional government as to bring forth a demand for a single instead of a two-House system.

The Republicans—

And I hope that the distinguished columnist was in error in this particular statement—

The Republicans have lined up behind a move which will permit a majority to shut off debate. Some Republicans favor a simple majority and others favor two-thirds to apply cloture on those procedural points not covered by the present rule whereby debate is limited in part. But in either event, it would be possible for the minority to be deprived of its right to be heard.

At this point I wish to inject the remark, Mr. President, that Mr. Lawrence calls attention to the fact there that while there is a difference in degree between these two suggestions, that is the suggestion for majority cloture and that of two-thirds cloture, it is only a difference in degree, because he says, and I quote his statement again:

But in either event, it would be possible for the minority to be deprived of its right to be heard.

I continue to read from Mr. Lawrence's column:

For decades the United States Senate has been the one place in the world of free governments where the minority could not be shouted down and its chance taken away to be heard fully and comprehensively.

Mr. President, I like the words "shouted down." The words "shouted down" express, I think, completely what happens in a body that submits itself to majority control from day to day, either through the previous question or by any other procedure which brings about the same result. That is thoroughly and characteristically indicative of what happens when a majority which has rules permitting it, gets into the habit of literally shouting down, overriding without giving a chance to be heard, overriding in derision and ridicule, overriding as something not worthy of hearing, not worthy of taking a moment's time of the deliberative body in question. The majority shouts down the position of the minority even though it may be a strong minority, a nonyielding minority, a minority which knows that it has as correct information as to the complete failure in large sections of the Nation of the law sought to be passed, because of the fact that the law as proposed to be passed would come squarely into contravention and contradiction of fundamental views on intimate racial and personal relations that exist in those large segments of the Nation.

I am not going to read all of Mr. Lawrence's column. I shall skip now and take up another small paragraph, because I think it also gives a good indication of what Mr. Lawrence is trying to say:

The real objection to the adoption of any arbitrary rule to cut off debate is that it encourages the formation of arbitrary and intolerant majorities which can become tyrannical.

Again, Mr. President, Mr. Lawrence uses some strong words, and they are words which I think should be guideposts to which the Senate should look in the event it is seriously considering taking the course which is inveighed against so heavily here by this distinguished American.

The real objection to the adoption of any absolute rule to cut off debate is that it encourages the formation of arbitrary—

Arbitrary decisions are those not based upon soundness of logic, not based on good judgment, not based on excellent or reasonable grounds, but on whimsical reasons, and on the hopes and beliefs or aspirations of the majority that they can work their will and carry through their intention regardless of what faces them. They know that they have only a minority of votes facing them. They give little consideration to the principles, equities, and fundamental values which lie in their way. So the first word he uses, to which I call attention, is the word "arbitrary."

The next word is the word "intolerant." If there is anything for which this Nations stands, it is tolerance in the truest sense of the word—our willingness to live and let live, our willingness to accept as expressed in good faith and sound purpose the opinions of another which may not be in accord with our own; and our willingness to give another the benefit of the presumption of good faith which we claim for ourselves, and believe that we always have on our side of the fence. The use of the word "intolerant" should be another red flag brought to the attention of the people of the Nation, and particularly to the attention of the membership of the Senate during this vital debate.

The next word is "majorities." The writer first calls attention to the fact that intolerance exists, and next to the fact that a majority exists which is willing to be affected by and to follow wherever intolerance points the way. It may be only a bare majority. The word "majority" has little application to the fundamental objectives and functions of the United States Senate, which, above all agencies in our Government, was created to see that the minority, the weak, the poor, and the small always had a forum where they stood equally with everyone else, with full opportunity to express their vital views and aspirations, regardless of what qualities or qualifications others might have.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the able Senator from Florida what he thinks would be the result of a referendum in any State of the Union if the question were submitted to the people and they were permitted to pass upon the question of whether or not a condition should be created in the Senate under which there was a strong likelihood that neither Senator from that State would be permitted to be heard at length on the floor of the Senate in defending the rights of those people? How would the people vote if they knew that their voice—because the only untrammeled, unshackled voice the people of a State have is that of their Senators—would not be heard? If they knew that their Senators, through a condition which might arise by reason of proposed changes in the rules of this body, might be confronted with situations in which they would be compelled to stand practically mute in attempting to stop some bill or legislation that was of vital importance to the people of the State, what would be the feeling of the people? I ask the Senator how the people of any State would feel if it were brought home to them that a condition might arise in which the voice of that State could not be heard in this great deliberative body on a matter of vital consequence to the people of the State.

Mr. HOLLAND. In answer to the vital question propounded by the Senator from Georgia, I simply say that my observation is not sufficiently wide to enable me to make an answer for all States of the Union, or even to make an answer for the people of my own State, of which I am certain. But I will say that I am just as sure as I can be, without having seen the actual results of a referendum vote of the people of the State of Florida, that in that State at least the people do not propose to have created a condition such as described in the question of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, a condition under which the voices of the two Senators representing the sovereign State of Florida could be stilled by reason of hostile action of a mere majority, or even of a two-thirds majority temporarily in power and temporarily endowed with the qualities which are so well stated by Mr. Lawrence—arbitrary, intolerant majorities.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. STENNIS. While the Senator is on the subject matter which he has just mentioned, let me say that there has been a great deal said about the so-called civil-rights program on the calendar. I ask the Senator from Florida this question: If there were no such program before the Congress, what would be the Senator's position with reference to changing the rules of the Senate on the matter of cloture, leaving out altogether any consideration of the civil-rights program?

Mr. HOLLAND. My answer to the question of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi is that the civil-rights program is something temporary, in my opinion, something that exists just now, and is affording the spur, the motive power, for this particular effort. But I believe that many questions much more vital in their application to all the people of this Nation than this, will arise. My position is based upon what I think is sound government and sound American philosophy, and it would be my position if there were no such questions as those embraced in the civil-rights program.

Mr. STENNIS. Am I correct, then, in understanding the Senator to say, in effect, that if the so-called civil-rights program had already been passed and had been signed and enacted into law, the Senator's position on this question would still be in favor of free speech and ample opportunity for all areas and all interests to be heard exhaustively, even to the extent, if their representatives deemed it proper, of resorting to extreme lengths of debate to protect those fundamental rights? Is that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is exactly correct. If the civil-rights question were disposed of adversely to my contention, or even the other way, on a permanent basis, my position would be exactly the position I am taking here now. We are talking about a government which has not only existed since 1789, but which will continue to exist for hundreds of years in the future, to bless not only America, but all the people of the earth, because we have become the greatest stabilizing force for decency and for humanitarian objectives throughout all the world. So far as I am concerned, I shall not base my position on this vital question upon any temporary group of questions, either civil-rights questions or any other. We are talking about fundamental, sound American government for a period as long as this Nation shall stand, which, please God, will be a long time in the future.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask the Senator if I correctly understand his position, that it is impossible to gag the Members of the Senate of the United States without gagging the people of a sovereign State. The sovereign States created the Senate and the Constitution.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is exactly correct, and he has voiced tersely, and in fewer words than I have been able to voice it, one of the ideas which I have been attempting to express. What is involved is not merely the rights of Senators who sit here now, not merely the rights of those who will sit here during all the history of the Nation, when I hope the Senate will have just as much prestige and responsibility as it now has. We are talking about rights which were given to the Senate to protect the people of the sovereign States. If those rights are once yielded the effectiveness of the Senate to carry out its original function will be destroyed. In its original place, as well as its present place in our system of government, it has shown a fine capacity to grow in strength and stature.

Mr. President, now I reach the fourth word in this little statement by the columnist, Mr. David Lawrence, which I think rather effectively winds up the subject matter insofar as he is concerned, and he expresses my thinking on it; I adopt his statement. It will be remembered that he said that—

> The real objection to the adoption of any absolute rule to cut off debate is that it encourages the formation of arbitrary and intolerant majorities—

And here is the clincher—

> which can become tyrannical.

Mr. President, anyone who thinks Mr. Lawrence is straying from the truth or from the fact as to what are the possibilities when there is a rule which allows a simple majority to work its will, simply has not looked at the record of history and has not looked at the record of the other branch of this Congress, which I respect so highly, but which unfortunately, because of its size and for other reasons, has to have cloture as one of the characteristics of its existence. If we look to the actions of legislatures which have that rule, if we look beyond the limits of our Nation to the actions of other parliamentary bodies which have such a rule, we shall see that frequently exactly what Mr. Lawrence says has come true: that those who exist for the moment as a majority and who are arbitrary and intolerant as a majority become tyrannical, and that that is one of the sources of tyranny which has been clearly evidenced, not merely on this continent of ours, but in many other places on the earth; and the columnist wants us to remember that as we go through the course of this debate. I thought his suggestion was so potent and so proper that I should bring it to the attention of the Senate and to the attention of the people of the Nation, particularly those of them who may not have seen the article or may not have analyzed it, so that they might realize that here is what a keen and lifelong student of American government thinks about this design which is sought to be foisted upon the Senate of the United States.

We remember that at the beginning of the article he said that there is only a question of degree between two-thirds cloture and majority cloture; and in this statement he is talking about either of them and both of them when he says that such an absolute rule to cut off debate does encourage—

> the formation of arbitrary and intolerant majorities which can become tyrannical.

Mr. President, I shall not read at great length further from this column, but I do wish to read the last three paragraphs:

> There are more instances each year of violations on the picket line in labor disputes, more instances of cars overturned as workers seek to get into factory parking lots, and more instances of intimidation in the homes of workers by strong-arm men than there have been lynchings in the last 10 years. The proposal to put the police power of the Federal Government behind the civil rights of Negroes would be widely acclaimed if it were broadened to include all manner of violence in which citizens have not been given protection by the local authorities. If any Republican or any southern Democrat sought the passage of any such all-inclusive law, the northern Democrats would never support it and would back away from the issue.
>
> The antifilibuster movement is really tied up with a movement by the Republicans to win the Negro vote in the North, though, to be sure, a large part of it has gone Democratic for several years notwithstanding the fact that the late President Roosevelt never attempted to force the members of his own party from the South to give up their rights to unlimited debate and to jam through Congress any civil-rights legislation.

I wish to call attention to that paragraph, Mr. President. There are still some persons who like to think in terms of what might have happened during the administration of President Roosevelt upon this sort of an issue. Now we see what this distinguished columnist has to say about that:

> President Roosevelt never attempted to force the members of his own party from the South to give up their rights to unlimited debate and to jam through Congress any civil-rights legislation.

I now read the concluding statement:

> The Republicans are the minority party in Congress and filibustering is a weapon of the minority. That's why it seems strange that the Republican leaders are willing to give up the one method left in congressional procedure by which the arbitrariness of any majority in either party can be held in check.

Mr. President, I think the advice given by Mr. Lawrence is completely sound; and, further, I think it is equally applicable to Members on both sides of the aisle. I do not know why the columnist wished to confine his advice-giving activities to those on the other side of the aisle; I think his advice would be equally effective to those on this side of the aisle who appear to be willing to relinquish the heritage of their fathers, the right to have unlimited debate and to fight for the protection of the people of their sovereign States. So far as I am concerned, I do not limit the application of the Lawrence article to the Members of the Senate on one side of the aisle. I think it is just as wise advice when given to Members of the Senate coming from one party as it is when given to Members coming from the other party, and I think it is sound American advice given to good Americans serving in both parties here.

Mr. President, history shows that today's majority will be tomorrow's minority. Aside from that fact, history

also shows that many of the most vital questions always have been and always will be essentially nonpartisan and will cut squarely across party lines. I shall not stop to mention many of those issues. I remember offhand one which has gained great and able attention from the present Presiding Officer of the Senate, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the former Governor of Missouri, for whom I have such high affection and respect. I remember that subject—the subject of tidelands oil. I think he has very definite and very fixed and very lasting convictions upon that subject. They may not be, and in fact I think they are not, the same convictions as those which are entertained by the junior Senator from Florida. But the point I am making, Mr. President, is that vital questions of that type frequently cut clear across party lines, just as that particular question cuts across party lines, and that vital questions of that type frequently pertain to a minority group of States, just as it is true that a minority of States have any active personal interest in that problem by reason of having any tidelands of their own which might be affected by it.

I could easily multiply the type and the number of issues which I might mention as coming within this same general classification.

I remember that in appearing before the Committee on Rules and Administration at the hearings on these resolutions, I suggested to the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the chairman of the committee, how vital a matter it was to his fine State of Arizona—a comparatively small State in population and development, but a fine State—and how tremendously necessary it was to that fine State that it have assigned to it an adequate proportion of the waters of the Colorado River, which really brings life to that State, and without which there cannot be any unlimited development of any sort in that State. I reminded him, just as I remind the other Members of the Senate now, that that question is bipartisan and nonpartisan; that question will find Republicans and Democrats on both sides of the issue, because it is a vital economic and geographic question which applies to States regardless of whether for the moment they happen to be in the Democratic or in the Republican column.

So I could go on almost endlessly enumerating many such vital questions and issues—for instance, questions affecting the distribution and control of the oil supplies of the Nation, entirely apart from tidelands oil. As Senators know, the oil-producing States of the Union are in the minority, yet it may be and probably will be, as the scarcity of the oil reserves become more and more apparent and of more and more vital importance to the people of the Nation and to the Nation's future, there will come a time when the oil-producing States will need to stand together; and they are not going to look to the label of the Senators representing them, as to whether they are Democrats or Republicans, but as to whether they will stand up and fight for what such States assume to be their vital interest in the decision of that problem.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Louisiana for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator aware of the fact that only a few years ago the number of Republicans in the Senate was reduced to the small number of less than 20, the Democrats having roughly about 70 and the Republicans about 20 Senators?

Mr. HOLLAND. In answer to the Senator, I may say I remember that time. It seems that we have come a long way since then, and perhaps it is for the best interests of the Nation that the two parties be more evenly balanced in the Senate than they were at that time.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Louisiana for a further question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a further question.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator from Florida aware of the fact that, at that time, when the Democrats had a majority of more than two-thirds of the Members of the Senate, it would have been very easy for the Democrats to have changed the rule so that a simple majority could have applied cloture, at its every whim, and that that would have been a convenient method for putting through New Deal measures such as the court-packing bill, which was defeated as the result of extended debate?

Mr. HOLLAND. In answer to the Senator, I may say I am well aware such action could have been taken at that time by the Democratic majority. I am glad the Democratic majority saw fit to make a stand for sound Americanism on the floor of the Senate by refusing even to consider such a monstrous course.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Louisiana for a further question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator from Florida aware of the fact that if such a thing had happened and if the southern Senators had proposed or had joined in some such plan as that, or some such scheme, at that time, the southern Senators themselves would today have been deprived of the great right which they are exercising to defend the right of their people and to debate and set forth fully the merits of a question with respect to which they feel they are most vitally affected?

Mr. HOLLAND. In answer to the Senator I may say I am fully aware of that fact, and I have unceasing cause to be grateful both to Democrats and Republicans, and particularly to the Democrats, for not, at any time in the Nation's history, including the time mentioned by the Senator in his question, foisting on the Senate cloture or any binding rule—I mean a completely binding rule—under which firm, effective limitation of debate could have been accomplished by either a majority or by a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. May the Chair respectfully request the Senator from Louisiana to address the Chair, in the interest of having the record perfectly clear that the request has been presented to the Chair and then to the Senator from Florida? Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Louisiana for a further question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Louisiana would like to ask if the Senator from Florida is aware of the fact that although the Republican minority in the Senate today may consist of about 40 Senators, it is quite possible that at some distant date in the future the Republican Party may again be reduced to a point where they have fewer Senators in the Senate even than the Senators representing the southern section of the country?

Mr. HOLLAND. In answer, I may say there certainly is such a possibility. That is one of the vague areas of politics in this Nation. The fortunes of our political parties go up to the peaks and then come down to the valleys; and some times the valleys are pretty deep.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator from Florida yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair assumes the Senator from Louisiana is addressing the Chair.

Mr. LONG. The Senator is addressing the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Louisiana for a further question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a further question.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator from Florida aware of the fact that if such a thing should ever happen and the right of unlimited debate be destroyed in the Senate, such a Republican minority would at that time be in an immeasurably worse position than the southern Senators are today, because in that event they would even be denied the right of full debate in the Senate?

Mr. HOLLAND. In answer I may say that I am well aware of that fact. Not only would such a Republican minority be left helpless but a minority that would be willing to stand up and fight for labor would be left helpless, or a minority that would be willing to stand up and fight for the small States or for any principle which was right, such as certain of the principles I mentioned a while ago. A minority standing for fundamental principles on any subject is apt to be left in that distressing and helpless condition described by the question of the Senator from Louisiana, if such a cloture rule is adopted.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Louisiana be kind enough to address the Chair?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is not said at all unkindly to the Senator; but, in order that the record may be entirely clear, the Chair is making the suggestion to the Senator.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Chair for the suggestion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Louisiana for a further question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a further question.

Mr. LONG. I should like to ask the Senator from Florida whether he is aware of the fact that if such a day ever comes the Republican side of the aisle would be even further embarrassed by the fact that a large segment of the Democratic Party, particularly Senators from the South, would have very unkind feelings toward the Republican minority in the Senate?

Mr. HOLLAND. In answer to the Senator's question, there is always the possibility of that kind of result occurring, but I like to think, Mr. President and Senators, these battles are fought through to a finish, and the day after we are through with them, we again become able to work with each other on such terms as properly to serve the welfare of the Nation. I am quite well aware of the fact, and the Senator has merit in his question, that sometimes that ideal is not subserved, and sometimes bitterness coming from a debate of this kind lives on and on and on and rears its ugly head in the determination of later questions which ought not to be affected or touched at all by the bitterness of the debate or by the vital question being discussed in the first instance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator permit the Chair at this time to insert in the RECORD the particular portion of rule XIX to which reference was made by the Chair a few moments ago? The rule reads as follows:

> When a Senator desires to speak, he shall rise and address the Presiding Officer, and shall not proceed until he is recognized, and the Presiding Officer shall recognize the Senator who shall first address him.

The Chair may say again to the Senator from Louisiana that that is not said in any critical sense at all but merely that we may have the RECORD perfectly clear as to the fact that the Presiding Officer is addressed and the Chair in turn inquires of the Senator speaking whether or not he yields.

Mr. LONG. If I may have the Chair's permission to make a statement at this time——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the Senator's making a statement at this point?

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I object.

Mr. RUSSELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The Senator from Florida has the floor, and he may proceed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I may say at this point the Senator from Florida not only appreciates the warm help which is being extended by the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana, but he also is highly appreciative of the fact that his rights upon the floor as a Senator of the United States are being properly safeguarded by the distinguished Senator from Missouri, who now presides. The Senator from Florida feels he is in entirely safe, impartial, and nonpartisan hands when the Senator from Missouri leaves his seat as a Senator and comes to preside over the forum of the Senate of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thanks the Senator from Florida for his very kind observation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have talked at some length on the question of the fear, the apprehension which I think is present, and reasonably so, at this very session, in this very Congress, in this very debate. There is real reason for us to fear that an effort may be made, and perhaps a successful effort, to substitute majority cloture for the two-thirds cloture rule suggested by the report of the committee. But, continuing from that point, even if I could know that the determined effort to substitute majority cloture which will be made—and, Mr. President, there is no doubt it will be made; we have been apprised of that in every way so that every reasonable person must have the information—will be defeated, I should continue to oppose the pending motion to take up the resolution, for the reasons I have already stated; in other words, for reasons having to do with the unwisdom of simple majority cloture or constitutional majority cloture in the Senate.

I have brought out this point in answering some of the questions which have been propounded to me, but I do not believe this question is being determined only upon present facts and issues. I think it is a great fundamental question which has to do with the future, and the welfare in that future, not only of those who may serve in the Senate, but of their ability to serve the people of their States and of the Nation in consonance with the objectives of the Senate of the United States. So I would continue to oppose the pending motion just as vigorously, even if I knew in advance, even if there were assurances given by the words of Senators at this time, at this moment, on this occasion, that a strong, conclusive majority of the Senate would confine itself to the consideration of the resolution as reported by the committee and would not yield to the demand to consider simple majority cloture. If the motion shall prevail and if the resolution reported by the Senate shall be taken up and adopted without having substituted for it a provision for majority cloture, there will still be, and, I think, even to a greater degree at that time and under those conditions, an invitation to those who are so minded to complete their work, to finish their objectives, as has been announced by so many of the ablest and most influential Members of the Senate who have stated freely that they want majority cloture and want to adopt it at the first convenient opportunity.

In the very nature of politics, Mr. President, there will continue to be vital issues which a scant majority will want hastily to pass. The adoption of the resolution as reported would leave a much more favorable situation to bring about that result than if we leave the rule as it is now, subject to the imperfections which are in it. Whether they were intended by those who framed it in the beginning, I am not able to say. But let me give a moment's attention to that point.

I would not for the world question any expression by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], because he is much better qualified to express an opinion on most matters pending in the Senate, certainly on all matters having to do with the history and traditions of the Senate, than is the junior Senator from Florida. But I have been in public life quite a while, myself, and I knew some of the Senators whose names were read on the roll call of fame by the Senator from Arizona a few days ago when he gave to the Senate the names of the members of the committee who participated in the framing of our present rule XXII. It is very difficult for me to believe, looking at those names, considering the background and experience of the men who participated in that effort, that they, or at least some of them, out of the wealth of their experience, confronted with the fact that on the question of the Journal there was a special rule applicable to motions to correct the Journal, and making such motions privileged—it would be very difficult, or almost impossible, for me to feel that all members of the committee submitted that rule without being conscious of the fact that those imperfections were in it.

Mr. President, I am glad to see that the distinguished Senator from Arizona has come into the Chamber.

The imperfections of the rule began to become apparent within a very short time after its adoption. My recollection is that it was in the early 1920's. It may have been earlier than that. Certainly, it was at a time when some of those Members were here. If they had not done what they set out to do, but, instead, had done an inferior and ineffective job, I think some of them would have stood upon the floor of the Senate and so stated, and I think there would have been an effort to complete the doing of what they thought was a good job when they tried to do it in 1917.

Mr. President, there are only two possible conclusions to which I can come. One is that either they knew those imperfections were in the rule all the time, or else they discovered them later and were glad they were in the rule, and they did not propose to proceed to polish off what had proved to be a defective piece of work. I do not see what other conclusion can be, for the moment, entertained by anyone, because it is a fact that most of the members of that committee continued to serve in the Senate

and were here when the so-called imperfections of the rule began to assert themselves, and were certainly clearly understood.

The adoption of the resolution as reported would operate in this way, it seems to me, Mr. President: It would simply unlock the gate, open up the Pandora's box, as the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has so frequently said, and leave the gate temptingly open. That gate is not open now, and it will not be open unless the proposed new rule or a worse one should be adopted. As I say, it would leave the gate temptingly open so that, gazing through it upon the green fields which lie beyond, a majority, for the moment hungry for power which they had not exercised for a long while, hungry for the chance to deal with a subject matter which they wanted to deal with in a certain way at that particular time, would be subjected to the temptation—and it would be a very large temptation and one to which it would be difficult not to yield—to go one step further and adopt a majority cloture rule through which their objectives could be more easily attained.

So, Mr. President, I conclude on that first point of my objections to the proposed rule, namely, that it involves both now and in the future, if it should be adopted as reported by the committee, a serious danger of substituting a majority cloture rule for the two-thirds cloture rule which is proposed by the resolution reported by the committee.

The second point of view which I wish to urge, Mr. President, as a ground for my unyielding opposition to the resolution which it is now sought to take up, is that I oppose strongly the immediate purpose for which the proposed change in the cloture rule is sought.

I think everyone knows, Mr. President, that the immediate purpose is to enable the passage—the prompt and convenient passage—of the so-called civil rights measures which are being supported mistakenly by so many good persons, and which are objectionable to the people of the Southern States. I think I am safe in saying that I know, from much correspondence which I have had, that they are likewise objectionable to many people who do not happen to be residents of the Southern States.

The record shows, Mr. President, that the only measures against which cloture has been attempted, which have not been passed, are in the field of the particular civil-rights program. In support of that statement I should like to read from a statement of the Senator from Arizona. I always like to read from him. To me he is an authority in this field. His statement was made during the hearings on this subject, appearing on page 40 of the printed record of the hearings. I think it is a final showing of the fact that cloture is sought only, in the last analysis, to enable the passage of the so-called civil-rights measures. I read from the statement of the Senator from Arizona:

> Anyone who reads that list of legislation defeated by filibusters—

He speaks there of the list which is found in a brochure which was prepared by Dr. Galloway and printed by the Library of Congress—

> would not know that actually and in truth, aside from the fair-employment-practice bill, the anti-poll-tax bill, and the antilynch bill, all of the remainder of this legislation, while delayed, ultimately became law.

Mr. President, briefly, the Senator from Arizona has simply said that every other measure which may have temporarily encountered difficulty because of filibuster or delaying debate, and because of the attempted application of a cloture rule which had been sought to handle it, but which was not permitted to be so handled at that time—every other measure has subsequently been disposed of satisfactorily, except the three mentioned by the Senator from Arizona, namely, the FEPC, the antilynching bill, and the anti-poll-tax bill.

Mr. President, I therefore am opposing the adoption of the pending motion because it is evident, as so freely stated by many of those who have appeared to support some such change in the cloture rule, that their purpose and motive and objective is to permit of the early and quick and successful passage of these three particular so-called civil-rights measures. They might have gone ahead and stated that other civil-rights measures were on the program and would come up a little later, but the three which they mentioned in appearing before the committee, during the hearings in the committee—and they have mentioned them over and over again—are these three measures, and their desire to have cloture strengthened so that these three measures may be effectively taken up and passed.

Mr. President, several of the witnesses, both in 1947 and in 1949, frankly admitted that that was the case. Speakers over the radio, speakers who have appeared in various public gatherings, many pronouncements of the press, have stated it countless times, and the public well knows that the present objective in bringing up this proposed change is to pass these three measures. So I think that a brief discussion of those measures immediately at issue is appropriate at this time—and I shall attempt to be brief in discussing them—merely to show in the RECORD why it is that we of the South have such unalterable opposition to the enactment of these three measures.

First, Mr. President, with reference to the poll tax. Let me say that, insofar as the Senator from Florida is concerned, he has a record already on that subject. When he was a member of the Florida State Senate in 1937, there came up in that forum, in which there was a great deal more political danger in taking a definite and fixed stand on this subject than there is here, a proposal to abolish the poll-tax requirement which had existed for many years in the State of Florida, and to bring about such a situation that the payment of a poll tax would no longer be a prerequisite for voting. I am happy to say to any who may not know it that I was glad to support the measure which, so far as Florida was concerned, caused the poll tax to become a dead issue, and which did away with that requirement. I am glad I took that position. We have found cleaner politics, we have found more votes, we have brought about a more difficult situation for those who would like to control politics, since the elimination of the poll tax in Florida as a prerequisite for voting.

I may say likewise, Mr. President, that I also have a record on this subject in this body, not only during the last session, when I stated my strong desire that this subject should be approached constitutionally through the submission of a constitutional amendment, but also in the present session have I proceeded along that line.

I should like at this time to ask the consent of the Senate to have printed at this point in my remarks the body only, that is, section 1 and section 2, of the proposed article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States, embodied in Senate Joint Resolution 34, which was offered in the Senate on January 13 of this year by the following southern Senators: Mr. GEORGE, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. LONG, Mr. HOEY, Mr. BROUGHTON, and Mr. ROBERTSON, as well as myself. Those 10 southern Senators felt that it was not sufficient simply to oppose what they thought to be unconstitutional and unsound and illegal, but having had some experience in this field themselves, they felt they should offer a firm and affirmative approach to this particular problem, hence the introduction of this joint resolution, which I shall now read into this portion of my debate:

> SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax or to meet any property qualification.
>
> SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Mr. President, the wording of this joint resolution speaks for itself, and I should like just for a moment to comment on the fact that the resolution not only presents a legal approach to this subject, but it presents a much broader approach than any that has been presented in any proposed statute, at least any that it has been my privilege to see, because under this approach the right of a citizen in any State to vote in elections for electors for President, Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress is guaranteed, regardless of their failure to pay any poll tax, and regardless of their failure to pay any other tax, a property tax or other sort of taxation, and regardless of their failure to meet any property qualification.

It is true that no State at the present time has, as a prerequisite for participating in Federal elections, the requirement of the payment or nonpayment of other taxes, or the requirement of meeting any property qualification. It is also true, however, that heretofore many of the

States of the Union have had such provisions in their constitutions and statutes, and it is also true that some of them, outside the South, now have provisions in their constitutions and statutes which require the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for participation in town meetings and various other types of local government meetings.

I have been told that the town meetings of New England are perhaps the closest approach to true democracy of the Grecian type, which we heard mentioned by the distinguished Senator from Texas day before yesterday in his able debate, to be found anywhere in our Nation. With that in mind, I should like to call attention to the fact that in several of the New England States, according to my information—and there is no fairer and finer and better part of our Nation than New England—there are still requirements for the payment of poll taxes which operate as a prerequisite for participation in certain town meetings, which are so thoroughly democratic.

Mr. President, I do not care to argue at length the questions involved in this matter which make so many of us feel that a constitutional amendment is the only proper method of approaching this subject, so far as the Federal Government is concerned, but I do think that a brief statement of our position should appear in the RECORD at this time, and for that reason I shall place it there.

Section 2 of article I of the Constitution, which provides for the membership of the House of Representatives, contains these words:

> The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for the electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Mr. President, I heard a good bit of debate last summer, both in committee and on the floor of the Senate, in which gentlemen sought to quibble a little and to draw in and limit the meaning of the word "qualifications," as stated in this particular section of the Constitution, so as to contend that the requirement for the payment of the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting should not be considered or held to be within the purview and meaning of the word "qualifications." I have listened carefully to some able discussions on that subject. Mr. President, regardless of the ability of those who have expressed opinions to the contrary, I find it impossible to arrive at any conclusion in this matter other than that the word "qualifications," as used by the framing fathers, did embrace the question of the poll tax, and did embrace the actual payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting, because such an interpretation was known at the time and was known to those able governmental authorities who sat down together in Philadelphia to frame the Constitution.

Mr. President, at this point, without attempting to read into the RECORD provisions of the constitutions of 8 or 9 other of the original 13 States on the subject, I should like to read into the RECORD the provision which was in the Constitution of the State of New Hampshire, one of the original 13 States, and which must have been known not only to the representatives of that State, but to the other able governmental authorities who sat down in Philadelphia in 1789 to frame the Constitution. I read from the Constitution of the State of New Hampshire of 1784, which was in force and applicable in 1789. First I read an excerpt which has to do with the State senate, and with the qualifications of electors for the senate:

> The senate shall be the first branch of the legislature; and the senators shall be chosen in the following manner, viz: Every male inhabitant of each town and parish with town privileges in the several counties in this State, of 21 years of age and upward, paying for himself a poll tax, shall have a right at the annual or other meetings of the inhabitants of said towns and parishes, to be duly warned and holden annually forever in the month of March; to vote in the town or parish wherein he dwells, for the senators in the county or district whereof he is a member.
>
> And every person qualified—

The Senate will note that the word "qualified" is specifically used here—

> And every person qualified as the constitution provides, shall be considered an inhabitant for the purpose of electing and being elected into any office or place within this State, in that town, parish, and plantation where he dwelleth and hath his home.

Then proceeding to that part of the New Hampshire Constitution of 1784 which deals with the house of representatives—because I call to the attention of the Members of the Senate the fact that the provision in the Federal Constitution is that the same qualifications as are prescribed by a State for electors to vote for the Representatives in the most numerous House of the Legislature shall be binding upon the Federal Government—I quote from the provision of qualification of electors to vote for members of the House of Representatives in New Hampshire which is in the Constitution of New Hampshire of 1784, as follows:

> The members of the house of representatives shall be chosen annually in the month of March, and shall be the second branch of the legislature.
>
> All persons qualified to vote in the election of senators shall be entitled to vote within the town, district, parish, or place where they dwell, in the choice of representatives.

In other words, Mr. President, it is entirely clear that under that Constitution of New Hampshire not only was a poll-tax required to be paid by every male inhabitant of the age described in the provisions of the constitution which I have read, but the payment of a poll tax was a prerequisite for voting in the election for the Senate, and then the same qualifications were carried over, and the same requirement was made, in the provisions for voting for members of the house of representatives, which was the most numerous body, under the set-up in New Hampshire in those early days.

Mr. President, eight or nine of the other original 13 States have somewhat comparable provisions, except that none of them has a provision which relates to the payment of a poll tax being a prerequisite, but in most every other instance the condition is a much more difficult condition to meet, generally being a property-ownership condition, or a condition for the payment of property or other tax in a fixed and stated amount, much larger that the amounts which have now for many years been considered as appropriate to be used in the setting of amounts to be paid as poll tax by the citizens of the various States.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. BALDWIN. I was very much interested in what the distinguished Senator from Florida has been saying about the history of qualifications by way of taxes and property ownership for the right to vote. The Senator has apparently made a very thorough study of the subject. Did not the Senator find in the course of his study that the general tendency down through the years has been away from qualifications of all kinds? In other words, the general tendency down through the years has been, has it not, to extend the suffrage without qualification?

Mr. HOLLAND. In answer to the question of the Senator, I would have to say in candor that there certainly has been a tendency to make easier the qualifications to vote, either by removing poll-tax requirements or property-ownership requirements, or other taxpaying requirements, or by reducing those requirements. But I call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut to the fact that we are not now talking about a tendency and we are not talking about a practice which has prevailed in the various States from that time until now, and which I shall take up a little further along. We are talking about what is the proper interpretation of that portion of the Constitution of the United States, as framed by our founding fathers, and as appears in section 2 of article 1 of the Constitution, in which it appears so clearly that I would defy the Senator or anyone else to state it more tersely or more clearly, that the qualifications prescribed by the several States for electors to participate in elections of the members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature were adopted by the Federal Government and made by that Federal action, as it appears in the provision of the Constitution referred to, the Federal qualifications for electors for participating in elections of representatives or Members of the House of Representatives. The wording could not be clearer.

The reason for my going back and quoting the language I did, if I may say further to the Senator from Connecticut, is that I have observed with some surprise, and even with some alarm, the tendency of certain Members of the House and of the Senate, and various other persons, simply to attempt to rewrite their own definition of what is in the Constitution, because they would like to see this trend which has manifested itself in the various States automatically carried over into the Constitution of the United States in order to bring

about a different interpretation of a part of that Constitution from the interpretation which undoubtedly was in the minds of the framers, and which I think controls and which I think the Senator from Connecticut will admit controls. I think the Senator from Connecticut will agree with me that, upon clear showing that such and such a provision written into the Constitution of the United States by the founding fathers meant, and could have meant, only one thing, the only way to take it out of the Constitution is to change it by amendment of the Constitution, and that it cannot be done by statute simply to meet a trend which develops somewhere else.

Mr. BALDWIN. May I ask the Senator from Florida this question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Connecticut for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. BALDWIN. Does the Senator believe that any State legislature could pass a law imposing unreasonable, rigid restrictions upon the qualifications to vote? Suppose, for example, a State legislature should pass a law that was obviously designed to permit only a certain class of citizens to vote. Suppose it required that only those who owned property to the value of $500,000 should be qualified to vote in an election. Would the Senator think that that sort of law would be constitutional if questioned in the Federal courts?

Mr. HOLLAND. My answer to that question is that in that case the Senator would have a situation under which the proposed standard sought to be established went far beyond any standard set up in the case of the thirteen original States, and it would certainly present a question for interpretation by the courts.

Mr. BALDWIN. Under what constitutional provision would the courts have a right to examine it? Would it be under the provision of the Constitution that each State shall have a republican form of government? I am speaking of "republican" in the broader sense, with the small "r", not from the partisan standpoint.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have yielded for a question only. In answer to that question, I will say to the Senator that whatever was the meaning of a republican form of government then is certainly the meaning of a republican form of government now; and that when it appears clearly that the forms of government prevailing in the 13 States were acceptable to the framing fathers and known to the framing fathers, and were incorporated, at least to the degree mentioned, in the quotations from the framing fathers, it would ill behoove us now to say that those provisions were not a part of a republican form of government as intended by the framing fathers.

Mr. BALDWIN. Is not the Senator taking the position that the Constitution of the United States must be interpreted only in the light of the understanding of those who wrote it? Of course their understanding was controlled by and subject to the conditions and days in which they lived. I do not understand that the Senator means that.

Mr. HOLLAND. My answer to the Senator is that there are many provisions in the Constitution which are flexible with passing time—for example, the provision with reference to general welfare. When something comes into being now that was not even thought of in those days, such as aviation, radio, and many other products of the inventive genius of man with which the Senator is familiar, our idea, and I believe the American idea, is so to interpret the Constitution as to find a place to put those various new developments, and to find a meaning of the term "general welfare," broad enough to include the particular things which I have mentioned.

But when it comes to any formula embraced in the Constitution which is clear and inescapably means only one thing, and which uses words in such a way that it is impossible to interpret them as meaning anything else, then I think the only way to change it is by constitutional amendment. I would dislike to think that by mere fiat of the Congress of the United States, provisions which were placed in the Constitution for safeguarding the States and the rights of their people could be changed when a specific, definite, and certain meaning was given to them, and that specific meaning was placed behind those words and into those words for the protection of our people. It is too easy to amend the Constitution for us to start on a program of changing clear, unequivocal expressions of the Constitution to suit our will, which I judge is what is desired by the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. BALDWIN. The Senator has apparently made a very comprehensive study of this question. Did he not find that on one or more occasions the Supreme Court of the United States has passed upon laws enacted by legislatures concerning voting qualifications, laws which the Supreme Court considered unreasonable and highly restrictive, to the extent that they did not guarantee to the people of the States involved a republican form of government? Are there not cases of that kind?

Mr. HOLLAND. I will say to the Senator that I have not reexamined this subject lately, but my clear recollection is that the cases which the Senator mentions are cases arising not under this particular section of article I, but arising under section 4 of article I, which reads:

> The times, places and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

In order to make that applicable to the situation which we have been discussing, it would have to be regarded as having changed the specific meaning and the specific wording of the language appearing in section 2 of article I which I read in the beginning; and I have found no court which has stated that such a change was accomplished by section 4.

Mr. President, I shall not at this time attempt to make an exhaustive showing of what the various charters or constitutions of the various States contained—and some of the States were still operating under colonial charters at that time. I have in my file a showing as to what was provided in each of the Thirteen Original States on this subject in such a conclusive way that anyone reading it must know beyond any peradventure of doubt, that in nearly all the original States there were prescriptions of qualifications for voting which went further than the requirement of the payment of a mere poll tax, going to the matter of holding property of a certain value, or the payment of a property tax or other tax of some stated amount. I have always felt, and I now express the opinion for whatever it may be worth, that we are simply wasting time when we try, by fiat of the Senate and House of Representatives, approved by the President, at this time to place a different meaning on the clear, meaningful words which were employed by the founding fathers when they worded section 2 of article I of our Constitution.

To come to the next phase of the question, it is not merely a question of determining what was meant in 1787, when the Constitution was framed, because it so happens that this same formula, which was used in section 2 of article I, in its identical verbiage was employed at the time of the submission by Congress of the seventeenth amendment for the direct election of Members of the United States Senate, and at the time of the adoption of the seventeenth amendment by the several States of the Union. In the seventeenth amendment the second sentence reads as follows:

> The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

Those are the identical words of the formula stated in section 2 of article I. They were submitted in 1912 by the Congress of the United States in the form of a proposed amendment, which later became the seventeenth amendment by action of 37 States.

I think it is peculiarly valuable and appropriate to find out what was the meaning of those words and the understanding of those words in 1912, when the debate took place on the floor of the Senate and the House prior to the submission of the seventeenth amendment. I have read that debate very carefully. I shall not encumber the record by incorporating portions of it here. I invite any Senator who cares to do so to read it.

There are various expressions of this same thought appearing throughout the course of that debate. Incidentally, the debate lasted off and on for 2 years, in two sessions of Congress. Those expressions are to the point that the submission of this amendment and its adoption would still leave to the States, without change, the protection which they had always received under section 2 of article I, and under the formula stated therein.

I remember in particular a long and able address by Senator Borah, of Idaho, in the ccurse of that argument. I have it before me, but I prefer not to insert it in the RECORD. It would unduly encumber the RECORD. But Senators who care to read that statement will find that in his statement Senator Borah made his point very clear. He was arguing to a group of southern Senators and a group of New England Senators, in the main, who objected to the change of the provision under which the legislature had always had the right to select Senators. He assured all of them that the States would still be in the ascendancy, that the States still had control of their elections and still had the benefit of the identical formula written into the Constitution by the founding fathers as a part of article I, section 2, and it was in connection with that statement that the proposed amendment to the Constitution was presented to the people and was adopted.

Mr. President, I ask you in all candor. When the record so clearly shows what is the part of honesty and decency in this matter, thus giving weight and force and effect to assurances of that kind which were given preceding the casting of the votes of the southern States for that constitutional amendment, is it the decent and honorable thing to ignore statements of that kind, made under such circumstances?

But, Mr. President, there is a much stronger factor in this picture than that, because when the amendment went to the States, it took the approving vote of 5 southern States which had the poll-tax requirement at the time to amass the total of 37 States, of which 36 had to legally approve and ratify the amendment before it could come into being as a constitutional amendment. Mr. President, there is not the slightest doubt in the world about that. Senators, by simply turning to page 477 of the Senate manual, can find the list of the States who approved this amendment, and they can also see there how speedy the adoption of this amendment proved to be, because it was submitted on May 13, 1912, and was approved by the thirty-sixth State on April 8, 1913, or less than 11 months after the time of its submission. But the five States from the South which gave their sovereign approval—and all of them poll-tax States, at least four of them had to give their approval in order to enable the ratification of the amendment—are the States of North Carolina, Texas, Arkansas, Tennessee, and Louisiana.

Mr. President, I think there, again, is a showing of the sound equity which lies behind the feeling that inasmuch as those southern States acted in that progressive, forward step under the assurance and belief that their constitutional provisions protected them, and under the assurance, given frequently on the floor of the Senate and on the floor of the House, that such was the case, the suggestion now made that that particular provision with reference to the qualification of electors was meaningless is a departure from good faith and has no semblance of good faith or good conscience about it.

Mr. President, I have before me the provisions of the constitutions of five of those Southern States, of whom, as I have said, four had to vote for this amendment or else it could not have been adopted. However, I do not think it will be necessary for me to read into the RECORD at this time the pertinent provisions of all five of those State constitutions. I simply wish to say for the record that the constitutions of all but one of those States do provide the poll-tax qualification, and they provide it in connection with the use of the word "qualifications" itself, so that there can be no question about the fact that the framers of those State constitutions and those who were representing those particular States and those who were looking to their own States to see what was the meaning and understanding of the word "qualifications" could have come to no other conclusion than that the word "qualifications" did include the question of the payment of poll tax as a prerequisite for voting.

Mr. President, without attempting to place in the RECORD a great many quotations from the constitutions of those five States, I should like to present at this time that portion of the Constitution of the State of North Carolina which was in force at that time. It is headed "Article VI—Suffrage and eligibility to office," and it has the words "qualifications of electors" stated four times on the margin by the text; and it has the word "qualifications" stated in section 1, as follows:

> Every male person born in the United States, and every male person who has been naturalized, is 21 years of age, and possesses the qualifications as set out in this article, shall be entitled to vote at any election by the people of the State except as herein otherwise provided.

Now, let me refer to section 4; the other sections which come between section 1 and section 4 may be inspected by anyone who wishes to do so, but they do not happen to be applicable to this point. Section 4 reads, in part, as follows:

> Every person presenting himself for registration shall be able to read and write every section of the constitution in the English language; and before he shall be entitled to vote he shall have paid, on or before the 1st day of May in the year in which he proposes to vote, his poll tax for the previous year, as prescribed by article 5, section 1, of the constitution.

That comes under the heading "Qualifications of electors to register and vote."

So, Mr. President, without taking further time to present quotations from that particular State constitution or from any of the other State constitutions, I point out that it is abundantly clear that in the constitutions of the States whose votes were necessary to the adoption of the seventeenth amendment to the Federal Constitution, and whose votes were given in making possible the adoption of the seventeenth amendment, there were provisions for the payment of the poll tax, and those provisions include the payment of the poll tax under the word "qualifications" as part of that which must be done by their electors before they were qualified to vote or to participate in elections.

Mr. President, it may be interesting to note that at the time of the submission of that amendment in 1912, not only were five southern States in the position of having such provisions in their constitutions, but in the case of the great State of Pennsylvania there was a provision of property ownership; I shall read the provision as it appeared in article VIII of the Constitution of Pennsylvania at that time. By the way, this provision of the Pennsylvania Constitution has been amended and stricken out since 1913, since the adoption of the seventeenth amendment to the Federal Constitution, just as the State of North Carolina, the State of Florida, the State of Louisiana, and the State of Georgia have likewise removed the payment of poll tax as a qualification for voting.

Article VIII of the Pennsylvania Constitution reads as follows:

> SUFFRAGE AND ELECTIONS
>
> SECTION 1. Qualifications of electors: Every male citizen 21 years of age, possessing the following qualifications, shall be entitled to vote at all elections, subject, however, to such laws requiring and regulating the registration of electors as the general assembly may enact.

Those qualifications are four in number. I shall not read the first, second, and third of them, but I shall read the fourth. Qualification No. 4, under section 1, entitled "Qualification of Electors," reads as follows:

> 4. If 22 years of age and upward, he shall have paid within 2 years a State or county tax which shall have been assessed at least 2 months and paid at least 1 month before the election.

In other words, not only in the case of the five Southern States, but in the case of the great State of Pennsylvania there was at that time a provision as a prerequisite of voting that a citizen of a certain age must pay taxes. That provision was written under the general head of "Qualifications for voting" and was stated to be one of the qualifications as enumerated in that constitution. So, Mr. President and Senators, it becomes crystal clear that not only in the South where the poll-tax provisions were already in the constitutions of not only the States I have mentioned but of other States as well, but even in Pennsylvania there was a provision which made it crystal clear that the word "qualifications," at least as understood by the good people of Pennsylvania, went so far as to cover a requirement that one applying to vote and seeking to show that he was qualified must show as one of his qualifications that he had actually paid taxes, and he could not vote unless he made such showing.

The issue of the poll tax has been unduly magnified. It is being settled by the States. I mentioned a while ago that several of the Southern States have already abolished it. I helped to abolish it in Florida. I could have mentioned that it is now in process of being abolished in other Southern States. So far as I am concerned I should like to see that process speeded up. So far as I am concerned if there is anything I could do legally which would add impetus to the movement to speed up that process I

should be glad to do it; and because there is only one thing I know of that I could legally do to accomplish that end, I have joined with nine other southern Senators in proposing a constitutional amendment which would do just exactly that.

Mr. President, I see it stated frequently in the press and in the pamphlets and releases of the various organizations that are so eager for the passage of the so-called civil rights measures, that there is nothing affirmative about the position of the South, that we are unyielding on things, that we do not have any constructive forward-looking program to offer. I respectfully call to the attention of the Senate and to the attention of any critics who may have voiced such an expression that there is now in the lap of the Senate, and available for action by the Senate, a constitutional amendment to which not only 10 southern Senators, as sponsors, are bound as supporters, but as to which there will be somewhere between 4 and 8 additional southern Senators whose votes will be counted in support of it. I believe its submission by the Senate and the House to the people and to the several States would bring early action.

What is it that is wanted by the agitators? Do they want a political cause to keep on boiling up, to keep on inciting people to political effort from year to year and from election to election? Or do they instead want solid accomplishment in this field? Do they want progress made either by the adoption of the constitutional amendment or by the speeding up of the State processes of elimination which might follow submission of the constitutional amendment? For myself, I should prefer to see the action taken by the States, but if the submission of the constitutional amendment would add impetus to the effort, I am willing to see it submitted; not only willing but I am anxious to take a part of the responsibility in submitting it, so the question may be legally disposed of.

I am aware of the fact that the issue has been used and is being used as a political issue and as a political football. I am hoping that some time in the Senate, and also at the other end of this long Hall, there will come an understanding of the fact that it is not a political handling of a thing which is best in the long run, that frequently it is the sound legal handling that offers the only avenue of approach which is constructive, and that it is time for us to think American, act American, and legislate American. It is in the hope we will do that that the 10 southern Senators whom I have mentioned have joined in submitting or offering this particular constitutional amendment.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield for a question by the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. I should like to ask if the Senator would be of the opinion that, had the poll-tax question been approached as a constitutional amendment in the beginning, possibly such an amendment might have been passed by the Congress and ratified by the States?

Mr. HOLLAND. In answer to my friend, I may say, any answer would be a mere conjecture. It would be my feeling that if it had been submitted, and if one-tenth of the effort had been put into seeing that it was fairly submitted to the legislatures and the people of the several States, as has been exerted in the effort to cram it down the throat of Congress through an illegal Federal statute, it would long ago have been a part of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Louisiana for a further question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. I should like to ask the Senator from Florida if it has not been a fact that in the four or five southern States where the poll tax has been removed it was approached as a theoretical proposition, that a poor man should be entitled to vote without paying a tax, and not as a racial proposition, and that upon that basis the States have been willing to eliminate it?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is exactly correct. I stated in the opening approach to the question that the repeal of the poll-tax requirement in Florida had brought real and substantial benefits to our State, and I stated what the benefits were. None of them were racial in their scope, none of them were limited to any racial application. In our State more benefit has arisen from the elimination of the poll tax in connection with the white vote than there has in connection with the colored vote, because we have a vastly greater white vote than colored, and because a system of manipulating elections through the payment and control of the poll tax, and through the control of poll-tax receipts, had grown up in several places, which practice has been eliminated since the poll-tax requirement was abolished.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Louisiana for a further question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I should like to ask the Senator this further question: Does the Senator feel that if the pressure groups would quit injecting the racial issue into the poll-tax question, the poll-tax question would probably be settled by the States themselves? Is the Senator of that opinion?

Mr. HOLLAND. In answer to the Senator, I may say I have given a good deal of thought to that very question. I think there have been various issues, and the poll-tax issue is one of them in at least two States, in my opinion, which have been adversely affected by outside compulsion on the part of various reformers, on the part of agencies which have become so eager to accomplish a particular reform that they had to transfer their activities into a jurisdiction where they were not wanted, where they were not invited, and where their insistence simply brought confusion and difficulty and added delay, as has been the case, in my judgment, in certain of the States, because of outside illegal compulsion in connection with the poll tax.

Mr. President, I come next to the second of the elements in the so-called civil-rights program which is most frequently mentioned, and which the Nation knows is one of those issues the proponents of this rule change think will enable them to solve simply by reason of changing the rule. That question is the passage of an antilynching measure. I do not suppose anyone who has lived and grown up and become mature in a State where no lynching has ever occurred could possibly have the chance to observe the horrid impact upon the whole community directly affected, and upon most of the remainder, and sometimes even the remainder of the States, and upon large portions of adjoining States, which occurs when there is a lynching. I know of no other manifestation of human anger, vexation, and intolerance which is clothed with so many and such dire consequences as flow from a lynching. It has been my unpleasant experience to have been in communities from time to time or nearby communities where lynchings have taken place, mostly in the long, long ago. So far as I am concerned, there is no one thing in connection with improper practices by citizens against other citizens which to me has the appeal of prohibiting, preventing, bringing to an end, bringing to a cloture, if we may use that word, this thing of lynching, which has been productive of such vast ill-effect not only in the South but elsewhere, where it sometimes has been practiced.

I do not like to speak, Mr. President and Senators, of any part of my own record not known to the Senate on any matter pending, but I think it is only fair to say, and Senators can very easily find that what I am saying is exactly the fact, that my own strength, influence, activity, and effort as a private citizen, as a prosecutor, later as a judge, later as a member of the State senate, later as the governor of my State, and now as a member of the United States Senate, have always been unalterably, unswervingly, and unyieldingly opposed to any effort on the part of a mob or others to take the law into their own hands and to take the life of a fellow human being. I know, as other Senators know, that occasions arise which strain one almost beyond his ability to withstand; but I have seen the sentiment so changed in the period of my own lifetime—and I happen now to be 56 years of age and to have served in public office some 30 years—I have seen such change in this field that I think I can say to my friends and brethren in the Senate that it is a fact that insofar as law will go in such a field, the crime of lynching has been stamped out. That is not to say that occasionally we do not have an unfortunate episode, but such episodes are growing less and less; there are fewer and fewer of them; there is greater and greater resistance on the part of the average good citizen,

whether white or black, to anything that even pretends to be included within this subject matter.

We have made an immense amount of progress, Mr. President. I repeat what I have said, that I think, insofar as it is possible for law by itself to go, we have already received all the advantage to come from the passage of laws and have already gone far beyond any point to which we could have gone simply by the use of compulsion through law, because, Mr. President, we are dealing with a subject matter which does not follow the law; it flies in the face of law.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Do I correctly understand from the Senator's statement that what he means in regard to lynching is that by passing a law we would merely provide for further punishment and would not prevent that one lynching a year which might be occurring?

Mr. HOLLAND. I mean that and a great deal more. I mean, in the first place, that insofar as the deterring effect of law is concerned, every one of the Southern States has laws for the punishment of murder and unlawful homicide. Most of them have specific laws against lynching. Those laws have been asserted and enforced, and the public knows them and fears them, except that small part of the public which might be inclined to take the law into their own hands. But beyond that, most of the progress which has been made in this particular field, in my humble opinion, does not flow from those laws or their passage or enforcement, and will not flow from the passage of laws here or anywhere else, because we are dealing with a subject matter which has to do with feelings, emotions, passions, which will occasionally, I regret to say, break out even in communities where the inhibitions are strongest and where the efforts to control such occurrences are most unyielding.

In the first place, we have laws, and the people know them and intend to observe them. In the second place, we have gone along with those laws, and, because of a continued, persistent, and unyielding effort on the part of countless good citizens in private and public life, whose concern is that they bring an end to that horrible thing which is called lynching, we are just about to accomplish that eminently desirable objective.

Mr. President and Senators, when we look at the record we see that in each of 2 years in the recent past, I believe, 1945 and 1947—the figures are available in the printed record—there was only one lynching throughout the Nation. The record discloses that in the last 10 years the number of lynchings—and I regret and deplore every one of them, and would go to the limit of my strength to avoid them—has been small and has been steadily diminishing, and the number of good people who frown upon lynching and are willing to insist that the law should take its course is growing until practically all of them feel that way about the matter.

So I would greatly deplore seeing an effort made, under the guise of law, to pass Federal legislation on the subject. I think it would eventually be abrogated anyway, because I think that in all probability it would be unconstitutional. The laws I have heard suggested, which really had teeth in them, were unconstitutional. That fact was admitted, finally, by some of the proponents when a much less offensive law was proposed in the last session of Congress, and immediately the outcry went up from some of the ultra-liberal groups that such a law would be no good at all, that it would not meet the situation, and could not possibly bring relief. They were correct about that, because no law can bring relief. The law which they suggested would have brought even less relief, because it was clearly unconstitutional and was an invasion of the prerogatives of the States.

Mr. President, I do not stand upon any merely legalistic point of view. So far as I am concerned, I want to bring an end to lynching. I am always ready to compare, or to contrast as the case may be, the performance under our peculiar system in the South and under our laws in the South, in this field or in any other field, with similar performances in other States and in other parts of the Nation. Insofar as I am concerned, I want to say to the Senate that, while I have no bricks to throw at any other State, I believe we can make in the South a much stronger, a much clearer, and a much more conclusive showing with respect to violations growing out of race hatred and clashing race feelings than is being made in other parts of the Nation.

The question of lynching is only one aspect of the violence which arises from race clashes. Senators know that to be true. They know that a race riot is another manifestation of the same feeling. They know that the attacks upon certain groups of aliens which were made in one of our sister States on the Pacific coast, as stated in the record of the hearings last year, by American citizens against American citizens who happened to be of oriental lineage, were more than 100 in number.

I merely wish to point out to the Presiding Officer and Members of the Senate, and the public, that the South is willing to submit its record in this very vital field as against that of any other section; and if there ever was a vital field it is one that has to do with human life and of people living by each other in every conceivable sort of contact over a great part of our Nation. We are willing to put up our record against the record being made elsewhere. When those records are compared fairly and squarely, I believe there is a contrast in our favor, and that many of those who are so anxious to shake their fingers at the South and sponsor punitive measures against the South will wonder if they have not been seeing the mote in the Southern eye and overlooking the beam in their own eye.

Mr. President, in mentioning one or two incidents I shall do so without casting reflection upon the communities where they have occurred, because I know perfectly well that the good people of California, for instance, deplored more than anyone else the more than a hundred outbreaks against the Japanese-Americans, and I know that the good people of Detroit deplored more than anyone else the race riot which occurred there in 1943, and that they would do all in their power, I am sure, to avert such a horrible catastrophe again. We are willing for them to do it. We know they feel that way. We know they are good people, and we know they want to do justice by their own brethren. We wish they thought we wanted to do justice by our brethren, as we have tried to do through all these years, and as we are doing in greater and greater measure year by year.

Let us go back to the Detroit race riot which occurred June 20 to 27, 1943. The figures I have are furnished to me by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress under date of February 21. I presume they are dependable. It is said the figures are taken from the Negro Year Book for 1947, at page 241.

The figures show that the number of casualties in the race riot in Detroit, in June 1943, were 9 whites and 25 Negroes killed. Thirty-four humans lost their lives in that wild extravaganza of race hatred which broke out there, certainly without the approval, but to the shame and dismay, of the good people of Detroit, who did everything they could to quell the riot after it started and have done everything they could to prevent its repetition. The figures further show that 250 white persons and 211 Negroes were wounded in that particular race riot.

Mr. President, I cite these figures, not to throw any bricks at the good city of Detroit, or the splendid State of which it is the leading cosmopolitan center, but, instead, to show that such clashes occur in spite of every effort to avert them, in spite of the passage of every law that could be applicable to prevent them, because no one would claim, and it is not a fact, that the State of Michigan is devoid of good laws, for the enforcement of the rights of their citizens and for the protection of their lives. No one for a moment would claim that this riot happened because of weak laws, or because of the desire or intent of the good people of Detroit to have such a thing happen. To the very contrary, Mr. President, the people there have struggled during the years of the existence of that fine State to perfect more and more the laws of that State under which just such things as this, and other things, are effectively prevented, and the participants are punished after they have occurred. But in spite of the best preparation, and in spite of what I am sure were the best efforts to enforce the law on the part of the law-enforcement officers and other officials of that great State and that great city, the lamentable fact is that 34 persons lost their lives during that race riot, and that 461 persons, of whom 250 were white and 211 Negroes, were wounded, as is shown by the report from which I have just quoted.

Mr. President, does anyone claim that the existence of a Federal law would have

changed that situation? Does anyone claim that the passage of a Federal statute to enable Government officials to look into that situation, or perhaps to punish some persons who might be overlooked by a partial State inquiry—and I do not think there was a partial State inquiry—would have improved or prevented that situation? I think it would be idle for any such claim to be made, and I think it is idle now to claim that the passage of a proposed antilynching law by Congress would avert such incidents.

Mr. President, I come next to an event occurring the same year, August 1 and 2, 1943, in the city of New York, referred to in the report of the Library of Congress as the Harlem riot. As stated here—and again the figures are taken from the Negro Year Book of 1947, at page 245—5 Negroes were killed in the rioting; hospitals treated 561 persons who were injured in the rioting, and most of those who were injured were Negroes.

Again I wish to apply to New York all the favorable things I have said of Detroit and of the State of Michigan. I know that riot was not condoned by any responsible person—any good citizen—in all the length and breadth of the great State of New York, of which every person in our Nation is proud because it is the greatest unit of government we have, and the city in which the riot took place is our greatest city—the pride and joy of the people of the United States. No one has any criticism to make of the people of New York, either of the city or the State.

I am merely pointing out what occurred in that State, which is an old State, noted for effective law enforcement, a State which has sound laws on its books, and good men to enforce its laws, a State which has an enviable record for law enforcement. But, notwithstanding the laws and notwithstanding the existence of able officers to enforce them, and notwithstanding the fact that the great majority of the people—I am sure 99 percent of them—not only did not participate in this riot, but frowned upon it and would have fought it and prevented it with every power they possessed. Yet, in that situation a spark sets off this bitter thing, this race hatred, which somehow, sometimes, breaks out, just as it did recently in South Africa, just as it did a little while before in India. Such disasters as we have had here do not compare in size, or in any other way, with the disasters which have been sustained in other parts of the world, when sometimes a group of colored men, sometimes a group of white men, sometimes a group of brown men, have, because of their hatred for others, whether religious hatred or race hatred, allowed themselves to become worked up to such a point that animal passions have simply overcome their inhibitions, and they have committed acts for which no civilized person could find any apology or excuse, and certainly we find none here on the floor of the Senate.

The point I am making is that not only have we State laws against lynching, but good enforcement of those laws. I believe if there were a Federal law on the subject a tapering-off process would still go on. That is what is happening now. We are finally becoming old enough, mature enough, experienced enough, and kind and patient enough, to get entirely away from the time when lynching will be possible. Regardless of the passage or nonpassage of laws, I believe we have to look in some direction other than the mere existence of or enforcement of laws in order to get the best results in a field of this kind.

Mr. President, I believe that every Senator who is present knows that what I have said is true. I believe every person listening to my voice knows it is not because of the absence of law these things have happened. It is not because of the failure of both white people and colored people to seek to avoid them, but because of the fact that we are in a field which is peculiarly like a tinder box, which is peculiarly inflammatory, and which in all the days of history has shown itself to be so. Occasionally some incident happens to set off the tinder box.

Let us go back to the main thesis of the question of an antilynching law. This is not only a field in which no additional good will be accomplished by the enactment of a Federal statute of doubtful constitutional validity, and perhaps completely unconstitutional, depending upon what kind of a bill is passed; but it is such a field, Mr. President and Members of the Senate, that just so sure as I am standing here and speaking to the Senate, much harm will be done by the passage of such a bill.

I do not have to tell the intelligent Members of the Senate that the people of their States do not like to have compulsion applied to them when they are working to the top of their ability to accomplish a certain end, and, instead of commendation, find themselves subjected to criticism and the deprivation of some of their choice and most prized rights as American citizens. I do not have to tell Senators that the leadership of every decent citizen in their States, white and black, insisting on doing all the things which will avert these calamities, and doing them themselves to the very best of their ability, as is the case now, is far more potent and far more effective in preventing such occurrences as those to which reference has been made. I do not have to tell Senators that it is a tremendously powerful factor to have every governor in the South feel that he is upon his honor to see that decent treatment and lawful treatment is handed out to the members of the colored race who happen to be citizens of his State or happen, for the time being, to be transients there.

Mr. President and Senators, I say, after some little experience with this subject, that there is a terrific responsibility not only upon the chief executive of the State, but upon all the other law-enforcement officers, to see that a good and a clean record, which will stand up under the most searching investigation, shall be made in this field by the law-enforcement agencies and public officials in every Southern State. We have been trying for these last two or three decades, with all the strength we have, to do away with this thing, which is far more dangerous to us than it is to those of the North or to anyone outside the limits of our States.

Mr. President, I do not believe that anyone who has not been close to one of those events can realize either their terrible nature or the uncertainty, fear, and dread that come later, when everyone realizes that, something having been done which was tragically wrong and inhuman, repressed feelings somewhere are bound to find expression, perhaps 5 miles, 10 miles, 50 miles, a hundred miles, or even 1,000 miles away, because unfair and un-American treatment has been meted out. Such a situation is often provocative of a grave crisis in local governments.

I feel that anyone who has the slightest understanding, the slightest comprehension of the effort, and of the unanimity of that effort, on the part of the good people of both races, to bring an end to this thing in the South, should thank us and express his appreciation and pay his respects for a good job well done, instead of trying to create and foment more trouble by the passage of law which levels a gun from Washington at the head of their governor, at the head of their sheriffs, at the head of their attorney general, and other prosecutors, and which deprives them of the sound, solid footing they now have, based upon the desire to do the decent and human and the civilized thing. No better foundation can be placed under law-enforcement officials and the best citizens of both races of a State than the rock of good conscience, sound government, fair dealing, enabling them to handle affairs so impeccably that no citizen, whether he be white or black, can find anything to criticize.

Mr. President, I wish to say that the South feels that it is entitled to credit, and great credit, for what it has done in this particular field. There are many others besides myself in this body who have served as chief executives for a time by the suffrage of the people of their several States in the South. I have heard them express themselves. I know that they feel what I am now trying to say, that no more serious responsibility rests upon the shoulders and the heart and the conscience of a man assuming to act as governor, to serve his people as governor in a Southern State, than the responsibility to see that the courts are protected in the enforcement of the law, and that the thing called lynching shall cease to exist on the face of God's green earth, and particularly in those fair States which call themselves the South. We have made an enormous effort in that field. I was shocked during the time of my service as governor at the complete misunderstanding which is prevalent in other parts of the Nation about this matter.

I hesitate to bring up matters pertaining to me personally, but I think it is proper that I should do so. I did not hesitate to call out the State police corps, I did not hesitate to call out the road patrol and ask for the help of good citizens, and go myself and participate in the effort, on the three or four occasions when it was necessary to stop a threat of this kind of action of which we had

any foreknowledge or warning during the time I served as governor. And at once, Mr. President, we would begin to receive expressions of appreciation. We would receive such expressions not by the dozens, but by the hundreds, and I think it would be safe to say by the thousands, from persons and agencies outside the State.

But, Mr. President, to state the obverse of this situation, the peculiar thing is that the minute the law takes its course, the minute the criminal, often the self-confessed criminal, who has been protected by the law—even though it meant the expenditure of many thousands of dollars of State money to accomplish his protection—the minute he has had the benefit of the submission of his case to a court, and either been found guilty, after fair trial, or, as in most instances in such cases, in flagrant cases, has pleaded guilty, and the time has come, after appeal has been had, for the issuance of the warrant and the writ by which human life is taken away—and there is not any heavier responsibility than that which rests upon the conscience of a human being, governor or otherwise—the minute the law has taken its course, I have found that the same persons or agencies throughout the Nation which had previously commended us, or a large number of them, have indulged in censure and criticism. They had no knowledge whatever of the conditions existing with respect to the particular case. They were perfectly willing in the first place to commend the southern governor and the people of a Southern State for having done something which was nothing but plain duty in the first instance, but, after the law has taken its course, they come forward with charges that this, that, or the other thing, entirely improper, had been done, charges which no reasonable person in possession of his faculties, or having any knowledge whatever of the practice of the courts, could have ever believed. In such cases there would be telephone calls by the dozen, and telegrams by the hundreds, and those who made the calls or sent the telegrams would throw calumny and humiliation upon the name of the State and its officials. This criticism would come from those who previously had commended the State and its governor a few months ago, because, as they said, after the trial had taken place, there was a legal lynching, or something was being done which was not in accordance with the law, but in accordance with an effort to bring prejudice to bear and to punish where no punishment was due.

Mr. President, it is wholly impossible to bring this thing under the purview of Federal law and to have any impersonal, any objective, any wholly fair and just handling of the problem, because it simply happens to be the case that so many good people outside the South do not understand and apparently do not want to understand what is the situation there on such occasions as the ones which I have mentioned.

So, Mr. President, it is not for me to make threats, because whenever the law is passed I am going to support it, and, just as I have been out night and day on more occasions than one, standing between an accused person and a mob which was trying to take him, I shall not hesitate to do so again.

This problem cannot be solved by law. It requires intestinal fortitude and a willingness to do the right thing. If we want the question handled well, we must let it repose in the judgment and conscience of the American people, including the people of both races who live in the South. They are doing a good job of it. They have accomplished a great deal, in the face of almost insuperable obstacles. They have kept reasonably pure the stream of blood of both races in their racial integrity, in the troublesome years since 1865. They are entitled to a great deal of credit.

I wonder how many Senators have been to some of our neighboring countries, particularly in Central America, where there is no color line, where there is no purity of stock, where everything is a mixture, a hybridization, and a mongrelization. I wonder if Senators have had time to think about what the South would be like now if after 1865 there had not been the desire and the determination on the part of good white people, and good colored people as well, to preserve the integrity of their own race, in real pride of their own race and its achievements, and in the hope that they would be allowed to go forward to equal opportunity, equal education, equal health advantages, and equality before the law, to which they are entitled.

A while ago I stated that the South is willing to assume a reasonable attitude, and not a legalistic position. Very few Senators were present yesterday afternoon to listen to the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY]. One could not listen to him without realizing that he is very proud not only of the record of his State but the record of the South as a whole. I am proud for him, and for the Old North State, and for the good people of that State. He related the things which have been accomplished by way of giving opportunity for advancement and recognition to the people of the colored race, as well as to the people of the race to which he and we belong. He is proud of the achievement in the field of decency, impartiality, and even-handed justice in the grand old State of North Carolina.

In substance, this is what he was saying: "Here is the kind of record we are making down there. Do you see anything like that in other parts of the country where this problem is beginning to exist in a greater degree than in past years? Is there anything to show that you are handling it under your system better than we are handling it under ours?" He was willing to match performances. Senators will remember what he said about the school question.

I should like to inject a figure at this point in connection with the opportunities in schooling under the segregated system of instruction which applies in Southern States and a few others, and under the nonsegregated system which applies in the rest of the Nation. Senators will remember that last year in one of the debates I introduced a report from the Library of Congress. I take the liberty of referring to it now simply to cite certain figures.

That report showed that in the States where segregation in education applies much greater opportunity for recognition and advancement is given to the Negro educator than is found in other States. Yesterday the Senator from North Carolina gave the figures for the State of North Carolina. I give the overall figures again, simply by way of a comparative showing as to what is occurring in the segregated part of the Nation as compared with what is occurring elsewhere in this field.

The report from the Library of Congress showed that 7 out of every 1,000 Negroes in the South, where segregation in education prevails, are professional people in education, either at the level of humble teachers, principals, professors in colleges, or presidents of colleges. That report showed that, compared with the figure of 7 out of every 1,000, only 1 out of every 1,000 Negroes in the rest of the Nation had comparable opportunity and recognition, or had become professional teachers. In other words, the opportunity was 7 to 1 as between the system in the South, under which we are making such strides, and the system in the North, under which, apparently, there is nothing to appeal to the Negro who wants to qualify for a life-long profession in the teaching of his fellows. The opportunity is 7 to 1.

But the opportunity is better than that in favor of the segregated system, as was brought out in the hearings before the Judiciary Committee. It was shown that there was not a single Negro president of a college in the nonsegregated area of the Nation, as compared with nearly 200 in the southern section. In other words, there is opportunity for advancement in the South. There is opportunity for men who really have the ability to give to the job to enter the field of education in the South. They can make their way up the ladder and become college presidents. They are recognized as men and women of great ability and character, who have done much for their people, and are doing much for the Nation.

The difference does not end there. There is another very material difference between our system and the system in the rest of the Nation, which operates wholly to the advantage and prestige of our system. Under the system of segregation in education a Negro teacher is given the opportunity to work exclusively with the people of his own race for their advancement, for the increase of their standard of living, and for the improvement of their standard of health. He is given the opportunity to do something for his people in a way which makes him or her a person of prestige, with recognition among the colored people of the community in which he or she may be serving.

That situation does not prevail in many places in the rest of the Nation. The whole picture in the field of education is entirely in favor of the system which we have. We are willing to compare results in that field. We should be.

There is another field in education which I wish to mention. I refer to the superior ability of the South, under its system of education, to meet probably the most critical need for education which exists among the Negroes—and, incidentally, it is just about as critical a need among the white people—for the training of more doctors, dentists, and nurses. To quote very briefly from the figures produced in the hearings and the tables placed in the RECORD last year, let me cite one set of figures on this point, because I think that will be enough. They are the figures for last year. They represent the facts of last year, and not this year. I would not pretend that they have been brought up to date.

Those facts and figures showed that all the medical schools in the country outside of the South, where segregation exists, had in training to become doctors only 86 Negro youths. I see the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] nodding approval. I believe he is the one who first introduced that fact into the RECORD during the debate last year. I assure him that I am not plagiarizing, but I thought that this point in the debate would be a proper place for the introduction of this set of facts.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Inasmuch as the Senator has brought up the question of regional schools, I wonder if he has noticed in the press within the past day or two accounts of the progress which has been made by the Southern States with reference to regional education for both the white and colored races in medical schools, despite the fact that those who now are advocating the so-called civil-rights measures defeated a resolution on the floor of the Senate to permit the Southern States to enter into an educational compact. The figures, which have been released within the past few days, show that various States are providing for the attendance of white medical students at medical schools or dental schools in other States, in cases in which the States from which those students come do not have medical schools or dental schools of their own, and are making exactly the same arrangements for Negro students. As I recall the figure, the amount allowed was $1,500 for each student, and it was applied identically to the white students and the Negro students alike. I wonder whether the Senator from Florida has seen those figures, and whether he can give them in more detail than I have stated them.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for his question. I have seen those figures. I cannot from memory give them in detail.

I am glad to say that the Senator's question is based upon the facts, but I am sorry to state that his question is based upon the fulfillment of a very limited field of operations which is left for the application of this regional school idea in the South, because of the failure of Congress to approve the Southern Regional Education Compact.

In explanation of that statement, let me say that the only developments which have been possible have been to utilize more fully and up to their full limits the capacities of institutions already operating; but no State has yet shown any willingness, nor do I think any State will or should show such willingness, to pledge millions of dollars of State money for the construction of new physical facilities, in the form of new buildings, laboratories, and the like, for the needed scientific and graduate schools—I mention those fields particularly—until there is a firm foundation upon which to build, because there is no assurance that the legality of the structure will be upheld by the Congress, and there is every reason to know that sooner or later some disgruntled citizen will raise the question. By the blind and short-sighted attitude taken by some Members of the Senate—for it will be remembered that the House of Representatives passed this measure—we in the South are thus precluded from developing the idea of regional education to anything like the degree to which it is possible of fulfillment.

Mr. President, I finish my answer to the Senator by saying that I sincerely hope that upon seeing the pledge of serious intention on the part of the South, which is being given to the limit of our ability under existing law, the Senate will review and reconsider its decision of last year, and will agree that this compact shall have the approval of Congress, so that the Southern States may then begin the enlargement physically or the construction anew of some badly needed institutions of higher learning, particularly in the scientific and medical fields and in the field of graduate work. I thank the Senator for his question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wonder whether the Senator from Florida, who has been making a very masterful presentation of this subject, can verify the statement which I have seen, that, despite the fact that through a great part of the country there are what are supposed to be nondiscrimination and nonsegregation in schools, yet to the States in the South, which do have segregation in their schools, more Negroes are returning to attend college in completely segregated Negro colleges than there are Negroes who attend the colleges in all the Northern States combined.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for his question. I happen to know that in the fields of medical and dental training he is absolutely correct, and I believe what he has mentioned to be true in other fields, although I do not have the figures as to them.

Mr. President, to recur to the question of medical education, I believe I just stated that the figures for last year show that 86 Negro youths were enrolled for medical training in all medical colleges in the Nation outside the South. As against that number, between 1,000 and 1,100 Negro youths were enrolled for medical training in the two medical schools—the Medical School at Howard University, here in the District of Columbia; and Meharry Medical College, at Nashville, Tenn.—where the Negro boy is given a chance to qualify to bring to his people the ministrations of mercy which are only possible through the acquisition of training in the medical field.

I may say to the Senator from Alabama—and I thank him for bringing up this subject—that I had a most interesting contact in this matter during the Democratic convention at Philadelphia last summer, when I was there. I was asked to appear on a television hook-up to discuss briefly some of the matters pertaining to the so-called civil-rights program, and incidentally the question of the regional-education compact was brought up. It has no place at all in this civil-rights argument, but it was brought up. I stated there, over the television—and what I stated was true, because it was so shown by the record—that the great medical school on the campus of the University of Pennsylvania, within the confines of the city of Philadelphia, had only one Negro youth enrolled for training in medicine. Not only was I called immediately by the interlocutor and master of ceremonies, who quickly satisfied himself that my statement was true; but upon returning to my hotel, I found that numerous other citizens in Philadelphia had no idea that such a situation was true; and some called to question and to criticize, but others called to say that after having gotten the facts they were simply astounded that that was the case. That does not mean that discrimination is to be found in that great institution. To the contrary, someone there told me that for every student admitted to that school, from 10 to 14 others, beyond the capacity to be accepted, were applying for admission, but of course the school had to accept those who were best trained and who could show the best results from examinations or who could otherwise show the best results from their under-graduate work in college. It simply works out that not only in that great institution but in many other institutions there is scarcely any place for the Negro youth.

In the course of the hearings last year, we had a letter—and I now see on the floor of the Senate the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]—from the University of California, at Los Angeles, the letter having been written either by the dean or the assistant dean of the medical school of that university. I do not recall which one sent the letter, but it was printed in the hearings and in the debates last year. In answering an inquiry as to whether Negroes were enrolled at that medical school, he stated that they wanted some Negro students, and that they had a large number of applicants from among the Negro youth, but that their screening had to be applied to them, just as to any other applicants; and that so far—at least, for a period of years; I am not sure he meant always—they had not been able to find qualified Negro youths to come into their student body, although they wanted some Negro students in the medical school; and they suggested that Meharry Medical College send some of the best-qualified Negro youths who had applied to it

for admission, and had been admitted, to the University of California at Los Angeles, so that the University of California might have a chance to develop a program whereby both white and Negro students would be on the campus at the same time. That is the situation; there can be no question or doubt about it.

Next, I wish to bring up the other point mentioned by the Senator from Alabama, which is that at the same time there were a great many more Negro students attending medical college at Howard University, in Washington, D. C., and also attending Meharry Medical College, at Nashville, than there were attending the University of Pennsylvania Medical School and the women's college of medicine—I have forgotten what its name is—in Philadelphia, and also attending the Pittsburgh Medical School, which were the three medical schools in the State of Pennsylvania where any Negroes were then enrolled. There were a great many more Pennsylvania youth of that race enrolled that year at Meharry, and a great many more Pennsylvania youth that year enrolled at Howard than were being trained at all the Pennsylvania medical schools together, including the University of Pennsylvania and the other medical schools in that great State. The Senator is entirely correct that segregation in education has meant in practical terms, in the terms of opportunity to youth, a great deal more in connection with opportunity for the ambitious Negro youth who wants to serve his people by securing medical training; it has furnished much more medical training and much greater opportunity than it has been possible for them to acquire in other parts of the Nation.

So, Mr. President, there is another comparison or contrast between a better job being done in the South under the peculiar system which we follow in the South than is being done in other sections. I am not criticizing them. I would not for a great deal want to have my statement construed as a charge that discrimination is being employed in such schools as the University of Pennsylvania Medical School; I would not believe that, unless it were clearly proved to me, and I do not believe it. I have the same feeling about the Harvard Medical School where last year only one Negro was enrolled; but the competition is so severe that they cannot find any practical opportunity except by coming to the segregated schools designed to train Negro youth; and unfortunately we have too few of them, with too few facilities, in the South. I think we should be allowed greatly to enlarge those facilities out of our own money, out of our own public southern money, just as quickly as it is possible for the Compact to be confirmed and approved by the Congress, so that the needed millions of dollars which have to be expended in order to construct facilities for a medical or dental school may be safely provided by the States of the South.

Mr. President, we got into this discussion while I was talking about the antilynching bill. I want to say again in my judgment the trouble is we are talking in legalistic terms. The folks who want an antilynching bill are unwilling to face the practical facts, to make the exact comparison or contrast, such as we of the South are willing to make in all these fields. Instead, they think the passage of a law will take care of the situation, and they are unwilling to realize that we are dealing with a field which is not susceptible to control and to being worked out on a decent, humanitarian, civilized basis through the passage or attempted enforcement of Federal laws. What we of the South have done is to accentuate the real cure for such tragic situations as have occurred in the past, by intensifying our efforts to secure greater fairness, more complete justice, equal opportunity, practical Christianity, better understanding, greater patience, more good will, enlarged mutual respect—all coupled with the sincere desire of good citizens of both races to preserve racial integrity and race pride, and steadily to increase the opportunity afforded to all races by all units of government. We are steadily and rapidly solving in the South this problem which was left with our fathers and mothers for solution in 1865. We are solving it upon the broad human basis I have just mentioned, and for the permanent maximum welfare of both races.

I desire to throw out a challenge to Senators who are inclined to think that the so-called civil rights program is good law and should be passed. I want them to review the situation a little and to realize that it is not the passage of a bill by a majority, coming not from the area which understands the problem, not from the citizenship which will have to agree to the enforcement of the bill, but coming instead from the whole Nation, of which various parts have little comprehension of the problem; and that it is not by the mere passage of such a bill that the problem is solved.

This is a problem in human living, one of the vastest problems of the kind the world has ever known. We, in that great part of the Nation extending from Kansas City to Miami and from Baltimore to the Rio Grande, have over 45,000,000 people, according to the 1940 census, of whom more than 34,000,000 are white, and a little more than 10,000,000 are colored. We are living together in every possible admixture—I am not talking about racial miscegenation at all, but a mixture as to the locality of our homes and as to the type of our working and serving together and we are doing so humbly, we are doing so peacefully, and we are doing so, by and large, in the very sincere and mutual and lasting and consistent effort to bring better opportunities and to bring fair treatment to both races and to make our States just as fine States as they can be made. We realize that if the white people alone prosper our States cannot attain to anything like their potential effectiveness and strength, and likewise, if the colored people alone prosper, full development cannot be attained. We know that to accomplish the desired result it takes both of them going ahead as Americans, working together in the extension of opportunity each to the other, and in seeing that they both get fair treatment before the law, but always consistent with that prime ideal and objective, which I think is sound, and that is, that the racial integrity of each race must be preserved, and that social admixture which would tend to break down racial integrity must be avoided, so that social integrity and the purity of the bloodstream of the two races may be safeguarded.

Mr. President, I think one of the things that shows how legalistic at least some are who are pushing this program is what might be referred to as the first recommendation, the recommendation numbered 1, of the President's Committee on Civil Rights. Here in the Senate we may think—some Senators who come from States where the problem does not exist may think sincerely—that the question of enforcement will take care of itself and that there is no serious difficulty involved. I digress long enough to remind Members of the Senate that the two Senators who were most vocal last year in discussing the subject from the standpoint of upholding the civil-rights program and of enacting it into law—and I have respect for both of them; they are entitled to their opinions and they are entitled to voice their opinions on the floor of the Senate—by reason of the very fact that they have had no chance to understand what it means to have great white and colored populations mingled together, are not in a position to understand the implications of this problem. One of those Senators was the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. The Senate may remember that during one of his debates on the subject—and again I do not question his sincerity—it came out upon questions from the junior Senator from Florida, that the Census of 1940 showed the State of North Dakota had at that time 201 Negro citizens as found by the Census enumerators.

The other Senator who was most forceful in his manner was the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] who is a very distinguished Senator in his ability in many fields. But it was brought out that under the census returns for 1940 in the great State of Oregon there was no problem of this kind of any consequence, because there were only 2,500 Negro citizens in the State of Oregon in 1940.

Mr. President, in my own case, by way of illustration—and I hope it will not be regarded as improper again to refer to my own situation—I come from a small town of approximately 10,000 people. It is a good town. It was built by good people, whether white or colored. They are friendly, living together in peace and harmony and helping each other. There are more Negroes in that small town than there are in the two States so ably represented by the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from Oregon. My little town of 10,000 population is only 1 of many such towns. Of course there are some fairly large cities in my State, which has a total population of approximately 2,400,000, according to the latest census estimate. The States which really have the problem know something about its solution, and it is unfortunate that, for some reason which I cannot comprehend, well-meaning Senators who represent States which do not have the

problem are not willing to rely either upon the soundness of experience or the sincerity of convictions of their brethren from those States which have the problem and who have worked so tremendously in an effort to solve it fairly under a truly American pattern.

So, Mr. President, what I started to present to the Senate at this stage was the fact that there are some persons who realize that the enforcement of any law on these subjects passed by Congress really involves something vastly different, not only from anything we now have, but vastly different, I think, from anything that fits into the truly American pattern of law enforcement.

I read now from the well-known volume entitled "To Secure These Rights," being the report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights. I am reading from pages 151 and 152, Recommendation I:

To strengthen the machinery for the protection of civil rights, the President's Committee recommends:

1. The reorganization of the Civil Rights Section of the Department of Justice to provide for:

The establishment of regional offices:

A substantial increase in its appropriation and staff to enable it to engage in more extensive research and to act more effectively to prevent civil-rights violations;

An increase in investigative action in the absence of complaints;

It does not say, Mr. President, in the presence of complaints, but it wants to set up a gestapo to go about and probe into the lives of persons in the communities in that part of the Nation where that set-up would be applicable.

An increase in investigative action in the absence of complaints.

THE GREATER USE OF CIVIL SANCTIONS

Some of the general methods they suggest are, for instance, the tying up of appropriations for experiment stations, for our land-grant colleges, and our public-health services, unless we, forsooth, yield to the demand that our long-established policy of segregation shall no longer prevail.

That is what is meant by the greater use of civil sanctions.

Lastly:

Its elevation to the status of a full division in the Department of Justice.

Mr. President, here is textually the treatment given to this matter by this able committee, two members of which come from the South, as I recall, and they are out of accord with some of the strongest recommendations contained in the report. I read further:

The creation of regional offices would enable the Civil Rights Section to provide more complete protection of civil rights in all sections of the country.

Listen well to this, Mr. President and Senators. It means to set up, for instance, at Atlanta or Birmingham a regional office to deal with States in the southeastern section of the country.

It would lessen its present complete dependence upon United States attorneys and local FBI agents for its work in the field.

Mr. President, do I detect a note of suspicion on the part of those who wrote this report that they will not rely upon the United States attorneys who were named by the President of the United States and confirmed by the Senate of the United States to serve fairly, impartially, and effectively in this important field? Let me read that again:

It would lessen its present complete dependence upon United States attorneys and local FBI agents for its work in the field. Such regional offices should be established in eight or nine key cities throughout the country, and be staffed with skilled personnel drawn from the local areas. These offices should serve as receiving points for complaints arising in the areas, and as local centers of research, investigation, and preventive action. Close cooperation should be maintained between these offices, local FBI agents, and the United States attorneys.

I go back and quote a few words again:

These offices should serve as receiving points for complaints arising in the areas, and as local centers of research, investigation, and preventive action.

Preventive action, Mr. President and Senators.

Close cooperation should be maintained between these offices, local FBI agents, and the United States attorneys.

The Department of Justice has suggested that heads of these regional offices should have the status of assistant United States attorneys, thereby preserving the centralization of Federal criminal law enforcement.

Do Senators begin to see what is involved here? They want attorneys who can go before Federal juries in Federal courts, who do not have to be named from the areas affected at all, and who can be entirely removed from the suspicious influence of having to deal and work with the local district attorneys.

Thereby preserving the centralization of Federal criminal law enforcement.

Centralization is something from which we are trying to get away. It does not bring the desired results. It does not follow the American pattern, and is exactly the thing we do not want. Yet that seems to be the key word in this remarkable report.

The President's committee is fearful that under this plan the goal of effective, courageous, and nonpolitical civil rights protection in the field will not be reached unless satisfactory measures are taken to prevent these assistants from becoming mere political subordinates within the offices of the United States attorneys.

Could it be any clearer that what they are talking about is a law-enforcement officer not answerable to the people of that area, not coming from that area, necessarily, not conversant with the problems in that area or sympathetic toward them? They want to divorce his responsibilities entirely from the district attorneys chosen from various districts in the area.

Additional funds and personnel for research and preventive work would free the civil-rights section from its present narrow status as a prosecutive agency. Through the use of properly developed techniques and by the maintenance of continuous checks on racial and other group tensions, much could be done by the section to reduce the number of lynchings, race riots, election irregularities, and other civil-rights violations. Troublesome areas—

I do not know what they were talking about there. I shall leave that to the imagination of the listener.

Troublesome areas, and the activities of organizations and individuals who foment race tensions could be kept under constant scrutiny.

What are they talking about, Mr. President? Are we in America? Are they talking about an American establishment for law enforcement? Are they not talking about something which, while it does not have the same name, is, just as truly as I am standing here, a Gestapo whose task it would be to keep under constant scrutiny "troublesome areas, and the activities of organizations and individuals who foment race tensions"?

Mr. President, if that is a typically American suggestion, if it dovetails with the American doctrine of law enforcement, then my some forty-odd years of work in the law, trying to serve a jealous mistress as well as I knew how, have been completely lost, because to my mind such a step as this is wholly at variance with and contradictory to the essence of any American law-enforcement program.

This is recommendation No. 1. It is the first one the able persons sitting upon this committee have felt would be necessary in order to secure some chance of enforcement of the laws which they recommend later to have passed.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Does it not occur to the Senator that these so-called troublesome areas would be much more troublesome after they were put under constant observation and subjected to constant enforcement of the laws by officers sent from afar?

Mr. HOLLAND. In answer to the question of the Senator from Louisiana I should like to say that I think he has gotten the drift of what I was discussing, because to my mind that would just as inescapably happen in Louisiana, Florida, or Georgia—and I see sitting before me the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia, who feels so deeply on this subject—as in California, in the event there were any such un-American set-up in an effort to control the troublesome Japanese question that is found there. I know the people of California are trying to control it to the best of their ability, and I know they can control it better than if we sent someone from Washington to try to tell them what to do, and tried to keep in close contact with them and attempted to control enforcement of the law. It simply will not work, and I cannot conceive of a Member of Congress who realizes that this is a fundamental suggestion of the whole group having any question in his mind as to the unreason of the whole unworkable mumbo jumbo.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. I wonder if the Senator would be of the opinion that these so-called troublesome areas, if put under such supervision and control, might require even further supervision and control, and the greater the number of Federal agents sent out to supervise and control, the more would have to be sent, until finally there would be a Federal army to control those so-called troublesome areas.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator's opinion is based on fewer years and blacker hair than I possess. I hope no such thing would occur, but it is certainly within the realm of possibility, and I think any such step in the field of law enforcement as this would be, set up and predicated upon the existence of such outside prosecutions as are spelled out here, and upon a heavy investigatorial staff—and special FBI training might be required of the units to be made available to the regional offices—to my mind would almost surely bring trouble with it. But I prefer not to cross that bridge at this time. I think that as a result of a presentation of the true aspects of this whole plan and program to the American people, and particularly to the American Senate, there will come a calm, reasonable and a judicial solution of this problem, and that the solution must inescapably be that we will have nothing of such a hopelessly and wholly un-American program as is projected, only a small part of which I have read.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. EASTLAND. Will the Senator tell me what one factor more than anything else is responsible for the power of the United States Senate, a power that has existed for good throughout the life of the Republic?

Mr. HOLLAND. There is only one possible answer, namely, the existence of the right and privilege, the rare and rich and unspeakably valuable privilege——

Mr. EASTLAND. And duty.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of unlimited debate upon the floor of the Senate.

Mr. EASTLAND. Will the able Senator yield for another question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Would the Senator say that the pending resolution if adopted would destroy the power of the Senate of the United States?

Mr. HOLLAND. I think the resolution as reported would be an opening wedge toward its destruction, and would be much more than the small first step that is mentioned in the words of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. In the event of the adoption of majority cloture, which I think would come, either in this debate or very shortly afterward, I agree with the verdict that is implicit in the question of the Senator from Mississippi, that majority cloture would mean the destruction of the prestige and effectiveness of the Senate to do the job it was created to do. What was that? To stand and stand and stand, and fight and fight and fight, for the rights of the States and of minorities, and to make sure that here, if at no other place in all the Nation, the minorities and the weak would have a rock of refuge to which they could come, and where they could find succor.

Mr. EASTLAND. Then, would not the Senator from Florida say that the adoption of the resolution would be a long step forward toward the destruction of the power of the United States Senate?

Mr. HOLLAND. My answer is that I do, conclusively, finally, feel that the adoption of the resolution just as it is reported from the committee would be such a step and would be followed by others more harmful and more destructive. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, there is much more of the same sort of stuff in this report, but there is only one other thing to which I wish to refer that is not included in the elements of the so-called civil-rights program which are customarily discussed, and which are thought to be awaiting the adoption of the proposed cloture rule so that they can be rammed through. I refer to recommendation 10, found on page 163 of the report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights.

I am not only bringing up this recommendation because I think it is so hopelessly wrong, because I think it is such a terrible trouble maker, but I am bringing it up in order to report to the Senate, and, through the Senate, to the people of the United States, an actual incident which occurred in my home in Florida during the past summer, when I was approached by a very fine old colored man, who is a good and honorable citizen, and who was in great trouble because he had heard about this particular provision being included in the civil-rights program.

This particular recommendation, No. 10, on page 163, reads as follows:

> 10. The enactment by Congress of legislation providing that no member of the armed forces shall be subject to discrimination of any kind by any public authority or place of public accommodation, recreation, transportation, or other service or business.

Mr. President, they are not talking merely about riding in railroad trains, they are talking here about all places of public accommodation, public recreation, and public transportation, or other service or business. Of course, the objective, the well-meaning objective, that lies behind that recommendation, is a feeling that the wearing of the uniform of the United States Government is such an accolade for the individual who is privileged to wear it, who is responsible for good conduct while he wears it and is rendering unselfish service to his Government, whether his skin is white or black, that he should be entitled, and should be allowed, to break down and to violate at will, and to pay no attention to, barriers which are put up by State governments and local governments in respect to the question of segregation, and which are founded upon long experience, great wisdom, much trouble in the past, and pleasant living in the present, and upon hopeful plans for the future in which the two races shall go forward in even greater prosperity and good will together. I think I can understand why such a suggestion should be made; but it is a trouble-maker if there ever was a recommendation made which was full of trouble.

I desire to tell the Senate what happened in my own case with reference to this particular recommendation. Shortly after I returned home last fall I had a call from a very fine old colored citizen. I had known him for a very long time. I respected him highly. He is an honorable man. He has a nice home, well painted, with a yard well-kept. His family is well dressed. He is well-behaved himself, and so is his family. He is surrounded by his children, who have settled close around him, and they have similar homes. He has grandchildren, I do not know how many, because Senators must know that our Negro citizens are prone to have large families, and it is well that they should. They love their homes and they love their families.

This man came to me in trouble. He said, "Judge—" and Senators must know that once a man is a judge, even if he is only a justice of the peace, he is always known as a judge, he is addressed as "Judge" for the rest of his life in the community in which he lives. He said, "Judge, I am troubled, and I should like to discuss my trouble with you." I invited him into my office, and he sat down and came to the point very quickly. He said, "Judge, some of our people over there in our chamber of commerce, and in our local groups, and at the church, have been telling me that part of the President's civil rights program is the requirement that any soldier or sailor or marine, anyone in the uniform"—I do not remember how he expressed it—"will be allowed to come into any place of public recreation or of public accommodation, regardless of whether or not it is designed to be used exclusively by the white people or by the colored people." He said, "Is there any truth in that?"

I had to tell him that there was. I got out my volume of this report from which I have just read, a volume which I keep at home, and I read to him the particular paragraph I have read to the Senate, and we discussed it a little bit. Then finally this is what he said to me, and not I to him. This is what was on his mind before he came to see me, and I did not suggest it to him. He said, "Judge, that just wouldn't work. Don't you know it wouldn't work?" I said, "Why do you think so?" "Why," he said, "you know that would mean that the white boys in uniform would come over and stay at our little boarding house, and come over and play pool at our pool rooms, come over and bowl at our bowling alleys, dance on our dance floors, eat at our restaurants, and" he said, "Judge, you know that wouldn't do." He said, "You know the kind of white soldiers or sailors that would come over there would be the ones whose ideas would not always be right." He said, "The first thing you know one of them would insult one of our colored girls, would lay his hands on her. One of them would act unfriendly to some of our colored boys, would act offensively, and," he said, "that would start trouble."

He said, "Judge, don't let them do this, because you know and I know that it is not those folks right there who are going

to suffer in the long run, but it is the decent, respectable, God-fearing people, white and black, that live in these communities, and particularly our people of the Negro race, who want nothing more than to live in peace and to enjoy our opportunities, which we are enjoying in ever greater measure all the while." The old man actually had tears rolling down his face, so tremendously was he impressed with the seriousness of a situation which I confess had never occurred to me in the first instance.

Yes, Mr. President, we, too, often think about things in terms of our own selves, of our own race, of our own color, of our own problems. I had thought about the situation from the standpoint of the possibility of some colored soldiers coming from other parts of the country trying to claim accommodations at a white hotel or a white restaurant, and that probably such a thing might bring on difficulties. But it had never once occurred to me—and I suspect it has never once occurred to many Senators listening to me now—that the other side of the situation also exists, and that it is fraught with a problem of the most severe implications, implications particularly hurtful and harmful and objectionable and dangerous to the law-respecting and the God-fearing and the decent colored people, of whom we have millions and millions throughout the Southland.

That is the kind of foolishness that is in these recommendations. Many of them are unthought-out, unbalanced, unstable. They are not based on any possibility of being enforced locally. They are based instead upon the necessity, as shown by recommendation No. 1, of creating and setting up a Gestapo—whatever name it may be called, that is what it would be—of setting up and maintaining a federalized prosecuting service which would be completely removed from any control by the district attorney or by the citizens in the local areas affected. I believe the next thing those who made these recommendations would suggest would be to deprive our people of the right to trial by jury, because the suggestions which they make are almost as sweeping and terrific in their implications against the peace and sobriety and the calm and the chance to go ahead progressively in our southern communities, as they could possibly be made.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Mississippi for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. Would the FEPC deprive one charged by the Commission of the right of trial by jury? Is not that already proposed?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, that is, of course, in the proposal, and I thank the Senator for suggesting it. I had not yet gotten down to the FEPC, because that subject was so beautifully and skillfully and comprehensively treated by the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] yesterday afternoon, that I was leaving it only for passing mention. But I will come right now to the FEPC.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Louisiana for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. In view of what seems to be such a complete lack of understanding of the problems of the South, as shown by the proposal which the Senator read from the book as to how certain rights were to be secured, would the Senator feel that there is any substantial number of members on the Civil Rights Committee responsible for the report, who had an actual close-hand knowledge and understanding of the problems of the section of the country most vitally affected by the recommendations?

Mr. HOLLAND. The answer of course is no. Only two members of the commission, as I recall—perhaps there were three, but I think there were only two—came from the South. I believe those two refused to join in some of the recommendations. The book does not say that they declined to join, but I understand they did not join in some. I have no definite information, however, on that subject. It is quite apparent that they made an effort to do what I am sure was an appealing job to certain people. I would not question their motives, but I should question their knowledge, experience, and judgment concerning conditions which have to do with the intimate living together of 45,000,000 people in that great portion of the Nation which we call the South. I believe they do not have the faintest conception of the problems of people living together in the way we have and of solving many problems as fully as we have solved them. We hope to solve them even better as we go forward.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. EASTLAND. Can the Senator tell me whether or not, in the investigation or in the preparation of that report, any southern governor, any southern Senator, any southern Representative, or any southern public official or leader was consulted, or whether the views of any such person were sought before those recommendations were made?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sorry that I cannot answer that question. I cannot give the Senator that information. I do not know. It is my judgment that if any southern governor, Senator, or Member of the House was consulted, certainly he was not given the authority or opportunity to shape in any way the recommendations as they appear in the report.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it not obvious that if the advice or recommendations of any southern leader, or anyone else who knew the problem first-hand, were sought, such advice and recommendations were ignored?

Mr. HOLLAND. My feeling is that the report certainly does not follow any suggestion or recommendation that could possibly have come from any informed southern person.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. EASTLAND. Were any responsible southern leaders members of that committee?

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will bear with me a moment, I will see if I can find the names of the members of the committee in the report.

The names which are signed to the report, without showing the places of residence of the persons bearing the names, are as follows:

Charles E. Wilson, chairman. We all know who he is.

Mr. EASTLAND. Who is he?

Mr. HOLLAND. He is chairman of General Electric, is he not?

Sadie T. Alexander.

James B. Carey.

John S. Dickey.

Morris L. Ernst.

Roland B. Gittelsohn.

Frank P. Graham. He is president of the University of North Carolina.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. EASTLAND. Would the Senator say that Dr. Frank Graham is a representative southerner, or represents the viewpoint of the South?

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will permit me, I will simply say that in my judgment many of his views do not comport with what I regard to be sound southern philosophy.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield first, for a question only, to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. With due regard to Dr. Graham, and not taking issue with him, would the Senator say that he is a representative southerner?

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will allow me to somewhat shade my answer, I will say that he is a highly regarded educator, that he is regarded as ultra-liberal, that he is regarded as on the "pinkish" side, and that he is regarded as not at all conversant, in a sound way, with the true traditions of the South. Yet I think he is very highly regarded for some of his attainments. I recall that last year, when some question arose about the participation of Dr. Frank P. Graham as a member of this committee, the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] made a statement on the floor of the Senate to which I listened with care, and which I read later. I believe that if the Senator will address his question to the senior Senator from North Carolina he will address it to a much better informed source than is the junior Senator from Florida.

Mr. EASTLAND. I am not trying to disparage Dr. Graham in any way; but would the Senator say that Dr. Graham represents the viewpoint of the South?

Mr. HOLLAND. My answer is that he does not represent what I think is sound southern philosophy and the southern approach to racial questions.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. If he does not represent the viewpoint of the South, would the Senator say that he is a representative southerner?

Mr. HOLLAND. From that standpoint alone, my answer would be "No"; but I think he has done much good work, and that he is so recognized. My observation of educators leads me to believe that we cannot apply exactly the same standards to them that we apply to other people. They are inclined to be idealistic. They are inclined to be impractical. It may be well that they are of that tendency. At any rate, many of them are, and the Senator knows that as well as I do.

To continue reading the list of names:

Francis J. Haas.
Charles Luckman.
Francis P. Mathews.
Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr.
Henry Knox Sherrill.
Boris Shishkin.
Dorothy Tilly.
Channing Tobias.

That completes the list.

Mr. President, I was about to undertake the FEPC discussion, on which I shall be very brief, because the Presiding Officer and Members of the Senate have been very patient. I dislike to take so long. If my strength permitted, I could take a great deal longer, merely by reading the provisions of the charters of the several States. Those provisions have very close germaneness to one of the questions which I discussed this afternoon. I do not wish to impinge unduly on the time or patience of the Senate.

Before entering upon the discussion of the FEPC, I should like to make a blanket statement.

In my judgment the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] yesterday afternoon, and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] in his discussion beginning this debate, said many things which I think are sound. In my opinion everything they said was sound. I should like to associate myself with those distinguished Senators, Southerners, and Americans in their expressions with reference to the un-American and hopelessly impracticable device of FEPC, designed, as it is, to invade the private rights of citizens and to attempt to control the preference of individual Americans in the selection of their own associates and employees.

I also thoroughly approve of another portion of the statement made by the Senator from North Carolina yesterday, in which he so clearly and affirmatively showed the great good which has come to North Carolina by reason of its moderate, temperate, fair, just, and Christian handling of the race question in that great State.

I should like to read one expression from the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] on this point, because I think it is applicable not only to the FEPC situation, but also to other proposals in the so-called civil-rights program, or that portion of it which is aimed at the South.

I digress long enough to say that I feel that all of us are prone to forget the fact—I am sure that I am—that there are some proposals in the so-called civil-rights program which have no application directly to the South, and which are fair, and in my opinion honorable. I should like to see them carried out. The Presiding Officer and other Senators have heard me on various occasions speak out in favor of home rule in the District of Columbia. I believe that many Senators know my attitude with reference to the addition of further States to the Union. There are other questions involved in the civil-rights program, and I do not want my statement of opposition to the civil-rights program to be regarded as all inclusive. I think it is misnamed a civil-rights program. My statement voices my objection to those parts of the program which tend to destroy or harmfully affect law enforcement in the South and our control of our own business and employment practices, as well as our control over our voting machinery and elections and primaries within the limits of our States.

Mr. President, I shall read a part of a paragraph from the able address of the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. It pertains not only to the FEPC program but also to a great deal of the rest of the so-called civil-rights program—in fact, in my judgment it pertains to all of it—which is aimed in a punitive way at the South. These are patient, moderate, and kind words; but they are patriotic words, coming from an experienced American, who not only has served his State with great distinction upon its Supreme Court, but also has become one of the most noble figures to adorn this Chamber that I have known in my lifetime. He said:

> Furthermore, Mr. President, I have long been of the opinion that some things in America cannot be settled by legislation.

How right, Mr. President—just as right as rain—is that statement, that there are things that can be solved by legislation, and then there are things that cannot be solved by legislation. In this field we are talking about things which cannot be solved by legislation.

When I consider the persons who are insisting upon a legalistic handling of this matter, because of their view that the passage of such laws will settle the whole problem, I wish we could get them to do what we in the South are willing to do—not to stand upon mere legal rights, but be willing to measure performance in their States against performance elsewhere—and where they find that performance in their States does not measure up to performance elsewhere, be willing to do speedily a better job; and admit that if they do not do it, ways and means must be found, under either their own State laws or under Federal laws, or both, to provide the machinery with which to do a better job.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. I ask the Senator whether it is a fact that because of the very suggestion of this type of question by southern Senators here the North itself has begun to wake up to some of its duties to its minorities, and based on that it is beginning to realize that it, too, just like the South, owes to its minorities the duty of working out problems of racial understanding, just as we in the South are doing?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should not like to indicate by my answer that I think their making of charges against us and their criticism of us has enabled them to see the beam in their own eye; but I would say that the good people of the North, like the good people of the South, do not want wrong things to continue to exist in their States; and they are doing, as they have always done, the things they consider good.

I am glad the Senator asked the question, because it gives me a chance to say something which I might not otherwise have said, namely, that we of the South have not had a great deal of money or a great deal of financial means and ability, and therefore we have frequently had to depend upon having our problems seen and understood by generously inclined and Christian-like persons of the North and elsewhere, who, seeing a problem existing in our part of the country, have been willing to help us by giving us of their substance, in an effort to enable us to solve that problem. Such a family was the Meharry family. Although I am not sure about this, my recollection is that they were Civil War soldiers who came south in blue uniforms, and saw what the situation would be with a great throng of millions of persons delivered from servitude into freedom over night; and they used their substance and means to furnish the small beginnings of the tremendous foundation fund which has made possible that great institution, Meharry Medical College, at Nashville. Incidentally, Mr. President, that medical college has trained more than 52 percent of all the doctors and dentists of the colored race since 1876. Perhaps that result might have been attained by means of some other effort; but, so far as I am concerned, I think the generosity of the original donors should be recognized, and I think the people of the South are happy and glad to recognize the foresight, generosity, and Christian feeling which existed and lay behind that gift, and thus made possible the beginnings of what is now a great institution of medical and dental and nursing training and service, Meharry Medical College.

I could continue to cite instance after instance of that kind, but I content myself by merely saying that in the course of the debates last year the showing was made—and it was freely and gratefully recognized by the Senators from the South who were requesting approval of the compact for regional education—that Meharry Medical College had been

able to keep its doors open and had been able to continue its training program for doctors and dentists and nurses of the future from among the colored race, in large part because certain great foundations in the North, which have been set up to serve in the fields of charities and Christian service, have been assuming the obligation of meeting the deficit which has had to be faced by Meharry Medical College. That deficit has run as high as $300,000 or $400,000 a year; but certain of the great foundations in the North to which I have referred have met that deficit, and have done so in order to keep the doors of Meharry Medical College open. Instance after instance of that kind has occurred; so not for a moment would I consider leveling any criticism at the people of the North or the people of the East or the people of the West. All of us have our problems, but all of us are trying to solve our problems; and all of us are Americans, and we believe in the American system and the American way of government.

It so happens that the distinguished junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], who now occupies the chair, comes from a State which we in the State of Florida like to refer to as our sister State, because it happens that we in Florida received the great and beneficial gift of membership in the Union under what is known as the Missouri Compromise, under which Iowa came into the Union as a free State at the same time when Florida entered the Union as a slave State. Iowa and the other States have been generous to us.

The little groups of agitators are the troublemakers. They are not working along the constructive paths which will lead to the results that all good persons wish to have achieved. If the agitators want desirable results achieved, they should stop what they are doing now and should realize the effect their activities will produce.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President will the Senator yield to me for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Louisiana for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator of the opinion that if all the so-called racial laws or laws of special applicability to the South were passed—such as the anti-lynching law and the FEPC law; and some persons would even choose to inject the issue of the anti-poll-tax law, which should not be a racial issue at all—that would satisfy these agitators; or is the Senator from Florida of the opinion that that would only give them, possibly, a multitude of additional ideas for additional Federal legislation which they would wish to impose or would seek to agitate about, based on such laws?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the answer to that question is to be found in the report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights, which contains 173 printed pages of findings and recommendations not only touching the three fields we have been discussing and the two additional ones I have mentioned, but also touching many, many other matters. I am sorry to have to report to the President of the Senate and to other Members of the Senate what I am sure, however, is known by some of them, namely, that in this field there are agitators who are so blind to the interests of the very minority groups from which they come, and which I am sure they are trying to serve, that they cannot see, for instance, the value of continuing Meharry Medical College as a great segregated institution of medical, dental, and nursing training. I was never more astonished in my life than when I heard witnesses, coming from the leading or largest organizations for the betterment of the affairs of the colored people, state at the hearing on the Regional Compact last year that they would rather have Meharry fold up than to have it continue as a segregated institution; and that in the face of the fact and after knowledge of the fact that the institutions outside the South were not doing the job and could not do it because of the tremendous competition which now exists and which will for some years exist in the matter of trying to obtain enrollment into a medical or dental school.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Louisiana for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. I ask the Senator if it would not be true that to a large extent a segregated school such as Meharry might be of great advantage to colored youths because, while under present circumstances they can go to medical schools over the entire United States, yet then they have to compete with young men who have had possibly a better basic education? At Meharry they at least have a school fitted for their particular and special needs, guaranteeing they will have a better opportunity to become capable doctors?

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, the Senator is correct. If the Senator had been here last year he would remember one of the most moving parts of the debate on the Regional Compact which came along when the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] who served as chairman of the Judiciary Committee, brought into the Chamber a great pile of letters, telegrams, and other communications from colored youth, most of them living in this country, but a few living in Liberia and other places in Africa, or in Jamaica, stating in the most pleading way they could possibly state it that their chance to fulfill their ambition to serve their peoples for the rest of their lives depended upon whether Meharry was kept open and going, because they could not get into other institutions. They stated they had tried to do so, but could not because of the existing competition. There were literally hundreds of such letters, if my memory serves me correctly.

The Senator is, of course, correct. But now to continue the reading of the statement, the able statement, the completely true statement, made moderately, patiently, firmly, and, I thought, with tremendous effect by the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]:

> Furthermore, Mr. President, I have long been of the opinion that some things in America cannot be settled by legislation. I have long been of the conviction that one of the great fallacies in America is that anything can be settled if only some legislature will pass an act to that effect. That cannot be true. In all proposed legislation which is even akin to the so-called fair employment practice measure, the effort is made to control the judgment, the emotions, the choice, and, if you please, the prejudices of our people. Prejudices may be ugly; they may be regrettable; but they cannot be controlled in that way.

Mr. President, that is just as true as gospel. The answer to the problem lies in continued and continuing and persevering work and effort and the expenditure of energy and devoted service as we try to create more and more understanding, more and more good will, more and more justice, better and better health conditions, better and better opportunities in education, better treatment in the matter of economic fairness and justice and the truly American treatment of one citizen by another, and of one group of citizens by citizens of another color. That must be mutual; and, by the way, it is mutual in the South, as applied to far more than 99 percent of the people of both colors among our citizenship.

[At this point, Mr. HOLLAND yielded to Mr. TYDINGS, who obtained unanimous consent to have considered and confirmed sundry routine nominations in the National Military Establishment. The action on the nominations appears at the conclusion of Mr. HOLLAND's speech.]

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Georgia for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Florida whether he knows that the President of the United States, at his press conference, held a few moments ago, came out strongly in favor of the imposition of gag rule in the Senate by simple majority vote, and whether he believes the adoption of such a rule as is suggested and supported by the President would not give the executive branch of the Government complete domination over the legislative and destroy the system of checks and balances upon which our forebears predicated our Government.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in answering solemnly and to the best of my ability, I should have to say that in my considered judgment the adoption of majority cloture and making it applicable to the deliberations of the Senate, is tantamount to the destruction not only of the prestige of the Senate but of its usefulness and ability effectively to carry out and perform the high functions and the high duties which were entrusted to it by the framing fathers and which are still in our hands and on our hearts as a

trust in behalf of all the people of the Nation.

Mr. President, I have discussed as briefly as I could—and I apologize for having taken so long—the first two reasons why I object to the motion; the first of them being that I could see implicit in the proposal the probability that majority cloture, and not two-thirds cloture, should be adopted.

Since I began to speak it appears that the picture is more clear on that point, from the announcement just made by the distinguished Senator from Georgia. I wish I had known about that announcement in time to have given it some consideration as I was reading from the column of Mr. David Lawrence and as I was addressing myself to earlier portions of my debate. But, Mr. President, I think the Senate has been greatly the gainer by the delay in my receiving the information, not only in the fact that my speech will be terminated more quickly, but in the much more important fact that the matter can be confidently left, and I do confidently leave it, for full exploration, discussion, and analysis by the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. President, the second ground of my objection to the adoption of the motion was that it was apparent that it was designed to pave the way for the passage of the three civil-rights measures most often mentioned, and of others which still repose within Pandora's box. I hope the Senator from Georgia will not have any feeling about my using his term in this regard.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Georgia for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the Senator if he does not know that the Senator from Georgia is honored when the distinguished Senator from Florida uses any expression which the Senator from Georgia has used?

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate very much that question, and I am glad it appears, from the floor of the Senate, that we southern Senators, and the southern people, whether they have anything else left or not, in the judgment of some of our friends, are at least still courteous, still friendly, and we still have deep affection for each other and for every other Senator with whom we serve, without any exception whatsoever.

Mr. President, the second ground upon which I oppose the adoption of the motion, I believe I stated briefly, was that it paves the way, it lays a predicate, for the adoption of a so-called civil rights program to which I am not only opposed, and which I think would not have merely a nugatory effect if adopted, but I think every element in that program would be deeply hurtful. It would roll back to an immeasurable degree, the progress made in the South. I am not voicing my own attitude alone or the attitude of southern Senators, educators, and other southern leaders of my race, but, when I make that statement, I am voicing the expression which has come to me through the years from innumerable leaders of the other race who agree implicitly with the way in which we are approaching the problem as being the sensible, sane, and successful way to approach it. If they were here they would want me to read over and over again the first sentence in the statement made by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and when I get through reading it there would be a chorus of "Amens" regardless of any rule of the Senate as to cloture or otherwise.

Mr. President, my third reason for opposing this motion is that I think the proposed rule, in itself, as reported by the committee, is hurtful, not only in that it may be merely a step to majority cloture now or in the future, not only in that it may be and will be a hopeful step toward the realization of the passage of the civil-rights program, but because, in and of itself, it helps to remove a bulwark which has proved its worth and dependability and usefulness. I do not want to see that done.

I shall not reiterate a great deal what I have said heretofore about the Senate having functioned ably and with ever-increasing prestige during more than 150 years without any cloture rule. The present cloture rule has proved effective, with the elapse of a little time, in some cases, in permitting the handling of legislation of every type that has been brought before the Senate, and only in stopping FEPC, anti-poll tax, and antilynch measures which have several times been proposed.

I think it is important to defeat this rule. It has been mellifluously stated by many that it is designed only to remedy a defect. Whether that be the fact or not, I am certainly opposed to the adoption of the resolution as reported, for the reason—and I think it is an all-inclusive one—that, in my judgment, it will simply strengthen the present cloture rule, and make it possible more often to still the voices of Senators, the voices of States, and the voices of minorities upon the floor of the Senate, because it will be so used.

I am not wise enough to be able to pierce the veil of the future, to be able to see what kind of issues will arise from time to time, but, Mr. President, I think it does not take a soothsayer, in our present complex world and in the face of the peculiar responsibility in which our Nation finds itself, regardless of whether it wants to be there, to know, without having knowledge of the precise nature of the issues which will occur, that many complex issues will be presented through the approaching months and years of which we have no present knowledge and as to which we could not have even an intimation at this time.

If it be desirable simply to have a rule which will preclude two or three or four, or even as many as ten obstreperous Senators from stopping the wheels whose turning is necessary for parliamentary procedure when our Nation is in an emergency situation, I am agreeable to adopting such a rule. I am agreeable to the one proposed by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. I think it would meet the tests and the standards in the event a handful of obstreperous Senators might be headed in the wrong direction and might be willing to abuse procedural processes in the Senate in a time of grave national emergency. I should be willing to agree to such a rule as that, and I think the whole group of southern Senators would agree to such a measure.

So let it not be charged to the Senators from the South that they want to do indirectly a most intolerable thing which they have never done directly, namely, to take an unpatriotic position on the floor of the Senate of the United States which would becloud the ability and stymie the capacity of our Nation to prepare for defense and to defend itself, or to make its vast strength count when we are in mortal combat with an aggressor against whom we must protect ourselves.

But, Mr. President, that is not what is proposed here. It is proposed, instead, to make the two-thirds cloture rule ironclad. I feel so strongly and so keenly about it that I want to make that the third separate point of my opposition to the adoption of the pending motion. Even if I knew that the resolution would pass as presented, even if I knew that no Senator would ever be so unwise as to try to amend it so as to provide for majority cloture, I still would stand and fight it, because I think it is fraught with dangers and uncertainties, in that it seeks to hedge about that last right which means so much to our States, our people, and our minorities, the right of untrammeled and unlimited free debate in the Senate, although it is not wholly unlimited or wholly untrammeled at the present time, because of the existence of rule XXII.

Mr. President, there is much I could say as to my own thoughts about this matter, but I saw in the Washington Post this morning a column entitled "Today and Tomorrow," by Mr. Walter Lippmann, who certainly knows something about America, who certainly knows something about our domestic and foreign policy, who certainly knows something about what constitutes true values in the American Government. I thought that that column was so fully expressive of my own feeling upon the subject matter we are considering that I am asking that it be included at this point, in toto, as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

FILIBUSTERS AND THE AMERICAN IDEA

(By Walter Lippmann)

Although the question before the Senate is whether to amend the rules, the issue is not one of parliamentary procedure. It is whether there shall be a profound and far-reaching constitutional change in the character of the American Government. The proposed amendment to rule XXII would enable two-thirds of the Senate to close the debate and force any measure, motion, or other matter to a vote. If the amendment is carried, the existing power of a minority of the States to stop legislation will have been abolished.

"Stripped of all mumbo-jumbo and flag waving," says the New York Times, "the issue is whether the country's highest legislative body will permit important measures to be kept from a vote through the activities of a few leather-throated, iron-legged Members who don't want democratic decision." This is an unduly scornful and superficial way to dispose of a great constitutional problem. For the real issue is whether any majority, even a two-thirds majority, shall now assume the power to override the opposition of a large minority of the States.

In the American system of government the right of democratic decision has never been identified with majority rule as such. The genius of the American system, unique I believe among the democracies of the world, is that it limits all power—including the power of the majority. Absolute power, whether in a king, a president, a legislative majority, a popular majority, is alien to the American idea of democratic decision.

The American idea of a democratic decision has always been that important minorities must not be coerced. When there is strong opposition, it is neither wise nor practical to force a decision. It is necessary and it is better to postpone the decision—to respect the opposition and then to accept the burden of trying to persuade it.

For a decision which has to be enforced against the determined opposition of large communities and regions of the country will, as Americans have long realized, almost never produce the results it is supposed to produce. The opposition and the resistance, having been overridden, will not disappear. They will merely find some other way of avoiding, evading, obstructing, or nullifying the decision.

For that reason it is a cardinal principle of the American democracy that great decisions on issues that men regard as vital shall not be taken by vote of the majority until the consent of the minority has been obtained. Where the consent of the minority has been lacking, as for example in the case of the prohibition amendment, the democratic decision has produced hypocrisy and lawlessness.

This is the issue in the Senate. It is not whether there shall be unlimited debates. The right of unlimited debates is merely a device, rather an awkward and tiresome device, to prevent large and determined communities from being coerced.

The issue is whether the fundamental principle of American democratic decision—that strong minorities must be persuaded and not coerced—shall be altered radically, not by constitutional amendment but by a subtle change in the rules of the Senate.

The issue has been raised in connection with the civil-rights legislation. The question is whether the vindication of these civil rights requires the sacrifice of the American limitation on a majority rule. The question is a painful one. But I believe the answer has to be that the rights of Negroes will in the end be made more secure, even if they are vindicated more slowly, if the cardinal principle—that minorities shall not be coerced by majorities—is concerned.

For if that principle is abandoned, then the great limitations on the absolutism and the tyranny of transient majorities will be gone, and the path will be much more open than it now is to the demagogic dictator who, having aroused a mob, destroys the liberties of the people.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I shall not read all the article, because I presume most of the other Senator have read it, and I hope they have been impressed by it, just as I have been, but I shall read some of it, because it seems to me that Mr. Lippmann, with his customary acumen, has really analyzed this subject matter, that he really calls a spade a spade, and really puts first things first in his treatment of this subject in his column of today.

The column is entitled, "Filibusters and the American Idea." I do not know what one means when he says "filibuster." If by filibustering one means that such a term applies to a Senator who, having the deepest possible convictions upon a subject, something he believes in, rises and tells what he hopes for his people and what he thinks about measures pending or threatening, and tells it moderately and inoffensively, but clearly, so that he can be understood, then I am guilty of filibustering. But if one means by filibustering some of the questionable procedures which sometimes have been carried on here, so far as I am concerned, I am having no part or portion in them. I believe the distinguished Presiding Officer will say that I have not spoken a word which has not been germane to the subject matter to which I have addressed myself. I have been impressed by the fact that, although the press in this Capital City comes out with startling news to the world, under headlines stating that the southern filibuster had started when the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] began his 44-minute speech a few days ago, I do not believe there has been the slightest semblance of a filibuster up to this stage, because I think we have confined ourselves, as we should, moderately and temperately, to our convictions or subjects vital to our people and to the whole Nation. The majority of today is the minority of tomorrow, and the issue of today is forgotten and gone tomorrow. The issue of tomorrow may be just as vital in its implications upon the great plains where the tall corn grows as is this group of so-called civil-rights issues in its implications and its application to our vital problems in the South.

Mr. Lippmann says:

FILIBUSTERS AND THE AMERICAN IDEA

Although the question before the Senate is whether to amend the rules, the issue is not one of parliamentary procedure. It is whether there shall be a profound and far-reaching constitutional change in the character of the American Government.

Mr. President, those are not idle words. Those are carefully selected words of the strongest import, and I think of the greatest soundness and of great truth. The question is whether there shall be a profound and far-reaching constitutional change in the character of the American Government.

The proposed amendment to rule XXII would enable two-thirds of the Senate to close the debate and force any measure, motion, or other matter to a vote. If the amendment is carried, the existing power of a minority of the States to stop legislation will have been abolished.

Mr. President, that is the admitted purpose of the authors of the proposed resolution. Then he quotes from the New York Times, without approval.

"Stripped of all mumbo-jumbo and flag waving," says the New York Times, "the issue is whether the country's highest legislative body will permit important measures to be kept from a vote through the activities of a few leather-throated"—

Mr. President, I wish I had a leather throat, but I do not happen to have one—

"leather-throated, iron-legged members"—

Mr. President, I digress long enough to say again that I wish I had iron legs, but I have not—

"The issue is whether the country's highest legislative body will permit important measures to be kept from a vote through the activities of a few leather-throated, iron-legged members who don't want democratic decision."

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at that point?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator happen to know the name of the clever coiner of pet phrases who wrote the editorial for the New York Times, and what his knowledge of American Government and American history might have been?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sorry to say, Mr. President, that I do not know the answer to the Senator's question. If he does, and if he has a contribution to make along that line, I shall appreciate his making it in his next discussion. I am sure the Senate would be glad to know about it.

This is an unduly scornful and superficial way to dispose of a great constitutional problem. For the real issue is whether any majority, even a two-thirds majority, shall now assume the power to override the opposition of a large minority of the States.

Mr. President, would one call it a large minority of the States when some 13 to 15 States, either through their entire delegation or through one member thereof, have appeared here with a willingness to carry this fight on just as long as they are able to state sound arguments in the forum of the Senate because they believe their own vital interests and the vital interests of their people and of their Nation are threatened by proposed legislation?

Mr. Lippmann further says:

In the American system of government the right of democratic decision has never been identified with majority rule as such.

Mr. President, that is part of the genius of our American Government, and I am going to reread that. Anyone who thinks otherwise has not read the history of America, does not know the traditions of America, and does not know at all the real essence of what is America and what it stands for. I read again:

In the American system of government the right of democratic decision has never been identified with majority rule as such. The genius of the American system, unique I believe among the democracies of the world, is that it limits all power—including the power of the majority. Absolute power, whether in a king, a president, a legislative majority, a popular majority, is alien to the American idea of democratic decision.

The American idea of a democratic decision has always been that important minorities must not be coerced. When there is strong opposition, it is neither wise nor practical to force a decision. It is necessary

and it is better to postpone the decision—to respect the opposition and then to accept the burden of trying to persuade it.

For a decision which has to be enforced against the determined opposition of large communities and regions of the country will, as Americans have long realized, almost never produce the results it is supposed to produce.

How thoroughly correct is that statement.

The opposition and the resistance, having been overridden, will not disappear. They will merely find some other way of avoiding, evading, obstructing, or nullifying the decision.

For that reason it is a cardinal principle of the American democracy that great decisions on issues that men regard as vital shall not be taken by vote of the majority until the consent of the minority has been obtained. Where the consent of the minority has been lacking, as for example in the case of the prohibition amendment, the democratic decision has produced hypocrisy and lawlessness.

This is the issue in the Senate. It is not whether there shall be unlimited debates. The right of unlimited debates is merely a a device, rather an awkward and tiresome device, to prevent large and determined communities from being coerced.

The issue is whether the fundamental principle of American democratic decision—that strong minorities must be persuaded and not coerced—shall be altered radically, not by constitutional amendment, but by a subtle change in the rules of the Senate.

The issue has been raised in connection with the civil-rights legislation.

Mr. President, Mr. Lippmann is known as being highly liberal in his views in this field, so I hope Senators will listen very carefully to what he says about the civil-rights program.

The issue has been raised in connection with the civil-rights legislation. The question is whether the vindication of these civil rights requires the sacrifice of the American limitation on majority rule. The question is a painful one. But I believe the answer has to be that the rights of Negroes will in the end be made more secure, even if they are vindicated more slowly, if the cardinal principle—that minorities shall not be coerced by majorities—is conserved.

For if that principle is abandoned, then the great limitations on the absolutism and the tyranny of transient majorities will be gone, and the path will be much more open than it now is to the demagogic dictator who, having aroused a mob, destroys the liberties of the people.

I do not believe I can improve, nor would I hope to improve upon that statement. Therefore I close with its insertion in the RECORD at the end of my address, with the feeling that Mr. Lippmann has well stated a proposition which will commend itself to the sound and seasoned judgment of the Members of this body if they only will take the long-time view and look at the type of work that has been done in the South, and that continues to be done, and then look at the objectives which are sought to be carried out by forcing down the throats of the South this punitive legislation, which is destined to failure because it is in a field where legislation will not accomplish the desired result.

Mr. President, I strongly and sincerely hope that the Senate will refuse to agree to the motion, and will refuse to make the resolution reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration the unfinished business of the Senate of the United States.

NOMINATIONS IN THE NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

During the delivery of Mr. HOLLAND's speech,

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, with the understanding that the Senator from Florida shall not lose the floor, that certain routine nominations for the Army and Navy may be acted on, as in executive session, with the understanding that the Senator from Florida shall have the floor immediately thereafter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is reminded that under the rules by which the Senate is now proceeding, the unanimous-consent request must come from the Senator who has the floor. Does the Senator from Florida propound the request?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in an effort to accede to the gracious request of the distinguished Senator from Maryland, I now ask that I be granted unanimous consent of the Senate to yield to him, without losing my place on the floor, for the purpose of his requesting the unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland if these are nominations that have come out of his committee by unanimous vote of the Committee on Armed Services, and whether he can inform the Senate if there was any opposition or is likely to be any opposition to them.

Mr. TYDINGS. The nominations are purely routine in the armed services. Earlier in the day they were reported unanimously by the committee, and no objection has been filed against any of them. None is expected.

I ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, that the nominations for routine promotions in the various branches of the national Military Establishment be confirmed, that the President be notified immediately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed, and without objection, the President of the United States will be notified immediately.

Mr. TYDINGS. I hope, without violating the rule, I may thank the Senator from Florida for his courtesy.

After the conclusion of Mr. HOLLAND's speech,

THE ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF MINNESOTA

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, just 100 years ago today a President of the United States affixed his signature to a measure duly enacted by Congress, and thereby established the legal entity which is Minnesota.

On this birthday anniversary, marking the close of the first century in the life of a great Commonwealth, it is a privilege for me to speak briefly in tribute to Minnesota and her people.

A hundred years is not long in terms of the existence of some of the States of the Union, whose history extends over three centuries of time, but to the people of this Commonwealth a century is the space of time within which a raw wilderness was transformed into one of the most productive of the 48 States.

The Territorial years beginning in 1849 were the significant formative years of Minnesota's history. Government was established, following the signing of the organic act on March 3, 1849, by President Polk, under the leadership of such men as Alexander Ramsey, the first Territorial governor, Henry N. Sibley, who later became the first State governor, and Henry M. Rice, one of the State's first United States Senators, whose statue represents Minnesota in Statuary Hall in the Capitol.

With the establishment of government began the movement of organized civilization into an Indian wilderness. Treaties with the Indians in 1851 opened the territory west of the Mississippi to white settlers. People flooded into the territory by all available means of transportation, so that within 9 years the population had grown from less than 5,000 white persons to almost 160,000. Wheat began pouring from newly tilled farms and lumbering became a major industry. Cities and towns bloomed on virgin forest and prairie lands, farms were hewn from the raw earth, homes were built, schools and churches carried the culture of America onward toward the West. In a decade civilization was transplanted into a wilderness, and in 1858 the frontier territory was adjudged capable of assuming the duties and responsibilities of a sovereign State.

Beginning today, which has been proclaimed Establishment Day by Gov. Luther W. Youngdahl, Minnesota's centennial observance will continue throughout the year as other significant historical events of 1849 are noted, such as the anniversary of the proclamation of the territorial government on June 1, the establishment of the judicial districts on June 11, the formation of legislative districts on July 7, the holding of the first election on August 1, and the meeting of the first legislature on September 3. The Minnesota Historical Society, the first institution created by the Territorial legislature, which will be 100 years old on October 20, is the official agency for the centennial celebration.

In Minnesota we are looking back at this moment upon an historic century, both in the history of our own Commonwealth and in the history of this great Nation of which it is a part. This is neither the time nor the place to recount in detail the contribution which Minnesota has made to the welfare and progress of the United States. It has been a great contribution. I am certain that my colleagues in the Senate, representing all in the sisterhood of States, share my deep sense of pride in the record of the one whose birthday occurs today. Other States are unique in their respective excellences, but few, not even excepting the Empire State itself, have greater sweep and breadth than Minnesota in almost every important field. Her farms are as fertile as those of any State, so that her corn, and wheat, and

dairy products rank in value among the highest. Her chief port is outranked in the amount of tonnage carried only by one great harbor on the Atlantic seaboard. Her mineral deposits, more extensive than those of the Ruhr Valley, furnish two-thirds of the Nation's iron ore. Her flour mills are the greatest in the world, and her industrial development among the most significant. Her State university, with its preeminent medical center, is one of the largest in this country. Her lakes and streams and forests offer rest and recreation to people from everywhere.

And yet we must turn to a greater resource than all these to find the real stature of Minnesota. It is in the character and caliber of her people. This typical commonwealth was founded by the toil and pain of pioneers who had a vision of greatness. Upon the foundation that they laid, Americans of many national stocks have labored to build a State which would offer the security, prosperity, happiness, and freedom which America has always held forth as her promise to the sons and daughters of every land. They have created an environment of tolerance and understanding which is not unique but which is representative of this great Nation at its very best.

Minnesota is taking inventory today of all that has gone into the building of a great commonwealth. Her people are proud of what the North Star State has become, but they are prouder still that their wise husbanding of the resources with which nature endowed their State, their toil and vision through the generations, and the blood of valiant sons in the defense of their country have been blended with the like contributions of the people of all our other States as part of the common heritage and greatness of America. Therefore, although the people of Minnesota commemorate what may seem to be a purely local occasion, they in reality are appraising the qualities and experiences of the whole of this great land.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. LUCAS to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 15, amending the so-called cloture rule of the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the pending measure is the motion of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] to make Senate Resolution 15 the unfinished business of the Senate.

This is a legislative body. The legislative process is a continuing one. First a bill or resolution must be introduced. It must be referred to the proper committee. If favorable to the bill or resolution the committee makes its report to the Senate. The bill or resolution then goes on the calendar. Later as part of this process, a motion is made to bring it, in a formal way, before the Senate. As a general rule, this is done without any prolonged discussion on the measure at this point in the legislative process. The bill or resolution is then subject to discussion, debate and vote. For a Senate resolution, the legislative process in this chamber is completed at that point, and for a bill, the legislative process continues through the House, at times to the conference committee, back to the House and Senate and on to the President for his approval or veto. If the latter, the process continues until the veto has been acted upon.

Webster's new international dictionary defines the word "measure" as:

A step or definite part of a progressive course or policy; a means to an end.

I submit, Mr. President, that the motion of the Senator from Illinois fits into that definition.

It is my desire to discuss the merits of his motion. When the motion has been favorably acted upon there will be ample time to debate the merits of Resolution 15. Even the adoption of a cloture petition on the Lucas motion would not cut off debate on the resolution. It would only help put the Senate in a position where the debate may properly be on Resolution 15.

The basic issue facing the Senate of the United States for the last 3 days is whether or not the Senate is to be able to function as a legislative body.

There is no monopoly in this body of devotion to the Constitution by the group upholding the right of unlimited filibuster.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I decline to yield at this time. I shall be glad to yield later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The oath that we on this side of the aisle, took to support and defend the Constitution of the United States is no less sacred to us than theirs is to them.

It is one thing to fully debate the merits of the resolution when it is before the Senate for action. It is quite another to take the position that by the power of endurance the Senate is to be prevented from ever having the resolution before it under parliamentary conditions where amendments could be offered and voted upon.

It is my considered judgment that a substantial majority of this Senate will vote to make rule XXII the effective two-thirds cloture it was intended to be when adopted in 1917 and will vote against any amendment to provide for cloture by a majority provided they ever get to the parliamentary stage where they are allowed to vote. Whether we get there or not is in the hands of this body, and so is the responsibility for their action or lack of it.

But under the present absurd parliamentary situation, one quarter of the Senate can prevent three quarters of the Senate from voting their convictions on this issue.

Under our Constitution, each State has equal representation in this body. On legislation, the vote of a Senator from one State can cancel out the vote of a Senator from another when they are on opposite sides. In some instances—as in the two-thirds required for ratification of treaties, Presidential vetoes and constitutional amendments—the vote of one Senator voting "nay" will cancel out the vote of two Senators voting "yea."

However, Mr. President, I can find nothing in the Constitution of the United States and nothing in the rules of the Senate or in equity that supports the contention that 25 Senators should be able to keep 71 Senators from discharging their legislative rights and duties. This is minority government with a vengeance.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I decline to yield at this time. I shall be glad to yield when I finish.

We are critical when minorities abroad take over and destroy free governments. Yet, in the name of constitutional government, there are some who would contend that a minority should have the power completely to obstruct the legislative process.

I commend the Democratic leadership for joining with those of us on this side of the aisle who wish to have an effective two-thirds rule in recognizing that the issue is so fundamental that it should be fought out head-on here and now.

If a way can be found to permit this legislative body to legislate, then Senate resolution 15 can be discussed on its merits and such amendments as may be offered can be discussed on their merits. Then the Senate by the Democratic representative process of voting can fulfill its Constitutional duty of adopting and amending its own rules.

The record is clear that the men who served in the Senate in 1917 were able men who believed they were adopting an effective cloture. While it is true that clever men found loopholes in the rule, the Senate itself has the power to close those loopholes in one or more ways or a combination of ways.

Even the Supreme Court has been known to reverse itself. No precedent should be allowed to obstruct the legislative process, make a dead letter of a Senate rule and force 70, 80, or 90 Senators abjectly to surrender to the forensic guns held at their heads by a small minority.

Responsibility for legislative obstruction if this effort to perfect rule XXII is finally defeated must rest upon those who give aid and assistance to those who are determined to prevent the Senate from voting on resolution 15 and any amendments thereto.

Mr. President, there is always the possibility that this Nation may be confronted with a great national emergency. We have had filibusters in the Senate of the United States which lasted for 42 days. I wish to call the attention of this body to the fact that Holland was overrun by Germany in just 5 days, Yugoslavia in 12 days, Belgium in 19 days, and Poland in 28 days. The Senate has had filibusters last longer than it took nations to lose their independence and people their liberty.

Mr. President, I submit that there is a body of opinion which believes that rule XXII was meant to perform in the way it is stated, which is that two-thirds of the Senate, after due deliberation, may have a legislative process by which the Senate can perform its constitutional duty of legislating.

I called attention the other day, while on the floor of the Senate—and I wish to repeat it at this time—to the language of

the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] during the hearings in January and February of 1947. Here is what the distinguished senior Senator from Texas had to say at that time:

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the present cloture rule is sufficient for all practical purposes to enable the Senate to force a vote whenever two-thirds of the membership desires it.

Later on in his same testimony he said:

Now, you have got a rule—I won't go into it, you know what it is—that upon the signature of 16 Members of the Senate, following 1 day over, it shall be set down and a vote had, and if two-thirds of the Senate, after 1 hour debate per Senator, if two-thirds of those present vote that they don't want any more debate the debate is cut off.

In the testimony of the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] before the Rules Committee, during the same hearings, we find that he had this to say:

At the outset I concede that the rule may properly be made applicable to any pending motion, question, or measure. This, of course, involves a change in the rule and a substantial change in point of fact, but, nevertheless, it is a change which I think should be made in the Senate rules.

Mr. President, I submit that unless the Senate interprets rule XXII as applying to a motion, we must concede that the men who adopted that rule by an overwhelming vote in 1917 were doing it with their tongues in their cheeks, were doing it to deceive the Senate of the United States and to deceive the American people. I can put no such interpretation upon the act of those very able men who served in this body in 1917, because if rule XXII does not apply to a motion to bring up a bill, it is an absolute dead letter, it is meaningless, it is an idle and wasteful gesture on their part; because no measure, no bill, no resolution can come before the Senate of the United States except by motion; and if rule XXII does not apply to a motion, then it might just as well not be on the Senate's rule book in any way whatsoever.

Mr. President, I merely wish to say this in closing that this is one of the historic periods, I believe, in the Senate of the United States. During the course of this debate and the legislative action which will soon follow, we are going to determine whether the Senate of the United States can function as a legislative body and can perform its constitutional duties. If we abjectly surrender, if we yield on this issue, probably for as long as any of us serve in this body we shall have surrendered into the hands of a minority the right to obstruct the entire legislative process.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield first to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator two questions based on the argument made the other day by one of the very distinguished Senators on the other side of this question. I think I am correct in saying that he made two points.

The first was that if this amendment to the rule is adopted under Senate Resolution 15, it would be a deprivation of the equal rights of the States. That was his first point.

His other point was that the Senate, while it is a legislative body, of course, is essentially a deliberative body, with other functions in addition to legislative functions, and therefore this amendment should not necessarily be added to the rule. I should like to have the Senator from California, who has just spoken so ably, give his view on those two questions.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In the first place, Mr. President, in answer to the Senator from Massachusetts, I would say that Resolution No. 15, which proposes to close the loopholes in rule XXII, in no sense deprives any State of its equal representation in the Senate of the United States; but, to the contrary, if we do not make rule XXII effective, we in effect permit one Senator or a small handful of Senators from a few States to deprive all the other States of their equal representation.

After all, one of the ways the State the Senator from Massachusetts represents or the State the junior Senator from California represents has a right to be heard in the Senate of the United States is by having its Senators vote on legislation; and the unlimited use of the filibuster by a small handful of Senators can in effect deprive 91 Members of the Senate of the United States, representing the number of States those 91 Senators might represent, of a voice in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. First, I wish to answer the other question of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, the other question I ask him is this: Does he consider the Senate, although a legislative body, to be essentially a mere deliberative body, with other functions; and therefore does he believe that the proposed amendment to the rule should not be made?

Mr. KNOWLAND. In answer to the question of the Senator from Massachusetts, let me say that of course I recognize the fact that the Senate has other duties, in addition to its regular legislative duties; but under the Constitution of the United States the Senate has, of course, a coequal part with the House of Representatives in the legislative process. Filibusters which operate against permitting the Senate to perform its constitutional function, seem to me to be entirely out of place. For that reason, I do not believe that the other functions of the Senate are such that its legislative function should properly be obstructed.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield first to the Senator from Louisiana, who previously has requested that I yield to him.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, with reference to the Senator's point that Holland was overrun in 5 days, let me ask what possible relationship does the time it took the Germans to conquer Holland have with the time it might take the Senate of the United States to pass a law?

Mr. KNOWLAND. In answer to the Senator from Louisiana, if he will permit me to answer at this point, I will say it is entirely conceivable that during the period of time in which those of us who now are serving the Senate of the United States remain here, some aggressor power might begin to move in western Europe, and might start to overrun some of the western democracies.

Mr. LONG. May I ask the Senator——

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana permit me to finish, please. It is entirely possible that the Senate could be kept tied up in knots for the critcal period of 4 or 5 days when a particular nation or group of nations might be being overrun; and as President Woodrow Wilson pointed out, we would then be faced with the situation that the Senate of the United States was completely tied up, and in the eyes of the rest of the world it would be most difficult to explain how this great representative Republic came to be in that unfortunate position.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Louisiana for a further question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. I take it then that if it would require the Russian Army 12 hours to overrun Luxemburg, the United States Senate would be limited to 12 hours in which to decide whether or not we wanted to take this Nation into war; is that correct?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No. I may say to the able Senator from Louisiana that even those on his side of the aisle recognized this was a very important question, and as the able Senator from Louisiana well knows, the Senator from Mississippi, recognizing that we might be faced with a very critical emergency, presented an amendment to the committee. I want to call the attention of the Senator from Louisiana to it. At this point, I ask, Mr. President, that there be placed in the RECORD the amendment which was offered by the Senator from Mississippi to cover national emergencies.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

If at any time a motion, signed by 86 Senators, is presented to bring to a close the debate upon any measure on the Senate Calendar (and a Senator having the floor may be interrupted for this purpose), the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and declare the measure the unfinished business of the Senate. Two hours after the motion has been stated (unless the motion itself as filed shall specify a longer time for debate, which specification, if any, shall control), the Senate shall proceed to vote on the passage of the measure by a yea-and-nay vote. At least one-half of the full time allowed for debate shall be allotted to Members who do not sign the motion. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the motion has been filed. No dilatory motion shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I desire to call to the attention of the Senator from Louisiana the fact that under the absurd parliamentary situation in which this great deliberative body finds itself tonight, and in which we have been for 4 days, and are likely to be for at least a week more, we could not even get a chance to vote on such an amendment as that of the very able Senator from Mississippi.

Mr LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield for a further question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr LONG. Does the Senator realize that the United States carried on, and that the men who built the American Government thought enough of the rule we have to permit it to continue for 117 years?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the Senator from Louisiana, we now live in the age of the airplane and the atom. Only yesterday there was published in the newspapers the information that one of our B-50 bombers flew completely around the world, some twenty-three-thousand-odd miles, without stopping. What this Nation can do, other nations, given a little more time, will be able to do; and what was satisfactory in the days before the airplane may not be satisfactory for the security of our Republic under present-day conditions.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has the floor. Does the Senator yield? If so, to whom?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield, to give a little time to the Senator from Mississippi; then I shall come back to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. STENNIS. I should like to ask the Senator from California whether the amendment to which he refers as having been offered in the Committee on Rules and Administration was rejected by the committee.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. The amendment provided a rule whereby 86 Members of the Senate could at any time bring debate to a close and allow only 2 hours for further discussion, did it not?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. The amendment further provided, did it not, that it would apply to all matters that might be brought before the Senate, whether a pending measure, a motion, or anything else? Is not that correct?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Mississippi is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. I think that clears up the record. I wanted this to appear in the RECORD following the remarks of the Senator from California.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Louisiana for another question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator not realize that the President, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, is required to defend this Nation in the event it is attacked, regardless of whether Congress declares war before the attack?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the Senator from Louisiana on a Pearl Harbor type of attack against the continental United States or its possessions, I think there is no question on that score. There might be, however, in case of an attack upon the western nations of Europe, the necessity and desirability of the Congress of the United States being able to function under those conditions.

Mr. LUCAS and Mr. WATKINS addressed the Chair.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Illinois for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to ask the Senator one question. I take it the Senator is familiar with the personnel of the United States Senate in 1917, when the present rule XXII was adopted.

Mr. KNOWLANL. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator agree with me that the great men in the Senate at that time really knew what they were doing when they adopted the rule?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think there is no doubt about that. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator know of any unusual or omnipotent judgment now in the United States Senate that would construe the meaning of rule XXII differently from the way those men construed it to be at that particular time?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Frankly, I cannot see how the Senator can put any different interpretation on it than that they were acting in good faith and meant to have an effective cloture procedure.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator agree with me that at the time rule XXII was adopted, those men, with the exception of three, all agreed to the rule, and that they believed at that moment they were adopting a rule which would be absolutely effective in bringing debate to a close?

Mr. KNOWLAND. In my judgment the Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. LUCAS. I want to——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair has the responsibility to cut off colloquies, unless the Senator yields.

Mr. LUCAS. I am asking a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am yielding for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from Illinois asking whether the Senator from California will yield for a further question?

Mr. LUCAS. I should have asked the Presiding Officer whether the Senator from California would yield for a further question. I apologize to the Chair. I admit I violated the rule. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Illinois for another question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield for a further question.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator agree with me that there may be an opportunity in the course of the present debate to follow out the intent of those who in 1917 framed the resolution, by following the decision of the Chair, if it should come at the proper time, and the decision should be made in line with what the Senator and I are thinking?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think that is quite a hopeful possibility.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Illinois for another question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield for another question.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator agree with me that the Senate of the United States makes the rules of the Senate and the Parliamentarian follows the rules thus made?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct. Under the Constitution itself the Senate is the judge of its own rules.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Illinois another question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield for another question.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator agree with me that the records of the United States Senate at the present time disclose that at no time has the Senate itself passed upon this question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, we have had rulings from the Chair on two different occasions, but insofar as the Senate of the United States is concerned the Senate has never directly passed upon this question; is that correct?

Mr. KNOWLAND. In answer to the Senator's inquiry, I may say that is my understanding.

Mr. SALTONSTALL and Mr. WATKINS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield for a question? If so, to whom?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts for a question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator a question along the lines of the questions asked by the Senator from Illinois. Would not the Senator construe the fact that in the debates of the period when rule XXII was adopted, there was apparently no discussion of the rule not applying to motions to take up, and incidental questions of that character, as an indication that the members felt it was clear the rule did apply to such motions and questions?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say in answer to the Senator's inquiry, after a very careful study of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD regarding the discussion that took place at the time, in the logic and common sense of the situation, the reading of the rule itself and the fact that

the dictionary definition gives an indication that it is a part of a continuing process, to my mind at least indicates that there can be no doubt that the Members of the Senate at that time thought they were going to have an effective cloture procedure.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Florida for a question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to continue for a moment. As the able Senator from Massachusetts well knows, Senate Resolution 15 is in no sense a gag rule. All it proposes and purports to do is to close any loopholes which may have been discovered since the rule was adopted. There will be complete freedom of debate in the Senate of the United States.

I doubt that there are many Members of this body who would sign a cloture petition until there had been adequate time for discussion. After the petition is filed it has to lay over an intervening day. Even if two-thirds of the Senators finally determine that the time has come to act and not to talk, each Senator has still one additional hour. So that when the charge is made that this is some kind of a new gag proposal, it is not in keeping with the facts.

Mr. PEPPER and Mr. STENNIS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield for a question; and if so, to whom?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Florida for a question.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I was going to ask the Senator from California if it is not a fact, as he has already inferred, that all the pending resolution proposes to do is to plug two parliamentary loopholes in rule XXII as adopted by the Senate in 1917 by a vote of 73 to 3, and after the unanimous recommendation of 10 Members of the Senate, 5 from the Republican side and 5 from the Democratic side—to plug two loopholes which have been discovered——

Mr. KNOWLAND. Three loopholes.

Mr. PEPPER. Three loopholes which have been discovered by ingenious parliamentarians of the Senate, to prevent bringing an end to debate?

Mr. KNOWLAND. It is my judgment that the Senator from Florida is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield for a further question.

Mr. PEPPER. And that there is nothing different in character, intent, or purpose involved in the proposed rule change from that which was involved when it was adopted by the Senate in 1917?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I believe the Senator is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield for a further question.

Mr. PEPPER. And all the honorable tradition and pride in the merit and character of this body which has prevailed in the past in respect to the application of the present cloture rule certainly may be expected to prevail in the future with respect to the application of an amended cloture rule, should it be amended as proposed?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am satisfied that the Senator is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. STENNIS. With regard to the record with reference to what happened after the adoption of the rule in 1917, is it not true that the first ruling under the new rule was from the Chair, to the effect that cloture would not apply to certain pending amendments in the nature of reservations to a treaty? Is that correct?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is my understanding.

Mr. STENNIS. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield for a further question.

Mr. STENNIS. Is it not true that the next ruling was in 1922, when the Chair ruled that the rule would not apply to a motion to correct the Journal?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is my understanding.

Mr. STENNIS. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield for a further question.

Mr. STENNIS. Was there any successful effort made following the ruling in 1919 or in 1922 to prevent the application of the rule?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would merely answer the Senator from Mississippi in this way: None of us who are now in this body were in the Senate of the United States at the time of those two prior rulings. I cannot know what was in the minds of the Senators by their taking or not taking action at that time, but I merely wish to say to the Senator from Mississippi that it seems to me that for the first time in the history of the Senate of the United States we shall have a clear-cut issue on this one point of whether a motion to take up is an integral part of the legislative process. It will be the first time that any Presiding Officer has had an opportunity to rule clearly and definitely on that precise issue.

I certainly feel that the Senate of the United States was lax in not itself taking action when the prior rulings were made, because I do not believe it should surrender out of its own hands the very clear intent of rule XXII, that it would be an effective cloture, and permit merely a ruling from the Chair to make a dead letter of a rule which apparently meant something.

Mr. STENNIS. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield for a further question.

Mr. STENNIS. To complete the record, let me ask the distinguished Senator if there was not another ruling by the Chair in 1943, which was that the cloture rule did not apply to a then-pending matter, the Senator from Tennessee being in the chair, and that the Senate accepted that ruling?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will merely say to the Senator that there was a ruling at that time, and it is my judgment that the Senate of the United States did not itself pass upon that question. Furthermore, I do not believe that any of the rulings which the able Senator from Mississippi has mentioned went to the exact point of the situation which the Senate now confronts as of today and all of this week. This is a new question. It has never been ruled upon by any Presiding Officer of the Senate. So, to that extent, it is the judgment of the junior Senator from California that the Presiding Officer will be called upon for the first time in the history of the Senate to rule on a clear-cut, new proposal.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Mississippi for one more question.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator remembers the ruling of last July in which it was held by the Presiding Officer that a motion to take up a bill did not come under the present cloture rule, and the Senator will recall that the Senate accepted that ruling as being correct. Is not that so?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Just a minute, Mr. President. I want to say to the able Senator from Mississippi that that was at a time when the junior Senator from California was in the Senate of the United States. The fact of the matter is that that was not the precise situation which will exist if and when the Presiding Officer shall rule on this particular question. There was pending business before the Senate of the United States. Here we have a clear-cut situation in which there is no pending business before the Senate; it is a new situation; it is entirely different from any of the other situation in which the Senate has had an opportunity to hear a ruling from a Presiding Officer.

Furthermore, I would say in answer to the inquiry from the Senator from Mississippi, that in that case the senior Senator from Ohio took an appeal from the decision of the Chair. The parliamentary situation was entirely different from that which exists at this time. The appeal from the decision of the Chair was itself subject to unlimited filibuster. Therefore, due to the legislative situation, it could not be successfully pressed at the moment. It is true that those on the other side of the issue, had they so desired and had they thought they had the necessary votes to permit them successfully to make the motion, could have moved to lay the appeal of the senior Senator from Ohio on the table, which would have been action by the Senate making the decision of the Presiding Officer final.

I shall not say what was in the minds of my able colleagues on the other side of the aisle, but I rather suspect that perhaps they thought that such a motion, if made by them, would not be agreed to. The members on this side of the aisle were not in a position to make that kind of a motion, because it would have run counter to their deep convictions. All of them recognized the practical situation that under the unlimited filibuster which exists in the Senate at this time, that motion could

have been discussed from the time the ruling was made to the end of the session, and no other business would have been transacted.

So I say to the Senator, again, that for the first time in the history of this body we shall have a clear-cut decision on this issue.

Mr. STENNIS. Will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield for one more question.

Mr. STENNIS. May I ask the Senator to point out again the distinction between the parliamentary situation existing now and that which existed at the time of the ruling of the Presiding Officer last July?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I will say to the able Senator from Mississippi that I am prepared to make and expect to make some observations if and when the Chair is prepared and undertakes to rule on the situation. My statement is now in the process of preparation. I am convinced the situation is an entirely different type from what was before confronted. The Senator will hear my arguments later.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator very much.

THE PROPOSED NORTH ATLANTIC SECURITY PACT

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I realize the hour is growing late, but I intend to start some remarks I desire to make, and then submit a unanimous-consent request.

Notwithstanding that the Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, have urged that debate on the North Atlantic security pact be postponed until the pact is ready to be given to the Senate for approval, the honoring of the request has been more observed in the breach than in the observance.

Throughout this country and in foreign countries, newspapers and other publicists have been waging the debate on the proposed North Atlantic security pact.

From time to time quotations from the pact itself have been printed in our newspapers. This has been done in spite of the fact that the Congress has been told, through the Secretary of State and the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, that the text of the pact, whatever it is at the moment, is top secret.

It is inconceivable that either the Secretary of State or the Senator from Texas have been giving out information on the text of the pact, in view of the statements they have made to the Congress.

Where do these quotations come from? Since the information is apparently accurate—and I say that with some reservations; I am assuming an established newspaper would not publish them unless they had some ground for thinking they were accurate—I must assume that someone directly connected with the negotiations is actually giving out the information for some definite purpose.

In view of the history of previous programs for foreign relief, one may well conclude that one or more nations interested in such an alliance would take advantage of such a propaganda campaign to assure its adoption by the participating governments. One of the most effective ways, of course, would be to get information into the hands of friendly newspapers, correspondents, and commentators, so that these friendly publicists could present the matter in a favorable light to the American people. Wherever or whatever the source, it is my belief that the underlying purpose of this prepact publicity is a propaganda campaign designed to win the overwhelming support of an uninformed American public.

When that purpose has been achieved, the alliance will be tossed into the lap of the United States Senate. Then, those who took months to draw and obtain support for the pact will say—and I believe I have heard similar admonishments before—"Act on this immediately. This is our last chance for peace."

The United States Senate will then be placed in this position: It can bow to public pressure for the sake of political expediency; or Senators in opposition can object to the principles involved and incur the possibility of political extinction.

This I believe without a doubt to be the objective of the proalliance propagandists. They have little desire to seek the advice of the Senate during the formulative stages of the alliance.

An editorial in a western newspaper came to the attention of the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] and, in an open session of the Senate, he called attention to some provisions of the proposed treaty. The questions of the Senator from Missouri brought some very enlightening responses from two leading Senators who are members of the Foreign Relations Committee. The statements made by the two members of this committee were reassuring to the country, and undoubtedly to many of the Senators who expect the Constitution of the United States to be faithfully observed by the officials of this Government in any treaty negotiations with foreign countries.

The Senators on the Foreign Relations Committee taking part in the discussion made abundantly clear that there would be no moral or implied pledge to take up arms in case of attack against the members of the security pact. This would not be a military alliance. No power of future Congresses to act independently in the matter of declaring war would be abridged in any way.

These assurances seemed to go full distance in the protection of the United States in the entering of such a pact. There would be no commitment, either expressed, implied, or moral, that would obligate the United States to take military action against any aggressor which might attack one or the other of the signatory nations.

This assurance to the people of this country, however, was contrasted by consternation in the capitals of the nations in Europe who were negotiating to enter the pact. What they wanted was a military alliance, the old-fashioned kind, in which the United States would be bound to come to the rescue of any nation or nations in the pact immediately upon any armed attack being made on such nation or nations. They knew, or should have known, the provisions of the Constitution of the United States which make it impossible for this country, if that document were honored in writing the pact, to make any such binding agreement. No future Congress can be bound to declare war.

There were hasty conferences to iron out the difficulties. Immediately the press of this country—at least many of the leading newspapers—took up the debate. They were not at all backward in going all out for what, in effect, would be a strong military alliance in which the United States would be brought into any fighting if any of the nations joining in the pact were attacked by any nation which could be termed an aggressor.

The problem seemed to be to find a way in which Europe could be given the military alliance it wanted and at the same time satisfy the people of the United States so that they could feel secure that the Constitution was being observed in letter and in spirit.

These positions, in my opinion are incompatible. Europe was not satisfied with the commitments our senatorial spokesmen were able to assure under our Constitution.

As a result of this situation, the editorials then began to run something like the one I now have before me. This one, and it is typical, appeared in the Washington Evening Star under date of February 18. After quoting article I, section 8, of the Constitution, which reads: "The Congress shall have power to declare war," the editorial comment in part was as follows:

> When those words were written, war was a slow, tedious process. It was a matter of transporting armies across vast stretches of ocean in sailing ships, of naval blockades, of equipping men with muskets to face other men with muskets. The authors of article I, section 8, could not foresee the day when war would become a matter of sudden, devastating attack, designed to destroy a country long before its Congress could assemble to declare war. They could not have been expected to foresee the time in which we live, a time in which man's true hope of survival lies in preventing wars, not fighting them.
>
> This being so, it is not reasonable for Members of the Senate to be standing on the letter of the Constitution; to be saying that Congress must not yield any part of its constitutional power to declare war. To do this is not only unreasonable, but puts in grave jeopardy our one best hope for the future.

In this language we have an invitation, in effect, urging Senators to forget their oath of office to uphold the Constitution and to adopt a program which under the circumstances the editor feels is reasonable and is absolutely necessary for our future welfare.

If the Senate takes a contrary view and stands by its oath of office, stands by the Constitution, it, in the words of the editor, puts in grave jeopardy our one best hope for the future. We have only one choice. Violate the Constitution and save the world peace.

Nowhere does the editor admit even the possibility that we can both observe the Constitution and at the same time do something for the peace of the world. It is the military alliance or nothing.

Later in the same editorial, there appears the following:

Much, perhaps all, depends on the attitude of the Senate. Those who oppose assuming any military commitment in the North Atlantic pact are motivated by reluctance to see the constitutional functions of Congress whittled down. This is understandable, and it may be that persuasive constitutional arguments in support of their position can be advanced.

But it is difficult to believe that rational men would want to win a constitutional argument at the price of losing this last best hope for peace.

It probably has not occurred to the editor that there are Senators who have an abiding respect for their oath of office and believe that the Constitution of the United States is one of the greatest instruments ever devised by man for the government of a free people, and that none of its provisions should be regarded lightly and violated because it seems a matter of reason to violate it.

Mr. President, this is a typical editorial. Others appearing in newspapers throughout the country follow the same line.

At this time, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may cease, and be permitted to resume the floor upon the resumption of the session of the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there are no reports of committees the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

UNITED NATIONS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Erwin D. Canham, of Massachusetts, to be an alternate representative of the United States of America, second part, third session, General Assembly of the United Nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of W. Averell Harriman, of New York, to be the United States special representative in Europe, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as the representative of the United States of America on the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Edward F. Bartelt, of Illinois, to be United States member of the Fiscal Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, term of 3 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of H. Merle Cochran, of Arizona, to be representative of the United States of America on the Good Offices Committee of the Security Council of the United Nations on Indonesia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations to the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations to the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange will be confirmed en bloc.

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Dr. H. van Zile Hyde, of New York, to be the representative of the United States of America on the executive board of the World Health Organization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES TO PAKISTAN

The legislative clerk read the nomination of H. Merle Cochran, of Arizona, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States to Pakistan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, March 4, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 3 (legislative day of February 21), 1949):

UNITED NATIONS

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Erwin D. Canham to be an alternate representative of the United States of America to the second part, third session, General Assembly of the United Nations.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

W. Averell Harriman to be the United States special representative in Europe, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as the representative of the United States of America on the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Edward F. Bartelt to be the United States member of the Fiscal Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 3 years.

SECURITY COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

H. Merle Cochran to be the representative of the United States of America on the Good Offices Committee of the Security Council of the United Nations on Indonesia.

UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

B. Harvie Branscomb, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for a term expiring January 27, 1951. (Appointed during the recess of the Senate.)

Harold W. Dodds, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for a term expiring January 27, 1950. (Appointed during the recess of the Senate.)

Martin P. McGuire, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for a term expiring January 27, 1949. (Appointed during the recess of the Senate.)

Mark Starr, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for a term expiring January 27, 1949. (Appointed during the recess of the Senate.)

Edwin B. Fred, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission an Educational Exchange for the remainder of the term expiring January 27, 1950, and until his successor has been appointed and qualified.

Martin P. McGuire, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for a term of 3 years expiring January 27, 1952, and until his successor has been appointed and qualified.

Mark Starr, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for a term of 3 years expiring January 27, 1952, and until his successor has been appointed and qualified.

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

Dr. H. van Zile Hyde, to be the representative of the United States of America on the executive board of the World Health Organization.

AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE COUNTRY INDICATED

H. Merle Cochran, Pakistan.

REGULAR ARMY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment in the Medical, Dental, and Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.) and title II of the act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 355, 80th Cong.):

To be majors

Jeremiah A. Dailey, MC, O324751.
Gordon P. Fisher, MC, O376967.
Charles W. Hoffman, Jr., MC, O356378.

To be captains

Robert O. Emmett, MC, O1775028.
Woodard M. Herring, Jr., DC, O1735285.
Delbert W. Hess, MC, O1703583.
John T. Massey, DC, O473374.
Warren C. Myers, DC, O619451.
Max W. Pegram, MC.
Wayne W. Thornberry, DC, O397916.
John W. White, MC, O1735136.

To be first lieutenants

Archibald M. Ahern, MC.
John C. Baber, Jr., MC.
Dexter T. Ball, MC.
Earl M. Bradley, JAGC, O378069.
Hugo M. Cardullo, MC.
Dean R. Dort, JAGC, O954030.
John A. Duggan, MC.
William A. Graber, MC.
William Hausman, MC.
Robert W. Hobson, DC.
Rudolph M. Jarvi, MC.
Richard G. Johnson, MC, O1746311.
Arthur R. H. Knox, MC.
William W. Kramer, JAGC, O305301.
Franklin M. Lockwood, MC.

Donald L. Manes, Jr., JAGC, O433146.
David N. Marine, MC.
Elwin W. Midgley, MC, O1717947.
Arthur J. Moseley, MC.
Joseph G. Murphy, MC, O1705409.
Merrill F. Nelson, MC.
Robert E. L. Nesbitt, Jr., MC.
Lester I. Nienhuis, MC.
George W. Pogson, MC.
Irvin L. Schweitzer, MC.
George W. Shannon, MC, O442647.
Leon Stutzman, MC.
Gilbert A. Varnell, MC.
Leonard J. Wiedershine, MC, O1767504.
Forrest J. Woodman, Jr., MC, O1757064.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Luis A. Becerra.
Charles D. Brohawn.
Charles R. Covell.
John P. McConnell.
Martin P. Moser, O959081.

The following-named person for appointment in the Army Nurse Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress:

Patricia I. Ward, N792135.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

PROMOTIONS

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of sections 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. (Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (*) are subject to examination required by law.)

To be first lieutenants

Anselin, Frank Belmont, AO56689.
*Bjorgen, Leonard Leroy, AO50530.
Bryant, William Anthony, AO41356.
Davidson, Bernard Clark, AO50532.
Davis, William James, AO56692.
Ferguson, Charles Laird, AO56690.
Gagnon, John Arthur, Jr., AO50527.
Holtorf, Arthur Miles, AO56694.
Kimbel, Joseph Bruce Keirce, AO50529.
Lamb, Charles Melford, Jr., AO38362.
*Marcarelli, John Alphonse, AO56688.
Meyers, Roy Lee, AO50526.
Nave, William Patrick, AO56691.
Neff, Benjamin Groff, AO56697.
Simmons, James Albert, AO56699.
Smith, Charles Ames, AO38528.
Smithson, Daryl Purdy, AO50528.
Stockton, Lyle Edward, AO50531.
Weigelt, Winfred Hamilton, AO56693.
Wortman, John, Jr., AO56696.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 3, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who alone gavest us the breath of life and alone canst keep alive in us the holy desires Thou dost impart, we beseech Thee, for Thy compassion's sake, to sanctify all our thoughts and endeavors that we may neither begin an action without pure intention nor continue it without Thy blessing. And grant that having the eyes of the mind open to behold things invisible and unseen we may in heart be inspired by Thy wisdom and in work be upheld by Thy strength, and at last be accepted of Thee as Thy faithful servants.

Let the words of our mouths and the meditations of our hearts be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, our strength and our Redeemer. In the name of our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE LATE HON. WALLACE STEPHEN DEMPSEY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I announce the death of Hon. Wallace Stephen Dempsey, a former Member of the House of Representatives of the United States.

Mr. Dempsey served as a Representative of the Fortieth Congressional District of New York State from 1915 to 1931. He rendered conspicuous public service not only in connection with his district but with respect to the whole Nation. Those Members of Congress who still survive who served with Mr. Dempsey will recall the great ability with which he discharged his duties as chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee. The people of this Nation who saw the possibilities of water transportation found in Representative Dempsey a man of vision and an able and courageous leader in this important work.

Our former colleague came to Congress well prepared to take a prominent part in all legislative problems, because of his conspicuous service as assistant United States attorney from 1899 to 1907 and his broad experience in the practice of his chosen profession.

The natural charm and unfailing courtesy of Representative Dempsey won him a host of friends throughout the Nation. After leaving Congress Representative Dempsey opened a law office in Washington and soon built up a large and lucrative practice. I have a deep affection for our former colleague as did all those who had the privilege of serving with him.

Representative Dempsey is survived by his wife, Mrs. Laura Hoag Dempsey, and two grandsons, Lt. William D. and Lt. Charles S. Moseley of the British Navy. I extend to Mrs. Dempsey and to her grandsons my heartfelt sympathy in their great bereavement.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman from New York in expressing regret at the death of Mr. Dempsey. When I first came to the Congress Mr. Dempsey was one of our outstanding Members. He was a man of great ability. As chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors he was active in developing our great waterways and in building a strong merchant marine. He was truly a great American and an outstanding legislator.

I wish to convey my deep regret and sympathy to his wife and family in their great loss.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. BLAND. When I came to Congress on July 3, 1918, Mr. Dempsey was here and he served for many years thereafter.

I heartily endorse everything that both of the distinguished gentlemen have said. Mr. Dempsey was a distinguished Member of this House and rendered very distinguished service on the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, of which he was chairman. He was careful, studious, diligent, and imbued with a desire to perform the best service possible. It would be difficult to describe adequately the great service which he performed for the rivers and harbors of America for that was a field in which he was very distinctly an expert.

I join in the gentleman's expressions of sympathy to his widow.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr RANKIN. I wish to endorse every word the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] has just said with reference to our former colleague, Wallace Dempsey.

I served with Mr. Dempsey for many years. He was one of the finest gentlemen, one of the most courageous legislators, one of the finest Americans who ever sat in this House.

I wish to join in expressing to Mrs. Dempsey and the other members of his family my heartfelt sympathy in their great bereavement.

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr TAURIELLO. I wish to subscribe to all that has been said about Mr. Dempsey. As a young man, former Congressman Dempsey was my Congressman. I always looked upon him as an outstanding statesman. It is certainly a great loss to the Nation in the death of such an outstanding man.

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the gentleman.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CLEVENGER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

Mr. LANE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a very interesting article.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Mobile Register.

Mr. BOLTON of Maryland asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. PRESTON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an exchange of correspondence with the Veterans' Administration, and a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR WITH REFERENCE TO H. R. 2032

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 7, a subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor will open hearings on the bill H. R. 2032, a bill to repeal the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, and to reenact the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, and for other purposes. We have reserved Monday, March 7, as the day for Members of Congress. We have mailed notices to every Member. We hope that all Members who wish to appear before that committee will do so on Monday, if possible.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Will the Members not have an opportunity to register their approval or disapproval on the floor of the House, when the time comes for us to vote on it?

Mr. KELLEY. I do not see why not. Under ordinary procedure you do.

Mr. RICH. Instead of allowing the time for Members of Congress, why do you not bring the people from the outside who are interested, and let the Members of Congress express themselves on the floor when the matter comes on the floor?

Mr. KELLEY. We are not trying to prevent Members of Congress from expressing themselves at any time.

Mr. RICH. Neither am I.

Mr. KELLEY. But some Members will want to appear before the subcommittee and we are setting aside Monday for them.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may sit during general debate in the session of the House this afternoon.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is for general debate only?

The SPEAKER. The Chair may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the Chair is following the rules and precedents the gentleman from Massachusetts himself followed when he was Speaker, and is recognizing only requests for committees to sit during general debate.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I appreciate the assurance of the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, by direction of the chairman, that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit during general debate in the session of the House today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 1731 on the extension of rent control.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman also include the right to file minority views, if there are any?

Mr. PRIEST. I so modify my request, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a manuscript entitled "The United Nations Genocide Convention."

Mr. TAURIELLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address by Hugh Thompson, regional director of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Mr. PATTEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Arizona Daily Star.

LEWIS DESCHLER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one for whom all of us entertains the greatest respect and the highest regard celebrates today another step in the pathway of life—our distinguished and beloved Parliamentarian, Lewis Deschler; who enjoys another birthday today. Had I consulted him he would have tried to talk me out of making these few remarks. I know, of course, that every Member of the House would want to congratulate him today, and we all do; and in congratulating him we also congratulate Mrs. Deschler and their very happy family.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. On such an occasion as this I always yield to my friend.

Mr. RICH. I am sure the membership of the House, with the high regard we have for Lew Deschler, would be very happy to extend him the privilege of the floor to make a speech. I do not see why we should not permit him to do that, because we all love him so much. I think it would be a grand thing; I should like to hear from him.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I wonder if the gentleman from Massachusetts would be willing to add to his remarks the fact that Lew Deschler also was a citizen of Ohio, born in Ohio; and Ohio is very proud of him.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very glad to do that with this one qualification: That while he might have been born in Ohio he is equally a citizen of every State of the Union and is known to the people of every State of the Nation. I shall leave to my friend the right to retain his citizenship in Ohio with the one reservation that we in Massachusetts may consider him one of our Massachusetts citizens.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I will accept that amendment, but I wish to remind the gentleman that it will be in Ohio, near my home town, that the monument will eventually be erected to Lew Deschler.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ought to object to this dragging of the Parliamentarian all over the country in this manner. He belongs to the whole country.

Lew Deschler is one of the greatest parliamentarians on earth, I say that advisedly.

I join the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] in wishing that Mr. Deschler had the privileges of the floor of the House. We needed him down here a few weeks ago when inexperienced and uninformed Members helped to literally destroy the Rules Committee.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I have had my attention called by my colleague from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER] that in his district there has been a town named after our Parliamentarian—Deschler, Ohio—and I hope every other State in the Union follows that practice.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. I wonder if the gentleman from Massachusetts has brought out how old Mr. Deschler is?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a question to which I never make reference; however, we all know that no matter how old Lew Deschler is, he is young in his thoughts. For the RECORD, may I say that he is young and he is the number one parliamentarian of the world.

Mr. JENKINS. When I came here he was sitting on the other side of the Speaker and I think he was in short pants then. So he is a young man. May I say further that, in my opinion, he is the only man I know of any place in the world whose place cannot be filled.

Mr. McCORMACK. If there is such a thing as an indispensable man, he comes the nearest to it in the field of parliamentary law of any man I know of.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I am very happy that the gentleman from Massachusetts has called to our attention the fact that this is the birthday of Lew Deschler. Some reference has been made to his age. I do not know what it really is, but I would point out that Lew Deschler is without age except as to experience, wisdom, judgment, fairness and capacity. I think he is one of the most remarkable men that I have ever come across.

His is a difficult job. It requires patience and understanding—particularly an understanding of the rules and an understanding and knowledge of the problems of the Members. Always has he been fair. He served here in the Eightieth Congress when we on our side were in control. He has served here in my time when you of the Democratic Party were in control.

Always have we found him in to be completely objective in his determinations. That certainly is about the finest thing that can be said of any man in his position.

Not only is he an able parliamentarian, but more than that, he is a splendid citizen, a fine gentleman, the sort of fellow with whom we all like to associate, not only on the floor in the rough and tumble of debate and in the skirmish for parliamentary advantage, but also as we see him socially and personally when the House is not in session.

Mr. McCORMACK. I may say that he is very outstanding in some other ways I know of than in the knowledge of parliamentary law.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JACKSON of California. I should like to associate myself with all the fine tributes that have been paid Mr. Deschler and his ability. Ohio may have been his birthplace and where the monument will stand on that sad day when Lew departs this world, but I think in the tributes to his intelligence and to his over-all ability it has not been mentioned that he spends his summers in California.

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. McGUIRE. I did not have to come down here to learn of Mr. Deschler's birthday today because I sent him a birthday card yesterday. I know every one who is a colleague of ours from Ohio wishes that they were as popular as Mr. Deschler. With all of his attributes we know that he will run on the Democratic ticket if he ever runs for public office.

The SPEAKER. In reference to the suggestion that Lew Deschler take the floor, the Chair would concur in that thought except for the fact that Mr. Deschler is so popular universally and the Chair has witnessed the fact that on many, many occasions gentlemen have lost popularity by taking the floor.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed gratifying, notwithstanding the fact that Lew Deschler was born in Ohio, that he has been able to outlive that unfortunate condition. I had the privilege to serve under what I believe to have been a great Parliamentarian, Mr. Hinds, many years ago. His works, as well as those of Mr. Clark and Mr. Cannon and many others are available to Members. But, I must admit, whether I like the gentleman or not, that frequently he just rules against me. But, I presume he is right. Nevertheless, I consider him the greatest of all of them, and I am indeed gratified that he from time to time comes to my rescue. As to the rule that has been called to our attention by the gentleman from Mississippi, I want to say that it was also the distinguished gentleman, Mr. Deschler, who helped to draft it. So, taking everything into consideration he is doing a splendid job.

Mr. McCORMACK. Might I conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying to our good friend, Lew Deschler, that he has just witnessed a manifestation of our great respect and friendship for him. I know that he will interpret the sincerity of it, and I hope that it brings happiness to him, and to his dear wife and children.

THE PRESIDENT'S PROGRAM

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, perhaps after the dove of peace has fluttered around the Chamber this is no time to make these remarks. But, the country last week heard issued the threat of a legislative purge on the part of the President, a purge directed at those who fail to agree with him in his interpretation of a very foggy mandate, delivered on last November 2. The President has threatened to stump the country against those who fail to agree with him unless they fall into line. I think it is only fair to say that it will not be necessary to go touring again on public funds because in most respects, so far as the legislative program is concerned, the country is already stumped; stumped with regard to most of the blank checks which were issued during the election and which now are coming due and payable. There are simply not enough funds in the currency of promise to redeem them all, and no tirades of abuse directed by the President against those who oppose state socialism is going to solve the situation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include data relating to social security.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include some pertinent data.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SADLAK addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

NONSTOP FLIGHT AROUND THE WORLD

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include the Associated Press account of the trip of the B-50 which flew around the world nonstop.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a couple of flyspecks upon the body politic of America issued a statement on what they would do in the event of a war between the United States and Russia. I am not going to waste my minute saying anything more than that they spoke treason.

However, an event was consummated yesterday which will say much more effectively to the world what the American people can do in the event of a war. I refer to that epochal event, the circling of the globe by the B-50. Its impact upon the future history of the world is probably as great as the dropping of the atomic bomb.

It is my conviction, Mr. Speaker, that this demonstrated ability to fly anywhere, anytime, and carry a pay load to the ends of the earth, is a more effective deterrent for any world aggressor than all the conferences that have been held. This flight can mean more for peace and more to secure human freedom in the world than all the millions of words that have been spoken and all the billions of dollars that are being spent to secure bases and to win friends. God grant that we have the wisdom to use rightly and justly the tremendous weapons and the great power He has placed in our hands.

Let us speak softly and temperately while we carry the big stick.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a report on the blizzard of 1949.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Martin H. Budge, director of the Wisconsin State Department of Agriculture.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mr. O'CONNELL.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a copy of the Washington Newsletter distributed by Congressman PAUL SHAFER, of Michigan.

Mr. BATTLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent in Fairfield, Ala., about traffic accidents.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two occasions and include two resolutions.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture be permitted to sit during the session of the House today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to call the attention of the House to the fact that today marks the one hundredth anniversary of the establishment of the Department of the Interior in our Government, that great Department that so well serves this country in developing our natural resources. It has been a prime factor in the development of irrigation not only for the benefit of the West but for the benefit of the whole country. It has helped in the development of our soil resources. In the matter of electric energy, it has more than any other agency of the Government to do with making that power available to the whole country. The Geological Survey in the mapping of this country has done outstanding work. The Fish and Wildlife Service has to do with the development of our fish and wildlife resources that mean so much not only to the economy of the country but to the pleasure of the people.

The Bureau of Mines serves this country equally well in the search for new mineral resources and the study of better methods of processing ores. The Bureau of Territories and Insular Affairs is of great value to our Territories in their efforts to improve their political and economic status. The Office of Indian Affairs, transferred to the Interior Department many years ago from the War Department, has one of the most difficult domestic assignments in our Federal Government. The National Park Service is the custodian of our national parks and monuments which were enjoyed by millions of people last year.

The Department of the Interior has concluded 100 years of outstanding service to the Nation. There is still a great service to be performed, and this agency has the personnel, the background, the history, and experience to do it. Its record of achievement gives us confidence that in the years ahead it will continue to contribute greatly to the social and economic welfare of the United States.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that the hearings which I previously stated would be held Wednesday on the veterans' pension bill were continued up to about 1:30 on yesterday, but could not be concluded, so tomorrow the hearings will continue before the Committee on Rules.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. A number of Members have spoken to me about what the President's attitude is in respect to this pension bill. He has been making many statements as to what should and should not be passed. In fact, he seems to be quite definite about many proposals before us. I wonder if the gentleman would undertake, as chairman of the Rules Committee, to find out whether the President is for or against this pension bill at this time. I think the President should state his position.

Mr. SABATH. I am not in position to state whether he is for or against it. When all the information is available, perhaps he will then be in position to know whether or not he will be in favor of the bill. However, he is for any and all legislation that is for the best interests of the country.

COMMUNISM VERSUS AMERICA

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, those elements in and out of Congress that have been maligning and abusing the Committee on Un-American Activities now have an opportunity to choose sides. The Communist party—which is composed largely of a racial minority—announced yesterday that if we get into a war with Russia they would take the side of Russia.

Communism is not a party, it is a Gestapo. It is a machine. It is a worldwide organization, and it has in this country untold numbers of Communist-front organizations, which our committee has exposed. Many Communists, and especially many members of Communist fronts, are today holding offices in your States and in the Federal Government.

I say it is time for the American people to wake up, clean house and fumigate, before it is everlastingly too late.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HALLECK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the distinguished majority leader whether he can tell us about the program for the balance of the week and next week also. I may say at the outset to the gentleman that I have discussed the matter of the Gulf States marine fisheries compact bill with the ranking Republican member, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WEICHEL], who said it is entirely agreeable with him to dispose of that matter today.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is fine. With reference to the program for next week, I ask the indulgence of the membership until tomorrow to announce the full program for next week.

The Department of Labor appropriation bill will come up on Wednesday of next week. As to what will be scheduled before and after that, I am unable to state at the present time, but I will be in a position to make an announcement on that tomorrow.

If we finish with the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill today, which I understand will involve 2 hours of general debate, I would like to take up the bill relating to the approval of the Gulf States marine fisheries compact. I understand there is not much opposition, if any. When that is completed there would be no further legislative business for the balance of the week.

The House will meet tomorrow, however, because of the special order obtained by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] to properly commemorate the great life and great contributions to American history of General Casimir Pulaski. That is done each year and the House will meet only for that purpose tomorrow.

Therefore, as I have previously stated, there will be no business following the disposition of the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill today and also if the Gulf States bill is disposed of. I will say frankly if the situation develops where both bills cannot be disposed of today, I shall put this Gulf States compact bill on the program for next week. I would not feel warranted and there would be no necessity in keeping the Members here on the floor tomorrow or to not give them a full day in their offices, because we are all busy, and I would not want this bill to stand in the way. But I am hopeful that we can take it up in view of the fact that there is very little, if any, opposition to it. I hope that we can dispose of it after the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill is disposed of.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will make the flat statement without regard as to

whether or not this bill does come up, that there will be no business for the remainder of the week.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1950

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3083) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes. Pending my motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 2 hours, one-half the time to be controlled by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3083) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, with Mr. PRIEST in the chair.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. PRIEST). Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] will control 1 hour of the time and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] 1 hour.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] is recognized.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, for the third consecutive year, the Subcommittee on Treasury and Post Office of the Appropriations Committee brings to you a unanimous report. The bill today was reported unanimously out of the subcommittee, and unanimously out of the full committee.

In view of that fact, I think I might trespass upon your time for a few moments to do a little bragging about this subcommittee of which I am justly proud.

Two years ago, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] was made chairman of the Subcommittee on Treasury and Post Office Departments. It was my privilege to serve with him as the ranking minority member. I made the statement on this floor last year that I considered the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] one of the ablest chairmen in this body. He is not only an able chairman, but he is also a courteous gentleman. He showed every consideration to the minority members of the committee in the deliberations on the bill.

This year I want to say to you that he is equally as cooperative, now that the situation has changed and I have the honor of being chairman of the committee and he the ranking minority member. We owe him a debt of gratitude for the work he has done on this bill.

The other members of the committee this year, while they are new on the Appropriations Committee, are veterans of the House. The gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ] has a long record of public service. He served his own State in many public capacities before coming to Congress. He has been a Member of the Congress for several terms. This year his ability was recognized by placing him on the Appropriations Committee, and he has made a notable contribution to the work of our subcommittee.

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], the other Democratic member of the committee, is also a veteran in this body. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] has had a wide business experience in his native State of Louisiana. His judgment and business acumen made him a most useful member throughout the deliberations of the committee.

The other minority member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT], served with us for a while; but I am sorry to state that he found it necessary to leave Washington for a short time on account of his health. After his departure his place was ably filled by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN].

I would not be fair if I did not also say that in my judgment in Mr. Kenneth Sprankle we have one of the ablest executive secretaries who is connected with the Committee on Appropriations. He has served us efficiently and well; and the work of the committee would not have been half as comprehensive, or half as well done, had it not been for his able services.

We have submitted a report dealing in detail with the recommendations of our subcommittee; I, therefore, will not at this time attempt to discuss all of its various items. I wish to say to you, however, that the Treasury and Post Office Departments spend more of the budget money than any other departments of the Government, not excluding the armed services. Of this amount, however, by far the greater part consists of permanent and indefinite appropriations over which the committee has no jurisdiction: For example, we spend annually over $5,000,000,000 for interest on the public debt. This amount cannot be changed, because whatever the interest is, annually, we must pay it; for, certainly, the Government is not going to default in the payment of any part of the interest on its debt. It is estimated that next year because of some changes in the interest rate there will be an increase of $125,000,000 which will bring the total payments for interest on the public debt to $5,540,000,000. In addition to that, as a permanent and indefinite appropriation we have the refunding of internal revenue collections. This item covers the amount of taxes that the Government has collected from its citizens over and above the amounts that are legally due. Each year these overpayments must be refunded.

This year, for the first time, we are making a change in the method of handling these funds. Whereas it has been customary in the past to show them as budget expenditures, this year we are changing the bookkeeping so as to deduct the refunds from the receipts that come into the Treasury, and instead of reporting them as expenditures we are showing only the net receipts which come into the Treasury after the deduction of refunds. Those refunds, however, must be paid out of the Treasury.

The permanent indefinite appropriations amount to $8,260,000,000. In addition, the Treasury Department handles large trust funds, over which this Committee has absolutely no jurisdiction; they are funds out of which must be paid the Federal old age and survivors' insurance benefits which are estimated at $2,685,000,000 for 1950. Another item of these funds is the unemployment trust fund the total payments from which for 1950 is estimated at $1,202,000,000.

The various trust fund payments aggregate $3,888,000,000 for 1950. The permanent and indefinite appropriations together with the trust funds for 1950 aggregate, therefore, approximately $12,000,000,000.

The operating expenses of the two departments are the expenditures over which the committee does have jurisdiction. They are the expenditures which we examined very carefully. Sitting in session day after day we have interrogated the heads of all the departments, bureaus and divisions and may I assure you that the committee did not approach its task with any thought of partisan politics. We recognized that the Treasury and Post Office Departments are the two most important Departments of the United States Government and unless they function properly our governmental machinery is bound to suffer. We recognized, on the other hand, that we are facing huge expenditures during the approaching year; therefore we felt it our duty to investigate the requests of these Departments to see what reductions could be made without impairing their efficiency and which would at the same time permit us to reduce the tremendous budget with which we are faced.

The over-all picture as we present it to you is that in 1949 the appropriations for the Treasury Department were $796,000,000. I am using round figures in presenting this to you. The Department request was $1,093,000,000 for 1950. The committee recommends $1,027,000,000. The amount requested by the Treasury Department was $231,500,000 more than was appropriated for that Department for 1949. In fairness to the Department, however, it should be said that $225,000,000 of the increase was for the stock piling of strategic materials, which is very important as I shall explain to you later. The balance of the increase was largely due to the increase in salaries under Public Law 900 which was enacted by the Congress during the last

session. The committee reduced the amount requested by $65,000,000.

It may be that in some instances we have trimmed pretty close, but, nevertheless, we feel that this is a reasonable bill, and, may I repeat, the committee is unanimous in that thought. When I say the committee is unanimous, it does not mean that we were always unanimous in committee. We had differences of opinion but we resolved those differences within the committee so that we could bring this report to you today as the unanimous report of the committee. Although in some instances the appropriations have been trimmed pretty close we believe that we have allowed enough money for the Treasury Department to operate efficiently during the next year.

For the Post Office Department the appropriations for 1949 were $1,857,000,000. The Department requested $2,079,000,000, which was an increase of $187,000,000 over 1949. Most of that increase is due to Public Law 900, which increased the salaries of Federal employees. We have reduced that appropriation $34,500,000.

Summing up the two Departments, their appropriations for 1949 were $2,653,219,000. They requested $3,172,666,000 for 1950. The committee recommends $3,072,817,000 for 1950, which is an increase over 1949 of $419,598,000, but a decrease of the amount requested of $99,848,000. Frankly, if we had added these figures up before the committee finished operating, we were so close to the $100,000,000 mark that we might have gone back to see if we could not cut just a few more thousand dollars to make it $100,000,000. But we did not do that. We bring the report to you as it is.

In addition this year there have been added to the duties of this committee two corporations that have heretofore been considered by the Government Corporations Committee. One is the Export-Import Bank of Washington and the other is the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Now, I shall discuss with you briefly some of the outstanding provisions of this report.

In the first place, the language of the report has been greatly simplified. The Bureau of the Budget has done a very excellent job this year in simplifying the language in the various appropriation bills. Not only has it simplified the language, but it has also reduced the language so that the bills are more uniform and they are more understandable.

Moreover, the justifications as presented by the Treasury Department this year were greatly simplified. They were reduced from three volumes as heretofore presented to the committee to one volume. The budget staff of the Treasury Department and members of the staff of the Committee on Appropriations worked together in perfecting those changes which were a material aid to the committee.

Now, the first division of the Treasury Department which I shall discuss is that of the Bureau of Accounts. In connection with this Bureau I think you will be glad to know that we are making substantial progress in the unification and improvement of Government accounts. If there is one point in our Federal system that is now and has been open to criticism in the past it is the accounting systems of the various bureaus and agencies. Nothing is much more important in Government than proper accounting, and yet the accounting methods have varied according to each individual agency. There has been practically no uniformity. In some agencies the accounting systems have been very good; in others they have been very poor. In an effort to accomplish more uniformity in the accounting systems there has been established a joint committee composed of representatives of the Bureau of Accounts of the Treasury Department, of the Bureau of the Budget, and of the General Accounting Office. That committee is studying the various accounting systems with the idea of devising a system that can be recommended to the various governmental units, so that each of the units or agencies may have a uniform system and that we may have a general uniform accounting system throughout the Government.

I know each of you will agree with me that that is a consummation devoutly to be wished. Our committee gave its blessing to this project, and we are hopeful that it will accomplish the purposes for which the joint committee was created.

I shall not discuss the Bureau of Customs because my predecessor as chairman of this committee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD], has worked very hard over that Bureau and has a story to tell you about it, which he will do after I am through. I shall, therefore, leave this subject to him.

One of the main items in this bill, and the one which gave our committee the most concern, was that of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The Bureau of Internal Revenue, as all of you know, collects the taxes for the Federal Government. I have more or less specialized in the field of taxation for a number of years. It was my privilege to serve as the head of the tax department of my own State of Virginia. In my entire experience in taxation I have never seen but one popular tax, and that is the tax the other fellow pays.

In view of that fact, a great many of our citizens try to avoid taxes. Our Supreme Court in Virginia has said that tax avoidance is perfectly proper; that it is neither illegal nor immoral, because avoidance of taxes is merely taking advantage of every provision of the law to see that you do not pay more taxes than your share.

But there is another class of citizens, and I am glad to say that it is comparatively small, who are trying to evade taxes. That is an entirely different situation. They are using illegal methods to prevent paying their fair share of the cost of the Government, which they enjoy. Whenever any citizen escapes his proper share of the burden of taxation he merely passes that burden on to some honest taxpayer who is paying his proper share of the tax burden.

We feel that the Bureau of Internal Revenue should be provided with all reasonable facilities to ferret out the tax dodgers, and to make them contribute their proper share to the Government.

The Bureau of Internal Revenue asked for 7,000 additional employees for this purpose. They argue that they will return to the Treasury $20 for every dollar we spend for their compensation. They make out a pretty good case, because they have brought into the Treasury nearly $5,000,000,000 during the last 3 years in omitted taxes, but we must recognize that sooner or later you reach a point of diminishing returns. Our committee thought that we should approach that point of diminishing returns gradually rather than too rapidly. We allowed the Bureau of Internal Revenue 1,950 additional employees last year.

We have not had an opportunity yet to evaluate their services because they have not been employed long enough to provide the proper statistics. The Treasury this year asked for 1,476 additional employees on a full-year basis, plus 5,473 additional employees to be placed on the rolls during the last half of the fiscal year 1950, which would leave them with an increase of 7,019 persons at the close of the year whom we would have to continue on for the next year. Our committee thought that was too many. We did feel, however, that they should have some additional employees, and after long deliberation we determined that next year the Bureau should be allowed 1,500 additional employees on a full-year basis without any additional part-time employees. We specifically recommend in our report that the funds appropriated shall be used for the employment of full-time men and that it shall not be used to employ 3,000 men for half a year so that we would not have them on our hands next year. We believe that is a sufficient number to do the job. In view of that we reduced the request of the Bureau of Internal Revenue $12,268,000, which was the amount required for the additional men over and above the 1,500 which we have allowed.

In the Bureau of Narcotics we have not cut the budget request one penny. We are faced with a very serious situation today with narcotics throughout the Nation. There is an increase in violations of law and in the use of narcotics. Our committee last year appropriated some funds out of which the Bureau sent several agents abroad. Those agents went abroad and worked with the enforcement officers in other countries, such as Egypt and France. I am happy to report to you that the money was well spent. It paid rich dividends because those agents helped to break up several well-established narcotic gangs in foreign lands, who were shipping narcotics into this country. In other words, we were attacking the problem at the source.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Does the gentleman think it is much better to stop this at the source than to try to catch them and take care of it here?

Mr. GARY. Very much better. That is the reason that this committee broke

a precedent, so far as I know, and appropriated money to send these agents abroad. Of course they had no authority abroad, but they worked with the law-enforcement officers of foreign countries and accomplished a great deal. We have a very serious situation in America with reference to marijuana, as you may have read in the papers recently concerning cases arising out of the use of marijuana, especially by young people. In view of this situation, we felt we should allow this Bureau, which is operating very efficiently, the money which it requested.

In the Bureau of Engraving we reduced their appropriation $2,000,000. That Bureau requested 400 additional employees and then proceeded to tell us that a great many of those employees could not be obtained because they were highly specialized men and were not available. We saw very little point in appropriating money for employees that could not be obtained, so we reduced their appropriation to some extent, but allowed them a sufficient amount to pay overtime to some of their present employees so that they can keep up the work of the department.

In the Secret Service Division, we did not touch the appropriation covering funds which are set aside for the guarding of the President of the United States and Government buildings. We felt that the Secret Service knew better than the committee what funds were necessary for that purpose and we allowed the full amount requested.

However, they did request 33 additional positions for 1950 for enforcing the counterfeiting and other laws which come under the Bureau. There has been some increase in counterfeiting in the United States, and it is very important that those activities be controlled. We felt, however, that an increase of 33 men to the now 333 used for that purpose, a 10 percent increase, was a rather large increase for next year, and we allowed approximately one-fourth of the additional positions which were requested.

In the Bureau of Federal Supplies we made some substantial reductions. I am going to read one sentence from our report which I think is very expressive:

> The committee feels that curtailment should be made in the activities of this Bureau, which shows an appropriation increase of nearly 400 percent in the last 10 years, despite the fact that the major part of the finances of the Bureau are supplied by funds from other appropriations and programs.

The Bureau of Federal Supplies does the buying for the other Federal agencies. A substantial portion of their expenditures comes out of funds supplied by the other agencies, for the articles which they purchase.

We recommended $1,400,000 for the maintenance of that office, which is a reduction of $350,000 below the estimate.

They requested $4,000,000 additional for their general supply fund. That is the fund out of which they purchase supplies. Last year they requested $10,000,000 additional for that purpose, but after the committee refused to appropriate it, they found that they could get advancements from the other departments, and they were able to operate successfully without the additional amount. This year they said that, with the advancements, they still needed $4,000,000. The amount of this capital supply fund was $9,525,000. The committee decided that instead of appropriating $4,000,000 they would just bring the fund up to $10,000,000. Consequently, instead of $4,000,000, the committee recommends $480,000, roughly, for that purpose.

Under the Bureau of Federal Supplies also comes the stock piling of strategic materials. Let me say to you that nothing that this Government is doing today is of greater importance than the stock piling of strategic material. If we have another war, we certainly do not want to be caught short on rubber, tin, and other materials, as we were at the beginning of World War II. The only way to prevent that from recurring is by stock piling these materials in sufficient amount to supply the Nation. The Munitions Board, which is responsible for this task, has worked out a 5-year program, and that program is advancing at a very satisfactory pace. Our committee did not curtail that program in any particular.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. I happen to be a member of the subcommittee that drew the Stock Piling Act, and of course I know how short we are on some very critical materials.

We were induced in the amendment we made several years ago to insert a clause which states that if metals and other things were in short supply in the domestic market they should not be stock-piled. I have been sorry ever since that we put that qualification in there because it has acted as a road block to getting the proper stock pile.

I wish to endorse the gentleman's statement of a moment ago that there is nothing more important to our safety and security than having proper stock piles at this particular time. I wish also to compliment the committee in giving what these men asked in practically every detail.

Mr. GARY. I thank the gentleman from California and wish to say that we did not reduce one penny the budget request for stock piling. The request totaled $525,000,000, which included $314,000,000 in new cash and $211,000,000 in contract authority, plus $250,000,000 in cash for the purpose of liquidating prior contract authority.

The committee allowed the $250,000,000 for liquidating the prior contract authority. It did not, however, feel that it was necessary to appropriate the entire amount requested in cash for 1950; so instead of the $314,000,000 in cash the committee recommends $275,000,000 in cash. The $39,000,000, however, which was deducted from the cash, has been added to the contract authority, raising the contract authority from $211,000,000 to $250,000,000; so that next year there will be appropriated for stock-piling purposes $250,000,000 to liquidate obligations already incurred, $275,000,000 in new cash, and $250,000,000 in contract authority. This aggregates the total of $525,000,000 which has been requested.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I shall be very glad to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. No Member of the House has been more interested in the stock piling of strategic materials than the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, [Mr. MARTIN]. He is a veteran of World War I, and has followed this item very closely down through the years. I know that he is pleased with the action taken by the committee on this matter.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I wish to thank the gentleman from Virginia for the opportunity to express my point of view on the action of the Appropriations Committee in approving the full amount asked for by the Munitions Board representatives in this program. I am still holding the Munitions Board to task, however, for having required a delivery of only 22 percent of the planned stock pile in two years and a half of a program that was planned to be completed in 5 years.

I wish also to call attention to the fact that until last year the program had lagged terribly. The Eightieth Congress, a year ago, in planning the appropriations for the current fiscal year gave the first forward impetus to the acquisition of strategic and critical materials by more ample appropriations.

While I am glad to commend the Committee on Appropriations for its action in this proposed bill, I wish to put the Munitions Board on notice that I am not settling for any 22 percent, the strategic and critical materials on hand. We cannot fight a 22-percent war. We have had 2½ years under Public Law 520, which was enacted in July 1946, to do a better job than that. I have not overlooked the fact that the RFC crawled out under this loophole my friend from California [Mr. JOHNSON], referred to. They handled $12,000,000,000 worth of strategic and critical materials, but when this is all settled only $400,000,000 of that had gotten into the strategic and critical materials stock pile and at the time I made this inquiry a year ago they still had only about $250,000,000 of that material left. They made complete use of that loophole we allowed to get into Public Law 520. That is one reason why the stock-pile program is lagging.

Mr. GARY. May I say to the gentleman that was one of the reasons we reduced the amount of cash for next year because we did not think the deliveries would be sufficient to require the full amount of the cash requested. I may say to the gentleman, however, that the Munitions Board is running at the present time into real difficulties because of the lack of cash funds. There is now pending before the Deficiency Committee of the Appropriations Committee a deficiency request for this year.

The Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from

Missouri [Mr. CANNON] was with us when we heard the Munitions Board and when that Board pointed out the situation to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, although its request had not yet been transmitted to the Congress, he assured them that as soon as it reached his committee it would receive immediate consideration.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I am glad to have that additional assurance because I think there is room for some timely help in taking advantage of the supply of materials that may now be available provided they get the funds.

Mr. GARY. That is unquestionably true. That should be taken care of and will be taken care of, no doubt, in the deficiency appropriation for this year. This is needed vitally and immediately. We feel we have provided ample funds for next year. As a matter of fact, we have recommended everything they requested.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Is it not true that the Bureau of the Budget cut somewhat the funds requested by this agency, and that our committee allowed all that was recommended by the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. This is a problem, of course, which is the heart of our defense program. Public Law 520, which was reported by the Committee on Military Affairs, and which the gentleman from Iowa and I sponsored, provided for a report to be made to the Congress every 6 months. Was that report made available to the committee in arriving at a conclusion as to the amount to be appropriated for the strategic materials stock pile?

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Mr. DURHAM. The committee had that report before it?

Mr. GARY. The chairman and other representatives of the Munitions Board came before the committee and presented charts and went very fully into all of the problems. We had a very complete hearing.

Mr. DURHAM. The committee went fully into the report on each item?

Mr. GARY. Yes, into the various items. On the chart they showed the various needs and exactly what they were contemplating. Of course, much of this information is such that it cannot be divulged on the floor of this House.

Mr. DURHAM. Yes, that is true.

Mr. GARY. But the committee was in executive session and they gave us the various items in detail.

Mr. DURHAM. We have the same report in the Armed Services Committee made available to us. I am sure it would be necessary to have this information, otherwise the committee could not act wisely on appropriations.

Mr. GARY. The committee went into that very fully with the Munitions Board, with the Bureau of Federal Supplies, and with the Army.

Mr. DURHAM. This is not only a program that aids in our national defense, but it is very necessary to keep our mining interests in operation in this country. There are some items in there at the present time I am sure the chairman of the committee is aware of that are in very short supply. There is some legislation pending on those items at the present time.

Mr. GARY. It is very essential to our entire civilian population——

Mr. DURHAM. That is correct.

Mr. GARY. As well as the mining interests. If our industries are going to run in time of emergency then they must be supplied with materials. If we do not have those materials the industries cannot produce.

Mr. DURHAM. I want to congratulate the committee on bringing out this amount of money at the present time. Last year, as the gentleman knows, we had to go after a supplemental appropriation by which we did do a pretty good job on this stock piling which had been neglested for some time.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SHAFER. I merely want to make an observation that as chairman of Subcommittee No. 3 in the Eightieth Congress I had considerable to do with the legislation concerning the stock piling of strategic materials. I want to say now that we are neglecting a most important program. In Michigan, for instance, we have copper mines that are under water today, and it will take 7 years to get them out from under water to produce? It is up to this Congress to see that this program is carried out in its entirety.

Mr. GARY. I do not want to get into an argument as to the efficiency of the program. I do want to say, however, that I will not agree with the gentleman that we are neglecting it. It may be possible that we are not doing all we could do in connection with this program, but if we are not, that is not the responsibility of our committee, because we are allowing them everything that was requested. If the stock-piling activities are not proceeding at a sufficiently rapid pace, then somebody else should be prodded rather than our committee. We are unanimous in our agreement as to the importance of the program.

Mr. SHAFER. I agree with the gentleman to a certain extent, but I want him to recall that in the last Congress the stock-piling appropriation was cut from $750,000,000 to about $225,000,000, and until the Congress did something about it it remained at $225,000,000. After the Congress got busy and called attention to the fact that this amount had been cut by the Bureau of the Budget on recommendation of the President, nothing was done. But, after we did call attention to that fact it was increased back to the original amount as set forth in the original legislation.

Mr. GARY. Our committee this year is allowing $775,000,000; $250,000,000 to pay on previous obligations, $275,000,000 of new money, and $250,000,000 of new contract authority.

Mr. SHAFER. It is a drop in the bucket as to what we are spending in other places in the world as far as our preparedness is concerned.

Mr. GARY. Well, that is all that our committee was asked to appropriate.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. It was the unanimous feeling of our subcommittee that the new Chairman of the Munitions Board, Mr. Carpenter, had put some zip into this program, and it was being accelerated.

Mr. GARY. That is unquestionably true, and we were very much gratified at the progress that is now being made.

Now, with reference to the Coast Guard, and I must be very brief as to these other items, last year our committee had the feeling that possibly the Coast Guard was trying to create a second navy. The Coast Guard has a very important function to perform, particularly in the matters of safety and shipping, but to be certain that there may be no overlapping between the activities of the Coast Guard and the activities of the Navy, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the Secretary of the Treasury agreed upon an outside agency to come in and make a survey. This agency was known as the Ebasco Agency. As is quite frequently the case when we appoint surveys for the purpose of efficiency and economy, they frequently result in efficiency but seldom result in economy. The Coast Guard this year used that very report as the basis for asking for a large increase in funds.

One of the greatest defects we have found in the Coast Guard is the lack of a proper accounting system. The survey recommended the employment of an accountant and a supply officer. That has been done and they are installing today a modern accounting system in the Coast Guard. Our committee was greatly gratified at the improvement that has been made in the efficiency of the Department, and we have allowed what we think is necessary to keep up that pace during the next year.

The Post Office Department occupies a very unusual position. In the first place, they have very little to say about what they shall spend, because the ICC tells them what they shall pay the railroads for hauling the mail and the Civil Aeronautics Board tells them what they shall pay the air lines. Two years ago the railroads filed an application with the ICC for an increase of 45 percent in the rate structure for handling the mail, and subsequent thereto filed an amended application requesting a 65-percent increase instead of a 45-percent increase. The ICC allowed a 25-percent temporary increase.

For the first time the Post Office is undertaking to present a strong defense to these applications. The Post Office today has a very efficient solicitor, and he has brought in an expert in rate matters to handle these cases before the ICC. They are putting up a defense, yet

whatever the ICC determines is the proper amount the Post Office will have to pay.

The estimated deficit for the Post Office Department for 1949 is $526,000,000. The estimated deficit for 1950 is $522,000,000. In other words, the Post Office Department is giving approximately half a billion dollars a year to the users of the mails by carrying the mails at less than cost. The only class of mail handled by the Post Office Department that is on a paying basis is first-class mail.

I have here some figures which were just released on yesterday that show the actual deficits by classifications for the year 1948. This is a cost-ascertainment report of the Post Office Department. I shall give you these figures in round numbers, and the totals may not add correctly because of the elimination of some of the small figures.

In 1948 the profit from first-class mail was $154,300,000, the profit from postal savings was $19,000,000, and the other, unassignable profits, were $21,900,000. That constitutes the entire profits of the Post Office Department. On the other hand, here are the losses: On second-class mail, $163,400,000. What does that mean? Newspapers and magazines are classified as second-class mail. That means that the Post Office Department is subsidizing the newspaper and magazine publishers to the tune of $163,400,000 a year.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. Last night the Scripps-Howard papers in the United States carried an editorial in which they expressed their willingness to pay their way. They said that the newspapers of our country, which are forever editorializing against subsidies should not be expecting subsidies themselves. It was a very good editorial, written in the interest of the taxpayers of our country.

Mr. GARY. I am very glad the gentleman has made that statement.

Third-class mail consists of advertising matter and parcels under 8 ounces. Last year the loss on third-class mail was $86,700,000. What does that mean? It means that the Post Office is subsidizing mail-order houses and other commercial users to the tune of $86,700,000.

We hear a great deal of talk about the subsidies given to the farmers of this Nation, but we do not hear much about the subsidies given to other commercial interests through the Post Office Department.

On fourth-class mail, which is parcel post, the loss this last year was $76,100,000. Let me tell you something about the parcel post. We have increased the size of packages that the Government can carry by parcel post. The Railway Express Agency has increased its rates and it now has a minimum charge of $1. Therefore, all unprofitable packages which were previously carried by the railway express service are being carried today by the Post Office Department, because the Post Office Department is carrying them at less than cost.

On domestic air mail the loss was $27,100,000.

On foreign mail, $1,700,000.

Foreign air mail, $27,800,000.

Registered mail, $9,600,000.

Insurance, $1,100,000.

C. o. d., $6,200,000.

Special delivery mail $11,600,000.

Money orders, $28,500,000.

Postal notes, $4,000,000.

That makes a total net loss, after deducting the profit from first-class mail, of $249,200,000 on revenue-producing mail service.

In addition to that, the penalty mail amounts to $3,100,000.

Franked mail, $962,000.

Free mail for the blind, $353,000.

Free registered mail, $7,600,000.

Nonpostal services, $18,700,000.

That makes a grand total of losses of $308,972,000.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. PACE. Have the gentlemen of the committee made any estimate of what the increased cost would be to the average newspaper, if the second-class rate should be raised to where that service was self-supporting?

Mr. GARY. The committee has not made any such estimate. That is not within the province of our committee. The Postmaster General on February 21, 1949, submitted to the House of Representatives detailed suggestions for additional increases in postal rates and services. His recommendations have been incorporated in the provisions of a bill, H. R. 2945. That bill is now before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. It is within the province of that committee and the Congress of the United States to fix rates for these various classifications of mail. All that our committee is trying to do in this report is to point out the facts and to urge upon the Congress the necessity for placing the Post Office Department on a self-sustaining basis.

The committee unanimously recommends to the Congress that they give immediate consideration to that subject.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GARY. I yield further.

Mr. PACE. I was very much interested in the question I propounded for this reason: As the gentleman knows, in a democracy, where the people are supposed to rule, it is more important than in any other form of government that the people be kept informed; that they receive the daily newspapers; that they have an opportunity to receive them at what we might call a nominal cost. Therefore, in my own personal study of this question, there has come to my mind the other side, as to whether or not if we made the newspaper pay its entire cost of distribution through the mail, it would result in raising the cost of subscription to the newspaper to such a rate as would substantially reduce the circulation.

Mr. GARY. I will say to the gentleman that that is unquestionably an argument to be advanced against the increase in rates. This bill does not deal with increases in rates. We have no authority to consider that subject, but we are urging that this Congress give the matter earnest and serious consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] has consumed 1 hour.

Mr. CANFIELD. Does the distinguished gentlemar desire additional time?

Mr. GARY. I think I have concluded my remarks, thank you.

May I say I am sorry I did not know I was consuming all of the time allotted to our side. I have only one request for time, but I am anxious for some of my colleagues, other members of the committee, to be heard. If the gentleman from New Jersey has some extra time, I will appreciate it if he wil' allow them some of his time.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am pleased to say to the chairman of our subcommittee that I do have extra time, and I shall be happy to accommodate his request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 25 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I feel it is a good omen that this bill is brought up on the birthday of our distinguished Parliamentarian, Lew Deschler, the right arm of the Speaker, and the savior of many chairmen of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

It is very pleasing to me to have the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill again brought before the House with a unanimous subcommittee report, as it did throughout the Eightieth Congress. This is further evidence of the nonpartisan approach which the subcommittee has continued to take in providing funds for these two service agencies. I have had several opportunities to express in the House the deep affection I hold for the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY], and what I have said in past years of his work as ranking minority member of the subcommittee is equally true now that he has assumed the chairmanship. He has been fair and courteous to everyone, has permitted thorough consideration of the estimates while operating the hearings with dispatch and order.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] has a unique background for his assignment because of his experience as head of the tax department in his native State of Virginia and his work on the House Legislative Committee dealing with Post Office matters. He is characterful and for my money he is "the salt of the earth."

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The gentleman very adequately expresses, I am sure, the sentiments of every member of the subcommittee.

Mr. CANFIELD. I thank the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico.

It has also been a pleasure to serve with the chairman's two colleagues on

the majority side the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ] who has just joined me in this tribute to our subcommittee chairman, and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN]. Both were newly assigned to the committee this year, although they are veterans of this House; they have good legal and business backgrounds and they acquitted themselves very well. Unfortunately, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT], who was originally my associate in the minority, was taken ill early in the hearings. He is now convalescing in the Southland, and we hope for his speedy return. Everyone knows of his outstanding record of service both in the New York State Legislature and in this Congress. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT], is one of the greatest lawyers in the land. We did not have the full benefit of his experience which I know would have resulted from his continued service with us this year. In his absence the committee was fortunate to have the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN] substitute for the gentleman from New York, and his was a happy choice, bringing a representative of the great Northwest to the subcommittee, which considers many vital matters involving that region in which he lives and which he represents so well. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN] in physical stature is the biggest man in the Congress of the United States, and I want to bear this witness, he is also big in mental stature, his mental processes are triggerlike, and he has exerted his abilities in these hearings and made a real contribution.

It is also good to have the opportunity to express thanks and appreciation to the executive secretary of the subcommittee, Mr. Kenneth Sprankle, who entered a new field when our hearings started. He promptly showed his ability to grasp the subject and he has rendered us much valuable assistance. He is a veteran in congressional experience.

I shall not comment too much on the bill itself. The two major titles cover the Treasury and the Post Office. Both of them are service agencies, and their work load and expenditures are largely determined by outside factors. It is particularly difficult to determine so many months ahead the work load of the Post Office, which has the right to request and receive supplemental funds if shown to be necessary for the proper expedition of the mail. There may be places where cuts have been a bit too deep for personal services and deficiencies will be incurred. At the same time, however, it is the feeling of the subcommittee that these may be obviated if the present business recession is continued or expands. I see no need for any deficiency or supplemental appropriations for objects other than personal services during the fiscal year 1950. Your subcommittee has been most cautious in making sure that the efficiency of these two departments, as well as the other two agencies included in this bill, the Export-Import Bank and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, will not be impaired. They may have to economize somewhat, but there are mighty few, if any, instances where economies cannot be made without loss of efficiency and service.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. I believe that the Post Office Department could raise its efficiency if they appointed career men to the top jobs in the service. In 1920 it was my privilege, a Republican, to persuade Senator Phelan of California, a Democrat, to appoint a man out of the Stockton post office to become the postmaster, over the pleas of politicians to put in a purely political appointee. Frankly, I cannot understand why the post office is not run by men who are trained in the service, but invariably the man who gets the top post gets it because of some political work. That applies alike to Republican administrations and to Democratic administrations. You have the curious situation that the man who is appointed to the post-office job which pays the highest salary and gives him the most power is trained to do the job by people who are his subordinates and get only a fraction of his salary. I am looking forward to the day when people who devote their lives to the postal service may have the opportunity of looking forward to getting the top spot in their post office or somewhere else in the Department.

I mention this because I know the gentleman last year commented on the fact that President Truman appointed Mr. Donaldson, a career man, as Postmaster General of the United States, which was a very good example, and I hope it will be followed all through the service so that these career men may have the opportunity of getting the best job if they render an efficient service.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am glad to hear the gentleman from California make that statement, because I know how close he has been to the postal service and how much he has been interested in better service in his part of the country. Last year he was very helpful to the subcommittee in calling to our attention some deficiencies in the far West, notably in the State of California, all of which are being corrected. I am sure he does not mean to say that the man now heading that Department is in anyway an amateur. Mr. Donaldson, as the gentleman intimated, is a career man. He has had 44 years of service, having started as a letter carrier. He has really applied himself to his assignment. Further, he testified this year before our committee that in appointing new postmasters the appointments of career men were on the increase.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman mentioned the fact that today is the birthday of our Parliamentarian, Mr. Lew Deschler.

Mr. CANFIELD. May I say to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that I mentioned that in my lead-off statement. I said it was a good omen that this bill was being brought up on his birthday.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to join the gentleman in wishing Mr. Deschler a very happy birthday. We are all indebted to him for his work during the years. He is loyal to every Speaker under which he serves, but he must be absolutely honest in his interpretation of the legislation that is offered and passed. He is endlessly patient in advising those of us who ask for information regarding legislation. He deserves the best there is.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I suggest that the amity that exists on this subcommittee between the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] is als a nice birthday present for Mr. Deschler.

Mr. CANFIELD. I thank the gentleman and I am sure the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] is appreciative.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES. The distinguished chairman of this great subcommittee has given considerable attention to the matter of individuals being appointed to certain positions because they are qualified for their jobs. He tells us that he hopes the time will come when career people will get these higher pay positions.

While the Postmaster General was before the subcommittee I wonder whether anything was said with respect to appointments to certain jobs, for instance as rural-mail carriers and such jobs as that, and whether the appointments are made of men who get the top grades or whether these men are selected on a political basis? Has that matter been discussed?

Mr. CANFIELD. May I say to the gentleman from Kansas that was not discussed. That would be a matter to be discussed by the committee of which the gentleman is a member, the legislative committee. The gentleman from Kansas knows that our committee is an appropriating committee.

Mr. REES. I just wondered if the gentleman does not care to comment on that.

Mr. CANFIELD. I will say this much, that the gentleman who is speaking in the well of the House is not so naive as to fail to realize that that situation has been going on for many years in both Republican and Democratic administrations.

Mr. REES. That is right.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am hopeful that the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, which will go a long way toward eliminating that abuse, will be approved by this Congress. Both the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. John W. Snyder, and the Postmaster General, Mr. Jesse M. Donaldson, are men with sound training, high moral character, and faithful public servants. They can be trusted to do the best possible job with the money we have allowed them to effect savings wherever possible, and to provide efficient service.

I want to salute particularly three agencies in the Treasury, which were the subjects of management surveys last

year, and which have profited by those surveys and today are doing a better job therefore. They are the Coast Guard, under the leadership of Admiral Joseph W. Farley and the chief of his planning and control staff, Captain Richmond; the Bureau of Customs, under Acting Commissioner Frank Dow; and the Bureau of Internal Revenue, headed by Commissioner George Schoeneman. And while praises are being sung, I want to single out Mr. Paul Banning, head of the Division of Disbursement in the Treasury, who appeared before the subcommittee to ask less money than he had last year, and who said: "We had a saving, and we turned it back to the Treasury." It is not the first time he has asked us for less money; he has made a record, and he is an inspiration to others.

When Paul Banning made that statement I interrupted him to say this: "I think that the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Snyder, should take the statement you have just made and see that it is properly framed and hung in every Federal agency in this country, each to bear the name of Paul Banning, Chief Disbursing Officer, United States Treasury."

Further along in his testimony Mr. Banning made this statement: "We may have to effect more economies this year," and in making that statement he seemed to feel as if he were being challenged to do a better job, and all of the members of the committee were exceedingly pleased with his presentation.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. The gentleman knows that in the examinations that have been given the last 3 years by the College Entrance Examination Board that the cadets at the Coast Guard Academy have finished ahead in their average marks of the midshipmen at Annapolis and the cadets at West Point, which is a good indication of the caliber of men they are getting in the Coast Guard.

Mr. CANFIELD. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. On the matter of the Coast Guard, can the distinguished gentleman inform us why the contemplated chapel at New London is to be partly financed by private donations? That there has never been a chapel at the Coast Guard Academy seems strange. Some of my constituents who have been solicited for contributions have asked me why. They apparently feel it would be suitable for the Government of the United States to erect a chapel for the Coast Guard just as it has at Annapolis and West Point.

Mr. CANFIELD. May I say to the gentlewoman from Ohio that that matter was not called to our attention by the Coast Guard. However, we are glad to hear about it now.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. In reference to the section of the bill having to do with motor facilities in the Post Office Department, I see the committee has provided $5,631,000 for the purchase of trucks and tractors for the delivery of the mail. That is new equipment, is it?

Mr. CANFIELD. That is right.

Mr. McDONOUGH. We have a problem in Los Angeles County now.

Mr. CANFIELD. Our subcommittee is aware of that, and it was explored most thoroughly last year and this year.

Mr. McDONOUGH. We have a wide expansive day delivery, and we have been tolerating an inefficient truck-delivery system for a long time. We have some trucks so old we cannot even buy the parts from the manufacturers any longer. I trust that out of this $5,631,000 a proportionate share to meet the urgency and necessity in Los Angeles county will be forthcoming. What Assistant Postmaster General could inform me of the proportionate share we may receive?

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Burke, the First Assistant Postmaster General, also Mr. Myers, the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General.

May I say to the gentleman from California that the subcommitee is aware of his interest in this problem. He discussed it with the subcommittee last year, and we were given assurance by Postmaster General Donaldson that the problem in his section of the country would be met. The employment picture in California has improved; more people are seeking employment in the postal service out there. The big difficulty at the moment is the shortage of space. Space in Federal buildings is inadequate, and satisfactory leased quarters cannot be found. Highway postal service has eased the situation somewhat around Los Angeles. Los Angeles has the only helicopter mail service in the country, and it has been very valuable in speeding up mail service in that area as page 114 of the hearings shows. Over half the appropriation in this bill for electric-car service will go to California.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. If the gentleman will yield further, on the matter of the Post Office, did the subcommittee go into the matter of the cost to the Department of all these special stamps?

Mr. CANFIELD. Yes, indeed. I am going to discuss that further in my presentation this afternoon.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. May I ask if your discussion will include the number of stamps demanded by legislation as well as those that are automatically printed by the Department?

Mr. CANFIELD. That is right.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CANFIELD. I have made reference to Customs, and therein lies what I consider to be the most interesting story of our subcommittee's work these last 2 years; yes, the top story of the full committee's work. You may recall that in 1947, when this committee reported to you a $3,000,000-plus cut in the $36,000,000 request of Customs for the fiscal year 1948, there was a hue and cry throughout the land. The then Commissioner of Customs fired and furloughed border and port guards right and left, and governors, mayors, chambers of commerce, and what-have-you moved on Washington. A portion of the press editorialized that a great crime had been committed. What was the aftermath? I shall tell you.

Our committee undertook an investigation by an independent engineering concern, the Senate Committee on Executive Expenditures moved in and the Secretary of the Treasury ordered Customs to take a self-inventory. In a few weeks a great proportion of the men fired or furloughed were returned to their posts, the Commissioner of Customs was relegated to a less important position and the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Snyder, expressing regrets over what had happened, assured me that Customs would do a real job under its appropriation. They did just that and now listen. Customs came back the next year and its request for funds—those for fiscal 1949—were $500,000 less than granted them the year before when those not interested in saving money for the taxpayers of the United States tried to do a job on this committee. Our detractors were 100 percent wet and our work has been fully borne out as proper and wholesome.

Mr. Chairman, in the hearings this year I have commended Secretary Snyder, his Under Secretary, Mr. Wiggins, and the Acting Commissioner of Customs, Mr. Dow, and the whole Customs establishment for applying themselves and doing a real job. They tell us frankly that the investigation and self-inventory made these last 2 years not only promoted efficiency, but will in time develop new economies in their Bureau. And listen also to this. They thank us for what we did for them.

In some field offices of the Treasury employees are getting higher salaries than the head of the Bureau, and in one instance even more than the Secretary of the Treasury. I asked Secretary Snyder what he thought of this condition, and he quite rightly termed it an outrage. Interesting material on this appears on page 27 of our hearings. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue, who is charged with collecting over $43,000,000,000, receives only $10,000 per year; less than some national bank examiners. The Commissioner of Customs receives $10,000 a year, while there is under him a collector in one port receiving $12,000. These two Commissioners are responsible for bringing in most of the revenues which are required to operate the Government. They operate in highly specialized and technical fields. Yet their salaries are disgracefully low. The Post Office Department, the biggest business in the world, is headed by a man receiving $15,000 and three Assistant Postmasters General each receiving only $10,000. I hope that when this appropriation bill comes before us next year we will have the legislative authority necessary to pay these top level people higher salaries, more commensurate with the heavy responsibilities they bear.

Our hearings on the Post Office Department brought out many things which will require legislative action, originating with another committee. It cannot be successfully denied that the present Post Office Department has grown in a rather unplanned fashion. It is hemmed in and tied down by restrictive rules and regulations, its revenue is determined by several outside agencies, its expenditures controlled by Congress, and its work dependent on the mailing habits of the people. It is often too closely associated with political activity. Many of its activities are carried on in archaic and outmoded fashions. The largest business in the world, it is still dependent on foot power and manual operation for a large part of its activity. As has been said before, the post office is handling now a record-breaking volume of mail, and is facing problems which it has never been called upon to face before. We are obliged to appropriate the funds to carry on the work of the department as it is presently constituted, for it is not within the power of the Committee on Appropriations to change the legislative authorities of the Department. I have great confidence in the ability of the postal workers not only in the very able and capable leaders in the Department here in Washington but also in the supervisors and the clerks and the carriers in the field, to surmount these obstacles and keep the mail moving. The record of postal workers for loyal and faithful service is unsurpassed, and I know we can count on them to do their best with whatever money, whatever authority, we give them.

Nonetheless the evidence presented to the subcommittee this year, and my experience as chairman of the group for the last 2 years, and as a member thereof in prior years, convinces me that we must take action at an early date to effectuate the very necessary and intelligent recommendations of the so-called Hoover Commission as they affect this Department. Any delay in so doing will cost millions of dollars, and, in my opinion, will eventually interfere with the handling of the mail in efficient fashion.

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. CROOK. Observation over the last several years convinces me that this class of citizens throughout our great Nation that is constantly condemning the United States Post Office Department for going in the red is the same group of individuals that are asking for the greatest amount of subsidy. Now we know how to put the United States Post Office in the black, and we can eliminate this big trouble that they are kicking about. But when we do it the people who today are being subsidized are going to pay their fair share, or we will have to have taxes which will bring the appropriation in to counteract that situation. I do not like to see those people who are getting the greatest benefit condemning a political party for something that the party is not responsible for.

Mr. CANFIELD. I thank the gentleman, and I am sure that he subscribes in full to the statement in our report on that subject.

It is only natural that some of the people in the Department do not take kindly to these recommendations; they have lived all their lives, and worked for years, under the existing situation. They have seen the present system work in the past, and they have seen it deliver the record volume of mail in recent years, although we know that the system has creaked and groaned sadly in so doing. Yet to an impartial observer, changes are necessary. Now we have an over-all plan under which such changes can be made, economies effected, and efficiency improved. We cannot afford to pass by this opportunity and I urge the Congress to act as speedily as possible on the Hoover Commission's recommendation for reorganizing the Post Office.

I want also to comment on another matter dealing with Post Office legislation and that is the matter of passing bills for commemorative stamps. The very competent and hard-working Third Assistant Postmaster General, Mr. Joseph Lawler, discussed this with the committee and I am sure that many of you saw the article on these commemorative stamps in a January issue of Life magazine. You may also have seen the editorial captioned "Pressure group stamps," in the Washington Star of February 7, which I will place in the RECORD at this point, as part of my remarks:

PRESSURE-GROUP STAMPS

The Eightieth Congress authorized and directed the Postmaster General to issue more than 20 postage stamps which philatelists have stigmatized as undesirable. Most of the unwanted labels were intended as compliments to groups and individuals who ordinarily would not have been so honored. Political pressure was the explanation. The character of the Nation's postal adhesives was stultified to accommodate selfish interests. One of the stamps was a publicity stunt staged by the publisher of a magazine of the poultry trade. It featured an egg and a rooster, but no hen.

And the Eighty-first Congress is following in the steps of its predecessor. The day it assembled saw the introduction of several bills requiring the manufacture and distribution of stamps which the Postmaster General uncoerced never would have considered. One of the stickers demanded would glorify the trotter Hambletonian; another would advertise the centennial of the Angora goat. The resolutions authorizing and directing these obviously unworthy issues probably will be passed. Both are indorsed by important political forces.

Meanwhile, a proposal for a series of stamps in aid of educational campaigns for improved public health remains unnoticed by the House and the Senate. The American Cancer Society has submitted four attractive designs for a label to "point up" its drive in April. Similar adhesives have been requested to help the crusades against tuberculosis, poliomyelitis, and heart disease. A stamp to dramatize the Forestry Service's endeavor to halt forest fires was suggested more than a year ago, and the soil conservation efforts of the Government have been urged as meriting such help. Stamps for half a dozen national parks hitherto not pictured also are pending.

What makes the mistaken policy of Congress so deplorable is the fact that, when the Post Office Department schedule for new issues is crowded with unworthy stickers, stamps which are of national significance and therefore deserve to be produced are pushed aside. This happened in 1948, and may happen again in 1949, unless Senators and Representatives heed the protests of the philatelic fraternity which pays the engraving and printing costs of all new postal labels.

Last year there were 29 commemorative stamps issued. This large number is confusing to the public; detracts from the philatelic value to stamp collectors; and lessens the honor intended. The Post Office is opposed to such great numbers of special issues; the press is indicating opposition, and I am sure that the general public is confused and tired of the situation.

I urge on the Members the greatest care in future consideration of bills calling for commemorative stamps and hope that every effort will be made to cut down on the number requested. By the same token, special commemorative coins are a burden on the Mint and confusing to the public, and should not be encouraged.

While we are considering the Post Office, I want also to point out one group of postal employees generally overlooked, and that is the supervisory employees, particularly the assistant postmasters. Because they are not covered by overtime-pay laws, these supervisory employees, on whom rests much of the burden for the handling of mail and the special services of the Post Office, receive less take-home pay than clerks and carriers in the same offices. This is brought out on page 61 of the hearings on this bill. It is destroying in some cases the incentive for a man to seek a higher position. It will tend to lessen the interest and destroy the morale of the supervisors. They should be given special consideration in the way of pay increases. The case of assistant postmasters should also receive consideration. In a great many post offices, the assistant postmaster is a career man who is the actual executive head of the office. Great are his burdens and responsibilities, both to the Government and to the people. Yet these men are frequently underpaid under the present formula for fixing their compensation. I sincerely hope that the legislative committee on the Post Office will give this matter thorough study at an early date.

I have already mentioned the recommendations of the Hoover Commission on the Post Office. I would also urge upon the Members full study and early consideration of the report of that Commission on Federal purchasing. At the present time the Bureau of Federal Supply is in the Treasury Department and funds for it are carried in this bill. The Post Office also does some purchasing for the other Government agencies. A reading of the hearings on this Bureau, not only for this year but for past years, will show the need for an overhaul. There is at present no uniform statutory requirement on purchasing and the authority of the present Bureau of Federal Supply is a legislative hodgepodge. It is not the most economical system which could be devised, nor is it the most efficient, although the Bureau as now constituted, is an improvement over past practices, and the men who head it are trying to do a job. The Hoover Commission's recommendations on this subject and related matters on an Office of General Services are excellent, and I hope they can be adopted in the near future, not only insofar as they directly affect this bill before us today, but as a general improvement, the need for which this bill emphasizes.

I hope that this appropriation bill will be approved. It is nonpartisan. It has a unanimous subcommittee report. It meets the needs of the departments and gives some needed economies to the taxpayer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has again expired.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the gentleman from New Jersey if he will be so kind as to yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. CANFIELD. First, may I ask the Chairman how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey has 25 minutes remaining.

Mr. CANFIELD. I gladly yield 10 minutes to the distinguished member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say at the outset that the most pleasant assignment I have had since becoming a Member of Congress has been membership on the Treasury and Post Office subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee under the very able leadership of my chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] and with the distinguished ranking minority member, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

We have been asked in the Treasury bill to appropriate money to the Treasury Department for paying interest on the overpayment of income taxes.

On January 13, 1949, I introduced H. R. 1409 which was a duplicate of H. R. 2667 introduced by me on March 20, 1947. My bill would reduce the interest on overpayment of income tax from 6 to 2 percent.

In discussing my bill with Secretary Snyder, he stated that the average interest on long-term Government securities yields an average of 2½ percent per annum, and on short-term securities, that is those with a 1-year maturity, yields 1¼ percent. Certainly there is no justification for paying 6 percent interest per annum on overpayment of income tax, especially since it has been established that many taxpayers are purposely overpaying their income tax so as to receive a 6-percent investment. I direct to the attention of the Members that overpayment of income taxes is refunded within an average of 11 months after overpayment. If the recipients are paid 2 percent, that is a greater yield than they would receive on any other Government security.

The overpayment of income tax today is in excess of $2,000,000,000 annually. This is double the amount of all annual revenue collected by the Federal Government prior to 1918.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to call your attention to the fact that the Treasury Department is requesting $82,000,000 to pay interest only on overpayment of income tax for fiscal year 1949, and it is estimated that a like amount will be required for fiscal 1950.

I discussed interest rates with the Hon. Frank Dow, Acting Commissioner of Customs, relative to refunds and overpayment of duties collected. He informed me that the Bureau of Customs refunded, during the fiscal year 1948, $19,000,310. Many of these claims were 2 or 3 years old and the interest rate on refunds of overpayment of customs amounted to zero. In other words, there is no interest on refunds of overpayment of duties.

It will be argued by a few that since the Government charges 6 percent on underpayment of income tax, that it is proper to pay 6 percent on overpayment of income tax. I contend that these two items fall in two different categories and that the Treasury Department is dealing with two different segments of our taxpayers and the subjects are not related. For instance, if I purchase short-term Government securities, the Government pays me 1¼ percent interest, but if I should borrow money from one of the Federal lending agencies on the same basis, they charge me 4 percent interest. This is also true with banking institutions; if they lend you money they charge you an average of 6 percent, but if you lend them money, they pay you an average of 2 percent per annum interest. It should be stated further that if banking institutions or the lending agencies of the Federal Government paid the same rate of interest on securities and time deposits as they charge when lending money, then neither could stay in business very long.

Mr. Chairman, in this day of uncertainty, it is the duty of the Congress to start making adjustments so as to effect savings wherever possible. My bill would save the Government approximately $50,000,000 annually. If a few such savings could be effected, it would materially reduce governmental expenditures and be a step toward bringing this overexpanded spending program under control. In my opinion, my bill should be considered on its own merits and not in connection with a general over-all tax revision program, because if it is not, the saving may be absorbed or lost in a compromise.

It does not matter whether the idea is original with me or whether the bill is reported out in my name, but it does matter whether or not the Congress takes action.

Mr. Chairman, in connection with the Coast Guard appropriation for pay and allowances for the fiscal year 1949, the Congress appropriated $71,295,000. The Coast Guard requested for the fiscal year 1950, $77,425,000 for pay and allowances. The subcommittee recommends $74,500,000.

There has been some criticism to the effect that the recommended reduction has been too great. I should like to call the committee's attention to the fact that for the first 6 months of the fiscal year 1949 the Coast Guard obligated only $34,385,000 of their pay and allowance account.

I should also like to call the attention of the committee to the fact that out of 1,931 total officer complement in the Coast Guard, 929 of these officers are lieutenant commanders or of a higher rank. There are 237 commanders in the Coast Guard against only 171 ensigns. For the fiscal year 1950 the Coast Guard will have a total of 266 full commanders, or an increase of 29 over 1949; and 190 ensigns, which is an increase of only 19. In my opinion, if the Coast Guard continues promoting on this basis, in a very few years the entire officer complement of the Coast Guard will be admirals.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HAND. Is the gentleman familiar with the fact that what appears on the surface to be a somewhat overmanning in the Coast Guard in ranking officers is due, if not necessarily due, because under the act of Congress they have taken over the entire Bureau of Marine Inspection, which is an officer activity, and probably about, as I recall the figures, some 600 officers result from that activity alone, and therefore the figures which seem to show that the Coast Guard is overmanned in officer personnel is not so at all? It is caused entirely by the fact that they have taken over and absorbed, under our direction, the Bureau of Marine Inspection, and that in truth the amount of officers to enlisted men, if this is taken into consideration, is about 1 to 15, which compares very favorably, indeed, with the other branches of the armed services.

Mr. PASSMAN. I should like to say to the gentleman, as a former officer of the United States Navy, that I know the rank of officer personnel of all branches of the service is supposed to be proportioned on a percentage basis. If all branches of the military service increase the rank of their officer personnel as the Coast Guard does, there is something wrong with the system.

Mr. HAND. I quite agree with the gentleman on the general basis of his thinking, but I again call attention to the fact that that only seems to be so in the case of the Coast Guard because of the fact that they have absorbed the Bureau of Marine Inspection. The Bureau of Marine Inspection, as I am sure the gentleman knows, was a group of civil service officers of a rather high rating, so that when the Coast Guard absorbed that Bureau under our direction, as a result of an Act of Congress, they were obliged, of course, to assign commissions to those former civil-service employees, and that results, of course, in what seems to be an overmanning of officer personnel. But that is the only reason for it.

Mr. PASSMAN. According to the record it is time for reduction in these high ranks. It is not so much the basic differential between an ensign and a

full commander, because the longer an officer serves, of course, the larger bonus he gets, and some commanders draw as much as $6,600 annually. With the allowance for longevity, in many instances officers of commander rank draw three times the pay of an officer of ensign rank. They have asked for an increase in commander rank for the fiscal year 1950.

Mr. HAND. Is the gentleman referring to commanders or lieutenant commanders?

Mr. PASSMAN. I am referring to commanders. The Coast Guard has 237 full commanders at this time and only 171 ensigns. In 1950 they are requesting an increase of 29 full commanders, which would bring the total to 266, and 190 ensigns, which is an increase of 19 over the 1949 ensign complement.

Mr. Chairman, I hope before the Eighty-first Congress adjourns that I will be privileged to vote for a bill that will increase the postal rates on certain classes of mail. Something was mentioned earlier today about the postal service being a service institution. That is true. I know of one publisher in my own district who places in the mails 1,000 copies of his paper each week, and who is paying less than $1 to have these 1,000 copies distributed by the post office. Certainly there should be an increase in this category.

I again call the attention of the committee to the large increase in the amount of parcel post being handled by the Post Office Department at a tremendous loss.

It was brought out during the committee hearings that many of the mail-order houses ship as many as two or three carloads of parcel post in 1 day. Express companies have placed a high minimum on shipments, so over a period of years most of the small packages handled by these companies have been shifted over to the Post Office Department; thus, we are certainly subsidizing mail-order houses to the extent of many millions of dollars monthly. I think that a correction should be made. I certainly hope the proper committee gives consideration to drafting legislation that will correct this situation, because we are subsidizing practically every mail-order house in America. That applies also to their catalogs.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, first, may I congratulate the Treasury and the Post Office Departments on the able leadership that has been shown in this subcommittee on both sides of the aisle, and the fine personnel on this subcommittee on both sides of the aisle. I think it is a happy circumstance, and we can expect progress and good government out of such a combination.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. May I say that that is doubly appreciated, because the gentleman speaking from the well was in the last Congress the efficient and able chairman of a subcommittee which turned in a remarkable performance.

THE LATE J. P. ALVEY

Mr. HORAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, at a time when we are paying very proper respect to the conduct and the efficiency of servants who work as bureaucrats for the Federal Government, I regret very much to announce to his many friends and acquaintances in this body that yesterday evening one of the finest men to serve in the administration of our Government passed from our midst, the result of a heart attack which could be attributed only to the long and arduous hours he spent on behalf of the people of the United States.

J. P. Alvey, familiarly known as "Perry" Alvey to all who dealt with him, for the past 12 years had been in charge of the Washington, D. C., office of the Bonneville Power Administration in the Department of the Interior. Without a doubt he could be described as one of the best bureaucrats—and I use that term as a compliment—in the entire Government service. During a long and distinguished career as an engineer, utility executive, soldier, and public servant, he became a most trusted friend and adviser of thousands who came to him for assistance. In his years of work in the Bonneville Administration office here, in which his primary responsibility was to serve as the liaison between that agency and us who represent in Congress the territory it serves, no request of ours was too great to be handled nor too trifling to deserve a full consideration. To my personal knowledge, he worked day and night, Sundays and holidays, whenever his duties required, in order to meet the demands of the Congress and the people. I honestly believe he literally worked himself into the grave.

Perry Alvey was born in Galveston, Tex., December 1, 1885. He was graduated from the University of Texas in 1906 and from Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1907. From that time until 1937 he worked in the construction business and for various utility and railway companies, taking time out to serve as a captain of engineers in the AEF. In 1937 he left his post as general manager of the Chicago & Illinois Valley Railroad to become consulting engineer of the Bonneville Power Administration.

We will all miss him very greatly.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for recognition at this time on this 3d day of March that I might bring to the attention of the committee Earl W. Chaffee, the Republican reading clerk, who is in the forty-fourth year of his service in this House, on his eighty-second birthday. Since 1905 he has been within these Halls. He is just an institution, a part of the very life of the House which he deeply loves. Always courteous, always willing, always smiling, even though at this very moment he is living days and nights of anxiety over the illness of his beloved wife. To meet Earl Chaffee in the Hall, in the Chamber, is a delight indeed.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the membership of the House to join with me in all good wishes to this loyal man. May he long be among us.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to concur in the tribute of the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON]. Mr. Chaffee loves the House of Representatives. Most certainly he is an inspiration to all Members, young and old.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I join my colleague the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] in paying tribute to J. P. "Perry" Alvey who for the 12 years prior to his death yesterday, was head of the Bonneville Power Administration offices in the National Capital.

During my 2 years in Congress, I have had many occasion to call upon my friend, Mr. Alvey, for data and information about the Bonneville power development on the Columbia River.

His response to every request was always prompt and complete. His knowledge of his favorite subject, the development of the great resources of the Columbia River was immense. He was always courteous. He was, in my opinion, one of the ablest and most intelligent of Government servants of the people with whom I have come in contact during my 2 years in the Congress.

What western Congressmen have been able to contribute toward the development of the enormous resources of the Columbia River Valley would not have been possible without the help and assistance given us by Perry Alvey. I have talked with many of my western colleagues and know that they all feel as I do about this able and faithful public official.

The great network of public power facilities that now are everywhere in the Pacific Northwest, adding to the pay rolls and prosperity of that region, will stand forever to the memory of Perry Alvey and others like him who by their planning and labor made these developments possible.

Such men do not die, for the inspiration and fruits of their good work endure forever to benefit millions, still unborn, who will follow them.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I should like to address a question to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] with reference to this $87,000,000 that you are providing in this bill for the carrying of the foreign and domestic mail at rates set by the CAB, which the Post Office must pay. I know you realize that this total sum includes not only compensation for the carrying of air mail, but includes in addition a subsidy which is paid to the air lines. The Hoover

Commission has recommended that this compensation and subsidy should be separated; that the Post Office should pay only the compensation for carrying the air mail but the Congress itself should determine to what extent we should subsidize these air lines. Do you not think that while you have provided in this bill for the total amount, in the future we should distinguish between compensation to cover the cost of carrying the air mail and the subsidy paid to the air lines.

Mr. GARY. I will say to the gentleman that our committee did go into this question and it is a fact that part of the compensation to the air line is a subsidy to them to keep them running so that they can carry the mail. Frankly, I do not think that the subsidy should be considered as a part of the cost of transporting the mail and attributed to the Post Office Department.

If it is necessary to subsidize the air lines of this country, and I am not prepared to say whether it is or not, but certainly if it is necessary, it is a matter that should be considered independently. It is a matter, however, over which our committee has no jurisdiction. At the present time the responsibility for fixing the rates is placed by the Congress with the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Post Office Department is required to report whatever rates the Civil Aeronautics Board requires.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND], who in the last Congress was chairman of the Subcommittee on the Coast Guard of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to make it plain that this is not in any sense a controversy between me and the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN]. As a matter of fact, if I may make a remark, that has nothing to do with the Coast Guard. I want to congratulate the gentleman on his suggestion concerning the reduction of interest on refunds of income tax, which I think is a long-overdue reform. But I do want to emphasize what I had occasion to say to the gentleman in our recent colloquy about the situation which appears to give the Coast Guard an overmanning in the officer class. I again say that this is entirely caused by the fact that, pursuant to congressional direction, they have taken over the Bureau of Marine Inspection. The Bureau of Marine Inspection, almost without exception, was a group of rather high-priced and rather highly rated civil-service employees. They are experts in that particular field, and necessarily they were of that character. When they were taken over by the Coast Guard, also necessarily, they were not enlisted personnel, but they were officer personnel. And it was wholly because the Coast Guard was required by the Congress to take over this group that there appears to be a disparate number of officers.

As a matter of fact, in that extra number category—and they are an extra number category—the Coast Guard has a flag officer, 17 captains, 34 commanders, 292 lieutenant commanders, none of which should properly be regarded as a part of the regular military officer personnel of the Coast Guard service. As a further matter of fact, when we disregard that additional officer personnel which has resulted from the absorption of the Bureau of Marine Inspection, the Coast Guard has authorized in the flag rank 2 less than the statutory amount allowed; 7 less in the rank of captain; 12 less in the rank of commander; 22 less in the rank of lieutenant commander; 56 less in the rank of lieutenant. There is some increase in the rank of lieutenant, junior grade. The Merchant Marine safety function is almost entirely an officer function, as I recall it. I think I have the figures and I think they are accurate. There were 650 billets for officers in that particular branch, the marine inspection service, and only 124 billets for enlisted men. When we disregard what has always been, until recently, a purely civil function, we find that the ratio of enlisted men and officers in the Coast Guard Service is approximately 1 to 15, which compares very favorably indeed with the other armed services in this country. I say this is no controversy between me and the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana. He is just as friendly to the service as I am, but I feel it my duty to point out that that is the true situation, in my opinion.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAND. I yield.

Mr. PASSMAN. Will the gentleman tell the committee when this condition will be corrected?

Mr. HAND. As long as we have the Marine Inspection Service in the Coast Guard, whose men are in a very special rank and special duty, we may have some disproportion. I suppose it will be gradually adjusted downward sometime somewhat, as these men go out of service and as lesser-rank officers come in.

To go into some detail, Public Law 219 of the last Congress integrated into the Coast Guard personnel of the former Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation. Because of their relatively high civil-service ratings it was necessary to commission this personnel as officers in the higher ranks, and this tends to give a distorted picture of the rank structure in the Coast Guard. All of these officers are carried as extra numbers, as prescribed by law enacted by Congress, and as attrition thins their ranks and their positions are filled by newly appointed officers the over-all rank structure will tend to be equalized. Until time remedies the situation there is no effective action that the Coast Guard can take to correct this problem. At the present time there are 344 officers in the extra-number category in the various ranks, as follows:

Flag	1
Captain	17
Commander	34
Lieutenant commander	292

Disregarding these extra numbers and using the percentages authorized by law for the Coast Guard, which, incidentally, are comparable to the percentages allowed for the Navy, we find in fact that of the 1,532 officers, excluding extra numbers on board on March 1, the Service has not availed itself of the full percentage for flag officers and actually has less in each senior rank than the number authorized by law, for example:

Grade	Statutory (percent)	Number authorized	On board	Difference
Flag	0.75	12	10	−2
Captain	6.00	95	88	−7
Commander	12.00	190	178	−12
Lieutenant commander	18.00	285	263	−22
Lieutenant	24.81	392	336	−56
Lieutenant (junior grade) and ensign	38.06	609	707	−98

The ratio of officers to enlisted men for fiscal year 1949, including extra numbers, is approximately 1 officer to 9 enlisted men. This ratio is lowered to 1 to 10 for the personnel requested for 1950. This ratio compares favorably with any other armed services. Even if this were not true, a different proposition exists in the Coast Guard in that the Coast Guard is discharging one function, the merchant marine safety function, which is almost entirely an officer function without any comparable enlisted-man strength. For fiscal 1949 there are 650 billets for officers and only 184 billets for enlisted men for this function. If these 650 billets engaged in this peculiar function are disregarded, the actual ratio is still further reduced to approximately 1 to 15, which more than compares favorably with the other armed services.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND] has expired.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read the bill.

Mr. GARY (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with, that the bill be considered as read, open to points of order and amendments at any place.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order? [After a pause.] Are there any amendments?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the chairman of the committee what, if anything, is provided in this bill with reference to highway mail service.

Mr. GARY. I assume that the gentleman has reference to the highway post offices.

Mr. HARRIS. Yes; that is true.

Mr. GARY. That is covered under the star-route service; that is a part of the appropriation for the star-route service on page 34 of the bill.

Mr. HARRIS. I may say to the gentleman from Virginia the reason I bring this matter to his attention is that there is one particular service in southeast Arkansas whereby the bus at McGehee,

Ark., picks up mail there and delivers it to Dermott, Halley, Lake Village, Eudora, Readland, and on down into Louisiana. They have had a lot of difficulty with the mail service in that the mail is supposed to arrive in the morning, but many times it does not arrive until late, sometimes in the afternoon, and sometimes way into the night. This matter has been discussed with the Post Office Department. They tell us they cannot inaugurate any additional highway post offices, so-called, that is on trucks, unless money is made available for that specific purpose. They have the money to deliver this mail by contract, but they cannot inaugurate this highway post-office mail service unless money is appropriated for this specific purpose.

They have had a Nation-wide study under way for some time, particularly within the last year or so, and I believe a report is soon to be issued advising the Congress of the needs to correct the situation and to give better mail service to those areas.

Mr. GARY. I may say to the gentleman from Arkansas that for the fiscal year 1948 they had $409,000 for that purpose. They asked for $1,412,000 in 1949; and for $1,570,000 in 1950. But that was all a part of the star-route service, and the committee recommended $30,000,000 for the star-route service, which was a reduction of $3,475,000 below the estimate, but approximately $2,200,000 in excess of the estimated obligations for the fiscal year 1949.

Mr. HARRIS. If the gentleman will permit me to continue further, that is the information I wanted.

Will the Post Office Department have the authority to spend such sums of this $30,000,000 as they deem necessary to give this improved service in certain areas?

Mr. GARY. They do have that authority.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. Five routes were in operation June 1, 1948. Since that time 26 more routes have been put into operation in all parts of the country and about 15 more are to be established before June 30, 1949. Between 20 and 25 can be established in the fiscal year 1950 under this appropriation.

Mr. HARRIS. Under the appropriation provided for in this bill, can the Department establish this Highway Post Office Service from McGehee, Ark., to post offices south into Louisiana?

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose: and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRIEST, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3683) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH moves to recommit the bill, H. R. 3683, to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days within which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole and include an editorial from the Washington Evening Star.

INTERSTATE COMPACT RELATING TO THE BETTER UTILIZATION OF THE FISHERIES OF THE GULF COAST

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 124 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2363) granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) to the Gulf coast and creating the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] and at this time I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 124 makes in order consideration of the bill H. R. 2363, which grants the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization and conservation of the fisheries of the Gulf coast and creating the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission. The States affected are Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas.

There was no controversy, as I understand it, about this matter in the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives. A similar bill has already passed the Senate.

So far as I know, there is only one matter that is at all in dispute, and when the bill is read for amendment I expect to offer a very brief amendment to satisfy the opposition that has been expressed.

The main purpose of this legislation is to give those interested in commercial fishing of those States an opportunity to enter into this compact so that they can better utilize, promote, and conserve the great natural resources in the matter of fish in that great arm of our sea, the Gulf of Mexico.

It is my understanding that similar legislation has been authorized in the past permitting those interested in fishing on the Atlantic coast to perform the same functions. I shall not take any further time on the matter at this time. When the bill is read, as I said, I expect to offer an amendment.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H. R. 2363, grants the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries of the Gulf coast. The bill also creates the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission. It is proposed that any two or more of the States of Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas may enter into the compact.

By this legislation we are not vesting any legislative power to the Commission. The Commission will not itself be vested with the power to legislate. It will not have any police power. The recommendations of the Commission will not of themselves have the force of law.

The jurisdiction of the Commission, however, will be very broad and valuable. The Commission will have plenary power to make surveys, investigations and studies to promote the furtherance and conservation of the fishing industry. The recommendations will be made to the legislatures and appropriate authorities of the several States entering into the compact. This will make it possible for all of the interested States to adopt uniform laws, rules, and regulations affecting this most important industry. Such uniformity will have salutary effects.

We all know, of course, Mr. Speaker, that fish in the water is not stationary and stagnant. It is ambulatory. It is ubiquitous. Depending upon their proximity to the boundary line of two States in open water, fish, for example, may one day be in Louisiana waters and the next day in Texas waters. Of little good would it be for Louisiana to have ideal laws relating to the better utilization of the fisheries, marine, shell, and anadromous, and for Texas to have deficient legislation on the subject; and vice versa, of course. The same is true with regard to other States which might be interested in becoming parties to the compact. It is to cure this evil, or this possible evil, and ultimately to bring about adequate uniform and forward-looking laws, rules, and regulations that we are seeking the consent of Congress to enter into this compact.

All of the five States above mentioned are anxious to secure this authority from the Congress in order to further, promote, and advance this outstanding industry. I believe that some of the Representatives from the five States have offered bills similar to the one under consideration. As author of one of such bills, together with my other colleagues from Louisiana who introduced similar legislation, I commend its unanimous adoption.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, article I, section 10 of the Constitution requires the consent and approval of Congress be given to any compact entered into between two or more States. The States bordering on the Gulf coast have developed such a compact known as the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Compact. The compact has already been ratified by the States of Alabama, Florida, and Louisiana. Mississippi and Texas will probably join the compact this year now that their legislatures are in session.

Congress has already approved very similar interstate fisheries compacts for both the Atlantic coast and the Pacific coast. The enactment of H. R. 2363 would merely grant the consent and approval of Congress to this compact. There would be no cost to the Federal Government. I have been very interested in the enactment of this legislation and have introduced a similar bill myself, H. R. 1719.

The establishment under the compact of the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission will be a far-reaching and forward step in providing a means for these States to cooperate among themselves in attacking the common problems of developing and regulating the fisheries of the Gulf. The Commission would consist of three representatives from each of the ratifying States. The Commission would offer a medium through which disputes between Gulf States could be settled and also afford an opportunity for correlated research among the States on their fisheries problems and for concerted action toward the conservation, improvement and development of the Gulf marine fisheries resources. The fisheries cannot be treated satisfactorily by each State individually, but are an entity along the Gulf coast. The proposed Commission could in no way invade the authority of individual States, but would have the authority to recommend to the States carefully worked-out uniform legislation and the coordination of the States' police power.

Mr. HALLECK. We have no requests for time on this side, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. COLMER. Then, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the resolution (S. J. Res. 42), similar to the House bill, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby given to any two or more of the States of Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas to enter into the following compact and agreement relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Gulf coast and creating the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission. The compact reads as follows:

GULF STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMPACT

The contracting States solemnly agree:

ARTICLE I

Whereas the Gulf Coast States have the proprietary interest in and jurisdiction over fisheries in the waters within their respective boundaries, it is the purpose of this compact to promote the better utilization of the fisheries, marine, shell, and anadromous, of the seaboard of the Gulf of Mexico, by the development of a joint program for the promotion and protection of such fisheries and the prevention of the physical waste of the fisheries from any cause.

ARTICLE II

This compact shall become operative immediately as to those States ratifying it whenever any two or more of the States of Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas have ratified it and the Congress has given its consent subject to article I, section 10, of the Constitution of the United States. Any State contiguous to any of the aforementioned States or riparian upon waters which flow into waters under the jurisdiction of any of the afore-mentioned States and which are frequented by anadromous fish or marine species may become a party hereto as hereinafter provided.

ARTICLE III

Each State joining herein shall appoint three representatives to a commission hereby constituted and designated as the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission. One shall be the head of the administrative agency of such State charged with the conservation of the fishery resources to which this compact pertains or, if there be more than one officer or agency, the official of that State named by the Governor thereof. The second shall be a member of the legislature of such State designated by such legislature or in the absence of such designation, such legislator shall be designated by the Governor thereof, provided that if it is constitutionally impossible to appoint a legislator as a commissioner from such State, the second member shall be appointed in such manner as may be established by law. The third shall be a citizen who shall have a knowledge of and interest in the marine fisheries, to be appointed by the Governor. This commission shall be a body corporate with the powers and duties set forth herein.

ARTICLE IV

The duty of the said commission shall be to make inquiry and ascertain from time to time such methods, practices, circumstances, and conditions as may be disclosed for bringing about the conservation and the prevention of the depletion and physical waste of the fisheries, marine, shell and anadromous, of the Gulf coast. The commission shall have power to recommend the coordination of the exercise of the police powers of the several States within their respective jurisdiction to promote the preservation of these fisheries and their protection against overfishing, waste, depletion, or any abuse whatsoever and to assure a continuing yield from the fishery resources of the afore-mentioned States. To that end the commission shall draft and recommend to the Governors and legislatures of the various signatory States, legislation dealing with the conservation of the marine, shell, and anadromous fisheries of the Gulf seaboard. The commission shall from time to time present to the Governor of each compacting State its recommendations relating to enactments to be presented to the legislature of that State in furthering the interest and purposes of this compact. The commission shall consult with and advise the pertinent administrative agencies in the States party hereto with regard to problems connected with the fisheries and recommend the adoption of such regulations as it deems advisable. The commission shall have power to recommend to the States party hereto the stocking of the waters of such States with fish and fish eggs or joint stocking by some or all of the States party hereto and when two or more States shall jointly stock waters the commission shall act as the coordinating agency, for such stocking.

ARTICLE V

The commission shall elect from its number a chairman and vice chairman and shall appoint and at its pleasure remove or discharge such officers and employees as may be required to carry the provisions of this compact into effect and shall fix and determine their duties, qualifications, and compensation. Said commission shall adopt rules and regulations for the conduct of its business. It may establish and maintain one or more offices for the transaction of its business and may meet at any time or place but must meet at least once a year.

ARTICLE VI

No action shall be taken by the commission in regard to its general affairs except by the affirmative vote of a majority of the whole number of compacting States. No recommendation shall be made by the commission in regard to any species of fish except by the affirmative vote of a majority of the compacting States which have an interest in such species. The commission shall define what shall be an interest.

ARTICLE VII

The Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior of the Government of the United States shall act as the primary research agency of the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission cooperating with the research agencies in each State for that purpose. Representatives of the said Fish and Wildlife Service shall attend the meetings of the commission. An advisory committee to be representative of the commercial salt-water fisherman and the salt-water anglers and such other interest of each State as the

commissioners deem advisable may be established by the commissioners from each State for the purpose of advising those commissioners upon such recommendations as it may desire to make.

ARTICLE VIII

When any State other than those named specifically in article II of this compact shall become a party hereto for the purpose of conserving its anadromous fish or marine species in accordance with the provisions of article II, the participation of such State in the action of the commission shall be limited to such species of fish.

ARTICLE IX

Nothing in this compact shall be construed to limit the powers or the proprietary interest of any signatory State or to repeal or prevent the enactment of any legislation or the enforcement of any requirement by a signatory State imposing additional conditions and restrictions to conserve its fisheries.

ARTICLE X

It is agreed that any two or more States party hereto may further amend this compact by acts of their respective legislatures subject to approval of Congress as provided in article I, section 10, of the Constitution of the United States, to designate the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission as a joint regulating authority for the joint regulation of specific fisheries affecting only such States as shall so compact, and at their joint expense. The representatives of such States shall constitute a separate section of the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission for the exercise of the additional powers so granted but the creation of such section shall not be deemed to deprive the States so compacting of any of their privileges or powers in the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission as constituted under the other articles of this compact.

ARTICLE XI

Continued absence of representation or of any representative on the commission from any State party hereto shall be brought to the attention of the Governor thereof.

ARTICLE XII

The operating expenses of the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission shall be borne by the States party hereto. Such initial appropriations as are set forth below shall be made available yearly until modified as hereinafter provided:

Florida	$3,500
Alabama	1,000
Mississippi	1,000
Louisiana	5,000
Texas	2,500
Total	13,000

The proration and total cost per annum of $13,000, above-mentioned, is estimative only, for initial operations, and may be changed when found necessary by the commission and approved by the legislatures of the respective States. Each State party hereto agrees to provide in the manner most acceptable to it, the travel costs and necessary expenses of its commissioners and other representatives to and from meetings of the commission or its duly constituted sections or committees.

ARTICLE XIII

This compact shall continue in force and remain binding upon each compacting State until renounced by act of the legislature of such State, in such form as it may choose; provided that such renunciation shall not become effective until 6 months after the effective date of the action taken by the legislature. Notice of such renunciation shall be given to the other States party thereto by the secretary of state of the compacting State so renouncing upon passage of the act.

Mr. THOMPSON (interrupting the reading of the resolution). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and open to amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLMER: Page 6, line 16, after the word "limit", insert "or add to."

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I offer this amendment out of an abundance of precaution. It is the contention of some of the citizens of some of the States involved in this proposed compact that the States have certain proprietary and riparian interests and rights to the waters of the Gulf and its tributaries which would grant them exclusive jurisdiction over the fish and fisheries mentioned in the bill. There are those who further contend that, as a result of these asserted claims and rights, one State can prevent the citizens of another State from fishing in or taking fish from these waters adjoining a particular State. It is my contention that no State, through its legislative bodies or agencies set up by it, can constitutionally invoke any statute or regulation of such a restrictive nature as to prevent the citizens of a sister State from fishing in or taking fish from the waters of the State so seeking to restrict the fishing.

When this compact was first proposed, I was requested, along with other Members of Congress, to introduce it. I hesitated to introduce the bill because of certain statements therein asserting alleged proprietary rights to the fish or fisheries described in the bill, H. R. 2363. Therefore, when the bill was reported from the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House, and application was made to the Committee on Rules, of which I am a member, for a rule for its consideration on the floor, I requested that the matter pass over and a rule be denied until I had further opportunity to look into the matter. Thereupon I conferred with the very able Representative from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON], the author of H. R. 2363, and raised the objection to which I have just referred. The very learned gentleman from Texas advised me that it was not his contention nor the contention of the committee that the passage of this resolution would grant any rights, affirmatively or indirectly, to the States in this matter; that it was his contention and the view of the committee that the passage of this bill was for the sole purpose of permitting the citizens of the several States affected thereby, Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas, to enter into a compact for the purpose of the conservation and the advancement of the fishing industry in the affected States. And, further, that it was the purpose of the legislation to iron out existing differences between the States involved. I was, also, informed by citizens of my own State of Mississippi that the learned attorney general of that State was of the opinion that the enactment of this legislation would not serve to bolster the claim, if any, that any particular State, who was a party to the compact, might claim to the jurisdiction of the fisheries of the waters adjoining that State. Moreover, I was, also, advised that the Office of the Attorney General of the United States was of the same opinion.

However, Mr. Speaker, in order to further safeguard that phase of the matter, and in order to insure the status quo on this question, I have offered this amendment. It will be noted that the amendment simply says that nothing construed in the legislation will add to any asserted claim.

I would have much preferred to have made the amendment much more far-reaching and to have stricken out certain language therein referring to proprietary interest entirely, but, since one or more of the States involved have already passed enabling acts on the basis of the bill as originally written, it was thought sufficient to maintain the status quo by this simple amendment. I understand there will be no objection to the amendment, and I ask for its adoption.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, there is no objection to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

H. R. 2363 was laid on the table.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in one to include two letters.

MINNESOTA CENTENNIAL

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, this year of 1949 is the centennial anniversary of Minnesota, and it is a real honor and privilege to take this opportunity to pay homage and tribute to my home State, the North Star State of Minnesota. It was 100 years ago—March 3, 1849—that Minnesota became a separate territory of

the United States, a status which she enjoyed until 1858 when she was admitted as a member State in the Union.

Although Minnesota did not become a separate political unit until 100 years ago, early explorers left records of their travels in this western land as long ago as the mid-seventeenth century. No one knows who was the first white man to travel the fertile plains, the lakes and valleys whose beauty entered into the name of Minnesota, which in Indian means "cloud-tinted waters."

Two Frenchmen, Radisson and Groseilliers, left a written record of their travels in this "upper country" and may have been the first white visitors. Later came Nicolas Perrot who in 1686 built a fort on the shores of Lake Pepin. He was followed by Du Lhut, Father Hennepin, and La Verendrye, who came to take possession of this territory in the name of France.

Following peace between Great Britain and France in 1683, a peace which brought eastern Minnesota under the British flag, trade with the Indians prospered, and many traders built their palisaded forts on Minnesota rivers and lakes. Jonathan Carver, Peter Pond, and David Thompson figured prominently during this period.

AMERICAN BEGINNINGS

Eastern Minnesota became a part of the United States in 1783 at the close of the American Revolution, and the remaining portion of our State came under United States jurisdiction with the Louisiana Purchase. By 1816 the British-owned Northwest Co. had passed from the scene to be replaced by the American Fur Co.

Thus began a new era of exploitation of the plentiful resources of the Minnesota Country—an exploitation which has continued until today. To build the fur industry came hunters, trappers, and traders, and to protect them Fort Snelling was established on the banks of the Mississippi in 1819. Missionaries and settlers flocked in and a number of small settlements were established by the day, 100 years ago, when Minnesota became a separate territory. Statehood followed in 1858, 3 years before Minnesota was to send her sons forth to battle for preservation of the Union.

Following the Civil War, the history of Minnesota was tied directly to the history of the growing nation. Lumber was the next resource to claim the attention of settlers and eastern capitalists. It was a great period of exploitation and wastage of our virgin forests and the lumber barons made huge fortunes before the trees were gone and they moved on toward the Pacific. Close on the heels of the lumber king came the iron magnates, who claimed the ore from the Mesabi Range, the richest ore deposits in the American nation.

Thousands of ordinary Americans and immigrants from Europe came, too, to establish farms and homes on the prairies and in the rich valleys of the State, to build its cities and to work in its mills and mines and on the farms. Through their labors, industry and agriculture prospered, and Minnesota became the State it is today.

TRIBUTE WELL EARNED

Thus today as we commemorate the one hundredth anniversay of Minnesota, we pay tribute to her people and to their contributions to America. We pay tribute to her valiant political leaders of the past, to Charles A. Lindbergh, Sr., and to that great governor and great American, Floyd B. Olson, who went forth to battle against the trusts and corporate interests in behalf of social justice for the people. We honor the miners of the Mesabi Range who came from many parts of the Old World to mine the iron to provide the sinews of American industry and the weapons of two world conflicts—we honor the farmers and workers who made their contributions. We pay homage to her sons who have fought in three great wars in defense of the Nation.

I know that I speak for the entire Minnesota delegation when I say that we are proud of our State's record—of her people's accomplishments, of our contributions to America's welfare. We love Minnesota's sky-blue waters, her valleys and rivers, and her people who came from all lands—Norway, Finland, Ireland, Sweden, Denmark, Italy, Poland, Yugoslavia, Scotland, Germany, and many others—to build a new life in midwestern America, in the heart of a great continent.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. FUGATE for Thursday and Friday of this week, on account of official business.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 56. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1956 Olympic games at Detroit, Mich.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Air Force.
3. Department of the Army.
4. Departments of the Army and the Air Force.
5. Department of Commerce.
6. Department of Justice.
7. Department of the Navy.
8. Atomic Energy Commission.
9. Federal Security Agency.
10. Selective Service System.
11. Veterans' Administration.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

CIO WOULD TAKE AWAY YOUR MEAT—PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S THREAT

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the executive board of the CIO union in the packing-house industry has learned little, if anything.

Last year, although two unions—the Amalgamated Meatcutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, AFL, and the Independent Brotherhood Union—settled their grievances with the packing industry without a strike, United Packinghouse Workers of America, CIO, called strikes in 20 States, which threatened to cut off the meat supply in several of the larger cities.

The strike was felt by hundreds of thousands of the workers and 100,000 union members were directly involved. It was settled on May 24, 1948, the union accepting the original offer of the packing industry.

During this strike, two men, both pickets, were killed; millions of dollars in wages were lost; the packing industry lost profits running into millions, and the meat supply of the public was in several cities curtailed.

Railroad tracks were blockaded; freight cars were damaged; factory workers were beaten, imprisoned, and kidnapped. The enforcement of the law was broken down and, in at least two States, governors were forced to call out the troops to end civil strife.

But apparently the CIO unions in the meat-packing industry have not learned their lesson.

Recently, the executive board of the CIO has been asking for Federal and State laws forbidding the operation of factories where a plant has been struck.

Perhaps Mr. Truman, who had no use for the Eightieth Congress, who apparently thinks the Eighty-first Congress is even worse, although the majority in each House is Democratic, considering himself, as he apparently did in his Jackson Day dinner, the fount of all wisdom, will tell the Congress that it should include in his labor bill a provision requiring all employers to cease operations when the officers of a local or international CIO union so demand.

The absurdity as well as the arrogance and conceit of CIO top officials is demonstrated by this latest of their demands.

Permit me to restate the proposition. The executive board of this CIO union now asks that the Congress write a law which would close every factory and every place of business in the United States if and when that factory or business was struck by a CIO local.

The proposition is so absurd that it would not merit mention, were it not for the fact that it shows just how arbitrary, unreasonable, and dictatorial the CIO, under Philip Murray, the political boss or lieutenant, whichever you prefer, of President Truman, has become.

If the demand of the CIO was accepted by the Congress, shortly we would have a scarcity of meat, in fact, of many of the necessities of life.

Moreover, the people of this country would in fact become the slaves of the CIO, for industry, if its plants were closed, would be forced to grant whatever demands the CIO might see fit to make.

We would in truth and in fact have a slave-labor law, but the slaves would be all those who did not belong to the CIO.

That the CIO thinks it can, without punishment, resort to violence; that it can defy the law of the land; that it can do as it pleases, is evidenced by the fact that, for years, it has intimidated, coerced, and beaten those who defied its orders.

Only recently has the National Labor Relations Board shown independence enough to begin to protect the right to work of employees who depended upon a pay check for their livelihood.

On February 25, 1949, the Board handed down a decision, saying that a union, its officers, and its representatives, violated section 8 (b) (1) (A) of the Taft-Hartley Act, when its pickets persisted in—

(1) Carrying of sticks by pickets on the picket line, and the piling of bricks for use by pickets;

(2) Blocking of plant entrances by railroad ties, automobiles, raised gutter plates, and tacks;

(3) Threatening violence to nonstrikers over the picket-line loudspeaker;

(4) Intimidation of nonstrikers as they sought to enter the plant;

(5) Placing of pickets in such a manner as to prevent nonstrikers from unloading a boxcar on a railroad spur to the plant;

(6) "Goon squad" mass assaults on nonstrikers, the overturning of a nonstriker's automobile, and individual assaults on nonstrikers;

(7) Barring a plant superintendent and a foreman from the plant by force and intimidation, and attempts to upset the foreman's automobile or damage it.

The surprising thing about this situation is that it should have been necessary for the Board to make the order. Such an order became necessary only because the Board, the courts, and the public overlong have coddled and favored the CIO and some of its communistic-inspired organizers who have infiltrated into the unions and, through their control, are attempting to overthrow this Government by force.

Let the President "take a train," as he threatened in his Jackson Day speech to do: let him announce himself as the champion of the CIO and its program of mob violence, of the destruction of property, of the beating of citizens by CIO goon squads.

Perhaps the President will learn something. Yes, let him "take a train." Many of us wish he would. And, if he does, he will find an altogether different opposition than that which he encountered in his Presidential campaign. This time he will not be meeting a self-satisfied, over-confident candidate for the Presidency. He will be meeting the foremen, the Members of Congress who are sick and tired, as well as disgusted, with his assumption that he is a "big man," the source of all wisdom.

Some of us know him as a one-time member of the Tom Pendergast corrupt political organization; an average man who has muffed a big opportunity; a man who has been taken by Phil Murray and others to the top of the mountain and shown a mirage—not a true vision of the promised land.

P. S.: Oh, yes, there is another matter that I for the moment forgot.

Some unions during strikes are in the habit of using a loudspeaker and over it using all sorts of obscene and profane language.

If and when the President takes this train—no doubt at Government expense—to tell the home folks just how bad the Eighty-first Congress is, will he please advise them as to whether he approves of the union practice of using nasty language over loudspeakers where women and children are forced to hear it?

While on that subject, he might also advise the Christian, kindly mothers and grandmothers and little children, for that matter, who come out to see and hear him just why he used the unprintable language he did use when referring to Drew Pearson in the presence of a mixed audience, and just why he, the next day, felt that the public reaction to his use of that language was favorable.

If the President will turn to pages 6895–6896 of volume 61, part 7, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sixty-seventh Congress, first session, under date of October 27, 1921, he will find some interesting reading.

A Member of Congress obtained permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD. In doing so, he quoted from an affidavit which contained, among other things, the unprintable language recently used by the President at one of the Jackson Day dinners here in Washington last month.

The then Democratic leader of the House introduced a resolution calling for the expulsion of the Member who had inserted in the RECORD an affidavit of another which contained language similar to that used by the President. Two hundred and four Members voted to expel that Member; 113 voted nay; 1 Member announced present; 113 did not vote.

Then the Member, the House having declined to expel him, was by resolution ordered to the bar of the House, 293 Members voting in the affirmative; 26 announcing present, and 112 not voting. The resolution ordered the Speaker to censure the Member.

On that occasion, the Speaker of the House, among other things, said:

I have been directed to censure you because, when you had been allowed by the courtesy of the House to print a speech which you did not deliver, you inserted in it foul and obscene matter, which you knew you could not have spoken on this floor; and that disgusting matter, which could not have been circulated through the mails in any other publication without violating the law, was transmitted as part of the proceedings of this House to thousands of homes and libraries throughout the country, to be read by men and women, and, worst of all, by children, whose prurient curiosity it would excite and corrupt. In accordance with the instructions of the House and as its representative, I pronounce upon you its censure.

Is it not a sign of conceit, of arrogance, of coarseness, of a lack of propriety, for the President of the United States to use language which the House unanimously characterized as foul and obscene; which practically every thinking citizen in the United States would avoid using?

Should a resolution be introduced in this House, advising the President that the House of Representatives views with regret and disapproval his use of that unprintable language, his statement on a subsequent day that the public's reaction to his use of that language was favorable?

The November election seems to have had an unanticipated effect upon Harry S. Truman.

Has he forgotten that old riddle of his childhood days:

Humpty Dumpty sat on a wall;
Humpty Dumpty had a great fall;
And all the king's horses and all the king's men
Couldn't put Humpty Dumpty together again.

Even a President may learn that all the self-serving groups, the special interests, which boosted him to the "wall," may never be able to put him together again.

Is Truman just an egg?

RULES OF PROCEDURE UNDER MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to point out a situation which has developed in the House. A device is being employed to avoid a record vote on the issue of civil rights. As we well know a record vote cannot be obtained on an amendment which is offered in the Committee of the Whole. The only manner in which a record vote can be obtained on an amendment which has been defeated in the Committee of the Whole is by offering in the House a motion to recommit with instructions, directing the bill be reported back forthwith to the House with the amendment. Preference in offering a motion to recommit properly belongs to the minority. They have the preference provided that the person who offers the motion is opposed to the bill.

However, the rules are clear, that a person to qualify to offer a motion to recommit, must be in good conscience opposed to the bill. That qualification is not a mere formality. There is a good reason for that rule. The reason for it is that the motion to recommit rightfully belongs to one who is opposed to the bill. When anyone formally states that he is opposed to the bill and in actuality is not, he is not playing this game according to the rules. He is depriving a Member, who is in good conscience opposed to the bill, of an opportunity to offer a motion to recommit with an amendment. Yesterday I attempted to offer a motion to recommit with instructions to report back the bill with an amendment guaranteeing civil rights in the District of Columbia. I was opposed to the bill because I refused to vote for any appropriation to any department which denies equality of

education, services, and employment to anyone because of race, color or creed. It was my intention today to offer a motion to recommit with a similar amendment to the appropriation bill just passed. I was deprived of the opportunity to present the civil-rights amendment both yesterday and today when two of the ranking Republican members of the Committee on Appropriations which reported out the bill, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], offered straight motions to recommit, that is, motions without the civil-rights amendment. The Speaker asked: Is the gentleman opposed to the bill? Both gentlemen replied in the affirmative. I am not going to challenge the good faith of any Member. Let the record speak for itself.

The Committee on Appropriations unanimously reported out both bills. I do not believe that the rule is being considered with the seriousness that it deserves.

There is another very significant thing here and the people might as well know it. An attempt to get a vote on the civil-rights issue is being thwarted by a filibuster in the other body. It is being thwarted by a Republican-Democrat coalition in this body. It comes with poor grace from the Republican Party with its campaign promises on civil rights before us, to have some of its leading members on the Committee on Appropriations offer motions to recommit so as to prevent the obtaining of a record vote on the issue of civil rights in the House of Representatives.

So the Congress is confronted with a very tragic situation: a filibuster in the Senate by Democrats to prevent a vote on civil rights in the Senate, and cooperative action by Republicans in the House to prevent a record vote on civil rights in the House. Of course, I am not going to give the Republican Party any advice. They have wiser men and much abler men than I within their ranks. However, I would be derelict in my duty to the people whom I represent not to inform them from the well of this House as to what the score is.

This is a devious game. The American people voted for civil rights, and by devious devices, a filibuster in the other body by Democrats, and Republican cooperation in this House, the American people are deprived not only of civil rights, but they are being deprived of an opportunity to have their representatives' vote on record for or against civil rights.

I shall pursue my endeavors, under the rules of the House, and in keeping with the rules of the House, time and time again, I shall do the best I can to obtain a record vote on the civil-rights issue.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOLTON of Maryland asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by J. Milton Patterson, director of the Maryland State Department of Public Welfare.

Mr. FURCOLO asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BOLTON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 4, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

311. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1950 in the amount of $1,600,000 for the Department of the Army, in the form of an amendment to the budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 96); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

312. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the annual report of the Comptroller General of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

313. A letter from the Executive Vice Chairman, National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission to proceed with plans for the celebration and commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the seat of the Federal Government in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

314. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the appointment of officers on the active list of the Philippine Scouts in the Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

315. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the voluntary plan for the allocation of steel products for gas pipe line to Atomic Energy Commission plant and the request and the letter of compliance to the plan; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

316. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the protection of personnel engaged in the enforcement of regulations and the inspection of aircraft engaged in interstate and foreign air commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

317. A letter from the Director, Executive Office of the President, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting a report of personnel ceilings as determined and fixed pursuant to section 607 of the act, as amended by section 14 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 (Public Law 390, 79th Cong.), for the quarter ending December 31, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

318. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 20, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Mispillion River, Del., up to Milford, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

319. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 30, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompany papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Cundy Harbor, Maine, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 1823. A bill to amend the act of February 19, 1941, as amended, so as to establish a Women's Reserve as a branch of the Coast Guard Reserve; with amendments (Rept. No. 203). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 1821. A bill to amend the act of July 23, 1947 (61 Stat. 499); without amendment (Rept. No. 204). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REGAN: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 2877. A bill to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Big Bend National Park, in the State of Texas, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 207). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 969. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the three hundredth anniversary of Annapolis, Md.; without amendment (Rept. No. 205). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2231. A bill for the relief of Marie E. Wright; with an amendment (Rept. No. 208). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2233. A bill for the relief of Ewa Plantation Co., a Hawaiian corporation; without amendment (Rept. No. 206). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 3174. A bill authorizing the improvement of the port of Redwood City, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3175. A bill declaring October 13 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 3176. A bill repealing certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to the tax on oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 3177. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to establish a national cemetery in the southern portion of Louisiana; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3178. A bill to authorize the appointment of one additional district judge for the

district of Oregon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 3179. A bill to redefine the units and establish the standards of electrical and photometric measurements; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3180. A bill to authorize the construction and equipment of a radio laboratory building for the National Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 3181. A bill to provide for more effective conservation in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 3182. A bill to provide an equitable rate of compensation for specific service-incurred disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 3183. A bill to repeal the tax on transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H. R. 3184. A bill to establish a National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 3185. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to establish a national cemetery in the southern portion of Louisiana; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 3186. A bill to approve a repayment contract negotiated with the Kittitas reclamation district and to authorize its execution, to approve the reclassification of lands within the Kittitas division of the Yakima project, Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 3187. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the seizure by General Gage of the powder house in Somerville, Mass.; to the Committee on Post Offices and Civil Service.

H. R. 3188. A bill to establish a Federal Commission on Services for the Physically Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3189. A bill to authorize the issuance of a silver certificate bearing the portrait of Franklin Delano Roosevelt; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 3190. A bill to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 3191. A bill to amend the act approved September 7, 1916 (ch. 458, 39 Stat. 742), entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," as amended, by extending coverage to civilian officers of the United States and by making benefits more realistic in terms of present wage rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LODGE:

H. R. 3192. A bill to amend the act of July 31, 1947, with respect to the maintenance of actions to recover possession of publicly operated housing accommodations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 3193. A bill for the relief of public utility district No. 1, of Cowlitz County, Wash.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 3194. A bill to provide for the acquisition of site and preparation of plans and specifications for a new Federal building and post office in Whitefish, Mont.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 3195. A bill to correct an inequity existing between the rates of controlled-circulation business publications such as trade, technical, scientific, and professional periodicals, and other publications mailed under the second-class mailing privilege; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H. R. 3196. A bill to authorize appropriation for roads, trails, and other aids to transportation serving lands and facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MORTON:

H. R. 3197. A bill relating to the sale of the old Louisville Marine Hospital, Jefferson County, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 3198. A bill to amend the act of June 18, 1929; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. R. 3199. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 3200. A bill granting exemption from income tax with respect to $1,500 of the amount paid to any individual by the United States or by any State or political subdivision thereof as a pension, retired or retirement pay, or as a retirement annuity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 3201. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 3202. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 3203. A bill to provide for the recognition of the Veterinary School of Middlesex University, Waltham, Mass.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3204. A bill relating to flight-training courses under title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3205. A bill to provide a 1-year extension of the time for making application for terminal-leave pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PHILLIPS of California:

H. R. 3206. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the State to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 3207. A bill to amend and reenact sections 411 and 412 of title 28, United States Code, acts of March 3, 1911, chapter 231, section 275, 36 Stat. 1164, and acts of February 3, 1917, chapter 27, 39 Stat. 873, to authorize the judges of the district courts to appoint two jury commissioners, who shall meet on or before July 1 of each year to make a list of persons competent to act as jurors in the Federal courts; defining the qualification of such jurors; prescribing the oath to be taken by such commissioners, the records to be kept, and providing for their compensation; the method such commissioners shall use in the drawing of such jurors from the prepared ballots, required to be kept in a locked jury box until withdrawn by said commissioners in the presence of the clerk of said court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 3208. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration," approved January 3, 1946, to provide a more accurate nomenclature for certain classes of persons specified therein; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3209. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration," approved January 3, 1946, to provide for the appointment of dental specialists, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3210. A bill to amend section 7 (a) of "An act to establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration," approved January 3, 1946, to establish the chief grade in the Dental Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3211. A bill to promote maximum employment, business opportunities, and careers in a free competitive economy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 3212. A bill to raise the limit placed on the monthly disability compensation payable to veterans suffering from service-connected quadraplegia; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RICH:

H. R. 3213. A bill to authorize the construction of flood-control works at and in the vicinity of Bradford, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 3214. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to a moving-picture theater; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 3215. A bill to exempt from tax the transportation of persons on boats used for fishing purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TACKETT:

H. R. 3216. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to permit the mining of coal on the land now occupied by Camp Chaffee, Ark.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 3217. A bill to establish a Federal Commission on Services for the Physically Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 3218. A bill to authorize the construction of a research laboratory for the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, at or in the vicinity of State College, Centre County, Pa.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WHITAKER:

H. R. 3219. A bill to provide clerical allowances at certain post offices of the fourth class; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 3220. A bill to correct an inequity existing between the rates of controlled-circulation business publications such as trade, technical, scientific, and professional periodicals, and other publications mailed under the second-class mailing privilege; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 3221. A bill to advance officers and enlisted men on the retired lists of the armed forces to the highest grade for which they satisfactorily performed the duties in time of war; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 3222. A bill to foster the cooperative agriculture education work of the extension services, to free the extension services from the performance of nongovernmental functions and political activity, and to promote economy in agricultural extension work, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 3223. A bill to amend section 3406 (a) (4) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. R. 3224. A bill to equalize taxation on earned income, encourage individual financing of social security, encourage individual ownership of United States Government bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 3225. A bill to incorporate the Twenty-ninth Division Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 3226. A bill to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 3227. A bill to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in the year 1952 in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the arrival of Carl Schurz, an illustrious soldier and statesman, in this country on September 17, 1852; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WOOD:

H. R. 3228. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 3229. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and the Federal Alcohol Administration Act, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 3230. A bill to authorize Federal aid to school districts overburdened with war-incurred or defense-incurred school enrollments or by Federal activity in such district for the construction of additional school facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. J. Res. 184. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim the first Monday of February as National Children's Dental Health Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. Res. 126. Resolution for the relief of Mrs. Charlotte H. Murdock; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. Res. 127. Resolution providing for the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, requesting the continuation of adequate appropriations to the Farmers Home Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, urging the appropriation of necessary funds to proceed at once with the early and speedy construction of the Palisade Dam project in Idaho; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Indiana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to oppose the federalization of the National Guard of the United States and the National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia in whole or in part; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, requesting the passage of legislation to broaden the benefits of social security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 3231. A bill for the relief of Mario Farabullini and Alla Farabullini, his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 3232. A bill for the relief of John L. Routzahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 3233. A bill for the relief of Victor Hamati, also known as Victor Hamaty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARE:

H. R. 3234. A bill for the relief of Jesse A. Lott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 3235. A bill to provide for the permanent residence of Toy Lin Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER:

H. R. 3236. A bill for the relief of Pietro Caligaris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITAKER:

H. R. 3237. A bill for the relief of G. H. Lazarus, Jr., and Jesse F. Bewley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

156. By Mr. MAHON: Petition signed by 385 Lynn County, Tex., farmers, concerning certain pending legislation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

157. By Mr. RIEHLMAN: Petition of League of Landlords, Inc., Syracuse, N. Y., proposing decontrol of rental housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

158. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 128 residents of Beaver County, Pa., urging the repeal of the railroad-transportation tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

159. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Hilton E. Heineke, secretary, Oneonta Chamber of Commerce, Oneonta, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to construction of a flood-control dam on the Charlotte River at Davenport Center, town of Davenport, county of Delaware, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Works.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MARCH 4, 1949

(Legislative day of Monday, February 21, 1949)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Dr. Seth R. Brooks, minister, Universalist National Memorial Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, if only the pure in heart see God, how far off at times we must stand. But we believe it is in Thee we live and move and have our being, that Thou art not far from any one of us. In this Lenten season we would sense that which Jesus knew in the wilderness—man's need and Thy sure help.

As we face the issues in our world, the tasks of our Nation and the responsibilities of our own life, make us to know that Thou art an available power we can use. We would hear what the ages are saying to the hours. We would lay hold upon those virtues which make men not alone great but good. Believing that unto whom much is given of him will much be required, we offer as our most worthy gifts not wealth, might, or power but lives that are useful, noble, and wise.

Bless these Thy servants and help them ever to know that Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 42) granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Gulf coast and creating the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3083) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION AND LETTER

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letter, which were referred, as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, TREASURY DEPARTMENT (S. DOC. NO. 25)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the Treasury Department, amounting to $3,600,000, fiscal year 1950, in the form of amendments to the budget (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUSPENSION OF EMPLOYEES WITHOUT PREFERMENT OF WRITTEN CHARGES

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to permit the suspension of employees without pay for periods of 30 days or less without the preferment of written charges (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

CALL OF THE ROLL

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into yesterday, the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] has the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a quorum call?

Mr. WATKINS. Without losing my place on the floor, I ask unanimous consent that that may be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It can be done only by unanimous consent.

Mr. LUCAS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Utah may yield to the Senator from Illinois for the purpose

of enabling him to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without losing his right to the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Without losing any of his rights under the agreement entered into last evening before the Senate took a recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I do not know all of the agreement that was entered into. Was it limited to the effect that the Senator from Utah would not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. LUCAS. It provided that the Senator from Utah would not lose his right to the floor.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Reserving the right to object——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arkansas reserves the right to object.

Mr. McCLELLAN. May I propound a parliamentary inquiry without taking the Senator from Utah off the floor?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Not without unanimous consent.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I ask unanimous consent——

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is one unanimous-consent request pending, namely, that the Senator from Utah be permitted to yield to the Senator from Illinois for the purpose of enabling him to make the point of no quorum. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hoey	Murray
Anderson	Holland	Myers
Baldwin	Humphrey	Neely
Brewster	Hunt	O'Conor
Bricker	Ives	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Jenner	Pepper
Broughton	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Butler	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cain	Ketauver	Saltonstall
Chapman	Kem	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Connally	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Lodge	Sparkman
Douglas	Long	Stennis
Downey	Lucas	Taft
Eastland	McCarran	Taylor
Ecton	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Flanders	McFarland	Thye
Frear	McGrath	Tobey
Fulbright	McKellar	Tydings
George	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Gillette	Malone	Watkins
Green	Martin	Wherry
Gurney	Maybank	Wiley
Hayden	Miller	Williams
Hendrickson	Millikin	Withers
Hickenlooper	Morse	Young
Hill	Mundt	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is necessarily absent because of the death of his father, Mr. Alvin T. Capehart.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield so that I may make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield on the condition that I do not lose the floor by so doing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will not lose the floor under those conditions.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may be permitted to introduce bills and joint resolutions, present petitions and memorials, and other matters which are ordinarily presented during the morning hour, without thereby interfering with or jeopardizing the parliamentary situation on the question now pending before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask permission of the Senate to be absent from the session of the Senate tomorrow to fill an engagement made some weeks ago.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from the session of the Senate after 3 o'clock this afternoon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Memorial 4

"To the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas there are certain inequalities in the old age and survivors' insurance law as now enacted especially with relation to married women, and those not fully qualified under the law to receive the benefits though contributions have been made therefor; and

"Whereas at present prices the amount of all social-security benefits are inadequate;

"Now, therefore, your memorialists respectfully pray that the Congress of the United States speedily pass legislation:

"1. To include among the classes within the purview of social-security legislation public employees, employees of religious and charitable organizations, and all self-employed persons including those in the professions, in commerce, in agriculture, and other groups; and to grant to the several States the full option of placing their employees and the employees of their political subdivision under Federal old-age and survivors' insurance;

"2. To provide that persons over 60 who are severed from their employment before reaching age 65 and would have been eligible at the time of the severance of their employment had they been aged 65, shall upon reaching the age of 65 be eligible for their pension as though the severance had then occurred;

"3. To provide that the pensioner shall be entitled to additional pension for a dependent wife upon her reaching the age of 60, and that widows of persons, who at the time of their death, had they been 65, would have been pensioners, shall be entitled to a widow's pension upon reaching the age of 60;

"4. To provide that no deduction in pension shall be made for income from other sources including salaries and wages;

"5. To provide for increase in the amount paid in all categories by at least 50 percent; and

"6. To provide for the refunding to those not eligible to pension all contributions made by them therefor; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, and to Members of the United States Senate and United States House of Representatives from this State."

Petitions of Mrs. Louise Soloman, of Mason City, Iowa, and Arnold Schlossberg, of Roanoke, Va., praying for the enactment of legislation to continue rent control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Memorials of Aldrich Blake, of Laguna Beach, Calif., and sundry other citizens of the United States, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to continue rent control; to the Commitee on Banking and Currency.

Petitions of M. E. Lacey, of Louisville, Ky., and sundry other citizens of the United States, praying for the enactment of legislation to broaden the provisions of the social security law; to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of W. D. Knox, of Port Atkinson, Wis., praying for the enactment of House bill 1703, relating to taxes on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Bruce Underwood, of Louisville, Ky., relating to the creation of a Cabinet post for health education and welfare; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

The petition of Carl B. Humphrey, director, the USA-Morocco Trade Co., of Casablanca, Morocco, praying for the enactment of legislation to assist American interests in Morocco (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the United States, praying for the enactment of legislation providing Federal aid to education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The petition of William H. Harrison, of Washington, D. C., praying for the enactment of legislation to strengthen the Taft-Hartley labor law; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A telegram in the nature of a memorial, signed by T. C. Vanarsdall, Committee of Mercer County (Ky.) Medical Society, Harrodsburg, Ky, remonstrating against the enactment of the compulsory health-insurance bill; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Petitions of Harry Rothschild, of Los Angeles, Calif., and sundry citizens of the United States, praying for the enactment of legislation to repeal the Taft-Hartley labor law; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Petitions of Don Drennen, of Birmingham, Ala., and Fred H. Peoples, of Memphis, Tenn., praying for the enactment of legislation to

continue the Taft-Hartley labor law; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A petition signed by Mrs. Roberta Howlett, of Louisville, Ky., and sundry other citizens of the State of Kentucky, praying for the enactment of House bill 2143, to require Federal district courts and State courts to enforce certain support orders of courts of other States, and to confer jurisdiction on Federal district courts to make support orders in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The memorial of Richard A. Charter, of Ottawa, Kans., remonstrating against the militarization of the Government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN MONOPOLISTIC PRACTICES—PETITION

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a petition from numerous residents of Venango County, Pa., urging investigation of any monopolistic practices involved in the recent industry cut of 20 percent in crude-oil prices to the small producers. Several committees of the Senate concerned with aspects of the antitrust laws and with small business are no doubt interested in such a matter. I ask that the names and addresses of the petitioners be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, together with the signatures and addresses, as follows:

To the Honorable Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS, OF PENNSYLVANIA,

Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned, are oil producers in and near to Venango County, Pa., and we hereby respectfully urge and request you to use every reasonable effort and endeavor to find out and determine why the price of our crude oil has been reduced approximately 20 percent during December and January last by the refining interests and to determine as to whether the same was done by monopolistic practices.

C. L. Irwin, Pearl E. Irwin, A. I. Daugherty, Cora M. Hoffman; G. A. Eakin, Mary E. Eakin, H. E. Hoffman, Grace Hoffman, John E. Williams, J. B. Porter, Clintonville, Pa.; Mrs. B. A. Porter, Earl McElhinney, Delbert D. Hoffman, O. G. Midbeny, J. R. Baker, Harrisville, Pa.; R. B. Phipps, Merle P. Phipps, S. B. Atwell, C. B. Hoffman, Len E. Riddle, P. O. Moore, C. R. Moore, Clintonville, Pa.; C. G. Highfield, Franklin, Pa.; J. W. Richards, R. J. Hovis, C. L. Wedellind, J. D. McKee, Clintonville, Pa.; George S. Smith, Franklin, Pa.; Earl W. Griffin, Geo. T. McMurdy (Adm.), C. R. Smith, Bird E. Smith, John C. Craig, John Vogus, Mrs. Harry H. Craig, R. O. Williams, Clintonville, Pa.; M. H. Dattener, Albert L. Sweetapple, Kennerdell, Pa.; W. H. Sweetapple, Bradford, Pa.; Chas. E. Whilldon, Kennerdell, Pa.; Park Griffin, Polk, Pa.; J. D. Gibb, Kennerdell, Pa.; R. V. Phipps, C. C. Phipps, T. M. Phipps, J. M. Phipps, Lillian B. Phipps, Mabel C. Phipps, Clintonville, Pa.; J. C. McKee, R. C. McKee, E. J. Naber, Parkers Landing, Pa.; Elizabeth S. Ramage, Oil City, Pa.; Sam. J. Ramage 3d (by E. S.), Edmond H. Ramage (by E. S.), Kennerdell, Pa.; Hazel V. Hutchison, Sterling E. Hutchison, Vilena E. Hovis, C. H. Oakes, Mrs. C. H. Oakes, R. J. Eakin, Clintonville, Pa.; W. A. McFadden, Kennerdell, Pa.; N. L. Chase, Fred Chase, Harrisville, Pa.; Braden C. Griffin, Clintonville, Pa.; E. R. Hovis, Harrisville, Pa.; E. M. Bindick, Clintonville, Pa.; M. J. Hoffman, Grove City, Pa.; Elizabeth Guenzh, Mary S. Hamilton, Lester C. Hamilton, Clintonville, Pa.

GENERAL PULASKI'S MEMORIAL DAY—RESOLUTION OF COMMON COUNCIL OF CITY OF SALEM, MASS.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and myself, I present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Salem, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation proclaiming October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's memorial day resolution now pending in Congress

Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

Whereas the 11th day of October 1779 is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union, through legislative enactment designated October 11 of each year as "General Pulaski's Memorial Day"; and

Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated from October 11, 1929, to October 11, 1946, to be General Pulaski's Memorial Day in United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the common council of the city of Salem and State of Massachusetts:

SECTION 1. That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

SEC. 2. That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, and each of the United States Senators and Representatives from Massachusetts.

AID TO STATE IN ENFORCEMENT OF CIGARETTE TAX—RESOLUTION OF MINNESOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a concurrent resolution adopted by the Minnesota State Legislature memorializing and requesting the Congress to enact a bill to aid the State in the enforcement of the cigarette tax now evaded by use of the United States mails.

The concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution memorializing and requesting the Congress of the United States to enact a bill to aid the State in the enforcement of the cigarette tax now evaded by use of the United States mails

Whereas the State of Minnesota has seen fit to impose a tax on the sale of cigarettes within its boundaries, and the revenues so obtained constitute an important portion of the funds available for its functions of government; and

Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Minnesota that a large and growing system of evasion of such tax law has developed; that the United States mails are flooded with advertisements and inducements to the citizens of this State to violate the law of this State; that in numerous instances such advertisers entice prospective customers with statements to the effect that the use of the United States mails is sufficient proof of the legitimacy of such business and such a system; that the mails of the United States are constantly flooded with cigarettes in the process of delivery within this State, and on which cigarettes the tax required by the laws of this State have not and will not be paid; that this State is seriously disadvantaged by such use of the postal offices and mails of the United States for the purpose of evading the laws of Minnesota; and that Minnesota faces and is now suffering serious losses of revenue as a result of such system of evasion; and

Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the House of Representatives and the Senate of Minnesota that there is now pending before the Congress of the United States a proposed bill which would aid the States by requiring shippers of cigarettes in interstate commerce to furnish to the taxing authority of the State to which shipped a copy of the invoice on each shipment and the name and address of each person to whom shipped: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Minnesota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be and the same is hereby memorialized and respectfully urged to enact a bill requiring shippers of cigarettes in interstate commerce to furnish to the taxing authority of the State to which shipped a copy of the invoice on each such shipment; or to enact such other bill to the aid of the several States affected as may be proper; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Congressman and Senator from the State of Minnesota.

C. ELMER ANDERSON,
President of the Senate.
JOHN A. HARTLE,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Approved February 28, 1949.
LUTHER W. YOUNGDAHL,
Governor of the State of Minnesota.

TAX ON OLEOMARGARINE—RESOLUTION OF MINNEAPOLIS (MINN.) CENTRAL LABOR UNION

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Minneapolis (Minn.) Central Labor Union, in

CAPEHART] is necessarily absent because the full option of placing their employees praying for the enactment of legislation to

regular meeting assembled February 23, 1949, relating to the tax on oleomargarine.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINNEAPOLIS CENTRAL LABOR UNION,
Minneapolis, Minn., March 1, 1949.

To All Minnesota Senators and Congressmen; H. D. Cooley, Chairman of the Agricultural Committee of the House of Representatives; Elmer Thomas, Chairman of the Agricultural Committee of the Senate; Minnesota State Legislature:

At the last regular meeting of the Minneapolis Central Labor Union on February 23, 1949, the following resolution dealing with oleomargarine and repeal of all taxes was adopted. We urge you to give this resolution your full support:

"Whereas there are now in Congress several bills dealing with regulating the manufacture, sale of oleomargarine, and repeal of all taxes; and

"Whereas the repeal of taxes on yellow oleomargarine should bring a reduction in price to consumers who cannot afford to buy the superior food product, butter; and

"Whereas yellow oleomargarine resembles butter so closely that it cannot be distinguished from butter by consumers and therefore invites substitution and fraud, making it necessary that the consumers be protected by prohibiting oleomargarine to be colored yellow; and

"Whereas any such substitution or fraud would benefit approximately 23 large corporations in the United States who manufacture oleomargarine and would so benefit at the expense of the consumers and the millions of dairy farmers who produce butter; and

"Whereas House File 1703 provides for the repeal of all taxes on oleomargarine and section 3 of said act also prohibits the manufacture, transportation, handling, possession, sale, use, or serving of yellow oleomargarine in commerce or after shipment in commerce, but does not prohibit the use of yellow oleomargarine in private homes: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Minneapolis Central Labor Union, in regular meeting assembled this 23d day of February 1949, adopt this resolution and respectfully urge upon Congress the adoption of said House File No. 1703; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution, urging full support, be sent to all Minnesota Senators and Congressmen; to H. D. COOLEY, chairman of the Agricultural Committee of the House of Representatives; ELMER THOMAS, chairman of the Agricultural Committee of the Senate, now holding hearings on the above subject; and request the Minnesota State Legislature to introduce a resolution memorializing Congress to put into effect what the contents of this resolution requests."

Respectfully submitted.

MINNEAPOLIS CENTRAL LABOR UNION,
WALTER CHAMMOND,
Recording Secretary.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION—LETTERS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk various letters and communications sent to me by educational organizations in my State urging support of Federal aid to education. I ask that these letters and communications be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point. I commend these expressions to the attention of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the letters and communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILWAUKEE SECONDARY
EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,
Milwaukee, Wis., February 1, 1949.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: At its last meeting the executive committee of the Milwaukee Secondary Education Association, comprised of more than 600 members, strongly endorsed legislation for Federal aid to education similar to that passed by the United States Senate last year, and again proposed in bill S. 246 for consideration by the Eighty-first Congress. They requested that I write you in the name of our association and urge you to support legislation that will assure a basic educational opportunity for the youth of all of our States.

The precarious times in which we live make it imperative that education to strengthen our democracy go beyond provincial State lines and become a national issue. Here are some statistics that should cause grave concern to us all:

1. Four million children in the United States from 5 to 17 years of age are not now enrolled in any school.

2. We have, at present, 800,000 illiterates of age 14 or older.

3. Eight million one hundred and ninety-seven thousand citizens 14 years and over have had less than 5 years of schooling.

4. In World War II 650,000 young men were rejected for military service because of educational deficiencies.

Federal aid to education is a must in order to eliminate the educational slums of the Nation; to provide an equalization of educational opportunity regardless of residence, race, or economic status; and to improve schools and salaries so that more of our ablest young men and women will be attracted to the teaching profession. You, no doubt, are aware that school enrollment will increase tremendously within the next few years and that there is already an acute shortage of qualified teachers.

Do we dare risk delay in providing Federal aid to education? A serious consideration of facts, we believe, will cause you to support legislation to alleviate the critical deficiencies that exist in our national program for the training of the head and heart of our youth.

Sincerely yours,
GERDA P. WHITTMAN,
President.

SUPERIOR, WIS.

Senator WILEY,
Chippewa Falls, Wis.

DEAR MR. WILEY: I am writing you to let you know the Itasca PTA is in favor of the new education bill.

MRS. R. J. KMECIK,
Secretary of PTA.

MINETTE, WIS., *January 27, 1949.*

Senator WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The President's State of the Union message again placed the Federal-aid-to-education bill before Congress for passage; we as citizens wish to express our hopes that this time it will become a law.

In a democracy education is a major factor, and Government support of vocational education has long been forthcoming; laymen feel that education from kindergarten to high school is equally important for an enlightened and educated citizenry. We sincerely hope that you will give your support to the passage of this bill.

Sincerely,
ALICE K. SUNSTROM,
President of the Marinette Education Association.

WINNECONNE, WIS.,
February 14, 1949.

Honorable Mr. WILEY:

I am writing in behalf of the Jack and Jill Club. This club consists of 88 mothers of children from kindergarten, first, second, and third grades of the Winneconne community school system.

The club at its last meeting voted unanimously to urge our Senators to support the bill giving Federal aid to education.

Respectfully yours,
JACK AND JILL CLUB,
MRS. GLENN DAVEY,
Secretary.

RICE LAKE PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Rice Lake, Wis., January 3, 1949.

Mr. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I sincerely hope that the Congress will find it advisable to put through some form of Federal aid to education during the course of this session. Of course, by Federal aid, I am aware of the fact that it it cannot be of the type, with all its restrictions, which is now being supplied the schools in various departments. I believe you also are of the opinion that it must be aid without extreme control.

I do hope that some provision will be made to assist the local schools in their struggle to meet the already existent construction problem. I am certain that other communities are exactly in the same position as Rice Lake. We find our operation costs mounting and we have all we can do, with ever-increasing tax levies, to meet our current obligations. I cannot see, under present conditions, how most schools can even hope for any construction unless some aid is given. I'll admit that this aid might also be provided by State sources. We in Rice Lake have now an enrollment of 750 students in the high-school building which was designed for a capacity of 350. We have elementary expansion as our first necessity, and if that is done, the construction of a new high school certainly looks very gloomy.

I presume that this is only one of many letters which you receive relative to this situation. My only reason in reiterating it is that I do sincerely hope that Congress will find ways and means of providing some aid to this very fundamental necessity in life, namely, education.

Thanking you for your consideration.

Yours very truly,
ROGER B. HOLTZ,
Superintendent of Schools.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 110. A bill to broaden the cooperative extension system as established in the act of May 8, 1914, and acts supplemental thereto, by providing for cooperative extension work between colleges receiving the benefits of this act and the acts of July 2, 1862, and August 30, 1890, and other qualified colleges, universities, and research agencies, and the United States Department of Labor; without amendment (Rept. No. 92).

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 779. A bill relating to the pay and allowances of officers of the Naval Establishment appointed to permanent grades; without amendment (Rept. No. 93).

By Mr. THYE, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 979. A bill to amend section 9 of the act of May 22, 1928, as amended, authorizing and directing a national survey of forest resources; without amendment (Rept. No. 94).

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. BRIDGES):

S. 1173. A bill relating to the fixing of wage rates for employees in naval shipyards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. LANGER):

S. 1174. A bill to amend the act of June 25, 1938, relating to the appointment of postmasters under Civil Service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(Mr. FREAR (for himself and Mr. FLANDERS) introduced Senate bill 1175, to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 with respect to mutual savings banks, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MCCLELLAN:

S. 1176. A bill to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the fifty-ninth annual reunion of the Confederate Veterans, to be held in Little Rock, Ark., September 27 through September 29, 1949; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 1177. A bill for the relief of Pietro Bruno Tinino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCKELLAR:

S. 1178. A bill for the relief of Fella H. Holbrook; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1179. A bill for the relief of Myron Kolodziejczak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1180. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey by quitclaim deed certain mineral rights in certain lands situated in the State of Oklahoma to Alfred A. Drummond and Addie G. Drummond; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1181. A bill to authorize the appointment of officers on the active list of the Philippine Scouts in the Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 1182. A bill for the relief of W. Irving Lincoln; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 1183. A bill to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF HOME OWNERS' LOAN ACT RELATING TO MUTUAL SAVINGS BANKS

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 with respect to mutual savings banks, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an explanatory statement of the bill prepared by me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from Delaware will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1175) to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 with respect to mutual savings banks, introduced by Mr. FREAR (for himself and Mr. FLANDERS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The statement presented by Mr. FREAR was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FREAR

The purpose of this bill is to correct an omission in the existing Federal law which provides for reciprocal conversion between Federal and State local mutual thrift and home financing institutions. There are two types of local mutual thrift and home financing institutions in the country. One is the savings and loan type of institution and the other is the mutual savings bank. The Home Owners' Loan Act now permits State chartered savings and loan type institutions and State chartered mutual savings banks to convert into Federal savings and loan associations. The Federal law also contains the reciprocal provision permitting the Federal savings and loan associations to convert into State chartered savings and loan associations. The reciprocal provision for conversion of Federal savings and loan associations into mutual savings banks, however, is lacking. This bill would supply this feature and make this conversion privilege a two-way street. As a corollary to the existing authorization for mutual savings banks to convert into Federal savings and loan associations, this bill would permit Federal savings and loan associations to convert into mutual savings banks.

The bill prescribes adequate safeguards as a prerequisite to any such conversion. For example, such a conversion would be permitted only when State law allows a mutual savings bank to convert into a Federal savings and loan association. A favorable vote of at least 51 percent of all shareholders represented at a special meeting called for the purpose would be required. The converted institution would have to qualify for insurance by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. Of course, no conversion would be permitted which did not satisfy the requirements of State law.

There are 552 mutual savings banks in operation in 17 States. These mutual savings banks have a total of approximately 18,000,000 depositors with deposits of approximately $18,000,000,000. These mutual savings banks are nonprofit, nonstock, local, thrift institutions, operating independently and playing an important part in the home-mortgage field. Reliable information has been received by the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks that two Federal savings and loan associations in one of our Western States have already endeavored to convert themselves under their State laws into mutual savings banks but have been prevented from doing so by the absence of Federal permission. The National Association of Mutual Savings Banks has also been reliably informed that other Federal savings and loan associations are interested in the possibility of conversion into mutual savings banks.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3083) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRESENTATION TO SENATOR CONNALLY OF THE MARK ANTONY AWARD FOR DISTINGUISHED AND HUMANE SERVICE IN THE CAUSE OF WORLD PEACE

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the able Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has just been signally honored by his selection to receive the Mark Antony award for distinguished and humane service in the cause of world peace. This high honor was conferred upon the senior Senator from Texas by the Mark Antony Lodge, Knights of Pythias, in conjunction with the Grand Lodge of the Domain of New York.

No one could be more worthy of this outstanding award than the Senator from Texas, whose devoted studies and intense active interest have contributed greatly to the cause of amicable relations among nations of the world. Our citizens are delighted that this recognition is made of his splendid work and of his untiring efforts for world accord.

In his ackowledgment Senator CONNALLY presented so adequately the spirit of brotherhood which has inspired the United States, in all its generous contributions to world economy, welfare, and peace that I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD the report of the ceremony as contained in the Sunday New York Times.

There being no objection, the article from the New York Times was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

CONNALLY SAYS UNITED STATES WILL CONTINUE AID—MATERIAL AND SPIRITUAL HELP TO BROTHERHOOD OF NATIONS IS SEEN BY SENATOR

Senator TOM CONNALLY, of Texas, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, declared last night that the United States would continue on a worthy and lofty conception of international affairs to contribute materially and spiritually to the brotherhood of nations and peoples.

The Senator spoke after receiving the fifth annual Mark Antony award for distinguished and humane service in the cause of world peace from the Mark Antony Lodge, Knights of Pythias, in conjunction with the grand lodge of the domain of New York. The presentation took place at the Roosevelt Auditorium, 100 East Seventeenth Street.

Paying tribute to the current observance of Brotherhood Week, Senator CONNALLY characterized this Nation as an internationally outstanding example of brotherhood toward the other nations of the world.

"The United States in a spirit of brotherhood proposed and urged the formation of the United Nations," he said. "At San Francisco it advocated the adoption of the Charter which had for its chief purpose the

settlement in peace of international controversies.

"However, the veto has been invoked by Russia so often that the United Nations has been handicapped and hampered in many of its splendid purposes. It was designed to maintain the integrity of nations and to preserve their liberty and independence."

Mr. CONNALLY predicted that the veto provision would be modified.

The Senator said that the United States, in a spirit of brotherhood, extended generous aid to the nations suffering from the war. This country, he related, contributed 72 percent of the millions that were expended by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration to relieve hunger, want, and misery, principally in the countries of Europe.

"Since the war," Mr. CONNALLY continued, "the United States has given to China approximately $2,000,000,000 for relief. Our country has also extended generous loans to numerous other countries. In Greece, to preserve its freedom and prevent its absorption by totalitarianism, $400,000,000 was authorized by Congress. To preserve the integrity of Turkey, more than $100,000,000 was extended.

"The most gigantic and generous act of its kind in all history was embodied in the Marshall plan. Eighteen billions of dollars are to be devoted to the rehabilitation of the shattered economies in Europe."

The Senator also cited the North Atlantic Pact, currently being negotiated, as new evidence of this Nation's ideal of brotherhood. He declared that its purpose was to aid through union the freedom and integrity of the signatory nations.

"This record," he added, "covers some of the generous and unselfish efforts of the United States to contribute to the brotherhood of nations and peoples and to preserve and maintain the peace of the world. The United States will continue upon this lofty and worthy conception of international affairs. We shall hope to attain these noble objectives."

Municipal and judicial officials attended the ceremonies, which included a tableaux depicting the founding of the fraternal order 85 years ago.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR O'CONOR BEFORE PENNSYLVANIA AND ATLANTIC SEABOARD HARDWARE ASSOCIATION

[Mr. WILLIAMS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Senator O'CONOR before the Pennsylvania and Atlantic Seaboard Hardware Association, at Baltimore, Md., on March 1, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

FLOOD CONTROL AND RIVERS AND HARBORS WORK—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement regarding flood control and rivers and harbors work made by him before the Senate Committee on Appropriations, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HON. W. JOHN KENNEY BEFORE THE HAMPTON ROADS MARITIME ASSOCIATION

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by the Under Secretary of the Navy, Hon. W. John Kenney, before the Hampton Roads Maritime Association, Norfolk, Va., on February 24, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT BY 14 WASHINGTON JURISTS AND DEANS OF LAW SCHOOLS ON THE TRIAL OF JOSEF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a public statement by 14 leading Washington jurists and deans of law schools in condemnation of the trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, which appears in the Appendix.]

NEITHER RACE NOR CREED—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Neither Race nor Creed," from the New York Times of March 3, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

SOUTH'S MAN OF THE YEAR—ARTICLE BY HUBERT F. LEE

[Mr. MCCLELLAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Hubert F. Lee entitled "South's Man of the Year" relating to C. Hamilton Moses, of Little Rock, Ark., published in the winter edition of Dixie Business, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARMISTICE IN PALESTINE—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Armistice in Palestine," published in the New York Herald Tribune of February 25, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

NOMINATION OF MON C. WALLGREN

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD several newspaper editorials and letters relating to the nomination of Mon C. Wallgren to be Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, which appear in the Appendix.]

CONGRESSMEN DEFINE A LIBERAL—ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

[Mr. BALDWIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article containing comments by Senators and others on the meaning of the word "liberal" from the New York Herald Tribune, which appears in the Appendix.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further matters to be presented, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Utah.

THE PROPOSED NORTH ATLANTIC SECURITY PACT

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I began to speak last night on the North Atlantic security pact. There were very few Senators in the Chamber at that hour, and I now wish to review in substance the first part of my remarks, because I should like it to appear in the same volume of the RECORD, and I should like the Members of the Senate present to hear the opening part of my discussion.

Notwithstanding that the Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, have urged that debate on the North Atlantic security pact be postponed until the pact is ready to be given to the Senate for approval, the honoring of the request has been more observed in the breach than in the observance.

Throughout this country and in foreign countries, newspapers and other publicists have been waging the debate on the proposed North Atlantic security pact.

From time to time quotations from the pact itself have been printed in our newspapers. This has been done in spite of the fact that the Congress has been told, through the Secretary of State and the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, that the text of the pact, whatever it is at the moment, is top secret.

It is inconceivable to me that either the Secretary of State or the Senator from Texas have been giving out information on the text of the pact, in view of the statements they have made to the Congress and to the public.

Where do these quotations come from? Since the information is apparently accurate—and I say that with some reservations; I am assuming an established newspaper would not publish them unless they had some ground for thinking they were accurate—I must assume that someone directly connected with the negotiations is actually giving out the information for some definite purpose.

In view of the history of previous programs for foreign relief, one may well conclude that one or more nations interested in such an alliance would take advantage of such a propaganda campaign to assure its adoption by the participating governments. One of the most effective ways, of course, would be to get information into the hands of friendly newspapers, correspondents, and commentators, so that these friendly publicists could present the matter in a favorable light to the American people. Wherever or whatever the source, it is my belief that the underlying purpose of this prepact publicity is a propaganda campaign designed to win the overwhelming support of an uninformed American public.

When that purpose has been achieved, the alliance will be tossed into the lap of the United States Senate. Then, those who took months to draw and obtain support for the pact will say—and I believe I have heard similar admonishments before—"Act on this immediately. This is our last chance for peace."

The United States Senate will then be placed in this position: It can bow to public pressure for the sake of political expediency; or Senators in opposition can object to the principles involved and incur the possibility of political extinction, because they are running counter to public opinion which has already been determined by press propaganda.

This I believe without a doubt to be the objective of the proalliance propagandists. They have little desire to seek the advice of the Senate during the formulative stages of the alliance.

An editorial in a western newspaper came to the attention of the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] and, in an open session of the Senate, he called attention to some provisions of the proposed treaty. The questions of the Senator from Missouri brought some very enlightening responses from two leading Senators who are members of the Foreign Relations Committee. The statements made by the two members of this committee were reassuring to the country, and undoubtedly to many of the Senators who expect the Constitution of the United States to be faithfully observed by the officials of this Government in any treaty negotiations with foreign countries.

The Senators on the Foreign Relations Committee taking part in the discussion made abundantly clear, at least to me, that there would be no moral or implied

pledge to take up arms in case of attack against the members of the security pact other than ourselves. This would not be a military alliance. No power of future Congresses to act independently in the matter of declaring war would be abridged in any way.

These assurances seemed to go the full distance in the protection of the United States in the entering of such a pact. There would be no commitment, either expressed, implied, or moral, that would obligate the United States to take military action against any aggressor which might attack one or the other of the signatory nations.

This assurance to the people of this country, however, was contrasted by consternation in the capitals of the nations in Europe who were negotiating to enter the pact. What they wanted was a military alliance, the old-fashioned kind, in which the United States would be bound to come to the rescue of any nation or nations in the pact immediately upon any armed attack being made on such nation or nations. That became abundantly clear through the statements of their officials in the press of foreign lands. They knew, or should have known, the provisions of the Constitution of the United States which make it impossible for this country, if that document were honored in writing the pact, to make any such binding agreement. No future Congress can be bound to declare war.

There were hasty conferences to iron out the difficulties. Immediately the press of this country—at least many of the leading newspapers—took up the debate. They were not at all backward in going all out for what, in effect, would be a strong military alliance in which the United States would be brought into any fighting if any of the nations joining in the pact were attacked by any nation which could be termed an aggressor.

The problem seemed to be to find a way in which Europe could be given the military alliance it wanted and at the same time satisfy the people of the United States so that they could feel secure that the Constitution was being observed in letter and in spirit.

These positions, in my opinion are incompatible. Europe was not satisfied with the commitments our senatorial spokesmen were able to assure under our Constitution, as stated in the interchange between the Senator from Missouri and members of the Foreign Relations Committee.

As a result of this situation, and the consternation it created in Europe, as well as in this country, the editorials then began to run something like the one I now have before me. This one, and it is typical, appeared in the Washington Evening Star under date of February 18. After quoting article I, section 8, of the Constitution, which reads: "The Congress shall have power to declare war," the editorial comment in part was as follows:

> When those words were written, war was a slow, tedious process. It was a matter of transporting armies across vast stretches of ocean in sailing ships, of naval blockades, of equipping men with muskets to face other men with muskets. The authors of article I, section 8, could not foresee the day when war would become a matter of sudden, devastating attack, designed to destroy a country long before its Congress could assemble to declare war. They could not have been expected to foresee the time in which we live, a time in which man's true hope of survival lies in preventing wars, not fighting them.
>
> This being so, it is not reasonable for Members of the Senate to be standing on the letter of the Constitution; to be saying that Congress must not yield any part of its constitutional power to declare war. To do this is not only unreasonable, but puts in grave jeopardy our one best hope for the future.

In this language we have an invitation, in effect, urging Senators to forget their oath of office to uphold the Constitution and to adopt a program which under the circumstances the editor feels is reasonable and is absolutely necessary for our future welfare.

I think we owe a debt of gratitude to the editorial writer of the Evening Star for stripping the issue of all its camouflage and bringing it squarely before us. This editorial writer seemed to know what Europe wanted and still wants; and he seems to take the position that many are taking in this country, that we will give them what they want provided we can find the language to fool the American people and satisfy the consciences of some Senators.

If the Senate takes a contrary view and stands by its oath of office, stands by the Constitution, it, in the words of the editor, puts in grave jeopardy our one best hope for the future. We have only one choice. Violate the Constitution and save the world peace. It is our last chance, he says.

Nowhere does the editor admit even the possibility that we can both observe the Constitution and at the same time do something for the peace of the world. It is the military alliance or nothing.

Later in the same editorial, there appears the following:

> Much, perhaps all, depends on the attitude of the Senate. Those who oppose assuming any military commitment in the North Atlantic pact are motivated by reluctance to see the constitutional functions of Congress whittled down.

I digress here for a moment to emphasize that statement. We are motivated, this writer says, by our reluctance to see the constitutional functions of Congress whittled down. I submit that the problem goes much further than that. I submit that neither this Congress nor any other Congress, at any other time, has the right to give to the various departments of Government any more powers than are given by the Constitution itself. The Congress cannot, by supinely allowing powers to be taken away, have its own powers whittled down. The powers reside really in the people, not in the Congress. My senatorial friends from the South have been arguing that point at great length, and I admit that their argument is rather persuasive with me.

The editor further says:

> This is understandable, and it may be that persuasive constitutional arguments in support of their position can be advanced.

He admits there is a possibility.

Then he says:

> But it is difficult to believe that rational men would want to win a constitutional argument at the price of losing this last best hope for peace.

Mr. President, let me read that again:

> But it is difficult to believe that rational men would want to win a constitutional argument at the price of losing this last best hope for peace.

It probably has not occurred to the editor that there are Senators who have an abiding respect for their oath of office and believe that the Constitution of the United States is one of the greatest instruments ever devised by man for the government of a free people, and that none of its provisions should be regarded lightly and violated simply because it seems a matter of reason to violate it.

Mr. President, this editorial is a typical one. I have no argument or quarrel with the editor who wishes to take that position; I am merely calling the attention of the Senate to what is going on. While we are here without information as to the exact terms of the pact, it seems that the public is obtaining information from some source as to what is contained in the pact, has already made up its mind, and is telling us what to do; and in the minds of many editorial writers and other persons, we are a group set off by ourselves, probably representing only ourselves, from their point of view. Some of them do not seem to remember the fundamental fact that we are here only in a representative capacity. All the Americans from the 48 States cannot come here and speak their minds, so they have sent us; and when we speak, unless we are violating our oath of office, we are speaking for the American people and the people of the States from which we come.

I say to the Senators from the South who have been presenting their arguments to us that I do not regard them as merely a group of men talking for their own purposes, but I believe that they are speaking for the mass of the Southern people who would say the same things if they could be here themselves. Those Senators are speaking in their representative capacity.

So, Mr. President, it is important to know that when we consider and deal with certain matters because we think we should do so, we are doing it for the American people, who cannot be here in person. It seems to me that under our oath of office it is going a long way to argue that men will find some way to get around the Constitution or they will not listen or give heed to reasonable arguments in favor of the Constitution. Of course, Mr. President, it stands in the way of some persons and what they want to do; and therefore their attitude is that as reasonable men we should do what they want us to do.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield for the purpose of a question only.

Mr. DONNELL. In connection with the Senator's mention of the Constitution, does he agree with the sentence in Washington's Farewell Address which reads:

> But the Constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and

authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all.

Mr. WATKINS. In answer, I say I agree most wholeheartedly; and if it is necessary to change the Constitution, in order to permit us to enter this alliance, we know how to change it. Ever since World War I, certain persons have been talking about getting the United States into a position in which it can take active part in the affairs of the rest of the world and can fight their battles and intervene. Our Constitution stood in the way of some of those persons at that time, but they have had plenty of time to try to have changes made in it. So they should not come here now and ask us to violate the Constitution simply because they have not had the foresight or the courage—let me put it that way—to try to have it changed. If this question were submitted to the people of the United States by means of a proposed constitutional amendment providing that someone other than the Congress be given the power to declare war—and I mean the Congress, sitting at the time the duty became apparent—I greatly doubt that such an amendment would be adopted. In my opinion it would be overwhelmingly defeated by the American people. That is the reason why it has never been submitted to the people.

I expect to show, if I have the time, that in the history of this country there have been instances after instances of Presidents of the United States having ignored this part of the Constitution and, by one move or another, having put the Congress in a position where it had no other recourse than to declare war.

Mr. President, one writer, Mr. Roscoe Drummond, chief of the Washington bureau of the Christian Science Monitor, suggests a way whereby the problem may be circumvented. In other words, those who seek to circumvent the Constitution are trying out all possible ways of doing so. This writer wants us honestly to admit that we cannot use the Constitution, that it is out of date.

I shall quote Mr. Drummond, who agrees that Congress has the sole right to declare war, but who presents an argument to support those who believe that one Congress can commit a future Congress and the Nation to military action if certain events occur.

To support his view, Mr. Drummond stated in an article in the February 21, 1949, issue of the Monitor as follows:

> First, would it be constitutional for the Senate to undertake a commitment by which the United States in the future would be bound to join automatically in the common defense of a signatory of the North Atlantic Pact without a specified declaration of war?
>
> One answer to this question is to be found in paragraph 2 of article VI of the Constitution which specifically provides that "all treaties made or which shall be made * * * shall be the supreme law of the land * * * anything in the Constitution of laws or any State to the contrary notwithstanding."
>
> This constitutional provision suggests—indeed, many constitutional lawyers will agree it demonstrates—that Congress, in possessing the power to declare war today, also possesses the power to determine at any time the circumstances in which the United States automatically would go to war tomorrow; such circumstances, for example, as an unprovoked attack upon a signatory to the North Atlantic Pact.
>
> If such a commitment should be embodied in a treaty, then under article VI future Congresses would be bound by it as "the supreme law of the land" as long as the treaty remained in force.

Mr. Drummond then proceeds to point out that Congress already has delegated the President the power, to be used at his discretion, to resort to force against an aggressor at any time the UN Security Council can command sufficient unanimity to take such action.

One of the greatest tasks of the legal profession is that of seeking the intent of laws passed by legislative bodies. Mr. Drummond presented a good argument; but regardless of past actions, many of which were taken during periods of hysteria, I do not believe that the Eighty-first Congress has the power to say that American schoolboys of today shall be the front-line forces in any conflict that might occur 5, 10, or 15 years from now, or a generation from now.

And speaking of intent, I should like to call attention again to section 8 of article I of the Constitution which gives Congress, among other powers, the power "to raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use, shall be for a longer term than 2 years."

The supporters of future war commitments apparently believe that we can pledge the Nation's resources and the lives of America's youth to a future military action, but the framers of the Constitution, apparently well aware of the imperialistic aims of the uncontrolled military establishments of those times, provided in section 8 of article I a definite brake on military action and expansion.

If the men who wrote the Constitution had that in mind, I cannot believe we can by circumvention write into the Constitution any authority to commit the people of this Nation to a future military action without the approval of the Congress of the people of the time or period concerned.

In other words, if we are to support Mr. Drummond's theory, we are to place greater value on the wisdom of spending American dollars, than upon protecting the lives and future of those who may have to fight a war.

No Congress can go further than to appropriate for 2 years, but under Mr. Drummond's theory we can bind future generations, so long as the pact might continue, to fight a war.

It so happens that the provision in question is probably one of the strongest protections in the entire Constitution for the lives and liberties of the people of this great country. It is not enough to say that it is inoperative and completely out of date because someone may make a sudden attack upon this country. When sudden attacks on this country have been made in the past, there has been nothing in the Constitution, or in the acts of Congress itself, to stop the Executive and the heads of our Army and Navy from immediately moving in to the defense of this country. No one waited for Congress at Pearl Harbor. What we had left of our fighting force after the attack had begun, immediately went into action.

Sudden attacks, unannounced, can always be met by immediate defense. Under such circumstances, of course, Congress recognizes a state of war as actually existing. It does not need to declare it. It already exists by the action of the enemy. It is conceded Congress could even say war does not exist, and refuse to make a declaration of war. It could also go further and refuse to appropriate money and raise armies, an air force, and a navy. But that is not realistic, and there is not the slightest likelihood that any refusal would come if in fact this country were attacked. Let me repeat, we would then be at war without any action of Congress. All the Congress would have to do would be, for the record, to recognize what already existed.

It is a far different matter, however, to say now, and to say it in the form of a binding treaty, that in the event of the happening of certain circumstances, this country will go to war. To argue that the present Congress will be passing up the last chance for peace assumes that we of this age will know more about what should be done 10 years from now than the Congress which may be sitting at that time.

There are certain inalienable rights guaranteed by the Constitution, and one of them is, as I see it, that the people of this country will never be put into a war by any agreement in advance of the circumstances demanding a declaration of war.

We may obligate our people to pay debts, to pay heavy taxes. More than $250,000,000,000 of debts are now on our books, on the red side of the ledger. We have obligated them with taxes, we have loaded them down with nearly everything we can think of, and we may do some more of that for the purpose of arming and aiding and assisting other nations. But we may not say to them, in my opinion, if we observe the Constitution, both its letter and its spirit, that they are obligated to go one step further and take up arms against enemies which we, in our wisdom, in our egotism, now determine to be the enemies of those who will have to fight the battles, in the event of the happening of certain circumstances.

The lives of the generation which is to do the fighting are at stake—not ours, although some of us may be living when the time comes; which, at the present rate, is entirely likely. Theirs is the responsibility, through their elected representatives, of saying whether or not they will risk their lives or give their lives in the defense of their country under such alliance as we are proposing to enter into, or whether they will give their lives at that time in the defense of other countries that we may take into such an alliance with us.

It should not be in our power—and, fortunately, if we observe the Constitution it is not in our power—to say what the future generation should do under certain circumstances. And yet this is precisely what this line of propaganda in the editorials I mention urge us to bind ourselves, our children, and our children's children to do.

I have never seen any statement as to how long the proposed alliance will last. Some Member of this body has referred to it, I think, in a speech as a temporary alliance. Who knows it will be a temporary alliance? It may be a long-drawn-out battle between this country, our idealism, our Christian civilization, and the anti-Christian, anti-God civilization of communism.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield for a question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield for a question only, on condition that I do not lose the floor.

Mr. PEPPER. I understand that. Would it make any difference, in the opinion and the attitude of the able Senator, as to whether the duration of the so-called pact should be until the Security Council should be found able to give protection against aggression to the nations and peoples of the world, instead of it being for a protracted period in terms of years?

Mr. WATKINS. I may say in answer to the Senator, I would hold the same position exactly, because when he puts it on the condition that the Security Council of the United Nations acts and does something about it, that might be 1,000 years from now at the rate they are going at the present time. It is impossible for them to get any unanimity. That is why they are talking about an alliance now, because in the organization of that council are nations that are not dedicated to peace. The veto is not the only thing that is wrong with the United Nations Council. The thing that is wrong is, it is not made up of peace-loving nations. So, I would say to my distinguished colleague from Florida that if he is going to put it on that condition, I certainly would be of the same opinion.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield for a question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield for a question only, and on condition I do not lose the floor.

Mr. HILL. Is the Senator going to discuss how far he feels we have already gone in the direction toward which he is addressing his remarks, under our commitments through the United Nations Charter?

Mr. WATKINS. In answer to the Senator, I may say I do not at this time intend to discuss that question. I intend to point out the things we should look into before we commit ourselves to the pact. I think it is high time the American people study the matter more carefully and view its implications in the light of recent history. At some future time I intend to discuss it. I intend to discuss the United Nations. I intend to point out what in my humble opinion is the matter with it.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield for a further question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield for a further question, on condition that I do not lose the floor.

Mr. HILL. In order that we may properly orient ourselves for the discussion—and I may say it is a very important question—does not the Senator think we should consider carefully what our commitments are now under the United Nations Charter, and how far we have gone. If I may ask the Senator a further question, he recalls, does he not, that under the United Nations Charter there is a provision for an international police force? As the Senator knows, that police force has not yet been established, but certainly the idea was that we should contribute to such a force and that it should be subject to the orders of the United Nations Security Council. I take it when that force became involved, we ourselves would be involved; is that correct?

Mr. WATKINS. That is correct. But policemen are needed because there are violators of law. Russia is not a peace-loving nation. It is expanding. It is an aggressor. That is the reason why we cannot get anywhere and have no police force. If the happy day ever comes when we shall have peace-loving nations, I certainly would be in favor of a police force. Suppose there had not been a veto provision in the Charter of the United Nations, and we should submit what we think Russia should do, and it were agreed to by a majority vote. Suppose we had voted that Russia should cease her control of Poland and should give up the territory she took after the German conquest of Poland. Suppose that, by a majority vote, the United Nations should say to her, "Give it up." What would be the answer? She would say, "No." Then what would we do? If we had a police force, we would send a police force to enforce the demand on Russia; and if we sent a police force for that purpose, we would have the same kind of a war we may yet have, even though we do not have a police force.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. WATKINS. I will yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not reasonable that we consider our commitments under the United Nations Charter?

Mr. WATKINS. We certainly should do that; not only our commitments under that Charter, but all our other commitments, some of which we do not know about. That is one of the reasons why I am making this speech, to serve notice on the State Department to give us all the commitments which have been made in the name of the United States, of every kind and character, because there have been many, and they have gotten us into so much trouble that, before we go any farther down the road, we should have a clean-cut inventory of all the commitments that have been made.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield for a further question.

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator also have in mind commitments we may have, so far as the other countries in the Western Hemisphere are concerned?

Mr. WATKINS. I do have that in mind. We have already committed ourselves to help defend, in case of attack, all the other nations in the Western Hemisphere, every one of them. We know, as a matter of fact, that they are not prepared to defend themselves. We will always do the fighting. Furthermore, we intend to help certain nations in Europe, in this proposed alliance. What will we do about China, Japan, and the rest of the world? I do not know. I only know that before we enter into this pact I want to be sure what the implications are and what the program will be.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield for another question.

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator understand that our commitments under the proposed North Atlantic Pact would be any more binding or any stronger than the commitment we now have, so far as the defense of the Western Hemisphere is concerned?

Mr. WATKINS. I am unprepared to answer that question. I have not seen the pact. All I can find out about it is what Mr. James Reston of the New York Times tells us. My distinguished colleagues on the Foreign Relations Committee, the chairman and the ranking Republican member, apparently have been told something about it, but the other Members of the Senate of the United States do not know anything about it. I have to go to the New York Times to ascertain what my Government is doing concerning the matter. I, as one ninety-sixth of the Senate, cannot find out what is being done, and I am taking this opportunity to say what I think probably ought to be done.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Utah, whose able address I have been following with great interest, if there is not a possibility that these articles are trial-balloons which are sent up here and there to ascertain the views of Members of Congress and of the American people as to the proposed pact? Is not the Senator aware of the fact that in these days of propaganda and high pressure in Washington the course is ofttimes followed of sending trial balloons in order that those in particular positions in the Government might ascertain the views of Senators and of the people, as well as to influence opinion?

Mr. WATKINS. I admit that there is evidence in favor of that suggestion, but I understand that the Secretary of State told the Foreign Relations Committee that this matter was a top secret and should not be revealed. Of course, if that be true, I do not think they are sending up any trial balloons in order to induce Senators to give their views. On the other hand, leaks are taking place in connection with what is going on in the chamber where the negotiations are taking place. The New York

Times and other newspapers are discussing it in detail. They even quote paragraphs. Paragraph 5 has been quoted time and time again, with the various changes which have been made. Maybe that is how they are working. I am not accusing them of bad faith. They hope the Senate will not debate the matter until the treaty is submitted. But, in the meantime, these things are going on. Information is being given out, apparently, from some source. I have never seen a denial by the State Department that the New York Times is quoting accurately what is taking place.

To proceed with my text, Mr. President:

Since this discussion has occurred in this country and abroad, apparently the negotiators representing our own country and the other governments involved, have been able to write language which apparently satisfies Europe in its requirement that we will be bound to fight and which also, it is hoped, will satisfy American public opinion and the requirements of our Constitution.

What that language is—and I now come to what we have just been discussing—we have no means of knowing for a certainty.

But the same sources of information give out an abridgment of the important clauses in the treaty. Not, of course, to the Senate of the United States which in the performance of its duty must give its advice, and I say advice advisedly, and consent to such a treaty, but through certain favored newspapers.

It is now said that the language of the important paragraph in the treaty will follow the Rio de Janerio inter-American Pact, or the United Nations Pact, and that, of course, it is perfectly satisfactory now to our leaders and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

I am very anxious to know whether or not the language that has recently been discussed is satisfactory to our leaders on the Foreign Relations Committee and to other Members of the Senate. They may know more about it than I do, but from what I have seen in the newspapers, I have some grave doubts in my own mind as to whether the language is satisfactory.

Whether this is true or not, we have no means of knowing, since the Senate itself has not been given copies of the wording of the important sections of the proposed pact. We are kept in the dark while the newspapers and publicists go on with their propaganda, building up sentiment for the pact.

In the words of the Senator from Georgia, they are sending up trial balloons.

It is recognized everywhere that the adoption of such a pact by the United States will be a departure from its historical position; that it will be one of the most momentous steps ever undertaken by this country.

I am calling attention to it today bebecause it seems to me that we are following the same propaganda pattern which has been used time after time in this country when the administration and foreign nations are seeking to lead this Nation into some program which may not meet or be approved by public sentiment in this country.

We had the British loan a number of years ago. Although not in the Congress at that time, I remember well the propaganda in behalf of that measure. It followed the same pattern as that now going on in this country.

Then came the Greek-Turkey loan. This was supposed to be a departure from a long-established American policy, but as a matter of fact, if we will be honest about it, it was merely a return to the principles stated in the Atlantic Charter, principles which we had cynically abandoned time and again, and the abandonment of which brought the threat to our peace and security and that of the entire world of free nations.

Then came the Marshall plan, and following that the Vandenberg resolution which inched us one step nearer, I should say miles nearer, what is now facing us, the proposal of a military alliance with foreign powers in times of peace. In each instance the debate went on outside the Congress on leaks of information supplied by someone apparently interested in the successful consummation of the proposals. When the matters were finally presented to the Congress in each instance, as I recall, the Congress was urged to act speedily on the matter.

Time was of the essence. In the case of the Marshall program, I remember very distinctly the Congress was accused of "fiddling while Rome burned," simply because we wanted a real understanding of the real obligations we would have to meet, the need for those obligations, the need for the help, and all collateral matters which should have been considered.

The Congress was bombarded with propaganda from all over the country and accused of downright negligence.

Well, the State Department has been negotiating this treaty, we are told in the press, for more than 6 months, possibly 8 months, perhaps a year. I do not know definitely. I do not know whether even the public knows.

Our representatives started sometime last summer to meet with western European diplomats to consider the terms of the alliance. Unless I am badly mistaken, and unless we have a change in pattern, when the treaty is finally presented, the Senate will be bitterly criticized if it does not act at once to approve the pact which the people will have been led in the meantime to believe is the only salvation of this country and the free nations of the world. Time will be of the essence again.

Mr. President, Members of the Eightieth Congress, and Members of the present Congress, I am sure have been acting in good faith in trying to keep the oaths of office which they took when they came to Washington. Theirs is the responsibility. But it seems that everybody else on the outside knows all about this foreign program a long time before the Congress itself is taken into the confidence of the executive department.

Where the leaks come from I do not know. I do not accuse the State Department of bad faith, but certainly someone in the confidence of the negotiators must be giving out the information, and for a purpose.

Not all newspapers get it; only certain ones. That is as far as I am able to ascertain by some search. I think most Senators are aware of the fact that the building up of a strong sentiment in favor of a program of such infinite consequences without having all angles of the program, is extremely dangerous to the future welfare of the country. It certainly is in my opinion.

How can the Senate of the United States, in an atmosphere of bitter criticism and demands for immediate action, properly discharge its duty under the Constitution How can it give the attention it should give, free from bias and prejudice and pressure, to such a momentous change in foreign policy?

This matter, involving as it does the future welfare, the future freedom, the future destiny, and the very lives of citizens of this country, should not be decided in haste or under pressure. It should not be decided in the absence of all the facts, of all the truth about the necessity for such a venture, such a change of foreign policy, as has existed in this country from the very beginning.

There are numerous questions which should be answered, and answered truthfully, in the consideration of this treaty. I do not read any discussion of them in the press which seems to be handing out advice to the United States Senate with such a lavish hand.

May I propound a few of these questions here?

What is the relationship, for instance, between Great Britain and Russia at the present time by reason of the treaty of alliance entered into during the World War II between these two countries? I think that should be explored fully.

Is Great Britain in a position now to enter into a pact with this country—honorably, I mean—and the other nations contemplating becoming members of the North Atlantic security group?

Are the terms of the understanding between Russia and England all expressed in what was given to the world as the treaty of alliance?

Are there any secret agreements between Great Britain and Russia?

What other agreements—trade agreements, principally—now exist between Russia and Great Britain?

Mr. President, I made some investigation on my own, and I have been able to get a copy of the alliance, the 20-year pact, between Great Britain and Russia, in which in substance England and Russia bind each other not to join any coalition or any alliance which may be aimed against either one of them.

I have also seen a trade agreement between Great Britain and Russia in which Great Britain agrees to furnish large quantities of steel, as I recall, in the way of locomotive equipment and rails for railroads.

I have seen a trade agreement between Great Britain and Poland under which many thousand tons of copper products, a metal which is greatly needed in war, is to be sent by Great Britain to Poland under this exchange agreement, and of course possibly it will build a war potential in Poland, which is a satellite of Russia.

Then I ask, is Great Britain at the present time furnishing to Russia commodities which will build up the war potential of Russia and her satellites? Will this pact make such a policy impossible?

What about France's agreement of alliance with Russia? I assure the Senate there is one, as I have seen it. What are its terms? What does France, where there is a strong Communist minority, think about its obligations under the pact? Are there any secret agreements between France and Russia and her satellites? What if any trade agreements exist between France and Russia and her satellites? What guaranty is there that France will be able to perform her part in a security pact with us and the other North Atlantic nations?

What agreements, if any, exist between the other nominees to the Atlantic security pact and Russia and her satellites?

Here is something very important. What will be the definition of aggression? Will the treaty of alliance be limited to armed attack only? Or will it consider as a cause for action the overthrow of existing forms of government by so-called peaceful means, by infiltration, by an election? How are we to know when aggression has been committed and when we may have to take a part? By that, I mean if Russia should abandon any intention to proceed other than by a presentation of her propaganda, without the use of force at all, what if under those circumstances she is able to go into those countries and by the presentation of her arguments convince the wills of the voters in a free election to embrace communism? What then? What will we do under such circumstances? Will the communistic nation into which the Russians go—or which will probably become communistic under such a free election, still remain in the alliance?

I know it will be said that this alliance is not aimed at any nation in particular, that it is merely against aggressors. Well, call the roll of the nations in Europe, and when we get through calling the names of the western democracies, where do we find any nation left but Russia with any possibility of being classed as an aggressor nation, and one against whom the alliance will be aimed?

The President of the United States in his inaugural address, I think, settled that matter. He did not mince words. He named the aggressor, and spelled it out so that there could be no misunderstanding. The alliance is aimed against Russia, and I do not think anyone in his right senses would deny that.

What guarantee will we have that one or more of the nations we are inviting to join with us in this pact will not adopt communism by constitutional means?

Now I am going to talk about that. An alliance is only a preventive, it does not cure anything really. It merely says, "Here is the flood, here is the danger of war. We will set up a dam to hold it in place." What, if anything, are we doing to end the threat of war itself? That is an important question which should be discussed thoroughly and looked into before we enter into any pact of the kind proposed.

Furthermore, which nations are to join the proposed alliance? Are we going to leave out Italy, Greece, and Turkey, nations on which we have spent hundreds of millions of dollars to help them fight Communism, or are we to have another alliance in that part of the world known as the Mediterranean Alliance, of which we will become an underwriter and whose battles we will fight as well? That we do not know. We should know that before we ever take such a step as is now proposed.

Will Germany be allowed to join? That raises a very important question. Let us say we form the alliance. Then Germany continues to make some progress toward the ways of peace. Will that permit her to join?

Then there is another question which is closely related to it, and in my opinion more important than that. What is the policy of the United States with respect to Germany? Is it the policy General Clay has been pursuing, or is it the policy the State Department has been pursuing which, much of the time, has been in opposition to what General Clay has been doing over there? Do we have a well-defined German policy?

I ask, what will the alliance do about Germany? Will we defend against aggression that part of Germany now in the physical custody of France, Great Britain and ourselves? I think we would probably all say "Yes." But conditions have changed, sides have changed over there so frequently in such a short time that we probably do not know today about that. In other words, we do not know too much respecting what we are getting into.

What relationship will the Allies have to any other nations in Europe not behind the iron curtain, but regarded by us as liberty-loving democracies? Will this alliance also defend the colonial possessions of its members against attack, particularly those in the Pacific held by European democracies? What about Indonesia? What about the French colonies in southeast Asia, such as Indo-China? Are we going to go to their defense, as well, if they are attacked? Those are questions we should look into.

What commitments have we already made to defend other countries? Has Congress been fully advised respecting the executive agreements which in effect might commit us to the defense of other governments?

We know, as a matter of fact, that we have entered into the inter-American agreement whereby we shall be required to defend any nation or nations on this hemisphere which may come under attack. Moreover, we read in the press from time to time that our generals and our administrative officers apparently are attempting to make commitments.

Senators probably all remember the interview with Secretary of the Army, Kenneth C. Royall, in Tokyo. Whether he did or did not make the statements there attributed to him by the press is beside the point. He was talking about the matter one way or the other. Something was said at least about our commitments or our lack of commitments to defend Japan. But on February 25, in Washington, Gen. J. Laughton Collins, Deputy Chief of the American General Staff, told a press conference, "If Japan were attacked, American troops would certainly fight." Secretary Royall said he "concurred entirely with Collins' statement."

As I remember, the last time the Army or the executive department had any directive from the Congress of the United States, which is supposed to declare war and provide the sinews of war, we told them to attack Japan. We are not quite up to date yet. Now we are considering the question of defending Japan. The point is that outside of what Congress told the executive department may be done, in fields that the Congress alone can decide, there are many things going on of which Congress should take notice.

Then I call attention to the statement of Brig. Gen. Robert Travis, as reported by the Associated Press, under a Sydney, Australia, March 1 date line. The general is quoted as saying the United States would immediately come to the aid of Australia if she were threatened by an aggressor. Mind you, Mr. President, this is before the Atlantic pact. General Travis has been in Australia in connection with a good-will tour he is conducting.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'CONOR in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana for a question.

Mr. LONG. Would it seem to the Senator that there should be a difference between the type of commitment to a nation which is close to a possible aggressor, and could easily be overrun, and the type of commitment made to a nation which could not be easily overrun by an aggressor nation?

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator's question assumes we should make some commitments. If I were to grant for the purpose of the argument that we should make commitments, then I think the Senator's question could be answered in the affirmative. But I do not grant any such thing at this moment. Until we have full information and advice I believe it would not be wise to make any commitments to anybody.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Would the Senator feel that there should be a difference between the type of commitment we might make, such as the Monroe Doctrine, to defend nations that could not be easily overrun from afar, and the type of commitment, let us say, to defend a nation such as Denmark, which can be easily taken by a foreign power?

Mr. WATKINS. We have a historic policy known as the Monroe Doctrine, which we announced many years ago, and which has been observed and upheld by the United States, and which has been respected by all the rest of the world up to the present time. The Inter-American Pact seems only to take into account the Monroe Doctrine, and to give it full

recognition by a legal document. There is some question whether we went too far before in making a commitment there, but whether we have made the commitment or not, I think we would have followed along the principles of that declaration by President Monroe and we would fight. Of course we have no such policy, or have not had one until recently, with respect to Denmark and other nations of the world outside the Western Hemisphere.

I call attention to one more statement. From Japan comes the story—and it is only a day or two old—that Gen. Douglas MacArthur is quoted as saying that if Russia attacks Japan, "we should certainly defend her." In connection with this I should like to invite the Senate's attention to the language used. It should be noted that General MacArthur is more meticulous in his choice of language than the other notables because he says "We should"—putting it in the subjunctive—"We should defend her." In other words, he thinks it would be good policy for us to defend her. He did not say we would defend her. He did not make that declaration, because I think General MacArthur realized, and he showed by his statement that he realized, that it is not in the power of the Army or the executive department to say what country we shall attack or what country we shall defend, and that is important to keep in mind.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Is it not true that, regardless of the language of the proposed commitments, which would be commitments to defend, actually such commitments could not be commitments to defend, because the nations proposed to be defended probably would be overrun within a week or two, before America could get there to defend them, and in such case actually what we would do would be to attack a foreign power, in the event such a power attacked another foreign power we were committed to defend, because we would be completely powerless to defend the foreign nations attacked.

Mr. WATKINS. Unless we were to adopt a complete program of building up defenses in the countries we would commit ourselves to defend we could not defend them. It would be necessary to furnish them with arms and ammunition and all kinds of armament, and then supply them with troops as well. I remember very distinctly, as, no doubt, the Senator from Louisiana does, that in the beginning of World War II the European democracies said to the United States, "Send us the arms and the guns and the ships and the instruments with which to fight, and we will do the fighting." That did not last very long. It was not long until we were sending our men over there. And I think we would have to do the same now under the circumstances the Senator from Louisiana mentioned.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. In view of recent history, the history of the last war, when the Dutch Government surrendered after 4 days of fighting, and the Belgian Government surrendered after 2 weeks of fighting, would it not occur to the Senator that a great number of the tanks and guns and a great part of the ammunition we would send to such foreign countries on the Continent of Europe as we might be committed to defend, would simply be donated by us to a foreign aggressor against those countries, in case that foreign country decided to attack them?

Mr. WATKINS. I think that would happen. We can fully expect, if we get into war with Russia, that the airplanes, tanks, many of the guns, the trucks, and transportation equipment that we sent over there under lend-lease will be used against us. If an aggressor were to take over Holland, there probably would not be time to destroy any such items in the hands of the Dutch. If Holland were quickly overrun, whatever we had sent over there would fall into the possession of the nation attacking. Of course, I do not know that. I am assuming, from what has happened in the past, that it would probably happen again.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield for a question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. As a matter of fact, is not that just what has been happening in China during the past few months?

Mr. WATKINS. In answer to the Senator's question, I am told that the trucks which the communist armies in North China used to carry their provisions and troops to the attack were American trucks shipped to Korea or other places on American ships. Some of the arms were of American manufacture. I mention transportation equipment particularly, because we must remember that an army cannot do much fighting until it gets to the place where the fighting is going on.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. In view of the fact that there is only one other nation in the world as well armed as the United States, namely, Russia, which is much better armed than the United States, does it not seem to the Senator that if this Nation were to attempt to defend itself and protect the peace of the world, it should make sure that the tanks, guns, and planes which are built would be available to fight with in the event of war? Should not the United States undertake to guarantee that the tanks, guns, and planes which it furnishes are used in the defense of the United States, or in the defense of our commitments?

Mr. WATKINS. I assume that it would be very difficult to go into one of the nations which might enter the pact and say, "We give you these airplanes, tanks, submarines, and ships, but you must use them only as we tell you, or against nations which become our enemies." We might tell them that, but how on earth could we ever enforce such an agreement? As I pointed out a moment ago, if the Communists take over those governments, they will do the directing.

I remind Senators that there are some very important questions to be taken into consideration in connection with the proposed pact and the implications growing out of it. It should not be entered into in a hurry. I think the Senator has very well pointed out some of the problems.

Returning to what General MacArthur said, I repeat that the use of the word "should" gives point to the fact that apparently General MacArthur keeps in mind that it is not within the power of the executive department, the Commander in Chief, or any of his generals, to commit the United States to war or to the defense of any part of the globe other than our own country. Apparently there are generals in the Army who do not know this, if we can believe the dispatches which we receive from foreign countries, where our globe-trotting generals make frequent appearances. General MacArthur, apparently, at least recognizes that the power to make war rests in the Congress, and in that body alone. But these commitments by our globe-trotting generals and secretaries are being made in all parts of the earth. Undoubtedly, they give a false sense of security to the war-weary peoples of the world.

Can it be possible that the executive department does not yet realize that it has not the power to make war, or to undertake commitments which could be kept only by the waging of war? Recent events have demonstrated that it probably would be a good idea to make the Constitution of the United States required reading, not only for the executive departments, beginning with the Commander in Chief, but also for Members of Congress. Then, we would all remember what we have sworn to defend. Sometimes I think we do not know what we have sworn to defend.

From the foregoing, is it not a fair question to ask, Should we not have an inventory of commitments already made to fight, before we undertake more pledges to other nations? Let us get them all together and see how many we have agreed to take on. We have undertaken the defense of all the nations in the Western Hemisphere. Now it is proposed that we take over the North Atlantic; and possibly there will be a proposal to take over the Mediterranean nations. Who knows? We do not get all the proposals at once. There is no over-all plan. We are given just a little at a time. We are given whatever it is thought the American people will take. Then the next proposal begins to loom on the horizon. How many more are we going to take on?

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. KEM. As I understand, the signatories to the proposed North Atlantic Pact are not only powers with territories in western Europe, but in many cases they are also colonial powers, with vast colonial holdings in various parts of the world. In the case of two of them, Holland and France, those colonial possessions are now under armed attack. I ask the Senator from Utah if he understands that the proposed pact would

result in the United States guaranteeing not only the territorial integrity of the countries in western Europe but also wherever else in the world they happen to have possessions.

Mr. WATKINS. That would be a possibility. Before the Senator entered the Chamber, I believe, I stated that we do not yet know what would be involved. I have asked that very question: Will we be defending the Asiatic possessions of the European democracies? I also asked the question, What is aggression? Would an attack upon any of the Asiatic possessions be an attack upon the signatory powers themselves, an attack which we would be required to defend under the proposed North Atlantic Pact? If it becomes a military pact, which the Europeans want, and which apparently some of our people are willing to give them, no one knows at the moment just what the result will be.

Mr. KEM. Certain information as to the contents of the proposed pact——

Mr. WATKINS. If the Senator will address the Chair, and if I can obtain permission to yield without losing my rights, I shall be glad to yield for a question. Otherwise I may lose the floor, and I do not want to do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah yields to the Senator from Missouri for a question only.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator this question: Apparently certain information as to the contents of the proposed pact is emanating to the American press from sources unknown. From the remarks which the Senator made yesterday, it appears that he has been putting himself to a great deal of trouble to find out just what these statements mean. I should like to ask him whether he has been able to learn whether any provision is made in the proposed pact for the particular situation which I have described.

Mr. WATKINS. I can answer that I do not know. I have never seen anything except what the New York Times has been able to dig out of someone attending the negotiations. I am not in the confidence of members of the Foreign Relations Committee, who have been shown copies of the proposed pact. I do not know what it contains. I have tried to find out, and I have been told that it is top secret—in fact, there is not yet any pact at which the Senate can take a look.

I may say, in connection with the point which the Senator has now raised, that it seems to me a strange situation when the general public, through some newspaper, can be given what apparently is an accurate statement of what is going on, but United States Senators, unless they happen to be members of the Foreign Relations Committee, cannot get the same information, unless they call on James Reston, or the New York Times, or someone who is in the confidence of some of those attending the meetings.

Mr. KEM. Is it possible that Senators are being put through a sort of softening process, and that we are not yet in proper condition to receive the pact?

Mr. WATKINS. That is possible. I myself have wondered if some of our officials were trying to soften me up by what they are doing. However, in my particular instance, I have been aroused to the point that I want to know where my country is going. I have the same responsibility that any member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has so far as my oath of office is concerned. I finally vote on what is done, or is not done, and that vote counts just as much as does the vote of any member of the Foreign Relations Committee. I cannot subscribe to the view that all the State Department has to do is to let the Foreign Relations Committee know what is going on, and that by so doing it is letting the Congress know what is happening.

As a matter of fact, that does not suffice at all; and even if it were proper for such information to be taken first to the general public and the newspapers, certainly it would be a courtesy to the Members of the House of Representatives and the Members of the Senate if the information were presented to them.

Mr. President, various Senators have reminded me that at the conclusion of the First World War, the then President of the United States announced what I think was a very good policy; it was 1 of his 14 points: "Open covenants openly arrived at."

In this particular instance, I remember that one of the New York newspapers carried a very able editorial pointing out that if Woodrow Wilson were alive today, as we are considering the proposed North Atlantic Pact, he would be very happy indeed, because the development of this pact is being made in full view of every one, according to the editorial. I obtained a copy of the document which purported to give information on the North Atlantic Pact. I found that it was a propaganda sheet issued by the State Department. In it I found a great deal of general language, but nothing in particular; and when I finished reading it, I was just as ignorant regarding the proposed pact as I was when I began to read the release. Perhaps that was my fault; but I could not find in that document anything about the North Atlantic Pact which would indicate that it is an open covenant openly arrived at.

Mr. President, after calling on the executive department for an inventory, I should like to see the inventory given not only to the Foreign Relations Committee in executive session but also to the entire country. I remember that during the recent war we were told that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee went to the President of the United States and asked about certain matters which were supposed to be occurring, but was told that it could not have that information because of security reasons. However, today we are supposed to be at peace, or at least partially at peace; an armistice is in existence between the former warring powers. So what reason is there now that there cannot be given to the Congress and to all the American people specific information regarding all the commitments of every kind that our Nation has made all over the globe?

My next question, Mr. President, is, What will be the cost of the North Atlantic Pact to this country, not only in money, commodities, armament, but in human lives? Can anyone give us the approximate cost of such an undertaking?

What effect will it have on our country? Will the fulfillment of obligations under such a treaty tax our economy and our strength to or beyond the breaking point?

Mr. President, I submit that the answers to those questions are most important to all of us. Not long ago I read with considerable interest an article written by Bruce Barton, once a Member of the House of Representatives, and a man who has made an earnest study of our foreign affairs and of economics in this country. It is his considered opinion that we are already biting off more than we can chew. So, Mr. President, before entering an alliance of the kind now proposed, I would wish to have an answer to the questions I have just propounded, and I would wish to have the answers to these questions presented by an able group of men who would make a careful study of those matters.

Now, Mr. President, I come to what may be the $64 question: Is such a pact necessary to our defense and security? Of course, many persons assume that it is. The majority of the publicists and newspaper writers and radio commentators seem to believe that the proposed pact is necessary to our defense and security. I wonder whether it really is. I should also like to know whether there are alternative programs which have the promise of accomplishing our objectives.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator feel that it would be better to have those who are handling the proposed pact consult the Senate and find out how the Senate feels about these proposed commitments, rather than to consult the newspapers and commentators and get their opinion as to whether America will agree to join in these commitments?

Mr. WATKINS. Of course, Mr. President, the constitutional way of proceeding in this matter would be to have the Senate consulted, because the Constitution provides that the President shall make treaties by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. That does not mean that the President should make the treaty and should then say to the Senate, "I have done it; here it is;" but that provision of the Constitution means that the Senate should be consulted in advance.

Of course, some persons believe that only certain Senators can be trusted with confidential information. Accordingly, the rest of us have to accept what filters down to us when those who are given the confidential information get ready to pass it on. Of course, those who are advised confidentially are placed under a pledge of secrecy. I have no quarrel with the Foreign Relations Committee. The members of that committee are doing a good job in a troublesome situation. But the obligation of secrecy does not seem to be placed on some of the negotiators. I do not know whether the statements which have been made come

from foreign sources or from sources in our own State Department; but, apparently, someone who knows what is going on is making public statements regarding these matters. Otherwise, some denials would be made of the statements which appear in the press. However, when those who release such statements are able to quote the exact language of certain of the sections and other subdivisions of the proposed pact, it is apparent that someone who is taking part in the negotiations is telling what is going on.

Mr. President, I think the Senate is deserving of consultation in regard to these matters. If Senators are not worthy of such trust, they should go home. However, as I have previously stated, we are here to represent the people who sent us here. They must have had some confidence in us, or else they would not have sent us here. I repeat that the people themselves cannot come to Washington to conduct the Government themselves, so they have sent us here, to speak for them. It seems to me that the President of the United States, who hints he will go to the people, to tell them what is going on in connection with these matters, should first let Congress know. That would be a much better way of proceeding.

It has been said by some military men that we shall be handicapped by any agreement which binds us to go to the rescue of nations which we may later determine to be of little strategic importance in a future war.

Shall we be bound to go to the rescue of Europe or any country in it within the pact when it may clearly appear to our military men that our best defense—in fact, our hope of winning the war—lies in the Pacific?

Mr. President, I hope the Members of this body will really consider that question carefully. In the last analysis, our freedom of choice is definitely involved in the proposed pact. We should consider the situation we are now in and the situation we shall be in if we enter into such a pact, which would bind us to go to the rescue of the countries of Europe, just as today we feel bound to go to the aid of the countries of South America.

Of course, Mr. President, if aggressive steps are taken by one of the Great Powers, we shall have to consider what is the best military strategy for us. Our best interests might demand that we concentrate our forces in the Pacific Ocean, not in the Atlantic. If we enter the proposed pact and if by it we are required to send our forces across the Atlantic to Europe if one or more of the European nations that are signatory to the pact are about to be overrun, and if after signing the pact we are called upon for help by some of the European nations signatory to the pact, either we shall have to break our agreement under the pact or else we shall have to send our forces across the Atlantic to Europe, and thus take great chances and run the risk of losing the war.

Furthermore, Mr. President, if we enter into such an agreement, will not we be required to sacrifice many possibilities of success in another field in order to keep our agreement with the other signatory powers?

Next, let me ask this question: What is the real strength of Russia today, militarily and economically speaking? The answer to that question takes us back to the question, Is the proposed pact necessary? We say that today the Russian people are not told the truth about us, and we spend millions of dollars to get the truth to them. On the other hand, just how much do we really know about Russia? Is she really the tremendous power that some persons say she is? I remember a time when she was on the verge of defeat unless the United States furnished her with arms. That has not been many years ago. That was at the time Germany was fighting all Europe and Russia at one time, and Russia at that time could not overcome the German Army. I repeat, What is the real strength of Russia today? We should know that, militarily and economically speaking. Just how much of a threat is she to our security? I take it for granted that the security of the United States is of first and primary importance, and our future policy should be considered largely in the light of our own needs of security—in other words, first, the security of the United States, and, secondarily, the security of our allies and other peace-loving nations. I am not predicting, but the time may come when we can be of more use to the world as a surviving, going Nation in our own hemisphere, strong and able, with the light of liberty shining brightly to nations that may be overrun by a totalitarian power, and only from this country could there come hope for a future in which they might overthrow and repel those who had taken over their countries. That is only a supposition, but that is all we can do with respect to the future.

It is all well and good to go to the rescue of other peoples, but we must not do that at the possible jeopardy of our own security.

Such a pact and a program under it can only be justified on the hypothesis, based on facts, that our own security is in jeopardy or that it can only be protected by taking such far-reaching steps.

What is the view of our military leaders with respect to the soundness of tying up our forces in a guaranty to help Europe in the event countries over in that section of the world are under attack from an aggressor?

Can we possibly know the future and gage its effect upon our security to the extent that we can now make a determination which should be binding upon a future Congress of this country when a crisis might arise?

Should we now take steps and enter into an agreement which will leave a future Congress no other choice than to declare war?

I submit that to do those things now which would leave only one choice for a future Congress, that of war, would bring us in direct violation of both the letter and the spirit of the Constitution, which I believe provides that the people, at the time war is to be declared, are the ones who shall make the declaration, through their representatives.

Would it be fair to the future generations of our people who would have to meet a crisis, that the only step we have left open to them by reason of such an agreement is to declare war?

There are numerous other questions which should be asked. The answers should be given, the whole program thoroughly studied. I ask again, can this pact be given the consideration it should be given in an atmosphere of criticism and high pressure from groups interested in furthering such an alliance?

In connection with the question, I ask, is it necessary—may I suggest this possibility should be considered? When Stalin, through a newspaper correspondent offered to meet with President Truman and discuss an end to the cold war, we were quick to say that actions speak louder than words. We want action. We want Russia to speak in such a way that we shall know she means she wants peace. The time for talking will come when we have an evidence of definite action on the part of Russia.

Has not the United States expressed to all the world through the steps it has taken in connection with lend-lease in the past, with the adoption of the Greek-Turkey loan, the so-called Truman doctrine, the putting into effect of the Marshall plan with its billions of dollars of outright grants to nations fighting for their freedom—I say, has not the United States by these very deeds spoken a stronger language, a far more understandable one, than could possibly be put into any treaty?

If what we have done—if the programs we have already adopted have not convinced our friends in Europe and the Communist nations who are engaged in the cold war with us that we will fight if our common security is threatened—then I say words will be weak indeed to express such a position. We cannot strengthen what we have said by mere words in any kind of pact.

Too many times—far too many times in the past—we have entered into programs concerning our relations with other nations which might not have been undertaken as they were undertaken had we known the full truth. Let me remind you of a glaring example:

The United Nations organization was supposed to have been made up of peace-loving nations. That was told us time and time again. Even the nation we have been denouncing recently was received in all respectable quarters in the United States, at the White House, in the State Department, and everywhere else throughout the country. The United Nations had been fighting the war against tyranny and despotism. In order to be successful at all, the first requirement would be that the nations entering into the charter would be nations which desired peace and which had no programs of expansion and conquest. But to admit anyone else was, of course, to destroy it from the very beginning. In other words, they must be in very deed peace-loving nations.

We were led to believe that all the nations signing the charter at San Francisco were nations which could qualify under the term, honestly interpreted, "peace-loving nations."

But were we told the truth about Russia? All I need to do to demonstrate that we were not, is to call attention to the following facts:

The American Army on April 1, 1945, discovered the German Foreign Office files which told the story of the perfidy of Russia—of her aid and assistance to Germany—of her congratulatory telegrams to Hitler upon the happenings of those events. Mr. President, you will remember the secret agreement for the division of eastern Europe, and for spheres of influence in Asia, entered into between Hitlerite Germany and Russia at the beginning of World War II. That came to light, and then came the telegrams, in which Hitler was congratulated by Stalin when he overran the very democracies we now seek to defend. That agreement came into our possession April 1, 1945. Later on, a long time after we had entered the United Nations, the State Department gave the information to the world. Why? So as to meet the propaganda of Russia. That story should have been told to our representatives at the United Nations Organization meeting at San Francisco. What is more important, it should have been read before the Senate of the United States, when the Charter was before it for approval.

It should be kept in mind that the difficulty with the United Nations is not the right of veto, but the fact that in the Security Council the UN is not made up of peace-loving nations—not all of them. Is it possible that this country through its negotiators, through its executive department, and through the Senate of the United States would have given approval to the United Nations Organization in which Russia was to be a member and one with increased powers in executive council if our negotiators, if the Senate of this country had really known the truth about Russia? I submit it would not have been adopted, or that Russia would not have been taken in.

Yet the truth was available on April 1, 1945. The executive department, the State Department, the President all knew, because the files had been captured and the intelligence agents could easily have ascertained the truth. They knew before the negotiations had been undertaken at San Francisco that Russia was a nation not to be trusted.

The executive department determined that in order to keep Russia in the war to fight aggression, to fight the Axis dictators, it was necessary to violate the principles of the Atlantic Charter. The President of the United States determined he had to agree with Great Britain to the bribing of Russia by granting her great interests in China and in other countries to get the cooperation of that nation in fighting Japan.

He determined that certain agreements had to be entered into with respect to Poland before Russia could be kept in the fighting. Russia had already served notice on the world of her true nature by her conduct in absorbing the three small Baltic States.

The President of the United States, at the secret meeting in Yalta, Cairo, and so forth, was made fully aware of the grasping, greedy demands of Russia, and yet in spite of all that, we were not told the truth; and because, in my humble opinion, we were not told the truth, we took this Nation into the United Nations organization and robbed it of the opportunity of becoming a strong instrument for peace which we and the millions throughout the world hoped it would become.

But the real truth about Russia was not given to the people of this country or to their representatives.

My point is, Mr. President, that had the American people and their representatives at San Francisco and in the Senate of the United States been told the truth about Russia as the President and his advisers knew it from their close contacts and dealings with that nation and the peace-loving nations of the earth, we might have been in a far more secure position today than we are at present.

We have been told that the Second World War occurred because we did not go into the League of Nations. It has been said that was the cause of World War II, and we have been told, "Now, before the war ends, we will set up this great preserver of the peace, the United Nations," which had wonderful objectives to which I subscribed, and I have been willing to support that organization and give it every assistance it needs in order to help it to succeed.

Americans, believing in the United States as a strong power for peace, insisted that their sons be brought home from Europe, from the Pacific area, and all the other parts of the globe in which they were stationed. A demand was made to bring them home, and they were brought home, but we have not been able to agree with Russia on treaties of peace with our enemies. Russia did not demobilize as we did. She had an overwhelming force in eastern Germany and the countries of eastern Europe. We are told that Russia respects only force. It may have been a far different story if our armies had remained in being until peace had been secured.

So I say, Mr. President, in considering the North Atlantic security pact, let us have the truth and nothing but the truth.

I return now to the security-pact negotiations which are said to be rapidly drawing to a conclusion. It seems that James B. Reston, of the New York Times, is the reporter who is favored with news of what is taking place in the top-secret meetings between our representatives and western European diplomats. To the newspapers is where we go to get our information in the Senate. I had to wait until my home paper came from Salt Lake City to tell me what was being done in those negotiations.

From an exclusive syndicated article sent out to other papers the country over, under a Washington date line, February 24, I read the following:

> The latest and probably final draft of article 5 of the North Atlantic security pact makes specific reference to the possibility of armed force being used to defend the North Atlantic community.
>
> It can be stated with assurance that the new text is not as direct as the Lovett draft, which would have obligated the signatories to take military or other action forthwith in the event of an armed attack against one of the pact members.
>
> At the same time it restores reference in the pact to armed force, which was eliminated from the Lovett draft at the suggestion of Senators TOM CONNALLY (Democrat, Texas) and ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG (Republican, Michigan).
>
> The sense of the article—but not the precise language—is as follows:
>
> Here is what we are supposed to have as one of the final drafts to which everybody is agreed, including, I understand, the chairman and ranking Republican member of the Foreign Relations Committee:
>
> That in the event of an armed attack on one of them, the signatories would assist each other in such ways, also if necessary with armed force, as would seem desirable to defend the North Atlantic area.

This is the language used, we are given to understand through our unofficial source. That is not the exact language, but is the substance of what has been given out as being in the minds of the negotiators.

The story goes on as follows:

> This conveys, in the opinion of State Department officials, the compromise arrangement proposed by members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in their meeting with State Secretary Dean Acheson last Friday.
>
> It is totally different from another text which evidently was circulated and printed Thursday in Paris, but responsible officials here this evening said that the Paris version is inaccurate in several respects and that the meaning of the latest draft is as reported here.
>
> Article 5 has, therefore, had a stormy passage.

The reporter seems to know the difficulties which they have experienced even in the secret negotiations.

> It started perhaps too boldly, was trimmed and trimmed again, then swamped by a gust from Capitol Hill.

I suppose the gust referred to was the time when the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] propounded questions to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and he was told there was no commitment to take this country into war or that would bind any future Congress.

> Now it has come back a bit and is apparently out of danger.
>
> For the record, the sequence of changes was as follows:
>
> In the event of an armed attack on one of its members the others would—
>
> Draft No. 1 (the European draft): "Take military and other action forthwith."
>
> Draft No. 2 (the Lovett draft): "Take military or other action forthwith."

They seem to be exactly the same.

Draft No. 3 is labeled "The Vandenberg-Connally draft," and I have not seen this denied, by the way. Then follows:

> Take action forthwith.

Without describing any particular kind of action. Apparently, that did not satisfy Europe.

Draft No. 4, the compromise draft, is as follows:

> Assist each other in such ways, also if necessary with armed force, as would seem desirable to defend the North Atlantic areas.

They got armed force into the picture.

Then the news story says:

This last, which is not the text but the sense of the text, may not be very elegant, but is evidently regarded by the negotiators as an acceptable compromise.

From that, I think we shall conclude in the end that they all mean the same thing.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WATKINS. I will yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. After reading all those drafts and getting down to the final one, is it the Senator's interpretation that the final draft would or would not commit us to engage in war in case some member nation were attacked?

Mr. WATKINS. I have already said that the ordinary person, in my judgment, would think they mean the same thing. They merely dress it up in different language. I think it would mean we were committed to armed force, because it says "assist each other in such ways, also if necessary with armed force." Of course, I take it they would not act unless it should be necessary. So that is not substantially different from the other draft.

In this newspaper account we seem to have a fairly accurate review of what has been taking place in the attempt to draft a satisfactory text of the most important article of the treaty. This is information, by the way, which only a few of the Senators and the Foreign Relations Committee have been able to obtain.

I have sought to get this information, but first I was told that the text of the treaty had not yet been written, and then that it was top secret and that I would have to wait until it had been sent to the Senate by the President.

Whether or not the language of the draft as it eventually is written will satisfy both Europe and the Senate of the United States and the people of this country remains to be seen. Judging from the propaganda grist which has been grinding out daily, it is going to be necessary for the Senate to bypass the Constitution or violate it outright in order to get a treaty which will satisfy Europe, and our own people who want to go along in that direction.

However, it is claimed that the distinguished Senators on the Foreign Relations Committee are satisfied with the latest draft. I have not seen that denied.

On the constitutional questions involved, Mr. President, I have one further comment, and then I am through.

It is my considered opinion, after a review of the various steps that were taken during World War II by the President of the United States, that it was the failure on the part of the President to observe the requirements of the Constitution in entering into executive agreements which were to all intents and purposes treaties, without submitting them to the Senate for its advice and consent, that really got us and the other peace-loving nations of the world into most of the difficulties which now beset us.

In fact, Mr. President, I think most of our troubles, both at home and abroad, have had as one of their principal causes the violation of the Constitution of this country.

One could speak for hours on that. I need only mention the thousands of directives which have been written by the executive departments which have all the force and effect of law. In fact, the Federal Register, in which they appear, I think has published more laws than the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Congress of the United States during the same space of time.

The history of those violations is a long story, one I shall not review here, but it is one, I submit, that is very persuasive, and should be a warning signal to this country, its officials and people, that somewhere along the line these violations must be stopped if this country is to endure. It has become a great country in spite of its handicaps, but not even the most optimistic can help see the grave perils and the stupendous problems it faces today.

Mr. President, I voted for the Greek-Turkish loan. I supported the European recovery program. We were told in each instance that we had no other choice open to us. As I examine the matter I find that probably that was true simply because of the mistakes, the colossal blunders, that were made behind the scenes in the political-diplomatic fields during the war and at the end of the war.

That is a desperate situation to be in. The decisions in the Greek-Turkish loan matter and on the European recovery program did not involve any question of the violation or circumvention of our Constitution. They were decisions that involved matters of policy only.

But we have now a far different adventure confronting us. We have gone a long way down the foreign entanglement highway and now we come to a turn in the road. We are about to enter new territory. Is it too much to ask that before we decide to enter this new territory we take stock of ourselves and see how the journey has gone thus far?

Is it too much to ask for all the facts, all the truth about our present status and the obligations we will be assuming if we take up the new adventure? Is it too much to ask that we get the facts, the reasons, all the known truth before we make the decision rather than afterward?

Mr. President, I have gone into this matter today with some reluctance. I realize that under the Constitution the conduct of foreign affairs, at least the negotiation of treaties, is in the hands of the executive department. I have respect for that department and for the Constitution of our country. But in the short time I have been a Member of the Senate, and in my observations before I came here, I have seen how these matters are brought to such a point many times that there is no choice left for Congress in taking action. Before there is any more of that it seems to me we should call for the most searching investigation before we make a decision.

In saying what I have said so far I have that objective in mind. I am not saying how I shall vote on this matter until I do get the truth. I want to know the facts and weigh them, and see how the questions raised should be answered.

I have sympathy for the Russian people as a people. I am utterly against the type and kind of government maintained in Russia, and the philosophy behind it. I think possibly my record will show that I spoke out publicly in my own State against communism. I was not a national figure, but I spoke out publicly in my State against communism a long time before many of those who are now in high places in Washington were saying anything about it. On the contrary, as I remember it, they were receiving the Communists everywhere.

I was against the recognition of Russia in the first place. I think the long chain of events which has happened since that time, in which America has taken important steps, has aided and assisted in building Russia to the point where she is now, a menace to the peace of the world. I want to see that done which could be done for the best interests of this country first, to secure its peace and happiness, and then have our country do all we can for the rest of the world.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair had recognized the Senator from Maine. Does he yield for that purpose?

Mr. BREWSTER. I ask unanimous consent that I may, without losing my status on the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator can make the point of order himself that there is no quorum present.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should not care to do that myself. May I have unanimous consent to yield to the Senator from Alabama for that purpose?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator may if the Senate is willing to give unanimous consent. Is there objection to the Senator from Maine yielding to the Senator from Alabama in order that he may make the point of no quorum? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	McKellar
Anderson	Hayden	Magnuson
Baldwin	Hendrickson	Malone
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Martin
Bricker	Hill	Maybank
Bridges	Hoey	Miller
Broughton	Holland	Millikin
Butler	Humphrey	Morse
Byrd	Hunt	Mundt
Cain	Ives	Murray
Chapman	Jenner	Myers
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	O'Conor
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Douglas	Kefauver	Pepper
Downey	Kem	Reed
Eastland	Kerr	Robertson
Ecton	Knowland	Russell
Ferguson	Long	Saltonstall
Flanders	Lucas	Schoeppel
Frear	McCarran	Smith, Maine
Fulbright	McCarthy	Smith, N. J.
George	McClellan	Sparkman
Gillette	McFarland	Stennis
Green	McGrath	Taft

Taylor	Tydings	Williams
Thomas, Okla.	Vandenberg	Withers
Thomas, Utah	Watkins	Young
Thye	Wherry	
Tobey	Wiley	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

APPOINTMENT OF LOUIS A. JOHNSON, OF WEST VIRGINIA, TO BE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I desire to speak briefly about the recent appointment by the President, of Mr. Louis A. Johnson to be Secretary of Defense. There has been some implication in some of the discussions that this appointment may have been, to some degree at least, politically motivated. I certainly will not challenge the idea that Mr. Johnson is a distinguished Democrat, and that he rendered great service in the last campaign. I do not, however, conceive that to be disqualifying.

On the other hand, I think that any tendency to regard the appointment as resting at all exclusively upon any such considerations would do serious injustice to a very able man, and, therefore, as a result of certain associations and knowledge which I acquired in my service in the Congress regarding Mr. Johnson, I felt that it was desirable that something of his record should be incorporated here in order that not only those of us who must consider the appointment, but also others who may be interested, may have some idea of the elements which, as it seems to me, may very properly have entered into consideration by the President in appointing Mr. Johnson to one of the most responsible positions in our Government today.

I venture to say, first, that perhaps I speak while looking through the colored glasses of friendship, because of happy associations for many years in the American Legion, an organization naturally and profoundly interested in our national defense. However, Mr. Louis A. Johnson, not only as National Commander of the American Legion, but as Assistant Secretary of War and as Acting Secretary of War for a substantial period, was associated with the evolution of what, in the judgment of many persons, was perhaps the most difficult problem in the development of modern war. I speak of the problem of industrial mobilization. That was a matter which came very much within the purview of the so-called Truman committee, which was dedicated primarily to a study of that question, disregarding, as we did, questions of military and other strategy which once plagued this Government during the War Between the States in the Committee on the Conduct of the War, and which at that time nearly wrecked the generals as well as the administration.

Senator Truman, as chairman of the War Investigating Committee, adopted the proper policy of directing our activities primarily and almost exclusively to the question of industrial mobilization, which, under the conditions of modern war, is the very great problem that we face, and which we still face in the proper and prudent preparedness for the future conduct of any tragic war that may occur.

I think it is interesting and important to know that on that score there probably is no one in private life in the United States more intimately familiar with the problem, and who has demonstrated more capacity for accurate judgment regarding the issues which are involved. Following the First World War, when Bernard Baruch contributed to our industrial mobilization, a consistent and constant study was carried out for the next 15 years under Bernard Baruch, Newton D. Baker, and finally under Louis A. Johnson as Assistant Secretary of War in charge of this problem during the late 1930's. At that time the first chart for industrial mobilization was prepared. That was issued under the imprimatur of Louis A. Johnson, who was at the time Acting Secretary of War.

To my mind it is interesting and important to follow the history of that program. As we moved toward involvement in the Second World War, President Roosevelt appointed Mr. Edward Stettinius as chairman of a committee to review the program for industrial mobilization. That committee made a full and complete report regarding the matter. Under the conditions of war which then existed President Roosevelt did not feel it proper or expedient to reveal that program to the public. Senator Truman, as chairman of the Truman committee, during the course of our studies, while we were involved in war, with many difficulties developing in our industrial requirements, asked for that report and was refused. I do not question the propriety of that refusal. Following the accession of Mr. Truman to the Presidency, as chairman of the War Investigating Committee following the close of the war, I asked President Truman for the Stettinius report. We received it, and it was made public at that time. It confirmed seriatim the reports of the Johnson industrial mobilization plan, demonstrating that Mr. Stettinius in his studies had come exactly to the same conclusion that Secretary Johnson had reached.

I wish to cite further authority on this score, as dealing with the question of whether or not Mr. Johnson has demonstrated a somewhat unique capacity to reflect an informed opinion on the question of industrial mobilization. We held extensive hearings on this problem following the close of the war, in the War Investigating Committee; and in connection with the studies which were still in progress regarding our preparation for another war. I hold in my hand the report of the hearings of that committee, which, as it will be seen, is rather voluminous. In the course of that study we heard as witnesses not only Bernard M. Baruch, but Lt. Gen. Lucius D. Clay, Ferdinand Eberstadt, former Chairman of the Army and Navy Munitions Board; Maj. Gen. O. P. Echols, of the Office of Military Government for Germany at the time, but previously in charge of aviation procurement; James Forrestal, Secretary of Defense; Thomas J. Hargrave, Chairman of the Munitions Board; Arthur M. Hill, Chairman of the National Security Resources Board; John H. Hilldring, Assistant Secretary of State; Kenneth C. Royall, Under Secretary of War at the time; Charles E. Wilson, president of General Electric Co., and former vice chairman of the War Production Board; Donald M. Nelson, former Chairman of the War Production Board, and many others.

We went into the question most exhaustively. I think it is fair to say that every conclusion we reached indicated the great wisdom with which the Johnson industrial mobilization plan had been prepared. I should like to read into the RECORD certain statements made by Bernard Baruch in the course of that testimony, not in order to raise any question as to our procedures during the war, but in order that we may recall the tragic developments in the course of that mobilization, and his own considered opinion as to how it might have been more effectively carried on. Mr. Baruch said, as reported on page 25736 of the record of the committee in the investigation of the national defense program:

If I am to be pinned down as to its economic industrial aspects, then I say to you that because of our foot dragging and fumbling, because of our inability to apply corrective methods when they were clearly indicated, the war cost us, unnecessarily, thousands of lives, extra billions of dollars, and months of time. This is my firm conviction based upon an intimate association which is demonstrable.

That is certainly very strong language from one who speaks with the unique authority born of studies of a quarter of a century, covering two world wars.

On the following page, Mr. Baruch again speaking:

My experience in two world wars, the aftermaths, and the endeavors to make a lasting peace make me marvel at the regularity with which errors are repeated. One of the errors that most frequently recurs is failure to study and understand the record of past experience.

I move on to his further testimony at page 25750 and 25751.

I know Louis Johnson had the right point of view. We tried to get the Government to order 300 or 400 of what afterward was the B-29—

The one upon which we now depend, the evolution of which, in the B-50 model, has just flown around the world without a stop.

If he had ordered them at that time—I think that was in 1937 or 1938—the United States would have been the master of the air, and no country could have survived against it.

I quote further from Mr. Baruch's testimony:

Johnson's recommendations were things that I heartily approved of, particularly in the making of ammunition and production of airplanes and the buying of critical materials and building of powder plants. I can't tell why they were dropped. Nobody consulted me about them.

I have ventured to call attention to this testimony in order to dissipate any erroneous impressions or doubts which may exist as to the Johnson appointment reflecting the most careful consideration of the national welfare and of what in my judgment is still the most pressing problem in military preparedness, namely, the matter of industrial mobilization. It is a recent development in the science of modern war. Historically, when the Minute Men of Concord and Lexington grabbed their squirrel rifles and went out behind the stone walls, industrial mobilization was of secondary moment. But today, as everyone recognizes, it goes to the very foundations of our military power.

That was the problem on which Louis Johnson some 15 years ago used all his great talents and ability, and came out with the report on industrial mobilization. As Mr. Baruch says, if there had been the will to follow that report, it might have made a very material difference in our progress in the early stages of the recent war.

Now I quote from the report of the Committee Investigating the National Defense Program. On page 2 of the report, quoting not only Bernard Baruch, but also General Eisenhower, we find the following:

In his final report to the Secretary of the Army in February 1948 he pointed out as follows—

This is General Eisenhower speaking—

Despite the time cushion afforded us by our allies, and the industrial tooling and experience gained through lend-lease orders, improvisation characterized much of our initial war effort. A magnificent national unity carried us through, but greater efficiency in price planning would have saved much time and money.

Mr. President, leaving now the question of the foresight which Louis Johnson demonstrated in the early stages of our involvement in those international affairs, I wish to speak of a somewhat more personal phase of the matter, which it seems to me has a most interesting and significant bearing on the question of whether President Truman in his appointment of Louis Johnson was primarily motivated by any considerations connected with the recent campaign. In 1942, when we were struggling with the problem of industrial mobilization, there was discussion that perhaps Secretary Stimson, then Secretary of War, might retire. He was a man advanced in years, and the burden was terrific; and there was a great deal of discussion of the matter. Mr. Truman, then Senator Truman, as chairman of the committee investigating this phase of the war effort was vitally concerned. It was my responsibility to be the ranking minority member of that investigating committee. We discussed the matter repeatedly and canvassed all its phases. We finally arrived at the conclusion that if there were to be a change in the Office of Secretary of War, there was one man who stood out above all others for appointment to that office because of his record in this country.

At the suggestion of the then Senator Truman, I consulted none other than the leader of the Republicans in the Senate, the late Senator Charles McNary. I told him of the problem and of how we felt about it, and I asked him how he would view the selection of Louis Johnson as Secretary of War. Instantly speaking out on the basis of his association with him in earlier days as Acting Secretary of War and Assistant Secretary of War, Senator McNary said it would be an admirable appointment; and at the request of the then Senator Truman, I secured from Senator McNary a letter to President Roosevelt strongly recommending the appointment of Mr. Johnson if the vacancy should develop. I delivered that letter to Senator Truman. That was 7 years ago. Certainly no question of politics or personalities entered into the picture at that time. We were solely concerned with how the terrifically important task of our industrial mobilization for the war in which we were then engaged could be most effectively performed. If Mr. Truman's records are still complete, he has in his files the letter we secured at that time. I am sure that the opinion of the former minority leader of this body, the late Senator McNary, who in writing that letter was speaking out of the wealth of his experience, which carried back to the First World War, would carry a great deal of weight, even today. It carried a great deal of weight with all who considered the matter then.

Mr. President, I make these remarks in justice to Louis Johnson and in justice to the President of the United States, but more especially in justice to the office which Mr. Johnson may perhaps be destined to fill if his nomination shall be confirmed by this body, in order that he shall enter upon it with no reflections whatsoever that primarily political considerations motivated his selection, because going back 7 years in the record one can clearly see the recognition which was accorded him. I say this because I think all of us agree that the office to which he has been nominated is possibly second in importance to but one other Cabinet position, that of Secretary of State, and possibly has priority in importance over all other Cabinet positions. Certainly those two posts are vitally concerned with the security and safety of our Nation.

I hope and believe that if Louis Johnson enters upon this tremendous task, he may do so with the full confidence of the Senate and of the entire Congress and of the country that in many ways he is uniquely fitted to fulfill that role. This is no disparagement of his very distinguished predecessor, who has ability and capacity which have been demonstrated throughout many years. It is to be pointed out that Louis Johnson has a definite firmness in action. If there has been any criticism of Secretary Forrestal—and I have discussed this matter with Secretary Forrestal within recent days—it has possibly been of his failure to exercise the additional powers which were vested in him as Secretary of Defense. Mr. Forrestal was the first to recognize that perhaps that criticism might be leveled. In entering upon a new office, with a combined responsibility for three services, he hesitated to go too far. I think all of us recognize that Louis Johnson's character and determination are such that perhaps at this very time, when there is a necessity for the exercise of a firmer hand, he is ideally suited to the task. It seems to me that if Mr. Forrestal had remained in that office, he would have been the first to recognize that necessity himself, as he indicated to me in recent discussions. In addition to the unique knowledge and experience which Mr. Johnson brings to this office, he also brings a firmness of purpose which is well calculated to deal with the unfortunate differences which still seem to persist between the various services. He also brings an understanding and a character which are well calculated to serve the country in what I think all of us recognize is still one of its hours of greatest need.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Defense Secretary," appearing in today's New York Times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DEFENSE SECRETARY

The Department of National Defense is today at a critical stage of development. Set up under the National Security Act of 1947 as the unified agency of national defense, it has in a year and a half of operation shown many minor and some major defects. Suggested remedies, based on congressional observation, a thorough study by the Hoover Commission and recommendations from within the Department itself, are soon to be presented to the Eighty-first Congress. In these circumstances it is difficult to think of anyone in the Government whose abilities in his post will be missed more than those of the retiring Secretary. No one else can possibly be as familiar as he is with the working of the Department, with its good points and with its defects.

For 9 years Mr. Forrestal has given unselfish and outstanding service to his country. First he was one of President Roosevelt's "anonymous assistants" in the days of preparation for the war that both saw coming. From that position he was stepped up to the post of Under Secretary of the Navy, in charge of procurement and production. When his superior, Frank Knox, died in the spring of 1944, he became Secretary of the Navy. Although he at first opposed unification of the services, when the unified department was established by Congress in 1947 he was widely endorsed as the man best fitted for the job. He has tried over the last year and a half, with diplomacy, and with a club when necessary, to make the Department work efficiently. When he saw that it wasn't going to work efficiently he was one of the first to recommend reforms.

In the choice of Mr. Forrestal's successor there is reason to believe that political factors have played some part. This is regrettable since national security demands the best available man in the Nation to head the Defense Department, irrespective of any other consideration. However, on the record there should be no diminution of zeal for a strong national defense under the new Secretary. As Assistant Secretary of War from 1937 to 1940, Mr. Johnson was indefatigable in his efforts to build up the Army, to draw plans for industrial mobilization and to make the people of the United States conscious of the great decisions that lay before them. In testimony a year and a half ago before the Senate War Investigating Committee he revealed that it was a split within the Roosevelt Cabinet that prevented the adoption and publication in 1939 of a plan for industrial mobilization which had been drawn up at his direction. Many of the essentials of this plan were incorporated later in the war-mobilization effort.

Mr. Johnson takes over the Defense Secretaryship at a difficult time. It is a job that will put him on his mettle and require of him not only hard work but courage and great wisdom. On his success in mastering it may depend events not now foreseeable. We regret Mr. Forrestal's departure but we wish Mr. Johnson well in the post he has assumed.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I shall say but a few words at this time. I am in no sense a person who believes in anything like a filibuster, but it would be wrong for me to keep my seat and not associate myself with the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] in the splendid remarks he has made regarding Louis Johnson, whose name has been sent to the Senate by the President for appointment to the office of Secretary of Defense.

Long before I became chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, and long before I became a Member of the Senate, my interest in our country ran along much the same line as did the interest which Louis Johnson displayed when he became Assistant Secretary of War. I was not a Member of the Senate when amendments to the National Defense Act of 1920 were considered, and I took part, in a small way, in the first attempt at national mobilization in peacetime.

When I came to the Senate it was my good fortune to be assigned to the Committee on Military Affairs. From the very beginning I became associated with activities which proved themselves to be rather necessary as circumstances moved on and war began to face us and to engulf the world.

I sponsored, in the Senate, the Army air-base bill, which was the first step toward making the Air Force one of the major activities of our country. I took part in legislation in connection with strategic materials. It was in connection with those activities that I learned to know Louis Johnson and to regard him highly. After I became chairman of the Military Affairs Committee and after Mr. Johnson left the Government service, whenever any question regarding strategic materials arose, or whenever there came up any question which had to do with the complete mobilization of our country in the war effort, I met Mr. Johnson from time to time and chatted about the first struggles which we had had. One of the regrets which have come to me is that I am not in a position to see completed the reorganization of the Army and Navy, which surely will be accomplished, ultimately, by the bill which our committee reported and which I sponsored.

Louis Johnson, I may say, has the capability, determination, and understanding of one who realizes that there must not be division in the Armed Services at a time of great emergency, and that even in time of peace, for the sake of economy there should not be any division. I am sure he knows what we all know, when we think things through, that we can never bring unity into our Armed Services by dividing them.

CASIMIR PULASKI

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, in these days when we Americans are giving lavishly of ourselves and our substance to aiding countries all over the world, especially in Europe, to achieve economic and political freedom, we are apt to forget that without the timely aid of certain men of European origin and birth who believed as passionately in freedom as did our forefathers, our task might have been doubly hard.

I am thinking particularly of Casimir Pulaski, Polish soldier and statesman, to whom America owes so much. In Polish hearts the flame of freedom has always burned high. The history of Poland is replete with heroes who have given their lives and fortunes to carry the torch of freedom—flickering feebly at times, it is true, but carried forward always, even as it will be in the future.

Casimir Pulaski joined the American Army under George Washington in 1777, at a time when the fortunes of the tattered Army were low, indeed. With the zeal of a true patriot he threw himself into the battle for freedom. He so distinguished himself during the Battle of Brandywine that he was made a brigadier general and chief of Cavalry by Congress. He fought gallantly at Germantown and in the battles of the fearful winter of 1777-78. Following those battles, he raised a mixed corps, called the Pulaski Legion, with which he defended Charleston in May 1779.

This brave soldier was mortally wounded at Savannah, where he died on October 11 of that year.

This year, 1949, will mark the one hundred and seventieth anniversary of Pulaski's death. I deem it fitting and proper that we honor the memory of this man, born in Poland, who gave his life that freedom and all it means might be carried forward in this young, new country. It is true that we have named towns after him; that we have statues erected to him; that the famed Pulaski Highway Bridge leading out of New York has been named in his honor. But I feel that he deserves further honor. Therefore, I have submitted Senate Resolution No. 8 to make October 11, the date of his death, Pulaski Day, an official memorial day. This resolution is now pending before the Senate Judiciary Committee.

That Poland and its people have always had a deep, abiding friendship for the United States is not only evidenced by what Pulaski did in making the supreme sacrifice that this country might attain its freedom. Other Poles have earned our undying gratitude. There was Thaddeus Kosciusko. He too, heard the call of freedom. In 1776 he entered the United States as a volunteer and brilliantly distinguished himself, especially at New York and Yorktown. Recognizing his ability, General Washington promoted him to the rank of Colonel of Artillery and made Kosciuzko his adjutant. His humanity and his charm of manner made him one of the most popular of American officers. The Congress of the United States, recognizing his devotion to duty and his service to the cause of American independence, rewarded him by giving him American citizenship, a considerable pension with landed estates and the rank of brigadier general. Kosciusko was far in advance of his age in his manner of thinking in that he maintained the Republic could only be regenerated on the basis of absolute liberty and equality before the law.

I could cite instance after instance of men of Polish origin who cast their lot with the infant United States; men in whose hearts burned the flame of liberty. In the ensuing years, men and women of Poland have extended the hand of friendship to this country and in turn have had the hand of friendship extended to them. Thousands of them, following the vision of freedom and opportunity, have come to our shores, determined to be Americans in the true sense of the word. They have scattered throughout our land, settling in various communities and States, and they have become sturdy, self-supporting citizens of our country.

There is hardly a day passes but that men and women of Polish ancestry are honored in some manner. Their names lead scholarship lists, athletic honors, civic community efforts.

There has been a tradition of friendship between the people of Poland and the United States. This tradition rests on the common denominator of the love of freedom and individuality. The history of Poland shows us that the Poles embraced Christianity in the very beginning and began immediately to convert the pagan people to the concepts of the Christian religion. From that time on the Polish people have always been a deeply religious race.

History shows us, too, that Poland has been ravished and partitioned time after time. Not a century has gone by since the founding of the country that partitioning of some sort had not taken place. But so virile is the love of freedom and individual liberty in the heart of every Pole, that Poland has always regained her freedom as a state. And that early Christianity has always been a force. It has been the one stable and unifying element, and the clergy consistently protected the lower from the tyranny of the upper classes.

After World War I, on March 17, 1921, Poland became a republic. In 1928 Poland had a unified judicial organization and a uniform code of judicial procedure. State protection was given to labor, and insurance against unemployment, illness, and accident was guaranteed. Poland was putting into practice the liberty and justice which had always been in every Pole's heart.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield for a question?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield for a question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I understand the Senator is discussing the Government of Poland. Did Poland have an institution called the senate?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes; Poland had a senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Did they have the same rules as our Senate?

Mr. McCARTHY. They had unlimited debate as to subject but not as to time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Did the Polish Government survive very long? Is it in being today?

Mr. McCARTHY. It is not in existence today. I may answer the Senator's question further by saying I think one of the reasons Poland has always been able to regain her freedom is because she has always tried to protect the rights of minorities. I think there can be no doubt of that. I am sure the Senator from Arkansas recalls Ignace Jan Paderewski, the George Washington of Poland, who was the Premier of Poland after World War I. Paderewski was one of the greatest statesmen of all times and one of the world's greatest symbols of freedom and liberty.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield for a further question?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield for a question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. My point is, in view of the conditions which I understand exist in Poland today, it is not my impression that her legislature was functioning in a very free or effective manner, in the sense in which we think of a free institution.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say the Senator and I can heartily agree that Poland did not fall as the reason of decay from within. From a military standpoint, Poland was a relatively weak nation caught between two gigantic forces. She was completely crushed, but not through a lack of intelligence or bravery, not through a lack of foresight on the part of Polish leaders. I believe the Polish legislative body enjoyed the right of almost unlimited debate as to subject but not as to time, though I do not claim to be an authority on the subject. Possibly that is the information the Senator desired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield for a further question?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield for a question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it not true that Mr. Pilsudski took over the direction of the government almost as a personal matter during the 1920's, and is it not true the legislature really did not exert much influence in that era?

Mr. McCARTHY. It is true that Pilsudski was a powerful force in Poland and exerted tremendous influence, both on the people and on the legislative body. I strongly feel, however, that, had Pilsudski still been living in 1939, the fate of Poland might have been considerably different. Certainly, had he been alive and in charge of the Polish Army at the time of invasion, Poland would have been able to have withstood Hitler's onslaught longer. I might say I consider Pilsudski to have been one of the greatest leaders of all times and also a great statesman.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If I may comment on that, I agree——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator may ask a question.

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield for a further question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator misunderstood. I agree as to Pilsudski being a great soldier, but I was inquiring as to the vitality and integrity of the legislative chamber. The Senator said Poland was weak and fell because Pilsudski died. I think the information is clear that the legislative body was not sufficiently strong to keep the nation in such a condition that she could resist incursions by her enemies.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say to the Senator I do not think Poland fell because Pilsudski died, but I believe that, had Poland had the services of Pilsudski at the time of the German invasion, she most likely would have been able to withstand the invasion longer. I assuredly do not feel that Pilsudski or any other man could have stood up against the tremendous German Army.

I know in asking these questions that the Senator has in mind the rather historic discussion which has been proceeding in the Senate for the past few days and which, no doubt, will continue. I may say I think it would be a tremendous mistake for the Senate ever to try to invoke cloture by majority rule. I believe it could mean that the rights of minorities could at some future time be completely lost in this Nation. I think we should have a sensible cloture rule which will make it impossible for a few irresponsible individuals at any time to prevent the Senate functioning. But I think it would be a great loss to every minority group in the country if the Senate were to say at this time that cloture will be invoked and that the right of unlimited debate and freedom of speech will be denied, through a simple majority vote.

Mr. President, today, as we all know, it is not possible for the traditional hand of friendship to be extended freely between ourselves and our Polish brothers. Some day the curtain will lift and we will be able to clasp the hand of brotherhood once more.

In the meanwhile, the life of our Nation has been enriched by those of Polish ancestry who have cast their lot with us. They have added glory to the deeds already done in the name of freedom and liberty by such a man as Casimir Pulaski. The honor rolls of those who fought, were wounded or died in this cause, are dotted with the names of men whose ancestral roots were in Poland.

These United States owe much to men and women who saw in this land the opportunities which their hearts longed for as well as to the men who saw the dream of independence taking shape in this new and untried country.

If it were not for men like Pulaski, who dared to stake his fortune and eventually his very life on this dream; who came forward with no hope of reward except that of liberty; who underwent untold hardships—cold, hunger, lack of adequate arms—trying to shape into the semblance of an army a group of untrained men, who knows what the outcome of this fight for freedom might have been?

Such friendships, carried on by succeeding generations, cannot and must not be forgotten. In this time of our great national strength, we can do no better than to honor in every way we can those men who cast their lot with us when the reward was nothing more than fighting side by side with men who had nothing more to offer than their determination and their dream of liberty to govern themselves.

That is why I have offered Senate Resolution 8 to so honor a man who made the supreme sacrifice that we might be a free nation—a nation that is now the beacon light for all free nations and for those who are struggling to regain their freedom.

Pulaski Day, October 11, as an official memorial day, can be used by all Americans as a day of rededication to the American way of life, in the memory of the man who gave his life for liberty, freedom and independence. It is a day, too, dedicated to those men and women of Polish descent who have carried on this torch from one generation to another and who have given us citizens whose devotion to liberty is unexcelled. It is a gesture of friendship to Poland herself, once more partitioned, once more enslaved by alien peoples, but in whose heart still burns the torch of liberty and Christianity.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. LUCAS to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 15, amending the so-called cloture rule of the Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Baldwin	Holland	Mundt
Broughton	Humphrey	Murray
Butler	Jenner	O'Conor
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Ecton	Long	Sparkman
Flanders	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Fulbright	McCarthy	Thye
George	McClellan	Tydings
Gillette	McGrath	Wherry
Hill	Martin	Wiley
Hoey	Maybank	Williams

The VICE PRESIDENT. Thirty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is not present. The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The legislative clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. McKELLAR, and Mr. TAYLOR answered to their names when called.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is not present.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not think it is very commendable that we cannot get a quorum after two calls, at 3:30 in the afternoon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Debate is not in order while a quorum call is in progress.

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. YOUNG entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. CAIN, Mr. DONNELL, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. IVES, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KEM, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. McFARLAND, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MYERS, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. TAFT, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. VANDENBERG, and Mr. WATKINS also entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, it seems to me rather odd that so many of the strong supporters of the proposed amendment of the Senate rule are unable to stay on the floor in order to hear the discussion; it is impossible to get a quorum except after great difficulty. I should have thought that if they were so interested in the proposal, they would at least remain here to listen to the debate.

The question under consideration today is one of the most important that has come before the Senate since I have been a Member of this body. Unfortunately, in the minds of some members of the press and some other persons, the present proposal to amend rule XXII has been identified with certain substantive legislation which has been proposed. I think that is unfortunate, because, in view of the way the situation has developed and particularly in view of the fact that the President and his administration have taken such an active interest in it, it now involves a fundamental change in the distribution of power in our Government. I can think of no other issue which has been before the Senate in the past several years that is of comparable importance, except the Supreme Court reorganization battle in the thirties, when an effort was made by the administration then in power to change the Supreme Court. At that time the Senate recognized that that proposal involved a fundamental change in the checks and balances of our constitutional system; and of course all of us are familiar with what happened in that respect.

I think the issue presently before us is not simply a proposed step toward the enactment of certain so-called civil-rights bills, although it might be that, and I think it is designed for that purpose; but its long-term significance would be to change the relative power of the coordinate branches of our Government.

Mr. President, the strange thing about this debate is that the very first day it was opened, it was described and dubbed as a "filibuster." The distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] started the discussion of this proposal. If I correctly recall, he spoke between 40 minutes and 1 hour. I do not think any other Member of this body—certainly none with comparable experience—speaks less than does the senior Senator from Georgia. I think that is probably explained by the fact that he speaks only when he has something worth saying and worth listening to. Certainly he is not noted for his long-windedness. But in spite of that, the press started off that day by saying the filibuster had begun; which I think illustrates the prejudices which have been engendered by the press and certain of the so-called liberal leaders of the country with regard to the whole question.

I was interested in knowing just what a filibuster is, in the mind of someone who could not be accused in any way or suspected of merely trying to make headlines or produce what the press calls "reader interest material." I find in Mr. Haynes' book, The Senate of the United States, a very short definition which seems to me to fit the situation very well. It reads:

> The agility with which some of the most eminent Senators have from time to time shifted their attitude on the filibuster illustrates the appropriateness of the definition—

And this is the principal point—

> A filibuster is either a reprehensive artifice of a sinister opposition, or an ingenious and patriotic device of our friends for saving the people.

Again, he says:

> A filibuster is an abomination unto the Lord, and a very present help in trouble.

So, Mr. President, you may take your choice. From time to time, that is about the way filibusters have been described in the past. But I may say that uniformly, in my rough estimate, about 90 percent of the press, if not more, have dubbed the present debate a filibuster from the very beginning of it, the very minute it was opened by the senior Senator from Georgia. I think if one is at all fair in looking at the RECORD of the past week, he will find there has been remarkable restraint on the part of those in opposition to the pending question. For myself, I was very anxious to begin my speech and conclude it at the earliest possible moment, but in spite of my desire, many of the Senators supporting the resolution were unable to attend the Senate and furnish a quorum.

There is one remarkable, and I think most interesting, exception to the attitude of the press, that this is a superficial matter, and, in the sense that it involves only a simple rule of the Senate, is a filibuster to begin with. That remarkable exception appeared in a column in yesterday's Washington Post. Its author, I think, is recognized by every thoughtful student of governmental affairs as one of the most profound thinkers we have had during the past 20 years; certainly one of the leading commentators on governmental matters. I refer to Mr. Walter Lippmann. He so concisely condenses the essence of the significance of the problem before us that I think his column should be read into the RECORD at this point. I may say I do not think anyone could accuse Mr. Lippmann of being a provincial or sectional man, and if he should be called that by someone who might disagree with him, he certainly is not from the South, which is being accused of dilatory tactics in this instance. The title of the article is "Filibusters and the American Idea." Mr. Lippmann says:

> Although the question before the Senate is whether to amend the rules, the issue is not one of parliamentary procedure. It is whether there shall be a profound and far-reaching constitutional change in the character of the American Government.

That is what I had reference to when I said this is comparable to the change in the Supreme Court that was proposed in the 1930's. As Senators will remember, the proposal at that time was merely to increase the number of Justices of the Supreme Court, but it would have altered in a very drastic manner the whole significance of that body. Mr. Lippmann continues:

> The proposed amendment to rule XXII would enable two-thirds of the Senate to close the debate and force any measure, motion, or other matter to a vote. If the amendment is carried, the existing power of a minority of the States to stop legislation will have been abolished.
>
> "Stripped of all mumbo-jumbo and flag waving," says the New York Times, "the issue, is whether the country's highest legislative body will permit important measures to be kept from a vote through the activities of a few leather-throated, iron-legged Members who don't want democratic decision." This is an unduly acrimful and superficial way to dispose of a great constitutional problem. For the real issue is whether any majority, even a two-thirds majority, shall now assume the power to override the opposition of a large minority of the States.
>
> In the American system of government the right of democratic decision has never been identified with majority rule as such. The genius of the American system, unique I believe among the democracies of the world, is that it limits all power—including the power of the majority. Absolute power, whether in a king, a president, a legislative majority, a popular majority, is alien to the American idea of democratic decision.

I think that is a very significant passage.

> The America idea of a democratic decision has always been that important minorities must not be coerced. When there is strong opposition, it is neither wise nor practical to force a decision. It is necessary and it is better to postpone the decision—to respect the opposition and then to accept the burden of trying to persuade it.
>
> For a decision which has to be enforced against the determined opposition of large communities and regions of the country will, as Americans have long realized, almost never produce the results it is supposed to produce. The opposition and the resistance having been overridden, will not disappear. They will merely find some other way of avoiding, evading, obstructing, or nullifying the decision.

For that reason it is a cardinal principle of the American democracy that great decisions on issues that men regard as vital shall not be taken by vote of the majority until the consent of the minority has been obtained. Where the consent of the minority has been lacking, as for example in the case of the prohibition amendment, the democratic decision has produced hypocrisy and lawlessness.

This is the issue in the Senate. It is not whether there shall be unlimited debates. The right of unlimited debates is merely a device, rather an awkward and tiresome device, to prevent large and determined communities from being coerced.

The issue is whether the fundamental principle of American democratic decision—that strong minorities must be persuaded and not coerced—shall be altered radically, not by constitutional amendment but by a subtle change in the rules of the Senate.

The issue has been raised in connection with the civil-rights legislation. The question is whether the vindication of these civil rights requires the sacrifice of the American limitation on majority rule. The question is a painful one. But I believe the answer has to be that the rights of Negroes will in the end be made more secure, even if they are vindicated more slowly, if the cardinal principle—that minorities shall not be coerced by majorities—is conserved.

For if that principle is abandoned, then the great limitations on the absolutism and the tyranny of transient majorities will be gone, and the path will be much more open than it now is to the demagogic dictator who, having aroused a mob, destroys the liberties of the people.

Mr. President, I think that article sums up in a very concise and intelligent manner the very essence of the pending question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). If that remark were addressed to the Chair, the Chair would like to agree with the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I appreciate the Chair's attitude. I think the Chair is of course much better able to recognize the significance of it than is the Senator from Arkansas, the Chair having had much greater experience in matters of this kind. I must say I can well understand why many people who have not studied the Senate closely can misconstrue the significance of the issue, because on its face the proposal appears to involve a very simple little change in the matter of procedure. I think that explains why so many Senators first come to the Senate with the idea that so-called unlimited debate must be a terrible thing and the rules ought to be changed. But in reading the record made at the hearings, and in reading the books, particularly the one I just mentioned, by Mr. Haynes, almost without exception, ever since the Senate has been in existence, after Senators have been here a few years, long enough to become acquainted with the function of the Senate, they have changed their minds and have been against cloture.

I think it is rather significant, and I shall refer to it again, that some of the proponents of this measure, the overwhelming majority of the enthusiastic supporters of cloture, are Senators serving their first term. I think that has some significance in the consideration of the validity of the arguments of the proponents of the resolution.

There is another very short editorial which I should like to read, which appeared in the Evening Star of Tuesday, March 2. It contains a statement of the elder La Follette which is quite appropriate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair admonishes the occupants of the galleries to desist from conversation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Chair for endeavoring to keep order.

The editorial to which I have referred is entitled "Filibusters and Democracy." I shall read only two paragraphs. The first one is as follows:

> A classic defense of the filibuster came from the elder La Follette, one of the great Senate liberals of all time, in these words—

Before I proceed, let me say that I hope I shall not forget to refer later to the subject of liberals. It is a strange coincidence that so-called liberals predominate in this great movement to restrict the power of the Senate. Those liberals are, in most cases, the identical Senators, in their first term, who have not yet come to appreciate the significance of the rules and functions of the Senate.

These are the words of the elder La Follette:

> Believing that I stand for democracy, for the liberties of the people of this country, for the perpetuation of our free institutions, I shall stand while I am a Member of this body against any cloture—

Any cloture, he said—

> that denies free and unlimited debate. Sir, the moment that the majority imposes the restrictions imposed in the pending rule, that moment you will have dealt a blow to liberty, you will have broken down one of the greatest weapons against wrong and oppression that the Members of this body possess.

I think some of the professed liberals who are so anxious to change the rules would do well to study the thoughts of one who, I think, can be ranked as one of the true liberals of this Nation.

I read further:

> Behind the cloture fight that began in the Senate yesterday is the civil-rights legislation, and one is apt to classify as "liberals" those who favor civil-rights legislation as against the "conservatives" who oppose it. But the true liberal would be more apt—

Note this, Mr. President—

> the true liberal would be more apt to oppose cloture and defend the filibuster than otherwise. And while there are many things that in truth may be said against the filibuster, one of them is not that it is undemocratic. Existence of the filibuster device, no matter how it may be used, is as true as any evidence that we operate under a democratic system. Only in a democracy could the filibuster exist.

I submit, Mr. President, that is absolutely unanswerable. It is a strange thing that those gentlemen who, I think, believe they are liberals, are among the most aggressive proponents of this effort to restrict the freedom of debate in the Senate. I cannot help but be reminded of some of the situations which arise, and have risen in the past, in connection with the use of words. It was only 20 or 30 years ago that the leaders of the revolution in Russia were spoken of as liberals. They were always identified as liberals. They were far to the left. Such persons soon go so far to the left that we find them coming in on the opposite side of the right. They have become so liberal that they are now either Fascists of Communists. The difference I am unable to discern. I think they often lose sight of the extremes to which they can go. I shall have some very interesting comment later with regard to the position of the labor unions in that connection.

Mr. President, I have a few little maxims of some very famous men, and I thought it would be well to put them into the RECORD in my introductory remarks, in order that my feeble words may have the prestige of those of much more eminent men who have spoken on the subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is doubtful, but, without objection, the maxims may be incorporated in the RECORD.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Chair.

James Madison made a very short statement. I am confining these statements to the very shortest ones I can find. I should like to be able to put into the RECORD the much more extended remarks of Mr. James Madison. He said:

> The use of the Senate is to consist in its proceeding with more coolness, with more system, and with more wisdom, than the popular branch.

Moncure D. Conway said:

> There is a tradition that on his return from France Jefferson called Washington to account at the breakfast table for having agreed to a second chamber.

He had reference to the Senate.

> "Why," asked Washington, "did you pour that coffee into the saucer?" "To cool it," quoth Jefferson. "Even so," said Washington, "we pour legislation into the senatorial saucer to cool it."

I think that is an illustration which most of the Senators can understand.

Edmund Randolph said:

> The general object was to provide a cure for the evils under which the United States labored; that in tracing these evils to their origin every man had found it in the turbulence and follies of democracy; that some check, therefore, was to be sought against this tendency of our Government; and that a good Senate seemed most likely to answer this purpose.

James Wilson said:

> It is a maxim that "the least numerous body is the fittest for deliberation; the most numerous, for decision."

Mr. President, I place those maxims in the RECORD simply as something to which to refer, because I think the points which I hope to be able to develop in the course of my remarks bear out the sentiments of those eminent gentlemen.

As I said a moment ago, the tendency of the new Members of the Senate to be in favor of changes is not a new one. In the debate of 1918, the late Senator Townsend, of Michigan, had this to say—and I thought it was quite interesting, because the situation which exists in the Senate today is nothing new. He was speaking in the debate on the Underwood resolution of 1918. He said:

> Most new Senators are instinctively for reforming rules.

That was true in 1918, and it is evidently still true. I have no doubt it was true before that time. I think the majority leader quoted, a day or two ago, a statement of the elder Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts, who became a Member of the Senate about 1893. He quoted a statement which the late Senator Lodge had made when he first became a Member of the Senate. It was an article which he had written to the effect that he thought a change in the rules was advisable. But the majority leader did not quote a later article which the late Senator Lodge wrote in 1915, in which he very strongly condemned the effort then being made to change the rules.

Let me read one other sentence from former Senator Townsend, of Michigan, in the same speech, which I thought worthy of quoting, since I have it before me. I read:

> It will be a sad day for our Republic when the Senate ceases to be a free and open forum. Not culture but intelligent deliberation is the present need. This is an insidious attempt, as it seems to me, to limit debate and confine it according to the wishes of people not connected directly with the Senate.

I may call the attention of the Senate to a great many other statements of some of the well-known and leading statesmen of the past contained in the back part of the hearings before the committee.

Mr. President, I have listened to the debate on this question during the past few days with a great deal of interest. Although the proposal in form is merely a change in the rules of the Senate, as Mr. Lippmann says, in fact and in substance it is far more than that. Although it is generally believed that this change is motivated primarily by the desire of some Senators and the administration to pass the anti-poll-tax, anti-lynching, and FEPC measures, such a change has a much greater and more profound significance than the passage of any particular legislation.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROUGHTON in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator spoke of one of the bills being the FEPC bill. Did the Senator know that the labor committee of the Minnesota State Senate killed a State FEPC bill in the State of Minnesota on Tuesday of this week?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not know that, and I am astounded to hear it. In view of the position, certainly, of some of the representatives of the State of Minnesota, I am very much surprised.

Mr. EASTLAND. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator think that the representatives from Minnesota, after the people of their State through their legislature have killed FEPC, should, through the power of the Federal Government, attempt to force that vicious system on their own people and on the people of the rest of the country?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It would seem to me to be an entirely unwarranted procedure, and I cannot imagine that anyone would undertake to do such a thing. I had thought that the only excuse they could have was that their own people certainly were in favor of it, and I had assumed that in a State like Minnesota they had long since adopted it and were living up to it in every respect. I did not know about the report to which the Senator refers.

Mr. EASTLAND. Did the Senator know that the Minnesota State Senate, before it killed the whole bill, amended it to eliminate the provisions which would permit hearsay evidence to be introduced against one charged before the commission which was sought to be set up, and to let the rules of evidence apply? Does the Senator think, then, that they should come here and attempt to use the full power of the Federal Government to enact a law under which hearsay evidence would be admitted and American employers deprived of their right, through the power of the Federal Government, when their own State government would not accept it?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I certainly do not think they should do so. Along that line, I think it was last year or the year before, in the debate on the Senate on the measures enumerated, I said, and I still very strongly feel, that the proper way to approach it, if people are serious about this matter, is for each State which wants it to enact such legislation and give it a trial; in other words, to act as a laboratory, and if they can prove by experience that it has merit and can be administered in a way which is satisfactory to the people, after a number of years of trial—if a sufficient number of States do that, I am quite sure the other States, with that kind of experience before them, assuming that it is good, would be willing to accept it, but assuming it is not good, as I think will be proved, we will have a final and definite answer, and no longer will be bothered by the question in the Congress.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator know that in the State of Minnesota the senate committee on labor of the legislature first adopted an amendment, before it killed the whole bill, giving an employer the right to appeal to the courts for the adjudication of his rights, a right which would be denied an employer under the pending FEPC proposal in the Congress? Since the State of Minnesota has so spoken, as has every other State in the Union, where the people have been left to vote, does the Senator see the justice of using the power and force of the Federal Government to enact a law which would deny an employer even an opportunity to have his rights adjudicated in the courts created by the Congress of the United States for that purpose?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I cannot see any justification at all for any such procedure. I think that one of the great weaknesses in many of the bills which have been passed is that an effort has been made to impose from Washington measures which really none, or very few, of the local governments of the States would be willing to accept, especially in this field, where uniformity is something that is extremely hard and difficult to attain, and I do not think it is desirable to begin with.

Mr. EASTLAND. In view of the fact that FEPC has been voted on by the people of 15 States, including the State of California, where it was defeated by a vote, roughly, of 2 or 3 to 1, and lost in every county in that State, does the Senator feel that the Congress of the United States should listen seriously to an attempt to cram down the throats of the people a law which they have repudiated every single time it has been placed on the ballot?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I certainly think it should not be considered at all, in view of facts such as that. I must say, Mr. President, that I am greatly surprised at the news the Senator from Mississippi brings, and he knows more about this subject than anyone else in the Senate.

Mr. EASTLAND. In view of the fact that the people in every instance have repudiated FEPC, and have defeated it when they have had a chance to vote on it, does not the Senator see in an effort to adopt this resolution and amend the Senate rules so that these various measures can be passed through Congress, an attempt by a very small minority of the people of the country to enforce their will on the great majority of the people, and pass a law promoted by a very few special groups which the great majority of Americans oppose?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Certainly, Mr. President, the sponsors of the pending resolution make no secret and no bones about their intention, indicating that that is why they want cloture in the Senate rules. As I tried to point out in the beginning, it is a very unfortunate aspect of this whole affair, that, motivated by a desire for legislation of this character, they are willing to sacrifice the long-established rules of the Senate, which not only would result in the evil to which the Senator from Mississippi has referred, but in my opinion would make us subject to unknown evils of a similar kind, brought about by measures supported only by some transient majority in the Senate at some time in the future.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it not simply an attempt to amend the rules to pass legislation that is opposed by the vast majority of the people of the United States?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As of this moment, this particular move is exactly that, in my opinion.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it not an attempt to force minority rule on the country?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think in this instance it certainly is, and of course, it could be used for that purpose in the future.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to ask my able friend, the Senator from Arkansas,

what it is that the minority of the United States Senate are attempting to force on the country by preventing the public business being transacted in an orderly manner?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will say to the Senator that the present procedure was not forced on the Senate by the minority—that is, if the Senator is intimating that I am of the minority. In my opinion, when the vote comes, it is very likely that we, to whom the Senator refers, will not be in the minority. But assuming, as the Senator in his question assumes, that we are in the minority, I wish to say that we did not force the fight on this question at all. It was demanded in the first place by the leadership of the Senate, and reinforced yesterday by the attitude of the President. I think this is another example of the irresistible desire of all executives—and I am not speaking merely of our present President; it has been true with respect to executive power throughout history—that whenever there is obstruction to the carrying out of their will in the immediate future, they want to do something about it, and they usually attempt to force through their will, and this is one of the few countries in the world in which they have not been successful in doing it.

I think the present procedure in the Senate is part and parcel of that instinctive desire on the part of the Executive to override obstructions. That is why I made the reference to the Supreme Court fight. The same situation existed at that time. In that instance circumstances happened to be such that the Supreme Court was not going along with the Executive. Therefore it was desired to pack the Court in order to destroy the obstruction. It so happens that now, under different circumstances, it is believed that the Senate is holding up something, not going along just as the Executive wants, and therefore the effort is made to change the rules of the Senate, which, in my opinion, has just as much significance for the future of the Government as packing the Supreme Court. I can see very little difference. It is an effort to destroy the real power and function of the Senate in our system of Government. That is exactly what I think it is. And the effort of the so-called minority, if the Senator from Illinois likes to call it the minority, is to let the people know the significance of this move.

Mr. Walter Lippmann stated—the Senator from Illinois was not present, I believe, when I referred to it—that this is a very subtle change which appears to be a small, limited, insignificant move, designed to pass civil-rights legislation. But that is not what it is at all. The public, and 90 percent of the press, think that is what it is. Members of the press write of it in that way. They all seem to be for it. They do not seem to realize what it is. So it is the function of the minority, as the Senator from Illinois terms it, to give the people of the country the time to understand what is involved. Fortunately one columnist, who speaks with some authority, is able to see what is involved, and has written an article which, I believe, will open the eyes of a great many people of the country.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. Will my able friend, the Senator from Arkansas, tell the Senate and the country just how long he thinks it will take the minority to advise us exactly what it has in mind by way of educating the American people as to what is at stake here?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish I could determine that. But this is the first time the senior Senator from Illinois has been on the floor while I have been speaking. Unless those who are proponents of the resolution will stay on the floor and expose themselves to a little serious information on this subject, it can take an indefinite period to educate them. I venture to say that if those who favor the resolution would stay on the floor and listen to what is being said seriously on this subject, it would take no longer than a week to change the opinions of 90 percent of them. But they will not stay here. The Senator from Illinois said a moment ago that it required 30 minutes to get even a quorum on the floor. I was present during the quorum call. Many of the opponents of the resolution were present. I must say that it will take a long time to educate Senators if they are not present on the floor to listen to what is being said. We can give pertinent information on this subject to a very few Senators during the short time they are present on the floor. We can only make little pecks at them. The Senator from Illinois may be present for a few minutes, but he may be gone in the next 5 minutes. I think I can guarantee to the Senator that if he will bring in all the proponents of the resolution, and make them stay here and listen, that we can convert them inside of a week. But how can we do it when there is no one here?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Arkansas yield further to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator from Arkansas guarantee to the Senator from Illinois that there will be a vote taken upon the proposal now pending if I bring in a majority of Senators, and keep them here constantly for a week to listen to the Senator from Arkansas and other Senators from the South talk on the subject?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator would bring in all the proponents, the great liberals, who have been referred to as proponents, they could be educated and brought around to our point of view. I am sorry the Senator was not present when we were talking about liberals, because I think he would have been interested in that part of the discussion. But what has now taken place gives us an example of what I mean. I feel that I will now have to go all over that question for the benefit of the Senator from Illinois. It is the function of the Senate to inform the people. That is its principal function to a much greater degree than legislating, and I have some very good authority on that very point which I shall quote to the Senator in a very few minutes, if he will do me the compliment of staying here and giving me an opportunity to do so.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield further to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator agree with me that whatever the Senator from Arkansas says will secure wide expression in the press of the country? The Senator said a moment ago that he was not attempting to educate the Senate as much as he was the people of America to the seriousness of this situation. The Senator will agree with me that whenever he speaks upon the floor of the Senate he makes headlines. He does not need to address himself so much to the Senate as he does to the country as a whole to convince the people, because the Senator is aware that every Senator knows now how he is going to vote on this question. The Senator has been in various meetings. He has been in contact with Senators and he knows exactly what the vote is going to be, so far as his group interested in this question is concerned. It is not a question of educating Senators at all. It is simply a question of taking the time of the Senate of the United States to hold up the orderly business of the United States Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I would say to the Senator that I believe he is quite incorrect. Since day before yesterday, as the result of the letter which I shall read in a moment, sent out by a Mr. Cowan, of the CIO, and also as the result of the statement by the President made yesterday, we have gained a substantial number of votes. Senators' eyes are being opened. Daily, as a result of the debate proceeding in the Senate, the position we take is gaining adherents very rapidly. We are gaining in strength as a result of the debates which are taking place. After all, the purpose of debate is to endeavor to convince others of the justice of one's cause. Therefore, I think the Senator from Illinois is entirely wrong in saying that today every Member of the Senate knows exactly how he is going to vote. Senators do not know how they are going to vote. I think Senators are very rapidly coming to see the light on the question, and if we are given another week I think the majority leader will not even dare to bring the question to a vote. I think it will all be forgotten.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator could guarantee to me that he would get a vote here within 2 weeks' time I would be glad to give him 2 weeks' time But the Senator from Arkansas does not believe any

Senator is so naive that such a statement can be taken seriously.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. So far as I am concerned, and I believe that would be the view of others on our side of the question, I think we could have a vote if the Senator from Illinois would guarantee to keep all Senators here on the floor during the debate. But how can the Senator do that? We are obliged to deal with Senators one at a time as they have a few minutes between their committee meetings. That is all we can do.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire for a question only.

Mr. TOBEY. I have a very pertinent question to ask. Preliminary to the question, I point out that often the very pertinent cry wells up from the stomachs of men: "When do we eat?" and I, as a Senator from the State of New Hampshire, on behalf of the Senate of the United States, propound to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas the question: "When do we vote?"

The Senator from Arkansas has asserted that Senators are not present on the floor of the Senate while the debate is going on. I will tell the Senator why they are not present. It is because some of them are sick unto death of this piddling stuff which is going on day after day here, this childish, this kid stuff. Senators are talking and talking without getting to the point. I do not share the confidence expressed by the Senator from Arkansas. Most Senators know how they are going to vote on the question. They want a chance to vote and get down to a decision. But here there is a continual drool, drool, drool. I am heartily sick of it. So I ask the Senator: "When do we vote?"

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yielded for a question.

Mr. TOBEY. That is the question I should like to have answered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senate will vote when Members of the Senate have nothing further to say on the question. That is according to the well-established and ancient rules of the Senate.

Mr. TOBEY. Ad infinitum, ad nauseam.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, may I be protected from this interference? I yielded only for a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield only for a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator has made the remark that if Senators were required to remain in the Chamber and listen to all the debate, the opposition could be convinced. I should like to know whether or not the Senator is familiar with the constitutional provision against cruel and unusual punishment. [Laughter.]

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I realize that it might well have been that, because as I was about to speak it was difficult to obtain a quorum. I think it is very mean of the Senator to call attention to my reputation; but unfortunately I cannot help it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. TYDINGS. Does not the junior Senator from Arkansas realize, as he looks over the Senate Chamber, that because of his eloquence, logic, and persuasion, he is addressing one of the largest meetings of the Senate that has been held since we convened on the 3d of last January?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I appreciate the implication of the Senator's remark. I must say that there seem to be a few more Senators present than there were when I started.

The way in which one may regard this change in the Senate rules will be influenced to a considerable extent by what one may think is the proper role or the principal function of government in human affairs.

To me, one of the principal objectives of government is to provide the machinery by which free people may live in peace with one another. There are of course other functions that have been assumed in recent years of a paternalistic nature, some of which I regard as necessary, required for the most part by the growth of industrialism and scientific discoveries.

Nevertheless, basically I think government's role is to enable individual human beings to live together in peace. Good government assures the citizen freedom and justice. Government is a substitute for the law of the jungle, under which every man looks only to his own resources for his protection from his fellow men.

As the Declaration of Independence puts it, governments are instituted among men to secure, among others, the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It will be noted that it says pursuit of happiness, not that happiness is to be handed us on a silver platter.

In the achievement of this basic objective of our Government, I think the Senate of the United States has played an extremely important, if not indispensable, part. When we examine closely the various parts of our governmental structure and the functions they play in the daily operation of our country, we find that the Senate is the one unique body in that complex organization. In no other government in the world that I know of is there a body in which the membership is selected on a basis similar to that applying to the Senate, and in no other body is there the right of free debate uncontrolled by a transient majority of its own members or some outside autocrat. I believe that the unique character of the Senate in our system of government cannot be overemphasized.

In Russia they have a constitution, which on paper looks as good as or better than ours, but it has no meaning whatsoever. In England they have no constitution, and yet they have self-government. I should add, however, that during the period of England's greatness as a world power, her upper House did have the power to restrain for a limited period the excesses of the House of Commons.

My point is that in view of the success of our system of government for 170 years, and the fact that the Senate, with its tradition of unlimited debate, is a unique feature of our Government, it seems to me that it would be the height of folly to abandon that tradition under the circumstances now prevailing in this body.

The reason why this tradition of unlimited debate is of such importance is that its existence, the possibility of its use, has been the greatest inducement we have to restraint and reasonableness on the part of Members of this body.

One of the Members of this body, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], on several occasions in the hearings expressed the view that we can safely rely upon the sportsmanship, the tradition of courtesy in this Chamber, for the reasonable use of the power to shut off debate which he wishes to give the majority. He introduced a resolution providing for majority cloture. The assumption of the junior Senator from Oregon seems to be that Senators are not like other men, that in some mysterious way we are above the temptation which so commonly afflicts the rest of mankind to use power to the fullest.

I think that point is very interesting. I think the junior Senator from Oregon is very sincere in the point which he makes. He makes it in many places in the hearings. I should like to read a few of his statements to show examples of what I mean, because I honestly believe that it is around that idea that several conscientious younger liberal Members have formed the conclusion that that is what accounts for the success of the Senate. I read several brief sentences from statements of the junior Senator from Oregon. As reported on page 32 of the printed hearings, the Senator from Oregon said:

> With no reflection on the House, I just want to call attention to the great differences not only in the traditions between the two bodies, but the great difference, I think, in the point of view which men have when they come to the Senate in protecting the great historical traditions of that body.

He has the feeling that there is some great difference between Members of the Senate and Members of the House.

On page 33 the Senator from Oregon stated:

> I am not at all disturbed about the fear that both you and Senator HAYDEN have expressed as to what a majority in the Senate might do because I think you are overlooking the great pulling weight of the traditions of the Senate in protecting legitimate minority interests. I think that the rule requiring 16 signatures to get cloture out is a very important safeguard that we must not overlook. Just go around and try to get 16 men to sign a cloture petition. It is a very difficult thing to do, and you have got to have a good case before you can get the signatures.
>
> Senator GREEN. What is a good case? The other person thinks it is a bad case.
>
> Senator MORSE. That is the purpose of having majority rule, to decide what the final decision should be.

Again, on page 62, he expresses the idea that in some way the traditions of the Senate are a sufficient protection:

> Senator MORSE. My honest and very sincere answer is I think there is no danger of it in

the Senate because I simply believe in the decency and fairness of men, and I think that the historical traditions of the Senate are such that we need never fear the Senate's denying to the minority adequate time to make its case on the merits.

The argument seems to be that because Senators are such good fellows that is all that is required. That argument runs throughout his statements.

On page 63 he says:

I just feel that people in the Senate of the United States are never going to let partisanship blind them to good sportsmanship and fairness.

That argument is repeated throughout his statement.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. In that connection, I ask the Senator what he thinks of the argument that the traditions of the United States Senate will protect us from unrestrained majority rule when the advocates of the change of the rule to a simple majority are proposing that we first change the rule, and then that they submit a cloture petition on one piece of legislation, followed by another, having at least three pieces of legislation in mind which they intend to pass under gag rule? How long does the Senator think the traditions of the United States Senate calling for free, full, and fair debate would last if at this session we were to tear the rule apart and pass three pieces of legislation under cloture as soon as we change the rule?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I say to the Senator that I do not think they would last at all. I think the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who has just come to the floor of the Senate—and I am very glad he has—is completely and absolutely in error in believing in the theory that the fairness and decency of Senators, which he says seem to be inherent in them because they are Senators, will protect the Senate in the exercise of the majority rule which he proposes.

In that connection let me point out that this morning in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which the able and distinguished junior Senator from Oregon is a member, we had a good example of what may happen in that respect. It is my understanding that at the committee meeting this morning the so-called repealer bill of the Taft-Hartley Act was brought up; and it is also my understanding that at that time the majority of the committee did not act in the way the Senator from Oregon has stated he has felt sure that majorities in the Senate would act if the proposed change in the rule were made. I understand that at the hearings on the proposed change in rule XXII the Senator was driven to say that he felt sure he could rely on the decency and fairness of majorities in the Senate. In describing majorities in such terms, I am sure the Senator did not mean to exclude the Members of the Senate now present in the Chamber. Nevertheless, I understand that this morning the committee to which I have referred refused to recognize the Senator from Oregon for the purpose of permitting him to present his amendment to the repealer bill to the Taft-Hartley Act, voted the Senator out of order for attempting to present his amendment, and voted that the bill be reported by the committee without any amendment whatsoever. I think that is an excellent example of just how effective the decency and sense of fairness and good sportsmanship to which the Senator from Oregon has referred would be when applied on the floor of the Senate as soon as an end were made to the power to debate and examine a question fully and fairly here.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senate to understand that the junior Senator from Oregon has already been denied the senatorial courtesy on which he has been relying?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know that I would use exactly that phrase, but I think that is what happened this morning, because as I understand the matter his confidence in relying upon majority rule in the Senate was based upon his feeling that the usual senatorial courtesy was inherent in the Members of this body, regardless of the Senate rules.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, who is making an excellent presentation, if the recent outburst here by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] because he could not fix the exact moment of voting to please his own convenience, is perhaps illustrative of what a sweet spirit of Christian charity and courtesy we might expect to find if we ever put into the hands of a majority of this body, which in some cases could be only 25 Senators, the power to gag Senators before they had an opportunity to speak. The Senator from New Hampshire became excited and "exploded all over the place" because he could not vote at a time convenient to himself, whereas there are on the floor a number of Senators who have not yet had an opportunity to present their views on this important issue.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I say to the Senator that I could not agree with him more heartily, and it seems to me that the idea of senatorial kindness and fair dealing is in many respects denied by the very submission of the proposal we are now considering. If all Senators are such good fellows and are so fair about all matters, why do some Senators wish to change the rule? Why are not we fair enough to let other Senators have due and fair treatment on the floor of the Senate? I cannot see any occasion for a change of the rule, under those circumstances.

Mr. President, if we carry that theory to its ultimate conclusion, we must decide that we do not need to have any rules whatsoever in the Senate and we do not need have a Presiding Officer to give us lectures when questions of this kind come up for consideration and tell us how to act. That would be entirely unnecessary, according to that theory. However, we know that it is necessary to have rules in the Senate, just as it is anywhere else.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Oregon, but only for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Is it the understanding of the Senator from Arkansas that the iron-curtain tactics which the Democrats used this morning in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare are comparable to the tactics which they could possibly be allowed to use under the cloture rule in the Senate which the junior Senator from Oregon has proposed?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is my belief that in the logical working out of the proposal the Senator from Oregon has made, he would find exactly that situation on the floor of the Senate.

Later, Mr. President, I shall discuss a little more fully a matter which I do not mind taking up now: I think the great error in the position of the Senator from Oregon is that he thinks he can guarantee that the change under consideration will go no further than his particular concept of what the rule should be. However, in view of the fact that the President says he favors simple majority cloture, which in its furthest extent could mean that 25 Senators could impose cloture, and in view of the great expansion of centralized government which has occurred all over the world, and certainly in this country, as the Senator from Oregon well knows, if he considers this matter seriously, I do not think he can correctly assume that the change in the rule he urges is the only change which would be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would observe that the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is permitted to join the Senators on the Democratic side and to speak there only by unanimous consent. [Laughter.]

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am only asking a question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I may say to the Chair that we are delighted to have the Senator from Oregon on this side of the aisle, and I think he is an excellent prospect for persuasion in this field. That is one of the justifications for carrying on these debates, which I hope are not too much aside from the point.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MORSE. Is it the understanding of the Senator from Arkansas that now, on another issue, the President of the United States has come to agree with the junior Senator from Oregon—namely, on the issue in regard to the majority vote principle in the Senate?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is my understanding from the press that on yesterday the President stated he was in favor of a simple majority cloture rule in the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator from Arkansas permit me to ask him one or two questions in regard to the procedure

which the junior Senator from Oregon has proposed to the Senate, and in regard to which the President of the United States seems to be in complete agreement: First, does the junior Senator from Arkansas agree that the junior Senator from Oregon has proposed a form of cloture that would allow the Senate to debate for a period of 96 hours after the invoking of cloture, if it were invoked?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I understand that that is the proposal made by the Senator from Oregon. The point I was making a moment ago is that there is no way by which the Senator from Oregon can assure us that that would be the actual rule a week after the adoption of his proposal, because it could be changed at any time to provide for simple majority cloture.

Mr. President, I do not wish to labor this point too long. I am not making a mere distinction between cloture by a simple majority, a constitutional majority, and a two-thirds majority. I am in accordance with the views taken by the authorities I have cited—such as Woodrow Wilson, before he was President. It is noteworthy that those were his views before he was President; and I mention that because it is true that once a man, even a man as highly educated and talented as was Woodrow Wilson, enters upon the performance of the duties of the office of President, he begins to feel the power which goes with that office, and then he changes his former views.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, does not the Senator from Arkansas think it is possible that the President always learns from experience?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; I think it is inherent in the possession of executive power for the person who possesses it to wish to destroy the power which rests in other branches of the Government. I think the examples we have of that are most persuasive; and I believe the Senator from Oregon is really very definitely in error when he assumes that the characteristics and tendencies demonstrated in the past by men in public life will not be demonstrated in the future by other men in public life. I do not think the Senator from Oregon can safely rely, as he seems to be doing, upon having Members of the Senate in the future act differently from the way that well known and outstanding persons in public life have acted in the past. That is the point I make to him now.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield for another question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Arkansas understand that under my resolution, after a majority has voted cloture, then Members of this body would have the right to farm out their hours of time in case they did not want to use it themselves?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do. I think I read every word of the Senator's testimony, and I have marked it. I may say that just before the Senator came on the floor, I had been quoting at considerable length from the Senator's testimony. I read it, and I believe I understand exactly what the Senator proposed.

Mr. MORSE. Did the Senator from Arkansas read the suggestion of the junior Senator from Oregon that an amendment may be desirable, namely, if we adopt the majority-vote cloture rule, it might be desirable then to adopt an additional rule that the rule of cloture cannot be changed thereafter except by two-thirds vote?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not recall that, I confess. I overlooked that. That becomes quite complicated. I did not notice it. I shall have to think about that, if it has any merit. It does not appeal to me at the moment as having any merit.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator will study it——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will study it. I think the Senator from Oregon would be surprised to know how closely I have read all his testimony and his record in this case during the past few days.

Mr. MORSE. I compliment the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Georgia for a question only.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does not the Senator from Arkansas think the chief vice in the proposal of the Senator from Oregon lies in the fact that under it a Senator has no chance to speak until after he has been defeated, for after cloture has once been voted, the adversary of a bill is in such a position that his views are of no consequence; they are not news? The gentlemen in the Press Gallery are not going to sit here after cloture has been voted and the issue has been determined. He has no opportunity to get his views and argument across to the country as a whole, and, even if he could find a Senator generous enough to give him an hour, it would be impossible for him to have a hearing. Since after only about half of 4 or 5 days in which to debate this important constitutional question, Senators are not present in any large numbers to hear even the distinguished and brilliant Senator from Arkansas present his views. I should like to ask him if he does not think it would be impossible to get them in with a log chain, after the issue had already been determined by a cloture vote, to hear anything, and would it not likewise be impossible to get the debate before the country? It would be news about the dead, after cloture had already been imposed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I may say to the Senator from Georgia that is entirely correct, but my point is one that goes much further. I am not really quibbling about the difference between a two-thirds majority and a constitutional majority or a simple majority. I do not think debate ought to be restricted at all. I think the fundamental character and function of the Senate would be changed by the adoption either of a two-thirds cloture rule or even a three-fourths rule, if the Senator wants to go that far. I would not say that, if necessary, it might not under some circumstances be three-fourths, and I think a suggestion was made to include the words "if necessary." But I believe it would be a great mistake to change the function of the Senate, which is a unique body in all history. No one, I care not how learned he may be, can ignore the fact that the system under which we operate has been most successful and is today, I think, the most successful system of government from the point of view of the ordinary human being and the ordinary values of what we usually refer to as western Christian civilization. There are many defects, I know, and we can put our finger on them; but, considering the over-all picture, what other country has made greater success? In contemplating the picture, can we fail to take into consideration the fact that the unique element in our Government is the Senate, with a traditional freedom of debate not found in any other legislative body in the world, with the possible exception of the British Parliament as it existed prior to last year? As we know, for all practical purposes, the upper House of the British Parliament has recently been eliminated.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In a moment. The over-all consideration it is difficult for me to escape is that executives in all governments are always tending to do the same thing, namely, absorb all other powers. Throughout the world, with a few exceptions, they have absorbed them all in recent years.

Other nations have had houses of representatives similar to our House of Representatives. I presume it is not becoming on our part to be too critical of the House, but many of us have been Members of that body, and we know it is a sort of conduit for legislation upon which they exercise very little influence. I think if one looks over the whole system the one thing that is unique and probably has contributed more than anything else to the success of the Government is the United States Senate. I think we should hesitate a long time before we begin kicking it around and changing its most distinctive characteristic. I now yield, for a question only, to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I myself am not led to the conclusion the Senator has disclosed, and I ask him, is it not a fact that in the larger number of cases, where it was admitted the present cloture rule was applicable, the Senate has not granted cloture, although the request was based upon a petition of the required 16 Senators?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct. There is a lot of refinement there. I mean, in several of the cases there was not even a majority.

Mr. PEPPER. That is the point, if the Senator will yield to me for another question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield for a further question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for another question only.

Mr. PEPPER. That is the point I wanted to ask the Senator about. If we start with the assumption to which the Senator has just referred, which I believe to be the record, that in the majority of cases where cloture was sought, although it was a case where rule XXII was admittedly applicable, the Senate has not chosen to grant cloture, I ask the able Senator, if that is true, does it not indicate that the power to use cloture in the Senate does not mean in any sense that the Senate will be ready to invoke cloture? In other words, are not the same safeguards still preserved for the Senate to retain the great traditions and the great liberties and privileges of this body, two-thirds having the power to invoke cloture, as is shown by the fact that while the rule was admittedly applicable, only in a very few cases when cloture has been sought has the Senate been willing to invoke it?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not believe the Senator from Florida was here when I began to discuss this particular aspect. To go back a moment——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the Senator if he will not kindly go over that, because I think the Senator from Florida is a fine possibility for a convert. He at one time favored majority cloture, and now has offered a cloture amendment, a gag amendment which, if the Senate must be gagged, is an amendment to be preferred to all of the others that have been offered.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to thank the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. On the point I was making, I may say to the Senator from Florida, I had just read several expressions of the junior Senator from Oregon. He was proceeding on the theory that we can rely upon "traditional courtesy," I believe he calls it, and decency, and a sense of sportsmanship. I read one or two statements. One of them, I think, is illustrative. It is a quotation from the statement of the Senator from Oregon, found at page 62 of the hearings. The chairman and other members had said, "After you make this change, the process is started, and it goes on, and there is no end to it, and you completely change the character of the Senate." The Senator from Oregon said:

> My honest and very sincere answer is I think there is no danger of it in the Senate because I simply believe in the decency and fairness of men, and I think that the historical traditions of the Senate are such that we need never fear the Senate's denying to the minority adequate time to make its case on the merits.

I think the Senator has completely confused cause and effect. The principal reason for the traditions, the decency, the mutual respect of the Senate, is because of the rule and the tradition of unlimited debate. If that is taken away, the whole basis is taken away. I do not mean that all the present Members, who have lived with the tradition, would change, but as new Members come in and are subjected to arbitrary action, there may develop as a result bitterness and lack of the decency by which the Senator has been so impressed.

I understand from the Senator from Oregon that there was certain action taken in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare this morning which was a demonstration of the arbitrary action of a majority in cutting off an opportunity even to offer an amendment by the minority. That is an illustration of what a majority can do and will do if unrestrained by unlimited debate.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. PEPPER. Is it not probable that the Senator's information, having come only from the able junior Senator from Oregon, might be a one-sided report of what happened in the committee this morning?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will say to the Senator that I am not a member of the committee. The junior Senator from Oregon is here. I felt that I was taking no chances in representing him when I stated what he had told me. I cannot pass judgment upon the accuracy of the statement.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator yield for a further statement?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. For a question only.

Mr. PEPPER. Has the Senator from Arkansas found other instances in which the Senator from Oregon has been diligent in pursuit of cloture for the other side, but has been persistent in support of the privilege to filibuster for his side?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will say to the Senator from Florida that there is a definition of cloture which I read before the Senator came in, and I think it applies exactly. I do not think the Senator from Oregon was here when I read it. It consists of only two lines, as follows:

> A filibuster is either a reprehensible artifice of a sinister opposition, or an ingenious and patriotic device of our friends for saving the people.

Then:

> A filibuster is an abomination unto the Lord and a very present help in trouble.

I think the Senator from Oregon was in trouble this morning and he wanted an opportunity to talk.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas permit me to ask him a question in the form of a reply?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Oregon be permitted to ask a question in the nature of a statement.

Mr. MORSE. I wished to ask the Senator from Arkansas a question. Will the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MORSE. Has the Senator from Arkansas always found the junior Senator from Oregon, without fail, ardently supporting the principle of majority rule on the floor of the Senate or in committee?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. So far as I know, that is correct, but I do not think that the action taken today will tend to reinforce his enthusiasm.

Mr. MORSE. May I ask the Senator from Arkansas if he is laboring under the impression that the junior Senator from Oregon believes it is necessary to have a rule of cloture, such as the existing one, in the Senate, in order to be assured that Members of the Senate will participate in fair play and good sportsmanship in recognizing minority rights?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is my view. I said that the basis for the courtesy and general good conduct of the Senate is the existence of the rule of unlimited debate, because each Senator knows that he cannot afford, as a practical matter, to build up personal enmities and feuds in a body as small as is the Senate, and invite attacks. He can differ, of course, on matters of legislation. The Senator knows what I mean as to the difference between personal attacks and offensive actions, and the conduct which characterizes the Senate. Each Senator knows that it has built up a tradition of respect. Some persons believe that by some mysterious influence a Senator acquires great respect for his fellow Members. The tradition of decency and fair dealing is a very nice thing. We all appreciate it. There is something in the Senate which accounts for it, and I think it is the tradition of unlimited debate. If I do not like some Senator and begin to be offensive about it, he can thwart me. One might think that if I am a member of the majority I would not care what I say to that Senator. But even though I am a member of the majority I do not want to have a falling-out with any Senator, because the relationship is more personal than that, and it always has been.

There is a description of this body by Woodrow Wilson, before he became President, when he was one of the leading authorities of the world on constitutional government. In his book on constitutional government he gave a description which was so good that I think I shall read it a little later. It is obvious that most of the Senators are not acquainted with it. It should be more persuasive with all Senators than would be anything I can say about it. I know that Senators do not have time to read good books. All they have time to do is to run errands and attend committee meetings.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. For a question only.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My question is, How will the adoption of this resolution change the character and attitude of Senators which the Senator from Arkansas has just been describing?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Because it would result, I think, in arbitrary action of the majority. I think a rule of that kind would soon change the whole character of this body. I am much too new a Member of the Senate to say these things on my own authority, and that is why, in responding to the Senator from Oregon, I wish to read into the record what Woodrow Wilson stated in 1908,

long before he was bothered about the particular things which are bothering the Senate at this time. He was recognized as one of the greatest constitutional scholars in the world. His description of this body is better than any that I have ever read. He tells why it would make a great difference. I have read, with great attention, his and several other authorities on the subject. To me it is very persuasive that those scholars agree with some of the greatest Senators who ever sat here. I said a while ago, before the majority leader came back into the Chamber, that he quoted the elder Henry Cabot Lodge, but he quoted from a statement which Henry Cabot Lodge made soon after he came to the Senate, whereas, after he had been here long enough to become well acquainted with the body, he took directly the opposite view and wrote a most powerful article on the subject, which will be found in the hearings. He said that all new Senators come here with an instinctive desire to reform its rules, but that after they have been here a while they have almost invariably changed their minds.

There are wonderful and clear statements in the back of the hearings by men such as Borah, Lodge, Robinson, and Reed. I think there will be found among them some of the greatest public figures we have had in the last century.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Oregon was on his feet first. I will yield to him for a question only.

Mr. MORSE. Is it the Senator's position that we need the present cloture rule in its present form in order to insure the minority a fair hearing?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. To me the present cloture rule is of no significance at all. We got along for nearly 100 years without that rule, quite as well as we are getting along now. I should be quite willing, if the Senator desires to abolish the present rule, to have that done and to leave the rules as they were before 1917. I think that would be in accord with the arguments and consistent with my position on the rules of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Then, is it the position of the Senator from Arkansas that the minority, in order to have its rights in the Senate protected, should be entitled to a parliamentary procedure that permits it to control the majority?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; I think the Senator is entirely wrong in the way he puts the question, that is, the assumption that the minority controls. It is true that in these matters there is no easy way to make the distinction. What the minority has the right to do is to exercise the power of resistance to arbitrary action by the majority. That, I think, is a much clearer and much closer and more accurate description of what happens. Actually, the experience in the Senate, under this rule or without the rule, is that very few measures for which there was real support, I am almost tempted to say that no measures which a clear and strong majority of the American people have favored, have been defeated. Some have been delayed. Before the Senator came in I mentioned the only body similar to ours that played a function like ours was the old House of Lords, which had the power of delay. It did, but it has it no longer. It did have it when that was a really great and powerful country. It is the power to delay which forces explanations, consideration, and all that, that is significant.

I never approve reminding Senators of what they have said before, because I think that is a bad practice, but I have in mind something which occurred such a short time ago that I do not think the junior Senator from Oregon would mind my referring to it.

Mr. MORSE. Not at all.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I recall what great pride the Senator took in a little delay he indulged in a while ago. The only difference between his point of view and mine was that he thought a week was enough time to take because it was sufficient in that particular instance. As I recall, I read, to begin with, that this basic change in our fundamental structure is presented as an attempt to bring about a little change. There is now before us an entirely different question. The proposal is for a permanent change in the rules of the Senate. In consideration of that kind of a change, I would say we need some deliberation, because I do not think many people really understand it, and I believe 90 percent of the press is completely in the dark as to what it means. The first article I read that really showed an understanding of it was the article by Walter Lippmann which I have read today. Did the Senator see that?

Mr. MORSE. I saw it, in the Washington Post.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with what Mr. Lippmann says in that article. The Senator from Oregon wanted the country given time to understand his bill, involving labor, I think it was, although I have forgotten for the moment. The Senator referred to it two or three times in the hearing. I congratulate the Senator. He was in effect carrying on a little private filibuster, giving the country time to understand what was involved. The Senator was quite frank to admit that to be so; I agreed with him, and did not try to cut him off.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Arkansas recognize the difference between prolonged debate to postpone a vote to a time definite and certain, and a filibuster which seeks to prevent a vote from ever occurring on an issue?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the distinction which the Senator draws is just like the distinction in this book—if one takes the position strongly that this is a desirable resolution, anything that is said is a filibuster. Consider this debate. The Senator will agree that on the first day, when the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] made a 40-minute speech, I believe it was—and I think the Senator from Oregon will admit he speaks very well on this floor—every newspaper in the country said the filibuster was on, did it not?

Mr. MORSE. Would the Senator from Arkansas say that he disagreed with that?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am only calling attention to that fact, which is a fact.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to be protected in my right to the floor, and I am willing to yield only for a question. I see the majority leader on his feet, and I understand they are determined to hold our feet to the fire in this whole business, and we must not deviate one iota from the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. For a question only.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator agree with me that the pending question is a simple motion to take up a resolution?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is my understanding that that is what it is—a motion to take up an amendment to the rules.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator will agree with me also that in these circumstances the motion to take up a measure could require at least 3 months, if Senators desired to debate it that long. Is that correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not quite follow the Senator's suggestion.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator agree with me that those who are seeking to delay this motion to consider a resolution could debate it, if they so desired, for a period of 3 months?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes; it is possible. I do not expect that, but it is possible.

Mr. LUCAS. It is possible to do that. There have been filibusters which lasted for a long time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thought it was very unwise to bring up this resolution, if that is the point. I think it was a great mistake to bring it up. [Laughter.]

Mr. LUCAS. Let me ask the distinguished, brilliant, progressive, and liberal Senator from Arkansas——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I appreciate the Senator's compliment

Mr. LUCAS. Whether he conscientiously believes that the Senate of the United States should stay for 3 months on a simple motion to take up a resolution?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not. I will say to the Senator I think the motion should be withdrawn at the first opportunity and abandoned. [Laughter.] I see no excuse for its being here at all. But I have no choice in the matter. It is here, and I have not the power to withdraw it. If I had, I would withdraw it right now.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. Would the Senator object to a unanimous-consent request for an insertion in the RECORD?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I shall make that unanimous-consent request, if that is what the Senator desires.

Mr. BALDWIN. That is what I want.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Without prejudice to my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without prejudice to the Senator's right to the floor, he may make the request.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I ask unanimous consent, without prejudice to my right to the floor, to yield to the Senator from Connecticut for the purpose of his making an insertion in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the Senator very much.

[Mr. BALDWIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a certain article, which appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I am quite unable to take any responsibility for the motion which the Senator from Illinois has made. I do not think any Senator opposing this motion is responsible for its being the pending question. The majority leader knew quite well what to expect when it was brought up. There was no secret about it; it has been up before. The trouble is that it involves a matter of far deeper and more profound significance, I think, than has ever been realized by the people of the country generally and by the Members of the Senate, but since it is brought up, involving, I think, a fundamental change that ranks in importance with a change in the Constitution, I think it has to be debated thoroughly.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator assume any responsibility whatsoever for keeping the pending motion from coming to a vote?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The only responsibility I assume is to the extent that I think it is necessary to inform the Senate—and I hope that some of the Members will be influenced thereby—of what I believe to be the true and very pertinent observations made by such individuals as Woodrow Wilson, respecting the significance of this matter. I do assume the responsibility, under the circumstances, of taking adequate time to present the case as well as I know how. I will say to the Senator that if he will look back at my record in the Senate he will find that I have taken up very little time of the Senate. In fact, this is the first time I have made a speech this year, and I do avoid taking much time in the Senate. It is with considerable reluctance that I make any speeches at all, because this is notoriously the worst forum, I suppose, so far as attention goes, particularly in the case of a new Senator. The Senator from Illinois knows that there are rarely three or four or five Members present when a new Senator speaks. After a Senator has reached the eminence of the majority leader, of course, he then receives very respectful and courteous and close attention. But when a new Senator speaks upon the floor of the Senate it is difficult to secure a quorum, and when a quorum is secured, to have even half a dozen Senators present while the Member is making his speech. So I have no desire to prolong the debate merely for the fun of speaking. It is no particular fun for me to speak. But I consider this to be one of the most important subjects that has been before the Senate since I have been here, because it changes the fundamental part of our Government, as opposed to measures dealing with transitory things, things which are here today and gone tomorrow.

The Senator from Illinois is on his feet. Does he wish to ask me to yield for another question?

Mr. LUCAS. No, Mr. President; I thought the Senator had about finished his speech.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No, Mr. President. Because of many interruptions which have been made I have just begun my speech. I may say I am only on page 4. I was quite astounded, and I may say highly complimented at the questions and by the interest which has been evinced this afternoon over the remarks I have had to offer. I had no idea that either the majority leader would be here or that so many Members would be present today. There are more Senators present now than I have seen before this week. The questions asked of me have delayed me in my presentation. I have just really begun. [Laughter.] I believe the Senator will agree that what I have said has been to the point. I do not intend to wander one iota from the point, or in any way to bring in any extraneous matter. If I do bring in any extraneous matter I hope the majority leader will call my attention to it, because it will have been unintentional on my part if I do so.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Louisiana for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana for a question, but I do want to get on. As the Senator from Illinois has reminded me, it is time for me to get along.

Mr. LONG. By way of illustrating the same point the Senator has been making, I wish to ask if the Senator is aware of the fact that in the hearings held by the Committee on Rules and Administration, although there were four new members on that committee, the Republican minority on the committee attempted to report the change proposed in the rules without any hearings whatsoever? Every member of the Republican minority voted to report the resolution without any hearings whatsoever, although four new members were on the committee, and three of them had never before heard the issue discussed. Does the Senator know further that two Senators, who were new members of the committee, changed their minds almost completely during the course of the hearing, based on what they heard said by the witnesses who came to testify with regard to the change in the rules?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will say, Mr. President, in answer to the question of the Senator from Louisiana, that I did not know that. But, at the beginning of my remarks, I quoted the words of, I believe it was from Senator Townsend, of Michigan, who said that most new Senators are instinctively in favor of reforming the rules of the Senate. So the preponderant number of new Senators have the instinctive desire to make a change in the rules. When they first arrive in the Senate their natural instinct is to reform its rules.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator aware of the fact that there are certain Members of the United States Senate who are actually being tortured in their consciences, and if the debate now going on tortures their consciences longer, they may seek to preserve the sacred rules of the United States Senate?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have noticed in the last day of two a very decided interest in preserving the integrity of the United States Senate from the encroachment of the Executive. The fundamental effect of this proposed change is just beginning to dawn upon a number of Senators. As I said in the beginning, what is proposed to be done is disguised as only a move to pass civil-rights legislation. It is true that civil-rights legislation is involved, but that is, as I have said, a rather minor aspect of it. The most important thing inherent in what is proposed to be done is the change in the character of the Senate itself, and the function it plays.

I believe what the Senator from Louisiana has said is quite correct. All that Senators need is a little longer exposure to the facts of the case.

As I previously said, Mr. President, I did want to place in the RECORD two other remarks made by the junior Senator from Oregon. I wanted to place them in the RECORD in order to fortify the point I made regarding his idea as to why we need not fear a change. I quote from page 64 of the hearings. This is the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] speaking:

> Senator MORSE. I think from the very beginning of the history of the Senate up to the present date, if you study that history, you will see a very brilliant thread running through it, a thread that binds the thinking of the Senate together on the proposition that minority rights and minority points of view must always have their day in court in the Senate. Thus you will find great historical instances in which Senators of diametrically opposing views see to it that the other fellow, who on that particular occasion may be in the minority, is given sufficient time to debate his point of view on the merits on the floor of the Senate, and I don't think you will ever drive that protection out of the Senate.

That, Mr. President, is a completely false assumption. I read another sentence from the Senator from Oregon on page 69. When asked if he did not think any political pressure would build up from a party standpoint around the adoption of the so-called Morse rule, he said:

> I do not. I think men will be fair under my rule.

Mr. President, if that be true, why not leave the rule as it is? If men are fair under the rule, why not leave the rule as it is? The Senator apparently thinks we are not being fair under the present

rule, but that everyone will be fair under his rule.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let me make one further statement.

I appreciate, as I know all other Senators appreciate, the compliment implied by the statement by the able Senator from Oregon, but I submit that his assumption is naive and completely erroneous and false. I agree that there is an unusual and extremely happy tradition of courtesy and fair dealing in the Senate, but I am absolutely sure that the principal reason for the respect and consideration with which Senators treat each other is the knowledge that to do otherwise would be more than likely to result in a personal feud which could thwart every action desired by the offending Member. Under the present rules, even a Member of the majority party cannot afford to be rude and offensive to the minority. How often did I marvel at the patience and restraint of the former leader of this body in the Seventy-ninth Congress when I first came here. Although then the majority leader, who is now the distinguished Vice President of the United States, could, if he had had the power to clamp down cloture at any time, have disregarded other Senators, the Senator will recall with what great care he sought a little support from all Members. I think that condition would not obtain under the Senator's proposal. I am confident of that purely as a matter of human nature.

I now yield for a question only to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wanted to ask the Senator from Arkansas if he recognizes, as of course he does, the difference between desire on the part of men to be fair under any rule, and the desire on the part of men in the minority, when they have the power to control the majority by their tactics, some day to make the maximum use of a minority-rule role.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will say to the Senator that I have already commented on that. I do not believe it is a matter of control. We cannot force any action. There is a great difference between acting affirmatively to impose one's will, and reaching a point of no action at all. I think the Senator from Oregon knows that to be true in many instances in life. I will grant to the Senator that many things in government, particularly the British form of government, and our system of government, are not exactly logical. They and we did not reach our systems of government by logic, as the French attempted to do and have completely failed. As an illustration, take the question of proportional representation, which sounds logical to a good Democrat. It ought to appeal to him. But the Senator well knows that it has been a complete failure wherever it has been used, except in a few small communities. Yet logically it is a fine thing. It is just as logical as the Senator's proposal about majorities.

To me there are certain things about our Government which are difficult to explain. I cannot prove the connection between the customs in the Senate and the result. All I can say is that I have a feeling that in this very complex system of ours the one unique element in it, the Senate of the United States must have a great bearing on it. I feel that it does. I cannot prove it.

The Senate has brought into our Government throughout its history a toleration and moderation that no other government has had, with the exception I have mentioned, in which there was a similar device. I refer to the British Parliament. In all other cases governments went through periods of democracy, that is, democratic forms. They had constitutions more beautiful than ours. The Russian constitution today reads better than ours. On paper, it protects all the rights with which we are concerned, but the Senator knows that in practice it does not do any of those things. It has no relation to the actual reality of government.

The same statement can be made about government in many other countries. The Senator knows history better than I. He knows what happened in Italy. I have a little summary of that, just a page or two in a document issued by the House. In spite of the forms of democracy, it is shown how the executive operated within those forms and took away all the power.

The first thing Hitler did was not to abolish the legislature. He used the legislature. He went through the form of being elected, and then, of course, he kicked it out. He was a great liberal when he came in. He offered all sorts of things to the workingmen. He formed labor fronts, and did many other things.

Back in Roman days the emperors were the first to start courting the mob. We all know that. Why is it that this particular government, of all the governments of the world, has been so successful in preserving fundamental human rights? For lack of any better argument, I will say that the Senate has been responsible in large part, because it is a unique part of our Government. With all due deference to the House of Representatives, I cannot see any great difference between its practices or role and those of any other legislative body, whether it be in our States or abroad, with the exception of the British Parliament. It is a legislative body, with the customary procedure, which subjects it to an extreme degree of control, as the Senator well knows.

I think it would be a wonderful thing if the Senator from Oregon could serve for 2 or 3 years in the House when the opposite party was in control. I believe he would find that there are very few Members of the House who could not give him some very interesting observations about the rights of Members of the House under their organization.

I have endeavored to express what I think about the Senate. Partly, I suppose, it is a feeling rather than a strictly logical explanation; but I feel that in the absence of being shown where else in our system of government there is something that accounts for the success of the American system I must adhere to that view. Under our system of government we successfully reconcile the diverse interests of 48 independent States. In a sense, they are equivalent to 48 nations. How can we explain the reconciliation of their differences in a successful government except through the Senate, as being the most significant element of our Government. At least, I have not been told of any better explanation.

Mr. President, it has often been said that the right of free debate is the only real protection of the rights of minorities, which is true; but it is not so generally recognized that the same right to have one's say is of the very essence of what is called the courtesy or the spirit of fair dealing among individual Senators. This spirit of fair play, in which the most unpopular Senator is treated with respect and consideration, may seem to be unimportant and trivial to the unthinking, but I firmly believe that it is one of the principal reasons why, with one exception, the people of this great country have been able to live in peace and prosper as they have. It surely cannot be seriously believed that it is purely accidental that Americans, composed of all the races of Europe plus a sprinkling of several others, have been so successful in living together in harmony and peace, and with freedom. I know that it is comforting and pleasing to think that we, as a people, somehow possess some mysterious virtue which others do not possess, that somehow we are different, and that our personal excellence accounts for our success. There are occasions in our public life when it is appropriate to take that view, but neither science nor reason will support it. It is my belief that what virtue we possess as a community is to a great extent due to our system of government, and that the most unique and significant part of that system is the Senate of the United States, as now constituted and regulated by its own rules of procedure.

The point has been made in this debate that because of the increased volume of legislation which now comes before the Senate we must streamline our procedure, and that to do this we must limit debate, if not eliminate it altogether. I grant that something, perhaps, should be done to lessen the amount of time consumed by Senators in coping with the enormous volume of mail and the almost continuous stream of visitors. I think that is what takes most of the time of Senators, and makes it difficult for them to fulfill their functions. I do not know the answer to that difficulty except to pass a law doubling the number of hours in each day. I suppose that some of those who have such great confidence in the effectiveness of law would feel that that was a proper approach to the problem. But the very fact that today we have legislation dealing with so many more aspects of our daily life than we formerly had is, I think, a persuasive reason why we should retain the integrity of the Senate.

My feeling, of course, is based upon the further thought that we wish to preserve our freedom, and, insofar as possible, the integrity of our local and State governments. I grant that if we are ready to abandon the concept of a Federal state and adopt the completely centralized system which has been such a signal failure in Europe and Asia, then

there is no need to be concerned about the Senate.

I submit, Mr. President, that the Federal system is the only system that has been successful on a scale comparable to ours in extent and size, and which at the same time has preserved any appreciable degree of human dignity and human freedom. The only case I can think of which might be regarded as an exception is Great Britain during the last century. However, I should like to point out the fact that during the period of her greatness, the period when she controlled a diverse and large area of the world, Great Britain also had a device in her Parliament which served a purpose similar to that now served by the Senate. During that period the Upper House of the Parliament also had the power to consider and delay the legislation of the House of Commons. It is only since England has shrunk to a mere shadow of her former self that the power of the Upper House has been almost eliminated. Perhaps that is not merely a coincidence. I am not sure about that, but at least that is what has happened. Personally I do not think this country is quite ready for that move yet. I do not believe that we have quite reached that period in our history when we are ready to assume fewer responsibilities.

It is true, of course, that large countries have been ruled by a centralized government in the past, and there is one outstanding example today. But in every case those countries had very little, if any, regard for the ordinary human being, and to a great extent relied upon slavery. For a time Rome was a centralized republic; but being unable to renew her strength, she fell into the evil ways of tyranny under the emperors, and passed from the scene.

Today Russia is a centralized dictatorship. She is powerful now, but I venture to predict that her strength within her present political system, if that persists, will not be increased relative to her resources, because she is stifling the originality, the energy, and the spirit of her people.

The point which I try to make is a difficult one to lay down in simple terms. I believe that the spirit of freedom in this country, and the ability to reconcile the diverse interests of the country go back to the Senate more than any other place, because that is where those diversities are represented more than in any other place.

I think the Senate will agree, Mr. President, that in the actions and the freedom of the individual Senators who compose this body there is much greater diversity than exists in any other body of our Government.

Under our Federal system not only have we become strong and powerful, as demonstrated in two wars, but up to now we have preserved the basic freedoms of our people. I think one of the principal reasons for that situation is the fact that in preserving the integrity of the various component parts of our federation, we have, to a considerable extent, preserved the diversity which is essential to progress. Each of the 48 States is, in a sense, a laboratory for social and political experiment and development. No one of them, and certainly not the Federal Government, is endowed with omniscience and final wisdom. Mistakes are made, of course; but all the States have an opportunity to learn from the mistakes of the others. Of course, I may say that there are many successes, as well as mistakes. Successes are very common, and the Federal Government should learn from the successes of those various laboratories.

In any case, the net result has been the development of a society with energy, vitality, originality, and resourcefulness. The principal fear I have for the future of our Nation is the possible elimination of that diversity, with a resulting standardization of our ideas and aspirations—a development which is threatened more and more because of the increase in the power and scope of the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I know that in many instances the proponents of certain measures have very carelessly used all kinds of propaganda, and have characterized those of us who oppose them as constituting a dictatorship, and all that. I do not wish to be extreme in what I say, and to apply such terms to the proponents of any measure, even the one we are now discussing, or to say that that is the ultimate objective of the administration in this case. Nevertheless, it is apparent that it is the diverse character of the States which has enabled them to preserve the originality of their progress and has enabled our people to become the most powerful and prosperous and free of all the peoples in the world.

Mr. President, in addition to my interest in protecting the integrity of our Federal system I think that in doing so we may encourage a very salutary development in the world. As many Senators know, I have long been interested in the accomplishment of a federation of the western states of Europe. One of the most persuasive reasons in that respect is the experience this country has had. Let us consider for a moment various illustrations that are in point in that connection. Some persons think that the people of western Europe are determined that nothing shall be done along the line of accomplishing a federation of the countries in which they live. However, I do not think so. I think those people are interested in the proposal and are willing to work out a solution of that problem. On the other hand, they are interested in preserving their cultural differences, differences of language, and so forth. I agree that such differences should not be destroyed, for they constitute one of the principal safeguards of the individuality of the states, and the individuality of the states composing a federation must be preserved if a sound system capable of the maximum of progress is to be developed and maintained.

Some persons may take the position that the idea of having a federation of the western states of Europe is fantastic, and that there is no possibility that such a federation will be developed. However, I say that such a federation must eventually come into being. It would possess central strength for military, currency, and other purposes; but it would also maintain the individuality of the component states in the cultural sense, as well as the right of the exercise of the police power on local levels.

Of course, I have a considerable interest in this matter, because for more than 2 years I have been urging such a federation, and I have cited Poland as a clear illustration of the necessity for the adoption by the countries of western Europe of a federal system comparable to our own. I realize that there would be differences between such a federal system and ours, and I would not for a moment expect to impose upon them the same kind of system we have. But I am sure they must adopt the principle of federation, by which those 16 western European countries can be joined together. I believe the hope of such a development is the only justification for the Marshall plan. If today I were positively convinced that there were no chance of the development of such a federation among those countries, I would be opposed to an extension of the Marshall plan.

Senators will recall that last year I attempted to have the Senate adopt a resolution stating, as a matter of policy, that the Senate was in favor of the establishment of such a federation among the western European nations; and I intend to offer such a resolution again, this year, for I have not given up hope that the Senate will endorse the statement of policy I have presented, and I have not given up hope that the countries of western Europe themselves have given up all hope of achieving such a federation. If it is true that those countries still hope to achieve a federation, that is justification for the sacrifices we have made under the Marshall plan. On the other hand, if it is not true, then I would say that except for the humanitarian aspects of that program and except insofar as we have saved people—which according to our ethics, is a proper and right thing to do—the Marshall plan is a mistake; that it is a mistake when we go beyond those aspects of the situation. In other words, I think any part of that program which may be attributable to a desire to have those countries become rehabilitated as independent areas in the world will be a failure, because I think that under existing conditions if those nations remain separate and unfederated, they can no longer be self-sustaining or can defend themselves or can ever go off relief rolls, so to speak—in other words be independent of either this country and the Western World or of Russia. Certainly, under existing circumstances, if the countries of western Europe remain separate and distinct, they must be dependent on either America or Russia. The countries of western Europe cannot be the great force for progress and civilization that they were in the last century unless they can bring themselves into a federal system.

To my mind—and I think it would also be to European minds—the great recommendation of a federal system is the fact that it offers a means of preserving the individuality of the states; and, to my mind, the basic institution of all the institutions in our government which accounts for that system is the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, I hope I have not entirely misled the Members of the Senate regarding that particular point. As I see it, it is the principal point in this whole matter. A moment ago I referred to Woodrow Wilson. I now hold in my hand a volume entitled "Constitutional Government in the United States." In view of the discussion which has taken place, I shall read one chapter of this volume to the Senate. At first, I did not intend to read it, because I thought at least some Members of the Senate were acquainted with this work. However, from the discussion this afternoon it is quite obvious that very few Senators, if any, have had an opportunity to read the chapter of the book to which I refer. Accordingly, I think it is quite worth while and, in fact, necessary that this particular portion of the book be read to the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator state the date of this book by the great Woodrow Wilson?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe it is 1908; the prefatory note is dated March 24, 1908.

Mr. MORSE. Can the Senator tell me what official connection the great Wilson had with the Federal Government prior to his writing of that book?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I must confess to the Senator from Oregon that I am not clear as to that; I do not recall.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit another question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not true that that book was written prior to Woodrow Wilson's coming into the Federal service?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes; it was written prior to his becoming President of the United States. I thought I had made that point clear. I do not recall that he had any connection with the Federal Government prior to 1908. If the Senator knows of it, very well; I did not know it.

Mr. MORSE. I was merely laying the foundation for a question I wanted to ask. It is true, is it not, as the Senator has previously said today, that after Woodrow Wilson became President and had the practical experience of serving as Chief Executive of the country and observing the operation of the Senate from the vantage point of the White House, he considerably changed the point of view as to the Senate which he set forth in the 1908 book?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I may say to the Senator I made that point. I think it is inherent that any President who has been thwarted in any degree, any President who has any ambition—and he certainly had—becomes impatient at the delay and obstruction of his proposals of legislation. I am glad the Senator brought that up. I hope I do not fail, before I finish, to read a very short statement as to the history of the way both Hitler and Mussolini handled their legislative matters. An executive always thinks the legislative body is thwarting him, and I may say all of them become impatient. My criticism of the present President of the United States is not exclusively applicable to him. I think he is doing only what human nature will cause anybody to do who assumes that high office, an office which is almost too powerful for any human being to have. The more power they have, the more they always want to restrict and curb the only body in the government possessing even a slight degree of independence. I think that is why they changed their minds. But I would say the considered opinion of this great scholar, while still at Princeton and considering the matter in an objective manner, was far better than an opinion expressed by a participant in a battle over some issue which may have been before the Senate. The Senator from Oregon having been a professor, he will, I think, agree with that conclusion.

Mr. MORSE. I may say I never attained the level of scholarship, but I did seek to do a little teaching. What a different course I should teach on legislation now from what I today believe to have been the very poor course I taught without the practical experience I have had since I have been in the Senate.

I am sure the Senator wants the record perfectly clear, and that he does not wish to have in the RECORD any basis for a misinterpretation by anyone, to the effect that the Senator from Arkansas thinks Woodrow Wilson at any time used any of the executive devices of Hitler or Mussolini.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think it fair for the Senator to characterize it that way. I said that all the executives I know of, without exception, if they had any spirit at all, displayed that propensity. We have had some who took no interest in matters. But all executives who have been in the slightest degree ambitious and possessed of strong personalities have always attacked and had trouble with their legislatures, in any democratic system. In many cases I say the executives have eliminated the influence of the legislature and have completely abolished it, because it is the one source of opposition to their exercise of power. I say that is human nature. It is no reflection upon any particular President or any particular dictator. That is the usual course. It has been a struggle ever since the beginning of time for a legislature to keep itself alive and effective. Going back to Roman times, what was the principal quarrel at the beginning of the decline of the Roman Republic? It was a quarrel between the senate and the proconsuls, who later became the first emperors. I forget their names at the moment; I am somewhat rusty on history myself. But the Senator well knows the story. That was the principal story. The Senate in Rome was the guardian of the constitution of the Republic, and it was finally eliminated by the emperor. In such circumstances it is the usual thing for legislative bodies to be wiped out. That is all I meant to leave on the record with respect to President Wilson. He had one difficult experience, as we know, and he may have had others. The difficult experience to which I refer related to the arming of merchant ships. I familiarized myself with the case. I do not know whether the Senator did or not. I did not look up the actual proceedings in the RECORD, but I read a book describing it. The bill was brought into the Senate. I merely cite it to show a condition of impatience; but it was wartime, as the Senator will remember. It showed the impatience of the President. I think the bill was brought to the Senate on the 28th of February. The Congress then in session had to adjourn, I think, within 4 days. One of the Senators who discussed it, according to my notes, was the late Senator Norris. A statement by Senator Norris is my principal source of information. It was not a filibuster, although it is always listed among the bills killed by filibusters.

He said they did not really have adequate time for debate, that the reason it had been killed was that it was considered during wartime, and everybody thought it ought to be passed immediately. Within 4 days it was necessary for the Congress to adjourn. If I am wrong, I hope the Senator will correct me. I think that is the story as given by the late Senator George W. Norris. He said it was never classified as a filibuster, and should not have been; that there was not even time for legitimate debate, and no filibuster tactics were pursued. Yet it has always been called a filibuster. It is listed in the pamphlet issued by the Legislative Reference Service as a terrible filibuster.

Mr. MORSE. It is true, is it not, that during the discussion of the bill the then senior Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. La Follette, held the floor at great length, with interruptions, and that he participated in and prolonged the discussion of that particular bill?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the Senator say that the 4-day discussion of a bill of that importance in view of the long isolationist policy of the country was an undue and unconscionable length of time, under his own theory of giving the country a little time to understand what we are getting into, for which he was willing to talk a week on a matter I should say of much less international importance? I think the time was limited to 4 days. I do not recall that Senator La Follette or any one man took up most of the time. I recall Senator Norris positively said there was not time for legitimate discussion even by those who approved of the measure.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator recall, in his study of the bill of 1917, providing for the arming of merchant ships, that many of the speeches made during that particular debate bore very little relationship to the subject matter of the bill, and therefore could not very well be called debate on the merits of the issue? That is the point the junior Senator from Oregon is constantly making in regard to his insistence on the right to discuss the merits of an issue.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am afraid I am not qualified to say. I do not recall that particular point. I know the President was very much irritated about it and

condemned the Senate. But I may say further on that point—and I think the Senator from Oregon and all other Senators will agree with me—that in wartimes we have always made concessions to what we call our usual governmental practice. We delegate power to the President. We have naturally found later that many persons thought the delegated powers were unconstitutional, and all that, but we do it under the stress of war. I do not think it really is justifiable to rely too much on what happened in wartime under those circumstances, when we come to judge what ought to be done by our Government as a permanent practice. I cite that case merely because of Senator Norris' characterization of it. He was here I think at the time. He said it never should have been classified as a real filibuster.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit one further question? Then I shall desist.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MORSE. Is my understanding correct that the Senator, who is about to read a chapter from Wilson's book on constitutional government, the chapter dealing with the Senate, thinks that it should be given greater weight by the Members of the Senate in this particular debate because of the fact that Mr. Wilson wrote it while still a professor at Princeton University, without having had any practical experience in the Federal Government, in preference to the views set forth on the issue after he had been in the White House and had an opportunity, from experience, to observe the operation of the filibuster rule?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will say to the Senator that, to my mind, there is no question of the superiority of his judgment before he had become infected by the virus of executive power in the White House. I think it does something to a man, particularly now that this Nation is the most powerful one in the world and has great responsibilities in all fields, especially in the domestic field. I think it does something to the judgment of men in connection with the question of power. I do not think it improves at all the quality of judgment on a question which deals with the fundamental relationship of our governmental powers under the Constitution. I am speaking of our system of checks and balances and the basic theory of our government, that no particular part of it should be allowed to concentrate or accumulate all of the powers of government. I think it is as natural as that day follows night that when a man becomes President of the United States he does not like opposition. He soon reaches a point at which he knows all the answers and wants everyone to do what he directs. I think they all do it. I do not believe, under those circumstances, such a man is a good judge of governmental powers.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MORSE. Would the Senator say that Members of this body should discount materially the recommendations of former President Hoover in regard to the reorganization of the Government simply because he has at some time been subjected, to use the Senator's language, to the virus of executive power?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not understand that his recommendations in any respect go to the fundamental relations of the powers of the Government. They are concerned only with the efficiency of the executive arm. I would say that his recommendations as to constitutional changes, whether the Supreme Court should be abolished, or the Senate should be merged with the House, would have very little significance. It is purely as a business operation of the Government that he makes recommendations. I have not seen his full report. But the question we are discussing deals with basic political power in the Government, not simply the organization of a bureau in order to try to make one man do the work of the two men who are now doing it, which is really a question of economy.

There seems to be a feeling that the Senate should be made more efficient. That is not what is wrong. It need not be efficient, but it should be wise in the results it reaches. One of the principal objectives of the proponents of a change in the rule is efficiency.

As the late Senator Reed said on one occasion, we already have laws enough to last us 10,000 years. What this body needs is the wisdom which should result from deliberation. I know that the Senator from Oregon has contributed a great deal to the reflection and deliberation of this body, and I may say he has contributed much wisdom in many respects. The only explanation I can offer for his present attitude is that he is interested in so many different things that he has not had an opportunity to let his very powerful mind examine this question thoroughly.

The Senator himself said in the hearings:

> We liberals have to spread ourselves so thin that we do not get to give all the attention we should like to, sometimes, to these problems.

It was something to that effect that the Senator said.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. When I read it, it gave me hope. I could see that the Senator had not had an opportunity to study the question with the thoroughness which he usually gives to a matter such as the Taft-Hartley Act, for instance. If the Senator understood the importance of this question, and had studied it as seriously as he has studied labor legislation, I have no doubt he would agree with me as to the merits of the question before us. The Senator will admit that one of the great defects is the lack of time in which to study and understand the basic merits of a question such as this.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. For a question only.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator permit me to give him my complete assurance that I know of no problem I have ever studied more carefully than I have studied the filibuster problem, or one as to which I could be more convinced of the soundness of my position that minority rule in the Senate of the United States must be ended by the defeat of the present filibuster?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In view of the Senator's experience this morning, I am really surprised at his conclusion. I was sure he would think minority rights are just as palatable as the domination and the arbitrary and tyrannical rule of a majority such as was imposed upon the Senator this morning.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator for a question only.

Mr. LONG. In regard to the conflicting statements of the late President Wilson, would it not seem to the Senator that the earlier statement, made at the time when he was studying the question from a detached point of view, would certainly carry much greater weight than would his statement at a later date, when he was obviously prejudiced and aroused by having been thwarted by the Senate at that time?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is no question about that, in my mind. The passions which were aroused because of the difficulties in preparing for war and the impatience in getting on with the task would cause him to have that view. In contrast with a man who happens to become the Chief Executive, we have the great weight of experience of persons who have come to the Senate. They think the procedure should be reformed immediately, but after a slight experience of a few years, almost invariably they change their minds about it. So there is no doubt in my mind that the opinion of the late President Wilson in 1908 was a much more detached, objective, and sound one than that which he expressed under the pressure of trying to carry on the war.

Mr. President, I mentioned a moment ago that I wanted to read one chapter for the RECORD. I hope the RECORD will be of sufficient interest to many Members so that they will read the chapter. Perhaps quite a number of them will have an opportunity to get the book from the Library and read it. It is written in a very fine style and is an extremely interesting treatment of the subject, so I do not think it will bore any of the Members of this body.

I quote:

> It is very difficult to form a just estimate of the Senate of the United States. No body has been more discussed; no body has been more misunderstood and traduced. There was a time when we were lavish in spending our praises upon it. We joined with our foreign critics and appreciators in speaking of the Senate as one of the most admirable, as it is certainly one of the most original, of our political institutions. In our own day we have been equally lavish of hostile criticism. We have suspected it of every malign purpose, fixed every unhandsome motive upon it, and at times almost cast it out of our confidence altogether.

One gathers that from hearing the discussion today this could have been written this week, so far as its occurrence goes.

> The fact is that it is possible in your thought to make almost anything you please out of the Senate. It is a body variously compounded, made many-sided by containing many elements, and a critic may concentrate his attention upon one element at a time if he chooses, make the most of what is good and put the rest out of sight, or make more than the most of what is bad and ignore everything that does not chime with his thesis of evil.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, when the Senate resumes its session in recess, the Senator from Arkansas be permitted to continue to occupy the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Reserving the right to object, may I ask the Senator from Illinois the length of time he expects the Senate to be in session tomorrow, so far as he can tell at the present time?

Mr. LUCAS. It is a little difficult for me to anticipate how long the session will last. It may depend somewhat upon the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if I may interject, if the Senator is asking my view, I would much prefer to go over until Monday. I should not like to detain the Senate at all tomorrow, if the Senator merely wants my opinion.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate the sympathetic attitude of the Senator from Arkansas. May I have the unanimous consent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Illinois that, following the reconvening of the Senate tomorrow after the recess, the Senator from Arkansas shall have the floor, and may resume his argument? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator from Arkansas so yield so that I may move that the Senate go into executive session?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes; with the understanding stated.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator from Illinois answer my query as nearly as he can?

Mr. LUCAS. I think probably the Senate will be in session no later than 4 o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROUGHTON in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received see the end of Senate proceedings.)

CONDUCT OF FOREIGN RELATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER, as in legislative session, laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

The conduct of the foreign relations of the United States has become an increasingly momentous responsibility of our Federal Government. Many of our hopes for world peace and domestic security are dependent upon the effectiveness of our machinery for the development of foreign policy and for translating policies into action.

The foreign-affairs activities of this Government are carried on by a number of agencies, but the greatest share of the responsibility is borne by the Department of State. Moreover, the President, and the Congress as well, rely upon the Secretary of State to provide leadership among the Government agencies concerned with various aspects of foreign affairs and to recommend the steps necessary to achieve an integrated and consistent foreign policy.

The State Department has for some time recognized the need for modifications and improvements in its internal organization to enable it to discharge the increased responsibilities which have been assigned to it in the postwar period. During the past year, under the leadership of Secretary Marshall, the Department made certain urgent adjustments in its organization and undertook comprehensive studies of its long-range organizational requirements. The major recommendations arising from these studies received my approval some months ago, but were not placed in effect pending the completion of the report of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

The Commission has made a thorough study of our governmental machinery for the conduct of foreign affairs. With respect to the organization of the Department of State, the Commission's recommendations generally embody and endorse the organizational plans formulated by the Department. With my approval, the Secretary of State is now proceeding to put these plans into effect.

In order fully to carry out this reorganization, two changes in the statutes governing the Department are required. First, additional positions of Assistant Secretary of State should be created to permit the Department to organize its principal activities on a geographic basis and, at the same time, to maintain its requisite relationships with the Congress, and with the other Executive agencies and the international organizations. Second, certain powers vested by the Foreign Service Act of 1946 in subordinate officials should be placed in the Secretary, subject to his delegation. This action is needed to provide the Secretary with authority commensurate with his responsibilities, and further to apply the principle, strongly recommended by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, of clarifying the lines of responsibility and authority within the Executive Branch.

Early action on these measures is desirable to strengthen this Government's resources for achieving its international objectives.

The suggestions of the Commission with regard to the personnel management of the Department of State and the Foreign Service will require additional study before recommendations can be submitted to the Congress.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 4, 1949.*

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Michael J. Galvin, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary of Labor;

Earl James McGrath, of Iowa, to be Commissioner of Education;

Charles U. Culmer, and sundry other candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service; and

Lawrence Kilham, and several other candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William E. Davis to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James S. Lamb to be collector of internal revenue for the district of North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harris Walthall to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 24.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edward A. Dent to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified of all confirmations of today.

ALBEN W. BARKLEY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, at this time I desire to take a brief moment of the Senate's time to pay a very well-deserved tribute to the Vice President of the United States. It is my understanding that today marks the thirty-sixth anniversary of the beginning of the service in the Congress of the United States of our distinguished Vice President, ALBEN W. BARKLEY. His service covers a longer period than that of any other man who has served in the legislative and executive branches of the Government continuously.

I am sure I speak for all the Members of the Senate when I wish for the Vice President many, many more years to carry on the magnificent devoted public service I know he will continue to render the people of the United States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, while I am not the Senator to whom it would ordinarily fall to add to the felicitations and congratulations expressed by the majority leader on this anniversary of the distinguished Vice President, I do, as one who is for the time being sitting in the place of the minority leader, join the Senator from Illinois in his expression of good will toward our Vice President, and I hope with him that the Vice President will have many more years of service.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 6 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Saturday, March 5, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 4 (legislative day of February 21), 1949:

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Louis A. Johnson, of West Virginia, to be Secretary of Defense.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Edward T. Kane, of Michigan, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Michigan, vice Thomas P. Thornton, elevated.

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Maj. Gen. Edward Hale Brooks, O6657, United States Army, for appointment as Director, Personnel and Administration, United States Army, with the rank of lieutenant general, under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 4 (legislative day of February 21), 1949:

COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE

William E. Davis to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Alabama.

James S. Lamb to be collector of internal revenue for the district of North Dakota.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Harris Walthall to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 24, with headquarters at El Paso, Tex.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

Edward A. Dent to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, for a term of 5 years, effective on and after March 4, 1949.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MARCH 4, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend John F. McCadden, O. P., treasurer of the Dominican Villa, Sea Bright, N. J., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Enter into our hearts, O God, and remain with us. Teach us what we are to do, and grant us the strength to do it well. Show us what we must accomplish in order that, with Thy help, we may be able to please Thee in all things; and be Thou alone the author and finisher of all our judgments. Suffer us not to disturb the order of justice, Thou who lovest equity above all things; let not ignorance draw us into devious paths, nor partiality sway our minds; neither let respect of riches or persons pervert our judgment; but unite us to Thee, that we may be one in Thee and never forsake the truth. Inasmuch as we are gathered together as representatives of Thy people, so may we in all things hold fast to justice tempered by mercy, so that in this life our judgment may in no wise be at variance with Thee, and in life to come we may attain to everlasting rewards for deeds well done. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

VOLUNTARY FIRE COMPANIES OF AMERICA

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H. R. 2971, to correct a great injustice to the volunteer fire companies of America.

Under the present laws, a taxpayer may not claim a deduction in his income tax return for contributions to a volunteer fire company. If a citizen dies and makes such a gift in his will, his executor may not credit the bequest against estate taxes as he can with gifts to other organizations for public charity.

Such a tax policy is as unwise as it is unfair.

Volunteer fire companies render a great service in rural areas of the country. They protect the lives and property of the citizens from fire; they protect the food supply stored in warehouses and silos; they protect the factories in thousands of small communities.

In the tax policy toward volunteer firemen, Uncle Sam bites the hand that feeds him. Post offices and Federal buildings are given free fire protection in cities and towns throughout the country. Because of the reduced premiums on fire insurance policies in communities served by volunteer fire companies, the net income of many taxpayers is increased. On the other hand, in cities which have a paid fire department, the taxes which citizens pay to maintain the municipal fire departments are deductible from Federal taxation.

The expense of maintaining modern and efficient fire-fighting equipment is large. The members of volunteer fire companies have demonstrated considerable self-reliance in raising money for these purposes through their own efforts. However, sometimes a man wants to make a cash gift to his fire company or to remember it in his will. Such gifts to a splendid, charitable organization ought not to be discouraged by unfair tax discrimination.

The bill introduced by me differs from that offered by the distinguished gentleman from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] in that my bill exempts gifts by will from estate taxes. Both bills would exempt gifts from income taxes. The revenue lost to the Treasury in either case will be very small but the injustice of the present law is very great.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KLEIN (at the request of Mr. HUBER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement from the Times-Leader-Evening News of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., dated February 10, 1949, on the subject of anthracite mine safety.

Mr. THOMPSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address by the Honorable Willis Bradley and introductory remarks thereto.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. PATTEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Arizona Daily Star.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include editorials.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a Jackson Day address he delivered at Norwalk, Ohio.

Mr. CLEVENGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Columbus Dispatch.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

CIVIL-SERVICE EMPLOYEES ON THE WARPATH

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, every week I have been sending home a short write-up on the doing of Congress. Last week I wrote a story on the trials and troubles of a Congressman and in some way this article got to all the papers here in Washington. These papers, following newspaper custom, published such parts of the story as appeared to them would be a good news story.

As the newspaper story appeared it was altogether a different story than the one I had written. I referred to the employees in my own office and never had the civil-service employees in mind at all. My employees are not civil-service employees. They came with me from North Dakota and were never in Washington before. The story was written from a comic angle and all the employees in my office understood it that way.

Countless numbers of people, unknown to me, called my office and wanted to talk to me. As soon as I got on the phone they let loose a barrage of invectives against me for saying the civil-service employees did not do much work. They referred to the Washington newspaper report. I tried to explain to them that I had said nothing about civil-service employees, but they ignored that and continued wild and excited blasts. These tirades were all about alike and it appeared like a rehearsal. Many voices and titters could be distinctly heard on the phone, when one of the tiraders would score what they thought was a point. These voices showed a marked foreign accent, and they all had me branded as a villain, for each tirade usually wound up by saying they did not want a Hitler in America.

I think it is cowardly for anyone to get on a phone and call anyone a liar when, as in this case, there was absolutely no justification for it.

There is no complaint I can make against the newspapers, for they have a right to use all of the article or a part of it, or not use it at all. I am sure they rewrote this as a news story and had no intention of putting me on the outs with many civil-service employees. It is just one of those things that can happen. Had the full story been published it would have been obvious that there was no attack of any kind on civil-service employees.

These tiraders want me to apologize, which I would gladly do if I had wronged them, but when I did not refer to them at all, there is no apology that can be made. I think these people, whoever they are, owe me an apology for calling me a liar about their work when I had no reference to them. The way these people handled this case is not the American way. They should have found the facts first and allowed me to present my side of the controversy. My attitude concerning civil-service employees is well known from my years of service in the House and I have cast no vote except one to aid and assist these employees.

THE LATE STEPHEN W. DEMPSEY

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, I regret it comes to me as a solemn duty to report the death of one of my predecessors, former Representative Stephen Wallace Dempsey, who so ably served the Fortieth New York Congressional District from the Sixty-fourth to the Seventy-first Congress.

Mr. Dempsey served as chairman of the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors. As such, he was one of the Republican advocates of the improvement of our waterways and ports. He was an intimate friend of the late President Calvin Coolidge. He did not favor the St. Lawrence ship-canal project, and conducted a fight for an all-American waterway through New York State from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic.

Mr. Dempsey was a gentleman, and adhered to all of the gentlemanly codes of days gone by. He always was meticulous in his conduct.

After he left Congress in 1931, he was popular in Washington legal and social circles. He was a friend of both Republican and Democrat alike, and often his counsel was sought by them in matters relating to national policy or improvement of rivers and harbors.

In the passing of this former predecessor of mine, New York State, and Washington, lose a man of the stature of an able statesman.

THE LATE MME. SAROJINI NAIDU

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday of this week there died in India one of the great women of our era, Mme. Sarojini Naidu. In her death India has lost a great and devoted patriot and the world one of its leading champions of a free, democratic spirit.

As a poetess and political leader, Madame Naidu served her country long and well. A tireless crusader for freedom and a stanch disciple of Mahatma Gandhi, she lived to see the free India she had fought for become a reality and was destined to serve it as the first woman governor of a province.

Her life span of 70 years encompassed a great variety of activities and brought to her numerous honors and the sincere affection of the people of India. She was a pioneer in the women's movement of her country and by her shining example blazed a trail of accomplishment for Indian womanhood, paving the way for women's full participation in political life.

An early interest in the Indian National Congress—the Congress Party—led to her position as member of its working committee and one of its top leaders, ranking with Gandhi, Nehru, and Patel. In 1925 her country bestowed upon her its greatest honor—the presidency of the Indian National Congress. When the Asian Conference was held in New Delhi in 1947, Madame Naidu was elected its president by acclamation.

Educated in England, Madame Naidu published her first volume of verse there, where it met with immediate success. Her volumes of poetry, written originally in English, have been translated into many European languages and the chief languages of India. But when her country's need summoned her, she left what could have been a life of ease and comfort and devoted her whole being to the nationalist movement.

She brought to the Indian struggle for freedom a warm, vital personality, a deep understanding of and interest in people, and the gift of a ready wit. A brilliant, persuasive speaker, she gave the women of India a realization of their responsibilities to their country, and they flocked to follow her lead. Her country men and women came to know her as a tireless, sincere worker in the cause of independence, and an inspiring leader.

She worked beside Gandhi, was his nurse during his fasts, and came to have great influence with him. Like the other Indian nationalist leaders, she was jailed several times for her role in the civil-disobedience movement. In 1931 she represented Indian women at the London round-table conference—called to discuss political reform in India.

Madame Naidu was vitally interested in education, public health and welfare, and cultural activities. As a strong advocate of Hindu-Moslem unity, she played a major part in bringing about communal harmony in the United Provinces, of which she was governor at the time of her death.

Particularly, Madame Naidu had a deep feeling for the young people of India, with whom she was immensely popular. She once said that when she died she would like to have her epitaph read simply, "She loved the youth of India."

It was my very great privilege to have met and known Madame Naidu when she visited this country in 1928. She was one of the world's truly great women—a world citizen of international outlook—to whose memory women in all countries will continue to look for inspiration and guidance. Her contribution to all of mankind is no less than the heritage she leaves India.

With a full heart I echo the words Prime Minister Nehru said yesterday to the Indian Parliament:

India will produce great men and women in the future as she has done in the past and in the present, but I wonder whether she will or can produce another just like Sarojini.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LOVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include House Concurrent Resolution 3 passed by the South Dakota State Legislature.

Mr. HORAN (at the request of Mr. ELLSWORTH) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana and Mr. BOLTON of Maryland asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HINSHAW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "Skyways," from the Los Angeles Times.

CARDINAL SPELLMAN

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, a story carried in the press of yesterday and this morning about Cardinal Spellman leading 100 young priests to a cemetery in New York to bury the dead who had accumulated to the number of 1,200 and who had been denied burial because of a strike called by the grave-diggers union again focuses world attention upon this great and good man.

Mr. Speaker, a million young men in New York should today petition the cardinal that they be permitted to participate in the performance of this act of mercy.

If this thing were to occur in the part of the country from which I come, the women and children, town and country, would band together and with their hands tear to pieces any force that stood between them and the grave of their dead.

Mr. Speaker, I am not particularly a reverent person. My prayers may be unavailing. But by authority of such religion as I have, I pray the Great Master to shower his blessings upon the good cardinal and his hundred priests and all others who may come to his aid in finding a last resting place in the bosom of mother earth for the dead.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore granted, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, on March 1, 1949, I was on the floor during general debate of H. R. 199, which is a law having to do with naturalization and immigration. This bill was considered by the Committee on the Judiciary, on which I have the privilege of serving, and I supported the bill.

I was urgently and unavoidably called away from the floor and, during my absence, roll call No. 22—page 1692 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—was had. The roll call was on motion to recommit the bill to the committee. In order to have my position in the RECORD, I announce that I was for the bill and, therefore, if I had not been unavoidably absent when the roll call was taken, I would have voted "nay."

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I am not going to object, may I inquire what the program will be for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. On Monday the Consent Calendar will be called.

There are several requests for rules before the Committee on Rules, which will continue hearings on them this afternoon. If rules are reported out on the following bills or any of them, they will be brought up Monday and Tuesday:

H. R. 2546 relates to radar protection for our country. H. R. 1741 is known as the guided missiles bill and H. R. 2663 relates to the Central Intelligence Unit. H. R. 2216 provides an additional Under Secretary of Defense. Senate Joint Resolution 36 deals with Arab and Jewish refugees of Palestine.

I want to make one correction however. The bill H. R. 2663, the central intelligence bill may be brought up under suspension of the rules on Monday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Might we inquire of the Speaker if there are any other suspensions that he has in mind at this time?

The SPEAKER. No.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The bill to which the distinguished majority leader referred is the so-called hush-hush bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is the bill where the committee had to receive testimony in executive session on a certain part of the bill but not the entire bill. That was on a good proportion of the bill and insofar as that has relationship to hush-hush the answer is "Yes."

On Wednesday the Labor and Federal Security appropriation bill will be taken up.

Thursday and Friday I am leaving open. It all depends on whether the rent control bill comes out of the committee, which I expect. Then there is the wage-hour bill, that is the minimum-wage bill, and the amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act. If either one of them are reported out, it is my intention to bring one of them up and if possible, both of them on Thursday or Friday, but I doubt if both can be brought up on those days. But I would like to have that flexible reservation so that the House and every Member will feel that I am keeping faith with them.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

FEPC LEGISLATION AND THE ANTISEGREGATION DRIVE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker—

While the lamp holds out to burn
The vilest sinner may return.

I see that the Washington Post, our local Pravda, has now got to the point of at least straddling the fence, and maybe coming on our side of this Communist movement to destroy the public schools of the District of Columbia by wiping out segregation.

I am gratified to note that the State of Minnesota has also joined in this revival of righteousness and killed the infamous FEPC bill, which Joe Stalin trumped up in 1920 and which a few Red radicals and irresponsibles have been trying to ram down the throats of the American people.

They have never got by with it in any State where the people had an opportunity to vote on it.

They took a vote on it in California and defeated it by a majority in every single individual county in California.

The legislature had this hideous monstrosity before it, and when they referred it to a committee of that august body they turned it down flatly, saying in effect, "We do not need such communism in Minnesota."

A leading Minnesota paper has this headline "Death ax swings on FEPC bill."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, relating to bills that he is introducing today.

REPORTS FROM COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tomorrow night to file privileged reports from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], is recognized for 1 hour.

TWO HUNDRED AND FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF GEN. CASIMIR PULASKI

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, 201 years ago today, there was born in Podolia, Poland, a man who believed in freedom and liberty, as do all of his countrymen. He took a prominent part, under his father Count Joseph Pulaski, in the formation of the confederation of the bar and in the military operations which followed, becoming ultimately commander in chief of the Polish patriotic forces.

The American people owe a deep and great debt of gratitude to this distinguished patriot. A lover of free institutions, he dedicated his talents and skills to the cause of a small struggling nation, which in 1777 had not yet earned the regard and respect of the world in which it was seeking to become a member nation.

General Pulaski's services partook of the nature of an unselfish contribution to the cause of humanity. He believed that all peoples have a right to be free, and he took unto his heart and mind, the

full meaning and significance of the principles embodied in the Declaration of Independence, Rousseau's Le Contract Social, and Locke's Fundamental Orders—all of which in their day set a pattern for the aims, ideals, and inspirations of a liberty-loving nation to follow.

That General Pulaski was unselfish in his love of freedom and the desire that others shall be free, cannot be gainsayed, for did he not make the supreme sacrifice on the field of battle? What more true and definite test can one be put to, in order that he surrender his very existence—his life—for his fellow man.

I would like to take you back with me to the year 1777 in our national history. The fortunes of our Revolutionary fathers were at a low ebb. We were seeking to anchor our ship of state to some port of foreign call in the form of a friendly nation which would, in some measure, contribute aid to the already depleted forces of a people and its defenders who were fighting a lone fight against great odds. It was at this time that we turned to France, and with the aid of Benjamin Franklin's diplomacy we succeeded in attracting her to our side.

This material and spiritual aid was given further impetus by the addition of Pulaski's great moral and spiritual regeneration. This served the purpose of encouraging the upliftment of a moral discouragement which had set in as a result of the failure of the military forces to win an outstanding victory on the military field, as well as in counteracting the forces of the American Tories of that day who set obstacles in the path of the patriots and sought constantly to discourage the further undertaking of the war which they labelled a lost war.

How well Casimir Pulaski nurtured and kept alive the seed of freedom which had been planted in the colonies by such men as Washington, Franklin, Otis, Jefferson, Samuel Adams, Patrick Henry, and a host of others too numerous to mention, is written on the historical pages of eternal fame. He was a source of inspiration to the men under his command. They swore undying loyalty to him. No danger was too great, no obstacle too stubborn to surmount. He would not ask to be done what he himself believed should not be done, for he understood men and their problems as all great leaders must of necessity. He lived in an age where the times cried out for leadership and leaders. Chaos and disunity filled the air. Forces repelled each other with the result that order and harmony were much in the background. This ability of discernment of true situations and evaluation of the problems of his time, made him a valuable asset to the full realization of American independence.

History tells us that in 1772 General Pulaski was driven into exile and went to America where he joined the Army of Washington in 1777. He offered his services and military experience to General Washington, who, in a short time, recognized his fine qualities. His ability, firmness of character, and determination led to his assignment to an important position. General Washington relied upon him implicitly and trusted him to the fullest extent, commissioning him in the Continental Army. His name shall forever be linked with the battles of Brandywine, Warren Tavern, Germantown, Trenton and Haddonfield. He so distinguished himself at Brandywine, that Congress made him a brigadier general and chief of cavalry.

Casimir Pulaski, Kosciusko, and many others of Polish birth and descent who came to this country contributed much to our heritage. I am familiar with their love of freedom and liberty and of their deep loyalty and patriotism; I was familiar with their aims to help their kinfolk in their native Poland to be free of their oppressors.

True to our assurances for their self-determination, America made possible the uniting of all Polish people and the creation of the Polish Republic. Thus, when Poland was recognized as an independent state, the purposes, ambitions, and dreams of her people became a reality, and no one was more overjoyed than I.

On February 14, 1949, I thought it fitting and proper to introduce a resolution in the House of Representatives—House Joint Resolution 159—which I feel will enhance the respect that the people of the United States owe to General Pulaski. I was profoundly proud to introduce such a resolution. The resolution reads as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is authorized and directed to issue a proclamation calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all governmental buildings on October 11 of each year, and inviting the people of the United States to observe the day in schools and churches, or other suitable places, with appropriate ceremonies in commemoration of the death of Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

I trust and hope that this resolution will be given the consideration that it is entitled to by the Congress.

From his pace on high, Casimir Pulaski looks down upon Poland, his native land, and sees oppression and suffering. The heel of the tyrant is upon its throat. His countrymen were betrayed and sold into bondage, and now have difficulty in surviving. The warm, kind, and industrious Pole is prevented from pursuing his daily and accustomed life because foreigners have moved in and taken possession of his native land. The Polish farmer is no longer the spirit of enterprise, for his labors and their fruits go toward the swelling of the coffers of a totalitarian regime. The scholar no longer has possession of academic freedom, for which all Poles have fought and died. Therefore, his literary output—once large and sought after—is now small and inconsequential. The arts and sciences no longer carry the inviolable imprint today of a once sturdy and free Poland. All this because the foreign invader has imprisoned him, his initiative, and his skills. No doubt General Pulaski mourns and laments the poor state of his once great homeland. He, like all of us, hopes and prays for the speedy rehabilitation of a new Poland, which will assert itself when the moment is propitious. American aid to long-suffering Poland will be speedily forthcoming the moment that Russia releases its stranglehold upon the political, social, and industrial life of the country.

The contributions of Poland to world peace will be certain as well as effective. Throughout history the men and women of Poland have distinguished themselves in the cause of justice and freedom. They have fought successfully against great and overwhelming odds—against all those who attempt to defile their institutions and overrun their territories. On each occasion they have dislodged the enemy and have won back their cherished rights and possessions. And just as history continues, so will Poland, through her spiritual and virtuous conduct, and she will again reassert herself and take her place among the important nations of the world, striving for peace, freedom, and contentment.

The citizens of Polish extraction in this country have taken the outstanding feats of Pulaski, Kosciusko, and others who also came from Poland as the road of life which has to be followed. By precept and by example in their communities, they have exemplified and manifested the highest duties and obligations of citizenship and civic virtue, to the end that they have made noteworthy progress and contributions toward the greater development of the United States. Polish men of letters, scientists, industrialists, all have set high standards in their respective fields. In every community they stand out as prominent and worthy citizens who are bent on advancing the cause of God and country.

Truly does the spirit and soul of Gen. Casimir Pulaski hover high above us and urge us onward toward a greater sense of accomplishment. On this two hundred and first anniversary of the birth of a great patriot, who is dear and sacred to American institutions, we the American people renew our debt and gratitude to General Pulaski, whose prodigious accomplishments on behalf of a great America shall spur us onward toward a greater realization of the necessity of transmitting to posterity unimpaired, the principles of our beloved Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, when Benjamin Franklin engaged Casimir Pulaski for service in the Continental Army, he recommended him to General Washington with these words:

Count Pulaski, of Poland, an officer famous throughout Europe for his bravery and conduct in defense of the liberties of his country against the three great invading powers of Russia, Austria, and Prussia, will have the honor of delivering this into Your Excellency's hands.

With such an introduction, Pulaski came here, imbued only with the pure ideals of liberty and justice, to fight for the freedom of the New World. Compelled by Russian oppression to leave his own beloved land, he became an exile; and when the spark at Lexington started the conflagration which became the American Revolution, his restive spirit impelled him to join the cause of the colonists.

Honor and a true desire of distinguishing myself in defense of liberty was the only motive which fired my breast for the cause of the United States—

He wrote to Gen. R. H. Lee in 1778, and a little over a year later, on October 11, 1779, he paid the last full measure of devotion to that cause by his death from grapeshot wounds at the siege of Savannah.

As the commander of the celebrated Pulaski Legion, the formation of which was sanctioned by the Congress on March 19, 1778, he recruited, equipped, and maintained the first effective cavalry corps in the fledgling Army of the United States. His services to General Washington during the bitter and discouraging winter of 1778–79 were invaluable, and his discovery of the enemy army when Washington and Hamilton were halted at Warren Tavern in Pennsylvania certainly prevented the surprise and possible rout of the American forces.

On orders from the Congress, Pulaski left the area around New Jersey and Pennsylvania and marched south to place his legion under the command of General Lincoln. By this time, it was an infantry organization, and his sorties so harassed the British General Prevost that the enemy retired from Charleston.

In pursuing the retreating British, he dealt the enemy stinging blows whenever possible, and during the siege of Savannah he received his mortal wound when attempting to halt the retreat of the French columns in the American ranks.

March 4 marks the anniversary of the birth of this noble Pole who sacrificed his honor, his fortune, and his life for the cause of American freedom. He was buried from the side of the U. S. brig *Wasp*, and his death was lamented universally by the friends of liberty everywhere.

In a brief, obscure pamphlet by one Dr. Charles C. Jones commenting on the sepulture of Pulaski and Gen. Nathaniel Greene, we find the most fitting accolade to the heroic Polish count who became an American legend:

> He sleeps where the ebbing tide of the Savannah meets and commingles with the waters of the broad Atlantic. Fit resting place for a hero of such expansive soul! He sleeps where the praises in honor of his great deeds, sung by the waves of the Savannah as they kiss the shore consecrated by his valorous deeds, are caught up by the billows of ocean and are by them joyfully repeated in wider circles, in more heroic strains. He sleeps where the ambient air, fragrant with the perfumes of a land whose freedom he died to achieve, tells to Atlantic breezes the story of his martyrdom that they too, in glad acclaim, may answer back to the farthest coast the greatness of his fame. By a strange coincidence the beloved of Mars rests in the embrace of Neptune.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I want to at this time take the opportunity to thank my friend from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] for asking for 1 hour's leave to address the House to commemorate the occasion of the two hundred and first anniversary of the birth of a great Revolutionary general, Casimir Pulaski, who has given ample time to many Members who want to speak about this great hero, whose name became the symbol of the deeply rooted ties which unite the American and Polish people.

As I stated in previous speeches on General Pulaski, his name became in two centuries the symbol and banner under which humanity fights for freedom. His memory so widely honored in the United States, has a profound and deep meaning for those who strive to keep alive the devotion of the American people for the ideals of human rights and democracy.

Casimir Pulaski, at a young age, being only 24 years old, was a veteran of the most cherished belief in freedom, having fought gallantly during the patriotic uprising of the Poles against the ruthless Russian oppressors beside his famous soldier father of those days. He fought a losing battle with the confederation for 5 years and when the uprising was crushed, he went into exile in France. From there he led an expedition of Poles into Turkey to join that nation in war against the Russians. This venture was doomed from the start for lack of promised support of the French. He was again compelled to flee to France and upon arrival in Marseilles, was cast into a debtor's prison for failure to repay debt incurred in organizing the Turkey expedition.

At this time Benjamin Franklin arrived in France from America. The general immediately offered his services to the revolutionary cause and was accepted. He came to America to fight for the same liberty for which he struggled in Poland. The same liberties cherished by all of us, for which American armed forces have fought in the last two world wars. History describes Casimir Pulaski as fighting at Washington's side, first as a brigadier general in command of the revolutionary cavalry and later as founder and leader of the famous and historical Pulaski Legion. He died nobly in the American cause at the battle of Savannah, Ga., on October 11, 1779.

No true American can remain indifferent to the fact that the Poland of Pulaski and Kosciusko cannot speak for herself today. The freedom-loving Poles are silenced and it is the American-Polish blood which can only still speak for the enslaved Polish people.

We shall not stop reminding the world that the country whose war record made her, in President Roosevelt's words: "The inspiration of nations," is now entirely dominated by a hostile, foreign power, that Poland's most worthy sons and daughters are being exterminated or deported, that a foreign, godless, totalitarian philosophy is being forced upon a Christian people, which strains all its moral and material forces in order to sweep out the Soviet puppets who now enforce a rule of terror in that unhappy country.

It is our sacred duty to most solemnly pledge ourselves to the memory of Pulaski, that we will not rest until the promises of freedom and independence for Poland given to the Polish Nation during the war while she was fighting and bleeding—are redeemed. We shall not rest until Pulaski's motto, "For our freedom and yours," will be fully applied to Poland—the nation which practiced it during 10 centuries of its recorded history.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LINEHAN].

Mr. LINEHAN. Mr. Speaker, America is observing today the two hundred and first anniversary of the birth of Gen. Casimir Pulaski. Here is a great American who made worth-while contributions to the cause of free government. Every American regardless of race or religion, is under obligation to this distinguished American soldier, who gave of his mind and heart for the cause of independence and freedom.

In 1777 he joined the Army of Gen. George Washington. In a short time, because of his ability, he grew in the estimation of General Washington who trusted him and gave him important tasks to carry out. His heroism demonstrated itself in the battles of Brandywine, Germantown, and Trenton. It was at Brandywine that he was recommended for the commission of brigadier general and chief of cavalry. Congress concurred in this recommendation. Not content with these honors, General Pulaski called together a group of Poles living in America, designated them as the Pulaski Legion, and led them in the famous battles of Little Egg Harbor and Charleston.

General Pulaski's military career was brought to an untimely end while fighting courageously and valiantly, when he was mortally wounded and died on October 11, 1779.

The record of this famous American of Polish extraction—champion of liberty and defender of American freedom—is one that shall go down in the annals of history as one of the most revered and distinguished in our American life. We in America are grateful that General Pulaski lived, for it was his belief in a great cause that gave impetus and life to the American people when the outlook was dark.

Today, the Nation of General Pulaski's father is in the throes of deep trouble and desolation. It is one of the satellite nations under the control of Russia. The initiative of the Polish people does not reassert itself with the same warmth and vigor to which it has been accustomed. Its people are not free to do as they would do were they free from the shackles and bonds of communism. The Polish nation must be helped and rebuilt in order that they might again take their proper place among the other freedom- and liberty-loving peoples and nations of the world. I am proud of the progress they are making toward this end. May the two hundred and second anniversary of the birth of General Pulaski see a new and free Poland.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, of the many heroes and patriots from foreign lands who came to the shores of the fledgling United States of America to offer their sword and their purse to the cause of liberty, the name of Casimir Pulaski stands to the fore. With his compatriot, Thaddeus Kosciusko, Pulaski, the eldest son of Count Joseph Pulaski, was born in Podolia, Poland, in 1748.

The great Polish patriot served in the guard of Duke Charles of Courland and in 1768 returned to Poland where he joined his father in an active rebellion against the foreign domination of Poland. After many hazardous experiences and heroic exploits and considerable success, his forces were finally defeated, all of his property confiscated, and he escaped to Turkey in 1772.

Subsequently, he was in touch with many friends of the Colonies in Paris and in 1777 Benjamin Franklin arranged an introduction of Pulaski to George Washington.

Down through the years of American history there have been many and great leaders of cavalry, and the cavalry arm of our armed forces has always been brilliant in the service of the Nation. No greater or more daring cavalry commander ever served our flag than Casimir Pulaski. As a matter of fact, we might well say that Pulaski was the father of the American cavalry because during the first 2 years of the war, in the Continental Army there was no regular cavalry unit and only in the latter part of the second year were regular cavalry regiments established.

During the fall and winter of that year Pulaski participated in numerous engagements, including the major battle of Brandywine and Germantown, and later at Trenton and Flemington. General Pulaski, with Gen. Anthony Wayne, had much to do in obtaining supplies for the colonial troops in winter quarters during the desperate months at Valley Forge. Pulaski was impatient for action and was always unhappy when in garrison or not happily engaged in the field; and for the next 2 years no commander had a wider or more varied experience as a line officer, serving in all theaters of operation—north and south.

With General Lincoln at the seige of Savannah on October 9 Pulaski, bravely leading a charge against the enemy lines at the head of his cavalry, was mortally wounded and died 2 days later. His gallant death inspired to greater action his brothers in arms for the cause of liberty and equality so ably espoused by this visiting hero and friend from liberty-loving Poland.

Down through the generations of American free and independent history Poland and her sons were always friends in need.

And so now today the millions of American citizens in whose veins flow the proud blood of Polish ancestry continue to hold high the torch of freedom. Inspired by the courage, ability, and skill of Poland's great soldier, the name of Pulaski is enshrined forever in the hearts of all Americans.

God willing, the United States of America will never forget the debt owed to Pulaski and his Polish friends, so that today, with Poland under the heel of an invading tyrant, we can repay this debt.

Mr. Speaker, on this, the birthday of the patriot-soldier, Casimir Pulaski, I take this opportunity to pay tribute to his proud name and sacred cause.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK].

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, all freedom-loving Americans are acquainted with the deeds of the great Polish hero, Brig. Gen. Casimer Pulaski. They know of his fruitless struggle for freedom in Poland when that country was partitioned by Germany, Russia, and Austria. They also know of his interest in the cause of American freedom and his arrival in the Thirteen Colonies to fight brilliantly at the side of George Washington. He organized cavalry units and trained American men. History has come to call him the father of the American cavalry. All freedom-loving Americans also know of his supreme sacrifice at the Battle of Savannah in Georgia, where he was mortally wounded, dying 2 days later at the age of 31.

Thus, General Pulaski inscribed his name in the heart and memory of every American. His name has become synonymous with freedom—a quality inherent in every person, particularly persons of Polish descent, who have known so little of freedom during the last 2 centuries. To honor the memory of Pulaski today is also to honor his brave compatriots, from his day to ours, who gave their lives that freedom may live.

Poles all over the world were inspired by this ideal to fight. When Poland was overrun by Germany in 1939, the people took up arms and fought back bravely. They did not sell out their country at any time. They withstood hardships, suffered incarceration in prison camps, saw their families killed by invaders, their homes burned, their schools and churches destroyed, but not once did any of them flinch from the steadfastness to his ideal of freedom.

Even after Poland was overrun by Germans on one side and Russians on the other, the Poles continued their valiant struggle. At home, they organized the heroic underground army. Abroad, they formed armies of men from 16 to 60 and fought brilliantly in the battles of France, Trieste, and Monte Casino. In England, they reorganized the Polish Air Force and carried on the fight in the air. Forty percent of these men, including the famous Suicide Squadron, lost their lives in the fight. Like Pulaski, they had youth and a future, but, like Pulaski, they cherished freedom above all else.

Altogether, more than 6,000,000 Poles gave their lives in this last war. However, on May 8, 1945, when all of Europe was rejoicing over the end of hostilities, the Poles alone could not share in the celebration. The Poles, first to suffer the onslaught of the aggressor and fight him to the bitter end, were now deprived of the very ideal for which they fought—freedom. They were overcome by a new power, a new kind of slavery known as communism. Their country was cut up and part of it was given to Russia as compensation for the latter's losses in the war. Poland, for all her sacrifies, was ignored. In fact now, many Poles were being arrested as German citizens and sent to Siberia as slave laborers. Factories were being torn down and sent to Russia. Poland's wealth was being confiscated. And just as freedom was being reborn in other countries of Europe, it was being stamped out in Poland.

Pulaski would shudder in his grave if he knew that this was the justice meted out to a country and people loyal to the cause of freedom. If we are to pay loyal tribute to the memory of Pulaski today, we should dedicate ourselves to the preservation of the freedom for which he fought and died. We owe Pulaski a great debt, a debt we can help repay by helping Poland in her desperation today. We shall be helping the Poland that Pulaski loved and tried to liberate.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on January 27, 1949, I introduced House Joint Resolution 119 for favorable action by the Eighty-first Congress. This joint resolution, when enacted, would authorize the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski Memorial Day for the observation and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

This resolution contains the following language:

> *Resolved etc.*, That the President of the United States is authorized and directed to issue a proclamation calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all government buildings on October 11 of each year, and inviting the people of the United States to observe the day in schools and churches, or other suitable places, with appropriate ceremonies in commemoration of the death of Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

Gen. Casimir Pulaski, outstanding Polish statesman, military hero and patriot, is one of the very few men in history who fought and gave his life for liberty and free government on two continents. Long before he set foot on American shores to help our fledgling Republic fight for independence, he had established a place high in the firmament of Polish patriots of all time. Before coming to our country, and as a mere youth, he stated that his destiny was clear and that he regarded every moment as lost that was not employed in repelling the enemies of Poland. In those years of fighting for Polish independence, he endured all the bloody sacrifices of war, the slaying of members of his family by the enemy, but continued steadfastly the battle for a free Poland. His example has not been forgotten by the people of that nation down through the years and to the present hour when every true Pole is fighting for religious and civic liberty.

When General Pulaski came to America and presented himself to Gen. George Washington, he was already famous throughout Europe for his bravery and conduct in defense of the liberty of his own country against the great invading powers of Russia, Austria, and Prussia. We can readily see and understand why men like General Pulaski and his famous fellow countryman, General Kosciusko, who also covered himself with undying glory in the Revolutionary War, were not soldiers of fortune, but men imbued with the burning desire to overthrow tyranny and establish liberty and freedom on this earth.

General Pulaski's outstanding and heroic deeds during the Revolutionary War need not be repeated here to the students of American history. Pulaski gave his life for American independence. He died as he had lived—a noble and undaunted warrior fighting the battles of liberty for our Republic. He sacrificed himself, his fortune, his splendid genius and all his earthly hopes for liberty, justice, and humanity. For these things he gave all he had—his martyred life.

It is my earnest hope that this Eighty-first Congress will act favorably on House Joint Resolution 119 and make October 11, the anniversary of the death of General Pulaski, a national holiday. The memory of this distinguished Polish patriot and hero is entitled to our veneration for his outstanding service and deeds of valor which greatly contributed to the price of our independence.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'BRIEN].

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, appreciating the great services rendered by Gen. Casimir Pulaski and his sacrifice to help our country obtain her freedom and liberty, I heartily subscribe to what has been said of his noble services by all the gentlemen who have preceded me.

Pulaski actually gave up his life in battle in order that we might attain our freedom and independence, and I feel that we now, in turn, owe it to Poland, his native country, to help her obtain freedom and independence to which she is justly entitled.

The Polish people are liberty-loving people who for years were oppressed by the Prussians and the Russians. After years of struggling they gained their independence, and then were again deprived of it by the Nazis. Now they are being deprived of their freedom for a second time by the Russians who are taking advantage of their might and strength by interfering in Poland's domestic affairs.

I hope that our Nation in recognition of the services rendered to us not only by General Pulaski, but by many others of Polish descent who have so illustriously fought in our wars, will give Poland all the aid and assistance possible, so that she may again attain her liberty and freedom, which as I said before, rightly belongs to her.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORSKI].

Mr. GORSKI of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the two hundred and first anniversary of the birth of Gen. Casimir Pulaski, a great soldier of the Revolutionary War, a lover of freedom and independence, a hero of two continents, who made the supreme sacrifice in our country's struggle for independence. On this day we pause to pay tribute to his memory and honor. By his valor, heroism, and patriotism we are reminded of the blessings we enjoy here in America as a nation of free people.

It is only proper that we honor our great heroes, and by so doing we remind ourselves of the heritage they have bestowed on us, and we should ever be mindful, especially in these troubled times throughout the world, that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." We must at all times be prepared to defend ourselves against any threat to our way of life as we enjoy it here.

We have just emerged from a world war, the second great struggle within a generation, wherein freedom and democracy of all nations was threatened throughout the world. General Pulaski, while serving under General Washington in 1777, fought and died for these same principles. He knew both freedom and tyranny, and our enemies in the last world war were the same enemies who partitioned Poland, the native country of Pulaski.

General Pulaski was a citizen of Poland, one of our allies in the last world war. We all know how bravely the Polish people fought to defend their freedom. The heroic defense of Warsaw stirs the heart of all free people. We all remember how that country was invaded by both the Germans and the Russians. Today two of her enemies, Germany and Austria, lie prostrate, while Russia dominates them by force, but the spirit of freedom will never die, and Poland, together with other European freedom-loving nations who may temporarily be under the domination of Russia, shall by the grace of God be relieved of this communistic cloak of darkness with its religious persecution, hate, and everlasting fear, and emerge as they should into the sunlight as free, independent, and peace-loving people.

I hope and pray the day is not too far distant when Russia, the one country who is obstructing the peace of the world, will see the light and change her attitude toward the small democratic nations and stop interfering in their internal affairs, withdraw their domination, return the stolen lands, and let every country govern themselves. Then all nations can turn their efforts toward a common understanding. We will then enjoy world peace, happiness, and prosperity, the hope of the past centuries of mankind everywhere.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHESNEY].

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Speaker, the chapters of Polish history are crowded with epoch-making events which precipitated Poland toward greatness. It may be said that Poland was a great civilized, democratic, and tolerant state until her neighbors became covetous of her democracy.

The magnificent account of how the Poles have preserved their spiritual unity, nationality, religion, and language, throughout the many years of partitions and wars, is a symbol to all courageous, freedom-loving people.

In that land of a brave and courageous people was born, on March 4, 1757, Casimir Pulaski. Unlike many other great heroes of Poland, he was the second son of the richest family in south central Poland. His father, Josef, gained considerable prominence for his political and financial abilities which brought the Pulaski family wealth and public acclaim. His childhood was as happy and normal as any young boy under the customs of the period. By the time he was 21, he had gained sufficient education and worldly experience to venture with his father against the political demagogues and imperialistic enemies of Poland.

Even at this young age, the name of Pulaski inspired the Polish people to nationalistic valor. Pulaski, the patriot and warrior, was the answer to the revival of the country's spirit.

Born to lead his nation, he was a man of principal and ideals, devoted to the cause of liberty. His deep-rooted conviction for the salvation of Poland knew no bounds. In an early skirmish with his enemies, he said:

> One hundred thousand are too few, for a free people. Citizens will come to such courage and desperation, that all will be ready for their faith and freedom to shed their blood and lay down their lives.

He indeed was a patriot worthy of his people.

Pulaski was the guerrilla of his day, who would not stop at imprisonment or banishment from his native land. As if by magic, he would arise to plague his enemies with political and military coups. Many times he fought alone, with his followers of independence. His mastery of military strategy created admiration among the rulers of Europe, but it also caused jealousy and distrust among the weak puppet kings of Poland.

When he left his country, it was not in defeat, or dishonor, but only to save his fellow man and followers from extermination by an enemy and a king. The internal conflict had reached a crisis, where the collaboration of the government in power and the enemy became a hopeless situation. He knew he had reached an insurmountable barrier. His only refuge was to go into exile.

Pulaski left his Poland—never to return.

The Governments of Prussia, France, and Turkey found this dashing Pole adventurous and determined. Whenever an opportunity arose to gather a military force to attack the enemies of his country, he was always ready to lead the crusade. As a hero in exile, he gained no victory, but only defeat, but in his failures the nations of Europe rediscovered that this soldier of freedom would never rest until his mission of liberation was accomplished.

To the shores of America came Casimir Pulaski on July 23, 1777; to a land which, like his own, was fighting for freedom and liberty. The situation in America was almost as confused and troubled as in his beloved Poland.

Soon after his arrival, Pulaski won his spurs. The reward came during the heat of a battle in which the forces of Washington were being routed. He rallied the American Army to a skillful withdrawal. The battle was lost, but Pulaski earned a reputation and respect for his ability and understanding. He did not fight for any political glory but only for American liberty.

It was not long before General Pulaski, as he was now an officer in the United States Army and in command of our Cavalry, rose to new and greater heights. Pulaski's valor in the battles of Brandywine, Haddonsfield, and Savan-

nah only reaffirmed the past history of this unusual man. Nor can we forget the brave group of independent cavalrymen named the Legion, organized and led by him.

This warrior who offered his sword in defense of a new country never faltered in his determination to do battle with an enemy of liberty. He obeyed the orders of his Commander in Chief, George Washington, and when he was sent with his legion to Savannah never did he suspect that this was to be his last fight. The fatal moment came when he was hit by a bullet, and a day later he died of his wound.

His death was a great loss to the cause of American independence. Pulaski had many misfortunes and trials, but he always reflected heroism and Polish endurance, which this grateful Nation has never forgotten.

The people of the United States will always remember March 4 as Pulaski Day.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to associate myself with the sentiments which have been expressed by my colleagues in connection with this two hundred and first anniversary of the birth of Gen. Casimir Pulaski. But I think that we would be disappointing the general, and I think that we shall be missing an appropriate opportunity if we gather here today simply to pay lip service to his glorious deeds. We must act in the great tradition which these deeds inspire. We should seize upon this occasion to rededicate ourselves to the liberation of Poland just as General Pulaski dedicated his life to the freedom of America.

Poland, a free land surrounded by the twin tyrannies of fascism and communism, was the tinderbox which ignited World War II. It was not the fault of the Poles that they were caught between the two fires. They were a freedom-loving people. They still are a freedom-loving people, a people of deep and abiding religious piety, who have contributed immeasurably through the centuries to the march of freedom and progress.

Right here in America, Mr. Speaker, we owe a great deal to the Poles. From among them America received precious ideals of liberty and human progress. Thousands of Polish men and women have crossed the Atlantic to contribute their talents, their courage, their labor, and their loyalties, their love of freedom, their hatred of slavery to the social fabric of America.

You all know the story—how the war was started by the unholy alliance between fascism and communism, how Poland became the first battleground and the first nation to shed her blood for the cause of freedom, how Poland fought on, even when she was conquered, in the underground and abroad, how her legions at home were unified into a mighty army; how her legions abroad, especially in Italy and in the critical battle of Britain, fought under her own banners and the banners of her American and British allies. Yet Poland has not reaped the fruits of the common victory to which she contributed so much. Alone among our allies she is still under the cruel heel of the oppressor. Mr. Speaker, we must atone for the wrong which we committed at Yalta.

Oh, I suppose that it would be more tactful not to bring this matter up. We have a lot of troubles these days, and it would be nice to turn our backs upon the past and try to forget this ugly blot on our national honor. But the trouble is that this past is still very much with us. It is with us in the sense that from these fuzzy gestures of indecision and appeasement have stemmed many of the troubles which surround us now. It is with us because at this very moment, while we gather here in our Chamber to celebrate the birthday of this fine soldier, there are millions of Poles languishing in the Stygian horror of the torture chambers, in the fetid squalor of the prisons, and in the indecent stench of the concentration camps created by our Soviet allies. The cause of freedom to which General Pulaski gave his life and which unites the overwhelming majority of our people demands that we pause today in recognition of the Gethsemane in which the freedom-loving Poles are still enveloped.

No man is wise enough to say when or by what means the suffering people of Poland will be liberated. Since her enslavement by Stalin's lackeys, cumulative crises have created a world dilemma so vast and so complex that this original sin is all but swallowed up in the gathering clouds of conflict. The fate of Poland must wait upon the fate of the world. It will not be decided until a general settlement has been arrived at.

In the meantime, let us commemorate the birth of General Pulaski by reaffirming our faith in freedom and by conducting our foreign affairs in such a manner that the people of Poland can take heart. Let us recognize by actions as well as by words that the obliteration of freedom in Poland is a threat to the freedom of the United States. Just as General Pulaski made a mighty contribution to the freedom of America so let us resolve to strive toward the liberation of Poland.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LODGE. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I rise to commend the gentleman for these splendid remarks and to say that I am happy to associate myself with everything the gentleman has said. I also urge speedy action by this Congress with reference to resolutions which have been introduced to commemorate the life and services of Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

Mr. LODGE. I thank my distinguished friend from New York for his contribution.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the minority leader.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in observing the anniversary of the birth of Casimir Pulaski, America is again reminded of the principles of this great soldier, who was inspired by the conviction that the fight for freedom is the fight of freemen everywhere. Whenever Pulaski found freedom endangered in a neighboring country, he was there to lend a helping hand. The sacred flame of freedom burned brightly in his heart because his own Poland, which he loved so well, had often felt the whiplash of those who would enslave her.

In his day, when Poland fell under the heel of an aggressor and the time was not then opportune to throw off the shackles, Pulaski went to France. Through Benjamin Franklin, he contacted Gen. George Washington and volunteered for service in the cause of the American Colonies. It was his feeling that if freedom could be established in America, the good news of its triumph would spread and would inspire the lovers of freedom everywhere never to rest until their bondage had been broken.

Thus, Pulaski has taken his honored place among the great names of men who throughout the centuries have sacrificed and shed their blood in order that their countrymen and their neighbors might sleep at night in the refreshing air of liberty.

What a salutary effect it would have upon the history of our times if at this moment the leaders of nations might reflect upon the creed of Casimir Pulaski, who believed that no country could trample upon the liberty of its neighbors and remain secure itself.

The treasured memories of this great soldier reveal a message of hope and confidence to all those who today suffer behind the darkness of the iron curtain. They may be comforted by the glowing fact that as long as there are men and women who are imbued with the immortal spirit and the love of freedom of General Pulaski, the sacred cause of freemen will live and will eventually succeed. It was unfortunate a free Poland did not emerge free after its great contribution to freedom in World War II. The world will eventually correct this.

This observance is itself a tangible proof that the people of America have not forgotten their debt to Pulaski and to the millions of foreign born who have defended and have helped to build our America. But it should be more than that. It should be a time for the renewal of our determination that the great country which nurtured the noble Pulaski shall again take its place in the dignity of free and independent nations.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to call to the attention of the House of Representatives, on this day honoring Gen. Casimir Pulaski, the fact that a bill known as H. R. 3128 has been introduced by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON].

The significance of H. R. 3128 is that, if passed, it will provide for the granting of permanent residence in the United States to Miss Jadwiga Pulaski, a descendant of the brother of Casimir Pulaski, who is being given this signal recognition by this House.

The gentleman from Illinois, Congressman GORDON, one of our ablest Members

and a high-ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, is to be commended for this action on his part. Always alive to his responsibilities in behalf of the people he so ably represents, he is also a keen student of events abroad, especially in Poland. We look to the gentleman from Illinois, Congressman GORSON, for advice and counsel on questions affecting Poland, and his voice is often heard in the interests of this stricken country.

It is my hope that the bill, H. R. 3128, introduced by the gentleman from Illinois will be considered soon and that this illustrious descendant of a great Polish-American will be allowed to remain among us. We can then, in part at least, repay our debt to General Pulaski.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GORSKI].

Mr. GORSKI of New York. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the birthday of a man to whom we in America are proud to pay tribute.

Gen. Casimir Pulaski was the leader of his countrymen in their unequal struggle to preserve his country. General Pulaski unselfishly offered his services, and finally his life, to the American colonists that freedom and liberty might be gained for our forefathers in America.

What would be the thoughts of General Pulaski today were he here to see the persecution and bloodshed perpetrated upon the smaller and defenseless countries. As he fought for freedom then, so would he today be alined with those fighting for existence, true liberty, and freedom.

His memory will ever be revered by the people of America as the great Polish leader who made the supreme sacrifice for American freedom and liberty.

As Pulaski, Kosciusko, and others of Polish descent offered their services to our country, I am also mindful of the many who joined with us and our allies in World Wars I and II emulating Pulaski's aim for freedom that democracy might live.

Pulaski knew that freedom might change in appearance but not in substance. Being one of those who are ahead of their times, he sensed its meaning. Though men might lose their way along freedom's trail, he knew they would in time find their true course, leading to a life of happiness, where their reward would be enriched in a measure for the extent of their labors.

Let us hope, as the years go by, as we the Representatives of the people gather to memorialize the name of General Pulaski, that our strivings, our dreams, and our aspirations will bring, through joys and sorrows, the goal so valiantly sought by this great leader. That the sacrifices and sufferings of the decent thinking people of the world will not have been in vain. That our efforts will bring a lasting tribute, to the motto of Pulaski, "For our freedom and yours," fully applied to Poland and other nations throughout the world.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO].

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, today marks the two hundred and first anniversary of the birth of Gen. Casimir Pulaski. It is very fitting that the Congress should set aside this time to do honor to the memory of so great a patriot.

General Pulaski was not only a great Polish hero, but he was a great hero of the American Revolution. It was in 1772 that General Pulaski, driven into exile, came to America and joined the army of Gen. George Washington. He marked for himself a distinguished career. He was made a brigadier general and chief of cavalry by order of Congress. He later raised a mixed corps called the Pulaski legion and, with these troops, defended the city of Charleston in May 1779. And it was on October 11 that General Pulaski, mortally wounded at the Battle of Savannah, gave up his life for this country.

It is true that many of the people of America, who are of Polish descent, are disheartened that Poland is behind the iron curtain. But the American people have lost none of their friendship, none of their sympathy, nor none of their admiration for the heroic Poles in their battle for freedom.

I saw personally, the great sacrifices made by the Poles during this last war. I had the privilege and honor of seeing these gallant soldiers in action against the hordes of tyranny and dictatorship. I can attest to their gallant fighting spirit. This spirit will not die. The inspiration of General Pulaski, I am sure will continue to give courage and confidence to all the friends of Poland, and to all of those who hold Poland dear to their hearts. Although the heel of the Soviet bear tries to crush the Polish spirit, these freedom-loving people, who have a fierce pride of independence, will not swerve from their desire to once again take their rightful place among the free nations of the world.

And so, today, on the anniversary of the birth of this patriot, America feels closer than ever to the land of his birth and it salutes the people of Polish descent in America, and to the people of Poland still behind the iron curtain—it says do not lose hope for the spirit of General Pulaski will not die and one day Poland will again breathe freely in the spirit of democracy.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we today pay tribute to Gen. Casimir Pulaski on this the two hundred and first anniversary of his birth.

Famous for his defense in the cause of all liberty-loving people in his native Poland, General Pulaski came to America in the year 1777 to help our American colonists in their fight for freedom and liberty. With only a letter of introduction from our Ambassador to France, General Pulaski presented himself to General Washington, whom we all know accepted his generous offer of help to our cause.

General Washington commissioned General Pulaski in the Continental Army. This great Polish soldier, who came to our shores, acquitted himself with great valor, and because of his courage and the military genius he displayed, was promoted to the rank of brigadier general, and was permitted to form a legion of his own—the Pulaski legion.

This legion mainly consisted of volunteers, men who came to America from foreign lands as did General Pulaski to help America fight tyranny. Under General Pulaski this legion made many contributions to our cause of freedom. The general was wounded in the battle of Savannah, Ga.; 3 days later he died, October 9, 1799.

Americans are deeply appreciative of not only the outstanding services of this great general, but of the services of thousands and thousands of others of Polish extraction who have gladly and willingly offered their services to the people of the world everywhere in the defense of freedom.

The American people deplore the happenings in Poland since the invasion by Nazi Germany in 1939 who destroyed the freedom and independence of those liberty-loving and religious people. We also deplore Soviet Russia's constant interference in the internal affairs of that great nation.

With the memory of General Pulaski uppermost in our minds today, we in America fervently pray that within the very near future these liberty-loving and suffering people of Poland, who have contributed so much to the welfare of humanity, will again breathe the free air of democracy.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CROOK].

PULASKI, HERO OF TWO CONTINENTS, AMERICA AND POLAND

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Speaker, on the anniversary of the birth of General Pulaski, I want to place in the RECORD a brief biography of a great man who made supreme sacrifice at an early age for the cause of our esteemed liberty:

PULASKI, HERO OF TWO CONTINENTS

(By Anthony F. Zaleski)

The celebrated Count Casimir Pulaski, better known to us in America as Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski of Revolutionary fame, was born in Winiary, Poland, on March 4, 1748. He was the eldest son of Count Joseph Pulaski, a venerable old man who belonged to the Polish nobility. The father was the chief magistrate of Warech and was noted for his knowledge of jurisprudence.

Gen. Casimir Pulaski was educated for the bar also, and received his early military training as a youth in the guard of Charles, Duke of Courland. He was in the castle of Mittau when it was besieged by 15,000 Russian soldiers.

In order better to appreciate the spirit which animated General Pulaski, the activity and zeal in the defense of justice and human liberty which prompted him to come to a strange land, where he was unknown, and whose customs and language he did not understand, to fight for these cherished principles, it is fitting for us to refer to his part in the struggle for liberty in his native country.

SHAMEFUL CONSPIRACY OF RUSSIA, PRUSSIA, AND AUSTRIA

One of the foulest deeds ever recorded in history was the violent dismemberment of Poland by her three treacherous neighbors between 1772 to 1795. A nation one-fifth larger than France in area, and containing a population of 20,000,000 people, was ruthlessly torn asunder, its people subjugated and politically annihilated, under a sham

pretext of preserving law and order in that country. This catastrophe did not come about all at once, but gradually through internal dissensions fomented by Poland's enemies and their intermeddling in the internal affairs of the Polish Government, which was then a precocious democracy surrounded by an insidious autocracy. Poland's system of electing kings and her famous constitution of May 3, 1791—of which Edmund Burke said, "It was the most pure * * * public good which has ever been conferred on mankind"—were indications of the liberal and constructive government in that period.

CONFEDERATION OF THE BAR

When Stanislaus Poniatowski, the puppet of Catherine of Russia, was elected by the Polish deputies under the impending threat of the Russian Army who surrounded the Polish Diet at the time of the election, and he became a mere tool in her hands for the execution of her will in Poland, such patriotic and gallant Poles as Count Joseph Pulaski realized that it was time to arouse the spirit of their countrymen and to do the only honorable thing that a self-respecting person could do under the circumstances—resort to force to resist the calamity and humiliation at any cost. He was then about 60 years old, and he divulged to his three sons a plan conceived by himself and other nobles of the nation to forestall the enemies of his country and form an organization to effect its rescue from the inevitable fate that it was headed for. Such an organization was created in the town of Bara in Podolia, about 20 miles from the Turkish border, and was known as the famous Confederation of the Bar.

Suffice it to say here that for 4 years, under the most trying conditions and the greatest adversity, this patriotic organization fought against overwhelming odds to oust the enemies of Poland, chiefly the Russians, from their country. But all their efforts proved fruitless. The aged Pulaski died in prison; one of General Pulaski's brothers was killed before his eyes, as he himself says, by the enemy; the youngest brother was taken into captivity, and many of his countrymen were doomed to misery.

Gen. Casimir Pulaski, with whom we are concerned, was the leading spirit of his countrymen in this unequal struggle to preserve his nation intact. He fought bravely, tenaciously, with the unremitting zeal of a young man then but 25 years old. Heedless of his own safety, always leading his men into sallies against the enemy, which was much more powerful than his poorly equipped army, and much larger in size; he made repeated stands against the Russians, especially at the famous monastery of Czestochowa, saved it on several occasions from prolonged sieges, and would probably have succeeded the last time had it not been for the assistance given the Russians by Frederick the Great of Prussia.

"Never was there a warrior," says the historian Ruhlieri, "who possessed greater dexterity in every kind of service. Endowed by a peculiar gift of nature, strengthened by exercise, he was always the first to charge in person, with an intrepidity which inspired his followers to imitate his example." Benjamin Franklin, in introducing him to Washington, writes: "Count Pulaski, who was a general of the confederates in Poland, and who is to join you, is esteemed one of the greatest officers in Europe."

Casimir Pulaski not only lost his father and brothers in this glorious attempt to save Poland from the first of her ignoble partitions, but his estates were confiscated and he was proscribed by King Stanislaus and had to flee to Turkey. Soon thereafter Russia, Prussia, and Austria, in their zeal for the ostensible good of Poland, agreed to help themselves to large portions of her territory, and had the effrontery to convene the Polish Diet and under duress compel it to sanction the beginning of what Henry Wharton called "the most flagrant violation of national justice and international law which has occurred since Europe emerged from barbarism."

PULASKI'S MEMORABLE MANIFESTO

Soon thereafter, in 1772, Count Casimir Pulaski issued his memorable manifesto, in which he said in part:

"I am not astonished that the enemies of my country, resolved on her ruin, should direct their shafts against those who most firmly resist their impetuosity, and that they should regard as such the brave Poles, whom they have sacrificed and who are still repelling their most cruel attacks. * * * My destiny was clear when, at the age of 21, far from yielding to the amusements of youth, I regarded every moment as lost which was not employed in repelling the enemies of my country. * * * I have endeavored to mark my course by an invincible fortitude. Neither the blood of one of my brothers, which was shed by the enemy before my eyes, nor the cruel servitude of another, nor the sad fate of so many of my relations and compatriots, has shaken my patriotism. * * * I believe I have proved, by 4 years' service, that I have not been influenced by interest of a false point of honor. * * * I declare before God, before the Republic of Poland, and before all the powers of Europe, that my heart entered my imagination to attempt the life of any person to whom has been assigned, in any manner whatsoever, the government of the nation, or to avenge the wrongs of my country in any other way than that of open war."

Perhaps no better insight into the sturdy character of the illustrious Pulaski, known and revered both in Europe and America, could be given than the above excerpt from his manifesto. We are not surprised to hear a man of his lofty type later on, in August of 1779, state to the Continental Congress: "I could not submit to stoop before the sovereigns of Europe, so I came to hazard all for the freedom of America, and am desirous of passing the rest of my life in a country truly free and of settling as a citizen to fight for liberty."

HIS TRAVELS IN SEARCH FOR ACTION

From Turkey Pulaski wended his way to Paris. "Across the Atlantic," says Henry Williams, Esq., on the laying of the cornerstone of the monument to his memory at Savannah, on October 11, 1853, "came to him the tidings that the people of another hemisphere had bid defiance to oppression and were arming for the struggle. The sound stirred the heart of Pulaski like the voice of a battle trumpet. It was a struggle for liberty. It was his cause, whoever the people and wherever the scene of conflict. Fate forbade him to achieve the independence of his own country, and true to the noble impulses of his soul, he came to aid in establishing that in America."

"He saw," says Jared Sparks, in his American biography, "a new field opened for vindicating with his sword the same principles, the same rights of mankind, the same unchangeable laws of justice, as those for which he had wielded it with so much courage and singleness of purpose in his own country."

Benjamin Franklin, writing from Paris to General Washington on May 29, 1777, says: "Count Pulaski, of Poland, an officer famous throughout Europe for his bravery and conduct in defense of the liberties of his country against the three great invading powers of Russia, Austria, and Prussia, will have the honor of delivering this into your Excellency's hands."

We can readily see and understand why men like General Pulaski and his famous countryman, General Kosciusko, who also covered himself with undying glory in the Revolutionary War, were not soldiers of fortune, nor waifs thrown to the surface of troubled waters by the love of adventure and quest of money or emolument, no matter what the cause might be that they were fighting for. These men fought long and hard to establish the principles of liberty and justice on their own soil, they were imbued with this spirit in their own cause, for their own country, and it was only natural that when they had given their best for these sacred ideals without success against tyrants and intriguing despoilers of humanity, they should hear the shot fired at Lexington that was "heard round the world" with an eager ear, and should be willing to come to a foreign strand, although they neither understood the language nor were familiar with the customs of strange people on another continent. The principals of human liberty and justice are essentially the same in every clime and they were eager to resist a mighty empire that was trying to wrest them from a struggling people, a people whose slogan was "Give me liberty or give me death."

Like his famous compatriot, General Kosciusko, who when he appeared before Washington, and was asked by him what he could do, answered in a quiet way: "Try me and see," Pulaski did not wait for any appointment from Congress, but on hearing that the enemy was attacking Washington's forces, hastened to join them as a volunteer.

On August 25, 1777, Pulaski addressed a communication to John Hancock, President of Congress, which is his first letter in English: In it he states:

"I have dought it not my duty to stay here any longer, in as much as I have hear: that his Exy Genl. Washington is gon to meet the enemy; wherefore I will go to the Army, it is I can not do much, but hover I will shew my good will."

HIS ARRIVAL IN AMERICA

General Pulaski landed in America about the middle of July 1777, and after presenting his letters to Washington and Congress, waited for Congress to take action. But restless and eager to aid our cause as he was, he did not wait for official cognisance. Captain Bentalou, an able officer who fought under Pulaski until he died and was wounded along with Pulaski at Savannah, Ga., writes:

"The inherent ardor of his warlike spirit, his habits of activity, and the desire of efficiency serving the cause which he had so warmly embraced did not permit him to wait for the decision of Congress on his application—but he immediately joined the Army."

It so happened that General Pulaski and his friend, the Marquis de Lafayette, another distinguished officer, struck their first blows for American independence at the battle of Brandywine on September 11, 1777. Washington was bent at this time on opposing the advance of General Howe's army northward toward Philadelphia. At Brandywine Washington's army was repulsed, and a large part of it might have been captured had it not been for the masterly aid given by Pulaski at the head of a cavalry squad, who delayed the progress of the British and thus enabled the army of Washington to retreat in an orderly way and to save their baggage.

AN EXCELLENT ACT OF A VOLUNTEER AND AN APPOINTMENT

In describing Pulaski's activities at this battle Jared Sparks states:

"At Brandywine Pulaski, as well as Lafayette, was destined to strike his first blow in the defense of American liberty. Being a volunteer and without command, he was stationed near General Washington till toward the close of the action, when he asked the command of the general's bodyguard, about 30-horse, and advanced rapidly within pistol shot of the enemy, and, after reconnoitering their movements, returned and reported that

they were endeavoring to cut off the line of retreat and particularly the train of baggage. He was then authorized to collect as many of the scattered troops as came in his way, and employ them according to his discretion, which he did in a manner so prompt and bold as to effect an important service in the retreat of the army, fully sustaining by his conduct and courage the reputation for which the world had given him credit. Four days after this event he was appointed by Congress to the command of the Cavalry, with the rank of brigadier general."

The historian Ramsay says:

"At Brandywine Pulaski was a thunderbolt of war, and always sought the post of danger as the post of honor."

When Congress on September 15, 1777, elected Pulaski "commander of the horse with the rank of brigadier," he became the highest ranking officer of the Cavalry, and had under his command four regiments of cavalry, under the immediate commands of Colonels Bland, Baylor, Moyland, and Sheldon. It must be said that during the early part of the Revolutionary War the Cavalry did not take much of a part in the warfare, that the Colonists did not seem to realize the importance of this unit, said to be the eye of the Army, and did not know much about opposing cavalry attacks successfully. Until the advent of Pulaski the highest rank the Cavalry Division had was that of colonel, and such regiments as did exist were not able to do much, for the reason that they were often scattered on detail and reconnoitering work for the generals and the Army; and besides, there was not so much open warfare being conducted.

Pulaski was a great horseman; he believed in a strong cavalry, and was experienced in cavalry fighting from his warfare carried on in Poland. Dissatisfied with what he considered the deplorable condition of the American cavalry, which prevented him from doing effective work on a large scale, he continually urged Washington and Congress to strengthen this branch of the Army. He drew up and presented to Washington several plans for its reorganization, made various estimates and regulations, and was strong for disciplining his men and horses. Always restless and active, he wanted to be in the thick of the battle and produce results.

In his memorial to Washington of December 19, 1777, Pulaski advances a cogent argument for the building up of the Cavalry, which must appeal to every thinking person:

URGING GEORGE WASHINGTON TO STRENGTHEN HIS CAVALRY

"The advantages that would arise from a superiority in cavalry are too obvious to be unnoticed. It may be further observed that during this war the country will daily become more open and clear of woods and fences, consequently better adapted to the maneuvers and service of the cavalry. While we are superior in cavalry the enemy will not dare to extend their force, and, notwithstanding we are on the defensive, we shall have many opportunities of attacking and destroying the enemy by degrees, whereas if they have in their power to augment their cavalry, and we suffer ours to diminish and dwindle away, it may happen that the loss of a battle will terminate in our total defeat. Our Army once dispersed and pursued by their horse will never be able to rally; thus our retreat may only be cut off, our baggage lost, and principal officers taken, and many other events occur not less fatal.

"Your excellency may be assured that the good of the service is my constant study, but the weak state of the corps I command renders it impossible to perform every service required. Nay, my reputation is exposed, as being an entire stranger in the country the least accident would suffice to injure me, but, notwithstanding, I cannot avoid hazarding everything that is valuable in life."

PULASKI'S SERVICE AT WARREN TAVERN AND IN GERMANTOWN BATTLE

After the Battle of Brandywine General Pulaski saved the army of Washington from a sudden surprise that might have proven fatal at Warren Tavern on September 16, 1777. At the head of his cavalry, while reconnoitering, he came upon a whole army of the British near Warren Tavern. He harrassed the enemy, thus impeding their progress, and hastily gave the information to Washington, who then prepared to meet the enemy. He also was in the Battle of Germantown, and spent the winter at Trenton.

Washington spent the winter with the Army at Valley Forge. There was a great scarcity of food for the men and forage for the horses, and Washington ordered Gens. Anthony Wayne and Pulaski to go to Haddonfield, near Camden, to look for supplies in that part of the country. The British upon learning of this fact sent a force of 1,200 men to capture either Wayne or Pulaski.

The opposing forces met at Haddonfield. Pulaski at the head of his little troop of cavalry was everywhere alert, charging the enemy with the spirit and effect. His own horse was shot from under him, and he personally took seven prisoners. General Wayne, in making his report of the battle, praised Pulaski very highly, saying that he "behaved with his usual bravery."

PULASKI LEGION

However, still dissatisfied with the condition of the cavalry of which he was in command, and with the fact that his pleas for the reorganization and strengthening of the same were apparently unnoticed, and feeling the lack of cooperation from his officers, who did not like to be subjected to the authority of a foreigner, Pulaski resigned his command in the early part of March 1778, and asked Washington and Congress to give him leave to organize an independent corps, known later as the famous Pulaski Legion. Congress, upon the recommendation of Washington, resolved on March 19 that an independent corps be established by Count Pulaski, consisting of 68 horses with lances and 200 light Infantry, and that he retain the rank of brigadier general. By October of that year he had recruited 330 men for his legion. "The scheme of independent legions," says Sparks, "seems to have been first suggested by Pulaski; and it proved of the greatest importance in the subsequent operations of the war, and, above all, in the southern campaigns. Lee's and Armand's legions were formed upon a similar plan."

While on a visit to Bethlehem, Pa., in April of 1778 Pulaski asked the Moravian nuns, whose convent was located there, to make a special banner for his legion. This was done, and the banner delivered about May, when he again was there. Longfellow has immortalized the making and the presentation of the banner in his Hymn of the Moravian Nuns at the Consecration of Pulaski's Banner, but according to information received from the Pennsylvania archives (Pennsylvania in rev. II), and other sources, the transaction was simply a business affair, and the flag was paid for by Pulaski. Subsequently, it was presented to the Maryland Historical Society.

The contention that it was purchased and paid for by Pulaski is supported by the information that he spent his own money to help equip his legion. In his address to Congress on September 17, 1778, he states: "* * * I have expended $16,000 at least of my own." And again in his memorable letter of August 19, 1779, to Congress, reproaching Congress for its lack of appreciation for his services and efforts, he says: "* * * you must be sensible also, that I did not come to America destitute of resources, to be a burden on you; that I have a letter of credit on Mr. Moris; and that I was known by almost every foreigner of character." It is estimated that Pulaski advanced $50,000 of his own money in forming and equipping his legion.

The Pulaski Legion saw action at Egg Harbor, N. J., on October 15, 1778, where it repulsed a surprise attack on the infantry under the command of De Bosen, who was betrayed by a traitor of the name of Juliet, and also at Osborn's Island, where the legion drove back the enemy in confusion, but was checked after a bridge had been destroyed by the retreating foe.

The Pulaski Legion spent the winter around Minisink in New Jersey, where the hostile attitude of the Torries and Indians required their presence for the protection of the frontiers, and on February 2, 1779, Congress resolved that Count Pulaski march with his legion to South Carolina to join General Lincoln, then in command of the southern campaign. Congress also made provision for enlarging the corps.

In pursuance to the resolution of Congress that he march south, Pulaski with part of his force reached Charleston on May 8. Three days later the remainder of the legion arrived. On his way to Charleston, Pulaski heard that General Provost of the British forces was coming up from Georgia. On the 11th the latter crossed the Ashley River at the head of 900 men, and scarcely had he landed when Pulaski made an assault upon the advance lines. He kept up a sharp skirmish, but was finally forced to retreat on account of the superior numbers of the enemy. He then planned on drawing the enemy into an ambuscade, but his infantry, eager to get into action, gave his strategy away. Sparks says: "His coolness, courage, and disregard of personal danger were conspicuous throughout the encounter, and the example of his prompt and bold attack had great influence in raising the spirits of the people and inspiring the confidence of the inexperienced troops then assembled in the city."

FORCED RETREAT OF GENERAL PROVOST

Pulaski by appearing before the Governor and Council of Charleston, who were ready to capitulate and surrender the city to the British, by his plea and advice, ably assisted by General Moultrie and Colonel Laurens, persuaded them to reject any offer of submission, and the same night General Provost, who had heard that General Lincoln was marching to Charleston with 4,000 men, retreated across the river.

Savannah, Ga., was a stronghold of the British, and it was the intention of General Lincoln to besiege the city and drive the enemy away. On the 3d of September, he received information that Count d'Estaing was off the coast with a large fleet and that he would join General Lincoln in an attack upon the city. The latter left Charleston with his army for Savannah, and Count Pulaski and General McIntosh were sent ahead of the main army to atack and harass the British outposts. Pulaski dispersed a detachment of British at Ebenezer with his dragons, and likewise was sent by General Lincoln to attack a party of the British that had come up the Ogechee River and landed below the ferry. He suddenly fell upon the enemy, forcing them to retreat and taking a number of prisoners.

BATTLE AT SAVANNAH

The armies of the French under d'Estaing and the American forces came together at Savannah about the 16th of September. A siege was begun, but the enemy was strongly entrenched and refused to give ground. Finally, becoming weary of the prolonged siege and fearing for the safety of his vessels, Count d'Estaing requested that the city be attacked by storm. General Lincoln consented to this plan with some hesitation, believing that if the siege were kept up the

enemy would be forced to surrender or to evacuate the city.

On October 9 the order was given out that the ramparts of the British were to be taken by storm. The plan of the assault had been carefully gone over, and orders were issued as to the manner of attack and the points to be assailed. The cavalry of the French and American was under the command of Pulaski, and he was to charge the embattlements, following up the infantry, who were to storm the right of the British lines.

The attack was made as planned as to time and the center of attack, but a soldier who deserted the American forces after the scheme and order were given out informed the enemy, who massed their troops at the points of expected attack, and by a deadly, galling fire, repulsed the assailants. Count d'Estaing, instead of taking a circuitious road to get to his point of attack, endeavored to cross directly over a swamp. He was caught between a deadly cross fire, and havoc was wrought among his men.

PULASKI MORTALLY WOUNDED

Pulaski, seeing the apparent confusion and realizing that all was not well, drove up at the head of his cavalry to where the French were, to reinforce and encourage them, thinking that he might be able to get to the rear of the enemy through some opening. Dashing madly ahead into a withering flame of shot and shell, he himself was struck in the groin by a swivel shot and fell from his horse mortally wounded, to be picked up later and carried away. Count d'Estaing was also wounded.

Major Rogowski, one of Pulaski's officers and also a Pole, who was in the heroic charge, states in his description of the battle:

"For half an hour the guns roared and blood flowed abundantly. * * * Imploring the help of the Almighty, Pulaski shouted to his men, 'Forward,' and we, 200 strong, rode at full speed after him, the earth resounding under the hoofs of our chargers. For the first two moments all went well. We sped like knights into the peril. Just, however, as we passed the gap between the two batteries, a cross fire, like a pouring shower, confused our ranks. I looked around. O sad moment, ever to be remembered, Pulaski lies prostrate on the ground."

PULASKI'S DEATH AND A WATERY GRAVE

Pulaski was carried away by his soldiers and placed on the American brig *Wasp*, and put under the care of skilled French surgeons, who vainly endeavored to remove the bullet and save him. Gangrene had set in, and as the ship pulled out of the harbor for Charleston Pulaski expired, and the stench from his wounds was so bad that he was deposited in a watery grave on the 11th day of October 1779 at the age of 31 years.

When the *Wasp* pulled into the harbor of Charleston with her flag flying at half mast and it became known that the gallant Pulaski was dead, the city took on an aspect of general mourning. The Governor, the council of the State, and the citizens united to pay tribute to their youthful defender, who shortly before by his bravery and advice had saved them from an ignominious surrender. Resolutions were passed, public ceremonies were held, and a day was designated for the holding of his funeral obsequies. Three French and three American officers carried his bier, followed by the horse that Pulaski rode, with all the trappings, armor, and dress that he wore. The procession was large and imposing, and a chaplain of the Army delivered a fervid eulogy over the departed officer. Congress, on being apprised of Pulaski's death, resolved "that a monument be erected to the memory of Brigadier Count Pulaski."

Thus ended the brilliant career of the illustrious and gallant officer, a heroic figure on two continents, who had written to Col. R. H. Lee on August 13, 1778: "Honor and true desire of distinguishing myself in defense of liberty was the only motive which fired my breast for the cause of the United States," and who had written to Congress on September 17, 1778, "I am a Republican whom the love of glory and the honor of supporting the liberty of the Union drew hither."

HONORED BY THE CITIZENS OF SAVANNAH AND UNITED STATES CONGRESS

The citizens of Savannah, Ga., erected a monument to the memory of Pulaski in Monterey Square, which was completed in 1854. The resolution of the Continental Congress providing that a monument be erected to his memory was not carried out until 1910, when the Fifty-seventh Congress of the United States provided for the erection of a bronze equestrian statue in Washington at a cost of $50,000. This monument, together with one erected by the Polish National Alliance of America in memory of Thaddeus Kosciusko, was unveiled during the month of May 1910.

The Honorable A. L. Brick, who appeared before the committee in Congress urging the erection of the monument in Washington, said:

"Pulaski died as he had lived, a noble and undaunted warrior, fighting the battles of liberty and of the Republic. * * * He sacrificed himself, all the years of his young life, his fortune, his ancestral dignity, his lofty spirit, his splendid genius, and all his earthly hopes, for liberty, justice, and humanity. For these things he gave all he had—his martyred life."

DOCUMENT OF AMERICAN MILITARY HISTORIAN

In the American Military Biography containing the lives and characters of the officers of the Revolution who distinguished themselves in achieving our national independence, the author says: "Perhaps a braver man than Pulaski never drew a sword," and in describing his death at Savannah, "Thus fell, in a most bold and daring achievement, the distinguished Polish patriot and hero, in the cause of American liberty; his memory is entitled to our veneration, as his life forms an item in the price of our independence."

It is only proper and just that America and grateful people enjoying the blessings of liberty, peace, and prosperity should recall the life of this great man and pay tribute to his valor and chivalry. He left the old world and came to this continent to help establish, as the immortal Lincoln said, "a new Nation, dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." He gave his last full measure of devotion to that cause, and four millions of his countrymen residing in the United States rejoice with the American Nation, of which they are a part, that Pulaski and that other illustrious Polish patriot, Thaddeus Kosciusko, and other distinguished men of Polish blood stood by the cradle of American independence and helped to lay the foundation for a new government in the new world, dedicated to the principles of human liberty and justice.

UNDER OUR FLAG A BRIGADIER GENERAL OF TWO HEMISPHERES MADE SUPREME SACRIFICE FOR THE CAUSE OF LIBERTY

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

UNDER OUR FLAG

(By Ignatius K. Werwinski, former chairman of the U. S. Pulaski Sesquicentennial Commission)

Under our flag, purest, most potent emblem of law, order, Christian civilization, that ever saluted the dawn, during the Revolutionary War, gave a life to a hero of two hemispheres, Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

Under our flag, ne'er dropped in dust of defeat, fostered by revered father of the Revolution, the name of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, is imperishably written in letters of gold on the pages of American history, defying the ages.

Under our flag, floating in zephyrs of high heaven o'er the eternal capital of a republic, founded on the rock of righteousness, symbol of humanity's fondest, dearest hope, forever proclaiming justice, human brotherhood throughout the land, through the inspiration left us by Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

Under our flag, unstained, untarnished, bejeweled, gleaming in darkest night, her triumphal march across the centuries a path of light. Who dare touch with profaning hand, this sleepless majestic guardian of an ardent, strong, brave, free people, and under which flag Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski gave his life in Savannah, Ga., on October 11, 1779.

Under our flag, inspiration of a mighty race, mingling in sentiment of cherished children, native of her soil undefiled, and lovers of liberty from every clime, seeking naught by the common good, yearning to serve mankind 'neath sheltering aegis of the red, white and blue, under which Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski fought.

Under our flag, immortalized by Washington, and under which flag fought Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, her beauteous folds spread from Gulf to coast by Jefferson, borne aloft by Lincoln in strife of heroes that united as one a sisterhood of States and blended the blue and gray, in fires of patriotism, preserving every star in the shining standard of national sovereignty. May Old Glory, under which Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski fought and gave his life in all the flood of time wave with undimmed radiance and increasing splendor over the fairest expanse of God's earth.

Under our flag, precious, sublime inheritance, blessing of America's faith, power, unity, sanctified by patriot blood of our hero, Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, we consecrate anew in o'erflowing measures our hearts, our eager, willing service of hand and brain to the defense and greater glory to our country for which Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski fought and gave his life.

Under our flag, may the American people pay the due tribute to the memory of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski on the two hundred and first anniversary of the birth of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, Revolutionary War hero, by observing the anniversary of his birth on March 4, 1949.

(Dedicated to the Sons of Revolution.)

SOUTH BEND, IND., *March 4, 1949.*

(Mr. CROOK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include some articles.)

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE].

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, today marks the two hundred and first anniversary of the birth of a great son of Poland and a great hero of the American Revolution, Gen. Casimir Pulaski. The facts about General Pulaski's life are so well known that they need no repetition. We are all familiar with the fact that Casimir Pulaski, born at Podolia, took a prominent share under his father, Count Joseph Pulaski, in the formation of the Confederation of Bar and thereafter in the military operations. Ultimately he became commander in chief of the Polish patriotic forces. Having been driven into exile in 1772, Pulaski came to America and joined the Army of Gen. George Washington.

He distinguished himself in the battle of Brandywine, was made a brigadier general and chief of cavalry by order of Congress. He fought at Germantown and in the battles of the winter of 1778. After that, he raised a mixed corps called the Pulaski Legion, with which he defended the city of Charleston in May 1779. We all know that General Pulaski was mortally wounded at Savannah and that he passed to his eternal reward on October 11.

Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the birth of this great patriot of Poland and this great friend of the United States, not as a mere tribute to a man who has long since passed into the realm of history. Rather, I call attention to his magnificent life because the inspiration of his deeds is so important not only to the United States, but to all the sons and daughters of Poland—the inhabitants of that stricken land which was the first to fight in the Second World War, but which seems to have paid for its sacrifices only by continued enslavement.

The inspiration of General Pulaski, I am sure, will continue to give courage and confidence to all the friends and admirers of Poland, both within that ravaged land and beyond its boundaries.

Although the great state of Poland is now behind the iron curtain, the people of the United States have lost none of their friendship, none of their sympathy, none of their admiration for the heroic Poles.

As we observe the steady pressure against the aspirations of the Polish people and other peoples who have a right to be free, all thinking Americans realize it is our sworn duty to rally to the cause of Poland, and indeed to rally to the cause of every helpless suppressed nation which is struggling to be free from imperialistic tyranny.

Our boys have fought and died for freedom and the very least we can do is to strive to fulfill the ideals for which so many of them paid the supreme sacrifice. Poland must and will be free, or else the cause of democracy, which she symbolizes so nobly, will be submerged under the sea of totalitarian dictatorship and the world will revert again into brutality and barbarianism.

Under the inspiration of Pulaski, whose life exemplifies so magnificently the devotion and sacrifice of Poland and the Polish people, let us renew our determination to work and pray for the liberation of Poland and all the other oppressed liberty-loving peoples of the world.

I am proud to pledge my continued efforts to the sacred cause of Poland and all human freedom. By the grace of God and our united efforts, may Polish freedom soon be an actuality.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, today marks the two hundred and first anniversary of the birth of the renowned Polish-American hero, Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

This hero who died on October 11, 1779, from wounds received in fighting for American freedom should be especially remembered. It was not his fight. He was not an American. Yet there coursed through his blood a love of liberty and freedom that brought him to the side of our great patriots in their struggle to establish this great Nation.

It is only proper that Congress recognize his sacrifice and that we call the attention of the world to it.

The name of General Pulaski lives in history and will ever serve as an inspiration to all who love freedom and justice.

His role in resisting the forces oppressing his beloved Poland has been celebrated by the historians of every freedom-loving nation. Every American schoolboy has been taught the debt of gratitude that our own country owes to the contributions and courage of this great patriot. As we revere his memory, we honor through him that love of liberty and that dauntless spirit, stemming from his Polish heritage, which sent him forth to fight for freedom in the New World.

Civilization is based upon a reign of peace and justice, and for this reason America has been ennobled by the spiritual contributions of her citizens of Polish descent. By being true to their culture and their creed, Americans of Polish ancestry cannot help being true to their country. Their love of Poland and desire to make it free will only enhance their love of America. All of us might well be proud if we could contribute as much as Pulaski did to progress in the United States and peace in the world.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, today, March 4, 1949, is the two hundred and first anniversary of the birth of that great Polish-American hero, Gen. Casimir Pulaski. Several Congressmen, including myself, have introduced resolution to proclaim October 11, not only this year, but every year, a General Pulaski Memorial Day.

With the passage of this resolution the President will call upon the officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all the Government buildings and will invite the people of the United States to observe the day in schools, halls, and churches, with appropriate ceremonies, commemorating the death of Gen. Casimir Pulaski, the Polish patriot, who fought and died for the cause of American independence.

Pulaski was born in Podolia, Poland, at a time when that nation was undergoing a severe internal political battle. With rapacious neighbors beginning to conspire against the freedom of the people, the boy Pulaski was consumed with an early desire to ward off danger, and evinced a keen interest in military affairs at a very young age. Long before he reached his majority Pulaski joined in the guard of Duke Charles, and thus gained a rigorous and practical experience in the art of warfare.

In 1769 he joined his father, Joseph Pulaski, in what was termed "The Confederation of Bar," this confederation being a conjointure of Polish noblemen, each one of whom pledged his time, his fortune, and his life to the salvation of Poland. Casimir Pulaski and his brother, Francis, became the active leaders in the movement. The older leaders were soon dispersed, some going abroad; others were confined in dungeons. Pulaski's father was one of those confined in a dungeon prison, where he later died.

But despite this Casimir carried on, and at the head of a small force of cavalry he performed heroic feats. With his brother he became a constant terror to the Russians, who were trying to capture him. Against overwhelming odds for 4 years this great patriotic organization under this great leader fought to oust the enemies of Poland from his country. But all their efforts proved fruitless. During this time one of General Pulaski's brothers was killed before his eyes, the youngest brother taken into captivity, and many of his countrymen were doomed to misery.

Gen. Casimir Pulaski was the leading spirit of his countrymen in this unequal struggle to preserve the country intact. Although but 25 years of age, he was the acknowledged leader and the hero of his countrymen. Heedless of his foe, which was much more powerful, he fought with a zeal and tenacity that made him renowned as a cavalry leader throughout the Continent of Europe.

General Pulaski not only lost his father and brother in this glorious attempt to save Poland from the first of her ignoble partitions, but his estates were confiscated and he was proscribed by King Stanislaus and had to travel to Turkey. Soon thereafter, in 1772, Count Casimir Pulaski issued his memorable manifesto, in which he said in part:

> I am not astonished that the enemies of my country resolved on her ruin, should direct their shares against those who most firmly resist their impetuosity, and that they should regard as such the brave Poles whom they have sacrificed and who are still repelling their most cruel attacks. * * * My destiny was clear, when at the age of 21, far from yielding to the amusements of youth, I regarded every moment as lost which was not employed in repelling the enemies of my country. * * * I have endeavored to mark my course by an invincible fortitude. Neither the blood of one of my brothers, which was shed by the enemy before my eyes, nor the cruel servitude of another, nor the sad fate of so many of my relations and compatriots has shaken my patriotism.

Perhaps no better insight into the sturdy character of Pulaski, who is revered both in Europe and America, could be given than the above excerpt from his manifesto. He traveled to Turkey, but, repelled with the feeble notions of liberty entertained by the Sultan, he journeyed on to Marseilles, France, and from there to Paris. It was in the French Capital that he made the acquaintance of Benjamin Franklin and young America's struggle for independence. Benjamin Franklin, writing from Paris to General Washington on May 29, 1777, said:

> Count Pulaski, of Poland, an officer famous throughout Europe for his bravery and conduct in defense of the liberties of his country against the three great invading powers of Russia, Austria, and Prussia, will have the honor of delivering this into your excellency's hands.

General Pulaski landed in America the middle of July 1777, and after presenting his letters to Washington and Congress, waited for Congress to take act on. In the meantime Washington's army passed through the streets of Philadelphia. Spurred by the sight of marching

soldiers, Pulaski, restless and eager to aid our cause, decided not to wait for his commission, but to follow the Army as a volunteer. In Europe a member of the nobility, an officer of distinguished prestige, in America a private in the ranks. Such was Pulaski. Not self, but service, was his life's motto.

The night of September 8, 1777, Washington assembled a council of war to decide which position the Army should take in defense of Philadelphia. The upland, across the brook of Brandywine, was chosen. The Army moved to this position at dawn. The enemy's attack was expected on the 11th and about 9 o'clock of that day the red uniforms appeared. The battle started. The vanguard, under General Maxwell, retreated under heavy pressure. The rest of the Army was stretched out lengthwise for a considerable distance along the brook. The right wing was under the command of General Sullivan, and the left wing, to the south, was under the command of General Armstrong.

General Wayne and General Proctor commanded the cannon and the artillery. Washington remained with the reserve, which was commanded by General Greene, and Pulaski was stationed by the side of Washington.

Upon the withdrawal of General Maxwell the British kept up fire, but did not attempt crossing the creek. Washington was about ready to strike a blow at the enemy, but first wanted to be convinced that the opponents' main forces were not circumventing him for an attack at the rear. To that end a detachment was sent out to explore the region. About 2 o'clock an orderly dispatched the news that the enemy could not be seen on any of the roads on the opposite side of the creek. An order of attack was about to be issued when a man in a cart was noticed waving his hat and striving to reach headquarters. The man turned out to be Squire Cheney, with the startling news that the main forces of the enemy had crossed the Brandywine to the north and were fast approaching the Army's rear.

Washington immediately directed the division of Sullivan, together with the brigades of Conway, Stirling, and Stephans to meet the enemy. They hurriedly arrayed themselves for battle, just as the British were spied on the road. Thereupon the British vanguard showed itself on the plain. The American artillery opened fire. Hessian riflemen were playing havoc with the American front ranks. At the same time a column of infantry rushed to the upland occupied by the Americans. The center was holding up under the bombardment but both wings were fleeing. The enemy then concentrated on the center which soon wavered. Chaos reigned.

At this juncture Pulaski secured Washington's permission to use his bodyguard, some 30 horse, and launched a furious attack at the pursuers. With great skill he wedged into the side of the pursuing column. Swinging their sabers from left to right, this small detachment brought confusion to the ranks of the enemy. The pursuit was momentarily checked. Pulaski's forces took shelter with General Greene's army and together they held the enemy while the rear of the American Army retreated to Dillworth. There the road narrowed and the Americans gained a vantage point where they could withstand the onslaught of the enemy. Thus Washington's army was saved.

Within 2 months after his arrival on September 15, 1777, Congress elected Pulaski commander of the horse, with the rank of brigadier.

General Washington's letter to Congress recommending the appointment of Pulaski read as follows:

> This gentleman has been, like us, engaged in defending the liberty and independence of his country and has sacrificed his fortune and his zeal for these objects. He derives from hence a title to our respect that ought to operate in his favor as far as the good of the service will permit.

Shortly afterward, Washington's army was saved from an almost inevitable destruction at Warren Tavern, near Philadelphia, only by the warcraft of Pulaski. He also engaged in the Battle of Germantown. On the day of the Battle of Germantown he was sorely disappointed and mortified. There were but four regiments of cavalry raised and not one of them completed. Three of them only, such as they were, had joined General Washington's army, and on the day of the battle, guards were furnished out of those regiments to attend on the Commander in Chief and on other generals. This was a matter of deep regret and bitter chagrin.

When General Washington had taken his winter quarters at Valley Forge, the cavalry were sent over into New Jersey on account of forage and for other service on that side of the Delaware. Pulaski made his headquarters in Trenton.

Weary of the lapse in activity subsequent to these previous battles and dampened by the pettiness of the command under which he was stationed, as well as the tardy tactics of Congress in carrying out his suggestions for the improvement of the infantry, Pulaski expressed a wish to return to Europe. Washington persuaded him to remain, however.

In March 1778 he asked permission from General Washington and Congress to organize an independent corps, later to be known throughout the Colonies as the Polish Legion. In equipping it he is said to have spent $50,000 of his own funds. These horsemen, among other arms, bore the famous Polish lances, a new weapon on this continent. Rated as the most expert horseman in the American cavalry, his service in leading and inspiring the cavalry was of inestimable value. From the time Pulaski took command it became a notable weapon of offense and defense.

Then followed the battle of Charleston, S. C., when the city was sieged by 900 British troops from General Prevost's army. Although not altogether successful in his assault, Pulaski held the city 2 days until the arrival of reinforcements.

Probably Pulaski's most distinguished service was rendered in the siege of Savannah, Ga., although this move was made contrary to the sound advice of Pulaski, who pleaded a delay of a number of days due to their unpreparedness. Pulaski was here made commander of the entire cavalry, both French and American. During the battle their scheme failed. The French became entangled and their Admiral D'Esaing was wounded. Chaos resulted in the ranks. Hoping to rally the men and regain order, Pulaski rushed into the thick of the battle. Leading his men in a desperate charge, he received a wound in his right thigh and was carried from the field of battle fatally wounded. Pulaski died 2 days later while on board the brig *Wasp*, leaving Savannah Harbor on the way to Charleston. According to his friend and companion in arms, Capt. Paul Bentalou, he was buried at sea, and funeral services were held afterward in the city of Charleston.

In this manner, at the age of 31 years, ended the life of one of the most active and greatest patriots of his time. A man well born, of handsome physique and liberal education, who abandoned a life of ease and complacency for a career of unnumbered hardships, his was a proud and magnanimous personality. His corps of lancers and light infantry, which were recruited mostly in Baltimore, has since become famous under the name of Pulaski's Legion. He is known as the founder of the American Cavalry. Pulaski, like Washington, could have chosen the easy course. They were both men of large means. But they recognized the responsibility of wealth and rank.

An equestrian statue, which stands between Thirteenth and Fourteenth Streets on Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, commemorates this hero of two hemispheres.

The splendid funeral honors paid by the citizens of Charleston to the memory of the brave Pulaski—the united regrets of the people and of the Army at the loss of an officer no less beloved than he was useful—and the last tribute of respect offered to his memory by Congress have already evinced the sensibilities and gratitude of our Nation. The gallant son of Poland had enthusiastically espoused the cause of America. He served that cause with zeal, ardor, and fidelity.

Pulaski died as he had lived—a hero, but an enemy of kings. Since the time of Pulaski others have come from his native land to mix their blood with the blood of other peoples to make one common country and to build a single destiny. Many Americans of Polish extraction have offered their lives in defense of this country on many battlefields—in the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, and in the great World Wars. The blood of Pulaski still flows in the blood of his countrymen.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, because of the inspiration I have received, and the renewed faith in the destiny of my country that has come to me, when on many occasions during the years I have addressed gatherings of my fellow Chicagoans of Polish descent or extraction, I had wished for the first time

to raise my voice in the historic well of the House on the occasion of the birthday of Casimir Pulaski.

Unfortunately, because of the termination of the present rent-control law on March 31, 1949, and the catastrophic tragedy which would fall upon hundreds of thousands of American families if another rent-control law were not by that time enacted, I was, during the hour devoted by the House to impressive ceremonies honoring the natal day of Casimir Pulaski, engaged with my colleagues on the House Committee on Banking and Currency in the final deliberations on this vitally important measure.

Availing myself, therefore, of the general leave asked and granted for the extension of remarks, I wish here to call the attention of my colleagues to the quality of patriotism and love of country which is such a marked characteristic of men and women of Polish blood.

I have never known audiences that respond in greater measure and with more spontaneous applause than do those of the Polish-Americans of Chicago at any mention of an American tradition, the epic of an American heroism or the destiny of these United States as guide and servitor of mankind in the march to the mountaintops of human contentment.

In Chicago, Mr. Speaker, to be of Polish blood is to come with highest recommendation to universal esteem and to the confidence of all citizens.

From the first and down the years the sons and daughters of Poland have been conspicuous among builders of America. As far back as Jamestown they were part and parcel of the great American adventure. As Indian fighters and as craftsmen no members of Capt. John Smith's settlement excelled them. Skillful in making pitch tar and soap ashes they were made teachers of young men so that "their skill shall not die with them."

Reading in the early Jamestown records of the strike of the Polish Colonists when the House of Burgesses refused to permit them to vote I realize how long and consistent has been the fight of the people of Polish blood in America to attain for all men the enjoyment of civil rights.

The America to which Casimir Pulaski gave his life will erect its most fitting monument to him, not of granite, not in the flowers of laudatory phraseology, but in a social and an economic order in which no human being shall suffer the lash of cruel discrimination unless by his own deportment and lack of character he has isolated himself from the normal relationships.

To have lived but 31 years, only two of them in this America of ours, and then for 172 years to have been enshrined in the hearts of all Americans epitomizes the story of Casimir Pulaski. His name has been known affectionately to generations of American school children and their parents. He is one of our great national heroes. On his birthday after two centuries have passed this historic House of Representatives in what truly may be said to be the Capital of the world pauses in its deliberation on present problems to do honor to his memory.

Yet when he came to America, as so many who followed him, there were those who shunned him as a foreigner. Snarls there were among some because the accident of birth had given to Poland and not America the honor of his nativity. Some there were who refused to serve under him because he was not native-born and his ancestry, courageous and liberty-loving, nevertheless had no American background.

It had been the same in France. Impoverished because of his sacrifices for country and for the cause of liberty, he was thrown in jail for debt. Poverty, however, in the eyes of Benjamin Franklin did not hide the stature of one whom he described to Washington as one of the greatest officers of Europe famous throughout Europe for his bravery and conduct in defense of the liberties of his country against the three great invading powers, Austria, Russia, and Prussia.

To the cause of the Colonies he gave himself tirelessly. To the army of Washington he contributed the spark of his brilliant military genius. In the siege of Savannah when his own command was not in the immediate engagement word came that the French command was sorely pressed. Immediately he rode to the rescue of the French commander despite the great danger involved. First his horse was shot from under him, then rushing forward on foot he received the fatal wounds. Thus he died for America, where by a petty few he had been discriminated against because he was a foreigner, and in an effort to save the soldiers of France, where he had been jailed for debt.

Casimir Pulaski has been an inspiration to all of us, and in an especial sense to the men and women of his extraction who have followed him in service to our country.

Three of our distinguished colleagues from Chicago [Messrs. GORDON, GORSKI, and CHESNEY] are of that extraction. The gentleman from the Eighth District [Mr. GORDON], I might say, is the nephew of the beloved Father Gordon, who founded in Chicago the newspaper which has the largest circulation in the world of a newspaper printed in the Polish language, a journalistic preeminence to which our colleague as business manager made large contribution. The gentleman from the Fifth District [Mr. GORSKI] is a leader at the Chicago bar, and the gentleman from the Eleventh District [Mr. CHESNEY] is a hero of the sports-loving public of Chicago because of his all-American stature on the Bears' football 11.

Three of our colleagues from Detroit [Messrs. LESINSKI, SADOWSKI, and DINGELL], one from New York [Mr. GORSKI], one from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK], and two from Wisconsin [Messrs. ZABLOCKI and O'KONSKI] are of Polish blood.

The Honorable Victor Schlegger, the recorder of deeds of Cook County and outstanding leader in every worthy undertaking in Chicago; the Honorable Benjamin S. Adamowski, brilliant corporation counsel of the city of Chicago, who, as a young man and majority leader in the general assembly at Springfield, made a legislative record that has never been surpassed in our State; the Honorable Edmund K. Jarecki, county judge, whose protection of the purity of the ballot box has furnished a pattern for the entire Nation; the Honorable Joseph Baran, distinguished city treasurer of Chicago and prominently numbered among the great businessmen of the metropolis; the Honorable Casimir Griglic, member of the sanitary district and renowned as one of the great orators of the Nation; and the Honorable M. S. Szymczak, Governor of the Federal Reserve and internationally esteemed as one of the foremost financial authorities in the world; these are but a few of the many, many faithful public servants whose fidelity to their trust and brilliant achievements in the public interest have so impressed the electorate of Chicago and Cook County in Illinois that candidates of Polish blood invariably receive majorities of such size as unmistakably reflect the fullest confidence of all our people.

The Honorable Walter La Buy, learned jurist on the bench of the United States district court; the Honorable John Prystalski and the Honorable Peter Schwaba, on the State bench; and the Honorable Edward Scheffler, Victor Kula, Edward Luczak, and Raymond Paul Drymalski on the municipal bench of Chicago; all are of Polish extraction.

Capt. Peter Kielbasa, veteran soldier of the Civil War, was the first man of Polish blood elected to the Illinois Legislature. Today in the State senate at Springfield sit Senators Stanley Mondala and John S. Kluczynski; and on the house side are Representatives John Kukliski, Anthony Prusinski, Adam S. Miodoski, Joseph Zientek, Thaddeus Adesko, Stanley A. Halick, Stanley R. Kosinski, Frank Krasniewski, and Theodore Swinarski, while in the City Council of Chicago Alderman Joseph P. Flostenkowski, Joseph Ropa, Walter Orlikowski, and Felix Kucharski have made enviable records in the complex and difficult domain of municipal legislation.

Nor should I forget to mention Mr. Louis Lesnicki, noted veteran political observer for the Polish Daily News of Chicago, whose warm friendship I have prized for four decades. His literary but dynamic style of writing, combined with his keen insight into the minds and motivations of men, long have made him a journalistic power of magnitude in the Middle Western States. Also not to be omitted is the name of Anthony Czarnecki, Knight of St. Gregory and writer on the staff of the Chicago Daily News who long ago achieved, for a lone and then young reporter, the remarkable feat of unhorsing a mayor of Chicago at first almost single-handed.

From the Polish colonists at Jamestown; from Pulaski and Kosciusko, the "Father of American artillery" in the War of the Revolution; from Charles Blaszkowicz, mapping the coast of New England; from Sister Mary Veronica, nursing the wounded on the battlefield of Gettysburg; on down to Governor of the Federal Reserve Szymczak and the others of the virile today has come a rich contribution to the American heritage.

All this is heartening to us whose faith is in the destiny of America to recall, on this birthday 201 years after the nativity on Polish soil, of a great American hero.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article that appeared in a recent issue of Freedom and Union:

"FORWARD!" PULASKI SHOUTED

(Count Casimir Pulaski, born in Poland, March 4, 1748)

Count Pulaski, Polish patriot and American Revolutionary War hero, has often been called the father of American cavalry. He had the same difficulty in selling the use of the cavalry arm to the infantry generals of the American Revolution as did Gen. Billy Mitchell in advocating the use of air power before World War II.

Pulaski gave his life in a demonstration of the power of cavalry in the assault on Savannah, October 9, 1779. Major Rogowski, a Polish officer in the Pulaski Legion, gave this eyewitness account:

"For half an hour the guns roared and blood flowed abundantly. Seeing an opening between the enemy's works, Pulaski resolved with his legion and a small detachment of Georgia cavalry, to charge through, enter the city. Imploring the help of the Almighty, Pulaski shouted 'Forward!' and we, 200 strong, rode at full speed after him. Just, however, as we passed the gap between the two batteries, a cross fire, like a pouring shower, confused our ranks. I look around Oh! sad moment, ever to be remembered. Pulaski lies prostrate on the ground. I leaped toward him; a canister shot had pierced his thigh, and the blood was also pouring from his breast, probably from another wound. Falling on my knees, I tried to raise him. He said in a faint voice, "Jesus! Maria! Joseph!" Further, I know not, for at that moment a musket ball, grazing my scalp, blinded me with blood, and I fell to the ground in a state of insensibility."

Two days later Pulaski died in great agony of gangrene infection. He had given his life for America—and for freedom.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who wish to do so may extend their remarks in the RECORD within five legislative days.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BROOKS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

MONTANA MANGANESE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as our colleague the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] said in a speech on the floor of the House on February 28, "Manganese is the starch in steel." There is no substitute for this material in the making of steel, and were it not for manganese our steel mills would not be operating at the present time. According to testimony before the Mining Subcommittee of the Public Lands Committee, the United States now has in the national stock pile approximately 1,340,000 tons of manganese ore. At the present time we consume approximately 1,500,000 manganese tons of ore a year. This means that we have on hand a little more than a year's supply. Due to the fact that we produce only 130,000 tons a year in the United States, we are dependent to a large extent upon supplies from foreign countries. There has been a decided drop in the imports from India, the U. S. S. R., and other countries. Cuba, which was a major supplier of manganese, is now no longer to be considered because its deposits have been completely exhausted. At the present time there is no assurance as to how long we will be able to keep importing manganese from overseas. The result is that there is no surplus supply of manganese ore in the world. New sources must be developed. Foreign or domestic, we should get every ton of manganese ore available in the world as speedily as possible and stock pile it in the United States until our position is secure.

The best policy, in my opinion, would be to develop the manganese potential of the United States at the earliest opportunity. We cannot depend upon foreign countries for our needs and manganese is the most precious of all strategic minerals at the present time. In the Butte and Philipsburg areas in Montana, we have manganese-deposits. We now have the means by which we can process low-grade ores. I therefore urge the Congress, in view of the present critical situation of manganese, that it give every possible consideration to the passage of H. R. 1239, a bill introduced by me on January 10, 1949, to stimulate the exploration, production, and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals and for the establishment within the Department of the Interior of a Mine Incentive Payments Division, and for other purposes. This will revive the premium-price plan which was so successfully carried out during the war and it will give hope to the small operators in Montana to prospect and develop their claims and will likewise give them some assurance in the matter of price. Because of the need for manganese, and other metals such as lead, zinc, copper, and other ores, it will give to the price of that mineral the stability which it needs so badly at this time. We have an abundance of manganese ore in the western part of Montana as well as in 27 other States. The properties are largely undeveloped and milling plants are required for the ore. No money is available for the domestic development and research and action is needed for the research of manganese and without delay. It is my hope therefore that this Congress will recognize the need for urgency in this matter and do all within its power to support the enactment of legislation that will give hope and assurance to our small operators and not only develop manganese deposits but other critical mineral needs as well.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in this part of my remarks a letter which I received on January 24, 1949, from William R. McLure, of Philipsburg, and also a resolution addressed to the Congress of the United States by the people living in the Philipsburg mining district of Granite County, Mont.—many of them my close personal friends. These people know whereof they speak and in their behalf I ask that the Congress give serious consideration to their request.

PHILIPSBURG, MONT., *January 24, 1949.*

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: The writer has been chosen by the mining interests of Granite County, as well as by our leading citizens generally, to present our Montana Senators and Representatives in the Eighty-first Congress with the resolution of which the enclosed, being a certified copy, the original being in the files of the city of Philipsburg, Granite County, Mont., is a copy, as certified by the city clerk. Upon a reading of the enclosed certified copy you will find it fully and fairly self-explanatory.

The people of Granite County have every confidence in its present representation in Washington, D. C., and they believe that you, Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Senator ZALES N. ECTON, Representative WESLEY D'EWART can put the metals program over for Granite County and that you will leave no stone unturned in your combined and individual efforts to do so.

Please advise if I should send copies of the resolution also to the Committee on Mines and Mining of the Committee on Public Lands, and the Army and Navy Munitions Board.

We will appreciate very much hearing from you and receiving any suggestions by which we will be further able to help you in securing an effective presentation of this whole matter as set forth in the title and in the body of this enclosed resolution.

With kind personal regards and best wishes for the best in the New Year for you and yours, I am

Very sincerely yours,
WILLIAM R. MCLURE.

Resolution to the United States Congress, in its eighty-first session, and to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY and ZALES ECTON, Members of the Senate thereof, and to the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD and WESLEY A. D'EWART, Members of the House of Representatives thereof, urging and imploring upon that honorable body and the Members thereof, the creating of a stock piling program for the stock piling of low-grade and complex raw ores; and urging and imploring the passage of premium price legislation, now before the new Congress, in support of such a program in and for the Philipsburg mining district, Granite County, Mont.

To the Honorable Congress of the United States of America, in its Eighty-first Session Assembled, and to the Honorable James E. Murray and Zales N. Ecton, Members of the Senate Thereof, and to the Honorable Mike Mansfield and Wesley A. D'Ewart, Members of the House of Representatives Thereof:

Whereas the Philipsburg mining district, Granite County, Mont., has had and enjoyed a gross production of nonferrous metals in the amount of approximately $75,000,000;

Whereas the said Philipsburg mining district, Granite County, Mont., was one of the largest, if not the greatest contributor of manganese to the success of the war effort in and during World War I, during and through the period 1917 to 1919, inclusive;

Whereas for the information of the addressed, Bulletin No. 78 of the United States Geological Survey, and subsequent publications thereto, the latter stressing in some particularity, the manganese deposits in the district, give in excellent discussion, the over-all picture of the mineral character of the Philipsburg mining district, with particular reference to the Philipsburg quadrangle, geological survey thereof;

Whereas it is sought to enlist the attention of the appropriate committees of the

said eighty-first session of the United States Congress in sessions assembled, namely, the Committee on Mines and Mining of the Committee on Public Lands, and also, the Army and Navy Munitions Board, and/or other appropriate committees and/or boards, through and by the Montana representation herein addressed, in stressing to the Eighty-first Congress in it's regular session assembled, the necessity of stock piling of low grade and complex raw ores for the serving of any of several emergencies, which it appears, may soon arise, and which are already existent to great extent;

Whereas there are large deposits of lead, zinc, and copper ores in the said Philipsburg mining district, and whereas, if shipped to a lead smelter, the shipper is penalized for the zinc;

Whereas there is no zinc concentrator nearer to the said Philipsburg mining district, than one located at Salt Lake City, Utah, where payment of percentages of all contained metals is made;

Whereas the said Philipsburg mining district has large reserves of carbonate manganese that were partly disclosed during World War II, but no thorough examination or study of this potential supply has ever been made by the Bureau of Mines, to determine either the grade or the tonnage available;

Whereas, however, there was approximately 70,000 tons carbonate ore of a commercial grade mined and shipped to the Government stock pile during World War II. There was also mined and sold during the same period, to the Government stock pile, approximately 60,000 tons manganese oxide ore, as well as substantial tonnage of battery ore produced and sold to private industry. This tonnage likewise was sold during World War II.

Whereas there are in the district, considerable deposits of copper and iron ores, which also contain tungsten values, the latter being completely lost in the processes of custom smelting, but which, in the presence of a premium price plan, covering such strategic minerals, might well be saved for the requirements of the economies and advantage of the country and its emergencies;

Whereas there are immense deposits of ores containing strategic minerals, that are complex and marginal, but recovery of all of which could be effected under a stock-piling program set up for the Philipsburg mining district as herein proposed, supported by the proposed premium price legislation, which is also now before the honorable Eighty-first Congress of the United States;

Whereas in the findings of the Hoover committee, it has been found and established that the conditions of stock piling of strategic material in this country is deplorable, and whereas it is felt that a stock-piling program, supported by premium-plan legislation, would go a long way toward curing this observation made, and objection by the Hoover committee as herein quoted, with the said Philipsburg mining district given a part therein: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States Congress has heretofore, in regular session assembled, passed and adopted legislation for the stock piling of low-grade and complex and low-grade raw ores, and that a stock-piling program be set up and established in accordance tr rewith; and that the proper authority be exercised to the end that such a stock-piling program be initiated and ordered for the Philipsburg mining district; be it further

Resolved, That the Eighty-first Congress, in regular session assembled, do pass proposed legislation now before it, for a premium-price plan applicable.

Dated at Granite County, Mont., this 31st day of December 1948.

American Machine & Metals, Inc., L. B. Manning, manager; L. B. Manning; Roy McLeod; Bernard Le Roy; Doris E. Hoehne; W. L. Degenhart; Robert Franz; Ben Walkup; Lawrence M. Wanderer; Vernon R. Steffan; William R. McLure; Edward H. Kaiser; Herman Lindstadt; Jenny Saurer; Pauline R. Byrne; Huffman Grocery; R. J. Huffman; A. J. Murray; John Pankey; Bernice Pankey; J. W. Winninghoff; M. Everett Doe; Wilda W. Doe; Doe's Drug Store; Philipsburg Drug Co.; Frank Reavley; Theodore D. Saurer, Sr.; Earl Bellm; James Kistle; Lewis Massa; Harry Hanifen; Carmon Bassinett; Wallace McPheters; C. A. Metcalf; Fred Coward; Arthur Taylor; Cleve R. Metcalf; Malcolm Moreen; Lewis E. Crowley; H. J. Courtney; Angus A. McDonald; Edward C. Neu; Carl M. Noreen; Virgil J. Sanderson; Charles D. McLure; Beverley McLure; Wm. Wallin; Billy Beckley; Ray Danielson; Philipsburg Hardware, by D. F. Knight; H. F. Knight; Katherine Knight; Frank Rickard; R. R. Wilson; Woodrow Wilson; B. E. Barnhill; E. F. Maehl; F. E. Splitz; James S. Sullivan; Robert L. Everhard; Joseph Mazza; G. J. Morman; B. G. Paige; A. L. Kearns; Gemma Mazza; W. C. Bowen; J. P. Beretta; H. E. McDougal; Barney Pickett; F. S. Neal; J. L. Miller; Sidney Kinsman; Joe Matelich; George M. McDonald; Charles Cantero; C. A. Brundy; E. A. Hanifen; Thomas J. Churchwell; John W. Orr; Leu Griffith; James E. Maehl; Ralph L. McLeod; James Conn; H. Murphy; E. R. Winninghoff; G. M. Dunn; E. J. Donnelly; Stella Holt; Vatis Page; C. E. Kennedy; Blanche C. Goff; William G. Schneider; Frank Winninghoff; James E. Dissett; William Haitz; Ryan Wicksberg; Charles Purbert; Joe Costello; Pete Lattola; Alfonso Bergamaschi; Harold Sanders; Charles Goff; F. R. Lueck; W. W. Moore; Frank Fessler; Harold Mitchell; Wm. H. Welch; Jake Polich; Fred Karkaran; Chris Johnson; Allen S. McKenzie; Esther Porter; Joe S. Porter; Theodore E. Saurer; John D. Miller; Clarence Therriault; Ross M. Hayworth; Joseph A. Kearns; James Patten; Geo. M. Mungas; Edmond M. Storer; Arnold Holt; H. A. Featherman; James M. Foster; Joe J. Slovack; T. R. Page; Mitchell A. Blanchard; Pershing D. Hanifen; Geo. A. Winninghoff; Basil H. Kennedy; Norman Sichveland; George McLean; Conell Kushman; Wm. H. Watson; Robert H. Lawry; Duncan McRae; George Untinen; Wm. R. Parfitt; B. J. Johnson; Marcus Arthur; W. R. Love; John H. Cole; Louise M. Cole; Val. C. Dietz; J. E. Serigstad; Ernest L. Mazza; Alvin V. Taylor, Jr.; Tom Van Norman; Herman Sholom; John C. Cape; J. W. Kaiser; A. Z. Harris; C. Woody; Frank Puyear; Lou Cunningham; Fern Evans; Forrest Haggard; Beverly Crncevich; A. Andre; Charles Budel; Clarence Hamilton; A. A. Ackerschott; Lowell S. Johnson; Charles Bergamaschi; Roy V. Hamilton; Lyle L. Graham; Wilbur R. Storer; H. Leroy Sprague; Ray Budel; F. R. Hartley; Roy Owens; Rod. S. McRae; Thomas Ryan; Leonard Swanson; Ronald Day; Isac Therriault; Forrest J. McKenzie; George Hayworth; A. J. Budel; Raymond Danielson; Herman L. Hauck; Hans G. Scheiffele; Omer Edgar; John Raile; Jack Hoehne; P. W. Merrifield; E. P. Rule; Eli B. Christensen; Raymond Danielson, Jr.; G. A. Van Ostrum; Al. Morrison; Wm. E. Harris; Mary Harris; Mrs. Wm. W. Moore; M. N. Moody; L. E. Sandin; Henry Kistle; Walter C. Welker; J. Chandice Ettien; Jacob Schneider; Milo M. Hoyt; Frank R. Sprague; Jack Hiemark; John W. Pearson; E. C. Olson; Jas. W. Sorensen; Hugh F. Carlin; Buck Sanders; James W. Young; S. N. Watcheff; Fred Schultz; Ed. Lannon; Albert Budel; A. A. McDonald; Henry Luoma; Walter R. Edgar; Ollie W. Pickett; John Raile, Jr.; Caroll M. Huffman; George S. Hegley; Everett Finn; Arthur Peterson; George Rodgers; Donald Morrison; Wm. Patterson; S. T. Parr, Sr.; Neal Hunt; Nels Broman; Emery Carnegie; O. J. Durand; G. A. Jenkins; Ernest C. Eckleadafer; J. H. Mellen; R. J. Fischer; K. H. Leishman; C. K. Muchmore; George G. Hanson; George A. Clawson; H. S. Norris; F. A. Ferry; Joseph C. Beck; Cecil R. Owen; B. H. Lynne; J. Peterson; Bert T. Kingrey; S. R. McGregor; H. P. Bissonette; E. L. Clawson; Leslie C. Nelson; Leo A. Hamilton; Reinhart Heinlitz; Mildred McLain; W. A. McGowan; R. W. Hilcox; Lorin S. Arrington; F. C. Corth; Roy E. Rogers; Arnold W. Briggeman; John H. Brunett; F. M. Durfee, president, Lions' Club, Drummond, Mont.; Verlin Bradshaw.

CITY OF PHILIPSBURG,
County of Granite, State of Montana, ss:

I, Edwin T. Irvine, the duly appointed, qualified, and acting city clerk of the city of Philipsburg, Granite County, Mont., do hereby certify and declare that the within and foregoing instrument is a true, exact, and compared copy of a resolution duly and regularly on file and of record in the office of the city clerk of the said city of Philipsburg, Granite County, Mont., as of the date of this certificate.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the said city of Philipsburg, Granite County, Mont., a municipal corporation, this 19th day of January 1949.

[SEAL] EDWIN T. IRVINE,
City Clerk of the Said City of Philipsburg, Granite City, Mont.

A BRIEF SURVEY OF THE MINERAL RESOURCES OF THE PHILIPSBURG MINING DISTRICT

HISTORY

The Philipsburg mining district is one of the oldest in Montana. The Hope mill which was the first quartz mine in the State was started in 1866 and operated almost continuously until 1906.

The first ores of the district were mined entirely for their silver and gold values but as the mines became deeper the lead and zinc values increased to such an extent that the milling of the ore became a serious problem and the early-day miner found it next to impossible to extract his gold and silver at a profit. The result was that a number of the smaller mines closed down around 1905. The total production of the district up to the present time is between seventy-five and one hundred million dollars in nonferrous metals.

MANGANESE

With the coming of World War I, manganese became the No. 1 critical mineral in the United States. Prospecting was started for this mineral in the Philipsburg district and some of the largest and richest deposits in the country were uncovered. It is safe to say that without the Philipsburg manganese the United States would have been in serious difficulty during the years of 1917-18. After the First World War these manganese-dioxide deposits were mined for battery ore and Philipsburg has been the main source of this grade of ore ever since 1918.

Underlying the manganese-dioxide deposits lie the manganese-carbonate ores. During World War II some 70,000 tons of this ore was mined and shipped to the Government stock pile. These ores lie in the footwall and in beds cut by the lead, silver, and zinc fissures. There is unquestionably a very large tonnage of these carbonate ores already developed and ready to be mined. They should extend to the thousand-foot level or even

greater depth making the possible tonnage even greater than the dioxide ores.

ZINC LEAD

About a mile east of the town of Philipsburg lies the granite-line contact, and it is along this contact and extending into the granite for about 2 miles that the most productive fissures have been found. Where these fissures cut the limestone their walls have been replaced by zinc, silver, and lead minerals in some places to the extent of 20 to 30 feet, and it was from these veins that a large tonnage of lead, silver, and zinc ore was shipped to the Anaconda zinc plant during the time Anaconda was buying zinc ore. This ore averaged in the neighborhood of 12 to 14 percent zinc, 3 to 5 percent lead, 10 to 15 ounces silver, and two to four dollars in gold. All of this character of ore carries some manganese carbonate.

OUTLYING DISTRICTS

Princeton: The Princeton district lies about 18 miles northeast of Philipsburg, at the head of Boulder Creek.

The veins in this district are not so numerous as in the Philipsburg district; therefore, they have not been developed to the extent that the veins in the Philipsburg area have. But in late years several deposits of lead, zinc, and silver ores have been developed, and this district shows promise of being able to produce large quantities of these minerals.

Sunrise: This district lies 15 miles northwest of Philipsburg, at the head of Henderson Gulch. These veins are replacement veins in limestone and are very extensive as to both strike and dip. During World War I a large tonnage of this ore was shipped to a copper smelter in Butte, the average of which was 3 percent copper, 0.22 ounce gold, and 1.5 ounces silver. During the last few years there has been discovered very large and extensive bodies of low-grade tungsten ores lying along the contact between the lime and intrusive and igneous dykes. The Bureau of Mines has been investigating this district within the last year.

Black Pine: The Black Pine district lies 10 miles northwest of Philipsburg. The veins are fissure veins in quartzite and like Sunrise are very extensive both as to strike and dip. One vein, the Combination, was mined extensively in the early days for silver and has produced nearly $3,000,000 in silver and gold. The sulfide ores of this district carry copper and would average around 2 percent. These veins also carry tungsten and will average from two-tenths of 1 percent to three-tenths of 1 percent (WO_3). Like Sunrise the Bureau of Mines has been investigating this district.

CONCLUSION

The Philipsburg area has five of the most critical metals wanted by the Government for stock-piling, that is, manganese, lead, zinc, copper, and tungsten.

These metals are associated in two groups, the manganese, lead, and zinc in one group and the copper and tungsten in the other.

The lead-zinc fissures cut the beds of manganese carbonate in such a manner that to make a profitable mining enterprise they should all be mined in one operation. Also the tungsten is a by-product of the copper, silver, and gold ores of the camps of Black Pine and Sunrise.

With a stock-piling project in the Philipsburg area these ores could be mined and stock-piled until such time where a mill could be provided to treat and separate each mineral. With such a program the Philipsburg area could provide a large tonnage of ore with which to overcome the shortage of these strategic minerals.

Most of the plants which handle custom ore are running at full capacity so that there is no outlet for the ores of the Philipsburg district at the present time.

WILLIAM R. MCLURE.

FEBRUARY 28, 1949.

(Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a letter and also a petition.)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BREHM asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the London Daily News.

PARLIAMENTARIAN LEWIS DESCHLER

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REDDEN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, now that the shouting and tumult has died regarding our versed and beloved parliamentarian, and so many of you have had such a good time trying to get into the act, I think it is time to set you straight and remind you that Mr. Lew Deschler is my constituent, that his home town is Chillicothe, Ohio, and that I will continue to efficiently represent him in the future as I have in the past, unless you folks continue to brag on him and get him so puffed up that he would decide to run for Congress and represent himself. Of course in this event I would be compelled to support him for the office.

FEDERAL AID FOR EDUCATION

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BROOKS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, several days ago, Hon. Roy Taylor, member of the North Carolina Legislature which is now in session, introduced in that body H. R. 177 relating to Federal aid for education. This bill was enacted into law last Thursday by the legislature of that State. It memorializes the Congress of the United States to support a program providing Federal funds for equalizing educational opportunities in the public schools of the Nation without Federal control.

In my opinion, this is the type of Federal aid for education that the people in this Nation desire, and the only type the people of North Carolina will accept.

I wish to congratulate the legislature of my State in the stand it has taken on this subject. I hope that the Congress will hasten action on legislation providing Federal aid for education, and that it will be aid without control.

Many of the States of the Nation are unable to provide a proper and needed standard of education, and I hope more legislative bodies will let the Members of Congress know their attitude in this respect.

I wish to commend Representative Taylor for his action in behalf of education. He lives in a section of North Carolina which is indeed appreciative of his outstanding public record in behalf of forthright legislation.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 56. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1956 Olympic games at Detroit, Mich.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 7, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

320. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting additional evidence and requesting that the case of Karel Krajsky or Charles Krajsky, file No. A-3199958, CR 21623, be withdrawn from those now pending before the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

321. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the annual report covering the activities of the Department of the Army for the fiscal year 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

322. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting revised estimates for the fiscal year 1950 involving an increase of $5,700,000 for the Department of Commerce, in the form of amendments to the budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 97); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HART: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. House Joint Resolution 143. Joint resolution to authorize vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore between United States ports on the Great Lakes during the period from March 15 to December 15, 1949, inclusive; without amendment (Rept. No. 209). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2222. A bill to provide a 2-year moratorium with respect to the application of certain antitrust laws to individual, good-faith delivered price systems and freight-absorption practices; with amendments (Rept. No. 210). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 128. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 1741, a bill to authorize the establishment of a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 211). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 129. Resolution for consideration

of H. R. 2546, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish land-based air warning and control installations for the national security, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 212). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LYLE: Committee on Rules, House Resolution 130. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 2663, a bill to provide for the administration of the Central Intelligence Agency, established pursuant to section 102, National Security Act of 1947, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 213). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules, House Resolution 131. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 2216, a bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to provide for an Under Secretary of Defense; without amendment (Rept. No. 214). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 1731. A bill to extend certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 215). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 3238. A bill to authorize all Federal agencies to donate surplus properties for educational purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3239. A bill to provide for the appointment of three additional district judges for the United States District Court for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3240. A bill to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 to provide that claims under section 17 must be filed within 6 months to be allowable, to stop further accrual of such claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 3241. A bill to provide for payment for motor vehicles used by carriers in the delivery of mail on an hourly basis instead of by contract; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H. R. 3242. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to announce the parity price of milk, and to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to immediately announce the support price of milk; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 3243. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 3244. A bill to provide for the liquidation of the trusts under the transfer agreements with State rural rehabilitation corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 3245. A bill to terminate certain excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3246. A bill to terminate the tax on places furnishing entertainment in connection with the serving of food; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3247. A bill to amend the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act of 1934 of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 3248. A bill to amend the Federal Alcohol Administration Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHAFER (by request):

H. R. 3249. A bill to provide for a national cemetery at Fort Custer, Mich.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. STANLEY:

H. R. 3250. A bill authorizing the construction of the Smith Mountain Dam and hydroelectric power project in the Roanoke River Basin; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WORLEY:

H. R. 3251. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to grant to States projects administered under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act containing major recreational developments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MICHENER:

H. J. Res. 185. Joint resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating Memorial Day, 1949, as a day for a Nation-wide prayer for peace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. Con. Res. 43. Concurrent resolution to create the Westbrook Pegler Annual Award of Journalistic Infamy; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, requesting that any authorization or appropriation for the construction of the Glendo Reservoir be withheld until plans therefor have been submitted to the State of Nebraska and to its department of roads and irrigation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, urging the enactment of legislation requiring shippers of cigarettes in interstate commerce to furnish to the taxing authority of the State to which shipped a copy of the invoice on each such shipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 3252. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Zelma Inez Cheek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 3253. A bill for the relief of Doris M. Faulkner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H. R. 3254. A bill for the relief of Iva Gavin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 3255. A bill for the relief of Roy F. Arnold; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

160. By Mr. HART: Petition of New Jersey Education Association, Trenton, N. J., requesting that public benefits be not extended to public employees covered by their own public pension funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

161. Also, petition of the John J. Grogan Association, condemning the Communist processes which so inhumanly resulted in the imprisonment of Cardinal Mindszenty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

162. By Mr. KEARNEY: Memorial of Common Council of the City of Amsterdam, N. Y., advocating passage of the resolution designating October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

163. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of Albert L. Quinn Post, No. 52, American Legion, Jersey City, N. J., condemning the action of the Communist Party for their persecution of all forms of religious activity, Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

SATURDAY, MARCH 5, 1949

(Legislative day of Monday, February 21, 1949)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, Thou hast taught us that our very bodies are to be the shrines of Thy spirit. We do not seem to ourselves temples of the holy but rather very secular houses not fit for Thy dwelling; yet Thou seest a temple in each of us, an altar there, even though forgotten, and needs and aspirations, yearnings and capacities, if we could be but strengthened by Thy might to be our best selves. For our own sakes and for the sake of this needy world Thou hast summoned us to serve in a desperate day, God of all grace, cleanse us, make us right within, that our humble shrines may be alight with the divine. Ere our day is done use us as Thy instruments, so that the paganism that blights the world shall be redeemed into the decency and justice and mercy and brotherhood of Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROTECTION OF PERSONNEL ENGAGED IN INSPECTION OF CERTAIN AIRCRAFT

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the protection of personnel engaged in the enforcement of regulations and the inspection of aircraft engaged in interstate and foreign air commerce (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON PERSONNEL CEILINGS

A letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report of personnel ceilings for the quarter ended December 31, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SALARIES OF SUSPENDED GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

A letter from the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to suspensions of employees of the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] may be excused from attending the sessions of the Senate until next Wednesday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hoey	O'Conor
Anderson	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hunt	Pepper
Bridges	Jenner	Reed
Broughton	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Butler	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Cain	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Chapman	Kem	Smith, Maine
Chavez	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Connally	Knowland	Stennis
Cordon	Long	Taft
Donnell	Lucas	Taylor
Downey	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Eastland	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Ecton	McClellan	Thye
Ferguson	McFarland	Tobey
Frear	McGrath	Tydings
Fulbright	McKellar	Vandenberg
George	Magnuson	Watkins
Gillette	Malone	Wherry
Green	Martin	Wiley
Gurney	Maybank	Williams
Hayden	Miller	Withers
Hendrickson	Millikin	Young
Hickenlooper	Mundt	
Hill	Myers	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE and Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is necessarily absent because of the death of his father, Mr. Alvin T. Capehart.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized, under the unanimous-consent agreement of yesterday.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me so that I may make a unanimous-consent request, without the Senator losing any of his rights thereby?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield, with the understanding that by so doing my right to the floor shall not be affected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois asks the Senator from Arkansas to yield, without surrendering any right thereby. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Illinois may proceed.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may be permitted to introduce bills and joint resolutions, present petitions and memorials, and other matters which are ordinarily presented during the morning hour, without thereby interfering with or jeopardizing the parliamentary situation on the question now pending before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without debate?

Mr. LUCAS. Without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relating to aid to that State in enforcement of cigarette tax; to the Committee on Finance.

(See concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. THYE on March 4, 1949, p. 1845, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 9

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to make provision for payment of the exact equivalent of taxes to the States and other lesser political subdivisions whenever the tax base of such taxing units is depleted by withdrawals of lands for the use of Federal agencies

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House concurring therein):

"Whereas the Federal Government and agencies thereof from time to time have withdrawn from the State and its political subdivisions areas such as the Ammunition depot at Provo; the Angostura irrigation project in Fall River and Custer Counties; the Belle Fourche irrigation project in Butte and Meade Counties; submarginal land utilization areas principally located in Stanley, Lyman, Jones, Jackson, Pennington, and Perkins Counties; air bases at Rapid City and at Sioux Falls; the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation; the Crow Creek Indian Reservation; the Cheyenne Indian Reservation; Rosebud Indian Reservation; the Standing Rock Indian Reservation; the Lower Brule Indian Reservation; the Sisseton Indian Reservation; the Black Hills National Forest; the Harney National Forest; Wind Cave National Park; Jewel Cave National Park; the Bad Lands National Monument; the Rushmore National Monument; the East and West Short Pine National Forests; veterans' facility hospitals at Sioux Falls and at Fort Meade; the bombing range in Shannon County; the experiment station at Newell; the various Indian schools; the Indian hospital at Rapid City; the Federal sanatorium at Hot Springs; and the other lesser withdrawals; and

"Whereas in the development of the Missouri River project it will be necessary for the Federal Government to acquire extensive areas in South Dakota such as dam sites, areas to be inundated and marginal lands, rights-of-way for canals and ditches, townsites, and areas for administrative facilities; and

"Whereas the State of South Dakota has for a period of 10 years paid on school and endowment lands held in trust by the State, the exact equivalent of school district and county levies; Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the house of representatives concurring therein) do memorialize the Congress of the United States to take steps to provide for the payment of the exact equivalent of taxes which would otherwise be levied on lands in the State and its political subdivisions were such lands not acquired by the Federal Government and its agencies; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to His Excellency, the President of the United States, the United States Senator CHAN GURNEY, United States Senator KARL MUNDT, Congressman FRANCIS H. CASE and to Congressman HAROLD O. LOVRE, and to the presiding officers of both Houses of Congress."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Joint Memorial 6

"To the honorable Senators and Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that:

"Whereas millions of acre-feet of the water of Snake River are annually running to waste into the Columbia River and Pacific Ocean; and

"Whereas such wasted waters are urgently needed to supplement the water rights of water users of the Snake River Valley in Idaho; to irrigate new desert lands in the Snake River Valley of Idaho; and

"Whereas the conservation and storing of such waters will control the flooding and washing of thousands of acres of valuable farm lands in the upper Snake River Valley and will provide water power for the production of hydroelectrical energy, which is urgently needed in the Intermountain States: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Idaho (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That we most respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States of America that it appropriate the necessary funds and proceed at once with the early and speedy construction of the Palisade Dam project in Idaho; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized and he is hereby directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the Senators and the Representatives in Congress from this State, and to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America."

A letter in the nature of a petition signed by Norma Sims, chairman, social action committee, American Association of Group Workers, of New York, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation providing a program of low-rent housing, public and private, open to all groups; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The petition of Edward H. Weyler, secretary-treasurer, Kentucky State Federation of

Labor, of Louisville, Ky., praying for the enactment of House bill 2313, to suspend certain import taxes on copper; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the general committee of adjustment, Order of Railway Conductors, Illinois Central Railroad Co., of Chicago, Ill., opposing the St. Lawrence River project; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The petition of George K. Way, secretary, and several other members of the Board of Temperance of the Methodist Church, South Carolina Conference, of North Charleston, S. C., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of liquor advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the Partisan Republicans of California, of Los Angeles, Calif., opposing the establishment of a police state in America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolutions adopted by the City Council of the City of Salem, Mass.; the Polish Army Veterans, General Haller Post, No. 125, of South Bend, Ind.; the Council of the City of Dearborn, Mich.; the City Council of the City of Clifton, N. J.; and the Common Council of the City of Amsterdam, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation proclaiming October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Florida State Chamber of Commerce, of Jacksonville, Fla., protesting the enactment of legislation to federalize the practice of medicine; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Paul E. Sanders, recording secretary, Local Union No. 2058, United Steelworkers of America (CIO), of Maywood, Calif., praying for the enactment of legislation to repeal the Taft-Hartley labor law; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter in the nature of a petition signed by Nicasie Figueroa, president, Union de Mecanicos, Auxiliares y Ramas Anexas, of Santurce, P. R., relating to the minimum wage law, and so forth; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by Jack Kroll, director, CIO Political Action Committee, Washington, D. C., requesting permission to arrange for a broadcast of Senate proceedings on Senate Resolution 15, to amend the so-called cloture rule; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by Marilyn Kaemmerle, administrative secretary, National Citizens' Council on Civil Rights, of New York, N. Y., praying for a change in the rules of the Senate so as to provide for cloture by majority vote (with an accompanying paper); ordered to lie on the table.

FEDERAL HOUSING PROGRAM—RESOLUTION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH] and myself, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, favoring the creation of a Federal housing program.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Resolution 543

Resolution requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to use their good offices to secure prompt passage of legislation for the creation and support of a Federal housing program

Whereas the lack of decent and adequate housing for citizens of our State and the United States is a problem confronting the American people which apparently cannot now be solved by local administrative governing bodies; and

Whereas a long-range housing program developed by the Federal Government should attack this challenge in the interest of health, safety, and welfare for all, through encouragement of private enterprise in the construction industry or the providing of Federal funds to clear slums and furnish public low-rent housing to areas whose needs cannot be fully met through reliance on private enterprise or local and State revenues: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States be, and they are hereby, requested to use their good offices to secure the prompt passage of legislation for such a Federal housing program; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States.

REPEAL OF TRANSPORTATION TAX—RESOLUTION OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] and myself, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina, urging the repeal of the 15-percent Federal transportation tax imposed upon railroads as a wartime measure.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution requesting and urging that the National Congress consider the repeal and discontinuance of the 15-percent Federal transportation tax imposed upon railroads as a wartime measure

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina:

SECTION 1. That the National Congress be requested and earnestly urged to consider the repeal and discontinuance of the 15 percent Federal transportation tax imposed upon the railroads of the Nation. That this request is being made to remove the tax for the reason that, as we understand it, this transportation tax was placed on railroads as a wartime measure to discourage civilian transportation during the war years and that the reason for the imposition of such tax no longer exists.

SEC. 2. That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each Member of the Senate and the House of Representatives in the National Congress from the State of South Carolina.

DRAINING OF WACCAMAW, LITTLE PEE DEE, AND BIG PEE DEE RIVERS—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF THE LEGISLATURE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] and myself, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a concurrent resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina, relating to the draining of the Waccamaw, Little Pee Dee, and Big Pee Dee Rivers, and for the drainage of the swamps adjacent to and tributaries entering said rivers.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide for the draining of the Waccamaw, Little Pee Dee, and Big Pee Dee Rivers, and for the drainage of the swamps adjacent to and tributaries entering said rivers

Be it resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States to provide funds for, and direct, the draining of the Waccamaw, Little Pee Dee, and Big Pee Dee Rivers, and for the drainage of the swamps adjacent to and tributaries entering said rivers in order to bring into active production a larger amount of farm lands lying adjacent to the streams.

That a copy of this resolution be forwarded each United States Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from South Carolina.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. KEFAUVER, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 213. A bill to provide benefits for members of the reserve components of the armed forces who suffer disability or death from injuries incurred while engaged in active-duty training for periods of less than 30 days or while engaged in inactive-duty training; with amendments (Rept. No. 95).

By Mr. GILLETTE, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. Res. 36. Resolution to investigate certain matters relating to crop production; without amendment (Rept. No. 96); and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WHERRY (for himself, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. MAYBANK):

S. 1184. A bill to encourage construction of rental housing at or in areas adjacent to military and naval installations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 1185. A bill to provide that all employees of the Veterans' Canteen Service shall be paid from funds of the Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CAIN:

S. 1186. A bill for the relief of N. H. Kelley, Bernice Kelley, Clyde D. Farquhar, and

Gladys Farquhar; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MCKELLAR:

S. 1187. A bill to provide for a Federal court building in Winchester, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE—AMENDMENT

Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the resolution (S. Res. 15) amending the so-called cloture rule of the Senate, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMERICAN AID TO CHINA—RELEASE BY THE CHINESE EMBASSY

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, in the column entitled "Washington Merry-Go-Round," of March 1, Mr. Drew Pearson reported Secretary of State Dean Acheson as having stated, in his conference with Republican Members of Congress last week, that much of the American aid to China "wasn't used to fight communism, but went into the pockets of Chiang Kai-shek's lieutenants."

Mr. President, I have in my hand a release from the Chinese Embassy, dated March 3, dwelling on the subject, refuting the statement, if it was made by Mr. Acheson. I ask unanimous consent that the release may be inserted in the RECORD, and in connection therewith I wish to say that such investigation——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will say to the Senator from Nevada that debate is not in order under the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. MCCARRAN. I would not assume to debate it at all. I have nothing to debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Any statement is regarded as debate. The Chair will hear the Senator.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Very well. I will insert the release in the RECORD without comment.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In his column, Washington Merry-Go-Round, of March 1, Mr. Drew Pearson reported Secretary of State Dean Acheson as having stated, in his conference with Republican Members of Congress last week, that much of the American aid to China "wasn't used to fight communism, but went into the pockets of Chiang Kai-shek's lieutenants."

The spokesman of the Chinese Embassy stated that the conference to which Mr. Pearson referred was understood to be off the record, and that there is no way to check the accuracy of the report. It is highly doubtful, however, that Secretary Acheson could have made such a statement or was accurately quoted.

American aid to China in the postwar period falls into different categories. They are different in nature and are administered in different ways. But there is absolutely no justification in saying that such aid was misappropriated for private gain.

One of the main items of postwar aid to China was the UNRRA program for China, to which the United States contributed some 72 percent. UNRRA was an international agency, and one of its basic principles was that the distribution of UNRRA supplies must be under the close observation of UNRRA personnel on the spot. At the peak of UNRRA operations in China more than a thousand UNRRA employees were stationed in various regions of China, actively supervising the distribution of UNRRA supplies. The successive heads of the UNRRA mission in China were all Americans, first Mr. Benjamin Kiser, later Maj. Gen. Glen E. Edgerton, and still later Mr. Harlan Cleveland. Their staff in China comprised nationals from practically all the larger nations of the world. Later the UNRRA Committee of the Council of the Far East, composed of representatives of the major nations in the Far East, including the United States, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, Australia, Canada, etc., was stationed in Shanghai and exercised the closest supervision of the distribution of supplies in China in accordance with UNRRA resolutions. UNRRA procurement was, of course, done by UNRRA in Washington and the different contributing countries. There were differences of opinion from time to time, especially with regard to the exact quantities of supplies to be shipped to the areas under Communist occupation, but no case of irregularity or misappropriation was reported and substantiated.

After the termination of UNRRA, the United States extended to China further aid amounting to $45,700,000, mostly in food and a small quantity of medical supplies. The distribution of these supplies was placed under the observation of the American Relief Mission in China, attached to the American Embassy in Nanking. The Relief Mission was headed by Mr. Donald Gilpatric. The food supplies went into the ration programs in the principal metropolitan centers of China. The exact scheme was worked out between the Relief Mission and the Ministry of Food of the Chinese Government. The actual funds for the purchase of the supplies were handled exclusively in Washington, between the State Department and the supply agencies of the United States Government, such as the Bureau of Federal Supply, the Commodity Credit Corporation, etc. The Chinese agencies, whether in Washington or in China, never handled any funds.

Under the China Aid Act, 1948, the China-aid program was administered by the Economic Cooperation Administration, which handled all the funds under that act, and procurement of supplies was done exclusively by American Government agencies in Washington. Like the previous programs, the Chinese Government never handled any funds.

The ECA also established a China mission in Shanghai, headed by Mr. Roger Lapham, who is now in Washington reporting the progress of the $275,000,000 civilian-aid program for China. Mr. Lapham's duties included close observation of the implementation of the program in China. There has been no case of misappropriation reported.

The China Aid Act, 1948, also included a $125,000,000 program which the Chinese Government used for the procurement of military supplies. It was at the express request of the Chinese Government that 75 percent of this fund was transferred to American Government departments and agencies to handle the procurement for China. Less than 20 percent of the funds were handled by the Chinese agencies in the United States. This decision to avoid handling any funds was to prevent all possibility of suspicion of irregularity.

According to the procedure suggested by the Chinese Government, whenever a procurement contract is signed by the Chinese technical representative in Washington, an application for payment, together with the contract or invoice or other necessary documentation is submitted to the State Department. In accordance with the agreed procedure the necessary payment is released by the State Department to the designated American bank which, in turn, makes payment direct to the American manufacturer concerned. At the end of each month these releases and payments are audited by a certified public accountant and a report is made to the State Department.

In view of this careful and businesslike procedure, no complaint or dissatisfaction has been heard from the American side or from any others.

During the postwar period the Export-Import Bank also extended a loan to China of $82,800,000. Of this sum, $16,000,000 was undisbursed, not drawn from the bank, and $12,000,000 repaid on schedule.

In view of the above, it would seem that any statement of misappropriation of American aid funds on the part of the Chinese is unfounded and unjustified. It is apparent that the desire of the Chinese Government to make the fullest and most effective use of American aid is as sincere as on the American side.

CORRESPONDENCE ON DISMANTLING OF GERMAN PLANTS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter I addressed to the Secretary of the Army, Mr. Kenneth Royall, on February 14, 1949, asking questions regarding the dismantling and shipping of plants from western Germany into the satellite countries, and a letter dated March 2, 1949, from the Department of the Army giving some of the information requested.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 14, 1949.

Hon. KENNETH ROYALL,
Department of the Army,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The London Times of February 8 contains an article which raised the question in Parliament relative to the dismantling and shipping to Czechoslovakia of heavy equipment from the Krupp works at Essen. The Times of the following day shows pictures of a heavy steam hammer and a heavy press in the process of being dismantled.

Will you please furnish me with the latest available information as to the amount of German equipment which has been shipped out to the western zone as reparations or otherwise during the year 1948 to:

1. Soviet Russia.
2. Czechoslovakia.
3. Yugoslavia.
4. Poland.
5. Hungary.
6. Bulgaria.
7. Rumania.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senator.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
Washington, D. C., March 2, 1949.

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: Further reference is made to your communication of recent date, addressed to Secretary Royall, in which you requested information as to the amount of German equipment which has been shipped out of the western zone of Germany as reparations or otherwise during the year 1948 to Soviet Russia and to European satellite countries.

The following information has been compiled on this subject and although it covers only the first 11 months of 1948, I trust it

will be sufficient to supply the information you desire.

Reparation shipments made from the United States zone of occupation to the U. S. S. R. (including Poland) during 1948 was less than 500 tons. This equipment consisted of miscellaneous items remaining in plants previously removed to the U. S. S. R. under allocations made by the Allied Control Authority in late 1945 and early 1946 and before such allocations from the United States zone were stopped. This completes the shipments from these plants.

Reparation shipments to the satellite countries during the first 11 months of 1948 from the three western zones of Germany (United Kingdom, United States, and French zones) were: Albania, 1,126 tons; Czechoslovakia, 13,435 tons; Yugoslovia, 52,428 tons.

These shipments consisted of equipment which was allocated to these countries by the Inter-Allied Reparations Agency (IARA) under the terms of the Paris agreement of January 1946. Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania were not allies and, therefore, do not receive reparations equipment.

Other equipment shipped to these nations during the year 1948 was arranged through contract agreements between these countries and Bizonal Germany and were made generally for the purpose of securing critical raw materials needed in Germany. The total amount of export deliveries made under these agreements during the first 11 months in 1948 amounted to approximately 2.3 percent of the total of all exports from Bizonal Germany. The amounts roughly are as follows:

Albania	None
Bulgaria	$19,000
Czechoslovakia	8,837,000
Hungary	1,233,000
Poland	1,192,000
Rumania	13,000
U. S. S. R.	78,000
Yugoslavia	1,050,000

Records are not available to indicate the exact break-down of the equipment furnished. However, in general, products furnished under these agreements consisted of machinery, electrical equipment, refrigerators, vehicles, machine parts, mine equipment, optical apparatus, chemicals, and related products. In return Bizonal Germany received foodstuffs, clothing, shoes, steel, kaolin, and other needed raw materials. Imbalances in trade were settled in dollars.

It is a pleasure to have obtained this information for you.

Sincerely yours,

C. G. BLAKENEY,
Colonel, GSC, Legislative and Liaison Division.

SERVICE IN THE HOUSE AND SENATE OF WILLIAM P. FRYE, OF MAINE

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement I have prepared relative to the service of the Honorable William P. Frye, of Maine, in the House and Senate of the United States.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, I want to join in the tributes the distinguished majority leader [Mr. LUCAS] and the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] yesterday paid to our great Vice President, ALBEN W. BARKLEY. His unparalleled service and devotion to his country and the tremendous respect and affection that those of us who have served, and are serving, with him in the Senate, hold for him are subjects which justify frequent repetition. He has done much to make my entry into this august body most pleasant.

But I do want to correct the RECORD to show that the distinction of having the longest service in Congress is held by the grandfather of my predecessor. William P. Frye, of Maine, served in the House and Senate for more than 40 years—from March 4, 1871, to August 8, 1911.

I want to join the majority leader and the minority whip in their tributes to Vice President BARKLEY. I am sure that no Democratic Vice President has ever attained the place in the hearts of Republican Senators that Vice President BARKLEY has.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS—STATEMENT BY SENATOR THYE

[Mr. THYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on labor-management relations made by him for the Trainmen's News, Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, on February 26, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

TEN GREAT TRUTHS ABOUT THE CONSTITUTION—ARTICLE BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article written by him entitled "Ten Great Truths About the Constitution," published in the Daughters of the American Revolution magazine for March 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HUMPHREY AT HOWARD UNIVERSITY

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at Howard University on March 2, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY—ARTICLE FROM DENVER POST

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled, "Proposal Urging MVA Unit Fails," published in the Denver Post of February 17, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY—ARTICLE FROM NORTH DAKOTA UNION FARMER

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Legislators Back MVA," published in the North Dakota Union Farmer of Jamestown, N. Dak., of February 21, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

RESISTANCE IN INDONESIA—ARTICLE BY GEORGE T. MCKAHIN

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Resistance in Indonesia," by George T. McKahin, published in the Far Eastern Survey of February 23, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

NOMINATION OF MON C. WALLGREN

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD several editorials, telegrams, and letters relating to the nomination of Mon C. Wallgren to be Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE WATCHDOG COMMITTEE—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES OF MARCH 2, 1949

[Mr BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Watchdog Committee," published in the New York Times of March 2, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

IMPLICATIONS OF THE CLOTURE FIGHT—ARTICLES BY ARTHUR KROCK AND MARK SULLIVAN

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article entitled "Will the Product Justify the Cost," written by Mr. Arthur Krock, and published in the New York Times of Wednesday of this week, and an article headed "Fears on the anti-poll-tax bill," by Mr. Mark Sullivan, published in the Washington Post of this morning.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of March 3, 1949]

WILL THE PRODUCT JUSTIFY THE COST?

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, March 2.—In a Government of divided powers one of the most difficult decisions the people must make is where official responsibility lies for what is done or not done by Government. The blame or the credit is usually a matter of dispute between the executive and legislative branches, and sometimes the judiciary is a party to the argument.

But if the current Senate filibuster against the proposed new cloture rule permanently damages the general welfare or the President's program or—where they chance to coincide—both, Mr. Truman's responsibility will be plain. And it will be equally plain that no blame can be charged to Senator LUCAS, the majority leader. He had a plan that would have made the filibuster harmless in these respects, and the President overruled him.

Mr. LUCAS, though a strong supporter of a two-thirds cloture rule that could be applied to any Senate discussion, and an advocate also of most of Mr. Truman's so-called civil-rights program, devised a legislative formula whereby business of high urgency could be taken up by the Senate at any time during a filibuster. The immediate subject would have been laid aside long enough for action that was required by a specified time—the next appropriation for the Economic Cooperation Administration is a good example. By this formula the basic issue in the filibuster would have been deferred until coming to grips with it would not imperil legislation which by common consent is classified as essential.

The majority leader's purpose was not to surrender to the filibuster or block the passage of the new rule. He planned only to prevent it from doing the damage to more paramount legislation that it may do.

THE PRESIDENT TAKES CHARGE

But when his plan was announced, the pressure groups which put civil rights foremost, and claim a large share of credit for the President's election, attacked Mr. LUCAS as a secret enemy of their principal interest and a defeatist. They served open notice that if his formula was followed they would charge the Democratic leadership and the administration with betrayal of the party platform, Mr. Truman's message to Congress last year, and the campaign pledges which, they said, attracted to him the votes he required to win.

The President reflected this viewpoint when on Monday last he told Mr. LUCAS and the other Democratic leaders in Congress that he wanted them to meet the filibuster head on, to carry the battle to a finish without interruption. By so saying, Mr. Truman assumed full responsibility for the consequences of this policy, whatever they may be, since to follow it was to reverse the procedure of his party leader in the Senate.

It may, of course, eventuate that the filibuster can be broken and the new rule adopted before any lasting harm is done to any other legislation, including that which the calendar makes urgent. In that case, those to whom this outcome is more important than any other will give to the President the credit that will be due. And those whom Mr. Truman has impressed as a political tactician, a fighter who won't recognize the hazards of hard battle, will be even more impressed.

Such a victory in the current issue is far from impossible. As has been pointed out in this space several times, the first section of the filibuster can be crushed if Vice President BARKLEY holds that the present cloture rule (No. XXII) can be invoked against it and a simple Senate majority sustains that finding. After that, two-thirds of the Senate, if so disposed, can adopt a new rule by using the old one to smash the second section of the filibuster. All this could be accomplished in 2 weeks, at the most, if there is the will to do it and continuous sessions are ordered toward the end.

VICTORY HAS ITS DANGERS

If the will does not exist, the filibuster could come to a successful conclusion in even less time, and no serious damage to other legislation would have occurred. For that outcome a Senate majority, either simple or two-thirds, would clearly have the blame or the credit, according to the viewpoint of the observer. And the President's insistence on a fight to the finish at this juncture of the session could not be arraigned as basically harmful to the general welfare, though his responsibility for the risk involved would still be clear.

From at least one aspect that might generally be a more useful result to Mr. Truman. If the filibuster of the southern Democrats is crushed by the stern measures the President ordered, they may form a hard bloc against other administration measures which they view with doubt but, in the absence of the new rule, might be persuaded to accept in the party's name. As a bloc they could make a majority with the Republicans against the rest of Mr. Truman's program and then the new rule could not be invoked. For, though the Republicans are under political pressure to aid the President on the immediate issue, the contrary would be true with respect to most others. The price of the new rule would then be loss of Democratic control.

But such a consequence is dismissed as foolish speculation by the President and those Senators and groups outside which are committed to break the filibuster in the interests of his civil rights program and want to abolish unlimited debate in that branch of Congress. They are resolved to take the chance, and leading them is Mr. Truman.

[From the Washington Post of March 5, 1949]

FEARS ON THE ANTI-POLL-TAX BILL

(By Mark Sullivan)

In the process by which a people are enabled to arrive at a common public opinion and course of action, an important agency is the voices of leaders. But the people themselves must have standards of judgment by which to evaluate the voices they hear.

In evaluating contemporary voices, one that commends itself strongly is that of General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower. He just now has two positions, to both of which he was called because of unique and elevated qualities recognized in him. For an emergency he is serving the Department of National Defense in a function which few men could perform as well—presiding officer of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Permanently, he is president of Columbia University, selected for that post by persons whose responsibility was to get high equipment for the guidance of youth.

From the time General Eisenhower ended his military service in Europe, it has been increasingly recognized that he has equipment for public service in fields additional to military, that he has understanding of principles of government and society. One principle he holds is that the President should not be a military man. But for firm adherence to that principle, General Eisenhower might be President today. Democrats who doubted Mr. Truman's qualifications tried almost desperately to persuade General Eisenhower to accept the nomination. And there was a formidable movement by Republicans to nominate him as the candidate of that party.

General Eisenhower the other day, addressing preparatory and high school student leaders at the Columbia Forum of Democracy, warned of a danger. He described it as "a creeping paralysis * * * a readiness to accept paternalistic measures by the Government and along with these paternalistic measures coming a surrender of our own responsibilities and, therefore, a surrender of our own thought over our own lives. * * *"

"If," General Eisenhower warned, "we allow this constant drift toward centralized bureaucratic government to continue * * * there will be a swarming of bureaucrats over the land. Ownership of property will gradually drift into that central government and finally you have to have dictatorship as the only means of operating such a huge organization. * * * It is things such as that we must watch today."

General Eisenhower's warning was in general terms. It was against a broad trend. If someone were to make specific application of the warning to the many proposals for economic and social change which President Truman has sent to Congress, more than half the proposals would be rejected.

One among Mr. Truman's proposals would work with special force toward centralized government. This is the proposal that State poll taxes as a qualification for voting be abolished by act of Congress.

The primary and indispensable requisite of centralized government is to weaken local government. The poll-tax measure asserts that Congress has power to take away from the States their right to fix their own qualifications for voting for President, Vice President, and Members of Congress. The right to fix voting qualifications is perhaps the most fundamental power a State has. If that power is taken away, the very principle of statehood is undermined.

The principle involved, or the violation of principle, applies to every State, and also to every kind of voting qualification. If Congress takes the poll-tax qualification from a few Southern States, it thereby asserts that it can take from every State any of the many qualifications which States have. A familiar example is the length-of-residence qualification.

When southern Senators resist the poll-tax measure, it is not merely for the sake of the poll tax. That qualification is increasingly disapproved in the South, and some States have abolished it themselves. (Incidentally, the poll tax does not involve race discrimination; on this point there is widespread misconception.) The resistance is for all the States, for the right of every State to fix its own qualifications. It is for a principle, the rights and integrity of all States, their very existence as units of government.

The resistance is against a danger, centralized government, carrying threats of becoming totalitarian government. This danger is recognized as inherent in many of the proposals for economic and social change which President Truman has demanded that Congress enact. The breadth and imminence of that danger justifies the resistance to the poll-tax measure. If the resistance makes use of the Senate tradition against limitation of debate, the very existence of that tradition implies justification. The founding of the tradition and the preservation of it for a century and a half must have had a reason.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. LUCAS to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 15, amending the so-called cloture rule of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 15.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, yesterday there were several exchanges on the floor of the Senate, and there are one or two points to which I wish to refer before I resume the main thread of my speech.

I tried to give from memory a statement made by the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I should like to read it. It consists of only one paragraph. I read it so as to keep the RECORD straight for the benefit of those who may read it. The following is found on page 65 of the committee hearings:

Senator MORSE. In view of the fact that the Senator made that reference, I want to say I appreciate his compliment. I never knew any prolonged speech of mine in the Senate ever changed anybody's vote. I seldom make prolonged speeches in the Senate in the hope that they will change votes. I think I either have them at the start or I do not have them.

I have to make those speeches for the record because I know if I don't say some of the things I say, they are not going to be said, and one of the difficulties with liberals is we have to spread ourselves out pretty thin and we have to fight a lot of battles and so sometimes I am making speeches on the floor of the Senate, not in the hope of changing votes, but in the hope that maybe 5 years or 10 years from now the record may create some new votes in the Senate when new faces get there after the people exercise the majority rule at the polls.

I would add this: That under my rule I still think I can make those prolonged speeches.

The Senator from Oregon is under the illusion that if we adopt the majority cloture rule, he can still make his long speeches, as he has in the past. The point of the interchange yesterday on the floor was that the great liberals of the Senate who are in favor of the pending resolution apparently have to spread themselves so thin that I do not think they have had an opportunity to digest and understand exactly what is involved. As I stated yesterday, the fact that the civil-rights question is involved in this matter has tended to becloud the issue. I think it has misled a great many persons, and that they have failed to appreciate the fundamental importance of a change in the rules of the Senate.

One further point which was made yesterday related to the parallel which

exists between the effort to increase the membership of the Supreme Court back in 1937 and the issue before the Senate today. I think there is a very close parallel. I believe that issue was perhaps one of the most far-reaching and important that came before the Congress in the 1930's, because it dealt with the integrity of one of the three coordinate branches of our Government. I think the present issue is very similar. Evidence of this fact is that virtually the same arguments which are now made on behalf of the proposed change were then being made on behalf of the attempt to subvert the Supreme Court to the wishes of the executive branch of the Government. I know that a great many present Members of the Senate were here at that time, although I was not. There are quite a number of other new Senators here. I desire to read a few brief passages to call their attention to the analogy. After that fight was over, and after the proposal was defeated, I believe that on second thought the vast majority of the people and the majority of Members of the Senate were convinced, and are convinced, that the decision on that issue was correct.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. PEPPER. Does not the Senator from Arkansas make a distinction between an Executive recommendation to the Congress for legislation, such as was involved in the Supreme Court question, and the comment at his own press conference of a President who had been for 10 years a Member of the Senate, as to what he thought might appropriately be a Senate rule? Does not the Senator from Arkansas distinguish between those two cases?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think it is a distinction without any difference. We all know the relationship which exists between the majority leadership and the Executive on these subjects. There is no secret about it. After a conference the majority leader said, "This is the plan." It is commonly accepted that there is a close relationship. I certainly am not the one to say that they should have nothing to do with one another; but, after all, these are separate branches, and I think the independence of this body is just as important as the independence of the Supreme Court. I believe that the difference between the Senator's view and mine arises from the confusion caused by the injection of the civil-rights question into this issue.

I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that there is not one word in the Democratic platform about changing the rules of the Senate. The Democrats are not committed to change the rules of the Senate. They are committed to pass the civil-rights program. They have undertaken to force the Senate. With the great power of the Executive, I must say that I think it can be done, if they are willing to take the consequences.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Just a moment. If they want to undertake this program regardless of what may happen to the rest of the administration's program, they probably can force this change through. Why do they not place the question before us directly in connection with the civil-rights legislation? Then if they achieve that legislation, they will have achieved their commitment. They will not have disturbed and destroyed the great significance of the Senate.

I now yield to the Senator from Florida for a question only.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is aware of the fact, is he not, that the Senator from Florida was addressing his question to the Senator from Arkansas based upon the supposed analogy which the Senator from Arkansas was making between the recommendation of the President of the United States in his executive capacity to the Congress of the United States relative to certain subjects of legislation, and a comment at his press conference by the President of the United States, who had been for 10 years a Member of the Senate? My question is, Does not the Senator from Arkansas distinguish between the power of the President to make legislative recommendations and the power of the President to make recommendations relative to a change in the rules of the Senate?

Is it not true that the President has the power to recommend legislation to the Congress? But the President does not have power to recommend rule changes to the Senate in his official capacity. Therefore, is it a fair analogy to compare one with the other?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think it is a very excellent and precise analogy. I think the Senator is in complete error in saying that the President has not the power to make recommendations with respect to changing the rules. I think he has made such recommendations. Judging from reading the press, that is exactly what has happened. If we go back and examine statements made by the majority leader of the Senate a few weeks ago, and follow the policy through, in the light of what is happening here today in the Senate, we find that that policy is in direct accord with what the President has requested.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a last question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. First, I wish to make one other comment. I think the Senator from Florida does not distinguish between the propriety of the President's doing it and his power to do it. He actually has done it, so he has the power to do it, but I agree with the Senator from Florida that it is not proper for him to do it.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator from Arkansas recognizes, does he not, that any imputation of impropriety came from the Senator from Arkansas, not from the Senator from Florida?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; I think it came from the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator from Arkansas insist upon the privilege of uninterrupted free speech for the Members of the Senate, but deny the privilege of free comment to the President of the United States at his press conferences?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; there is no means by which I could deny it to the President if I wanted to; I do not have the power to do so. But I think the question as to what I might deny to the President is wholly immaterial and irrelevant. There is no question about the fact that the President of the United States is the most powerful person in the world today. There is no king, no potentate, who has the power that the head of our country has, with its tremendous wealth and the distribution of $40,000,000,000 throughout the world and all that.

However, I make no point of that. I only say the President's power should be confined to the executive branch, and he should not try to dominate the one remaining independent branch of our Government. He has the power to appoint members of the Supreme Court; but the Senate is the only remaining branch of our Government which the President has not been able to dominate. Of course, Presidents have tried to change the rules of the Senate, but up to now such efforts have not been successful.

As I have said, in view of the demonstrated success of our Government, why the President should, in an offhand way, and mixed up with emotions as to entirely different matters in our country—namely, civil rights—attempt to intermingle those with the question of the Senate's rules is a matter entirely beyond my understanding. I think these questions should be brought up separately. Unfortunately, that cannot be done at this particular moment. But it can be done in the case of civil-rights legislation. Those in the majority can force continuous sessions, as they are doing now; and if they are willing to take the consequences, I have no doubt they could succeed in having such proposed legislation passed.

This issue really comes down to a question of the extent of the determination on the part of the leadership and the majority. If they are sufficiently determined and if they believe it is wise to pass the bill, there is no doubt that they can do so. This filibuster is purely a matter of degree. What has happened in the past in practically every case is that, due to the delay and the weighing of the wisdom of forcing the measure in question through the Senate, some kind of accommodation or compromise has been reached, generally speaking. There is nothing final about a filibuster. It is illusory to think that all filibusters are bound to succeed—in other words, that in such cases resistance is always effective. Such is simply not the case. The overwhelming power and influence of the Executive, combined with the power and influence of the majority party in the Senate, certainly outweigh that of any other group in the long run, if the majority party is willing to take the consequences of forcing through its decision. I think there can be no question about that.

But, Mr. President, I must say, in spite of the judgment of the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], for whom I have the greatest respect, that there is a very close analogy between the substance of these two matters, in that both of them change radically and drastically the powers of one of the three coordinate branches of our Government. When I say "three," I mean that the Senate is the one in the legislative field which has any effective power resistance.

I started to read a paragraph from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with regard to the fight on the Supreme Court. As evidence of the point of view of those who were making the fight in favor of that proposal to change the Supreme Court, I quote from pages 6873 and 6374 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 7, 1937, from the argument of Senator Guffey, of Pennsylvania, in behalf of the Supreme Court packing bill. He was a proponent of that bill, and I now read what he said on that occasion:

> The essence of democracy is majority rule.

Mr. President, that is exactly what the proponents of the resolution now before the Senate are saying.

I read further:

> The American people, by a plurality never before equalled in our history, indicated that they desired the enactment of a program of social legislation to meet the conditions which exist today.

Mr. President, do not those words sound exactly like some of the arguments which are presented in connection with the matter now before us?

I continue to quote from the remarks of Senator Guffey in 1937:

> They did not ask Congress to think up a lot of legal quibbles and sophistries as to why this cannot be done or that cannot be done. They experienced too much of that type of negative statesmanship in the days of the unfortunate Mr. Hoover. What they want now is not someone to tell them why this or that program cannot be enacted but to point out how it can be enacted. The people would like a demonstration of the fact that progressivism in politics means something more than a constant policy of obstruction and frustration.

Mr. President, I submit that argument is identical with the argument being made today about obstructionism in the Senate. The speech of the former Senator from Pennsylvania could be applied on all four's to the present case, and I believe no one would believe it was not made in the course of this debate.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MYERS. The Senator from Arkansas just made a reference to Pennsylvania, but I did not understand the entire reference.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I may say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that I quoted two paragraphs from a speech made by former Senator Guffey, of Pennsylvania, in the course of the debate on the Supreme Court packing bill, in 1937. I was not referring to the present senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MYERS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I may say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that I am delighted that he is here and is paying such close attention that he caught my reference to Pennsylvania. I am very happy that he is here.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MYERS. Does the Senator from Arkansas know that the Senator from Pennsylvania has been here practically the entire time during the course of this debate, since it first began?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I did not mean to leave the impression that the Senator from Pennsylvania is not very attentive to his duties on the floor of the Senate. I know that he is. However, it is so seldom that the junior Senator from Arkansas has anyone to listen to him, that I simply assumed that, along with other Senators, the Senator from Pennsylvania was not here during all of of my presentation of this matter. I beg the Senator's pardon if I was incorrect in that assumption.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only, Mr. President.

Mr. MYERS. I hope the Senator from Arkansas will understand that when I do leave the floor, I do not go very far from the floor, but just to the cloakroom or to the President's room.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I appreciate that very much.

Mr. President, although, as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has said, no filibuster occurred on the attempt to reorganize the Supreme Court, I think it can safely be said that the right of unlimited debate was at least in some respect responsible for the unhurried and orderly consideration of that bill.

In support of this point, I wish to quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 6, 1937, at page 6788. In moving that the bill be taken up by the Senate, the then majority leader, Senator Robinson, of Arkansas, said:

> If a filibuster develops, as has been threatened, I shall then take the course, so far as I am concerned, which judgment prompts. I shall not commit myself now to any policy that would be in aid of a threatened filibuster.

Senator Robinson further said:

> However, considering the advanced stage of the session and the fact it has been heralded throughout the Nation that those who are opposed to the Court reorganization bill in any form have the intention of obstructing business, of preventing the Senate from registering its opinion, I now announce that it is my intention, so far as I am able to do so and so far as I have support in that purpose, to keep the bill before the Senate, when it is taken up, until it is disposed of, making reasonable allowance for such emergency measures as may be brought to the attention of the Senate.

I think those paragraphs most clearly confirm the analogy between what was involved in the approach to the two problems, which I think are of equal importance. It is so important that I want to read a little further from the statement made by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], because he was in the Senate at the time, and because of his reputation as one of the foremost constitutional authorities, not only in the Senate but in the country. It is not a very long excerpt, but I want to tie down the important point which I think might impress many, I shall not say unthinking persons, but many of those who are too hurried to be able to study the matter, including certain liberals who have to spread themselves so thinly over so many issues that on a matter of this character they can give it only passing attention. That is why it seems to me to be important to invite their attention to the analogy. In the course of 12 years, they have come to realize the importance of the court-packing proposal, and I think they now universally condemn it. That is true even of the liberals and of those who were impatient with any obstruction to the carrying out of whatever they thought was involved in the proposal of 1936. The same spirit is abroad today. We had an election last fall. Everything said in the course of the election, to the very last syllable of the platform, must be carried out because the election was favorable to a particular party. From the hearings of the subcommittee of the Committee on Rules and Administration, on February 18, 1947, I quote from the statement of the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], as follows:

> I come, however, finally to what I believe to be the most important and far-reaching legislative proposal placed before the American people and the American Congress in my day and time.

I may say it was quite a day and time the senior Senator from Georgia had been in the Senate.

I have referred to the President's message of February 5, 1937, recommending a reorganization of the judicial branch of the Government. That recommendation was referred to the Judiciary Committee of the Senate upon the date named; that is, February 5, 1937. On February 8, 1937, the distinguished Senator Ashurst, of Arizona, the then able chairman of the Judiciary Committee, introduced a bill (S. 1392) to reorganize the judicial branch of the Government, which bill was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. From that date in early February until June 14, 1937, this bill was before the committee—

It was not before the Senate; it was before the committee.

From that date in early February until June 14, 1937, this bill was before the committee and under constant debate. The bill was finally reported adversely, with certain amendments, on June 14, 1937. On July 6, 1937, the bill was taken up in the Senate on motion of the then majority leader, the able and lamented Senator Joseph Robinson, of Arkansas. The bill was debated from July 6 continuously through July 13, and until July 14, when Senator Robinson passed from the scene of action. His death was then and now universally lamented. On July 22, 1937, the bill was recommitted to the Judiciary with instructions to report a bill within 10 days relating to judicial reform, substantially noncontroversial in character. There was organized in the Senate of the United States

no actual formal filibuster against the President's proposal, but in committeeroom, in conference, and wherever Senators who were opposed to the measure foregathered, the proposal was under constant discussion. From February 5 until the date of Senator Robinson's death, July 14, 1937, the proposal was one of sharp controversy in the press, over the radio, and on the floor of the Senate. I expressly disclaim any purpose to indulge in criticism of the late President Roosevelt or of his court proposal of February 5, 1937. Upon that proposal I have long since expressed my own views. I have no hesitancy in saying that this proposal, although not intended by the then President and not designed by him to have the effect, would have changed the whole character of the American Government, in my opinion.

That is the analogy I want to emphasize, for, in my opinion, the pending proposal, which appears on its face to be and is promoted by many as merely a step to enforce civil rights, would, aside from the merits of the particular issue, in the words of the Senator from Georgia, change the whole character of the American Government.

In a sentence, it would have converted the judicial branch of the Government into a mere agency or arm of the Executive, contrary to the intent and purpose of the Constitution.

Certainly, it requires no arguments now to show that the very genius of the American system of government is the judicial protection of the rights of the one man against the ninety and nine.

What an analogy it is! What is the function of the minority in the Senate except to protect the rights, as we see them, of, let us say, either our constituents at home or the citizens of the country as a whole? I mean, in any case, it is not an aggressive power we are defending; it is a power to resist the imposition of an arbitrary power by the Executive. It is "the judicial protection of the rights of the one man against ninety and nine."

Certainly it needs no argument to demonstrate that the whole Bill of Rights is but a clear and unmistakable declaration that certain immemorial rights of free men in America are above and beyond all government, general as well as local.

How may these rights be preserved unless we retain a strong, independent, and coordinate branch of the Government—the judicial branch—to give to them validity and life. As a Member of the Senate in 1937, I can assure you that those of us who opposed the reorganization of the judicial branch of Government were most anxiously concerned respecting our ability in the beginning to marshal even a scant one-third of the Senate against a powerful and a popular President of the United States—a great leader, not only of his party but of American thought. The effort was not actually made to invoke cloture and to limit and restrict debate upon this important issue; but if debate had been limited to 1 hour by each Senator on the bill as introduced by the chairman of the Judiciary in the early days of 1937, or if the present proposals to give to a scant majority of those voting or the constitutional majority of the whole membership of the Senate the power to limit debate had been the rule, the bill would probably have passed the Senate.

That is the conclusion I especially wanted to emphasize, that here the judicial branch does not have power to protect itself. It would not have had, I assume, if the bill had been passed. We were the ones in the exercise of our powers who protected the integrity of another branch, the judiciary. At this time our own integrity is being attacked, in my opinion, by an effort to change the rule.

The clear implication of the statement of the Senator from Georgia in the excerpt I read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is that if majority cloture had been available to the then leadership it would have been used. I think that is clear from the implications of the statements by majority leaders of the Senate of that day, and it is certainly clear that is the opinion of the senior Senator from Georgia. He continues:

The bill would probably have passed the Senate. I must remind you that there were then in the Senate 76 Democrats, but 16 Republicans, 1 Independent Republican, 1 Progressive, and 2 Farmer-Labor Senators.

One-third of the Senators had been newly elected in the preceding fall election. With majority cloture, under those circumstances, I think it only common sense to believe the bill would have been passed, and could have been passed in short order. It is my guess that one of the reasons for the delay in bringing it to the floor was probably the effort to try to do something about the power of resistance of Senators, because they evidently had full control of the situation under the leadership of Senator Robinson, of Arkansas.

Mr. President, before I revert to the late President Wilson, I have an editorial which I should like to read. I have read from various documents, but this editorial is from a rather different source, and I think it might be interesting to some of our friends across the aisle. It is from the Wall Street Journal, a journal which is not ordinarily, I think, identified with a radical point of view on matters of this kind. It is in the issue of March 2, 1949, and reads as follows:

Every President within our memory has been dissatisfied with the Senate. For this body by design has been especially protected from a speed-up, whether demanded by the Chief Executive or by public sentiment itself, except under the most extraordinary circumstances.

Thus to most Presidents, sooner or later, the Senate comes to be a stumbling block in the way of prompt fulfillment of their urgent plans. And frequently the whole of this stumbling block appears to rest on the shoulders of a small group of willful men.

The Senate, unlike the House of Representatives, operates under rules which permit a few Members by the simple process of talking to delay action as long as their vocal cords hold out or until two-thirds of their colleagues will agree that time must have a stop.

This rule is a form. The substance which it represents is a conviction that matters of state should not be acted upon, except in gravest emergency, without full and unrestricted debate in at least one public place.

In the operation of this rule, and of others akin to it, it sometimes has seemed that a few men have used the form to abuse the substance of the principle.

The filibuster, which is this seeming abuse in action, is an odious word. Therefore it is frequently proposed to outlaw the filibuster. And we are told upon each such occasion that we are only avoiding paralysis in Congress, that we are merely changing the form and not the substance. We are clipping the wings of obstructionists.

That is what we are told, Mr. President. We are told that the situation is not really being changed. When it was proposed that the Supreme Court of the United States be enlarged, the idea seemed to be that if nine members are good, why are not 18 twice as good? They were not abolishing the court; they were only adding a few more justices. In this instance the statement is, "We are not doing anything to you; we are just cutting off the one source of power you have. There will be the same number of Senators in the Chamber."

The way the English used to attack the same problem in Parliament was to take in enough new peers to override the opposition. The unfortunate and rather sad history of the British Empire may have been influenced by that action involving the upper House of Parliament. They have now taken the final step of complete obliteration of the power of the House of Lords to hold up legislation. In 1910 they restricted to 2 years, as I recall, the power of that body to hold up any bill other than a money bill. Last fall, a special session was called finally to eliminate that power of the upper House of Lords. I do not say that explains the situation, but it might not be a mere coincidence that as that great empire began to lose its virility, certainly the facts are plain that there was the coincidence of the destruction of the power of the upper House. In any case, the change did not help them; it did not maintain them in their prior position.

Mr. President, I shall not take the time to read the remainder of the editorial which I started to read a few moments ago, because I know that Senators are impatient to get on with the business of the Senate; but I recommend to the Members of the Senate, as being very interesting, the entire editorial from the Wall Street Journal.

The main point, which I did not have an opportunity to make yesterday, was to bring to the attention of the Senate, in as clear a way as possible, what is the character of the body of which we are Members. As to the older Members, there is no need of that. They know much better than I do its significance. As I pointed out yesterday, it is very significant that the older Members of this body have, generally speaking, always resisted changes in the rules. As Senator Townsend, of Michigan, said, in the speech which I quoted yesterday, the wish to change the rules originates with new Members. He said they always come in with an instinct or a determination to reform the Senate. That has been true throughout the history of this body.

Before I read into the RECORD one chapter from Woodrow Wilson's book, which is all I intend to read—and that chapter is very short—I should like to refer to the question raised by the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] with reference to the late President Wilson. He said that Mr. Wilson had changed his views after he became President. That is quite correct. The only experience Mr. Wilson had in the Government—I think I am correct in this statement, and I hope any Senator will correct me if I am in error—was as Chief Executive. He had

never been a Member of the Senate or of the House of Representatives or of any other legislative body. His attitude was the very natural one that all Executives adopt with reference to any obstacle to the exercise of their power.

So I do not believe his impatience in regard to the Senate in any way destroys the force of his reasoning as exhibited in his book entitled "Constitutional Government in the United States," which was, when I was in school, and I think still is, regarded as one of the finest books on our constitutional system that has ever been written. It was published in 1911 by the Columbia University Press.

I may observe that I have often heard it said that Mr. Wilson's lack of understanding of the character of the Senate, or at least the appreciation of its character, after he became President, was responsible to a considerable degree for the difficulties he encountered. It has been said that his failure to consult with the leading Members of the Senate at that time accounted for his difficulties to a great degree. It is characteristic of all Executives to be impatient with the legislature. We have some very striking examples of that situation in other countries of the world, within recent years, and I think it would be well to call attention to some of the executives in other countries, such as Germany and Italy, who were able to take over their Governments. That is nothing new, and it is no reflection on any particular President. It inheres in the nature of Executive power, which, in my opinion, it naturally tends to expand and to dominate.

Did anyone ever hear of a legislative body which ever enslaved the people in any country? I cannot recall any time in history when a legislative body developed tendencies of expansion. A legislative body is always in the position of resistance to expansion of executive power. Someone may say that possibly Oliver Cromwell was an exception to the rule when he ordered the beheading of Charles I. But I think that at that time there was a revolution against the pretension of divine power with regard to kings which Charles I had tried to perpetuate and to impose upon the British. It was more in the nature of a popular revolution. It did not, of course, succeed in establishing itself in the England of that day. The course of history has always been the other way. The people begin usually by the establishment of the kind of government they really want—that is, it is more or less democratic—in the way the Greeks and the Romans did. But it always ends up by the executive department, which of course in the nature of things has to be established to execute the laws, as a practical matter, swallowing up the legislative. It always has. In my opinion, the power of the legislature in the United States to check the Executive is the reason why we have not been completely enveloped, because the Executive has all the advantage in the minds of the populace.

I am not trying to be personal about these things, I hope I can be objective, but last fall the press certainly did not evidence an overwhelming support of the successful candidate for the Presidency. Yet when we look from day to day, in the nature of things everything that is said by the Executive is carried in all the newspapers, the slightest statement, even of private affairs, is carried all over the country, and that gives a tremendous impetus to the powers of the Executive.

Most of the time some of the eccentricities of the Senate are criticized. It is very seldom otherwise. I cannot remember what I would call an out and out complimentary discussion of the Senate in any newspaper. The press occasionally will approve of some specific act, in a restricted way, but I am referring to the Senate as a body. I am not criticizing anyone. I am giving the facts concerning the type of organism or institution we represent. People can personalize the President. They can imagine they might be President, that their sons might be, and they can attach to the President the personal qualities which they cannot to the amorphous sort of idea of an institution such as the Senate or the House of Representatives. That condition inheres in the nature of things. The ability to resist that natural tendency is the great secret of the success and of the importance of this body.

I need not go on stating my own views, for the reason that President Wilson had such a power of expression that it would be much more informative to the Senate if I should read and put into the RECORD, so that the public could gain the advantage of it, what he said about the character of this body. I read from his work, Constitutional Government in the United States:

It is very difficult to form a just estimate of the Senate of the United States. No body has been more discussed; no body has been more misunderstood and traduced. There was a time when we were lavish in spending our praises upon it. We joined with our foreign critics and appreciators in speaking of the Senate as one of the most admirable, as it is certainly one of the most original, of our political institutions. In our own day we have been equally lavish of hostile criticism. We have suspected it of every malign purpose, fixed every unhandsome motive upon it, and at times almost cast it out of our confidence altogether.

The fact is that it is possible in your thought to make almost anything you please out of the Senate. It is a body variously compounded, made many-sided by containing many elements, and a critic may concentrate his attention upon one element at a time if he chooses, make the most of what is good and put the rest out of sight, or make more than the most of what is bad and ignore everything that does not chime with his thesis of evil.

The Senate has, in fact, many contrasted characteristics, shows many faces, lends itself easily to no confident generalization. It differs very radically from the House of Representatives. The House is an organic unit; it has been at great pains to make itself so, and to become a working body under a single unifying discipline; while the Senate is not so much an organization as a body of individuals, retaining with singularly little modification the character it was originally intended to have.

I should say it is the only institution that has done that, except in the sense that the executive power has not changed in time so much as degree. It has greatly expanded.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCARRAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to his colleague?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator is reading some very enlightening information as to how the Senate is constituted. Was it not intended by the founding fathers, the framers of the Constitution, that the Senate should ever be a body that was as far removed from politics as it was possible, under our processes of government, so that it could be away from the immediate effect of politics, and therefore free to make decisions without undue influence, and on the basis of statesmanship and the preservation of the very liberties which are guaranteed by the Constitution?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator is entirely correct. So far as they could go without, we will say, adopting the principle of hereditary titles or hereditary rights, such as existed in the mother country at that time, they did adopt that very principle. That is the explanation why the terms of office of Senators are longer, and why it is a continuing body, since all Senators are not elected at the same time. There is a system of overlapping of terms. It was an admirable compromise to accomplish the purpose desired.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will my colleague yield further?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Did not the framers of our Government have in their minds, as was clearly indicated all through the formulation of the Constitution, and in the letter and spirit of the document itself, that in order to form a union it was necessary to delegate to the Federal Government certain power, but does not the thread run all the way through the processes of forming the Constitution, and of the Constitution itself, of a constant limitation upon that power so as to keep the power of government as nearly in the people themselves as it is possible to do, and at the same time form a union of the States?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator has put it much better than I could. That is exactly the purpose. I cannot emphasize too strongly that the great distinction between our system and the systems that have been attempted in countries like Germany, in the case of the Weimar Republic, and in Italy, is that the founders of our Government erected barriers against the expansion of the executive power, or against the domination of the transient majority. It is the checks to that power which is the distinguishing feature of our Constitution. Constitutions like that of the Weimar Republic in Germany sound beautiful. In many respects that constitution makes a more complete document, perhaps, that the American Constitution, covering all the phases of human activity. It is very liberal, and all that. Of course, it had a fatal defect when the time came when Hitler was elected chancelor. It

had the fatal defect that under certain circumstances he could suspend it. There was, therefore, unrestricted power in the executive. In a legal way I think he violated the spirit, but in a strictly legal way, under the constitution, he did destroy it. I shall refer to that a little later. I have one excerpt about that situation which I think demonstrates clearly what I have said.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will my colleague yield further?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. For a question only.

Mr. McCLELLAN. May I ask the Senator whether he does not agree with me that so long as we retain the limitations and adhere to the limitations of power which are retained in the Constitution, there will never be a dictatorship or totalitarian government in the United States?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree to that. That is, presuming that these bodies, the Court and the Senate, retain their integrity; but if a means can be found by which the executive branch, through its influence with the party and the majority leadership of the Congress, can work its way, then I think there will be a perfect opportunity to take over that power.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Will my colleague yield further for another question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Our Government has survived very trying periods during the past 175 years, and during that time we have made greater progress in most every field than have any other people or nation in the history of the world. After we have demonstrated the great work and value of our system of government under the limited powers and the restrictions placed upon Government, does my colleague have any fear or does he share the apprehension I feel that if we now were to begin to relax or discard these restrictions and limitations we would ultimately destroy the very power and strength which has made us what we are, and that we will soon begin going in the direction of other governments which have surrendered this power to absolute state control?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree entirely with my colleague. As I have tried to point out, the trend we have been witnessing is not merely something that is restricted to us. It has been going on all over the world, and we must be, I should say, unusually intelligent and vigilant to restrict a movement which is so widespread, and which began a good while ago. Of course, I believe that if we stand fast and are successful in preventing that trend here, it might well be the seed for the revival of free governments and democratic systems over the world. That, after all, is the whole theory, in my judgment, of a plan such as the Marshall plan, the ECA. The justification for the Marshall plan is to provide a breathing spell during which we hope there can be a rebirth and a strengthening of the democratic system which, for all intents and purposes, many countries lost during the last war. Of course, that is the result of the character and nature of wars. They tend to destroy popular and democratic government.

I resume reading from President Wilson's statement:

As I have already said, * * * it is impossible to characterize the United States in any single generalization; and for that very reason it is impossible to sum up the Senate in any single phrase or summary description. For the Senate is as various as the country it represents. It represents the country, not the people: the country in its many diverse sections, not the population of the country, which tends to become uniform where it is concentrated.

Most of the leading figures among the active public men of the country are now to be found in the Senate, not in the House. This was not formerly the case. Before the House became an effective, nondebating organ of business, it shared quite equally with the Senate the leading politicians of the country; but it has not been so of recent years. Organization swallows men up, debate individualizes them, and men of strong character and active minds always prefer the position in which they will be freest to speak and act for themselves. The Senate has always been a favorite goal of ambition for our public men, but it has become more and more the place of their preference as the House has more and more surrendered to it the function of public counsel.

Of course, there are fewer Senators than Members of the House, and it is a more conspicuous thing to be 1 of a body of 90 than to be 1 of a body of 357. Moreover, the tenure of a Senator of the United States is three times as long as the tenure of a Member of the House of Representatives, and every Member of the Senate must feel it a considerable advantage that 6 years instead of 2 are given him in which to make his impression on the country. There is time to find out what he is about and to master a difficult task. Both the smaller membership of the Senate and the longer term of its Members contribute to individualize the men who compose it and to give them an advantage and importance which Members of the House do not often have, unless they rise to one of the three or four places of real power which crown the committee organization of the representative Chamber.

I think this is a very significant paragraph.

And yet these are not the radical and fundamental differences between the House and the Senate. Size and tenure are after all matters of detail. They count, and count a good deal, in giving the Senate its character, but they do not go to the root of the difference between the two Houses. What gives the Senate its real character and significance as an organ of constitutional government is the fact that it does not represent population, but regions of the country, the political units into which it has, by our singular constitutional process, been cut up. The Senate, therefore, represents the variety of the Nation as the House does not. It does not draw its membership chiefly from those parts of the country where the population is most dense, but draws it in equal parts from every State and section.

It seems to me that those critics of our Government—they are, I believe, without exception domestic critics—who criticize the principle upon which the Senate is made up on the ground that States having little wealth and small population have as many representatives in the Senate as the richest and most populous States of the Union, the newest and least developed as many as the oldest and most highly organized, entirely mistake the standard by which the Senate should be judged as an instrumentality of constitutional government in a system like ours.

Mr. President, I believe some Senators and others who come from very large States, such as New York, ought to think that over, because there is a tendency to say, "Well, we pay a great amount of taxes, we have many people, and we ought to run this show." We see that implied in the press, and in statements made many times and in many places, and President Wilson here has put his finger on that element very clearly. As he said, they entirely mistake the standard by which the Senate should be judged.

I continue to read from President Wilson:

They are entirely wrong in assuming, for one thing, that the newer, weaker, or more sparsely populated parts of the country have less of an economic stake in its general policy and development than the older States and those which have had a great industrial development. Their stake may not be equal in dollars and cents—that, of course—but it is probably greater in all that concerns opportunity and the chances of life. There is a sense in which the interest of the poor man in the prosperity of the country is greater than that of the rich man. He as no reserve, and his very life may depend upon it. The very life of an undeveloped community may depend upon what will cause a richer community mere temporary inconvenience or negligible distress. And yet even this, vital as it is to the validity and the usual criticism of the make-up and character of the Senate, is in fact neither here nor there as compared with the essential point of the matter.

Neither is it of material consequence that some of the States represented in the Senate are not real communities, with distinct historical characteristics, a distinct social and economic character of their own, as most of the older States are. It is true that you have only to look at a map of the United States to see at a glance that many of the newer States of the Union are purely arbitrary creations, their boundaries established by the theodolite of the public surveyor. They are squares on a great checkerboard, elaborated into rectangular sections on broad plains where there are no natural boundaries to divide region from region; and these artificial squares, which Congress first laid off as the areas of Territories, it has one by one converted into States, each of which sends two Members to the Senate, just as Virginia and Massachusetts do, the history of whose boundaries and organization is a long history of constitutional struggle which gave them from the very outset characters and purposes of their own. Many a square Western State, laid out by the public surveyor, has now a more homogenous population and a more discernible individuality than some of her eastern sisters into whom a miscellaneous immigration has poured social chaos.

I agree wholeheartedly with that statement. I believe that much of our trouble originates in our social chaos.

And their very separateness of political organization insures them a development of their own.

Yet even that is not of material consequence. Even if every State of the Union were of artificial creation, not a natural community, but merely a region marked off to make a congressional district for elections to the Senate, the principle I am just now interested in pointing out as of capital importance in a system and country like ours would not be altered or affected. That is the principle that regions must be represented, irrespective of population, in a country physically as various as ours and therefore certain to exhibit a very great variety of

social and economic and even political conditions. It is of the utmost importance that its parts, as well as its people, should be represented, and there can be no doubt in the mind of anyone who really sees the Senate of the United States as it is that it represents the country, as distinct from the accumulated populations of the country, much more fully and much more truly than the House of Representatives does. The East and North are regions of concentration, regions of teeming population and highly developed industry—the regions north of Mason and Dixon's line and east of the Mississippi. It will not long be so. Cities are springing up in the South and beyond the Mississippi in the Middle West, on the Pacific coast, and upon the great lines of traffic that connect coast with coast, which will presently rival the cities of the East and of the old Northwest in magnitude and importance, and many a region hitherto but sparsely peopled is thickening apace with crowding settlers and an accumulating commerce. But for the present the South and West, if I may use those terms in the large, are not the centers of wealth or population, and have a character unlike that of the marts of trade and industry, and there are more Senators from the South and West than from the North and East. The House of Representatives tends more and more, with the concentration of population in certain regions, to represent particular interests and points of view, to be less catholic and more and more specialized in its view of national affairs. It represents chiefly the East and North. The Senate is it indispensable offset, and speaks always in its make-up of the size, the variety, the heterogeneity, the range and breadth of the country, which no community or group of communities can adequately represent. It cannot be represented by one sample or by a few samples; it can be represented only by many—as many as it has parts.

I think that is an element which has been completely forgotten in recent days. After all, we must remember that this man was a great liberal in his day, and is still considered a great progressive. He is not speaking as what so many of our people call a reactionary—anyone who does not approve of the complete elimination of the districts and sections of this country.

It thus happens that there are in the Senate more representatives of the individual parts of the country than of the characteristic parts of it. At least that is true if I am right in assuming that the characteristic parts of America are those parts which are most highly developed, where population teems and great communities are quick with industry, where our life most displays its energy, its ardor of enterprise, its genius for material achievement. Other communities are no doubt more truly characteristic of America as she has been known in the processes of her making. Only modern visitors, visitors of our own day, have known her as industrial America, the leader of the world in all the processes, whether material or economic, which produce wealth and accumulate power, the land of manufactures and of vast cities. The older America is still represented by the South and West with their simpler life, their more scattered people, their fields of grain, their mines of metal, their little towns, their easier pace of intercourse, their work that does not crowd out companionship.

Certainly it is easier to represent a northern or eastern constituency in Congress than to represent a southern or western constituency. There is more individuality, man for man, in the West and South than in the East and North. How constantly we repeat each other's opinions and bow to each other's influence; how seldom we take leave to be ourselves and utter thoughts of our own genuine coinage, in regions where we are parts of a packed and thronging multitude. Rubbing shoulders every day with thousands of your fellow citizens, putting your mind into contact with other minds at every encounter, you slowly have the individuality rubbed out of you by mere attrition and are worn down to a common pattern. Your opinion is everybody's opinion; my information is the common information current everywhere; your mind, like mine, like our neighbor's is assaulted day and night with the multitudinous voices of clamorous talk, and a common atmosphere gives us a common habit and attitude.

I think this is something that all of us in the Senate ought to rub up against every year. We have come to discount the very basic values of our whole idea of a progressive community, it seems to me, in recent years. Of course, such things as radio and television only make it easier to destroy the individuality of men's minds, and their habits and thoughts.

Only very unusual men can remain individual under such pressure of uniformity. It is uncomfortable to be singular in any habit, whether of action or of thought, where so many look on and make comment. Conformity is the easiest, plainest, safest way, and countless multitudes there be that walk in it. "Always be of the opinion of the person with whom you are conversing," was Dean Swift's advice to all who would win the repute of being sensible persons. And in crowded places of enterprise it is a very valuable asset of success to be thus reputed a man of sense.

He is now drawing our attention to one of the reasons why the Executive has such power in the legislative body, if it is not watched. This is very interesting on that point.

To conform opens the way to promotion. It is the common and very uncomfortable fortune of men of original views to be greeted at every turn with a stare and a shrug of the shoulders, as Mr. Bagehot has said, and to be followed with the comment, "An excellent young man, sir, but unsafe, quite unsafe." Mr. Bagehot must certainly have known: he was himself most singularly original and seemed always to have had the freshness of youth about him.

The variety of the country, therefore, is better represented in the Senate than in the House; its variety of opinion as well as its variety of social and economic make-up; its variety of opinion because of its variety of social and economic make-up. There are more opinions because there is more individuality in the uncrowded South and West than in the crowded East and North. Each mind is there apt to have a greater, freer space about it, space in which to look around and form impressions of its own. No country ought ever to be judged from its seething centers. To be truly known, it must be known where it is quiet, in places where impulse is not instant, hot, insistent; where you can at least presume that opinion will next week be what it is today.

In those hot centers of trade and industry, where a man's business grips him like an unrelaxing hand of iron from morning to night and lies heavily upon him even while he sleeps, few men can be said to have any opinions at all. They may bury their heads for a few minutes in the morning paper at breakfast or as they hurry to their offices, may dwell with dull attention upon the afternoon paper as they go wearily home again or drowse after dinner; but what they get out of the papers they cannot call their opinions. They are not opinions but merely a miscellany of mental reactions, never assorted, never digested, never made up into anything that can for the moment compare in reality and vitality with the energetic conceptions they put to use in their business. In small towns, in rural countrysides, around comfortable stoves in cross-road stores, wherever business shows as many intervals as transactions, where seasons of leisure alternate with seasons of activity, where large undertakings wait on slow, unhasting nature, where men are neighbors and know each other's quality, where politics is dwelt upon in slow talk with all the leisure and fond elaboration usually bestowed on gossip, where discussion is as constant a pastime as checkers, opinion is made up with an individual flavor and wears all the variety of individual points of view.

That is a wonderful description. I can well imagine, living in a city such as this, how extremely difficult it is to have a moment of leisure to contemplate anything. We are so burdened with the necessity of giving attention to so many external activities that there is virtually no time any more to think about anything.

I read further:

And the Senate has more Members from such regions than from those where opinion is made up by conglomeration and upon the moment, out of newspapers, and not out of the contributions of individual minds. It represents the population of the country not in its numbers but in its variety, and it is of the utmost consequence that the country's variety should be represented as thoroughly as its mass.

The processes by which we have made States out of the Territories of the United States have been seriously impaired once and again by mistakes which are the more to be deplored because they are apparently irremediable. Once make a State and you cannot unmake it. Once or twice Congress has admitted to the Union in equal partnership with the older States Territories which not only did not have population enough to justify their admission but which had no real prospect of gaining a population large and various enough to develop into compact and important communities with a character and purpose of their own—communities already sufficiently represented in kind in the councils of the country and not constituted in a way which gave promise of political vitality. But such mistakes have been few, and many a State which at first seemed a premature and unjustifiable creation has been speedily lifted to a plane of real dignity and importance by the abounding forces of our national growth. It has been hard to make mistakes where populations throng forward so steadily and in such wholesome masses to occupy the free spaces of the continent. We have had to reclaim deserts to accommodate their multitude. And as each new-fledged State has come in its two spokesmen in the Senate have added its voice to our councils in a place where voices can still be individually heard.

Here is the main point of the whole section:

The fact that the Senate has kept its original rules of debate and procedure substantially unchanged is very significant. It is a place of individual voices. The suppression of any single voice would radically change its constitutional character; and its character being changed, the individual voice of the country's several regions being silenced, there would no longer be any sufficient reason for its present constitution.

That statement is extremely appropriate to the present situation. In other

words, the conclusion is that there would be no reason for our continuance if the voices in the Senate were to be silenced and if the Senate's rules were to be changed.

I continue to read:

If it were to follow the example of the House and make itself chiefly an efficient organ for the transaction of business, the critics who condemn it because it is unequally compounded upon any balanced reckoning of the wealth and numbers of the country would have not a little tenable ground to stand upon.

In other words, one of the principal arguments made in the hearings before the committee was that this body is not efficient, and that a more efficient organ is needed for the efficient disposition of business. But, of course, Mr. President, that is exactly what should not be wanted; and that reasoning is precisely opposite to the wise course, especially at a time such as this in our history, or, for that matter, at any time.

I continue to read:

Another circumstance gives a Senator of the United States an individual importance which the average Member of the House of Representatives lacks. He comes into contact with a much greater variety of the public business. He is not a mere legislator. He is directly associated with the President in some of the most delicate and important functions of Government. He is a member of a great executive council. He is brought into very confidential relations with the President in matters which oftentimes call for not a little discretion and for very prudent judgments—judgments not to be drawn from public opinion but only from official facts privately considered, not spoken out of doors, belonging to intimate counsel and not to public debate. There is no better cure for thinking disparagingly of the Senate than a conference with men who belong to it, to find out how various, how precise, how comprehensive their information about the affairs of the Nation is; and to find, what is even more important, how fair, how discrete, how regardful of public interest they are in the opinions which they will express in your private ear.

Mr. President, I ask Senators to compare that passage with the later condemnation of the Senate, and I leave it to Senators' own good judgment to determine which one was given in an objective attitude, free from any personal pique or interest in the outcome of a controversial matter. I think it is rare that we find as approving a statement of the Senate as we find in this chapter of Woodrow Wilson's book.

I call the next statement particularly to the attention of the Senate:

The most reticent men in Washington are the members of the Supreme Court of the United States. It would, of course, be a great breach of professional honor on the part of any member of that Court to discuss any question involved in a pending case which the Court was considering or was about to consider—

I would say that in recent years that idea has changed considerably, because I think many of the members of the Court today take a deep interest in public matters. I do not mean to say that I condemn that, but it is a change which has come about with regard to the Court.

I read further:

but his obligation of reticence goes much further than that. Almost any piece of public policy that touches the individual, though it be ever so indirectly, may sooner or later come before the Supreme Court for judicial examination. Every member of the Court, therefore, feels bound to keep his opinions upon such matters to himself. He will not discuss with you any but the most general public questions, holds discretely silent with regard to every mooted matter of legal policy or construction. Men who know the proprieties never broach such matters with members of the Court. Senators feel a similar obligation of honor with regard to the matters in which they bear a confidential relation to the Executive. They are not at liberty to say to you or even to their constituents at home the grounds for such action as they may have taken in executive sessions of the Senate until the whole matter is so long gone by that no possible harm or embarrassment can come of publicity with regard to it. Members of the House are not under such restraints. Nothing comes before the House of Representatives which it is not the right of every man in the United States to discuss if he will. No doubt Members sometimes act upon private information from the White House or a department which they would feel it unwise to make generally known; but that seldom happens, and if the House talked at all, it might talk about anything it chose that it had information enough to understand.

Mr. President, I shall skip the next page; it is not particularly appropriate to this subject.

Now I go to page 126, and I shall soon be through:

In order to get a correct impression of the Senate, it is necessary that you extend your observations beyond particular sections of the country. One of the greatest disadvantages that public opinion labors under in the United States is that we have no national newspaper, no national organ of opinion. There is no newspaper in the United States which is not local, and narrowly local at that, both in the news which it prints and in the views which it expresses. Each paper makes such selections of general news as will interest the particular locality in which it is printed, and expresses such views of the Nation's affairs as local interest or information suggests. If you read New York papers, you will have New York opinions; if you read Philadelphia papers, you will have Philadelphia opinions; if you read Chicago papers, you will have Chicago opinions; if you read San Francisco papers, you will have, not western, but merely San Franciscan, opinions.

And if you read papers from all four cities, you will not get national opinion. Though the impressions they give you may sometimes seem to have the air of being national, you will find that they are, after all, local impressions, though made up out of national material. They bear the color of a place. I dare say the thing is inevitable in so big a country; but undoubtedly one of the reasons why we so habitually misjudge the Senate of the United States is that we have no national medium of intelligence, and the papers most widely read reflect not national, but local, conditions.

Indeed, one of the serious difficulties of politics in this country, whether you look at it from the point of view of the student or the point of view of the statesman, is its provincialism—the general absence of national information, and, by the same token, of national opinion. And one is forced to believe, reluctantly enough if he live in the East, that the East is the most provincial part of the Union—a very serious matter, because most of our information and most of our opinion is printed in the East and transmitted thence.

The observation by President Wilson that the East is the most provincial part of the United States is very interesting. Unfortunately, the East is the source of most of the national magazines and of much information, which, of course, makes it extremely difficult for those in the South and West to inform the rest of the people. It is one of the principal obstacles to making them aware of the real significance of an issue such as the one now before the Senate. I think, were it not for that unfortunate circumstance, and if we had, as President Wilson says, a national newspaper or some source of information that would represent the national view, it would be much easier to conduct the public business. I may say that might be an acceptable substitute for freedom of debate in the Senate. It is about the only thing I can think of that might take its place.

The East, being the oldest part of the country, having been for a long time the whole of it, having the oldest roots of history, the longest traditions of influence, the greatest wealth, and hitherto an unquestioned command of the economic development of the whole country, shows as yet little intimate consciousness of the rest of it—

This is remarkable, coming from a man who at the time was living in New Jersey—

is much less aware of other communities and other interests than its own than are other parts of the country. The chief reason why the President of the United States can concentrate in himself, if he choose, greater power and more extended influence than any other person or any other group of persons connected with the Government is, as I have already several times pointed out, that all the country is curious about him and interested in him as our one national figure, eager to hear everything that emanates from him. His doings and sayings constitute the only sort of news that is invariably transmitted to every corner of the country and read with equal interest in every sort of neighborhood. He is the one person about whom definite national opinion is formed, and, therefore, the one person who can form opinion by his own direct influence and act upon the whole country at once.

That is exactly the thought I was trying to express a moment ago, that, because of that very characteristic, we must be alert at all times to prevent the utilization of his unique position in an effort to expand and to extend the power of the Executive over the legislature; in fact, to destroy the independence of the legislative power.

It has, therefore, too often escaped the attention of the country as a whole that the large majority of the Members of the Senate of the United States obtain their seats by perfectly legitimate methods, because the people whom they represent honestly prefer them as representatives; yet the large majority of them are poor men who have little or nothing to live on besides their inadequate salaries; that the opinion and action of the Senate are for the most part determined by the influence of quiet men whom the country talks about very little, and about whom it suspects nothing in the least questionable or dishonorable; and that the few notorious Members whose reputations are most talked of generally play a very obscure part in its business. In most of the States great corporations, great combinations of interest, have little to do with the choice of Senators. Men go to the Senate who are in a very real sense the choice of the people—or rather men to whom natural and genuine political leadership has come by reason of their personal force or of their

services to their party—men of the rank and file who have made their way to the top by political, not by commercial, means, and who enjoy a veritable popular support. There are one or two very influential Members of the Senate who are also very rich men; but they are influential, not because of their riches, but because of their long and intelligent service, their complete experience in affairs, and the relations of intimate personal confidence which they have established with their fellow Senators. You have but to make the most casual inquiries in Washington to ascertain that the men who are in fact most influential in the proceedings of the Senate are not the men most advertised in the newspapers, most conspicuous in the talk of the Capital, not the men who talk most effectively for those far-off galleries, but small groups of quiet gentlemen seldom spoken of in the public prints, more thoughtful of their duties than of being generally talked about—men who have not laid by fortunes, but who have been at pains to grow rich in the esteem of the fellow citizens at home who know and support them.

One of the present difficulties lying in the way of maintaining a high grade of excellence in the Senate, as in the House, is that we do not pay our representatives in either House salaries large enough to command men of the best abilities, or even sufficiently to support those who accept seats in the Houses, in the sort of domestic comfort and dignity we naturally expect them to maintain.

I confess that portion of the paragraph does not bear directly upon the subject in hand, but I thought it might be interesting to note the attitude of President Wilson at that remote date.

Men of the highest ability do accept seats in the House and Senate, but they do so generally at a great sacrifice, find it exceedingly difficult to live in so expensive a place as Washington without a very teasing economy, and are usually forced at last to seek some remunerative employment in order to pay the debts they have almost inevitably accumulated in serving a country which economizes in the wrong items of its budget. If the Senate should ever come to deserve in fact the reputation of being a rich men's club, the true cost will be found rather in the salary account on our national budget than in the power of wealth to buy legislative seats. As it stands now, only rich men can afford, if they be in love with self-respecting ways of living, to accept an election in the Senate.

This, then, is the Senate, the house of individuals, a body of representative American men, representing the many elements of the Nation's make-up, exhibiting the vitality of a various people, speaking for the several parts of a country of many parts and many interests, wholly and yet full of sharp social and political contrasts; men much above the average in ability and in personal force; men connected in most cases by long service with the business of the Government and accustomed to handle its affairs in all their range and variety; a body of counselors who act, if not always wisely or without personal and party bias, yet always with energy and without haste.

It is interesting to the looker-on in Washington to observe the unmistakable condescension—

I fear I may have some reservations to make about the next thought expressed by President Wilson—

It is interesting to the looker-on in Washington to observe the unmistakable condescension with which the older Members of the Senate regard the President of the United States. Dominate the affairs of the country though he may, he seems to them at most an ephemeral phenomenon. Even if he has continued in his office for the two terms which are the traditional limit of the President's service, he but overlaps a single senatorial term by 2 years, and a Senator who has served several terms has already seen several Presidents come and go. His experience of affairs is much mellower than the President's can be; he looks at policies with a steadier vision than the President's; the continuity of the Government lies in the keeping of the Senate more than in the keeping of the Executive, even in respect of matters which are of the especial prerogative of the Presidential office. A Member of long standing in the Senate feels that he is the professional, the President an amateur.

Mr. BROUGHTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. BROUGHTON. It is true, is it not, that what the Senator has just read was written prior to the time the author himself became President of the United States?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It was written before the author became President. I may also say it was written before the two-term tradition had been changed, so I think it quite an excusable observation, though not in accordance with recent developments regarding the Presidency.

I have dwelt at some length upon the character and the true constitutional purpose of the Senate because that character and purpose govern its whole organization and action. It is as different from the House in organization as in character and constitutional position.

I call that particularly to the attention of newer Members of the Senate, for there is the thought running through the hearings that the Senate should be more like the House, so that business could be disposed of more quickly and efficiently.

Its power is not concentrated—

I call attention to this, also, because I am not sure, in view of recent developments, whether it is entirely accurate. It says:

Its power is not concentrated in its Presiding Officer as the power of the House is. On the contrary, its Presiding Officer is of all its constituent parts the least significant. In mere fact, the Vice President of the United States is, in any analysis of the powers and activities of the Senate, practically negligible. Some occupants of that singular office have, it is true, made a considerable impression upon the Senate and have left distinct marks of their individuality upon its record, particularly in matters of procedure. Men of great natural force and unusual personality cannot spend 4 years in the chair of so serious and so busy an assembly without leaving some memory of their influence. But the Vice Presidents of the United States have, almost without exception, whatever their natural vigor or instinct of initiative, felt that their relation to the Senate was purely formal. The Vice President is not a Member of the Senate. His duties are only the formal and altogether impartial duties of a Presiding Officer. His position seems to demand that he should take no part in party tactics and should hold carefully aloof from all parliamentary struggles for party advantage. Its very dignity seems to rob it of vitality in respect of the only duties assigned to it by the Constitution. And yet the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Vice President's substitute upon occasion, is a vital political figure. He is chosen by his party associates of the majority to play a real part in the business of the assembly. He holds office at the pleasure of the Senate and is in a much more intimate and sympathetic relation with the party he represents than the Vice President of the United States can be.

Once or twice it has looked as if the President pro tempore were likely to accumulate powers and prerogatives which might give his office a power and authority comparable with those of the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The Senate, like the House, prepares its business through the instrumentality of standing committees, and in 1828 it conferred upon its President pro tempore the authority to appoint its committees. But in 1833, for political reasons which it is not necessary to detail here, it again changed its rule and resumed to itself the right to constitute its committees by its own choice by ballot.

Mr. President, with the permission of the Senate, I recommend all of this chapter, but I can see that it is long, and so I shall skip two or three pages at this point, and read further:

But the Senate is a deliberative assembly and is under no such discipline of silence and obedience to its committees as the House is. The duties of its committees are much more like those of ordinary old-fashioned committees such as are usually found in all parliamentary bodies, than are the duties of the House committees. They are by no means in complete control of the business of the Senate. A bill introduced by an individual Senator may be put upon the Calendar, debated, and voted upon without reference to a committee at all. The committees are an imperative convenience, and the greater part of the Senate's business is, of course, prepared by them, but they are not permitted to monopolize the floor, and the Chamber is quick to recognize the right of its individual Members to have their proposals considered directly, without committee intervention.

Moreover, the make-up of the committees of the Senate is determined much more strictly by seniority and by personal privilege and precedence than is the membership of the committees of the House, with much less regard to party lines and much more regard to personal and sectional considerations—by equitable arrangement rather than by the personal choice or individual purpose of the caucus chairmen. The variety of the country is allowed to show itself in the constitution of its committees, as in its debates and its recognition of individual privilege among its Members. An old-fashioned air of equality and democracy is still perceptible in the Senate, its popular reputation to the contrary notwithstanding—something of the discipline of party whips and leaders, as must in any political assembly be inevitable, but much more of the air of debate, much less the air of rigidly organized business and mere efficiency, than in the popular Chamber.

Indeed, the Senate is, par excellence, the Chamber of debate and individual privilege. Its discussions are often enough unprofitable—

I think this is the answer to the argument with reference to efficiency.

Its discussions are often enough unprofitable, are too marred by personal feeling and by exhibitions of private interest which taint its reputation and render the country uneasy and suspicious, but they are at least the only means the country has of clarifying public business for public comprehension.

In other words, it is true that there are inconveniences, and none of us really

enjoys a lot of speeches, whether they be in or out of a filibuster.

When we turn to the question which is the central question of our whole study, the question of the coordination of the Senate with the other organs of the Government and the synthesis of authority and power for common action, it at once becomes evident that such a body as I have described the Senate to be, must be very hard indeed to digest into any system. A coordination of wills, united movement under a common leadership, is of the very essence of every efficient form of government. The Senate has a very stiff will of its own, a pride of independent judgment, very admirable in itself, but not calculated to dispose it to prompt accommodation when it differs in its views and objects from the House or the President. Its very excellencies stand in its way as an organ of cooperation: Its slow deliberation, its tolerance of individual opinion, its confidence in the political judgment and experience of its own leaders, the feeling of permanency and stability which seems to lift it a little above the influences of the immediate day, the critical moment of decision. It looks upon the House of Representatives very much as it looks upon the President—as an organ of opinion, indeed, and as a coordinate branch of the Government of undoubted commission from the people, but as likely to change, a thing that, in its present character and disposition at least, is here today and gone tomorrow, to make room for new men and new moods. * * *

Particularly in its dealings with the President has the Senate shown its pride of independence, its desire to rule rather than to be merely consulted, its inclination to magnify its powers and in some sense preside over the policy of the Government. There can be little doubt in the mind of any one who has carefully studied the plans and opinions of the Constitutional Convention of 1787 that the relations of the President and Senate were intended to be very much more intimate and confidential than they have been; that it was expected that the Senate would give the President its advice and consent in respect to appointments and treaties in the spirit of an executive council associated with him upon terms of confidential operation rather than in the spirit of an independent branch of the Government, jealous lest he should in the least particular attempt to govern its judgment or infringe upon its prerogatives. The formality and stiffness, the attitude as if of rivalry and mutual distrust, which have marked the dealings of the President with the Senate, have shown a tendency to increase rather than to decrease as the years have gone by, and have undoubtedly at times very seriously embarrassed the action of the Government in many difficult and important matters.

The Senate has shown itself particularly stiff and jealous in insisting upon exercising an independent judgment upon foreign affairs, and has done so so often that a sort of customary modus vivendi has grown up between the President and the Senate, as of rival powers. The Senate is expected in most instances to accept the President's appointments to office, and the President is expected to be very tolerant of the Senate's rejection of treaties, proposing but by no means disposing even in this chief field of his power. Advisers who are entirely independent of the official advised are in a position to be, not his advisers, but his masters; and when, as sometimes happens, the Senate is of one political party and the President of the other, its dictation may be based, not upon the merits of the question involved, but upon party antagonisms and calculations of advantage.

The President has not the same recourse when blocked by the Senate that he has when opposed by the House. When the House declines his counsel he may appeal to the Nation, and if public opinion respond to his appeal the House may grow thoughtful of the next congressional elections and yield; but the Senate is not so immediately sensitive to opinion and is apt to grow, if anything, more stiff if pressure of that kind is brought to bear upon it.

But there is another course which the President may follow, and which one or two presidents of unusual political sagacity have followed, with the satisfactory results that were to have been expected. He may himself be less stiff and offish, may himself act in the true spirit of the Constitution and establish intimate relations of confidence with the Senate on his own initiative, not carrying his plans to completion and then laying them in final form before the Senate to be accepted or rejected, but keeping himself in confidential communication with the leaders of the Senate while his plans are in course, when their advice will be of service to him and his information of the greatest service to them, in order that there may be veritable counsel and a real accommodation of views instead of a final challenge and contest. The policy which has made rivals of the President and Senate has shown itself in the President as often as in the Senate, and if the Constitution did indeed intend that the Senate should in such matters be an executive council it is not only the privilege of the President to treat it as such, it is also his best policy and his plain duty. As it is now, the President and Senate are apt to deal with each other with the formality and punctilio of powers united by no common tie except the vague common tie of public interest, but it is within their choice to change the whole temper of affairs in such matters and to exhibit the true spirit of the Constitution by coming into intimate relations of mutual confidence, by a change of attitude which can perhaps be effected more easily upon the initiative of the President than upon the initiative of the Senate.

It is manifestly the duty of statesmen, with whatever branch of the Government they may be associated, to study in a very serious spirit of public service the right accommodation of parts in this complex system of ours, the accommodation which will give the Government its best force and synthesis in the face of the difficult counsels and perplexing tasks of regulation with which it is face to face, and no one can play the leading part in such a matter with more influence or propriety than the President. If he have character, modesty, devotion, and insight as well as force, he can bring the contending elements of the system together into a great and efficient body of common counsel.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Just a moment. I have completed reading the chapter on the Senate, from the book by Woodrow Wilson. I merely wish to explain that I did not feel it necessary to take the time of the Senate to read the whole book, but I recommend that it be read, and very seriously, by everyone who is interested in the question pending before the Senate.

I now yield, for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Does not the Senator feel that the excerpt which he has been reading from that great book by Woodrow Wilson strongly indicates that Senators were originally intended by the founding fathers to be more or less ambassadors from the States, to be consulted by the President when legislation vitally affecting their States in particular was presented?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I most certainly think so. We use the word "ambassadors" of the States. That expression, particularly in Washington, has acquired a certain special connotation; but I think that President Wilson in talking about the individuality of the representatives of the respective States meant exactly that, and I think being ambassadors is their proper function. I believe up to the present they have retained it to a considerable degree, except in those great metropolitan areas of the East in which President Wilson says social chaos has arisen.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Does it not appear, judging from the book which the Senator has been reading, that it was originally planned, in the order of things in the American Government, that the President, rather than surrounding himself with a lot of White House consultants, legislation vitally affecting certain sections of the country was involved, even before asking for such legislation would send for Senators from the States most vitally affected, and carefully consult with them, just as he would consult with ambassadors with regard to this Nation's policy toward other nations before sending to the Congress proposals affecting them?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe that was the thought President Wilson had, particularly in the latter part of the section in which the initiative to bring about coordination is spoken of as lying particularly in the President's hands.

Mr. LONG. Does it not strongly follow, from the excerpts from the late President Woodrow Wilson's book, which was written before he was President, that the great President, certainly before he was President, realized that the United States Senate itself should be the judge of the rules by which this great body was to proceed, and that the President from the White House was not to dictate to the Senate what rules it should use when proceeding to the consideration of the Nation's business, as the representatives of the sovereign States?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. A few moments ago the Senator from Florida, in the course of our discussion, raised that question. It seem to me that, while, of course, anyone has a perfect right to comment on anything of public interest, because of the coordinate position of the executive, legislative, and judiciary departments, the great power of the Executive should not be used in such a way as possibly to destroy the independence and power of the Senate. I disapprove of it very heartily, in the same way that we disapproved of his exercising a power to submit legislation to change the Supreme Court. To be sure, he had the power to suggest it, there was nothing unconstitutional or anything of that sort in the suggestion, but it was certainly disapproved by the Senate, and I think by the people generally.

If the people understand what I really believe to be involved in this particular move, namely, that it means a very substantial lessening, if not the ultimate destruction, of the power of the Senate in our system, I do not think the people will approve of this, either. But, as I have said, I think he has mixed up the matter of substantive law with his civil-rights legislation, which has an appeal all its own, entirely aside from how this matter affects the Senate. There is great danger in the way it is presented, and I do not think it is a proper way to present a question of this kind.

Mr. LONG. Would it not seem to the Senator that it would certainly be a more appropriate procedure, if the President of the United States had legislation in mind which he wanted enacted by the Congress, to proceed to the consideration of such legislation, rather than tell the Senate how it should change its rules in order that he might more expeditiously force such legislation through this body?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the first is the proper way. It seems to me there is a proper course if gentlemen are sincere about civil rights. As I pointed out, that is the issue to which the party is committed. There is not a word in the Democratic Party platform about changing the rules of the Senate. I did not hear everything that was said at the convention in Philadelphia, but I was there, and I do not recall that subject was ever discussed as being a proper objective of the Democratic Party. The delegates did not say anything about it. They had a very distinguished committee on the platform, of which the present majority leader was I think a most brilliant member, and I do not recall that they ever mentioned a change of the rules of the Senate. But they mentioned civil rights. The proper approach for us today would be to be debating civil rights. So far as importance is concerned, I do not think the civil-rights question is in a class with the question of a change in the Senate rules. It is one of those more or less transitory measures which come and go, which have been before us from time to time. No doubt one of these days the question will be solved. I do not know exactly how it will be solved. I do not believe the civil-rights proposals which have been introduced are exactly the proper solution. They do not go to any fundamental aspect of our Government, and are in no way comparable in importance and significance to a proposal to change the rules of the Senate or the constitution of the Supreme Court.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Does it not seem very likely that the effect of any change in the Senate rules will be far greater in the future than would appear probable, in view of the fact that Senators cannot be prevented, under the present rules, before they are changed, from having an opportunity to make themselves heard, while they may not have an opportunity to be heard at all if we change the rules in accordance with the present suggestion?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator could not be more correct in his attitude.

Mr. President, I have a little more material, one very striking feature, which I shall only mention, although I wish to read the whole letter later, bearing on that point. The CIO addressed letters to many Senators, one to me, and I want to contrast that with the position of the A. F. of L. in 1925, when Vice President Dawes undertook to reform the Senate rules. Let me show the difference, because at that time the protection of labor against the reactionary threats of the Republican majority was involved. Now the situation is somewhat reversed. Labor, feeling that it has a majority, wants to destroy this same thing that in 1925 labor thought was its whole salvation. That is exactly the point I hope to bring out in a little more detail. I could pursue it now, but I shall do so a little later on in my remarks.

Mr. LONG. Then, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Louisiana for a further question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Is it not true that organized labor certainly should be able to see potential future danger to itself in view of the fact that a great mass of people feel that some day there is going to be a tremendous reaction against the cause of organized labor, and that at such time certainly labor will need a spokesman to stand forth and debate the rights of labor on the floor of the United States Senate against punitive legislation which may be introduced if such a reaction should occur?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should not want to confine it against any particular minority. The same thing can be said of any interest that is of significance or importance in this country along either economic lines, or social lines, or geographical, or along any other lines of interest. Unlimited debate in the Senate is essentially a device for protection from a transient majority, protection against the imposition of arbitrary power. It is very significant in the case of labor, because in 1925 labor took such a positive position with regard to the matter.

I think the Senator from Louisiana is entirely correct. But that is the evil of bringing up the question of civil rights in connection with a proposal of a different kind, embracing an attempt to destroy the independence of the Senate, thereby so confusing the issue that the people do not understand what is involved. They think this is simply a desirable way to pass civil-rights legislation. Civil rights, in most instances, substantively have no particular interest to those of us who oppose the pending resolution. Our only disagreement with the advocates of the program is that under the Constitution the States not only should take care of such matters, but are doing the very thing which is being asked to be done, and they are proceeding very rapidly.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Does it not seem to be completely unfair to the people of the United States that a basic fundamental of their Government should be confused with something that carries so much prejudice and so much misunderstanding as does racial legislation?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think that is the inherent evil of this approach. I would say that if it were not for my firm belief that this is a very difficult matter to understand, I would not begin to take the time of the Senate in trying to explain it. That is the main reason why a thorough discussion of this question is justified. If we were considering at the moment substantive bills on civil rights, I would see no excuse for me to pursue this sort of a discussion, because such measures are much easier to understand; they involve comparatively simple propositions.

Mr. President, I shall not read anything at great length; but I should like to cite an authority. I read a paragraph from The American Senate, written in 1926 by Prof. Lindsay Rogers. It is a very interesting book. I read only one paragraph from the preface, which states its thesis, and then recommend it to those who are interested:

> My view then, shortly stated, is this: The undemocratic, usurping Senate is the indispensable check and balance in the American system, and only complete freedom of debate permits it to play this role.

I think that is a very clear, unmistakable statement by this man, who is an authority on the question. He was for many years a leading professor of Columbia University. I continue to read:

> Its power comes, in large part, from the guillotine to which the House of Representatives submits—a procedure which has attracted scant attention—and is the more indispensable because it is directed against government by favorable publicity through the medium of the White House "spokesmen." Adopt cloture in the Senate and the character of the American Government will be profoundly changed.

I submit that statements of this character by leading scholars on the subject of government are very worthy of serious attention. I do not see how anyone can brush off this debate as mere pettifogging. The newspapers try to say this whole discussion is only a pettifogging argument by a few disgruntled southerners. This man is no southerner. He comes from Columbia University. I repeat:

> Adopt cloture in the Senate and the character of the American Government will be profoundly changed.

I continue to read:

> This is the subject that I discuss in the following essay, and I make no apology if occasionally I may seem to have the qualification that Byron said Mitford possessed for writing history, "complete partiality and a

bad temper." Considering my purpose and method, this may be an advantage.

I read another short paragraph on page 256:

> Its—

He is referring to the Senate—

> Its collective judgment on legislation cannot fail to be superior to the judgment of the House which too frequently represents no more than the hasty opinion of a few leaders. There is no legislation, no prior veto, such as exists in a parliamentary system of government and such as there is, in the United States, in respect of treaties. The rigid two-party system of the United States is not hospitable to minority groups, which reversing the experience of other governments, have secured their most adequate representation in the Upper Chamber of the American Congress.

In other words, according to the writer, this is the place where minority groups are most likely to receive fair and equal treatment.

Mr. President, another point has been greatly labored, I think, in some of the previous discussions, as if there were any doubt about the ultimate objective of the sponsors of this resolution. We have seen the public statement as to the objective of the President of the United States—that is, his advice to the leaders on the question of simple majority cloture. The majority leader of the Senate says he is in favor of cloture by a constitutional majority. I want to tie that point down by reading a few excerpts from the record by some of the sponsors of the proposal to show the universality of the view that cloture should be possible by a majority vote of the Senate, and not two-thirds. In other words, the idea is very clear that some of those who are in their hearts and in their convictions for majority cloture have for the moment compromised that and assented to two-thirds cloture, in order to make the first step and get into position to impose majority cloture.

I want to make a few short references to the record. On page 28 of the hearings, this statement appears, as made by the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]:

> It seems to me that the majority-vote rule is the basic American principle in passing legislation, even though I recognize that in our system of government there are some exceptions to the majority rule. I don't think it is a very sound argument to argue, as some do, that the majority will trample the rights of the minority if majority rule prevails.

Then again on page 33 the Senator from Oregon said:

> I am perfectly willing to trust the majority-rule principle to prevent that hypothetical of yours from becoming a reality.

On that same page the Senator from Oregon further said:

> That is the purpose of having majority rule, to decide what the final decision should be.

On page 34 he said:

> That fundamental principle of popular government, that the majority shall rule and take the consequence.

And on page 46 he said:

> On the first day of the next Congress all Senators who believe in the establishment of majority rule in the Senate should support an amendment to the rules aimed at preventing any future filibuster.

I dislike to take too much time on this point. I am citing the several pages to emphasize the fact that there can be no doubt, when one reads the record, that the purpose of certainly most of the sponsors and proponents of this change is majority rule. I do not think there is the slightest doubt of it. Therefore, to accept the first step toward that end without clearly admitting and recognizing that the ultimate development from that step is majority rule, to me seems tantamount to being insincere in the whole effort. I do not see how it is possible for anyone to make himself believe that we could stop with the limited cloture which the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has proposed. He insists, as he did yesterday, that that is as far as he wants to go. But as a practical matter, if we subject the Senate to the cloture rule which he has proposed, I do not see how any reasonable man can fail to believe that at some time, when some critical measure comes before us and there is the slightest impatience with delay, there will be an effort to impose simple majority cloture, under which there will no longer be any freedom of debate. In the words of Professor Rogers, it will completely change the character of our constitutional government.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Does it not seem extremely likely to the Senator that if this proposed change of the rule is adopted, it may be used hereafter by some future majority as an entering wedge and as a weapon by which they will proceed, without permitting full discussion, to change the rule to majority cloture, or to the type of thing which the President of the United States is now recommending?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wonder if the Senator will repeat his question. My attention was distracted.

Mr. LONG. Does it not seem to the Senator from Arkansas that if this proposed change in the rule is adopted, it will be used by some future majority as the entering wedge, as a method to shut off debate before Senators fully understand the issue, and bring about a further change in the rule to majority cloture, or to the type of proposal which the President of the United States is now making?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There would not have to be any persuasion. If at some time in the future, after an election, there is a strong majority, it will be found, as is usual, that there will be a substantial number of newly elected Senators who, as Senator Townsend said, come to the Senate with an instinctive desire to reform the Senate. Such a proposal could be put through with little difficulty. I do not think there is the slightest doubt that they would be able to accomplish what the Senator suggests, and they would do it. At every session of Congress there are some controversial issues. That is bound to be the case, in a country so large as this, with so many different interests. With the typical and usual impatience of a great executive power, one of the first things to do is to get rid of the obstruction by imposing majority cloture. I think there is not the slightest doubt of it.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator not of the opinion that the proposed change in the rule is probably a method of the administration by which it proposes to initiate its onslaught with a great barrage of bills affecting the subject of civil rights?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think they are the first ones on the agenda; but I see no reason why the effort could not be extended to anything of a controversial nature which it is desired to put through Congress, by virtue of the control which the Executive exercises, and always has, over a substantial number of Members of the Senate. It would certainly be done.

The civil-rights question merely happens to be the issue which is immediately pending, and in connection with which there has been some difficulty. But the effort certainly would not be restricted to that issue. As the Senator pointed out a moment ago, some of our labor leaders and some of our more influential capitalists ought to remember that from time to time they have been the object of attack by the administration, and there is no doubt that they will be again. I think the Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. In driving an automobile, just as in being a Member of the United States Senate or of any other legislative body, is it not a good idea to proceed at a speed slow enough so that one can stop within the range of his headlights and see what is happening before he proceeds?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think that is very good advice. I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his contribution.

Mr. President, most of the citations which I gave were from the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. The senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] had this to say on page 82:

> The original Senate Resolution 25 in 1947 sought to do this by a majority vote but we have eliminated that provision in this resolution.

This is the significant part:

> We have done so, in my opinion, and I speak only for myself, in order to take a short step forward in the effectiveness of parliamentary procedure. We have done this because we believe that there is a better opportunity to get a favorable decision in this way. It is better to move forward, even though we do not get as far as we want, than not to move at all. We must be practical and realistic. Therefore, in my opinion, and I speak only for myself, I believe it is much wiser and will be much more helpful to make such changes as will make cloture more easily possible and trust that two-thirds of the Members will want to reach a vote than to provide for cloture on a majority vote and get nothing at this session of the Senate.

In other words, he says, "Although we really want majority rule, we will try this as the first step."

On page 84, another Senator, speaking along the same line, said:

> I agree * * * that this is just a step to perfect our procedure.

On page 85 the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] said:

> I believe, as a practical matter, that this is the most that can be expected from the Senate at this session of Congress.

The whole tenor of his remarks is that "we really want majority rule, but as a practical matter we do not believe we can get it, so we will accept the two-thirds, and that will be a stepping-stone by which, at the proper time, we will move on to majority cloture."

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], who is one of the most active proponents of this proposal, said on page 86:

> As you will have gathered from what I said in those instances, I favor, myself, cloture by majority. I do not believe personally that a legislative body of any kind ever should be in a position where a majority of its total membership—not just a majority of a quorum, but a majority of the total membership—is not in a position to determine actions and procedures by that body. * * * I myself shall not press for the majority idea at the moment, even though I strongly believe in it.

I must say that they are very frank and candid about it. There is no attempt to deceive or mislead anyone as to the purpose. The Senator from New York says that at the moment, although he strongly believes in majority cloture, he is willing to accept the two-thirds rule in order to adapt himself to the conditions now prevailing in the Senate.

On pages 86 and 87 another Senator said:

> Mr. Chairman, I personally felt the same on the majority rule, but I think we should not press for that, which is my personal opinion, but we should press for at least this amendment which will make this cloture rule applicable to all matters so that we can function.

This is the same thought which was expressed by another Senator who is a proponent of this proposal. The same thought runs throughout the testimony on behalf of the proponents of the change in the rule. Every witness who testified before the committee on behalf of a change in the rule, except one, in effect admitted that if he were willing to accept two-thirds cloture, it would be only a step in the direction of majority cloture.

In addition to this evidence, at page 81 the one witness before the committee who did not admit his support of majority cloture, did say:

> While a simple majority may be desirable, it seems to me that there is still a strong sentiment among Democrats and Republicans for the two-thirds rule.

In addition to this we know that two of the five resolutions before the committee would have changed the rules so as to provide for majority cloture.

We also know that the majority leader has expressed himself as favoring cloture by a constitutional majority, and that the majority whip has indicated that he will offer an amendment to this resolution to provide for majority cloture.

I understand that he has changed his mind.

We also know that the organizations which are most active on behalf of a change in the rules have been most insistent that it provide for gag rule by a bare majority.

We also know that, although this rule proposes a two-thirds cloture, it, or any amendment to it, can be passed by a majority vote.

Indeed there can be little doubt that this proposal is not only a step toward majority cloture, but that it is intended only as such by its most ardent proponents.

To bring about a system facilitating cloture is to make a grant of power. If we are to act with wisdom upon grants of power we must not exclude any possibilities of how it may be used, and, in fact, we must assume that it will be exercised to the utmost.

This being true, and I do not think it can be denied, let us see what can follow from such a grant of power.

As an example of what may happen, I quote, from page 94 of the hearings, a statement by the Senator from Mississippi as to what has happened:

> The historic debate in 1908 over the adoption of the Aldrich-Vreeland currency bill was an ominous example of how a disciplined majority, with frayed temper and short patience, could ride roughshod over previously established precedents and customs of the Senate.
>
> At this time the great Senator Robert M. La Follette, of Wisconsin, was leading the opposition to what he believed to be a scheme of the privileged few to tighten their grip upon the money power of the Nation.
>
> As the debate developed, the Presiding Officer of the Senate, Vice President Charles W. Fairbanks, acknowledged as partial to the majority who favored the Aldrich-Vreeland bill, made two precedent-shattering rulings and was immediately sustained. In the first he counted a quorum to declare that action on a vote had been taken, even though the total vote was less than a quorum. In the second ruling, Mr. Fairbanks declared that debate in the Senate was not business, and that no quorum could be called when only debate had intervened since a previous call.
>
> Regardless of the merits of these two precedents, the fact remains that they were both established without debate, and at the instigation of a disciplined majority led by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. Aldrich.
>
> The Aldrich-Vreeland bill debate not only provoked these two sudden, unpremeditated changes in the Senate rules—it also brought about one of the most patently unfair decisions of a Presiding Officer in the history of the Senate.
>
> With Senator George Sutherland, of Utah, in the chair, Thomas P. Gore, of Oklahoma, moved the absence of a quorum. Sutherland held a call not in order, and then brazenly ruled that even an appeal was not in order. As one commentator has reported, "the majority was in no mood for the niceties of parliamentary procedure."

Mr. President, I think that is a very good example—and there are many others—in answer to the argument advanced by the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that under any kind of rules the traditions of courtesy in the Senate are such, and we are all such nice fellows, that we would never impose on one another, but would always be fair to the opposition. That seems to be the Senator's principal basis for contending for a change of the rule; but of course his contention in that respect is not correct. In that connection I would ask Senators who were not here yesterday to read the RECORD for yesterday and see what the Senator from Oregon said about the action of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in refusing to permit him to offer an amendment in the committee.

Mr. President, the fact is that the only protection held by any minority in the Senate, either now or hereafter, is the difficulty of obtaining cloture. Our rules are changed by a majority only, and the only restraint upon that majority is the right of unlimited debate. To assume that this potential power of a majority will never be exercised is an assumption of the utmost folly.

Senators have pointed out that a provision for majority cloture may lead to a provision for the previous question, as is practiced in the House of Representatives. As a matter of fact, however, in the absence of the right of unlimited debate, under the Constitution there is no limit whatsoever to what can be done by way of changing the rules of the Senate.

That is to say, there is no constitutional limit to what could be done if a majority chose to go to extremes. In periods of high partisan feeling, which are not too difficult to imagine during these times, it is an ever-existing danger, for we should assume that a well-disciplined majority could adopt any rule of debate or procedure which would facilitate enactment of its program. That is one aspect of this whole matter which rather interests me, namely, the determination on the part of some Members of the Senate, particularly those on the other side of the aisle, to change this rule, when I know they are not so particularly interested in the passage of all of the program of the administration, which this proposed change is designed to facilitate. It seems to me they must feel a certain inconsistency in their position, because if they put this power of cloture in the hands of the leadership, then they certainly can look forward to very quick action on some of the other measures, which I am quite confident they are not too anxious to have passed. That is something I think they should very seriously consider.

Under such circumstances we could expect to move from the previous-question procedure to the delegation of power to a committee to decide what, if any, amendments may be presented upon the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, any former Member of the House of Representatives knows very well how that completely stifles even the right of amendment on the floor. In the House of Representatives, if a closed rule is brought in, a Member of the House cannot even offer an amendment. All he can do is vote either "Yes" or "No." That is the only privilege of a Member of the House of Representatives in such circumstances. Such an arrangement is only a short step, and a very well known

one, from the usual practice of moving the previous question.

The Senate would thus become a smaller, and, therefore, more manageable, adjunct of the House. Of course, it is argued that even if this should occur, the people would retain their right to overthrow by election any body assuming such total powers. However, in answer to this, it should be noted that although the House is answerable to the public every 2 years—at every opportunity the people have to pass upon questions of national policy—the Senate is a continuous body, answerable to the public, in its total membership, only every 6 years; and it is entirely possible that such dictatorial powers could be assumed and retained for at least 4 years.

But this is only one of the dangers arising from the exercise of arbitrary power. A much greater danger than continuous control by a well-organized majority of Senators, is the ever-encroaching power of the executive branch of the Government. Mr. President, I keep coming back to the thought that that is the point that is fundamentally involved, because it is not peculiar to this particular case. That struggle is the one that has been going on ever since there has been any kind of governmental structure at all. In every kind of democratic government, where there must be a division between the legislative and the executive, there has always been such a struggle between them, and it will be a continuous struggle. There is nothing particularly bad about its existence, for it is characteristic. What is dangerous is for the weaker side, which is the legislative side, to give up its power. When I say weaker, I mean that in character it cannot be aggressive, for it does not execute the laws. Its power is primarily that of resisting the extension of arbitrary executive power.

The destruction of individual freedoms always comes from the executive. I can recall no instance, except isolated instances of the passage of a particular law in the heat of passion, in which the destruction of individual freedom has come from a legislative body. The approach of the executive is always to destroy the legislative branch, which constitutes the protection of the people's liberties. First, the executive branch destroys the legislative branch, largely by making some demagogic appeal to the weaknesses, the greed, the avarice of people. But when the legislative branch is destroyed, the pattern is very plain: the executive branch then finds itself in possession of complete and irresponsible power.

Mr. President, a moment ago I referred to two excerpts which I thought would be worthy of reading with regard to the growth of power in the countries of Europe in which there once was a regularly constituted democratic system, which gradually disintegrated under the impact of the rise of Hitler and Mussolini. These are short excerpts to remind Senators of what happened. I took this material from a factual statement in the Encyclopedia Brittanica. There is just one page of it, and I shall read it to show the developments from a fairly normal democratic system, in which there are the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of government, to a dictatorship.

I am not citing this, I may say, with any feeling that I think the present President or any other President of the country had in mind becoming a Hitler. That is not my reason for citing it. I do not think that enters even remotely into President Truman's mind. But growth and changes in power are not merely dependent upon the personal ambitions and desires of individuals. Once started, they have a way under any system of continuing. The growth of executive power is inherent in the system, the executive constantly showing a tendency to expand the power of the executive department.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that power feeds upon power?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Absolutely.

Mr. HILL. And is it not also true that the more power there is, the greater the inherent impetus continually to reach out for more power?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator puts it very well. The more powerful an office such as the Presidency becomes, naturally the more impatient the President becomes toward any kind of obstruction or obstacle. If an official has but little power, he becomes accustomed to the necessity of compromise and adjustment to other conflicting powers. But the more powerful one becomes, the less patient he is toward any obstruction. The Senator from Alabama has described that better than I could. In other words, power feeds upon itself. I think the pending proposal is not altogether uninfluenced by the fact that as a result of the war the President has become much more powerful. The President still possesses powers given to the administration during the war, which would not have been delegated in normal peacetime. I think that is one of the things contributing to the President's impatience at any delay whatever on the part of the Senate.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. HILL. Is it not due not only to the enhanced power which the war necessitated being placed in the hands of the Chief Executive, but to the enhanced power the Chief Executive now holds, by reason of the fact that the Federal Government has been forced into so many fields of activity undreamed of in the past?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is absolutely correct. The Senator has described it precisely. I may cite a slightly different aspect of the argument. It has been said here that because during the war additional functions have been assumed, and because of the growth of such things as social security, the Senate, therefore, should become more efficient and should pass legislation without the same consideration as heretofore. I think a more persuasive argument is that because the Government is now impinging upon the rights of citizens in every direction, legislation should be given more careful consideration and deliberation in the Senate than heretofore. It touches everyone so much more closely and vitally than ever before. There is no reason for abandoning what little deliberation the Senate can give to legislation.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a further question only.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that, under our form of government and governmental procedures, the one place where careful and thorough consideration and deliberation of legislation may be had is in the Senate of the United States?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I may say to the Senator it is the only place where such consideration can be had.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the question is not so much one of speed or what might be termed "sharp efficiency" as it is one of deliberation and the exercise of true wisdom on the part of the Senate?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Alabama states it exactly as it should be stated. That is precisely what I have in mind. The people who are thinking about speed and efficiency are entirely on the wrong track. When we speak on that subject, I am always reminded of a remark made by Senator Reed—that we have plenty of laws accumulated during the past 10,000 years; it is not a greater volume of laws we need; the need is for good laws. Resistance to the enactment of bad laws has accomplished more good than affirmative action, even through the passage of good laws.

Mr. President, I desire to read a brief article into the RECORD. I repeat, particularly for the benefit of those who have come into the Chamber later, I intend no comparison between the desires, intentions, or motives of the administration and the article I am about to read. I use it only to remind people of what actually happened under other democratic regimes that folded up. That is my only reason.

[At this point Mr. FULBRIGHT yielded to Mr. LUCAS, at whose request and by unanimous consent, the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, relating to the maintenance of adequate armed forces, the reading of which was deferred until later.]

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I may say to the distinguished majority leader, if he would like to have the message read at this time, I shall be glad to yield for that purpose, under a unanimous-consent request. I do not want to occupy the floor to the exclusion of the very important message from the President, which I am sure it is.

Mr. LUCAS. I can understand the Senator's extreme and deep interest in the message.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as I said a moment ago, what I am about to read is a quotation containing, as I think, simply a statement of fact:

> As a result of this and other strong-arm methods the Nazis won 44 percent of the votes, and, with 8 percent of their Nationalist coalition allies, had a clear majority of 52 percent. Though Hitler was opposed in principle to parliamentary government, which he had denounced as a lamentable failure, he was ready to use the ballot and the existing constitutional machinery to secure absolute control; on March 23 the Reichstag majority virtually set aside the Weimar constitution, leaving virtually dictatorial power in Hitler's hands. The Nazi revolution had begun.
>
> In reorganizing Germany, Hitler proceeded to sweep away to a large degree the old division of Germany into states—Prussia, Bavaria, Saxony, Baden, etc. He set up instead a more centralized government ruled from Berlin.

Many have forgotten that only such a short time ago as that Germany was really a federal government very similar to ours, with quite a considerable degree of autonomy possessed by each of the German states.

> Germany, like France as a result of the French Revolution, became "one and indivisible." Federal government was replaced by unitary government. This gave Germany greatly increased strength, abolished local states' rights jealousies—

It did the very thing that is now sought here. We are all to be good fellows, States' rights jealousies are to be eradicated—

> and put an end to extensive and unnecessary duplication of administration.

These are very worthy purposes. Similar purposes have been current in this country in recent years, and are now current.

> He also abolished or forced the voluntary dissolution of all political parties except the National Socialist Party. Germany became a one-party state, the state being controlled by the party. Hitler became the supreme head of both. On the leadership principle he appointed his lieutenants who were responsible to him. They in turn appointed their subordinates, and so on down through the hierarchy of state and party. One of the chief duties of the party is to instil Nazi tenets into the party members and also into all German citizens, thus uniting the whole German people into a single totalitarian state.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. HILL. From what document is the Senator reading, may I ask?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have read from volume 10 of the Encyclopedia Britannica, at page 310. For the Senator's information, I have a House Document, No. 401, on Fascism in Action. It is one of several very excellent documents, as the Senator will recall, published by the Legislative Reference Service, the Library of Congress, under the direction of Ernest S. Griffith. I have another publication, Communism in Action, which is House Document 754. The pamphlets contain much longer statements than the one I have read. I have read that one, not so much because of the authenticity of the Encyclopedia Britannica, although it is certainly a very reputable publication, but because there is no question about the facts. It is simply published in a condensed form. The same material is in these two documents. With reference to the one on Fascism in Action in 1947, I should like to read one page from Part I—Political, appearing in House Document No. 401:

> Described in 1919 as the most democratic democracy in the world, the Weimar system succumbed 14 years later to a combination of circumstances. The internal weakness of the republic, its lack of inspiring leadership and popular support, bureaucratic sabotage, the multiplicity of warring parties created by proportional representation, economic depression, the humiliating treatment of Germany by the Allies, her defeat in the First World War, the harsh Treaty of Versailles, antisemitism, the influence of the reactionary upper classes and the military clique, Nazi propaganda, and Hitler's dynamic leadership—all contributed to the overthrow of the republic and the triumph of the national socialist movement in 1933. And in addition, article 48 of the Weimar constitution provided that the President of the Reich might intervene, with armed force if necessary, to restore public security and order when they were seriously disturbed. He might in time of emergency abrogate certain fundamental rights, including the freedoms of speech, press, and assembly, and might remove guaranties of personal liberty and property rights. Thus the National Socialist Party under the leadership of Adolf Hitler rose to power in Germany within the legal framework of the constitution.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that that is exactly what cloture does? It stifles and cuts off freedom of speech, does it not?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is the point I am trying to make. I hesitated to use this example, because I felt that some persons might think it was a very extreme example, and might say, "Do you really think the President will take over?" No; I do not think so; but I would remind Senators that when we first heard of Mr. Hitler, our correspondents returned from abroad, and made fun of him, and said he was merely a funny little man who came into power accidentally, and it would be only a year or two until the people would be rid of him. He wrote a book and told us exactly what he was up to, and we said, "He is a madman. It is all nonsense." Look at what happened to the world when no one took him seriously or did anything about it, when something could have been done. I am not trying to accentuate the thought that this is a culmination of the destruction of our Government. All I am saying is that it is the beginning, at least, of a movement which may not be stopped and which could destroy the Senate.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. HILL. Would the Senator say that it is a signboard along the highway of government?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Absolutely; it certainly is. I know someone may say, "Oh, you are too extravagant in your statement." Some persons always say that, just as they did when we suspected that Hitler might be dangerous.

The same thing, of course, has happened in Russia. Russia was a great republic. It had a wonderful constitution which guaranteed the rights of everyone against poverty and against discrimination, but in reality, with the exception of a small number of party members, the Russian people are all slaves.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not a fact that one who reads the Russian Constitution might think that utopia had at last arrived on the earth?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. But, instead of its working as utopia, it has worked out as a land of slaves?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Exactly that. It seems to me that it should be very interesting to those who are so concerned regarding civil rights. Russia had them in its constitution, not simply a law, such as is being proposed here, but in the basic constitution. See how effective it has been. I think those who are so greatly concerned about curing our evils by some paper act or legislative act would be better advised to consider what has happened in Russia. I am not saying the President wants to bring about a dictatorship such as is in existence in Russia, but I do want to emphasize the point that in these matters, as the Senator so well said, when once started, power begins to feed upon itself and becomes more and more tyrannical.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. For a question only.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the Senator from Arkansas if the last question he raised does not present the fact to the Senate that in that case it was a minority group taking over control in the country which he mentioned?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In Russia. That is correct. It was done by force of arms.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does not the Senator feel that in the history of Russia the fact that the Douma at that time did a lot of talking instead of acting to correct some of the laws of the Kerensky republic may have enabled the Communists to charge that the democratic processes of Russia were not functioning, and therefore they would seize the government by force? Does not the Senator recognize that as a danger, if a parliamentary body is not in a position to function in the field of legislation?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I shall try to answer the Senator's question in this way: The minority to which I referred is the executive power. It has force at its disposal. It is always extending itself when there is any obstruction in its way.

democratic system, in which there are social security, the Senate, therefore, the message.

Another observation I should like to make is that there never had been in Russia any kind of a legislature with any real power. It had been an autocracy throughout its history. During the very short interval in which Kerensky was nominally head of the government, it was not an effective government. I do not think there was any background for the carrying on of a democracy at all. The point I had in mind was the nature of executive power and how it always ends up by taking on more power. I do not think that in Russia there was an opportunity to function. Kerensky was in office only approximately a year. I doubt that any people, however wise, are able to pass from autocracy to an effective democracy inside of a year. It requires a century or so to develop such institutions.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in connection with the minority question raised by the Senator from California?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KERR in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Under the resolution which the pending motion would bring before the Senate to change the rules of the Senate, would it not be possible for 64 Senators representing less than one-third of our entire population to stifle, choke, and steamroller, the opposition of 32 Senators representing more than two-thirds of our entire population?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Certainly. That is brought out very clearly, as the Senator has put it, in many interesting statistics in the hearing, demonstrating how the idea about majority rule loses all its substance when we examine the way the Senate is constituted, for one of the principal ideas of our constitutional system is to prevent the majority from imposing its will. Nearly all the safeguards in the whole system are to prevent what Senators are trying to bring about.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. For a question.

Mr. HILL. What is the Bill of Rights all about? What are the first ten amendments all about? Why was it that before the States would ratify the Constitution they had to be given absolute assurance that the Bill of Rights would be adopted?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should say the best reason was protection in the fields covered by the amendments against imposition by a majority, the same majority that has become so dear to the hearts of the proponents of the pending measure. That was the very purpose. The founding fathers could foresee that it would be difficult to get a majority to go together, but even if they did so, the framers of the Constitution did not want them to impose upon the minority in this way.

Mr. HILL. Is it not a fact that surely the founding fathers were thinking of the very thing which the Senator has so ably expounded here today when they wrote into the Constitution the provision that no State, without its consent, should be deprived of its two Senators?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes, indeed. Of course, that is one of the provisions which cannot be amended by even three-fourths of the States. There is no amendment possible to that provision. That is the extreme example of their determination that no majority, no matter how large, even 99 percent, should, without its consent, ever decrease the representation of a State in the Senate.

Mr. HILL. In other words, is not that a perfect illustration of an absolute, iron-clad protection in the Constitution of the minority?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Exactly, and that runs throughout our system. It was never intended, in my opinion, that there should be rule by majority.

Mr. President, a moment ago, in an interchange with the Senator from Louisiana, he raised the point about labor, which now is very strong in its influence on the counsels of the Government, and their urging that the rule be changed to a majority rule, that is that there be control of debate by a majority; and that has not always been their position.

In order to tie that point down, I wish now to read into the record a letter I received, addressed to me, from the Congress of Industrial Organizations, dated February 28, 1949, signed by Mr. Nathan E. Cowan. I wish to read it, and then contrast a statement in 1925 on the same subject by the American Federation of Labor. The letter says:

MY DEAR SENATOR: We understand that the pending business of the Senate is a motion to take up the Hayden-Wherry resolution. This measure would do no more to change the Senate rules on cloture than we believe Vice President BARKLEY will do at the first opportunity by the common-sense interpretation of the present rule which he proposed in Senate debate last August 2 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 9501).

Now that a filibuster upon a false issue has begun, we call upon every Senator who values the good name of our Government to fight the real issue through to a showdown.

The real issue is majority rule against the exercise of the veto power over the will of the elected majority by a minority of one-third plus one. This amounts to majority against minority rule. It means the practice of a denial of democracy itself.

The Hayden-Wherry resolution proposes to change rule XXII, not to reduce the majority necessary to limit debate from the present two-thirds to a simple majority, but only to make cloture by the present two-third majority to apply to motions as it now applies to bills. This is an evasion of the real issue. As a remedy for the veto-by-filibuster, it is a transparent fake.

I hope that puts the proponents, those who brought forward the resolution, in their proper place.

Its principal supporters agree with southern Democratic defenders of unlimited debate in their opposition to the Myers-Morse resolution which proposes to reduce the number of votes necessary to invoke cloture from the present two-thirds to a simple majority.

By opposing the Myers-Morse resolution, Senators opposed to democratic practices in the Senate hope to avoid a reduction of the cloture vote requirement from two-thirds to a simple majority, and thereby to lessen the chances of enactment of civil-rights legislation, particularly FEPC.

The strategy of such Senators is aimed also at delaying and, if possible, preventing repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and enactment of the major items of legislation for which the American people voted November 2. Those who fear the practice of democracy in the Senate of the United States are using the age-old formula of divide and rule.

The brazen hypocrisy of this maneuver is an attempt to frustrate and defeat the express wishes of the American people. It must not be allowed to succeed in its evil purpose of heading off real majority rule in the Senate and of delaying or defeating the measures for which the American people have voted their approval and their mandate.

Continuance of a filibuster over the fake "reform" offered in the Hayden-Wherry resolution would be an obscene offense against democracy. It would be particularly damaging at this time when every action of our Government is observed by the peoples of the world who are daily being asked to choose between democracy and totalitarianism. In these days of global cold war between ideas we cannot afford such a spectacle.

To transform the debate into a real discussion of the basic issue and to insure a show-down and record vote upon it, we urge you to—

1. Insist upon day-and-night, round-the-clock sessions.

2. Sign and present immediately a cloture petition which, under Vice President BARKLEY's certain ruling, will be valid against any filibuster device.

I do not know how they became so certain about the Vice President's ruling, but they say, "Vice President BARKLEY's certain ruling."

3. Insist upon the adoption of the Myers-Morse resolution as an amendment to the Hayden-Wherry resolution.

4. Vote for cloture and for the Myers-Morse resolution.

The above course, if begun at once, can bring the debate to a decisive vote within a week or 10 days, without causing an undue delay of other vital measures.

We believe the American people will support those Senators in both parties who cut through the maneuverings for partisan or sectional or economic advantage to get at the great moral and political issue that powerful groups in both parties are seeking to avoid. We believe that a two-thirds majority can be assembled to bring about a limitation of debate and proceed to a sure majority vote in favor of the Myers-Morse resolution.

The issue is the practice of democracy within the Senate of the United States. We urge you to use your voice and vote to bring about a vote upon that issue.

Sincerely yours,

NATHAN E. COWAN,
CIO Legislative Director.

Mr. President, I wish to quote from Mr. Haynes' book, The Senate of the United States, which is one of the leading books on the Senate, at page 416. I may say this is a very interesting passage, and since it involves two points which have been raised, one the part the Vice President plays in our deliberations, together with the position of the American Federation of Labor, I think I shall read the whole page.

I quote, beginning on page 415:

No other Vice President upon the occasion of his own inauguration has ever created such a sensation as did Charles D. Dawes. Hardly had he taken the oath of office in the presence of the President, the Supreme Court, the diplomatic corps, Members of the Senate and House, and a most distinguished audience that thronged the galleries, than with strident voice and violent gestures he entered

upon a scathing denunciation of the Senate rules, and an exhortation for their thoroughgoing reform, as "demanded not only by American public opinion, but I venture to say in the individual consciences of the Members of the Senate itself."

There again he was a new Member in the legislative branch, like those to whom Senator Townsend, of Michigan, referred who come to the Senate full of vim and energy toward the reform of the Senate.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Alabama for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. HILL. That was the first day Vice President Dawes presided over the Senate, was it not?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That was the first time he had ever held any public office, I believe. To my knowledge, he had never been elected a Member of the Senate, or before that time to any national office.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. HILL. Is it not a fact that he certainly had not served in any office in the Federal Government before that?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is what I meant. I have no knowledge of his having served in any such office. If it is true that he had, it has never been called to my attention. What I meant was that he had never been a prominent figure in Washington in the Federal Government. What he did, I may say, is characteristic of most of the proponents of this legislation. It takes time to become seasoned and to understand what is the significant role that Senators play.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator for a question only.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is it not correct that Mr. Charles G. Dawes was quite familiar with Washington, having been Director of the Budget in the Harding administration?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Dawes was the right hand, the most powerful agent, in a sense, of the then President. He had the usual typical executive attitude toward any of the people's representatives in the Senate. I think that without exception nearly every executive, or man who is closely associated with an executive, has that same attitude. They do not like to wait or have to wait. They want to get action now. They do not like people to disagree with them. One must go down the line or one does not suit any executive.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will not the Senator from Arkansas recognize the fact that the question asked by the Senator from California was not for the purpose of entering into an argument, but merely for correcting the record in respect to the intimation that Mr. Dawes had not held any public office and was not familiar with the operations of the Senate or the House.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I appreciate the Senator's statement. Mr. Dawes had not held any elective office. He was in an appointive office, as a part of the executive branch. I was trying to re-emphasize the point I made a moment ago.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not a fact that Mr. Dawes at that time had not held any office in the legislative branch of the Government?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. HILL. And is it not also a fact that certainly at the time Mr. Dawes was the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, he held the most powerful office in the Government, with the single exception of the Presidency itself?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think that is correct, and I presume it is still one of the most powerful offices in the Government, because it has such great influence upon the supplies for all departments.

I continue to read from Mr. Haynes' book:

What he most—

Referring to Mr. Dawes—

What he most strongly condemned was that feature of the rules, which, as developed under senatorial courtesy, made it possible during the last few days of a session for the minority or even for a single Senator to kill legislation providing the revenue to pay the expenses of the Government, or to force the President of the United States to call a special session of Congress. Who would dare maintain that in the last analysis the right of the Senate to act should ever be subordinated to the right of one Senator to make a speech?

Not content with launching this attack, Vice President Dawes soon declared his intention to carry his reform campaign to the country, and the surprising spectacle was witnessed of the President of the Senate, imposed upon that body by the Constitution, continuing, wherever and whenever opportunity offered, his violent denunciation of the Senate rules. An early evidence of the belief that this issue might have votes in it was seen in a California Representative's forthwith announcing his candidacy for the Senate on a platform of reform of Senate rules. The most formal and outspoken opposition to the Dawes program of reform came from an unexpected quarter. At its national convention, the American Federation of Labor condemned unanimously the Vice President's campaign to abolish free speech in the United States Senate and urged that every publicity be given to the denunciation by labor of the Dawes scheme which does not come from the people but emanates from the secret chambers of the predatory interests.

One could substitute "special interests" for "predatory interests." I continue the quotation from the statement of the American Federation of Labor:

For several months the Vice President of the United States has conducted an agitation for the purpose of abolishing free speech in the United States Senate, the only forum in the world where cloture does not exist and where Members can prevent the passage of reactionary legislation * * *.

The railroad industry, the great oil industry, and other great industries in the United States want to make it possible for a handful of men in the United States Senate to control all legislation.

Imagine the application of that.

It is a vicious idea, a vicious purpose to which the Vice President of the United States has loaned himself.

That is the end of the quotation from the statement by the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. HILL. If the American Federation was correct at the time it adopted the resolution of denunciation of Vice President Dawes' plea for a change in the rules, has anything happened in the meantime that would keep the resolution and denunciation from being just as correct and just as powerful and just as persuasive today as it was when it was issued?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Alabama has raised a very interesting question. Of course, I believe they were eminently correct then. The only thing I can think of is that they feel that they are no longer a minority which needs protection; that they are so strong now—I am speaking of the CIO, not of the A. F. of L.——

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I had not concluded. But I yield for a question only.

Mr. HILL. The Senator realizes that, of course, no officer or representative of the CIO can possibly speak for the A. F. of L.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I grant that. I was assuming for purposes of illustration that labor's position then was very clear and very plain.

Here is an important segment of labor which takes exactly the opposite view, and the only explanation I can give is that if that change is representative of all labor—if it is, and I do not know that it is, and do not think it will be—if they would disentangle the element of substantive legislation which has been injected into this question of change of the rules, if they would make the distinction between that and the straight-out destruction of freedom debate in the Senate, I do not believe the A. F. of L. leaders would be for it today. But it is extremely difficult to give anyone an opportunity to regard this question for what it merely is. It is mixed up with the civil-rights legislation. That is what has misled the CIO. They think it is a minor change, which if made will facilitate the passage of civil-rights legislation, and the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law. In other words, it is so intimately connected with this program that they have not considered its long-range effect on others than themselves, or on any other group interested in the democratic systems.

If that be not true, we have to assume that they feel so strong and so secure in their position that they can always dominate the situation; that they are no longer interested in the protection of minorities. But in 1925 they were a minority interest, and they certainly put their

views into very strong language in the statement I have read. It is as strong language as one can find anywhere in any book I have seen, in condemnation of the effort to destroy the right of free speech in the Senate.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the course of history clearly demonstrates that the majority of today is very often the minority of tomorrow?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Of course, that is true. As the Senator well knows, that is exactly what has happened. Anyone who would assume that the present pattern of interests in this country is frozen for all time is a very foolish person. I do not know which interest will rise and which will not; but certainly any such assumption as I have suggested would be a misconstruction of history.

Mr. President, there is only a little more of this particular quotation, which I should like to read to complete the record:

The Vice President's intent was fulfilled. He made the Senate rules as to debate the chief topic of the day and called forth a prodigious amount of press comment and popular discussion. The impulse of the people—whose patience during the preceding 18 months had been sorely tried by the ridiculous and discreditable features of two uproarious filibusters—was to side with the Vice President in his strictures. But men of longer memories could but contrast the sweeping condemnation erupting from a Vice President, who at the moment was facing the Senate for the first time, with the far more tolerant judgment which had been expressed by Vice President Stevenson as he left the office after 4 years of service as the Senate's Presiding Officer.

The distinguished majority leader comes from the State of Illinois, whose present Governor, I believe, is a grandson of Mr. Stevenson. For that reason I think I shall read this one paragraph. This is Mr. Stevenson's comment on the problem. I think it is an excellent one. There are so many comments from so many distinguished people that I feel bad about not putting them all in the RECORD. However, I read this:

It must not be forgotten that the rules governing this body are founded deep in human experience; that they are the result of centuries of tireless effort in legislative halls to conserve, to render stable and secure the rights and liberties which have been achieved by conflict. By its rules the Senate wisely fixes the limits of its own powers. Of those who clamor against the Senate, and its methods of procedure, it may truly be said: "They know not what they do." In this Chamber alone are preserved, without restraint, two essentials of wise legislation and of good government—the right of amendment and of debate. Great evils often result from hasty legislation; rarely from the delay which follows full discussion and deliberation. In my humble judgment, the historic Senate—preserving the unrestricted right of amendment and of debate, maintaining intact the time-honored parliamentary methods and amenities which unfailingly secure action after deliberation—possesses in our scheme of government a value which cannot be measured by words.

I do not believe that a better statement of what is involved in this whole question can be found than that of Vice President Stevenson.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the words of Mr. Stevenson which the Senator from Arkansas has read to the Senate were uttered by Mr. Stevenson upon his retirement as Vice President of the United States, after having been the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate for 4 years?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct. That statement, together with others, indicates an extremely able man with profound powers of observation and judgment. His distinguished grandson is now the Governor of Illinois.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that this statement of Mr. Stevenson's, made at the time of his retirement as Vice President after having presided for 4 years over the Senate, gives us a striking contrast to the statement of Vice President Dawes, made on the first day he came to the Senate, before he had even presided over the Senate?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is entirely correct. The statement is consistent with what has happened to so many Senators. Contrast what the elder Senator Lodge, of Massachusetts, who came here in 1894 or 1893, said about the Senate rules when he first came here with what he said after 15 or 20 years' service. If I remember correctly, the distinguished majority leader quoted the statement which he made when he first came to the Senate. Contrast that with what he said in 1915, after he had had 15 or 20 years' experience. It is exactly the opposite. His statement after he had had a number of years' experience is one of the strongest statements ever made against a change in the rules of the Senate.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that Senator Lodge's earlier statement, made at the time he first entered this body, was made immediately after the measure which he had sponsored in the House of Representatives, known as the Lodge force measure, had been defeated by unlimited debate?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that as we study the history of the United States Senate and of the motions and resolutions which have been proposed to provide for cloture, we find that in practically every instance the author of the particular motion or resolution to provide for cloture had only recently, before he offered the motion or resolution, suffered some temporary defeat in this body in connection with the failure of a particular resolution or bill?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Generally speaking, in nearly every instance I have observed, that has been true, except in the case of new Senators. They nearly always have the desire to reform the Senate, even though they have not suffered any great frustration.

In that connection, I invite the attention of the Senate to a statement by former Senator Moses, of New Hampshire. This statement is found on page 135 of the hearings:

"It is to be observed that with few exceptions the demand for a change in the rules of the Senate arises from those whose contact with the Senate is either brief or nonexistent," the Senator continued. "Many a man has come into the Senate with a determination to tame it, and almost without exception these men themselves have been tamed by the Senate and have come to realize the true value of the Senate rules."

Mr. Moses declared that limitation of debate already existed in the Senate. "It was generally applied," he said, "under unanimous-consent agreements—agreeing to a time for a vote and that, pending such vote, no Senator should speak more than once, nor more than a given time, upon a measure or a proposed amendment."

I do not wish to carry the quotation further. However, it illustrates very strikingly the practical unanimity of view among Senators of long experience.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the able Senator from Arkansas if it is not a fact that the same Senator Lodge who served in the Senate for a long period of time was one of the 76 Senators who voted for cloture, rule XXII, and one of the 88 Senators either present or announced as in favor of the present rule XXII, which is now in the rules of the Senate?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is true. Of course, rule XXII is a very mild restriction upon the right of debate. I am quite sure that there was no confusion in the minds of Members of the Senate at the time the rule was adopted, as to the way it should be applied, which is the way it is being applied. It is a very slight restriction. In view of the elder Senator Lodge's statement in 1915, which is a very strong statement, I am satisfied that he felt, in deference to the conditions arising during the war, that perhaps it would be possible to maintain the integrity of the Senate if this very slight restriction were imposed. I agree that the restriction under the present rule is very slight. I do not want to see it increased. On the other hand, in view of the elder Senator Lodge's previous clear statement about restricting debate in the Senate, I am quite confident that he was under no illusions as to how strong that restriction was. I am quite sure that if he had believed that the rule would be interpreted as the CIO, in its letter, says the Vice President is going to interpret it, he would not have voted for it. He voted for it because he interpreted it in the same way the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] interpreted it last year. That is a very logical interpretation. That is the only way I can reconcile Senator Lodge's statement,

which is published in the RECORD, with his vote for the rule.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. HILL. Would the Senator from Arkansas mind reading to the Senate the last paragraph on page 202 of the hearings, which contains a portion of a statement by former Senator Lodge, of Massachusetts? I hand it to the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Very well; I am glad to do so. This is to be found on page 202 of the hearings:

And then he closes with these words:

"The Members of the United States Senate have always cherished the freedom of debate which has existed in this Chamber. Senators have been reluctant to adopt any rule of cloture, and, even after the present rule was adopted in 1917, they have been reluctant to invoke it. Cloture is a gag rule. It shuts off debate. It forces all free and open discussion to come to an end. Such a practice destroys the deliberative function which is the very foundation for the existence of the Senate. It was the intent of the framers of the Federal Constitution to obtain from the upper Chamber of the Congress a different point of view from that secured in the House of Representatives. Thus the longer time, the more advanced age, the smaller number, the equal representation of all States. Careful and thorough consideration of legislation is more often needed than the limitation of debate."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at this point?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does not the Senator from Arkansas agree, after reading that statement, that the late Senator Lodge, of Massachusetts, thought, contrary to the interpretations the Senator from Arkansas has made, that the rule he was then discussing was an effective cloture rule in the Senate of the United States; and does not his very statement, as contained in the hearings, indicate that in his judgment cloture was, as he put it, a gag rule which the Senate was reluctant to use? Will not the Senator agree with me that if the present interpretation of the rule prevails, namely, that cloture does not apply to a motion to bring up a bill, then rule XXII is absolutely meaningless?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I say to the Senator from California that it is not absolutely meaningless. There are a great many instances, as shown throughout the RECORD, of attempts being made to use it; in other words, a petition for cloture was submitted. However, in many cases the Members of the Senate were not willing to vote for it.

In his first question the Senator from California said the late Senator Lodge, of Massachusetts, voted for cloture. I am not informed about that. If he did vote for cloture, the only way I can reconcile such a vote for cloture and his definite statements as to what he thought cloture was, would be that he realized that the rule did not amount to any more than I think it does—which is what the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] ruled on. In other words, if the late Senator Lodge, of Massachusetts, had believed the rule to mean what the Senator from California wants us to believe it means, I cannot see how Senator Lodge could possibly have brought himself to vote for it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator from Arkansas understand that the late Senator Robert La Follette, of Wisconsin, was one of the Senators who took part in the debate at the time when the cloture rule was adopted by the Senate?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes; that was in 1917.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator from Arkansas agree with me that the late Senator Robert La Follette, of Wisconsin, had one of the keenest minds that ever graced this body?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think so.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator from Arkansas agree with me that the late Senator La Follette knew what he was doing at the time when he opposed this very cloture rule?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. My guess is that he knew what he was doing at practically all times.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator from Arkansas further agree, then, that the late Senator Robert La Follette, of Wisconsin, was correct when he made on the floor of the United States Senate the statement I am about to quote, in reference to the present cloture rule which the Senator from Arkansas has been discussing, and as to which he has used statements made by the late Senator Lodge, of Massachusetts, to prove his case? I point out that the late Senator La Follette was one of the three Senators who voted against the proposed cloture rule at that time. Now I read what he said then:

So far as I am concerned, I will never by my voice or my vote consent to a rule which will put an end to freedom of debate in the Senate.

Can the able Senator from Arkansas reach any other conclusion than that the great Senator Robert La Follette, of Wisconsin, thought that when the cloture rule was adopted by the Senate it meant the closing of all loopholes which might permit endless debate in the Senate of the United States?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I can only say that even though I have great respect for the late Senator La Follette, as I have stated, I cannot say that he was the only Senator who knew anything at that time. The vote at that time was 76 to what?

Mr. LUCAS. Seventy-six to three.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think it could often happen that at least 3 Senators out of 79 might be mistaken. In other words, we are not infallible; and those 3 Senators might have misinterpreted the significance of the proposed change. I am positive that the late Senator La Follette and many of the 76 Senators who voted in favor of the cloture amendment at that time did not intend to close debate in the sense that the Senator from Illinois wishes to have it closed. I do not think they thought of it in that way.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator from Arkansas believe that the late Senator Lodge, of Massachusetts, whom he has been quoting to prove his point, would have immediately challenged the theory of Senator La Follette, had he not believed that Senator La Follette was correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am frank to confess that I am not familiar with all of that debate. I was not on the committee. I obtained my information in the hard way, by reading the hearings. However, he might not have been present, and thus might not have had an opportunity to challenge it. So I cannot answer the question.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to complete this dialogue first.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; I should like to ask a further question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the distinguished majority leader for a question only.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator from Arkansas, from his reading of the debates which occurred at that time, recall that in those days there was a Member of the Senate by the name of Gronna—Senator Gronna, of North Dakota?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes; I remember such a name. It does not stand out in my memory as being that of a particularly distinguished Senator; I merely remember the name.

Mr. LUCAS. At least, he was a Member of the United States Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I mean he was among other Senators; I did not mean he was merely one among ordinary individuals.

Mr. LUCAS. Certainly.

Does the Senator from Arkansas agree that Senator Gronna was correct when he made this statement on the floor of the Senate, in connection with the cloture amendment?—

I think it is dangerous for a great government like ours to deny a minority, small though it may be, an opportunity to be heard.

How does the Senator from Arkansas interpret statements of that kind, if those great Senators at that particular moment—Senator Gronna, Senator La Follette, and Senator Sherman, of Illinois, the three Senators who voted against the cloture amendment—did not believe at the moment when they were debating the cloture amendment on the floor of the Senate that if it were adopted it would close all the loopholes?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have no doubt that those Senators believed that, and, of course, I agree that they were entirely correct in their general idea of opposition to the adoption of the rule and the closing of debate. But I think there might well have been a disagreement as to how to interpret that particular provision. After all, that is not so strange, because among the very distinguished Members of the present Senate there exists considerable disagreement as to what the rule means.

But all I can say is that a great many of the Senators who voted at that time for the cloture rule did not think it was

a serious impingement upon the powers of the Senate. Otherwise, I do not believe they would have voted for it. I think they believed it was a mild change.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. HILL. I ask the Senator from Arkansas, Is it not a fact that under the circumstances in which the cloture rule is applicable and may be invoked, it does deny freedom of speech to the minority in the Senate?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It most certainly does.

Mr. HILL. And is it not a fact that the late Senator Robert M. La Follette, Sr., of Wisconsin, then had in mind the very proposition that under the circumstances, when the cloture rule is applicable and is invoked, it shuts off the minority and denies it the freedom of debate and freedom of speech in the Senate?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There can be no question about that. That is exactly what happens. I am sure it is what he had in mind at the time. The only point raised by the Senator from California is about the vote of a man who so obviously was bitterly opposed to over-all restriction of debate. The only way I can explain it is, he must have thought the proposal would be restricted in its operation; otherwise, his statement in the article from which I have quoted makes no sense at all.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Apropos of the statement made by the Senator from Alabama that the cloture rule would restrict the minority, does not the Senator from Arkansas agree with me that the unlimited use of the filibuster by a small minority in the Senate in effect acts as a gag rule on the overwhelming majority of the Senate, and, in addition to that, acts as a means of preventing an overwhelming majority of the Senate from exercising its constitutional obligation and right to cast a vote, not only upon the rules, which it has the constitutional power to do, but on substantive legislation? Does not the Senator recognize that the blockade exists on the right of the majority as a result of unlimited use of the filibuster?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, that question, if it is a question, contains so many assumptions with which I do not agree that it is very difficult to answer it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules the Senator is under no obligation to answer the question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Chair. There are a great many aspects to it. In the first place, I know of no constitutional duty on the part of Senators to act upon any particular legislation. Senators are supposed to exercise wisdom, and if it is not wise to pass legislation, they ought not to pass it. I mean there is no great urgency merely to pass bills in order that bills may be passed. I may say further, when emphasis is laid upon the overwhelming character of the majority and the smallness of the minority, I am not willing to agree that those presently interested in defeating the pending resolution are but an insignificant minority. I dare say no filibuster has succeeded or has seriously inconvenienced the Senate that has not been conducted by a very substantial minority. I doubt if any filibuster has been successful, except in the old days of the lame-duck Congresses. I may cite as one instance the bill to permit the arming of merchant ships, which came to the Senate March 2 or March 3, when, under the law, the Congress had to adjourn on March 4. It is true that under such circumstances an individual, or two or three of them, could be an awful nuisance. But I qualify that by saying I doubt it is such a substantive injury to the legislative process as to warrant complete destruction of a great principle that has been in existence for so long a time.

The good must always be balanced against the bad. I should call it a minor inconvenience.

There were one or two examples last year, or the year before, when, only because Senators were tired, at 2 o'clock in the morning, somebody made a nuisance of himself. I did not like it, neither did the Senator; none of us did. But that is a small matter when viewed against the background of the history of the Nation and all that is involved. I do not approve of it. But my position is, the inconvenience is minor compared to denying freedom of debate to substantial minorities. I may say to the Senator, I do not think insignificant minorities have ever been successful to any real extent. They are merely minor nuisances, comparable to a flea bite, or something of the sort.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is speaking of the history of the United States Senate. Is it not true that the history of the Senate, from its beginning down to date, over a period of 170 years, shows that free and unlimited debate by the Senate has not operated as a gag, and the most that can be said is, it has at times operated as a brake in slowing down the impulsiveness or perhaps the impetuousness or the impatience of a majority that would work its will, except for the right of free and unlimited debate?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is entirely correct. The pamphlet lists bills alleged to have been defeated as a result of the filibuster, yet in all but two or three instances, connected with civil rights legislation, it did not defeat the legislation at all. It merely delayed it to afford reasonable time for consideration. That was its only effect.

In further answer to the Senator, I may say the criticism always implies that there is something terribly wrong with the United States. What amazes me is that our country, compared to other countries I know of—I have not been in Korea or Timbuktu or San Marino, or certain others—has done, relatively speaking, pretty well. The implication of the whole criticism is that something terrible is gnawing at the vitals of our democratic system, and that it is the filibuster in the Senate. How in the world is it possible to reconcile the success of our country, according to criteria accepted by civilized people, with the criticism and implication by way of criticism that we have failed in our obligations under the Constitution to legislate for the welfare of the people? That is what is absolutely incomprehensible to me. I cannot see anything so terribly wrong with this country as to require a fundamental change. If we were on the verge of revolution, if there were enemy troops at our gates, if somebody were flying over us with some kind of bomb, or something of that drastic nature, I might take it more seriously. But frankly I do not see what is wrong with thi country compared to other countries. I know we are not perfect, but we can only consider these things with regard to the progress made generally by humanity. I simply cannot see that we have failed so dismally in the performance of our duties under our system of government. I think that is the final answer to those who say we have always failed in the performance of our duty.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. HILL. Is it not still true that the map of experience is the best light we have for our guidance?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think so; and that is one reason I have tried to rely on persons with experience, people who were considered and accepted as wise, not upon my own judgment. That is why I cite men like Woodrow Wilson, the various Senators, Mr. Rogers, and others of that type.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield for another question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not also true that with the exception of the so-called civil-rights measures, the proponents of the change in the rule cannot lay their hand on a single measure to justify the change?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe that is correct, even if one were to go back beyond the period discussed, even to the first day in the history of the country. I wonder if Senators could search the record and find any bill, or can think of one, that was defeated by unlimited debate, which they would like now to pass in the light of subsequent events. The pending resolution is involved in politics, as everyone knows, in the light of current impatience, to which no one knows the answer. We merely know there is a great deal of difference of opinion as to the proper manner in which to approach this difficult problem. That is about all it amounts to. I wonder whether, in the

light of history, Senators would say with respect to any particular measure, "There is where we went astray; that was a terrible thing, which happened by reason of the filibuster."

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. HOEY. In this connection, is it not significant that for 22 years no single petition for cloture has succeeded; that for the past 22 years, with the rule just as we now have it, the Senate has not applied cloture to any particular measure?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If I understand the Senator, he means, even where, under the rule, it was applicable.

Mr. HOEY. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is, where there was an actually pending measure, and cloture was voted down.

Mr. HOEY. Is it not true that for 22 years every single attempt to apply cloture as provided in the present rule has failed?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe that is correct. I think that is the record.

Mr. HOEY. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That also leads one to wonder why the sudden interest in changing the rules. Is it because there is really something wrong with the rules, or is it merely a part of the civil-rights program? That is how I think even the most sincere person can be led astray—by looking only to the civil-rights aspect of the situation. There are those who are perfectly willing, we may say, to burn down the house in order to kill a mouse, willing to destroy the whole house, in order to get at this relatively minor matter; which it is, when viewed in the light of the whole complex of American life.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. For a question only.

Mr. HILL. I should like to ask the Senator this question: Is not this whole matter a perfect illustration of the statement of Edmund Burke that politicians who do not understand their trade sell their tools?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think that is entirely correct. If we sell this tool, or if we give it away, there will be very little excuse for our staying in Washington, because there will be no distinction between the functions of the House and those of the Senate. There will be every reason in the world for people to say, "Why not get rid of the Senate?" In my opinion, we would be well on the way toward the fate which has overtaken every other democratic country we can think of, with one exception, during recent years. There would be complete domination over the Senate and there would be no more participation for us as elected representatives.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In view of the statement just made by the able Senator from North Carolina, that the rule has not been invoked for 22 years, may I ask the able Senator from Arkansas why we are gun-shy of having a rule in a position where it can be voted on by the Senate of the United States?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I tried to make that point very clear a moment ago in reading from the record the statements made by the proponents themselves, including the Senator from California, that it is simply a maneuver in the first stage for complete majority control, which, in its ultimate conclusion, would be 25 Members. I hope I did not misquote them. I read the statements of the Senator from California, the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. They said, in effect, "We are really for majority rule, but as we do not think we can get that at this time, in order to make progress we will take a two-thirds majority rule, and as soon as that is accomplished we will clamp on cloture by a majority rule."

If there were any practical way to guarantee it would not go beyond two-thirds or three-fourths, I think we might make some progress toward reconciliation. But the proponents have so exposed their hands that there is no reasonable man who could accept any offer of restraint on their part, in view of their testimony before the committee. There is piled on top of that, recent evidence that the President is in favor of a majority cloture rule. So we have to treat it as an effort to bring in such a rule.

Mr. KNOWLAND and Mr. LUCAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield for a question; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the Senator from Arkansas, if he were sure that there were sufficient votes on his side of the aisle and on this side of the aisle so that any major amendment to the cloture rule would be rejected, would the Senator be willing to let the Senate get into a parliamentary situation where it could at least vote on the subject?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is beginning to get a little beyond me, by that question. The Senator knows that I am not very expert on this subject, and I should prefer to defer to some of my older colleagues with respect to the more technical aspects of the question. I have been led to believe that there is no practical way in which assurance can be given to this side of the aisle that the movement would stop there. I should prefer to leave that question to such Members of the Senate as the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

It is my view that there is no practical way in which any such assurance can be given. I do not think it can be done in that way. I do not think it is intended to do it that way. The Senator is speaking about the possibilities of the use of power. There is no reason, if he once had that power, for not coming in the next day with a proposal for cloture by a simple majority. If I am incorrect about that, I should like to be corrected. I do not profess to be an expert on the technical niceties of rules. I am interested in the basic function which the Senate has had in our Government. The distinction of the Senate depends upon unlimited debate. That is the only reason the Senator and I have the slightest influence in this Government above that of a Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I may add that I am not too "blown up" about the influence I have. I am not boasting about it; it is not very great. But it would be even less if there were not the possibility which now exists here of influencing the course of legislation or the possibility of restricting the unlimited power of the Executive. It is only a possibility. It is seldom used, but it can be used if the Executive gets too far out of line.

I now yield for a question only.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the Senator from Arkansas, inasmuch as he has previously quoted Woodrow Wilson, from a book written at a time considerably prior to the time he became President of the United States, if he is not familiar with the statement which Mr. Wilson made at the time the matter of arming merchantmen was being considered, when he said——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not believe that, under the rules, I would be justified in yielding for the Senator from California to quote the statement of Mr. Wilson, especially in view of the fact that the very point has been already covered, and I hesitate to burden the RECORD. I have tried to keep the discussion as brief as possible in order to conserve time and space in the RECORD. That point was covered this morning, and even yesterday. I am quite familiar with the statement. It was brought out. It does not in the least disturb me. It is characteristic of those who get into the Executive Office. They always have that attitude. If we search through history we might find another executive like Marcus Aurelius; we might find one or two additional ones, but most of them have had the irresistible impulse to acquire all possible power.

When Mr. Wilson, great philosopher as he was, came into his great power and responsibility in wartime, he became impatient with any obstruction to the exercise of it. As the Senator well knows, he did not very long survive the war, so as to be able to reflect upon those conditions. In my opinion, if he had lived long enough to have thought back he might have recognized how impatient he was. The statement in his book, which was published in 1908, is a statement based upon the fullness of his scholarship, and was written at a time when he had no personal interest in the subject. I think it is much more to be relied upon than would be the statement of a man in the midst of a fight, who does not like what is going on. When men go from here to the Executive Office they change their views, and when they come into the legislative branch and spend some time

here, invariably they change the other way. They have respect for the rules and know their significance.

Mr. HILL and Mr. LUCAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Alabama for a question only.

Mr. HILL. I should like to ask the Senator from Arkansas this question: Is it not true that President Wilson's very words show he was impatient and had personal feeling in the matter and was not looking at it objectively or philosophically, as he was in the early period to which the Senator has adverted?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is quite right. I do not like to repeat, but I merely wish to draw attention to the discussion that was had, that President Wilson had a very difficult time during the war, which is a period in which great power is given to the President, and much is expected of him. Presidents naturally become impatient. It is not that kind of a situation upon which we should base decisions as to the normal conduct of an institution such as the Senate. We normally delegate to the President, under wartime conditions, many powers which he does not ordinarily possess.

The incident having to do with arming merchant ships came right at the beginning of the war, and public opinion and the opinion of the Senate had not caught up. As the Senator no doubt remembers, the authorities went ahead and accomplished the purpose desired anyway. The delay in itself did not cause irreparable harm. After that we went on and won the war. I do not recall the exact facts, but I think the administration accomplished the chief purpose desired in some way. But that is not material.

I am a great admirer of President Wilson and his philosophy, and what he accomplished, but I certainly think he did have unfortunate relations with the Senate. I would not be a bit surprised if his failure to get ratification of the Treaty of Versailles, and to accomplish other things, was because of his impatience with the Senate, and his inability to understand how it worked under the actual conditions of war. That is the only way I can explain that. I do not think, however, that that tainted his scholarship in the slightest, or in any way raised a question about the soundness of his earlier position.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Is it not true that the rules of the Senate which guarantee to the minority the right to delay the majority and the right to be fully heard do from time to time irritate and irk the President, and agitate the majority, and make them angry? If that were not true, would the rule, after all, amount to much?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No. In other words, what the Senator actually is saying is that the only way to get along with the President is to do everything he wants, to have no rules, so that he can simply run over us. Any executive is going to be irritated at any restriction of his power.

The traditional difficulty in legislative systems is that the legislative branch has given up complete power to the Executive, as has been done in nearly every country. I said England has the exception. The executive there is part and parcel of the legislative. The difficulty is not met in that kind of a system. It is different from ours. They do not get the same kind of a reaction we have. But the House of Lords constituted a restriction, and it played a function in some degree like the Senate plays, though different in some respects, with regard to the House of Commons, and the Executive itself concentrated in the House of Commons. Now they are abolishing the House of Lords. That is a long story, which I went into. I do not think the success of Great Britain in recent years furnishes a model which we should go out of our way to follow. In considering what is relative success in a government or a community, the question arises how is it progressing? Is it much worse than any comparable government, or better? If it is worse, I would go along with the Senator from California and say, "Let us find out what is wrong if the machine does not function." In this country the demonstration of productive ability, of power, and, I may say of quite an appreciable increase in the wisdom of its policies, especially in the foreign field in the last few years, to me has been rather encouraging. I do not quite agree with the implication that there is something fundamentally wrong with this country. There are some changes, I grant, which can well be made.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to yield to the distinguished majority leader, who was on his feet a while ago, for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas have his fears allayed in any way with respect to the question of a constitutional majority or simple majority in the resolution if I tell him, as the majority leader of the Senate, that upon a check of the Democrats, approximately 44 out of the 54 favor the two-thirds, as provided in the resolution in its present form?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator will understand, I think, what I tried to make plain a while ago, that I am no authority on the technical aspects of the rule. I have been led to believe, and I am subject to correction, that that is what the Senator might do next week, but that following next week, if he so desired, he might change it to a majority. What has disturbed us in the very frank admission by so many of those active in this whole movement, including the distinguished majority leader, is that they really want a majority cloture provision. The question is one which is difficult for me to answer. The Senator is now arguing about the niceties, as to just how far the Senate is to be gagged. My position has consistently been that there should be no gag rule, because there is no place to stop.

I am unable to say at this time that I would never agree to any restriction; I do not think that is quite the position I wish to take. But under present conditions, with this rule change involved, inextricably involved, with substantive changes of laws which have entirely different implications, I do not see, as a practical matter, how we can afford to make the kind of an agreement suggested.

The present situation came about through no motion of my own or of the majority leader.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the distinguished majority leader for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. The slight concession the Senator made is appreciated, and I will ask the Senator whether he will not in his thinking, and in reaching a conclusion, have in mind the great legislative program that is before the country, including his bill for oleomargarine, the cotton bill for the South, appropriation bills, the reciprocal trade agreements measure, and other similar measures? And will he not have in mind in his thinking and in his conclusions the guaranty which I propose to give, so far as the majority is concerned, with respect to the number of Senators who will support a two-thirds rather than a constitutional majority or a simple majority. All I am asking the Senator to do is to think about it. I am not asking for a conclusion at this time, but I do believe it is worth while at this particular time, in what seems to me to be one of the most controversial periods of our history, to give that matter some serious consideration, especially in view of the immediate program we have in front of us, which we all know is highly controversial in many respects.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I appreciate the attitude of the majority leader. I will say to the Senator from Illinois that I thought his first approach to this problem was a very good one, that is, that we have a discussion of the matter. I think the debate has brought out some points of view, at least it has impressed upon some Members of the Senate the seriousness of the question which is involved, regardless of the decision they may ultimately reach. I thought it would be a very sensible course to have a debate on this subject, give opportunity for some speeches on the part of those who are seriously interested, and even lay it aside for some of the important legislation. That would give an opportunity to the country to hear about it, and to discuss it, and then we could take it up again. That is the program I understood the majority leader stated he would have 2 or 3 weeks ago.

I may say that I do not mean this as a personal matter; I cannot emphasize strongly enough that this is not peculiar to the present occupant of our Executive Office; but the fact that he injects himself into this question suggests the thought that there may be involved this irresistible urge of great, powerful office, in whatever country it may be, to eliminate obstructions, not only now but potential obstructions against something the President might want next year. That does not appeal to me at all. I hope I make it clear that my thought is

not affected by who is in the office now. If we go back in history, we find this result has occurred time after time in the case of Presidents. In fact, the greater they are, the more powerful they are, the more likely they are to take these steps. The weaker they are, the more contented they are, the more willing they are to let things run along. I think the Senator will agree with my statement. There have been some excellent books written on the relation of the office of the President to the Legislature. All the great Presidents have had similar experiences.

I will think about the matter. Of course, I have tried to think about it. I will say to the Senator I certainly have not made up my mind that no compromise is acceptable. The Senator spoke of two-thirds vote. Let us take this illustration, purely for the purpose of demonstration, that three-fourths is agreed upon. That is strong enough. It may be that would insure against an immediate further change. There can be a change when a majority, even a large majority, does not wish it to be made. That is the way the Communist Party operates. If they win one election under their system, all elections are ended. One decision by a two-thirds vote may be a little too close to the line; it could eliminate any restriction at all. That would come about, however, as a result of pressure from the Executive, because there is no motive here to do it.

Mr. LUCAS rose.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I thought the Senator had finished his speech.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am ready to yield, if the Senator is desirous of recessing or adjourning at this time.

Mr. LUCAS. I desire to make a motion to recess until Monday when the Senator finishes his speech.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senate for its patience in listening to this very long discussion and for not having thrown me out entirely. Perhaps for the last time I have enjoyed the opportunity of freedom of debate on the floor of the Senate without having to sit down unceremoniously in the middle of a speech. So if the opportunity never occurs to me again, I will have enjoyed it once. I appreciate the attitude of the majority leader very much.

MAINTENANCE OF ADEQUATE ARMED FORCES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

During the delivery of Mr. FULBRIGHT's speech,

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous-consent request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield, with the understanding I do not thereby lose the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, without the Senator from Arkansas losing the floor, the message from the President of the United States, now on the Vice President's desk, relating to national security, be laid before the Senate, and that its reading be deferred until some time later in the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, does the Senator from Illinois care to have the message read? Is it of such importance, coming from the Chief Executive, that it ought to be read at once?

Mr. LUCAS. No. I may say to the Senator, the only reason I make the request is for the convenience of the press. It is unnecessary that the message be immediately read.

Mr. HILL. In other words, before it can be released to the press, the message must be formally laid before the Senate, is that correct?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for unanimous consent?

There being no objection, the Chair laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, with the understanding that the reading thereof should be deferred until later in the day.

After the conclusion of Mr. FULBRIGHT's speech,

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the message from the President of the United States, which has previously been laid before the Senate, be printed in the RECORD at this point without reading.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

The maintenance of adequate armed forces has been one of the principal functions of the Federal Government since the establishment of this Nation. Today we maintain our armed forces in support of our primary desire for world peace. They are evidence of our determination to devote our utmost efforts toward achieving that all-important goal.

Throughout our history, the steady advance of science and technology has resulted in constant changes in the means of warfare and the character of our armed forces. In the few years since the cessation of hostilities in World War II, tremendous developments in technology have been made. The speed of aircraft has doubled, the means of undersea warfare have been revolutionized, the range and accuracy of guided missiles have increased, the potentialities of the atom have been more fully revealed.

The development of man's ability to shrink space and time and to control natural forces makes imperative a corresponding development of the means for directing and controlling these new powers. The effective and workable organization of our Government, and especially of our armed forces, is essential in the modern world.

The recent reports of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government have focused attention on the importance of the sound organization of the Federal Government. The Commission has stated that the first essential to the achievement of better government is a general clarification of the lines of authority and responsibility within the executive branch. In its report entitled "National Security Organization," the Commission has specifically applied this principle to the organization of our armed forces. The report states that we now lack adequate civilian authority and control over the military forces, that maximum efficiency and economy are not being realized in defense expenditures, and that interservice relationships must be improved to achieve the most effective defense. The recommendations of the Commission which would strengthen the National Military Establishment and the position of the Secretary of Defense have great merit and present an objective toward which I believe we must continue to move.

I have long been aware of the necessity for keeping our national security organization abreast of our security requirements. To this end, I recommended unification of the armed forces to the Congress in December 1945. My desire was to improve our defense organization while the lessons of World War II were still fresh in the minds of all. We must not forget these lessons in evaluating our security position today.

A great deal was learned from those 4 years of war. We learned, among other things, that the organization of our War and Navy Departments, prescribed by detailed statutes, was far too rigid and inflexible for the actual conduct of war. We learned that modern war required the combined use of air, naval, and land forces welded together under unified commands overseas, and under the strategic direction of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Other lessons were also learned. We learned that widely diverse supply policies of the separate services were costly and hampered the total effectiveness of military operations. We learned that there were great differences in training and combat doctrine among the services, and that these differences often provoked sharp conflicts in our theaters of operation.

My message to the Congress of December 1945 had a double purpose. It was intended to take advantage of our wartime experience and to prevent a return to the outmoded forms of organization which existed at the outbreak of the war.

Following that message, the subject of the proper organization of our armed forces was debated throughout the Nation. After the most careful consideration, the National Security Act was enacted by the Congress in July 1947.

This act has provided a practical and workable basis for beginning the unification of the military services and for coordinating military policy with foreign and economic policy. A few examples of the progress achieved in the period since the act became effective are evidence of its value.

The efficiency of military purchasing has steadily increased until today more than 75 percent of the matériel of the armed services is procured under coordinated purchasing arrangements.

A number of joint training and education programs have been instituted so that the personnel of each service may gain a greater understanding of the weapons and doctrine of the other services.

A uniform code of military justice has been developed, designed to be applicable to the personnel of all the armed forces. This code is now before the Congress for its consideration.

The coordination of military policy with foreign and economic policies has been greatly improved, principally through the efforts of the National Security Council and the National Security Resources Board.

The past 18 months have dispelled any doubt that unification of the armed forces can yield great advantages to the Nation. No one advocates a return to the outmoded organization of the days preceding the National Security Act. On the contrary, the issue today is not whether we should have unification, but how we can make it more effective.

We have now had sufficient experience under the act to be able to identify and correct its weaknesses, without impairing the advantages we have obtained from its strength. We have also had the advantage of a thorough-going appraisal by the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. On the basis of our experience to date, as further borne out by the Commission, we should now proceed to make the needed improvements in the act.

The duties and responsibilities of the Secretary of Defense as now set forth in the act are of too limited a character, and are restricted to specified items. For example, the act expressly provides that all duties not specifically conferred upon the Secretary of Defense are to remain vested in the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. While the Secretary of Defense, as the head of the National Military Establishment, ought to be ultimately accountable, under the President, for its administration, he is specifically limited by this act in the degree to which he may hold the military departments responsible to him. The departmental Secretaries are specifically authorized to deal directly with higher authority. Furthermore, many of the key responsibilities of the Secretary of Defense have been assigned by this statute, not to the Secretary, but to boards and agencies which derive much of their authority from the military departments themselves.

In short, the act fails to provide for a fully responsible official with authority adequate to meet his responsibility, whom the President and the Congress can hold accountable. The act fails to provide the basis for an organization and a staff adequate to achieve the most efficient and economical defense program and to attain effective and informed civilian control.

I, therefore, recommend that the National Security Act be amended to accomplish two basic purposes: First, to convert the National Military Establishment into an executive department of the Government, to be known as the Department of Defense; and, second, to provide the Secretary of Defense with appropriate responsibility and authority, and with civilian and military assistance adequate to fulfill his enlarged responsibility.

Within the new Department of Defense, I recommend that the Departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force be designated as military departments. The responsibility of the Secretary of Defense for exercising direction, authority, and control over the affairs of the Department of Defense should be made clear. Furthermore, the present limitations and restrictions which are inappropriate to his status as head of an executive department should be removed. The Secretary of Defense should be the sole representative of the Department of Defense on the National Security Council.

I am not recommending the blanket transfer of all statutory authority applicable to the Departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to the Secretary of Defense. Neither am I recommending any change in the statutory assignment of combatant functions to the Army, Navy, and Air Force. I recommend, however, that the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force administer the respective military departments under the authority, direction, and control of the Secretary of Defense.

To meet these additional responsibilities, the Secretary of Defense needs strengthened civilian and military assistance. This can be provided by the creation of new posts and by the conversion of existing agencies of the National Military Establishment into staff units for the Secretary. I recommend that Congress provide an Under Secretary of Defense and three Assistant Secretaries of Defense.

The duties now placed by statute in the Munitions Board and the Research and Development Board should be recognized as responsibilities of the Secretary of Defense. The act should be amended to make possible the flexible use of both of these agencies, and of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as staff units for the Secretary of Defense. Finally, I recommend that the Congress provide for a chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to be nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate, to take precedence over all other military personnel, and to be the principal military adviser to the President and the Secretary of Defense, and to perform such other duties as they may prescribe.

In my judgment these changes will make possible effective organization and management of the Department of Defense. They will provide a responsible official at its head, with strengthened civilian and military assistance, to undertake the immense job of aiding the President and the Congress in determining defense needs and in supervising the administration of our defense activities. These measures are essential to continued and accelerated progress toward unification. I am convinced that only through making steady progress toward this goal can we be assured of serving our major objective, the most effective organization of our armed forces, a full return on our defense dollar, and strengthened civilian control.

I urge the Congress to give prompt consideration to these recommendations. From the standpoint of present and potential cost to the Nation, there is no more important area in which to work for improved organization and operations. Action on these recommendations will prove beneficial to the Congress, the American people, and the President by providing better means of assuring defense needs and administering the defense program. We should seize this opportunity to strengthen our defense organization which is so vital to the security of this Nation and the peace of the world.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 5, 1949.*

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LUCAS. I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KERR in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Reports of committees are in order. If there be no reports——

PROGRAM FOR SENATE SESSIONS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on the subject of reports of committees, I desire to make an announcement for the benefit of the Senate. The Senate will meet again, in recess, on Monday next. At that time the debate will continue on the motion to take up Senate Resolution 15.

I want to give a little hint as to what may come along next week. It seems to me that we have reached the point where we must hold longer sessions. I am fairly certain that some time in the early part of the week we will have to sit a little later than 6 o'clock in order to keep my good friends on the other side of the aisle from telling the country that this is a phony filibuster. I am sorry that the distinguished minority leader had to advise the press to that effect. I think I have been fairly diligent, as the majority leader, in the conduct of the affairs of the Senate since we have been moving along with the subject which is now before the Senate. I think my friend, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], who is also interested in the subject before us, will agree with that statement. I have conferred with him a number of times about this question. We are trying to move along in an orderly way, and at the same time we do not propose to be too technical and too stringent about this matter. But I do believe that we may have to have little longer sessions as we move into the business before us if we expect to accomplish anything.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the majority leader a question. Certainly no one on this side of the aisle wants to deprive those who feel differently on the subject from having ample opportunity to discuss the matter, but would it not be well, beginning next week, to have the sessions run later into the evening, so that more Senators who are opposed to the motion may have an opportunity to present their case prior to the time any cloture petition might be filed?

Mr. LUCAS. I will say to the able Senator from California that my previous statement more or less stands in respect to what I think should be done. I believe that the sessions should last a little longer.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to my good friend from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to express to the Senator from California my appreciation for his solicitude in seeing that those of us who wish to be heard on this subject have an opportunity to do so. If the majority leader will permit, I wish to state that, without regard to the validity of the word "phony" which is being passed back and forth from this side of the aisle to the other, I think the debate has not reached any stage of filibuster, and will not until every Senator has had an opportunity to be heard on this question.

I hope Senators on both sides will give every Senator who desires to do so a chance to be heard, because it appears that, if some Senators are able to work their will, this might be the last occasion when these historic walls shall have seen free, untrammeled, unrestricted debate after the Senate of the United States has been in existence for 160 years.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois if it is not a fact that, even though cloture against his motion to take up might be found to apply, either by decision of the Chair or action by the Senate, that that in itself would not cut off discussion, but it would merely move us into the parliamentary situation whereby the merits of Senate Resolution 15 could be discussed on the resolution itself?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, does the Senator from California mean to infer that those of us who are opposing the resolution have not discussed the merits of the question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will the Senator from Illinois yield to me to answer that question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have not charged that the able Senators, for whom I have a very high regard, have not consistently stayed right on the subject. They have not discussed any extraneous matters during the period of time I have been in the Chamber, I should like to say, and I think the Senator will agree, that I have been in the Chamber practically all the time the discussion has been proceeding.

Mr. RUSSELL. I will bear testimony to that. I think the Senator from California is the only Senator present who has been on the floor as much as has the Senator from Georgia, who has been present constantly.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I merely wish to say to the able Senator from Georgia that a filibuster does not necessarily mean that extraneous matters are being discussed. I think that a filibuster could also be defined as an announced effort of preventing the Senate of the United States from getting itself into a parliamentary position where it could even vote on the resolution itself, and I am merely pointing out that the able Senator would not be deprived of any of his freedom of debate if he and his associates would permit the Senate of the United States to function as a legislative body and amend its own rules.

Mr. RUSSELL. Some of us are still old-fashioned, and we speak a little more easily and with less restraint when we are speaking outside the shadow of cloture or gag rule that is always hanging over us after a measure has been laid down, thereby bringing it within the provisions of rule XXII, by making it the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Michael J. Galvin, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary of Labor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Earl James McGrath, of Iowa, to be Commissioner of Education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Public Health Service will be confirmed en bloc; and, without objection, the President will be notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate stand in recess until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, March 7, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 5 (legislative day of February 21), 1949:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

William R. Hart, of Iowa, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Iowa, vice Maurice F. Donegan, term expired.

John C. Pickett, of Wyoming, to be United States attorney for the district of Wyoming, vice Carl L. Sackett, retired.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 5 (legislative day of February 21), 1949:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Michael J. Galvin to be Under Secretary of Labor.

COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

Earl James McGrath to be Commissioner of Education.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR CORPS OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Charles U. Culmer to be surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance.

Lewis H. Hoyle to be surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance.

Willie G. Simpson to be senior assistant surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance.

Howard M. Kline to be scientist (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance.

Lawrence Kilham to be surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance.

Gerald R. Clark to be senior assistant surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance.

John D. Faulkner to be sanitary engineer (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 7, 1949

(Legislative day of Monday, February 21, 1949)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. R. Orman Roberts, D. D., minister, Temple Methodist Church, San Francisco, Calif., offered the following prayer:

Remembering, O God, that gratitude is the parent of all virtues, we pause today on the threshold of this new week to give thanks to Thee for life itself and for every blessing that, out of Thy great heart of love, Thou hast bestowed upon us; praying especially that such intangibles as quietness of spirit, singleness of purpose, exaltation of righteousness, devotion to justice, rejoicing in hope, and the pursuance of peace shall be ours, now and in the life to come. In the name and spirit of our blessed Master, we pray. Amen.

DEATH OF SENATOR BROUGHTON, OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, it becomes my sad and painful duty to announce to the Senate the death of my distinguished colleague from North Carolina, Hon. JOSEPH MELVILLE BROUGHTON, which occurred Sunday morning, March 6, at 8:45 o'clock, as the result of a heart attack.

This is the second time within my brief service in the Senate that I have had to announce the death of my colleague from North Carolina. The first instance was the death of Senator Josiah William Bailey, which occurred on December 15,

1946, and today the announcement of the death of Senator BROUGHTON, after he had served in the Senate the brief period from December 31, 1948, until his death yesterday, being only 2 months and 6 days.

Short as was the tenure of service of Senator BROUGHTON, it was long enough for the Senate to make some appraisal of the man, and to realize that if he had lived he would have achieved great distinction in this body, even as he served with high devotion and pure patriotism the people of his Commonwealth and of the Nation. Already he was taking high rank in the Senate because of his gentlemanly bearing, his attention to his duties on the committees where he served, and in the Senate, which he attended with regularity, as well as in the social contacts with the membership of this body, each of whom he esteemed most highly.

When Senator BROUGHTON came to the Senate as the elected representative from North Carolina, he was no stranger to this membership, having served as Governor of North Carolina at the same time that 16 other Members of this body had served as governors of their respective States. All of them entertained high admiration for him and were acquainted with his character, ability, and high public service.

JOSEPH MELVILLE BROUGHTON was born in Raleigh, N. C., on November 17, 1888, and therefore was just a little over 60 years of age. He was educated in the common schools of North Carolina, graduated from Wake Forest College, where he studied law, and later studied law at Harvard University, and was admitted to practice by the Supreme Court of North Carolina in 1914. He immediately entered upon the practice of law, achieved great distinction in his chosen profession, and soon obtained a lucrative practice.

Senator BROUGHTON was interested in public affairs throughout his entire career. He was elected to the State senate from Wake County in 1926, and was elected Governor of North Carolina in 1940, and served from January 1941 to January 1945. He made a notable record, sustaining the best traditions of service established through the long line of distinguished men who filled that high position in North Carolina.

Senator BROUGHTON was unanimously endorsed by the Democratic State Convention in North Carolina for nominee for Vice President in 1944, and his name was presented at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago, where he received the solid support of his own State, and votes from many other States.

In 1948, in a hotly contested primary in North Carolina, he was chosen as the Democratic nominee for the United States Senate, and was elected in the general election in November 1948, by a majority of over 300,000, following which he began his service in the Senate on December 31, 1948.

Senator BROUGHTON is survived by his gracious and charming wife, three sons, and one daughter, who have the deep and abiding sympathy of his host of friends in this hour of travail and sorrow.

Senator BROUGHTON was a comparatively young man, and yet he had lived long enough before the "silver cord was loosed or the golden bowl was broken" to have established a reputation for ability, character, and integrity, together with patriotic devotion to duty, which characterized his whole private life and public career. He had won the confidence, esteem, and affection of the people of North Carolina to a remarkable degree, and his passing will be mourned by all the people of the State, as well as his many acquaintances and friends throughout the Nation.

On another occasion, and at a more appropriate time, I shall take advantage of the opportunity to pay tribute to his memory and to set forth somewhat in detail the elements of his greatness and the extent of his service.

I would not close this brief tribute without recalling that he was a man of great faith and of high Christian virtues. All his life he had been intensely active in church affairs, and was a leading layman in the great Baptist denomination of North Carolina, and also one of the most outstanding Sunday school teachers in the Nation. In Raleigh, his home city, he taught a large men's Bible class for many years, including the period while he served as Governor, and when he came to Washington in January, he began the teaching of another men's Bible class at the First Baptist Church in Washington, and was continuing this almost lifelong service to his fellow man. The last thing he did Saturday night before retiring was to prepare his Sunday school lesson for his Sunday school class at 10 o'clock the following morning, but death intervened and the lesson prepared remains undelivered, except as he speaks to the members of his class and his friends and the Nation through his exalted example of high purposes and holy living.

Today in the United States Senate, of which he had been an honored Member for only a brief time, he had expected to deliver his maiden speech in discussion of the proposition now pending before the Senate, upon which he had very deep convictions, and he would have spoken with great effectiveness out of the wealth of his experience and the wisdom of his counsel.

Mr. President, we can ill afford to lose a man of the type and character of Senator BROUGHTON from public service. These days call for high thinking, noble action, and unselfish dedication to the ideals of the Republic, and a spiritual faith which shall always be a source of strength and power in every crisis. It is well to remember that there has never been a night dark enough to put out the stars, and amid all the confusion, strife and chaos extant in the earth, and likewise amid the sadnesses of sickness and death, this is still "My Father's world," but there is appointed a time for man to die. There is something majestic about death. Its very universality makes it a dreaded visitor in the homes of kings and subjects, presidents and citizens, rich and poor, white and colored, around the whole world. It levels all rank and makes a common denominator of all men. Sickness and death are not the tragedies of life; they are only the sadnesses. The age-old question propounded in the Book of Job, "If a man die, shall he live again?", is affirmatively answered by the faith of men in immortality, and all nature shares that faith as it expresses the beautiful resurrection each springtime from the death of winter.

Tomorrow, in his home city of Raleigh, N. C., we shall commit the body of Senator BROUGHTON to the earth in his loved Carolina, even as his spirit has already ascended the heights of immortality. May God rest his memory, and bestow His kindest benedictions upon his beloved family.

Mr. President, I offer the resolution, which I send to the desk, and which I ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 80) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. J. MELVILLE BROUGHTON, late a Senator from the State of North Carolina.

Resolved, That a committee of 16 Senators be appointed by the Vice President to take order for superintending the funeral of the deceased.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I know that I speak the sentiments of each and every Member on this side of the aisle, and I am sure of the entire membership of the United States Senate, when I say that we are assembled today in sorrow because of the passing of one of our colleagues. In these circumstances certainly we know no party lines.

News of the passing of the junior Senator from North Carolina, Mr. BROUGHTON, is a painful shock to all of us.

It was not my privilege to have a long association with him, but during the little more than 2 months he was a Member of this body I got to know him quite well and I came quickly to respect his sincerity and his high purpose. He was almost immediately accorded the respect and the admiration of his colleagues in the Senate, because of his kind understanding and tolerant manner. I am sure that we all looked forward to much aid from him in solving the many great problems that come to the Senate for determination.

As has been so ably stated already by his colleague, the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the junior Senator from North Carolina had an illustrious career of service to his State and to his Nation—as educator, State legislator, governor, and finally as a United States Senator.

Mr. President, I personally join in the expressions of profound regret over his passing, which are shared by Senators on this side of the aisle, and indeed by the entire Senate. We extend to his immediate family our sincere sympathy and condolences.

North Carolina has lost one of its leaders, and we of the Senate have lost an able colleague, who advocated honorably and courageously the course of government for which he stood.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, every Member of the Senate has been shocked and saddened by the sudden and untimely death of the junior Senator from North Carolina, J. MELVILLE BROUGHTON. His death comes as a severe blow to all of us who knew him, and it comes as a particularly severe blow to the Senator from Illinois, because, Mr. President, I had the opportunity of knowing this distinguished man since 1940, when I first met him at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago and had the pleasure of appearing with him on the Chicago University round table program for a discussion of important issues of the day.

In the short time he spent in these halls, he impressed every Senator with the force of his personality, the keenness of his mind, and his genuine friendliness toward his fellow men. He was at the threshold of a most illustrious career in the Senate. If he had been spared, he would have taken rank among the distinguished leaders of this body.

I can personally testify as to his indefatigable work as a member of the committees to which he was assigned, because of my personal contact with him in respect to several bills which he was handling as chairman of a subcommittee.

He had already achieved a brilliant career as a lawyer and as a statesman in North Carolina. He won recognition in political circles when he served as a member of the State senate there from 1927 to 1929. In 1936 he was the temporary chairman and keynoter of the Democratic State convention. He was elevated to the governorship in 1941 and served through 1945.

He was a champion of southern economic improvement and served at one time as chairman of the National Planning Association's committee of the South. He took an active part in the work of this committee, and he had great dreams for the future development of his native region.

In 1944, while he was still serving as Governor of North Carolina, his fellow Democrats supported him for the Vice-Presidential nomination on the Democratic ticket. He was a vigorous campaigner in the national elections in 1944 and 1948, and was a warm friend of the late President Roosevelt and of President Truman.

He regarded a place in the United States Senate as one of the highest attainments in American life, and he took his seat in this Chamber last December 31 with a serious determination to serve the American people with all his energies and abilities.

His determination to fulfill his duties wholeheartedly may have been one of the contributing causes of his death. Although he had been in poor health for some weeks, he continued to appear for the sessions of the Senate and he presided over our deliberations as recently as last Friday.

We feel deep regret and sorrow that he was taken from us after so brief a period in the Senate. But we also feel deep pride in having known such a fine man as a colleague and a friend, even for a little time.

I know I speak for all Senators who will not have an opportunity today to express their sentiments when I say that we send to his loving wife and family our deepest sympathy in their hour of trouble and bereavement.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as one who served with Senator BROUGHTON for 4 years as a fellow governor, and for several years as a member of the executive committee of the governors' conference, I rise to pay my brief tribute to him today.

During that period of time we became close friends. I respected his judgment, I respected his word, I respected his method and common-sense manner of arriving at his conclusions. As a result of that friendship and mutual understanding I believe we were able to settle several problems which concerned out respective States more easily, more amicably, and with better results for both States in the long run.

He was the first southerner to speak at Gettysburg on Memorial Day from the spot where Lincoln delivered his famous address. He was there, as were we all, as the guests of the then Governor of Pennsylvania, now a Senator from that State [Mr. MARTIN]. At that time Governor BROUGHTON made a very moving address. I remember it, and I am proud of having been present on that historic occasion, where, as a northerner, I was also invited to speak.

Senator BROUGHTON was a man of great sense of humor. He was an inimitable story teller, and a fine comrade. Whenever he saw me he always said that he started his political career in Massachusetts. He came to Massachusetts to attend the Harvard Law School in 1912. It was the year of the campaign in which President Wilson was a candidate. MEL BROUGHTON at that time made a few speeches in Massachusetts. He attended the victory parade, and in his elation that night he sent a telegram to his father saying, "We carried Massachusetts for President Wilson." He always referred to that incident whenever he met me.

Mr. President, this body has lost a man with whom all Senators would ultimately have become friends. His State has lost a man whose judgment and whose common sense in the affairs of public life it always valued. The fact that he had been Governor of his State, and subsequently, until his death, Senator, is evidence of the confidence in which his people held him. The country will miss his unfailing judgment on many of the most difficult questions which will come before the Senate for decision.

Mr. President, I extend my sympathy to his widow and to his fine boys and to his daughter. All of us are shocked at his sudden, sad, and unexpected death.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I rise to pay my brief tribute to the memory of Senator BROUGHTON. We were all terribly shocked when the announcement of his death was made.

I wish to refer briefly to the incident which has already been brought to our attention by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. The governors' conference was held in Pennsylvania in 1944. On Memorial Day, which is May 30 in the Northern States, it was felt appropriate that suitable exercises be held at Gettysburg. After going over the list of southern governors it was felt that the address on behalf of the South should be made by the then Governor BROUGHTON, and the address on behalf of the North by the then Governor SALTONSTALL, who was the chairman of the governors' conference.

That program was carried out, and there was a Nation-wide hook-up of radio facilities. Moreover, the exercises were transcribed for the use of our armies beyond the seas. I had the honor of presiding at those exercises. The two speeches were of outstanding value so far as American patriotism is concerned, and served as a morale builder for our troops all over the world. Those speeches have been preserved in the archives of Pennsylvania, and in the archives of the Gettysburg Battlefield Commission.

Senator BROUGHTON was an ideal American. He was a man of great courage. He was a man of real eloquence, because he believed in the things which he advocated. We have had the privilege of hearing him often in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and our State is better by reason of his fine speeches. I believe that the Senate of the United States and the people of America have lost a great advocate, who believed in the highest ideals of America. Personally I have lost a fine friend.

I wish to extend to his family and to the people of North Carolina my sincerest sympathy.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, because of my acquaintance with the distinguished junior Senator from North Carolina over a period of years antedating his entry into this body, during which time I was a member of and served as chairman of the conference of governors, in which he participated most actively, I should like to pay a brief tribute to his memory.

In the untimely passing of the distinguished junior Senator from North Carolina, the Honorable J. MELVILLE BROUGHTON, the Senate of the United States and the people of our great country have lost a splendid public official, and we who have been privileged to know him over a period of years personally mourn the loss of a close friend, who has endeared himself by the excellence of his qualities and the breadth of his vision.

From the first day of contact with J. MELVILLE BROUGHTON, shortly after his accession to the governship of his great State in 1941, I was deeply impressed with his outstanding personal and official qualifications. His devotion to the public interest, his thorough knowledge of the law, combined with the eminent good sense of his interpretation of the statutes; his remarkable grasp of the problems of agriculture, of business, and of industry, in all of which he had wide experience; his high ideals both as to the purpose and aims of Government and, even more particularly as to his own life and conduct, set him apart, in my mind, as a gentleman whose friendship would be a true treasure and whose consultations and advice would ever furnish a sure guide.

In the various meetings and conferences among the governors of the country during the critical war years, I considered myself privileged to have available at all times his understanding knowledge of the problems with which we were mutually faced and the inspiration of his courageous efforts to devote to their solution all the capabilities which he possessed in such high measure.

No official of my acquaintance during the years I first met MELVILLE BROUGHTON has had a loftier concept of the opportunities afforded in Government to serve and advance the interests of all the people, not only of his own State but of the entire country. As has been indicated in the previous comments, he believed—and he acted in accordance with the conviction—that the American system of government was the ideal of all governments. The imperfections he accepted solely as challenges for the attainment of absolute perfection. He was just as firm in his convictions that his party represented the most advanced thought in the program for advancement of the people's interest and his support was never lacking in any program which would bring greater participation in government to the people or increased benefits in daily living.

The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] have made reference to the conference of governors. As an indication of the deep impression which Senator BROUGHTON made upon representatives from every section of the country, this instance may be cited: During a session of the governors' conference, attended by more than 40 of the chief executives of the States of the Union, an outstanding governor of one of the largest States, who happened to be of a different political affiliation from the Governor of North Carolina, asserted that if a poll were taken among the chief executives as to the one for whom the highest regard was entertained by all present, that choice would be the then Governor BROUGHTON.

Only last Thursday, when, with a group of Senators composing a subcommittee, we were at the White House with Senator BROUGHTON, the President of the United States, after the Senator's departure, gave expression to a tribute highly complimentary to the North Carolina Senator.

The entire period of his service in the different levels of government has been sufficient, I know, to impress deeply upon all his colleagues his thorough knowledge of governmental matters, his clear perception of fundamental principles, and his lofty idealism, all of which eminently marked him as a leader among men. Now that he is gone, I find that words are futile, indeed, to express the full meaning of his loss.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I rise to add a word of appreciation for a dear friend who has passed on.

It so happens that my father was a native of North Carolina, as was well known to our distinguished brother and colleague Senator BROUGHTON. The kindly references which he made to what he was pleased to consider a somewhat close kinship between himself and me, because of the fact that my father was a North Carolinian, in no small part contributed to the affection and regard which I had for our friend.

Mr. President, his qualities were known to all of us who had been associated with him, both in the Senate and as governors of States. His wholesomeness was manifest on all occasions. His kindly simplicity was equally obvious to all who knew him. Soundness of judgment characterized him, as it did others of our great men of present and past. Finally, he possessed a delicious sense of humor. These were all qualities which were designed to, and did, endear him to those who were associated with him.

Reference has been made by several Senators today to the historic incident at Gettysburg on the 30th of May 1944. It was my good fortune to be present on that occasion. I shall never forget the beauty of it. Great multitudes of children passed in single file and placed upon the graves of soldiers who had died scores of years ago flowers which were emblematic of the fact that today our Nation pays tribute and devotion to those of the North as well as those of the South.

I shall never forget the two notable addresses which were delivered upon that occasion, one by the Governor of a northern State, our distinguished colleague [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who spoke a few moments ago. He spoke on that occasion with characteristic frankness, plainness, and eloquence.

The other fine and beautiful address was delivered by our colleague from North Carolina who has gone on. Those addresses typify and symbolize to my mind the fact that today our Nation—North, South, East, and West—is united, regardless of the differences which may have separated us in years past.

So today, Mr. President, as in sorrow we express ourselves as to his departure, may we take some comfort in the fact that our great Nation, as he and the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts so clearly exemplified on that notable occasion, is today drawn together by bonds of friendship and affection—North, South, East, and West—which we all trust may never be severed.

I join with our colleagues today in expressions of sorrow at his departure, and in the further expression of our deepest sympathy for his sorrowing wife and other members of his family.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, since we last met here, less than 60 hours ago, the only condition in which all men, everywhere, are truly equal has befallen one of our esteemed colleagues. An inevitable death has claimed the junior Senator from my neighboring State of North Carolina.

He was struck down as he prepared to use the time now allotted to me to further a cause in which he believed. As he walked and talked among us on this very floor Saturday afternoon, few of us discerned the fate that was in store for him. Now, we pause to pay our heartfelt homage to his memory, and to extend our condolences to his bereaved family and friends.

It was my pleasure to know Senator J. MELVILLE BROUGHTON when he served as chief executive of his beloved State of North Carolina. He served with distinction and credit to himself and to the people of his native Commonwealth. It was in his 4 years of service as Governor, that North Carolina awakened to the fact that local responsibility is essential to good government. As a tiller of the soil himself, he sought to show to all his people the advantages of crop diversification and other improvements in farming methods and marketing. He did much, also, to enhance the educational and health advantages of his people.

In addition to his official duties, he found time to be a servant of the public in other ways. He was an active, civic-minded citizen. Service as president of his State bar association and the Raleigh Chamber of Commerce, and long service as teacher of Sunday-school classes, mark his illustrious career. Senator BROUGHTON was a good party man. He was selected in 1936 as temporary chairman of the Democratic State convention, and delivered the keynote speech.

A little more than 60 days ago, Senator BROUGHTON and I took the oath of office in this body at the same time. In his short service here, he endeared himself to his colleagues and to all those with whom he came in contact. We extend our profound sympathy to his immediate family and friends. We join the people of North Carolina in grief at the loss of his services. But, to paraphrase Tennyson, now that God's fingers have touched him, he sleeps.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY].

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

Under the second resolving clause the Vice President appointed the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased Senator.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Senator, I move that the Senate do now take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Tuesday, March 8, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 7, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Holy Lord God of Hosts, the giver of all that makes life blessed, we thank Thee for the privilege of being man; made in Thy holy image; for freedom of the spirit, for the right of personal choice; for the joy of fellowship with Thee. Thou hast made us a little lower than the angels. Thou hast covered us with glory and honor. How excellent is Thy name.

In this day, we pray that we may not be conformed to this world but transformed by the renewing of our minds, that we may prove what is that good and acceptable and perfect will of God.

Keep in the folds of Thy loving care our President, our Speaker, and the entire Congress. In the name of our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 4, 1949, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed a joint resolution and bill of the House of the following titles:

On March 2, 1949:

H. J. Res. 84. Joint resolution to provide for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train by the Archivist of the United States, and for other purposes.

On March 4, 1949:

H. R. 54. An act to retrocede to the State of New Mexico exclusive jurisdiction held by the United States over lands within the boundaries of the Los Alamos project of the United States Atomic Energy Commission.

THE LATE HONORABLE WALTER GRESHAM ANDREWS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER].

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, last week it was my sad duty to report to the Members of this House the death of one of my distinguished predecessors, former Representative Stephen Wallace Dempsey, who so ably served the Fortieth New York Congressional District from the Sixty-fourth to the Seventy-first Congress.

Today it is with profound grief that I inform you of the untimely death of my immediate predecessor, Walter Gresham Andrews, who served the same district with distinction in this House from the Seventy-second to the Eightieth Congress, and who did not seek reelection last year because of ill health.

Walter Gresham Andrews was born July 16, 1889, at Evanston, Ill. He was a grandson of Walter Q. Gresham, Secretary of State in Grover Cleveland's Cabinet.

When he was a boy, his family moved to Buffalo, N. Y., where he attended public school. Later he attended Lawrenceville Academy, New Jersey, and was graduated from Princeton in 1913. While at college he was a great athlete and excelled at football, later serving as head coach of the Princeton team for 2 years.

Walter Gresham Andrews was a great soldier. In 1916 he enlisted as a private in the First New York Cavalry, and served on the Mexican border. During World War I he went to France with the One Hundred and Seventh Infantry, and attained the rank of major. Wounded in action on the Hindenburg line, he was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross.

Walter Gresham Andrews was a distinguished gentleman and statesman. He was the ranking Republican member of the House Military Affairs Committee from 1935, and served with great honor as chairman of the Armed Services Committee during the Eightieth Congress.

Walter Gresham Andrews was my friend. It was my privilege to serve on his staff in 1938 when he was chairman of the New York State Republican Congressional Campaign Committee, and he taught me much. I shall miss his friendship, his advice, and his counsel, and I join with all my colleagues in expressing deep sympathy and condolences to his sister, Mrs. William P. Urban, in her bereavement.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the death of Walter G. Andrews came as a great shock to his legion of friends, both in and out of Congress. As one who was privileged to enjoy his close friendship for many years, it was particularly sad news. As we travel through life we come to appreciate more fully that stout, lasting friendships count more than the material things of life. To lose a friend like "Ham" Andrews is indeed a great loss.

Andrews came into Congress 18 years ago, and his service to his district, his State, and his Nation was such that he was repeatedly elected without much effort. It could be truthfully said he could have been returned as long as he wished.

He was not a candidate for reelection because of waning health due to the strenuous work of reorganizing the national defense. This work will live long as one of his greatest contributions to his country. He was the first chairman of the unified Armed Services Committee, and his work of organizing the committee was a great tribute to his organizational ability.

As a veteran—a veteran who was injured in battle, privileged to wear the Distinguished Service Cross—he knew the national defense needs and he gave unsparingly of his time and health to build a defense that would keep secure the country he loved.

"Ham" Andrews was a grandson of Walter Gresham, a former Secretary of State. He graduated from Princeton. At college he excelled both as a football and baseball player. Later he served as coach. He always maintained his interest in these two great national sports.

For some months he knew he faced a losing fight, but he faced oncoming fate with the resolute courage that made him a fine athlete, a courageous Congressman, and an American patriot.

This world is the poorer through the death of "Ham" Andrews. Our deepest sympathy goes to his sister and her family.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a man I am proud to have known—a man beloved by us all, our former colleague, Walter G. Andrews, of New York, known affectionately to us as "Ham"—who suddenly and unexpectedly passed away last Saturday.

This is a profoundly sorrowful occasion for me. "Ham" Andrews was as fine a man as I have known in the House in the time I have been a Member of this body. He was honest and courageous in his views. He was as devoid of partisanship as a person can possibly be. He was true in friendship and extremely diligent in his attention to public affairs—so much so that I know that the fine service he rendered so overtaxed him that it must have had much to do with his untimely death.

His ambition was to serve well, to keep our Nation's interest always uppermost in the deliberations of the Congress. I never knew him to swerve from these goals throughout the many years he was with us here.

He was the first chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services. This was, to him, the highest honor the country could bestow. He devoted himself to that office with a selflessness and zeal and earnest conviction rarely seen in public life. All of us on that committee have remarked many times on how splendidly he served. I shall always be convinced that few men in America—if, indeed, there be anyone else who could have done so—who could have made that new committee function as excellently as it did during its first 2 years.

Such fairness in a man, such stanch loyalty to his friends, such disdain of narrow partisan considerations, such unswerving dedication to the Nation's interest—these all are characteristics of a great man. They are attributes of character to which we all aspire, to which we all pay homage.

"Ham" Andrews had them all—in abundance.

I have lost a respected and beloved associate, a cherished friend. In his passing, our Nation has lost a man who was as fine a public servant, as statesmanlike a Representative, as genuine a patriot, as it can produce.

It is an honor to have been among his friends.

I am moved beyond the power of words to express that he has gone.

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. I thank the gentleman.

I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, our departed colleague, "Ham" Andrews, as he was affectionately known to all who served with him here, was a very dear friend of mine for many years.

Our friendship extends back all the way to the days when we attended rival colleges, played on rival football teams, and subsequently coached those teams.

We both served as officers in World War I. We both served together here as Members of this House for 18 years.

We have been in each other's homes many times. The members of my family were devoted to him. We made various trips together over the years.

I have a sense of very deep personal loss in his death.

Under date of June 19, 1948, I expressed my great regret at his decision to retire from the Congress because of ill health, and paid my tribute to his character and to his capacity. That statement will be found in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I shall attempt no detail at this time.

May I simply say, Mr. Speaker, that "Ham" Andrews was a man of the greatest courage. His courage was proven in an outstanding war record with the Twenty-seventh Division, during World War I, in which he was wounded, and in which he received the Distinguished Service Cross and an extraordinary commendation from his division commander, Maj. Gen. John F. O'Ryan. The latter stated that in the general's opinion, "No company officer in the division had a better record than yours for skill and determined leadership in battle." His courage was also demonstrated here both in committee and on the floor of this House, as those who served with him know, time and time again.

"Ham" Andrews was also a man of great ability, a fact proven by the outstanding contribution which he made to the Nation as ranking member of the Committee on Military Affairs during World War II and by the splendid work which he did in organizing the new Committee on Armed Services. That work has been commended by all concerned.

"Ham" Andrews was also a man of great human understanding and of great kindliness. He was always holding out a helping hand to those with whom he came in contact. He had a very wide circle of devoted friends, literally of all ages, and in every walk of life; true friends who are today the better for having known him; true friends who today mourn his untimely passing.

Mr. Speaker, I join in extending my heartfelt sympathy to his sister and to the other members of his family.

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. I thank the gentleman. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include some extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sad heart that I announce the death of Hon. Walter G. Andrews, our beloved colleague of 18 years' service in the House of Representatives.

I know that in his death he will be mourned by the people in every city and hamlet of the Forty-second District of New York, which he served so faithfully and so well.

That our good friend approached death like a philosopher and a brave soldier, no person who knew him can doubt. "Ham" Andrews, as he was affectionately known and called by his colleagues, knew, when he left Congress, that his impaired health would permit him no longer to render a public service which his constituents would expect of him.

To the end of his last term in the Eightieth Congress he devoted his time, his strength, and his fine ability to the welfare of his constituents and in promoting legislation that would make for the security of his country, which he loved so devotedly and for which he had so valiantly fought and sacrificed.

I am only one of innumerable friends here and throughout the Nation who will this day deeply mourn the death of our friend and former colleague.

We all recognize that an outstanding athlete, a brave soldier, a constructive legislator, a statesman, and a great American has conscientiously accomplished his life's work and that he has performed it well. We all know that the Republic is infinitely stronger and better for his having lived and having served.

As a part of my remarks, I am inserting an article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on March 6, 1949:

W. G. ANDREWS, REPRESENTATIVE 18 YEARS, DIES—BUFFALO MAN HEADED HOUSE MILITARY COMMITTEE IN EIGHTIETH SESSION—WON DISTINGUISHED SERVICE CROSS

DAYTONA BEACH, FLA., March 5.—Walter G. Andrews, 59, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee in the Eightieth Congress, died after a heart attack here today at a hotel. A veteran of 18 years in the House, Mr. Andrews represented the Forty-second Congressional District of New York. He was a resident of Buffalo.

WAS WAR VETERAN

Walter G. Andrews, a Representative since 1930 and chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, announced in June 1948 that, on account of his health, he would not be a candidate for reelection. He was a veteran of World War I and held the Distinguished Service Cross.

He was born in Evanston, Ill., the son of William Henry and Kate Gresham Andrews. He was a grandson of Walter Q. Gresham, who was Secretary of State under President Grover Cleveland.

After his graduation from Princeton University in 1913 he was varsity football coach there for 2 years.

In 1916 he enlisted in the First Cavalry of the New York National Guard and went with that unit to the Mexican border. After the entry of the United States into World War I he was sent overseas and participated in several campaigns. He was wounded in the assault of the Hindenburg line. At the time of his discharge he had attained the rank of major in the One Hundred and Seventh Infantry, the former Seventh Regiment.

He was a director and a member of the executive committee of Pratt & Lamberg, Inc., and in 1930 was Federal census director for western New York. In that year he was elected to Congress for the first time.

In 1935 he became ranking Republican member of the House Military Affairs Committee. A gunnery expert in World War I, he took a practical view of military questions before the House. He was an advocate of universal military training and of the draft, but opposed combining the two in one bill.

In the rivalry between the Air Force and the Navy air arm in the newly constituted military forces, Mr. Andrews sided with the Air Force. All land-based aircraft, he held, should be controlled by the Air Force. He was active in promoting the restoration of old Fort Niagara and the improvement of the present Fort Niagara.

He was a member of the American Legion, the Saturn Club of Buffalo, the Metropolitan Club of Washington, D. C., and the Tiger Inn of Princeton University. He was not married.

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound sorrow but no surprise that I learned yesterday of the passing of our late and lamented friend, Walter Gresham Andrews. For the past 18 months I have watched him fail in health, due to overwork and anxiety about the country which he loved and for which he died.

"Ham," as all of us affectionately called him and as he liked to be called, was a most remarkable individual. Many people did not fully understand and appreciate him. He could be abrupt, irascible, and impatient with those who could not as clearly and quickly grasp a point as he could himself. Often we differed on matters of legislation; in fact, at times we violently clashed in committee, out of committee, in his home, and in my home, but he was the type of man with whom you could differ and still love.

He was a man of superb courage, resolute will, and indomitable spirit, untiring in his efforts to serve his country whether in war or in peace. I seriously doubt if any man in this Congress could have performed the marvelous job he did following the reorganization, when we merged the old Committees on Military and Naval Affairs. Due to his indefatigable industry and earnest effort, he succeeded, I think, in molding the Committee on Armed Services into a rock of impregnable unity and of common understanding. He will always be remembered as its first chairman. And seldom will there be an abler one.

Whether it was on the football field, whether in the front-line trench, whether in the long, arduous hours of slavish work behind a desk, "Ham" Andrews, the grandson of the Secretary of State under Grover Cleveland, measured up in every way to the best traditions of his forefathers.

Many of us have been the recipients of his generous and gracious hospitality. Never was there a better host. His heart was rugged, but it was so big that it finally burst. He enjoyed helping others. For 14 years I have been privileged to sit by his side in our committee. We have felt the thrill of victory and the sting of defeat. Out of our mutual experiences was born a priceless friendship. My heart now aches and I shall miss him sorely.

"Ham" Andrews has left a rich legacy to each and every Member of this House. We admired him because of his sterling patriotism. His soul burned with love of country. He has left us the blessed memory of a comrade who could play

just as hard as he could work and whose rich fellowship in and out of Congress we shall cherish until the final day. God rest his soul, bless his loved ones, and help us to love our country with the same unalloyed passion that he did.

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I served on the old Military Affairs Committee with our late lamented friend, Walter Gresham Andrews, for many years. I knew him intimately. He was a real American; and his deportment and actions in Congress and elsewhere showed more conclusively than words that he placed the welfare of his Nation above all other considerations.

"Ham," as he was affectionately known by all of us, was, in fact, a man of action. He was a distinguished wearer of the Distinguished Service Cross. Endowed by nature with the rare ability to organize, he set to work to weld together into one great unified legislative force, the individual members of the two historic committees—the Military Affairs and the Naval Affairs Committees. In the handling of this work, Chairman Andrews performed such an outstanding job that his handiwork remains today in this Eighty-first Congress.

"Ham" did not seek reelection. He knew he was a very sick man. He knew he could not live long. We gave him a farewell party just before adjournment of the Eightieth Congress, and no one knew better than "Ham" the meaning of the word "farewell" as we left him there at the doorway of this party.

He has gone, but, in the great hereafter, where there is reward for honest, sincere, rugged effort; where there is appreciation for loyalty and patriotism of the highest order, there today is "Ham" Andrews, clad in the raiments of royal purple, welcomed and appreciated for the rugged, courageous public official that he was, affectionately accepted and received into the hereafter.

New York may well be proud of this native son, and this Congress of a brilliant and most conscientious Member.

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I want also to pay my tribute to the memory of Walter G. Andrews. I served only one term with him—my first and his last—but he had that gift of friendship so that even when one knew him a short time one felt as though one had an old and trusted friend.

I had the opportunity of seeing his work as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, that new committee which came out of the Reorganization Act. I admired his patriotism, and above all, I admired his conviction. He believed in the rearmament of this country. He believed in the strengthening of our defenses. I think it can be truly said that to that end he not only worked but gave his life.

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. I thank the gentlewoman; and I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, there comes a time that we like to think about individuals deeply and sincerely; this is a trait that we should not be ashamed of here in this body. I had the privilege of serving with "Ham" Andrews during the most trying time that this country has ever passed through. Ham was always loyal to the principles of national defense. He not only used his influence but he worked hard at it.

When history is written, in my opinion it will be recorded that "Ham" Andrews exercised as much influence on not letting our armed forces fall to pieces after World War II as any individual on the committee. It so happened that he stepped into the chairmanship at an opportune time.

I am glad to have had the privilege of serving with this man of high character, and I wish to express to his family my deepest sympathy.

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. I thank the gentleman; and I yield now to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret and sorrow we record the passing of our very dear and able friend, and former colleague, Walter Andrews.

Serving with him as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I can speak of the kind and sympathetic manner in which he considered all the problems that were presented to him as the chairman of this committee.

His previous military experience amply qualified him for this very important assignment and the efficient and constructive manner with which he organized the committee in the Eightieth Congress and carried on its work won for him the respect and admiration of all the Members on both sides of the aisle.

He was a fine, devoted and patriotic American whose one ambition in life was to preserve the principles and ideals of liberty and free government and to hand on to posterity those same great privileges and opportunities that were handed on to him.

He served his State and Nation and served them well. He will be greatly missed and it is with a feeling of deep sadness that we record his passing.

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. I thank the gentleman from Pensylvania.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so, may have five legislative days within which to extend their remarks in the RECORD at this point on the passing of our colleague.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, Walter G. Andrews came to this Congress imbued with a desire to see that America was made strong. When World War II came on our country was better prepared because of his diligence and his knowledge of military. Behind the scenes, in preparation for that great struggle, Congressman Andrews contributed no end to the adequate preparation and defense of this great nation. I always went to him for advice on questions of national preparedness. I was always rewarded by his sound suggestions. One of the things I admired most about Mr. Andrews was the fact that he never consummated anything until he had given it great thought, and after he had digested the facts in connection with any question, he submitted it and voted honestly and intelligently before the entire House. I have admired the great work that he did. America is certainly in a much more strategic position to defend herself in time of war because Walter Andrews was chairman of the Committee on the Armed Services.

His honesty, his sincerity, his forthrightness remind me of Polonius' speech in Hamlet:

To thine own self be true,
And it must follow, as the night the day,
Thou canst not then be false to any man.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, Walter G. Andrews was a tower of strength in the House of Representatives.

He probably did more to build up the defense picture of the United States than any other member. In reality, he wore himself out in the work that he did in connection with the armed services.

He was a fine character, a man of real courage and one whom the country could ill afford to lose.

We rejoice that so fine a person was able to serve with us in the House of Representatives.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, from the time I came to Congress a little more than 10 years ago until the end of the last session, it was my privilege to have served with "Ham" Andrews on the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services. As chairman of the later committee he rendered an outstanding service in its organization. In the selection of its administrative staff and other personnel he adhered strictly to the letter and spirit of the reorganization act. Aside from reducing the number of subcommittees, the organization and personnel of the committee remained unchanged when the committee was reorganized this year under a new chairman. This, I believe, was a tribute, not only to his unusual administrative ability and his sense of fairness but to his complete nonpartisanship on any matter pertaining to national defense and welfare of the Nation.

"Ham" Andrews served with distinction on the battlefields of France during World War I. He enlisted as a private and rose to the rank of major. For gallantry in action he was decorated with the Distinguished Service Cross. When he retired from Congress last year the House lost one of its most effective members and the Nation one of its most devoted public servants. "Ham" Andrews regarded nothing more sacred than the privilege of being an American.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, the country has lost a great citizen in the death of Walter Gresham Andrews. He was a truly great American, an unselfish, honorable, able man and legislator and a fine soldier.

When I first came to Congress 9 years ago he was extremely kind and helpful and always remained a true friend. He

did not hesitate to criticize me when he thought I was wrong but it was always to me directly. He had a great capacity for being kind and helpful in a quiet way. We all know his great legislative record with the Military Affairs and Armed Services Committees. He always took the broad viewpoint, thinking of his country first and did not use his influence in the committee for petty or selfish purposes. He loved to entertain and was a delightful host. In his passing I have lost a true friend and the country has lost one of its finest citizens.

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep sorrow that I read of the death of our former colleague, Walter G. Andrews, in yesterday's New York Herald Tribune. We, who are members of the New York delegation, regretted to learn last year that "Ham" was not going to run again for reelection due to ill health.

While in the Congress he devoted practically all of his time to our Nation's military affairs and, as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, he worked faithfully to bring about complete harmony in combining the duties of the old Military Affairs Committee and the Naval Affairs Committee. For 18 years he served his country in the Congress.

In 1916, "Ham" Andrews enlisted in the First Cavalry of the New York National Guard, and with that unit he went to the Mexican border. During World War I, he participated in several campaigns overseas. He was wounded and received the Distinguished Service Cross. At the time of his discharge, he was a major in the One Hundred and Seventh Infantry.

"Ham" was a graduate of my old alma mater, the Lawrenceville school in New Jersey, where he was held in very high esteem. At Princeton, he was one of its outstanding football players and after graduating from that institution, he was its varsity coach for 2 years.

At his home in Buffalo he was actively interested in the Pratt & Lambert Co. and had a wide acquaintance with the business and banking leaders of that city.

The city of Buffalo, New York State, and our country, mourn the loss of a devoted and loyal American.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound sorrow that I learned of the passing of Walter G. Andrews.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee it was my pleasure and privilege to serve under his leadership.

"Ham" Andrews demonstrated his loyalty and patriotism by serving his country on the Mexican border and in the First World War. As you all know, he had a distinguished military career, and as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services he again demonstrated his extreme devotion to his country.

Because of his understanding of the urgent necessity of preparing our country for any eventuality he brought to his work as chairman, a point of view which resulted in great accomplishment. He was a man of great determination and drive and at the same time was extremely considerate of the viewpoint of others. "Ham" Andrews may have been impatient at times; but we who worked with him never doubted that his impatience was born of a realization of the urgency and importance of his work, and a zeal to have done with vital jobs which needed doing. Underneath it all he was a generous, kind, and extremely considerate soul. Those of us who had the opportunity to work with him and know him well have lost a good friend.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, March 5, the Great Umpire called a third strike on a great American.

I shall always cherish the memory of having served as a member of the first Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives under its first chairman, the late Walter Gresham Andrews, former Member of Congress from the State of New York.

Walter Andrews, affectionately known as "Ham," possessed all of the attributes of great leadership. His vision, wisdom, and fairness will always remain a goal to which any American may proudly aspire.

I particularly cherish the memory of "Ham" Andrews because, in addition to his tremendous administrative ability and his keen appreciation of the defense needs of this country, he was also a sportsman and he played the game of life as he played baseball or football; honestly and with determination.

As a ballplayer, I fully appreciate this characteristic in a great man, and in the formation of the first Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives, "Ham" exhibited all of the qualities of leadership and direction that are found in a captain of a successful baseball club or football team. And he produced a winning combination as evidenced by the accomplishments of the first Armed Services Committee, and the assurance that it will continue as one of the greater committees of the Congress.

Winner of the Distinguished Service Cross in World War I, commander of a machine-gun company during sustained combat, and holder of the Purple Heart for wounds received in action—Member of Congress from 1930 until this past January—"Ham" Andrews devoted a great portion of his life to the American people.

The world can little spare men like "Ham" Andrews. This Congress, the armed services, and the American people owe him a debt of gratitude for his untiring efforts in behalf of our national defense. His passing leaves a void in the ranks of great living Americans.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, the death of "Ham" Andrews brings a poignant feeling of loss to me and my family. All of you knew of his intelligent, high-minded, devoted work here in Congress, especially in the program for the armed services which came from his committee. All of you may not know of his thoughtful, friendly activities and interest in all kinds of people, both in and out of Congress. He was willing to appear as a crusty old bachelor, of limited friendships and interests; he was actually a great soul, thoughtful, considerate, and kind, with a host of friends in many different circles and walks of life. He befriended me, as a freshman Congressman, 10 years ago. He was thoughtful and generous in many little kindnesses to me, my wife, and our children. His wise advice and guidance resulted in the formation of the Wednesday Nite Club, a group of Republicans who still meet, and who helped others to start similar groups, first, to learn the ropes in Congress, then to improve our work by meeting together in good fellowship, hearing experts on various subjects, then discussing these subjects informally and frankly. Many other groups doubtless owe their original inspiration to "Ham" Andrews.

He was high-minded, tough, unswerving, and courageous in his own decisions on legislative matters, but his tact, his understanding and sympathy with those of opposing views, and his organizing ability, helped to make some of the debates on vexatious defense questions generate more light and less heat, leaving fewer scars after the vote was taken. His organization of the new Armed Services Committee last session was a work of real statesmanship that will benefit our country for years to come, and could well be an example to other committees.

A bachelor, his colleagues were his family; the armed services, his friends, his country were his family. My heart goes out to his sister and his close relatives at this time, but the whole human family benefited from his life and suffered a loss in his passing.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I concur in what has been said today about the late Representative Walter G. Andrews, whose untimely passing was a shock and loss to me. I served with "Ham" Andrews, as we all affectionately called him, the last 2 years of his long and strenuous service in the House. His interest in me and kindness to me shall always be remembered. He was a real statesman and an able legislator, and I know that his life had been devoted to the protection and welfare of his country. Needless to say, he will be greatly missed by his host of friends and admirers. I should like to take this opportunity to extend to his family my sincere and deep sympathy.

BROTHERS UNITED

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, on July 18, 1944, Pfc John P. Dennewitz was killed in action. On April 15, 1945, T/5 James H. Dennewitz was killed in action, and then, Mr. Speaker, on April 16, 1945, just 24 hours later William J. Dennewitz, United States Navy, was killed in action. These men were brothers and the children of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Dennewitz, R. F. D. No. 5, Chillicothe, Ohio.

These young brothers were killed in different parts of the world, but all three of them made the supreme sacrifice in order that America might remain free. The spirits of these brothers have been united since their death and now their mortal remains have again been united in death by appropriate military services in their native Ross County, Ohio.

I know Mr. Speaker, that you and all my colleagues in this House join me in offering heartfelt sympathy to the parents of these fine American boys and are grieved beyond expression that their homecoming and reunion had to be in this manner.

I am confident that all of us will renew our pledge and redouble our efforts in the hope that we may with divine guidance somehow formulate and build a just and lasting peace in order that future tragedies such as this may be eliminated from the world scene.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURTIS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech delivered by him before the Legislature of Nebraska.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include Senate Joint Memorial No. 6 of the Oregon Legislature.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in four separate instances on the excise tax.

Mr. SCUDDER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Humboldt Times and a statement by Aubrey Drury.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF LUTHER BURBANK

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, today is the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Luther Burbank. He was born on March 7, 1849, and his birthday is observed every year as Arbor Day in California, provided for by an act of the State legislature. Today, thousands of trees will be planted in California to commemorate this man who loved and worked with nature.

Luther Burbank was known as the plant wizard. His work in the propagation of hundreds of varieties of fruit, vegetables, and flowers has caused his name to be indelibly imprinted in the minds of civilized humanity. When disease struck the potato crop in Ireland and threatened their livelihood, it was Burbank who came to the rescue by developing a potato with immunity. When the Phylloxera blight struck the vineyards of France and many of our American vineyards, Luther Burbank discovered that the California wild grape root would withstand this disease, and by its development saved the grape vineyards and the wine industry. Today the vineyards of Europe grow on California wild grape roots.

The work of Luther Burbank as the benefactor of a man cannot be overemphasized. Today in Santa Rosa, Calif., a fitting tribute is being paid this great American.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial from the February issue of the National Grange Monthly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Mr. Ellis, of the University of Arkansas.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CHESNEY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

NEW DEFINITION OF TREASON

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we have just heard two of our colleagues speak on the subject of communism. My purpose this morning is to speak on the subject of a House joint resolution which I introduced on the first day of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come when we must amend our Constitution's definition of treason which, as it now stands, is restricted to acts committed in time of war.

On the first day of this session I introduced House Joint Resolution 9, which adds to the present definition the following provisions applicable in peace as well as wartime:

> Adhering to any group which advocates the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States, or collaborating with any agent or adherent of a foreign nation in working for the overthrow or weakening of the Government of the United States, whether or not by force or violence.

I believe that the people of our country desire the opportunity to add this new definition to our Constitution's provisions. Many veterans' organizations have endorsed it and many civic and other organizations. We should pass this immediately so that the legislatures of the various States can pass upon it without delay. I hope that if any Congressman is in doubt on this proposal that his constituents will let him know their opinions upon it. Personally, I feel that there is no doubt that the vast majority of Americans want to have a chance to put this provision in our Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this country, in my opinion, are astounded by the fact the Congress has not yet acted after all of these investigations which are very worthy. Laws against the Communists should be enacted, and our Constitution should be revised along the lines I have suggested.

MINNESOTA FEPC LEGISLATION

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, on Friday of last week the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] addressed the House for 1 minute. He prefaced his remarks with an excellent quotation to this effect, that "while the lamp holds out to burn, the vilest sinner may return." He went on then to commend the legislature of the State of Minnesota for having voted down the Fair Employment Practice Act. I would like to inform the Speaker that repentance in Minnesota followed fast, and on Friday, almost at the time when the gentleman from Mississippi was addressing the House, Senate Committee of the State Legislature of Minnesota reconsidered the FEPC and voted favorably on the measure. There is joy over the one that has returned; the lamp still burns for others.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WILLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement he made before the Civil Functions Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations on Flood Control.

Mr. PASSMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include editorials.

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. COFFEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Senator MYERS on the bill S. 1163.

Mrs. DOUGLAS (at the request of Mr. HOLIFIELD) was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in five instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAVENNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include newspaper excerpts.

Mr. FURCOLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a magazine article.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. HULL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include resolutions.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GOLDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of Federal taxation.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor may sit this week at times when there is no legislation on the floor of the House, or when the House is not in session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am making the announcement that we have this morning started hearings on the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. I will make another announcement, that by a majority vote the Committee on Minimum Wages, has voted that no roll call be taken on that particular bill before Wednesday, so I am setting Wednesday for a roll call on the minimum-wage bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCRIVNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include tables relating to aid to education.

Mr. POTTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a joint statement prepared by Representatives FORD, ENGEL of Michigan, and himself.

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include two editorials.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter, also a statement he made before the Committee on Agriculture.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Friday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. McDONOUGH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE FEPC BILL BEFORE THE LEGISLATURE OF MINNESOTA

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we have just listened to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] boasting that the committee of the Minnesota Legislature handling the so-called FEPC bill has reversed itself and reported that communistic monstrosity favorable.

If the gentleman from Minnesota gets any consolation out of this movement toward industrial suicide for his home State, it must be based upon his lack of information on the subject.

Instead of the committee reversing itself, only one member of that committee agreed to change his vote in order to let the measure come to the floor of the House, but in so doing he announced that he would vote against the bill.

Industries are running out of those States that have already adopted the FEPC program, which we all know was promulgated by Joe Stalin in 1920; and I predict that if the legislature imposes it upon the people of Minnesota it will sound the death knell of the industrial progress which that State is now making.

If the people of that great State want the legislature to commit industrial suicide for them in that way, I do not know of anything that we can do about it here. But I am reasonably certain that the sponsors of this communistic program could not ram it through both Houses of the Congress of the United States from now until doomsday.

The hush-hush attempts now being made in those States where this program has been adopted fails to conceal the evil influence it is having on the industrial progress of those areas.

It hangs like the sword of Damocles over the head of every businessman in those States where it has been adopted; and many of them are closing out their enterprises and moving elsewhere.

For instance, I have a letter before me here from a businessman who is out now looking for a place for his plant. He happens to have been in business in a State that adopted the FEPC, which compelled him as well as others to close down and move to some other State.

In this letter he says:

> I have been in business in the State of ——— for a long time. I am now getting the hell out of there.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL SECURITY ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 99)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The maintenance of adequate armed forces has been one of the principal functions of the Federal Government since the establishment of this Nation. Today we maintain our armed forces in support of our primary desire for world peace. They are evidence of our determination to devote our utmost efforts toward achieving that all-important goal.

Throughout our history, the steady advance of science and technology has resulted in constant changes in the means of warfare and the character of our armed forces. In the few years since the cessation of hostilities in World War II, tremendous developments in technology have been made. The speed of aircraft has doubled, the means of undersea warfare have been revolutionized, the range and accuracy of guided missiles have increased, the potentialities of the atom have been more fully revealed.

The development of man's ability to shrink space and time and to control natural forces makes imperative a corresponding development of the means for directing and controlling these new powers. The effective and workable organization of our Government, and especially of our armed forces, is essential in the modern world.

The recent reports of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government have focused attention on the importance of the sound organization of the Federal Government. The Commission has stated that the first essential to the achievement of better government is a general clarification of the lines of authority and responsibility within the executive branch. In its report entitled "National Security Organization," the Commission has specifically applied this principle to the organization of our armed forces. The report states that we now lack adequate civilian authority and control over the military forces, that maximum efficiency and economy is not being realized in defense expenditures, and that interservice relationships must be improved to achieve the most effective defense. The recommendations of the Commission which would strengthen the National Military Establishment and the position of the Secretary of Defense have great merit and present an objective toward which I believe we must continue to move.

I have long been aware of the necessity for keeping our national security organization abreast of our security requirements. To this end I recommended unification of the armed forces to the Congress in December 1945. My desire was to improve our defense organization while the lessons of World War II were still fresh in the minds of all. We must not forget these lessons in evaluating our security position today.

A great deal was learned from those 4 years of war. We learned, among other things, that the organization of our War and Navy Departments, prescribed by detailed statutes, was far too rigid and inflexible for the actual conduct of war. We learned that modern war required the combined use of air, naval, and land forces welded together under unified commands overseas, and under the strategic direction of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Other lessons were also learned. We learned that widely diverse supply policies of the separate services were costly and hampered the total effectiveness of military operations. We learned that there were great differences in training and combat doctrine among the services, and that these differences often provoked sharp conflicts in our theaters of operation.

My message to the Congress of December 1945 had a double purpose. It was intended to take advantage of our wartime experience and to prevent a return to the outmoded forms of organization which existed at the outbreak of the war.

Following that message the subject of the proper organization of our armed forces was debated throughout the Nation. After the most careful consideration the National Security Act was enacted by the Congress in July 1947.

This act has provided a practical and workable basis for beginning the unification of the military services and for coordinating military policy with foreign and economic policy. A few examples of the progress achieved in the period since the act became effective are evidence of its value.

The efficiency of military purchasing has steadily increased until today more than 75 percent of the matériel of the armed services is procured under coordinated purchasing arrangements.

A number of joint training and education programs have been instituted so that the personnel of each service may gain a greater understanding of the weapons and doctrine of the other services.

A uniform code of military justice has been developed, designed to be applicable to the personnel of all the armed forces. This code is now before the Congress for its consideration.

The coordination of military policy with foreign and economic policies has been greatly improved, principally through the efforts of National Security Council and the National Security Resources Board.

The past 13 months have dispelled any doubt that unification of the armed forces can yield great advantages to the Nation. No one advocates a return to the outmoded organization of the days preceding the National Security Act. On the contrary, the issue today is not whether we should have unification, but how we can make it more effective.

We have now had sufficient experience under the act to be able to identify and correct its weaknesses, without impairing the advantages we have obtained from its strength. We have also had the advantage of a thoroughgoing appraisal by the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. On the basis of our experience to date, as further borne out by the Commission, we should now proceed to make the needed improvements in the act.

The duties and responsibilities of the Secretary of Defense as now set forth in the act are of too limited a character and are restricted to specified items. For example, the act expressly provides that all duties not specifically conferred upon the Secretary of Defense are to remain vested in the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. While the Secretary of Defense, as the head of the National Military Establishment, ought to be ultimately accountable, under the President, for its administration, he is specifically limited by this act in the degree to which he may hold the military departments responsible to him. The departmental Secretaries are specifically authorized to deal directly with higher authority. Furthermore, many of the key responsibilities of the Secretary of Defense have been assigned by this statute, not to the Secretary, but to boards and agencies which derive much of their authority from the military departments themselves.

In short, the act fails to provide for a fully responsible official with authority adequate to meet his responsibility, whom the President and the Congress can hold accountable. The act fails to provide the basis for an organization and a staff adequate to achieve the most efficient and economical defense program and to attain effective and informed civilian control.

I, therefore, recommend that the National Security Act be amended to accomplish two basic purposes: First, to convert the National Military Establishment into an executive department of the Government, to be known as the Department of Defense; and, second, to provide the Secretary of Defense with appropriate responsibility and authority, and with civilian and military assistance adequate to fulfill his enlarged responsibility.

Within the new Department of Defense, I recommend that the Departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force be designated as military departments. The responsibility of the Secretary of Defense for exercising direction, authority, and control over the affairs of the Department of Defense should be made clear. Furthermore, the present limitations and restrictions which are inappropriate to his status as head of an executive department should be removed. The Secretary of Defense should be the sole representative of the Department of Defense on the National Security Council.

I am not recommending the blanket transfer of all statutory authority applicable to the Departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to the Secretary of Defense. Neither am I recommending any change in the statutory assignment of combatant functions to the Army, Navy, and Air Force. I recommend, however, that the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force administer the respective military departments under the authority, direction, and control of the Secretary of Defense.

To meet these additional responsibilities, the Secretary of Defense needs strengthened civilian and military assistance. This can be provided by the creation of new posts and by the conversion of existing agencies of the National Military Establishment into staff units for the Secretary. I recommend that Congress provide an Under Secretary of Defense and three Assistant Secretaries of Defense.

The duties now placed by statute in the Munitions Board and the Research and Development Board should be recognized as responsibilities of the Secretary of Defense. The act should be amended to make possible the flexible use of both of these agencies, and of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as staff units for the Secretary of Defense. Finally, I recommend that the Congress provide for a Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to be nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate, to take precedence over all other military personnel, and to be the principal military adviser to the President and the Secretary of Defense, and to perform such other duties as they may prescribe.

In my judgment, these changes will make possible effective organization and management of the Department of Defense. They will provide a responsible official at its head, with strengthened civilian and military assistance, to undertake the immense job of aiding the President and the Congress in determining defense needs and in supervising the administration of our defense activities. These measures are essential to continued and accelerated progress toward unification. I am convinced that only through making steady progress toward this goal can we be assured of serving our major objectives, the most effective organization of our armed forces, a full return on our defense dollar, and strengthened civilian control.

I urge the Congress to give prompt consideration to these recommendations. From the standpoint of present and potential cost to the Nation, there is no more important area in which to work for improved organization and operations. Action on these recommendations will prove beneficial to the Congress, the American people, and the President by providing better means of assuring defense needs and administering the defense program. We should seize this opportunity to strengthen our defense organization which is so vital to the security of this Nation and the peace of the world.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 5, 1949.*

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES: FOREIGN AFFAIRS ACTIVITIES (H. DOC. NO. 98)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying message, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The conduct of the foreign relations of the United States has become an increasingly momentous responsibility of our Federal Government. Many of our hopes for world peace and domestic security are dependent upon the effectiveness of our machinery for the development of foreign policy and for translating policies into action.

The foreign affairs activities of this Government are carried on by a number of agencies, but the greatest share of the responsibility is borne by the Department of State. Moreover, the President, and the Congress as well, rely upon the Secretary of State to provide leadership

among the Government agencies concerned with various aspects of foreign affairs and to recommend the steps necessary to achieve an integrated and consistent foreign policy.

The State Department has for some time recognized the need for modifications and improvements in its internal organization to enable it to discharge the increased responsibilities which have been assigned to it in the postwar period. During the past year, under the leadership of Secretary Marshall, the Department made certain urgent adjustments in its organization and undertook comprehensive studies of its long-range organizational requirements. The major recommendations arising from these studies received my approval some months ago, but were not placed in effect pending the completion of the report of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

The Commission has made a thorough study of our governmental machinery for the conduct of foreign affairs. With respect to the organization of the Department of State, the Commission's recommendations generally embody and endorse the organizational plans formulated by the Department. With my approval, the Secretary of State is now proceeding to put these plans into effect.

In order fully to carry out this reorganization, two changes in the statutes governing the Department are required. First, additional positions of Assistant Secretary of State should be created to permit the Department to organize its principal activities on a geographic basis and, at the same time, to maintain its requisite relationships with the Congress, and with the other executive agencies and the international organizations. Second, certain powers vested by the Foreign Service Act of 1946 in subordinate officials should be placed in the Secretary, subject to his delegation. This action is needed to provide the Secretary with authority commensurate with his responsibilities, and further to apply the principle, strongly recommended by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, of clarifying the lines of responsibility and authority within the executive branch.

Early action on these measures is desirable to strengthen this Government's resources for achieving its international objectives.

The suggestions of the Commission with regard to the personnel management of the Department of State and the Foreign Service will require additional study before recommendations can be submitted to the Congress.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 4, 1949.*

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McDaniel, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution (S. Res. 80):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. J. MELVILLE BROUGHTON, late a Senator from the State of North Carolina.

Resolved, That a committee of 16 Senators be appointed by the Vice President to take order for superintending the funeral of the deceased.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock meridian tomorrow.

The message also announced that pursuant to the foregoing resolution the Vice President had appointed Mr. HOEY, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. DONNELL, Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. THYE, Mr. KEM, Mr. STENNIS, and Mr. KERR as members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article on the restoration of Red Hill, the home of Patrick Henry.

Mr. THOMPSON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech by Hon. Willis Bradley, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds the limit established by the Joint Committee on Printing and will cost $248.50.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement on the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. SPENCE (at the request of Mr. BUCHANAN) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD regarding sections 4 and 5 of the housing bill.

Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include the testimony given by the dean of the A. and M. College of Texas.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter in each case.

Mr. SANBORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the life and character of Col. James Perry Alvey, one of the most valuable men he has known since being in Washington.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order for today. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks may be printed in the RECORD at the end of the legislative program and other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day.

The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER PARKWAY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1997) to authorize the survey of a proposed Mississippi River Parkway for the purpose of determining the feasibility of such a national parkway, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CRAWFORD objected.

COUNTY OF ALLEGHENY, PA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1959) for the relief of the county of Allegheny, Pa.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the county of Allegheny, Pa., the sum of $29,147.50, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for damages sustained by the County of Allegheny, Pa., by a fire which completely destroyed a building known as Agricultural Hall, located in South Park, county of Allegheny, Pa., on February 16, 1944, while being occupied, used, and exclusively under the control of the War Department: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CERTAIN POSTAL EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2049) for the relief of certain postal employees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 593) for the relief of certain postal employees be substituted for the House bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all employees at first- and second-class post offices who were reduced from the position of regular clerk or regular carrier to the position of substitute clerk or substitute carrier prior to July 1, 1945, or who were formerly regular clerk or regular carrier and were reinstated as substitute clerk or substitute carrier prior to July 1, 1945, and whose compensation was converted to $1.24 per hour effective July 1, 1945, instead of $1.04 per hour as provided by sections 12 (a) and 24 of the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the Postal Service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 435, ch. 274), are hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States any amounts paid to them as a result of such overpayment of salaries from July 1, 1945, until the date their compensation was adjusted to conform to the provisions of the

act of July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 435, ch. 274), as amended, and in the audit and settlement of the accounts any postmaster or other designated disbursing officer of the Post Office Department or postal service the amounts paid to such employees from July 1, 1945, as compensation shall be considered to have been authorized. Any amounts heretofore credited to such employees, or refunded to the United States by them on account of such overpayment of salaries shall be repaid to them out of any money available for the payment of salaries to city delivery carriers and clerks at first- and second-class offices: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT TO COMMISSIONED GRADE IN THE SUPPLY CORPS OF THE NAVY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 630) to amend section 19 of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), so as to remove the upper age limit for appointment to commissioned grade in the Supply Corps of the Navy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 19 of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 19. No person shall be appointed to a commissioned grade in the Supply Corps of the Navy who will be less than 21 years of age on July 1 of the calendar year in which appointed and until his physical, mental, and moral qualifications have been established to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Navy."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UPPER HALF PAY AND ALLOWANCES FOR NAVAL RESERVE ADMIRALS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 673) relating to the pay and allowances of officers of the Naval Reserve performing active duty in the grade of rear admiral, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any officer of the Naval Reserve serving in the grade of rear admiral shall, receive the pay and allowances prescribed by law for rear admirals of the upper half when any officer of the active list of the line of the Regular Navy, junior to him, is in the upper half of the list of rear admirals: *Provided*, That the provisions of this act shall not apply to officers of the Naval Reserve while on any lineal list established pursuant to title III of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947: *Provided further*, That no back pay or allowances shall be held to have accrued under the provisions of this act for any period prior to the date of its approval.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, after the comma, insert the following: "When otherwise entitled to active-duty pay and allowances."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE MARINE BAND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2485) to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the Eighty-third and Final National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held in Indianapolis, Ind., August 28 to September 1, 1949.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized to permit the band of the United States Marine Corps to attend and give concerts at the eighty-third and final national encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, to be held in Indianapolis, Ind., August 28–September 1, 1949.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of defraying the expenses of such band in attending and giving concerts at such convention, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated a sufficient sum to cover the cost of transportation and pullman accommodations for the leaders and members of the Marine Band, and allowance not to exceed $8 per day each for additional traveling and living expenses while on duty, such allowance to be in addition to the pay and allowance to which they would be entitled while serving their permanent station.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT TO THE BANKRUPTCY ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2513) to amend subdivisions (d) and (e) of section 58 of an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ELSTON objected.

AMENDMENT TO THE NATIONAL SECURITY ACT OF 1947

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2216) to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to provide for an Under Secretary of Defense.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 202 of the National Security Act of 1947, approved July 26, 1947 (61 Stat. 496; 5 U. S. C., sec. 171a), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) There shall be an Under Secretary of Defense, who shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Under Secretary shall perform such duties, and shall exercise such powers, as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe. The Under Secretary shall act for, and exercise the powers of, the Secretary of Defense during his absence or disability."

SEC. 2. Subsection (a) of section 301 of such act (5 U. S. C., sec. 171b), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"The Under Secretary of Defense shall receive the compensation prescribed by law for Under Secretaries of executive departments."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, after line 9, insert "*Provided*, That a person who has within 10 years been on active duty as a commissioned officer in a Regular component of the armed services shall not be eligible for appointment as Under Secretary of Defense."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARKING OF VEHICLES ON POST-OFFICE PROPERTY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2660) to prohibit the parking of vehicles upon any property owned by the United States for postal services.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be unlawful to park, store, or leave any vehicle of any kind, whether attended or not, or for the owner of any vehicle of any kind to allow, permit, or suffer the same to be parked, stored, or left, whether attended or not, upon any property owned by the United States for postal purposes, over which the United States has exclusive or concurrent jurisdiction, without the consent of the postmaster, custodian, or any other officer of the United States charged with the custody and control of such property. Whoever violates the provisions of this act, or any rules or regulations promulgated hereunder, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $25.

SEC. 2. The Postmaster General is hereby authorized and empowered to promulgate such rules and regulations as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. Violations of such rules and regulations shall be subject to the penalties prescribed in section 1 of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CREATION OF PROFESSIONAL AND SCIENTIFIC POSITIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 20) to amend the act of August 1, 1947, as amended, to authorize the creation of 10 professional and scientific positions in the headquarters and research stations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if a member of the committee would explain this bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The purpose of this bill is to establish 10 positions in the professional-scientific service within the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. Under an act passed by the Eightieth Congress certain positions were created within the Department of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force which authorized the payment of more than $10,000 to certain employees and certain persons doing work of a professional nature. This extends that by creating 10 additional positions in the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

The purpose of this is explained in a letter from Mr. Hunsaker of the National

Advisory Committee for Aeronautics to the chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, in which he states the following:

It has become difficult for NACA to hold and attract outstanding scientists while being at a competitive-salary disadvantage, not only with industry but with the three military services as well.

It is believed, as was brought in the hearings, that the refusal of the Congress to create these 10 additional positions would greatly impair the work of the NACA.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Are these 10 new positions, or are they simply increasing the salaries of positions that now exist?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is to increase the salaries of positions that now exist.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. In other words, what this is, in fact, is a pay increase, a salary-increase bill for just these classifications?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not exactly, because they have such difficulty in holding the men that they have. There has been quite a turn-over.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman feel that it would be inadvisable to consider these 10 positions in connection with the pay bill which I understand the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service is now studying?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That bill will not affect anybody but the Chairman of the NACA.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. In the judgment of the gentleman, there is no direct relationship?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Except wherein the chairmanship is concerned, and if I am not mistaken, that bill provides for $15,000 salary for him anyhow.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, does the gentleman know what the budget is for NACA for the next fiscal year?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I cannot say that I do. But, the Budget Commission has endorsed this bill.

Mr. STEFAN. Does the budget allow the amount of money for these 10 additional professional positions in the budget for the fiscal year 1950?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That I cannot say, but the Budget Commission has approved this bill along with the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. STEFAN. The bill has budget approval for the appropriation for this salary increase in the budget for 1950, and the appropriation is now before us.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That I cannot say, sir.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I am informed that they have, sir, but I have not personally checked it.

Mr. STEFAN. I withdraw my reservation, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the act entitled "An act to authorize the creation of additional positions in the professional and scientific service in the War and Navy Departments," approved August 1, 1947, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That (a) the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force are respectively authorized to establish and fix the compensation for, within their respective departments, not more than 13 positions each, and the Secretary of Defense is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for not more than 6 positions, each such position being established to effectuate those research and development functions, relating to the national defense, military and naval medicine, and any and all other activities of the National Military Establishment which requires the services of specially qualified scientific or professional personnel.

"(b) The Chairman of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for, in the headquarters and research stations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, not to exceed 10 positions in the professional and scientific service, each such position being established in order to enable the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics to secure and retain the services of specially qualified personnel necessary in the discharge of the duty of the Committee to supervise and direct the scientific study of the problems of flight with a view to their practical solution.

"(c) The rates of compensation for positions established pursuant to the provisions of this act shall not be less than $10,000 per annum nor more than $15,000 per annum and shall be subject to the approval of the Civil Service Commission."

SEC. 2. Section 3 of such act of August 1, 1947, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. The Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics shall submit to the Congress, not later than December 31 of each year, a report setting forth the number of positions established pursuant to this act in the National Military Establishment and in the headquarters and research stations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, respectively, during that calendar year, and the name, rate of compensation, and description of the qualifications of each incumbent, together with a statement of the functions performed by each. In any instance where the Secretary or the Chairman, respectively, may consider full public report on these items detrimental to the national security, he is authorized to omit such items from his annual report and, in lieu thereof, to present such information in executive sessions of such committees of the Senate and House of Representatives as the presiding officers of those bodies shall designate."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPLETION OF PROCESSING OF VISA CASES

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 160) to authorize completion of the processing of the visa cases, and admission into the United States, of certain alien fiancés and fiancées of members, or of former members, of the armed forces of the United States, as was provided in the so-called GI Fiancées Act (60 Stat. 339), as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas the so-called GI Fiancées Act, as amended and extended, expired on December 31, 1948, at which time several hundred cases of alien fiancés or fiancées of American citizen members, or former members, of the armed forces of the United States were pending under that act at American consular offices abroad; and

Whereas the quotas to which the aliens in most cases are chargeable are oversubscribed for several years: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That American diplomatic and consular officers are hereby authorized to finish processing all cases of the alien fiancés or fiancées of citizens of the United States which were pending at American diplomatic and consular offices on December 31, 1948, under Public Law 471, Seventy-ninth Congress (60 Stat. 339), as amended and extended, in the same manner as if that act were still in effect: *Provided*, That the American citizen concerned in each case has personally met his or her fiancé or fiancée: *Provided further*, That the processing of all such cases shall be completed and the aliens concerned, who are granted visas, as well as those who received such visas before January 1, 1949, and were unable to come to the United States for reasons beyond their control, who arrive at a port of entry in the United States before July 1, 1949, and who are found to be admissible under the immigration laws, including the provisions of Public Law 471, as amended, may be admitted into the United States within the period of validity of the visa, as provided in Public Law 471, as amended, the same as if it were still in effect: *And provided further*, That the record of entry of aliens admitted under the provisions of this act, who within 90 days of admission marry the fiancé or fiancée to whom they were destined at the time of entry, shall upon the submission of proof of marriage, be amended to show admission for permanent residence.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALTER: Page 2, line 21, after the comma as it appears after the word "act", insert the following: "and under the provisions of Public Law 471, as amended."

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF POSTMASTERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 253) to amend the act of June 25, 1938, relating to the appointment of postmasters under civil service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will a member of the committee kindly explain to the membership what this bill does?

Mr. MORRISON. This bill merely takes away the requirement for the appointment of a postmaster where a post office changes from third class to fourth class, and vice versa, where the post office changes from fourth class to third class, so that it is not necessary to have another examination and have the appointing all over again of a postmaster. If a post office changes from third class to fourth class, under this bill the postmaster remains the same. If the post office changes from fourth class to third class, the postmaster still remains the same.

This bill was considered by the subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office

and Civil Service. It has a favorable report from the National Association of Postmasters, the Civil Service Commission, and the Postmaster General. It was unanimously passed by the House subcommittee and unanimously passed by the full Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of interest expressed in this bill by people who depend upon third- and fourth-class offices in my district for their service. I appreciate the gentleman's explanation and hope the bill passes.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. GOLDEN. Is it not a fact that this bill just does away with the extra expense of an examination?

Mr. MORRISON. The gentleman is correct. The cost is $65 per post office, and last year some 300 post offices were involved in these changes, so that much will be saved.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, this bill has much to commend it and should pass unanimously. I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act entitled "An act extending the classified civil service to include postmasters of the first, second, and third classes, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1076), as amended, is amended by striking out the following after the word *"Provided,"*: "That postmasters now serving may continue to serve until the end of their terms, but they shall not acquire a classified civil-service status at the expiration of such terms of office except as provided in section 2 hereof" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "That postmasters of the fourth class, appointed in the classified civil service, whose offices advance to a higher class, and postmasters of other classes, appointed in the classified civil service, whose offices are relegated to the fourth class, shall continue to serve under their original appointment until a vacancy occurs by reason of death, resignation, retirement, or removal, in which event the appointment shall be made as provided in section 2 of the act."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PENSIONS FOR VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I AND WORLD WAR II

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2661) to provide pensions for veterans of World War I and World War II based on nonservice-connected disability and attained age, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

MINING CLAIMS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 942) to amend the act entitled "An act to amend section 9 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 512)" (Public Law 598, 80th Cong.).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to amend section 9 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 512)" (Public Law 598, 80th Cong.), is amended to read as follows: "That the first proviso of section 9 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 512, 515), be amended to read as follows: 'Provided, That all authorized indebtedness shall be paid in the order of its creation; all taxes shall be uniform upon the same class of subjects and shall be levied and collected under general laws, and the assessments shall be according to the true and full value thereof, except that all mining claims may be valued at the price paid the United States therefor, or at a flat rate fixed by the legislature, but if the surface ground is used for other than mining purposes, and has a separate and independent value for such other purpose, or if there are improvements or machinery or other property thereon of such a character as to be deemed a part of the realty, then the same shall be taxed according to the true and full value thereof. No tax shall be levied for Territorial purposes in excess of 2 percent upon the assessed valuation of the property therein in any 1 year; nor shall any incorporated town or municipality levy any tax, for any purpose, in excess of 3 percent of the assessed valuation of property within the town in any 1 year'."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the first proviso of section 9 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended by the act of June 3, 1948 (62 Stat. 302), be further amended by deleting the phrase 'unpatented mining claims and nonproducing patented mining claims, which are also unimproved,' and inserting in lieu thereof the phrase 'all mining claims'."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE YOUNG AMERICAN MEDAL FOR BRAVERY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 157) authorizing the Attorney General of the United States to recognize and to award to outstanding courageous young Americans a medal for heroism known as the Young American Medal for Bravery, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to promulgate rules and regulations establishing a medal; the method of selecting such recipient thereof and awarding the same to any child residing in the United States, who is 18 years old or under, who has exhibited exceptional courage, extraordinary decision, presence of mind, and unusual swiftness of action, regardless of his or her own personal safety, in an effort to save or successfully saving the life or lives of any person or persons whose life or lives were in actual imminent danger.

SEC. 2. The Attorney General shall also honor by an appropriate medal such American boy or girl citizens, 18 years old or under, who, in the opinion of the Attorney General, shall have achieved outstanding or unusual recognition for character and service during any given year.

SEC. 3. The medal to be awarded for bravery or valor as defined in section 1 of this act shall be known as the Young American Medal for Bravery, while the medal for outstanding character and service as defined in section 2 of this act shall be known as the Young American Medal for Service, and such medals shall be presented by the Attorney General in person, or through a duly authorized representative designated by the Attorney General.

SEC. 4. Accompanying such medals herein designated there shall be an appropriate certificate of commendation presented to the recipient or recipients stating (a) the circumstances under which the act of bravery was performed, and (b) citing the outstanding recognition for character and service.

SEC. 5. It shall be the duty of the Attorney General to make a report to the Congress at the end of each fiscal year and to furnish the Congress with a list of the names of all those upon whom he shall have conferred either of such medals.

SEC. 6. It shall also be the duty of the Attorney General to list in his annual budget request the sum of money necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, which sum is hereby authorized.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 15, after the word "presented", insert the word "personally."

In lines 16 and 17, delete the language "in person, or through a duly authorized representative designated by the Attorney General," and insert in lieu thereof "for and on behalf, and in the name of the President and the Congress of the United States of America."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALASKA GAME LAW

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 220) to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to revise the Alaska game law," approved July 1, 1943, as amended (57 Stat. 301).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act entitled "An act to revise the Alaska game law," approved July 1, 1943, as amended (57 Stat. 301), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. Residence and citizenship: That for the purposes of this act a citizen or a national of the United States who has resided in the Territory for a continuous period of 12 months immediately preceding his claim for resident hunting, trapping, fishing, or other privileges under this act, or a foreign-born person not a citizen or national of the United States who has declared his intention to become a citizen of the United States, and who has resided in the Territory for a like period, shall be considered a resident; but if such a foreign-born person shall not have been admitted to citizenship within 7 years from the date he declared his first intention to become a citizen, he shall thereafter be deemed to be an alien until admitted to citizenship: *Provided, however*, That whenever the Secretary shall determine the fur resources of Alaska are threatened by hunting or trapping, or from other causes, he may, in his discretion and for such periods as he shall determine, extend the required residence period in the Territory from 12 months to 3 years as a prerequisite to obtaining a resident trapping license; a citizen or a national of the United States who

has not resided in the Territory for a continuous period of 12 months, or for the extended period of 3 years, as the case may be, immediately preceding his claim for resident privileges shall be considered a nonresident; and a person not a citizen or a national of the United States who is not a resident of the Territory, as defined in this section, shall be considered an alien."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, strike out the word "resided" and insert in lieu thereof the words "maintained a bona fide residence."

Page 1, line 8, strike out the word "continuous."

Page 2, line 14, following the words "months to", insert the words "not exceed."

Page 2, line 16, strike out the word "resided" and insert in lieu thereof the words "maintained a bona fide residence."

Page 2, line 16, strike out the word "continuous."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALASKA COUNCIL OF BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1337) to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the Alaska Council of Boy Scouts of America for recreation and other public purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Alaska Council of Boy Scouts of America is hereby authorized for a period of 1 year from and after the effective date of this act to apply for the purchase of, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to convey to the organization for recreation and other public purposes the following-described public lands situated in Alaska:

The east half of the northwest quarter and the northeast quarter of unsurveyed section 2, township 15 north, range 1 west; Seward meridian, embracing 240 acres.

SEC. 2. That the conveyance shall be made upon the payment by the said council for the land at its reasonable appraised price of not less than $1.25 per acre, to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That the conveyance hereby authorized shall not include any land covered by a valid existing right initiated under the public-land laws or found by the Secretary of the Interior to be needed for public purposes: *Provided further*, That the coal and other mineral deposits in the land shall be reserved to the United States, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 14, after the word "under", insert "applicable laws and."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLAIMS OF ALIEN ENEMIES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 29) to authorize payment of claims based on loss of or damage to property deposited by alien enemies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would appreciate it if the chairman of the committee, or someone, would explain this bill.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, this bill authorizes the Attorney General to pay claims of less than $1,000 to former enemy aliens, particularly those on the west coast, whose property was taken by the military authorities. In many instances the Japanese there were forced to evacuate their homes, and cameras, binoculars, and other important items of personal property were seized by the military. This bill permits all those whose personal property was thus taken, where the property has not been restored, to file claims with the Attorney General, and the Attorney General is permitted to allow those claims, provided they are under $1,000. If they are above $1,000, he must report back to the Congress.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman, and wish to ask him one more question. Does this bill include enemy aliens in the Islands of the Pacific and of the Philippines and Hawaii?

Mr. CELLER. I do not think there is any limitation in the bill. It is my understanding from a cursory reading at this time that those aliens would be benefited by the act.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Does the gentleman have any information as to how many of them there are and how much money it would cost?

Mr. CELLER. I am informed the amount is not very large, because the items are not very great or costly.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Does it exceed $1,000,000?

Mr. CELLER. Oh, no; nothing like that.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, from what funds are these claims to be paid?

Mr. CELLER. This bill provides for the appropriation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is hereby authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, settle, and pay in an amount not in excess of $1,000, when accepted by the claimant in full satisfaction and final settlement, any claim against the United States arising on or after December 7, 1941, for damage to, or loss or destruction of, personal property, the use, operation, possession, custody, or control of which was prohibited by proclamation No. 2525, dated December 7, 1941, and proclamations No. 2526 and No. 2527, dated December 8, 1941 (55 Stat. pt. 2, pp. 1700, 1705, and 1707), the possession of which property was not prohibited by law prior to said promulgations and which was deposited by alien enemies or United States citizens of Japanese ancestry in the manner provided in the regulations promulgated by the Attorney General on February 5, 1942, as amended (7 Fed. Reg. 844; 28 C. F. R. 30.1–30.16): *Provided*, That the damage to or loss or destruction of property shall not have been caused in whole or in part by any negligence or wrongful act on the part of the claimant, his agent, or employee, and that the claim is substantiated in such manner as the Attorney General may by regulation prescribe: *Provided further*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the Attorney General to pay or settle any claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property which had been used for espionage or other illegal purposes on or before December 7, 1941.

SEC. 2. No claim shall be considered unless presented in writing within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 3. Any decision or settlement made by the Attorney General under the authority of this act and such regulations as he may prescribe shall be final and conclusive, notwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary.

SEC. 4. The Attorney General may report such claims as exceed $1,000 to Congress for its consideration.

SEC. 5. Such appropriations as may be required for the settlement of claims under this act are hereby authorized.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CERTAIN CONSULTANTS FORMERLY EMPLOYED BY THE TECHNICAL INDUSTRIAL INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEE OF THE FOREIGN ECONOMIC ADMINISTRATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1950) for the relief of certain consultants formerly employed by the Technical Industrial Intelligence Committee of the Foreign Economic Administration, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That no provisions of any law, regulation, or order (including travel orders or authorizations) which authorize or direct deductions from per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence for items of meals or lodging obtained free or purchased from any Government agency or from the Military Establishment or from any branch of the Government drawing rations from the military or providing quarters by arrangement with the military, shall be deemed to apply to those persons employed as technical, scientific, or other form of expert consultant by the Technical Industrial Intelligence Committee division of the Foreign Economic Administration without compensation or at $1 per annum during the fiscal years 1945 and 1946, by reason of such employment and during the period thereof; and no deductions shall be taken from per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence to such employees for any such meals or lodging during such employment (such meals or lodging being sometimes referred to herein as "items").

SEC. 2. Any charges for such items against the accounts of such employees appearing on the books of any Government agency shall be canceled and eliminated, and proper credits shall be entered against such accounts therefor.

SEC. 3. No certificate or statement as to such items furnished such employees shall be required of them.

SEC. 4. In order to carry out the provisions and purposes of this act—

(a) In any case wherein any such employee has not been paid any sum for said allowance and has not been advanced any funds for travel or other expenses, the Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed to allow credits or to cancel charges for such items in the accounts of such employee (whether on accounts in his office or in the office of any certifying, disbursing, or other accountable officer) and in the accounts of any present or former certifying, disbursing, or other accountable officer.

(b) In any case wherein any such employee may have been paid such allowance without deductions for such items, the Comptroller General is authorized and directed to allow credits or to cancel charges therefor in the same manner and to the same extent as provided in paragraph (a) of this section.

(c) In any case wherein any such employee has furnished a certificate as to such items, as a result whereof deductions therefor were taken from any sums paid him for such allowance, or in any case wherein any such employee has paid or refunded any sums to any Government agency by reason of claim made against him for such items, a sum equivalent to the amount of such deductions or refund shall be paid to such employee, and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to make such payments; and, for such purpose, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this paragraph; and the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to allow credits or to cancel charges therefor in the same manner and to the same extent as provided in paragraph (a) of this section.

(d) In any case wherein sums for travel or other expenses have been advanced to any such employee, or in any case wherein any such employee has been partially paid on account of such allowance, the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to allow credits or to cancel charges for such items in the same manner and to the same extent as provided in paragraph (a) of this section, so that any such charges will be eliminated and canceled in determining whether such employees or the Government is entitled to any difference between such advance or partial payment and the allowable per diem: *Provided, however*, That in any case wherein any sums were advanced to any such employee for travel or other expenses, the disbursing officer shall be credited for charges for such items only to the extent of any such advances outstanding.

SEC. 5. Any surety on any bond furnished by any such employee is hereby relieved from any liability by reason of any claim or charges for any such items.

SEC. 6. No provision of this act shall apply to or prejudice any claim of the United States against any such employee or the surety on his bond by reason of any item other than those specified in section 1 of this act; and any refunds or payments made to any such employee by reason of this act shall be subject to deductions by reason of any other proper charges against the account of any such employee.

SEC. 7. Any refund or payment to any such employee, or any credit or cancellation of any charges for such items, made by reason of this act, shall be in full settlement of all claims by any such employee against the United States or any department or agency thereof for reimbursement for expenses of such employee for such items.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING TRANSFER OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

The Clerk called the bill (S. 170) to authorize the transfer of certain property to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire of the chairman of the committee about this, first, as to how much it would cost.

Mr. GRANGER. I have a similar bill to S. 170. There is no way of estimating what this would cost at the present time, because nothing has been done to determine that. It will be determined by how large the school will be. I understand they are talking about a school for five or six hundred students, which would make it cost about half as much as they are talking about.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. After the transfer of the property is made, will there be expenditure of funds for building of the school or enlarging it?

Mr. GRANGER. That is, provided the appropriations are made.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of the War Assets Administration is hereby authorized and directed to transfer to the Secretary of the Interior, without reimbursement or transfer of funds for use by the Bureau of Indian Affairs as a vocational school for Indian children and a center for housing and training adult Indians for off-reservation employment and placement, the property known as the Bushnell General Hospital near Brigham City, Box Elder County, Utah, comprising two hundred and ninety-eight and five-tenths acres, more or less, together with roads, buildings, and other betterments thereon.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to take over the property as soon as Congress has appropriated the necessary funds to provide for alterations, maintenance, and operation.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSTRUCTION, EXTENSION, AND IMPROVEMENT OF SCHOOL BUILDINGS IN HOOPA, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 554) to provide for the construction, extension, and improvement of school buildings in Hoopa, Calif.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of not to exceed $803,000 for the construction, extension, improvement, and equipment of school buildings in Hoopa, Calif.: *Provided*, That plans and specifications for the construction, extension, and improvement of the said school buildings shall be furnished by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs: *And provided further*, That the said school buildings so constructed, extended, and improved shall be the property of the United States, and shall be turned over to the Hoopa Valley Unified School District under the provisions of the act of April 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 596), as amended by the act of June 4, 1936 (49 Stat. 1458), and shall be made available to all the Indian children of the said district on the same terms, except as to the payment of tuition, as to other children of said school district.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRIBAL FUNDS OF NAVAJO INDIANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 994) to provide for disposition and use of tribal funds of the Navajo Tribe of Indians.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any other provisions of existing law, the tribal funds now on deposit or hereafter placed to the credit of the Navajo Tribe of Indians, in the United States Treasury, shall be available for such purposes as may be designated by the tribal council of said tribe and approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RED LAKE BAND OF CHIPPEWA INDIANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1755) to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to withdraw as much as may be necessary from the fund on deposit in the Treasury of the United States arising from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber within the Red Lake Reservation in Minnesota, according to the provisions of the act of May 18, 1916 (39 Stat. 137), to the credit of the Red Lake Indians in Minnesota, and to pay therefrom $100 to each member of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians of Minnesota who is living at the date of enactment of this act. Such payments shall be made as soon as practicable under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe.

SEC. 2. No money paid to Indians under this act shall be subject to any lien or claim of attorneys or other persons. Before any payment is made under this act, the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians of Minnesota shall, in such manner as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, ratify and accept the provisions of this act.

SEC. 3. Payments made under this act shall not be held to be "other income and resources" as that term is used in section 2 (a) (7), 402 (a) (7), and 1002 (a) (8) of the Social Security Act, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 edition, title 42, secs. 302 (a) (7), 602 (a) (7), and 1202 (a) (8)).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That concludes the bills eligible for call on the calendar at this time.

THREE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF ANNAPOLIS, MD.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 22) to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the three hundredth anniversary of Annapolis, Md.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to state that he has consulted with the gentleman from Tennessee and understands the gentleman from Tennessee has cleared this matter with the majority Members on both sides.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to prepare for issuance in May 1949 a special series of 3-cent postage stamps, of such design as he shall prescribe, in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of Annapolis, Md.

The resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 2663) to provide for the administration of the Central Intelligence Agency, established pursuant to section 102, National Security Act of 1947, and for other purposes, as amended.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

DEFINITIONS

SECTION 1. That when used in this act, the term—

(a) "Agency" means the Central Intelligence Agency;

(b) "Director" means the Director of Central Intelligence;

(c) "Government agency" means any executive department, commission, council, independent establishment, corporation wholly or partly owned by the United States which is an instrumentality of the United States, board, bureau, division, service, office, officer, authority, administration, or other establishment, in the executive branch of the Government; and

(d) "Continental United States" means the States and the District of Columbia.

SEAL OF OFFICE

SEC. 2. The Director of Central Intelligence shall cause a seal of office to be made for the Central Intelligence Agency, of such design as the President shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken thereof.

PROCUREMENT AUTHORITIES

SEC. 3. (a) In the performance of its functions the Central Intelligence Agency is authorized to exercise the authorities contained in sections 2 (c) (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (10), (12), (15), (17), and sections 3, 4, 5, 6, and 10 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 (Public Law 413, 80th Cong. 2d sess.).

(b) In the exercise of the authorities granted in subsection (a) of this section, the term "Agency head" shall mean the Director, the Deputy Director, or the Executive of the Agency.

(c) The determinations and decisions provided in subsection (a) of this section to be made by the Agency head may be made with respect to individual purchases and contracts or with respect to classes of purchases or contracts, and shall be final. Except as provided in subsection (d) of this section, the Agency head is authorized to delegate his powers provided in this section, including the making of such determinations and decisions, in his discretion and subject to his direction, to any other officer or officers or officials of the Agency.

(d) The power of the Agency head to make the determinations or decisions specified in paragraphs (12) and (15) of section 2 (c) and section 5 (a) of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 shall not be delegable. Each determination or decision required by paragraphs (12) and (15) of section 2 (c), by section 4, or by section 5 (a) of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, shall be based upon written findings made by the official making such determinations, which findings shall be final and shall be available within the Agency for a period of at least 6 years following the date of the determination.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

SEC. 4. (a) Any officer or employee of the Agency may be assigned or detailed for special instruction, research, or training, at or with domestic or foreign public or private institutions; trade, labor, agricultural, or scientific associations; courses or training programs under the National Military Establishment; or commercial firms.

(b) The Agency shall, under such regulations as the Director may prescribe, pay the tuition and other expenses of officers and employees of the Agency assigned or detailed in accordance with provisions of subsection (a) of this section, in addition to the pay and allowances to which such officers and employees may be otherwise entitled.

TRAVEL, ALLOWANCES, AND RELATED EXPENSES

SEC. 5. (a) Under such regulations as the Director may prescribe, the Agency, with respect to its officers and employees assigned to permanent-duty stations outside the continental United States, its Territories, and possessions, shall—

(1) (A) pay the travel expenses of officers and employees of the Agency including expenses incurred while traveling pursuant to orders issued by the Director in accordance with the provisions of section 5 (a) (3) with regard to the granting of home leave;

(B) pay the travel expenses of members of the family of an officer or employee of the Agency when proceeding to or returning from his post of duty; accompanying him on authorized home leave; or otherwise traveling in accordance with authority granted pursuant to the terms of this or any other act;

(C) pay the cost of transporting the furniture and household and personal effects of an officer or employee of the Agency to his successive posts of duty and, on the termination of his services, to his residence at time of appointment or to a point not more distant, or, upon retirement, to the place where he will reside;

(D) pay the cost of storing the furniture and household and personal effects of an officer or employee of the Agency who is absent under orders from his usual post of duty, or who is assigned to a post to which, because of emergency conditions, he cannot take or at which he is unable to use, his furniture and household and personal effects;

(E) pay the cost of storing the furniture and household and personal effects of an officer or employee of the Agency on first arrival at a post for a period not in excess of 3 months after such first arrival at such post or until the establishment of residence quarters, whichever shall be shorter;

(F) pay the travel expenses and transportation costs incident to the removal of the members of the family of an officer or employee of the Agency and his furniture and household and personal effects, including automobiles, from a post at which, because of the prevalence of disturbed conditions, there is imminent danger to life and property, and the return of such persons, furniture, and effects to such post upon the cessation of such conditions; or to such other post as may in the meantime have become the post to which such officer or employee has been assigned.

(2) Charge expenses in connection with travel of personnel, their dependents, and transportation of their household goods and personal effects, involving a change of permanent station, to the appropriation for the fiscal year current when any part of either the travel or transportation pertaining to the transfer begins pursuant to previously issued travel and transfer orders, notwithstanding the fact that such travel or transportation may not all be effected during such fiscal year, or the travel and transfer orders may have been issued during the prior fiscal year.

(3) (A) Order to the United States or its Territories and possessions on leave provided for in 5 U. S. C. 30, 30a, 30b, or as such sections may hereafter be amended, every officer and employee of the agency who was a resident of the United States or its Territories and possessions at time of employment, upon completion of 2 years' continuous service abroad, or as soon as possible thereafter: *Provided*, That such officer or employee has accrued to his credit at the time of such order, annual leave sufficient to carry him in a pay status while in the United States for at least a 30-day period.

(B) While in the continental United States on leave, the service of any officer or employee shall be available for work or duties in the Agency or elsewhere, but the time of such work or duties shall not be counted as leave.

(C) Where an officer or employee on leave returns to the United States or its Territories and possessions, leave of absence granted shall be exclusive of the time actually and necessarily occupied in going to and from the United States or its Territories and possessions, and such time as may be necessarily occupied in awaiting transportation.

(4) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, transport for or on behalf of an officer or employee of the Agency, a privately owned automobile in any case where it shall be determined that water, rail, or air transportation of the automobile is necessary or expedient for any part or of all the distance between points of origin and destination, and pay the cost of such transportation.

(5) (A) In the event of illness or injury requiring the hospitalization of an officer or full-time employee of the Agency, not the result of vicious habits, intemperance, or misconduct on his part, incurred while on asignment abroad in a locality where there does not exist a suitable hospital or clinic, pay the travel expenses of such officer or employee by whatever means he shall deem appropriate and withcut regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and section 10 of the act of March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1516; 5 U. S. C. 73b), to the nearest locality where a suitable hospital or clinic exists and on his recovery pay for the travel expenses of his return to his post of duty. If the officer or employee is too ill to travel unattended, the Director may also pay the travel expenses of an attendant.

(B) Establish a first-aid station and provide for the services of a nurse at a post at which, in his opinion, sufficient personnel is employed to warrant such a station: *Provided*, That, in his opinion, it is not feasible to utilize an existing facility;

(C) In the event of illness or injury requiring hospitalization of an officer or full-time employee of the Agency, not the result of vicious habits, intemperance, or misconduct on his part, incurred in the line of duty while such person is assigned abroad, pay for the cost of the treatment of such illness or injury at a suitable hospital or clinic;

(D) Provide for the periodic physical examination of officers and employees of the Agency and for the cost of administering inoculations or vaccinations to such officers or employees.

(6) Pay the costs of preparing and transporting the remains of an officer or employee of the Agency or a member of his family who may die while in travel status or abroad, to his home or official station, or to such other place as the Director may determine to be the appropriate place of interment, provided that in no case shall the expense payable be greater than the amount which would have been payable had the destination been the home or official station.

(7) Pay the costs of travel of new appointees and their dependents, and the transportation of their household goods and personal effects, from places of actual residence in foreign countries at time of appointment to places of employment and return to their actual residences at the time of appointment or a point not more distant: *Provided*, That such appointees agree in writing to remain with the United States Government for a period of not less than 12 months from the time of appointment.

Violation of such agreement for personal convenience of an employee or because of separation for misconduct will bar such return payment and, if determined by the Director or his designee to be in the best interests of the United States, any money expended by the United States on account of such travel and transportation shall be considered as a debt due by the individual concerned to the United States.

(b) In accordance with such regulations as the President may prescribe and notwithstanding the provisions of section 1765 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 70), the Director is authorized to grant to any officer or employee of the Agency allowances in accordance with the provisions of section 901 (1) and 901 (2) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946.

GENERAL AUTHORITIES

SEC. 6. In the performance of its functions, the Central Intelligence Agency is authorized to—

(a) Transfer to and receive from other Government agencies such sums as may be approved by the Bureau of the Budget, for the performance of any of the functions or activities authorized under sections 102 and 303 of the National Security Act of 1947 (Public Law 253, 80th Cong.), and any other Government agency is authorized to transfer to or receive from the Agency such sums without regard to any provisions of law limiting or prohibiting transfers between appropriations. Sums transferred to the Agency in accordance with this paragraph may be expended for the purposes and under the authority of this act without regard to limitations of appropriations from which transferred;

(b) Exchange funds without regard to section 3651 Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 543);

(c) Reimburse other Government agencies for services of personnel assigned to the Agency, and such other Government agencies are hereby authorized, without regard to provisions of law to the contrary, so to assign or detail any officer or employee for duty with the Agency;

(d) Authorize couriers and guards designated by the Director to carry firearms when engaged in transportation of confidential documents and materials affecting the national defense and security;

(e) Make alterations, improvements, and repairs on premises rented by the Agency, and pay rent therefor without regard to limitations on expenditures contained in the act of June 30, 1932, as amended: *Provided*, That in each case the Director shall certify that exception from such limitations is necessary to the successful performance of the Agency's functions or to the security of its activities.

SEC. 7. In the interests of the security of the foreign intelligence activities of the United States and in order further to implement the proviso of section 102 (d) (3) of the National Security Act of 1947 (Public Law 253, 80th Cong., 1st sess.) that the Director of Central Intelligence shall be responsible for protecting intelligence sources and methods from unauthorized disclosure, the Agency shall be exempted from the provisions of sections 1 and 2, chapter 795 of the act of August 28, 1935 (49 Stat. 956, 957; 5 U. S. C. 654), and the provisions of any other law which require the publication or disclosure of the organization, functions, names, official titles, salaries, or numbers of personnel employed by the Agency: *Provided*, That in furtherance of this section, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall make no reports to the Congress in connection with the Agency under section 607, title VI, chapter 212 of the act of June 30, 1945, as amended (5 U. S. C. 947 (b)).

SEC. 8. Whenever the Director and the Attorney General shall determine that the entry of a particular alien into the United States for permanent residence is in the interest of national security or essential to the furtherance of the national intelligence mission, such alien and his immediate family shall be given entry into the United States for permanent residence without regard to their inadmissibility under the immigration or any other laws and regulations, or to the failure to comply with such laws and regulations pertaining to admissibility: *Provided*, That the number of aliens and members of their immediate families entering the United States under the authority of this section shall in no case exceed 100 persons in any one fiscal year.

SEC. 9. The Director is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for not more than three positions in the professional and scientific field, within the Agency, each such position being established to effectuate those scientific-intelligence functions relating to national security, which require the services of specially qualified scientific or professional personnel: *Provided*, That the rates of compensation for positions established pursuant to the provisions of this section shall not be less than $10,000 per annum nor more than $15,000 per annum, and shall be subject to the approval of the Civil Service Commission.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 10. (a) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, sums made available to the Agency by appropriation or otherwise may be expended for purposes necessary to carry out its functions, including—

(1) personal services, including personal services without regard to limitations on types of persons to be employed, and rent at the seat of government and elsewhere; health-service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); rental of news-reporting services; purchase or rental and operation of photographic, reproduction, cryptographic, duplication and printing machines, equipment and devices, and radio-receiving and radio-sending equipment and devices, including telegraph and teletype equipment; purchase, maintenance, operation, repair, and hire of passenger motor vehicles, and aircraft, and vessels of all kinds; subject to policies established by the Director, transportation of officers and employees of the Agency in Government-owned automotive equipment between their domiciles and places of employment, where such personnel are engaged in work which makes such transportation necessary, and transportation in such equipment, to and from school, of children of Agency personnel who have quarters for themselves and their families at isolated stations outside the continental United States where adequate public or private transportation is not available; printing and binding; purchase, maintenance, and cleaning of firearms, including purchase, storage, and maintenance of ammunition; subject to policies established by the Director, expenses of travel in connection with, and expenses incident to attendance at meetings of professional, technical, scientific, and other similar organizations when such attendance would be a benefit in the conduct of the work of the Agency; association and library dues; payment of premiums or costs of surety bonds for officers or employees without regard to the provisions of 61 Stat. 646; 6 U. S. C. 14; payment of claims pursuant to 28 U. S. C.; acquisition of necessary land and the clearing of such land; construction of buildings and facilities without regard to 36 Stat. 699; 40 U. S. C. 259, 267; repair, rental, operation, and maintenance of buildings, utilities, facilities, and appurtenances; and

(2) supplies, equipment, and personnel and contractual services otherwise authorized by law and regulations, when approved by the Director.

(b) The sums made available to the Agency may be expended without regard to the provisions of law and regulations relating to the expenditure of Government funds; and for objects of a confidential, extraordinary, or emergency nature, such expenditures to be accounted for solely on the certificate of the Director and every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the amount therein certified.

SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

SEC. 11. If any provision of this act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of this act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 12. This act may be cited as the "Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949."

Mr. VINSON (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill as amended be dispensed with and that the same be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will that deprive any Member from making a point of order against the bill at this time?

The SPEAKER. A motion to suspend the rules suspends all rules. Therefore, a point of order would not lie as to any provision of the bill.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Including the Ramseyer rule?

The SPEAKER. Including the Ramseyer rule.

The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to embarrass the gentleman from Missouri, but I submit that to demand a second a Member must be opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Missouri opposed to the bill?

Mr. SHORT. I am not; I am very much in favor of it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the bill. I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER] is recognized for 20 minutes; the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 8 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 2663 is a bill to provide for the administration of the Central Intelligence Agency. There have been some misconceptions as to its purposes. For this reason, I would like to make certain broad statements concerning the bill and its purposes before discussing it in detail.

The Central Intelligence Agency was established as a successor to the Central Intelligence Group, under the provisions of section 102 of the National Security Act of 1947. This section sets out the functions of the Agency. It should be pointed out at once that H. R. 2663, which we are now considering, does not alter or add to these functions in any way. It simply provides for the administrative implementation of the functions which the Congress has already seen fit to give to the Agency.

Secondly, it should be pointed out that CIA functions exclusively under the powers granted it by the National Security Act of 1947 and not under any Executive order whatsoever.

Thirdly, with one or two exceptions to which your attention will be drawn, there is no authority in this proposed bill which at some time or other has not been granted to some other agency of the Government or which some other agencies are not now utilizing through their own implementing legislation. The reason why the hearings have been held in executive session, and why a certain amount of secrecy has been utilized in connection with this bill, is that the discussions with the members of CIA who appeared before the committee went into the operational background of the Agency. Naturally, operational details cannot be talked about in public for they go to the very heart of CIA's activities. Bear in mind, however, that the CIA is prohibited by law from any internal security functions. It deals only in the field of foreign intelligence.

This bill which we are now considering with one difference was introduced into the second session of the Eightieth Congress last year, and was unanimously approved by the Armed Services Committees both in the Senate and the House after detailed hearings. The bill itself passed the Senate on the last day of the session, but due to the last minute pressure of business could not be called up in the House. After most careful consideration, the present measure has again been unanimously approved, first by a subcommittee and then by the full Armed Services Committee in the House.

As I have said, its purposes are administrative, and its provisions break down into four main categories. In the first place, the Agency seeks to avail itself of the benefits of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 so that it may utilize the most up-to-date procurement facilities in connection with its activities. Secondly, in connection with the sections dealing with foreign travel and similar allowances, the Agency, in availing itself of many of the provisions of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, is seeking to build up a career service in the intelligence field second to none. A second-best intelligence service is almost as bad as none at all. Within the framework of existing Government laws and salaries, we are seeking to place CIA on a career basis, particularly for those of its employees who may spend a large portion of their career on foreign assignment. Thirdly, we are supplying the Agency, by this bill, with certain general administrative authorities which are needed. Finally, we are supplying the Agency with appropriations language to which their budget and fiscal employees, as well as those of the General Accounting office, may look in the auditing of the Agency's expenses.

In broad terms, therefore, H. R. 2663 seeks to assist this country in the building up and development of a career foreign intelligence service, and to free the Agency from certain restrictions so that it may operate as a mature intelligence service must operate.

Section 1 of this bill merely contains certain very basic definitions of terms used in the act.

Section 2 authorizes a seal of office for the Agency, and provides that judicial notice shall be taken thereof. From time to time it has been necessary for CIA to produce records in court. For example, the records of the monitoring of foreign propaganda broadcasts in their possession have included recordings of the speeches made from Germany by Douglas Chandler and Robert Best. These recordings were the basis of the recent convictions of these two men for their treasonable activities during the late war. In order that authenticated copies of such material can be submitted when called for in court, a seal is necessary of which the court can take judicial notice.

Section 3 of the bill authorizes the Agency to utilize certain of the authorities granted the armed services in the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947. The main features of this law which are being extended to the CIA are in the field of negotiation for contracts without advertising. The general ceiling for which contracts can be negotiated without advertising today is $100. The Armed Services Procurement Act raises this ceiling to $1,000, and it is being extended to include CIA contracts up to this amount. In addition, the act authorizes negotiation of contracts without advertising where public exigency will not admit of delay, where it is impracticable to secure competition, and for supplies or services the nature of which should not be publicly disclosed. It stands to reason that certain of the technical equipment which this Agency must utilize may be made only by one firm for reasons of security, and certainly some of this equipment should not be openly advertised for. Therefore, it seems only proper that these authorities which the Congress has already extended to the armed services should be further extended to CIA. The remainder of this section sets forth the applicable provisions of the Procurement Act regarding rules for advertising, the type of contracts that can be made, damages, joint procurement, delegations of authorities and limitations thereon.

Section 4 of the bill authorizes the Agency to assign its personnel to schools for special instruction and training, and to pay the cost of such tuition and expenses. This will permit the Agency to send selected employees to such schools as the National War College, advance courses in international relations and related fields, refresher courses in language fields, and special training courses.

Section 5 of the bill presents one of its most important features from a career standpoint. Virtually all of the provisions of this section have been taken directly from similar provisions in the Foreign Service Act of 1946. It provides for the payment of travel expenses for the employees of the Agency and for the members of their families when proceeding to posts of duty abroad, and from post to post abroad. It provides for their being returned to the United States with their families on statutory home leave after 2 years of continuous service abroad.

It must be reemphasized that these provisions are not new departures created for CIA, but are merely extending to the Agency the best features of other career services in the Government. This section also provides for the hospitalization and medical care of the Agency's full-time employees abroad, and includes provisions for the periodical physical examination of all of the employees on foreign posts.

Certain general administrative provisions are granted to the Agency, most of which are similar to authorities granted to other agencies of the Government at one time or another, or which deal with the security of the Agency's operations. For instance, there are provisions permitting the arming of couriers and guards carrying confidential documents. Specific authority is needed to override State statutes which prohibit the carrying of firearms without special licenses. Such a statute is in existence for the FBI, and the armed services have always been allowed to arm officer couriers.

Section 8 of the proposed bill contains a provision which will permit the entry of 100 aliens into the United States for permanent residence. This will be explained more fully by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM]. However, I would like to emphasize that this section involves a time factor. Time is of the

essence, and should these people be required to go through the many procedures of obtaining visas, having photographs taken, and filing applications—they would be dead before taking their second step. In certain areas of the world such persons can only contact an American once. This section permits quick action to save the lives of persons of high intelligence value to the United States.

Finally we have provided in this bill some basic appropriations language to which the Government Accounting Office and the budget and fiscal offices of the Agency can look in the expenditure of funds. Much of this language is necessary, for without it the expenditure of funds for the purposes set forth herein cannot be allowed. In addition, we have provided the legal basis for the granting to the Agency authority for the spending of those unvouchered funds which the Appropriations Committee of the House will earmark, and without which there can be no successful operation of an intelligence service.

For the reasons I have set forth, I urge the passage of this bill. Above all, it will allow this country to continue and increase the successful operation of its foreign intelligence, upon which some day the security of this country and our very lives may well depend.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SASSCER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Will it affect the personnel of our American military government in Germany?

Mr. SASSCER. It is my understanding that it will not.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself one additional minute.

Basically it is outlining the administrative procedure. There is a section in the bill relating to bringing in aliens, which my able colleague the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] will discuss. However, I would like to again emphasize that this section involves a time factor. It in no way encompasses the functions or prerogatives of the immigration authorities or congressional committees. This is a security measure. These men can only contact an American once. Time is the element. If they cannot make a quick exit their heads may be off and valuable information lost.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SASSCER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Does the gentleman mean to imply that immigration restrictions built up over the years are not suspended by this bill?

Mr. SASSCER. They are suspended for 100 aliens on the basis of their potential news value for security purposes and not for the purpose of general immigration laws.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has again expired.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, although I do not like the hush-hush business surrounding this bill, I shall not oppose it. Certainly if the members of the Armed Forces Committee can hear the detailed information to support this bill, why cannot our entire membership? Are they the Brahmins and we the untouchables? Secrecy is the answer. What is secret about the membership of an entire committee hearing the lurid reasons? In Washington three men can keep a secret if two men die. It is like the old lady who said, "I can keep a secret but the people I tell it to, cannot."

I must counter the remarks of the previous speaker. We have in the bill this very significant language "for permanent residence without regard to their inadmissibility under the immigration or any other laws or regulations."

In the first place, if there had not been a closed rule, I would have made the point of order to strike out this provision because it is exclusively within the province of the Committee on the Judiciary and is not the business of the Committee on the Armed Services. The Committee on the Armed Services has nothing to do with immigration. Now this provision I have read throws out the window, at the discretion of the Director mentioned in this bill and the Attorney General, all the legislative immigration restrictions that we have built up over the years. It throws them to the winds, and if the Attorney General and the Director wish to admit Facists, Communists, Hitler sadists, morons, moral perverts, syphilitics, or lepers, they can do it. I think the House ought to know what it is legislating about, and I think, in a measure, this indicates how the cold war is unhinging the nerves of some of our high military authorities. The secrecy, especially the brand we are treated to, is ridiculous. Secondly these immigration privileges are badly conceived. If you want to give this authority to the military, all right, but I think we should know what we are doing and whither we are going. The military is not infallible. Witness the situation of the charges levied by the military intelligence against one Agnes Smedley recently, that she was a Communist, or a Russian spy, and instead of retracting when they found they were in error, they simply admitted a faux pas. The military is indeed not infallible. On the question of immigration they are given carte blanche, willy-nilly, to admit 100 persons under this particular provision which should be stricken from the bill or, if it is not stricken, certain safeguards should have been added.

I have spoken briefly to advise the Armed Forces Committee to stick to its own knitting. When immigration is involved, let the proper committee be consulted—the Judiciary Committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, in the past few days, much has been said about a provision in the proposed act which will permit the entry of 100 aliens annually into the United States without regard to immigration laws. I would like to explain this provision carefully and fully.

Section 8 of this bill provides that whenever the Director and the Attorney General shall determine that the entry of a particular alien into the United States for permanent residence is in the interest of national security or essential to the furtherance of the national intelligence mission, that alien and his family shall be given entry without regard to their admissibility under the immigration laws and regulations. The number of persons who can come into the country under this provision is limited to 100 persons in any one year. Let me emphasize that what is being waived are the laws regarding the admissibility of an alien into this country, but no laws are being waived regarding his conduct once he is here. The alien must live up to every law of the United States just as every other alien must do, and failure to do so will lead to his deportation for cause. What is the purpose of this section? Briefly, it is this. There are many people all over the world who believe in this country and what it stands for implicitly. Many of them are living in police states. Some of them may have formerly been highly placed in the service of their government. Some of them may even be there now. Many of them have important intelligence information to make available to this country, and such information may be of vital importance to our national security and our policies. These people, be they soldiers or statesmen or scientists, can only approach a representative of America once. If they are seen talking with an American, it may mean the concentration camps, or in some instances death itself. There is no time here to get visas and fill out the forms which the immigration laws require. The element of time is often 24 hours or less. When CIA plans such an operation, security requires that the people knowing it be held to an absolute minimum. The people who will be selected will be most carefully screened by CIA, and only the select few will be chosen. The concurrence in the Director's selection lies with the Attorney General, whose Immigration and Naturalization Bureau must administer the immigration laws once these people have arrived. The Committee feels that this power should be granted to the Director of Central Intelligence, and that the operation of our intelligence agency requires its existence. Its force and effect is testified to by the screams of anguish which have already emanated from Communist sources abroad. The Rumanian radio protested immediately after the Armed Services Committee approved this section. This is what it said:

> Dollars fatherland, fatherland of gangsters and of international swindlers, is now officially decreed fatherland of spies from any corner of the world.

A statement by the American Slav Congress, which is on the Attorney General's list as a Communist organization, was forwarded to this committee, and almost upon its very receipt the Moscow radio started to broadcast its text. The Moscow radio says that this provision will make every freedom-loving American and every honest person in the world

disgusted with the cynicism of the United States Congress and its policy of reviving fascism and preparing a new world war. It is interesting to note that the Moscow radio picks up and endorses this protest almost as soon as the committee itself has received the telegram. The people who will enter this country under this provision are not spies. They are defactors from the totalitarian state. They are people whose love of democracy is so great that at the risk of their lives they come to representatives of the United States to give them information which will help the west and the United States survive.

I believe the well-known radio commentator, Edward R. Murrow, very neatly summed up the purpose of this section in his broadcast of March 4, in which he stated, and I quote:

> This is essentially an underground railroad for first-class passengers only, up to 100 a year. It will be confined to people of the highest caliber, morally and mentally, who have to get out of their own countries on short notice or face arrest, torture, or execution, people whose background, information, and services are so valuable to us that it would not be safe to keep them for any prolonged length of time even in countries of western Europe.

Mr. Speaker, the dearest thing we can give these aliens is admission to this country, and that is what your committee proposes.

As an essential weapon for the successful operation of this country's foreign Intelligence Service, and after the most serious and searching consideration, your committee has endorsed this section and urges its adoption, as well as all other provisions of the bill.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the Members of the House who are present to the language on page 6 of the report. I think it can be said without any fear of contradiction that this is the first time in the history of the United States that this language is found in any report accompanying a bill coming before the Congress. It reads as follows:

> The report does not contain a full and detailed explanation of all of the provisions of the proposed legislation in view of the fact that much of such information is of a highly confidential nature. However, the Committee on Armed Forces received a complete explanation of all features of the proposed measure. The committee is satisfied that all sections of the proposed legislation are fully justified.

Let us look at this a moment. We are being asked to vote for legislation without having full explanation of all of the provisions of the bill.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. The gentleman knows of course that this is an espionage bill.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I do not see what difference that makes. We have gone through two world wars. We have gone through a civil war and the Congress has never been asked to vote for any legislation without explanation of all of the provisions of the bill and that is what this report asks the Members of this House to do. Can anyone deny that that is what we are being requested to do under this motion to suspend the rules?

What are we doing here? First of all, as to the secrecy with which the committee has been operating, it admits that its members have the information which they are withholding from the House. As the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the former Speaker of the House [Mr. MARTIN], said, if he is correctly reported in this morning's press: "There is no such thing as a secret in Washington, when any three persons know it." Yet, we are told that the information the committee has must be kept a secret from the Members of the House. What is worse, the committee informs us through its report that the Members of the House must pass this bill without any explanation of all of its provisions. This makes every single section of this bill suspect. No Member of Congress has been informed. No Member of Congress has been given the full explanation of all of the provisions of the legislation to which the representatives of the people are entitled before voting on any legislation. Only the members of the Committee on Armed Services, we are told, have been given the explanation. That is the situation you have before you. If under the wave of hysteria you want to abdicate your legislative functions to just one committee of the House, that is your privilege, but as for me I refuse to do it. I no not care what reason is given. There has never been and there can never be any justification at any time for the representatives of the people, who are elected to Congress, to abdicate their function of legislating with full knowledge on the matters which come before them. This bill suspends that function and says, "You must not have knowledge of all of the provisions of the bill." It says, "You must vote blindly and must take the word of a committee." No one challenges the good faith of the committee members, but the fact is that with 435 Members from 435 different districts, we are all entitled to have our own viewpoint on legislation based on at least a full explanation of all of the sections of a bill. For that reason all times in the history of the Congress of the United States the membership has been given full explanation in a report which is intended to explain the bill. Never has Congress been told in a report accompanying a bill, as this one does, that Congress cannot have a full explanation of all provisions in the bill. This is the first time that Members of the House are told, "You cannot have any full explanation of this legislation. It is highly confidential. It deals with espionage."

As a result of the hysteria under which this bill is being passed I suppose a majority of the House will vote for this bill, even though in doing so you are suspending your legislative prerogatives and evading your duty to the people of this Nation.

Now, without having been given explanation of all of the provisions, I have been trying to find out something about this bill by reading the bill, as well as the report. Here are a few things that the Members of the House ought to know. I deal with section 4, on page 3:

> SEC. 4. (a) Any officer or employee of the Agency may be assigned or detailed for special instruction, research, or training, at or with domestic or foreign public or private institutions; trade, labor, agricultural, or scientific associations; courses or training programs under the National Military Establishment; or commercial firms.

What does this mean? With all of the vast powers that are given this agency under the guise of research and study, you are subjecting labor unions and business firms to the will of the military. You are opening the door for the placing of these intelligence agents, supposed to deal with security pertaining to foreign as well as internal affairs in the midst of labor organizations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] has expired.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself five additional minutes.

You are opening the doors for the entrance of intelligence agents into labor organizations; yes, to spy on labor and carry out antilabor activities. I am sure if it were not for the cold war hysteria, very few Members of the Congress would vote for that provision. Certainly the majority would not vote to suspend the rules so that you must take this bill as it is without any opportunity for amendment, despite its serious implications against the security of the liberties of the American people.

The gentleman from New York has discussed the immigration provision of the bill. I simply want to add to his comments that this section will work out only in one way: That there will be admitted into this country former Fascists and Nazis, antilabor people, promonarchists, people that a democracy such as ours would want to keep out. It is only natural that the followers of the Hapsburgs, Francos, and other Fascist scum will be the beneficiaries of this feature of the bill, which suspends the immigration laws and allows for permanent admission of 100 of them per year.

Then, from the standpoint of Government operations, on page 15 of the bill, we find this:

> The sums made available to the Agency may be expended without regard to the provisions of law and regulations relating to the expenditure of Government funds.

I wish some of you gentlemen who have been cutting down appropriations for unemployment services and social welfare legislature would listen to this:

> The sums made available to the Agency may be expended without regard to the provisions of law and regulations relating to the expenditures of Government funds.

So what are we doing here? From what we know—and, mind you, we have not been told everything—but from what we know, we are suspending civil liberties in the interest of a military intelligence agency. That is definite. You cannot get away from that. We are also making it possible to have admitted into this country, under the guise of

counterespionage or counterintelligence, people that a democracy would spew out under all circumstances. We are suspending all laws with regard to Government expenditures, and we are asking the Members of Congress to suspend their prerogatives and cease to do their duty on legislation with full explanation of the legislation. Of course, there are times when bills get by. We cannot all be up to date on everything. We might not know what is in a bill. That happens. But this time we are told that we are not supposed to know what is in the bill. I want to read that again, and I hope it will sink in:

> The report does not contain a full and detailed explanation of all of the provisions of the proposed legislation in view of the fact that much of such information is of a highly confidential nature.

Congress is suspending its right to legislate and we are being asked to do this in furtherance of a cold war. This is illustrative of what this imperialist cold war is imposing on the people of a country: Suspending its civil liberties, invasion of the labor movement by intelligence agents, admission of undesirables—undesirable in any democracy—and asking Members of Congress to suspend their prerogative to pass on legislation.

But you say this is dealing with espionage, that this is done for the sake of security. I refuse to believe that our Nation is so unsafe from a security standpoint that we have to suspend not only the civil liberties of the people but the legislative prerogatives of the Representatives of the people in the Congress. If you want to do this in the hope that a newspaper will not criticize you for voting against it because of the hysteria which is being whipped up, that is your privilege; but I submit that the situation is obvious: Hysteria is used to undermine the civil liberties of the people and extend the military control—military control—I emphasize that, over the lives and thinking of the people of these United States.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, there is some plausibility in the argument advanced by the gentleman from New York. I suppose that none of us in the Chamber at this moment likes this particular kind of legislation, but I think we all will agree that the weakest link in our chain of national defense in days gone by has been in a weak intelligence system. The Germans, the Russians, the British, have had far better systems of intelligence than have we, and in spite of all our wealth and power and might we have been exceptionally weak in psychological warfare notwithstanding the fact that an idea is perhaps the most powerful weapon on this earth.

The pending bill, H. R. 2663, is substantially the same as H. R. 5871 which was introduced in the Eightieth Congress, unanimously reported by the Senate Committee on the Armed Services, and passed the Senate. A companion bill was unanimously reported by the House Committee on the Armed Services, but due to lack of time it failed of passage in the Eightieth Congress.

The purpose of this bill is simply to give the Central Intelligence Agency authority that is necessary for its proper administration. It is true that we will bring in not to exceed 100 persons a year, but before they are admitted they will be carefully screened by both the Director of Central Intelligence and the Attorney General of the United States. They act jointly, and it is absolutely essential that some of the information given to members of our committee as was given to members of the Rules Committee, must be kept confidential, because it is of a secret nature. The FBI does not advertise the movements it makes in the apprehension of a criminal. Our intelligence officers to be effective and in their own defense as well as the country's must keep many of their movements secret. I think it would be supreme folly for us to discuss every phase and ramification of a bill that is of such a highly confidential nature.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. Did the committee satisfy itself as to the expenditure of this fund?

Mr. SHORT. It did, and there is a definite limitation upon this. We limited not only the number of persons to be admitted but also the amount of money to be expended; however, we are not telling how, when, where, or to whom the money will go. We cannot, because of the very nature of the problem.

I am glad the gentleman from New York quoted from page 6 of the committee report because the language itself is self-explanatory. You are going to have to trust somebody, Mr. Speaker, and while perhaps it is asking too much for you to trust the members of the Committee on the Armed Services I think you can trust the Committee on Rules or any other committee of this House. Both committees mentioned reported this bill unanimously.

We are engaged in a highly dangerous business. It is something I naturally abhor but sometimes you are compelled to fight fire with fire. There is no other way out of it so far as I can see and perhaps the less we say in public about this bill the better off all of us will be.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri has stated correctly that information is withheld sometimes by a committee when it receives information which is confidential. However, what is before us is not an instance of merely withholding information. I read from the report:

> The report does not contain a full and detailed explanation of all of the provisions of the proposed legislation.

It is obvious, and even a 6-year-old child can see the distinction. What we have here is not a matter of withholding information; it is a matter of asking the Congress to legislate even though an explanation of the legislation is refused by the committee. The complaint I make is that the committee refuses to give any explanation of some of the provisions of the bill.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I want to call the attention of the Members of the House to a sentence from Rear Adm. Hillenkoetter's request which he made in a letter addressed to the Speaker of the House, found on pages 6 and 7 of the report.

In next to the last paragraph he states:

> In almost all instances, the powers and authorities contained in the bill already exist for some other branch of the Government, and the bill merely extends similar authorities to the Central Intelligence Agency.

That is absolutely true. These authorities exist for other Government agencies and all this bill does is to extend to the Central Intelligence Agency the powers already enjoyed by other agencies.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman from Missouri has answered himself. The rear admiral says "in almost all instances," and again I say the committee refuses to explain the instances that are not covered by the rear admiral's statement, "In almost all instances." It is the exceptions that concern me.

Mr. SHORT. In the original statement of the gentleman from New York he said that never before had the Congress considered such legislation. We all know that the President was given blanket authority so far as the atomic bomb was concerned, and we spent $2,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money before anybody knew what it was.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman will remember that in connection with the atomic bill that we had here there was a report on the legislation. Nowhere in the report was it stated that the report did not contain a full and detailed explanation of all the provisions of the proposed legislation. The legislation was explained section by section in the report accompanying the bill. This is the first time in the history of Congress that Members are being asked to vote on legislation about which not merely information is withheld but also explanation as to the provisions of the legislation.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would like to question the gentleman from Missouri. On page 4 of the report, subsection 5 (b), it is provided that an employee while in this country on leave may be assigned to temporary duty in the United States for special purposes or reorientation prior to returning to foreign service.

In the original unification bill passed through the Committee on Expenditures, of which I am a member, we had the setting up of this CIA. It was clearly

brought out at that time that no internal security work of any kind would be done by the CIA; that all of its intelligence work would be done in a foreign field. In view of this particular paragraph here I want to be assured at this time that such special duties as are mentioned here, or reorientation, do not apply to security functions in the United States.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I will say to the gentleman that that is correct, that this bill is in no wise directed to internal security. If they come back here it is purely a matter of leave, and reorientation, and training to go back into their work in foreign fields.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 348, nays 4, not voting 82, as follows:

[Roll No. 23]

YEAS—348

Abernethy
Albert
Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Allen, La.
Andersen, H. Carl
Anderson, Calif.
Andresen, August H.
Andrews
Angell
Arends
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Barden
Barrett, Wyo.
Bates, Ky.
Bates, Mass.
Battle
Beall
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Bentsen
Biemiller
Bishop
Blackney
Bland
Blatnik
Boggs, Del.
Boggs, La.
Bolling
Bolton, Md.
Bolton, Ohio
Bonner
Boykin
Brambleett
Breen
Brehm
Brooks
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Ohio
Bryson
Buchanan
Burdick
Burke
Burleson
Burnside
Burton
Byrne, N. Y.
Byrnes, Wis.
Camp
Cannon
Carlyle
Carnahan
Carroll
Case, S. Dak.
Cavalcante
Celler
Chatham
Chelf
Chesney
Chiperfield
Christopher
Church
Clemente
Clevenger
Coffey
Cole, Kans.
Colmer
Combs
Cooper
Cotton
Cox
Crawford
Crook
Crosser
Cunningham
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
Deane
Delaney
Denton
D'Ewart
Dollivar
Dondero
Doughton
Doyle
Durham
Eaton
Eberharter
Elliott
Elsworth
Elston
Engel, Mich.
Engle, Calif.
Evins
Fallon
Feighan
Fellows
Fenton
Fernandez
Fisher
Flood
Fogarty
Forand
Ford
Frazier
Fugate
Fulton
Furcolo
Gamble
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Gillette
Golden
Goodwin
Gordon
Gore
Gorski, Ill.
Gorski, N. Y.
Gossett
Graham
Granger
Grant
Green
Gregory
Gross
Hagen
Hale
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Halleck
Hardy
Hare
Harris
Harrison
Hart
Harvey
Havenner
Hays, Ohio
Hedrick
Heffernan
Heller
Herlong
Hobbs
Hoeven
Holifield
Holmes
Hope
Horan
Howell
Huber
Hull
Jackson, Calif.
Jackson, Wash.
Jacobs
James
Jenison
Jenkins
Jennings
Jensen
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N. C.
Judd
Karst
Karsten
Kearney
Keating
Kee
Keefe
Kelley
Kennedy
Kerr
Kilburn
Kilday
Kirwan
Klein
Kruse
Lanham
Larcade
LeCompte
LeFevre
Lemke
Lesinski
Linehan
Lodge
Lovre
Lucas
Lyle
McCarthy
McConnell
McCormack
McCulloch
McDonough
McGrath
McGregor
McGuire
McKinnon
McMillan, S. C.
McMillen, Ill.
Mack, Ill
Mack, Wash.
Madden
Magee
Mahon
Mansfield
Marsalis
Marshall
Martin, Iowa
Martin, Mass.
Mason
Merrow
Meyer
Michener
Miles
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Mills
Monroney
Morgan
Morrison
Morton
Murray, Tenn.
Murray, Wis.
Nelson
Nicholson
Noland
Norblad
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Minn.
O'Konski
O'Sullivan
O'Toole
Pace
Passman
Patman
Patten
Perkins
Peterson
Pfeiffer, William L.
Phillbin
Phillips, Calif.
Phillips, Tenn.
Pickett
Poage
Polk
Potter
Preston
Price
Priest
Quinn
Rabaut
Rains
Ramsay
Rankin
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees
Regan
Rhodes
Ribicoff
Rich
Richards
Riehlman
Rivers
Rodino
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rooney
Sabath
Sadlak
St. George
Sanborn
Sasscer
Scriven
Scudder
Secrest
Shafer
Sheppard
Short
Sikes
Simpson Ill.
Simpson Pa.
Sims
Smathers
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Spence
Staggers
Stanley
Steed
Stefan
Stigler
Sullivan
Sutton
Taber
Tackett
Talle
Teague
Thomas, Tex.
Thompson
Thornberry
Tollefson
Towe
Trimble
Underwood
Van Zandt
Velde
Vinson
Vorys
Vursell
Wadsworth
Wagner
Walsh
Walter
Welch, Calif.
Welch, Mo.
Werdel
Wheeler
White, Calif.
Whitten
Whittington
Wickersham
Wier
Wigglesworth
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Tex.
Withrow
Wolcott
Wolverton
Wood
Woodruff
Worley
Yates
Zablocki

NAYS—4

Bosone
Marcantonio
Morris
Powell

NOT VOTING—82

Abbitt
Addonizio
Bailey
Baring
Barrett, Pa.
Bloom
Buckley, Ill.
Buckley, N. Y.
Bulwinkle
Canfield
Case, N. J.
Chudoff
Cole, N. Y.
Cooley
Corbett
Coudert
Davenport
Davies, N. Y.
Davis, Tenn.
DeGraffenried
Dingell
Dollinger
Donohue
Douglas
Gilmer
Granahan
Gwinn
Hall, Leonard W.
Hand
Harden
Hays, Ark.
Hébert
Herlong
Herter
Hill
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Irving
Javits
Johnson
Kean
Kearns
Keogh
King
Kunkel
Lane
Latham
Lichtenwalter
Lind
Lynch
McSweeney
Macy
Mitchell
Moulder
Multer
Murdock
Murphy
Nixon
Norton
O'Neill
Patterson
Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Plumley
Poulson
Redden
Sadowski
Scott, Hardie
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Smith, Ohio
Somers
Stockman
Tauriello
Taylor
Thomas, N. J.
Weichel
Whitaker
White, Idaho
Wilson, Ind.
Wilson, Okla.
Winstead
Woodhouse
Young

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.

Mr. deGraffenreid with Mr. Case of New Jersey.

Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Hardie Scott.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Hand.

Mr. Lind with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

Mr. Addonizio with Mr. Kean.

Mr. King with Mr. Coudert.

Mr. Tauriello with Mr. Canfield.

Mr. Winstead with Mr. Macy.

Mr. Murphy with Mr. Kunkel.

Mr. Lynch with Mr. Patterson.

Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Poulson.

Mr. Buckley of Illinois with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.

Mr. Granahan with Mr. Kearns.

Mrs. Norton with Mr. Latham.

Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Young with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. McSweeney with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.

Mrs. Douglas with Mr. Gwinn.

Mr. Lane with Mr. Corbett.

Mr. Donohue with Mr. Lichtenwalter.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.

Mrs. Woodhouse with Mr. Weichel.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the bill just passed at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, during the past few days there has been a great deal of publicity and discussion about a bill reported favorably by the Armed Services Committee with respect to our Central Intelligence Agency.

There is nothing startling in this bill and, with one major exception, practically all of the remaining provisions of the proposed legislation now exist for some branch or branches of the Government. In fact, almost all of the proposed legislation was taken from existing laws applicable to other Government agencies, particularly the State Department.

The Central Intelligence Agency was established pursuant to section 102 of the National Security Act of 1947. Its functions are set out in that act, which states that it shall be the duty of the agency, under the direction of the National Security Council:

First:

To advise the National Security Council in matters concerning such intelligence activities of the Government departments and agencies as relate to national security;

Second:

To make recommendations to the National Security Council for the coordination of such intelligence activities of the departments and agencies of the Government as relate to the national security;

Third:

To correlate and evaluate intelligence relating to the national security, and provide for the appropriate dissemination of such intelligence within the Government, using

where appropriate existing agencies and facilities: *Provided*, That the agency shall have no police, subpena, law enforcement powers, or internal security functions: *Provided further*, That the departments and other agencies of the Government shall continue to collect, evaluate, correlate, and disseminate departmental intelligence: *And provided further*, That the Director of Central Intelligence shall be responsible for protecting intelligence sources and methods from unauthorized disclosures;

Fourth:

To perform, for the benefit of the existing intelligence agencies, such additional services of common concern as the National Security Council determines can be more efficiently accomplished centrally;

Fifth:

To perform such other functions and duties related to intelligence affecting the national security as the National Security Council may from time to time direct.

Now, what authority is granted in the proposed legislation? Well, the bill creates a seal of office for the Central Intelligence Agency. It extends to it certain provisions of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947. It permits the Director to provide for special instruction and training of agency personnel. It provides for travel allowances and expenses for agency personnel. It permits agency personnel to return to the United States on leave after 2 years of foreign service. It provides for the payment of transporting and storing household belongings. It provides for the health of employees overseas by permitting the payment of travel expenses to the nearest adequate medical facilities when local medical facilities are inadequate. It provides for the establishment of first aid stations at posts overseas. It provides for physical examinations for all employees. It provides for transporting the remains of an employee or a member of his family who may die while overseas, and it provides that the agency may recruit foreign nationals abroad where citizens of the United States are not available for such employment. And it provides allowances for agency employees similar to those given to State Department Foreign Service employees. It also contains other provisions of greater significance, such as the authority to transfer and receive from other Government agencies such sums as may be approved by the Bureau of the Budget for the performance of any of the agency functions. This is how the Central Intelligence Agency gets its money. It has been going on since the agency was created, and this simply legalizes that important function which is the only means by which the amount of money required to operate an efficient intelligence service can be concealed. Likewise, the bill removes certain limitations which exist under provisions of law which limit the amount of rental that the agency may pay for its quarters overseas and the amount of improvements that it may make in such leased facilities. This makes sense in view of the fact that an efficient intelligence agency must be able to rent adequate facilities regardless of the value of the property and must be permitted to make such improvements in the property as may be necessary for the proper safeguarding of information, and the installation of necessary equipment. The bill also eliminates the agency from the requirements of law which result in the publication of personnel data in the Official Register of the United States, and exempts the Bureau of the Budget from the necessity of including in its public report to the Congress the agency's personnel strength. This information has not heretofore been made public and must, of course, continue not to be made public, and this merely legalizes such action.

The most widely publicized feature of the bill is that with respect to the provision which provides for the admission of 100 aliens for permanent residence in the United States. This will only be done when the Director and the Attorney General concur in the admission of such aliens and will permit the agency to offer to certain defectors and others the greatest reward possible in this world today, residency in the United States. These people will be carefully screened and their admission will only be in the best interests of the United States, and, furthermore, if at a later date they should prove undesirable they can be deported.

Another section of the bill provides that the agency may spend sums made available to it without regard to provisions of existing law. It also permits the expenditure of funds for confidential purposes to be solely accounted for by certification of the Director. This is not unusual. The State Department has such authority, as does the Atomic Energy Commission, and, for that matter, so in effect do all branches of the armed services.

Therefore the only significant feature of this bill which will be completely new in all respects will be that pertaining to the admission of 100 aliens in the United States.

There has been a great deal of discussion as to why the committee meetings were conducted in executive session without a stenographic record being kept. It is obvious that there is certain information which must be confined to as few people as possible. For example, it would not be wise to disclose to the world the amount of money necessary to operate the Central Intelligence Agency annually. Nor would it be wise to announce to the world the number of personnel employed by the agency. Nor would it be wise to announce just where our CIA is operating, or how they are operating, or what information they are seeking to obtain, or what information they have obtained. But in order for a congressional committee to properly analyze a bill granting authority to an agency to perform certain functions, it seemed wise to obtain this information but not to make it public.

This bill will enable the agency to have legal authority for practically all the things it is now doing. You will note that the National Security Act specifically excludes the agency from internal security functions. There is no problem of invasion of the rights of American citizens involved in this legislation. If this Nation wants a modern, efficient, effective, capable, valuable intelligence gathering agency, then we must give it certain authorities. If we do not want such an agency, we will be the only nation in the world without one. It would seem a little ridiculous to spend one-third of our annual budget for our national defense and not grant reasonable monetary statutory and administrative support to the agency charged with gathering the intelligence information which has so much to do with the size of the appropriations we grant for the strength of our armed services.

I might add that this bill was reported unanimously by the subcommittee and unanimously by the full committee. That there were no dissenting votes is significant. The records indicating the Members who attended the meetings are available for public inspection.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 130

The SPEAKER. Without objection, House Resolution 130 will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

THE COMMUNIST PARTY

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the daily recurrence of events we cannot longer sit supinely by and allow members of the ungodly Communist Party to destroy us. Repeatedly, I have spoken out against the apparent determination on the part of Stalin's agents in this country to thwart all efforts toward establishing permanent peace.

Words and efforts of conciliation have proven to be of no avail. We must strike and strike now before it is too late. Today, I have introduced a bill in the House, which if enacted, would outlaw the Communist Party and order deportation of all foreign Communists within our borders. I submit this vital measure to each of you for its immediate favorable consideration.

Attached hereto I include a very timely editorial from my home-town newspaper, the Greenville Piedmont:

COMMUNISTS DROP MASK OF PATRIOTISM

In less than 2 weeks Communists in three democratic countries have made the convenient flexibility of the Red line of reasoning and the calculated treachery of the party oath brutally clear. The truth is not in them and honor has no meaning for them.

The two top American Communists, National President William Z. Foster and General Secretary Eugene Dennis, said this week that in the event of war between the United States and Russia the American Communist Party would try to defeat the predatory war aims of American imperialism.

They said they did not think war was inevitable, that they believed the American and Russian systems could exist separately and peaceably. But, they added, if Wall Street should plunge the United States into war, the Communists would oppose it as unjust and aggressive and destructive of the deepest interests of the American people.

There, you have it. Should Russia attack us, Wall Street aggression would be blamed.

French Communist Maurice Thorez said last week that Soviet Russia was by definition incapable of aggression. Therefore, if another nation becomes involved in a war with Russia, no matter what the circumstances,

that nation, not Russia, is the aggressor (just as little Finland committed acts of aggression against Russia at the dawn of World War II).

Thorez said also that if, in defending freedom and democracy Russia should pursue the troops of the other nation across its own borders, Communists residing in that country would automatically join with Russia and take up arms against their own nation.

There you have a classic example of Communist dialectics, which is completed by the following:

Thorez was asked how it was Russia invaded Poland in 1939 if it was by definition incapable of aggression. His answer: "Since Marshal Smigly-Rydz and other members of the Polish Government had fled to Rumania, there was no Polish Government against which to make an aggression."

Thus, we suppose, "by definition" an aggression against a people is not an aggression, while an aggression against a government might be. And why, do you suppose, the Polish Government fled in 1939?

Italian Communist Palmiro Togliatti backed up the Thorez line of reasoning. In a newspaper interview he declared: "I have no information to support the idea that the Soviet Union has the slightest intention of attacking any country. * * * As to the hypothesis that a Russian army would pursue on our soil an aggressor, I think in this case the Italian people * * * would have the evident duty to aid in the most efficient way the Soviet Army * * * in order to give that aggressor the lesson he deserves."

And if the Italian Army, or that of any other nation, undertook to defend itself against a Russian troop movement across its borders, the Communist mind and tongue would twist it into an act of aggression of the most heinous kind.

At last the mask has been dropped by American, French, and Italian Communists. They are quick to hide behind the American flag like rats seeking a hole when the heat is on. Dennis and his codefendants on trial in New York on a conspiracy charge, have been hiding behind every legal device known in democratic courts.

Yet they made it quite plain that if their countries should seek to defend themselves against a Russian onslaught, they and their followers will do their best to help the enemies of their countries.

If that isn't treason, then what is?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas (at the request of Mr. TRIMBLE) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

Mr. COLE of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a very fine dissertation by Mr. Arthur Krock on Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Mr. John Nicholas Brown.

MOVIE SHORT DEPICTING OLD-AGE PROBLEMS

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to invite all Members of the House to see a very significant movie short that is being shown between 4 and 5:30 p. m. every day, starting today and running through Friday, March 11, in room 1302 the Public Works Committee room in the New House Office Building. There are no admission charges, and all Members of Congress and their respective staffs are cordially invited to attend any of these showings.

This movie short is a March of Time production which has been prepared and edited by the editors of Time, Life, and Fortune magazines, and it relates to one of the most important and pressing social problems of our times—the problem of the hardships and sufferings of our old folks, the fathers and mothers of America.

This film describes the problems of old-age security in America, and the employment attitudes of the masters of modern industry regarding workers in middle age. It is a grim reminder of the desperate economic plight of millions of our senior citizens—it is a convincing presentation of the problem, and it shows the need for a thorough overhauling of our Federal old-age pension and assistance programs in order to give genuine economic security for our old folks after their life's work is done.

Inasmuch as the Congress may be called upon shortly to consider pending old-age-pension legislation, including the Townsend old-age insurance plan, I do believe that my colleagues will find this movie interesting and educational, and that it is well worth seeing. It is my hope that as many Members of the House as possible will find it convenient to see one of these several showings of said movie short.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE], is recognized for 30 minutes.

CHINESE POLICY

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to discuss what is going on in China and what we ought to do about it.

Early last month several of us prepared a letter to the President of the United States which was signed by 51 Members of the House and sent to President Truman under date of February 7. As the letter has never, so far as I know, been printed in full anywhere, I am asking unanimous consent to have it included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALE. The letter is as follows:

FEBRUARY 7, 1949.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We, the undersigned Members of the House of Representatives, are deeply disturbed by what is happening in China. We believe that the American people are justifiably apprehensive. Our policy in Asia and the Pacific has for many decades been based upon the recognition that the freedom and independence of China are indispensable to the security of our country.

While it is impossible to identify all the causes of World War II, it is clear that the era of aggressions which preceded the attack on Pearl Harbor derived its first and fatal momentum from the inaction of the western powers, when in 1931 the Japanese attacked Manchuria. One of the principal objectives of World War II was the preservation of a free and independent China. This was the announced policy of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt. He made firm commitments to President Chiang Kai-shek and the National Government of China in the conviction that a free and independent China is necessary to world stability and peace as well as to our own security. These commitments were made with full knowledge of the imperfections and limitations of that Government and in the conviction that there was no constructive alternative. Recent events have underscored the validity of that conviction.

Unfortunately, after our great victory over Japan in August 1945, the policy of supporting the National Government of China was abandoned in favor of a policy of insisting upon a coalition with the Communists as the price of American aid. This new policy has proved to be disastrous. Indeed, the State Department acknowledged the folly of such a policy in France, Italy, and Greece and received a dramatic demonstration of its dangers when Czechoslovakia, through its coalition government, was ruthlessly drawn behind the iron curtain.

Today the Communist armies in China appear to be on the verge of complete victory over our wartime ally and are demanding the heads of the Chinese leaders who supported us and opposed them.

In our opinion, victory of the Communists in China would be a monumental and historic defeat for us and a grave threat to our national security. It would represent also a defeat for the forces of freedom for which so many Americans gave their lives in World Wars I and II. It would constitute a victory for the forces of Communist tyranny which could not fail to impress and influence those peoples who have no natural affiliations with communism but whose continued resistance is threatened by Communist aggression and intrigue. Such a victory would enormously multiply the hazards of war.

We respectfully invite answers to the following specific questions:

1. Does the United States Government consider that it has met the obligations to the Republic of China which it assumed under the Cairo and Yalta agreements?

2. What has the United States Government done and what does it intend to do to induce the Government of the U. S. S. R. to meet its obligations to the Republic of China, including the commitment to "render China moral support and assistance with military and other material resources, this support and assistance to be given fully to the National Government as the Central Government of China" (Treaty of Friendship, Mutual Assistance, and Postwar Collaboration Between the U. S. S. R. and China, entered into pursuant to the Yalta Agreement and signed August 14, 1945)?

3. What is our present policy toward China?

4. To what extent is it based on the findings and recommendations contained in the Wallace report of 1944, and to what extent on the findings and recommendations contained in the Wedemeyer report of September 1947?

5. What changes, if any, are contemplated in our present policy toward China?

6. Does the administration intend to support vigorously the Chinese Government and other elements in China which are resisting or which will resist subjugation of that country by Communist forces?

7. If the National Government of the Republic of China should bring the matter of Communist aggression in China before the Security Council or the General Assembly of the United Nations as a threat to the peace, will the United States Government support its action?

In view of the grave threat to our national security presented by the crisis in China, it is our considered judgment that the public

interest requires as a minimum the appointment of a commission of one or more eminent Americans, with top-level military, economic, and political advisers, to make an immediate reexamination of the situation and report its recommendations to you and to the Congress.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT HALE, Member of Congress, First, Maine; LEROY JOHNSON, Member of Congress, Third, California; CHARLES P. NELSON, Member of Congress, Second, Maine; JOHN W. HESELTON, Member of Congress, First, Massachusetts; JAY LEFEVRE, Member of Congress, Thirtieth, New York; JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, Member of Congress, Third, New Jersey; HAL HOLMES, Member of Congress, Fourth, Washington; W. STERLING COLE, Member of Congress, Thirty-ninth, New York; JAMES I. DOLLIVER, Member of Congress, Sixth, Iowa; JOHN JENNINGS, Member of Congress, Second, Tennessee; FRANK BARRETT, Member of Congress, Wyoming (at Large); CARL HINSHAW, Member of Congress, Twentieth, California; ANGIER L. GOODWIN, Member of Congress, Eighth, Massachusetts; FRANK FELLOWS, Member of Congress, Third, Maine; NORRIS COTTON, Member of Congress, Second, New Hampshire; T. MILLET HAND, Member of Congress, Second, New Jersey; T. H. WERDEL, Member of Congress, Tenth, California; WESLEY A. D'EWART, Member of Congress, Second, Montana; THRUSTON B. MORTON, Member of Congress, Third, Kentucky; ROLLA C. McMILLEN, Member of Congress, Nineteenth, Illinois; W. KINGSLAND MACY, Member of Congress, First, New York; JOHN DAVIS LODGE, Member of Congress, Fourth, Connecticut; KENNETH B. KEATING, Member of Congress, Fortieth, New York; LAWRENCE H. SMITH, Member of Congress, First, Wisconsin; J. W. WADSWORTH, Member of Congress, Forty-first, New York; BEN F. JENSEN, Member of Congress, Seventh, Iowa; DONALD L. JACKSON, Member of Congress, Sixteenth, California; JAMES T. PATTERSON, Member of Congress, Fifth, Connecticut; LEON H. GAVIN, Member of Congress, Nineteenth, Pennsylvania; CHESTER E. MERROW, Member of Congress, First, New Hampshire; FRANK B. KEEFE, Member of Congress, Sixth, Wisconsin; NOAH M. MASON, Member of Congress, Twelfth, Illinois; ANTON N. SADLAK, Member of Congress, Connecticut (at Large); J. CALEB BOGGS, Member of Congress, Delaware (at Large); CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, Member of Congress, Tenth, Massachusetts; ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, Member of Congress, Tenth, Wisconsin; GEO. A. DONDERO, Member of Congress, Seventeenth, Michigan; F. L. CRAWFORD, Member of Congress, Eighth, Michigan; JOS. P. O'HARA, Member of Congress, Second, Minnesota; CLIFFORD P. CASE, Member of Congress, Sixth, New Jersey; WALTER NORBLAD, Member of Congress, First, Oregon; EDWARD T. MILLER, Member of Congress, First, Maryland; AUG. H. ANDRESEN, Member of Congress, First, Minnesota; PAUL CUNNINGHAM, Member of Congress, Fifth, Iowa; WALTER H. JUDD, Member of Congress, Fifth, Minnesota; JOHN PHILLIPS, Member of Congress, Twenty-second, California; FRANCES P. BOLTON, Member of Congress, Twenty-second, Ohio; WALT HORAN, Member of Congress, Fifth, Washington; JOHN SANBORN, Member of Congress, Second, Idaho; RICHARD M. NIXON, Member of Congress, Twelfth, California; GEORGE J. BATES, Member of Congress, Sixth, Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, all of the 51 signers were Republican Members of the House. From this the inference may be drawn that the letter was a partisan demonstration. Such an inference, however, would be quite unwarranted. We asked several Members of the majority party to sign the letter, and many such Members were in full accord with the views expressed but for highly legitimate personal reasons were hesitant to sign. Under those circumstances we did not press for signatures.

On February 24 Secretary Acheson came up to the Ways and Means room in the New House Office Building and met with 30 signers of the letter. The Secretary stressed the fact that his discussion of our policy toward China would have to be confidential in character. Naturally I shall respect the Secretary's confidence. It must be plain to the House, however, that something is radically wrong when the Secretary of State feels obliged to confine to a closed session his discussion of our policy in China. I do not, of course, mean by this that in our relations with any country it may not be wise to maintain secrecy as to certain things, for example, appraisals of individual party leaders and programs. But if our policy to China were a clear and intelligent policy, the seven questions propounded to the President in our letter might, it seems to me, have been clearly and publicly answered.

These questions I should like to read to the House.

Unfortunately I am not an expert on China. I have never visited the country. I do not speak the language. I have never met Chiang Kai-shek or any of the other Chinese leaders either on the side of the National Government or on the Communist side. I should be even more modest than I am about the deficiencies in my knowledge of the subject were it not for the fact that probably a majority of the Members are no better equipped in this respect than I.

Fortunately, most of the facts which must govern our opinion about China are basic geographical and historical facts ascertainable without special knowledge. In view of the preconceptions and prejudices of the men upon whom the Secretary of State relies for information, up to the minute information upon which the Congress must base its decisions must be obtained from a Commission with top-level economic, military, and political advisers as recommended in our letter.

As a matter of history, everybody knows that we went to war in December 1941 to prevent the Japanese conquest of China. The Japanese attacked us at Pearl Harbor not because of antipathy to us as a nation, but because we were standing in the way of their Chinese conquest. It is an equally well-known historical fact that this country has always deemed a free and independent China essential to American security.

National security must be the paramount consideration of any intelligent foreign policy in this or any other country. It was the paramount consideration when we were forced to declare war on Germany in April 1917 as when we were forced to declare war on Japan and Germany in December 1941.

The outstanding and obvious fact about China today is that the Communist armies under Mao-Tze-tung are conquering China. The National Government under the Presidency of Chiang Kai-shek which in the Roosevelt administration we committed ourselves to support has thus far not succeeded in halting the Communist advance. We must consider that, unless effective steps are taken, Communist domination of China may become complete.

I do not for the life of me understand how there can be any doubt in the mind of any Member of the House of the consequences which would be entailed by such domination. We have seen the U. S. S. R. conquer one country after another in Europe, some by ruthless seizure, as in the case of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and East Poland, some by infiltration and "coalition," as in the case of western Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Rumania. The only difference between Russian conquest of these countries and Russian conquest of China is that China is a far bigger mouthful to swallow. I cannot myself believe that this distinction is very important.

The Russians have perfected the police state as no other country has ever succeeded in doing. Neither Hitler nor Mussolini in their palmiest days applied the technique of tyranny as thoroughly as it has been applied by Stalin, the Politburo, and the various subordinate agencies of the Soviet Government. They can erect a police state in China as they have already done in Russia which is as large in area and perhaps as decentralized. In the areas already conquered they seem already to have set up a police state and millions of refugees are fleeing into free China.

With China firmly in the Communist grasp all the other countries of continental Asia are brought under the heavy shadow of Communist aggression. I refer, of course, to Korea, Siam, Indochina, Burma, Malaya, India, and Pakistan. The same is to be said of the islands which lie off the southeast coast of Asia, the most important of which are, of course, Japan, the Dutch East Indies, and the Philippines. Who can imagine that this is a tenable situation for the United States? Probably not a dozen Members of this House. I do not think that even the State Department imagines it to be a tenable situation for the United States, but it hopes against hope and believes against reason that the worst will not happen. The cancer will just get well by wishing and neglect.

For the attitude of the State Department I refer the House to four very interesting articles which appeared in the New York Times under the signature of C. L. Sulzberger on February 14, 15, 18, and 21. These were obviously written on the basis of information received from State Department personnel. Just who the people were in the State Department I do not at the moment know, but the reasonable accuracy of the articles is admitted by State Department representatives with whom I have talked.

I am going to comment on these Sulzberger articles because they are more enlightening on the question of State Department thinking than anything that comes direct from the State Department. For instance, under date of February 14, Mr. Sulzberger writes:

"The United States, clearly recognizing the possibility that while Mr. Mao is a devout Marxist he may also be a Titoite heretic, cannot crystallize its own Chinese policy, until the political photograph is clarified." There is no question about the sincerity with which Mr. Mao regards himself as a Marxist. However, possibly ideology is the only tie between Mr. Mao and the Kremlin. It may alone serve to keep him the abject political tool of Moscow. It may not. For this reason Washington policy makers must watch and wait.

These statements mean simply that the United States cannot have any policy in China until the political photograph is clarified and the political photograph will not be clarified until we know how much Mr. Mao resembles Tito. This seems to me utter nonsense. The whole idea that between Mr. Mao and the Kremlin there is nothing but spiritual and ideological connection seems to me quite childish. Moreover when are we going to find out just how much Mr. Mao resembles Tito and when are we going to get copies of the communications which pass directly or indirectly between Mr. Mao and the Kremlin? If our own decisions as to China await absolute certitude on these points, when can we expect to have a Chinese policy?

Moreover, even if Mao did turn out to be another Tito, would that be any cause for rejoicing? Even if China became a replica of Yugoslavia it would still be a totalitarian state committed to the destruction of democracies.

On the 15th Mr. Sulzberger writes:

There is evidence that both the Chinese Communists and the Soviet Government are somewhat baffled by what has been occurring during the past few months in China. Mr. Mao's followers seem to feel furious and betrayed by the voracious appetite of their Communist guardian in Moscow.

If this means simply that Mao and Stalin are both surprised by the rapidity of the Chinese collapse it may be true. But why is Mr. Mao furious and betrayed at the voracious appetite of Moscow? At least we in this House ought by this time to know that the appetites of Moscow are insatiable.

Again Mr. Sulzberger—February 18:

There is logical basis for the belief that Moscow is reluctant to see too great an expansion of the powers of Chinese communism and for more than one reason.

This logical basis Mr. Sulzberger attributes partly to a latent fear in Moscow that Mao is going to be another Tito. This theme runs all through the articles.

Then Mr. Sulzberger goes on:

There are shrewd men in the State Department who ask: "If Stalin was adamantly opposed to the creation of a semi-independent Balkan federation under the leadership of Georgi Dimitrov, would he not be horrified at the growth of a huge, unwieldy Asiatic federation that has already demonstrated vital strains of nationalism? Under present Communist doctrine, as conceived by Moscow, all and any forms of nationalism are taboo."

It does not seem to me that the men in the State Department who ask this question are particularly shrewd. Nor do I believe that there is any truth in the statement that nationalism is taboo in Moscow. The Communists are quite capable of using nationalism as a tool. In fact, they are specifically indoctrinated so to do.

Mr. Sulzberger's delineation of our Chinese policy culminates in an article of February 21 in which he says:

The present Fabian phase of American policy toward China is founded upon the assumption that Mao-Tze-tung's Communist movement has a strong nationalist bias * * *. Whether this is a correct deduction must be judged by time. If so, it is bound to react against Soviet plans.

By the same token, if not so it is bound to react against America. And again the idea that the only thing we can do about the Communist enslavement of China is to wait and see, or more likely, to wait and not see.

Our policy makers—

Continues Mr. Sulzberger—

now reason that the United States must await the completion of the disintegration process in China before formulating a more positive policy there.

If we must await the completion of disintegration in China why did we not await the completion of disintegration in Greece and Turkey, Italy and France? Why do we have to have a North Atlantic Pact when apparently you could get more and better disintegration without it?

We cannot afford to commit ourselves to anything yet—

Mr. Sulzberger continues—

It would be futile to believe that a wall of provincial war lords can become a permanent dam, and sponsoring such a concept would incur the wrath of the victorious Mr. Mao.

Reading this, I ask myself why we incurred the wrath of the victorious Mr. Hitler or why we should have kept annoying the Japanese with our B-29's. Our military aid to Chiang, Mr. Sulzberger says, "was useless and only excited Americano-phobia among the Communists." Again the dreadful thought that the Communists will get to dislike us.

On the basis of our own experience it is felt that the U. S. S. R. can no more intervene and succeed in China than could the United States. External forces can influence but not control China.

Then why did we fear the Japanese? To be sure, they influenced China by overrunning the country, destroying and plundering. But they never in the State Department thesis could have controlled it. Almost everyone else, including an experienced Secretary of State, thought they could.

This thesis is also caressed editorially by the Washington Post, which spoke comfortingly only a few days ago of the "swift and remorseless way that the Chinese softened the invading Japanese." In view of this swiftness and remorselessness I do not understand why we fought a Pacific war. We ought to have let the Japanese invaders conquer and stay in China, subjecting themselves to this softening Chinese influence.

I should have said that the whole idea that China was insusceptible to conquest was repudiated once and for all the day after Pearl Harbor. Still Mr. Sulzberger complains:

It is difficult for the State Department to go a step further and spell out a specific policy, as many people demand.

This is all self-delusion, fuzzy thinking, and moral cowardice. Why should the State Department evade its duties because the performance of those duties is difficult? Obviously it is much more comfortable to wait and see. But we have pretty nearly reached the time to decide whether we are going to keep on being comfortable or make some overt effort to preserve American security by preventing attack from a Communist Russia buttressed by a Communist China in her rear. It is not so much that the State Department has failed. It has succeeded in making easy the advance of the Communists.

Most of the authorities seem agreed that Russia will not risk war on the west while her Chinese flank is exposed, and that she may risk it if her Chinese flank becomes secure.

Again and again it has been pointed out that Russia by focusing our attention on Berlin distracts it from China. This is a trick employed by every good prestidigitator and Stalin is a good prestidigitator.

The State Department is a majestic agency of our Government with what seems at times an inspired capacity for making mistakes and all the while believing itself infallible. It has been in the past permeated with Reds and leftists. If it is not still so permeated, there seem to be plenty of people left who have no fixed convictions against communism and are quite gullible about Communist propaganda. From information that comes to me recently I gather that the anti-Chiang and leftist influences in the State Department are right now in process of being further strengthened.

The Secretary of State is a man of high intellectual attainments with several years of experience in the Department, but he is dependent like any other department head on the briefing he gets from his staff. I am satisfied that the briefing has been bad. A great many things which indisputably happened in China are simply not in the State Department book. General Chennault would appear to me to know something about China. I am certain that our colleague from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD, knows a great deal about China. Such sources of information, the Secretary rejects and scornfully rejects. Despite the documentary evidence, including General Marshall's own report, the State Department will not even admit that General Marshall sought to "influence the formation of a coalition government" in China.

The State Department's motto is aptly represented by the old rhyme:

What there is to know, I know it,
What I don't know is not knowledge.

This attitude of mind on the part of people in power can wreck the greatest nation.

What can we do now to avert catastrophe? Many say, it is too late; but others who appear to me quite as worthy

of confidence say it is not too late. On this point I would like a fresh opinion which can be speedily obtained by sending a competent commission to China.

Some people regard Chiang Kai-shek as a great national hero; other as an incompetent villain surrounded by a corrupt personnel. I have no first-hand opinion but I make the observation that it is to the Communists' interest to make him out an incompetent villain. Therefore when I hear him disparaged I suspect the disparager has been unconsciously misled by the Communist line. The Kremlin understands the art of disparagement. How flattering are Pravda and Izvestia in their reference to President Truman, Secretary Forrestal, Secretary Marshall, and other American leaders?

Chiang is still the actual if not the titular head of the only organized opposition to Chinese communism. He has been our friend and in the long run we shall not profit from abandoning our friends. We are now making an unenviable record as a nation not to be relied on.

I would rather chance two or three more billion if that should prove necessary in a genuine effort to save China from Communist control even now than face the absolute certainty of disaster 5 or 10 years hence when the Kremlin has atomic weapons and is ready to move.

Even if the State Department is willing to see China disintegrate and wait till the dust settles, I hope that the Congress will not acquiesce in any such program. Quite as much as the executive department of the Government, we are responsible for the honor and safety of the Republic.

ANOTHER INDISPENSABLE MAN?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, meeting with little opposition while kicking the Eightieth Congress around, and elected partly because of his promises and surrender to special interests and partly because of the soft campaign of an overconfident opponent, President Truman has jumped to the false conclusion that he was elected because a majority of the people supported his political program of promising to give everyone whatever was asked. At two Jefferson Day banquets held here in Washington, where the representatives of special interests, of big business, and of city political machines paid $100 each—and it is said the "kitty" was around $300,000—to fatten the National Democratic treasury, the President threatened not only Republicans but members of his own party with a purge. He said he might be forced to again tour the country, condemning the Eighty-first Congress—his Congress—the Congress he asked the people to elect—in fact, everyone who does not bow down and worship at the feet of Truman.

Never in the history of this country and seldom in known history has a little man in his own opinion grown to such stature.

In his campaign, the President condemned the Eightieth Congress as the second worst Congress in the history of our country, this though the greater part of the record it made was supported by his own party members. Now it is the Eighty-first Congress—and why? Just because it has not acknowledged the Truman brand of politics? As a former member of the Pendergast corrupt political machine, he just cannot understand the independence of certain party members, their adherence to their convictions, their devotion to their constituents.

Now he has the conceit to think he can make the people believe that he is the champion of the little man, of the people as a whole, though he has gathered around him the representatives of big business, though he consults daily with millionaires and labor bosses and would-be dictators, though it is a matter of common knowledge in Washington, at least, that he is the political prisoner of the CIO and other special interests.

His policies indicate he has been taken over, lock, stock, and barrel, hook, line, and sinker, by Phil Murray, the CIO, and its political adherents.

During his campaign he promised, and he is still promising, special privileges, special benefits to groups which he thinks can continue him in power. His only suggestion as to where he can get the money to pay off his political allies is to impose more and greater taxes upon everybody. His program for additional taxes will make the little man pay more for everything he eats and wears.

In the Eightieth Congress, a majority of his own party—Democrats—disregarded his orders and on several occasions overrode his veto. They voted for measures which they believed would contribute to the national welfare and security. That, in the Truman book, was treason to him. Now he is sending his orders to the United States Senate.

During the campaign, President Truman evidently believed that there were enough rubber-stamp, wishy-washy, spineless Democratic candidates for Congress who, if elected, would blindly follow him, even though his measures might wreck our national economy.

Due, in part, to his promises, many of of which he must have known were impossible of fulfillment, the President was elected and the people gave him an overwhelming majority in the Congress. His campaign was one of expediency, of promises—letting the chips (taxes) fall where they may.

Now he finds that, if judged by the measuring stick he used on the Eightieth, the Eighty-first Congress—"his" Congress, he called it—having enough good sense and sound judgment to refuse to follow his campaign promises which would wreck us, is worse than the Eightieth Congress.

Evidently peeved and irked at the failure of the Democratic Congress to bow down and worship at his feet, the President reveals his smallness and his weakness by applying to one of his radio critics an unprintable name. Nor, according to the reports, is that the first time the President used that language. In his campaign in California, it is reported he referred to a Republican candidate for Congress, the Honorable Bertrand Gearhart, many times selected by the people of his district to represent them, by expressing the hope that Mr. Gearhart—and the President, the press charges, referred to him as "that ———" —would be defeated.

Now most folks, at least decent folks, know, and many a mother has advised her little son when first he learned to use naughty words, that it was only the ignorant—people lacking ability, good sense, good judgment, common decency—who found it necessary to use nasty, obscene or profane language in describing their opponents. Perhaps the President learned the naughty words when a member of Tom Pendergast's vote-stealing political organization.

When he entered the White House door he should have either forgotten them or filed them away until he was out of the house honored by Lincoln and other God-fearing, God-serving, clean-mouthed Presidents.

The President has forgotten that this is a Republic. He has forgotten that pride goeth before a fall. Apparently by his utterances he considers himself greater than his party, than the Congress. He talks like a dictator.

He threatens to again take a train, to go out into the country, to whip up sentiment so that the people will repudiate their chosen Representatives, coerce them into doing his—Truman's—will.

Yes, using his own yardstick, the Eighty-first Congress has demonstrated that it is worse than the Eightieth, insofar as asserting its independence of Mr. Truman is concerned. So he will take a train. Hop to it, Mr. President.

The President promised that the Taft-Hartley Act would be repealed, the Wagner Act reinstated. The House Labor Committee turned down that very proposition, and in the Senate it is becoming more and more evident that the essential provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act will be retained. Congress has not yet sold out to the CIO.

In all humility, may it be suggested to the President that he take a train—that he appeal to the people, and that while on his train, he explain to them just why he must use nasty, dirty language; why he surrenders to Phil Murray and the CIO; why he has not taken effective measures to oust the Communists from the Federal Government; where he is going to get the money to carry out the program which he advocates and, for good measure, that they, the people, are paying for his train—he won't pay for it out of his increase in salary which the Eighty-first Congress gave him.

Yes, Mr. Truman, you take a train—take along your swelled head and it is quite certain that on this trip, if you take it, you will be met, not by a complacent, confident, self-satisfied Dewey, but by an opposition which will at least try to cut you down to size, expose your false front and hand you some of the same medicine—not socialized—you appear to be so eager to hand out.

President Truman evidently thinks he is on the way to a dictatorship, but it is just possible that he may learn, as have other self-satisfied individuals, that the Americans are a little slow, but eventually they will demonstrate their ability to take a man's true measure.

From the Chicago Tribune of the 28th of February is an editorial bearing upon the question of Mr. Truman's real greatness. It reads as follows:

GOVERNMENT BY CLAQUE

Mr. Truman told some of the New Deal faithful at a Jefferson-Jackson dinner that "I may even get on the train again and make another tour around the country" to try to dragoon Congress into passing his program of state socialism. The Republican response has been to tell him to hop to it. His quarrel with Congress lies at least as much with the sensible elements among his own party as it does with the Republicans, and the feeling is that if Truman takes the stump he will only succeed in exposing the high-nonsense content of his so-called program and its inherent contradictions.

All of the arguments are against him on such proposals as reverting to the Wagner Act, raising taxes, installing a full set of controls over the Nation's economic life, putting the administration into business as a producer of steel and other commodities, socializing medicine, hunting up alliances for war, etc., etc. But he feels that the demagogic tactics that won him an election are still good for another try, and that by rambling around the country addressing appeals to the prejudice and self-interest of the pressure groups which turned out for him before, he can whip Congress into obedience as if it were a circus dog with a trick to perform.

This certainly represents the nadir of representative government in the United States. If representative bodies are to vacate all judgment and simply govern themselves by the decibel count of the witless huzzahs of mobs driven to station platforms by political and union bosses, we might as well fold up and let Truman govern by decree, like a Hitler, a Mussolini, or a Stalin.

The arrogance of the minority President's public behavior has been growing by leaps and bounds. Mr. Roosevelt himself never gave a better exhibition. Within 2 days Truman cursed out his opponents in public, insulted the head of a presumably friendly state, and then threatened to go out and raise claques around the country to howl down Congress in its appointed job of legislating for the whole Nation.

Nobody must argue with the illumination that has descended upon this man. Nobody must oppose. Obedience to the leader: That is all that is required of the people and their representatives. No, this is not the Germany of the blood purge, the Italy of the castor-oil treatments, the Russia of the Moscow trials. It is the United States which an arrogant and intolerant man of small capacity and less wisdom and no dignity is trying to create in 1949.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. MURDOCK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper item.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALE asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks previously made and include a telegram from David Clark and an editorial from the World Telegram.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD indicate that if I had been present and voted on the bill H. R. 2663 I would have voted in the affirmative. I was delayed in getting to the floor by a delegation visiting me at the time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOSEPH MELVILLE BROUGHTON

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad and painful duty to announce to the House the death of the Honorable JOSEPH MELVILLE BROUGHTON, junior Senator from North Carolina, which occurred yesterday morning at 8:40 at the naval hospital as a result of an acute heart attack.

One of the mysteries of life is that one so young and active, with a career so useful and brilliant, should be suddenly removed from our midst. It reminds us of the uncertainty and brittleness of the thread of life.

JOSEPH MELVILLE BROUGHTON was born in Raleigh, capital of North Carolina, November 17, 1888, of a family long identified with public service.

The practice of law, the chosen profession of Senator BROUGHTON, has been interspersed with such public and civic responsibilities as city attorney of Raleigh, president of the Raleigh Chamber of Commerce, president of his county and State bar associations, member of the North Carolina Senate in 1927 and 1929, and Democratic Presidential elector-at-large in 1936.

In 1940 Senator BROUGHTON was elected governor of North Carolina by the largest majority ever received by any candidate for governor in the State, and in 1944 he received the unanimous endorsement of his State, as well as considerable support from other States, for the Democratic nomination for Vice President.

Throughout his professional, civic, and political activities, JOSEPH MELVILLE BROUGHTON was motivated by a religious conviction regularly and faithfully nurtured in active service as an outstanding layman in the church and superintendent of Tabernacle Baptist Sunday School in Raleigh for nearly 30 years, and as teacher of a men's Bible class in that Sunday school for a similar number of years, demonstrating that his philosophy in life was to consider things in the order of their importance.

At the age of 28 Mr. BROUGHTON took unto himself a real helpmate, Miss Alice Willson, of Raleigh. Surviving, in addition to Mrs. Broughton, are one daughter, Alice, and three sons, Melville, Jr., Bobby, and Woodson, all three of whom have served their country in the armed forces.

Senator BROUGHTON had the rare faculty for understanding the problems of agriculture, industry, and labor, and of manifesting his sympathetic interest in attainment of the goals of each of these groups without bias or partisanship. As a result, he enjoyed the confidence of industry, agriculture, labor, and all worth-while groups.

Senator BROUGHTON was elected to the United States Senate, after a heated contest, in 1948 by a majority of over 300,000, demonstrating that by his high character, outstanding ability, and conscientious devotion to duty he had earned and enjoyed the support of an overwhelming majority of the people of our Commonwealth. He assumed his duties as Senator on December 31, 1948, and consequently had served only a little more than 2 months. Yet, by his outstanding ability and assiduous devotion to duty he had impressed his colleagues most favorably.

Senator BROUGHTON was a most useful private citizen; an outstanding statesman; a devoted religious leader and teacher; a successful businessman; an able lawyer; and a great American—a truly great man.

It was of such as he the inspired writer wrote:

Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright; for the end of that man is peace.

I would not conclude these remarks without extending my heartfelt and most sincere sympathy to the bereaved family—the devoted wife and children.

I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, again it becomes my sad duty to take the floor of the House in regard to a friend. I believe I could sum up my statement in a few words in regard to this great man by saying his whole concept of human rights was based on his belief in God. He was a man who spent much of his life in the interest of what he believed in, and he had a deep religious conviction. I suppose his influence in teaching over the radio has reached as many people in the last 10 years or more than any other individual in our State of North Carolina. He served as Governor of North Carolina during a part of the emergency that this country faced. He did an exceptional job, always placing his country first. He served, as Governor of North Carolina, not one class of people in our State, but he served all classes of people. I am very sorry that I will be unable to attend the funeral tomorrow due to the fact that I have legislation here on the floor of the House, but I wish to extend to his noble wife my deepest sympathy, to his sons and daughter, and may we grow many more men in the State of North Carolina that will measure up to the capacity and the character of this grand individual. He truly lived the life of a gentleman.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has lost an able and distinguished Senator in the death of J. MELVILLE BROUGHTON, junior Senator from North Carolina, who died in the early hours yesterday morning. He had just served 2 months in the Senate but had unquestionably impressed his colleagues in the Congress as a most capable statesman and valuable addition to the United States Senate. He had just presided in the Chamber of the Senate Friday morning for 2½ hours, which was quite a long period for a freshman Senator.

Senator BROUGHTON was to make his maiden speech in the Senate this morning on the much-discussed rule 22. Although warned somewhat by a slight heart disturbance, he was determined to carry his part of the burden and planned to start his speech in the Senate today even with this slight physical warning, showing courage and obedience to duty in this decision.

In North Carolina Senator BROUGHTON was a distinguished lawyer, a great statesman and a splendid citizen. He served in the State Senate in 1927 with fine distinction. He was elected governor of North Carolina in 1942 and served for 4 years, giving the State a progressive, far-seeing administration, emphasizing especially the needs of the farmers and school teachers. After a spirited primary in 1948, he was elected by a substantial majority in the fall election and came to the Senate with the expectancy that he had entered into a long period of valued service to his State and Nation.

His home life was ideal as he left surviving him four fine children and a charming, gracious wife who must be credited with a great deal of the success which was accorded her talented husband.

Senator BROUGHTON graduated from Wake Forest College with a bachelor of arts degree in 1910, taught school and did newspaper work for several years, entering Harvard Law School in 1912. In 1914 he was admitted to practice law in his native State of North Carolina. As a successful lawyer he was outstanding, enjoying one of the best practices in the State and being elected by his fellow lawyers president of the North Carolina Bar Association.

North Carolina has lost a great statesman and citizen, and the Nation a distinguished Senator with a fine career predicted for him in that body, in the death of J. MELVILLE BROUGHTON, junior Senator from North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, may I join with my colleagues from North Carolina in extending sympathy to his family.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE].

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning at approximately 8:45 those of us who happened to be passing in front of the Capitol noticed the flags at half-mast. This indicated to us that some Member had passed on. It was Hon. J. MELVILLE BROUGHTON, United States Senator from North Carolina.

In thinking of the passing of this distinguished North Carolinian, this outstanding Christian layman, I cannot help but feel that perhaps many people on the sidelines and those who may daily visit the Capital of our great land may not fully realize the tremendous pressure Members of Congress face, day by day. Perhaps many may feel that all we do here is to respond to roll calls and vote "yea" or "nay." This was not true of this distinguished gentleman who has passed away and many who are Members of this great body. The trials, the work, the burdens here are terrifically heavy.

Senator BROUGHTON eagerly assumed the tasks assigned to him in the Senate during these past few weeks. He literally gave of himself without concern for his physical well-being.

Those of us who have been close to him through these years cannot help but feel that not only North Carolina but our Nation has lost a distinguished citizen, a great political leader, and an outstanding Christian gentleman.

I join with my colleagues in extending to his beloved wife and devoted children my feelings of sincere sympathy.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CHATHAM].

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Speaker, the Baptist Church has lost an outstanding teacher, the State of North Carolina has lost a great representative, and the Nation has lost a great statesman. Senator BROUGHTON was beloved in our State of North Carolina as few men ever have been. He was a great farmer, a fine church leader, a teacher, a great lawyer, and one of the finest governors we have ever had. Throughout the length and breadth of our State there will be many a teary eye today and tomorrow. His place is secure in the hearts of the people of North Carolina because he will go down in history as one of the most beloved men ever to come out of our State. For his family, I hope that they will stand up under this great loss knowing that they have the affection and love of the people of our State. I extend to them my sincerest sympathy.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CARLYLE].

Mr. CARLYLE. Mr. Speaker, when I learned of the sudden and untimely passing of that great statesman, Hon. J. MELVILLE BROUGHTON, of North Carolina, it was impressed upon me again that although we are enjoying life, we are but a step removed from the Great Beyond. I talked with him only a few hours before his passing, and he was in good spirit and appeared in good health.

Senator BROUGHTON had a fervent desire to be of real service to his State and Nation, and to that end was exerting to the fullest measure his able talents and ability.

My duties in Washington brought me in close contact with Senator BROUGHTON, and his counsel was invaluable and his full cooperation at all times assured. His splendid record as Governor and as United States Senator gives full assurance that he will be remembered as one of North Carolina's greatest sons. Our State and this Nation have lost an able and devoted public servant. Truly, a great and good man has fallen.

Senator BROUGHTON was a man who was at all times loyal. He was devoted to his family, his friends, his country, and his Creator. He was diligent in all of his undertakings, and the Death Angel almost caught him at his desk. He was strong in action, loyal to his purpose, and upright in life. It is difficult for us to realize that he has passed from among us, and we feel that the poet was using inspired words when it was written:

There is no death, I am sure of that;
The thing that seems to be
Is but a touch of winter
That lays bare the spreading tree.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, several years ago, while on a speaking engagement in North Carolina, Mrs. McCormack and I had the honor and pleasure of first meeting the late Senator J. MELVILLE BROUGHTON. He was then Governor of the State of North Carolina. He immediately made a favorable impression upon both of us. We shall always remember the day and we shall always remember his fine personality, his generous hospitality, and the warmth of his reception. As Governor of the State of North Carolina, during a long public career, the name and fame and reputation of this great man had gone far beyond the geographical limits of the State of North Carolina.

We of Massachusetts and New England recognized him before he came to Washington as a Member of the other branch, as a man of great character, a man of unusual ability, and a man who considered public office to be a public trust.

Speaking, as I am confident that I do, for all of my colleagues in the House without regard to political party, we regret very much the passing of the late Senator BROUGHTON. His election to the Senate meant that on the national field he would be able to give to the people of the country the benefit of his great capacity, of his broad and understanding mind, and particularly of the deep faith that he entertained. Without regard to our religious convictions—and I am a communicant of the Catholic Church—I like to see persons entertain and possess a deep faith. Our institutions of government are dependent upon the belief of our people in God. No people can have democratic institutions of government who do not believe in God. Democratic institutions of government are strengthened when men and women of the country enjoying democratic institutions of government, not only believe in God but live as nearly as they can the life of God and the Redeemer.

This great man, referred to and properly so as a deeply religious gentleman and a great American, certainly exemplified that during his lifetime.

His widow and son cannot help, as time passes, but derive great consolation from the knowledge that he was a man of deep faith, and, possessing the deep faith that he had, that he was an example and an inspiration for all others to follow in life. In death, his memory will be a similar inspiration for all who follow.

I join with my colleagues in the House in expressing to our colleagues from North Carolina our deep sympathy in their great loss and sorrow, and to Mrs. Broughton and her son our profound sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] requested me to state that he would necessarily be absent today. Otherwise he would submit some remarks on this occasion.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that all Members may have five legislative days within which to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on

the life and services of the late Senator BROUGHTON.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, the sudden death of Hon. J. MELVILLE BROUGHTON shocked the Nation and left the State which he loved and served so ably in profound sorrow at the passing of its junior Senator. His death at any time would have been a tragedy. Coming as it did when he was approaching the fullness of his life and the climax of his power to serve his State and Nation, it is most unfortunate.

Senator BROUGHTON was a member of a family which has devoted its life to the religious uplift of our State and the installation of those human characteristics which keep men in step with God and enable them to obtain peace and success on earth and that crown in eternity which the faithful secure. North Carolina was proud of MELVILLE BROUGHTON and honored him as but few of its citizens have been honored. He was a well-equipped lawyer and in his profession convinced the people of his great State of his faithfulness and his reliability in every trust committed to him. He was elected Governor of North Carolina and held that position with distinction and afterward was elected to the Senate of the United States. These honors which his great State bestowed upon him do not compel you to forget the many other useful acts of his life. There burns deep in the hearts of all who knew him a shrine to the memory of this man whose life was a mirror of the God he loved. As a United States Senator, Mr. BROUGHTON stood on the threshold of an even more illustrious career and gave certain promise of taking his place among the great men of this Nation as he had already done among those of his native State.

Mr. BROUGHTON evidently knew that he had some serious physical trouble, yet he carried on by his own will power and innate greatness and continued his work in behalf of freemen everywhere and never ceased to withhold any of his physical, moral, and mental energy to serve his State and the Nation he loved so dearly. The wealth of a State or a Nation is not judged by its rich minerals and fertile lands, but by the manhood and womanhood of its people. Rich indeed is the State that can claim J. MELVILLE BROUGHTON as her son, and even richer are we who can claim him as a friend and realize the quickening inspiration of his life and his warm fellowship and constructive service which he always gladly rendered throughout his life.

All over the world, throughout all history, the scattered gone still live, not visible, but in some spiritual imbedded form; every day we meet someone who reminds us of someone we have known or loved.

What a happy thought, at least, to think that we may be privileged to live indefinitely in innumerable lives, long after we have retired for our last, long sleep.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HAYS of Arkansas, for 5 days, on account of necessary absence from Washington.

To Mr. HÉBERT (at the request of Mr. BROOKS) for 5 days, on account of urgent business.

To Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. (at the request of Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania), on account of illness.

THE LATE HONORABLE J. MELVILLE BROUGHTON

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 135), which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. J. MELVILLE BROUGHTON, a Senator of the United States from the State of North Carolina.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That a committee of 12 Members be appointed on the part of the House to join the committee appointed on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to attend the funeral, Mr. DOUGHTON, Mr. KERR, Mr. BULWINKLE, Mr. COOLEY, Mr. BARDEN, Mr. DURHAM, Mr. BONNER, Mr. DEANE, Mr. JONES, Mr. REDDEN, Mr. CARLYLE, and Mr. CHATHAM.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 8, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

323. A letter from the chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting the Commission's report on reorganization of the Department of Commerce (H. Doc. No. 100); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

324. A letter from the chairman, Comsion on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting to the Congress a study prepared for the Commission's consideration on the independent regulatory commission of the Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

325. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates in the amount of $2,250,000 and contract authorizations in the amount of $3,400,000 for the fiscal year 1950 for the Department of the Interior, in the form of amendments to the budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 101); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

326. A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Munitions Control Board, transmitting a report covering the exportation and importation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war for the period January 1 to June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

327. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of propcsed legislation to exempt the Post Office Department from the provisions of the Federal Register Act, as amended, and the Administrative Procedure Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

328. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a bill to permit the suspension of employees without pay for periods of 30 days or less without the preferment of written charges; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

329. A letter from the assistant to the Attorney General; transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the extension and application of the provisions of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to certain officers and employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in the Department of Justice; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

330. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 25, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Cathance River, Maine, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

331. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 26, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Jefferys Creek, Florence County, S. C., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

332. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 26, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports of waterway from Bon Secour Bay, Ala., to the Gulf, by way of Oyster Bay, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on September 25, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BLAND: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 1340. A bill to provide for United States-flag shipping participation in Government-financed cargoes; with amendments (Rept. No. 220). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report 221. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2672. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims of military personnel and civilian employees of the War Department or of the Army for damage to or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of personal property occurring incident to their service; with an amendment (Rept. No. 227). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 679. A bill to authorize the admission of Mrs. Julia Balint to the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 216). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1010. A bill for the relief of Mrs. May K. Y. Mok, Frederick W. S. Mok, and Vincent W. C. Mok; with an amendment (Rept. No. 217). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1591. A bill for the relief of Bram B. Tellekamp; with an amendment (Rept. No. 218). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1876. A bill for the relief of Ralph Martin Elzingre, also known as Ralph Seawell; with an amendment (Rept. No. 219). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1791. A bill for the relief of Raleigh B. Diamond; without amendment (Rept. No. 222). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 731. A bill for the relief of James Flynn; with an amendment (Rept. No. 223). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 682. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Harry E. Hewitt; with amendments (Rept. No. 224). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 607. A bill for the relief of Harvey M. Lifset, formerly a major in the Army of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 225). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary: H. R. 602. A bill for the relief of Fritz Busche; without amendment (Rept. No. 226). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 3256. A bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3257. A bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIEMILLER:

H. R. 3258. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of cerebral palsy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 3259. A bill to add to the Abraham Lincoln National Historical Park, Ky., certain land acquired by the United States for that purpose; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CHESNEY:

H. R. 3260. A bill to terminate the war tax rates on telephone, telegraph, and other communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COFFEY:

H. R. 3261. A bill to amend the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 3262. A bill to restore the right of American citizens to freely own gold and gold coins; to return control over the public purse to the people; to restrain further deterioration of our currency; to enable holders of paper money to redeem it in gold coin on demand; to establish and maintain a domestic gold coin standard; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 3263. A bill to provide special pensions for certain persons awarded medals for extraordinary heroism while serving with the armed forces of the United States of America; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER:

H. R. 3264. A bill to authorize the Veterans' Administration to reimburse State and local agencies for expenses incurred by them in rendering necessary services in ascertaining the qualifications of educational institutions for furnishing training to veterans and in the supervision of educational institutions offering such training; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE of California:

H. R. 3265. A bill to provide price support for raisins; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 3266. A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 3267. A bill to provide for the acquisition of land and preparation of plans for the remodeling and expansion of the main post-office building in the Borough of Braddock, Allegheny County, Pa., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3268. A bill to provide for acquisition of land and the construction of a post office in the Borough of East McKeesport, Allegheny County, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3269. A bill to provide for acquisition of land and the construction of a post office in the Borough of Elizabeth, Allegheny County, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3270. A bill to provide for acquisition of land and the construction of a post office in the Borough of Glassport, Allegheny County, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3271. A bill to provide for acquisition of land and the construction of a post office in the Borough of Dravosburg, Allegheny County, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 3272. A bill to mitigate the effect of double taxation of corporate income by allowing a limited credit against the income tax of the shareholder receiving dividends; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3273. A bill to increase the rate of surtax, in the case of corporations, from 14 percent to 16 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 3274. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain historic properties to the State of Georgia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 3275. A bill to provide for the sale or other disposal of certain submarginal lands located within the boundaries of Indian reservations in the States of Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 3276. A bill to grant recognition for wartime service in the United States merchant marine and to provide that persons who served in the wartime merchant marine shall not be liable for induction into the armed services under the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 3277. A bill to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the establishment of the first cotton mill in the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3278. A bill to amend section 22 (d) (6) (A) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to involuntary liquidation and replacement of inventory; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3279. A bill to provide free postage for hospitalized members and veterans of the armed forces and to make available for such purpose to certain Government hospitals machines for the impressing and cancellation of postage stamps; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3280. A bill to extend the loan benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to certain widows of veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3281. A bill to raise the limit on the amount of annual income from other sources which may be received by the widow or child of a veteran of World War I or II without disqualifying such widow or child for a pension for the non-service-connected death of such veteran; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 3282. A bill to repeal certain acts of Congress, known as Indian liquor laws, in certain parts of Minnesota; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 3283. A bill to provide for cooperation with State agencies administering labor laws in establishing and maintaining accident-prevention activities in industry and in the preparation, promulgation, and enforcement of regulations to control industrial accident hazards; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 3284. A bill to authorize grantees of recreational demonstration project lands to make land exchanges relating to such properties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. REGAN:

H. R. 3285. A bill authorizing the replacement and reconstruction by the Bureau of Reclamation of certain bridges across the Franklin canal of the Rio Grande project of the Bureau of Reclamation within the city of El Paso, Tex., and authorizing appropriation for that purpose; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. TACKETT:

H. R. 3286. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Waldron, Ark., a post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3287. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Ashdown, Ark., a post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3288. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Booneville, Ark., a post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 3289. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to further promote the development and maintenance of the American merchant marine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 3290. A bill to outlaw the Communist Party; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 3291. A bill to amend the Shipping Act of 1916, as amended, to provide for the development of the American merchant marine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 3292. A bill to establish a Federal Commission on Services for the Physically Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 3293. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of

optometry in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 3294. A bill to regulate the hours of duty and the pay of civilian keepers of lighthouses and civilians employed on lightships and other vessels of the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. R. 3295. A bill to direct the Veterans' Administrator to repay certain educational loans made to veterans of World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 3296. A bill to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital for Negro veterans at the birthplace of Booker T. Washington in Franklin County, Va.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 3297. A bill to authorize the addition of certain lands to Manassas National Battlefield Park, Va., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. DEANE:

H. Con. Res. 44. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 401, Eightieth Congress, entitled "Fascism in Action"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. REE:

H. Con. Res. 45. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to procure 2,000 additional copies of its hearings on the bill (H. R. 2362) to amend an act entitled "The Economic Cooperation Act of 1948," approved April 3, 1948; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. Res. 132. Resolution to provide funds for necessary miscellaneous expenses of the Committee on the District of Columbia; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. COX:

H. Res. 133. Resolution to amend paragraph (2) (c) of rule XI of the rules of the House (relating to the Committee on Rules) to read as it read during the Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. Res. 134. Resolution providing for the employment of 12 additional elevator operators, office of the Architect of the Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARING:

H. R. 3298. A bill for the relief of Domingo Ozamis-Ormaechea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3299. A bill for the relief of Serapio Zabala-Arrien; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIEMILLER:

H. R. 3300. A bill for the relief of Mary Thomas Schiek, a Red Cross employee injured by the Army; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 3301. A bill to extend the time within which suit may be filed under the Federal Tort Claims Act on the claim of the estate of Mrs. Juana Mercado Valle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3302. A bill for the relief of the guardian of Porfirio Velázquez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3303. A bill for the relief of Nemesio Vegas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3304. A bill for the relief of José Cotto Santiago; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3305. A bill for the relief of the estate of José Salgado Santos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3306. A bill for the relief of Antonio Rojas Vélez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3307. A bill for the relief of Cristóbal Rivera Santiago; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3308. A bill for the relief of Aida Morales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3309. A bill for the relief of the guardian of Ovidio Vázquez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3310. A bill for the relief of Lydia Cortés; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3311. A bill for the relief of Carmen Morales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3312. A bill for the relief of Héctor Luis Méndez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3313. A bill for the relief of the estate of the late Manuel Graulau Vélez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3314. A bill for the relief of the estate of the late Eulogio Reyes Suárez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3315. A bill for the relief of Alejo Padilla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3316. A bill for the relief of the estate of the late Francisco J. Córdova; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3317. A bill for the relief of the estate of the late Domingo Acosta Arizmendi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3318. A bill for the relief of Gladys Prieto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3319. A bill for the relief of Juana Pagán; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3320. A bill for the relief of Ignacio Colón Cruz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3321. A bill for the relief of Gloria Esther Díaz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3322. A bill for the relief of Lilly Vélez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3323. A bill for the relief of the estate of Rafael Rebollo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3324. A bill for the relief of the estate of the late Anastacio Acosta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 3325. A bill for the relief of Catherine A. Giesener; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 3326. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ann Morrison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANBORN:

H. R. 3327. A bill for the relief of the Elmore Cooperative Hatchery; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 3328. A bill for the relief of Daniel Lindsey Payne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 3329. A bill for the relief of Hayward O. Brandon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 3330. A bill for the relief of Therese Hohmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHEELER:

H. R. 3331. A bill for the relief of J. H. King, Jr., and R. H. Padgett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 3332. A bill for the relief of Theodora Dovalis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

164. By Mr. CARROLL: Memorial of the Colorado State Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for the creation of a Department of Natural Resources, the establishment of regional or branch offices of that and other Federal departments and agencies, and for the location of a United States Military Academy of the Air in Denver, Colo.; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

165. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution passed by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to use their good offices to secure prompt passage of legislation for the creation and support of a Federal housing program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

166. By Mr. HART: Petition of St. Francis Holy Name Society, Hoboken, N. J., protesting against the outrageous procedure employed in the alleged trial of His Eminence Josef Cardinal Mindszenty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

167. Also, petition of Chapter 150, Catholic War Veterans, West New York, N. J., stating the signatories are in complete accord with the denunciations heaped upon the Hungarian communistic government for the outrageous charges made against His Eminence Cardinal Mindszenty and the reprehensible methods employed in the conduct of his so-called trial; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

168. By Mr. JACOBS: Memorial of the Eighty-sixth General Assembly of the State of Indiana to the Congress of the United States, to enact a law making family desertion a national crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

169. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the Eighty-sixth Indiana General Assembly, the senate concurring, that Congress pass and the President of the United States approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution to establish October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

170. Also, memorial of the Eighty-sixth General Assembly of the State of Indiana to the Congress of the United States, to enact effective legislation providing for flood control in the Wabash River watershed area and tributaries thereto; to the Committee on Public Works.

171. By Mr. LOVRE: Concurrent resolution of the South Dakota Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which will assure the payment of prices for farm products at not less than 100 percent of parity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

172. Also, concurrent resolution of the South Dakota Legislature, memorializing the Congress and the President of the United States to take action to prevent the passage of legislation permitting the coloring of oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

173. By Mr. NORBLAD: Address of Dr. A. L. Strand, president, Oregon State College, Corvallis, Oreg., setting out the records of Dr. Ralph W. Spitzer and L. R. LaVallee, whose contracts with the college were not renewed; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

174. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Harold Colee, executive vice president, Florida State Chamber of Commerce, Jacksonville, Fla., requesting that Congress do not enact legislation in any form dealing with socialized medicine, be it known as compulsory health insurance, a national health program, State medicine, Government insurance, or by any other name; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

175. Also, petition of Dr. Maurice Beck, Florida Apartment House Association, Miami, Fla., vigorously protesting against extension of rent control in any form; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 8, 1949

(Legislative day of Monday, February 21, 1949)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Ralph Candler John, S. T. M., assistant minister, Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Spirit, our Heavenly Father, Thou art the creator and preserver of life, and Thy providence is the invincible guardian of that which is true and good. So instruct our minds that our thoughts may be as from Thee. So establish Thy ways in our hearts that we may lay claim to those invaluable qualities, exemplified by our Lord, which Thou alone canst give.

These mercies we ask to the end that as the affairs of our Nation and our world find determination in this place of destiny, all may be made to rest upon the timeless foundations of wisdom and righteousness. May we stand in strength because we stand with and for Thee. This we ask in Jesus' blessed name. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. J. Melville Broughton, late a Senator from the State of North Carolina.

The message announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 29. An act to authorize payment of claims based on loss of or damage to property deposited by alien enemies;

S. 170. An act to authorize the transfer of certain property to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes;

S. 593. An act for the relief of certain postal employees;

S. 630. An act to amend section 19 of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), so as to remove the upper age limit for appointment to commissioned grade in the Supply Corps of the Navy; and

S. J. Res. 22. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the three hundredth anniversary of Annapolis, Md.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 673) relating to the pay and allowances of officers of the Naval Reserve performing active duty in the grade of rear admiral, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 20. An act to amend the act of August 1, 1947, as amended, to authorize the creation of 10 professional and scientific positions in the headquarters and research stations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics;

H. R. 157. An act authorizing the Attorney General of the United States to recognize and to award to outstanding courageous young Americans a medal for heroism known as the Young American Medal for Bravery, and for other purposes;

H. R. 220. An act to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to revise the Alaska game law," approved July 1, 1943, as amended (57 Stat. 301);

H. R. 253. An act to amend the act of June 25, 1938, relating to the appointment of postmasters under civil service;

H. R. 554. An act to provide for the construction, extension, and improvement of school buildings in Hoopa, Calif.;

H. R. 942. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to amend section 9 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 512)" (Public Law 593, 80th Cong.);

H. R. 994. An act to provide for disposition and use of tribal funds of the Navajo Tribe of Indians;

H. R. 1337. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the Alaska Council of Boy Scouts of America for recreation and other public purposes;

H. R. 1755. An act to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation;

H. R. 1950. An act for the relief of certain consultants formerly employed by the Technical Industrial Intelligence Committee of the Foreign Economic Administration, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1959. An act for the relief of the county of Allegheny, Pa.;

H. R. 2216. An act to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to provide for an Under Secretary of Defense;

H. R. 2485. An act to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the Eighty-third and Final National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held in Indianapolis, Ind., August 28 to September 1, 1949;

H. R. 2660. An act to prohibit the parking of vehicles upon any property owned by the United States for postal purposes;

H. R. 2663. An act to provide for the administration of the Central Intelligence Agency, established pursuant to section 102, National Security Act of 1947, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 160. Joint resolution to authorize completion of the processing of the visa cases, and admission into the United States, of certain alien fiancés and fiancées of members, or of former members, of the armed forces of the United States, as was provided in the so-called GI Fiancées Act (60 Stat. 339), as amended.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON OPERATIONS UNDER BOULDER CANYON PROJECT ADJUSTMENT ACT

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the seventh annual report of operations under the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, for the year ended May 31, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXEMPTION OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT FROM PROVISIONS OF FEDERAL REGISTER AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACTS

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to exempt the Post Office Department from the provisions of the Federal Register Act, as amended, and the Administrative Procedure Act, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COST ASCERTAINMENT REPORT OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Cost Ascertainment Report and Appendix of that Department for the fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Department of Commerce (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Regulatory Commissions (appendix N) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Federal Communications Commission (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Federal Trade Commission (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Securities and Exchange Commission (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Federal Reserve System (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Civil Aeronautics Board (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Interstate Commerce Commission (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the National Labor Relations Board (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Federal Power Commission (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the United

States Maritime Commission (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] be excused from attending the sessions of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LUCAS. I also ask, Mr. President, that the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] be excused from attending the sessions of the Senate for the next few days because of illness in his family.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to be absent from the Senate on Friday and Saturday next.

Mr. ANDERSON asked and obtained leave to be absent from the sessions of the Senate on Friday and Saturday next.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Millikin
Anderson	Hendrickson	Morse
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bricker	Hill	Murray
Bridges	Hunt	Myers
Butler	Ives	Neely
Byrd	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Chavez	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Connally	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Knowland	Sparkman
Douglas	Langer	Taft
Downey	Lodge	Taylor
Eastland	Longe	Thomas, Okla.
Ecton	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	McCarran	Tobey
Ferguson	McCarthy	Tydings
Flanders	McClellan	Vandenberg
Frear	McFarland	Watkins
Fulbright	McKellar	Wherry
George	Magnuson	Wiley
Gillette	Malone	Withers
Green	Martin	Young
Gurney	Miller	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] are members of the committee on the part of the Senate, appointed to attend the funeral of the late Senator Broughton, of North Carolina, and are therefore necessarily absent.

The Senators from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. PEPPER] are absent by leave of the Senate to fill a long-standing engagement at Winter Park, Fla., where today the President of the United States is to receive an honorary degree at Rollins College.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are absent as members of the committee of the Senate attending the funeral of the late Senator Broughton, of North Carolina.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal be approved from February 25 up to and including March 7.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, does that cover all the days since the Journal was last approved?

Mr. LUCAS. It does.

Mr. WHERRY. And the request, if granted, would not jeopardize in any way the present parliamentary situation?

Mr. LUCAS. It would not.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to say that I had noticed with interest that the distinguished Senator from Illinois had not asked to have the Journal approved during the past several days. Why is it necessary to approve it at this time?

Mr. LUCAS. I think it is a matter of convenience. I will say to the able Senator from Georgia, for the clerks who write up the Journal. I probably should have had it approved by unanimous consent each morning, but I have failed to make the request. I now ask unanimous consent to have the Journal approved for the days I have indicated.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to assist the clerks, but I want to consider the matter. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made by the Senator from Georgia.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I make the same request I have previously made on the opening of Senate sessions, to wit, that all Senators desiring to introduce bills and joint resolutions, present petitions and memorials, and other matters for the RECORD, may be permitted to do so, without debate, and without jeopardizing the parliamentary situation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois requests that all Senators be permitted to introduce bills and joint resolutions, and present petitions and memorials, and file reports and present other ordinary routine business, without debate, and without affecting the present parliamentary situation. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Legislative Resolution 16

"Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation has asked Congress for an appropriation for the commencement of construction on the Glendo Reservoir on the North Platte River in Wyoming, unlimited as to the capacity of the reservoir, and unlimited as to the uses of the water to be impounded; and

"Whereas the Flood Control Act of 1944, enacted by the United States Congress, requires as follows: That before action is taken on any construction on rivers in this area, investigations must be conducted in such a manner as to give to the affected State or States during the course of the investigations, information developed by the investigations and also opportunity for consultation regarding plans and proposals and so far as practicable, opportunity to cooperate in the investigations. The said Flood Control Act also requires the transmission to the affected State or States a copy of the proposed report and plans and proposals. If any affected State sets forth objections, the proposed works may not be authorized except upon approval by an act of Congress; and

"Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation in relation to the proposed Glendo Reservoir has not complied with this provision of the Flood Control Act to the extent of giving to the Nebraska authorities the information required; and

"Whereas Nebraska is one of the States which will be affected by the proposed Glendo Dam and there is a possibility that the effect will be detrimental to the general welfare of Nebraska citizens and to Nebraska projects, making and intending to make use of the waters of the North Platte River; and

"Whereas on June 11, 1945, the Supreme Court of the United States adjudicated the rights of the United States and of the States of Colorado, Wyoming, and Nebraska, in the waters of the North Platte River, and stated that further relief could be granted if further construction of reservoirs threatened to disturb the delicate balance of the river; and

"Whereas there is reasonable ground to believe that the construction of the Glendo Reservoir and its intended operation as announced by officers of the Bureau of Reclamation, would give to Wyoming more than its apportioned share of the river waters and would disturb the balance of the river: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Legislature of the State of Nebraska hereby requests the Congress of the United States to withhold any authorization for the construction of the said Glendo Reservoir and any appropriation of money therefor, until the plans therefor have been submitted to the State of Nebraska and to its department of roads and irrigation, and an opportunity given to it to examine and evaluate said plans, and to present its objections if said plans should require objections."

Resolutions adopted by the Wholesale Dry Goods Institute, Inc., of New York, N. Y., favoring the adoption of a free-enterprise system with a minimum of Government controls; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Petitions of Bessie A. Childress, of Jefferson City, Mo., and Elizabeth E. Knight, of Fairfield, Maine, praying for the enactment of legislation to continue rent controls; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Petitions of Lillie H. Coleman, of Jacksonville, Fla., and sundry other citizens of

the United States, praying for the enactment of legislation to abolish rent controls; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter in the nature of a petition signed by Donald F. Kruger, adjutant, Shangri-La Post, No. 1064, the American Legion, Springfield, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide pensions for all veterans; to the Committee on Finance.

Petitions of Mrs. M. W. Pope, of San Diego, Calif., and sundry other citizens of the United States, relating to old-age pensions and social security; to the Committee on Finance.

A telegram in the nature of a petition, signed by Barto Chiappe, president, the Committee to Strengthen Friendship Between United States of America and Italy, Chicago, Ill., praying that Italy be included as a member of the North Atlantic Pact; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Petitions of Margaret C. Oest, of Rochester, N. Y., and sundry other citizens of the United States, relating to aid for China; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Petitions of Morris Bachrach, of New York, N. Y., and sundry other citizens of the United States, relating to the admission of the State of Israel as a member of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Petitions of E. Russell, of Washington, D. C., and sundry other citizens of the United States, relating to the trial and conviction of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Petitions of L. S. Jordan, of Memphis, Tenn., and several other citizens of the United States, praying for the continuation of the Un-American Activities Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolutions adopted by the city commission of the city of Grand Rapids, Mich., and the common council of the city of Linden, N. J., favoring the enactment of legislation proclaiming October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Petitions of L. E. Evans, of Louisville, Ky., and sundry other citizens of the United States, relating to Federal aid to education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Petitions of Ernest Deheulle, of Everett, Mass., and sundry other citizens of the United States, relating to changes in the minimum wage law; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Petitions of D. C. Abbott, of Sarasota, Fla., and sundry other citizens of the United States, relating to the Taft-Hartley labor law; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter in the nature of a petition from W. E. Napier, of Oak Ridge, Tenn., relating to working conditions at Oak Ridge, Tenn.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Pike County (Ky.) Fish and Game Protective Association, of Pikeville, Ky., favoring the canalization plan for the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River; to the Committee on Public Works.

A paper in the nature of a petition, signed by Phil Hamel, secretary of the Tribal Council of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, of Montana, relating to the establishment of a Columbia River Authority; to the Committee on Public Works.

A letter in the nature of a petition from W. L. Totten, of Durham, N. C., relating to the constitutionality of civil-rights legislation; ordered to lie on the table.

Petitions of W. J. Davis, of Calera, Ala., and sundry other citizens of the United States, praying for a change in the Senate rules to prevent the filibuster; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Concurrent Resolution 8

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Oklahoma delegation to the Congress of the United States to promote and support legislation changing the old-age assistance program to a direct-pension program and providing for pension payments of at least $60 per month

"Whereas the old-age-assistance program is not a direct-pension program based on the age of recipients but is a program of payments to persons, otherwise eligible, who do not have sufficient income or other resources to provide for themselves; and

"Whereas the old-age-assistance program requires vast expenditures of funds for administration which expenditures reduce the amount of funds available for distribution; and

"Whereas a direct-pension program whereby checks are mailed from Washington, D. C., to citizens eligible therefor by reason of age will not require said vast expenditure of funds for administration and will materially increase the amount received by each eligible person; and

"Whereas the payments under such a direct-pension program should be at least $60 per month; and

"Whereas such a change in the old-age-assistance program can be made by the Congress of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-second Legislature of the State of Oklahoma (the senate concurring therein)*, That the Oklahoma delegation to the Congress of the United States is hereby requested to promote and support legislation which will change the old-age-assistance program to a direct-pension program whereby checks are mailed from Washington, D. C., to citizens eligible therefor by reason of age, and which will provide for pension payments of at least $60 per month.

"That an authenticated copy of this resolution be presented to each member of the Oklahoma delegation to the Congress of the United States.

"Adopted by the house of representatives the 28th day of January 1949.

"WALTER BILLINGSLEY,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

"Adopted by the senate the 9th day of February 1949.

"JIM RINEHART,
"*President of the Senate.*"

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. LANGER):

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Concurrent Resolution K

"Concurrent resolution petitioning Congress to continue adequate appropriations to the Farmers Home Administration

"Whereas the members of the Thirty-first Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota, mindful of the service performed by the Farmers Home Administration, in the rehabilitation of farmers upon the soil, and being cognizant that only through this agency has credit been available to many of the farmers of the State, and recognizing that the continuation of this agency is in the interests of all of the people: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the senate concurring therein)*, That we memorialize, petition, and urge Congress to continue the Farmers Home Administration, and to make adequate appropriations therefor; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to the Secretaries of Agriculture and Labor, Farmers Home Administration, President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to North Dakota's delegation in Congress.

"PALMER LEVIN,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"GEORGE OLSON,
"*Chief Clerk of the House.*
"C. P. DAHL,
"*President of the Senate.*
"W. J. TROUT,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*"

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Concurrent Resolution N

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to extend time for filing tax returns by farmers

"Whereas under the Federal income-tax laws a farmer who makes a declaration of his estimated tax for the taxable year must file such estimate on or before January 15 of the succeeding taxable year; and

"Whereas under the Federal income-tax laws a farmer who does not file an estimate of his tax must file his income-tax return for the preceding year on or before January 15; and

"Whereas due to weather conditions in the North Central States it is frequently impossible for a farmer to procure adequate records at such season of the year and to file his estimate and return; and

"Whereas the Commissioner of Internal Revenue has the power and authority to extend the time for filing such returns: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the senate concurring therein)*, That the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is petitioned and urged to extend the time for filing such returns by a farmer in the North Central States up and until February 15; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state is hereby directed to send copies of this resolution to the North Dakota delegation in Congress and to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

"PALMER LEVIN,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"GEORGE OLSON,
"*Chief Clerk of the House.*
"C. P. DAHL,
"*President of the Senate.*
"W. J. TROUT,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*"

By Mr. GURNEY:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 9

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to make provision for payment of the exact equivalent of taxes to the States and other lesser political subdivisions whenever the tax base of such taxing units is depleted by withdrawals of lands for the use of Federal agencies

"Whereas the Federal Government and agencies thereof from time to time have withdrawn from the State and its political subdivisions areas such as the Ammunition Depot at Provo; the Angustura irrigation project in Fall River and Custer Counties; the Belle Fourche irrigation project in Butte and Meade Counties; submarginal land utilization areas principally located in Stanley, Lyman, Jones, Jackson, Pennington, and

Perkins Counties; air bases at Rapid City and at Sioux Falls; the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation; the Crow Creek Indian Reservation; the Cheyenne Indian Reservation; Rosebud Indian Reservation; the Standing Rock Indian Reservation; the Lower Brule Indian Reservation; the Sisseton Indian Reservation; the Black Hills National Forest; the Harney National Forest; Wind Cave National Park; Jewel Cave National Park; the Bad Lands National Monument; the Rushmore National Monument; the East and West Short Pine National Forests; veterans' facility hospitals at Sioux Falls and at Fort Meade; the bombing range in Shannon County; the experiment station at Newell; the various Indian schools; the Indian hospital at Rapid City; the Federal sanatorium at Hot Springs; and the other lesser withdrawals; and

"Whereas in the development of the Missouri River project it will be necessary for the Federal Government to acquire extensive areas in South Dakota such as dam sites, areas to be inundated, and marginal lands, rights-of-way for canals and ditches, town sites, and areas for administrative facilities; and

"Whereas the State of South Dakota has for a period of 10 years paid on school and endowment lands held in trust by the State, the exact equivalent of school district and county levies: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the house of representatives concurring therein) do memorialize the Congress of the United States to take steps to provide for the payment of the exact equivalent of taxes which would otherwise be levied on lands in the State and its political subdivisions were such lands not acquired by the Federal Government and its agencies; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to His Excellency, the President of the United States, the United States Senator CHAN GURNEY, United States Senator KARL MUNDT, Congressman FRANCIS H. CASE, and to Congressman HAROLD O. LOVRE, and to the Presiding Officers of both Houses of Congress.

"REX A. TERRY,
"*Lieutenant Governor, President of the Senate.*

"Attest:

"NIELS P. JENSEN,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*

"A. E. MUNCK,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

"Attest:

"W. J. MATSON,
"*Chief Clerk.*"

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 13

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States; His Excellency, the President of the United States, to take action to prevent the passage of legislation permitting the coloring of oleomargarine

"Whereas the dairy industry brings over $10,000,000 to South Dakota farmers annually; and

"Whereas this industry must be given every encouragement; and

"Whereas uncontrolled competition from a product made from vegetable oils would seriously menace the dairy industry, thus causing untold loss to South Dakota agriculture; and

"Whereas the production of vegetable oils is relatively unimportant to South Dakota: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Senate of the Thirty-first Session of the South Dakota Legislature (the House of Representatives concurring therein), do memorialize the Congress of the United States to prevent the passage of legislation allowing the coloring of oleomargarine; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to His Excellency, the President of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, to the chairman of the Committees on Agriculture of both Houses of Congress, to United States Senator CHAN GURNEY, to United States Senator KARL MUNDT, to Congressman FRANCIS CASE, to Congressman HAROLD LOVRE, and to the presiding officers of both Houses of Congress.

"REX A. TERRY,
"*Lieutenant Governor, President of the Senate.*

"Attest:

"NIELS P. JENSEN,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*

"A. E. MUNCK,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

"Attest:

"W. J. MATSON,
"*Chief Clerk.*"

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which will assure the payment of prices for farm products at not less than 100 percent of parity

"Whereas the payment of prices for farm products at 100 percent of parity, is essential to the preservation of a sound national economy, and to prevent loss, discouragement, and distress, and maintain and increase the large production of farm products required to meet both domestic and foreign needs: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the senate concurring)*:

"1. That the Congress of the United States be, and is hereby memorialized and urged to promptly enact suitably implemented legislation to insure the payment of 100 percent parity prices for farm products.

"2. That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of Agriculture, and to each South Dakota Senator and Member of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

"A. E. MUNCK,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

"W. J. MATSON,
"*Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.*

"REX TERRY,
"*Lieutenant Governor.*

"NIELS P. JENSEN,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*"

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A resolution of the House of Delegates of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolution relating to the administrative expenses of the Employment Security Board

"Whereas as part of the enactment of employment security and unemployment compensation insurance, the Federal Government has provided that every employer having eight or more employees must pay to the Federal Government a tax of three-tenths of 1 percent of his pay rolls to pay administrative costs of the several Employment Security Boards; and

"Whereas these tax payments are wholly separate and distinct from other payments made to the State of Maryland from which the actual unemployment compensation benefits are paid; and

"Whereas it has been the history of these payments to the Federal Government for administrative expenses that the Federal Government has collected much more money than it has ever returned to the States for such administrative expenses; and

"Whereas this collection of excess monies is well illustrated by the current fiscal year during which it is estimated the Federal Government will collect approximately $224,000,000 from taxpayers throughout the country, while it has appropriated only about $130,000,000 for the payment of administrative expenses to the several Employment Security Boards: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Delegates of Maryland*, That this body hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States either to reduce the amount of tax collected to defray the administrative costs of unemployment compensation or to return the excess amounts to the several States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That this resolution be spread upon the Journal of the House and that the chief clerk of the house be and he is hereby instructed to send copies thereof to the President of the United States, to the Social Security Board, to the chairman of the Employment Security Board of Maryland, to each member of the Maryland delegation in the Congress of the United States, to the Council of State Governments, and to the Employment Security Board or Unemployment Compensation Board of every State in the United States."

A resolution of the House of Delegates of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Resolution protesting the trial of 15 Protestant pastors in Bulgaria

"Whereas the freedom-loving people of the world for the second time within a few days have been outraged by the charges of espionage and black-market dealings against 15 Protestant pastors in the city of Sofia, Bulgaria; and

"Whereas these trials, just as the recent trial of Cardinal Mindszenty, of Hungary, constitute an attack by atheistic communism upon the freedom of religion; and

"Whereas prominent members of all religious groups in this country characterized the unjust trial of Cardinal Mindszenty, of Hungary, as a gross crime against freedom and as a rape of justice; and

"Whereas the trial of these 15 Protestant pastors in Bulgaria is but another example of the fact, if any were needed, that atheistic communism in this world is on the march against any and all freedom of religion and of expression; and

"Whereas all these trials are but part of a world-wide conspiracy of atheistic communism to threaten the liberty, democracy, religion, and the very life of the freedom-loving nations; and

"Whereas the Soviet, the Hungarian, and now the Bulgarian Governments have violated the basic guaranties of the United Nations as to freedom of worship, fair and impartial trials, and freedom of speech: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Delegates of Maryland*, That this body representing a great State in which toleration and freedom not only are guaranteed by the Constitution but also are part of the very fabric of its life, solemnly protests the outrageous crime against religion and humanity now being perpetrated in the trial of these 15 Protestant pastors in the city of Sofia, Bulgaria; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That this resolution be spread upon the journal of the house and that the chief clerk be and he is hereby directed to send copies thereof to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State of the United States, and to each Member of the Maryland delegation in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the Senate of the Legislature of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Senate resolution protesting the trial and conviction of Cardinal Mindszenty

"Whereas the trial and conviction of Cardinal Mindszenty, of Hungary, constitutes an attack by atheistic communism upon the freedom of religion; and

"Whereas prominent members of various religious groups in this country have characterized this unjust trial and conviction as a gross crime against freedom and as a rape of justice, these persons, including Cardinal Spellman, archbishop of New York, the Reverend Daniel A. Poling, president of the World Christian Endeavor Union, and the Reverend Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the Senate of the United States and pastor of Foundry Methodist Church in Washington, D. C.; and

"Whereas Cardinal Mindszenty was imprisoned in a Nazi concentration camp during World War II for his efforts in saving 1,500 Hungarian Jews from the clutches of the German Gestapo, thereby proving himself a defender of and a martyr for civil rights and humanity; and

"Whereas the arrest, trial, and conviction of Cardinal Mindszenty is a conscienceless attack upon religious and personal freedom and a wanton persecution which has called for a universal condemnation; and

"Whereas the main purpose of the trial, which is really a persecution, was to discredit and coerce religious leadership in Hungary in order to remove one of the main sources of moral resistance to communism; and

"Whereas the persecution of Cardinal Mindszenty is but a further evidence to show that the people of Hungary have been increasingly denied the fundamental human rights and freedom which are guaranteed by the United Nations; and

"Whereas this trial and conviction is part of a world-wide conspiracy of atheistic communism to threaten not only the countries of eastern Europe but also the liberty, democracy, and very life of the United States and the world; and

"Whereas representatives of the freedom-loving nations were barred from the courtroom during the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of Maryland*, That this body, representing the great State in which tolerance and freedom of religion were not only recognized in its founding and have, from its very beginnings, been guaranteed to its citizens and have been imbedded in the constitution of the State, but they are also a part of the very fabric of its citizens, solemnly protests the outrageous crime against religion and humanity perpetrated in the trial, conviction, and sentence of Cardinal Mindszenty; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That this resolution be spread upon the journal of the senate and that the secretary be, and he is hereby, directed to send copies thereof to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State of the United States, and to each Representative from Maryland in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution adopted by citizens of Baltimore, Md., under the sponsorship of the Council of Lithuanian Societies, relating to the thirty-first anniversary of the proclamation of the independence of Lithuania; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Baltimore, Md., favoring the enactment of legislation proclaiming October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NATIONAL FARM PROGRAM

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Wisconsin Farm Bureau Federation, Madison, Wis., signed by Curtis Hatch, president, relating to the national farm program.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Madison, Wis., February 9, 1949.

Hon. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR McCARTHY: In view of the apparent confusion today on the question of farm opinion regarding the national farm program—a confusion which we believe is disproportionately reflected in the press and in the public utterances of some individuals, we respectfully call to your attention the position of the Wisconsin Farm Bureau Federation on this issue.

First, we would like to show clearly that the Wisconsin Farm Bureau Federation is wholly in accord with the American Farm Bureau Federation in support of the 1948 Agricultural Farm Act, as enacted by the Eightieth Congress and as it stands today.

In fact, the Wisconsin Farm Bureau Federation was influential, through its voting delegation, in drafting the policy of variable price supports which was adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation in annual meeting at Chicago in 1947. As you are aware, that principle of a flexible farm program with variable supports was recommended to the Eightieth Congress by the American Farm Bureau Federation.

When that principle was incorporated into title II of what became the Agricultural Act of 1948, the Wisconsin Farm Bureau Federation was in full concurrence with the American Farm Bureau Federation in recommending passage. We called for action on this measure before the Congress should adjourn, and were gratified that the Congress, avoiding partisan differences, did enact it.

We are proud of the role of Farm Bureau in helping to bring this about. While all of the major farm organizations approved the act, we are confident that Farm Bureau support was responsible for its enactment.

Title I of the act, continuing the basic principles of the Steagall amendment through 1949, extends the time in which farmers may adjust their plans of operation to conform with the needs of the postwar era. Titles II and III assure farmers against disastrous price breaks in the period following 1949, and encourage them to seek the utmost efficiency in their farming operations.

This was the intention of the members of the Wisconsin Farm Bureau when they urged the adoption of a flexible price-support program, and it is their intention today.

The resolution adopted by the voting delegates of the Wisconsin Farm Bureau Federation at their annual meeting in 1947 set forth that:

"We will support the development of a long-range program that is primarily self-sustaining and which will assist in correcting the basic causes of disparity between agriculture, labor, and industry. We favor a price-support program that will prevent extremely low and disastrous prices. We recommend that all price-support programs be contingent upon compliance with production goals, market quotas, or other mechanisms to prevent excessive production."

This determination was reiterated at the annual meeting of the Wisconsin Farm Bureau in November 1948, following the enactment of the Agricultural Act of 1948, when the voting delegates affirmed endorsement of a variable price-support program with these words:

"We support the present farm price-support policy under the 1948 act. We believe it protects the Nation against a bankrupt agriculture, and insures ample supplies of agricultural products at a fair exchange value. * * * We believe that any change in present policy should be in the direction of placing greater emphasis on livestock farming in the interest of soil conservation and human health."

These voting delegates were voicing the instructions given them by members of the county farm bureaus in Wisconsin, who elected them for the purpose of expressing farm opinion through farm bureau resolutions.

This year the Farm Bureau in Wisconsin is gaining more new members because we are presenting the question of the level of price support as an issue in our membership campaigns.

Wisconsin farmers are aware that the freedom to choose the method of operation of their farms would in all likelihood be sacrificed if they should throw themselves on the reliance of artificial prices and the severely administered economy which would be the inevitable result.

Our farmers are well aware of the disruption which has resulted from a too rigid support of the price of potatoes, of the hampering restrictions which the potato program has brought about, and of the loss of public sympathy which has resulted.

Our farmers fear not only the regimentation and the restriction of opportunity which would follow rigidly supported prices, but they also recognize that such a program, universally applied, could alienate the good will of the public, and impose an excessive burden on the Federal Treasury.

The farmers of Wisconsin, expressing themselves through the Farm Bureau, believe that this organization should labor to achieve parity for agriculture. They believe that in extreme conditions it is the role of Government to provide floors under prices as an insurance against disaster. This concept is expressed in the Agricultural Act of 1948.

They do not believe that it is desirable, or possible, for the Government to underwrite the prices of farm products on an artificially high plane nor as a permanent practice.

They believe that the Agricultural Act of 1948 should be given a fair trial before consideration is given to making substantial changes in its objectives or its methods.

The Wisconsin Farm Bureau Federation earnestly requests that the Eighty-first Congress permit such a fair trial for the act. If or when need for corrections appear, we will join in suggesting such corrections.

Meanwhile, it is our sincere desire that the Congress give full consideration to all other measures which will help agriculture attain parity. We suggest such measures as the extension of trade treaties, which will reopen the channels of international trade; the international wheat agreement; support and encouragement for farmers' cooperative enterprises; coordination of programs to improve and conserve the fertility of the soil; aid and research for more efficient production and marketing; cooperative credit and rural electrification; equalization of educational opportunity and access to the fullest developments in health and nutrition; and, in general, aid for the expansion of the educational functions of the extension service of the land-grant colleges.

We do not believe that Government can guarantee parity, but we do believe that Government should guarantee the opportunity to achieve parity.

It is in this light that we ask you to give your considered deliberation to matters affecting farm policy before the Eighty-first Congress.

Yours very truly,

CURTIS HATCH, *President.*

EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION FROM FARMERS OF KNOX COUNTY, NEBR.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a very splendid thank you statement from the farmers of Knox County, Nebr., expressing their appreciation for the assistance rendered during the recent disastrous storm over Nebraska and other Western States. I ask that the resolution be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THANK YOU FROM THE FARMERS OF KNOX COUNTY, NEBR.

The farmers of Knox County, Nebr. wish to extend their thanks to all who contributed to and aided in Operations Snowbound. Practically every farmer, with few exceptions, in the county has been isolated for long periods of time since the initial blizzard of November 18–19. Recurring heavy snows accompanied by high winds, kept all roads blocked the major portion of the time.

The United States Weather Bureau credited east Knox County with having received 71 inches, and west Knox County with 57 inches of snow from November 18 to February 1. Continuous cold weather held the snow depth constant. There was almost no travel.

Food supplies dwindled, fuel was exhausted in many cases, and feed supplies within reach were low. The tremendous depth of snow made it impossible, in many cases, to reach roughage and hay supplies stacked in the fields.

A disaster was at hand. Swift action followed the request of our board of supervisors to Gov. Val Peterson to classify Knox County an emergency area. We are grateful for the prompt and efficient work of the Army engineers, the Fifth Army, the State of Nebraska, the National Guard, the National and the local Red Cross.

We are also grateful to the disaster committees set up in each town, the pilots who flew emergency missions under adverse conditions and patrolled the county locating cases of distress, and citizens who volunteered their time and services in this emergency. We especially want to thank each member of the county board of supervisors who gave 24-hour service in coordinating and directing work throughout Operations Snowbound.

In order that persons and governmental agencies and those responsible for Operations Snowbound be informed of our great appreciation for their work, a copy of this letter is being forwarded to each of the following: the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman; the Governor of the State of Nebraska, Val Peterson; the Congress of the United States; the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; Gen. Lewis A. Pick; Corps of Engineers of the United States Army; the Fifth Army of the United States; the national and the local Red Cross; the National Guard; Knox County Board of Supervisors.

Herbert Schroeder, President, Knox County Farm Bureau; Perry Adams, Chairman, Knox County Soil Conservation District; Herman Block, Chairman, Knox County Noxious Weed District; Ben Banks-C. H. Olson, Directors, Cedar, Knox Rural Public Power District; Joe Buschkamp, Chairman, Farmers Home Administration; Wm. R. Fosterman, President, Knox County Farmers Union; Albert Vakoc, Chairman, Production and Marketing Administration; Ben Banks, Chairman, S. E. Knox Noxious Weed District; Fritz Rokahr, Chairman, North Central Nebraska Public Power District; True Carder, Chairman, Knox County Agricultural Extension Service.

ALUMINUM FOR RURAL ELECTRIFICATION PROJECTS—STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER AND LETTER FROM THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement I have made in reference to certain correspondence I have had with the Department of Commerce. I also ask that the letter from Secretary Sawyer be printed following my statement.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUGH BUTLER

The attached letter to me from the Secretary of Commerce is being inserted at this time as a follow-up to correspondence inserted in the RECORD on February 17, 1949.

This letter is a fairly good summary of the prospects for increased supplies of aluminum for manufacture of electric conductor for use in rural electrification during the rest of this year and next year. It will be noted that the statement indicates that the rate of production of aluminum conductor is being increased by the end of this year to a level of two and one-half times the present rate. This letter in large part merely confirms reports I have already received from trade sources. Most of the increased capacity is due to an expansion by the Reynolds Metals Co. I believe this expansion of capacity will be a very material help in solving the conductor shortage from which we are suffering today.

Credit for this expansion must be divided among a number of individuals and groups who have been working earnestly and sincerely to find a means of solving this shortage. I have myself been deeply concerned about this problem for some time and have been exploring every possible means of securing additional aluminum for rural electrification. I believe the efforts of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association deserve particular recognition. This fine organization has taken a very active part in exploring the possibilities of expanding our aluminum supply, and I believe it deserves the gratitude of every farmer who is waiting anxiously for electric service.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
Washington, March 3, 1949.

The Honorable HUGH BUTLER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: I wish to acknowledge your letter of February 16 in reference to the supply of aluminum for the production of electric conductor for rural electrification projects.

My staff has been making an intensive study of the all-over aluminum problem, with particular reference to the available supply of redraw rod for aluminum conductor. This study has not been completed and until it shall have been completed, I am unable to determine whether it is essential that a voluntary allocation program be recommended for supplying REA projects with aluminum conductor.

In the meantime, I am glad to give you the data already developed on aluminum conductor for such projects.

Formerly the price differential between aluminum and copper conductors was such that REA divided its purchases of conductor between aluminum and copper. Today the price differential between aluminum and copper conductors makes it possible to build the average aluminum line at a saving of $150 to $175 per mile over a copper line of like capacity. REA, therefore, is naturally favoring the construction of aluminum rather than copper lines.

The aluminum industry produced approximately 60,000,000 pounds of redraw rod for conductor in 1948. It is estimated that the production figure for 1949 will be 84,000,000 pounds. This increase of 24,000,000 pounds of aluminum for conductor will be brought about through an increase in aluminum ingot production and the installation of additional redraw rod and conductor facilities. A part of these increased facilities will be put into service in May. The last of this increase in facilities will not be installed until October. Therefore, the increased production because of all new facilities is only reflected in the last few months of 1949, whereas in 1950 when all these new facilities will be in service for the entire year, it is estimated that 150,000,000 pounds of metal will be available for conductor.

A given weight of metal provides 50 percent more conductor by weight. Therefore, the aluminum conductor production in 1948 was about 90,000,000 pounds. The estimated conductor production in 1949 will be 126,000,000 pounds. The estimate of conductor production in 1950 is 225,000,000 pounds.

If, upon completion of the study by the office of Industry Cooperation, it appears that a voluntary allocation plan is necessary, I shall so recommend such a plan to the aluminum industry.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES SAWYER,
Secretary of Commerce.

JOHNSONVILLE (TENN.) STEAM PLANT—TELEGRAM FROM G. F. BULGRIEN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution which I have received from a union in my State, protesting against the proposed new TVA steam plant in Tennessee. This resolution opposes such a plant as a step toward socialism and toward further competition with our free-enterprise system.

I certainly endorse the sentiments expressed in this resolution, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTAGE, WIS., *March 4, 1949.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the 1,000 members and officers of Local 965, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, active in the heart of Wisconsin, do believe that the appropriation of our money to build the Johnsonville steam plant as an auxiliary for the TVA is a direct step toward socialism, and at complete variance with the intent of the TVA as originally set up.

We are very much opposed to any steps to put the Government any further into any business which will be in direct competition with any American business which has been built up by our free-enterprise system. Free enterprise has made us the great Nation that we are today. Let us take no action which may slow down this process.

We ask that you devote your full efforts to removing this item from the deficiency appropriation bill which is coming up in the Senate in the near future.

G. F. BULGRIEN,
Business Manager.

RESOLUTIONS OF WISCONSIN HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION RELATING TO TAX-SUPPORTED INSTITUTIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received two resolutions from the able executive secretary of the Wisconsin Hospital Association, whose headquarters is in Eau Claire, Wis., a few miles outside my home town. The association represents approximately 85 percent of the hospital bed capacity of the Badger State, and it comprises both tax-supported institutions, together with voluntary private hospitals. One of the resolutions pertains to the controversial subject of consolidation of all Federal hospitals, and the other refers to a similar much-debated issue of compulsory Federal health insurance.

In connection with the latter resolution, I certainly endorse the sentiments expressed therein in opposition to such a compulsory program. I feel that these resolutions and similar resolutions from other hospital experts throughout the Nation should and will receive the careful attention of my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the body of the RECORD, as follows:

"Whereas the American Hospital Association has repeatedly advocated the best possible medical and hospital care for veterans of the armed forces; and

"Whereas the American Hospital Association believes that this result can be obtained best by coordinating the Veterans' Administration hospitals and the hospitals of the other Federal agencies with the hospitals that provide care to the population as a whole; and

"Whereas the Voorhees Subcommittee on Federal Medical Services, in its report to the Hoover Commission studying the reorganization of the executive branch of the Federal Government, has advocated such coordination in order to achieve economy and to improve the standards of hospital care in Federal hospitals: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Wisconsin Hospital Association, a unit of the American Hospital Association, meeting in Milwaukee February 17, 1949, does hereby commend the recent action of President Truman which recognized the principles of coordination and integration which have been endorsed and recommended by the Voorhees subcommittee, and expresses confidence that further study of the problem of integrating and coordinating all of the hospitals of the Nation can result in further improvements in the quality of hospital care available to citizens of this Nation."

I, N. E. Hanshus, executive secretary of the Wisconsin Hospital Association, do hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was unanimously adopted by the membership of the Wisconsin Hospital Association at its annual meeting assembled in Milwaukee on February 17, 1949.

N. E. HANSHUS,
Executive Secretary, Wisconsin Hospital Association.

"Whereas the house of delegates of the American Hospital Association, at its meeting in Cleveland, Ohio, in October 1944, adopted a resolution embodying a progressive program for improving the quality and distribution of hospital care; and

"Whereas the Hill-Burton Hospital Survey and Construction Act is already putting into practice the recommendation of the association for Federal aid for hospital construction in areas where additional hospital facilities are most needed; and

"Whereas the phenomenal growth of Blue Cross prepayment plans represents the remarkable progress toward the accomplishment of another essential part of the association's program; and

"Whereas the recent creation of the national agency to make voluntary prepayment protection more easily available is another step toward extension of voluntary budgeting for the cost of medical and hospital care as recommended by the association; and

"Whereas the need for Federal, State, and local government assistance in the provision of care for those unable to pay the whole cost is another essential recommendation of the association which has not been yet acted upon; and

"Whereas compulsory health insurance does not necessarily provide assistance for the care of persons unable to pay the whole cost; and

"Whereas current legislative proposals for compulsory health insurance would result in serious deterioration of the quality of care now available to the American people: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Wisconsin Hospital Association reaffirms its program for the improvement of the quality and distribution of hospital care; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Wisconsin Hospital Association urge legislative attention to provision of assistance for those unable to meet the whole cost of medical and hospital care; and for the provision of public health services and for more adequate numbers of trained personnel in the health field; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Wisconsin Hospital Association reaffirms its conviction that a program of Federal compulsory health insurance is inadvisable, and that such a program is bound to be detrimental to the continued improvement of the quality of care for the American people."

I, N. E. Hanshus, executive secretary of the Wisconsin Hospital Association, do hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was unanimously adopted by the membership of the Wisconsin Hospital Association at its annual meeting assembled in Milwaukee on February 17, 1949.

N. E. HANSHUS,
Executive Secretary,
Wisconsin Hospital Association.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 249. A bill to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 99).

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 314. A bill authorizing the transfer of a certain tract of land in the Robinson Remount Station to the city of Crawford, Nebr., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 98).

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. J. Res. 53. Joint resolution to provide for the reforestation and revegetation of the forest and range lands of the national forests, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 97).

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Llewellyn M. Williams, of Alaska, to be Secretary of the Territory of Alaska.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1188. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, so as to reduce the eligibility age for old-age or survivors benefit payments; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1189. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide for retirement on full annuity at age 55 after 30 years service, and for payment of annuities to widows of retired employees without reduction in the annuities of such employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma (for himself and Mr. EMAS):

S. 1190. A bill to establish a United States Air Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 1191. A bill for the relief of Clifford N. MacLloyd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER (for himself and Mr. MCCARRAN):

S. 1192. A bill for the relief of certain Basque aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER (for himself and Mr. WAGNER):

S. 1193. A bill to implement and augment existing statutes, so as to increase the prevailing immigration quota for Greece; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. MUNDT (for himself and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina) introduced Senate bill 1194, to protect the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 1195. A bill to incorporate the Blue Star Mothers of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. FERGUSON also introduced Senate bill 1196, to protect the United States against un-American and subversive activities, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1197. A bill to amend section 67 of section 81 of the National Defense Act, as amended, to provide for an active-duty status for all United States property and disbursing officers, and to provide for additional officers of the National Guard of the United States on active duty in the National Guard Bureau; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 1198. A bill to provide for the education, medical attention, relief of distress, and social welfare of Indians in the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1199. A bill for the relief of Fernando Gerassi, Estefania Maria Gerassi, and John Gerassi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1200. A bill authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of Gleason Creek, Robinson watershed, at and in the vicinity of Ely, White Pine County, Nev.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 1201. A bill to provide for a new Federal building in Fort Branch, Ind.; and

S. 1202. A bill to provide for a new Federal building in Bloomington, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JENNER:

S. 1203. A bill to authorize the award posthumously of a Distinguished Service Cross to Thomas L. Suedhoff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 1204. A bill to authorize lump-sum payments to Air Force Reserve officers or former Air Corps Reserve officers who are or were selected for commission in the Regular Army, or Regular Air Force, or who were transferred to the inactive Reserve and then called to active duty in the Air Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HUNT:

S. 1205. A bill to revise the law with relation to the Dental Corps of the Army and to amend certain laws herein named; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HUNT (for himself, Mr. FREAR, and Mr. SCHOEPPEL):

S. 1206. A bill to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

CONTROL OF SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to protect the United States against un-American and subversive activities, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks together with a brief explanatory statement, an article from the New York Times of March 3, and excerpts from testimony before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on May 23, 1948.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and without objection the bill, together with the matters referred to by the Senator from Michigan, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1196) to protect the United States against un-American and subversive activities, introduced by Mr. FERGUSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the Subversive Activities Act, 1949.

NECESSITY FOR LEGISLATION

SEC. 2. As a result of evidence adduced before various committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, Congress hereby finds that—

(1) The system of government known as totalitarian dictatorship is characterized by the existence of a single political party, organized on a dictatorial basis, and by an identity between such party and its policies and the government and governmental policies of the country in which it exists, such identity being so close that the party and the government itself are for all practical purposes indistinguishable.

(2) The establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship in any country results in the ruthless suppression of all opposition to the party in power, the complete subordination of the rights of individuals to the state, the denial of fundamental rights and liberties which are characteristic of a representative form of government, such as freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, and of religious worship, and results in the maintenance of control over the people through fear, terrorism, and brutality.

(3) There exists a world Communist movement which, in its origins, its development, and its present practice, is a world-wide revolutionary political movement whose purpose it is, by treachery, deceit, infiltration into other groups (governmental and otherwise), espionage, sabotage, terrorism, and any other means deemed necessary, to establish a Communist totalitarian dictatorship in all the countries of the world through the medium of a single world-wide Communist political organization.

(4) The direction and control of the world Communist movement is vested in and exercised by the Communist dictatorship of a foreign country.

(5) The Communist dictatorship of such foreign country, in exercising such direction and control and in furthering the purposes of the world Communist movement, establishes or causes the establishment of, and utilizes, in various countries, political organizations which are acknowledged by such Communist dictatorship as being constituent elements of the world Communist movement; and such political organizations are not free and independent organizations, but are mere sections of a single world-wide Communist organization and are controlled, directed, and subject to the discipline of the Communist dictatorship of such foreign country.

(6) The political organizations so established and utilized in various countries, acting under such control, direction, and discipline, endeavor to carry out the objectives of the world Communist movement by bringing about the overthrow of existing governments and setting up Communist totalitarian dictatorships which will be subservient to the most powerful existing Communist totalitarian dictatorship.

(7) In carrying on the activities referred to in paragraph (6) such political organizations in various countries are organized on a secret, conspiratorial basis and operate to a substantial extent through organizations commonly known as Communist fronts, which in most instances are created and maintained or used in such manner as to conceal the facts as to their true character and purposes and their membership. One result of this method of operation is that such political organizations are able to obtain financial and other support from persons who would not extend such support if they knew the true purposes of, and the actual nature of the control and influence exerted upon, such Communist fronts.

(8) Due to the nature and scope of the world Communist movement, with the existence of affiliated constituent elements working toward common objectives in various countries of the world, travel of members, representatives, and agents from country to country is essential for purposes of communication and for the carrying on of activities to further the purposes of the movement.

(9) In the United States those individuals who knowingly and willfully participate in the world Communist movement, when they so participate, in effect repudiate their allegiance to the United States and in effect transfer their allegiance to the foreign country in which is vested the direction and control of the world Communist movement; and in countries other than the United States those individuals who knowingly and willfully participate in such Communist movement similarly repudiate their allegiance to the countries of which they are nationals in favor of such foreign Communist country.

(10) In pursuance of communism's stated objectives the most powerful existing Communist dictatorship has, by the traditional Communist methods referred to above, and in accordance with carefully conceived plans, already caused the establishment in numerous foreign countries, against the will of the people of those countries, of ruthless Communist totalitarian dictatorships, and threatens to establish similar dictatorships in still other countries.

(11) The recent demonstrations of Communist objectives and methods throughout the world and the nature and control of the world Communist movement itself present a clear and present danger to the security of the United States and to the existence of free American institutions, and make it necessary that Congress, in order to provide for the common defense, to preserve the sovereignty of the United States as an independent nation, and to guarantee to each State a republican form of government, enact appropriate legislation recognizing the existence of such world-wide conspiracy and designed to prevent it from accomplishing its purpose in the United States.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this act—

(1) The term "person" means an individual or an organization.

(2) The term "organization" means an organization, corporation, company, partnership, association, trust, foundation, or fund; and includes a group of persons, whether or not incorporated, permanently or temporarily associated together for joint action on, or advancement of views on, any subject or subjects.

(3) The term "Communist political organization" means any organization in the United States having some, but not necessarily all, of the ordinary and usual characteristics of a political party, which (A) is substantially dominated or controlled by the foreign government or foreign governmental or political organization controlling the world Communist movement referred to in section 2, and (B) operates primarily to advance the political objectives of such world Communist movement.

(4) The term "Communist-front organization" means any organization in the United States (other than a Communist political organization and other than a lawfully organized political party which is not a Communist political organization) which (A) is under the control of a Communist political organization, or (B) is operated primarily for the purpose of giving aid and support to a Communist political organization, a Communist foreign government, or the world Communist movement referred to in section 2.

(5) The term "Communist organization" means a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization.

(6) The term "publication" means any circular, newspaper, periodical, pamphlet, book, letter, post card, leaflet, or other publication.

(7) The term "United States," when used in a geographical sense, includes the several States, Territories, and possessions of the United States, the District of Columbia, and the Canal Zone.

(8) The term "interstate or foreign commerce" means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication (A) between any State, Territory, or possession of the United States (including the Canal Zone), or the District of Columbia, and any place outside thereof, or (B) within any Territory or possession of the United States (including the Canal Zone) or within the District of Columbia.

(9) The term "Board" means the Subversive Activities Board established by section 12 of this act.

(10) The term "final order of the Board" means an order issued by the Board under section 13 of this act, which has become final as provided in section 14 of this act, requiring an organization to register under

section 7 of this act as a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization.

CERTAIN PROHIBITED ACTS

SEC. 4. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person to combine or conspire with any other person to perform any act which would substantially contribute to the establishment within the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship the direction and control of which is to be vested in, or exercised by or under the domination or control of, any foreign government, foreign organization, or foreign individual, with intent to assist in the establishment within the United States of such totalitarian dictatorship. For purposes of this subsection, the term "totalitarian dictatorship" means a government, not representative in form, characterized by (1) the dominance of a single political party to such an extent that such party and its policies are indistinguishable for all practical purposes from the government and governmental policies of the country in which such party exists, and (2) the suppression of opposition to such party, and (3) the denial of those fundamental rights and liberties of individuals which are characteristic of a representative form of government, such as freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, and of religious worship.

(b) Any person who violates subsection (a) of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000, or imprisonment for not more than 10 years, or by both such fine and such imprisonment, and shall, moreover, be thereafter ineligible to hold any office, or place of honor, profit, or trust created by the Constitution or laws of the United States.

EMPLOYMENT OF MEMBERS OF COMMUNIST POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 5. (a) When there is in effect a final order of the Board requiring an organization to register as a Communist political organization, it shall be unlawful for any member of such organization, with knowledge that such order has become final—

(1) in seeking or accepting any office or employment under the United States, to conceal the fact that he is a member of such organization; or

(2) to hold any nonelective office or employment under the United States.

(b) When there is in effect a final order of the Board requiring an organization to register as a Communist political organization, it shall be unlawful for any officer or employee of the United States to appoint or employ any individual as an officer or employee of the United States, knowing that such individual is a member of such an organization.

DENIAL OF PASSPORTS TO MEMBERS OF COMMUNIST POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 6. (a) When there is in effect a final order of the Board requiring an organization to register as a Communist political organization it shall be unlawful for any member of such organization, with knowledge that such order has become final—

(1) to make application for a passport, or the renewal of a passport, to be issued or renewed by or under the authority of the United States; or

(2) to use or attempt to use any such passport.

(b) When there is in effect a final order of the Board requiring an organization to register as a Communist political organization, it shall be unlawful for any officer or employee of the United States to issue a passport to or renew the passport of any individual knowing that such individual is a member of such organization.

REGISTRATION AND ANNUAL REPORTS OF COMMUNIST ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 7. (a) Each Communist political organization (including any organization required, by a final order of the Board, to register as a Communist political organization) shall, within the time specified in subsection (c) of this section, register with the Attorney General, on a form prescribed by him by regulations, as a Communist political organization.

(b) Each Communist-front organization (including any organization required, by a final order of the Board, to register as a Communist-front organization) shall, within the time specified in subsection (c) of this section, register with the Attorney General, on a form prescribed by him by regulations, as a Communist-front organization.

(c) The registration required by subsection (a) or (b) shall be made—

(1) In the case of an organization which is a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization on the date of the enactment of this act, within 30 days after such date;

(2) In the case of an organization becoming a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization after the date of the enactment of this act, within 30 days after such organization becomes a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be; and

(3) In the case of an organization which by a final order of the Board is required to register, within 30 days after such order becomes final.

(d) The registration made under subsection (a) or (b) shall be accompanied by a registration statement, to be prepared and filed in such manner and form as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe, containing the following information:

(1) The name of the organization and the address of its principal office.

(2) The name and last-known address of each individual who is at the time of the filing of such registration statement, and of each individual who was at any time during the period of 12 full calendar months preceding the filing of such statement, an officer of the organization, with the designation or title of the office so held, and with a brief statement of the duties and functions of such individual as such officer.

(3) An accounting, in such form and detail as the attorney general shall by regulations prescribe, of all moneys received and expended (including the sources from which received and the purposes for which expended) by the organization during the period of 12 full calendar months preceding the filing of such statement.

(4) In the case of a Communist political organization, the name and last-known address of each individual who was a member of the organization at any time during the period of 12 full calendar months preceding the filing of such statement.

(e) It shall be the duty of each organization registered under this section to file with the Attorney General on or before February 1 of the year following the year in which it registers, and on or before February 1 of each succeeding year, an annual report, prepared and filed in such manner and form as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe, containing the same information which by subsection (d) is required to be included in a registration statement, except that the information required with respect to the 12-month period referred to in paragraph (2), (3), or (4) of such subsection shall, in such annual report, be given with respect to the calendar year preceding the February 1 on or before which such annual report must be filed.

(f) (1) It shall be the duty of each organization registered under this section to keep, in such manner and form as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe, accurate records and accounts of moneys received and expended (including the sources from which received and purposes for which expended) by such organization.

(2) It shall be the duty of each Communist political organization registered under this section to keep, in such manner and form as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe, accurate records of the names and addresses of the members of such organization and of persons who actively participate in the activities of such organization.

(g) It shall be the duty of the Attorney General to send to each individual listed in any registration statement or annual report, filed under this section, as a member or as an officer of the organization in respect of which such registration statement or annual report was filed, a notification in writing that such individual is so listed; and such notification shall be sent at the earliest practicable time after the filing of such registration statement or annual report. In the event that the individual so notified shall disclaim the accuracy of such listing, he may by written communication so advise the Attorney General who shall thereupon enter the fact and date of such disclaimer upon the registration statement or annual report upon which such individual is so listed.

(h) In the case of failure on the part of any organization to register or to file any registration statement or annual report as required by this section, it shall be the duty of the executive officer (or individual performing the ordinary and usual duties of an executive officer) and of the secretary (or individual performing the ordinary and usual duties of a secretary) of such organization, and of such officer or officers of such organization as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe, to register for such organization, to file such registration statement, or to file such annual report, as the case may be.

(i) If there is in effect with respect to an organization a final order of the Board requiring it to register under this section—

(1) such organization shall, upon conviction of failure to register, to file any registration statement or annual report, or to keep records, as required by this section, be punished for each such offense, by a fine of not less than $2,000 and not more than $5,000; and

(2) each individual having a duty under subsection (h) of this section to register or to file any registration statement or annual report on behalf of such organization, shall, upon conviction of failure to so register or to file any such registration statement or annual report, be punished for each such offense by a fine of not less than $2,000 and not more than $5,000, or imprisonment for not less than 2 years and not more than 5 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

For the purposes of this subsection each day of failure to register, whether on the part of the organization or any individual, shall constitute a separate offense.

(j) Any individual who, in a registration statement or annual report filed under this section, willfully makes any false statement or willfully omits to state any fact which is required to be stated, or which is necessary to make the statements made or information given not misleading, shall upon conviction thereof be punished for each such offense by a fine of not less than $2,000 and not more than $5,000, or by imprisonment for not less than 2 years and not more than 5 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

KEEPING OF REGISTER; PUBLIC INSPECTION; REPORTS TO PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS

SEC. 8. (a) The Attorney General shall keep and maintain in the Department of Justice a register of all organizations which are registered under section 7, and such register shall be known as the Register of Communist Organizations. Communist political organizations and Communist-front organizations shall be listed separately in such register.

(b) Such register, together with the registration statements and annual reports filed under section 7, shall be kept and maintained

in such manner as to be open for public inspection.

(c) The Attorney General shall submit to the President and to the Congress annually (and at any time when requested by either House by resolution) a report with respect to the carrying out of the provisions of this act, including the names of the organizations listed in such register and of the data (including the names and addresses of the individuals listed as members of such organizations) contained in registration statements and annual reports filed under section 7.

MEMBERSHIP IN CERTAIN COMMUNIST POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 9. It shall be unlawful for any individual to become or remain a member of any organization if he knows that (1) there is in effect a final order of the Board requiring such organization to register under section 7 of this act as a Communist political organization, (2) more than 30 days have elapsed since such order became final, and (3) such organization is not registered under section 7 of this act as a Communist political organization.

USE OF THE MAILS AND INSTRUMENTALITIES OF INTERSTATE OR FOREIGN COMMERCE

SEC. 10. It shall be unlawful for any organization which is registered under section 7, or for any organization with respect to which there is in effect a final order of the Board requiring it to register under section 7, or for any person acting for or on behalf of such organization with knowledge of such registration or order—

(1) to transmit or cause to be transmitted, through the United States mails or by any means or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce, any publication which is intended to be, or which it is reasonable to believe is intended to be, circulated or disseminated among two or more persons, unless such publication and any envelop, wrapper, or other container in which it is mailed or otherwise circulated or transmitted bears the following, printed in such manner as may be provided in regulations prescribed by the Attorney General, with the name of the organization appearing in lieu of the blank: "Disseminated by ———, a Communist organization"; or

(2) to broadcast or cause to be broadcast any matter over any radio or television station in the United States, unless such matter is preceded by the following statement, with the name of the organization being stated in place of the blank: "The following program is sponsored by ———, a Communist organization."

DENIAL OF TAX DEDUCTIONS AND EXEMPTION

SEC. 11. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no deduction for Federal income-tax purposes shall be allowed in the case of a contribution to or for the use of any organization if at the time of the making of such contribution (1) such organization is registered under section 7, or (2) there is in effect a final order of the Board requiring such organization to register under section 7.

(b) No organization shall be entitled to exemption from Federal income tax, under section 101 of the Internal Revenue Code, for any taxable year if at any time during such taxable year (1) such organization is registered under section 7, or (2) there is in effect a final order of the Board requiring such organization to register under section 7.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES BOARD

SEC. 12. (a) There is hereby established a Board, to be known as the Subversive Activities Board, which shall be composed of three members, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. One of the original members shall be appointed for a term of 1 year, one for a term of 2 years, and one for a term of 3 years, but their successors shall be appointed for terms of 3 years each, except that any individual chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member whom he shall succeed. The President shall designate one member to serve as Chairman of the Board. Any member of the Board may be removed by the President, upon notice and hearing, for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, but for no other cause.

(b) A vacancy in the Board shall not impair the right of the remaining members to exercise all the powers of the Board, and two members of the Board shall, at all times, constitute a quorum. The Board shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.

(c) The Board shall at the close of each fiscal year make a report in writing to the Congress and to the President stating in detail the cases it has heard, the decisions it has rendered, the names, salaries, and duties of all employees of the Board, and an account of all moneys it has disbursed.

(d) Each member of the Board shall receive a salary of $12,500 a year, shall be eligible for reappointment, and shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment.

(e) Upon application made by the Attorney General under subsection (a) of section 13 of this act or by any organization under subsection (b) of section 13 of this act, the Board shall determine whether any organization is a Communist political organization within the meaning of paragraph (3) of section 3 of this act, or a Communist-front organization within the meaning of paragraph (4) of section 3 of this act, as the case may be.

(f) Subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, the Board may appoint and fix the compensation of a clerk and such examiners and other personnel as may be necessary for the performance of its functions.

(g) All of the expenses of the Board, including all necessary traveling and subsistence expenses outside the District of Columbia incurred by the members or employees of the Board under its orders, shall be allowed and paid on the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Board or by any individual designated by it for that purpose.

(h) The principal office of the Board shall be in the District of Columbia, but it may meet and exercise any or all of its powers at any other place.

(i) The Board shall have authority from time to time to make, amend, and rescind such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the performance of its functions.

(j) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Board such sums as may be necessary for the performance of its functions.

PROCEEDINGS BEFORE BOARD

SEC. 13. (a) Whenever the Attorney General shall have reason to believe that any organization which has not registered under subsection (a) or subsection (b) of section 7 of this act is in fact an organization of a kind required to be registered under such subsection, he shall file with the Board and serve upon such organization a petition for an order requiring such organization to register pursuant to such subsection.

(b) Any organization registered under subsection (a) or subsection (b) of section 7 of this act may, not oftener than once in each calendar year, make application to the Attorney General for the cancellation of its registration and for relief from obligation to make further annual reports. Within 60 days after the denial of any such application by the Attorney General, the organization concerned may file with the Board and serve upon the Attorney General a petition for an order requiring the cancellation of such registration and relieving such organization of obligation to make further annual reports.

(c) Upon the filing of any petition pursuant to subsection (a) or subsection (b) of this section, the Board (or any member thereof or any examiner designated thereby) may hold hearings, administer oaths and affirmations, may examine witnesses, and receive evidence at any place in the United States, and may require by subpena the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of books, papers, correspondence, memoranda, and other records deemed relevant to the matter under inquiry. Subpenas may be signed and issued by any member of the Board or any duly authorized examiner. Subpenas shall be issued on behalf of the organization which is a party to the proceeding upon request and upon a statement or showing of general relevance and reasonable scope of the evidence sought. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such documentary evidence may be required from any place in the United States at any designated place of hearing. Witnesses summoned shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the district courts of the United States. In case of disobedience to a subpena the Board may invoke the aid of any court of the United States in requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of documentary evidence. Any of the district courts of the United States within the jurisdiction of which such inquiry is carried on may, in case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued to any person, issue an order requiring such person to appear (and to produce documentary evidence if so ordered) and give evidence relating to the matter in question; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof. All process in any such case may be served in the judicial district whereof such person is an inhabitant or wherever he may be found.

(d) All hearings conducted under this section shall be public. Each party to such proceeding shall have the right to present its case with the assistance of counsel, to offer oral or documentary evidence, to submit rebuttal evidence, and to conduct such cross-examination as may be required for a full and true disclosure of the facts. An accurate stenographic record shall be taken of the testimony of each witness, and a transcript of such testimony shall be filed in the office of the Board.

(e) In determining whether any organization is a Communist political organization, there shall be taken into consideration—

(1) the extent to which its policies are formulated and carried out and its activities performed, pursuant to directives or to effectuate the policies, of the foreign government or foreign governmental or political organization in which is vested, or under the domination or control of which is exercised, the direction and control of the world Communist movement referred to in section 2 of this act; and

(2) the extent to which its views and policies do not deviate from those of such foreign government or foreign organizations; and

(3) the extent to which it receives financial or other aid, directly or indirectly, from or at the direction of such foreign government or foreign organization; and

(4) the extent to which it sends members or representatives to any foreign country for instruction or training in the principles, policies, strategy, or tactics of such world Communist movement; and

(5) the extent to which it reports to such foreign government or foreign organization or to its representatives; and

(6) the extent to which its principal leaders or a substantial number of its members

are subject to or recognize the disciplinary power of such foreign government or foreign organization or its representatives; and

(7) the extent to which in order to conceal its foreign connections (i) it fails to disclose, or resists efforts to obtain information as to its membership (by keeping membership lists in code, by instructing members to refuse to acknowledge membership, or by any other method); (ii) its members refuse to acknowledge membership therein; (iii) it fails to disclose, or resists efforts to obtain information as to, records other than membership lists, (iv) its meetings are secret; and (v) it otherwise operates on a secret basis; and

(8) the extent to which its principal leaders or a substantial number of its members consider the allegiance they owe to the United States as subordinate to their obligations to such foreign government or foreign organization.

(f) In determining whether any organization is a "Communist-front organization", there shall be taken into consideration—

(1) the relationship of persons who are active in its management, direction, or supervision, whether or not holding office therein, to any Communist political organization, Communist foreign government, or the world Communist movement referred to in section 2; and

(2) the extent to which its support, financial or otherwise, is derived from any Communist political organization, Communist foreign government, or the world Communist movement referred to in section 2; and

(3) the extent to which its funds, resources, or personnel are used to further or promote the political objectives of any Communist political organization, Communist-foreign government, or the world Communist movement referred to in section 2; and

(4) the extent to which the positions taken or advanced by it from time to time on matters of policy do not deviate from those of any Communist political organization, Communist foreign government, or the world Communist movement referred to in section 2.

(g) If, after hearing upon a petition filed under subsection (a) of this section, the Board determines that the organization is a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served on such organization an order requiring such organization to register as such under section 7 of this act.

(h) If, after hearing upon a petition filed under subsection (a) of this section, the Board determines that the organization is not a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served upon the Attorney General an order denying his petition for an order requiring such organization to register as such under section 7 of this act. A copy of such order shall be sent to such organization.

(i) If, after hearing upon a petition filed under subsection (b) of this section, the Board determines that the organization is not a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served upon the Attorney General an order requiring him to cancel the registration of such organization and relieve it from the requirement of further annual reports. A copy of such order shall be sent to such organization.

(j) If, after hearing upon a petition filed under subsection (b) of this section, the Board determines that the organization is a Communist political organization of a Communist-front organization, as the case may be, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served on such organization an order refusing to cancel the registration of such organization and to relieve it from the requirement of further annual reports.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 14. (a) The party aggrieved by any order entered by the Board under subsection (g), (h), (i), or (j) of section 13 may obtain a review of such order in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia by filing in the court, within 60 days from the date of service upon it of such order, a written petition praying that the order of the Board be set aside. A copy of such petition shall be forthwith served upon the Board, and thereupon the Board shall certify and file in the court a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding, including all evidence taken and the report and order of the Board. Thereupon the court shall have jurisdiction to review the proceedings of the Board. In such review, the court shall review the evidence contained in the record so certified, make its findings of fact and conclusions of law thereon, and enter an order affirming or setting aside the order of the Board. If the court sets aside an order issued under subsection (j) of section 13 it may enter a judgment canceling the registration of the organization and relieving it from the requirement of further annual reports. The judgment and decree of the court shall be final, except that the same shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court upon certiorari, as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

(b) Any order of the Board issued under section 13 shall become final—

(1) upon the expiration of the time allowed for filing a petition for review, if no such petition has been duly filed within such time; or

(2) upon the expiration of the time allowed for filing a petition for certiorari, if the order of the Board has been affirmed or the petition for review dismissed by the United State Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, and no petition for certiorari has been duly filed; or

(3) upon the denial of a petition for certiorari, if the order of the Board has been affirmed or the petition for review dismissed by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia; or

(4) upon the expiration of 10 days from the date of issuance of the mandate of the Supreme Court, if such Court directs that the order of the Board be affirmed or that the petition for review be dismissed.

PENALTIES

SEC. 15. Any organization which violates any provision of section 10 of this act shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished for each such violation by a fine of not less than $2,000 and not more than $5,000. Any individual who violates any provision of sections 5, 6, 9, or 10 of this act shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished for each such violation by a fine of not less than $2,000 and not more than $5,000, or by imprisonment for not less than 2 years and not more than 5 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

APPLICABILITY OF ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

SEC. 16. Nothing in this act shall be held to make the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act inapplicable to the exercise of functions, or the conduct of proceedings, under this act, except to the extent that this act affords additional procedural safeguards for organizations and individuals.

SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

SEC. 17. If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remaining provisions of this act, or the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

The matters presented by Mr. FERGUSON were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FERGUSON

Mr. President, the need for legislation of the sort that I am now introducing has been reemphasized during the past week by the coordinated statements of world Communist leaders, including those of the American Communist Party. These statements demonstrate that Communists the world over consider themselves to hold a superior loyalty to Russia.

More pointedly, they demonstrate that American communism would do whatever possible to sabotage the security and defense efforts of the United States in the event of armed conflict with Soviet Russia.

My interest in this legislation was aroused last year by my examination of William Z. Foster, chairman of the American Communist Party, in hearings before the Senate Judiciary Committee. At that time Foster took a position for American Communists that was identical with his joint statement last week with Eugene Dennis, secretary of the American Communist Party. The more recent statement was made graphic by its timing, in connection with similar statements by Communist leaders in France, Italy, Great Britain, and other countries.

An article from the New York Times of March 2, reviewing those statements and giving the text of the Foster-Dennis statement, is attached, together with Foster's testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee a year ago, to which I have referred.

The bill which I am introducing is the product of considerable independent study and of hearings which were conducted in the Senate last year on H. R. 5852, known as the Mundt-Nixon bill. As the result of study by members of the Senate Judiciary Committee last year it contains numerous departures from that bill.

The essence of the bill which I am presenting is a recognition of the world Communist conspiracy, a severe penalty for any conspiracy to attempt the establishment in the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship under foreign control, and a requirement that Communist organizations in the United States identify themselves by registration with the Government and identification of their propaganda activities. An independent board of three persons would be set up to make determinations as to whether an organization is of such a nature as to require that it be registered.

Cardinal features of the bill are as follows:

1. It establishes that "the recent demonstrations of Communist objectives and methods throughout the world and the nature and control of the world Communist movement itself present a clear and present danger to the security of the United States and to the existence of free American institutions, and make it necessary that Congress enact appropriate legislation recognizing the existence of such world-wide conspiracy and designed to prevent it from accomplishing its purposes in the United States."

2. It provides heavy fine and imprisonment for a conspiracy to attempt the setting up in the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship under foreign control, and specifies characteristics of a totalitarian dictatorship.

3. It defines a Communist political organization in the United States as one having characteristics of a political party but substantially dominated or controlled by the foreign government or foreign political organization controlling the world Communist movement and operating primarily to advance the political objectives of the world Communist movement; and it defines a Communist-front organization as one under the control of a Communist political organization or operating primarily for the purpose of giving aid and support to a Communist political organization, a Communist foreign

government, or the world Communist movement. Both are referred to in the bill as "Communist organizations."

4. It requires registration with the Attorney General of Communist organizations and a filing of a list of officers and a report on the source and expenditure of funds.

5. It requires Communist political organizations to file a list of members and makes knowing membership in an unregistered Communist political organization illegal.

6. The Attorney General is required to notify all individuals listed as officers of a Communist organization or members of a Communist political organization and such individuals, if erroneously listed, may file a disclaimer with the Attorney General.

7. It denies United States Government employment and passports to members of a Communist political organization.

8. It requires identification of broadcasts or publications circulated through the mails wherever sponsored by a Communist organization.

9. It removes tax exemptions or income-tax deductibility provisions for contributions to Communist organizations.

10. It establishes a Subversive Activities Board which may issue orders, following public hearings and a determination that an organization is a Communist organization, requiring an organization to register. The Attorney General may petition the Board for such an order. Orders and findings of the Board are reviewable by United States courts of law. The Board would consist of three individuals, appointed by the President with approval of the Senate.

It is important that the present bill be read in proper context.

Sincere and conscientious effort has been applied to exclude from the bill any feature which could be reasonably construed as persecution of any organization which by its nature does not constitute a real threat to American security and institutions. Particular effort has been made to avoid any use of the bill's provisions to smear any individual by any erroneous or unfair implication with a subversive organization.

It is not a thought-control bill. It is a measure requiring the identification of certain types of activity so that the public may be on guard as to its nature.

At the same time existence of a real threat cannot be denied.

This is not a time for hysteria. But the conclusion that the Communist movement constitutes a threat to the security of the United States and its institutions is not a cry of alarmists.

This is a time for clear thinking. It is, moreover, a time for hard thinking.

With due regard to the spirit of our national Bill of Rights and our legal system, the people and the Congress of the United States must address themselves to an obvious and present danger.

[From the New York Times of March 3, 1949]

COMMUNISTS HERE WOULD OPPOSE UNITED STATES IN WAR WITH SOVIET—TOP LEADERS OF PARTY FOLLOW LINE OF THE REDS IN OTHER NATIONS ON AID TO RUSSIA—WALL STREET IS ACCUSED—FOSTER AND DENNIS STATEMENT SAYS FOLLOWERS WOULD ACT TO DEFEAT IMPERIALISTS

(By Will Lissner)

The top leaders of the American Communist Party served notice yesterday that they would pursue a policy intended to defeat United States' aims if this Nation were involved in a war they considered "unjust, aggressive, imperialist."

Declaring that United States military preparedness and the North Atlantic defense pact raised a real threat of war embroiling France and Italy in military operations against the Soviet Union, the American Communist leaders said they would oppose such a war and cooperate to defeat its aims and bring it to a speedy conclusion.

The statement setting out this policy was signed by William Z. Foster, national chairman of the party, and Eugene Dennis, general secretary. It followed similar declarations by the top Communist leaders of France, Italy, Germany, and Great Britain.

Mr. Foster and Mr. Dennis said:

"If, despite the efforts of peace forces of America and the world, Wall Street should succeed in plunging the world into war, we would oppose it as an unjust, aggressive, imperialist war, as an undemocratic and an anti-Socialist war, destructive of the deepest interests of the American people and all humanity.

"Even as Lincoln, while a Congressman, opposed the unjust, annexationist Mexican War and demanded its termination, so would we Communists cooperate with all democratic forces to defeat the predatory war aims of American imperialism and bring such a war to a speedy conclusion on the basis of a democratic peace."

The flurry of declarations from the heads of the Communist parties began with that of Maurice Thorez of France in an address on February 22 before a meeting of his party. He said:

"If the common efforts of the freedom-loving French do not succeed in bringing our country back into the camp of democracy and peace, if later our country should be dragged against its will into a war against the Soviet Union and of the Soviet Army, defending the cause of freedom and of socialism, should be brought to pursue the aggressors onto our soil, could the workers and people of France have any other attitude toward the Soviet Army than has been that of the peoples of Poland, Rumania, and Yugoslavia?"

HOLDS DISCUSSION ABSURD

Palmiro Togliatti, of Italy, commented on this in a statement to a newspaper on February 26. He said he considered it absurd to discuss a war between the Soviet Union and Italy, but when asked what the attitude would be if the Soviet Army were to pursue an aggressor on Italian territory, he said:

"I think that in this case the Italian people cannot but condemn all aggressions and would have the evident duty of helping the Soviet army in the most effective way possible to give the aggressor the lesson he deserves, letting the whole world know immediately that the Italian people—or at least the great majority of their active and fighting part—think this way will help without a doubt to check aggressors and preserve peace."

Harry Pollitt of Great Britain, general secretary of the Communist Party, told party leaders on February 27 that British Communists would try to stop any "imperialist aggressive war against the U. S. S. R." He said:

"If provocateurs ask us what we will do in the event of an imperialist aggressive war against the U. S. S. R., we will reply in the same way as Ernest Bevin in 1920—organize strikes and councils of action to prevent that war from being carried through."

The statement of Mr. Foster and Mr. Dennis was in the same vein as Mr. Pollitt's, but less specific. Mr. Dennis and the other members of the national committee of the American Communist Party are on trial in Federal court here on charges of conspiracy to organize the party to advocate the overthrow of Government by force and violence.

ISSUED FROM HEADQUARTERS

The statement was issued from the national committee's headquarters on the ninth floor of 35 East Twelfth Street in response to requests from two newspapers and a news service for comment of the Thorez-Togliatti statements. A spokesman handed out mimeographed copies, explaining that it had been written by Mr. Foster and Mr. Dennis in collaboration.

Mr. Dennis, according to the spokesman, was in his office on the same floor. Mr. Foster, who is ill of heart disease, sent his notes by messenger from his home on Walton Avenue, the Bronx, and exchanged drafts with Mr. Dennis.

Asked if the succession of declarations did not indicate that the leaders had been directed to issue them by Moscow, the spokesman said, "No, that's nonsense."

After the reporters had read the statement, a stenographer took down their questions. They follow:

"What means would the Communists in this country take to oppose this so-called imperialist war that this country would be engaged in?"

"If this country were engaged in a war you considered unjust, aggressive and imperialist, would you promulgate or support a general strike?"

"By 'all democratic forces' do you mean Russia specifically?"

"If in such a war the United States should be invaded, would the Communist Party undertake to support the forces of the invading armies, namely, the Soviet armies?"

"In such an event (let us assume the war is considered unjust and imperialist), would you attempt by strikes to oblige armament factories to convert to peaceful production?"

"Will the Communist Party in this country oppose the military forces of this country if it is engaged in a war with Russia?"

The stenographer took the questions in to Mr. Dennis. Shortly thereafter the spokesman issued the following note:

"Mr. Dennis was tied up in a conference on the coming trial of the 11 Communist leaders scheduled to open next Monday at Federal court. Shown a series of written questions, he glanced at them and stated that he would seek to answer them during the course of the trial."

One of the newspapers referred to in the statement was the New York Times. Last Monday the city desk of the Times wrote Mr. Foster, asking him to reply to a question posed in an editorial in this newspaper last Sunday. It read:

"What would be the attitude of American Communists if Soviet Russia should charge Canada with aggression, land an army there, and pursue Canadian forces across the border of the United States; would American Communists have 'the evident duty,' as Signor Togliatti put it, of aiding in the most efficient way the Soviet Army?"

Mr. Foster and Mr. Dennis did not reply directly to this question, but they indicated that they had read it by quoting a phrase from the next sentence: "The event is, we hope, wildly improbable, but we have a right to know the answer."

Although the statement did not go into specific policies as had Mr. Pollitt's the recent history of the American Communist Party is a clue to what the American leaders had in mind.

POLICY WAS CHANGED

Before the Stalin-Hitler pact was signed in Moscow on August 24, 1939, the Communists were ardent supporters of an anti-Fascist front and campaigners for collective security. On the signing of the pact they did a flip-flop overnight, opposed recruiting and conscription with the slogan, "The Yanks are not coming." They denounced the war between Germany and England as "the imperialists' war," and opposed aid to Britain with the slogan, "Not a cent, not a gun, not a man."

Campaigning for American neutrality, they denounced Franklin D. Roosevelt, then President, as a "war monger," accused Wall Street of fomenting war, and formed innocents' fronts like the American League for Peace and Democracy, the American Youth Congress and other groups to urge isolation.

When campaigning was unavailing, the Communists turned to direct action. They fomented strikes in the war plants through which this country was rearming, among them the North American Aviation, the Vultee Aircraft, and the Allis-Chalmers plants. In the latter plant especially the strikes were pressed with increasing violence and lawlessness. They colonized the maritime unions and fostered unrest in its personnel.

But when the Soviet Union was invaded on June 5, 1940, they did another flip-flop. Mr. Roosevelt became our superb leader, the war a people's war of national liberation and a holy cause and the slogan of the day, "Fight America, fight." Strikes were suppressed wherever Communists had influence, no matter how just or how unrelated to the war effort; war production was spurred and the draft pressed, many Communists themselves entering the armed forces. Once the war was over, Communists among the troops started a concerted campaign: Bring the boys back home.

In the last paragraph of the statement the Communist leaders referred to a peace drive they are about to start. This is parallel to a world peace drive being prepared by the Soviet Information Bureau, an agency under the Soviet Council of Ministers.

The American effort will include well-publicized conferences of intellectuals, of women and of youth. In addition, Henry A. Wallace, who collaborates with the Communists in the Progressive Party, has invited sympathetic leaders throughout the world to join him in barnstorming for peace in the spring. Pietro Nenni, Italian deputy who collaborates with the Communists; Pierre Cot, former French cabinet minister; and Konni Zilliacus, left-wing member of the British Parliament, accepted.

TEXT OF RED STATEMENT

The text of the statement issued by William Z. Foster and Eugene Dennis on the Communist position in the event of another war follows:

"The Thorez and Togliatti statements emphatically serve the cause of universal peace.

"Only those who plot a third world war and seek to embroil France and Italy in aggressive military operations against our great ally of World War II, the Soviet Union, could read anything un-French or un-Italian in these statements.

"French and Italian sovereignty and independence are threatened today solely by Wall Street's schemes of world domination as expressed in the Marshall plan and the proposed Atlantic war alliance. It is our military and those of the British who have established a general headquarters at Fontainebleau. Not Russians but Americans have military bases and are intervening in the internal affairs of Greece, Turkey, Iran, China, Canada, Greenland, Brazil, as well as France, and Italy.

"On February 27 the New York Times editorially termed the danger of an invasion of our shores wildly improbable. What the Times failed to say, however, was that the threat of aggression against other nations is not wildly improbable and that this threat emanates precisely from Wall Street and its cartel-connected trusts. It is this which explains the colossal peacetime military budget, the effort to stampede the Nation into the Atlantic war alliance and plunge America and the world into an atomic war.

"We Communists join with millions of other patriotic Americans in opposing those who seek a new world war. We strive for peace and friendship between the U. S. A., the U. S. S. R., the new democracies, the colonial and all other peoples. We do not regard a new world holocaust as inevitable. We hold the peaceful coexistence of two different social systems wholly possible. We believe that efforts of the peoples to achieve peace can check the war makers and create new opportunities to achieve peace. The peace camp is infinitely stronger than the war camp.

"It is this which makes the war camp so reckless and ruthless. An atmosphere is rapidly being created in our Nation that to work for peace and American-Soviet amity is considered equivalent to treason. The trial of the Communist leaders, the current witch-hunts and other attacks on civil liberties are indicative of today's political climate.

"If, despite the efforts of the peace forces of America and the world, Wall Street should succeed in plunging the world into war, we would oppose it as an unjust, aggressive, imperialist war, as an undemocratic and an anti-Socialist war, destructive of the deepest interests of the American people and all humanity. Even as Lincoln while a Congressman opposed the unjust, annexationist Mexican War and demanded its termination, so would we Communists cooperate with all democratic forces to defeat the predatory war aims of American imperialism and bring such a war to a speedy conclusion on the basis of a democratic peace.

"American security and American peace lie in world security and world peace—not in any Wall Street-Ueber Alles policy decked out in the trappings of 'the American century.'

"For our part we will work with all those who seek peace, democracy, and social progress. The American people, assuming their historic responsibility, must reject the war policies of the Wall Street-Churchill cartelists and their bipartisan puppets and return our Nation to the peace policies of Franklin D. Roosevelt, the 'Grand Design' and cornerstone of which is firm American-Soviet friendship."

EXTRACT FROM TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM Z. FOSTER, CHAIRMAN OF THE AMERICAN COMMUNIST PARTY, UNDER EXAMINATION BY SENATOR HOMER FERGUSON BEFORE SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE, MAY 23, 1948

Senator FERGUSON. Has it been brought out as to whether or not the American Communist Party is tied in any way with other Communist parties in the world?

Mr. FOSTER. I can answer that briefly, if I may.

No; it is not tied in any way whatsoever. Our party is an independent party without any world connections.

Senator FERGUSON. No strings or any connections whatsoever?

Mr. FOSTER. No connections or no strings with any other party.

Senator FERGUSON. Do you follow any other program?

Mr. FOSTER. No. We make our own program. You are absolutely right.

Senator FERGUSON. You are absolutely independent? No one else has anything to do with it or to say about the making of your program?

Mr. FOSTER. Precisely.

Senator FERGUSON. What is known as the Communist line, then?

Mr. FOSTER. Marxists think the same all over the world.

Senator FERGUSON. It is just a spontaneous thought?

Mr. FOSTER. Approximately.

Senator FERGUSON. That is your contention as to why——

Mr. FOSTER. For example, I just stated a minute ago here that the experience in central Europe in the building of socialism has been such that we have learned very, very much from it—very much. That is the path that socialism takes.

Senator FERGUSON. Do you in any way deviate from the Russian Communist Party? From their line?

Mr. FOSTER. In what respect?

Senator FERGUSON. Any respect? You say it is one of these spontaneous things. You think like the Soviet Russians do, and therefore, I want to know whether you deviate, whether the thought is conclusive?

Mr. FOSTER. We work out our policies, and you take a capitalist group in the United States. They work out a set of policies, and you will find that they will dovetail almost exactly to a similar capitalist group.

Senator FERGUSON. And I want you to answer my question.

Do you deviate from the Soviet Union policy?

Mr. FOSTER. We go along in a general way along a line of support of the fight for peace and so on, which the Soviet Union is following.

Senator FERGUSON. Do you deviate?

Mr. FOSTER. We are Communists. Why should we deviate?

Senator FERGUSON. All right.

Mr. FOSTER. I might say we did not deviate from the policy of the Chinese party, either. We agree with the policy of the Chinese party. We agree with the policy of the British party. We agree with the policy of the French Communist Party.

Senator FERGUSON. Because you are all one, is that not the fact?

Mr. FOSTER. We are Communists in different countries with a similar ideology and a similar Marxism and we work out our problems in the same general principle.

Senator FERGUSON. It comes to this, that you have one policy the world round.

Mr. FOSTER. No; that is not true.

Senator FERGUSON. Suppose that an American came into an armed conflict with Russia, where would the Communist Party's stand be, your Communist Party?

Mr. FOSTER. I will be frankly glad to answer that for you.

Senator FERGUSON. Where would you stand?

Mr. FOSTER. The Soviet Union is a Socialist union.

Senator FERGUSON. That is right.

Mr. FOSTER. A nonimperialist country.

Senator FERGUSON. I do not agree to that.

Mr. FOSTER. We will discuss that, too. Maybe you will have to withdraw some of your objections.

Senator FERGUSON. Tell me where your stand would be.

Mr. FOSTER. Give me a chance and I will be glad to explain it to your satisfaction.

Senator FERGUSON. I will be very patient if I get that answer.

Mr. FOSTER. The Soviet Union is a Socialist country, and a nonimperialist country. It is dedicated to the proposition of peace and its whole record has been a record of fighting for peace. If attention had been paid to what the Soviet Union said before World War II, there would not have been any World War II, and Mr. Churchill just said so in his memoirs.

Senator FERGUSON. Do you know what Ribbentrop and Molotov did about dividing the world before the World War?

Mr. FOSTER. Please let me explain. You asked me to explain a question, and I will do it completely.

Senator FERGUSON. I don't see how that part of the answer has anything to do with the question, but go ahead.

Mr. FOSTER. I am describing to you the policy of the Soviet Government is a peace policy. The fact of the matter is an exchange between the Soviet Government of letters indicates that the Soviet is not only that but hundreds of people all over the world.

The CHAIRMAN. His question was in case of war, where would your party stand?

Mr. FOSTER. Please let me explain.

The CHAIRMAN. You can answer without roving around the whole United States of America.

Mr. FOSTER. That is what you think. Who is answering these questions?

The CHAIRMAN. You aren't.

Mr. FOSTER. I will answer it. Don't make any mistake about it.

The CHAIRMAN. You will not take all week answering that question.

Mr. FOSTER. Any war, therefore, the Soviet Union being committed fundamentally to the proposition of peace, any war that may be developed between the United States and the Soviet Union can only be an imperialist war at the instigation of Wall Street, and we Communists are against all imperialists' wars.

Senator FERGUSON. Therefore——

Mr. FOSTER. Just a minute, please. Whether that war be directed against Russia, Great Britain, France, Italy, or wherever it is, we are against imperialist war of all kinds.

Senator FERGUSON. Then you would be with Russia?

Mr. FOSTER. What we would do in the event of such a war is we would fight to terminate that war at the earliest possible moment with a democratic——

Senator FERGUSON. On whose side, on the Russians' side?

Mr. FOSTER. A peace that would conserve the interests——

Senator FERGUSON. Whose side would you fight on?

Mr. FOSTER. Listen, you can't make me say things——

Senator FERGUSON. I am not trying to. I am trying to get an answer.

Mr. FOSTER. I am telling you what we would do in the event of a war and what our position is. We are against all imperialist wars, whether it is against Russia or anybody else.

Senator FERGUSON. But you are in favor of Soviet wars.

Mr. FOSTER. We are not in favor—Soviets don't make wars. No Socialist country makes wars.

Senator FERGUSON. All this penetration, all this murder, and all that goes on to penetrate is not war in your opinion?

Mr. FOSTER. That is just Red-baiting. First of all, there is no murder and war. Where is there murder? Please tell me.

Senator FERGUSON. But you would be on the side of the Communists in the case of this war?

Mr. FOSTER. In case of this war we would be on the side of immediate democratic peace. We would not support any imperialist war. We have never done so.

Senator FERGUSON. You would be against America?

Mr. FOSTER. Then America would be against the democratic peace. Is that what you are telling me? Not only would the Communists be for a democratic peace, but so would the American people, all except a handful of monopolists here who are trying to run the world.

The CHAIRMAN. What if Russia attacked America, where would you be?

Mr. FOSTER. Russia would never attack America. You are asking me an impossibility.

Senator FERGUSON. How is that impossible? How do you know it is impossible?

Mr. FOSTER. Because a Socialist Government is not an aggressive government.

The CHAIRMAN. What did she do to Poland?

Senator FERGUSON. What did they do to Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia?

Mr. FOSTER. I just recited to you what they did.

The CHAIRMAN. They did not plan a march into Poland when Hitler went in on one side, they did not go in the other side and take half of it; no.

Mr. FOSTER. They marched in there, that is right. This was just Russian land that the Polish Government had——

The CHAIRMAN. Let us assume a hypothesis here. What if Russia should attack America, where would you stand?

Mr. FOSTER. You are not going to assume anything of the kind, with me. Such an attack cannot take place. You might as well try to say if Washington went up in the air at a higher level, what would I do in the cellar, or something. I can't conceive of such a proposition.

Senator FERGUSON. Then what is the purpose of this infiltration, this penetration in America of the Communist Party?

Mr. FOSTER. What penetration?

Senator FERGUSON. You think there is not any?

Mr. FOSTER. I want to say this: We have a Communist Party in the United States, and I have been a member of this party and its antecedents for 48 years, 48 years; 18 years before the Soviet Government was born. Socialism springs native to all countries.

Senator FERGUSON. You said that Russia never had——

Mr. FOSTER. It is not a conspiracy. There are 500,000,000 people in the world today following native Communist leadership, and to try to reduce that to the status of a conspiracy is ridiculous. Nobody would undertake that except some Red-baiter in America who has so little faith in the system that he is blowing so much about and such a great inferiority complex toward communism that he will find any kind of wild explanation to explain away realities.

Senator FERGUSON. What do you say about the war against Russia, that last attack of Russia on Finland? Was that an aggressive war?

Mr. FOSTER. Listen, Finland showed where it stood in the war. Finland was the tool of reactionaries of every stripe. It showed where it stood when it joined up with Hitler, in the war.

Senator FERGUSON. I see what you mean, then, that if the country that is attacked by Russia is not communistic——

Mr. FOSTER. There is no such country.

Senator FERGUSON. Then there is no aggression by Russia.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no such country. I will tell you what the matter is with the world. What is the matter with the world is that this is the big lie of the present situation. The United States is out to dominate the world, and it is carrying on the most aggressive campaign of imperialistic expansion in the entire history of the world.

CONTROL OF SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a revamped version of the so-called Mundt-Nixon bill, to control subversive activities, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill, together with an explanatory statement issued by me thereon be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill, together with the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1194) to protect the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities, introduced by Mr. MUNDT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "Subversive Activities Control Act, 1949."

NECESSITY FOR LEGISLATION

SEC. 2. As a result of evidence adduced before various committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, Congress hereby finds that—

(1) There exists a world Communist movement which, in its origins, its development, and its present practice, is a world-wide revolutionary political movement whose purpose it is, by treachery, deceit, infiltration into other groups (governmental and otherwise), espionage, sabotage, terrorism, and any other means deemed necessary, to establish a Communist totalitarian dictatorship in all the countries of the world through the medium of a single world-wide Communist political organization.

(2) The establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship in any country results in the ruthless suppression of all opposition to the party in power, the complete subordination of the rights of individuals to the state, the denial of fundamental rights and liberties which are characteristic of a representative form of government, such as freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, and of religious worship, and results in the maintenance of control over the people through fear, terrorism, and brutality.

(3) The system of government known as a totalitarian dictatorship is characterized by the existence of a single political party, organized on a dictatorial basis, and by an identity between such party and its policies and the government and governmental policies of the country in which it exists, such identity being so close that the party and the government itself are for all practical purposes indistinguishable.

(4) The direction and control of the world Communist movement is vested in and exercised by the Communist dictatorship of a foreign country.

(5) The Communist dictatorship of such foreign country, in exercising such direction and control and in furthering the purposes of the world Communist movement, establishes or causes the establishment of, and utilizes, in various countries, political organizations which are acknowledged by such Communist dictatorship as being constituent elements of the world Communist movement; and such political organizations are not free and independent organizations, but are mere sections of a single world-wide Communist organization and are controlled, directed, and subject to the discipline of the Communist dictatorship of such foreign country.

(6) The political organizations so established and utilized in various countries, acting under such control, direction, and discipline, endeavor to carry out the objectives of the world Communist movement by bringing about the overthrow of existing governments and setting up Communist totalitarian dictatorships which will be subservient to the most powerful existing Communist totalitarian dictatorship. Although such Communist political organizations usually designate themselves as political parties, they are in fact constituent elements of the world-wide Communist movement and promote the objectives of such movement by conspiratorial and coercive tactics, instead of through the democratic processes of a free elective system or through the freedom-preserving means employed by a political party which operates as an agency by which people govern themselves.

(7) In carrying on the activities referred to in paragraph (6), such Communist organizations in various countries are organized on a secret, conspiratorial basis and operate to a substantial extent through organizations, commonly known as Communist fronts, which in most instances are created and maintained, or used, in such manner as to conceal the facts as to their true character and purposes and their membership. One result of this method of operation is that such affiliated organizations are able to obtain financial and other support from persons who would not extend such support if they knew the true purposes of and the actual nature of the control and influence exerted upon such Communist fronts.

(8) Due to the nature and scope of the world Communist movement, with the existence of affiliated constituent elements working toward common objectives in various countries of the world, travel of members, representatives, and agents from country to country is essential for purposes of communication and for the carrying on of activities to further the purposes of the movement.

(9) In the United States those individuals who knowingly and willfully participate in the world Communist movement, when they so participate, in effect repudiate their allegiance to the United States and in effect transfer their allegiance to the foreign country in which is vested the direction and control of the world Communist movement; and, in countries other than the United States, those individuals who knowingly and willfully participate in such Communist movement similarly repudiate their allegiance to the countries of which they are nationals in favor of such foreign Communist country.

(10) In pursuance of communism's stated objectives, the most powerful existing Communist dictatorship has, by the traditional Communist methods referred to above, and in accordance with carefully conceived plans, already caused the establishment in numerous foreign countries, against the will of the people of those countries, of ruthless Communist totalitarian dictatorships, and threatens to establish similar dictatorships in still other countries.

(11) The recent successes of Communist methods in other countries and the nature and control of the world Communist movement itself present a clear and present danger to the security of the United States and to the existence of free American institutions, and make it necessary that Congress, in order to provide for the common defense, to preserve the sovereignty of the United States as an independent Nation, and to guarantee to each State a republican form of government, enact appropriate legislation recognizing the existence of such world-wide conspiracy and designed to prevent it from accomplishing its purpose in the United States.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this act—

(1) The term "person" means an individual or an organization.

(2) The term "organization" means an organization, corporation, company, partnership, association, trust, foundation, or fund; and includes a group of persons, whether or not incorporated, permanently or temporarily associated together for joint action on any subject or subjects.

(3) The term "Communist political organization" means any organization in the United States having some, but not necessarily all, of the ordinary and usual characteristics of a political party, which (A) is dominated or controlled by the foreign government or foreign governmental or political organization controlling the world Communist movement referred to in section 2, and (B) operates primarily to advance the objectives of such world Communist movement, as set forth in section 2 of this act.

(4) The term "Communist-front organization" means any organization in the United States (other than a Communist political organization and other than a lawfully organized political party which is not a Communist political organization) which (A) is under the control of a Communist-political organization, or (B) is primarily operated for the purpose of giving aid and support to a Communist political organization, a Communist foreign government, or the world Communist movement referred to in section 2.

(5) The term "Communist organization" means a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization.

(6) The term "publication" means any circular, newspaper, periodical, pamphlet, book, letter, post card, leaflet, or other publication.

(7) The term "United States", when used in a geographical sense, includes the several States, Territories, and possessions of the United States, the District of Columbia, and the Canal Zone.

(8) The term "interstate or foreign commerce" means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication (A) between any State, Territory, or possession of the United States (including the Canal Zone), or the District of Columbia, and any place outside thereof, or (B) within any Territory or possession of the United States (including the Canal Zone) or within the District of Columbia.

(9) The term "Commission" means the Subversive Activities Commission created by section 13 of this act.

(10) The term "final order of the Commission" means an order issued by the Commission under section 14 of this act, which has become final as provided in section 15 of this act.

CERTAIN PROHIBITED ACTS

SEC. 4. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person knowingly to combine, conspire, or agree with any other person to perform any act which would substantially facilitate or aid in the establishment within the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship the direction and control of which is to be vested in, or exercised by or under the domination or control of, any foreign government, foreign organization, or foreign individual. For purposes of this subsection, the term "totalitarian dictatorship" means a form of government, not representative in form, characterized by (1) the existence of a single political party, (2) such identity between such party and its policies and the government and governmental policies of the country in which it exists as to render such party and the government itself indistinguishable for all practical purposes, and (3) the abolition or prohibition of all other political parties.

(b) It shall be unlawful for any officer or employee of the United States or of any department or agency thereof, or of any corporation the stock of which is owned in whole or in part by the United States or any department or agency thereof, to communicate in any manner or by any means, to any other person whom such officer or employee knows or has reason to believe to be an agent or representative of any foreign government or an officer or member of any Communist organization as defined in paragraph (5) of section 3 of this act, any information obtained in the course of his official duties or employment of a kind which shall have been classified by the President (or by the head of any such department, agency, or corporation with the approval of the President) as affecting the security of the United States, unless such officer or employee shall have been specially authorized by the head of such department, agency, or corporation to make such disclosure of such information.

(c) Any person who violates any provision of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000, or imprisonment for not more than 10 years, or by both such fine and such imprisonment, and shall, moreover, be thereafter ineligible to hold any office, or place of honor, profit, or trust created by the Constitution or laws of the United States.

(d) Any offense punishable under this section may be prosecuted at any time without regard to any statute of limitations.

EMPLOYMENT OF MEMBERS OF COMMUNIST POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 5. (a) When there is in effect a final order of the Commission requiring an organization to register as a Communist political organization, it shall be unlawful for any member of such organization, with knowledge that such order has become final—

(1) in seeking or accepting any office or employment under the United States, to conceal the fact that he is a member of such organization; or

(2) to hold any nonelective office or employment under the United States.

(b) When there is in effect a final order of the Commission requiring an organization to register as a Communist political organization, it shall be unlawful for any officer or employee of the United States to appoint or employ any individual as an officer or employee of the United States, knowing that such individual is a member of such an organization.

(c) As used in this section, the term "member" shall not include any individual whose name has not been made public because of the prohibition contained in section 9 (b) of this act.

DENIAL OF PASSPORTS TO MEMBERS OF COMMUNIST POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 6. (a) When there is in effect a final order of the Commission requiring an organization to register as a Communist political organization, it shall be unlawful for any member of such organization, with knowledge that such order has become final—

(1) to make application for a passport, or the renewal of a passport, to be issued or renewed by or under the authority of the United States; or

(2) to use or attempt to use any such passport.

(b) When there is in effect a final order of the Commission requiring an organization to register as a Communist political organization, it shall be unlawful for any officer or employee of the United States to issue a passport to, or renew the passport of, any individual knowing that such individual is a member of such organization.

(c) As used in this section, the term "member" shall not include any individual whose name has not been made public because of the prohibition contained in section 9 (b) of this act.

REGISTRATION AND ANNUAL REPORTS OF COMMUNIST ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 7. (a) Each Communist political organization (including any organization required, by a final order of the Commission, to register as a Communist political organization) shall, within the time specified in subsection (c) of this section, register with the Attorney General, on a form prescribed by him by regulations, as a Communist political organization.

(b) Each Communist-front organization (including any organization required, by a final order of the Commission, to register as a Communist-front organization) shall, within the time specified in subsection (c) of this section, register with the Attorney General, on a form prescribed by him by regulations, as a Communist-front organization.

(c) The registration required by subsection (a) or (b) shall be made—

(1) in the case of an organization which is a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization on the date of the enactment of this act, within 30 days after such date;

(2) in the case of an organization becoming a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization after the date of the enactment of this act, within 30 days after such organization becomes a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be; and

(3) in the case of an organization which by a final order of the Commission is required to register, within 30 days after such order becomes final.

(d) The registration made under subsection (a) or (b) shall be accompanied by a registration statement, to be prepared and

filed in such manner and form as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe, containing the following information:

(1) The name of the organization.

(3) The name and last-known address of each individual who is at the time of the filing of such registration statement, and of each individual who was at any time during the period of 12 full calendar months preceding the filing of such statement, an officer of the organization, with the designation or title of the office so held, and with a brief statement of the duties and functions of such individual as such officer.

(3) An accounting, in such form and detail as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe, of all moneys received and expended (including the sources from which received and the purposes for which expended) by the organization during the period of 12 full calendar months preceding the filing of such statement.

(4) In the case of a Communist political organization, the name and last-known address of each individual who was a member of the organization at any time during the period of 12 full calendar months preceding the filing of such statement.

(5) In the case of any officer or member whose name is required to be shown in such statement, and who uses or has used or who is or has been known by more than one name, each name which such officer or member uses or has used or by which he is known or has been known.

(e) It shall be the duty of each organization registered under this section to file with the Attorney General on or before February 1 of the year following the year in which it registers, and on or before February 1 of each succeeding year, an annual report, prepared and filed in such manner and form as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe, containing the same information which by subsection (d) is required to be included in a registration statement, except that the information required with respect to the 12-month period referred to in paragraph (2), (3), or (4) of such subsection shall, in such annual report, be given with respect to the calendar year preceding the February 1 on or before which such annual report must be filed.

(f) (1) It shall be the duty of each organization registered under this section to keep, in such manner and form as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe, accurate records and accounts of moneys received and expended (including the sources from which received and purposes for which expended) by such organization.

(2) It shall be the duty of each Communist political organization registered under this section to keep, in such manner and form as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe, accurate records of the names and addresses of the members of such organization and of persons who actively participate in the activities of such organization.

(g) It shall be the duty of the Attorney General to send to each individual listed in any registration statement or annual report, filed under this section, as an officer or member of the organization in respect of which such registration statement or annual report was filed, a notification in writing that such individual is so listed; and such notification shall be sent at the earliest practicable time after the filing of such registration statement or annual report. Upon written request of any individual so notified who denies that he holds any office or membership (as the case may be) in such organization, the Attorney General shall forthwith initiate and conclude at the earliest practicable time an appropriate investigation to determine the truth or falsity of such denial, and if the Attorney General shall be satisfied that such denial is correct, he shall thereupon strike from such registration statement or annual report the name of such individual. If the Attorney General shall decline or fail to strike the name of such individual from such registration statement or annual report within 6 months after receipt of such written request, such individual may file with the Commission a petition for relief pursuant to section 14 (b) of this act.

(h) In the case of failure on the part of any organization to register or to file any registration statement or annual report as required by this section, it shall be the duty of the executive officer (or individual performing the ordinary and usual duties of an executive officer) and of the secretary (or individual performing the ordinary and usual duties of a secretary) of such organization, and of such officer or officers of such organization as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe, to register for such organization, to file such registration statement, or to file such annual report, as the case may be.

REGISTRATION OF MEMBERS OF COMMUNIST POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 8. Each individual who is a member of any organization which he knows to be registered as a Communist political organization under section 7 (a) of this act but which has failed to include his name upon the list of members thereof filed with the Attorney General, shall, within 60 days after he shall have obtained such knowledge, register with the Attorney General as a member of such organization. The registration made by such individual shall be accompanied by a registration statement, to be prepared and filed in such manner and form, and containing such information, as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe.

KEEPING OF REGISTERS, PUBLIC INSPECTION, REPORTS TO PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS

SEC. 9. (a) The Attorney General shall keep and maintain in the Department of Justice—

(1) a register of Communist political organizations, which shall include (A) the names and addresses of all Communist political organizations registered under section 7, (B) the registration statements and annual reports filed by such organizations thereunder, and (C) the registration statements filed by individuals under section 8; and

(2) a register of Communist-front organizations, which shall include (A) the names and addresses of all Communist-front organizations registered under section 7, and (B) the registration statements and annual reports filed by such organizations thereunder: *Provided*, That the Attorney General shall not make public the name of any individual listed in either such register as an officer or member of any Communist organization until 30 days shall have elapsed after the transmittal of the notification required by section 7 (g) to be sent to such individual, and if prior to the end of such period such individual shall make written request to the Attorney General for the removal of his name from any such list, the Attorney General shall not make public the name of such individual until 6 months shall have elapsed after receipt of such request by the Attorney General, or until such time as the Attorney General shall have denied such request and shall have transmitted to such individual notice of such denial, whichever is earlier.

(b) Such registers shall be kept and maintained in such manner as to be open for public inspection.

(c) The Attorney General shall submit to the President and to the Congress on or before May 1 of each year (and at any other time when requested by either House by resolution) a report with respect to the carrying out of the provisions of this act, including the names and addresses of the organizations listed in such registers and (except to the extent prohibited by subsection (b) of this section) the names and addresses of the individuals listed as members of such organizations.

MEMBERSHIP IN CERTAIN COMMUNIST POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 10. It shall be unlawful for any individual to become or remain a member of any organization if he knows that (1) there is in effect a final order of the Commission requiring such organization to register under section 7 of this act as a Communist political organization, (2) more than 30 days have elapsed since such order became final, and (3) such organization is not registered under section 7 of this act as a Communist political organization.

USE OF THE MAILS AND INSTRUMENTALITIES OF INTERSTATE OR FOREIGN COMMERCE

SEC. 11. It shall be unlawful for any organization which is registered under section 7, or for any organization with respect to which there is in effect a final order of the Commission requiring it to register under section 7, or for any person acting for or on behalf of any such organization—

(1) to transmit or cause to be transmitted, through the United States mails or by any means or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce, any publication which is intended to be, or which it is reasonable to believe is intended to be, circulated or disseminated among two or more persons, unless such publication, and any envelope, wrapper, or other container in which it is mailed or otherwise circulated or transmitted, bears the following, printed in such manner as may be provided in regulations prescribed by the Attorney General, with the name of the organization appearing in lieu of the blank: "Disseminated by , a Communist organization"; or

(2) to broadcast or cause to be broadcast any matter over any radio station in the United States, unless such matter is preceded by the following statement, with the name of the organization being stated in place of the blank: "The following program is sponsored by , a Communist organization."

DENIAL OF TAX DEDUCTIONS AND EXEMPTION

SEC. 12. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no deduction for Federal income-tax purposes shall be allowed in the case of a contribution to or for the use of any organization if at the time of the making of such contribution (1) such organization is registered under section 7 or (2) there is in effect a final order of the Commission requiring such organization to register under section 7.

(b) No organization shall be entitled to exemption from Federal income tax, under section 101 of the Internal Revenue Code, for any taxable year if at any time during such taxable year (1) such organization is registered under section 7 or (2) there is in effect a final order of the Commission requiring such organization to register under section 7.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES COMMISSION

SEC. 13. (a) There is hereby established the Subversive Activities Commission, which shall be composed of three members designated by the President, one from the Department of State, one from the Department of Commerce, and one from the National Military Establishment. Members of the Commission shall serve as such without additional compensation. It shall be the duty of the Commission—

(1) upon application made by the Attorney General under section 14 (a) of this act, or by any organization under section 14 (b) of this act, to determine whether any organization is a "Communist political organization" within the meaning of paragraph (3) of section 3 of this act, or a "Communist-front organization" within the meaning of paragraph (4) of section 3 of this act; and

(2) upon application made by the Attorney General under section 14 (a) of this act, or by any individual under section 14 (b) of this act, to determine whether any individual is a member of any Communist political organization registered, or by final order of the Commission required to be registered, under section 7 (a) of this act.

(b) Subject to the civil-service laws and Classification Act of 1923, as amended, the Commission may appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary for the performance of its functions.

(c) The Commission may make such rules and regulations, not inconsistent with the provisions of this act, as may be necessary for the performance of its duties.

(d) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Commission such sums as may be necessary and appropriate to carry out its functions.

PROCEEDINGS BEFORE COMMISSION

SEC. 14. (a) Whenever the Attorney General shall have reason to believe that any organization which has not registered under subsection (a) or subsection (b) of section 7 of this act is in fact an organization of kind required to be registered under such subsection, or that any individual who has not registered under section 8 of this act is in fact required to register under such section, he shall file with the Commission and serve upon such organization or individual a petition for an order requiring such organization or individual to register pursuant to such subsection or section, as the case may be.

(b) Any organization registered under subsection (a) or subsection (b) of section 7 of this act, and any individual registered under section 8 of this act, may, not oftener than once in each calendar year, make application to the Attorney General for the cancellation of such registration and (in the case of such organization) for relief from obligation to make further annual reports. Within 60 days after the denial of any such application by the Attorney General, the organization or individual concerned may file with the Commission and serve upon the Attorney General a petition for an order requiring the cancellation of such registration and (in the case of such organization) relieving such organization of obligation to make further annual reports. Any individual authorized by section 7 (g) of this act to file a petition for relief may file with the Commission and serve upon the Attorney General a petition for an order requiring the Attorney General to strike his name from the registration statement or annual report upon which it appears.

(c) Upon the filing of any petition pursuant to subsection (a) or subsection (b) of this section, the Commission (or any member thereof or any examiner designated thereby) may hold hearings, administer oaths and affirmations, may examine witnesses and receive evidence at any place in the United States, and may require by subpena the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of books, papers, correspondence, memoranda, and other records deemed relevant to the matter under inquiry. Subpenas may be signed and issued by any member of the Commission of any duly authorized examiner. Subpenas shall be issued on behalf of the organization or the individual who is a party to the proceeding upon request and upon a statement or showing of general relevance and reasonable scope of the evidence sought. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such documentary evidence may be required from any place in the United States at any designated place of hearing. Witnesses summoned shall be paid the same fees and mileage paid witnesses in the district courts of the United States. In case of disobedience to a subpena the Commission may invoke the aid of any court of the United States in requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of documentary evidence. Any of the district courts of the United States within the jurisdiction of which such inquiry is carried on may, in case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued to any person, issue an order requiring such person to appear (and to produce documentary evidence if so ordered) and give evidence relating to the matter in question; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof. All process in any such case may be served in the judicial district whereof such person is an inhabitant or wherever he may be found.

(d) All hearings conducted under this section shall be public. Each party to such proceeding shall have the right to present its case by oral or documenary evidence, to submit rebuttal evidence, and to conduct such cross-examination as may be required for a full and true disclosure of the facts. The testimony in any hearing conducted under this section shall be reduced to writing and filed in the office of the Commission.

(e) In determining whether any organization is a Communist political organization, the Commission shall take into consideration—

(1) the extent to which its policies are formulated and carried out and its activities performed, pursuant to directives or to effectuate the policies, of the foreign government or foreign governmental or political organization in which is vested, or under the domination or control of which is exercised, the direction and control of the world Communist movement referred to in section 2 of this act;

(2) the extent to which its views and policies do not deviate from those of such foreign government or foreign organization;

(3) the extent to which it receives financial or other aid, directly or indirectly, from or at the direction of such foreign government or foreign organization;

(4) the extent to which it sends members or representatives to any foreign country for instruction or training in the principles, policies, strategy, or tactics of such world Communist movement;

(5) the extent to which it reports to such foreign government or foreign organization or to its representatives;

(6) the extent to which its principal leaders or a substantial number of its members are subject to or recognize the disciplinary power of such foreign government or foreign organization or its representatives;

(7) the extent to which (i) it fails to disclose, or resists efforts to obtain information as to, its membership (by keeping membership lists in code, by instructing members to refuse to acknowledge membership, or by any other method); (ii) its members refuse to acknowledge membership therein; (iii) it fails to disclose, or resists efforts to obtain information as to, records other than membership lists; (iv) its meetings are secret; and (v) it otherwise operates on a secret basis; and

(8) the extent to which its principal leaders or a substantial number of its members consider the allegiance they owe to the United States as subordinate to their obligations to such foreign government or foreign organization.

(f) In determining whether any organization is a Communist-front organization, the Commission shall take into consideration—

(1) the identity of the persons who are active in its management, direction, or supervision, whether or not holding office therein;

(2) the sources from which an important part of its support, financial or otherwise, is derived;

(3) the use made by it of its funds, resources, or personnel; and

(4) the extent to which the position taken or advanced by it from time to time on matters of policy does not deviate from the position taken by any Communist political organization.

(g) If, after hearing upon a petition filed under subsection (a) of this section, the Commission determines—

(1) that an organization is a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served on such organization an order requiring such organization to register as such under section 7 of this act; or

(2) that an individual is a member of a Communist political organization (including an organization required by final order of the Commission to register under section 7 (a)), it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served on such individual an order requiring him to register as such under section 8 of this act.

(h) If, after hearing upon a petition filed under subsection (a) of this section, the Commission determines—

(1) that an organization is not a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served upon the Attorney General an order denying his petition for an order requiring such organization to register as such under section 7 of this act; or

(2) that an individual is not a member of any Communist political organization, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served upon the Attorney General an order denying his petition for an order requiring such individual to register as such member under section 8 of this act.

(i) If, after hearing upon a petition filed under subsection (b) of this section, the Commission determines—

(1) that an organization is not a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts; issue and cause to be served upon the Attorney General an order requiring him to cancel the registration of such organization and relieve it from the requirement of further annual reports; and send to such organization a copy of such order; or

(2) that an individual is not a member of any Communist political organization, or (in the case of an individual listed as an officer of a Communist-front organization) that an individual is not an officer of a Communist-front organization, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts; issue and cause to be served upon the Attorney General an order requiring him to (A) strike the name of such individual from the registration statement or annual report upon which it appears or (B) cancel the registration of such individual under section 8, as may be appropriate; and send to such individual a copy of such order.

(j) If, after hearing upon a petition filed under subsection (b) of this section, the Commission determines—

(1) that an organization is a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served upon such organization an order denying its petition for the cancellation of its registration and for relief from the requirement of further annual reports; or

(2) that an individual is a member of a Communist political organization or (in the

case of an individual listed as an officer of a Communist-front organization) that an individual is an officer of a Communist-front organization, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served on such individual an order denying his petition for an order requiring the Attorney General (A) to strike his name from any registration statement or annual report on which it appears or (B) to cancel the registration of such individual under section 8, as the case may be.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 15. (a) The party aggrieved by any order entered by the Commission under subsection (g), (h), (i), or (j) of section 14 may obtain a review of such order in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia by filing in the court, within 60 days from the date of service upon it of such order, a writtten petition praying that the order of the Commission be set aside. A copy of such petition shall be forthwith served upon the Commission, and thereupon the Commission shall certify and file in the court a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding, including all evidence taken and the report and order of the Commission. Thereupon the court shall have jurisdiction of the proceeding and shall have power to affirm or set aside the order of the Commission. The findings of the Commission as to the facts, if supported by the preponderance of the evidence, shall be conclusive. If either party shall apply to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence, and shall show to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material, the court may order such additional evidence to be taken before the Commission and to be adduced upon the proceeding in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as to the court may seem proper. The Commission may modify its findings as to the facts, by reason of the additional evidence so taken, and it shall file such modified or new findings, which, if supported by the preponderance of the evidence, shall be conclusive, and its recommendations, if any, with respect to action in the matter under consideration. If the court shall set aside an order issued under subsection (j) of section 14 it may, in the case of an organization, enter a judgment canceling the registration of such organization and relieving it from the requirement of further annual reports, or in the case of an individual, enter a judgment requiring the Attorney General (A) to strike the name of such individual from the registration statement or annual report on which it appears, or (B) cancel the registration of such individual under section 8, as may be appropriate. The judgment and decree of the court shall be final, except that the same shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court upon certiorari, as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

(b) Any order of the Commission issued under section 14 shall become final—

(1) upon the expiration of the time allowed for filing a petition for review, if no such petition has been duly filed within such time; or

(2) upon the expiration of the time allowed for filing a petition for certiorari, if the order of the Commission has been affirmed or the petition for review dismissed by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, and no petition for certiorari has been duly filed; or

(3) upon the denial of a petition for certiorari, if the order of the Commission has been affirmed or the petition for review dismissed by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia; or

(4) upon the expiration of 10 days from the date of issuance of the mandate of the Supreme Court, if such Court directs that the order of the Commission be affirmed or the petition for review dismissed.

PENALTIES

SEC. 16. (a) If there is in effect with respect to any organization or individual a final order of the Commission requiring registration under section 7 or section 8 of this act—

(1) such organization shall, upon conviction of failure to register, to file any registration statement or annual report, or to keep records, as required by section 7, be punished for each such offense, by a fine of not less than $2,000 and not more than $5,000; and

(2) each individual having a duty under subsection (h) of section 7 to register or to file any registration statement or annual report on behalf of such organization, and each individual having a duty to register under section 8, shall, upon conviction of failure to so register or to file any such registration statement or annual report, be punished for each such offense by a fine of not less than $2,000 and not more than $5,000, or imprisonment for not less than 2 years and not more than 5 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

For the purposes of this subsection, each day of failure to register, whether on the part of the organization or any individual, shall constitute a separate offense.

(b) Any individual who, in a registration statement or annual report filed under section 7 or section 8, willfully makes any false statement or willfully omits to state any fact which is required to be stated, or which is necessary to make the statements made or information given not misleading, shall upon conviction thereof, be punished for each such offense by a fine of not less than $2,000 and not more than $5,000, or by imprisonment for not less than 2 years and not more than 5 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment. For the purposes of this subsection—

(1) Each false statement willfully made, and each willful omission to state any fact which is required to be stated, or which is necessary to make the statements made or information given not misleading, shall constitute a separate offense; and

(2) Each listing of the name or address of any one individual shall be deemed a separate statement.

(c) Any organization which violates any provision of section 11 of this act shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished for each such violation by a fine of not less than $2,000 and not more than $5,000. Any individual who violates any provision of section 5, 6, 10, or 11 of this act shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished for each such violation by a fine of not less than $2,000 and not more than $5,000, or by imprisonment for not less than 2 years and not more than 5 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

APPLICABILITY OF ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

SEC. 17. Nothing in this act shall be held to make the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act inapplicable to the exercise of functions, or the conduct of proceedings, by the Commission under this act, except to the extent that this act affords additional procedural safeguards for organizations and individuals.

SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

SEC. 18. If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remaining provisions of this act, or the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

The statement presented by Mr. MUNDT was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The following statement, issued today, is descriptive of the more important phases of the following bill to control subversive activities within the United States:

"TOUGHER, TIGHTER MUNDT-NIXON BILL INTRODUCED IN SENATE AND HOUSE—NEW PROVISIONS OUTLAW PEACETIME ESPIONAGE, WAIVE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS

"WASHINGTON, D. C., March 8.—Culminating 3 months of study, consultation, and interviews dating back to the "pumpkin papers" hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities last December, Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, and Congressman RICHARD M. NIXON, of California, today introduced companion bills in the Senate and the House which incorporated the major features of the Mundt-Nixon bill of the Eightieth Congress (which passed the House, 319 to 56, but failed to reach the Senate floor for a vote). The new Mundt-Nixon legislative proposal substantially tightens the provisions curtailing Communist activities in this country, provides a tougher series of penalties, includes new sections outlawing peacetime espionage, makes the statute of limitations inapplicable to treasonable acts in time of peace, and requires the registration and publication of the names of all members of the Communist Party in the United States of America.

"As explained by its authors, the new Mundt-Nixon bill does not outlaw the Communist Party, but it sets up specific regulations forcing its operations out into the open and denying its members certain privileges, including the right to hold appointive Federal offices or to secure American passports to travel abroad. 'The controversial section 4 of last year's Mundt-Nixon bill, which was the focal point for attack by opponents of the legislation, has been entirely rewritten,' Senator MUNDT said, 'and we have clarified its language and purposes so that no honest opponent or misguided critic can allege that it is a "thought-control measure," that it outlaws the Communist Party, or that it denies any loyal citizen the complete exercise of his citizenship privileges. Our bill does, however, specifically outlaw certain treasonable acts; it puts a penalty upon types of espionage treachery disclosed in the Bentley hearings, the Chambers-Hiss hearings, and now in the Judith Coplon case; and it spells out methods and penalties for keeping Communists off the Federal pay roll.'

"MUNDT continued: 'In short, the new Mundt-Nixon bill sharpens the teeth and expands the bite of the legislation we introduced last year, and which the House approved by more than a 5-to-1 majority in a roll-call vote. Due to developments at home and abroad the past few months, I feel confident the present Congress will approve this formula for protecting freedom from the phalanxes of Communist treachery.'

"Congressman NIXON stated, 'An overwhelming majority of the House Members who voted for the Mundt-Nixon bill in the Eightieth Congress were reelected. It seems certain that those who voted for our Communist-control bill last time will support it even more vigorously in view of the sensational disclosures made by the House Committee on Un-American Activities last August and December and the fact that now we even find a trusted and highly placed employee of the Justice Department caught red-handed in passing security information to a Russian Communist.'

"In explaining the new Mundt-Nixon bill its authors jointly stated, 'Nothing has been changed from our original legislation which could in any way weaken the legislation or circumscribe its coverage of disloyal activities. On the other hand, a new provision (sec. 13) tightens the measure by establishing a Subversive Activities Commission (three members, appointed by the President: One each from Department of State, the Department of Commerce, and the Military Establishment) to work with the Attorney

General in enforcing and administering the provisions of the bill. Section 4 now outlaws peacetime espionage and requires the Communist Party to sever its umbilical cord with Russia or refrain from acts designated to establish totalitarianism in this country; and it waives the statutes of limitations on crimes of this type; section 8 requiring registration and publication of all Communist Party members and officers of all Communist-front organizations has been rewritten to provide new specific safeguards for innocent people falsely listed and sets up the machinery for such individuals to avoid publication of their names; section 12 denies tax deductions and exemptions to Communist and Communist-front organizations; section 2, paragraph 1, provides a concise, complete, and accurate definition of communism as it operates and is understood by its members and leaders today.'

"Senator MUNDT told the press today, 'I am gratified by the fact that many Senators have spoken to me of their interest in this legislation the past 2 months and have urged its prompt reintroduction. Now that one of the famous 'red herrings' has been found in the personal pantry of the Department of Justice, itself, I am hopeful that the executive and legislative branches of our Government will join forces to screen every Communist from the Federal pay roll, to press forward with the indictments already secured, to enact the corrective legislation both major parties promised the people in their political platforms, and to protect our freedoms in these anxious times from those who wittingly or unwittingly would sell us out to a totalitarian power that recognizes neither God nor man but whose sole objective is world-wide domination for the selfish satisfaction and sadistic greed of the power-crazed men of the Kremlin and their satellite sycophants who slink and snivel their way into positions of authority in every country failing to take action against such disloyalty.'

NORTH ATLANTIC SECURITY PACT

Mr. WATKINS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 81), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas the President of the United States in his inaugural address announced that he hoped soon to send to the Senate a treaty respecting the North Atlantic security plan resulting from negotiations between this country and other countries;

Whereas according to press reports the negotiations have proceeded to a stage where the text of said agreement or treaty is nearly completed and ready for submission to the governments of countries contemplating entering into said pact or treaty;

Whereas the proposal for the United States to become a party to said pact or treaty involves a departure from the historical policy of the United States with respect to alliances with other nations; and

Whereas the Senate is charged under the Constitution with the duty of advising the President in the matter of making treaties with foreign nations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that it is in the interest of the security and unity of the United States and of friendly relations with other nations of the world that the text of said pact or treaty and all pertinent facts relating to it be submitted by the President to the Senate for consideration and study at a reasonable time before the date appointed for the signing of said pact or treaty by participating nations.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS AMENDMENT

Mr. THOMAS of Utah submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 249) to diminish the causes of labor disputes, burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated:

H. R. 20. An act to amend the act of August 1, 1947, as amended, to authorize the creation of 10 professional and scientific positions in the headquarters and research stations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; and

H. R. 253. An act to amend the act of June 25, 1938, relating to the appointment of postmasters under civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 157. An act authorizing the Attorney General of the United States to recognize and to award to outstanding courageous young Americans a medal for heroism known as the Young American Medal for Bravery, and other purposes;

H. R. 1950. An act for the relief of certain consultants formerly employed by the Technical Industrial Intelligence Committee of the Foreign Economic Administration, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1959. An act for the relief of the County of Allegheny, Pa.; and

H. J. Res. 160. Joint resolution to authorize completion of the processing of the visa cases, and admission into the United States, of certain alien fiancés, of fiancées of members, or of former members, of the armed forces of the United States, as was provided in the so-called GI Fiancées Act (60 Stat. 339), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 220. An act to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to revise the Alaska game law," approved July 1, 1943, as amended (57 Stat. 301);

H. R. 554. An act to provide for the construction, extension, and improvement of school buildings in Hoopa, Calif.;

H. R. 942. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to amend section 9 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 512)" (Public Law 593, 80th Cong.):

H. R. 994. An act to provide for disposition and use of tribal funds of the Navajo Tribe of Indians;

H. R. 1337. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the Alaska Council of Boy Scouts of America for recreation, and other public purposes; and

H. R. 1755. An act to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation; to the Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs;

H. R. 2216. An act to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to provide for an Under Secretary of Defense;

H. R. 2485. An act to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the Eighty-third and Final National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held in Indianapolis, Ind., August 28 to September 1, 1949; and

H. R. 2663. An act to provide for the administration of the Central Intelligence Agency, established pursuant to section 102, National Security Act of 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2660. An act to prohibit the parking of vehicles upon any property owned by the United States for postal purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

AMERICAN AID FOR CHINA—STATEMENT BY ARCHBISHOP PAUL YU-PIN

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, Archbishop Paul Yu-Pin, archbishop of China, made a statement in response to an article appearing under an AP headline, which is contained in a press release of last evening. I ask unanimous consent that the expressions of Archbishop Yu-Pin may be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Archbishop Paul Yu-Pin, of Nanking, today issued the following statement on the Associated Press dispatch quoting from an editorial attributed to the newspaper Yi Shih-pao, published in Nanking:

"I have always advocated, and shall continue to advocate, American aid for China in her struggle against Communist domination.

"I have not yet received the text of the Yi Shih-pao editorial referred to by the Associated Press, but I can say definitely that the views represented in the dispatch referred to are not my views.

"The Yi Shih-pao is owned by a group of Chinese Catholics. As president of the board of trustees of the Yi Shih-pao, I can say the policy of this paper has always been and still is anti-Communist.

"It has always considered American aid to China as an important contribution to the free people of China in their struggle against Communist armed invasion.

"The Yi Shih-pao is published in six cities in China. However, the papers in Peiping and Tientsin have already been confiscated following the Communist occupation of those cities."

INSTITUTE OF CHINESE CULTURE.

REDS' MILITARY ACTIVITIES IN FAR EAST — ARTICLE BY CONSTANTINE BROWN

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Reds' Military Activities in Far East Apparently Being Overlooked by United States," written by Constantine Brown and published in the Washington Star of March 3, 1949. Mr. Brown in his article presents a very interesting discussion of the subject.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REDS' MILITARY ACTIVITIES IN FAR EAST APPARENTLY BEING OVERLOOKED BY UNITED STATES

(By Constantine Brown)

While the attention of the American public is focused on dramatic developments in Europe, where the cold war has been greatly intensified, other equally dramatic developments in the Far East are being overlooked.

In high official quarters it is admitted that Malaya, Indochina, Indonesia, Burma, India, and the Philippines are of vital importance to us not only because they contain such great populations, but because they possess raw materials of great strategic value. If present unsettled conditions continue or grow worse, we may be denied access to them.

While we are disturbed by the situation in Berlin and by the antics of the Communist leaders in all the western European countries, there is a real war going on in most of the far eastern countries. The Communists have stepped up their military activities in Burma, where Premier Thakin Nu stated last week that 30,000 persons already have been killed in Communist-inspired disorders.

At one time the Communist bands, led in many instances by others besides native Burmese, have enjoyed important successes. At one time they threatened Rangoon. The disorders, which are infrequently reported in the press, are continuing.

In Malaya the British are having a hard time keeping up with the fast-moving Malayan guerrillas, who are well armed and ably commanded. Their hit-and-run tactics lead the British high command to believe that the leaders are trained especially for this kind of warfare.

REINFORCEMENTS CALLED

Last year only skirmishes were reported from Malaya, and the British Government thought they could be dealt with by the comparatively small military detachments they maintained there. In the last 2 months important reinforcements had to be called to Malaya, but there are no indications that their arrival has in any way slowed the activities of the guerillas.

The Indochinese war, which started late in 1946, continues in spite of efforts by the French authorities to come to an understanding with Viet-Nam leaders.

Although only occasional reports reach the outside world from that country, the French Government admits off the record that the campaign is draining France of its best troops and is costing a great deal of money.

In New Delhi, capital of India, Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru declared that Communists are inciting the population to active rebellion. This Communist policy, he said, has resulted in looting, violence, and sabotage in certain areas. Mr. Nehru added that the Government is determined to suppress these with all means at its disposal, but it is known to foreign observers in India that existing armed forces are too small to put down really serious outbreaks in the vast subcontinent.

Moscow has been successful in planting a large number of Communist cells throughout India. Until the outbreak of World War II, Indian young men who desired higher education went in large numbers to America, Britain, France, and Germany. When the war broke out various regulations imposed by those countries prevented them from going west.

MOSCOW STEPS IN

Moscow stepped into the breach and made it known that any Indian student desiring to study in Russia would be given all kinds of facilities. These included drastic reduction of fares to and from their native lands, free courses of instruction, and a very low charge for room and board.

A large number of young Indian intellectuals availed themselves of this opportunity and received thorough educations in such schools as the Lenin School at Baku. The curriculum there included thorough indoctrination in the Soviet "neodemocracy." The young Indians also were taught all that is to be known about machine guns and hand grenades. They were trained to become eventually the spearheads of the Russian fight against British imperialism in India, and this, of course, appealed to the Indian students.

After India became independent these men shifted to interference with the efforts of the Government to put the nation on its feet. Some of them now have joined the Indian Government, but there are still many who continue to be tools of U. S. S. R. intrigues. Some are active in labor unions, while others are working independently in various parts of the country.

The aim of the Soviet Union, according to those who follow these movements, is to create such conditions throughout the Pacific and Indian Ocean areas that in the event of a head-on clash with the west the latter will be denied strategic materials from those regions.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS—EDITORIAL FROM CLEVELAND PLAIN DEALER

[Mr. BRICKER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Time for Good, Hard Look," published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of February 15, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

HEALTH INSURANCE OR SOCIALIZED MEDICINE—ARTICLE BY PHILIP W. PORTER

[Mr. BRICKER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Porter on Health Insurance," written by Philip W. Porter and published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of January 8, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

REPRESENTATIVE HAYS' COMPROMISE PROPOSAL ON CIVIL RIGHTS—EDITORIAL FROM THE ARKANSAS GAZETTE

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. Hays' Compromise," dealing with the subject of civil-rights legislation, published in the March 1, 1949, issue of the Arkansas Gazette, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNLIMITED DEBATE A WEAPON FOR MINORITIES—ARTICLE BY GOULD LINCOLN

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Unlimited Debate Is Fine Weapon for Minorities," written by Gould Lincoln and published in the Washington Sunday Star of March 6, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

REDUCTION IN WORLD TRADE VOLUME—ARTICLE BY ROBERT H. PATCHIN

[Mr. FLANDERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Total World Trade Volume At Scant Prewar Level," written by Robert H. Patchin, vice president, W. R. Grace & Co., and published in the Grace Log for January-February 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

A COMPARISON OF COMMUNISM WITH DEMOCRACY—ADDRESS BY MR. JUSTICE WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address making a comparison of communism with democracy, delivered by Mr. Justice Douglas, of the Supreme Court of the United States, at a dinner of the Associated Friends of Occidental College, California Club, Los Angeles, Calif., February 18, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NORTH ATLANTIC PACT

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Atlantic Pact or Union?", published in the February 7, 1949, issue of the Providence Evening Bulletin, and an editorial entitled "Partners Or Allies," published in a recent issue of the Washington Post, which appear in the Appendix.]

PROGRAM OF SENATE SESSIONS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may propound an inquiry to the majority leader at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the majority leader, in view of his announcement, how late we may expect the Senate to be in session before a recess.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am very glad that the minority leader took the opportunity to make his unanimous-consent request, because I think every Senator should know that we are going to hold a night session tonight. We shall be here at least until 9:30, and probably 10 o'clock. All Senators should be reminded of that plan, because quorum calls may be in order from time to time. I hope it will not be necessary to call upon the Sergeant at Arms, as we had to do on two occasions last week, in order to find Senators and get them in the Chamber in order to answer a simple quorum call.

That is about all I have to say, and I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished majority leader for the answer to my query.

THE NORTH ATLANTIC PACT

Mr. WATKINS obtained the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LUCAS. Can the Senator tell me about how long he expects to speak upon the subject to which he is about to address himself?

Mr. WATKINS. I will say to the Senator that I am speaking without manuscript, and it is impossible for me to estimate the time any closer than to say possibly half an hour or an hour.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LUCAS. Is the Senator speaking on the motion to take up the resolution proposing to amend the Senate rules?

Mr. WATKINS. I am not.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr WATKINS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask the distinguished Senator from Utah if he does not know that when he obtains the floor in his own right he is privileged to speak as long as he chooses, without accounting to anyone?

Mr. WATKINS. I so understood in my reply to the question of the distinguished Senator from Illinois. I did not think for a moment that the distinguished Senator from Illinois was questioning my right to speak as long as I desire, or on any subject I desire.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator believe that I was within my rights in merely asking for information?

Mr. WATKINS. I certainly do, or I would not have answered the question.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator for his kindness and courtesy.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, last Friday I discussed at some length some of the problems connected with the international affairs of the United States, and our security as a nation. During the course of those remarks I had occasion to call attention to something of which I thought there was some evidence, namely, a propaganda campaign to get the Senate of the United States in such a position that it could do nothing but accept the text of whatever treaty the President might send to the Senate.

I did not say that any particular newspaper or newspapers were guilty of any

such propaganda. What I shall say today will not refer specifically to any charge that there was propaganda. What I should like to do is to invite the attention of the Senate to what actually takes place when a Senator rises on the floor and discusses what, in my judgment, is one of the most important problems which will come before us. I naturally expect that the newspapers will give such matters coverage fairly and without attempting directly or designedly to keep from the people what was said.

I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that I asked a number of questions which I thought were sufficiently important to be discussed here and to be presented to the American people. I did not do what some of the newspaper stories said I did. Let me cite an example of the coverage which was given to that particular speech.

The first item which I wish to call to the attention of the Senate is from the Washington Star of Friday, March 4, 1949. The subject of my speech covered approximately 22 pages of legal size paper, and I did not, of course, expect any newspaper to report the speech at great length. However, this is what was said in the Washington Star, in a story entitled "Danish Foreign Chief Coming Here for Pact Discussion Next Week." At the end of the story, following a number of other news items, we find the following:

Meanwhile, Senator WATKINS, Republican, of Utah, assailed in a Senate speech what he called a propaganda campaign to convince this country that a military alliance with western European countries is the last chance for peace.

He criticized newspaper editorials on military phases of the proposed security arrangement, and publication of what purported to be details of treaty provisions which are not available yet to Members of Congress generally. He demanded that obligations which the United States will assume under the pact be aired fully before, rather than after, the Senate acts on ratification.

Senator WATKINS foresaw the possibility of the pact being tossed into the lap of the Senate after what he described as a prepact publicity campaign to win the support of an uninformed American public.

I comment on that particular story only to the extent of saying that none of the arguments, observations, and comments I made in respect to the constitutional phase of the question involved, and particularly my comments on the editorials of the Washington Star, were given at all in that story. They were left out completely.

Then, Mr. President, in the New York Times for March 4, an article appeared under the heading "Norwegians join in Atlantic talks."

In the body of the article appearing under that heading the following statement appears:

Meanwhile, the Soviet propaganda campaign that the North Atlantic Pact is not a defensive arrangement but is clearly aimed at the Russians received aid from an unexpected quarter. Senator A. V. WATKINS, Utah Republican. Senator WATKINS said that the treaty is aimed at Russia, a view that was contrary to the official United States explanation that it was not aimed at any country in particular but was designed to prevent attack from any quarter by advance warning that it would be met by overwhelming force.

The Utah Senator admittedly—

Then there is a complete change over, which leaves the previous part of the sentence standing alone and without making sense. Probably that is due to an error in the make-up of the newspaper; something was left out. The further comment is as follows:

The Utah Senator admittedly papers had published details of the proposed treaty before it had been made available to all Members of the Senate. This, he said, was part of a propaganda pattern to win support in Congress and public opinion, and he threatened to demand long hearings and debate on the treaty when it came before the Senate.

In the first place, Mr. President, let me comment on this particular news story. It is really an editorial written by a news reporter who is supposed to be giving the facts. He did not state what I said. He has drawn his own conclusions, and he editorializes in connection with the comment. He did not report the actual facts, when he said that "the Russians received from Senator A. V. WATKINS," and when he said that I said the pact is aimed at Russia. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, I had said that it was the President of the United States who had singled out Russia and had said the pact was aimed at it as a nation. That is quite a different story, when the truth of the matter is disclosed.

Furthermore, I did not say I would demand that long debates on the pact be held in the Senate. I made no threats of any kind or description. The comments appearing in the newspaper article in that connection are merely more editorializing.

Mr. President, so much for the news stories. I have not seen all the others. However, in at least two Washington newspapers there was not one line or one word referring to my particular speech in the Senate. Yet both those newspapers had carried strong editorials in support of the proposed pact. However, for some reason or other, they were not willing to publish a single word of what I said about it. I am not saying that those newspapers are trying to be one-sided. I do not know the reason for their failure to make any reference to my speech. Perhaps what I said was not of sufficient importance to deserve comment by them, even to the extent of a paragraph. I simply point out what is taking place in this country. I say it because some of the newspapers' actions seem to justify the charges that are made by labor unions, and even by the Communists, namely, that the people of this country do not get news of all that is happening here, but learn from the newspapers only certain things the newspapers want the people to know.

Mr. President, I am not making that charge. In a very modest way I was myself a newspaperman at one time. I ran two small newspapers for a number of years. I know the problems the newspapers have because of the limitations of space. So I am not accusing those newspapers of deliberately omitting any reference to my remarks. However, they did not seem to be willing to devote any space at all to a discussion of the questions which have been asked in regard to this very important matter.

Then I called attention, in my remarks on Friday, to an editorial appearing in the Washington Star on February 18. I said it was an invitation to the Senate to disregard the plain words of the Constitution, and to follow a line of reason. I shall read that editorial in full, because the editor of the Washington Star on last Sunday morning took exception to what I said, though not in a spirit of bitterness. I think the Star writer is sincere; in fact, I believe all these newspaper writers are sincere; but it seems to me that they are so overwhelmingly committed to a certain line of action that they think that anything is fair in connection with it, and that they can say anything and do anything because it is in the interests of the country. I submit, Mr. President, that the duty of a newspaper which serves many persons is very much the same as that of a public utility. A newspaper is a conveyor of information, and at least it should give the information to the people. It is within the rights of the editor of the particular newspaper to print any kind of editorial he wishes to print, so long as it does not interfere with or damage the rights of other persons.

I shall read in full the editorial to which I referred last Friday, because I was charged with not giving all of it to the Senate:

ARTICLE 1, SECTION 8

This section of the Constitution says that "the Congress shall have power * * * to declare war * * *."

When those words were written, war was a slow, tedious process. It was a matter of transporting armies across vast stretches of ocean in sailing ships, of naval blockade, of equipping men with muskets to face other men with muskets. The authors of article 1, section 8, could not foresee the day when war would become a matter of sudden, devastating attack, designed to destroy a country long before its Congress could assemble to declare war. They could not have been expected to foresee the time in which we live, a time in which man's true hope of survival lies in preventing wars, not in fighting them.

This being so, it is not reasonable for Members of the Senate to be standing on the letter of the Constitution, to be saying that Congress must not yield any part of its constitutional power to declare war. To do this is not only unreasonable; it puts in grave jeopardy our one best hope for the future.

This hope lies in the broader concept of a North Atlantic security pact. If that pact is to be effective, it must serve two purposes. It must put the Soviet Union—

By the way, Mr. President, the Star does not hesitate to name the aggressor—

on notice that an unprovoked attack on any member of the North Atlantic community will be regarded as an attack on all of the members, and will meet with a united resistance. It must also provide a method for organizing a common defense, for providing the members with the necessary military equipment, and for bringing their united military power into play immediately after an act of aggression against any member.

If this is done, it will serve the important secondary purpose of enabling the western nations to present a strong front against aggression if the worst comes. But it will also serve the more immediate and much

more important purpose of discouraging aggression. For the Soviets are far less apt to resort to war if they know that the western powers are both resolved and ready to meet force with force.

In the best of circumstances, this undertaking will be difficult enough. It will be hopeless if we do not play our full part.

Much, perhaps all, depends on the attitude of the Senate.

This is the statement I quoted from the editorial on Friday:

Those who oppose assuming any military commitment in the North Atlantic Pact are motivated by a reluctance to see the constitutional functions of Congress whittled down.

This is understandable. And, for me, that persuasive constitutional argument in support of their position can be advanced.

But it is difficult to believe that rational men will want to win a constitutional argument at the price of losing the last best hope for peace.

Senators will remember I quoted that and dwelt on it at some length.

Yet the chance for peace will surely be lost if the United States finally takes the position that it will assume no commitment to join with its friends and fight if need be against aggression. This is a matter in which men must not lose sight of the main chance. Differences over a constitutional doctrine which was valid enough—

The constitutional doctrine "which was valid enough" was the doctrine that only Congress can declare war, and at the time and place the duty or the opportunity comes to declare war. It continues:

Differences over a constitutional doctrine which was valid enough a century and a half ago must not be permitted to bind us and cripple us in an atomic age. If we are to have any hope of security, then the people of the United States must insist that their Senators and their President approach this measure in the spirit—

We now get to the point to which the Star editorial on Sunday calls attention—

If we are to have any hope of security, then the people of the United States must insist that their Senators and their President approach this matter in the spirit of accepting the maximum commitment that is constitutionally possible.

I call the attention of this body to the fact that all the arguments up to that point are absolutely to the contrary. There would have been no reason whatever for me to make any comment if the editorial had started out by saying:

If we are to have any hope of security, then the people of the United States must insist that their Senators and their President approach this matter in the spirit of accepting the maximum commitment that is constitutionally possible.

That keeps within the Constitution. I think that particular sentence is what we know in the law as an escape clause. The editorial had been arguing step by step for an acceptance of a program which the writer said might even be contrary to the express words of the Constitution, and making a plea that we do that very thing; and then of course, to be on the safe ground, he finally says in effect, "Well, notwithstanding anything I have said up to this point, do not do anything of course that is not constitutional."

This statement is made in concluding the editorial:

We must remember that our attitude, and the effect of that attitude on both our friends and our potential enemies, can spell the difference between success and failure in this all-important venture.

Then, on Sunday, March 6, another editorial was published by the Star. I shall be a little fairer with the Star editor than he was with me. I am going to give his editorial full coverage here. My arguments on this constitutional matter were not even mentioned in their news story. From an editorial entitled "The Senatorial Oath," published in the Washington Star, on Sunday, March 6, 1949, I read:

Senator WATKINS, of Utah, has taken the Star to task for urging editorially—as he sees it—that Senators should violate their oath to uphold the Constitution in connection with ratifying a North Atlantic security pact.

The Star does not in any way question Senator WATKINS' sincerity in this matter. But he has misinterpreted the Star's editorial position, and, more importantly, he seems to have missed the main point of the proposal for a security pact.

The Utah Senator quoted excerpts from an editorial published February 21 which, standing alone, might seem to support his claim that the Star urged Senators to violate their oath. But he did not quote this sentence of the editorial: "If we are to have any hope of security, then the people of the United States must insist that their Senators and their President approach this matter (the security pact) in the spirit of accepting the maximum commitment that is constitutionally possible."

That is the end of the quotation from the Star's first editorial, the one which I claim is the "escape clause," which was very clearly writter into the tail end of the editorial.

This goes to the heart of the controversy.

I admit that it does. If they are going to stand on the Constitution and say, "Give us the best you can in view of the Constitution," that is one thing. But to come to us and say, "No matter what the Constitution says, we want this," is an entirely different matter.

This goes to the heart of the controversy. Senator WATKINS is among those who believe that the Senate should not and cannot ratify a treaty which would contain any commitment, formal or informal, military or moral, for the United States to go to the aid of an ally attacked by Russia.

I submit that piece of editorializing is a splendid example of a half-truth. I did not say at any time that we could not make any commitment, "formal or informal, military or moral." I said we could not make a commitment to declare war, but I did not say we could not make a formal moral commitment for help short of armed assistance. I said we could not make a moral commitment to fight, an implied commitment to fight, to take up arms.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield for a question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire for a question only.

Mr. TOBEY. Did the Senator ever read the poem by Alfred Lord Tennyson entitled "The Grandmother"? One line of which would seem to me to refer to the Senator's recent statement about a half-truth, reads as follows:

That lie which is half a truth is ever the blackest of lies.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator for his contribution. I have read the poem, but it was a long time ago, and I had forgotten it. I appreciate the Senator's mention of it. To continue with the editorial:

The Star does not believe this is the proper attitude.

Of course, if I had taken any such attitude, I would agree that that is not the proper attitude.

While not professing competence to pass judgment on the constitutional question involved, this newspaper most emphatically believes that our real hope of peace, and perhaps our only hope—

Easing up just a little bit from the other day, when the editor said "our only hope of peace," and stated that categorically—

and perhaps our only hope, turns on the willingness of the Senate to assume the maximum commitment that is constitutionally possible, and to do this in a spirit of resolution which cannot be misinterpreted abroad.

That represents, of course, a complete abandonment of the early part of the argument in the first editorial. To continue:

Senator WATKINS says: "I do not believe that the Eighty-first Congress has the power to say that American schoolboys of today shall be the front-line forces in any conflict that might occur 5, 10 or 15 years from now, or a generation from now."

Continuing with the editorial:

It would be nothing short of tragic if this should become the prevailing view.

Again, we have the statement that the only thing to do, is to be in such a position that we should be able to go to war. There is no commitment in that statement that any other course would be practical, if it should become the prevailing view that we ought to go to war. Write the ticket, and tell generations yet to come whether they shall fight, or whether they shall not fight. That is the gist of the whole matter. That is the thing I was talking about with respect to the constitutional argument.

For the simple truth is that the Eighty-first Congress will have nothing to say about it.

That is what I have been contending, namely, that the Eighty-first Congress should not have anything to say about what future generations shall do in the way of fighting, whether they fight or do not fight.

If a war of aggression should begin in Europe, or anywhere else, the schoolboys of today will be in the front-line forces, no matter what might be the wishes of the Eighty-first Congress.

I say that will be true, providing the Congress which those same schoolboys

had helped elect, and which represents them, declares war, or makes war possible. Then they will be there, but not without the declaration of the Congress, unless we now take the steps making it impossible for a Congress and those boys of the future to have any choice in the matter but to fight.

In such a war, the chances are the front line will be right here at home. The schoolboys of today and the schoolboys of tomorrow will be among its victims. The one real hope is to prevent that war from starting.

I am in accord with the Star that, if possible, we should keep it from starting.

And the one best chance of preventing it lies in a stand by this country which will make it as clear as possible that never again will we make the error of trying to sit idly by in the face of aggression.

We do not necessarily have to sign any pact in order to make it abundantly clear that we may fight if nations of our own kind are attacked and our security is in danger. As I pointed out on Friday, we have taken a course of action; we have made progress; we have adopted policies with respect to helping Europe, through the Marshall plan, the Greek-Turkey loan, aid to China, and numerous other commitments. We have gone ahead with this program and have made commitments. I said at that time that if these acts of ours do not speak more strongly than any language we can write, then it seems useless to attempt to do anything further.

When Stalin announced, through a newspaper correspondent, that he was willing to talk about entering some agreement regarding the abandonment of the Berlin blockade, and for the settlement of other questions, we said very curtly to Russia, "When you begin to act as you talk, we will listen to you." Why not apply that policy in this present instance? Our talk will be weak indeed if our actions do not carry such a message that it can easily be understood where we stand with respect to Russia and her aggression.

It seems to me, now, in going over the editorial opinion of the country, that the decision has already been made. There is really not anything left for the Senate to do except to take the treaty and put our rubber stamp on it and pass it back to the executive department.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MALONE. Is the North Atlantic Pact today, in reality, a response on the part of the President of the United States and the State Department to the resolution adopted by this body last year; and, if so, does the editorial comment of the country support the theory that we are already morally committed to accept the pact by reason of the resolution already adopted?

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator asks two questions. I would say, in a general way, in answer to them, that some newspaper editorials which I have read say that we are more or less morally committed, having once adopted the Vandenberg resolution. I do not believe we are committed by that resolution. I remember that in the debate the Senator from Nevada asked the distinguished Senator from Michigan a number of very pertinent questions in which he wanted to know definitely whether the adoption of the resolution would be a commitment to enter into any defense pact or any alliance of any kind with any other nation.

I do not know whether I have answered the Senator's questions.

Mr. MALONE. I think the Senator has answered them. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MALONE. Right along that line of reasoning and the editorial comment we notice every day, if we accept the North Atlantic Pact, even though we have a technical loophole in the pact, have we given the world to understand that we are morally bound to go to war when any one of the European nations says it is attacked?

Mr. WATKINS. That is one of the arguments I have heard during the course of the debate on the Greek-Turkish loan, on the Marshall program, and also on the Vandenberg resolution. The contention was that there is not anything else left for us to do. I voted for the Greek-Turkish loan and for the Marshall program on the theory that we had either to help those nations or retire from Europe and admit that we had lost the war completely, and let the Communists take over, and I thought it would be the lesser of two evils to help those people, regardless of putting a heavy burden upon the taxpayers of the United States.

Mr. MALONE. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MALONE. One hundred and twenty-five years ago President Monroe laid down a doctrine which has worked very well. Would the Senator consider an extension of that doctrine, covering the nations of Europe and Asia and saying that, in the opinion of the President of the United States and the State Department, their integrity is important to our ultimate peace and safety? If, where our safety is threatened, we cover those nations by such an extension of the Monroe Doctrine, would not that be an answer to the situation?

Mr. WATKINS. I suppose that what the Senator wants to know is whether I favor a Monroe Doctrine for Europe.

Mr. President, may I have unanimous consent to ask a question of the Senator from Nevada as to just what he meant by the question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah may ask the Senator from Nevada to clarify his question.

Mr. MALONE. I appreciate the opportunity.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator mean we should have a Monroe Doctrine for Europe?

Mr. MALONE. The Monroe Doctrine has been very successful for 125 years in the Western Hemisphere. President Monroe said, in words of one syllable, that:

We owe it, therefore, to candor, and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers, to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to the Western Hemisphere, as dangerous to our peace and safety.

If the President should consider any attack on the nations of Europe and Asia dangerous to the peace and safety of the United States, he could then extend the Monroe Doctrine to include such nations, as was suggested by President Monroe at the time of the adoption of the Monroe Doctrine.

Mr. President, I submit that a considered danger to our peace and safety is the only basis on which we should ever go to war—then we would be the sole judge of whether or not our peace and safety were threatened by any particular disturbance; instead of the nations of Europe or Asia being the judge. Would the Senator consider that that might be something worth thinking about and seriously considering before making any definite military commitments?

Mr. WATKINS. If the Senator puts it that way, "something to think about," I agree that I should be willing to think about it, but I should want to be certain, before taking on any more territory to defend, that the United States would have the ability to defend such territory and to enforce and defend such a doctrine before we announce it. I am not saying I would not vote for it, but I should certainly want to get the facts indicating what it would mean, in all directions, and to get all the truth connected with it, before I would want to make commitments with regard to it.

Mr. MALONE. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. WATKINS. For a question only.

Mr. MALONE. The Senator does consider, I assume, that if we should sign any pact with a foreign nation, a North Atlantic pact or any other kind of a pact, there would be a commitment. Does the Senator consider that there is a commitment to go to war if the pact should be violated?

Mr. WATKINS. Whether there is or is not a commitment depends upon the wording and intent of the pact. I have heard it said that there is no commitment. As I understand, the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, and the ranking Republican member of that committee, have said that, so far as they are concerned, the document will contain no provision which would commit this Nation to go to war.

Mr. MALONE. It would seem that everyone in the United States read the pact except the United States Senators.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator yielded for a question.

Mr. WATKINS. I cannot, of course, Mr. President, control statements which are made; but I take it that the Senator's comment was only an observation which would not cost me the floor.

A moment ago I had come to the point at which I said the matter has been decided, so far as the newspapers of the

country are concerned, without the necessity of the Senate doing anything about it except giving it rubber-stamp approval. I wish to read, now, from an editorial appearing in the Christian Science Monitor of March 1, 1949:

PACT'S PROGRESS

There is going to be an Atlantic Pact. It is going to be a good one. To so say requires no special talent for prediction. It's all in the news.

Secretary of State Acheson has been able to go further than seemed possible for a while in assuring America's prospective allies of military aid in the event they are attacked.

Apparently someone has agreed with him now, and he can go to the point apparently where he satisfies them. The matter about which they wanted to be satisfied was this, "Will the United States come into the war, with an armed force, to help us in case we are attacked?"

I continue the editorial:

The draft of the treaty is nearly ready for submission to the governments.

By the way, the Senate now ascertains, through the Christian Science Monitor and the Associated Press, that the pact will soon be ready for us.

The draft of the treaty is nearly ready for submission to the governments. It reportedly includes not only adequate military assurances but provisions to help Europe help itself back to a respectable posture for defense, through supplies from American military surpluses and through financial aid.

As I see it now, they are going to do this all up in one package. It seems the popular thing to do is to put our measures all in one package. Now we are to put the financial aid in this package, as well as the military aid, and the supplies we may send them from our surplus. I continue reading from the editorial:

Both the Secretary of State and Senator VANDENBERG, ranking Republican member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, express themselves as more than satisfied with what has been accomplished.

I do not know whether or not these distinguished gentlemen would be willing to accept that commitment by this editorial writer. I doubt it very much, in view of what they have already said on the floor of this very body.

Senator TAFT, too, has given the pact a blessing, but has taken out a little political insurance on the side by expressing doubts as to the program for helping Europe to arm itself in advance of trouble.

Of course, I have no means of knowing that the editorial writer had the right to commit the Senator from Ohio to the particular views here expressed. If the Senator has not taken out such insurance, and has made such a statement as that, I think it high time he does take out insurance.

The editorial continues:

His move is believed to forecast stiffer opposition in Congress to the arms program than to the pact itself.

I call attention to the fact that the editorial writer says that it, the pact, will have something to do with military surpluses and the agreement for financial aid. I do not see how the Senator from Ohio, distinguished gentleman and great scholar that he is, is going to be able to separate those items unless we get a complete separation in the pact between the military help, or whatever help is provided for, the financial help, and the matter of economics.

The editorial continues:

We hope such opposition will not develop. There have been doubts enough cast on American intentions to make an effective alliance.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] and the Senator from Utah, the present speaker, and all other Senators who were asking questions, are raising a lot of doubts—quite enough of them, according to this writer:

There have been doubts enough cast on American intentions to make an effective alliance.

Now what are we to do if we do not get a satisfactory response to our questions, because after all is said and done, these newspaper editors, and the others throughout the country who are making these comments from daylight to dark, are not the ones who decide for the American people. It will be the Senate of the United States which will make the answer.

The editorial continues:

As from American sources, so from European, the news blows briskly pactward.

This is a very able editorial. I have no quarrel with the editor's right to write that way if he so desires, but I am calling the attention of the American people and of the Senate to the fact that a propaganda campaign has gone forward now to the point where the propagandists believe it is completely won. I have disagreed with some of these papers. I still think we should propound some questions. I think we should go into this pact, if we do so, with our eyes wide open. I still subscribe to what Woodrow Wilson said, that covenants of this kind should be openly arrived at. I have voted for the other programs, and I may vote for this one when I get it before me so that I can satisfy my conscience and my understanding of what the pact means.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WATKINS. For a question only.

Mr. MALONE. I inquire of the distinguished Senator from Utah if it does not seem to be shaping up lately that most things brought before the United States Senate must be passed in a hurry, that the Senate is just a stumbling block, not disposed to review anything along the lines of the Constitution, that we must cut down debate, cut down the number of votes necessary to impose cloture, that this body is merely a challenge to the State Department in finessing legislation giving them full authority over national and international policies?

Mr. WATKINS. Is the Senator asking that as a question?

Mr. MALONE. Yes. What is the Senator's attitude in the matter of the Senate of the United States maintaining its independence of the executive branch?

Mr. WATKINS. Surely the Senator can answer that as well as I. I am laying the facts before the Senator from Nevada and other Senators. They can develop for themselves whether we are to be regarded as a stumbling block.

I can see very plainly, the way the news is being given out and the way dispatches are reading now, that the pact is almost ready for signature, and that we are not going to be able to place before the American people the matters which should be before them so that whatever is done can have their support.

So, Mr. President, I determined to call this matter to the attention of the President of the United States. I felt that we should have a discussion in this body of the terms of the treaty which is destined to change the historical foreign policy of the United States. We all ought to know about it. We are not now in war, and I can understand no reason why, from security reasons, the American people cannot be told officially about what is going on in these negotiations, as well as those who write the inspired reports that are printed in some newspapers. We had better get the truth, and perhaps these reports are not giving us the truth. It takes time to get all the facts, all the truth. So I sent the following telegram to President Truman last night, to his temporary headquarters at Key West, Florida:

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In your inaugural address, you declared that a joint defense agreement between the United States and certain European democracies was being negotiated. From the press I learn that the negotiations have gone forward to the point where the proposed treaty will soon be ready for the signatures of the nations participating.

You will realize, and I believe it is generally conceded, that this proposed pact, as far as the United States entry into it is concerned, will be precedent-making and one of the most momentous steps this country has ever taken.

From time to time newspaper accounts purporting to give the language of the important articles in the pact have been released to the press. Members of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate have been permitted to read preliminary drafts. Other Senators, however, have been kept in the dark as to what the provisions of the pact will be. Meanwhile, a general debate has been carried on in the press and over the air by editors, columnists, and commentators on the necessity for, and the wording of, the pact.

The proposal that the United States enter into a pact which in effect is a treaty of alliance with European countries, is unprecedented.

For that reason, I am taking the unprecedented step of respectfully urging you now to give to the entire Senate of the United States and to the people of this country at least 60 days before the date set for the signing of the pact, the text of the proposed agreement, the names of the nations which will participate and the reasons why the United States should become a party to the pact.

I am convinced the American people should be given time to study and think about this proposed departure from our historic policy of "no entangling alliances," and that the Members of the Senate should have additional time in which to study this important matter.

You will realize, Mr. President, that if the text of the proposed treaty and the reasons for entering it and the names of the nations invited to join are not given to the Senate in advance of the signing of the treaty, that it will be very embarrassing, and possibly harmful, to the United States to have the

treaty discussed at length at the hearings before a committee of the Senate, and possibly in the end to have it rejected or have it approved with substantial reservations.

I submit, Mr. President, that the submission of the treaty to the Senate as a fait accompli will be decidedly unfair to the Senate and to the participating nations.

I am urging this suggestion in all seriousness because I sincerely believe that in times of peace we should adopt and follow the principles of President Wilson, who advocated "open covenants, openly arrived at."

I wish to comment on one statement which I made in the telegram, that under all the circumstances it would be unfair to the Senate to be confronted with a completed, signed treaty. I wonder if we could envision the situation we would be in if that should happen. Here we are fighting a cold war, at least we are told we are fighting a cold war, with Russia. There may be many Senators who will want to uphold the President, and I know I would uphold him so far as I could and still discharge my constitutional oath, in whatever he is doing in the executive department, in a military way, in operations in Europe, and in a struggle to maintain free institutions and free peoples everywhere. But, Mr. President, the moment anyone attempted to stand up and undertook to question the treaty, and throw doubt on it, and make the usual arguments which are made in cases of this kind, the cry from editorial writers and others all over the United States would be, "This man is attacking his own country and its program. They are debating in Congress, while our whole future is in jeopardy." Such people, Mr. President, under today's circumstances, would come almost to the point of accusing any Senator who questioned the matter as being guilty of the crime of treason.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MYERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Is it not true that the Monroe Doctrine was not a treaty, but a mere declaration by the President?

Mr. WATKINS. That is as I understand it. President Monroe made the statement concerning the necessity of other nations staying out of this hemisphere.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Is it not true, in light of that fact, and in light of precedent, that the President of the United States, if he wanted to commit us to fight, could proceed and commit us, just as President Monroe did in the case of the Monroe Doctrine?

Mr. WATKINS. I may say, Mr. President, in answer to the Senator's question, that one of the things I am complaining about and concerning which I have been very much disturbed is the fact, as borne out by the history of the past 14 years, that the President of the United States, through executive agreements, has made commitments in the name of the United States which have put us in such a position that now our very security is threatened by Russia; not only our security, but the security of the democracies of the world. The President of the United States has great power; in fact he exercises much more power than he actually has under the Constitution, because many times Congress is willing to eat out of his hands. He can have his own way and go right on down the road just as he pleases. There is no question at all about that, in many instances.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. In view of the suggestion by some persons that Congress should cease debating this issue, and should join in some sort of a pact in order to be ready for an atomic war, is it not true that the President, under his powers as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy has had the power to meet force with force in the defense of the United States, or in our interests, and that historically the President has exercised that power from time to time to place our troops on foreign soil in time to fight if need be?

Mr. WATKINS. I believe the Senator is correct. Whenever we have been attacked by an enemy, if it was a sudden attack, like the attack at Pearl Harbor, or in any other way, the President of the United States and the armed forces have met the attack as rapidly as they could, without a declaration of war having been made by Congress, and authority from Congress. When such an attack is made a state of war is brought into being. It does not take an act of Congress declaring it to bring on a state of war. When an attack is made upon us a state of war exists. It is there. It is an actual, existing thing, and Congress appropriates the money necessary to carry on the war, and continues with further appropriations. For the sake of many of our legal requirements and forms, the Congress probably would go through with a formal declaration to take care of the matters I have just mentioned.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. In other words, is it not true that if this country were attacked, or if it found that its security was involved, and that we had to fight to preserve our security, what would happen would then actually be that the President of the United States would proceed to take whatever measures were necessary and commence fighting by using the Army and Navy; in other words, do just as was done after the attack upon us at Pearl Harbor; and that Congress would take action after the fighting started?

Mr. WATKINS. That might be true. We might want to know whether he would do that in event an attack was made on some nations who are contemplating becoming members of the North Atlantic Pact. We might want to know whether or not he would feel, in the absence of a pact, that an attack made upon those nations would make it incumbent upon us to resist the aggressor. We have, as a matter of fact, for a number of years permitted democracies in Europe to disappear. I refer to Czechoslovakia and Hungary. We have permitted them to fall, with nothing more on our part than formal protests. Some have said we could not do anything about it. Others have said that Russia was only obtaining what she was entitled to as a part of the implied agreements enentered into at Yalta and Tehran. Whether or not the statement contained in the question asked by the Senator from Louisiana would be correct under all possible situations, I am not prepared to say.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. WHERRY. I, like other Senators, am not familiar with the North Atlantic Pact. We know about it only as we have read about it in the newspapers. I read a commentary or an editorial recently—I cannot recall clearly to mind which it was—which made the distinction between the situations which existed before prior wars, and the situation which might exist now. For example, we had at one time the Neutrality Act upon the statute books. That served notice, apparently, on an aggressor power that the United States would not go to war to defend a nation which might be attacked by an aggressor. The writer to whom I have referred raised the question that there was a difference between the precedents prior to wars in which we have become involved in Europe previously, and what might happen now, in this respect, that if we sign the North Atlantic Pact, together with the other nations who are proposed to become signatories to the pact, the provisions therein contained, as we would assume from the reports we have heard, would be notice to an aggressor power such as Russia—I did not mean to refer to Russia, but the Senator spoke of Russia—that in the event——

Mr. WATKINS. Editorials have contained the same statement.

Mr. WHERRY. It would be notice to Russia, or any other nation, that if they attack any of the signatory countries, the United States would fight. Therefore, it would eliminate the possibility which was not eliminated previously, because the United States would already be on record in a treaty that in event one of the signatory nations should become involved under the provisions of the pact, we would go to that nation's assistance and fight against the aggressor. What does the Senator think about that observation? Do I make myself clear?

Mr. WATKINS. I think I understand the point the editorial writer or commentator was striving to make, as the Senator has stated it. I think the commitment contained in a treaty is not the only way to serve notice on Russia that we will fight if any of the signatory nations are attacked. As has already been called to our attention by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], there

are some other ways that could at least be explored. On the other hand, if we give notice that we will fight, if we commit ourselves to go to the rescue of the nations which come within the pact, and commit our forces, that is something else. That is another problem.

In order to illustrate what I have in mind, I may say that a man of considerable military knowledge and experience told me only today that many military men in this country are alarmed at the prospect that the pact may contain a military commitment which will bind the United States to fight on the ground in Europe. He called attention to the fact that Hitler, with 222 divisions, tried to smash Russia, and it cost him 5,000,000 men killed. He called my attention to the fact that every nation in history which has tried to invade Russia has been repulsed. He said the military are convinced that if there is any commitment to send troops over there, to make the war a ground war, the United States will be in grave danger under such a commitment. I mention that for what it may be worth. I have every confidence in the gentleman to whom I refer. He served for many years in the war. He has been on the staffs of some of our commanding generals, and I think he knows what he is talking about. It is something to think about. It is another question which I should like to see explored before we go too far.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MALONE. If I correctly understood the trend of the Senator's argument, what he means to say is that before we sign a pact which is a strong moral commitment to go to war any time a European nation in the North Atlantic pact says it has been attacked, we should carefully look into the situation. I believe the statement has often been made—at least it is very nearly correct—that there has been some kind of war going on in Europe continuously for 2,000 years. Does the Senator conclude that other means should be explored, such as an extension of the Monroe Doctrine by the President, who is charged with working out foreign policies?

Mr. WATKINS. Or by Congress.

Mr. MALONE. The Senate is not charged with making foreign policy, and, of course, we have no foreign policy.

Would the Senator conclude, from the trend of his remarks—I judge that he would—that we should explore the field to see if by some act of ours, or some foreign policy laid down by the State Department or the President of the United States, it could be made clear that we will go to war only when we believe that our peace and safety is threatened, and not be bound either technically or morally to declare war because some other nation says its peace and safety is threatened?

Mr. WATKINS. I think the Senator raises an important question, a question of policy for the United States to decide. Does it want to preserve freedom of action in fighting its wars? Or is it willing to be bound by some commitment to fight at a certain time and place, and in a certain way, as a matter of commitment for the future? I think that is one of the important questions involved in this entire program and in the debate. I will say to the Senator from Nevada that in my opinion it would be very unwise for the President of the United States even to follow the precedent established by President Monroe and make such a declaration himself. It—if made at all—should be made by joint resolution of the Congress, concurred in by the President.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not want to belabor this question, because I realize that it is on a subject not related to the motion which is the unfinished business, but I suggest to the Senator that he did not answer my question to my satisfaction. That is no reflection on the Senator. However, it seems to me that the crux of the whole pact is this: Those who propose it want to assure the signatory countries that they will receive the military assistance of which the Senator has been speaking, if they are attacked. Can we give them such assurance in any other way except by entering into the North Atlantic pact? If we can, it seems to me that an alternative plan, if possible, should be suggested by the Senate. It seems to me that is the meat of the whole pact. If we are going to give other nations that assurance, if that is the sense of the administration's foreign policy, we can do it in the North Atlantic pact. Can we do it in any other way, within the framework of the Constitution? So far as concerns assuring signatory nations that they will have security and the promise of aid in the event that an aggressor nation attacks them, can we accomplish the purpose of the North Atlantic pact by some other means? I am asking for light. Whether the Senator wishes to discuss that question now or not does not make much difference. There is plenty of time. I should like to see some alternative plan which would accomplish the same purpose without going into the North Atlantic pact. Can such a thing be done within the framework of the Constitution?

Mr. WATKINS. I will answer a categorical "Yes" to the Senator's question. Moreover, I have already pointed out that, in my opinion, the conduct of the United States in the programs which have been adopted is a strong declaration that we will go to the rescue of the free countries of the earth if they are attacked by an aggressor.

Mr. WHERRY. If that is the answer, what is the difference between that and the provisions of the pact? Do we not make a moral commitment which is just as far reaching and binding as though we were in the pact?

Mr. WATKINS. I think not. We still preserve the right to choose where and when we will fight, the kind of weapons we will use, and the kind of campaign we will fight, primarily for our own preservation, and secondarily for the preservation of other nations.

Mr. WHERRY. I want information for myself. A moment ago the Senator stated that he might even vote for the pact if it would solve some of the questions which are bothering him. I am asking the Senator a question which I think is the meat of the whole subject. Can we give assurance of the aid which is expected of us, either under the provisions of the pact, or outside the pact, and still remain within the framework of the Constitution?

Mr. WATKINS. We may not be able to give the assurance which other nations want, but as the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] has stated, I believe that an assurance which should be satisfactory can be given. I do not believe that we ought to go to the extent of violating the Constitution to make a commitment for armed force in the event of an attack upon any one of the signatories without the Congress itself having the absolute power to say whether or not there should be war.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation at this point?

Mr. WATKINS. Unfortunately, under the ruling of the Chair during recent days of debate, I cannot yield for the purpose of permitting an observation. I can yield for a question only. I yield only for a question.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I shall now ask the Senator a question. Is it the Senator's impression of the proposed North Atlantic Pact, which, so far as we know, no Member of Congress has yet seen in detail, that if we enter into the North Atlantic pact, we shall be automatically committed to go to war upon the call of any of the signatory powers which believes that it has been invaded, or against whom aggression has been committed, according to its own belief?

Mr. WATKINS. I am unable to answer that question, because, of course, I have not seen the language of the pact. But, in the words of the newspaper writers who claim to know what it is all about, apparently there would be such a commitment, and it would mean just what the Senator states.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Preliminary to the question which I am about to ask the Senator, let me say that I have been somewhat familiar with the general theory of the North Atlantic Pact. Not only is it my definite and firm impression and belief that there is no intention to commit this country to go to war without compliance with the constitutional process, which gives Congress the sole and exclusive right to declare war, but, in my judgment, it will be made abundantly clear at the time the pact is considered that this country will retain the right to examine into the circumstances which might call for armed action, to examine into the surrounding situation, and the provocation, if you please. This country must always retain the right to decide the method, the

place, and the manner of bringing relief to the invaded country for the purpose of repelling aggression or invasion. I believe that that right will be clearly safeguarded and satisfactorily established.

Mr. WATKINS. I must remind the Senator of the recent ruling of the Chair that Senators may not make observations in the guise of questions. If the Senator wishes to ask me a question, I shall try to answer it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to ask the Senator one further question. Did not the Senator observe the question mark at the end of my remarks a moment ago?

Mr. WATKINS. It may have been there, but I will say that it was rather faint from this distance.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MALONE. I ask the Senator first, Does he remember the furor that was manifested in the foreign newspapers, and was taken up to a certain extent by the newspapers here at home, when it was merely indicated that we would not commit ourselves to go to war in case the nations of western Europe were attacked? Does the Senator remember that? It was only a month ago.

Mr. WATKINS. I remember the consternation which was manifested in Europe. The nations of western Europe were thunderstruck by the interpretations made by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate [Mr. CONNALLY] and by the ranking Republican member of that committee [Mr. VANDENBERG]; and I remember the stories about the stormy times and the discussions back and forth. The people of western Europe wanted and expected a direct commitment on the part of the United States to come to their aid in case they were attacked; and they expected not only aid in an economic way, but aid by military means. Of course, the newspapers abroad took up that question. The article from the Christian Science Monitor to which I have referred, calls attention to it, as does the news story to which I called attention the other day. The writer of that story had five different drafts of the so-called pact. I have before me an article, coming from a Paris newspaper, which indicates that we are right back where we were when the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] asked for and received assurance that nothing of that sort would occur.

But now everything has been settled, according to the newspapers, to the satisfaction of the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Michigan, and, therefore, to the satisfaction of the entire Senate, according to the newspaper stories. However, Mr. President, let me say, with all due respect for those distinguished gentlemen, for whom I have great admiration and affection, that, regardless of whether they are satisfied or are not satisfied with it, their opinions alone will not suffice so far as I am concerned, because under my oath I myself have to be satisfied about these matters.

I say that advisedly, because time and time again in the recent history of our country, and particularly in the last few years, I have seen policies adopted, that in my humble opinion have been wrong. For instance, let me refer to the China policy and the sending of General Marshall to China in an effort to bring the Communists into agreement with the Government of the Chinese Nationalists. In my opinion that was completely wrong. Yet apparently that policy received approval in this country, for the time being.

One policy after another has been presented. Let me refer, for instance, to the Italian treaty and the question of its ratification. We have not heard much about that recently; but we do see some discussion in the newspapers about whether Italy will be invited to join this proposed pact.

Mr. President, what is the situation in Italy? What did that treaty do to Italy with respect to permitting her to defend herself?

Mr. MALONE rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Nevada for a question?

Mr. WATKINS. I am answering his question; I have not yet finished answering it. I realize I am making a long answer, but it is still an answer.

Mr. President, I was referring to the Italian treaty. If the terms of that treaty are considered, it will be found that by it Italy is left without any defenses in the way of modern arms. Her fortifications were required to be leveled. She was permitted to have some obsolete armaments, but only a limited number of soldiers. At the time, I protested. I said it is the God-given privilege of every man, woman, and child who comes to this earth to have the right of self-defense; and I said the treaty is not fair to Italy, inasmuch as Tito and Stalin are glaring at the Italians from across the border; certainly it is not fair to Italy to take away every defense she has, unless we are prepared to provide her defense for her. When Senators discuss foreign policy, I point to that one example, in which case I think we made a complete mistake.

Only a year ago, I believe it was, one of the members of the Foreign Relations Committee said on the floor of the Senate that the ratification of that Italian treaty was a mistake. Commitment after commitment in our foreign policies has been made, and many of them have gotten us into trouble.

So, Mr. President, the mere fact that a commitment is recommended does not necessarily convince me that the proposal is a correct one. I want to know about these proposed commitments.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield for a further question.

Mr. MALONE. Again referring to the Italian treaty, I ask the Senator whether he remembers an hour-long debate of that treaty on the floor of the Senate, in the course of which I stated that 198,000 Italians would be required to work 7 years without wages or compensation of any kind to pay the $360,000,000 reparations to Russia and her satellite countries—that the cost would be approximately $1,000,000,000, which of course we must pay since we have the only credit on which real money can be raised—the taxpayers of America must pay Italy's reparations to the iron curtain countries.

Incidentally, does the Senator recall that I pointed out that the processing of such raw materials would require about 14,000 Russian foremen and superintendents to remain in Italy for 7 years and that they probably would not be selected for their anti-Communist attitude. The result of course would be that the Italians would be under the domination of the very nation we are trying to protect them from today. Does the Senator remember such a discussion of the provisions of that treaty?

Mr. WATKINS. I remember that something to that effect was provided by the treaty, and I remember that I was very much opposed to the treaty because I felt it was premature and because I felt that problems in Europe growing out of the war had not been settled, and that it was the wrong time to make that treaty. I also objected because I believed the treaty would deprive the Italian people of the right to defend themselves, and certainly they should have that right.

Mr. MALONE. That is correct. We were both against it.

Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield for a question.

Mr. MALONE. First let me say, to complete my former statement, that, according to the treaty, the Italians were not to be paid for completing the job the Italian treaty would thus pin on them. The result is that we are paying for all that now. The taxpayers of America are paying the Italian reparations to Russia and the satellite countries. I did not like it at the time it was proposed by the State Department and do not like it now.

To revert to the discussion of the proposed North Atlantic Pact, I inquire whether the Senator from Utah remembers the very great furor which developed in the western European nations press because of their claims or charges that we were not consistent when Senators CONNALLY and VANDENBERG agreed that the pact could not bind us technically to military action. Evidently promises had been made by someone that we would make a military commitment; but when Senators on the floor of the Senate stated that that would be impossible because of the Constitution of the United States, editorial writers all over Europe and in many parts of the United States condemned such statements as bad faith.

Can the Senator from Utah imagine what will be the tone of the editorials in the European press if we sign the Atlantic pact and then should later claim that we were not technically bound to come to the aid of the European countries when they say that their safety is threatened. Can the Senator anticipate the editorials and furor if we refuse to furnish military

aid to those countries after we signed the proposed North Atlantic pact on the grounds that our peace and safety was not threatened?

Mr. WATKINS. I can imagine that those countries would be very much disappointed. As a matter of fact, unless they receive the kind of commitment they wish to receive, I have grave doubt whether they will sign the proposed pact. A mere statement that we shall try to come to their aid will not satisfy those people, in my opinion. It seems to me that is not what they want, and they will not be satisfied with it.

But apparently today they are satisfied; and when I see articles such as the one I saw from a Paris newspaper today, I am inclined to believe that we are right back where we were before; in other words, we are faced with the identical meaning which formerly was given by the distinguished Senator from Missouri to the statements made by the distinguished Senators whom I have mentioned.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield for a further question.

Mr. MALONE. Then does not that make it absolutely imperative that the field be explored for other means of assuring Europe that when we consider our safety to be endangered by a threat to the integrity of any of the nations of Europe, or the nations we would name, then it would be our policy to protect that integrity. In other words, should we not adopt an international policy which would permit us to determine for ourselves when our peace and safety is threatened?

I say to the Senator that should be absolutely the only criterion for a declaration of war by the United States, namely, when we believe our peace and safety to be threatened. Does not that make it imperative that we explore the field, and not only determine the responsibility for fixing our foreign policy, but just what is the criterion for a declaration of war by this Nation—when our peace and safety is threatened, or when some other nation's peace and safety is threatened?

Mr. WATKINS. If the Senator asks me that as a question, I shall say that the President of the United States is supposed to negotiate treaties and to initiate the foreign policy by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; but I think we cannot discharge our duty as Senators very well unless we are given an opportunity to function.

There is much merit, Mr. President, in what the Senator implies by his questions; but I am not prepared to go into those matters at this time, and I have no intention of discussing the question whether we should enter the treaty. I am simply trying to get the treaty laid before us so that we can see what it is. To be very frank about the matter, I do not like the idea of having to depend on a newspaper columnist for information which will be of help to me in making up my mind in regard to such a proposal.

I do not think it is fair to me or to the other Members of the Senate to be put in the postion, after it is signed, of being told, "Well, here it is. If you now turn down the President, the whole world will say the Communists have won a victory, and you men are only helping the Communists." I do not want to be put in that position, and I do not think it fair of the President to put us in that position. I think he should do something more. I have a resolution here, calling on him to do something more than he has done up to this point.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MALONE. I may ask the distinguished Senator from Utah, has it not over the years gradually become customary to sell the public on a proposition proposed by the State Department, through the tremendous public relations and propaganda machines in Washington, and to do that selling job thoroughly, before it ever reaches the Senate?

Mr. WATKINS. I have heard of it being done. I have, I think, some evidence there has been an attempt to do it in this particular case, without full and complete disclosure of all the facts.

Resuming where I left off before the series of questions began, let me say that I attempted, as I have already said, to get the President of the United States to lay before the Senate the text of the proposed pact and all pertinent facts relating thereto, before it should be signed by the participating nations. I did this inasmuch as he had announced the negotiation of a treaty and what its purpose was. I thought probably he might not refuse at least to listen to such a suggestion. I therefore sent him the telegram which I read a few moments ago. I can see from the developments now taking place in rapidly moving order that a mere request from one Senator is not sufficient; and so I have prepared and have offered today the following resolution (S. Res. 81):

Resolved, That the President of the United States in his inaugural address announced that he hoped soon to send to the Senate a treaty respecting the North Atlantic security plan resulting from negotiations between this country and other countries,

That according to press reports the negotiations have proceeded to a stage where the text of said agreement or treaty is nearly completed and ready for submission to the governments of countries contemplating entering into said pact or treaty,

That the proposal for the United States to become a party to said pact or treaty involves a departure from the historical policy of the United States with respect to alliances with other nations,

That the Senate is charged under the Constitution with the duty of advising the President in the matter of making treaties with foreign countries,

That it is the sense of the Senate that it is in the interest of the security and unity of the United States and of friendly relations with other nations of the world that the text of said pact or treaty and all pertinent facts relating to it be submitted by the President to the Senate for consideration and study at a reasonable time before the date appointed for the signing of said pact or treaty by participating nations.

I have offered that resolution, and I hope the Foreign Relations Committee will give it a hearing, within a very short time, because I understand again from the press that the pact is about ready for signature. As I pointed out, after that is done and it is laid before us, it is very embarrassing to oppose it, or ask any questions that might possibly injure the United States in the conduct of its foreign policy.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Texas for a question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. CONNALLY. I may say to the Senator from Utah that the Foreign Relations Committee will give the resolution a hearing when and if it reaches the committee in proper form. The committee cannot hear it until it is submitted to the Senate by the presiding officer.

Mr. WATKINS. I am referring, as the Senator will recall, to the resolution I sent to the desk earlier today, which was referred to the Foreign Relations Committee. It is a resolution telling the President, or it is the sense of the Senate, it is our belief we ought to have the treaty and the facts surrounding it, and the names of the nations that are to become participants in it prior to the signing of the pact, in order that we may consider it and in order that the American people may know what is in it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield for a further question only.

Mr. CONNALLY. The draft of the treaty probably will be made known much sooner than the Senator could hope to get action on the resolution, I may say.

Mr. WATKINS. Will it be before it is signed, if I may ask the Senator? I ask unanimous consent for permission to ask the question.

Mr. CONNALLY. It is my belief——

Mr. WATKINS. Just a moment. I do not care to surrender the floor, and if the Senator will pardon me a moment, I ask unanimous consent that I may ask the Senator a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. WATKINS. I asked the Senator from Texas if the pact would be made known before being signed, so far as he knows. I understand the Senator has seen it. Is that true?

Mr. CONNALLY. I have seen it as far as it has gone. I feel sure the contents of the pact will be made known to the Senate before it is finally signed by the participating countries.

Mr. WATKINS. How long before it is signed?

Mr. CONNALLY. It will be but a very short time.

Mr. WATKINS. The resolution I have offered if adopted, would require of the President a disclosure of the treaty, a considerable time before the date set for signing; and that would involve putting off the date of signing until the Senate

had an opportunity to consider the treaty in all its implications.

Mr. CONNALLY. I cannot answer the Senator on that point, because treaty-making is a function of the President. Nobody may direct him, nobody may interfere with him, nobody may lay down the terms upon which he shall act. I am unable to speak for him.

Mr. WATKINS. I realize that, but there is no harm in our suggesting, as advisers of the President, and saying it would help us a great deal if he would give us the information in advance, not after it becomes an accomplished fact.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have no quarrel with that. The Senator has offered his advice in the form of a resolution, which I am sure the State Department will promptly receive, and which I am sure will be accorded proper attention.

Mr. WATKINS. Certain questions have been raised by Members of this body in respect to any other methods which might be adopted possibly to resolve the difficulties we are now having with our erstwhile allies following the great struggle in which we overcame the axis powers. It seems to me every avenue should be explored, none should be overlooked. We have suggested in labor relations that there should be a cooling-off period. I wonder if that would not be a good suggestion to follow in respect to this matter. I have noticed in dispatches from Europe that every step that seems to be taken by the United States and the western democracies toward the culmination of negotiations for an alliance stirs a corresponding movement and action on the part of Russia and her satellites. It seems to constitute in their minds a threat to their peace, their security. I do not know whether they are sincere in their views; but I have a strong belief they are fanatics, and most fanatics are sincere in their beliefs. I remember it was said that even Hitler during the time he was making his denunciations and making one move after another, was a very sincere man, who believed he was right. Yet he was misguided and, of course, in error throughout the time he was going forward with his program. So, these people may be very sincere.

Mr. President, years ago I came across the words of the late Woodrow Wilson in a great essay which he wrote not long before his death. It was entitled "The Road Away From Revolution." This is an excerpt from what he said:

The sum of the whole matter is this, that our civilization cannot survive materially unless it be redeemed spiritually. It can be saved only by becoming permeated with the spirit of Christ and being made free and happy by the practices which spring out of that spirit. Only thus can discontent be driven out and all the shadows lifted from the road ahead.

Here is the final challenge to our churches, to our political organizations, and to our capitalists—to everyone who fears God or loves his country. Shall we not all earnestly cooperate to bring in the new day?

Our late President was writing about "the road away from revolution;" but I believe the principles laid down by him as the guide and criterion which we should follow with respect to our domestic affairs, can likewise be applied in the conduct of our foreign policy. I should like to see it tried more than it has been tried.

Mr. President, at the time the Greek-Turkish loan was before this body for discussion I made a statement which I believe, if it had been followed, would have been very helpful. After discussing historical instances which had occurred before the presentation of the so-called Truman doctrine, I made this statement:

Mr. President, I am voting for this bill with the belief and the hope that this is only the first step; that we shall now come back to the first principles as set forth in the Atlantic Charter not only in Greece and Turkey, but in China; that we will reverse the action we took in that nation recently when we decided not to take sides as between the Nationalists and the Communists, but decided to get out; that we will redeem our promise made to the Koreans that they shall have their independence; that we shall refuse to make any more agreements with Russia until she gives some evidence that she is willing to honor and respect the agreements she has already made from the days of the Atlantic Charter down to the present time; that as a logical outgrowth of that stand we shall not ratify with Italy the treaty which renders Italy defenseless for a long time to come against a constant threat of the Communist Tito and his government, which is a satellite of Russia; that with respect to Germany we make no further agreements of any kind with Russia respecting that nation until such time as Russia honors her past agreements; that we lay all of the facts on the table before the United Nations.

I may say, Mr. President, that prior to the time at which I was speaking, the senior Senator from Virginia had offered a resolution to the effect that we should have a show-down with Russia in the United Nations and try to work out some plan that would stop the rapid progress toward a third world war.

I continue with my statement made at that time:

Let us also declare it as our policy that we expect to honor all our agreements and expect other nations to do likewise; that we shall be glad to help Russia attain any of her legitimate ambitions and her necessities by peaceful means.

Russia probably has some legitimate needs and ambitions which should be satisfied. Over the years I have read, as we all have, about her need for warm-water ports, of access to the sea, and for certain raw materials which she does not herself possess. Of course, some consideration should be given to such needs.

Then I laid down this point. I remember that at the time I wondered how it would be received by Members of this body, and I had in mind the statement which I have just read, which was made by the late President Wilson. Let me read what I said:

In fact, let us declare to her that as we are a Christian Nation, we shall be willing to abide by the doctrine of the Christ, known as the Golden Rule.

By taking this stand, Mr. President, I sincerely believe we can stop the present ideological war and prevent a shooting war. Half-way measures, in my opinion, will not do. We must go the full distance. This is a case which requires the boldest of action. By any other methods, I believe we court disaster, and I say this notwithstanding the fact that we have the atom bomb. It should be clear that we cannot in any warfare in Europe use the bomb indiscriminately against any nation, because we may, in doing so, have to destroy millions of innocent people who have had no part in the bringing on of the struggle.

Then I referred to the fact that the people in England would, without doubt, as things were then going, be required to be neutral or they would immediately become the object of a heavy bombing attack with propelled missiles, or atomic bombs, should our antagonist acquire such bombs by that time.

I realize, Mr. President, that in this world of greed, in this world of bitter hatreds and controversies, there seems to be very little hope for the application of the doctrine of the Christ. Yet, we are a Christian nation. A chaplain comes here each day the Senate is in session and offers a prayer to the God who is the Father of us all, and the prayer is offered in the name of His Son Jesus Christ. I am wondering if we should not now make overtures in the spirit of Christianity to our supposed enemies? It was soon after I made that suggestion in my statement on the Greek-Turkey loan, before Czechoslovakia was taken over and before Hungary fell. I have noticed suggestions from time to time that it might be well for us to postpone action on the North Atlantic Pact, to explore still further all possibilities to see if we cannot sit down in the League of Nations and frankly say to Russia and all other nations, "These are our requirements. What are yours? Let us see if we cannot get together and take care of all the requirements for the peoples of this world so that they may have their place in the sun."

Mr. President, in concluding what I have to say today, I wish to refer to some of my personal views and my philosophy with respect to the basis on how we should resolve problems confronting this Government. I realize that what I have just said will probably be the subject, possibly not so much of criticism, as of a feeling that "It cannot be done; it is too idealistic. We would all be blown to pieces or placed under dictatorship and control of commissars before we could get such a program started."

In the concluding part of my campaign, when I ran for the Senate, I issued to the people of my State, a statement which I hope has been my guide in the discharge of my duties as a Senator. The statement is as follows:

In the following brief personal statement I shall not attempt to discuss political issues. Rather, I shall give underlying principles on which, in my opinion, all questions of policy should be determined.

With millions of my countrymen, I realize that we are living in tragic and anxious days, when the whole world is at unrest—days when selfishness and greed seem to be the activating forces that are taking us headlong to destruction.

Whether we can stay these forces and bring order out of chaos and still preserve the precious liberties which Divine Providence has given us is one of the grave questions of the hour.

We are beset with almost insurmountable difficulties both at home and abroad. The war clouds have not dispersed and at home we are confused, bewildered, and frustrated.

Shortly before his death, Woodrow Wilson in The Road Away From Revolution, pointed out the great dangers facing the nations of the world and made a fervent plea that the spirit of Christ be made the basis for our conduct.

Said President Wilson: "The sum of the whole matter is this, that our civilization cannot survive materially unless it be redeemed spiritually. It can be saved only by becoming permeated with the spirit of Christ and being made free and happy by the practices which spring out of that spirit. Only thus can discontent be driven out and all the shadows lifted from the road ahead.

"Here is the final challenge to our churches, to our political organizations, and to our capitalists—to everyone who fears God or loves his country. Shall we not all earnestly cooperate to bring in the new day?"

In this critical hour when the fear of a third world war is gripping the nations and when we are at each others throats in our own land--

This was in 1946—

even now it is not too late to adopt the advice of the late President. It is not only not too late, but it is imperative that we act upon it immediately.

Humbly, then, and with at least a partial realization of the difficulties ahead, knowing that all men are beset with human frailities, I give my pledge that if chosen as your Senator, the spirit of Christianity will be my guide in seeking the solutions of the perplexing problems now confronting us.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I may say that it was in the selfsame spirit of that statement that I sent the telegram to President Truman last night, to which I have referred, hoping that we would find some way to stay the present rapid headlong rush into world war III. It was in the same spirit that I offered the resolution in the Senate today, because I believe, with the late President Wilson, that only "by the practices which spring out of the spirit" of the Christ can the world be saved and its people made free and happy.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and just before the clerk starts to call the roll, I should like to state that for the first time in my experience a lady, the Senator from Maine, Mrs. MARGARET C. SMITH, will occupy the chair of the minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MILLER in the chair). The Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ferguson	Kefauver
Anderson	Flanders	Kilgore
Brewster	Frear	Knowland
Bricker	Fulbright	Langer
Bridges	George	Lodge
Butler	Gillette	Long
Byrd	Green	Lucas
Cain	Gurney	McCarran
Capehart	Hayden	McCarthy
Chapman	Hendrickson	McClellan
Chavez	Hickenlooper	McFarland
Connally	Hill	McKellar
Cordon	Hunt	Magnuson
Douglas	Ives	Malone
Downey	Jenner	Martin
Eastland	Johnson, Colo.	Miller
Ecton	Johnson, Tex.	Millikin
Ellender	Johnston, S. C.	Morse
Mundt	Schoeppel	Tydings
Murray	Smith, Maine	Vandenberg
Myers	Sparkman	Watkins
Neely	Taft	Wherry
O'Mahoney	Taylor	Wiley
Reed	Thomas, Okla.	Withers
Robertson	Thomas, Utah	Young
Russell	Tobey	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. SOL BLOOM, late a Representative from the State of New York, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE NAVAL RESERVE

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 673) relating to the pay and allowances of officers of the Naval Reserve performing active duty in the grade of rear admiral, and for other purposes, which was, on page 1, line 4, after the word "shall" to insert a comma and "when otherwise entitled to active-duty pay and allowances."

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I wish to move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

Mr. WHERRY. Is this in the nature of a uninamous-consent request?

Mr. TYDINGS. This is in the nature of a privileged matter.

Mr. WHERRY. That is why I wanted the explanation on the record. This involves the adoption of a conference report, which is a privileged matter, and does not require unanimous consent.

Mr. TYDINGS. It is not a conference report, but it is akin to it. What I am asking is concurrence in an amendment of the House without asking for a conference.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

Mr. TYDINGS. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

Mr. WHERRY. Will not the Senator explain what the amendment is?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the bill involved is one which corrects an ambiguity in the law concerning the pay of certain officers. The amount involved is not large, but if the ambiguity is not cleared up by legislation the result may be the filing of some claims in the Court of Claims. As I recall, the testimony before the committee was to the effect that if the proposed legislation were adopted it would clarify an issue which is in doubt. As I have said, the amount involved is not large, as I recall, and both Houses have approved the bill, which came from the Armed Services Committee of the Senate with a unanimous report. The amendment is a small one, which corrects an apparent error in the bill which existed when it was passed in the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maryland that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

NOMINATION OF MON C. WALLGREN

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, on February 7, 1949, the President of the United States nominated Mr. Monrad C. Wallgren, of the State of Washington, to become the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. This nomination was forwarded to the Senate and referred to the Armed Services Committee because of the constitutional provision which requires that certain nominations shall only be followed by confirmation by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Mr. Wallgren's nomination is one of those which the Constitution demands shall only become effective when it has been confirmed by the Senate.

On February 9 I informed the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], that I wished to appear before the committee in opposition to the President's nominee. I first appeared before the committee on February 17 and was heard fully before the committee decided to consider the question further in executive session. The committee has not as yet made known its decision, which will either be to initiate an examination of its own on the charges I have preferred against Mr. Wallgren, as is my hope, or to vote favorably or unfavorably in sending the name of the nominee to the floor.

Mr. President, this afternoon I want to present in full my case of opposition to the President's nominee. This will take time, quite a good deal of time, sir, but the preparation of this case has taken all I have had in time, thought, and energy.

My presentation will, in part, be as constructive as I can make it, for I expect to detail the mission and work which lies ahead of the National Security Resources Board, and my presentation will partly be as destructive as I can make it because of my determination to prove that the President's nominee is not qualified for the task to which he has been appointed by the President. I shall hammer and keep on hammering at this point, because if my contentions are right I do the Senate and the country a favor in providing sound and legitimate grounds which will not permit us to confirm an unfortunate nomination.

There is just one question to be decided by the Armed Services Committee and by the United States Senate. Is the President's nominee qualified when examined against the necessary and reasonable requirements and standards of education, training, background, experience, reputation, and intellect, to be the chairman of the National Security Resources Board. What I think of Mr. Wallgren as a person is totally unimportant. What he thinks of me as a person or as a Senator, is, from my point of view, meaningless. If I have, on any single occasion, been discourteous or unfair to the nominee in any way, I ought to be criticized, and certainly I should be most happy to apologize. If I have raised issues which are not germane to the primary question they ought to be

stricken from the record. The only thing that matters is whether or not the President has selected a man who is competent to undertake a major security responsibility.

I have endeavored to establish, and I hope to prove beyond legitimate question, that if the Senate of the United States confirms the appointment of Mr. Wallgren we shall have given the nominee an assignment beyond his ability to master, we shall unjustifiably bring embarrassment and possible eventual discredit and shame to the President of the United States, and we shall hold in jeopardy the right and dreams of millions of Americans to hope for a world in which peace and tranquillity, and law and order, shall reign and prevail. In my case before the committee, I have made three major charges. They are that:

A. The nominee does not possess the capacity required by the Chairmanship of the National Securities Resources Board.

B. That the nominee has on occasions before the Armed Services Committee not told the truth.

C. That the nominee has been closely associated, in recent years, with those in Washington State who seek eventually to destroy constitutional government through their activities as Communists and as fellow travelers.

Let me make myself very clear at this point. I have not said, nor do I intend to say at any time, that Mr. Wallgren is in his own name and right a Communist or a fellow traveler. What I am saying is that he has kept company with those who have been, and so far as I know, continue to be such, and will be so considered by the average American in the days of tomorrow.

No charges could be more serious than those the junior Senator from Washington has preferred before the Senate Armed Services Committee against the President's nominee. No man has any right to serious consideration if any of these charges are proved to be fact. The nominee can be cleared of my charges only by the results of a painstaking inquiry which can only be undertaken, so far as I know, by the Armed Services Committee. The nominee is entitled to be cleared of every charge I have registered against him if a painstaking inquiry provides no single basis for any of my charges. As a Senator in my own right, I am entitled to have my charges proved or disproved by means of a painstaking inquiry.

That is all that I have ever asked the Senate Armed Services Committee to do up to this time—to undertake a thoughtful, thorough, painstaking inquiry into the validity of the serious charges which I have placed before that committee.

Before discussing the functions of the National Security Resources Board or the lack of capacity of the nominee I want to recognize and establish the very obvious weaknesses of my case of opposition to the nominee. I want Senators to know that I fully appreciated these weaknesses before signifying my intention to oppose the nominee.

My opposition would have been much the easier had the following not been true:

First. The nominee and the junior Senator from Washington live in the same State.

Second. The nominee and I belong to different political parties.

Third. The nominee is known to have been appointed to the chairmanship of the National Security Resources Board because of his personal relationship with the President.

Fourth. It has been rumored that I am ungrateful because the nominee appointed me to a short term in the Senate in 1946 when he was the Governor of Washington State.

Fifth. It has been claimed that I have been motivated by a personal grudge I have held against the nominee.

Sixth. It is said, as an obvious weakness, that when this case was begun it was the sort of contest which could not possibly be won. It was a 100-to-1 shot. The weakness involved in that premise is that, human nature being what it is, people are not very anxious to support those whom they have reason in their own minds to regard as losers.

Seventh. The last weakness is that the President's nominee, Mr. Wallgren, is a former Member of the United States Senate, and for that reason there would be a disposition on the part of my colleagues and his ex-colleagues not to go closely into the nature of any charges which were critical of any man who ever sat as a Member of this magnificent body.

Naive as I am politically—and this I very willingly admit—I hope no colleague of mine will be even more naive in thinking that I did not recognize that the above-mentioned weaknesses constituted in the beginning a serious obstacle to my securing a sympathetic hearing before the Armed Services Committee and before the Senate. I recognized every one of the items as being a serious handicap to the case I wanted to make against the nominee. I now think that members of the committee and the Senate are conscious of the need for finding out for themselves whether the nominee is competent and suited to his intended responsibilities. I wish briefly to give my own answers to each of the case weaknesses which I have mentioned.

With reference to the contention that my battle of opposition, if one cares to call it that, was at the outset a 100-to-1 shot, I wish merely to read one paragraph from a letter which I wrote under date of February 23 to Mr. Marquis Childs on this subject. I told Mr. Childs that I enjoyed exceedingly his Tuesday article, and felt that it would be helpful in determining the truth of the case before us. I added the suggestion that "you examine the testimony which was given on Monday, for it adds information to that which was rather scanty when the hearings first began last Thursday." I said to Mr. Childs, "I disagree conclusively only with your assumption that the nominee will be obviously confirmed. I think it is not far from even money that he would not be. I think that Mr. Truman, President of the United States, must have felt like this when practically everybody else said he could not win."

I recognize the amount of prestige which covers any man who ever has sat in the United States Senate. I recognize that it is painful and not very pleasant to examine any charges which have been made against any man who ever sat in the United States Senate. My only answer to that as a weakness is to say out loud what I feel deeply, that every Member of this body whom I have known during my two short years here will certainly on every occasion place the welfare and the security of his country above his friendship for and disposition to be kind or charitable to any man who ever previously sat as a Member of this body.

I wish now to answer the charge that I have been motivated by a personal grudge against the nominee by reading the letter which I wrote on this subject under date of February 23 to one whom most of us know by name, at any rate—Mr. Drew Pearson. The letter speaks fully and clearly for itself.

FEBRUARY 23, 1949.

Mr. DREW PEARSON,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PEARSON: Someone has told me that you said on your Sunday broadcast that my opposition to Mr. Wallgren had sprung from some sort of personal feud between the nominee and myself. Please don't believe this because it doesn't happen to be true. I have no use of any kind for Wallgren the man, but I wouldn't waste precious time in opposing him for personal reasons. I believe that his appointment would make meaningless everything our Nation is trying to do at home and abroad. He simply doesn't have what it takes and should you bother to examine the power and influence which is exercised by the Chairman of the NSRB you will surely agree with my contention. If you do you ought to do something about it. You have a chance in this instance to do something constructive for your Nation. I hope you make it.

Very sincerely,

HARRY P. CAIN.

In that connection I was exceedingly interested this morning in a column by Mr. Drew Pearson which concerned itself in part with the proposed confirmation of Mr. Mon Wallgren. I wish to read it. The heading of the portion which covers his comments to be made on the President's nominee is "Poker partner."

Southern leaders have quietly passed the word to block appointment of Mon Wallgren, the President's crony, as the first act of reprisal against President Truman's stubborn stand on the filibuster and civil rights.

First hint of this came when southern Democrats joined Republicans in delaying a vote on Wallgren behind the closed doors of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Wallgren has been the target of bitter charges from Senator HARRY CAIN, Washington Republican, ever since Truman named his old crony and poker partner to head the National Security Resources Board.

When the appointment came up for a vote by the Armed Services Committee, Senator STYLES BRIDGES, New Hampshire Republican, demanded that a subcommittee investigate CAIN's charges and prove Wallgren either innocent or guilty. This didn't suit Chairman MILLARD TYDINGS, Maryland Democrat, who wanted an immediate vote. But he was

overruled by a coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats.

In acid tones, TYDINGS set off the fireworks with a few cutting remarks about Senator CAIN.

"Senator CAIN has adopted a mass of charges based on innuendoes from newspaper reports," crackled TYDINGS. Then he read a statement from Wallgren retorting to CAIN's charges.

DESERT PALACE

In the statement, Wallgren claimed he had spent $20,000 building a so-called palace in Palm Desert, Calif.—not $60,000 as reported by the Associated Press. His wife had sinus, Wallgren explained, and the doctor had ordered her to stay in a dry climate.

Wallgren also denied that his business had gone bankrupt in 1933. It had slipped into poor financial condition, he admitted, but he had managed to salvage it. He owned his present healthy bank account, he added, to wise investments.

After reading the statement, TYDINGS wanted to take a vote on Wallgren at once. But BRIDGES held up a warning hand.

"I intend to approach this question with an open mind," declared the Senator from New Hampshire. "I had the pleasantest relations with Wallgren while he was in the Senate, but Senator CAIN has raised some very grave questions—so grave that the Armed Services Committee can't close its eyes without a thorough investigation."

He served notice that he would offer a resolution to authorize a subcommittee to get to the bottom of CAIN's charges.

The tip-off on how the South stood was given by Virginia's Senator HARRY BYRD who announced bluntly that he was "not prepared to vote" on the appointment and demanded that it be held over at least a week.

Before the meeting, Georgia's Senator DICK RUSSELL had given the signal to sabotage the Wallgren appointment as an act of defiance against Truman's fight to the finish on the filibuster.

In line with the southern bloc, Kentucky's Senator VIRGIL CHAPMAN agreed to the postponement and even suggested that the full committee instead of a subcommittee investigate Wallgren.

This got up the dander of administration Democrats who protested bitterly.

"We have heard a lot of political innuendoes and wild charges," bristled Wyoming's Senator LESTER HUNT. "The hearings have gone far afield, and nothing has been proven."

Tennessee's Senator ESTES KEFAUVER agreed that the hearings had already been overloaded with irrelevant material and that Senator CAIN had nothing else to prove. The charges against Wallgren, he warned, also reflected upon Washington's Democratic Senator WARREN MAGNUSON and President Truman himself.

"Any further delay," KEFAUVER declared, "will only do damage to the Nation, the agency and Wallgren."

But the Republicans, bolstered by the southern Democrats, ganged up on the President's friends and put off the vote.

Mr. President, I have not the slightest idea as to what portion, if any, of that article by Mr. Drew Pearson in this morning's Washington Post is true. I think a good many things about Mr. Pearson, as do most of the other Members of this Congress. One of the things I think is that he has on many an occasion manifested a magnificent disregard for accuracy. I am reminded of that fact because on March 4, just a few days ago, he called me by telephone and said he was interested in this matter, and said there were certain things he wanted me to know and certain things that he thought he would do. However, there is no recognition of any part of that conversation in this article, which he has just written so learnedly in regard to the Wallgren confirmation question.

Mr. Pearson said to me over the telephone—and I wish to quote him, because to my mind this matter is rather significant and very important:

Got your letter about Mr. Wallgren, and I have mixed feelings about Mr. Wallgren. I don't think he is as bad as you think he is, but I don't think he is too good. Be that as it may, did you look into the reported fact that some time ago, I should say about 3 or 4 years ago, Wallgren won $50,000 in a crap game from Johnny Myers, of Howard Hughes employ, at Palm Springs, Calif.?

Mr. President, that is precisely what was said to me over the telephone, and Mr. Pearson will know that I am speaking the truth, word for word, when I say that on the morning of March 4, Drew Pearson said that to me over the telephone, in a call which he had initiated from somewhere.

I do not know whether Mr. Wallgren won $50,000 from Johnny Myers, in Palm Springs, or anywhere else; but Drew Pearson thinks so; and I would encourage the committee to subpena Mr. Drew Pearson and have him testify, under oath, what he has said to me by telephone, because at the time when he called me on the telephone he went on to add this:

I can tell you this is a fact—

Mr. President, he did not say, "I can tell you this is a rumor" or "I have picked it up somewhere"; but he said, in his own words:

I can tell you this is a fact: That the Federal Bureau of Investigation heard about it, and they—the FBI—were convinced it was true. I don't believe they ever investigated it.

Mr. Pearson went on to say:

I think they figured it was a sort of political matter. They dropped it, but I know they heard about it. They had a couple of stooges or investigators down there, and they probably felt it was linked with some airplane contracts.

Mr. President, in this instance who knows whether Mr. Drew Pearson has spoken the truth I do not know. I know that no Member of the Senate on either side of this aisle knows whether Drew Pearson has spoken the truth. But he claims it to be the truth; and I think the Armed Services Committee of the Senate would do itself, the nominee, the junior Senator from Washington, every other Member of the United States Senate, and the American people a real service by interrogating closely a man who talks like that over the telephone to a United States Senator.

Mr. Pearson concluded a rather long conversation by saying:

I agree with you 100 percent that there should be a very thorough investigation. Let the investigation be the judge. You might be thoroughly correct. I am certainly with you on that investigation.

He went on to add that he thought he would let those who read his articles in the American free press and those who listen to him on the radio know that he thought a thorough investigation for the good of the country ought to be conducted. But he saw fit not to do that.

In the article he wrote in today's Washington Post he says that the only obstacle to confirmation of the Wallgren nomination is an obstruction put up by the southern Senators out of some venom, so Mr. Pearson says, they have for the President of the United States.

Mr. President, I am not in possession of any investigative moneys or personnel. I cannot take Mr. Pearson on the one hand and his words on the other and prove them, or have him do as he should do publicly—eat them if they are not true. But I think it is about time that some organized agency of the Congress investigated the promiscuous comments which are being made and have been made on this subject.

Mr. President, with reference to another of the weaknesses in this case, I wish to state only the truth. I was appointed to the Senate on the 26th day of December 1946 from the State of Washington by the then Governor, Mr. Mon Wallgren. That appointment was made for reasons best known to Mr. Wallgren. I did not ask for the short-term appointment nor did I seek it. That appointment probably constitutes one of the few instances on record when a Senator-to-be had no conversations of any kind with the Governor who appointed the Senator-elect to fill a short term. I have made that position clear only for the reason that I have been advised it has been said to other Members of this body that "Senator CAIN is extremely ungrateful because the person against whom he has proffered charges appointed him to a short term in the Senate of the United States." Of course he did. And, of course, he did it for reasons of which, so far as I know, he alone had knowledge.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Illinois for a question?

Mr. CAIN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LUCAS. Did the Senator know all these things with which he charges Mr. Wallgren, when he accepted appointment by the Governor?

Mr. CAIN. In answer to that question, I say I think we shall satisfy every conceivable question the Senator from Illinois may have, before our case is concluded.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator has not answered the question.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington will answer the question in the remainder of his case.

Mr. President, any President ought to have great latitude in the appointment of his executive assistants and it naturally follows that it is most difficult to make a case against a nominee who is bound by deep ties of personal friendship to the President. It has been said in my presence and related behind my back that HARRY CAIN has been right in his prime contention that the nominee is not suited for the chairmanship of the National Security Resources Board but because the nominee represents a personal

appointment of the President, the President should have his wish complied with and be held responsible for the future conduct of his appointee. Some colleagues for whom I have the greatest regard on my side of the aisle have made comments like this. I can only feel very strongly that there is no validity of any character in such a contention. If the wrong man becomes the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board and if then he either fails to prepare for the future or cannot conquer any trouble which may come, what good would there be in then holding a President responsible for destruction which could not be repaired. I am fighting the President on this appointment because I think it is a bad one to make. In making it I feel that the President is unintentionally trifling with the future well-being and security of all citizens. The Constitution states that the President shall seek advice from and secure the consent of the United States Senate before making certain appointments. I am a Member of the Senate, and, though my advice was not sought, I shall certainly not give my consent to an act which would be injurious to the future good of our Nation.

The President's nominee is a Democrat and the junior Senator from Washington is a Republican. Because of this there are those in this body who think that I oppose Mr. Wallgren in an effort to secure some sort of political advantage. Nothing could be further from the truth. I doubt if any Senator on the Republican side of the aisle could possibly have as much respect for the Democratic Party as I do. I am a member of a Democratic family which first settled in Virginia in the early part of the seventeenth century. My mother was a Kentuckian. My father was an Alabaman. I am a Tennessean by birth. To the best of my knowledge I am the only member of the Republican Party my family has ever produced. I know a Democrat when I see one and I have a tremendous amount of respect for what he is and represents. According to my own definition and concept, the present-day Democratic Party contains many members who bear no similarity to the conduct or principles or actions of Democrats like Andrew Jackson and Thomas Jefferson. This is strikingly true in the sovereign State of Washington, in which Mr. Wallgren and myself represent the two great political parties. It was a great and living Democrat, Mr. James Farley, who proclaimed this lamentable but undeniable fact to the American people. Just a few short years ago Mr. Farley referred to the Nation as consisting of 47 States and the soviet of Washington. What he meant was that the Democratic Party in Washington State had been captured and taken over by a group of irresponsible, profligate, spendthrift persons who carried on their destructive operations under the guise and cloak of modern-day liberalism. These persons brought discredit to their party and shame to the State. At long last the moderate and reasonable groups within the Democratic Party in Washington State rose in their wrath in 1946 and after denouncing were able to remove most of the wrongdoers from their ranks. I refer to the names of De Lacy and Coffee and Savage as some examples. The President's nominee does not bear the un-American stigma which has been attached to the names of such persons as O'Connell, Coffee, Savage, and De Lacy, but we ought not to forget that he associated, worked, ate, planned, and slept with them. He used them and they used him. When Mr. Wallgren is disposed of and a few remaining others are taken care of, then the Democratic Party in the State of Washington shall have regained the prestige it lost during recent years. I am opposing the President's nominee in part, not because he is a Democrat, but because of those with whom he has been too closely associated in the past he has been a very bad Democrat.

There are those, Mr. President, who think it improper for the junior Senator from Washington to raise questions of adequacy and competency about an appointee who lives with him in Washington State. My only answer to this is that because of that fact I know what I am talking about and my feelings are supported and advanced by thousands of other citizens in Washington State. These citizens, both Democrats and Republicans, have recently retired the President's nominee from the office of Governor and they think it would be wholly improper to permit him to transfer his base of operations to the Nation's Capital. My State is proud of those executive appointments which can be given to qualified persons from Washington State, but there are not very many who believe that the wrong man can bring the right sort of credit and praise to the State of his domicile. During recent weeks I have introduced into the RECORD some scores of letters written by citizens from Washington State. These men and women know the nominee, they have watched him in action, they have considered his conduct, and they have found him wanting. It would serve no purpose for me to sit idly by and leave the waging of this contest up to them. If I know that something should not be given to a citizen from my State, I ought to say so, and I am trying to say it in language which is courteous but very plain. If a man as a public official has a soul and a conscience, I am going to lay mine on the Senate floor this afternoon for all to see and examine. This exposure will convince even those whose minds are frozen in favor of the nominee that there is a Senator who thinks more, at least in this instance, of what is right than of what is expedient, easy, and politic.

In the Tacoma News-Tribune of Wednesday, February 23, 1949, there appeared the following paragraph from a story about the Wallgren confirmation question which was written here in Washington, D. C.:

Former Gov. Mon C. Wallgren, of Washington State, states that he would like to know, "Who is behind the campaign to discredit him" for the chairmanship of the National Securities Resources Board.

I think this is a fair question and I think Mr. Wallgren and everybody else is entitled to know.

I think it is safe to say, Mr. President, that only three persons were responsible for beginning the case against the President's nominee for that office. I, the junior Senator from Washington, am one. A dead man is the second, and a man in the sky is the first.

In order to throw some reasonable light on what I admit is a somewhat unusual statement, I want to tell part of a story. On March 8, 1940, nine short—or long—years ago, a man died in my presence in the junior ballroom of the Winthrop Hotel in the city of Tacoma. Because of his unexpected and distressing death, I sit today in the United States Senate. The man's name was Dr. Kerstetter and he was to have been the next mayor of Tacoma. I sat in his presence, Mr. President, to wish him well in the election which was to be held on the following Tuesday. March 8 was a Friday. I had gotten my feet wet in politics for the first time in the primary campaign not 10 days before, for the office of mayor, and had been defeated. I had run third in a field of five. It is not important, Mr. President, that after my defeat in the primary election I had decided to return where I had come from, the field of competitive business, or that I had no intention of endeavoring again to seek public office. I was young and inexperienced. I wanted, if I could, to go to the city hall to try to make some reasonable contribution. In failing in the attainment of my desire, I thought I had better let well enough alone and leave public life up to others.

Dr. Kerstetter's death was just as unusual in design as it was unexpected. He had finished what he had to say in his excellent speech, which lasted maybe a half hour. He said, "Thank you," sat down, and died. No fuss, no furor, no noise. He simply said, "Thank you," and died.

Because of his death, and for the reason that I had been third in the primary campaign, the superior court of Pierce County saw fit to place my name on the ballot. The judge of the superior court could have held, as I have always understood, either that my name was to be placed on the ballot, acting on the assumption that it was the intention of the law to have a contest after a primary between two persons, or he, quite logically, could have said, I suppose, "It is an act of God, and, therefore, the man who survives is automatically the candidate." He saw fit not to do that, and my name was placed on the ballot. On the following Tuesday, four short days from the time Dr. Kerstetter died, I was elected as mayor of the city of Tacoma, from which position I came to the United States Senate in 1946.

There is a point involved here, Mr. President, which I have never said anything about or felt constrained to say anything about, but today I wish to do so in the matter which is currently before us. The point involved, Mr. President, is that I have always been conscious that neither my friends, of whom I have many, my supporters, or myself were by any means entirely responsible for sending the junior Senator from Washington from civilian life to the city hall in

Tacoma. A power far greater than all of us in this body possess collectively, a power which I understand only in part, made it possible for me to become a part of public life. Should I remain in the Senate for a long time—and certainly that is my personal wish—I hope I shall never forget how my public life and career began. There has been a very simple way for me to acknowledge the assistance I got from other than material and human sources. I decided, at the outset of my admittedly brief career in public life, to listen to my conscience and to my instinct when they spoke on important matters.

This has permitted me, Mr. President, to be a completely free agent since I entered politics in 1940. This is to say that I have sometimes, and even in the face of what appeared to be great opposition, had occasion to do in a full way what I thought was the right way to do something. I want Mr. Wallgren to know this, and, under the circumstances, because of Mr. Wallgren, I want the Senate to know about it also. This story is an honest and conclusive answer to the question, "Who is behind the campaign to discredit the nominee?" Such a question was carried in the press of this country all over the land.

Mr. President, as I shall attempt to prove, sir, I am not endeavoring to discredit anyone. I am simply of the opinion that the President's nominee is not suited to the portfolio which the President seeks for him. I am satisfied that my contention is right, accurate, and proven.

Mr. President, Mr. Wallgren might more properly have raised the question, "Who are those who did not approve, in the beginning, Senator CAIN's intention to oppose the nominee?"

I think we ought to examine that question, because I have heard comments made about the cloak rooms here in the Senate that HARRY CAIN was put up to this job by his Republican associates in the State of Washington. I want to bring them into the story where they properly fit into it.

I know one man in the State of Washington, a prominent Republican, who was not very enthusiastic about it. I refer to the present Republican Governor of the State of Washington. He did not approve of my intentions. Some Senators know him, because some have served with him in conferences of governors in years gone by, and they know him as an honest, excellent, extremely articulate and able man. The Governor of the State of Washington, Mr. Arthur B. Langlie, when this case of opposition to Mr. Wallgren arose, did not approve of it.

My determination to oppose the nominee was not supported by the chairman of the Republican Central Committee in the State of Washington. That is a very important political post. It is the position of a man who speaks with authority, very generally, for what is going on in Republican circles throughout the 39 counties of my State. This gentleman did not approve of my intention. Both of these gentlemen, Mr. President, happily from my point of view, have since changed their minds, but in the beginning they were completely out of sympathy with what I had in mind to do.

I wanted to make certain about the opposition to my intention which came to me from across the country. I wired Mr. J. M. Dawley and asked for more information. That is all I did. I wanted information.

On February 10—and that is nearly a month ago, because the matter has been pending before the Armed Services Committee for a long time—Mr. Dawley, the Republican central committee chairman, wired me as follows:

> Election return figures being forwarded. Believe it would be a mistake for one of Washington's Republican delegation to object to Wallgren's confirmation. If pitch is to be made suggest it be from one of another State.

I think my response to Mr. Dawley should be in the RECORD. It is as follows, a telegram:

> Thanks for forwarding the election return figures. I could not determine from your wire whether or not you thought an attempt should be made to stop the confirmation. If you agree that the nominee is completely unsuited to the post in question it logically follows that every Senator who subscribes to this position ought to fight the nomination. I think that others will and I know that I shall. If you take any position in the matter at all, and it is not for me to suggest that you do, you ought to conclusively either be for or against the nominee. I am against his nomination not primarily because I am from Washington State but fundamentally because I am an American who thinks the nomination is indefensible.

On February 10 Governor Arthur B. Langlie, of Washington State, talked to me by telephone from his office in Olympia. He initiated the telephone call. He stated that he had been advised that I intended to oppose the President's nominee. He urged me not to do it, because he thought it was a futile battle, and that I would hold our great State up to criticism and question. He thought I would be butting my head against a stone wall, and for that reason the attempt would not be worth while. He actually said that he would have nothing to do with my intended opposition.

The Governor of the State of Washington, an excellent man, talked with me at some length, but on this occasion he could not change my mind, and I did not know whether I had changed his. I thought about the significance of the conversation because of the state of the world as we find it today. I thought about our conversation for a good part of that night, and sent him the following telegram the next morning:

> After thinking about your expressed position during most of last night, I am truly sorry that you are in opposition to my determined intention to oppose the President's nomination of Mr. Wallgren to become the chairman of the National Security Resources Board. I want to believe, and I do, that you meant literally every charge of incompetence and incapacity which you so ably made and documented during the last election. A majority of the voters in a sovereign State believed these charges to be true. Their action clearly said that if the nominee wasn't qualified to fill a national job possessed of powers and influence far greater in scope and authority than are the powers possessed by any single governor. I want to believe that you haven't been fully briefed on the requirements and power potential of the job in question. I am sending you a definition of this job tomorrow. Unless you see fit to change your position, I shall make it clear to anyone who inquires that you think the nomination should not be opposed and particularly by a representative from Washington State. There is no valid reason for us to quarrel about this problem for our responsibilities differ greatly. I do not only represent a sovereign State but, like any other Senator, I have a conclusive responsibility for every public question which affects the Nation. I would rather give up my seat in the Senate than to sit quietly by and countenance an appointment which I feel would be injurious to the best interests of all citizens. I hope that in due time you will find it right to agree with my position. Because of the way I feel I shall be satisfied if mine is the only vote which is cast against the nominee but I have every confidence that my opposition will be supported by other Senators on both sides of the aisle. There are items of principle which rise far above party loyalties. I think the problem before us is one of them.
>
> Very sincerely yours.

And I signed my name to this telegram to the Governor of the State of Washington.

I have read these telegrams, Mr. President, because I do not want anybody to think that I was encouraged by others to oppose the President's nominee. I want to add that both the Governor and the Republican State chairman have changed their positions since the fight began. They have been given reason to think about this country and its needs; they have reached their own decision to support my action because they have come to know that it is right, and that neither the State of Washington nor the Nation would benefit from the confirmation of the President's nominee.

The case against Mr. Wallgren has been my own individual responsibility from the beginning, but I have looked to those at home to provide me with the factual answers to many legitimate questions I have raised. In responding to these inquiries, the Governor and Mr. Dawley are no different than thousands of other citizens in Washington State. As I have recently read into the RECORD scores of letters from those citizens supporting my opposition to the nominee, I can this afternoon, and tonight, if required, read on the floor thousands of letters which have come from every one of the 39 counties in Washington State, and from many other sections of America, as well. Those letters are to me the greatest example of the vigor of the voice of America when it is motivated to take positive action.

At a later stage in my presentation there are certain things I must say about the President's nominee, not because I want to, but because to fail to do so would permit of a grave injustice being done to the American people.

I want to paint the nominee as being painfully naive, for that is what he is.

I want to picture him as being unusually and singularly uninformed on a vast variety of subjects, for there is nothing to be gained from saying that he is not.

I want to prove that he is soft and unintelligent in his treatment of Communists and fellow travelers for the record will bear me out.

I want to open him up for public scrutiny by all, because only by so doing is there to be gained an opportunity for stopping his confirmation, and even though I might assume, by way of argument, that he is to be approved by the United States Senate, I want all those in America who are concerned to know in whose hands they have entrusted their security for the future.

I want to hope that all of us will recognize that if we confirm the President's nominee the people should abolish that section of the Constitution which says that such appointments shall be confirmed only with the advice and consent of the Senate. The nominee's confirmation would make that provision both futile and meaningless.

During a recent press conference the President of the United States said that he considered my opposition to constitute a personal political fight between his nominee and myself. I consider the President's comment to be both unreasonable and unfair. He overlooked entirely the substance of the charges I have preferred against his nominee. He gave no evidence of being deeply interested in the competence or capacity of his nominee. I think that the President must concern himself with these questions before concluding action is taken by the Senate.

When the President said that he thought my position constituted a personal political fight between his nominee and myself, I am curious to know what he conceivably could have meant.

It is not a secret to anyone that this problem concerning the Wallgren nomination has been before the Committee on Armed Services now for about a month. Everyone knows that the committee for the last 10 days or 2 weeks has been considering the problem in executive session. Everyone knows that prior to that time the junior Senator from Washington, who was preferring the charges, was given an opportunity to prefer them before the committee, and everyone knows that anyone else who desires to be heard in support, for example, of the nominee, was made welcome by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services and by his colleagues. If there was any validity of any kind, character, or description to the President's contention that this must be a political fight between Mr. Wallgren and myself, I raise what I construe to be a valid question in my own right. If that be so, why has not Mr. Wallgren been defended before that committee, on this charge that there is a personal political fight, by my colleague, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]? My senior colleague [Mr. MAGNUSON] served in the Congress with Mr. Wallgren. He has been a close political associate of Mr. Wallgren's over a number of years, and if there was any truth of any character in the President's contention it would have necessarily followed that my senior colleague would have risen to the support and the defense of the nominee. That is what records are for—to let people read them. I would encourage every Member of the Senate to read the record which has been written before the Armed Services Committee, and in the absence of being able to find any evidence of a political fight between Mr. Wallgren and myself, in terms of any such allegations made by my senior colleague—and they were not made—I dare say the President must reconsider the carelessness of the answers which he gave in his own press conference.

I am going to talk for a couple of minutes about the President of the United States. I would rather not be misunderstood about that, either, because he is my President as well as everybody else's President; and if I question his motives, it is only because I think he is wrong, and I am not doing it merely to be politically critical.

Mr. President, I know of no President in all our history who has talked so much about the need for cooperation between the Congress and himself and done so very little to secure it. All around us today in the Senate, and for weeks gone by, is evidence of an unwillingness on the part of the President to seek advice from the Senate, which in itself often makes cooperation possible.

So far as I know, Mr. Truman never consulted with a single Senator about his desire to nominate Mr. Wallgren. I have reason to believe that most Senators would have suggested to the President that Mr. Wallgren was not a happy choice for the position of chairman of the NSRB. If Mr. Truman had turned to those of his own party in the Senate and asked their advice, I believe they would have willingly recommended that Mr. Wallgren be assigned to some other task, and on the first day of my presentation before the Senate Armed Services Committee I certainly went so far as to say there are scores of portfolios to which I, as a Senator, would not have objected had Mr. Wallgren been appointed to one of them.

Mr. Truman has forced a fight in this matter where no fight of any kind was necessary. My opposition to the President's nominee has brought unnecessary embarrassment to some of my Democratic colleagues who are faced with the difficult alternative of either voting to support the President when they know or may feel him to be wrong or to vote against the choice of the President. This is an unhappy situation which could so easily have been prevented had the President confided with his many friends in the Senate.

Mr. President, I bear no prejudice against the President of the United States of America, for in fact he is my President, and I wish him well. I did my best to tell him this in a brief note which was written to him shortly after the election. I want to read it now, because it bears on the question presently before us. I wrote:

> MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Perhaps no single Senator enjoyed working harder for your opponent, but certainly I join with our American majority in wishing you happiness, health, and success. I shall look for ways in which to support those portions of your coming programs with which I can logically agree. On the occasions when I oppose your recommendations I shall try my very best to do so on the basis of facts rather than on political prejudice. The challenge before our Nation is excitingly tremendous in every respect. As a member of the loyal opposition I hope to be of service in sharing your responsibility.

The President responded to my letter in the following fashion:

> I certainly appreciated your note of November 9 very much and I sincerely hope that the new Congress and the President will be able to accomplish a constructive program. I believe we will.

This correspondence indicates that as a Republican Senator I had no intention of being antagonistic to the President for reasons of political bias. The President's response is cordial, and I thought sincere.

After I had concluded my presentation to the Armed Services Committee, I had occasion to again write to the President. I wanted him to be thoroughly familiar with the reasons for my opposition to his nominee. I think this letter ought to become a part of our consideration, and Senators will want to know what the President wrote to me in response to my letter. I wrote as follows:

> For your attention and consideration there is attached a copy of a statement covering the Wallgren confirmation question which I submitted today to the Senate Armed Services Committee.
>
> Shortly after your election as President of our United States, I wrote to you personally to wish you success. That wish was completely sincere. I said that I would look for ways in which to support those portions of your programs with which I could logically agree. I meant that. I added that when I found it necessary to oppose your recommendations I would try my best to do so on the basis of facts rather than on political prejudice. I continue to be so minded at this time.
>
> The attached statement is a recitation of what I believe to be fact, not prejudice. I am unalterably opposed to your nominee because I do not think him qualified for the work which lies ahead. In my considered opinion the record supports this position. I have no personal interest in any choice you may make for any executive portfolio, but if your selection will affect the security of every American citizen, and for as long as the Senate of the United States is charged with the responsibility for confirming your appointments, I am on the soundest possible ground in raising a public question regarding the character, capacity, and knowledge possessed by any nominee.
>
> My opposition to Mr. Wallgren is both firm and honest. In the problem before us I respectfully suggest that the nominee, while perhaps possessing virtues required by some assignments, is singularly lacking in what you require from advisers and assistants whose sole objective is that of keeping our Nation free at home and secure against aggression from abroad. The attached statement which bears on this subject is, I believe, deserving of thoughtful study by you, our President.

I did not say in that connection "somebody else's President." I did not personalize it by saying "my President." I said with all the respect at by command, "you, our American President." I went on to conclude with this paragraph:

> Should you wish to talk with me personally about any aspect of the Wallgren nomination, I shall be privileged to sit with you at any time.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, I cannot tell you what the President thinks

about my letter or my position, because he has not yet found it convenient to reply, despite the fact I sent to his desk a week ago yesterday that which represents as serious a letter as this Senator could ever write to anybody.

I only know that the President—and this is public information—is now seeking rest and relaxation somewhere where I would like to be, where every other Senator would like to be—in the sunshine of Florida.

On the date I wrote to the President I likewise wrote to one I considered to be a friend of mine in the White House, Mr. John Steelman. I want this letter to be a part of my argument, in part because I want Mr. John Steelman to see it and to respond to it, because as a friend I am entitled to an acknowledgment, and as a Senator I must have one in order to determine the attitude of those on the executive side of this question.

My Dear John:

Which indicates that I do know him, as in fact I do—

I think you will want to thoughtfully read the attached statement which I submitted this afternoon to the Senate Armed Services Committee. It supports my point of view and that of thousands of conscientious, patriotic citizens.

So I was not writing to Dr. John Steelman either as merely one Senator or as a friend of Dr. Steelman, but as a representative of thousands of unhappy American citizens.

When last we met some days ago for the purpose of having the President brief the Public Works Committee about the need for remodeling the White House, I told you that my objection to the appointment of Mr. Wallgren was very deep-seated, and that I would fight his appointment as best and as long as I could. Since our conversation I have found no possible reason to change my mind covering Mr. Wallgren's fitness for his intended post.

I don't care who the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board is, provided he is intelligent, informed, and completely above suspicion and reproach. Mr. Wallgren must be judged by his past conduct and associations and he is found wanting when examined against the requirements of any reasonable standard.

To fight the President is neither pleasant nor easy. It is in fact wholly unpleasant and extremely difficult but I shall very willingly continue my opposition in hope that the President will come to understand that his appointee is not the man to protect America against war, or the man to win it if it comes.

The last sentence in the letter to John Steelman makes a great deal of sense to me—not that Mon C. Wallgren, as the President's appointee, is not the man to protect America against war or the man to win it if it comes. That is the unimportant part. Actually the fundamental question before the Armed Services Committee and before the Senate is: Whom are we going to get who is qualified to prepare America against the coming of the next war, and who will be one of the great managerial brains in winning that war if it comes?

I think it is a fantastic thing that I am required to consume as many hours as I shall take on this floor to defeat, if I can, a man who has been appointed for a job which anyone possessed of the barest kind of common sense knows is over his head. Why should we spend time in doing that, which appears to be necessary? Rather, should we not spend time in looking for someone? We have that kind of intellect, brain, and soul in this country. We have men qualified to undertake the responsibilities laid down, not by the President of the United States, but by the Congress, of which I am proud to be a part.

Mr. President, unfortunately, Mr. John Steelman has not yet found it convenient to acknowledge my letter. Whether he likewise is enjoying—as any man would and always ought to when he can—the sunshine of a great State called Florida, I am not qualified to say. But I have not had answers to either of two very important letters on a very important American public question.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that the executive branch ought to give more attention to problems which are presented to it by Members of the legislative branch. If my letters to the President and to Dr. John Steelman had been discourteous or facetious or antagonistic, I could understand why answers had been conveniently neglected. But the letters which I have just read into the RECORD admittedly are very courteous; and what is even more important, they were filled with substance about an important public question. They were deserving of the courtesy, not merely of a reply, but of an adequate reply. I wrote those letters in my official capacity as a United States Senator, and I trust that my indignation and distress over the careless way in which they have been treated will be shared by every other Senator on both sides of the aisle.

Cooperation is, and must always be, a two-way street. The President of the United States appears to define cooperation as meaning that his word on any subject is law, that his wish about any nomination must be approved, and that it is not for Members of the Senate to question, but to obey. I deny his premise in all its dangerous implications, as being continually bad for that harmonious relationship which the President constantly states to the country he must establish with the Congress.

Obviously, I do not compare the President of the United States, for whom I have a very great sympathy, with anyone else in public life in any of the many countries across the sea; but I am reminded that a year of my life some years ago was spent in Germany watching the development of the Third Reich. The year was 1935–36. I understood then that war was on its way. I was only surprised that so many very intelligent Americans thought we could avoid being drawn into it.

In Germany in those days the people used to look back to the good old days of Bismarck, who in his day was not always too highly regarded by his people, for they thought him a very strict disciplinarian. Bismarck had a slogan. Apparently he permitted the people to argue to their hearts' content, but he expected them to obey.

When Mr. Hitler came along he improved on that premise. It was very clearly understood by everyone in what had been a great nation—and I hope some day it may be again—back in 1935 and 1936, that Mr. Hitler had improved on Bismarck by saying, "The time has come when I do not want you to argue, but I do expect you to obey."

It is a very long road to disaster for any country, but this country will have less chance of encountering real and grave and disastrous trouble in the future if the executive branch, represented by the President, and the legislative branch, represented by the Congress, can work out and maintain a harmonious relationship which is completely denied in this particular example, in which the executive branch says, "We have presented to the Congress the name of a nominee and we shall brook no interference. We shall listen to no questions. We are not interested in any argument." I think the President has been unnecessarily careless in this instance, and I hope, for his own good and that of the Congress, that he will not do so again.

Mr. President, as one who has been a serviceman, I want to challenge the thinking of every service man and woman in this country concerning the President's present choice of a chairman to head the National Security Resources Board. Like most people who are referred to as being veterans, I do not talk very much about having been in World War II, but just as a matter of record I enjoyed an unusually rich experience during most of my several years of service, spent somewhere on a line running from Africa to the shores of the Baltic Sea. That was a long and fascinating journey. It took about 3 years to get from the beginning to the end. I think it is sufficient to say that I was there along with millions of others. I was privileged to serve first with the military government, and then with the Allied Control Commission, at a jumping-off place for the old crusades—Brindisi, down in the south of Italy. At that time I was with the Allied Control Commission; next with the supreme headquarters on a planning level; and then for a period of a year and a half, as I recall, with the greatest foot soldiers the world has ever known, the Airborne Infantry; and it goes without saying that I shall volunteer to go again if my country will have me, should the need arise.

Mr. President, I remember that what our American service personnel had to do under and on and over and beyond the seas was made completely worth while to all of us because of our confidence in what was being done by those who stayed at home. We knew that America had the best food, the best weapons, the best tanks, the best gliders and aircraft. We knew that the mechanical and intellectual genius of America was making it possible for our fighting forces to bring the war to a successful conclusion. We had reasons to believe that the very best brains in America were being employed in the Nation's Capital and throughout the land during our absence. We used to sit around, many a night, and talk about that; and we would say, "Well, we are a pretty lucky group of people over here, because the best brains we have at home

and all the experience and all the capacity our people have are being used to give us what we need in order to win this contest, which is only one small but important part of the war." We were sure that during our absence from the United States, the best brains to be found in our country were being employed to aid us. We knew that no one was going to let us down, and we felt certain that the management was vested only in the hands of the competent.

Mr. President, I cannot begin to tell you how important that feeling was to the soldiers, sailors, airmen, Marines, Waves, Wacs, Spars, and all the others, as they served outside the United States. We did not have any reason to doubt that a good job was being done at home. If the confidence to which I refer should ever be shaken or destroyed, should another war ever be forced upon us, it is this one Senator's opinion that there would be very little chance that the United States would ever win such a war. From my own personal point of view, I do not think there would be a chance of winning a war if those who fought it ever lost confidence in their leaders, particularly their leaders on the civilian level. Unless the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board is considered by the armed forces and by the millions of ex-service personnel to be brilliantly and soundly qualified in every way, he should be denied the office or should be removed from the office for his own good and for the good of the country.

Mr. President, from the beginning of this opposition to a man by the name of Mr. Wallgren, I have thought that it is a most regrettable thing that his name was ever sent to the Senate. The President of these United States, in seeking, understandably, to do something good for a friend, has placed that friend in a position from which he will never be able to extricate himself were he to live for a million years. I said at the beginning that I will hammer and keep on hammering on this point of competence. If I am right—and I know that in fact no one can say I am wrong—if I am right when I say that the chairman of the National Security Resources Board must be considered to be brilliantly and soundly qualified in every possible way, then we are convinced without argument that the President did his good friend, Mr. Wallgren, a monstrous, though unintentional disservice in nominating him for a position for which he must be opposed by everyone who wishes to give 10 minutes' thought to the functions of the job which is intended for him.

I have said somewhere—I think it was in the committee—that I had always known Mr. Mon C. Wallgren to be invariably and uniformly courteous and pleasant and congenial. I have known him through his operations in a political way for a good many years. We have never traveled in the same sort of social company, we have never been close to each other in a congenial or personal sense, but I have been in his presence and I have been in his company. He is a very pleasant man. But we are not looking for a pleasant man to save this country. We are not looking for someone who is congenial. We are not looking for anyone other than one of the outstanding brains we can find somewhere in our country; and, under oath or without it, Mr. Wallgren himself would be the last to suggest that he comes in that category.

Someone wrote me a very antagonistic letter a few days ago; I thought it an interesting one, too. The writer of the letter said, "It appears to us that you are opposed to Mr. Wallgren because you want the job." Well, Mr. President, there have been thousands of letters on this subject; but when my eye happened to glance at that one, I said to my office force, "I should like to answer it."

In answering it, I said:

I think you missed the point, but I will answer you. Were I to be offered such a job, I would consider it to be as great a compliment as conceivably could be offered to me in my lifetime; but though I have spent a little better than 42 years in trying to work rather hard at training an intellect, and have had the advantage of traveling broadly around this world, both before and during and after the war, I would not begin to think that I possessed 10 percent of the qualifications which are needed for a job like that of chairman of the National Security Resources Board.

Mr. President, in the committee I asked Mr. Wallgren a question, and he gave me an answer which was satisfactory to him, although not satisfactory to me. I said:

Mr. Wallgren, aren't there occasions when it is necessary to say "no," when offered a job, because the person who has had the job offered to him is of the considered opinion that he is not qualified for the responsibility?

Mr. Wallgren's answer to me, as I recall it, was:

Well, the President thinks I am qualified.

Mr. President, one necessarily has to fight an unwise appointee who will not relinquish the offer of his own free will.

Among the articles about Mr. Wallgren which have been circulated broadly throughout the country, I read one—it was in one of the national weekly magazines; I think it was News Week, although I am not certain of that—which went something like this:

Mr. Wallgren was offered the Chairmanship of the National Security Resources Board by the President, and the reporters asked Mr. Wallgren what he thought. Mr. Wallgren said: "Well, I like this. Any job is all right. This looks like a good one."

But, Mr. President, by the time we have gotten through, if the people care to examine the record, it will be found that we shall have proved conclusively that that attitude of mind is not adequate in itself to save this country.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAIN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. In the course of his speech, does the Senator propose to prove or to establish that the nominee has any trait about him that would disqualify him for the position to which he has been nominated, or will the Senator show that he simply lacks the necessary qualifications, or will the Senator do both?

Mr. CAIN. I shall attempt to prove that by virtue of his background and training he is not qualified to undertake the responsibilities involved in the particular office; and, further, I shall attempt to prove that because of his chosen associates in recent years gone by, he is not deserving of consideration for a post which is primarily concerned with the future security of this country.

I thank the Senator from Louisiana very much for his question.

Mr. President, I think the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the Amvets and the American Veterans Committee and the Disabled American Veterans ought to have an opportunity to judge the qualifications of the President's nominee. The memberships of these fine organizations fought the last war, and many of them were killed or injured or maimed by it. Certainly their wishes are deserving of consideration when a man is to be selected for this important position, for the man selected for the position will have very much to say concerning whether such people, numbering in the millions, shall live or die in our brave new world of tomorrow.

Speaking as a serviceman and as a member of three such organizations, I want to say that every man overseas in any future war would have ample reason to shudder and to be frightened and to be scared over the management of the war at home, if the President's nominee is confirmed by the Senate. I wish I had words sufficient to the task of describing what war actually is without being either dramatic or personal about it. But if the Members of the Senate and the people of the country understood what war is and what it does to those who fight in it, as all America is likely to be required to fight in the next war, I think there would be such a demand on the part of the general public for competence and intelligence in executive public offices, in any security field, that we would never be required or requested to confirm those who so obviously lacked the requisite qualifications, not only Mr. Wallgren, but others who have been named. I will tell one more story, which merely comes to my mind. During the early part of the war as I recall—and the very distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] might be interested in this, because of his great distinction in the armed services—the United States had two gliders as I recall, and I think I remember General Collins having told me once, a good many months ago, that those gliders could not be used in training operations because they had to land on a concrete runway for fear of being destroyed. At that time the Germans or the "Krauts," call them what you will, or wish, were invading with paratroops and gliders the island of Crete and they were doing very well with it; and so America thought it would try an improvement. The Eighty-second Airborne Division had that very unfortunate experience when they jumped off from somewhere in Africa and attempted to take needed ground in Sicily. That was the occasion on which a considerable number of C-47's, containing a good many parachutists, were knocked out of the air, because the operation has been so top secret with reference to the military

airborne side, that I presume certain of our naval units had not been properly briefed.

Because of that disaster, though the ground operation eventually was quite successful, as I understand, a decision was almost reached, so far as the Americans were concerned, not to wage war, with the use of air-borne troops and gliders. Fortunately the decision was not actually made, and once upon a time, in company with a number of other Americans, I stood on the friendly side of the River Rhine and watched the better part of 30,000 Americans, gliders and parachutists, air-borne. But in that particular engagement the Americans and the British who were fighting together had the mission of taking a small German town by the name of Wessel on the far side of the Rhine. On one occasion I happened to become lost in an area which was being fought over by the Seventeenth Airborne Division. We were going down a country road which was in fact a boundary between the American ground soldiers fighting on one side of the hedge and the Germans a few yards removed on the other. Certainly much to my consternation and to that of my jeep driver, we were going right up this boundary and passing a home out of which Americans had chased some German soldiers. We found four lying dead in the road. As sometimes happens when one thinks more of saving his life than of observing the amenities, we kept right on going. There was no way to detour around the four dead Germans. We knew they could not be hurt by anything we did, and so we merely ran right over them and went on our way. It was not a pleasant feeling, but I had occasion, I think it was 3 or 4 days later, to come back over the same road. The fighting had not then entirely ended. I found the same four dead German soldiers in the same road, with one distinction. They were still recognizable, but their heads were flattened out. I do not know how many scores of American jeeps had had occasion to run over the heads. It was a memory I thought of when I was talking about the need for getting people at home who could do the job in the next war and answer for what they may do in it, to those who in a physical sense will have to go to war the next time. Riding over the heads of what had been human being—and their stomachs, too—was made not only worth while but possible only because of the thought and the conviction that able men were doing big things at home in the United States of America.

I very much doubt, Mr. President, if the Senate of the United States has ever before been confronted with such a confirmation question as we have before us now. I find this very interesting. I have never known of a comparable case nor have I been able to find any in the confirmation records of the Senate where so few people had so little to say in approval or support of a Presidential nomination. The President made his nomination more than a month ago, and yet so far as I know there has been no editorial support for the nominee. I have never known this to happen in years gone by.

I asked the Congressional Librarians if they would not dig up for me the file on all the problems of confirmation that have been before the Senate almost from the beginning of our governmental structure. They did a good job. I spent a good many hours pouring over it, to find out who favored a nominee and who was against him, and the name of the nominee. In practically every case there were strong arguments for and strong arguments against a particular nominee.

I remember when the question concerning the nomination of Mr. David Lilienthal was before the Senate. I see our very distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] has just entered the Chamber. He remembers that fight. It was a vigorous fight; it was a tough fight; it was an interesting fight. It was a serious question and the nominee was strongly supported by many Senators and vigorously opposed by others. Their attitudes were reflected in the editorial columns of our country.

This was likewise true when the President advanced the names of Mr. Ed Pauley and Mr. Dean Acheson. The people of America were conclusively in support of or in opposition to these men. This does not appear to be the case with Mr. Wallgren. I have yet to find a reputable or leading American paper which proclaims that the nominee is suited to the chairmanship. Something is obviously wrong somewhere, on the face of it. I am encouraging people, and have been doing so for 4 weeks, to find an editorial in support of the nominee, in order that arguments I had not previously considered might be considered by the one who is preferring the charges. I have had no such competent editorial comment brought to my attention in favor of the President's nominee.

I think this is a very important point to consider, because, in part, it constitutes one of the most serious indictments of his incapacity. No job could possibly possess greater significance and potential power. Yet we are thinking of placing a man in that job about whom no one seems to have much of a constructive nature to say. The nominee is inclined to shrug this off, because he maintains, with reference to Washington State, that all of the papers are controlled by Republican editors. But those very editors, Mr. President, ought to be the first to applaud the nomination if they thought it would benefit the Nation. I know of no newspaper in Washington State which thinks that the President ought to appoint a Republican to the chairmanship of the National Security Resources Board. They take for granted that the President is entitled to select anyone he wants to select. These editors insist that the President has made an unwise choice, not because his selection is a Democrat but because his nominee is lacking in what the President needs to make certain that the job is done. I have introduced other editorial comment from papers situated throughout the land. These papers usually represent both the Republican and the Democratic points of view. Yet not a single one of them has applauded the President's selection. The newspapers of this country will be the ones to explain the activities and the conduct of the next Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. It concerns me that they are seemingly in no position even to wish him well.

Read that editorial comment and think about it, because, unless a vote is cast in favor of the appointment, assuming that the appointment is made, no satisfaction will be gained in years to come from reading the reasons why——

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAIN. I yield for a question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I was not here during the early part of the Senator's remarks. He may already have answered this question, but, if not, I should like to inquire if the Senator is intending to comment on the duties which are imposed upon the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. What is the Chairman required to do? If the Senator intends to include the answer to that question later in his remarks, of course, I shall not ask him for the information at this time. I merely want to ask if it will be given at some point in the Senator's speech.

Mr. CAIN. Please permit me to answer that question. I should be inclined to think that the distinguished Senator from Alabama had had an opportunity to read what I am about to present, for my glance is on the next page, on which I embark on the constructive part of the speech, and it is a constructive answer to the Senator's question.

I am frightened, personally, Mr. President, that so many of the newspapers throughout the land consider the nomination to have resulted from a political obligation. Those words are not mine. Democratic and Republican newspapers all over the country say that happens to be a fact. I am distressed that they say it, whether it should or should not turn out to be a fact. I am further distressed that so many American newspapers have entirely ignored the question of Mr. Wallgren's confirmation. To me, it indicates only one thing, and that is that there are very few people in the Nation who are remotely conscious of the responsibilities which have been given to the NSRB. I hope, before my case is completed, to provide any person who wants to think with the information he needs to understand the mission, the workings, and the destiny of the National Security Resources Board.

I now come, Mr. President—and I ask the attention of the Senator from Alabama in this connection—to that part of my presentation which I like the best, because it is positive and constructive.

I want to discuss the National Security Resources Board against the background of where it came from and why; who designed it and laid down its mission, activities, and responsibilities, and the role it will likely play in the future.

I shall call as my first witnesses the chairman of the Senate Armed Services

Committee in the Eightieth Congress, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] and other members of that committee which worked so long, hard, and sincerely, in developing and recommending the passage of Senate bill 758, the National Security Act of 1947, which is now referred to as Public Law 253. During the debate which took place on the subject in July of 1947 these gentlemen spoke feelingly on what they had endeavored to create in support of the future security of our great Nation.

Under date of July 7, 1947, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] had this to say, in part:

> The unification bill is a sincere and earnest attempt to put into effect by legislation a security organization which is adequate, effective, modern—and yet economical.
>
> The bill also provides for a National Security Council, a Central Intelligence Agency, and a National Security Resources Board, all of which report directly to the President, but which also work closely with the agencies under the Secretary of National Security.

There are, I think, a great many people in the Nation, and there are, to my knowledge, certain Senators, who are not aware of the fact that the National Security Resources Board was created as a part of the unification bill which was passed by the Congress and signed by the President on, I think, July 26, 1947.

I have previously had prepared a chart of the organization for national security. It points up rather clearly for those who are interested in looking at it the fact that the organization for national security includes three great agencies, the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and the National Military Establishment.

It may be news to some to learn, as we consider the advisability and wisdom of confirming the nomination of Mr. Wallgren, of Washington State, to be the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, that automatically by confirming him we would make of him one of a limited number of members of the National Security Council, for though the definition of the National Security Resources Board does not say so, it is provided in the case of the National Security Council that among its members shall be the Chairman of the NSRB. I think it pretty important for people not only to know all there is to be known about the NSRB, but we had better take a sufficient amount of time in which to tell the Senate, and, through the Senate, the country, what the National Security Council is and what its functions are to be in the future.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] proceeded to say this about the unification bill:

> The bill before the Senate for consideration, in addition to the elements included in the National Security Organization, provides for the creation of a National Security Council. This Council, reporting to the President and aving as permanent members the Secretary of State, the Secretary of National Security, the Secretaries of the military departments, and the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, gives us for the first time a permanent organization for the thorough integration of our foreign and military policies. Recognizing that military policy is an extension of foreign policy, it gives us a means of developing our foreign policy upon the basis of our military and economic strength. This function is now performed by the State, War, and Navy Coordinating Committee.

I wish to add this word at this time to what is being recited by the Senator from South Dakota. He tells us that the National Security Council shall concern itself primarily with the formation of an organization for the thorough integration of our foreign and military policies: We had better give even greater consideration than we had previously thought of giving to who is to be chairman of the NSRB, because he must know something about the needs of integration of foreign and military functions.

I continue to read from the Senator from South Dakota:

> As an important adjunct to the National Security Council there is provision for a Central Intelligence Agency, which fills a long-recognized demand for accurate information upon which important decisions relating to foreign and military policy can be based.
>
> The National Security Resources Board, headed by a chairman and composed of the heads or representatives of such departments and agencies as the President may appoint, will in time of peace advise the President concerning the coordination of military, civilian, and industrial mobilization to provide him with a sound basis on which to evaluate the elements involved in our domestic, military, and foreign policies.
>
> In time of war it would be made the effectuating agent for putting mobilization plans into operation generally, and for determining the needs of the civil and military elements of the Nation and allocating material and facilities among them.
>
> By means of the National Security Resources Board, Mr. President, there would be established adequate and timely provision—provision now desperately needed—for the protection and planned employment of our national resources; for we cannot afford ever again to dissipate those resources in the pursuit of extemporized plans, conceived in haste and executed under the pressure of emergency.

The chairmanship of the National Security Resources Board turns out to be quite a job, does it not? The Senator from South Dakota continued:

> Mr. President, many grave problems face the Eightieth Congress—problems calling for prompt and sound solutions. None, in my opinion, transcends in importance and urgency the proposal before the Senate today to unify the armed forces.
>
> The profound significance and far-reaching effect of the legislation may well change the course of history.
>
> I am sure the Senate understands that there is involved here more than a problem of organizing armies and fleets and air forces. There is embraced in the legislation the far greater task of laying the foundation and planning the structure of total national effort in event of total war—and it is perhaps the most challenging organizational problem that any nation can face.

I should like to say, in parenthesis, that I am willing to grant that the Senator from South Dakota is correct, that here is one of the most challenging organization problems that faces this Nation. If the President's nominee is qualified to undertake such an overwhelming responsibility, let us confirm him, and if he is not, the sooner we deny his confirmation, and give the President an adequate and reasonable and timely chance to appoint someone who can do the job, the better off everyone in this country will be.

I continue to read from the Senator from South Dakota:

> It is not being an alarmist to point out that, with the development of supersonic planes and guided missiles with atomic warheads, the cushion of distance provided by the Atlantic, Arctic, and Pacific Oceans will no longer provide a corresponding cushion of time in which we may react to attack and mobilize our forces. It is not being an alarmist to point out that in the event of another global war hostilities will be initiated without prior warning, and by an attack as complete and devastating as lies within the capabilities of the Nation which launches it.
>
> Clearly, Mr. President, the time to plan, the time to prepare, is now.
>
> And yet much of the planning of our military services has had to mark time, has necessarily had to wait for long months while these basic problems were debated and studied and finally resolved. It is now within the power of the Congress, it is now its responsibility, to give those services improved procedure and adequate agencies to help them with their tremendous task. It is now within our power to shun any display of weakness and vacillation which might encourage aggressors or lessen the faith of free peoples in our steadfastness of purpose. It is now within our power to give the President the help he so urgently needs, and to replace the security organization of 1798 with the organization of 1947. It is now our responsibility to act, for I say to the Senate in all sincerity, to procrastinate is to invite disaster.

That concludes my quotation from the Senator from South Dakota, but only for a moment, because I wish to return to him very shortly.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. CAIN. For a question.

Mr. LONG. Assuming that the organizational chart which the Senator has before the Senate is actually a correct analysis of the establishment of the defense organization of the United States, what was the reason for placing the National Security Resources Board in a position to advise the President rather than to advise the Secretary of Defense, who has all the other boards under him?

Mr. CAIN. In answer to the question of the Senator from Louisiana, I will say that one of the prime reasons for passing the unification bill as it was eventually enacted by the Congress was to make certain that a major responsibility for preparing for war and waging war in the future would reside in the hands of civilians. It was a considered act which the designers of this legislation took. They wanted to give the Secretary of Defense every possible chance to be heard before the President, but they likewise wanted to make certain that the Secretary of Defense, as he represented the Military Establishment, would not,

under any circumstances, have an opportunity to place the military activities of this Government above the rights and responsibilities and obligations of civilian operation.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. CAIN. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Further, assuming the accuracy of the chart before us, is it for the same reason that the Central Intelligence Agency was placed under the National Security Council, rather than being placed directly under the Secretary of Defense?

Mr. CAIN. I think that was the logic which was used by the designers of that legislation. I might suggest to the Senator from Louisiana that he has just raised another interesting question, because, as the chairman of the National Security Resources Board finds automatic membership on the National Security Council, he has, as a member of that council, jurisdiction over the Central Intelligence Agency which is charged, through its mission, with coordinating intelligence activities of Federal agencies concerned with national security. When we discuss the President's nominee, Mr. Wallgren, we are speaking of three different categories: his membership on the NSRB, his membership on the NSC, and his overriding jurisdiction over the Central Intelligence Agency.

Another of the prime proponents and authors of the unification bill of 1947, was the very able and distinguished Senator from the State of Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I want to call him as my next witness to make a few remarks about what is likely to happen in the world of tomorrow either if we encounter trouble overseas, or if overseas brings trouble to this country. The Senator from Massachusetts said on July 7, 1947, from his seat just about two removed where I stand now:

> If Members of the Senate are wondering how they shall vote on the pending unification bill, I ask them first of all to try to visualize in their mind's eye what the war of the future will be like. Once they have done this I have not much doubt what their conclusion will be.
>
> What will this dreadful war of the future be like? I quote from an expert, Lt. Gen. Lawton Collins.

For the benefit of Members of the Senate who do not know it, the then Lt. Gen. Lawton Collins is now a four-star general, and the official capacity of Gen. Lawton Collins is Deputy Chief of Staff. General Collins said:

> We could expect that the war would start very suddenly and come through the air and that the enemy would try to eliminate the United States at the outset, not making the same mistake as last time of taking on somebody else first and allowing us to prepare. The attack would be primarily at the great cities and would cause great destruction both to physical structures and the people. It might involve atomic bombs, radioactive materials, biological warfare, and crop-destroying chemicals. The atomic bomb would probably be used against cities in preference to military targets.

Oh, and if it does! Everybody should pause and consider seriously what General Collins there says:

> The atomic bomb would probably be used against cities in preference to military targets.

Anyone who has been overseas in the past several years, either as a soldier or a civilian, man or a woman, knows what our side did, not with atom bombs, but with ordinary bombs, against the cities of our enemies overseas. One man's guess is as good as another's. I do not know how long other people think it is likely to take to clear away the debris in Berlin and then build Berlin up again to be a reasonably habitable city. How long is it going to require to make a city again out of Muenchen—or Munich, as you will? How long is it going to take to recreate Vienna? How long is it going to take to rebuild Wuppertal? Has any Senator ever heard of that place? Some 300,000 lived in that German city in the Ruhr. I remember being with some of the first ground soldiers who went into the place called Wuppertal. It had the only overhanging railroad train I at least had ever seen, or that existed anywhere in the world. By virtue of our might and the might of the British in the air, we killed, we conservatively figured, about 60,000 people in that community of some 300,000. Particularly was this made possible, or did it happen, because that was one of the cities whose management Hitler had advised had nothing to worry about because of the Yanks. Hitler assured its people the Yanks would never get as far up as the Ruhr. But the point involved is that what we have so successfully, without atomic bombs, done to large portions of the rest of the world will, if trouble comes again, be visited on us, and probably, as General Collins says, with atomic weapons, and even worse instruments of torture and destruction may be developed to follow them.

General Collins continued:

> We would have chaos, with communications disrupted, millions of persons sick, wounded, and dying, civil disorder, and sabotage. The initial bombing attack would likely be followed by air-borne troops. There is also the possibility of long-range submarines popping up offshore and directing guided missiles to targets on this continent.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] said further last year:

> There is the opinion of the responsible professional. Can Senators imagine it? Can they visualize this country with its cities in smoking ruins, its railroads destroyed, its major bridges blown up, all communications such as telegraph, telephone, and mail obliterated? Can they see the dead and the wounded and those who have been artificially made sick by radioactivity and by the germs of biological warfare? Can they comprehend it? It is hard for us Americans to do so, because never in the lifetime of a single American has our country ever been really stricken by a foreign foe. But we might as well start thinking about it now, because if there is another war, that is the way it is going to be.

This is the way in which we are going to attempt to get ready to make that war unlikely in the first place, and to wage successful war if it comes—by the agency organized as indicated on the chart before me.

My mind goes back to the position taken by several of my colleagues, close friends of mine, who say with reference to the President's nominee that he is the President's nominee, and that it should be his personal right to appoint anyone he wants to, and that we in the Congress, after the appointee secures the job, should hold the appointee responsible for what he does, and hold the President responsible for the conduct of the nominee after he is confirmed. But if war comes to this country, and comes rapidly, as every competent witness one could bring from anywhere would testify it will come, if it comes, and we are not ready because we have got a well-intentioned but by no means qualified man as the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, in heaven's name I ask any American citizen what earthly good it is going to do then to turn to some President and say, "We think a predecessor of yours, or you, Mr. President, made an unwise choice in your selection of the Chairman of the NSRB, and we hold you entirely responsible for his misconduct, which is best represented by looking out the window"—if in those days there would be a window to look out of—"and see 10,000 Americans with their heads blown off."

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAIN. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. In line with the Senator's thinking, does it not pretty well stand to reason that if a foreign power were able to wage such war against the United States of America, the outcome of the war would probably depend almost entirely on the ability of this Nation to fight at the outset rather than its ability to fight after the war had been going on for a few months?

Mr. CAIN. In my considered opinion, the Senator is correct. We in this country have been blessed among all people. There have been two wars in my short lifetime. In both those wars, because of mistakes made by other nations and because of good fortune in general, we were given an opportunity to prepare ourselves before we had to go to war. In both instances we were about as unprepared as any nation could be or ever has been in the history of the world.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. CAIN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. In line with the chart before the Senate, would it not appear to the Senator that the Central Intelligence Agency under the National Security Council should be so organized that this Nation will know in the future approximately what would be the ability of a foreign power to attack the United States, and about how much of a stock pile of material and munitions such foreign power might have?

Mr. CAIN. In answer to the very interesting and worth-while question of the Senator from Louisiana, I can only refer to the mission of the Central Intelligence Agency. It is to coordinate in-

telligence activities of the Federal agencies concerned with national security, and, to the degree which is reasonable, to make its information available to the American people, so that we, in a psychological sense, can prepare ourselves against future or impending trouble.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Is it not more or less a fact that the United States is one of the few nations which really has no adequate spy system to determine what other nations are doing? It must judge through other information coming to it.

Mr. CAIN. The junior Senator from Washington is not qualified or competent to answer that question. I think there is good reason to believe, from my point of view, that we have extremely intelligent agents endeavoring to determine presently what is going on throughout the rest of the world; but whether or not we have them in sufficient number to compete on anything like an equal basis with other nations interested in securing intelligence from this country, I do not know.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] had some other things to say on the subject of the unification bill passed in July 1947. I think they are important for the RECORD, and of interest to anyone who cares to listen. The Senator from Massachusetts had a second reason for favoring the unification. I believe that his reason will be of interest to the Senator from Louisiana, because it appears to fit into his last question. The Senator from Massachusetts said:

> My second principal reason for favoring unification is that it will result in a definite well-thought-out procedure for the allocation of our available supply of military manpower. Saving money is, of course, of vital importance. But to save manpower is even more crucial because we have a definite shortage of manpower in this country for all of the things that we need to do. If we take the age group of young men physically fit for military service and then deduct the ones who must remain in essential nonmilitary activities, we have not a great deal left. It is too important a matter to leave the allocation of this manpower to last-minute horse trading between the Army and the Navy and the Air Force, as was the case during the war. There must be a definite system of allocation. This is one of the results which will flow from having the machinery to take care of the problems which all the services have in common.

The Senator from Massachusetts had a fourth reason.

> Fourth, I notice that in this bill the National Security Resources Board is given as one of its functions the duty of advising the President on policies to establish adequate reserves of strategic and critical materials and for the conservation of such reserves. The adoption of an intelligent policy with respect to our diminishing raw materials of all kinds is of vital importance and can mean the difference between defeat and victory in case of war.

I believe that in the fourth reason the Senator from Massachusetts has laid down a great mission which must be achieved; but by strong implication he is saying that it does no good to put a job on paper unless we have the brain of a man or woman to make it work. As we hammer on the question of a man's competency, I recommend careful consideration of the reasons stated by the Senator from Massachusetts and ask the question, Is the President's nominee qualified to do the job?

We turn from the Senator from Massachusetts to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], who himself had a great deal to do with the writing of the unification bill. He felt very strongly on the subject. He stated on the floor of the Senate on July 9, 1947:

> Briefly, what does this unification accomplish? First, it provides a National Security Council to advise with the President and the Congress on the integration of our domestic, foreign, and military policies. That is a very important consideration. It is something which we did not achieve in World War II until we had had a long and bitter experience with a different situation. We tried to establish it in Washington in a way that would provide the greatest coordination, but we found from experience that there was much delay, much uncertainty, and a lack of a sound integration of policy and program, and it was not until along toward the end of the war that we approached in our organization an establishment which is similar to that provided for in this bill—the National Security Council. True, the personnel are different, but our experience demonstrated conclusively that we needed something of that kind. So this bill creates a National Security Council.

I believe that what the Senator from Connecticut is saying is that out of the suffering of the past the unification bill presents itself as being at least in part an answer to the needs and requirements of tomorrow. The Senator from Connecticut continued:

> I might point out, Mr. President, that the National Security Council is entirely, as I recall it, a civilian organization. It is made up of the President, the Secretaries, and such other persons as the President may designate. Of course, that Council could bring to its service any officer it might desire. Consequently, it is the main coordinating factor, I think, in all our preparations for national security and for our defense. God grant that we shall not have to prepare for war, but merely for the possibility that it may come, and thus be prepared to defend ourselves.
>
> Under the Council there is established a central intelligence agency to provide coordinated, adequate intelligence for all Government agencies concerned with national security.

I think the Senator from Louisiana will be interested in the next observation of the Senator from Connecticut:

> When one reads the record of the past war in regard to that field, it is found that there was much to be desired in the way intelligence was covered, and there was great conflict about it. I say nothing here in depreciation of the men who were engaged in the Intelligence Service, because some remarkable and extremely courageous things were done. Nevertheless, we demonstrated from our experience the need of a central intelligence agency; and this bill provides such an agency. Neither a national security council nor an intelligence agency now exists.
>
> The bill provides for a National Security Resources Board to advise the President and the Congress on the coordination of the military, industrial, and civilian requirements of all national resources for war. It gears the capacity of our national economy to the requirements of national security and works closely with the National Security Council. That Board does not now exist. We had its counterpart in several different boards during the war, but it took a long time to coordinate them and have them work together. Provision is made for that by this bill.

All the Senator from Connecticut is saying is that because of mistakes made in years gone by, we are going to be as certain as we can that such mistakes are not permitted in the future. We are going to design ever and ever better instruments. It likewise logically follows that as we get better instruments we must get the very best brains to get the best work out of the best instruments.

Mr. President, in my presentation up to this time I have said, and I shall say it again, that in my considered opinion the President of the United States has made a grievous error in thinking that his nominee for the chairmanship of the National Security Resources Board is qualified to keep pace with congressional progress in the field of future war preparation and fighting legislation, if you please.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] further said, as shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 9, 1947, at page 8499:

> The question of civilian control, as I have said, has been raised repeatedly in the discussions. Although the armed forces of the United States are at present under stringent civilian control, and although there has never been any legitimate fear that such control might be lessened or was becoming undermined, the unification bill, it seems to me, greatly increases civilian control over the Army, Navy, and Air Force.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Not only is there increased civilian control in the direction and maintenance of the armed forces, as just stated, but there are several new agencies which will have considerable influence over the military forces, but they are to be predominantly civilian in nature and composition.
>
> I think one great thing the bill accomplishes is that it brings into closer contact with the armed forces themselves a larger number of civilians than ever. That was true during the war, and one thing the bill does is that it continues and preserves these relationships with these new agencies, several of which are controlled in large part by civilians.
>
> For example, the National Security Council is composed of a civilian Secretary of State, a civilian Secretary of National Security, the civilian Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, a civilian executive secretary, and such other members as the civilian President may designate. Military domination of that body hardly seems likely.
>
> Next, we find nothing but civilians in the National Security Resources Board, which is composed of a civilian Chairman and such civilian heads or representatives of the various executive departments and other agencies as may be designated by the civilian President.
>
> The only military agency in the entire bill is the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the reason that is a military agency is that it is set up to do a purely military job.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAIN. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator feel that that organization is entirely wise in limiting the membership of those boards entirely to civilians, without the inclusion of some military personnel to guarantee sound military advice in the handling and organization of our natural resources for war?

Mr. CAIN. I think there is a very logical answer to the Senator's query. The Chairman of the National Security Resources Board presently has, as the members of his Board, the secretaries of all the executive portfolios of the President: the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the various other Secretaries. On our National Security Council, which is in a full sense a civilian organization, we find the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Corps. We have a civilian Secretary of Defense who obviously has among his staff the best and most highly trained professional soldiers this country has to offer.

So it is my opinion that this organization for national security—which is the Senator's life and mine, in fact—is a fine integration and synchronization of the finest intellects and training possessed by both civilians and military personnel in America.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. CAIN. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. During the course of his speech, does the Senator propose to explain what qualifications he believes a man should have in order to be a member of the National Security Resources Board?

Mr. CAIN. I shall do that only in part, for I am speaking to the broad question of whether the President's nominee is qualified to be Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. I think it would not be proper for me to state in the course of this debate what qualifications should be possessed for some other position—for instance, what qualifications a Secretary of State should have—when that question is not before us.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. CAIN. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. To be more precise about the matter, during the course of his speech on the subject, does the Senator propose to go into the question of what qualifications he would expect for a man who would be Chairman of the National Security Resources Board?

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington has every intention of doing so, and will come to it as soon as the remaining several witnesses who were designers of the law on unification of the armed forces have been quoted. I thought it important to try to establish what some of the leaders in the activity which resulted in the armed forces unification law thought was needed by our country.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAIN. I yield for a question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Am I correct in my understanding that the National Security Resources Board compares, on the one hand, with the armed forces, on the other hand; in other words, that whereas the armed forces are charged with the responsibility of carrying on combat and making plans for combat, the National Security Resources Board is charged with the responsibility of mobilizing our resources in order to enable the armed forces to carry on combat?

Mr. CAIN. I think a proper answer to the Senator's question would be as follows: The National Security Resources Board has as its mission, laid down in the legislation pertaining to it, the responsibility of advising the President concerning the coordination of military, industrial, and civilian mobilization. That is its mission.

The National Security Council has the mission of advising the President on the integration of domestic, foreign, and military policy.

The National Military Establishment, which includes within it the Secretary of Defense, has as its mission serving as the principal assistant to the President in all national security matters.

I trust that is a satisfactory answer to the Senator's question, because it is a factual answer as to the missions laid down for them.

Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] had more to say during the debate on the armed forces unification bill. He said:

> In fact, in a modern war it does not make too much difference whether a citizen is in uniform or not because the entire country goes to war in this day and age. To quote General Eisenhower:
>
> "War is no longer the concern of the soldier alone; in its commencement, its waging, and its settlement, he is only one of many. Although the outcome of battle is depending upon his action, the strength for a victory is the product of the entire nation behind him. The economist, industrialist, scientist, the farmer, worker, and teacher are all necessary to the waging of war. Similarly they are likely targets of enemy action. Security against war is a function that belongs to all citizenship."

From my point of view, I think that is a terrific American sentence, as used in that testimony by General Eisenhower, when he said:

> Security against war is a function that belongs to all citizenship.

In other words, he was saying that security matters are not restricted to consideration by the military in this country; but if war is to come and if we are to win a war, we must get ready again for war, if it is thrust upon us, by virtue of the activities of the National Security Resources Board and the National Security Council, which are civilian agencies aiding and abetting and assisting the National Military Establishment, which includes our veterans of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Corps.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] further said:

> In a word, there has always been adequate civilian control over the armed forces. Now that we have found a need for wider civilian participation in the national security, we are proposing in this bill an increase in the civilian control to be exercised what might be termed the national, not merely the military, mobilization of the United States in the interests of its own existence.

Mr. President, at this point I should like to quote from the testimony of another witness, a distinguished Member of the Senate who sits on the other side of the aisle, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. In speaking to the armed forces unification bill, he said:

> It would provide adequate security measures at all times, rather than only when hostilities threaten. It creates the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Munitions Board, and the Research and Development Board, in order that we may make certain that our foreign and military policies are coordinated and mutually supporting; that a central intelligence agency may collect and analyze the mass of information which is so essential for the Government to maintain peace and without which the Government cannot wage war successfully; that scientific research and development may be coordinated, not only within the military services, but between the military services and other Government agencies and with industrial and educational activities; that intelligent planning may guarantee coordination of our military program with the Nation's resources in manpower, materials, and facilities; and that all these objectives may be accomplished with the greatest possible economy consistent with a strong and effective national security.
>
> The result is a balanced, workable composite of the sound, constructive proposals advanced through the long history of this vital measure. In that regard it is significant that the Army-Navy agreement evolved by Admiral Sherman and General Norstad and transmitted by the President to the Congress with the full approval of Secretaries Patterson and Forrestal and of Admiral Nimitz and General Eisenhower is in important particulars identical with S. 2044 of last year, which was evolved by the Senate Military Committee. Thus the pending bill, S. 758, can find its genesis in proposals which the Congress commenced to study over 3 years ago and which have through mature and deliberate consideration been embodied in the wise and constructive measure now before the Senate.
>
> The bill is simple. In essence it does two things: First, it creates a single Secretary at the head of a National Security Organization for general supervision and control of an autonomous Army, Navy, and Air Force; and, second, it creates machinery for coordinating military and foreign policy on the one hand and military and industrial mobilization of resources on the other. That is all. But if these things are not done, I fear for our future security.

What does the Senator from Alabama really fear? He fears that if in this country we do not now begin to coordinate our military and foreign policy on the one hand, and our military and industrial mobilization of resources on the other, we are not going to be in position to withstand or resist or repel any aggressor or invader in the future. The Senator from Alabama says these things must be done. The President has said to us that his nominee, as chairman of the National Security Resources Board, who would automatically become a member of the National Security Council, is qualified, through his understanding and

managerial capacity, to get the Nation ready for any war that might come. The junior Senator from Washington has thought it proper to suggest to the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, and now suggests to the Senate itself that the nominee ought to be required to prove he is qualified. Under no circumstances, regardless of who the man may be, should we accept any individual as being qualified without questions concerning his capacity.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] has other cogent reasons for recommending unification to the Senate; and they were needed, too, in 1947. He says:

> There is another cogent reason why unification is needed in Washington, in addition to the ones I have just stated, and that is that our own country may be a battlefield of the future. Any enemy strong enough to be a threat to world peace, will have weapons of range and power sufficient to attack our homeland, the United States itself. If the enemy is going to launch a world war, he will launch those weapons against us. Our clear duty is to admit this fact and to plan now for our security. If the United States should become a true theater of operations, no one would argue that we should have divided command in this, the most vital theater of all, while admitting the necessity of unity elsewhere.
>
> If we are to be prepared at all to meet the speed of future attack, we must prepare in peacetime. We cannot wait for the distant red glow of another and far more disastrous Pearl Harbor to give us the danger signal. This unification proposal lies at the very base of all this country's postwar military planning.
>
> It is the lessons of World War II which we must now apply. We must look forward so that we shall not be caught unprepared and outmoded if another war must come. If it comes, it will come fast.
>
> I believe that that is what the bill would do. It applies those lessons in an intelligent, gradual fashion and provides a means for a further study of the complex problems of national security.
>
> A corollary lesson is that the people, the Congress, and the President have no single individual or agency charged with the overall problem of national security to whom they can look for impartial recommendations and coordination. This bill provides the Secretary of National Security, a sort of Deputy President, to assist the Chief Executive in the carrying out of his great responsibility as Commander in Chief.
>
> Unification will also apply another clear lesson of World War II, and World War I for that matter, and that is that there must be an agency to plan and administer the proper allocation of the economic and human resources of the country so that both civilian and military needs are adquately met in time of war. The National Security Resources Board is proposed for just that purpose.

Mr. President, I want to read that single paragraph by the distinguished Senator from Alabama again:

> Unification will also apply another clear lesson of World War II, and World War I for that matter, and that is that there must be an agency to plan and administer the proper allocation of the economic and human resources of the country so that both civilian and military needs are adequately met in time of war. The National Security Resources Board is proposed for just that purpose.

Parenthetically, I may say that obviously now there is a National Security Resources Board. All that is needed to make it work is a chairman. The President has recommended that a particular individual be confirmed as chairman, to make possible the attainment of the fine goals talked about by the distinguished Senator from Alabama. I think we of necessity must prove beyond the very shadow of a doubt, not that he is a good fellow and a harmonious person, but that he is a competent person qualified to grapple with problems and to prepare for any trouble which may visit itself upon the world and upon this country in the years of our tomorrows.

> Under a National Security Establishment wherein the efforts of all the armed services are brought into harmony—and there is no such establishment today—unnecessary duplications of money and effort can be eliminated. And through the recommendations of the Secretary of National Security to the President and the Congress, continuing improvements in efficiency and economy can be made which will carry out the obvious intent of the Congress.

It was the obvious intent of the Congress to see that the Military Establishment, which includes the National Security Resources Board, is an institution, an agency which works. The intent of the Congress is to make undeniably certain that whoever the Chairman may be, he shall have abilities commensurate with his responsibilities.

> The various civilian agencies and the key civilian officials provided in the bill assure the traditional (and essential, if our system of government is to continue) civilian control of the Military Establishment. Together with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, these civilian agencies comprise an organ which can plan and prepare for the United States to meet the threat of a total war. Mark you, Mr. President, no one longer doubts that the next world war, if it should come, will be a total war. Much of this planning has not even been started, and without passage of this bill it will continue to be delayed.

Mr. President, the bill was passed. A small start has been made, it seemed to me, in the direction of preparing against the possibility of that total war to which the Senator from Alabama so graphically referred in July 1947. It ought again to be obvious to any American man or woman who thinks of America as never having been exposed to any small part of a total war, that if war comes again it will be total in all its gory, horrible aspects. Our job today is to get ready for it. The best and most well-intentioned legislation that the mind of man has ever conceived has not a chance of accomplishing the mission unless we select the finest brains in the Nation to make such magnificent words come to life.

Mr. President, charts are pretty to look at, but they do not operate or develop or run businesses. They do not win or forestall wars. They are designed only to arouse the curiosity of man to such a degree that he determines to do the job which is referred to on any such chart.

I like what was said by the Senator from Alabama in concluding his portion of the debate on the unification bill. He said:

> The Congress must act now—this session—in order to give the country and the people the best security for the money spent. The lessons of World War II, only recently so vivid to us all, are dimming as time passes. We cannot ignore them. It would be a shocking incrimination of the Congress, and a welcome scandal for those at home and abroad who decry our form of government, if that which the country and its responsible leaders so clearly want is ignored or delayed by the representatives of the people in the Congress. I entreat my colleagues in the Senate, Mr. President, to take immediate and favorable action to accomplish the translation of the unification bill, S. 758, into enacted legislation so that it may become a law of the land to provide a suitable structure for our postwar national security in a world where lack of security may well spell a nation's death warrant.

Mr. President, it so happens that the Senator from Alabama is now in the Chamber, and I am delighted to have an opportunity to say in his presence that I know of no single paragraph on the subject of unification more clearly written or more clearly stated before the Senate at the time of the debate than was his statement. I can only join with the Senator in hoping that whoever becomes finally the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, he may be qualified to undertake the monumental responsibilities referred to by the Senator from Alabama, by members of the Armed Services Committee, and by the Senate itself.

Mr. President, on July 9 the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] returned to the Senate to answer some questions and to make further comments regarding the unification bill. I should like to refer to him as my last witness, among those I have called, to show to the Senate and to those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD what it was we had in mind at the time the unification bill was framed and recommended to the Senate. It is particularly significant that the committee did not carelessly create either the National Security Resources Board or the National Security Council. These civilian agencies were created because of suffering which had been endured by this Nation to its detriment in the past. Those two agencies in question are in part an answer to the future. Each of the witnesses I have previously called to testify has spoken strongly on this subject.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] on July 9 had this to say:

> Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that the bill provides that the President shall preside over the National Security Council, provided that in his absence he may designate a member of the Council to preside in his place. That is set forth in title I of the bill, on page 31.

I should like to use that particular bit of testimony to indicate that if the President's nominee is confirmed as chairman of the National Security Resources Board, and he then automatically finds himself to be a Member of the National Security Council in the absence of the President of the United States, the Chairman of the NSRB can become the active Chairman of the National Security Council, and through those respective chairmanships can speak with greater authority on more subjects than can any other man in this country.

Others may say, and think it proper, that the President's nominee is qualified to fill the chairmanship of the NSRB and the potential chairmanship on the National Security Council; but as one who knows the nominee, who comes from the same State in which both of us have resided for a long time, I want to say, as seriously as I can, that the qualifications demanded for such assignments, are not possesed by the nominee in question.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] added:

We do not propose to give the Secretary of National Security such standing that he will in a sense be the deputy commander in chief, shall we say? We do not wish to take away from the President, in any shape, manner, or form, his constitutional duty as Commander in Chief of the armed forces. With the President a member of the National Security Council and with this board set up primarily to advise the President on matters of national security, our committee did not feel that we should put the new Secretary of this new organization in a position superior to the one in which he is now placed by the bill, as shown on the chart. We might call the armed services organization cur policeman. But we believe that the men in the organization, under the Secretary of National Security, will be men of standing, and men who will have knowledge of much value in meeting the whole national security problem. Therefore, taking them out of their positions as heads of the military branches or as heads of the Research and Munitions and War Council Boards, and bringing them up to sit on the Security Council, is of great value. We do not believe that the National Security Secretary should in any way control, by means of a superior position, the conclusions which emanate from the Security Council or the Resources Board.

I take it that what the Senator meant was that he wanted to disabuse the minds of anyone, especially those who felt that it was the intention of some to place the Secretary of Defense in a higher position, possessed of greater authority and influence than would be the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board and the National Security Council. The Senator was saying that it is the intention of the Congress to make certain that the National Security Resources Board and the National Security Council stand relatively on the same level with the office of Secretary of Defense, in order that they may more completely represent the civilian point of view in preparing for and fighting any war which might come to this Nation in the future. It is only another way of saying that now, since we have some time, as we appear to have, we had better make certain that the best brains available for such uses in this Nation are actually employed, as was the intention of the Congress.

On November 15, 1948, the Committee on the National Security Organization reported to the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government on the historical background, prevailing status, and needs and requirements of, first, National Security Council; second, Central Intelligence Agency; third, National Security Resources Board; fourth, Office of the Secretary of Defense; fifth, military budget; and, sixth, Joint Chiefs of Staff and joint staff.

From these comprehensive reports I wish to discuss in detail the National Security Resources Board. Everyone is interested in it; not very many know very much about it. I think it safe to say that everything I shall say about it is included in reports and records which are available to anyone who wishes to ferret them out. I have been privileged to have an opportunity, or to be required, to do this necessary study, but now I am presuming to give a constructive, complete, and concrete answer to the average inquiry as to what the National Security Resources Board is. I want the people to know, as they should know, and this is the place from which the information should be given to them.

I. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The National Security Resources Board was established by the National Security Act of 1947. Its Chairman took the oath of office on September 26, 1947. Six weeks later the President appointed to membership on the Board the Secretaries of the Treasury, Defense, Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor. On the same day, the Board held its first meeting at the White House. On February 20, 1948, the President completed the Board, as now constituted, by appointing the Secretary of State to membership.

The National Security Resources Board is the outgrowth of an extended history. It begins with the experience of World War I. Neither the United States nor any other nation had an accurate conception of the demands on the national economic structure that were to develop between 1914 and 1918. After the war the National Defense Act of 1920 was passed, which charged the Assistant Secretary of War with the duty of planning for industrial mobilization. It is noteworthy that until the passage of the National Security Act of 1947, he was the only officer of Government specifically charged by law with this responsibility. In implementation of this responsibility, the Army and Navy Munitions Board was organized on July 15, 1922, with the Navy a somewhat reluctant partner, for the purpose of preparing joint industrial mobilization plans.

In 1931 the Army and Navy Munitions Board completed its first mobilization plan, which was subsequently revised in 1933, 1936, and again in 1939.

In principle the industrial mobilization plan of 1939 was sound. It made provision for centralized control of mobilization policies to be carried out through coordinated decentralized operations.

Mr. President, I do not know how many persons, either Senators or others, other than myself, are thoroughly familiar with this law, but in having been interested in the subject, I became concerned with the problem in detail because of a question or two I personally directed to the President's nominee when he was being heard by the Senate Armed Services Committee. I asked him:

"Mr. Wallgren, what is the National Security Resources Board?"

He appeared not to be very familiar with it, its function, its history, its background, or what it was intended to accomplish. I asked him, as did other members of the committee:

"What are you going to do when you become Chairman?"

His answer, at least in substance, as well as I remember it, was that he did not know, because he thought it would be presumptuous on his part to raise any question about an office to which he had not yet been confirmed. I think I asked him if he had done any reading on the subject, and his answer was "No." When I returned constantly to the question of competence I was horrified, as an American citizen and as a Senator, that a man could have offered to him one of the great opportunities this great country offers, and not exercise and show sufficient curiosity about it even to know any of the historical background of the agency or the mission assigned to him.

Because of the nominee's utter lack of understanding about what the position calls for I decided to find out all I could about the genesis of the NSRB in order that the RECORD would be clear and concrete and precise on this subject, so that at any time in the future a question was raised about the NSRB we could look back to the RECORD of March 8, 1949, and somewhere in my presentation find an answer to any legitimate question not only about the National Security Resources Board, in fact, but about the National Security Council as well.

I wish to look at the RECORD so far as the history of the NSRB is concerned.

WORLD WAR II

As World War II approached the industrial mobilization plan was not put into operation. The decision not to implement it was President Roosevelt's. What his reasons were he never stated publicly. There are various surmises. Among these are inadequate public appreciation of the urgent needs of the time and lack of public support for so abrupt a measure. Nineteen forty was a Presidential election year. The prospect of involvement in the European war was a matter of deep concern to the electorate. Industrial mobilization for war was unwelcome. Thus the mobilization plan for 1939 had political disadvantages.

I would personally recognize the disadvantages which are stated in this paragraph, but I am acutely conscious of the fact that when war comes to us in the future, if it does, we are not going to have time in which to concern ourselves in either political advantages or disadvantages. If we are prepared when the next war comes in terms of what is intended on the basis of the charts before us and these missions, we shall immediately and instantaneously, with the help of the American people, get on with the waging of the war. If we are not ready, the war is going to engulf us, as surely as the Germans, when they got ready, swept over the unpreparedness of France, for example, of Belgium, and likewise of Poland.

The plan, having been prepared by the Army and Navy Munitions Board, bore the label of its military origin. For many reasons, the organization that prepared it was not the one to put it into operation. There was no other organization able to do so. Mr. Roosevelt was faced

with either setting up a formidable new mobilization agency or resorting to less compromising but at the same time far less effective ingredients.

This is one of the most important lessons of World War II, and is one that should be heeded in the future. Fortunately, the National Security Act of 1947, in creating the National Security Resources Board, has spared President Roosevelt's successors the embarrassment of having to choose between the unsatisfactory alternatives he had to face.

ECONOMIC GENERAL STAFF

The National Security Resources Board is potentially one of the most influential units of the President's staff. It has been placed on the same level as the National Security Council, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Council of Economic Advisers—directly under and responsible to the President himself. In addition to the Chairman, its membership is composed of such "heads or representatives of the various executive departments and independent agencies as may from time to time be designated by the President." At present they are the seven members of the Cabinet, mentioned above, whose departments are most intimately concerned with the intended functions of the Board.

When President Truman was faced with the responsibility of appointing the membership of the National Security Resources Board, he had an opportunity to select as members representatives of any of his executive agencies. But because the President, in part, is thoroughly conscious of the importance of the NSRB, he made it his business, in the first place, to see that only the members of his Cabinet were likewise officially sitting members of the NSRB. It was at a time later than that—much later in fact—that, for reasons obviously best known to the President, he thought it fit and proper to recommend to the Senate as a nominee one who, on the basis only of his lack of training and experience, is obviously unqualified to sit authoritatively on that Board as its Chairman.

The form and language of the statute creating the Board, as well as its legislative history, indicate that this high-ranking civilian body was intended to provide the basis for a kind of economic and social general staff, comparable in position and prestige to its three companion units in their respective fields. Thus the National Security Council deals with high questions of our domestic, foreign, and military policy; the Bureau of the Budget with fiscal matters; and the Council of Economic Advisers with economic policy in broad outlines.

The National Security Resources Board provides a civilian planning and coordinating agency, capable of connecting and correlating the requirements of the Military Establishment with the capacities, potentialities, and needs of the civilian aspects of any mobilization effort.

It should be capable of planning in peace for industrial and civilian mobilization and of providing the blueprints and, to a certain extent, the skeleton organizations that would have to be instantly available in the event of another emergency or another war. It should also be able to coordinate these in the early, as well as in the advanced, stages of mobilization.

Three points must be strongly emphasized:

First. It is a civilian agency, thus recognizing the fundamental tenet of civilian control over our economy in times of war, as well as the fact that in modern war the purely military organization represents an important part, but still only a part, of the total effort.

Second. It is not subordinate to, nor even part of, the Military Establishment.

Third. It is a staff agency: its powers are not operative or executive. Whatever measure of coordination or control it may exercise must be exercised through or on behalf of the President.

II. STATUTORY RESPONSIBILITIES

In the original design of the National Security Resources Board, as indeed of the entire organizational pattern of which it is a part, the guiding thought was, undoubtedly, to prepare against a future emergency that might arise at some unpredictable time in the years ahead. At the end of the World War II, it was widely believed that the Nation was returning to a period of peace, comparable to that which existed prior to 1939, or even prior to 1914.

Mr. President, it obviously takes a long time to design and develop a presentation of this character, and I was just thinking at the moment how unfortunate it is that the President's nominee, in his several appearances in the hearings before the Senate Armed Services Committee, did not respond to questions of members of that committee by giving the information which I necessarily find it required of me now to give. I desire to make the function and the background of the NSRB as clear as we can to the Senate and others, for one reason—because the President's nominee, as of the time when he appeared to speak for himself before the Senate Armed Services Committee, did not have the remotest idea of either what his job had been, was, or was going to be in the future.

THE PHASE PATTERN

National Security was largely conceived in terms of planning against a hypothetical M-day, not in terms of current policy and action. Thus in virtually all the security planning, in the strictly military as well as in the industrial and related fields, one finds functions and requirements typically laid down in a phase pattern—phase I, peace, which might continue for an indefinite time from today; phase II, the appearance of an emergency; phase III, a declaration of war. For many types of planning this pattern is perhaps unavoidable, but its realism under the conditions of today is open to question.

The functions of the National Security Resources Board are defined in section 103 (c) of the statute as follows:

(c) It shall be the function of the Board to advise the President concerning the coordination of military, industrial, and civilian mobilization, including—

(1) policies concerning industrial and civilian mobilization in order to assure the most effective mobilization and maximum utilization of the Nation's manpower in the event of war;

(2) programs for the effective use in time of war of the Nation's natural and industrial resources for military and civilian needs, for the maintenance and stabilization of the civilian economy in time of war, and for the adjustment of such economy to war needs and conditions;

(3) policies for unifying, in time of war, the activities of Federal agencies and departments engaged in or concerned with production, procurement, distribution, or transportation of military or civilian supplies, materials, and products;

(4) the relationship between potential supplies of, and potential requirements for manpower, resources, and productive facilities in time of war;

(5) policies for establishing adequate reserves of strategic and critical material, and for the conservation of these reserves;

(6) the strategic relocation of industries, services, government, and economic activities, the continuous operation of which is essential to the Nation's security.

CURRENT FUNCTIONS

While this definition lays stress upon planning for a hypothetical future war, nevertheless the fact that the Board might also discharge important functions relevant to peacetime was not overlooked, either in the statute itself or in its legislative history. Thus, in subparagraph c (5), the Board is made responsible for advising the President concerning policies for the establishment and conservation of strategic and critical material—currently a matter of prime importance. In subparagraph c (6), it is similarly charged with advice concerning the strategic relocation of industries and services—a matter of profound significance to the peacetime economy.

There is further evidence that it was the intent of Congress that the Board would discharge functions more immediate than those of making blueprint plans for a future emergency.

The duties, responsibilities, and functions of the Board, it would seem, should not depend upon conventional and unrealistic time "phases" or upon the interpretation of such terms as "mobilization," "emergency," or "war." The Board's functions and duties should be gaged by realities, rather than by technical definitions. It appears to have been the intent of Congress that in case of need the Board should become the principal coordinating and mobilization agency.

A unique opportunity lies within the grasp of the Board. It can bring to the President and responsible agencies a full understanding of current economic policy relationships and their consequences on national security. The Board can provide the mechanism for coordinating the economic aspects of the Government's current security policies and for measuring them against the needs of the long-term civilian mobilization plan.

Unless the Board, or some other agency, exercises such responsibilities in these areas, there is no assurance that activities now undertaken in the name of national security will not, in the long run, impair our national strength.

For the Board to be occupying itself with theoretical blueprints and statistics looking to theoretical M-days when it

could and should be performing real, useful, and valuable current services hardly seems sensible.

PRESENT NEED FOR NSRB

Today we are unquestionably facing a situation that was not foreseen clearly at the time of the enactment of the National Security Act of 1947, but which does call imperatively for realistic evaluation of our resources, capabilities, and risks. On the one hand, the demands of merely stand-by preparedness against possible future emergency—as they have been developed out of the still imperfectly coordinated planning of the three services and related agencies—are proving to be much more onerous than was foreseen. Furthermore, we are living in a time of troubles which bears small resemblance to peace as we have been accustomed to think of it. For the first time in our history we are carrying, almost unaided, the full burden of world economic and military power.

This situation simply does not fit into the phase pattern that has dominated so much of our planning in the field of national security. It demands precisely that kind of civilian and industrial staff work, of economic coordination and control, that the National Security Resources Board is required by law to provide in a time of mobilization; while some of the major responsibilities involved—for example that of stock-pile policy—are those with which the Board is specifically charged in time of peace.

The Board's first duty was and is to plan for, and to advise the President concerning, industrial mobilization in the event of war. But unless this planning is related closely to present realities the Board cannot successfully discharge this duty, nor can it realize its full potentialities as one of the major organs of government.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAIN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator feel that in view of the burden which is presently on the United States, of defense not only of this Nation, but of half the rest of the world, we should dissipate our strength by spreading our tanks, guns, and airplanes, and whatever other arms we have, over the entire world; or does he feel that we should keep them in the United States, where they may be concentrated for the use of this Nation or any other nation to whose defense we may go in the future?

Mr. CAIN. The only answer the Senator from Washington can give to his friend from Louisiana is that I do not know nearly enough, or nearly so much as I should like to know, as to how the assets of this country should realistically be used in places beyond the continental United States. But one thing I do know is that unless this position is occupied by a man who knows infinitely more than the Senator from Louisiana and I know collectively, and who knows a great deal more than most of us, about making such determinations, which he will presumably lay before us for our consideration in the future, we shall not have the remotest idea of what we ought to do throughout the rest of the world, but we shall automatically be distrustful of any recommendations which are made by a chairman, for example, who we have reason to believe is not nearly so well qualified as is the Senator from Louisiana to come to conclusions which would provide an answer to the question which he has just asked.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. CAIN. I am happy to yield for another question.

Mr. LONG. In view of the Senator's statements on the floor today, I ask the Senator if he is inclined to agree with the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] in the statement which he made earlier in the day concerning the proposed North Atlantic Pact, to the extent that we could probably expect very little aid from other countries if we should enter into a compact with all the western European nations. We should merely be extending our commitments.

Mr. CAIN. This day has had more hours than I had previously intended it should have, and I have been constantly busy with a problem which I am presenting to the Senate. For that reason I did not have an opportunity to listen to the Senator from Utah, although he told me of the subject on which he was to speak. I shall, of course, read the RECORD with interest at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. CAIN. I am happy to yield for a further question.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator intend, during the course of his discussion of the qualifications of the nominee recommended by the President, to go into the background of the man whom he is discussing, and discuss what relevancy his training may have to appointment to the National Security Resources Board?

Mr. CAIN. I am delighted to say to the Senator from Louisiana that I am discussing at considerable length, because I think it important to have the RECORD show the situation clearly and concisely, the nature, functions, responsibilities, and missions of the National Security Resources Board, and, likewise, by way of historical background, of the National Security Council. When I get through with that, it is my intention, if required so to do, merely to tell the story of who the nominee is, where he comes from, what his training consists of, and who his associates have been, in order that the Senate may have two things before it: First, full knowledge of the man made available to every Senator; and secondly, full knowledge as to the requirements of the job. That is as far as I can go in making what I hope will be a positive contribution to the thinking of my colleagues. After that, the decision is theirs as to whether they think a job which is one of the largest with which I have ever had any research contact, can adequately be filled by a gentleman who, while possessing a good many harmonious virtues, is lacking in knowledge commensurate with the undertaking which he would take in hand.

I appreciate very much the questions from the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. President, I should like to discuss for a few minutes the organization of the Board.

III. ORGANIZATION

The present adequacy of the Board in its organization and operations should be measured against the foregoing statement of purposes and principles. As to the present internal organizational pattern, I should like to refer to a chart which I have had prepared. If I may be so bold as to suggest it, until the very recent past very few Senators have had an opportunity to see this chart or study it.

The chart shows the position of the National Security Resources Board in the executive branch of the Government, as established by the National Security Act of 1947, for which many of us as Senators voted. The chart shows the relation of the National Military Establishment, which maintains close liaison with the National Security Resources Board, of which it is intended by the President that Mr. Wallgren shall be the Chairman, which Board, in turn, maintains very close relationship with the National Security Council, on which the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board will automatically sit as a member. With respect to the President and with respect to the security needs and requirements of this country, these three agencies are the three most important agencies in the United States.

The chart which I have laid before the Senate was approved by the Chairman on May 14, 1948. As I understand, the present internal organizational pattern is very flexible and well suited to the requirements both of the present and of a possible future emergency. The position of the several units on the chart indicates their relationship, not their relative importance. The large significance of this chart lies in the liaison features of the chart.

I now present the internal organization chart of the National Security Resources Board. I have no intention of lecturing from this chart, though I shall make reference to it.

It was said to the Senate Armed Services Committee by Mr. Wallgren, the President's nominee, that his job was largely that of dovetailing his activities with those of members of the Board who were also members of the President's Cabinet, and that he, as Chairman of the NSRB, would not have much of an administrative function. I lay before Senators for their own consideration and judgment precisely the administrative capacity to be demanded of the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board.

Mr. President, the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board has jurisdiction over the four great mobilization planning staff positions, namely, the Director of Production, the Director of Transportation and Storage, the Director of Human Resources, and the Director of Economic Management.

We should not forget to bear in mind that in the event of war, each one of

those four great agencies becomes a war agency; and the chairman who sits at the top has more to do by way of preparing the Nation for war than does any other individual or group of individuals in the United States, outside possibly the President.

As the chart which is placed before us shows, this pattern generally speaking establishes the staff on three levels under the Chairman.

The first level—as I now point out for those Members of the Senate who are interested in looking at the squares on the chart—includes:

First. The general counsel, responsible not only for the general legal work of the Board and its relations with the Congress, but also for preparing and maintaining current drafts of the legislation and executive orders that should be ready for use in the event of emergency.

Second. The secretary, charged with direction of the Board's secretariat and the administrative or housekeeping work of the Board including such important responsibilities as management of the advisory committees, certain relations with other governmental departments and agencies and with private institutions as well as with research and reports not falling within the special province of other divisions.

Third. The information officer and the functions of public relations.

Fourth. The office of Vice Chairman, the immediate director of the staff in its larger functions of planning and mobilization.

The Vice Chairman has at his command three staff agencies:

First. The Director of Plans and Programs and his staff, including the Chief Statistician, Chief Economist, Plans Branch, Program Branch, and Program Adjustment Division, who guide the development of the broad strategy of industrial mobilization planning and of the detailed programs necessary to support it. This important division is charged with integrating military requirements with the capacities of the civilian economy. Its duty is to consolidate military with civilian requirements, and to recommend steps to meet deficiencies, to formulate control mechanisms, to develop standard statistical, analytical, and planning methods and to balance and adjust the various resulting programs to each other.

Second. The Director of Mobilization Procedures and Organization and his staff are responsible for developing the basic concepts, the guiding principles, the fundamental procedures and organizational forms of the industrial mobilization plan itself. The division studies past experience in these matters, develops standard planning specifications for the guidance of all public and private agencies that may be involved, and maintains technical liaison with such agencies and with the advisory committees.

Third. The Mobilization Planning Staff proper consists of four divisions. Each is responsible for one of the major fields of industrial mobilization; production, transportation, manpower, and economic stabilization, through fiscal, financial, rationing, price and wage controls.

Mr. President, I should like to think that every Member of the Senate, in reflecting upon the problem of the confirmation of this nomination, would, as against the several paragraphs which I now wish to read, as a service to himself, mentally place the President's nominee in the seat of the chairman of the National Security Resources Board, and then consider whether the nominee could function as the chairman of this Board should

It is safe to say that a very great many persons in this country could not function adequately in the position of chairman of the National Security Resources Board. However, for the moment we are not concerned about that; we are concerned with one particular key individual.

As I said a moment ago, the mobilization and planning staff proper consists of four divisions. Each is responsible for one of the major fields of industrial mobilization: Production, transportation, manpower, and economic stabilization, through fiscal, financial, rationing, price and wage control. These divisions, through their relevant groups and subdivisions, are to supply the direct contact between the mobilization plan, in all its aspects, and the civilian economy. Their task is to develop and recommend detailed plans in several fields for matching resources to requirements, maintaining stockpiles or stand-by plants, developing new sources, and balancing requirements as among the various claimant agencies.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAIN. I am most happy to yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Are we to understand from this chart that the director of production, who comes under the chairman and the vice chairman, as indicated by the chart, is to be in charge of the manufacture of aircraft, ordnance, marine, consumers' goods, equipment, tools, construction, and general products; and in the case of materials, solid fuels, petroleum and natural gas, steel, chemicals—including plastics—rubber, nonferrous metals, nonmetallic minerals, forest products, textiles, fiber, leather, and food; and in the utilities groups, fuel and other utilities, and communication? Is the chairman in charge of all of those, or is he simply in charge of advising in connection with their production?

Mr. CAIN. At the present time the Director of Production would be held responsible for formulating plans to be used by such subordinate agencies during war. If war comes to this country, under mobilization conditions the Director of Production, who is the director of this entire division, is director of a division which is intended to be the nucleus of an Office of War Production. In other words, it would be the Office of War Production for the next war; and there would also be the Office of Transportation, the Office of Manpower, and the Office of Economic Management. There is the organization for the next war.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington is most happy to yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator from Washington have any idea as to the number of men presently engaged in or under the control of the National Security Resources Board and, further, how many men it is contemplated might be under the direction of the National Security Resources Board in the event of war?

Mr. CAIN. In the year 1947, when the National Security Resources Board was first established by law, it was, if I am not mistaken, given a budget of $2,000,000. For the reason that it had just begun its operations, it was possible for it to spend only $791,000.

Its budget for 1949, if I am not mistaken, is $3,000,000. Its budget for 1950 is to be $4,000,000. I stand ready to be corrected as to those figures, but I think they are essentially correct. If the Senator from Louisiana continues his interest in determining the exact number of men presently employed by the National Security Resources Board, it will take only a very few minutes entirely to satisfy his curiosity on that subject.

I found this problem somewhat interesting when I was looking into it, because I am trying to determine whether the President's nominee is qualified not only to manage and supervise these positions, but also to hire the personnel to fill them; and it seems to me that the Senator from Louisiana also may find it worth while to note in passing that, in connection with the National Security Resources Board, there are authorizations for the employment, under its Chairman—and the positions I am about to mention have nothing to do with the other members of the Board, who constitute the President's Cabinet—of persons to fill 60 openings on the National Security Resources Board as specialists, as they are called, special assistants, advisory committee members, directors, and technical assistants of one kind or another. There are 60 of those jobs at salaries of $10,000 each in the National Security Resources Board; and if I am not mistaken, 40 of them have already been filled.

I am likewise told, and I take it to be a fact, that a freeze order recently was imposed on the National Security Resources Board until the question of the confirmation of the nomination we are considering is settled. That leaves available to whomsoever becomes the next Chairman of that Board a minimum of 20 jobs at $10,000 apiece. Among my items of curiosity concerning the President's nominee is the question of how well and how wisely he would be able to select qualified assistants. It is not a question of what salary is paid to such a person, but it is a question of what he gives back in terms of energy and production.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MILLER in the chair.) Does the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. CAIN. I am happy to yield for another question.

Mr. LONG. For the benefit of the Senate, will the Senator state the salary of the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board?

Mr. CAIN. I think it should be a very great deal more than it is on paper. The salary attaching to the office of Chairman of the NSRB is $14,000. What a strange and contradictory thing that is. It was not the intention of anyone to make such a mistake. Let us assume it was in fact a mistake. When the law was passed by the Congress creating the NSRB, it was provided the Board should consist of any representatives the President saw fit to appoint from among the executive agencies of the Government. He therefore could have appointed minor subordinates. Instead, the President wisely saw fit to create as a board his Cabinet. Each member of the Cabinet, as I understand, is paid an annual salary of $15,000. Therefore, we have the Chairman drawing $14,000, with each of the other members of the Board drawing $15,000, in part for other duties they perform. My conception of the position of the Chairman and its magnificence in potentiality is that it would not make any difference what was paid to the right man to fill the position. In America the job ought to be first to find the man, then to ask him how much he wants, for he is the one who is to wage the next war for us.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield for a further question?

Mr. CAIN. I am glad to yield for another question.

Mr. LONG. In view of the fact that the other members of the Board, with the exception of the Chairman, are members of the President's Cabinet, would it not seem obvious that the Chairman could expect little more than advice from the members of the Board, and he would have to do all the work himself?

Mr. CAIN. I think it is a very logical construction which the Senator from Louisiana draws. I do not see how it could be otherwise. The Chairman is solely responsible. I want to make thoroughly clear to the Senator from Louisiana and to other interested Senators, for himself developing, through his administrative competence and influence over the directing heads, the plans which as Chairman he will in turn lay before the Board members for their consideration and approval or rejection.

As I conceive the relationship of the Chairman to the NSRB, it is comparable to the relationship existing between the president of an American corporation and his board of advisers; the board meets generally at stated times, and the president of the corporation comes in to advise the board as to how well operations have been moving along since the last meeting. I think that is precisely the situation which will confront Mr. Wallgren in the event he is confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. President, it is obvious from the broad scope of its functions that the National Security Resources Board must operate in an area in which a number of other executive agencies—some staff, some line—already have staked out jurisdictional claims. The Board is only one of several Presidential staff units and furthermore must deal with a host of long-established line agencies.

Neither statutory blueprints nor organization charts alone will solve this problem. Good will, a spirit of teamwork, and, above all, a clearly defined work program and clearly defined working relationships will go far toward its solution.

During the course of the past year satisfactory personal relations have been established between the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. Periodic informal meetings between the heads of these three agencies are held. The Council of Economic Advisers is operating in the same general areas as the Board, and close working arrangements between these agencies promises mutual advantages. In time, it may prove to be desirable to merge them.

Unfortunately relationships with other important agencies leave much to be desired. Good will is not lacking, for example, in relations with the Munitions Board, but lines of responsibility are not clearly laid out although the work of these two agencies has not been seriously hampered thereby. Entirely satisfactory relations have not yet been established with the Department of Commerce. The same problem exists with other executive agencies. Most of the difficulty has arisen from lack of an agreed-upon NSRB work program clearly defining its relations to other agencies.

The degree of confidence that the President reposes in an agency and the extent to which he uses and supports it are not matters of legislation. The most crucial Board relationship is with the President himself. Statutory provisions requiring the President to consult with the National Security Resources Board before acting are of dubious constitutionality and of no practical value. Close relationships based on mutual confidence and respect alone will work.

The Board has taken a constructive step in forming the Interdepartmental Staff Group, consisting of representatives of its members—the Secretaries of State, Treasury, Defense, Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor. This will promote continuity in the Board's activities. It will also encourage a continuous and understandable flow of information, upon which policy decisions of the Board can be based, from the several departments to the logical reservoir for such information—the Board itself.

Many advantages should result from this arrangement. Among others, the designated representatives, meeting regularly and frequently as a working group, should engage in staff work that will assure adequate prior consideration of matters requiring the attention of the Board. Each representative also will serve as a focal point in his department for matters relating to the work and responsibilities of the Board and for facilitating the coordination of the Board's work with that of his department.

It is apparent that the four main divisions of the Mobilization and Planning Staff correspond to certain major war agencies of World War II—the War Production Board, the Office of Defense Transportation, the War Manpower Board, and the Office of Price Administration. Each should be capable of providing a plan and nucleus organization around which such agencies could be quickly re-formed, should the need arise. In the same way, certain of the subdivisions could, as circumstances might demand, serve as nuclei for other war agencies or pass into the established departments as the latter took over war functions. Thus, it is intended that the food subdivision of the materials group, under the Director of Production, would, in the event of war, pass to the Department of Agriculture as the nucleus of a war-food division within that Department; the foreign economics subdivision, under the Director of Economic Management, could become the nucleus for an office of economic warfare.

Under the full pressure of a war mobilization, the Mobilization Planning Staff proper would be expected to drop out of the National Security Resources Board organization, in order to provide the foundations for the required executive agencies of wartime direction. The Board, together with the remainder of its staff, would be the central coordinating agency for the guidance and control of the whole civilian war effort. If and when the pressures grew so heavy that this function could no longer satisfactorily be discharged by a board, but required a single directing head comparable to the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion in the latter part of World War II, then the upper half of the present NSRB organization would provide his staff.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Illinois for a question?

Mr. CAIN. I yield for one question only.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire from the able Senator as to how long he expects to speak on this subject?

Mr. CAIN. I inquire of the Senator from Illinois his wishes concerning the recess tonight.

Mr. LUCAS. I may say to the Senator, since he is asking me a question, that we are going to stay until he finishes his speech.

Mr. CAIN. Then, in answer to the question, I would not be able to say.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CAIN. I would not be able to say how long I shall take. This is a serious undertaking, and I shall attempt to conclude, strength permitting, before the night is over.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate that, and I merely wanted to know. Some of the Senators were inquiring as to how long the Senator might speak.

Mr. CAIN. I would, if I could, answer the question; but I cannot.

Mr. LUCAS. It will be 2 or 3 hours, will it not?

Mr. CAIN. Will the Senator repeat his question?

Mr. LUCAS. It will probably be 2 or 3 hours, at least, will it not?

Mr. CAIN. Oh, all of that; yes.

Mr. LUCAS. We will accommodate the Senator and remain here just as long as he wants us to.

Mr. CAIN. I appreciate that very much.

While the basic principles of organization and procedure have been clearly established by experience in two World Wars, it is difficult to lay down precisely the detailed forms that the Federal executive organization as a whole should assume in the event of a third great war, except in the light of conditions as they develop.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Louisiana for a question?

Mr. CAIN. I am pleased to yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Would it not occur to the Senator that, in view of the fact that the chairmanship of the National Security Resources Board ordinarily requires a man of high qualifications, it would be extremely difficult, during a period of peace, to find a properly qualified man, compared with the qualifications of a man whom patriotism would compel to take that position in time of war, since in time of peace a man who was qualified for the position would probably wish to be making more money as the head of a large corporation, whereas, in time of war, all persons naturally feel that they should come to the assistance of the Nation?

Mr. CAIN. I do not know. I am inclined to think that if the people of this country fully understand what the NSRB and the National Security Council were designed by legislation to consummate and attain, there would be many of the most able, talented, and properly trained men in America available for that opportunity. I will tell the Senator why. Anyone who thinks at all in these days knows that if another war shall come, it will not be a case of winning the war, it will be a case of somehow surviving as only a segment of society. The best brains of our Nation must be made to understand what will happen if war should come in the future, in order that they may accept offers made by the President of such portfolios as this one, and in order to make unnecessary the next war. I do not think the President of the United States would have any difficulty whatsoever in securing the services of an adequate, competent, immensely broad, and talented administrator for the office of chairman of the NSRB. I am convinced that in the present nomination the President was well intentioned, but he did not pay much attention to it. He was looking for an opening—and there is no criticism of this intended—to pay a political debt. As of the day on which he nominated Mr. Wallgren for the chairmanship, I think it is safe to say that there was no one else available as chairman in any of the scores of portfolios in agencies, bureaus, and commissions to which the President has authority to nominate men from civil life.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. CAIN. I shall be pleased to yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. In view of the fact that the position, according to the Senator's point of view, would probably indicate the need of man of great experience in production, such as the head of a great corporation, or a man who had been a member of the board of directors of many corporations who might have resigned from his position as president of a corporation or chairman of the board of directors, would it not seem to the Senator that to accept the position of chairman of this agency he would have to suffer a great financial sacrifice, because he would be required to resign his position as president of a great corporation, for instance?

Mr. CAIN. The Senator is correct. There are however, many people in the United States who have accumulated a great deal of this world's goods and who would be glad to represent their country in a position of that kind.

Mr. President, because I yielded in the middle of a sentence, I should like to repeat the last sentence.

While the basic principles of organization and procedure have been clearly established by experience in two world wars, it is difficult to lay down precisely the detailed forms that the Federal executive organization as a whole should assume in the event of a third great war, except in the light of conditions as they develop. The present organization of the National Security Resources Board, leaning as it does rather strongly toward the actual organization developed during the last war, provides a framework on which that type of organization could be quickly rebuilt in case of sudden emergency.

ADVISORY COMMITTEES

It is important to fill out as soon as possible the structure of advisory committees. Although these are indicated on the chart as directly associated only with the chairman, every key unit throughout the organization, including the subdivisions of the Mobilization Planning Staff, should attach to itself an advisory committee drawn from civil life and consisting of those with knowledge and, where available, wartime experience in the relevant field. Such advisory committees have already been formed for the Legal Division and for the Plans and Programs Division. These committees are essential, not only because of the advice and assistance they can give, but also as a reservoir from which the staff may be recruited when necessary and as a cadre of active participants in the event of emergency. Without such cadres on hand it would be very difficult for the staff divisions to fulfill their functions as nucleus agencies. It would contribute greatly to the speed and smoothness of an actual mobilization if the members of the advisory committees could, in addition to holding occasional meetings, individually spend a week or 2 weeks from time to time working directly with the staff unit with which they are associated.

PERSONNEL AND BUDGET

The proper personnel and fiscal requirements of the National Security Resources Board can best be measured in terms of staff and financing of other executive agencies. The Bureau of the Budget costs approximately $3,250,000 and the National Security Resources Board approximately the same amount. Many times this amount could be spent upon civilian mobilization planning, depending upon the degree of detail, but one may doubt its value. The Board spends a much larger proportion of its budget for consultants, advisers, and temporary contractual employees than does the Bureau of the Budget.

Since last spring the National Security Resources Board has been making strenuous efforts, and with some success, to fill a number of important staff posts. Recently the post of Vice Chairman, which was long vacant, has been filled. One difficulty in obtaining competent personnel from business and industry arises from the lack of clarity surrounding the legal conditions and circumstances in which such personnel can assume responsibilities. It is desirable that legislation be passed to clarify this situation.

IV. PRESENT PROGRAM

In appraising the accomplishment of the National Security Resources Board it must be remembered that the Board itself is a new organization.

LACK OF A SYSTEMATIC PROGRAM

The greatest defect in the NSRB operation in the past has been lack of a definite, carefully planned, and comprehensive work program. Progress toward remedying this defect was made by a memorandum, prepared under date of August 19, 1948, entitled "Preliminary Statement on Guiding Principles and Program Framework for Mobilization Planning" which brings the matter into focus.

This is a substantial step forward. Consistent attention paid to programs in the future should expedite the work of the Board's staff and remove uncertainties both internally and in relations with other agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

MOBILIZATION PLAN LACKING

As of November 1, 1948, the Board had not completed even an emergency mobilization plan. Delay was occasioned chiefly by the absence, until recently, of a work program that would put first things first. Many months ago the Munitions Board sent the NSRB a draft mobilization plan based on World War II experience. While a number of individual studies of value to mobilization planning have been undertaken by NSRB, the over-all plan was still lacking on November 1, 1948. It is encouraging to be able to report, however, that considerable progress was made in the fall months and that a tentative mobilization plan—more of an organizational framework and working philosophy than a detailed plan, however—was to be completed by December 1 and published by the end of this year.

SCHEDULE OF CIVILIAN REQUIREMENTS

A definite schedule of civilian requirements—at least as definite as military requirements—ought to be one of the most important, immediate NSRB projects. Civilian mobilization planning will remain largely theoretical until this has been accomplished.

Program analysis and program clearance give much better control than production priorities. If a program is within the capacity of the country, a relatively simple priorities system will work. If it is beyond the Nation's capacity, no system however complicated will produce results.

NSRB ACCOMPLISHMENTS

In spite of growing pains, the Board has done much toward assembling a competent staff and establishing a sound organization. It has made progress in the development of procedures—always a difficult task for a young agency. The Board itself had held 11 meetings as of November 1, 1948. It has given active consideration to a variety of major subjects falling within its province, and as a result has formally submitted a number of recommendations to the President, some of which have been rejected. Chart 3, on the dais, indicates the role of the Board in the national economy.

AD HOC STUDIES

The work of the staff has yielded several important and significant studies of resources, supplies, and present policies in special fields. Lacking a clear work program, however, the Board's staff has devoted itself primarily to the ad hoc consideration of a series of specific questions. The choice of subjects in large measure has been haphazard.

Notable among these studies is one dealing with the capacity and requirements of the Nation's electric power systems and the production of heavy power equipment; another dealing with raw materials and stock-pile policy; another on effective mobilization of the operating and manufacturing phases of the communications industry. Another study on the problem of economic stabilization in the event of a heavy pressure of security programs or of war emergency, estimates the probable magnitude of the task of stabilization in an already fully-occupied peacetime economy and discusses the kind of measures that would be required to deal with it. It represents an original and valuable contribution to a field that is too little understood.

The Board has devoted considerable attention to the study of possible relocation and dispersion of Government facilities and industrial enterprises. It has published a pamphlet guide on this subject. The studies indicate that dispersion of existing industry would be prohibitively expensive, but a proper location, with a view to adequate dispersion, of new construction is possible. Additional work on this subject and on underground facilities is needed.

I do not know the attitude of any other Senator in the Chamber, but when I read of the studies which are being undertaken and of the functions which are yet to be performed, I wish to come back and ask the question again of the Senate, is the President's nominee within 90 percent of being a man into whose hands can be entrusted the responsibilities which have been laid down, not by the President, but by the Congress? On the basis of hard-headed, common sense, I say that the answer obviously is that he is not competent. Judge, now, the President's nominee, for a few minutes, against what follows.

The studies indicate that dispersion of existing industry would be prohibitively expensive, but a proper notation, with a view of adequate dispersion of new construction, is possible. Additional work on this subject and on underground facilities is needed. Other similar studies are under way. A survey is being made of the wartime experience with machine tools and of the present machine-tool position, with a view to developing appropriate present and future policies in this field. A comprehensive survey of the world petroleum position has been made.

Questions relating to manpower are now under study by the Board. Several Government agencies are collaborating, at the Board's request, on a project to determine the characteristics of the human resources of the Nation, not only as to age, sex, and location, but as far as possible as to distribution of particular occupational skills. It is analyzing selective-service legislation, and has made specific recommendations to the President as to the form such legislation and Executive orders issued thereunder should take. It is undertaking a survey of those occupations that would be critical or in short supply in the event of a war, so that they may be identified in advance as far as possible and training programs can be undertaken in especially short areas. Progress on a manpower mobilization program has, however, been extremely slow.

In the medical field, the Board is commencing a series of studies to develop more accurate information and specific plans in connection with the national health in time of war. The health resources of the country represent a highly specialized phase of national security. The medical division of the Board is planning to press forward with studies of facts in these areas as rapidly as possible.

With the concurrence of the National Security Council, the Board recently has assumed certain responsibilities of a planning character with respect to economic warfare. It is also participating in the determination of current export controls policies, final responsibility for which rests in the Department of Commerce. Economic warfare planning had not advanced during the committee's sessions—to a point where it was available for committee examination. More active attention to this field seems essential.

The general counsel has prepared a draft of an Emergency Powers Act, designed to provide for powers of various kinds that may be required in emergency or war. It covers such things as priorities and allocations, the creation of Government corporations, contract price adjustment, price wage stabilization, authority to requisition, import and export controls, censorship, selective service, and many others. Some of the titles would come into effect upon enactment. The title covering price and wage stabilization would come into effect only after Congress makes a finding of the existence of a threat to the economic stability of the United States. Other titles would come into effect only upon a congressional declaration of war.

I do not know how many Senators will think that the President's nominee, Mr. Wallgren, is qualified by training and experience to lay down in general the price and wage regulations which ought to govern in this country, should the Congress make a finding of the existence of a threat to the economic stability of the United States. I do not think the President's nominee is competent for that task. I think other Senators will want to make more certain of his competence than they are now before assigning him to a role in which he will exercise great domestic influence and power over all the citizens of this country.

The legislation affecting this matter has been prepared carefully, and seems comprehensive. It does not include among its titles a National Service Act, but the powers it would bestow upon the President in time of emergency would seem to be almost as far-reaching. Two caveats to this phase of the Board's work must be entered. The first is to the method of procedure. This legislation, of far-reaching effect on labor particularly, has been framed without direct labor participation. From the point of view of acceptance of the steps proposed, this omission may prove to have been a mistake.

The second caveat relates to the philosophy of the proposed Emergency Powers Act. It may well be that the next war will be so horrendous in its effects, so comprehensive in its universality, that nothing less than conscription of the entire Nation to the compulsion of war will be adequate. It might, however, well be given the proper directives, proper leadership, proper mechanisms, and proper incentives, that the Nation would produce more under voluntary conditions than under compulsory ones. Wage increases are natural incentives in a capitalistic society; so, too, is every man's desire to better himself. Most men work better for the hope of reward than for the fear of punishment. It is completely clear that controls, probably far more extensive than ever before, will be needed to govern the economic life of the Nation in the next war, but those controls should be minimal, not maximal. Congress should study carefully the proposed Emergency Powers Act, and the Board would be well advised to restudy it with full participation by labor.

THE WORK MUST BE SYSTEMATIZED

The conclusion is justified that many of the Board's activities have been of an important and significant character. It is essential, however, that a comprehensive and orderly approach be developed to the multiple problems with which the Board must deal. Much remains to be

done to insure proper interrelation of the several divisions and projects. The major objectives must be plainly recognized, kept firmly in mind, and systematically advanced. Proper programing will go a long way to assist in attaining these goals.

STOCK PILING

The Board has a major policy-determining role in regard to stock piling strategic material. I think in this instance, Mr. President, we, as the Senate, had better move most carefully in making certain that there be selected for the role of Chairman of the NSRB one who understands strategic stock piling for the national welfare and security. To make a mistake in this respect is to make a gigantic error in terms of opportunities for selfish dealing that can result from the selection of a wrong individual through whose efforts others, possibly as little qualified as he, will be charged with the responsibility for a major endeavor.

Stock piling has important repercussions on procurement. Stock-pile requirements are now procured independently by the various relevant departments, the actual purchase being effected through the Treasury. This brings stock-pile demands into the open market uncorrelated with the demands of the other security programs, with resultant effects on both supply and prices. There is need for better coordination and timing. At other points, it is necessary to consider the development of new sources of supply, financing new plant and equipment rather than bidding competitively for the short existing supply. This, in turn, involves important considerations of foreign economic policy. For all these reasons, stock piling must stand high among the major subjects of both current and long-term planning by NSRB. On June 30, 1948 the Board submitted a memorandum to the President, which he subsequently approved, entitled "Steps Necessary to Accelerate the Stock Piling of Strategic and Critical Materials." Since that date somewhat more substantial progress has been made, but as of November 1, 1948, over half the items in the program had still not reached their goals. In the light of the international situation this is very serious.

Though apparently the President's nominee, when he appeared before the Senate Armed Services Committee as a witness to speak in his own behalf, did not think there was anything serious about the fact that some of the goals herein referred to had not been reached. This being in the latter part of February, he was not aware of what the goals were, or that they had not been reached. His complete attitude of mind at those hearings was that of a man who was delighted to have been given a job—period. He was not curious about the job; he did not understand the job; but it was a job. The nominee said to us without a smile that, the President in thinking the nominee was qualified, having expressed his confidence in his nominee, it likewise followed that the members of the Senate Armed Services Committee without question would think him qualified. I am one Senator who, not being a member of the Armed Services Committee, would still not take a chance with my Nation's security by accepting the President's nominee without not only mere questions, but without serious questions.

PUBLIC RELATIONS

Public reporting, as complete as is possible within the limits of necessary secrecy, must be regarded as one of the Board's essential activities. Understandable and significant reporting is the foundation of successful public relations. It is the first requisite in spreading through public, industry, and government alike a grasp of what the Board is doing and an adequate comprehension of the significance and importance of the work. Without that comprehension, the activities of the Board cannot hope to prosper. Limited results have been attained in this field.

I know all of us are one in hoping that the results in the future will not be limited in any way, shape, or form, because the more the country knows about the successful progress of the NSRB and the National Security Council, the more rapidly this great Nation, through its people, will be able to support and uphold the efforts of its Government, as reflected in these several agencies.

V. EVALUATION

Let us try to evaluate what the NSRB has accomplished up to date.

The United States would have experienced even greater difficulty and delay than it did in meeting the mobilization demands of World War II had there not existed in the country a considerable cushion in the form of unused plant capacity, slack employment, and a relatively moderate wage and price level. Today there is no such situation. The civilian economy is already running at or near capacity, wages and prices have risen, at least to within sight of danger points, and there is little or no surplus manpower for even civilian needs. On this heavily occupied economy are imposed very substantial additional burdens.

THE MEASURE OF THE PROBLEM

Programs related to security and foreign aid policies that have been adopted, or are in process of adoption, include the Atomic Energy Commission program; the Economic Cooperation program; Army, Navy, and Air Force programs calling for heavy increases in manpower and in procurement; substantial programs for the stock-piling of strategic and critical materials; proposed expansion of shipbuilding, including tankers; possible lend-lease military aid.

No provision appears to have been made for continuing and comprehensive studies of the combined impact that all these programs are likely to have upon the civilian economy. Such estimates as have been made seem to indicate that the over-all burden in the initial stages would not be beyond the over-all capacity of the economy to sustain. But even if correct, such findings are subject to serious qualification. They assume the stability—except as they may be affected by the programs themselves—of present wage and price patterns. They refer only to the initial stages of these programs. Heavy upward revisions of all the programs might be compelled by events.

More importantly, over-all estimates do not reveal the many and often serious specific pressure spots and bottlenecks, which in the absence of proper coordination or control could have cumulative effects upon the entire economy.

Analysis undertaken by the National Security Resources Board staff clearly reveals the especial importance of the stock-piling program in the problem of supply of materials. In many short or strategic materials, stock-pile objectives constitute a very large percentage of the total "preferred" demand—that is, the demand for military, European recovery, and related security programs. In these cases, stock-piling policy alone can make the difference between sufficiency and inflationary shortages. It is, therefore, plainly apparent that stock-piling policy must be constantly coordinated with current procurement and adjusted as to rate, time, and methods of acquisition, to the policies of the Military Establishment and Economic Cooperation Administration, either by open-market purchase or through the development of new sources of supply.

Yet there is no single agency of Government today dealing from an over-all viewpoint with such unquestionably critical problems of coordination, correlation, timing, and method.

There is no authoritative agency through which the estimated requirements of the Economic Cooperation Administration can be directly related to the requirements of the armed forces, and the specific demands of the one adjusted and timed to the specific demands of the other. The Atomic Energy Commission stands almost completely outside the entire complex, mainly because of secrecy in its operations, but the effects of its purchases of steel and power and other items cannot, of course, be separated from the economy as a whole. The President must have available considered and integrated advice on all such policy items, backed by adequate current staff and statistical studies, and formulated jointly by the major operating agencies. The National Security Resources Board was created in order to perform precisely this kind of job.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAIN. I am pleased to yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator have any information as to how well the National Security Resources Board has fulfilled the functions which he is discussing up to this time?

Mr. CAIN. What I have been relating in recent minutes attempts to present an evaluation of how well they have done their work. Certain criticisms have been made of the NSRB, to the effect that it has a number of capacities yet to be filled by capable persons. It simply has not yet been able, probably because of lack of personnel—it has not been lack of money—to pursue studies which lead to a further integration of our military and manpower problems. The only way in

which I can further answer the question of the Senator from Louisiana is to suggest that on the basis of its limited operation, there is great need for further effort by the NSRB. Everyone seems to be in agreement that if it gets the proper management it will go on from where it is, in a beginning stage, to become a real factor for the good and future stability of our economy, and will be a protection in terms of security for the future.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. CAIN. I am glad to yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. With reference to the Senator's study, has he any knowledge as to the extent to which this country has acquired and accumulated the critical stock piles necessary in the event of another war?

Mr. CAIN. I wish I could answer the Senator's question accurately, but I have absolutely no information on that question.

NSRB AS THE COORDINATING AGENCY

It is clear that Government will have failed to make its own contribution unless it correlates its own programs, procurement policies, contract policies, and manpower policies to a much greater degree than it is now equipped to do. The President must have available considered and integrated advice on all such policy issues, packed by adequate, current staff and statistical studies and formulated jointly by the major operating agencies. The National Security Resources Board was created in order to perform precisely this kind of job. It not only was created to perform that sort of job, but its Chairman is expected to be a man who is qualified in his own right to explain to the President of the United States what the Board has done.

I hope I shall not be misunderstood in suggesting why I thoroughly disagree with a particular point of view which was before the Senate Armed Services Committee on one of the days of their recent hearings, which were open to the public. I had raised against Mr. Wallgren a question which I thought to be legitimate. I wanted to know what his educational background was, in order that we might measure his attainments against the standards of the job. It became obvious as we went along that, for one reason or another, he had been required to leave school in his sophomore year in high school. There was nothing distressing about that, but I was looking into the record to determine if in subsequent years he had seen fit to go back to school to specialize in some lines of endeavor which would be helpful in making him competent for the chairmanship of the NSRB.

About that time a question was asked of Mr. Wallgren which went something like this: "Is it not true that your education in a formal sense is about comparable to that of the President of the United States?" The answer was obviously "Yes."

The second question was, "Do you not think that you have as much right to be selected to be the chairman of the NSRB as the President had to be elected by the people of the country to be the President?" Mr. Wallgren's answer went something like this: "That is the President's opinion." Someone was trying to make the point that because our President did not have an opportunity, perhaps—and I have not looked into that record—to go to college and do postgraduate work, and so forth, because he did not benefit from that particular type of trained education, it was perfectly proper that he should have as an adviser to him someone whose best recommendation was that he had not had any more opportunity than had the President to benefit from higher education. I take that premise to be undeniably wrong and false and seriously injurious to the future in which we all seek to live in peace and happiness.

If the President is lacking in any capacity of any character, but has attained his position because of his native intelligence, he ought to be the first to make certain that he seeks advice from no officer who is not infinitely better trained and qualified than is he. One of the resistances which many of us have to the appointment of the President's nominee is that it is a further step in Government by mediocrity, and we disapprove of it conclusively, and hope we always will.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. CAIN. I am pleased to yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Is it not entirely possible that a man appointed to this high position, even though he may have had very little experience with it to begin with, after he had held the job a while might learn the job by doing it, and gain the experience necessary properly to fulfill the job?

Mr. CAIN. Is the Senator referring specifically to this job?

Mr. LONG. Yes.

Mr. CAIN. I should say—and it is only my judgment; I may be mistaken—that it would be utterly and fantastically impossible to expect a person who was untrained—speaking of training in terms of the trained intellect—to fit into a place where he must deal competitively with the brains represented by the other members of the President's Cabinet, and, in his other capacity as a member of the National Security Council, deal with some of the foremost intellects of the country. Under any other circumstances, perhaps the Senator's premise would be correct; but in this particular instance I believe that a man must be possessed of administrative facility amounting almost to genius. That requirement is recognized by everyone who goes into the question. He must be possessed of a broad education which, roughly, would cover, on the basis of experience, some exposure to the fundamentals of the four agencies which, beyond the shadow of a doubt, will conduct the next war.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. CAIN. I am happy to yield for a further question.

Mr. LONG. Is it not entirely possible that a man without the experience which the Senator would require might surround himself with the proper advisers, whose knowledge would compensate for his lack of knowledge on the subject?

Mr. CAIN. I think there is much to be said for the Senator's position; but I shall attempt to answer his question from the chart before us. Whoever the Chairman of the NSRB is, he must, in a real sense, compete—if that is the proper word—with other members of the National Security Council, with every Cabinet member who sits as a member of the NSRB, and with the Secretary of Defense. If it is humanly possible, I believe that we ought to have as Chairman a man whose grasp of the required subjects is so concise and broad that he will be able to judge, in a reasonable and fair way, the requests, demands, aspirations, and desires of all the other agency heads with whom he works.

One of the things I have in mind is the following: Take, for example, a man for whom I have a very high regard, and who has recently left the Government service, or so we are told by the press, Mr. James Forrestal; or take, if you please, Mr. Symington, the Secretary of Air; or take, for example, Mr. Sullivan, the Secretary of the Navy; or take Mr. Royall, the Secretary of the Army. All four of those gentlemen sit on the National Security Council, and the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board also sits on that Council. Other Senators know as well as I do the competitive factors which are inherent in discussions between those military men. As the Chairman of the Board sits there, if he thinks one or the other of those military agencies is perhaps developing on the selfish side in the Board, he will have to be so able that he can require them to minimize their selfishness and, instead, act in furtherance of the national goal. It is not that they are actually so selfish, but it is really a question of whether each group tries to get more than its proper share of the national product for its own uses.

(At this point, Mr. CAIN, by unanimous consent, yielded to Mr. CONNALLY to report an original bill and submit a report, which appear under the appropriate heading at the conclusion of Mr. CAIN's speech.)

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, in the absence of a civilian agency capable of performing this current coordinating and regulating function, the failure to utilize the National Security Resources Board can lead to only one result: Inevitably it must lead to domination by the military over great areas in civilian and industrial life of the United States.

A moment ago the Senator from Louisiana wished to know whether an untrained man, such as I claim the President's nominee to be, could take over the job of Chairman of the National Security Resources Board and get along satisfactorily. I think the sentence I have just read shows that, if he cannot get along satisfactorily, the inevitable result will be that the military will take over functions in this country which properly, as the military well know, belong to and should be maintained by civilians.

An example of this is the powers conferred on the Secretary of Defense by the Selective Service Act of 1948, in respect to the allocation of steel. It is not the duty of the military to correlate military and civilian manpower needs; it is their duty to estimate the number of men required to fill their ranks. Theoretically, the selective-service systems are supposed to consider conflicting requirements, but they are inadequately equipped to do so.

The Munitions Board is under the duty of coordinating contracts so as to avoid conflict between the military programs themselves; it is not its duty to adjust these programs to the needs of the civilian economy, or even to such related programs as those of the Atomic Energy Commission or European Recovery.

The National Security Resources Board was created because of the acute realization of the limitations upon purely military planning, and of the lamentable consequences that must follow if there is nothing to balance large military demands on the Nation's resources. Yet, if the Board is not utilized, there will be no such balance wheel, and the national economy will be dominated in large part by the military.

LEARNING BY DOING

The idea that the Board can, in the midst of current problems and situations closely comparable in kind, if not in size, to those of an actual mobilization, simply sit down to the drawing of theoretical plans against a theoretical future, and yet still be adequate to the demands of that future, is patently fallacious. If the Board enjoys real responsibility, it can test procedures, improve its planning by experience, and establish close relations with the civilian and industrial agencies through which it would have to work in time of war.

It can learn to know the top personnel in private life upon whom it will have to call to staff the war agencies and attract many of them into its service, either as advisory consultants or as staff members. This would give the Board and its staff a body of experience and knowledge of personnel that would be of incalculable value in the event of war, and that might well reduce by months the time required to get an effective industrial mobilization into high gear.

Insofar as possible, the Board's research staff should be kept small. The fullest possible utilization of the facilities of existing Government departments and agencies should be accomplished.

MOBILIZATION PLANS MUST BE LIVING FACTS

From the negative point of view, the case is even clearer. If the Board is relegated purely to future problems, the results upon the Board structure itself are easily predictable and will certainly be lamentable. Top Cabinet officers are too busily preoccupied with the clamant present to give close attention to long-range planning; and under such circumstances the meetings of the Board members would be likely to become fewer and fewer, as well as less and less realistic. The Board's staff would be almost certain to drift off into a useless vacuum, isolated from the day-to-day issues of practical government out of which the future for which they should be planning would be growing, and the Board would be uncertain of both its responsibilities and its authority. However excellent its work, it would inevitably decline into a mere blueprint agency, with a certain by-product output of statistical material. As such, it would probably end up somewhere among the lower ranks of the present Presidential secretariat and staff agencies, with the value of the Board's own influential membership wasted.

The results of such an isolated approach were very clearly demonstrated in 1939 and 1940. Sound industrial mobilization plans were developed by the Army and Navy Munitions Board and were put, ready for use, in the pigeonholes—plans so good, indeed, that their salient features were ultimately adopted, after an enormous amount of time, energy, and perhaps human life had been wasted by disregarding them. The important question here is why they were disregarded. The basic reason was that the planning was divorced from the current political, industrial, psychological, and even governmental situations. Public opinion and its Representatives in Congress were reluctant to support the drastic measures the plans required. Even the industrial, agricultural, and labor leaders, on whose understanding and cooperation the plans depended, were unfamiliar with them or with the reasons behind them, and were often unconvinced of their correctness or of the necessity for resorting to them.

In another severe emergency one can expect a repetition of this situation unless the plans and planners are kept in close and continuous contact with the civilian life and economy for whose mobilization they are responsible.

The only way in which the indispensable contact between plan and public can ever really be maintained is by giving the planning agencies and staffs a genuine and significant responsibility in the day-to-day functioning of government and formulation of policy.

To date, the National Security Resources Board has failed to live up either to the congressional intention or to the urgent needs of the time. This is not wholly, by any means, the fault of the Board. Until the functions and purposes of the Board and its importance as a viable entity of government are appreciated by the top echelons of government, it cannot serve its purpose.

The Board has been entrusted with both current and future functions by the National Security Act, yet the demarcations between them apparently are not clear either to the Board itself or to those who should employ its services. There are indications that this concept is not understood, or perhaps not approved, in high circles. There is confusion among other departments and agencies as to the functions of the Board, and there are some evidences of departmental opposition to its activities. The danger is obvious; an outbreak of war tomorrow might again find us without a sound mobilization plan; we might once again be compelled to waste time, men, and money in the laborious process of evolving one after war had started. The National Security Resources Board must build the idea, and the business, of mobilization planning into a large number of interlocking Government agencies; it must not attempt to confine every detail of planning to itself. It must relate itself more closely to both industry and labor; it must bring representatives of both into its own and Munitions Board planning at an early stage.

But the Board will never be any stronger than the support it receives. Unless it is utilized, unless it is supported, it is a meaningless organization. It is completely clear that the head of this important Presidential staff agency must enjoy closest relations of mutual confidence with the Nation's Chief Executive. But it follows as day does the night that the confidence the President has in the Chairman must come from his and the country's knowledge that the Chairman is one of America's outstanding men, and that no one will ever have cause to question or doubt his character, competence, and capacity. On the basis of this standard, the President has no right to endow Mr. Wallgren with a vote of confidence, when a majority of all informed citizens will deny that Mr. Wallgren is suited to the chairmanship.

Mr. President, I have before me the testimony of Arthur M. Hill, first Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, who some weeks ago resigned. Let us bear in mind the agency was created by the Congress in 1947. Why should not this testimony become a part of the RECORD in order that we may become more familiar with the attitude of mind which guided Mr. Hill in the early days of his chairmanship of the Board? Mr. Hill was being questioned by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] in the hearings before the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, pursuant to Senate Resolution 46, adopted by the Eightieth Congress, first session. I refer to part 42 of the hearings. I shall read the question by the Senator from Michigan and the response by Mr. Hill:

Senator FERGUSON. I think it is interesting and valuable to the committee to know what we may have in mind for the future.

Mr. HILL. I would like to direct my testimony to the future. Later I will endeavor to answer any questions that the committee might have.

It seems to me that two salient factors stand out as the basis of any consideration of planning for our future security in the field of our natural and economic resources. The first lies in the nature and extent of the impact of war on our national life. The phrase "total war" has been used for many years. The United States has not, however, ever experienced a total war. To date the continental United States has not been subject to direct attack. It is also true in the degree to which the activities of a nation—governmental and private—become involved in and are essential to the support of a war effort.

We are prone to think that we were engaged in "total" mobilization during World War II. Actually our mobilization did not tax our resources to the greatest extent possible.

From war to war more types of weapons are used; they become larger in size and number, more mechanical, more scientific, and more complex. More man-hours, more machine-hours, more facilities, more raw materials are needed in their manufacture. The productive capacity on the home front to support the armed forces increases proportionally. The ratio of the men behind the guns to the men manning the guns is ever expanding. Consider in this respect the machine gun, which was one of the major weapons of World War I, and the B-29 bomber, one of the major weapons of World War II. Then project this comparison to the atomic bomb.

This accelerated development of weapons means for the future that, while there may be relatively less personnel in actual contact with the enemy, the armed forces will need in their service branches relatively larger numbers of men with more varied equipment in greater quantities to supply, maintain, and transport the actual fighting forces. In any future war the logistical problem of the armed forces will be larger and more complex than during World War II. The requirements of the armed forces will demand more from the home front—more industrial capacity, more materials, more machine tools, more agricultural production, greater utilization of the transportation system. In turn, this drain on the normal civilian economy will require more extensive organization of all civilian activities for war.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. CAIN. I am pleased to yield for a question.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wanted to inquire of the Senator, in connection with consideration of the problem, whether or not he had examined the evidence of Mr. Baruch, who, perhaps more than any other person, was responsible for the development of the whole idea of our industrial mobilization, as a result of his studies through the past 30 years, since the First World War?

Mr. CAIN. I may say to the Senator from Maine I have, with great and continuing interest, read his observations made before the committee of which the Senator from Michigan was chairman.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. CAIN. I am pleased to yield for a question only.

Mr. BREWSTER. That was covered very extensively. I wondered whether or not the Senator had had his attention drawn to the testimony at the time Bernard Baruch, Mr. Forrestal, and various men who had charge of procurement during the World War, including Mr. Louis Johnson, who has just now been named as Secretary of National Defense, were all testifying. Has the Senator ever had occasion to examine the so-called Stettinius report?

Mr. CAIN. I think the answer to that question is "No." I have read the testimony, to which the Senator has referred of Mr. Baruch, Mr. Forrestal, Mr. Johnson, and others.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. CAIN. I am pleased to yield for a question.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to invite the attention of the Senator to the so-called Stettinius report which followed the Johnson industrial mobilization report of 1938, I believe, and was the result of a committee appointed by the President before our entry into the war, but, as I recall, after the European nations were at war, in connection with which the question was examined very carefully. If the Senator has examined the record, he has found that the President did not feel it prudent to publish the report during the war, because of its impact on defense, but following the war President Truman furnished it to the War Investigating Committee. If the Senator will examine that report, I think he will find it to have a very substantial bearing. Will the Senator say whether or not he has had his attention directed to the discussion of that report in the various hearings before the War Investigating Committee, of which Mr. Truman was chairman both during the war and at its conclusion?

Mr. CAIN. So far as I have had time to do it, I have read all the testimony taken by the War Investigating Committee during the several years I have been in the Senate. Time simply has not as yet permitted me to do as I should like, which is to study carefully all the testimony taken during and shortly after the war.

But, on the basis of what I have had an opportunity to read and study, I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Maine that because of what has been so well established in the testimony, we must be extremely careful and, in fact, completely certain that the man whose nomination we confirm as Chairman of the National Security Resources Board shall be an individual suited by competence, character, and integrity to the responsibilities he seeks to assume.

Mr. Hill continued:

I do not profess to know exactly what the weapons of war will be 10 or 20 years from now. It is my belief, however, that, regardless of what they will be, a type of warfare which involves only a relatively small number of people in the war effort and a relatively small part of civilian production is very unlikely. If experience is any criterion, the whole trend of war is toward greater and greater national effort in every field of human activity. Modern wars are fought not simply by the armed forces but by the totality of a country's organized resources.

The second basic factor in connection with industrial support of the Military Establishment is that of timing. In both World Wars I and II we had time to organize our war production in relative safety. With the probably increased range of future weapons and with the knowledge that the United States has been the decisive factor in two world wars, there is little likelihood that we will be granted such a respite again.

This means two things for us in the future. First, that we must have available definite and immediately workable plans for organizing our entire Government and our entire national life on short notice for war. Secondly, and more importantly, it also means that everything substantive which cannot be done promptly after the outbreak of war must be in a state of readiness ahead of time. For example, in any future war we cannot take the time that we took during World War II to build synthetic rubber plants. The lead time in the manufacture of fighting aircraft is about 2 years. We cannot afford to wait 2 years after the outbreak of war for mass production of aircraft.

Success in modern war depends upon the timely and comprehensive mobilization of a nation's resources. This is the basic factor. Without it, our Army, Navy, and Air Force are impotent.

The National Defense Act of 1947 recognizes the need for better planning and coordination than experienced in World War II in the utilization of our resources for any possible future war. In furtherance of these points, the act established the National Security Council, over which the President presides, to coordinate our foreign, domestic, and military problems. It integrated the Army, Navy, and Air Force into the National Military Establishment under the Secretary of Defense.

It also created the National Security Resources Board. The Board is composed of the Chairman, appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, and such heads or representatives of the various executive departments and independent agencies as may be from time to time designated by the President to serve as members. To secure coordination at the highest level, the Chairman of the National Securities Resources Board is also a member of the National Security Council, by law.

The function of the Board under the act is to advise the President concerning the coordination of military, industrial, and civilian mobilization. Supplementary to this broad statement, the act goes on to include certain items within the purview of the Board.

As these items have already been stated for the RECORD, I shall not again read them at this point.

The National Security Resources Board is not a part of the National Military Establishment but is an independent agency responsible directly to the President. It is a civilian agency. This provision of the act makes clear that the planning for the utilization of our economy in time of war is primarily a civil and not a military responsibility.

Civilian direction of the economy in wartime is essential in view of the democratic traditions and the organization of the American economy, which, under our great free enterprise system, will, in the final analysis, always be called upon to produce the munitions and weapons for the common defense in the event of war. The Board is visualized under the act as the President's principal channel of advice on matters concerning the state of the country's readiness in the field of economic preparedness.

Of course, the armed services must necessarily participate in the military aspects of industrial mobilization. Machinery for this participation is provided for in the act.

The Munitions Board, which is a part of the National Military Establishment under the Secretary of Defense, is charged in the act with three important functions:

(1) To coordinate and supervise procurement, production, and distribution, within the National Military Establishment;

(2) To plan for the military aspects of industrial mobilization; and

(3) To prepare material and personnel requirements to meet military needs.

The respective roles and responsibilities of the National Security Resources Board and the Munitions Board are thus clearly established.

You will appreciate, I am sure, the fact that I have only recently been appointed Chairman of the Board. Since my appointment in September, I have been actively

engaged in studying the problems involved in getting under way. In this connection, this series of hearings has been most instructive and helpful.

Mr. President, at this point let me say that Mr. Hill, whom I do not know, who was the first Chairman of the Board, in his very competent testimony said that from the moment of his appointment he had been studying his job with all seriousness. I do not think it should be forgotten that when a similar question as to what he knew about the job was posed to the individual who seeks it now, he merely said he thought it would be presumptuous of him to raise any questions of any character regarding the job until he had been confirmed in that portfolio. That was a concrete example of Rome burning while important work remained to be done.

I come back again to the question of competence, because, to me, it was utterly impossible for a man who was serious-minded regarding an important job to sit before a qualified committee of the United States Senate and give evidence of the fact that he not only had little knowledge of the job he sought but had no curiosity concerning the details of the portfolio, and would not have until he was actually ensconced in administrative charge.

I read further from Mr. Hill's testimony:

I wish at this time that I could present specific ideas of how the Board will operate. Considerable study is necessary before the Board's administrative machinery can be set up on a sound basis.

As provided in the National Security Act, we expect to make full use of all of the appropriate departments and agencies of the Government to carry on investigations, undertake studies, and prepare policies and plans for the consideration of the Board. Mobilization planning has of necessity become a function of the entire Government. The Board is the focal point for such planning.

The best brains in the country are none too many to solve all the complicated problems involved in the duties of the Board. We expect to draw on the wealth of experience resulting from World War II. The reports and records of the numerous hearings of this committee will be of great value to the work of the Board.

Mr. President, I should like to go back to the first sentence in that paragraph:

The best brains in the country are none too many to solve all the complicated problems involved in the duties of the war.

The chief and primary criticism of the President's nominee is that the President has recommended, for the Senate to confirm, an individual who, regardless of the merits and virtues he may possess, is not acknowledged by any one, to my knowledge, as being among the best brains in this country.

We expect to make the maximum use of the universities, research institutions, engineering and management firms, professional societies, management, labor, and consumer organizations, and private industries. We expect to make wide use of consultants from all the fields of specialization of interest to the Board.

The Board will require a staff to plan the program of work of the Board, review and integrate the materials received from agencies within and without the Government, and prepare plans and recommendations for the consideration and approval of the Board proper and transmittal to the President. We are trying to find for our staff the best possible career Government employees. The permanent staff, which will give continuity to the work, must be supplemented by men of outstanding capabilities from private life who should serve full time on a rotating basis or in an advisory or part-time capacity. This will lead to a roster of men familiar with mobilization plans, who can be called upon to fill key positions in an emergency.

Our immediate objectives are to determine the procedure which will best fit the functions assigned to the Board by the act, to organize and secure the personnel for the staff of the Board and to secure the cooperation and assistance of all appropriate agencies within and without the Government.

As I see it now, the end results of the work of the National Security Resources Board fall in three major categories. We must determine the status of our national resources in terms of materials, industrial plant, manpower, and the other essential factors of our economic life. We must also determine the essential wartime civilian requirements divided as between minimum consumer needs and the necessities for the maintenance and development of our industrial system. The total requirements, both civilian and military, must then be compared with the estimated total potential supply.

This leads to our second major responsibility, that of continuously reviewing current problems in the light of our economic readiness for a possible war. Such a review will undoubtedly result in recommendations to the President on specific actions to be taken to overcome existing shortages prior to the outbreak of any possible war. Stock piling of critical and strategic materials and preservation of our synthetic-rubber plants are cases in point. This is an immediate responsibility of the Board to determine those things that need to be done now, to keep us strong and insure our security.

Thirdly, it is incumbent upon the National Security Resources Board to develop comprehensive and detailed plans to cover the administrative machinery, that is, the policies, regulations, organizations, systems, and procedures that would be necessary in case of war to effectively channel and control production for the war effort and at the same time protect to the maximum possible extent our civilian economy. These plans would cover the entire field of the emergency agencies of World War II, such as Office of War Mobilization, War Production Board, Office of Defense Transportation, Office of Price Administration, Bureau of Economic Warfare, and War Shipping Administration. Such plans must necessarily be based on many intangibles and assumptions. They must be flexible and kept up to date.

The view has often been expressed that a democratic type of government such as ours is at a disadvantage in modern war. I do not share that view. A comparison of the American and German experience in World War II discredits any such theory. The only disadvantage that a democracy has in a modern war is that of the initiative—a disadvantage which we must overcome by the type of planning which I have been discussing.

To point the economy of an industrial state into total war is an enormous and complex undertaking. No one man or group of men can solve the problems involved. It can only be done with maximum effectiveness through the cooperative efforts of those engaged in all phases of national life: government, industry, agriculture, and labor. It is in that spirit that we are approaching the important task for national security which has been assigned to the National Security Resources Board.

Mr. President, all afternoon I have been trying as best I could to lay before the Senate in a documented way the duties, the functions, and the responsibilities of the National Security Resources Board, in order that all Senators who have not previously been familiar with those topics—and most Senators have not been—will be given an opportunity to study the NSRB from the record, and, against that record and against that study, will then, I think for the first time, qualify themselves to determine the right, from the standpoint of qualifications, of the President's nominee to become the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, and the American people generally—for they ought to be held in high regard—will begin to understand what previously they have known nothing about, the National Security Resources Board and the National Security Council, which were designed by the Eightieth Congress in order to make as certain as legislation could that free people will live in the world of tomorrow.

Mr. President, what I have just concluded reading from has been what I conceive to be competent testimony submitted by a competent American who for a period of some months operated as the first Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. I had another reason for using this testimony. It was because I hoped that Senators concerned with this confirmation problem would contrast the legitimacy and the substance of the testimony of Arthur M. Hill with the inadequate testimony on the same subject submitted recently before the Senate Armed Services Committee by the President's choice to take the place of Mr. Arthur M. Hill, who has so recently resigned as Chairman.

Mr. President, though it will take a little time, which at this hour of the day obviously concerns me more, I think, than it does anyone else, I wish to discuss the National Security Council, where it came from and what it is designed to do. There is only one justification for taking the time of the Senate to engage in such a discussion; it is for the reason that I cannot myself ever get away from the fact that we are not being asked to appoint the President's nominee solely to the chairmanship of the National Security Resources Board but we always must confront his activities on the National Security Council, of which he becomes a member by automatic appointment resulting from his chairmanship of the NSRB.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington is most pleased to yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Oregon is correct, is he not, that the Senator from Washington is opposed to the appointment of Governor Wallgren to the position of Chairman of the National Security Resources Board?

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Oregon has been correctly informed.

Mr. MORSE. Is the junior Senator from Oregon correct that one of the reasons why the Senator from Washington

is opposed to the appointment is that he believes that the duties involved in the appointment are of such vital concern to the security of our Nation that this particular nominee should not be appointed because, in the opinion of the Senator from Washington, he is lacking in the necessary qualification of competence?

Mr. CAIN. In the considered opinion of the junior Senator from Washington the lack of competence is but one of the defects.

Mr. MORSE. It is one?

Mr. CAIN. One, and a major one.

Mr. MORSE. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Washington is opposed also to the appointment because he believes that the former Governor of Washington does not have the technical background in his training that the Senator from Washington believes to be a prerequisite to this particular appointment?

Mr. CAIN. I should like to answer the Senator's question, if I may, in a more general way, by saying that I have found nothing in the nominee's background which indicates that he has benefited sufficiently from any technical knowledge or competence; that he is singularly lacking in almost the mechanical requirements demanded by a unique and important national job of this sort.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Washington take the position that the former Governor of Washington, Mr. Wallgren, should not be appointed to any Federal position?

Mr. CAIN. When the Senate Armed Services Committee first permitted me to appear before it, I remember saying in substance—I cannot remember precisely the words—that the President's nominee could have been nominated by the President to any of a score of positions on other Government agencies, bureaus, and commissions, and his appointment to any such position would not have been objected to by the Senator from Washington. I wanted to make myself very plain on that question, and I am most happy that the Senator from Oregon has seen fit to ask me that question.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I cannot hear the Senator from Washington. May we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). The Senate will be in order.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator from Washington yield for a few more questions?

Mr. CAIN. I think my rights can only be protected if we take the questions one at a time.

Mr. MORSE. I mean a few more questions, one at a time.

Mr. CAIN. Indeed. The Senator from Washington would be most pleased to yield for a question only. I merely want to be certain that my floor rights are maintained.

Mr. MORSE. Is the junior Senator from Oregon correct then in his understanding that the opposition of the distinguished junior Senator from Washington to Mr. Wallgren is not based upon any attempt on the part of the Senator from Washington to prevent Mr. Wallgren from being appointed to any Federal job, but only to this particular Federal job?

Mr. CAIN. There may be other Federal jobs to which the President might appoint Mr. Wallgren to which appointment I would take exception. I am taking vigorous exception to his appointment to this job, but I conceive that there are many jobs to which the President might appoint the gentleman in question and I certainly would raise no objection.

Mr. MORSE. May I ask the Senator from Washington then, in view of the answer he has just given me, whether I am correct in the conclusion that the Senator from Washington is not objecting to this confirmation on the basis of any political opposition that may have existed at one time in the State of Washington between the junior Senator from Washington and the former Governor of Washington, Mr. Wallgren?

Mr. CAIN. I may say to the junior Senator from Oregon in that connection that it was 9 years ago the 12th of this month that I was elected to the mayor's office in Tacoma, Wash., as the junior Senator from Oregon knows. I think it is a perfectly honest and accurate statement to make that until such time as I signified my intention of opposing Mr. Wallgren's confirmation for the chairmanship of the National Security Resources Board I had never under any circumstances or for any reason ever mentioned his name in public in my political career. There has never in the past, as between Mr. Wallgren and myself, been any association of any kind, character, or description.

Prior to the time the junior Senator from Oregon came into the Senate Chamber, I reviewed, at the beginning, what I conceived to be the weaknesses in my case, one of which was that it was said the junior Senator from Washington was ungrateful because the then Governor of the State of Washington had appointed HARRY CAIN to a short term in the United States Senate. I said that is true, but even in that instance there had been no conversation between the Governor of the State of Washington and the Senator-elect from the State of Washington. I said I supposed the reason for his appointment of myself was that his predecessor, when the situation was reversed, had made a comparable appointment. But there had been no political contest, if I understood the question asked by the Senator from Oregon correctly, between Mr. Wallgren and myself.

Mr. MORSE. Did the Senator from Washington, in the answer he just gave, or the comments he just made, mean HARRY CAIN or Hugh Mitchell?

Mr. CAIN. No; I meant HARRY CAIN.

Mr. MORSE. HARRY CAIN.

Mr. CAIN. This is rather important, if I may be permitted to answer a part of the Senator's question in this way. It has been said in and around the Senate in recent days, and it has come to my attention—such things always do; whatever is said becomes common information—that Senator HARRY CAIN is acting not quite properly; that he ought to be more grateful; he ought to remember that Mr. Wallgren, when he was the Governor of the State of Washington, appointed HARRY CAIN to a short term in the Senate, which was, I think, for about a week; the inference being that the appointment was made because of some association between Mr. Wallgren and myself. It was not so.

Homer Bone once sat in the United States Senate. As I recall, he was not very well during the latter part of his term as Senator. He resigned from the Senate, or left the Senate and became a circuit judge, as I recall, in a western judicial district. At the time of his departure from the Senate, if I am not mistaken, my senior colleague [Mr. MAGNUSON], then a Member of the House of Representatives, ran for the United States Senate and was elected. And again, if I am not mistaken, the then Governor of the State of Washington, Arthur B. Langlie, a Republican, quite logically appointed Mr. WARREN G. MAGNUSON to the short term in the United States Senate.

Some 4 years later the shoe was on the other foot, one might say, politically. Mr. Wallgren appointed me on the 26th day of December 1946 to the United States Senate, but perhaps it is the only case on record where one who was appointed to a short term or longer term of the United States Senate by any governor, had no association of any kind, character, or description with that governor.

Mr. MORSE. At the time of that appointment was the Senator who now has the floor Senator-elect.

Mr. CAIN. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Washington is aware, is he not, that the newspapers in recent days have carried stories to the effect that the President of the United States has characterized the opposition of the junior Senator from Washington to Mr. Wallgren as mere Washington politics?

Mr. CAIN. Yes; and prior to the time the Senator came in, some several hours ago, I did my very best to acknowledge the President's remarks. I said, "Sir, it was unfair, it was unreasonable, it was careless, it meant nothing. It could not be true." And I told why. But I said there were some serious charges preferred against Mr. Wallgren. The President has not acknowledged those. But the nominee himself, against whom I have preferred those charges, must be cleared of those charges, else he will carry them with him for a very long time. I thought the President, in fact, Sir, would rather not answer the substance of my charges or my letter which I wrote to him as a covering letter to a statement which I filed with the Armed Services Committee a week ago last Monday. But then I went on to suggest several hours ago that if this had been a political fight between Mr. Wallgren and myself in the State of Washington, it would have necessarily followed, would it not, that my senior colleague, who sits in this Chamber now, and who has been closely associated and affiliated with Mr. Wallgren for some years, would, during the hearings, have risen either in opposition to my assertions or in vigorous support of the President's nominee. I say that to the President. There is no political fight in the State of Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. CAIN. I am delighted to yield for a question only.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I merely wish to disabuse my colleague's mind. I expect at the proper time to make known my views on this nomination, and I conceive the proper time to be when the nomination is before the United States Senate for confirmation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAIN. No; I wish to reflect on the observation of my colleague. It is for every Senator to determine, on every public question, what he thinks is the proper time and place. Certainly members of the Armed Services Committee, who for a period of 10 days or 2 weeks held open hearings, conceived that that was the proper time for people to make their comments known. I conceive that this afternoon is the proper time for me to speak. If my senior colleague sees fit to regard the proper time as some future date, I can only say that every Senator must be the judge of his own positions.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator have at his desk a copy of the transcript of the record of the Armed Services Committee hearings on the Wallgren nomination?

Mr. CAIN. The transcript is in my office. I do not have it at my desk on the floor of the Senate. I shall be pleased to send for it if the Senator from Oregon wishes.

Mr. MORSE. Can the Senator advise me whether or not he expects to be still speaking at the end of the period of time which would be required to send a messenger to his office to get the transcript of the record?

Mr. CAIN. Indeed so.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator intends to speak for some time, I wish he would get the transcript of the record, because I should like to ask him a few questions about some of its contents.

Mr. CAIN. I shall be pleased to do so.

Mr. President, I believe that a historical review covering the National Security Council will bring illumination to many on a subject on which they have previously known very little.

If the National Security Council—sometimes referred to as NSC—can be said to have had any statutory predecessor of comparable character in our recent governmental history, it must be found in an organization known as the National Defense Council. This was an advisory body, provided for in a clause of the Army Appropriation Act of 1916. Its members were the Secretaries of War, Navy, Interior, Labor, Agriculture, and Commerce, its responsibility to coordinate industry and the national resources for national security. The National Defense Council obviously was patterned after the British Committe of Imperial Defense, established in 1904, following and as a result of the Boer War, which now has been succeeded in present British defense by the Defence Committee. The National Defense Council of 1916 did not include the Secretary of State. Its responsibilities related to the mobilization of the national economy. It was not charged with responsibility for coordinating military policy and foreign policy. The Council itself met only a few times and soon fell into disuse. There emerged from World War I, then, no organization dedicated to the coordination of our foreign policy and our military policy. Prior to and during World War II, the Secretaries of State, War, and the Navy sometimes met in what was referred to as the Committee of Three. The President, the same Secretaries, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, and sometimes the Chief of the Army Air Forces, met to consult on questions of national strategy; these meetings were sometimes referred to as a war council or war cabinet. During the years 1945–47, the Committee of Three, consisting of the Secretaries of State, War, and the Navy, and existing simply by their joint agreement, met informally each week to coordinate matters of common interest. All these groups were informal. They had no regular staff or secretariat.

In 1944, the State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee was formed by interdepartmental agreement. This committee, known as SWNCC (and so referred to hereinafter), was composed of the Assistant Secretaries of State, War, and Navy for Air, and was to "reconcile and coordinate the action to be taken by the State, War, and Navy Departments on matters of common interest, and under the guidance of the Secretaries of State, War, and the Navy, establish policies on politico-military questions referred to it."

The committee served to bring the State Department and the military departments together on the level of Assistant Secretaries. SWNCC accomplished something on the interdepartmental level, but suffered from certain weaknesses, which in summary, were: First, it was not organized on the highest level; the heads of departments did not themselves compose the committee; second, it did not have sufficiently broad powers; third, it did not have a sufficiently large or permanent secretariat. The Eberstadt report, therefore, recommended the establishment by statute of a National Security Council, which, to quote from that report "would be the keystone of our organizational structure for national security affording a permanent vehicle for maintaining active, close, and continuous contact between the departments and agencies of our Government responsible, respectively, for our foreign and military policies and their implementation."

I should like to go back to the first sentence again. The National Security Council "would be the keystone of our organizational structure for national security."

If Mr. Wallgren is beyond question one of the half dozen or small group of outstanding persons in this country, then America would benefit from his membership on the National Security Council, which is to be the keystone of the American organizational structure for national security. But if he is not—as in fact will be proved—it would be only a great disservice to him, to our President, and to this Nation were his nomination to be confirmed.

The National Security Council would be a policy forming and advisory, not an executive body.

Specific recommendations in the report contemplated that this proposed Council—hereinafter generally referred to as NSC or the Council—would take over the functions then performed by SWNCC. However, 2 months after NSC was established by the National Security Act of 1947, provisional terms of reference were approved reconstituting SWNCC as the State-Army-Navy-Air Force Coordinating Committee, known as SANACC—and so referred to hereinafter—which committee, with reduced jurisdiction, is still functioning on a provisional basis.

Neither the Committee of Three nor SWNCC can be regarded as NSC's forebear in our national security organization.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I am pleased to yield for a question only.

Mr. MORSE. Would the Senator yield to permit me to ask unanimous consent for a quorum call, with the understanding that it would in no way affect the Senator's rights on the floor?

Mr. CAIN. If the Senator from Oregon will permit me to consult the present distinguished occupant of the chair, or if I may yield without jeopardizing my rights, I shall be very pleased to accommodate the Senator's request.

Mr. MORSE. That is the basis of my request.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for a quorum call without in any way affecting the rights of the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the earlier committees were, unlike the National Security Council, not statutory; the level of membership is different; neither of the earlier committees served as an advisory body to the President. Thus, the National Security Council, as established by the National Security Act of 1947, may properly be regarded as a new agency, which began life in September 1947. Judgments as to its effectiveness must, therefore, be tempered by considerations of its youth, its lack of tradition, of established procedures, and of continuity of personnel.

II. THE ORGANIZATION

The members of the National Security Council are, by statute, the President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, the

Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, and the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board.

As additional members, the President may designate the Secretaries of the executive departments, the Chairman of the Munitions Board, and the Chairman of the Research and Development Board. At its first meeting the Council recommended, and the President approved the recommendation, that the permanent membership of the Council be confined to the mandatory members under the act. Other authorized officials were, however, to be invited to sit as members when agenda items in which they had a substantial interest or responsibility were before the Council. The Director of the Central Intelligence Agency attends all meetings as an observer and adviser.

The basic function of the Council, in the words of the act is—

To advise the President with respect to the integration of domestic, foreign, and military policies relating to the national security so as to enable the military services and the other departments and agencies of the Government to cooperate more effectively in matters involving the national security. (Title I, sec. 101 (a), Public Law 253, 80th Cong.)

The act then provides, in general terms, for the performance by the Council of other functions, as directed by the President—the objective, the coordination of national security policies and functions. Specifically, the act prescribes it to be the duty of the Council:

(1) To assess and appraise the objectives, commitments, and risks of the United States in relation to our actual and potential military power, in the interest of national security, for the purpose of making recommendations to the President in connection therewith; and

(2) To consider policies on matters of common interest to the departments and agencies of the Government concerned with the national security, and to make recommendations to the President in connection therewith. (Title I, sec. 101 (b), Public Law 253, 80th Cong.)

There is also a general clause to the effect that the Council shall make such recommendations and other reports to the President as it deems appropriate or as the President may require.

A further activity of NSC concerns the Central Intelligence Agency, generally referred to as CIA, which, by the same act, was established under the Council. The CIA's specified duties include, in general terms, advice and recommendations to the Council and other services of a similar nature, as directed by the Council, for the declared purpose of "coordinatnig the intelligence activities of the several Government departments and agencies in the interest of national security." The CIA is the direct descendant of the Central Intelligence Group, which was established by Presidential directive, dated January 22, 1946, and inherited the personnel, property, and records of that agency. This agency, with its superior, the National Intelligence Authority, went out of existence when the Director of Central Intelligence took office under the National Security Act of 1947. All the directives of the National Intelligence Authority have been revised by the National Security Council, and the Council has issued, to date, nine new directives. To the members of the Council, to its consultants, those within the operating procedure of the Council, to be more fully described below, to the chief planners in all departments and agencies, and to all intelligence chiefs, the Central Intelligence Agency furnishes daily reports of intelligence data, a weekly summary, and a more formal monthly review of the world situation.

The Council's staff, as prescribed by the act, is headed by a civilian Executive Secretary, appointed by the President. Under the Executive Secretary are two Assistant Executive Secretaries. The permanent employees at the present time, including these officers, number 14; their annual base salaries amount to $68,864. The organization chart indicates that there are two classes of consultants: NSC consultants, men in Government positions who function within the internal-operating procedure of the Council, and those known as special consultants. Special consultants, highly qualified persons who are not regularly in the Government service, may be employed by the Council, from time to time, on a temporary basis, and for a specific purpose. In its first year of life, the Council has, under this plan, utilized the services of one expert in an oil-policy case, and employed a former member of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to make a study of the internal security of the United States. This report has been completed and the employee has become permanent, at an annual salary of $9,975, as a specialist in internal security. The Council is also currently employing, as special consultants, a group of six persons engaged in making a survey of, and report on, the Central Intelligence Agency and its relations with other Federal intelligence organizations concerned with the national security. These special consultants began work in February 1948. Their report must be submitted to the Council by January 1, 1949. The total expenditure for this project to July 20, 1948, amounted to $7,731.

Mr. President, I now ask consent to have the organization chart of the National Security Council printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ORGANIZATION CHART OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

The President.

National Security Council.—Central Intelligence Agency: The President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, the Chairman, National Security Resources Board, and as designated by the President, the Secretaries of the other executive departments, the Chairman of the Munitions Board and the Chairman of the Research and Development Board. Committees or boards (which may be established under the National Security Council). Reports special consultants (who may be employed by the National Security Council for special surveys or projects). NSC consultants (chief operational or policy planners designated by the respective NSC members to advise and assist the Executive Secretary). Executive Secretary. Arrangements and assistants.

National Security Council Staff: Secretariat (headed by an Assistant Executive Secretary and charged with performing necessary secretariat functions for the NSC, such as circulating papers, preparing agenda, arranging meetings, maintaining files, handling correspondence, etc.) Staff (headed by a Coordinator designated by the Secretary of State, composed of members both detailed from participating Departments and Agencies and employed by NSC, and charged with developing a program and arranging for the preparation of studies and recommendations for consideration by the Council).

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the Council's budget requirement for salaries and expenses for the fiscal year 1949 is $200,000. As this will be the Council's first full year of operation, no valid comparisons with the past are possible. The Council has, for the present, adequate office space and physical facilities in the old State building, and occupies no property under private lease. Administrative services for the Council are furnished by the facilities of the Central Intelligence Agency. The Council has authorized the employment of 10 persons as secretariat personnel to assist the executive secretary in reviewing and circulating papers, preparing agenda, recording and filing minutes, and so forth. At present, nine are employed for this purpose.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAIN. I shall be most pleased to yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Do I correctly understand that the budget for the coming year for the National Security Resources Board is only $200,000, or is that the budget for only one of the agencies of the board to which the Senator from Washington is referring?

Mr. CAIN. It does not happen to be either one. That is the budget requirement for the National Security Council, not the National Security Resources Board, which in the fiscal year 1949 has an administrative budget, as I recall, of $3,000,000, as opposed to a budget of $200,000 for the National Security Council, to which I have just referred.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. CAIN. I am pleased to yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Does the budget of $200,000 include the budget for the Central Intelligence Agency, which, according to the chart now before us, is an agency with functions under the National Security Council?

Mr. CAIN. I ask the distinguished Senator from Louisiana to permit me to obtain for him an answer to that question, for I can only assume that the Central Intelligency Agency of necessity would have its own administrative budget, as differentiated from that of the National Security Council itself. However, I cannot accurately answer that question now. I shall be very happy to obtain an answer to the question.

Mr. President, the so-called staff members of the Council's staff prepare the reports that the Council is to consider in performing the first of its specified duties previously referred to. In order that

these reports may be given broad consideration and in order that different points of view may be represented in their preparation, the present Executive Secretary decided not to confine the staff members to permanent employees of the Council, who might soon lose touch with realities. Nor did he deem it wise to draw these members solely from the staffs of the several departments and the Agency represented on the Council, since turn-over of such members might well result in loss of continuity and consistent policies. The aim, therefore, was a group composed of both types.

For what may be termed its own permanent career personnel, the Council seeks to employ individuals who have proven themselves outstanding students and analysts of world affairs, and who will thus bring to the staff a national, rather than a departmental, view. The number planned for this group, including necessary research analysts and clerical personnel, is 20. At the present time the Council employs five.

Each department and the Agency represented on the Council, except the Office of the Secretary of Defense—that is, the Departments of State, Army, Navy, Air Force, and the National Security Resources Board—were requested by the Council to assign one or more of their own staffs, with necessary alternates, for a 2-year tour of duty as staff members of the Council. Since the Department of State is chiefly responsible for our foreign objectives, commitments, and risks, the presiding officer of this group is at present a Foreign Service officer, class 1, from the State Department. He is known as Staff Coordinator; actually he sits as a presiding officer, and does not directly represent the State Department. One of the Council's permanent staff members acts as assistant to the Coordinator. The other members of this working staff are composed of a representative from the State Department, a representative and alternate—the alternates do not take part in the discussions—from the Department of the Army, one from the Department of the Navy, a representative and alternate from the Department of the Air Force, and one from the National Security Resources Board. From the Central Intelligence Agency there are detailed a representative and his alternate to attend meetings of the staff members—the staff members including the Staff Coordinator, No. 10.

The actual work of the Council operates through three tiers or levels, the staff members being the first level.

Here the actual breaking of ground begins. Here the paper that eventually takes the form of a report to the President is usually initiated. The second level is that of the NSC consultants. These compose another group who play an important part in the Council's work. Each report or paper that emerges from the staff members' level, having received final treatment there, is then submitted to the five NSC consultants for further consideration and action thereon by them. In this intermediate level each of the departments (and the agency member) is represented by a consultant, so delegated because his special duty within his own department or agency is in the planning and/or operations branch. This special duty qualifies him, ex officio, as an NSC consultant, and he continues to act in this capacity for the Council until relieved of that duty. Thus, the NSC consultants are: Director, Policy Planning Staff, State Department; Director of Plans and Operations, Army; Deputy Chief of Naval Operations; Deputy Chief of Staff, Operations (Air); Chief, Plans Branch, National Security Resources Board.

The third or top level in the Council's structure is found in the members of the Council itself.

III. OPERATING PROCEDURE

The Council's end-product, labeled "Report of National Security Council"—the form the "recommendation to the President" contemplated by the act takes in practice—may stem in its beginnings from many different sources. In the short history of the Council the large majority of papers have been initiated by members of the Council itself. The State Department has been responsible for a number, as have the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Army. Appropriate questions of policy may also come to the Council from the President, from other departments, agencies, or committees, such as SANACC, for example, and from the Council's own staff members. In some cases, matters under consideration by SANACC may be taken over by the Council on the ground that they are questions of top-level policy.

After a matter has been submitted to the Council, the Executive Secretary decides whether or not it is, within the purview of the act, an appropriate subject for the Council to consider. Does the matter concern the national security, and, if so, should recommendations be made to the President with respect to it?

One of the most important duties of the Executive Secretary is to act as screen for all subject matter referred to the Council. The Council itself, however, has, of course, final decision as to what matters it wishes to consider. If the Executive Secretary decides that the subject is within the Council's jurisdiction, the matter is then taken under consideration by the staff members who, for this purpose, meet on an average of three or four times a week, generally for an entire afternoon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. CAIN. I am glad to yield to the Senator for a question only.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Washington now have before him the transcript of hearings before the Armed Services Committee?

Mr. CAIN. I have, indeed.

Mr. MORSE. Could the Senator turn to that volume of the transcript which contains the testimony of Mr. Wallgren in regard to the appointment of Mr. Coughlan as a member of the Social Welfare Board of Washington?

Mr. CAIN. May I ask a question of the Presiding Officer? I am obviously desirous of accommodating the wish of the junior Senator from Oregon. But I am not prepared to say I can immediately find the answer to his question. I wonder if it is proper for me in standing here to take whatever time is necessary to establish an answer to the Senator's question? I should like to do it, but I want to be most certain, if I may say so, that I am not imposing on the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair suggests the Senator have one of his assistants look up the reference while he continues with his own speech, until it is found.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield for a question, while his assistant looks up the reference I should like to have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. CAIN. If I remember, the Senator from Oregon asked whether we could find the testimony covering Mr. Wallgren's reference to Coughlan as a member of the social-security bureau or commission of the State of Washington.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. CAIN. I am pleased to yield for a question only.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator recall in the testimony of the former Governor of Washington, Mr. Wallgren, in regard to the appointment of Mr. Coughlan to the social welfare board, I think it was——

Mr. CAIN. I think the name of it is Social Security Committee of the Public Welfare Bureau of the State of Washington.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Washington recall that in the course of his testimony the Governor from Washington said something to the effect that there is in the State of Washington or was in the State of Washington an organization of old people known as a pension union?

Mr. CAIN. The old-age pension group was what Mr. Wallgren referred to.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Washington recall that in his testimony the former Governor of Washington, Mr. Wallgren, said the old people in the pension union had been beseeching him to appoint one of their members, or one friendly to their interests, to a position on the Social Security Welfare Board of the State of Washington?

Mr. CAIN. That was Mr Wallgren's testimony, as I recall it; certainly in substance.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Washington recall that Mr. Wallgren, the former Governor of Washington, the nominee involved in the confirmation today, said in effect that Mr. Coughlan was counsel of the pension union?

Mr. CAIN. I think Mr. Wallgren said Mr. Coughlan was the local representative of the old-age pension group, and that he had been selected for membership on the social-security committee of the State "as a sop to the old people."

I think that was the phrase Mr. Wallgren used.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator from Washington have one of his assistants find in the transcript the exact reference setting forth the language which Mr. Wallgren used in his testimony when he said, in effect, that he had made that appointment as a sop to the old people of Washington? Will the Senator from Washington, when his assistant finds that reference, read it in detail, including Mr. Wallgren's testimony, some paragraphs before and some paragraphs following, so that the junior Senator from Oregon may question the Senator from Washington further in regard to his interpretation of the implications of the testimony of the former Governor of Washington?

Mr. CAIN. I think a member of my staff, I will say to the junior Senator from Oregon, will very soon have the references in which the Senator has evidenced interest, and as soon as they are available I should like to call them to the Senator's attention.

In the meantime, I shall continue with my prepared discussion of some of the functions and the history of the National Security Council.

The staff members from the departments and the National Security Resources Board who are assigned to duty on the Council maintain close relations with their own people. The Army member, for example, may spend half his working day in the Department of the Army, getting the Army views on such matters as may be before the staff members, so that when he sits as a staff member he will have available "the thinking of the Army." The same procedure is followed by the representatives of the Departments of State, of Navy, of the Air Force, and of the National Security Resources Board. Beginning at the working-staff level, a unanimous acceptance, not necessarily an agreement, is sought among the members representing the several departments and the National Security Resources Board.

After a paper has passed through the hands of the staff members it is then submitted, as explained above, to the NSC consultants. If the consultants cannot reach an agreement, the paper is put on the Council's agenda with the dissents noted, a split paper, as it is called. This practice is followed throughout the operational procedure of the Council. A split paper may come from the staff members; the final report to the President may have to go up as a split paper. In every case the dissenting elements are identified.

At the same time a paper is submitted to the consultants, information copies of the paper go to the Director of Central Intelligence; to the office of the Secretary of Defense; and when the subject is of concern to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to the Staff Director, Joint Staff. It should be noted here that the Staff Director, Joint Staff, may, when the matter under consideration is of interest to him in his official capacity, attend meetings of the consultants as an observer. After the consultants have concurred on the paper or after it emerges from their level as a split paper, two copies then go to the Joint Chiefs of Staff for their consideration and comment. This paper has, of course, passed by this time through various hands in the several departments of which the Chiefs of Staff are the military heads. As a matter of practice, the Joint Chiefs of Staff meet every Wednesday and thus pass on the paper for the first time in their corporate capacity only, 1 day before the Council meets, which is on Thursday, every other week.

The office of the Secretary of Defense receives the comment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on Wednesday afternoon or Thursday morning. This comment forms part of the Secretary of Defense's briefing for the Council meeting on Thursday afternoon. When the paper is received from the Joint Chiefs of Staff and if the time element permits, the Secretary of Defense may send it, with his approval or disapproval or without taking any action on it, to the executive secretary of the Council so that the Council members may acquaint themselves with the comment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff before the Council meeting. The comment from the Joint Chiefs of Staff is usually from the strictly military point of view, but the time element is close and the Secretary of Defense and the other members of the Council should have a longer interval in which to study the Joint Chiefs' comments. Needless to say, the Council gives full consideration to the views of the Joint Chiefs as thus expressed; in every case the comment of the Joint Chiefs is submitted to the President together with the Council's report. This is in keeping with the terms of the act which provide that the Joint Chiefs of Staff shall act as principal military advisers to the President and the Secretary of Defense.

The biweekly Thursday afternoon meetings of the Council last about 2 hours. The act provides that the President shall preside over these meetings, but in his absence may designate a member to preside in his place. The President presided at the first meeting. Since then he has generally named the Secretary of State, or, in his absence, the Secretary of Defense, in order of precedence, as presiding officer. The President attended and presided at the meeting of July 22, 1948, when Gen. Lucius D. Clay, the American commander in Germany, appeared before the Council and at two subsequent meetings.

In practice the Council has not hesitated to invite other persons to attend who have a substantial interest in, or responsibility for, the subject under review. For example, in a recent United States civil air policy matter involving certain foreign countries, the Secretary of Commerce, the ECA Administrator, and the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board were asked to sit with the Council and to express their views. It may be noted that in this instance the Secretary of Commerce was clearly eligible to join the Council, the ECA Administrator probably so since he is of Cabinet rank, but the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board was not thus eligible. This indicates that the Council feels free to invite nonmembers to attend its meetings whenever such attendance would contribute to a more comprehensive, better-informed treatment of the matter under consideration.

There is no fixed rule as to the origin or processing of NSC papers, each paper being handled as an individual problem in the way best adapted to its character. Papers may therefore originate by direction of the President, by suggestion of any other Council member, by reference from other departments or agencies, including interdepartmental committees such as SANACC, or by the initiative of the NSC staff itself. Papers may be prepared by the NSC staff, based upon drafts from appropriate departments, or by staff members. If requested or appropriate, however, papers referred to the Council may be submitted directly to the Council for consideration without study or action by the NSC staff members or by the NSC consultants. This is current standard procedure in the case of all papers referred to the Council by SANACC. If it appears appropriate in the case of any particular paper, an ad hoc group from the departments or agencies primarily concerned may be formed to prepare a draft paper for the Council. On the other hand, if it appears best in a given case, the regular NSC staff may be supplemented by additional members from other departments and agencies. In other words, maximum flexibility is retained so that each case may be handled in accordance with particular characteristics, importance, or urgency.

IV. EVALUATION

The National Security Council is the key organizational agency in the entire security structure, and on its proper and effective operation the success of the whole depends. While it has made great progress, especially in recent months, it has not yet measured up fully to the needs of the Nation.

In general, the Council has proved equal to dealing promptly with matters of immediate urgency; it has not yet, however, produced a comprehensive statement of current and long-range policies, although there was before the Council, as of November 1, 1948, a paper dealing with the threats that now confront this country and our objectives with respect to the major threat. The committee understands that certainly within 3 weeks, and possibly within 2 weeks of this date, this paper will have received thorough consideration by the council and will be in final form for submission to the President. In its early months the Council did not grapple with many problems that seemed to come squarely within its jurisdiction. A notable omission was its failure to deal with occupation policies, which appear to be the very type of problem for which the Council was conceived. Until quite recently these matters were left to SANACC (State-Army-Navy-Air Force Coordinating Committee), a junior organization. Now however, the Council is itself handling major occupation problems.

It is true that the Council was not consulted in the matter of Palestine, but our national policy vis-à-vis that country was established before the Council came into being. The position taken by the President and by the individual members of the Council is that such policy has never changed although certain modifications thereof have occurred.

The President's major policy address of March 17, 1948, particularly in its demand for Selective Service and bringing our forces up to their authorized strengths, was based on advice received from the Council. While the President has in no case refused to accept the views of the National Security Council, he has often failed to ask for them. Thus, a part of the Council's failure results simply from the fact that it has not been fully used. The Committee wishes to stress the conclusion that the Council's future value will depend largely on the degree to which it is employed for the purposes for which it was intended. The President's resort to its advice in connection with the crisis over the Berlin blockade is encouraging evidence that this is now being recognized.

On July 10, 1948, the Secretary of Defense formally asked the Council for guidance in connection with the formulation of the military budget for fiscal year 1950. An adequate reply to this inquiry goes to the very essence of the Council's basic function. It deserves and has received a top priority on the Council's agenda. Its preparation admittedly calls for most careful and deliberate thought and study. A reply had not, however, been received by the Secretary of Defense at the time of writing this report but the committee was advised that it would be forthcoming in the very near future.

The Council's weakness in long-term planning has been partly due to the pressure of emergency problems. It is now taking steps toward fulfilling its important long-range responsibilities. However, it is still far from being in a position to give the National Military Establishment that basic guidance which it must have if we are to achieve an efficient and economical balance between the size of the military establishment and the real needs of the Nation.

No complete formulation of our political objectives throughout the world has been made, although, as pointed out above, a thorough analysis of the major threats to the Nation and of our objectives in meeting these threats is about to be submitted for Presidential consideration. Obviously, a definition of these aims must precede the formulation of any realistic strategic war plans. Lacking this definition, our strategic planners either must make basic assumptions as to our national policies, which it is not their duty—as military men—to make, or they must plan in a political vacuum. Is it our political aim to leave an enemy country prostrate and devastated? What effect would this have upon the world after victory was won? Would victory be won more quickly and easily if our peace aims were defined in more constructive terms? These questions have not been answered; some of them have been posed to the Council by the Secretary of Defense, who has rightly asked for guidance. Strategic planning should follow, not lead, political planning.

For these deficiencies in the National Security Council the principal remedy must lie in a better realization, by the members of the Council itself, of the agency's true responsibilities and potentialities. The statute has established it; but its own members will have to make it work as it was designed to do. Some minor organizational improvements, however, can be made.

An interesting suggestion that the Committee considered was that the Vice President should preside over the National Security Council. Such a change might seem to be particularly appropriate, especially if the Vice President should assume, as many now believe that he should, a more active role in the executive department of Government. This suggestion has many superficial attractions: it would provide for continuity in the chairmanship of the Council, and it would focus primarily upon one man the responsibility for placing upon the Council agenda all those matters of broad policy that the Council ought to consider.

But it has grave objections. From a practical point of view Vice Presidents usually are chosen with more regard to geographical considerations than for their knowledge of foreign policy or national security matters. Moreover, they frequently represent a different and sometimes an opposite wing of the party from that of the President. The Security Council was intended to be, and must be, very close to the President; it is the highest advisory body in the land, and no intermediary should be placed between the President and the Council. The President now presides over the Council; in his absence the Secretary of State acts as chairman. This arrangement, in the Committee's opinion, is a completely proper and essential one and should not be changed. It is necessary to add, however, that the link between the President, the Secretary of State, and the Executive Secretary of the Council should be close and intimate. The two latter in particular should be jointly responsible for bringing to the Council's attention all those matters that should be considered. The Executive Secretary of the Council must remain just that; he must be close to the President, but he must never usurp the functions of the Secretary of State. The present Executive Secretary has met these requirements.

Mr. President, I am conscious of the fact that a short time ago the junior Senator from Oregon inquired as to whether I might find certain passages in the Wallgren hearing testimony. I thought that members of my staff could do so, and they have, but I should like to suggest to the Senator from Oregon that I have but five more double-spaced pages on the subject of the National Security Council, and if he will permit me to finish them to maintain the continuity, we will then go into the other matter.

While every witness before the committee testified to the usefulness of the Council, a number questioned the preponderance in its membership of representatives of the military departments. It was suggested that this tended to undermine its prestige and authority, not only with the public but with the other governmental departments, by making it seem primarily an organ of the military. More importantly, the presence of the three service Secretaries was criticized as leading to discussions as to which service should do what rather than of what should be done. The committee believes that the military representation in the members of the National Security Council should be confined to the Secretary of Defense. Obviously, any one of the service Secretaries can be invited to sit with the Council when matters with which he is particularly concerned are under consideration. This decrease in the service representation at the Council level should not, however, affect the present working relations between the Council and the three military services at the staff and consultant level.

The elimination of the service secretaries from the National Security Council might require consequent revision of the procedures within the National Military Establishment for the handling of Council papers—which now, at the first stages of formulation—are considered by the separate politico-military and planning sections of the individual departments and not in the office of the Secretary of Defense. If the Secretary deemed it advisable, he could, however, by simple administrative order, require clearance of Council papers—prepared by the separate departments—through his office.

Another suggestion advanced to the committee envisaged the attendance of the Joint Chiefs of Staff as nonvoting observers at all Council meetings. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have suffered from a want of guidance from the Council, but the latter also has suffered from a certain aloofness on the part of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. They might well, as a general rule, be invited to attend National Security Council meetings.

There is some feeling in the State Department that the Joint Chiefs have, in effect, a double veto—or more properly—two opportunities to comment on Council papers during the process of formulation, and that therefore the balance should not be further weighted toward the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Another possible solution to the problem of tightening the bond between political planning and strategic planning would be to have a civilian political expert, preferably a representative of the State Department, sit with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, either as a nonvoting observer or as a liaison officer. There should not be, in any case, any statutory requirement that the Joint Chiefs must attend all National Security Council meetings.

The value of the National Security Council might be increased if the Secretary of the Treasury were added to its permanent membership. Representatives of the Atomic Energy Commission and/or of the Research and Development Board should, on appropriate occasions, be invited to sit with the council. There are advantages in keeping an advisory board small; on the other hand, the formulation of national policy must be closely linked with financial policies and

with research and development progress. There is no need for any statutory change in this connection.

Permanent congressional membership in the Council—another suggestion made to the committee—would be neither practicable nor desirable, but the committee feels that some advantage to the national purpose might result if certain key Members of Congress, notably the chairmen of the Foreign Affairs Committees, were invited to sit in at certain meetings.

The relationships of SANACC with the National Security Council, lately clarified by administrative order, may require further clarification in the future. SANACC has performed much useful work in the past but some of its functions now have been properly assumed by the Council. It now has a provisional term of life, and during that interval its future usefulness should again be examined. It seems to this committee that SANACC might well continue as a subsidiary of the National Security Council, perhaps with a common secretariat. There are some organizational objections to this suggestion, but they do not appear to be insuperable. SANACC certainly should not handle broad matters of policy, and the Council should continue to have the power to requisition items from SANACC's agenda if desired.

In the past, matters of occupational policy were handled far too loosely; the organizational structure of the Government made for delays, divided jurisdiction, and confusion; as a consequence, policy often was not made in Washington, and the vacuum had to be filled by overseas commanders. The National Security Council has now assumed responsibility for major occupational policies, involving important political, strategic, or economic considerations; minor and routine matters—once handled by SANACC—are now jointly handled by the State and Army Departments, with the Air Force and Navy included when their interests are involved. This seems a logical way of meeting a difficult problem, with one proviso: the National Security Council, and the State Department as implementing agency, must keep in close touch with problems in occupied areas.

Even the most cursory review of the Council's duties indicate its high importance to the Nation. Its secretariat should remain small; the present budget—which may need some expansion—should not require major increase. There must be, however, a firm effort to attract the best brains of the Nation, in the field of foreign policy and national power, to the Council.

Mr. President, I may say in parenthesis, that all I have been attempting to do since the hearing on the Wallgren nomination, and all during the course of this long day, is to raise the question again and again as to whether the President's nominee represents some of the better brains of the country. If he does he is entitled to serious consideration for the portfolio which he seeks. If he does not it does the President and the country no favor to consider seriously his confirmation for a job which has so much significance with reference to the security of the future of our land.

Suggestions were made to the committee that the Council should review the military budget. The committee does not believe that it would be wise to define by statute a hard-and-fast statement of specific tasks for the Council, nor does it believe that the Council can, or should, usurp the functions of the Secretary of Defense. The review of the military budget is properly the concern of the Secretary of Defense. The Council, however, is charged with recommending broad, general policies for our actual and potential military power, based on an assessment of our objectives, commitments, and risks. An appraisal of the calculated risks we must face as a basis for fixing the size of the military budget is a proper function of the Council.

The committee is of the opinion that if the National Security Council is used sufficiently—and its use is increasing—it will be an invaluable agency of Government. It is properly placed, organizationally, as a high-level, policy-forming, advisory body to the President.

A few minutes ago the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] was exceedingly curious concerning some of the testimony which was offered by Mr. Wallgren during the hearings before the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield so that I may restate my question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. CAIN. I yield for a question only; yes.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator from Washington please turn to those pages of the transcript of record of the hearings of the Armed Services Committee on the confirmation of the President's nominee, Mr. Mon Wallgren, former Governor of the State of Washington, for the chairmanship of the National Security Resources Board, and read to me the testimony of Mr. Wallgren preceding his discussion of the appointment of Mr. Coughlan to the Social Security Welfare Board of the State Government of Washington, through that part of his testimony which dealt with the reasons he gave for the appointment, including a few paragraphs following that testimony?

Mr. CAIN. I know that the Senator from Oregon will not think me discourteous when I say that I was endeavoring to listen to him, and wanted to listen to him, while at the same time I was listening to several members of my staff who sit on my right. If I understood the substance of the Senator's question, it was that the Senator would like to have me briefly recite from the record some material references to Mr. Coughlan, who is a member of the Social Security Committee in the State of Washington, and any references Mr. Wallgren may have made to him, and to the unimportance of the job to which he was appointed.

I have in my hand, Mr. President, a copy of the hearings before the Committee on the Armed Services on the subject of the nomination of Mon C. Wallgren to be Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, which was taken on February 24, 1949. I wish to read a few pages of its contents in order to satisfy a legitimate question previously addressed to me by the junior Senator from Oregon.

On page 281 the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] is asking Mr. Wallgren a question:

> There have been some remarks, and I have already seen the papers from my county saying that the Governor places Communists in high positions, government positions. When?

Mr. Wallgren responded by saying:

> There was one man appointed, and he was charged with being a Communist, and brought before the district court and acquitted.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] asked:

> What was his name?

Mr. Wallgren replied:

> His name was Coughlan, C-o-u-g-h-l-a-n, and I think his first name was John. He had been appointed to a meaningless job that paid no salary whatever.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. You mean he is the man who served on the social security board?
>
> Mr. WALLGREN. That is right.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. Does that pay a salary?
>
> Mr. WALLGREN. No. It has never functioned.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. What were the nature of the duties of Mr. Coughlan while he was on the social security board?
>
> Mr. WALLGREN. He had no duties, Mr. Chairman.
>
> I might point out to you—I have some information on that, and we called to find out a little more about that. We called long distance, as to why he was appointed, and that is the important thing, I think.
>
> Out there we have an old-age pension union. All the old people who are enjoying benefits under social security belonged to this old-age pension union, and this man was their attorney. They came down to me and had an idea that the social security committee in some way would function in a manner to provide them with additional benefits, and asked me to put him on the committee. We had no one on there at the time, and we just had three members that were supposed to serve.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The committee was not functioning. It was a forgotten agency and, of course, if there was any sop here to the old folks it was to the old folks who really wanted representation on that committee. That was it.

It was on page 245 that Mr. Wallgren made reference to having appointed Mr. Coughlan as a sop to the old people of the State of Washington who belonged to the Old Age Pension Union.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAIN. I am happy to yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator from Washington reread that paragraph in which the testimony seems to indicate that the nominee was making the appointment as a sop to the old people of the State of Washington?

Mr. CAIN. The one paragraph that covers that subject reads as follows:

> Out there—
>
> Obviously meaning the State of Washington—
>
> we have an Old Age Pension Union. All the old people who are enjoying benefits under social security belonged to this Old Age Pension Union, and this man was their attorney. They came down to me and had an idea that the social security committee in some way would function in a manner to provide them with additional benefits, and asked me to put him on the committee. We had no one on there at the time, and we had just three members that were supposed to serve.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The committee was not functioning. It was a forgotten agency and, of course, if there was any sop here to the old folks it was to the old folks who really wanted representation on that committee. That was it.

I may say to the junior Senator from Oregon that I think somewhere in one of the other volumes of testimony taken by the Armed Services Committee Mr. Wallgren, early in his appearance before that committee, made the statement that John Coughlan had been appointed by him as a sop to the old folks of the State of Washington. In the part of the record to which I have just been referring, there is but a reference to the fact that the appointment of John Coughlan was a sop to the old folks of the Old Age Pension Union in the State of Washington.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. CAIN. I am very pleased to yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator from Washington endeavor to have a member of his staff find the earlier reference in the transcript of his testimony, in which it is alleged by the Senator from Washington that Mr. Wallgren made some reference to the appointment of Mr. Coughlan as a sop to the old people of Washington?

Mr. CAIN. As a matter of fact, on page 285 the Governor recognized that in his own words. He said:

> The committee was not functioning. It was a forgotten agency and, of course, if there was any sop here to the old folks it was to the old folks who really wanted representation on that committee. That was it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. CAIN. I am glad to yield for a further question.

Mr. MORSE. Is the Senator still of the opinion that earlier in the hearings there was another reference?

Mr. CAIN. Yes, indeed.

Mr. MORSE. A reference to the appointment of Mr. Coughlan as a sop to the old people of Washington?

Mr. CAIN. I shall be very glad to try to find it for the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. I shall appreciate it if the Senator will try to find it for me.

Mr. CAIN. A member of my staff will have it immediately available.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. CAIN. I am pleased to yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Is the Senator from Washington of the opinion that the nominee at least left the impression with the Senator from Washington at the time of his testimony before the Armed Services Committee that he did make the appointment of Mr. Coughlan as a sop to the Old Age Pension Union of Washington in order to relieve himself of the political pressure of the Pension Union which it was placing upon him for some representation on the Social Security Committee of the State of Washington?

Mr. CAIN. It is my opinion that the portion of the record to which the Senator refers, which covers the case of John Coughlan, is a series of startling contradictions which sooner or later must be reconciled by members of the Armed Services Committee. It is strikingly true—at least in my mind—that Mr. Wallgren, among other things, said that the Social Security Committee was meaningless, that it did not operate, that it did not function, that it had no function, and did not operate all during the 4 years of his last incumbency, but that he had told the Old Age Pension Union group that the appointment was as important in fact as it appeared to be on paper. So in order to placate them, to reduce the amount of political pressure they might exert on him, he said to them, "I will appoint your attorney, John Coughlan, as one of a three-man board."

It so happens that the record of a later date proves beyond question—and the Armed Services Committee will, I hope, see fit to subpena Mr. Coughlan to reconcile the discrepancies between his story and that of the Governor—that Mr. Coughlan came to Washington, D. C., as an official representative of the State of Washington, and of Mr. Wallgren, then its Governor, all of which Mr. Wallgren, while admittedly not under oath, but before a committee of Senators, has denied. It is difficult for some of us to see how a committee which was entirely meaningless, which never met, which the Governor hardly knew existed, could send one of its agents to Washington, D. C., to testify officially in a 10-page statement before the House Committee on Ways and Means, while Mr. Wallgren, then Governor, was entirely unconscious of the fact that Mr. Coughlan was ever in Washington. In fact, in the record Mr. Wallgren denies that he knew anything about it, until such time as it was drawn to his attention by me just a few short days ago.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAIN. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. If the interpretation of the Senator from Washington of the testimony of the nominee is correct, namely, that Coughlan was appointed by the nominee in order to satisfy the old-age pension union group by way of throwing them a sop, what does the Senator from Washington think about the ethics, the morality, and fairness of such tactics on the part of the nominee if, as a result of those tactics, he misled thousands of old people in his State into believing that he was making an appointment of substance and importance to them?

Mr. CAIN. I can only give to the junior Senator from Oregon one answer to his question. On the basis of what I had reason to believe I knew about the President's nominee before I submitted my case in opposition to the Senate Armed Services Committee, and on the basis of the record which the President's nominee wrote into those hearings in his own words—not mine—I remain convinced, as I have been convinced for many weeks, that Mr. Wallgren is not big enough for serious consideration for the chairmanship of the National Security Resources Board.

One of the reasons—and we need to show only one reason before reasonable men, because it is not necessary to prove conclusively reasons one, two, three, four, and five—is this: The man who is to be selected for a job like this must have no weakness in his armor. I challenge any fair-thinking person to read the record covering only this one situation involving a man by the name of John Coughlan, with respect to whom the man who once had been Governor of the State of Washington said at great length that his appointment was meaningless, unimportant, and of no influence at all, but was a sop to a group of American citizens. If that becomes a proved fact, in my opinion, any person could rest his case against the nominee right there. I happen to think it is a fact; but it happens to be up to the Armed Services Committee to prove or disprove it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAIN. I am most pleased to yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Is it the conclusion of the Senator from Washington that the nominee, while Governor of the State of Washington, appointed Coughlan in order to obtain political advantages for the nominee from the Old People's Pension Union, in the State of Washington?

Mr. CAIN. In that sense, I think I am not qualified to answer that question. My concern is that Mr. Wallgren fooled a large group of American citizens, namely, the old-age pension group in the State of Washington. What his reasons were for fooling those Americans, I do not know.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator advise me as to what motivations he thinks the nominee might have had for making the appointment under the circumstances under which the testimony showed he made it?

Mr. CAIN. I do not know that I can answer that question. My feeling is that the President's nominee, then Governor of the State of Washington, was guilty of a great display of moral weakness, regardless of what his reasons may have been, when he led the old-age pension group of the State of Washington to believe that it was going to get something, when he never had any intention of giving them anything except a fairy story. In the State of Washington we do not think that sort of conduct is very

good; but we believe it would be absolutely criminal to transplant it from Washington State, where at least we can isolate it, to the Nation's Capital.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further and permit me to ask another question in regard to the Coughlan appointment, so that I may lay a foundation for a question or two in regard to the appointing powers which the nominee would have if he were made Chairman of the National Security Resources Board?

Mr. CAIN. The junior Senator from Washington would be most pleased to yield to his colleague from Oregon for a question only.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, when the Senator from Washington says that the nominee's testimony at least indicates that Coughlan was appointed as a sop to the old people who were members of the Pension Union in the State of Washington, does he think that statement on the part of the nominee, which in effect I have accurately summarized, I think—in other words, the statement of the nominee that he made the appointment as a sop to the old people—supports a reasonable inference that he made it for political advantage in his relationships with the old people in the State of Washington?

Mr. CAIN. If anyone were to tell certain persons they were going to get something, when he had reason to know that they were not, and when the person who told them that they were going to get something for nothing was in a seat of public authority, I suppose that conceivably he would appoint one of their kind as a sop either in the hope that they would not be a serious political pressure upon him or because he had reason to believe that that sort of treatment would encourage all of them to support him in whatever programs he might wish to advance in the future. I cannot conceive of any other reason why a man—and the record points that out—would tell a number of persons, "Yes, you deserve representation. We have a fine social-security committee on the State level; and I, the Governor, and my Assistant Governor are members of it; so we will take your legal counsel, Mr. Coughlan, and put him on it; and from now on, all your troubles are over," when Mr. Wallgren's next breath was to the effect that it was never his intention to have a meeting of that committee at any time; but he swore the man in as an official agent of the State of Washington, and clothed that man, from the minute of his swearing in, with all the prestige and influence and power that went with a State appointment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. CAIN. I shall be pleased to yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator know of his own knowledge, based upon his own experience as a Senator from the State of Washington, that the various old people's groups, of which the pension union is one in the State of Washington, exercised considerable political power and influence in the State of Washington.

Mr. CAIN. I have heard it said by many persons in the State of Washington that what is known as the Old-Age Pension Group or Society wields a considerable amount of political power, particularly on the western side of the State. Speaking only as an individual, I have never been conscious of that supposed power one way or another.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. CAIN. I shall be glad to yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator from Washington tell the Senate whether the nominee, if confirmed for appointment as Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, would, in his capacity as Chairman, have the power of appointment in filling various positions on the staff of that Board?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oregon will permit me to take one moment, I hope and think that I have a copy of the law which obviously will provide an accurate answer for the Senator's very reasonable question.

I read from the law:

The Chairman of the Board—

Referring to the National Security Resources Board—

subject to the direction of the President—

That is all; the direction of the President—

is authorized to appoint, and fix the compensation of, such personnel as may be necessary to assist the Board in carrying out its functions.

So far as I understand the law, I wish to make it clear to the Senator from Oregon that whoever the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board may next be, he will in his administrative capacity have mandatory authority over as many jobs as are represented by the chart of the organization of the staff of the National Security Resources Board, which I now indicate. I have been told by the Bureau of the Budget, if I am not mistaken, that there are 60 $10,000 jobs within the office of the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, over which Mr. Wallgren, if appointed, will have complete power. That is not to say that he will discharge everyone who is there. He spoke of that subject only briefly during the hearings. He said, in effect, "If I am confirmed, I have some reorganization plans in mind." He did not go so far as to say what they were.

However, because of some "freeze" order, there now remain open approximately 20 jobs at $10,000 each, waiting to be filled by appointments to be made by the new chairman of the National Security Resources Board.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. CAIN. I am pleased to yield for a question only.

Mr. MORSE. Am I correct, then, in my understanding of what the Senator from Washington has just said, that if the nominee proceeds to function as Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, he will have the power to make some 60 appointments in due course of time, in filling various positions on the staff of the Board?

Mr. CAIN. I wish I had with me a break-down of the budget for 1949 for the office of Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. I do not have it. I would not want the Senator to think the Chairman is restricted to 60 appointments to positions within his operation, for it may be as a practical matter that many more than 60 persons are required. It may be the new Chairman, whether Mr. Wallgren or someone else, will leave the hiring of personnel to others or it may be that he and his associates will have several hundred jobs to fill. But we should bear in mind, I may point out to the junior Senator from Oregon, that the development first began as the result of the passage of the unification bill by the Congress, signed by the President on July 26, 1947. It is a mushroom organization. It is preparing to get started. But I have been able to secure only the chart indicating the division of the director of production, which every Senator in the Chamber should have interest in studying. I have not been able to secure the organizational charts for the other three planning divisions; which may mean that the other three have not been fully staffed as yet, and that the new Chairman will have to concern himself with filling the personnel requirements of the three planning staff divisions the Senator from Oregon can notice on the chart.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. CAIN. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Is the junior Senator from Oregon then correct in his understanding that irrespective of the number, the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board will have the authority, and it is authority under the law, to fill by way of appointment a considerable number of very responsible positions?

Mr. CAIN. On that subject I can only be guided by my understanding of the law, which says without reservation that the chairman, subject only to the wishes of the President, has complete authority and jurisdiction over all the personnel required to make the entire organization work.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. CAIN. I am pleased to yield for a further question.

Mr. MORSE. Is it the fear of the Senator from Washington that if the nominee, while Governor of Washington, appointed a man by the name of Coughlan counsel for the Pension Union, which the Senator has testified is an organization of old people, to the Social Security Welfare Board of the State of Washington, as a political sop to the old people, there might be a danger that as chairman of

the National Security Resources Board, if confirmed for the position, he might make appointments of a political-sop nature to that board?

Mr. CAIN. Perhaps I could best attempt to answer that question by saying it was left up to certain members of the committee to find out who from the State of Washington are today working in the National Security Resources Board, and at what figure. Mr. Wallgren came as a witness before the Armed Services Committee, he was given every encouragement to talk, and questions were directed to him. He was asked, "What do you know about this job? What are your plans?" To which he replied, "Oh, I do not know anything about the job. I have not been confirmed yet. I want to stay as far away from it as I can until I am confirmed. But I have a couple of men down there somewhere." They are there as special assistants to the Chairman. One was what Mr. Wallgren called his "Assistant Governor" in the State of Washington. Another man had some sort of State job. Mr. Wallgren did not mention the second man in the presentation of his case to justify his claim that he is big enough to be considered for the job. But we merely called up the Budget Bureau and said, "Is anyone working down there?" The reply was, "Yes." They gave us the names of persons working at $50 per day. It was not the $50 a day, I may say to the Senator from Oregon, which most annoyed some of us who are most serious in our opposition to the appointment of the man. It was that his lack of standing, his lack of bigness, his lack of character in this particular instance would not permit him to say, "I have two men working in my interests for $50 a day down at the National Security Resources Board."

In further answer to the Senator's question, I think it is as certain as the fact that we are sitting here that, while Mr. Wallgren is, I suppose, eminently qualified to fill many a position, he is not qualified to fill this one. If confirmed, he will be the one to determine the brains to be employed in the four peacetime agencies which will become the wartime agencies to wage the next war. Therefore, to me, not only as a Senator from Washington State, but as a citizen of this country, I am not concerned with what any man or woman in the agency is paid; I am concerned solely with what he produces for his employer, who in a literal sense is the chairman, but who, in a much broader sense is every American citizen. If Mr. Wallgren has the disposal of in excess of 20 jobs at $10,000 each, that is totally unimportant, providing he could get the 20 right brains to fill the 20 niches in these important portfolios; and though I might be the only one, I am satisfied completely that his talent does not qualify him to select the brains required in order to wage and win the next war.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. CAIN. I am glad to yield to the Senator for a question only.

Mr. MORSE. Is it the fear of the Senator from Washington, then, based upon his answer to my previous question, that if the nominee is appointed chairman of the National Security Resources Board, which position carries with it broad appointive powers in the filling of a very long list of responsible jobs, and judging from the basis on which he seems to have made the appointment of Mr. Coughlan to the Social Security Welfare Committee of the State of Washington, he might not make appointments in the public interest, if confirmed for the position to which he has been appointed?

Mr. CAIN. I should rather say in my considered opinion he is not qualified to select the proper personnel for the Agency. If he, as an individual, is not qualified to be the chairman, as I shall certainly endeavor to establish before the case has reached its conclusion, I do not, for the life of me, see how an unqualified chairman can be, on the other hand, a qualified personnel procurer for an agency which prepares for and wages war. I think the best answer to the Senator's question is that the gentleman in question, the President's nominee, has been assigned to a job which he is not qualified to master. He will, in terms of swimming, I am certain, go down three times and come up only twice, and the country will the loser.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington is very pleased to yield for a question only.

Mr. MORSE. Is it the fear of the Senator from Washington, judging by the nominee's appointments in the State of Washington, not only in respect to the appointment of Mr. Coughlan to the so-social-security and welfare committee of the State, but also other appointments in the State government of Washington, that there is a danger that he will not make appointments in the public interest, if appointed as Chairman of this Board?

Mr. CAIN. I shall go back to my previous answer, if that answer satisfies the Senator, and if I correctly understand the Senator's question. But I think the nominee's lack of bigness and understanding of the job intended for him would make it all too easy for him to make appointments to positions within the National Security Resources Board which are not in the national interest. I would not say there would be any premeditated attempt on his part to make bad appointments, but I say that, necessarily, he would make them because I do not think him competent to fulfill his responsibilities.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. CAIN. I shall be glad to yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Washington agree that those of us who are not familiar with the appointing record of the nominee while Governor of the State of Washington, save and except as we have learned something about it in connection with the Coughlan case, ought to look to his appointments generally in the State of Washington in attempting to reach a conclusion as to the type of appointments he might be expected to make as Chairman of the National Security Resources Board?

Mr. CAIN. I think that would be a fair position, sir. I think I have so stated in my various presentations. There have been a number of other appointments under the jurisdiction of the one who was then the Governor of the State of Washington that were not made in the best interest of the citizens of that State.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator permit another question along this line?

Mr. CAIN. I shall be pleased to yield for a question, sir.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree that those of us who are trying to reach a final conclusion as to whether we should vote to confirm or not to confirm in this instance need to satisfy ourselves that the nominee has a record of appointments in the State of Washington which is of such quality that if he carried the same appointing policies into the position for which he has been nominated the public interest would not be jeopardized thereby?

Mr. CAIN. I may say to the junior Senator from Oregon, if I understood his question correctly and if my assumption is correct, that Mr. Wallgren misled a considerable number of Washington State citizens by holding out to them, as a sop, the appointment of one John Coughlan to a committee which the Governor said later on never had any intention of functioning, then I think it would not be necessary to look beyond that point—that a man who was capable of the John Coughlan appointment, on the basis only of the record, would obviously be capable of other similar appointments, none of which would be good for the common welfare, and just one instance of which ought to result in automatic cancellation of any serious consideration which had been previously given to the nominee.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator permit one more question?

Mr. CAIN. I shall be most pleased to yield for a question, sir.

Mr. MORSE. Is the Senator prepared to say whether, in his opinion, this nominee, in filling appointments in the State of Washington, made any considerable number of appointments which could possibly be criticized as purely political appointments in the sense that the qualifications of the appointees had little or no relationship to the particular tasks which had to be performed in the office to which they were appointed?

Mr. CAIN. In my opinion, that is quite correct.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. CAIN. The Senator will be pleased to yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Is it, then, a charge of the Senator from Washington against the nominee that an investigation of

the appointing practices of the nominee while he was the Governor of the State of Washington would lead to the conclusion on the part of a fair-minded person who is seeking to find the facts in order to make a judicial decision as to whether he should vote to confirm or not to confirm this nomination, would disclose that this nominee has a record of making political appointments in the sense that he appoints men for political advantage without primary consideration being given to their qualifications for the office to which he appoints them?

Mr. CAIN. The junior Senator from Oregon is probably conscious of the fact that all the junior Senator from Washington has thus far requested of the Senate Armed Services Committee is that it undertake a serious examination of the charges which I have preferred, one of which is that Mr. Wallgren has been in the past extremely careless in his political appointments; and, in further emphatic response to the Senator's question, I am completely and wholly satisfied that if the Senate Armed Services Committee undertakes such an investigation, it will determine to its own complete satisfaction that whatever other virtues Mr. Wallgren may have, one of them is not considering the public interest as being primarily important when making a political appointment. The Senator would find, through any disinterested, open examination, that Mr. Wallgren, to an unusual degree, has used political appointments under his power for results of political preference to him.

Mr. President, this has been an extraordinarily long and exceedingly interesting day and debate to the junior Senator from Washington. I began in the hope that I might thoroughly lay before the Senate two subjects with which I had reason to believe Senators were not as familiar as was I, first, the National Security Resources Board and, second, the National Security Council. I think that any of my colleagues in the Senate and the general public who are interested and curious and will study today's RECORD will find that it contains factual information which will be of assistance to their thinking about the future which lies ahead of all of us.

I have before me, as one can obviously see, Mr. President, as much material concerning the Wallgren confirmation matter as I have covered today, and more, which I trust I shall have an opportunity to discuss and submit for the RECORD before the question is resolved.

Mr. President, I understand that any Senator has two opportunities to speak on any question which is before the Senate. Having availed myself of a very long opportunity to talk once on the subject of this confirmation today, I shall look forward with enthusiasm to an opportunity to conclude my presentation at some later date.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington has yielded the floor.

AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 100)

During the delivery of Mr. CAIN's speech,

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield for a moment?

Mr. CAIN. The Senator is permitted to yield only for a question.

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask unanimous consent that I may report a bill, which is very important, and then let it rest.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, is there any way by which I can accommodate the Senator from Texas and request such unanimous consent without jeopardizing my right to the floor?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator can request unanimous consent that the Senator from Texas be permitted to do so, without interfering with the right of the Senator from Washington to the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, if it is agreeable to the Senator from Washington, let me say that I shall enter no objection, because the purpose of the Senator from Texas is simply to report or introduce a bill, and although it will come in the middle of today's session, and did not come at the beginning of the session today, nevertheless I feel that that courtesy should be extended to all Senators who wish to introduce bills.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Washington.

Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations I report the Economic Cooperation Administration bill, otherwise known as the Marshall plan bill, which I think to be of sufficient importance to warrant being reported from the committee at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal report may be filed within the next 48 hours.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Texas is most welcome.

The bill (S. 1209) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 was read twice by its title, and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

After the conclusion of Mr. CAIN's speech,

ADDITIONAL BILLS INTRODUCED

By unanimous consent, additional bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 1207. A bill to amend the law relating to timber operations on the Menominee Indian Reservation in Wisconsin; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1208. A bill for the relief of Pasch Brothers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original bill (S. 1209) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, which was ordered to be placed on the calendar, and appears under a separate heading.)

MEMBERS OF BOARD OF REGENTS OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE BLOOM, OF NEW YORK

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate resolutions from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
March 8, 1949.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow the death of Hon. SOL BLOOM, a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That a committee of 15 Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in behalf of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], I send to the desk a resolution and request that it be read and immediately considered.

The resolution (S. Res. 82) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. SOL BLOOM, late a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and the junior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] as the committee on the part of the Senate to join a similar committee from the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, I now move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was unanimously agreed to, and (at 9 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 9, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 8 (legislative day of February 21), 1949:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Hugh W. Cross, of Illinois, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1950.

MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Milton S. Kronheim, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be an associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia, vice Hon. John P. McMahon, deceased.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

John Brown, of Tennessee, to be United States attorney for the western district of Tennessee, vice William McClanahan, resigned.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Bernard Fitch, of Connecticut, to be United States marshal for the district of Connecticut. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 29, 1948.

Dimitre A. Batchoff, of Montana, to be United States marshal for the district of Montana, vice George A. Wright, term expired.

Raymond A. Morgan, of New York, to be United States Marshal for the western district of New York, vice Frank C. Blackford, retired.

Larry M. Morphis, of Tennessee, to be United States marshal for the middle district of Tennessee, vice Reed Sharp, term expired.

IN THE ARMY

Col. James Lowe Harbaugh, Jr., O12339, Judge Advocate General's Corps, United States Army, for temporary appointment as brigadier general in the Army of the United States under the provisions of section 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 8, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in the name of Him whom Thou hast highly exalted, we pray that we may catch the still small whisper of Thy voice. Thou hast said if any man lack wisdom let him ask of God, who giveth to all men liberally and upbraideth not. Thou knowest our frame and rememberest that we are dust. Restrain us and bless us with pure and humble hearts.

If we have wronged any man, if we have been false to ourselves, O Lord God, make us true. Deliver us from all things that blight and blur; search us and know our hearts, and see if there be any wicked way in us, and lead us in the way everlasting. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

We pause in deep sorrow this morning, in memory of one distinguished in public service, and the friend of man.

"This be the verse you grave for me;
Here he lies where he longed to be;
Home is the sailor, home from the sea,
And the hunter home from the hill."

Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow, March 9, 1949.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand the first order of business will be the appropriation bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. The first order of business will be the appropriation bill; and when that is disposed of it will be followed by the bills we had scheduled and programed for today.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts, that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow?

There was no objection.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. FOGARTY, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 3333) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 228), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. KEEFE reserved all points of order on the bill.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the rules of the House, the bill (H. R. 3333) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, may be considered tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] if time has been agreed on with respect to the Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill?

Mr. FOGARTY. I conferred with the ranking member of the minority and we have agreed on 2 hours' general debate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

THE LATE HONORABLE SOL BLOOM

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is with genuine sorrow that we have learned of the demise of a distinguished colleague of ours, the gentleman from New York, Mr. SOL BLOOM.

A kindly man has left us. A life dedicated to service is no more. A gentle being who ever helped the helpless and hopeless passed on his way to an undiscovered country. A man high in his fellows' esteem can no longer strive and struggle for his country's weal. He might have disagreed with you but never was disagreeable. His distinguished service on the Foreign Affairs Committee under Presidents Truman, Roosevelt, Hoover, and Coolidge, as member and chairman, where he participated in fashioning and passing bills affecting war and peace, made him the cynosure of all eyes.

The name SOL BLOOM was known the world over for patriotism and gallant endeavor. With an early awareness of the value of reasoned and reasonable public relations he built up a reputation that spread from London to New Delhi, from New York to San Francisco, from Paris to Rio.

He leaves behind a good name, and as the Psalmist says:

Better is the fragrance of a good name than the perfume of precious oils.

In true Horatio Alger fashion he lifted himself from humble beginnings to heights of fame and power. Friend of kings and potentates, he nontheless never lost the common touch.

Guest of ambassadors and ministers, decorated by many rulers, frequently signally honored in his own land, he never forgot those in low estate, here or abroad. He bravely and courageously espoused just, although at times unpopular, causes. He fought for the stateless, the homeless, the displaced—those whose fate was like one on a ship on a sea without a shore. Ever a Zionist he aided in implementing the aim of his people in Israel. He was at home with tycoons or tanners, with bankers and clerks, with millionaires, and, as well, with the poor and lowly constituents of Tenth and Eleventh Avenues.

The universality of his endeavors and works is striking.

Our Constitution, the life of Washington, numerous centennials in our history, were dwelt upon by him. He has written well upon the tablets of our literature. Humorist, story teller, philosopher, statesman, wit—he was much sought after for radio, television, and the public platform.

One of his last acts was preparation for his annual birthday party which was always celebrated with the St. Ann orphans, of Washington.

We pray that the Lord God of Hosts may assuage the anguish of the bereavement of his surviving daughter, Vera. She must take comfort in a cherished memory of the loved and lost.

Well might we recall a passage in Proverbs:

A little sleep, a little slumber, a little folding of the hands to sleep.

I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH].

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, last night in New York I learned with deep regret of the death of our distinguished and beloved colleague, SOL BLOOM. He was a character in New York life. He had represented his district, originally the Nineteenth and later through reapportionment the Twentieth District, since 1923, and on the 3d of March of that year he took his oath of office in this House for the first time.

His career was like a story book. He was born of poor parents in Pekin, Ill. He went out west to San Francisco at the age of 3, where, after a few years, only a young boy 10 years of age, he obtained his first employment. He remained in San Francisco until he was 19 years of age, at which time, as the result of his business acumen, he had amassed what was then considered a fair-sized fortune, and putting Horace Greeley's words, "Young man, go west," into reverse, he started eastward and stopped off at Chicago, where he remained and engaged in business until 1903, and then went to New York. In 1923, 20 years later, he, for the first time, held the office of Representative in Congress, and has been in this House ever since until the date of his death. He would have been 79 years old tomorrow.

Here in the House he has had a distinguished career. He was twice chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and he has always shown statesmanship in the legislation that he has had passed through this House as chairman of that distinguished committee. Those who knew him in New York will miss him as a most charitable friend. He has more friends among the poor on the West Side of New York than probably any other man in public or private life. He was well known in the theatrical life of New York for several generations, and those in that profession will lose a great friend. We in the House have lost a distinguished colleague. The State of New York has lost a most able Representative, and I personally have lost a very close and dear friend.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON].

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, once more we are face to face with the great, solemn reality that we belong to two worlds. Our dear friend Sol, alive, forceful, active, suddenly ceases to be, so far as we know, and has entered into the eternal silence from which he came and to which we are all journeying.

Lacordaire, the great French orator, standing by the dead body of Louis XIV, began his oration with these words, which I have often pondered: "God alone is great."

In these grim and tremendous realities which hover over us and swallow us up sooner or later, we realize that all men are equal, equal in our mortality, and gloriously equal in the immortality with which the Divine Creator has endowed us.

I have been associated with SOL BLOOM on the Foreign Affairs Committee since 1927. I have always been profoundly interested in him as a unique character which could develop only in this country. He was absolutely without academic education. He had one of the most acute natural intelligences I have ever known in or out of Congress. He was a remarkable man in his resources of mind and character and in what he accomplished in life.

Mr. Speaker, his message to us today would be his great debt to America. America gave him his opportunity and America honors him in his passing. He represents the glory and the challenge of our civilization. He was a devoted public servant. He had his faults and failures, which endeared him to me personally. In our long association on the Foreign Affairs Committee we did not agree many times; but we always agreed in our friendship. I stood by him and he stood by me. Now he is gone, but he leaves a great contribution to the interpretation of the fundamentals of our civilization. We will long cherish his memory, and we will do him the greatest honor possible by allegiance to those principles of our life which he defended so gloriously in his study of the Constitution of this country.

Dear Sol. I told him the other day that we would stand by him in the work of our committee. We cannot any more, except by endeavoring to follow out, as best we can, the ideals that he, in his life and in his death, so notably represented. May his spirit rest in eternal peace.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE].

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my tribute to the memory of SOL BLOOM. For 16 years I was closely associated with SOL BLOOM on the Foreign Affairs Committee. I worked with him side by side. I was a personal friend of his. I walked with him and I talked with him. He was one of the finest characters I have ever known.

Last night when the telephone rang in my apartment and the news came that SOL BLOOM had gone down in the valley of the shadow of death, it was one of the greatest shocks I have ever had. I have not recovered from it yet. It was so sudden, so unexpected, that even at this moment I cannot fully realize that my friend has passed away.

Death is something that we all must meet, but when it comes it sometimes comes with surprising suddenness. We sorrow with death when it comes to one who is in the prime of life or one in early youth; but often when it comes to those who have lived a full and complete life, to those who have done great things in this world and who have grown gray in the service of their country, it comes as a comforting spirit that with kind and gentle fingers presses down their eyelids to eternal rest. That is the rest that will come to SOL BLOOM. He was a man of intense loyalties. He was loyal to his family. He was loyal to his committee. He was loyal to his friends. He was loyal to his party and he was loyal to his country. He served his country well. He served humanity well. He was a charitable man. He was the kind of man we love to meet, the kind of man we love to work with and talk with. When I think of him, I feel that James Whitcomb Riley, the Hoosier poet, must have had a man of his character in mind when he said:

The kind of a man for you and me!
He faces the world unflinchingly,
And smites, as long as the wrong resists,
With a knuckled faith and force like fists:
He lives the life he is preaching of,
And loves where most is the need of love;

* * * * *

The latch is clicked at the hovel door
And the sick man sees the sun once more,
And out o'er the barren fields he sees
Springing blossoms and waving trees,
Feeling as only the dying may,
That God's own servant has come that way.

* * * * *

The kind of a man for me and you
Lives for the good that he can do;
He walks abroad and he meets all kinds
Of querulous and uneasy minds,
And sympathizing, he shares the pain
Of the doubts that rack them, heart and brain,

* * * * *

And feeling them with a faith half glad
That the bad are as good as the good are bad,
He strikes straight out for the right, and he
Is the kind of man for you and me.

Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of man we have lost from this body. May he rest in peace.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], our distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, there is indeed great gloom in the House of Representatives in consequence of the deep sorrow which is ours in the passing of our beloved colleague and friend SOL BLOOM. Sweet, charitable, lovable, loyal, sincere, a real philosopher, possessed of an understanding mind and possessed of nobility of character, with a deep religious feeling, a man of profound faith, SOL BLOOM has left his favorable imprint upon everyone who knew him. He was a great legislator and a great American. He has left his indelible imprint upon the pages of American history. His death shocked all of us, the more so because it was unexpected.

His constituents and his people might well feel proud of the representation that SOL BLOOM gave them. SOL BLOOM was a great national figure, a man of national and international importance. His death is a sad loss, not only to the House of Representatives, but an irreparable loss to the country. In his passing, many of my colleagues, including myself, have lost a valued and close friend. To his daughter I extend my profound sympathy in her bereavement. I know that in this extension of sympathy I express the thought of all of my colleagues of the House of Representatives.

One of the noblest, one of the finest characters I have ever met on the journey of life, or that I ever expect to meet as long as I live, was SOL BLOOM.

May God have mercy on his soul.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE].

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, SOL BLOOM was as much a part of the New York City picture as Times Square, Al Smith, or Jimmy Walker. To you Mem-

bers who do not live in the great metropolitan area, New York no doubt appears to be a hurly-burly existence. Yet there is another life to the great Baghdad-on-the-Subway. It is home to 8,000,000 people. It is a city that has a heart. It is a city that has its life of charity, life of religion, and cultural life.

During the course of the years we who are citizens of the city of New York learned to know that there was never a movement affecting our people, their lives or their hopes in which SOL BLOOM was not playing a foremost and active part. He loved New York as he loved the Nation. It was natural that he loved the Nation because he loved all mankind. He was a man of deep feeling, a man of fine sensibilities. I do not believe there is a member on this floor today who cannot visualize SOL BLOOM coming through that door. Every step of the way there was a smile and a continuous procession of friendship, kindliness, and thoughtfulness.

It may seem an anomoly, but SOL BLOOM possessed a great Christian attribute. I never heard him say a harsh word of any other human being. I can remember the days of hard and rugged debate that preceded the war when Sol would stand where I am standing now, leading the battle and taking the brunt of the shock. Ofttimes many an unkind word was thrown in his direction, but never was his answer harsh or mean. He would throw off the hurt in his humble fashion and was ever ready to extend the hand of forgiveness. He always seemed to realize that he was dealing with human beings whose dignity he respected. He fully understood and forgave the frailties and weakness of men. He set a splendid example to everyone in this House and in this country as to what constitutes a real gentleman.

We of the House shall miss Sol. We respected him. As my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH] said, truly his was a typical American life. He came from a very humble beginning and through intellect, perseverance, diligence, and character he worked his way up gradually. Finally he reached the high places and walked with the great, but always in humility. His responsibilities were immense in the most trying period of the history of civilization.

Death has come to Sol as it must come to all Members. I think he has written his own eulogy and his own epitaph in his service to his city, in his service to his country, and in his service to mankind.

May his soul rest in peace.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have sat with SOL BLOOM on the Foreign Affairs Committee over a period of years have had many evidences of his loyalty to the United States, of his faithfulness to the tenets of his own belief, of his sense of responsibility to his Maker as an immortal soul. His death deprives the committee and this Congress of an able public servant, and leaves an emptiness that no one will ever quite fill. There will never be another Sol.

I have not always agreed with him—indeed, we have had some wonderful battles. But between us there was always recognition of the rightness of disagreement, that as Americans we could differ violently but in the end be friends. Not all men are so understanding of what such freedom in argument means, but Sol did, and one could not but love him for it, whose capacity for friendship will long live after him.

Many of the Members of this House have known him over a longer period of years than I, but I am certain that few have had opportunity to appreciate the peculiar charm that was his, the warm friendliness of his heart. I think that few, perhaps, have had the glimpse that he gave me upon two occasions of the desolation that came to him when his wife was taken from him. The privilege of such close moments are beyond the descriptive power of words; one never forgets them; one knows then the depths of a man's feeling, the quality of his faith.

I have had many opportunities to see his method of procedure; I have watched the results that have come from them. Recently, within the last weeks, I have watched his indomitable will carry him through and over intolerable moments of physical pain. Those moments, too, one does not forget. So alive has he been that it is hard to realize that today we cannot speak with him, nor touch his hand; we cannot see that amazing smile light up his face; yet we believe as he did, that his soul, freed from the restrictions of his failing body, has other work to do; so we cannot mourn him; we can but join together here to do him honor; we can but think of him—

* * * as one who layeth
His worn-out robes away,
And taking new ones, sayeth,
"These will I wear today!"
So putteth by the spirit
Lightly its robe of flesh,
And passeth to inherit
A residence afresh.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I too must pay my tribute to the great chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It is difficult for me this morning to speak about the loss of SOL BLOOM. When I went to the Committee on Foreign Affairs a little over 4 years ago I immediately lost my heart to this good and gentle man. I thought when I heard the news last night: Another of the great ones has left us.

But the sorrow I think we feel today is not for SOL BLOOM; he has had a rich and a full life; he has made a real contribution to the Congress, to the people of this country, and to the people of the world; the sorrow we feel is one of loss—another human being whom we have had the privilege to know and come to love has gone from us for the time being.

I should like to add a thought to the many things that have been said about SOL BLOOM that I think is heart warming at this time, and that is of the quality of the friendships that exist around the Foreign Affairs Committee table. The quality of friendship which has been built up in our committee has been made possible by SOL BLOOM with the cooperation of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON]. In our committee more nearly do we override differences of party than in any other committee of the House. When I spoke to the gentleman from West Virginia, Judge KEE, the first thing he said was: "This is a great shock to me, a very great loss, but it is a comfort to realize that we are all good friends on the Foreign Affairs Committee and that everyone will help at this time to carry on."

SOL BLOOM made possible the warm relationship, the real affection, to which the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] referred and on which the gentleman from West Virginia, Judge KEE, now relies. We could disagree, and we did, but we remained friends. SOL BLOOM made it possible for that kind of atmosphere to exist. I for one think that was a very real contribution to the many other contributions he has made.

Our friend has gone from us today, a man for whom I had come to have the deepest affection. Words at this time mean very little. The one tribute that I shall pay to SOL BLOOM is that I shall never forget him.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it was my very great privilege to have known SOL BLOOM as a young man when he and I were members of several clubs and societies. Since that time, not only during his youth but ever since, SOL BLOOM has gained the confidence and the friendship of all those with whom he came in contact. He has served his people well, but, above all, he has served his country. He was loyal and devoted to his dear family, his departed wife, and his aggrieved daughter, Vera.

It has been my privilege to have served with over 3,000 Members of this House, but I cannot recall or recollect anyone who has made more friends and deservingly so than SOL BLOOM.

SOL BLOOM was a kindly man, a religious man, and devoted to his duty as a Representative from New York and to the service of his country. In his loss the people of his district, his State, and the Nation lose a great citizen.

SOL BLOOM was born in my own State—the great State of Illinois—on March 9, 1870. Tomorrow would have been the anniversary of his seventy-ninth year.

SOL BLOOM has served during the 25 most crucial years in the history of the country, and as chairman of that great Committee on Foreign Affairs he has at all times had the best interests of our country and people at heart. He was a peace-loving man, and frequently expressed the hope that, notwithstanding the general world disturbances, universal peace will be forthcoming to the people of our country as well as to the people of the world.

I know that he had the confidence of the President and all those in high positions because of his gentlemanly conduct

and insight into the principles of righteousness and goodliness.

Though of Jewish faith—a God-fearing man—showing a great deal of interest in the future plight of the Jewish people, he at all times, and properly so, had the interest of his country always uppermost in his mind.

I regret profoundly his passing, but I feel that he has left behind a splendid reputation, unblemished and noteworthy, which should and will be emulated by posterity and by many of those who have the privilege of serving in this House and who have a desire to serve the Nation. His memory and deeds shall live on forever.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay my tribute to an amazing American. There was only one SOL BLOOM. There was only one country in the world where a man could have had the varied career that SOL BLOOM had. He loved to tell incidents of his career, and has told some of us many interesting anecdotes; about a poor boy who won his way and became rich, and who loved his country, and who became a great servant of the people.

I do not suppose there is any Member of this House that had more fights with SOL BLOOM than I have had, in committee and on this floor, and yet we were friends. SOL BLOOM was a hard fighter, but he never harbored a grudge. After some of the difficult and sometimes bitter debates involving our foreign affairs in the past decade, I have had the experience of leaving this floor and meeting him with his hand outstretched, willing to be friends, after we had settled the matter between us, because SOL BLOOM, in committee and on the floor, felt that Congressmen should be like scissors; they should cut what is between them and not each other.

SOL BLOOM was a great showman from the time he took part in the World's Fair in Chicago in 1893 down through the years. He appreciated putting things across so that the public would be interested and understand. For a long time during his service in Congress he devoted his genius as a showman to putting the history of the United States across with the public. Because of his activities a lot of people who were then children and are now grown to manhood know a lot more about George Washington and the early history of our country than they would have otherwise. Because of this genius of his a lot of us know more about the forming of our Constitution and the early events in the life of this young Republic. His contribution was a rare one, an unusual one, that could have been made in no other country.

SOL BLOOM was a Jew, and he was not afraid of being a Jew, or ashamed of it, or sensitive about it. In the past 10 years the Committee on Foreign Affairs has had before it many matters involving Jews and Palestine, and if we had had a chairman who made it difficult to talk about all phases of the problems involved, our work would have been greatly hampered. But SOL sat at the head of the table as a Jew who was proud of it but not sensitive about it, and he led in the discussions wherein all of us with SOL BLOOM, our chairman, faced the problems as Americans should.

He has made a unique contribution to the history of this Republic, he has made a unique contribution to the telling of the history of this Republic. This great soul will be remembered long. Our sympathies go to his daughter, Vera. SOL BLOOM will live not only in her heart and in the hearts of his friends, but in the life of the Republic he loved, for he helped to make his countrymen understand better their own great heritage.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, may I add my word of tribute to this fallen leader who, during his life, did so much for his beloved country.

Like the gentleman from Ohio, I had my differences with Sol in our committee, but I always found that after the smoke of our differences had cleared away we could get together on common ground.

Sol was a remarkable man. He was a remarkable American. He was a strong pillar of the church of his orthodox faith. He was a stalwart champion of the hopes and aspirations of his race. But most of all, Mr. Speaker, he was proudest of the fact that he was an American, and he gave unstintingly of his time, his energy, his love, and his great ability to the advancement of the interests of his country.

We Members of the House will doubtless remember Sol first of all as the proponent and champion of legislation of momentous consequence to this country during the last decade. He led many a battle here in the field of foreign affairs, and he helped develop the foreign policy of this country into a virile movement for world stability, democracy, and peace.

We will remember him too as he came in that door with his grin, banter, and showmanship. Those of us who knew him pretty well realized that down under that flippant exterior was a heart running over with sentiment. The love of Sol for his wife and his daughter was a beautiful thing. I do not believe he was ever the same after his devoted wife left his side for the great beyond some years ago. I have heard it said by those who knew him longer than I that he was never the same afterward. Now he has left that talented, devoted daughter, who mourns his passing. I sincerely believe, as she sits at the bier of her father, that, in the words of Robert Ingersoll, "Listening love hears the rustle of a wing."

I always thought that Robert Ingersoll's great speech at the grave of his brother would have been more powerful, more comforting, if instead of saying, "On the night of death hope sees a star, and listening love hears the rustle of a wing," he had said, "Faith sees a star, and listening love hears the rustle of a wing."

Faith was inherent in this man. Who is there here today to guarantee that the path of faith he has chosen for himself is the right way, and that the other fellow is wrong? Only when the mists of eternity roll away will we find the answer. The important question for us who tarry here is whether we have faith in what we profess to believe. SOL BLOOM had that kind of faith. God rest his soul.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply shocked to hear late last night of the sudden death of SOL BLOOM with whom I have had the pleasure and honor of serving for over 2 years on the Committee on Foreign Affairs—first when he was ranking minority member and recently when he was chairman of this great committee. As chairman during the critical war years, he piloted much significant legislation through the Committee on Foreign Affairs and through this Chamber. He played a highly significant part in the international affairs of this country, both as chairman of this important committee and as a delegate to the United Nations Conference at San Francisco. SOL BLOOM was a man of many talents, great energies, lively wit, and a great capacity for friendship. He rose to outstanding achievements—a notable example of the vital opportunities and rewards that are available under our free system. Overcoming many obstacles he lived a long and useful life during which he attained great material success, rendered distinguished public service and made many fast friends. His life was a tribute not only to his own character and ability but also to the American system which makes possible such exceptional accomplishments. His participation, his leadership, his friendship, will be sorely missed. His death will be widely mourned. I mourn his passing.

* * * he is not dead, he doth not sleep—
He hath awakened from the dream of life—
'Tis we, who, lost in stormy visions, keep
With phantoms an unprofitable strife,
And in mad trance, strike with our spirit's knife
Invulnerable nothings. We decay
Like corpses in a charnel; fear and grief
Convulse us and consume us day by day
And cold hopes swarm like worms within our living clay.
He has outsoared the shadow of our night;
Envy and calumny and hate and pain,
And that unrest which men miscall delight,
Can touch him not and torture not again;
From the contagion of the world's slow stain
He is secure.

SOL BLOOM has gone where, beyond these voices, there is peace.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF].

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, SOL BLOOM was a good man. He lived a good life. He accomplished good deeds.

SOL BLOOM was a religious man. He worshiped the God of his fathers. He respected the religious concepts of every creed, for he knew that all great religions were similar in their reverence of moral righteousness. To him the Bible was the greatest of books, and he walked in the steps of his Lord.

SOL BLOOM was a simple and friendly man. Free from rancor and hate, he loved all mankind. He forgave and was sorry for those whose souls were curdled by prejudice. His helping hand was outstretched to all mankind. His sympathy encompassed all suffering, all injustice. Kindly, the troubled of the world found

in him a champion. A charitable man, he gave his largess to all worthy causes.

Born in Pekin, Ill., the son of immigrant parents, he removed to San Francisco at a tender age. His life was the American story repeated—but repeated with emphasis. SOL BLOOM was the American dream come true. From beginnings no matter how humble, from whatever race, color, or creed, in the United States of America he who will can rise to heights of influence and service. His imagination and industry drove him forward from poverty and obscurity to a distinguished place in the affairs of our Nation. Self-educated, he was elected to Congress from the Twentieth District of New York in 1923, and again and again his district sent him back to Washington. His honesty, patience, quiet sincerity and ability won for him the respect of his colleagues, Presidents of the United States, and the entire Nation. SOL BLOOM loved America. He believed in its institutions and doctrines with all his heart and all his soul.

SOL BLOOM became chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee at the most crucial period in American history. To him fell the responsibility of the revision of the Neutrality Act, legislation dealing with national defense, lend-lease, our country's participation in the United Nations, rehabilitation of peoples in liberated countries, measures for the rescue of refugees, declaration of American policy in regard to world peace, the European recovery program, and other important legislation vital to our country and the freedom-loving nations of the world. He was one of the American delegates to the San Francisco Conference.

As a first-termer, he was kindly and helpful to me—a stranger to him. He welcomed me to the Foreign Affairs Committee. During our short friendship, we talked much together, and his wisdom, derived from experience, made a deep impression upon me. He was fatherly. In talking with SOL BLOOM, you knew that uppermost in his mind and heart was the welfare of the United States. Everything else in his life was subordinate to his country.

Death has stilled SOL BLOOM's heart and voice in the service of his Nation. All of us who knew him have had our lives enriched by his friendship. His contribution to our country and mankind will live on forever.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD.]

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, the first time it was my privilege to meet the Honorable SOL BLOOM whose passing we mourn today was just 10 years ago, during the hearings on the neutrality legislation before the Foreign Affairs Committee.

I had just returned from China, where I had spent the last year or so removing American scrap iron from the bodies and brains of Chinese men, women, and children, and a period of several months under the control of the invading Japanese armies.

I was given an opportunity to testify before the committee, on what I had seen of Japanese aggression and the menace I felt it held for our own country and for world peace. I was a little shell-shocked, I know, by what I had been through, and felt so intensely that America must take action immediately to stop building up Japanese militarism. I remember so well my first impression of the chairman of the committee, Mr. BLOOM. He was completely courteous and considerate but the long, black ribbon he wore so jauntily on his eyeglasses, his immaculate dress, his gay manner seemed so casual in the face of the situation I felt so urgent. Then I noted how skillfully, during the questioning and discussion that followed my statement, he intervened two or three times, with some keenly witty remark or even mild banter which brought us back to calmer voices and better balance. After that hearing of 45 minutes or an hour my impression of the man had changed completely. It was apparent that he did not wear his feelings on his sleeve. No matter how deep his own concerns he maintained an even temper as chairman. His good humor increased, not lessened, the ability of all to think sanely. The real character of the man and his motivations were revealed—his depth, steadiness, dependability.

He was as good a blend as I have known of strong convictions and unfaltering devotion to them, mixed with unfailing kindliness, gentleness, friendliness, and fairness. He worked throughout his long and full life for a greater tolerance in human relations without developing a single iota of intolerance, or prejudice, or resentment, or bitterness himself.

I know how deeply disappointed he was by mankind's failure in immediate postwar period to accomplish the dreams he had for the United Nations to which he had given so much of his thought and effort as a delegate from our country to the conference at San Francisco. He brought it up one day in conversation. He had so hoped that this organization would somehow be able to resolve the age-old jealousies and hatreds, the minority problems, and boundary quarrels, and national rivalries; and that it could become the agency by which the eternal yearning of man for peace on earth could come to fruition. Yet, with all his disappointment and, perhaps disillusionment, there never crept into his words or manner a sign of cynicism or defeatism. He continued to pursue the dream. His unshakable confidence came out of his deep belief that God is; and that, therefore, what ought to be can be; but that God operates through men; and he was one who was glad to lay his time and his talents in the hand of the Eternal to be used as an instrument in bringing to earth His principles of human brotherhood and spirit of love and good will.

After serving with him in recent years on the Foreign Affairs Committee my admiration for SOL BLOOM steadily grew.

The life of SOL BLOOM is an unanswerable answer to modern American cynics. It is the everlasting denial of their doubts. What he did and what he became should give to all renewed faith in man and faith in this country and the principles on which it was founded, which gave him the opportunity to rise from the humblest beginning to a position of great influence and make an immeasurable contribution to his country and to the world.

He had lived such a rich and full life that we cannot grieve today for him; rather we grieve for his daughter and for ourselves—that we must go on without him. Many problems will become more difficult without his genial spirit and great experience to help guide us. We can honor him most in the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to which he was so devoted, and in the House of Representatives by doing an even better job for America and for mankind because we have to do it without his companionship and help.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, words are useless at a time like this to express the deep love and appreciation that the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the House of Representatives had for SOL BLOOM.

A great and a good man has passed from among us.

Those of us who had the privilege of serving under him on the Committee on Foreign Affairs will miss him, and miss him greatly. He was a man who could be held up as an ideal anywhere in this great country of ours, because SOL BLOOM by his own life had symbolized for all just what an American is and just what Americanism means.

At this time I want to express my very deep sympathy to his daughter, Vera Bloom, in this her hour of deep sorrow. I want to repeat again that this House has lost an outstanding Member, the country has lost a great statesman, and the world has lost a good friend.

May his soul rest in peace.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I knew a good deal about Sol, as we all called him, from a rather close range. He represented the Twentieth Congressional District of New York which borders my district and has a population very much like that in my district.

Perhaps the greatest tribute that could be paid Sol is the love and devotion in which he was held by the people of his own district who, after all, knew him best. They came to him when they needed help. They cherished and loved him when he was here. You could note it by the tone in which every resident of the Twentieth Congressional District spoke of Sol, regardless of party.

Mr. Speaker, something has been said by my colleagues about SOL BLOOM's people. He was unmatched in his love for his faith, in his pride of origin and in what has been called the passion for justice—moral righteousness which distinguishes his own ancestors; yet, Mr. Speaker, SOL BLOOM was distinguished even more as he saw it by the fact that his people were the American people, and I believe that is the way he would like to have it known forever.

Some things stand out in a colleague's mind. I was a colleague of Sol's on the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I can never forget the light in his eye, the joy in his voice, whenever we talked about

the problems of children. Children, I think, meant more to Sol than any other human equation on earth. He showed that in his devotion to his duties and by his support for St. Ann's Orphanage here in Washington. He showed it in his solicitude for children everywhere through the International Children's Fund. He showed it most admirably by the light in his eye when he even talked about children.

My colleagues have spoken of the problems on which they may have disagreed with Sol. Two or three days before he died, and my colleagues I am sure will remember this, he said in the Foreign Affairs Committee, and I quote his words exactly, "I hate controversy." When Sol wanted things brought to a conclusion, and I think I understood him, it was only because he hated controversy and wanted to resolve the disagreement at the very earliest possible moment.

The innermost nature of the man was his love, and his longing for peace for men individually and collectively everywhere in the world.

Mr. Speaker, may the Lord give SOL BLOOM's soul everlasting peace and give us perception to see the light in his life so that it may illuminate our way.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this solemn moment to add a simple but heartfelt tribute to the memory of that lovable, that loving gentleman, SOL BLOOM:

Counsel in the heart of man is like deep water, But a man of understanding will draw it out. (Proverbs 20: 5.)

Such a man of understanding was SOL BLOOM; this was an understanding that was deep-rooted in the true, the real American tradition. A background such as his could not be acquired by being educated in a school, but by education that was gained from a lifetime of experience—an education that stood him so well in treating with his fellow man. That genial, respectful, and respected gentleman will long be remembered by us, always ardently fighting for that which he thought was right, but never forgetting that there was the possibility that he was wrong and that the other person was right.

It was in that spirit that he always carried on in and out of this House. It was that spirit that I looked to for guidance when I came here, and I know it was that spirit that prompted others, when they might have been tempted to be harsh with someone who disputed with them, to be kindly. It was that spirit that urges and causes us to be more temperate and more tolerant of the other man's viewpoint.

May the remembrance of that fine gentleman ever be a shining example to us who remain of how to carry on the finest traditions of our country in the best interest of all.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, death is an unwelcome visitor under any circumstances. And all the more so when he comes unheralded and unannounced. That is particularly true in this instance when he knocked unbidden and unexpected last evening at the door of our colleague and our friend, SOL BLOOM.

SOL BLOOM was one of the most lovable of men. He radiated happiness. He loved life. He loved people. It was his delight to be of service. There is not a Member of this House to whom he has not rendered affectionate service whenever opportunity afforded. And to all of us who are left behind, the world is the sadder for his going.

He was a man of exceptional capacity. In him was strikingly exemplified that ancient proverb: "Seeth thou a man diligent in business? He shall stand before kings."

That was literally true of SOL BLOOM. And in his commanding position in this House, he dealt with affairs of state in which he negotiated with the executives of administration and the heads of governments of practically every nation throughout the world. The contributions which he rendered to his country and to mankind cannot be fully appreciated until the history of this age is written years hence.

And now that the chapter is ended those of us who really knew him on this floor can feel that he has passed on with a quizzical backward glance and a cheery wave of the hand. Certainly, with him, if with anyone, death is a door which leads to light, a door which opens through the silence of the darkest night to endless day.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, SOL BLOOM and I came to Congress together in 1923, and it has been our privilege to serve ever since. SOL BLOOM was a man of even temper. He was a careful and a patriotic man. He was, above all, a real American, whose heart beat for the freedom which was his, and which he enjoyed and wished the rest of the world to enjoy. Few men have made a greater impression upon this House than he. Few men have rendered greater service than he.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, there is very little I can add to the glorious tribute that has been paid to our colleague here this morning, but I know that, if Sol were listening here—and I am one of those who believe that he probably is—he would be overjoyed to know the esteem in which his colleagues hold him and the example he is leaving behind for us here to follow.

I, too, represent a district adjoining Sol's in the Borough of Manhattan, in New York City. In 1941, when I first came here after a special election, it was he that presented my certificate of election to the Speaker, and who escorted me to the well of this House and introduced me to the Members. Since then, on many occasions I have come to him for guidance and advice, and have never found him wanting.

He was a great American. He was a great Jew. As one of his coreligionists, I may say about him that he was one of our great assets. All religions, all races, and all creeds have their good and their bad, and we Jews are no different. However, as long as we have men like SOL BLOOM, as long as we have such assets as him we can overcome the liabilities we may have in those who bring discredit upon us, and as in business when your assets exceed your liabilities, we have no fear of spiritual insolvency or bankruptcy. Thanks to SOL BLOOM and many others, including our coreligionists in this House, we do have our assets, we do have people who bring glory and credit to all of us.

The people of this country, of the city of New York, of the Borough of Manhattan, particularly, and of the world, will miss him sorely. I offer my condolences to his daughter on my own behalf and on behalf of the Democratic organization of the county of New York and its leader, the Honorable Hugo Rogers, who called me this morning, the mayor of the City of New York, and all of the people of the city, who knew him so well and who loved him so dearly. We will miss him sorely, but I know his spirit will live on among us and guide us. May he rest in peace.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI].

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the House have spoken about the great virtues SOL BLOOM possessed. They have spoken about the virtues of faith and hope. I should like to speak a few words about another great virtue he possessed, the virtue of charity.

He was not only charitable to the Members of Congress and to people he would meet in ordinary, everyday life, but his charity was unbounded. Many of us of the Catholic faith are charitable in our way to our institutions. Those of us of the Protestant faith are charitable to Protestant institutions. But SOL BLOOM's charity went beyond his faith, his religion, his own Jewish institutions. I know something about it. I am a member of St. Ann's Catholic parish. All my children have attended school there. His Catholic charities are well known even to the school children. There is in the District a Catholic charitable institution known as St. Ann's Infant Asylum. SOL BLOOM took upon himself to support generously the orphanage of St. Ann's. In speaking about it to him on several occasions and expressing my deep appreciation, Sol would wave aside these expressions. He did not like to be praised about his charity. I think it is proper for me at this time to express the deep sorrow that all Catholics must feel. Certainly today there is great sorrow in the heart of Sister Superior Angela and her flock of nuns and there is great sorrow in the hearts of those orphans. It is said that the good Lord listens to all prayers, no matter what your faith. No matter what church you may belong to, all prayers are received by the Lord and are welcome. I know there will be many prayers said by the orphans at St. Ann's for peace and rest for the soul of SOL BLOOM, and I know that all of the members of St. Ann's Orphanage will join in those prayers.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN].

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, as one of the newer members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I add my tribute to a great American. Mr. BLOOM rose to eminence via the difficult path of merit. He leaves a lovely trace in the course of human progress. Death, the inevitable, to him is the benediction to a rich life and a beautiful invocation of immortality.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart and conflicting emotions that I attempt to speak at this time a few words of tribute to the memory of our dear friend and honored statesman, SOL BLOOM, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, with whom I had the honor to serve under.

In my long service with him I had the occasion to observe first-hand his unselfish devotion to duty and his guiding desire to strive for the peace of the world.

SOL BLOOM was a man whose great experience proved of great value to our country and to the world during those critical war years when he served as chairman of our Committee on Foreign Affairs and piloted through to enactment vital measures affecting the conduct of the war that will lead to the establishment of peace to the world.

Born of Polish immigrants, SOL BLOOM typified all that is great and glorious in our wonderful democracy. Denied the advantages of a formal education because of the extreme poverty of his parents, he became self-educated in the best and truest sense of the word. His long and varied career is a shining example of what honesty, integrity, industry, and a desire to help others can enable one to accomplish in this great land of opportunity.

SOL BLOOM was a deeply religious man and showed it in his love for his fellow man and his ever willingness to lend a helping hand to those who needed assistance.

The record of his 27 years of service in Congress is one long list of not only outstanding legislative achievements but of actions where he used his high office to extend assistance in all worthy cases which came to his attention.

SOL BLOOM will be greatly missed, not only by his colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee and in the Congress, but by a host of friends all over the world who were privileged to have his friendship.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE].

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply shocked to learn last night that SOL BLOOM had passed away. In my brief period of service here as a Member I sincerely regret that I did not have the opportunity to know him well. Much has been said today by Members who knew him very well, but since my home town of Pekin, Ill., is the birthplace of this great American, I feel impelled to say just a few words in his memory, and to extend the sympathy of his friends and relatives in Pekin and Peoria to his family.

SOL BLOOM lived only a brief time in Pekin, and that as a small child. He came up the hard way and the honest way, working hard as a youth, and then blossoming out in his manhod as a great example of our American citizenry, and as a splendid representative of the Jewish faith.

SOL BLOOM was always proud of his Pekin birth and early childhood. The citizens of Pekin are proud to claim their home town as the birthplace of such an outstanding American as SOL BLOOM. I am particularly proud to have served with him as a Member of Congress.

May his soul rest in peace.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCSWEENEY].

Mr. MCSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, as a former member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I raise my humble voice in tribute to our great leader in that committee, but in the words of William Winter, I can only say:

What can I write upon my scroll, dear Master,
Thou, who with a wizard's brain and subtle skill,
With pen pellucid, voice divinely saying,
Has served thy fellows with untiring will.

Not mine to write upon thy scroll
The sum of garnered sheaves thy patient years have won.
Immortal voices on the trail's last bend
Shall laud thee statesman, patriot, father, friend.

As a boy my father told me that in all services of life aside from ability there must be a heart and mind for that work. We may combine those two qualities and say it is temperament. I believe that Mr. SOL BLOOM had a temperament for public service that is seldom exceeded by any man in public life. He always had a genial word for all those with whom he was associated. He had a temperament that allowed him to understand the vicissitudes of life. He took such pride in his family, in his friends, and in his public service.

We shall miss him. America's greatness rests on the fact that men like him have given so much of their time and effort to the well-being of their country. I am very glad to know that his very gracious and talented daughter carries on many of the concepts Mr. BLOOM had about life itself.

So my humble voice is raised in tribute to a great American.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I would not say anything after all of these wonderful tributes that have been paid to SOL BLOOM, except that SOL was such a friend. Few deaths have occurred since I have been a Member of Congress that more deeply affected me than the passing of SOL BLOOM; there have been but few men in Congress with whom I have served, or there have been few men in all my life, for whom I had a deeper affection than I had for SOL BLOOM. Every day of his life he paid tribute to the country in which he lived by his gratitude for what this great country had done for him, the opportunity it had given a poor boy, sending him to San Francisco, to Chicago, to New York, to make him successful in business and more successful as a servant of his country in this day and generation when good men and true—and women—are needed in the service not only of this country but in the service of the world.

SOL BLOOM gave a full portion of fine service to his country and to the age in which he lived; and today wherever out there—I do not know where—out there where mighty spirits have been waiting throughout the years, when this fine spirit approached he was welcome and received as an equal among the mightiest of spirits.

Sol's friendship was an enriching treasure which he gave to me without stint; in the memory of that friendship I shall not be so very poor.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 136):

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. SOL BLOOM, a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That a committee of 15 Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the funeral committee the following Members of the House: Mr. CELLER, Mr. BUCKLEY of New York, Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. KEOGH, Mr. O'TOOLE, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. HEFFERNAN, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. ROONEY, Mrs. DOUGLAS, Mr. QUINN, Mr. REED of New York, Mr. VORYS, and Mr. JAVITS.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life and character of SOL BLOOM at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I could not fail to embrace this opportunity to raise my voice in brief but very sincere tribute to the life, character, and public service of Hon. SOL BLOOM.

It was with a very great shock and deep regret that I heard that he had passed away. He had been one of my closest and warmest friends during my period of service here. He was one of the most likable men I have ever known. His heart beat in tune with the welfare of the masses of our people, and he sincerely loved his fellow man. He possessed the highest attributes of character and all of the sterling qualities of manhood. He was a man of recognized ability and demonstrated devotion to

public service. He rendered most outstanding and distinguished service to his country and the world, and his guiding influence will be sorely missed in this critical period of world affairs.

I concur in the remarks made by my colleagues, and I desire to convey my deepest sympathy to his dear daughter and loved ones.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound sorrow and a keen sense of personal loss I learned of the passing of SOL BLOOM, our beloved colleague from the Twentieth District of New York.

SOL, as he was affectionately known by his friends, was born in Pekin, Ill., just 20 miles from my home, Canton. So we of Illinois claim him as our own.

No one could have served on the Foreign Affairs Committee as I have for more than 10 years without learning to love and admire our great chairman, Mr. BLOOM. His outstanding ability, his sense of fairness to each and every member of that committee is known to us all.

With all his fine qualities, to me, his outstanding characteristic was his kindness to everyone and his love for his fellow men.

It is more than a coincidence that his passing was at the end of brotherhood week, for his life typified the precepts of brotherly love. He made friends all over the world and in all walks of life without regard to their race or religion. He was one of the outstanding men of our time. Truly a world citizen.

He gave so unstintingly of his time to his committee that he undermined his health. He died in the service of his country just as much as a soldier on the battlefield. If the true measure of a man lives in his good works, his influence on the lives of others, and the impact of his life on his time, then SOL BLOOM surely left his mark.

To me, his life was epitomized by Browning in the lines:

I was ever a fighter, so—one fight more the best and the last.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, when a colleague passes, one always is conscious of a personal loss. It means one we have been accustomed to see from day to day in our labors no longer will be a part of the scene.

In the death of SOL BLOOM, I feel a special sense of shock. Few men in public life have merited so well the respect of their friends. Few have been able to win and hold so many genuine friendships.

SOL BLOOM was a humble man. He was sensible always of the free opportunities of a democracy which made possible his rise to high station. He regarded his great public responsibilities in the chairmanship of the House Foreign Affairs Committee as a trust to be discharged in the best interests of democratic principles.

He was a vigorous fighter and forceful in all things, but SOL BLOOM was at heart a man of peace. Passionately he wanted a world of amicability and constructive progress. His faith was that this must come eventually, and he still was working toward it on the day of his death.

Amid many concerns of high policy, he never forgot that it was the people of the Twentieth New York District who sent him to the House and gave him his opportunities for service. He served them well because he understood them. His district, the State of New York and the Nation all have been bereft of a character of great nobility. The world has lost an influential and untiring worker in the cause of brotherhood.

SOL BLOOM's words and actions exemplified his devotion to understanding, his abhorrence of discord and intolerance. Firm in his Jewish faith, he never bound his good offices to the confines of creed. One of the chief interests in his life was a Catholic orphan home.

I know all of my colleagues join me in expressing deepest sympathy to his daughter in her bereavement.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, as one sat here today listening to the many glowing tributes being paid to the memory of our colleague, SOL BLOOM, one could not help but notice the sincerity and emotion with which the sentiments were expressed, coming as they assuredly did from the hearts of those uttering them.

The thought occurred to me that if, in this one small Chamber, so many could speak in such terms of our departed colleague, how great a chorus of distress and sorrow must now be coming from literally thousands upon thousands, not only in Washington and New York and throughout the United States, but from practically every nation in the world, because the influence of the gentle and kindly soul and works of SOL BLOOM were indeed felt in all places, high and low; always for the good and for the well-being of humanity.

During perhaps the most trying period of international dealings and in the history of the United States, when the most momentous decisions of any time had to be made, SOL BLOOM, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, guided and directed those decisions—which will for generations affect the future of all our citizens, as well as the course of world events.

Always courteous, always kind, always with the single purpose in mind of promoting justice, liberty, freedom, and truth, SOL BLOOM indeed played a significant and powerful part in shaping world events.

None who ever lived had more love of country and patriotism in his heart than our departed colleague. His place in history is secure.

To his daughter, Vera, I express the deepest kind of sympathy, the kind which can only go to a faithful and loving daughter who has lost a father who was magnificent in many ways.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, the death of Representative SOL BLOOM is a tragedy not only to the residents of his district but to the Nation and the world. Mr. BLOOM was one of the great figures of this day, and the country has suffered a loss that cannot be measured.

The service he rendered to this Nation will live in the years to come and will benefit future generations. His whole public service was devoted to aiding humanity and seeking to improve the lot of all mankind.

His life should serve as an inspiration to all, and the goals he fought for should continue to be the aim of all those who believe in a better world.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it was with sincere regret I learned of the death of SOL BLOOM, whose warm personal friendship I had enjoyed for 25 years. When I first came to Congress 25 years ago, I was assigned to the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and upon that committee was SOL BLOOM. A friendship was started which was never tarnished.

SOL BLOOM was a man of character and ability. He had a keen mind and a studious nature. Through the years he devoted his fine talents to the study of foreign affairs, and at the time of his death was an acknowledged authority with a world-wide reputation.

He was a fine example of the opportunities which only America can give to its youth. Born a poor boy, with only a self-acquired education, he won both wealth and fame. He was admired by a host of friends who appreciated his generous and kindly nature.

Congress has lost a valued Member in the death of SOL BLOOM. To his daughter I extend my deepest sympathy in her hour of sorrow.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I know all our hearts are saddened by the unexpected news of the passing last night of our dear friend and distinguished colleague, the Honorable SOL BLOOM, of the Twentieth Congressional District, New York. It is with deep emotion and a feeling of great sorrow that I raise my voice in brief, but nonetheless sincere, tribute to the life and character and public service of such a fine gentleman.

Congressman BLOOM served continuously in this House since March 4, 1923. As a Member for over 20 years and twice chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, he wielded a tremendous influence in solving many difficult problems during the most critical period of our international relations.

SOL BLOOM was a man of devoted patriotism to this great country of ours and of sincere allegiance to the people whom he was elected to serve. He gave his all toward establishing a more harmonious relationship between the conflicting forces of our society.

His genial and kindly manner, and his earnest and sincere loyalty to his colleagues in the House won him their love and respect.

Only recently I had many consultations with him concerning the resolution which by its terms protested the arrest, trial, and imprisonment of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, of Hungary, and Archbishop Aloysius Stepinac, of Yugoslavia. On February 9, 1949, I took occasion to sincerely commend him for his promptness in bringing this legislation to the floor of the House for a vote.

Mr. Speaker, we have lost a skilled legislator, a great humanitarian, and a fine gentleman. His many years of public service and his record as a statesman will long endure. I am sure that I speak

not only for myself but for all the Members of this House and his legion of friends when I say that his kindness, his memory, will linger in our hearts forever. My prayer is that his daughter will be consoled by the fact that his long life was well and valuably spent. I extend to her my deep and sincere sympathy upon her loss. May he rest in peace.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, it was my good fortune to meet SOL BLOOM personally when I came to the Eighty-first Congress a short time ago. I was tremendously impressed by his friendliness and his burning desire to achieve those goals which he conceived to be necessary for the welfare of our Nation. I had heard of SOL BLOOM for many years through reputation and had come to rely upon him as a leader among those in our Government in its dealings with the nations of the world in seeking to achieve world peace and better understanding among all peoples. My brief acquaintance with him convinced me that the great reputation he had attained had not been lightly gained, but that it was founded upon true attributes of insight, wisdom, and justice.

This country has indeed suffered a great loss with the passing of SOL BLOOM, and I desire to join with the others among my colleagues who have paid tribute to this humble and great servant of our country.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, last night I was reading Spencer's Faerie Queene, not knowing that my friend SOL BLOOM was then dead.

I copied the following lines, which are apropos and applicable to him, and I use them now as my tribute to him and to his memory:

Life is not lost for which is bought
Endlesse renowne.

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker and Members of the Congress, the passing of our dear colleague, SOL BLOOM, has affected all of us with a depth of sorrow that cannot be measured by mere words.

I met SOL many years before I came to Congress. He had always been very active in New York political circles, and was of such a happy disposition that once meeting him was to never forget him. He was always the life of every gathering, and his human and good-natured friendliness made all his companions call for more and more of his wit, sallies, and jollity.

When I did come to Congress his work in the George Washington celebration was occupying much of his time, and his approach to that obligation was of the very highest quality. It became a perfect passion with him, and he was so indefatigable in following through on every detail that practically every man and woman in Congress marveled at his strength and enthusiasm. His work as chairman of the great House Foreign Affairs Committee, and his optimism in every movement of our country toward final victory was contagious, and elevated the spirits not only of his fellow members of the committee, but literally thousands who came in contact with his overflowing spirit of certainty that nothing could stop us in our victorious march to eventual success.

Mr. Speaker, and fellow Members, a truly wonderful husband, father, citizen, and patriot has passed to his highly earned eternal reward, and I say of dear SOL, as Hamlet spoke of his father:

He was a man, take him for all in all;
We shall not look upon his like again.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, in the loss of SOL BLOOM from our midst, we have lost a great leader, patriot, astute legislator, and friend.

In his lifetime, SOL BLOOM won the love and respect of all who knew him. His innate kindliness and love for his fellow man endeared him to all. By his varied career, by his industry and love of country, as well as his outstanding successes, he proved that America is indeed a land of opportunity and democracy.

His many friends keenly feel shock and grief at his departure from this life; the people of this country have lost a great statesman. As a Member of Congress for more than 20 years, he fulfilled his duties as a Representative with dignity and courage. Twice chairman of the powerful Foreign Affairs Committee, he wielded great influence in steering our Nation through some of the most troubled and stormy periods of its international relations.

SOL BLOOM, while he was in our midst, set us an example of faithfulness, sincerity, honesty, and untiring devotion to responsibility which we found a challenge to emulate. Now that he is gone, his memory will remain with us, for it is not possible to forget such a man.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, the death of Mr. SOL BLOOM removed from the House one of its most colorful characters. While I never had the pleasure of knowing him personally—having taken my oath of office less than 10 days ago—I was well acquainted with his career as a legislator and followed it closely during the past 20 years.

From what his distinguished colleagues said of him, it is evident that the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee have lost a fair-minded and helpful chairman; his district, a sympathetic and understanding Congressman; the people of New York State, a conscientious public servant and a man of great integrity and character; and Congress and its membership, a good, true friend who knew how to smile and who never lost his sense of humor.

SOL BLOOM was a true American. He believed that truth and justice are fundamental to an enduring social order; he believed in the sacredness of a promise, that a man's word should be as good as his bond; that character—not wealth or power or position—is of supreme worth; he believed in the dignity of labor, whether with head or hand; that the world owes no man a living but that it owes every man an opportunity to make a living; he believed that the law was made for man and not man for the law; that government is the servant of the people and not their master; he believed in the supreme worth of the individual and in his right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; he believed that the rendering of useful service is the common duty of mankind; he believed in an all-wise and all-loving God, named by whatever name, and that the individual's highest fulfillment, greatest happiness, and widest usefulness are to be found in living in harmony with His will; and he believed that love is the greatest thing in the world—that it alone can overcome hate—that right can and will triumph over might.

The life and achievements of SOL BLOOM are a challenge and an inspiration to the youth of the land. He has shown that in America great heights can be achieved, despite poverty and obscurity or lack of educational advantages.

I can find nothing more appropriate in describing SOL BLOOM and what he personified throughout his life than this credo:

I am an American!
The Golden Rule is my rule!

In humility and with gratitude
I acknowledge my undying debt
To the founding fathers
Who left me a priceless heritage
Which now is my responsibility.

With steadfast loyalty,
I will uphold the Constitution
And the Bill of Rights.

I will treasure my birthright
Of American ideals:
I will place moral integrity
Above worldly possessions.

Problems of interest to my country
Shall be of interest to me!

I will count my right of suffrage
To be a sacred trust,
And I will diligently strive
To prove worthy of that trust.

I will give my full support
To uphold public servants,
But those with unclean hands,
I will firmly oppose.

Each obligation that comes to me
As a true American,
I will discharge with honor!

My heart is in America
And America is in my heart!

I am an American!

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, saddened and shocked, I rise to pay tribute to one of the most distinguished, productive, and lovable characters ever to serve the cause of humanity in this Chamber. The service record of SOL BLOOM is replete with outstanding accomplishment and there is nothing that any Member can say that could possibly add luster to what he himself had wrought. SOL BLOOM was as sincere as he was diligent in his application to the task before him. He was most kindly and considerate. He was an outstanding example of tolerance. However much he might have disagreed with the proponents or opponents of ideas not in conformity with his own, in my friendly and intimate contacts with him, which I have enjoyed over the many years of our joint service, I cannot recall a single instance when our departed colleague willfully or even accidently, by word or deed, ever bruised the mental or physical feelings of a fellow Member or a witness before the great committee of which he had become the distinguished and productive chairman.

SOL BLOOM rose to great heights from a most modest beginning, but he never lost the common touch. He had never forgotten the hardships of his youth, and throughout the entire span of his kaleidoscopic life he shared most charitably his many blessings.

SOL BLOOM always had a kindly word for his fellow man. He was ever ready for a kindly jest. His disposition, like his presence, dispelled the gloom with its sunshine. He was my friend.

A soft and a kindly voice has been stilled in this Chamber, but those of us who were privileged to hear his appeals on behalf of humanity will never forget the ring of sincerity which inclined even his opponents to support the righteous proposals which he espoused. There can be no doubt but that the reward of eternal rest will be granted to this outstanding legislator, who embodied all the cardinal virtues.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tender my expression of deep sympathy to Vera Bloom, the worthy and surviving daughter of my distinguished colleague, and I want to claim for myself a precious equity in her sorrow. I want moreover to express the prayer and the hope that God will rest and reward his weary, worthy soul, and that some day in Heaven we may meet again.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the balance of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 9, 1949, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

333. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting the cost ascertainment report and appendix for the fiscal year 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

334. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the seventh annual financial statement and report of operations under the provisions of section 13 of the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act (54 Stat. 774, approved July 19, 1940); to the Committee on Public Lands.

335. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a detailed report showing credit operations through June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Public Lands.

336. A letter from the executive secretary, American Chemical Society, transmitting the annual report of the American Chemical Society for the calendar year 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 3333. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 228). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 2799. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act regulating the retent on contracts with the District of Columbia," approved March 31, 1906; with amendments (Rept. No. 229). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 3333. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. REGAN:

H. R. 3334. A bill to grant the consent of the United States to the Pecos River compact; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MILES:

H. R. 3335. A bill to grant the consent of the United States to the Pecos River compact; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming:

H. R. 3336. A bill to grant the consent of the Congress to the Cheyenne River compact; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 3337. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to strengthen the American merchant marine, to encourage investment in the American merchant marine to build more ships, and to remove inequities; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 3338. A bill to amend section 9 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to grant credit in accordance with such section for service for which, through inadvertence, no deductions from salary are made; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 3339. A bill to establish a Federal Commission on Services for the Physically Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes: to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GILMER:

H. R. 3340. A bill to provide for the designation of the reservoir formed by the dam on the Grand River near Fort Gibson, Okla., as Lake Chouteau; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 3341. A bill to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the Fifty-ninth Annual Reunion of Confederate Veterans to be held in Little Rock, Ark., September 27 through September 29, 1949; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NIXON:

H. R. 3342. A bill to protect the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 3343. A bill to provide for the incorporation, regulation, merger, consolidation, and dissolution of certain business corporations in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 3344. A bill to authorize the appointment of officers on the active list of the Philippine Scouts in the Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SECREST:

H. R. 3345. A bill to amend Income Tax Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3346. A bill to grant equal allowances for quarters for all married enlisted personnel of the armed forces regardless of grade; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 3347. A bill to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H. R. 3348. A bill to grant an increased monthly pension rate to certain persons entitled to pension based on service during the Indian Wars; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. J. Res. 186. Joint resolution to extend the time for use of construction reserve funds established under section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 137. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which will assure the payment of prices for farm products at not less than 100 percent of parity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take action to prevent the passage of legislation permitting the coloring of oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to retain jurisdiction of the land management of the public domain in the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to make available funds for the purpose of maintaining, on a defense standard, the airports and facilities which have been either constructed or taken over by the armed forces and which are of primary strategic value to said forces; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass S. 246, a bill granting $300,000,000 in aid of the public schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to locate a surplus Navy floating drydock at Wilmington for preservation of bottoms of Maritime Commission-owned merchant marine fleet laid up in Brunswick River; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States that all presently proposed Federal irrigation projects and all such which are proposed in the future for construction in the State of Wyoming be continued in all stages under the direct supervision of the United States Bureau of Reclamation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to extend pensions of veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal unemployment tax and the Internal Revenue Code to permit a 100-percent credit against pay-roll taxes collected by States and to return to the States full control over the administration of their unemployment-compensation laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider and pass legislation to amend and broaden the coverage of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to permit the naturalization of all peoples without regard to race or national origin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 3349. A bill for the relief of Russell A. DeLong; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 3350. A bill for the relief of Clifford N. MacLloyd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3351. A bill for the relief of John J. Franklin, James H. Bradford, William M. Orr Co., and Alex Maier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 3352. A bill to authorize the naturalization of Michael Kroskof-Thomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILMER:

H. R. 3353. A bill to authorize the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Medal of Honor to John T. Norman; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 3354. A bill for the relief of John E. Paradissis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 3355. A bill for the relief of Albina Bucewich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

176. By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming: Memorial of the Thirtieth Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to retain jurisdiction of the land management of the public domain in the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Public Lands.

177. Also, memorial of the Thirtieth Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States that all presently proposed Federal irrigation projects and all such which are proposed in the future for construction in the State of Wyoming be continued in all stages under the direct supervision of the United States Bureau of Reclamation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

178. Also, memorial of the Thirtieth Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States to consider and pass legislation to amend and broaden the coverage of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

179. By Mr. HESELTON: Resolution of the General Court of Massachusetts, urging Congress to amend the Federal unemployment tax and the Internal Revenue Code and to enact legislation to permit 100 percent credit against pay-roll taxes collected by the States and return to the States full power over the administration of their unemployment-compensation laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

180. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Memorial of the city council of Fall River, Mass., urging the designation of October 11 of each year as General Pulaski Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

181. Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, urging amendment of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act and the Internal Revenue Code to permit a 100 percent credit against pay-roll taxes collected by States and to return to the States full control over administration of unemployment-compensation laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

182. By Mr. WHITE of Idaho: Senate Joint Memorial 6, requesting that Congress appropriate necessary funds and proceed at once with the early and speedy construction of the Palisade Dam project in Idaho; to the Committee on Appropriations.

183. By the SPEAKER: Petition of John C. Burt, New York, N. Y., protesting against the rent and eviction control laws; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

184. Also, petition of Carl V. E. Cassel, D. D. S., secretary, Minnesota State Dental Association, St. Paul, Minn., opposing the enactment of any bill containing the principle of compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 9, 1949

(Legislative day of Monday, February 21, 1949)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty Father, the source from which we come, the goal to which we travel, the light and strength of these, our pilgrim days: We turn for this quiet moment from converse with our fellows to commune with Thee. Grant us for our hallowing thoughts that pass into prayer, prayers that pass into love, love that passes into life. In Thee is the secret of every virtue we possess and every victory won, and every thought of holiness. Enter into our lives this day and make them Thine. Redeem them from fear and frustration, equip and empower them by Thy heavenly grace, that they may be adequate for all the varied duties and responsibilities that confront these Thy servants entrusted with the authority of government. In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 29. An act to authorize payment of claims based on loss of or damage to property deposited by alien enemies;

S. 170. An act to authorize the transfer of certain property to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes;

S. 593. An act for the relief of certain postal employees;

S. 630. An act to amend section 19 of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), so as to remove the upper age limit for appointment to commissioned grade in the Supply Corps of the Navy;

S. 673. An act relating to the pay and allowances of officers of the Naval Reserve performing active duty in the grade of rear admiral, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 22. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the three hundredth anniversary of Annapolis, Md.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON CREDIT OPERATIONS TO CERTAIN INDIANS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing credit operations to certain Indians, through June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON EXPORTATION AND IMPORTATION OF ARMS, AMMUNITION, AND IMPLEMENTS OF WAR

A letter from the Executive Secretary of the National Munitions Control Board, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report covering the exportation and importation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, for the period January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask permission to be absent from the Senate during the remainder of the week, beginning at 6 o'clock this evening.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Eastland	Holland
Baldwin	Ecton	Hunt
Brewster	Ellender	Ives
Bricker	Ferguson	Jenner
Bridges	Flanders	Johnson, Colo.
Butler	Frear	Johnson, Tex.
Byrd	Fulbright	Johnston, S. C.
Cain	George	Kefauver
Capehart	Gillette	Kem
Chapman	Green	Kerr
Chavez	Gurney	Kilgore
Connally	Hayden	Knowland
Cordon	Hendrickson	Langer
Donnell	Hickenlooper	Lodge
Douglas	Hill	Long
Downey	Hoey	Lucas

McCarran	Murray	Taylor
McCarthy	Myers	Thomas, Okla.
McClellan	Neely	Thomas, Utah
McFarland	O'Conor	Thye
McGrath	O'Mahoney	Tobey
McKellar	Pepper	Tydings
McMahon	Reed	Vandenberg
Magnuson	Robertson	Watkins
Malone	Russell	Wherry
Martin	Saltonstall	Wiley
Maybank	Schoeppel	Williams
Miller	Smith, Maine	Withers
Millikin	Sparkman	Young
Morse	Stennis	
Mundt	Taft	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators desiring to incorporate matters in the Appendix of the RECORD, to introduce bills and joint resolutions, present petitions and memorials, or present for the RECORD other matters usually presented during the morning hour, be permitted to do so without debate, and without prejudicing the parliamentary situation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Reserving the right to object—and I am not going to object to the request—I wish, without seeming to be presumptuous, to ask the distinguished majority leader if it is his intention to request the approval of the Journal.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I shall make such a request when the pending unanimous-consent request has been acted upon.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, some of us did not hear the unanimous-consent request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Illinois is that Senators be permitted to introduce bills and joint resolutions and present routine matters as has been done at the beginning of each session for several days. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal from February 25 up to and including yesterday be approved.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have not yet had an opportunity to study the Journal. Therefore I feel constrained to object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, protesting against the enactment of legislation to permit the coloring of oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. GURNEY on March 8, 1949, p. 1962 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, praying for the enactment of legislation to assure the payment of prices for farm products at not less than 100 percent of parity; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. GURNEY on March 8, 1949, p. 1962 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Joint Memorial 6

"*To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:*

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas the west coast during World War II was vital to the defense of the entire United States; and

"Whereas this defense required the construction of large airports and extensive facilities for the operation of long-range aircraft and for the training of large numbers of air force personnel at strategic locations in Oregon; and

"Whereas these strategic airport and training facilities must be maintained so that our western defense front is held in a state of readiness; and

"Whereas the maintenance of these strategic airports is beyond the capacity of the present finances of the municipalities affected; and

"Whereas the Oregon cities owning these strategic airports are faced with increasing population: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the house of representatives jointly concurring therein)*, That the Eighty-first Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized, and this forty-fifth legislative assembly of the State of Oregon hereby does petition the Congress to make available funds for the purpose of maintaining, on a defense standard, the airports and facilities which have been either constructed or taken over by the armed forces and which are of primary strategic value to said forces; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be and he hereby is directed to transmit copies of this memorial to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative therein, representing the people of the State of Oregon.

"Adopted by senate February 9, 1949.

"WM. E. WALSH,
"*President of Senate.*

"Concurred in by house February 25, 1949.

"FRANK J. VAN DYKE,
"*Speaker of House.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Memorial 5

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to consider and pass legislation to amend and broaden the coverage of the Social Security Act

"Whereas there still remain inequalities in our social-security system which require readjustment to assure a fuller life for all our citizens; and

"Whereas there are over 20,000,000 Americans still excluded from the benefits provided by the National Social Security Act; and

"Whereas, in view of the increased cost of living, present provisions are inadequate to provide our elderly citizens with a decent standard of living: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Thirtieth Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the senate concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States of America be memorialized to enact legislation for the extension of the Social Security Act of all deserving Americans not otherwise so protected, and broadening social security to provide an increase in aid for elderly citizens; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to United States Senators JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY and LESTER C. HUNT and Congressman FRANK A. BARRETT.

"HERMAN D. MAYLAND,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"GEORGE BURKE,
"*President of the Senate.*

"Approved February 25, 1949.

"A. G. CRANE,
"*Governor.*"

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial 3

"Joint memorial memorializing the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States of America to retain jurisdiction of the land management of the public domain in the Department of the Interior

"Whereas the Department of the Interior of the United States has been the custodial agent of the public-domain lands of this Nation since the foundation of the Republic; and

"Whereas the Department of the Interior, as the managerial agent of the public domain, has performed its functions in a creditable manner; and

"Whereas the functions of the Department of the Interior in the continental United States are confined almost entirely to the public-land States, and said Department has generally shown a sympathetic interest in the problems of the Western States, as was evidenced by the prompt, efficient, and diligent manner in which the Department of the Interior assisted the people of this State and of the West in opening roads and trails during the current storm disaster; and

"Whereas it is reliably reported that the Hoover Commission on the Reorganization of the Executive Departments of the Government, has recommended that the functions of the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior, except as to minerals, be transferred to the Department of Agriculture; and

"Whereas such recommendation, if adopted by the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States, and approved by the President of the United States will strike a mortal blow to the welfare of the people of the West: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the Thirtieth Legislature of the State of Wyoming (its house of representatives concurring)*, That the President of the United States and both Houses of the Congress of the United States be memorialized to oppose said recommendation of the Hoover Commission; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States and to the President of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to United States Senators JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY and LESTER C. HUNT, and Congressman FRANK A. BARRETT.

"GEORGE BURKE,
"*President of the Senate.*
"HERMAN D. MAYLAND,
"*Speaker of the House.*

"Approved February 25, 1949.

"A. G. CRANE,
"*Governor.*"

"Senate Joint Memorial 4

"Joint memorial memorializing the President and Congress of the United States that all presently proposed Federal irrigation projects and all such which are proposed in the future, for construction in the State of Wyoming, be continued in all stages under the direct supervision of the United States Bureau of Reclamation

"Whereas the United States Bureau of Reclamation has had many years of, and the only, experience in initiation, construction, maintenance and development of all Federal irrigation projects in the West and in such matters has been and is required by laws of the Nation, to comply with all affecting State laws: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the Thirtieth Wyoming Legislature (its house of representatives concurring)*, That the President and Congress of the United States be and they are hereby memorialized, to promptly and effectively enact such legislation as may be appropriate to vest in said Bureau beyond any possibility of judicial doubt or executive direction concerning congressional intent, continued and direct supervision of the initiation, construction, maintenance, and development of all Federal irrigation projects wholly or partially within the State of Wyoming, now or in the future proposed, consistent with objectives of the so-called Pick-Sloan plan, and opposed to objectives of such plans as the Columbia Valley Authority and Missouri Valley Authority; be it further

"*Resolved*, That certified copies of this joint memorial be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of the United States Congress and to the Honorable JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, the Honorable LESTER C. HUNT, and the Honorable FRANK A. BARRETT, Senators and Representative respectively in said Congress, from Wyoming

"GEORGE BURKE,
"*President of the Senate.*
"HERMAN D. MAYLAND,
"*Speaker of the House.*

"Approved February 25, 1949.

"A. G. CRANE,
"*Governor.*"

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 5

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to permit naturalization of all peoples without regard to race or national origin

"Whereas the United States of America stands today as the champion of the equality of men before the law without regard to race, color, or creed; and

"Whereas the recognition of the fact that we are all members of one world and that men are individuals to be valued as such without regard to the color of their skins has been recognized in the change of the naturalization law of America permitting Chinese, Filipinos, and East Indians formerly barred by their racial antecedents to the privilege of citizenship; and

"Whereas the outmoded naturalization law still denies citizenship to Japanese, Koreans, Indonesians, Siamese, Samoans, and Guamanians: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the Twenty-fifth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the house of representatives concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States be, and it is respectfully urged to enact legislation permitting naturalization of all peoples without regard to race or national origin; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to the Congress from Hawaii."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Carolina; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Senate Joint Resolution 180

"Joint resolution petitioning the Congress of the United States to locate a surplus Navy floating drydock at Wilmington for preservation of bottoms of Maritime Commission-owned merchant marine fleet laid up in Brunswick River

"Whereas it has come to the attention of this General Assembly that the United States Congress is giving consideration to providing drydocks for the purpose of inspection and giving primary preservative treatment to vessel hulls of the Maritime Commission reserve fleets; and

"Whereas there are approximately 425 vessels of the Maritime Commission's merchant fleet now laid up in Brunswick River at Wilmington to be inspected and given such preservative treatment as the United States Maritime Commission decides essential; and

"Whereas the servicing of the Wilmington fleet by means other than a floating drydock at the lay-up basin, will involve excessive towage charges to the nearest commercial drydocks, located at Hampton Roads, Va., and Charleston, S. C., and will be an inefficient and uneconomical method of preserving the hulls of said vessels; and

"Whereas the United States Maritime Commission recognizes that greater efficiency and larger material savings can be effectuated by having said vessels serviced at the places where they are laid up and has recommended that floating drydocks be provided for the servicing of such vessels: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring)*:

"SECTION 1. That the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the United States Congress are requested and urged to give favorable consideration to, and take favorable action on, the recommendations of the United States Maritime Commission to provide floating drydocks to service the hulls of ships of the reserve fleets of said Commission at the places where they are now laid up.

"SEC. 2. That copies of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the chairmen of the Senate and House of Representatives' Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and to each Member of Congress from the State of North Carolina.

"SEC. 3. That this resolution shall be in full force and effect from and after its ratification.

"In the general assembly read three times and ratified, this the 2d day of March 1949.

"H. P. TAYLOR,
"*President of the Senate.*
"KERR CRAIGE RAMSAY,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*"

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Memorial 1

"Memorial by the Nineteenth Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the Congress of the United States to extend pensions of veterans of World War I

"*Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico:*

"Whereas there are many veterans of World War I in the State of New Mexico who, as a result directly or indirectly of their military service in World War I, are no longer capable of full-time, gainful occupation; and

"Whereas many of said veterans of said World War I are suffering from disabilities, both service- and non-service connected, which incapacitate them from gainful employment: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico*, That the Congress of the United States be, and is hereby, memorialized to enact legislation which will give to the veterans of World War I who have reached the age of 55 years a pension of not less than $60 per month, and that all veterans of World War I suffering from non-service-connected disability be granted disability compensation based on the existing total amount of disability; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded respectively to the President of the United States of America, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States of America, and to the Senators of the State of New Mexico in the National Congress."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Joint Memorial 6

"Joint memorial to the Congress of the United States requesting the enactment of legislation for the establishment of a separate united Pueblo Indian Administration

"Whereas there are various Pueblo Tribes of Indians within the State of New Mexico, who live on their own reservations and who have title to their own reservations as a tribe; and

"Whereas these Tribes of Pueblo Indians are only Pueblo Indians of their kind in the United States; and

"Whereas the problems of said Pueblo Tribes are peculiar to them and different from all other Indian Tribes in the United States; and

"Whereas in the past legislation applicable to other tribes has been applied to the Pueblo Indians of this State, without understanding the peculiar problems of said Pueblo Indians; and

"Whereas it appears that a separate administration would greatly benefit the Pueblo Indian Tribes and be beneficial to both the United States of America and the State of New Mexico; and

"Whereas the State of New Mexico is particularly interested in the welfare of the said Pueblo Indian Tribes: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico:*

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby memorialized to enact legislation that will provide for the establishment of a United Pueblo Administration for the State of New Mexico, at the head of which shall be an administrator who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; said United Pueblo Administration to be separate and apart from the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs; to exercise its powers and duties under the direct supervision of the Secretary of the Interior; and the principal office of which to be within the State of New Mexico.

"SEC. 2. *And be it further resolved*, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted to each of New Mexico's Representatives and Senators in Congress, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and President of the Senate of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"House Joint Memorial 8

"Joint memorial memorializing the President of the United States to immediately go on record as favoring the specific mention of rheumatic diseases in the National Service Foundation bill now before the Congress of the United States

"*Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico:*

"Whereas from a survey made by the United State Public Health Service on the social and

economic significance among chronic diseases in the United States; rehumatism ranked first in prevalence and second in producing disability and invalidism; and

"Whereas 6,850,000 of our people are plagued by this disease and 147,000 of them each year become permanently invalided to join that large army of isolated prisoners; and

"Whereas a large number of our comrades are among those sufferers and permanent invalids who cry out for relief from their agony; and

"Whereas we, a democratic organization, believe we can best help our comrades by helping our whole citizenry in need of such service, by a research program such as the Government-subsidized National Service Foundation bill now before the United States Congress to promote research in medicine, physics, biology, national defense, and other fields: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico*, That the President of the United States be and is hereby memorialized to take immediate and proper action as has been resolved by national conventions of the Disabled American Veterans, the American Legion, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars by going on record as favoring the specific mention of rheumatic diseases in the National Service Foundation bill, as is cancer and heart disease so mentioned, and to request the Congress of the United States to take immediate action.

"Approved by me this 2d day of March 1949.

"THOMAS J. MABRY,
"*Governor, State of New Mexico.*"

A resolution adopted by the Niagara (Wis.) Grange, favoring a Federal support price on butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by J. W. Steele, treasurer, Woodford County Farm Bureau, Versailles, Ky., praying for the enactment of legislation providing a 90 percent parity support price by the Government be continued on all farm crops under quotas; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution adopted by the American Warehousemen's Association, Washington, D. C., relating to Government ownership, price controls, wages, and so forth; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Petitions of Arthur Post, chairman, New York Hotel Tenants League, of New York, N. Y., and sundry other citizens of the United States, praying for the enactment of legislation to continue rent control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter in the nature of a memorial, signed by Dr. Maurice Heck, E. E. Branscome, and S. G. Gilman, the Publicity Committee, Florida Apartment House Association, Miami, Fla., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to continue rent control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by A. L. Haugan, chairman, National Service Committee, Renton (Wash.) Kiwanis Club, praying for the enactment of legislation to carry out the recommendations of the Hoover Commission on streamlining the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by Walent Bizuk, chairman, American Liberation Committee for Spis and Orava, Chicago, Ill., relating to the treatment of the Slovak people (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Wolfe Tone Council, American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic, the Bronx, N. Y., relating to the trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty and others; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by Jack R. McMichael, executive secretary, the Methodist Federation for Social Action, New York, relating to communism and the First Amendment of the Bill of Rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Common Council of the city of Fall River, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation proclaiming October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Dewie J. Gaul and J. J. Comiskey, Jr., of Loras College, Dubuque, Iowa, praying for the enactment of the McMahon-Johnson bill, granting aid to private-school students; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Resolutions adopted by the Minnesota State Dental Association, of St. Paul, Minn., and the Lions Club, in the State of Idaho, protesting against enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Petitions of Samuel Caplan, secretary, American Jewish Congress, of New York, N. Y., and Jack R. McMichael, executive secretary, the Methodist Federation for Social Action, praying for a change in the Senate rules to provide cloture; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by the Missouri State Council of Machinists, in conference assembled at St. Louis, Mo., favoring the repeal of the Taft-Hartley labor law; ordered to lie on the table.

PROTEST AGAINST TRIAL AND CONVICTION OF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY—RESOLUTION OF SENATE OF MARYLAND

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the Senate of Maryland, protesting the trial and conviction of Cardinal Mindszenty by the Communist-dominated Government of Hungary.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. TYDINGS on March 8, 1949, p. 1963, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

AID TO PUBLIC SCHOOLS—RESOLUTION OF UTAH LEGISLATURE

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I present a letter from the secretary of state of Utah enclosing a resolution adopted by the Legislature of Utah, favoring the enactment of Senate bill 246, granting $300,000,000 in aid of public schools, and I ask unanimous consent that they be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE OF UTAH,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Salt Lake City, March 4, 1949.

The Honorable ELBERT D. THOMAS,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am requested by the Legislature of the State of Utah and have the honor to transmit to you herewith a copy of House Resolution No. 5, passed by the Legislature of the State of Utah on March 3, 1949, entitled "A Resolution Memorializing the United States Congress To Pass S. 246 Granting $300,000,000 in Aid of the Public Schools."

Yours very respectfully,
HEBER BENNION, Jr.,
Secretary of State.

House Resolution 5

Resolution memorializing the United States Congress to pass S. 246 granting $300,000,000 in aid of the public schools

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Utah:

Whereas public education is the strongest single force for the preparation of skilled producers and informed citizens; and

Whereas the control of education is a State-local function but the support of education is a great, long-standing tradition shared by local, State, and Federal governments—a tradition older than the present Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas the Federal Government has for more than 150 years made grants in aid to education without taking the control of public education away from the State and local school boards; and

Whereas more than 50 great national organizations, including the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars; National Grange; American Farm Bureau, Farmers' Union, NAACP, CIO, A. F. of L. and educational organizations, as well as many others, urge Federal aid, without Federal control, to help finance public education; and

Whereas the social welfare of an individual is expressed throughout the entire population; and

Whereas education is considered the foundation of modern culture and civilization, and the responsibility necessarily belongs to everyone who is a part of that culture and civilization; and

Whereas only the Federal Government can equalize the opportunity for schooling of the Nation's children under conditions now prevailing: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the Twenty-eighth Utah Legislature memorializes the United States Congress to pass S. 246 to provide $300,000,000 to the public schools of the United States; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to each of the United States congressional delegation from the State of Utah.

FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT TAX—RESOLUTIONS OF GENERAL COURT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], I present for appropriate reference resolutions adopted by the General Court of Massachusetts, favoring an amendment to the Federal Unemployment Tax Act and the Internal Revenue Code to permit a 100 percent credit against pay roll taxes collected by States and to return to the States full control over the administration of their unemployment compensation laws, and I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the RECORD.

The resolutions were referred to the Committee on Finance, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolutions memorializing Congress to amend the Federal Unemployment Tax Act and the Internal Revenue Code to permit a 100-percent credit against pay-roll taxes collected by States and to return to the States full control over the administration of their unemployment-compensation laws

Whereas the Federal Government now finances the entire cost of the State employment security operations of the several States having approved unemployment-compensation laws, although such a 100-percent Federal grant of funds to administer State laws does not exist elsewhere in the field of Federal grants-in-aid; and

Whereas under terms of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act and the Internal Revenue Code the Federal Government levies a 3-percent pay-roll tax on defined employers against which tax these employers are given a maximum 90-percent credit, based on their contributions paid and experience rating credits earned; and the remaining 10 percent of the 3-percent tax, which is generally referred to as the three-tenths of 1 percent administrative expense tax, is not earmarked for the purposes for which it was originally intended, namely, for the expenses of the administration by the States of their unemployment-compensation laws and is not now being used in its entirety for such purposes; and

Whereas the Federal Government has collected by means of the said three-tenths of 1 percent administrative expense tax as of July 1, 1948, $1,670,940,000, out of which sum the States have been granted approximately $780,000,000 for unemployment compensation and employment service administration, leaving a Federal profit of approximately $891,000,000; and

Whereas the Federal Government under the present law determines what sums of money shall be returned to the States for expenses to administer unemployment-compensation laws, although the States, having the responsibility to administer their own laws, should have the right in their own judgment to determine what sums of money are needed to administer their own laws; and because the present control over such funds by the Federal Government has exposed large numbers of employees of the Division of Employment Security of this Commonwealth to loss of employment, which threatens to impair the efficiency with which this law is now being administered; and

Whereas the 100-percent Federal grant instead of promoting good Federal-State relations has a tendency to injure them: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal Unemployment Tax Act and the Internal Revenue Code and to enact legislation which will result in giving to employers a 100-percent credit against pay-roll taxes collected by the States, and giving to each State with an approved unemployment-compensation law the right and the power to expend from the receipts of the pay-roll tax levied upon employers as much as it deems necessary for the proper and efficient administration of its State law; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to Members thereof from this commonwealth.

In house of representatives, adopted, February 25, 1949.

In senate, adopted, in concurrence, March 2, 1949.

EXTENSION OF SOCIAL-SECURITY LAW—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF LYNN, MASS.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Lynn, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation to broaden the provisions of the social-security law, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas petitions will be filed with the Eighty-first Congress for changes in the social-security laws; and

Whereas social-security benefits should be increased to provide for the increased cost of living, and social-security coverage extended so as to include many persons who should, in all fairness, be entitled to the benefits of same: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Lynn, That the Eighty-first Congress be urged to enact such legislation as to enable social-security benefits to be increased and social-security coverage extended while maintaining the status quo in respect to certain employment taxes; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to United States Senators LEVERETT SALTONSTALL and HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr., the Members of Congress from the Massachusetts districts, President Harry S. Truman, and the press.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT—RESOLUTION OF ESSEX (MASS.) COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the county commissioners of Essex County, Mass., favoring the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act to incorporate therein provisions to prevent lowering of tariffs or establishing quotas to a point where American industry would be placed in jeopardy, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there is a bill pending before the United States Senate Finance Committee extending the President's authority to negotiate trade agreements; and

Whereas American industry must be protected against harmful foreign competition so as to prevent widespread unemployment and lowering of living standards; and

Whereas safeguards should be established by Congress to protect the shoe industry and all other industries in Essex County, textile industry in Lawrence and North Andover, fishing industry in Gloucester, leather industry in Peabody, hat industry in Amesbury, as all of these Essex County communities are highly dependent upon these industries; and

Whereas the county commissioners of Essex County approve the Economic Cooperation Administration program, and endorse the policy of encouraging international trade as a means to help relieve suffering and distressed peoples throughout the world so as to enhance the chances of world peace and calculated to prevent the spread of communism: Be it

Resolved, That Congress be urged in extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act to incorporate therein provisions to prevent lowering of tariffs or establishing quotas to a point where American industry would be placed in jeopardy and to include the so-called escape clause to further safeguard against mistakes in judgment and such further restrictions as may be necessary to enable the President to fulfill his assurance to the American public that reciprocal-trade agreements program will not injure domestic producers; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to Senators Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., Leverett Saltonstall, Congressmen Edith Nourse Rogers, George J. Bates, Thomas J. Lane, Angier L. Goodwin, President Harry S. Truman, Gov. Paul A. Dever, the press, and copy spread upon the records.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 969. A bill to transfer the Pomona station of the Agriculture Remount Service, Department of Agriculture, at Pomona, Calif.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 102).

STUDY AND INVESTIGATION OF CLOSING OF TEXTILE MILLS—REPORT OF INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE (REPT. NO. 101)

Mr. TOBEY, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, submitted a report on the study and investigation of the closing of American textile mills and the operations of Textron, Inc., which was ordered to be printed.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 9, 1949, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 29. An act to authorize payment of claims based on loss of or damage to property deposited by alien enemies;

S. 170. An act to authorize the transfer of certain property to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes;

S. 593. An act for the relief of certain postal employees;

S. 630. An act to amend section 19 of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), so as to remove the upper age limit for appointment to commissioned grade in the Supply Corps of the Navy;

S. 673. An act relating to the pay and allowances of officers of the Naval Reserve performing active duty in the grade of rear admiral, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 22. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the three hundredth anniversary of Annapolis, Md.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Walter Lee Dunham, of Michigan, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for a portion of the term expiring June 30, 1950.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

David J. Coddaire, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the United States Maritime Commission for the term expiring April 15, 1954, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

Joseph F. Farley, and sundry other officers and persons for promotion and appointment in the United States Coast Guard and United States Coast Guard Reserve;

Gordon L. Bates, and several other officers of the United States Coast Guard Reserve to be commissioned in the United States Coast Guard, and Samuel R. Early, to be ensign in the United States Coast Guard; and

Lorin F. Woodcock to be lieutenant in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 1210. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Chloe

Ford Riley a patent in fee to certain land; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GURNEY (for himself, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. HUNT):

S. 1211. A bill to grant the consent of the Congress to the Cheyenne River Compact; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 1212. A bill for the relief of Carlton Hotel, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH:

S. 1213. A bill for the relief of Nicholas J. Manticas and his family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH (for himself and Mr. WAGNER):

S. 1214. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Gulbenkian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1215. A bill authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of Martin Creek at and in the vicinity of Paradise Valley, Humboldt County, Nev.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 1216. A bill to promote the general welfare through the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in providing more effective programs of public kindergarten or kindergarten and nursery-school education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1217. A bill for the relief of Abraham Trattler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

USE OF CERTAIN MERCHANT VESSELS FOR TEMPORARY TRANSOCEANIC PASSENGER SERVICE

Mr. FLANDERS (for himself, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. MYERS, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. MUNDT) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 83), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Whereas the Congress has by the act of August 1, 1946 (Public Law 584, 79th Cong.), the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (Public Law 402, 80th Cong.), and the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 (Public Law 472, 80th Cong.) encouraged travel by American citizens in countries participating in the European recovery program and the interchange between the United States and foreign countries of students and other persons traveling for educational or cultural purposes; and

Whereas it has become evident, because of the shortage of accommodations for passengers in transoceanic shipping, that many students and other persons desiring to travel to foreign countries for educational or cultural purposes during the coming travel season are going to be unable to do so unless additional transoceanic passenger shipping accommodations at reasonable rates are made available in the near future; and

Whereas the United States Government owns certain merchant vessels which are now laid up but which could readily be returned to active service and outfitted for the transoceanic transportation of passengers; and

Whereas it is believed that the executive branch of the Government is possessed of adequate legal powers to enable it to return such vessels to active service and outfit them for the transoceanic transportation of passengers: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the President is requested to provide, through such departments and agencies of the Government as he may deem appropriate, for the return to active service and the outfitting for transoceanic transportation of passengers of such number of laid-up merchant vessels of the United States as may be required to provide accommodations, at rates reflecting costs to the United States, for the travel to and from foreign countries during the period May 1, 1949, to November 1, 1949, of approximately 7,500 American students and other citizens desiring to travel abroad for educational or cultural purposes. The President is further requested to utilize any vessels so returned to active service for the transportation to the United States, during the time that such vessels are not being used for the return travel of American students and other citizens, of displaced persons at such rates of fare as may be prescribed after negotiations with the International Refugee Organization.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR BROUGHTON

Mr. HOEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 84), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed to arrange for and attend the funeral of Hon. J. Melville Broughton, late a Senator from the State of North Carolina, on vouchers to be approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

MEMORIAL TO UNKNOWN SOLDIER OF WORLD WAR II

Mr. GILLETTE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 85), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved, That the President is requested to cause the United States Representatives to the United Nations to recommend to it that there be erected, at its permanent headquarters, a memorial which (1) shall be known as the United Nations Unknown Serviceman Memorial; and (2) shall mark the burial place of a member of the armed forces of a member nation, chosen by lot in a fitting manner, and so as not to identify the nation of his allegiance, from among the unknown dead of World War II.

ACTIVITIES OF CERTAIN FOREIGN AGENTS

Mr. O'CONOR submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 86), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States express its great concern over the threat to our Nation's security which might arise out of unrestricted activities of foreign agents serving with secretariats or delegations of international organizations which have their official residence within the United States; and that it is the sense of the Senate that the Department of State and the Department of Justice should (A) in the exercise of authority heretofore conferred by law, take action at the earliest practicable date, in agreement with appropriate international organizations, to conclude such arrangements governing the entry, conduct, and activities of members and employees of such secretariats and delegations from foreign countries as may be necessary to prevent occurrences prejudicial to the safety and interests of the United States; and (B) in the event that existing statutory authority is inadequate to accomplish such object, to prepare and submit to the Congress at the earliest possible time, such proposed legislation as may be required therefor.

AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. JENNER submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1209) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ASSISTANCE TO BLIND VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II—AMENDMENT

Mr. BALDWIN submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 807) authorizing financial assistance to blind veterans of World War II in obtaining an automobile or other conveyance, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and ordered to be printed.

NOMINATION OF MON C. WALLGREN—LETTERS, TELEGRAMS, AND EDITORIAL COMMENT

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD several newspaper comments, telegrams, and letters relating to the nomination of Mon C. Wallgren to be Chairman of the National Security Resources Board.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to know something about the contents of these letters. If they are the same type of letters as those introduced the other day into the RECORD by the Senator from Washington, I certainly am going to object.

Mr. CAIN. Would the Senator from Illinois permit the junior Senator from Washington to read only what I ask permission to submit for the RECORD in order that the Senator from Illinois and other Senators can consider the validity of the character of the comments?

Mr. LUCAS. I am constrained to interpose an objection if the Senator does not tell me that these letters are different from the type he introduced into the RECORD the other day. If they are the same type of letters I must object.

Mr. CAIN. I may say, Mr. President, to the Senator from Illinois, that each of the letters, each of the telegrams, and each of the editorial comments has been written by individual American citizens. The author of each document is not writing a similar letter or anything similar to what is written by others. It is the desire of the authors to write to a United States Senator, and it has only been his wish to submit their views for the RECORD in order that they may be considered by whoever wants to look at them.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator will have plenty of time, when Mr. Wallgren's nomination comes up for consideration, to read the type of scurrilous and scandalous letters he put into the RECORD the other day. I therefore object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois objects.

THE CRITICAL IRON ORE SITUATION—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement which I have prepared, urging an investigation of the critical iron ore situation facing the Nation. I have made this suggestion in a letter which I have sent to the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the able chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

In the letter I pointed out that one of the most critical shortages facing our Nation's industrial economy and plaguing our defense plans is the lack of adequate reserves of high-grade iron ore.

I feel that if we can get an investigation under way on this problem, we will be taking the first step to a solution of a matter affecting not only America's future but the future of the western world, which depends upon United States steel production for its very survival.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

NEED FOR INVESTIGATION OF CRITICAL IRON ORE SITUATION BY SENATE INTERIOR COMMITTEE

This statement concerns one of the most critical problems facing our Nation's defense planners—the depletion of American iron ore reserves. It is a problem on which we, as Americans, have been bumbling and stumbling along, virtually blind, virtually heedless of the danger confronting us. We have ignored the problem almost completely. We—military men and civilians alike—have sat back on our haunches in a pre-Pearl-Harbor-like stupor. The time has come to awaken on it, and that is the purpose of these remarks—to sound an alarm so to speak, just as others have begun to toll the bells to warn our country of the danger. Uncle Joe is laughing at us, I am sure, in our lack of concern over this danger. The time has come to look at reality and to act.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS OF THIS PROBLEM

A year ago in connection with this debate on the St. Lawrence seaway, I brought this subject to the attention of the Senate, pointing out the imminent exhaustion of the iron ore resources in the Middle West. At that time, there was some skepticism expressed by a number of my colleagues. I can well understand this, since the facts were not generally known at that time. Since then, however, the facts have been coming out gradually. The iron and steel industry itself has become much concerned about this situation, and has been engaged in a variety of activities to find substitute sources of iron ore. The most recent exhaustive study of this situation appeared in the magazine, Iron Age, of January 6. I commend this article to the careful attention of my colleagues. A few days ago, I wrote to our able colleague, the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who is chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on this subject.

Let me read an introductory note by W. A. Lloyd, Cleveland regional editor of the Iron Age. Mr. Lloyd says in introducing this subject:

"The reign of the fabulous Mesabi is ending—1960, perhaps earlier, will see the end. United States dependency upon foreign ore is a reality. How and when this Mesabi tonnage will be replaced is told in this objective survey of the steel industry's No. 1 problem."

The study itself, which I am recommending to the attention of the Senate, was prepared for the Iron Age magazine by Dr. John W. Gruner of the Department of Geology and Mineralogy, University of Minnesota.

NEED FOR INTERIOR COMMITTEE INVESTIGATION

I consider this situation so serious that in the afore-mentioned letter to my industrious colleague, the senior Senator of Wyoming, I have respectfully requested that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which has been making a study of natural resources, initiate a thorough inquiry into the iron ore situation and the alternative methods of meeting the requirements of the iron and steel industry in the foreseeable future. This is one subject that we cannot improvise from day to day, as it will take years to develop substitute sources for the Mesabi Range. It is, in my view, the No. 1 problem of national security, since without the secure foundation of the iron and steel industry, our capacity to mobilize will be seriously weakened; indeed, the capacity of the western world will be threatened.

WHERE ARE WE GOING TO GET THE ORE?

There is a great deal of confusion as to where our country is going to find adequate supplies of ore after the Mesabi resources are exhausted. The average annual shipments from the Lake Superior region have been 80,000,000 tons of ore a year during the past 8 years. Much of this has come from open-pit mines. When these are exhausted, new supplies will have to be provided from other sources. Some students of the subject glibly assert that we can get all we want from low-grade ores. Others claim that it will be impractical economically and physically to get 80,000,000 or even 60,000,000 tons of ore from low-grade taconite. In fact, those who are actively engaged in the development of low-grade ores anticipate no more than 20,000,000 tons from this source by 1964. Where is the country going to secure the rest of the necessary ore supplies to make up the total of 80,000,000 or more tons needed? Unless this question is settled, there will be a real danger that part of the iron and steel industry in the Middle West will gradually move away to the coastal areas in order to take advantage of foreign ores. This cannot be beneficial to the country either in peace or in war, it will mean further suicidal industrial centralization of the type that I have been warning against for years.

COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM NEEDED

This is such a vital problem that we must have a comprehensive national program worked out in cooperation with industry. And I feel certain that when such an overall program is worked out on an economical basis that it will provide for the continued utilization of the present ore mines; it will provide for the development of taconite up to the maximum of its economical and technological capacity; and it will also provide for the importation of substantial amounts of ore from outside sources (i. e., from Labrador and elsewhere) into the Middle Western mills.

I, therefore, respectfully call upon the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to make a thorough and impartial study of this subject.

TENTATIVE SCHEDULE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON PROPOSED CUT-BACK IN VETERANS' HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the tentative schedule of public hearings before a special subcommittee and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on the proposed cut-back in veterans' hospital construction program.

There being no objection, the schedule was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE—TENTATIVE SCHEDULE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON PROPOSED CUT-BACK IN VETERANS' HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

A special subcommittee of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, composed of Senator PEPPER, chairman, Senator HUMPHREY, and Senator MORSE, will hold public hearings to investigate the proposed curtailment of the veterans' hospital construction program and to determine the need for additional facilities and the availability of doctors, dentists, nurses, and other medical personnel to staff such facilities.

Under an Executive order of the President, the Veterans' Administration plans to cancel the construction of 24 new hospitals and to reduce the size of 14 others—a total of 16,000 beds. The States in which such cancellations and reductions are to take effect are as follows: California, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee will conduct public hearings daily, except Sundays, from 10 a. m. until 12 noon, beginning Thursday, March 10, in the committee hearing room, P-26, in the Capitol Building.

All witnesses scheduled to appear before the subcommittee are instructed to submit 75 copies of their prepared testimony to the office of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, room 42, Capitol Building, at least 72 hours in advance of their scheduled appearance. Witnesses are to present only a brief oral summary of their prepared testimony at the time of their appearance and should be prepared to answer any questions raised by the members of the subcommittee during the balance of the time allotted to them. The tentative schedule of the public hearings follows:

Witnesses should note this schedule carefully in order that the hearings can be carried out without confusion or delay:

THURSDAY, MARCH 10

10 a. m. to 12 noon: Veterans' Administration, the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

FRIDAY, MARCH 11

10 a. m. to 10:30 a. m.: United States Army.
10:30 a. m. to 11 a. m.: United States Navy.
11 a. m. to 11:30 a. m.: United States Public Health Service.
11:30 a. m. to 12 noon: Regular Veterans' Association, American Hospital Association.

MONDAY, MARCH 14

10 a. m. to 11 a. m.: Disabled American veterans.
11 a. m. to 12 noon: AMVETS.

TUESDAY, MARCH 15

10 a. m. to 11 a. m.: American veterans' committee.
11 a. m. to 12 noon: Veterans' Administration.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 16 [1]

10 a. m. to 11 a. m.: California—State service officers, State and local veterans' organizations, State medical association, State public agencies.
11 a. m. to 12 noon: Florida—State service officers, State and local veterans' organizations, State medical association, State public agencies.

THURSDAY, MARCH 17 [1]

10 a. m. to 11 a. m.: Georgia—State service officers, State and local veterans' organizations, State medical association, State public agencies.

[1] In order to facilitate the presentation of testimony to the subcommittee, it will be necessary to arrange for the testimony of the State service officers and the representatives of the State and local veterans' organizations to be presented jointly in the form of panel discussions. This means that all State service officers and representatives of State and local veterans' organizations of a given State will testify together at the same time on the same day. Following the panel discussions for each State, the testimony of the State medical association and the public agencies of that State will be presented. This means that all testimony bearing upon the problems of a particular State will be concluded on the same day and appear consecutively in the record.

11 a. m. to 12 noon: Illinois—State service officers, State and local veterans' organizations, State medical association, State public agencies.

FRIDAY, MARCH 18 [1]

10 a. m. to 11 a. m.: Kentucky—State service officers, State and local veterans' organizations, State medical association, State public agencies.

11 a. m. to 12 noon: Michigan—State service officers, State and local veterans' organizations, State medical association, State public agencies.

SATURDAY, MARCH 19 [1]

10 a. m. to 11 a. m.: Minnesota—State service officers, State and local veterans' organizations, State medical association, State public agencies.

11 a. m. to 12 noon: Mississippi—State service officers, State and local veterans' organizations, State medical association, State public agencies.

MONDAY, MARCH 21 [1]

10 a. m. to 11 a. m.: Missouri—State service officers, State and local veterans' organizations, State medical association, State public agencies.

11 a. m. to 12 noon: New York—State service officers, State and local veterans' organizations, State medical association, State public agencies.

TUESDAY, MARCH 22 [1]

10 a. m. to 11 a. m.: North Carolina—State service officers, State and local veterans' organizations, State medical association, State public agencies.

11 a. m. to 12 noon: Ohio—State service officers, State and local veterans' organizations, State medical association, State public agencies.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 23 [1]

10 a. m. to 11 a. m.: Oklahoma—State service officers, State and local veterans' organizations, State medical association, State public agencies.

11 a. m. to 12 noon: Oregon—State service officers, State and local veterans' organizations, State medical association, State public agencies.

THURSDAY, MARCH 24 [1]

10 a. m. to 11 a. m.: Pennsylvania—State service officers, State and local veterans' organizations, State medical association, State public agencies.

11 a. m. to 12 noon: South Carolina—State service officers, State and local veterans' organizations, State medical association, State public agencies.

FRIDAY, MARCH 25 [1]

10 a. m. to 11 a. m.: Tennessee—State service officers, State and local veterans' organizations, State medical association, State public agencies.

11 a. m. to 12 noon: Texas—State service officers, State and local veterans' organizations, State medical association, State public agencies.

SATURDAY, MARCH 26 [1]

10 a. m. to 11 a. m.: Washington, D. C.—District service officers, District veterans' organizations, District medical association, District public agencies.

[1] In order to facilitate the presentation of testimony to the subcommittee, it will be necessary to arrange for the testimony of the State service officers and the representatives of the State and local veterans' organizations to be presented jointly in the form of panel discussions. This means that all State service officers and representatives of State and local veterans' organizations of a given State will testify together at the same time on the same day. Following the panel discussions for each State, the testimony of the State medical association and the public agencies of that State will be presented. This means that all testimony bearing upon the problems of a particular State will be concluded on the same day and appear consecutively in the record.

COUNTING OF ELECTORAL VOTES—STATEMENT BY SENATOR FERGUSON

[Mr. FERGUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by him before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, March 9, 1949, relating to Senate Joint Resolution 2, the proposed constitutional amendment to change the method of counting the electoral votes, which appears in the Appendix.]

COUNTING OF ELECTORAL VOTES—STATEMENT OF BASIL BREWER

[Mr. FERGUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the statement made before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary by Basil Brewer, publisher of the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard Times, on Senate Joint Resolution 2, to change the method of counting the electoral votes, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE EQUAL-RIGHTS AMENDMENT—STATEMENT BY DR. LOUISE POUND

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the equal-rights amendment by Dr. Louise Pound, professor at Nebraska University, which appears in the Appendix.]

IMPORTATION OF JAPANESE FABRICS—ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Embargo Is Sought on Japan's Fabrics," and an article entitled "Knit Glove Protest Due," published in the New York Times of March 9, 1949, which appear in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENT OF WAR CLAIMS COMMISSION—LETTER FROM FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Francis M. Sullivan regarding the establishment of a war-claims commission, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FILIBUSTER—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEWARK (N. J.) EVENING NEWS

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Filibuster," published in the March 7, 1949, issue of the Newark (N. J.) Evening News. The editorial, in discussing the filibuster, sets forth certain fundamental principles which the President of the United States and Members of this body can well afford to read and reflect upon.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FILIBUSTER

Given enough books, reports, and clippings and the manpower and physical stamina to read them into the record, a willful minority in the United States Senate can bring the legislative machinery of the Nation to a standstill. The parliamentary deadlock thus achieved is known as a filibuster. How long a well-organized filibuster endures depends more on the ability of the majority to take it than upon the capacity of the minority to keep it going.

The evil of the filibuster is that it not only delays action on the measure under debate but that it prevents action on all measures. When successful, it imposes the will of the minority upon the majority, and in so doing is held to be alien and inimical to the democratic process.

But the filibuster is not without defenders, some of whom abhor, as in the present civil-rights case, the causes for which it has been invoked. At its theoretical best the filibuster has been defended as a brake on legislation which might otherwise be enacted hastily, in the heat of passion, a spirit of reprisal, or for some transient, partisan gain.

A man so far removed from southern sympathies as Senator VANDENBERG (Republican, Michigan) last year was forced to rule against his own party in the fight to apply cloture to the anti-poll-tax fight. He recognized the weaknesses of the existing Senate rules, but he also called the filibuster the last legislative sanctuary for minority rights. Yet as so often happens in practical application, theory is in sharp conflict with reality.

In the last 30 years the filibuster has been resorted to mainly by southern Senators to ward off antilynching and anti-poll-tax legislation. And in the debate now begun in the Senate to simplify cloture, the filibuster is being used not for the protection of the minority but as an instrument to continue minority oppressions in the South.

The Democratic attempt to change the Senate rules is a culmination of the civil-rights fight begun in the Democratic National Convention. Administration leaders, resuming in Washington where they left off in Philadelphia, act with Mr. Truman's full sanction and encouragement: Presumably they also act with full recognition of the possible cost to the Presidential program, including such high priority legislation as the Taft-Hartley Act, and more crucial to more people, the extender for expiring (March 31) rent controls.

But the Democratic attempt to change the Senate rules, which depends for success on Republican aid, was given a serious set-back by Mr. Truman himself. At a press conference last week, he casually remarked that it should be possible to invoke cloture by a simple majority vote. The cost of this off-the-cuff observation could be the alienation of Republican Senators who, while they resent the uses to which the filibuster has been put, nevertheless are apprehensive that what the President intends is to crush minority rights by application of a ruthless gag rule. It was a tactical blunder by Mr. Truman, the result of which is to jeopardize success of the cloture fight and the enactment of a civil-rights bill.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. LUCAS to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 15, amending the so-called cloture rule of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 15.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I rise with some reluctance to speak against the motion now before the Senate.

I have been a Member of the Senate only 2 months. On both sides of the aisle sit men with experience here far exceeding my own who believe sincerely that this resolution is worthy and essential and should be adopted.

I respect their sincerity, and I do not weigh their judgment lightly.

In this debate, however, we are asked to choose between the freedom to enact laws hastily and the freedom to speak. For me, there is no choice. I cannot embrace any freedom which demands, as the terms for its existence, the imprisonment of another and more precious freedom.

CLOTURE NO HANDICAP TO ME

I am aware that the proponents of this resolution deny that their form of cloture would impede free speech. They only intend to prevent filibusters by limiting each Senator—if two-thirds of the Members desire to do so—to 1 hour on the floor to speak for or against a piece of legislation. Personally, that would rarely be a handicap or an affront to me. I can imagine few occasions—even now—when I would desire more than an hour of the Senate's time to present my views on most issues arising here.

But I would not knowingly imperil a moment of my freedom to speak. So, I refuse now to seek an authority over others which I would not yield myself.

It matters not, Mr. President, whether cloture permits Senators to speak 1 hour, 1 week, or 1 month. If this resolution is adopted, the bridle will be upon the tongues of all minorities, and no mount is free, once the bit is in its mouth.

There is no such thing as a "reasonable limit" on free speech. Good intentions, gentle reforms, and reasonable limits have destroyed more freedoms than evil forces could ever do, and I fear that danger now. As a distinguished Senator from Missouri, Senator Reed, once said:

> Cloture means the granting of a power. Whenever you grant a power, you must assume that the power will be exercised. So, when we discuss this proposed rule, we must do so in the light not of how it may be exercised so as to do no harm, but we must consider how it may be exercised to do harm.

Cloture is to the majority what filibuster is to the minority. Each is a device by which a group may try to achieve its goal in legislative deliberations. But the devices are not equals.

CLOTURE—THE DEADLIEST WEAPON

A filibuster, at best, has no assurance of success; it is more prayer than promise, a last hope for a conscientious minority. Not so, cloture. It is perhaps, the deadliest weapon in the arsenal of parliamentary procedures. Once a majority is armed with that weapon, the majority can be—if it so chooses—beyond the laws and moral compulsion of such flimsy restraints as parliamentary courtesy and precedents.

Against this, a minority has no defense.

When I say minority, I do not limit the term to mean only the South. A peculiar and passing interlude in history has vested the defense of the filibuster in the South, but only temporarily. The filibuster is not a Southern creation; it belongs to all the Nation, and to all the minorities—racial, religious, political, economic, or otherwise—which make up this Nation. I can foresee unlimited situations in which some of the minority groups, which have for 10 years agitated so earnestly for the filibuster's abolition, would want, and would use if they could, the filibuster to defend their rights.

Mr. President, I realize that we of the South who speak here are accused of prejudice, that we are labeled in the folklore of American tradition as a prejudiced minority. I would point out, though, that prejudice is not a minority affliction; prejudice is most wicked and most harmful as a majority ailment, directed against minority groups. Prejudice inflames, excites, exaggerates; prejudice, I think, has inflamed a majority outside the Senate against those of us who speak now, exaggerating the evil and intent of the filibuster. Until we are free of prejudice, then there will be a place in our system for the filibuster—for the filibuster is the last defense of reason, the sole defense of minorities who might be victimized by prejudice.

A KING CAN DO NO WRONG

When we speak of minorities, though, we are answered with the argument that the will of the majority should prevail, and that it is in the American tradition that the majority should prevail. This is a commonplace fallacy. It is akin to the doctrine that "a king can do no wrong."

In this country, a majority may govern, but it does not rule. The genius of our constitutional and representative government is the multitude of safeguards provided to protect minority interests. On the legislative level, where the laws are written, the House of Representatives was so designed by the architects of our Constitution that virtually every valid sectional or local interest would, at least, have a guardian here to scrutinize each law which might be enacted. But those guardians, in most instances, have little time and few opportunities to give voice to their thoughts on the floor for the benefit of their own constituents, their colleagues, or the people of this country.

The citadel of this carefully planned protection of minority rights is the Senate. Here, Members must be somewhat older in years than in the House, their terms of office are longer, and the change in membership is deliberately less abrupt. As the House is designed to provide a reflection of the mood of the moment, the Senate is meant to reflect the continuity of the past—to preserve the delicate balance of justice between the majority's whims and the minority's rights.

SENATE IS A BODY OF EQUALS

When we speak of majorities in the Senate—based solely on the numerical division of the Members—we speak in hollow terms. The Senate was conceived as a body of equals, with each of the States in the Union equally represented. Majority rule obviously did not underlie this concept. Here was a forum in which minorities—minorities of population or minorities of ideas—could stand on equal footing with the most overpowering majority.

Under this system, the 15,000,000 people of New York have no more votes in the Senate than the 110,000 people in Nevada. Does that imply any intent for the majority to reign supreme here? Certainly not; the implication is clearly contrary to the principle of the resolution sought to be brought before us. It would be folly to yield to New York the power to shut off the voice of Nevada; it would be a greater travesty upon justice to permit Nevada to invoke cloture against New York.

Let us look further at this theory of majority rule and the futility of its application to the Senate's procedures:

As has already been made plain by my colleagues on the Senate floor and in committee hearings, the 14 New England, Middle Atlantic and East North Central States, with a population equivalent to 47.7 percent of the population of the United States, has less than 30 percent of the votes in the Senate of the United States. Under the present rules of the Senate requiring a two-thirds vote to effect cloture, all of the Senators from this group of States could not prevent cloture.

If Texas and California were added to this list, we would have a majority of all of the population of the United States represented in this Senate by only one-third of the Members of this body.

Let me name those States: Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Texas and California. Now, Mr. President, if, under the rules of the Senate, cloture should be invoked against the Senators from those States, it is clear that the will of the majority of the people of this country would most certainly be thwarted.

That would mean that the will of the majority of the Senators had prevailed, but it would not by any device of logic or argument mean that the will of the majority of the American public had prevailed.

IN TERMS OF INCOME

Mr. President, I dislike to talk of freedom in terms of income, in terms of money, but in passing I cannot refrain from pointing out that measured by the latest percentages of collections of Internal Revenue, the 14 States, mentioned above, exclusive of Texas and California, contributed 60.9 percent of the total income received by the Federal Government during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948.

If the shoe were on the other foot, and if a revenue or appropriation measure were involved, I feel that the Senators from New York, Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, and the other States mentioned, would not and should not hesitate to say that since their constituents contributed a majority of the revenue and a majority of the population they should have the right to exercise their freedom of speech to prevent the passage of legislation ruinous to their people.

When we speak of majorities, Mr. President, let us not be blinded by our own estimate of our status. Let us not overemphasize our personal convenience or our personal convictions; and, particularly, let us not be guided by personal estimates of our colleagues. We may each in our private conscience find faults and shortcomings in the ability, as well as the reasoning, of some of our colleagues here. Mr. President, it is a great temptation to yearn for the power to shut off an irritating voice, particularly when that voice is being used against you.

MAJORITY IS SOMETIMES WRONG

But the fact that a voice of the minority is irritating or repetitious or even sometimes presumptuous does not indict that voice as being wrong and in error. The majority is ofttimes irritating, repetitious and presumptuous, and the majority is sometimes wrong.

If either the majority or minority assumes that all arguments have been heard, all evidence presented, all original thoughts revealed, then that group is making an assumption which our human fallibility does not permit. Mr. President, it takes great wisdom for a man to know when he himself has said enough, and I pray for that good sense myself. But, I say to you, Mr. President, only wisdom akin to divine judgment can tell us when our fellow man has said all he should say.

The late Senator Joseph Robinson, of Arkansas, once said in this Chamber:

> I am willing to vindicate this forum of open debate where fools may be arrogant, but where men who have studied problems still have a chance to speak.

Some may, most certainly, be arrogant here. Others may shame the name of the Senate. Willful men may be abusive. But when, in irritation, you withdraw freedom from the few who abuse it, you withdraw it from the wise and learned men, too.

If you subtract from the freedom of one region and of those who represent that region, you subtract from the freedom of all regions and all representatives. Freedom, gentlemen, does not oblige the formulas of mathematics. You cannot subtract a quantity here and add it elsewhere. True, it may be divided, but only in equals, not in fractions. There can be no two-thirds freedom or three-fourths freedom or ninety-nine point nine percent freedom; and no majority is so powerful, so righteous, so benevolent that it can change this simple reality.

MAJORITIES ARE NOT PERMANENT

Majority is, after all, Mr. President, a treacherous word. Majorities are not fixed, they are not permanent. The majority which today seems secure may vanish tomorrow.

I think it is quite pertinent to this discussion to examine the creation of majorities, how they are built and who builds them in American life today. Majorities, after all, do not simply materialize of their own accord without leadership and encouragement.

Majorities are the creation of communications. People form their judgments and mold their thinking by what they read, by what they see, by what they hear—and, perhaps, sometimes, or oftentimes, by what they smell. In this country, as in no other country in world history, our people have the opportunity to read more, see more, and hear more about public issues.

As our system of communications is improved and advanced by the discoveries of science, information is imparted with greater speeds. The report of what is going on—or, to be more exact, what seems to be going on—rushes direct from the point of origin to all Americans simultaneously. By radio, telegraph, telephone, and television, the information—or what one or two men in a particular agency may consider information—speeds out over the Nation and is received by individuals without a great deal of editing or much intentional commentary.

CITIZENS ARE BELIEVING SAME THING

The result of this is sobering, because, more and more, all our citizens are hearing the same thing, seeing the same thing, reading the same thing, and believing the same thing.

Furthermore, the trend of all agencies controlling the channels of rapid communication—a trend apparently demanded by the public—is for brevity. Our wire-service correspondents, our radio newsmen, all others collecting and presenting accounts of what happens here in the Senate Chamber or elsewhere, are told, "Make it brief, make it simple, but make it fast."

In such an atmosphere of speed and brevity, the word "filibuster" becomes a much more useful and meaningful expression than something such as unlimited debate or complete freedom of speech. A majority which would vigorously and devoutly defend a Senator's complete freedom of speech will, on the other hand, angrily condemn a Senator's filibuster because the word has been presented to them as an evil term, scornfully used.

That is only an illustration of a minor point, but I think it helps to emphasize the impact of rapid communications in building majority opinion.

MAJORITIES ARE ACCIDENTS OF TIMING

As the information reaching the public becomes more and more standardized, the first group to advocate and sponsor an idea here in Washington wins a tremendous advantage over their opposition. By presenting their case forcefully and persuasively and by presenting it rapidly, they have a good chance to captivate the majority of the people before any opposing group has time to marshal its forces and its evidence.

In other words, Mr. President, a majority can be and frequently is an accident of timing rather than the product of persuasion. As our communications become more rapid, almost instantaneous, we are going to see more majorities built up in a matter of days and even hours than in a period of months or years. We are going to see majorities demanding changes on less evidence and with less thought.

In the face of this obvious trend, it seems almost criminal to me for us to spend our time whittling away at the few remaining safeguards against unchecked and uncontrolled majority rule. These majorities, before which we are asked to bend our knee in submission, may not always be what they seem. Mass-produced majorities are quite likely to encourage mass-produced laws.

Somewhere in our legislative system, Mr. President, there must be preserved a forum where representatives of a minority, equipped with little more than their convictions and their voices, can stand in dignity and plead their case, unhurried and unhampered. If the pending resolution is adopted, no such forum will exist.

Oh, I know that proponents of this cloture resolution say every Senator would have ample time to present his case. I know others will point out that what a minority says here will be given equal treatment by the agencies of communication, and the public will have ample opportunity to weigh the merits of the minority's case.

That may be true, as a theory. But while we have made tremendous progress in devising methods and mechanics for getting more and more opinions and information into the minds of the public, we have not made much progress in finding devices to get opinions out of the mind of the public. Mr. President, you may convince a man that something is true with merely a word or a sentence, but if you seek to convince him that he should change his mind, then a lifetime may not be long enough to achieve that goal.

We must not, we cannot, submit to the theory that a majority is a divine and sacred thing. We must not, we cannot, ignore the forces which construct majorities. Truth must retain the privilege of open competition with information, for truth and information are not always one and the same thing.

1948 CAMPAIGN PROVES FALLACY

I would call to mind the happenings of last fall, which impressed me profoundly with the weight and power of unlimited debate. I say this to my colleagues on this side of the aisle, and I say it with sincere respect. The information was abroad in the land that the Democratic Party was doomed to defeat; for most of the year, perhaps even as late as October, I am sure a majority in this country, accepted that information as correct. But there was no cloture rule on the man in the White House. There was no rule limiting him to an hour's debate because two-thirds of the Nation thought they had heard from him all they could hear, or all they wanted to hear.

Mr. Truman went out to the people. He talked to them, telling them his views again and again, repeating his arguments as often as men and women would come to listen. I rode with him on that train for awhile. I saw him up before daybreak, waiting to speak to the people who gathered around the rear platform as early as 6 o'clock in the morning. I saw him still speaking far into that night. Over and over again, I heard some of his close associates say, "If only we had a few more weeks, there would be no doubt about the outcome." They knew then that because Mr. Truman had dared to keep speaking, because Mr. Truman had not bowed before the opinion of the majority 5 months before, the people were listening and were changing their minds.

If anything in our history exposes the fallacy of assumptions ventured here regarding the infallibility of temporary majorities, the Presidential campaign and election of 1948 does just that. It will not be remembered to the credit of our name if a Democratic leadership deprives the Senate and the Nation of that right now.

Mr. President, during the course of our consideration of this measure, I have been greatly impressed by an observation which the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], made during the committee hearings. Speaking of his service in the House prior to his election to the Senate, the able Senator recalled that he often heard the appeal as a Representative:

> We must go along with the party, because party government is the way of the House of Representatives.

And the Senator from Alabama added:

> I am pleading here today that we not retreat to this position of party government, but let the Senate of the United States stand where it has always stood as the great forum of the American people, of the American Nation, and of the constitutional American Republic.

That is a point upon which I urge the Senators to think seriously. It will be, I believe, a sad day when the rules of the Senate can be written in the national conventions of any political party. I realize, of course, that the Democratic convention of last summer did not suggest that the rules of the Senate be changed. But, Mr. President, both parties adopted plans and presented promises which some leaders thought would necessitate limitations on debate here—if those planks and those promises were to be fulfilled. If we submit now to this effort to change the rules, we will be submitting to the dangerously unsound proposition that a political party shall be entitled not merely to representation by its members here, but to the greater and overwhelming power of dictating how the business of the Senate shall be conducted.

On Saturday, the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] pointed out very effectively that it is characteristic of strong Executives to become impatient with any obstruction which thwarts their exercise of power. Political parties suffer some of the same characteristics. If, though, we change the rules here to oblige the Executive and oblige victorious parties, we may make those executives and those parties stronger, but we most certainly shall not be making our Government stronger. We shall, instead, be taking away from the strength of the Government. We shall be opening the way to rule by political leaders and closing the door on government by responsible and duly elected officials.

That brings us to another consideration I should like to review, without thought of personalities, present or past.

I sincerely believe that the right of unlimited debate in the Senate is an essential safeguard against potential total supremacy of the executive branch.

A man elevated to the office of the Presidency has virtually unlimited powers of influence over his countrymen. His own personality is a force of great impact upon all the people of the Nation and, in fact, upon the people of the world. Add to those powers directly his all those less-conspicuous powers of his aides, his administrative agencies, and the multitude of channels which feel his influence, and you have a force no other representative government has ever entrusted for long to one man.

If on occasion you grant to this titular head of government the further intoxicant of an overwhelming majority of loyal supporters in the legislative branch, then, Mr. President, you have a force well-nigh irresistible. The distinctions between executive and legislative are difficult to preserve under such circumstances; mere memoranda become laws, and laws become mere memoranda.

In such a situation, which, happily, is more hypothetical than historical, the entire theory of our governmental system of checks and balances dissolves and evaporates. There is no one to check and no one to balance, unless and except the remaining minority has the prospect of holding each decision up to lengthy and thorough inspection here on the Senate floor.

FEW GOOD BILLS WRITTEN HASTILY

Delay may be bad in the legislative process, although I do not think delay is bad per se. It has been my observation that few good bills have been written hastily, and few bad measures have been written slowly.

Checks and balances, as I interpret the theory, imply that the authors of our form of government were not so worried about good legislation being delayed as they were about bad legislation being delayed not at all. I believe it was their thought that the minority, no matter how small numerically, might always have something to say that the momentary majority should hear. The right to check and balance was not granted to the majority, because a majority rarely seeks control over itself. Those rights were conceived and installed in the Constitution solely as safeguards for minorities.

Examine the branches of our Government, examine the struggles and conflicts of philosophy, and this is evident: The distinction between our form of government and totalitarian government is the distinction between the executive and legislative branches.

To whatever extent that distinction disappears, falls into disrepute or disuse, or is destroyed, to that extent this Government loses its representative character and becomes totalitarian in practice.

If that distinction be removed, the authority of the courts, of course, becomes fictional.

Fortunately, through most of our history, the voters of the various sections of the Nation have held sufficiently different opinions as to send here legislative representatives of divergent views, men and women with principles and purposes that were not all culled from the same political primer. This has preserved for us the character and purpose of Congress as a forum where representatives of many shadings of thought and ambition could assemble, where they could blend laws suited to the wants and needs of more than 150,000,000 people. There has always been ample representation for minorities, whatever their identity or distinction.

But, as I stated earlier, the last two decades have brought us the advent of instantaneous communications, and with that a standardization of reported information, information which is frequently all too brief and consequently misleading. Yet its influence on the opinion and viewpoint of the American people is profound.

Political beliefs are not immune; rather, they are particularly vulnerable, much more likely to succumb to the constant hammering of standardization than our religious, ethical, or moral beliefs. Many commentators already insist that the distinction in professed beliefs of our major political parties is disintegrating and remains only as a matter of emphasis.

This may be good. I do not propose to pass final judgment here, but this I believe: There is rarely one and only one proper answer to any problem, particularly the sort of delicate, complex problems presented to the legislative branch of this Government.

CONFLICT AND COMPROMISE

Lasting answers evolve from conflict and compromise. A gag rule is the trade-mark of temporary solutions arrived at by lazy minds. Yet the whole trend of our modern day thinking, as exemplified in this cloture resolution, is toward a gag rule and glorification of an unchallenged majority.

We—and I am speaking of all the Nation—read the same news, hear the same opinions on the radio, see the same personalities on the screen, and arrive, at approximately the same time, at the same conclusions. We think we have been thinking and congratulate ourselves on having thought alike, when actually we have not thought at all.

To me, all this is disturbing.

I am distressed by the regimentation, conscious or not, of our opinions, so that if we once make the wrong assumption and proceed on that judgment, we will plunge headlong to disaster with no one to warn us. But, Mr. President, I am more than distressed, I am genuinely alarmed, when this emphasis on standardization, and regimentation, if you please, paralyzes the judgment of a legislative body which was created to give sanctuary to disagreements.

If we fall prey to this trend here in the Senate, then the legislative branch of Government will surrender its most effective guarantee of a check on itself and a balance against the executive branch. For unlimited debate is a check on rash action within the legislative channels and a balance against abuses in the executive branch. Furthermore, we will be surrendering this guarantee at a time in our history when all evidence indicates a greater need to preserve and encourage the right to criticize and challenge mass opinion.

ROLE OF THE HOUSE

Like many of the Members of the Senate, I served for a number of years in the House of Representatives, at the other end of the Capitol, before coming to the Senate. I think I understand what that body can do and what it cannot do as a part of the legislative branch. It can and does feed a great quantity of new ideas into the bloodstream of legislative

thinking, because of its large and diverse membership. The House, also, is a great legislative laboratory for perfecting legislation, correcting oversights, and preventing impositions harmful to specific areas or groups.

But—and this I say with no intention to minimize the House's role—the House does not and cannot exert the force upon the Nation's political thinking that the Senate has and still does. Nor, in fact, does the House exert the equivalent influence upon the executive branch—its Members are not so secure in tenure, the frequent elections subject the Members to whims of public opinion, which, as we all know, can sometimes be aroused and inflamed by the leaders of the executive branch.

Why is the House in this role? Because there is no unlimited debate there. A member must ofttimes beg for a chance to address his fellow Members and then he is limited generally to 5 minutes or less. In that short time, he is fortunate if he can impress any of his colleagues, much less impress the Nation. As a consequence, the floor of the House and the cloakrooms constitute a national legislative workshop.

SENATE IS A NATIONAL FORUM

That leaves to the Senate the role of a national forum, where the underlying philosophy of legislation—as well as the surface details—can be laid bare for the public to contemplate. That in itself is a persuasive argument to me for lengthy and thorough debates on fundamental issues.

When a Senator speaks at length, it seems to me he is speaking, not alone to his colleagues, but to the Nation. Certainly history shows that the Nation frequently listens. To cut off any Senator from further debate is to cut off the Nation from further opportunity to become acquainted with the proposals affecting our people. Personally, I believe it is better for the Nation to hear too much about a bill before it becomes law than to know too little about it after that bill becomes a law.

So, Mr. President, it is my conviction that the right of unlimited debate here in the Senate is an essential safeguard in our American system of representative government; first, as a safeguard for the public's right to full information on all legislative decisions; second, as a safeguard against the deliberate or accidental destruction of the distinctions between the legislative and other branches of government; third, as a safeguard for Members here—both majority and minority—against rash, impetuous action, or action predicated on incomplete or inaccurate information.

It is well, perhaps, to add to this discussion an examination of the filibuster in actual practice. I do not wish to burden the ears of the Senators here or the pages of the RECORD with a repetition of history already presented so ably by various of my colleagues. But I do not honestly believe we can come to the heart of the debate unless and until some of the mythology of filibusters is exposed as more fiction than fact.

What, for example, does the average American citizen interested in affairs of his Government believe about the filibuster?

FILIBUSTER NOT SOUTH'S PROPERTY

First, I believe it is a widespread conviction that the filibuster is now and has always been exclusively the property of Southern Senators. For the past few years this has been so as to certain pieces of legislation which, by their nature, concerned the South primarily. This is not necessarily a traditional alignment.

When the cloture resolution under which we now operate here in the Senate was adopted back in 1917, the southern Members of the Senate at that time voted for it, as did virtually all Senators on both sides of the aisle. One year later, the Underwood resolution, to limit debate during wartime to 1½ hours for each Senator, was brought before the Senate. That was even more drastic than the cloture proposed now. I was impressed, though, when I looked over a tabulation of the voting on that resolution. Voting for the resolution, and thus voting against filibusters, or even very extensive debate, were a majority of the Senators from Southern States. The bulk of the opposition to the measure came from 29 Republican Party members.

Through the years there have been similar votes in which some Southern Senators have been as vigorously opposed to the filibuster as Senators from other regions are today. I do not believe it can be shown that the South created the filibuster, or that only the South has defied the rest of the Nation in preserving it.

FILIBUSTERS NOT COMMONPLACE

Another concept prevailing in the public mind is the idea that the Senate does nothing but waste valuable time while a minority of its Members engage in filibusters. Cartoonists, literary artists, and sponsors of a lot of ill-considered ideas have labored long and with some success to implant this concept in the public mind.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield for a question only.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator adverted a little while ago to the fact that some of these so-called filibusters—I repeat, so-called—were carried on by Senators from the South. Is it not true that the reason that has happened is that the legislation the southern Senators were opposing was aimed at the Senators from the South, and was presented from a geographical and a political standpoint?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator speaks quite correctly, and I shall discuss some of that legislation in detail a little later in my remarks. I thank the senior Senator from Texas.

Frankly, until the resolution came under consideration here, I did not know what the truth was. I rather thought that filibusters were more or less commonplace affairs here in the Senate. But since this matter came before us, I have studied the history of filibusters and I have been surprised at what the true history of the filibuster is. From 1841 through 1948, only about 35 important filibusters have been conducted on the Senate floor. When we consider the tremendous volume of legislation passing through here without filibuster, that number seems surprisingly small.

ONLY FIVE BILLS DEFEATED

What have these filibusters accomplished? As Senators have heard, and as many of them know, some 26 different bills have been temporarily defeated. I say temporarily because all except five of the measures filibustered have since become law—some within a few days, some within a few weeks, and a few such measures were delayed for a number of years. But just to reemphasize the record, I want to list the bills which, so far, have failed to become law because of filibusters:

First. The Force bill of 1890.

Second. The armed ship bill of 1917, which was actually not necessary since our merchant ships were armed under another existing statute.

Third. The antilynching bills.

Fourth. The anti-poll-tax bills.

Fifth. The FEPC bill.

That, Mr. President, is the list, the casualty list of filibusters.

Some of the proponents of the resolution contend that the fatality list should include some bills which were never brought to the floor for fear of a filibuster. That is easily said. But it might be more accurate to say only that a number of bills were never brought to the floor because their sponsors knew they would fail if brought to a vote. If you are going to indict the filibuster as a killer, indict it, please, only for the deaths of bills actually killed by filibusters, not for the deaths of weak-spined legislation which died of fright at the prospect of unlimited debate.

The fact remains, nevertheless, that filibusters have not occupied the majority nor even a significant portion of the Senate's time during the past 108 years. Filibusters have not killed off a great amount of legislation; instead, the overwhelming majority of bills filibustered have eventually become law. Only five bills can truthfully be listed as victims of the filibuster.

The Force bill of 1890 is a dead issue; history seems to agree that it was an unfortunate measure which should not have been passed anyway.

The armed ship bill became a dead issue almost immediately after its defeat, because it was not necessary.

I think I am safe in saying that no proponents of our present cloture resolution are in the least concerned over what happened to those two particular pieces of legislation. The defeat of those bills did not instigate this resolution. The defeat of those bills did not inflame the public hue and cry against unlimited debate in the Senate.

CIVIL RIGHTS FUNDAMENTAL ISSUE

No, Mr. President; when we strip away the trappings of rhetoric and theory and legend which surround the arguments here against the filibuster, we have left the simple fact that we are debating the so-called civil-rights legislation.

Some men, and some groups, have grown tired of exposing their measures for abolition of the poll tax, for punishment of lynch mobs, and for establishment of a Fair Employment Practices Commission to full debate in the Senate of the United States. In their estimate of freedom, the freedom to speak here in the Senate is expendable and they are willing to demand its sacrifice for the theoretical gain of having these civil-rights measures enacted into law promptly. So, in great haste, and with a certain amount of strange illogic the strategy calls for depriving one minority of its rights in order to extend rights to other minorities.

As I said earlier here, Mr. President, freedom is not something which can be subtracted in one place and added somewhere else.

This civil-rights question brings into play all those strong and evil forces of racial prejudice. Perhaps no prejudice is so contagious or so dangerous as the unreasoning prejudice against men because of their birth, the color of their skin, or their ancestral background. Racial prejudice is dangerous because it is a disease of the majority, endangering minority groups. I say frankly that the Negro—as the minority group involved in this discussion of civil rights—has more to lose by the adoption of any resolution outlawing free debate in the Senate than he stands to gain by the enactment of the civil-rights bills as they are now written. Certainly these laws might give the Negro some opportunity to see those punished who interfered with his rights, but I do not believe any of these bills would actually guarantee the Negro—or any other group—that his rights would not be molested. If, perchance, the prejudice against the Negro of which we in the South are accused should spread across the Nation, fanned by inflammatory incident of only passing consequence, the Negro would have no recourse to halt enactment of vicious legislation here or elsewhere if this right of unlimited debate did not exist in the Senate.

I am not being fanciful in that illustration. The Ku Klux Klan, the Black Legion, and other such bigoted and vicious organizations have never been confined solely to the South; nor has prejudice itself thrived only in the South.

When we of the South rise here to speak against this resolution or to speak against the civil-rights proposals, we are not speaking against the Negro race. We are not attempting to keep alive the old flames of hate and bigotry. We are, instead, trying to prevent those flames from being rekindled. We are trying to tell the rest of the Nation that this is not the way to accomplish what so many want to do for the Negro. We are trying to tell the Senate that with all the sincerity we can command, but it seems that ears and minds were long ago closed.

I say this because I want my position on the civil-rights legislation understood clearly.

DO NOT BELIEVE IN POLL TAX

For example, I do not believe in the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting. In all of my campaigns for public office—six times for the House and twice for the Senate—I have made my position perfectly clear, and those who voted for me understood that. I told them, as I tell Senators now, that I see no reason for the poll-tax provision in the statutes of my State. I have advocated and do advocate the repeal of the constitutional provision of Texas which makes the payment of a poll tax necessary before a citizen can vote. I point out, too, that the present Governor of Texas has recommended to the legislature the repeal of the poll-tax provision in the statutes. A resolution has been introduced in the Texas Legislature and reported favorably by a committee of the Texas Senate, traditionally the most conservative branch of the Texas Legislature, which would submit to the voters of Texas an amendment to the Constitution eliminating the payment of a poll tax as a qualification for voting.

That is as it should be. The framers of the Constitution of the United States were plain, specific, and unambiguous in providing that each State should have the right to prescribe the qualifications of its electorate and that the qualifications of electors voting for Members of Congress should be the same as the qualifications of electors voting for members of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures. For that reason, and that reason alone, I believe that the proposed anti-poll-tax measures introduced in previous sessions of this body and advocated in the President's civil-rights program is wholly unconstitutional and violates the rights of the States guaranteed by section 2 of article I of the Constitution.

Believing that, I think I have the right to use my freedom to speak and stand on the floor of the Senate as long as I have the will, the determination, and the breath to oppose such a measure. I believe that I, and any other 32 Members of the Senate have as much right and the equal duty to prevent the passage of an unconstitutional law as do 9 members or 5 members of the Supreme Court to strike it down after it has been passed. I am not willing to surrender that right or that duty because the President of the United States thinks otherwise, or because of the hue and cry set up by those who claim to protect the rights of a minority while at the same time saying the majority should always rule supreme.

THE SOUTHERN POSITION

Mr. President, some Senators will find fault with that position; they may say that it answers nothing. But let me point this out to them: I, and a number of my colleagues from the southern poll-tax States, would like to have the poll tax repealed. We think that it may be done, eventually, if not this month or next month. But we know—because we know the South and because we know the people we represent—that if one of the anti-poll-tax bills is enacted, we may never see the States accept repeal of such a law. If we had a bill here and the power here to remove the laws properly and constitutionally, I, for one, would vote for repeal of the poll tax. But I do not believe that we have either the bill or the power. We would merely enact a law which, in due time, would be stricken down by the Supreme Court. Then we would have nothing. The States would be hamstrung by a hasty, ill-considered, and entirely futile act. The poll tax would remain; the right of unlimited debate would be dead, and the prospect of eliminating the poll tax would be dead. Remember that many of us agree with other Senators in opposing the poll tax. Our counsel is not insincere, nor is it founded on prejudice. We, like they, are representatives of proud people; we know what our people will accept and what they will not accept, and we urge them earnestly to heed our advice.

TEXANS DETEST LYNCHING

I, like all other citizens, detest the shameful crime of lynching just as I detest the crime of murder in every form.

In Texas, lynchings are virtually nonexistent and not thought of as a recourse of individuals seeking justice, or what they consider justice. Most Texans would be incensed at the suggestion that a lynching would be proper, no matter how vicious the crime of which a man might be suspected. I cannot speak for all the Southern States because I am not as familiar with the residents of those States. But, Mr. President, within the past 20 years new generations of Texans have reached maturity free of the ingrained hatreds and prejudices which beset their forebears who had seen more violent eras. What these Texans—young Texans, primarily—know about lynching they have learned from the same source as Americans in regions outside the South have learned. They have learned about lynching through the modern-day literature, in which so many barren authors have sought to enrich their plots with dramatic accounts of lynch law. Every lynching is a tragedy; but lynching is not, modern fiction notwithstanding, the great and fundamental tragedy of American Democracy.

I say this not in an effort to summon a self-righteous argument to the defense of the South, but because I want to remind Senators of the changing character of the South. We have our faults, historical and otherwise. But if Congress is to legislate—or try to legislate—a new character for us, I think it should be mindful of conditions as they are, not as they have been pictured.

Again, I say, with respect to lynching as with respect to the poll tax, most of us agree with the motives of our colleagues, but we are trying to tell them that the method proposed in the civil-rights legislation will not accomplish what they intend.

The proposed antilynching bill—or those proposed in the past—would not merely punish the crime of murder, which should be punished, but would hold responsible those who are entirely innocent. It would indict as killers men and women who never held a gun in their hands; it would punish as accomplices men and women who would never associate with the irresponsible elements which perpetrate most lynchings.

I hold that if an officer fails or refuses to protect me against a mob bent upon invading my property, depriving me of my liberty to go where I please or do me physical violence, I am entitled to as much protection as a prisoner accused of crime who is likewise treated to mob violence. But these antilynching bills only propose punishment in the case of a prisoner under lawful arrest. Mr.

President, an enlightened public already has rendered such a law virtually unnecessary even if it were not unwise in its scope.

One of the other civil-rights measures deserves some passing attention. That is the bill for creation of a Fair Employment Practices Commission.

This, to me, is the least meritorious proposal in the whole civil-rights program. To my way of thinking, it is this simple: If the Federal Government can by law tell me whom I shall employ, it can likewise tell my prospective employees for whom they must work. If the law can compel me to employ a Negro, it can compel that Negro to work for me. It might even tell him how long and how hard he would have to work. As I see it, such a law would do nothing more than enslave a minority.

Such a law would necessitate a system of Federal police officers such as we have never before seen. It would require the policing of every business institution, every transaction made between an employer and employee, and, virtually, every hour of an employer's and employee's association while at work.

I do not think the proposed law is workable, Mr. President. I am convinced it would do everything but what its sponsors intend. I feel certain it would reverse our entire historical trend of progress. It would do nothing more than resurrect ghosts of another day to haunt us again. It would incite and inflame the passions and prejudices of a people to the extent that the chasm of our differences would be irreparably widened and deepened.

I can only hope sincerely that the Senate will never be called upon to entertain seriously any such proposal again.

Those are my feelings, Mr. President. I pray that they will not seem either unreasonable or narrowly prejudiced.

For those who would keep any group in our Nation in bondage, I have no sympathy or tolerance. Some may feel moved to deny this group or that the homes, the education, the employment which every American has a right to expect, but I am not one of those. My faith in my fellow man is too great to permit me to waste away my lifetime burning with hatred against any group. I believe, and I believe sincerely, that we have a system of representative government which is strong enough, flexible enough, and fair enough to permit all groups to work together toward a better life.

I believe, Mr. President, that we can find the fair and permanent answers to our problems of housing, education, medical care, income—and all the other domestic issues—without reducing government to an absurdity by attempting to police the most intimate thoughts of our populace. I do not concede to Federal law an obligation which I think rightfully belongs to education, and which education alone can discharge. These advances must come and will only come as an outgrowth of conviction, not by compulsion.

Mr. President, we in the Senate should learn the facts of life. We cannot legislate love. We can, and as a nation we do, work together. We have done that in the past. We are doing it today. It is my conviction, though, that the opportunity for unlimited debate—somewhere within the framework of our Government—will be a greater aid to unity and cooperation and justice than any of the laws presented to us in the civil-rights program.

I realize, Mr. President, that it is easy for a young man to say, "We're going to roll up our sleeves and remake the world." I know the temptation is great for young men to assume that spead and progress are one and the same thing; that if you move rapidly, you move forward.

No nation, though, can long survive if its lawmakers legislate only from day to day. Somewhere within the fabric of our actions we must weave the sturdy fibers of our past, lest what we do in haste today unravel tomorrow. Read the history of our Nation, the history of American democracy, and I think it seems clearly evident that few things have contributed more to our solidarity, to our emerging maturity, or to our stature as citizens of the world than the debates conducted here in the Senate Chamber. Debate here has been, perhaps, the sturdiest fiber of our design for more representative government.

That is as it should be, Mr. President, and as it must be. As nations go we are young, both in terms of physical existence and in concepts of what we want to do. From the start we have had to proceed without signposts to guide us. Our concept of government has been an experiment, and it remains so today. We have nothing but our own reason to guide us; there are no precedents, no past examples to steer us easily through the shoals of international leadership where we find ourselves today.

Our predecessors here—the great names of American political history—were keenly aware of the responsibilities resting upon their decisions. They made no effort to dismiss their duties in great haste. They weighed a man's convictions, not by the clock, but, rather, by what he had to say.

Read through the transcripts of the Senate's proceedings when giants like Webster, Calhoun, and Clay stood here. No official record was kept of the length of time they spoke, as measured in hours and minutes; but we find, if we look, that a speech by Webster, back in 1830, filled 30 pages of the Journal; John C. Calhoun's last speech on slavery in 1850 was 22 pages long; Henry Clay, speaking on the compromise of 1850, expressed his firm convictions for 26 pages. Perhaps styles of oratory have changed since those men were here. Perhaps none of us have that much to say. But, Mr. President, styles do not change in freedoms; and the inability or unwillingness of men to utilize their freedom does not justify taking of it from them.

The freedoms we enjoy today are not freedoms of our own making. Through all the long history of civilizations preceding ours, mankind's highest aspiration has been for greater freedom. It was not until this union of States was formed a little more than a century and a half ago that freedom found a sanctuary. I do not propose to tear down that sanctuary now, in the name of haste, because I believe the freedom to speak—the freedom of unlimited debate somewhere in our law-making process—is the keystone of all other freedoms.

Look back at the governments of history. The senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] a few days ago very appropriately referred to debates in the Roman forum. Rome enjoyed its greatest progress, its greatest era of achievement during the days when great orators could stand in the forum and speak with freedom. When, in irritation, the Caesars and their partisans removed that freedom, Rome began fading as an influence in the world; and the way was paved for a long succession of arbitrary monarchs and dictators. The right of unlimited debate in the Senate of France was lost in 1814, a victim of cloture—and there followed a century, and longer, of internal confusion and strife. In England, the House of Commons gave up its right to unlimited debate in 1888. That nation has produced some great prime ministers since—men who had the privilege, as well as the talent, to speak thoroughly and forcefully, but it would be difficult for any Member of the Senate to name any lengthy list of members of Parliament who have inspired their countrymen with arguments advanced on the floor of the House of Commons since 1888.

I am no historian, but as I have studied the history of governments gone before us, I have been impressed by the fact that the freedom of unlimited debate in legislative chambers has been given up many times by members themselves who were irritated or frustrated by a minority. But, so far as I have found, once that freedom was yielded, it has never been returned. If we now give up this freedom in the Senate, I, for one, do not expect to live to see its return. For that reason, I cannot and I will not join hands with those who seek to throw this freedom out the window now.

As the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] said the other day, this effort to cut off unlimited debate is a whittling process, whittling at the essential freedoms of our mind. I should like to point out here to the writers with their wrathful pens, to the commentators with their caustic voices, to the cartoonists with their derisive skills, and all who join the throng to keep alive the cries against unlimited debate that we here in the Senate of the United States cherish our freedom of expression as they cherish theirs. But for the grace of God and the United States Senate we might today be debating the limitation of their freedom to speak or that of the press, rather than our own.

If, Mr. President, I were given a choice, if I should have the opportunity to send into the countries behind the iron curtain one freedom and only one, I know what my choice would be. I would send to those lands the very freedom we are attempting to disown here in the Senate. I would send to those nations the right of unlimited debate in their legislative chambers. It would go as merely a seed, but the harvest would be bountiful; for by planting in their system this bit of freedom we would see all freedoms grow, as they have never grown before on the soils of eastern Europe.

This freedom we debate, Mr. President, is fundamental and indispensable. It stands as the fountainhead of all our freedoms. If we now, in haste and irritation, shut off this freedom, we shall be cutting off the most vital safeguard which minorities possess against the tyranny of momentary majorities. I do not want my name listed as one of those who took this freedom away from the world when the world most needed it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Hoey	Mundt
Baldwin	Holland	Murray
Brewster	Hunt	Myers
Bricker	Ives	Neely
Bridges	Jenner	O'Conor
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Reed
Capehart	Kefauver	Robertson
Chapman	Kem	Russell
Chavez	Kerr	Saltonstall
Connally	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Cordon	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Donnell	Langer	Sparkman
Douglas	Lodge	Stennis
Downey	Long	Taft
Eastland	Lucas	Taylor
Ecton	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	McClellan	Thye
Flanders	McFarland	Tobey
Frear	McGrath	Tydings
Fulbright	McKellar	Vandenberg
George	McMahon	Watkins
Gillette	Magnuson	Wherry
Green	Malone	Wiley
Gurney	Martin	Williams
Hayden	Maybank	Withers
Hendrickson	Miller	Young
Hickenlooper	Millikin	
Hill	Morse	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). Ninety-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

Mr. BRIDGES obtained the floor.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a question.

Mr. BYRD. I should like to make an insertion in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator yields for that purpose, he will yield the floor.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator yield in order that I may make an insertion in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish to make sure that my right to the floor is protected.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Virginia that every morning, immediately after the Senate has convened, opportunity has been afforded, under a unanimous-consent agreement, to present routine matters. I dislike very much to object, and I shall not at this particular time, but I hope that Senators will be present when the roll is called in the mornings, so that we can proceed without interruption. I have made this suggestion to one or two other Senators, and I make it again to my friend from Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia? The Chair hears none, and consent is given the Senator from Virginia, with the understanding that the Senator from New Hampshire does not lose his right to the floor.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government during the month of January 1949, and, in accordance with the practice of several years' standing, to have it printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

I ask also that the report be preceded by a statement of explanation and comment which I submit at the same time.

There being no objection, the explanatory statement and comment and the report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Federal civilian employment in January 1949 exceeded the number employed in January 1948 by more than 100,000, and pay-roll figures for the first half of the current fiscal year indicate civilian personal service costs in the executive branch this year will reach $6,500,000,000.

PERSONNEL

Compared with the report for January 1948, the new report covering civilian personnel in the executive branch during January 1949, as compiled today by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, shows:

January	Total civilian employees, executive branch	Civilian employees, Military Establishment	Civilian employees, civilian agencies	Civilian employees inside continental United States	Civilian employees outside continental United States
1949	2,102,854	892,184	1,210,670	1,911,342	191,512
1948	2,001,836	834,376	1,167,460	1,776,867	225,969
Increased or decreased	+101,318	+57,808	+43,210	+135,475	−34,457

The steady increase of Federal civilian employment inside continental United States is obvious from these figures. This results largely from reduction of its civilian force abroad by the Military Establishment and the increase in the number of its civilian employees at home. Within the year the Military Establishment decreased its civilian rolls overseas by 34,933, but it increased its civilian employees at home by 92,741. Civilian agencies increased their employment 42,734 inside the United States and 476 abroad.

PAY

In the first 6 months of the current fiscal year the Federal pay roll in the executive branch cost $3,258,446,000. If this average of more than a half billion a month is continued through the second half of the year to June 30, the personal service cost for the year will be in excess of $6,500,000,000.

During the first 6 months the pay roll cost increased successively in every month except October. It was $516,578,000 in July, $532,062,000 in August, $535,280,000 in September, $525,487,000 in October, $535,303,000 in November, and $613,716,000 in December.

JANUARY-DECEMBER

While there was a net decrease of 1,602 in the total civilian personnel employed in the executive branch in January as compared with December, there was an actual increase of 653 in the employment inside continental United States. This net increase inside the country occurred despite substantial seasonal decreases by the Post Office and Agriculture Departments, a major decrease in the Veterans' Administration resulting from field office reorganization, and the continuing liquidation of War Assets Administration. Larger increases were reported by the Treasury Department and the Military Establishment. The over-all employment in January totaled 2,102,854 in January as compared with 2,104,456 in December.

MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

With its civilian employment rising each month, the Military Establishment in January was employing 892,184 civilians. Uniformed military personnel in the same month numbered 1,665,000. Both figures were in excess of the average for next fiscal year which the President, in his budget message estimated at 865,000 civilians, and 1,616,000 uniformed military personnel in active status.

CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT OVERSEAS

This committee report includes a tabular break-down of civilian personnel employed outside continental United States as of December 1948. It shows nearly 200,000 employees representing 33 Federal agencies in 96 countries.

Agencies with the larger numbers of persons assigned overseas include the Army, Air Force, Navy, State, Interior, Commerce, Agriculture, and Post Office Departments, the Economic Cooperation Administration, and the Veterans' Administration.

Foreign countries to which the largest numbers of Federal employees are assigned include Austria, China, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Philippine Islands, Newfoundland, Mexico, Great Britain, and Canada.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES, CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, PURSUANT TO SECTION 601 OF THE REVENUE ACT OF 1941 ON FEDERAL PERSONNEL AND PAY

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH DECEMBER 1948–JANUARY 1949, AND PAY NOVEMBER–DECEMBER 1948

(Note with reference to personal service expenditure figures: It should be noted that the latest expenditure figures for personal service shown in table I of this report are for the month of December, and that they are compared with personal service expenditure figures for the month of November, whereas the latest employment figures covered in this report are for the month of January and are compared with employment figures for the month of December. This lag in personal service expenditure figures is necessary in order that actual expenditures may be reported.)

(Figures in the following report are compiled from signed official personnel reports by the various agencies and departments of the Federal Government. Table I shows total personnel employed inside and outside continental United States, and pay, by agency. Table II shows personnel employed inside continental United States, by agency. Table

III shows personnel employed outside continental United States, by agency. Table IV gives by agency the industrial workers employed by the Federal Government. For purposes of comparison, figures for the previous month are shown in adjoining columns.)

Personnel and pay summary

(See table I)

According to monthly personnel reports for January 1949 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures:

	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Pay roll (in thousands of dollars) in executive branch		
	In January numbered—	In December numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In December was—	In November was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total	2,102,854	2,104,456	−1,602	613,716	535,303	+78,413
1. Agencies exclusive of National Military Establishment	1,210,670	1,214,228	−3,558	380,102	316,094	+64,008
2. National Military Establishment	892,184	890,228	+1,956	233,614	219,209	+14,405
Within National Military Establishment:						
Office of Secretary of Defense	1,226	1,190	+36	450	415	+35
Department of the Army	367,884	367,365	+519	94,118	84,443	+9,675
Department of the Air Force	158,789	157,799	+990	38,292	39,136	−844
Department of the Navy	364,285	363,874	+411	100,754	95,215	+5,539

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agency.

Tables II, III, and IV break down the above employment figures to show the number of employees inside continental United States, the number outside continental United States, and the number in the so-called industrial categories. This further break-down in tables II, III, and IV does not include pay figures because pay-roll reports submitted to the committee by some agencies are inadequate for this purpose.

Inside continental United States

(See table II)

Federal personnel within the United States increased 653 from the December total of 1,910,689 to the January total of 1,911,342.

Exclusive of the National Military Establishment there was a decrease of 4,265 from the December total of 1,159,955, to the January total of 1,155,690.

Total civilian employment within the United States for the National Military Establishment for January was 755,652, an increase of 4,918 over the December total of 750,734.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense increased 36 from the December figure of 1,190 to the January figure of 1,226.

The Department of the Army civilian personnel within the United States increased 2,792 from the December figure of 297,049 to the January figure of 299,841.

The Department of the Air Force civilian personnel within continental United States increased 1,259 from the December figure of 130,946 to the January figure of 132,205.

The Department of the Navy within the United States increased 831 from the December figure of 321,549 to the January figure of 322,380.

Outside continental United States

(See table III)

Outside continental United States Federal personnel decreased 2,255 from the December total of 193,767 to the January total of 191,512.

An increase of 707 was reported in the overseas civilian employment of the departments and agencies other than the National Military Establishment, from the December total of 54,273 to the January total of 54,980.

Total overseas civilian employment for the National Military Establishment decreased 2,962 from the December figure of 139,494 to the January figure of 136,532.

The Department of the Army reported a decrease of 2,273 in overseas employment from the December figure of 70,316 to the January figure of 68,043.

The civilian personnel of the Department of the Air Force overseas decreased 269 from the December figure of 26,853 to the January figure of 26,584.

The Department of the Navy reported a decrease of 420 in overseas employment from the December figure of 42,325 to the January figure of 41,905.

Industrial employment

(See table IV)

Total industrial employment during the month of January decreased 284 from the December total of 574,448 to the January total of 574,164.

The departments and agencies other than the National Military Establishment increased 431 from the December total of 19,327 to the January total of 19,758.

The National Military Establishment decreased its total industrial employment 715 from the December total of 555,121, to the January total of 554,406.

The Department of the Army decreased its industrial employment 216 from the December figure of 206,605 to the January figure of 206,389. Inside continental United States there was an increase of 1,899, while overseas industrial employment decreased 2,115.

The Department of the Air Force industrial employment decreased 198 from the December figure of 95,248 to the January figure of 95,050. Inside continental United States the Air Force industrial employment increased 301; while outside continental United States it decreased 499.

The Department of the Navy decreased its industrial employment 301 from the December figure of 253,268 to the January figure of 252,967.

The term "industrial employees," as used by the committee, refers to unskilled, semi-skilled, skilled, and supervisory employees paid by the Federal Government who are working on construction projects such as airfields and roads, and in shipyards and arsenals. It does not include maintenance and custodial employees.

Employees outside continental United States as of December 1948

Table V is carried at the end of this additional report by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures as a special report. It will not be repeated as a regular table in the report. It was compiled at this time in response to a request by members of the committee and it should be noted that the figures in this table were reported orally by responsible officers in each of the reporting agencies instead of in signed reports ordinarily required by the committee for preparation of the other tables in its regular monthly reports.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during January 1949, and comparison with December 1948; and pay for December 1948 and comparison with November 1948*

Department or agency	Pay (in thousands of dollars)				Personnel			
	November	December	Increase	Decrease	December	January	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):								
Agriculture	18,419	19,323	904		74,963	73,680		1,283
Commerce	12,195	12,614	419		40,139	39,928		211
Interior	13,496	13,999	503		49,484	49,588	104	
Justice	9,178	9,539	361		26,195	26,345	150	
Labor	1,131	1,211	80		3,507	3,521	14	
Post Office	125,072	178,809	53,737		508,321	507,507		814
State	5,649	5,941	292		20,001	20,115	114	
Treasury	26,578	28,075	1,497		88,567	89,015	448	
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	85	84		1	214	218	4	
Bureau of the Budget	248	261	13		538	530		8
Executive Mansion and Grounds	15	15			64	69	5	
National Security Council[1]	9	9			19	22	3	
National Security Resources Board	170	190	20		390	410	20	
Council of Economic Advisers	23	23			39	39		
Emergency war agencies:								
Office of Defense Transportation	12	17	5		40	39		1
Postwar agencies:								
Displaced Persons Commission	32	46	14		116	147	31	
Economic Cooperation Administration	800	876	76		3,852	3,078	226	
Office of the Housing Expediter	1,565	1,661	96		4,837	4,856	19	
Philippine Alien Property Administration	32	34	2		134	128		6
Philippine War Damage Commission	217	203		14	947	933		4
War Assets Administration	4,155	5,007	852		7,349	6,708		641

[1] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during January 1949, and comparison with December 1948; and pay for December 1948 and comparison with November 1948*—Continued

Department or agency	Pay (in thousands of dollars)				Personnel			
	November	December	Increase	Decrease	December	January	Increase	Decrease
Independent agencies:								
American Battle Monuments Commission	14	15	1		135	138	3	
Atomic Energy Commission	1,682	1,768	86		4,835	4,803		32
Civil Aeronautics Board	260	274	14		664	670	6	
Civil Service Commission	1,247	1,480	233		4,118	4,228	110	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	60	61	1		123	122		1
Federal Communications Commission	503	535	32		1,354	1,353		1
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	371	389	18		1,631	1,652	21	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	198	221	23		377	374		3
Federal Power Commission	353	341		12	831	824		7
Federal Security Agency[1]	9,321	9,234		87	34,972	35,114	142	
Federal Trade Commission	244	296	52		634	650	16	
Federal Works Agency	5,751	5,978	227		22,853	23,081	228	
General Accounting Office	2,887	3,034	147		9,411	9,432	21	
Government Printing Office	2,099	2,231	132		6,953	6,999	46	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	3,636	3,806	170		11,678	11,862	184	
Indian Claims Commission	6	7	1		11	11		
Interstate Commerce Commission	872	913	41		2,286	2,248		38
Maritime Commission	2,099	1,878		221	6,530	6,571	41	
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	1,816	2,236	420		6,887	6,895	8	
National Archives	105	135	30		380	388	8	
National Capital Housing Authority	70	81	11		306	308	2	
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	9	13	4		20	18		2
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission	2	1		1	3	3		
National Gallery of Art	80	82	2		317	320	3	
National Labor Relations Board	574	567		7	1,661	1,582		79
National Mediation Board	53	58	5		107	108	1	
Panama Canal	3,290	3,216		74	22,918	22,920	2	
Railroad Retirement Board	683	706	23		2,388	2,421	33	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	1,832	[1] 1,832			4,623	[2] 4,623		
Securities and Exchange Commission	467	486	19		1,159	1,165	6	
Selective Service System	1,075	1,212	137		5,979	5,903		76
Smithsonian Institution	166	175	9		555	549		6
Tariff Commission	103	108	5		239	240	1	
Tax Court of the United States	54	53		1	124	122		2
Tennessee Valley Authority	3,510	3,775	265		13,982	13,771		211
Veterans' Administration	51,501	54,948	3,447		215,078	212,928		2,150
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	316,094	380,102	64,426	418	1,214,228	1,210,670	2,020	5,578
Net change, excluding National Military Establishment			64,008				3,558	
National Military Establishment:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	415	450	35		1,190	1,226	36	
Department of the Army								
Inside continental United States	71,312	78,463	7,151		297,049	299,841	2,792	
Outside continental United States	13,131	15,655	2,524		70,316	68,043		2,273
Department of the Air Force:								
Inside continental United States	33,800	32,661		1,139	130,946	132,205	1,259	
Outside continental United States	5,336	5,631	295		26,853	26,584		269
Department of the Navy	95,215	100,754	5,539		363,874	364,285	411	
Total, National Military Establishment	219,209	233,614	15,544	1,139	890,228	892,184	4,498	2,542
Net increase, National Military Establishment			14,405				1,956	
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	535,303	613,716	79,970	1,557	2,104,456	2,102,854	6,518	8,120
Net change, including National Military Establishment			78,413				1,602	

[1] Includes personnel and pay of Howard University and Columbia Institute for the Deaf.
[2] January personnel figures and December pay-roll figures for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation were not available in time for inclusion in this report.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during January 1949, and comparison with December 1948*

Department or agency	December	January	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT)			
Agriculture	73,101	71,622	−1,479
Commerce	37,138	36,922	−216
Interior	44,325	44,260	−65
Justice	28,725	28,868	+143
Labor	3,471	3,485	+14
Post Office	506,585	505,774	−811
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT)—continued			
State	7,608	7,744	+136
Treasury	87,919	88,359	+440
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT			
White House Office	214	218	+4
Bureau of the Budget	538	530	−8
Executive Mansion and Grounds	64	69	+5
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT—con.			
National Security Council	19	22	+3
National Security Resources Board	390	410	+20
Council of Economic Advisers	39	39	
EMERGENCY WAR AGENCIES			
Office of Defense Transportation	40	39	−1

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE II.—Continued

Department or agency	December	January	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
POSTWAR AGENCIES			
Displaced Persons Commission	45	56	+11
Economic Cooperation Administration	854	901	+47
Office of the Housing Expediter	4,813	4,831	+18
Philippine Alien Property Administration	2	2	.....
Philippine War Damage Commission	7	5	−2
War Assets Administration	7,326	6,693	−633
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
American Battle Monuments Commission	7	7	.....
Atomic Energy Commission	4,832	4,800	−32
Civil Aeronautics Board	644	650	+6
Civil Service Commission	4,113	4,223	+110
Export-Import Bank of Washington	121	120	−1
Federal Communications Commission	1,318	1,318	.....
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,031	1,052	+21
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	377	374	−3
Federal Power Commission	831	824	−7
Federal Security Agency [1]	33,994	34,141	+147
Federal Trade Commission	624	640	+16
Federal Works Agency	22,394	22,448	+54
General Accounting Office	9,411	9,432	+21
Government Printing Office	6,953	6,999	+46
Housing and Home Finance Agency	11,634	11,814	+180
Indian Claims Commission	11	11	.....
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,266	2,248	−18
Maritime Commission	6,492	6,532	+40
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	6,887	6,895	+8
National Archives	280	288	+8
National Capital Housing Authority	366	368	+2
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	20	18	−2
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission	3	3	.....
National Gallery of Art	317	320	+3
National Labor Relations Board	1,648	1,570	−78
National Mediation Board	107	108	+1
Panama Canal	635	647	+12
Railroad Retirement Board	2,388	2,421	+33
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	4,610	[2] 4,610	.....
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,159	1,165	+6
Selective Service System	5,819	5,742	−77
Smithsonian Institution	550	543	−7
Tariff Commission	239	240	+1
Tax Court of the United States	124	122	−2
Tennessee Valley Authority	13,982	13,771	−211
Veterans' Administration	213,477	211,327	−2,148
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	1,139,961	1,133,600	−5,821 +1,356
Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment			−4,465
NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT			
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,190	1,226	+36
Department of the Army	297,049	299,841	+2,792
Department of the Air Force	130,946	132,205	+1,259
Department of the Navy	321,549	322,380	+831
Total, National Military Establishment	750,734	755,652	+4,918

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE II.—Continued

Department or agency	December	January	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT—con.			
Net increase, National Military Establishment			+4,918
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	1,910,695	1,911,342	+6,474 −5,821
Net increase, including National Military Establishment			+653

[1] Exclusive of personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.
[2] Includes personnel of Howard University and the Columbia Institute for the Deaf.
[3] January personnel figures for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation were not available in time for inclusion in this report.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during January 1949, and comparison with December 1948*

Department or agency	December	January	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT)			
Agriculture	1,862	2,058	+196
Commerce	3,001	3,004	+3
Interior	5,159	5,328	+169
Justice	470	477	+7
Labor	36	36	.....
Post Office	1,736	1,733	−3
State	12,393	12,371	−22
Treasury	648	656	+8
POSTWAR AGENCIES			
Displaced Persons Commission	71	91	+20
Economic Cooperation Administration	1,998	2,177	+179
Office of the Housing Expediter	24	25	1
Philippine Alien Property Administration	132	126	−6
Philippine War Damage Commission	930	928	−2
War Assets Administration	23	15	−8
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
American Battle Monuments Commission	128	131	+3
Atomic Energy Commission	3	3	.....
Civil Aeronautics Board	20	20	.....
Civil Service Commission	5	5	.....
Export-Import Bank of Washington	2	2	.....
Federal Communications Commission	36	35	−1
Federal Security Agency	978	973	−5
Federal Works Agency	459	633	+174
Housing and Home Finance Agency	44	48	+4
Maritime Commission	38	39	+1
National Labor Relations Board	13	12	−1
Panama Canal	22,283	22,273	−10
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	13	13	.....
Selective Service System	160	161	+1
Smithsonian Institution	5	6	+1
Veterans' Administration	1,603	1,601	−2
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	54,275	54,980	+767 −60
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			+707

TABLE III.—Continued

Department or agency	December	January	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT			
Department of the Army	70,316	68,043	−2,273
Department of the Air Force	26,853	26,584	−269
Department of the Navy	42,325	41,905	−420
Total, National Military Establishment	139,494	136,532	−2,962
Net decrease, National Military Establishment			−2,962
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	193,767	191,512	−3,022 +767
Net decrease, including National Military Establishment			−2,255

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during January 1949 and comparison with December 1948*

Department or agency	December	January	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT)			
Commerce	1,237	1,098	−139
Interior	3,935	4,509	+574
State	359	353	−6
Treasury	4,305	4,352	+47
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
Atomic Energy Commission	157	150	−7
Housing and Home Finance Agency	2	6	+4
Panama Canal	1,887	1,853	−34
Tennessee Valley Authority	7,445	7,437	−8
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	19,327	19,758	+625 −194
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			+431
NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT			
Department of the Army:			
Inside continental United States	158,863	160,762	+1,899
Outside continental United States	47,742	45,627	−2,115
Department of the Air Force:			
Inside continental United States	75,460	75,761	+301
Outside continental United States	19,785	19,286	−499
Department of the Navy	253,268	252,967	−301
Total, National Military Establishment	555,121	554,406	−2,915 +2,200
Net decrease, National Military Establishment			−715
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	574,448	574,164	−3,109 +2,825
Net decrease, including National Military Establishment			−284

TABLE V.—*Civilian personnel of the executive branch of the Federal Government employed outside continental United States as of December 1948*

[NOTE.—These figures were compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures in response to a request by members made during the meeting of the committee, Jan. 26, 1949. The figures included in this table were reported orally by responsible officers in each of the reporting agencies, instead of in signed written reports ordinarily required by the committee for the preparation of its regular monthly personnel reports]

Country	Agriculture Department (1)	Commerce Department (2)	Interior Department (3)	Justice Department (4)	Labor Department (5)	Post Office Department (6)	State Department (7)	Treasury Department (8)	Air Force Department (9)	Army Department (10)	Navy Department (11)	American Battle Monuments Commission (12)	Atomic Energy Commission (13)	Civil Aeronautics Board (14)	Civil Service Commission (15)	Displaced Persons Commission (16)	Economic Cooperation Administration (17)
1. Aden							10										
2. Afghanistan							33										
3. Alaska	107	1,584	3,698	120	3	364		128	2,612	1,704	910			20			
4. Argentina		3					156				7						
5. Atlantic Islands [1]		2					84		1,233	3,333	2,064						
6. Australia		2					100				3						
7. Austria							179			8,731							29
8. Azores									1,058								
9. Balkans (unspecified)							4										
10. Belgium							184	3				3					21
11. Bermuda									551								
12. Bolivia	3	2					75										
13. Brazil	3	4	3				371			116	80						
14. British Guiana									525								
15. Bulgaria							59				2						
16. Burma							56										
17. Canada				44			280	31	255		4		3				
18. Canal Zone	7	125		8			3		3,423	4,922	3,539						
19. Ceylon							38										
20. Chile		1					128				7						
21. China (including Hongkong)		4					1,045	3	40	963	1,605						468
22. Colombia	4	1					126				4						
23. Costa Rica	133						64										
24. Cuba	3			9			149	3			3,027						
25. Cyprus							8										
26. Czechoslovakia							177										
27. Denmark and possessions							109				5						19
28. Dominican Republic	3						48										
29. Ecuador	5						102										
30. Egypt	2	9					243	2	1		91						
31. El Salvador	3						67										
32. Eritrea										147							
33. Ethiopia							36										
34. European colonies (Gibraltar)							7										
35. European colonies, protectorates, etc., in Near East and Africa							159										
36. Finland							68										
37. France and possessions (including French Morocco)	2	4					741	5	111	3,633	559	116					633
38. Germany (and Bizonia)				59			681	4	876	6,897						71	20
39. Great Britain (including North Ireland)		6		1			611	12	12	3	121	4					79
40. Greece							271		29	167	5						490
41. Greenland		31							555								
42. Guatemala	39						120		44		7						
43. Haiti	38						78										
44. Hawaii	134	619	65	75	8	616		295	3,661	6,321	15,473				5		
45. Honduras							48										
46. Hungary							139										
47. Iceland		18					34										1
48. India and Pakistan	2						431				9						
49. Indochina							34										
50. Iran							133										
51. Iraq							79										
52. Ireland							73										5
53. Israel							18										
54. Italy (including Trieste and the Vatican)							695	5	46	1,605	7	2					146
55. Jamaica									362								
56. Japan		3	5				116		5,819	7,093							
57. Korea							81		2	222							
58. Labrador									323								
59. Lebanon							65				4						
60. Liberia							109										
61. Libya							7		796								
62. Luxemburg							12										
63. Malaya							38										
64. Mediterranean area										1,645							
65. Mexico	644	7	9				601	3			8	3					
66. Morocco							82										
67. Netherlands and possessions (excluding East Indies)	3						182	1			6						35
68. Netherlands East Indies							62				3						
69. Newfoundland							13		1,435		803						
70. New Zealand							43										
71. Nicaragua	3						64		3								
72. Norway							108				4						22
73. Nova Scotia				4													
74. Pacific Islands [1]	2	226				18	8		1,620	5,141	6,914						
75. Panama	1						86	2									
76. Palestine							63							1			
77. Paraguay							83							6			
78. Peru	13	7	1				161				5						
79. Philippine Islands		170	143				235	31	771	17,822	5,671						
80. Poland							182										

[1] Includes Antilles, British West Indies, and American West Indies except Virgin Islands.
[2] Includes Canton, Carolines, Guam, Marianas, Midway, Okinawa, Palmyra, Ryukyus, Samoa, Swan, Tinian, and Wake Islands, etc.

TABLE V.—*Civilian personnel of the executive branch of the Federal Government employed outside continental United States as of December 1948*—Continued

Country	Agriculture Department (1)	Commerce Department (2)	Interior Department (3)	Justice Department (4)	Labor Department (5)	Post Office Department (6)	State Department (7)	Treasury Department (8)	Air Force Department (9)	Army Department (10)	Navy Department (11)	American Battle Monuments Commission (12)	Atomic Energy Commission (13)	Civil Aeronautics Board (14)	Civil Service Commission (15)	Displaced Persons Comsion (16)	Economic Cooperation Administration (17)
81. Portugal and possessions							118				6						2
82. Puerto Rico	632	112	556	42	25	633		113	1,041		1,505						
83. Rumania							89				7						
84. Russia							157				10						
85. Saudi Arabia							73										
86. Siam	2						76				7						
87. Spain and possessions							217				6						
88. Sweden							148	4			8						26
89. Switzerland							208	4									
90. Syria							58										
91. Turkey							185			66	9						2
92. Union of South Africa							89				4						
93. Uruguay							83				6						
94. Venezuela		2					99				4						
95. Virgin Islands		16	685	20		54											
96. Yugoslavia							112				4						
Location unspecified		[3] 11		[4] 88		[4] 21				[5] 574							
Without compensation, location unspecified	74	30	2				2			1							
Total	1,862	3,001	5,159	470	36	1,736	12,393	648	26,853	70,316	42,325	128	3	20	5	71	1,998

Country	Export-Import Bank (18)	Federal Communications Commission (19)	Federal Security Agency (20)	Federal Works Agency (21)	Housing and Home Finance Agency (22)	Maritime Commission (23)	National Labor Relations Board (24)	Office of Housing Expediter (25)	Panama Canal (26)	Philippine Alien Property Administration (27)	Philippine War Damage Commission (28)	Reconstruction Finance Corporation (29)	Selective Service System (30)	Smithsonian Institution (31)	Veterans' Administration (32)	War Assets Administration (33)	Total
1. Aden																	10
2. Afghanistan																	33
3. Alaska	1	8	21	128	3		7					4	11		71	13	11,536
4. Argentina																	166
5. Atlantic Islands [1]																	6,716
6. Australia																	105
7. Austria																	8,939
8. Azores																	1,038
9. Balkans (unspecified)																	4
10. Belgium																	211
11. Bermuda																	581
12. Bolivia				3													83
13. Brazil	2											1		2			882
14. British Guiana																	525
15. Bulgaria																	61
16. Burma																	86
17. Canada			14														621
18. Canal Zone			1						72,283								24,111
19. Ceylon																	38
20. Chile																	136
21. China (including Hongkong)			1														4,129
22. Colombia																	135
23. Costa Rica				25								1					233
24. Cuba			2													1	3,185
25. Cyprus																	8
26. Czechoslovakia																	177
27. Denmark and possessions																	133
28. Dominican Republic																	51
29. Ecuador				1													108
30. Egypt																	348
31. El Salvador				2													72
32. Eritrea																	147
33. Ethiopia																	36
34. European colonies (Gibraltar)																	7
35. European colonies, protectorates, etc., in Near East and Africa																	159
36. Finland																	68
37. France and possessions (including French Morocco)			6			4											5,811
38. Germany (and Bizonia)			10			1											8,619
39. Great Britain (including North Ireland)			5			11											865
40. Greece																	962
41. Greenland																	285
42. Guatemala			4	12								2					228
43. Haiti												1					117
44. Hawaii		17	66	7	14		3						28		199	6	27,602
45. Honduras				1													49
46. Hungary																	139
47. Iceland																	53
48. India and Pakistan																	442

[1] Includes Antilles, British West Indies, and American West Indies except Virgin Islands.
[2] South American mission.
[3] Location withheld for security reasons. Overseas personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency is excluded from this table for security reasons.
[4] The latest actual reports available from the Post Office Department with respect to its personnel overseas was for the month of October. The figures in this chart represent a departmental estimate based on adjustments from the October report. Information on the location of 21 employees was insufficient for this adjustment.
[5] South American mission (10) and Army Attachés, world wide (564).

TABLE V.—*Civilian personnel of the executive branch of the Federal Government employed outside continental United States as of December 1948*—Continued

Country	Export-Import Bank (18)	Federal Communications Commission (19)	Federal Security Agency (20)	Federal Works Agency (21)	Housing and Home Finance Agency (22)	Maritime Commission (23)	National Labor Relations Board (24)	Office of Housing Expediter (25)	Panama Canal (26)	Philippine Alien Property Administration (27)	Philippine War Damage Commission (28)	Reconstruction Finance Corporation (29)	Selective Service System (30)	Smithsonian Institution (31)	Veterans' Administration (32)	War Assets Administration (33)	Total
49. Indochina																	34
50. Iran																	133
51. Iraq																	79
52. Ireland																	78
53. Israel																	18
54. Italy (including Trieste and the Vatican)			2			8											2,425
55. Jamaica																	362
56. Japan						4											12,949
57. Korea																	305
58. Labrador																	321
59. Lebanon																	69
60. Liberia			4														111
61. Libya																	743
62. Luxemburg																	12
63. Malaya																	38
64. Mediterranean area																	1,045
65. Mexico			1												2		1,177
66. Morocco																	82
67. Netherlands and possessions (excluding East Indies)			1														228
68. Netherlands East Indies																	65
69. Newfoundland																	2,273
70. New Zealand																	43
71. Nicaragua				5													75
72. Norway																	134
73. Nova Scotia			1														5
74. Pacific islands [1]																	13,931
75. Panama				15													104
76. Palestine																	63
77. Paraguay																	85
78. Peru			1												1		189
79. Philippine Islands			602	196		10					152	950				558	27,488
80. Poland																	182
81. Portugal and possessions																	126
82. Puerto Rico		10	226	21	25		10	17					3	116		775	3	5,886
83. Rumania																	96
84. Russia																	167
85. Saudi Arabia																	52
86. Siam													1				86
87. Spain and possessions																	223
88. Sweden																	186
89. Switzerland		1															215
90. Syria																	55
91. Turkey				28													290
92. Union of South Africa																	93
93. Uruguay																	91
94. Venezuela																	105
95. Virgin Islands			10	5	2									5			777
96. Yugoslavia																	116
Location unspecified																	404
Without compensation, location unspecified																	109
Total	2	36	978	459	44	38	13	24	22,283	132	930	13	160	5	1,603	23	193,767

[1] Includes Canton, Carolines, Guam, Marianas, Midway, Okinawa, Palmyra, Ryukyus, Samoa, Swan, Tinian, and Wake Islands, etc.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield in order that I may make a similar request?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield under the same conditions.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I shall not object. I presume the matter has come in since my announcement.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall wait until tomorrow morning.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator.

FEDERAL PUBLICATION ACTIVITIES

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, last year, while I had the privilege of serving as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, I asked for and obtained a survey of governmental publications for the previous fiscal year. They amounted to an astounding number—between 83,000 and 84,000. I then determined that at some time I should like to acquaint the Members of the Senate and the people of the country with the results of the survey, and it has seemed to me, inasmuch as time was being consumed here, that this would be a very appropriate time to deal with a very worthy subject.

Mr. President, recently the President of the United States presented to the Congress his 1950 budget, calling for the largest peacetime expenditures this country has ever contemplated, almost $42,000,000,000. So large were the demands for increased expenditures that it was indicated that even the revenues produced from our present record-breaking national income will not be sufficient to balance the books. In other words, unless we increase the present rate of taxation, we are going to be faced with deficit spending—deficit spending in the year of the greatest prosperity the country has ever known.

I am wholeheartedly in accord with the President's idea that we must not resort to unbalanced budgetary practices in years of plenty. If we are ever to reduce our mammoth debt of over $250,000,000,000, we must do so now. Certainly we are only playing into the hands of the Kremlin cronies if we resort to deficit spending.

The administration's solution to this problem is to increase taxes. And I would be in favor of this method of budget balancing, too, if I were convinced that this constituted the only solution to the problem.

But I am convinced that it is not. I shall continue with my present conviction until a sincere attempt is made to reduce expenditures by eliminating the waste, the extravagance, and the duplication of activity and personnel which today have supplanted economy and efficiency in our Federal Government.

I am certain in my own mind that we can balance the budget and reduce the debt without increasing taxes. We can do it by reducing appropriations. We can reduce appropriations without impairing a single necessary function of Government. Even those who doubt this assertion—in all fairness—should admit that it is worth a try.

For years now I have continued to protest against ever-mounting appropriations and expenditures which were not necessary to the essential welfare of the country. I am referring to those appropriations which may catch votes, but which weaken our financial strength. We all know which ones they are. We also know how frequently they are brought before this body.

I have recently heard the assertion made that there is much criticism of the size of our Government, of its profligate spending and waste, but that no one points out just where we can reduce.

This is just not so. I and a number of my colleagues have repeatedly pointed out specific places to cut the budget. I shall not take the time now to enumerate these soft spots. It would take too much time—and besides, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate today one particular soft spot which has been too long ignored.

PUBLICATION COSTS A SPENDING "SOFT SPOT"

I refer to the publication activities of the Federal Government. I recognize that what I am about to say will be printed and at public expense, but for once the cost of this printing will be more than repaid thousands, I hope, millions of times over, if the situation which I shall describe is attacked with vigor and sincerity by those persons in the Government who are responsible for the flood of unnecessary Government pamphlets that today clog the mails and plague the public. I am endeavoring on this occasion to relieve the strain on the eyes and pocketbooks of the American taxpayers caused by the facile and foolish pens of the Government authors who, consciously or otherwise, have foisted upon us a new WPA writers' project of gigantic proportions.

My attention was first drawn to this field of Government activity during budget hearings when I noticed ever-increasing estimates for printing and binding, when I heard budget officers justify larger printing and binding appropriations on the grounds of large backlogs of unpublished material, and when a large number of Federal publications began streaming across my desk whose very titles indicated that the Government bureaus had virtually taken all knowledge as their field.

I asked the staff of the Appropriations Committee last year to investigate and a wealth of information was uncovered. Some of this I want to pass on to my colleagues today.

OVER-ALL COSTS UNKNOWN

Because we have no cost accounting system in the Government, no over-all figures on publishing expenses are available. Unless we canvassed each department and agency and they, in turn, canvassed each of their bureaus and units, no Government-wide figures on publishing could be obtained. The cost factor and the time factor precluded such an ambitious program. Thus, no one knows how many publications are published by the Government. Nor does anyone have any idea of the ultimate cost to the public. We do not even know the number of personnel involved.

But we do know that the United States Government is the largest publishing house in the world. We know that the over-all costs run into many hundreds of millions of dollars. We know that thousands and tens of thousands of employees work full-time on the various phases of disseminating information.

I wish to state here that what I am about to say implies no criticism of the Government Printing Office. We have found their records to be surprisingly complete. Furthermore, they have no power to limit the vast quantities of printed material which they turn out yearly for the entire Government.

Nor have I anything but praise for the efforts of my colleagues on the Joint Committee on Printing. Recently they have instituted changes in the regulations on printing and binding which will grant them more supervisory powers and which should provide the Congress with much needed and greater controls over printing and duplicating. What knowledge we do have of agency activity in this field—aside from that of the Government Printing Office—comes as a result of a recent survey made at the instance of the joint committee.

But, on the other hand, I do question the freedom exercised by many departments and agencies in spending vast sums of Federal money to publish material of little or no value. Of course, some of the projects involving expenditures other than for the printing and binding of authorized documents can be justified.

I do question their use of objects of expenditure other than the proper one to print and bind their documents unless so authorized.

I do question their duplication of information already made public by private sources or other Government agencies.

I do question their use of high-grade papers, their lavish use of illustrations, and their expensive formats.

In 1942 a subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee sharply criticized several departments and agencies for their attempts through publications to propagandize the American public on controversial issues that were even then being debated in the Congress. I heartily agree that the public should not be taxed to pay for being propagandized, and I question this practice where it continues.

And I do question the advisability of the Government's having—in some cities—more than 20 separate printing and duplicating plants.

EIGHTY-THREE THOUSAND PUBLICATIONS SENT TO COMMITTEE

No one knows the number of publications which are printed and processed yearly by the Federal departments and agencies. That is a thing most people do not realize. Most people think that the printing of the Federal Government is all done in the city of Washington. In some cities in the United States the number of Federal agencies and bureaus runs into the hundreds. For instance, in the city of Chicago, the home city of the majority leader, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and the present distinguished Presiding Officer of the Senate, the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], there are 530 Federal agencies.

Now let us get back to printing. In San Francisco and in Philadelphia, for example, there are 20 separate printing and duplicating plants. Think of that. As I have said, most people think all the printing for the Federal Government is done in the Government Printing Office in the city of Washington, but all up and down this land, there is a vast array of Federal offices and agencies, and there are printing offices, duplicating offices, and all kinds of offices turning out Government propaganda. It is a very interesting matter, and I want the Senate to listen to the story.

No one knows the number of publications printed and processed yearly by the Federal Government departments and agencies. Much of this is done through the Government Printing Office, and of these we have complete records, but much more is done by the agencies themselves in their own printing plants throughout the country, and through contracts with outside printing firms. For the committee, I asked each agency to submit one copy of each publication issued during the past fiscal year which went to the general public. I want Senators to understand this point. In the last fiscal year we asked for one copy of each publication these agencies printed and distributed to the general public. The response almost overwhelmed me. This is not something that goes back 9 or 10 years, but it applies to the last fiscal year. We received between 83,000 and 84,000 separate copies of separate booklets and pamphlets issued by individual departments of the Federal Government.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. BALDWIN. Does the Senator mean by that that there are 83,000 separate documents dealing with 83,000 separate subjects?

Mr. BRIDGES. There are between 83,000 and 84,000 separate documents dealing with from 83,000 to 84,000 separate subjects.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield ?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Did the Senator also learn how much the publications comprised in total volume?

Mr. BRIDGES. I can answer that as to some instances, but as to others the information was so weird and so far-reaching that it is necessary to make a general estimate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The figures the Senator has just given do not, I assume, include pamphlets of instruction to field agencies, and the like?

Mr. BRIDGES. No; they relate only to publications for distribution to the general public.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Has the Senator any figures as to the number of pamphlets of instruction issued to field agents?

Mr. BRIDGES. No. I may say to the Senator from Massachusetts that we have no such figures. That is still another field. We could not go into that in such great detail; but it is still another field. For instance, I see present in the Chamber the distinguished former Secretary of Agriculture, my good friend,

the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], whom I admire greatly. I make reference to him and his former Department only in passing, because of my admiration for him. He told us they could not send in certain types of information because if they did they would comprise a stack of publications 52 feet high. They had to do with agricultural extension work, and so forth, which we are not including in this list at all.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a question only.

Mr. FERGUSON. The 83,723 publications, as I understand, do not include forms?

Mr. BRIDGES. No; they do not include forms. They are merely pamphlets and documents distributed to give information and propaganda to the general public.

I referred to one of the departments whose publications are not contained in this list. Even the eighty-three-odd-thousand publications which the committee received do not comprise more than a fraction of the total publications of the Government last year. They do not contain any of the multitude of publications which were issued solely for the internal workings of the Government. They exclude also thousands of publications which the agencies indicated would be expensive to collect. As I previously stated, one bureau begged off because its output would comprise a stack of publications estimated to be 52 feet high. Another begged off on a group which would fill, according to their own estimates, seven file cabinets of four drawers each. A third estimated that just one type of publication from that agency would fill a warehouse, if they could ever be collected. Remember, what I am talking about is just one copy of each publication going to the general public in the past fiscal year. I have not included the publications of the bureaus just referred to in the eighty-four-odd-thousand. Their publications are sort of bonuses on top of the eighty-three or eighty-four-odd thousand.

Yesterday the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the present chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, went with me to the basement of the Capitol. I should like to have any Senator who wishes to do so take a little trip down there, because I believe it would be worth his while. If he would take a trip into the basement of the Capitol of the United States he would see rooms filled with publications of the sort I refer to. It is really an astonishing thing.

The Government Printing Office told me that in the past 10 years, from 1939 through 1948—and I have just received this figure—they delivered 133,582,867,587 copies of printed matter. Just think of that, Mr. President.

There are 140,000,000 people in this country. This is what they had to feed on. Just think of it. From the Government Printing Office alone—and it does not include the production of all the other plants over the country—came, during the 10-year period—133,582,867,587 copies of printed matter. That printed matter is of sufficient volume to bury all 140,000,000 of our citizens. During the past 10 years enough printed matter has been put out by the Government Printing Office to cover and bury the 140,000,000 people in the United States. It would provide them safe coverage.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a question only.

Mr. FERGUSON. Of course, the people ought to feel fortunate that we have not passed a law compelling them to read these documents. Does not the Senator think that is true?

Mr. BRIDGES. I think the Senator is correct and I agree with him.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a question only.

Mr. McMAHON. Are the Senator's speeches included in that number?

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator mean——

Mr. McMAHON. If they are I was going to concur in the observation just made by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am talking about the publications put out by the executive departments, but I am sure that if the speeches of the Senator from Connecticut were included they would make wonderful reading. I know that would be true, and I know that he would not press to have several billion of them distributed. Perhaps he would want printed only a sufficient number to cover the people of Connecticut.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a question only.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am familiar with the fact that the speeches made by Senators and Representatives are not included, and that the publications referred to by the Senator from New Hampshire included merely those put out in the executive branch.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico for a question.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is the Senator in position to affirm that the 133,000,000,000 copies of printed matter do not include the reprints of congressional and senatorial speeches?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is my understanding. Our request was for publications put out by executive departments.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does the Senator know whether the total run of the printing office would include such delicate items as 500,000 reprints for one Member of Congress?

Mr. BRIDGES. I will check that matter for the Senator. But we requested the run for the executive departments.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wonder if the Senator from New Hampshire or the Senator from New Mexico has the relative rate of mailing of executive and congressional publications? I have seen the figure from time to time, and my impression is that it runs at a ratio of about 20 to 1, but I will not make that as a statement. I know that I was considerably relieved when I found how much more profligate the executive department was.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to observe to the Senator from New Hampshire that he is under no obligation to yield to other Members of the Senate for statements. He should yield only for questions.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. And if other Senators interrupt to make statements of their own the Chair shall be reluctantly forced to rule that the Senator from New Hampshire has lost the right to the floor.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Presiding Officer. I shall take heed and abide by that warning. I might say to the Senator from New Mexico, who made a statement as well as asked a question, that I do not know whether he did it with any ulterior purpose of making me lose the floor, but I would grant to him that he did it in all sincerity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair was not referring to any remark made by the Senator from New Mexico, but to the prior remarks made by the Senator from Michigan, and subsequently to remarks made by the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a question.

Mr. BREWSTER. Do I understand that the rules of the Senate do not apply to the other side of the Chamber?

Mr. BRIDGES. That I cannot answer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The rules of the Senate are impartial. The Chair was listening very carefully to the Senator from New Mexico, and he asked questions of the Senator from New Hampshire, but the Chair did not understand the Senator from Michigan to be asking a question, but rather as making a statement, and the Chair thought that the Senator from Maine was making a statement rather than asking a question of the speaker.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, may I ask a further question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a question only.

Mr. BREWSTER. I shall be happy if the Senator from New Mexico or the Senator now in the chair will examine the RECORD, and I should like to inquire, after they have done so, if they do not find there that the Senator from New Mexico stated very clearly that the Senator from New Hampshire was in error. If that is not a statement, I should be glad to be advised what it was.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We will read the RECORD very carefully tomorrow morning, sir, and in the meantime the Chair would like to caution the Senator from New Hampshire that he should yield only for questions directed to him.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I should be very much delighted to yield, if it is within my province to do so now, in order to have the RECORD read, if the Presiding Officer desires to determine the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no necessity for that. What the Chair said was not an attempt to take the Senator off his feet, but it was an attempt to protect the Senator against inquiries which might be made by some of the Senator's colleagues which would, unintentionally on their part, have that effect.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Presiding Officer for his consideration.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Michigan for a question only.

Mr. FERGUSON. Of course the Senator from Michigan believes that he was only asking questions. But the Chair has ruled otherwise. I ask the Senator if he can state whether or not during the time that these great volumes of publications were going out we were suffering from a paper shortage in the United States.

Mr. BRIDGES. I shall be glad to answer that question and say that during the period when these publications were going out we were suffering from the greatest paper shortage in the history of the country. I have no doubt that the printing of these publications, running as they did to terrific volume, into the billions, contributed very greatly to the paper shortage.

The publications I have referred to do not include the immense quantities of material turned out by the departments and agencies themselves. No one can tell, no one can even estimate the colossal magnitude of what these establishments have processed and printed on their own presses. However, some slight indication of the volume may be gleaned from a survey made at the instance of the Joint Committee on Printing in 1947. This showed that at that time there were 133 Government printing plants and 256 Government duplicating plants located through the country. One department had 44 printing plants. Another 41. Another 23. One agency had 100 duplicating plants. Another 43. In all, there were 32 departments and agencies with printing or duplicating plants located all over the country. One city had 25 plants. Another 23. Washington had 61.

And all this—mind you—does not include the Government Printing Office operation itself, which had 15 plants, since reduced to 9. Do Senators wonder when I tell them that it is impossible to estimate—impossible to overestimate—the volume of Government printing and processing that is done outside the Government Printing Office?

Is it any wonder that I am bothered when I know that far away from Washington, D. C., in the city of Chicago, located in the great State represented in part by the distinguished Presiding Officer at the present time, 530 Federal agencies and departments have offices? That is an astounding thing to me.

Take the home city of the whip of the majority [Mr. MYERS], the city of Philadelphia. Philadelphia has 25 printing plants. The city of Washington, where we think bureaucracy is concentrated, has only 61 printing plants. That is quite a number of plants, but when we stop to think of the number of plants located in Philadelphia, which is not the capital of the country, perhaps 61 is not too high a figure for Washington.

One of the amazing characteristics of our Government is that it can carry on contradictory activities at the same time. I am not referring to the lady who wrote to me complaining that the Department of Interior's publication How To Control Vagrant Cats contradicts the purposes of National Cat Week sponsored by the Department of Commerce, although she may well have a good point.

I may say to the Presiding Officer that the woman who wrote me protesting against these two departments operating in conflict, with the Department of the Interior trying to control cats and the Department of Commerce sponsoring National Cat Week, came from Illinois. She is a very distinguished citizen of Illinois.

I hold in my hand a booklet which tells about how to control vagrant cats. On the first page there is a note as follows:

> This leaflet supersedes United States Department of Agriculture leaflet 50, How To Make a Cat Trap, issued in November 1929—a contribution by the Bureau of Biological Survey.

The pamphlet tells about commercial live traps for cats.

Under the heading "Commercial live traps," we find the following:

> There are several types of commercial live traps on the market that are effective in catching cats. They vary in door and trigger designs. Instructions for setting them are given by the manufacturers of the traps. They may be obtained through local hardware dealers or pet animal stores. These traps should be baited as described for the home-made trap.

Note this:

> After it is determined that the captive cat is not a neighbor's pet, it may be disposed of by placing the wire trap in a tightly closed box and gassing as has been described. Instead of gassing, the animal may be drowned by submerging the trap in water.

We are getting into some pretty high stuff here.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a question only.

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall try to make it a question. At least the pamphlet does give the option of two methods of killing a cat.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is the Senator asking me whether it does or not?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. Does it not give two methods of killing a cat?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. The booklet goes into great detail. Once you catch the cat, the first thing you do is determine whether or not it is a neighbor's cat. If it is not a neighbor's cat, as I have quoted from the booklet, the directions are either to gas the cat, or if one does not like to gas a cat, the thing to do is to get a large tub and submerge the cat in the tub so that it will be drowned.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a question only.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it not well known that a cat has nine lives? [Laughter.]

Mr. BRIDGES. I point out that one of the things that bothers me particularly——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire wish to reply to the question of the Senator from Maine?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. I have heard the report that a cat has nine lives, but I am not sure of it. It is not so stated in the booklet issued by the Government. That is one thing they forgot to tell. They forgot to tell whether a cat has nine lives or not.

The thing that bothers me particularly is that the woman from the State of the distinguished Presiding Officer is very sorely troubled. What is she troubled about? She is troubled because the Department of the Interior has issued a booklet on how to control vagrant cats. She says that that is in opposition to what the Department of Commerce is doing, because it is sponsoring National Cat Week. Mr. President, I think that it is a problem we ought to settle. It is too bad that the Government must publish thousands of booklets which raise a conflict in the minds of the people, and particularly this distinguished and outstanding woman from the home State of the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, I do not wish to take more time on cats. I shall have something to say about other animals, and other subjects.

It is a very interesting thing that the right hand does not know what the left hand is doing. I am referring to the seemingly paradoxical situation whereby one agency of the Government will offer the same publication free of charge to the public which another agency of the Government is attempting to sell. This is true of not just one publication. It is a general practice for the departments and agencies to offer free of charge—as long as the supply lasts—copies of publications which the Superintendent of Documents is attempting to sell at a nominal charge. Even then the Government loses money, for his sale is based, not on total cost—which, as I have indicated, is unobtainable—but on the reprint cost plus a mark-up.

Last year the Superintendent of Documents issued free of charge for the agencies—I repeat, free of charge—61,979,102 publications. How many million publications the agencies themselves issued free of charge, we cannot even surmise.

I would be remiss in my duties if I made this a blanket condemnation. I do not wish to be so understood. Many of these publications undoubtedly are highly necessary to the workings of our Government and the welfare of our citizens. Many of them, in all justice, should be distributed free of charge. Items on rat control and the prevention of forest fires, to mention only two, are of such nature that one could not expect general dissemination if a price were asked for them.

But this is not to condone the vast flood of free publications which daily clutter our mails. A businessman, for example, can conceivably secure 465 publications from the Department of Commerce free of charge by merely mailing a penny postcard to the Department. The Congress itself is not above criticism in this respect, as we all know.

Recently Senators received a communication from a Government agency which apologized to us because only 160 copies a month of a popular Government pamphlet could be furnished for the next several months because of higher publishing costs. I do not know how other Senators feel about it, but I am willing to take a dose of my own medicine. I am willing to take a lesser number of publications for free distribution to help the cause of lowering the cost of publications. In the long run the people are not getting these publications free of charge; the cost is not paid directly, but it is paid indirectly in higher taxes.

In consequence, I hope my colleagues here and in the House of Representatives will join with me in a conscientious endeavor to order only such publications for distribution to our constituents as will really be of use to them. Let us continue to send them Infant Care, and let us think twice before we send them publications on Eliminating Bats from Buildings.

The bat is an interesting animal. Bats sometimes trouble people. The longer I remain in Washington the more trouble I have with bats. I have met a great many batty people here. Most of them I have found in certain Government departments. They all make some contribution, of course.

Perhaps Senators would like to hear something about how to get rid of bats:

> The most satisfactory and the only permanent way of obtaining freedom from the bat-roost nuisance, however, is to shut the bats out.

[Laughter.]

That is quite an effective way, Mr. President; I think that is one of the best things that could be done in that connection. Incidentally, the title of this portion of the pamphlet is Bat-Proofing Buildings."

I read further from it:

> Frequently there are only a few small entrances to the bat roost, and in such cases bat-proofing is relatively simple. It is necessary only to close the openings—

And so forth. Then I find this:

> In closing the entrances used by bats it is necessary that one or two be left open until after nightfall, so as to allow egress of the bats, and thus shut them out and not in. Ordinarily during midsummer all the bats will have left the roost within 15 minutes from the time the first one starts, but after their accustomed routine has been thus upset, several hours may lapse before the last bat finds its way out.

In other words, sometimes there is a laggard, and one or two of the bats might linger behind. That would be very serious.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a question.

Mr. BREWSTER. I was called out of the Chamber for a few minutes, so I have not heard all the Senator's discussion. I wonder whether he has yet reached the subject of dogs. Is there any information dealing with the maternity problem of dogs and their descendants? [Laughter.]

Mr. BRIDGES. I shall discuss the dog situation a little later; but I should like to have the Senator remain while I discuss an item which very directly concerns dogs. A booklet which has been published at considerable cost to the Federal Government will be, I think, of real interest in that connection. The booklet is on fleas. That is a very highly controversial issue, and it has to do with the dog situation, and I shall discuss it.

In fact, I now hold that booklet in my hand. It is entitled "Fleas of North America." [Laughter.]

Mr. President, this booklet appears to be quite a publication. The subtitle is "Classification, Identification, and geographic distribution of fleas." [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I should like to read some of the material contained in the booklet. I hope that all Senators will listen to the reading of this material, for I am quite sure they will be interested in this, too.

I now read from the booklet:

> In the United States, fleas are serious pests of dogs—

So, Mr. President, dogs come into this matter. The complete sentence is as follows:

> In the United States, fleas are serious pests of dogs, of cats, and of poultry. Dogs may be greatly annoyed by fleas, when attacked, and spend much time gnawing at their affected parts.

That is a great contribution, Mr. President—to learn that when fleas attack dogs, the dogs have to spend a large part of their time gnawing at the affected parts.

I hope Senators will listen to this, and they should listen carefully, if they wish to understand what is the most frequently affected part. The booklet says:

> The most frequently affected part is the back, near the root of the tail.

[Laughter.]

As a result of fleas, that part of the dog—the root of the tail—becomes, so we are told by the booklet, raw and sore, and infection often follows. So we see that quite a big problem exists in this country in that connection; and we have this booklet, entitled "Fleas of North America—Classification, Identification, and Geographic Distribution of Fleas," to which we can turn. As we are told by this publication, the place to look on the dog is near the root of the tail; that is where the greatest trouble with fleas is, according to this booklet.

Mr. President, there are many other phases of this subject of fleas. This booklet comprises 142 pages, so it is apparent that many different angles in regard to fleas must be covered by this publication. I think it is something very worth while that we should pursue. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I do not wish to become at all personal, but I may say that this publication is issued by the United States Department of Agriculture; it is Miscellaneous Publication No. 500. I do not know whether the distinguished former Secretary of Agriculture, now a Member of this body, could add any more than I have added in regard to the problem of identifying fleas, and so forth; but I shall do the best I can.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question only?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; for a question only.

Mr. ANDERSON. Has the Senator been familiar with the work done by the Department of Agriculture laboratory in Florida on the development of cures for this problem within the past few years?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I am not criticizing that; I am merely talking about the publications the Department issues. I am not blaming the former Secretary of Agriculture at all. I am simply enlightening the Senate and the country in regard to some of the publications the Government issues, and this one was a particularly good one, it seemed to me. Frankly, I picked out only certain sections; I did not wish to read the entire 142 pages, so I picked out some of the pages which I thought would be of particular interest.

Now let me discuss the matter of the mailing list for such Government publications. Even the free distribution of publications has not been sufficient inducement to the public to gobble up this horde of printed documents. Let me explain. After an agency orders a publication printed by the Government Printing Office, the agency receives a supply it believes sufficient for its immediate needs. It arranges with the Printing Office to distribute another large group, supplying addressograph plates for the purpose. The Printing Office at present has a collection of over 2,000,000 addressograph plates which they must use to send out publications for the agencies. The agencies do not pay for this service, which runs to over $300,000 annually.

The remaining supply of publications is retained by the Government Printing Office as stock available for free distribution. The storage space the Printing Office has for this free stock is limited to about 35,000 square feet. Tons of undistributed publications dating back for many years serve as mute but concrete evidence of waste and extravagance resulting from poor administrative judgment that has come from overstocking of publications. Other unknown tons have been transferred to agency warehouses or sold as waste paper. The Government Printing Office is constantly pleading with the departments and agencies to remove their dead stock. I suspect they are fearful of the contingency whereby they would be forced out of their own building by surplus publications ordered by Government agencies.

During the past 2 years the Government Printing Office condemned over 10,000,000 publications. No one knows how many were condemned by the other Government establishments.

Committee investigators found widespread evidence of undistributed publications. Over 500,000 copies of some publications were found. And there were many publications of which there were from two to three hundred thousand copies available. They had lain there

for several years—untouched and unwanted.

PRINTING AND BINDING COSTS A FRACTION OF TOTAL

I am afraid that there are many of us in the Congress who have been misled as to the cost of the Government's publishing activities. The Bureau of the Budget recently estimated that the overall printing and binding cost for the entire Government in fiscal 1948 was approximately $45,000,000. This, of course, does not include the cost of the original research, the editing, the typing, the reviewing and checking, and the distribution. In fact, the committee discovered that in certain instances it does not even include a large part of the printing and binding costs themselves.

One large agency of the Government made an independent check on its publishing activities and discovered that printing and binding activities accounted for only about 25 percent of the total cost of processing the material from the manuscript to the printed page. And even this, it must be emphasized, did not include any costs whatever for research, writing, and distribution.

The head of another agency revealed that the distribution cost alone of a particular document came to five times the cost of printing it.

Still another agency admitted that the printing and binding cost of just one publication came to three times as much as they had secured from the Congress for printing all their publications.

It is apparent then that the object classification of printing and binding is but a part—probably a very small part—of the total costs of publishing in the Government.

With such figures as a guide—fragmentary as they are—one may well wonder how many hundreds of millions of dollars these publications are costing the people of this Nation.

It is apparent, also, that many departments and agencies have resorted to processing publications in their own plants to avoid congressional limitations imposed on printing and binding appropriations.

Moreover, the Congress itself has been remiss in this matter, for we have been told for a number of years by the Public Printer in his annual reports—and in unmistakably clear language—that the situation had gotten beyond his control. I, as one Member of the Congress, join with the Public Printer in urging a discontinuance of these wasteful practices and a general strengthening—without censorship—of the controls over publications of the executive branch.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly; for a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. Can the Senator from New Hampshire advise the Senate whether there is a strict rule in regard to what may be published or printed in the Government Printing Office itself for a department or agency of the Government?

Mr. BRIDGES. I think it is supposed to be something pertaining to the work of the department; but I think that allows quite a good deal of latitude—too much, in fact.

Mr. FERGUSON. Can the Senator advise the Senate whether any of the publications are printed in foreign countries?

Mr. BRIDGES. They are.

Mr. FERGUSON. Can the Senator advise the Senate why that is done, or how it happens to be done?

Mr. BRIDGES. I think we filled up all the printing offices in this country, and had to expand, so to speak, in other countries, in order to get the printing done.

UNCLE SAM'S BOOK-OF-THE-MINUTE CLUB, UNLIMITED

At this time I should like to call your attention to some of these volumes which are issued by our Government agencies. I have not examined all of the publications carefully. It would take years to do a thorough job on that. Therefore, in bringing them to your attention, I do not wish to imply and I do not wish to have inferred, that I necessarily am critical of any one volume. I merely bring them to your notice at this time because I, for one, was amazed at some of the volumes I uncovered, and because I thought you would be interested in the variety of titles, the subject matter of many, and the format and binding of others. There may be valid reasons for some of the pamphlets, books, brochures, and other printed material which I am about to bring to your attention, but all of them contain questionable passages, questionable material, and many are overelaborate and costly of presentation.

This modest little book I hold in my hand is entitled "Tales From Korea." It is a book containing 143 pages. It is a very worth-while book. It was printed at Government expense and was widely distributed.

From the introduction to the book I read the following:

> Mr. Pyun offers us a collection of Korean tales, myths, fairy stories, and folk tales. You will find old friends, such as Brer Rabbit and Cinderella, dressed it is true in Korean clothes; Brer Rabbit speaking in Korean idioms instead of darky dialect, Cinderella riding in a sedan chair instead of a coach and four, but nonetheless truly the same old friends half the way round the world from where we met them last.

From the foreword I read the following:

> Many will perhaps disagree about the way the native names are rendered in this book, and feel that the doubtful improvement it brings does not quite compensate for the shock one is likely to feel in a humorousless travesty.

It continues with various descriptions.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a question only.

Mr. BREWSTER. Would it be contended we were wasting our time in a discussion of this character?

Mr. BRIDGES. I may say, in answer to the Senator, I do not see how that could be contended because certainly the administration should not be ashamed of any document it issues—84,000 individual copies of publications on various subjects—for free distribution all over this country and all over the world. I should say we are merely bringing to light certain illuminating facts.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it the Senator's feeling that the Senate and the country should be informed of the nature of the publications in order that they may determine whether they feel it is an appropriate matter for public expenditure?

Mr. BRIDGES. I certainly do. I was going to say the volume, Tales From Korea, a very interesting book of 148 pages, was published for general distribution. It contains some very interesting pictures, too. It was printed at Government expense. The book was written by Y. T. Pyun, and the dedication placed in this booklet, printed at Government expense, reads:

> To my wife who mothers five children as well as our common son.

That is a very lofty dedication of a Government publication—"To my wife who mothers five children as well as our common son." I desire to go over some of the things with which he deals in the various chapters. He has one little story entitled "The Vanity of the Rat." That ought to be particularly important. Another one is "The Old Woman and the Tiger." The next one is "The Traveler and the Tiger." Then there comes one in which he really gets down to work—"The Origin of the Sun and the Moon." We all want to hear about that. I do not have time to read the chapter, but his discussion of the "Origin of the Sun and the Moon" ought to be very good. Another title is "The School Boy and the Fox." Another one is "The Strange Dream." That ought to be very appropriate here, I think. Another one is "Lies Rewarded With a Bride." That ought to have some particular appeal. Another is "The White-Eared Tiger." That ought to be of particular appeal to people. Another one is "The Absent-Minded Man." I shall not take more time on this, which merely shows the variations of the Government publication situation.

I should have here a pamphlet on Women in Radio, which I wanted to discuss with Senators. That is a very laudable subject, something I think quite worth while. It is put out by the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor. Most of it deals with biographical sketches of women who have become well known as the result of their radio activities. It is one of an extensive series on woman's place in various occupations. It is published, among other things, for the woman who wants to go into radio, and maps out for her her whole life career, going into all the various matters in which she might be interested.

I have another booklet here, which I think will be of great interest, called Federal Duck Stamps, and Their Place. This is a very interesting story about Federal duck stamps. The booklet also includes Canadian goose, the pin-tailed duck, the canvasback duck, the green-winged teal, the black duck, the white duck, the white-front goose, the red-headed duck, and the snow goose. To all

these creatures we have apparently devoted this little booklet; which presumably contributed somewhat to our influence.

Various other publications have been issued, such as Getting Into a Different Thing, Farm Fishponds, Techniques of Fishpond Management, Farm Fishponds and Their Management, all of which is good and of varying interest to various people.

Another one is entitled "Family Spending and Saving, as Related to Age of Wife and Age and Number of Children." This is crammed full of interesting facts; for example:

> Did you know that "among the young families without children, wives tended to spend more on their wardrobes than husbands"?

That ought to be interesting. That is page 33, paragraph 2. That is gone into in some detail.

> Did you know that "almost one-fourth—23 percent—of the wives 60 or older at an income" below $1,000 "spend so little for dress that they used less than 30 percent of the family's clothing funds, leaving the balance for their husbands"?

Husbands seem to be getting the better of this deal.

In paragraph 1, page 19, the book tells how they conducted a survey of what women discuss, and they found that they always talked about their grocery bills, instead of about something really interesting.

I now come to another one. Here is a book on Estimating the Muskrat Population by House Counts. It is quite a book. I am sure it must be contributing something to the great good of the country. I do not know just where to start. It contains 17 pages, so I shall not take the time of the Senate to go into it. It has very many interesting things in it regarding the census method used, and all about the general situation.

Another booklet, which is a very good one, is entitled "Fish for Breakfast—And Why Not?" That is very good. In this booklet we find some very interesting quotations. Persons from the Middle West would be interested in this. It says:

> The national stand-by of bacon and eggs is all very well, but some people find that such a breakfast dish is too rich, and, in any case, the possibilities for variety are strictly limited.

So they recommend fish for breakfast. It says further:

> Perhaps the reason that those few minutes' extra sleep seem preferable to breakfast is that the breakfast menu has become drab and monotonous.

So they recommend fish. That is a good thing. I come from a State that has some seacoast, and we catch some fish from the sea and some from the very fine lakes in New Hampshire. I like fish. This publication contains a recipe for "kedgeree." That is a special kind of a fish preparation. It is made with flaky fish and is cooked with rice, hard-boiled eggs, and so on. The publication goes into all kinds of things.

Here is a very interesting one on attracting birds. It starts off by saying:

> Formerly there seemed to be no question about the desirability of attracting birds. Now certain doubts have arisen in the minds of people as to whether it is wise to attract them or not.

So there is a disagreement. It says further:

> Birds, as a rule, not only do not want bird neighbors too near, but are impatient with human meddling, and therefore should be granted as much privacy as possible.

So we should pay some attention to that.

> The greatest reward from attracting birds—doubtless also in most cases the main incentive for the practice—is human enjoyment. The activity, beauty, and songs of birds supply life, color, and charm. Birds ornament the homestead, entertain the senses, and afford natural companionship that is a joy to a majority of mankind. They are so keen and spritely that they compel attention, so intensively alive and so in harmony with their environment as to inspire the beholder.

I could go on, but I do not wish to cover the whole field.

Here is another interesting publication, issued in recent weeks, entitled "Two Home-Made Traps for English Sparrows." It should be very interesting. In New Hampshire there is a dispute going on as to whether we should name the chickadee as the State bird. I am sure that if we could obtain a supply of these booklets and send them to New Hampshire, this particular one on how to make home-made traps for English sparrows, they might be able to catch some of the chickadees and examine them a little more carefully.

Here is a pamphlet entitled "Suggestions for Combating Objectionable Roosts of Birds—With Special Reference to Those of Starlings." That gets right down to Washington. The starlings in Washington are birds that cause some embarrassment, not only as to the Capitol, but to various buildings, including some of the statues. Washington is a beautiful city of statues, but we seem to have a major problem in connection with the starlings.

Here is a booklet which has been issued for general circulation on how to deal with the starling problem. That should be one of the most interesting problems that we could tackle here.

Here is one showing how to make a table lamp. It says that the first thing is—

> Be sure to buy a socket with a three-position switch if you use a three-light bulb (50-100-150-watt).

It goes on at some length. It says:

> It conserves eyesight, saves energy, and gives your room new attractiveness. You can make one, cheaply and easily, with materials readily available.

Here is another one that really gets home. Its title is "Care of Parrots." The care of parrots is probably one of the major problems of the country, and here is a little booklet on the care of them. It contains 16 pages and deals with parrot fever. It also deals with the difficulty in refeathering after molt. It speaks of egg-binding. I do not know what is meant by that. It must be something new in the science of caring for parrots. There are all kinds of angles to the parrot situation. The publication goes into details and covers quite a good deal of ground.

Here is one entitled "Feeding and Caring for Squirrels." That should not be a major problem, because I can remember that when I was a small child—I could not have been more than 2 or 3 or 4 years of age—I used to go out in the backyard and feed peanuts to squirrels. I had not had the advantage of having read a United States Government booklet on how I should feed squirrels.

I went through Boston, Mass., a few days ago. The Senator from Massachusetts knows all about Boston Common. I saw beautiful squirrels there, and I saw little tots feeding peanuts to them. I do not know whether the Senator knows, and I shall not ask him here, whether the people of Massachusetts have read about how to feed squirrels so that they will know the best way to hand a peanut to a squirrel. It must be a very efficient Government operation.

The next booklet is a very worth-while one, entitled "Establishing and Operating a Flower Shop."

As business gets a little dead in this Democratic administration it might be well to look into this booklet. When we got the Fair Deal I did not think we would get into anything like the situation we are in, so I think we ought to begin to think about new types of business. Here is a booklet which is rather a lengthy one, containing all kinds of diagrams. It is 46 pages long, telling about how to go into the flower business so that we can have more flowers.

Here is a booklet entitled "Establishing and Operating a Year-Round Motor Court." It devotes 125 pages to telling how to operate a motor court. A motor court is a very useful thing in our life in the United States as we travel over the country. I see the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is present. Persons in his section of the country have been able to operate motor courts rather successfully. Persons come along in their automobiles and have to stop somewhere overnight. They do not want to sleep in their cars, so they go into a motor court. Here is a booklet of 125 pages as an aid to conducting that business.

Here is one to which I want the Senators to pay particular attention. I know the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is a very distinguished gentleman and he likes to solve major problems. Here is one into which I do not think he has looked. This publication is entitled "The Cuban Frog Leg Industry." The Government is issuing publications on the Cuban frog-leg business. I wish I had time to go into many of the features in connection with the frog-leg business. Much of it is very interesting. I see that one of the subheads is "The Age for 'Prime' Frog Legs." That is something I did not know about. I shall quote from that for a moment. In Cuba some frogs are known to live longer than others. [Laughter.] That is very interesting.

> In Cuba some frogs are known to live as much as 7 years or longer. For commercial purposes to insure tender meat——

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. For a question only.

Mr. BRICKER. Does the pamphlet show any way to calculate how far a frog can jump by the length of his legs? [Laughter.]

Mr. BRIDGES. I have not found that in the pamphlet as yet. I will see. I shall go on with this, because it is interesting. It says that some frogs live longer than others, and some as long as 7 years. Then it says:

For commercial purposes to insure tender meat, however, only those at least 1 year old (after reaching the frog stage)—

Get that—

and not older than 2 years old are taken, because those younger than 1 year are not economical and those older than 2 years are not sufficiently tender.

That is really solving a major problem. I wish the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the majority leader, had been here earlier. I shall not take his mind off other things now, but I have had some very interesting letters from people in Illinois, and I discussed them with the present distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who is now presiding. But I am sure that if the senior Senator from Illinois will read the RECORD tomorrow, he will get some real inspiration.

Mr. LUCAS rose.

Mr. BRIDGES. I cannot let the Senator interfere with me, because I might lose the floor. [Laughter.] I shall be glad to answer questions.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will my distinguished friend yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator tell the Senate and the country why the distinguished Senator from Vermont, who is an indefatigable worker, Chairman of the Appropriations Committee for the past 2 years, did not find out about these frogs when he was Chairman of that Committee, when these same pamphlets were being issued, and he had the power and the Republican Party had the power to stop the issuance of them?

Mr. BRIDGES. I will answer that. In the first place, I cannot speak for the Senator from Vermont, because I do not see him here in the Chamber. The Senator from Illinois referred to the "Senator from Vermont." The Senator from Illinois occasionally knows I am the Senator from New Hampshire, and I am very proud of the fact that I am. I occasionally go into Vermont.

Mr. LUCAS. I apologize to the Senator.

Mr. BRIDGES. I accept the apology. These publications were collected during the past two years, when the Republicans were in control of the Congress. We have had to assemble them, and I am just making them known. If the Senator from Illinois and his Administration want to balance the budget and to get things done, what he should do, instead of rooting up subjects for new taxes on people, is to undertake to cut down some of the Government publications. That is one way he could render the people of Illinois a real service.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator believe that by eliminating the frogs we could balance the budget?

Mr. BRIDGES. I will say that by eliminating some of the publications on frog's legs, which I have not had time to go into, we would help balance the budget, and to that end I invite the cooperation of the Senator from Illinois.

The next publication I have is another very interesting one, "The Cuban Shark Industry." Mind you, if we were talking about how to raise Hereford cattle, something practical in this country, I would be for it. But Cuba is not like the Hawaiian Islands, a territory of the United States. Cuba is an independent country. Yet we are organizing the frog industry there and now we are organizing the shark industry. There is very wide diversification in this pamphlet, and many fine pictures, and 27 pages of how to organize the shark industry.

To show that we have no prejudice against any particular country, the next one I have here is a pamphlet on Venezuela. The Venezuelan Salt Fish Industry. That is quite a publication, with maps and pictures—81 pages on the Venezuelan salt fish industry.

I cannot go into all these; it would take several hours merely to name them. But we have no prejudice. We will do something about any matter that comes along.

Now, here really is one; and I hope the Senator from Illinois, the majority leader, will give a little attention to this. I have one here now which I think will really catch his eye. It is Recipes for Cooking Muskrat Meat. [Laughter.] This is a very fine publication, and I assume from what it says that muskrat meat must be quite a delicacy.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. For a question.

Mr. BRICKER. Has the Senator ever tried it?

Mr. BRIDGES. I have never tried it. I have quite an inspiration since I have been reading this booklet, but I have never tried muskrat meat yet. However, I want to tell some of the ways it should be cooked. This is put out by the administration of which the distinguished Senator from Illinois is the majority leader, and I want him to be informed as to what his administration is doing. They give a fine recipe here for fried muskrat. Then they have another one for muskrat fried in wine. That would have a particular appeal. It might even appeal to a wider variety of people than just plain fried muskrat. Then we have smothered muskrat. That ought to be pretty good. Then we get into broiled marsh rabbit, and so forth.

Here is one from Maryland. I do not see either of the Senators from Maryland on the Senate floor, but we have Maryland shredded muskrat meat. That must be a super de luxe dish.

Here is another one, muskrat meat with tomato sauce. I always like catsup and I think tomato sauce would take some of the taste away.

Here is another that I did not think they could do—muskrat salad.

Another one is stewed muskrat liver, with onions.

Here are two more, indeed, three more. One is pickled muskrat. That should be good. The second is muskrat pie, and the other one is muskrat a la Louisianne. [Laughter.] That ought to be pretty good.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a question; yes.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wonder whether in the exploration of these various publications, particularly on this matter of edibility the Senator has found one which deals with the matter of how to cook and eat crow.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have not run into that yet, but if I do, I should like very much to talk about it. I have not yet discovered anything on that subject.

Mr. BREWSTER. I did not know whether the distinguished majority side had planned that for Republican edification or not, but I should like to inquire whether the Senator from Illinois might also have investigated the matter of eating crow in connection with the current discussion?

Mr. BRIDGES. I cannot speak for the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator will yield to me——

Mr. BRIDGES. For a question.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator agree with me that if pamphlets did come out on how to eat crow, they ought to come definitely from the Republicans, and not the Democrats?

Mr. BRIDGES. I would have some question about that, but I would say there was a period last November when that might be true.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield for another question——

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. As to whether or not the current conditions in the Senate might indicate that the majority leader might be eating crow very shortly? [Laughter.]

Mr. BRIDGES. I would say that from my general knowledge—I have no specific knowledge—that is entirely possible, but I should not care to say definitely, because I have great respect for the Senator from Illinois, and I want him to have perfect latitude and not be influenced by anything I might say along that line. [Laughter.]

Here is another one that is pretty good, "Deer mortality from gunshot wounds." I like to go hunting, and I think it is a very worth-while sport. It is a subject which should be gone into, but I do not know just how anyone, however wise he may be, could prepare an accurate publication on that subject.

Here is something very good. Here is a document of 115 pages on Certain Child-Welfare Terms in Spanish, Portuguese, French, and English. I can understand the ones in English. There may be some reason for the others. But I will say we are going a little far afield when the Government issues free publications of 115 pages, translating these very endearing young terms into four different languages.

Here is another pamphlet which is very good. It is entitled "Mist Netting for Birds in Japan." We go over into Asia now, into the Far East, to consider things done there. This publication is about 40 pages. It contains a number of nice pictures. It deals with mist netting for birds in Japan. As I said there are many pretty pictures in the pamphlet. I do not believe I shall go into this pamphlet. I merely wish to say that it proves we are not prejudiced in the matter of putting out pamphlets dealing with other countries.

Here is one which has real appeal. It is entitled "Music While You Work." We could talk about such a thing as that for the Senate. If we could arrange to have music while we work on the Senate side of the Capitol it would be worth while. The pamphlet contains something like 60 pages on how best to provide music while we work.

We now go to the farm. I hold in my hand a pamphlet entitled "Your Farm House. Planning the Bathroom." Listen to this:

Whether you are putting a new bathroom into an old house or building everything new, plan the bathroom to fit your family's present and future needs. Let every one in the family, young and old, join in the planning. Here are just a few of the many questions you will want to talk over before you make your final plans.

Will dad and the boys coming in from work use the bathroom as a washroom, or can you build a separate washroom? Can you plan your bathroom to meet the special needs of the children or sick or aged members of the family? Do you need bathroom space to bathe and dress a baby?

Will there be a morning rush on the bathroom?

That is an important subject.

Perhaps you need a bathroom that several persons can use at one time.

That would be a wonderful thing. We have something there, Mr. President. I can remember when I was in college, living in a boarding house. There were three floors in the house. On the floor I lived there was one bathroom. I think there were 12 boys who lived on that floor. We all made a dash for the bathroom at one time. Of course we were all of one sex, and that did not cause as much embarrassment as if there had been mixed sexes living there. But we made a dash for the bathroom, and it would have been ideal if we could have had there to advise us the planner who put out the pamphlet.

I continue to read:

Perhaps you need a bathroom that several persons can use at one time.

I have been thinking about how that would work. It would be rather a difficult thing at best, even for the very astute minds of some of the planners we have here in Washington to figure out how that could be done in one bathroom. I can see how there could be a multiplicity of receptacles there, and that perhaps several persons could use the bathroom at one time, but I cannot understand how the planners could arrange it so the bathroom could be used by any great crowd at the same time. Yet, that is one of the solutions we are offering on the part of the United States Government, for such a problem.

The pamphlet says:

Always plan in advance.

That is a good thing to do. If we could sort of apportion the time of those who use the bathroom it would be very worth while.

Here is a pamphlet I got from the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. It deals with the Columbia Basin. It is entitled "Columbia Basin—Joint Investigations—Farm Improvement." The pamphlet consists of 126 pages. I shall not have time to go into all of it. But there were several things contained in it that I particularly wanted to read to the Senate.

Home-furnishing needs are discussed. I hope the distinguished Presiding Officer is not going to leave, because I want him to hear this. I think it is very worth while. I know the Senator from Illinois to be a very learned man, with a very fine educational background, but I think he can learn some new things from what I am saying today. He may hear something he has probably never even imagined before.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will pay very close attention to what the Senator from New Hampshire is saying.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator. I read:

Roughly, three kinds of furnishings deserve consideration: Furniture, appliances, and accessories. The most important pieces among the first will be davenports, chairs, tables, pianos, radios, beds, and storage pieces—

And so forth and so on. Now we come down to something else:

Second, the pieces must satisfy the settler's taste. This is one of the more difficult problems to resolve. The average ruralist seems to feel his daily routine to be rather unexciting and in selecting home furnishings he is likely to satisfy his consequent craving for glamour by choosing flashy pieces.

Mr. President, I do not like that statement. I do not like to have that said with respect to the people of the State of the Senator from Washington. That is a direct reflection by the bureaucrats in Washington upon the taste of the people of that State. I rather resent that, because I think the farmers in the State of Washington, and the Columbia River Basin, at least those I have met, have pretty good judgment. I do not want to have reflections cast upon them any more than I would like to have reflections cast upon the farmers of the State of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]. Apparently, the bureaucrat who wrote the pamphlet thinks that the farmers of Washington, in the Columbia Basin, go in for glamour by choosing flashy pieces. I continue to read:

Ponderous davenports covered with brilliantly colored pile fabrics, refrigerators with much brightwork, highly figured rugs and wallpaper, elaborate pictures and accessories—these are the sort of things that may tempt him. He is likely to pass up the simpler articles and spend extra money he can ill afford to buy pieces with more class.

I realize that the bureaucrat who wrote the pamphlet believes as he wrote, but I cannot bring myself to condemn people in the State of Washington, as he does by what he writes. It is a matter which has been troubling me ever since I read it, and I will say to the senior Senator from Washington, that I felt bound to bring it to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Does not the Senator from New Hampshire think that probably the purpose of the pamphlet is to sort of educate all the settlers we expect to come to our State, to the Columbia Basin, from New England and the middle west, to the real simple way of life in Washington, and to warn them not to bring their fancy ideas of the East with them when they come to our State?

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not think so, I will say to the Senator. I believe the Senator's friends there are perfectly competent to take care of themselves in this respect without needing such aid as is attempted to be provided in the pamphlet. I am sure that such a thing as this is rather of a questionable nature. But I will say in all candor to the Senator that I simply do not like the reflection that is cast upon the Senator's people by what I have read.

I read further:

It is not suggested that the farmer's taste is bad and that he must be saved from himself and made to buy only the proper things selected by trained decorators. Rather it is proposed that the desires which cause him to select a special type of furnishings shall be analyzed and those desires satisfied with items which individually and together are good buys.

Now that is a part of the collective state, as I see it. It is not proposed even to let the farmer in Washington buy what he wants. The bureaucrats seem to be afraid the farmer might have bad taste. So they are going to analyze him and analyze his desires for the items individually, so they can guide him in the direction of the type of things he had best buy.

I do not want to discuss the pamphlet further, but I suggest it is a subject which the Senator from Washington and the Senator from New Hampshire should look into more fully, because it is a sort of a reflection on some of our best people.

Here is a very nice pamphlet. It is entitled "Habits, Food, and Economic Status of the Band-Tailed Pigeon." Now we are getting into a new field—the habits, food, and economic status of the band-tailed pigeon. That is really a new matter. I am not very familiar with the band-tailed pigeon, but here we have a pamphlet of 76 pages on the subject of the habits, the food, and the economic status of the band-tailed pigeon. I cannot go into it in great detail, Mr. President, but I think Senators will be interested in one paragraph which tells about the courtship of the band-tailed pigeon:

Apparently little is recorded concerning the courtship of the band-tail. Bent (1932), quoting Swarth, indicates that cooing and other calls and spectacular circling glides by the male from a perch are among the details of courtship.

That is very interesting. The male starts to coo, and he coos a little and calls a little, and then he does circular gliding movements from a perch. That indicates the start of the courtship.

Pearse (1935) describes another activity, apparently part of the courting behavior. Short flights in a hesitant, quivering manner, during which the bird seems almost to float, form the basis of this display. The tail is fully spread, and Pearse says that the tips of the wings appear to be held down. The display is accompanied by two separate very low calls, one of which he describes as being very like the modified chirping of a cricket.

I should like to read another paragraph under the heading "Calls." This has relationship to the courtship of the band-tailed pigeon.

The deep, cooing notes of the band-tailed pigeon are distinctive. Once heard, as they ring through the depths of some mountain canyon, they will never be forgotten. Mrs. Florence Merriam Bailey (1902) terms the calls owl-like. They are most often heard during the courting period, and Wales (1926) describes the tilting of the head downward to horizontal, the inflation of the neck, and other actions incident to the display of that particular period.

The courting period of the band-tailed pigeon is an important period in its life. I can believe that.

After nesting has begun, the cooing is more subdued and less frequent.

A variety of low gutteral call notes may be heard when the parents are together at or near the nest: these are similar to the notes of the domestic pigeon at such times.

After the courtship is over and the nesting period has begun, they act like ordinary pigeons.

The squab, when hungry, utters a thin, piping note. Neither of these latter calls can be heard for more than a few yards.

That is a book which I think everyone should look into. Senators should carry it in their brief cases, because it gives inspiration to go on. If we can get down to the details of the courtship of the band-tailed pigeon, we certainly ought to be able to do something about humans.

The State Department sent to the committee approximately 20 volumes which it issued for South American distribution. Every one of these volumes is in Spanish. One group is highly technical and professional. I am limited to English and a smattering of French which I acquired many years ago when I was in college. I am not an authority on Spanish. If any Senator is a Spanish scholar, I think he would be very much interested in some of these books. They are not inexpensive books. The one I hold in my hand contains 847 pages. It deals with some of the details of human relations. It is printed in Spanish, and we are sending it to other countries for their use. It is a pretty good book to have in one's library.

There is another group of publications, which I shall not take the time to discuss in detail. Here is one which is very interesting, on Mobey Dick. It has been translated into Spanish. The book contains 700 pages, and is very elaborate.

Mr. President, I could continue citing examples like these for hours, but I shall not take the time to do so. There are one or two more publications which I should like to discuss.

This one is entitled "Among the Birds in the Grand Canyon Country." Let me quote from it:

One night after a thunderstorm over the North Rim, while the stars were still hidden, the moon gave a soft light through which the large landscape features could be discerned. Under the turreted South Rim our amphitheater walls led down in gigantic dark silhouetted steps lowering to the mesa; and beyond across the width of the great chasm was faintly seen the far-away familiar level of the North Rim. But as I gazed around dreamily, the soft, soothing voices of little toads, the drowsy chirring of crickets, and the faint poor-will, poor-will, soon lulled me into peaceful sleep.

That is what we paid for. We not only paid for the printing, but we paid for the trip and all the research. This author had some amazing experiences. They are almost startling. I took the book home and read it. It made me wish that I could take a trip out there next year.

The next publication is entitled "List and Index of Department of the Army Publications." One does not need to take the time to go through the Army publications. He can consult this list of all the publications issued by the Army. They concern almost every subject in the world.

There is another publication to which I think I should refer. It has to do with how to tell the sex of a watermelon. I think that is a very interesting thing. It is a subject which we should look into, and probably give some study. The pages in this publication are not numbered, but my guess is that it contains from 20 to 25 pages. It deals with a very heavy subject. When we come to determining the sex of a watermelon, it really taxes the brain of the average citizen, because that is a major subject. I know that some distinguished Senators come from States where watermelons are produced in great quantities. I like watermelons. I have spent some time either cultivating or eating them, but never determining their sex or studying their sex life. But I can appreciate that the sex life of a watermelon might be a very interesting subject to study. It certainly could do no one any harm. It would be perfectly harmless reading. If one could become proficient in determining the sex of a watermelon he could probably make some contribution—as much as many of our bureaucrats are making—to the country as a whole.

I cannot even pronounce the title of the next publication, but it consists of 49 pages. In one of the chapters there is discussed the cross between a goose and a swan. The goose is a commercial bird, something in which we are all interested. A good fat goose to eat is delicious, and goose feathers are of commercial importance. I do not know what we would gain by crossing a goose with a swan; but here we have a chapter on how to cross a goose with a swan.

Another chapter in this book is entitled "A New Name for the Japanese Blue Magpie." It tells why the Japanese blue magpie should be named differently.

Another chapter describes a hybrid between an Emden goose and a mute swan. Mr. President, I do not know what a mute swan is. This tells how they were kept in the Munich Zoo, and lists three other known records of that hybrid; and they call the cross between the Emden goose and the mute swan a swoose. [Laughter.]

So, Mr. President, we have a chapter on the swoose, which is a new thing in bird language, and one of the things we are contributing our tax money to develop in various ways.

Mr. President, the subject I have been discussing is the result of a survey made by the Appropriations Committee of the United States Senate last year, and finished then. Sometimes I have wished to discuss some things regarding it. Today I have discussed perhaps 50 of these pamphlets; but if Senators will come with me to the basement of the United States Capitol, the building in which we stand now—and, Mr. President, I should be delighted to escort you and other Senators down there—I can show them in one of the rooms in this building between 83,000 and 84,000 booklets and pamphlets, individual issues, every one of them representing a great series of publications issued by various agencies and divisions of the Federal Government. Not all of them are about the swoose, but many of them will make as interesting reading as some of the ones I have referred to today.

Mr. President, I think there are many subjects on which our Government can properly publish information, and I am not condemning all such publications. In the field of agricultural publications, when pamphlets are issued on diseases of cotton, or the hoof-and-mouth disease, or subjects of that sort—something useful to the people of our country—such publications are commendable, and I am in favor of them. If our Government publishes a book on infant care, I think that is a fine thing. But today the Government of the United States is wasting hundreds of millions of dollars not only in printing costs but in the labor that goes into preparing and writing such books and publications—and not only in the printing and the writing of such publications, but also in the research that goes into assembling the facts in regard to how to cook muskrat meat, for instance.

Mr. President, money comes rather hard today; and in spite of the change of control in the Congress, following the elections last November, and in spite of the 4-year lease of life given to the minority administration in Washington today and its desire for big spending, someone must save some money somewhere along the line.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Would not the Senator like to mention, in connection with the arguments he has just made, the scarcity of paper?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; the scarcity of paper is an important item. These different publications, between 83,000 to 84,000 in number, were published—some of them in lots running into hundreds of thousands, and some in lots of only thousands—in a period when paper was extremely scarce; in fact, during that period we suffered from perhaps our greatest scarcity of paper.

Mr. President, I see the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] in the Chamber. I wish he had been here when I was talking about one of the recipes in a Government publication, which was entitled, "The Way To Cook Shredded Muskrat Meat à la Maryland." I did not know that Maryland specialized in that dish; but it was one of the very interesting things in the book.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes, for a question.

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator would like to have me tell him how to cook muskrat à la Maryland, I shall be very glad to tell him how to cook it; and not only that, but if he will furnish the muskrat I shall be glad to cook it. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I am delighted to know that. Perhaps the Senator from Maryland does not need to read the book. Under those circumstances, he can join with me in opposing the publication of the book, and in that way we can save some money.

Mr. President, I have tried to point out that Government agencies are scattered throughout our country, and are not located solely in the city of Washington, D. C. I have tried to point out that in one city—Chicago, Ill.—there are 530 separate Federal departments and agencies housed in offices there. I have tried to point out that some cities outside of Washington have as many as 25 separate Federal Government printing establishments.

I have tried to point out the ramifications of this great printing and propaganda problem in this country, and that the printing was not limited to Washington, D. C., and the Government Printing Office here, but has spread all over the United States, and even into foreign countries.

Mr. President, I have stated that from the Government Printing Office alone, here in Washington, there have rolled out, recently, 133,000,000,000 copies of publications and pamphlets and when we stop to think that we have 140,000,000 citizens, that is rather good coverage. In short, Mr. President, I have indicated some of the ways of presenting this matter. Of course, I have used some of the more humorous bits as examples and illustrations, because I think they typify the problem I am trying to state.

Mr. President, as I conclude my remarks, I hope this talk will not be entirely in vain, but that the Congress of the United States will make a serious attempt, as the appropriation bills come through, to limit the amount of money which the Government departments can spend for printing and binding and propaganda. It is one of the most fertile fields for Government economy the Congress of the United States can find.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a question only.

Mr. KNOWLAND. While the Senator from New Hampshire is speaking of printing, I should like to mention another subject, although perhaps it is not exactly the subject he has been discussing: I wonder whether the Senator from New Hampshire is familiar with the fact that the new Congressional Directory, which has just been issued, on page 313, shows, as Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, Mr. Mon C. Wallgren, of Washington, who has not yet been confirmed by the Senate, nor has his nomination been reported from the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, that is very interesting; I did not know that. I now turn to page 313 of the new issue of the Congressional Directory; and it is rather startling to see Mr. Wallgren's name listed there, because I assumed that his nomination was still before the Armed Services Committee. But here is the Congressional Directory, printed by the Government of the United States, under the direction of the United States Congress; and this new issue of the Congressional Directory lists as Chairman of the National Security Resources Board a man whose nomination has not yet been reported from the Senate committee having charge of it. As a matter of fact, this book must have been printed and published some time ago; yet the nomination of that gentleman has not yet been reported to or confirmed by the Senate. Mr. President, when such a thing occurs, it must be either oversight or some kind of crystal-ball gazing. I thank the Senator from California for calling it to my attention.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a question.

Mr. CAIN. I wish to ask whether the Senator from New Hampshire has had occasion to refer to one of the first pages of the new Congressional Directory, the one opposite the page which carries the picture of the Capitol; and, after looking at that page, does the Senator from New Hampshire know to what date the new issue of the Congressional Directory is stated to have been corrected?

Mr. BRIDGES. I now refer to the page the Senator from Washington has mentioned. It says:

Eighty-first Congress, first session, beginning January 3, 1949.

Official Congressional Directory for the use of the Congress of the United States.

Then a picture of the American eagle appears, and then we find the following:

First edition, corrected to February 15, 1949.

Mr. President, today is March 9, 1949, as I recall; so apparently there is some little error even in the congressional establishment, in connection with the printing of books.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wonder whether the Senator from New Hampshire or the Senator from California really believes that particular mistake in the Congressional Directory was deliberate? Actually, there are several mistakes in the Directory.

Mr. BRIDGES. I may say to the Senator from Washington I do not know how the name got there, unless somebody put it there.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Somebody, of course. As the Senator knows, proofs are made up, and is it not true many mistakes are made by the clerks? There are several mistakes in every issue, which must be corrected. The Senator of course does not believe it was deliberate, does he?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. As a matter of fact, the Senator asked a question, as I did. The matter was called to the attention of Senators. We have asked the chairman of the Committee on Printing to find out about it.

Mr. BRIDGES. I may say in answer to the Senator, I should like to know whether he thinks the name was placed there by mistake?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is a mistake at this time; of course it is; just as there are several other mistakes.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a question only.

Mr. CAIN. Does the Senator know the date on which Mr. Wallgren was nominated by the President to be the next Chairman of the National Security Resources Board?

Mr. BRIDGES. February 7, 1949.

Mr. President, I shall conclude my remarks on the Government printing operations and Government propaganda campaign. I am sure the distinguished Vice President now occupying the chair, who is part of the administration, pledged to the reduction of expenditures, will cooperate in eliminating a good deal of the unwise propaganda pouring forth in great fountains from Washington to all parts of the country; and if he will devote his energies and attention to the subject, based upon my knowledge of him and of his performance in the past, I feel sure we shall have great assistance in achieving the objective we seek.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thanks the Senator from New Hampshire for his generous compliment.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. LUCAS to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 15, amending the so-called cloture rule of the Senate.

Mr. BYRD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Douglas	Hendrickson
Baldwin	Downey	Hickenlooper
Brewster	Eastland	Hill
Bricker	Ecton	Hoey
Bridges	Ellender	Holland
Butler	Ferguson	Hunt
Byrd	Flanders	Ives
Cain	Frear	Jenner
Capehart	Fulbright	Johnson, Colo.
Chapman	George	Johnson, Tex.
Chavez	Gillette	Johnston, S. C.
Connally	Green	Kefauver
Cordon	Gurney	Kem
Donnell	Hayden	Kerr

Kilgore	Miller	Stennis
Knowland	Millikin	Taft
Langer	Morse	Taylor
Lodge	Mundt	Thomas, Okla.
Long	Murray	Thomas, Utah
Lucas	Myers	Thye
McCarran	Neely	Tobey
McCarthy	O'Conor	Tydings
McClellan	O'Mahoney	Vandenberg
McFarland	Pepper	Watkins
McGrath	Reed	Wherry
McKellar	Robertson	Wiley
McMahon	Russell	Williams
Magnuson	Saltonstall	Withers
Malone	Schoeppel	Young
Martin	Smith, Maine	
Maybank	Sparkman	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, in view of the very strict enforcement of the rules of the Senate I withhold at present the making of a parliamentary inquiry. My understanding is that the pending question is on the motion to take up consideration of Senate Resolution 15. That resolution, Mr. President, has for its purpose a change in a rule of the United States Senate which gives protection to a minority of the membership of this body, and often, in doing so, it gives protection to a majority of the citizenship of this Nation. A simple change in the rule is not all that is involved in this issue. It has many ramifications of great significance, and it has the possibilities of tragic consequences. What is involved in this matter is an inexhaustible subject. I do not presume that in the time I shall occupy the floor this afternoon I shall be able to say all that I might say upon the subject or to discuss at length all of its ramifications. The subject, Mr. President, could easily exhaust me and consume the full measure of my physical strength and mental vitality long before I could exhaust the discussion of the subject, assuming that I had the wisdom to discuss all phases of it.

So, Mr. President, I shall not undertake to exert myself and expend my strength hastily; but if I proceed with some deliberation I want to assure the President of the Senate and my colleagues that that is no indication or evidence of lack of sincerity or of enthusiasm or of conviction with respect to the position that I shall take.

Mr. President, in contemplating this occasion the scene which we now witness in this Chamber and which we have witnessed for the past 10 or 15 days—the threat that the Senate would lay aside important business and important affairs to take up what I knew, and what every other Member of this body knew, would be one of the most controversial subjects that has come before this body in the last quarter of a century, or possibly longer. I realized this, Mr. President, from the history of past debates on subjects and issues which involved very much the same questions and problems which are involved in this debate. Knowing the action taken in the past, the long debates which have ensued, knowing also, Mr. President, there was possibly great pressure being applied from minority groups and from others who would like to impose this iniquitous thing upon the American people, knowing that the pressure at this time and on this occasion would be more intense and concerted not only against the Senate of the United States but against the President of the United States himself and against this administration, there would possibly arise, and I think there has arisen, a desire on the part of the majority leadership of the Senate and others to make this an ordeal, an endurance test, a test of strength and capacity. Yes, Mr. President; it is a physical ordeal. It carries with it some anxiety, and particularly when we realize the merits involved, because we would lay aside in this time of world history great and important questions when there is more trouble, more distress, more chaos, more threat to human rights than ever before in the history of the world, except possibly when war was actually in progress.

Contemplating that, Mr. President, I found myself wishing that there might be some way, that something might transpire to cause the leadership of this body and others who were willing to compel consideration of this motion not to do so. As I thought about it the other evening, before the motion was made, after I had retired and these perplexing thoughts came to my mind as to why this was necessary, why we must suffer this ordeal, I found myself uttering a prayer in words almost in exact quotation of the prayer that Jesus offered up in the Garden of Gethsemane. Not only did I hope that the Senate of the United States might be spared this unnecessary, this useless, trouble, this conflict, because I not only wanted to be spared myself, but I thought of my fellow Senators. But, Mr. President, if I prayed more intensely about one thing than another it was that there still were enough of us left here who thought more of our country, who loved our liberty more, and who loved it sufficiently to have the strength to stand and oppose this movement until that strength was exhausted.

I hoped and prayed above all that the majority in this body and the leadership of this body would not press that cup to the lips of the American people and make them drink those bitter, those destructive drugs that are contained in this proposal. I urge Senators to think well of what they do.

Mr. President, I hope that this cup may soon pass from the Senate, and I hope it will never again be pressed to the lips of the free men and women of America.

Mr. President, I do not know whether reading from the Bible would be a breach of the rules of the Senate, it is getting pretty hard to tell what the rules are right now, but I thought I might read just a little Scripture. I am sure every Senator here is already informed, but when I turned to this Scripture the other night and read where Jesus prayed that that cup might pass from Him, I could not help following on and reading a little further, and recalling again what history has recorded as to what transpired immediately thereafter.

Mr. President, we are hearing much about majority rule. We are hearing much about breaking precedents. We are hearing something around here about the precedents of the Senate being overruled for the sake of expediency. I recall that our Saviour who prayed that the cup might pass from Him was soon to be condemned by a mob, by the majority, by majority rule. Then, Mr. President, I remembered, as I read the Scripture again, that the Saviour of man was condemned by the overruling of precedents, in that Pontius Pilate, the governor, could find no fault with him, and it was not the practice, and it is not the rule, to condemn to death innocent men. But precedent was broken in order to serve the will of a majority, a howling mob.

Mr. President, back in the shadows behind the Senate there are howling mobs which insist that Senators forget their oaths, forget their consciences, forget their duty, and be subservient to the will of the mob, even if it takes the overruling of the precedents of the United States Senate. That is what Senators are being asked to do, that is what Pontius Pilate was asked to do, and he did it, and the Saviour of mankind was crucified.

Yes, I know what he did, in a back-door sort of fashion. He sent and got a bowl of water and washed his hands and said, "I am going to have nothing to do with this good man," and tried to get the mob, on that occasion, as was the practice, to let him release the Saviour, but they would not do that, they took Barabbas instead.

You are taking Barabbas instead when you condemn these traditions which have made America great, when you overrule the precedents and the rules of the United States Senate which made it possible for minorities to be protected in the past. You are asking the release of the other, and subjecting to crucifixion, if the majority can have its way in the United States Senate at this time, one of the greatest bulwarks of liberty which the American people have.

Mr. President, the Senate was not intended to be just another legislative body. The very construction of it, the way it was set up, the very conception of it in the hearts and minds of our founding fathers, made the United States Senate something distinct, separate, apart, unto itself, as a legislative body. It has been kept that way until now. It ought to be so retained. Yes, Pilate washed his hands in an endeavor to see to it that the blood of the Saviour be not upon him. I am not going to wash my hands. I am going to vote against, speak against, and so long as I have the strength and the rational mind necessary, oppose what the Senate now proposes to do.

Mr. President, in political campaigns it is the practice, and quite proper, to exhort all good men to come to the aid of their party. I suppose most all political parties do that, particularly when a campaign is on, and we see, even when a campaign is not on, that cartoonists sometimes depict the minds of leaders in government and others, by giving illustration in comedy, in the nature of cartoons. Just this week, on March 7, one of the leading newspapers in Washington contained a cartoon on the first page showing the chairman of the Democratic National Committee pounding away on his typewriter, exhorting: "Now is the time for all good men of the North, East, and West to come to the aid of their party."

Of course, the cartoonist was simply being facetious. But, Mr. President, in times of national emergency, in times of danger of peril to our country, or when there is threat of evil legislation, we need to exhort all good men to come to the aid of their country.

Mr. President, I have never known how to be anything else politically but a Democrat. Democracy, as Southern Democrats know it, and have lived it and loved it, has been instilled into me from infancy. I shall never forget when I was only 8 years old attending a little summer country school. I had a little difficulty with another student, and the teacher, in order to enforce better discipline, and not being quite certain who was at fault, made sure he punished the right one by punishing both of us. I am not quite so certain I was not the right one, but according to the way I reported the incident to my father I probably deserved a medal rather than a thrashing.

It developed that the school teacher was a Republican. There were not many Republicans in that part of the country. He was the only one I can remember at that age. So my father, being such a partisan Democrat, thought it very appropriate that we even the score with this Republican school teacher, and in accordance with custom, some two or three weeks later when the school closed, and when we had the little exercises wherein the students might recite, "Twinkle, twinkle little star," or some other little poem or verse to display their oratorical abilities, instead of my memorizing some little verse, my father had prepared for me a speech supporting the nomination of Alton B. Parker. So Senators may understand that I am a Democrat from the beginning until now.

But, Mr. President, that is not the greatest thing of which to boast. However much more merit the Democratic Party may have, or however superior the Democratic Party may be to other political parties, or vice versa, that is not the issue.

What I am trying to emphasize is that it does not matter today, when it comes to the question at issue, whether one is a Republican or Democrat. The issue before us transcends party alinements. It transcends party obligations. Being a member of a political party, according to my concept of duty and conscience, imposes no obligation upon me to follow the leadership of that party, if and when the leadership of the party proposes legislation or policies which contravene or threaten or endanger the fundamental liberties of our land.

No, Mr. President, no Member of this body is under any such obligation, and took no such oath of allegiance, but he did take an oath of a higher allegiance than party allegiance when he became a Member of the United States Senate.

So I say, Mr. President, that the issue before us is one—and we sometimes hear it facetiously said—upon which we ought to rise above principle, and I mean party principle. We ought to rise to the height of American dignity, and everything Americanism stands for, and everything that is guaranteed by the fundamental law of the land.

I heard the able senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] speak on this subject a few days ago. He warned Senators that our Constitutional guarantees could be whittled away little by little. Very few countries have lost their liberties through one bold stroke of legislation. Most countries who have lost their liberties have lost them by a softening process, by the temptation to and a response of yielding to a little demand here and a little more there, and on and on. If America ever falters, if America ever fails, the America that you and I know, in view of our almost matchless power and strength economically and as a military power, will more likely fail by reason of disintegration from within. Disintegration can be brought about, and it is possible for disintegration to come in America, by the whittling down process of which the very able senior Senator from Georgia spoke a few days ago.

Mr. President, speaking of all good men coming to the aid of their country, that is important when this great deliberative body, the United States Senate, is urged to enact laws which are inimical to the welfare of our people, and which contravene the very concept of our liberties. On such occasions it is the duty and obligation of every Member of this body to rise above partisanship and above political considerations, and thus come to the aid and protection of our country.

Mr. President, is there one among us, is there a single Member of the United States Senate, who will refute the charge, and undertake to sustain the refutation of it, that except for political pressure groups this proposal would not be before the Senate today? Instead of wasting its time the Senate, in whose integrity and wisdom of action the very safety of America is reposed, could be undertaking to legislate on constructive measures which might bring more order, more peace, and more harmony among our people, and strengthen our economy. The time and energies of Members of this body, possibly for a period of weeks, is being consumed by an effort to impose upon the American people an iniquitous program, one which would stir up more strife, more disunity, and one which has less to recommend it to the conscience of honest men than any program that has ever been submitted to the Senate.

Mr. President, if we are going to yield to pressure groups, America cannot survive. When men write to Members of Congress and insist that they do their will without thinking, and undertake to coerce and intimidate by threatening to defeat them at the polls in the next election, if that philosophy, that sort of coercion and intimidation, is substituted for rational thinking and sound judgment on the part of Members of the Congress, the doom of America and of American liberty and freedom is somewhere in the offing.

But it is said that this is a democracy, and that the people vote, and that we ought to carry out their will. I do not know about that. When that will may have been expressed without full knowledge and information, or whenever that will contravenes the fundamental law of the land, no one is under obligation to carry it out.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator not agree with me that the so-called FEPC bill is one of the main bills behind the move to change the rules of the Senate and impose gag rule in this body?

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator is correct in part. That is the main one which appears on the surface. A while ago I spoke of the mob back in the shadows. That is not the final objective of their program. If we pass the bills now pending in the Senate, the next measure, and the final objective, will be to break down the segregation of the races. Make no mistake about it. We could not compromise with the gang which is behind the proposed legislation and pressing for its passage, threatening Members of Congress with defeat in the next election if they do not pass it. We could not settle with them on the present program.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator from Arkansas familiar with the fact that the so-called FEPC bill, in a State version, has been submitted to the people of 15 States, and that every time it has been submitted to the people for their vote it has been voted down by overwhelming majorities? Is it not true that the question was recently submitted to the people of the State of California, and that the people of the State of California voted it down overwhelmingly, by a vote of more than 3 to 1? Does the Senator know that the people of California defeated it overwhelmingly in every county in the entire State?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have not checked that information, but I believe I have heard it stated on the floor of the Senate that that is what occurred in California recently. I have not counted the number of times the question has been submitted, but I do know that from time to time when the question of an FEPC under State law has been submitted to the people, it has been defeated. I do not recall a single State where such a proposal has been submitted, where the people approved it. All States are represented in the Senate by two Senators. If there is a single State in the Union where the people have approved such a law when the question was submitted to them, surely some Senator supporting this legislation would rise and cite evidence of the will of the people in any State where such a law might have been approved by the people.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President——

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I do not yield further at the moment.

That is why the supporters of this program want the Congress to disregard the Constitution and everything it stands for, because they know that they cannot

carry out their abominable will by going directly to the people of the States. Would not that be a fair way to do it? No one would object to that method.

If the people of New York want to have an FEPC there, or if the people of Montana or the people of Wyoming or the people of Pennsylvania or the people of Texas or the people of Kalamazoo or the people of any other section of our country want an FEPC law, they can have it, Mr. President; in such a case the Congress could not legally interfere with it. The only way they could be prevented from having it would be for Congress to submit and the States to ratify a constitutional amendment prohibiting the enactment of such a law; but, of course, everyone knows such a proposal would not get anywhere.

However, some persons want to reverse the situation, inasmuch as the people in the several States where such an FEPC proposal has been submitted have condemned it and rejected it, an attempt now is made to resort to the Congress and have the Congress violate the Constitution in order to get that infamous proposal adopted.

Now I shall be glad to yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Arkansas whether he read the portion I shall mention of the hearings on the proposal to limit debate in the Senate of the United States; and I read now from pages 132 and 133, where the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] made this statement with reference to the FEPC bill:

> For instance, I will take the State of California. There it—

Meaning the FEPC—

> has been submitted to a vote of the people, as I recall, and every time it has been submitted to the people it has been overwhelmingly defeated. It was overwhelmingly defeated in California, as I remember, by a vote of more than 2 to 1.
>
> Is that accurate?

To that question the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] answered:

> It was overwhelmingly defeated.

Then the following occurred:

> Senator EASTLAND. In every county?
>
> Senator KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, does the Senator from Louisiana ask me if I read that?

Mr. LONG. Yes; did the Senator from Arkansas read it?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I was not present at that time, and I did not hear the Senator testify. But I did read the testimony given by the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President——

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I do not yield further at the moment.

Mr. President, I have been discussing the question of rising above party, and going to the aid of our country. This is equally true when we are confronted with requests for the enactment of measures which, if enacted, would usurp the powers that are reserved unto the several States of the Union and unto the people themselves.

I have just said there is no doubt that the Constitution reserves to the States themselves the power to do everything that is requested in connection with these proposals, except the power to set up a Federal police power over lynching. Otherwise, all such powers are reserved to the States themselves. When the Constitution is rightfully interpreted, it is found that such powers are not granted the Federal Government, and never have been, because all the powers of the Federal Government are derived from the people themselves, and only the powers that are delegated to the Federal Government can be exercised by the Federal Government. All other powers—in this connection I shall not take time to read the provisions of the tenth amendment to the Constitution, for all Senators are familiar with it—are reserved to the States and to the people themselves.

Mr. President, it is not disputed that the States themselves have the right to adopt the proposals which presently are made to us. That is the important point to be remembered in connection with the present proposals and the contentions regarding them. If the people of any State believe in these proposed laws and wish to have them, they can have them so far as we are concerned; just let the people back home approve these proposals and adopt them. It is easy to have them adopted, if that is the people's will. But if it is merely some pressure group that is making such demands, that is different.

Mr. President, I make no claim to perfection. All of us are beset with some human frailties. But if there were ever a period in the history of our Republic when the highest quality of intellect, wisdom, and integrity were needed by the Members of this body, that time is now. Our country needs our best, because there is a threat to our liberties. There is danger to our traditions and to many of our basic freedoms. Our concepts and ideals of freedom are under attack. A cold war, a global war, is now in progress. This war is an unrelenting war. There is no prospect that it will end or can be terminated within the foreseeable future. I do not know how long it will last, but I see no prospect of having it end now or at any time soon.

This cold war may grow in intensity. Not only does the cold war that now is in progress strike at governments and nations, but it actually imperils civilization. Smaller and weaker nations, unable to resist, have been helpless and defenseless, and have been compelled to capitulate to the forces of tyranny and conquest, to that powerful monster, communism, which is now abroad in the world seeking to devour and to destroy every vestige of freedom, wherever it may exist. At the moment, the direct thrust may not extend to America, but the indirect thrust is present here. This monster intends to destroy human liberty everywhere in the world. All concepts of freedom, wherever they exist in the world today, are under attack. In many parts of the world, where battles in this cold war are now being fought, we find the forces of religious freedom being persecuted and the rights of the individual and his freedom of mind and of thought and of action restrained and controlled by the state.

Mr. President, is there religious persecution in our land? None of these measures is designed to prohibit any religious persecution in our country. Of course we have none. Some persons say that religion and ancestry and color and race are taken into consideration when a person seeks a job. But, actually, all that has nothing to do with a man's religion and his right of freedom of worship. That goes beyond religion, and goes into the question of whether one man has a right to share with another individual what he himself has created. I shall have more to say about that matter before I conclude my remarks.

Mr. President, what I have just mentioned is not a matter of religious freedom. A man can have all the religious freedom on earth he wants, but never be employed by me or by some other Senator or by anyone else.

In the newspapers of this morning we read of the sentences which have been imposed on ministers of the Protestant faith in a foreign land, ministers who it is said have committed no crime whatsoever. Recently we learned of the Catholic priest who was condemned to life imprisonment in a foreign country.

Yes, Mr. President, the menace of which I speak intends, if it has the power to do it—and let us make no mistake about that—to spread its ideology throughout the world; and its ideology is human slavery. We are aware, or at least we should be, that this monster is presently employing and pursuing every means short of a shooting war, while actually preparing for a third world war, which it boldly proclaims is inevitable, to beguile, deceive, soften, and cripple our own people and our own Government and all civilization for the final kill.

Follow me as I lead up to this point. I am not mistaken about it. This power has decreed that our capitalistic economy, our free-enterprise system, and our way of life and the dignity of man as an individual must be exterminated from the face of the earth.

Are we so blind that we will not see; so deaf that we will not hear? Are we incapable of reading the signs of our time? Or seeing, do we refuse to read? Or reading, do we give those signs their proper interpretation and acknowledge their significance?

Our complacency and lack of diligence, if not our actual stupidity within the last quarter of a century, brought us into two world wars unprepared. We were well warned beforehand. There were many unmistakable signs in concrete events that transpired, from which we could have known that our becoming involved in those wars was inescapable. But we refused to interpret correctly those events. We did not heed the warnings in those prewar days, and our neglect to make ready for those contests exacted a much heavier cost in material wealth, human lives, and suffering as the price for winning those military victories. Have the blood, sweat, and tears we expended for survival in those mighty conflicts instilled into us no greater wisdom,

no keener sense of danger, no better understanding of the tactics and insidious softening processes employed by the developing aggressor? Have we learned nothing from those tragic experiences of the recent past? If we have not, Mr. President, then I fear we at present are living in a fool's paradise. If we have learned any lesson, Mr. President, from two world wars from which we were unable to escape, then certainly we should make use of that knowledge and employ the experience and wisdom gained to build a stronger fortress of Government and citadel of freedom over here.

Mr. President, the aggressor—and we know who that aggressor is in the world today—will not attack in a shooting war until it believes it has the superior power and strength to conquer. But once it becomes so convinced, the world will again be plunged into a a holocaust of brimstone and fire.

Your country and mine, Mr. President, is the hope of the world today. The United States of America enjoys the honor and the enviable position of being the only present insurmountable barrier to a world Communist superstate and the literal enslavement of the human race. Were it not for our might and power the sovereignty of many nations, smaller and weaker than are we, would have long since perished.

What made our country great and powerful, Mr. President? I acknowlege there are many answers to that question. The answer in fact cannot be given in a single word, in a sentence, in a chapter, or in a single book. Volumes would be required to tell the whole story. But, Mr. President, we can name in one word the thing that is inimical to everything that has made America great. That one word is communism. If there was ever a government in its concept and in its principles and in its fundamentals that was further away from communism, that government, the one furthest away in the history of the world, is the United States of America.

This greatness is the priceless heritage of our generation. And Mr. President, that heritage is now entrusted to you and to me as the elected representatives of the people of the several States in the United States Senate. If we falter through lack of wisdom, or if through political pressure today we yield to unwise demands, and pass unwholesome laws, laws that do not come within the letter and spirit of the Constitution, which is the fundamental law of our land—if we do that, Mr. President, we shall be poor guardians, we shall exercise a sordid trusteeship of the great heritage we are expected to preserve and hand down to posterity.

We are the trustees, the guardians of this great citadel of strength and freedom, and millions of people throughout the world are the direct beneficiaries of the might and power embraced in the greatness of our country.

What are we doing today to help the world, and particularly the war-torn countries that were devastated by the war? What are we doing out of our greatness and a heart that is as human as the power and economic might of the United States is great? Out of that we are taxing our people to help the unfortunate peoples of the earth. If America had not had the kind of liberty we have had for the past 175 years, do you think, Mr. President, we would be in a position today to extend this helping hand to the other governments and nations and peoples of the world? I say no, we would not be. I ask you to show me a nation with any other kind of government—and we are comparatively the youngest of all—show me a nation with any other kind of government, Mr. President, any other kind of ism that is inimical to democracy as we know it and practice it and believe in it. Where is that government, with the power and strength to help? Yes, other governments, millions of other human beings, are still alive today because America has the economic power developed and established and maintained under a free-enterprise system under which we prize human liberty and the rights of the individual and the dignity of man, Mr. President, above those who have authority to rule.

Yes, Mr. President, if this strength and power are to be preserved, maintained, and increased, so that they may be forever the insurmountable barrier they are today to the evil forces of tyranny, aggression, and conquest, we must not permit any weakening of the basic structure upon which they rest.

Mr. President, I would ask the question here, Will any Senator dare rise in this body and assert that America is weaker today, economically, spiritually, or otherwise, because this proposed change in the rule was not adopted a hundred years ago or at some other time in the history of our Nation? Of course, a Senator would not dare to do so, Mr President. It is absurd. Why insist upon a change at this time? The country is doing very well. We have our problems, but they consist in what we are doing to ourselves more than in what another nation is doing to us. If we keep America on the beam and keep the Constitution of the United States as our forefathers framed it, we shall not have much trouble.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may propound a question to him?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the Senator, if he prefers not to be interrupted at this stage in his very able discussion, please to say so, because I can defer my question until later if he prefers that that be done.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am perfectly willing, Mr. President, to yield for questions. I will say that it would be impossible for me, even if I had the physical strength to do so, to conclude within any reasonable time all that I might say on this subject. I am perfectly willing to yield to a reasonable extent to my colleagues for pertinent questions. I yield for a question only.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the able Senator from Arkansas if one of the essential elements of the strength of the American system of free enterprise is not the right to own private property?

Mr. McCLELLAN. May I answer that question by saying it is, and by saying that every individual in America who owns any property is a part of the capitalistic system of this Nation. A man who owns a little home, even though it be a humble cottage, has the right to own it, under the laws of the land. He owns it in his own right, without interference from Government, without the right of the Government to take it and use it. The Government can take property in this capitalistic land of ours, only for public use and only by paying just compensation for it, so that the property owner sustains no loss.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the Senator a further question, if he will yield further.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is it not true that one of the most insidious forms of the attacks of communism, which the Senator has aptly described as the very antithesis of the republican form of government, is the attack being made upon the right of ownership of private property?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the Senator if we can escape state socialism if we permit an entering wedge to be driven by the Government or any agency of the Government or the representatives of any minority group and they are given the right to say to any man who owns a plant or a store whom he shall employ? Is not that pure state socialism, which will result in the Government taking over and owning private property and thereby destroying our free system of competitive enterprise?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct.

Mr. President, when I was quite a young lad, I often went with my grandfather to cut down selected white-oak trees, from which we took the sap so that my grandfather could make splints and weave baskets. We cut down hickory trees in order to make mauls and ax handles. When a man cuts down a tree and converts that natural resource into a tool of usefulness, who would dare say that tool does not belong to him? If I had the genius and the talent to sit at this desk or in my office and write a poem or a song that would touch the hearts and move the souls of men, whose property would that poem be if I cared to have it copyrighted? If, through my ingenuity, I invent an instrumentality that can lighten the burden of mankind or be of service to humanity, if I care to have it patented, I have a property right in it which is mine, and my Government so recognizes. Then, Mr. President, if a man creates a job by investing money which he has earned and saved, it belongs to him. He invests his money in a business. He takes the risk. He has an incentive to go into business to make a profit. Whether it be a little corner grocery store or some great enterprise which spread from coast to coast across this continent, if he creates it, it is his. The Government did not create it. When we want the Government to create jobs, and the individual not to create them, that is socialism. Whenever the Government takes control, it is nothing but

bureaucracy, under which the Government would tell us where to work and what pay we should receive. Do we want that in America? Those are the things that did not make America great. We can sometimes tell what produced a result by knowing what did not produce it. A job which I have created by my own ingenuity, my own capital, my own toil, labor, and thrift does not belong to any bureaucrat, in any democracy, among any free people on earth, to dispense to whomever the Government chooses. It belongs to me, so long as America is free. If it were otherwise, it would be another instance of the whittling-away process. That is exactly what it would be.

Mr. President, we cannot permit any weakening of the basic structure upon which the Government rests. We cannot preserve, and persevere in, this strength and power if we ever begin compromising with the ideology which Russia is now trying to impose upon the rest of the world. We cannot compromise with Russia. That is thoroughly demonstrated. Its goal, its objectives, its ideology permit of no compromise. I say permit of none; they might make an agreement temporarily, but who would have any faith in it?

Under the present leadership of Russia and under the ideology of communism as practiced today, I do not think we can take her word for anything. I think we will be foolish if we ever do. I think we had better make her understand our words, we had better stay prepared and keep our freedoms and keep strong, and shun the very appearance of communism in this country. I remember some more of the Bible; I do not know too much about it, not nearly enough, but I think it teaches us to shun the very appearance of evil. We had better shun anything that begins to smack of communistic doctrines in this country.

We hear so much about making democracy work and making democracy live. So often many who claim to have that high purpose insist that to do so we must depart from and abandon many of the basic fundamentals which have served so effectively in the past in the building of our greatness, and accept, instead, and to degrees, parts of the Communist philosophy of politics, society, and economy.

Why do we have to partake of any part of it? We hear commentators and others say, "Well, if you do not want communism over here, you have to do a lot of the things Communists are doing." That makes sense to a fool, and to no one else.

We do not cause something to live by pouring poison on it or putting a destructive substance on it. If we want it to live we feed it the blood of life, that which goes into making it what it is, and we do not make it live by taking away from it. Every part and parcel of communism we adopt in America in this year or the next year or the next will simply take away that much of the real Americanism that has made America what she is.

Such arguments portend a dangerous indoctrination. If our people should ever become so careless or indifferent, or should be so gullible and stupid, as to accept or follow such illogical and dangerous leadership, our strength and power will degenerate accordingly. We cannot partake of communism, or accept any part or parcel of its philosophy and ideology, without weakening our own fortress of liberty.

To the extent that we pattern our laws after the socialistic theory and communistic practices we will place in jeopardy the freedom we love. To whatever degree we depart from or abandon the fundamentals of our own system of government, which by comparison and by time and test has proven to be superior to any other form or system of government ever instituted by man, to the same extent will the fiber and vitality of our own Government, and of the way of life it protects and preserves, deteriorate and decay.

If we want to soften America for the kill when the next war comes, if one shall come, there is no better way to do it than to begin now compromising with communism, and begin patterning our laws after those of Soviet Russia.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. EASTLAND. What could set the pattern of communism to take over the United States more than the undermining of the powers of our State governments, depriving the American people of the very genius of the American system, which is local control of their affairs and local protection of their affairs, concentrating all power in the National Government, as the proposals we are discussing seek to do?

Mr. McCLELLAN. If ever State rights are abrogated in America, there will be no restraining power in the world to prevent a dictator from taking over in this country. Destroy State rights, and once they are destroyed, the people within the States will lose the power of control.

Hitler had his fifth columns in many lands and in many governments for a long period of time before he began World War II. Those fifth columns served well in preparing the way for success of war against the countries wherein those columns stood. It was a softening process by corruption in the high places and by propaganda that deceived and deluded the minds and hearts of people, and which had its telling effect upon the political integrity of governments themselves. Thus, many countries were weakened and their conquest made certain and easy.

Mr. President, if the Communist powers or power can get Americans to believe that the way to get along with them is to pattern after their laws and their ideologies, Americans will be placing themselves in a position of danger and jeopardy from which they would be unable to extricate themselves if and when such a war should come.

Mr. President, similar evil forces are present in America today. We need not think that all the influence of communism and all the activity of communism and all the subversiveness and all the cold war exists only in Europe or in Asia or somewhere else. These forces are present in America today. We are reassured over and over that the number of real Communists in America today is small. In fact, we are told the number is so small that we need not be concerned, and that their power and capacity for harm, either in time of peace or in time of war, would be infinitesimal. But I am not so certain that such statements or such attempted assurances are at all justified, if the whole truth were known. It occurs to me that they possibly have larger numbers and are of greater potential danger than we are willing to concede. But, irrespective of the number of real Communists in America, whether that number is small or much larger than we think, it is bold and threatening.

Mr. President, I only have to refer the Senate, as I shall in a little while, to headlines and newspaper articles which appeared only a few days ago, since the present debate has been going on in the Senate, to show the danger that exists.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator familiar with the argument that has been made by some persons that it would help us in curtailing the activities of Communists and subversive interests if we would change the rules of the United States Senate so as to install gag law here on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I shall comment on that as I proceed a little further. I can give my opinion about it, and tell the Senator who will rejoice when such a thing happens. It will not be the God-fearing and God-loving people of America, who love their country and want to preserve it—those who know what the real results of such action would be.

In the course of the present debate, since the motion to take up the resolution has been pending, the Communists in America, through their leaders, have brazenly announced in no uncertain terms that if war should come they will aid our enemies, they will fight on the side of the aggressor.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Louisiana for a further question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Is it not true that so far as the Communists are concerned, the Communists have made their position known on this gag-rule proposition to the effect that the Communists want gag rule in the United States Senate, and the Communists want the same kind of FEPC law, for example, that is proposed to be passed by gag rule?

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Communists do not want freedom of speech anywhere in the world, and they do not tolerate it. I think everyone knows that to be so. It would be just a step in that direction if this body should take the action we are now asked to take, after all our tradi-

tions of the past, and when no one can point to any real harm which has ever come from unlimited debate in the United States Senate. There may be temporary delay, but no real harm has ever come to the American people by maintaining this sanctuary of freedom of speech. I hope it will never be destroyed. I do not want to see our freedom taken away or see our country begin to abandon them.

Mr. President, I said the Communists were bold and brazen and threatening. A short time ago certain articles appeared in all the newspapers of the land dealing with what the Communists in this country had announced. I hold in my hand the Times-Herald of Washington, dated March 3, published since the present debate began. The headline is: "United States Commies join French Reds' threat to aid Soviet in war."

I shall not take the time to read all the news article. It says that the two leading Communists in America, the official representatives of communism in America, William Z. Foster and the general secretary, Eugene Dennis, said that American Communists would oppose such a war "as an unjust, aggressive, imperialist war."

They do not say they would oppose it if Russia started it. They do not say they would oppose such a war if it was provoked by aggression from Russia. There can be but one implication in that statement, and that implication is that if war comes they will oppose it. I suspect without war coming, so long as there is ever a possibility that there may be a war between Communist Russia and America, every Communist in the United States is a potential at least, if not an active, spy for Russia.

Some of them may be so simple they do not know what they are doing. We have had some testimony to that effect. One man was consorting with a known Communist. He carried papers to this Communist in secret. He delivered the papers to him. He pleaded his ignorance, or his youth, or something else. That could be true. The point I make is that every Communist in America, the little ones, the big ones, the middle-sized ones, the yellow ones, the striped ones, the spotted ones, the pink ones, the red ones, or those of any other color or term which can be applied to them—every one of them is an enemy of this country. They are enemies of everything you and I love. They are enemies of every vestige of freedom we enjoy, because we would not enjoy any if we had communism here. Every one of them that is physically able and well enough is a potential soldier, an enemy soldier, if and when war comes.

One may talk about tolerating them, temporizing with them, compromising with them; but they do not deserve the respect of the toleration of those of us who love our freedom and who intend, if we can, at all costs to maintain and preserve it.

Those who are not able to carry arms, when that war comes will definitely be engaged in sabotage, and from now until war comes they are engaged, so far as they can go and get by with it, in subversive activities.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator familiar with the figures which have been released on occasion that it is estimated the Communists have 70,000 members in the United States, and that they have 700,000 fellow travelers who would do the bidding of the 70,000 Communists?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not think anyone knows the number.

We all know the characteristics of communism. Communists will lie about anything. The truth is not in them. They must have a few known members; but there are many who have accepted the faith and who give their allegiance to Russia, though they are American citizens. They are undertaking to keep the truth concealed. Many of them are today advocating and encouraging many of the things which are being done.

A little while ago the very able Senator from Georgia asked me about property rights. Under the guise of liberalism and human rights versus property rights, great harm is being done in America today. Whenever we destroy property rights, there are no human rights, except as some dictator may permit. We cannot have human rights without property rights. Wherever in the history of the world property rights have been taken by the state, human rights of the individual have perished. If we cannot maintain and preserve property rights in our capitalistic system in America, we cannot retain that measure of freedom, that dignity of the individual, which Americans have today.

And what is transpiring in the United States today and what has been the business of the Senate for the past 10 days is a fair sample, Mr. President, of just what I mean. There is not a Communist in America who is not happy and pleased. There is not an informed Communist in Russia or within the jurisdiction of the Cominform who is not elated at the prospects of the passage of the resolution that has been moved for consideration in this body.

I would not say that many persons who are supporting this resolution, or who might support it or favor it, are not just as good Americans as I am; but I think they are mistaken when they believe that they are serving America. I know that if we were doing something which tended to strengthen America, tended to make her stronger and not weaker, something which represented another safeguard of our liberties and our freedoms, that would not please the Communists.

Every Communist in America, if he follows the party line, would vote to curtail and limit debate in the United States Senate. There is no freedom of debate in Russia. Every Communist in America, and throughout the world, in my opinion, will applaud every vote for this resolution. But while applauding, in my opinion, they will be laughing at those who so easily but terribly blundered.

Mr. President, the reasoning which brings us to conclusions and final judgment with respect to our actions in this body as Members of the United States Senate can be subjected to many tests. One rather safe test, I think, we, as Members of the Senate, can make as we consider measures in this body and that is, Does the measure have Communist support? There might be some exceptions, but as a general rule measures which have the support of Communists in America are measures which, if enacted, would harm our country and serve to advance the cause of communism. Therefore, when the Communists in this country express an opinion on policies of our Government, upon proposed laws or programs, this should serve as a warning to make us more cautious, to cause us to stop, look, and listen before we proceed to do that which would give them any comfort or cause for the slightest gratification.

Mr. President, when I vote—if I have that opportunity—to prevent consideration of Senate Resolution 15, to change the rules of the United States Senate, or when I vote against cloture on the pending motion, or on the resolution itself, I shall not please the Communists in America or the Communists abroad.

I regret to say, Mr. President, that in view of some things I have been hearing today, and in view of circumstances beyond my control, I may not have the opportunity to vote, whichever way the test comes in this body on that issue; but if I have the opportunity to vote to prevent consideration of Senate Resolution 15 or to vote against cloture on the pending motion or on the resolution itself, I shall not please the Communists. They will not applaud my vote; they will get no aid or comfort from my decision and action. But the American people can get comfort and gratification from my vote, and they will. Those who love America, who love their freedom, who cherish religious liberty and freedom of speech and freedom of mind and freedom of conscience, and who want to preserve these and hand them on to posterity—they can applaud those of us who vote here to prevent this evil thing from being done.

Mr. President, the American people are becoming a little impatient about the inaction of the Federal Government in dealing with Communists in this country. I am not prepared at the moment to say what legislation is required or just what action is needed; but a few days ago, while this debate has been in progress, I received a letter from a citizen in my State, a man who is chairman of the Americanism committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of Arkansas. I was very much impressed by it. I can well understand why any American citizen might express the same views that are expressed by this citizen of my State, who represents the boys who went across and actually did the fighting to win the great military conflict which threatened the Christian civilization of the world.

I am persuaded that there are many who wonder if the Congress will rise to the occasion and meet these issues, irrespective of small political groups and pressure gangs who try to threaten us. Mr. President, I would rather cast one vote in the United States Senate and be

expelled from it than to be elected for a thousand years and have to do the bidding of the Communists in this country.

The letter reads as follows:

DEAR SENATOR: Now is the time for all good red-blooded Americans to demand the outlawing of the Communist Party within this United States of America.

Mr. President, I do not know whether I have already said that that is exactly the best procedure; but the American people want something done about that situation. What are we doing here? We are doing just the opposite. What is being undertaken to be done in the Senate will, if it succeeds, furnish much gratification and joy to the Communists, for then they will have one more place where restrictions will have been placed on freedom of speech. The United States is where they want that done. If they can ever prevent freedom of speech in the Senate of the United States, they will be just that much closer to preventing freedom of speech among all the people of the United States, and they will be that much closer to destroying religious freedom and the other freedoms we cherish.

I read further from the letter:

The leaders of this murderous, traitorous, destructive and double-crossing, slave-driving, and libelous movement, have plainly declared their intentions toward our United States of America in case of war with our common enemy—Russia.

Mr. President, that is what I referred to a while ago, when I held up the headlines of a recent issue of a Washington newspaper. The American people are conscious of this danger, even if the Senate of the United States is not. The American people know it is time for action. But the kind of action that is being attempted to be taken here in the Senate is not the kind of action the people want, and it is not the kind of action that is necessary to protect the people and to preserve for them what they cherish and love and what their sons died for across the seas in two world wars.

The writer of the letter continues, as follows:

No case will ever be more clear. This is a dire threat that shall not go unanswered.

Listen to this, Mr. President:

You know now they definitely intend sabotage, destruction, pollution, and hindrance to the fullest extent of their power if war should come between our great Nation and this common enemy—Russia.

Mr. President, this letter comes from a former serviceman, a veteran who represents thousands of veterans in my State; and I know that thousands of veterans elsewhere in America share the same views he expresses in this letter.

I read further from the letter:

It is high time that this enemy in our very midst be openly recognized as such and necessary legislation be passed to outlaw and control this national menace. To outlaw an international gangster is the natural thing to do—we do not permit the individual gangster to run rampant in our communities. If the Communists go underground, let them go; you can catch a mole, and we have the means to do that little thing. To permit them to walk our public streets unmolested and have the use of our public halls is inviting national suicide. And we know you do not favor this.

Mr. President, the program of communism is the overthrow of our Government and all other governments by conquest, by force, if necessary. I think any American citizen who subscribes to that doctrine is a traitor to his country; and if any of our citizens commit any overt act in that direction, under existing law they are guilty of treason. Possibly our laws should be strengthened. Instead of creating a great army of snoopers to go around and find out whether a man would prefer to have white people work for him in certain capacities, rather than Negroes, and spend great sums of money for that purpose, and stir up more race trouble, why not spend that money to do something about the Communists in this country, who are our real enemies? If we get rid of them, we shall be serving everyone of our people.

However, I do not hear very much discussion of that matter. Some persons would prefer to have the Senate kill time and provide a spectacle, such as the procedure now being indulged in in the Senate of the United States. Our attitude on the present proposals is no surprise to anyone, for everyone knows how deeply we feel about this matter. But some persons would prefer to have the present situation develop in the Senate, rather than to have Senators spend their time as statesmen and American patriots in trying to protect our people from a common enemy.

However, instead, we do the bidding of the common enemy, for we drag into this Chamber proposals which only consume the time of some of the statesmen of this Nation, if there are such in the Senate, and consume their energies in debating a matter which only serves to stir up more strife and to breed more disunity.

Mr. President, why do not some persons wake up to the actualities? Certainly there is plenty of work to be done by the Senate; there is plenty to engage the time of the Senate. There are many things for us to do; there are many things which the American people will applaud us for accomplishing. But as I understand the present situation, it is proposed now that we jeopardize all other measures, for some persons take the position that the proposal now before us is paramount and simply must be fought out to a conclusion.

Mr. President, the letter which I have been reading continues, as follows:

We ask that you use your every effort in the passage of legislation to curb and oust every Communist and fellow traveler from our Nation.

Would not that be much better than hiring thousands of snoopers to run around, supposedly while enforcing a Fair Labor Practices Act, so-called? In the first place, Mr. President, they would not enforce it; in many instances they would trump up charges, merely to hold their jobs, for if they did not trump up charges, they would not have jobs. The proposal is simply one to deprive some of our people of their rights under the Constitution of the United States, and to make them accept a social standard which they do not wish to accept and will not accept. This is an attempt to tear down traditions and to deny to many of our people their right to choose their associates. That is one of the greatest freedoms we have. If I do not like to associate with another man, and if I do not wish to have him visit me in my home, or if I do not wish to work with him across the desk from me in my office, in my place of business, I should not be compelled to do so. Freedom of choice in that respect is one of the greatest liberties our people enjoy—the right of choosing one's associates, as well as the right to choose one's religion and to worship God according to one's own conscience. Our people cherish their right to set up standards of society that are acceptable to them, and not be subjected to associations which are obnoxious to them.

This challenge is ours, the crusade of the twentieth century is with us; let us carry the torch of freedom, boldly and fearlessly, to every nation upon the face of the earth by the defeat of communism within our own borders, first.

Mr. President, that is the thinking and the message from a veteran of the last war, Mr. R. G. Johnson, of Rogers, Ark., who represents the Veterans of Foreign Wars of Arkansas.

Yes, Mr. President, we had better be attending to some things of importance. I understand the President of the United States, at least the administration, has decided the pending question is all-important; that the changing of the rules of the Senate, which, of course, carries with it the so-called civil-rights program, is more important than any other legislation, and therefore the issue must be fought out. I did not hear the President say it, but every implication from published newspaper articles and from partial quotations of the President, is that he has not only agreed to it, but has insisted upon it; and while he insists upon that, knowing exactly what condition it would provoke in the Senate, namely, a stymie to the enactment of other important legislation—notwithstanding that, those are the orders, and Senators are now attempting to carry them out.

While we have the Communists in America threatening to join enemies if war comes, and while we ought to be doing something about it, far more important than what we are trying to do—which will please the Communists if the effort is successful—with this situation facing us, the President takes a vacation.

My thinking is that if the other legislation needed to be enacted in this body is of less importance than the question which is now involved in the issue presented by the motion, in my opinion, every Member of the Senate could very well take a vacation; and if they go on a vacation instead of passing the proposed legislation, they would be doing a far greater service to the country to go fishing and take no action, than they would to remain here and fight battles such as the pending one, and finally im-

pose this iniquitous thing on the American people.

Yes, Mr. President, I should like to have a vacation. I have not had one in 6 years—not since I came to the Senate. These have been very trying times. Perhaps it is my fault. Perhaps I could take a vacation; perhaps I should. I need one now. I should like to be spared the present ordeal; but I shall never, so long as I serve in the Senate, shirk any duty my conscience tells me I should perform, and I should certainly be remiss in my duty if I did not speak out in opposition to the pending proposal—yes, more, Mr. President, I should be more than derelict in duty if I did not fight it with all the power and strength I have.

How is the result sought to be accomplished? The very fact that the motion is pending and such a resolution was offered is self-evident that the present rule of the Senate, if observed, does not permit of a cloture petition being filed against a motion, but only against a measure. It is being urged that such a petition affecting the motion is expedient, because without it, in all probability the Senate can never get the resolution to a vote—not for quite some time, at least. In order to get a vote, it is proposed to file a cloture petition.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Is it not true and necessarily a fact that the Committee on Rules and Administration would never have reported favorably a proposed two-thirds cloture rule if it thought the rule already eliminated loopholes, as some persons say the Chair should rule it does?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have just said that is the best evidence that the present rules of the Senate do not permit a cloture petition to be filed against a motion. But, I may say to my friend that it is now proposed that the Chair overrule the precedents of the Senate, for expediency purposes, and hold that the rule does permit the filing of cloture against a motion. That is why I could not help but refer earlier in my remarks to how the Christ himself was condemned by overruling all precedents, through the power that reposed in the then governor, and through his not having the courage to stand against pressures.

I hope, Mr. President, if there is a cloture petition filed and an attempt made to get the President of the Senate to reverse the ruling made here less than a year ago by one of the ablest Members of the Senate, in keeping with past precedents of the Senate, when there was an opportunity then to appeal from it, and the present President of the Senate, then a Member of this body, took no appeal, it will be held that, if it was wrong then, that was the time to correct it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Would the Senator from Arkansas not agree with me that an appeal was taken from the decision of the Chair on the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], but that it never came to a vote? Was not that the parliamentary situation?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think that is correct; but we did not have to let it pass by without coming to a vote. Senators could have insisted on a vote.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for another question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Was not the parliamentary situation in this body such at that time that the appeal itself from the decision of the Chair would have been subject to unlimited filibuster?

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator means unlimited debate; does he not? I should like to assist the Senator in asking his question. Yes; it was subject to unlimited debate.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. If the Chair should so rule and were actually correct, then would it not have been wasting a great deal of time arguing about something when the rules already provided for it?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Every Senator knows what the rules of the Senate mean. They are very plain. I do not think a wayfaring man could err in interpreting them.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. Was it not so obvious that the decision of the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the President pro tempore of the Senate at that time, was correct and in line with the precedents of the Senate that the Republican Senators did not press an appeal from his decision.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Of course that is correct. The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] asked if an appeal would not have been subject to unlimited debate. It would have been. But a motion could have been made to table the appeal at any time, and that would have cut off the debate and brought a vote. That is the same approach, the same tactics, the same technique as are now proposed to be used.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Arkansas if it is not a fact that the parliamentary situation a year ago was exactly the reverse of this one, and had a motion to lay on the table been made in connection with the appeal by the Senator from Ohio it would then have made the ruling of the Chair final by action of the Senate? If the able Senator and those who had the same point of view——

Mr. McCLELLAN. There would have been a decision one way or the other. Whether the motion was laid on the table or not, it would have indicated the decision of this body.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Had the able Senator and those colleagues who felt that way about it been so sure, would they not themselves have moved to table the motion on appeal by the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I cannot speculate as to what any individual Senator on this side of the aisle might have done any more than my colleague can speculate regarding Senators on his side of the aisle. Some Senators still have some individual privileges in the Senate as to making motions and parliamentary moves.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. EASTLAND. What would have been the point in Senators from south of the Mason and Dixon taking such action, when we had already won the fight?

Mr. McCLELLAN. It was not our place to appeal. We did not want to appeal from a decision which was correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. The decision of the distinguished Senator from Michigan was correct; is that the Senator's opinion?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does the Senator mean the decision of the able Senator from Michigan?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes. Was it correct?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Of course it was correct. I am only hoping that the Senate will never, by any parliamentary finesse or technique—there may be many words that could be used to express it—resort to such expediency as may be thought necessary definitely to abrogate the long-standing rules of this body.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield to the able Senator from Texas for a question.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is it not true that, in addition to the precedents and the ruling by the Senator from Michigan, the situation, as we contend, had been observed by the Senate for 50 years by practically unanimous consent?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct. Of course no Senator was surprised at the ruling of the very able Senator from Michigan who then occupied the chair. His decision was correct. There was no real fight over it after he made it. It was accepted as settling the question. It would seem to me—and I care not how earnestly Senators want the enactment of the civil-rights program or a change in the rules—that within less than a

year's time, to urge or even request the present Presiding Officer, who was then the leader of the minority in this body, to reverse that ruling, would weaken confidence in the integrity of this body. In my opinion, that would be the result. If we cannot rely upon a continuity of rulings which conform to precedents of this body, then, Mr. President, how are we to know that the written rule today will not be a mockery tomorrow when a parliamentary question arises? What caused some persons to lose confidence in the Supreme Court of the United States and begin to criticize it? It was because, without rhyme or reason, it began overruling the long-established precedents of that Court. If we act in that way in the United States Senate we may bring down upon our conduct the condemnation of the American people.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it not the opinion of the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas that if this resolution should be adopted and a gag rule be established in the United States Senate, certain forces in this country will immediately begin an attempt to impose a capital levy and follow that with a drive to socialize American industry?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, there is no limit to what some forces in this Nation will do to destroy America. When they make so bold as to announce that they will fight with the enemy in case of war, how can we have any confidence that they will not do anything in their power, small or large, to hasten the day of our destruction? As I have pointed out as I have tried to progress with my remarks this evening, every time we compromise a little they expect and demand more. We shall not appease them and prevent another war, and we shall not save America, by partaking of any part of communism in any form or fashion.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it the Senator's opinion that the Senators from the South, in opposing with every weapon at their command the adoption of this resolution, are fighting for the preservation of the American system of government and the American way of life, and are holding in check the forces of socialism and communism which would destroy our country?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, in answer to the able Senator from Mississippi, without, of course, reflecting in any degree whatsoever upon the Americanism, patriotism, and statesmanship of any other Member of this body, I do say that, in my opinion, the faith of the people of the South in their ideology of democracy and Americanism under this Government is unsurpassed in America or anywhere else in the world. We may have our faults.

We may have our faults; no doubt errors have been made, of course, but who has not made them? However, on the question of patriotic integrity, we make no apology and surrender to no other segment of our population, East, West or North.

Before I conclude, Mr. President, I shall read a letter from a southern mother. I have had a copy of it placed on the desk of each Senator. The lady does not live in my State at present; she has lived in a number of States. She lives in the South. I challenge anyone to read the letter and tell me that there is any higher quality of true Americanism than the sentiments expressed by this mother.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER [Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair]. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator agree that the right of free debate in the United States Senate is actually one of the greatest bulwarks this country has against communism or action by pressure groups, or groups that would overthrow our Government?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have said that repeatedly. Certainly it will not strengthen America to weaken the rule we are discussing. It can only serve those who want to impose their will on America, and unless we do preserve the power and the strength and the instrumentality of resistance, we can lose our liberty.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator recall the statement made by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] a few days ago that in his opinion the famous Court-packing bill of 1937 would probably have been passed by the Senate if the right of free and full debate had not prevailed?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes, I remember that very well. I was serving in the House of Representatives at that time, and when the President came in person and delivered his message, I stood and applauded and thought that what he suggested would be a wonderful thing to do. If the Supreme Court was behind with its work, if the docket was congested, and more judges were needed in order to expedite the Court's business, I thought it would be a wonderful thing to do. If the bill had been brought up that day, or any time immediately thereafter, if there had not been debate on it, and I had not learned what the real situation was, I would have gone along. That shows the advantage of debate, the advantage of unlimited debate. Unlimited debate is one of our safeguards.

Mr. LONG. After mature reflection, and looking back on the subject historically, would not the Senator be of the opinion that if the United States Supreme Court had been packed at the request of the Executive, that would have had the effect of undermining a great portion of the American democracy?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not think the Court should be packed by the Executive at any time. Of course, it is the prerogative of the Executive to make appointments when vacancies occur, in order to keep the personnel of the Court complete, but such appointments can only be made after confirmation by the Senate. To increase the Court so as to change the philosophy and thinking of the Court in order to achieve a definite result in regard to legislation which, in the opinion of the Court previously appointed in the proper constitutional way, was unconstitutional, is a subterfuge I do not think should ever be resorted to.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. EASTLAND. Would the Senator say that if it had not been for the right of unlimited debate in the Senate, or the right to resort to long debate in 1943 and 1944, a soldier-vote bill would have been rushed through this body, under gag rule, which would have jeopardized the election of President Roosevelt in 1944?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Some said that would have been the effect. At the moment I do not recall all that was involved in the fight, but I do remember that there was quite a long debate on the bill, and the bill did not pass in the form in which it was presented.

Mr. President, I am very much concerned about what may happen in this body if a cloture petition is filed and cloture attempted. I am concerned about it because I would want to be here and vote on it, but it appears now that may be impossible. But I cannot refrain from saying that if a cloture petition is filed before those who want to speak on the pending motion have an opportunity to do so, it is a further warning, and a significant warning, of what we may expect when the rule is changed. Senators need not be under any illusion that a change in rule in accordance with the pending resolution is all they are going to have to contend with. That is only the beginning. It is merely an entering wedge.

I had prepared to say, Mr. President, that the effort now being made to amend rule XXII of the Senate rules will serve as an opening wedge further to gag this body. Rule XXII was designed to shut off debate in the Senate. It has done that in the past, and can do so in the future, and I dare say that if and when there were an occasion when the Nation could not afford not to have action in the Senate, when its interest would actually be jeopardized, the rule as it is would work again as it has in the past.

If Senate Resolution 15 should be adopted, it would undeniably serve as a precedent for again amending the rule. The proposed rule is to make cloture apply to motions, or whatever the pending business may be, without changing the two-thirds majority required, but when the motion to bring it up in the Senate is made amendments are offered to change the rule so as to provide that a constitutional majority, 49 Senators, may invoke cloture. The movement did not stop there. According to press reports the President went further and said he wanted to see the number reduced to a simple majority, or 25 Members of the Senate. That should be a warning, and serve notice upon Senators that they should get ready for and expect further effort to restrict debate in the Senate by those who will want to cut off debate, and pass any measure that is proposed

without debate, without adequate deliberation. Those who make such proposals are not, in my judgment, serving democracy's interest and the welfare of the people of the Nation.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Would it not seem to the Senator from Arkansas extremely likely that if the rules of the Senate were ultimately changed to permit mere majority cloture, any time a capable and able leader saw his majority was getting away from him due to the effect of arguments on the opposing side, he would probably move to cut off debate?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I say it is not possible to delegate power without expectation that the power will be used, and no power possibly was ever granted that was not sometimes abused. I think we could expect it to be used, and often abused in order to cut off debate, in an effort to try to get hasty action before the Nation could be informed of the real merits of what was involved in the issue, and have time to form intelligent judgment, and to express its will and wish, through its elected representatives in this body. Yes, Mr. President, I think the thing proposed to be done is dangerous.

There is no pleasure and there is no comfort in standing on the Senate floor and enduring the discomfort we endure here, when pleading, hoping, praying that some Senators will yet see the light, hoping we can by persuasion restrain the decision which some Senators may desire to have made, and thereby put in motion forces which are destructive, and can never be stopped.

Mr. President, there is now before us the proposal by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] to amend Senate Resolution 15, so that cloture might become effective by vote of a majority of those elected. Then we have next heard, as I said, Mr. President, that the President of the United States favored the further amending of the rule so that cloture may be invoked by a bare majority of those present, which could be as few as 25 Members.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes, I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not also true that some Senators who are now supporting Senate Resolution No. 15, with its change in the rules, have at different periods in the past advocated either a change to provide for cloture by a constitutional majority, or even by the simple majority to which the Senator has just adverted?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think the Senator is correct; yes.

Mr. HILL. And is there not testimony from some Senators in the record of hearings before the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration to the effect that they look upon the resolution as simply one step? Is it not a fact that the implication is inescapable that if they can take this step then they will be back to take the other step, which will be either a provision for a constitutional majority, or perhaps even for a simple majority, which under certain circumstances may mean only 25 Senators?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct. I take it, Mr. President, that whenever we reach that point in the United States Senate there will be little protection for the American people. There will then be little restraint to compel the Senate to deliberate before it acts, because there will be a continuously increasing volume of business, continually increasing pressures for legislation in a government which has grown as ours has in the past quarter of a century. Our Government has grown from one which expended for governmental purposes two or three billion dollars, to one which expends over $40,000,000,000 a year. For such a government certainly more legislation is required, and greater care, greater effort, and greater labor are demanded on the part of the Appropriations Committees to try to determine how public funds and tax revenues shall be expended. More legislation is required to provide the agencies of the Government necessary to administer, supervise and expend judiciously the funds which are appropriated for the several functions and services of Government which the people in a growing nation like ours require.

So, Mr. President, every time we relax this rule or that rule, a rule intended to protect minorities, we are simply relaxing further and further the provisions for our protection, and weakening the bulwarks which have been set up to protect minorities, the very minorities to appease whom it is now sought to take action to change the rule.

The able Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] said earlier this afternoon, or possibly it was the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], that the minority some Senators now try to appease and to gratify by the enactment of the so-called civil-rights program is the very minority for which Senators would be tearing down the barriers of protection. We had better think about these things more seriously than we have heretofore.

While discussing this phase of the matter I should like to read excerpts from the statement I made before the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the very reasons the Senator has so ably set forth here are the reasons why the Senate, through the years, has refused to deny free and unlimited debate?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think they are the reasons, and I think our forefathers and our predecessors in this great body had that vision.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield further for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that there is sound wisdom, sound philosophy, and sound statecraft in these reasons which through the years have kept free and unlimited debate in this body?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes. Without undertaking to discuss in detail what had made America great, I tried to contrast earlier today the difference between what our country stands for and what communism stands for. I said that books could be written on that subject. I pointed out that it was not communism or anything like communism which had made America great. That we know. I said there are two clashing forces in the world today. I asked: Do we want to keep whittling away our liberty a little bit at a time, and weakening the structure upon which our liberties rest, as was so ably discussed by the senior Senator from Georgia a few days ago? I say not. I say we had better move slowly.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that if we were to change the rules of the Senate we would not only change the procedure in the Senate, we would not only change the Senate itself, but we would make a fundamental change in the very American Government itself?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes, we would. To those Senators who, by voting for the proposed change, believe it will have no significance, I point out that, in my opinion, they are thereafter going to be asked to go further. They may not be asked to go any further in the present session of Congress, but they will be asked to do so hereafter, or succeeding Senates will. Senators can then say, "Well, the Senate which made the change did not have to make it." Of course not. But the argument will then be made that the Senate now in existence made the change. If a change is once made, changes can be made again and again, and it is by that process of further encroachment, further taking away of the liberties we have heretofore preserved, one step further being taken each time, that finally the strength of our Nation is broken.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not the same old story of the camel once getting his nose under the tent?

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is the same old story.

Mr. President, I was about to read——

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one other question before he reads?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I will yield for one further question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not of the greatest significance that with the exception of the so-called civil-rights bills, the proponents of this change in the rules are unable to put their hands on a single measure of any great significance or beneficence which has been defeated because of free and unlimited debate in this body?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is absolutely true. Earlier in my remarks this afternoon I asked if there was any Senator who would dare say on the floor of the Senate that that was not the whole motivating cause behind the present proposal to change the rules. I do not think anyone would dare deny it. I went further and stated that I did not believe

that any Member of this body would dare make the assertion, and defend it, that any great harm had ever come to this Nation under the present rules of the United States Senate. There may have been a little delay and a little inconvenience, such as I and other Senators are now suffering in the effort to stop this awful thing from being done. Yes, there may have been a little delay and a little inconvenience, but I challenge any Senator to rise on the floor of the Senate and point out where, in all the years this rule has been in existence, America has suffered by reason of it.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that on May 4, 1918, while this country was in World War I, a resolution was submitted and presented to change the rules of the Senate so as to cut off free and unlimited debate for the duration of World War I, and that that resolution was defeated? We fought the great World War I. We made that herculean effort, and not a single soul can point to any act which brought any suffering or any impairment of the war effort, or any weakening of that effort because that resolution was defeated and because free and unlimited debate was preserved in this body.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct. Since then we have fought a much larger war, with the rule unchanged.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that we fought a much larger war, and that at no time was there any effort to cut off free and unlimited debate in order to pass any measure for the prosecution and winning of that war?

Mr. McCLELLAN. In all probability, had the rule been changed and had the rule been during the war what the President of the United States says he now wants, some of the very forces which are now demanding that we change the rule would have been able to draft the railroad boys into the military service in order to break a strike. A motion could have been made and debate could have been cut off, and they could have been in uniform before night, figuratively speaking.

Mr. President, that is a dangerous power to grant to any man. If the Senate is unwilling to retain the power it now has to protect minorities and to make certain that the American people can be informed on the issues involved before final action is taken, then we shall be making a sad mistake.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the American Federation of Labor foresaw the very danger to which the Senator has just adverted in citing the illustration of killing the bill to prevent the drafting of the railroad workers, when the American Federation of Labor passed the stinging resolution condemning the proposal of Vice President Dawes to cut off free and unlimited debate in this body?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes, indeed, Mr. President. While some of the labor leaders are writing letters insisting that we vote to change this rule, let me say that that is the very thing that I am trying to point out. When I prepared the statement which I gave before the Rules Committee I was hoping that I might appeal to the wisdom and judgment of some of my friends across the aisle, because I knew that a large number of Senators on this side of the aisle would oppose it. As I said earlier in the day, I thought the issue transcended partisanship, and I hoped that I might make some suggestions which would cause every Member of this body to stop and think.

This is the statement which I made before the Committee on Rules and Administration:

> You have before you some five Senate resolutions proposing to relax this rule in varying degrees, even to the extent of abrogating the provision that requires a two-thirds vote to invoke cloture and thus limit debate on any pending measure.
>
> I oppose the adoption of any and all of these resolutions, and I appreciate this opportunity to state briefly for the record some reasons for my opposition.
>
> Any change in this rule will be a radical departure from long-established precedent.

When we come to depart from precedent there ought to be some real reason for it, if that precedent has served us well in the past. Why should we depart because of some whim, or to pass one particular bill, or two or three bills, to please minority groups, and for no other reason in the world? Why should we shatter precedent and disregard it or abrogate it, or overrule it? When we do so we are resorting to expediency. If we are to legislate all the time under the pressure of expediency, we cannot preserve our Constitution or the things it stands for.

That is the reason for the Constitution. That is what rules and precedents are for. I do not mean that they cannot be changed, but they certainly should not be changed for the sake of expediency, to gain a single objective without looking to the general results which may follow after the change is made.

Continuing with my statement before the Committee on Rules and Administration:

> Some of the changes are designed and intended to so liberalize procedure in the United States Senate as will enable a bare majority to compel in some instances hasty, ill-advised action on any pending matter. They will serve to enforce the will and purpose of the majority on the Senate and the people without granting opportunity for due deliberation, and before the people can be sufficiently informed to give enlightened expressions and make their views known on the vital issue then pending.
>
> The present rule has long stood the test, and has stood like a sentinel on guard providing an armor of defense against the enactment of ill-considered measures and those often sponsored to appease minority groups for political expediency, measures that would transgress the constitutional rights of majorities and substitute and impose the will of minorities on the body politic.

Mr. President, in my opinion every one of the pending proposals is unconstitutional. Earlier this afternoon I was speaking when some Senators who are now present were not in the Chamber. I was speaking about the FEPC. Why is the Federal Government asked to pass such a law when every State has the right to pass it, and every State which has undertaken to pass it, and has left it to the vote of the people, has met with failure, because the American people do not want it? Why do we want to have this battle for days and days, in an effort to change the rules of the United States Senate if we do not want, by Federal legislation, to impose a diabolical thing on the people of America, who do not want it and who reject it at every opportunity that is afforded them?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield for a question only.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the FEPC proposal has been defeated approximately 15 times in approximately 15 States of the United States?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is what I understand. It has never been approved by the people, wherever it has been submitted.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that in the State of California the FEPC proposal was not only defeated, but it failed to receive a majority of the votes in a single county in the entire State of California?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think that is true. Let me say to the very able Senator from Alabama that it seems to me that one of the reasons why it failed in every county in the State of California may be attributed to some of the debates in the Senate of the United States, which informed those people of the iniquity of that proposal and of other proposed legislation of a similar character.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question at this point?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that if the Members of the Senate had been denied free and unlimited debate, it might well have been impossible for those speeches to have been made here in the Senate?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is absolutely true. Even despite the present rule and what we know it is and what it has repeatedly been held to be, there is now a hope on the part of some persons, in order to secure the enactment of these proposed laws, to have the precedents of the Senate overruled, and then to have sufficient pressure applied here to cause that action to be sustained.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Then, does not this FEPC question boil down to about this situation: Does it not mean that the majority of the people of the country, when they understand what the FEPC proposal is, are opposed to it, but a small pressure group, exerting pressure on a majority of the Members of the United States Senate, is actually attempting to force upon the majority of our people what the majority of the people themselves do not want?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is certainly the only logical conclusion at which I can arrive.

Mr. President, the only reason why Senators want the proposed change in the Senate rule is to permit the passage of the proposed civil-rights program. If the people of the several States want an FEPC, such a law can be adopted in the States where the people want it, and it can be made just as airtight as is desired, so long as the Constitution of the United States is not violated, for, of course, it would not be legal for the Constitution of the United States to be violated under either a State statute or a Federal statute.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the FEPC bill which was before the Senate in 1946 would have violated right after right which the Constitution and Bill of Rights guarantee to the American people?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is absolutely true.

Mr. President, I hope I can induce some of my colleagues to think about the importance of this matter. Today Senators on the other side of the aisle are in the minority. Perhaps after another election they may be in the majority, or perhaps they may remain in the minority. However, regardless of whether they are in the majority or are in the minority, they should carefully bear in mind the fact that the action proposed to be taken by the Senate will, if actually taken, forge a weapon which will be a dangerous instrumentality affecting all Senators. Certainly the majority can use it today to accomplish their ends, whether those ends be for good or for evil. However, the same majority, which creates and forges that weapon, will not always be able to retain control of it, for it will exist in the future to be used against them whenever they are in the minority. Thus they will have created the very weapon which may mean their own destruction.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that approximately only 12 years ago the minority in the Senate had only about 16 votes, while the majority had approximately 80 votes; and is it not also true that in a situation of that sort—for that situation existed here only a dozen years ago, and it might again exist here at any time in the future—the one protection, the one shield, the one bulwark which the minority has to protect its rights is the right of free and unlimited debate?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is true.

Mr. President, let me point out how far some persons might go in this matter. Today the most deep-seated convictions lie back of the inspired opposition to the pending proposal. I do not think anyone questions our sincerity. Members of the Senate would not stand on this floor time and time again, for generation after generation, fighting measures of this sort unless there were in their souls a deep and abiding conviction that the proposal was wrong. I have not seen those who wish to have the resolution adopted exert half as much effort in an attempt to have it adopted as we do in trying to prevent its adoption.

Mr. President, what is proposed to be done now by those who advocate the adoption of this resolution? Although they realize that a number of Members of the Senate have very deep convictions regarding this matter, the plan is to file a cloture petition and have action taken on it, if possible, before a number of the Members of the Senate have an opportunity to be heard even once on this question. Is not that a warning to all of us? Once the power is granted, it will be used; let us make no mistake about that. It may be used when Senators are otherwise defenseless.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana for a question.

Mr. LONG. Is it not entirely likely that if the Senate rule be changed so that two-thirds can impose cloture at any time, possibly as soon as the next Congress convenes a proposal may be made to change the rule so as to provide for cloture by simple majority vote; and then on the next occasion of the proposal of so-called civil-rights measures, the newly amended rule might be used, with the result that cloture would then be imposed as soon as the motion to apply the rule had been made?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Certainly that is possible.

Mr. President, I wonder whether it is true that there is a plan to file a cloture petition immediately on the commencement of the session tomorrow—and thus deny to many Members of the Senate an opportunity to let their people know what the issues are from their point of view.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it not the proposal to file a cloture petition in an attempt to shut off debate before half the Senators who oppose this resolution and who desire to speak against it have an opportunity to speak?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not know when the petition is proposed to be filed; but if it is filed before Senators are given an opportunity to speak once on this proposal—whereas, under the rule they have a right to speak twice on any proposal—and if they are thus to be denied the right to speak even once, it certainly seems to me that the gag will be used if authority to use it is ever granted.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. If the cloture petition is filed tomorrow, to the Senator's knowledge, what percentage of the Senator's will have spoken in opposition to the motion, who desire to speak?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have not kept count, but according to my recollection, I should say probably not over half will have spoken, of those who intended to speak. I may say to the able Senator from Mississippi I cannot possibly cover the subject in one speech and say all I had intended to say. I thought I had something I could speak about for an hour or two. Mr. President, I have not the physical strength, I cannot possibly hold out here in one speech through the hours of the night when Senators ought to be home getting some rest. While the President of the United States is vacationing we ought to have some rest, too; but we must remain here to fight this battle. That is the way I feel about it. But certainly, Mr. President—we certainly should have the right to debate the pending proposal. I do not know what the limit of my physical strength may be, but no matter if I held on until late in the night, if I am compelled to undertake to do so, I could not exhaust the subject. I should like to make another speech, under the rules of the Senate, when I shall have recuperated. I am suposed to have that right if I want it.

Mr. President, I cannot be here tomorrow to continue my remarks, and I cannot be here the following day, for reasons I need not state in the RECORD. But I should hate to be deprived of the right to be here and vote when the vote is taken, and I should hate to be deprived by my colleagues of the right and privilege of making another speech and concluding my remarks, getting into the RECORD for posterity, or for my own satisfaction at least, the fact that I have done everything in my power to prevent what it is proposed to do and to keep this evil from being imposed on my people. But now I do not know whether I am going to have that right or not. We have become rather strict here. We have got to apply a little pressure and a little gag; we have got to overrule the precedents, probably, and do a few other things I do not think should be done. In doing those things I think we are hurting our country. I think we shall finally come to the time when there will be some weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth in America if it is done.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that if cloture should be ordered on the resolution, thereafter there could be adopted by the vote of a majority of only those present and voting, an amendment which would change the two-thirds requirement of the resolution to any kind of majority, and that then, after the adoption of such an amendment, a simple majority of the Senate could adopt the resolution?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is absolutely correct, if we let the resolution come up, and if we do not do everything in our power to prevent it. Of course, when it is once taken up, it is subject to amendment, and I do not know what pressure may be brought to bear; I do not know how the majority feel. The majority might be persuaded to amend the resolution further to abolish the two-thirds rule; I do not know. It is tampering

with a thing that is dangerous. But if it is determined to do it, I want the RECORD to show and history to record, if it should take note of my feeble efforts, that so long as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS are kept, they will show that I made the supreme effort of my physical strength and endurance to try to prevent the enactment of the proposed laws, which the change in rule is designed to expedite.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Then, is it not true that if cloture is adopted, and if the amendment reducing the required two-thirds to a simple majority, which in its barest form would mean only 25 Senators, should be adopted, no Senator could speak more than once, or longer than an hour, in opposition to the resolution?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct; that is the extent to which he could speak.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MAYBANK. If the amendment to the rule should be adopted, I ask the Senator whether he thinks it would be possible to legislate the civil-rights program into the hearts of the people of the United States?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Oh, we may place it on the statute book, but as I have been pointing out regarding the FEPC, where the people have a chance to express themselves, they say they do not want it.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is true.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is unanswerable to me. I simply cannot understand a Senator making a fight in this body to change the rule, in order to pass an FEPC bill that his own people have rejected and repudiated.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MAYBANK. In view of the fact the Senator well recognizes, as do other Senators, that the FEPC cannot be enacted into law, and that if it is, it will be no law, because of the impossibility of legislating such things into the people, does not the Senator believe the real purpose of the change in rules is to wreck the business interests of the country?

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the FEPC bill should ever pass, as I said this afternoon, it would mean thousands of snoopers around meddling in people's business and putting control on the capitalistic enterprises of the Nation, under the domination of bureaucracy here in Washington. That is all it means. That is what it means; it means nothing less; it means that much and more. I may say to the Senator from South Carolina, that this afternoon, earlier, in discussing the pending question, I pointed out to other Senators who were present that instead of spending millions of dollars to hire snoopers to run around and see whether a man was employing Negroes or white people or somebody else in the shops he himself had created—instead of doing that we had better be spending the money to track down the Communist spies in the Federal Government itself. There is the great danger. But no, we have got to undertake to interfere with private enterprise, and with the individual liberties of the businessman, hiring snoopers and boards, and using "cease and desist" orders and every other thing to tantalize him.

It is said that much can be done by conciliation. Senators know how conciliation is carried on. The conciliator goes to a man and looks at him in a conciliatory manner, calculated to convey the idea, "Well, you had better do this"; and he had better do it that way, or else; if he does not do it that way, of course, he knows he can be dragged to the Capital and carried on through the courts possibly. Many people will go ahead and yield to some of the demands in the hope of escaping a long-drawn-out, expensive hearing, court procedure, and so forth. But, Mr. President, that is a form of coercion and intimidation, nothing else; because the conciliator will come back after using such methods and tactics and make a report that he has been able to work the thing out by conciliation, and by mediation. It is a form of totalitarian rule; we cannot get away from that. That is what it will be, if we ever get it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does the Senator recall any bill which the administration has sent to the Congress that was strong enough and had sufficient teeth in it to track down the Communists in the employ of the Government?

Mr. McCLELLAN. If we had a bill such as that in the Congress, the same elements which are now trying to force civil-rights legislation through the Congress would be here fighting and talking about individual liberty and preserving freedom. The Communists would be the first to holler if we attempted to invoke any law against them. They would take all the advantages of the Constitution, although they want to destroy it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from South Carolina for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. In view of the fact that this resolution has been advocated by the administration, does the Senator know why such a thing is recommended when the Democratic Party did not recommend it?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I cannot reason out, understand, or fathom all of the purposes back of the administration's program. I never have been able to do so, and I cannot at this time.

Mr. President, I want to read a little more of what I said before the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Section 2 of rule XXII is an imposing bulwark of true democracy.

Through the years it has served to safeguard the liberties of our people and has afforded them the right of thorough expression through the medium of their chosen representatives in the United States Senate.

Strike down and destroy if you will this fortress and protection of free and unlimited debate in the most profound legislative body in the world, but I want no part of the evil that will flow from such action charged against my official record and conduct as a public servant.

Contention is made with great emphasis that the present rule permits abuses. Abuses have occurred. I have witnessed some of them since I have been a Member of the Senate, in some instances by those who now clamor for a change.

But those abuses, Mr. Chairman, while they may have caused temporary delay and have served to inconvenience other Members of the Senate, their attainments and any harm that resulted as a consequence were infinitesimal in comparison to unwise and unsound legislation that would have been passed had the rule been different, if it had conformed to the changes now proposed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the right of free and unlimited debate in the Senate throws its cloak of protection not only around the greatest and most powerful corporations, but also around the humblest and the lowliest citizens of the United States?

Mr. McCLELLAN. It certainly does. The proposed change is actually not in the interest of anyone. As I said earlier in my remarks, one of the tests which we can safely make is that if the Communists favor legislation which is pending, it is time to stop, look, listen, and beware. I think every Communist in the world is applauding everything that will break down the protection and safeguards of the minority. I think every Communist in America and abroad will applaud every vote to change this rule. They will not applaud my vote or the votes of my colleagues, these able Senators who are helping in this fight. That I know. I am not trying to please the Communists. If I should do such a thing I would begin to wonder about my own integrity.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield to the able Senator from South Carolina for a question only.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does the Senator know of any State in the Union, other than New York, in which an FEPC bill has been passed?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not know the circumstances of how it was passed in the State of New York. I know there have been efforts to try to introduce such legislation in several States, but every time it has been suggested the people have rejected it and refused it. Yet certain Senators are trying to pass such legislation here.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does the Senator realize that such a law was attempted to be passed in the State of California?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes. That has been discussed this afternoon.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not a fact that Mr. Dewey, who was instrumental in having an FEPC law passed in New York, carried the State of New York over Mr. Truman.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not know whether that had anything to do with it. Whether the FEPC law had any particular influence on the election in that State I have no knowledge. I think we have plenty of concrete examples in the instances of some 12 or 15 States in which such a law has been proposed and has been submitted to the people themselves, but in each instance, I am advised, the people of those States—some of them are in the North, some in the West, but I do not think there are any in the South—have declared they wanted no part of it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not a fact that Henry Wallace received more votes in the State of New York than in any other State?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think that is correct. Of course, New York has more votes than has any other State in the Union.

Mr. MAYBANK. I will say, in proportion.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes; I think that is correct. It simply means that Mr. Wallace received very few votes in a State like that of the able Senator from South Carolina, or in my own State, because our people are red-blooded American citizens; they love the American way of life; they love everything for which we are fighting here tonight. That is why they are not easily deluded and deceived and why they do not vote for false "isms" and false doctrines which, if they were adopted in this country, would mean the loss of the liberty they love.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. LONG. Is it not a fact that the way the so-called pressure groups work is to play the Democrats against the Republicans, and the Republicans against the Democrats, and then wind up going for some Communist, for Henry Wallace, or some odd party?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct. Some of the folks who voted that way were, of course, misinformed, not capable, possibly, of appreciating what they were really doing. But a great many persons who voted for Henry Wallace were persons who want to overthrow this Government. I am not so sure that Henry Wallace does not want to do it, himself.

Mr. President, I have said this before, but I do not think I have ever said it in this Chamber. I remember that in 1944 at the convention in Chicago, at the time President Truman was given the nomination for Vice President, among the group who made the fight to make certain of Harry Truman's nomination over Henry Wallace, are men who are here tonight fighting to preserve the liberties of the people in which we believe and which we did not believe Henry Wallace believed in then.

Whatever service I may have rendered in the National Congress at any time, I say to my friend from Alabama, to my friend from South Carolina, and to you, Mr. President, the greatest service I have ever rendered my country up to this hour was when I helped to defeat Henry Wallace and to nominate Harry Truman for Vice President of the United States in 1944. Whatever may be the President's errors of judgment now, whatever else he may try to do, I know that my own judgment is that if Henry Wallace had been the successful nominee, and had become the President of the United States, there would be a gag rule in the Senate by this time. That is his philosophy of government. We all know that that would have happened if he could have had his way.

I say, Mr. President, these are dangerous times in the world. We had better be on guard in this body every day, every hour. We cannot trifle with these off-hand formulas and philosophies. It is dangerous to do it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield to the able Senator from South Carolina, for a question only.

Mr. MAYBANK. I shall ask only one question, namely, is it not true that in 1944 there was an effort almost all one night to put gag rule on the Democratic Party, so to speak, by stampeding the convention in Chicago, when many of us who are here fighting today supported Harry Truman against Henry Wallace?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I remember that well, and I say without fear of successful contradiction that I know that my able friend from South Carolina, my able friend here from Virginia, and other Senators, stood with us in that fight, and kept Henry Wallace from becoming President of the United States. Mr. President, I guess it is now forgotten. I wonder if it is remembered.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MAYBANK. I ask the Senator if he does not remember the large groups around the auditorium in Chicago, and the parades, and all the rest, that tried to beat us down that night?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Oh, yes; I remember it, Mr. President; but people who have convictions, and who believe in the Americanism that we believed in that night, and in which we still believe, are not easily beaten down, nor are they easily threatened or intimidated. It sometimes takes a great deal of courage to carry out one's convictions and meet the obstacles which are placed in the way. It takes courage to come into this Chamber and stand and do one's duty under threat of political defeat. Most of us who are in politics, and who come to the Halls of Congress, or to any other office or position of importance in the Nation, like to have the realization and the comfort and the gratification of knowing that we can serve well enough in this body, or in whatever position of trust we hold, so that we can be reelected, if we desire to be, when the time comes. Men who serve in this body now dedicate their lives to public service, to serving their country. They do not have the opportunity, as was true perhaps in the earlier period of our Nation's history, to spend most of the time engaged in some private enterprise or vocation. We have to devote practically our entire time to our public duties, and our very pride in success makes it at least a possible temptation to us when people say "If you do not vote this way or that way, this group, our group, will see to it that you are defeated in the next election."

It takes a good deal of courage to stand the test and go through the fiery furnace we are sometimes compelled to endure in public service, but unless we have enough men in the Congress of the United States who will not thus be threatened and coerced and intimidated, and who will have the courage to walk up here and vote their convictions on the vital issues of the day, there is not much hope of America enduring indefinitely. It is that kind of courage which built America. It is that kind of political courage and political sacrifice which may be necessary to preserve this country.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to ask the Senator if he does not believe that minority groups are stronger in the industrial centers and in the large cities than they are in the great back country whence he and I come, and if he does not believe that we can see the picture more clearly, without threats and without fear? We have no fear. There may be threats, but we pay no attention to them.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have never worried seriously about threats, but I do know that making threats is the tactics which seem to be employed in modern times by groups and organizations. They do not ask too often what we honestly think of the merits of an important question. We are not supposed to think. They want us merely to jump through the hoop.

I am sure every one of the Senators received a letter like the one sent me. I do not think I will have time to refer to it. I believe it was from the CIO, a letter telling us how to jump through the hoop. I do not think I am jumping. I am going to do what my conscience tells me is right, and my conscience does not tell me that the position this organization is taking on the proposed change in the rules is right. I think it is wrong, and I am not going to vote for a change in the rules.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does not the Senator remember that last year an attempt was made by the Senator who is now the

distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration to suggest a constitutional amendment on the poll-tax question, and that the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and Walter White, sent a telegram in an effort to persuade the Senate not to pay any attention to the constitutional-amendment method proposed last August on the poll-tax question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator is correct, and while an anti-poll-tax bill is involved in the fight we are making, let me say in all fairness that I do not believe the people of America want the FEPC in many States, and the 13 States in which it was voted on were not Southern States, but it was rejected. If those who desire to abolish the poll tax had gone about it in a constitutional way some few years ago, by constitutional amendment, and had not wanted to force it arbitrarily by statute, I think the resolution proposing the constitutional amendment would have passed both Houses and the amendment would have been on its way to the people in the due process of amending the Constitution. I believe in my State it would have been ratified, although we have a poll tax, because the people are ready to get away from it. They have been ready for some years. They merely wanted to find a better system, and had a Federal constitutional amendment been submitted, realizing that it would probably have been ratified by most of the States, or the required number of States, the proponents of the repeal of the poll-tax laws would have gotten by persuasion, by due constitutional processes, what they wanted, long ago; whereas they have not been able to get it, they have delayed the attainment of it, by the method they used, which we think is unconstitutional.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Louisiana for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Would not the fact that the Communists and many of the pressure groups oppose a constitutional amendment to repeal the poll tax, although they scream and shout that the poll tax should be removed by congressional legislation, pretty well indicate that the pressure groups do not want to do anything for anybody, but rather seek to get something to scream and shout about?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I will say, respecting some of them, that all they want to do is to agitate, and if they were not agitating about this matter they would be agitating about something else. I am talking particularly about the communistic elements. They cannot be pleased, they cannot be compromised with and settled with. Their purpose is to continue agitation. They want anything about which to agitate. They will get on one side or the other, it does not matter, so long as they think they can stir up disunity in the United States and provoke discord.

Mr. President, I wish to continue reading the statement made by me before the committee. I regret that more Republicans are not apprehensive about the possible effect the proposed action will have on them. But I want to emphasize the statements I made before the Rules and Administration Committee. I read further from my statement:

Contention is made with great emphasis that the present rule permits abuses. Abuses have occurred. I have witnessed some of them since I have been a Member of the Senate, in some instances by those who now clamor for a change.

But those abuses, Mr. Chairman, while they may have caused temporary delay and have served to inconvenience other Members of the Senate, their attainments and any harm that resulted as a consequence were infinitesimal in comparison to unwise and unsound legislation that would have been passed had the rule been different, if it had conformed to the changes now proposed.

Great stress is put on the argument for majority rule. Yes, Mr. Chairman, majority rule is a general rule applicable to all democratic governments. But, like all other general rules, its strength and virtues are emphasized by noted exceptions which are dictated by common fairness and justice.

The founders of this Republic, in their wisdom, recognized and provided for some exceptions to guard against the enforcement of the will of a mere temporary majority by requiring a two-thirds vote of the Members of both Houses to override a Presidential veto, thus establishing a check and balance that would better insure the enactment of wholesome legislation to promote the general welfare and protection of the people in the flouting of authority by an overenthusiastic or frustrated majority of their representatives in the Congress.

Why, then, Mr. Chairman, must this wise provision of the Senate rules now be tampered with? There is no compelling need for these proposed changes except to serve political ends.

If there were no civil-rights program pending, these resolutions, in my opinion, would never have appeared on the scene in this session of Congress.

Obviously, those who advocate the enactment of measures embraced in the so-called civil-rights program realize the deep and unshakable convictions in the minds and hearts of those of us in the Congress and millions of other Americans who oppose the enactment of those measures. In an effort to overcome this unyielding opposition, they are now willing to resort to this tactic and attempt a change in the long-established, well-tested, and able-serving rules of the Senate in the hope of gaining an advantage that will enable them to enforce their will upon the Nation.

I wish the Republicans could listen to this:

Is such a victory worth the price they seem willing to pay? Is this rule to be changed just to serve this purpose? Do not the sponsors of these proposals know that the temporary advantage they may gain on the civil-rights issue now before the Congress is a two-edged sword? Do they not know that the same weapons they now attempt to forge and use to pierce the heart of the finest traditions of American democracy will ever remain available as a weapon to be seized and used for their own destruction when the situation may be reversed and they are on the defensive and fighting for a cause about which they have equally as deep convictions as do those of us who now oppose this procedure and the measures that inspire it?

By this process, Mr. Chairman, by these proposed changes in the rules, the majority is fashioning a dangerous legislative instrumentality. Its powers of destruction and evil will not long be controlled by its creators and those who first will use it.

Yes, Mr. President, overrule precedents if Senators want to get the resolution before the Senate, but when we overrule the precedent we are discussing then we invite the overruling of the next one which does not please us, and, simply to serve any temporary expediency, we can soon destroy the integrity of all the Senate rules. Are we willing to pay such a price? A Senate rule ought to mean something. We train and practice to play under the rules of the game, to observe the rules, and we rely upon them being observed, and expect to observe them ourselves. It will be a dangerous thing, Mr. President, to make such a change in the Senate rule as is now proposed.

Once it is established and its forces set in motion—

I am talking about this weapon—

its use will not be confined nor limited to those who create it. It will then become an accepted form of warfare in legislative battle, and the know-how and use of it can, and will, be employed to every advantage it will serve, not only in the impending battle on civil-rights measures, but with equal force and destructiveness against those who are willing to change the rule as an expediency to gain this shallow victory.

These proposed changes will not insure against abuses in parliamentary procedures in the processes of legislation in the future. These changes will invite greater abuses in the enactment of unwise laws than has already occurred under the present rule.

The present rule has been used to prevent hasty action on measures about which there was deep feeling and strong division not only among the Members of the Senate but among great sections and segments of the American people.

The changes now proposed would place a far greater advantage in the hands of those who are more responsibe to pressure groups and political considerations.

Which is the safer course, to forego temporarily or for a season the enactment of some law or laws that are highly controversial, although they may be highly meritorious, until the people can become enlightened and convinced of their merit and are willing to accept it, or change the rule so that a mere majority can enforce the enactment of legislation at will and undertake to compel the American people to abide by what they may regard as an unjust imposition on them?

Which is the safe course for our Nation? Which course has most in principle and virtue to recommend it, in keeping with the finest traditions of our democracy? Which course will better safeguard and protect the liberties of our people?

My answer is to retain the present rule.

Mr. President, I digress at that point to say that the faith which I have in the American people, to which I have referred, has been exemplified by the reports of what the American people have done in the States where they have had an opportunity to vote on an FEPC law. All we are fighting for is to keep government next to the people themselves.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that if the American people had wanted the rules changed, or had thought that it would be wise to change them, they would have been changed long ago?

Mr. McCLELLAN. There is no doubt about it. The proposal to change them now is based upon political expediency, and nothing else.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield for another question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the rules have remained as they are, and free and unlimited debate has been retained in the Senate, because the people themselves recognized the wisdom of retaining free and unlimited debate, and have given their consent and approval to the retention of free and unlimited debate in the Senate?

Mr. McCLELLAN. During the last campaign I did not hear anyone say that any political party had a mandate to change the rules of the Senate. So far as I know, the people have never made any demand for a change in the rules of the Senate. The request for a change in the rules comes from the very elements which seem to me to be the least American and the least interested in the survival of America, of any class, group, or segment in our Nation.

Mr. President, no one enjoys a contest of the character of that now being waged in the United States Senate. When we undertake to do these things in the constitutional way, and bring about reforms constitutionally, I think the American people will make a more favorable response. As I said a few moments ago with respect to the amendment to the Federal Constitution regarding the poll tax, I believe that it is within the province of the people to delegate to the Federal Government the power to prohibit the poll tax. But I also believe that the American people have not yet done it. They did not do it in the Constitution, or in any amendment which has been made thereto.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. I ask the Senator if he does not believe that the American people and those of us who are opposing this legislation would be glad to follow and support the Constitution which we took an oath to support, not only with respect to the poll tax, but with respect to all other measures?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I agree with the Senator. I am sorry, but I cannot yield except for a question. I have not yielded except under the rulings of the Chair, for a question. I know that no Senator wants to violate the rule. I can well appreciate that sometimes in asking a question Senators wish to express their own views. However, I am sure that no Senator wishes to take advantage of the present rules or interfere with the determination to see that they are rigidly enforced during this debate.

Mr. President, I did not quite conclude reading my statement before the Committee on Rules and Administration. I continue:

I have an abiding faith in the wisdom and final judgment of the American people. They may be slow to accept change in the fundamental laws of our land.

They have been slow, Mr. President. In the history of this Nation we have not had very many amendments to the Constitution. They have been slow to change because they had something wonderful, the greatest document ever penned by the hand of man; and certainly they are going to be slow to change it. They ought to be. That is the only way we can have safety and security and protect our Government. Rapid changes, hastily conceived, hastily advised, hastily legislated, and hastily executed would destroy any freedom that any government ever instituted among men.

They may be slow to accept change in the fundamental laws of our land, but once they are enlightened and informed—

That is what debate is for—

they can be relied upon to make the right decision.

They may make mistakes because they have not been adequately informed. Some of them may be making a mistake in saying that they favor the civil-rights program; but if we are permitted to inform them, most of them will change their opinions.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that they have not made very many mistakes so far as fundamental changes are concerned?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I believe that is true. That is what I was speaking of. I said that the people were slow to make changes in the fundamental law of our land. We can make changes in statutes. We can repeal a statute in a few days if we do not like it, or a month or a year later. If after trial and test in the administration of it, and after gaining experience, we decide that we have made a mistake, we can change the statute and no serious harm is done. But if we propose a constitutional amendment, our people are slow to change, because a constitutional amendment cannot be repealed as easily or as quickly as can a statute.

Mr. President, some time ago in my remarks I started to discuss another phase of this question. I have found it very difficult to follow through with any particular line of thinking. Because of the keen interest in this issue there are many questions in the minds of Senators, and those questions, as they are asked, often lead us away from the line of thought which we had prepared for our remarks.

I made some references to parliamentary decisions, and expressed the hope that no action would be taken by the Chair, or by those contemplating filing a motion for cloture, until all Senators who wish to speak on this question have an opportunity to be heard. I think it would be unwise for such action to be taken until every Member of the Senate who wishes to speak twice on this issue, under the present Senate rule, has a chance to do so; but certainly every Senator should have an opportunity to speak at least once on it. When and if such a petition is filed and when and if a ruling in support of the petition is made, there should be sufficient time thereafter for every Senator who wishes to be present and vote on that question to have an opportunity to do so. Sometimes unavoidable circumstances prevent Senators from being present even on occasions when the Senate is voting on important issues. But the Senate can make it possible for most Senators who wish to be present and to vote on such issues to do so.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from California for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Arkansas, whether it is a fact that in the event that cloture is applied to the motion of the Senator from Illinois, that in itself would not cut off debate on the merits of Senate Resolution 15, but would merely move it up one additional step; and is it not also true that then Senate Resolution 15 would be subject to full debate?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Of course, the Senator from California knows that is possible under the rule; but the Senator also knows that under the rule, the minute the motion to have the Senate take up the resolution was adopted, it would be possible to file a cloture petition on the question of adoption of the resolution; and if cloture were then invoked, it would shut off debate on the resolution itself. Once the motion to take up the resolution was agreed to, and the resolution was before the Senate, certainly there would be a right to file a petition for cloture on the question of consideration of the resolution; it would not be necessary to wait as long as 30 minutes to file such a petition, once the resolution was taken up. Once the rule was thus changed for the sake of expediency, I do not know but that what I have just mentioned might occur, once the resolution itself was taken up. So far as I am concerned, I do not wish to take any chances of having that done.

Mr. President, parliamentary decisions which have become precedents in the United States Senate should not be brushed away lightly for a momentary expedient to accomplish any given result, however meritorious or desirable that objective may be. The word "measure" as used in rule XXII does not mean "motion." The present matter before the Senate is a motion to take up a resolution, which can be done by majority vote. Cloture lies only against "a pending 'measure' under" rule XXII of the Senate. Until the Senate agrees to take up a bill or resolution for consideration, it is not pending business. Under a correct interpretation of the present rule, cloture does not lie at any time—past, present, or future—against a "motion" to take up a

bill or a "motion" for any other purpose, until the present Senate rule shall have been changed. This has been recognized and accepted and confirmed repeatedly by parliamentary rulings by occupants of the Chair. Mr. President, if that were not the rule and the interpretation of it and the established usage of it, we would not now have before the Senate the motion to take up Resolution 15, and there would be no need for the resolution. The very existence of the resolution in the Senate is an acknowledgment that at present a cloture petition does not properly lie against a motion to take up a measure. That is why the attempt is made to have Resolution 15 considered.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield to the able Senator from Alabama for a question.

Mr. HILL. Has the Senator from Arkansas noted from the articles appearing in the press that some persons believe that the proponents of the resolution to change the rule might seek to invoke cloture not only against the motion to have the Senate proceed to the consideration of Resolution 15, which provides for changing rule XXII, but also on the resolution itself, at one and the same time?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is true; I understand that is being considered.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that unless and until the motion to proceed to consider the resolution to change the rule is adopted by majority vote, the resolution will still be on the calendar and will remain there?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Of course. It is not now pending. If it were pending, it would be the measure under consideration.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator from Arkansas know any way or earth to abide by the Senate rule and still invoke cloture on a resolution or a bill which remains on the calendar?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That has never been the interpretation of the present rule. I know of no way by which that can be done except by making the resolution the pending business, and that process has been undertaken. However, a cloture petition does not lie against a motion.

Let me say that if there is this much deep-rooted opposition to a measure, it certainly should not be taken up at a session of this sort, when so many important matters are waiting to be attended to, until such important business has been disposed of.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. I ask the Senator this question: Does not the fact that this proposal is made—and I refer to the double-barreled proposition of attempting to invoke cloture on a resolution still on the calendar—show how far the proponents of the proposed change in the rule would try to go in their efforts to bring about such a change in the rule?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is true, and that what makes me so apprehensive of this whole proposal and suggested procedure.

Mr. President, repeated parliamentary rulings have established, as a firm, fixed and unchallengeable precedent that rule XXII of the Senate, which now is in force, means exactly what it says, namely, that a cloture petition can be filed against a "measure," but not against a pending "motion," which "motion" is intended to determine the next course of procedure in this body.

The resolution which is the subject of the pending motion not only confirms but is within itself self-evident of this truth. Mr. President, I believe no one will challenge the statement I have just made as being a correct statement of the present rule of the United States Senate, insofar as it at present governs the processes and deliberations of this body.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. Did not the Senator from Arkansas just state that the change of the rule proposed by Senate Resolution 15 might very well lead to a further change of the rule?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I say that the pending motion, if rejected, will dispose of the resolution, for if the motion to consider the resolution is rejected, we shall not proceed to consider the resolution. On the other hand, if the motion to consider the resolution is agreed to, we shall then proceed to consider Resolution No. 15. In short, the fate of the motion will determine the next procedure in the Senate; either we shall reject the motion, and then shall proceed to act on some other matter, or we shall adopt the motion and then shall proceed to consider Senate Resolution 15.

Mr. MAYBANK. Let me ask the Senator whether in his judgment the adoption of the motion and the adoption of the resolution might lead to a further change of the rule?

Mr. McCLELLAN. It might very well do so, and that is what I am complaining about. I do not wish to see the rule changed. I do not wish to have the Senate vote to change it, and I do not wish to see the precedents which have governed the procedure in this body for so long a time be overruled.

The pending resolution not only confirms but is within itself self-evident of this truth. I believe no one will challenge the statement which I have just made as being the present law of the land so far as the rules of the Senate are concerned and insofar as they at present govern the processes and deliberations of this body.

Contention is made that the framers of the rule, that cloture could only apply to a measure, did not know what they were doing at the time, or intended something else. I am not prepared to question the integrity or intellect of those who framed this rule. Whether the rule is wise or unwise is not the issue. They used simple language that anyone can understand. Yes, more, they used language that even a layman, a wayfaring man, can understand. And no one need err therein. I dare assert that past rulings of eminent statesmen should be sustained. A reversal of established precedent will not only do violence to the integrity of the Senate itself, but it will go much further than that; it will shatter confidence in our legislative processes and will be a terrific, weakening blow to every safeguard to the liberty of the American people.

The significance of a ruling that would arbitrarily change the whole course of Senate procedure may be, and I readily concede it will be, a convenient expedient to serve those who seek to attain a specific objective, namely, the enactment of the so-called civil-rights program. If such ruling is made, it may well gain that immediate objective. It may be the simple but dangerous instrumentality needed for the moment that will be productive of presently satisfactory results. But what we do, or what is done about this, is not of temporary duration. If it would only accomplish what is presently intended, the forging of such a weapon ultimately might be excused and forgiven. But the weapon that will be fashioned by such procedure is one that will neither rust nor decay. Its effective striking power will remain for future occasions. Those who have created it for use in this battle, perhaps for a decisive victory, will not long retain control of it. They construct it, use it, and control it for today; but for today only. Tomorrow it will be in the hands of someone else; or, if not tomorrow, it will some day be in the hands of the adversaries of those who would now fight with it.

Mr. President, when the situation is reversed there will be "weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth." While it is all right to be contrite in spirit, and is certainly commendable to beg forgiveness, yet when mankind comes to the point of "weeping, wailing, and gnashing of teeth,' according to the Scriptures, as I read them, it is "too little and too late."

What we do on this issue is not temporary. We cannot escape history. History is going to be written about this battle in the United States Senate, and history is going to record—and subsequent events are going to reveal that which history will record—if our opponents win this fight by relaxing the rules of the Senate, whether that victory served the welfare of America or whether it became one more blow to the liberty of the American people. The destiny of America will be influenced to some degree, either great or small; but, in my judgment, greater than we think, if an adverse decision is made.

I may say to those of the opposition, you may shatter precedents and bask in all of the glory of a victory gained because you have the immediate physical power to achieve it. But victory thus gained will have a way of turning sour. Such victories can very well consume those who resort to the use of such weapons, and the glory so gained, is a glory of the moment but a glory that will evaporate and be gone with the wind

except to leave a stain on the pages of history. Yes, Mr. President, I should hate to see a ruling like that made.

Our founding fathers in forming our Republic, a union of the several States, were confronted with a dilemma. They wanted a Republic, but they did not want to create a government that was or could be autocratic. It was their purpose to form a union, a federation of the several States, primarily for the purpose of security and defense; but they also intended to keep the sovereignty of the States and the liberty of the individual citizen inviolate, hence the tenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States. The framers of our Constitution made certain in unequivocal terms that the Federal Government was to be a Government of delegated powers only, and not a Government of absolutism, a Government with authority only to exercise specific powers granted to it by the sovereign States and the people themselves. Powers not delegated were expressly reserved. Within that structure of Government the greatest liberty to the individual citizen has been assured and preserved.

Mr. President, I challenge any Member of the Senate to rise and give convincing argument that anywhere in the Constitution any of the three civil rights proposals is expressly the result of delegated power by the people or by the States to the Federal Government. It cannot even be read into the civil-rights program. It can be stretched, twisted, and distorted, but in the end, it does not fit.

So, Mr. President, our forefathers did not intend that action should be taken in this way. They intended, as I said before, that if the Federal Government did not want the States to fix the qualifications of voters, as the power was reserved to the States in the Constitution which was adopted, then the only way the Federal Government could get a change would be to carry out and follow the processes and provisions of the Constitution authorizing amendments to that document. The framers of our Constitution made certain, in unequivocal terms, that the Federal Government was to be a government of delegated powers only, and that the powers not delegated were reserved.

Within that structure of government the greatest liberty of the individual citizen has been assured and preserved in America up to this time. Are we to cut loose from that anchorage? Are we to set sail without guide, without course, and without controls?

Books have been written, and many more could be written, on the majesty and dignity of man under the American system of government. Books have been written, and countless volumes could yet be written, depicting the rapid growth and development of America, and undertaking to tell why we have eclipsed the growth and power of every other government and nation or empire that ever existed. But, Mr. President, whatever may have been written and what could yet be said about it, liberty of the individual has been the most potent factor of all. And associated with liberty—and it cannot be disassociated from it—is some place, some forum, where the citizens, through his chosen representatives, can have freedom of speech, unlimited expression. Mr. President, there is today under the present rules of the United States Senate that one forum in existence. But only one, Mr. President. There is no other such forum in the world.

This body has been able to operate and function under the most liberal rules with respect to debate and with respect to speech and expression that the world has ever known. We built this great America under this system. Why is it necessary to change? There is today, under the present rules of the Senate, this one forum. If we change the rules and begin reducing and restricting that freedom which we now enjoy, we are simply, to the same degree, reducing the liberty and freedom of expression and the opportunity of expression of the American people whose representatives we are.

Mr. President, why do we have a United States Senate? What function as a safeguard, as a check and balance, was it intended to perform? Our forefathers, as the Constitution clearly directs, intended that Members of the House of Representatives should be close to the people and, therefore, provided that every Member of the House of Representatives should be elected every 2 years. If, Mr. President, it had been intended or if it were wise that legislation should conform to and carry out the immediate will of a temporary majority or the momentary popular sentiment of the people of this Government, there would have been no necessity in the world for creating this body, the United States Senate.

We hear a great deal about majority rule by representatives of the people. There was never any necessity for creating the United States Senate if whenever the will of the majority was ascertained it should immediately become the law of the land, irrespective of further deliberation and checking to make certain it was right, wise, safe, and sound.

I feel so deeply regarding the question, Mr. President, that I do not think any Senator who opposes the proposed change and who opposes the proposed civil-rights legislation ought to quit fighting this effort to impose such legislation upon the people of the Nation so long as he has the strength to fight. Of course, others have a right to think otherwise, but I reserve the right, so long as I have rights under the rules of the Senate, and have sufficient physical strength to do so, to speak out against this awful thing which is proposed to be done.

Mr. President, what is the United States Senate? The founding fathers intended that it should serve the very purposes which it has served throughout the Nation's existence. It was at first presumed that practically all legislation would originate in the House of Representatives, in which the membership was fresh from the people, and in which the Members were elected every 2 years, and that this body would be more of a supervisory, examining, and deliberative body to smooth out proposed laws and bring them within the Constitution, or reject them if they were unconstitutional.

It was intended to serve as a check against ill-advised legislation and not necessarily to jump through the hoop every time someone thought he had a majority on his side of an issue.

Our forefathers intended that the Senate should be a deliberative body. While the Senate was not restrained from initiating legislation, it certainly was the idea of those who founded this Government that most legislation would originate in the House of Representatives, whose Members were fresh from the ranks, the emotions, the reactions, the sentiments, of the people themselves. But our forefathers recognized that majorities are sometimes wrong.

Oh, yes, Mr. President, the Senate was created so that there might be a check and a balance and deliberation until the people could become better informed and have an opportunity themselves to reexamine the vital issues of the day, and then, after doing so, could reelect their Members to the House of Representatives the next year, or they could reject a Member and elect another if he did not favor a particular issue.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to ask the Senator whether after the Philadelphia Convention the small States were not the first to ratify the Constitution and go along with the Government.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is true. The Senate was created also to give protection to the smaller States, the minority groups in political subdivisions. The House was constituted on the basis of population. The representation of each State in the House is determined by population, but in the Senate the smallest State has as much force and as many votes as do the largest States in the Union. How those from small States with small populations could begin now to whittle away the protection they have here for their people I cannot understand.

Mr. President, we are probably more often wrong than our forefathers thought we would be. They were pretty farseeing, but probably did not contemplate that in the twentieth century, when the tempo of ingenuity and events is carrying us at a rapid pace, we might be prone, under pressures of expediency within and pressures of diabolical intent from abroad, to surrender to that which appears necessary for the moment to gain the immediate result desired. An immediate victory perhaps can be gained, but it would be a victory of expediency constructed on sinking sands.

I wish to call attention to the proposed change in rule in connection with the question how some may expect it to operate. Some say the present rule may have been somewhat abused, and they will change the rule so as to stop up loopholes, as they are called.

What Senators call loopholes are actually further protection to minorities.

I call particularly to the attention of the Republican Members of the Senate, to whom I now wish to refer, that if they think they can change these rules and not have Democratic majorities take full advantage of them, they are mistaken. I think they have every evidence they need of that. They should know by now what gag rule is and what it can do to them.

Some of them are very much interested in legislation which is pending before one of the committees of this body, and they remember when that legislation was first referred to that committee by the Presiding Officer. I am referring to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. They remember a measure of vital importance, in which there was great interest, not only on their part, but throughout the Nation. They remember the majority first undertook, without even holding hearings, to report that vital measure, which would have repealed a very important law passed during the last Congress. I think that was also true with reference to some other legislation. But Senators will remember they had to have a battle to get hearings on the bill, and after public hearings they had to have a battle with the majority to keep them from closing the hearings before they could have reasonable opportunity to be heard, or to have witnesses they desired to be heard brought before the committee. Finally, after the hearings were concluded, and the committee undertook to write up the bill, the gag was applied to the Republican members. Important as that bill is, and controversial as it is, the majority would not even give the Republican members the opportunity to present an amendment and have the committee vote on it. There was gag rule. Is the minority going to support it? Do they want some more of the same medicine? How consistent can they be, or how inconsistent will they be. I do not see how they can support it. They can expect a lot more treatment like that, if that is what they want. But they do not protect their people. Mr. President, you and I know that much time was lost by not trying to work out the bill in the committee.

I am persuaded that the pending motion is not the only measure which will come up in this body during this session which will cause some pretty long debate. But this is a sample of how a majority, where there are no rules to protect the minority, can operate. Think about it. If that is the kind of gag rule the minority likes, let them begin voting to change the rules of the Senate.

I am not going to have time to read a letter which was sent to me, an open letter addressed to the Members of the United States Senate, but I do wish to read the cover letter which I received from the lady who wrote this letter, which I have had mimeographed and placed on the desk of every Senator in order that my colleagues may have the opportunity—and I hope they will exercise the privilege—of reading this letter signed by an American mother from the South. I received the covering letter, which is dated March 4. I believe the letter enclosed with it, which is an open letter to all Senators, is also dated March 4.

This letter impressed me. As I have said, I shall not have time, possibly, to read the letter tonight, but I have made it available to every Senator. I do, however, wish to read excerpts from the covering letter which the lady wrote, which was addressed to me personally, and with which she enclosed the letter I have made available to all my colleagues. The letter is dated, as I said, March 4, 1949, and is from an address in Tennessee. The letter, which is addressed to me, is as follows:

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: From the bottom of our hearts—

And, Mr. President, as I read this letter it will explain why I had the other letter mimeographed and made available to all Senators:

From the bottom of our hearts, the mothers in the South are grateful to you and each and every one in the Senate who is trying to uphold the right to freely speak and to filibuster. We lived in Marianna, Ark., 4 years before coming to Tennessee. * * *

Women in the North are becoming very powerful in political life, as can be seen from all the legislation they are sponsoring and trying to get women all over the country to sponsor in federated clubs, American Association of University Women, and even in church societies. In the South we are too prone to leave all the disagreeable tasks to the men, and take for granted things will work out all right.

I am not at all sure what the procedure is in getting a letter read on the floor or getting one on each Senator's desk. The enclosed article comes straight from the heart, and expresses the sentiments of thousands of us who have in the past been inarticulate. I did not know if it were possible, should I get it mimeographed, to have one placed on each Senator's desk and also have the southern Senator holding the floor in the filibuster also read it, or just how it could be handled. I am sending it to you to do with as you think best, as I see you will have the floor tomorrow. If it would do any good to have a copy given each Senator I would gladly pay such expenses.

Mr. President, I wish I could assure the lady that some good will come of her letter. I hope that it will touch the hearts of Senators, and cause them to think well before they vote to change the rule.

I quote further from her letter:

It has been hard for us, in the South, to get rid of the old thought that only "cranks" write to their Congressmen, and I do not want you splendid men to feel you are alone in your fight for our rights and liberties. The thoughts and prayers of thousands of women back home are with you and being said for you.

I have signed the letter as I did—

She is referring there to the letter which I have made available to each Member of the Senate—

I have signed the letter as I did—

And listen to this, as an indication of what people are thinking—

because it seems that anyone who opposes Mr. Truman in his platform is abused unmercifully and I don't want any member of my family to suffer because I believe as I do that all Americans should support a cause that he thinks is right. My son is a Reserve officer in the Air Corps, and I should hate for him to later be penalized because I have taken part in supporting something the present administration is against. After all such tactics were in line with the gestapo and the Moscow regime, and seem wholly un-American to me, but Mr. Truman is in the driver's seat and seems to consider himself a dictator, rather than a servant to the people.

One of my father's great-great, etc., grandparents was a brigadier general in the Revolutionary War, and a member of the family has been in every war fought for freedom since, with the exception of the Spanish War when there was no man of fighting age. There are two small sons who will be in line for the next war that seems in the making, and I truly believe our lawmakers should be spending their time unifying the Nation and the peace-loving democracies, rather than causing strife and discord among our own people.

God bless you all. May the filibuster stay, the FEPC die its rightful death and President Truman become the President of all the people, and not just those who think as he does.

Mr. President, when I shall have concluded my remarks I shall hope to receive unanimous consent then to have the letter which I have made available, which the lady was anxious to have made available to every Senator, placed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator make any request now, or is he giving notice that he will make it?

Mr. MCCLELLAN. I am giving notice, Mr. President, that I expect to make the request. I should like the letter to appear after I have finished my remarks, and not right in the midst of them, if I may.

I had in mind to discuss quite at length each one of the bills. But I shall not discuss them as fully as I had hoped to do. But I want to take a little while on the three bills. I do not know how long the leadership intends to hold the session tonight. If it is a rule that we are going to stay until 9 o'clock, I think I am prepared to stay, but of course if Senators think they have heard as much as they want to hear tonight, and if the leadership feels that way, we might quit a little earlier, but if not, Mr. President—and of course I cannot conclude, as I said—I shall have to speak again, if I receive that opportunity. But I want to talk now briefly about the three bills.

Mr. President, in the course of the debate today I have stated that the three bills now pending do not represent all there is in the civil-rights program. They are all the legislation which has been introduced so far in the Congress, but that is by no means all that is required to satisfy those who are agitating for so-called civil-rights laws. I stated earlier that many of those who are advocating these laws, and who are applying very serious pressure to try to get them, would not be satisfied with the enactment of the anti-poll-tax law, the antilynching law, and the FEPC. They will not be satisfied until they get the Negroes of this country into every swimming pool, every hotel, every place of entertainment, every church, every society, every club, and everywhere else where white people may assemble. That is what is behind the effort. That is the ultimate goal. If these three bills were

passed now, that would not end this controversy. The proponents of civil-rights legislation wish to go a great deal further.

Mr. President, that is something that a great many people in America are very sensitive about. We do not want such a condition to be forced on us by law. If such a condition ever occurs—and I doubt that it should ever occur in America—it ought to come through the processes of education and evolution, and not by a force act, as those who advocate that relationship between the races now propose. These proposals are in the nature of force acts.

It is not necessary to dwell long on the anti-poll-tax measure, because it is of little consequence. I think there are only seven States which have the poll tax. Some of them, and possibly all of them, are now in the process of making arrangements to eliminate the poll tax. I predict that before we could get an anti-poll-tax law enacted in the Federal Congress, there might not be anything against which to enact the law. Regardless of how rapidly or slowly changes come in the States, it is their right to make the changes. I hope that by the time we get through with this fight it will have been lost because it will be found impossible to force an unconstitutional measure like this through the Congress.

The poll tax has been greatly exaggerated by many. For example, my State has a poll tax. It is only a dollar. Every penny of it goes into the common school fund. In my judgment any sorry son-of-a-gun in America who is not willing to pay a dollar to educate our children does not possess such attributes of citizenship as to entitle him to vote, in the first place. We cannot get very good government from people who would complain about paying a dollar to help educate the youth of the land.

A great deal of racket is raised over the poll tax. It has been said that it prevents many persons from voting. In my State 450,000 poll taxes were paid this year. How many do Senators suppose voted for President? Only a little more than half the number who paid poll taxes voted for President of the United States. So it was not the poll tax which kept them from voting. Two hundred thousand of them had poll-tax receipts in Arkansas, but did not vote. Some other reason will have to be found.

Of course, these arguments have been made many times. I do not care to dwell too long on the poll-tax measure. Whether it is right or wrong, the States are changing it. They are instituting a registration system. That is what is occurring in my State. I do not know how soon it will be inaugurated, but the people have already acted on it and authorized the legislature to establish a registration system. I am not sure that the bill has passed, but it will probably be passed at the present session of the legislature. So that question is of no great importance. We do not care very much about a poll tax. That is not the violence represented in these proposals, although it is unconstitutional. But if we start voting for and passing laws which we know are unconstitutional, they will operate just as the gag system operates. We shall continue to be gagged.

Mr. President, we took an oath to support the Constitution. I respect any Member of this body who, having taken such an oath, votes against a measure when he conscientiously believes and has a conviction that it is unconstitutional, whether he believes in the objectives of it or not. If he believes that the means of seeking to gain the objective are unconstitutional, he has my admiration if he adheres to his conviction and votes against the measure.

So far as the poll tax is concerned, it is overexaggerated. It is not a problem. I would not lose a minute's sleep if the poll tax were repealed in my State. I have always said that I did not care what was done about it. Every time the issue has been raised in my State, I have stated that I would just as soon run for office with a poll tax as without one. It makes no difference to me. When I go out to campaign, I am talking to my own people. If I cannot be elected with the poll tax in existence, I probably could not be elected without it.

We are using every penny of the money to support the schools. We need plenty of revenue to try to support the schools. I do not believe that this particular issue is all-important. Frankly, as I stated a while ago, I believe that any citizen who is so sorry that he would not be willing to contribute a dollar to help educate the children of the community possesses a doubtful quality of citizenship on which to base his right to vote. After all, the States can set the qualifications under the Constitution. They have set them, and when they set them, I think they have a right to set them.

Mr. President, I wish to pass to the next measure, the antilynching bill. From the time this measure was first introduced, it has been considerably watered down. The present bill does not go nearly so far as did some of the bills introduced many years ago, when the antilynching proposal may have been more popular. I do not know whether it was more popular or not, but it was far more justified then than it is now, if it ever was justified, because there were then a few lynchings to complain about.

If we had not had unlimited debate in the United States Senate, an antilynching bill would have passed and become a law which would penalize the taxpayers of a county by requiring them to be taxed and assessed to pay damages whenever a lynching occurred. Of course, Mr. President, that matter is not covered by the motion and the resolution we are discussing; but if the principle of the proposed antilynching bill is to be established by law so far as lynchings are concerned, it should be applied to all other crimes. If that were done, every murder or other heinous crime would be covered by the law, and then why could it not be assumed that the occurrence of the murder or other crime was the fault of the officers, in not enforcing the law? Certainly if the sauce is good for the goose, it should be good for the gander. It may be said, "That fault has been eliminated, so why talk about it?" I am simply showing how the same principle might apply in other cases.

But, Mr. President, why is there all this hubbub about the antilynching bill? Of course, lynching is a form of murder, perhaps in an aggravated form in that it is committed by a mob. Nevertheless, when a man is lynched, he is just as dead as if he had been murdered, and life was just as sweet to him as it is to any other man.

Last year there was only one lynching in the United States, but now we are asked to take all this time in the Senate because of the attempt to have the Senate pass an antilynching bill. Of course, such a bill is unconstitutional. If the Federal Government can pass a law to prevent one lynching, the same Government can pass a law to take jurisdiction over every murder in the country, and should do so. After all, why should there be discrimination so far as murders are concerned? We hear a great deal of talk about discrimination, and some persons say they are trying to prevent discrimination. But the antilynching bill is the rankest and most contemptible discriminatory bill ever to be introduced in the Congress. It singles out only one crime, but absolutely ignores all other crimes of comparable heinousness. Under the provisions of that bill, so far as the Federal Government is concerned, a murder could be committed and the Federal Government would owe nothing to the heirs of the murdered citizen of the United States if a gangster committed the crime. On the other hand, if down South a Negro raped a white man's daughter, and the Negro was lynched, then, under the proposed antilynching law, the Federal Government would owe something to the family of the Negro.

Mr. President, let Senators consider the reports in the daily newspapers. The Negro race has made marvelous progress, but the Congress cannot legislate culture or morals or civilization or progress in the case of any race.

Let me state what this propaganda is doing. The South is not paying for it, but the other sections of the Nation are paying for it. We, in the South, are not having any additional trouble; in fact, we are having less than ever before. But the other sections of the country are paying for this propaganda, for in many cases it is inciting the basest and most bestial instincts ever manifested.

I assume that most Members of the Senate read yesterday's newspapers. I do not wish to refer to the crime referred to there, or to take the time of the Senate by doing so. I merely point out that while last year there was only one lynching in the South, those who are responsible for the proposed antilynching bill would not have it apply to other forms of murder.

I do not know how many murders were committed in the United States last year, but there were 8,444 in 1946. I understand that there have been more than that in the years since then. In 1946 there were six lynchings. The number of lynchings is decreasing without the benefit of any Federal law, but the murder rate is rising. I do not have the exact figures for the murders committed

in 1947 and 1948, but they are on the increase.

In the same year, 1946, when there were 8,444 murders in the United States and only 6 lynchings, there were 12,117 cases of rape in the United States. Then Mr. President, where is the sincerity back of this proposal? Where is the great interest in humanitarian civil rights? When has the right to protect and preserve the virtue of womanhood ceased to be a human right and a civil right? However, no attempt is being made to have the Federal Government protect the womanhood of America; there is no demand to have such a provision included in the antilynching bill. If such a provision were made a part of it, those who now favor the antilynching bill would not vote for it. Why would they not vote for it? Because in that case the pressure groups would cease their pressure for the enactment of the bill.

The proposed antilynching bill discriminates, because if it were enacted the Federal Government would take over the job of protecting only one phase of human rights. However, if that step were taken, the Government should also undertake to protect the people of the Nation against the commission of all the most heinous crimes, and provision to that effect should be placed in the bill.

Since when has virtue not been sacred and worthy of protection? Some persons prize virtue higher than life itself. Men have died and have given their lives to defend the womanhood of their community and of their families. Yet the agitators for the proposed antilynching law—which would violate the Constitution, and is being proposed simply and solely to add insult to injury upon the section of our Nation which had the Negro imposed on its people in the first place by the profiteers of the North—would not have to live with the problem they would thus create, but we in the South would have to live with it.

Mr. President, I can vouch for practically everything that was said with respect to the relationship of the races by the good lady who wrote the letter which has been referred to. The races are getting along well. There may be some discrimination. There is discrimination with respect to social equality, and there always will be in the hearts of true southerners. But, so far as education is concerned, we are making progress.

Let me remind the Senate that if we have not been able to do all we should have done for the Negro in the South, we have not been able to do all we needed to do for ourselves. After all, the South was a war-torn region, and we were not given much opportunity to make an economic comeback. We have been under economic disadvantages ever since the Civil War. Because of freight rates and many other things, our economic recovery has been tremendously handicapped. Yet, Mr. President, today we are being taxed—by our own acceptance, of course; through their representatives in the Congress, the people of the South are being taxed—to rehabilitate the people of foreign countries and to try to restore their economy and relieve the suffering of those our people have never seen.

After the Civil War the South received no help. There was no ECA; there was no relief program for the South. Instead there was imposed upon the people of the South a carpetbag rule that should never have occurred. It is a blot upon the history of the Nation. We of the South know our problem. Others are learning it, and are going to learn more about it. There are those who keep agitating the race issue. The more they meddle with it, the more it is agitated. The race problem is magnified. There is not so much of a race problem in America as some may think. If those who meddle with it were to stop talking about it and quit agitating it, it would be found to be practically no problem at all. But the agitators keep telling the Negroes they ought to have certain rights and ought to do certain things. The more ideas of that kind are spread, the more news stories there will be such as the one recently in the newspapers.

We of the South know the Negroes. We get along well with them. No relationships can be perfect. It would be better if the problem were left to us and if others would quit meddling with it. I am misleading no one. The problem should be left to those of us who have lived with it and know how to handle it. There are organizations in the metropolitan cities that keep howling for Congress to do something about racial problems. I invite a comparison between such metropolitan areas and the South with respect to the number of heinous crimes committed relative to population. Those who agitate the question are inviting an increase in crime. I realize Senators have heard arguments like this before. It is not pleasant for me to stand here and endeavor to plead with Senators. If I did not believe they needed to know the truth of what I am saying, and if I did not think I knew what I was talking about; further, if I did not think there was some hope of getting the opposition to realize what they are doing before it is too late, I do not know that I would expend the effort, except for the consciousness I have that it is my duty to oppose unconstitutional laws and measures which I think would be detrimental to my country. But if the Congress, and if the majority and minority leadership, were to announce the abandonment or repudiation of the civil rights clap-trap and proceed in an effort to protect the economy of our country, the free-enterprise system that made America great, and endeavor to find a way of establishing peace in the world, enabling us to devote our minds, our wisdom, and our energy to things that are worth while, instead of to things that are destructive, we should be proceeding along the right path. The proposed program is destructive; it is productive of disunity, and it is causing an increase in crime.

It is said that what is proposed is in the interest of protecting human life. An antilynching bill is to be sought in the interest of protecting human life. I say that for every lynching such a bill would prevent, a dozen murders would result. If the message is sent across the land, "The Federal Government has enacted an antilynching bill; it will be down here to protect you," an idea will be put into the minds of some who now do not dare think of it. Is that what Senators want?

The fruits of such unwisdom are beginning to be seen in the North. That will not be the case in the South. The best thing on earth that could happen to America with respect to the proposed program would be to drop it. It is unfortunate that both political parties, as a sop to voters, endorsed it. It is tragic, to those of us in the South who know how vile it is, and what the penalty will be in exactions upon the harmonious relationship of the races, if the program is enacted. The best thing that could happen would be for both parties to repudiate the whole thing and for the Senate figuratively speaking to kick the whole program into hades and proceed with its legitimate business.

Earlier in my remarks I pointed out the danger to America of the spread of communism throughout the world. I pointed out that that was the real danger to America, not the matter of race relations. There is no danger from that. The relations between the races are improving all the time, but can only be worsened by a program of this sort. My advice is to let the matter alone.

Mr. President, I want to take only a few moments on the FEPC bill. Senators know pretty well what it is designed to do. I have said, and I repeat, these bills are not the end of the program. There are those who would not be satisfied even though all three of the civil-rights bills were enacted. Enactment of the FEPC, if it ever attempted to break down the segregation laws of the country, would be a greater step toward incitement to crime in America than anything else the Congress could do. That is FEPC. I do not know who conceived the idea, but it is not an American concept.

A little earlier today in answer to questions by my colleagues, I endeavored to point out that wherever property rights do not exist and are not respected and recognized by Government, human rights and human liberty do not exist. Is there any government on the face of the earth that recognizes human liberty and freedom and the individual liberty, majesty and dignity of man, that does not also recognize property rights? The right to own property, to create property, to possess and enjoy property, cannot be disassociated from the liberty of the individual. Take that right away from a man and you take away from him the right and the liberty to pursue happiness.

What does the FEPC bill propose to do? Fundamentally it proposes to say to those who own property and who operate a business, "No matter what your pleasure is, no matter what is required to make you happy in your business in operating it as you desire, you cannot do certain things with respect to your own personal comfort and pleasure."

It attempts to say that if one of another race or of another creed, color, or ancestry, applies for a job, the owner of the job—and I say that jobs are property—cannot discriminate by selecting an employee of the race, the color, or the religion he wants.

When did it come to pass in America, Mr. President, that he who creates property, who creates a job in his own right and on his own initiative, with his own capital, his own investment, his own ingenuity, cannot control the situation with reference to whom he will permit to share the benefits, the advantages, and the rewards of the labor involved? It is totalitarianism when the Government can tell the man who creates a thing that he cannot own it or cannot have it except under Government control. If he writes a song or a book, if he creates an invention of usefulness, his Government says that he can get his right protected by copyright or by patent, and no one but him can use it. It is a product of his labor, and he is protected. But now we are asked to break down that structure. The man who creates a job no longer has any protection.

What will happen if FEPC legislation is passed? Thousands of snoopers will be employed. We will tolerate a number of voluntary snoopers who will go around and see if they cannot find some one who has created a job and decided he wanted to employ white people. Then he will be taken somewhere for a hearing, or taken to court, and a cease-and-desist order will be issued against him. The bill provides for establishing I do not know how many commissions and committees. It would establish committees in each community. There will be a great many persons trying to run everyone's business. How much will it cost? I do not know, but if the law is enforced it will cost a great deal of money.

Mr. President, I again emphasize, as I did earlier in my remarks this afternoon, the fact that we had better be appropriating money for devising some means of getting Communist spies out of the Government of the United States, and out of the country. American business people take care of themselves. I do not know anyone who cannot make a living if he wants to work. I do not know anyone who is discriminated against or prevented from going into any kind of business he wants to enter.

I do not want a law which would compel some member of the black race to employ me, certainly not in any confidential or close relationship. It is his right to deny me any job he creates, and I have no right to call on the Federal Government to enact such a totalitarian law, so that a little bureaucrat in Washington, who does not know anything about local conditions, and who cares less, can decide for me whom I can employ and whom I cannot employ. If there were much sincerity about this, many Senators would practice what they preach. I have not seen many persons of another color in Senators' offices. There may be some.

Mr. President, if I were advocating this bill, if I were advocating the enactment of an FEPC bill such as the one proposed, I do not believe I could face a fourth of the population of my State and say, "Although I preach it I do not practice it." Those things have a great deal of weight with me. I simply believe that if it is good under legislation, it is good before legislation is enacted. Those who advocate the legislation ought to manifest their good faith and their purpose by setting an example of how they think it should work.

Mr. President, I do not know whether it is the purpose of the leadership to continue this evening. I have much more that I wanted to discuss and place in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent at this point that the letter which I placed on the desk and made available to each Senator be placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 4, 1949.

DEAR SENATORS: The women of the South, mothers, wives, and daughters of real men, who have fought and died to make this Nation great, are proud of the men, who again are risking their health and lives to preserve the Constitution of the United States, which you, as Senators should also revere. Neither bribery from corrupt politicians nor pressure groups can tempt them to give up their fight, and if you men, supported by the taxpayers of this great Nation, were real men, there would need to be no filibuster to prevent passage of so un-American a bill as the so-called FEPC. The Constitution guarantees to each State the right to levy taxes and make laws necessary for the well-being of its citizens. There is no excuse for the Federal Government attempting to make blanket laws, regulating the lives of all citizens, without respect to the needs of all those citizens. More descendants, counted on a percentage basis of the voting population, of the original founding fathers of this great Nation live below the Mason and Dixon's line than in any section of the Nation. For this reason, we are willing to stand abuse and privations in order to preserve for posterity the freedom of the individual, guaranteed us under the great document the Bill of Rights.

In times so grave as now, you men owe it to the Nation and to the world, to show your power of leadership by working on bills to stop communism in the United States and the world, to help unite the Western Powers for world peace, rather than try to put over on the country a piece of legislation such as the FEPC, which is nothing but tragic discrimination against the whites who have fed, clothed, and nursed the Negroes, when those same southern white people had lost all they owned because of them and hardly had enough to eat themselves. Why didn't the Negroes flock north following the Civil War, when the Federal Government was passing all sorts of discriminatory laws against the South? Care packages, lend-lease, money to rebuild schools, churches and homes destroyed by northern troops in the South were conspicuous by their absence in those days. Even just debts and justified claims of the South were refused payment under section 4 of the XIV amendment to the Constitution, forbidding the payment of the Confederate debt. One reason the Negroes didn't go north was that some of their loving northern brethren, such as Abraham Lincoln, had made it impossible for them to do so. While a member of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, Abraham Lincoln presented a bill preventing Negroes settling in that State.

However, since they have been treated as a political football ever since the northerners collected their money for these human beings they had brought over from Africa, there is little use in appealing to you on political grounds. Had the North never brought slaves and unloaded them on the Southern people, our section would have developed more rapidly. Our mechanized farming would be on a par with that in the Wheat and Corn Belts, had we not known the Negroes had to be housed, fed, doctored, and educated, no matter how little returns we received, or how little material wealth we started with after the disastrous Civil War. The education of our white children would be on a much more equal basis had we not had, again, this problem of education of the Negroes. We are steadily improving our schools for both races, and if the Federal Government will stop trying to stir up ill-feeling between the two races we will work out all these problems. But here again, most of you are not interested in our economics or educational problems.

Our final appeal is as human beings, and wives and mothers, who are entitled to just as much consideration as you would wish given your own wives and mothers. I received my degree from a northern university, and most of my married life was spent in New York, Detroit, and Baltimore. I know how totally ignorant most of you are of the real problems of southerners who live in communities where the Negroes outnumber us 3 to 1, and in some sections 10 to 1. These are not the clean, ambitious, self-sufficient colored people with whom you are sometimes thrown into contact. These are the indolent, happy-go-lucky people who believe in hoodoo, swap wives or women at will, don't enjoy a church meeting or social gathering unless there is bootleg whisky and a knifing scrape or two. They live in better houses than the log cabins and houses of our white forefathers and have greater facilities for keeping clean, but they go to our health clinics and won't follow the simplest instructions as to health habits and cleanliness. They won't save their money, as they love new clothes, cars, and liquor too well, so when a doctor is needed the white man for whom they work guarantees the bill, whether or not he is ever reimbursed. They work as little as they can, and only go to the cities when they hear of big unemployment checks; for how they love unemployment.

For 3 years I have lived in the country, and northern friends who have visited us cannot understand why I am not terrified to live where I am the only white woman in a radius of 5 miles, with hundreds of Negroes around me. They are our friends, and know we are the best friends they have ever had, but if you men don't wake up and realize what you are doing by all your pointless agitation I don't know how long they will remain friendly. They all have their radios, and hear the biased reports on civil rights. You wouldn't let your little children attend school with these children, drink from the same drinking fountains, and have three out of every five teachers colored. Education in the South will be retarded 50 years or more if nonsegregation is put in schools. Because of interbreeding many of the children are not very bright, yet there would be 10 Negro children to each white child, and of course many of the white children are from rather poorly educated homes, so children from homes such as yours or mine would, of necessity, have to be kept back or neglected in school while those others caught up.

These colored children have very low morals, as a large percentage are illegitimate children of very young unmarried colored girls, and for that reason alone, nonsegregation in such sections would be a tragedy. Perhaps, you think we should send our children to private schools. May I tell you that Southern farmers' incomes would hardly cover that, with high taxes, paying about twice as much for everything we buy, because labor costs have increased so tremendously since the New Deal sold out to unions. Of course, there is the other alternative of selling out, and starting over where we could live in a Northern city in a section where there are no Negroes. That seems rather hard on a disabled veteran of World War I, and our son, a pilot for 3 years in World War II, and a daughter and two other small sons, but it might be possible. It would be absolutely impossible for thousands of less fortunate white families

who have struggled to build up from nothing, their grandparents having lived in abject poverty as a result of the Civil War and World War I.

You are probably working for votes, but we are pleading for our very lives, for a chance to live in peace with a race that through the greed of Northern white men were brought to this section and resulted in one tragic war. They are free to go to other States, if our individual State laws do not please them. Why take away again the freedom of the white man in those States where the white man has borne the burden of the colored race all these years, and at a time when together, we are making progress in health, education, and all ways of life? In the name of all Southern womanhood, of mothers of veterans of past wars, and those wars that may result from your wasting time in causing disunity when we need unity, here and abroad, I plead with you to leave to each State those rights of local self-government as guaranteed to them, and get on with legislation that rightfully belongs to you, and is so needed to make the world safe for our generation, and for generations to come.

AN AMERICAN MOTHER FROM THE SOUTH.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, since I cannot finish tonight, and since tomorrow I am compelled to leave and cannot be present for the next few days, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate for the next 3 days, or until next Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission is granted.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I express the hope that during the time I am compelled to be absent from the Senate there will be no vote on the pending motion, and I hope there will not be any cloture petition filed or a vote taken on any action which may result from such cloture petition, because I want to be present to vote on the question.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Reports of committees are in order. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

SECRETARY, TERRITORY OF ALASKA

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Llewellyn M. Williams to be Secretary of the Territory of Alaska.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and, without objection, the President will be advised of the confirmation at once.

ANNOUNCEMENT AS TO CLOTURE PETITION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity to notify the Members of the Senate that when we recess today we will recess until the usual hour of 12 o'clock noon tomorrow, and there will be another night session on the pending question.

I may add that today we have circulated a petition for cloture to be filed on the motion to take up the pending measure, which is the amendment to the cloture rule. It now appears that probably sometime tomorrow afternoon the petition for cloture will be filed.

I merely make this announcement in order that Senators may know about it. We must get along with the business of the Senate, and it seems to me that after the length of time that has been spent in debating the issue, the time has now arrived when we must ascertain exactly where we are going with respect to the cloture petition.

I am not saying that what I have suggested will be done tomorrow, but from the number of signatures we have upon the petition for cloture, it seems very probable that we will file it sometime tomorrow.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the able Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sure the Senator realizes that there is a difference of opinion as to whether the motion to take up is the pending measure.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand that there is quite a difference of opinion as to whether or not the motion to take up is subject to cloture, and no doubt the Senator from Georgia will make the point of order at the proper time.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator stated it was "the pending measure." I did not want to leave the impression that the entire Senate agrees that that is the case.

Mr. LUCAS. It is part of the pending measure, I will say to the Senator from Georgia, in the interpretation of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. RUSSELL. Very well.

Mr. LUCAS. As in legislative session, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 9 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, March 10, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 9 (legislative day of February 21), 1949:

SECRETARY, TERRITORY OF ALASKA

Llewellyn M. Williams, to be Secretary of the Territory of Alaska.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 9, 1949

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou in whom power and pity blend, who dost give us all things, restrain us from evil impulses and wrongdoing. Create in us new instincts, new desires, new powers of thought and feeling and will. As we stand before a righteous and a just God, may we dare to do the right, conscious that our works do follow us.

Keep in our minds that we are made in Thine image and Thy judgments will ever hold us to a strict accounting for the deeds done this day and every day. O lead us on in the ways of Christian manhood and womanhood, firm in the triumph of faith, the dominion of hope, and the ruggedness of courage. We humbly pray in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McDaniel, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 82):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. SOL BLOOM, late a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock meridian tomorrow.

Pursuant to the above resolution, Mr. WAGNER and Mr. IVES were appointed on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 673. An act relating to the pay and allowances of officers of the Naval Reserve performing active duty in the grade of rear admiral, and for other purposes.

THE LATE WASHINGTON J. McCORMICK

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep personal regret that I inform the House this morning of the passing of a former colleague and a predecessor of mine in the House of Representatives. Mrs. Cora Quast McCormick, wife of former Congressman Washington J. McCormick, who represented the First Montana District from 1921 to 1923, called me on the phone yesterday afternoon to tell me of her husband's passing. I know there are very few Members of the House today who served with Washington McCormick, but there are some old-timers who will recall the sterling service which he rendered on behalf of his constituents and the people of the United States as a whole.

Washington McCormick came of a pioneer Montana family. He was born in Missoula, Mont., on January 4, 1884. He attended the public schools in Missoula, the University of Montana, and the University of Notre Dame. He was graduated from Harvard in 1906. After that he attended the Law Department of Columbia, graduating from there in 1910. He was admitted to the New York bar in 1910, returned to Montana and was admitted to the Montana bar in 1911.

He engaged in the practice of law in the State of Montana. He was a member of the State house of representatives from 1918 to 1920 before being elected to the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States.

I wish at this time to extend my most sincere condolences to Mrs. McCormick. We of Montana will miss her husband greatly because of his fine character, and his great contribution to the development of our State.

He was a good man who unselfishly served Montana and the Nation. A captain in the Army of the United States in World War I, he served his country in an industrial capacity in World War II. Only age kept him out of the armed forces in the late struggle but even that could not stop him from doing his share wherever and whenever he found the opportunity to do so.

Yes, Washington J. McCormick is gone from among us. But, the accomplishments which were his remain and the memories of his friendship will linger long after his body is laid to rest. His frankness, humor, and sagacity have endeared him to us and we will think of him lovingly in the years ahead.

May his soul rest in peace.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial appearing in the Journal of Commerce, New York, under date of March 8, 1949, relative to keeping the FDIC an independent agency.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BROWN of Georgia addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement relative to the Calumet-Sag Channel.

Mr. GRANAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in five instances and include excerpts.

Mr. STIGLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. EVINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include letters and articles.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may sit while general debate is in progress during today's session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Commitee on Agriculture may sit while general debate is in progress during today's session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

COMMUNIST TRIALS

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter from the Holy Name Society of the Buffalo diocese and an editorial appearing in the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, it is just 1 month today that I stood in the well of the House to protest the infamous trial of Cardinal Mindszenty. At the time I said it was not so much that it was a high dignitary of the Catholic Church that was being prosecuted and persecuted; it could have been some dignitary of some other denominational faith. That has now come to pass where the Communist-controlled Government of Bulgaria has arrested ruthlessly 15 ministers of the Protestant denominations and sentenced these men. I am raising my voice in protest here at this ruthless war on religious freedom by these satellite nations. Certainly this House of Representatives should take some action in voicing its protest against all these infamous trials.

Reports from reliable sources indicate that these ministers were ruthlessly arrested, incarcerated, drugged, and tortured so they would confess to things in which they had not participated.

This is a campaign on the part of antireligious forces to destroy religion and religious freedom not only in these Communist-controlled countries of Europe, but throughout the world. Certainly then, these antireligious forces are not only on the rampage to destroy religion and religious freedom but to destroy democratic nations throughout the world.

This apparently is their program and it remains for us, a democratic nation, believing in the great principles of freedom of religion, speech, the press, and all other freedoms to become alert to this great menace that exists and to combat it by asking the President of the United States and the State Department to file a strong formal protest with these Communist-controlled governments, which are carrying on this vicious campaign to destroy religion and the freedoms of all peoples, and to invoke economic sanctions if possible.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Boston Traveler, advocating a reduction in excise taxes.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MACK of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Dr. Raver, the Bonneville Power Administrator.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the Missouri Valley Authority, and further to extend his remarks and include a survey on the closed shop by Rogers Dunn.

Mr. HULL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by David Lawrence on the subject Nonstop B-50 Flight Demonstrates Need for a Big Army and Navy.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and to include in one a speech by Henry J. Taylor over the radio entitled "Keep Uncle Sam Solvent," together with questions sent him by mail and his answers, and in the other an article entitled "Mr. Farmer, the Wage Law Hits You Too!—Aimed at the Factories It Goes Through to the Farms!" I do not know who the author is but I certainly approve what the gentleman who wrote it says.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

NAVY VESSELS LOANED TO RUSSIA

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter from former Secretary of the Navy Forrestal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, we were all pleased to learn that after 5 years under the Red flag of Russia, the U. S. S. light cruiser *Milwaukee* is back under the American flag again.

If that ship could talk, I wonder what it would have to say about life under the hammer and sickle.

The question the administration should now answer for the American

public, is: When will the other 580 Navy vessels we loaned to Russia be returned?

That the Members may have readily available a list of the ships we turned over to Russia, there is quoted below a letter from then Secretary of the Navy James Forrestal, dated April 30, 1947, in which 581 ships are listed, together with the dates on which they were turned over to Russian custody:

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, April 30, 1947.

Hon EMETT P. SCRIVNER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SCRIVNER: As requested in your letter of April 17, 1947, the following is a list, by type, of ships, boats, barges, and/or floating drydocks of the Navy transferred to the U. S. S. R., together with inclusive dates on which transfer was made:

Type	Number	Dates
AG (river tugs)	15	Aug. 21, 1944 through Apr. 11, 1945.
AM (mine sweepers)	34	June 23, 1943 through Aug. 17, 1945.
LCIL (landing craft, infantry)	30	June 10, 1945 through July 29, 1945.
PF (frigate)	28	July 13, 1945 through Sept. 4, 1945.
SC (submarine chasers, 110-foot)	78	July 13, 1943 through Sept. 2, 1945.
PTF (motor torpedo boat)	8	Feb. 8, 1944 through Feb. 16, 1945.
LCT (landing craft, tank)	17	Apr. 15, 1945 through May 26, 1945.
PT (motor torpedo boat)	194	Feb. 15, 1943 through Aug. 30, 1945.
YMS (motor mine sweepers)	43	Mar. 31, 1945 through Sept. 2, 1945.
YR (floating workshops)	4	June 19, 1943 through July 20, 1945.
PTC (submarine chasers)	26	Dec. 8, 1943 through Aug. 13, 1944.
LCM (3) (land craft, mechanized)	54	June 7, 1943 through Dec. 30, 1944.
RPC (submarine chasers)	36	Dec. 3, 1943 through Mar. 4, 1944.
Motor launch	1	Oct. 19, 1944.
Plane personnel boat	1	Mar. 15, 1945.
LCS (S) (landing craft, support)	2	Dec. 30, 1944.
LCVP (landing craft, vehicle and personnel)	2	Do.
CR (ice breaker)	3	Feb. 23, 1944 through Mar. 24, 1945.
200-ton pontoon barges	4	Jan. 10, 1945 through Oct. 15, 1945.
CL (light cruiser)	1	Apr. 20, 1944.

With exception of the light cruiser (formerly the U. S. S. *Milwaukee*) all the above-listed craft are subject to return to the United States not later than the termination of the present wars. The light cruiser is on loan to the U. S. S. R. and is subject to return upon implementation of the terms of the Italian peace treaty.

Very truly yours,
JAMES FORRESTAL.

Let us hope they come back to us soon, and in condition so they can rejoin their sister ships under the Stars and Stripes.

MINORITY VIEWS ON RENT-CONTROL BILL

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] be permitted to file minority views on the Housing and Rent Act of 1949.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

RENTAL HOUSING

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will consider the rent-control bill. I have some facts which I should like the House to consider as we approach this difficult problem.

At least 2,850,000 apartments and other rental-housing units have been added to the Nation's nonfarm housing supply since 1940, Melvin H. Baker, chairman of the Construction Industry Information Committee, stated Saturday.

Nevertheless, there are now 760,000 fewer rental units and 4,600,000 fewer persons living in rental accommodations than in 1940, because in the 9 years more than 3,000,000 units, mostly single-family houses, have been purchased for occupancy by new owners and thus have left the rental supply.

This unprecedented reduction in the number of rental units is attributed principally to the fact that many owners preferred to sell their properties rather than continue to operate them under rent controls.

This trend is a reversal of the customary pattern of the past, by which older single-family dwellings were frequently transferred from owner-occupancy to rental use.

Of the 2,850,000 rental units added to our supply since 1940, about 1,500,000 units have been created by remodeling of existing structures to provide additional units. About 750,000 units were provided with public funds in the war and postwar emergency housing programs, and 600,000 units were in new rental construction financed with private funds.

This decade has been the greatest period of housing production ever known, surpassing even the former all-time record years of the 1920's. But, in contrast, privately financed new rental construction has been at the rate of less than 70,000 units a year, compared with 350,000 units a year from 1923 to 1927.

The decline of rental units in the face of our tremendous total residential production is an abnormal and unprecedented situation.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RIVERS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object; would the distinguished majority leader inform us as to the program for the rest of the week?

Mr. McCORMACK. The Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill is the first order of business today. Then there are the several bills which were on the program for yesterday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. But the appropriation bill comes first?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; and I am hopeful that we can dispose of that program today because I understand there is not much opposition to any of the bills, or at least that is my information. In any event the rent-control bill will come up tomorrow for general debate and will be continued under the 5-minute rule on Friday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. There being 5 hours' general debate, we will consume about 6 hours on that tomorrow.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, there will be 1 hour on the rule; I suppose my distinguished friend has that in mind. If the bill is not disposed of on Friday, I will be constrained, however reluctantly, to go into a Saturday session. If the bill is disposed of on Friday, then we will adjourn over until Monday. Tomorrow I will confer with the gentleman from Massachusetts about coming in Friday at 11 o'clock to take the bill up under the 5-minute rule. I always like to adjourn from Friday to Monday whenever it is possible and the House has always cooperated whenever there has been such a full program, because the Members are exceedingly busy in their offices, and it gives them an opportunity to catch up with their mail and performing the many other duties in the performance of their work.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I have no objection to meeting on Saturday if it is necessary.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have made that statement because it is necessary that the rent bill be disposed of, and I hope it will be disposed of by Friday.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is being done to cut down on these appropriation bills that are coming up, so that the taxpayers of this country can get some relief from the great burdens that are being imposed upon them?

Mr. McCORMACK. My friend is a very prominent and powerful Member when it comes to appropriations.

Mr. RICH. I am not a member of the Committee on Appropriations. They would not have me on that committee because if I were a member of it I would cut the heart out of some of these appropriations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1950

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3333) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related

independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes. Pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, the time to be divided between the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3333, with Mr. TRIMBLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the agreement, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is the annual appropriation bill for fiscal year 1950 for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, the National Mediation Board, and the Railroad Retirement Board.

First, I would like to pay tribute to the members of the subcommittee. In the 9 years I have been a Member of this honorable body I have yet to see a committee that has been more diligent than this Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Labor and the Federal Security Agency.

We held hearings on the bill for several weeks, and there was seldom a time when a single member of the subcommittee was absent.

I pay particular tribute to my colleagues on the Democratic side, the able gentleman from West Virginia, Dr. HEDRICK, and the able gentleman from New York, Judge McGRATH, for the valuable assistance they gave me during these weeks of hearings.

I want also to pay tribute to the members of the minority, including the former chairman of this subcommittee and ranking member on the minority side, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER], for the support and cooperation they gave to me while these hearings were in progress.

I would like to pay special tribute to our very able and conscientious clerk, Paul Wilson, who we were so fortunate to have as clerk for this committee. Without his help and support we would not have been able to report this bill today. He has been a monument of strength to every member of the committee in helping us to bring this appropriation bill to the floor today.

This is a very difficult and complex bill. In my opinion, it is one of the most important appropriation bills that will come before this House this year. It embraces many and varied programs. I am very happy to say that the membership of this committee, although we may disagree on some items in the bill, are generally in agreement. Some of the members felt that some appropriations should have been increased more than the Bureau of the Budget allowed, and we have done that in three or four instances. Some of us might have felt that some of the increases that we have allowed should have been in lesser amounts. Some of the members may feel that some of the requests that were allowed by the Bureau of the Budget should have been decreased, but in the over-all, I think I can safely say that we are fairly well in agreement on the the recommendations in this bill.

The bill carries total direct appropriations of $2,211,794,085, which is an increase of $353,838,775 over what has been appropriated for the fiscal year 1949 to date, but is a reduction of $23,271,600 under the Budget estimates. The increase over 1949 appropriations to date does not take account of substantial additional funds now pending in the first deficiency bill. I hope you will follow the report as we go along in this discussion, because it is a very comprehensive and well-prepared report that explains and covers practically every item in the bill, and shows in detail comparisons with the estimates and the current year.

The first portion of the bill relates to the Labor Department itself. On page 42 of the report there is a breakdown of the appropriations for the Labor Department, and you will notice in the last column a decrease in the amount of $216,200. This represents a supplemental request sent up for the International Labor Affairs Office after we had concluded regular hearings on the bill. Although we held hearings for part of a day on this supplemental item, we did not feel we had sufficient knowledge to determine whether or not this was necessary at this time, and thus to justify granting it without further consideration, and so we have excluded it from the bill. But in all the other items for the Department of Labor we have recommended the full amount allowed by the Budget. In total, the Department has available this year, fiscal year 1949, $14,373,150, and we are allowing them for fiscal 1950, $16,550,000, or an increase of $2,176,850 over what they had for fiscal year 1949. About $991,000 of that increase is for Public Law 900 pay-raise costs.

The largest single increase in the bill for the Department of Labor is for the Bureau of Labor Statistics, $1,441,452; and the largest item in that increase is for the collection of statistics on employment, hours, and earnings, on a State basis, and for selected industries, which will be a very comprehensive program in the future. It is supposed to eliminate duplication of collection of statistics from employers as has happened on occasion in the past. It will in effect permit the sending of but one form to an employer for reporting all these statistics, whereas in the past the employers have been bothered by having to fill out several forms. So it is our hope that by the inclusion of this item we will eliminate a duplication that has been going on in the past in the matter of the collection of important statistics on employment, hours, earnings, and so forth, by or through the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The increase also includes additional funds for strengthening the wholesale-price index and the cost-of-living index which have such wide usage. It will also provide for needed building construction statistics which are not available at the present time. We hope that with this and the other items of appropriation the Department of Labor will be more able to function as a real department next year.

My statement that this is a very difficult and complex bill is borne out by the portion dealing with the Federal Security Agency. For this Agency alone the budget estimates of direct appropriations are $1,501,431,985. Of that amount $1,372,655,260, or 91½ percent, represents items, which, for the most part, we cannot touch. In other words we cannot materially reduce the expenditures involved in these items which include grants and benefits to States and others of various kinds. Many of the amounts represent mandatory grants as, for example, the public-assistance grants which for the first time in history has reached a total of $1,058,000,000. For vocational rehabilitation there is $20,500,000. The unemployment-compensation and employment services grants are $135,000,000 in cash. For vocational education, $19,842,760. The Employees' Compensation Bureau, $13,000,000. The Children's Bureau receives annually for grants to the States, $22,000,000. The Public Health Service estimate of grants is $88,653,000. Another general category is for hospitals that we have to appropriate for, which are mainly marine hospitals, and the estimates of total appropriation for them are $29,519,789, or 2 percent of the over-all Federal security figure. In order to operate the educational institutions it takes $2,650,000, or two-tenths of 1 percent.

The construction program at Howard University, St. Elizabeths Hospital, and at Bethesda, Md., that we have embarked upon in the past 3 or 4 years included in this bill is mostly for past contract authorizations and the estimates for those are $25,928,425, or 1.7 percent of the over-all bill.

So, all in all, in the Federal Security appropriations that we have before us today, involving estimates of about $1,500,000,000, 95.4 percent represents items in which we could not show substantial savings; we have made reductions, however, wherever we could. We only have 4.6 percent of that sum, or about $69,000,000, to operate on and in which to make other cuts. We have made cuts wherever we felt justified in doing so under all the circumstances.

As I say, we have cut some of the items in the Federal Security Agency, but there are three notable exceptions where we have gone beyond the figures allowed by the Bureau of the Budget in the Public Health Service. On those three items the committee is unanimous in its decision, feeling that the Bureau of the Budget did not know of or perhaps fully appreciate the program that had been

started by this committee in the past 2 or 3 years and has been followed through by this committee when the Bureau of the Budget cut the request of the Public Health Service for mental-health activities, for cancer activities, and an appropriation for the National Heart Institute.

Those of you who were here a year ago will remember that this committee took the same type of action at that time under the leadership of the then chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], who has been very active in this entire program in the past. At that time we went over the figures of the Bureau of the Budget in providing funds for mental-health activities, for the National Cancer Institute, and approved substantial amounts for the National Heart Institute. The latter program was given added emphasis a year ago with the passage of the National Heart Act in June 1948, by the Eightieth Congress.

As I think everyone knows, when the public-health officials appear before committees of Congress, they are obliged to justify and support the budget figures, and are not allowed to justify anything over the budget; but because of the intense interest of this committee in these three programs — mental health, heart, and cancer—it was the unanimous decision of the committee to call in some of the outstanding men in those three fields in the country. So, as a result, after consultation with the Surgeon General, we set aside 2 days of hearings to have some of these outstanding men come in and testify and give us the benefit of their experience in these fields, to see what we could do to hold these programs started a year or two ago.

These men in the mental-health field included men like Dr. Menninger, of Kansas, eminently qualified in that field; also Dr. Paul White in the heart field; and in the cancer field we had Dr. Rhoades of Memorial Hospital, N. Y., who is considered one of the outstanding men on cancer in the world today. There were others before the committee. I know, if you will read the hearings and read our report and read the testimony of these and other outstanding people who appeared before the committee, that everyone of you would be willing to vote for more than we are allowing in the bill today for these three very important programs at the present time.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to commend the committee for its splendid action. I think it is a good step. I wanted to voice my approval now as well as later.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I, too approve of what the committee has done. At Ohio State University, in Columbus, Ohio, the State has made substantial appropriations for increasing the medical center, and it was hoped that there could be a construction program amounting to $1,500,000 in connection with cancer research. I note that that item was presented by Dr. Heller, and I wonder if the gentleman could tell me how much of that program could be carried out under the $2,500,000 additional granted by the committee.

Mr. FOGARTY. As I recall the testimony, the National Advisory Cancer Council had cleared, or had ready for clearance, about 17 projects at a cost of about $8,688,000. We are now recommending only $2,500,000, and it would be up to the Advisory Council and the Surgeon General to decide where the $2,500,000 will be allocated as regards specific projects cleared by the Council.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman will recall, when the matter was under discussion before the committee, that Dr. Heller listed a number of projects which they considered to be of high priority in the construction of facilities for cancer research. They totaled about $8,600,000, as I recall. The gentleman will also recall, I believe, that Dr. Heller testified that the National Advisory Cancer Council had not yet approved any of those projects because there were no funds presently available. What actually happened was, we have today in this bill $2,500,000 for construction funds, and, as the gentleman from Rhode Island has stated, the National Advisory Cancer Council will determine the allocation of those funds to the projects for which applications are now pending.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I find, on page 20 of the report, a statement that—

> The $2,500,000 allocated for construction grants is firm. It is desired that the amounts for the other projects be allocated approximately as shown, but the committee wishes to point out that it has no intention or desire to so firmly earmark the breakdown as to require utilization of total resources contrary to the considered judgment of the Surgeon General based upon recommendations of the National Advisory Cancer Council.

Now, do I understand by that that if the committee has no intention to finally earmark funds, it has the intention that these funds shall be used as the National Advisory Cancer Council shall deem best, and not require spending a little on all of the projects, but permit them to pick specific projects if that is deemed the best way to meet the problem?

Mr. FOGARTY. I presume that will be what they will do. The reason we earmarked the $2,500,000 as a firm item is to make sure that that amount goes into construction grants and not go anywhere else; that they allocated it for that purpose.

Mr. VORYS. It is the intention of the committee to make it firm for construction, but not to require that it be allocated for any specific project or any specific lists of projects?

Mr. FOGARTY. No; we are not attempting to tell them where to spend the money. We are leaving that up to the Advisory Council and the Surgeon General. We have the utmost faith in that Council and the decisions that have been made by them and by the Surgeon General.

If you will refer to the report on these activities, starting on page 16 of the committee report, you will see the breakdowns we have allowed for the mental-health activities and cancer and heart research. At the bottom of page 16 you will see a table relating to funds for mental-health activities. We have allowed, in total appropriated funds for 1950, $825,000 more than was allowed by the Bureau of the Budget for the mental-health activities, and have allowed $2,010,000 more in contract authority for research—grants—and training—graduate and undergraduate—than the Bureau of the Budget allowed for contract authority in connection with mental-health activities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

It was testified before the committee that the mental-health problem is one of the most serious problems we have to face in this country today. It was testified that about 50 percent of the hospital beds are occupied today by mentally ill patients. It was further testified that 8,500,000 people are mentally ill in this country at the present time.

I think if some of you had an opportunity to visit some State asylum run by the various States throughout this country, you would be shocked at the treatment that is being given in some States to their mentally ill. I, for one, firmly believe that something can be done to ease this situation. It is going to take time; it is going to take money; and it is going to take trained personnel. We are attempting in this bill to provide funds in the years to come, not only this year, to get the trained technicians, scientists, and other personnel we need at the present time and in the future to attempt to find out the causes of mental illness. Until we do find the causes, there is not much we can do about it. But I think when 50 percent of the hospital beds in this country are occupied today by mentally ill patients, it is about time the Federal Government took a definite step forward in attempting to find a solution to the problem of the causes of mental illness.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. I asked the gentleman to yield simply so I could express a very sincere appreciation for the work the subcommittee has done on the mental-health program. I am the author of the mental-health act that passed this House a few years ago. I have watched the beginnings of that program, and have been encouraged by some of the work that has been done. I appreciate the attitude of the subcomittee in providing funds that this work may be expanded, and I say this because it is a very sincere appreciation out of the depths of my heart.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman.

On page 19 of the report you will find a similar break-down for the funds of the National Cancer Institute. Here again

we have exceeded the figures that were given to us by the Bureau of the Budget by $4,400,000. The Bureau of the Budget requested $16,100,000 in appropriation. That request was increased $300,000. Because this is a program that has been started and implemented by this committee and the Congress in the past few years, we believe it is a going program and we have allowed the full amount which was requested by the Bureau of the Budget for the National Cancer Institute and increased the appropriated funds by $300,000. A year ago $8,000,000 was approved by the Congress for contract authority for cancer research construction grants. This year the Bureau of the Budget only allowed $900,000 for forward financing research projects. We have exceeded the figure by $4,100,000 in this field because we have made up our minds to keep this program going forward and not allow it to slip backward.

It was testified in the committee that one out of seven are dying of cancer in this country at the present time. It is the second leading cause of death. Some cases of cancer which were incurable a few years ago are being cured today because of the research that has been going on during the past 3 or 4 years. Unless we keep up that program; unless we allow contract authority for forward planning and graduate work in these schools, and for research facilities, so that we can get the proper men in this field and provide them with the facilities, we are not going to get properly trained people in this field of cancer or make progress like we should. There are hundreds and hundreds of men today who are putting their lives into this field of cancer research. If we can give them some encouragement, we believe that we can go a long, long way. That is why we have exceeded the budget by $4,400,000, over-all.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I am very much impelled to thank the gentleman for the magnificent work that his committee has done in this aspect of the budget. There is nothing that can contribute more for the encouragement of those who are working so desperately in this research field than this program of forward payment, and the refusal to submit to a cut. Those of us who have not had the privilege of working with you thank you for the work that you have done.

Mr. FOGARTY. May I say to the gentlewoman that this is not my program. This is the program of the entire Committee on Appropriations. They were unanimously in favor of this program, which was started before I became a member of the committee and which I am happy to play a part in now. Every member of the committee deserves credit for this program, because they have been unanimously in favor of it.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. I realize, of course, that the full committee had to pass on this program, but I do appreciate so much that the subcommittee went to bat for it.

Mr. FOGARTY. On page 20 you will find the same break-down for the fund for the National Heart Institute. It is a relatively new program which has been implemented by the passage of the National Heart Act of 1948. We have increased the budget estimate for the National Heart Institute in appropriated funds by $3,725,000, and in contract authority by $3,220,000, or a total of $6,945,000.

This is practically a new program. But after listening to the testimony of outstanding men in this field, we were convinced that it is one of the most necessary programs that the Federal Government can support at the present time. I believe the Members of Congress and the members of the committee today could never find any fault with this subcommittee in going over the figures of the Bureau of the Budget, especially in view of what has happened within the last 4 or 5 days when we have lost three outstanding men in this country, one a Member of this body, another a Member of the Senate, and the third a former Member of this House, the former chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. Andrews, of New York. Those three men have passed away in the last 4 or 5 days by sudden heart attacks. I know there are those in this Congress who will say, "What can we do about it?" That has been one of my complaints in the past. There are too many who seem to take that attitude, that if you have heart trouble there is not anything to do about it except to go home and go to bed. After listening to some of the men in this field, we are convinced that something can be done about it, if we provide the necessary funds to establish various clinics, to establish a way to get trained personnel in this field, and to establish proper research facilities throughout the country. That is the principal reason why we have gone over the figures of the Bureau of the Budget in this item. The No. 1 killer of our people today is heart disease. While we have been appropriating money in past years, year in and year out, for the Public Health Service for preventive diseases, like venereal disease, tuberculosis, and others, they have found new drugs to help in the cure of those diseases. But at the same time not much had been done about heart disease. Where we have found drugs that help in these preventive diseases, the record shows the cause of death by those diseases is going down year after year, but in the case of death by heart disease, the record shows an increase in the past 10 years. Instead of leveling off we are going higher and higher and higher. I think something should be done about it.

This Congress has appropriated in the neighborhood, as I recall, of $25,000,000 a year, or at least we did last year, to try to find out something about the hoof-and-mouth disease in cattle.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has again expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

This Congress has appropriated over $25,000,000 for research in the hoof-and-mouth disease. That is a good program, and I am for it. I voted for it. I think it is necessary. But I think if we can do something like that we can at least not only take care of the animal industry of the country but also the human beings of this country, in an attempt to try to find out some way whereby they can have a longer and healthier life.

We are spending in the neighborhood of $9,000,000 for Bang's disease in cattle. We are spending millions of dollars to find out what diseases affect plants and trees. I think it is about time we gave serious consideration to the ailments affecting you and me and every other human being in the country, and we are attempting to do something about it in this bill.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. DEANE. I would like to join with my colleagues in commending the committee for the forward approach and the great vision they have taken in bringing forward this very comprehensive piece of legislation. In thinking about what you are spending for hoof-and-mouth disease, I am reminded that we are spending today approximately 34 cents out of every dollar paying for past wars and preparing for future wars. It seems to me we need to begin to emphasize these great social problems involving the health and education of our people. I wish to highly commend the committee for its forward approach in coming to grips with this important subject.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. YATES. I would like to join in the statements made by my colleague, and to commend the committee for the appropriation act which it has produced. Like the committee, I believe the greatest natural resource which our country has is the men and women who make up this country. The millions which we are spending to save our mineral resources, forests, and other resources are very essential to the national welfare, but the funds which this committee has appropriated will do much to check and eradicate the dread scourges which are killing and crippling so many of our people. These appropriations truly recognize the need for protecting and preserving our greatest natural resource, and I am happy to support them.

Mr. FOGARTY. There is one other major change in this appropriation bill to which I shall address myself and that is the appropriation for the Bureau of Employment Security for the fiscal year 1950. I think, as perhaps most of the Members know, the funds for the employment security programs in the States have not been sufficient for this fiscal year and that the Members perhaps have received many requests from the administrators of employment security in the various States for additional funds to be granted to them in this bill. As I remember the figures of a year ago the Bureau of Employment Security requested of the Bureau of the Budget $160,000,000 for fiscal year 1949. The Bureau of the Budget cut that request by about $15,000,000, that is, cut it down to $145,000,000 plus; this House cut that

request to $123,000,000, or a further decrease of $22,000,000; and we finally came out of conference with the sum of $130,000,000 for the State employment security programs.

The estimate of $135,000,000 for the fiscal year 1950 was based on work loads which it now appears certain are outdated. All of us know that unemployment has risen since last November or December, although I believe it is leveling off at the present time. I will not, however, admit that the unemployment situation today is anything to get alarmed about after reading the report of the Bureau of the Census released last week. A year ago, in February of 1948, we had employed in this country 57,200,000 people; in February of 1949, according to the figures of the Census, we had the same number of people employed, 57,200,000; but during the year 600,000 new employable people came into the labor market with no increase in available jobs; so, as a result, we have about 600,000 more unemployed today than we had a year ago, but we have exactly the same number of people employed today that we had in February of 1948.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I wish to ask the gentleman how this money is allocated to the States: Is it allocated on the case load of the State? The reason I ask the question of the gentleman is that in Massachusetts last year we asked for a million more than we got. The consequence was that in October we had to lay off workers and could not take care of the work load thrust upon us. According to this report, the matter of allocation is left to somebody who does not make a proper allocation.

Mr. FOGARTY. I would not say that. The decision is left to the Director of the Employment Security Bureau, Mr. Robert C. Goodwin, who makes the various allotments. The first step is for the State to submit to the Bureau of Employment Security here in Washington a budget of what it thinks it is going to need in the next year. We all know there are indeterminate factors that cannot be foreseen with accuracy, such as the increase of the work load or the increase of unemployment; but the States make their budget and their budget is sent to Washington to be passed on by the Bureau of Employment Security. It then goes to the Bureau of the Budget and the Bureau of the Budget determines what shall be submitted for the next year. For the coming fiscal year 1950 the Bureau of Employment Security requested $159,000,000 plus for this purpose; the Bureau of the Budget cut that request to $135,000,000, only $5,000,000 above what the Congress allowed them originally for 1949. In 1949 they were allowed $130,000,000. By recent action of this House in a deficiency bill they received an additional $10,000,000; so that, presumably, they will have available in 1949 at least $140,000,000 instead of the original $130,000,000.

Now, to get back to the gentleman's question, I think the committee has arrived at a common-sense solution of the over-all problem, and if the gentleman will let me proceed for just a couple of minutes, maybe I can clarify some of the things he has in mind. We of the committee realize how difficult it is to forecast in the future what the unemployment-compensation work load is going to be in any particular State. We realize the problem that the chief of the department has in making allotments to the various States under the budget that they request. We also realize that when some States were ordered a year ago to cut down because of lack of funds from the administrative level here in Washington, they refused to cut down and take off employees at the State level, and certain difficulties arose. That has been the fault of the State in two or three instances. Every State in the Union has run short of funds and has had to lay off help in their local offices. So, this year we are attempting to do something in this bill that will help straighten out the difficulties that were experienced in connection with the deficiencies experienced last year.

A year ago it was recommended that we establish a contingency fund of 10 percent of the base appropriation. If we had done that a year ago, we would have had a contingency fund of $13,000,000 to be used in the fiscal year 1949 to take care of this unforeseen increase in the work load that exists at the present time. We did not do that. So this year in order to overcome the situation, as we see it, we are appropriating the amount that has been allowed by the Bureau of the Budget, $135,000,000, but we have added certain language, and if you will look on page 25 of the report, you will see the language we have added to the bill, as follows:

Provided, That during the period ending March 31, 1950, this appropriation may be apportioned and obligated at an annual rate not in excess of $150,000,000 and, to the extent that the Federal Security Administrator, with the approval of the Director of the Budget, finds necessary to meet increased costs of administration resulting from change in a State law or increases in the numbers of claims filed and claims paid or salary costs over those upon which the original State's grant was based, such annual rate may be increased to not in excess of $157,500,000:

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, that means, as the report explains, that they can spend in the first three-quarters of the fiscal year 1950 at an annual rate of not to exceed $150,000,000. If this work load keeps up as it is at present they might have to spend the $150,000,000. If they do they will have to come in for another deficiency to this Congress next spring. I do not believe the rate is going to hold up that way. In my opinion, this is an unusual situation we are in at the present time. The unemployment situation is not going to continue as it is at the present time.

Also a year ago we wanted to establish some sort of a contingency fund to offset certain of these increases in State salaries that we could not foresee and that the State people and Federal security could not foresee. So we have set out in the language of the bill, "To the extent that the Federal Security Administrator, with the approval of the Director of the Budget, finds it necessary to meet increased costs of administration resulting from change in a State law or increases in the number of claims filed and claims paid or salary costs over those upon which the original State's grant was based, such annual rate may be increased to not in excess of $157,500,000."

This means that we are establishing a contingency reserve of 5 percent of the basic maximum annual rate of $150,000,000, or $7,500,000, that can be used for those purposes, if need be, under the conditions stated.

We have high hopes that in the near future after this contingency fund has had a chance to work we will eliminate the need for coming back to the Congress each time for a deficiency. Another thing we will be doing by granting this contingency fund is this: In the past the Employment Security Director has been able to make these grants on only a semi-annual basis. The State people have found fault with that, and I think they have had some reason to find fault with it, but we have the assurance of Mr. Goodwin, Director of Employment Security, that if they are granted a contingency fund he will be able to allocate the funds on a yearly basis in the coming year; therefore I think that this is a common-sense approach to the over-all problem, which is very difficult to determine on a realistic dollar basis so far in advance as we normally have to do in this Congress.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. With those increased provisions which go beyond anything ever provided for, if I understand the gentleman, the States then will have to submit their budgets to the headquarters down here and then let the headquarters here work out through contingency funds and such additional appropriations as the Congress might make, to meet the load that may develop. That is what the program would be.

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I have talked much longer than I anticipated on this bill.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE. My people in Texas, who are responsible for the administration of the George-Barden Act, have indicated that they were very short of money this last year, yet in the hearings, on page 110, it shows there was approximately $1,000,000 unexpended under this act. Does that mean that the $1,000,000 of the approximately $19,000,000 that was appropriated was not used?

Mr. FOGARTY. The total for fiscal 1948 was mentioned in the hearings. I do not recall the precise amount.

Mr. TEAGUE. It shows Texas has an unexpended balance of about $28,000.

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not know the total offhand, but there were some funds in the various States that were not used by the States. That is a matching fund item, and I would say that that would be the answer. But, we have had several requests for increasing this appropriation which is authorized by law to go up to $29,301,000 plus. There are a lot of things in this bill on which we would like to go over the budget request but we have to stop somewhere. So, we have allowed only the same that they had last year for the George-Barden program.

We have one new appropriation in the bill, for the water pollution program, and we have allowed practically what the Bureau of the Budget called for. There is $1,000,000 in grants to States. They asked for $1,380,000 for Public Health Service salaries and expenses, and we have reduced that by $380,000. But, we have been assured that this program authorized a year ago will not be hurt in any way by that reduction.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is perhaps the ninth time that I have appeared in the well of the House to discuss this particular appropriation. I elected to stay upon this particular subcommittee because I love the work. I want to say that in all the years that I have been upon this subcommittee I never have appreciated or enjoyed it more than this year. It has been a delightful experience to see such unanimity of thinking on the part of the members of this committee, and such a splendid approach manifested by the three new members of the committee who have taken such a great interest in the welfare of this country as evidenced in the appropriations made under this bill. I want to thank the chairman for his uniform fairness and courtesy. I have tried to be of such help as I could in aiding in the conduct of these hearings, in order that the Members would have the information at hand on the subjects with which this bill deals.

I want the House to know that both the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HEDRICK] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCGRATH] have shown great interest and have made every effort to understand the very complicated appropriation items that are contained in this bill. I feel tremendously relieved to have as one of the minority members of this committee the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER], who always, out of his very clear thinking and his good mind, puts his finger exactly on the point at issue and is at all times trying to see if it is not possible to reduce appropriations and expenditures of money to ease the tax burden upon the people of America.

We are confronted with a peculiar situation and always have been under this bill. Just think of it: The little appropriation that is required to maintain the Department of Labor is puny and infinitesimal compared with the amounts we appropriate for the Federal Security Agency. The Venereal Disease Control Division of the Public Health Service alone spends more money than the entire Department of Labor in its activities. I use that just as an illustration to show the situation with which we are confronted in this bill.

In this bill you have the appropriation for railroad retirement. The law states that the railroad workers and the carriers shall contribute into the Public Treasury for the maintenance of the railroad retirement program, and we have to appropriate that money to them and have nothing to say about it. The law requires it to be done. It runs into hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars.

You have all the appropriations for the Bureau of Public Assistance, that matches the State funds in the grants under the social-security law, for old-age assistance, for maternal and child-welfare aid, for aid to crippled children, and for aid to the blind. This year for the first time in the history of this Congress the amount of Federal aid for matching funds under the various titles of the Social Security Act reached the astounding total of $1,058,000,000.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. On the very point the gentleman is discussing, public assistance, it is stated on page 32 of the bill that the appropriation is for grants to States for old-age assistance and dependent children. I do not find any place, either in the report of the committee or the hearings, where any of these States repay to the Federal Government any portion of the grant they receive. Am I correct in that?

Mr. KEEFE. What does the gentleman mean, repay it to the Federal Government?

Mr. CAVALCANTE. They do not pay back to the Federal Government any portion of any grant they receive.

Mr. KEEFE. Of course; it is a matching-fund program. They do not pay it back.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. I wonder whether the committee knows that there are States that receive this grant, but, when a citizen applies for old-age assistance or for aid to dependent children, the State requires the signing of a restitution bond or agreement, and upon the death of the recipient of the old-age assistance the State levies against the estate and collects that money back, but does not account to the Federal Government for any portion of the money it collects.

Mr. KEEFE. I say to the gentleman that he is entirely in error with respect to that. That is not a fact. I have gone into that question at length, year after year, and it is a fact that is pretty well known, that the Federal Government does not require, in the administration of social security, that any State law shall require liens against the homes of beneficiaries. That is entirely a matter of State law.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. But when an old-age pensioner, for example, who lived in a State which requires a lien to be filed against his or her home, dies, and the State takes that property over and sells it in order to realize a benefit under their lien and to recover the amount of money that has been paid, the Federal Government shares in the distribution of those funds just as the State does.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Does the report show where the Government does receive the benefits? I have not been able to find it.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman can take that matter up with the Social Security Administration. I do not know whether it is shown this year in the tables, but it has been shown year after year. You will find out the exact amount that comes back to the Federal Government as its share of the recoveries under such social-security legislation. I know that is a fact, because I have gone into it. The matter has been raised time and time again in years past.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Referring to the $1,058,000,000 set forth on page 52 of the report and the $715,889,000 on the Railroad Retirement Agency on page 53 of the committee report, as I understand it, the Congress appropriated those funds. Was the $715,889,000 paid into the Federal Treasury by the railroads and the railroad employees?

Mr. KEEFE. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It was paid in?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes; that is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Likewise, what portion of the $1,058,000,000 was paid in under social security? What portion of that was paid into the Federal Treasury?

Mr. KEEFE. None of it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. None of it?

Mr. KEEFE. No.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, the $1,058,000,000 is a direct appropriation and a burden on the taxpayers?

Mr. KEEFE. The $1,058,000,000 is a direct burden on the Treasury of the United States to provide matching funds under the social-security law.

Mr. CRAWFORD. While the $715,889,000 is an indirect burden paid in by the railroads and their employees?

Mr. KEEFE. That would fall in the same category as the appropriation for old-age and survivors' insurance. Under that program, the employee pays into the Treasury 1 percent of his wage and the employer pays in 1 percent of the pay roll. The total thus paid into the Treasury is then appropriated to the trust fund of the OASI. It falls in the same category. There is nothing that can be done about it. It has to be done under the law. What I am leading to with reference to that point and what I am trying to demonstrate, as I have in years past, is that people come in and say, "Here is a bill covering two-billion-two-hundred-and-thirty-million-odd dollars. That is a lot of money. Why do you not cut these appropriations? You ought to be able to cut off 25 percent or 10 percent or 15 percent." Or they quote some other theoretical percentage. But they lose sight of the fact that with this particular bill we have a very limited field in which the Committee on Appropriations can operate. In fact, I believe, of the appropriated funds carried in this bill, about 93 percent or 94 percent, or even 95 percent,

is in the category that you cannot touch unless you want to default and destroy the very programs that you have put upon the statute books, such as the railroad retirement and social-security programs.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I do not like to correct the gentleman, but the funds of the Railroad Retirement Board are not covered into the Treasury. They are carried in a trust fund, the gross amount of which is something in the neighborhood of $7,000,000,000. Transfers are made from the trust fund to railroad retirement appropriations; is that not correct?

Mr. KEEFE. The chairman will be glad to answer that.

Mr. FOGARTY. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] is correct. We put it into the general Treasury and then we appropriate to the trust fund.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am sure the gentleman will find there is a trust fund——

Mr. KEEFE. Of course, there is a trust fund. The appropriation we are talking about is appropriated out of the Treasury to that trust fund. The trust fund under social security represents billions of dollars. They have a trust fund under the Railroad Retirement Act, just as they have a trust fund under unemployment compensation, and just as they have a trust fund for old-age and survivors' insurance; but under the Constitution of the United States that money has to be paid first into the Treasury of the United States and we make an absolute appropriation of the total amount out of the Treasury to the trust fund for railroad retirement of the amounts that have been paid in both by the workers and the carriers. That is my understanding of the law. That goes to a trust fund, and that trust fund is managed by the Railroad Retirement Board in the payment of annuities.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. In reading the report on the bill, under "Grants for hospital construction," I wish the gentleman would explain how a hospital can qualify for aid under this section of the bill.

Mr. KEEFE. I would be glad to make an explanation on that. I think every State in the Union understands that each State may receive aid under the provision of the Hill-Burton Act; that is the Hospital Construction Act. Under that law every State has set up a hospital authority. That is a State authority, operating under the jurisdiction and direction, in most States, of the State public health service. That local State authority makes a survey of their particular State and determines the necessity for hospital beds in that State. They determine the priority, whether it shall be this type or that type of hospital, whether the hospital ought to be located here or there. That is all a matter for the determination of the local State hospital authority. A local village or city or community that is interested in building a hospital and wants to get funds under the provisions of the Hill-Burton Act does not make its application to Washington. It makes its application to its own State authority, and that authority lists all of those applications and determines, as I say, the necessity and the priority under which the construction will take place. They then recommend approved projects here to Washington, and on those approved projects, for which funds are made available by the Congress each year under the Hill-Burton Act, $75,000,000, the Washington office administering that law approves that project which has been initiated and which has been approved and presented by the State, and we furnish $1 for each $2 raised by the State or the local authority. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. McDONOUGH. Except for this: Can a philanthropic body, not connected with a city or county or municipal government, apply for a grant?

Mr. KEEFE. Of course. Any eleemosynary institution or institution operated for nonprofit purposes is eligible to receive the benefits of the Hill-Burton Construction Act. Does that answer the gentleman?

Mr. McDONOUGH. It does. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KEEFE. I am glad to answer any questions with respect to this bill because the details are so multitudinous that you just cannot within the time limits attempt to cover all of these items. The chairman has done that very well.

Mr. FOGARTY. One thing I did not cover was that we failed to make appropriation for the National Labor Relations Board and the Conciliation and Mediation Service.

Mr. KEEFE. I think the report indicates that heretofore this bill has carried appropriation estimates for the National Labor Relations Board and the Conciliation Service. You will not find them in the bill. Action has been deferred pending action by the Eighty-first Congress, which has not yet taken place, and we do not know what that Eighty-first Congress is going to do.

That sort of leads me to rather a little bit of talk that I think we ought to discuss a little in connection with this matter. I do not want to throw any cold water on the spirit of harmony that has been manifested here, but I cannot help thinking of last year and the year before, when I was charged with the responsibility of presenting this bill to the Congress; what a belaboring I received from the Democratic side. Oh, how well I remember how we were charged with destroying the Department of Labor. Do you remember it? I have the speeches right here. I do not want to rub any salt in any old wounds, but I recall the speeches that were made, and I had to bear the brunt of that criticism. I want to tell you that I worried along with it for 2 years. I know how an assistant of the Labor Department came out into my State and charged the Eightieth Congress, the "do nothing" Congress, with destroying the Labor Department because of cutting off its funds; and I remember how he charged that I, as the chairman of that subcommittee, was responsible for stabbing labor in the back and all that sort of tripe. I notice he has just resigned, in disgust perhaps, because he was not appointed Under Secretary of Labor; I do not know what else; but he and plenty of others reiterated that stuff to the American people, and they did it here on this floor, and they pointed out how we had cut this appropriation and cut that appropriation, and how we had destroyed labor. Do you remember that? Some of you new Members who are here for the first time, who came in on that platform perhaps, and the promise that you and the Eighty-first Congress were going to take care of it; you were going to restore the Labor Department, and you would show this miserable Eightieth Congress a thing or two; you would show them a trick with a hole in it; you would put these funds back. What have you done? Well, you have done absolutely nothing up to date, absolutely nothing; and we have been here two months and a half. You have not done anything.

I know what the temptation is to talk politics on this floor; I know what it is; I know what the temptation is to go out and talk politics to the people of the country, but are you not just a little bit ashamed now that you realize the facts and the truth? Are you not a little bit ashamed for the way you misled the people—or at least tried to mislead them—you went out and paraded this information that the Eightieth Congress had destroyed the Labor Department.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Now, let us look at the picture. We get into a very interesting subject here now and one that I think ought to be canvassed just a little bit on this floor. I am glad to say that my friends on the majority side of this committee this year perhaps looked at the recommendations of their President and his Bureau of the Budget with very great alarm when they discovered that in actuality and in fact the Bureau of the Budget accepted almost in toto the action of the Eightieth Congress so far as appropriations for the Department of Labor were concerned. Where is all this restoration of funds? Where is all this pledge that you were going to see that the Department of Labor was built up, and that you were going to give them all the money they asked for? Is it in this bill? Go back and tell the people what you have been doing; tell them the truth. If you tell them the truth you will find that the Eightieth Congress did a pretty good job, because the President himself and his Bureau of the Budget put their seal of approval on what the Eightieth Congress did when they submitted a budget estimate this year with only an increase, a total increase as between the bill passed by the Eightieth Congress and the bill suggested here, of only $2,176,850.

What makes that increase possible and necessary? Why, $991,000 of it represents salary increases that the Eightieth Congress gave to employees of the Labor Department and other agencies of government which became effective last August. Do you remember that?

You are so interested in these employees and doing things for labor. But the Eightieth Congress gave these employees a pay increase last August. Of the total increase in this bill for the Labor Department for 1950, $991,000 of it is accounted for by that pay-increase law.

That leaves $1,185,850 and of that amount $1,129,000 of the increase is for the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Do you remember what happened on this floor last year? The committee recommended an appropriation for the Bureau of Labor Statistics and that was cut down by virtue of an amendment adopted on the floor of the House. The amount of the increase that the Bureau of the Budget gives in this bill to the Bureau of Labor Statistics is practically the same amount as the committee last year gave before action was taken on the floor of the House. You are getting just about the same amount that a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the Eightieth Congress gave to the Labor Department in total, the total increase being $56,850.

Now, that is the great mouse you have developed as a result of this yelling and hollering as to what the Eighty-first Congress was going to do for the Labor Department. When you are charged with the responsibility as we were last year, and you are charged with a responsibility that compels you to look facts in the face as the Bureau of the Budget did and as the President did, you will find that the Eightieth Congress did a pretty good job and you cannot improve very much on it.

That leads me to another thing.

Do you remember the editorials and the wails that went around when the subcommittee last year, and there was great force behind it, wrote a lot of legislation into the appropriation bill to streamline the Federal Security Agency? Do you remember that? Do you remember the wails that went up? I remember one article after another published in the papers of my State, vicious articles, which said that I was responsible for destroying the social-security program. Right here on this floor it was said that if the Congress accepts the suggestion of the gentleman from Wisconsin and his subcommittee it will destroy the social-security program. Do you remember that? Oh, how I suffered under that.

Are you not a little bit ashamed of yourselves now? Are you not really ashamed of yourselves?

Now, read the record. The thing has been in operation now for a year. Do you believe Oscar Ewing, head of the Federal Security Agency? He is your boy. Do you believe Bob Goodwin, head of the Employment Service? He is your boy. Read their statements in this record. It is crystal clear that the thing is working magnificently and all this talk about what you were going to do to social security, the USES, the UC, and all that sort of thing was just a lot of bolonoy thrown out for pure, dirty, nasty political purposes. I want to rub your nose into it, good naturedly. I want to call to the attention of the American people how you fooled them.

Now listen, and I want you to get this. When Mr. Ewing, the Federal Security Administrator, was before the committee I asked him this question which you will find on page 739 of the hearings:

> Mr. Ewing, first of all I want to compliment you and the agency in carrying out and accelerating, if I may use that word, the program which this committee set out for you to do with the intent of strengthening the top administration of this agency and streamlining the operations in the field. If I interpret your statement correctly, the proposal for the consolidation of the various and sundry field offices of the constituent unit agencies into the Federal Security Agency regional office set-up, with the top-flight regional director, and the people under him representing the staffing arrangement at the headquarters here, has proven to be an efficient and satisfactory step, has it not?
>
> Mr. EWING. It has, and it is working, at the end of 7 months, very much more smoothly than we ever anticipated that it would.

Why not tell the American people the truth? We did a job in their interest and in the interest of the people of this country. And, you saved some money by doing it, too, do you know that? Yes; we closed a lot of these regional offices. You had a lot of these boys in there drawing big, fat salaries, and they squealed and they squawked, and they said, "You are going to throw us out of these fat jobs." They did not care anything about efficiency. They cared nothing about whether they were rendering service to the States or not. They were interested in their jobs as people of that kind always are. We went through it and we said, "Listen, we are setting up the Federal Security Agency on an efficient basis." I had the finest kind of help from the top-flight people in the Federal Security Agency to do that job last year. No one man could do it alone. We had wonderful help. But, the fellows on the outside, they always want to raise a political question, and the hangers-on that were getting these big, fat salaries, they did not like it.

Now, we have had it for 7 months. Mr. Ewing, Mr. Kingsley, Mr. Leo Miller, Mr. Stephens, and the people charged with the responsibility of doing that job, have done a magnificent job. And the thing is working. Has social security been destroyed? We cut a million-odd dollars off of Mr. Altmeyer's office. Did you restore it this year? You did not. You cut it even more. Why? Because we demonstrated that the job could be done without all that top-heavy overhead down there.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

It seems to me that just common decency and just good neighborliness, under the good-neighbor policy, maybe, should require some of you people to go out and tell the American people the truth about the Eightieth Congress and what they did in connection with this particular program.

I wish I had time to quote all the things that are in this record. Now we are moving in that direction, and I compliment my friend from Rhode Island, who has done a pretty good job. I think he has seen the light of this picture. Things did not work out as bad as they predicted it would last year, and we are getting some sort of management into this giant, sprawling thing we call the Federal Security Agency.

In this great field of public health that most of you know I have taken some part in for a period of years, I am proud of the work and the contribution that the Federal Government and its Public Health Service has been able to make in this great field of research and control in the matter of disease. I want you to know that the chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], and I see eye to eye on the necessity for the continuation and the enlargement of this program. There is no politics in it. I was amazed, as he was, and no doubt you were, to read the President's budget and find where he had recommended to this Congress action which, if we allowed it to go through, would have practically destroyed these vital programs involving cancer, heart disease, and mental health.

I am glad to know, and I pay tribute to him again, that the chairman of this subcommittee has the courage, in the face of extreme pressure applied to him as the chairman of a subcommittee not to override the Presidential budget, to stand firm and say, "I am interested in the people of America and in the health and welfare of the people of America. We are not going to allow these programs to deteriorate and be cut back so that they will be destroyed."

You take your hat off to that kind of a fellow. I do. They never take their hats off to me. They throw a lot of bricks at me. But I tell you right now, I take off my hat to that kind of a fellow. I believe in tossing an orchid whenever I find that kind of behavior.

So we have this great program set up and under way. I shall not rehearse again the fine presentation that was made by the chairman of this subcommittee, but I want you to know that I have been privileged to speak over this country and in various parts of the country and to many, many audiences, and I have yet to find the first man or woman who is not willing to pay taxes to support these great programs in the interest of public health. So we are going to move forward.

This represents a compromise. There have to be compromises in all our thinking. I think the chairman and myself would have gone much further with these programs than we finally did as a result of a compromise in the subcommittee. However, as the subcommittee stands, we agreed that we would effect those compromises which are always necessary to get a job done, and we have a bill here that we all support. It is a good bill. It is one that will carry forward the program that the dirty, nasty Eightieth Congress started in many of its aspects.

Again, carrying that program forward in the interests of the welfare of the people of America, we did a thing last year that was one of the most revolutionary things in this whole program that had ever been attempted before.

The scientists of this Nation had looked forward to it for years in the field of research. That was the program of forward financing, by which we provided the funds so that one of these trainees, these young medical men who are in the field of research, could be hired in a research program and be assured that his job would not terminate at the end of any Government fiscal year.

We provided, again, for a construction program in connection with the heart and cancer programs. The President's budget cut that program out entirely, cut out practically all the forward financing. I want to ask the Budget Director or anybody else, what is the use of building all these hospitals around the country under the Hill-Burton implementation, what is the use of building this $60,000,000 research hospital out here at Bethesda that will be the greatest research institution in the world, what is the use of doing all this research unless you are going to have the doctors and the clinicians and the people to staff these hospitals to give to the people of America the benefit of the research as it takes place?

So I am proud to have had a little part in this program, and I thank the Members of Congress who have unitedly, on both sides of the aisle, unanimously, supported this program. You have been simply wonderful. Last year when the committee came up with a brand new item to take care of public-health activities in Alaska, was there any dispute on the committee? There was not. We overwrote the budget $1,100,000, and we are overwriting it again $300,000 on that item, to carry forward that great work in Alaska to try to whip venereal disease and tuberculosis, to protect your son and mine who may be exposed to it as a member of our armed forces. In this field this committee and the Congress have been alert to the needs of the people of the United States. Thank God there has been no division in this field as between Republicans and Democrats. We are going to carry this program forward. We have just begun to scratch the surface. We are simply complementing and supplementing the work that is already going on in the great research centers of America, helping the magnificent men and women who are already in the field unsung and unknown, working day after day at the bench in an effort to find the causes of and a cure for cancer, for heart disease, and all these other ailments that are affecting so many people. Do you not think it is a good work? Are you not proud to be a Member of the Congress that is alert to that situation? Let me close by just saying this: We have many wonderful men and women in this country. That is what makes me believe that we can fight out our troubles and conquer almost any problem, because of the genius of the people of America. Is it not a wonderful thing that men like Maurice Goldblatt, of Chicago, a great businessman, will devote his time, effort, and money as a member of the National Advisory Heart Council trying in every way possible to find a cure for heart disease? Is it not wonderful when a man like Ernst Mahler, one of the distinguished scientists in the field of industrial chemistry, of the Kimberly-Clark Corp., will devote his time and talents and energies to help humanity serving as a member of this Advisory Council?

I could go on here for an hour and tell of the magnificent work of Dr. Wortis, of New York, in the field of psychiatry and mental health and Dr. Rhoads in the field of cancer, and Dr. White in the field of heart disease. I could tell you of these unselfish, magnificent men working here at Bethseda under the direction of one of the greatest men it has ever been my privilege to know, Dr. Dyer, head of the Institute of Health at Bethseda. I could name any number of these great men who, at great personal sacrifice, as far as money is concerned, are giving of their time, effort, and of their life in the interest of humanity. So that is why I like this bill. That is why I like the men who are on the subcommittee. This bill deals with human interest and human welfare.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman has made a magnificent contribution to public health during the last few years, as has the committee. I, for one, am extremely grateful. My question is whether the placement service for the veterans is working out satisfactorily.

Mr. KEEFE. Is the gentlewoman talking about the Veterans' Employment Service?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. There was testimony before the committee that it was. Representatives from the various veterans' organizations, appearing before the committee, said that it was. Mr. Faulkner, the Director, said that it was. Apparently the Bureau of the Budget and the President did not think so, because they cut something over a million dollars from this budget this year.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I trust the Senate will put it back into the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has again expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate what I said this morning and what I had to say in my remarks a year ago, that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], when he was chairman of this committee for 2 years, and myself, were in complete agreement on all items under the Public Health Service. We see eye to eye on every appropriation in the Public Health Service.

I will admit that a year ago I complained quite bitterly about the proposed changes in the Federal Security Agency. I will admit this afternoon that the changes that have been accomplished in the administration of the Federal Security Agency have been all for the good. It has all been beneficial.

I complained in the last 2 years quite bitterly about what the Eightieth Congress was doing to the Department of Labor. I do not see any reason for changing the attitude that I had 2 years ago when I said publicly, in many speeches in the campaign last year, that the Eightieth Congress was crucifying the Department of Labor. The same type of statement I made on this floor a year ago, and 2 years ago, and I think with some justification.

I do not want to disagree too much with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], because this year above all years we have been getting along much better than we ever anticipated. But when he brings in the record of the Eightieth Congress, if I were ever a candidate as a Republican in a national election I would never want to bring up the name of the Eightieth Congress, because if there was anything that helped elect Mr. Truman as President of the United States, in my humble opinion, it was the record that was established by the Members of the Eightieth Congress.

What did they do to the Department of Labor? In the fiscal year of 1948, 2 years ago, the Eightieth Congress cut the over-all appropriations that were allowed by the Bureau of the Budget for the Department of Labor by about 44 percent, as I recall. Let there be no mistake about that. What happened a year ago? This committee and this House cut the budget estimates of the Department of Labor by 25 percent, which was an additional 20 percent over what they cut them in 1948 fiscal year. Now, when we talked about the Bureau of Labor Statistics, they asked for, roughly, $5,000,000 2 years ago. What did we do? We cut that Bureau by 40 percent. Our committee did it. Then when we came on the floor to present the bill, as we are today, a motion was made by a Member on the Republican side to cut the appropriation for the Bureau of Labor Statistics by another million dollars. Even though we believed at that time, and said so on the floor, that it should not be cut, that is what happened.

What happened a year ago? The Bureau of Labor Statistics asked for over $5,000,000 and we allowed them $2,500,000 which is a little more than a 50-percent cut. And not only the cuts that were made by this committee in the last 2 years, but what I was complaining about at that time, and I believe I was right, was that we were taking these various agencies away from the Department of Labor and building up a huge administration in the Federal Security Agency. What happened years ago when we had the old Immigration Service in the Department of Labor? That was taken out. The Children's Bureau was taken out of the Department of Labor. Last year, by action of this Committee on Appropriations, we legislated the United States Employment Service out of the Department of Labor and put it into the Federal Security Agency.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the Hoover Commission has made its report, and I am now very thankful that last year when this matter was before the House we based our argument on the proposition that we should await the report of the Hoover Commission before we took any action as to whether or not the employment services should be taken out of the Department of Labor and put into the Federal Security Agency. If that had been followed we would have avoided a lot of unnecessary work, because the Hoover Commission now is recommending that the employment service be taken from the Federal Security Agency and put back into the Department of Labor where it belongs. Some of us believe that the Conciliation and Mediation Service should be put back into the Department of Labor.

I want to see the Department of Labor a real living department; I want to see it have some authority; I want to see it have some power; and this year for fiscal 1950 for the first time in years, and years, this committee has allowed the full amount that was awarded by the Bureau of the Budget for the Department of Labor.

I will not admit that the figures quoted by the gentleman from Wisconsin are correct; it is not an increase; it is not something that we have made any promise on, that we are going to build this up into a great, huge, governmental agency—I do not want to see it built up unless we can justify it; but there are certain agencies like Employment Security and others that I believe belong in the Department of Labor, and I hope they will eventually be placed there.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I am pleased to yield to my friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I have listened very carefully to what the gentleman has said. He does not challenge the figures which I submitted in my statement. I am just wondering what the gentleman's answer is? The gentleman says we have allowed the estimates of the Bureau of the Budget; as a matter of fact, the gentleman just got through saying how the first session of the Eightieth Congress cut its budget 44 percent, and the second session cut it twenty-odd percent. Has the gentleman's party restored it? Has it overridden the Bureau of the Budget to put those things back? Of course, it has not. You have accepted the figures of the Bureau of the Budget and thus accepted the action of the Eightieth Congress. That is what you have done.

Mr. FOGARTY. We like to proceed with caution in going above the figures of the Bureau of the Budget on any item for which we appropriate, and I know that the gentleman from Wisconsin agrees with me that, in general, none of us want to go above the figures that are given to us by the Bureau of the Budget, because the Bureau has an over-all budget of some forty-odd billions this year. There are a lot of items in the Department of Labor I should like to have increased, but because of the over-all limitation I felt that it was within the policy of making good government in keeping as well as we could within the figures of the Bureau of the Budget; and in only three or four outstanding instances, in public health, did we go above the figures of the Bureau of the Budget. The fact still remains that the Eightieth Congress did more to tear down and break up the Department of Labor than any other Congress in the history of the Department, since 1913, when the Department of Labor became a Cabinet Department. I read between the lines all the way down the building up of this huge administration under Federal Security which I said a year ago if we let it go on, and on, and on, and built it up, would become such a tremendous agency that we probably could not control it in the future or control the appropriations it was demanding.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. I heard the gentleman both in the full committee and in his statement here this morning, and I want to commend the gentleman for the splendid statement he has made.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to confuse the issues here, or anything like that; but, sincerely, if I were running for reelection on the Republican ticket in the next general election, I would not bring up the matter of the Eightieth Congress. It has been so explored, and the record has been brought to every nook and corner of this country that if you want to come back do not run on the record of the Eightieth Congress. If we as Members of the Eighty-first Congress cannot do a hundredfold better job for the common, ordinary people of this country than the Eightieth Congress did in the 2 years the Republicans were in control I do not want to run for reelection.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. FELLOWS. When are you going to start?

Mr. FOGARTY. We have started. May I say to the gentleman from Maine one of the best starts of any Congress in the history of this country has been made by the Appropriations Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is the third appropriation bill that has been reported. The schedule called for now by the Committee on Appropriations is to report to the House every appropriation bill by the 1st of May. That is something which has never happened in a previous Congress. To my way of thinking, that is getting a pretty good start on what we intend to do and what we hope to accomplish in this year and the next year. We still have almost 2 years to go to make good and we are going to do our very best to make good in those 2 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HEDRICK].

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Chairman, first I wish to thank Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, for his outstanding statement made before our subcommittee and his unselfish cooperation with us in determining the needs of his departments.

I am pleased to report that the death rate from all causes in 1948 is the lowest ever recorded in the history of this country by 9.9 per 1,000 population. There is a marked decrease in the maternal and infant mortality and in such diseases as tuberculosis, pneumonia, and influenza. For example, the death rate from tuberculosis was 194 per 100,000 population in 1900, and in 1948, it was only 31 per 100,000 population.

The increase in births in 1948 was unusually great, being 3,700,000 live babies born during that year. The infant death rate also reached a new low. In 1915, we lost 100 babies out of 1,000 births, before they reached the age of 1 year. In 1948, the rate was only 32 per 1,000 births. This showing may add 17 years to the span of life. A new-born baby may now be expected to reach the age of 67, compared to 50 years in 1900. This is most encouraging, but we are now faced with the problems of the middle life, which is not as good, generally speaking. In 1948, diseases of the heart, kidney, circulatory system, and cancer accounted for 60 percent of all deaths in the United States. In 1900, the same group of diseases accounted for less than 23 percent of all deaths. Since 1900, the death rate for heart diseases and related ailments has increased from 333 per 100,000 population to 466 per 100,000 population. In the same time, cancer has increased from 64 in 1900 to 134 in 1948. This increase is likewise true in mental diseases, 600,000 mental patients now occupying beds in overcrowded hospitals in the United States.

The Public Health Service is one of the oldest Federal agencies. Last July, it celebrated its one-hundred and fiftieth anniversary. Today, it operates 25 marine hospitals and 120 out-patient clinics. It also operates hospitals for narcotic addicts and one leprosy hospital at Carville, La. The marine hospitals and clinics are the first to learn about epidemics and go into action to protect our country against spread of disease. The recent outbreak of yellow fever in Panama was soon under control by the prompt action of the United States Public Health Service. Thousands of doses of yellow-fever vaccine were flown to Panama and thousands of people were immunized against the disease. All quarantine stations and our ports were on the alert to prevent the entry of the infection into this country as well as the South American countries.

A few months ago at Donora, Pa., 20 people lost their lives due to smog. At the request of the Pennsylvania health authorities and other interested people, the Public Health Service stepped in and is making an investigation as to the causes and how to prevent similar occurrences in other communities. Numerous highly trained individuals have been experimenting for the past several

months, endeavoring to ascertain the causes of this calamity.

During the year 1948, the National Institute of Health isolated a virus of the common cold, and is now making an all-out fight against all virus diseases.

Although the Water Pollution Control Act of 1948 was passed, which authorizes a new laboratory at Cincinnati, Ohio, for extensive research in the field of water pollution, this laboratory has not yet materialized. This is badly needed, and I hope it can be made available within the near future.

While the death rate from tuberculosis, as formerly stated, has been steadily declining, we still have about 50,000 deaths yearly from this dreaded disease. The States are making more than 1,000,000 X-rays annually under the supervision of the public health, endeavoring to make an early diagnosis of the disease. It is generally known that the secret in treating tuberculosis successfully is an early recognition of the disease, and prompt and scientific treatment established at once.

In the past 10 years, the death rate from syphilis declined 45 percent. It has dropped from 21,000 in 1937 to 13,000 in 1947. There has also been a remarkable decline in congenital syphilis and central nervous system types of diseases which has been especially noticed within the past 10 years.

In the cancer field, Congress has made it possible for the Public Health Service to expand research in the National Cancer Institute and to aid non-Federal institutions in their research. While nothing striking has been brought out in the past few years as to the cause of cancer, it is felt by the authorities that the proper approach is being made and that something is bound to materialize within the near future. We must not get discouraged in this fight. We must wage war against cancer and every effort must be made to determine the causes regardless of the cost and the time it takes to accomplish this.

Concerning the problem of cardiovascular diseases, arthritis, and rheumatism, which affect the heart, we do not know the causes of many pathological conditions of the heart, but we must continue our investigations and experimentations until this problem has been solved.

The question of high blood pressure, for instance, is a question that still must be answered. Just why a young individual must have unusually high blood pressure and another individual, late in life, has a normal blood pressure or even a low type of pressure, is something that we are as yet unable to answer. However, we do know considerable about rheumatic heart disease which is commonly known in the medical profession as endocarditis. This type of heart disease, which should in reality be called infection of the heart, is most always caused by focal infection. In children, infection of the middle ear, diseased tonsils, and adenoids, and in infants pyelitis, are among the common causes of this type of heart infection. In reality, any concealed infection or pus formation within the system can readily cause endocarditis. It is vitally important before attempting to eradicate any infection of the body, especially in children, that a few doses of penicillin be given to safeguard against heart complications. This is also true in the treatment of acute inflammatory rheumatism which so frequently causes heart complications. A few years ago, rheumatic heart disease was practically always fatal, or at least the patient was disabled for life. Today, with our modern methods of treatment, a considerable number of these cases recover.

In recent years, there has been a marked increase in diabetes. Thousands of cases have been ascertained through annual physical examinations, examinations made by insurance companies, and the armed services. A simple blood test has recently come into use to determine diabetics and potential diabetics. It is estimated that thousands upon thousands of cases of diabetes now exist that have never been diagnosed.

The dentists of this country are to be congratulated on their recent scientific studies of tooth decay and gum infection. It was only recently that sodium fluoride has become of general use in the prevention of tooth decay in children. Numerous dental treatment units are now in certain sections of the country, endeavoring to instruct teachers and parents, as well as the local dentists in the use of this unusual treatment. It is estimated that 40 percent of tooth infection and cavity formations can be lessened by the use of this remarkable drug. Many communities throughout the country are now making studies and investigations with the idea of using sodium fluoride in their drinking water. Great results may be obtained by such usage. It has also been determined in recent years that the eating of candy is a cause of a large percentage of dental cavities.

In medical diseases, our studies must continue, endeavoring to determine the causes which bring about or promote this ever increasing type of disease. We need hundreds of trained individuals in this field, as well as in the field of heart and cancer diseases to continue the scientific investigations in the effort to relieve the human race of these most dreaded afflictions.

Mr. Chairman, I am quite sure that the vast majority of the membership of the House has had numerous communications from constituents and interested parties all over the country, with regard to increasing appropriations for some of these items, especially that of mental diseases. Our committee also received hundreds of communications in this regard. We endeavored to be as liberal as possible and did increase appropriations for cancer, heart diseases, and mental disorders. However, the increase naturally had to be moderate. We well realize the importance of these subjects and millions of dollars could be spent in research which, no doubt, would be money well spent, as far as most of the taxpayers are concerned. But we felt there had to be a limit on the amount of money spent in this regard. The expense of government is terrific, and we sought to make our appropriations justifiable.

I sincerely hope that the Members of the House will realize the responsibility that was placed on our shoulders and will collaborate with us in this respect.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he desires to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCGRATH].

Mr. MCGRATH. Mr. Chairman, in addressing this body for the first time, one must recognize the stupendous task that falls upon every Member of the Congress of the United States. When the partisanship of the campaign is over and five men sit down as we did in this subcommittee representing different political thoughts, coming from districts having little in common—save their Americanism—one recognizes the responsibility that the public has reposed in us.

This subcommittee allowed at no time any partisanship considerations to interfere in its deliberations. We have presented to you, our colleagues, this morning a budget that is not skimpy and yet is not fattened out with unnecessary appropriations.

The Labor Department has received its just due as explained by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]. Public health is marching on under the guidance of the gentleman from West Virginia, Dr. HEDRICK, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], who though not a doctor, has the heart and soul of a physician. And to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] came at all times the guidance of a successful and yet practical and humane businessman.

The Federal Security Agency appropriation consists of a direct total appropriation of one-billion-four-hundred-and-seventy-eight-million-odd dollars, an increase of $278,000,000 above the 1949 appropriation.

In addition to this sum, there are contract authorizations of $106,000,000.

Among the departments under the Federal Security Agency is the appropriation for the American Printing House for the Blind which was set at the same amount, namely, $115,000, as was granted last year.

The employees' compensation fund shows an increase of $2,188,000. This is occasioned by the fact that there was an increase of approximately 15 percent in claims in 1949 over the previous year. This has been caused by the many injuries sustained during the war years when production, wages, and patriotism kept many employees on the job who thus delayed filing their claims.

The very important protection which is afforded to the food-consuming public is handled by our Food and Drug Administration. This agency is charged by law with the enforcement of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, the purpose of which is to protect the public from harmful, impure, or falsely labeled food and drugs. It is interesting to note that every day an average of 10 tons of rat or insect defiled foods are seized, the violators prosecuted, and the public is saved from illness and death. The committee saw fit to grant this department the sum of $5,900,000 and for this amount the American public is certainly getting real value.

The Bureau of Vocational Education receives the exact appropriation that it

received last year, $19,842,000, being the amount allotted by the Bureau of the Budget, plus certain allocations for Hawaii and Puerto Rico. With these allocations, the Office of Vocational Education has been allotted roughly $24,000,000.

Vocational rehabilitation is a program that appeals to everyone, first from a humane and even from a business viewpoint. The program is jointly financed by the States and the Federal Government; the States provide the services to the individual and the States defray half the costs of medical examinations, and surgical treatments. The Federal Government pays the other half of these costs as well as the costs of administration.

We are happy to advise this body that through this agency over 65 thousand people were rehabilitated this year and approximately seventy-four thousand should be rehabilitated next year. These people now take their place in society, contribute to our tax rolls, and if there is one agency that certainly returns more than it takes, it is this vocational rehabilitation program.

The problem of grants to States for unemployment compensation presented a difficult and somewhat vexatious problem. In view of the sudden and substantial increase in work load in the various States in paying unemployment compensation during the last two or three months, your committee felt it necessary to give extended consideration to the amount of funds needed by the States next year. A deficiency of $10,000,000 was approved by the House several days ago to give the States some additional funds to handle the recent rise in work load and with that amount, if ultimately granted, they will be able to operate during the balance of the current fiscal year to June 30, making it in all in the neighborhood of a $150,000,000 annual operation. The committee was convinced that the budget of $135,000,000 was insufficient for next year but it is next to impossible to forecast precisely the amount of funds needed. The record of past appropriations was that the States have had to run deficits and come in for supplemental appropriations almost every year. Some of the State costs are controllable; others are uncontrollable. In an effort to make reasonable provision for State operations, the bill provides for $150,000,000 during the first three-fourths of the fiscal year. This should permit the States to be able to operate effectively in handling payments of unemployment compensation promptly while at the same time permitting them to maintain a vigorous and effective employment service which certainly should be maintained at a time when people are unemployed and asking for compensation payments.

The language of the bill also provides for a contingency reserve of $7,500,000. The States and the Federal bureau have advocated some such procedure as this for several years and it is designed to provide some reasonable means for meeting emergencies when the Congress is not in session, or sudden increases in unemployment work loads which no one can foresee.

I appreciate that there are two schools of thought on the question of employment. Our committee considered all this and are united in the hope that unemployment will decrease but we are not prophets and it is our studied opinion that this appropriation will be sufficient for at least a period of 9 months and we believe for longer.

Because of the statutory obligation for public assistance which is on a State grant-matching basis, the Federal Government is obligated to appropriate $1,058,000,000 and this amount has been included in the bill. This is an increase of $261,000,000 over last year's budget. The Federal matching provisions were increased as of last October.

Another item that our committee has been diligent in observing is the question of administrative costs. They have been carefully pared wherever possible; for instance the Federal Security Administrator has asked for an increase of $223,000 for additional assistants. This item has been deleted entirely from the bill.

Mindful of the statutory obligations and the forward march in the field of health and the development of our Federal security program and Justice for the Labor Department, we respectfully submit this budget for the consideration of the House.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 14 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, in view of the very fine and cordial relations that this committee has enjoyed I hesitate to inject politics into the discussion. But inasmuch as the chairman of the subcommittee has seen fit to do so I say here again that I am partly in agreement and partly in disagreement with him. Rather than referring to "the record of the Eightieth Congress" I would qualify that as I have qualified some of his other statements and say, "The unknown record of the Eightieth Congress," because our greatest campaign weakness was in not making the record of the Eightieth Congress known to the American people. For had the American voters known the entire record, they would have endorsed it.

Along with the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HEDRICK] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCGRATH], I am serving my apprenticeship on this subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. When this assignment was given me, I did not know what the future held for me in that activity. I had known the gentleman from West Virginia, Dr. HEDRICK, before having served with him on the Veterans' Legislative Committee. Judge MCGRATH, a new member, I did not know. I had not had much contact with the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], though I knew the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]. But all of my misgivings were ill-founded and it has been a very, very pleasant relation. The hearings went forward with great dispatch. Sometimes I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCGRATH], the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HEDRICK], and I felt that we were taking some of these things pretty much on faith and sometimes on faith twice removed, because the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] had gone into many of these matters with the various witnesses in very great detail over the past 2 years. We did not know them so well, but having faith in the chairman and the former chairman, and having faith in their faith in some of these witnesses, we took some of their statements just that way.

There was not complete unanimity. I thought some of the items could have been scaled down some more. I thought very few of them needed more than the budget allowed. We heard the presentations. All of our differences were in the committee room. There they were settled and we are unanimous in our position on this bill today.

The chairman remarked that we were called upon to consider some ILO funds. Our discussion of that and the hearings disclosed that as far as we saw the legislative authority which was cited to us did not relate to appropriations to this particular phase of the matter at all but rather to the Department of State. While we are mentioning ILO, I think some of you gentlemen may find some very interesting reading if you get the reports of the International Labor Organization, particularly the convention adopted by that organization in Philadelphia in 1945. You may find there some of the roots or some of the ideas for some of the far-reaching programs that have been suggested to the Eighty-first Congress in the last few weeks.

On the matter of railroad retirement, as has been suggested, Congress is dealing with trust funds. This appropriation does not come out of the general treasury as we think of appropriations, but nevertheless this committee has a duty to perform. We are obliged to see that these trust funds are properly handled and that they are handled with as great economy and efficiency as is humanly possible to conserve all of the funds available in that trust, so that the employees of the railroads may have full benefit thereof.

Mention has been made of the appropriation this year for old age assistance, and dependent and crippled children. That is a thousand and fifty-eight million dollars. Yes, $1,058,000,000. That is a great sum. To show you how these programs grow—well, it sounds like the Old Gold program that we hear on Sunday night—they grow and grow and grow. The first appropriation for old age assistance in 1938 was $214,000,000. Today it is $1,058,000,000; it tripled in the last few years, so they tell us. It makes us wonder where it is going in the next few years. We should see in our minds, as we think of these things, the sign on the railroad crossing, "Stop, look and listen." Where are all of these funds coming from? Where are they going? If you read some of the tables that were placed in these hearings at my request you will see that some of these programs look like the old game of put and take. Some States put in millions and millions of dollars and take little out; other States put in very little and take out enormous sums. It may be interesting if the Members study this juggling of funds and see how

the redistribution of wealth has taken place in the activities of this Government.

In the unemployment program we found some interesting information. The Congress and the public should be informed as to the charges made by some of the inadequate way in which it is claimed that the States have been carrying on their unemployment service; that they are not doing a proper job of scanning all these applications for unemployment payments. Well, there is not much mystery about it. The States can only do so much with the money that is recommended by the President and the Bureau of the Budget and allotted to them by appropriations. We find that from these taxes on employers, the Federal Treasury has received $1,313,580,000. That money has gone into the Federal Treasury. How much has gone out to the States for administration and in payment of benefits to employees, in these various State offices in that period of time? Five hundred and forty-eight million dollars, which means that there has been a net profit to the Treasury of the United States of $800,000,000. If that $800,000,000 paid in as a special fund by the employers of this Nation had been distributed to the States of this Nation, I dare say there would have been a much better job done, especially in the screening of many of these claims, and many, many millions of dollars might well have been saved.

According to the chairman [Mr. FOGARTY] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] there has been a great deal of improvement in efficiency in the Federal Security Agency in its application of the programs. From the admissions made to us, there can be still greater improvement. Mr. Ewing and Mr. Kingsley both admitted that there was a great deal of overlapping of programs. When we tried to find out where the overlapping is, they said, "Well we do not know where it is, but we know it is there." The heads of these various offices, along with the various employees who handle the financial activities and the budget matters, might very well look into some of these overlapping programs and eliminate those that now overlap. We will then have a still more efficient department there than we now have.

Two things have not been mentioned, but I think this House should give some detailed thought to them. One is Howard University. Starting on page 688 of the hearings, you will find the full and complete hearings on this great school. Starting on that page, you will find where Dr. Mordecai W. Johnson, the president of this university, told the entire story of the fine work they are doing, of the type of graduate they are turning out, the faculty they have, the difficulties they have encountered. But they are doing a marvelous job, and they are working on a great asset of this country, namely, young people of America. To carry on this program, constantly increasing appropriations have been made. The young colored people going out of there as graduates are doing a marvelous job not only in teaching but in medicine, dentistry, engineering, and all the other courses that are made available. Dr. Johnson is to be commended on the fine leadership he has given to the school and its pupils over a period of years, and the fine example he makes for them. He told us that he had come there to take a temporary job when he took that assignment, but that temporary job now has lasted over 20 years, according to my recollection. He can well be proud of the work he has done.

Many people seem to have the idea that Howard University is completely financed by the Federal Government. That is not true. The school is not financed completely by Federal funds at all. You will find that the students attending that school pay over $1,000,000 for their tuition just as in other schools. It is true there is a very considerable amount appropriated to finance the school, and properly so, I think, in view of all the circumstances, the past history and the very fine work they are doing. The money spent there will eventually repay this Nation not only in the services of those graduates but in the fine caliber of citizenship that will be there developed.

The other item that should be mentioned here, is Freedmen's Hospital, the cost of which runs more than the cost of a normal hospital because it is an adjunct of Howard University. The young colored students of medicine are taking much of their training and some of their internship there. With the added use of this hospital for education there is, of course, a greater cost of operation than there might be in some other hospital.

Before my time expires there is one question that I feel should be answered. That is one about the reduction of $11,000,000 in the appropriations for general health. This program is in addition to the special ones relating to cancer, heart, tuberculosis, venereal disease, and all that. We looked over that program, which called for an increase of more than 100 percent over last year's budget. They told us that the $11,000,000 they had last year took this general health service to communities with a total population of 90,000,000 people. They wanted to more than double it, and thus increase the scope of activity to only another 10,000,000 people. We thought that they just were not making a showing of sufficient utility of the dollars to justify this increase in appropriation; therefore, it was denied. Even though the increase was denied, their present activites will not be curtailed.

In closing, I, too, want to commend the chairman and other members of the committee on the very fine way in which this bill has been handled. Although nearly all of my suggestions for decreases were overruled, it was done with such a charming smile and courtesy that even though I did not get the proposals over, the wound was not deep.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

IS IT A FAIR DEAL TO DISCRIMINATE AGAINST INDEPENDENT UNIONS IN WRITING OUR LABOR LAWS?

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, it has always been my contention that whenever Congress considers labor legislation care must be taken to see that all working men and women are treated fairly and squarely, not just the few millions who happen to be members of the CIO or the AFL.

It is commonly overlooked in Congress and in public discussions and in the newspapers that there are hundreds of independent unions with millions of members in these United States. They have a perfect right to be considered in all our discussions and considerations. It also frequently is overlooked that there are millions of laboring men and women who do not belong to any union. They, too, of course, should have a place in our minds when we think of legislation for all the people of our Nation.

Personally, my study of independent unions has proved to me that these can be the most effective for the individual worker and yet not be subjected to all the ills and weaknesses and abuses to which the big unions sometimes have been subjected. The members of the independent unions are more aware of their role in union affairs; they are more anxious to preserve their unions and to increase production. They have better leaders, all things considered, than do the members of the huge, mass unions which could prove so dangerous if infiltrated by the Communists and misled by men who want to make over America.

Mr. Chairman, I am referring to these independent unions at this time because of a recent visit with Floyd Huber and Maurice Porter, representatives of the independent union of the Sutherland Paper Co., at Kalamazoo, Mich. They are constituents of mine and I know them to be patriotic, sincere, honest, hard-working Americans. This also is true of most of their members, and of the vast majority of the workingmen in my district, regardless of race, creed, or color.

Mr. Huber and Mr. Porter understand that there is to be a repeal of the labor law we passed 2 years ago and that another labor law is to be enacted. I do not know whether this is to be the case or not, as yet, but I hear it myself. Personally, I am strongly in favor of the so-called Taft-Hartley bill. I voted for it before and I will vote for it again, although it, like all legislation, has some points in it that could be revised without too great difficulty.

The two independent union representatives brought me a resolution which their union had passed at a recent meeting. With the permission of my colleagues, I should like to read this resolution:

Whereas there have been instances of discrimination against segments of American labor; and

Whereas new legislation is presently being formulated: It is hereby

Resolved, That the Confederated Unions of America at this time present to the Congressmen of each individual State, these four points to be made a part of the new labor law:

1. In deciding all cases under the National Labor Relations Act of 1949, the same regulations and rules of decision shall apply irrespective of whether or not the labor organization affected is affiliated with the labor organizations national or international in scope.

2. Equal representation in the Department of Labor.

3. Upon request of the parties in dispute, the Secretary of Labor shall furnish arbitrators—all cost of which is to be borne by the National Government;

4. In the appointment of Labor-Management Advisory Committees for respective industries, equal representation must be granted all unions whether or not the union is national or international in scope.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that there are many men in the Congress who are opposed to discrimination. At this time, a great deal of talk for and against discrimination is being heard on every side.

I am personally opposed to discrimination. Let me urge my colleagues to stand beside me. The particular discrimination to which I object—although there are many others, of course—concerns these independent unions. Of all the minorities in America, I sometimes think they are more discriminated against than any other.

For years, the present political administration has ignored the leaders of these independent unions. No independent union representative ever has been chosen to become an Assistant Secretary of Labor. There is a vacancy now in the Department of Labor for a union man of high caliber. But is any consideration being given to the idea of putting an independent union leader in that post? Not that I have heard of. I urge the President and his coworkers to consider this idea. While the suggestion comes from a Republican, it is still a good suggestion and I hope that some one among "the powers that be" will act upon it.

Likewise, for many years, under the old Wagner Act and the National Labor Relations Board as constituted in the hey-day of the New Deal, independent unions could expect no mercy if they happened to run afoul either the AFL or the CIO. The NLRB in those days invariably discriminated against the independents and in favor of the major unions. Only during the past 2 years has the NLRB made any attempt to deal fairly and squarely with the independent unions.

Yet, even under the Taft-Hartley law, there have been some discriminations against the independent unions, although not purposely so, of course. A provision in the law makes it mandatory for any union in a dispute to pay a part of the cost of the mediation. The costs in such cases, to the big unions, were inconsequential. But to the small, independent unions, these costs are exorbitant. It is manifestly unfair to ask the small, independent unions to bear the same share of this cost that the large, well-financed unions, with millions of members, are asked to pay.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am against discrimination, and I know that you and other Congressmen join with me in the determination to do everything possible to stop the discrimination against small, independent unions. They are composed of the hard-working, thoughtful, patriotic, law-abiding citizens America needs in this crucial period. We should encourage them, not discourage them.

The Government, in all its resources and majesty, could afford to pay the relatively small sums for conciliation and arbitration needed in various union disputes. The members of small, independent unions should not be penalized by having to pay these costs.

Mr. Chairman, President Truman has told the people of the country that his administration is to be the Fair Deal administration. If this is true, the discrimination against independent unions must cease. Members of these independent unions should be given equal consideration under our labor laws with members of the AFL and CIO.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and ask that the Clerk read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights: For expenses necessary to render assistance in connection with the exercise of reemployment rights of veterans under section 8 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended (50 U. S. C., App. 308), the Service Extension Act of 1941, as amended, the Army Reserve and retired personnel service law of 1940, as amended, and section 9 (h) of title I of the Selective Service Act of 1948 (Public Law 759, approved June 24, 1948), and under the act of June 23, 1943, as amended (50 U. S. C., App. 1472), of persons who have performed service in the merchant marine, including personal services in the District of Columbia, $270,000.

Mr. FOGARTY (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that the bill be subject to points of order and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order?

Are there any amendments to be offered?

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CAVALCANTE: Page 32, line 18, after the word "year", strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That any State receiving a grant for such assistance or aid shall not require as a condition precedent from any recipent of such assistance or aid a promise, bond, or lien whereby such recipient or his or her estate shall be held to make repayment or restitution in the amount or part of any assistance or aid received by such recipient."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, may I add that it also imposes additional duties on the Department in question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment is definitely in order. I merely wish to call to the attention of the Chair the decision by the House not many days ago when the deficiency appropriation bill was before us, when an amendment similar to this was offered to that bill and the ruling of the Chair was that the amendment was proper and in order.

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania would entail additional duties upon the agency involved. Therefore, it would be legislation on an appropriation bill.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TRIMBLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3333) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, directed him to report the same back to the House, without amendment, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TABER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment: On page 29, lines 8 to 17, strike out the first proviso and insert in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided*, That, to the extent that the Federal Security Administrator, with the approval of the Director of the Budget, finds necessary to meet increased costs of administration resulting from change in a State law or increases in the numbers of claims filed and claims paid or salary costs over those upon which the original State's grant was based, this appropriation may be apportioned and obligated at an annual rate not in excess of $150,000,000."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an address and in the other to include a letter written to the President of the United States.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a magazine article.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a certain article.

Mr. CARROLL (at the request of Mr. BIEMILLER) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement he made before the Rules Committee.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. CLEMENTE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an open letter by Generoso Pope.

Mr. FORD asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution from the city of Grand Rapids.

RADAR AIR WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 129 and asked for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2546) to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish land-based air warning and control installations for the national security, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I will yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] 30 minutes; and pending that, I yield myself 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the bill (H. R. 2546) a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish land-based warning and control installations for the national security, and for other purposes.

This is a highly technical matter. It is not such a matter that one who has had as little opportunity as I have had to study it, could intelligently discuss or explain. The learned gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] who is a member of the Armed Services Committee, is fully familiar with the purposes and necessity for this legislation. I shall, therefore, defer to him and not take the time of the House myself. I am sure that when the House goes into the Committee of the Whole that he will give the House the necessary information to justify this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, since I have no request for time on this side, I shall move the previous question on the resolution unless the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] desires to speak or has request for time.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time on this side.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time on the Republican side.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2546) to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish land-based air warning and control installations for the national security, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2546, with Mr. DAVIS of Georgia in the Chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan for 30 minutes.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, the legislation before the Committee for consideration, H. R. 2546, is of the most urgent character; it is necessary for the maintenance of our national security. The bill provides for the erection of public works, including buildings, facilities, utilities, and roads in both the continental United States and in Alaska, which may be necessary to provide for the establishment of an adequate air-warning and control system. Let me make doubly clear what I just said by emphasizing again that the authorization in this legislation is merely a public-works authorization. At the same time, however, the bill has much broader and more far-reaching implications. The construction of the public works which it will authorize is a necessary prerequisite to the setting up of an aircraft warning and control system which will alert our people and our defensive forces in sufficient time to permit the employment of all effective means of defense available to us against attacking enemy aircraft seeking to destroy our vital centers of production and population. The public works themselves will not provide us with an operational system; in addition there must be radar equipment, communications equipment, and an organization, in being, manned by highly trained technical personnel. But all of these essential elements must await the construction of the necessary public works.

An aircraft warning and control system is vitally needed for the protection of the United States. But let me make clear at the outset that such a system in and of itself alone by no means guarantees us security against injury from enemy air attack. To understand why this is so we must first know exactly what an aircraft warning and control system is and, secondly, what it is capable of doing and what it cannot do.

The primary purpose of such a system is to detect approaching enemy aircraft in sufficient time before they arrive at vital targets to permit friendly interceptor fighters to be directed against the enemy planes so that they may destroy them before they have accomplished their mission.

That is not the only purpose of such a system but it is by far its most important function. Other purposes are to alert other active defensive forces such as antiaircraft batteries and, also, to give air-raid warnings in order that every available means of passive defense as well may be employed.

But turning back again to what I said was the most important function, namely, the direction of interceptor fighters, let me explain why this is true.

As we all know, it is an axiom of military operations that the best defense is a good offense. This principle applies with full force in the case of air defense against attacking enemy aircraft. If we merely sound our air-raid warnings when enemy planes approach, it will be possible indeed for our population to seek cover in air-raid shelters and to take other measures of a passive category. But none of these passive defensive measures will stop the enemy bombers from coming over the targets and dropping their bomb loads. Much more can be accomplished if we mount an actual offensive against the enemy planes. That is, if we attack them with every means at our disposal. To a limited extent we can do this with antiaircraft, but this means again that we are seriously restricted because the enemy planes cannot be attacked until they actually fly within range of the antiaircraft batteries. We could, of course, deploy antiaircraft guns in such a way that no possible area of the sky was not covered, but the cost of any such fantastic proposal would be out of this world.

It is easy to see, therefore, why fighter aircraft afford the best available means of defense over large areas such as that of the United States. Because of their tactical mobility fighters can move around over large areas to any point where attacking hostile aircraft may appear. We can thus obtain a far greater degree of protection and can intercept a good many of the attacking aircraft long before they reach their targets, and can do so far more economically than if we made the entire countryside bristle with antiaircraft guns.

Now there are several technical points about an aircraft warning and control system which ought to be made very clear. When I say that they are technical, I do not mean that they are beyond the comprehension of a layman; on the contrary, an understanding of these features is essential to an understanding of the purposes of and the need for this legislation.

First of all, an aircraft warning and control system performs considerably more than the mere function of detection and early warning of approaching aircraft as they cross our borders. A flight of enemy planes entering the United States at a given point might be destined for any one of a great number and variety of vital strategic targets located one, two, or three or more hours of flight time away from the point of entry. If we knew that the planes had entered the United States, we could, of course, alert the entire country with consequent stoppage of production while the whole population scurried for air raid shelters. The absurdity of such a procedure is obvious. It is also clear that if we knew merely that at a given moment the planes had crossed our border and thereafter had no knowledge of their subsequent path, we would have no way of telling our fighters where to intercept them. It would do no good to send our interceptor planes to the point where the enemy had crossed the border because by the time they arrived there the enemy will have long since passed on.

Faced with these problems, therefore, it is plain that we must provide some method of continually tracking enemy aircraft once they have been detected so that we will know at any moment thereafter exactly where they are and what changes of direction they may take. Only by continually tracking the enemy position can we lead our friendly fighters to the kill.

It is this element of fighter direction which is the most important single function of an aircraft warning and control system. It is this which gives the system the name "control." What the system accomplishes is first, to detect and constantly track approaching enemy aircraft and, secondly, to issue orders to friendly interceptors to take off and attack the enemy. While they are doing so they are guided by control centers on the ground to the point of interception. Should the enemy change his course radically between the time the friendly fighters take off and the time they catch him, the control centers on the ground will be able to detect this change of course by means of the continual tracking process, and will be able to alter the course of our fighters accordingly.

Now I am sure that most of you gentlemen are familiar with the method in which radar is employed as the means for detecting and tracking the enemy planes and for directing our own planes against them. At the cost of repeating some information with which I am sure many of you are thoroughly familiar, it might be advisable nevertheless to go over some of the characteristics of radar rather briefly.

As you know, radar was developed shortly before World War II and was shrouded in secrecy during that conflict, so much so that for a long time even the name "radar" itself was taboo. We all know today, however, that it was one of the most important developments contributing to our successful operations in World War II, and it is very important that we should also fully realize in considering the pending legislation that it was radar which won the Battle of Britain. Radar, employed in much the same manner that we propose to employ it under this bill, was the key to the aircraft warning and control system established by the British. It was by means of radar that the approach of Hitler's planes was detected and by means of radar that the RAF defenders were guided to an interception.

Radar functions on a very simple principle despite the fact that complicated electronic equipment is required to make use of this principle. An ultra high-frequency transmitter sends out a radio wave of very high frequency. This wave travels through space until it strikes a target such as an approaching enemy plane, an enemy surface ship, or a distant mountain and a portion of the wave is then reflected back to the transmitting station where it is picked up by a receiver. Both the transmitter and the receiver, of course, are all part of the radar set. In addition, the set contains an electronic device capable of measuring the lapse of time between the instant when the radar impulse or wave was sent out and the instant when it returned. Since the speed at which the wave travels through space is known, the radar set computes the distance at which the target which reflected back a part of the wave is located. Also, because it is possible to control the direction in which the wave is beamed in the first instance, the radar set can tell us not only how far the target is but in what direction it lies. These two elements, direction and distance, enable us to locate the target's exact position on the map with reference to the known position of the radar set.

Now you will remember that I said a moment ago that a portion of the wave would be reflected back. Other portions of the same wave will travel out farther to other targets and the radar set will then show these to lie at a greater distance and in perhaps a slightly different direction. The point I want to bring out is one with which most of us are thoroughly familiar, namely, that our present-day radars as developed during World War II permit us to see a picture of the entire area within a distance of many miles in all directions from the radar set. The radar actually gives us a picture very much like a map on which we can see mountains, airplanes, high buildings and chimneys and, if at sea, ships, aircraft, land, and so forth. In other words, when used in an aircraft warning and control system, it will give us a continual picture of the enemy planes moving across the screen and it will also show us our own fighter planes and permit us to see at any instant whether they are headed on the proper course for an interception.

I said a few moments ago that radar was responsible for winning the Battle of Britain. This brings me to one of the most important points which we must constantly bear in mind in our consideration of the present legislation. An aircraft warning and control system will not under any circumstances guarantee us absolute security. There is no means known to science or the military today whereby we can throw an impenetrable ring or barrier around the United States which will protect us against all injury from enemy air attack. We cannot hope to keep out completely all enemy bombers who may seek to destroy vital centers. The best we can do is to destroy some of them and to attempt insofar as we can to disorganize their mission so completely that those we cannot shoot down will unload their bombs over some mountainside perhaps, instead of over a railroad yard. But even then many of the enemy's planes may still get through to points where vital damage can be done.

Radar and the aircraft warning and control system in which it was employed in the Battle of Britain did not win World War II, nor did it prevent tremendous destruction and loss of life in London, Coventry, and other cities. Neither did it destroy the German Luftwaffe. But granting all this to be true, let us make no mistake about its effectiveness. Had it not been for radar and for the British aircraft control and interception system by which Spitfires were unleashed against the oncoming Luftwaffe, it is virtually certain that the Battle of Britain would have been lost. And there can be no doubt that the ensuing destruction of cities and loss of life would have been of untold proportions so grave that the actual damage done in World War II would look negligible by comparison. Had Britain not possessed this system, she could have offered no effective defense against the German attacks.

It is because no other means exist for effectively utilizing our defensive capabilities that we so urgently need an aircraft warning and control system in this country. We must have the means by which we too can detect, track, and effectively intercept enemy aircraft threatening our homeland. Such a system is indispensable to the economical and effective use of our defensive weapons such as fighter aircraft and antiaircraft artillery. Without such a system it would be theoretically possible to deploy fighters so thickly in the air space over the United States that they could not fail to intercept any attack, but it is equally clear that the economy of this country would collapse before we were able to build the number of planes which would then be required. An aircraft warning and control system permits us to make the most effective and economical use of the planes and the guns which we have. It tells us that the enemy planes are here—and not over there somewhere; it thus enables us to direct our fighters here—instead of having them patrol aimlessly somewhere else. It also tells us that we must take passive defense measures and seek security in air-raid shelters here—and that it will not be necessary to do so in other places. Thus production may continue uninterrupted everywhere else although it may be necessary to suspend it temporarily here while the attack is in progress.

As the aircraft warning system used in the Battle of Britain did not suffice to destroy the Luftwaffe, nor to prevent many of its planes from bombing London, neither can we reasonably expect complete security from the system which will be provided under this bill. But what the Battle of Britain did accomplish, and what we can reasonably expect from our own aircraft warning and control system under comparable circumstances, was to provide the means whereby the interceptor fighters of the RAF were able to exact such a high toll of German bombers that Hitler was suddenly brought to the realization that the attacks were unprofitable in terms of the balance between the damage inflicted on Britain and the losses which he was suffering. This consideration alone forced Hitler to the conclusion that the German economy could not much longer stand the drain resulting from the high attrition rate imposed upon his bombers.

In like manner we hope to establish in the United States a warning and control system which will permit us to use our own interceptor planes so effectively that we can impose a prohibitive attrition rate upon enemy bombers seeking to destroy our vital centers. We cannot escape unscathed without a scratch, nor can we hope to avoid being hurt—perhaps badly in some places. But if we can provide the means whereby our fighters can hurt the hostile bombers badly enough to make the enemy call the whole thing off, the aircraft warning system will have fully justified the expenditure of every penny invested in it.

When we consider how much more effectively we will be able to use our defensive fighter aircraft with an aircraft warning and control system, it becomes very clear that we may actually be able to reduce the over-all cost of air defense because of the simple fact that a lesser number of fighters can be used more effectively. I do not mean to imply by this that we can afford any reduction in the number of fighters presently planned, even with such a system in being. The point is that we would need a great many more to adequately protect the United States if we do not provide an aircraft warning and control system.

An aircraft warning and control system consists essentially of radar stations, control centers, and communications facilities. An individual radar station will pick up enemy planes on its radar screen, and after identifying them as hostile aircraft, will communicate information as to their location to a control center. The control center will have operational control over defensive fighter aircraft and antiaircraft weapons and will immediately alert all defensive forces under its command which can be brought to bear upon the enemy. It will issue orders to fighters to take off and will guide them to a point of interception.

From what I have said to you so far, I believe it will be quite obvious that an aircraft warning and control system must be set up in such a manner as to provide a sufficient interval of time between initial detection and interception to permit all the necessary steps in the process to be taken before the enemy planes reach vital targets. In other words, the radar stations which detect the planes must be so located geographically in relation to vital strategic targets that the process of identification as enemy aircraft, transmission of information to a control center, orders to fighters, take-off of fighters, climb to enemy altitude and actual interception—so that all of these steps in the process can be accomplished before the enemy bombers arrive at their assigned targets.

Radar unfortunately has certain technical limitations. The radio waves or beams which it utilizes cannot be directed below the horizon. In other words, radar cannot "see" around the horizon and hence can detect only those targets which are above the line of sight to the horizon. It is this feature which made it possible for low-flying planes during World War II to escape detection by radar as they approached their targets. Just as a high mountain can be seen over the horizon, so also can a plane flying at higher altitudes. For all practical purposes, therefore, the range of radar is limited to about 150 miles, assuming that the attacking plans fly at altitudes which are tactically feasible. However, we can obtain greater range by deploying an additional radar station beyond the first. This would give us what was recently referred to in the newspapers as a two-notch program, whereas one station would represent what we might call a one-notch program. You may ask why, if we use two notches, we could not dispense with the original notch on the inside. We would still require that in order to enable us to continually track the enemy after he had passed inside the range of the outer radar station. Otherwise, without the inner station we would merely obtain early warning from the outer screen, but we would not know what the enemy's position was subsequently and hence we would be unable to continually track him until our fighters were able to complete the interception.

Because the basic active defense weapon for any large area is the fighter airplane, the first and most important consideration in organizing an aircraft warning and control system is to meet the requirements for fighter defense.

Fighters may be moved quickly to meet changing situations, but an aircraft-warning system is relatively fixed and immobile. We must, therefore, provide an aircraft-warning service in those areas in which it appears likely that we may be required to deploy fighters. The establishment of an aircraft-warning system is, in effect, an organization of the ground to provide a capability for utilizing fighters effectively. Actual fighter deployment will depend upon the force available and the tactical situation.

Aircraft warning requirements for fighter defense are based largely on the time and space relationship between friendly fighter performance, enemy aircraft performance, radar performance, geographic deployment of fighter airfields, geographic deployment of radar stations, and geographic location of the boundary of the area being defended.

Defensive fighter aircraft on ground-alert status at an airfield will be ready to take off on orders from a control center. However, because of the time element involved in the performance of all the necessary steps which must take place between the time of initial detection of enemy aircraft and the time of completion of interception, the enemy aircraft will have advanced a considerable distance during this interval. Hence an area lying between the point where they were originally detected and the point of interception by friendly fighters cannot be defended by the fighters; an area lying behind the point of interception by the fighters may, on the other hand, be considered to be defended.

From this it is very clear that if we can extend our early warning frontiers farther out, so to speak, we should be able to discover the enemy earlier, thus permitting fighters to intercept him earlier, and thereby extending the cover of fighter protection over a larger territory.

Where it is necessary to protect a vital target lying out in an area which is not defended, that is exactly what we will do. We will deploy an additional radar station farther out, thereby extending the cover of fighter protection to the target in question. In this manner, simply by deploying a radar station outward, we can obtain the same additional degree of protection which could otherwise be achieved only by the construction of an additional fighter airfield at a considerably greater expense.

The deployment of radar stations and control centers under the proposed program is designed to achieve full utilization of available fighter airfields.

The control centers, which will exercise tactical control over defensive fighter aircraft, will be provided, of course, with their incoming lines of communication from outlying radar stations which will furnish information of approaching hostile aircraft. But, in addition, they will also have lines of communication to civil and military airfields, both Air Force and Navy, for the operational control of fighters; to local antiaircraft artillery defenses; and to CAA traffic centers for movement liaison and control. Finally, there will be lines to local military commands for air-raid warnings and, also, off-shore radio liaison for coordination with naval ships and forces at sea. The control center will be the point from which all air-defense operations are controlled and directed for a given area. It is to be the command post of the air-defense area in which it is located. I will now proceed to a description of these areas.

The entire United States must be organized into air-defense areas to enable us to conduct an effective air defense. As I said a few moments ago, the system which it is proposed to establish is essentially an organization of the ground to provide a capability for utilizing our defensive fighter aircraft effectively. Accordingly, the entire United States will be divided into eight air-defense areas for peacetime and initial operations in war.

Upon mobilization of the Air National Guard, the eight original areas will be subdivided to make a total of 20 air-defense areas, covering the entire United States. Each of these areas will be under the command of an area air-defense

commander whose command post will be a control center. Of the 12 control centers to be brought into operation and manned by the Air National Guard a few days after mobilization, 10 are to be used as peacetime training stations at the home of the unit. The other two centers will have to be manned by National Guard units from other areas. These two must be constructed in advance and ready to receive the National Guard units. These two, plus the eight initial centers, make up the total of 10 centers in our current construction program.

The closest possible coordination exists between the Air Force and the Army and Navy in connection with this program, and I might say that the committee has been impressed by the cooperation evidenced by the three services and by the complete absence of the slightest indication of the existence of any interservice problems or controversies in this field. The only difficulties which exist today are those which stem from purely technical problems rather than from questions of responsibility.

Under the program planned, the commander of the eastern and western air defenses, respectively, will be charged with coordination with eastern and western sea frontiers and with the appropriate United States Army commanders in matters of mutual defense.

This program will provide the United States with the minimum acceptable degree of protection from a military point of view, but, at the same time, it is one which is economically feasible. It will furnish us with a modest degree of protection at a very reasonable cost; without this system we would have no protection whatsoever against attack by enemy aircraft.

It will require a considerable length of time to install and perfect this system and to make it operational. This element of lead time is of vital importance in our consideration of the present legislation. If the protection sought by this bill is to become a reality within a reasonable time in the future, we must act at once to get this program under way. Prompt and early action is essential if the United States is to have an adequate system of air defense within a reasonable time in the future. In this connection, let me point out that the achievement of an operational system in being will be necessary before we can expect protection from an aircraft warning and control system. The mere construction of buildings and installation of equipment is not sufficient. The system must be a going concern—an organization of large numbers of technical and operating personnel who have had extensive training and experience over a long period of time. I can think of no more appropriate illustration of the importance of this factor than the recent press reports regarding the failure of Navy radar operators to detect the approaching aircraft which recently dropped a simulated A bomb over a task force in the current fleet maneuvers. It is inconceivable that such penetration could have been accomplished without detection in actual operations during World War II when all personnel and units were in a high state of training and readiness.

The proposed program is of high priority, particularly in view of the time factor mentioned which will be required not only to accomplish the prompt installation of radar equipment, but also to achieve the required level of training and operational experience necessary to make the system fully operational. Until the system is in being and operationally effective, the Air Force cannot hope to discharge its primary responsibility for the air defense of the United States. Neither can the forces of the Army and the Navy, which those Departments will be required to furnish in defense of the United States against air attack, be utilized with maximum effectiveness unless employed in conjunction with a land-based air-defense system. The establishment of the system, however, will facilitate the development of tactics and techniques for joint employment of all available forces for air defense.

Because of the vital importance of this program as a defensive measure, the Air Force deemed it appropriate to request specific authority for the construction herein authorized, apart from the usual public-works program.

A construction program amounting to $85,500,000 will be authorized pursuant to the authority contained in this bill. This sum includes only the cost of construction of buildings, facilities, utilities, and other public works. It does not include the acquisition cost of real estate nor the cost of radar and communications equipment.

The total over-all cost of the air-warning and control system, including those costs which are not covered by the present legislation, will amount to approximately $161,000,000, exclusive of personnel costs. This sum includes an item of $42,250,000, representing the value of radar and communications equipment now on hand, which has already been bought and paid for. It also includes $7,000,000 for the cost of conversion and equipment of four radar picket vessels to be provided by the Navy under the program. These four vessels will be used to provide radar coverage over sea approaches in localities where the proximity of vital targets to the coast line precludes the deployment of land-based radar installations sufficiently far out to permit early warning and interception of enemy planes. Funds for these vessels were requested by the Navy but were deleted from current budget estimates prior to submission to the Congress. It is understood that the Navy already has a number of vessels of this character; hence these vessels can be provided by the Navy, even though funds are not included in the budget. In furnishing them, however, the Navy will be compelled to reduce correspondingly the amount of radar protection furnished by vessels of this character to the operating forces at sea.

After deducting the value of existing equipment and the cost of the picket vessels, there remains a total estimated cost of about $112,000,000, for which the Air Force will have to obtain new funds. This sum consists of the $85,500,000 for which authorization for construction is sought in the present bill, and also of an item of about $26,000,000 representing the cost of new radar and communications equipment, authority for the procurement of which exists independently of this bill.

This program has been considered by intelligence agencies looking at our strategic make-up from the point of view of a possible enemy. It will not furnish absolute protection, but it will give us a reasonable degree of protection where protection is needed at a cost which the economy of this country can sustain. Moreover, it represents a balanced program in which this particular project is in balance with other armed services' projects. It takes account also of the great strategic importance of Alaska where existing radar facilities are totally and wholly inadequate. In this connection, I might say also that testimony was received during the hearings from responsible officers of the Air Force to the effect that words would be impossible to describe how poor our radar defenses in the continental United States are today. This program has been approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of the Air Force, the Secretary of Defense, and the Bureau of the Budget.

In view of the fact that this particular legislation is designed merely to authorize the construction of the necessary public works, the Committee on Armed Services believes it appropriate to limit the authorization contained in this bill to $85,500,000. The bill has been amended accordingly, but with the clear understanding and intent that this limitation shall apply only to construction costs and will in no way limit the cost of procurement or installation of radar and communications equipment or other technical equipment required to establish an operational system in being. It is intended that this limitation shall apply expressly and exclusively to construction costs alone. The Committee on Armed Services and its staff has made a very careful and thoroughgoing study and analysis of the pending legislation. Prior to the hearings, a comprehensive list of written questions pertaining to almost every conceivable question which might arise in connection with this bill was submitted to each of the three armed services, and written replies were requested. Much of the information furnished in response to these queries was classified and hence cannot be made available. However, those replies which did not require classification for reasons of military security have been printed in the hearings and may be found at pages 352 to 359.

Complete and exhaustive hearings were held before the subcommittee, of which I am chairman, and by the full committee, and in both instances a motion to report the bill favorably was carried unanimously.

Despite the fact that a great deal of the information pertaining to this bill and obtained both during the hearings and in answer to the written questions is of a highly classified nature, I believe the Members of the House will find ample justification for this legislation in the open hearings and the committee report.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

At the outset I wish to compliment the able and distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] for his concise and clear presentation of this legislation. Any further remarks as to the purposes of this bill are unnecessary.

I would state, however, that this legislation comes to the floor by a unanimous vote of the committee. There is no opposition on the part of the minority members. All agree that it is essential that land-based air warning and control installations should be installed as soon as possible for our national security. It is recommended by the Department of the Air Force and all other defense-minded agencies, including the Aviation Policy Committee of the Eightieth Congress.

I urge the unanimous adoption of this legislation.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, the Congressional Aviation Policy Board of the Eightieth Congress in its report dated March 1, 1948, entitled "Senate Report No. 949" had the following to say, as a fifth recommendation:

> There should be established a joint task group designed to withstand an initial attack directed at the United States and to form the basic organization for a strong territorial defense. Defense plans must contemplate an aggressive attack designed to cripple our centers of war potential. In the current atomic age it may be expected that such attacks on the United States will be delivered by air with little or no warning. Now is the time to organize the internal defenses in order to localize and repel such an attack. It is imperative that an air-warning network be extended in all directions from which an attack may be expected. Economy may be achieved by employing elements of the civil-airways system wherever practicable.

Then, with reference to recommendation No. 6:

> A competent aircraft-warning network should be established under the direction and control of the proposed territorial command. An aircraft-warning network is composed essentially of long-range surveillance radar and a system of rapid communication. As much of this system as can be employed feasibly and integrated into the civil-airways traffic-control system should be so employed. This will provide economy by avoiding duplication as well as providing a reservoir of highly skilled operators and technicians in an emergency.

Mr. Chairman, this bill comes to the floor of the House to authorize the construction of those works necessary for the Military Establishment in connection with the early-warning network intended to cover the United States. There is also being set up in the Civil Aeronautics Administration a system which will employ radar in civil-airways traffic control. As much of that system and its communication system as are possible to be employed jointly and in conjunction with the Military Establishment in the event of war is intended to be so employed that as much of the product of the funds that are so expended by the people of the United States may be employed in the interests of national defense. The Civil Aeronautics Administration has under its jurisdiction several transcontinental circuitously laid teletype lines. There are a great many radio stations in conjunction with it, and, jointly between these two services in the event of an attack, we may expect the best possible warning that can be obtained.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. I might say to the gentleman that we took that into consideration in arriving at the conclusions on this bill. Of course, the gentleman understands there are many things about this program that are off the record and classified as military secrets. But does not the gentleman, with the experience that he has had with this matter, and I believe he is fully qualified to answer this question, believe that the continental United States gets more defense out of this one thing than any other thing that has come before us in the last several years?

Mr. HINSHAW. I can say this to the gentleman, and I am not repeating anything that has not been heretofore published when I say it, that tests made at Eglin Field Air Base of the United States Air Force have indicated that the B-36 when flying at altitudes of 40,000 feet or over can hardly be intercepted at the present time by the best type of interceptor aircraft that we have. These airplanes at an altitude of 40,000 feet will fly at the rate of approximately 6 miles a minute. It takes 26 minutes for the best fighter interceptors we have got, to get off the ground and get to that altitude. If you multiply 6 by 26 you will find we will not be able to meet an oncoming plane of the character of the B-36 at 40,000 feet altitude unless you know about it when that plane is at least 155 miles away from its target. Consequently, to make ourselves really more safe, we should know about it a great deal more than 155 miles away from any potential target. We should know about it, if possible, an hour away from its target, if not more.

Furthermore, we should be able to trap an oncoming bomber and know its direction, determine its altitude and its speed and the approximate target which it may have as its objective.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. The gentleman well knows this equipment can be placed on that type of bomber.

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes, it can be placed on that type of bomber, but you cannot keep them in the air all the time. The equipment that the gentleman is providing in this bill is intended to be ground equipment, as I understand it.

There is a bill coming up right after this bill, in connection with guided missiles. There is considerable question in the minds of those who are engaged in this study at the present time as to whether or not a bomber of the quality and character of the B-36, or some others that are on the drawing board today, can be intercepted at all by human-manned aircraft. It is quite possible that the only way they may be properly intercepted is through ground-to-air guided missiles likewise equipped with radar.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. Of course our latest bombers, the Boeing XP-47, which flew 2,289 miles recently from Moses Lake, Wash., to Andrews Airfield at a speed of approximately 610 miles an hour, is really faster than most of our interceptors today?

Mr. HINSHAW. That is perfectly true, but that kind of a bomber is not going to go over the North Pole and strike the United States right away, because they do not have the range.

Mr. SHORT. It will take time.

Mr. HINSHAW. Unfortunately for the airplane, it consumes fuel at a rate that increases in proportion to the square of the speed of the aircraft. There are distinct limits both upon the speed and the range of the aircraft in accordance with the amount of fuel that can be carried, and so forth. But you will remember that back in 1934 there were three Russian aircraft that flew over the North Pole and landed in the United States. One of those planes landed in the State of Oregon. The other two landed in southern California, if you please. It is perfectly possible to fly clear across those poles within limits. The less speed, the farther you can fly. Of course, you may say, "We do not need to worry about the slow-speed aircraft," but if you do not know they are there, what are you going to do about it? They can be over the target before you have any idea they are coming. Hence the vital importance of establishing this great early-warning network, not only in the continental United States but in other parts of the North American Continent, and extending the cooperative efforts with other departments of the National Defense Agency into other areas than the actual continent itself.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. We were assured that there was very close cooperation.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am sure there is.

I remember last year it was promised there would be complete cooperation in the continental defense command and in the seas adjoining the continental limits of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, the scope and purpose of this legislation has been fully explained. I rise for the purpose of underscoring what has been said regarding the importance of the measure, particularly in strategic spots, like Alaska. After several years of study a definite plan and program for an aircraft warning and control system in the United States and Alaska have been finalized by the Air Force and reviewed and approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense.

The bill authorizes the expenditure of $85,500,000. This authorization applies only to expenditures for buildings, facilities, utilities, and similar expenses, but does not include the cost of radar and communications equipment. Authorization for those expenditures is already in the law, and the Appropriations Committee is authorized to act under existing law.

It has been pointed out that necessary radar and communications equipment to be provided will cost an additional $26,000,000. Moreover, existing radar equipment valued at $42,250,000 will be available for allocation for use in this radar warning system.

"WHO HOLDS ALASKA HOLDS THE WORLD"

Mr. Chairman, I should like to address myself in particular to the importance of this measure in connection with the defense of what is perhaps the most vital of all our strategic spots today—Alaska. A good many years ago the famed air general, Billy Mitchell, said that "who holds Alaska holds the world." How right he was and how prophetic was his vision.

There is no question today but that Alaska is woefully underdefended. There is no secret about that fact. The Alaskan Command has publicly stated that the Territory is presently vulnerable to enemy thrust and that the defenses are presently inadequate to repel a possible attack. General Spaatz has stated:

> Provided with bases close to the Arctic area, an enemy could attack the most important cities of the United States, and, inversely, American bombing forces located close to the sixty-fifth parallel of north latitude could carry out reprisals of the same nature against the most important centers of population of any possible enemy.

That means that, operating from bases in Fairbanks, for example, enemy bombers could bomb most of the industrial heart of America.

The fall of China to the Chinese Communist armies, thereby bringing China under Communist pressure and Soviet Union influence, if not control, threatening to engulf the larger part of the Asiatic land mass, changes the complexion of the entire Pacific area and lays bare the weaknesses of our Alaskan defenses. A glance at the map reveals the fact that thousands of miles separate the California coast from the Asiatic mainland in the deeper latitudes. But the mainland of Alaska is only 56 miles from the Soviet Union, across the Bering Strait.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, it is well to point out that the security of Alaska is the security of the great circle, the most efficient air route to the Orient. A further glance at the polar map shows that the Aleutian chain stretches along this air route toward the Kamchatka Peninsula, to Japan, China, and the Philippines. This main air route to the Orient uses Anchorage, Alaska, as an important base.

RUSSIA IS ACTIVE IN SIBERIA

In considering the over-all problem of defending Alaska from possible attack, it is well to recall that the Russians are thoroughly familiar with most of the airfields and installations in the Alaskan area. During the war more than 7,000 lend-lease planes were delivered to Russian fliers at Fairbanks. Quite a large number of Russian officers and men were kept there during much of the war and others received training in the Aleutians.

We do not know what the Russians are doing with regard to their military installations in Siberia in the vicinity of Alaska, but we do have good reason to believe there is much activity in that area. We know that Russia's Eulen Field is only some 200 miles from Nome. We know that the Soviet base of Anadyr, on the Siberian coast, is in that immediate vicinity. We know that not since 1944 has an American plane been permitted to fly across that area, en route to Moscow via Alaska and Siberia. We know that the Russians now hold the former Japanese naval base of Paramushira, which is only 716 miles from the Alaska Aleutian chain. And we have good reason to believe that an all-out industrial-development program is taking place in Siberia, with stepped-up military preparedness activities being pushed ever closer to the Bering Straits. According to Maj. Gen. William E. Kepner, of the United States Air Force, the Russians across the Bering Straits are very likely conducting tests of men and equipment similar to our own experiments.

ALASKAN DEFENSE NEEDS

Now, in order to carry out plans for the defense of Alaska, there are three important considerations:

First. A comprehensive warning system, such as is contemplated in the bill we are now considering.

Second. The deployment of more troops, equipment, and airplanes to Alaskan bases.

Third. More adequate housing in order to make possible such deployment and in order to make more effective the best utilization of the radar screen in the Arctic area.

It is certainly important that we recognize the danger of relying too much upon the presence of radar and other installations and not forget the human element which is necessary to operate them effectively. The more we build up our Alaskan defenses, the more we shall need personnel to man and protect the equipment for possible defensive and offensive warfare.

Mr. Chairman, we can no longer think of Alaska as a sort of sentry-base. Alaska is likely to be a major base in any future war. There is every reason to believe that such a war would see planes and missiles sent back and forth across the North Pole. Arctic tests of such equipment, as the Air Force has announced, are going on in Alaska this winter.

MUST THINK IN TERMS OF EAST AND WEST

In our last two wars, the United States sent its strength around the wide circumference of the earth, east and west across the oceans in the traditional and conventional concept of a flat projection of our planet. That geographical concept is archaic and abruptly we are faced with the military need to reorient our thinking in terms of east and west alone, and to start thinking of the different picture which the earth presents looking north and south across the polar cap. In the last war, for example, we used Africa as a stepping stone to Europe, and Australia was on our route to Asia. But if we look at the world from the Arctic region, we see that Europe and Siberia lie almost next door—between North America and Africa, the Sudan, India, Indo-China, the East Indies, or Australia. This is a whole new view of geography, and we must learn to think in these terms if only because the Soviet Union is assuredly thinking in them.

I am thinking of national defense plans in relation to the only great power with which our country could be forced into conflict at this stage of history. This is the air age and we have placed our hopes for peace largely on air power; in consequence, as part of our planning for peace we must turn our thinking toward Alaska.

I have spoken of possible attacks by air. But there is no guaranty that an attack would come by air alone. I was interested in reading a recent statement by Maj. Alexander de Seversky, a well-known aviation writer. In This Week magazine he singled out the Alaska-Kamchatka area as the only one in which, during another war, sea and land warfare would also be important. Major de Seversky cannot be accused of bias in favor of the importance of land and sea forces as compared with air power, and for him to make such a statement is significant.

ARCTIC TESTS ARE BEING MADE

But without attaching too much weight to any one commentator, we can all agree that the defense of Alaska is of the utmost importance. In recent months the Air Force has announced its testing under Arctic conditions of radio-controlled bombs and of the B-36 long-range bomber. These tests in Alaska, it is interesting to note, follow the tests given under artificially manufactured cold weather down at Eglin Air Force Base, in Florida. It was recently found—as just one example of many which come up during actual service tests in the Arctic—that Arctic duty produced an effect upon the tires not discovered during the previous tests at Eglin Air Force Base. Ordinarily, the tires of a plane upon landing are temporarily flattened and quickly resume their shape. But in the Alaskan tests of one plane the flattened tire froze and remained flat. These and other difficulties will be ironed out in present and future tests.

About a year and a half ago the Air Force announced that flights by Alaska-based squadrons had proved that Air Force units could fly anywhere in the polar regions during any season of the year. I am informed that already years of work, millions of flying miles and many millions of dollars, have gone into the work of testing material and personnel, observing and photo-mapping the Alaskan area for the strategic location of defenses.

ALASKAN COMMAND DOING GOOD JOB

The armed forces in the Territory, I believe, have done a good job with the resources and equipment available. The joint command of the services in Alaska has been unified, with Lt. Gen. Nathan

F. Twining, an Air Force officer, as commander in chief for Alaska, and Rear Adm. A. E. Montgomery as deputy commander. Army Alaska is commanded by Maj. Gen. B. L. Scott, an engineering officer, and the Alaskan air command, formerly under Maj. Gen. J. H. Atkinson, is now under Brig. Gen. Frank A. Armstrong.

The teamwork among these officers has been carried down the line to various bases and installations, each of which likewise has a unified command.

What is the present state, however, of Alaska's defenses? According to a New York Times dispatch of last February 14, the 586,400 square miles of the Territory, with its coast line of 33,000 miles, is defended by one antiaircraft battalion, a few B-29's—which are actually weather and photographic planes, about one group of Air Force jet fighters, one squadron of all-weather fighters, and a few naval patrol planes. There are no infantrymen and no combat ships, according to this report, permanently assigned to its defense. The military personnel of all services are chiefly members of supply, service, experimental or testing units, or staff and headquarters units.

HOUSING SHORTAGE IS ACUTE

The deployment of additional units, I am informed by the Air Force, waits upon the provision of additional housing. After the completion of housing now under way at Elmendorf and Ladd Air Force Bases, and the erection of temporary barracks authorized for Eielson Air Force Base, there will still be a shortage of space for 4,700 troops.

Those troops we now have in Alaska are in many cases inadequately housed. This was my own observation during a trip to Alaska last October, and I am pleased to have it confirmed by the New York Times reporter, Hanson W. Baldwin, who wrote on February 13 from Anchorage as follows:

> Nowhere has this correspondent seen soldiers and airmen and their wives living in such squalid, ramshackle huts as pass by the name of houses here.

At Eielson Air Force Base, near Fairbanks, in the interior, an Air Force inspector recently reported that enlisted personnel were housed in Pacific-type huts—built for a very different climate—in most cases inadequately heated, poorly lighted, and crowded. The latrines were a long way from the huts, and at winter temperatures of 20 to 45 degrees below zero, their walls and floors stayed covered with ice.

The shortage of space—even after present construction is completed—for some 4,700 additional troops is based upon emergency living-space conditions of 50 square feet per man. It does not allow for expansion to normal peacetime quarters of a personnel already stationed there. Ordinary peacetime space allowances run from 72 square feet for privates to larger spaces for higher ranks; in Alaska, the average allowance should be something like 90 square feet per man, compared with the 50 square feet which is provided. And the Arctic is not a good place in which to cut the soldier's living space. In this long, dark winter, and sparsely settled country, most of his off-duty time must be spent indoors. This means, in practice, that a soldier coming inside from temperatures of 20 degrees or more below zero, to a heated barracks, is confined there to a space 5 by 10 feet or less. This area is largely taken up already by his bunk. When he takes off the heavy parka, boots, and other outside clothing and hangs them up, there is hardly enough room left to turn around.

FAMILY QUARTERS NEEDED

Nor, Mr. Chairman, does the estimated shortage of barracks space on an emergency basis for 4,700 troops, which will still exist when current construction projects are completed, take into account the urgent need for family quarters for the men who are already there. There cannot be many areas in which this need is greater. Alaska is a long distance from the continental United States, and is itself an enormous Territory—stretching in length a distance about equal to the width of our country. It has less than 100,000 people and a handful of small towns and cities separated by hundreds of miles of wilderness. The leading towns are smaller than the military bases which are nearby, although their populations have already been swollen by the last war. They can offer very little accommodation to the soldier or civilian who wants to bring his family along. If you will imagine the most crowded boom town near the camps and war factories in the United States during the last war and multiply the shortage several times over, you will have a rough idea of the state of affairs.

At Eielson Air Force Base, which is some 26 miles out in the wilderness from Fairbanks, a town of about 8,000 people, the requirements for family housing are spaced to house 345 officers' dependents, and 1,282 dependents of enlisted men. The actual provisions for such housing now provide for a total of 16 dependents, in converted Quonset huts. At the other bases, the shortage of family quarters is almost as great.

Mr. Chairman, I have spent some time referring to the housing problem in Alaska. I saw some of it under favorable weather conditions, and I can testify the acute shortage applies also to civilians. The shortage has made it very difficult for the armed services to recruit the number or quality of civilian technicians needed. The bases are like small cities—for Alaska, they are big cities—each with its public utilities, streets, heating, telephones, and so on, to be operated best, most economically and efficiently by trained civilians. But capable technicians of the sort who are most needed can seldom be persuaded to leave their homes and families in the United States for civil service pay and dormitory life in the Arctic. I was informed that the annual turn-over of those civilian employees runs more than 100 percent.

The services have done their best to provide for all these needs with their available funds. The Air Force, for example, gives priority to Alaska in all its housing schedules. But it is costly to house forces in the Arctic. Because of the need to import labor and shipbuilding materials from the United States, and because of changes in design needed in areas of permanent frost, construction costs on the average are two and a half to four times the cost of comparable housing in the United States. For example, cement delivered in Alaska has cost $60 per barrel and in Seattle the cost is only $15.

Mr. Chairman, funds should be provided with the minimum of delay to meet all the needs I have mentioned: first, for additional barracks to permit the deployment of additional forces, and as soon as possible to permit the men now overcrowded to spread out into a normal space; second, to replace the present temporary barracks—rapidly wearing out—which house 11,000 men; and, third, to provide family housing for an estimated total of 5,600 dependents and housing for civilian technicians.

HOUSING SHORTAGE OBSTRUCTING DEFENSE PLANS

All these shortages, the Air Force informs me, have combined so far to prevent deployment of forces in the desired numbers, to retard the training programs, to lower the morale of the personnel, and cause difficulty in securing enough civilian specialists. Thus, the lack of adequate housing in Alaska has already seriously interfered with national defense at one of its most strategic points.

Let us not be lulled into false security by legislation such as the radar bill, nor by reports of technical progress in planes, guided missiles, or other weapons which may be used in possible future battles over the top of the world. These things by themselves do not win wars. They must be operated, and defended, by men on the ground, who must have adequate quarters for life in the Arctic regions.

In the hands of an enemy, Alaska would be as frightful a menace as it is now an asset and a safeguard. We have only to remember our brief taste of such a danger during the last war when the Japanese obtained a lodgment on the Aleutian Islands. This Aleutian episode, costly as it was in life and treasure, was only a feeble slap compared to the devastating blow which the United States would suffer from the loss of Alaska in a future war.

ALASKA HAS BRIGHT FUTURE

Mr. Chairman, before concluding I should like to put in a good word for Alaska generally and its future. It has many attractions, great opportunities for outdoor recreation, and remarkable resources for industry and agriculture. One of its main drawbacks has been lack of transportation facilities. Alaska raises only 10 percent of its food. Its roads are limited and inadequate. Many of its resources have been exploited. But it is still a virgin country with tremendous possibilities for the future. I am hoping for ultimate peace rather than ultimate war, and I am sure that our present military investment in Alaska can some day be repaid many times over by the future growth and development

of this magnificent territory. There is no better place to build for the future.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, in support of this bill, H. R. 2546, which is to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force of the United States to establish land-based air warning and control installations, in the interest of our national security, and for other purposes, I speak briefly and yet emphatically and most sincerely for its unanimous approval.

As a member of the subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee of this House, I have sat at hearings on this proposal and, therefore, had the benefit and advantage of hearing all of the testimony of the expert witnesses who appeared before us in support of the bill's objectives.

As the witnesses testify, and as this bill is to be voted upon, I specifically call your attention to the text of the report accompanying this bill and to the fact, on page 2 thereof, that one of the functions of the United States Air Force is as follows, to wit—item 8 of section 6:

> To develop, in coordination with the other services, doctrines, procedures, and equipment for air defense from land areas, including the continental United States.

One particular phrase in this item which I desire to emphasize to your attention is that the function of the Air Force, in developing equipment for land areas, is that it shall make such developments in coordination with other services. I am sure that the taxpayers of the United States are very much pleased at every point where they find that there is coordination with the other services, and, as a Member of this great Congress, I am particularly pleased that the President of the United States and the Secretary of Defense have repeatedly and clearly urged that there shall be unification and coordination between the services which are described as our Military Establishment.

I believe that the people of the United States will not be found wanting in a willingness to furnish all of the funds necessary for our adequate national defenses; but, Mr. Chairman, I also believe that the taxpayers of the United States clearly expect and anticipate that wherever duplication, rivalry, or overlapping of expenses or efforts for the same thing can be eliminated, without lessening the efficiency or progress of our national defense, those duplications or expenditures which so largely use the most of our tax dollar should be eliminated.

No doubt, in a peculiar way, and may I say possibly a personal way, I have been and am interested in the support of the worthy objectives of this bill, for the reason that my own distinguished son in his lifetime was a lieutenant in the Army Air Force, in the Aleutians-Alaska area, and he being a war casualty, I naturally remember more specifically some of the things he told me about the beneficent effects and results of radar, in connection with the Air Force's use of it in the Aleutians-Alaska area. I also remember his emphatic statement to me, the last time I talked with him, that our Nation must properly and adequately erect, construct, and maintain what he termed to me as a "radar picket fence." Naturally therefore, based upon his expert testimony to me, through his many years' experience in flying in the defense of our country, together with the expert testimony of the witnesses before our subcommittee, I find myself being in the unusually satisfactory position of being in support of this bill. I expect and anticipate that every Member of this House will vote for it; it deserves the unanimous vote of all Members.

In closing, may I briefly say that during the political campaign, by the result of which I was elected to return to this Congress, having served previously in the Seventy-ninth Congress, I used a slogan of mine which was, "A safe and sound America in a world at peace." It appears appropriate for me to repeat that slogan here, today, for the reason that, as the world now is, there appears that there can be no safe America without this radar fence. It further appears that there can be no sound America without being safe from aggression and until the world settles down enough to realize that the world citizens must live together in terms of peace, if they are to live at all. Lastly, the world must live at peace, because, in the presence of the rapidly expanding development of technological discoveries, there can be no survival of civilized man unless there is world peace. I pray God that it may not be a peace which comes primarily as a result of world fear, but for the present and until there is actually, essentially, and fundamentally a peaceful world, our great Nation must remain strong enough, in a military sense, to do its fullest share to prevent a world catastrophe to civilization which would surely be the result of any ungodly, crazy aggression, initiated in the world.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I wish you and my colleagues to understand that my interpretation and the emphasis I place upon being militarily strong is that our beloved Nation must never be the aggressor; but must remain strong enough militarily to fulfill to the fullest our mission and responsibility toward world peace, which is our keeping a mental attitude and spiritual conception of our world relationships which dictate that we shall never be the aggressor with our military forces, but that we shall be and remain sufficiently strong to insure that there is a safe and sound America in a world at peace.

In conclusion, I feel certain that you will join with me in reiterating that we hope and pray that every resource within the strength of the United Nations organization will be given such latitude, force, and effect that through the United Nations organization there shall more speedily come a world status of world understanding and cooperation which will reasonably insure a fixed and enduring world peace, which shall make possible and reasonable a much earlier de-emphasis upon the need of military strength than any of us can now conceive. I pray God that this status of a safe and sound America in a world of peace shall be steadily in our minds, in our hearts, and in our prayers.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Air Force is hereby authorized to establish and develop within and without the continental limits of the United States in fulfilling the air defense responsibilities of the Department of the Air Force such land-based air warning and control installations and facilities, by the construction, installation, or equipment of temporary or permanent public works, including buildings, facilities, appurtenances, utilities, and access roads, and to provide for necessary administration and planning therefor, without regard to sections 1136, 3648, 3734, Revised Statutes, as he may deem necessary in the interest of national security.

SEC. 2. In furtherance of the above, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to make surveys and to acquire lands and rights pertaining thereto or other interests therein, including the temporary use thereof, by donation, purchase, exchange of Government-owned lands, or otherwise, and to place permanent and temporary improvements thereon, whether such lands are held in fee or under lease, or under other temporary tenure.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, and when so specified in an appropriation act such amounts shall remain available until expended.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, after line 4, insert the following: "*Provided*, That not to exceed $85,500,000 shall be appropriated for the construction of public works authorized by this section."

Page 2, after line 20, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 4. The provisions of this act shall be subject to the duties and authority of the Secretary of Defense and the departments and agencies of the National Military Establishment as provided in the National Security Act of 1947 (Public Law 253, 80th Cong.)."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2546) to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish land-based air warning and control installations for the national security, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 129, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read a third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD and Mr. JOHNSON asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KERR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD with regard to the late Senator Broughton.

LONG-RANGE GUIDED MISSILES PROVING GROUND

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Rules Committee, I call up House Resolution 128.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1741) to authorize the establishment of a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 1741 is a companion bill to the one just passed. It provides that the Secretary of the Air Force shall be authorized to establish long-range proving grounds for guided missiles and other weapons by the construction, installation, or equipment of temporary or permanent public works, including buildings, facilities, appurtenances, and utilities within or without the continental limits of the United States.

There was no opposition to this bill in the Committee on Rules, and it came out of the Committee on the Armed Services with a unanimous vote.

I was particularly interested in an article which appeared in a New York paper the other day in regard to this very thing. The article was the result of an interview with Air Force Secretary Symington. The article reads as follows:

While we cannot predict the exact role which guided missiles may play in any future war, we must do all we can to make certain such a conflict will not find the United States lagging behind.

The Air Force's research and development program in guided missiles aims to develop weapons to aid the primary Air Force mission.

This primary mission calls for the maintenance of air power to defend us from aerial attack, to provide tactical support for ground forces, and to wage strategic warfare to destroy the enemy's capacity to wage war and his will to fight.

The possibilities of guided missiles became clear toward the end of World War II when the Germans used, with considerable effect, the V-1 and V-2. We used radio-controlled bombs with effect.

MAY REPLACE BOMBS

Experts now estimate that within 10 years guided missiles may replace airborne guns and bombs. Within 15 years they predict we may have surface-to-surface guided missiles which can play important roles in tactical and strategic bombardment.

Since the war, we have conducted exhaustive research on all types of guided missiles. We are now beginning to develop selected projects which will produce high-performance missiles in various categories.

We confidently expect air-to-air and surface-to-air missiles will increase greatly our ability to ward off air attacks; that air-to-surface missiles and surface-to-surface missiles will be necessary to effective counterattacks.

Air-to-surface guided missiles are being developed which can strike with high accuracy. The first, soon to be furnished to our combat groups, are bombs weighing 12,000 pounds or more.

RELIES ON GRAVITY

This missile, an improvement on our radio-controlled bomb, relies on gravity and can be deviated in its course by electronic controls. It will be valuable in support of ground forces where precision bombing is all-important.

Next will come self-propelled missiles which can be launched from airplanes flying beyond the enemy's highly defended areas. Powered by rocket or ram-jet and flying at supersonic speeds, the missile may be electronically guided in any of several ways. Designed for long-range strategic bombing, it will be ready for use in the next few years.

Our bombers carrying these missiles to the launching point will use for defense air-to-air missiles similar to those designed for our interceptor fighters for use in breaking up air attacks.

SEE 10,000-MILE RANGE

A time may come when surface-to-surface missiles will go as far as 10,000 miles from the launching site. Such a weapon, we feel, must be one of accuracy rather than one like the V-2, capable only of area bombardment.

It must be able to deliver a knock-out blow on a specific target if it is to repay the vast expenditures of man-hours and materials invested.

This Nation has the technical experts and the industrial capacity for leadership in guided-missile development and employment. Helping to achieve and continue in that leadership to safeguard international peace is a prime concern of the United States Air Force.

Our present launching site for guided missiles is only about 150 miles long, but within the present year the Air Force, the Army, and the Navy, will have missiles that will go beyond 500 miles. Immediate action on this bill is necessary so construction can be started on testing grounds for missiles already manufactured that will travel over 500 miles. It is predicted by the experts that within a very few years we will have missiles that will go as far as three to four thousand miles.

This appropriation originally was for $200,000,000, but it was reduced to $75,000,000 for the purpose of getting immediate action on the installation of these necessary proving grounds for the Air Force, the Army, and the Navy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, we have no requests for time on this side of the aisle on this rule.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1741) to authorize the establishment of a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1471, with Mr. KARSTEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill bears the unanimous endorsement of the national defense establishments. It bears the endorsement of the Office of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force. It has been approved by the budget. It was approved unanimously by the Committee on Armed Services. It comes to you today without opposition that I know about.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this legislation is to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles and other weapons by the construction, installation, and equipment of necessary public works, either temporary or permanent, within or without the continental limits of the United States.

This proving ground is to be used jointly by the Army, Navy, and Air Force for scientific study, testing, and training purposes. It is a joint venture of the three armed services, because all services have a need, in varying degree, for such a facility. Moreover, from the inception of this project, each service has had equal representation in all phases of the planning.

In discussing this project, it would be desirable if we were able to predict exactly the relative importance of guided missiles in any possible future conflict. Unfortunately, we cannot at this time make such exact predictions as to the role which guided missiles will play in the future. The potentialities of these new weapons, however, were clearly indicated in the latter stages of World War II, when the Germans employed, with considerable effect, the V-1 and V-2 surface-to-surface missiles, and we ourselves employed radio-controlled bombs. I might say in this connection that the V-1, or buzz bomb, as it is popularly known, was not a guided missile in the strict sense of the term, because, if I am not mistaken, no means had been developed by the Germans by which its flight could be controlled or altered in any way to suit changing conditions, once the weapon had been launched. In other words, the V-1 was merely a projected but not a guided missile. I believe the same may also have been true of the V-2, a high-altitude rocket, which was employed with limited but nonetheless devastating effect in the latter stages of the war in Europe.

The weapons used in World War II, however, might be compared roughly to the aircraft used during World War I; they were of a crude and elementary character, but, nevertheless, their importance in the recent conflict is outweighed by their significance as forerunners of things to come in the future. Indeed, our experts in the field of guided missiles believe it quite likely that within 10 years we will be replacing present guns and bombs by guided missiles, and that within 15 years weapons of this character will have been perfected to the extent that they will have important applications in the field of tactical and strategic bombardment operations. These ultimate potentialities cannot possibly be realized, however, unless we pursue energetically the tasks which lie before us in research and development and operational experimentation and training.

During the hearings before the subcommittee which considered this legislation, testimony was received from Dr. Karl T. Compton, Chairman of the Research and Development Board, who gave the committee a very helpful description of some of the terms in daily usage in the field of guided missiles and the general problems and principles involved. Dr. Compton's remarks were of particular assistance in view of the fact that many important facts pertaining to this legislation must necessarily be classified for reasons of military security. For this reason, I believe it may be of assistance to some of the Members if I repeat to you some of the information which Dr. Compton furnished to us in open session. In that way I can be on safe ground, reasonably assured against the danger of venturing into those areas where security must prevail.

Dr. Compton has defined a guided missile as "an unmanned vehicle moving above the earth's surface, whose trajectory or flight path is capable of being altered by a mechanism within the vehicle."

By mutual consent, the services have further subdivided guided missiles into four categories according to the manner of launching and the location of the target. These are: Surface-to-surface, surface-to-air, air-to-air, and air-to-surface. A surface-to-surface guided missile, for example, is one which is launched from the ground or from a ship and is thence steered during its flight to strike its distant target, which may be an enemy ship or factory or other military objective on the ground or sea. An air-to-surface missile would be one launched from an airplane against a target on the surface of the earth, either on land or sea, and moving or stationary. Note particularly that we do not include ordinary bombs, shells, or bullets, as these missiles do not incorporate an internal mechanism to influence their trajectory.

The proving ground under discussion today is required primarily for the completion of research and development work on guided missiles with ranges greater than 150 miles, for which no facility now exists in this country.

To further explain guided missiles as compared to conventional shells or bombs and at the risk of oversimplification, let us consider the action of these two types of missiles. The artillery shell or bullet is fired from a gun at high velocity. After firing, it is influenced only by atmospheric conditions and gravity. In both cases, accuracy of the initial aim plus prediction of atmospheric conditions and possible movement of the target are the factors that determine a hit or miss.

The guided missile, on the other hand, usually has incorporated in it a motor which takes over after launching and accelerates the missile or continues it at a constant speed for an extended period of time, thereby increasing its range. Various internal mechanisms may be used to provide guidance and control to the missile while in flight. These mechanisms are controlled in various ways by outside influences, such as by radio or radar, as one example. The missile may have some kind of seeing eye which automatically steers it to its target after it has come within a few miles of its objective.

By these means, a missile can fly a predetermined course to a target, recognize it, and make final alterations to its course, in order to deliver the warhead within the target area. All this will be done eventually at supersonic speeds to reduce the possibility of enemy defense against it. This oversimplified description of a guided missile is, in no sense, what we have today, but is what we are working toward. At the same time, however, I will state that none of the features so briefly described are considered insurmountable by American science, and all are in an encouraging state of development.

A test range is an area within which the experimental guided missiles can be tested in flight to study their over-all performance and the behavior of all their parts—wings, motors, electronic equipment, rudders, stabilizers, and so forth. By such tests, faults can be identified and corrected, adjustments perfected, and alternative methods of operation compared. Without the benefit of such tests, the manufactured missiles would be so unreliable that the money spent on their development would be largely wasted.

An important term that is used repeatedly in connection with test ranges is instrumentation. This term is applied to the integrated system of devices used at a range to acquire the test data. One function or element of the instrumentation system is called telemetering, which may be described as the transmission of data from the missile to the ground by electrical means. It is essential that the scientist who is developing a missile know exactly what is happening within it at all times. Telemetering data tell us how engines, control surfaces, and other mechanisms of the missile are functioning, and whether the missile is rolling, tumbling, or deviating from its course. These data are picked up at various ground instrumentation stations located at intervals along the predicted flight path.

In connection with instrumentation, I would like to use this illustration. You all know the instrumentation panel which is in front of a pilot of an airplane, which gives the performance of the motor, his compass, and all the details that he needs to know about the functioning of the instruments. It is by means of the readings on those instruments that he properly controls his craft. In a guided missile there is no pilot present who can see those things, but it is necessary to have that same kind of information. Therefore, the instruments are put in the guided missile but, instead of having the pilot in the missile to look at the instruments, all the readings of those instruments are sent down to the ground by some kind of radio control and are reproduced in instruments on the ground so that the observer there sees what is going on in the plane just as if he were sitting in an imaginary cockpit in the guided missile and looking at the instruments themselves. That is what is known as the telemetering device.

In addition to the telemetering receivers at each station, special electronic instruments are necessary to track the missile throughout its flight to continually indicate its position in space, as well as high-speed cameras to take pictures of the launching and early part of the flight.

At the conclusion of a flight, a study of the data thus obtained gives a complete picture of what happened to the missile during its entire flight. Even the simplest missile, made to test a particular component of the finished product, costs many thousands of dollars. The more complicated may well run into the hundreds of thousands. This reason alone makes it absolutely essential for both economy and success that a flight-test range have adequate instrumentation to produce the data necessary in the experimental work connected with the development of guided missiles.

The project for the long-range guided missiles proving ground had its inception about 3 years ago when the Guided Missiles Committee of the Joint Chiefs of Staff recognized the necessity for a test range much longer than any existing facility; the maximum range at any present facility is 150 miles. The matter was, therefore, turned over to the Joint Research and Development Board which promptly established in the fall of 1946, the Committee on Long-Range Proving Ground, of which Brig. Gen. William L. Richardson, United States Air Force, was chairman. This committee consisted of representatives from the Army, Navy, and Air Force and was assigned as its mission the "examination of the entire question of a single, national, long-range guided missiles proving ground."

That committee determined first, that there exists an urgent requirement for such a facility and, secondly, as a result of its studies, established the necessary characteristics of an ideal proving ground.

As a result of investigation, it was found that a facility of this character would have to be located in a relatively isolated area for reasons of safety and security. It was found also that the ultimate development of the program would

require an eventual community of 13,000 inhabitants, consisting of 5,000 military and civilian employees and an estimated 8,000 dependents. Due to the necessity of establishing the installation in a sparsely populated area, it is necessary to provide to a minimum degree housing, shopping, schools, and other necessities of American life.

Testimony was received during the hearings before our subcommittee to the effect that plans for initial construction do not contemplate accommodating 13,000 persons. Only the minimum essential facilities will be included in the initial installation.

The required facilities for a long-range guided missile proving ground may be divided into three main groups:

First. A base area with suitable launching site, technical and administrative facilities.

Second. Instrumentation range at least 3,000 miles long, thoroughly instrumented by means of observation stations for the first 500 miles, and with impact areas at various points along the line of flight.

Third. A suitable climate for year-round operations. Existing guided-missile proving grounds are not capable of expansion in length to accomplish the task of testing missiles at longer ranges than 150 miles. Installations now in operation are those at White Sand-Alamogordo in New Mexico; Point Mugu and Inyokern in California. Even apart from the inability of these facilities to handle longer range missiles, a survey of the work loads of existing ranges by an independent committee of the Research and Development Board has disclosed that they will be saturated during the next few years. The services have agreed, therefore, that the long-range proving ground may be used to test shorter range missiles so long as this work does not interfere with the primary long-range flight-test missions.

For reasons of military security, the location of the proposed long-range guided-missile proving ground cannot now be disclosed. However, it has been ascertained that there will be no serious likelihood of hazard to persons or property, or of interference with private and commercial interests in connection with the test flying of missiles on the proposed range. The danger will be very small because every possible precaution will be taken. Means will be provided to dispose of missiles in the air, over a safe area, should they deviate too far off course. Normally they will fly so high as to be impossible of detection except with special instruments. From a safety standpoint they will be no more dangerous than conventional airplanes flying overhead, and from a nuisance standpoint they will be less objectionable. Most important of all, the test range will be located in a region so sparsely inhabited in the areas where there might be any danger that the hazard will be wholly negligible.

The need for a facility of this type is urgent. Experts in the field are convinced that guided missiles with ranges in the hundreds of miles and accuracies acceptable to the military can be developed. Their development is dependent upon the existence of a suitable range on which to test them. The guided-missile development program is one of our largest research and development programs in which the investment to date has amounted to hundreds of millions of dollars. If work was started upon the construction of this facility today, it would be needed for testing missiles ready for flight tests before it could be placed in operation.

Missiles with ranges up to 500 miles will be ready for testing during 1949, without a range of sufficient length on which to fly them. If the services are unable to test these and other lang-range missiles at time of completion, the entire schedule of research and development will be disrupted. Certain other nations have availed themselves of the services of German scientists and technicians and are making vigorous efforts to produce guided missiles of intercontinental ranges. The absence of suitable facilities in this country could easily make it possible for other nations to forge ahead of us in the development of long-range guided missiles.

In proposing the project to the Secretary of Defense, the Research and Development Board recommended that sponsorship of the project be assigned to the Air Force. Although the Air Force will have over-all responsibility for the range, each service will be appropriately represented at the operating level. Moreover, section 5 of the bill enables the Secretary of Defense to change the primary responsibility to either of the other services should he feel that such a change would better serve the National Military Establishment.

The proposed project is vigorously supported by the Army and by the Navy. These two services have expressed the view that all the services will enjoy significant advantages as a result of intimate association with all projects conducted at such a station; moreover, it is felt that this method of operation will be most economical.

The Navy has supported the project since its inception, both with material and personnel, and has assigned personnel to duty with the Air Force. In addition, the Bureau of Yards and Docks of the Navy Department is presently engaged in making engineering studies and designs leading to the construction of all off-shore facilities.

The proposed legislation, as submitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, would have authorized a total expenditure of $200,000,000, which contemplates the eventual cost of the project. Testimony was received, however, to the effect that the first phase, representing the minimum requirements to begin operations, will require an estimated expenditure of at least $70,000,000 over a period of approximately 3 years. A figure of $60,000,000 was mentioned during consideration of the bill in open session by the subcommittee. This estimate, however, relates to technical requirements only and does not include the minimum requirements for housing and necessary community facilities. A complete breakdown of costs furnished to the subcommittee in executive session fully supports the estimated figure of $70,000,000.

Testimony further disclosed the fact that no accurate estimate can be made at this time as to the ultimate cost of construction which may be required during later phases of the long-range guided-missiles project; the ceiling of $200,000,000 in the bill submitted by the National Military Establishment appears to have been merely an arbitrary figure selected at the request of the Bureau of the Budget. In view of these circumstances, the committee believes it appropriate to limit the authorization to the amount which will be required for the initial phase of the project. In setting such a figure, however, it is imperative that a reasonable margin of safety be allowed to provide for contingencies in order to insure that there will be no fiscal obstacles to the effective development of this vitally important facility. Taking into consideration the difficulty of estimating the exact cost of construction of certain highly technical elements and the possibility of fluctuating construction costs, the committee believes it appropriate at this time to fix the total authorization at $75,000,000, and the bill has been amended accordingly.

The proposed legislation has the approval of the Secretary of Defense and of all three Departments of the National Military Establishment. In addition, it has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

The Committee on Armed Services unanimously recommends the enactment of this bill.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may need.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the subcommittee has done an excellent job of explaining a highly technical and restricted subject. There is no controversy on this bill; it is unanimously reported by the Committee on Armed Services, and we feel that it should be passed.

Mr. Chairman, I take pleasure in yielding to the sole surviving minority Member from the great State of Missouri, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], 5 minutes.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, being the only Republican Representative from Missouri is no new experience for me, for I was the lone wolf from that great State, the home of our President, in the Seventy-fourth, Seventy-fifth, and Seventy-sixth Congresses; but I assure you it was an honor and distinction I did not ask for then, and I do not particularly cherish, relish, or enjoy the distinction now.

You know the greatest compensation for being a Member of this body is the rare and rich fellowship which we enjoy with our colleagues. I do not think we should wait until a man dies before saying nice things about him, particularly when he so well and so richly deserves them.

I am going to take advantage of this opportunity to say that though I have had the pleasure and privilege of working under several different chairmen of various committees of this House, all of them fine men, I have never served under a finer, abler, fairer, more effective chairman than the present chairman of our Committee on Armed Services, the distinguished and outstanding Member from Georgia, Hon. CARL VINSON. For over 36 years he has served his district, State, and Nation well in positions of high responsibility. Any person who can be returned election after election for more than a third of a century to the United States Congress has to possess many fine qualities. Through the prolonged and paralyzing depression, through the terrible and trying years of the war, and in this, the most difficult postwar period, the gentleman from Georgia, CARL VINSON, has been a great bulwark and stabilizing influence and inspiration to his colleagues who have worked with him.

Through his rich and long experience he has accumulated a fund of wisdom. Every member of our committee respects him for his character, admires him for his ability, and we all are grateful for his helpful cooperation. All of us benefit from his wise counsel and from his sound judgment. He is astute and resourceful. He knows men and how to deal with them.

Since I have been a Member of this body I can truthfully say I do not think there is any chairman who ever comes on this floor with a bill better prepared to explain and defend than is the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. That is the reason all these bills we have brought in thus far at this session have come out of our committee by unanimous report. We have no partisanship in our committee because we are dealing with the security of our Nation, realizing that we all are in the same boat and we are going to sink or swim together.

This bill, of course, is highly important. The new weapons of modern warfare are terrifying. Pilotless planes and guided missiles, no doubt flying at invisible heights at supersonic speed, will be able to rain death and destruction from the sky. God forbid that we shall ever have to use them. While we want to keep ourselves strong on sea, land, and in the air, invincible to any attack from any quarter, I think we all would do well to work and pray for the cause of peace and do our best to create and develop a moral conscience of mankind whereby civilization shall not be destroyed by the instruments of our own hand.

As a member of the congressional delegation that visited the atrocity camps in the Reich 3 or 4 weeks before Germany surrendered, I visited a great underground factory at Nordhausen near Leipzig where the V–1 and V–2 bombs were being made, an underground factory with 33 miles of subterranean passages, comparable in magnitude and efficiency with the Ford plant at Willow Run or Boeing out in Seattle or Alcoa down in the Tennessee Valley. There we saw long assembly lines turning out those instruments of death and we saw the awful havoc that they did at Antwerp and at London. We got there just in time. Those bombs, however, in the last war, were not under control after they were once fired. Their course and direction was limited from the spots where they were touched off, but now we are producing missiles that can be guided by radar, and in the course of their flight, can have their direction changed. Why, Nagasaki and Hiroshima were nothing compared to the scenes of awful suffering and indescribable misery that will be experienced in another global conflict.

We shall continue, as members of the Armed Services Committee, charged with the security of this Nation, to keep our country strong, but I think that perhaps we should put forth all of our efforts not only as Members of Congress, but as citizens of a great Nation and as members of the human family, to create a moral conscience in this world and not put all of our faith in "horses that run upon the rocks."

For our distinguished, lovable chairman, I want to say that each and every one of us on our committee love him, and we hope that the good people in Georgia will continue to exercise their hard sense and sound judgment in returning him to this body as long as he desires and in which he has served for over a third of a century, and to which he has made such a magnificent contribution.

God bless you, Carl.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to my colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD].

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the House Committee on Armed Services, I have already had the responsibility of expressing myself in regard to H. R. 1741, which proposes the establishment of a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles. Since this measure has been reported to the House by the unanimous vote of the House Committee on Armed Services, it is readily apparent that I fully support the measure. However, I want to take this additional opportunity to briefly voice my sentiments on the importance of the proposed legislation.

This is not a hastily prepared measure. On the contrary, it had its inception almost 3 years ago when the Joint Chiefs of Staff recognized the necessity for a testing range much longer than any existing facility. Even with the improved facilities which have been established within the last 3 years, we have no existing facility with which to test guided missiles at a range greater than 150 miles. We have been advised—and it is now a matter of public record—that guided missiles with ranges up to 500 miles will be ready for testing during 1949. Since we have no range upon which to test such missiles, we have arrived at the crossroads of our problem. We need to ask ourselves two questions: First. Is it in the best interest of our national defense to confine our endeavors to an improvement of guided missiles which have a maximum range of 150 miles? Second. Is it in the best interest of national defense to construct a guided-missiles range which will permit us to exhaust all foreseeable potentialities of guided missiles?

I do not hesitate to endorse the second choice. We cannot remain static in the field of guided missiles at a time when it is universally known that our only potential enemy is making a maximum effort in this field. We must not only keep abreast of any other nation in this field, we must be the undisputed leaders. I fully realize that this undertaking will entail the expenditure of large sums of money, and I am as reluctant as anyone else to increase the heavy tax burden which our people already bear. However, I am firmly convinced that if we have any hope for a lasting peace that it is mandatory to maintain an adequate defense which necessarily entails the expenditure of large sums of money on undertakings of this character. When one considers the astronomical sums which our Nation spent in winning the last war, I believe the present expenditure is justified as an agency which will either help us maintain the present unsteady peace or defend ourselves in the event of another national emergency.

On that basis and with that hope, Mr. Chairman, I give my full support to the proposed legislation.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, the bill pending before the Committee now is in accordance with recommendation No. 71 of the Congressional Aviation Policy Board of the Eightieth Congress. I desire to quote one paragraph of the explanatory matter accompanying recommendation No. 71. It says:

> Physical facilities required for transonic and supersonic research and development of aircraft and guided missiles are so expensive they can be furnished only by the Government. The NACA and the Research and Development Board are preparing a coordinated program of facilities required in the national interest. Since adequate research and development facilities are essential for continued United States aviation leadership, this plan should be expedited.

Mr. Chairman, I should have to be in favor of this bill, but I must here express certain doubts as to the wisdom, let us say, of giving such high priority to very long-range guided missiles, and I do so in the light of the recent experiments I mentioned earlier in connection with another bill, the experiments at Eglin Field, Fla., which indicated the great difficulty that pursuit ships will have in the interception of high-altitude aircraft which may be advancing upon the United States. It would seem to me that the results of those tests would indicate quite clearly that a far more important program than the one now before us is the program of research and development in the ground-to-air missiles. I say that because with the increasing speeds and altitudes of aircraft carrying bombs which may approach the United States it is quite apparent that it will be necessary to have something other than manned aircraft to intercept them. We do now have in the primer stage, almost, a guided missile which can be sent from

the ground, guided by ground radar, to a certain point.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. May I point out to the gentleman that in the statement of Dr. Karl T. Compton before the subcommittee he indicated that under this bill provisions are made for four types of guided missiles—surface to surface, surface to air, air to air, and air to surface, which I think covers the point raised by the gentleman.

Mr. HINSHAW. I agree that that is part of the program; but I feel strongly that the important thing we have to consider now is the interceptor type of missile, much more so than the attack type of missile. The interceptor-type missile is about the only thing that can with certainty do the job of intercepting a high-flying, fast-flying bomber directed against the United States. That has been practically proven in the tests conducted at Eglin Field. I believe that while it is nice to know that you can send missiles 2,500 miles—we have never been able to do it yet, but we may—and it will be nice to know that when the times comes, the important thing today is to develop the interceptor type of missile, a missile which can remain under control until the missile itself, through its own radar, can make contact with an oncoming vessel, either in the air or on the sea, and then release itself from ground control and control its own path with an integral electronic computer system which will direct it to the point of interception, and there, by other means which were known during the past war, explode itself in the vicinity of the attacking airplane.

I hope and trust that the funds that are to be expended by the Research and Development Board will be expended in this direction, not to the exclusion, perhaps, of these other plans, but to a degree whereby such a missile may be perfected and placed in production in the shortest possible time. This is vitally important to the defense of our country and to the discouragement of attacks against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and that amendments be in order at any point in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That the Secretary of the Air Force is hereby authorized to establish a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles and other weapons by the construction, installation, or equipment of temporary or permanent public works, including buildings, facilities, appurtenances, and utilities, within or without the continental limits of the United States, for scientific study, testing, and training purposes by the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Air Force is authorized in discharging the authority given in the preceding section to make surveys, to acquire lands and rights or other interests pertaining thereto, including the temporary use thereof, by donation, purchase, exchange of Government-owned lands, or otherwise, without regard to section 3648, Revised Statutes, as amended, in administering the provisions of the act of July 9, 1942 (56 Stat. 654, 43 U. S. C., Supp. 315q).

Sec. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, not to exceed $200,000,000 to carry out the purposes of sections 1 and 2 of this act.

Sec. 4. The Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force are hereby authorized to contribute to the support of the joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles and other weapons to the extent they may deem necessary or advisable, including, but not limited to, the allocation for such support of funds available to them for such purposes.

Sec. 5. The Secretary of Defense may, at his discretion, transfer and reallocate to any department, board, or agency within the National Military Establishment all, or any part of the authority granted herein, and, in connection with such transfer or reallocation, may transfer all or any part of the funds available for the establishment or support of the joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles and other weapons.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 10, strike out "$200,000,000" and insert "$75,000,000."

Page 2, line 19, after "reallocate" strike out the remainder of line 19 and all of line 20, and insert "to the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force all, or."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KARSTEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1741) to authorize the establishment of a long-range proving ground for guided missiles, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 128, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to leave granted me to extend my remarks, I wish to include as part of my remarks a statement by Dr. Karl T. Compton, Chairman, Research and Development Board. This statement was made before Subcommittee No. 1 of the Armed Services Committee of the House on February 14, 1949. It deals with the subject of H. R. 1741, a bill authorizing the establishment of a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles.

Dr. COMPTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, since the research, development, and test of guided missiles is a comparatively new field, I will start my discussion by explaining a few of the terms that are in daily usage in this work. First, what is a guided missile? The currently accepted definition is that it is "an unmanned vehicle moving above the earth's surface, whose trajectory or flight path is capable of being altered by a mechanism within the vehicle."

By mutual consent, the services have further subdivided guided missiles into four categories according to the manner of launching and the location of target. These are: Surface-to-surface, surface-to-air, air-to-air, and air-to-surface. A surface-to-surface guided missile, for example, is one which is launched from the ground or from a ship and is thence steered during its flight to strike its distant target, which may be an enemy ship or factory or other military objective on the ground or sea. An air-to-surface missile would be one launched from an airplane against a target on the surface of the earth, either on land or sea, and moving or stationary. Note particularly that we do not include ordinary bombs, shells, or bullets, as these missiles do not incorporate an internal mechanism to influence their trajectory.

The proving ground under discussion today is required primarily for the completion of research and development work on guided missiles with ranges greater than 150 miles, for which no facility now exists in this country. There are other requirements for this facility, however, as will be brought out by General Richardson.

To further explain guided missiles as compared to conventional shells or bombs, and at the risk of oversimplification, let us consider the action of these two types of missiles. The artillery shell or bullet is fired from a gun at a high velocity. After firing, it is influenced only by atmospheric conditions and gravity. The airplane bomb, after it leaves the plane, is affected only by the motion of the plane at launching, the atmosphere, and gravity. In both cases, accuracy of the initial aim plus prediction of atmospheric conditions and possible movement of the target are the factors that determine a hit or miss.

The guided missile, on the other hand, usually has incorporated in it a motor which takes over after launching and accelerates the missile or continues it at a constant speed for an extended period of time, thereby increasing its range. Various internal mechanisms may be used to provide guidance and control to the missile while in flight. These mechanisms are controlled in various ways by outside influences, such as by radio or radar, as one example. The missile may have some kind of seeing eye which automatically steers it to its target after it has come within a few miles of its objective.

By these means, a missile can fly a predetermined course to a target, recognize it, and make final alterations to its course, in order to deliver the warhead within the target area. All this will be done eventually at supersonic speeds to reduce the possibility of enemy defense against it. I hasten to say that this oversimplified description of a guided missile is, in no sense, what we have today, but is what we are working toward. At the same time, however, I will state that none of the features so briefly described are considered insurmountable by American science, and all are in an encouraging state of development.

A test range is an area within which the experimental guided missiles can be tested in flight to study their over-all performance and the behavior of all their parts: wings, motors, electronic equipment, rudders, stabilizers, etc. By such tests, faults can be identified and corrected, adjustments perfected, and alternative methods of operation compared. Without the benefit of such tests, the manufactured missiles would be so unreliable that the money spent on their development would be largely wasted.

An important term that is used repeatedly in connection with test ranges is instrumentation. This term is applied to the integrated system of devices used at a range to acquire the test data. One function or element of the instrumentation system is called telemetering, which may be described as the transmission of data from the missile to the ground by electrical means. It is essential that the scientist who is developing a missile know exactly what is happening within it at all times. Telemetering data tell us how engines, control surfaces, and other mechanisms of the missile are functioning, and whether the missile is rolling, tumbling, or deviating from its course. These data are picked up at various ground instrumentation stations located at intervals along the predicted flight path.

If I might interpolate just a bit into my prepared statement, I would like to use this illustration. You all know the instrumentation panel which is in front of a pilot of an airplane, which gives the performance of the motor, his compass, and all the details that he needs to know about the functioning of the instruments. It is by means of the readings on those instruments that he properly controls his craft.

Well, now, in a guided missile, there is no pilot there who can see those things, but it is necessary to have that same kind of information. So the instruments are put in the guided missile; but, instead of having the pilot in the guided missile to look at the instruments, all the readings of those instruments are sent down by some kind of radio control to the ground and reproduced on instruments at the ground so that the observer on the ground sees what is going on in the plane just as if he was sitting in the cockpit of a guided missile and looking at the instruments themselves. That is the telemetering device.

In addition to the telemetering receivers at each station, special electronic instruments are necessary to track the missile throughout its flight to continually indicate its position in space, as well as high-speed cameras to take pictures of the launching and early part of the flight.

At the conclusion of a flight, a study of the data thus obtained gives a complete picture of what happened to the missile during its entire flight. Even the simplest missile, made to test a particular component of the finished product, costs many thousands of dollars. The more complicated may well run into the hundreds of thousands. This reason, alone, makes it absolutely essential for both economy and success that a flight-test range have adequate instrumentation to produce the data necessary in the experimental work connected with the development of guided missiles.

You are undoubtedly interested in the question of the hazard to people and property, and the interference with private and commercial interests, in connection with the test flying of missiles on the proposed range. In the minds of the uninitiated, the danger element has been greatly exaggerated; the mere mention of guided missiles conjures up visions of death and destruction. Actually the danger in this case will be very small, because every possible precaution will be taken to make it so. The test missiles will not have explosive warheads; they will have means to dispose of them in the air, over a safe area, if they deviate too far off course. They will normally fly so high that it will be impossible to detect them without special instruments. From a safety standpoint, they will be no more dangerous than a conventional airplane flying overhead; from a nuisance standpoint, they will be less objectionable. Most important of all, the test range will be located in a region so sparsely inhabited, in the areas where there might be any danger, that the hazard will be wholly negligible.

I have tried to give you a brief picture of a guided missile from the point of view of the scientist who is developing it, some of the terms used, and the essentials of a test range. We who have been associated with the guided-missile field from its inception are convinced that weapons such as I have described, with ranges in the hundreds of miles and accuracies acceptable to the military, can be developed. To develop them, we must have a range on which to test them. The need is urgent. Actually, the guided-missile development program is one of our largest research and development programs, and hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of the results of this work are becoming dependent on the availability of such a test range. As so often happens, we will need this facility before it is in operation even if work were started on it today, as we are rapidly outgrowing existing facilities.

I do not mean by that that the existing ranges are becoming obsolete. On the contrary, I cannot visualize the time when we will not need the three existing smaller ranges. However, none of them permit expansion in length; and we are in dire need of a facility that can meet all of our foreseeable needs in the field of the long-range guided missiles.

I have purposely kept my discussion in general terms and left the presentation of detailed information to General Richardson. As already mentioned, this project has been critically studied by the experts of the Committee on Guided Missiles of the Research and Development Board, and unanimously approved by them and by the Board.

Thank you.

HOUSING AND RENT ACT

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 138, Rept. No. 243), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1731) to extend certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 5 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute committee amendment recommended by the Committee on Banking and Currency now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MCCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter received from the Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. COFFEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. FUGATE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Greenfield Reporter.

PALESTINE REFUGEES

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 139, Rept. No. 244), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 36) for the authorization of a special contribution by the United States for the relief of Palestine refugees. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time this afternoon in order to present a few facts and make a few pertinent comparisons in the interest of getting the record straight.

A great many of our Republican friends have remarked recently that the Eighty-first Congress has been slow in getting any action on legislation. In order to keep the record straight, I simply want to point out that during the first 2 months of the Eighty-first Congress 12 bills have been enacted into law, compared with 8 that were enacted into law during the same period in 1947 when the Eightieth Congress convened on January 3.

This record, Mr. Speaker, includes the first 2 months of both the Eightieth and

the Eighty-first Congress through the date of February 28 in each year.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the House passed in the first 2 months of the present session, exclusive of bills on the Private Calendar, 15 bills in addition to those that have had action completed on them in both Houses and have become law. In the same period 2 years ago the Republican House passed only seven legislative measures, exclusive of those written into law.

Among the 12 laws enacted in January and February of this year were those extending the authority of the President to enter into voluntary agreements providing for the allocation of certain scarce materials and commodities; legislation providing for export controls; for the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate ships. Other laws that have been enacted include appropriations for relief of disaster victims in the blizzard areas.

The promptness with which this Congress moved to meet the emergency in the recent western storm area reflects credit, I think, upon our legislative processes. Fifteen other measures passed by the House and sent to the other body during the first 2 months of this year included the Government Reorganization Act of 1949. That is the act which permits the President to bring about economies and greater efficiency in the Federal Establishment, and to put into effect many of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

Included also in bills that have passed this House and have gone to the other body is a bill extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act, a basic essential in our foreign policy, a bill that has been called by Cordell Hull the very keystone of our foreign policy.

Other bills passed by the House and sent to the Senate include a bill extending the War Assets Administration, a bill covering the export of copper, and a bill covering cotton acreage planting.

All those bills referred to do not include numerous actions taken by the House necessary to the organization of Congress. Of course, both political parties had those problems. In the early days of the Eightieth Congress, when the Republican Party took over, of course they had to reorganize the Congress. The same thing was true when the Democratic Party took over on January 3 of this year.

My good friend, the chairman of the Republican National Committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.], said a few days ago—and I have the newspaper clipping in my possession—that this was a "no-can-do" Congress. Evidently he was resorting to some fiction and not fact in making such a statement, or at least the chairman had not compared the record of the Eightieth Congress up through February 28 with the record of the Eighty-first Congress for the same period this year.

The record shows that this Congress accomplished more in the first 2 months of this session than did the Eightieth Congress in the first 2 months under the Republican administration.

Legislation is coming from committees and now scheduled with full programs ahead for every day of every week. I have here, Mr. Speaker, a tabulation of some of those bills. I simply want to refer to them so that the record on this point at least can be correct.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, I might observe, before asking the question, that it occurs to me the gentleman is protesting too much. How many of these bills to which the gentleman has referred have actually become law?

Mr. PRIEST. There have been 12 that actually have become law compared to 8 up to February 28 of 1947.

Mr. HALLECK. As I understand it, the gentleman referred to the allocation of materials and other things that had to do with price control; that was just an extension of legislation passed in the Eightieth Congress, was it not?

Mr. PRIEST. Yes; that was, but it was legislative action by the Congress.

Mr. HALLECK. That is right, and then the legislation to which the gentleman referred, extending the power of the Maritime Commission to operate ships; that was just an extension of what was done in the Eightieth Congress, was it not?

Mr. PRIEST. With some modification, I believe.

Mr. HALLECK. And the relief of copper from import duties; was not that just an extension of what was done in the Eightieth Congress?

Mr. PRIEST. I believe with some modification; yes.

Mr. HALLECK. Those are three.

Mr. PRIEST. Those are three.

Mr. HALLECK. And the control of exports from the United States with some slight modification was just an extension of what was done in the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. PRIEST. As I recall the legislation it would go perhaps a little beyond being a slight modification; it was almost new legislation on that subject, but it was one of the bills that has been enacted into law; that is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. Included in the 12 measures to which the gentleman refers, one was the measure which the gentleman does not specifically mention, raising the President's salary.

Mr. PRIEST. Yes; that was one.

Mr. HALLECK. And did the gentleman include in the 12 accomplishments of the Eighty-first Congress to date the enactment of legislation providing for the 4-day holiday for public employees?

Mr. PRIEST. If the gentleman will just permit; I am happy to continue to yield, but I will read at this point each one of the 12 bills that have been enacted during the first 2 months of the Eighty-first Congress and follow that by reading a list of the laws enacted during the first 2 months of the Eightieth Congress. I believe that is the best way to get the record straight.

Now, as to the bills enacted into law during the first 2 months of the Eighty-first Congress, they are shown by the following table:

BILLS ENACTED INTO LAW, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS IN THE FIRST 2 MONTHS

Public Law 1 (S. J. Res. 16): Federal employees, holiday. Approved January 18, 1949.

Public Law 2 (S. 103): President, Vice President, Speaker of House of Representatives, salary increases. Approved January 19, 1949.

Public Law 3 (H. J. Res. 112): Appropriations disaster relief. Approved January 28, 1949, appropriating $500,000 for emergency relief in Western blizzard area.

Public Law 4 (H. J. Res. 88): Railroad equipment, free entry, amend. (Merci train.) Approved February 3, 1949.

Public Law 5 (H. J. Res. 136): Appropriations, disaster relief. Approved February 7, 1949. Five hundred thousand dollars for disaster relief in blizzard area.

Public Law 6 (S. 547): Prices, stabilization of, amend. Approved February 9, 1949. Continues through September 30, 1949 authority of the President to make voluntary agreements affecting transportation, inventory control, and speculative trading in commodities which basically affect the cost of living.

Public Law 7 (H. R. 2402): War Assets Administration, continue. Approved February 21, 1949.

Public Law 8 (H. R. 1252): Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, amend. Provided that professional staff of congressional committees may be hired by executive branch of Government when such persons are terminated from committee staff. Approved February 24, 1949.

Public Law 9 (S. 492): Stamps, commemorative, Alexandria, Va.

Public Law 10 (S. 713): General Accounting Office, building, increase limit of cost.

Public Law 11 (S. 548): Export Control Act of 1949. Approved February 26, 1949, extends until June 30, 1951, the authority of the President to control exports.

Public Law 12 (H. J. Res 92): To continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels. Signed February 28, 1949.

I have here a list of the eight laws enacted by the Eightieth Congress during the first two months, from January 3 to February 28, 1947:

BILLS ENACTED INTO LAW, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, IN THE FIRST 2 MONTHS

Public Law 1 (S. J. Res. 3): Senate, employee, approved January 31, 1947.

Public Law 2 (H. J. Res. 57): Alcohol plants, produce sugars, approved February 1, 1947.

Public Law 3 (S. J. Res. 4): Senate, employees compensation, approved February 19, 1947.

Public Law 4 (S. J. Res. 24): Senate, committee, staff organization. Approved February 19, 1947.

Public Law 5 (H. R. 1353): National Service Life Insurance Act, 1940, amended. Approved February 21, 1947.

Public Law 6 (H. J. Res. 114): Maritime Commission, vessels. Approved February 26, 1947.

Public Law 7 (H. J. Res. 121): United Nations, gift taxes. Approved February 26, 1947.

Public Law 8 (S. 563): Agriculture, foot-and-mouth disease. Approved February 26, 1947.

Those are the eight bills that were completely enacted into law on which the legislative process had been completed up to February 28, 1947, compared to the 12 I have just read.

I have here also, and I shall ask unanimous consent to insert it in the RECORD, a list of the 15 bills on which House action has been completed up to that time this year and the 7 bills on which House action had been completed prior to February 28 of 1947.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think the gentleman from Tennessee, the distinguished whip of the majority party, is entitled to a vote of thanks for bringing the record up to date. I should like to call his attention to the fact that the Republicans made arrangements for an inaugural in January of this year which caused us a loss on this side. We have had to take that added burden but in spite of it we have been able to show a better record to date than the Republican Party did over a similar period 2 years ago.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank the chief assistant majority whip of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I also call attention to the bills that have passed the House and are now over in the Senate. Two of them are very important bills.

There is the reorganization bill which passed the House in one day. I do not remember of a reorganization bill ever having passed the House with less than one week's debate. I remember the first reorganization bill that came up in this body years ago. It was adopted by the committee after 3 weeks debate, then recommitted. Here is a bill that passed the House in 1 day providing permanent legislation.

In the same week we passed a reciprocal trade agreements bill in 2 days. Ordinarily I should say that either one of those bills would take a week.

Mr. Speaker, this is all due to the very fine Democratic organization that exists in the House and in great part to the wisdom of the voters last fall in sending to this body close to 100 new Democratic Members who are the tops so far as I am concerned.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank the distinguished majority leader. I have here a list of these bills. My purpose in taking the floor today was simply to get into the RECORD some facts. I was a newspaper man for 14 years before coming to this body and having been a newspaper man I believe in facts. A great deal has been said pro and con about the slowness of operation of the Eighty-first Congress and I wanted some facts in the RECORD to show what has happened and some comparison of what happened during a similar period in 1947.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennesse has expired.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may include as a part of my remarks a list of bills enacted and a list of bills enacted by the House but on which action has not been completed during both the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

OTHER BILLS PASSED BY THE HOUSE, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS, IN THE FIRST 2 MONTHS

H. R. 54: Los Alamos project of the United States Atomic Energy Commission. (Awaits signature of President.)

H. R. 128: Agriculture, cotton acreage. (Conference.)

H. R. 164: California, Churntown Elementary School District.

H. R. 858: Fair Labor Standards Act, 1938, amends. It would exclude from the regular rate of pay, for purposes of overtime computation, premiums paid for Saturday, Sunday, and holiday work and for work at undesirable hours.

H. R. 967: El Paso, Tex. (private bill).

H. R. 1211: Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1949. Extends the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act to June 12, 1951, and eliminating amendments written into the act by the Eightieth Congress.

H. R. 1243: Hatch Act, amend, penalty. Relates to governmental employees who engage in political activity. Under the present law the penalty is automatic discharge. The bill permits the Civil Service Commission to fix the penalty.

H. R. 1401: Michigan, Mount Hope Cemetery Association.

H. R. 1998: Florida, Pinellas County, land description corrected.

H. R. 2101: Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation. Making $44,000,000 in loans available to farmers in the western disaster area.

H. R. 2313: Copper, copper-bearing ores, exemption from import tax. Continues the suspension of import duties on copper for 2 years, until March 31, 1951.

H. R. 2361: Reorganization Act of 1949. Provides for the reorganization of the Federal Government.

H. R. 2632: Appropriations, first deficiency. Steam plant.

House Joint Resolution 84: Freedom Train, acquisition. Authorizing the Government to operate the Freedom Train for 2 years at a cost of $2,500,000. Now awaits signature of President.

House Joint Resolution 85: Inauguration tax, admission tickets.

H. R. 4: Failure to bring a person under arrest before a committing officer within the proper time shall not render evidence admissible. Passed House February 24, 1947.

H. R. 597: Prevents disposition of garbage in Territorial waters of the United States. Passed House February 10, 1947, and later was pocket vetoed.

House Joint Resolution 27: Amendment to Constitution. Limiting Presidential tenure to two terms. Passed House February 6, 1947.

House Joint Resolution 122: United States Maritime Commission, Alaska Ocean Service. Passed House February 18, 1947.

H. R. 2157: Courts, limit jurisdiction. Overtime-pay suits must be commenced 1 year after date of accrual. Passed House February 28, 1947.

H. R. 1030: Continues in effect certain war excise taxes. Passed House January 29, 1947.

H. R. 1968: Urgent deficiency appropriation bill. Passed House February 18, 1947.

THE RECORD OF THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I am not a little amazed to discover here today that my very amiable and fine friend from Tennessee, the majority whip, has deemed it necessary to come down here in the well of the House and undertake to explain why so little legislation has been passed by the Eighty-first Congress. That he would deem it necessary to make any sort of explanation or comparison at all seems to me to get him very close to the point where he must have something of a guilty conscience.

I was not too sure as I listened to the interruption by the majority leader, my very good friend from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], whether he was endeavoring to take credit for what had been accomplished or to commend the Republicans who have cooperated, certainly in the passage of the reorganization bill to which he referred.

First of all, in respect to the Eightieth Congress, I may say to my friend from Tennessee that for him to compare the Eighty-first Congress with the Eightieth Congress is to make a comparison with a Congress that did a magnificent job for the people of the country. I am glad to see that he apparently recognizes that, because he wants to put his comparison on that basis.

Now, among other reasons for my conviction in that regard is the fact that when the Eightieth Congress came into being and convened in Washington, it fell to our lot to put into effect the provisions of the Reorganization Act that had been enacted by the Seventy-ninth Congress. It was a tremendous job to shrink the committees from 48 to 19; to bring about the complete reorganization of committees; to staff those committees under the provisions of the Reorganization Act, and to carry into full force and effect every line of the Reorganization Act.

I have said before, and I say it again, that if the Eightieth Congress had not been a Republican Congress, the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act would never have been put into effect. Now, enough for that.

Let me say just this: In my opinion this attempted apology for the record of the Eighty-first Congress to this date is nothing more than a smoke screen to cover up the very obvious fact that none of the pledges made to the people in the last campaign, as to what would be done in this Congress, have as yet been carried out. Now, it would appear to me just as a bystander that over on the other side of the Capitol Mr. Truman seems to be filibustering his own program. I do not know how soon they will be able to move forward with the accomplishment of any of the promises that have been made.

Here in the House the plain fact remains that old hands are at the wheel. In other words, you have on the Democratic side in the Eighty-first Congress old hands with experience in the Seventy-ninth and preceding Congresses, who just moved back into the chairs they previously held and yet, in these upward of 2 months, as I said before, none of the significant, important pledges made to the American people have as yet been accomplished.

I hazard this prediction, too, from what I have been able to see around, that very few of those pledges are finally going to be enacted into law. I think if

you get down to it, that is the real reason for this attempted apology today. Certainly, no one of experience in this Chamber would otherwise get very excited about any one statement about a no-can-do Congress. Why, we took that criticism on our side during the Eightieth Congress. I sometimes think that over here you can dish it out but you cannot take it. I recall how you complained about the inaction of the Eightieth Congress. Well, we did not pay any attention to it. We knew that we could accomplish everything that we had promised the American people and we did accomplish that program. We got to it in an orderly way. We held careful hearings and the legislation was enacted into law. Yes, may I remind you again, the most significant parts of that program were enacted into law with more Democratic votes for them than against them.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my friend the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. The generosity and kindness of my friend from Massachusetts overwhelms me. I have a slight feeling that he is getting ready to make a speech himself, and I hope he does. I hope he does, as I would like to hear him predict just what is going to be accomplished in connection with this promised program. Maybe he is going to tell us about the pension bill that, under this new rule adopted by the Eighty-first Congress, seems likely to come up next Monday although, as I understand, the Committee on Rules has not yet voted out a rule.

I inquired here on the floor the other day about whether the chairman of the Committee on Rules, my very dear friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] could tell us what the President's attitude is about that pension bill. The President has advised us about everything else that is up here in the way of a legislative suggestion. I had not heard anything about that pension bill, although I did see that yesterday, according to the press this morning, the new Director of the Budget was up here testifying in opposition to the pension bill, so I would assume that the President is opposed to the pension bill.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HUBER. May I ask the distinguished gentleman from Indiana if he will urge the leadership on his side to support the so-called Rankin bill?

Mr. HALLECK. My recollection is that the gentleman from Ohio was one of the Members on the Democratic side in the Eightieth Congress who was constantly upbraiding the Rules Committee because they did not bring out more bills for the veterans, when the fact of the matter is that the Eightieth Congress enacted 188 different bills of direct benefit to the veterans—one of the best programs for the veterans ever enacted by any Congress. So I am not to be dissuaded by the gentleman's interrogation of me in that regard. I am wondering on my part whether or not he is going to challenge the position of the Bureau of the Budget as the official spokesman of the executive branch of the Government in respect to the position it has taken on this pension matter.

The other day at that dinner held here in the District, it was reported in the press—I did not get an invitation to the dinner so I was not there—the President said that the Republicans in Congress were blocking the accomplishment of his program. The majority leader has just referred to the 100 new Democrats who have come here to swell the ranks on the Democratic side. Why, we Republicans are down to 171 Members. You have all the rest of them out of 435. You have a great majority in the other branch of the Congress. Now, how in heaven's name does it stand to reason that the Republicans are blocking the accomplishment of this great "pie in the sky" that was offered the people in the last campaign?

Speaking only for myself, I would like to believe that there was sufficient strength among the Republicans to block a considerable part of this program that has been proposed, because I happen to think that a lot of it ought to be blocked. And, again I say, it is going to be blocked because there are enough Democrats in the Congress who put the welfare of their country, its solvency, and the freedom of the people ahead of political promises or political expediency. They are going to see to it that a lot of that program is not enacted into law.

THE EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, when I asked for the additional 5 minutes for my distinguished friend from Indiana, I had no intention of making any remarks, because nothing my friend said caused the spirit in me to move in the slightest, but as a result of the additional time the gentleman obtained he did make a few statements that did cause the spirit to move and prompted me to seek recognition.

My friend seems to place a great deal of emphasis on the liberalization of the rule. May I say to him that he had better study that rule, as well as some other rules, a little more and then he will not leave himself open to a devastating come-back in relation to a pension bill coming up under only one rule. Other than that, I have no observation to make. If he will confer with his friend to the right, the gentleman from Illinois might be able to advise him further. I make that suggestion to him out of the very extreme kindness of my mind and heart, as I do not want my good friend the gentleman from Indiana to make too many misstatements.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I thought that we might explore that question of the rule a little bit further. Does the gentleman mean the Committee on Veterans' Affairs can bring up a pension bill at any time if they so desire?

Mr. McCORMACK. A general pension bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Can the Committee on Veterans' Affairs bring up a bill at any time if they so desire, under the rule?

Mr. McCORMACK. It has a privileged status, the same as the appropriation bills or tax bills.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I believe that probably the gentleman from Mississippi would appreciate that information.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I must yield first to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] who is on his feet.

Mr. RANKIN. The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is correct in saying that pension legislation is privileged. But since the eclipse of the Committee on Rules, we also have the right to move on next Monday, or on Monday 2 weeks from now, to bring the rule up on the floor of the House under the new rule, whether it is privileged legislation or not. On those Mondays we are permitted to move, under the rule, to call up the rule after it has been introduced 21 days.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is under the rule as amended this session.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct, but I was not referring to that. I was referring to something else.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will yield further, he also said that the gentleman could bring it up tomorrow if he wished.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman had better read the rules a little more. However, my remarks were not directed to the gentleman from Massachusetts, but were directed to my good friend the gentleman from Indiana, because I do not want to see him embarrassed in the future.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I thought the entire membership would like to have the same information that the gentleman possessed.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not want to see my friend from Indiana embarrassed in the future, when he says that pension legislation can only come up under one rule. The rules are there for anyone to read. An appropriation bill does not need a rule, if there is no legislation attached to it. A tax bill does not need a rule. If the gentleman will look up the rules, he will find that there are some others that do not need rules.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. For the enlightenment and information of the gentleman from Massachusetts, as well as the Members of the House, the special rule to which he has alluded does provide that if the Committee on Rules fails

to report out a rule requested by the chairman of a committee having charge of the legislative bill which has been reported to that committee within 2 calendar days, then on the second and fourth Mondays of each month the chairman of that legislative committee may call up his rule for consideration. That is, he may call up the rule which he has submitted to the Committee on Rules, and the Chair shall recognize the gentleman for that purpose. However, in this particular case, the rule which would be called up under that special rule by the gentleman from Mississippi, the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, would be a closed rule, providing, of course, that the Committee on Rules does not grant a rule.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has said nothing which is inconsistent with what I have said.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] have five additional minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, that shows the spirit of America.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that the purpose of the gentleman from Tennessee was not to offer an apology, but to make the record straight to show what has happened to date in the Eightieth Congress and the Eighty-first Congress.

My Republican friends, in their desperation, have been making some statements which are rather far-removed from the true facts. It is only the Republican mind that could place such an interpretation upon it, when a Democrat takes the floor and presents the facts, particularly when it is uncomfortable to our Republican friends, that he is undertaking to make an apology.

I can remember last session. We did not attack the Republican Party at the outset because of its failure to function because we realized that it takes at the outset of a Congress at least 2 weeks for committees to be formed. We are all practical men and we know that. For the Democrats to attack the Republicans in the last Congress when they were in control for taking about 2 weeks to have the committees formed would not have been right. It would not have been fair and we did not do it. After the committees are formed, it then takes about 10 days or 2 weeks to internally organize and to get their bills assigned for hearings. So that the practical operation, when a new Congress meets, no matter what the Congress be, whether it is Republican controlled or Democratic controlled, we who have had some experience know that it takes from 4 to 6 weeks before a new Congress actually starts functioning. That is what happened 2 years ago and that is what is happening now.

Some of our Republican friends have been making some statements and speeches—even my good friend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] made one down in South Carolina, as I remember, some weeks ago. Of course, I knew that JOE had departed from the role of statesman and was talking as a true Republican, attacking the Democratic-controlled Congress for having passed only one bill—a bill increasing the salary of the President, the Vice President, and the Speaker. In that case my friend knew that bill had to be passed on or before January 20. Otherwise any increase for the President would not have become effective during the term of the present President of the United States, and we were all unanimous in having a proper increase in salary for the President of the United States. Both sides cooperated, but that bill had to be enacted into law, as I remember it, on or before January 20, when President Truman assumed his present term of office.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; I yield to my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman does not say that my statement was not correct?

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, no. I say the gentleman discolored it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. In what way did I discolor it?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman made the statement that we had done nothing, when the record shows we have done more to date than the Eightieth Congress, of which my friend from Massachusetts was the leader of the Republican Party and the Speaker of the House.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman said in his South Carolina talk——

Mr. McCORMACK. Was it South Carolina?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It was South Carolina. The gentleman said there were two bills passed and one of them was an increase in the pay of the President. Is that correct or incorrect?

Mr. McCORMACK. When did the gentleman make that speech?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. At 7 o'clock in the evening.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thought my friend from Massachusetts retired about 7 o'clock at night. In any event, I meant what date? Of course, 7 o'clock is rather late for my friend. But what date was it?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do not recall.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does not the gentleman know that it takes 2 weeks when a new Congress meets for the committees to be formed?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does it not take 10 days or 2 weeks thereafter for the committees to organize? Is that not right?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I remember the gentleman stood on this floor and said you were going to bring the wage-hour bill out in 1 day, January 18, and you have not brought it out yet.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is true, but that is due to the fact that the Republican members of the committee are not cooperating. Any kind of a real extension of the wage-hour law, from 40 cents to 75 cents, will not come out of the committee through any assistance of any Republican member, with the possible exception of one. I hope there will be one, but I doubt it. In any event, however, the fact remains that the Eighty-first Congress, stating the record in response to the inaccurate statement made by Republican leaders, is far ahead. The final answer will be the end of the Congress. The people of the United States gave a vote of commendation of this Democratic Congress when they overwhelmingly repudiated the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress last November.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight tonight to file a report and minority views on the bill (S. 135) relating to daylight-saving time in the District.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, and in one to include a report of the Soil Conservation District of Benton County. This report may exceed the limit a little; but, notwithstanding this, I ask consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

"THIS IS GREATER LAWRENCE" PROGRAM WINS NATIONAL RADIO AWARD

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, rating third place among the hundreds of radio stations in the United States for outstanding public service, WLAW, 50,000-watt affiliate of the American Broadcasting Co. at Lawrence, Mass., takes justifiable pride in its achievement.

Official notification wired on March 6, 1949, to Fred A. Sullivan, promotion manager of WLAW, by Jerry Franken, radio and television editor of Billboard,

the Nation's outstanding amusement weekly magazine, stated:

WLAW has been awarded third place for clear-channel network affiliates in the public-service category of Billboard's eleventh annual radio and television promotion competition. Details will be published in the March 12 issue of Billboard. Heartiest congratulations.

Produced and directed by Chief Announcer Frederick P. Laffey, who is also a captain in the Military Intelligence Reserve, the program is heard every Thursday at 7:15 p. m. It is sponsored by the Pacific Mills of Lawrence, world famous as a producer of fine textile fabrics.

Stressing the voluntary and effective teamwork which knits together all the diverse elements into democratic unity, "This Is Greater Lawrence" is an inspiring program idea, expertly produced for reception in all American homes.

Communism will never divide us as long as we have such affirmative expressions of tolerance, of mutual faith, and of work-a-day fellowship as are revealed in this program of community understanding, a program which should be emulated by every radio station.

Lawrence is one of the most cosmopolitan industrial cities in the United States. Of its 84,000 residents, 22,000 are foreign-born. But there are no racial or religious tensions, thanks to the community spirit developed through constructive public-relations efforts of which Pacific's program is such a splendid example.

Representatives of organizations embracing all civic endeavors tell the stories of the roles they play in the life of this city. They tell of the accomplishments which have been realized toward the greater health, happiness, and prosperity of their fellow men. They plan for the higher goals of tomorrow.

Reaching out to the neighboring communities of Methuen, Andover, and North Andover, "This Is Greater Lawrence" weaves a living, vibrant pattern of democracy in action.

Ernest D. Walen, executive vice president of Pacific Mills; Irving E. Rogers, president of the company which owns and operates the broadcasting facilities; and Frederick P. Laffey, producer and director of the program—these are the men who merit the plaudits of their fellow citizens.

Hats off to an all-American public service from Lawrence, Mass.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) for balance of week on account of death in family.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 29. An act to authorize payment of claims based on loss of or damage to property deposited by alien enemies;

S. 170. An act to authorize the transfer of certain property to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes;

S. 593. An act for the relief of certain postal employees;

S. 630. An act to amend section 19 of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), so as to remove the upper age limit for appointment to commissioned grade in the Supply Corps of the Navy;

S. 673. An act relating to the pay and allowances of officers of the Naval Reserve performing active duty in the grade of rear admiral, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 22. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the three hundredth anniversary of Annapolis, Md.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MILES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 10, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

337. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the voluntary plan for the allocation of steel products for farm-type storage bins and the letters of compliance to the plan; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

338. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a list of copies of orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service suspending deportation, as well as a list of the persons involved; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

339. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting an additional list of copies of orders of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Service suspending deportation, as well as a list of the persons involved; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Ohio: Committee on Banking and Currency. Part II, minority views on the Housing and Rent Act of 1940 (Rept. No. 215). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 1757. A bill to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended; with amendments (Rept. No. 237). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2285. A bill to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights," with respect to relaxation of provisions governing copyright of foreign works; with amendments (Rept. No. 238). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KEE: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Joint Resolution 178. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1956 Olympic Games at Detroit, Mich.; without amendment (Rept. No. 240). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE of California: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 165. A bill to authorize the American River Basin development, California, for irrigation and reclamation, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 241). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 2373. A bill to amend the act establishing the Hot Springs National Park; with amendments (Rept. No. 242). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 138. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 1731, a bill to extend certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 243). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 139. Resolution for consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 36, joint resolution for the authorization of a special contribution by the United States to the United Nations for the relief of Palestine refugees; without amendment (Rept. No. 244). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HARRIS. Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 135. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District; with amendments (Rept. No. 245). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 2960. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act to provide for rural telephones, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 246). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 593. A bill for the relief of Hampton Institute; without amendment (Rept. No. 230). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 599. A bill for the relief of Victor R. Browning & Co., Inc., without amendment (Rept. No. 231). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 735. A bill for the relief of Phil H. Hubbard; without amendment (Rept. No. 232). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 766. A bill for the relief of John F. Galvin; with amendments (Rept. No. 233). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3077. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rebecca Levy; without amendment (Rept. No. 234). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3234. A bill for the relief of Jesse A. Lott; without amendment (Rept. No. 235). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3254. A bill for the relief of Iva Gavin; without amendment (Rept. No. 236). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1101. A bill for the relief of Anna Malone; with amendments (Rept. No. 239). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES of Kentucky:

H. R. 3356. A bill to modify the plan for flood control in the Ohio River Basin approved by the act of June 28, 1938; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 3357. A bill authorizing annual payments to States, Territories, and insular governments, for the benefit of their local political subdivisions, based on the fair value of the national-forest lands situated therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 3358. A bill to combat un-American activities by requiring the registration of Communist-front organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. BOLTON of Maryland:

H. R. 3359. A bill to provide for local taxation of real estate owned by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 3360. A bill to grant the consent of the Congress to the Cheyenne River compact as entered into under the act of February 26, 1927; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HARRIS (by request):

H. R. 3361. A bill relating to children born out of wedlock; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3362. A bill to amend sections 260, 267, 309, 315, 348, 350, and 361 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, to provide that estates of decedents being administered within the probate court may be settled at the election of the personal representative of the decedent in that court 6 months after his qualification as such personal representative; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3363. A bill to amend section 16-416 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia to provide that an attorney be appointed by the court to defend all uncontested annulment cases; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3364. A bill to amend section 137 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, relating to the time within which a caveat may be filed to a will after the will has been probated; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3365. A bill to amend section 13-108 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia to provide for constructive service by publication in annulment actions; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3366. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, to provide a family allowance and a simplified procedure in the settlement of small estates; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3367. A bill to amend section 16-416 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia to conform to the nomenclature and practice prescribed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3368. A bill to amend sections 356 and 365 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, to increase the maximum sum allowable by the court out of the assets of a decedent's estate as a preferred charge for his or her funeral expenses from $600 to $1,000; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3369. A bill to amend sections 130 and 131 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, relating to the notice to be given upon a petition for probate of a will, and to the probate of such will; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3370. A bill to amend section 16-415 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia to provide for the enforcement of court orders for the payment of temporary and permanent maintenance in the same manner as directed to enforce orders for permanent alimony; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3371. A bill to provide for the appointment and compensation of counsel to impoverished defendants in criminal cases in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3372. A bill to amend section 1537 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended, so as to provide for service of process on agents or employees of a nonresident individual, partnership, association, group, organization, or foreign corporation conducting a business in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 3373. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 3374. A bill to reduce the rate of tax on transportation of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3375. A bill to authorize the construction of a United States Veterans' Administration general medical-surgical hospital facility in Humboldt County, Calif.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TACKETT:

H. R. 3376. A bill to amend section 6 of Public Law 526, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3377. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the general welfare by establishing a system of Federal old-age benefits, and by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for aged persons, blind persons, dependent and crippled children, maternal and child welfare, public health, and the administration of their unemployment-compensation laws; to establish a Social Security Board; to raise revenues; and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1935, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELCH of California:

H. R. 3378. A bill to broaden the cooperative extension system as established in the act of May 8, 1914, and acts supplemental thereto, by providing for cooperative extension work between colleges receiving the benefits of this act and the acts of July 2, 1862, and August 30, 1890, and other qualified colleges, universities, and research agencies, and the United States Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 3379. A bill to authorize the Bureau of Indian Affairs to make and accept loans of road-building equipment; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 3380. A bill to liberalize the delimiting marriage date in pension laws relating to certain widows of veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the China Relief Expedition and the Philippine Insurrection; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3381. A bill relating to the immigration status of the lawful wives and children of Chinese treaty merchants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3382. A bill to allow a deduction, for income-tax purposes, of $30 to a taxpayer who voted during the taxable year at any election in which a candidate was to be nominated or elected for Federal office; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 3383. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3384. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to suspensions of employees of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 3385. A bill to require United States Civil Service Commission to establish regional office for State of Michigan at Detroit, Mich.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 3386. A bill to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act to increase the time within which claims under such act may be presented to Federal agencies or prosecuted in the United States district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 3387. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 3388. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 3389. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 3390. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 3391. A bill to exempt graduates of the United States Merchant Marine Academy who hold commissions in the Naval Reserve from induction or service under the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 3392. A bill to regulate the sale of reserved accommodations on passenger trains; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3393. A bill to create and establish an international university for the purpose of promoting universal understanding, justice, and permanent peace, to provide for the course of study, management, and operation of the university, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 3394. A bill to provide benefits for members of the Reserve components of the armed forces who suffer disability or death while on 2 weeks' active duty, and for their

dependents; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 3395. A bill to provide assistance for local-school agencies in providing educational opportunities for children on Federal reservations or in defense areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin.

H. R. 3396. A bill to amend the law relating to timber operations on the Menominee Indian Reservation in Wisconsin; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 3397. A bill to provide that all employees of the Veterans' Canteen Service shall be paid from funds of the service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 3398. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the State to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3399. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act so as to more fully utilize the productive facilities of small-business concerns in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 3400. A bill for the purpose of erecting adequate Federal office and postal facilities in Tacoma, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WOODRUFF:

H. R. 3401. A bill to include the Virgin Islands in certain titles of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 3402. A bill to amend section II of the act entitled "an act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. J. Res. 187. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. J. Res. 188. Joint resolution to provide for the coinage of a medal in recognition of the distinguished services of Vice President ALBEN W. BARKLEY; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GREGORY:

H. J. Res. 189. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special 3-cent postage stamp commemorative of the Tennessee Valley Authority; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. J. Res. 190. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the term of office and qualifications of Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. Res. 140. Resolution to pay a gratuity to Annie O. Brown; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. Res. 141. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate and study public-opinion polls; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. Res. 142. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Public Lands to investigate and study the circumstances surrounding the making of contracts and leases relating to golf courses in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. Res. 143. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Armed Services to investigate and study the facts and circumstances relating to the obtaining of evidence in certain war-crime cases in Germany; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. Res. 144. Resolution for the relief of Jean Ness; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 3403. A bill for the relief of John B. H. Waring; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3404. A bill for the relief of Thomas F. Dugan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 3405. A bill for the relief of Vivian Newell Price; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 3406. A bill for the relief of Leslie Fullard-Leo and Ellen Fullard-Leo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 3407. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Ann Oliver; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 3408. A bill for the relief of Opal Hayes and D. A. Hayes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 3409. A bill to provide for the advancement of James Edgar Davis on the emergency officers' retired list of the Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 3410. A bill for the relief of Peter Kristian Kristensen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SOMERS:

H. R. 3411. A bill for the relief of George Koniditsiotis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 3412. A bill for the relief of N. H. Kelley, Bernice Kelley, Clyde D. Farquhar, and Gladys Farquhar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 3413. A bill for the relief of Alfred Baumgarts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

185. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Memorial of the State Legislature of State of South Dakota, memorializing the Congress of the United States not to enact legislation permitting the coloring of oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

186. Also, memorial of the State Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which will assure the payment of prices for farm products at not less than 100 percent of parity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

187. Also, petition of Ralph R. Chapman, correspondent, and 26 other members of Local Branch 1225, National Association of Letter Carriers, Rapid City, S. Dak., veterans of World War II, requesting enactment of legislation to correct injustice of Public Law No. 134, enacted in July 1945; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

188. By Mr. TOWE: Petition of Hudson County Federation of Holy Name Societies, Jersey City, N. J., protesting against the outrageous procedure employed in the alleged trial of His Eminence Josef Cardinal Mindszenty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

189. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Resolution of the Michigan State Legislature, protesting to the world the ruthless and unjust exercise of autocratic power in connection with the trial and conviction of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

190. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Associated Townsend Clubs of Pinellas County, Clearwater, Fla., requesting enactment of H. R. 2135 and H. R. 2136, Eighty-first Congress, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 10, 1949

(Legislative day of Monday, February 21, 1949)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers, to whose kingdom of justice and love the future belongs: It is Thy might which hath made and preserved us a Nation. In the dedication of this quiet moment, perplexed by rushing cares, we would still all other voices that Thine may be heard.

We long to see the genuine spirit of brotherhood regnant in our common life—cleansing it from all that is unwholesome, sweetening every human relationship, composing the differences of class with class and nation with nation, delivering from the lust for gain or power or privilege which would narrow our loyalties and harden our sympathies. To this end we pray that Thou wouldst hear us for the outward growth of Thy kingdom in the world, and for its inward growth in our own hearts and consciences. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1741. An act to authorize the establishment of a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2546. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish land-based air warning and control installations for the national security, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3333. An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 1741. An act to authorize the establishment of a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2546. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish land-based air warning and control installations for the national security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3333. An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

REVISED ESTIMATE, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY (S. Doc. No. —)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revised estimate of appropriation for the Federal Security Agency, involving an increase of $9,013,000, fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Treasury Department (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Fiscal, Budgeting, and Accounting Activities (appendix F) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Transportation and the National Government (vol. I, Proposed Revision of National Transportation Policy and Administrative Organization) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Transportation and the National Government (vol. II, the Provision of Facilities and Regulation of Transport Enterprises) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Chapman	Ellender
Baldwin	Chavez	Ferguson
Brewster	Connally	Flanders
Bricker	Cordon	Frear
Bridges	Donnell	Fulbright
Butler	Douglas	George
Byrd	Downey	Gillette
Cain	Eastland	Green
Capehart	Eaton	Gurney
Hayden	McCarran	Russell
Hendrickson	McCarthy	Saltonstall
Hickenlooper	McFarland	Schoeppel
Hill	McGrath	Smith, Maine
Hoey	McKellar	Sparkman
Holland	McMahon	Stennis
Hunt	Magnuson	Taft
Ives	Malone	Taylor
Jenner	Maybank	Thomas, Okla.
Johnson, Colo.	Miller	Thomas, Utah
Johnson, Tex.	Millikin	Thye
Johnston, S. C.	Morse	Tobey
Kefauver	Mundt	Tydings
Kem	Murray	Vandenberg
Kerr	Myers	Watkins
Kilgore	Neely	Wherry
Knowland	O'Conor	Wiley
Langer	O'Mahoney	Williams
Lodge	Pepper	Withers
Long	Reed	Young
Lucas	Robertson	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. LUCAS to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 15, amending the so-called cloture rule of the Senate.

Mr. PEPPER obtained the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Florida yield so the Chair may ask the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] if he proposes to make a request similar to that he has previously made for unanimous consent respecting the insertion in the RECORD at this time of routine matters?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield for that purpose, Mr. President.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not care to make that request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida has the floor.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I cannot escape the conviction that there are involved in this debate——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield so that I may ask unanimous consent to make an insertion in the RECORD?

Mr. PEPPER. I shall be glad to do so, Mr. President, if I may without impairing my status as being engaged in making my first speech upon the pending question.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest to the majority leader that, if it meets with his approval, Senators be given the same privilege as has been afforded for several days past, to make insertions in the RECORD, at this time, at the beginning of the day's session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida has really not started his speech. If it is agreeable to the Senate, the Senator from Illinois——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I withdraw the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida may proceed.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I had begun by saying that I cannot escape the conviction that there are involved in this debate crucial and vital issues. I deem those issues to be, first, the supremacy of the Constitution of the United States; second, the power of the Government of the United States to function; and, third, the duty of the Government of the United States to protect and further the principles of democracy in the United States and in the world. I say the supremacy of the Constitution of the United States is involved, because the situation in the Senate today contravenes the Constitution of the United States, and denies to the Senate of the United States the privilege of discharging its constitutional duty to legislate, for in Article I of the Constitution is to be found the following provision:

SECTION 1. All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

Now, Mr. President, what is the legislative power? It is the power to consider legislation. It is the power to function. It is the power of its committees to deliberate on legislative proposals, to report them to the Senate, the power of the Senate to receive them, to regard them, to put them upon its calendar, to deliberate upon them, to adopt them, and at some reasonable time, Mr. President, to come to a decision with respect to such legislative proposals. Anything which denies to the Senate of the United States the power to function in one of those essential respects at any essential step from the initiation to the conclusion of a legislative proposal denies to the United States Senate its constitutional power and prerogative to legislate for the United States of America.

Mr. President, let me in the very beginning of my remarks say that if the Government of the United States was ever a confederacy it is not now a confederacy of sovereign States. The Government of the United States is the government of a nation. I am a Senator of the United States, a nation, a sovereignty in itself. The American flag floats over a nation. Thank God, it is a united nation among the political units of the world.

We all know, of course, the evolution of our state, our Nation, our national sovereignty. We know how it had its beginnings, of course, but, Mr. President, the third word in the preamble to the Federal Constitution is "people".

We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty—

To whom? To the States? To the governors of the States? To the State legislatures? To the State supreme courts? No; "to ourselves," "the people," the Constitution says. And to whom else—the successors of the State sovereignties? No, Mr. President—to "our posterity."

This is a nation of people, Mr. President, not a nation of some political concepts that may be called sovereign states—

and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

For a nation, the United States of America.

Article I, section 1, of the Constitution reads as follows:

All legislative powers—

Legislative powers for whom, Mr. President? For the States? No; for the Government of the United States, which was breathed into being in the Constitution in 1787, and came into an effective status in the inception of this new thing upon the face of the earth, the Government of the United States, in 1789.

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

Mr. President, we derive our very compensation from the Government of the United States. The check which we receive for our services comes out of the Federal Treasury, and the funds to provide the sources of that compensation come from taxes levied by the Government of the United States.

The President is not the chairman of a board of directors. He is not the chairman of a conference of States. He is the Chief Executive and the principal magistrate of the most supreme power on the face of the earth, the United States of America, a nation, not a confederation. I thank God that I have the privilege to be a small part of the greatest unit of political character on earth, the United States of America.

This honored body has been vested with the power to be a part of the legislative function of the Government of the United States. Of course, our membership comes from the States, just as the membership of the House of Representatives comes from the districts. But, Mr. President, I do not represent the Governor of Florida. I do not represent the Legislature of Florida. I do not represent the Supreme Court of Florida. I do not hold my commission from them. I was not appointed by the Governor of Florida. I was not designated by my legislature or by the supreme court of my State. My certificate, on file in the office of the Secretary of the Senate, attests that I was elected by the people of Florida in an election.

So we are members of a government. This is not a part of some loose confederation which might have existed at some previous period of our history. The constituency of the Senate, of course, is founded upon a geographical entity, which is the State; but I say again that if there ever was any concept that a Senator represented a State in its official and sovereign capacity, that concept was certainly altered when the method of selection of Senators was changed from appointment by legislatures to election by the people. I regard a Senator as simply a member of a bicameral legislature, the Senate and the House of Representatives, in which is vested the legislative power of the Government of the United States.

Whatever thwarts the exercise of its legislative power by the Senate of the United States is a denial of the Constitution of the United States to that extent. There have been times in the past when an arrogant monarch actually barred the doors of a legislative assembly to the members of the assembly. That, of course, would be a denial of the legislative power.

Let us suppose that the honorable and honored minority in the Senate, opposing even a consideration of a rule change recommended by the Committee on Rules and Administration of this body, were to post themselves around the doors of this Chamber and say, "We forbid entry to every Senator who does not share our sentiments, every Senator who would organize the Senate into a legislative body, every Senator who would insist upon a calendar of Senate business, every Senator who would insist upon debate but eventually upon a decision and a roll call. We deny you access to this Chamber because we do not like what you might do." Of course, that would be unthinkable; but would it not be thwarting the legislative power and the duty of the Senate to legislate, to organize itself into a legislative assembly, and to function as such?

The counterpart of that is what is being done here today. It was done all last week. It will be done, undoubtedly, according to previous announcements, until in some manner the obstruction—not the debate—may be brought to a close.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to make my direct address, at the conclusion of which I shall be very glad to yield to Senators.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida declines to yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I say that that is the counterpart of what is being done here now. Let us suppose that we gathered in this Chamber at noon of this day, and the Presiding Officer took his seat. Suppose he should deny recognition to any Senator who might rise to his feet. The Senate rules provide that every Senator must address the Chair and be recognized before he can utter a word. Suppose the Chair should say, "The Chair will not recognize any Senator who rises to his feet." The able leader of the majority might rise and say, "Mr. President—" and the Chair would say nothing. Again the able leader would insist, "Mr. President—" and the Chair would refuse to hear him, to recognize him. The minority leader might rise and say, "Mr. President—" and the Chair would refuse to call his name, to give him the floor. Senator after Senator might rise and seek recognition by the Chair. One after another they might be refused. We would sit here, a helpless body of men gathered together as a Senate, but unable to function because the Chair would not perform his part in the process and give the required recognition to Senators who aspired to carry on the business of the Senate.

That would shock the sensibilities of every Senator and every citizen; yet in principle, is not that what is being done now? We are being denied the power to change our own rules, to fix our own calendar, to determine what shall be the business of the Senate. It might as well be a bill of legislative character that might be thwarted by the minority in this case, which is not satisfied to rest the issue upon a vote of Senators, but which says to its fellow Senators, "We deny you the power to change the rules of the Senate, or even to consider a change." In numerous other cases the denial has been of the privilege to consider proposed legislation.

So I say, Mr. President, that if Senators were to range themselves around the doors, or if the Presiding Officer were to fail to recognize any Senator, that would be a denial of the duty of this body to function.

Let me give another case. Suppose Members gathered in the well of the Senate and made such loud noises that the business of the Senate could not be carried on, or distributed themselves over the Chamber and so conducted themselves that business could not be transacted. Would anyone deny that that would be something which would strike at the very quality of this body as a legislative assembly, something which would eventually have to be met and mastered before democracy could function and this assembly could discharge its duty? Of course not. None of the honored Members of this body could, in the remotest imaginative contemplation, be a party to such conduct. Yet, Mr. President, would that, in essential character be different from what they do now in denying to the Senate the right to consider a proposed rule change recommended by a standing committee of the Senate by a vote of 10 to 3 of the 13 members of the Committee on Rules and Administration, after public hearing and deliberation?

So, Mr. President, I say that whatever denies to the Senate the power to function in the exercise of its legislative power, contravenes and thwarts and denies and obstructs the functioning of the Constitution of the United States.

Let me put another case: Not far away from us is the Supreme Court of the United States. It has a membership of nine justices. They, too, have a calendar. They have an obligation under the Constitution, because the Constitution provides that the judicial power shall be vested in a Supreme Court and in inferior courts.

The judicial power imposes a duty as well as a prerogative upon the justices of that Court. Suppose they were attempting to fix the calendar of the business of the Supreme Court and provide for the argument of cases before the Court. Suppose that three of the justices, or one-third of the total number, were to say, "No; we do not want case A brought up. Carry that over until tomorrow or until next week;" and suppose that when next week came they

were to say, "Carry it over until next month;" and suppose that when next month arrived they were to say, "Carry it over until next year; we want to submit some more data. We do not approve what the majority may do in that case; therefore we protest against having that case placed on the calendar of the Supreme Court. We protest against its being argued by counsel before the Court, and against the briefs being received and considered." Or suppose the case had been argued, and suppose the Court had the matter before it, and suppose when the nine justices of the Court came to their conference, three of the justices were to say, "Mr. Chief Justice, we are not ready today. We do not want to take up that case now"; and suppose at the next conference they said the same thing, and at the next conference they persisted in the same course, and at the fourth conference the same conduct was engaged in, and day after day and week after week and month after month passed and those three justices continued to deny to their six brethren on the Supreme Court bench the right, the prerogative, and the duty of taking up and disposing of a case pending before that Court. If that ever became known, Mr. President, what would be the shock and the consternation of the citizens of the United States over such conduct by that Court, no matter how deeply the minority of justices felt that the probable opinion of the majority would be objectionable to them, and even not in accordance with the Constitution of the United States.

It all goes to show that when a minority presumes to tell a majority that the majority cannot even bring before a legislative body a legislative proposal or, in the case of a court, a legal proceeding, in such event the legislative or judicial powers are being denied to that body which has the obligation of functioning as a legislative or judical tribunal.

So I say that the Constitution of the United States is thwarted when the legislative function is denied to the Senate of the United States by a minority of its membership.

Mr. President, I realize that majorities can often be and often have been wrong; but surely there cannot be so much error in the decision of a majority upon a matter properly before the tribunal of which the majority is a part as there can be in a policy of a minority, often a small minority, which denies to the tribunal even the privilege of considering, let alone deciding, a matter which is properly before the duly constituted tribunal.

Furthermore, the Constitution of the United States provides that upon the demand of one-fifth of the Members of the Senate, a yea-and-nay vote may be required. Obviously that provision contemplated that eventually there would be a yea-and-nay vote if one-fifth of the Members of the Senate wanted the decision to be recorded by the yeas and nays. Obviously the forefathers contemplated that the Senate should get something done, should do its duty; so that provision of the Constitution clearly contemplates that although the Senate should debate, it should eventually decide the issues which are properly before it.

A third provision of the Constitution is that each House of the Congress of the United States is vested with authority to make its own rules. That is a constitutional privilege. Of course that is inherent in the nature of the body itself, but it is recognized by the Constitution that the Senate of the United States, and also the House of Representatives, shall have the power and of course the duty, since it must have rules in order to transact business, to prepare and to formulate and to determine its own rules.

Mr. President, is the minority in this case willing to allow the Senate of the United States to amend one of its rules? Obviously it is not. I say this is not a debate, but it is a determined obstruction which does not appeal to the Senate as to how it should vote, but tells it with all the strength the minority possesses that the Senate shall not vote; and not only that it shall not vote, but that it shall not even bring up a proposed rule change and make it the unfinished business on the Senate calendar. The minority says to the Senate, "We will not even allow you to consider a rule change," which under the Constitution of the United States the Senate is certainly privileged to do. Indeed, Mr. President, the Senate has a duty to modify its rules as experience dictates the necessity thereof, so that it may the better discharge the duty imposed by the first article of the Constitution which vests in the Senate and the House of Representatives the legislative power of the Government of the United States. Indeed, Mr. President, one of the ablest Senators who ever sat in this body, Senator Walsh, of Montana, argued, back in 1917, that it was unconstitutional for the Senate of the United States to adopt a rule that would thwart the legislative function which the Senate is duty bound to discharge. He said that we cannot escape the duty of legislating, imposed upon us by the Constitution, by the adoption of a rule which would thwart legislation and deny the right of the exercise of legislative power.

Mr. President, the Constitution of the United States provides that the Senate shall have a right to adopt its own rules. Of course, it does not tell us what the rules shall be; it does not prescribe the details. Of course it was contemplated that they should be worked out according to the wisdom of the Senate, based on the knowledge and the experience Senators would acquire.

But what do we have here? As we go back down the lane of history, we find that in the organization of the first Senate, when the rules were first promulgated, there was provision for a previous question. I know it has been well and ably said that the "previous question" was not contemplated as an instrument to bring debate of a general character to a conclusion, but that it was intended only to prevent the further discussion of matters of great delicacy and subjects the airing of which would not be in the public interest. Nevertheless, Mr. President, the previous question conferred upon the Senate a power to decide when it should use it.

Of course I am aware that when the rules were revised in 1806, after the farewell adress to the Senate of Vice President Aaron Burr, who called attention to the little use that was being made of the previous question rule, and that it probably was not necessary to retain it in the rules as then revised, the "previous question" was eliminated.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I regret exceedingly not to yield to my able friend the Senator from Georgia, but the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] previously asked me to yield to him, and I replied that, if I might do so, I should like to finish my remarks, and then I shall gladly yield to any Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. Very well.

Mr. PEPPER. So, Mr. President, I say there was that power in the first Senate. Someone may say, "Yes, but the founding fathers never contemplated there would ever be such a thing as cloture." Eleven of those who were Members of the first Senate had participated in formulating the Constitution of the United States. They sat in the Senate. They had sat in the Constitutional Convention. The records do not disclose any outcries from those founding fathers that the inclusion of the previous question in the Senate rules was contrary to the sentiment of the framers of the Constitution. I do not recall whether their names have been put in the RECORD previously, but I shall not burden the RECORD very much if I put them in. They were John Langdon, of New Hampshire; Rufus King, of New York; Caleb Strong, of Massachusetts; William S. Johnson, of Connecticut; Oliver Ellsworth, of Connecticut; William Patterson, of New Jersey; Robert Morris, of Pennsylvania; George Read, of Delaware; Richard Bassett, of Delaware; Pierce Butler, of South Carolina; and William Few, of Georgia. Eleven Senators who sat in the Constitutional Convention were Members of the first Senate. They inserted within its rules the power to invoke the previous question. Moreover, we are told the previous question was employed prior to 1806, I believe, four times. I do not know, and I am told the details of its use are not disclosed, as to the occasion. I am aware of what has been said by authorities on the subject as to the limitation of it. But the previous question to bring debate to a conclusion was used four times between 1789 and 1806.

Through the years there has been a lengthy and voluminous history of efforts by leaders and Members of the Senate to curb the abuse of unlimited debate, in the public interest, in order that the Senate might discharge its constitutional duty to legislate for the Government of the United States. When I look back over the list of Senators who made those proposals, I am not ashamed to be in their company. I mention now Oscar Underwood, of Alabama, Senator Martin, of Virginia, the majority leader in 1917, Henry Clay, of Kentucky, but in the history of the country, from 1806 until

1917, scores of other Senators have recognized the necessity of meeting the abuse of the privilege of unlimited debate which prevailed in the Senate with a good many modifications which I shall not go into at this time.

During the Civil War, when there were executive sessions of the Senate, debate was limited to 5 minutes in executive session. There were numerous times during that period when the Senate voluntarily imposed limitations upon debate. Even now the rules of the Senate, aside from rule XXII, provide two limitations I can readily think of. One is that in the morning hour a Senator can speak for only 5 minutes; the other is that no Senator can speak more than twice on the same measure on the same legislative day. That is a permanent rule of the Senate. Nobody has attempted to repeal it. It is a limitation on debate. If there is to be free and unlimited debate, as some day there must be, why limit a Senator to two speeches on a bill? I am sure most of us think, Mr. President, the oftener we speak, the more we educate and edify our colleagues and the people of the country. Why limit a Senator's opportunity to educate and edify to only two speeches in one legislative day upon a subject, if it be a very serious and important subject? Can Senators not well imagine we might be debating the Atlantic Pact, in connection with which the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the ranking minority member, might want to make a dozen speeches. Their colleagues might wish to hear them. Yet, under the rules of the Senate they would have to get unanimous consent before they could speak more than twice. Thus there has been constituted a rule for the limitation of debate, the necessity for which has developed from our experience of more than one and a half centuries of fruitful existence.

What was the occasion for the adoption of rule XXII, an amendment to which is now attempted to be brought before the Senate? Some say filibusters have never stopped anything that mattered; no legislation of any importance has ever been killed by a filibuster. In 1917 the ominous shadow of Kaiser Wilhelm and Prussian militarism and conquest already hovered over a great part of Europe and hung in the American skies. President Wilson proposed to the Congress that the Executive have authority to arm merchant ships of America plying the waters of the Atlantic, in order that we might defend Americans who were the crews of those ships, in order that we might preserve the freedom of the seas, which was a cherished American doctrine, in order that we might deliver goods to those to whom we chose to sell. Protecting the lives and the property of American citizens was the highest function of the Chief Executive. Yet when the proposal reached the Senate one Friday afternoon, at a time when, under the Constitution, the Senate would adjourn on the following Sunday because of the expiration of the Congress, it was a filibuster that prevented a vote in the Senate upon that bill, which admittedly, I think, would have prevailed had the Senators been given an opportunity to discharge the right they have to vote.

We hear a great deal in the Senate about the rights of minorities, although I am not so sure that the purpose of the present filibuster is not to prevent the majority of the Senate from preserving the rights of important minorities. I am not so sure from what has been said whether the minority today speaks the language of liberation from oppression or wishes to continue to forge shackles which have clung around the wretched feet of some minorities for centuries past.

I say we hear a great deal about the rights of minorities. Would it be an impropriety if I were to suggest that possibly the majority also has some rights in a legislative body? Would I be presumptuous to suggest that one of them is the right to determine what the Senate business shall be? Do I go too far when I intimate we have the right to debate and to deliberate and eventually to vote? Is it an unreasonable demand of the majority that they have a right to fix the Senate calendar, to determine what we shall debate, to give ample opportunity for discussion, and finally give Senators the right to act officially and to make a decision one way or the other?

I think I correctly recall that it was Daniel Webster who, in giving a definition of due process of law, said:

> It proceeds upon inquiry. It hears before it condemns, and renders judgment.

Does not a majority eventually have a right to render judgment, along with the right of inquiry, the right of hearing, before it decides?

So, Mr. President, I venture to say that the majority of the Senate has some rights which might be spoken of here, I hope, without offense, without any desire to diminish the rights of any Senators in this Chamber.

In 1917 a Senate filibuster killed President Wilson's recommendation that the Government be permitted to arm the merchant ships of America navigating hostile waters in moving across the sea. That precipitated action by the Rules Committee of the Senate. The agitation had started in 1915, and the Rules Committee had recommended in 1916 that there be adopted a cloture rule substantially in the form of rule XXII. But finally, when the filibuster killed President Wilson's proposal to arm American merchant ships, there was such indignation in the country at such restraint against the exercise of such power—indeed, Mr. President, there was such a consciousness in the Senate that something should be done—that something happened. What was it? The Republican conference and the Democratic conference agreed almost unanimously, as shown by the debate, upon the appointment of a committee of five Democrats appointed by the Democratic conference, and five Republicans appointed by the Republican conference, to get together and to formulate a cloture rule, because none existed in the Senate at that time. That committee of 10, a splendid bipartisan committee, made its recommendations. I believe the debate shows that at one time the action was unanimous, and then some Senator raised a question, but it was certainly an overwhelming unanimity which that committee presented to the Senate when it recommended the adoption of rule XXII. The Senate adopted the recommendation of the committee by a vote of 76 to 3 after about 6 hours' debate.

We Senators know what rule XXII is, but to those who may not be so well informed as we are, and who may read the RECORD, may I simply say that it is, of course, a rule which allows 16 Senators to file a petition for cloture. When such a petition is filed, it is the duty of the Presiding Officer to give notice to the Senate, through the clerk, of the filing of such a petition, and on the following calendar day but one, 1 hour after the Senate convenes, it is the duty of the Presiding Officer to lay the cloture petition before the Senate. Then it is up to the Senate to decide by a vote whether debate shall be brought to a close. If two-thirds of the Senators present and voting, it being assumed, of course, that a quorum is present, vote for closing debate, it is closed; but thereafter each Senator may speak for 1 hour on the bill or amendments, or upon amendments exclusively, whichever may be his choice. That gives the privilege of debate for 96 hours. It did not take the B-50 more than 94 hours to circle the globe. So an airplane could fly around the world while Senators were still debating under the permission of the cloture rule, rule XXII, if two-thirds of the Senators present and voting should bring debate to a close.

Mr. President, in 1917 that rule was proposed by a bipartisan committee of five Democrat and five Republican Senators. After 6 hours' debate in the Senate it was adopted by the Senate as rule XXII. It was assumed then that the Senate, by a two-thirds vote, could bring debate to a close. I have read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD every word of those 6 hours of debate, and there is not one intimation in the debate that any Senator had a doubt of the universality of the application of rule XXII to any pending question, as well as to any measure; that is, any bill or resolution that might happen to be before the Senate. In my opinion, it was certainly the belief of the Senate which adopted that rule and of the Senators who proposed it that debate was subject to being closed by two-thirds of the Senators present and voting, if they chose to close debate.

Of course, Mr. President, just as the founding fathers could not anticipate everything, it proved later on that the framers of that rule did not anticipate everything.

But before I pass to what happened in 1917, may I call the attention of my honored and revered southern colleagues to what southern Senators did in the Senate in 1917, with respect to rule XXII. I think the able Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and I, if we associate ourselves with the conduct of southern Senators in 1917, need not be ashamed of our company, or regret it. In the first place, who was it who brought the ma-

jority resolution before the Senate but the able majority leader and distinguished Senator from the Old Dominion State of Virginia, Senator Martin.

Mr. President, I want to read the names of the Southern Senators who voted for the cloture rule, rule XXII. Mind you, Mr. President, I say that when they voted for it they did not anticipate that shrewd and ingenious parliamentarians would later discover the loopholes which have permitted numerous filibusters since 1917 and which permit the filibuster which is in existence in the Senate today and it is these loopholes which the proposed rule change now before us would eliminate.

Here are the southern Senators who voted "yea" upon the adoption of the two-thirds rule:

Beckham of Kentucky; Broussard of Louisiana; Hardwick of Georgia; James of Kentucky; Kirby of Arkansas; McKellar of Tennessee; Martin of Virginia; Overman of North Carolina; Ransdell of Louisiana; Robinson of Arkansas—

I pause, Mr. President, to pay tribute to the great name of Joe Robinson, who was the leader of the Senate when I had the honor to come here in late 1936—

Sheppard of Texas; Shields of Tennessee; Simmons of North Carolina; Smith of Georgia; Smith of South Carolina; Swanson of Virginia; Underwood of Alabama; Vardaman of Mississippi; Williams of Mississippi.

Those were the Senators from the South, Mr. President, who actually voted for the adoption of that resolution.

Certain southern Senators were absent, but their attitude was recorded in the RECORD. They were:

Underwood of Alabama, for whom it was announced that he would vote "yea"; Culberson of Texas, on whose behalf it was announced that he would vote "yea"; Tillman of South Carolina, for whom it was announced he would vote "yea." The then senior Senator from Florida, my revered predecessor, Senator Duncan U. Fletcher, was absent and apparently was not recorded.

Mr. President, would anyone suggest that those southern champions did not love the South? Were they traitors to its traditions? Were they scallywags or carpetbaggers? Were they acting against the land of their birth and of their loved ones? No, Mr. President, I do not regard myself as being untrue to the South, to its traditions or its great champions of the past, if I associate myself with those in the Senate who believe that under the Constitution we have a duty to function, that under the Constitution we have the right to amend our rules, or, Mr. President, in this troubled era of the earth, when we stand like an Atlas with the world trembling upon our shoulders, that we have an obligation to promote and to further democracy in America and in the world.

As I have said, Mr. President, it was discovered that there were loopholes. I believe the first discovery came when it was suggested that there might well be cloture applied to the reservations to the Treaty of Versailles, and the Presiding Officer ruled that the cloture rule would not apply to reservations. But the author of the petition did not seek to make it applicable to the treaty and the reservations. Let that be remembered and borne in mind.

Then in 1922 there was debate upon another one of the so-called civil-rights bills, in that year the antilynching bill. I believe it was called the Dyer bill at that time. A moment ago I read the name of Mississippi's able John Sharp Williams as one of those who supported cloture in 1917, and now I refer to one of the most able and beloved men who ever sat in the Senate, a man to whom I am personally greatly indebted, Senator Pat Harrison, of Mississippi, who, apparently, was the ingenious discoverer in 1922 of the privileged motion to amend the Journal which brought the first ruling, I believe, that the cloture rule was not applicable to a motion to amend the Journal.

Filibuster after filibuster intervened, Mr. President, until finally in 1946, when the able Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] was in the Chair, a question was presented as to whether rule XXII was applicable to a motion, and the Senator from Tennessee, then the President pro tempore of the Senate, ruled that rule XXII would not apply to the motion which was involved at that time, that also being, if I recall correctly, a motion to amend the Journal.

In 1948, when the able senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] was in the Chair as the President pro tempore, another cloture petition was presented. That cloture petition attempted to bring to a conclusion debate upon a motion to take up one of the so-called civil rights bills, the anti-poll-tax bill. I may say with no regret, Mr. President, that I am basically the author of that bill, introduced in the Senate in 1941. The able President pro tempore at that time filed an opinion in which he said that he felt himself bound by precedent and by the limitations of the rule to hold that the cloture rule, rule XXII, did not apply, under the circumstances then prevailing, to a motion to take up the anti-poll-tax bill.

If I recall the situation accurately, I think it should be said that this was a motion to take up, but there was other unfinished business in the Senate at that time. But I shall read in part what the able President pro tempore gave as his opinion. I quote from page 16 of the very excellent bulletin entitled "Public Affairs Bulletin No. 64," prepared by Dr. George B. Galloway, on the subject Limitation of Debate in the United States Senate. Dr. Galloway is now with the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. He was the principal adviser of the Joint Committee of the Congress on Reorganization, which produced the Reorganization Act effective in January 1946. This is a quotation from the opinion of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], then President pro tempore:

> In the final analysis, the Senate has no effective cloture rule at all. * * * a small but determined minority can always prevent cloture, under the existing rules * * * a very few Senators have it in their power to prevent Senate action on anything.

Mr. President, this is the President pro tempore of the Senate speaking, in the midst of a decision, or as a part of the explanation of an official decision made by him in interpreting rule XXII. I repeat:

> A very few Senators have it in their power to prevent Senate action on anything.

The Senator from Michigan continued:

> The existing Senate rules regarding cloture do not provide conclusive cloture. They still leave the Senate, rightly or wrongly, at the mercy of unlimited debate ad infinitum.

That decision was delivered on August 2, 1948.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield, as I said a while ago, only if some Senator wishes to question the accuracy of a quotation. I shall yield for that, but as I indicated a moment ago, if the Senator will permit me to conclude my address, I shall then yield to any Senator who wishes to ask a question. If I do not follow that course I shall never get before the Senate the main points I wish to make.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, under that condition, Mr. President, I could not question the Senator, because I agree completely with the accuracy of the statement he has quoted. I merely desired to ask the Senator whether he was in agreement with the authority he was quoting so earnestly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). The Senator from Florida declines to yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Experience has proved thus far, at least, that the Senator from Michigan was right in what he was saying. It has generally been insisted that he was right. The question may be before the Senate at a later time, and if the question is presented to me as to what I would do, perhaps, if I were Presiding Officer of the Senate, that might be one thing. What I might do as a Senator, when the Senate has the right to make rules, may be another thing. I have never questioned the sincerity of the ruling of the able Senator from Michigan. I did, along with the majority leader, and I believe another Senator or two, submit some observations at the time the ruling was about to be made as to its correctness which speak for themselves.

I do say that certainly some way must be devised by which the Senate can control the business of the Senate and the Senate Calendar. We may have to decide that matter, Mr. President, before this discussion is concluded. But I am saying that, since 1917, Presiding Officers, when motions were presented, have ruled that there were loopholes in rule XXII, adopted in 1917, and the loopholes so far discovered by ingenious parliamentarians—than whom there are no abler anywhere than there are in the Senate—have been in reference to motions to amend the Journal after an adjournment, and, of course, motions to take up. To plug these loopholes is the primary purpose of the proposed amendment to rule XXII we are trying to take up.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], in the chair as President pro

tempore, and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], in the chair as President pro tempore, have held that they were bound by precedent to rule the way they did rule. What a court says, of course, is some evidence of what the law is, and the Chair certainly makes the rule, if the situation is such that a Senator cannot gain anything by taking an appeal; he is the final authority. If he rules that the rule does not apply, there would be no efficacy in taking an appeal, because that, in turn, would be subject to unlimited debate; and if the appeal were laid on the table, the ruling of the Chair would simply be affirmed. So when the Presiding Officer decides against the applicability of rule XXII, the majority is helpless to reverse him or even to get a vote of the Senate, because of the privilege of unlimited debate, which may be applied even to an appeal from the decision of the Chair by a previous understanding among Senators and under rulings of the several Presiding Officers.

It was discovered, therefore, that these loopholes were assumed to exist, and it was felt as long ago as the year before last that something should be done about it by the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate. A resolution came out of that committee in 1947, and lay upon the Senate Calendar throughout the session. In 1947 the able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], if I recall correctly, was designated by the Republican conference to study the subject of how the rule might be amended to bring about some kind of effective cloture in the Senate. The Committee on Rules and Administration reported favorably the resolution which we are attempting to get before the Senate, which received bipartisan support, and the favorable report for the proposed rule change was made by a vote of 10 to 3. Now the matter is here before the Senate upon a motion to take up.

Mr. President, I certainly do not question the motives or the deep sense of conscientiousness that impels the Senators of the minority in this fight, but has any Senator ever heard of a Senator associated with the minority in this debate propose to repeal rule XXII? Has any Senator ever heard the suggestion that rule XXII was undemocratic, that it thwarted the will of the minority or that it would destroy the character and impair and tarnish the noble traditions of the Senate? If they feel that any form of cloture accomplishes such odious results—and admittedly rule XXII applies to a bill once it is under debate—why have not these honorable Senators proposed a complete repeal of rule XXII, its eradication from the rule book, the obliteration of that contamination from the structure of law which governs the Senate? But they have not done that. Of course, they are temporarily satisfied to rely upon the loopholes which they have ingeniously discovered, or which their predecessors have discovered.

The question, Mr. President, which cannot be escaped is, Shall the Senate of the United States have the power which is conferred upon it by the Constitution, to make its own rules? If it has the power under the Constitution to make its rules it has the right to consider proposed rule changes, and anyone who denies that, I respectfully submit, denies the admitted right of the Senate to exercise its constitutional prerogative.

Yet able and honorable Senators of the minority tell us that in spite of the fact that one of the outstanding standing committees of the Senate has had before it numerous resolutions proposing rule changes, has had public hearings upon those proposals, has adopted them in committee, has recommended one of them to the Senate by a majority of 10 to 3, and has had it placed upon the Senate Calendar—yet notwithstanding all that they forbid the Senate the right to consider a proposed change in its rules.

Is that in accordance with the Constitution? Is that in accordance with the basic obligation of all of us to facilitate the business of the Senate? Is that in protection and in furtherance of democracy in this last great strong citadel of democracy in the world today? I submit that the answer is obvious—it is "No."

As I have stated before, Senators may say, "Well, there is nothing of any moment that has ever been thwarted by a filibuster." Dr. Galloway has listed on pages 20 and 21 of his bulletin, to which I have referred, a number of bills which have been defeated by filibuster.

The reconstruction of Louisiana in 1865.

The repeal of election laws in 1879.

The force bill in 1890 and 1891.

Three rivers and harbors bills in 1901, 1903, and 1914.

A tri-State bill in 1903. If I am informed correctly, that was a bill for the admission of three States into the Union, and it was defeated by filibuster. They may have later been admitted, no doubt were, but it confirms what the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], said in his decision, that filibuster, under the present state of things, may be applied to anything. While it happens to be a rule change today, it was other things at other times.

The Colombian treaty over the Panama Canal in 1903.

Two ship subsidy bills in 1907 and 1922–23.

The Canadian reciprocity bill in 1911.

Arizona-New Mexico statehood in 1911.

The ship purchase bill in 1915.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will allow me——

Mr. McFARLAND. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PEPPER. I have been declining to yield until I could conclude, and if the Senator will allow me——

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator mentioned my State.

Mr. PEPPER. In that case I guess I will have authority to make my own distinction. I want to be accurate about anything I say. If there is any inaccuracy in what I have said I should like to be corrected. I yield for a question only to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. Is the Senator aware that the filibuster in regard to statehood of New Mexico and Arizona in 1911 was to secure action of the Senate which would permit the admission of Arizona as a State and that if it had not been for that filibuster, Arizona might not have been a State today.

Mr. PEPPER. I have no doubt, Mr. President, that Arizona would have made such an impression upon the Senate with its claim for admission that it would have been heard and have received favorable action at an early date. But I am glad to have any elucidation on the subject from my able friend from Arizona.

I mentioned the ship-purchase bill. That was in 1915. There were German ships in American ports. President Wilson wanted to purchase those German ships and put them in American commerce. Senators filibustered the proposal and defeated it by a filibuster. That was related to the national defense. An adequate maritime service, of course, is essential to the national security.

I have already referred to the armed-ship resolution of 1917. A filibuster prevented the President of the United States from protecting American lives and property and preserving the American freedom of the seas at that time.

Oil and mineral leasing bill and several appropriation bills in 1919.

Let me interpolate, Mr. President, so that I may proceed in chronolgical order, that I believe it is a fair judgment that the Treaty of Versailles was defeated in the Senate because there was no effective cloture rule applied—at least at the time of the debate upon that vitally important proposal.

Senators will remember that President Woodrow Wilson sent the Treaty of Versailles to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in July of 1919. It was far into 1920 before that measure was ever disposed of—after prolonged debate and propaganda had so confused and divided the minds of the American people that they failed to demand of the Senate support of the President. The Senate did not support the President. The League of Nations was defeated. America stayed out, although we had initiated the proposal in the Versailles Peace Conference, and I, for one, will always feel that a part of the penalty and price we paid for that error was World War II.

There were three antilynching bills defeated by filibuster—in 1922, 1925, and 1937–38.

The migratory-bird bill, 1926.

The campaign-investigation resolution, 1927.

The Colorado River bills—Boulder Dam project—1927–28.

Emergency officers' retirement bill, 1927.

Washington public-buildings bill, 1927.

National-origins provision in immigration law—resolution to postpone—1929.

Oil-industry investigation, 1931.

Supplementary deficiency bill, 1935.

Work-relief bill — prevailing-wage amendment—1935.

Flood-control bill, 1935.

Oil-conservation bill, 1936.

There were four anti-poll-tax bills, in 1942, 1944, 1946, and 1948.

The fair employment practices bill, 1946.

Dr. Galloway adds at the bottom of page 21 of the bulletin the following:

Numerous appropriation bills: For a partial list of 62 such bills that failed from 1876 to 1916, see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 2d, 1916, pages 10152 and 10153.

So, Mr. President, the power to filibuster applies not only to the bad; it applies to the good. The power of the minority which may be exerted to defeat the consideration of a bad measure may also be used to thwart the most crucial decision the Government of the United States could make. I am not saying that it has been so used. I say that it could be. I say that it is a power which is dangerous to American democracy. I say that it is a power which is out of harmony with the character of this body, this Government, and this Nation. I say that it is a sword which might strike down the very deliverance of this country from danger. It is a power which no minority in any assembly should possess. It is a power which must be denied and curbed if the Senate of the United States is to discharge its constitutional duty to legislate, its privilege to provide its own rules, and its obligation to protect and further the greatest Government in the world, and the sentiments of democracy at home and abroad.

Another thing which I wish to emphasize to my honored colleagues is the complexity and multiplicity of the problems and tasks which face us as legislators in the Senate, and the almost immeasurable demands which face the Government of the United States, which we as Senators must squarely meet.

This is the highway of legislation; and, if legislation cannot pass this junction point, the American Government is paralyzed and helpless. If a minority can prevent the taking up of a proposed rule change, if a minority in the Senate can deny to the majority the right to consider a bill, it can also filibuster a motion to make a declaration of war, or the making of peace, or the supplying of the armed services with necessary funds, or the raising of an Army, Navy, and Air Force, or the organization of a National Guard.

Mr. President, that same power might paralyze a government in peace or war. It is a dangerous power. Senators ought not to ask that they be protected in the exercise of such a power. While they might not abuse it, who can attest that every man who will ever sit in this assembly will have an equal fidelity to the aims and objectives of this great Republic?

Take the matter of the Senate giving advice upon treaties, giving to the President of the United States concurrence in the establishment of our foreign policy. I invite attention to the danger which the power to filibuster constitutes to the Nation's foreign policy, which is our weapon along with our armed forces, to maintain peace and democracy in the world.

Today the question happens to be a motion to take up a proposed rule change. At an earlier time, in 1948, it was a motion to take up an anti-poll-tax bill. In 1946 it was a motion to take up an anti-poll-tax bill. In 1946 it was a labor disputes measure. In 1946 it was a British loan which was the subject of filibuster, upon which a cloture petition was filed, which was defeated by an equal vote of 41 to 41. That was a British loan. It might have been the Marshall plan. It might now be the proposal to extend the Marshall plan for another 15 months. Such a measure is now on the calendar. When the able chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee rises to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the extension of the Marshall plan, suppose Senators leap to their feet and begin to filibuster.

Someone may say, "Filibusters do not last very long. It is only a matter of a few days." Some figures have been compiled on that question by Dr. Galloway. Let me give the time consumed in some famous filibusters. I am referring to some data given me by Dr. Galloway.

In 1841 the subject filibustered was the Bank of the United States. The filibuster lasted 14 days.

In 1846 the subject was the Oregon bill. The filibuster lasted 2 months.

In 1880 it was the Blair education bill. The filibuster lasted 26 days.

In 1881 the subject of filibuster was the reorganization of the Senate, and the filibuster lasted 47 days.

How many more days are we in for now, if some way is not discovered to bring this matter to a close?

In 1890 the force bill was the subject of filibuster, and the debate lasted for 29 days.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question concerning the accuracy of those statistics?

Mr. PEPPER. On that subject, I yield only for a question, so that I may not lose my standing.

Mr. STENNIS. May I inquire of the Senator if the time given as to the duration of those filibusters includes merely the days from the beginning to the end, or whether it is the actual days consumed in debate on the particular bills? For example, this subject has been before the Senate since a week ago last Monday. As the Senator knows, a great deal of time has been spent on other subjects. Does the Senator have information with reference to the so-called filibusters he cites which will give us the interim time?

Mr. PEPPER. I regret that I am unable to give the Senator that information. I asked Dr. Galloway to do some research in the Library of Congress about the length of filibusters and the subjects. These are the data which he supplied me. However, I promise the Senator that I shall ascertain that information accurately and place it in the RECORD, or else advise him at a later time, so that he may state it for the RECORD, if he chooses to do so.

In 1883, as I have said, the Silver Purchase Act was under consideration by the Senate, and the filibuster on it lasted 64 days.

In 1914, the Panama Canal bill was the subject of a filibuster which lasted 31 days.

In 1917 the armed ship bill was the subject of a filibuster which lasted 23 days.

In 1926, the World Court bill was the subject of a filibuster. Mr. President, I think that was related to the peace of the world. Had it not been for the cloture rule, the debate could not have been brought to a close. I know what the issue was. The Senate did not agree to have the United States join the World Court; but at least the Senate passed upon the matter, because the cloture rule was held applicable. If some Senator had moved to bring up that bill, and then the filibuster had started, there would not have been any power, according to the past rulings of the Chair, to have concluded debate upon that vital matter.

In 1933 branch banking was the subject of a filibuster which lasted 14 days.

In 1938 the antilynching bill was the subject of a filibuster which lasted 29 days. In that case I would not be surprised to learn that that was time actually devoted to debate. Incidentally, let me make my own position clear. I am going to refer to the civil-rights bills in a few minutes. I joined in the fight on an antilynch bill in 1938, and spoke for 6 hours on one day and for 5 hours on the next. I remember that many other lengthy speeches were made by my colleagues at the same time. I wish to interpolate, however, that my deep conviction about the League of Nations and the feeling I have always had that it was the fact that the Senate did not then bring debate to a close within a reasonable time that defeated the League of Nations in the Senate, have, I admit, colored my thinking on the subject ever since. I have always had strong convictions about an international organization, because of what happened then in the Senate. There was no more able advocate of the League of Nations than the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, John Sharp Williams, who was a giant in the Senate in support of that great proposal. But I became convinced that I would rather risk the wrong that the Senate might do after debate had been fully had and, if rule XXII applied, after it should be observed, than to deny the Senate the privilege of doing anything.

I think I would prefer the protection of the courts of the country against having a majority prostitute and deny the safeguards of the Constitution, rather than to have to depend on a minority of the Senate, with all respect and deference to my honored colleagues. I am afraid that sometimes Senators in their zeal and in their conscientiousness forget that we still have courts to assure the application of all the curbs and restraints of that blessed document, the Constitution, which Gladstone said is the greatest document ever struck off at a given time by the mind and hand of man.

So, in addition to the restraining influences of their own consciences and their own loyalty to their country and their consideration for their colleagues, we have the assured debate which rule XXII will allow even if amended as proposed because everyone knows that under rule XXII, if all the loopholes are plugged, it is necessary first to obtain the signatures of 16 Senators, in order to be able to file a cloture petition. Sixteen Senators constitute one-sixth of the entire Senate. I cannot imagine that Senators would join in a cloture petition

unless it had already been announced or unless it was previously known that the debate was not to educate, but to obstruct. I signed the petition that will be presented here today. I could not be forced to put my name on that piece of paper, Mr. President, if my honored colleagues here were to say, "Senators, hear us for a reasonable time. Pause before you decide." I tell my colleagues of the minority today, I would vote to give them a month for debate if they will give us assurance that when the month has expired, the majority may proceed to fix the Calendar of the Senate and bring this question to a decision. In fact, Mr. President, I would go further: If the minority will give me assurance that they will let us decide this matter, I will sit here in my seat every day I am able to be here for 2 months, to give them a chance to say everything they want to say.

But can they in good conscience give us such assurance, Mr. President? Have not they already said they feel this matter is so vital and so supreme that they cannot surrender any power they possess to prevent the Senate from even debating this question properly? That is the reason why we have to file the petition, because we know what their position is. We know the strength of their determination and their capacity to do what they have, with all honor and credit to them, set out to do, namely, to prevent the Senate from ever voting on the proposed change in the rule if they can help it.

So, Mr. President, I say I would prefer the protection of a majority and the shield of the courts, rather than to put the liberties and the security and the safety of America almost exclusively in the hands of a temporary minority of Senators in this body.

I was referring to bills which had been the subject of filibusters, and the length of time those filibusters consumed. The last one I have on my list is the one occurring in 1939, on the monetary bill. The time consumed by that filibuster was 16 days.

Dr. Galloway adds that the total time consumed on those several measures was 364 days; and there are 12 of them, so that makes an average of 30 days for each measure which was the subject of a filibuster, if Dr. Galloway's figures are correct.

Of course there have been numerous filibusters since 1939, which is the last date shown on the list I have. We have had filibusters on numerous other occasions.

Mr. President, I have pointed out the measures which have been the subject of filibusters. I have given the best evidence I have as to the length of time, both total and based on an average, consumed by those several filibusters.

And now, Mr. President, we come to the making of a very serious decision, namely, whether we are to allow the Senate to function as a legislative body, whether we are to allow it to discharge its constitutional privilege of fixing its own rules, or whether we are to deposit that power in a minority which from time to time may exist in the Senate of the United States.

Let it be remembered, Mr. President, that although this minority may be one-third of the Senate or may be even larger, on occasion it has been only one Senator, or only two Senators, or a very small number of Senators; as the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has said in his ruling, "A very few have the power to thwart the will of the Senate."

Mr. President, I said that I thought the filibuster and the power to filibuster are contrary to the provision of the United States Constitution which vests the legislative power in part in the Senate of the United States, as one of the coordinate bodies of the United States Congress. But there is another power the Senate has, as well as the legislative power, and that is what might be called a sharing of the executive power and functions. For instance, it is the power of the Senate to give concurrence upon treaties and other matters of foreign policy.

I have already mentioned that a filibuster was applied at one time to the British loan. I have pointed out that it might be applied to the Marshall plan. I, of course, suggest it might be applied to the Atlantic pact when it comes here in a few days from another committee of the Senate.

This is what concerns me: I spoke a while ago about the complex and awesome burden which faces the Government of the United States. Think how colossal are our responsibilities in the world at large. I feel that if the Senate is to continue to discharge its functions adequately to advise and consent to the ratification of treaties, if it is a necessary concurring party to our foreign policy as negotiated by the President, the Senate must not only have the power but it must be willing to make decisions with respect to whether it shall give or withhold its concurrence. This is what I mean: In 1918 President Woodrow Wilson, at the end of the then greatest war in history, went to Paris to the Versailles Peace Conference. He felt that if out of the peace conference there was not brought forth a League of Nations we in another generation should have to face another world war. In fact, upon his western swing, if not at Pueblo, Colo., where he fell stricken during an illness in September 1919, he made the prediction that in 25 years, if we did not adopt or support the League of Nations, we should be faced with another war. It was only 20 years later, in 1939, that the evil Hitler sent his Nazi hordes across the border of Poland to start the actual fighting part of World War II, which later sucked into its maelstrom the lives of half a million American citizens.

President Wilson, while at Versailles, had notice that the Republican membership of the Senate to a considerable extent was proposing reservations to the League of Nations. He had notice that there was criticism of his effort to have the League of Nations included in the League Covenant. He had notice that a round robin had been signed by Senators and piled upon their desks, advising that they would not concur in the Versailles Treaty unless the reservations specified were attached to the League of Nations Covenant. He had notice of that. Before he left Versailles he also had notice that France was demanding security from the United States against the subsequent violation of its borders by a revived Germany. He had rumblings from back home as to what the Senate might do with respect to such a treaty executed by him as President. But what could he do, either with respect to the League of Nations Covenant or with respect to the treaty which he signed assuring our pledge of coming to the aid of France along with England if a revived Germany should again assault that ancient and noble people? What could he do except come home? What could he do except submit the League of Nations Covenant to the Senate and let it take its own good time, in committee and upon the floor, to determine whether it should give or withhold its advice and consent to the ratification of the treaty? Meanwhile, what did the Senate do? It was not until far into 1920 that the matter was disposed of. What had happened meanwhile? The Versailles Conference was disbanded. The world stood suspended awaiting the verdict of America, whose President had proposed the League of Nations, to see what we would do; for then, as now, we had emerged from the war as the supreme power on earth. And although Wilson should plead and beg and implore, though he should go to the country and urge the Senate to act, nobody had power to make it act. If the loopholes which have since appeared had been discovered, when the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee brought the proposed treaty to the floor, Senators could have filibustered it to death on a motion to take up, and it never could have been even considered.

The Atlantic Pact, by a filibuster, can be kept from the calendar of the Senate, no matter what the demand from the Nation may be, if we allow this dangerous power to remain uncurbed.

Senators feel deeply about civil rights. Other Senators have their convictions about other subjects. They are not alone in the very deep sentiments they have on various subjects. If we honor their conscientious determination with respect to the proposed rule change, can we deny to other Senators the equal protection of the principles they regard as vital? And if every minority is accorded such privilege, such unimpeded prerogative, where are we, as a body?

If I recall correctly, I do not believe President Wilson ever submitted the proposed guaranty to France. But suppose it should have been necessary to have given France an answer within a reasonable time from the date of the negotiation of the treaty, perhaps, for her own security, to stop her from marching into Germany, and the President had sent it to the Senate saying, "Senators, I lay this before you. I think it is a national necessity. I beg of you to give it your primary consideration and to give me your answer about it. Will you advise and consent to its ratification when it goes to the Senate?" Senators feeling deeply on a subject can filibuster against the measure ever being taken up, let alone being decided.

I raise the question I stated on this floor in late 1944, that I thought the

Senate had a concurrent power with the Executive with respect to the foreign policy of the country. I still believe so. Certainly in respect to that policy which is embodied in treaties, we are a necessary concurring party. In other words, we are a partner to the partnership, the concurrence of both members of which is essential before partnership action, as it were, may ensue. Yet the President might be in the most important of all conferences. He might need our concurrence or at least our advice as to whether or not we would concur. He might send us an urgent appeal to act. But a minority has it in its power to prevent any action at all. With all humility, I want to say to my colleagues that in this important era of world history, in this day when America is reaching the perihelion, the Senate must be able to act. I do not suggest what its action shall be, but it must meet the challenge to act and to decide according to its good judgment and its conscience. Yet, so long as the power of filibuster remains uncurbed in the Senate, the United States of America has no assured capacity to do anything that a minority of the Senate might not permit. Can we afford that? Is that safe? Is that wise? Is that a rock, the durability of which is such as to bear the destiny of America and America's obligations? Can we make a determined minority of the United States Senate the arbiter of American conduct, the light of history, and the final rendezvous with human destiny? I deny that that is a safe power to remain in the hands of any minority, however conscientious, patriotic, and devoted to its convictions and the public interest such a minority may happen to be.

Mr. President, in conclusion on that point, I believe the President of the United States, having the right and duty to negotiate our foreign policy, should feel that it is essential to America's security and to the peace of the world to negotiate an international agreement, should have the right to do so. And having done so within a reasonable time he should be able to tell foreign powers, "I will give you an answer one way or the other." Yet, with the type of filibuster taking place in the Senate, no honest President, least of all, one informed of the Senate's traditions, can assure any foreign government that there can be an answer ready within any reasonable time as to what the Senate of the United States will do.

I base that statement on the fact that advocates of the antilynching bill have been trying since 1922 to secure its passage, and they have never been successful yet. Advocates of the anti-poll-tax bill have been knocking at the door of the Senate for years. That bill has seldom been on the calendar. On one occasion the able Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], one day in the morning hour, by a clever thought, moved to take it up, when it was not debatable, and he kept it before the Senate until 2 o'clock. That is the only time we ever had an opportunity to debate it. It may not be a good idea, it may not be sound policy, but I have introduced such a bill, and I think it is entitled to the consideration of my colleagues. They can decide whether they want to support it. I should like to have the privilege of addressing myself to it and to the Senate in its behalf. I do not have any power to coerce Senators to an affirmative conclusion. I ask only the right to be heard upon the consideration of this measure. To deny that is to deny democracy. The majority of the Senate asks the right to be heard. Is that an unreasonable request to make, Mr. President—debate, deliberate, eventually decide? That is democracy.

Mr. President, I am addressing myself to this matter primarily because the subjects of all the filibusters which I have enumerated have not always been civil rights. There are 26 measures enumerated by Dr. Galloway as being the subject of previous filibusters. I have counted three antilynching bills as only one. I have counted the anti-poll-tax bills as only one. I have counted the Fair Employment Practice Committee bills as only one. It will be seen that only five of all the bills I enumerated a moment ago have been concerned with civil rights. Therefore, Mr. President, I am not addressing myself merely to the civil-rights program. I am talking about other legislation which may come before the Senate. I am talking about any rule change which the Committee on Rules and Administration or any Senator may propose to the Senate, having the right of consideration and eventual decision by the Senate.

Mr. President, that is the basis upon which I principally predicate my position. However, I am not afraid to say a few words regarding the civil-rights program. Again, Mr. President, I am no Yankee; I am no carpetbagger; I hope I am not even a scalawag. But I am not ashamed to associate myself with the general principle of human rights, yes, of civil rights, of all the people of this country, of all races, creeds, colors, and national origins. I myself happen to come of Anglo-Saxon stock. Of course, I am proud of it, but I do not ask any preference for that lineage of which I happen to be a part. I would not presume to suggest that they are the only worthy people and that before the law they alone have rights entitled to protection.

Mr. President, I have never known of a public issue more distorted, more misrepresented, and, therefore, more misunderstood, than is the so-called civil-rights program of the President of the United States.

Mr. President, I am not saying something here that I have never said anywhere else. If I am not presumptuous, I want to quote a little from a speech which I made in Montgomery, Ala., on October 7, 1948, in a debate with the very able spokesman for the so-called Dixiecrats, and representatives of the Republican and Progressive Parties.

Here are a few things which I presumed to say at that time:

> It is good to feel beneath one's feet again the soil of his native State. Not far from here, I, like my ancestors before me, was born. To this State my forbears came in the long ago, seeking the fulfillment of the American dream. They planted, they toiled with their harvests, they reared their children, built churches and school houses and their humble homes. And from Alabama's soil my grandfathers went off to wear the gray in a cause that was already lost 90 years ago.
>
> Go back with me to 1860. The Democratic Party split because our forebears demanded Federal protection for the extension of human slavery into the new States growing up in the West. A position which the National Democratic Party would not and could not accept. In the election of 1860, northern Democrats who nominated Douglas and the southern Democrats who nominated Breckinridge got nearly one-half million votes more than the Republican nominee, Lincoln; but Lincoln, because of the Democratic split, won in the electoral college and became the President. Those who risked all upon extending slavery into the new territory wound up by losing the slaves they had even in the South, which assuredly they could have saved for decades, if not generations, and have been paid for in the end.
>
> Today, speaking to you with the candor which the situation demands, history was against human slavery just as history today is on the side of the Government of the United States, which is the champion of human liberty and freedom in this world, practicing at home the democracy it preaches to mankind. Anything other or less than the Government of the United States, giving fair and just constitutional rights to every segment of our citizenship, holds us up to ridicule and scorn before the totalitarians of the world as hypocrites, as preaching one thing and practicing another. If the South throws its weight and strength against the Constitution of the United States and the basic principles of Americanism it will and should lose.
>
> But there is a clear and distinct sphere for the application of the Federal Constitution with utter fairness and impartiality and the operation of State laws, traditions, and customs, without one doing violence to the other. The President of the United States has been flagrantly if not designedly misrepresented in his recommendations on the so-called civil-rights measures to the Congress.
>
> Hear me, my colleagues, and my fellow southerners.
>
> He has not recommended one thing relative to segregation in the States, in the public schools, in restaurants, in hotels, in theaters, swimming pools and the like—and, of course, he has made no recommendation concerning churches, lodges, clubs, and associations of local and personal nature.
>
> He has recommended the abolition of the poll tax as a condition precedent to any citizen, white, black, yellow, or brown, voting for President, Vice President, Senator, or Congressman, as the United States Congress has the power, and in my opinion the duty to do, if the States will not strike it down themselves. He has recommended Federal jurisdiction to prosecute lynchers of any citizen whatever his color or wherever he may be, if the sheriff or his deputy or the United States marshal or his deputy willfully conspire in the lynching but only in such cases. He has advocated that in respect to commerce crossing State lines, Congress has the right to require that race, religion, color, or national origin should not be the sole basis of either hiring or firing. He has advocated that private companies have no authority to segregate passengers crossing State lines in public conveyances. And he has advocated equality of treatment and opportunity in the armed forces. But, of course, he has not recommended, and of course, Congress has no power to interfere with or to abolish local laws, traditions, customs, and practices, respecting the wise separation of the races in certain local places and institutions in the several States.

Time, education, and wise experience will determine when, whether, or to what extent the local practices requiring certain race separations should be changed. And whatever the decision is in these matters, mind you, it must be made by the people in the several States under the Constitution of the United States.

The State of New York has abolished segregation between different races. All races are assured equal access to any kind of public place. But that was not done by the Federal Government but by Governor Dewey and the Republican Legislature of New York.

What I plead for is that we not be deceived over a misunderstanding or by misrepresentation of this issue and fall into the crushing embraces of the Republican Party which is the historical, political, and economic enemy of the South.

You know how the South has grown under 16 years of Democratic administration. You know what Franklin D. Roosevelt did for southern industry, agriculture, labor, for the aged, for welfare, for women, for children, for the physically handicapped, for public power—for the whole South. You know how things were in the South before Roosevelt came in, under the Hoover administration. I don't need to remind you of those sad days—of a South as prostrate almost as when the Lancelot of the Confederacy sheathed his shining sword at Appomattox. I don't need to remind southern businessmen and farmers that when they fought for lower freight rates to northern markets it was Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, who led the fight against them. I don't need to remind you how Republican administrations tried to strangle your Tennessee Valley and the TVA; I don't need to tell Alabama farmers of how Republican agriculture legislation in the last Congress cut down parity and the support prices for cotton, corn, and peanuts and tobacco and rice, and that this legislation alone will take hundreds of millions of dollars away from southern farmers. I don't need to remind southern labor that if the Republicans gain full national power they will drive the Taft-Hartley dagger all the way into labor's heart. They will strangle social security; turn over the TVA again to the private power companies.

Republican rule meant depression under Hoover. It will mean a worse depression under Dewey. Republicanism will mean pushing the South back down the hill. Following off after either the third or the fourth parties means Dewey and depression—nothing less—nothing more. Don't be deceived by those who cry "wolf" against Truman but who also just as loudly cried "wolf, wolf, wolf" against Roosevelt, once or twice or maybe even three times, and, strangely, the very men who clamor States' rights and their brand of democracy will not let you vote in Alabama for the President of the United States if you want to vote for the nominee of the Democratic Party.

Mr. President, I interpolate, that is a strange inconsistency, that certain people who denied their people the right to vote for the nominees of the Democratic Party, including the President of the United States—they are not in the Senate, but in the State—would support the position of the minority in this matter.

I read further:

You know that in those Roosevelt elections many men with a lot of corporation clients and big business support in the South voted against Roosevelt behind the false facade of States' rights.

Mr. President, I interpolate, if I must take my choice, I am not so much interested in the preservation of State wrongs as I am in the adequate protection of human rights. With affection and the deepest earnestness, I say to my fellow southerners, history will condemn you if you stand persistently as the uncompromising champions of those who would perpetrate wrong in the name and behind the false facade of States' rights.

Mr. President, I had two grandfathers who wore the gray and fought for a cause which was lost 90 years ago. Human slavery was wrong, condemned by a just God to ignominious oblivion, and they to die by the sword who would perpetrate it or defend it. They were against the stream of time, Mr. President. I honor them out of the depth of my heart, but they were wrong.

I say today, Mr. President, that it is legal discrimination—and I am not talking about anything else—to say to a black man, "You have not an assured trial by jury." That is wrong. The God with his protecting bosom who hovers above and shields the Anglo-Saxon is also the God of the humble African, and the law that does not, from the majesty of a Nation's might, give him comparable protection, is an ignominious, hypocritical, false facade of pretense.

Mr. President, I say that I cast my lot with human rights rather than for the preservation of State's wrongs, let the consequences be what they may. Others claim the right to speak with candor. May I not exercise the same privilege?

I say, Mr. President, the South could get concessions if it came here with a proposal of compromise, not of unreasoning and persistent obstruction. Senators are not wedded to the bills we have heard mentioned, in any form that is unreasonable. I cannot believe Senators would be open to persuasion by their colleagues on every other subject and deaf to their entreaties on these matters.

Mr. President, I regret to say that my colleagues of the South do not say to us "Meet us in fair compromise." They say, as we said to the enemy in a foreign land, "Thou shalt not pass," even to the Senate of the United States when it is attempting to amend its rules so that it may transact its business against the day when they assume it might make a decision which they would not like. I said to these fellow citizens of my native State of Alabama in Montgomery, in the campaign of last year:

You know that in those Roosevelt elections many men with a lot of corporation clients and big business support in the South voted against Roosevelt behind the false facade of States' rights. They did not want the Federal Government to give the public cheap power. They did not want the Federal Government to help southern workers get fair wages.

Mr. President, I have no disposition to be presumptuous. I possess no merit worthy of mention. But I do have a vivid memory that in 1938 I fought a campaign on the issue of the minimum wage law. With all honor and deference to my respected southern colleagues, I do not recall that one of them was in accord with me or voted with me in the Senate on that just and wise measure. But I think later they have come to appreciate the wisdom of what we then did, for I have never heard of any proposal to repeal the law, although not all of them have been anxious to increase the amount, as I think we should at all times.

If today there exists a tragic difference between us, I have to be mindful of the fact that it is not the first, because when I came to the Senate, owing no allegiance to Roosevelt or any other President, sensible in my heart of no duty except to try to be a good Senator, I soon discovered, I thought, where human right and human progress lay, and to the best of my humble ability I identified myself with Franklin D. Roosevelt and what he was trying to do. My only regret is that I could not help more.

I think that is the future for my South. No part of America needs Federal help more than we. There are no more glorious people than ours. They wish to upraise the Nation.

When I hear what is said in the Senate about the President of the United States I cannot but recall a sight I saw only day before yesterday in one of the great cities of Florida, Orlando, when the President of the United States, within my sight, rode through what the newspaper headlines said were 50,000 cheering people lining 8 miles of highway and streets from the airport to Rollins College where he was the recipient of the degree of doctor of humanities. I did not hear hisses and catcalls. I did not hear epithets and denunciations hurled against him. The people seemed to receive him like any honest and sincere President seeking to do his duty—a great friend and leader.

I sometimes wonder if the people would feel as they do about some of these matters if we, their friends in whom many of them have confidence, would tell them the truth, instead of letting them hear the faults from their own enemies, those who have not always—I speak only of private interests, not of any Senators, of course—been the advocates of their best interests; if they could be told the facts instead of letting the words descriptive of these measures come from those who distort them.

As I said, I was speaking to the people in Montgomery about their future lying with the Democratic Party, and I did not mean with any offshoot of the Democratic Party; I meant the Democratic Party that had a convention at Philadelphia, that adopted a platform at Philadelphia. I did not go off to some other State only, I made 15 speeches in my own State supporting that President and that party and that platform, and I talked about civil rights in every speech I made, as I recall, but I explained the matter as I have here; that it is a falsity to say the President has proposed the abolition of the practice of segregation generally in the South. He has not. I go further and say that the Congress of the United States, in my opinion, possesses no power to make all the children of a community go to a given school, if there are other schools there of comparable quality and character open to them. It is only when we do not have but one school that colored children have a constitutional right to go to that school.

I challenge anyone to show me any decision of the United States Supreme Court which says if we have school A and school B and school C, and local law says that white children shall go to one school, and yellow children to another, and black to another, that the Federal Government, if the local facilities are at all comparable, can change that local requirement and make them all go to the white school. I have never seen any Member of this Senate seriously endeavor to bring about such a thing. On the contrary, we in the Senate passed the Federal education bill, with bipartisan support behind it. Therein we said the contrary. We said in that bill which we passed that not only do we not interfere in local affairs, but we put the provision in this law that the Federal Government shall not do so. Under that law providing for Federal aid the executive branch of the Government has nothing to do with the curriculum, with the faculty, with the schools the children go to, or who goes to certain schools. Those are local matters.

Yet, Mr. President, it is being said that the civil-rights measures mean that colored and white must be received in the same swimming pools. That is not true, if the colored have another one they can go to. If a swimming pool is built with public money, and the colored people and the brown people pay a part of it, they are entitled to swim in it. But if another one is provided for them out of public money, it reasonably follows, and we believe it is in the public interest to say, "You colored can swim in that one, and you whites can swim in this one."

Mr. President, if the truth were known by the people of the South about what the law is the whole civil-rights question would be regarded differently.

Now what about the anti-poll-tax proposal? I said in 1941, when I introduced the anti-poll tax bill, that it was framed upon somewhat of a new theory to apply to primaries as well as to general elections, to forbid any local authority from requiring a poll tax as a condition precedent to voting in a Federal election only. Only a Federal election. It has nothing to do with State elections, or local elections. But I maintain, Mr. President, that the Federal Government possesses the power to protect the integrity of Federal elections. I maintain that if a State says, "You have got to have a thousand acres of land before you can vote for Senator," that if it is not held to be invalid in the courts, Congress can forbid it. If we can forbid the requirement of a thousand acres of land as a prerequisite to voting, we can also forbid the requirement that an individual pay a dollar as an odious poll tax in the exercise of the franchise to vote, which I believe to be the duty as well as the privilege of the citizens.

I say that all the bill does is to provide that a citizen going to the polls for purpose of voting for a Senator, or a Representative, or an elector for President or Vice President, cannot be made to pay a local poll tax. That no longer, if it ever were, is a qualification. I know what the language of the Constitution is. But I cite to the Senate the case of the United States against Classic, which is later than the Breedlove case, the Pirtle case, and others. In that opinion the Supreme Court of the United States, speaking through Mr. Justice Stone, said that the right to vote for a Member of Congress is a right protected by the Federal Constitution, and that decision has never been reversed and has been followed in numerous cases since it was made. If it is protected by the Federal Constitution, whose duty is it to see to it that that right is implemented, if not the Congress of the United States? If that be a part of the Federal power, why should we not go to the defense of such a right? I venture to say that if a Federal statute forbidding the requirement that a poll tax must be paid in order that a citizen may vote in a Federal election comes before the Supreme Court, the Supreme Court of the United States will uphold it.

Why does not the minority which claim such a measure is constitutional refer it to the arbitrament of the law? Is not that good citizenship? Let them vote as they will. But let the Senate eventually decide. No, Mr. President, they put their power above that of the Congress, above that of the majority of the Senate. They say, "You cannot even consider an anti-poll-tax measure here. If we can catch you making a motion to bring it up, we will start a filibuster in time to stop it." That is the history of the situation. I do not say it with disparagement. I do not say it in any derogation of my colleagues, but that is the fact from the standpoint of parliamentary history, as it has been made here in the Senate. So I say the bill may not be good policy. Opinions may honestly differ. But the Senate should have the right to act upon it as it may determine.

Senators have told us that the poll tax is fast disappearing. Yes; thank goodness, it is. All honor and credit to those who have been making it possible for it to disappear. But I do not deny some credit for that progress to the often announced and persistent policy advocated by a large segment of the Government of the United States. I believe that agitation in the Congress has also been a part of the motive power behind the progress made in the several States in the abolition of the poll tax. Perhaps we, too, have done some good by agitating these emancipating proposals.

Let me add a further observation on that subject. Go to the records of Louisiana since the poll tax was abolished, and see the percentage of increase in women voting. I think it will be found to be approximately 75 percent. I have said before, and I am not ashamed to repeat it, that I was born in a humble house on a small farm. What was true of my mother is true of many other mothers. They do not always have even a dollar lying around to take down to the courthouse and give to the clerk at the appointed time. Usually it is $2, because they must pay for 2 years. There is more than one family to whom in a poll tax State $2 means a vote, and a child does not get a pair of shoes.

So I say that payment of a poll tax is no longer a qualification to vote. In my State, with the able advocacy and leadership of my distinguished colleague in the Senate [Mr. HOLLAND] the Legislature of Florida abolished the poll tax in 1937. I consider that action was subsequently responsible for my election in 1938. Perhaps that is proof that it should not have been abolished. I allow for a difference of opinion on that subject, although I assert the right to have my own. In the election of 1938 the vote in the Florida white primary jumped 100,000 over the election of 1936, after the poll tax was abolished in 1937. We know what class is primarily the beneficiary of the removal of such a burden. It is the ordinary, average citizen of America.

Mr. President, I have said something about the anti-poll-tax bill which I think the Senate might consider; and if we adopt this rule change it may eventually be possible to bring it up and debate it and decide it one way or the other.

I have spoken about the antilynching bill. It is said by those who oppose it that it is a discriminatory, anti-Southern law, and that it will apply to those who lynch a Negro in the South, but leave guiltless and harmless those who may murder a gangster in Chicago, for example. Those who say that have not seen the bill which was last reported from the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] was chairman of of the committee. The committee made a thorough investigation, with a bipartisan approach, into the power of Congress in this sphere. It was held that the only way that the Congress can enter this field is in respect to officers, State or Federal, who willfully conspire—and that is the language of the bill with the lynch mob. The Judiciary Committee, in its latest report, says that Congress cannot legislate on the subject unless a sheriff or his deputy, or a United States marshal or his deputy, willfully conspires with a lynch mob.

Mr. President, one of President Truman's recommendations was that we strengthen the civil-rights section of the Federal statutes. That is a statute adopted in the post-Civil War days. It provides that it shall be a Federal offense to deprive a citizen of a right guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. Let me cite a case which happened in my State.

According to the evidence in the case, a constable in a little village had a personal difficulty with an old Negro. On more than one occasion they had had strife. Later, so the evidence disclosed, the constable got this Negro out on the Suwannee River bridge and threatened him, and made him jump off. Later his body was found hanging in the bushes down the river.

The local grand jury did not indict the constable. He was a white man, and his victim was a Negro. I do not know of any other reason. There was no record of the reason in the proceedings. I do not question the patriotism of those people. However, the fact is that the grand jury did not indict the constable. He was later indicted by a Federal grand jury and tried in the Federal court. He

was sentenced to a year in prison, because that was the maximum under the civil-rights statute—murder, and a year the maximum penalty. Judge Waller, my former law partner, wrote the decision for the United States circuit court of appeals. The court affirmed the conviction and the sentence of a year imposed by the court.

I realize the problem of superimposing Federal power upon the State, but I say that case after case worthy of consideration has occurred. So, Mr. President, it is a subject worthy of the Senate's thinking and prayerful regard. I do not know the answer, but I do know that there should be adequate power in the Federal Government when that power may properly be invoked to protect the constitutional rights of those who are citizens of the United States as well as citizens of the several States. Sometimes we forget about the dual sovereignty. Citizens of the United States are citizens of the State in which they were born or naturalized, and also citizens of the United States. If the State has its rights, so has the Federal Government.

In connection with the civil-rights question, I intend to vote for the anti-poll-tax bill. That bill as I introduced it, went to the Judiciary Committee in 1941. A subcommittee was appointed to consider it. The chairman of the subcommittee was Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska, a greater figure never served in the Senate. The subcommittee made some amendment in the bill, and it has ever afterward had substantially that form, in its passage through the House and its subsequent consideration in the Senate.

I shall also vote for the anti-lynching bill if it ever comes up, provided it follows the general tenor of the investigation and the bill reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee, or satisfies my mind as to its constitutionality.

With respect to the FEPC, I do not know what I shall do until I see the bill. I recognize the delicate line which is involved in that legislation. However, in my opinion it is basic Americanism to say that employment or discharge shall not be predicated solely upon race, religion, creed, or national origin. I do not know of anything un-American about that. It may be that it is not wise to lay down any standards of employment and discharge, that it is an undue interference with what is the fair prerogative of the employer.

But we have been telling some employers who have been denouncing the labor unions before our Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and scholars on the subject, like Dr. Feinsinger, of the University of Wisconsin, Mr. William H. Davis, an able author and a most experienced man in this field, and Mr. Leiserson, one of the most eminent authorities on labor-management relations, have been telling them, that if they continue to insist on the protection of the individual against his labor union, they might get ready to experience legislation by Congress curbing their power to hire and fire except upon meritorious standards. So, Mr. President, an FEPC law may not be wise. That is the reason why we have reported out to the Senate the kind of labor bill we have. We say, "Stay out of the regulation of management, but at the same time stay out of the internal regulation of labor unions. Give us the latter, and we will later give you the former. Be assured of that. But we oppose both."

So I say it may not be wise, although not because it is a race matter, to enter into the field of interfering in respect to the hiring and firing of employees by employers in this country. I reserve an open mind on that matter.

As to these other matters, which are not so vital, I have already said that I think obviously the Congress has the power to regulate interstate commerce, and, of course, the power to control the conduct of the armed forces.

These measures may not be wise. Honest men may differ regarding them. But how can anyone rightfully deny to the Senate the privilege of considering these matters if it chooses to do so?

I read further from my Montgomery speech:

> I say further that some persons did not want the Federal Government to protect the small investor or the farmer against northern speculators with whom those persons were tied in, so they used a sort of States' rights argument against the shield of the public welfare.
>
> Mr. President, the South needs more, not less, of what it has been receiving in the way of Federal aid. The South demands a Government that will fight against monopoly, not a Government which will make it more dominant. Let us beware—

Mr. President, I said to my fellow southerners—

> of false prophets and false leaders.
>
> Remember the words of the Scripture: "For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also."
>
> When we hear these voices clamor against the old Democratic faith and party, let us ask where their interest is, and then we shall know that their hearts are there, too.
>
> Remember—
>
> "He whose bread I eat, his servant am I."
>
> When we hear these voices raised against the old Democratic principles, let us ask whose bread they eat, and then we shall know whose servants they are.
>
> I call not only upon all southerners who have voted in the ranks of democracy, but upon all liberals, as well, even the erring ones, to come back to the party which is the home of the liberals, the party of Jefferson and Jackson and Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt and, yes, President Harry S. Truman, who has followed in their footsteps, with a courage they would have commended.
>
> Yes, I have been a Democrat; I am a Democrat; I shall continue to be a Democrat. Toward my party I would proudly express the sentiment of him who said:
>
> "Woodman, spare that tree!
> Touch not a single bough!
> In youth it sheltered me,
> And I'll protect it now."
>
> I say to my fellow southerners, for a century and a half the Democratic Party has sheltered you. I know the quality of your own loyalty, and that you will protect it now.

Mr. President, I have ventured to trespass upon the kindness of my colleagues long enough to say that I have shown some consistency upon this subject. I do not want the Republican Party justly to be able to claim that Republicans alone are the champions of human liberty. Let us see how they vote when these crucial issues come to a test, so as to see whether they are more interested in perpetrating a division in the Democratic Party or in carrying out their own platform pledges. President Truman has raised a standard to which all good men may repair. Let us see how many of our honored Republican colleagues will repair to that standard, which they have professed to embrace for so long a time.

I have spoken of my party. I do not want the Democratic Party to be called the citadel of reaction. It does not deserve that appellation. Our progress stretches over more than a century and a half. I want the Democratic Party to give progressive democracy to the people of the United States. I want all the other programs that are being clogged and impeded by the filibuster which is now impeding the flow of the stream of legislation to have a chance to move. I want the dam to be broken; I want the legislative stream to run. In this Congress we can give America and the world more democracy than they have ever had, if we shall put through this program.

I am beginning to wonder, Mr. President, whether the fears of some persons are well founded—namely, that lurking in the background of this filibuster is a determined opposition to a large part of the President's program, as well as to the civil-rights program. I do not charge it; I do not state it or assert it; but I say I cannot help but wonder whether far in the background such an opposition may make its visage appear.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PEPPER. As soon as I have concluded, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. President, on the other side of the aisle I wonder how many there are who may play fast and loose, or, rather, I would prefer to say, who may not aid in the effort to expedite the Senate's business or to improve the Senate rule, and who will be gratified at least that this unhappy controversy and conflict may impede the progress of legislation which they have almost consistently opposed. I hope they will by their vote follow some of their splendid leaders who have been in the very forefront of this fight, so that we may truly make this a bipartisan victory for the Senate and for the Constitution and for democracy here and elsewhere in the world.

Mr. President, I add only one other comment. I hold in my hand a report on the Ninth International Conference of American States. I also hold in my hand the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. These were entered into by representatives of our Government; they were negotiated by our spokesmen. I believe they have already been reported to us, although we have taken no action on them.

Let me read from the Bogotá declaration of the rights and duties of man:

> ARTICLE 1. Every human being has a right to life, liberty, and the security of his person.
>
> ART. 2. All persons are equal before the law, and have the rights and duties established in this declaration, without distinction as to race, sex, language, creed, or any other factor.

That is what we said at that international conference. Do we believe that? Do we practice it here at home? Would we be embarrassed to have foreigners ask us about it? Mr. President, please remember, again, that I am talking about equal treatment before the law. No man has a right to come into my home, save when I invite him to cross its threshold. A man's home is still his castle; his goods and effects are still immune from undue search and seizure. His liberty and person are still inviolate under the law. But, Mr. President, social relations and contacts are personal; yet I have had some persons ask me, in Florida, "Is it true that President Truman is advocating that we have to take colored people into our sewing circle, into our garden club, into our church, into our civic club? That is what people have been telling us." I said, "Of course not. The President never recommended it. Congress could not require it, should it desire to do so."

I am speaking about rights before the law, rights to vote, the right to vote without a poll tax which discriminates against the poor of every color and creed; the right to trial by jury and to due process of law even against lynchings, and, if not assured by the States, then by the Federal power, whose sovereign the citizen partially is, under the Constitution; the right to regulate interstate commerce in reasonable respects; the right to regulate the transportation of passengers across State lines in public conveyances, under the interstate-commerce clause; the right to provide in the Department of Justice a civil-rights section for investigation and inquiry; the right of Congress to set up committees to deal with civil rights if it chooses to do so. The other document is entitled "universal declaration of human rights," declared by the United Nations Assembly. Mrs. Roosevelt was the chairman. In this declaration there are also affirmed the personal rights which we preach, which I am sure we all want to practice. I take, for example, article 6:

> Everyone has the right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law.

Are we going to continue to be embarrassed in international conferences because we do not really apply democracy in America? There will be difficulties. From my own life experience, from generations of which I do not know before me, resident in the sacred soil of the South, I know the problems, the difficulties. I do not sympathize with extremists, but I affirm that ours in the South is a democratic people. We want to do right; we believe in progress, including human progress. Our people are of great heart and generous nature. The warm compassion of comradeship and Christian fellowship surges through their hearts. They are not the enemy of any class, of any color, of any creed; and if sometimes we misinterpret the things they cherish, if sometimes we misinform them on public issues and excite their emotions, and they appear to lack something of that blessed compassion which is Christian in its character, it is not because it is their true character, for there is no braver, finer, more generous and understanding and loyal people in all the world than are the people of our Southland.

I am taking far more time than I had contemplated; for which I humbly ask the indulgence of my colleagues. I have attempted to show that there is involved in the discussion the basic question of implementation of the Constitution of the United States. There is also involved the basic necessity of the power of the Senate to change its rules.

There is manifestly and immediately at stake the crucial question of the duty of the Government to protect and to further the principles of democracy here and throughout the world. May I, in closing, quote words, the eloquence and exalted character of which have been a challenge to me ever since I heard them. They fell from the lips of the Chaplain of the Senate, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, not only a man of God but blessed with almost divine genius. As part of a prayer which he raised here from this rostrum, Dr. Harris laid upon each of us a compulsion we should all in our own way seek to observe and discharge, when he said:

> May the servants of the public will be wise interpreters of Thy eternal law, brave spokesmen of Thy will, and of the truth which sets men free from ancient wrongs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at the conclusion of my remarks several editorials regarding the subject we have been discussing.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of March 7, 1949]

MAJORITIES HAVE RIGHTS, TOO

After a week's gentlemanly skirmishing the administration's fight to reform the cloture rule in the Senate has made no progress. Mr. Truman's own followers have rejected his ill-advised proposal to invoke cloture by majority vote. The pressure of important measures, which ought to be acted on with the least possible delay, may tempt them to give up or at least postpone a serious attempt to tighten up the existing cloture rule so that a two-thirds vote may at any time set a limit to debate. If this happens it will be a victory for about 20 southern Senators who claim the right to prevent the Senate from voting on bills they don't care for. The bills they don't expect to care for at this session are civil-rights measures promised in both major-party platforms and therefore presumably accepted by far more than a two-thirds majority of our citizens.

The parliamentary procedures involved are enough to confuse anybody who was not weaned on Roberts' Rules of Order. But there need be no confusion between full and free debate, on the one hand, and the machinery of the filibuster, on the other hand. Anyone who has ever seen a filibuster in operation, or who has even read about it in the newspapers, can tell the difference. A filibuster is not honest debate. It is an attempt to obstruct legislation by unfair means.

Fifty-six years ago the late Henry Cabot Lodge made some pungent comments on the relative sanctity of debating and voting. "Of the two rights," he said, "that of voting is the higher and more important. We ought to have both, and debate certainly in ample measure; but if we are forced to choose between them, the right of action must prevail over the right of discussion. To vote without debating is perilous, but to debate and never vote is imbecile."

The Senate will not be in legislative session today. Tomorrow the fight will be resumed. We hope the administration Democrats and their Republican allies will make it a real fight. After all, majorities have some rights, too.

[From the St. Petersburg Times of March 6, 1949]

QUESTION BEFORE THE SENATE IS WHETHER PEOPLE WILL TOLERATE THE RULE OF A MINORITY

(By Henrietta and Nelson Poynter)

Filibuster—a freebooter; buccaneer; a lawless military adventurer who invades a foreign country—to act as a filibuster; to delay legislation by obstructive tactics.—Webster's Dictionary.

Twenty-one southern Senators are now busy preventing the people of the United States from expressing an opinion. The notable exception is CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida.

Senator HOLLAND held the Senate floor for 5½ hours Thursday.

The question at issue is not the civil-rights program; it is whether a minority group can prevent the Senate of the United States from discussing and voting on proposed legislation. The rules of the Senate permit a single man to hold up the whole process of government. The proposal now being filibustered is to change them to allow the majority to be heard.

These 21 willful men are admittedly holding the floor to prevent a majority of the duly elected Senators from expressing an opinion. This time the problem is civil rights, but the Versailles Treaty was filibustered and the World Court—to name two notable examples. The filibuster is the triumph of a minority's will over the judgment of the people of the United States.

AS SIMPLE AS THIS

The present proposal to change the rules merely asks that at any time two-thirds of the Senators could vote to stop one man from talking. Senator ELBERT THOMAS, of Utah, dramatized the point by saying, "Any country that can send its people to war on a bare majority vote ought to be ashamed of itself when it takes a nearly unanimous vote to change a rule of procedure in the Senate."

The southerners are not alone in trying to maintain the autocracy of the Senate. The last test to limit debate was in 1946 on the anti-poll-tax bill, and such Republican stalwarts as MILLIKIN, of Colorado; BRIDGES, of New Hampshire; YOUNG, of North Dakota; and GURNEY, of South Dakota, voted against breaking the filibuster.

The Republican maverick, Senator LANGER, of North Dakota, has now changed his mind and says he will not vote to change the Senate rules. Some weeks ago in Washington he told why:

"Charlie McNary gave me some good advice years ago, and I've decided he was right. 'Don't ever vote for cloture,' he said, 'you may want to talk yourself some day.'"

Cloture is defined by Congressional Quarterly as "The process by which debate can be limited in the Senate. A cloture motion, which applies only to a bill or resolution, must be presented with the signatures of 16 Senators. It is voted upon 1 hour after the Senate meets on the second day after presentation. If it is agreed to by a two-thirds vote, each Senator thereafter is limited to 1 hour's debate."

In other words, the Senate is then allowed to talk for 96 hours; and if cloture were permitted, the present filibuster would have been over in 21 hours and the work of the country could go on. Nothing but public indignation is likely to make the Senate

change its rules. The cloture proposal itself was adopted in 1917 only because the country became so aroused over a successful filibuster against Wilson's armed-ship bill, which would have authorized the arming of merchant ships shortly before the United States entered World War I.

The fight to stop Senators from talking as a delaying tactic has been going on for over a hundred years. Henry Clay tried to do it in 1841 and Stephen Douglas tried again in 1850. Oscar Underwood, of Alabama (remember "24 votes for Underwood," who worked so hard to be President in 1924?) repeatedly attempted to cut the Senate talkathon.

But the Senate is still talking. And while the country waits for decisions on war and peace, housing and labor, we are treated to the spectacle of the son of the "Kingfish" threatening to match his father's record. We don't need recipes for pot likker from the United States Senate. We need democracy. And only the people can convince our Senators that they are not the aristocracy of the country—that they, too, are subject to majority rule.

[From the Washington Post of March 7, 1949]

CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUE

The first week of the filibuster in the Senate attained some aspects of a momentous constitutional debate in spite of the fact that the southern Senators are determined to defeat any limitation of debate by continuous talking. Much was said about the nature of our Government, the function of the Senate, and the intellectual climate that democracy must have in order to flourish. To say the least, the discussion gives added perspective to the country's civil rights problems. Its only deplorable aspect to date has been the announced intention of the minority to make the outcome depend not upon reason and persuasion but upon the coercion of endless talk.

We cannot agree with those who say that the issue before the Senate is the protection of minority rights. To be sure, the Senate is a bulwark against overhasty legislation; we hope it will always be such. In a free country there must necessarily be checks upon the tryanny of the majority. Individual rights must be upheld by the courts against unconstitutional legislation. And aside from constitutional rights, any policy closely touching the lives of the people is likely to fail, as prohibition did, if it is imposed upon a large and bitterly antagonistic minority by Federal force. All these factors must be carefully weighed when the Senate comes to debate the various separate measures in the President's civil-rights program.

But that bridge can be crossed only when Congress comes to it. The question now before the Senate is merely whether or not rule XXII shall be amended so that a two-thirds majority may end debate, with allowance for every Senator to have his say even after cloture has been invoked. Some Senators have talked as if the proposed amendment would deprive their States of representation in the Senate. On the contrary, it would make such representation more meaningful by depriving a relatively small group of the power to jam the legislative gears. It is absurd to say that an effective rule against filibusters would impinge unfavorably upon our constitutional system. The Constitution specifically gives each House of Congress the power to determine its own rules. The founding fathers must have concluded that this power would be used to save the Senate as well as the House from becoming an "imposing spectacle of impotence."

The only candid argument against the proposed change in rule XXII that we have heard is that if the Senate is freed from filibusters it may make some unwise decisions. But that is true of any form of democratic government, or any other type of government. The real question is whether greater mistakes will not be made by inaction forced upon the Senate by a minority than action supported, after due deliberation, by the majority. The way of popular government is to debate and let the majority decide. When unwise decisions are made, they will have to be corrected by experience. But under no circumstances can we permit the door to experimentation to be indefinitely closed by a willful minority without sacrificing the very essence of American constitutional government.

When rule XXII has been amended, Congress will have to face Mr. Truman's civil-rights proposals, not as political slogans, but as subjects for practical legislation. It may then decide, for example, as we think it should, that a constitutional amendment is the proper means of abolishing State poll taxes. But in no event can a talkfest to prevent Congress from taking up this or any other problem be justified. We have here not majority coercion of the minority but minority coercion of the majority. It is a great constitutional issue, and, as we see it, the outcome will determine whether our system of representative government can be reasonably adjusted to the requirements of the times in which we live.

[From the Washington Star of March 7, 1949]

FIGHT OVER FILIBUSTER—DEFENSE SEEN PRETENDING SIMPLE ISSUE IS ACTUALLY BASIC THREAT TO REPUBLIC

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

A lot of dust and noise and high-level constitutional confusion, mixed with ordinary political sand, has been kicked up to obscure the very simple issue involved in the current Senate battle over proposals to curb filibusters.

All that the Senate Democratic leadership is trying to do is what the Senate thought it was doing 32 years ago when it adopted the rule, rule 22, which permits limitation of debate by a two-thirds vote on presentation of a cloture or closure petition signed by 16 Members.

That rule has become unworkable under a decision from the chair in the last Congress by then President pro tempore of the Senate, Senator VANDENBERG, Republican of Michigan, that it did not apply to motions to take up a bill. This allows a filibuster against a mere motion to bring a bill before the Senate for consideration, so that the legislative process can be completely paralyzed. The current southern filibuster, correspondingly, is against a motion to take up a resolution reported by the Rules Committee which does nothing except make rule 22, adopted in 1917, applicable to filibusters against such motions.

The Michigan Senator publicly regretted his ruling, but said it was all he saw he could do. He urged the Senate to close this loophole, whereupon Senator TAFT, Republican, of Ohio, pledged his party to do that at the first opportunity in this Congress. Democrats, in control of this Congress, have accepted that responsibility.

ISSUE IS SIMPLE

That is the only direct issue involved in all the uproar in the Senate. It is very simple, yet it is presented as complex. All sorts of circumstances have been exploited for politics' sake to confuse this simple issue and blow it into something titanic on which our Republic might stand or fall, which is, of course, pure nonsense.

The southerners, alone, are simple and direct in purpose, which is to stave off, by any means available, the consideration of civil rights legislation, though if there ever was a mandate on any subject there was one on this issue in the last election. For both major parties were committed to civil-rights legislation.

Republicans have been acting very strangely and very timidly for all their bold public pronouncements. It will be to their advantage naturally in the congressional elections 2 years hence if President Truman has failed to realize at least a part of his civil rights program. Some of them are very much aware of this political factor and are cuddling up with the southern Democrats, an old familiar alliance, with the idea also of nourishing this alliance against other Truman measures later.

They sought an excuse first in the fact that it was a Republican, Senator VANDENBERG, who made the ruling which will become the first test, and they must stand by a party man, mustn't they? Vice President Barkley is expected to reverse the VANDENBERG ruling, when the issue is raised soon, and hold that the cloture rule is applicable also to motions. That will bring an appeal from the Chair. A number of Republicans are planning to join southern Democrats to overrule the Vice President, despite the TAFT pledge of the last Congress.

FAVORS MAJORITY CLOTURE

Republicans also have capitalized on President Truman's remark at a press conference that he favored imposing cloture by a mere majority, instead of two-thirds. That may have been impolitic in the midst of a fight, but it was honest. There are only a handful in the Senate for majority cloture, logical as a majority rule might seem in a democracy, so Republicans are only building up a straw man here, and they know it.

President Truman deserves high commendation for ordering an all-out fight on the filibuster, which holds the blockade against his civil-rights program, for he takes certain risks about the rest of his program. But it overshadows all else. Until it is settled, nothing really is settled.

There comes a time when a man must fight, and the President has recognized that clearly. The filibuster could be broken if his Senate leadership was sincere about it, hammered right through, and kept the Senate in session day and night. That is, if they are helped by Republicans, as they should be. For this is a national issue beyond party lines.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, it is always extremely difficult to follow the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], but I do not think it could ever be more difficult than to follow him than now after he has just concluded such a splendid and stirring address.

The Senate of the United States is now in the midst of debating an issue which far transcends a mere change in our rules.

I think that is conceded by most of us who stand committed to effective cloture, effective machinery for terminating debate when debate has ceased to be informational, has ceased to be contributory to a reasoned decision on the basis of the facts, and has become merely obstructionist, dilatory, time-consuming, and valueless in the determination of fact.

Of course, those on the other side of the issue who have so far participated in this historic debate are correct when they have stated—let us say have warned—that great issues beyond the ostensible issue of revising Senate rules are involved in the debate.

Mr. President, let us face it. The debate now proceeding in the Senate of the United States is round 1 of the showdown on the issue of civil rights. Let us

recognize it as being that, and let us not pretend otherwise.

Several Senators in opposition to the change in the rules of the Senate take the position that such a change would restrict the rights of some of the small States. They are of course sincere in that position. Frankly, however, I am not aware of any plot on the part of a combination of large States to destroy the small States or to gang up on them. It is not the Balkans of Europe with which we are dealing; it is the United States of America; it is a Nation whose people by and large recognize that when one area of the Nation seeks to profit at the expense of another, the result is disadvantageous to both. We have here issues which are often fought along geographic lines, but they are not issues of large States versus small States; they are issues in which the large States and small States in any one area may find themselves opposing the large States and small States in another area. And there are very few such issues.

There are issues in which industrialized States, large and small, and agricultural States, large and small, may see a problem somewhat differently; although, there again, large States like Pennsylvania and New York and California and Illinois, with great industrial capacities, also have tremendous agricultural production. I myself firmly believe, as I think most Americans do, that the so-called conflicts said to exist between the farmer and the industrial worker over economic issues are manufactured by certain special interests which breed upon division in the population. These alleged conflicts are not inherent at all. Labor and agriculture learned in 1948, for instance, that they both depended upon a liberal Congress for the full realization of their goals of a prosperous and balanced economy, and so farmers and industrial workers joined in electing the Eighty-first Congress and in electing a President who sees no conflict between the economic aims of the farmer and the economic aims of the industrial worker.

So, Mr. President, I am puzzled by the opposition of certain Senators to the change in our rules on the expressed ground that the smaller States from which they come are threatened unless the Senate can from time to time be prevented from proceeding with the legislative process.

We are not here today seeking to end the normal right of unlimited debate in the Senate. We are not setting up hard and fast rules, such as exist in the House of Representatives, for limiting Senators to 1-minute speeches or to 5-minute speeches under the rules and limiting debate on the vital issues to a few hours.

There is nothing in this change in the rules to prevent any Senator from taking the floor and holding it for as long as he can stand on his feet in order to call to the attention of the Senate and of the country certain facts he may have bearing on vital legislation which he thinks might otherwise be suppressed or ignored.

No, Mr. President, although some Senators may have various reasons for hesitating to join in this long-overdue revision of the Senate rules, reasons other than the issues of civil rights, the fact is that the hard core of opposition here, the backbone of the opposition, comes from those who have one concern and only one concern, and to them it is an overbearing concern. That is that if these rules are changed, then the Senate of the United States and the Congress of the United States finally will be in a position to enact civil-rights legislation.

We have not been able to enact civil-rights legislation—and the Congress has tried many times to do so, particularly in the days since the start of the first Roosevelt administration—because nearly all the Senators from below the Mason and Dixon's line have regarded this legislation as repugnant, un-American, perhaps communistic, and so on. Under the rules of the Senate, whenever a measure containing one of the well-known civil-rights proposals is about to be brought before the Senate—and usually this is known in advance—these Senators have proceeded to tie the Senate in knots, to bring it to complete paralysis, so that not even the routine business of approving the Journal can be accomplished, and so no legislation whatsoever is passed by the Senate of the United States unless and until the leadership of the Senate surrenders——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MYERS. I cannot at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCGRATH in the chair). The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. MYERS. And agrees not to take up or seek to take up the particular civil-rights measure involved, be it an anti-poll-tax bill or an antilynching bill or a bill to establish a Fair Employment Practice Commission or to deal otherwise with matters of discrimination for reasons of color, primarily.

Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Georgia for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire to ask the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania to point out the legislation which has been killed completely, to which he has referred, and to point out legislation on which a vote has not been had on a cloture petition under the two-thirds rule, at some stage of the proceeding.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I refused to yield until I had completed a sentence. The sentence I just read is as follows:

> So that not even the routine business of approving the Journal can be accomplished, and so no legislation whatsoever is passed by the Senate of the United States unless and until the leadership of the Senate surrenders and agrees not to take up or seek to take up—
>
> Any of these bills.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the question which I desired to propound to the Senator was: Can he point out the instance and the bill to which the statement he has just made will apply; can he point out an instance in which the Journal was not finally approved, and, at some stage of the proceeding, a vote on a cloture petition was not had? Of course, the Senator knows that the Journal has been debated, but there was a final vote on the cloture petition. The Senator says they had to surrender——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from Georgia propounding a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from Pennsylvania yielded for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Georgia was undertaking to elicit the answer from the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I will answer the question. I do not think we need to split hairs. I think the Senator from Georgia is fully aware of the import of my remarks; he is fully aware of what I have said. I repeat that under the present situation it is impossible for us to take up any other legislation until the pending question is laid aside. The opposition has determined that they will continue this debate for 2 weeks or 2 months, if necessary. During that period of time we cannot enact any other legislation, unless we agree to lay this subject aside.

That is the only point I seek to make. I say that under those circumstances we have a filibuster. That is the type of filibuster we encounter most frequently. Its purpose is to prevent the Senate from taking up for debate and possible passage a bill to which some Senators object.

The device of obtaining the floor and holding the floor in order to prevent immediate consideration or immediate passage of a particular bill—meaning that hour or that day—is also sometimes referred to as a filibustering tactic, but I do not think that is involved here. Most of us, at some time or another, have used that device to delay action on a measure momentarily, usually while there are absences from the Senate which we think hurt the chances of a bill one or another of us may favor, sometimes because we think the issue requires more clarification and more public understanding of the facts, sometimes because an individual Senator or a few Senators think that if they can hold off the final decision for a day or a few days at most, they can enlist a great public reaction which would have some influence upon wavering Senators who might otherwise vote differently.

That device, I said, is used frequently. I used it a year ago to hold the floor and prevent a vote on a particular day on a proposal advanced in the absence from Washington of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to extend the title VI provisions of the Federal Housing Act for a full year.

We who opposed that proposal felt that it would destroy our slim chances in the Eightieth Congress of getting through a good housing bill, the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, including provisions for public housing, if this one section of it, liberalizing financing methods for builders, was passed independently. I held the floor on the day this proposal was called up because that appeared the only means of holding off the decision until Senator TAFT and several other of the Republican friends of public housing, then out of the city, could return and

be heard. Their voices were heard a few days later on the issue, and the proposal was defeated at that time.

I regard that device as legitimate, and I think most Senators regard it as legitimate. That device is not threatened by these proposed changes in the rules. Under the proposals now before us to provide for termination of debate, the rule would remain the same, that 16 Senators must sign a petition for cloture and that this petition must lie over for two calendar days before it could be voted on, and then each Senator is allowed one full hour for debate. Senators fearful of hasty legislation and who sought to delay action for a reasonable period in order to bring certain facts to light would not have to fear cloture action. It just is not undertaken under those circumstances. Any attempt to steam-roller legislation here on the floor without giving Senators an opportunity to be heard on it is always resisted by the Senate, and cloture in such an instance could not be obtained unless the character of the men who sit in the United States Senate shall have been radically altered. I have seen time and again Senators stand up for the rights of other Senators with whom they violently disagreed. The best recent instance of that was just last June, during the debate on the conference draft bill, when one Senator who had been speaking for many hours and holding the floor against the bill and who then lost the floor under a ruling of the Chair on a point of order, succeeded in obtaining the floor once again for his second speech, when other Senators, favoring passage of the bill, insisted that their colleague be recognized by the Chair and be permitted to proceed.

That unselfish and fair-minded action might have resulted in keeping the Senate in session much longer than it otherwise would have been kept in session, but I think all of us here were heartened by the show of fairness which was accorded a Senator then conducting what the newspapers called a filibuster.

It is not our intention in these proposals to provide for cloture that they should apply to filibusters in the newspaper use of that term. Each time a Senator or several Senators attempt to take more than a few days in the discussion of a vital bill, the newspapers immediately begin referring to the "filibuster."

We have devoted weeks and weeks to certain important issues before the Senate in the past, but they have not been filibusters. When the debate is designed to inform and to plead on the basis of facts, it is healthy, and it is often compelling, that we have extended debate. It is only when the debate is intended to paralyze the Senate and prevent a determination of the issue that it is a filibuster. And that is what we are determined to prevent under these proposals.

Let us look for a moment at the resolution which we are trying to make the pending business of the Senate, namely, Senate Resolution 15, and at my proposed amendment to that resolution. Senate Resolution 15, reported favorably by the Senate Rules Committee, provides merely that the Senate of the United States be permitted to legislate when two-thirds of the Senators present and voting have decided that the debate on any matter—as opposed to any measure—has been a full and complete debate, a debate in which all facts relevant and germane to the issue have been brought to light, a debate in which there has been free expression of all informed views on the issue.

That is all the resolution does. There is nothing mysterious about it. There is nothing sinister about it. It does not embody a new, novel, or revolutionary theory, but one which the Senate over the years has accepted in regard at least to debates on bills and other measures. It is new only in the sense that it would reverse the rulings of some previous Presiding Officers to the effect that this limitation on debate could not apply to matters other than bills and measures—could not apply, that is, to the approval of the Journal, could not apply to motions to take up a bill or a resolution.

My proposed amendment, which I supported in the executive sessions of the Senate Rules Committee when we were considering this matter prior to the reporting out of Senate Resolution 15, and which I intend calling up when amendments to Senate Resolution 15 become in order, does go one step further. It provides that rather than two-thirds of those Senators present and voting, a majority of all Senators, namely, 49 Senators, under normal circumstances, in the absence of any vacancies in the membership, can take the responsibility and have the power to require a termination of debate and to end a filibuster in the Senate of the United States.

Is this a sinister proposal? Is this an attempt to gag the Senate of the United States? Is this an effort to impose silence—compulsory silence—upon individual Members of the Senate of the United States, when, perhaps, they shall be seeking to enlighten the Senate of the United States on facts as they bear upon issues before the Senate? Is this slavery for Senators? Is this a denial of the freedom of speech guaranteed to every American by our great Constitution? Is it any of those things, Mr. President?

Of course not. With due respect to the sincerity of so many opponents of these proposals for giving the Senate a degree of mobility now denied to it, I feel compelled to say that the arguments against effective cloture are window-dressing for a much deeper issue, namely, the issue, as I said before, of whether the Congress of the United States shall be permitted to enact legislation pledged to the people of America by the platforms of both the Democratic and Republican Parties in 1948 and in previous years. The issue, in other words, I repeat, is civil rights.

I would like to read that portion of the 1948 platform of the Democratic Party drafted at Philadelphia last July dealing with civil rights, which was agreed upon first by a small group of about 17 delegates designated by the chairman of the Democratic National Committee as a preliminary drafting group, and then subsequently approved by the 108-member resolutions committee of the Democratic Convention, which included 2 delegates from each State and Territory. This is what that draft said:

> The Democratic Party is responsible for the great civil-rights gains made in recent years in eliminating unfair and illegal discrimination based on race, creed, or color.
>
> The Democratic Party commits itself to continuing its efforts to eradicate all racial, religious, and economic discrimination.
>
> We again state our belief that racial and religious minorities must have the right to live, the right to work, the right to vote, the full and equal protection of the laws, on a basis of equality with all citizens as guaranteed by the Constitution.
>
> We again call upon the Congress to exert its full authority to the limit of its constitutional powers to assure and protect these rights.

I reiterate, Mr. President, that this plank, the so-called civil-rights plank of the Democratic platform, is the way it read when it was agreed upon by the 17-member preliminary drafting subcommittee and by the full 108-member resolutions committee of the Democratic National Convention of 1948. This was before anything new was added on the floor of the convention. This was before the vigorous, all-out floor battle on the convention floor over the addition of two additional paragraphs which subsequently were written into the platform by a vote of the majority of the convention delegates.

I have no intention of pretending that this plank as it was originally drafted and before it was expanded on the convention floor by vote of a majority of the convention delegates had the wholehearted and enthusiastic support of each member of the resolutions committee or of the preliminary drafting subcommittee. Far from it. We had no 5-minute rule, no limitation of debate of any kind in either the subcommittee or the full resolutions committee. We argued this matter out in a democratic manner, allowing free expression of views. There was no gag; there was no attempt at a gag; there was no consideration of the possibility of imposing a gag. Democratic delegates from nearly all the States actively participated in this discussion, and no delegate was limited as to the time he could speak. Every aspect of this issue, for it is all one issue, was thoroughly explored by able speakers. In our preliminary subcommittee, the argument raged for nearly all of an evening and a night. In the full resolutions committee the following day, we were in session from shortly after 2 o'clock in the afternoon until 2:30 or 3 o'clock in the morning of the following day, and although not all of the discussion by any means revolved around this plank, many hours were devoted to its free discussion—and, I might add, to a vote. The vote was had, and the will of the majority prevailed, and this plank was incorporated in the platform as submitted to the convention.

Let me repeat a few of those pledges:

> The Democratic Party commits itself to continuing its efforts to eradicate all—

Mr. President, I interrupt the reading to say that there is no hedging here. It

says we commit ourselves to continue our efforts to eradicate all—

> racial, religious, and economic discrimination.

I think that means what it says. It so means to me. It so meant to President Truman when he carried his case for election to the people of the United States. As the presiding officer at those committee deliberations and debates at the convention, I can attest to the fact that those words were recognized as meaning what they say to all members of the resolutions committee. Those who feared the import of those words as they indicated the course which our party would follow in the Congress did not pretend to us that the words meant something else or that they were wishy-washy, or that they were watered down, or that they were any kind of a compromise on this issue of civil rights.

Again, in our platform plank as originally drafted and approved prior to submission to the convention, we reiterated a belief on the part of our party officially as a party that racial and religious minorities "must have the right to live, the right to work, the right to vote, the full and equal protection of the laws, on a basis of equality with all citizens as guaranteed by the Constitution."

The Constitution sets up no first and second classes of citizenship and our 1948 convention platform similarly allows for no such categorization.

The plank says further:

> We again call upon the Congress to exert its full authority to the limit of its constitutional powers to assure and protect these rights.

There has been much discussion here in recent days about the constitutionality of some of the civil-rights measures which are to be enacted by this Congress, if this Congress, if Republicans and Democrats alike in this Congress, are to be true to the campaign pledges which they made; if the Congress, that is, is to redeem its promises.

The debate which has been carried on so far has been marked by frequent insinuations that the liberties of the people of America are to be trampled on and destroyed in contravention of the Constitution if the Senate succeeds in fortifying its machinery, its rules, with the power to legislate when two-thirds of the Senators present and voting or, under my proposal, a majority of the Members of the Senate, including those not present or not voting, determine that debate has been full and complete and that time for action, for a vote, has arrived.

Are there, Mr. President, Members of the Senate of the United States who believe that the courts of this democracy have abdicated to the Congress or to the Executive? Is there no protection left in America, Mr. President, should this pending resolution be approved, against unconstitutional legislation? Is our sole barrier to unconstitutional Government in the United States a minority of the United States Senate? Are they alone the defenders of free government in America?

If there should come before the Senate of the United States a measure which seeks to violate the Constitution of the United States, are we doomed, is our Constitution threatened, unless one-fifth of the Senate membership can hold the Senate inactive and helpless indefinitely?

Or, on the other hand, can we tolerate a device in the Senate which seeks to deny us the right to implement Constitutional guarantees of the full and equal protection of the laws for each citizen on a basis of equality with all other citizens?

That is really what we are determining here. We are determining whether the Congress is to be allowed to outlaw the poll tax. Many States have voluntarily abandoned the poll tax as a source of revenue, or worse, as a means of disenfranchising voters. Some opponents of Federal legislation to outlaw the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting in Federal elections pronounce themselves willing to approve the submission of a constitutional amendment to the States on this issue on the grounds that the legislation itself would be unconstitutional.

This issue has been argued and reargued, examined, analyzed, explored, many times in the Congress of the United States over the years and the prevailing view of the majority of the Members of the Congress is that the elimination of the poll tax by legislation is not unconstitutional.

Assuming we may be wrong, Mr. President, granting for the sake of argument that we may be wrong, is there no defense against unconstitutional legislation except the endless talk of a group of Senators able to paralyze the Senate of the United States, and with it, the process of democratic government? Are there no judges in our Federal system who dare defend the Constitution?

Our platform, and the platform of the Republican Party, promises legislation to establish a Fair Employment Practices Commission. This measure also has been denounced in this Chamber and in the other Chamber as unconstitutional, as vicious and un-American, as a Communist plot, as a threat to the public peace.

As I recall, we had during the war a temporary Fair Employment Practices Commission instituted by Executive decree which sought to end unfair discriminations in employment practices, and, lo, Mr. President, the Union stood, the Nation endured, the domestic peace was maintained, and communism continued ineffectual and despised in America.

I have no intention at this time of debating the individual provisions, fair or unfair, good or bad, constitutional or unconstitutional, of the various civil-rights bills which will be coming before this Congress, and which, I trust, will be enacted after full, complete, and thorough discussion and analysis and debate. If this is a filibuster which we now have under way, then I, of course, have no intention of seeking unnecessarily to prolong the debate.

If a cloture petition is filed, as it probably will be this afternoon, to seek to shut off debate on the motion to take up the proposed resolution and to test the rulings of previous Presiding Officers on whether cloture applies in a case like this, there will, I am sure, regardless of the decision of the Vice President in this instance, be adequate opportunity for full discussion of all aspects of the issue before it is resolved. So I do not feel that I am contributing to a filibuster.

I think it appropriate, in view of my previous references to the mechanics of drafting the 1948 Democratic platform, to point out, before the debate goes any further, that so far as this side of the aisle is concerned I think the issue was settled clearly at our Philadelphia convention.

I am not referring to the amendment from the floor spelling out in some detail the civil-rights proposals which our party, as a party, announced its intention of supporting. I am referring to the original language of the committee draft of that plank, language which pledges us to continue our efforts to eradicate all racial, religious, and economic discrimination and to guarantee to racial and religious minorities the right to live, to work, and to vote, and the full and equal protection of the laws on a basis of equality with all citizens as guaranteed by the Constitution through the exertion by Congress of its full authority to the limits of its constitutional powers to assure and protect these rights.

That is what we said in the original draft of the plank, and it stayed in the platform. Please note the fact, Mr. President, that there was no attempt by any opponents of civil-rights legislation to seek to rip any of this language out of the platform once it was presented to the convention. There were, however, several attempts to water it down by association, to insert in close juxtaposition to this language other language stressing States' rights. This effort was obviously aimed at weakening the original civil-rights plank. No one who voted on it had any doubt in that respect.

A distinguished Texan, former Gov. Dan Moody, submitted such an amendment and asked for a roll-call vote on it. This was a vote on whether or not the Democratic platform should stress the issue of States' rights in the same portion which also stressed the importance of civil rights. The vote on this amendment was 309 votes, yes; 925 votes, no; or 3 to 1.

This amendment got the support of the full delegations from Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia. It got support from a fraction of the delegations from California, Colorado, Oregon, and Wyoming, and half the votes from Alaska.

The vote against the amendment designed to emphasize States rights in connection with civil-rights issues was: Arizona, Connecticut, Delaware, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin. Those were unanimous votes of those delegations. In

addition, it got 52½ of California's 54 votes, 9 out of Colorado's 12, 13 out of Oregon's 16, 5½ of Wyoming's 7, 3 of Alaska's 6, and the unanimous vote of all of the other possessions.

There was a further amendment from the floor on this issue that I think is relevant now. It was submitted by a delegate from Mississippi. It would, in juxtaposition with the civil-rights plank originally submitted, and which remained in our platform, insert language reserving to the States all rights and powers reserved to them by the Constitution, among them, according to this amendment, being the power to provide by law for qualifications of electors, the conduct of elections, regulation of employment practices within the States, segregation within the States, and define crimes committed within their borders and prescribe penalties therefor, except such crimes which under the grant of power by the Constitution to the general Government may be defined by it.

That is language which would have said: The poll tax is strictly a matter for the States; FEPC legislation is outside Federal jurisdiction; antilynch law is for the States alone.

Mr. President, this amendment was defeated without even the formality of a roll-call vote. It was shouted down in derision by the convention. There was no request for a division or a roll call. It was like a pro forma amendment striking out the last word.

The Democratic Party drafted its platform in good faith, in a good-faith determination to make good on it. We did not have our fingers crossed when we adopted these pledges on civil rights. We meant them. We will fight for them.

The Republican Party drafted a similar platform pledge on civil rights. I trust that that party also had no mental reservations about making good on this pledge.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MYERS. I am very happy to yield for a question.

Mr. IVES. Does the able Senator from Pennsylvania recall that the Republican platform, which embraced the provisions to which the able Senator refers, was adopted unanimously at the Republican Convention at Philadelphia?

Mr. MYERS. My answer to the Senator from New York is that that is my understanding and belief. I hope that his party will fight, as I know he will fight, for that plank as it was adopted at Philadelphia.

It is obvious by now that the Democratic Party and the Republican Party together can make good on our civil-rights pledges only if we can end the power of an organized minority to combine in successful efforts to kill each such proposal by nothing more lethal than talk, to kill it by endurance of their lungs and their feet, to kill it by being prepared to talk on and on and on and on until such time as the Senate and the people of America will have thrown in the sponge and surrendered and said that other matters of pressing importance held back from Senate consideration by a filibuster must go forward, and so the effort to pass civil-rights legislation must be sacrificed.

There are some other issues involved here, of course; but I do not believe I should go into them at this time.

In any event, I wish to make this pledge—and I think nearly every Senator would make a similar pledge: So long as I am in the Senate, I am going to stand fast for free speech and the free right of any Senator to express his views on pending legislation and to help us reach reasoned and fair determination of the issues through any material or information which he can provide in that direction. The Senate of the United States is an institution which, regardless of our tenure here, awes us all. We cannot help but be impressed by the responsibility we carry as Members of such a great body. I know of no Senator now a Member of this body who would have so little regard for the sacred principles of American democracy as to seek to make a mockery of them by joining in an arbitrary attempt to silence another Senator in the course of intelligent debate on any issue. When, as, and if cloture is invoked on this floor, whether by two-thirds rule, or by 49 Senators, as provided under my amendment, it will be invoked, I am sure, only after full debate and full opportunity for each Senator to contribute intelligently to the deliberations of the Senate.

But, Mr. President, when that privilege is abused—and we all know when it is being abused; we all know when extended debate has turned into filibuster, and when deliberation has turned into delay and obstruction—when that occurs, then we must have available the machinery by which to restore the Senate of the United States to its customary dignity and to return to the Senate its opportunity to act in the interest of the people, in the interest of the country, in the interest of humanity, in the interest of decency.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to support and defend the President of the United States, who I think has made the one and only sound proposal for the elimination from the Senate of the United States of what I consider to be the evil practices of filibuster.

I point out that the President has had a considerable amount of experience in the Senate of the United States as a Senator from Missouri; and on the basis of that experience and on the basis of his experience in the White House, I understand that it is correct—and I do not believe it will be denied—that the President of the United States in recent days has expressed his approval of a reform of the Senate rules for which some of us have been fighting for some time past—a reform which would truly restore to the Senate the principle of majority rule. I understand that the President has expressed himself in favor of the cloture petition or cloture procedure which some of us have been proposing for the past several years, namely, that under certain procedural steps in the Senate of the United States, we shall end debate by the same vote we use in passing major legislation, such as an Economic Cooperation Administration plan or lend-lease; yes, by the same vote rule we follow when we find it necessary to declare war, namely, a majority-vote rule.

I am a little at a loss, to say nothing about being somewhat disappointed, to find a complete retreat, apparently, on the Democratic side of the aisle from the President of the United States, the Democratic leader, insofar as giving to him the support he so justly deserves, in my opinion, for his proposal that we end debate in the Senate of the United States under a cloture rule which will permit of a majority-rule principle. I had hoped that for my antifilibuster resolution, which provides for a majority-vote rule, I would get some Democratic support. I do not want the present Presiding Officer of the Senate or any other Democratic Senator to think for a moment that I am the least bit embarrassed about standing here on the floor of the Senate and defending the President of the United States. On the contrary, I consider it a great privilege and a high honor. I only wish I had some Democrats joining me in defending the President of the United States this afternoon, because I think the President of the United States in his recommendation, which happens to correspond with my own recommendation and resolution, is standing for the only sound procedure which would make it possible for the Senate to operate efficiently and would give voice in the Senate of the United States to the people's business by taking care of it in accordance with what I am satisfied an overwhelming majority of the people think is basic to American democracy, namely, rule by the majority. Yet I understand that my good friend the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the majority leader, has said, in effect, that on this particular matter he is sorry that he cannot follow his chief. I do not quote him verbatim, of course, but I am sure I correctly quote his meaning, if he has been correctly quoted in the newspapers.

I have just listened to the speech of the Democratic whip, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], who earlier in this session submitted a resolution on cloture which provided for the principle of majority rule, and which differed from my resolution only in one particular. My resolution, as I subsequently perfected it, provided for a majority-vote principle; and, provided that after the adoption of cloture, through a petition filed by 16 Senators—as is the case under the present rule—and after 96 hours of debate would be permitted, each Senator who did not wish to make use of the full hour of debate after cloture—allowed to him by my resolution, would have the right and privilege of farming out his time, if some other Senator wished to take it and add it to the hour which the resolution automatically would provide to each Member of the Senate. I went to the Senator from Pennsylvania and suggested to him that we try to combine our two resolutions. My resolution, when first submitted, as the Presiding Officer will recall, sought to give to each Senator a 2-hour period for debate, after the adoption of

cloture, with the farming-out privilege; but I proceeded to make an investigation of the statistics shown in the history of filibusters in the Senate, and I discovered that not even the 96-hour period has ever been used, after cloture. So I decided that the minority would be adequately protected, so far as giving them adequate time to debate the merits of the case, if I changed my proposal so that, instead of providing a 2-hour period, it would provide a 1-hour period, and I so notified the Committee on Rules when I testified before it at the hearings.

At that time it was my understanding the Democratic whip was of opinion the majority-rule principle should prevail, save and except he thought the time should be limited to but 1 hour for each Senator, without the farming-out provision. I suggested to him we combine our two resolutions by my giving up the 2-hour provision and adopting his 1-hour provision, and in turn, by his agreeing to the farming-out provision of my resolution. He was very courteous, as he always is, and in fact, as all my colleagues always are to me and as I try to be to them. He said that under all the circumstances—and I think I quote him accurately—he thought perhaps it would be better if each one of us pressed for his individual resolution. I understood that language. I took it for granted the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania had good reasons, which he was not at the moment discussing with me, for not accepting my compromise proposal; but I did not have the slightest notion that what he had in mind was, that at a subsequent date he would further modify his position by adopting a constitutional-majority principle in place of a simple-majority principle. But that is what he subsequently did; and so even the very distinguished and exceedingly able Democratic whip left the President of the United States on this issue and adopted a constitutional-majority principle for his resolution.

I have not been able to find out for a certainty, but it may be I stand here this afternoon as the only Member of the Senate solidly in support of the President on this issue. Be that as it may, if it is true, I am proud of it, because I am satisfied the President is absolutely right in the position he has taken; and I hope I have demonstrated by this time during my service in the Senate that whenever I think the President or any other Democrat is right, I am going to be nonpartisan enough to support him. I take it for granted the people of my State sent me here to support and fight for what I think is right. I am convinced, for reasons I shall hereafter set forth in this speech, that the simple-majority-vote principle for which the President is standing, if I have been correctly informed as to his position, is the absolutely sound way to eliminate the filibuster evil from the Senate.

With that as an introduction I wish to make a brief comment upon the rather peculiar position in which I find myself this afternoon, a position that might be subject to misunderstanding or misinterpretation if I did not make a clarifying statement. I have no desire to assist in any way a filibuster in the Senate. But I think that, before the cloture petition is filed this afternoon, those of us who have very definite views on the merits of the filibuster issue should get them into the RECORD. I am not sure what the parliamentary situation may be as to our rights to place them in the RECORD, at least in time for them to become a part of the RECORD before the vote, so far as the cloture matter is concerned, if we do not do it now.

So I desire to state for the RECORD my reasons in support of the Morse antifilibuster resolution, and I want to reply briefly to some very able, but I think fallacious, arguments which have been made on this issue by some of my distinguished colleagues on the other side.

I agree with the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] this is a momentous debate. I think it is but another chapter in a great fight that is going to continue to be waged in the Senate until the coming of that happy day when the people's will will prevail and a rule in the Senate will be adopted making it possible for the will of the people through a majority vote of their elected representatives to be registered in this august body.

I do not think we are going to win the fight this time. I wish I could be more optimistic about it. But I expect now as in the other rounds of the fight in times gone by, the proponents of an antifilibuster resolution will lose. Why? Because neither party in the Senate, Republican nor Democratic, in my opinion, has stood up in the fight and made it clear it is willing to take those steps necessary to win the fight. Thus it must go back to the people, and the people once again are going to have to impress upon more Senators at the ballot boxes their determination to see to it that the fight is won in the Senate, either by getting men now in the Senate, once they come again face to face with the people on this issue in campaigns, to change their thinking on the issue, or by supplanting men already here, at future elections, with other candidates for the Senate, who will come here and make the fight which I think should be made now, and, as I have said on the floor on this issue in times past, which should have been made in previous battles.

We cannot win unless we are willing, as we have not been thus far in the fight, to continue in session for as many days, weeks, and months as may be necessary to demonstrate to the minority that we do not propose to have the majority will trampled by minority tactics in the Senate. It must be done some time; why not now?

I have asked that question over and over again during the last 4 years. I shall continue to ask it, until the time comes, which I hope will not be in the far distant future, when my party in the Senate, as a Republican policy will organize by way of opposition to a filibuster, and declare our determination to remain here for as many months as may be necessary to break the filibuster. I hope the alleged antifilibusterers on the Democratic side of the aisle will with equal determination so organize themselves that we can get the issue behind us. I am satisfied the rule of the Senate permitting filibusters is devastating to the interests of the people in the case of issue after issue.

I repeat, Mr. President, that the rights of the people in legislation before the Congress of the United States are no better than their procedural rights in the Senate of the United States. So long as the rules of the Senate permit, through a filibuster, the defeat of the will of the great, overwhelming majority of the American people on various issues, then there must be eliminated the procedures which produce such an unconscionable result, if this is to be a truly representative government. To me it is a very simple issue. I am either right or wrong, Mr. President, in saying that the most fundamental tenet of a democratic form of Government is that which says the majority will shall prevail, subject to the checks and balances of the Constitution, through a judiciary, and the veto of the President, in case the majority of the Senate and the House pass legislation which cannot be squared with the fundamental constitutional guaranties of the document which gave us all of our rights and liberties.

That is why I never have been able to accept, and cannot now accept, the able arguments of distinguished Democrats on the other side of the aisle, that the Constitution guarantees to them that, under the rules of the Senate, they shall have preserved to them the right to block the majority through procedural tactics, because, in their judgment, they do not believe certain legislation which the majority otherwise would pass is constitutional. Mr. President, that defies, in my judgment, our whole theory of government, not only of checks of powers but separation of powers as well.

The American people need to reflect once again on the fact that under our system of government, if we pass legislation which, in fact, is unconstitutional, the courts will pass on it unless, before it gets to the court, the President of the United States exercises his veto, which, under the Constitution, requires a two-thirds vote to override.

When the founding fathers were faced with the problem of establishing the checks in the Constitution they did not have any difficulty in providing a two-thirds vote requirement when they wanted a two-thirds vote requirement as a check. They understood the effect of a two-thirds vote requirement as well as we do; and in the magnificent document which they wrote they checked us, the Senate of the United States, in the passing of unconstitutional legislation, by giving to the President the veto power over us and requiring that his veto shall stand unless a two-thirds vote of the Senate, as well as of the House, overrides it. But they did not anywhere in that document provide that the debate in the Senate of the United States shall be unlimited in the sense that a handful, a minority, of Senators can organize and block the will of the majority by

preventing a vote ever occurring on a piece of legislation. If they wanted to place that power in any minority group in the Senate, the English language was perfectly capable of being so used. But they did not do it. What did they provide? They provided that the House and the Senate shall be allowed to make their own rules governing procedure.

Mr. President, I think one of the most able arguments which has been made in the course of this debate was the argument made by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], for whom I have the highest respect and for whose views, as the RECORD will show, I find myself many, many times, I think, more often than not, in agreement; a man who, in my judgment, is a great lawyer; but with whom, on this issue, I find myself in complete disagreement. Because the argument he made recently on the floor of the Senate, in my judgment, has had great weight in the thinking of my colleagues, I propose, very humbly, this afternoon to answer a few of his observations, inasmuch as I disagree with the Senator on a great many of his historical observations and interpretations, and I disagree with him on some of his conclusions as to constitutional law.

In the speech of the Senator from Georgia, delivered on February 28, 1949, he said, at page 1606 of the RECORD, that had someone suggested a limitation on debate in a conference of the States, before the formation of the Constitution, it would have dissolved the conference.

The Senator from Georgia can assert it, but it is an assumption, which, in my judgment, does not rest upon historical probability. Why do I say that? Because, Mr. President, the Continental Congress, which preceded these great constitutional debates, operated on the basis of a rule which permitted of the previous question. It did not dissolve over that parliamentary practice which limited debate. At the very time the constitutional fathers sat it was the common practice in parliamentary bodies, colonial, and, to the extent we had them, combinations of colonial bodies such as the Continental Congress to use the previous question technique as the device for limiting debate.

I most respectfully say to my good friend from Georgia that I know of no basis in history to support his assumption that had any such proposal been made at the Constitutional Convention to limit debate in the Senate of the United States, the convention would have dissolved. To the contrary, I think the assumption ought to be that, in view of the parliamentary practice which prevailed at that time, by way of the previous question as a device for limiting debate just the opposite conclusion from that reached by the Senator from Georgia is the one which we should accept.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I shall be very glad to yield for a question.

Mr. GEORGE. Does not the Senator know that the previous question, at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, was itself a debatable question, and that it has little relationship to the previous question as now known in the House of Representatives?

Mr. MORSE. I am perfectly aware of that, but I am sure, also, that the Senator from Georgia would agree with me that at the time of the Constitutional Convention, at the time of the Continental Congress, the usages or practices which grew up around the use of the previous question did not fall into the evil way of a filibuster as it has developed on the floor of the Senate. Rather the fact is that Members voted on the previous question for limiting debate on a majority-vote basis. In other words, the practice was that men who assembled in parliamentary bodies, after full and fair debate on the merits of an issue, recognized the right of the majority eventually to end debate by the previous question.

In defending the right of unlimited debate in the Senate, Senators GEORGE and CONNALLY, for example, relate it somehow to State sovereignty, to the sovereignty of the individual State.

Sovereignty means supreme power. The question of the location of sovereign power in the United States is to be answered, not by reference to the political theory of the American Constitution, but by reference to the hard facts of American life. Whatever the original design, the stubborn fact is that supreme power has come to reside in the central government (if it resides anywhere) as a result of the outcome of the War Between the States, the industrial revolution, and the onward march of science and technology. The intellectual edifice of State sovereignty and States' rights, with its corollary doctrines of nullification and withdrawal, treating the National Government as the mere agent of associated States, which was elaborated by Calhoun, collapsed with the defeat of the South in the Civil War.

State sovereignty, in a narrow sense, no longer fits the cold hard facts of modern industrial society. It has passed away forever down the irreversible stream of time. Yet it lingers on in the southern mind like the nostalgic echo of a voice that is still. "But, oh, for the touch of a vanished hand, and the sound of a voice that is still."

Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia, in his very able speech on February 28, said that a right which attaches to the sovereign State is this right of unlimited debate. As I have just said, the Constitution does not say so. Article I, section 5, paragraph 2, of the Constitution provides that each House may determine the rules of its proceedings. Therefore I do not think there can be any reasonable doubt, certainly no reasonable constitutional doubt, concerning the power of the Senate under the Constitution to adopt a rule regulating debate in this body. If that premise is sound under article I, section 5, paragraph 2, then certainly there is no invasion of sovereign powers of the States under the Constitution for this body to adopt a majority-vote rule, because article I, section 5, paragraph 2, contains no word of limitation on the power of the Senate of the United States to adopt its rules.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. Of course, the Senator is familiar with the Constitution, and he recognizes, does he not, that there are some things which cannot be done by the Congress except by the consent of the States, and the one and foremost provision is that no State can be deprived of its equal representation or equal suffrage without its consent?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. I also call the Senator's attention to another constitutional provision, namely, that there can be no subdivision of a State, or the creation of a new State out of an old State, or the creation of a new State by combination of parts of two States, except by the consent of the States.

Mr. MORSE. That is true.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator would not contend, would he, that by mere rule or regulation those constitutional prohibitions could be written out of the Constitution?

Mr. MORSE. Not at all, but I do contend that the observation just made by the Senator from Georgia is entirely irrelevant to the issue before the Senate, as to whether or not under article I, section 5, paragraph 2, of the Constitution the Senate of the United States has the right to adopt a rule governing debate in the Senate which will provide that a majority vote may limit debate. Such a proposed rule has not the slightest connection with the sovereign right of any State.

Mr. President, of course there are rights given to the States under the Constitution which the Senate of the United States cannot take away from the States, but I cannot go along with what I consider to be a fallacious conclusion in the logic of the Senator from Georgia, that because certain rights of the States are guaranteed to them under the Constitution, there is any connection whatsoever with the grant of rights and powers in article I, section 5, paragraph 2, which specifically reserve to the House of Representatives and the Senate the right to adopt rules governing their proceedings. I most respectfully say that the implication of the argument of the Senator from Georgia is a clear non sequitur.

Mr. President, in his very able speech the Senator from Georgia pointed out that there is a danger of whittling away the rights of the States. Let us consider the Hayden resolution for a moment. I am sure the Presiding Officer knows that I am not in favor of the Hayden resolution, save and except I may in the last analysis be forced to vote for it because I apparently stand here this afternoon, as I said before, as the only defender of the President of the United States in support of a majority-rule principle for limiting debate in the Senate, and, of course, if I have no support at the present time for the position the President of the United

States and I take in this matter, I shall have to bide my time until the electorate changes that situation, and during the interim I may have to go along with the Hayden resolution, inadequate as I think it is; but it is better than the present rule. So let us look at the Hayden resolution for a moment.

I say, Mr. President, that the safeguard of States' rights is to be found in the equal representation of the States in the Senate, and not in its parliamentary procedure. I repeat, my first answer to the able argument of the Senator from Georgia is that the safeguard of States' rights is to be found in the equal representation of the States in the Senate, not in its parliamentary procedure.

The Hayden resolution proposes no change in the voting requirements for the application of cloture, nor any reduction in the time allowance for debate following the vote on the cloture motion. No apprehension of the impairment of the rights of the States was voiced in the debate preceding the adoption of the existing cloture rule in 1917, for which all the southern Democratic Senators voted on that memorable day. Were State rights jeopardized during the 5-year period from 1917 to 1922, before the first breach in the ramparts of the present rule was found by a Presiding Officer? The States rights argument in this connection, I say most respectfully, Mr. President, is unsound, and designed to catch timid and unwary souls.

Mr. President, let us consider what an examination of the facts shows about the debates which occurred in 1917 at the time the present cloture rule was adopted.

The date was March 8, 1917. The debate consumed 6 hours, or 26 pages of the RECORD. Of the Senators who participated in the debate, six expressed their preference for majority rather than two-thirds cloture. They were:

Hollis, of New Hampshire, whose comments appear on pages 26 and 27 of the RECORD for March 8, 1917.

Norris, of Nebraska, whose comments in support of majority rule appear on pages 27 and 28 of the RECORD for that date.

Stone, of Missouri, whose support of majority rule cloture appears on page 31.

Owen, of Oklahoma, whose comments appear on page 32.

Thomas, of Colorado. Read his support of majority rule on page 33.

Vardaman, of Mississippi. Note his comment on page 39.

Senator Stone on that occasion prophesied that the two-thirds cloture rule would prove ineffective, and I venture in my humble way to prophesy this afternoon that, even with the adoption of the Hayden resolution, we will not solve the filibuster problem in the Senate, and we will never solve it until we adopt the majority-vote principle in this body.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. I will not yield. I am sorry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say why I will not yield, except to the Senator from Georgia. As a matter of courtesy to him, because of my reference to his argument, it would in my judgment be most unfair for me not to yield. But I am not going to yield to any other Senator, now that I have the floor, for two reasons. First, I do not want to be charged with engaging in a debate 1 minute longer than in all sincerity and good conscience I think I have to speak to make my case on the merits of the great issue pending before the Senate. In the second place, I am not going to yield because I do not want to be taken off the floor, and, although I know that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] would not attempt to take me off the floor by way of seeking to file a cloture petition while I am on the floor, I know he cannot necessarily control other Members of the Senate. I recall that at one time last year—I think my memory serves me correctly—a debate was proceeding when a ruling was handed down that if a Senator obtained the floor for the filing of a cloture petition he could take the speaker off his feet, and I am going to do my best to protect myself until I finish this argument, which so far as my political record is concerned, Mr. President, is of utmost importance to me. I submit that from the standpoint of future events in this country, the arguments which I propose to make this afternoon are going to be of utmost importance to some other Senators in the Senate of the United States.

On March 8, 1917, Senator Owen, of Oklahoma, stated that at least 40 Senators then favored majority cloture, but were bound by a gentlemen's agreement to vote for a two-thirds rule. It is my understanding that what happened behind the scenes in 1917 was that some 40 Senators expressed preference for a simple majority-vote rule in the Senate of the United States for limiting debate, but the leadership prevailed upon them, as so often happens in the Senate now, to modify their views or compromise their position by going along with a two-thirds vote rather than the majority vote which they preferred. It was that understanding and that arrangement which I assume Senator Owen was referring to when on March 8, 1917, he said that at least 40 Senators then favored majority cloture, but were bound by a gentlemen's agreement to vote for the two-thirds rule.

The RECORD shows, Mr. President, that Senator Thomas, of Colorado, on that day said:

> The principle of majority rule is an established and essential principle in American government from the Nation to its smallest hamlet. The majority should have and exercise the power of determining what its policy will be not only with regard to legislation, but, as well, the methods by which legislation is to be accomplished. Two-thirds cloture—

He said—

> will bring no real measure of relief. It will provide a delusion and a snare. Unless the rules be amended by providing cloture by majority the practical operation of this amendment will prove a deep disappointment to the hopes of its sponsors.

If prophetic words were ever uttered in the Senate of the United States, Mr. President, on March 8, 1917, Senator Thomas, of Colorado, uttered them in connection with the quotation from his speech I have just read to the Senate, because I think it is perfectly clear that the two-thirds vote rule in regard to cloture has proved to be a delusion and a snare.

On that same historic day, the Senator from Mississippi, Mr. Vardaman, stated that he recognized that unlimited debate has served the people of the South—

But—

He added—

> I would prefer that the rule would provide for the invocation of the cloture by a majority rather than by a two-thirds vote.

Mr. President, the two-thirds cloture rule was adopted on March 8, 1917, by a vote of 76 to 3. Of the 16 Senators not voting, it was announced that 11 would have voted "yea." Thus, at least 87 of the 96 Senators then favored a limitation of debate in the Senate of the United States. Where were the southern protests on that day when the sovereignty of the States was being invaded? Where were the southern protests on that day that a great constitutional safeguard was being destroyed in the Senate of the United States? Southern Senators on that day voted for the rule. I think it is also quite obvious that they voted for the rule, thinking, as was the practice for the 5 years thereafter, that it applied to all matters of business before the Senate, be it a motion to take up a bill, or to approve the Journal, or to consider a measure in the sense of the subsequent interpretation of the word "measure" being limited, as the Presiding Officer 5 years later ruled, to a pending bill.

No; I am not impressed, Mr. President, with the argument that the sovereignty of the States is being invaded by putting into application the simple majority-vote principle in the Senate of the United States so that we can transact the people's business and protect the people from the obstructionist tactics of men who seek to talk a bill to death so that no vote can ever occur on it.

I repeat now what I think I have said before on the floor of the Senate—I certainly have said it in committee—that there is all the difference in the world between a prolonged debate on the merits of an issue and a prolonged debate that is intended to continue until such time as the majority yields to an agreement or understanding that no vote on the measure at all shall take place, but, rather, that the majority shall surrender to the minority and the proposed legislation shall be laid on the table or be withdrawn. That has happened since I have been in the Senate, and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is filled with many instances of its happening before I came to the Senate. I say that that type of prolonged debate in the Senate of the United States defeats what I consider to be one of the fundamental purposes and principles of democratic government—majority rule.

Not only that, but let it be understood that one of the most costly prices we pay for the filibuster tactics in the Senate of the United States is in committee—not on the floor of the Senate, but in committee. The American people, I am sure, are not fully aware of the fact that the threat of the filibuster is a common weapon that profilibusterers use frequently in committee, where, after a committee by a clear majority is of one mind as to what kind of legislation should be recommended to the floor of the Senate, a minority of the committee will say, in effect, "If you vote the bill out in that form, we warn you we will talk it to death on the floor of the Senate." I call that parliamentary intimidation and, in my judgment, it is used too often in the Senate of the United States, with the result that too frequently committees bring to the floor of the Senate, not legislation by way of recommendation which corresponds to their real desires as a majority; not legislation which the majority of the committee thinks would be in the public interest; but legislation which has been whiplashed out of them by way of a threat of a filibuster if they do not yield in committee to the will of the minority.

Mr. President, if I had to state what I think is the greatest evil in the filibuster, I would not mention first the tremendous waste of time and expense involved in holding up the people's business on the floor of the Senate in actual debate, bad as I think that is. I should say that the great cost of the rule which permits a filibuster is paid in committee, in executive sessions of the committee, away from the public view, where the public is not aware of what is going on behind committee doors. We are confronted there with the threat that if we do not yield to the whiplash of the minority by writing into the bill provisions which we do not think ought to be in the bill, we either cannot get a bill at all, or if we get it to the floor of the Senate, the minority will talk it to death, to use the exact phrase which I have heard on several occasions in committees of which I have been a member since I have been in the Senate.

That is not good government. I do not think it is democratic government. Thus I repeat that I am proud to stand here today shoulder to shoulder with Harry S. Truman in support of a principle of good government which I think in some way, somehow, we must make prevail in America—that the Senate of the United States shall operate and function on the basis of a majority vote principle. My invitation is an open one, and will continue to be extended over the months and years ahead, so long as I am in the Senate, for Democrats and Republicans alike to join with me in support of President Truman on this issue, because he is right.

Returning to the argument of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], in this very able argument he said, on February 28:

> We can have absolutism in a legislative body. We can bring about absolutism in the Congress by a gag rule.

Mr. President, absolutism means despotism. Absolutism is the doctrine or practice of unlimited authority and control. I repeat that there are ample limits upon public authority in our constitutional system of checks and balances; but unlimited debate in the Senate has never been a part of American political theory.

I quote from the scholarly book by W. F. Willoughby, Principles of Legislative Organization and Administration, published in 1934. I read excerpts from pages 495 and 499. In that book Willoughby says:

> The real issue involved in obstruction in the Senate is simply this: Shall majority rule and responsible party government prevail? Impartial students of the question have concluded that it is desirable that the Senate should provide by its rules for greater freedom of debate than obtains in the House, but that it should at the same time provide means by which an abuse of this freedom may be prevented. * * * Obstruction which goes beyond that of legitimate debate is an evil that should be brought under control, both because it consumes the time of the Chamber and because it places undue obstacles in the way of proper working of party government. * * * As in all cases where power is granted, the opportunity for its abuse exists and * * * reasonable safeguards against such abuse should be provided. Such safeguards, however, should not go as far as to enable the minority, in an open contest, to make its will prevail over the majority. While a majority can use its powers in an illegitimate way, the same is true of the minority; and as between the two, the former * * * is the lesser evil.

Mr. President, I fail to see any basis in merit for the fear of the Senator from Georgia that the adoption even of a majority-vote rule in the Senate of the United States would run any danger whatsoever of absolutism. The Senator from Georgia was speaking of the Hayden resolution. I am sure that he would deplore even more my resolution. However, even under my resolution, I do not see any basis for the fear which he has expressed, if we constantly keep in mind the other checks against a majority which might seek to abuse its powers, as suggested by Mr. Willoughby in the book from which I have quoted; if we keep constantly in mind the veto power of the President, the two-thirds vote under the Constitution in regard to overriding the veto, and the great judicial safeguards of the United States Supreme Court in protecting constitutional rights both of individuals and of States.

That leads me to repeat for the RECORD the protection to minority rights contained in the resolution for which I am fighting and which adopts majority-vote-rule principle. It has been suggested in the course of this debate—in fact, in the committee the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] suggested it—that if we adopt a majority-vote principle in a resolution which provides for 96 hours of debate, as my resolution does, and which accords to each Senator the right to farm out his time, as my resolution does, there is nothing thereafter which would stop the Senate from further modifying such a rule so as to reduce the 96 hours to 48, the 48 to 24, the 24 to 12, the 12 to 6, or to use the argument of reducing it to an absurdity, wiping out entirely—so those who fear that danger say—any right to debate after cloture has been adopted.

I know that reducing things to an absurdity is frequently a very effective technique when someone wishes to argue from fear rather than from the realities. I believe that those who make that argument fly in the face of the realities of practice of the Senate. Why do I say that? I say it because, as I shall show later by certain statistics which I shall offer, it is most difficult to get 16 Members of the Senate to sign a cloture petition in the first instance. They are not going to do it, and they do not do it, unless and until they become convinced that there is in progress a filibuster which seeks to prevent a vote from ever occurring on an issue.

After the petition is signed, there is another safeguard reality. Those who employ the fear argument tell us that there is a danger that a majority may subsequently further modify the rule or overlook it. The safeguard is that after 16 Members have signed a cloture petition, under my resolution it would require a majority of the Members of the Senate to apply cloture. Has that happened very frequently? In the cases in which cloture petitions have been filed, we find that out of 19 times when such a petition was filed, it was possible to get a majority vote only 12 times. Incidentally, it was possible to get a two-thirds vote only 4 times. That is why I say that the proposal which is being offered here for a two-thirds vote is ineffective. Statistically it is shown to be little more than a gesture. A two-thirds vote was obtained only 4 times out of 19, and a majority vote 12 times out of 19. So it is evident that a majority of the Members of the Senate will hesitate a long time before they stop their colleagues from discussing the merits of an issue, unless they are convinced that the minority have organized in an endeavor to prevent the majority from even voting. Then I say it is proper for the Senate rule to vest in the majority the right to vote, as provided in my resolution. Although there are some Members of the Senate who seem to think that this type of a practical check in the Senate is not effective, I think the matter of fair play in the Senate and the matter of senatorial courtesy is one of the very practical safeguards protecting the minority from any steamroller tactics which those who have protested my use of the so-called senatorial courtesy argument seem to fear. History supports me, Mr. President, for the statistics which I shall shortly present show that the majority is very hesitant, as it should be, to apply any gag upon the minority, save and except in instances when it is satisfied that the minority is seeking to deny to the majority its democratic right to reach a vote on the issue in question.

So I say that when we examine the realities of Senate practices, the fear arguments, which are being advanced by the opponents of my resolution providing for a majority-vote rule, deserve very little weight.

But the Senator from Georgia apparently feels that there is a great danger of this, because in his speech on February 28 he said:

> Senate Resolution 15 is a grant of power which ultimately will be used to perpetrate a great wrong.

Mr. President, I do not share that opinion. I do not agree with the Senator from Georgia that Senate Resolution 15 is a grant of power. I say it is naught but a rule of procedure prescribing the conditions under which debate may be closed. It can be successfully invoked, under the Hayden resolution, only if two-thirds of the Senators present vote in favor of it. Two-thirds of the Senate will not perpetrate any great wrong upon the American people; in fact, the statistics show that, on the average, 83 Senators have voted on each of the 19 cloture petitions or motions which have been submitted since 1917. We see, therefore, that when a cloture fight arises in the Senate, and when the time comes for voting on that question, there are not very many empty seats in the Senate Chamber. The record shows that to be so. I repeat that, on the average, 83 Senators have been in their seats at the time of the vote on 19 different occasions since 1917 when cloture petitions have been filed and the question of invoking cloture has been voted on.

Mr. President, cloture does not take away any part, I submit, of the right of the smaller States of the Union to have their say in regard to what they wish to say.

In his speech on February 28 the Senator from Georgia also said:

> The smallest State in this Union * * * can say what it wishes to say.

I agree with the Senator from Georgia, but I deny his conclusion that Senate Resolution 15 will in any way take away that right. There will be ample opportunity for every State, large or small, to be heard upon the merits of a question, under Senate Resolution 15 or under my resolution providing for cloture by majority vote, if you will, Mr. President, both during the pre-petition stage, during the 2-day interval between the filing of the cloture petition and the vote on it, and during the 96 hours of potential debate after cloture has been adopted, if it is adopted. Under those procedural steps, I ask, can one really imagine a situation in the Senate of the United States in which the smaller States will not have ample opportunity or time to have their say, and all they want to say, on the merits of any issue pending before the Senate of the United States? Let us keep in mind, first, the reluctance of any 16 Members of the Senate to file a cloture petition unless they are convinced that a filibuster has started—which means that prior to that moment there has been adequate and ample time for debate on the merits of the issue in question—and, second, the fact that after the filing of the petition there is a 2-day interval which permits of two continuous days of debate on the merits of the issue involved in the cloture petition; and the further fact that after the adoption of cloture, if it is adopted, 96 hours of debate are permitted under the Hayden amendment, if each Senator wishes to use his hour, to discuss the merits of the issue; and the further fact that under my resolution 96 hours of debate is permitted, with the farming-out privilege, which I think is an additional safeguard to minority interests in the Senate—which I, too, wish to protect; I simply do not wish to give the minority the right to trample the majority underfoot. That is the difference. I do not wish to give to the minority the right to deny effectively to the majority the right to pass proposed legislation, which the present rule permits the minority to do.

No, Mr. President; the talk about taking away from the smaller States their right to say what they wish to say on an issue is a fear argument. It simply will not work out that way in practice. It does not work out that way in practice and I submit it cannot work out that way in practice. My proposal does give—and its great merit is to be found in its strength—to the majority in the Senate the right to prevent any minority group of Senators from denying to the majority the right finally to pass proposed legislation.

My good friend the Senator from Georgia said on February 28:

> If a man's soul recoils from such a proposition as that, is he not justified in saying that, so long as he can prevent it, it shall not even be submitted to the Congress of the United States for decision?

My answer to him is that I do not think such a right should be recognized under the rules of the Senate of the United States, because I believe such a claimed right, if allowed to be exercised, is equivalent to a license to defeat a fundamental tenet of democratic government, namely, the will of the majority. For one Senator or a minority of Senators to refuse to permit the Senate to vote upon a proposition, simply because the minority believe it is unconstitutional or is contrary to some sectional interest, in my judgment is an arrogant substitution by the minority of their judgment for that of the entire Senate and of the courts of the land. The final arbiters of the civil rights and liberties of the American people are and should be the courts, not transient minorities in the Senate of the United States, whose Members may come from only one section of the country or from only one political party, and none of whom may have been elected recently. The fifth amendment to the Constitution did not enact Herbert Spencer's proposed Social station. Neither should rule XXII enable a handful of Senators to prevent consideration of legislation passed by the House of Representatives and desired by an overwhelming majority of the American people.

Let me say a word about the interesting question of political science and political ethics, as to just whom we represent in the Senate. Reasonable men may differ, as they differ on the point I now make; but so far as I am concerned it is a crystal-clear dictate that I feel was vested in me when the people of my State sent me to the Senate. They did not send me to the Senate from Oregon for Oregon. They sent me under our representative system of government from Oregon for the Nation; not to sit here and vote a blind partisan sectional interest on any piece of legislation. Great as the temptation sometimes is to vote and act in that way, weak and inclined as some of us at times may be to yield to the temptation, if and when we do, I say, in my judgment, we do not measure up to the great trust the people of our States placed in us when they sent us to the Senate.

I look upon the Senate as a part of our representative government, as a part of a legislative government, I may say to my good friend from Georgia, as a part of one of the legislative branches of the Government, sent here to legislate in the interests of all the people from the Pacific to the Atlantic and from the Canadian border to the Gulf of Mexico. The people of Oregon did not send me here as an ambassador from Oregon. I thought we answered and found the solution to that issue, terrible as it was, costly as it was, in the War Between the States. I thought as the outcome of that war the notion of Calhoun that we sat here as ambassadors from our respective States was repudiated, and that from that time on we were to sit in the Senate, not as ambassadors from particular States, fighting for the selfish sectional interests, economic, political, and social, of various sections of the country, but fighting for the welfare of the Nation. At least it is in that spirit I propose to stand always on the floor of the Senate and fight as a representative in the Senate from the great State of Oregon, believing that by so doing I am carrying out the great principle of representation to which I pledged myself when I took the oath at the Presiding Officer's desk when I first came into the Senate, to support and defend the Constitution—which means all the rights set forth in the Constitution for the benefit of the whole Nation—and to pass legislation, if necessary, to see to it that millions of people in this country who may not be getting the full fruits of their constitutional rights as set forth in the letter of the Constitution shall be able to live in terms of those rights. That is my conception of my duty of representation in the Senate. I am perfectly aware of the fact, as I read the able speech of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, delivered on February 28, that he has a considerably different notion as to what representation in the Senate imposes upon him by way of duties and rights and obligations.

Since I have come to the Senate I have been saddened several times because I felt on both sides of the aisle alinements were formed on the basis of selfish sectional interests on various economic and social problems before the Senate for consideration. I know the pressure to do that is great, and I know that sometimes when one does not yield to the pressure his failure to do so may be at

great cost to his own political fortunes. I have been able to practice it thus far, and I pray I shall have the strength and the courage to continue to practice it on specific issues, namely, that whenever I am satisfied a vote for a measure that would be of great benefit to my State would not at the same time be in the public interest, I intend to vote against the measure.

I say from the floor of the Senate this afternoon to the people of the State of Oregon I am willing to apply that concept of my duty now to two great measures about which much misunderstanding as to the facts exists in Oregon. Due consideration has not been given to the facts which the people of Oregon sent me here to give consideration to. I suspect the people of Oregon, at a referendum, if it were held today, might vote against the positions I think I shall probably take on those issues. But I shall take them because I do not think it important that any of us stay in the Senate, though I think it important that while we are here we vote on the basis of what we think is the national interest and not the interest of our respective States, if on an issue the national interests and the interests of our States are in conflict.

Thus, I mention the tidelands case, and I say to the people of Oregon today that in spite of the fact that a tremendous drive is being made in Oregon to line up the State in support of the tidelands bill, and although I am convinced that on the basis of that propaganda and its effect on public opinion as of now, in the State of Oregon, if I wanted to play politics with the issue I would vote for it, I shall not vote for it if, when the debate is over, such able constitutional lawyers in this body as the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] can convince me that, as a matter of law, the tidelands belong to all the people of the United States, and not merely to the people living in the States whose shores the tidewaters wash. That is a specific application of the principle I am talking about. That issue, so far as I am concerned, must be decided in answering the mixed question of fact and law. Who, as a legal proposition, under our Constitution, owns the tidelands? If the debate satisfies me they are owned by all the people of the Nation, I shall vote against the tidelands bill. And let me say, so far as considerations of party responsibility are concerned, that I shall vote against it, even though the Republican Party made the tidelands bill a part of its platform. Theory, Mr. President, is fine. The test comes as to whether one is able to practice the sound political theory which I think was clearly written into our organic law. I do not read the Constitution of the United States as containing one word which would support even a presumption that Members of the Senate should sit here and vote sectional interests, although I confess that too frequently that is what has happened.

There is another issue, and that is the labor issue. In my State I cannot find very many "middle-of-the-roaders." They seem to want either the Taft-Hartley law, or the Thomas bill, depending, apparently, upon whether they follow the lines of management or the lines of labor. I think that in due course of time the people of my State will awake to the fact that both the proponents of the Taft-Hartley law and the proponents of the Thomas bill are taking extreme positions which are not in the public interest. They have got labor so disturbed, in my State, that the letters and telegrams I am receiving from labor are phrased in terms of charging me with "running out" on some position I have heretofore taken in the Senate of the United States. It is probably asking too much that they read the RECORD, but I say to organized labor, not only in Oregon but at the A. F. of L. headquarters, the CIO headquarters, and the brotherhoods' headquarters here, "You are being 'taken for a ride' by the proponents of the Thomas bill. You are being taken for a ride in several respects. First, they apparently are giving you the false impression that the Thomas bill has a chance of passing the Senate."

I shall not argue a question of fact, Mr. President, and that is all it is. It is so simple that all we have to do is to count. I have done some counting. I say to labor that the Thomas bill cannot pass the Senate of the United States. It is about time for labor to take stock of that fact. What we need, as I have said before, is a piece of labor legislation which will protect the legitimate rights of labor, which is all labor has the right to ask, and which will protect the legitimate rights of management, which is all management has a right to ask, and which thereby will protect the public interest.

I thought I had made myself clear, time and time again, on this issue during the committee hearings, but propaganda works wonders when the propagandists seek to misinform. Let me say once again that one of the amendments I tried to offer in committee, but was not allowed to, and which I shall offer, in due course of time, on the floor of the Senate, calls for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law, because, in my judgment, that law is an extreme piece of legislation which is productive of class-conscious conflict and labor unrest, and is unfair and unworkable in many of its provisions. I shall also propose amendments, with the joint sponsorship of Senators on both sides of the aisle, which will protect the legitimate rights of labor and of management and which, to the extent that we can use the figure of speech in this discussion, follow a fair, middle-of-the-road course of procedure.

Mr. President, I say again that I refuse to sit in the Senate of the United States either as a blind partisan representative of a sectional interest, or as a biased representative of any pressure group, be it labor or management, or any other group. I say that it is not important that I stay here, but it is important so long as I stay here that that be my course of action.

Some people say, "In this organized drive against you, what are you going to do when you are licked in 1950?" My reply is, "I am not licked yet, but if and when that shall happen, I shall go back to my home town and into my law office and into further public service on a lower level." I might even run for the city council, Mr. President, because I think I might do a pretty good job of public service even on the city council. We need to understand in America that good public service is needed on all levels of our governmental organization. I think it is to be taken for granted that one who is as devoted to the public interest as I think my record shows I am, can be counted upon, so long as he has the strength to do so, to devote a great deal of his energies to public service, irrespective of the height of the level. I shall keep it pure public service, too, Mr. President.

I return now to my major thesis, namely, that it is a mistaken notion to assume that we sit here as the representatives of the small States or of the large States; but it is a sound theory that we sit here as representatives of the Nation.

Mr. President, in his very able speech on February 28 the Senator from Georgia said:

> There are those who would repeal the Bill of Rights, but I am sure there are none of those persons in the Senate.

In reply to my good friend from Georgia, I say that the Bill of Rights is not involved in the fight to curb the filibuster. It would require a constitutional amendment to repeal the Bill of Rights. All that is involved here is a procedural reform in the parliamentary rules of the Senate. Some persons are seeing ghosts under their beds, in the fears they are stirring up over the implications of this fight to curb filibusters in the Senate. The Hayden resolution is not inspired by a desire to clear the way for this or that legislation, but by a desire to increase the efficiency of the Senate in the performance of its legislative functions. My resolution is devised and designed to accomplish the same ends more effectively and more efficiently than is the Hayden resolution.

Mr. President, another argument in the able speech of the Senator from Georgia was the statement that whenever a measure possesses any real merit there will never be a filibuster against its consideration.

I merely submit the record to answer that argument. I say that the annals of the Senate of the United States are replete with filibusters ranging in length from a few hours to 2 months, on many meritorious issues; and without taking the time to read them, I cite as a reference a list of outstanding filibusters from 1841 to 1948, as published in the corrected copy of George Galloway's pamphlet entitled "Limitation of Debate in the United States Senate."

Mr. President, I ask to have incorporated as a part of my remarks at this point this list of filibusters in the Senate for the years mentioned, as set forth on pages 17 to 19 of the Galloway pamphlet.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUTSTANDING SENATE FILIBUSTERS FROM 1841 TO 1948

1841: A bill to remove the Senate printers was filibustered against for 10 days. A bill relating to the Bank of the United States was filibustered for several weeks and caused Clay to introduce his cloture resolution.

1846: The Oregon bill was filibustered for 2 months.

1863: A bill to suspend the writ of habeas corpus was filibustered.

1876: An Army appropriation bill was filibustered against for 12 days, forcing the abandonment of a rider which would have suspended existing election laws.

1880: A measure to reorganize the Senate was filibustered from March 24 to May 16 by an evenly divided Senate, until two Senators resigned, giving the Democrats a majority.

1880: The Blair education bill was filibustered. The force bill, providing for Federal supervision of elections, was successfully filibustered for 29 days. This resulted in the cloture resolution introduced by Senator Aldrich which was also filibustered and the resolution failed.

1893: An unsuccessful filibuster lasting 42 days was organized against a bill for the repeal of the Silver Purchase Act.

1901: Senator Carter successfully filibustered a river-and-harbor bill because it failed to include certain additional appropriations.

1902: There was a successful filibuster against the tri-State bill proposing to admit Oklahoma, Arizona, and New Mexico to statehood, because the measure did not include all of Indian Territory according to the original boundaries.

1903: Senator Tillman, of North Carolina, filibustered against a deficiency appropriation bill because it failed to include an item paying his State a war claim. The item was finally replaced in the bill.

1907: Senator Stone filibustered against a ship-subsidy bill.

1908: Senator La Follette led a filibuster lasting 28 days against the Vreeland-Aldrich emergency currency law. The filibuster finally failed.

1911: Senator Owen filibustered a bill proposing to admit New Mexico and Arizona to statehood. The House had accepted New Mexico, but refused Arizona because of her proposed constitution. Senator Owen filibustered against the admission of New Mexico until Arizona was replaced in the measure. The Canadian reciprocity bill passed the House and failed through a filibuster in the Senate. It passed Congress in an extraordinary session but Canada refused to accept the proposition.

1913: A filibuster was made against the omnibus public building bill by Senator Stone, of Missouri, until certain appropriations for his State were included.

1914: Senator Burton, of Ohio, filibustered against a river and harbor bill for 12 hours. Senator Gronna filibustered against acceptance of a conference report on an Indian appropriation bill. In this year also the following bills were debated at great length, but finally passed: Panama Canal tolls bill, 30 days; Federal Trade Commission bill, 30 days; Clayton amendments to the Sherman Act, 21 days; conference report on the Clayton bill, 9 days.

1915: A filibuster was organized against President Wilson's ship-purchase bill by which German ships in American ports would have been purchased. The filibuster was successful and as a result three important appropriation bills failed.

1917: The armed-ship bill of President Wilson was successfully filibustered, and caused the defeat of many administration measures. This caused the adoption of the Martin resolution embodying the President's recommendation for a change in the Senate rules, on limitation of debate.

1919: A filibuster was successful against an oil and mineral leasing bill, causing the failure of several important appropriation bills and necessitating an extraordinary session of Congress.

1921: The emergency tariff bill was filibustered against in January 1921, which led Senator Penrose to present a cloture petition. The cloture petition failed, but the tariff bill finally passed.

1922: The Dyer antilynching bill was successfully filibustered against by a group of southern Senators.

1923: President Harding's ship-subsidy bill was defeated by a filibuster.

1925: Senator Copeland (New York) talked at length against ratification of the Isle of Pines Treaty with Cuba, but the treaty was finally ratified.

1926: A 10-day filibuster against the World Court Protocol was ended by a cloture vote of 68 to 26, the second time cloture was adopted by the Senate. A bill for migratory bird refuges was talked to death by States' rights advocates in the spring of 1926, a motion for cloture failing by a vote of 46 to 33.

1927: Cloture again failed of adoption in 1927 when it was rejected by 32 yeas against 59 nays as a device to end obstruction against the Swing-Johnson bill for development of the lower Colorado River Basin.

One of the fiercest filibusters in recent decades succeeded in March 1927 in preventing an extension of the life of a special campaign investigating committee headed by James A. Reed, of Missouri. The committee's exposé of corruption in the 1926 senatorial election victories of Frank L. Smith in Illinois and of William S. Vare in Pennsylvania had aroused the ire of a few Senators who refused to permit the continuance of the investigation despite the wishes of a clear majority of the Senate.

1933: Early in 1933 a 2-week filibuster was staged against the Glass branch-banking bill in which Huey Long first participated as a leading figure. "Senators found him impervious to sarcasm and no man could silence him." Cloture was defeated by the margin of a single vote. Finally, the filibuster was abandoned and the bill passed.

1935: The most celebrated of the Long filibusters was staged on June 12–13, 1935. Senator Long spoke for 15½ hours, a feat of physical endurance never excelled in the Senate, in favor of the Gore amendment to the proposed extension of the National Industrial Recovery Act. But the amendment was finally tabled.

1938: A 29-day "feather duster" filibuster in January–February 1938 defeated passage of a Federal antilynching bill, although an overwhelming majority of the Senate clearly favored the bill.

1939: An extended filibuster against adoption of a monetary bill, extending Presidential authority to alter the value of the dollar, continued from June 20 to July 5, 1939, but finally failed by a narrow margin.

1942, 1944, 1946, 1948: Four organized filibusters upon the perennial question of Federal anti-poll-tax legislation were successful in these years. An attempt to pass fair employment practice legislation in 1946 was also killed by a filibuster. The present Senate cloture rule proved ineffective in these cases as a device for breaking filibusters.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, another argument of the Senator from Georgia was that some things in America cannot be settled by legislation. If this be true—and it may be—the remedy then certainly is not to deny to the Senate a chance to consider legislation in point, but for the Senate and the House to reject a bill, after full debate on the floor of each House, in accordance with a majority vote principle. That is the answer to that argument. But it certainly is no sound argument to set up a straw man and say, by way of assumption, that some things cannot be settled by legislation, and then say, "In order to prove we are right about that, we are going to deny to the majority any chance to try to settle them by legislation. We are going to put up our minority viewpoint as a blockade to any legislative attempt to try to settle things which we, the minority, may think cannot be settled by legislation."

The Senator from Georgia also said, in the course of his speech, that we should not shackle the States with respect to matters which offend their traditions, cultural institutions, and deep convictions. I submit that the Hayden resolution is not proposed to shackle the States. It is a reform, I repeat, in legislative parliamentary procedure. The civil-rights bills, if we want to discuss them at this point, are not designed to shackle the States, but to extend the frontiers of democracy throughout the country, and take the shackles off millions of fellow citizens who are being denied their constitutional rights and liberties in some sections of the country.

The Senator from Georgia refers in the course of his speech to the baneful influences of parties. I think it is clear that he means political parties. There are adequate safeguards, either under the Hayden resolution or the Morse resolution, to protect the minority from what I think the Senator from Georgia has in mind when he talks about the baneful influences of parties.

A few moments ago I listened to a very able and stirring address by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Democratic whip, who, although he has left the President of the United States on this issue, nevertheless made perfectly clear this afternoon in his speech that he thinks there is an obligation resting upon the Democratic Party to carry out what he considers to be at least certain party commitments on which a great campaign was waged in this country prior to November 2, 1948. I understood the Senator from Pennsylvania to be talking about giving effect to party responsibility, and urging his Democratic colleagues to keep faith with what he considers to be the pledges of his party in the field of civil rights.

I recognize that there may be those who will characterize his position as an exhibition of the baneful influence of political parties, but I say that by way of legislation we ought to submit such proposals on their merits to the Congress and let the majority decide by majority vote whether or not the pledges of the Democratc Party—yes, and the pledges of the Republican Party—should be given their day in the Senate for submission to a majority vote of the Senate, in order to enact legislation which will make it possible to send those issues to the President for his signature or his veto, and to the United States Supreme Court ultimately for its determination as to whether they are constitutional.

Mr. President, let me say, on the question of the constitutionality of legislation, that if I felt that any piece of legislation in the field of civil rights violated any constitutional provision I would not vote for it, and I would not have my friend, the Senator from Georgia, or any other Senator on the other side of the aisle who may differ with me on the issue of civil rights, vote for a piece of civil-rights legislation which he or they believed contained a single unconstitutional provision, because I believe we must live up to our oaths to support the

Constitution. I have not yet and I never shall vote for a piece of legislation in the Senate which I think contains any unconstitutional provision. But I am never going to take the position that because I think a piece of legislation contains an unconstitutional provision I have a right to organize a fighting minority in the Senate to block the majority from ever voting on such a piece of legislation. I have lived up to my oath when I make my argument against the constitutionality of a legislative proposal, when I cast my vote against it, and then start the legislation on its way to the White House, if it passes, and to litigation, on the way to the courts, for their determination as to its constitutionality.

I do not know, Mr. President, how we are to preserve our democratic form of government if we adopt any other principle in regard to such issues. The principle which it seems to me the gentlemen of the opposition are in fact defending is that they ought to have the right, a right which should be recognized, by physical force and endurance, through a filibuster, to prevent a vote on a piece of legislation to which they are opposed, in their good judgment, reasonable as they may be in their attitude on whether it is Constitutional or unconstitutional.

The word "despotism" has been mentioned in the debate, and I say it is more accurately applied to the position of a minority which wants to block a vote from ever occurring on an issue than to a majority which seeks to live within the checks and balances of our constitutional system of government.

At another place in his remarks the Senator from Georgia said, "You will come to majority rule in the Senate of the United States." Is not that a horrendous prospect? I thought that majority rule was always intended to be the rule governing the passage of legislation in the Senate. I thought that majority rule was the procedure for adopting amendments to the Senate rules. I thought majority rule to be the very essence, so far as a fundamental tenet is concerned, of our republican form of government. I thought that at all levels Federal and local officials are elected, laws are passed, and decisions rendered by majority vote, save and except in specific instances where by words of limitation in organic law exceptions are made to the majority-vote rule. As I said earlier in my speech, no such exception is set forth in the Constitution applicable to the issue to which we are addressing our attention, namely, the right of the Senate of the United States to adopt a parliamentary rule of procedure which will permit the majority to prevail in accordance with such provisions as are contained in the Hayden resolution and the Morse resolution.

At another point the Senator from Georgia said:

> There is an almost irresistible drift toward a larger and larger concentration of power in the Federal Government.

I agree to that statement; and I believe, Mr. President, I have, concerning that drift, some of the same fears the Senator from Georgia entertains. My fears are so deep that I think we must not delay longer in adopting in the Senate of the United States rules which will so improve its efficiency that we can move faster and more expeditiously to check abuses which develop through the great centralization of power in the Federal Government. So I say the drift to which the Senator from Georgia refers, to my way of thinking, presents all the more reason for increasing the efficiency of Congress so that it can cope more effectively in the public's interest with big business, big labor, and big government.

Filibusters weaken and delay the legislative processes and expose the Senate to public ridicule and the loss of public confidence. One has only to look at the calendar before us to see how correct I am as to the effects of a filibuster in producing delay in the enactment of legislation. Already in this debate both the proponents of the filibuster and the opponents of the filibuster have been expressing great concern over the fact that a backlog of vitally important legislation, such as rent control, ECA legislation, agricultural legislation, appropriation legislation—all vital to the welfare of the country—is beginning to pile up. No one should be surprised at that argument. It is the stereotyped argument. If Senators will read the past history of filibusters in the Senate they will find that the filibusterers say, in effect, "Yield now to us, the minority, because if you do not yield to us now you will be simply a party to piling up higher and higher important pieces of legislation which should be passed in the public's interest, because we will not let you vote on that legislation unless you withdraw the particular matter now before the Senate on which we are filibustering."

Mr. President, I have not analyzed myself sufficiently well to know just why it is that temperamentally, intellectually, yes constitutionally, I cannot yield to that sort of intimidation, and I never shall. I think the people of the United States had better understand the true meaning of that particular technique of the filibuster, because when they analyze its true meaning, then I think they will have a more adequate understanding of the common definition of a word which has crept into this debate, namely, "despotism."

In the course of his remarks the distinguished Senator from Georgia said:

> These proposals—
>
> Referring to the civil-rights bills—
>
> are essentially revolutionary.

I file my dissent to that conclusion and observation, because I do not think it is at all revolutionary to propose by law to abolish the poll tax, to outlaw lynching, and to promote fair employment practices.

As to the merits of such legislation, Members of the Senate can have many honest differences of opinion, but as to any conclusion that it is revolutionary, such a conclusion I think has to be based upon the assumption that giving to all the people of the country, irrespective of race, color, or creed, full protection to their constitutional rights, full constitutional liberties written into the organic law by the founding fathers, is revolutionary. To state the argument is to answer it. Revolutionary? No. Unfortunately, however, it represents a process of evolution we have had to develop in the field of civil rights, as the result of the already too long delay caused by refusal to accept, in some sections of the country, a full recognition of the fact that discrimination on the basis of race, color, or creed cannot be reconciled with constitutional guarantees.

At another point in his notable address the Senator from Georgia said:

> It is impossible, except through revolution, ever to take away the equality of representation in the Senate.

As I stated to him earlier in our colloquy, no one is proposing to take away that equality. I think that is a false, bogey argument. That equality does not confer, however, upon any State or group of States, the right to prevent the Senate from considering and enacting legislation. The business of an organism is to function, and the constitutional rights and duties of the Senate call upon us to legislate, leaving to the other branches of Government the opportunity to exercise their checks upon us if we legislate contrary to the organic law.

The last comment I shall make on the distinguished Senator's remarks of February 28 is his reference to the formation of political policies along sectional lines. I deplore that, too. But I ask, What is the basic cause of the sectional aspect of some proposed legislation? I say out of deep conviction that I think the basic cause is to be found in the cultural lag of the South behind the political and economic standards of the rest of the country, plus the unwillingness of many southern leaders to use their influence in extending the frontiers of political and economic democracy in that region.

I recognize it is going to take time to satisfy the many needs of the South that need to be satisfied in order to give it comparable standing economically with other parts of the country. I have said before, and I now repeat, that we cannot do these things overnight. I do not happen to be one who believes that it would be in the best interests of the South or of the Nation overnight to put into effect all the reforms which the civil righters want to put into effect. I am severely criticized by some of them because I have taken that position. Of course, we cannot make progress, as I said before, by way of a social avalanche. But I do say that we cannot even take the first steps until the Senate changes its rules so that at least we can pass some legislation which will give hope to millions of our fellow citizens for a full share of the liberty and freedom which those of white skin are entitled to enjoy under the Constitution.

On January 27, 1949, I addressed a letter to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] in answer to a point which he made, and a point which the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] made in his speech on February 28, the Senator from

Arizona having set forth to me the fear that, if my resolution were adopted, at some subsequent time there might be a further change of the rule which would permit, not 96 hours of debate, but of a lesser time. In order that the RECORD may be complete, and in order that it may show that I have conscientiously tried to work out a conscionable compromise with those who have a vitally and fundamentally different point of view on this subject, I wish to read the letter of January 27 which I wrote to the Senator from Arizona:

JANUARY 27, 1949.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: You will recall that in conversation with me at the time I introduced my resolution (S. Res. 12) to amend the cloture rule, as well as in statements during the hearing (see discussion at pages 66–69 of the transcript) on the pending cloture resolutions, you pointed out that if rule XXII were amended as I suggest in my resolution, to permit cloture to be voted by a majority, then in the future that rule or any other could be amended by a simple majority so as to further curtail freedom of debate.

While a majority may now amend the rules, I recognize that if the cloture rule were changed so as to permit cloture to be voted by a majority then the circumstance to which you refer could occur; and conceivably the gusranties to the minority contained in my resolution could be reduced. While I feel that the danger to which you refer is not likely to occur, your committee may wish to consider the following suggestion:

If, in addition to a rule such as is embodied in my resolution, rule XL were amended at the same time to provide that a two-thirds vote would be necessary to amend that portion of rule XXII relating to cloture, the danger you envisage would be minimized. The result of such a combination of amendments to the rules would be that cloture could be applied by majority rule but the guaranties of adequate time for debate could be changed only by a two-thirds vote.

I considered proposing such a change as a formal part of my resolution, but I decided that there was no practical danger that the safeguards contained in my resolution would, if adopted, be cut down at a later time. Therefore, I limited my resolution to amending rule XXII. I still feel the same way, but in view of the fears you and others have expressed, I thought it might be helpful to offer this additional suggestion for your consideration.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator.

Mr. President, if and when we get into such a position that amendments to the Hayden resolution can be offered, I intend to offer my resolution, Senate Resolution 12, calling for cloture by majority vote with 96 hours of debating time after cloture has been adopted, with the right to farm out the time, plus a further amendment along the lines of the letter which I wrote to the Senator from Arizona on January 27.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Just a moment. The amendment I have suggested would provide that thereafter the provision as to the length of time allowed the minority to debate after cloture had been adopted shall not be changed except by a two-thirds vote.

Mr. RUSSELL and Mr. HAYDEN addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. MORSE. I yield first to the Senator from Georgia. First, let me state the condition under which I yield. I yield for a question only, and with the understanding that the Senator to whom I yield will not seek to offer parliamentarily any matter which will take me from the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator can yield only for a question; and if any interrupting Senator does not ask a question, the Senator can protect himself by refusing to yield further.

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. I assure the Senator that I shall only ask a question.

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. Am I to understand from the statement just made by the distinguished Senator from Oregon that every matter to come before the Senate should be submitted to a pure majority vote, except the one final work of perfection, the resolution proposed by the Senator himself, allowing majority cloture, which can never be assailed in the future except by a two-thirds vote? Is that the position of the Senator?

Mr. MORSE. I will tell the Senator what my position is. I think it is fundamental that we adopt a cloture rule which will permit of proceeding with legislation and voting on legislation by way of a majority vote; and because I think it is so fundamental to preserving the democratic form of government in the Senate that we must adopt a majority-vote principle in order to stop a minority from filibustering us into inaction on a particular piece of legislation, I am willing to try to work out with those who say they fear my resolution will threaten and jeopardize minority rights in the Senate to the degree of denying the minority adequate time to debate an issue on the merits, some conscionable compromise which will give the minority assurance that they are to have at least 96 hours after cloture has been adopted, to debate an issue, unless, under my proposal for cloture limitation, in that particular respect two-thirds of the Senate decide to reduce the 96 hours to a further limitation of time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question only.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is the position of the Senator that any question before the Senate should be decided on a majority basis except the one rule which the Senator himself proposes to write, which shall be sacrosanct, and can be assailed only by a two-thirds vote of the Senate?

Mr. MORSE. First, let me say that I do not propose to write it. I simply propose to yield to Senators who I think represent the minority point of view in this matter, and that in order to remove some of their fears about the majority not giving them adequate time to express the minority point of view, I am willing that they be given greater protection.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does not the Senator think it is somewhat unfair to denounce those of us who oppose the imposition of cloture or gag rule by a mere majority, while at the same time seeking to preserve, with the protection of a necessary two-thirds vote, the rule which he insists should be written?

Mr. MORSE. No; I do not think there is anything unfair about it. On the other hand, I think I am clearly demonstrating great fairness in trying to answer the argument of the minority that if my so-called simple majority rule is adopted for limiting debate, at some subsequent time the majority may try to take away from the minority the 96 hours of debate assured them under my rule.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does not the Senator think that he should be a little more tolerant of the views of those who are seeking to protect themselves by a two-thirds rule, inasmuch as he himself is seeking to protect his provision by a two-thirds requirement that he proposes to write into the rule?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia is mistaken if he thinks I am trying to protect my provision by a two-thirds rule. I want my provision as is; but many of the Senators on the minority side of this question have argued that my provision may, some time in future, be changed to provide for cloture by a simple majority vote so as to deny the minority a reasonable time to debate. Unless the Senator from Georgia wishes to take the position that after cloture is invoked 96 hours is not adequate time in which to debate the merits of the issue—and, of course, those 96 hours would come after all the time that would be available prior to the invoking of cloture—I see nothing at all unreasonable about my offer of compromise.

I hasten to add that I do not prefer the compromise; however, I offer it in good faith only to assure those of the minority that I am willing to work out any conscionable proposal which will accomplish what I think is fundamental, namely, a basic rule which provides cloture may be applied by a majority vote and that after cloture is applied or invoked the minority shall be given 96 hours in which to debate the merits of their position.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield for a further question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it is impossible to carry on this discussion in the form of a question and really express my views, so I shall desist.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to point out that throughout this debate I have not heard any mention of the rules of debate which prevail in legislative bodies generally in this country. Of course, the rules of other legislative bodies are not controlling in regard to our decision; I am perfectly aware of the fact that in a great many respects the Congress of the United States, which is created by the Federal Constitution, and is a part of a Federal Government of delegated powers, is quite a different legislative body from the legislatures of the States; but I am also aware of the fact that the legislative bodies of the States and the Congress of the United States have many similarities, many points in common. I think they certainly have one great common denominator, which is a general recognition on the part of the people of the country that legislative bodies, representing the people of the country either on a Federal level or on a State level, ought to carry out the people's will by way of a majority principle.

So I thought it would be rather interesting to find out what are the rules in the various State legislatures in regard to limitations upon debate, and to see whether, when I propose in the Senate of the United States the adoption of a majority-vote principle, I have proposed a parliamentary monstrosity which endangers the very foundation of our form of government. As I have listened to some of my friends of the opposition during this debate, I sometimes have asked myself the question, "What is it that you are proposing that is so terrible, so threatening to the perpetuation of democratic forms in this country?" Then I have reflected for a moment, and I have recognized that all I am offering is to put into practice a parliamentary procedure that is common throughout the Nation in the various State legislatures; and then I have felt a little better about it, because even momentarily I do not like to entertain the suspicion of a fear that I am proposing something that is revolutionary, as has been said by implication here on the floor of the Senate, in its effect on our great freedoms and liberties, as guaranteed by the Constitution, which I am just as desirous of defending as is any member of the opposition.

So I requested the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to prepare for me a study of the practices which prevail in the various States. I wish to read a few excerpts from those findings. I am satisfied—having checked them by a sampling process—that it is a very fine piece of research work which has been submitted to us, and I wish to give the entire Senate the benefit of the information set forth in the study.

The study shows that—

Examination of the rules of procedure in effect in the several State legislatures indicates that four major approaches are followed in an effort to limit debates. These are: (1) limitation on the number of times a member may speak to any single question; (2) limitation on the length of time a member may speak; (3) use of the previous-question motion to cut off debate; and (4) special forms of cloture.

Now let us see very briefly what is the general finding in regard to each one of these methods of limiting debate:

1. Limitation on number of times a member may speak: With but isolated exceptions, the rules of State senates and houses of representatives alike limit the number of times any member may speak on a single question at a single stage in procedure. The number specified is commonly twice, with a proviso that a member may not even speak the second time until all who desire to speak once have done so. Exceptions are, however, commonly made in favor of committee chairman, bill sponsors, etc.

2. Duration of normally permitted debate: About half of the legislative chambers go further and specify that, at least on a given day or at a given stage in procedure, a member may not speak in excess of a limited period of time without unanimous consent or other permission. Periods as short as 5 to 10 minutes are found (Oklahoma House and Senate respectively); a 30-minute limitation is common; while 1 hour (Alabama Senate and Arizona House); and 2-hour specifications (South Carolina and Colorado Senates) are also found. In some instances there are ever more restrictive time limits in force for debate on special subjects, e. g., questions of privilege.

Mr. President, what about the technique by way of moving the previous question: We find that—

Most State legislatures specifically permit use of the motion for the previous question as a device for cutting off debate, and word their rules so as to facilitate its use. Only two legislative chambers (the Senates of Utah and Vermont) are known to forbid the motion.

4. Other forms of cloture: In view of the frequency of provisions of the above types, it is obvious that the State legislatures do not have any great need for other forms of cloture. The following are some examples of those special cloture rules known to exist.

Mr. President, without taking time to read it, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire memorandum inserted at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIMITATION OF DEBATE IN STATE LEGISLATURES

Examination of the rules of procedure in effect in the several State legislatures indicates that four major approaches are followed in an effort to limit debate. These are: (1) limitation on the number of times a member may speak to any single question; (2) limitation on the length of time a member may speak; (3) use of the previous-question motion to cut off debate; and (4) special forms of cloture.

1. Limitation on number of times a member may speak: With but isolated exceptions, the rules of State senates and houses of representatives alike limit the number of times any member may speak on a single question at a single stage in procedure. The number specified is commonly twice, with a proviso that a member may not even speak the second time until all who desire to speak once have done so. Exceptions are, however, commonly made in favor of committee chairmen, bill sponsors, etc.

2. Duration of normally permitted debate: About half of the legislative chambers go further and specify that, at least on a given day or at a given stage in procedure, a member may not speak in excess of a limited period of time without unanimous consent or other permission. Periods as short as 5 to 10 minutes are found (Oklahoma house and senate respectively); a 30-minute limitation is common; while one-hour (Alabama senate and Arizona house) and two-hour specifications (South Carolina and Colorado senates) are also found. In some instances there are even more restrictive time limits in force for debate on special subjects, e. g. questions of privilege.

3. Previous question: Most State legislatures specifically permit use of the motion for the previous question as a device for cutting off debate, and word their rules so as to facilitate its use. Only two legislative chambers (the senates of Utah and Vermont) are known to forbid the motion.

4. Other forms of cloture: In view of the frequency of provisions of the above types it is obvious that the State legislatures do not have any great need for other forms of cloture. The following are some examples of those special cloture rules known to exist.

New York Senate, rule XIV, section 1, paragraphs 3 and 4:

"When any bill, resolution or motion shall have been under consideration for 2 hours, it shall be in order for any senator to move to close debate, and the president shall recognize the senator who wishes to make such motion. Such motion shall not be amendable or debatable and shall be immediately put, and if it shall receive the affirmative vote of a majority of the senators present, the pending measure shall take precedence over all other business.

"The vote shall thereupon be taken upon such bill, resolution or motion with such amendments as may be pending at the time of such motion, according to the rules of the senate, but without further debate, except that any senator who may desire to do so shall be permitted to speak thereon not more than once and not exceeding 5 minutes; upon the roll call any senator may speak not to exceed 5 minutes in explanation of his vote." (New Mexico Senate has a variant of this applicable after 6 hours with 30 minutes allowed subsequently.)

Alabama Senate, rule 34:

"The committee on rules may at any time report a special rule that debate on a pending measure shall cease at a certain hour, and a vote be taken on the measure. The consideration of such special rule shall not exceed 30 minutes, when a vote shall be taken thereon."

Indiana Senate, rule 51, paragraph 2:

"The senate at any time, by resolution adopted by a majority of the senators-elect, may further limit the time of debate." (E. g., shorten normal half-hour allowed each member.)

Louisiana Senate, rule 9, second paragraph:

"The Senate may at any time, by a majority vote, limit debate so that no senator shall be permitted to speak longer than 1 hour at one time without permission of the senate, and a motion to that effect shall be in order at any time, taking precedence over every other motion, except a motion to adjourn." (Par. 1 prohibits a member from speaking more than twice to any question without permission of the senate.)

Massachusetts Senate, rule 47:

"Debate may be closed at any time not less than 1 hour from the adoption of a motion to that effect. On this motion not more than 10 minutes shall be allowed for debate, and no member shall speak more than 3 minutes." (Motion has high priority under rule 46.)

Colorado Senate, rule X, paragraph 2:

"Debate may be closed at any time not less than 1 hour from the adoption of a motion

to that effect, and upon a majority vote of the members-elect an hour may be fixed for a vote upon the pending measure. On either of these motions not more than 10 minutes shall be allowed for debate, and no Senator shall speak more than 3 minutes; and no other motion shall be entertained until the motion to close debate, or to fix an hour for the vote on the pending question, shall have been determined."

Rhode Island Senate rule 23, is the most comprehensive existing, to our knowledge, and is quoted below:

"When any bill, resolution or motion shall have been under consideration for 2 hours it shall be in order for any senator to move to close debate, and the president shall immediately recognize the senator who wishes to make such motion. Such motion shall not be amendable or debatable and shall be immediately put. The motion to close debate may be moved and ordered upon a single motion, or an amendment or amendments, or may be made to embrace all pending amendments and include the bill, resolution, or motion to its passage or rejection. If such motion to close debate shall receive the affirmative votes of a majority of the senators present, a vote without further debate shall thereupon be taken upon such bill, resolution, or motion, provided that any senator who desires so to do shall be permitted to speak thereon not more than once and not exceeding 5 minutes, and provided further that one motion to adjourn shall be in order before such vote is taken. Should said motion to adjourn be carried, the measure under consideration shall be the unfinished business of the senate until disposed of. All incidental questions of order pending at the time of such motion to close debate is made, and on such questions arising after a motion to close debate has been made and before the final vote has been taken on the matter or matters to which the motion to close debate shall have been directed whether the same be an appeal or otherwise, shall be decided without debate."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a tabulation of the rules of the various State legislatures in respect to the following points: The number of times a member may speak without leave; the duration of permitted remarks; the motion for previous question authorized; and other cloture rules. This tabulation is complete, and I ask consent to have it incorporated at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	Number of times member may speak without leave [1]		Duration of permitted remarks [2]		Motion for previous question authorized? [3]		Other cloture rules (for text of statute)	
	Senate	House	Senate	House	Senate	House	Senate	House
Alabama	2	2	1 hour	10 minutes		Yes	Rule 34	
Arizona		[4] 2		1 hour [5]	Yes	Yes		Rule 9 (9).
Arkansas	1	1	1 hour [5]	1 hour [5]	Yes	Yes	Rule 4	Rule 15.
California	[4] 2	[7] 1		5 minutes	Yes	Yes		
Colorado	[7] 2	1	2 hours [8]	10 minutes [8]		Yes	Rule 10 (2)	
Connecticut	2	2				Yes		
Delaware	[7] 2	2				Yes		
Florida	[4] 2	[4] 2	30 minutes	30 minutes [9]		Yes		
Georgia	[4] 2	[4] 2	30 minutes	1 hour [4]	Yes	Yes		
Idaho	[7] 2	[4] 2		1 hour	Yes	Yes		
Illinois	[4] 2	1	15 minutes	30 minutes	Yes	Yes		
Indiana	1	[4] 2	30 minutes [5]		Yes	Yes	Rule 15 (2)	
Iowa		[4] 1		(10)	Yes	Yes		
Kansas	[7] 2	1			Yes	Yes		
Kentucky	(6)	[4] 2	1 hour [8]	30 minutes [8]	Yes	Yes		Rule 12.
Louisiana	2	[4] 2		30 minutes	Yes	Yes	Rule 9	
Maine	[11] 3	2				Yes		
Maryland	(4, 12)	[4] 2				Yes		
Massachusetts	(6)	(6)				Yes	Rule 47	Rule 53.
Michigan	[7] 2	1			Yes	Yes		
Minnesota	[7] 2	[4] 2	(13)		Yes	Yes		
Mississippi	[4] 2	(6)	5–20 minutes [14]	5–10 minutes [15]	Yes	Yes	Rule [16]	
Missouri	1	[4] 2		15 minutes [12]	Yes	Yes		
Montana	[7] 2	1		30 minutes [4]	Yes	Yes		
Nebraska	[7] 2				Yes	Yes		
Nevada	[4] [7] 2	[4] 2			Yes	Yes		
New Hampshire	[7] 2	[4] 2			Yes	Yes		
New Jersey	3	2		5–15 minutes [4, 17]		Yes		
New Mexico	[4] [7] 2	[4, 7]	(18)		Yes	Yes	Rule 65	Rule 78.
New York	[7] 2	2		15 minutes [4]		Yes	Rule 14 (3) (4)	
North Carolina	[7] 2	[19] 2	30 minutes [7]	10–30 minutes [11]	Yes	Yes		Rule 19.
North Dakota	[4] 2	[4] 2	5–10 minutes [20]	5–10 minutes [20]	Yes	Yes		
Ohio	2	[4] 2	20 minutes [7]	20 minutes [7]	Yes	Yes		
Oklahoma	[4, 21] 2	[4] 2	5–10 minutes [21]	5 minutes	Yes	Yes		Rules 36, 37.
Oregon	2	[4] 2	(22)		Yes	Yes		
Pennsylvania	2	2			Yes	Yes	Rule 9	
Rhode Island	[4] 2	[4] 2			Yes	Yes	Rule 21	Rule 21.
South Carolina	[7] 2	[4] 2	2 hours [7]			Yes	Rule 14	
South Dakota	[4] 2	[4] 2	10 minutes	10 minutes	Yes	Yes		
Tennessee	[4] 2		10–20 minutes [23]	10–15 minutes [23]	Yes	Yes		
Texas	[4] 2	[4] 2		10 minutes [11]	Yes	Yes		

[1] These are the general provisions as to the number of times a member may speak on a given issue. Where 2 is the rule, it is commonly stated that no member may speak his second time until all desiring to speak once have done so. Special provisos are often made, but not listed here, for committee chairmen, bill sponsors, movers of the question, etc. Moreover, special allowances are usually found for committee of the whole and certain types of business.

[2] These are the general provisions as to the length of debate. Special limits sometimes exist for particular classes of members or types of business.

[3] Frequently accompanied by special provisions tending toward an immediate vote.

[4] No member may speak more than once on a question until every other member desiring to be heard has spoken.

[5] In the aggregate on any question.

[6] Unnumbered rule on previous question, sec. 2.

[7] In any one day on the same question.

[8] During the last 25 days of the session members shall not speak longer than 10 minutes at any one time.

[9] Members may speak only once without leave, and may not speak more than twice to a question until every member desiring to speak has spoken.

[10] When bills are being considered prior to their last reading, debate thereon is limited to 10 minutes to each member.

[11] No senator may speak more than once to the exclusion of others, if objection is made without leave.

[12] Except by unanimous consent.

[13] In discussing any resolution, senators are limited to 5 minutes each.

[14] 20 minutes is allowed a member to speak to the main question, and 5 minutes on a subsidiary question; when the time of a senator is extended by leave of the senate, it must be for a specific period.

[15] No member may ordinarily speak more than 10 minutes on any main question, or 5 minutes on an amendment, without leave.

[16] Rule on Motions and Amendments in listing the precedence of motions (preceding Rule 64) lists the motion to close debate at a specific time.

[17] No member shall speak on any question longer than 15 minutes the first time or 5 minutes the second time, without leave.

[18] During the last 3 days of the session no member may speak longer than 10 minutes on any one question.

[19] Except by consent of two-thirds of the members present.

[20] No member may speak more than once on amendments or certain motions.

[21] No member may speak on a question longer than 20 minutes for the first speech and 15 minutes for the second speech, without leave; nor may he speak longer than 10 minutes on an amendment or certain motions.

[22] No member may speak to a question longer than 10 minutes the first time or 5 minutes the second time, except by unanimous consent.

[23] Members may speak only once to an amendment to a question or a substitute question.

[24] No member may consume more than 10 minutes in debate on a question without the unanimous consent of the senate; and he may consume only 5 minutes when considering bills on general order, without such consent.

[25] During the last 10 days of the session, no member except the author of a bill shall be permitted to speak on its final passage for longer than 5 minutes, but members may waive their time in favor of another member; during those 10 days no member may speak on a motion or resolution longer than 3 minutes.

[26] No member may speak to a question longer than 20 minutes in the first speech and 10 minutes in the second.

[27] No member may speak to a question longer than 15 minutes in the first speech and 10 minutes in the second.

[28] The house by vote may extend the time allowed for only 10 minutes; but during the last 10 days of a regular session and the last 5 days of a special session the extension may be for 5 minutes only, and such extension requires unanimous consent.

	Number of times member may speak without leave		Duration of permitted remarks		Motion for previous question authorized?		Other cloture rules (for text of statute)	
	Senate	House	Senate	House	Senate	House	Senate	House
Utah	[6] 2	[7] 2			Prohibited	Yes		Rule 29.
Vermont	[4] 2	[4] 2			Prohibited			
Virginia	[4] 2	[4] 2			Yes	Yes		
Washington	[6] 2	[8] 2		10 minutes [9]	Yes	Yes		
West Virginia	[4] 2	[4] 2			Yes	Yes		Rule 38.
Wisconsin	[4] 2	[4] 2			Yes	Yes		
Wyoming	[7] 2	[6] 2	(10)		Yes	Yes		

[4] No member may speak more than once on a question until every other member desiring to be heard has spoken.

[5] In the aggregate on any question.

[7] In any one day on the same question.

[10] After the first 50 days of the session no member shall ordinarily speak more than once to the same question, without leave, or longer than 3 minutes.

[9] Any member is limited in debate on bills on third reading or amendments thereto to speaking not more than twice on the bill or on any one amendment, and may consume not more than 5 minutes each time he speaks.

Alabama Senate Rule 34: "The Committee on Rules may at any time report a special rule that debate on a pending measure shall cease at a certain hour, and a vote be taken on the measure. The consideration of such special rule shall not exceed 30 minutes, when a vote shall be taken thereon."

Arizona House Rule IX, par. 9: "There shall be no debate at the third reading of a bill except by a two-thirds vote of all members elected to the House."

Arkansas Senate Unnumbered Rule on Previous Question, sec. 2: "The previous question is the only motion used for closing debate in the Senate itself except the motion to immediately consider * * *."

Arkansas House Rule XV, sec 2: "The previous question is the only motion used for closing debate in the House itself except the motion to immediately consider * * *."

Colorado Senate Rule X, par. 2: "Debate may be closed at any time not less than one hour from the adoption of a motion to that effect, and upon a majority vote of the members-elect an hour may be fixed for a vote upon the pending measure. On either of these motions not more than ten minutes shall be allowed for debate, and no Senator shall speak more than three minutes; and no other motion shall be entertained until the motion to close debate, or to fix an hour for the vote on the pending question, shall have been determined."

Indiana Senate Rule 51: "Second.— * * * The Senate at any time, by resolution adopted by a majority of the Senators-elect, may further limit the time of debate."

Kentucky House Rule 12: "A motion to limit debate being moved and seconded, the question from the Chair shall be, 'Shall debate be limited?' A majority of the members present may limit debate to the time specified in the motion at any time. The Speaker shall proportion the time each member may speak under the motion to limit debate."

Louisiana Senate Rule 9: "* * * The Senate may at any time, by a majority vote, limit debate so that no Senator shall be permitted to speak longer than one hour at one time without permission of the Senate, and a motion to that effect shall be in order at any time, taking precedence over every other motion, except a motion to adjourn."

Massachusetts Senate Rule 47: "Debate may be closed at any time not less than one hour from the adoption of a motion to that effect. On this motion not more than ten minutes shall be allowed for debate, and no member shall speak more than three minutes."

Massachusetts House Rule 55: "Debate may be closed at any time not less than thirty minutes from the adoption of a motion to that effect. In case the time is extended by unanimous consent, the same rule shall apply at the end of the extended time as at the time originally fixed."

Mississippi Senate unnumbered rule: "Chamber provides for a motion to close debate but rule gives no details."

New Mexico Senate Rule 65: "When any bill, resolution or motion shall have been under consideration for six hours, it shall be in order for any Senator to move to close the debate, and the President shall recognize the Senator who wishes to make such motion. Such motion shall not be amendable or debatable and shall be immediately put, and if it shall receive affirmative votes of a majority of the Senators present, the pending measure shall take precedence over all other business. The vote shall thereupon be taken upon such bill, motion or resolution, with such amendments as may be pending at the time of such motion, according to the rules of the Senate, but without further debate, except that any Senator who may desire so to do shall be permitted to speak thereon not more than once and not exceeding one-half hour. After such motion to close debate has been made by any Senator no other motion shall be in order until such motion has been voted upon by the Senate. After the Senate shall have adopted the motion to close debate, as hereinbefore provided, no motion shall be in order but one motion to adjourn and a motion to commit. Should said motion to adjourn be carried, the measure under consideration shall be the pending question when the Senate shall again convene, and shall be taken up at the point where it was at the time of such adjournment. The motion to close debate may be ordered upon a single motion, a series of motions allowable under the rules, or an amendment or amendments, or may be made to embrace all authorized motions or amendments and include the bill, resolution or motion to its passage or rejection. All incidental questions of order, or motions pending at the time such motion is made to close debate, whether the same be on appeal or otherwise, shall be decided without debate. Provided, however, that debate upon contested election cases shall be limited to sixty minutes. Upon such question no Senator shall consume more than three minutes in debate thereof and no Senator shall speak more than once."

New Mexico House Rule 78: "When any bill, resolution or motion shall have been under consideration for three hours it shall be in order for any member to move to close debate, and the Speaker shall recognize the member who wishes to make such motion. Such motion shall not be amendable or debatable and shall be immediately put, and if it shall receive the affirmative votes of a majority of the members present, the pending measure shall take precedence over all other business. The vote shall thereupon be taken upon such bill, motion or resolution, with such amendments as may be pending at the time of such debate. After such motion to close debate has been made by any member no other motion shall be in order until such motion has been voted upon by the House. After the House shall have adopted the motion to close debate, as hereinbefore provided, no motion shall be in order but one motion to adjourn and a motion to recommit. The motion to close debate may be ordered upon a single motion, a series of motions allowable under the rules, or may be made to embrace all authorized motions or amendments and include the bill, resolution or motion to its passage or rejection. All incidental questions or orders, or motions pending at the time such a motion is made to close debate, whether the same be an appeal or otherwise, shall be decided without debate."

New York Senate Rule 14, secs. 3 and 4:

"SEC. 3. When any bill, resolution or motion shall have been under consideration for two hours, it shall be in order for any Senator to move to close debate, and the President shall recognize the Senator who wishes to make such motion. Such motion shall not be amendable or debatable and shall be immediately put, and if it shall receive the affirmative vote of a majority of the Senators present, the pending measure shall take precedence over all other business.

"SEC. 4. The vote shall thereupon be taken upon such bill, resolution or motion with such amendments as may be pending at the time of such motion, according to the Rules of the Senate, but without further debate, except that any Senator who may desire so to do shall be permitted to speak thereon not more than once and not exceeding five minutes; upon the roll call any Senator may speak not to exceed five minutes in explanation of his vote. After such motion to close debate has been made by any Senator, no other motion shall be in order until such motion has been voted upon by the Senate. After the Senate shall have adopted the motion to close debate, as hereinbefore provided, no motion shall be in order but one motion to adjourn or for a call of the Senate by the Temporary President, and a motion to commit. Should said motion to adjourn be carried, the measure under consideration shall be the pending question when the Senate shall again convene, and shall be taken up at the point where it was at the time of such adjournment. The motion to close debate may be ordered upon a single motion, a series of motions allowable under the rules, or an amendment or amendments, or may be made to embrace all authorized motions or amendments, and include the bill, resolution or motion to its passage or rejection. All incidental questions of order or motions pending at the time such motion is made to close debate, whether the same be on appeal or otherwise, shall be decided without debate."

North Carolina House Rule 19: "No member shall speak more than twice on the main question, nor longer than thirty minutes for the first speech and fifteen minutes for the second speech, unless allowed to do so by the affirmative vote of a majority of the members present; nor shall he speak more than once upon an amendment or motion to commit or postpone, and then not longer than ten minutes. But the House may, by consent of a majority, suspend the operations of this rule during any debate on any particular question before the House, or the Committee on Rules may bring in a special rule that shall be applicable to the debate on any bill."

Oklahoma House Rules 36 and 37: "These rules give each side 30 minutes in the aggregate to debate on final passage of a bill; provided, that when a bill or resolution carries an emergency section such section shall constitute a separate question, to be debatable for an aggregate of ten minutes, five minutes to be allotted each side. When there is a majority and minority committee report, five minutes is allotted each side for debate on the question of receiving the majority or minority report."

Pennsylvania Senate Rule 9: This rule lists a motion to limit or extend the limits on debate, but the rule gives no details.

Rhode Island Senate Rule 23: "When any bill, resolution, or motion shall have been under consideration for two hours it shall be in order for any senator to move to close debate, and the president shall immediately recognize the senator who wishes to make such motion. Such motion shall not be amendable or debatable and shall be immediately put. The motion to close debate may be moved and ordered upon a single motion, or an amendment or amendments, or may be made to embrace all pending amendments and include the bill, resolution, or motion to its passage or rejection. If such motion to close debate shall receive the affirmative votes of a majority of the senators present, a vote without further debate shall thereupon be taken upon such bill, resolution or motion, with such amendments as may be pending at the time of such motion, provided that any senator who desires so to do shall be permitted to speak thereon not more than once and not exceeding five minutes, and provided further that one motion to adjourn shall be in order before such vote is taken. Should said motion to adjourn be carried, the measure under consideration shall be the unfinished business of the senate until disposed of. All incidental questions of order pending at the time of such motion to close debate is made, and on such questions arising after a motion to close debate has been made and before the final vote has been taken on the matter or matters to which the motion to close debate shall have been directed whether the same be an appeal or otherwise shall be decided without debate."

Rhode Island House Rule 21: This rule provides for a motion to fix a time for closing debate, but the rule gives no details.

South Carolina Senate Rule 14: "* * * the debate on any question and the time when such question shall be voted upon may be fixed by a vote of two-thirds of the Senate; and the debate on the question of fixing such time shall be limited within the discretion of the chair; and such motions shall have precedence of [other designated] motions * * *."

Utah House Rule 29: This rule provides for a motion to limit debate, but the rule gives no details.

West Virginia House Rule 38: "* * * The House by majority vote may limit debate on any question."

LIMITATIONS ON DEBATE ADOPTED BY THE SENATE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the course of debate it has been stated in effect that opponents of either my cloture rule or the proposed Hayden rule sometimes say one of the great traditions of the Senate is that it has carried on its proceedings for more than a century and a half without any effective limitation upon debate, so why change now? I should like to read now a memorandum showing that the Senate rules provided for a motion for the previous question during the first 17 years of its existence, and that a dozen other limitations upon debate have been adopted by the Senate over the passing years. Rather than take the time to read it, because I have talked longer than I intended, I ask unanimous consent to have the memorandum entitled "Limitations on Debate Adopted by the Senate in the Past" inserted in the RECORD at this point, in rebuttal of the argument that we have gone along for 150 years without any rules or limitation of debate, so why adopt one now?

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIMITATIONS ON DEBATE ADOPTED BY THE SENATE IN THE PAST

1. From 1789 to 1806 the Senate rules provided for a previous question motion which, if adopted by majority vote, had the effect of ending debate and bringing a question to a vote.

2. Since 1846 the Senate has frequently adopted unanimous-consent agreements which are a species of cloture.

3. During the Civil War debate in secret session on matters relating to the rebellion was limited by rule to 5 minutes by any Member and was confined to the subject matter.

4. In 1868 the Senate adopted a rule providing that motions to take up or proceed to the consideration of any question should be determined without debate.

5. In 1870 the Senate adopted the Anthony rule limiting debate on the call of the calendar to one 5-minute speech per Senator on any question. The Anthony rule was made a standing rule in 1880. (Rule VIII.)

6. During the 1870's Senate debate on appropriation bills was limited by the 5-minute rule.

7. In 1881 the Senate agreed, for the remainder of the session, to limit debate to 15 minutes on a motion to consider a bill or resolution, no Senator to speak more than once or for longer than 5 minutes.

8. In 1884 the Senate amended its rules to provide that all motions made before 2 o'clock to proceed to the consideration of any matter shall be determined without debate. (Rule VIII.)

9. In 1884 the Senate amended its tenth rule so as to provide that all motions to change the order of precedence on special orders, or to proceed to the consideration of other business, should be decided without debate.

10. In 1884 the Senate provided by rule that motions to lay before the Senate any bill or other matter sent to the Senate by the President or the House of Representatives should be determined without debate. (Rule VII, 7.)

11. In 1908 it was decided that Senators could, by enforcement of the rules, be restrained from speaking on the same subject more than twice in the same legislative day.

12. In 1917 the Senate adopted its present cloture rule. (Rule XXII.)

13. In 1939 and 1945 the Senate passed executive reorganization acts containing an antifilibuster rule.

Mr. MORSE. The memorandum will show that such a generalization as the one advanced by those who have made the argument I am attempting to rebut is not sound. It will also show the matter of limitation of debate has been one of frequent discussion in the Senate. It has in recent years been successfully defeated so far as changing the existing rule is concerned, by way of the filibuster technique itself. Thus we are confronted with the paradoxical situation that in order to eliminate the filibuster technique from the Senate we first have to defeat a filibuster. I do not know how many times the Senate is going to be willing to surrender in the face of that intimidation. I can merely go on hoping, as I said earlier in my remarks, that the happy day will come and come soon when both the Republican and Democratic parties in the Senate will awaken to the fact—and I believe it to be a fact—that the great majority of the American people want us to end the filibustering technique in the Senate by the adoption of a rule that will successfully banish it from the Senate.

There was another very able speech made during the course of the debate which I want to answer very briefly. I refer to the speech by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. He made his speech on March 1, 1949. The Senator challenged the proponents of the Hayden resolution to show how the American people have ever been harmed by the filibuster. I have already had inserted in the RECORD a list of the filibusters, as set forth in the corrected copy of the Galloway report, and I say one need only read that list and take into account the implications of the legislation filibustered to recognize that the public interest did suffer and has suffered as the result of many filibusters in the Senate. I would answer him further that the public interest has suffered, the rights of millions of fellow Americans have suffered, because the filibuster technique has made it possible to date to prevent the passage of civil-rights legislation, for example.

Of course the Senator from Mississippi does not agree with me on the merits of civil-rights legislation. But the fact that he does not agree with me on civil-rights legislation does not make his argument a sound one when he says, "Wherein has the public interest suffered as a result of the filibuster technique?" It has suffered not only in respect to civil-rights legislation but it has suffered in my judgment because of the many compromises, as I stated earlier in my remarks this afternoon, which frequently have to be made in committee before we can even get legislation to the floor of the Senate, under a threat that if we do not yield to minority demands the bill will be talked to death on the floor of the Senate. That is a terrible cost to have to pay for minority rule in the Senate.

The public interest has suffered also, as is evident from a statement of the legislation involved in bills held up by filibusters, as set forth in the Galloway Report, because of the compromise changes that had to be made before the legislation was subsequently passed. The argument has been made in the course of the debate that eventually the legislation was passed. But the proponents of that argument do not tell us in what form it was finally passed. In many instances it was passed in compromised form, compromises having been forced by the threat of filibuster. That is rule by intimidation, not by majority vote. That is rule by legislative blackmail, not by democratic processes.

Let us not forget that over the years of the history of the filibuster there is a filibuster on bill X or issue X, and a whole series of bills behind it never get to a vote in that session because of the delay caused by the filibuster. That is a tremendous loss to the public. The record will show that in many instances many appropriation bills were lost. Is it any answer when the Senator from Mississippi says, "But eventually the bills were passed, eventually the appropriations were made?" I say that is no answer at all. How much of a loss is it to the people of the United States to have postponed for 1 or 2 or 3 years a very important appropriation for some great public development that ought to have been passed at the very time a filibuster backlogged it and prevented it from getting to the floor of the Senate for passage?

If we want to add up the great cost to the people of the United States caused merely by delay alone to bills which were held up and never got to the floor of the Senate for a vote because another bill was filibustered, the delay cost alone would be a complete answer to the Senator from Mississippi, who says, "In what way has the public interest suffered from filibustering practices in the Senate?" I answer, in a multitude of ways, at terrific cost to the public welfare; and we ought to end it. The more quickly we end it, the better for the people of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a table entitled "Citations to Later Action on Filibustered Bills."

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Citations to later action on filibuster bills

Bills	Year of filibuster	Citations to later acts on same subjects
River and harbor bill.	1901	32 Stat. 331, June 13, 1902.
Do	1903	33 Stat. 1117, Mar. 3, 1905.
Do	1914	38 Stat. 1049, Mar. 4, 1915.
Colombian Treaty	1903	33 Stat. 2234, Feb. 23, 1904.
Canadian reciprocity.	1911	37 Stat. 4, July 26, 1911.
Arizona-New Mexico statehood.	1911	37 Stat. 39, Aug. 21, 1911.
Ship-purchase bill	1915	39 Stat. 728, Sept. 7, 1916.
Mineral lands leasing bill.	1919	41 Stat. 437, Feb. 25, 1920.
Migratory-bird conservation.	1926	45 Stat. 1222, Feb. 18, 1926.
Colorado River bill	1927	45 Stat. 1011, May 29, 1928.
Do	1928	45 Stat. 1057, Dec. 21, 1928.
Emergency officers' retirement.	1927	45 Stat. 735, May 24, 1928.
Washington public buildings bill.	1927	45 Stat. 51, Jan. 13, 1928.
Oil-industry investigation.	1931	49 Stat. 30, Feb. 22, 1935.
Work relief bill, prevailing wage amendment.	1935	49 Stat. 1608, June 22, 1936.
Flood-control bill	1935	49 Stat. 1570, June 22, 1936.
Coal-conservation bill.	1936	50 Stat. 72, Apr. 26, 1937.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall refer again to the argument of my good friend from Mississippi. And let me say that when I use the words "good friend" it is not simply a matter of formality, with me. I mean it when I refer in my speeches to the Members of the oppositions as friends or as able and distinguished Senators from their States. I want to say, and I am only sorry that he is not on the floor at this time, that I not only consider the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] a good friend, but I consider him one of the finest men, in the dictionary sense of the word "finest," that it has ever been my pleasure to know as intimately as I have come to know the Senator from Mississippi. I think his sitting in the Senate of the United States is a great honor to the State of Mississippi and a great honor to the Senate. But he and

I simply disagree fundamentally on the question of whether the rules of the Senate should be so changed as to prevent the technique of filibuster on the floor of the Senate. I am sorry to be in disagreement with a friend for whom I have such an affectionate regard as I have for the Senator from Mississippi, but I cannot accept the conclusions he has reached in the course of the debate in regard to the effects, which he thinks do not endanger the public welfare, of the filibuster technique in the Senate.

The Senator says:

Whence comes the demand for the alteration of the present rule?

I will tell him whence it comes. It comes from millions of American citizens; it comes from millions of voters who believe that the present cloture rule of the Senate does not permit the transaction of the people's business in accordance with democratic procedures which the people at least thought should prevail in the Senate of the United States. That is where it comes from, Mr. President. It comes from such organizations as the National Committee for Strengthening Congress.

I offer for the RECORD at this point, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a memorandum which the National Committee for Strengthening Congress published on December 29, 1948.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

National Committee for Strengthening Congress, Inc., Washington, D. C.: Robert Heller, chairman, Robert Heller & Associates, Cleveland; H. Chapman Rose, treasurer and counsel, Jones, Day, Cockley & Reavis, Washington, D. C.; Warren S. Ege, secretary; Winthrop W. Aldrich, chairman of the board, the Chase National Bank of New York; Paul Block, Jr., publisher, the Toledo Blade; Sevellon Brown, publisher, Providence Bulletin and Journal; Louis Brownlow, public administration consultant; Erwin D. Canham, editor, the Christian Science Monitor; James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer, CIO; William L. Chenery, publisher, Collier's; Frederic C. Church, Bolt, Dalton & Church, Boston; Carle C. Conway, chairman of the board, Continental Can Co., Inc.; Brooks Emeny, president, Foreign Policy Association; Mark Ethridge, publisher, Louisville Courier-Journal; Edward P. Farley, chairman of the board of directors, American-Hawaiian Steamship Co.; H. W. Fraser, president, Order of Railway Conductors of America; Paul G. Hoffman, president on leave, the Studebaker Corp.; Nathaniel R. Howard, editor, the Cleveland News; Ernest Kanzler, chairman of the board, Universal C. I. T. Credit Corp.; John D. Kerr, president, American Fruit Growers, Inc.; Allan Kline, president, American Farm Bureau Federation; John Shively Knight, editor, Chicago Daily News; Sigurd S. Larmon, president, Young & Rubicam, Inc.; Murray Lincoln, secretary, Ohio Farm Bureau Federation; Henry R. Luce, editor in chief, Time, Inc.; Rabbi Edgar F. Magnin, Los Angeles; Fowler McCormick, chairman of the board, International Harvester Co.; Thomas A. Morgan, chairman of the board, the Sperry Corp.; Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam; Frederick D. Patterson, president, Tuskegee Institute; James G. Patton, president, National Farmers Union; Eugene C. Pulliam, publisher, Indianapolis Star and the News; Quentin Reynolds, general manager, Eastern States Farmers Exchange, Inc.; Raymond Rubicam, Scottsdale, Ariz.; Beardsley Ruml, chairman of the board, R. H. Macy & Co.; David A. Simmons, lawyer, Houston, Tex.; H. Christian Sonne, president, Amsinck, Sonne & Co.; Miss Anna Lord Strauss, president, National League of Women Voters; Charles M. White, president, Republic Steel Corp.; Charles E. Wilson, president, the General Electric Co.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR STRENGTHENING CONGRESS,
Washington, D. C., December 29, 1948.

The Hon. A. S. MONRONEY,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: With the opening of the Eighty-first Congress we are writing to each Member, as we did on December 30, 1947, again to urge the full enforcement of all the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and to go even further with some changes, the need for which has become progressively more apparent during the last year.

There is threatened the abandonment of the legislative budget. Why retreat now from proper legislative control of expenditures? We strongly urge all Members of the Congress to resist the proposed repeal of the legislative budget provision as threatened by the new chairman of the Appropriations Committee. This provision is designed to put into clear focus an over-all fiscal plan of expenditures and income for the year. It can be made to function properly if the leaders of the revenue-raising committees and the appropriations committees diligently seek to make it effective. The failure of the last two sessions to make this fiscal-control feature work is no excuse for abandoning this provision. It merely seeks to require the revenue-raising committees and the revenue-spending committees to get together and fix their over-all fiscal program at the beginning of the session.

In the past, the target for annual income and annual expenditures has been left to piecemeal chance without any effort to coordinate total expenditures with revenue. Congress cannot continue to appropriate money without any relationship or responsibility as to income. By making the legislative budget work as planned, the Congress and the country can have a businesslike approach to governmental fiscal affairs. If the February 15 date is too early for formulating a real legislative budget, then the date could be changed to 30 or 60 days later without difficulty.

At this time when the financial resources of our Nation are being stretched to the widest limits in our history, what is more important than the orderly management of the money affairs of the people? Why not have an informed center of financial responsibility in Congress, resting on the majority party so that the executive and legislative branches can adequately work together as was intended by the Constitution?

The Eighty-first Congress has an unparalleled opportunity to abolish fiscal anarchy in the legislative branch for the following reasons:

1. The standing committees have been reduced to a workable number.

2. One party is in control of the executive and legislative branches of the Government.

3. The reports of the nonpartisan Commission on Organization of the executive branch of the Government will be available early in January.

Beyond the provisions of the act, the performance by Congress of its legislative, supervisory, and representative functions could be improved in many ways. Many Members of Congress believe and have told us that steps should be taken to strengthen party government in, and democratize the procedures of, our national legislature.

We appeal to your sense of practical expediency—to every Member of Congress who wants his and its work done well. How can you possibly accomplish your great tasks without adjusting your machinery promptly?

Four great dangers now confront the efficient functioning of the Eighty-first Congress:

1. Filibusters in the Senate.
2. Blockades in the House Rules Committee.
3. Hostile coalitions on the floor.
4. Converting professional committee staffs into patronage positions.

As to filibusters in the Senate, the existing cloture rule (Senate Rule 22) which requires a two-thirds vote of those present to close debate, has failed to prevent successful filibustering.

What could be more undemocratic than permitting a minority to impose its will on the majority? Can the Senate afford during these critical times to block the road needlessly for much-needed legislation?

The intention of the majority of the Eightieth Congress was so plainly thwarted by filibuster threats of the minority party in its final days that maximum popular attention was called to the majority party's inability to formulate and control its legislative program. Adopted in 1917, this rule has been successfully invoked only 4 out of 19 times, the last time being in 1927. We urge immediate action to eliminate the filibuster in the Senate. We recognize and defend the right to full and adequate debate, but to so abuse this privilege with the filibuster makes the world's greatest deliberative body appear ridiculous to the Nation and the world.

Changes in the Senate rules to insure full debate yet forestall filibuster through applying the cloture rule are vital if the Senate is to continue to function without blockade to orderly legislative processes. We agree with those Senators who want to apply cloture by a majority vote instead of a two-thirds vote to end a filibuster. Such a change must protect the right of any Senator to be heard for adequate discussion or debate on any matters germane to the subject but must provide for ending a filibuster by majority rule. To be effective this must apply to such obstruction whether taken on legislation or at other points in the Senate's procedures to prevent dilatory tactics.

House rules must be changed to eliminate the veto power of the Rules Committee over other standing and coequal committees. In theory the Rules Committee is traffic director on the legislative highway, determining the order of business on the floor of the House. In practice it has become an obstruction to orderly traffic. It frequently usurps the functions of the regular legislative committees of the House by holding hearings on, and reviewing the merits of, bills that have already been carefully studied by the proper legislative committees. The practice of using this veto to force other committees to the will of the Rules Committee effectively thwarts the will of the majority. It has been proven that this cumbersome and abortive method can be effective only in extreme and exceptional instances. After a regular standing committee has conducted hearings often for months on important legislation, the Rules Committee should not have the absolute and unquestioned right to decide in one afternoon that it will not permit the House membership to express themselves on the bill.

1. We suggest that the House rules be changed to require the Rules Committee to report any legislation approved and submitted to them by a standing committee. The Rules Committee would be required to report to the House with the recommendation that the House:

(a) Grant a rule for immediate consideration of the legislation; or

(b) That no rule for consideration be granted.

Thus the Rules Committee could still serve to function as a traffic director of legislation to the floor of the House; but the House membership as a whole could override the Rules Committee by majority vote in case the Members disagreed with the Rules Committee's adverse report.

2. We oppose the granting of closed rules by the Rules Committee since they prevent effective legislative consideration and amendment from the House membership. In such exceptional cases where closed rules might be required we feel that a two-thirds vote should be required to grant a closed rule. The same provision should apply to the waiving of points of order by the Rules Committee since this waiver also suspends the House rules and should require a two-thirds majority. Closed rules effectively suspend the ordinary rules of the House and therefore the two-thirds requirement for suspension of the rules should also apply to the granting of a closed rule.

The danger of hostile coalitions on the floor can be met by strengthening party government in Congress, as follows:

1. The appointment of majority and minority policy committees in the House and Senate, these committees to include the chairmen of all standing committees so that there would be a complete synthesis of each House, and in turn chaired by the party leader in each House. These committees are not to be confused with the present committees in the Senate which are nothing more than steering committees and which do not include the chairmen of all the standing committees. The center of responsibility on both parties should be complete, formalized, and definitized.

2. Give the party leadership responsibility and power to select the chairmen of the standing committees instead of relying upon the seniority system; that is, permitting the committee on committees of the majority party in each Chamber, or the majority floor leaders, to select the committee chairmen.

Only the bonds of tradition and convention prevent the abolishment of the seniority system. Can Congress afford to retain this system when it should have a sensible plan for advancement of able people on the committees? Seniority provides advancement only by retirement, defeat, or death.

The two-party system is the only way for us to run our democracy. It is the motive power which makes the wheels of Congress go round. Party accountability and responsibility should be sharpened and strengthened. A favorable climate for this growth can be achieved by changing the machinery of Congress.

The House should follow the lead of the Senate, whose Committee on Executive Expenditures has studied ways and means of implementing and improving the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. We recommend that the Committee on Executive Expenditures of the House appoint a subcommittee for this purpose. We believe it has already been too long delayed.

One of the great achievements of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 was the provision for professional staffing of standing committees on a permanent basis without regard to political affiliations and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the office. The staff members were to be considered permanent employees of the Congress and should not be dismissed for political reasons.

During the second session of the Eightieth Congress the standing and special committees of the Senate had 120 professional employees, and those in the House had 174. While some appointments may have been strictly political and while some professional staff members may have engaged in work other than committee business, contrary to section 202 (a) of the act, it would, we believe, be a regressive step to convert these staff jobs into patronage plums. We recommend a realistic staffing of committees with capable people from both parties in conformity with our two-party system.

We have a single objective and that is to be of help to you people in Congress. Many of us first became acquainted with Congressional problems of organization and procedure in 1944. We again offer to you our experience for what it may be worth.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT HELLER,
Chairman.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I call attention to some of the sponsors of this organization, so that the Senator from Mississippi can judge for himself whether they represent responsible, patriotic, Constitution-loving American citizens.

Winthrop W. Aldrich, Paul Block, Jr., Louis Brownlow, Erwin D. Canham, James B. Carey, Edward P. Farley, H. W. Fraser, Paul G. Hoffman, Nathaniel R. Howard, Henry R. Luce, Thomas A. Morgan, James G. Patton, Beardsley Ruml.

I am skipping as I go down the list. They will all show in the RECORD.

Miss Anna Lord Strauss; Charles E. Wilson.

It is such citizens, Mr. President, by the thousands, yes, by the millions, who think that something should be done to change the rules of the Senate so that the technique of the filibuster can be driven once and for all from the floor of the Senate.

That is my answer, on that point, to the Senator from Mississippi.

At another point in his remarks the Senator said:

The Senate is the last major forum in the world where any group, however small, can seek and secure protection.

Mr. President, can the colored people of the South seek and secure protection in the Senate of the United States with respect to the passage of civil-rights legislation? I do not think so. I do not believe they will get such protection until we shall be able to modify our rules so that the majority-vote principle will prevail, and we can pass legislation free from the blockade of a minority that says, "We will not let you get to a vote."

At another point in the debate a statement was made, I think by my good friend the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], to which I desire to refer. I may say in passing that all I have said about the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] with respect to the high regard in which I hold him, I say with equal affection in regard to the junior Senator from Georgia. But here, again, on this point, he and I disagree. At one time in the debate he challenged, as I read the record, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] to name some prominent Democrats who ever favored cloture. There were many Democratic Senators who signed the cloture petition on November 13, 1919, to close debate on the reservations to the Versailles Treaty, among whom were Senators McKellar, Harrison, Hitchcock, Robinson, Shepard, Swanson, Underwood, Walsh, and others.

I may say further to my good friend from Georgia that if he will go back to March 8, 1917, when cloture was first adopted, he will find all the Southern Democratic Senators who were present on that day voting for it. He will find Senator Vardaman, of Mississippi, saying on that date, as I have previously stated here today, that he favored a majority rule. In effect, he said, "Yes; the filibuster has protected the South," but, nevertheless, he felt that the majority-vote principle ought to be adopted. There were distinguished statesmen from the South in years gone by who favored cloture.

Mr. President, by way of summary I desire to emphasize the points in regard to my own resolution. To me it is a very simple issue: We either favor making it possible to act by a majority in the Senate of the United States, or we favor permitting a minority to block the will of the majority. We either believe the people of the United States want our representative form of government to function on the basis of majority rule, or we believe that the people of the United States favor minority blockage of their will.

I submit that the objective evidence clearly supports the conclusion that the American people want majority rule in the Senate of the United States. I submit, Mr. President, that, taking the country as a whole, when the present President of the United States took the issue to the people in the last campaign, it is a fair conclusion, by and large, that the people supported his position in regard to majority rule.

As I have said heretofore on the floor of the Senate in respect to another issue, I recognize that I cannot in all honesty say that there has been any mandate on this subject to date. We have to judge as we read or take the public pulse what public sentiment is, but I am firmly of the opinion, based upon my observation and from my talks with thousands of them that the American people by and large are sick and tired of the retention of the filibuster technique in the Senate. I am satisfied that the great majority of the American people are applauding Harry Truman today because of his great courage in saying to Congress and to the people of this country, "Yes, I favor majority rule and the majority rule principle in respect to cloture in the Senate."

Mr. President, I close with the same premise with which I started my speech; I am very proud to stand here today helping Harry Truman fight his battle for majority rule in the Senate. I am saddened and deeply regret that I do not have a whole army of Democrats behind me in backing up the President of the United States. I am sorry the majority leader and the democratic whip have left me on this issue. But I think they will come back, perhaps not at this session of Congress, but as the President takes this issue to the people, as I hope he will, and as other men who hold firm convictions about the importance of preserving majority rule if we are to preserve democratic government itself take

their position to the people of this country. The time will come, and I think in the not too distant future, when there will be a sufficient number of men, either those now serving in the Senate who will have changed their thinking on this point, or new men who will be elected by the people who will have the point of view of majority rule, to accomplish what I think we should accomplish now, namely, the adoption of Senate Resolution 12 rather than Senate Resolution 15, the resolution which would give us a cloture rule based upon the majority-vote principle.

THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT—FULTON LEWIS, JR., POLL

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, ever since final enactment, in the first session of the Eightieth Congress, of the 1947 Labor-Management Relations Act, commonly known as the Taft-Hartley Act, that law has been the subject of one of the greatest controversies in the labor-management history of our country. It was subjected not only to criticism, but to actual abuse, even before the statute had had opportunity to be tested. Certain labor leaders labeled it "slave labor," "vicious," and "un-American."

Proponents of the act were not as vociferous in their defense of the act as had been its opponents. Apparently they were content to give the act a fair test, and have been content with the results of its operation.

In the 1948 preelection campaign, certain groups sought to make the Taft-Hartley Act a labor issue. Certain labor leaders now call the result of the 1948 Presidential election a mandate to the present administration to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act and reenact the Wagner Act. This the administration now proposes to do, and legislation for that objective is now before the Members of the United States Senate.

That the election results were not considered by a vast segment of the American people as a mandate to repeal the most beneficial legislation ever enacted in behalf of working men and women, and management as well, is indicated by the avalanche of replies to the questionnaire broadcast by Fulton Lewis, Jr., a well-known radio commentator. Mr. Lewis submitted 19 questions over the air in two successive broadcasts. As a result of those broadcasts, the office of practically every Member of Congress has been deluged with replies to the questions, indicating an overwhelming demand that the Taft-Hartley Act be retained.

The replies, according to an analysis I have made of those received by me, represent the thinking of a cross section of the people in my State. They come from members of labor organizations, from businessmen, from housewives, from farmers, from white-collar workers, and professional men and women.

May I presume, Mr. President, briefly on the time of the Senate to read some extracts from letters accompanying the replies. Here is one from a constituent in Indianapolis:

I believe in unions. I am not an employer of labor, but on the other side; but I believe in the welfare of our country.

From another letter:

I strictly favor this law as it gives the employees freedom and privileges heretofore denied them.

From Gary, Ind., well known as a great industrial center, comes this statement:

From what I can see and hear, labor relations are in much better shape now and more stable under Taft-Hartley than they ever were under the Wagner Act. Labor union bosses are hell bent to get their old czaristic powers back but the laborer, the man who is "just a member of the labor union" seems to be relieved to get out from under the tyranny of his bosses.

From Indianapolis—from a white collar worker:

I am not one of Mr. Jacobs' illiterates, but a white collar worker.

From another letter I read this:

From August 1913 until Nov. 1, 1920, I was a member of the A. F. of L., belonging to the stenographer and bookkeepers union, and was employed by the president of the International Typographical Union. During that time I learned much in regard to the methods used by officials of local unions, which were in their infancy then compared to the methods used today, and I am confident that a labor law containing the principles brought forth in the questionnaire and answered as follows will be free of any hardships or injustices to the membership of any union organization, and will be a boon to the entire public.

In the replies, many of the correspondents pointed out particularly that they were members of CIO or A. F. of L. labor organizations.

I have refrained from using the names of these correspondents because, I do not want reprisals against these good union men and women.

Mr. President, I submit herewith an analysis of the first 750 replies I have received from Mr. Lewis' questionnaire and ask consent to have it inserted in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FULTON LEWIS, JR., QUESTIONNAIRE

(Percentages are those of the first replies received; figures in parentheses are the actual replies received)

1. Do you believe that the law should preserve the worker's right to strike? Yes, 80.8 percent (660); no, 19.2 percent (90).

2. In the case of a strike that would cause a national emergency, endangering the health and safety of the Nation—should the President be empowered to get a court injunction to delay such a strike? Yes, 95 percent (713); no, 5 percent (37).

3. When two or more unions are fighting each other, over who is to do a job or who is to represent the workers, and a strike is called to get for one union the work or the recognition—that is a jurisdictional strike. Should the law prohibit strikes of that kind? Yes, 94 percent (705); no, 6 percent (45).

4. When a union is engaged in a labor dispute with an employer, and seeks to coerce that employer, indirectly, or by interfering with the business of other companies where there is no dispute between the management and the workers, but which merely do business with the employer who is being struck—that is a secondary boycott. Do you believe the law should prohibit such boycotts? Yes, 98 percent (735); no, 2 percent (15).

5. Should the law forbid management to deduct union dues and assessments from the worker's pay envelope, except when the worker gives his personal O. K.? Yes, 77 percent (577); no, 23 percent (173).

6. Do you believe the law should require both unions and management to bargain in good faith? Yes, 99 percent (742); no, 1 percent (8).

7. Should the law guarantee to management and workers alike, the freedom to express their respective points of view on labor-management problems, provided there are no promises of bribes, or threats or reprisals—direct or implied? Yes, 99 percent (742); No, 1 percent (8).

8. Should the law protect the worker against unfair practices by unions or by management? Yes, 99 percent (742); No, 1 percent (8).

9. Do you believe the law should require union officials and company officials alike, to swear that they are not Communists, or Fascists, or members of any group which advocates the overthrow of the United States Government by force and violence? Yes, 99 percent (742); No, 7 percent (8).

10. Should the law require unions to make financial reports to members and to Government, just as companies are required to make the same reports to stockholders and the Government? Yes, 100 percent (748).

11. Should the law require that a collective-bargaining contract must be honored by both parties? And that each party has an equal right to sue the other party, for breaking the contract? Yes, 100 percent (749).

12. When a union requires an employer to pay money for work that has not been done, and will not be done, that is called "featherbedding." Do you believe the law should forbid "featherbedding?" Yes, 98.4 percent (738); No, 1.6 percent (12).

13. When a union, by contract or otherwise, requires an employer to hire only members of that Union—that is a closed shop. Do you believe the law should permit such a closed shop? Yes, 56.7 percent (425); No, 43.3 percent (325).

14. Do you believe it should be unlawful for a worker to be prevented from performing his job, by the use of violence, force, or intimidation? Yes, 74.3 percent (557); no, 25.7 percent (193).

15. Do you believe that foremen and supervisors, who have a divided responsibility to management which hires them and to the workers under them should be permitted to have unions of their own? Yes, 38.8 percent (291); no, 61.2 percent (459).

16. Do you believe the law should guarantee to every worker the right to join or not to join a union—to remain or not to remain a member—just as the individual worker wishes? Yes, 97 percent (727); no, 3 percent (23).

17. Do you believe that unions and employers alike, can now so affect the public interest for good or ill, that the law should state, as a matter of national policy, that the relationships of each with the other shall be regulated equally by law? Yes, 89 percent (667); no, 11 percent (83).

18. Suppose that an economic strike—one that does not involve any unfair labor practices—is under way, and a given striker has been replaced by a new worker, in his job. An election is held to decide what union, if any, is to present the workers if and when the strike has finally been settled. Should the law permit this worker, who is out on strike, to vote in that election? Yes, 24 percent (180); no, 76 percent (570).

19. Should the law place unions under the same prohibition against political activity or making political contributions in election campaigns, that applies to corporations? Yes, 94 percent, (705); no, 6 percent (45).

MILITARY TRIALS—PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a petition for writ of habeas corpus filed in the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Willis M. Everett, Jr., on behalf of Valentin Bersin et al., before the Supreme Court.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

(Willis M. Everett, Jr., on behalf of Valentin Bersin et al., petitioner, versus Harry S. Truman, Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States, and James V. Forrestal, Secretary of Defense of the United States, and Kenneth C. Royall, Secretary of the Army of the United States, and General Omar N. Bradley, Chief of Staff of the Army of the United States, and Thomas C. Clark, Attorney General of the United States, respondents.)

To the Honorable Fred M. Vinson, Chief Justice of said Court and the Honorable Associate Justices thereof:

This petition of Willis M. Everett, Jr., on behalf of Valentin Bersin, Friedel Bode, Willi Braun, Kurt Briesemeister, Willi Von Chamier, Friedrich Christ, Roman Clotten, Manfred Coblenz, Josef Diefenthal, Josef (Sepp) Dietrich, Fritz Eckmann, Arndt Fischer, Georg Fleps, Heinz Friedrichs, Fritz Gebauer, Heinz Gerhard Godicke, Ernst Goldschmidt, Hans Gruhle, Max Hammerer, Armin Hecht, Willi Heinz Hendel, Hans Hennecke, Hans Hillig, Heinz Hofmann, Joachim Hofman, Hubert Huber, Siegfried Jakel, Banom Junker, Friedel Kies, Gustav Knittel, Georg Kotzur, Fritz Kraemer, Werner Kuhn, Oskar Klingelhoefer, Erich Maute, Arnold Mikolaschek, Anton Motzheim, Erich Munkemer, Gustav Neve, Paul Hermann Ochmann, Joachim Peiper, Hans Pletz, Georg Preuss, Hermann Priess, Fritz Rau, Theo Rauh, Heinz Rehagel, Rolf Roland Reiser, Wolfgang Richter, Max Rieder, Rolf Ritzer, Axel Rodenburg, Erich Rumpf, Willi Schaefer, Rudolf Schwambach, Kurt Sickel, Oswald Siegmund, Franz Sievers, Hans Siptrett, Gustav Adolph Sprenger, Werner Sternebeck, Heinz Stickel, Herbert Stock, Erwin Szyperski, Edmund Tomczak, Heinz Tomhardt, August Tonk, Hans Trettin, Johann Wasenberger, Gunther Weiss, Erich Werner, Otto Wichmann, and Paul Zwigart, most respectfully shows unto this honorable Court as follows:

1

That petitioner, Willis M. Everett, Jr., is an attorney and counsellor at law of Atlanta, Ga., but from September 1, 1940, to June 15, 1947, was an officer in the United States Army. In May 1946 while serving under the commanding general, United States Forces, European theater, your petitioner was directed by him to serve as chief defense counsel for each of the above-named parties who will hereinafter be referred to as parties plaintiff or accused. Petitioner is unable to secure the verification by individuals named as plaintiffs due to the lack of time and the facts hereinafter set forth. Petitioner has continued to act as chief defense counsel for plaintiffs herein and they have full knowledge, coupled with a request, that this petition is being brought by petitioner on their behalf to this honorable Court.

2

That each plaintiff named herein was an enemy soldier who unconditionally surrendered to the Army of the United States of America. Further, each plaintiff is a citizen and national of Germany. Each plaintiff is presently unjustly and unlawfully detained and imprisoned at a United States Army penitentiary, at Landsberg, Germany, or a penitentiary operated under the commanding general, European command, at Landsberg, Germany. Each plaintiff is being illegally restrained thereat as a result of the verdict and sentences of a certain general military government court at Dachau, Germany, on July 16, 1946.

3

The respondent, Harry S. Truman, is Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States of America. In his capacity as Commander in Chief he has custody and control of each plaintiff herein.

4

The respondent, James V. Forrestal, is the Secretary to the President of the United States of America in charge of all defense, including the Department of the Army, who also has custody and control of each plaintiff herein.

5

The respondent, Kenneth C. Royall, is the Secretary of the Army under the Secretary of Defense and is directly responsible for the Department of the Army. In his capacity he has custody and control of each plaintiff herein.

6

The respondent, Gen. Omar N. Bradley, is the Chief of Staff of the Army, Department of the Army, who was selected by the President of the United States, and has supervision of all troops of the line and in this capacity has custody and control of each plaintiff herein.

7

The respondent, Thomas C. Clark, is the Attorney General of the United States of America and in his capacity as Attorney General is the chief prosecutor for the United States of America and the proper person upon whom service shall be perfected under existing laws.

8

Petitioner alleges with certainty that the trial before the General Military Government Court at Dachau, Germany, hereinafter referred to as the war crimes trial or Malmedy trial, was utterly void because of the facts hereinafter set out and especially for the reasons that:

(a) No defense was possible due to the short period of time, less than 2 weeks, to prepare the defense for the 74 accused, and

(b) The unfamiliar and arduous task of communicating through inexperienced interpreters as well as a lack of assigned stenographers and interpreters so hampered the defense staff that it was not even physically possible to interrogate all of the accused, much less plan a defense, prior to the forced commencement of the trial, and

(c) The entire plan of this forced trial was calculated to make the whole defense impossible by not allowing time to procure and interview witnesses.

Upon assignment as chief defense counsel petitioner was assured by various responsible officers of the United States Army that these 74 accused would be given a fair trial, but the entire trial was totally lacking in due process as known in the courts of the United States of America, Great Britain, France, Italy, Belgium, Netherlands, and other nations.

9

Plaintiffs were of varying ranks from generaloborst (general) to sturmann (private) with varying length of service in the German Army but each plaintiff was in the German Army until the Commanding General, United States Forces, European Theater did, on or about May 9, 1946, purportedly discharge all of plaintiffs from the German Army, thus attempting to end their prisoner of war status. Copy of said original carrier note requesting and confirming such discharge is hereto attached, marked "Exhibit A" and made a part of this petition.

10

Plaintiffs were, under the Geneva Convention, prisoners of war after surrender and apprehension by the United States Army until they were discharged as aforesaid. However, their status probably changed to that of an accused war criminal on April 11, 1946, when they were first served with notice that they were being charged with war crimes. Copy of said charge sheet, less the German translation, is hereto attached, marked "Exhibit B," and made a part of this petition.

11

Plaintiffs had been illegally and forcefully incarcerated in Schwabisch Hall, Germany, a German penitentiary the equivalent of one of our United States Federal penitentiaries and used by the United States Army as an interrogation prison for varying lengths of time but generally in excess of 10 months prior to being served with charges of war crimes as set forth in paragraph 10 above. There were approximately 500 other German soldiers, suspected war criminals, also confined thereat. With few exceptions, each was placed in solitary confinement throughout this period. That the said Schwabisch Hall was exclusively under the control of and used by the United States Army for all suspects in the Malmedy case. One Lt. Col. Burton F. Ellis, JAGD, United States Army, was the senior officer thereat and responsible for the abuse and mistreatment of plaintiffs herein at said penitentiary.

12

The forced and illegal detention of plaintiffs as aforesaid was in violation of the Geneva Convention which provides that prisoners of war must be humanely treated and protected, particularly against acts of violence and insults. They should be equally treated. No coercion may be used on them to secure information, and under no circumstances will they be threatened, insulted, or exposed to unpleasant or disadvantageous treatment of any kind whatever. They are entitled to have their honor and person respected. They must have sanitation, open air, and exercise. Under all circumstances, prisoners of war are subject to the laws in force of the detaining power. Attention is invited to exhibit C.

13

As illustrative of these violations of international agreements, the American prosecution team in Schwabisch Hall, Germany, would place a helmet hood completely over the head of individual plaintiffs herein, then usually a beating would be administered, after which they would be forced into a completely dark cell which was their trial room. The hood was removed and each plaintiff would see before him a long table, draped with black cloth touching the floor, with candles burning at both ends of the table and a crucifix in the center. Sitting behind this table were varying numbers of American civilians, members of the prosecution team, who were wearing illegally the uniform and rank of United States Army officers. A mock defense counsel, usually an officer of the United States Army on the prosecution team, was furnished these youthful German soldiers, who, although he was not an attorney, held himself out to the plaintiffs herein as their defense counsel. They were informed or led to believe that they were being tried by the Americans for violations of international law. At the other end of the table would be the prosecutor, who would read the charges, yell, and scream at these 18- and 20-year-old plaintiffs and attempt to force confessions from them. If this method of threats failed to force desired false confessions from these plaintiffs, the mock trials would proceed by bringing in

one false witness after another against them, "proving" beyond a doubt by falsehoods that these plaintiffs were guilty of many war crimes. During the entire mock trials these purported defense counsels were making a sham and pretext of defending them. At the end of these illegal trials conducted in the name of the United States of America, these gulleful defense attorneys would pretend to make a plea to this purported Army court for mercy. Upon conclusion, these sham courts would render death penalties within 24 to 48 hours by hanging. Thereupon said false defense attorney would express his sympathy, stating that he had done the best he could for these various plaintiffs. After these mock trials, the pretended defense attorney would attempt to, and was in a majority of instances successful in coercing these plaintiffs to sign false and void confessions, admitting any and all charges brought against them, because, as this false defense counsel would in effect say, "You will be hanged in 24 hours, anyway, so why not absolve someone else by taking the blame and writing out this confession I will dictate to you?" Many variations and modifications were made in the conducting of these mock trials which appeared entirely regular to these plaintiffs, as they were devoid of any knowledge of the American Army courts-martial system or war-crimes trials. There were 74 defendants, and there were 74 prosecution-dictated statements. All of the above described acts, deceits, and chicanery of American justice were performed by United States civilians, under Army jurisdiction, and by officers of the United States Army or executed under their immediate supervision and control.

14

As further illustrative of the violations of said international agreements and treaties, many plaintiffs herein at various times were deprived of food for days, all blankets were withdrawn in the middle of winter, many were given severe and frequent beatings and other corporal punishment, many were forced into what was called the death cell for days and weeks, others were given promises of immunity or light sentences if they would sign confessions implicating others, and endless tricks, ruses and so-called stratagem, all performed by these United States civilian employees of the Army or officers or enlisted men in the United States Army, or under their direct supervision, instruction, or acquiescence. Said group of American investigators or a majority of them subsequently became the prosecution team in said Malmedy trial.

15

As illustrative of promises of immunity or hope of reward, various behooded plaintiffs herein would be conducted to a room, then allowed to look out of a window where unknown persons were playing volley ball and similar games, at which time some American member of the prosecution team would urge plaintiffs to sign a confession, stating that they were not interested in punishing them, but were trying to convict their high-ranking officers, and if they would sign these dictated confessions implicating their officers they would be released within a few months and be out playing games with those other boys. Various plaintiffs herein would be assured and promised by the Americans that if they assumed full and complete responsibility for all the acts or alleged crimes committed by the soldiers under them and signed these prosecution-dictated statements or confessions, then the prosecution would not prefer any charges against members of their command.

16

As illustrative of the cruel torture and inhumane treatment of these plaintiffs as well as others in Schwabisch Hall, Germany, while prisoners of war, reference is made to the introduction into evidence of an unsigned statement by Arvid Freimuth, a young German soldier who had been through the various tricks, ruses and stratagem administered by the American prosecution which ended in one of those fateful mock trials. Lt. William R. Perl, an officer of the United States Army, had purportedly defended this youth. He was dictating to Freimuth one of those forced confessions in March 1946. Only 16 pages had been written by this boy and due to the lateness of the hour the completion was delayed until the next day. His death would not occur until then, according to the fake verdict of this false American military court. He was forced to write lies about his comrades in arms pointing to their guilt in crimes never committed. About 2 o'clock in the morning other prisoners heard him crying out in his cell, "I cannot utter another lie," or words to that effect. The body of that 20-year-old German youth was found dead hanging from his prison cell in Schwabisch Hall, Germany, when the guard opened the door a few hours later. The American prosecution was not satisfied with having the blood of this youth on their hands. During the real Malmedy trial the prosecution, over the objection of the defense staff, introduced this unsigned and unfinished statement in evidence against other plaintiffs herein, all with the approval and favorable ruling of the law member of the court. It was then that the American prosecution commenced asking this Lieutenant Perl, under oath, what this dead German youth would have said in his statement if he had lived. This incident is illustrative of the total lack of justice both pretrial and during trial.

17

In furtherance of illustrations wherein violations of international law were carried out by the United States Army investigation team or prosecution, while holding plaintiffs in solitary confinement in Schwabisch Hall, Germany, the investigators would forge the names of certain of plaintiffs' superior officers to confessions or statements, which would completely detail and point out the purported guilt of another accused. Then they would confront these young German soldiers with one or more of these forged statements and induce them to sign confessions to acts never committed by them. Many of plaintiffs herein while in Schwabisch Hall, Germany, would be hooded and taken to the death chamber and there unhooded and shown bullet holes in the wall where gruesome human flesh and hair would be imbedded from one of their "latest executions." By this method the American prosecution would force confessions of crimes never committed. On other occasions various hooded plaintiffs herein would be taken to the hangman's room and there unhooded, placed on a high stool and a hangman's rope placed around their necks. It was then that various plaintiffs herein would, upon belief that they would be hanged forthwith, sign directed statements not only admitting their own guilt of crimes never committed, but implicating other plaintiffs herein of crimes they had committed, which in truth had never been committed.

At the conclusion of many of these mock trials where other ruses had failed, the United States prosecution team would suggest and allow these youthful plaintiffs to write farewell letters to their parents before they would be hanged, which was in furtherance of the duress, scheming, and conniving of the Americans. Also the American prosecution would offer the privilege of seeing a priest in order to secure the "ministration of a Catholic priest before death." The American prosecutors would make many threats of violence and torture directed toward the mothers, fathers, sisters, wives, and children of various accused unless they signed complete confessions of acts and deeds never committed by them, and acts and deeds of other accused never witnessed by them.

18

One favorite ruse of the United States prosecution team in Schwabisch Hall, Germany, was to place plaintiffs in solitary confinement upon first being captured. Those German youths had no knowledge of why they were placed in this penitentiary. For weeks and months they would stay in the same cell without seeing a single person, not allowed to receive or write even a letter to their parents or wives, and not allowed to read anything. Then a stool pigeon would be placed in the same cell who was another German soldier. This youthful plaintiff was anxious to know what it was all about. This prosecution stool pigeon would relate an imaginary story of how he had just been tried by the American Army for shooting many Belgian civilians and maybe a few American soldiers. The stool pigeon would go into much detail about his own trial and then conclude with how light the verdict had been because he had cooperated, admitted everything whether true or not, and had written exactly what the American had dictated. Although he, the stool pigeon, had admitted many murders he had received only 1, 2, or 3 years' confinement for all that he had done. It was only a few days thereafter until that German lad would be hooded and brought before one of these mock trials with the hope and expectation of a light sentence such as the stool pigeon had described if he would sign an American prosecution-dictated statement.

19

All of the foregoing illustrations of violations of international laws, or practically all, were laughingly or jokingly admitted by the American prosecution team during their presentation of their case in the Malmedy trial or on direct examination of the witnesses. At this point these questions strongly suggest themselves: What did the American defense do about these forced confessions at the real Malmedy trial? Why were these confessions admitted as evidence and in many cases constituted the sole and only evidence against certain of these plaintiffs? Attached here, marked "Exhibit C," and made a part of this petition, is a copy of motion to withdraw confessions or statements of accused, which was properly presented and pleaded at the Malmedy trial, but this motion was promptly denied by the ruling of the law member of the court.

20

The question of jurisdiction of the General Military Government Court of the United States of America at Camp Dachau, Germany, is specifically raised because all of the crimes alleged to have been committed occurred within the sovereign state of Belgium and the situs of the crimes lay entirely outside the American occupation zone of Germany. The claim as to jurisdiction by the United States Army was by virtue of the physical custody of plaintiffs herein. Generally speaking, international law has repeatedly ruled that a person must be tried before the forum where the crime was committed. These principles were recognized in the Moscow declaration, the Potsdam declaration, and the London Conference. Reference is made to the Moscow declaration of October 30, 1943, which was entered into by Great Britain, the United States, and the Soviet Republic. The pertinent portion of said agreement touching on the subject presented to this honorable court is herewith quoted:

"German war criminals whose deeds can be localized will be sent back to those countries in which their abominable deeds were done in order that they may be punished

according to the laws of those liberated countries."

Again in the Potsdam declaration of August 2, 1944, entered into at Cecilienhof, near Potsdam, by the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Republic, the following is provided under article VII, which reads:

"The three Governments have taken note of the discussions which have been proceeding in recent weeks in London between the British, United States, Soviet, and French representatives, with a view to reaching an agreement on methods of trial of those major war criminals whose crimes under the Moscow declaration of October 1943 have no particular geographical allocalization. The three Governments affirm their intention to bring those criminals to swift and sure justice. They hope that the negotiations in London will result in a speedy agreement being reached for this purpose and they regard it as a matter of great importance that the trial of those major war criminals should begin at the earliest possible date. The first list of defendants will be published before September 1."

This London agreement entered into by the United States, Great Britain, the Soviet Republic, and the provisional government of the French Republic on August 8, 1945, provided as follows:

"Whereas the United States have from time to time made declarations of their intention that war criminals shall be brought to justice and whereas the Moscow declaration of October 30, 1943, on German atrocities in occupied Europe stated that those German officers and men and members of the Nazi Party who have been responsible for or who have taken a consenting part in the atrocities and crimes, will be sent back to the countries in which their abominable deeds were done in order that they may be judged and punished by the laws of those liberated countries and the free government that will be created therein, and whereas this declaration was stated to be without prejudice to the case of major criminals whose offenses have no particular geographical location and who will be punished by the joint decision of the governments of the Allies."

This London agreement went on to establish the International Military Tribunal to be held at Nuremberg, Germany, for the trial of war criminals whose offenses have no particular location. Article IV of this London agreement further provides:

"Nothing in this agreement shall prejudice the provisions established by the Moscow declaration concerning the return of war criminals to the countries where they committed their crimes."

A Central Control Council was instituted for the establishment of a military government in Germany by the four powers (United States, Great Britain, Soviet Republic, and the Provisional French Republic) and to each was allocated a zone of occupation, wherein each power was to establish its own military government. In the United States zone of occupation the military governor was and is the commanding general of the United States forces, European theater. Gneral McNarney, the then commanding general aforesaid, did on January 12, 1946, issue a directive as an amendment to the previous directive dated July 7, 1945, subject "Administration of Military Government in United States Zone in Germany," which embodied Control Council Law No. 10 and reads as follows:

"Article I, Control Council Law No. 10, provides: 'The Moscow declaration of October 30, 1943, concerning responsibility of Hitlerites for committed atrocities and the London agreement of October 8, 1945, concerning prosecution and punishment of major war criminals of the European Axis are made integral parts of the law'."

The military governor was without authority to alter or change the Moscow Declaration, the Potsdam Declaration, or the London agreement. His own orders authorizing the court and requiring officers under his command to act as judges of plaintiffs herein and to direct the prosecutor to draw charges and prepare for their trial was in violation of and inconsistent with his own directive.

21

Petitioner shows that the detention, confinement and restraint of liberty of plaintiffs herein is unlawful and without authority in law in that:

(a) The general military court which tried plaintiffs herein was unlawfully constituted and the individual members or a majority of them were not lawfully appointed to such purported general military court, and said war crimes trial and the proceedings thereof were void ab initio.

(b) On May 10, 1946, the commanding general, Third United States Army, did attempt to appoint to such court eight officers by Special Orders No. 117, and that six of such officers at the time of such purported appointment were not attached to, or under the command of the appointing authority, and that said appointing authority had no command over or authority to control or right to appoint these six officers to said purported general military court.

(c) Further that said six officers, Colonels Berry, Watkins, Raymond, Steward, Conder, and Rosenfeld, were not even subsequently transferred or assigned to said Third United States Army, thereby placing them under the control and authority of said commanding general.

Petitioner thus charges that by virtue of the above orders all members of the purported court with the exception of Brig. Gen. Josiah T. Dalbey and Col. Paul H. Weiland were not subject to the command of the appointing authority, had never been assigned or transferred to the command of the appointing authority, and the appointing authority had no authority in law to appoint said officers with the exception of General Dalbey and Colonel Weiland to the purported court, and therefore the court had no jurisdiction whatsoever over any of the 73 plaintiffs herein or the subject matter thereof, and that the proceedings, trial, and subsequent verdict were void ab initio. Attached hereto and marked exhibit "D" is copy of the Third United States Army order which is made part of this petition.

22

Petitioner shows that only six counsel were assigned him immediately prior to the commencement of this Malmedy trial and several of said attorneys were not adept, experienced, or skilled in defending criminal cases. Petitioner shows that less than 2 weeks' time was allowed by the United States Army to prepare the defense for 74 defendants in the case. At first the chief prosecutor, Lieutenant Colonel Ellis, even refused to turn over these forced confessions to the defense for inspection. Petitioner shows that three meetings of all the plaintiffs herein on different days were required, with their own officers exhorting them to confide in this petitioner and his staff, before it was possible to break down the barrier of mistrust between attorney and client created by the misdeeds of the American prosecution. Each of plaintiffs herein thought this was merely another mock trial. Not even all of the plaintiffs herein could be interviewed prior to the commencement of the Malmedy trial due to lack of interpreters and stenographic help which the United States Army failed to furnish upon repeated requests. Irrespective of many demands of petitioner, as chief defense counsel, insufficient time was given to make any investigation whatsoever prior to the beginning of the trial. Vigorous protests were made to the proper officers of the Third Army and the united forces, European theater, over the lack of time to prepare the defense, the lack of assistants required to make an investigation, and the questionable actions of the chief prosecutor and his staff.

23

As illustrative of the inadequacy of time to properly prepare a defense for the 74 defendants in the Malmedy case and the falsity of the confessions forced from the plaintiffs herein, reference is made to two atrocities alleged to have been committed by certain ones of the plaintiffs. When the prosecution rested its case, a few days were allowed the defense staff to interview witnesses and plan the defense for their 74 defendants. An officer was sent to Belgium and he investigated an incident in Wanne, Belgium, where it was alleged that one of plaintiffs herein had entered the house of a Belgian civilian and without provocation murdered a woman while she was sitting in her chair. This plaintiff in a forced false confession fully admitted the commission of this war crime and four or five of his codefendants swore to the same facts in their forced false confessions and related every detail exactly the same. This defense officer brought back an affidavit by the husband of the purportedly murdered woman to the effect that his wife had been killed during enemy action, but that his wife was standing in the street in front of his home when an American artillery shell exploded and killed her. This statement was properly sworn to before his priest.

The second illustration of the falsity of these forced false confessions relating to alleged atrocities concerned certain incidents within the churchyard at La Gleize, Belgium. Certain ones of plaintiffs herein admitted, in their forced false confessions, placing two or three groups of surrendered American soldiers, numbering 20 to 30, against the inside wall of this churchyard and shooting them down in cold blood with machine guns. The defense investigation developed the fact that there was no inside wall of the churchyard, but merely an outside retaining wall. The priest furnished this defense officer with a sworn affidavit that he was present in the church the entire time of the battle and alleged crimes, that he had examined the outside walls of the churchyard and no sign of any bullet marks were visible, that no such atrocities had ever been committed in the vicinity of his church, and that the only dead Americans he had seen in the town was the body of one in an American tank which was burned beyond recognition, and finally that on the afternoon the crimes were purportedly occurring he had walked along the outside wall and no dead Americans were there. Many more of the plaintiffs herein had corroborated these same detailed purported crimes under oath, but in forced false confessions. No additional time was given the defense staff to investigate each and every charge, although repeated requests were made.

24

On several occasions when witnesses were requested for various plaintiffs herein the members of the American prosecution staff would call them into their office before they could even be interviewed by the defense staff and would threaten them with being made defendants in the Malmedy case if they testified as to any knowledge of certain incidents and thereupon took sworn statements under duress from these witnesses to the effect that they knew nothing. Tampering with witnesses in the Malmedy trial was not an uncommon occurrence on the part of the United States Army prosecution staff.

25

Many witnesses for the prosecution were interviewed by the defense staff after they had testified on the witness stand and several were returned to the stand by the defense who thereby adopted them as their

witnesses. In each case they positively denied any truth in their original testimony and freely admitted perjury, giving as their reason therefor that they had been the victims of force, duress, beatings, and other forms of torture. However, when details of the beatings, etc., were requested, the prosecution would object and the law member of the court would always sustain the objection and prevent the evil and ruthless tactics of the prosecution from being further exposed in open court.

26

As illustrative of violations of the laws of all civilized nations the following is given. The relation of attorney and client is one of universal application. During the presentation of the defense of these plaintiffs, petitioner was in court with all his assistant counsel and all of the defendants, when petitioner noticed Lieutenant Peri slip into the bunker or long cell block where defendants slept. Shortly thereafter he was observed slipping out with an armful of papers. No American was allowed in this building as directed by competent American military authority. Lieutenant Peri then reported to the chief prosecutor, Lieutenant Colonel Ellis, and after a short conference went out of the court room. Within a few minutes petitioner secured the assistance of the officer of the guard who then surprised Lieutenant Peri in the chief prosecutor's office, and he admitted taking the private notes and papers written by the accused to their defense counsel and was translating them in accordance to instruction of Lieutenant Colonel Ellis.

During the course of the said Maimedy trial one or more of the prosecution staff would approach the wives of plaintiffs herein who were attending said trial and falsely represent themselves to be members of the defense staff. While posing as their husband's defense attorney they would attempt to gain further information about any and all privileged communications between husband and wife.

27

In addition to the absolute grounds of total lack of jurisdiction by this alleged court, petitioner has dealt briefly with many details which are recognized as not pertaining exclusively to the subject matter of jurisdiction, but in consideration of the broadened view of recent cases in the United States Supreme Court and Federal courts, it now appears a well-established rule that other matters such as due process may be inquired into by this honorable Court.

28

Petitioner charges that the misconduct of the chief prosecutor in the sanctioning of said acts and many of his staff in the execution of said acts was of such a grave character, both before and during the trial, that it rendered the entire proceedings void. In addition to illustrations hereinabove enumerated, the abusive manner of members of the prosecution staff in the questioning of plaintiffs herein as well as witnesses for the defense in open court was so offensive that it became necessary for the petitioner to call two recesses during the trial and advise all the plaintiffs herein not to take the stand in their own behalf. Finally, early in July 1946, petitioner, as chief defense counsel, announced in open court that he was taking the full responsibility in preventing the remaining defendants from taking the stand in their own behalf and further testifying as to the force, duress, and so-called tricks of the prosecution because the fear of those prosecutors lingers on.

29

Petitioner requested from the United States Army copies of the record of the Maimedy trial held during May, June, and July 1946, but the same was refused. For that reason petitioner is unable to give with certainty exact names, dates, quotations, facts, and places that involve the mass trial of 74 defendants and which covered a period in excess of 2 months. Furthermore, this trial was concluded almost 2 years ago.

30

Petitioner shows that from the best information available, three reviews of said case were made by the Deputy Judge Advocate for War Crimes and one review by the Judge Advocate, European Command, but petitioner has not received any of said reviews. Further, that on or about March 20, 1947, Gen. Lucius D. Clay, Commanding General, European Command, pronounced final judgment on plaintiffs herein. That execution of the death penalties will be carried out on Valentin Bersin, Friedel Bode, Kurt Briesemeister, Friedrich Christ, Josef Diefenthal, Ernst Goldschmidt, Hubert Huber, Paul Herman Ochmann, Joachim Peiper, Georg Preuss, Erich Rumpf, and Paul Zwigart on or about the 20th day of May 1948.

31

Petitioner further shows that much time and effort has been spent following the final verdict in said Maimedy trial pointing out many defects, deficiencies, and incorrect rulings during the course of said trial by preparing a brief based on the record and filing the same with the original record. Copy of said brief is hereto attached and marked "Exhibit E" and made a part of this petition. Due and impartial consideration was not and could not be given to said brief because the appointing authority was directed by the reviewing authority to try these plaintiffs and no latitude or freedom of judicial action could be accorded under such circumstances.

32

Petitioner has just received a petition addressed to this honorable court from Dr. jur. Eugen Leer, a Germany attorney who was an assistant to petitioner during said Maimedy trial. Said petition, it is believed, points out additional facts of other force, duress, cruel and inhuman treatment against certain plaintiffs herein by the American prosecution which was unknown at the time of said trial. Said petition is substantiated by various sworn statements of witnesses as well as medical examiners. Said petition is in German, and your petitioner has no English translation thereof and is unable to present the same either separately or in conjunction with this petition. After translation, permission is requested to amend this petition by adding the same hereto if its contents speak to the issues herein. Said petition is addressed as follows: To: Supreme Court, via chief defense counsel, Col. Willis M. Everett, Connally Building, Atlanta, Ga.

33

That such imprisonment and restraint of plaintiffs is not by virtue of any process issued by a court of the United States, or by a judge or commissioner or other officer thereof in a case where such court, judge, commissioner or officer thereof had, or has acquired, exclusive jurisdiction under the laws of the United States, and

That such imprisonment and restraint is not by virtue of any judgment or decree of a competent tribunal of criminal jurisdiction, nor by virtue of an execution issued upon such judgment or decree, and

That the cause or pretense of such imprisonment and restraint is by virtue of the verdict and sentences of the illegally appointed general military court at Dachau, Germany, on July 16, 1946, and

That there is no judge or officer in Germany or Europe competent to issue or grant a writ of habeas corpus or other legal remedies, and

That none of plaintiffs herein has any funds to defray the expenses in connection with the bringing a writ of habeas corpus in any other court, thereafter perfecting an appeal to this honorable Court, and under existing statutes and the decisions of the Federal courts no alien is permitted to proceed in forma pauperis, and

That the commandant of the Landsberg prison is an officer of the United States Army but is not made a respondent herein because he is not situated within the jurisdiction of this honorable Court and cannot be served with any process of this honorable Court. However, said commandant derives his power from and is subject to the direction and commands of the respondents Harry S. Truman, James V. Forrestal, Kenneth C. Royall, and Gen. Omar N. Bradley, all of whom are located within the jurisdiction of this honorable Court, and

That the facts hereinabove stated are questions of great moment and many difficulties are involved, to such an extent that both the principles of law and facts clearly classify this petition for a writ of habeas corpus as an exceptional matter. The case is therefore one within the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Wherefore petitioner on behalf of plaintiffs named in the opening paragraph of this petition respectfully prays:

1. That a writ of habeas corpus issue directed to Harry S. Truman as Commander in Chief of the armed forces of the United States of America, Washington, D. C.

2. That a writ of habeas corpus issue directed to James V. Forrestal, Secretary of Defense of the United States, Washington, D. C.

3. That a writ of habeas corpus issue directed to Kenneth C. Royall, Secretary of the Army of the United States, Washington, D. C.

4. That a writ of habeas corpus issue directed to Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Chief of Staff of the Army of the United States, Washington, D. C.

5. That service be perfected on Thomas C. Clark, Attorney General of the United States, Washington, D. C.

6. That respondents Harry S. Truman, James V. Forrestal, Kenneth C. Royall and Gen. Omar N. Bradley be directed to withhold instantly any action contemplated in the execution or hanging of any of the plaintiffs herein by the commandant of the Landsberg prison in Germany until further order of this Court.

7. That respondents be required to furnish any necessary copies of the original record and all allied papers, documents, and exhibits to this honorable Court and furnish petitioner with two copies of the original record and all allied papers, which shall include two copies of all reviews made in said Maimedy case.

8. That, after sufficient time has been afforded petitioner to read and study the proceedings of the trial and reviews, petitioner may amend or make additions to this petition to conform to the record if any changes are necessary.

9. That respondents furnish to petitioner any necessary German-English translations of papers and documents received from plaintiffs or their German attorneys in connection with this case.

10. That respondents shall be required to cooperate with petitioner in the taking and securing of any necessary depositions of plaintiffs herein or of witnesses to the extent that the truth may be freely testified to, rather than the fear of prosecution. Also that depositions may be had, where necessary, from members of the prosecution staff; and

11. That respondents shall do what this honorable Court shall order and direct concerning the illegal detention and restraint of plaintiffs herein.

WILLIS M. EVERETT, Jr.,
Petitioner.

(Willis M. Everett, Jr., 402 Connally Building, Atlanta, Ga., attorney for petitioner and plaintiffs; Everett & Everett, attorneys of counsel.)

STATE OF GEORGIA,
County of Fulton, ss:

Personally appeared before me Willis M. Everett, Jr., who, being duly sworn, deposes and says:

1. That affiant is a citizen and resident of the State of Georgia;

2. That affiant is the petitioner named above; and

3. That affiant has read the foregoing petition and knows the contents thereof and that the same are true of my own knowledge except as to the matters therein which are on information and belief, and as to those matters affiant believes them to be true.

4. That affiant has carefully examined the case and has just cause and verily believes that because of poverty, petitioners are unable to pay costs or give security therefor. It is further stated with certainty that no agreement or understanding has been entered into between plaintiffs herein and this affiant for any compensation for the services of affiant and there is no understanding to pay this affiant on the part of anyone whatsoever in or on behalf of plaintiffs herein.

WILLIS M. EVERETT, Jr.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 11th day of May 1948.

[SEAL] MARY EVERETT TOWNSEND,
Notary Public, State of Georgia at Large.

My commission expires April 2, 1950.

EXHIBIT A

Internal route slip, headquarters, U. S. forces, European theater

APRIL 26, 1946

DISCHARGE OF GERMAN PRISONERS OF WAR

No.	From	Pass to	Date	Has this paper been coordinated with all concerned?
1	JA., War Crimes Branch.	G-1, German Affairs Group.	Apr. 26, 1946	1. The Maimedy War Crimes case involving seventy-four (74) members of the German military establishment is scheduled to go to trial at Dachau, Germany, on or about May 2, 1946. 2. In order to preclude the possibility of legal complications arising with respect to the trial of the case, it is desirable that the provisions of "Disbandment Directive No. 8," Headquarters, United States Forces, European Theater, dated February 16, 1946, be carried out at once. It is therefore requested that the perpetrators in this case named in the attached list, now in custody at Dachau, be immediately discharged as prisoners of war and documented as civilian internees. 3. It is requested that this office be advised when documentation as civilian internees has been accomplished. (S) C. B. MICKELWAIT, *Colonel, JAGD,* *Deputy Theater Judge Advocate.* 1 encl., as stated. Telephone Wiesbaden 8707. Forwarded for your immediate action. For the A C of S, G-1: (S) HAL H. COOK, *Lieutenant Colonel, GSC.* 1 encl: n/c (For J. M. Colcman, Lieutenant Colonel, GSC, Chief, German Affairs Branch).
3	TPM USFET	G-1, German Affairs, JA War Crimes Branch (in turn).	May 31, 1946	Documentation as civilian internees as requested in c/n above was completed on May 9, 1946. For and in the absence of the Theater Provost Marshal: (S) FREDERICK R. LAFFERTY, *Colonel, Cavalry,* *Deputy Theater Provost Marshal.* /51, 3-3771 1 encl: n/c GA/RWG/cws/2-4007.
4	G-1 GA Br.	JA War Crimes Branch	June 4, 1946	Request contained in Minute No. 1 has been complied with. For the A. C. of S., G-1. (S) A. F. S. MACKENZIE, *Lieutenant Colonel, GSC,* *Acting Chief, German Affairs Branch.* Encl: n/c

EXHIBIT B

MILITARY GOVERNMENT COURT—CHARGE SHEET

DACHAU, GERMANY, *April 11, 1946.*

Names of the accused: Valentin Bersin, Friedel Bode, Marcel Boltz, Willi Braun, Kurt Briesemeister, Willi Von Chamier, Friedrich Christ, Roman Clotten, Manfred Coblenz, Josef Diefenthal, Josef (Sepp) Dietrich, Fritz Eckmann, Arndt Fischer, Georg Fleps, Heinz Friedrichs, Fritz Gebauer, Heinz Gerhard Godicke, Ernst Goldschmidt, Hans Gruhle, Helmut Haas, Max Hammerer, Armin Hecht, Willi Heinz Hendel, Hans Hennecke, Hans Hillig, Heinz Hofman, Joachim Hofman, Hubert Huber, Siegfried Jakel, Benoni Junker, Friedel Kies, Gustav Knittel, Georg Kotzur, Fritz Kraemer, Werner Kuhn, Oskar Klingelhoefer, Herbert Losenski, Erich Mauto, Arnold Mikolaschek, Anton Motzheim, Erich Munkemer, Gustav Neve, Paul Hermann Ochmann, Werner Pedersen, Joachim Peiper, Hans Pletz, Georg Preuss, Hermann Priess, Fritz Rau, Theo Rauh, Heinz Rehagel, Rolf Roland Reiser, Wolfgang Richter, Max Reidder, Rolf Ritzer, Axel Rodenburg, Erich Rumpf, Willi Schaefer, Rudolf Schwanbach, Kurt Sickel, Oswald Siegmund, Franz Sievers, Hans Siptrott, Gustav Adolf Sprenger, Werner Sternebeck, Herbert Stock, Erwin Szyperski, Edmund Tomczak, Heinz Tomhardt, August Tonk, Hans Trettin, Johann Wasenberger, Erich Werner, Otto Wichmann, Paul Zwigart, are hereby charged with the following offenses:

First charge: Violation of the laws and usages of war.

Particulars: In that Valentin Bersin, Friedel Bode, Marcel Boltz, Willi Braun, Kurt Briesemeister, Willi Von Chamier, Friedrich Christ, Roman Clotten, Manfred Coblenz, Josef Diefenthal, Josef (Sepp) Dietrich, Fritz Eckmann, Arndt Fischer, Georg Fleps, Heinz Friedrichs, Fritz Gebauer, Heinz Gerhard Godicke, Ernst Goldschmidt, Hans Gruhle, Helmut Haas, Max Hammerer, Armin Hecht, Will Heinz Hendel, Hans Hennecke, Hans Hillig, Heinz Hofmann, Joachim Hofmann, Hubert Huber, Siegfried Jakel, Benoni Junker, Friedel Kies, Gustav Knittel, Georg Kotzur, Fritz Kraemer, Werner Kuhn, Oskar Klingelhoefer, Herbert Losenski, Erich Maute, Arnold Mikolaschek, Anton Motzheim, Erich Munkemer, Gustav Neve, Paul Hermann Ochmann, Werner Pedersen, Joachim Peiper, Hans Pletz, Georg Preuss, Hermann Priess, Fritz Rau, Theo Rauh, Heinz Renagel, Rolf Roland Reiser, Wolfgang Richter, Max Rieder, Rolf Ritzer, Axel Rodenburg, Erich Rumpf, Willi Schaefer, Rudolf Schwanbach, Kurt Sickel, Oswald Siegmund, Franz Siever, Hans Siptrott, Gustav Adolf Sprenger, Werner Sternebeck, Herbert Stock, Erwin Szyperski, Edmund Tomczak, Heinz Tomhardt, August Tonk, Hans Trottin, Johann Wasenberger, Erich Werner, Otto Wichmann, Paul Zwigart, German nationals or persons acting with German nationals, being together concerned as parties, did, in conjunction with other persons not herein charged or named, at or in the vicinity of Malmedy, Honsfeld, Buellingen, Ligneuville, Stoumont, La Gleize, Cheneux, Petit Thier, Trois Ponts, Stavelot, Wanne, and Lutrebois, all in Belgium, at sundry times between December 16, 1944, and January 13, 1945, willfully, deliberately, and wrongfully permit, encourage, aid, abet, and participate in the killing, shooting, ill-treatment, abuse, and torture of members of the armed forces of the United States of America, then at war with the then German Reich, who were then and there surrendered and unarmed prisoners of war in the custody of the then German Reich, the exact names and numbers of such persons being unknown but aggregating several hundred, and of unarmed Allied civilian nationals, the exact names and numbers of such persons being unknown.

HOWARD F. BREEDEN,
Colonel, CMP, Army of the United States, officer preferring charges.

The above charges are referred for trial to the general military court appointed by paragraph 24, Special Order No. 90, Headquarters Third United States Army, dated April 9, 1946, to be held at Dachau, Germany, on or about May 2, 1946.

By command of Lieutenant General Keyes:

W. G. CALDWELL,
Colonel, Adjutant General's Dept.,
Acting Adjutant General.

EXHIBIT C

IN A GENERAL MILITARY GOVERNMENT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CAMP DACHAU, GERMANY

In the matter of the accused, Bersin, Valentin, et al.

Motion to withdraw confessions or statements of accused

1. Now come the defendants or accused and move to withdraw all their statements or confessions and expunge all reference thereto from the record.

A. (1) All of the above defendants were prisoners of war until April 11, 1946, which date was the day of the service of charges against each defendant. On and after April 11, 1946, each of the defendants was removed from the status of prisoner of war and became accused war criminals.

(2) The only law controlling this point is the Yamashita case in the Supreme Court of the United States of America which is quoted as follows:

"The day of final reckoning for the enemy arrived in August 1945. On September 3, the petitioner surrendered to the United

States Army at Baguio, Luzon. He immediately became a prisoner of war and was interned in prison in conformity with the rules of international law. On September 25, approximately 3 weeks after surrendering, he was served with the charge in issue in this case. Upon service of the charge he was removed from the status of a prisoner of war and placed in confinement as an accused war criminal."

Although this opinion is in Justice Murphy's minority opinion, it is in no sense a dissent from the majority opinion, as the issue was not raised in the petition. The majority opinion is therefore silent on this subject and the Court was not asked to decide this point. No other law or decision touches on this "change of status" and this expression of fact is the controlling law.

B. (1) Under the Geneva Convention, they, as prisoners of war, must be humanely treated and protected, particularly against acts of violence and insults. They should be equally treated. No coercion may be used on them to secure information, and under no circumstances will they be threatened, insulted, or exposed to unpleasant or disadvantageous treatment of any kind whatever. They are entitled to have their honor and person respected. They must have sanitation, open air, and exercise. Under all circumstances, prisoners of war are subject to the laws in force of the detaining power. Does solitary confinement for months or black hoods or mock trials or stool pigeons meet the dignified provisions of the Geneva Convention?

(2) Chapter 6, Prisoners of War of Geneva Convention of July 1929:

(a) Under article 2 the following applicable paragraph is quoted: "They must at all times be humanely treated and protected, particularly against acts of violence, insults, and public curiosity."

(b) Under article 3 the following applicable paragraphs are quoted: "Prisoners of war have the right to have their person and their honor respected. Difference in treatment among prisoners is lawful only when it is based on the military rank, state of physical or mental health, professional qualifications, or sex of those who profit thereby."

(c) Under article 5 the following applicable paragraph is quoted: "No coercion may be used on prisoners to secure information relative to the condition of their army or country. Prisoners who refuse to answer may not be threatened, insulted, or exposed to unpleasant or disadvantageous treatment of any kind whatever."

(d) Under article 9 the following applicable parts of paragraphs are quoted: "They may also be interned in enclosed camps; they may not be confined or imprisoned except as an indispensable measure of safety or sanitation, and only while the circumstances which necessitate the measure continue to exist."

(e) Under article 10 the following applicable paragraph is quoted: "Prisoners of war shall be lodged in buildings or in barracks affording all possible guarantees of hygiene and healthfulness."

(f) Under article 13 the following applicable paragraph is quoted: "It shall be possible for them to take physical exercise and enjoy open air."

(g) Under article 21 the following applicable paragraph is quoted: "Officers and persons of equivalent status who are prisoners of war shall be treated with the regard due to their rank and age."

(h) Under article 45 the following paragraph is quoted: "Prisoners of war shall be subject to the laws, regulations, and orders in force in the armies of the detaining power."

(i) Under article 46 the following applicable paragraph is quoted: "Any corporal punishment, any imprisonment in quarters without daylight, and, in general, any form of cruelty, is forbidden."

(j) Under article 56 the following applicable paragraphs are quoted: "In no case may prisoners of war be transferred to penitentiary establishments (prison, penitentiaries, convict prisons, etc.) there to undergo disciplinary punishment. These prisoners shall every day be allowed to exercise or to stay in the open air at least 2 hours."

C. (1) As prisoners of war under the Geneva Convention, all confessions were extracted by using varying degrees of force, duress, trickery, deception, mock trials, ceremonies, including the passing of judgment on those accused. In every situation involving a stress on the physical well-being, the natural impulses dominate the reasoning faculties. Any alternative that promises relief from a present intolerable situation is accepted without regard to consequences. When the primary feelings are stirred, the reasoning faculties are practically suspended. Under a promise or inference of relief, a person will choose to make a false confession as the speediest way to make his freedom certain. The question arises: Was the situation such that there is a reasonable probability that the accused made a false statement under duress? If so, the confession must be excluded.

(2) Attention is drawn to the opening statement of the prosecution in which the following language was used: "Despite the youth of these suspects, it took months of continuous interrogation in which all the legitimate tricks, ruses, and stratagems known to investigators were employed. Among other artifices used were stool pigeons, witnesses who were not bona fide, and ceremonies."

The prosecution's own witnesses testified on direct examination as follows:

"Question. Did you use any ceremony of any kind in the interrogation of Neve?

"Answer. I guess you would call it a ceremony. We used sort of a mock trial, I guess you would call it. We had whoever wasn't busy sitting in the chairs behind the table, posing as officers hearing the testimony. First the witnesses that we had against him were brought in, and if they were bona fide witnesses, they were sworn. And the interrogator sat down at a table with him and took notes, or maybe he started writing the statement right then.

"Question. Do you know whether or not the accused (sic) were confronted with witnesses who were not bona fide?

"Answer. I know that they were.

"Question. Do you know whether or not the interrogators ever raised their voices during interrogation?

"Answer. I am sure they did.

"Question. Do you know whether or not suspects ever broke down and cried after they had confessed?

"Answer. I saw a few; yes, sir.

"Question. Did they cry silently or did they sob out loud?

"Answer. I think out loud, sir.

"Question. Do you recall any other methods used for eliciting information other than you have already described?

"Answer. No special methods. Each interrogator had his own bag of psychological tricks, you might call it."

D. (1) The laws of military courts martial certainly control insofar as these accused are concerned up to the moment they were served with charges, alleging war crimes, at which time the Supreme Court has ruled that their status changes to a suspected war criminal. Under our court-martial laws no confession could be used and admitted against another jointly accused. In view of the position of authority of the prosecution staff, it will go without contravention that all the accused were in an inferior position and confessions to superiors should be regarded as clearly incompetent. It is not believed that by the widest stretch of imagination could these confessions or statements be used in a trial by courts martial due to the varying degrees of force and duress employed by the prosecution. On the other hand, it is readily conceded that if these statements had been subsequently reexecuted after the accused became suspected war criminals, no grounds for this motion would exist.

(2) On page 329 of Winthrop's Military Law and Precedents, we find the following language with appropriate substantiating cases: "In military cases, in view of the authority and influence of superior rank, confessions made by inferiors, especially when ignorant or inexperienced, and held in confinement or close arrest, should be regarded as incompetent unless very clearly shown not to have been unduly influenced. Statements, by way of confessions, made by an inferior under charges to a commanding officer, judge advocate, or other superior whom the accused could reasonably believe capable of making good his words, upon even a slight assurance of relief or benefit by such superior, should not in general be admitted. And it has been similarly ruled in cases of confessions made by soldiers, upon assurances held out, or intimidation resorted to, by noncommissioned officers."

On page 427, section 493, of Evidence from American Jurisprudence, the following is quoted as a clear statement of the law on confession implicating several persons: "The voluntary confession of a codefendant or coconspirator made after the commission of a crime or the termination of the conspiracy cannot be admitted against the other defendants when such confession was not made in their presence and assented to by them, even though the several defendants are being tried jointly."

This principle is briefly confirmed on page 327 of Winthrop's Military Law and Precedents, as follows: "A judge advocate upon a military trial may desire to keep out of sight a portion of confessions because it implicates parties other than the accused; but this is a reason not recognized as sufficient at law, since a confession is not evidence against any person (not an accomplice) other than the one who makes it."

E. The alleged confessions or statements of these accused are absolutely void and not admissible in evidence in this case. The laws of our Nation provide that a man should have only one wife at a time, and any subsequent marriage without appropriate divorce decrees render the second marriage void. The contracts of minors are void unless subsequent ratification after they reach their majority. The contracting of a party to commit a crime is void. Certain prerequisites are necessary to make a note negotiable, such as date due, a sum certain to be paid, etc., and without those elements they are void. So in criminal laws certain safeguards surround confessions or statements, in order to be admissible and not void. As previously outlined, international law laid down certain safeguards for treatment of prisoners of war, and any confession or statement extracted in violation thereof is not admissible in a court martial or any subsequent trial under a code set up by military government. If a confession from a prisoner of war is born in a surrounding of hope of release or benefit, or fear of punishment or injury, inspired by one in authority, it is void in its inception and not admissible in any tribunal of justice. Could anyone, by artifice, conjure up the theory that the military government rules and ordinances are superior to the solemn agreements of international law as stated in the Geneva Convention of 1929? Is this Court willing to assume the responsibility of admitting these void confessions? Is this Court willing to condemn these accused on written statements that are stained with illegality, due to their being obtained in the first instance in violation of the Geneva Convention to which our Nation is a signatory

and which has been championed from its inception?

F. That the so-called confessions or statements of these accused must be excluded from the record is apparent. It is not believed that the Court will put itself in the anomalous position of accepting statements into evidence which were elicited from prisoners of war in contravention of the Geneva Convention and therefore a violation of the rules of land warfare on the one hand and turn squarely around and mete out punishment for other acts which they deem violation of the same laws. To do so would be highly inconsistent and subject the Court and all American military tribunals to just criticism.

EXHIBIT D

HEADQUARTERS,
THIRD UNITED STATES ARMY,
APO 403, May 10, 1946.

SPECIAL ORDERS NO. 117—EXTRACT

32. Pursuant to authority delegated to the commanding general, Third United States Army, by Commanding General, United States Forces, European Theater, a General Military Court consisting of the following officers is hereby appointed to meet at the time and place designated by the President thereof for the trial of such persons as may be properly brought before it.

Detail for the court

Brig. Gen. Josiah T. Dalbey, O12440, United States Army Headquarters, Third Infantry Division.

Col. Paul H. Weiland, O8418, FA, Headquarters, Third United States Army.

Col. Lucien S. Berry, O4461, Cav., Ninth Infantry Division.

Col. James G. Watkins, O7249, FA, Thirty-second FA Brigade.

Col. Robert R. Raymond, Jr., O12274, FA, Ninth Infantry Division.

Col. Wilfred H. Steward, O8448, CAC, Headquarters Thirty-first AAA Brigade.

Col. Raymond C. Conder, O16131, FA, Headquarters Ninth Infantry Division.

Col. A. H. Rosenfeld, O212685, Inf., Headquarters USFET.

Lt. Col. Granger G. Sutton, O185405, Inf., Headquarters USFET, Trial Judge Advocate.

Lt. Col. Homer B. Crawford, O902586, AC, Headquarters USFET, Assistant Trial Judge Advocate.

Capt. Raphael Shumacker, O1798521, CMP, Headquarters USFET, Assistant Trial Judge Advocate.

First Lt. Robert E. Byrne, O1826233, JAGD, Headquarters USFET, Assistant Trial Judge Advocate.

Mr. Morris Elowitz, US CIV, Assistant Trial Judge Advocate.

Col. Willis M. Everett, Jr., O179702, MI, Headquarters USFET, Defense Counsel.

Lt. Col. John S. Dwinell, O241872, CAC, Headquarters USFET, Assistant Defense Counsel.

Capt. B. N. Narvid, O1557506, CE, Headquarters USFET, Assistant Defense Counsel.

Second Lt. Wilbert J. Wahler, O2052758, JAGD, Headquarters USFET, Assistant Defense Counsel.

Mr. Herbert T. Strong, US CIV, Assistant Defense Counsel.

Mr. Frank Walters, US CIV, Assistant Defense Counsel.

The employment of stenographic assistance is authorized.

By command of Major General Parker:

DON E. CARLETON,
Colonel, General Staff Corps, Chief of Staff.

W. G. CALDWELL,
Colonel, Adjutant General's Department, Acting Adjutant General.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON EXTENSION OF EUROPEAN RECOVERY PLAN

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I ask unanimous consent to report an original resolution, and request its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 87) was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That 1,000 additional copies of the hearings held before the Committee on Foreign Relations on extension of the European recovery program be printed for the use of said committee.

ADDITIONAL TIME TO FILE REPORT ON ECA BILL

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations may have 48 hours additional time in which to file its report on the ECA bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1219. An original bill removing certain restrictions and conditions imposed by section 2 of the act of May 27, 1936, on certain of the lands conveyed by such act to the city of Charleston, S. C.; and for other purposes (Rept. No. 103);

H. R. 2216. A bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to provide for an Under Secretary of Defense; without amendment (Rept. No. 104);

H. R. 2485. A bill to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the Eighty-third and Final National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held in Indianapolis, Ind., August 28 to September 1, 1949; without amendment (Rept. No. 105); and

H. R. 2663. A bill to provide for the administration of the Central Intelligence Agency, established pursuant to section 102, National Security Act of 1947, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 106).

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1218. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey for the construction of a channel from the yacht basin at Havre de Grace to connect with the Oakington Channel; to the Committee on Public Works.

(Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Armed Services reported an original bill (S. 1219) removing certain restrictions and conditions imposed by section 2 of the act of May 27, 1936, on certain of the lands conveyed by such act to the city of Charleston, S. C.; and for other purposes, which was ordered to be placed on the calendar.)

CONFIRMATION OF CERTAIN NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report numerous routine promotions in the Army, the Navy, and in the Air Force, and, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent for their immediate consideration, and that the President may be notified of the confirmations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration as in executive session of the promotions in the armed services? The Chair hears none, and without objection, the nominations are confirmed, and the President will be notified.

JOHN ERICSSON, CITIZEN OF THE WORLD—ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a program for a memorial ceremony at the John Ericsson Monument in Washington, D. C., on March 9, 1949, together with the speech delivered by him on that occasion, which appears in the Appendix.]

REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in view of the present situation, I ask unanimous consent that all Senators who at this time desire to submit matters for the RECORD or introduce bills or joint resolutions may be permitted to do so, as though it were in the morning hour, without debate, and without prejudicing or changing the parliamentary situation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object; yesterday the distinguished floor leader, the Senator from Illinois, a man whom I consider to be a very good friend, imposed an extremely severe and most unusual form of gag rule against one of his constituents and some of mine. I wonder if the Senator from Illinois intends to act now as he did yesterday in his self-imposed role of censor for what is offered for the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. LUCAS. I cannot answer that question until the Senator makes his unanimous consent request.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Illinois has made a unanimous consent request to permit all Senators to submit matters for the RECORD.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct. I cannot answer the Senator's question as the situation now is. If the Senator from Washington desires to object——

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington does object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I want to send to the desk a bill for appropriate reference.

Mr. LUCAS. Objection has been made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator from Illinois yield to me for the purpose of introducing a bill?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Michigan for that purpose.

Mr. FERGUSON. Out of order, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to send to the desk a bill for appropriate reference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Unless unanimous consent is given to the Senator from Illinois to yield to the Senator from Michigan for that purpose, it cannot be done.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator from Michigan were to obtain the floor by reason of the majority leader yielding to him, would it not be in order for the Senator from Michigan to ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule the Senator from Illinois can yield to the Senator from Michigan only for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. But if the Senator from Illinois were to yield to the Senator from Michigan for a question, could not the Senator from Michigan propound a question in the form of a request for unanimous consent to introduce a bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois could ask unanimous consent to yield to the Senator from Michigan to introduce a bill, without prejudicing the parliamentary situation.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Michigan for the purpose of introducing a bill, without thereby prejudicing the parliamentary situation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. CAIN. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington objects.

PRESENTATION OF CLOTURE PETITION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in a few minutes I shall send to the desk a petition to end debate on the motion to take up the Hayden-Wherry resolution.

This subject has occupied the attention of the Senate for 10 long days. None of us in this Chamber, I am sure, holds the idea that debate ought ever to be closed before the subject under consideration has been thoroughly explored. Full and free debate lies at the very heart of the democratic process. But the privilege of full debate carries with it the responsibility for eventual action.

In my judgment, the time for action has arrived. I respectfully submit that 10 days is more than ample time fully to explore and properly present the merits or demerits of a simple motion to take up a resolution. In ninety-nine cases out of one hundred such motions are passed without any debate at all. Therefore, Mr. President, we should not blind ourselves to what everyone knows—namely, that a determined minority of the United States Senate is attempting endless debate to keep us from fulfilling our legislative duties.

We have been elected by the people of our respective States as lawmakers. It is our primary duty to create the laws desired by the people and we must have rules under which the business of the Senate may be expedited. The Senate must not hang itself on the rope of its own rules. I wish to congratulate the Senators of both parties who have signed this petition to enable the Senate to rise to its responsibilities.

Although I am sure it will be contended by those who are participating in this endless debate that it is not a filibuster, no reasonable man can conscientiously deny that it is, if he will honestly analyze the record which has been made during the past 10 days.

I am perfectly aware that there are those in this body who are convinced that a cloture petition cannot be filed to close debate on a motion. But if I did not believe that the petition I hold in my hand is completely proper under the rules, I would not offer it. I shall have more to say later in defense of the petition at the appropriate time.

I now wish to present a simple statement of the basic truth at stake here. We are faced with the urgent necessity of making it possible for this legislative body to uphold the faith of our citizens in parliamentary government. Above and beyond all rules stands the firm expectation of the people of the United States that the Senate will prove that it can act when the time arrives for action.

Mr. President, I present the cloture petition, with the additional announcement that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who is absent by leave of the Senate because of the serious illness of his father, has requested me to state that had it been possible for him to do so, he would have signed the cloture petition.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The rule requires that the Presiding Officer shall read the petition to the Senate. If it is agreeable to the Senate, the Chair will ask the clerk to read it in his stead.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate upon the motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 15) amending the so-called cloture rule of the Senate.

SCOTT W. LUCAS; FRANCIS J. MYERS; ELBERT D. THOMAS; JAMES E. MURRAY; CLINTON P. ANDERSON; J. HOWARD MCGRATH; PAUL H. DOUGLAS; THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN; GLEN TAYLOR; HARLEY M. KILGORE; BRIEN MCMAHON; CLAUDE PEPPER; DENNIS CHAVEZ; JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY; M. M. NEELY; BERT H. MILLER; WARREN G. MAGNUSON; WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND; H. C. LODGE, JR.; IRVING M. IVES; CHAS. W. TOBEY; LEVERETT SALTONSTALL; RALPH E. FLANDERS; ROBERT A. TAFT; HOMER FERGUSON; RAYMOND E. BALDWIN; OWEN BREWSTER; EDWARD J. THYE; MARGARET CHASE SMITH; WAYNE MORSE; H. ALEXANDER SMITH; CLYDE M. REED; ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state the point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. I desire to make the point of order that under the provisions of rule XXII of the Senate the petition just offered by the Senator from Illinois is not in order.

Mr. President, I realize that in discussing this matter I speak at the sufferance of the Chair. I shall, therefore, not undertake to answer the argument made by the distinguished Senator from Illinois prior to his presentation of the petition, nor shall I undertake to answer the barrage of oratory laid down today by those who favor the course of action which the Senator from Illinois now proposes. I shall confine my remarks, if the Chair will permit, purely to the parliamentary question involved.

Mr. President, this is not a new question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair may say to the Senator from Georgia, and all other Senators, that debate on the general situation is not in order on the point of order. The Chair is not interested in hearing any argument except on the point of order made by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I shall endeavor to comply with the rule, which is as properly stated by the Chair.

The effort to file a petition to close debate at this stage of the parliamentary proceedings of the Senate flies in the teeth of the express letter, the very wording, of rule XXII of the Senate, as well as every precedent that has been established by Presiding Officers of the Senate on five separate occasions, upon two of which the decision of the Chair was upheld by a vote of the Senate.

I shall take the liberty of reading briefly from rule XXII:

If at any time a motion—

Notice the word "motion," Mr. President—

signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any pending measure is presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate—

I shall not read all the rule, because I am sure that in view of the extensive discussion which has occurred with respect to this question in the press and over the air waves, as well as on the floor of the Senate, all Senators have read rule XXII. The crux of the matter is in the words "pending measure," and the question whether or not a motion is a pending measure.

This matter is to me, by law and by precedent, crystal clear. In parliamentary terms, parliamentarily speaking, there is a great difference—not a distinction, but a great difference—between a motion and a pending measure. The words "pending measure," as they have been uniformly construed by Presiding Officers of the Senate, and on two occasions sustained by a vote of the Senate, relate to substantive legislation, to a bill or to a resolution, and do not apply to a mere motion.

Mr. President, this matter could not be clearer than from a reading of all of rule XXII. Rule XXII, within itself, clearly makes the distinction between a measure and a motion. The first line of the rule is:

When a question is pending, no motion shall be received but—

Then it outlines the motions which are in order, as distinguished from a measure which is pending at the time the motion is made.

In the body of the rule, in the last paragraph, it refers to motions which cannot be made after a cloture petition is filed with respect to a pending measure. This matter could not have been more clearly illustrated than by the statement of the present distinguished Presiding Officer of the Senate on the day this question was first presented to this body. On that occasion the Presiding Officer advised with the Senate as to the parliamentary situation. His advice clearly differentiates between a motion and a measure, and establishes beyond any peradventure that a cloture petition will not lie against a motion, because it cannot be a measure, under the Presiding Officer's statement. I refer to page 1584 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 28, where the Chair stated, before recognizing the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], chairman of the committee:

Before recognizing the Senator from Arizona, chairman of the committee, the Chair wishes to make a statement for the information and advice of the Senate in regard to procedure in debate.

This is the first statement which the Chair made:

In the first place, a motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill or a resolution cannot be amended by a motion to take up some bill in lieu of the one which is the subject of the pending motion.

Later, as found on page 1585, the distinguished majority leader asked this question of the Chair:

Do I correctly understand the Chair holds that any motion to lay aside the resolution amending the cloture rule, or a motion to take up another measure, would be out of order?

Another measure, mind you.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No motion to proceed to the consideration of another bill, either as an amendment or substitute to the pending motion, is in order.

That statement of the Presiding Officer, together with his preliminary statement that the motion was not subject to amendment, forever removed this motion from the realm of being a measure, if it was necessary to do so, and if the precedents in this case would not suffice, because it clearly distinguished between a motion and a measure.

That appears from rule XXII itself, in the first part of the rule, before we come to the paragraph which provides for the filing of a cloture petition upon a measure. It cannot be a measure if it is not subject to amendment.

I did not protest the Chair's ruling, because I agreed with him that this was a mere motion, and therefore did not come under the terms of rule XXII. Why do I say that? I invite attention to page 26 of the Standing Rules of the Senate. This is the language:

When a question is pending, no motion shall be received but—

Then it outlines several motions which may be made. When we get down to the last one, it says that there can be made a motion to amend, if it is a measure. A motion to commit may be made under rule XXII, if it is a measure. But a motion to amend a motion may not be made, nor may a motion to commit a motion be made.

When the Presiding Officer clearly distinguished, in his ruling, between a motion and a measure, it removed forever from the purview of rule XXII any effort to file a cloture petition, because it established, as clearly as do all the precedents in this case, the distinction between a motion and a measure.

I submit, Mr. President, that if the pending issue before the Senate is not subject to amendment, and is not subject to a motion to commit, as was ruled by the Chair in response to the question of the Senator from Illinois, and as had been earlier stated by the Chair on his own initiative, it cannot be a measure, but is a mere motion, and is therefore not subject to a petition for cloture. It has been uniformly held by every Presiding Officer that a pending measure may be a bill or a resolution, but not any of the incidental questions which may arise in the operation of the parliamentary machinery of the Senate. I have given some study to this subject. I have carefully read every word and every line of the debate which occurred in the Senate when this rule was first adopted in 1917. Not a single speaker inferred any intent or purpose in adopting this rule to make it apply to a simple motion. All the discussion shows that it was intended to apply only to matters of substantive legislation, such as are embraced within a bill or a resolution.

The first precedent which arose in this matter was established in November 1919. Not only was it established by a ruling by the then Presiding Officer—and of course a ruling by a Presiding Officer of the Senate is a binding precedent unless it is overturned—but it was established by the Senate on a vote. In that case, Mr. President, as the Chair realizes, of course, an attempt was made to file a petition for cloture to end debate in the Senate on reservations which had been offered by the then senior Senator from Massachusetts, the late Senator Lodge, to a resolution which he had offered providing for the establishment of peace with Germany. The attempt to file the cloture petition was directed only at the reservations and the resolution. A point of order was made by the late Senator George Norris, with whom so many of us served here, that the reservations and the resolution were not a pending measure, but that the pending measure was the treaty. The Chair sustained the point of order which was made by Senator Norris, holding in effect that cloture could apply only to a bill or a resolution, and would not be applicable to any of the collateral matters which come before the Senate, such as the present motion to proceed to the consideration of Senate resolution 15.

Mr. President, it is interesting to me to note the comment which was made by Senators who were present in that debate and who had also participated in the drafting of this rule. It showed to me very clearly that men like Senator Underwood and Senator Hitchcock, who filed the cloture petition, never thought that rule XXII, the cloture rule, was in fact so all-embracing as is proposed in connection with the attempt to make it apply in this case. Senator Hitchcock went so far as to say that in his opinion the treaty which was before the Senate could not be construed as a pending measure under the terms of rule XXII. Senator Underwood said:

This is a poor excuse for a rule.

Mr. President, those were his very words.

Of course, today many Members of the Senate say that it is a poor rule that we have. Nevertheless, it was the rule that the cloture petition would lie only to substantive legislation.

Mr. President, there are two other precedents, which, although not foursquare with this issue, do throw a good deal of light upon it:

In 1927 there were two rulings by the then Vice President Dawes, in which the issue arose as to whether cloture could lie to other than the measure pending before the Senate. In those cases Vice President Dawes—and all of us know there never has been a greater advocate of changing the rules of the Senate than former Vice President Dawes—ruled that the cloture petition applied only to the measure which was then pending before the Senate.

The next ruling which was made in this matter came on February 4, 1946, when the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the present President pro tempore of the Senate, was the Presiding Officer. In that case there was a collateral issue before the Senate, in the form of an amendment to the Journal. The bill had already been made the pending business, but after an adjournment, there intervened a discussion as to the approval of the Journal. In that case Senators recognized what had been recognized by every parliamentarian, what had been held by every person who had had occasion to study this matter, namely, that a cloture petition cannot properly be filed on a motion. So in that case, Senators did not undertake to file a cloture petition on the motion, knowing that such a petition would not lie to the motion to amend the Journal, but they sought to go around the motion to amend the Journal, which was impervious to cloture, and to file the cloture petition as against the bill, which as I recall was Senate bill 105.

The Presiding Officer, of course, ruled—and he properly ruled, in view of the clear wording of the rule and the precedents in the case—that the matter before the Senate was the motion to amend the Journal; and that the motion to amend the Journal not being subject to cloture, it would be a mere subterfuge to go around the motion and apply cloture to the bill, which was not before the Senate at the time.

Mr. President, those precedents bring us down to the ruling which was made by the able and distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], which follows in orderly course all the precedents involved in this matter, but which is foursquare with the issue which

is sought to be presented now by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]. That ruling clearly establishes that under the rules and precedents of the Senate a petition for cloture does not apply to a mere motion. I am sure every person who was present when the distinguished Senator from Michigan made that ruling was impressed with the travail of spirit which afflicted him, and was impressed with the fact that he was compelled to rule against a position in which he believed, or against legislation in which he believed, in order to sustain the rules and the precedents of the Senate. I shall read a few extracts from that ruling:

The Chair wishes to state at the outset—

Said the Senator from Michigan—

that he is deeply conscious of the importance of preserving the integrity of congressional procedures, which, in the Chair's judgment, transcends at this critical hour in the world's history any possible transient advantages which might come from ruling of a different character.

The Chair is also conscious of a very great personal embarrassment and difficulty in rendering the decision because of his well-known prejudice in respect to the basic issues involved. He favors the anti-poll-tax legislation. He believes that debate should come to an end after a reasonable period, and he emphatically agrees that the Senate should be in ultimate control of its own destiny.

In making the ruling which the Chair will shortly announce he hopes that it may be entirely plain that he is not only putting aside all his own personal prejudices and predilections, but that he is also not undertaking, even by indirect inference, to rule upon the merits of the pending measure. He is dealing solely with what he considers to be his responsibility under oath, as an officer of the Senate, required to deal with the Senate on the basis of his best judgment and honest reflection of what the Senate rules require.

I did not read all of it, because I have covered generally, in my feeble way, not with the eloquence of the Senator from Michigan, the precedents in the case, which I have already stated.

As Members of the Senate are aware, there is now pending on the Senate Calendar a resolution, Senate Resolution 25, favorably reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, which is designed to bring about such an amendment of the rule.

The Senate is familiar with the fact that the precedents of the Senate clearly indicate that a motion to approve the Journal cannot be brought within the jurisdiction of cloture action, and that conclusion has been very widely and generally accepted by all Senators with whom the Presiding Officer has ever conversed on this subject.

* * * * *

What is the basic measure at this moment?

Mr. President, I shall skip over that portion of the ruling and come to this statement of the Senator from Michigan, still speaking as the President pro tempore of the Senate:

The President pro tempore is not entitled to consult his own predilections or his own convictions in the use of this authority—

Referring to the authority of the Presiding Officer.

He must act in his capacity as an officer of the Senate under oath to enforce its rules as he finds them to exist, whether he likes them or not, and whether he agrees with them or not. Of all the precedents necessary to preserve, this is the most important of all. Otherwise the preservation of any minority rights for any minority at any time would become impossible.

The President pro tempore is a sworn agent of the law as he finds the law to be. Only the Senate has the right to change the law. The President pro tempore feels that he is entitled particularly to underscore this axiom in the present instance, because the present circumstances themselves bring it into such bold and sharp relief.

I pass over to this statement of the distinguished then Presiding Officer:

It was conceded when this committee reported, on March 24, 1947, more than 1 year ago, Senate Resolution 25, which seeks to make the existing Senate cloture rule succeed in its purported power to permit two-thirds of the Senate to curb unlimited debate. That resolution has been on the Senate Calendar for 16 months. It has not been adopted. It is intended to prevent the precise purpose sought by the pending point of order. Its presence on the Senate Calendar, by order of the Rules Committee, is, in the opinion of the Chair, complete proof that the Senate Rules Committee admits the validity of the pending point of order. The President pro tempore cannot be expected to cure, by an arbitrary ruling, the existing fatal defect in the cloture rule which the Senate itself has been invited, but has thus far declined, to cure.

After that statement by the Senator from Michigan, he sustained the point of order and ruled that the cloture petition did not apply to a mere motion; thereby following all the precedents and complying with the letter of the law.

In the case before us today, we have an instance wherein not once has the Rules Committee reported that this defect existed in the rule, but twice. In the Eightieth Congress the Rules Committee gave the matter exhaustive study and reported and stated in the committee report that there was a defect in the rule. In the Eighty-first Congress we have an effort to take from the calendar the very rule which it is now sought to circumvent and strike down by a ruling from the Chair that the rule is not necessary.

Mr. President, the Rules Committee of this body stands as an equal of any other committee of the Senate. It is charged with certain definite responsibilities, one of which is to study the rules and make suggestions for change. In this instance we have the commiteee charged with that responsibility in two different Congresses reporting that the cloture rule could not be applied to a mere motion, and suggesting that it be changed. Now we are told that, because of the fact that debate has gone on for a few days, in effect we should take a short cut and not follow the rules of the Senate which provide for their own amendment.

The Senator from Illinois invokes a ruling from the Chair that the Rules Committee of the Senate has done not only a vain but a foolish thing to struggle with this matter through two Congresses, to hold extensive hearings, to report resolutions to the Senate and seek to have them considered by the Senate, because if the cloture petition would lie as presented by the Senator from Illinois, the Rules Committee of the Senate has wasted its time, and all the Presiding Officers of the Senate who have ever passed upon this question were likewise in error.

Mr. President, the distinguished present occupant of the chair was a Member of the Senate. There has been much comment in the press about the views of the present occupant of the chair on this question, and I must confess it has been discussed somewhat around the Senate Chamber. But the then Senator from Kentucky, as a Member of this body, August 4, 1948, made a statement which showed conclusively the establishment of this precedent and the necessity for adopting an amendment to correct the rule if cloture were to be applied to a motion. I read briefly from the remarks of the present Presiding Officer of the Senate, the then Senator from Kentucky. It will be recalled, I am sure, that the Senator was speaking after a statement had been made by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] that it was necessary for an amendment to be adopted in order to cure the rules and that it could not be done at that session of the Congress.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator from Nebraska, the acting majority leader, has said in regard to the present status of the rules of the Senate. There is no need to reiterate what has happened here in the past. When I was confronted with the same situation which confronts him I repeatedly stated that I favored an amendment to the rules of the Senate so that it would not be impotent when a well-organized group of a few Senators, or many, as the case might be, could, if they wished, tie up legislation indefinitely.

The other day when the Chair ruled against the cloture petition filed by the Senator from Nebraska, I then took the position, which I felt was justified, that when the Senate adopted the rule XXII it really thought it was bringing about the termination of debate on any matter which was pending before it, which was the subject of extended debate, which has come to be known as a filibuster. I still entertain that viewpoint. But the Chair ruled otherwise, and there is now an appeal from that decision pending.

I do not know how long it will take to amend the rules of the Senate. There has been a resolution on the calendar for 17 months to amend the rules of the Senate. So far as I recall, no effort has been made to bring that resolution before the Senate for consideration, and no motion has been made to take it up. I realize that on such a motion the same course could be pursued as on the motion now pending.

The then Senator from Kentucky concluded with these remarks:

Therefore, I not only am now, but have been in the past, and shall continue in the future, so long as I am a Member of this body, to be earnestly in favor of an amendment to the Senate rules—

Not to a ruling by the Chair that reverses the precedents and rules—

to be earnestly in favor of an amendment of the Senate rules that will make it possible for the Senate to function under any conditions which may arise in the deliberations of this body and in the consideration of legislation. It is a situation and a condition which does not prevail in any other legislative body in the world.

So I wanted to say to the Senator from Nebraska, that, notwithstanding the fact that for 17 months there has been on the

calendar a resolution to amend the rules—and no effort has heretofore been made to bring it up—and I presume no effort is to be made to bring it up at this session—whenever it comes up—

The amendment, in the orderly processes prescribed by our rules for amendment of the rules—

whenever it comes up, at this session or at the next session, I am in favor of such an amendment of the rules—

Not the rule that exists, that cloture will apply through a simple motion, but—

I am in favor of such an amendment of the rules as will make it possible for the Senate of the United States to function as an ordinary legislative body.

Mr. President, I do not desire to tire the Chair by reading statements of Senators on this subject, but I think that the distinguished Senator from Arizona [MR. HAYDEN], the present Chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, who is charged with responsibility in this matter, should be quoted in the course of this point of order. This statement was made before the ruling of the distinguished Senator from Michigan which followed and more firmly established the precedent that a petition for cloture does not lie to a motion to proceed, and which sustains the point of order I have made.

I shall read very briefly from the statement of the Senator from Arizona. We all know he is a man not given to many words he expresses himself clearly in a few words. He was discussing what the Committee on Rules and Administration had found in the last session of Congress, just as has been found in this session, that a cloture petition does not lie to a motion to take up a bill. This is the Senator from Arizona speaking:

It was the deliberate judgment of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, after careful study, that at the present time the rules of the Senate did not permit a cloture petition to be filed either upon a motion to approve or amend the Journal, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill.

That is what the Senator from Arizona said. He was addressing himself to the then President pro tempore before he ruled.

If the Chair were to reverse that position, he would go directly contrary to the action taken by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration which, to my mind, would be parliamentary highjacking, in which neither the Chair nor the Senate should indulge.

Mr. President, that shows the views of the Committee on Rules and Administration which is charged with the primary responsibility in this case.

Mr. President, it is, of course, unnecessary for me to argue with legislators of long experience and great familiarity with the rules as to the value of precedents in the Senate of the United States. There are in the manual approximately 40 written rules. There are several hundred precedents which guide us in our deliberations. Those precedents have as much weight, they have the same authority, they have the same importance attached to them, as have the written rules of the Senate. I shall illustrate that by the statement made by our distinguished Presiding Officer on the day on which this matter was submitted to the Senate. He said:

If a Senator yield for any purpose other than to be asked a question, he would lose the floor.

We may study these rules from cover to cover, and we shall find no such rule as that. That is a precedent which has grown up in the Senate, which is just as valid, but no more valid, as the precedent that a cloture petition will not lie to a motion to consider a bill. It is just as sacred, but not a bit more sanctified than the present existing precedent. It is a rule of the Senate until changed by action of the Senate, that a cloture petition will not lie to a motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill.

The Chair further stated to the Members of the Senate:

The Senator having the floor cannot yield for the purpose of allowing some other Senator to make a point of no quorum and having a roll call without losing the floor.

Senators may read the Senate rules, but they will find no such written rule. That is a precedent handed down to us and invoked, after its establishment, by Presiding Officers, just as I am earnestly imploring and expecting the present Presiding Officer to apply the precedent which has been established in the Senate for years past, by holding that this cloture petition does not apply to the motion to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 15.

Mr. President, the matter of precedents, as I say, is familiar to the Vice President, and more familiar to him than it is to the Senator from Georgia. The Vice President is the constitutional President of the Senate. He is not a Senator. We regretted that the distinguished Senator from Kentucky was translated to the chair, because we lost him as a Senator; but, of course, that regret was tempered and cleansed away by our delight that he would still be with us as our Presiding Officer.

Of course, it is the function of the Presiding Officer to follow the precedents which have been established in this body, just as it is the duty of a judge to apply the law as he finds it, without regard to the opinion of the individual sitting on the bench as to what the law should be.

Mr. President, I could read statements from all the great parliamentarians of the past, from Thomas Jefferson on down through Hopkins of Virginia, Speaker Henderson, Speaker Gillette, Senator William H. Evarts, who was a great Senator, regarding the dangers which always ensue when short cuts are undertaken to be made, and their conclusions that precedents are as much rules of this body as is any rule written in the Senate Manual. Those rules and those precedents are the safeguards of order in the Senate, just as the law of the land is a safeguard of order in our States. We are all bound by them until they are changed in the manner prescribed by the rules themselves. Any other course would cause chaos and confusion in this body, and no Senator would have any assurance or any idea of what his rights might be upon the floor.

By the express wording of rule XXII it is crystal clear that it differentiates between a mere motion, as is the case here, and a pending measure.

Mr. President, I submit the point of order and invoke the Chair's favorable ruling.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish most respectfully to argue very briefly to the Presiding Officer that I believe the point of order is not well taken.

The motion of the senior Senator from Illinois to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 15, a resolution amending the so-called cloture rule of the Senate, is the pending measure within the meaning of rule XXII. If it is not, what is it the Senate is now debating? It is stated on our calendar of business that the "pending business" is his motion. In this case I respectfully submit that the "pending business" is clearly the "pending measure" within the meaning of rule XXII.

It is significant to note, Mr. President, that prior to 1917, when rule XXII was amended to include a cloture petition, there had never been a filibuster conducted in the Senate on a motion to amend the Journal of the Senate or upon a motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill or resolve. I cite this because it helps us to understand why the framers of the amendment to the rule used the words "pending measure," and did not in the debate prior to the adoption of the rule discuss what they intended those two words to mean. It is equally clear, it seems to me, that they intended by this amendment to adopt a procedure that would, in effect, if properly followed, be a method for closing debate and permitting action by the Senate.

Your decision, Mr. President, on this point of order, makes the fifth time, if we include the three times that Vice President Dawes ruled on the same point as one time, that a ruling has been made as to whether or not a cloture petition is in order. The first ruling was made by Senator Cummins, in 1919, when he ruled that a cloture petition was not in order when reservations to a resolve to ratify a treaty was the question before the Senate. He ruled that the resolve was the "pending measure," and that the reservations were in effect amendments and, therefore, not the "pending measure."

In 1927 Vice President Dawes ruled that a cloture petition must apply to the measure under consideration when the cloture petition was filed, rather than the one that was being debated at the time when the cloture petition had to be voted upon under the rules.

In 1946 the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] President pro tempore, ruled that cloture was not in order on a motion to amend the Journal of the previous session. He ruled that "Senate bill 101, the FEPC bill, while technically unfinished business had been temporarily superseded by a highly privileged matter which must be proceeded with under the rules until disposed of."

In 1948 the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], President pro tempore, ruled that cloture was not in order on a motion to take up an anti-poll-tax bill when the pending measure in the Senate was a bill to provide for the development of civilian transport aircraft. The latter, in his opinion, was the "pending measure," under rule XXII. In each of these cases, therefore, the Presiding Officer had to decide what was the "pending measure."

In the present instance there is nothing pending before the Senate except the motion to take up Senate Resolution 15. This is certainly not a privileged motion within the meaning of an amendment to the Journal under rule III or under rule VI, regarding presentation of credentials of a Senator.

Our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], recently quoted the definition of the word "measure" from Webster's New International Dictionary:

> A step or definite part of a progressive course or policy; a means to an end.

How can it properly be argued, Mr. President, under the existing circumstances, where there is no other motion or amendment or other unfinished business pending before the Senate, that the motion of the Senator from Illinois "to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 15" is not a measure within the meaning of the definition of that word? I quote the definition again. "Measure" is "a step or definite part of a progressive course or policy; a means to an end."

The Senate is a deliberative body. It is a legislative body. Its rules have been established to effect its orderly procedure. Its problems are principally those of legislation. Its deliberations must come to an end in each instance if legislative action is to follow. Again I turn to Webster's Dictionary for the definition of the word "deliberation." It is defined as—

> A discussion and consideration by a number of persons of the reasons for and against a measure.

The present rule XXII was adopted in 1917 after there had been a failure of action because of lengthy debate by a small minority of the membership. The words "pending measure" were not interpreted in the debate at the time of adoption of the rule. But, I respectfully submit, Mr. President, a careful reading of those debates will give you, as it gave me, the feeling that the authors of the amendment to the rules believed that they were making it possible for the Senate to end its deliberations and come to a vote on any question the Senate might be deliberating when two-thirds of its membership believed that the time had come for action.

It was not until 1922 that the astuteness of one Member of the Senate discovered a method of avoiding a cloture petition, by depending upon the high priority given to an amendment to the Journal of the previous session. In short, through that means a method was found of destroying the effectiveness of a cloture petition. I submit that it becomes our responsibility to attempt to see that the language in such an important rule is made crystal clear, to use the words of our great colleague from Michigan, so that the rule cannot be open to different interpretations by different Presiding Officers. That was the sole purpose of those of us who previously filed this resolve and who now support its adoption.

A further reason has appealed to me, Mr. President, the more I have studied the rules. The more thought I have given to the whole subject of any change in the rules, it has become increasingly clear to me that the only possible way in which the rules can be changed, if the attempt to change is filibustered, is through the method which is now being pursued. Unless you rule, Mr. President, that cloture is in order on the present motion, I do not believe the present rule XXII will ever be changed at any time in any way, if there is the will to resist. The present resolve or one similar simply cannot be brought before the Senate to be voted up or down unless the opponents yield.

I say again that there is no other matter at this time pending before the Senate to which a finger can be pointed as a "pending measure" as a finger was pointed in each of the other rulings by prior Presiding Officers. I say again, Mr. President, that I believe a proper grammatical construction of the words "pending measure" requires you to rule that this motion is the "pending measure" that leads to legislative action on this resolve.

I repeat, Mr. President, this question is a new one. You are, therefore, not bound by the precedents of the rulings of prior Presiding Officers. You have them, however, as a background on which to reach your decision. In this instance, where there is no other business pending, I believe that the authors of the present rule XXII intended such a motion to be included within the matters that could be subject to cloture; otherwise, there is no possible way in which to bring a bill or resolve before the Senate for deliberation and action.

For these reasons, therefore, I respectfully submit that you should hold this cloture petition properly filed, and the point of order therefore not well taken.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I respectfully request that the distinguished Presiding Officer of the Senate permit me to make a few observations on what seems to me to be an extremely important question from the standpoint of parliamentary law.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will hear the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. In the first place, I wish to associate myself with all the remarks the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] has made with respect to the point of order. While I have great affection for the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and high regard for his ability, I cannot agree with him either in his premises or his conclusions with respect to the point of order. I respectfully submit that there are no precedents which control this case, and that all the precedents cited by the Senator from Georgia have no application whatsoever to the pending question.

The ruling which the Chair is now called on to make on the point of order against the cloture petition will be one of the most significant rulings ever made in the history of the Senate by its Presiding Officer, because the point of order raises for the first time the question whether a cloture petition is proper when it is filed while no other business, except the matter on which cloture is sought, is pending before the Senate. This is the first time in the history of the United States Senate, through all the years when petitions for cloture have been filed, and when rulings have been made by the Chair upon various parliamentary points, that the Chair has ever been called upon for a ruling upon a set of facts similar to those now before the Senate of the United States.

Many Senators, of course, have in mind the ruling which was made on August 2, 1948, by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. I undertake to say that the precedent then established does not affect the question presented by the petition now on the Vice President's desk. Those who have studied the scholarly opinion of the senior Senator from Michigan will understand why this is so. Let me quote a few sentences from that opinion, which will make my position entirely and perfectly clear. This is what the then Presiding Officer said in the opinion handed down some 7 months ago:

> What is the pending measure at this moment? The pending measure is Senate bill 2644, a bill to provide for the development of civil-transport aircraft adaptable for auxiliary military service, and for other purposes. What is the purpose of the motion made by the able Senator from Nebraska, to which it is now being attempted to attach cloture? It is to create a new pending measure.

So the Presiding Officer, the senior Senator from Michigan, said at that time. Yes, Mr. President, "to create a new 'pending measure.'"

> That is exactly—

Said the Senator from Michigan—

> the objective which the pending motion has in view. In the view of the Chair, in a reasonable interpretation of the English language, the Chair is unable to believe otherwise than that the "pending measure" at this moment in the forum of the Senate is Senate bill 2644.

That is the ruling, Mr. President, upon which certain Senators support the point of order, and it has no more to do with the present situation with respect to cloture than the precedent established in 1919 when the Versailles Treaty was under consideration.

Further quoting the Senator from Michigan, who was then the Presiding Officer:

> It is not the motion of the Senator from Nebraska to proceed to the consideration of House bill 29.

Mr. President, if that was not important in making up the mind of the distinguished Senator from Michigan, why did he draw that issue into his opinion? Of course, that was the basis for the opinion, and no one can read his opinion and arrive at any other honest interpretation. While the senior Senator from Michigan did insert some obiter dictum into his opinion, as a judge frequently does, and told the Senate that it has no effective cloture rule at the present time, nevertheless there is the basis and the substance, in my judgment, of the position the Presiding Officer finally reached upon that occasion.

Mr. President, the present occupant of the chair is not confronted with the situation presented to the Presiding Officer last year. There is no bill, resolution, motion, or any other parliamentary matter before the Senate, except the motion to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 15. We are, therefore, writing on a clean slate. If the Chair should now rule that the cloture petition is in order, he would not be doing any violence whatsoever to the ruling made by the Presiding Officer last year. Nor would he do any violence to any ruling by any earlier Presiding Officer even among all the rulings the junior Senator from Georgia quoted in his remarks upon the point of order.

Some Senators may also recall the ruling made by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] in February 1946 when he ruled that a cloture petition was not in order while the Journal of the preceding legislative day was under consideration. Obviously, we are not confronted with that situation. We have disposed of the Journal. It is not before us for approval. It does not bar the present cloture petition.

But, Mr. President, my argument does not rest on the negative ground of distinguishing this case from the earlier precedents. It rests entirely on the proposition that rule XXII was meant to be, and indeed must be, construed to be an effective device for closing debate in the Senate of the United States.

I undertake to say that no reasonable man who has read the debate which took place when rule XXII was adopted can have any doubt that the Senate was laying down for itself an effective cloture rule, and not providing a rule which could be evaded and frustrated by exceptions and reservations and loopholes.

Can anyone believe that the great men in the Senate of the United States at that time, probably the greatest collective group of Senators ever to sit in this body, did not know what they were doing in adopting a cloture rule? If the ruling of the Senator from Michigan is correct, they adopted a completely worthless rule. I cannot believe that we, some 32 years later, know better what they were attempting then to do than they knew themselves.

Senator La Follette, the elder, whom we all remember as one of the keenest minds in the history of the Senate, voted against the rule. He was one of the three Senators, as the Chair will recall, who voted against it. He said:

> So far as I am concerned, I will never by my voice or my vote consent to a rule which will put an end to the freedom of debate in the Senate.

That is the elder La Follette of Wisconsin talking. Do Senators think he did not know what was going on in the United States Senate at that time? Does anyone believe that old Bob La Follette, with his keen, philosophic, penetrating mind, did not know what he was doing when he made that statement, and did not believe that, if the rule were adopted, all debate would be cut off under that rule? Can anyone believe that Senator La Follette did not understand the meaning of the rule? Is it not perfectly clear that he opposed the rule because he thought it would put an end to successful filibustering in the United States Senate?

The debate on the adoption of the rule is full of statements which confirm this understanding. Not a word was said about the ineffectiveness of the rule against motions to proceed to the consideration of measures. Senators in debate specifically discussed not only bringing to a close debates on bills and resolutions, but on all discussion and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD bears out that statement.

It does not behoove us, more than 30 years after the adoption of the rule, to say that the men who sat in the Senate in those days did not know what they were doing. Yet that is exactly what we are saying if we contend that the rule they adopted is useless to accomplish the purpose which they declared they had in mind.

Mr. President, everyone knows the position which you took on these questions when you occupied this chair as majority leader. You argued vigorously and eloquently in 1948, before the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] made his ruling, and in 1946 before the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] made his ruling.

Mr. President, you followed the admonition of St. Paul in his Epistle to the Corinthians, in which he said, "The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." We are following the letter rather than the spirit in this legalistic hairsplitting regarding the term "measure." Mr. President, this is no time in our history for legalistic hairsplitting. This is no time in the history of this Nation for a rigid interpretation. This is a time for the Presiding Officer to do exactly what he did a year ago, when he was a Senator, and to interpret the rule in the spirit that was intended by its framers back in 1917.

Mr. President, in my view the best presentation of the case for the propriety of the petition now pending before you was made in the language which you used last year when you occupied the position of minority leader of the Senate:

> I have not any doubt that when the Senate adopted the rule XXII, it intended to make it possible for the Senate to bring to a termination debate upon any matter before it. If it be true that a measure is a step, among other steps, and a progressive course to bring about the consummation of some action, certainly a motion would be a measure within that sense.

Mr. President, those were your words 1 year ago. That is the meat of the coconut, so far as I am concerned. I rest my case in behalf of myself and other Senators on both sides of the aisle who are greatly interested in seeing that this point of order is overruled, on the language which was used by the present Vice President when he was minority leader a year ago.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Chair indulge me for about 3 minutes?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator from Illinois has concluded, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. LUCAS. I had concluded, but I have a suggestion to make later.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I must say that I regard the argument made by the Senator from Illinois in his attempt to establish the difference between a motion on one occasion and a motion on another occasion as about as labored a reasoning as I have heard in this body.

If I correctly understand the argument presented in the effort to induce the Chair to rule that a motion is a measure, if a motion is made to adjourn when there is a bill before the Senate, it is a motion; but if a motion to adjourn is made when there is no bill before the Senate, it is a measure. That is the nature of the argument which is made here today. In other words, if there is a motion to take a recess when there is a bill before the Senate, that is merely a motion; but if there is no bill before the Senate, then it becomes a measure, according to the arguments made by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. President, of course a motion is a motion every day of the week, anywhere we find it; and we cannot make it a measure by attempting to say that because there is not some pending measure back of the motion to proceed, therefore the motion becomes a measure, but that if there were a measure back of the motion to proceed, the motion would still be a motion. I submit that that argument has no validity, and certainly is no reason for overturning the precedents in this case, which are overwhelming.

I was distressed by the argument made by the distinguished Senator from Illinois that this is a time of emergency, that we should not indulge in legislative hairsplitting, and should not pay attention to the precedents; that this is an emergency, and therefore we should go about our business, and the Chair should overturn the precedents and the Senate should sustain the Chair because there is an emergency.

The Chair knows better than I do, because of his longer service in this body, that that same argument will apply against any point of order which is made to sustain any Senator in any right which he possesses upon the floor. I say that the mere fact that men may be tired, and the majority leader is unable to work his will as rapidly as he may desire, is no reason for saying that we should not be legalistic, that we should have no hairsplitting, but because there is a desire to take up a measure, the Chair should rule and overturn the precedents, and, in the teeth of the express letter and wording of rule XXII, hold that a motion is a measure because there is no bill before the Senate at the present time.

I submit, with thanks to the Chair for his kindness in permitting me to make this statement, that there is no way to change a motion to a measure by sheer argument. It is either a motion at all times, or it is a measure at all times. Rule XXII clearly defines the difference between a motion and a measure. It provides that certain motions may be

ture petition. I submit that it becomes our responsibility to attempt to see that

Senator from Georgia have no application whatsoever to the pending question.

dictum into his opinion, as a judge fre-

made from time to time, and that the cloture rule shall apply only to the pending measure. That is clear evidence of the intent of those who framed the rule.

The Senator from Illinois challenges us as to whether or not the late Senator La Follette, of Wisconsin, knew what he was doing when he opposed this rule. The fact stands out from every word of that debate—and I have read every word of it—that the distinguished Senator La Follette, of Wisconsin, was opposed to cloture in any form, at any time. His statement cannot be used to throw any light upon the intention of those who framed this cloture rule to apply to a pending measure.

Under the precedents and under the rules, I submit that the Chair should sustain the point of order.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I presume that under the rules the Chair could have ruled immediately following the time when the point of order was made; but the Chair has been good enough to listen to these arguments, and I am sure that we all appreciate it. We hope that we have made some contribution toward helping the Chair make up his mind.

I rise to make a suggestion. I am not sure whether the Chair is ready to rule or not. I suggest that it might be possible for us to take a recess now until noon tomorrow, and that when the Senate reconvenes it be in order for the Chair at that time to make his decision on the point of order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. The cloture petition has now been filed. As I understand the rule, the cloture petition would be automatically voted upon at 1 o'clock on Saturday afternoon. Suppose the request is granted, and we recess until tomorrow noon. If after the ruling Senators should wish to debate the appeal, I ask the Chair whether the time set in the rule with respect to the cloture petition would automatically expire at 1 o'clock on Saturday. Is it the opinion of the Chair that Senators desiring to make speeches on the appeal might be permitted to do so? Would they be automatically cut off, and would the debate be terminated at 1 o'clock on Saturday afternoon?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That inquiry presents a serious question, as to whether debate on the appeal, if one is taken, should extend beyond the hour fixed in the rule for a vote, or whether debate on the appeal would be cut off. It would depend to some extent on whether a motion to lay the appeal on the table were made in the meantime; but the Chair has consulted the Parliamentarian about that question, because it occurred to the Chair that it might arise. Although the Chair is not finally passing on that inquiry, he is inclined to the opinion, based upon his consultation, that even if the debate should go beyond the 1 o'clock period on Saturday or 1 hour after the Senate convened, and if the decision of the Chair—whichever way it goes—should be sustained or overruled, so that the Senate would pass on the question of the application of the petition to the present motion, the vote would then take place immediately upon the conclusion of that matter, even if it were beyond 1 o'clock on Saturday.

Mr. WHERRY. In other words, if the debate continued on the appeal, when the Senator who was then speaking finished his argument, the cloture petition would become effective, and automatically the vote would be had on the petition?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Of course, it would depend on how the Senate voted on a possible appeal. But the Chair has in mind what the Senator from Nebraska has in his mind.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In other words, that the Senate will not deprive itself of the right to vote on the cloture petition——

Mr. WHERRY. That is right.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senate, either by upholding or overruling the Chair, should decide that the petition is fileable at this time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand, then, that the Chair expects to rule, if we should ever reach that stage of the proceedings, that the filing of the petition would be considered as not nunc pro tunc from the time when it was offered, but that the Chair would hold that it would be permissible to extend the vote on the petition.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is not finally ruling; but the Chair is giving the view which he at the moment entertains, after consultation with the Parliamentarian of the Senate.

But of course the Chair is subject to advice before that situation arises, if it does arise.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Chair sustained the point of order, that question would not arise.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proceedings under the rule would probably be stayed until that period had been reached.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to permit me to propound a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, my parliamentary inquiry is this: Will the proper time for making the point of order on the question raised by the parliamentary inquiry of the Senator from Nebraska come, let us say, at 1 o'clock on Saturday, if that is the time when the cloture petition would otherwise be in order to be voted upon?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is difficult to decide regarding a point of order which has not been raised, and which may not be raised; it is also rather difficult to pass on the question of when the point of order suggested by the question of the Senator from Nebraska might be raised so that the Chair could pass on it as it might arise under the situation which might then exist.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My point is that it could not arise until 1 o'clock on Saturday; could it?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Probably not. If all the proceedings should be consummated before 1 o'clock on Saturday and if a decision should be arrived at, either by the Chair or by the Senate, that this petition could be filed, then the vote would take place.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is it not true that in no event could there be a vote on the alleged cloture petition until the Senate and the Chair had taken final action on the parliamentary situation which is now before the Chair and the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks that is true.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, before I make a motion for a recess, I am willing to abide by the wishes of the Chair as to whether he wishes to rule at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is willing to rule now.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Rule! Rule!

The VICE PRESIDENT. It might be some accommodation to the Chair to have time overnight to study the arguments on the point of order, but if the Senate insists on having the Chair rule at this time, the Chair is willing to do so.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Rule! Rule!

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will rule now, if that is the wish of the Senate, unless the Senator from Illinois wishes to make a motion for a recess.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not insist upon having the Chair rule at this time. I am willing to abide by the Chair's preference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair supposes that he might as well proceed to a ruling:

The Chair appreciates the importance of the question now before him; and because of its importance, the Chair will ask the Senate to indulge him in a discussion of the whole matter.

Many conflicting statements have been made. Even the Chair has been quoted on both sides of this point of order, tonight; and the Chair supposes that cancels his statements altogether. The Chair will not comment upon that. But there have been so many speculations, predictions, and comments, both in the Senate and in the press and otherwise, as to how the Chair would rule, that the Chair feels somewhat like the man who was being ridden out of town on a rail: Someone asked him how he liked it; and he said that if it were not for the honor of the thing, he would just as soon walk. [Laughter.]

There are two phases of this matter, as the Chair sees it. One is an effort to ascertain what the Senate intended when it adopted rule XXII; and the other is the application of the precedents or decisions which have heretofore been made in interpreting rule XXII. The Chair wishes to analyze those decisions to the best of his ability.

The first case which arose, following the adoption of the rule to which reference has been made, was in connection with the Treaty of Versailles, which was

before the Senate in 1919. It had been made the unfinished business by a vote of the Senate, and was the pending measure. During its pendency and the discussion upon it, various amendments and reservations were offered to the resolution of ratification; and debate upon them proceeded for some length of time.

Senator Hitchcock, of Nebraska, who was in charge of the treaty, filed a petition for cloture, not on the treaty itself, but on the reservations and amendments to the resolution of ratification of the treaty. The Chair held—and the Senate sustained the Chair in the ruling—that cloture did not lie on the amendments or the reservations to the treaty. What the Chair would have ruled if the petition for cloture had been filed on the treaty itself, the Chair cannot now speculate.

But if the petition had been filed on the treaty itself, and had been adopted by the two-thirds vote required under the rule, that would automatically have limited or closed debate on the amendments and reservations, because, under the terms of the rule itself, when a cloture petition is filed and is adopted by the Senate on the main pending measure, it applies to all amendments which have been presented up to that time.

So the ruling of the Chair and the action of the Senate, in holding that a cloture petition could not be filed as to an amendment to a measure which was the main measure pending before the Senate, do not, it seems to the Chair, have any application to the pending motion offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

Passing for the moment the rulings of Vice President Dawes in 1927—which likewise, it seems to the Chair, have no relation to this matter, because there was a pending measure before the Senate, and the cloture petition seems to have been filed on a measure which was being debated, instead of the one which was actually the pending measure and the unfinished business—we come to the next precedent to which reference has been made, and which has been relied upon—namely, the ruling made by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] as President pro tempore of the Senate in 1946. In that case the Senate had, by affirmative action, made Senate bill 101 the unfinished business of the Senate. It was known as the FEPC bill, in charge of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. While that measure was pending and under discussion, an adjournment was taken, which brought about the morning hour. The question of amending the Journal was raised. Strange to say, the rule does not require the approval of the Journal. The Chair has been under a different impression. We have from time immemorial by habit secured an approval of the Journal; but the rule itself says nothing about the approval of the Journal, but provides for its being read for amendments and corrections.

The Journal was under discussion, on a motion to amend it, and while that was in progress, a petition for cloture was filed on Senate bill 101, which had been made the unfinished business. It had been the pending measure. The Senator from Tennessee, acting as President pro tempore of the Senate, held that the motion to amend the Journal displaced Senate bill 101 as the pending measure, and that, inasmuch as the cloture petition had been filed on Senate bill 101, which at least for the time being had ceased to be the pending measure, it was not receivable and could not be filed, because it was presented at a time when a motion to amend the Journal was under discussion, which temporarily at least had suspended the status of Senate bill 101 as the pending measure.

Therefore, in effect, the Senator from Tennessee, as President pro tempore, was not required to pass on the question whether a cloture motion would be applicable to a motion to amend the Journal, because it was not so filed. It was filed for the purpose of bringing about the closing of debate on Senate bill 101, which the Senator from Tennessee held was not the pending measure at the time the cloture motion was filed. Therefore, in the opinion of the Chair, that ruling does not apply to the present situation.

We come now to the decision made in 1948 by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. The Chair was happy the other day to see the distinguished Senator from Michigan quoted in the press as having said this was not a contest of popularity between the Senator from Michigan and the present occupant of the Chair. The present occupant of the Chair is very happy to feel that that is true; because if it were the question, the Chair would be foredoomed to defeat on that proposition in a contest with the Senator from Michigan. The Chair is sure the Senator from Michigan and all other Senators know there is no Senator here, nor has there been one since I have been in the Senate, for whom I have a more affectionate regard, and for whose opinions I have more profound respect than I have for his.

The pending measure at that time was Senate bill 2644, which was under the sponsorship and in control of the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], providing for the development of civil-transport aircraft adaptable for auxiliary military service. That bill was the unfinished business and the pending measure at the time the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] moved that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 29, the anti-poll-tax bill passed by the House, which had been reported by the Senate committee and which was on the calendar. That motion was in order. If it had been voted on and had been successful, it would have displaced Senate bill 2644, because a motion to proceed to the consideration of another bill while a bill is under consideration as the unfinished business and the pending measure, if successful, displaces the original bill and puts it back on the calendar. That is what the Chair had in mind when this debate began, in his probably rather presumptuous effort to advise the Senate in regard to some of the rules in regard to the procedure. But a mere motion to take up one bill cannot be amended by a motion to proceed to the consideration of another bill. Such a motion is not in order. The motion to take up the first bill would have to be defeated before a motion could be made to consider another bill. In other words, a motion to take up Senate bill 46, for instance, cannot be substituted for a motion to take up Senate bill 92. The motion to take up bill 92 must be defeated, and then a motion made to take up bill 46, if that is what is desired.

So when the Senator from Nebraska made his motion to proceed to the consideration of House bill 29, which was an anti-poll-tax bill, in lieu of Senate bill 2644, which was the pending measure, a point of order was made. After some debate a petition for cloture was filed, on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska. A point of order was made by the Senator from Georgia. It was debated. I think it is fair to assume the point of order of the Senator from Georgia was based upon his belief and conviction that a petition for cloture would not lie in regard to a motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill. The point of order was debated. The present occupant of the chair, as Senator, took part in the debate. That is one reason why the Chair has felt it a duty to himself and to the Senate to go as deeply as possible into this whole question, so that he would not be prejudiced or even influenced by that action, and the position which he took as a Senator on the floor, although the Chair recognizes that when a Senator later becomes the Presiding Officer, the situation is not precisely comparable to that of a lawyer in court employed by a private client to prosecute or defend a lawsuit, who later goes on the bench to decide cases that might involve the same problem.

After debate, the then Presiding Officer, the distinguished Senator from Michigan, ruled that the pending measure was not the motion of the Senator from Nebraska to proceed to the consideration of House bill 29, but that the pending measure was Senate bill 2644, the aviation bill. Having decided that the aviation bill was the pending measure and that the motion of the Senator from Nebraska was not the pending measure, the Senator from Michigan might have rested his decision on that point alone, because, if, by that decision, the motion of the Senator from Nebraska was in a sense, as we say, thrown out of court, it followed almost automatically that a cloture petition could not lie upon that motion. But, inasmuch as the Senator from Georgia had made his point of order on the ground that the motion itself was not in order, and that any motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill or resolution could not be construed as the pending measure in the sense that a petition for cloture would lie, the Senator from Michigan no doubt felt an obligation to comment on the situation and to rule on it, in a fashion. I mean by that, having made the other decision, although I doubt if the Senator from Michigan who was presiding at that time intended it so, it might be classified as obiter dictum, as lawyers and judges say when a judge renders a decision which makes unnecessary a declaration or observation in the decision of the matter before him.

Be that as it may, in view of the fact that the Chair ruled that the pending measure at that time was Senate bill 2644, upon which no petition for cloture had been filed, therefore the motion of the Senator from Nebraska was not the pending measure, although the Chair ruled upon the point of order made by the Senator from Georgia.

The Chair is of the opinion that that situation and its complications are not applicable to the question which is now presented to the Chair, so that the Chair does not feel that previous decisions, based upon a different state of facts and a different legislative situation in the Senate, are binding upon the Chair at this time in passing upon a simple question as to whether a motion, a stark, uncomplicated motion, with nothing else pending before the Senate, is the subject of a cloture petition.

In order to reach a reasonable conclusion on that point the Chair has read and re-read the debates which took place at the time the rule was adopted; and as the distinguished Senator from Michigan said, in his comments on August 2, last year:

> The question is not new before the Senate, because it has been under discussion ever since the Senate was organized in 1789. Various efforts have been made to bring about the closing of debate, but not until 1917 was any formal rule adopted providing for cloture such as that which is in rule XXII.

The Chair not only has read the debates which took place at that time, but has also tried to get some help from law dictionaries, decisions of courts, and from all kinds of sources that might shed some light upon what the Senate meant or thought it meant when it used the phrase "pending measure." It has long been the practice of courts, in undertaking to interpret statutes, not only to look at the wording of a statute, but, if there be any ambiguity or uncertainty, to resort to the debates in the Congress or in the legislature or to the reports of committees on the legislation passed, in an effort to divine the intention of the legislative body in passing the act.

The Chair was unable to find very many decisions—in fact, only one legal decision—defining the word "measure," and that was in a case in Arizona in which under the initiative and referendum, there had been submitted to the people to vote upon an act of the legislature or a proceeding of the legislature. The supreme court of that State held that under a constitution providing for initiative and referendum there had not been submitted a completed act upon which to vote, and they could not submit to the people a mere proceeding or anything less than a complete act upon which the people could vote.

The Chair has also undertaken to enlighten himself about what the Senate meant in 1917, by looking at all sorts of dictionaries, literary and legal. While they are not binding on the Chair, or on the Senate, they do shed some light upon what the Senate was trying to do in 1917. It is not necessary to quote those definitions, but the most reliable and, the Chair thinks, probably the one which sheds the most light upon the question, is the definition found in the Century Dictionary, which defines a measure as one of a number of progressive steps looking to a definite conclusion, looking to the accomplishment of a fixed end. Therefore, if that sort of definition should be applied here, it would undoubtedly apply to the word "measure" in the rule.

In the debates which have taken place and in the decisions of courts there seems no question that a court has the right to interpret a statute. It has a right to construe it as it may apply to situations within the intention of the legislature. Courts have even gone so far as to say that a court may so construe a statute as to make effective the meaning of the legislative body, even though the formal words used do not precisely match the situation with which it is seeking to deal. The Chair thinks that is a general rule of construction which lawyers and judges generally recognize.

Now, therefore, what was the Senate seeking to accomplish in 1917? The distinguished Senator Walsh, of Montana, who was one of the ablest lawyers who ever served in this body, made a very long speech in which he argued the question whether the Senate was a continuing body and whether its rules had to be changed every time a new Congress convened. That has no relationship to this matter, but the final conclusion to which he came was that, without regard to that question, the Senate had the right to adopt such rules as would enable it to transact its business. Senator Cummings, of Iowa, who was at that time a distinguished Senator and was later President pro tempore of the Senate, made an address in which he said that he had long been in favor of the closing of debate in the Senate, and had long been in favor of amending the rules so as to enable the Senate to transact its business. To the same effect were the statements of Senator Hoke Smith, of Georgia; Senator Vardaman, of Mississippi; and Senator Hardwick, of Georgia.

In his decision in 1946 the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] quoted a statement by Senator Underwood, of Alabama, in arguing a point of order, in which the Senator from Alabama said that the rule was intended to apply to a bill, a resolution, or any other parliamentary action that was before the Senate for its consideration.

While the question of a motion or any other ancillary proceeding prior to the making of a definite bill the unfinished business of the Senate was not mentioned, those who voted for the amendment of the rule indicated, as it appears to the Chair, at least, that what they were trying to do was to close debate on the process which may have been before them, which they construed as business, in order that they might transact that business. Those who voted against it—only 3, Senator Sherman, of Illinois; Senator La Follette, of Wisconsin; and Senator Gronna, of North Dakota—placed their opposition to the amendment of the rule on the ground that it undertook to limit debate, and they were unalterably opposed to the limitation of debate in the Senate. So, in his effort to find out what was in the mind of the Senate at the time, the Chair has reached the conclusion that what the Senate was trying to do, what it thought it was doing, what it intended to do, was to adopt a rule which would enable it to transact its business.

In order to nullify that intention, the Chair would feel that he must rule that the word "measure" or the words "pending measure" must be given the narrow, strained, and legalistic construction that they meant only a bill which had been made the unfinished business of the Senate, and therefore was the pending measure, and it undoubtedly would be a pending measure.

A motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill is an absolutely indispensable process in the enactment of legislation. It is just as indispensable in order that a law may become effective or be enacted by Congress as a vote on the bill itself when a final conclusion has been reached and the vote is taken. Without a motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill or resolution, the Senate cannot consider it, and therefore a motion to proceed is an indispensable step and a necessary part of the process taken by the Congress or any other legislative body in order that a bill may finally become a law.

The situation which exists here now is one which, in the Chair's opinion, has never presented itself before. This is the only time when an uncomplicated, bald, stark motion, without anything else on the calendar, without anything else pending before the Senate, has been presented. All the other situations to which reference has been made were complicated by some other matter that was pending at the time which the Chair has held constituted the pending measure.

The Chair is unwilling to believe and cannot believe that in 1917 the Senate did not know what it wanted, did not know where it was going, and did not know how to get it if it did know where it was going. The Senate at that time was composed of some of the most distinguished men in the history of the Senate. The Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Lodge; the Senator from Iowa, Mr. Cummins; the Senator from Georgia, Mr. Hoke Smith; the Senator from Mississippi, Mr. John Sharp Williams, and his colleague Mr. Vardaman; and many other Senators whose names could be mentioned only to emphasize the fact that they were able and outstanding Senators, composed the Senate at that time.

The Chair is unwilling to believe, from the debates which ensued not only on the resolution proposing an amendment to the rules, but the debates which had taken place from time immemorial in the Senate, that the Senate as it was then made up was so incompetent, so lacking in its conception of the effect of its action either on a rule or on a bill, that the Members contemplated that under the rule which they adopted a situation would arise such as that which confronts the Senate now. If what is contended is to be the rule of the Senate, then the Senate can never reach a point where it can vote on an amendment to its own rules, if there is a determined effort made to prevent the Senate from ever reaching that point.

The Chair cannot believe that the Senate in debating this rule intended to freeze its own rules in perpetuity, so that it could never vote to change them so long as there was a determined group of Senators opposed to any change, who were willing to prevent the Senate from even considering a change in the rules except by unanimous consent, and it would almost amount to that.

Therefore it is the opinion of the Chair, without going into any further detail, that the precedents which have been cited do not apply to the present situation; that the Senate, when it adopted the rule, intended to make it possible for a cloture petition to be filed in order that it might transact its business, and certainly the motion under discussion is business, because if it were adopted, under the rules of the Senate in regard to quorum calls, it would be the transaction of such business as would justify another call after it had been voted upon.

Therefore, in view of the obvious intention of the Senate in 1917, as the Chair sees it, to close debate, as Senator Underwood said, on a bill, resolution, or any other parliamentary action that was before the Senate, and in view of the fact that the precedents which have been relied on do not in the opinion of the Chair apply to the present situation, the Chair cannot do otherwise than overrule the point of order, which he does.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia appeals from the decision of the Chair. The question is, Shall the ruling of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, March 11, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 10 (legislative day of February 21), 1949:

UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

The following-named persons to be members of the United States Advisory Commission on Information for the terms indicated, to which offices they were appointed during the recess of the Senate:

Mark Foster Ethridge, of Kentucky, for a term expiring January 27, 1951.

Mark A. May, of Connecticut, for a term expiring January 27, 1950.

Justin Miller, of California, for a term expiring January 27, 1950.

Philip D. Reed, of New York, for a term expiring January 27, 1949.

Erwin D. Canham, of Massachusetts, for a term expiring January 27, 1949.

The following-named persons to be members of the United States Advisory Commission on Information for terms of 3 years expiring January 27, 1952, and until their successors have been appointed and qualified (reappointments):

Philip D. Reed, of New York.

Erwin D. Canham, of Massachusetts.

COMMISSIONER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

John R. Nichols, of New Mexico, to be Commissioner of Indian Affairs, vice William A. Brophy, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 10 (legislative day of February 21), 1949:

IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY

Maj. Gen. Herman Feldman, O5724, United States Army, for appointment as the Quartermaster General, United States Army.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major general

Maj. Gen. Stanley Lonzo Scott, O4439.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Albert Pierson, O11838.

Brig. Gen. Williston Birkhimer Palmer, O12246.

Brig. Gen. Robert Miller Montague, O12261.

Temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of section 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Vernon Edwin Prichard, O6882.

Brig. Gen. Francis Henry Lanahan, Jr., O12735.

Brig. Gen. Roy Charles Lemach Graham, O4971.

Brig. Gen. William Kelly Harrison, Jr., O5279.

Brig. Gen. George David Shea, O5465.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Frank Leo Howley, O299977.

Col. Edward Caswell Wallington, O3838.

Col. Kirke Brooks Lawton, O6805.

Col. Harry Reichelderfer, O7547.

Col. Emmett James Bean, O12381.

Col. Wesley Tate Guest, O14654.

NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY

The officers named herein for appointment in the National Guard of the United States of the Army of the United States under the provisions of section 38 of the National Defense Act, as amended:

To be major generals of the line

Maj. Gen. Ronald Cornelius Brock, to date from July 27, 1948.

Maj. Gen. Brendan Austin Burns, to date from October 25, 1948.

Maj. Gen. John Uberto Calkins, Jr., to date from April 27, 1948.

Maj. Gen. Karl Frederick Hausauer, to date from October 25, 1948.

Maj. Gen. Daniel Harrison Hudelson, to date from April 27, 1948.

Maj. Gen. Ralph Andrus Loveland, to date from July 27, 1948.

Maj. Gen. Alexander Gallatin Paxton, to date from July 27, 1948.

Maj. Gen. William Irwin Rose, to date from February 9, 1948.

Maj. Gen. Richard Smykal, to date from September 27, 1948.

Maj. Gen. Daniel Bursk Strickler, to date from July 27, 1948.

To be brigadier generals of the line

Brig. Gen. H. Miller Ainsworth, to date from September 27, 1948.

Brig. Gen. William Seiler Bailey, to date from February 5, 1948.

Brig. Gen. Frank B. DeLano, to date from April 28, 1948.

Brig. Gen. Alfred Halleck Doud, to date from October 26, 1948.

Brig. Gen. Homer Oliver Eaton, Jr., to date from April 28, 1948.

Brig. Gen. George Francis Ferry, to date from April 27, 1948.

Brig. Gen. William Murray Hamilton, to date from February 5, 1948.

Brig. Gen. Walter Jones Hanna, to date from July 28, 1948.

Brig. Gen. Thomas Linus Hoban, to date from October 25, 1948.

Brig. Gen. William Dolphus Jackson, to date from March 12, 1948.

Brig. Gen. Gordon Alexander MacDonald, to date from October 26, 1948.

Brig. Gen. Jesse Eschol McIntosh, to date from February 6, 1948.

Brig. Gen. Neil Robert McKay, to date from July 28, 1948.

Brig. Gen. John Webster Naylor, to date from April 28, 1948.

Brig. Gen. Carl Lawrence Phinney, to date from July 29, 1948.

Brig. Gen. Joseph Alsop Redding, to date from April 28, 1948.

Brig. Gen. Ralph Ferdinand Schirm, to date from July 29, 1948.

Brig. Gen. Patrick Elihu Seawright, to date from February 6, 1948.

Brig. Gen. Edward Devlin Sirois, to date from February 6, 1948.

Brig. Gen. Wint Smith, to date from June 8, 1948.

Brig. Gen. Paul Edward Warfield, to date from October 26, 1948.

Brig. Gen. Edward Otto Wolf, to date from September 8, 1948.

Brig. Gen. Warren Claypool Wood, to date from June 11, 1948.

To be major generals, Adjutant General's Department

Maj. Gen. William Henry Harrison, Jr., to date from March 5, 1948.

Maj. Gen. Curtis Dion O'Sullivan, to date from February 4, 1948.

To be brigadier generals, Adjutant General's Department

Brig. Gen. Murdock Alexander Campbell, to date from October 26, 1948.

Brig. Gen. George Milton Carter, to date from October 26, 1948.

Brig. Gen. Raymond Frederick Hufft, to date from November 1, 1948.

Brig. Gen. Richard King Mellon, to date from April 27, 1948.

Brig. Gen. George Clifford Moran, to date from July 28, 1948.

Brig. Gen. Frederick Gates Reincke, to date from July 28, 1948.

OFFICERS' RESERVE CORPS OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The officers named herein for appointment in the Officers' Reserve Corps of the Army of the United States under the provisions of section 37 of the National Defense Act as amended:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. James Bell Cress.

Brig. Gen. Hanford MacNider.

Brig. Gen. Robert Wilbar Wilson.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. William Andros Barron, Jr.

Brig. Gen. Wallace Harry Graham.

Brig. Gen. Telford Taylor.

Brig. Gen. Thomas Edison Troland.

Brig. Gen. Courtney Whitney.

Col. Frank Brown Berry.

Col. Robert Hunter Clarkson.

Col. Clyde Emerson Dougherty.

Col. John Bettes Dunlap.

Col. James Calvin Frank.

Col. Charles Lyn Fox.

Col. Thomas Rodman Goethals.

Col. Harold Leroy Goss.

Col. Robert Dinwiddie Groves.
Col. William Rodes Jesse.
Col. Henry Kirksey Kellogg.
Col. Richard Leeson McNelly.
Col. Henry Carlton Newton.
Col. Francis J. Reichmann.
Col. James Thomas Roberts.
Col. Carl Ferdinand Steinhoff.
Col. Arthur Elsworth Stoddard.
Col. Carl Thomas Sutherland.
Col. Frederick Marshall Warren.
Col. Richard Seabury Whitcomb.
Lt. Col. Clement Bates Ellery Harts.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The following-named persons for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

To be second lieutenants

Milton I. Aalen
Grey L. Adams
James R. Adams
James D. Alexander
Theofelos A. Aliapoulios
Fred C. Allen
Herman D. Allshouse
George B. Ashby
Roy E. Bach
Linford B. Bachtell
David J. Baer
Richard M. Bagley
George F. Barker
Glen E. Barrington
George W. Beale
Vaughn L. R. Beals, Jr.
John C. Beeley
Rowland H. Bemis
John J. Berky
LeRoy W. Berry
William J. Besaw
Rufus L. Billups
Tommy F. Blackstone
Sylvester F. Blakely
Rudolph Bonapace
Harold K. Boyd
Lester T. Brannon, Jr.
Joseph S. Breeden
Jerome G. Bricker
Frederick A. Bristol, Jr.
John E. Brooke
Earl C. Brown
John D. Brown (Reserve Officers' Training Corps)
John D. Brown (aviation cadet)
Marvin L. Brown
Robert R. Puckley, Jr.
Lawrence K. Bulen
Marshall E. Burbank
David D. Bush
Irwin C. Cairns, Jr.
William G. Cameron
Matthew J. Campanella
Lucian C. Cantin
Avril B. Carter
Robert F. Chadeayne
William R. Chapin
William I. Chenault
John E. Chrisinger
Carl E. Christenson
Gilvin L. Claypool
Douglas R. Clifford
David B. Cloud
Robert E. Clyburn
Joseph W. Cohen
W. Frank Cole, Jr.
Mitchell E. Coleman
James D. Collums
Malcolm K. Condie
James E. Conlon
Clyde A. Cook
Randolph D. Cook
Arthur Cooper
Kenneth J. Costa
Harris E. Coutchie
John R. Crane
John S. Croswell, Jr.
Joe W. Cunningham
James A. Cushman
Jacques C. Dastillung
Robert A. Davidson
Harold A. Davis
Kenneth E. Davison
Thomas J. Devanny
Douglas C. Dowell
Earloyde Edmonson
Clinton W. Ellinger III
Raymond Elliott
James T. Ellis
Morley L. Emery
Ferd B. English, Jr.
Paul J. English
Howard A. Hagen
Howard F. Hamill
Darwin R. Hamilton
Richard J. Hamilton
Robert L. Hamilton
Lloyd G. Hamlett
Victor W. Hammond
John I. Hammonds, Jr
George E. Hansen
Richard O. Hansen
Byne D. Harris
Thomas R. Harrison
Don M. Hartung
James E. Harvey
Robert A. Haun
Robert W. Hazlett
James G. Henry
Paul J. Hesketh, Jr.
Edward A. Hinkle
Robert C. Hinrichs
Richard H. Hittle
Gerald J. Hogenmiller
Walter A. Hogge, Jr.
Francis X Holbrook
Paul J. Holgren
Clarence W. Holloway
Arley R. Hombaker
Robert M. Horsky
Albert F. Howell
Virgil R. Huddleston
Bennett W. James
Robert D. Erickson
Francis P. Farrell
Kenneth W. F. Feltham
William P. Fey
Milo H. Fields
Edward F. Fisher
Charles M. Forbes
Dean W. Forbes
David L. Fort
Karl W. Forward
Thomas L. Foster
James E. Francy
Bobby G. Franklin
James D. Freeman
Robert E. Fullerton
Tom L. Gabbard
William H. Gallup, Jr.
James W. Geiger
John L. Gerwig
Kay G. Glenn
Jack D. Gooding
Robert A. Gray
James F. Green
Philip D. Greenwood
Robert E. Gross
David F. Guess
George C. James
Jake Jenkins
Evan L. Jensen
Gordon I. Jensen
Harold M. Jensen
Prentice E. Jones
Robert B. Jones
Robert C. Jones
Walter G. Jones
Robin A. Julien
Wilbur C. Kaiser
Eugene C. Karr
Alfred R. Kattar
Willis G. Kearl
David K. Keeler
Richard C. Keller
Howard F. Kempsell
Larry M. Killpack
William H. King
William M. King
James W. Kirk
Gilford W. Koopmann
Victor H. Kupferer
Robert J. Lacey
Robert H. Laier
Harry W. Lambe
Maximilian Lamont
Leonard C. Langdon, Jr.
Robert L. Larsh, Jr.
Robert W. Lauer
Norbert D. LaVally
Lawrence L. Lavanier
John H. Lawson
James E. Ledlie
Elmer K. Lile
Allen J. R. Longstreet
George A. Lowes
Robert T. Lowrance
William T. Luke
James V. Lukey
Benjamin C. Luna, Jr.
Richard J. Lyman
Paul R. Maguire
Samuel Mansbach
Lester P. Martin, Jr.
Richard L. Martini
Charles M. Mason, Jr.
Robert F. Maxwell
Bobby H. McAlister
Charles R. McAllister
Robert M. McAllister
Jerome M. McCarville
John C. McClure
Murray M. McColloch
Chester Z. McCollough, Jr.
Clayton L. McDowell
William J. McElroy III
Wilson A. McElveen, Jr.
Leon McGoogan
Cleon F. McGraw
William D. McMullen
Harold W. Meade
Wayne A. Melendrez
David K. Merrill
Joseph Meyer
Harold L. Meyers
Harris E. Miller
Joseph N. Miller, Jr.
Wallace G. Minich
Joseph R. Mitchell
Robert E. Mitchell, Jr.
Willard L. Mitchell
John K. Moberly
Leonard A. Mobley
Rufus M. Monts III
Bruce H. Moore
Harold W. Moore
Robert E. Morey
Harold J. Mosher
John M. Musterman
Gordon G. Neal
Franklin W. Neff
Howard O. Neff
Harold D. Nelson
William R. Nelson
Norton H. Nickerson
Melvin H. Nuechterlein
Clair H. Oberdier
Eric P. O'Briant
Daniel J. O'Brien
Thomas S. O'Brien
Edward W. O'Leary
Francis J. Oles
William A. Owings
John T. Palmer
Walter G. Palmer
William M. Palmer
Robert B. Parker
Benton K. Partin
Robert B. Patton
Thomas E. Pearsall
Robert C. Perdzock
Charles H. Perin
Gerald Perselay
Ralph T. Peterson, Jr.
Duane M. Phillips
Lowell G. Phillips
Richard L. Pierce
William E. Pilcher
Lew L. Pilkington
Edgar H. Pittman, Jr.
John W. Plantikow
John S. Quinn
Luther T. Quinn, Jr.
Carmen D. Ragonese
Merle R. Rauscher
Pat A. Restaino
Donald E. Rice
Charles R. Riley
Allen W. Ripley III
Charles R. Ritchie
William J. Ritts
Harry E. Roadman
J. Lee Robbins
George A. Roberts
Gerald B. Robertson
William E. Robins
Louis Robinson
Arthur R. Ross
Jack R. Rotzien
Berry W. Rowe
Gene V. Rowland
Grant C. Rowland
John A. Rubino, Jr.
John H. Rule
Joaquin A. Saavedra
Robert J. Sagwitz
James L. Sanders
James C. Scheuer
James D. Schneider
Robert J. Scott
Earl H. Seibert
Albert Shabaikowich
Elwood M. Shaulis
Robert J. Sheldon
Bernard L. Sherline
Guy J. Sherrill
Vernon P. Shockley
Alonzo M. Shoemaker, Jr.
Thomas D. Shortridge
Robert W. Slack
Edmund G. Smith
Glenn C. Smith
Richard B. Smith, Jr.
Robert C. Smith, Jr.
Ronald E. Smith
Billy J. Smoot
Earl F. Spencer, Jr.
Manning M. Stair
Adolph J. Stampfl
William R. Stapleton
Robert A. Stefanik
Kenneth L. Sterne
Billy E. Stewart
Leslie M. Stewart
Joseph E. Stockwell
William A. Sulter
Edward J. Sullivan
Roland H. Swartzlander
Robert E. Swett
Henry L. Swift
Luther A. Tarbox
Theodore K. Taylor
Willard D. Tease
Hagop H. Terzagian
Doyle Thigpen
Donald O. Thompson
Joseph C. Thompson
Richard W. Thompson
Stanwood Thompson
Lawrence E. Till
Archie W. Tucker
Donald B. Tuttle
Maurice O. Van Emon
Arthur C. Voudouris
Charles H. Wade, Jr.
Jack O. Wade
Arnold M. Walkow
Ernest C. Walley
Gerald L. Waterman
Ernest P. Watras
Robert L. Watson
Thomas M. Watson, Jr.
Richard A. Weil
Robert F. Wenger
James W. Wheat
Gene R. White
Gwynne W. White
Ralph W. White
John E. Wolter

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the line of the Navy:

Frank T. Watkins
Wallace R. Dowd
Tom B. Hill

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

Carl A. Broaddus
Joseph B. Logue

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

Frank C. Dunham
Stephen R. Edson

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the grade of captain in the line of the Navy:

Stanley M. Alexander
William C. Butler, Jr.
Rex S. Caldwell
Marshall E. Dornin
Walter M. Foster
John J. Greytak
Frederick V. H. Hilles
Bruce D. Kelley
Herman N. Larson
Nicholas Lucker, Jr.
William B. Moore
Marvin C. Parr
Louis F. Teuscher
John L. Wilfong

The following-named officer for temporary appointment to the grade of captain in the line of the Naval Reserve:

Edward R. Anderson

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

Luther F. Duncan, to be an ensign in the Navy from the third day of June 1949, in lieu of ensign in the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed, to correct date of rank.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Navy from the third day of June 1949:

John M. Andersen
Robert G. Anderson
Alex L. Baldwin
Joseph E. Bores
John P. Cooper
David E. Dearolph
James E. Feely, Jr.
Richard L. Gribling
Hughen G. Halliburton
Robert R. King, Jr.
Dale W. F. Krehmeyer
Bernard P. Kritzmacher
Lewis S. Lamoreaux
Oren A. Peterson
James K. Staud
Winston J. Taylor
James A. White
William DeW. Wingfield

Worthen A. Walls (civilian college graduate) to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

Robert W. Didion
Louis M. Ellis

Frederick S. Welham (civilian college graduate) to be a lieutenant in the Dental Corps of the Navy, in lieu of lieutenant commander as previously nominated and confirmed.

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Marilyn A. Blasio
Willidean Blazier
Eleanor F. Bresnahan
Dolores T. Burns
Mildred C. Cannaday
Clare P. Cooney
Georgia J. Donnelly
Mary V. Doyle
Hope M. Estey
Frieda C. Galipp
Elizabeth A. Geary
Freda M. Hawkins

Violet C. Haydel
Etha M. Horngren
Estelle Korol
Rosalind C. Light
Mary L. Lower
Alice T. McCarthy
Rose E. McCluskey
Katherine M. Merrill
Margaret C. Oleyar
Mary R. Remski
Margaret Shaker
Alice L. Spence
Frances C. Whitlock
Dorothy Zulick

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

Commander

William S. Lawler

Lieutenant commanders

Wendell A. Butcher
Hermann J. Lukeman

Lieutenants

Gustave T. Anderson
Charles E. Weber

Lieutenants (junior grade)

Victor G. Benson
Cyril J Honsik
Edward Martin, Jr.
Gerald A. Martin

The following-named officer to the grade indicated in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

Lieutenant

George LeR. Baker

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Lieutenants (junior grade)

Helen E. Crabtree
Pauline R. Uhorczuk

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 10, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Walter Dominic Hughes, O. P., S. T. D., Dominican House of Studies, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Direct by Your inspiration, we beseech You, O Lord, all the actions of these our elected representatives, and in Your tender providence and paternal care govern those who govern us. Sustain them, Heavenly Father, by Your power, so that neither the hostility of enemies nor the indifference of unappreciative allies may thwart their efforts or deny to them ultimate success.

Incarnate wisdom, Son of God, who came into the world to enlighten every man, teach them truth. Educate them in the practical prudence of just judgments and the impracticality of hasty expedience and unworthy compromise. Divine Legislator, who as man was the most faithful executor of the will of God, give these legislators sound judgment and a right conscience. By Your continuing assistance enable them to provide laws that will promote our temporal welfare and remove the obstacles to the spiritual good of all in this great Nation dedicated to her from whom You took Your flesh to dwell among us.

Strengthened by divine power and enlightened with supernal wisdom, may they be moved by the Holy Spirit of Divine Love to forestall selfish interests and accomplish the common good of each and all. May that common good be the motivation of all their deliberations and counsels. May they exercise their authority, not in the petty tyranny of a partisan spirit, but in the spirit of Christian love, knowing that only by their own subjection to God as their Father may they enlist the allegiance of their fellow men as brothers.

Beginning each day and every action before God in prayerful submission, unwavering confidence, and sincerest love, may they and those whom they govern be rewarded with that measure of temporal happiness which will most readily lead them to the unbounded happiness of heaven in the vision and fruition of God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, who lives and reigns for ever and ever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HERLONG asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the text of the address of President Truman given on the occasion of the conferring upon him of the honorary degree of doctor of humanities at Rollins College, in Winter Park, Fla., on Tuesday last.

Mr. SMATHERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Grantland Rice.

Mr. HELLER, Mr. PASSMAN, and Mr. BOGGS of Delaware asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. RAINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement made by himself.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make in the Committee of the Whole today and include certain extraneous matter.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in one an article from the United States News and World Report, entitled "You, Too, Work for Uncle Sam," and in the other an editorial from the Bristol Courier of Tuesday, March 8, on paying Britain's bills.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on House Resolution 143, which he has introduced, and include an article and an editorial.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a résumé prepared by herself regarding veterans' pensions, together with a letter from General Gray regarding veterans' pensions, and a statement from him regarding the discharges other than dishonorable.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper statement.

Mr. TOWE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on socialized medicine.

Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Newark Evening News.

Mr. HART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the New York Times.

GOVERNMENT COMPETITION WITH PRIVATE SHIPYARDS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, many thousands of shipyard employees are in danger of losing their jobs. This unemployment will result if the Maritime Commission is not prevented from involving the Federal Government in the ship-repair business.

A reduction in ship construction and repair work has already compelled the shipbuilding industry to lay off large numbers of men. Therefore, the entrance of the Federal Government into any phase of shipbuilding work at this time would cripple an industry that has proven indispensable to our national security; it would result in unemployment and hardship to workers whose skills are a most important element in our national defense.

The Maritime Commission proposes to use movable military-type drydocks in order to recondition 2,000 laid-up cargo ships grouped into 6 fleets anchored in as many locations.

Shipbuilding experts from the East, West, and Gulf ports have testified before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries that this activity of the Maritime Commission would be very injurious to their industry and not at all profitable to the Government. They warned that unemployment would spread throughout the industry as a consequence.

It was pointed out that the Maritime Commission, in formulating their plan, did not take into account the expense of shore installations necessary for such work. These installations are available in private yards where many were built during the war under facilities contracts by the Federal Government.

With funds already expended in our shipyards, it does not seem good judgment to employ additional Government money in the purchase of new equipment to accomplish what the existing private shipyards can do and have done during the war on a scale never imagined by the most imaginative.

My district contains one of the greatest shipping and shipbuilding areas in the country. Large numbers of our people depend directly or indirectly on the Maritime industries for their living. Government competition with private industry such as proposed by the Maritime Commission would have serious economic consequences to the people of the district I represent as well as to those of every other area in the country similarly situated.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, Williams Jewell College, one of the oldest schools west of the Mississippi, this month celebrates its centennial anniversary and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include addresses delivered by the Governor of Missouri and the president of the college and other related data.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

STATE REPRESENTATIVE DUSENBURY AND REPRESENTATIVE HUGO SIMS, JR., OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend two distinguished citizens of South Carolina, both active in representative capacities, who apparently took their political lives in their hands by voting in accordance with their consciences rather than upon the basis of political expediency.

The first, Representative Dusenbury, stated in the South Carolina Legislature his opposition to the State's $60,000,000 World War II veterans' bonus bill. The holder of the Navy Cross and Silver Star, Representative Dusenbury has lost the use of his legs in action against the Japanese.

He stated in substance that he was a citizen first and a veteran second and that he would favor rather the use of the $60,000,000 for roads or schools in the State.

He stated further his political philosophy when he said:

> I am certainly willing to put my political life on the line any time for my country.

The second person whom I should like to commend is the "baby" of this House, an ex-paratrooper in our armed forces, Representative HUGO SIMS, JR., who may be young but who has wisdom far beyond his years. Yesterday Representative SIMS voted his conscience in a way which he conceived to be for the welfare of his country by casting his vote—the deciding vote—in the Committee on Education and Labor in favor of the administration's minimum-wage bill. I know that extreme pressure was brought upon the gentleman to vote against the bill and that it may well have been much more expedient for him to do so, particularly at this time when he is beginning his career.

I am very proud to be among his associates in this House.

I am sure that in each of these instances the people of South Carolina will respect the integrity and ability of their representatives and will give them the long and distinguished careers they so richly deserve.

ANNIE O. BROWN

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 140) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Annie O. Brown, wife of Edward Brown, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death, and an additional amount not to exceed $250 toward defraying the funeral expenses of the said Edward Brown.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. CHARLOTTE H. MURDOCK

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 126) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Mrs. Charlotte H. Murdock, widow of Wallace C. Murdock, late an employee of the House of Representatives, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death and an additional amount not to exceed $250 toward defraying the funeral expenses of said Wallace C. Murdock.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BOARD OF REGENTS, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged resolution (H. J. Res. 89) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, be filled by the appointment of Jerome C. Hunsaker, a citizen of Massachusetts, for the statutory term of 6 years, to succeed Frederic C. Walcott, retired.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN F. SCHMELZER

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 93) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives the sum of $393.52 to John F. Schmelzer and Alliance Insurance Co., care of William H. Clark, attorney, 637 Woodward Building, Washington, District of Columbia, as reimbursement for damages sustained to the automobile of John F. Schmelzer on May 13, 1948, as a result of an accident involving a House of Representatives postal truck at the intersection of Connecticut Avenue and California Street NW., Washington, District of Columbia.

The postal driver of the House of Representatives truck, while on official business, entered the intersection of Connecticut Avenue and California Street NW. against a red light, and was arrested, pleaded guilty, and paid a fine.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 113) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 75, Eighty-first Congress, incurred by the Committee on Education and Labor, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $15,000, including expenditures for printing and binding, employment of such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 5, strike out the words "printing and binding."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STRATEGY AND TACTICS OF WORLD COMMUNISM

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I ask for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 18.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed as a House document and that there be printed in addition 15,000 copies of Supplement III (Country Studies A, B, and C) of the report of the Subcommittee on National and International Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs entitled "The Strategy and Tactics of World Communism" for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FASCISM IN ACTION

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit House Concurrent Resolution 44, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed 100,000 additional copies of House Document No. 401, Eightieth Congress, entitled "Fascism in Action," of which 84,000 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and 16,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUSING AND RENT CONTROL, 1949

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 138 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1731) to extend certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 5 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute committee amendment recommended by the Committee on Banking and Currency now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 24]

Albert	Hall, Leonard W.	Pfeiffer, William L.
Allen, Ill.	Hays, Ark.	Phillips, Calif.
Aspinall	Hébert	Potter
Bland	Howell	Poulson
Blatnik	Jackson, Wash.	Powell
Buckley, N. Y.	Jacobs	Reed, N. Y.
Bulwinkle	Javits	Richards
Byrne, N. Y.	Kennedy	Rooney
Canfield	Keogh	Scott, Hardie
Celler	Kirwan	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Chatham	Klein	Smith, Ohio
Cooley	Macy	Somers
Corbett	McMillan, S. C.	Stigler
Coudert	Marshall	Thomas, N. J.
Davis, Tenn.	Miles	Vorys
Dawson	Morris	Whitaker
deGraffenried	Murdock	Wickersham
Dingell	Murray, Tenn.	Wilson, Okla.
Douglas	O'Toole	Withrow
Fernandes	Patten	
Furcolo	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	
Gilmer		
Granger		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 369 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WALTER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a report.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include certain statements and excerpts.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he intends to make in Committee of the Whole and include certain statements and excerpts.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

HOUSING AND RENT CONTROL, 1949

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] is recognized.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order H. R. 1731, known as the rent-control bill. It is an open rule.

The rule provides for 5 hours of general debate, a very liberal time. The rule also provides that after general debate the bill will be taken up in the House under the 5-minute rule for amendment, thereby giving the Members ample opportunity and privilege to offer amendments if they so desire.

In the interest of the new Members, Mr. Speaker, may I say that during the Eightieth Congress the Committee on Banking and Currency endeavored for months to bring out a decent rent-control bill, and finally reported one out and instructed its chairman to come to the Rules Committee and ask for a rule on it. But, unfortunately, when the chairman appeared before the Committee on Rules, he forgot about the instructions of his committee and submitted his own closed rule not on the original bill reported by the committee but on a bill backed by the real-estate operators which was against the interests of millions of American veterans and people who were unable to obtain decent living quarters.

A reading of the bill now before us and the splendid report which the committee has submitted clearly shows that it is the aim of the committee to safeguard and aid veterans and persons of low earnings and income to obtain living accommodations.

I hope in view of what has taken place heretofore that my Republican friends will join with us in passing this bill so that they will not find themselves in the position of those who voted for the vicious real estate lobbyists bill in the last session of Congress. Some of them actually did intend to join us in passing a decent bill but, unfortunately, due to the powerful influences of the great lobby that was then active here, they were forced in voting against their own desires and convictions. The activities of the lobby has not in any way diminished and its representatives can be seen in the hotels, in the corridors of the Offices buildings, and in the galleries of the House and Senate, continuing their activities in full force, determined to kill this legislation in the interest of a few thousand owners of these big apartment buildings and hotels, most of which were acquired under distress conditions at 10, 15, and 20 cents on the dollar. They have spent over $3,000,000 trying to beat this legislation, legislation in the interest of the American people, but I hope none of you new Members, and even some of you Republicans, will not fall prey to the ingenious and arrogant tactics of this lobby which, mind you, Mr. Speaker, is sponsored by the National Association of Manufacturers, builders and contractors, hotel apartment operators, and by certain groups and combinations of hotel organizations that are acquiring every hotel and apartment hotel it is possible for them to obtain.

Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion that any Member who is sincere and honest, and realizes the shortage that exists in rental quarters will support the committee and the bill.

I wish to congratulate the committee upon the splendid bill they have reported, and I reiterate and restate that any Member who is sincere, honest, and desirous of voting in the interest of the deserving veterans and the people will support this bill.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for 1 minute of my time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I have said a thousand times and now repeat, that communism has gained such a commanding influence over the minds of men as to endanger the peace and security of the whole human family.

Under the ceaseless attacks of Soviet Russia, states are falling one after the other, freedom is seeking a place to hide, religion is in retreat, and the whole moral order of the world is in a state of decay.

If communism is to be stopped here in our own country, now is the time to begin an all-out effort to stop it, and so, I wonder if the time has not arrived when the people in every part of the country should be urged to send their representatives here to counsel with one another upon the safety of the Republic.

Mr. Speaker, I fear that the strength and the will to save America must be found outside of the Government.

There may be here great virtue and wide understanding, but of courage and unselfishness there is little or none. The general welfare is consistently subordinated to personal and party politics.

And so, Mr. Speaker, we continue to ride the tide that rolls on toward that equality and democracy of which the new order speaks—an equality of servitude—a democracy of degradation.

Mr. Speaker, as to the pending rule I favor its adoption. I would like to make the observation that in time of emergency the rights of individuals must be sacrificed to the general welfare, but when the emergency has passed these rights should be restored.

The law which it is proposed to continue is confiscatory in character. Continue it indefinitely and all landed property will ultimately be sacked and ravaged. It is not good legislation and it is not good government.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] will offer several amendments. It is my feeling those amendments should be adopted, the limitation of 90 days should be imposed, then the whole thing thrown out of the window.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may need.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], chairman of the Rules Committee, has told you, House Resolution 138 makes in order the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1731) to extend certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and provides for 5 hours' general debate thereon. This rule would also waive all points of order on the bill.

However, the gentleman from Illinois failed to tell you that H. R. 1731 is a very much changed measure from that which was originally introduced by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, on January 24. If you will study a copy of the pending bill (H. R. 1731), you will note that practically the entire original measure, as introduced, has been stricken, and in its stead the committee has reported to the House a new version of the measure to extend the Rent Control Act.

While I know that this bill will be very thoroughly explained and fully debated on the floor of the House during the remainder of the day, and perhaps tomorrow morning, I want to emphasize the fact that the pending measure which would continue Federal rent control for 15 months, or until midnight of June 30, 1950, under a much stricter law than the present one. In other words, it would not only continue present controls over rental property, but would actually broaden and extend them. It would also give to rent-control officials far greater and broader powers than they have ever exercised heretofore.

The proposed law also gives to the Rent Control Director the authority to recontrol much of the rental property which has been decontrolled if he, in his judgment and discretion, deems it wise to do so.

This bill does not in any way give any assurance, or any guaranty, to any rental property owner that he will receive any return whatsoever on his investment. As far as this bill goes, it only provides that in fixing rents the Rent Control Director shall take into consideration any increased costs of maintenance and operation, such as increased taxes, higher cost of coal, labor, and so forth. Nowhere in this bill is there any provision which will give any assurance whatsoever to any American citizen who owns rental property that the rent fixed under the provisions of this proposed Federal law will be such as to give a fair return on the investment.

I am sure I am speaking for almost every Member of this House when I say none of us believes in rent profiteering. We do not like it, and we do not want it. Certainly, we all want to see the individual who is compelled to rent living quarters to receive fair treatment. We think he is entitled to that. But, on the other hand, many of us have the fixed opinion owners of rental property are also entitled to fair treatment.

Many of us in Congress have had rather sad experiences during recent years which have convinced us that neither the Federal rent-control law nor the administration thereof have been fair or just to many property owners.

I understand that in the Committee on Banking and Currency an amendment was offered by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] to require that in fixing rents the rental rate be set so as to give a fair return on the fair value of the property; or in other words, rents be fixed at a figure which will guarantee, that while the property owner has to obey the orders of the Rent Control Director, he will not be compelled to rent his property without any profit or any return upon his investment. The Brown amendment was offered in the committee, as I understand, with the thought and with the intent to extend fair treatment to those thrifty citizens who have invested their life savings in rental properties on the returns from which they have to depend for a living.

I am firmly convinced that there has never been a property right that was not also a human right.

We hear a great deal of talk, most of which is just pure, simple guff, about how human rights must always be placed above property rights, yet every property right that I ever knew of—and our Constitution, and the founding fathers who wrote it, so provided—is also a personal or a human right. It is just as much of a human right for an old man or an old woman who has saved his or her money throughout the years and invested it in a little rental property, to receive a fair return on such an investment as it is a human right for any individual to obtain a place to live at a fair rental. We should approach this entire problem only on the basis of attempting to be fair to all concerned.

I understand an amendment was also offered in the committee to extend the present rent-control law as is for 90 days in order an opportunity might be given to determine just which way we are going in our economic life here in America—whether this so-called little depression or recession or disinflation in which we find ourselves is only temporary or whether it is the beginning of a more serious situation which could develop into a full-fledged depression.

Certainly the great Committee on Ways and Means of this House, and certainly many of the agencies of Government which have seen fit to postpone action on legislation and on Government construction and other important matters until it can be determined whether we are going into a depression or are to continue at the present level of economic life, production of goods and employment of persons, have acted wisely.

I think it would be well for us to at least delay for 90 days any further consideration of this matter, until we determine just what the future may hold for America.

Of course, I am of the rather firm conviction that if there are still any communities in America—and I presume there are quite a number—in which there is still a great scarcity of rental property, and where rent control is still needed, that authority to control should be exercised by the State and local officials rather than by the Federal Government.

When this bill was before the Rules Committee, I asked a number of the members of the great Committee on Banking and Currency, who were requesting this rule, to tell us when they expected Federal rent control in America to end. Whether, if this bill was written into law, it would be the last rent-control bill we would have before us, or whether there would be others to come in the future. Whether we were embarking upon a series of continued bills, so that we will always have rent control here in this country, or will have it for many years to come. I did not get any answers, because, seemingly, they do not know. Personally, I am a little fearful that perhaps we may be going into a controlled economy, which will not be of any benefit but of great detriment to the Nation.

Despite the remarks of my beloved chairman, the gentleman from Illinois, that this is a bill for the benefit of the veteran—and it does have a section or two referring to the rights of veterans, under certain circumstances, to purchase new property or reconstructed property—from experience we have learned that Federal rent control has actually worked to the disadvantage of the veteran, because in the first Rent Control Act, passed during the war, and in every bill since, we have frozen the occupants of rental property in that property. In other words, during the war we passed a rent-control bill which provided that tenants occupying a property could always stay in that property. We made it very difficult or impossible to get rid of any tenant against his will. So when our thirteen or fourteen million veterans came home, they found that people who were not in the war had all available property rented, and that there was not any rental property to be found for use of the veterans. There was no way for them to rent an apartment or a home. Their only chance to rent a piece of property was to find one that had become vacant—a rather difficult thing to do under the circumstances. So this is not truly a bill for the benefit of the veteran.

I want to urge you to pay close attention to the coming debate, and above all else to be on the floor tomorrow and to listen to the arguments made in favor of the various amendments which will be offered. Also to vote on those amendments, because I am rather fearful that, unless this bill is properly amended, its passage will work a real hardship on the people of the United States, including many of our veterans. I hope, as this bill is fully debated and explained, that every Member of Congress may become acquainted with its provisions. As I

said in the beginning, this bill will give to the Nation a much stricter rent-control law than we have ever had before. Almost 4 years after the fighting stopped, it is proposed we extend the controls over and restrictions on the owners of property even further than we did in time of war. Therefore, I hope you will give careful consideration to this measure. This is an important matter. It contains an issue that the Congress must meet and pass upon, the more quickly the better.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] a member of the committee.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House is very fortunate. We have a very fine chairman, the Honorable BRENT SPENCE, of Kentucky. He is not only able, but he is fair to everyone, regardless of political affiliations of the member. He is always fair. Under his leadership and guidance we are permitted to bring to the House of Representatives today, I believe the best possible bill that could be brought for rent control. I do not like rent control but it is necessary. In 1947 I voted against the weak bill for the landlords only which was presented to the House for rent control. I am convinced now that we must have rent control until the emergency is over or at least until it is over to a greater extent than it is at the present time. I am convinced that some of the landlords have demonstrated an attitude toward tenants that if we were to release them from rent control at this time, I am afraid they would go too far. I am sure all landlords would not, but a sufficient number would so as to disrupt our economy. It is my prediction if we do not have rent control for the next 15 months, the time provided for in this bill, we will have increases in rents, from 50 percent to 500 percent. I am basing that upon testimony received before the committee. Unfortunately these areas that are so tight where housing accommodations and residential units are so scarce are areas in which wage earners live; and if we do not have rent control, wage earners will have to pay more rent. It will be doubled; it will be increased 200 percent, and in some instances 300 percent. That means just one thing; that is, that these wage earners cannot take care of that under their present budget. They will necessarily ask for increased wages, and if they do not receive increased wages we will possibly have strikes. So it is possible if we destroy rent control in March that we will have work stoppages in May, through strikes caused by the action of Congress in refusing to extend rent control.

This bill contains many valuable provisions that it has not contained in the past. Heretofore I have been against recontrolling. When the Housing Expediter decontrolled an area I was opposed to his having the privilege of going back and recontrolling that area. But I am now convinced that at least 150 or 200 areas can be decontrolled immediately if this bill becomes law as it is, for the reason that it provides for recontrol in the event rents get out of line. Although the Expediter would like to decontrol, not having the power to put them back under control if they get out of line, he is reluctant to do it. I think he is acting wisely in that, but if we give him the power to recontrol then he will be more liberal and generous in decontrolling areas. So at least 150 or 200 areas or portions of areas will be decontrolled almost immediately if this bill becomes law.

This bill will provide something else. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] has an amendment which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] mentioned a while ago. I am going to vote for that amendment. That amendment provides for a reasonable return upon a reasonable value. That is all right. That will correct the criticisms of many Members of this House.

The bill that was passed in 1947 I consider was strictly a landlord's bill. That bill wholly disarmed the tenants. The tenants had no rights that they could exercise, and the landlord was armed with all kinds of rights and privileges and opportunities to get rid of the tenants. So the tenants had no rights. This bill is not just a landlord's bill. It is a bill that is fair to both landlords and tenants.

It has an unusual provision in this, that each area office will have a local expediter, we will call him. He is not named that, but we will call him a local expediter—a person designated by the local board to help both landlords and tenants in presenting their claims.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. The Housing Expediter learned, in contact with local boards all over the country, that landlords were not making applications for adjustments. They were discouraged. They would go into a local office and it would be filled with people. It would take up a lot of time. They would give up and go back home and suffer the consequences.

Out of 17,000 applications filed by landlords for readjustments in one recent month, 15,000 of those cases were processed up to a few days ago, and over 13,000 received increases in rents. So that shows that if they had merit in their case they would get a readjustment.

So this committee has recommended in this bill that we have a local person whose duty it is to do nothing else except to help the landlords and tenants in getting proper and fair adjustments. That is going to relieve many of these hardship cases. With that alone and with the Brown amendment, I think we will have a very fine bill for rent control.

The number of wage earners in this country who will be affected by these enormous increases in rents is sufficient to have a great effect, a devastating effect, upon our entire economy. So a vote for this bill is a vote for stabilization, and it is a vote against the stoppage of production and strikes in the future.

I hope you will vote for the 15 months' extension that the committee is asking you to vote for today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I was very much interested in the gentleman's statement that he believed the Brown amendment was a good amendment and that he expected to vote for it when it was offered on the floor. Will the gentleman tell the membership by what vote the Brown amendment failed in the Committee on Banking and Currency?

Mr. PATMAN. That, of course, was an executive session of the committee. Does the gentleman say it is all right to disclose what happened in an executive session?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I certainly think it is all right on this particular matter.

Mr. PATMAN. It failed by a vote of 12 to 11 when it was first brought out.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And did the gentleman who is now addressing the House vote for it?

Mr. PATMAN. I voted against it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. But the gentleman has changed his position now?

Mr. PATMAN. I have; I am going to vote for it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I wonder whether it is a conversion or whether the gentleman has come to the conclusion that he cannot pass the bill without the Brown amendment in it?

Mr. PATMAN. You cannot pass quick judgment on so long an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. PATMAN. May I have three additional minutes?

Mr. SABATH. I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas may proceed.

Mr. PATMAN. I voted that way because the Brown amendment is not a mass of Brown amendments, as the gentleman said a while ago; it is just one amendment; it is a very long amendment; and when you bring up an amendment like that, you see a lot of words and phrases you are not accustomed to, and you like to look into its definitions, you like to determine how the courts have construed such provisions in the past. When you are convinced that the words and phrases are all right and that it will not be disruptive to the Rent Control Act, then I think it is perfectly all right to change your mind and vote for it; and that is exactly what I am going to do, after thorough consideration.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the Brown amendment provides for a fair return based on the value of the property?

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman from Georgia will present his own amendment. I do not like to be brought into the discussion about details in the amendment. I hope the gentleman will not insist.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. I was thinking that probably the fairer way would be to base the return on the cost of the investment, because values have gone out of sight.

Mr. PATMAN. A number of ways were considered, but I think the Brown amendment fairly presents the matter; and that is the amendment I expect to vote for, after thorough consideration.

I am inserting herewith answers to questions that have been propounded to the Housing Expediter and his answers thereto:

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON H. R. 1731 AMENDING THE HOUSING AND RENT ACT OF 1947, AS AMENDED

1. Question. For how long does the bill extend control over rents?

Answer. Until June 30, 1950, unless sooner terminated by proclamation of the President or by concurrent resolution by both Houses of Congress.

2. Question. What changes are made in the decontrol provisions relating to hotel accommodations?

Answer. The bill decontrols all accommodations in transient hotels and recontrols all accommodations in apartment and residential hotels. The test date for determining the status of a particular establishment is June 30, 1947.

3. Question. What effect has the bill on trailers and trailer spaces?

Answer. The bill recontrols trailers and trailer spaces not used exclusively for transient occupancy.

4. Question. Does the bill continue the decontrol of new construction completed on or after February 1, 1947?

Answer. Yes.

5. Question. Does the bill continue the decontrol of accommodations created by a change from a nonhousing to a housing use on or after February 1, 1947?

Answer. Yes.

6. Question. Does the bill continue the decontrol of additional accommodations created by conversion on or after February 1, 1947?

Answer. Yes, except that in conversions created on or after the effective date of the new act the landlord must obtain a decontrol order from the Housing Expediter, which shall be issued if the conversion results in additional self-contained family units.

7. Question. Does the bill continue the decontrol of motor courts and tourist homes?

Answer. Yes.

8. Question. Does the bill continue the decontrol of accommodations not rented for 24 successive months between February 1, 1945 and March 30, 1948?

Answer. No, these accommodations are recontrolled.

9. Question. Does the bill continue the decontrol of newly constructed housing accommodations completed between February 1, 1945, and February 1, 1947, which were not rented prior to June 30, 1947?

Answer. Yes.

10. Question. Does the bill continue the decontrol of nonhousekeeping, furnished housing accommodations located in a single-dwelling unit?

Answer. Yes.

11. Question. How will maximum rents be established for recontrolled units?

Answer. On the basis of the maximum rent last in effect under Federal rent control, plus or minus applicable adjustments; or if there was no such rent in effect, then the rent for comparable units, plus or minus applicable adjustments.

12. Question. Does the bill provide for execution of voluntary 15-percent increase leases?

Answer. No.

13. Question. What will be the status of units now covered by 1947 or 1948 statutory leases which are still in effect?

Answer. These units are recontrolled and the lease rent will be the maximum rent as long as the lease remains in effect.

14. Question. What will be the status of units covered by 1947 statutory leases which were decontrolled because the leases terminated prior to April 1, 1948?

Answer. These units are recontrolled, and the maximum rent will be the lease rent plus or minus applicable individual adjustments, unless there has been an over-all increase in the area, in which event it may be higher. (See answer to question 16.)

15. Question. What will be the status of units covered by 1947 and 1948 statutory leases which were terminated on or after April 1, 1948, or will hereafter be terminated?

Answer. These units will be under control and the maximum rent is the lease rent plus or minus applicable individual adjustments, unless there has been an over-all increase in the area, in which event it may be higher. (See answer to question 16.)

16. Question. What will be the maximum rent on a unit covered by a 1947 or 1948 statutory lease which is terminated or hereafter terminates where the unit is located in an area covered by an over-all increase in rent?

Answer. The maximum rent will be the lease rent plus or minus applicable individual adjustments, or the maximum rent which would be in effect in the absence of a lease, whichever is higher.

17. Question. What provision is made for adjustments in maximum rents?

Answer. The Housing Expediter is authorized to issue regulations providing for adjustments in any or all maximum rents established under the act as may be necessary to remove hardships or correct other inequities. In making hardship adjustments he shall give due weight to the question as to whether or not the landlord is suffering a loss in the operation of his housing accommodations. This provision is the same as in the present law.

18. Question. Is any provision made in the bill to give assistance to tenants and small landlords to obtain fair rent adjustments?

Answer. Yes, the Housing Expediter is authorized and directed to appoint an officer for this purpose in every defense-rental area. These officers will assist tenants and small landlords by giving them full information concerning available rent adjustments and help them in the preparation of applications for such adjustments.

19. Question. Does the bill continue the existence of local advisory boards?

Answer. Yes.

20. Question. What authority is granted to such boards?

Answer. Their present authority is continued, namely, to make recommendations to the Expediter with reference to decontrol of areas or portions thereof, or classes of housing accommodations; recommendations for general adjustments in maximum rents in an area or portion thereof or with respect to any class of housing accommodations as are necessary to remove hardships or correct inequities; and recommendations concerning operations generally of local rent offices. In addition, they are authorized to make recommendations on individual adjustment cases to the local area rent offices.

21. Question. Must the Expediter approve such recommendations?

Answer. He must approve such recommendations within 30 days if they are appropriately substantiated and in accordance with applicable law and regulations.

22. Question. May a local board appeal from the Housing Expediter's disapproval of its recommendation?

Answer. If the local board follows the procedure required by the act in making its recommendation, and the Expediter disapproves such recommendation, the local board may file a complaint with the Emergency Court of Appeals within 30 days after notification of disapproval by the Housing Expediter. Under the present law the Housing Expediter is required to certify each such case to the Emergency Court of Appeals within 5 days after his disapproval.

23. Question. Does the bill make any change in the period of time given to the Emergency Court of Appeals to make a determination in such cases?

Answer. Yes, the period is extended from 30 to 60 days (90 days in exceptional cases).

24. Question. Is any provision made in the bill for the decontrol of defense-rental areas or portions thereof?

Answer. Yes, the present provisions are continued. The Housing Expediter is authorized and directed to decontrol, on his own initiative or on recommendation of a local board, where the demand for rental housing accommodations has been reasonably met.

25. Question. May the Housing Expediter control areas not now under control?

Answer. Yes, but this authority is limited to the recontrol of areas which were decontrolled on or after July 1, 1947, or are hereafter decontrolled. Moreover, this authority does not apply to areas decontrolled as the result of approval by the Emergency Court of Appeals of a recommendation of a local rent advisory board.

26. Question. What provision is made in the bill for the establishment of maximum rents on housing accommodations in recontrolled areas?

Answer. The maximum rent in each case shall be the maximum rent last in effect under Federal rent control plus or minus applicable adjustments; or, if no maximum rent was ever in effect, the maximum rent shall be the rent generally prevailing in the defense-rental area for comparable controlled housing accommodations plus or minus applicable adjustments.

27. Question. Does the bill continue the present provisions for treble damage actions by tenants in overcharge cases?

Answer. Yes.

28. Question. May the United States also sue for treble damages in rent overcharge cases?

Answer. Yes, the bill changes the present law by giving the United States authority to sue in such cases where the tenant fails to act within 30 days after the date of the violation.

29. Question. Must the court award treble damages in all such cases?

Answer. No, the liquidated damages shall be the amount of the overcharge if the defendant proves that the violation was neither willful nor the result of failure to take practicable precautions against the occurrence of the violation. This provision is also in the present law.

30. Question. Is any provision made in the bill for criminal prosecution against willful violators?

Answer. No.

31. Question. Is the United States given any other enforcement powers?

Answer. Yes, the United States may apply to the courts for appropriate injunctions or restraining orders in cases of violations, or threatened violations.

32. Question. Is the Housing Expediter authorized under the bill to conduct investigations and hearings and to issue administrative subpenas?

Answer. Yes.

33. Question. Does the bill place any limitation upon a landlord's right to evict a tenant?

Answer. Yes, the Housing Expediter is authorized to issue regulations covering evictions.

34. Question. Does the bill continue veterans' preference in the sale or rental of new housing accommodations?

Answer. Yes.

35. Question. When do the veterans' preference provisions expire under the bill?

Answer. These provisions continue in effect until June 30, 1950, unless sooner terminated by a proclamation of the President.

36. Question. To what housing accommodations does veterans' preference apply?

Answer. The veterans' preference applies to newly constructed housing accommodations and housing accommodations created by conversions, completed after June 30, 1947. This includes prefabricated houses and dwelling units covered by any cooperative mutual ownership plan.

37. Question. What kind of preference is given on a first sale or renting?

Answer. Veterans are given first priority during the period of construction or conversion and 30 days thereafter.

38. Question. What kind of preference is given on a resale or rerenting?

Answer. Veterans are given first priority for a period of 7 days.

39. Question. Does the bill contain any restrictions on a sale or rental to a nonveteran at a reduced price?

Answer. Yes, the bill provides that no such housing accommodations to which veterans' preference applies may be sold, resold, rented or rerented, to any person at a price or rent lower than that for which it had been last offered to veterans.

40. Question. Is the present provision for criminal sanctions in cases of violations of veterans' preference continued?

Answer. Yes; but not continued as to other sections.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, before yielding to the concluding speaker on this side, I wish to be permitted, out of fairness to the gentleman who has just addressed the House, to say to the Chair and to the House that the matter under discussion as to the vote in the committee on the particular amendment had been rather well and fully discussed in a public session of the Rules Committee, and there was no intent in any way to violate the secrecy of the executive session.

The SPEAKER. Not in the House of Representatives.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Not in the House as such.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has no control over committees or over public utterances.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. A complete report of the session and the hearing and the testimony in the Rules Committee did appear in the public press and over the radio.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include excerpts from certain letters.)

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the statement of the gentleman from Texas that a vote for this bill was a vote for stabilization is, in one respect, true. For example, if a man owns a home and there is a tenant in it, and the rent is fixed, while the price of painting, papering, and repairing, the carpenters' and the plumbers' wages go up, there will be stabilization. The roof will continue to leak, the old paper will stay on the wall, and the plumbing will continue to be out of condition. There is no question about that because if the owner cannot make the repairs the place will not be repaired. In that way you will get stabilization.

SURRENDERING OUR HERITAGE OF FREEDOM

Mr. Speaker, one accomplishment of the disciples of the New Deal, of the Fair Deal, to which future generations will point with humiliation is the surrender of one of the freedoms wrested by the barons from King John more than 700 years ago.

After centuries of oppression and of slavery it was on the battlefield in the meadows of Runnymede that his then subjects forced King John, on June 15–19, 1215, to sign Magna Carta, the Great Charter, the grant of freedom which is the foundation of the liberties of our forefathers, of our freedom.

That Charter, among many other things, declared that the right of habeas corpus should not be suspended; that trial by jury should be the right of every subject charged with an offense; that the word of a subject should not be taken, even by the King.

King John put his hand and seal on an instrument which acknowledged and guaranteed many of the rights which we, centuries later, have come to regard as the right of the lowliest citizen of our land.

Then was laid the foundation for Sir Edward Coke's later statement which, translated, is, "For a man's house is his castle."

Third Coke's Institutes, chapter 73, page 161, has these words:

> And yet in fome cafe a man may not onely ufe force and armes, but affemble company alfo. As any may affemble his friends and neighbours, to keep his houfe againft thofe that come to rob, or kill him, or to offer him violence in it, and is by conftruction excepted out of this act: and the fherif, &c. ought not to deal with him upon this act; for a mans houfe is his caftle, et domus fua cuique eft tutiffimum refugium; for where fhall a man be fafe, if it be not in his houfe?

The statement in Semayne's Case, Fifth Reports, chapter 91, again laid down the doctrine that, and I quote:

> The house of everyone is to him as his castle and fortress, as well for his defense against injury and violence as for his repose.

William Pitt, and again Burke, in his speech on the excise bill is credited with that historic statement which gave us these words:

> The poorest man may in his cottage bid defiance to all the force of the Crown. It may be frail; its roof may shake; the wind may blow through it; the storms may enter, the rain may enter—but the King of England cannot enter; all his forces dare not cross the threshold of the ruined tenement.

Perhaps the King of England may not enter a man's home; perhaps, with all his forces, he dare not cross the threshold of even the ruined tenement, but, by the action of the House today it is proposed by those who support legislation which may give away our liberties, which may give us a dictator and a tyrant, that the man in charge of the Office of the Housing Expediter may enter a man's home and that he may bring with him other men and women, their children, their dog and their cat, as well as, if they have one, the talking parrot.

More than 700 years ago, the poorest and the meanest, the poverty-stricken, found it necessary to fight a battle to obtain the right to live, to be free from persecution, to enjoy that which they had earned and saved.

Is it because today there are more tenants than landlords; is it because Members of Congress are elected by popular vote, that we find it necessary to repudiate the doctrine of Magna Carta?

But this is not the first time that the lesson learned by King John has been forgotten by tyrants, or by would-be dictators. Five hundred sixty-one years after King John had been taught his lesson, another King of England, George the Third, having forgotten some of King John's promises, was reminded by the signers of the Declaration of Independence that certain truths were self-evident, "that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

Then, by that same document, he was told that—

> The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injustices and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over these States.

Specific instances of his conduct tending to show that he was seeking to establish an absolute tyranny were cited and one of those instances was that "the King was quartering large bodies of armed troops among us." That is, that the King had forgotten or ignored the truth that a man's home was his castle and was forcing our colonial forefathers to take into their homes his soldiers, his officers, his agents and his representatives.

Eight long years of war were fought before the surrender at Yorktown demonstrated to the King that his former subjects were free, that again a man's home was his castle and that again the King's man had no right therein.

Our forefathers by the Revolutionary War freed themselves from kingly rule, established a new form of government—not a democracy, but a representative republic.

In an effort to make certain that neither one nor all of the branches of the new government should have the right to invade a citizen's home or to take his property for private or public use without his consent or just compensation, the Fourth and Fifth Amendments were written into the Constitution. The Fourth Amendment expressly stated, among other things, that the right of the people to be secure in their homes against unreasonable seizure shall not be violated. The Fourth Amendment was a restatement of a principle laid down in Magna Carta.

It was evidently assumed by the signers of the Declaration of Independence, and undoubtedly by the citizens of the States, when the fourth and fifth amendments to the Constitution were adopted, that the property of one citizen could not, without due process of law, be taken from him by another.

That fundamental doctrine, that principle of justice, had never, since the dawn of civilization, been questioned.

To protect the citizen against his own Government, the Fifth Amendment was

adopted. That, among other things, stated that no person shall be deprived of his property without due process of law nor shall private property, even by the Government, be taken for public use without just compensation.

The pending measure proposes to take from owners the use of their property, the property itself.

No longer can it be said that the income of property, the rent of property, is not property within the meaning of the Constitution.

Even if it be assumed that there are in these United States of ours a large number of citizens who are unable to find homes in which to live, will anyone contend that the duty to supply them with homes does not rest upon the Nation as a whole?

That such a duty is acknowledged by the Congress is evidenced by the legislation and the appropriations to build homes, to extend aid to the unfortunate.

Even if it be said that, being a Christian Nation, we cannot let some of our citizens suffer for want of shelter, by what reasoning is the burden of caring for them or of aiding or assisting them shifted from the Nation to another group of citizens, those who by their hands, their thrift, have obtained homes of their own?

Must we have another Runnymede? Must our citizens who are being deprived of their property by the Rent Control Act, after more than 700 years, fight another battle to reestablish their right to enjoy that which they have earned?

Must we have another Revolutionary War 173 years after our forefathers established their independence from King George III, to make good the statement of Lincoln, and I quote:

> That men who are industrious and sober and honest in the pursuit of their own interests should, after a while, accumulate property and after that should be allowed to enjoy it in peace, is right.

True, we cannot permit our people to be without homes, without shelter. We cannot permit them to live in caves or in the woods or in the open fields. And if the local communities and private enterprise fail to give them shelter, then the Federal Government must do it; but shame, oh, shame, on a Congress which will take from the man, from the woman—yes, even from the widow past middle age, from the widow of a veteran—the right to an income through rent from the home, the property which she and her husband have worked for, have earned, and upon which she depends for her food and clothing.

The rent-control law, as everyone who has given it a moment's thought knows, is outrageously unjust. It is a confiscation of the right to the enjoyment of private property; not for the benefit of the state but for the benefit of those who belong to a minority group. It is a transfer of private property—in many cases without compensation—from one individual to another.

It is not only unjust and un-American, but it is a policy which is destructive of our liberty, and which, if followed through, would turn backward the hands of progress more than 700 years.

If tenants need assistance, then, instead of quartering them upon the premises of the landlord without just compensation to him, let us assume the burden as a nation and pay the property owner a subsidy.

If a minimum wage is good for the worker, then a minimum rent is good for the landlord. If a subsidy is necessary and good for the farmer, then the landlord is entitled to a subsidy.

If the painter, the paperhanger, the carpenter, and the plumber are entitled to an increased wage, then the owner of the tenement is entitled to a rent which will enable him or her to pay the ever-increasing taxes and insurance exacted by the Government, the increased costs of upkeep and repair.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, let us be fair. Let us not start on that road which leads only to oppression by compelling one group of our citizens to, at their own expense, furnish homes for another segment of the population. If we are to extend rent control, let us all—all taxpayers—pay the cost—not penalize the property owners.

Excerpts from letters which illustrate the plight of many landlords are as follows:

> Please do what you can to keep them from passing this new rent law. I am a middle-aged woman with a few houses left me by my father, the rents from which are my sole means of support. There are many like me. We have put all we have into property because it was always considered a safe investment. Now with property taxes double what they were when these rents were set and labor prices also double, we cannot make a living, with the very small raise the OPA gives us in a few cases because of hardship. My tenants are making considerably more than I am. My property tax is about nine times my income tax; but still the Government won't give us a break.

> Please use all the influence you have to see that we property owners get a square deal. We don't want a rent-control board to tell us we have to take so much for living quarters we have for rent when the plumber and the decorator and the electric company and the water company and the taxes and the coal company all raise their prices on us; plus the destructiveness of the children of these young couples on an apartment—you would honestly think that a pack of wolfhounds had lived in the apartment when they move out.
>
> I am a widow. My husband was a vet of the first war. I lost him 4½ years ago from causes received in the war. I have a 16-year-old daughter I have in school here at Emmanuel Missionary College and we have made our upstairs into an apartment. The carpenter's wages were very high; the painting and decorating is very high; the apartment has to be redecorated once every year because folks allow their children to write on the walls and tear off brand new wallpaper and tear chunks out of new linoleum rugs.
>
> Please help us to have a square deal.

> Why a shortage of houses?
>
> I was talking to a businessman in this town who contemplates building a house. Upon asking him how soon, this was his answer, "I am making too ——— much money staying where I am to build now." Can it be he is waiting for the end of rent control before building?
>
> I happen to know he is getting a house for $25 per month, his landlady furnishing him housing at 1941 prices.

A complaint from a landlord shows how the agency's ruling in a hardship case would actually compel a landlord who claims her profit was but $3.25 per week, to make a refund of $10.25 per week.

That letter is as follows:

NILES, MICH., *February 26, 1949.*

Re rent control.

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: 1. I wish to present what I sincerely believe is a "hardship case" in connection with rent control, although I am led to understand that a case cannot be considered a "hardship case" unless a property has been rented for 3 years, which is not the case in this particular instance.

2. First of all I feel I am a fairly well educated and intelligent person, otherwise I doubt if I could have held a position in the attorney general's office at Lansing for 2 years prior to my marriage (during the time Harry S. Toy was attorney general); however, I am very inexperienced in the art of renting property. The property in question is the first I have ever rented (I do not own the property, merely rented it, and rerented it and I no longer have any interest in the property) and I shall never rent again.

3. If you will bear with me I should like to give you a detailed account of my story:

4. My father purchased a house just off the South Bend highway which is zoned for business. My home is just a block from this property (in Niles) and is also in the prescribed business zone. My father did not wish to rent his property on a monthly basis inasmuch as it would require 60 days' notice for removal of tenants if the property should be used for business purposes.

5. The housing shortage was very acute at that time and I felt it was a shame to have a vacant piece of property which might as well be doing someone some good. So, I hit upon the plan of renting it from him and in turn rerenting it to several girls, after furnishing it very tastefully. I believed this would be a beautiful set-up for girls who would ordinarily just be able to secure a sleeping room. With this arrangement they would have their sleeping quarters, plus a place to entertain their friends and an opportunity to cook their own meals. I thought in this manner if the property should be sold or used for business it would create no particular hardship on the girls moving just themselves and their personal belongings with a week or two notice and I would have endeavored to help them find another place to live. However, I have learned just recently that regardless how one rents, it still takes 60 days to remove a tenant, although I was not advised of this at the time.

6. Not knowing that a rerental must be registered I started renting to girls on July 23, 1946. Form letter APP. C, dated September 23, 1946, advising me to register the rental was sent me. I went to the rent control office (then in Niles) to inquire about procedure in this matter and upon their advice on September 23, 1946, I filed form DH-1B, setting up the 5 room house, plus laundry, screened porch, storeroom and garage as a rooming house for four to six girls to rent at $25 per week. In other words if there were four girls occupying the house each would pay $6.25; if five girls, $5 each, and if six girls, the individual rent per week for each girl would be $4.16⅔. I was to furnish 6 tons of coal per season and $8 per month on the utilities bills of electric and gas (automatic gas water heater); pay the water bill, for hauling of rubbish, ads, and interior minor repairs.

7. Shortly after this a notice of proceedings dated September 26, 1946, proposing to decrease rent to $15 was received. Conference at the office and a thorough investigation resulted in no change from the original registration.

8. The early part of June 1947 I was called into the office evidently on a complaint from one of the girls and shortly thereafter an Order Adjusting Maximum Rent dated June 13, 1947, from $25 to $22.50 per week effective next payment date, signed by Mr. R. L. Jackson, was received. I then wrote a letter dated June 17, explaining additional services rendered and after investigation received a Modified Order Adjusting Maximum Rent dated July 10, 1947, changing the rent from $22.50 back to the original $25 per week, this final order was also signed by Mr. Jackson.

9. I was concerned with the moral standing of this home and after renting it for well over a year in this manner an episode occurred which decided me against continuing to rent to just girls. I broke up a party there one night about 2 a. m. which undoubtedly was innocent enough but there were about a dozen or more couples at this party—some were drinking beer and inasmuch as some of the girls present were not old enough I felt I did not want to assume any more moral responsibility for these girls inasmuch as they would not do as I asked them about having company after midnight, etc. As I lived a block away I could not always be cognizant of what was going on. So I told the girls they would have to move. This was in September 1947.

10. With the girl situation not working out too well, I felt the next best thing or possibly even a better thing would be to rent to two couples preferably with children, because lots of landlords will not rent to children. I proceeded to do this without the slightest thought that this would constitute a change at the rent control office. I was still accommodating as many people as I had before (plus children) and the expenses remained the same—in fact coal was higher, etc. In other words each couple's rent was $12.50 per week regardless of the number of children and regardless if one couple were the sole occupants. The same rate that was charged for four girls. This was first rented to married couples the latter part of September 1947.

11. About the 16th of January, this year, I received a notice from the area rent-control office in South Bend that I was evidently overcharging. On the 19th, I went over to the office and there was interviewed by the attorney, Mr. Cholis. He said there were no complaints that in going through their files they found this registration which was entirely out of line. He stated that the original order or registration as a rooming house was made out incorrectly by the rent-control office—should never have been made out on that form at all. I volunteered the information that it had been rented for about a year to two couples and children at the same rate as set up originally, but that it was so difficult to get two congenial couples to live together and the constant complaint from one couple about the other couple and vice versa and trying to iron out their difficulties in a diplomatic manner was getting me down and I had decided to give it up as a bad job. I told him that only one couple had been in the house since before Christmas at $12.50 per week. (I had interviewed lots of applicants, answered the phone dozens of times, but after talking with them I realized their interests were not in common with the tenant (Fatter) already there or some other factors were not conducive to a congenial living arrangement.) I told Mr. Cholis that before I received notice from the rent-control office I had spoken to Mr. Fatter, the tenant, about different arrangements. I told Mr. Fatter that if we couldn't find someone congenial I would have to give up the house—because of his children I was very concerned—and I asked him if he would be interested in renting direct from my father with me getting out of the picture or if not perhaps it would be a good idea to keep his eye open for something else because I couldn't go on indefinitely paying him to live there. I didn't give him any notice or say he had to move—I was trying to make a workable solution for all concerned. Mr. Cholis then told me that regardless of whether one were renting furnished, by the week or otherwise, it still would require 60 days to remove a tenant.

12. He told me I would have to fill out a correct form on DD-U listing it as a two-family unit at $12.50 per couple or family. I told Mr. Cholis that I didn't know the whereabouts of any of the tenants who had lived there previously, in fact had never seen them since they moved, so he told me to enter the starting date of the remaining tenant (not the date the first married couples moved in). Wishing to fill out this form then and there so I could get any information required and considering it just a routine matter—for I was getting out of it anyway and if it required a 60-day notice I didn't care much what they would eventually set the rent at—I wouldn't mind taking another 60-day loss. I made out the form in the office and left it there. The date the Fatters moved in was set as February 21, 1948. However, when I got home and checked my records I found it was January 21, 1948. Inasmuch as I didn't dream of any retroactive business and also because Mr. Cholis hadn't asked for the starting date of the first married tenants, I didn't notify them.

13. Next I received a notice of proceedings dated January 28, from the rent-control office advising the rent was set at $14.75 per week for all occupants retroactive to February 21, 1948. The notice stated that I had the right to forward a statement to the office in writing if I felt this notice was not fair. Inasmuch as my cost of maintaining this establishment was more than the rental they set, I wrote a letter (copy attached hereto) which I felt would clearly show that I wasn't making an excessive profit on this venture. I took this letter over to the office asking to see Mr. Jackson. I was told he was busy but another man over there came up to the bar and talked with me. I asked him to read the letter and tell me whether I had included everything that was necessary—I stated that I did not set forth the expenses inasmuch as I was sure they knew just what all the services would be in connection with a rental of this nature. He said they would take my statement into consideration in reviewing the case.

14. On February 8, I received a final order decreasing maximum rent requiring refund to tenant with the same stipulation, $14.75 per week for all occupants and refunds payable to all tenants retroactive to February 21, 1948 (meaning $10.25 per week to be refunded). It was a waste of time to even write the letter.

15. This is really outrageous, because, if one tenant should be a disagreeable type that no one could get along with, he would be getting his rent for about $32 a month (unless the order means that if one couple occupies the house alone their rent would be $14.75 per week—but that isn't the manner in which I was renting—each couple knew that their rent would be just so much per week regardless of whether they were there alone or not) with me paying $40 rent for the house plus heat, light, gas, water, refuse disposal, use of furniture, depreciation on furniture, repairs, etc. It just doesn't add up.

16. This was originally set up on a businesslike basis with a reasonable profit to myself for making possible the rental of this property in the acute housing shortage. It was not set up on depression rentals, as I could not have handled it on that basis. For instance, this is the basis on which I predicated this venture in the first place:

Rent (which I pay)	$40.00
Coal ($18 per ton—furnished 8 tons instead of 6)	12.00
Gas and electricity (I paid at least $1 more per month than stipulated)	9.00
Water bill	1.32
Refuse disposal (ashes, tin cans, etc.)	2.00
Advertising	1.80
Furniture	10.00
Depreciation on furniture	6.25
Repairs, plumbing, windows, grates for furnace, etc	3.00
Total per month	85.37

So the overage between $85.37 and $108 was my profit per month if it were rented constantly. However, there were times when only one couple was there for a time and then my profit naturally was much less. As I stated in the enclosed letter I made $5.56 profit per week last year but that was not figuring the $10 went up for furniture; if I deducted that charge from my profit it would make my weekly profit about $3.25 and I am supposed to refund $10.25 per week—it doesn't seem to me that the rent control board was originally set up to require that hardship of any landlord.

17. As I mentioned before in this letter, Mr. Cholis stated there were no complaints but I have my reasons for believing Mr. Fatter must have made some kind of a complaint but, what it was I wouldn't venture a guess because he had mentioned several times to me what a decent landlady he thought I was inasmuch as I never snooped around over at the house. When a tenant would move out I would go over and see that the bedroom was in order for the next tenant. I felt that it was their home and as such they should have the privacy of it. One reason why I believe a complaint must have been made is that on the form DD-U which Mr. Cholis had me fill out I listed the name of the tenant as Mr. and Mrs. William Fatter and on the final order which I received from the office in the lower left hand corner the name of the tenant was listed as William J. Fatter, 941 Maple Street (the address of the rental property in question), Niles, Mich. I never knew his middle initial. Another reason why I believe Mr. Fatter made a complaint is that a local member of the rent advisory board after talking to Mr. Jackson was informed of this complaint and told me.

18. Something Mr. Fatter doesn't know is that last summer my husband wanted me to give up the house—that it wasn't worth the time and effort I was putting into it—but I felt inasmuch as the Fatters were steady and apparently good tenants and had two little children it would create a terrific hardship on them to find a place to live on account of the children—so I continued on trying to get congenial cotenants. However, when he left without bringing me the keys or the $3 overage he owed on the utilities—but worst of all moving out in the dead of winter when the pipes could have frozen—does not show the same consideration to me that I gave him and his family. If it hadn't been for the children I would probably have closed it out long ago. When I approached Mr. Fatter about renting the house direct from my father, I even sat down and figured out what his expenses would be and if he got another couple in with him to help share expenses it figured out to about $11 per week for each couple in the winter and about $8 per week for each couple in the summer.

19. Inasmuch as I didn't know the whereabouts of any of the tenants, I was told by Mr. Jackson that I should bring certified checks to the office and they would have the FBI look up the missing tenants. Is the rent-control office in the practice of trying to scare all landlords? If so, my

conscience was clear and I didn't scare. Instead, I contacted the FBI and learned that this is foreign to their work.

20. Now, to sum up, Mr. Jackson signed the original order of $25 per week when it was set up for girls, and when I drew his attention to the fact that he signed this order he claimed it was all right as set up then. However, Mr. Cholis, the attorney, said it was all wrong in the first place and I'm lucky they don't make it retroactive to the first date it was rented to girls. Surely, when a property is thoroughly investigated by the rent-control office and an order set by that office, it should be considered legally in force until a change is made by the rent-control office. I learned from another source that it was not properly set up in the first place—that is, on the wrong form—so should I be penalized for a mistake made by the rent-control office upon which I acted in good faith? Had they set it up in the first place at the rate they now feel is right, I would never have undertaken the project. Of course, I realize ignorance is no excuse in law; however, as I stated before, I innocently assumed that there was no change in renting to two couples with children than to just girls. This assumption surely should not be considered as grave a mistake as the one made originally by the rent-control office. They should know the rules and regulations when it is their business better than I, who am an inexperienced landlord.

21. It seems if a complaint was to have been made, it should have been made months ago, rather than now when I no longer have any interest in the property. And isn't the tenant just as much at fault for not asking to see the registration form and signing it?

Application to the Administrator here in Washington brought only the statement that the landlord better pay or she would be subject to a triple penalty.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the bill now under consideration, H. R. 1731, will, if enacted into law without major changes, aid greatly in relieving the effects of the critical housing situation in metropolitan areas.

Rent control is highly essential if we are to proceed with the President's anti-inflation program outlined in his economic report to the Congress. The President, after his Economic Commission made a thorough study of the housing situation, recommended that rental regulations be extended and strengthened in order to aid the millions over the country who are enduring deplorable housing hardships. The cost of housing, whether rentals on hotels, apartments, or houses, is an important item in this present high cost of living. We are at present highly short of apartments and houses at reasonable prices. The veterans of our country, unfortunately, in too many instances, have been the victims of avaricious builders and greedy landlords. Of course there are a great number of exceptions, but in the Calumet region of Indiana I have had numerous complaints from World War II veterans who have been victimized by purchases of unstable and poorly constructed homes. These veterans could have avoided this situation if it had been possible for them to obtain apartments, hotel rentals, or housing at a reasonable cost. Many veterans and other people have already bought houses at inflated prices that they could not afford and were not financially able to handle. These people are having difficulty in keeping a roof over their head and pay the high cost for food, clothing, and other necessities.

Release of rental controls would force many thousands of additional families to vacate and resort to any means for temporary shelter. It would force millions to increase their rental payments at the expense of medical care, clothing and other necessities of life to the detriment of health, contentment and other essentials for their future.

I received numerous letters from tenants in a combination apartment hotel in my district that the management has raised their rentals three times in the last 15 months. This building houses a great number of people of moderate means, including school teachers, who cannot find any other suitable living quarters in that area.

I realize a great number of smaller landlords have been inconvenienced and hampered on account of rental controls. Almost without exception, whenever they complained to the local area Rent Director in my district, he willingly made reasonable adjustments so they could receive a just and fair return on their property.

Numerous witnesses appeared before the Committee on Banking and Currency not only from Chicago, New York, Los Angeles and large industrial areas, but also from smaller communities in our Nation, insisting that present rent controls be continued and expanded until the housing crisis is relieved.

Every Member of Congress should read as much of the testimony that has been offered to the committee as possible in order to get a true picture before he votes against the bill now under consideration.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, in view of the statements made that the bill does not provide safeguards and benefits to the veterans, I am going to read for the benefit of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] the following provisions in the bill:

SEC. 2. Section 4 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. (a) In order to assure preference or priority to veterans of World War II or their families—

"(1) no housing accommodations designed for single-family residence, the construction or conversion of which is completed after June 30, 1947, shall be offered for sale or resale, or sold or resold, to persons other than veterans of World War II or their families, unless such housing accommodations have been publicly offered for sale exclusively to veterans of World War II or their families (a) during the period of construction or conversion and for 30 days thereafter, prior to a sale or offering for sale to such nonveterans, and (b) for a period of 7 days prior to a resale, or an offering for resale, to such nonveterans; and

"(2) no housing accommodations designed for occupancy by other than transients, the construction or conversion of which is completed after June 30, 1947, shall be offered for rent or rerent, rented or rerented to persons other than veterans of World War II or their families, unless such housing accommodations have been publicly offered for rent exclusively to veterans of World War II or their families (a) during the period of construction or conversion and for 30 days thereafter, prior to a first renting or offering for rent to such nonveterans, and (b) for a period of 7 days prior to a subsequent renting, or offering for rent, to such nonveterans; and

"(3) no housing accommodations designed for single-family residence, the construction or conversion of which is completed after June 30, 1947, shall be offered for sale or resale, or sold or resold, to any person at a price less than the price for which it had been last offered for sale to veterans of World War II or their families; and

"(4) no housing accommodations designed for occupancy by other than transients, the construction or conversion of which is completed after June 30, 1947, shall be offered for rent or rerent, or rented or rerented, to any person at a price less than the price for which it had been last offered for rent to veterans of World War II or their families."

Mr. Speaker, in view of these provisions does the gentleman from Michigan or the gentleman from Ohio still contend that the bill does not take care of the veterans in every possible way?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman advise the House whether the sections of this bill which pertain to veterans have anything at all to do with rent control?

Mr. SABATH. They have.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman explain how?

Mr. SABATH. It is bound to affect them, because in that case there will be more places for rent to these men, where now there are not enough.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I did not intend to make, and do not believe I did make, any statement that this bill did not give a benefit to veterans. The point I was trying to make was that there were veterans on both sides of the proposition, and I cited a case of a veteran's widow who owned a home and wanted to rent it.

Mr. SABATH. I am very glad that the gentleman made that clear to me. The gentleman from Michigan quotes King John and other kings. History tells us that the proclamations of King John and other kings were merely lip service to their subjects in an endeavor to appease them. I, myself, have never been in favor of the lip service of any kings, and I do not recall where kings have been of benefit anywhere so far as the liberties and rights of men and women are concerned. Surely, not in our own country. Now, so much as to the proclamations of the kings.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the views of Abraham Lincoln. This bill aims to carry out what he stood for and advocated. So far as the case of the widow is concerned, I have had five or six of these widows interview me. Whenever they permitted me to ask questions, I learned that they owned not only one but three or four apartment buildings. They were nicely dressed and I did not observe from their appearances that they suffered

financial losses due to the controlled rentals of their properties. I further ascertained that none of these unfortunate widows, who have been sent down here by the million-dollar real-estate lobby, have lost any money or that their properties have been foreclosed in the last few years. In fact, these small owners, I venture to say, whenever they made a complaint that they were not fairly treated, have had their complaints adjusted, and the only reason relief was not more speedily granted was because the Eightieth — Republican — Congress failed to appropriate sufficient money for personnel to administer prompt relief and adjustment of rentals in such cases where a just or valid claim for increased rental existed.

May I say to you gentlemen that I know something about real estate. I started when I was 21 years old. I have built some homes, and sold thousands and thousands of lots and homes in years gone by, and I am pleased to say that I never foreclosed on anybody or had anybody thrown out of their homes. Furthermore my family owns several fairly decent apartment buildings. They are in favor also of an increase, but I, representing the people and knowing the sad plight of the veterans, the white-collar workers, and people of low income, who have been unable to find a place to live within their means, find that my conscience and my heart dictate that I must and should give preference to people who are in distress and who are unable to pay higher rent for decent living quarters.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. As an indication of the problem of some of our veterans, I call to the attention of my colleague an advertisement which appeared recently in the local newspaper in Pittsfield, Mass. I quote:

Will exchange 13 Air Medals, 6 battle stars, Victory Medal for apartment, furnished or not, for wife and children 5 and 4 years. Dial 2-3474 evenings.

That is an advertisement which a veteran put in the paper seeking an apartment.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I wish I could show you the thousands of letters that I have received from veterans as well as other people pleading and urging that something be done to obtain the passage of a measure for the extension of rent control to enable them to obtain decent living quarters at a reasonable rental. The charge that property owners have suffered because of the increase in taxes and so forth is not well founded.

In years gone by 10 percent, or 2 months, were allowed for vacant apartments. Under present conditions there have been no vacancies anywhere, and every landlord has received full 12-months' rent. Therefore, that more than offsets the increase in the cost of coal, maintenance, and increase in taxes, and no property owner has had his property foreclosed as was the case before rent control was enacted when, during the Republican administration, thousands and thousands of homes were foreclosed.

Mr. Speaker, the extent to which these large combines of property owners will go, is amazing. You undoubtedly read in the newspapers several days ago an article that described the situation in Oklahoma and other large cities, where some owners will refuse to rent their apartments if rent control is continued. I have heard that same threat in my own city of Chicago, from unscrupulous, dollar-hungry, avaricious, wealth-seeking accumulators, most of whom spend their winters in Florida at Hialeah, and the summers in Maine and Canada paying exorbitant prices which they can obviously afford. All this at the expense of their tenants whose rents they have increased from 50 to 200 percent.

I heard personally, from many men who have lived in these apartment hotels for years, and where rents were increased last July from 150 to 200 percent, that they were forced to move in order to give the owners an opportunity to create some additional transient space which they can rent three times a day and at what a price.

Therefore I feel, though I am in favor of this bill, that we should adopt a positive amendment that will stop this abuse, and also others that purport to give the tenant a break, such as the offer of cooperative apartments which people are forced to buy in desperation at three times their actual value.

I have a letter here which I just received, and hundreds of similar letters, which state, and I quote:

Why should a building have no rent control on any portion of its space, just because it happens to have a limited number of rooms available to transients? There are a number of hotels in Chicago which have always housed a number of guests on monthly rates and yearly leases. In such of these where there happens also to be a few transient accommodations, the landlords have doubled and in some cases tripled the rents to the permanent guests. Many of these people have set incomes and are retired or semi-retired, and a great hardship is being worked on them. We certainly believe that the rent-control bill should designate permanent living quarters as apart from transient quarters, regardless of the building or whether it contains both such types of guest apartments. The point would seem to be a matter of protecting the people entitled to such protection, and not just a blanket coverage based solely on the buildings without due consideration to the facts concerning the individuals involved.

Landlords are not suffering, and as one who represents perhaps more property owners than any Member of the House, having over 440,000 people in my district, most of them being small-apartment and private-home owners, I am interested in the small property owner. That is the reason I am for this bill, because their rights and their interests will be safeguarded and protected in this bill, notwithstanding what some gentlemen may say.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have two questions. First, assuming that the ad which the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] read was inserted by a veteran, do you think that he, being a veteran of either the first or the last war, would want a widow of a First World War veteran to furnish him an apartment at less than it cost to keep it up?

Mr. SABATH. You know there are exceptions to every rule and of the thousands and thousands and thousands of people, you might get a letter from a woman who claims to be a widow, very likely a letter dictated by some of these big property owners who obtained the property at 10 or 15 or 25 cents on the dollar during the Republican crash, and of course you cannot go by that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman was talking about some 250,000 people in his district.

Mr. SABATH. No. Four hundred and forty thousand people.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Over in Allegan County, Mich., with fertile soil, there is a big place over there, a 14-, 15-, or 16-room house. Why do you not take some of them over there and let them raise gardens and the food will be a great deal cheaper?

Mr. SABATH. With the extremely high prices that the farmers are receiving today for their products. I think it would be well for people to take to farming and thereby raise some of the products which are selling for the highest prices in history, all because of legislation passed by this House. I am proud of it. I voted for it. I wish to help the farmer whenever possible, but this does not alleviate the undesirable conditions that exist in present housing-accommodation availability. I am profoundly interested in the unfortunate man who has been unable for some 2 or 3 years to find a decent place to live in for himself and his family at a reasonable rental that he can afford to pay.

I know that this bill will make possible some relief for these unfortunate people.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1731) to extend certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1731, with Mr. GORE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] is recognized for 2½ hours. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] will be entitled to recognition for 2½ hours.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. My purpose in asking my friend to yield was to announce to the Members present that later in the day when we go back into the House I shall ask that when we adjourn today we adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow. It was impossible to submit the unanimous consent request at the close of debate on the rule because the time had been exhausted, but I want to make this announcement so the Members will know what the program will be; and I may say that if we dispose of this bill tomorrow that it is planned to adjourn over until Monday.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, we are going to hear a great deal about the constitutional questions involved in the control of rents, and a great deal about the American way of life. We always hear such arguments when there is any movement for the protection of any great segment of the American people. I think the Constitution of the United States is the greatest instrument ever devised by man; I think ours is the finest form of government under which man has ever lived, but the Constitution of the United States is not a strait-jacket, and the Constitution bends to meet the necessities of our people. Those questions were all foreclosed about a year ago when the Supreme Court of the United States decided that an emergency still existed which would warrant the imposition of controls on rents. It did not hold, as some decisions have, that the Court could not nullify legislative findings of facts. This was decided in the case of Miller against Woods, and that was a unanimous decision of the Supreme Court; so that question is foreclosed as to the constitutionality of this act.

Why was the Rent Control Act passed originally? For more than 6 years the American people had been engaged in a war into which they were drawn against their will, for 3 years a fighting war, and before that we were the arsenal of the democracies of the world. All of the efforts of our industries and all of the efforts of our people were devoted to fighting that war. During that time practically no housing was built in the United States; we had 12,000,000 men abroad. When they came back home the emergency for housing was greater than it was while they were away. The emergency still exists.

I do not want to favor a law that will not be just to both the landlord and the tenant, but we have got to give some protection to our people. I heard the gentleman from Michigan talk about the dignity of the home, and it is a dignity that has long existed in British law and in our law. Lord Coke, the great English jurist, said that a man's house may be built of rough boards and roofed with thatch; the wind may blow through it, and the rains may enter it, but the King cannot. That is what we are trying to get for the people of America—homes. It is essential that they should have homes. A Member this morning talked about the subversive activities that were going on in the United States; they are not coming out of homes. The home is the greatest pillar of our Republic; it is the stabilizer of our institutions, and when we provide homes for the American people we are doing something to destroy sinister influences in this country.

No man is required to rent his house under this law; no man is required to sell it, but we have said to the man who has a house for sale or for rent that during the period of construction and for 30 days thereafter, if it is for sale, he must first offer it to a veteran, and he may not sell it at a higher price than the lowest price for which he offered it to a veteran. We include that same provision with reference to rental property. You must offer it to a veteran for 30 days before you offer it to anybody else. On a resale you must offer it to a veteran for 7 days for sale and 7 days for rent.

Why all the turmoil and shouting about this provision? That was in the last act. That was in the act passed by the Eightieth Congress, and is still in the act. Why was that done? Because the veteran was away. He had been away a long time, and when he came back he had to have a home, and we were trying to get him one. I do not think there is anything unconstitutional or un-American about that.

Mr. Chairman, of course, nobody can make an argument that there ought to be confiscation of property. Both sides should be treated fairly. We think in this particular bill we have accomplished that result.

There have been many complaints in the past that those asking for adjustments to prevent inequities and hardships have not been able to file their complaints with sufficient celerity to have justice administered. In this bill there is provision made for an officer of the Expediter in each defense rental area to make out the complaints just as the expert in the Internal Revenue Department helps you make out your returns. I think that will greatly facilitate the adjustment of these claims and will be a means of rendering justice to both sides.

We have in this bill repealed that provision where the owner or his family have lived in the property for a period of 2 years after February 1, 1945, and had subsequently rented, the property was thereby decontrolled. That was introduced in the bill for the purpose of acquiring additional housing. But we have found that in many instances the owner who owned several apartments or several houses left the one he lived in and rented it. It was not under control. He went into another apartment. It resulted in an inequity that was so apparent and so flagrant that we repealed that provision of the law.

I have seen some statements in the press that we have broken faith with those who have left their residences or their apartments and rerented them. It is my conception of the law that a Congress does not break faith when it repeals a law, whatever rights may have been acquired under it. If that were true, one Congress would have its hands tied because another Congress had enacted laws under which interests had been acquired. Of course, there is no merit in any such contention. The Expediter found that was used as a means to increase rents to the point where they were not comparable with other rents. He told us in committee of the inequities and injustices that had come about.

We have repealed the criminal sanctions in the former law with reference to the violation of regulations by landlords and have placed in here instead a provision that where the tenant for 30 days fails to bring suit for treble damages, which was provided in the previous law, the Expediter may bring that suit. We have found that although tenants had the right to bring suit for treble damages where rents had been over the ceiling, they failed to do so because of the fear of eviction by the owner. So the Expediter now has the authority to bring that suit, and he probably in many cases will bring it if the tenant fails to do it. It will be a means of compelling the landlord to comply with the regulations of the Expediter.

As regards evictions, there were certain causes for evictions stated in the law: that the owner wanted to use the property for himself or his family; that he wanted to take the property off the rental market; that he wanted to remodel the property. These were suggestions as to what he could do to get the property. Under that there were mass evictions in some places. We have repealed those provisions and have provided that evictions shall be subject to the regulations of the Expediter. It is the only effective way administration of the law could be accomplished. And I have no doubt that those regulations and rules will be fair and impartial. I have no doubt that the Expediter does want to rectify the injustices and the inequities as he has been directed to do so.

We hear a lot of talk about bureaucrats. A bureaucrat is an administrative officer that must carry out a law. There is no way to enforce laws without having those charged with their enforcement. They are subject to the frailties and the fallibilities of human nature. The only laws that I know of that enforce themselves are the laws of nature. A man knows, when he violates those, what the result will be. But we must have somebody to carry out the law and this is the only way that we can administer it, and we must give him full and adequate powers to accomplish that purpose. I know of nothing worse to the morale of our people or to our institutions than to enact a law that is not enforced or will not be enforced. People have a contempt for that law which results in a contempt for all law.

I have heard a good deal of talk about sending this back to the States. None of the governors of the States want this. You do not have to send anything back to the States. The States have this power. The powers that the Federal Government has are those delegated by the people of the States. The powers that were not specifically delegated were retained by the States and the people. So, they primarily had this power and they did not want it and they do not want it now. That is but a device to do

away with rent control. It will destroy it. It means that you vote against the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Then there is the proposition to continue rent control for 90 days. What we are trying to do now is to stabilize our institutions, to stabilize our economy, to let men know exactly what the future will bring forth, to give them confidence. To continue this law for 90 days would only result in chaos and confusion. Neither the landlord nor the tenant would know his future. How would the tenant feel if he thought he had a contract whereby his family might remain in the house where they resided for only 90 days? What are the worries and hardships that come upon a man when he goes to look for a house these days? I hope you will not vote for the 90-day extension.

There is more than rent involved in this case. There is more than the relationship between the landlord and the tenant. There is the stabilization of our economy. I do not know what the result will be if you do away with rent control at this particular time.

Housing is the prime necessity of our citizens. Civilized man must have shelter. If you raise the rents of the American people you have to raise their wages. If you raise the wages of the people, you have to raise the cost of everything they eat and everything they wear. It is a spiral of inflation that we are attempting to fight now. It is a danger that confronts each one of us. After the boom comes the bust. Let us not do anything to bring that catastrophe upon us after this great war. We have done pretty well up to now. We have pretty well stabilized our economy as far as is possible. If we turn loose these forces I do not know what the result will be.

Is there a man here who will say there is not a shortage in housing? Of course not. The Supreme Court of the United States said that a year ago. It still exists. The cost of everything depends upon supply and demand. There is a little supply and a great demand for this great necessity.

I do not say that all landlords would raise their rents. There are many good landlords. There are many landlords who have personal and friendly relations with their tenants. But there are some landlords that would raise their rents. They would raise them out of all reason. It is that minority, only those who try to impose upon their tenants who will feel the impact of this legislation. I want you to think of that when you come to vote for this.

This is not a political question. I know that on the minority side there will be an almost unanimous vote against the bill. If you beat it, the American people are going to know where that responsibility lies. They are pretty sharp about that. I want you to think of it also.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we have had some sort of rent control since 1942, and each year we have continued rent control in some form. Only once before has rent control been extended for more than 1 year. On one occasion we continued rent control for 18 months. Now, 3½ years after the cessation of hostilities, when we are enjoying a de facto peace, we are asked to continue rent control for 15 months with an expansion of powers of very unusual nature, and in some particulars we give the Expediter broader powers than he has ever had before under rent control. We should ponder the necessity of expanding this power in times of peace.

To provoke thought, I want to make a statement which will for political purposes be denied, but which for practical purposes must be admitted, that if we continue rent control for 15 months now, without any more knowledge than we have about where we are going in this economic transition that is taking place, then you must reconcile yourselves to the fact that we have established rent control as a permanent policy of the Government.

As the gentleman from Kentucky said, there were other things in this bill besides rent control. Title I of the bill has to do primarily with veterans' preferences. It contains provisions now that have never been in law before. If it is enacted in the form in which it is presented, we take the chance of completely drying up the real-estate market and giving only lip service to those whom we most want to help. Existing law provides that any newly constructed property which is to be sold as distinguished from property which was constructed for the occupancy of the builder by contract, or others, must be first offered to a veteran for 30 days. If the property is being built to rent, the property must be offered first to a veteran for 30 days for rent. That has been the law since 1946. The reason why it is in here now is because, of course, we set up the Expediter under that 1946 act to administer the allocations and priorities in respect of veterans' housing. The reason we took the action which we did was during the year when the Government had control over the distribution of every ounce of building materials and every hour of man labor which went into the construction of homes, we built about 413,000 units. When the Eightieth Congress removed those restrictions and wrote existing law in 1947, the same industry built 840,000 units, almost twice as many as had been built under Government control. During this last year, notwithstanding the statements of demagogues to the contrary, private enterprise—not the Government—built 947,000-and-some-odd units, the greatest number of units that had ever been built by any country in the history of the world.

I am fearful that, because you give these preferences on resales and on rerents, you will completely dry up the sources of investment capital in housing, and that we will be doing just the opposite which we intend to do. Of course, that authority runs to June 1950 and there is no way to correct that except by an act of Congress or by a proclamation by the President.

In respect to these priorities in title I, the Congress cannot get rid of them by concurrent resolution, as it can get rid of rent control. So free enterprise, the industry which we have to rely upon to build rental properties and to build homes is completely at the mercy of the administrators of the law. I will not argue with you about whether or not the Congress could, by the enactment of legislation, do away with it, because, of course, it would take a two-thirds majority of both Houses to do so.

Now, if we may go on to rent control. There are some very important differences. Let me repeat that I doubt the advisability of expanding rent control 3½ years after the cessation of hostilities and at a time when the national income is decreasing. I wish you would have in mind, Mr. Chairman, that it is axiomatic that vacancies in rental properties increase almost proportionately as national income decreases. That is why I advocate that we continue existing law as it is now until June 30, 1949, with assurance that this Congress will have to take another look at it before we adjourn, and, in the light of whatever changes may have taken place in our economy between now and June 30, we can then determine intelligently whether rent control should be continued, and the manner in which it should be continued and the standards which should be set up for its administration, in the light of whatever economic changes have taken place in the meantime.

Now there are precedents for that. The Ways and Means Committee of the House has argued, and argued well, that we should not consider tax legislation because of the changes which are taking place in our economy. They believe, undoubtedly, that we cannot intelligently enact tax legislation to fit into the changing economy, because we do not know what changes are taking place or are going to take place.

The Federal Reserve Board within the last 10 days has eased up on credit requirements under the so-called regulation W in recognition of the fact that there has been a diminishing demand for goods in several lines. I do not need to enumerate them. The papers are full of them. Decreases in production, decreases in demand, decreases in prices. And it naturally follows, decreases in national income, attending lack of production, lowering of prices, and so on.

Let me repeat, it is axiomatic that vacancies in rental properties increase almost proportionately as the national income decreases. I argue seriously. All of the groundwork has been laid. All of the hearings which are necessary have been had. Perhaps about the 1st of June we might have one session to bring ourselves up to date on what has happened to the economy, and during that month we would have ample time—more time than we have now before March 31, when this bill expires—to review this situation in the light of whatever changes have taken place.

Have in mind, Mr. Chairman, that I have always voted for rent control. To be sure, I have been denounced for being against rent control; and I have been denounced—in fact, my home has been picketed—for being for rent control. It is a rather unique position that I hold, having been denounced by both sides of

the question, a situation which, I can assure you, I did not enjoy very much. Nevertheless I like to think that I have been sensible in my approach to this question. I am firmly of the conviction that we should discontinue rent control just as rapidly as we possibly can; and, Mr. Chairman, this House, this Congress, is firmly convinced that we should do just that, because the declaration of policy to the effect that we should get rid of rent control just as rapidly as possible is not disturbed; and it seems to me that, under these present economic conditions, because of these fluctuations that are taking place at the present time, we are doing a most inconsistent thing to broaden rent control, expand rent control, give these new and unusual powers to the Expediter and at the same time leave a declaration of policy in the law that we should get rid of rent controls just as rapidly as possible. We announced to the world in the declaration of policy that we wanted to get rid of rent control just as rapidly as we possibly could, yet at the same time you are putting back controls on properties which had never been under control before. You are putting provisions in this bill which have never been in any rent control bill before in respect to powers of the Expediter and controls under the bill. I will take a short time briefly to skim over some of the powers which are reinstated, stressing those cases where the powers of control have never existed before.

Under the language of existing law we decontrolled all units in hotels where they were transient hotels, or apartment hotels, or residential hotels, provided that the hotel gave the hotel services ordinarily given by a transient hotel. That was the formula; that was the standard: Did the hotel in respect of any particular accommodation within the hotel give the maid service, the janitor, the bellboy service, the linen service, the secretarial service that is ordinarily given in a hotel? And unless those services were given that unit would not be decontrolled. It was a formula recognizing the increase in the cost of those services. But in the proposed bill we leave transient hotels out from under control; even though there are permanent units in these transient hotels, and even though the occupants of those permanent units have never had these hotel services; you decontrol them if they happen to be in a transient hotel. What is a transient hotel? No one knows; no one knows. We leave it to the Expediter to determine what is a transient hotel; he may hold that a transient hotel is a hotel that had 100 percent transient occupancy, and "transient occupancy" could be defined as occupancy for not more than 24 hours. We give him carte blanche authority to tell the trade what is a transient hotel. But notwithstanding the fact that in a residential hotel all of these services, and more too, are furnished, that hotel goes back automatically under control notwithstanding the fact that a majority of the units in the so-called residential or apartment hotel as found by the Expediter may be strictly transient units. So, of course, the sensible thing to do is to put this not on a hotel basis but on a unit basis. That is what we did and it has worked out very satisfactorily.

Heretofore trailers and trailer space have been decontrolled. They have not been under control. In this bill we recontrol all trailers and all trailer space which are not used for transient occupancy. No one who operates a trailer camp knows whether he comes within the controls or not, for the very reason he does not know what regulations are going to be set up, and we do not set up any standards in the act for the Expediter to follow in determining whether a trailer space is there for transient occupancy or permanent occupancy. Nobody will know until the regulations are published. You will not know what they are; this Congress will have no right to know, because it gives carte blanche authority to the Expediter to make such regulations as he desires to make in respect to all of these controls and all of the recontrols.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Did the gentleman say that all new construction from now on would come back under control?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No.

Mr. DONDERO. I misunderstood the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, heretofore all units which had been converted after February 1, 1947, for rental purposes were out from under control. These reconverted units will come back under control unless after the control has taken place, after expenditures have been made to reconvert them, the Expediter holds that they should be decontrolled. So, of course, you are going to get no converted units under this bill for the very reason that no one in his right mind is going to convert property for rental purposes unless he knows they are not going to be under control. They would have converted them before this if they were sure they were not going to be controlled. You cannot blame anybody for not converting a unit for rental purposes and take a chance in light of the history of the administration of this law, even though they have spent thousands of dollars in converting a home and making available five or six new units; faced with the fact they have no certainty that the Expediter is going to decontrol them, of course, they are not going to go to that capital expense, notwithstanding the fact that the Administrator might, by regulation or otherwise, lay down a certain standard. We laid down the standard 2 years ago that the Expediter shall make adjustments to prevent hardships and correct inequities. He has not done so, and if the Expediter will not follow the clear mandate of the Congress in that respect, then, of course, you know from the history of the administration of this act, he is not going to make it very easy for anyone to get out from under these controls.

He may recontrol any unit which has been decontrolled by any administration action since February 1, 1947. That means all of these units in any defense rental area which have been decontrolled by the Administrator on the recommendation of the Board which has been substantiated will go back under control. It means that all of these units which come onto the market, which have not been rented for any 2-year period—and there are thousands of them—since 1947, go back under control, notwithstanding the expenditure of thousands of dollars, perhaps, for reconversion of those units into rental units. So, every unit which has been taken out from under control, excepting those which have been taken out from under control by action of the Emergency Court of Appeals, go back under control under this law.

Now, to appease that situation we set up a helper, an officer, in every rental area. There are 767 local advisory boards serving approximately 600 defense rental areas, and all of a sudden, when we should be sloughing off these controls and getting rid of them, we make it possible for them to put 600 people on the pay roll. If it is to be at a salary of $3,000 each per year, it is pretty close to $2,000,000, is it not? To do what? To inform small landlords. There is no definition of what a small landlord is. Under the language of the law they do not inform landlords of five or six apartments, perhaps, if the Administrator says that you shall inform anybody who has less than four. We do not know what he means by small landlords. We know he does not mean small landlords in stature. But, we do not know anything more about it than that. They are to inform them concerning the conditions under which rent adjustments may be obtained. Well, the fault to be found with these adjustments is not any lack of knowledge on the part of the landlord in respect to his procedural rights.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Or that he does not know what his rights are. The letters which we get, the complaints against the administration of rent control, have to do with the failure of the Administrator to act after the matter has been presented to him. It is very obvious that they knew what their rights were, and they did not have to go to a friend of the court or somebody else to be told what their rights were. And they can get some help from this helper in the preparation of applications for rent adjustment and advise them on such other information as may be necessary and appropriate. It makes it possible to extend the administrative forces of rent control by at least 600 new employees. I would like to know what the Bureau of the Budget has to say about that. The President was never consulted on that one. He has not put that in his Budget. That was something, apparently, to appease the so-called small landlord and the tenant; appease them by a potential expenditure of over $2,000,000 predicated upon a minimum $3,000 salary for each helper.

Now, as to the review. Understand that there are no evictions here whatsoever unless the Expediter says that the tenant may be evicted. We set up the standards in existing law. But we do not know how or under what circumstances a person may be evicted because the Expediter under this law is given carte blanche authority to provide his own regulations in respect to evictions. But there is a very interesting thing with respect to review. At the present time you can get a review by the Emergency Court of Appeals in about 60 to 90 days, but under the language of this Act the matter may be delayed under the provisions of this bill for five or six months after the matter has been presented to the Expediter.

If a local board makes a recommendation to the Expediter, that matter can be stalled for 5½ months after the local board makes that recommendation.

We also in the bill give the Expediter the authority to come in and sue in the name of the United States for any alleged violations for the past year. Understand, they may go back a year and sue for any violations. If the tenant has not brought action within 30 days against the landlord for treble damages, the Expediter may in the name of the United States come in and get these punitive damages, treble damages, and no part of that goes to the tenant; it goes into the Treasury of the United States.

As we go along we will find some others. There is this snooper clause here which we discussed in connection with the export license bill we had up here 3 or 4 weeks ago. We thought that was obnoxious, but here is a real snooper provision. Without regard to whether a property is under control, the Administrator may subpena anyone into his office. He may obtain this information by subpena, requiring any person to appear and testify or to appear and produce documents, or both, at any designated place. Such person or anyone representing the Expediter can be put under oath by the Expediter. If he says anything that violates his oath as to a material matter, he can be brought before a district court for perjury and sent to jail, because the Expediter perhaps did not think he told the truth about the matter.

Here is a good one. This information shall be deemed confidential, if the person giving the information requests it, unless the Expediter determines that the withholding therof is contrary to the public interest.

Let me reiterate: This bill in its present form is such a bill as every one of us should hesitate to vote for in time of greatest emergency—in time of war. We do not know that conditions are getting better. We do know that something is happening to our economy.

Mr. Chairman, in all fairness to our oaths, in all fairness to ourselves and the offices which we hold, let us not do anything today that might put us in a very embarrassing position 3 months from now.

We will be in session 3 months from now, and the sensible thing to do is to continue rent control as it now exists on the statute books until June 30, and then take a look at it—let me repeat—in the light of whatever changes have taken place in our economy and determine our course then. We will know by then whether we want to continue rent control and in what manner and under what standards it shall be administered.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. At heart I have always been opposed to rent control. I voted to extend it a time or two because we were told it was the wise thing to do and because there were some outstanding commitments, perhaps not written, but implied. In the future it will be argued that there are going to be some hardships worked on somebody. Does the gentleman know anybody in any big city or in any community or anywhere who would be harmed by this extension that the gentleman has recommended? Does he know any group to which that would be a detriment?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No, I do not. I think we should have in mind that because of the present cut-back in employment and in production and wages in certain of our localities, certain Members of Congress say that they must vote for a continuance of rent control to protect those people who are now out of employment and who have lowered incomes from having to pay higher rent. You get the picture—as national income goes down, then I say, are we going to set up rent control as a matter of permanent policy to protect against low incomes in time of depression and against inflation in time of plenty? If so, at least we should be consistent enough to knock out the policy statement in the existing law.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. After the shattering argument and the irrefutable logic of the able gentleman from Michigan, it is beyond me to see how any reasonable person could vote for such a violent piece of legislation. This bill would legalize highway robbery. It would attack all human rights and property rights. What greater human right is there than for a man to work and save and enjoy the fruits of his own labor.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, we have just heard a very vigorous indictment of a large number of the Members of this House as well as a very large number of the people of our country. Highway robbers and epithets of that kind are names that will not withstand analysis when applied to what we are trying to do now to extend rent control for another 15 months.

Who wants rent control extended in this country? Is it the highway robbers? Is it some Republicans—the majority of the Democrats—or the people of this country who need our help? Labor, represented by the CIO, the A. F. of L., the railroad brotherhoods, every responsible labor organization, has come before our committee and said, "You must extend rent control." Are they highway robbers? I do not think so.

What about the veterans? They are not all Democrats. They are not all Republicans. They are not all laboring men. Every responsible national veterans' organization has come before our committee and said, "You must extend rent control."

Would you have me name those organizations for you? Perhaps you do not agree with the principles of some of them, but they do talk for national groups, and, as a whole, they talk for almost every veteran who served this country in World War I and World War II. You have among them the American Veterans Committee, the AMVETS, the Jewish War Veterans, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and the American Legion. Are they highway robbers? Do they want other than a fair deal from this Congress? I think the gentleman who resorted to name-calling, will think better of it before the day is over.

Yes. We have had rent control for a long time. We may have to have it for a long time to come. There is no man in this House who will stand on this floor and say that we want rent control or control of any kind as a permanent part of our free American Government and its institutions that are so dear to all of us. But so long as we are in an emergency period we are going to ask for emergency legislation. That is all we are here asking for now. This emergency will not disappear in 90 days, but if it should, and we would all like to see it disappear in 90 days, there is provision in this very law for the President to immediately terminate this emergency bill and these emergency provisions. If he should fail to do it and we are still in session 90 days from now, this House, acting concurrently with the Senate can, by resolution, without the signature or consent of the President, immediately vitiate and bring to an end these emergency laws.

But do not fool yourselves. We will not relieve the housing shortage in 90 days or a year or 15 months. The Housing Expediter came before our committee and reported to us the results of findings covering a thousand cities and villages in 48 States of the country. He showed us an analysis of surveys made in 91 cities with populations of over 100,000. In those cities alone there is a shortage today of over 1,000,000 rentable units. I do not care whether you come from Iowa or Kentucky or Connecticut or any of the 48 States of the country, if you will make a fair analysis of the situation in your State you will find that you do need an extension of this emergency legislation in order to protect the people who are living in rented units.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. FORD. Who made this analysis that was accepted and used by the Housing Expediter?

Mr. MULTER. They were made not only by his officials but by representatives of the local boards in the local areas. Existing law contains a provision for local boards—local people appointed by the Expediter upon the recommendation of the governors of the various

to do is to put this not on a hotel basis from under these controls.

imum $3,000 salary for each helper.

the statute books until June 30, and then I do not think so.

tion of the governors of the various

States. Those men are doing a fine job. Wherever they find a situation in their locality which warrants either an overall increase in rents or a decontrolling of their area or a part of their area or a classification of rental units within their area, they make a recommendation accordingly. They are working without compensation, and they are doing a good job. Wherever it is possible areas are being decontrolled and classifications within the areas are decontrolled when possible.

Mr. FORD. Is it possible that the analyses on which the Expediter based his opinion were taken by employees who are working for the Housing Expediter under the act and who might be seeking to have it perpetuated for personal reasons?

Mr. MULTER. I vigorously say to the gentleman that that is not the fact.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. If the gentleman will yield at this point, do I understand the method of picking the personnel of these local boards was changed in the Rent Act of 1948?

Mr. MULTER. That is correct.

Mr. CARROLL. And that act was passed by a Republican-controlled Congress?

Mr. MULTER. The gentleman is correct again.

Mr. CARROLL. And, as I understand, these local boards were to advise the Expediter and were to recommend the decontrol of certain areas where decontrol was feasible.

Mr. MULTER. That is correct.

Mr. CARROLL. Does their testimony indicate how they stand about this pending bill?

Mr. MULTER. How the local boards stand?

Mr. CARROLL. Yes.

Mr. MULTER. There has not been a request presented to the committee on behalf of any local board saying that their area should be decontrolled or saying that rent controls should not be extended; not a single board has sent such a request to our committee urging that rent controls cease.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MULTER. I yield for a question.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does not the gentleman's question assume that the Eightieth Congress was right? Is that the foundation for the assumption?

Mr. MULTER. No; the gentleman pointed out that the Eightieth Congress, Republican-controlled, put into the law a provision, which is continued in the bill presently before us, so that the localities may control the situation or, if it is warranted, decontrol.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And was that a good thing?

Mr. MULTER. None of those local boards have come before our committee and told us that we should end rent control.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If the gentleman will read a letter I put in the RECORD in my remarks he will see where the local board of South Bend, Ind., is making the owner of a unit pay about $8 a week for the privilege of renting it; and she can get no relief.

Mr. MULTER. I am sure if that is the situation——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is the situation.

Mr. MULTER. I do not care to dispute it with the gentleman, but if that situation prevails, this bill as it will pass this House I am sure will correct that kind of situation.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The gentleman from Michigan a while ago referred to recovery and recontrol in this present bill that would bring under controls certain individual units or areas that were never under control in any previous law; can the gentleman point out a single instance in the proposed bill under consideration wherein that is true?

Mr. MULTER. That is not so, so far as I have been able to ascertain. As originally drawn there was language in the bill that might have been interpreted that way, but before the bill came out of committee that was amended; and the bill in its present form specifically provides that recontrol can be applied only to property and areas that had been under control previously.

The provision in the pending bill is that if the Administrator decontrols an area or a classification, he may recontrol it if the situation changes. That is necessary because he hopes to be able to decontrol areas which are communities where they might be able to get along without control. The experience in taking off controls has shown that rents have increased as much as 89 percent once controls are lifted. If the Administrator has the right to recontrol those areas after he decontrols them, he can then say to that area: "I am ready to decontrol here and will do it, but if you are going to jump your rents unconscionably, if you are going to exact extortionate rents, we will have to put you back under control."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a short observation?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I merely wanted to point out that we set up mechanics and features in the last rent-control bill for the purpose of supplying the Congress and the country with information, and as a result of these provisions information has now come to us that we ought to have rent control continued; the local advisory boards have maintained that it is necessary.

Mr. MULTER. Yes. That is correct.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The gentleman from Michigan advocated taking a look at this matter again after setting it aside for 3 months. What does the gentleman believe the chances would be in the log jam of legislation that is apt to occur in the month of June in getting a fair rent bill or any bill at all at that time?

Mr. MULTER. The chances are that 90 days from now the situation in the House, and in the body at the other end of the Capitol will be such that there will be no chance of getting any legislation on this subject. That is my opinion.

In 1940, we had in this country 1,800,000 families living doubled up because there were no accommodations for them to live by themselves. The situation has not gotten better but much worse. In 1948, we had 2,333,000 families still living doubled up because of lack of accommodations.

While we are talking about the kind of proof that has come before our committee for and against this bill, let me call your attention to some of the propaganda that has been foisted upon the Members of the House and upon the committee too.

Many of us received letters from persons who claimed to be small property owners crying to the Heavens they were not getting enough rent with which to maintain their property, and that they were losing their property by foreclosure. Some of those letters were turned over to the Expediter and he investigated them.

One typical instance is in the record of the hearings before our committee. It revealed this person who sent in a letter claiming to be a small property owner about to lose her small investment in her home because she could not get an adjustment of rents was a domestic in the home of the president of a property owners' association, one which was represented before us in committee, pleading their cause. This woman never owned that property, she never owned any other property, and she never made an application for a rent increase anywhere. That is typical of the kind of stuff that was brought before our committee on behalf of so-called property owners.

They submitted to us a survey which purported to show that vacancies had increased to such an extent that we do not need rent control. Let me read to you what we learned about one of those surveys. The Housing Institute that submitted the survey upon which this property owners' association was making its claim, when asked about it by the Expediter, wrote as follows:

> We assume that specialists in apartment houses know of vacancies in the apartment units of their city but that their estimate of the vacancy ratio is just a guess based upon their own experience and that of their associates.

Now, we had some landlords come before us who were fair. We had property owners who came before our committee and said, "Rent control should be extended. All we want is an opportunity to get fair adjustments if we can show that we are entitled to them."

So we wrote into this bill a provision requiring the Expediter to appoint an officer in each local area who will help

the small property owners to process their application and get an increase if they are entitled to it.

More than that we had one estimable gentleman, a property owner himself, who came before us as general chairman of an organization representing the owners of one-seventh of all the property in the country which is rented and controlled under existing legislation and which will continue under control if this bill passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, what did he say to us? He said, "Gentlemen, you dare not take off rent controls. You must extend them."

This is a property owner talking for the owners of large multiple dwellings. He continued to say that there are abroad in this country persons who would extort oppressive rents; if you lift these controls you will have a chaotic condition the like of which the country has never had. You must continue controls, but give us the right, they said, to fair adjustments. That will be in this bill, I am sure, before we get through with it in this House.

There has been some talk about sending rent controls back to the various localities. Every person who was asked the question before our committee, the Representatives in Congress from various parts of the country and others, as to whether or not this can be handled on a local law basis said that it cannot be handled that way.

The only way it can be satisfactorily handled is by Federal legislation such as the bill presented to you now.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. I share in a large degree the views of the gentleman from New York on this matter, and that is why I am concerned with some of the provisions. I direct the gentleman's attention to page 25 of the bill, line 8, which provides that—

> Any person who willfully violates any provision of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to a fine of not more than $5,000 or to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or to both such fine and imprisonment.

That subsection says "who willfully violates any provision of this section." Is it the gentleman's intention that subsections (a), (b), and (c) are part of this section?

Mr. MULTER. The answer to that, sir, must be this way: My intention would be to take that same provision and make it applicable to the entire act, as we enact it. That, however, was not the intention of my committee. This section the gentleman has just read is existing law. It applies only to veterans' preference. We did have a provision for criminal penalties in the bill as proposed, but on motion of one of the members of the committee it was stricken out of the bill, and it is not in the bill.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Subsection (c) of that section says:

> The Housing Expediter is authorized to issue regulations and orders—

And so forth. Now, will a violation of subsection (c) or if one of those orders or regulations are violated, entail the punishment covered in subsection (d)?

Mr. MULTER. I am not trying to evade the question, but we have a whole body of law and decisions by the courts indicating what type of order carries with it a criminal penalty, when you have a provision such as subsection (d) in a law it will take much more time than I have available to tell you what kind of an order or regulation will be subject to a criminal penalty. There are any number of orders and regulations which an Administrator may issue which will not invoke a criminal penalty.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Would not that doubt be resolved if on page 25, line 8, after the last word "provision" you would insert there "of subsection (a), clauses 1, 2, 3, and 4 of this section"? Then you would eliminate any doubt as to whether that penal section does cover a violation of the regulation or order made under subsection (c) of the act.

Mr. MULTER. I am afraid, sir, that I must differ with the gentleman there. Certain orders and regulations that the Expediter will make, will necessarily require enforcement by the threat of a criminal penalty.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. On page 20 of the report, section 206 (a), we find this language:

> Any person who willfully violates any provision of this act, or any regulation or order issued thereunder, and any person who makes any statement or entry false in any material respect in any document or report required to be kept or filed under this act, shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to a fine of not more than $5,000 or to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or to both such fine and imprisonment.

What does that language mean?

Mr. MULTER. That is circumscribed by the same decisions that I referred to a moment ago in answering the question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I might say in answer to the previous statement that that is not in the committee amendment.

Mr. MULTER. There was a great deal said here about the impact of this emergency legislation upon our national economy. Let me direct your attention to a few facts and figures with reference to that. There have been no mortgage foreclosures anywhere in this country on account of rent control legislation. During the years we have had rent control legislation upon our statute books the fact is that mortgage foreclosures have constantly decreased. I do not say rent control is the reason for it, but I do say that rent control has not caused the loss of a single piece of property to any property owner by a foreclosure of a mortgage.

Just let me give you these simple figures: In 1939 we had over 100,000 mortgage foreclosures on nonfarm properties in the Nation. In 1948 we had a little over 11,000 mortgage foreclosures on the same type of properties.

In 1939 the savings and loan associations of this country, which invest practically all of their funds in real estate mortgages, owned $681,000,000 worth of property which they had to take back by foreclosure because the mortgagors could not pay the mortgage debt. In 1948 those same institutions owned only $10,000,000 worth of real estate.

The dividends paid by our savings banks have increased during rent control. The deposits in savings banks have constantly increased under rent control, not because of rent control, but rent control has had no impact upon them. The same is true of the aggregate of life insurance policies and dividends paid upon such insurance.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, the great State of Kansas this week has abandoned a tradition of many years. We used to be a State that was known as dry and now we are wet.

In the debate which took place out in Kansas on the problem, one individual said to another, "Alcohol is a bad thing. It causes you to do bad things. It causes you to lose your job, to speak crossly to your wife. Occasionally it causes you to think about shooting at your landlord, and, worse than that, it causes you to miss him."

On both sides of the aisle are men who are either for or against this bill. On both sides of the aisle are men who would not vote for rent control under any circumstances. On both sides of the aisle are men who would vote for rent control under any circumstances. I happen to be rather in the middle of those. I voted for rent control during the war period and after the war, but now I am tired of it. It is to those people who have some doubt about the continuance of rent control that I address my remarks this afternoon.

What are we here to determine? The law as it now stands provides that Congress recognizes that an emergency exists and that for the prevention of inflation and for the achievement of a reasonable stability in the general level of rents during the transition period rent control shall be continued.

The proponents of rent control say that there is an emergency and that the emergency arises by reason of a shortage of housing units; secondly, that rent control is necessary to prevent inflation;

and, thirdly, that we require rent control to have a stability of rent level.

I sat for 10 days hearing witnesses on behalf of rent control and opposing rent control. Those witnesses who appeared on behalf of rent control can be classified rather simply. First, there were two unions appearing, the CIO and the A. F. of L. Then veterans' organizations appeared. Then certain organizations representing tenants in New York City and Chicago. The mayor of Detroit appeared, and of course the Housing Expediter appeared. The armed services appeared. But absent, Mr. Chairman—absent from these proponents of rent control were the tenants. I want to call your attention to that a little bit later. The evidence produced in the order of importance was as follows:

That there is a shortage of houses for rent.

That prices will skyrocket if rent control is taken off.

That evictions will cause hardships.

That there will be social maladjustment if we decontrol housing.

That inflation will cause hardships if we do not continue rent control.

I want to examine some of the testimony for the benefit of the members of this committee which was produced in our committee by the proponents of rent control. Mr. Woods, the Housing Expediter, appeared before our committee and testified that the one reason for rent control is the housing shortage. He said the shortage does contribute to inflation because prices skyrocket. Mr. Chairman, his testimony and statement went to considerably greater lengths than that, but in the final analysis the conclusion of Mr. Woods' testimony is that we require rent control. Why? Because of a shortage of houses for rent, and secondly because of the danger of inflation due to skyrocketing rents if we decontrol.

Then the CIO testified before our committee, and they came in with a statement about an inch thick. An estimable gentleman representing the CIO said, "Here at last we have the facts and the figures to show you the situation with reference to rent control." Then what did he do? He presented to the committee a series of answers to telegrams sent to CIO presidents and local officers in many cities and States throughout the United States. A summary of their testimony may be made when I say that most of these statements are similar to this:

Miss Ruth Warran, of the Georgia Workers' Education Service, reports that the housing shortage is stated in terms of social effect. She said:

> The still acute housing situation may, in the long run, deprive us of more than a roof over our heads. It can, according to experts on the subject, have very far-reaching and drastic social implications.
>
> In Atlanta, for instance, the J's and their children could find no place to live, when they had to move, except to buy a 16 by 16-foot tent and make their home in an open field.
>
> Mr. J. makes enough to afford a modest apartment or house but at present has been spending all he makes to provide the family with food, bedding, clothes, and coal to keep them warm. Joe, the redheaded 14-year-old, recently has been slipping in his grades and playing truant from school. He doesn't want his playmates to know he lives in a tent.

Here is another report:

> WIFE FORCED TO LIVE WITH BRUTAL HUSBAND
>
> We know of one family, in which the wife, mother of six children, was forced to stay with her husband who was an alcoholic, beat her and the children and supported her very inadequately. She tried to leave him by moving to another State where she stayed with a married daughter, but the latter could not support her and, as she was a nonresident and ineligible for relief, she was forced to return to her husband.
>
> If she had been able to find an apartment or a house or rooms to stay in, away from him, she could have left him and established herself independently. But like many others she was forced by lack of housing to stay in a place from which she could not have her husband evicted.

Now, that is the type of testimony that the CIO brought before us. They also said in effect that there is a housing shortage, that the housing shortage causes a rise in prices and that there may be evictions which will cause social maladjustments.

Following that testimony also is contained an article from Chicago in which they said:

> One hundred forty-five Chicagoans perished by fire in 1947. The toll rose in 1948, when 152 died in that manner. Usually the pattern is the same. Fire, originating in some squalid tenement, where construction and materials create a trap from which few escape, does its deadly work before even Chicago's Fire Department, one of the best in the land, can arrive on the scene.
>
> On January 18 fire struck the tenement at 259 West Twenty-second Place. Mrs. Mary Woo tossed her two children out of a window. Both were injured. Mrs. Woo and her unborn child weren't so fortunate. They died. So did Lee Lung, 66 years old.

Mr. Chairman, the point I make is that that testimony was true 50 years ago in Chicago. It was true 10 years ago in Chicago. It is true today in Chicago under rent control, and it will be true tomorrow in Chicago and 10 years from tomorrow in Chicago.

The A. F. of L. came before us and testified. In a nut shell, they testified that there was a housing shortage; that the housing shortage would cause a rise in prices. Following that, the Tenant's League and the Consumer's League testified before us. They said there is a housing shortage and that will cause a rise in prices.

The mayor of Detroit said the housing shortage is no less serious today than it was during the war; that it is becoming more and more acute.

Witness after witness testified to one thing: There is a housing shortage. It is becoming more acute. It is more acute now than it was before the war.

The armed services came before our committee represented by an estimable young man who was assistant to an assistant, which assistant had been directed by the Secretary of Defense to say to us that there is a housing shortage, or, "We cannot find reasonable houses at a reasonable rate of rental to provide for our men. There is a housing shortage. Therefore, we believe in the continuation of rent control."

Now, Mr. Chairman, the point I make is that these dogmas have been repeated so long that the people of America do not understand that they are merely repeating by rote the dogma which has been told to them time and time again without questioning why.

Of course, I understand that many of these men are doing the job as organizations are required to do. Someone says, "There is a housing shortage. What shall we do about it?" Some other gentleman gets up and says, "We should continue rent control." And so they pass a resolution. They are doing their job. They are doing the best they can and that is their answer.

We lawyers have a motion which we call a demurrer. We say that when all the evidence is in, assuming its truth you have no case. Let us return to the issues in this case.

First, it is said that there is an emergency.

Secondly, that without rent control there will be inflation.

Thirdly, we need control to stabilize rents.

Let us assume that there is a shortage, for the purpose of this argument before this committee. Has anyone testified before the committee or will anybody in this House say that rent control will cure the shortage? I will tell you three people who said it would not do so. One was Mr. Woods in the testimony before our committee. The other is Mr. Goodman, of the CIO, who said the same thing, that it would not alleviate the housing shortage; and the third is the man who testified as the witness who represented the armed services. He said that it would not alleviate the housing shortage.

All right. We are talking about the continuation of something which will not alleviate the first principle for which we are arguing, or for which some people are arguing. Are we really interested in securing houses which are satisfactory and units which one may find satisfactory to him at a satisfactory rental, or are we interested in controlling evictions. If we are interested in controlling evictions and if we are worried about great social maladjustments which may occur by reason of evictions, it is a very simple thing for us to draft a simple bill for that purpose.

Concerning inflation and high prices, I suggest you read the hearings in behalf of the proponents of this case and see how many of the witnesses talk about inflation. The only one, that I find, who talked about inflation was Mr. Woods.

I asked him: "How will rent control affect inflation?"

He said that it might affect inflation, it might do some good somehow or other. You know, we have talked a great deal about inflation and done nothing about it.

Mr. Chairman, this discussion has not—nor has one witness attempted seriously to discuss the impact upon our economy of rent control; and I challenge anybody to say that they have. Prices may rise; and if they do, then what?

They talk about a 50-percent increase, or 100-percent increase, or 200-percent increase; those increases, Mr. Chairman, are relative increases. Are they increases which take into consideration the comparison to a day's work? I received a letter from one of my towns in Kansas, Manhattan, I think it is, about ten or twelve thousand population, in which the lady said she had to pay her plumber $3 an hour and his helper the same; in other words, to get the plumber in to work for 20 minutes she had to pay him a dollar. How much did she pay him before rent control went into effect?

Yes; prices may rise somewhat; I will not say that they will not rise; but if they do, is that a shocking thing? Or is it shocking that prices should rise when this individual had had his or her house controlled at a rate which was in effect in 1942 and the man living in the house has had his wages raised time and time and time again? And in addition to that, the man occupying the house may not be the one who may need it; he occupies it because he happened to be there, because he got there before that veteran about whom the chairman of the Committee on Rules talked so much this morning, the veteran who came home and found a fellow in the house he wanted to rent. That is what happened to him.

We talk about stability of rent levels; what they are talking about is low-rent levels, but does that really occur under rent control? We have shown that even upon the evidence of the proponents of this bill that if there is an emergency, if there is a housing shortage, this bill does not meet it; and, consequently, that rent controls even according to their testimony do not control inflation; and, third, that they do not provide for a stability of rents, because there is no stability of rents under rent control. If I may paraphrase an old familiar quotation:

Theirs is not to question why; theirs is but to lose their jobs or die.

We have evidence on the other side of this problem, evidence submitted by those who were against rent control, which may be summed up as follows: Rent control in peacetime betrays the tenant. I want you to think about that a little. Rent control creates unnecessary injustices to property owners. There are some people who believe that injustices are required, sometimes; but rent control creates unnecessary injustices. It is a pattern for permanent control.

Who appeared in opposition? The great national associations of real-estate owners, of course; the associations representing great hotels, and representatives of other large and important groups; but, Mr. Chairman, other than that, they were property owners and tenants. Property owners; yes. The gentleman from New York said there were some alleged property owners who were having a little trouble with rent control. I wonder where he has been. Probably sitting up there in New York City wondering what is happening to the rest of the country. Yes; thousands and thousands of property owners that are having a little trouble. During this hearing you could not pry your way into that committee room with a crowbar. Why? Because small-property owners at their own expense and at the expense of property owners within their community were there trying for one moment to get a word in to tell this Congress what has happened to them.

Do you mean to tell me that those people are the selfish, grasping landlords about whom they have been talking? No. Those are the people you find back home, the people who felt they had the right to save a few dollars and invest it in some property, to provide some security. Now, they come here and say to us: "We want to do something about this law which is unjust and unfair."

The tenants were there to testify and how. They were there in absentia. Their silence was just as strong, their voice was just as loud as an atomic bomb. Their silence is just as strong as if they were before you today in this argument.

Look at your files and see how many letters you have had from tenants who want rent control continued. Of course, some tenants want rent control continued. None of them want to face the possibility of paying more money. But weigh them in the balance between those property owners who have found unjust and unfair treatment under this law. You have one or two letters. I have two from my district. I have hundreds of letters from bona fide tenants and the gentleman from New York cannot possibly refute, who are suffering under the inequities of this bill. The tenants were:

Victims of those who would use the desperate plight of people to advance;

Victims of splendid organizations which attempt to solve a problem by passing a resolution;

Victims of sympathetic people who repeat by rote any dogmatism;

Victims of a system that says you must take a slice of your neighbors' policy—whether or not you want it or need it;

Victims of a law which requires them to live in dilapidated, dirty, and deteriorating homes;

Victims who are veterans returning home;

Victims who see the well-to-do live in cheap-rental units while the poor pay higher prices;

Victims of a plan which reduces opportunity for obtaining a decent place to live at a reasonable price.

Let us look at some of the facts:

First. Forty-six and eight-tenths percent of occupied nonfarm units were occupied by tenants in April 1948. Fifty-eight and nine-tenths percent in April 1940.

Second. On the average nonfarm tenant families paid twelve percent of their income for rent in 1948—down nearly one-fourth from a comparable ratio of 15.8 percent in prewar 1941. This ratio declined because family incomes roughly doubled between 1941 and 1948 while median rents were increasing only about one-half—50.2 percent.

Under strict Federal rent control, rents for comparable dwellings in large cities increased only 11.3 percent between early 1940 and 1948. One effect of this rent control is clearly shown in the loss of low-rent units—a net decline by April 1947 of 3,565,000 in the number of occupied units renting below $30 must have resulted principally from demolition of low-rent units, sale for owner occupancy or such substantial improvement as to justify rent increases under rent control. With the loss of lower-rent units and addition to the supply of units renting above $30, principally through new construction or conversion operations, median rentals rose from $21.46 in April 1940 to $29.33 in April 1947 and to $32.23 in early 1948, an over-all net increase of 50.2 percent.

Median rents for nonfarm tenant families with incomes of $5,000 or more were only $45.38 in early 1948, down more than one-third—37.1 percent—from the 1940 median rent of $72.10 for families of similar incomes, while median rents of lower-income families changed relatively less; increasing from $17.68 to $20.83 for families with incomes of $2,000 or less and declining from $36.11 to $33.79 for families with incomes of $2,000 to $4,999.

In other words, those families who have an income of less than $2,000 a year are paying more rent proportionately than the higher-income families.

Here are some other figures I want to leave with you. In 34 cities 190,000 more tenant dwellings were occupied by one person in 1947 than in 1941.

What has happened and why? More single persons can now afford to live alone under the freezing of rents and rental units.

When the census on housing was taken in April 1940, the number of married couples living as extra families was 6.4 percent of all married couples. The report prepared by the committee showed that there are more married couples today living doubled up than there were in 1941, or whenever the date was. There may be, because there are more married couples. But, understand this: When the census was taken in 1940 the number of married couples living doubled up as extra families was 6.47 percent of all married couples. By April 1947, after the impact of the greatly increased marriage rate had been felt, the ratio had risen to 8.35 percent, but by April 1948, the date of the latest survey by the Bureau of the Census, the ratio had dropped back to 6.8, or only about 5 percent more than in 1940.

Now, for the landlords a moment—those selfish people. I do not believe that you need statistics. Perhaps the gentleman from New York does, but an interesting thing about the testimony which was presented this time showed two interesting features. One is that I hear very little about those selfish landlords this year. I did last year and the year before and the year before that, but I think only one person has mentioned the selfish landlord. That is rather interesting. But the more interesting thing was that nothing was produced concerning the income of landlords; in other words, to show what they were making. This indicates a belief that the landlords do have a case.

I recommend for your reading the report in the hearings made by Mr. Donald Hass, from Seattle, Wash. The people of the city of Seattle, in conjunction with

the University of Washington, expended $35,000 to make a full and complete survey of the housing situation in Seattle. Those were not guesses. Those were not irrelevant estimates. They are absolute facts which are the result of a careful survey made on the spot of every house, every unit, every building, every person who is interested in buying or building or renting in Seattle. This report shows the discrimination on the part of rent control between people who want to rent and between the landlords. It shows that the owners do not get a fair return. It shows a wasteful use of space. The interesting thing is that Seattle has no housing shortage, according to this report. It shows that control discourages the building of new construction. I realize that other associations and organizations cannot spend $35,000 for similar surveys, and, although Seattle did prove it, they did not get decontrol. There are, however, fine statements from Dallas, Houston, Norfolk, Alameda County, Calif., and from all sections of this country of ours to show how this law has worked in an unfair and inequitable manner. Administratively it has been impossible to provide justice.

The report of the committee shows that only 14 local boards have recommended decontrol. The majority contend that apparently we should continue control because only 14 areas have asked for decontrol. I want to read to you what a local board must do in order to recommend decontrol, remembering that local boards are citizens acting without pay. So they must find this: They must find the population of the city on VJ-day and the present day. They must find anticipated increases and decreases in the population. They must find the general trend of employment in the last 6 months. They must find anticipated changes in employment during the next 90 days. They must list all students who live with their parents and their wife's families and how they live and under what circumstances. They must find the approximate number of families seeking rentals. They must find the extent of rent decrease during the past 6 months. Imagine doing that in a city like Los Angeles or Kansas City, or even Topeka, Kans. They must find prospective trends if rent control is removed. They must list uninhabitable and nonseasonal dwellings. In my judgment, these regulations make it impossible for the local boards to prepare a decontrol report.

Now, what have I said? I have said, first, that in a peacetime economy—remember, this was born of wartime necessity—the emergency has not been proved great enough and is not great enough to justify these controls. Let someone answer that question.

Second, we have not shown such an emergency or need. We have not shown that rent control will build more houses or provide more units for people to rent at lower rentals, or at any price.

Third, the controls defeat the very object for which they are sought, and remember the statistics I quoted. They create shortages and higher prices.

Finally, in the final analysis, it is an unfair, arbitrary, discriminatory law which we have foisted now, in peacetime, upon a large segment of our people. In my judgment, it should be wiped out.

Mr. Chairman, I was told not long ago that the atomic bomb was mere child's play, that today bacteriological warfare had come into being to such an extent that perhaps pouring a tumbler full of bacteria into the water system of a huge city of 100,000 would completely eliminate the population of that city within 24 hours.

Mr. Chairman, I think there are other weapons of destruction of humankind which are just as powerful. I think one of those weapons is the destruction of character, the destruction of our great Republic by false ideas. One of those ideas is that the Government must at all times, under every circumstance, be the source to whom you must go to be relieved of all hardships, of all ills, of all wrongs.

Mr. Chairman, I think this Congress today has the opportunity to point the way—to determine where we are going and what shall be our path. I hope that it will be a path which will lead to greater freedom and greater service and cooperation among men.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. First, may I congratulate the gentleman on the logic he has shown in summing up the position of the proponents and the opponents of the bill and the very fine statement he has made. Does the gentleman feel, as his conclusion from the study he has made, that the only basis upon which this legislation could be continued would be the continuation of an emergency condition?

Mr. COLE of Kansas. That is definitely right.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Does the gentleman definitely in his own mind feel that the emergency does not exist?

Mr. COLE of Kansas. I have definitely come to that conclusion, and I challenge anybody to prove the contrary.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Does the gentleman feel, further, that a continuation of this rent control would be what would amount to a legal destruction of the rights of certain people, and that, from the viewpoint of the courts, if there were a continuation, it would be discriminatory and arbitrary class legislation?

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Thousands and thousands and thousands of property owners are the answer to that question. I think that is true.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I desire to read a letter which I received this morning, dated March 9, 1949, from Hon. Herbert B. Brill, executive secretary of the Metropolitan Fair Rent Committee of New York City.

Hon. William E. Russell, chairman of this committee, testified before our committee. I think he is one of the fairest witnesses I have ever heard. He is thoroughly honest and he impressed every member of the committee that he was altogether sincere. He is from the district and a constituent of my good friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. GAMBLE]. This is what Mr. Brill has to say:

METROPOLITAN FAIR RENT COMMITTEE,
New York, N. Y., March 9, 1949.

Hon. PAUL BROWN,
Representative from Georgia,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROWN: On behalf of the executive membership of our organization as well as each and every individual owner of rental housing in our area, which contains one-seventh of all the housing units under rent control, I want to take this opportunity to express our deep and everlasting gratitude to you for your recognition of the fact that a provision for a reasonable return on fair value is the only prescription that can lead to the cure of one of the major inequities in the rent law.

The New York press reports that there is overwhelming support for your proposal to insist that owners get a reasonable return on the fair value of their property.

Please be assured that when the measure is debated on the floor of the House tomorrow and the day after, you will have the blessings and moral support of the owners of some 2,250,000 housing units who have been denied a living wage, in their case, a reasonable return on the fair value of their properties.

We do so hope that your proposal will be accepted but, in any event, we want to iterate and reiterate our great thanks to you for recognizing one of the greatest injustices and inequities in the law and to congratulate you for your courage in sponsoring one of the greatest remedies which has heretofore been consistently refused because of political expediency and the specious argument of the Housing Expediter that an appropriate formula is difficult to prepare.

With kindest personal regards and sincere wishes for success in your endeavor to obtain a fair deal, I beg to remain,

Very respectfully,
HERBERT B. BRILL,
Executive Secretary.

Mr. Chairman, there is need for rent control in some sections of this country yet. But if we are going to continue rent control in order to regulate the 10-percent selfish landlords of this country, we certainly must make it fair to the other 90 percent of the landlords who do not want to chisel anybody, but who do desire a fair return. I am going to support this bill if we can get fair treatment for tenants and landlords alike.

Everybody wants this. But if we cannot do that, then, gentlemen, it will be difficult to justify it. The landlords are the only segment of our people who are regulated today. Many are getting now only about enough to pay the upkeep on their houses. If we are to continue to let one man in Washington be the guardian of every landlord in the United States, then I say we must make it assured in the law that the landlord who is helpless and who owns his property shall receive a reasonable return on a fair or reasonable value of his property.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I cannot yield now.

The amendment which I am offering sets up a plan which requires the Housing Expediter and the local boards, when considering hardship cases or other cases involving inequities, to fix rents at levels

that will yield the landlord a reasonable return on the reasonable value of his property, and sets up certain factors which must be considered in determining this question.

This, I believe, is the first effort that has been made to assure landlords that they will not have to subsidize tenants. No effort has been made by the Expediter to put this principle into operation. There is nothing in the present law which requires him to give consideration to it. That is the thing I want to cure. In my judgment, this glaring defect in the law and the administration of it is the principal cause of the almost universal complaints that we hear against the law on the part of the landlords.

I wish the Members of this House could have witnessed the demonstration that took place last week when this bill was before the Committee on Banking and Currency. The committee room was packed to the walls and the crowd overflowed into the corridors. They were for the most part small landlords who had come from all parts of the country to fight to preserve their property rights and a reasonable return on their property. They were in anything but an amiable mood. They were American citizens whose property their Government had required them to rent to other American citizens at a rental that represented no return to them, and in fact in many cases represented an actual loss.

We have all heard or read of the recent demonstrations over the country on the part of the landlords who have been compelled to rent their property without profit. Those incidents indicate the seriousness of this problem and the urgent necessity that something must be done now. Without such provision as is contained in this amendment, this rent-control bill is not fair. Under ordinary circumstances, and in normal times, rent control is thoroughly un-American, and it violates practically all the basic principles on which our country and our institutions and our freedoms are based. The only justification for such a law is the existence of a national emergency. It was only because of such emergency that this law was passed by the Congress and approved by the courts.

I am willing to go along with the idea now on the theory that an emergency still exists, but I am willing to only on the condition that private property cannot, under the express provisions of the law, be taken without just compensation, and that landlords will be assured a reasonable return on the reasonable value of their property.

Rent control in effect converts one's property into the status of a public utility, but it is not regulated in the same way that public utilities are regulated. It is a cardinal principle of public utility regulations that a reasonable return shall be allowed on the reasonable value of the property devoted to the public use. Can there be any sound reason why the same principle should not apply to rent-controlled housing that is applied to public utilities?

Mr. Chairman, this is an extremely serious problem; it is one that we should not consider lightly; it is one that contains the seed of widespread discontent and one that we can go a long way in solving by saying to the country in this act that we still believe in and stand by the fundamental rights which are guaranteed to all American citizens by the Constitution of the land.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Not at this time.

Mr. Chairman, the only objection that I have heard to this amendment is that it would be difficult to enforce. The Expediter said that my idea was correct that the people were entitled to a fair return on a reasonable value of their property, but it would be difficult to set up such a formula. I understand, however, that he has changed his mind since then. If this principle that I maintain, that the landlords of this country are entitled to a reasonable return on a reasonable value, cannot be inserted in the bill, then it would be difficult to defend your vote for it. I say it can be enforced. The local board can go in and find out what is a reasonable value. The local people know the value of the property; they know the assessed value. The real estate men there know whether or not that speaks the real value; and if it does not they can get the facts to show what a fair value of that property is.

The local board makes recommendation to the Expediter. It is up to the Expediter to approve it, if the board has done its duty.

Someone might ask: What is a fair value? In every State of the Union and every city, when a person makes a tax return he must return his land for taxing purposes at a reasonable value of the land; he must make a fair return of his property. If he fails to do so the assessors appointed in that county raise his tax; the assessors get up the formula; the assessors know the value, and they know what a reasonable value is. The same is analogous with the Expediter. If the assessors have a right to determine the fair value of any locality for taxing purposes, the Expediter has a right to determine whether or not the value reported by the local board of their community is fair and reasonable. More than that, he will get all factors relating to value.

When I told the members of my committee that a reasonable return on a reasonable value was not a very difficult thing to ascertain and enforce, all of them did not agree with me. They were all in favor of the idea but troubled about whether or not you could say what was a reasonable or fair return. Hardship is not defined in the law, but the Expediter in his regulations defines hardship. If this be so, it should be no more difficult to get at a reasonable return or a fair return.

Mr. Chairman, some members of the committee have changed their views since the vote in committee on this amendment because I explained to them that the first thing in this bill is the declaration of an emergency and the courts would be more liberal in construing the act in carrying out the intention of Congress. Whether we have an emergency or not, we declare in this bill that we do have.

Under these circumstances the Supreme Court of the land will hold, as it has always done in wartime or in an emergency in peacetime, many things to be constitutional and legal which it would not so construe in peacetime. The idea is silly to me that you cannot obtain a reasonable or fair valuation of property and give the poor landlord a reasonable return under the emergency provision of this bill.

Without the emergency clause in this bill, the rent ceiling could not be enforced. You cannot in peacetime, without declaring an emergency, say that the Government has a right to control the landlord's property and act as his guardian in making rent contracts, and certainly if the Supreme Court says that you can do this, it will uphold the principle of my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, without this amendment you are going to be unable to be fair to both the landlords and tenants under this bill, and we will say to the people of this country, especially, the widows and Gold Star Mothers who have invested all they have in small homes for renting, that they will not get any return and all that they will receive is just barely enough or hardly enough to pay the taxes and upkeep of their property, and this to continue for 15 months longer.

I realize there was great need during wartime for rent control, and there is some need now in some sections of the country for it. I am willing to go along, and I know everyone wants to go along, if we can have a reasonable return based on a reasonable valuation for all.

When the veterans came back from the bloody struggle abroad—those who were able to come back—they found all the houses of this country occupied by people who did not go to war. The veterans got very few places. I wish that situation could be corrected.

New buildings for the last 2 years have not been controlled and under this bill no new homes will be controlled. So most of the veterans have had to pay a higher price for a place in which to live. These are the people we wanted to help most, but we have not helped them as much as we wanted to. It is claimed that there are in many cities of this country from 10 to 15 percent of the landlords who are selfish and, without rent control, would charge from 100 to 200 percent higher rents. To prevent such unreasonable rents from this class we should not penalize the other 85 or 90 percent of good citizens who do not believe in extortionary rents by failing to give them reasonable returns under any rent law. By this amendment effectively administered we will have a remedy to give justice alike to the landlords and to the tenants.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Georgia on the letter he has just read into the RECORD commending his proposed amendment. The writer represents an independent organization that is thoroughly familiar with rent control. To buttress the Brown amendment I would like to read from the testimony of Mr. Tighe E. Woods, Housing Expediter, pages 93 and 96 of the hearings:

The first type of adjustment is for financial hardship. The second type is for operating loss. The third is for fair return on fair value.

The first two types, hardship and operating loss, are now in our regulation. We have not been able to place the third, fair return, in our regulation because we have found no equitable and practical method for such a provision.

Page 96, quoting further:

In view of all these considerations we have been unable to develop practical and equitable individual adjustment provisions for fair return.

Well, if the Housing Expediter is unable to develop that formula after months of delay, I hope you will vote for the Brown amendment. The Housing Expediter having failed, let the Congress write the regulation.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAMBLE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would like to submit this question to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GAMBLE] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN]. Is there any instance in the operation of the Federal Government at the present time and through the machinery of the Congress where private citizens in peacetime or in wartime are asked to provide goods and services below the cost of production?

Mr. GAMBLE. Not that I know of.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is there any case on record?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE].

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE] indicated in his remarks that no national emergency existed. I wonder if he was present on the House floor yesterday when the House passed a bill for the purpose of erecting a radar fence around this country, the beginning cost being in the neighborhood of $80,000,000 and the ultimate cost approximately $170,000,000 to $200,000,000. If there is no national emergency, why did the Congress on yesterday decide that a 3,000-mile guided-missile range was necessary, the initial cost at the outset of around $71,000,000 with the ultimate cost reaching $200,000,000.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEANE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman please discuss the emergency around these national defense areas, especially the testimony of the representatives of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Corps?

Mr. DEANE. I will.

If there is no national emergency, why are we expending today 34 cents out of every budget dollar for national defense?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEANE. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Might I say that on next Monday, if a rule is reported, the composition bill of the Army and Air Corps providing for a 70-group Air Force will also be brought up.

Mr. DEANE. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts. If time permitted we could give one instance after another of the existence of a national emergency.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEANE. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. I did not say there was no emergency. I said there was no emergency of a housing nature which rent control would cure.

Mr. DEANE. If the gentleman did not say that there was no national emergency, I am glad to have him so advise the House.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. My statement did not have anything to do with what the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. DEANE. If there is no veterans' housing shortage, why did the representative of the Air Force, appearing before the committee in behalf of the Secretary of National Defense, make this statement in behalf of each branch of the armed forces? I quote from page 648 of the hearings:

Recent surveys on reenlistment figures definitely prove to us that the biggest factor in low rates is inadequate living conditions—housing—either a shortage of actual accommodations or inadequate accommodations at excessive rentals. At Mather Field, Calif., for example, the commanding general has allowed enlisted men and their families to recondition old barrack-type buildings, where it is necessary for entire families to use common cooking and other facilities. The reason? Principally because the military income will not stand a $60 to $80 per month room in a town 12 miles from the base.

I invite the Members to read the statement by this gentleman appearing on page 648 of the hearings.

Coming as I do from the Southern section of our country, and appreciating likewise the State of Kansas and certain States of our Union, where the need of rent control is not so pronounced, I contend we must keep in mind our Nation as a whole.

I am appearing here today as a small landlord, the owner of a small apartment house. If I voted my selfish convictions, I would vote against this bill.

My conscience will not permit me to vote against the extension of rent control because there is an emergency. If there is any doubt on the part of any members of this committee as to the urgency of the lack of housing accommodations throughout the country, I suggest that you go out and get in a taxicab in Washington or in any city of this country with a hundred thousand people, or even less, and make an individual poll, and you will find pretty soon how the people feel. I venture the prediction that if no rent-control act is passed by this Congress you will hear something and you will hear it very quickly. The average tenant is assuming that if the Eightieth Congress passed a rent-control law, surely the Eighty-first Congress will look after the interest of that great group of our citizens who have no spokesman.

I was interested and perhaps the other Members likewise would be interested in certain figures released by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. In 1948 the total housing units put under construction is estimated at 930,000. Of that number only 16.5 percent were available for rental. This situation continues to exist.

During the past year the Housing Expediter has made almost 8,000 surveys throughout the entire United States to determine whether rent control could be ended in the areas under rent control. Out of that large number, the Expediter was able to take only 31 decontrol actions, all of them in rather sparsely-populated areas. Although there were more than 750 of these boards, only about 15 of them sent in a recommendation to end rent controls in their areas. In my own district, there are three areas under control. I requested the Office of the Expediter to make a survey to determine the need for rent control. The findings showed that the leading officials of the towns in these areas indicated that there was a continuing need for rent control.

It seems to me that as we consider the legislation the individuals who can give the best opinion are not the representatives of the associations, or even labor or the veterans groups, but the best people to give us an opinion are the local advisory boards. If we accept their opinion on need, we will continue rent control.

Who is spearheading the opposition to rent control? They are the same organizations who, during 1948, spent approximately $1,000,000 in lobbying, not only against rent control but against housing. I am of the opinion that as we get into housing legislation you will find the same arguments against housing that we are having today against rent control.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEANE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. With reference to the figures the gentleman gave as to the need for housing, may I call to his attention the figures I have on Chicago, Ill., from which I am Representative? The gentleman from Kansas made reference to the fact that the city of Chicago had poor housing 50 years ago, has poor housing today, and will probably have poor housing 50 years from now. If the efforts of private industry in that direction are accepted, I am willing to accept his statement, for here are the statistics I have received from the Library of Congress:

There was a need in the year 1948 for 137,500 new houses for the city of Chicago. Six thousand were actually built during that year. The survey of the Chicago Housing Authority showed that of the 6,000 new units that were actually constructed, 81.5 percent of the new houses sold for more than $12,750, with none selling for less than $8,750.

They also estimate that rents average from $115 to $120 per month per unit.

Mr. DEANE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Folks can pay only so much for the shelter, which is a basic necessity of life. For example, here is a family in my district. The father is an average workingman who gets $2,400 a year with which he must provide for his wife and their three children.

Today he is not financially able to buy the food he would like. If we doubled his present rent of $35 a month by removing rent control he would have less money with which to buy the minimum of food and clothing which his wife and children need.

There is another reason for continuing rent control. All the housing erected since the war has been high priced homes built for sale to people in the higher income brackets. Less than 1 in 6 of the houses built have been for rental purposes. But even these rental units built since the war have had asking prices of $75 to $100 a month or more. This is clearly out of range of the average working family.

We all realize rent control is only a temporary stopgap piece of legislation and we all look forward to the day it can be eliminated. To that end we broadened the Expediter's power in the bill we just reported out of the House Banking and Currency Committee on decontrol and recontrol. At present when an area is decontrolled it cannot be brought back under control again even though rents skyrocket. Under the House amendment the Expediter is given the right to recontrol decontrolled areas if rents rise out of reason. In this way rent control can be removed now from many fringe areas and if the responsible landlords take the leadership and keep rents from skyrocketing—then that area has shown it can handle its own problems. If it lacks that ability or the pressures are too great and rents continue rising then the Expediter can step in and recontrol.

I think we all realize the Expediter has had a difficult law to administer over the past 2 years. He has been burdened with a weak and inequitable law and handicapped by inadequate budget and personnel. Some rental areas cover three or four counties with only one man assigned to do the job in the whole area.

The rental housing industry is a $50,000,000,000 industry. It is penny-wise and pound-foolish to hamstring the industry by providing the agency regulating it with inadequate funds and personnel.

In closing I should like to make reference to one group of people we should try to keep in mind but whom we have not represented adequately in the past. I speak of the veterans and their families. Even at this late date—4 years after the termination of the war—too many veterans and their families are not fully reestablished in their community. Many of them are still taking their GI-training courses. I think we have an obligation to these veterans as they come into the communities of America to give them a decent place to live—not a place which bars children or dogs, if you please, but a place where they can raise their children with all the benefits of a home and a decent environment, and at a rent they can afford to pay.

We must remember the loyal, faithful services these men and women gave their country at a time when all of us were making the greatest profits in our history.

The veteran and his sorry housing plight is too often forgotten these days. I do not think we are performing any more than our minimum responsibility when we give them the benefits of rent control, until such time as we provide sufficient housing to satisfy the needs of the American family, the first and greatest bulwark for the protection of the American way of life.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEANE. I yield.

Mr. McSWEENEY. I am supporting this legislation, but I am somewhat worried about the criticism that it might be a deterrent to future building. Do you see anything in it that would be a deterrent to building?

Mr. DEANE. I cannot.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I regret exceedingly that this bill has been reported to the House in its present form. In my judgment, it goes altogether too far under present conditions, nearly 4 years after the termination of World War II.

I am not in favor of terminating all rent control at this time. I want to see it terminated as fast as it can be safely done with justice to the tenants of this country, but not now.

I am in favor of continuing the present law for the time being with something like the amendment which I understand will be offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], with a view to insuring a reasonable minimum rate to the small owners of the country. This amendment is essential, in my opinion, in view of the failure of the Rent Control Administration to comply with the clear intent of the Congress in this connection.

I am also in favor, among other things, of eliminating the broad authority which is recommended to recontrol properties already decontrolled.

I think it would be well to shorten the proposed period of extension with a view to earlier reconsideration of the entire matter by the Congress.

I hope the bill will be so amended under the 5-minute rule that justice to tenants and owners alike may be assured.

I cannot support the bill in its present form.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I have received many letters from residents of my Congressional District complaining of the unfairness of rent control. I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues portions of a letter written to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee bearing upon rent control calling attention to its operation in my district. I hope we as representatives of our constituents will legislate fairly for both tenants and owners of rental property. The letter to which I refer in part is as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., February 25, 1949.
SENATE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
(Attention, Chairman.)

Re rent control.

It would appear from newspaper accounts and radio broadcasts that the President of these United States, certain Members of Congress and Mr. Tighe Woods, Rent Control Administrator are attempting to intimidate the rental property owners.

* * * * *

Furthermore, all Members of Congress and Government officials, irrespective of party affiliations, implicated in this seeming communistic move, who are required to take the same oath of office, should be investigated by the Un-American Activities Committee for attempted destruction of these United States. This committee should make exhaustive investigation as to who originated the idea of rent control in these free United States (at that time) and just who is behind the propaganda to continue this unconstitutional rent-control law and persecution of a segment of the citizens of this Nation. For it is attempted destruction of these United States when property ownership rights, one of the basic fundamentals on which this Government was founded, are abrogated. This is either the forerunner of State slavery with commissars living on the fat of the land, or a conspiracy on the part of Government, banking and mortgage interests to confiscate income properties.

* * * * *

It appears, even under the existing unconstitutional rent-control law, Mr. Tighe Woods does not have the right to use the courts in eviction cases for the benefit of the tenants, nor, does he or the local rent-control boards have the right to advise tenants, via radio, to contact them for assistance in case of eviction notices. Local courts have complete jurisdiction under the State law. It is high time the Federal Government stops breaking the laws they have enacted, either constitutional or unconstitutional.

For your information, I am not a member of any property owners' association; I am merely a woman, one of many millions of widows and elderly people who have worked hard to accumulate a small piece of rental property. Our type of property owner is not like the big operators, we do not ask to be subsidized by the Federal Government, we are self-respecting American citizens who do not want charity but we demand the right to support ourselves and the constitutional right to control the use of our own property which has been earned by the sweat of our brow.

Any individual in these United States of America, be he the President, Senator, Congressman, Federal judge, veteran, CIO or A. F. of L. union member, who would deny to us our constitutional rights, is not a good American citizen.

Sincerely,

HENRIETTA B. ZIMMERMAN.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] has just called our attention to a letter received from a constituent protesting against the continuation of rent control. Her reasons are legitimate and I have received literally hundreds of similar communications. The property owners affected by rent control in my congressional district are what has been termed here as the "little people." We do not have the large apartment dwellings. Much of our rental property is owned by the widow in the college town or the middle-class citizen who has been thrifty, worked hard, saved a little money, and invested it in a rental house in his home community. There is no real-estate lobby about these individuals. They do not belong to organizations and it is difficult for them to understand why their Government should discriminate against their particular type of investment.

Mr. Chairman, I voted for rent control, price fixing, and rationing during the war. We all realized when these laws were passed that they were discriminatory, but all war is discriminatory and exact equity cannot be accorded to all individuals and industries in a war emergency. Our people realized this and accepted the inevitable; however, the war which necessitated the imposition of these controls has been over for approximately 4 years, and still the property owners affected by rent control are required to accept approximately the same rental received in 1940 and 1941, notwithstanding the fact that wages, prices, and taxes have increased manyfold. I have in mind one widow who rents apartments in her own home. Utility costs have doubled. Her taxes have gone up 57 percent and upkeep likewise, yet this woman has been unable to get any appreciable rent for her property. My colleagues, this is wrong—dead wrong. What are we going to do about it? The bill which is before us and recommended by a majority of the Banking and Currency Committee will continue rent control for 15 months. A continuance of the present law is not contemplated. The proposed law extends the powers of the Administrator and places greater discretion in the Administration and in the Director of rent control to tighten up, loosen up, broaden, and extend rent control as in his own judgment seems most advisable. I am definitely opposed to granting these additional powers to any bureau or director, regardless of his political affiliations or his economic philosophy.

All those participating in this debate have admitted that rent control should not be continued permanently. Every speech supporting the pending bill is in the form of an apology accompanied by the assurance that eventually these long-suffering property owners will be released from the grip of their own Government and permitted to take their places in our economy on an equal footing with other owners of property, tangible and intangible.

Labor has been given a fair deal: Through unions, protected by the Government, labor can bargain and secure a fair price for its product.

Farmers have been given a fair deal: Parity prices; government buying of butter, wheat, corn, potatoes and other products; sometimes giving them away; sometimes burning them to keep prices up—and to hold up the income of the farmer.

The manufacturer is given a fair deal: Through the tariff, control of production and other practices legalized by the Government, he is allowed a fair profit.

The property owner has been given a raw deal: His expenses have increased—but not a thousand percent, like those of the United States Government. His gross income, through rent control enforced by Uncle Sam, is held down to the same sum he received in 1941. His net dollars are much fewer than in 1941. The dollars he has left, if any, will buy about one-half as much meat, bread, milk, potatoes, clothes and other necessities of life, as in 1941. Landlords are forced to subsidize their tenants, even though the tenant is rich and owner poor. Do shoe manufacturers supply the poor with shoes at half price? Do meat packers sell meat to the poor at less than cost? If the poor tenant needs help, why not let all the people help him?

It has been stated here that the Census Bureau's statistics show there is no housing shortage, but that there is a shortage of rental property. The number of housing units has increased since 1940 but the number of rental housing units has declined. Under the present law, houses are built for sale, but few indeed are built for rental. This condition will continue as long as rent control endures. The person, or the corporation, with money to invest cannot be expected to invest his money and savings in property with the threat of rent control hanging over his head. This is not theory—it is proven fact. It is not sufficient that the shortage of housing which we have be rationed or allocated among those requiring housing. The rationing alone of a scarcity of food, clothing, or housing can never produce an ample supply.

I believe that there is a general shortage of housing and that this condition can only be cured by more housing. Rent control deals with the effect and not with the cause. At the expiration of every continuation of this control, there is apparently less rental housing on the market, and it seems to me that the Congress should face the situation realistically and embark upon a course that will produce more rental housing. If we are to have adequate housing, it must come from one of two sources; either because the property owners can furnish rental housing at a profit and not at a loss, or the Government must enter the housing field and furnish homes to our people. In short, the property owners cannot be expected to continue to subsidize the tenants. He must be able to operate at a profit or the Government must take over.

This question cannot be decided on emotion. There must be more low-priced homes, both for sale and for rent. There are greedy landlords as well as greedy, inconsiderate tenants; however, landlords and tenants by and large are patriotic, good citizens interested in the welfare of their fellow men and their country. Congress must not foster class controversy or hatred. The tenants must have homes in which they can afford to live, and the property owners must have a fair return on their investments if the American way of life is to continue. Experience has demonstrated that rent control is not the answer.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot vote for this bill as reported by the committee because it will not produce more housing for anybody. I shall vote for the amendments which have been suggested and, if these amendments are adopted, the bill will be made much better.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON].

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether this is necessary or not. One says it is; the other says it is not. We have to take their word for it. However, there is one thing in this bill, Mr. Chairman, that I would like to call to the attention of the Members of this House. We took an oath to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States. A great many of us have taken that oath a great many times and a great many of us have read that Constitution probably a thousand times. Under this bill you give the Expediter the right to make the laws. In this bill we give him the right to make regulations and orders, and he has already done it, because when asked the question on some succession of an estate or something, he said it was not in there but they took care of it by making a regulation.

Under our Constitution, the very first line of the Constitution is that the legislature, the Congress, shall do all the legislating, and nobody else. If it were not for any other reason, we ought not to vote for this bill.

This bill goes further than the one we had before. I have never rented my house, but if I wanted to rent it and wanted to enter into a contract with you or anybody else for $60 a month, the Expediter can step in and say, "The going rate in this area is $40. Therefore, your contract is not any good."

I have always thought, as I read the Constitution, that the Federal Government forbids any State from passing any law impairing the obligations of the citizen, or the right of contract. So here we destroy the right of contract.

So there are two things, Mr. Chairman. This morning the gentleman from Michigan told you about Runnymede and what the barons did to King John on June 15, 1215. The principal thing they took care of in that was property. Property is sacred in this country. Everybody should have a chance to own a home for himself and his family and bring them up under the Constitution.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think we should follow the Constitution a little better than we have been doing.

Under this proposed law the Expediter is given the right to confiscate your

property. There is not any question about it. Yet the Constitution says you cannot confiscate anybody's property without due process or without giving the man adequate compensation. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] has an excellent amendment and, like the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] who said he hoped we would vote for it, I am going to vote for it. I am going to vote for the 90 days, just as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] said, and then I am going to vote to throw the whole thing out, and I hope the rest of you will be with me when that is done.

Mr. Chairman, the powers that are not delegated to the United States expressly are reserved to the people in the States or the people in the several States. So let us let the States run their own business, and if there is a shortage of housing in Massachusetts, let Massachusetts pass a law that will take care of the people in that State. When did it happen that we have to look to an all-munificent Government to run our affairs, to say where we will live and how we will live and how much we will pay to live?

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield.

Mr. MULTER. Has Massachusetts a local rent law?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Well, we have a kind of a stand-by law, I think. The Governor is going to put in another one, because I believe he believes it should be done by the State of Massachusetts.

Mr. MULTER. Is the gentleman's State legislature in session?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Yes, indeed; we stay in session up in Massachusetts for at least 6 months and take care of the laws that are needed for the people. And while I am on that subject, let me say to the gentleman that we in Massachusetts are able to distinguish between laws demanded by public necessity and laws demanded by public clamor. We had better start doing it down here in Washington and get back to the constitutional government under which we were born and brought up.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 14 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. WOODHOUSE].

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Chairman, this is the first measure before us in this Eighty-first Congress on which the vote will indicate whether we believe that we can be masters of the economic situation or that we must leave our fate in the blind hands of supply and demand. Carlyle, in one of his more acrimonious moods, said any poll parrot could be an economist. All you had to do to make him one was to teach him to say "supply and demand."

The last years have proven that we can handle the economic fluctuations if we will. They should also have taught us that we are all very interdependent—that the welfare of all is truly the only possibility for the long-term welfare of each. Some of us come from districts where rent control is of little local import. In other areas it is of vital concern. Currently, our economy is very sensitive. If rents get out of hand it will mean less expenditure by the average consumer on other goods, many of which have already shown a decline in sales. And the chain reaction set off might well affect the entire country. Uncertainty, such as would come from a 3-months' extension, would add to the dangers of instability.

Opponents of rent control argue that it will be permanent. There is no foundation for this fear. An article on the French situation has been given wide distribution by proponents of this idea. In the first place, any analogy between the economic situation in France and in the United States is fallacious. I also wonder if the people quoting this article by, in the words of the subtitle, "a distinguished Frenchman" know that the author was referred to by one of our outstanding conservative metropolitan dailies as "the French Goebbels" and that it was he who introduced Hitler's Otto Abetz to Pierre Laval and now lives in exile from his country.

Rent control was inaugurated as an emergency war measure. Other controls have been removed as the pertinent situation became more normal. And likewise rent control will be removed as soon as there is a better balance between people needing housing and housing available at a price or rent they can afford to pay. The housing shortage is a fact, not a dogma, as the gentleman from Kansas calls it.

The answer to rent control is not invective, not general statements about free enterprise, but more housing. I venture to say that had this body been permitted to vote on a housing bill in the Seventy-ninth Congress or even in the Eightieth, we would not be debating a rent-control bill today.

The vocal groups representing the average man testified for a continuance of rent control before the committee—the labor organizations, CIO, AFL, and some of the brotherhoods; the veterans, American Legion, AVC, Disabled American Veterans, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Jewish War Veterans.

A member of the committee asked a veterans' representative this question: "Suppose the Eighty-first Congress does not extend and strengthen rent control; what would be the sentiment among the veterans of America?" The reply was: "I think the reaction would be very much against the persons failing to do so."

These veterans and wage earners know what protection rent control has given them and they know the housing shortage is not yet licked. They represent great numbers of tenants.

None of the arguments against the continuance of rent control for a short period are valid. The administration can be improved and will be by the bill under discussion.

What are some of the arguments of the opponents of the extension of rent control?

First. It is argued that the removal of rent control will stimulate the building industry. New construction is not under control and has not been for some 2 years. Today rents on new construction are 75 to 100 percent above rents for comparable units, and even when it was under control were 20 percent above comparable units. And still we have a housing shortage.

It is not rent control, but the high cost of building that is the primary deterrent to building more rental housing. The builders know the current unreasonably high construction costs cannot last. They want to sell, make a profit, and get out. Mr. Roy Wenslick, a real-estate man of St. Louis, whose studies are held in high regard by members of his profession, reports that for a six-room house, between 1942–48, the sales price has gone up 105 percent, the uncontrolled rental 75 percent.

Rent control has not held back construction. The elimination of rent control will only increase the speculative and inflationary factors. What we need is continuance of rent control for a limited period and immediate housing legislation which will make possible greatly expanded production of permanent standard housing, particularly rental units, within the reach of middle- and low-income families.

It is argued that tenants are paying an unreasonably small percentage of their income for rent. The National Association of Real Estate Boards quotes the 1948 Survey of Consumer Income by the Federal Reserve Board showing that tenants are paying on the average 12 percent of their income for rent. They say that is too little, that the proper figure is 20 to 25 percent. It is true that in the depression years the higher figure was usual. But they do not quote a further paragraph of this report:

> There is not much statistical basis for the traditional thinking that the average family spends one-fourth of its income for rent. Such a relationship probably exists only where incomes are at an abnormally low level during a depression and when at the same time rent obligations remain a relatively inflexible item in the family budget.

The smaller the family income the larger is the percentage spent for rent. Families with incomes under $2,000 per year pay 21 percent, according to the report of the Federal Reserve Board; families with $5,000 per year or more pay 9 percent. In other words, as incomes rise the percent of income spent on rent decreases even while the dollar amount actually increases.

Today tenants are paying the highest rents in history. If controls are removed immediately rents will go up still more. Several witnesses suggested that the increase would be at least 50 percent.

Rents for new construction, not controlled, are 75 to 100 percent higher than rents for comparable old units still under control. Rents for units which had not been rented for 24 months and were thus decontrolled are 89 percent above rents of comparable units. A survey of 44,626 units decontrolled by the present law showed rent increases of 55 percent.

Let us think of this in terms of the family. There has been some slight decline in cost of living, but in the adjustment there has also been some unemployment. A rent hike just now would not only be a threat to the stability of

our economy, but would have severe effects on the welfare of our lower-income families. These are usually the families with many children. Their living quarters today are far from what we would wish as homes in which to bring up American children—children who must be strong in mind and body if they are as adults to carry the great world responsibilities the American citizen must assume if we are to have peace. Let us be certain that we think of these homes, of these children, of our human investment as well as of the financial investment of the landlords.

The latter of course must be considered and has been. Opponents of rent control do not always mention such facts as that on multifamily dwellings landlords from 1941 through 1945 paid off $400,000,000 in mortgages; or that the Federal Reserve Board reports that foreclosures have been reduced 75 percent between 1940 and 1947. If small landlords had been taking the losses suggested the number of foreclosures would have increased, not decreased. And the condition of housing has improved. The Bureau of the Census reported in 1940 that of 30,000,000 nonfarm dwellings 4,000,000 needed repairs, while in 1947 only 2,700,000 out of 34,000,000 needed much major repairs.

Now there have been adjustments in rents. Of the 17,500,000 million units, the maximum number ever under control, 6,000,000 units have been affected by area rent increases, by decontrol, or by hardship increases. The Housing Expediter reports that 63 percent of all petitions processed, that is 1,717,429 requests for adjustments, have been granted an average increase of 19.9 percent in rent.

The small landlord may use a short form in asking for adjustment. His name, address, the dwelling involved, the maximum rent, the rent requested, and the grounds are listed on a printed form. The bill debated here today gives him additional help from members of the rent control office specifically designated for this job. And all landlords will be helped by the method prepared by the committee for arriving at a reasonable and fair rent.

The tenant also gets more protection under the proposed bill in improved methods of enforcement, and especially in the matter of evictions.

There is just one more point I should like to mention. Many of the representatives of real estate groups insist that there is no housing shortage, that the problem is one of maldistribution of rental properties. Because of rent control, they argue, single people are occupying apartments; if the rents were higher they would have to double up or move into a room in somebody's home.

This remedy comes perilously close to a decision that single people have no right to a home, no right to privacy, that we must ration apartments through price. Now many of the single persons are employed women. Surely, since they lack all the joy that goes with a family, we should not go further and deny them a right to a small apartment home of their own. This seems hardly the way to attack the housing shortage.

The sensible thing is to extend rent control for 15 months and meanwhile pass housing legislation which will enable both the Government and private companies to build housing people can afford to buy or rent. If we take the over-all point of view of the welfare of the greatest number, if we accept the realities of the economic aftermath of the war, if we really want to have economic stability, we will pass this bill.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. The distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut is also a very able economist, and I should like to have her opinion on this point. As I understand, the cost-of-living index reflects a decrease of about 2 percent from September through January. What percent will this mean in the budget of those who are tenants? Does the gentlewoman have any idea? Will that offset this decrease in the cost of living as regards rents?

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. No. The increase in the rent would represent about four times what the decrease in the cost of living would be.

Mr. CARROLL. It is my information that there would be a 6 percent increase, and therefore it would wipe out this small amount that has been given in reduction of the cost of living.

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. The increase in rent would be higher than would be compensated for by the decrease in the cost of living.

Mr. CARROLL. There is a strange philosophy that as the cost of living goes down, as more people become unemployed, there is less pressure on the housing situation. I do not understand that. The gentleman from Michigan explained that as we go into more and more leveling off, with possible unemployment, there would be less pressure for housing units.

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Less pressure for housing units makes for more misery in living, more people crowded into fewer rooms, poorer conditions for bringing up children, an altogether unhealthy situation which we, the richest country of the world, should never permit ourselves to allow.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the continuation of rent control. The title of this bill should read, "A bill to guarantee that no houses will be built for rent until after June 30, 1950." A shorter title would be "A bill to discourage the building of houses for rent."

The statement on page 1 of the committee report that "as a result of exhaustive hearings the committee has concluded that the emergency with respect to the housing shortage growing out of the war still exists" should read "growing out of rent control."

Dictatorial rent control will increase the housing shortage. It furnishes an excuse for public housing and socialism. Our Government was established on the principle of private ownership of property; on that principle we have reared here in America the best, the strongest, and the richest country in the world. We have always believed that a man had a right to a reasonable return on his investment—whether it be from the toil of his hands, his business, or the property he owns.

Under this bill—far more hostile to property owners than the present law—that philosophy is abandoned. We are arbitrarily liquidating owners of rental property in favor of tenants and providing the excuse for public housing created by rent control.

I am informed that there are 2,000,000 less rental units today than there were at the beginning of the last war, or when rent control went into effect, and this in spite of the fact that 1,700,000 new units were constructed during the last 2 years. Rental properties are being removed from the market as fast as possible because there is no hope of reward from rental units. Rentals deserve the same freedom as food, clothing, and labor.

France has had rent control for 30 years. The people of that country watch the death notices now to obtain a place to live, and we are traveling in that direction.

In Blue Print for World Conquest, as outlined by the Communist International, the following statement appears:

> The starting point is the expropriation of the landlords and capitalists.

Rent control is alien philosophy against our thrifty middle-class population who, in the American way, have striven to remain free and independent citizens instead of becoming wards of the Government.

The theory of rent control is that the landlord is rich and the tenant is poor—yet 80 percent of rental property owners have incomes of less than $5,000 annually.

It does not take a financial wizard to know that the present cost of taxes, maintenance, repair, and operation of rental property is in many cases wiping out the income to which the owners are entitled. Many of them are widows, aged and infirm people, as well as minor dependents.

But, you say, they should go to the rent-control board for relief. Here is a statement from a widow, 74 years old, who writes to me:

> Don't tell me to see the rent-control board. That's a farce; all they do is ask for costly reports, then more reports, then stall and do exactly nothing.

Rent control will not build new homes for rent. It actually increases the evil it is intended to remedy.

We, who have been known as a Nation of home lovers, see not only the creeping hand of socialism taking over our home ownership, but, through a law such as this, stifle the very building of more homes and apartments to care for our needs. It is the plowing under of our assets all over again.

I say to you that this is a vicious law—a law of discrimination against a segment

of our people—and the quicker it is wiped off the books the better it will be. No economy can exist half slave and half free. Eventually none of it will be free.

There is no reason on earth to penalize the property owners alone from obtaining an adequate return on their investment. If they are to be held to a rigid line, then the building and construction industries must be held down in the cost of materials and wages to the same level, in building new rental properties or in repairing old properties. What is fair to one is fair to all.

Rent control must go, or it will be used as a wedge to control another phase of our national life. It is un-American.

Rent control will not build new rental properties. That is proven by the history of stringent rent control in France. Rent control defeats the very purpose which it is supposed to rectify. We see today more and more rental property being taken off the market because property owners can no longer afford to subsidize their tenants. Property is falling into disrepair because the owners cannot afford to make the repairs necessary to protect their investments. Eventually all rental properties will become slums.

Cases have come to my attention where the tenant has offered to pay more rent, only to have the rent-control board refuse to sanction it.

Complaints against the injustice of rent control are coming from the little people, small property owners, from all over my district.

Let no one be heard to say on this floor that it is only the real-estate owners who are opposed to rent control. On February 23 of this year, representatives of small-business organizations from 38 States, said:

> Let us begin practicing what we preach to the other nations of this world and mete out liberty and justice to our own 8,000,000 small owners of residential rental properties in America by terminating this un-American rent-control law.

It is my understanding that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] will offer an amendment to allow a reasonable return on the fair value of any property. Is there any Member in this House who is unwilling to be fair to his fellow citizens? I will support such an amendment.

This bill, H. R. 1731, to continue rent control for 15 months should be defeated and rental properties, virtually confiscated by rent control, restored to their rightful owners.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKINNON].

Mr. MCKINNON. Mr. Chairman, we have heard remarks several times in the House this afternoon to the effect that there is no housing shortage. In the few minutes that I have at my disposal I would like to review some of the things we found out as we filled some 852 pages of testimony before our committee during the last several weeks.

In the first place, the present law provides for local advisory boards—nominated by the governors of the respective States and appointed by the Expediter—to determine whether or not there is a housing shortage in any given area. We have some 767 advisory boards serving 600 defense areas since April 1, 1948. During that entire time since April 1, 1948, these local boards have recommended decontrol of only 14 areas. In less than 2 percent of our entire defense areas do we find a sufficient amount of housing to warrant decontrol of rental areas.

We also find from further testimony we have had before our committee another proof of housing shortages. The law provides for decontrol of areas or portions of areas by the Housing Expediter himself on his own initiative when he believes that the demand for rental housing has been reasonably met. In the past 9 months we have had 906 counties surveyed to determine the housing shortage in those various counties. The Housing Expediter, from facts and information he obtained in those surveys, has found it possible to decontrol only 26 of those areas, mostly in small, fringe areas lying on the outskirts of a large city. That, again, gentlemen, indicates a housing shortage in more than 97 percent of our defense areas.

The third reason that indicates there is a housing shortage in the United States today is the fact that the present law decontrolled new construction, conversions, units not rented for a 24-month period since February 1945, and permanent units in hotels. The Housing Expediter investigated 44,626 of these decontrolled units in over 1,000 cities in the 48 States in our country. He found that an average rental increase throughout all these decontrolled areas had taken place to the extent of 55 percent. In other words, the rents on places that did not have control had increased 55 percent in the past 2 or 3 years.

More than that, in some 8,000 units that came under the survey, rents had doubled in cost. In the 13,416 permanent hotel units in the survey, the rents had increased by about 60 percent. The fundamental reason, of course, is the fact that supply and demand are not in balance, and we do not have sufficient rental housing, and thus we do not have free competition in the establishment of prices for rental housing.

The fourth reason that indicates that there is a serious shortage in housing throughout our country is the many general statements that have been made to the effect that there is sufficient housing in such communities as Dallas, Des Moines, New Haven, Louisville, and several other places, calling for an investigation of the rental situation. The Division of Labor Statistics was sent in to investigate these claims that there was sufficient housing to allow for decontrol. But, instead, it found that just the opposite was true. In Dallas, for instance, in a study that was recently completed, there was a vacancy factor of less than eight-tenths of 1 percent; in Des Moines it proved to be four-tenths of 1 percent, according to this survey that was conducted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, not by the Housing Expediter's office, not by the landlords, not by the lenders, but by a thoroughly impartial outfit.

The fifth reason that indicates insufficient rental housing in our country comes because of population increase. Back in April of 1940, according to the Bureau of the Census, we had 1,846,000 married couples living doubled up. By April of 1948 that figure had increased to 2,333,000 married couples living doubled up in our United States. Our marriages during the period between 1930 and 1940 averaged 1,345,000 a year, but by 1946, due to the delay from war, marriages averaged 2,285,000 a year during 1946, 1947, and 1948. This has caused a big demand for housing and a serious shortage. As a consequence we often see our divorce mills loaded up; and one of the major reasons, our sociologists tell us, is due to the fact that there is not sufficient housing to give the average new family a decent start in life and a chance for a successful marriage.

One of the best indications we have as to the inadequacy of housing in our country is furnished by the current investigation being conducted by the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate. Testimony before that committee was to the effect that we shall need about a million and a half housing units per year for the next 12 years if we are going to meet the need for current housing and living accommodations for our population.

We also had a number of groups coming before our committee testifying to the need for more rental units—that there is a shortage of rental units at the present time. Who were they? The A. F. of L., the CIO, and also the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans, the Amvets, the Jewish War Veterans, and many other groups representing the men who went out and won the war for us in the past few years. They testified that rent control is very necessary if the veterans are to get a share of the housing at a price they can afford to pay.

And last, but not least of all, if you cannot take the experience, and the facts, and the figures of the eight disclosures above referred to, then I suggest that you, as a Congressman, forget the amount of money you now earn and put yourself in the place of a man who earns $2,000 or $2,500 a year and go out and try to find a place to live. Put yourself in the place of these people living on low incomes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield one additional minute to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCKINNON. Put yourself in the place of the man or woman, for example, who has an income of only $2,000 or $2,500 a year, and try to see if you can find a place in which to live. Then you will see whether or not there is a housing shortage. Experience is a very good school for certain kinds of people, and perhaps that experience would show many people that there most definitely is a housing shortage and that a further extension of rent controls is necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, we have under consideration here today and will have on tomorrow the bill H. R. 1731. This bill, as is the case with so many items of legislation, represents a great many things to a great many people. There probably are no two exact definitions, so far as this legislation is concerned. To the gentleman from Illinois it is almost an obsession; to the gentlewoman from Connecticut it is an absolute necessity; to others on this side of the aisle it is unfair, a monstrosity, and a few other things of that sort. So it is difficult to say exactly what it is, being, as it is, all things to all men. As I do not take issue with any Member of this body in his personal opinion with reference to the necessity for such restrictive legislation, I, in turn, must reserve to myself my own concept of it as a legislative sledgehammer to drive still deeper the socialistic wedge which will eventually crack open entirely the greatest political concept of government the world has ever known.

Rent control was in its infancy a wartime measure, and there can be little question among men and women of good will but that it was, as a wartime measure, very essential.

There are many of us who contend from an examination of the publications—the newspapers and want ads—in our own districts that this need has long ceased to exist and that the shortage of rental housing has come as a natural result of the withdrawal from the rental market of units which cannot be operated profitably under the present restrictive influence of an administration policy which gives every indication of seeking to take a course that leads down the broad road of state socialism.

A great deal has been said about the existence of a national emergency. If a national emergency does exist, Mr. Chairman, that emergency is far more dangerous in its inherent threat to our institutions and to our way of life than is represented in any threat to any of our military installations at the present moment.

People say, "Well, we can have rent control; it is not socialistic." My concept of any law that deprives an individual of the right to exercise control over legally acquired private property is that such a measure is socialistic, no matter what you call it or how you dress it up. You cannot have just a little bit of socialism. You cannot have a little socialism any more than you can be a little in the state of what the French call enceinte. Being a little socialistic is like shrugging off a minor detail like a cancer or any other malignant growth.

In the first place and unquestionably of primary importance is the fact that this is the crassest example of class legislation of which I have any personal knowledge. Is it class legislation directed against the drones in our society? Is it legislation directed against the dishonest or lazy or the parasites or those who would much prefer to earn their daily bread from the sweat of another man's brow? Is that the type of legislation it is? No. It is class legislation that is directed to the destruction of the property-owner class and to the eventual strangulation of the fine characteristics which have served to build the finest nation in the history of mankind. It is legislation directed in its basic concept at thrifty citizens, at initiative, at enterprise, at the desire for self-improvement and the desire for a better place in the sun.

Mr. Chairman, I must say that I do not approve in full measure some of the legislation which is currently being contemplated by the Eighty-first Congress, but I do feel that most of it is general legislation which cuts equally across the entire spectrum of our economic life. That cannot be said about the rent-control bill which has been brought to the floor of this House for action today. For instance, when the Mundt-Nixon bill was under discussion in this House, it was objected to by the rabid left-wing element on the grounds that you could not point to one single group of the citizenry and say, "We outlaw you." We cannot do that to Communists who should be taken by the seats of their pants and tossed out of this country, but we can do it to fine American citizens whose most serious crime has been the acquisition of rental units, many of these citizens being entirely dependent upon those units and the income from those units for their livelihood.

The legislation is not in its fundamental and basic concept the sort of legislation which has served to make this country great. In the first place I believe, and I say this with all humble deference to the Justices of the Supreme Court, that the act is, by its very terms, unconstitutional in that it denies to an American citizen the right to full and unfettered control over private property legally acquired.

In the second place this measure represents confiscation without due process of law. I have a watch. Perhaps the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut does not have a watch. But, I will deny and vociferously the right of any Government agency to tell me that I have to let him take it home overnight every other night in order that he may know what time it is, because he lacks a timepiece himself.

In the third place this bill centralizes powers in Washington, powers which should rightfully repose in the States and in the communities of this country. It is a physical impossibility to write an over-all rent-control law for a nation of 148,000,000 people that will be as equitable in the middle of Chicago as it is in the middle of the Everglades or in the Rocky Mountains of the West. It encourages—and I think this is a most important factor—the complete breakdown in that concept of democratic processes which requires respect for the rights and constitutional prerogatives of others.

This bill extends the dangerous philosophy of the New Deal, which philosophy has served, for the first time in our history, to set race against race, creed against creed, black against white, employer against employee, tenant against owner, and citizen against citizen.

The committee, according to my understanding of its proceedings, has refused to amend the bill in what appears to me to be a most reasonable respect. It was suggested by the gentleman from Georgia that, failing in other action, at least this House should say to the country and to the property owners of the country, "We believe as legislators that you have a right to a fair and reasonable return on your capital investment." It would be far from the ultimate in legislation, but it would restate, once and for all, a fundamental and basic principle of the American way of life. If we are going to have a Socialist state, let us not go in the back door to get it; let someone propose in the well of the House an amendment that will change the Constitution and make private ownership and control of property a treasonable crime against the state.

What about rent prices today? Are they high or low? How much should a family pay for rent? The traditional rule of thumb has always been, to the best of my knowledge, that rent should approximate 20 percent of income. We find today that the national mean, the national average, is from 10 to 12 percent, in spite of the fact that labor and material costs of every kind, services, and supplies, have skyrocketed all the way from 50 to 380 percent. We have not, as a matter of record, acquired any more rental units as a result of continued Federal rent control, nor are we apt to. The contrary is much more likely to be the case.

There are in this country and there are in my district single individuals occupying quarters which were intended to house an entire family, and that situation is certainly going to exist as long as we have Federal rent control with us. What is more, while we are talking about clearing the slums of today, continued Federal rent control is building up the slums of tomorrow because of the fact that the men and women who are attempting to operate rental units under present conditions cannot even keep up with the necessary repairs.

The gentleman from Massachusetts related a very appealing case which dealt with some veteran who was forced to trade in, or offered in the press to trade in, his medals won in combat in return for a place in which he and his family could live. I can only say in passing that if the Administration had not made it impossible to move the people who moved into that house when he was out winning those medals, he would not be faced today with the necessity of trying to trade them in return for a place to live. We hear a great deal about the veterans. There are 12,000,000 of them, but I think the important thing to remember is that the veterans of this country are Americans first, and they are veterans second. They certainly did not go out to fight the battles of this Nation and the battles of free men in order to come back to a regimented and total police state. Many own property, and many of their fathers and their mothers and their grandfathers own property. I think that is a very important point to remember.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. LODGE. The gentleman is making a very interesting statement, and the gentleman is a veteran. Is the gentleman also a property owner?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I am very happy the gentleman brought that out. It so happens that I do not own one foot of ground, nor am I likely to get myself in that unfortunate position until I find out for certain whether the Housing Administration is going to have the power to dictate how I conduct my affairs around the house.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. There are over 7,000,000 veterans who are heads of families who are now living in rental units that are under controls, and they will lose the benefit of this law if it is not extended.

Mr. JACKSON of California. That figure is predicated on some of the statements which have been made by the office of the Housing Expediter, and it has been my experience that in most cases he is more often wrong than right. I cannot hold any brief for the infallibility of Government bureau forecasts.

I certainly do not want to see a system of commissars set up throughout the length and the breadth of this land to control American citizens and to write legislation which should be written here on the floor of the House and in the other body.

If we are to veer off the rocks of state socialism, if we are ever to get back to some fundamental precepts which have successfully governed this country, this is the place to start. Let us be courageous enough to recognize inequity and injustice wherever it may be and, having recognized it, let us in the name of Heaven be strong enough to speak out against it. You cannot bend principles. One basic principle in this country is that a man has a right, an inherent, constitutional right, to control private property. You propose to take that right away from him. I propose to oppose you.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ADDONIZIO].

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee, I have attended the hearings on H. R. 1731, dealing with the problems of the extension of rent control and veterans' preference in the purchase and the rental of newly constructed housing accommodations. The overwhelming testimony of the witnesses who appeared before our committee indicates that the housing shortage in this country is as acute today as it was during the war years, particularly in the large urban areas.

Most of the witnesses representing landlord interests admitted that fact, and, when pinned down, admitted that there was still a need for rent control. So the only real opposition to an extension of rent control comes from persons who are confusing the issue because they have put personal gain above what is good for the country. Their methods are to try to befuddle our thinking, or, failing in that, to cripple the administration of the law by extending it for such a short time that its enforcement will not be possible, and it will wither and die. Both approaches are dishonest and an attempt to repudiate the very findings of our own joint, bipartisan committee which went out last year and did a thorough, workmanlike job of looking into the housing situation.

The American Legion, at its annual convention in Miami last fall, called the turn on the small but vocal minority which pretends to speak for the real-estate interests. In no uncertain terms, the Legion condemned not only the methods used by these saboteurs of truth—yes, even saboteurs of the basis of our democracy, the American home—but the Legion also announced unequivocally that this small element did not and never has represented the thinking of the great majority of the people in the real-estate business. And there are plenty of men in the American Legion who are in the real-estate business.

In the House Banking and Currency Committee hearings I was deeply impressed by the testimony of representatives of all the veterans' organizations. These groups, as we all know, represent both landlord and tenant interests. But in every instance these witnesses, recognizing the seriousness of the housing shortage in this country, recommended the extension of rent control. Once before these men had put aside the thought of selfish gain and flocked to the colors because that was what the country needed; now they proved once again that the good of their country came first, and they were willing to face it honestly.

The veterans' organization represented before this committee included the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and the American Veterans' Committee, the AMVETS, the American Legion, and the Jewish War Veterans.

Representatives of the two great labor organizations in this country, the A. F. of L. and the CIO, made a vigorous plea for a 2-year extension of rent control and predicted that we would be faced with a serious national crisis unless rent control was extended. A representation of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, representing 200,000 members, made a similar recommendation.

Some of those who are opposed to rent control, admitting that the demand for housing far exceeds the supply, contend that this is due to an inequitable distribution of dwelling space, and blame this maldistribution on rent control. Conceding that there has been a slight increase in the dwelling space occupied by the average American family, we cannot get away from the fact that we are in a serious housing emergency and that it will be several years before the supply of housing in this country catches up with the demand. We certainly cannot, by lifting rent controls, expect the American people to exchange their housing accommodations so that they will occupy the appropriate amount of dwelling space for a particular-sized family unit. It seems strange that those who are crying aloud that rent control is a form of police state would advance such a contention because it is only a police state that could distribute housing according to the needs of the occupant.

We are told also that the housing problem will shortly be relieved by new construction. I, for one, certainly hope that that day will be here soon. When that day arrives there will be no further need for rent control in this country. The facts indicate, however, that that day has not arrived and will not arrive in the near future. Although we have built over 2,500,000 new dwelling units in the last 5 years, this addition to the housing supply has merely absorbed in part the increased demand arising from large population increases and substantial increases in marriages and family-unit formations.

In our committee's report to this Congress, we have set forth a table showing the population of this country for the years 1940–48, inclusive, and the number of marriages during this period. These figures give us the answer as to why we are faced with a serious housing shortage in this country. Between 1940 and 1948 our population has increased from 131,979,000 to 146,114,000. The number of marriages increased from 1,595,000 in 1940 to a high of 2,285,000 in 1946. There were approximately 2,000,000 marriages in 1947 and 1,815,000 in 1948. By comparing these marriage figures with the average of 1,345,000 for the decade 1930–39, we can understand the tremendous pressure that has been placed on the housing market since 1946. It seems to be the consensus of opinion among those who should know that the number of new starts in housing will be less in 1949 than it was in 1947 and 1948. This is due primarily to the fact that the building industry is unable to construct houses for sale or for rent at prices that most Americans who are in dire need of housing are able to pay. You and I know that the average American veteran is unable to pay $10,000, $12,000, or $14,000 for a house, or pay a monthly rent of $100 or more, but this is what he must pay for newly constructed units. It is quite apparent that it will take years before sufficient new homes are constructed to relieve the pressures on residential rents in the larger cities in the United States.

In the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, which became effective on July 1 of that year, the Congress provided for the establishment of local rent advisory boards in all defense-rental areas. These boards were to consist of at least 5 members, who were to be appointed by the Housing Expediter on the recommendations of the respective State governors. In the Housing and Rent Act of 1948, which was effective April 1 last year, the Congress instructed the Housing Expediter to balance the membership on these boards so that landlords, tenants, and the general public would be properly represented. It is interesting to note that only 17 of over 750 of these advisory boards in approximately 600 defense-rental areas have recommended decontrol of an area, or part thereof. What better evidence can we have of the need for the extension of rent control than this? These boards, made up of representative American citizens who know conditions in their areas, by their failure

to recommend decontrol of their respective areas have given this Congress a mandate to continue rent control in this country.

The Housing Expediter in his testimony before our committee pointed out that within the last 9 months his staff made decontrol surveys in 986 counties throughout the United States, and that on the basis of these surveys, he has been able to take only 31 decontrol actions, and these mostly in fringe communities.

I could cite city after city, both large and small, throughout this Nation, which, according to the testimony presented to our committee, have practically no vacancies, and many others where the vacancy rate is less than 1 percent, but I shall not burden you with these further facts because I firmly believe that the need for the extension of rent control is quite obvious.

The opponents of rent control say, "Let all controls die on March 31, 1949, and the housing shortage will solve itself by the application of the law of supply and demand." They admit that rents will rise in the event that all controls are lifted but claim that the rise will be reasonable. They admit that there will be a considerable number of evictions immediately after controls are lifted but say that these shifts will only result in a more equitable and reasonable distribution of dwelling space.

I say, my dear colleagues, that these people, no matter how sincere, are completely blinded to the realities of the situation. We can get some idea as to what will happen to rents in the event that rent control expires this month by looking at the effect of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, which decontrolled certain classes of housing accommodations. By this act, for example, Congress decontrolled all units which were not rented for the specified 2-year period and most hotel accommodations. The testimony before our committee indicates that the rents for these decontrolled units skyrocketed immediately after the effective date of the act.

The Housing Expediter testified that a sample survey indicated that the average rent increase in 13,416 permanent hotel units and units not rented for the specified 2-year period which were decontrolled was 60 percent. Hundreds and hundreds of individual cases of exorbitant rent increases where rents have been decontrolled were cited to the committee at the hearing on extension of rent controls—some of them having doubled and tripled. The testimony also disclosed that rents on newly constructed units which were decontrolled by the 1947 act were increased on an average of about 60 percent.

It is my honest conviction that the removal of all Federal rent controls at this time would result in chaotic conditions, particularly in our larger cities. Hundreds of thousands of American families faced with substantial increases in rent greater than their ability to pay would be evicted from their homes; hundreds of thousands of others in the middle- and lower-income groups would be forced to pay the higher rent and would suffer great hardships because of their inability to properly provide themselves and their families with food, medical care, and other necessities of life.

President Truman, in his Economic Report to the Congress under the heading "Policies to combat inflation and to promote production in certain industries," had this to say about the extension of rent control:

> The present housing shortage makes it necessary to continue rent control for at least 2 years and to strengthen its enforcement. I recommend that this be done.
>
> Even if the most optimistic interpretation is placed upon the slight reduction in the cost of living in recent months, it would be unwise to lift living costs again by rent increases even larger than the moderate ones taking place under the present system of control. Such a course would inflict further hardship upon the families who have already been the prime victims of inflation, and would make it harder to exercise moderation in wage demands.

The bill reported out by your Banking and Currency Committee would extend rent control for a period of 15 months from April 1, 1949. It would cure some of the weaknesses in the present law by recontrolling certain accommodations which were decontrolled by the 1947 act, and by giving the Expediter authority to regulate evictions and to sue in treble damages, where a landlord willfully overcharges. These are very necessary changes in the present law if we are to have effective rent control in this country for the next 15 months.

The present law decontrolled practically all hotel accommodations, including permanent accommodations in residential and apartment hotels where customary hotel services were provided. The result has been that thousands of American people who have been living in this type of accommodation for years have been required to pay exorbitant increases in rents. A great many of them have been forced to vacate accommodations which have been their home for a long period of time. I am very glad to see that our committee has seen fit to make provision for the recontrol of all accommodations in residential and apartment hotels so that these people will be given the same protection as is given to tenants in apartment houses. I fully recognize that many of these hotels have expended large sums of money in rehabilitating and modernizing their structures and refurnishing their accommodations, but the reported bill provides adequate provisions for adjustment to grant relief in such cases.

The need for strengthening the enforcement provisions of the act was very apparent to the committee. The testimony indicated that there has been an alarming increase in overceiling rents since the effective date of the 1947 act because of the lack of enforcement powers in the Housing Expediter. Effective rent control requires adequate enforcement sanctions, and therefore the reported bill properly provides for suits by the Housing Expediter where a landlord overcharges.

This bill is fair to both tenants and landlords. It gives reasonable security of occupancy to the tenant, but at the same time continues present provisions for adjustment of maximum rents which are inequitable. It also continues the provision giving local rent advisory boards authority to recommend general rent increases, which recommendations must be approved by the Expediter if appropriately substantiated.

The reported bill very properly provides for the continuance of veterans' preference in the purchase and renting of newly constructed and newly converted housing accommodations. I am sure that it is the will of this Congress that veterans of World War II who have been the chief victims of our housing crisis be afforded this continued advantage.

I trust that this House will give overwhelming support to the bill reported out by the committee so that this country will have an effective rent-control law for the next 15 months. If we fail to pass this bill and permit rent controls to lapse at the end of this month, I feel that this country will face one of the most serious domestic crises that has confronted it in this generation. I earnestly solicit your support for this bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN].

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I am not a landlord. I have never represented a landlord, so far as I know. I have an old ancestral farm that I never intend to subdivide and go into the housing business. I am not a member of this committee, but I came to Congress in the first place because, after studying socialism around the world to some extent, I found, at the bottom step of the ladder of every Socialist state, rent control.

Rent control means without exception scarcity, just as OPA controls of all kind have meant scarcity, rent control, price control, generally stop production. A stoppage of rental housing means without exception Government housing. The cry goes up everywhere, "Give us a house," when the compulsory state stops the free market in housing by rent control. Because of that I wish to dwell these moments assigned to me on certain fundamental facts.

It happens in our country, by the statistics of the Census Bureau, that there is no housing shortage, but there is a tragic shortage in rental properties. That is the difference. Now, let us bear in mind that there is a very great difference between whether there is an actual over-all housing shortage or a rental shortage. The Census Bureau has published, and the Joint Committee on Housing of the House and Senate has published in House Document 1504, the actual number of dwelling units in the United States in 1940 as being 34,854,000; in 1947 the dwelling units numbered 39,016,000, or a gain of approximately 4,000,000. But here is the significant thing about these figures: For the first time in the history of our country the number of rental units declined; that is, the housing that was offered for rent declined from 1940, when the rental units stood at 19,658,000, down to 17,669,000; that is, we had approximately a little over half of our people living as tenants in 1940. By 1947 they had been reduced to 45 percent of the people living as tenants and 54 percent living as owners.

Never in our history have we had such a liquidation of housing for rent; and that, Mr. Chairman, is the evil of the compulsory state's management by central government of this economy called housing.

What has it done? It has forced liquidation on a large scale of the 8,000,000 property owners. Most of them are little property owners—at least 6,600,000 of our little property owners own two rental units on the average—they are the carpenter, the mason, the retired farmer, the person who has saved and built a two-family house. The owner lives on one side, and the tenant on the other; the owner acts as caretaker and janitor and looks to the tenant for his old-age security. Those are the folks who have built rental properties in America: 6,600,000 of them; and it represents $67,000,000,000 of savings. Under rent control, under the compulsory state's management of that economy, we have forced a liquidation of 2,000,000 units of that $67,000,000,000 worth of property. It has been liquidated at about 60 cents on the dollar. Would that not be so? The people have crashed the market with property for sale. Everywhere it is the same. Listen to these figures and see whether or not you can spell housing shortage from them. There has been no such liquidation of property apparently in the history of our country as we have seen under rent control.

The propagandists say, "Look at the money these people are making by selling houses." But, Mr. Chairman, there is a tragedy behind that. These little people have been by the socialist State actually liquidated to the extent of 40 per cent of the value of their property. Rent control means, if it means anything at all, the forced rental of property for less than its market value. The rental that these people have been able to get is 40 percent below the market at least. When you take 40 percent away from the rental value of property, you take away 40 percent from the value of the property itself. These people with their life savings invested have had to save what they could from the wreck. They have had to liquidate in order to make themselves safe for the future.

Here is the way the dumping of property goes on in all the big cities: In 1940 the New York Times carried 6,322 classified advertisements of houses and apartments for sale. In 1948 it carried 23,636. In Chicago it ran from 11,000 to 32,000 and in Los Angeles from 18,000 to 78,000.

Is that housing shortage? That is a liquidation of housing.

Who is going to build the houses of the future? Nobody in the world except the six or seven million little property owners who have been in the business of building property for rent. If you destroy them you destroy all possibility of rental property coming into the market.

I ask you, Is anyone here willing, himself, to invest his money, his savings, in a rental property? I ask the question, Will you make an investment on a 15-to-20-year basis to rent under Government management of our economy?

The answer is that these little property owners are refusing to build houses. They are refusing to employ the carpenters, masons, plumbers, and painters who are now going on the streets unemployed. These very people that the Government under socialism liquidates, the source of building houses, have had to quit. So the economy is stopping now at the point where half of our economy in building should be going ahead.

The forced liquidation of rental properties is increasing at an accelerated rate. These people have hung on hoping that rent control would be discontinued as we promised that it would when the war was over, and when the emergency was over.

The people who make it a business to build rental property are quitting because they have no confidence in their Government. This Government itself in this field of our economy has morally collapsed. Nobody believes in it. Nobody can make his plans for the future on what this Government will do. No commissar of government can be trusted with regard to property investment.

With the moral integrity of government itself gone, the individual stops. The individual is the sole source of invention, production, cooperation, and the know-how by which our economy goes forward.

The individual will begin to build houses for rent and put his old houses in the market for rent when his confidence in his Government is restored—not before.

Just now he sees nothing ahead but exploitation of the property-owner group for the benefit of another group, because they have the most votes, allegedly. That to him is strictly in accordance with Marxist doctrine by which a free society is destroyed. Socialism has no moral basis. It inspires no confidence, and there will be a worsening of conditions in rental housing until we restore law and order in the Government and constitutional rights of the individual to which the Government must hold fast with integrity and with determination.

Did you remember that old game we played as kids called "Chairs"? You remember the fellow who stood out in the middle of the floor; as long as everybody was frozen to a seat he had no chair, neither he, or she. But on a signal they had to move. When they moved, he had a good chance of getting a chair.

Now, we have destroyed the moving day in our housing economy. Everybody is frozen. Nobody moves unless he dies. All these veterans mentioned are standing out there in the middle, like they stood in the game of chairs. Nobody moves. Our occupancy of one person per apartment increases. Two persons per apartment increases, when there should be three or four in each apartment. The third floor is not rented; the second floor is declared vacant; apartment after apartment is not for rent. The old houses are not reconditioned for rent. They are sold.

That makes the shortage of houses for rent.

Veterans who came home were on the outside, everybody else who stayed at home were frozen in. People moving from one city to the other are paralyzed in their effort. Our economy is breaking down. What is worst of all, the people themselves have become afraid of freedom.

They are crying to this Central Government like they are in Europe, which has already destroyed the economy in housing. They say "Oh, almighty state in Washington, please hold us where we are. We look to thee for help." All the time the people who own property are liquidating and selling and throwing the tenants out on the street and into the arms of the chiseler. The Government itself has created the situation. The chiseler is that person who alone strives in rent control. There is no cure for a chiseler or for a shortage in the management of Government economy except freedom itself. If there is freedom in our economy, if there is competition, the chiseler goes out of business overnight. He is the man that refuses to obey the bad law. While 95 percent insist they must obey it. He is the man that puts in the hearts of all of our people the fear of what will happen to them if they are put out of their apartments. Let us do away with the chiseler. Let us do away with the restrictions that create him. Let us do away with our inability to move according to our needs and according to our pocketbook, and with more over-all housing per person per family now than ever before we will make the adjustment as we always have.

Let us put our faith, Mr. Chairman, in the free economy, in the good life we have known for 165 years. Let us refuse to put our faith in European statism, of the compulsory devil state itself, in the management of our affairs.

Let us stop exploiting one group to benefit another group. That is socialism itself. That is the robbery by which all alike lose everything and especially the tenants.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOLLINGER].

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Chairman, it is the solemn duty of this Congress to extend and strengthen rent control. We, to a great extent, are responsible for the necessity of continuing rent controls. Immediately after the shooting war stopped, Congress should have provided for a housing program of such magnitude and effectiveness, that housing accommodations would have been available to all. Unfortunately, that was not done. Therefore, rent control is necessary today, for we know that the housing shortage is still critical and will remain so for several years to come. Right now the little people of the country—widows and orphans, those receiving Government aid and pensions, the blind, the veterans—who cannot speak for themselves, look to us for effective and adequate rent-control protection.

The Joint Committee on Housing of the Eightieth Congress—a bipartisan committee—reported that in the spring of 1947 over 2,000,000 families were living doubled up—sharing homes with others, a half million were living in temporary housing, and 6,000,000 persons were living in housing below accepted standards of health and welfare. The

facts show that the housing shortage has become greater since then, and total building during this period has not even met the increase in family formation.

Landlords and the real-estate lobby threaten mass evictions—permitted under the present law—in order to compel us to withhold further action on rent control. Can we allow such tactics to continue? There are a total of at least 12,000,000 people at the bottom of the economic ladder in this country, who must survive on an average of no more than $45 a month, as well as those existing on unemployment insurance, veterans' pensions, civil-service pensions, and railroad-retirement pensions. If we were to have no rent control today, would any portion of their small incomes be left for food, or would the amount they receive be insufficient to pay for shelter?

Rents are a major item in the living costs of an average American family. No one can choose to do without shelter, nor can he provide himself with a substitute for it. We cannot divorce the cost of housing from our consideration of other economic problems. We have proof that we are still woefully short of housing, although the market seems to be saturated at high prices. Many have purchased homes they could not afford because they could not find places to rent at all, or because they could not afford to pay the rents being charged. Release of rent controls would force thousands of others to take the same unwise course—at the expense of diets, medical care, clothing, and other necessities of life.

When the Congress removed controls over new construction, it did so in order to encourage the building of new homes, and to correct the evils heretofore discussed. Did the decontrol of new housing accomplish the results claimed? The answer is, definitely No. Private industry cannot provide housing for less than $30 per room today, and the average American for whom these houses are being built, cannot afford to pay such rents.

We know that temporary housing is no solution. The State of New York attempted to alleviate the housing shortage by erecting temporary housing for veterans. Fox Hills, built only 2 years ago is already not livable—it has deteriorated into hovels standing in mud, which do not keep out the wind and rain—and the occupants must now be provided with new homes. New construction which is going up and which should provide homes for these veterans, is being offered for rent beyond their means, as their wages average only $56 per week.

The rent control bill before us is not satisfactory to me. Of course, I will vote for it, because without any controls, the housing situation in this country would be catastrophic, but I do plan to present amendments which I think are reasonable in view of the present emergency. I took the same position in committee that I take now, and offered the following amendments there. However, they did not receive favorable consideration, and I shall, therefore, offer them at the proper time before this body, and press for their passage.

The rent-control law should be extended to June 30, 1951. We know that the housing picture will not change for several years to come. Let us use foresight and enact the necessary protective legislation to see us through until the emergency is over and we have adequate housing. Should conditions improve sooner, there are sufficient provisions in the bill which would give the President, as well as the Housing Expediter, the right to terminate controls. Also, Congress has the right to enact legislation to end controls sooner, if conditions warrant.

As I have pointed out before, in removing controls over new housing, we did so with the assurance that enough buildings would be constructed to care for the shortage. That promise has not been kept. Less buildings were built last year than previously, and those that were built were out of reach of the average American. We must restore controls on all construction—new and old—or we will never solve our housing problem.

I feel that the inequity provision of the proposed bill should be completely eliminated, and that adjustment on the ground of hardship should only be considered by the Expediter in cases where the landlord has suffered an actual monetary loss in the operation of the housing accommodation. Further, no adjustment should take effect retroactively. The present law and the bill before us now, give the landlord the right to select the highest net operating income that he secured in any 2-year periods since 1939 and compare it with the period for which he seeks the hardship adjustment. And the Expediter will grant to the landlord such increase for the period requested, in order to restore the net operating income which he had in his two best years. Such a provision is unfair and unjust, and has no place in this type of emergency legislation. My amendment provides that a landlord has the right to apply for a hardship adjustment only in the event that he suffered an actual monetary loss in the operation of the housing accommodation.

Another scheme has been devised to compel the tenant to pay an unwarranted increase in rent, when all other attempts fail. This is called an application based upon comparability. It seems to me that this is the rawest kind of a scheme, designed to squeeze from the tenant the last available penny. All the landlord has to do in such case is to apply to the Expediter's office for a rent increase on the ground of comparability—which means that the landlord is receiving a lower rent than a comparable house or apartment is bringing. It is not necessary for the landlord to designate the apartment or building by name or number. It becomes the duty of the Expediter's office to go through their records and find a building which they consider comparable to the landlord's and then grant the increase. This service is granted by the Expediter's office without charge. It seems strange that a Federal agency should act as a representative of a landlord to grant an increase which is not justified. This practice works against the better interests of the American people and defeats the very aims of rent-control legislation.

The landlords have appeared before our committee asking for assistance and begging us to be "fair." Let us examine the case of the landlord. We find that before the acute housing shortage developed landlords suffered substantial losses due to vacancies and nonpayment of rents. Further, they formerly expended considerable sums for decorating and repairs, in order to retain tenants and attract new ones. Since the housing shortage became critical we know that the losses from vacancies and nonpayment of rent have almost disappeared and the need for competitive expenditures has vanished. Further, most tenants have assumed the cost of decorating and minor repairs. Figures show that landlord's incomes have been greatly increased by the 1,771,000 individual adjustments, by general area rent increases affecting 430,000 housing units, and the so-called voluntary 15 percent leases signed for 2,100,000 units under the 1947 and 1948 acts. These factors more than offset the expenditures actually incurred by landlords for essential items. A recent survey of 98 cities shows that the net operating income for apartment houses in 1946 was 24.7 percent higher than the average for 1939–40 and the net operating income for small structures was 31.2 percent higher. In New York City it was found that the net operating income in 1947 was nearly 10 percent higher than in 1943. We should not permit hardship adjustments to be granted on such a fallacious and ill-advised formula.

With respect to inequities, we know of cases where landlords applied for increases in rent because a rear apartment obtained a little sunlight for a few hours of the day, and in the landlord's eyes it made it a more desirable rental unit than a front apartment which was not fortunate enough to get a little sunlight. Since when can landlords charge for sunlight? Should we place premiums on sun and air and allow unscrupulous landlords to charge for them?

The bill before us puts back into the hands of the Expediter the right to grant certificates of eviction. These certificates are granted without any testimony being taken. The application is made by the landlord in writing, and the tenant submits his written answer. There is no opportunity given to either party to testify or cross-examine the other. In other words, a substantial right is taken from both parties when they do not have the right to a court of review. My amendment proposes to give either of the parties the right to appear in a court in which eviction cases are brought, and have the decision of the Expediter reviewed by a court and jury on questions of fact as well as of law. In my opinion this is the only fair way to protect the parties where such substantial rights are involved.

It is also our duty to prevent any gouging and exploitation by landlords—such cases having reached a high point during the past year. A frequent and most objectionable racket is to demand that a prospective tenant pay an exorbitant

price for furniture, which is no good and which the tenant does not need, before he can rent the apartment. In many cases large bonuses are obtained from prospective tenants—a hold-up which must be submitted to if the applicant wants a place to live.

In New York, where rent gouging is a crime, cases against landlords have brought shocking practices to light. In order to prevent continuation of such crimes, we must instill the fear of jail into the hearts of these inhuman creatures. Now that we are giving the right to the United States to intervene in the treble-damage suits, which will, in my opinion, remove a potent weapon from the law-enforcement agents of New York as well as other States that might feel inclined to enact such legislation, we must fortify the present rent-control bill. We should add to it a criminal penalty provision which would give the Government law-enforcement agencies the power to properly punish such landlords who prey upon those in desperate need of shelter, and who must reluctantly consent to any outrageous demands made upon them.

Finally, we must, by direction or otherwise, advise the Housing Expediter that the tenants are entitled to live in apartments and houses as human beings; that the apartments must be clean and habitable and not in disrepair. The Expediter's office states that we cannot insert in this bill any provision regarding the length of time that must elapse before a tenant is entitled to a paint job; that this question must be decided locally. I can see that it would be difficult to legislate on this point for the entire country, but I do serve notice now that I will insist that the expediter in New York promulgate rules to provide for restoration of such necessary services as painting, and so forth, which were heretofore in effect under the OPA. People must be allowed to live decently; nor should they be penalized for asking for their rights under the law. How would you like to live in an apartment whose walls were painted a nice sticky, depressing dark brown? That is known as spite painting, and we have had many such cases in New York. When compelled to paint an apartment, landlords have been known to use materials which would not dry on the walls, and colors offensive to live with. Rather than make the request of the expediter when the time limit had expired, a tenant has not asked to have his apartment painted, when threatened with spite painting by the landlord.

The present law that we seek by the bill before us to extend, was a tragic blunder. The law was so written as to invite evasion on the part of the landlords. The invitation was taken up, and how!

We are now able to right that wrong. We owe it, not only to ourselves, but to the American people. On November 2 last, they spoke in no uncertain terms. Their votes demanded more housing which they could afford to pay for and for a real, strong, sympathetic rent-control law. It has been traditional with us that we have kept our word. Let us not falter now, but without delay, live up to our obligation and legislate to protect our people as they expected we would, when they sent us to Congress.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, no words can adequately portray the serious damage which rent control is causing to our economy, or the injustices which this socialistic device has wrought upon our people; nor is it possible to overemphasize the danger in any further extension of it to the future well-being of the Nation.

Rent control affects not only renters and owners of rental property, but the public generally. Directly or indirectly it touches almost every segment of our economy. Home building is in fact the very foundation of our economy. Therefore anything which in the least hampers this industry must of necessity have an adverse effect upon all industrial processes.

As experience, of which there has been an abundance, has clearly shown, rent control in every country where it has been applied has had the effect of seriously retarding the construction and upkeep of rental housing. However, our own experience alone should convince any reasonable person of the deleterious effects which rent control has in these respects.

During the depression of the 1930's there was an oversupply of rental property. There were many vacancies. A point of the utmost importance is the fact that following this depression war conditions not only made it possible for renters generally to avail themselves of all existing housing space, but, according to a recent census report, of more on a per capita basis than they had customarily occupied. This situation has contributed in no small degree to the difficulty many families are having in finding rental quarters.

This was the situation that confronted our returning World War II soldiers who had recently married or were looking forward to doing so, of which there were many, many millions. The rent-control law had in effect destroyed the rental market and given the families occupying rental homes what amounted to a monopoly on them. The answer given by the Washington politicians for their conduct in creating this state of affairs was little else but the shedding of crocodile tears, demagoguery, and false promises.

Prices and wages had risen substantially during the war while rents had been fixed at comparatively low rates. There can be no question that the rent-control law had the effect of greatly favoring those renters who had remained at home and sharply discriminating against those who were forced by law to go to war and who would be in need of rental homes after cessation of hostilities. Simple justice would have demanded the release of all political restrictions on the rental market so as to give veterans and their families, as well as others in need of rental housing, equal opportunity with those who were supplied with housing, to bid for rental space.

It cannot be too strongly emphasized that rent control is a purely socialistic device. It definitely confiscates private property. It expropriates rental property owners as surely, though not as yet so completely, as took place with rental property owners in Russia under the Soviet Socialist regime, and as is presently proceeding under the Socialist regimes of France, England, and other European countries. Socialism in Europe and our own country is confiscating outright the savings of the people which are in the form of rental property. Mark well the crucial fact that rent control expropriates the fruits of the labor of one class of our citizens ostensibly for the benefit of another class, which follows the Marxian formula for destroying freedom and the right of every person to enjoy the fruit of his own labor, and substituting therefor total socialism—that is, unlimited plunder by the political authority of the producing element of the population.

To be sure, if the political authority can get away with this in respect of one group, it is in a position—or well on the way to such—to do the same to all, just as eventuated in Russia and is now taking place on an ever increasing scale in France and England and practically all the rest of Europe. The point is, that the renter group itself is also marked for eventual liquidation.

Indeed this group, along with the remainder of the producing population, is already being expropriated. Many insidious political tricks are being used to effectuate this object. I shall mention only one, though it is the most effective of them all, perhaps even basic and without which the others would be practically impotent. I refer, of course, to the insidious practice on the part of the political authority of printing money to pay for its socialistic programs. It has already run off the printing press hundreds of billions of dollars of such money, actual and potential. In addition to having destroyed the price mechanism, the law of supply and demand, indeed all true values, moral and spiritual, as well as material, which profoundly affect the renter group, as well as all others, printing-press money has permanently destroyed a great part of the purchasing power of the savings invested in life insurance, of savings loaned to the political authority against what are called savings bonds or Government securities, of savings which are in the form of bank deposits, and of savings supposedly invested in old-age and survivors insurance, and so forth. No group has been hurt more by this, the most potent of all socialistic devices, than the renter class, which is mostly composed of wage earners and others in the lower-income groups, because they have invested their life savings in the above-mentioned ventures.

Of all the contrivances for cheating the laboring classes of mankind—

Said Daniel Webster—

none has been more effectual than that which deludes them with paper money. This is the most effectual of inventions to fertilize the rich man's field by the sweat of the poor man's brow.

If Daniel Webster were living today he would perhaps alter this language so as to read, "This is the most effectual of inventions to fertilize the Socialists' field by the sweat of the poor man's brow."

Ordinary tyranny—

Said Webster further—

oppression, excessive taxation, these bear lightly on the happiness of the mass of the community, compared with fraudulent currencies and robberies committed by depreciated paper—

That is, printing-press money, commonly called inflation.

These facts are pertinent to a consideration of rent control because they show that renters are paying dearly for any real or imaginary benefits they may be deriving from such control. It should be borne in mind that the same political regime has with one hand made those benefits possible and with the other hand destroyed their life savings. Even such benefits as renters may be receiving through rent control can be only temporary.

Surely most renters of residential property must see the pernicious implications and far-reaching dangers of rent control, if not as they affect themselves, then surely as they are bound to affect their children.

If immediately after the war all political controls that directly or indirectly affected the construction of rental housing had been completely and permanently removed, and if all politics had likewise been eliminated from the homebuilding industry, the housing problem would by now be pretty well solved and rents would be in line with other living costs where they justly belong.

Every extension of rent control fastens the evil more securely upon the Nation and entrenches more firmly the forces of socialism, bringing our people ever closer to the slavery which socialism has already imposed and is in process of imposing upon the inhabitants of the Old World.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, to the circumstance of the passing by the Eightieth Congress of the Rent Control Act of 1947 do I owe my opportunity to raise my voice in this well. In the district that I represent, the Second District of Illinois, there is a Republican majority; it is a substantial Republican majority; in the reapportionment of the State it was intended that the Second Congressional District of Illinois should remain Republican; but in large part because of the provisions of the Rent Control Act enacted by the Eightieth Congress those Republican voters, as well as Democratic voters in the Second Congressional District of Illinois, voted me here.

In the Second Congressional District of Illinois are many apartment hotels. Millionaires do not live there; the tenants are school teachers, retired school teachers, retired municipal employees on pension, and educators from the University of Chicago. I will say that by and large in that district the average rent paid is about $10 a week. The Eightieth Congress in its great wisdom decontrolled the residential and apartment hotels; and those people—because of that and because of the distress that came upon them—and by distress I mean real distress—men who were paying $65 a month rent for a roof over families that contained children, and men perhaps making $250 a month, on fixed salaries, had their rent raised to $200 and $225 a month. What was their answer? It was to go forth on the 2d day of November and to vote to send to this Congress as the Representative from the Second District of Illinois someone who was not a Member of the Eightieth Congress and who voted for the decontrol measure.

People are not fools; there is a lot of common sense in even the person who has not very much vocabulary, who has had his experiences in life; and in Chicago there is not anybody who does not know that there is a housing shortage. Some of these good people who were in the galleries and who applauded loudly a spokesman for the sacred rights of property were here because they had the money to get here. I thought of the people back home who didn't have the money to come to Washington, and who will face goodness only knows what if, when there are no homes to rent within their means, they are left without the protection of rent control.

Mr. Chairman, we have been here a long time today, and at the moment not many are present in this chamber. The chairman of the committee on which I have been privileged to serve has been gracious enough to divide my time so that I might start this afternoon and complete my remarks tomorrow. I should like to bring to your attention something to which common sense can apply the rule: Do we get anywhere when we decontrol? I shall bring to you tomorrow the facts as those facts are shown in my district in the case of apartment and residential hotels and also in the case of commercial properties.

I shall show tomorrow in my remarks here that the decontrol of apartments and residential hotels did not result in any new construction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] such time as he may desire.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of my distinguished colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN], I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point his remarks with reference to the bill now under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

MASTERPIECE OF UNDERSTATEMENT

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote for this rent-control and housing bill of 1949, H. R. 1731, because it is the best bill that can be brought to the floor and passed. I will not say that I am voting for it with reluctance because it is an infinitely superior measure to the pale wisp of authority contained in the Rent Control Act of 1947, dictated as it was by the most stupendous pressure lobby assembled against the interests of the American people in many a long day.

This is, as a matter of fact, a good bill, but, with all respect to the very able chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], and the hard-working members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the country, and especially the metropolitan areas, could have used a stronger bill.

NEED IS ACUTE

Mr. Chairman, the committee has indulged in a masterpiece of understatement in the report when it says with straight face:

The committee has concluded that the emergency with respect to the housing shortage growing out of the dislocations of World War II still exists.

It may be that in parts of the country so mild a statement can describe the housing situation.

It may be that there are areas in which there is no appreciable shortage of rental housing of decent standards offered at reasonable rentals.

That cannot be said of the Nineteenth Congressional District of New York, nor, indeed, of the metropolitan area of New York as a whole.

My constituents write me daily, informing me of distressing conditions in our neighborhoods.

FAMILIES IN DISCOMFORT

Veterans—the men who were called on to fight for the safety and security of our Nation—and their families are jammed up in single-room apartments too small for an adequate bedroom. Many young couples write to me that they dare not plan a family until they are assured of a place in which they can live with babies in something approaching decency and comfort.

Others write of three families being crowded into a three-room apartment which affords no privacy, no comfort, no breathing room, with resultant discord and family quarrels. Last summer, during debate on the pitiful Republican Housing Act, I inserted in the RECORD a letter from a young couple striving to find a place to live while waiting for their baby.

MARRIAGE BROKEN

Now I have in my office anguished letters from that young wife telling how failure to find adequate quarters broke up their marriage. She is living with relatives on Long Island with their baby; the husband appears to have disappeared in frustration; and the couple is being divorced.

Others write me that they have received eviction notices because of plans for tearing down existing dwellings and replacing them.

We have still in this country thousands of American citizens who are displaced persons because of lack of adequate, reasonably priced rental housing.

I know that this Congress is going to pass the National Housing Act; I know that when passed it will greatly alleviate the present conditions; but I know also, and all of us here know, Mr. Chairman, that it will be years before the benefits

of the act are felt in the congested metropolitan areas.

Our housing deficit is huge, and new construction is not keeping pace with needs in the rental categories where the deficiencies are greatest.

I had hoped, Mr. Chairman, that the committee could agree to extension of rent control for at least 2 years, in order to supply stability to the housing industry and to tenants, and that the most desirable features of the Myers-Douglas bills could be incorporated into the committee bill.

LOBBY OF GREED

Nevertheless, realizing the vast pressures brought by the lobby of greed opposing rent control—a lobby which places higher values on sticks and bricks than on human lives and happiness—I know that the committee could not bring a better bill to the floor with any confidence of passage, and I must support what we can get.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. GORE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1731) to extend certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. DAVENPORT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON (at the request of Mr. COOPER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. SHAFER (at the request of Mr. WOLCOTT) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances and include certain letters and resolutions.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER. The Chair designates the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] to act as Speaker pro tempore tomorrow.

HOUR OF MEETING

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar Wednesday business of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 11, 1949, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

340. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting to the Congress, in typescript, volumes I and II of the detailed findings presented to the Commission by the task force which studied transportation and the National Government. This material is a further addition to the supporting data which accompanies the Commission's report on the Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

341. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1950 in the amount of $65,925 for the legislative branch, House of Representatives, in the form of amendments to the budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 103); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

342. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting to the Congress, in typescript, the following staff reports: (1) Securities and Exchange Commission, (2) Federal Trade Commission, (3) National Labor Relations Board, (4) Federal Power Commission, (5) United States Maritime Commission, (6) Federal Communications Commission, (7) Federal Reserve System, (8) Civil Aeronautics Board, (9) Interstate Commerce Commission. The above reports were prepared for the Commission's consideration by the task force as a supplement to the Commission's report on independent regulatory commissions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

343. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 11, 1949, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Redwood City Harbor (Redwood Creek), Calif., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted on January 28, 1947 (H. Doc. No. 104); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

344. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 24, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of report on the Lost River and tributaries in the vicinity of Orleans, Ind. Requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on November 15, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 105); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

345. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 27, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Horseshoe Cove, Fla., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on November 8, 1945, and a preliminary examination and survey of channel, turning basin, and improvements at Horseshoe, Dixie County, Fla., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 106); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

346. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated October 6, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration on an interim review of reports on the Mississippi River between Coon Rapids Dam, Minn., and the mouth of the Ohio River, with a view to local flood protection at Canton, Mo., requested by resolutions of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on September 18, 1944 (H. Doc. No. 107); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

347. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 26, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of Sandy Hook Bay, N. J., with a view to providing a channel and improvements at Leonardo, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 108); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

348. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 27, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of southwest side of Rappahannock River, in vicinity of Bowlers Wharf, Essex County, Va., to secure harbor of refuge and connecting channels, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 109); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

349. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated October 6, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration on a review of reports on Brunswick Harbor, Ga., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on May 23, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 110); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

350. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 14, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on waterway connecting Pamlico Sound and Beaufort Harbor, N. C., with particular reference to Taylors Creek, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted on April 20, 1948, and also requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, United States Senate, adopted on March 9, 1948 (H. Doc. No. 111); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

351. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 20, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Gulfport Harbor, Miss., requested by a resolution of the Committee

on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on May 16, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 112); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

352. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 4, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Potomac River and tributaries at and below Washington, D. C., with a view to elimination of the water chestnut, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 113); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

353. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated October 7, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Little Bay, Tex., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 114); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

354. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 10, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Pennypack Creek, a tributary of the Delaware River located in Philadelphia, Pa., with a view to providing facilities for light-draft navigation, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on July 24, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

355. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 10, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Finneys Creek, Accomac County, Va., and the channel connecting said creek with Wachapreague Inlet and the Atlantic Ocean, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

356. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease under the terms of that law for the month of January 1949; to the Committee on Agriculture.

357. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed bill to repeal certain obsolete laws and parts of laws relating to the sale of public lands; to the Committee on Public Lands.

358. A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting a study prepared for the Commission's consideration of fiscal, budgeting, and accounting methods and systems in Federal Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

359. A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting a report on the Treasury Department, and separately, as appendix F, the task force report on fiscal, budgeting, and accounting activities of the Federal Government (H. Doc. No. 115); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

360. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to promote the national defense by authorizing a unitary plan for construction of transonic and supersonic wind-tunnel facilities and the establishment of an air engineering development center; to the Committee on Armed Services.

361. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Works Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the construction at Suitland, Md., of a building or group of buildings for the servicing and storage of film records"; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calender, as follows:

Mr AUCHINCLOSS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 140. Resolution to pay a gratuity to Anne O. Brown; without amendment (Rept. No. 247). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 126. Resolution for the relief of Mrs. Charlotte H. Murdock; without amendment (Rept. No. 248). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. House Joint Resolution 89. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 249). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 93. Resolution for the relief of John F. Schmelzer and Alliance Insurance Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 250). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 113. Resolution to provide funds for the Committee on House Administration; with an amendment (Rept. No. 251). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 18. Concurrent resolution authorizing a reprint of supplement III (Country Studies A, B, and C) of the report of the Subcommittee on National and International Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, entitled "The Strategy and Tactics of World Communism," for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs; without amendment (Rept. No. 252). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 44. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 401, Eightieth Congress, entitled "Fascism in Action"; without amendment (Rept. No. 253). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. REDDEN: Committee on Public Lands. House Resolution 49. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; with amendments (Rept. No. 254). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REDDEN: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 331. A bill to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union; with amendments (Rept. No. 255). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 3414. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the signing of the documents terminating the War Between the States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Services.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 3415. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the State to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON:

H. R. 3416. A bill to provide for the construction of the Smith Mountain Dam and hydroelectric power project in the Roanoke River Basin; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. R. 3417. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for cooperation by the Smithsonian Institution with State, educational, and scientific organizations in the United States for continuing ethnological researches on the American Indians," approved April 10, 1928, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. COFFEY:

H. R. 3418. A bill to allow, in the case of miners working underground, an income-tax deduction with respect to work clothes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 3419. A bill to amend the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 3420. A bill to authorize the exchange of wildlife refuge lands within the State of Washington; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 3421. A bill to grant to fishermen's cooperatives the same exemption from income tax as is allowed to farmers' cooperatives; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 3422. A bill to include the Virgin Islands in certain titles of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 3423. A bill to provide for centralizing certain wage rates to the supervision of the Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 3424. A bill to establish a Federal Commission on Services for the Physically Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 3425. A bill to authorize the refund to the Florida Keys Aqueduct Commission of the sum advanced for certain water facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3426. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3427. A bill to exempt from admissions tax admissions to activities of elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3428. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for investigatory personnel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation who have rendered at least 20 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3429. A bill to amend the National Motor Vehicle Theft Act to include embezzled vehicles and aircraft; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SUTTON:

H. R. 3430. A bill for the purpose of remodeling and improving the post-office building at Franklin, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3431. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Hohenwald, Tenn., a post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3432. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Centerville, Tenn., a post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3433. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Waynesboro, Tenn., a post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 3434. A bill to promote the national defense by authorizing a unitary plan for construction of transonic and supersonic wind-tunnel facilities and the establishment of an air engineering development center; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 3435. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3436. A bill to amend section 3 of the Lucas Act with respect to redefinition of request for relief; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELCH of California:

H. R. 3437. A bill to amend the Federal Highway Act and other acts to permit the allocation of Federal funds to the construction, reconstruction, or maintenance of publicly owned toll bridges or toll roads; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 3438. A bill to prohibit the picketing of courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 3439. A bill to provide for a Federal court building in Winchester, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 3440. A bill for the addition of certain lands to Rocky Mountain National Park, Colo., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HUBER (by request):

H. R. 3441. A bill to provide for national cemeteries in the State of Ohio; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. JACKSON of California:

H. R. 3442. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the State to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3443. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 by adopting principles of procedure in investigations by committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 3444. A bill to provide for the collection and publication of cotton statistics; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3445. A bill to repeal the provisions of the Alaska Railroad Retirement Act of June 29, 1936, as amended, and sections 91 to 107 of the Canal Zone Code and to extend the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to officers and employees to whom such provisions are applicable; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 3446. A bill to amend the act of May 29, 1944, providing annuities for persons who participated in the construction of the Panama Canal, by extending the class to whom annuities may be paid; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H. R. 3447. A bill to create a General Property Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. WALSH:

H. R. 3448. A bill to provide that jewelry and luggage made at home by a disabled individual shall be exempt, if sold at retail by such individual, from the retailers' excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3449. A bill to establish in the Veterans' Administration a Department for the Cure of Alcoholism; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE of California:

H. R. 3450. A bill to provide price support for barley; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 3451. A bill to establish the United States Air Force Academy at Altus and Frederick, Okla.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H. R. 3452. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 with respect to the computation of annuities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3453. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 with respect to the definition of the employment relation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 3454. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 in respect of the apportionment among the States of the national acreage allotment; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 3455. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Monroeville, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3456. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Attica, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. J. Res. 191. Joint resolution relating to Father's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. Con. Res. 46. Concurrent resolution to provide additional funds for the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. TAURIELLO:

H. Con. Res. 47. Concurrent resolution to express the disapproval of the Congress of the action of the Government of Bulgaria in trying and sentencing 15 leading Protestant clergymen; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. Res. 145. Resolution providing for the employment of an additional clerk for any Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal Social Security Act to permit the Federal Security Agency to participate in the payment of public-assistance grants to persons residing in public hospitals or other public institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact and approve a bill requiring shippers of cigarettes in interstate commerce to furnish to the taxing authorities of the States to which the merchandise is shipped a copy of the invoice on each such shipment and the name and address of each purchaser, or to enact such other legislation in aid of the States affected as may be proper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3457. A bill for the relief of John W. Crumpacker, commander, United States Navy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 3458. A bill for the relief of Miss Celeste Iris Maeda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 3459. A bill for the relief of Freda Corber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOEVEN (by request):

H. R. 3460. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth J. Underhill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois:

H. R. 3461. A bill for the relief of Lester B. McAllister and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3462. A bill for the relief of Walter J. O'Toole; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 3463. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Fred A. Fletcher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. R. 3464. A bill to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of alien John Michael Ancker Rasmussen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3465. A bill for the relief of Jose Da Silva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 3466. A bill for the relief of William Couper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 3467. A bill for the relief of Frans Eugene Laub; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 3468. A bill for the relief of John K. Murphy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3469. A bill for the relief of Robert Joseph Vetter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES of Kentucky:

H. R. 3470. A bill for the relief of Central Grocery Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3471. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sarah J. Miller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

191. By Mr. BREEN: Memorial of the city council of Hamilton, Ohio, memorializing the Congress to pass the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

192. By Mr. GORSKI of New York: Memorial of Peter J. Rybka, councilman-at-large of Buffalo, N. Y., relative to immediate repeal of the Taft-Hartley law; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

193. Br. Mr. HART: Petition of Albert L. Quinn Post, No. 52, American Legion, of Jersey City, N. J., urging the condemnation of the Communist Party for its persecution of all forms of religious activity in general and for the outrageous treatment of Cardinal Mindszenty in particular; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

194. Also, petition of Jersey City Council, No. 137, Knights of Columbus, Jersey City, N. J., urging that the Government of the United States, as a signatory to the peace treaty of 1947 with Hungary, investigate the entire case involving Cardinal Josef Mindszenty and expose all violations of the treaty affecting his arrest, trial, and imprisonment and to take all necessary steps to compel enforcement of the treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

195. By Mr. HILL: Petition of the State of Colorado, asking for an appropriation of the sum of $500,000 for the continuation and completion of the Leadville drainage tunnel; to the Committee on Appropriations.

196. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of Fred D. Humphrey and other World War II veterans of Oskaloosa, Iowa, urging the adoption of legislation to permit postal employees who served in the armed services to benefit under Public Law 134; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

197. By the SPEAKER: Petition of William J. Pachler, secretary-treasurer, Utility Workers Union of America, CIO, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to distribution of public power, and correction of an erroneous impression that has been created regarding that union having been on record against the New Johnsonville plant of the TVA system; to the Committee on Public Works.

198. Also, petition of W. E. Wycoff, recording secretary, Stark County Industrial Union Council, Canton, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposing and condemning any extraordinary debate or filibuster; to the Committee on Rules.

199. Also, petition of Louis de Bourbon, Athens, Greece, asking an investigation of his case involving loss of American citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MARCH 11, 1949

(Legislative day of Monday, February 21, 1949)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord our God, who hast cast our lot in pleasant places: We praise Thee for our goodly heritage in this land. We remember with gratitude those whose gifts of head and heart and hand established the foundations of this Nation. We bless Thee for the ideals of faith and freedom which they cherished. Help us to hold them dear and to prize them above luxury or ease.

Deliver us from pride and self-sufficiency. So change our hearts and renew our wills that we shall love what Thou dost love and do what Thou dost command, and with singleness of mind and purpose seek first Thy kingdom and Thy righteousness. Grant to these leaders of the Nation purity of motive and soundness of judgment. Raise up in every land men of vision and courage who for the sake of the common good will think wisely and do justly and love mercy. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 89) providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 18. Concurrent resolution authorizing a reprint of Supplement III (Country Studies A, B, and C) of the report of the Subcommittee on National and International Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, entitled "The Strategy and Tactics of World Communism," for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs; and

H. Con. Res. 44. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 401, Eightieth Congress, entitled "Fascism in Action."

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

VOLUNTARY PLAN FOR ALLOCATION OF STEEL PRODUCTS FOR FARM-TYPE STORAGE BINS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Voluntary Plan for the Allocation of Steel Products for Farm-Type Storage Bins and letters of compliance therewith (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

Two letters from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REHABILITATION OF NAVAJO AND HOPI TRIBES OF INDIANS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians and the better utilization of the resources of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPEAL OF CERTAIN LAWS RELATING TO SALE OF PUBLIC LANDS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal certain obsolete laws and parts of laws relating to the sale of public lands (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN BUILDINGS AT SUITLAND, MD.

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the construction at Suitland, Md., of a building or group of buildings for the servicing and storage of film records (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. LUCAS to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 15, amending the so-called cloture rule of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question before the Senate is, Shall the decision of the Chair overruling the point of order made by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. VANDENBERG obtained the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me to make the point of no quorum?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Baldwin	Butler	Chapman
Brewster	Byrd	Chavez
Bricker	Cain	Connally
Bridges	Capehart	Cordon
Donnell	Johnston, S. C.	O'Conor
Douglas	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Downey	Kem	Pepper
Eastland	Kerr	Reed
Ecton	Kilgore	Robertson
Ellender	Knowland	Russell
Ferguson	Langer	Saltonstall
Flanders	Lodge	Schoeppel
Frear	Long	Smith, Maine
Fulbright	Lucas	Smith, N. J.
George	McCarran	Sparkman
Gillette	McCarthy	Stennis
Green	McFarland	Taft
Gurney	McGrath	Taylor
Hayden	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Hendrickson	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Hickenlooper	Magnuson	Thye
Hill	Malone	Tobey
Hoey	Maybank	Tydings
Holland	Miller	Vandenberg
Humphrey	Millikin	Watkins
Hunt	Morse	Wherry
Ives	Mundt	Wiley
Jenner	Murray	Williams
Johnson, Colo.	Myers	Withers
Johnson, Tex.	Neely	Young

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does the Senator from Illinois wish me to yield to him to make the usual request at this time?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do so.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, before the able Senator from Michigan proceeds, I ask unanimous consent that all Senators desiring to introduce bills and joint resolutions, present petitions and memorials, or committee reports, or submit for the RECORD matters usually placed in the RECORD during the morning hour, be permitted to do so, without debate, and without jeopardizing or affecting the present parliamentary situation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress to amend the Federal Unemployment Tax Act and the Internal Revenue Code to permit a 100-percent credit against pay-roll taxes collected by States and to return to the States full control over the administration of their unemployment-compensation laws

"Whereas the Federal Government now finances the entire cost of the State employment security operations of the several States having approved unemployment-compensation laws, although such a 100-percent Federal grant of funds to administer State laws does not exist elsewhere in the field of Federal grants-in-aid; and

"Whereas under terms of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act and the Internal Revenue Code the Federal Government levies a

3-percent pay-roll tax on defined employers against which tax these employers are given a maximum 90-percent credit, based on their contributions paid and experience rating credits earned; and the remaining 10 percent of the 3-percent tax, which is generally referred to as the three-tenths-percent administrative expense tax, is not earmarked for the purposes for which it was originally intended, namely, for the expenses of the administration by the States of their unemployment-compensation laws, and is not now being used in its entirety for such purposes; and

"Whereas the Federal Government has collected by means of the said three-tenths-percent administrative expense tax as of July 1, 1948, $1,670,940,000, out of which sum the States have been granted approximately $780,000,000 for unemployment-compensation and employment-service administration, leaving a Federal profit of approximately $891,000,000; and

"Whereas the Federal Government under the present law determines what sums of money shall be returned to the States for expenses to administer unemployment-compensation laws, although the States, having the responsibility to administer their own laws, should have the right in their own judgment to determine what sums of money are needed to administer their own laws; and because the present control over such funds by the Federal Government has exposed large numbers of employees of the division of employment security of this Commonwealth to loss of employment, which threatens to impair the efficiency with which this law is now being administered; and

"Whereas the 100-percent Federal grant, instead of promoting good Federal-State relations, has a tendency to injure them: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal Unemployment Tax Act and the Internal Revenue Code and to enact legislation which will result in giving to employers a 100-percent credit against pay-roll taxes collected by the States, and giving to each State with an approved unemployment-compensation law the right and the power to expend from the receipts of the pay-roll tax levied upon employers as much as it deems necessary for the proper and efficient administration of its State law; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Memorial 31

"*To the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:*

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas the State of Washington imposes a tax upon the sale and use of cigarettes within its boundaries, and the revenues so obtained constitute an important portion of the funds available for its functions of government; and

"Whereas it has been brought to the attention of your memorialists that a large and growing system of evasion of cigarette taxes has developed through the use of the United States mails; that advertisements and inducements are being sent through the United States mails to the citizens of this State and other States, which advertisements and inducements encourage violations of the cigarette taxes imposed by the various States; that in numerous instances such advertisers entice prospective customers with statements to the effect that the use of the United States mails is proof of the legitimacy of such business and such a system; that the mails of the United States are actually being used for the purpose of making deliveries into this State and other States of cigarettes on which the tax required by the laws of such States have not and will not be paid; that this State is seriously affected by such use of the mails of the United States for the purpose of evading the laws of this State, and faces substantial losses of revenue as a result of such system of evasion; and

"Whereas it has been brought to the attention of your memorialists that there is now pending before the Congress of the United States certain proposed bills which would aid the individual States in the enforcement of their cigarette-tax laws by requiring shippers of cigarettes in interstate commerce to furnish to the taxing authorities of the State to which the merchandise is shipped a copy of the invoice on each shipment and the name and address of each purchaser: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That your memorialists hereby respectfully petition and memorialize the President and the Congress of the United States to enact and approve a bill requiring shippers of cigarettes in interstate commerce to furnish to the taxing authorities of the States to which the merchandise is shipped a copy of the invoice on each such shipment and the name and address of each purchaser, or to enact such other legislation in aid of the States affected as may be proper; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Washington is hereby directed to forward certified copies of this joint memorial to the President of the United States and to the presiding officers of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and to each Senator and Representative in Congress from the State of Washington."

A letter in the nature of a memorial, signed by Mrs. Virgil Gustison, president, Pro America National Organization of Republican Women, King County unit, of Seattle, Wash., remonstrating against the confirmation of the nomination of Mon C. Wallgren to be Director of the National Security Resources Board; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter in the nature of a memorial, signed by Kurt Mertig, chairman, Citizens' Protective League, Inc., New York, N. Y., remonstrating against continuation of the Marshall plan; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Lexington, Ky., favoring the enactment of legislation proclaiming October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by Local No. 603, International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths, Drop Forgers, and Helpers, American Federation of Labor, Alliance, Ohio, relating to the Displaced Persons Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition signed by John K. Turton, of White Plains, N. Y., relating to the publication of a manuscript on the Constitution of the United States of 1787; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

A resolution adopted by the Tuscarawas County Industrial Union Council of Dover, Ohio, favoring amendment of the Senate rules so as to prevent filibustering; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. LODGE (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Resolutions memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the National Guard of the United States and of the several States

"Whereas the Congress of the United States is now considering proposed legislation which profoundly affects the civilian components of the armed forces and, particularly, the National Guards of the several States, and the National Guard of the United States; and

"Whereas much of this proposed legislation is based upon the so-called Gray Board report issued recently by the Committee on Civilian Components of the Secretary of Defense, or is based upon other similar recommendations of the Regular Military Establishment; and

"Whereas this proposed legislation is largely directed toward the disestablishment of the National Guards of the several States, beginning with the Air National Guard, in favor of reserve forces wholly under Federal control, thereby contravening the language, spirit, and intent of the Constitution of the United States; and

"Whereas many noble traditions of this Commonwealth, together with her sister States, spring from the military services our militia and National Guard have rendered in the cause of liberty from the beginnings of our country down through the years; and

"Whereas the national economy cannot sustain a reserve force program, estimated to cost $33,000,000,000 during the next 20 years, which cost would be additional to the $15,000,000,000 now annually budgeted for defense purposes; and

"Whereas it is unthinkable that the excellent reserve forces now in existence, the National Guards of the several States, which sent 18 well-trained and equipped National Guard divisions into the field during World War II and provided 12 combat groups to the Air Force, should be absorbed by another component: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the General Court of Massachusetts that our present dual system of Federal-State organization and jurisdiction for the National Guard is a tested and proven instrument of military policy which has demonstrated, historically, the foresight and wisdom of those who framed our Constitution, and that the President and Congress of the United States should, therefore, disapprove legislation which would, in any degree, vitiate this system of National Guard organization and jurisdiction or would adversely affect the rights, privileges, or emoluments of National Guard members; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the President of the United States direct the National Military Establishment to provide more effective cooperation and support for the National Guards of the several States and of the United States, in order to provide properly balanced, trained, and equipped National Guard forces for service in time of emergency; either local or national; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from the Commonwealth."

By Mr. HOEY:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Carolina; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Resolution 20

"Joint resolution petitioning the Congress of the United States to locate a surplus Navy floating drydock at Wilmington for preservation of bottoms of Maritime Commission-owned merchant marine fleet laid up in Brunswick River

"Whereas it has come to the attention of this general assembly that the United States Congress is giving consideration to providing drydocks for the purpose of inspection and

giving primary preservative treatment to vessel hulls of the Maritime Commission reserve fleets; and

"Whereas there are approximately 425 vessels of the Maritime Commission's merchant fleet now laid up in Brunswick River at Wilmington to be inspected and given such preservative treatment as the United States Maritime Commission decides essential; and

"Whereas the servicing of the Wilmington fleet by means other than a floating drydock at the lay-up basin, will involve excessive towage charges to the nearest commercial drydocks, located at Hampton Roads, Va., and Charleston, S. C., and will be an inefficient and uneconomical method of preserving the hulls of said vessels; and

"Whereas the United States Maritime Commission recognizes that greater efficiency and larger material savings can be effectuated by having said vessels serviced at the places where they are laid up and has recommended that floating drydocks be provided for the servicing of such vessels: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring):

"SECTION 1. That the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the United States Congress are requested and urged to give favorable consideration to, and take favorable action on, the recommendations of the United States Maritime Commission to provide floating drydocks to service the hulls of ships of the reserve fleets of said Commission at the places where they are now laid up.

"SEC. 2. That copies of this resolution be sent by the secretary of the state to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the chairmen of the Senate and House of Representatives' Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and to each Member of Congress from the State of North Carolina.

"SEC. 3. That this resolution shall be in full force and effect from and after its ratification."

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"House Joint Resolution 8

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to enact a bill confirming the title of the several States of the Union to submerged lands within their borders and requesting the Senate Committee on Armed Services to hold hearings to obtain information and to recommend to the Senate appropriate legislation defining and delimiting territorial waters of the United States

"Whereas the State of Maryland is the owner of approximately 1,600,000 acres of submerged lands covered by the tidel waters of the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries, as well as some 61,000 acres of submerged lands of the Atlantic coastal shelf within 3 miles from the shore, subject only to Federal powers of navigation, commerce, and national defense; and

"Whereas, in 1775, the State of Maryland succeeded to all rights of Lord Baltimore, and, as a sovereign, the State also became entitled to the recognized public-law rights of a sovereign to land within its borders under navigable waters; and

"Whereas, by virtue of the Federal Constitution, ratified by Maryland on April 28, 1788, the State of Maryland's rights to these submerged lands under navigable waters were recognized and forever formalized, subject only to delegated Federal powers of navigation, commerce, and national defense; and

"Whereas, for more than 170 years, the United States Government, Congress, and the Supreme Court have uniformly, unanimously, and consistently recognized that title and the rights which accompany it; and

"Whereas, in 1937, for the first time and as an original proposition, the Federal Government began to assert, through the agency of Secretary Ickes, claim to the marginal seas by reason of the fact that oil was being extracted in those areas by the States; and

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States, in 1947, in a suit instituted by the Department of Justice entitled *'U. S. v. California'* (332 U. S. 19), overthrew more than a hundred years of established precedents in a might-makes-right decision and held that the United States had paramount rights over the submerged lands adjacent to the shores of California, while not deciding the question of ownership; and

"Whereas in a subsequent decision, entitled *'Toomer v. Witsell'* (334 U. S. 385), decided in 1948, the Supreme Court held that the power of South Carolina to regulate fishing in the marginal sea area within its boundaries may be exercised only 'in the absence of a conflicting Federal claim,' citing *U. S. v. California*; and

"Whereas the President of the United States has heretofore issued an Executive order authorizing the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Interior to recommend establishment of zones for Federal regulation and control of fishery resources and fishing activities in those areas of the high seas contiguous to the coast of the United States, and the Department of State in December 1948 notified coastal State officials that it will begin to put this program into effect; and

"Whereas said Federal executive agencies have introduced in Congress and will attempt to speed the passage of a bill bestowing Federal ownership and control of the marginal seas of all the coastal States; and

"Whereas the Department of Justice in the proceeding above referred to entitled *'U. S. v. California'* is attempting to persuade the Supreme Court to declare that the San Pedro Bay off the coast of California is a marginal sea and so a Federal area, except as to points within headlands which are within 6 miles of each other; and

"Whereas the headlands of the entrance of the Chesapeake Bay are more than 6 miles apart; and

"Whereas the Department of Justice has publicly expressed the belief that the Chesapeake Bay, like Delaware Bay, is a historic exception to the 6 miles headland rule; and

"Whereas while the Department of Justice and the executive branch of the Federal Government have stated that the marginal-sea rule did not apply to navigable waters within the boundaries of the State and that its extension would not be sought, there are many in office in the Federal Government who believe and strive to the contrary; and

"Whereas if the Department of Justice and the executive branch of the Federal Government could persuade the Supreme Court to overthrow more than a hundred years of established precedent and to rewrite the Constitution of the United States in the case of the marginal sea, there is no reason to believe that they cannot, in the near future, similarly persuade the Court to extend that doctrine to the Chesapeake Bay and the inland waters of Maryland and all other States, and from there to all public lands and natural resources, and so destroy our present system of dual sovereignty and constitutional government; and

"Whereas the claims of those who would extend the Federal power are sought to be plausibly and immediately masked under the needs for defense of natural resources, including oil, and the necessity of Federal power over marginal seas for national defense; and

"Whereas actually the establishment of the open seas at a point within 3 miles of the shore line, in many cases, if not all, materially weakens the position of the United States in international law and thus hinders national defense; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has heretofore passed a bill (which was vetoed by the President of the United States) to retain in the States their formerly undisputed sovereignty and rights with the saving provision as follows: *'Provided, however,* That nothing in this act shall affect the use, development, improvement, and control by or under the authority of the United States of said lands and waters for the purposes of navigation or flood control or the production or distribution of power, or be construed as the release or relinquishment of any rights of the United States arising under the authority of Congress to regulate or improve navigation or to provide for flood control or the production or distribution of powers'; and

"Whereas a majority of both Democrats and Republicans in the Congress, since the decision of *U. S. v. California*, have always favored the passage of such a bill; and

"Whereas similar bills are now pending in the Congress of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the General Assembly of Maryland, (1) That the State of Maryland is emphatically in favor of continued State ownership and control, subject only to constitutionally delegated Federal powers of lands and resources within and beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the respective States and requests Congress to pass suitable legislation to that end; That the Senators and Members of the House in Congress from Maryland are hereby requested to give active opposition to all pending and proposed measures which would create Federal ownership or control of lands, fish, or other resources beneath navigable waters within State boundaries, except such rights as are delegated to the Federal Government by the Constitution of the United States, and that our Senators and Members of the House in Congress are hereby requested to give their active support to legislation which would recognize and confirm State ownership of such property; and

"(2) That the Senate Committee on Armed Services be requested to hold hearings at the earliest practicable date for the purpose of obtaining such information as may be necessary to enable that committee to recommend to the Senate appropriate legislation defining and delimiting the territorial waters of the United States consistent with the sovereignty of the several States of the Union, the international rights and obligations of the United States and with due regard to the national defense, to commerce, and to the conservation, development, and utilization of the resources of the marginal seas and the constitutional relationship with national economy and national defense; and

"(3) That a copy of these resolutions be mailed to each Senator and to each Member of the House in Congress from Maryland and that Senator MILLARD E. TYDINGS, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, be and he is hereby respectfully requested to introduce a resolution in the Senate substantially similar to resolution (2) hereof and to expedite the hearings referred to in that resolution."

By Mr. MILLIKIN:

A joint memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Joint Memorial 7

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide for the completion of the Leadville drainage tunnel

"Whereas there is a current shortage of base metals in the United States which is causing considerable distress among our people and those industries using said metals; and

"Whereas the Leadville, Colo., district is one of the outstanding areas in which base metals are known to exist as shown

by past production records and current studies made of the district; and

"Whereas a deep drainage tunnel for the Leadville area has long been advocated by the State of Colorado through its various mining agencies and by the Mining Association of the State over a period of years; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States, as one of the war-emergency measures, by Public Law 133, approved July 12, 1943, appropriated $1,400,000 for the construction of the Leadville drainage tunnel, which sum may be repaid on a royalty basis by those operating mines drained and benefited by said tunnel; and

"Whereas the National Minerals Advisory Council, the mining associations, and the Department of the Interior, including its subdivision the United States Bureau of Mines, has recommended the expenditure of an additional sum of $500,000 for the completion of the present tunnel to its first objective; and

"Whereas the present tunnel is of little value until the work is completed and the money heretofore spent thereon will be a loss to the taxpayers of the Nation and cause distress in the area in which the project was started; and

"Whereas the completion of said tunnel will assist in making available mineral reserves which can be used in the event of a future emergency and should be completed with the least possible delay; and

"Whereas the said tunnel is urgently needed to serve the best interests of the Nation, the State of Colorado, and the area in question: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Thirty-seventh General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the senate concurring herein), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby memorialized to appropriate the sum of $500,000 for the continuation and completion of the Leadville drainage tunnel to its first main objective; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be submitted to the President of the United States, to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate and of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Interior Department of the House of Representatives, and to the membership of the appropriate committees of both bodies of the Congress, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Colorado in the Eighty-first Congress of the United States."

By Mr. LANGER:

Three concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution E

"Concurrent resolution petitioning the Secretary of the Interior and the Acting Commissioner of Indian Affairs to take action with reference to claims awaiting presentation to the Indian Claims Commission

"Whereas by the McCumber Treaty entered into between the United States of America and the Chippewa Indians of the Turtle Mountains in North Dakota, the United States agreed to pay said Indians for lands ceded to the United States, and further agreed to provide allotments for the individual Indians on the Indian reservation or upon the public domain adjacent thereto; and

"Whereas said treaty was negotiated in 1894 but was not ratified by the United States until 1904, and in the meantime all of the public domain adjacent to the Indian reservation was otherwise appropriated and it became necessary to make allotments for many of the Indians in distant parts of North Dakota and Montana; and

"Whereas the said Indians appear to have legitimate claims against the United States which ought to be presented to the Indian Claims Commission; and

"Whereas in order for the said Indians to present such claims, it is necessary that they be represented by counsel and such counsel cannot be employed except with the approval of the Department of the Interior; and

"Whereas for 1 year the said Indians have been endeavoring to obtain the necessary approval so that such claims may be presented, and the Department of the Interior has wholly failed to take action in the matter, and has thus frustrated the efforts of the Indians to present their claim; and

"Whereas the time for presenting such claims is limited by law, and continued delay may prevent such Indians from properly preparing and presenting their claims: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the house of representatives concurring therein), That we request the Secretary of the Interior and the Acting Commissioner of Indian Affairs promptly to take such action as may be necessary or expedient to enable the Indians of the Turtle Mountains to present their claims against the United States; be it further

"Resolved, That we likewise request said officers to take like action with reference to the claims of any other tribes of North Dakota Indians who may have claims awaiting presentation to the Indian Claims Commission; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to the Secretary of the Interior, Acting Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and to North Dakota's delegation in Congress."

"House Concurrent Resolution Z

"Concurrent resolution memorializing and petitioning the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for the assumption of a proportionate share of the bonded indebtedness of local units of government when the assessed taxable valuation in such units of government is reduced through acquisition of land by the United States

"Whereas the removal of land from the tax rolls through acquisition by the United States of America dislocates the economy of local governmental units and imposes an increased burden on the remaining property; and

"Whereas the bonded indebtedness of local governmental units where land is so acquired in substantial quantities and removed from local tax rolls, frequently is excessive for the remaining taxable property to bear; and

"Whereas the existence of local units of government is jeopardized by the imposition of such excessive burdens of taxation and indebtedness: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the senate concurring therein), That we do hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing and requiring that when 10 percent or more of the taxable property in any local taxing unit is removed from the tax rolls by acquisition by the United States of America or any agency thereof, a percentage of the bonded indebtedness of such taxing unit, equal to the percentage of the taxable valuation removed by such acquisition, will be assumed by the United States of America or the acquiring agency; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be transmitted by the secretary of state to presiding officers of each House of Congress of the United States and to the Members of the North Dakota delegation in Congress."

"House Concurrent Resolution W

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact H. R. 2369, authorizing an appropriation for the completion of the International Peace Garden

"Whereas there has been established and is being maintained on the international boundary line between the United States of America and the Dominion of Canada a park situated partly in North Dakota and partly in the Province of Manitoba and known as the International Peace Garden, which park has been established and is being maintained as a constant memorial to the peaceful relations between the United States of America and the Dominion of Canada and for the purpose of furthering international peace among the nations of the world; and

"Whereas H. R. 2369, introduced in the Eighty-first Congress of the United States and referred to the Committee on Public Lands, would authorize an appropriation for the purpose of completing the International Peace Garden in accordance with plans previously approved: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to give immediate and favorable consideration to H. R. 2369; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands, and to the North Dakota delegation in Congress."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Concurrent Resolution Y

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress and the President of the United States not to support any proposition disturbing the Rural Electrification Administration as it is presently set up and not to disturb the existing power agencies or the Government's power policy to the detriment of the people

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the senate concurring therein):

"Whereas the press is still carrying news releases and other information to the effect that task forces of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of Government are recommending that the Rural Electrification Administration be dispensed with; and

"Whereas we have other information that other task forces will or may recommend changes in legislation affecting our Government's power program: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we appeal to our Senators and Congressmen as a group and individually, and that we appeal to the President of the United States to not support any proposition that will disturb the Rural Electrification Administration as it is presently set up and to not disturb the existing power agencies or the Government's power policy to the detriment of the people; be it further

"Resolved, That the North Dakota secretary of state be requested to send a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the United States Secretary of State, to the President of the United States Senate, and to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to each of the Senators and Representatives of the State of North Dakota."

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Concurrent Resolution S

"Concurrent resolution memorializing and requesting Congress to appropriate, and to make available, funds in the form of grants-in-aid to the counties of the State of North Dakota situated in the Red River Valley for constructing works for the prevention of floods and for drains adequate for the drainage of farm lands periodically flooded by waters of melting snows in the spring, and by heavy rains in the summer, of each year

"Whereas extensive areas of fertile farm lands in the counties of North Dakota located in the Red River Valley are flooded by the waters of melting snows in the spring and by heavy rains in the summer of each year, delaying, and often making impossible, the planting or harvesting of crops on these lands; and

"Whereas these flooded lands are very productive and produce a great amount of food when crops can be planted and harvested thereon; and

"Whereas the losses sustained are a serious depletion of the national economy, amounting in the aggregate to millions of dollars; and

"Whereas the cost of construction of works for the prevention of such floods and the construction of drains sufficient for the drainage of those lands is far beyond the financial ability of land owners to pay; and

"Whereas the counties affected, and the State of North Dakota, are unable to furnish the financial assistance required: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the thirty-first legislative assembly of the State of North Dakota (the senate concurring therein)*, That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby urgently requested to appropriate not less than $2,000,000 to provide grants-in-aid to the counties of North Dakota situated in the Red River Valley to enable said counties to construct works for the prevention of floods and facilities for the adequate drainage of farm lands; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be mailed by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, to the Vice President, as the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress."

"House Concurrent Resolution T

"Whereas the Department of the Interior of the United States through its Bureau of Reclamation, and the United States Army engineers, sixth district, is now engaged in the construction of projects to impound, divert, and otherwise control waters in the State of North Dakota; and

"Whereas the construction of such projects will result in the inundation of extensive tracts of land which are a natural habitat of wildlife in the State of North Dakota, including upland game birds and deer; and

"Whereas the destruction of such natural habitat of wildlife will seriously curtail, if not completely eliminate, the production of wild game within such areas unless adequate provision is made to provide a new and suitable wildlife habitat adjacent thereto; and

"Whereas the conservation of game to provide healthful recreation for the 70,000 hunters who each year take out hunting licenses in the State has become a serious problem in North Dakota; and

"Whereas such threatened extensive curtailment of the production of wildlife will endanger the entire game production and conservation program of the State; and

"Whereas the laws of the United States (60 Stat. 965) provide: 'Whenever the waters of any stream or other body of water are authorized to be impounded, diverted, or otherwise controlled for any purpose whatever by any department or agency of the United States, * * * such department or agency shall first consult with the Fish and Wildlife Service and the head of the agency exercising administration over the wildlife resources of the State wherein the impoundment, diversion, or other control facility is to be constructed with a view to preventing loss of and damage to wildlife resources. * * * The cost of planning for and the construction or installation and maintenance of any such means and measures (to prevent destruction of wildlife) shall be included in and shall constitute an integral part of costs of such projects'; and

"Whereas the Department of the Interior, through its Bureau of Reclamation and the United States Army Engineers, sixth district, are constructing or are about to construct such projects in the State of North Dakota without having complied with the provisions of said law for the reasons that the Congress of the United States has made no specific appropriation for the planning and construction of means to prevent the destruction of wildlife in connection with its appropriations for the construction of such projects: Be it therefore

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the senate concurring therein)*:

"1. That we earnestly petition and urge the Congress of the United States to make specific and adequate appropriations for the planning and construction of means to prevent the destruction of wildlife, as an integral part of all legislation authorizing the construction of projects to impound, divert, or otherwise control waters in the State of North Dakota;

"2. That we earnestly recommend to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Chief of the Bureau of Reclamation, and to the commanding officer of the United States Army Engineers, sixth district, that they, through their authorized deputies or agents, consult with the Game and Fish Commissioner of the State of North Dakota and with him formulate a comprehensive wildlife preservation program and that they construct means and measures to prevent the destruction of, and to promote the growth of, wildlife in the areas adjacent to all projects authorized by Congress for the impounding, diversion, or control of waters in the State; that such plans include the acquisition and development of lands adjacent to inundated areas as a new habitat for wildlife; and that a portion of said areas be set aside as game refuges but that 75 to 80 percent of such areas be reserved as and designated as public shooting areas to the end that game conservation and public recreation may be adequately and proportionately maintained; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of North Dakota shall cause copies of this resolution to be sent to the President of the United States Senate; to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States; to each Member of Congress from the State of North Dakota; to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States; to the Chief of the Reclamation Bureau; and to the commanding officer of the United States Army Engineers, sixth district."

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution R

"Concurrent resolution urging the use of North Dakota material in the construction of the Garrison Dam and other projects

"Whereas the construction of the Garrison Dam and other projects in North Dakota by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army will involve the use of large quantities of gravel, sand, and other materials available in North Dakota; and

"Whereas by tests performed in Logan County in July 1948, it was found that the gravel and sand of this region are satisfactory for such use; and

"Whereas large quantities of such gravel, sand, and other materials exist in this State, and the use of such local material will result in a monetary saving in the construction of the Garrison Dam and other projects: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the house of representatives concurring therein)*, That the use of such native North Dakota material is urged and recommended; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state send copies of this resolution to the Chief of Army Engineers, Washington, D. C.; Division Office, Corps of Army Engineers, Omaha, Nebr.; the District Engineer, Corps of Army Engineers, Fort Lincoln, N. Dak.; the Commissioner of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.; regional director of the Bureau of Reclamation, Billings, Mont.; district manager, Bureau of Reclamation, Bismarck, N. Dak.; and to the North Dakota delegation in the Congress of the United States."

"Senate Concurrent Resolution I

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation providing for the maintenance of the government of the Garrison Dam area

"*Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the house of representatives concurring therein)*:

"Whereas by reason of the Missouri River improvement program now being carried on in North Dakota, unusual situations have developed in counties where a large influx of itinerant people are gathered during the construction period; and

"Whereas the United States has acquired title to lands to be used in this development and approximately 100,000 acres of land are being taken off the tax lists and are now being rented back to individuals for agricultural purposes, thus maintaining social and governmental responsibilities, such situation creates an unusual hardship on local government: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States officers in charge that, wherever they operate for profit lands taken off the tax lists, they assume full responsibility for maintaining government in such area; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the State of North Dakota send copies of this resolution to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives in Congress for incorporation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to the Senators and Representatives of this State."

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the legislature of the State of North Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

EXCLUSION OF TUTTLE CREEK DAM FROM FLOOD-CONTROL PROGRAM—RESOLUTION OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF KANSAS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I present a resolution from the lower house of the Kansas Legislature, urging that the dam known as the Tuttle Creek Dam, on the Blue River, be omitted from the flood-control program. Because this matter will come first before the Appropriations

Committee, I ask that the memorial be referred to that committee, and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD:

House Resolution 35

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to delete the present Tuttle Creek Dam project from the Pick-Sloan plan for flood control and the conservation and development of the water resources of the Missouri Valley Basin

Whereas in 1938 Congress authorized a project for the construction of a dam, commonly known as Tuttle Creek Dam, to be located on the Big Blue River about 5 miles north of Manhattan, Kans.; and

Whereas the Tuttle Creek Dam is included in the so-called Pick-Sloan plan for flood control and the conservation and development of the Missouri Valley Basin; and

Whereas if the proposed Tuttle Creek Dam is constructed it would result in the inundation of at least 60,000 acres of land when at full reservoir and at least 30,000 acres of land when at normal reservoir; and

Whereas the lands which would be inundated constitute some of the richest and most fertile areas in this State for the growing of agricultural products and the production of fat cattle and hogs; and

Whereas the proposed Tuttle Creek Dam at full reservoir would completely inundate five cities and villages in this State, namely, Stockdale, Garrison, Randolph, Cleburne, and Bigelow and partially inundate the cities of Irving and Blue Rapids, Kans.; and

Whereas the proposed Tuttle Creek Dam project was rejected by some United States Government engineers because the loss which would be occasioned by its construction was found to be greater than the benefits which would be derived from its construction; and

Whereas the benefits hoped to be secured from construction of the Tuttle Creek plan project could be secured by a program of soil conservation and upstream flood control on the Big Blue River and its tributaries; and

Whereas the persons residing in the watershed of the Big Blue River, living in both Kansas and Nebraska, have already petitioned the United States Department of Agriculture to establish a soil conservation district embracing the entire watershed of the Big Blue River: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas, That we urge and request the Congress of the United States to delete the Tuttle Creek Dam project from the Pick-Sloan plan for flood control and the development of the Missouri River Basin and not to make any appropriation of funds therefor and that it enact legislation which will authorize and provide for a plan and program of soil conservation and upstream flood control on the Big Blue River and its tributaries; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to transmit engrossed copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the chairman of the Appropriations Committees of the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives, and to the members of the Kansas delegation in the Congress of the United States.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL SOCIAL SECURITY ACT—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF MINNESOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a concurrent resolution adopted by the Minnesota State Legislature memorializing the Congress to amend the Federal Social Security Act to permit the Federal Security Agency to participate in the payment of public-assistance grants to persons residing in public hospitals or other public institutions.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal Social Security Act to permit the Federal Security Agency to participate in the payment of public assistance grants to persons residing in public hospitals or other public institutions

Whereas many needy, blind, aged, and deserving persons, particularly the senile aged, require medical, nursing, rest home, and hospital care; and

Whereas in many localities such services are available only in public hospitals and other public institutions; and

Whereas the present Federal Social Security Act prevents the Federal Security Agency from participating financially in the payment of public assistance grants to these persons; and

Whereas there is no just reason for denying these persons the right to participate in the public assistance programs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States shall take immediate steps to remove from the present Federal Social Security Act those provisions which restrict and prevent the Federal Security Agency from participating in the payment of public assistance to needy, blind, and aged persons residing in public hospitals or public institutions; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Congressman and Senator from the State of Minnesota.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

ATLANTIC PACT AND ACTIVITIES OF COMMUNIST PARTY—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF BOSTON, MASS.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and myself, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the City Council of Boston, Mass., relating to the Atlantic Pact and the activities of the Communist Party and its members.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That the City Council of the City of Boston, in meeting assembled, hereby memorializes and petitions the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, a strong Atlantic Pact, "with teeth in it," taking full advantage of every provision in the Constitution of the United States for the peace and security of the people of our own land, and the peoples of every other land who are now in danger of losing their God-given rights because of the machinations of the Soviet Union; and be it further

Resolved, That the City Council of the City of Boston favors enactment of appropriate legislation which will curb the treasonable activities of the Communist Party and its members, and its sympathizers, in our land, to the extent of outlawing, if necessary, the existence of said party within our shores.

GENERAL PULASKI'S MEMORIAL DAY—RESOLUTION OF COMMON COUNCIL OF FALL RIVER, MASS.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and myself, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Fall River, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation proclaiming October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress.

Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

Whereas the 11th day of October 1779 is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union, through legislative enactment designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and

Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated from October 1', 1929, to October 11, 1946, to be General Pulaski's Memorial Day in United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Fall River and State of Massachusetts:

SECTION 1. That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

SEC. 2. That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, and each of the United States Senators and Representatives from Massachusetts.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 1211. A bill to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 107).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 277. A bill to enhance further the security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information concerning the cryptographic systems and the communication intelligence activities of the United States; with amendments (Rept. No. 111).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 1174. A bill to amend the act of June 25, 1938, relating to the appointment of postmasters under civil service; without amendment (Rept. No. 109).

By Mr. WILLIAMS, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 928. A bill to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital now being constructed at Wilmington, Del., as the William L. Nelson Veterans' Memorial Hospital; without amendment (Rept. No. 108).

By Mr. MYERS, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. J. Res. 52. Joint resolution to authorize vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore between United States ports on the Great Lakes during the period from March 15 to December 15, 1949, inclusive; without amendment (Rept. No. 110).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Frank C. Squire, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board for a term of 5 years from August 29, 1948, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate (reappointment).

POSTMASTERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I report favorably the nominations of 267 postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nominations will be received and placed on the Executive Calendar.

NATIONAL HOUSING—SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT OF BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE (PT. 2 OF REPT. NO. 84)

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I submit a supplemental report to accompany the bill (S. 1070) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public-housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed.

AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE FILED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the 10th instant,

Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, submitted a report (No. 100) to accompany the bill (S. 1209) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, heretofore reported by that committee.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 1220. A bill to provide for the adjudication of certain tort claims of Mrs. Ada Harris against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 1221. A bill to provide for the construction of a post-office at Albion, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 1222. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to John Lone Dog; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(Mr. MUNDT (for himself and Mr. GURNEY) introduced Senate bill 1223, to provide for the national defense through the acquisition of domestically produced manganese ores and concentrates essential to the manufacture of supplies and material for the armed forces in time of emergency, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TAYLOR:

S. 1224. A bill for the relief of certain employees and former employees of the Naval Ordnance Plant, Pocatello, Idaho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1225. A bill to amend the act providing for the admission of the State of Idaho into the Union by increasing the period for which leases may be made of public lands granted to the State by such act for educational purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1226. A bill to amend section 12 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 in order that persons of German ethnic origin, born in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and now living in Germany or Austria, may enter the United States under the German and Austrian quota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1227. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Rowland; and

S. 1228. A bill for the relief of Fella H. Holbrook; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1229. A bill to enable certain former officers or employees of the United States separated from the service subsequent to January 23, 1942, to elect to forfeit their rights to civil service retirement annuities and to obtain in lieu thereof returns of their contributions with interest; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1230. A bill to provide longevity pay for postmasters;

S. 1231. A bill to repeal the limitation upon the total annual compensation of certain rural carriers serving heavily patronized routes; and

S. 1232. A bill to increase the equipment-maintenance allowance payable to rural carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. FLANDERS):

S. 1233. A bill to amend section 4 (b) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. HENDRICKSON):

S. 1234. A bill to regulate the hours of duty and the pay of civilian keepers of lighthouses and civilians employed on lightships and other vessels of the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 1235. A bill to provide for the documentation of the Canadian-built vessel *North Wind* owned by a citizen of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRICKER (for himself, Mr. CAPEHART, and Mr. WITHERS):

S. 1236. A bill providing for the establishment, equipment, and maintenance of an experiment station at or near Marietta, Ohio, to conduct researches concerning petroleum and natural gas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1237. A bill for the relief of Donato Di-Pinto; and

S. 1238. A bill for the relief of Khushad Ullah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 1239. A bill to provide for the return of rehabilitation and betterment costs of Federal reclamation projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 1240. A bill for the relief of Sabina N. Heliczer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 1241. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the Huguenot colony in Virginia; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 1242. A bill for the relief of the D. W. Electrical Contracting Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH (for himself and Mr. GREEN):

S. 1243. A bill to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred or national-defense-incurred enrollments; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1244. A bill to reimburse certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons of the Department of Justice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1245. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1246. A bill to provide clerical allowances at certain post offices of the fourth class; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McGRATH (for Mr. WAGNER):

S. 1247. A bill for the relief of the New York Quinine and Chemical Works, Inc.; Merck & Co., Inc.; and Mallinckrodt Chemical Works; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1248. A bill for the relief of Shams Uddin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1249. A bill to provide homes for city and farm families of average income, particularly those of World War II veterans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. J. Res. 60. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the expenditure of public moneys in aid of foreign nations and peoples; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ACQUISITION OF MANGANESE ORES FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for acquisition of manganese ores for the national defense, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory statement presented by the Senator from South Dakota will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1223) to provide for the national defense through the acquisition of domestically produced manganese ores and concentrates essential to the manufacture of supplies and material for the armed forces in time of emergency, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MUNDT (for himself and Mr. GURNEY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The explanatory statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT IN CONJUNCTION WITH BILL ON MANGANESE INTRODUCED BY SENATOR MUNDT

Manganese is one of the vital elements essential to our national defense. In the long run it may prove more important to our national security and the perpetuation of our American way of life than multibillion-dollar grants abroad, defensive alliances, or a foreign policy which negates in Asia everything for which it professes to stand in Europe.

Up to now much of this indispensable ingredient called manganese has come to us in imports from Russia—in fact we have been receiving about 35 percent of our manganese imports from Russia. In the event that this supply should be shut off to us completely our entire steel fabricating industry would be seriously crippled. Consequently it becomes imperative that we develop our own sources of manganese and that we stock-pile sufficient of this metal to safeguard our security. The legislation which I have today introduced on behalf of Senator GURNEY and myself is designed to accomplish these specific objectives. Similar bills have been introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman MARTIN of Iowa and Congressman MILLS of Arkansas.

Yesterday's press carried reports that the Russian Government is now curtailing its shipments of strategic manganese to the United States by a sharp 70 percent. Russia is within her rights in such a move but it should be clear handwriting on the wall for all to see that legislation such as we are today introducing should receive the prompt and favorable attention of this Congress.

The price tag the Russians are placing on the lifting of their partial embargo on manganese going to the United States is that this country should export to the U. S. S. R. the machine tools and other war supplies that country covets so avidly. Mr. President, that price tag is too high. It will—to quote the phrase of a former President who used it for a less defensible purpose—be "both better and infinitely cheaper" to produce and procure our own manganese by developing such great areas of deposit as we have in the State of South Dakota and as are located also in other regions of this Republic.

TERRITORIAL WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. TYDINGS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 83), which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Armed Services, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation to determine what legislation may be appropriate to define and delimit the territorial waters of the United States, which definition shall (a) be consistent with the sovereignty of the several States and the international rights and obligations of the United States, (b) give due regard to the requirements of the national defense, of commerce, and of the conservation, development, and utilization of the resources of the marginal seas, and (c) observe the constitutional rights of the several States in their relationship to the national economy and the national defense. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $35,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN COMPACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCARRAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 790) to grant the consent of the United States to the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE—AMENDMENT

Mr. McMAHON submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him to the resolution (S. Res. 15) amending the so-called cloture rule of the Senate; which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PRINTING OF SUMMARY OF REPORTS OF COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT (S. DOC. NO. 28)

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], chairman of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I present a summary of the reports heretofore issued by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, including appendices and other supporting documents, and ask unanimous consent that it may be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following concurrent resolutions were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

H. Con. Res. 18. Concurrent resolution authorizing a reprint of Supplement III (Country Studies A, B, and C) of the report of the Subcommittee on National and International Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, entitled "The Strategy and Tactics of World Communism," for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs; and

H. Con. Res. 44. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 401, Eightieth Congress, entitled "Fascism in Action."

PRODUCTION OF FERTILIZER IN JAPAN

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter just received from the State department of agriculture of my State, the letter having to do with the manufacture of fertilizer. Attached to the letter is a short news article clipped from the New York Journal of Commerce. I ask that that be printed also.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Oklahoma City, March 7, 1949.

Hon. ELMER THOMAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Enclosed herewith is copy of a news dispatch which appeared in the New York Journal of Commerce on March 1, 1949, which includes the following: "Production of chemical fertilizers in Japan is nearing the 1941 prewar record. The Japanese Government's Ministry of Commerce has estimated 1948 production at: 917,000 metric tons ammonium sulphate, 997,000 metric tons superphosphate, 227,000 metric tons calcium cyanamide."

I have copy of your extension of remarks, entitled "Report on Nitrogenous Fertilizer," published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD February 7, which stated that the Department of the Army will supply to Japan and the Ryukyus 88,577 short tons of nitrogen during this fiscal year. I am not informed as to the cost of supplying this nitrogen, but based upon current prices and transportation charges, it will probably cost the taxpayers $20,000,000. The report also states that the requirements for Japan will increase by approximately one-third next year.

Before the war Japan was a large exporter of fertilizer. Now that its prewar production is resumed, it is difficult to understand why it is necessary for the Congress to appropriate funds to supply fertilizer to Japan, especially in view of the critical shortage of fertilizers in this country. Our farmers in the middle western States who are heavily burdened with taxes, part of which pay the cost of the foreign-relief program, are unable to buy the fertilizer they need.

Knowing your interest in the welfare of the farmers of our Nation, I am calling this situation to your attention.

Cordially yours,

HAROLD HUTTON.

[From the New York Journal of Commerce of March 1, 1949]

JAPAN FERTILIZER IS NEAR PREWAR—JANUARY OUTPUT EXCEEDS GOALS; HIGHER INSECTICIDE PRODUCTION PLANNED

TOKYO, February 28.—Production of chemical fertilizers in Japan is nearing the 1941 prewar record.

The Japanese Government's Ministry of Commerce has estimated 1948 production at 917,000 metric tons of ammonium sulphate, 997,000 tons of superphosphate, and 227,000 tons of calcium cyanamide.

EXCEEDS GOALS

Output in January 1949 far exceeded production schedules for the month. The good records were due to improved delivery of pyrites and coal and to the extra hydroelectric power made available for industry during the unseasonably warm weather which Japan has had this winter.

January production of ammonium sulfate totaled 81,292 metric tons, which was 124 percent of the goal. The output of superphosphate was 98,491 metric tons, or 109 percent of the goal. Calcium cyanamide production was 17,173 metric tons which was 122 percent of the goal.

SAUDI ARABIAN PIPE LINE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD correspondence which I have had with various Government agencies and references I have made to various standing committees of the Senate, in connection with the Saudi-Arabian pipe line, a subject which was under investigation by the Senate Small Business Committee for a number of months prior to its expiration.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 8, 1949.

Hon. MILLARD E. TYDINGS, *Chairman,*
Committee on Armed Services,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: The Senate Small Business Committee which has now expired, and of which I was chairman in the Eightieth Congress, investigated as a phase of its steel studies, the export of large quantities of steel pipe and other steel for the development of Middle East oil projects. One of these is the Saudi Arabian pipe line, which is being constructed by the Trans-Arabian Pipeline Co., a subsidiary of the Arabian-American Oil Co.

Independent petroleum producers in this country, and other users of steel and tubular goods protested that the export of large tonnages of steel to develop Middle East oil interests was causing hardship, and hampering the development of oil resources in the United States.

Starting in October 1947, the Senate Small Business Committee waged a continuous battle against shipments of steel for the Saudi Arabian pipe line. The committee was told in its first hearing that the decision to make the allotment of steel, in the height of the domestic shortage, was at Cabinet level, in what was referred to as the public interest. Subsequent hearings for over a year failed to reveal what that public interest was. Over 450,000 tons of steel were originally allotted for the project, to be shipped over a period of 2 years; 360,000 tons of which would be steel pipe and tubing.

It is not necessary to go into a long discussion of committee hearings on the subject, which are available in printed volumes. A summary of the investigation is contained in a statement by the chairman made on the floor of the Senate on May 10, 1948, a copy of which is enclosed.

On June 18, 1948, the committee was able to secure a commitment from the Department of Commerce that shipments of steel pipe for the main-line construction of the Saudi Arabian pipe line would be held in abeyance, until further investigation by the Department of Commerce. The Secretary of State, the Secretary of National Defense, and the Secretary of Commerce all agreed at that time that no further shipments of main-line pipe would be made between that time and January 1, 1949, without prior advice to the Senate Small Business Committee.

As of January 31, 1949, the Senate Small Business Committee expired. As far as holding hearings or carrying on committee business, its authority passed out of existence on December 31, 1948. On February 24, 1949, the Secretary of Commerce issued a press release to the effect that licensing of steel pipe to the Trans-Arabian Pipe Line Co. was being resumed to the extent of 25,000 tons of 30-inch pipe in the first quarter of 1949. In other words, as soon as the watchdog committee went out of business, the licensing of pipe for the construction of the pipe line continued.

As a matter of fact, shipments of steel and steel pipe (other than the 30-inch main-line pipe) continued to go forward to Saudi Arabia unabated during the second, third, and fourth quarters of 1948. In this respect the Secretary of Commerce's press release of February 24 is misleading in that it only refers to a total of 260,000 tons of main-line pipe required for the line, and fails to enumerate the other large tonnages of steel and other gages of pipe originally estimated to total 480,000 tons.

Secretary Sawyer's release further states that he had received the recommendation of the Department of State, the National Military Establishment, the Department of the Interior, and the Economic Cooperation Administration last fall that licensing of pipe for the line be resumed. Yet, in the experience of the Senate Small Business Committee in hearings up through June 18, 1948, the Department of State was very leery of the project; the Department of the Interior only approved it because of a shortage of tankers (which are no longer in such short supply); and the National Defense Establishment did not then, and does not now, seemingly, endorse the operation.

Enclosed is copy of a release from the National Military Establishment dated February 26, 1949, stating that it did not participate in the decision, and that "justification for the issuance of the export licenses for steel must be based primarily upon considerations other than military. The economic and political considerations involved are matters upon which other departments are more qualified to comment than is the National Military Establishment."

Secretary Sawyer further remarks in his press release that the saving to the Arabian-American Oil Co., which will result by the construction of the pipe line, is to be shared with the National Military Establishment.

"Negotiations between the company," the release says, "and the National Military Establishment on this question were begun in late November, and concluded in February 1949.

"The company has now agreed to transport for the National Military Establishment, at cost, substantial quantities of oil from the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean, for a period of 10 years after completion of the pipe line."

As I am sure you know, the Trans-Arabian pipe line proposes to run 1,100 miles across the Saudi Arabian desert, across Transjordan, across Syria to a Mediterranean outlet at Beirut, Lebanon. According to testimony before the committee last June, the Arabian-American Oil Co. did not have clearance for its line across Syria and there were other difficulties with the Arab states. Even under favorable conditions the line could not be completed until late 1950.

The announcement of an agreement between the Arabian-American Oil Co. and the Military Establishment introduces a further serious question. The pipe line is designed to transport crude oil. The National Military Establishment does not use crude oil. This would seem to require the construction of a refinery at the Mediterranean outlet, on the strength of the agreement. Furthermore, does not an agreement between the Military Establishment and Arabian-American Oil, or a commitment on oil to be held in reserve, establish a property right for the United States Government in the pipe line?

These are additional matters upon which investigation should be made. For this reason I am referring the matter to several standing committees whose interests I believe are involved in the problem: Banking and Currency on export controls; Armed Services in connection with agreements which the National Military Establishment may have undertaken; the Judiciary Committee which may be interested in the authority of an executive agency to enter into such contracts and the implications thereunder; the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which investigated so ably the question of oil for the Navy last year; and the Senate Investigating Subcommittee.

As far as the Senate Small Business Committee is concerned, its last statement in the matter was contained in the final report on steel supply and distribution. That report anticipated that shipments for the pipe line would be resumed and warned that large shipments of steel to Saudi Arabia and to other Middle East oil developments should be a matter of further senatorial investigation.

While it is true that the Department of Commerce has reduced exports of steel in the over-all in the past year, the supply of steel pipe and tubing, sheet and plate are still far short of meeting domestic demand. No one denies that Middle East oil is necessary to meet the needs of western European recovery. However, the building of the pipe line has nothing to do with increasing oil supply; it provides only a more economical means of transportation.

Under normal supply conditions, no one would contest the right of private enterprise to buy and send steel to the Middle East or to any other location, but the Department of Commerce itself has found that steel supply is some 7,000,000 tons below current demand. As long as this condition exists, large diversions of steel must be prevented that would be better used, under any circumstances, in developing oil resources nearer home.

The Military Establishment has stated that 50 percent of the world's supply of oil lies in the Western Hemisphere. The Armed Services Petroleum Board has stated that "the military need for oil from a strategic defense point of view can best come from the Western Hemisphere."

I am enclosing for the attention of your committee the references mentioned herein, and a copy of the Senate Small Business Committee's Steel Report. I urge your inquiry into the problems which this material suggests.

Cordially yours,

KENNETH S. WHERRY.

(Copies to Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK, chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, United States Senate; Hon. CLYDE R. HOEY, chairman, Senate Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, United States Senate; Hon. EDWIN C. JOHNSON, chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, United States Senate; Hon. PAT MCCARRAN, chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate.)

MARCH 8, 1949.

Hon. CHARLES SAWYER,
Secretary of Commerce,
Commerce Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SECRETARY SAWYER: I was very interested to note the Department of Commerce's press release of February 24, and the announcement that the licensing of mainline pipe for construction of the Saudi Arabian pipe line is being resumed.

In the fourth paragraph of the release you are quoted as stating that the Department of State, the National Military Establishment, the Department of the Interior, and the Economic Cooperation Administration recommended last fall that the licensing of line pipe for the project be resumed. I would greatly appreciate having a copy of these endorsements which you received from these agencies last fall, or in connection with your recent action. It is fully realized, of course, that the Secretary of Commerce has final authority, under the law, for granting the licenses.

You further state in the press release that "a thorough and intensive study of the proposal" has been made by the Department of Commerce. I would also appreciate receiving a copy of this study which, I am sure, will describe the importance of the Saudi Arabian pipe line to the domestic economy; how it will facilitate the development of petroleum resources of the Middle East; and explain the importance to our national and international policies of raising the level of economic activity in that area.

I have written to Mr. Keeney, Under Secretary of the Navy, separately asking him for a copy of the agreement which the National Military Establishment has entered into with Arabian-American Oil Company. You state it was an important factor in connection with resumption of steel shipments to construct the pipe line.

You will be interested, I believe, in the enclosed copy of the final report on Steel Supply and Distribution issued by the Senate Small Business Committee, which refers to the Saudi Arabian pipe line; to exports of steel in general; and to a number of other recommendations which involve the interests of the Department of Commerce.

Cordially yours,

KENNETH S. WHERRY.

MARCH 8, 1949.

Hon. W. JOHN KENNEY,
Under Secretary of the Navy, Department of the Navy, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. KENNEY: I am writing to you directly because of your responsibility, in behalf of the National Military Establishment, in connection with the Saudi Arabian pipe-line project.

The release of the Department of Commerce dated February 24, announcing the resumption of shipments of main-line pipe to Saudi-Arabia, and a subsequent release by the National Military Establishment on February 26, have been interesting to me. Copies of the releases to which I refer are attached.

It is noted that Secretary Sawyer states that he has had the recommendation of the National Military Establishment since last fall for resumption of steel shipments for the pipe-line construction. Yet in your release of February 26, it is implied that the National Military Establishment, within its area of authority, did not participate in the decision to resume licensing to the Trans-Arabian Pipeline Co.

Secretary Sawyer refers in his release to an agreement between the National Military Establishment and the Arabian-American Oil Co., which seems to call for delivery of oil at the proposed Mediterranean outlet for a period of 10 years. He states this agreement was an important consideration in the decision to permit further exports of steel for the pipe line.

No mention of this arrangement is made in your release of February 26. I would appreciate very much a copy of this agreement, on which negotiations began in November and were concluded on February 18, 1949. Your advice on this matter is requested at the earliest possible moment.

Cordially yours,

KENNETH S. WHERRY.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
Washington, February 24, 1949.

Approval of a license for the export of 25,000 tons of 30-inch steel pipe to be used by the Trans-Arabian Pipeline was announced today by Secretary of Commerce Charles Sawyer. This was the first export license granted for this purpose since April 1948, when licensing was suspended primarily because of disturbed conditions in the Middle East.

Today's action brings the total amount thus far authorized by the Department of Commerce for this pipe line to about 79,000 tons. The entire pipe line, which is to run 1,067 miles across the Arabian peninsula, is estimated to require a total of 260,000 tons of line pipe.

In making the announcement, Secretary Sawyer stated that during the period when licensing was suspended, the Trans-Arabian Pipeline Co. released for domestic use about 65,000 tons of pipe which had been produced for its account. This tonnage was transferred to domestic natural gas pipe lines being expanded to provide additional gas to the Pacific coast and Appalachian areas. The company has agreed to release additional amounts of pipe for domestic use during the next few months.

"The Department of State, National Military Establishment, Department of the Interior, and the Economic Cooperation Administration recommended last fall that the Department of Commerce resume the licensing of line pipe for this project," Secretary Sawyer said. "Action was deferred pending the completion of a thorough and intensive study of the proposal by the Department of Commerce. It was clear from this study that construction of the pipe line, which is being financed entirely by capital supplied by private American firms, would facilitate the development of the petroleum resources of the Middle East, and raise the level of economic activity in that area. The pipe line when completed is expected to permit the movement of oil from the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean at a cost greatly below that of tanker transportation. The study showed also that, despite sharp increases in steel production in the United States, line pipe is still in seriously short supply in this country.

"In view of the shortage of steel in the domestic economy, and in view of the requirements of the military agencies for oil in the Mediterranean area, the Department of Commerce suggested to the company that it consider the possibility of sharing with the United States Government some of the transportation savings which would result from completion of the Trans-Arabian line. Negotiations between the company and the National Military Establishment on this question were begun in late November, and concluded on February 18, 1949.

"The company has now agreed to transport for the National Military Establishment, at cost, substantial quantities of oil from the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean, for a period of 10 years after completion of the pipe line. The use of the pipe line, instead of tankers, for this movement is expected to result in a substantial financial saving to the United States Government."

NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT,
Department of the Navy,
Washington, D. C., February 26, 1949.

In response to numerous inquiries as to the interest of the National Military Establishment in the license recently granted by the Secretary of Commerce for exportation of steel pipe for the construction of the Trans-Arabian pipe line, W. John Kenney, Under Secretary of the Navy stated that the Secretary of Commerce had been advised that the position of the National Military Establishment was that—"the justification for the issuance of the export licenses for steel for the construction of the pipe line must be based primarily upon considerations other than military. The economic and political considerations involved are matters upon which other departments are more qualified to comment than is the National Military Establishment."

The Secretary of Defense did not participate in the determination of the desirability for the issuance of this export license as Mr. Kenney had been designated to represent the National Military Establishment in this matter.

Mr. Kenney is Chairman of the Armed Services Petroleum Board and as such has the responsibility and general supervision over all petroleum matters affecting the National Military Establishment.

EXCERPT FROM FINAL REPORT ON STEEL SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION REFERRING TO THE SAUDI ARABIAN PIPE LINE (S. REPT. NO. 43, ISSUED BY THE SENATE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE)

Both the Steel and Oil Subcommittees of the Senate Small Business Committee have made continuous efforts over the past year and a half to put before the Senate and the public the full facts concerning the building of the Saudi Arabian pipe line—and the export of large quantities of steel for that project.

Hearings have been held on the subject since October 9, 1947, and various statements have been made on the effects of this project upon the domestic economy by various members of the committee, including a complete résumé of the situation made on the floor of the Senate by Chairman KENNETH S. WHERRY on May 10, 1948. (See appendix A.)

In spite of this complete record, many of the major points of consideration in the controversy have been largely overlooked in the press, and misleading statements by public officials have clouded the issue (hearings, pts. 21, 22, 33, 40).

For example, the general impression has been given that the Saudi Arabian pipe line will increase production of oil. As far as its proponents have testified before the Steel and Oil Subcommittees, it is not being built to increase oil production at any point, but to provide a more economical means of transportation of the oil from the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean.

Statements have also been made that the building of the pipe line is necessary in order to relieve the strain upon tanker transportation, which has been said to be in a state of world-wide shortage. Yet the facts are that tankers are now being used, and will continue to be used to carry the 350,000 to 400,000 barrel-per-day production of the Saudi Arabian oil fields. And they will continue to be used, if and when the pipe line is completed approximately 2 years hence, to transport the oil from the proposed Mediterranean outlet to various points of consumption.

Less tankers may be needed then than are used now for the long haul around through the Suez Canal, but the fact remains that the building of a pipe line across Saudi Arabia is a matter of economics for the

owners of the Arabian-American Oil Co.,[1] rather than of increasing oil production.

It was also stated in steel and oil subcommittee hearings that the building of the pipe line, which will require 480,000 tons of steel (360,000 tons of which is steel pipe and tubing), is a more economical use of steel than to build tankers to add to those then available for Middle East oil transportation.

When that argument was put forth in October 1947 (hearings, pts. 21, 22), the United States Maritime Commission was arranging for the sale of 100 United States T-2 type tankers to foreign purchasers, at a terrific loss to coastwise oil shipping in the United States. In spite of protests by this committee, 83 of those tankers were approved for sale by the Attorney General in December 1947. Since that sale a huge new tanker-building program has been promoted to replace those tankers sold and to further relieve the so-called "world shortage" of tankers. This program within the past several months has been allocated 440,000 tons of steel plate (under the voluntary allocation plan provided by Public Law 395), with which 81 supertype tankers will be built.

At this point, not only is the Saudi Arabian pipe-line project being built with at least 122,000 tons of steel pipe and tubing (authorized from fourth quarter, 1947, through third quarter, 1948),[2] but 83 United States tankers have been put into foreign service, and steel has been allocated to build new tankers, which only a few months ago the committee was told the pipe line was supposed to replace.

The committee has tried to adduce testimony from the National Defense Establishment and from other responsible Government officials as to the practicability and defensibility of Middle East oil projects as compared with devoting the same quantity of steel to projects in the United States or in the Western Hemisphere.

This became such a point at issue in hearings that on March 17 the then Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Harriman, deferred the licensing of further steel for the Saudi Arabian pipe line, pending the advice of Secretary of Defense Forrestal.

At that hearing, also, the Assistant Secretary of State, Willard L. Thorp (hearings, p. 3680), was quoted as stating:

"It would be very stupid to be inflexible about a policy of granting export licenses for steel to build refineries and pipe lines in Saudi Arabia. The security and stability of the lease is uncertain. I think it is necessary to review our position regarding future export licenses."

Col. G. H. Vogel, of the Armed Services Petroleum Board (hearings, p. 3692), also testified, in answer to a question from the chairman, as follows:

"The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask you this question: With the availability of nearly 50 percent of the petroleum (in the world) in proven reserves located in the Western Hemisphere, from the military point of view and speaking now with reference to security and national defense, would you feel that it would be preferable to develop those reserves here or would it be just as wise to go to other parts of the world to do it?

"Colonel VOGEL. Certainly the military need for oil from a strategic defense point of view can best come from the Western Hemisphere."

It is obvious from its location on the map that the Saudi Arabian pipe line is not a defensible project from the standpoint of national defense.

It is equally true that the oil which is coming from the Arabian-American Oil Co.'s producing fields in Saudi Arabia—and from other producing fields in the Middle East—is invaluable to relieve the needs of western European countries that could not be served otherwise without strain upon Western Hemisphere resources.

That point has not been debated by the committee. In fact, the Senate Small Business Committee has put forth no objection to the continued shipment of minimum quantities of steel needed to increase production in the producing fields, even though such exports are a constant source of irritation to the smaller, independent oil producers in this country who are having great difficulty in getting steel.

The decision as to whether further shipments of steel would be approved for the Saudi Arabian pipe line was still in abeyance and in the hands of the National Defense Establishment as the session of Congress drew to a close in June 1948.

In the meantime, May 1948, a new Secretary of Commerce had been appointed, Mr. Charles Sawyer, and the problem which had been see-sawing back and forth between Mr. Harriman and Mr. Forrestal, automatically reverted to Mr. Sawyer, as the final authority in controlling exports.

In order to assure that the interests of the Senate Small Business Committee would be protected during the recess of Congress, Chairman WHERRY called an executive meeting on June 18, which was attended by Secretary of State Marshall, Secretary of National Defense Forrestal, Secretary of Commerce Sawyer, and Assistant Secretary of the Navy W. John Kenney. Following that meeting Secretary Sawyer announced that applications by the Trans-Arabian Pipe Line Co. for licenses to ship steel pipe in the second and third quarters of 1948 had been canceled until further consideration by the Department of Commerce. Secretary Sawyer agreed at that meeting that he would advise the committee when and if further licenses were considered.

In preparation of the final reports of the steel subcommittee and the oil subcommittee, the committee staff reviewed the situation on licensing of steel to Saudi Arabia and found that the two quarterly reports by the Secretary of Commerce on Export Control and Allocation Powers, published since the meeting on June 18, showed licensing of steel-mill products, including pipe and tubing, to Saudi Arabia. A further break-down secured from the Special Projects Branch, Office of International Trade, showed the following tonnages of steel licenses to Saudi Arabia in the second and third quarters of 1948:

TABULATION IV.—*Steel-mill products licensed, Saudi Arabia*

	Second quarter, 1948, short tons	Third quarter, 1948, short tons
Bars	316	598
Structural shapes	1,672	8,291
Sheets and strip	9	193
Plate	1,819	3,188
Wire and wire rods	184	359
Pipe and tubing	5,201	5,871
Rails and accessories		230
All other	13	90
Total	9,504	18,917

On December 27, 1948, the chairman addressed a letter to the Secretary of Commerce, drawing his attention to these figures in his published reports and asking for more information regarding the shipment of pipe and steel to Saudi Arabia, and to other Middle East oil projects.

The Secretary of Commerce was prompt to inform the committee, on December 31, that the Department of Commerce had adhered to the letter of its agreement, and assured the chairman that no licenses for line pipe have been issued to the Trans-Arabian Pipe Line Co. since his understanding with the committee on June 18. A fine line of distinction was made in Secretary Sawyer's letter between (1) main-line pipe and other pipe and tubing licensed to the Trans-Arabian Pipe Line Co., and (2) pipe and tubing and other steel licensed to the Saudi Arabian oil-field development. It is quite true, the Department of Commerce's commitment referred only to licenses issued to the Trans-Arabian Pipe Line Co., and not to licenses issued to Saudi Arabia, to be used for improving and increasing oil production in the Arabian-American Oil Co. fields.

There is only one oil project in Saudi Arabia, and that is owned by the Arabian-American Oil Co., of which the Trans-Arabian Pipe Line Co. is an operating subsidiary.

The splitting of hairs as to what phase of the Saudi Arabian oil project has received or continues to receive large quantities of steel is beside the point. What is important is that thousands of tons of steel pipe and other steel are going into a pipe line across the Saudi Arabian desert that might better have been spent in developing oil projects nearer home.[3] The Steel Subcommittee has been able to do nothing more than secure a partial curtailment. And there is no assurance that further exports for the actual pipe line will not be resumed at any time the Secretary of Commerce deems it advisable.

At the same time, shipments of steel pipe and steel to other middle east projects have increased appreciably. The Kuwait oil project (owned by Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., Ltd., and Gulf Exploration Co.) was licensed 25,612 tons of steel pipe and tubing in the second and third quarters of 1948; 11,650 tons of heavy-line pipe was licensed to the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., Ltd. (owned by the British Government, Burma Oil Co., and other individuals), in the second quarter of 1948, for bringing oil to port side from the Agha Jari fields. The committee knew of this latter license, but understood it would result directly in production that would in turn bring a delivery of 40,000 barrels of its 100,000-barrel daily production to the United States. It will take approximately 2 years to complete this installation, also, and the committee has recently been informed that it is doubtful that the 40,000 barrels will ever be forthcoming to the United States.

These and other shipments of steel abroad need to be accurately reported as to their use, and gaged as to the strain they are putting upon supplies available for the domestic economy and for developing oil resources nearer home; and their relative importance for carrying out our foreign policies.

The Secretary of Commerce has advised this committee that he has recently established an interdepartmental requirements committee to weigh "just such factors" in the consideration of export quotas. Under this committee there is also a projects subcommittee "which reviews in great technical detail every petroleum or other project of importance." This is very reassuring to the committee, in the light of the ineffectiveness of the previous interdepartmental export advisory group set up by the Department of Commerce.

It is urgently recommended by the Steel Subcommittee that the Senate Small Business Committee or its successor committee secure from the Secretary of Commerce all current export data on exports of steel to the Middle East and Far East oil projects, and,

[1] The joint owners of the Arabian-American Oil Co. are the Texas Co., Standard Oil of California, Standard Oil of New Jersey, and Socony Vacuum Co.

[2] Steel pipe was free of export control, May to September 1947. Controls were reimposed at insistence of this committee.

[3] Article in November 12 Christian Science Monitor quotes Trans-Arabian official as stating 145 miles of pipe line have been laid, and work is progressing at rate of 5 miles per week.

in fact, licensing of steel for all "special projects," accompanied by a full justification therefor, in relation to the purposes and objectives pertaining to export control set forth in Public Law 188 (the Second Decontrol Act of 1947).

REPORT 523

INDEPENDENT PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., March 1, 1949.

The announcement of February 24 that shipments of pipe for the Trans-Arabian pipe line are to be resumed under export licenses issued by the Department of Commerce raises questions which can be answered only by the participants in this transaction.

Such questions are apparent from a reading of the news release, copy of which is enclosed with this letter.

A properly constituted inquiry might find it in the public interest to try to develop the following points:

1. What formal, signed agreement has been made between the companies operating in Saudi Arabia and the National Military Establishment, or is the word "agreed" in the final paragraph of the release used to cover a verbal understanding?

2. If a formal agreement exists, has the National Military Establishment agreed to perform any service for the other parties to the agreement? Protection and defense of the properties, for instance.

3. Is there any authority in law for a 10-year agreement between the National Military Establishment? Normally, authorizations for work to be done or programs to be carried on are on an annual basis.

4. Does the agreement, in effect, establish a property right for the United States Government in the pipe line?

5. The pipe line is designed to transport crude oil. The National Military Establishment does not use crude oil. What further steps would be taken at the Mediterranean end of the line to convert the oil transported for the account of the military into usable products?

The events leading to this latest decision are unexplained. All we have is this announcement that the Government has blessed the enterprise and that the export of the pipe will be resumed. Nor has the confusion been lessened or the responsibility fixed by the statement of the National Military Establishment which came 2 days after the Sawyer release. Save that it seems to contradict the Sawyer assertion that the military recommended issuance of licenses and disclaims military necessity and responsibility, we are no further along. We need a great many answers. The Brewster Committee got some of them last year and they were rather terrifying to those who believe that decency in public office and in industry is essential to the survival of our form of government.

The statement of the Military Establishment is also reproduced and enclosed with this letter. It will be noted that the existence of an agreement between that service and the company as implied in the Sawyer statement is not denied, or even mentioned; merely that the Secretary of Commerce should not use military considerations as a primary reason for the issuance of export license.

The approval of license for 25,000 tons may not sound imposing but the fact that licensing has been resumed after a lapse of nearly a year indicates that additional licenses will be issued as needed. There is, incidentally, a large discrepancy between the statements of total tonnage involved. The press release of February 24 says that 260,000 tons will be required for the 1,067 miles of line. The final report of the Senate Small Business Committee, dated February 10—the Wherry committee—says that the line "will require 480,000 tons of steel (360,000 tons of which is steel pipe and tubing) * * *.

There is agreement between the Senate committee and the Secretary of Commerce on one point. The Senate report referred to said:

"Less tankers may be needed than are used now for the long haul around the Suez Canal, but the fact remains that the building of a pipe line across Saudi Arabia is a matter of economics for the owners of the Arabian-American Oil Co. rather than of increasing oil production."

The press release which is enclosed says that "the pipe line when completed is expected to permit the movement of oil from the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean at a cost greatly below that of tanker transportation."

There is no talk today of tanker shortage, as there was when the representatives of the Arabian-American company appeared by request on our program in Oklahoma City at our annual meeting in 1947 and later when the same argument was given to the Wherry committee. It is and always has been "a matter of economics." The economic advantage which Middle East oil already has over the high-cost, high-tax domestic production would be further increased by the pipe line.

The green light has been given to this program by a combination of agencies of Government, as the release shows. Secretary Sawyer speaks in his release of a thorough and intensive study of the pipe line project by his Department. It is not indicated whether this study resulted in a written report, or was one of those unrecorded findings which have been the basis for much official action in recent years.

Last June 18, as reported soon after, Senator Wherry held an executive session with Secretary of State Marshall, Secretary of National Defense Forrestal, Secretary of Commerce Sawyer and Under Secretary of the Navy Kenney. The Senate committee report previously referred to says that "Secretary Sawyer agreed at that meeting that he would advise the committee when and if further licenses were considered."

It would appear that this agreement was not kept, for the Sawyer press release says that four agencies of Government recommended last fall that licensing be resumed.

It is impossible to view this latest development as anything except one more step in a decision made long ago. Through all the evasions, the dodging and the squirming that has occurred over a period of 8 years, there has run one consistent thread. The Government of the United States was committed by certain officials to a course of securing the position of the oil companies which held the Arabian concession.

This was revealed in the hearings last year of the Brewster committee. The millions of dollars of public funds and the materials which were sent to Arabia placated a restless king and eased the burden of the companies. A few days ago a jury in New York awarded a former official of the companies which are part of the Arabian-American family more than $1,000,000 for services in bringing the needs of the companies to the attention of the right people in Government and getting the flow of public money started. The magazine, Newsweek, remarked that "for the first time, an official rate of pay was set up for influence."

There was the matter of the proposed Government pipe line across Saudi Arabia. Harold L. Ickes, then Secretary of the Interior, announced the project in early 1944. It was subsequently revealed that before the pipeline scheme was decided on, an attempt was made to buy stock in the companies operating in Saudi Arabia. Either way, the Government would have gone into business in the Middle East. The reaction in Congress was swift and heated. In response to a resolution in the Senate to kill the project by dissolving the Government corporation which would construct the line, a committee of 11 was created. The late Senator Francis Maloney was chairman. He held several executive sessions and announced that he had assurance that nothing would be done without further consultation. As a Government undertaking the pipe line was abandoned.

In the announcement by Ickes it was said that an agreement had been made which would reserve for the Navy 1,000,000,000 barrels of oil, at a price below the going market price. It was presumed that this agreement ended when the Government pipe line was killed. Yet, in the November 27, 1948, issue of the Saturday Evening Post, in an article, Allah's Oil, Author Leigh White referred to a reservation of 1,000,000,000 barrels of oil for the Navy in Saudi Arabia at a discount of 25 percent below market price. Mr. White went to the Middle East to get the material for his articles. An editor of the Post wrote us that a Government official was the authority for the statement mentioned above.

There are many things about the whole affair that American citizens are entitled to know. If the full purpose which has been so obvious and so persistent is realized, the safety of the United States will be greatly endangered. It has been conceded by officials of our Government that the Middle East oil fields, refineries and pipe lines could not be defended successfully, yet they go ahead with actions which seem to indicate that there would be an attempt to make a defense. If the Military Establishment has been given something—a stake in the project—that would constitute an obligation to back up the rights with arms. Again, this is a question that should be determined openly.

A more threatening aspect of the Government sponsorship of the Arabian development is the fact that it contemplates a dependence by the United States on this area for much of its military supplies of petroleum. In the event of war with Russia, the entire development in the Middle East area would be of no more value to us than was the Canol project of the recent war.

Very truly yours,

RUSSELL B. BROWN,
General Counsel.

THE MENACE OF COMMUNISM

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, no doubt each of my colleagues receives numerous communications from organizations in their States concerning the critical problem of the menace of communism. Within the last few months I for one have received innumerable messages, letters and resolutions on this issue.

I send to the desk three communications from three diverse groups, each of which has made and is making an important contribution to clear thinking and action. I believe that the sentiments expressed in these messages deserve not only my careful attention but the attention of my colleagues, in order that together, in a democratic way, without hysteria, without witch-hunting, but with firmness and clear vision, we may meet head-on the menace of subversive groups and individuals.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that these messages be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRATERNAL ORDER OF EAGLES,
SUCCESS AERIE 1954,
Hartford, Wis.

Hon. Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: No doubt you will be receiving many letters similar to the one we are writing you. The Fraternal Order of Eagles is sponsoring and advocating the support of all our Senators and Representatives to use all their efforts and influence in passing legislation that will outlaw communism or any other ism that is un-American.

This being the month of February and the birthdays of two of our most outstanding Americans George Washington and Abraham Lincoln, it should be especially proper that at this time we use all our efforts in defeating communism in every shape and form.

We are therefore asking you to support any good sound legislation that will defeat communism and that you will use your voice and influence to see to it that we will not be overrun with these sort of fellows in America. Your comments will be greatly appreciated.

Fraternally yours,
ROBERT T. HEINTZ,
Secretary.

KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS,
WATERLOO COUNCIL, No. 1669,
Waterloo, Wis.

Honorable Senator WILEY:

Whereas the Waterloo Council, Knights of Columbus, has this day at its regular meeting discussed the menace of communism to all Christian or religious organizations in this country, or in fact, in the world; and

Whereas the Constitution of these United States of America provides for the freedom of religious worship;

Therefore, we the undersigned strongly urge you to take whatever action is in your power to immediately exterminate any and all Communists from this our beloved country.

Sincerely yours,
ALVIN T. JOYCE,
Grand Knight.

FOND DU LAC COUNCIL OF
CATHOLIC WOMEN,
Fond du Lac, Wis.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILEY: Our organization has a very active legislative committee which carries on a spirited discussion at each meeting on current topics. Naturally one of our biggest peeves is the way the Communists are allowed entry into this country and the license granted them under freedom of speech to down the United States and declare allegiance to Russia.

It seems a very weak defense to invite traitors and treason at a time which is so static. Is it necessary to allow entry into our country of the Russian composer and the Italian top Communist leader who has been invited hefe by Henry Wallace? I am hoping that you, as our Wisconsin Senator, will use all your influence to stamp out such practices, to cut red tape in dealing with these individuals and stamp them as traitors with punishment due treason. We can't expect to curb evils unless we try to do away with them. It is a very poor lesson in citizenship to show our young people when the Government itself seems so gullible.

What about Anna Strong and the former bund leader? Are they desirable after giving up their American citizenship? Just how long does it take America to wake up? How many Pearl Harbors do we have to have before we learn?

Our men in Congress should be our spokesmen and believe me the people would rally if they would only take a definite stand on this question of communism. I'd suggest that they give the entire party a one-way ticket to Russia.

We mothers are tired giving up our young sons to foreign service when our leaders are inviting trouble and hob-nobbing with butchers of humans.

May we hope that you at least, Mr. WILEY, will play the game as a staunch American and throw your weight against all subversive elements?

Very truly yours,
MAE J. NEMICK (Mrs. J. A.),
President, Council of Catholic Women.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR PEPPER

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on civil rights delivered by him at Montgomery, Ala., on October 7, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MALONE

[Mr. JENNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the statement on the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act made by Senator MALONE before the Senate Finance Committee on February 24, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NEED FOR STRONGER RENT CONTROL — STATEMENT BY SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "The Need for Stronger Rent Control," made by him on Senate bill 888 before the Subcommittee on Housing and Rents of the Committee on Banking and Currency, March 10, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

DR. PETER MARSHALL

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the addresses at the funeral services of the late Dr. Peter Marshall, Chaplain of the Senate, together with the prayers delivered by him in the Senate during the Eighty-first Congress, which appear in the Appendix.]

PROCLAMATION OF MARCH 7 AS CZECHOSLOVAK DAY IN THE STATE OF NEW YORK

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a proclamation, issued by Governor Dewey, of New York, proclaiming March 7, the anniversary of the birthday of former President Masaryk, as Czechoslovak Day in the State of New York, which appears in the Appendix.]

HOW BUREAUCRACY SWINDLES THE TAXPAYER—COMMENTS BY GEN. CARL GRAY ON ARTICLE FROM THE READER'S DIGEST

[Mr. McGRATH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD comments by Gen. Carl Gray, Veterans' Administrator, concerning an article entitled "How Bureaucracy Swindles the Taxpayer," published in the Reader's Digest, which appears in the Appendix].

ADDRESS BY RALPH E. BECKER BEFORE THE OHIO YOUNG REPUBLICAN STATE CONVENTION

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Ralph E. Becker, Chairman of the Young Republican National Federation, before the Ohio Young Republican State Convention, at Columbus, Ohio, February 26, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

SOVIET "IMMIGRATION" INCREASES—EDITORIAL FROM THE HAVRE (MONT.) DAILY NEWS

[Mr. ECTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Soviet 'Immigration' Increases," from a recent issue of Havre (Mont.) Daily News, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NETHERLANDS POLICY IN INDONESIA—ARTICLES FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES AND THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by A. M. Rosenthal, a news item from The Hague, published in the New York Times of March 11, 1949, and an article by Daniel L. Schorr, published in the Christian Science Monitor of March 8, 1949, all relating to the Netherlands policy in Indonesia, which appear in the Appendix.]

NOMINATION OF MON C. WALLGREN—NEWSPAPER COMMENT, TELEGRAMS, AND LETTERS

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD several newspaper comments, telegrams and letters relating to the nomination of Mon C. Wallgren to be Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, which appear in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE BY RABBI WILLIAM F. ROSENBLUM TO THOMAS A. EDISON

[Mr. BRICKER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a sermon by Rabbi William F. Rosenblum, entitled "And There Was Light," preached at Temple Israel, New York, in commemoration of Thomas Alva Edison on February 11, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

BROADCAST BY GEORGE E. SOKOLSKY ON LINCOLN AND EDISON

[Mr. BRICKER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio broadcast by George E. Sokolsky on February 13, 1949, entitled "Lincoln and Edison," which appears in the Appendix.]

HISTORY OF THE WORD "FILIBUSTER"—ARTICLE FROM THE DETROIT FREE PRESS

[Mr. FERGUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on the history of the word "filibuster," written by Malcolm W. Bingay, and published in the Detroit Free Press of March 9, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

OPERATIONS SNOWBOUND — EDITORIAL FROM THE MEMPHIS COMMERCIAL APPEAL

[Mr. GURNEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Operations Snowbound," published in the Memphis Commercial Appeal of February 14, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

SUBSIDY PAYMENTS IN THE MERCHANT MARINE—ARTICLE BY GEORGE W. MORGAN

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Legislative Overhaul Asked for Nonsubsidized Lines," written by George W. Morgan, president, Association of American Shipowners, and published in the Journal of Commerce of February 17, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT—EDITORIAL COMMENT ON SPEECH BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Senator Fulbright Gives a Lesson in Constitutional Government," published in the Winchester (Va.) Evening Star of March 9, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

FAIR TRADE PRACTICES

[Mr. TYDINGS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Consistency, Thou Art a Jewel," from "The Apothecary" for February 1949, with a page from the same magazine entitled "Time—Life—Fortune Are Fair Traded," which appear in the Appendix.]

COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted the following conference report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 126) to provide that acreage planted to cotton in 1949 shall not be used in computing cotton acreage allotments for any subsequent year, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: That, notwithstanding the provisions of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, or of any other law, State, county, and farm acreage allotments and yields for cotton for any year after 1949 shall be computed without regard to yields or to the acreage planted to cotton in 1949.

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its amendment to the title.

ELMER THOMAS,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
SCOTT W. LUCAS,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STEPHEN PACE,
W. R. POAGE,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUG. H. ANDRESEN,
HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. LUCAS to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 15, amending the so-called cloture rule of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair overruling the point of order raised by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I briefly address myself to the pending appeal from the parliamentary decision announced last night by the distinguished Vice President on the point of order submitted by the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] in connection with the cloture petition submitted by the majority leader, the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

It happens that I was the President pro tempore of the Senate who faced the hard duty of making the parliamentary decision last August, upon which the present controversy is considerably based. Therefore, I feel that I have some continuing responsibility. I also have a concern to keep the record straight. But I speak without pride of opinion, and solely for the purpose of attempting to make clear precisely what I believe to be involved in the Senate's vote on this appeal. I have no desire to argue the question, but I think it is only fair to what I conceive to be the vital importance of this issue that I should restate my position and bring it down to date.

Mr. President, I have not changed my mind about the jurisdiction of the present, existing Senate cloture rule. Despite the ingenuous thesis developed by the majority leader and by the Vice President to rationalize the latter's departure from what I believe to be the plain mandate of the rules and precedents, I continue earnestly to believe that the existing rule does not permit cloture on a motion to take up a measure.

With equal tenacity I continue to believe that the rules of the Senate are as important to equity and order in the Senate as is the Constitution to the life of the Republic, and that those rules should never be changed except by the Senate itself, in the direct fashion prescribed by the rules themselves.

One of the immutable truths in Washington's Farewell Address, which cannot be altered even by changing events in a changing world, is the following sentence:

> The Constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all.

I respectfully submit, as a basic explanation of my attitude, that I accept this admonition without reservation, and I think it is equally applicable to the situation which Senators here confront, though obviously the comparison cannot be literal. But, so far as I am concerned, the Father of his Country said to us, by analogy, "The rules of the Senate which at any time exist, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole Senate, are sacredly obligatory upon all." I think that is the basic issue here today. Men of conscience obviously disagree about the facts. I respect their good faith, even though we reach opposite conclusions.

Mr. President, I repeat just a few words of the preliminary things which I said last August from the Presiding Officer's chair, so that there may be no misunderstanding of my motive. I think the Senate rules should be amended, by due process of law, to extend the two-thirds cloture rule to include motions and the entire parliamentary procedure involved in the legislative life of a measure. I favor the adoption of the Hayden-Wherry resolution. I think that unless the rule is changed as contemplated by this resolution, the Senate has no effective cloture at all, although a determined majority can break a filibuster if it really tries. Driven by experience to amend my much earlier belief in totally unlimited Senate debate, it is my conviction that the Senate must not longer leave itself in a legislative strait-jacket and impotent to legislate except by the process of exhaustion. This cannot be longer condoned in these dangerous days.

I believe that the Hayden-Wherry resolution perfecting cloture by a two-thirds vote meets this need without sacrificing the Senate's birthright, which is full, free, fair debate, with reasonable opportunity for the presentation of minority views and reasonable protection against intolerant and intolerable gags. To make my attitude totally plain, I think that any sort of majority cloture would violate these elemental specifications. I think the Hayden-Wherry resolution is the wise, rational middle ground.

But, Mr. President, as I said last August when I made my ruling, I repeat now, the rules of the Senate as they exist at any given time and as they are clinched by precedents should not be changed substantively by the interpretive action of the Senate's Presiding Officer, even with the transient sanction of an equally transient Senate majority. The rules can be safely changed only by the direct and conscious action of the Senate itself, acting in the fashion prescribed by the rules. Otherwise, no rule in the Senate is worth the paper it is written on, and this so-called "greatest deliberative body in the world" is at the mercy of every change in parliamentary authority.

In my view this is far more than a contest over the definition of words, though it may seem so to the casual bystander. This is a contest over the definition of Senate rights. I have no more trouble today, as Senator, than I had last August, as President pro tempore, in giving priority to what I believe to be these vital fundamentals.

I hasten to say that no word of mine reflects, directly or indirectly, on the good faith with which the distinguished Vice President is acting. I am sure he does not think he is changing the Senate rules by interpretive action. I am sure he thinks that after 32 years of darkness, he is uncovering the true meaning of the rule. He made it plain at the time that he did not agree with the President pro tempore last August. Yet his speeches frequently referred to his belief that the rules themselves should be changed to accomplish such results as he now would achieve by fiat. But I think he is substantially consistent. He thought I was wrong then. I think, most respectfully, he is wrong now. I suppose this is just that difference of opinion which makes horse races, as they say in Kentucky.

But if I may be allowed to say so, with greatest respect, I deeply regret that the distinguished Vice President, who was then on the Senate floor, did not then put his convictions to the test by appealing to the Senate from the decision of the Chair. That was the logical showdown hour, if there was any serious question about the validity of the ruling of the Chair. He did not do so. His then able assistant, the present majority leader, did not do so. A pro forma appeal was entered by the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], but it never was called up.

Senators who were here on that tense afternoon will recall that the President pro tempore repeatedly invited the Senate—indeed, he urged the Senate—to test his ruling on appeal. He said in plain language that he thought the Senate at the very least should decide by its own sovereign vote what it wanted the interpretation of the rules to be. But no appeal was taken when the President

pro tempore ruled that a motion to create a new pending question is not itself a pending question. I repeat, no appeal was taken. That is deeply significant.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Inasmuch as I have mentioned the Senator from Illinois, I will. I prefer to conclude my statement, and then yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Michigan to say that no appeal was taken from the decision of the President pro tempore at that time?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I say that an appeal was submitted, but not pursued.

Mr. LUCAS. It was debated on the Senator's side of the aisle for a long time, until it was finally withdrawn by the Senator who was representing the majority at that time.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Well, whatever point the Senator from Illinois is making, I do not know.

Mr. LUCAS. But there was an appeal.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have said an appeal was made pro forma. I have said it did not come from my friend the Senator from Illinois, that it did not come from my friend the Senator from Kentucky, and that it was never pursued to a finish. I submit that the absence of appeal upon that historic afternoon etched the precedent just that much deeper into the Senate's own recorded concept of its own rules, and makes its overthrow at this late date just that much more dubious. If the ruling was right then—and I repeat that it stood without final challenge—it is even more right today, in view of this circumstance.

Some say, "Oh, the issue today is different, and therefore the precedent last August does not apply today, in March." They say, "Last August the President pro tempore could point to the fact that there already was a pending question before the Senate when he denied the legality of cloture on a motion to create a new and different pending question. It is different now," they say, "All different. Now there is not any prior pending question."

That is right; there is not any pending question at all. There is only a motion to create one. Yet the rule says that cloture must attach to a pending question. This petition seeks to apply cloture to something which does not exist. The senior Senator from Michigan confesses that he is not impressed with the logic which asserts such a profound difference between cloture on a motion to displace a pending question and cloture on a motion to create one. The latter would seem to me to be even more elemental than the former; but in both cases it is the motion which is ineligible under what I believe the rule to be.

I freely agree, Mr. President, that precedents are rarely literal in their parallels, although I believe this one to be more literal than usual. And since I want to join the able majority leader in pleading, as he did last night, that we shall not split hairs, and since I want to join him in his Scriptural reminder that "The letter killeth, while the spirit giveth life," I respectfully ask to be excused from accepting what to me is the curious device by which the August precedent is thus sought to be escaped.

But the issue is now precipitated. Our parliamentary procedure has, by indirection, brought the Senate to a vote on a parliamentary ruling which would, for the time being, produce the same result as is sought to be produced by due process through the subsequent adoption of the Hayden-Wherry resolution. Thus, we sort of adopt the resolution in advance of adopting it. I do not know whether the dictionaries which Senators have been quoting would define that anomaly as standard practice or not. In any event, when the Senate decides, I want it distinctly understood that I shall act on the basis of its decision in further proceedings on this resolution.

Mr. President, it will be apparent that I attach high importance to the approaching roll call. Therefore, I urge that all Senators make sure they address their judgments to the one and only issue which in my respectful opinion is here legitimately involved. I urge that we put first things first, and keep them there.

The one and only legitimate issue in the approaching vote is this: What does the present rule of the Senate say and mean—not, what would many of us like to have it say and mean. We are not voting in this instance on whether we want a more effective cloture rule, and our votes are not appropriately related to that question. I say again I am one of those who do want a two-thirds cloture which shall apply to the total parliamentary procedure in respect to any measure. I shall so vote when that is the issue before us. But that is not the issue here. The immediate pending question is solely what the present and existing Senate cloture rule, with its interpretive precedents, says and means—that, and nothing else. If its present meaning, until changed by direct Senate action, is not faithfully protected, it makes little difference what we write into this or any other rule.

It may be said that we really are in effect actually voting for more effective cloture, if we sustain the ruling of the Vice President, because he would do, by a parliamentary device, precisely what the Hayden-Wherry resolution would subsequently accomplish by due legislative process. But I respectfully submit that this very fact underscores my contention that this is an affront to due legislative process. My point remains that our attitude toward the integrity of the rules, and not our attitude toward cloture, is the one and only question legitimately at issue on the approaching roll call.

Let me emphasize this point, Mr. President. I feel it is cardinal. I have heard it erroneously argued in the cloakrooms that since the Senate rules themselves authorize a change in the rules through due legislative process by a majority vote, it is within the spirit of the rules when we reach the same net result by a majority vote of the Senate upholding a parliamentary ruling of the Vice President which, in effect, changes the rules. This would appear to be some sort of doctrine of amendment by proxy. It is argued that the Senate itself makes the change in both instances by majority vote; and it is asked, What is the difference? Of course, this is really an argument that the end justifies the means.

I think there is a great and fundamental difference, Mr. President. When a substantive change is made in the rules by sustaining a ruling of the Presiding Officer of the Senate—and that is what I contend is being undertaken here—it does not mean that the rules are permanently changed. It simply means, that regardless of precedent or traditional practice, the rules, hereafter, mean whatever the Presiding Officer of the Senate, plus a simple majority of Senators voting at the time, want the rules to mean. We fit the rules to the occasion, instead of fitting the occasion to the rules. Therefore, in the final analysis, under such circumstances, there are no rules except the transient, unregulated wishes of a majority of whatever quorum is temporarily in control of the Senate. That, Mr. President, is not my idea of the greatest deliberative body in the world.

Again, we are not voting, on the next roll call, as to whether we do or do not favor new civil-rights legislation. I am one of those who do favor sound progress in this direction—under cloture if necessary—as my record clearly demonstrates. I shall continue this record consistently. But that is not the pending issue. The pending issue transcends any specific legislative program, no matter how notable or worthy. No matter how important its immediate incidence may seem to be to many today, the integrity of the Senate's rules is our paramount concern, today, tomorrow, and so long as this great institution lives.

Again, we are not voting, fortunately for me, as the Vice President has already goodnaturedly said, in a popularity contest between the distinguished Vice President and the President pro tempore of the last Congress. We are not voting in a political contest between a Democratic Vice President who rules one way and a Republican President pro tempore who ruled another. Perhaps this admonition is needless. But I merely want to be sure that none of my colleagues shall feel under the slightest compunction to vote on a friendship or loyalty basis so far as I am concerned. This is a solemn decision—reaching far beyond the immediate consequence—and it involves just one consideration. What do the present Senate rules mean; and, for the sake of law and order, shall they be protected in that meaning until changed by the Senate itself in the fashion required by the rules?

Here it is in a nutshell.

The Senate rules say that a cloture petition can be addressed to any pending measure.

The distinguished Vice President, supported by many of my closest colleagues, for whose opinion I have the profoundest respect, says the phrase pending measure includes a motion to make a bill or resolution the pending measure. He rules that a motion to create a pending measure is itself a pending measure.

The former President pro tempore ruled that the Senate cannot create a

pending measure until it has adopted the motion which undertakes to make it the pending measure. Since the rule confines itself to the pending measure, the present rule does not authorize cloture on the motion to create the measure, which is prerequisite to cloture.

I submit that this latter construction is the uniform and controlling Senate precedent insofar as and in whatever degree the precedents are pertinent. Certainly there is no shadow of a precedent to the contrary.

I submit that the very first Senate precedent, back in 1919, for whatever it is worth, confirms this view, even though the analogy may not be complete. At that time the late Senator George W. Norris was sustained, on roll call, on the point of order against cloture on reservations to a treaty which was the pending measure. His position was sustained in a Senate overwhelmingly composed of Senators who had created the cloture rule and who knew, better than can we, what were the rule's limitations.

Whatever the appropriate analogy at this point—and be it great or small—it will not escape the attention of Senators that, within 2 years after the adoption of the cloture rule, it was declared by its own authors not to cover the total legislative process, but really to relate to a correct identification of what was a pending measure. We hear it argued that these wise men surely intended totally effective cloture without what are now called loopholes. Well, Mr. President, all I know about it is that they themselves created at least one so-called loophole within 2 years of their promulgation of the rule and they did not act to close it. Others may speculate upon their intentions. All I know is what they did and did not do.

I submit that the Committee on Rules and Administration, in the recent Eightieth Congress, sustained my view when it reported a resolution—the forerunner of the present Hayden-Wherry resolution—to extend to motions as well as measures, the objective sought to be reached by the ruling of the distinguished Vice President. That was a year before the President pro tempore's ruling. Surely the Committee on Rules and Administration would not have proposed to amend, by due process, the cloture rules to bring motions within its jurisdiction if they were already there. It did not occur to anyone at that time that they were already there.

I submit that the Committee on Rules and Administration, in the present Eighty-first Congress, takes the same view, or it would not have reported the Hayden-Wherry resolution to bring, by due process, motions within the jurisdiction of the cloture rule. Indeed, the current report of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate categorically asserts that the decision of the President pro tempore last August was correct. The opinion of the Committee on Rules and Administration is not lightly to be set aside in a problem of this character.

I submit, Mr. President, that every Senator here today is conversant with our unanimous-consent procedures. We all know, by repetitious experience, that unanimous-consent agreements always spell out their reference not only to the pending measure, but also to all motions in connection therewith. Why? Because it is the rule, the practice, and the precedents of the Senate that pending measures do not include motions.

Senators, it is against this background that today's appeal from the ruling of the Chair—a ruling, I respectfully submit, that nullifies this total record—must be considered if we are to vote upon the only consideration which we are entitled to consult when the integrity of the Senate rules is at stake.

Finally, Mr. President, I respectfully suggest that if the ruling of the Vice President is not sustained, there still remains the necessity for passing new cloture legislation by due process, and every effort must be made to this end. Somewhere, somehow, it ought to be possible to find a meeting of minds among reasonable men of good will upon a problem of such transcendent importance. There must be some reasonable form of effective cloture in the Senate, just as there also must be some reasonable form of effective protection for full, fair freedom of debate. I personally think the Hayden-Wherry resolution is the answer. But whatever the right answer, it must be found not only for the sake of the public welfare and the national security, but also for the sake of the dignity of the United States Senate.

I prayerfully wish, Mr. President, that instead of entrenching in extreme positions at either end of the argument, we might set our minds to an equitable composition of a problem which will plague us with increasing bitterness and disruption until, by due process, we strike common ground. There can be no winner in the kind of endless battle which goes on here today.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, and Members of the Senate, it is with some hesitation that I follow my distinguished colleague from the State of Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. During the three-and-a-half years I have been in the Senate there have been few occasions on which I have differed from his point of view on legislation and other matters pending before the Senate. But, Mr. President, I wish to submit that if rule XXII does not apply to motions to bring a bill or a resolution before the Senate of the United States, then rule XXII was an absolutely idle gesture by the men who constituted the Senate of the United States in 1917, because no bill or resolution can come before this body except by motion.

I also want to say, Mr. President, that I, too, as have a number of Members on both sides of the aisle, read every word of the debate preceding the adoption of the present rule XXII. There is nothing in that debate which indicates in the slightest degree that the Senators who proposed rule XXII were doing it with their tongues in their cheeks or were doing it for the purpose of deceiving either the Senate or the public. It is clearly apparent that they thought they were adopting an effective cloture procedure. I submit, Mr. President, that had they desired to place this narrow interpretation upon the rule, they could very easily have done so by striking out the word "measure," which appears in the rule, and which, as the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] last night pointed out, by dictionary definition, is a part of a continuous legislative process—they could have stricken out the word "measure" and merely inserted the words "bill or resolution." That would have given the narrow interpretation confronting us.

Mr. President, there are two ways a bill or resolution can be defeated. One is to have a majority of those voting cast their votes against it. In this case each Senator, on his own responsibility, participates in the legislative process and is answerable to the people of his State for his actions. The other way is to talk a bill or resolution to death. In either event the bill or resolution is dead. However, in the first method a Senator voting "No" cancels out the vote of a Senator voting "Aye." In the first case each Senator and the States have the equal representation the Constitution provides. In the latter case, by the use of the unlimited filibuster, one Senator cancels out the right to vote of 10 or 20 of his colleagues.

In no sense is Resolution 15 a gag rule. To the contrary, it is a moderate proposal to enable the two-thirds rule to function as it was intended to function by those who adopted it in 1917.

If in this clear-cut case before us today, when there is no pending business other than the motion of the Senator from Illinois, the cloture rule does not apply, then the Senate is helpless, and is deprived of the power given it by the Constitution of the United States to determine the rules of its proceedings.

No matter how distinguished the authorities are and have been who have ruled on different points of order from the exact parliamentary situation we face today, the fact still remains that the entire membership of the Senate should and must retain its constitutional rule-making power.

The moderate proposal contained in Resolution 15 is not new. Its language is exactly the same as that reported favorably by the Rules Committee during the Eightieth Congress.

On February 18, 1947, the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], in his statement before the Rules Committee then holding hearings on the question of the cloture rule, had this to say. I quote from page 114 of the hearings:

> I am not disposed to quibble over the language of rule 22 as it now stands.
>
> At the outset I concede that the rule may properly be made applicable to any pending motion, question, or measure. This, of course, involves a change in the rule and a substantial change in point of fact, but, nevertheless, it is a change which I think should be made in the Senate rules.
>
> The real question before this committee resolves itself as follows: Is debate in the Senate to be limited by a decision of the majority present and voting upon the motion; by the decision of a constitutional majority; that is to say, by a majority of the whole membership of the Senate * * *; or is the rule to stand under which debate cannot be effectively closed unless two-thirds of the Senate present and voting upon the cloture motion decide to limit or close debate? All

other questions are immaterial and we are, therefore, brought face to face with the consideration of the real issue involved here—whether we will limit or close debate by a mere majority of those present and voting upon the question, whether we will require a constitutional majority of the whole membership, or whether we will permit the two-thirds rule, which has been in effect since 1917 to stand.

Mr. President, I was then and still am impressed by the argument made by the Senator from Georgia at that time. The committee was also. It appeared reasonable to assume that if the committee during the Eightieth Congress dropped the proposals for a simple majority or a constitutional majority cloture and merely closed the loopholes to make rule 22 effective, such a moderate proposal would receive the support of our colleagues from the South, or, if not their support, at least, would not have their bitter opposition.

In every way during the course of this debate those of us who favor this moderate Resolution 15 have sought to bridge the gap between us. On numerous occasions we have stated that a careful check on both sides of the aisle has indicated an overwhelming vote against any amendment to change Resolution 15 from an effective two-thirds rule to a majority cloture. Up to this moment we have received no assurances of cooperation.

Yet I do not easily abandon hope. The able senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has made it clear that the Senate should not fall prey to either extreme. Legislative minorities have rights which should be protected, but so do legislative majorities. There must be a common ground upon which reasonable men can meet.

An effective two-thirds rule is certainly considered fair by a vast majority of the Members of this body from every check that has been made. If the Senate is allowed to exercise its constitutional rule-making power by voting on a two-thirds effective cloture rule, this can be soon demonstrated. But unless the Chair is sustained, or those engaged in the prolonged discussion for the purpose of preventing the motion of the Senator from Illinois from being voted upon abandon their tactics, the Senate may never have an opportunity to vote on a change in the rules or to exercise its rule-making power under the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. President, in the interest of giving those on the other side of the aisle the maximum protection which can be given under our rules, I would be willing and am prepared on my own responsibility to offer an amendment to rule 22 reading as follows:

The above provision requiring a two-thirds vote of those voting to bring the debate on a question to a close shall not be changed, modified, or amended except by a two-thirds vote of the Senators present and voting.

This, Mr. President, together with the effective two-thirds cloture provisions provided in Resolution 15, should give the protection intended in rule 22 by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and by others who have opposed majority cloture on both sides of the aisle.

What is the alternative with which we are faced? The alternative is for the Senate to surrender its rule-making power and its legislative power into the hands of a small minority of the Senate. I do not refer now to the considerable minority now opposing Resolution 15, but to every future hostile minority which may attempt to force its will upon the Senate by the unlimited use of the filibuster to prevent the Senate of the United States from discharging its constitutional legislative duties and from discharging its constitutional rule-making power.

If that be the issue with which we are confronted, then this question must be fought out again and again, day in and day out, at this session and at the next session.

But we do not need to disrupt the business of the Senate and the security of the country by such a contest, which would be bound to leave deep scars.

For that reason, Mr. President, I have offered here a possible amendment to the rule which will give the maximum protection the rules of the Senate will permit to be given to those who wish to assure that they have an effective two-thirds cloture rule, and not something else.

Mr. President, as a Senate we cannot, we dare not, say now and thus continue some of the precedents which have been established, that this body does not have control over its rule-making power.

For the reasons I have given, Mr. President, I urge that the decision of the Chair be made the judgment of the Senate.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MYERS in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. BALDWIN. Would it be in order for me to ask a question of the majority leader?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would be in order.

Mr. BALDWIN. The question I desire to ask is this: If the Senate votes to sustain the Chair in its ruling, does the majority leader then intend to proceed to an amendment of the rules as recommended by the Hayden-Wherry resolution? I make this inquiry because I am deeply impressed, as all of us are, by the able and thought-provoking address delivered by the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. As for myself, I do not like to see the rules of the Senate, established on long precedent, changed in this fashion. However, if we are to proceed, by way of such a change, to an amendment of the rule so that the rule will rest in the future upon a written statement amending the rule and not upon a precedent established by a ruling of the Chair, I shall feel quite differently about the matter.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in answer to the inquiry of the able Senator from Connecticut, I will say that if the Senate should sustain the position taken by the Vice President last evening, it would practically accomplish what ultimately the rule would accomplish. So far as the Senator from Illinois is concerned, it would seem to him that if the Senate should sustain the ruling made by the distinguished Vice President, we should not have very much difficulty thereafter in obtaining a rule in line with what the Senator from Connecticut suggests, and insofar as the Senator from Illinois is concerned, he will continue to strive to obtain such a rule.

Now that the Senator from Connecticut has propounded the inquiry, the Senator from Illinois would say that the one way ultimately to secure the rule we all want is to sustain the Vice President's ruling, because that is the first step in the ultimate obtaining of the objective of the Hayden-Wherry resolution. If that ruling is not sustained, no Member of the Senate can say how long it will take in a sort of physical endurance contest to accomplish the things the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Michigan and every other Senator who is vitally interested in the problem, really want to have accomplished.

So far as the Senator from Illinois is concerned, he will make it the unfinished business to see whether we cannot finish it up if the ruling of the Chair is sustained.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois. I do not want to have anything I have said construed as a criticism of the distinguished Vice President who has ruled in a manner different than has been ruled previously when similar questions have been presented in the Senate. I do not support the ruling as a matter of expediency. I myself feel that it is an open question whether or not the word measure means a bill or a resolution or whether the word measure means any parliamentary proceeding in due course in the business of the Senate. Personally I take the latter view. I believe, as the distinguished Senator from California has said, that had those who made the rule intended it to apply only to a bill or a resolution, they would have said so. It has always seemed to me, in the brief experience I have had in legislative assemblies, that the term measure was an all-inclusive term; that it was used to embrace bills, resolutions, or any proposal of action presented for the vote of a legislative assembly. I do think, however, that we will rest on a much firmer foundation for the future if the proposed change in the rules is accomplished by an amendment as called for by the Hayden-Wherry proposal, and not have to depend upon the foundation of a precedent which to many of our colleagues appears to be a reversal of the position the Senate has long taken.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that at this juncture we should preserve in every way we can the rights of the minority. Those who drafted the Constitution of the United States took particular care to see to it that there was provision in that document to guarantee the integrity and the rights of the smaller States, and that is why they made that one provision of the Constitution a provision which never could be amended.

On the other hand, Mr. President, since those days, so long ago, the business of the Senate has increased enormously. Since those days, so long ago, the position of our country in the world has changed. We now find the business of the Senate tremendously pressing. Not only are there great and important measures before us, but there are also smaller matters which are in themselves important, which have to be considered; smaller matters in great number and increasing number I might say, Mr. President. It therefore seems desirable to me that at this day and time we find the best means we honestly can to accomplish this amendment of the rules, which guarantees the rights of the minority, at the same time to protect the rights of the majority and to guarantee ultimate majority rule.

Mr. President, I should like to support the proposed amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from California, because it accomplishes exactly that. It makes it possible for the majority to function in very pressing days, with many urgent matters before us, and at the same time it does protect the rights of the minority.

Mr. President, if we sustain the ruling of the Chair and then move on and adopt the change in the rules, as the distinguished Senator from Illinois says he intends to urge us to do, I venture to prophesy that in the future it will be even harder to get a cloture petition signed by a sufficient number of Senators so that it will be presented as an issue for a vote on this floor, because I think that we are all sensitive to the fact that the rule we are considering here, if adopted, is epoch-making. But I for one, Mr. President, firmly believe that it is a rule we must adopt; it is a change we must make; it is a thing we must do to make it possible for this, the greatest deliberative and the greatest free assembly in the world, to get its work done, because it must be free, but at the same time it must have rules under which it can accomplish the pressing business it has to consider and act upon and decide upon in these rushing days.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I am very happy the Senator has raised this issue, and, based upon what he has said in his very eloquent statement, I am sure he agrees with me that the one way, or at least one step in the direction that he and I are seeking to go in closing the gaps and the loopholes which now make it impossible to limit debate, is to sustain the ruling of the Chair. When we get the loopholes stopped up it will be a long step in the direction of ultimately securing a complete change in the rules through the proper legislative committee.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, in reply I may venture one further remark. If the ruling of the Chair is not sustained, I for one am willing to stay here until we talk this matter out, until we reach a vote upon his rule, if it takes all night tonight and all night every night next week, or as many days and nights as we may be called upon to sit thereafter. I think now is the time we should bring this matter to decision. If the ruling of the Chair is not sustained, I should feel very sorry if then the majority leader should say, "Well, cloture does not apply. We cannot end the debate. There are many other pressing matters. We must drop this and go on to something else." So, just as strongly as he has urged me to support the ruling of the Chair, I in turn urge him to continue on until we come to a vote upon this change of the rules, whether the Chair is sustained in this particular ruling or whether the Chair is not sustained.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator will agree with me, will he not, that the objective which he and I are attempting to reach can be reached much more quickly, and we can break down the opposition faster if we are able to sustain the decision of the Chair, because we shall then be in a position to make the amendment to the cloture rule the unfinished business. If the decision of the Chair is sustained, I promise the Senator that, so far as I am concerned, I shall be willing to go on to see that we finally get the rule about which he is talking.

Mr. BALDWIN. I will say to my distinguished friend that my name is upon the cloture petition; and having embarked upon that course, I intend to see it through.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BALDWIN. I urge the Senator, in turn, if we fail in this particular course, to adopt the other, and continue until this issue is finally resolved.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest and pleasure to the speech made by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the former President pro tempore of the Senate, who made one of the most logical defenses of the present rule that I have heard. I endorse every word he said about it.

It is a strange thing, but it is true, that men come to the Senate and immediately want to change its rules. They want to reorganize the Senate. They want to fashion it with their own specific remedies. It is a remarkable thing that many Senators have such a poor opinion of the body which they have been so active in getting into. I have known men without large means to spend nearly all they had—if not quite all, all they could borrow from their relatives, all they could scrape up, and all their friends could produce—in order to get into the Senate, and as soon as they get here, in a great many cases, their first proposal is to reorganize the Senate on a pattern wholly different from that which has made this body the greatest deliberative body on earth, in my opinion.

What is the matter with the present rule? I not only endorse the statements made by the distinguished Senator from Michigan, but I believe that his ruling when he was President pro tempore of the Senate was absolutely in accord with the precedents. I ruled virtually to the same effect when I was President pro tempore, 2 or 3 years ago. To be exact, I think it was in February 1946. I was called upon to rule on a very similar question. The precedent was not exactly analogous, but very nearly so. I held that a motion was not a measure, as contemplated under the rule. Under the circumstances, the Senator from Michigan being on the other side, I think it was a very remarkable position for him to take when he so boldly, so effectually, and so properly upheld the rules of the Senate which have made this body known all over the world as the greatest deliberative body in the world.

Freedom of debate has been the historic watchword of the history of the Senate. The first amendment to the Constitution was to guarantee freedom of speech everywhere. Is it not a remarkable thing that in the first amendment to the Constitution we should go to the extent of guaranteeing everyone in the United States freedom of speech, and then undertake to gag the Senate? I do not believe it is right. I believe that the policy is wholly wrong. I so held when I was President pro tempore of the Senate several years ago. I would so hold again if the matter comes up.

Mr. President, I formed my views from reading the history of the Senate. I wish to give a brief outline of that history. I am somewhat embarrassed because of the great speeches made in this body by Members on both sides, giving the history of the Senate.

Before discussing the historical features, I first wish to discuss the rule itself. What is the matter with the present rule? In what way has it not been effective? We talk about loopholes in it. There were no loopholes. I happened to be a Member of the Senate in 1917, when this rule was adopted. I had been here only three days. I suppose it was lack of experience and knowledge that caused me to vote for the present rule. I am not sure that I would do it again if the question should arise. I doubt if it has helped in the work of this body. However, I voted for it then and I still am for the rule and will be so long as it is the rule.

I wish to call attention to what the present rule has done. It has been tested 19 times in the 32 years since its adoption. The question first arose when the Treaty of Versailles was before the Senate for approval. Senator Hitchcock, of Nebraska, filed a petition, with 15 or 20 other Senators, to apply the two-thirds cloture rule. As I previously stated, I was here when the debate occurred on this rule. I was a new Senator, and my ears were open. That rule was the result of a compromise.

There were liberal Members of the Senate in those days, just as there are liberal Members of it today, although perhaps there were not quite so many liberal Members then. But at that time there were some liberals who favored majority rule. Some of them contended that when the President undertook to send a measure here with his recommendation, it should be passed forthwith; that any Senator should have the right to move the previous question, and, if the motion were adopted, end the debate and have action taken. Under such a contention, Mr. President, practically all the laws passed by Congress

would be the result of recommendations coming from the White House; any measures sent from the White House to the Congress, with the recommendation of the Executive, would be passed by the Congress, without debate, without amendment. That was the view of some of the Members in those days.

After talking over the matter, after going into it very fully, the great men in the Senate at that time, many of whom had been in the Senate for a long period of time, agreed upon a compromise. In that compromise they made a distinction between a motion and a measure. A measure was a resolution or a bill which was before the Senate. It was agreed that if two-thirds of the Senate voted for cloture on a measure—in other words, for debate to be brought to a close—then debate on it would end. The idea of invoking cloture on a motion to take up a bill was not discussed in that debate, as Senators will observe if they read the debate occurring at that time. That was not the question. It was not a question of ending debate on a motion to take up a measure. The amendment to rule XXII was adopted for the purpose of closing debate on a measure which had already been debated and which in the opinion of the Senate had already been debated long enough, and when it was the view of the Senate that debate should be stopped.

Let us see what has been the history of the present cloture amendment to the Senate rule. We talk about the greatness of the Senate in its first period—and it was a great period—and in its second period and in its third period and in its fourth period, for more than 100 years. That was when the Senate became great. Did the Senate have a cloture rule then, to make it great? No, Mr. President, the Senate had unlimited debate throughout its history. The Senate became a great body because of its power of deliberation, because of the freedom of speech in this body. This was the one body in the entire world where the right of freedom of speech and freedom of debate existed—a right which now some persons desire to end, so that the Senate would become merely the endorsing body for a bill sent to the Senate by an Executive at the head of the administration.

So, Mr. President, in considering the history of rule XXII, which now is 32 years old, we find that the first situation developing under the rule occurred when Senator Hitchcock wished to bring to a close the debate on the Treaty of Versailles. Cloture was invoked, and the treaty was approved. There was no failure of the rule at that time.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I ask, as a matter of historical interest—because I have not been clear in my mind about this matter—what was the date when the motion to invoke cloture on the Treaty of Versailles proper was made here in the Senate? Does the Senator have that information before him, or does he remember?

Mr. McKELLAR. I think I have it here.

Mr. PEPPER. I shall not ask the Senator to turn aside from the train of his thought; I assumed that perhaps he had that information immediately before him.

Mr. McKELLAR. It was about 2 years after the rule was adopted, and of course it was after the close of the World War. Application of the rule had not previously been requested; no Senator rose from his seat and asked for application of the rule for 2 years after its adoption.

Mr. President, what was the next step in the history of this rule? In 1921, on February 2, 4 years after the amendment to the rule was adopted, Senator Penrose, of Pennsylvania, sought the aid of the rule for the passage of the tariff bill. He applied for cloture under rule XXII. The vote was very close; it was 36 to 35. Of course, cloture was not invoked, but the effect of the debate was that within 2 weeks afterward, compromises and adjustments were made, and that tariff bill was passed. Was anyone hurt by that 2 weeks' delay in the passage of the tariff bill which attempted to raise the tariff duties upon the people? No. That bill passed by a vote of 44 to 30. It did not become the law, but that was not because of the failure of the cloture rule, but because of a veto by the President of the United States.

Thus, Mr. President, the rule was not changed during the first 4 years of its existence.

Afterward, one year and a half elapsed before any Senator again sought the aid of the rule. Senator McCumber, of North Dakota, sought its aid in the passage of another tariff bill. On that occasion, the motion was not agreed to. However, no longer than a month after the vote on cloture, unanimous consent was granted to limit debate, and the bill passed. So there was no trouble with the rule up to that time.

The next time the rule was brought up was by Senator Lenroot, in an endeavor to close debate on the question of United States' participation in the World Court of International Justice. The motion was agreed to, and the treaty ratified. That is the history of the rule through 9 years. Was any wrong done to anybody? Did the rule fail to work? Not at all.

Still later, on June 1, 1926, Senator Norbeck sought cloture on a bill to carry out the terms of the Migratory Bird Treaty with Great Britain. The motion was not agreed to. The bill did not become a law, and thus, for the first time within a period of 9 years, could it even be claimed the rule did not work. However, in the succeeding Congress, the Seventieth, a similar bill, S. 1271, was passed and approved and became a law—45 Statutes at Large 1222.

The next time cloture was invoked was when Senator Pepper, of Pennsylvania, sought to close debate on a bill to consolidate national banking institutions. The bill became a law. Was there any failure of the rule to work? Were there loopholes in it? Nobody complained. For 10 years the rule had been in use, and there had been no trouble with it.

The next time the rule was invoked was Senator Hiram Johnson, of California, moved to close debate on a bill for the protection and development of the Lower California Basin, commonly known as the Boulder Dam bill. The bill caused a fight between California and Arizona. It was a warm and vigorous fight. I recall it very distinctly. When Senator Johnson asked for cloture on the bill, it was defeated by a vote of 32 yeas to 59 nays, showing that the Senate took the side of the people of Arizona in the controversy.

However, largely due to that vote, the respective sides, according to Senate custom, as all Senators know, got together and compromised and adjusted their differences. The Boulder Dam bill became a law. The dam was constructed and it is now the property of the United States.

Again, cloture was invoked by Senator Tyson, of Tennessee, on a bill affecting the pay of officers, other than officers of the Regular Army, who had incurred physical disabilities in line of duty. Cloture was attempted. It was defeated, but in the next succeeding Congress a similar bill was passed, vetoed by the President, and enacted into law when the Congress overrode the veto. Surely, until that time, it could not be said the cloture rule had any loopholes in it or had failed to accomplish what its authors had intended.

About that time, Senator Lenroot sought cloture on a bill to authorize the purchase of certain lands for the erection of buildings within the District of Columbia. Cloture was denied, but within a short time, according to the usual practice in the Senate, the respective sides got together, a proper bill was agreed upon, and was passed. The lands were purchased and the improvements were made. The buildings still exist in our beautiful Capital city. Was there any failure of the rule at that time? Not the slightest. The rule had worked well until that time.

On the day the Lenroot petition for cloture was submitted, as I recall, on the bill to authorize the purchase of lands for the construction of buildings in Washington, Senator Jones of Washington filed a petition to close debate on a bill relating to the Bureau of Customs and prohibition. Senator Jones was a great prohibitionist at the time, as I was. I voted with him. Cloture carried on that measure by a vote of 55 to 27. The measure was at that time very popular. The bill was duly passed. It is true a subsequent Congress of which all of us were Members repealed prohibition, but it was not by reason of the Senate rule. The prohibition bill was not harmed by reason of a failure of the rule to work; on the contrary, it was aided by the rule. The bill was passed, and passed properly, the vote having been 71 to 6.

I come next to the Glass Banking Act. Senator Glass, of Virginia, was one of the ablest and one of the finest men I have ever known in my long service in this body. He was one of the most vigorous men I ever knew, one of the most honest. Intellectually he was one of the most gifted men I have ever known. He was one of the best men ever to serve in the Senate. Those who knew Senator Glass will remember his sterling character and

his splendid service to his country. A petition to apply cloture to the bill was defeated. Within a few days thereafter, due largely to the argument on the cloture petition, there was a unanimous-consent agreement for a vote, and the banking bill was passed.

The next time the rule was invoked, the petition was submitted by Senator Ball, of Minnesota, whom we all remember. He moved to close debate on the Bretton Woods Agreement, which was really a bill for a loan to Great Britain. That was in 1946. Cloture was defeated by a tie vote. The measure later became a law. In what manner? It was passed, as all measures ought to be passed in the Senate, in order to get the very best possible law, after deliberation, adjustment, and compromise.

It is a long time from 1917 to 1946. No one can say the present rule did not work during that time. It worked in every instance.

A short time before that, Mr. President, there was another kind of bill which was brought before this body—not merely one kind; there were three other kinds of bills brought before this body—and it is in regard to those bills that I wish to speak. What were those three bills which disclosed the so-called loopholes to which reference has been made?

Those three bills were the antilynching bill, the anti-poll-tax bill, and the FEPC bill.

As to all general measures coming before this body the rule had worked well, but it had not worked well in those instances. Why? The record shows why. Let me first discuss the antilynching bill. Lynching is a horrible crime. No one can defend it; no one does defend it. Lynching is a form of murder. Everyone knows that lynching is a form of murder, and everyone knows that the States in which murders occur, except the District of Columbia, has control and jurisdiction over that form of crime. It has been said that lynching is an unusual form of murder, is confined to a single section of the United States, and that for that reason the Federal Government ought to take jurisdiction and make it part of its business to punish the crime of lynching. Let us think about that for a moment. The time when lynching occurred quite frequently was many years ago. The Federal Government did not have any jurisdiction over it. It has no jurisdiction over it, under the Constitution. A few days ago the newspapers reported a man had killed his wife and buried his baby alive, just across the river, in Virginia. That was a horrible murder. I think the Senator from Massachusetts would agree that it is a horrible form of murder. Think of a man killing his wife and burying his child alive. It is a terrible crime. But, because it is a terrible crime, should the Federal Government, which has no jurisdiction, no constitutional power, over crimes committed in a State, step in and say, "Hereafter, we will punish anyone who commits such a horrible crime"? I think not. I do not think any reasonable person would say that the Government should do so.

I do not think any single Senator in this body would say for a moment that the Federal government has any jurisdiction over the crime of uxoricide, or the crime of filicide or infanticide, which are just as horrible as lynching. The proposed Federal antilynching law is purely a political step, wholly unconstitutional and wholly unnecessary. Under the control of the several States, lynching has virtually ceased. Let us let it stay ceased!

Why was an antilynching bill taken up? I shall come to that in a moment. Before I do, I want to say that on the first occasion cloture was invoked was by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. It was defeated; the bill never became law, and it should not have become law.

A short time after that, within 20 days, the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] again sought cloture on the same antilynching bill. The petition was defeated and the bill was not passed.

Later a petition for cloture was submitted by the then Senator from Kentucky, Senator BARKLEY. A vote was had, and the yeas were 37 and the nays were 41. Can the rule be said to have failed when the Senate, by a full majority, was opposed to the legislation? Some persons want to make it possible to invoke cloture by a majority of Senators present, and some want a constitutional majority of 49. But all of the antilynching bills were defeated, and the Federal Government did not take jurisdiction by force and violence.

What has been the result as to the crime of lynching? I am very happy to say that the crime of lynching has virtually ceased. There were only two lynchings last year, and I believe one was of a white man and the other was of a colored man. Yet the time of this body is being taken, largely for the purpose of authorizing the Federal Government to take unconstitutional jurisdiction of this particular crime. Why? It is for political reasons. It is politics, confined not to one party, not to one administration, but to both parties and both administrations. For what reason? For the purpose of punishing murder by lynching? Not at all! It is for the purpose of getting votes!

I digress here long enough to say that in what I have to say regarding this matter I have not the slightest prejudice of any kind against the colored people of my State or of the Nation. Some of the best friends I have are colored people. I want to help them rather than to hurt them. But we cannot make any people stronger and better by legislation. They must depend on their individual efforts in order to get anywhere in the world. That is how white people get ahead. We work for what we get. One cannot rise in life, here or anywhere else, through man-made laws. I am asking my colleagues to consider these matters when they come to vote today.

Mr. President, I have said that the reasons behind the pending motion are political. Let us see if they are not. We know that the Negroes compose the largest minority group of voters in this country. It is said the opposition to certain proposed measures is made up of men who are prejudiced against colored people. That is ridiculous. Indians are colored people, and we are not prejudiced against Indians. Bills are not being introduced to grant unusual rights to Indians. Who ever heard of such a bill being introduced? It is never done, for the reason that the Indians are very few in number in the several States. They do not form such a political group as to demand unusual treatment. They do not have enough votes in any State in the Union to justify violation of the provisions of our Federal Constitution. That is why bills making special provision for Indians are not presented.

What is the next measure on the list? The next is the anti-poll-tax bill, and that has heretofore failed because of the same reason I have given in the case of the first bill. It failed because a majority of the Senate was opposed to the bill, and so voted.

Next comes the FEPC measure. We all know what that is. The only reason for the effort to amend rule XXII is because of the failure to get the FEPC bill, the antilynching bill, and the anti-poll-tax bill passed.

So far as I am concerned, I have no objection to the enactment of an anti-poll-tax bill. If I were a member of a State legislature, I think I would vote for a bill to repeal the poll tax. But when we became Members of the Senate, we took an oath to uphold and defend the Federal Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic, and, so far as I am concerned, I still believe that that oath is a proper oath; I still believe that Constitution is the greatest document ever written by man. The formation of that Constitution of checks and balances, as it has been so frequently called, has done more for our Republic than all else.

Mr. President, I shall not pursue that thought further than to say that the effort to get cloture is a political matter, not confined to any one party. The Democratic administration, the executive branch of the Government, is just as strong for it as are our Republican friends. Our Republican friends want to obtain credit for the adoption of a cloture rule in order to get votes. The President wanted it in order to get the colored vote. The colored vote embraces a great minority in almost every State in the Union, and the effort is made here to inflict this unconstitutional measure upon the people of the United States for political purposes, pure and simple.

Mr. President, I do not believe that is a wise thing to do. It would be unfortunate for the colored people of my State and of my section of the country, and I am against the Federal Government undertaking to take the step, first, because I want to see the colored people of this country get along with the white people. It would disturb relationships which are now pleasant. It would stir up prejudices and trouble which would injure both the colored race and the white race. It would result in harm to our common country. Gentlemen had better let such matters alone. They had better stand by the Constitution of the United States.

It may be said that the Constitution is old-fashioned, that it has been in existence 150 years or more, and that it is

time to get a new one. What kind of a Constitution do those who make that suggestion want? Do they want one providing for majority rule? If they will read our Constitution, they will see that the Constitution is not fashioned on majority rule. There are many things which show that the Senate is a unique body of men, and let us look into history in order to see if it has been a failure under the rule of unlimited debate.

Who fashioned our Constitution and who fashioned the Senate? Of course, the leader of all was George Washington. Those who wrote the Constitution are commonly supposed to have been John Jay, Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and their distinguished colleagues in the Constitutional Convention. They were great men. They knew what they were doing. They created the greatest Government in the world.

Did they have cloture in those days? The first successful attempt at a modified cloture was in 1917, after more than 125 years of history under our Constitution.

What has been the history of it? Let us look at it for a moment. Beginning with the organization of the Senate after the Constitution had been ratified by the necessary number of States, and up until 1917, there had never been any cloture in this body. Freedom of debate had been the watchword of the Senate throughout its history. It was under this watchword that the Senate built up the high reputation it has had during our entire history as the greatest deliberative body in the world.

It will be remembered that when our Constitution was being drafted, beginning in 1787, I believe, the great body of our people were of British descent. We had been a British colony during practically all our history, and very naturally when the great men who were the framers of our Constitution, representing the Thirteen Colonies, came together in convention for the purpose of fashioning a new government, they evidently made the British Parliament their general guide, although of course they had before them the histories of the ancient Governments of Greece and Rome. They used their own ability and relied on their own experiences in shaping the Constitution.

Each of the 13 States, having a government of its own, with unlimited powers, was very jealous of its powers, and in forming the Federal Constitution they specifically provided that the jurisdiction of the Federal Government was to be limited to subjects over which it was given specific authority by the Constitution. All other powers were reserved to the several States or to the people.

Mr. President, as I said before, I am one of those who believe in our Government. I believe in our Constitution. I believe in American policies, in American practices, in American rules, and I am utterly and profoundly opposed to communistic proposals, whether they are advocated in Russia or whether they are advocated in America, or wherever they are advocated.

Mr. President, from the very beginning of our history, owing to our remarkable Constitution and to those who were elected to carry out its provisions, tremendous interest has centered around the personnel of the United States Senate. I am going to divide the history of the Senate and its personnel into periods.

In the period from 1789 to 1821 there was a great body of men who made themselves and their country famous. I will mention only some of the outstanding Senators of that period who made our country famous.

There was John Quincy Adams, of Massachusetts, who belonged to a celebrated family of that name, two of whose members afterwards became Presidents.

There was James A. Bayard, of Delaware, whose work not only made Delaware famous, but aided in making the Senate of the United States famous.

There was Charles Carroll, of Maryland, one of the greatest men of that first senatorial body.

There was Henry Clay, of Kentucky, a great orator and statesman, whose name is a symbol for all that is high and honorable in statesmanship.

There was William H. Crawford, of Georgia, one of the great men of his day.

There were John H. Eaton and Andrew Jackson, of Tennessee, both great men, and Andrew Jackson who first served in 1797 and who again served in 1823 and afterwards became President of the United States. I am proud even to have the pleasure of speaking his name in this body which he first adorned more than 150 years ago. Andrew Jackson was a fearless man, a man who was not bound, and was not willing to be bound, by gag rule of a majority, or of a party leader. I am proud to be one of the successors of such a man.

There was Rufus King, of New York, one of the outstanding men of his time.

There was John Langdon, of New Hampshire, a great leader from his State.

There was Samuel Maclay, of Pennsylvania, who took a great part in building up the Senate's reputation of that early day.

There was James Monroe, of Virginia, who afterwards became President of the United States.

There was Charles Pinckney, of South Carolina, who added great fame and prestige not only to his State but to the Senate itself.

These men and others of like kind, famous in their own communities, in their own States, and as citizens of the New Republic, gave to the Senate from the very beginning a great name and a great fame.

Were these great men bound down by cloture rule? No. It was not even suggested that they be bound by a cloture rule. They made this body great under the rule of unlimited debate. Has anyone been hurt by unlimited debate? Has our Government been hurt by it? Has our country been hurt by the freedom of debate which exists in the Senate? What American can say that our country would have been greater if the Senate had been under the control of a ruthless majority, with an ambitious Executive sending down to us for our approval such measures as he desired us to approve? That may be considered to be the modern way. Bills can be passed more rapidly in that way, there is no doubt of that. Mr. President, it is not my way. I do not believe it is right, and I shall vote against it. If the Senate did not have unlimited debate, all the President would have to do would be to send a bill to Congress, there would be no use for a committee to look into it, because that had already been done, and it should be passed as the Executive wanted it passed. That is the modern idea, that is the liberal idea. That is the way things are done in Russia. Russia right now is one of the outstanding nations of the world. Are we to pattern after Russia, or are we to pattern after the Government of our forefathers who created this great country of ours?

The men who first stood in the Senate, who were not ashamed of their seats in the Senate, who did not criticize the Senate and the Senate rules, were not bound by cloture. Why should we have cloture? So that some man may get more votes, as he thinks, in some States, to further his political ambitions? I do not think that is the reason why cloture should be established. I believe in the laws we pass here. I believe the United States Senate is still the greatest deliberative body in the world. I am proud to have a seat in a body which was first filled by the great men whose names I have read. They were not bound by cloture. Quite to the contrary.

Let us consider the next period for a moment, the period from 1821 to 1841. Who were some of the outstanding Senators of that period? There was Thomas H. Benton, of Missouri; James Buchanan, of Pennsylvania, who afterward became President; John C. Calhoun, of South Carolina, one of the greatest orators of his day; William Henry Harrison, of Ohio, who afterward became President; Robert Y. Hayne, of South Carolina, another great orator and statesman; James Iredell, of North Carolina; John Tyler, of Virginia, who afterward became President; Martin Van Buren, of New York, who also afterward became President; Daniel Webster, of Massachusetts, called by many the greatest orator of all time. There was also Franklin Pierce, of New Hampshire, who afterwards became President of the United States.

These were the men who gave the name and fame to the United States Senate. Were they gagged by cloture rule in those days? They had unlimited debate in those days. The laws which were passed by them, which made our country great, which brought us to the present state in which we find ourselves, were passed without any rule such as that which it is now proposed to inflict upon us.

Let us take the next period, the third period from 1841 to 1861. Some of those who sat in this body then were John M. Berrien, of Georgia, orator and statesman; Simon Cameron, of Pennsylvania, one of the great statesmen of his day. There was Lewis Cass, of Michigan. By the way, with all the name and fame that attaches to Lewis Cass, I doubt if he were a greater statesman than one of his successors in this body [Mr. VANDENBERG],

who stands for the American doctrine; not for the Russian doctrine of mob legislation, but the American doctrine of deliberation and debate.

Let us take some of the rest of them. Salmon P. Chase, of Ohio, was a great statesman and jurist. We all remember that afterward he became Chief Justice of the United States. John J. Crittenden, of Kentucky; Stephen A. Douglas, of Illinois, who was known as the Little Giant among orators in this body; John C. Fremont, of California; Hannibal Hamlin, of Maine, second to none; Sam Houston, of Texas, a great statesman and orator; Andrew Johnson, of Tennessee, who afterwards became President of the United States.

Did they have gag rule in those days? Did they accept directions from an Executive who desired votes, and would send bills down here to be approved without debate, merely because a temporary majority was in favor of them or in favor of the administration? That is not the way to legislate. We have the right way of legislating in this body.

As I stated a little while ago, I believe that I am the only Member of this body who was present and voted for the rule we now have, the amendment to rule XXII. When Senators have served as long as I have in this body, they will all have the same view I have. They will not be emphasizing the shortcomings of the Senate. They will be proud of its history, proud of its work, proud of its ability to do business. We do just as much business as, and probably more than, any other legislative body on earth today. We talk about the shortcomings of the Senate. What body in the world transacts more business than does the United States Senate?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator has spoken of the United States Senate and the business it transacts. The distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee is chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, which committee transacts more business than perhaps any of the other committees. If we should have gag rule in the Senate, what would be the final effect upon the committee? The distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee has kept hearings open day after day and week after week so that every witness, be he humble or high, could be heard.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator. I believe that if this gag rule is enforced upon the Senate, it will not be long before we shall not have a committee like the Committee on Appropriations or the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the Senate. Directions will simply be sent down here for us to approve; and if the administration is in the majority, they will be approved.

I am astounded by some of the expressions from Senators who come from not very populous States, but very large States in the West. Hardly a day passes that some of those Senators do not come before the Appropriations Committee to have various troubles corrected and various items considered in the interest of their States. They ought to come when they have business of that kind. I am not criticizing them for it. I am commending them for it. But if a gag rule, such as is proposed, is imposed upon the Senate, they will receive short shrift when it comes to getting for their constituents what they honestly believe they are entitled to. Under the present rules, it makes no difference what party is in control of the Senate. Senators can always get a fair and impartial hearing for the wants, needs, and desires of their constituents, both in committee and on the floor of the Senate.

Will Senators accept directions as to what sort of bills shall be passed? If a gag rule is imposed upon the Senate, when a young man comes down from the other end of the Avenue with a bill which the Executive wants to have passed, they will have nowhere to go. Why? Because a majority—sometimes a kindly majority with respect to the desires of Senators, but more often a ruthless majority which is looking only at its own interests—will not give them an opportunity to be heard.

Do Senators want to change our committees Those committees were organized under the rules of the Senate. Our actions here are under rules which have been established, for the most part, for more than 100 years. Do Senators want to change those rules so as to make this a different body? Do they want to make it a body patterned after the Russian idea, or a body such as they have in Italy or France, or—and I am rather ashamed to say it—a body such as now exists in England, a socialistic body? The administration sends to the Parliament what the head of the government wants, and they get it. Is that legislation? Is that the kind of legislation that Americans want?

What has made this body great throughout the years? It has been its independence, its courage, its desire to look after the best interests of the Nation. Why change it? What reason can be given for changing the fundamental rules under which we are governed? Because some man wants to be President? Because some candidate, whether Democratic or Republican—and I make no distinction in that regard—wants to carry a State in the next political contest? Some candidate wants more votes. That is the only reason that can be advanced for the application of such a rule as is proposed.

Mr. President, let us stand by the Government of our fathers, which has made us the greatest nation in the world. The men whose names I have read, who once served as Members of this body, and whose successors we are, were not afraid. They passed no gag rules in those days.

Mr. President, some persons say we are filibustering. I do not believe any Member of this body would charge that I have ever made a filibustering speech. The speech I am now making is about as near as I have ever come to a filibustering speech in my life. I am not filibustering; I am pleading with the Members of the Senate of the United States, regardless of party, to stand by the Constitution, which they swore before Almighty God they would defend and protect against all enemies, foreign and domestic. Those oaths, the Senate rules, and the work done in this body under its rules have made this a famous body. Let us not be afraid to stand for the right to stand for what is best for our country—to stand against legislation proposed for political purposes only, which legislation is foreign to the principles and policies of our great forefathers and our great predecessors in this body.

Mr. President, you and I know that many Senators besides myself have seen men in their own States spend all they have and more, all their friends would give them, and all their families would give them, to be elected to this body, and yet as soon as they came to this body, they wanted to reorganize it, they wanted to readjust it or remake it, they wanted to remake it along the lines of the Russian Government—in short, a body controlled by a ruthless majority, or a despotism after the fashion of a Lenin, or a Stalin, or a Hitler. I wish to say here and now, Mr. President, that I have been to Russia, I have seen the Russian people, I have seen the Russian Government, I have seen that Government working. Between this great, free, Government of ours, with a Senate which believes in the freedom of debate, and the Russian Government, for instance, there is no more comparison than there is between daylight and darkness. The Russians virtually have no government. The Russian people have no rights, except those handed to them by someone temporarily in power.

Mr. President, let us not make the fatal mistake of taking the first great step toward overturning our free Government which has made our Nation so wonderful and so strong. Thus far we have not met with failure, but our every step has been on the road to success. Let us keep on that way.

Now let me discuss for a moment the history of the membership of the Senate from 1861 to 1901. Who were the Members of this body during that period? Among its Members were Justin S. Morrill, of Vermont; John P. Hale, of New Hampshire; John Sherman, of Ohio; Solomon Foot, of Vermont; Thomas A. Hendricks, of Indiana; William Pitt Fessenden, of Maine; Samuel C. Pomeroy, of Kansas; Zachariah Chandler, of Michigan; Frederick T. Frelinghuysen, of New Jersey; Oliver P. Morton, of Indiana; Roscoe Conkling, of New York, one of the most outstanding of all Senators not only among those of his own day but among Senators of all time; Garrett Davis, of Kentucky; George F. Edmunds, of Vermont; Carl Schurz, of Missouri; Thomas F. Bayard, of Delaware; William B. Allison, of Iowa; John J. Ingalls, of Kansas, one of the greatest orators ever to serve in this body; James G. Blaine, of Maine, another of the very outstanding men of his day both as an orator and a statesman; John P. Jones, of Nevada; and John T. Morgan and Edmund W. Pettus, of Alabama.

Mr. President, having been born in Alabama, I know I will be excused for an additional word about these two great men. They lived in the county where I was born and they were friends of my father, who was also a lawyer. The firm of Pettus and Morgan was a leading law

firm in Selma, Alabama, our county seat. They were law partners for many years. General Morgan was elected to the Senate in 1877 and served until his death in June 1907. General Pettus entered the Senate in 1897 and served in this body with his law partner, Senator Morgan, for more than 10 years, and until his death in July 1907. As a child I remember visiting their offices in Selma with my father. They were both great men, grand men who made great Senators and who stood for no gag rule!

In this connection I might add here that I believe Senators Pettus and Morgan were the only two law partners living in the same town who ever both served at the same time in the Senate, with the exception of our friends, the present two Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. MCGRATH] who have served for several years together as Senators, from Providence, Rhode Island. They were also law partners and from the same town. Ordinarily Senators are elected from different sections of the State. Senators Pettus and Morgan, both of the then small town of Selma, were in the Senate together for nearly 10 years. It was quite unusual.

Mr. President, these great Senators in the period from 1861 to 1901, and others like them, aided greatly in maintaining and building up the name and fame of the United States Senate. Was there a gag rule on these distinguished men? Their names have been household words all over this country of ours. Many of them were great statesmen. Were they bound by gag rules? Did they get bills through the Senate by reason of cloture? Oh, no! They got their bills through by reason of their ability to put them through on this floor.

Others of the great Members of the Senate in those days were William Windom, of Minnesota; George F. Hoar, of Massachusetts; Lucius Q. C. Lamar, of Mississippi; James Shields, of Missouri; Isham G. Harris and Thomas Battle Turley, of Tennessee; Augustus H. Garland, of Arkansas; Orville H. Platt, of Connecticut; Henry M. Teller, of Colorado; George G. Vest, of Missouri; Zebulon B. Vance, of North Carolina; and Francis M. Cockrell, of Missouri.

Mr. President, were those men advocates of cloture? Oh, no; there was no cloture in those days. In those days, Senators stood on their own individual merit and got their bills passed by virtue of their arguments and eloquence and attention to duty. Bills were not shot through the Senate by a determined majority or by a gag rule imposed because of the wishes of an executive or a party majority. Those men made the United States what it is today; they made the United States Senate what it is today. In those days, men were men. Have we now no men to stand by our own institutions? Mr. President, I doubt whether 1 Senator among 10 in this body has even seen the work of the government that some persons are attempting to incline us toward—the Russian Government. In Russia, what is called majority rule exists. If any Senators here ever saw it, they would be ashamed of it, for it is not a government, it has nothing of which we would be proud. Senators are often told about it by persons who know very little or nothing about it. The present proposal is the first step toward communism in this country. I refer to the proposed amendment of the rule, the proposed abolition of freedom of debate in this body, and the creation here of a gag rule by which the Senate would pass bills which were sent to it by an Executive.

I wonder how many Senators have seen the so-called liberal government of Russia. If any Senator within the hearing of my voice has seen the Russian Government in action, I should be glad to have him stand up and tell me and tell the American people what sort of a government it is. That government does not have gag rules, because such rules are not needed. The Russian leader maintains whatever kind of government he desires; he has any kind of legislation that he wishes put through.

I see my friend, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], at his desk across the aisle. I wonder whether he would like to have a president send proposed legislation to the Senate and tell the Senate to pass it, regardless of whether the Senate liked it, but simply because the administration wanted it. Are we going to make the Senate that kind of a body? If so, Senators are not the kind of independent men I think they are. So, I am pleading with the Senate. I am not filibustering; I am pleading that this thing be not done to our country. Do not take this step. It was said today by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] it would be an historic step. It will be the first step toward the so-called liberalization of our Government, making it more and more like the supposed Russian Government about which we hear so much today.

Mr. President, I do not want to see the Senate reorganized. I do not want to see it refashioned to conform to any other legislative body. I think the Senate is the most effective legislative body in the world today. I am proud of being a member of it. I am proud of its history. I am proud of its rules. I am proud of its work. We had better let well enough alone. The Senate has done very well indeed for a little over 150 years. It would be better for us to stand by its rules instead of seeking to conform it to the new-fangled governments of the world.

I pause to give an illustration of what I really believe in. As the distinguished Senator from Michigan said, it is not exactly analogous to what we are talking about, but it is along the same line. A bill was recently sent to Congress requesting an appropriation of about $5,400,000, as I recall the figure. When General Fleming came before the Committee I was very greatly perturbed. I am not an architect, though I love beautiful buildings. As an American, I love the building we know as the White House. I think it is the most beautiful residence of any ruler or leader in all the world. Do Senators know what I was afraid of when General Fleming came to the Senate to ask for $5,400,000 with which to rebuild that edifice?

I was afraid the present White House was to be torn down and a newfangled building such as the Pentagon constructed in its place, to be known as the White House of America. I stated my fears to General Fleming. I said, "Before we appropriate one dollar of the money, I want to know whether you are going to change the outside appearance of the White House." He said he was glad to assure me it was not planned to change the outside appearance of the White House at all, that its outside walls, its columns and balconies and its general structure would be retained, but the purpose was to place a steel structure on the inside in order to make the walls strong. I then asked General Fleming what he was going to do to the historic rooms of the White House and the whole interior of that wonderful building. He said the Blue Room was not to be changed, nor the East Room, nor the various other historic rooms of the building. The building was to be repaired, but it would remain almost exactly as it appears today. I said to General Fleming, "So far as I am concerned, if you assure me that is what you are going to do, I shall be glad to vote for an appropriation to keep the White House as it is. It is an historic building. Every American should want it to remain as it is. We want it strong. We do not want its walls to fall, or anything like that." I said, "In my judgment, the people of America want the building to remain as it is. I certainly do. I expect to uphold your getting the money with which to repair it, on condition that its outer appearance and beauty are not to be destroyed, and on condition that its interior beauty, grace, and attractiveness are not to be impaired.

"That is the way I feel about the Government. I want to keep it as it is, with its present Constitution. I want to see it preserved along the lines intended by our great forefathers." They were great men in those days—Jefferson, Madison, Hamilton, and the others who fashioned it. They knew what they were doing. They erected a great Government. Our country has become better and richer and stronger and more efficient every year since it was established.

Today there are those who seek to undermine it through changing our rules. It is said, "The difference is only the difference between Tweedledum and Tweedledee. It is only the difference between a motion and a measure, so really there is no difference." All Senators know better than that. The effort is to make it conform to the fashion of the Russian Government; to which I am utterly opposed. I want our Government to remain an American Government. Our Government has succeeded when nearly every other government in the world has failed. Let us keep it an American Government of which we can all be proud.

As I say, regardless of anything that may be said to the contrary, I am not undertaking a filibuster. I am appealing to Senators, such of them as are present and listening, not to take the first big step toward destroying this great Government of ours. Let us stand by it. Let us uphold it. Let us uphold its Constitution and its rules. Let us uphold the principles upon which it was founded.

I mean no disrespect to the Vice President. He and I have been friends for more than 30 years, and I have great respect for him. However, I think he is entirely wrong in the ruling which he has made on the point of order. I shall vote not to sustain that ruling. I think that to sustain it would be a fatal step in our history. I hope the other Senators who feel as I do will vote the same way. I can perhaps say that I speak from experience. I have been here for more than 32 years. I was quite proud of my Government when I came to the Senate, and I am a thousand times more proud of it today than I was at that time.

For Heaven's sake, my friends of the Senate, let us stand by the Constitution! Let us stand by the Senate! Let us stand by its rules!

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to speak at length upon the question before us. I am one of those who have been giving thought to the question within the past few days, and I should like to express to my colleagues and for the record the reasons for such conclusions as I have reached in regard to my own action on the pending appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The first big issue, as I see it, Mr. President, is the question of whether we want any cloture rule at all. I want to commend, with all my sincerity, the strong case that I feel has been presented by our colleagues from the Southern States who are taking the position that there should be no limitation on debate under any circumstances.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does the Senator think that only Senators from the Southern States believe there should be no limitation on debate?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Not by any means. I am commending the arguments made by the Senators from the Southern States.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. Was not the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan the first speaker today——

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I shall come to that in a moment.

As I started to say, Mr. President, the first big question, it seems to me, is whether we want any limitation on debate at all, or whether the situation, as it has developed through the years, is such that there may be occasions on which it might be desirable, under extreme circumstances, to limit the freedom of unlimited debate. Having served for 2 years on the Foreign Relations Committee and being deeply concerned with world conditions, I feel that circumstances can arise in which it might seem important to a large preponderance of Members of the Senate that the business of the Senate be proceeded with. So I have come to the conclusion that somewhere, somehow, this body should be able to determine, after a long period of debate, and only after a long period of debate, that it is time we proceeded with the business before us. But I want to say, Mr. President, that I object strenuously to any suggestion from any source that it be a majority determination. I am much wedded to the idea that has been advanced by Senators on the other side of the aisle that the Constitution of the United States definitely protects us against the absolutism of majorities as well as against the absolutism of dictators. I agree entirely with that position, and I agree that in establishing the Senate it was understood that the States would be recognized State by State, their independent sovereignties recognized, and that we should not merge the States in what might be a majority of the population. That was undoubtedly the reason for the unlimited-debate rule.

So I say to my colleagues, very definitely, that I am opposed to any suggestion that a majority should determine the cloture rule. Personally, I say frankly that I should prefer to see a three-fourths majority cloture rule, because I think the privilege of unlimited debate is so important that only the most extreme circumstances should require setting it aside.

I will say, further, that the debates which have gone on in committee and the discussions which I have had convince me that a rule providing that a constitutional two-thirds majority, which would be 64 Members of the Senate, could determine that the time had come to set aside the privilege of unlimited debate, after a long and full discussion of any measure before us, it would be a reasonable rule. That is the rule which I understand is proposed by the Hayden-Wherry resolution.

Therefore, after thinking the matter through, I have come to the conclusion that I am prepared to support the Hayden-Wherry resolution as a clarification of the situation which now confronts us.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. I want to ask the Senator this question: Is the Hayden-Wherry resolution before the Senate?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. No; the motion to make it the unfinished business is before the Senate.

Mr. MAYBANK. So the question which is before the Senate is a motion; is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is correct. I am trying to address myself to the issues which have disturbed me in my thinking, and I appreciate the Senator's bringing out that point.

It has seemed to me that it was wise to approach the matter from the standpoint of clarifying what apparently is in our rules, known as rule XXII. That rule is our cloture rule. We have heard long debate on it. It provides that the cloture rule may be applied on any pending measure. We have heard discussed the question of whether a motion to make a certain piece of business the business before the Senate is a pending measure. There is obviously enough doubt as to what those words mean to make it important for us to try to clarify our thinking, if we are to have any effective cloture rule at all.

No one has a higher regard for my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Michigan, than I have. No one could have sat here last summer and heard his wonderful exposition of his interpretation of the language of the rule, and heard it again today, without realizing the great skill and the great earnestness with which he approaches all these questions. I very frankly admit that the position he takes is a perfectly reasonable one, because, certainly, from the use of that language and the precedents cited, it looks as though that were the sound conclusion to draw. I have no quarrel with the fact that he did decide in that way last summer, although I admit that at the time I felt completely frustrated when it seemed to him necessary to make that decision. Why frustrated? Because if rule XXII is limited to a measure before the Senate, and cannot be applied to any pending matter which might be holding up the Senate in its deliberations, then I could see no reason why the rule was ever adopted in the first place. In that case it is nothing; it is simply an expression which it is very hard for me to understand. It seemed to me, in thinking the matter through and studying it, that no one could possibly understand the motives of those who framed the rule, unless they intended to have some means by which, if the Senate expressed itself by a certain preponderance, which they set at two-thirds, the Senate could say, "At this point we will discontinue the debate and proceed to finish our business."

It seems to me without reason to argue that they intended to have a rule affect only a measure which was then before them, and not affect a motion to bring up that measure, if they really intended to make such a rule effective.

So, Mr. President, I have come reluctantly to the conclusion that I cannot agree with my distinguished colleague from Michigan. It seems to me that we become very legalistic if we do not go back into history and look into the minds of those who framed the rule, what the issue was before them at the time, what they were driving at, and why they thought it was necessary for them to do something.

What was the situation? There was a war in progress, as I read the record, when it was necessary for the Senate to look forward to the time when some issue might arise which would make it imperative for them to act. I feel that today, with the situation in the world as it is, I am unwilling to leave us without any possibility of shutting off what might be a genuine attempt to prevent this Government acting in case of a great crisis.

I feel that we must come to an agreement as to some kind of rule so that the preponderance of opinion of the Senate can be mobilized so as to say to those few who might want to head off action, "This is a crisis in which we feel we must act."

Mr. President, I believe that such a conclusion is consistent with my insistence that the right of unlimited debate

is one of the most precious possessions we have, one of the most precious protections for minorities in this country, one of the most precious protections against absolutism of a majority, of which I am as fearful as is anyone else.

I want very much to see us move in as rapidly as we can to determine whether or not we can, as statesmen, adopt the Hayden-Wherry resolution. I do not support the ruling of Vice President BARKLEY for any reason of expediency, but simply because I think he is on sound ground in saying he cannot explain the existence of rule XXII under any hypothesis except that it was the intention of the Senate, when the rule was adopted, to provide for the power to bring any discussion to an end and enable the Senate to go on with its business.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Utah in the chair). Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield for a question.

Mr. DONNELL. Is the Senator willing to state how he stood last summer in regard to the Vandenberg ruling, whether he agreed with it or did not agree with it?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. We did not act on the matter, the Senator will recall.

Mr. DONNELL. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I felt frustrated because I had hoped we would get another ruling. It seemed to me then, as I say now, that there was no way in which I could explain putting rule XXII into the Senate rules except on the theory that those who framed the rule intended to have some way by which they could bring debate to an end and proceed with their business. I still feel that way.

Mr. DONNELL. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I wanted specifically to know whether the Senator at that time agreed or disagreed with the Vandenberg ruling.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I disagreed with the ruling.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I saw an article in the New York Herald Tribune this morning which gave me a great deal of concern, and I wish to refer to it because I do not want anyone interested in this discussion to think I have acted in bad faith. The New York Herald Tribune this morning, Friday, March 11, after discussing the Barkley ruling and the news connected with it, said:

> Senators H. ALEXANDER SMITH, of New Jersey, and CLYDE REED, of Kansas, were among the Republicans who, after having promised to vote with the southerners, signed the cloture petition.

Mr. President, the last thing I would do would be to break a promise. I have never made a promise in this connection. I told the press I would not take a position until I heard the Vice President's ruling, and until I talked further with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. I told questioners I would not take a position, and there was no justification to report me in any poll whatsoever. I have not changed my position at all. I am stating how I have felt all the way through. But I have declined to be committed to any poll of any sort prior to the time when we had to vote.

To sum up what I have said in these few remarks, I wish to read a statement I sent out yesterday when I signed the cloture petition. I said this:

> I have joined the cloture petition today in order that the Senate may be able promptly to decide whether it proposes to have any cloture rule at all. The present rule XXII, covering the question of cloture, is ambiguous and may be subject to different interpretations.

There is no doubt of that, as evidenced by the fact that two of the leading statesmen in this body today, my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and the distinguished Vice President, Senator Barkley, have differed as to the interpretation of the rule, as it reads now. My statement continued:

> While I favor a cloture rule which may be effective when needed, I desire to make it clear that I believe firmly in the right of debate, and I would vigorously oppose any rule which would give a mere majority the power to curtail that fundamental right.

I wish to add, Mr. President—and I say it with deep respect—I was shocked beyond measure when I read in the press that the President of the United States had recommended that we adopt a majority rule on cloture. I continue reading from my statement:

> Ours is a Government of checks and balances, and the right of free debate is one of the checks to prevent the arbitrary domination by a mere majority. Only under extreme circumstances, and where the full membership of the Senate has had a chance to consider the implications, should the right of unlimited debate be curtailed. In my judgment, a two-thirds vote of the entire Senate, after twenty-four hours' notice and after a petition by a substantial number of Senators, should be required to set aside this safeguard of our fundamental liberties.

As I said before, Mr. President, I cannot reconcile the inclusion in our present rules of rule XXII except by the interpretation that it was the intention of those who framed it to provide that the Senate should have power to cut off debate on any subject when Senators felt it was important to proceed with Senate business.

For the reasons I have stated, Mr. President, I propose to support the Vice President's ruling at this time.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield for a question.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator stated he was against majority cloture. Does he differentiate between a majority of a quorum and a constitutional majority?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Of course, if it was a constitutional majority, it would mean 49 Senators. But I would certainly oppose any majority rule, even a constitutional majority. I would like to see a constitutional majority of two-thirds which would mean 64 Senators. The right of unlimited debate is too precious a protector of minorities to be cut off by any smaller preponderance. But we must have a cloture rule which can be used effectively.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, as a freshman Senator, I did not expect to speak for some weeks or months to come, and, after the addresses we have heard on the subject now under discussion, I know that what I may have to say will be of little weight, but before the debate was closed, I did wish to set forth my position. Also, I have some documents on my desk which I think might throw a little additional light on the intentions of the Senators in 1917 when rule XXII was adopted.

Mr. President, the position I take is not an easy one for me politically, because most of my colleagues from the South have been joining in this filibuster. It is not an easy position for me personally, because I have a very close and affectionate relationship with my colleagues from the South, and I dislike very much to have to disagree with them. I would not do so if I did not have a very deep conviction about the matter, and I hope my colleagues from the Southern States will understand that I am doing what my conscience dictates.

I have a firm conviction that the necessity of the Senate being able to function is paramount to any single domestic issue or any group of domestic issues, because if the Senate cannot discharge its constitutional obligation our whole system of democratic Government may be doomed. Particularly, Mr. President, at this time, when the United States of America has an obligation of world leadership for peace and world stability it is most necessary that our legislative body be able to function after reasonable consideration and debate. This position of leadership, holding the torch of democracy high, will require action with reasonable dispatch on important measures, treaties, resolutions, bills dealing with the defense of our country, and a score of international problems. All of these measures may be opposed, and undoubtedly will be opposed, by a few Members of the United States Senate. But they must be determined and not talked to death by a very few Members which is now possible unless rule XXII is strengthened.

During this crucial period of history, with a rule of unlimited debate, under which the mechanism of this body can be chained by the will of four or five determined men, I do not think we can afford to proceed into the difficult period ahead without making a determined effort to cure that situation.

When for the first time in the history of the world this Republic has a duty of international leadership, are we going to face the complexities of this period with our legislative body in a straitjacket?

Mr. President, the situation we now confront is exactly that which faced the United States Senate in March 1917, when rule XXII was adopted.

What was the purpose of the Senators in 1917? All the hairsplitting and technical interpretations that can be thought up cannot and should not obscure the in-

tent or thwart the purpose of the act of March 8, 1917, which is now rule XXII.

I know, Mr. President, that newspapers 30 years old may be subject to the statute of limitations, but in this case they are very revealing. The chief determination to be made here, I believe, is: What did the Members of the Senate in 1917 intend to do? At that time the *Lusitania* and other ships of the United States had been sunk by German submarines. President Wilson had recommended the passage of a bill to authorize the arming of ships, and the bill had passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 403 to 13. In the United States Senate, as has been so frequently stated, a small group of the Members of this august body filibustered and killed that measure. There was great indignation throughout the country. Petitions were sent to the United States Senate by several State legislatures, requesting that the Senate place itself in a position so that it could act for the defense of this country.

Mr. President, I have taken the trouble of going to the Library of Congress and reviewing a great many newspapers of that time, which, of course, reflected the condition of our Nation and the situation that brought about the necessity for passing some kind of cloture provision. These newspapers describe, with precision, the intention of the Senate.

Then, in recognition of the demand of the public, from the pulpit, the press, by the State legislatures, on March 4, 1917—and this is a point which I do not think has been brought out in the debates had here so far—as reported by the New York Times, a solemn agreement was signed by 33 Senators pledged to amend the rules to halt filibustering. On the front page of the New York Times of March 5, 1917, there appears an article which I shall read. The New York Times, I think, is one of the great newspapers of the country. At that time the editor and publisher was Adolph S. Ochs, of whom my home city of Chattanooga is very proud, because it was there that he had his start as publisher of the Chattanooga Times.

> WASHINGTON, March 4.— Under the leadership of Senator Robert L. Owen, of Oklahoma, virtually half of the new Senate has already pledged itself to cooperate to compel a change in the rules of the Senate, so that it can act instead of being rendered helpless by successful filibustering in the future.
>
> As soon as the Senate meets in special session tomorrow an agreement, now in possession of Senator Owen, and which has already been signed by 33 Senators, including several Senators-elect, will become effective pledging them to cooperate to "compel" such a change in the rules of the Senate as President Wilson, in the statement issued by himself at the White House tonight, declares to be the only remedy for the present powerless, helpless situation of the Government in a great international crisis. The pledge is in the following form:
>
> "WASHINGTON, *March 3, 1917.*
>
> "We, the undersigned, hereby mutually covenant and agree to cooperate with each other in compelling such changes in the rules of the Senate as to terminate successful filibustering and enable the majority to fix an hour for disposing of any bill or question subject to the rule of 1 hour to each Senator for discussion before or after the hour is fixed. This agreement to go into effect March 5, 1917."

Who were some of the signers of this solemn agreement? Robert L. Owen, Oklahoma; Atlee Pomerene, Ohio; Henry F. Hollis, New Hampshire; Ollie M. James, Kentucky; James A. Reed, Missouri; William Hughes, New Jersey; James K. Vardaman, Mississippi; Henry L. Myers, Montana; Morris Sheppard, Texas; George E. Chamberlain, Oregon; John Sharp Williams, Mississippi; William F. Kirby, Arkansas; A. A. Jones, New Mexico; Claude A. Swanson, Virginia; Duncan U. Fletcher, Florida; John Walter Smith, Maryland; Willard Saulsbury, Delaware; W. J. Stone, Missouri; Edwin S. Johnson, South Dakota; Charles S. Thomas, Colorado; Henry F. Ashurst, Arizona; Key Pittman, Nevada; Paul O. Husting, Wisconsin; Thomas J. Walsh, Montana; Joseph T. Robinson, Arkansas; James D. Phelan, California; W. H. King, Utah; J. C. W. Beckham, Kentucky; Joseph E. Ransdell, Louisiana; James Hamilton Lewis, Illinois; William H. Thompson, Kansas; Francis G. Newlands, Nevada; Albert B. Fall, of New Mexico.

And then the story of the New York Times continues, Mr. President:

> Others, who, while they have not yet signed the agreement, have agreed to support the movement, are Thomas S. Martin, Virginia; Hoke Smith, Georgia; Harry Lane, Oregon; John F. Shafroth, Colorado; Oscar W. Underwood, Alabama; Kenneth McKellar, Tennessee; and Park Trammell, Florida.

Mr. President, I think the statement of this covenant is very significant. It is very short, and I want to read it, and paraphrase as I do:

> We, the undersigned, hereby mutually covenant and agree to cooperate with each other in compelling such changes in the rules of the Senate as to terminate successful filibustering.

What was the main purpose of these distinguished Members of the Senate from every section of the United States at the time they undertook to adopt rule XXII? To terminate successful filibustering. They did not pledge to terminate filibustering on one type of proceedings and leave the right intact for other purposes.

It is very significant, Mr. President, with all this talk about majority rule, that the next sentence should be:

> And enable the majority to fix an hour for disposing of any bill or question.

These distinguished Senators, many of them southerners, did not feel that unlimited debate was so sacred. They wanted majority cloture.

Mr. President, what were the limitations to this covenant which was entered into at that time? Was there any limitation that they would terminate filibuster only on a pending measure after it was in the process of being discussed? No, Mr. President, it covered all proceedings. Was there any provision that this limitation would not apply to a motion to bring up a pending measure, and, of course, no measure can be brought up unless there is a motion to bring it up? Their determination was to stop filibustering. They made no limitation as to motions or any preliminary proceeding. They only made one limitation. This limitation is—

> Subject to the rule of 1 hour to each Senator for discussion before or after the hour is fixed. This agreement to go into effect March 5, 1917.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Did the Senator in reading the contents of the resolution also find the statement in the alternative bill or question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes. "Disposing of any bill or question." Yes, bill or question. This was their intention and we must assume they had the capacity to carry out their purpose.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will yield further, I will say that is the point I thought should be brought out.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the distinguished Senator for a question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not quite understand from what the Senator was reading. Was it a resolution adopted by the Senate?

Mr. KEFAUVER. This was the original beginning of the deliberations and of the agreement which led to the adoption of rule XXII. This was the covenant which was entered into by the Senators at that time as to what they were going to do to stop filibustering. "Covenant" is the word they used.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield for a question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not quite understand the use of the word "covenant." We do not use that word here. I wonder what the significance of the word "covenant" is.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That was the language which they used:

> We, the undersigned, hereby mutually covenant and agree—

That is the language they used. They had a gentleman's agreement for that purpose. They were joining in a solemn agreement to curb unlimited debate which had rendered the Senate impotent.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield for a question.

Mr. PEPPER. Did not the Senator also read the name of Senator Martin, of Virginia, who was the majority leader, and who later presented to the Senate the resolution which became rule XXII, as one of the Senators who indicated that, while they did not sign the covenant, they would support the objectives of the covenant?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator is correct. Those who said that they would agree to support it were Senators Martin, of Virginia; Hoke Smith, of Georgia; Lane, of Oregon; Shafroth, of Colorado; Underwood, of Alabama; McKellar, of Tennessee; and Trammell, of Florida.

These Senators were for the proposition of cloture by a majority.

After this time, in a bipartisan caucus, all the Democrats agreed to a change in the rule, as did all but two Republicans. Seventy Members agreed to cloture. When the bill was passed it was by a vote of 70 to 2, as I recall.

Is it possible that those great and capable Senators of that time, who had stated that they wanted to stop filibustering on any bill or question, did not know how to carry out their intention effectively? Is it possible that they would insert a limitation making the rule subject to the limitation of 1-hour debate, and, if they had intended other limitations, so that cloture would not apply to a motion, would have omitted mentioning such other limitations?

The expressions in the press of the Nation at that time are certainly very strong evidence of what Members of the Senate thought they were doing. In the Washington Post of March 8, 1917, on the front page, is an article undoubtedly written by a reporter who was present during the debate and at the time the vote was taken. I shall quote only part of it:

A patriotic, nonpartisan decision was reached by Republican and Democratic caucuses yesterday to amend the rules of the Senate to end forever the disgraceful spectacle of a filibuster such as last Sunday morning prevented the Senate from giving the President power to protect American ships at sea engaged in their lawful pursuits.

The article continues:

Democrats voted unanimously, after differences had been threshed out and reconciled, to support a rule under which debate could be limited by a two-thirds vote. * * * The Republicans, by a vote of 30 to 2, supported the same change in the rules.

The leading editorial in the Washington Post of March 8, 1917, is entitled "No More Filibustering." Prior to that time the Washington Post had editorialized on the need of a change in the rules. Certainly the editors of the Washington Post, as evidenced by the news stories and editorials, were satisfied that rule XXII had done what the agreement signed by the Senators was intended to accomplish. A part of the editorial of March 8, 1917, in the Washington Post is as follows:

The two party caucuses in the Senate have promptly agreed upon a new rule which will enable two-thirds of the Senators present to bring any debate to a close.

The editorial continues:

This is a perfectly fair rule. It does not limit debate if one more than one-third of the Senators present desire to continue the debate. Thirty-three Senators therefore can prevent cloture. On the other hand, 64 Senators can absolutely terminate a filibuster.

The greatest potential power possessed by the Senate is the power to approve or reject a treaty. This power, which might affect the national independence itself, was lodged in the Senate as the safest repository in the Government. Yet a treaty of the most far-reaching character may be ratified by two-thirds of the Senators present. It is surely proper and right to lodge with the same two-thirds the power to close debate.

Mr. President, it seems to me that neither in this editorial nor in any of the other editorials I have read in many newspapers which I have examined was there any doubt whatsoever on the part of the press at that time that rule XXII would enable any debate to be terminated by two-thirds of the Senators present on any question. That is, of course, what this editorial says.

I refer to a similar editorial in the Evening Star of March 9, 1917, as to the result of the vote which had been taken. This is also the lead editorial. The burden of the editorial was that actually the rule had not ended filibusters, that filibusters could still go on if one-third plus one of the Members of the United States Senate wanted them to continue.

It may not be difficult at any time to find 16 Senators in agreement as to closing debate on a bill; but a debate can only be closed by an order of two-thirds of the Senate. The difference between 16 and 64 is considerable.

So there was no question in the minds of the editors of the Star or of their reporters, as can be seen by the various news reports, as to what the result of the action taken by the United States Senate was. Neither this nor any editorial of that time suggested or implied that rule XXII was applicable to a part only of the legislative process.

The Washington Post gave its opinion as to what had happened, as to whether debate could be cut off by two-thirds of the Members of the Senate. It had been editorializing in favor of a cloture rule. Let us see what was the opinion of the Washington Post as to what had happened. I read from an editorial of March 9, 1917:

The adoption by the Senate of the new rule providing for the closing of debate is astonishing evidence of the power of public opinion in the United States.

A week ago the subject of cloture was an academic abstraction. Nobody paid serious attention to the proposal that had been pending for years, in one form or another, looking to a limitation of debate. The filibuster resulting in defeat of the armed ship bill disgusted the country. President Wilson seized the psychological moment to impress the country with the viciousness of the system which enabled a handful of men to block the processes of the Government, not by persuasion, but by mere physical obstruction. Thereupon the subject was one that would not down. Senators knew that it had to be disposed of. With admirable promptness they grappled with it, framed a sensible and a just rule, and by a vote of 76 to 3 put it into effect.

There can be filibustering still in the Senate, but it must be supported by 33 Senators to be effective. As a practical matter it is impossible to unite 33 Senators in a campaign of mere obstruction. There must be something radically wrong with a question which cannot reach a vote after reasonable debate. The determined opposition of 33 Senators to closing a debate would create the presumption that they had right on their side.

So, Mr. President, the Washington Post, which is a leading newspaper in Washington, as did all the great newspapers of that time, felt that the cloture rule applied to any action of the Senate, and that two-thirds of the Senators could limit debate. No exception is found to the conclusion of this editorial on the part of any Member of the Senate, in subsequent issues of the Post, so far as I have been able to find. No letters were written to the editors of any of the newspapers which I have examined disputing their logic that rule XXII applied to all proceedings.

Mr. President, on March 9, 1917, the New York Times, after having editorialized in favor of a change in the rules which would enable cloture by a two-thirds vote, in an editorial entitled "Cloture at Last," stated in emphatic terms that it was their opinion that there was a limitation of debate in the Senate on any subject or on any question which might arise, by a two-thirds vote of the Senate. I read from the editorial:

There could be no stronger proof of the way in which the events of the last month have impressed the Senate than the ease with which the advocates of cloture have had their own way. A month ago this greased slipping of cloture through the Senate would not have been possible. The House adopted it 27 years ago, after bitter and violent opposition, and it became a leading political issue in the elections.

The editorial goes on to say:

That a single incident like the filibuster of last week suffices to change the Senate's view, at a place where it seemed most strongly rooted, is eloquent of the way in which that body has been stirred and moved by the Nation's present peril.

Mr. President, it is very difficult for me to believe—as I think it would be for almost anyone who would read the newspapers of those days and consider the issue which was before the United States Senate in March 1917—that the Members of the Senate at that time would adopt an absolutely meaningless cloture rule. Their intention obviously was to limit debate, by means of cloture, on all matters of argument in the Senate of the United States. Is it reasonable to believe that those great Senators, by a vote of 70 to 2, would purposely exclude cloture from applying to that part of a proceeding which is absolutely necessary to the bringing of a bill before the Senate for consideration? Certainly they did not mean to do that, Mr. President; and in the gentlemen's agreement they signed, they specifically said they did not mean to exclude motions from rule XXII, because they made it subject to only one limitation, which is the invoking of cloture, as provided in rule XXII of the Senate Rules.

So, Mr. President, I feel that I must vote to sustain the ruling made by the Vice President. I wish to make it clear that I shall vote for cloture by two-thirds, and nothing less. Heretofore, I have made several statements on this subject, and in a book of which I was co-author I also stated that I felt that a legislative body must at some time be able to bring a matter to a decision. I think that is the general attitude of the Members of the House of Representatives. Of course, that is the theoretical attitude or philosophy of democracy.

I wish to say that I have been much impressed by many of the arguments and excellent speeches which have been made here by my colleagues from the South. I think there is a great deal of strength to the argument that more than a majority should be required in order to cut off debate. I am inclined

to agree with them on that score. But in any event I have joined other Members of the Senate in signing an agreement that I will not vote for anything less than cloture by two-thirds vote, which is the proposition being submitted here. I think that is a good compromise. I believe that the sponsors of the so-called majority cloture rule or the constitutional majority cloture rule would agree that their proposals have absolutely no chance of being adopted; I do not believe that there is any danger whatever that a provision for cloture by majority vote or by a constitutional majority will be approved by this body.

Mr. President, I know that the fear of civil-rights legislation is the prime factor which has brought about the present situation in the Senate. If civil-rights measures were the only ones which could be filibustered against, I would be very much tempted to join my colleagues from the South, because I am just as much opposed to some of the civil-rights measures as they are presented as any of them. But, Mr. President, unfortunately a filibuster cannot be limited to civil-rights measures or proposals. A filibuster is a multi-pronged instrument which can be used against any legislative proposal. Only a small percentage—I would say less than 25 percent—of the occasions when cloture has been invoked or has been attempted to be invoked, or when filibusters have been indulged in, have related to civil-rights legislation. Legislation for farm programs, to appropriate for TVA and other necessary projects must be presented in the Senate and they too would be subject to filibuster.

Mr. President, I am a southerner. I was born in the South, and my forefathers were born there and lived there for many, many generations. In the War Between the States, forefathers on both sides of my family fought on the Confederate side. I think I have as much love for the Southland as has anyone else. But, Mr. President, we cannot forever prevent by filibuster tactics the consideration of certain vital measures. As a matter of fact, under the rules of the Senate, as I understand them, except in the case of appropriation bills, there is no rule of germaneness. Any amendment—for instance, a civil-rights proposal—can be offered to a legislative measure; and, of course, at some time or other some of these bills will be passed. As a matter of fact, as I understand the rules, even in the case of an appropriation bill, under rule XVI, paragraph 4, if notice is given 1 day in advance, the rule can be suspended. So in such case by a two-thirds vote any rider in the form of proposed legislation which may not be germane to an appropriation bill can be added to it.

Mr. President, I feel that, in the case of most of the civil-rights measures, we have a good position on the merits of the controversies. As a matter of fact, I have the impression that, by relying on debate alone, by not meeting these issues on their merits, by not having some of us from the Southland take the initiative and show that we are solving our own problems, we are doing a good deal toward alining the rest of the Nation against us. We are giving the rest of the Nation the impression that we have no defense save a filibuster. If this is our only weapon we will lose eventually because some legislation to which a rider may be attached is going to pass. We cannot stop completely the legislative process.

I was very happy to see the distinguished Member of the House of Representatives from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] come forth with a proposed solution of the problem, thus taking the initiative; and in Life magazine of this week I find an article on that subject by a former distinguished Governor of Louisiana, Mr. Sam Jones, who has made a proposal for a solution. I have not had a chance to study it closely, so I shall not discuss it in detail. At any rate, it is a proposal looking toward a solution. It is evidence that we of the South can take the initiative in seeking a reasonable adjustment of a perplexing question.

Mr. President, if the Nation is convinced, as it must be, that we of the South are sincerely trying to work out our problems, I do not believe that a majority of the Members of the Senate will vote for any obnoxious civil-rights measure or will attempt to cram any such measure down the throats of the people of the South. I know the Senate will give us a chance to have a full hearing, a chance to present our side of the matter. Our defense is reason and merit. Certainly we cannot forever block the action of the Senate and prevent the consideration of certain measures merely by keeping them from coming up, because if they are not offered in one way they will be offered as riders or amendments to other proposed legislation.

Mr. President, I have full confidence that the Members of this great body will give those of us in the South a chance to settle our own problems. I have great confidence that we can persuade any Members of this body who have any doubt on this subject in their minds that we are making a real effort toward solving any difficulties or problems that we have.

I have full confidence in the fairness and integrity of judgment of this body. If we lose that confidence our democracy and our Nation is gone. We are exhausted of idealism and we are bankrupt of the high democratic principles of freedom, honesty, and fair dealing. If ever we must feel that Members of the Senate are not going to do the just and fair thing in connection with legislation affecting the South or any other part of our great Nation, then our institution of democracy is gone. I do not believe that to be the case.

So, Mr. President, it is with a great deal of trepidation that I take a position opposed to that of the great majority of my colleagues from the South. I feel, though, I must seek to bring about legislation and vote for legislation which I think is for the great national interest of our country. I feel that this is the time of supreme trial of our democratic process. I do not think we can approach without a proper rule enabling the Senate to act the frightful days ahead, when this great body having exclusive jurisdiction over certain aspects of our foreign relations is going to be called upon to give the Nation leadership in the field of international affairs. If we do not furnish that leadership, democratic process throughout the world may break down. So, the necessity of the Senate functioning over personal considerations connected with any domestic issues makes me feel there should be some effective way whereby we can take action when two-thirds of the Members want to do so. I have confidence, furthermore, that when our position is explained, when merit and logic are applied, the wisdom and the justice of the Senate are not going to be put forth on a partisan or sectional basis, to do any harm to the rightful aspects of the position of the great Southland.

Mr. DONNELL obtained the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to permit me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield, to permit the Senator from Georgia to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. DONNELL. I will, if I do not lose the floor by so doing. With unanimous consent that I do not lose the floor, I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. RUSSELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hoey	Murray
Baldwin	Holland	Myers
Brewster	Humphrey	Neely
Bricker	Hunt	O'Conor
Bridges	Ives	O'Mahoney
Butler	Jenner	Pepper
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Chapman	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kem	Schoeppel
Connally	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Donnell	Knowland	Sparkman
Douglas	Langer	Stennis
Downey	Lodge	Taft
Eastland	Long	Taylor
Ecton	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	McCarthy	Thye
Flanders	McClellan	Tobey
Frear	McFarland	Tydings
Fulbright	McKellar	Vandenberg
George	McMahon	Watkins
Gillette	Magnuson	Wherry
Green	Malone	Wiley
Gurney	Maybank	Williams
Hayden	Miller	Withers
Hendrickson	Millikin	Young
Hickenlooper	Morse	
Hill	Mundt	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ninety-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to speak this afternoon on the merits of Senate Resolution 15, the Hayden-Wherry resolution. Indeed, as was brought out so clearly and as has been evident throughout this debate, that resolution is not yet before the Senate for consideration. The question to which I desire to address myself relates to the appeal from the ruling made by the Vice President last evening.

Rule XXII of the Senate rules provides, as will be well recalled by all of us, that, if at any time a petition signed by 16 Senators to bring to a close the debate upon any pending measure is presented, the cloture provision provided for therein shall in due time ensue.

So, Mr. President, the question which presents itself to the Senate and addresses itself, likewise, to the Presiding Officer, is whether the motion now pending before us to proceed to the consideration of a measure, namely, Senate Resolution 15, is a pending measure.

Mr. President, the Vice President, last evening, of course recognized, and, by his analysis, demonstrated his recognition, the fact that the question involved is as to the meaning of the word "measure"; whether the word "measure" includes a pending motion to take up for consideration a resolution which is awaiting action upon that motion. The Vice President, with his energy and ability, had looked into the question as to what is the meaning of the word "measure"; and I quote from an observation made by him last evening, appearing at page 2174 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

The Chair has also undertaken—

And I pause to say that by the word "also" he was obviously referring back to the search which he had made in various decisions of the courts, to quote his language, "defining the word 'measure.'"

So the Vice President said:

The Chair has also undertaken to enlighten himself about what the Senate meant in 1917, by looking at all sorts of dictionaries, literary and legal. While they are not binding on the Chair, or on the Senate, they do shed some light upon what the Senate was trying to do in 1917.

Now, Mr. President, I call particularly to the attention of the Senate this further language of the distinguished Vice President. Said he:

It is not necessary to quote those definitions, but the most reliable, and, the Chair thinks, probably the one which sheds the most light upon the question, is the definition found in the Century Dictionary, which defines a measure as one of a number of progressive steps looking to a definite conclusion, looking to the accomplishment of a fixed end. Therefore, if that sort of definition should be applied here, it would undoubtedly apply to the word "measure" in the rule.

So, Mr. President, bearing in mind that the Vice President had placed upon the Century Dictionary the seal of his approval, with the thought in his mind, as he tells us, that "the most reliable, and probably the one which sheds the most light upon the question, is the definition found in the Century Dictionary," which, in substance, is then given by the Vice President. I made available to myself today the Century Dictionary to see just what that dictionary said. I found, interestingly enough, that the Century Dictionary, which I have here upon my desk, was in existence in 1917. Indeed, it had reached the Senate Library approximately 11 years before that time, namely, on January 24, 1906, and bore the copyright of 1890.

So, Mr. President, the definition to which the Vice President referred was in a standard, well-known, authentic dictionary which had been in existence for many years prior to the time the Senate acted in 1917 in the adoption of the cloture rule.

I found, Mr. President, on examining the Century Dictionary, that the word "measure" has numerous references and numerous applications. For illustration, I found, as we all know, that the word "measure" means literally a measurement; and so we find in this dictionary, as I find also in others, illustrative measures, such as a measure of a foot rule, a measure of a yardstick, a measure of a pint cup, or a bushel basket. Those are measures. Yet obviously that is not the sense in which the term is used in the Senate rules.

I find also that in a term somewhat unfamiliar to me, the term "prosody," which seems to have some relation to grammar, and also relates to verse forms, a definition is given in the Century Dictionary which obviously does not apply to the case now at bar before the Senate.

I find that under music there is a series of definitions in the Century Dictionary of the term "measure," which obviously, regardless of how musical the new rule may sound to our ears, has not the significance in which the term is used in rule XXII.

I find that even in a terpsichorean dance, the term "measure" is defined as "a slow, stately dance or dance movement," and again, Mr. President, we find obviously a definition which does not apply to rule XXII.

Then we find, Mr. President, the definition to which the Vice President alluded last evening, and I found, somewhat to my surprise, that it was somewhat longer, and contained other items than those mentioned by the Vice President last evening.

I should like to tell my colleagues where this definition is. It is set forth in a paragraph numbered separately, obviously confined to one specific type of subject, just as paragraph 14 is devoted to the subject of measure as related to dance, and as paragraph 12 is devoted to measure in the sense of its relation to music.

We find that paragraph 15 of the definition set forth in the Century Dictionary, as I have said, is quite a little longer, and contains some further illuminating language, in my judgment, which was not contained in the opinion of the Vice President last eevning.

With the permission of the Senate, Mr. President, I shall read paragraph 15 as it appears in the Century Dictionary.

15. A determinate action or procedure, intended as means to an end.

At least to that point it very closely follows the language of the Vice President, which was not intended to be a verbatim statement taken from the dictionary, but obviously the substance of the statement. So I say to that point the Vice President follows the dictionary. Then the dictionary proceeds:

Anything devised or done with a view to the accomplishment of a purpose.

I look in the Vice President's statement and I find there, after the reference to the definite conclusion, his mention of looking to the accomplishment of a fixed end, which again is substantially what appears in the Century Dictionary. So, obviously, the Vice President and the speaker at this moment had in mind the same identical definition in the dictionary to which I am now addressing myself.

I call to the attention of the Senate this further very helpful and very illuminating language which follows immediately after what the Vice President gave to us. It reads as follows:

Specifically—

"Specifically," Mr. President—

Specifically, in later use—

Remember that this dictionary had been here in the Senate for 11 years before 1917. I read again from the definition in the Century Dictionary:

Specifically, in later use, any course of action proposed or adopted by a government, or a bill introduced into a legislature: as, *measures*—

That is italicized—

(that is, a bill or bills) for the relief of the poor; a wise *measure;* rash *measures*.

Then appear several quotations with respect to measures, from Johnson, from Goldsmith, and from W. R. Greg.

The definition which I have quoted, Mr. President, is the complete definition, rather than the partial definition which the Vice President quoted last night from the Century Dictionary. It will be observed that nowhere in the definition set forth in the Century Dictionary, which I have read in full, is there any intimation even that the word "measure" would apply to a situation in which there was pending merely a motion to take up for consideration some bill or bills. The reference is, as I have indicated, to "measure," as something more comprehensive than that, any course of action proposed or adopted by a government, a measure, for illustration, by the Government providing for the drafting of soldiers, a measure for the adoption of a particular standard of monetary measure or value, some course of action. By the way, the reference with respect to the drafting of soldiers and to a monetary measure was my own interpolation.

The language in the definition is, as I have already quoted, "any course of action proposed or adopted by a government," which obviously does not include a motion made upon the floor of the Senate to take up for consideration some bill which is lying back awaiting disposition.

Then, Mr. President, even more significant than that very comprehensive language to which I have referred, which is indicated by the term "measure," even more significant, and to my mind of a nature which, without any criticism of the Vice President, should have been called to the attention of the Senate when a quotation, in substance, from the Century Dictionary was presented to us, is the language:

A bill introduced into a legislature: as, *measures* (that is, a bill or bills) for the relief of the poor; a wise *measure;* rash *measures*.

Therefore I submit, Mr. President, that the definition set forth in this authority, the Century Dictionary, to which the Vice President referred as the most reliable and probably the one which sheds most light on the question, very clearly leans toward the direction that by the term "measure" is not meant a mere motion to take up for consideration some bill or resolution or bills lying ready for preliminary action.

Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] yesterday also referred to a definition in the dictionary, and I am sure, from conversation with him today—and I do not know whether he is on the floor of the Senate at this moment—he thought he was giving us all of the definition from Webster's New International Dictionary. I quote from page 2170 of the RECORD of yesterday. He said:

Our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], recently quoted the definition of the word "measure" from Webster's New International Dictionary:

"A step or definite part of a progressive course or policy; a means to an end."

Then a little later, only 10 or 12 lines further down on the page, the Senator from Massachusetts said:

I quote the definition again. "Measure" is "a step or definite part of a progressive course or policy; a means to an end."

Mr. President, by this double quotation of the definition from Webster's New International Dictionary I take it that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts as well as the distinguished Senator from California gave those citations their full approval as representing what is meant, according to Webster's New International Dictionary, by the term "measure".

But again we find in Webster's New International Dictionary a situation similar to that which exists in the Century Dictionary to which the Vice President alluded. I find—and I shall attempt to be as brief as possible—that in Webster's New International Dictionary cited by the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from California, there are numerous types of measures, and then each one of them is set off separately by a number so one can tell by looking at the number, just as one can tell in the Century Dictionary by looking at the number, whether or not one is dealing with a separate category. What do we find when we get into the section from which the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from California quoted? True we find the language, I think, which they have specifically quoted to the Senate, but let me read to the Senate all of it.

11—

That is paragraph 11 of the definition of measure—

A step or definite part of a progressive course or policy; a means to an end;

The punctuation, by the way, Mr. President, is not a period. It is not the end of a sentence. It is a semicolon. And then, specifically, so the dictionary proceeds, or with an abbreviation which I understand to mean specifically, the abbreviation being "specif.," with the punctuation of period and comma after it:

Specif., a legislative enactment; as, political measures; an inefficient measure.

Again, Mr. President, there is nothing from the beginning to the end of the complete definition set forth in Webster's New International Dictionary which to my mind would justify the conclusion drawn by some others that the term "meaure" includes a motion to take up for consideration. The language which I read, beginning with "specif.," which I understand to be an abbreviation for specifically—

Specif., a legislative enactment; as, political measures; an inefficient measure—

Indicates very clearly to my mind that it is something of that nature—a legislative enactment or something which when enacted would become a legislative enactment, which is meant by Webster's New International Dictionary in the use of the word "measure" in this particular paragraph 11 of the dictionary.

Mr. President, I think I should say in fairness that the Webster's Dictionary to which I refer, so far as I have observed, seems to be not older than 1934. But I assume it is the same one that was used by the Senators to whom I have referred, and I think the language is the same. I have some difficulty in believing that the meaning of the word "measure" changed materially between 1917 and the year 1934.

So, Mr. President, we find that the Century Dictionary, when one reads it all—not merely the part given to us by the Vice President, but all of it—conveys the idea which I have mentioned, namely, that the word "measure" refers to bill or bills, and fails to convey the idea that the term "measure" refers to motions to take up for consideration. The same thing is true in Webster's New International Dictionary to which I have referred, the one from which the distinguished Senators from Massachusetts and California, respectively, quoted.

Mr. President, I have in my office another dictionary which is a 1935 edition. There is one outside in the lobby of the Senate, I suppose of the same date. At any rate, I have looked at the one in my office, which I think is Government property, but it is there. In that book, Funk & Wagnalls New Standard Dictionary of the English Language, 1935 edition, is this language under "measure." I may say before reading it that again in that dictionary likewise the term "measure" has many meanings. There is a long table, as I recall, of different kinds of measures, like one will find sometimes if one looks in a Bible dictionary; the measures that prevailed back in Egypt, or in the Holy Land, in the time of Christ or before. We find in the dictionary all these types of measures. But when we come down to this type of measure, what does it say? It says:

A specific act or course of procedure designed as a means to an end.

Yes; it says that. It says further:

An expedient; method; step.

And then this:

Specif., a legislative bill; as foolish measures; a party measure.

So, Mr. President, these great authoritative works which give us the meaning and the pronunciation and the derivation of words, all unite, as I see it, to the general tenor that the word "measure," as used in the legal sense in which we are here interested on the floor of the Senate, refers to something in the nature of a legislative enactment, a bill or bills.

Therefore, Mr. President, it seems to me that the information we received last evening—and again I say, it without criticism, but as a fact—is not complete as to the meaning, as shown in the dictionary or dictionaries with respect to the word "measure."

Mr. President, the word "specific" it will be observed, is used, I think, in all three of these definitions which I have read from. To my mind that is very significant in the case we now have before us, because we are talking here in the Senate now about something very specific, very definite. We are not talking about some vague theoretical consideration, some measure for the uplift of mankind, some measure far beyond, in ethereal heights. We are talking here in this particular discussion of a specific measure. Yes, it is not only specific, it is a pending measure, it is one we can put our fingers on. It is one that is pending in the Senate. The language of the cloture section of the rule refers to it, as I say, as any pending measure. So when we find in the dictionaries to which I have referred such a clear, definite, complete, if you please, indication of the specific application of the word "measure," it carries very great weight to my mind in determining what is the meaning of the word as used in the cloture rule, rule XXII.

Mr. President, it has been suggested here in a most interesting address, which I heard this afternoon in large part, delivered by the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], that it is inconceivable that Members of the Senate back in 1917 would have adopted a rule which would have a defect such as appears to some of us to exist. It was suggested that obviously, according to the New York newspapers and the Washington newspapers, they intended to cover all kinds of filibusters and absolutely to eliminate from the face of the earth, so far as the United States Senate is concerned, all future filibusters.

Mr, President, I do not know, and I do not know whether anyone else knows, what was in the minds of those who framed this rule, but I do know two things. One is that it has been graphically set forth to me earlier this afternoon by a Senator, and I hope he will have no objection to my mentioning his name—the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]—that the statute books of our country are replete with statutes in which the legislature meant to say one thing and said another. Who is there to say that the Senate of the United States is free from all fault, that we are infallible in the use of our language, that whenever we intend to say a particular thing we always say it, and that the language which we use is never wrong?

Mr. President, I do not know whether the use of the term "measure" was with the full realization of the fact that it

did not cover the situation or whether it was with the design not to cover this particular situation. I cannot look back 32 years and undertake to analyze from the scanty knowledge I have, the views of the persons who voted for or against the rule at that time. But I do know that we have a language for the purpose of expression of opinions. We have the English language. We have well understood terms in that language. To my mind it is perfectly clear that, the Senate of the United States having used the word "measure" in the cloture rule, when the thought comes to the mind of someone as to whether it applies to motions to take up, no one is reasonably likely to draw the conclusion that the word "measure" includes such motions.

After all, it is the ordinary acceptation of a term which, in the absence of something to the contrary, is to be deemed the meaning of the term. It seems to be that the meaning of the legislative body was that the word "measure" meant a bill, a resolution, or something which was to be enacted into law, just as the three great dictionaries to which I have referred so clearly indicate. So, as the Senator from Louisiana pointed out this afternoon in conversing with me, it appears to me that there is a very great fallacy in the argument that, merely because newspaper writers or Senators themselves intended to accomplish something—one man perhaps intending to accomplish one thing, and another intending to accomplish another—and it is evident that as a composite they surely intended to accomplish something, we must draw the conclusion that the language they used necessarily produced that result.

Not only does the legislative branch of our Government, both State and national, occasionally make errors; not only does the legislative branch of our Government occasionally fail to express what it may have meant; not only does the legislative branch of our Government sometimes mean something different from what someone else thinks it should mean 32 years after the action was taken; but it is also true of the executive and of the judicial branches of our Government that sometimes the expressions made by them do not accurately record what today we say should have been recorded years ago.

If I may adopt the language of the Senator from Louisiana, he referred to the fact that the statute books are replete with illustrations in which language was used which did not express what some individual thinks it should express. From time to time even the higher courts find that subordinate courts use language which does not accurately express the intention of the court. Even the highest Court itself at times uses language which it is called upon to change by later utterance, and which it is compelled to recognize as having ineffectively and improperly expressed what the Court may have had in mind.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield for a question only.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator will recall that the rule which we are now discussing was framed by a Virginia Senator named Thomas S. Martin, who at that time was not only chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, but was majority leader of the Senate. He had been here for a long time, and was experienced in legislation. I ask the Senator if it is not a fact that the extended debate on the ship-arming bill occurred on the bill, and not on the motion to take up the bill, and that after that bill was withdrawn and President Wilson had acted under other authority to arm the ships, he called upon Majority Leader Martin to amend the rule under which he said debate had been unduly extended in a national emergency? Was not the specific issue to which Senator Martin and the Members of the Senate then addressed their attention a bill?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I am unable to answer the question of my distinguished friend, but I know, from his learning, which I have seen so frequently evidenced on this floor and elsewhere, that I have the greatest of confidence in any historical statement he may make. I am quite willing to accept his statement as being accurate. It certainly carries with it a presumption of accuracy.

Reverting for a moment to the meaning of the word "measure," I think in the first place that a good dictionary is ordinarily an excellent place to go to find the meaning of a word. Furthermore, I take it that in order to know what is the meaning of a word as set forth in the dictionary, it is important to consider the entire definition, not merely a part of it. When a controversial question is before us, such as the one which is now before the Senate, in which the question arises as to whether the word "measure" means a bill or resolution, or a motion to take up, the Senate should have before it not merely the portion of the definition presented to us last evening by the Vice President, but the complete definition as set forth in the book for whose accuracy, care, and excellency the Vice President has so well vouched.

To my mind, there can be no serious question as to whether or not the term "measure" includes a motion to take up for consideration. As was mentioned earlier today by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] the very fact that the Committee on Rules and Administration, which considered Senate Resolution 15, which is now before us, had something to say on this subject, is significant. I take it this is what the Senator from Michigan was referring to:

> The ruling of the Chair—
>
> That is, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]—
>
> was clearly required by the rules and precedents of the Senate, and that is the reason why this proposed change in the rules is indispensable.

Mr. President, to my mind, we are entitled, while talking about Members of the Senate of long ago, to consider the qualifications of our own colleagues.

I was fortunate enough to be the law partner of one of those fine gentlemen who served in the Senate in days gone by. He died in 1925 while a Member of the Senate. I refer to Hon. Seldon P. Spencer, of Missouri. I was pleased to hear reference to the names of Senators Vest, Cockrell, and Benton, from my own native State. While we are considering all these great majestic and stately figures of the dim past, let us for a moment, without undue modesty, refer to our own colleagues, and consider who they are, so that we may have in the records of this Congress for all future time some mention of their identity.

I have referred to the report of the committee, which contained the observation that—

> The ruling of the Chair was clearly required by the rules and precedents of the Senate, and that is the reason why this proposed change in the rules is indispensable.

My understanding is—and if I am mistaken I should like to be corrected—that the only Senators who dissented from the majority report from which I have quoted were the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT]. Thirteen Members of the Senate are members of that committee. I do not know whether every one of the other 10 joined in the majority report, nor do I know the contents of the minority views.

At this point I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, if it does not already appear in the records of the Senate, a copy of both the majority and minority views, as set forth in report No. 69 of the Eighty-first Congress, first session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, as I say, I do not know whether the other 10 Senators, other than the 3 whom I have named, joined unanimously in the report. It does not appear from the report itself. However, I wish to mention very briefly something about the Senators who constitute the membership of the Committee on Rules and Administration, by which committee the majority and minority reports, respectively were presented. The majority report is made on behalf of the majority of the committee, and the minority views on behalf of the distinguished members of the minority of the committee.

Mr. President, taking up the minority first—because whether we agree or do not agree upon this issue, I think it only proper to say that each Member of the minority is a distinguished Member of this great body—we find on the minority of the committee the following members: The Hon. JOHN C. STENNIS of Mississippi. I happen to know he has presided as a judge of a court. Next we find the Hon. RUSSELL B. LONG of Louisiana, whom all of us know, and whom we are delighted to have with us; and I am sure I speak the sentiments of the Senate when I say that already, in the few weeks he has been here, he has endeared himself to us very much, and we are very happy to

have him here. Then we have the Hon. LESTER C. HUNT, of Wyoming, an old friend of mine, and former Governor of his State. The Senator who now sits in the Chair, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], also well knows that the Senator from Wyoming has been one of the great governors in the West, during the period when both the Senator from Maryland and I held similar positions in our respective States.

Mr. President, passing on to the remaining members of the committee, I come now to the majority of the committee. In the first place I do not see him in the Chamber at the moment, although perhaps he is here—we have the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona, CARL HAYDEN. Mr. President, I shall not pay fulsome praise or compliments to these men; but CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona, has served in the Senate from 1926 to 1949—23 years of service. Then we have my friend, whom I knew years ago when he was Governor of the State of Rhode Island, Hon. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, who, although elderly in point of years, is young and vigorous and alert both mentally and physically; and he has served in this great body from 1936 to 1949. Then we have the distinguished majority whip of the Senate, the Senator from Pennsylvania, the Hon. FRANCIS J. MYERS, who has served in the Senate since 1944, and has been a distinguished and active and vigorous member of our body.

Then we have my good friend from one of the States which adjoins my State—the Senator from Iowa, the honorable GUY M. GILLETTE, a man who has served his State and also has served the Nation with great distinction. He served in the Senate from 1936 to 1938, and again from 1938 to 1944; and in 1948 he was again elected to the Senate.

Then we come to a new Member, who comes to the Senate from Kentucky. All of us have learned to know him, and I have also grown to know him as a member of one of the committees of which I have the honor to be a member—the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I refer to the honorable GARRETT L. WITHERS, Senator from Kentucky, who I understand has likewise served his State in a judicial capacity, and certainly as a lawyer, and is a gentleman of excellent and studious and careful attention to his duties in the Senate.

Then, over on the minority side—I was about to refer to it most hopefully as the majority side—we have the distinguished minority leader, the honorable KENNETH S. WHERRY, of Nebraska. He has been a Member of the Senate since 1942, as I recall; and we hope—at least, we on this side do so—that he will remain in the Senate for many, many years to come. He has already been elected for 6 years more.

Then we have the honorable WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, of California, who came to the Senate in 1945, and by his great vigor and energy has demonstrated his great capacity and ability.

Then we have the honorable HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., of Massachusetts. His very name is at least presumptive of the ability and the courage he possesses. He does possess those qualities to a marked degree, and today we pay all tribute to a distinguished grandson of a distinguished grandfather who preceded him in the Senate.

Then we have the honorable WILLIAM E. JENNER, of Indiana, who spoke here yesterday, and who by his vigor and acumen has demonstrated, both here in the Senate and elsewhere, his ability and courage and determination.

Finally we have the honorable IRVING M. IVES, of New York. No Member of the Senate will quarrel with me when I say that in the Senator from New York we have, in the first place, an eminent authority on the subject matter now before this body, and a man of vigor and integrity and courage.

So, Mr. President, those are the men who constitute the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, to which I have referred, and which is the committee which reached the conclusion, as I pointed out earlier, that the ruling made by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] was clearly required by the rules and precedents of the Senate, and that that is the reason why the proposed change in the rule is indispensable.

Mr. President, to my mind, there can be no serious question as to the meaning of the word "measure." To my mind, it is clear—notwithstanding the excellent and most interesting and persuasive opinion, as it was persuasive to me, which was presented last night by the Vice President—that the word "measure" is correctly understood to have the meaning ascribed to it by the Senator from Michigan. I feel certain that when the opinion presented to us last night by the Vice President is analyzed in the cold light of reason and of the meaning of language, we shall arrive at the conclusion that the word "measure" cannot and does not include a motion to take up a bill for consideration.

Mr. President, I close for this afternoon by quoting a sentence which the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] earlier today quoted from Washington's Farewell Address. I think it is so apt and so much in point that it will bear repetition. The Father of His Country said:

> But the Constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the people, is sacredly obligatory upon all.

Mr. President, in like manner and by a clear analogy, the rules of the Senate which at any time exist, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the Senate, are sacredly obligatory upon all Members of the Senate.

EXHIBIT A

LIMITATION ON DEBATE IN THE SENATE

The Committee on Rules and Administration, to whom was referred the resolution (S. Res. 15) to amend subsection 2 of Senate standing rule XXII, relating to cloture, having had the same under consideration, report it back to the Senate without amendment and recommend that said resolution do pass.

The resolution is identical with Senate Resolution 25 of the Eightieth Congress, favorably reported to the Senate on April 3, 1947, to make rule XXII, as adopted on March 8, 1917, applicable to any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business. This change is primarily necessary in order to overcome the possibility of unlimited debate upon a motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of a bill or other measure which has not been made the unfinished business of the Senate.

The resolution further provides that a motion signed by 16 Senators to bring debate to a close may be presented at any time notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate. Rule III of the Standing Rules of the Senate provides that a motion to amend or correct the Journal shall be deemed a privileged question and proceeded with until disposed of, and rule VI provides that all questions and motions arising or made upon the presentation of credentials shall be proceeded with until disposed of.

The necessity for this change in rule XXII was first demonstrated in November 1922, when a number of motions to amend the Journal were debated for several days, thereby preventing the consideration of an anti-lynching bill which was finally laid aside.

Extended discussion of amendments to the Journal was the method usually used during the following 20 years to prevent the consideration of bills about which there were decided differences of opinion. In more recent years, however, the practice has been for several Senators to discuss at length the question of whether a particular bill should become the unfinished business of the Senate. A direct ruling that a petition to bring such discussion to an end may not be presented was made by the President pro tempore [Mr. VANDENBERG] on August 27, 1948. The intent of Senate Resolution 15 is to close those two loopholes in rule XXII and to make that rule applicable in all instances.

The fact that over 5 years elapsed before the first flaw in the cloture provisions of rule XXII was developed and that a much longer time expired before a second serious flaw was discovered is a definite indication that every Senator who voted to amend rule XXII in 1917 did so with a clear understanding that he was voting for an enforceable rule to close debate and not to produce a result, as Mr. Vandenberg stated, "That, in the final analysis, the Senate has no effective cloture rule at all." The ruling of the Chair was clearly required by the rules and precedents of the Senate, and that is the reason why this proposed change in the rules is indispensable.

That such a result was not intended is further substantiated by the fact that no statement by any Senator who was a Member of the Senate in 1917 has been found which would indicate that he supported the change made at that time in rule XXII because he was aware that the rule had loopholes in it which made it of no value as a means of bringing debate to an end. Upon the contrary all of the arguments advanced by Mr. La Follette of Wisconsin, Mr. Sherman of Illinois, and Mr. Gronna of North Dakota, the three Senators who voted against the adoption of the resolution offered on March 8, 1917, by Mr. Martin of Virginia, were all based upon the assumption that the adoption of that resolution would result in effective cloture, and no other Senator indicated to them that such a change in rule XXII would not accomplish that purpose.

While it is true that this limitation on debate was adopted during a period of national emergency, when war on Germany was soon to be declared, it was not hastily devised but came about as the result of consideration given to the subject during the previous session of Congress by the Senate Committee on Rules, from which

Senator Smith of Georgia favorably reported the following resolution on May 16, 1916:

"*Resolved*, That the standing rules of the Senate be, and they hereby are, amended as follows:

"At the close of rule XXII add '*Provided, however*, That if 16 Senators present to the Senate at any time a signed motion to bring to a close the debate upon any pending measure, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate and at the close of the morning hour on the following calendar day lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Chair shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

"' "Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?"

"' 'And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a two-thirds vote of those voting, then said measure shall be in order to the exclusion of all other business except a motion to recess or adjourn.

"'Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak more than 1 hour on the bill, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Chair to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. No dilatory motions shall be in order, and all points of order and appeals from the decision of the Chair shall be decided without debate.' "

Shortly after the Senate met in special session on March 5, 1917, the question of amending the rules of the Senate so that debate could be closed was considered at conferences of the majority and the minority and a joint committee of five Senators from each conference was selected to prepare the necessary resolution which was presented to the Senate on March 8, by Senator Martin of Virginia, the majority leader, who obtained unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. A comparison of the Martin resolution (S. Res. 5) with Senate Resolution 149 as reported by Senator Smith of Georgia on May 16, 1916, clearly shows that only clarifying changes were made in the text of the earlier resolution without in any way modifying its intent and purpose.

The roll call shows that 76 Senators voted for the adoption of the Martin resolution and announcements were made that 12 other Senators who were absent would have voted for its adoption if present. There is nothing of record to indicate that any one of those 88 Senators had any other idea than that from then on a two-thirds majority of the Senators present could bring debate to a close. There is no evidence to show that any one of them was aware that the rule would prove to be ineffective and that he supported it with any mental reservation or any purpose of evasion.

That the Senate was at that time seeking to find a safe and sensible middle ground between majority cloture and debate without limit may be properly inferred by reference to a speech delivered in the Senate by Thomas J. Walsh, a Senator from Montana, on March 7, 1917 (the day before rule XXII was amended), from which the following is quoted:

"Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I cannot doubt that the framers of the Constitution had in mind the fact that they were framing a system under which party government would be operative, and in that view they must have recognized that party members would confer and endeavor to agree upon a concerted line of action. I cannot doubt that. Their model was the English constitution; experience had taught them that there were two parties in the Parliament, and that the two parties were composed of members who conferred together and usually agreed upon a certain line of action which they desired to pursue.

"Mr. HARDING (Warren G. Harding, a Senator from Ohio). Mr. President, I am in perfect accord with the Senator from Montana in his statement that we are a Government through political parties. I think that it ever must be so, and I hope it will be so. I want to ask the Senator, however, if he is contending for a rule of the majority which will allow a majority in caucus to direct the majority in the Senate to come in here with a previous-question proposition which will deny the minority of the Senate the right of debate?

"Mr. WALSH. The Senator from Montana would not think for a moment of advocating any course the tendency of which would be to shut off legitimate debate; but I am sure the Senator from Ohio will have recognized in very recent events and in the proceedings of recent Congresses the necessity for shutting off something that is a mere pretense of debate.

"Mr. HARDING. Mr. President, if I may reply to that, I am again in accord with the Senator from Montana; and I have the abiding faith that a conservative cloture rule can be made a rule of this body along the lines of regular procedure for the amendment of the rules, without adopting a chaotic condition here wherein a majority of the Senate can fix the rules.

"Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I do not agree with the Senator from Ohio that any chaotic condition would ensue, but I join with him in the hope that a reasonable cloture rule may be adopted; and it is in view of the likelihood of the submission of such that I am now addressing the Senate upon the question as to whether, when it is before us, it will be possible under the rules as they exist—assuming that they continue—for a Senator to stand here and simply pretend to debate, and hold up the proceedings of the Senate until he drops in his tracks from physical exhaustion. I want to address myself to that question for a few minutes. * * *

"Suppose a rule of court expressly authorized counsel to be heard ad libitum, what reverence would be paid to it in the face of an abuse of the right by counsel who undertook to talk against time? Would not any court make itself contemptible by recognizing any force in such a rule?

"To make the parallel more perfect, let it be assumed that the rule forbade any decision so long as any member of the bench desired to talk. Would not the court be declining to discharge the functions reposed in it by the Constitution by refusing to decide, after a reasonable time for investigation had elapsed and a reasonable opportunity had been given to every justice to make known his views and to convert his brethren to his way of thinking?

"To delay justice is to deny justice. The judge who heeded such a rule, after becoming satisfied that the due proceeding of the court was being arrested to await adjournment or a change in its composition, or some other fortuitous circumstances that might avert the impending judgment, would be guilty of a violation of his oath to administer justice without delay.

"I assert unhesitatingly that the Senate has no power to make a rule which will prevent it from bringing debate to a close or setting a time for a vote. That there are limitations upon the exercise of the right to bring on a vote may be conceded, but to maintain that a rule has any virtue under which one man may, by his physical prowess alone, defeat a vote is to invite calamity unspeakable and expose the Senate to the well-deserved contempt of mankind."

In arriving at what would be "a conservative cloture rule" the then Senators were aware that, 2 years before, on January 13, 1915, the Senate had determined that a two-thirds vote was necessary to suspend a rule and it no doubt appeared reasonable to them that, in amending a rule, a like majority should be required to bring debate to a close. Senators at that time were also aware of the several constitutional provisions as cited by the late Senator Overton of Louisiana in his statement before the Committee on Rules and Administration on February 11, 1947:

"A two-thirds vote is not an uncommon procedure in the Congress of the United States. The Constitution, as well as amendments thereto, impose the rule of a two-thirds majority in quite a number of instances. I shall refer to those instances briefly:

"No person shall be convicted on impeachment without the concurrence of two-thirds of the Senators present (art. I, sec. 3).

"Each House, with the concurrence of two-thirds, may expel a Member (art. I, sec. 5).

"A bill returned by the President with his objections may be repassed by each House by a vote of two-thirds (art. I, sec. 7).

"The President shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur (art. II, sec. 2).

"Congress shall call a convention for proposing amendments to the Constitution on the application of two-thirds of the legislatures of the several States (art. V).

"Congress shall propose amendments to the Constitution whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary (art. V).

"When the choice of a President shall devolve upon the House of Representatives, a quorum shall consist of a Member or Members from two-thirds of the various States of the Union (amendment 12).

"A quorum of the Senate, when choosing a Vice President, shall consist of two-thirds of the whole number of Senators (amendment 12).

"The Constitution, therefore, does not give recognition, in all cases, to the right of the majority to control."

In recommending that a two-thirds vote be required to bring debate to a close, your committee has adopted the same line of reasoning which prevailed when rule XXII was amended in 1917. A two-to-one vote is a double preponderance of opinion which gives adequate protection against hasty or ill-advised legislation and minimizes the influence of special interests or pressure groups.

Senate Resolution 15 has for its sole objective a restoration of Senate rule XXII so that it will accomplish the intent and purpose of the Senators who voted for its adoption in 1917. At that time serious consideration was not only given to guarding the rights of a minority in the Senate, but it was fully intended to provide a means whereby a two-thirds majority or more of the Senators could effectuate their will in conformity with their responsibility to the people who elected them.

The text of the resolution as reported is as follows:

"*Resolved*, That subsection 2 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, relating to cloture, be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"'If at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

"' "Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?"

"' 'And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a two-thirds vote of those voting, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"'Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate.' "

MINORITY VIEWS

The United States Senate established a system of free and unlimited debate in 1806, when its Members agreed to discard the last of earlier rules which had been somewhat similar to the procedure of the House of Representatives.

These full and free debate privileges, differing from any other legislative body in the world have been changed only under the stress of the gravest of national emergencies—war. During the War Between the States a temporary rule was adopted restricting debate on war measures considered during secret session of the Senate.

In 1917, a filibuster (a term used here to mean extended debate and discussion designed to prevent action upon a measure) delayed the arming of merchant ships in the period just prior to American entry into World War I. A determined Senate, intent upon preventing any similar action during the period of national emergency, adopted an amendment to rule XXII, which allowed two-thirds of the Members to vote to cut off debate upon a measure under discussion. This is the so-called cloture rule which Senate Resolution 15 seeks to amend.

Under the cloture procedure, a signed motion of 16 Senators to set a limit on debate must be brought to a vote without debate 2 days after being filed. If the motion is adopted by a two-thirds vote, cloture is invoked, limiting further debate on the measure to 1 hour for each Senator.

The cloture amendment to rule XXII was never used during World War I, and the Senate has actually reached a vote on invoking cloture only 19 times in the 32 subsequent years. Cloture has been invoked only 4 out of these 19 times that it came to a vote.

In 1922 it was ruled that a motion for cloture under rule XXII was not applicable to debate upon amendments to the Senate Journal. At a later date it was ruled that cloture was not applicable to debate upon a motion to take up a measure for consideration by the Senate.

The Senate Rules Committee has had under study five resolutions involving cloture. Three of them were designed to make ironclad the two-thirds cloture rule, and two proposed to amend the rule through the adoption of majority cloture.

COMMITTEE ACTIONS

The Committee on Rules has properly seen fit to reject the proposals which would have made it possible for a bare majority to shut off debate in the Senate. Despite this action, however, it is still clear that the forces which seek to broaden the cloture rule have as a goal the establishment of majority cloture. There is every reason to believe that the passage of Senate Resolution 15 would be regarded as just a step toward a system of control by a bare majority. This very evident attitude on the part of most of the sponsors of cloture proposals makes it more vital to oppose the adoption by the Senate of Senate Resolution 15.

Three of the sponsors of Senate Resolution 13, a measure identical with Senate Resolution 15, stated in their testimony before the committee that they regarded it primarily as a step along the path to majority cloture. Senator KNOWLAND, the fourth sponsor of the resolution, associated himself with the testimony of Senators SALTONSTALL, FERGUSON, and IVES, the three sponsors who made clear their belief in majority cloture.

With these factors in mind, opposition to Senate Resolution 15 becomes an obvious necessity, not only from the standpoint that passage of the resolution would impinge too greatly upon the historic freedom of debate of the Senate, but because it would also let the bars down for an early change to cloture by majority.

There is every reason to fear that the establishment of majority cloture would be only a transitory period in the rapid change in the fundamental nature of the United States Senate that might be inaugurated through tampering with the rules today.

TRANSITION TO PARTISANSHIP

The existence of a majority cloture rule would provide a source of great temptation to the party which happened to be in power. Without contending that such a course would be deliberately adopted, it is virtually certain that the rule would soon become a weapon in the hands of the partisan majority, used to shut off debate whenever the party program appeared to be bogging down in the face of determined opposition.

The leaders of the political party constituting the majority would first persuade themselves that they would be justified in using it for their own partisan purposes in some controversy where the opposition appeared to be using delaying tactics, but it would not be a far step from that point to become convinced that they were derelict in their duty if they did not use it on every occasion of partisan policy matter. They would be continually prodded and pushed into using this weapon by political pressure groups that do not belong to any party, have no responsibility to the people, and no obligation to uphold the organic law of the land.

It would not be a difficult step forward from the continuous application of majority cloture to restriction of the right of amendment, the second basic tenet of legislative freedom in the Senate. If the right of amendment were restricted or curtailed, the Senate would have lost its last major point of difference from the procedure of the House of Representatives. The differences between the two bodies would be no more pronounced than they are in the average State legislature.

In calm reflection or study it may be difficult for a Member of the Senate to conceive of such changes being effected, for it is unlikely that any Member of the body, as constituted today, would approve of such a sweeping plan were it presented in toto. It must be remembered, however, that few of the changes in the Senate rules or precedents have come in the process of calm deliberation. Virtually all of them have come at the height of partisan feeling engendered by bitter debate on highly controversial issues. Members of the Senate, of all parties and all shades of political opinion and background, have reached these highly partisan stages in the past, and there is no reason to believe that they would not be reached at some stage in the future.

An example of a type of partisanship that obscures calm thinking about this most serious change in our legislative procedure can be found in the recent efforts of Members of the minority party in the Senate to force hasty and pell-mell action upon the rules change. This effort could not have been planned without the knowledge that it would disrupt all activity of the Senate, and perhaps permanently block action on a general legislative program recently endorsed by the electorate of the country. Such a fundamental change in the very nature of our Government deserves consideration in an atmosphere much clearer of partisanship.

WASHINGTON'S WARNING

It was partisanship of this nature that was warned against by George Washington in his farewell address:

"I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the State with particular reference to the founding of them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

"This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind. It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed, but in those of the popular forum it is seen in its greatest rankness and is truly their worst enemy. Without looking forward to any extremity of this kind, which nevertheless ought not be entirely out of sight, the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit of party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it."

With this very pointed reminder of the dangers of partisanship and party government, it is worth reflecting upon the reasons which have enabled this country to avoid the pitfalls described. There is general agreement that the stability of our two-party system, with neither party drawn along class or geographical lines, has been a major cause of the stability of our Government. There has been bitter partisanship at times, and various periods when one party has overwhelmingly dominated one or both branches of Congress, the most recent having been only 12 years ago, when 76 of the 96 Members of the Senate were Democrats.

What, in periods such as these, has prevented the partisan purposes of the majority party from completely crushing the opposition, running roughshod over efforts that might have been called attempts to delay or obstruct the will of the majority? The answer can be found in the rules of the Senate, with their provisions for free and unlimited debate, for the opportunity of full presentation to the people of the country of every point of view on legislative issues. Free debate in the Senate has become the bulwark of the two-party system during those periods when overwhelming sentiment in the country appeared to be threatening the institution. Debate in the Senate has made clear division over issues at times when it might appear that the minority point of view would be without a champion.

CHALLENGE

In the testimony favoring limitation on debate in the Senate presented to the committee, a great deal of theoretical handicaps and weaknesses of the present rules were presented, but the proponents of change failed to present one single example of any real injury to the American people caused by the delay on legislation due to extended debate. The opponents to change in the rules extend a challenge to the proponents to show such injury at any time since the free debate

rule was instituted in the Senate in 1806. This challenge was made early during the hearings on this subject, and was unanswered throughout that period. It is now specifically renewed.

Very lengthy and detailed studies have been made in regard to so-called filibuster efforts down through the history of the Senate. These studies show that on a number of occasions legislation has been delayed by lengthy argument, but that in very few cases has a bill been to all purposes defeated without a vote after having been debated on the floor of the Senate. Legislation has been erroneously reported as having been defeated by filibuster when it has actually only been delayed, with passage usually coming in an amended form. There is general agreement that these amended versions have been better laws in each case.

The printed hearings of the Rules Committee on the debate limitation question provide on pages 25 and 26 a documentary listing of later action on bills which were the subject of extended debate or filibusters. Of the important measures which can be described as definitely defeated by filibusters, the list dwindles down to five:

1. The force bill of 1890.
2. The armed-ship bill of 1917.
3. Antilynch bills.
4. Anti-poll-tax bills.
5. The Fair Employment Practices Commission bill of 1946.

There is now general agreement among all schools of thought, no matter what the views about Federal supervision of election processes, that the famous force bill of 1890, with its provision for Federal control of elections in the South with the use of Federal troops, was unwise legislation. We now realize that it developed from the partisan feeling that remained following the War Between the States, and that its eventual defeat through the process of a filibuster has served the best interest of our Nation.

ARMED SHIP CONTROVERSY

The armed ship bill of 1917 was important to the defense program of President Woodrow Wilson in the period immediately preceding World War I. Opponents were able to block its passage during the lame-duck session of the outgoing Congress, but immediately after this the President found authority to take this action without a new law, and our merchant ships were armed without any action being necessary by the special session of the War Congress that shortly convened. There is little doubt but that the bill would have been passed had the President desired it.

The three remaining bills that have been blocked by extended debate are part of the so-called civil-rights legislative program. There is ample reason to believe that their failure of passage is the motivating cause behind the present very extreme effort to change the time-tested rules of the Senate. Will the Senate be wise in taking such action to satisfy the temporary demands of a highly emotional pressure group? In the long legislative cycle, we know that this group will be succeeded in time by another group. Should the precedent be established for the amendment of Senate procedure whenever that procedure is considered a stumbling block in the face of demands of any powerful pressure bloc?

Each one of the so-called civil-rights bills that has reached the floor of the Senate has been of gravely doubtful constitutionality. Even some of the present most ardent sponsors of an antilynching law agree that the early Dyer Act and the later versions of this bill contained unconstitutional provisions. The extent to which the constitutionality of an anti-poll-tax bill is doubted can be best demonstrated by the fact that 10 Democratic Senators have submitted a constitutional amendment dealing with that subject, believing that to be the manner in which Congress should take action on a suffrage question. The FEPC proposal of 1946 contained provisions which have been universally decried as violating the constitutional requirements of a fair and impartial trial.

It would be superfluous to add that this type of legislation is conceded to be aimed at one section of the country, a type of action contradictory to the long-established American governmental principles first enunciated by President Washington. Have the American people suffered any injury through the defeat of these measures by use of prolonged debate?

BENEFITS OF DEBATE

Our recent legislative history offers very impressive testimony to show direct benefits that have been achieved through the system of extended and prolonged debate in the Senate. Two measures which were highly popular in the excited tempo of the times were defeated in the Senate because both the Members of the body and the citizens of the country as a whole had an opportunity to take a second and more detached thought on the matter.

In 1937, after the Supreme Court had ruled as unconstitutional several popular measures that were considered vital to the economic recovery program, a plan was submitted to enlarge the Court and make other changes in its personnel—the so-called court-packing plan. It is generally conceded that this plan would have passed the Senate by a fair majority if it had come to an early vote. Instead, opposition leaders adopted the strategy of delay. After a few months a majority of the Senate came to the conclusion that most of them hold today—that such action would have changed the fundamental nature of our Government, to the disadvantage of all of us.

A more recent case was that of the railroad strike of 1946, when it was recommended that striking employees be conscripted into the military service. Legislation to this effect passed the House of Representatives within a few minutes after the recommendation had been made. In the Senate, however, traditional procedure prevented hasty action or the invoking of any type of cloture, and the conscription plan was soon discarded as unwise.

There have been recent cases where prolonged debate has been the major factor in the passage of bills that were at a doubtful stage when first brought to the floor of the Senate. Two cornerstones of our recent foreign policy, the Lend-Lease Act of 1941 and the loan to Britain of 1946, both gained important support during the process of a lengthy debate.

NATIONAL EMERGENCY

The question has been raised that recent international history, with its record of totalitarianism disrupting the world, introduces the possibility of some misguided or disloyal handful of Senators obstructing emergency action designed to protect the physical security of the Nation. The possibility seems remote, but it is well to be prepared for any remote possibility in planning for the security of our country. To take adequate steps for such a situation, two of the authors of this minority report submitted to the Committee on Rules the following proposed amendment to rule XXII:

"If at any time a motion, signed by 86 Senators, is presented to bring to a close the debate upon any measure on the Senate Calendar (and a Senator having the floor may be interrupted for this purpose), the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and declare the measure the unfinished business of the Senate. Two hours after the motion has been stated (unless the motion itself as filed shall specify a longer time for debate, which specification, if any, shall control), the Senate shall proceed to vote on the passage of the measure by a yea-and-nay vote. At least one-half of the full time allowed for debate shall be allotted to Members who do not sign the motion. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the motion has been filed. No dilatory motion shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

The committee saw fit to reject this suggestion, but it is still available for the consideration of all Members of the Senate who would like to make preparation for action on national emergency matters and at the same time not break down the traditional safeguards for free debate.

Every evidence available indicates that the present cloture amendment to rule XXII was adopted only because the Senate considered it as a formula which would allow action on national emergency matters. The President, the Senate, and the country were angry following the action against the armed-ship resolution. President Wilson asked for a cloture rule because there existed "a crisis of extraordinary peril." A bipartisan group of Senators wrote and adopted the resolution with this thought in mind, and there were only 3 votes in opposition. Many of the Senators voting in favor of the resolution, including several who had filibustered against the armed-ship measure, had participated in filibusters previously and were to participate in them later. They considered themselves dealing with a national emergency involving the physical security of the country, as evidenced by the debate and newspaper accounts of the time.

MAJORITY RULE

This momentous change in the rules has been supported on the theory that it will implement majority rule in the Nation. This is a plausible theory that has its attractions, until a check is made of the actual representation in the Senate. Senators represent States, and not proportions of our population. It is possible for various combinations of 49 Senators to represent anywhere from 20 to 80 percent of the population of the country. Would it be rule by popular majority to say that 49 Senators representing only one-fifth of the citizens should have the power to run roughshod over the wishes of 47 representing four-fifths of the population?

To carry the illustration even further, it would be possible under a two-thirds rule for 64 Senators, representing less than one-third of our population, to run a steam roller over the opposition of 32 Senators, representing more than two-thirds of our population.

The effort to preserve this vital representation to each State is one of the primary causes of the tradition of free and unlimited debate in the Senate. The very geographic boundaries of our States sometimes cause conflicts with neighboring States that can be resolved only by action through the Congress. It is vital that the representatives of these States in the Senate have full and free opportunity to present their case.

Our founding fathers recognized the vital issues that might develop with the representation of the States in the Senate, and it was because of this that they made this representation the only provision in the Constitution that could not be amended or deleted.

The number of Senators who have been recorded as changing their views on the subject of cloture after a period of service in the Senate is impressive. Many have been recorded against any type of cloture after having initially favored it, while others have changed from favoring majority cloture to a less restrictive pattern.

It is well enough to talk about streamlining the rules of the Senate and avoiding an alleged waste of time, but when it comes to materially altering one of the fundamental principles which has controlled the operation of the body for many decades, and around which the Senate's most cherished and valued tradition has been built, we can realize the gravity of the subject matter with which we deal.

Unlimited debate on the floor of the United States Senate has become one of the major safeguards of American liberty. Those who seek to change this rule in the name of liberty may well pause to consider the dangerous precedent they are considering. A procedure which is today used to protect the rights of the States may be used tomorrow to protect the right of the individuals of a minority race or religion. The gag rule which some labor and minority groups now seek could be used in the future to deprive them of fundamental rights for which they have fought so hard.

BULWARKS OF LIBERTY

The major bulwarks of our liberty are the Constitution, our common law, and the free debate of the Senate. All safeguards of liberty are designed to prevent undue and unjust actions against a minority, and Senate debate is certainly so designed.

Debate is man's greatest political invention. It is the mother of parliamentary law. Because the United States Senate is the only parliamentary body in the world that has retained ulimited debate, the prestige of the Senate has grown to overshadow all similar bodies throughout the world. It is important that this symbol of free exchange of ideas should not be disturbed.

There are naturally abuses of free speech in the Senate, just as there are abuses of free speech on the part of private citizens. We should retain this freedom by something other than rigid rules that can be bent to the will of partisanship.

We know all too well the waves of emotionalism that actually do sweep across an entire nation at times, threatening to impair or destroy man's heritage of political, economic, and even religious freedom that is the product of centuries of effort.

We can find all too recent evidences in American history of political prejudice run rampant. Only 100 years ago prejudice against one particular religious group became so strong that the Know-Nothings, the political party built around this prejudice, attained for a brief period the status of the second major party in the Nation. No more than a quarter century ago a secret group, feeding primarily on religious prejudice, succeeded in grabbing political control of several States of our Nation—and these efforts were most successful outside the South.

But, as can be found in no other nation in the world, if any of our political, social, or religious groups find themselves under serious, sustained attack, they know that they have, as a last and effective place of refuge, the floor of the United States Senate. This condition did not just happen—it is the result of the tradition of freedom that finds expression on this same floor.

If the Senate has a majority cloture rule, or it begins to whittle away, bit by bit, the freedom of expression that has flowered there for so long, we will have taken a long step away from our heritage of freedom.

JOHN C. STENNIS.
RUSSELL B. LONG.
LESTER C. HUNT.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I venture rather timidly to get into the midst of this very technical discussion, because I realize that in our deliberations on this question the whole matter has now resolved itself into technicalities.

I say that, Mr. President, without in any way belittling tradition or precedent or the responsibility of the Chair, the Presiding Officer of the Senate, to rule in line with precedents. I know a little about that responsibility. I have a great respect for tradition. I have a great respect for precedent. I realize that by an irresponsible departure from precedent in the interpretation of the rules of a legislative body, that body always is threatened with ultimate chaos.

In this particular instance I regret exceedingly to feel that I must differ with my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], because I realize the process by which he reached his decision last summer and I realize the process by which he has reached his conclusion in the present instance. However, I point out that insofar as a presiding officer is concerned, as I see the matter, although his responsibility to rule in line with precedent is absolutely present in every instance, at the same time he must recognize differences in conditions which occur, differences in circumstances under which debates are conducted; and recognizing those differences, he must so rule.

Therefore, Mr. President, I do not find fault with the difference expressed by the Presiding Officer of the Senate, the Vice President of the United States, in his seeming conflict with the ruling of the President pro tempore, a year ago. I go further. Because I accept the premises on which he established his ruling in the present instance, I agree with his conclusions as expressed last evening. The question itself of "pending measure," as it has been so well explored by the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], is one of the questions which obviously, as a result of the extensive exploration into which he has just gone, is something on which there may be a matter of difference of opinion among honest individuals.

This afternoon I listened with great interest to the presentation by the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. I noted the evidence he presented from the record, which indicates, as he sees it and as I feel it must have been, the intent of those who were responsible for drafting rule XXII in its present form. I recognize the differences existing among us, especially on technical matters of this kind. I do not condemn presiding officers of legislative bodies who now and then, because they see these differences, rule differently, as some may see it, from the rulings in previous decisions.

However, as I said, in this instance I do not note such a difference. I do not note that the Vice President of the United States in effect is taking issue with previous rulings on the question at issue. It seems to me that regardless of the definition of "measure"—and he himself indicated that this definition is a question for the Senate itself to determine—the conditions with which we are confronted in the present instance are utterly different from those which have existed when other decisions of similar nature have been made. That, to me, in this particular instance, is of greatest importance.

Mr. President, it is very unfortunate that the civil-rights question has been injected into the debate. I am very glad indeed that the distinguished Senator from Michigan expressed himself as regretful it had become an issue in the debate. I wish this question of procedure and rule's amendment could be viewed and considered and decided completely apart from any other question that might possibly come before the Senate. As I see it, the question itself is of transcendent importance to the people of the United States everywhere.

We have heard a great deal in the course of the debate in regard to the rights of minorities.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'CONOR in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. IVES. I yield for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. Is there any question in the Senator's mind that the civil-rights issue is the reason the filibuster is on?

Mr. IVES. In answer to that, it would appear that because of the injection of the question of civil rights into the debate we are now faced with a filibuster. But I nevertheless regret exceedingly that this paramount question of procedure and rules amendment cannot be considered exclusively on its own merits.

I shall state the reason. We hear all around us a great deal about the rights of minorities. We have heard a great deal about the rights of minorities during the debate. I can assure you, Mr. President, that I, for one, respect those rights, and I, for one, would fight to the limit in the Senate, so long as I am a Member of it, to see that every legitimate right of a minority in the Senate, as membership here is represented, is protected. But there comes a time when majorities also have rights. There comes a time when over the period of years, let us say, because that seems to be what it finally amounts to, the rights of majorities not alone to express themselves but to be heard and finally to prevail become imperative. That, as I see it, is one of the principal things involved in this debate, the right of majorities, not in the first instance; not in the second instance; perhaps not in the third instance; but finally to be heard, finally to have their will prevail. That right, I say, is at issue at this time.

Mr. President, I realize very definitely there may be those who will want to differ with me as to this majority right. I am not talking about the right of the majority in the Senate to decide rules; that is irrelevant in this immediate matter. I am not talking about the right of a majority of Senators to express themselves about matters coming before the Senate. I am talking about the rights of majorities among the American people. There are some who may differ with me on that. But I want to point out that, with the Senate situated as it is at the present time, in the final analysis, we cannot control our own action; there is no way by which the will of overwhelming majorities can ultimately prevail. An overwhelming majority in the Senate cannot control the action of the Senate. And that, Mr. President, is a bad situation to have in perpetuity. There is no safety valve, there is no possibility by which continuing large majorities finally can realize self-expression. That is a dangerous situation in a legislative body.

Oh, I know some Members of the Sen-: te are worried about what might happen as the result of preponderant majority opinion existing in the United States which might be in conflict with some of our basic principles, as all of us who are here now believe them to be. One might worry about that, if a minority in the Senate finally might be able to control the situation. But I want to point out to my fellow Members of the Senate that if that condition should come about—and may God forbid it ever will arise in this country—but if that condition ever should arise, all the rules in kingdom come in the United States Senate would come to naught. Let us bear that in mind. That possibility, however, I think is not a question that should properly be under consideration in this debate.

I have noted with some concern reference to the majority report of the committee, and I want to say, insofar as I personally am concerned—and I can speak only for myself—I do not agree that the adoption of the resolution is essential in order to accomplish what is being attempted in the present instance through the ruling of the Chair. If one reads the resolution, for instance, he will note that it goes a great deal further than does the ruling of the Chair. It applies to "any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business." This is quite different in its effect from the mere question which now confronts us.

So I do not join in that interpretation of the report of the committee as being applicable in the present instance. I agree that if we are to straighten out this matter in the manner in which the committee contemplates, so that in all time to come, or at least, until some future Senate properly decides otherwise, we shall know definitely, and the country will know definitely, how the Senate of the United States is to be able to proceed on all questions coming before it; we must adopt the resolution itself; to my way of thinking, the question raised in the committee report will confront us when we are debating the resolution proper. But the very fact, sir, that a large share of this debate has been devoted to the resolution itself, indicates that the resolution itself is, in effect, a part of the motion now before us. We cannot separate them. They are one and inseparable. The very fact that there is nothing immediately before the Senate except the motion to take up the resolution is indicative of the fact that there lies the resolution also. They are one and the same thing, as I see it.

So, Mr. President, reverting to my earlier remarks concerning the rights of majorities, the great necessity that the United States Senate be in a position to control its activities is very evident. Oh, I know it has been suggested in the debate that we override the ruling of the Chair and seek some other course by which to resolve the problem; but, Mr. President, no other course has yet been offered which, in itself, provides any answer. We all know that if the Senators who are opposed to the resolution in its present form persist in their opposition, they can defeat it. We all know, from experience in this body, that if we stay here night and day, assuming this ruling is overridden—and Heaven knows, sir, I would be willing to stay, and I have urged the majority leader to take such action in such eventuality, and I know that most of the Members on this side of the aisle would be willing to do so—all of us know, I repeat, that if we physically can stay here night and day, week after week and month after month, so can the opposition. The opposition has sufficient strength, because of their number, to last as long as we can last. We must show up for quorum calls. We are responsible for this body remaining in continuous session and not being faced with a condition which would bring about adjournment. That is the responsibility of those of us who are trying to bring about this needed correction in the Senate's rules.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield for a question.

Mr. LODGE. Even though it be true, as the Senator from New York says, that it is more difficult for those who are in favor of limitation of debate to maintain a quorum in a continuous session than it is for those who are opposed to such a limitation, does not the Senator from New York think that the attempt to do so must be made if faith is to be kept with the people and with the pledges which have been made in the platforms of both parties?

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I am very glad the able Senator from Massachusetts has raised that question. I thought I answered it in my earlier remarks when I stated that I myself, personally, and I thought I was speaking also for a large and substantial majority on this side of the aisle, would be willing to stay here night and day until the matter is resolved as it should be resolved. Of course, we must stay in session if the question cannot be decided by a favorable vote on the ruling of the Chair. There is no alternative except to stay.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. IVES. I yield for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. Assuming that civil rights are involved in the filibuster, does not the able Senator from New York agree with me that the Republican platform pledges can be partially redeemed by sustaining the Chair's ruling upon this important question, with the idea of looking forward to the ultimate end of what is contained in the resolution?

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I think I brought that question rather to a point in a question which I raised yesterday with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, when I recalled to his mind that the Republican platform itself, dealing with the civil rights question, even as does the Democratic platform, was adopted unanimously in Philadelphia. Of course we have that responsibility, and of course this is a step toward keeping our platform pledge; but, Mr. President, in the remarks I am now making I do not want to go into the civil-rights question if I can avoid it, because I do not think it should be considered at this time. There is no one in the Senate to whom I will yield as a greater advocate of civil rights than am I. I stand for them and the whole civil rights program 100 percent. Of course we have a responsibility; there is no argument about it. Of course, if we can persuade sufficient of our number to join with us in this necessary preliminary step, it will enable us to bring about more quickly a solution to some of these other problems. But——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. IVES. Let me finish with my "but." But, Mr. President, I respect the rights of those who disagree with me. I have been trying to persuade Senators to join with me in approval of the ruling made by the Vice President of the United States, because I think it is a correct one, and I think it is the only way in which we can get this matter resolved. I see no other course, and none has been suggested in the course of the debate which has met with any acceptance worthy of the name.

Mr. President, in that connection, I would point out that the only way by which we can gain such an objective is to try to get together. If we try to get together and if we respect the rights of one another and the ideas of one another, perhaps we shall get somewhere; but right now there seems small likelihood of action of this nature.

I do not want to condemn Senators who disagree with me on the question, and I do not condemn them. I deeply respect their attitude. They have every right to it. I wish they felt differently, because if they did feel differently, we would soon have the matter resolved.

Mr. President, as I started to conclude once before, when I was diverted from doing so by several questions, as I see it, sustaining the ruling of the Vice President is the only legitimate course we can take to resolve the question which is before us. I know that the term "legitimate" can easily be challenged in the light of the presentations which have been made here, but I feel that it is a legitimate course. I feel, as I said, that the question of what is a pending measure is up to the Senate to determine insofar as definition is concerned. I feel that the situation before us, on which the ruling has been made, is a unique one. I feel that it has no exact parallel in all the history of Senate procedure; and I feel, finally, sir, that if we are to get ourselves into a position where we, as a legislative body, can be responsive to the overwhelming popular will, after all the necessary time for due and proper consideration will have elapsed, then this reform in Senate procedure must be made.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the question now before the Senate, namely the appeal from the decision of the Chair on a question of order.

The question involved is very important, because it involves the rule-making power of the Senate. The question is, who has the authority to interpret the rules of the Senate? The rule-making power is provided for in the Constitution.

Article 1 section 5 gives to the Senate, in fact, to both Houses, absolute power to make rules governing their proceedings.

Under the rule-making power we find rule XX in the Senate Rule Book. Any rule of the Senate can be tested as to its meaning by a question of order being raised. And how do we raise those questions? We raise them under rule XX, because the Constitution gives us absolute power, as a body, to make the rules.

The Vice President does not have a right to enter into the making of laws except in case of a tie vote. He is the Presiding Officer of the Senate, and by virtue of rule XX he is given certain authority. For instance, today, at this very moment, the Vice President does not occupy the Chair. If a question of order were raised, the present occupant of the Chair, the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] would rule upon it, as a Senator of the United States.

What does rule XX provide? I read:

> A question of order may be raised at any stage of the proceedings, except when the Senate is dividing, and, unless submitted to the Senate, shall be decided by the Presiding Officer without debate, subject to an appeal to the Senate.

In other words, the Senate of the United States adopted a rule conferring upon the Vice President, or any Senator in the Chair presiding, the right to make a decision, but subject to the decision of the Senate, under a rule made by virtue of the rule-making power conferred upon the Senate by the Constitution of the United States.

The second provision is:

> The Presiding Officer may submit any question of order for the decision of the Senate.

So I say, Mr. President, that the power to interpret the rule, which, in effect, is a rule-making power, is in the Chair, if no appeal is taken from the decision, or in the Senate on an appeal from a decision of the Chair, in case the Chair makes a decision, and in case the Chair does not desire to make it, he can submit it to the Senate for decision.

Mr. President, I know that men are sincere in their judgments in the particular matter before the Senate. This is an important case about which reasonable minds can differ. I think we should not treat it as a question involving civil-rights legislation, but of making rules and interpreting rules of the Senate of the United States. If we will keep that in mind, I think we will be able to decide what is a fair interpretation of the rule. We will be able to decide what the rule is. We can also decide the powers and authority of the Senate in interpreting the rules.

Mr. President, we have a decision of the Chair. Immediately there was an appeal for which the rule provides, and, as I understand, we have to ascertain what the judgment of each Senator is as to what the meaning of the rule is and what he desires it to be.

We speak about previous decisions of the Chair as binding on the Senators. Do we appreciate that the Senate did not have a parliamentarian, as such, until about the year 1935? The House has been closer in its following of decisions than has the Senate, because the Senate is not a judicial body; it is not a part of the executive branch; it is a political legislative body, except when it sits in impeachment proceedings.

Mr. President, one of the things I missed when I came to the Senate was that it did not follow precedents, and I miss it up until this day that we have not followed previous decisions, as courts have followed them, in order that we may interpret the rules and decide certain questions.

I have asked the Parliamentarian today whether we have a book on decisions to which we could readily refer. We have no such book of decisions. I say that the rule book of the Senate is not a book such as the rule books used by courts, in which precedents are followed. We would have citations under the rules showing where we could locate the interpretation of the rule. But the Senate of the United States, the greatest deliberative body in the world, does not have such a book, because it has not seen fit to follow precedents since it had the sole power to make the rules, and it had the sole power on an appeal from the decision of the Chair, or when a question was submitted to it by the Chair, to make the rule as of that date. That is very material at the present time. We have not followed decisions. For instance, I have seen questions of order raised when appropriation bills were under consideration because amendments were offered which were legislation on an appropriation bill. Did we follow decisions? I say that time after time I have seen Senators vote politically, because this is a political, legislative body, except during impeachment proceedings. They voted as they believed they wanted the legislation in the bill to be, or as they did not want it to be, according to their own political convictions. No precedents were cited or followed.

Mr. President, the measure we are considering is not a Republican measure, it is not a Democratic measure. There is not a Member of the Senate who does not think that we must have rules. We must have rules in order that we may have orderly procedure, and I think we probably surprise the world, when it comes to the matter of decorum and the dispatch with which this body acts, because it does act under rules, but it has the right to change the rules at any time by a majority vote on an appeal from the decision of the Chair.

Much of the work of the Senate is done by unanimous consent, and this body, by virtue of rule XX, always knows every hour of every day it is in session, that a question of order may be raised upon the floor and the Chair will have to rule, and if the Chair rules, any Senator can appeal from the decision of the Chair and a majority vote, on the appeal, will determine what the rule is and shall be for that particular case.

Mr. President, much has been said about the interpretation of rule XXII. In looking back through the records I have had a great deal of trouble in endeavoring to ascertain what those who adopted the rule had in mind. I have no quarrel with anyone who interprets the rule differently than I do, because I know that Senators are reasonable, but differ because they believe the position they will take when they make their decision is the correct one. I shall state what it is that impresses me and appeals to my conscience and dictates my decision in this matter. If rule XXII means that cloture can only be applied after a bill has been made the regular business then, Mr. President, the rule does not mean anything, for all any Senator has to do, or that any group of Senators has to do, is to be present in the Senate at the time the motion is made, and begin debate upon the motion.

Mr. President, we are now in the legislative day of February 21, 1949. Why? Because the Senate, under the interpretation of some Senators, cannot adjourn, and thus bring up a new legislative day, because if that were done the Journal would come up for approval, and there could be unlimited debate, without the right of cloture, upon the approval of the Journal. In this year of 1949 we face a situation in the Senate of the United States, whereby, because of the Senate rule, we are obliged to—yes I will say it—use a subterfuge, we have to recess instead of adjourn. We cannot have the morning hour because some Senators interpret the rule to mean that no cloture applies to debate on the question of approving the Journal.

As I have said before, I welcome precedent. I hope that we sometime can establish effective precedents in the Senate. I hope we can feel secure in following precedents, as the courts have done.

We hear complaint today that one of the defects of our judicial system is that our judges do not follow precedent. I saw the time, as other Senators did, when an attempt was made to pack the Supreme Court because the Supreme Court was following precedent. But I say that if Senators were today to ask our Parliamentarian, Charles Watkins, to show them any record of the precedents affecting the Senate rules, he would have great difficulty in doing so. He could show Senators his private records, and recall to them what he has in his mind on the subject, rather than furnish a definite record, because the Senate has not been in the habit of following precedents.

I say today, as my able colleague has said, that I have no quarrel with any other man's position upon this question. I cannot follow all the reasoning of the Vice President in his ruling, but my interpretation is that a motion to take up was included, or was intended to be included in the rule, unless we should say that those who adopted the cloture rule had their tongue in their cheek when they established the rule.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Did the Senator not come before the committee hearing and make a statement in direct conflict, to this effect, and I quote from page 85 of the hearings:

> It may be that we have just discovered this defect in our rules. Let's say that by Senator

VANDENBERG's decision in the last session it brought to the attention of all of us that there was a defect, and it was pointed out that the defect applied in particular procedures, for instance, that a motion to bring up was not subject to a cloture petition.

So, now is the time, when we have discovered that we really haven't a cloture on these various matters, the right of cloture, that we ought to amend this.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, that statement was made, and I stand back of it. In August 1948 the ruling of the Chair was appealed from, but no vote was ever taken. That does not change what I am saying here today. I merely say today that paramount rights exist. I believe that the right to vote on a measure is paramount to the right of unlimited debate. But I am a firm believer in full and fair and reasonable debate. I am of the opinion that provision for a two-thirds vote for cloture on all matters will provide a fair, reasonable debate. I believe the people of the United States can trust the Senate. I believe the States can trust the two Senators from each State to allow full and adequate debate. That does not mean unlimited debate, but it means that if a two-thirds vote will bring about cloture, we will have full and fair debate in the Senate.

Therefore, Mr. President, it is my judgment that, as a Senator of the United States who is obligated to make the rules under the Constitution, my vote should be cast to sustain the ruling of the Chair. At this time such a vote will mean that those of us who vote in favor of sustaining the Chair believe that the motion to take up is a pending measure within the meaning of rule XXII. I shall so vote.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, very briefly I want to state my position on this motion. In the Eightieth Congress I led the fight to have the Republican Party carry out its pledges. The Republican Party at that time did not do so. On June 7, 1948, I brought to the attention of the Senate that in the Republican platform of 1944 the Republicans had placed the following planks. First:

We pledge the establishment by Federal legislation of a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission.

Second:

ANTIPOLL TAX

The payment of any poll tax should not be a condition of voting in Federal elections and we favor immediate submission of a constitutional amendment for its abolition.

Third:

ANTILYNCHING

We favor legislation against lynching and pledge our sincere efforts in behalf of its early enactment.

And, Mr. President, fourth:

INDIANS

We pledge an immediate, just, and final settlement of all Indian claims between the Government and the Indian citizenship of the Nation. We will take politics out of the administration of Indian affairs.

Mr. President, day after day I stood upon this floor, when the Republicans had a majority, begging them to carry out the solemn promises, the definite pledges they had made to the people of the United States, and it is significant to note that I got exactly seven votes on three of the measures, and that only one of them was passed.

Mr. President, if I were assured that after this appeal had been decided my colleagues on the other side would make a sincere effort to carry out the wishes of President Truman, I would not take the few minutes I am taking. I have a definite idea as to their intentions. I wish to make perfectly clear the reason why I shall vote to overrule the decision of the Vice President yesterday afternoon.

In the first place, North Dakota holds a rather peculiar distinction. At the time rule XXII was adopted that grand and popular Viking, the late Senator Gronna, of North Dakota, was one of three Senators to vote against it. Also at that time there was in the Senate a man who was beloved all over the country, and particularly by the people of North Dakota. I refer to the late Senator Robert La Follette, Sr., one of the fighting champions—and one of the greatest—in behalf of the common people. Mr. La Follette was elected to the Senate in 1905. Because he had a lieutenant governor who disagreed with him politically he waited until 1906 before he came to the Senate. In 1917, eleven long years after Mr. La Follette first became a Member of this body, the question of cloture came up.

Mr. President, I believe that no other question which has arisen in the Senate during the 8 years I have been a Member has resulted in my receiving more telegrams and more telephone calls than I have received in this case, after announcing a few days ago that I would vote not to sustain the anticipated ruling of the Vice President.

In order that my position may be very clear, I wish to say that I fully agree with the late Robert La Follette, Sr. On March 8, 1917, in speaking of rule XXII, just before the vote took place, Mr. La Follette said:

With a rule such as is here proposed in force at that time, with an iron hand laid upon this body from outside, with a Congress that in 3 years has reduced itself to little more than a rubber stamp, let me ask you, Mr. President, if you do not think a rule of this sort would be bound to be pretty effective cloture? Especially is that true as some of the proposed legislation was of a character that appealed to certain Senators upon this side of the Chamber who, coming from States where the manufacture of munitions is a mighty important industry, are impressed with legislation that benefits the interests they represent?

Mr. La Follette continued—and I invite this to the attention of every man who pretends to be a progressive. Everyone who has studied history knows that Rome, after 450 fine years, fell when Julius Caesar made himself a dictator and when he subjugated the Roman Senate to his will. The English Parliament was strong for many hundred years, until Gladstone succeeded in abolishing the right of free discussion, at the time when the matter of freedom for Ireland came up for debate in Parliament.

I read at this time what Senator La Follette said when a proposal for cloture was before the Senate 32 years ago:

Mr. President, believing that I stand for democracy, for the liberties of the people of this country, for the perpetuation of our free institutions, I shall stand while I am a Member of this body against any cloture that denies free and unlimited debate. Sir, the moment that the majority imposes the restriction contained in the pending rule upon this body, that moment you will have dealt a blow to liberty, you will have broken down one of the greatest weapons against wrong and oppression that the Members of this body possess. This Senate is the only place in our system where, no matter what may be the organized power behind any measure to rush its consideration and to compel its adoption, there is a chance to be heard, where there is opportunity to speak at length, and where, if need be, under the Constitution of our country and the rules as they stand today, the constitutional right is reposed in a Member of this body to halt a Congress or a session on a piece of legislation which may undermine the liberties of the people and be in violation of the Constitution which Senators have sworn to support. When you take that power away from the Members of this body, you let loose in a democracy forces that in the end will be heard elsewhere, if not here.

I have not time to quote all of Mr. La Follette's speech. He gave one or two quotations. Here is one from a former Senator from Indiana, Senator Turpie, who, some 50 years previously, had made a statement in regard to limitation of debate. This is what Senator Turpie said:

I heard this body characterized the other day as a voting body. I disclaim that epithet very distinctly. I have heard it described elsewhere as a debating body. I disclaim that with equal disfavor. This body is best determined by its principal characteristic. The universal law and genius of language have given a name to this body derived from its principal attribute. It is a deliberative body—the greatest deliberative body in the world.

That was the first time, so far as I have been able to ascertain, that that description of the United States Senate was given. He continued:

Now, voting is an incident to deliberation, and debate is an incident to deliberation; but when a body is chiefly characterized as deliberative there is much deliberation apart from discussion and debate, and wholly apart from what is called the business of voting.

The essence and the spirit of a body like ours, now over a century old, may be best gathered from its rules of action, the body of law governing it always very small, now very brief. Of the 21 rules properly affecting parliamentary procedure in this body 11 relate to the subject of deliberation. More than one-half relate exclusively to that subject and have nothing to do with debate or voting. I suppose that the form of law under which the will of the majority must control this body embraces at least the rules which govern us. Here is rule XXII, one which touches us every day. I think it is the most frequently operative of any rule in the Senate.

Mr. President, after referring to the pledges made by the Republican Party, which they did not keep, I now call attention to the Democratic Party—whose members now say that they stand for civil rights. Mr. Truman was a member of this body for 5 years. What does the cold record show as to what he did for civil rights? Did he lead any fight for them in this body, Mr. President? I was here during those 5 years. He did not lead one fight for them. Where is he

today? He is not in Washington. Mr. President, he is out fishing, in Florida. That shows his great interest in this matter.

O Mr. President, these Negro votes are very fine on election day. Apparently the Democrats think they have to make a showing for civil rights this year and perhaps next year and perhaps the year after that—but not a serious effort to get these civil-rights measures enacted; and the effort here these past 10 days has not been serious.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I refuse to yield at this time; I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota declines to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the effort has not been serious. I imagine the Senator from Florida might give us some of Mr. Truman's votes on various measures. I think that he voted right when it came time to vote; but at no time did he lead a fight for civil rights.

Mr. President, what a difference. When two or three times at the last session I tried to prevent the passage of a bill which, under selective service, would draft the last remaining son of a family whose two other sons had been killed in the service, the Members of the Senate stayed here and had two sessions all night long—two long, long night sessions. But I have not seen any so far this session, Mr. President. So far in this session we have worked no later than 8 or 9 or 10 o'clock at night, and then we have quit until the next day at noon, not 11 o'clock. I, for one, want to make it very plain that at any time that the Democrats really want to pass these civil-rights measures, I am prepared to stay here all night or stay here a week or a month in order to enact the civil-rights program that Harry Truman has advocated since he has become President.

Not long ago the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] said he thought he was perhaps as good a friend of civil rights as was any other Senator upon this floor. I think he is correct. I wish to say that during the 8 years I have been here, I have voted for every bill, without exception, calling for the establishment of civil rights in this country. So, today, I wish to make it very plain that when I vote to override the decision of the Vice President, I am still a firm, fighting friend of civil rights—just as strong a friend of civil rights as I ever was; and if the Democrats will begin tomorrow or Monday with a really serious, honest effort to carry out Mr. Truman's civil-rights program, I assure my friend the distinguished majority leader [Mr. LUCAS] that he will find me voting with him every single time. I hope the Democratic Party will do that. I hope they begin on it right away, and never quit until they secure the enactment of that civil-rights program. I think they will receive a great deal of support from Senators on this side of the aisle.

Mr. President, apropos of the telegrams and telephone calls on this matter which have been received by Senators—and two of those communications are rather threatening, especially one from New York—I wish to say that it seems to me that the people who sent those messages do not really understand the problem we face here, which was so clearly set forth today by the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

Mr. President, in closing, let me say that when I came to the Senate I had no better friend than Senator Charles McNary, of Oregon, who at that time occupied the desk next to the one I now have in this Chamber. He was then the minority leader. I shall never forget when he said to me that in his judgment one of the greatest safeguards of democracy was the fact that the right of unlimited debate exists in this Chamber, and I remember very well that when a distinguished Senator came to me and asked me to sign a cloture petition I talked with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], and I also secured the advice of Senator McNary, of Oregon, and I did not sign it. Certainly when a Member of the Senate like Senator La Follette, who was here 11 years, or a Member of the Senate like Senator McNary, gave me such advice, I did not sign it; I took the advice of the distinguished Senator Charles McNary, of Oregon.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I wish the Senator to be correct in his statement. I am sure he did not mean to say that I asked him to sign the cloture petition, for I was against signing it.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct; the Senator from Texas was against signing it. When such a petition was brought to me and I was asked to sign it, the distinguished Senator McNary, of Oregon, joined the Senator from Texas in saying that the right of free and unlimited debate in the Senate was one of the finest things about this body.

Mr. President, again I wish to assure my friend the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the majority leader, that if he will bring up this question of civil rights he will find no better backer than myself, and I shall be one of those who will hold up his right arm in carrying on that fight.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from North Dakota is in favor of the Wherry-Hayden resolution?

Mr. LANGER. I am not certain; that is a question we shall take up after this one. So far as the question of invoking cloture by a two-thirds vote is concerned, I am not quite sure whether I favor it or am opposed to it. I may even be opposed to it. I know that I do not favor cloture by majority vote, under any consideration.

Mr. LUCAS. In any event, the Senator from North Dakota is in favor of free and unlimited debate, and he has been in favor of it all the time, I understand.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator does not favor the Wherry-Hayden resolution, why would he wish to keep us here for a month?

Mr. LANGER. I may be in favor of that resolution; I have not stated that I am opposed to it. I wish to study it and go over it. I do not wish to commit myself regarding it until I look it over and study it and hear the debate on it. I may even wish to offer an amendment to it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator has been talking about breaking this filibuster, but he is in favor of free and unlimited debate. I do not quite follow his reasoning, if he is in favor of having the Senate stay here for a month and if he is in favor of free and unlimited debate.

Mr. LANGER. It is very simple. If the Senator needs help, I shall be glad to give it.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall need a great deal of help.

Mr. LANGER. All the Senator from Illinois has to do is keep the Senate in continuous session. If that is done, it will not be very long, as the Senator from Michigan said today, before we shall arrive at some understanding or agreement which will be mutually satisfactory.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. What the Senator says may be correct; but I am not sure that I shall be able to depend on the Senator from North Dakota, when we finally attempt to break the filibuster, to help us to break it, because he may not be in favor of the Hayden-Wherry resolution. I hope I can depend on the Senator from North Dakota when the time comes for him to go along with us.

Mr. LANGER. I assure the Senator from Illinois that I shall go along in helping secure the enactment of the Truman civil-rights program.

Mr. LUCAS. But the Senator from North Dakota makes some qualifications in that respect.

Mr. LANGER. No; I make no qualifications. When the Senator from Illinois asks me whether I favor a resolution which I have not yet had ample opportunity to study, I say that I am not sure whether I shall favor it without the crossing of a "t" or the dotting of an "i."

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from North Dakota has mentioned the name of the great Senator Bob La Follette. I wish to ask the Senator a question, because we were here together with another great Senator from the West, Senator Wheeler. I am sure the Senator from North Dakota well remembers the debates on the floor of the Senate with that distinguished Senator from Montana. I wish to remind the Senator that many a time Senator Wheeler——

Mr. LANGER. Senator Wheeler stood first, last, and all the time for free and unlimited debate upon this floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. Also, as I remember, he was a candidate, along with the distinguished Senator Bob La Follette, of the liberal movement in America.

Mr. LANGER. That is right.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to inquire of the able Senator from North Dakota, in view of his statement and in view of the parliamentary situation with which the Senate is faced on the question of filibustering on a motion to take up a matter, how he anticipates he will ever get a chance to vote on any civil-rights legislation if we cannot even get it before the Senate for a vote.

Mr. LANGER. It would be delightfully simple. Just as the Senator from Michigan said today in his magnificent address, it will be possible to enact civil-rights legislation just as soon as either party makes up its mind it is going to do it—any time Republicans will make the sacrifices necessary to do it. The Senator will remember last year I brought up these Republican platform pledges. The junior Senator from Oregon rose on the floor and said he would bring up his cot every day, he would stay here a week, or a month. Just as soon as either the Republicans or the Democrats make up their minds to get the civil-rights program through it can be done. Instead of that, we adjourned for 3 days at a time until toward the end of the session. Then, in the last 2 or 3 weeks, some of us who were opposed to the drafting of our boys under selective service were kept here 2 nights before the Republican convention at Philadelphia, all tired out. We were kept in session because Senators wanted to adjourn and go to the convention. Although many days had been wasted during the month or 2 or 3 months before that, there was an adjournment 3 days ahead of time. So I close by telling the people of this country that I am unqualifiedly for the civil-rights program and will help to enact it—if only the Democratic majority will bring it up.

Mr. CORDON and Mr. PEPPER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I have never been one who believes in reiteration. I shall limit myself to one or two points which I believe have not been covered. Beyond that, I associate myself with the statement made earlier this afternoon by the eminent senior Senator from Michigan. I find myself in as embarrassing a position as the Senator indicated his was. I am a believer in cloture. I have reached that conclusion after long study and deliberation. I believe cloture should go to any motion, measure, or business, to any question which might be before the Senate at the time a petition for that purpose is submitted. I believe the petition should be a preferred matter, to be filed even while a Member of this body is on his feet. But, Mr. President, it is my conviction that we can pay too much in other more precious things for some of the things we desire.

Mr. President, as I view this matter, I am constrained to believe it has taken on a very great deal more importance, important as it is, than the subject matter warrants. I agree with the distinguished Senator from New York in his statement that this is a most important matter in the minds of millions of people. It has become important chiefly because it is misunderstood. The belief is abroad, based upon statements made and reiterated time after time and heard on the floor of this body, unless we correct the rule situation by the amendment we have to the present cloture rule, that in some moment of tragic and great public necessity in this country the Senate will find itself hog-tied and unable to act.

Mr. President, as long as the United States Senate is constituted under the provisions of the basic structure of this country, just that long a majority of a quorum on this floor can do what it will. We speak of rights under the rules of this body. If by the term "right" we mean a legal right, such rights are nonexistent. The rules we have in the Senate are worth while only to the extent that we who are Members of this body are willing to abide by them, as long as we who are Members of this body are willing to give our consent to their operation, as long as we who are Members of this body believe that the business of this body and the welfare of the people of the United States will be better served while we have those rules or some other rules.

But let us not delude ourselves, Mr. President, with any thought that we are hog-tied, handcuffed, futile in this body, if a time comes that we must do this or that. On that day, this body will act, and it will act within its constitutional power, because this body is the sole judge of its rules. The rules it has today exist by sufferance, by consent of a majority, even the rule of cloture, which requires two-thirds vote. That rule, or the rule requiring two-thirds vote for suspension of rules, can all go down and be overthrown on any day the Senate feels that the overriding welfare of the people here requires it.

So let us consider the rules for what they are. They represent the consensus of the Members of this body now and in the past that orderly operation in this body requires some ground rules. And we have, as a result of experience through the years, made, amended, modified, and added to, a set of ground rules. By sufferance of a majority of the quorums that appear here, we have restrained ourselves within them. Let it not be understood that I for a moment feel that we should not do that. On the contrary, I feel that the judgment of those who are in this body today, and of those who have been in this body since the inception of the Republic, has all gone to the proposition that the welfare of the country demands that we have orderly procedures.

I make only the point that there is no power under the shining sun that can tell a majority of a quorum of this Senate what it can or cannot do in the matter of rules at any given moment while the Senate is in session. The only place in which that power resides is in the body of the people, and then only by amendment to the Constitution itself.

So, Mr. President, let us have done with the thought that the country itself may be imperiled because we do not have the power to act. We can act at any time, on any question, when we feel that it is necessary. Our observance of the rule of restraint in this body has been outstanding, but just as outstanding has been the willingness of this body, by unanimous consent, time after time, in every session, to set the rules aside entirely and act as one.

If I may say that a careful consideration of the picture indicates that the Republic itself is not in danger as of the moment, then perhaps I can turn for another moment to the matter immediately at hand.

We are here concerned with a rule which had been adopted pursuant to other rules which were then in existence, by which we agreed to restrain our constitutional power for our good and for the good of the people. A question has arisen as to what the rule means. Again, Mr. President, let me say that although we have agreed among ourselves to follow a certain procedure to change the ground-rules we have adopted, we are not bound to do it, as witness the fact that at this moment we are here considering the question of whether we shall short-cut our rules. We can do it. It rests in the conscience and sound judgment of every Member of the Senate as to whether it is the better thing to do. There is no question about the power that rests here to do it.

Mr. President, as to the rule in question, I simply want to present one proposition, only one. There has been a very great deal of research done over the years, and most intensely within the past 2 weeks, to determine, so far as possible, what was intended to be done when the present cloture rule was adopted in 1917.

I want to associate myself with the remarks made by the Senator from Missouri, with reference to the definitions given of the word "measure." I think they should appear in the RECORD as broad as they appeared in the dictionaries. That has been done. The ruling was announced from the Chair that the words "pending measure" were not limited to bills or resolutions—in other words, actions of a substantive character—but that, necessarily, if there was no such measure before the Senate, then a motion to bring up such substantive business became itself a pending measure.

I say, in all frankness, Mr. President, that long ago, weeks ago, in my consideration of this question, I gave very deep and careful consideration to the point as to whether that should be the declaration from the Chair, because it appealed to me as answering one of the basic and fundamental rules of statutory construction, namely, that we must always presume that the legislative body did not intend a vain thing. But, Mr. President, when I had finished my investigation and again turned to the letter of the rule itself, to the plain words of the rule, I had to confess that the record carried evidence to the contrary. I then had to face this proposition as one who believes in law, one who believes there can be no order in this world without law, one who

believes that there can be no law unless there is precedent, that there can be no law unless a man today can determine his actions tomorrow by what happened yesterday, because I believe in that with every atom of my being. I had to say to myself, when I considered this matter, I cannot today legislate for the Members of this body who sat here in 1917, no matter what I may conjecture they intended to do. Unless I can find that they did it, I cannot today, ex post facto, do it for them. Therefore I had to turn my attention to the rule, and I now call the attention of the Senate to the rule.

Mr. President, if I may for a moment turn back to conjecture and speculation, always a dangerous field, I admit, I speculate that when those Senators in this body in 1917 adopted that rule they had in their minds the belief that it would be effective. That, of course, we all know. Then I speculate that, perhaps, had the evil which exists today existed at that time, or had they been able to foresee that it would exist today, they would have drawn a different rule. But, by the same token, Mr. President, had all of the lawmakers in all of the years that have passed had the same knowledge at the time they drew the laws of their times, they would have drawn them differently; and it might well be that there would be no purpose in a Senate or a House of Representatives today. We would have perfection in the law.

Mr. President, we cannot legislate for yesterday, but we can legislate today for today and for tomorrow. We have an orderly way of doing that. We have an extraordinary reserve power which we can wield if we must. But I believe in following ground rules when we have them, and when I follow the ground rules here, when I read the rule itself and seek from the context to determine what was in the minds of those who drew it, I find what, to me, is satisfactory evidence that it was not intended by its authors or those who adopted it to make the words "pending measure" apply to a motion of any kind at the time when the petition for cloture was filed. Let us look at the rule and see what we have. I now read from section 2 of rule XXII:

> If at any time a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any pending measure is presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall at once state—

I read no further, because from there on there is set out the method by which that petition is presented to the Senate.

There, Mr. President, the words used to identify the situation existing in this body are the two words "pending measure." Now let us drop down on the next page in my rule book and see if at any time in this rule there was any recognition that there could be two separate things, a pending measure and a motion. The rule says what I shall read, following the provision for adoption of cloture. We first have the method by which cloture is invoked, the condition under which it can arise, on a pending measure. Then we have the effect of invoking the rule, the limitation that happens then, and what do we find? I quote:

> Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the pending measure—

I interpolate; now follow the next words carefully—

> the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same.

Those who drew the rule had in mind that the condition on the floor of the Senate which would give rise to cloture was a pending measure, but once cloture attached by virtue of the procedure set up in the rule then that cloture went beyond the pending measure, it went to other matters, and those other matters were amendments to the measure and motions concerning the measure; and that I point out.

Mr. President, there was a recognition by those who presented this rule and those who adopted it that a pending measure and a motion were two entirely different things.

I think we cannot pass by the evidence in the rule by speculating as to what the men in 1917 would have done had there been at that time knowledge of the evil which faces us now, or had they projected their thinking far enough to realize that while their rule was still effective other evils might arise. They did not. The obligation that is now upon the Senate is the same obligation which rests upon us to take care of other deficiencies in other laws which have been passed since the Republic began, and they are many.

We must amend our rule. We can do it, as I said before, in either of two ways. We can do it in the way established, or we can cut through and do it by virtue of the constitutional power which rests in the majority.

Mr. President, because I have such a deep belief that this country cannot exist once we have lost the anchor, may I say, of precedent, which holds the ship of state, constructed of law, in its place; that once we have lost that we are drifting into anarchy and disorder, I must follow what I conceive to be self-established rules of the Senate for orderly operation.

One thing more. If I left the matter there I would feel I was a defeatist. What shall we do, faced with a situation with which we are faced, not these questions in the background of so-called civil rights, but just this one question of a resolution to amend the cloture rule? Are we stymied? Reserving the basic power that we have in the Constitution to act directly, are we not obligated, first, because we believe in law, because law is of the very meat and bone of our being, to try in good faith, with all the endurance we have, to bring this matter to a vote, after allowing those who object to speak until they can speak no longer? Let us try that once. I, for one, am prepared to do it, and I wish to quote now the words of my illustrious predecessor in the Senate, the revered late Senator Charles L. McNary:

> So far as I am concerned, I am willing to stay here from dawn till evening star, and evening star to dawn, till the job is done.

Let us try that, and then, Mr. President, if we find that after the most courageous attempt that can be made we cannot win, I for one, I say in all frankness, will turn then and see whether or not events justify my using that other reserved constitutional right which rests in this body. But I believe we can win.

Mr. President, perhaps I of all the Members of this body have used up less CONGRESSIONAL RECORD space than any other Senator. Perhaps I am not qualified to make this observation, but I cannot help believing that it takes more effort to stand on one's feet hour by hour and make a speech than it does to sit in one's chair and listen, or walk out in the cloakroom and forget it. If it be a matching of endurance, who has the laboring oar?

Before we admit defeat, let us carry the battle as far as it can be carried.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to make just a very few observations, if I may.

The question now is different from what it was yesterday, after the ruling of the Vice President. The question now is simply one as to whether the Senate is to sustain or not sustain the ruling of the Vice President of the United States.

Let it be clear that there is, in the words of the Senator from Michigan himself, the able President pro tempore who ruled on the 2d of August last year, no precedent save that ruling of the Senator from Michigan, who made the following statement in the course of his opinion. I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 8, at page 9603:

> There has been no direct ruling upon the specific question whether a motion to take up a bill is subject to cloture.

So there is but one precedent to the contrary, if it be a precedent, to the ruling of the Vice President of the United States yesterday on the pending petition to apply rule XXII to the motion to take up the resolution in question.

Second, Mr. President, I asked the Parliamentarian of the Senate as to whether there were instances when other Presiding Officers had ruled contrary to previous rulings. In the first place, the Vice President distinguished his ruling of yesterday from the ruling of August 2 of last year made by the eminent President pro tempore of that time. The Vice President yesterday pointed out that the President pro tempore last year ruled that the pending measure was a matter pertaining to aviation which had already been made the pending measure upon the motion of the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], and that the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] was a motion to take up the anti-poll-tax bill at a time when there was a pending measure, that is to say a resolution, already before the Senate and therefore a pending measure before the Senate. I thought there was great weight in the distinction made by the Vice President in the ruling he made from the facts as they existed on the second of August last year, and all of us lawyers know that the rule of stare

decisis, even to a court, means that it has binding effect only when the facts in the two cases are the same.

Mr. President, the Parliamentarian, at my request, examined the index of the precedents of the Senate which he is preparing under a resolution of the Senate, and noted down, at my request, 14 instances in the last 25 or 30 years covered by this compilation, when the Presiding Officer of the Senate has ruled contrarily to a previous ruling of the Chair. I have all of them here. I shall not take the time of the Senate to detail them, but Senators will observe them in the Index to the Rules of the Senate, by Charles L. Watkins, Parliamentarian of the Senate. It was this day, at my request, that he went through the index and noted 14 instances where Presiding Officers had ruled contrary to the decisions made by previous occupants of the chair.

Mr. President, I stated in my observations prior to the ruling of the President pro tempore last year that the President pro tempore, in my opinion, had the right, if not the duty, to pass upon any question presented to him according to the way he sees it, in light of the language of the rule and the facts and circumstances surrounding the action.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. In order to complete the RECORD, I wonder if the Senator would state, in connection with the 14 examples of rulings which were handed down which were contrary to previous rulings, in how many of the 14 instances an appeal was taken.

Mr. PEPPER. I do not know. The Parliamentarian, Mr. Watkins, said that just from the index he could not tell the number in which appeals were taken, but he did not think appeals were taken in many of those instances.

I stated, Mr. President, what I believed to be the right rule to govern the Chair when a motion is presented to it, as follows:

> The decision which the Chair is about to make is of grievous import to the country and possibly to the world. I am aware of the precedents. * * * However, Mr. President, every Presiding Officer, if I may say so, stands upon his own authority. He exercises his own power. He has the authority to make a decision in accordance with the rule, its language and intent, which the distinguished Presiding Officer himself thinks is right and proper in course of his duties.

This is what the able President pro tempore, the senior Senator from Michigan, himself said, as it appears on page 9603 of the RECORD, in the course of his opinion prior to his ruling:

> But in his capacity as President pro tempore the senior Senator from Michigan is bound to recognize what he believes to be the clear mandate of the Senate rules and the Senate precedents; namely, that no such authority presently exists.

So he was bound to carry out what he himself believed to be the mandate of the rules of the Senate.

Mr. President, in my observations to the President pro tempore I compared the position of the Presiding Officer to that of any appellate court. I said the Presiding Officer has the same authority to reverse or to distinguish a previous decision that an appellate court possesses.

I have before me the case of *West Coast Hotel Company* v. *Parrish*, 300 U. S., and I am reading from page 400. This is the concluding sentence of a paragraph of a decision by Chief Justice Hughes, speaking for the Court. This is what Chief Justice Hughes said:

> Our conclusion is that the case of *Adkins* v. *Children's Hospital*, supra, should be and it is overruled. The judgment of the Supreme Court of the State of Washington is affirmed.

Mr. President, that is merely one example of the Supreme Court of the United States, speaking through the able jurist, its Chief Justice, Mr. Charles Evans Hughes, for the Court directly, reversing a previous decision of the Court which had been the supreme law of the land for I think 14 or 15 years.

I read from another decision of the United States Supreme Court, Mr. President, the case of *Helvering* v. *Hallock*, 309 U. S. I read from the opinion of Mr. Justice Frankfurter, speaking for the Court, on pages 121 and 122 of the decision. This is what Mr. Justice Frankfurter said:

> This Court, unlike the House of Lords, has from the beginning rejected a doctrine of disability at self-correction. Whatever else may be said about want of congressional action, to modify by legislation the result in the St. Louis Trust cases, it will hardly be urged that the reason was congressional approval of those distinctions between the St. Louis Trust and the Klein cases to which four members of this Court could not give assent. By imputing to Congress a hypothetical recognition of coherence between the Klein and the St. Louis Trust cases—

Mr. President, I call especial attention to this language—

> we cannot evade our own responsibility for reconsidering in the light of further experience, the validity of distinction which this Court has itself created. Our problem then is not that of rejecting a settled statutory construction. The real problem is whether a principle shall prevail over its later misapplications. Surely we are not bound by reason or by considerations that underlie stare decisis to persevere in distinctions taken in the application of a statute which, on further examination, appear consonant neither with the purposes of the statute nor with this Court's own conception of it. We therefore reject as untenable the diversities taken in the St. Louis Trust cases in applying the Klein doctrine—untenable because they drastically eat into the principle which those cases profess to accept and to which we adhere.

There the Supreme Court of the United States said it has never followed the House of Lords in adhering to a disability to correct its own mistakes or its own errors.

I shall refer to two other cases. In the case of *Breedlove* v. *Suttles* (302 U. S. Reports, p. 283), the Supreme Court of the United States said:

> The privilege of voting is not derived from the United States, but is conferred by the State and, save as restrained by the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments and other provisions of the Federal Constitution, the State may condition suffrage as it deems appropriate.

That opinion was in 1937. But later the United States Supreme Court, writing in 1940, had this to say about that part of the opinion, and I am now reading from *United States* v. *Classic* (313 U. S., p. 315):

> While in a loose sense the right to vote for representatives in Congress is sometimes spoken of as a right derived from the States (see *Minor* v. *Happersett*, *United States* v. *Reese*, *McPherson* v. *Blacker*, *Breedlove* v. *Suttles*)—

The case from which I just quoted.

> This statement is true only in the sense that the States are authorized by the Constitution to legislate on the subject as provided by section 2, article I, to the extent that Congress has not restricted State action by the exercise of its power to regulate elections under section 4, and its more general power under article I, section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution, and to make all laws that shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] made one of the real original contributions to this debate, and I am sure his colleagues who heard him honor the sagacity of his research which brought to light the facts which he quoted here, which some Senators, not being in the Chamber at the time, might not have heard. The junior Senator from Tennessee read, I believe, from either the Washington Post or the New York Times of March 4, 1917. The RECORD will disclose which newspaper it was. He read from that newspaper the language of what might be called a sort of round-robin agreement, signed by 33 Senators. Senators will note that this was on the 3d of March. It bears that date. I have obtained from the Official Reporters of Debates a transcript of the statement of the Senator from Tennessee. This agreement is dated Washington, March 3, 1917. This is what it says:

> We, the undersigned, hereby mutually covenant and agree to cooperate with each other in compelling such changes in the Rules of the Senate as to terminate successful filibustering and enable the majority to fix an hour for disposing of any bill or question subject to the rule of 1 hour to each Senator from discussion before or after the hour is fixed. This agreement to go into effect March 5, 1917.

As I said, 33 Senators signed the agreement. I do not suppose it is necessary to name those Senators, but it will take only a moment. They were: Robert L. Owen, Oklahoma; Atlee Pomerene, Ohio; Henry F. Hollis, New Hampshire; Ollie M. James, Kentucky; James A. Reed, Missouri; William Hughes, New Jersey; James K. Vardaman, Mississippi; Henry L. Myers, Montana; Morris Sheppard, Texas; George E. Chamberlain, Oregon; John Sharp Williams, Mississippi; William F. Kirby, Arkansas; A. A. Jones, New Mexico; Claude A. Swanson, Virginia; Duncan U. Fletcher, Florida; John Walter Smith, Maryland; Willard Saulsbury, Delaware; W. J. Stone, Missouri; Edwin S. Johnson, South Dakota; Charles S. Thomas, Colorado; Henry F. Ashurst, Arizona; Key Pittman, Nevada; Paul O.

Husting, Wisconsin; Thomas J. Walsh, Montana; Joseph T. Robinson, Arkansas; James D. Phelan, California; W. H. King, Utah; J. C. W. Beckham, Kentucky; Joseph E. Ransdell, Louisiana; James Hamilton Lewis, Illinois; William H. Thompson, Kansas; Francis G. Newlands, Nevada; Albert B. Fall, New Mexico.

The newspaper article stated:

> Others who, while they have not yet signed the agreement, have agreed to support the movement are: Thomas S. Martin, Virginia; Hoke Smith, Georgia; Harry Lane, Oregon; John F. Shafroth, Colorado; Oscar W. Underwood, Alabama; Kenneth D. McKellar, Tennessee; Park Trammell, Florida.

Mr. President, the reason I call attention especially to this point, with all honor and credit to the junior Senator from Tennessee, is the presence of the words "of any bill or question." The agreement did not say "measure." It did not say "resolution." It did not say "proposed law." It said "bill or question." A motion is a question.

When was this, Mr. President? This was the day following the beginning of the filibuster against the bill providing for arming of merchant ships, requested by President Wilson, which bill was killed by a filibuster which continued from 4:30 o'clock on Friday afternoon, the 2d of March, until noon on the 4th of March, the following Sunday, when the Congress expired by the terms of the Constitution.

Here were men who knew that the filibuster had been upon a bill or resolution, but they did not say "measure." They said "any bill or question." On the 3d of March the filibuster was in progress in the Senate, when this agreement was signed. Those men knew that it was a bill which was being filibustered, but they did not stop at "bill." They said "any bill or question." That was on the 3d of March when the filibuster, which started on the 2d and ended on the 4th, was in progress.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield for a question only.

Mr. STENNIS. Was this agreement signed before the amendment to the rule was written?

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. They resolved to make it apply to a bill or question; but when they wrote the rule they merely said "pending measure." Does not the Senator think that that shows that they had changed their minds?

Mr. PEPPER. I do not think so, and I will state one reason why I say that.

On the 16th of May 1916, Senator Smith, of Georgia, reported Senate Resolution 195 to the Senate. In the debate on the 8th of March 1917, it was stated by Senator Smith that what became of rule XXII was substantially the resolution he had reported by the unanimous vote of the Rules Committee on the 16th of May 1916, which was Senate Resolution 195.

The reason I answer the able Senator from Mississippi as I do is this: Senator Hoke Smith, of Georgia, on the 16th of May 1916, reported a resolution to the Senate providing for cloture, which resolution used the words "pending measure." It said:

> If 16 Senators present to the Senate at any time a signed motion to bring to a close the debate upon any pending measure—

Nevertheless, here was that same Senator Smith, on the 3d of March 1917, saying he would support a covenant with his fellow Senators saying that they were going to try to compel such changes in the rules of the Senate as to terminate successful filibustering and enable the majority to fix an hour for disposing of any bill or question. Senator Smith had already used the words "pending measure" in 1916. I have a list of the members of the Rules Committee in 1916. They were: Overman, of North Carolina; Kern, of Indiana; O'Gorman, of New York; Williams, of Mississippi; Lea, of Tennessee; Smith, of Georgia; Warren, of Wyoming; Gallinger, of New Hampshire; Nelson, of Minnesota; and Cummins, of Iowa. It will be noted that Senator Williams, of Mississippi, who was one of the signers with the group of 33 on March 3, 1917, was also a member of the Committee on Rules.

It seems to me that if those gentlemen had fixed "pending measure" as the way to go at this matter in their minds, they would have put "pending measure" in the agreement which they signed, had they not regarded as synonymous what they said in the agreement signed by 33, what they said in the resolution in 1916, and what they said in what became rule XXII. In other words, "pending measure" is descriptive of "bill or question." That is the basis on which I answer the able Senator.

Mr. President, I have made a little inquiry. I shall not at this late hour take the time of the Senate to go into it, but I have noted instance after instance in the debate in 1917 in which reference was made to what this rule was to do. Here is one example, on page 31 of the RECORD of March 8, 1917. This is what Senator Stone, of Missouri, said:

> I wish to say, Mr. President, that I am in entire sympathy with and heartily for the adoption of a cloture rule. The proposed rule is not in the form I would have written it if I could have written it. It is perhaps not in the form in which other Senators would have written it if they could have written it. But it authorizes the Senate to bring discussion to a close whenever two-thirds of the Senate voting so conclude.

He uses the word "discussion."

There is another instance, on page 32 of the RECORD of March 8, 1917. This is Senator Owen, of Oklahoma:

> Mr. President, in giving support to this modified cloture, by which two-thirds may close debate—

He did not say "on the pending measure." He said "by which two-thirds may close debate."

It ought to be said, in fairness, that Senator Lodge, of Massachusetts, was one of the five conferees from the Republican side of the aisle. I have finally been able to get the names of all those conferees. On the Democratic side they were: Reed, of Missouri; Owen, of Oklahoma; Swanson, of Virginia; Smith, of Georgia; and James, of Kentucky. They were appointed by the Democratic conference on March 6, 1917. By the way, Senator Reed, of Missouri, was designated by the chairman of the conference, Senator Martin, of Virginia, on March 6 to notify the Republican members of this committee that the Democrats had appointed their members, and to suggest that they get together.

On the 7th of March, the chairman of the conference also added Senator Walsh, of Montana, although that made six Members from the Democratic side, to the gentlemen who were to represent the Democratic conference in trying to work out an adequate cloture rule.

The Republican Members were Senators Lodge, Brandegee, Penrose, Cummins, and Fall.

Mr. President, I have referred to what Senator THOMAS said. I have sent for these magazines. I have not yet been able to obtain them. Senator Lodge, according to Senator THOMAS in his remarks, in 1893 had written an article on the subject of cloture; and here are two quotations from Senator Lodge's articles, which were quoted by Senator THOMAS. As I said, I have not yet been able to obtain the magazines. Senator Lodge said this in the North American Review in November 1893:

> No minority is ever to blame for obstruction. If the rules permit them to obstruct, they are lawfully entitled to use those rules in order to stop a measure—

"A measure," Mr. President—

> which they deem injurious. The blame for obstruction rests with the majority, and if there is obstruction it is because the majority permit it. * * * They and they alone can secure action and initiate proceedings to bring the body whose machinery they control to a vote.

Senator Lodge also said, as quoted there:

> No extreme or violent change is needed in order to remedy the existing condition of affairs. A simple rule giving the majority power to fix a time for taking a vote upon any measure which has been before the Senate and under discussion, say, for 30 days, would be all-sufficient. Such a change should be made and such a rule passed, for the majority ought to have and must have full power and responsibility.

Senator Lodge used the word "measure." Other Senators used the words "close debate." Other Senators said "end discussion"; and other Senators have used similar terminology all the way through.

Mr. President, let me point out one other fact. Senator Martin, of Virginia, the Democratic leader, who presented that resolution to the Senate, was one of those who said he associated himself with the petition signed by the 33 Senators who said they must compel such changes in the rules of the Senate as to terminate successful filibustering and to enable the majority to fix an hour for the disposing of any bill or question.

I have checked the record of the votes; and I find that every one of the 33 Senators who signed that petition or document, voted for rule XXII, except 4 who were absent; and most of those indicated, through other Senators, that they would have voted for it had they been

present. But of the 33, 29 were present and voting on rule XXII, and voted for it. Mind you, Mr. President, that was on the 8th of March; and on the 3d of March they had signed the petition or covenant with one another, in which they said they were determined to compel a rule change that would stop successful filibustering on any bill or question.

Moreover, Mr. President, every one of the additional seven, consisting of the ones whose names I read a moment ago, who said that although they had not yet signed the agreement, they had agreed to support the movement—every one of them voted for rule XXII.

So what do we have? We find that on the 3d of March, 40 Senators covenanted with one another that they would compel a rule change which would stop successful filibustering and would permit the disposition of any bill or question at a fixed time by the Senate. Of these 40, 36 of them on the 8th of March voted for rule XXII.

That leads me to believe that they must have thought that rule XXII would accomplish the purpose they covenanted with one another to accomplish in the petition which the 33 signed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I remember very distinctly being one of those who was called into that conference. I was a new Member of the Senate at the time; I had just been sworn in. But I recall very distinctly that all these questions were talked about and carefully considered, language was redrawn, and Senator MARTIN was one of the principal ones who insisted upon the use of the language a "measure" before the Senate at the time; and it is a fact beyond controversy that that language was not the language which the first Senators had been agreed upon, but that it was in that conference, by compromise and agreement, that this rule was brought out. It was not for a "motion"; it was for a "measure" before the Senate at the time.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I thank the able Senator from Tennessee for his always valuable contributions.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I have before me a volume entitled "Sutherland Statutory Construction," the third edition, by Horack, which lays down what I believe are recognized to be the sound rules for the construction of statutes and provisions which have to be regarded and determined by courts. I should like to read two sections of this work to the Senate. The first is section 4704, entitled "Intention of the whole controls interpretation of the parts." I read from it here:

> Intention of the whole controls interpretation of the parts.
>
> The presumption is that the lawmaker has a definite purpose in every enactment and has adapted and formulated the subsidiary provisions in harmony with that purpose; that these are needful to accomplish it; and that, if that is the intended effect, they will, at least, conduce to effectuate it. That purpose is an implied limitation on the sense of general terms, and a touchstone for the expansion of narrower terms. This intention affords the key to the sense and scope of minor provisions. From this assumption proceeds the general rule that the cardinal purpose or intent of the whole act shall control, and that all of the parts be interpreted as subsidiary and harmonious. "A statute is to be construed with reference to its manifest object, and if the language is susceptible of two constructions, one which will carry out and the other defeat such manifest object, it should receive the former construction." Thus Chancellor Kent observed: "In the exposition of a statute the intention of the lawmaker will prevail over the literal sense of the terms; and its reason and intention will prevail over the strict letter. When the words are not explicit, the intention is to be collected from the context; from the occasion and necessity of the law; from the mischief felt and the remedy in view; and the intention should be taken or presumed according to what is consistent with reason and good discretion."

Mr. President, just one more section from this volume; I read now section 4706, entitled "Limitation on Literal Interpretation." It reads as follows:

> The literal interpretation of the words of an act should not prevail if it creates a result contrary to the apparent intention of the legislature and if the words are sufficiently flexible to admit of a construction which will effectuate the legislative intention. The intention prevails over the letter, and the letter must, if possible, be read so as to conform to the spirit of the act. "While the intention of the legislature must be ascertained from the words used to express it, the manifest reason and obvious purpose of the law should not be sacrificed to a literal interpretation of such words." Thus words or clauses may be enlarged or restricted to harmonize with other provisions of an act. The particular inquiry is not what is the abstract force of the words or what they may comprehend, but in what sense were they intended to be used in the act. The sense in which they were used by the legislature furnishes the rules of interpretation and when this cannot be determined from the context of the act, the court may resort to extrinsic aids.

Mr. President, that is a sound rule of construction in the courts. I think it is a rule of construction applied by the Vice President of the United States, ably and courageously expressed in his decision of yesterday. What would he have found if he followed the single precedent—and I want to emphasize that—the single precedent to the contrary of his ruling? In August of last year the Senator from Michigan, the then President pro tempore said there had been no direct ruling upon the specific question whether a motion to take up a bill is subject to cloture. If the Vice President had followed the single precedent of the President pro tempore of last year, what would have been the result? First, as ably pointed out by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], it would have made the cloture rule adopted in 1917 absolutely of no consequence at all. It would mean that a measure to which there was strong opposition would never be considered. It could never be made the pending measure, because of a previous filibuster on a motion to take it up, if debate could not be stopped on such motion. So the 1917 rule, rule XXII, would have been a vain act, as was first said by the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], when he also opposed ably, on August 2 of last year, the decision that was made, or rather submitted observations contrary to the decision subsequently made by the President pro tempore.

Secondly, what would be the effect, I ask, if the Vice President yesterday had followed the single precedent made by the President pro tempore on August 2 of last year? I do not have to go outside the statement of the President pro tempore himself at the time he made his decision. He said:

> The President pro tempore fully recognizes the implications of the resultant situation, as stated so eloquently by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]: There is nothing new about those implications. They have been perfectly apparent to students of the Senate rules for many years. They mean that, in the final analysis, the Senate has no effective cloture rule at all.

That is what the ruling of the Chair August 2 of last year meant. If adhered to by the Vice President on yesterday, that would still be the ruling of the Chair, and the effect of rule XXII. I continue to read from the opinion of the President pro tempore:

> They mean that a small but determined minority can always prevent cloture, under the existing rules. They mean that a very few Senators have it in their power to prevent Senate action on anything.

That was the effect of the ruling of the Chair, last year. If the Vice President had followed it yesterday, that would be the effect of the ruling on the meaning of rule XXII.

Mr. TYDINGS rose.

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. If I am not interrupting the Senator, I should like to ask him this question: Assuming that we had before the Senate a proposition to declare war; assuming that that had been debated at some length without bringing the matter to a decision, and a cloture petition had been filed to end debate and bring the matter to a decision. Then suppose there had been entered or offered a motion to postpone to a day certain, which would be a motion on a pending measure. Would the ruling of the Senator from Michigan, in the judgment of the Senator from Florida, apply, or would the ruling of the Vice President apply to that situation? Do I make myself plain?

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator mean, under the assumption that the resolution providing for a declaration of war had been made the unfinished business and the pending business of the Senate?

Mr. TYDINGS. It has been made the pending business of the Senate, and there has been a filibuster against it. A cloture petition has been filed, but there is a motion, which is in order, to postpone consideration of it to a day certain or to an indefinite day. I am looking at rule XXII.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes, I know there is authority.

Mr. TYDINGS. One of the measures or procedures that may be taken is to postpone indefinitely. We will assume for the sake of my question that the motion to postpone indefinitely is in order. Would the motion to postpone be

subject to the ruling of the Senator from Michigan, in which event the cloture petition would be avoided and the motion to postpone indefinitely could be debated at length, or would the ruling of the Vice President apply in that case under the present rule? Do I make myself plain?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes. I may say to the able Senator that in the first place attention was called to the fact that such motions could be made when rule XXII was adopted. Some thought that would deprive the Senate of the power to bring debate to a close. However, it seems to me the obvious answer to that is that any such motions can be laid on the table by motion, and that, of itself, would terminate debate immediately on those questions. I think that would be an effective way of disposing of any of those motions.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The point is that a motion to postpone indefinitely would not be subject, under the ruling of the Senator from Michigan, to any limitation on debate. Is that correct?

Mr. PEPPER. I think that is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. If that is correct, one of the things which has worried me about the situation is, there could be a declaration of war pending before this body; a cloture petition could be filed to end debate on it; but if a motion, which would be in order, to postpone to an indefinite date were made, that motion, under the ruling of the Senator from Michigan, would be without limitation, because it would not apply to a pending measure. Therefore, there would be no vote on whether the country were to go to war. I should like someone who has given this matter some study to answer that question.

Mr. HOLLAND rose.

Mr. PEPPER. Before I yield to my colleague, I should like to say that there would be no doubt of it if there were Senators on the floor who wished to oppose the declaration of war and wished to thwart it in every way they could. They could simply start their debate, of course, when the motion to take up was made, and unmistakably under the ruling of the President pro tempore last year, there would be no way at all except by sheer physical exhaustion to bring the debate to a conclusion.

Mr. TYDINGS. But I am assuming the cloture petition has been filed, and is in order, and has been voted by the Senate. Now suppose a motion is made to postpone the decision on a declaration of war to an indefinite date. Would that motion come under the cloture petition, or would it be without it? In the latter event, even though the debate had been terminated on the motion to declare war, there would still be the right to debate the motion to postpone indefinitely, from now to the end of doom, as I understand.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I may call attention to the fact that the rule, if read through to the end, textually provides that if the cloture is filed to the pending measure, that stops the debate, as the rule itself provides, of course, on all motions or amendments; so it could not be continued.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think that is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. I have just turned to the rule. It says, after these rules——

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask the Senator if the second paragraph in his judgment does not cover that situation, where it refers to the pending measure and the amendments thereto and motions affecting the same; so that in the contingency I have cited, the motion would not hold; it would come under the cloture resolution, would it not?

Mr. PEPPER. I do not know how the President pro tempore would have ruled upon that. It says all motions affecting the same. Naturally, I would assume that the motions enumerated would be regarded as motions affecting the same. If an attempt were made to close debate on some of those motions, and not on the measure—like the reservations to the Treaty of Versailles, rather than on the Treaty—there would have been no difficulty.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask the Senator if it is not his understanding that after the cloture resolution has been adopted it does apply to motions, and applies to everything outside the pending measure?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes, including amendments.

Mr. TYDINGS. But before it is adopted, under the ruling of the Senator from Michigan, it would not apply to motions or matters that were not pending measures. Is that correct?

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct. But let me repeat, that any opposition which was determined and wanted to make such a fight could, of course, initiate it when the motion to take up was made.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. My colleague asked me to yield for a question. I now yield to him.

Mr. HOLLAND. I was simply going to call attention to the same matter mentioned by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], namely, that when the cloture petition has been filed and voted on, the pending measure, amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same are all equally affected. I wanted to call further attention to the fact that the last portion of the paragraph which has been quoted in part specifically provides as follows:

> No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask the Senator from Florida if it is not a fact that a cloture motion does not cover antecedent motions?

Mr. PEPPER. That is the way the President pro tempore ruled last year.

I now yield to the Senator from Alabama for a question.

Mr. HILL. I was going to call attention to the same thing the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has developed.

Mr. PEPPER. I have never understood why a motion to lay on the table would not lie if one of those motions were made, even if it were a debatable motion.

Mr. President, I was stating what the President pro tempore said last year was the effect of his ruling. I have only one other quotation from the President pro tempore, which appears on page 9603 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 2, 1948:

> The fact is that the existing Senate rules regarding cloture do not provide conclusive cloture. They still leave the Senate, rightly or wrongly, at the mercy of unlimited debate ad infinitum.

That is the effect of the ruling of the President pro tempore last year. If the Vice President yesterday had followed that ruling, that would be the rule of the Senate this afternoon, without any action of the Senate to the contrary.

I now should like to call this to the attention of my colleagues: The Chair ruled yesterday on a motion to take up a resolution. The Chair has not yet ruled on the question of a motion to amend the Journal. So let no one suppose that there is no necessity for the adoption of the resolution, first, to put it beyond the hands of the Presiding Officer, to put it in unmistakable language, so as to resolve its ambiguity by language clearly intended to accomplish the complete effectiveness of rule XXII. But let it be remembered, Mr. President, that there is still a loophole. We do not know how many more may be discovered by ingenious parliamentarians and able Senators. There is still, after the ruling of the Chair yesterday, the unclosed loophole of a motion to amend the Journal, debate upon which cannot be closed by any ruling that has so far been made.

Mr. President, I conclude by saying that the President pro tempore last August made the only precedent that faced and influenced the Presiding Officer, the distinguished Vice President, yesterday, in his ruling that the consequences of adhering to that rule are to give a few the power to prevent the Senate from doing anything, to paralyze, if a determined minority wills it, the functioning of the Senate and, possibly, the Government of the United States.

Therefore, Mr. President, what is the duty of Senators? With those two rulings before us, the duty of Senators, and their right, is to vote upon that matter according to what they believe is most consistent with the public interest and with the real basic intent of rule XXII, for the President pro tempore himself said, when he ruled last year:

> In making the ruling I have recognized the right of the Senate to make and interpret its own rules.

If we vote against the Vice President's decision of yesterday, we continue the

power of a minority to prevent the Senate, in the language of the President pro tempore last year, from doing anything. If we stand with the Vice President in his able, clear, and courageous ruling of yesterday, we close the pending loophole, we close the pending filibuster outlet, and we, at least, so far as can now be surmised, make it possible for the Senate to discharge the right which it has under the Constitution of the United States to make its own rules. If we repudiate the Vice President's ruling of yesterday, there is nothing save a most bitter, exhausting, and acrimonious contest that will keep the Senate in continuous night sessions, which may mean the lives of one or more Senators, and which will bring this body into public question, if not disparagement. It will mean, Mr. President, indefinitely holding up the voluminous mass of legislation waiting to come to this Chamber, which means so much to the people of the United States and possibly to the people of the world.

Mr. President, the Senate itself, for the first time, has the power to move forward, and I certainly hope the Senate will give its confidence to the Vice President's ruling of yesterday.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to ask the Senator from Florida whether this whole controversy has for its basis the clarification or interpretation of the word "measure." Is that correct?

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct—"pending measure."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not the fact that the distinguished Senator from Michigan pointed out this afternoon that if we were to sustain the ruling of the Chair, the Vice President, in his interpretation of rule XXII, that would be a means to an end? Is that what he said?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; the Senator from Michigan did say that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, he pointed out that what we were attempting to do was to adopt the Hayden-Wherry resolution by sustaining the Chair; is that correct?

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I notice on page 1534 of Funk & Wagnall's New Standard Dictionary a new definition of the word "measure." I wondered whether the Senator had come across that definition. Let me give the definition, in view of what the distinguished Senator from Michigan has stated about means to an end. The dictionary states, in defining the word "measure":

> A specific act or course of procedure, designed as a means to an end; an expedient; a method; a step.

I should like to ask the Senator from Florida if rule XXII, as it is now written, does not encompass, in view of the definition given by a reputable dictionary, the term "motion," by this particular definition.

Mr. PEPPER. I think, unmistakably so, as the Vice President held yesterday. It also might be pointed out that in Webster's New International Dictionary, second edition, measure is defined as follows:

> A step, or definite part of a progressive course or policy; means to an end; specifically, a legislative enactment; as political *measures;* an inefficient *measure.*

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that despite the fact that we may sustain the ruling of the Chair, we yet must consider the over-all revision of rule XXII?

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As provided by the Hayden-Wherry resolution?

Mr. PEPPER. To close up other known loopholes, and still others which may yet be discovered.

I wish to say, in further answer to the question of the able Senator from Minnesota, that if any Senator is really interested in passing the Truman program, in carrying out the Democratic platform, I hardly know of any more effective step toward that end, any better measure toward that objective he could pursue, than to sustain the Vice President in his ruling of yesterday.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	Morse
Baldwin	Hoey	Mundt
Brewster	Holland	Murray
Bricker	Humphrey	Myers
Bridges	Hunt	Neely
Butler	Ives	O'Conor
Byrd	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Reed
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Chavez	Kefauver	Russell
Connally	Kem	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kerr	Schoeppel
Donnell	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Downey	Langer	Sparkman
Eastland	Lodge	Stennis
Ecton	Long	Taft
Ellender	Lucas	Taylor
Ferguson	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Flanders	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Frear	McFarland	Thye
Fulbright	McGrath	Tobey
George	McKellar	Tydings
Gillette	McMahon	Vandenberg
Green	Magnuson	Watkins
Gurney	Malone	Wherry
Hayden	Maybank	Wiley
Hendrickson	Miller	Withers
Hickenlooper	Millikin	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). Ninety Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I shall not take the time of the Senate this evening in analyzing my views of the precedents or of the philosophy underlying the rulings of past Presiding Officers of the Senate. Those are matters which have been adequately canvassed, and I believe that the basic views all can be expressed in a very few minutes. Sufficient to say that the question of the applicability of the cloture rule to incidental procedural mechanics of the Senate has, in my opinion, been amply answered by an unbroken line of decisions of able Presiding Officers in the past.

I can say at the outset that I agree thoroughly with the philosophy that the Senate should and must have, and I believe, arduous as it may be, that the Senate does have today, a means of eventually taking control of its deliberations.

However, Mr. President, I want to call to the Senate's attention now that the great progress which the Anglo-Saxon system of law and parliamentary procedure has made in the generations past has been based upon their adherence to a reliable system of rules, whether it be in their court procedure, which we have followed with success, or in the parliamentary procedure, which they laid down for us in the generations past. We have seen the examples in other nations where precedent has been disregarded, where the whimsical ruling of the majority has overridden the basic rights of the minority, and we have seen chaos and catastrophe inflicted not only upon the majority but upon the minority when violations of such orderly procedures have occurred.

In all fairness, Mr. President, I may say that I believe that the present cloture rule of the Senate is not sufficient. I shall support the Hayden-Wherry resolution when, as, and if, under orderly procedure of existing rules, it comes up for action. I believe we can strengthen the rules of the Senate in order to meet emergencies. But today we do not face a matter of philosophy. We face a matter of orderly and reliable procedure. There are various tools and weapons of protection for the minority and the majority in any orderly body. The majority, I may call to the Senate's attention, always has two safeguards. It has first and ultimately the safeguard of a majority vote which protects it. It also has the safeguard of reliable rules upon which it can count. The minority, on the other hand, only has the safeguard of reliance upon the rules. It does not have the safeguard of a majority vote. It can only rely upon the precedents and the historical background of fair dealing and fair treatment under the rules which have been established in an orderly manner.

We are facing that situation today. We are not facing the philosophy of cloture. We are not facing the philosophy of the will of the majority necessarily, unless we submit to the caprice of alternate rulings of Presiding Officers who are undoubtedly sincere in their approach to the question, but who nevertheless find themselves on opposite sides of a proposition that heretofore in an unbroken line of precedents has been held to be one way.

We are now met with the argument that if we do not support this reversal of the unbroken precedent in the Senate on this proposition we will never get to a vote on the ultimate question. To me, and with due respect to the great judgment and sincerity of those who advance it, that is a specious argument. Running all through the body of the law of these United States is the principle that difficulty of compliance is no excuse for the violation of the written law, and therefore the difficulty of compliance with the existing rules of the Senate is no excuse for the majority, because it has the votes capriciously and on whim, if you please, because of the exigencies of the situation, whether they be political or otherwise, to override the rules upon

which the minority may be expected to rely and have a right to rely on the one hand, and the rules which are a part of the protection of the majority on the other.

No, Mr. President, I shall not discuss the philosophy of the social program that is proposed. I may differ from many persons on that subject. I shall support at the proper time the adoption of a clearer rule of cloture because I believe in the principle of the ultimate control, under all circumstances, of a self-controlled body. But to say that because this body has the inherent and the constitutional right to write its rules and to pass upon the judgment of its Presiding Officers, is no excuse whatsoever to say that we can cast aside the reliance that either the majority or the minority is privileged to place upon existing precedents and existing rules.

This is a matter of the mehanics of the orderly operation of the Senate of the United States. It is a matter which, if approached from the standpoint of overriding action by a majority, upon its convenience and to serve its own purposes, will be precedent, if you please, which will have its repercussions for long periods of time, and the eventual results I would not dare predict.

I may disagree with my friends on the other side of the aisle, and perhaps with some of those on this side of the aisle on the ultimate vote on the question of the change of rules, but I find myself in agreement with many on this side and on the other side when it comes to the sanctity of the reliance upon the rules under which we operate.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield for a question.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is it not true that the very necessity for and the adoption of rules is to prevent the wild action of any majority, as in a town meeting? Is not the whole philosophy of the adoption of rules of procedure to prevent such wild action?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The necessity for adopting reliable rules has been recognized since the time civilized man began to move forward in orderly progress. Never until reliable rules have been adopted and held sacred, if you please, has real progress been made.

The Senate is sovereign. There is no question about that. The majority of the Senate today can override any decision of the Chair, and can take any action it wishes. I may say, as others have said, that I am not without experience as a presiding officer of a parliamentary body, and I am aware of the responsibilities. I am aware in some measure of the great problems which arise in the orderly procedure of legislative bodies. But I say, Mr. President, that we must not permit ourselves to lose sight of the fact that if we override those rules upon which historic reliance has been placed in our procedure, in order expediently to reach a political result, in its broadest sense, we shall be doing violence to the only body remaining in the world today which has comparative freedom of discussion and debate in the interest of human rights.

In order to try to make my position clear, and without arguing the technicalities and the hypercritical analysis of this particular decision or that one—and I have my views as to why I disagree with the distinguished Vice President in his differentiation of this decision, as a matter of principle, from others which have been made in the past—without going into those technicalities, I will say that I have come to the firm conclusion that the broad principle of reliance upon rules involved in the question before the Senate on the matter of application of cloture is no different from the principles which have been applied in former decisions of this body.

The decision of the President pro tempore of last year, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], called forth not one dissenting voice on the floor of the Senate. There was no objection to the philosophy of his decision. There was no call for a vote on an appeal. By reason of that action, or inaction, the decision was completely acceptable as applicable under the present rule.

Mr. President, we must operate under rules upon which we can rely. In relying upon those rules, where there is a question, we must be guided by precedent. The precedent is unbroken. The principle has not been destroyed. We must either rely upon such rules or we shall pass gradually, step by step, to the whimsical and capricious will of Presiding Officers and the exigencies of the moment in writing the rules of the game while the runner is between third base and home. I believe that we must determine to make the sacrifice of time and inconvenience involved in arduous night sessions, if we must have them; but we must live under the rules, so that orderly procedure can be had, or we may face a situation of chaos, in which neither the minority nor the majority can rely upon what the rule will be tomorrow, or what the action of the Senate will be under any given state of facts.

It seems that there is a great misunderstanding on the part of the people of the country. They ask, Why cannot the Senate get busy? Why can it not go to work? Why do Senators have to endure long speeches and continued debate? The orderly progress of our Nation and the growth of mutual respect by individuals, and mutual protection of their rights, came as a result of the very indulgence which the American people have accorded one to another, for the full and free expression of their views. Were it not so, we would have an autocracy in this country, and a system so highly controlled by those who rule that progress could not be made, and orderly parliamentary and legislative procedure could not go forward.

It is easy, in times when emotion runs high, to say, "Let us take the reins in our hands and ride roughshod to the objective. Let us brush aside the main principle, which is the orderly rule of procedure." So far as I am concerned, I am not so much supporting the ruling of last year as I am opposing the ruling of this year. I believe that the unbroken precedents support that kind of a vote. I am perfectly willing to undertake to endure any arduous discomfort to me thereafter, if as a result, the Senate can operate under orderly and reliable rules of procedure, and when the time comes for a vote, after exhausting the rights of the minority or the majority, vote on the issue at hand.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LUCAS. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that he is not supporting the opinion handed down by the Vice President, the Presiding Officer of the Senate, nor is he supporting the opinion which was handed down last year by the then President pro tempore of the Senate?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator did not correctly understand me. What I mean to say is that I am neither supporting nor opposing the opinion of last year or the opinion of this year, as a contest between two opinions. I am supporting the principle of the holding of last year by the Senator from Michigan, and the unbroken principle involved in the precedents. I am opposing the holding of yesterday because I think the principle is wrong, and that the holding is erroneous. I mean to say that I am engaging in no contest between the former ruling and the present ruling.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LUCAS. Did the Senator take the same position when he put his name on a petition for cloture about 9 months ago, when the poll-tax question was under consideration on a motion to take up the poll-tax bill?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I signed the petition for cloture on the motion to take up the poll-tax bill. This particular issue had not been raised at that time. The question had not been raised as to the applicability of cloture to such a motion. That question was not raised until later.

Mr. LUCAS. But the Senator knew what he was doing at that time, did he not?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I knew that I was signing a petition for cloture. Certainly I did.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator knew exactly what the results would be when he tried to get cloture by a petition with respect to a motion to take up the poll-tax bill, did he not?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator from Illinois is entirely in error. The Senator from Iowa did not know what the implications of the matter would be. The Senator from Iowa is not omniscient.

Mr. LUCAS. I am surprised that a man so brilliant as the Senator is should make such an admission.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator from Iowa tries to be frank. I do not know what the attitude of the Senator from Illinois is on such questions, but I

try to be frank. I admit that I did not know what the implication of this particular parliamentary procedure would be.

Mr. LUCAS. Was it a political implication?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Certainly not.

Mr. LUCAS. Then, why did the Senator sign the cloture petition with respect to a motion to take up the poll-tax bill last August, upon which the Senator from Michigan made the ruling? The Senator from Iowa is a distinguished Member of this body. He understands the rules, and he has very definite and specific opinions upon these questions. I think it would be interesting to the Senate and to the country to know why the great Senator from Iowa is now changing his mind overnight on this question.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator from Iowa is not changing his mind at all. Last year the Senator from Iowa signed the petition to bring debate to a close on the motion to take up the poll-tax bill. I believed that it should be brought to a close. Thereafter the question of the applicability of the cloture rule to that particular measure was raised. I frankly say to the Senator from Illinois and to the Senate as a whole that the matter of the applicability of that petition to the measure then before the Senate had not occurred to me, and I do not believe it occurred to the Senator from Illinois or to any other Senator.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. I shall ask the distinguished Senator from Iowa if I may request unanimous consent to propound a unanimous-consent question to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, that is a little complicated; I do not know whether I understand that any more than I understood the Senator from Illinois when he accused me of not understanding what I did last year when I signed the petition for cloture on the anti-poll-tax bill. But if it can be cleared up, I shall yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I do not wish to lose my right to the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Iowa not lose his right to the floor in yielding for this purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. With that understanding, Mr. President, I shall yield for that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, what is the ruling of the Chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. None.

Mr. LUCAS. Well, wait a moment.

Mr. WHERRY. That is to say, there is no objection on my part.

What is the ruling of the Chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection. Without objection, consent is granted.

The Senator from Iowa has the floor.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I understand that unanimous consent has been given, without prejudicing my right to the floor, to permit the Senator from South Carolina to propound a unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. I ask the Senator from Illinois how he has voted on cloture procedures in this body before?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I shall reserve my answer to that question until later. [Laughter.]

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Under the same conditions, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield for a question?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Is the request that I yield for a question, Mr. President?

Mr. MAYBANK. I ask only that, Mr. President.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. Then I would ask the Senator from Iowa to ask the Senator from Illinois how he voted on the poll-tax cloture and other clotures. [Laughter.]

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I have the greatest regard and affection for the Senator from South Carolina, and I shall accede to any reasonable request he makes, as a matter of friendship and as a personal accommodation.

Therefore, Mr. President, if the Presiding Officer agrees that I may do so without prejudice to my right to the floor, I shall ask the Senator from Illinois how he voted on the matter of cloture on the poll-tax measure. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that we proceed with the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa has the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to know the parliamentary situation, Mr. President, in view of all the parliamentary inquiries which have been propounded, one after another.

Let me say that I will answer all these questions when I get the floor; and there will not be any question about it, I say to my friends the Senator from South Carolina and the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, because of my great affection for the Senator from South Carolina and my desire to have his curiosity satisfied, I shall now yield the floor, in the hope that the Chair will recognize the Senator from Illinois, in order to give him an opportunity to answer the question of the Senator from South Carolina. [Laughter.]

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

SENATE RULES A MEANS, NOT AN END

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the debate which has taken place thus far would lead an onlooker, I think, to wonder whether the rules of the Senate are a means to an end or are an end in themselves. I do not believe this body is impervious to the rules of the common sense or of constitutional law. We are not here dealing with the laws of the Medes and Persians, which cannot be altered or changed; we are dealing with the power which was given under the Constitution of the United States to each House of the Congress to make its own rules. That grant of authority to the Houses of Congress to make the rules for their own procedure was a grant of authority designed to make it possible for each of those bodies to function as a governing institution. We are here only as members of the legislative body of the United States; and the business of a legislative body is to legislate. It is not to spend hour upon hour splitting hairs about the meaning of the word "measure" and the meaning of the word "motion" or talking endlessly about irrelevant subjects. We are endeavoring to determine whether the Senate can transact business.

I have observed over many years—and I speak as a lawyer—that lawyers are very much inclined to appeal to technicalities and there are many lawyers in this body. The debate up to this hour, on the part of those who have been trying to say that the word "measure" does not include "motion," as the Vice President ruled last night that it does, is an appeal to technicalities, in complete disregard of the fundamental need of our times. Parliamentary government in the world stands in its greatest danger at this hour. In times past, Members of this body stood upon this floor—Members affiliated with both parties—and warned the Senate that the abuse of the right of filibuster was making and would make the Senate lose the confidence of the people. These words have been uttered by men who have been able to hold the loyalty and devotion of Republican Senators and Republican voters, and by men who have been able to claim the loyalty and devotion of Democratic Senators and Democratic voters.

JEFFERSON'S MANUAL

Mr. President, I desire very briefly to call the attention of this body to the origin of these rules. First of all, I wish to cite the views of the great founder of the Democratic Party, Thomas Jefferson. I could almost say—in fact, I think I can say—that he was also the founder of the Republican Party. He was the Vice President of the United States and the President of this body under the administration of John Adams; and out of his great store of learning he undertook to say to the Senate, and to Senators for all time to come, what he thought of the rules of procedure. He prepared the Manual which appears in the Senate Manual which lies on the desk of every Senator—Jefferson's Manual. He wrote a little preface to it, and I now read a part of it:

> Considering, therefore, the law of proceedings in the Senate as composed of the precepts of the Constitution, the regulations of the Senate, and, where these are

> silent, of the rules of Parliament, I have here endeavored to collect and digest so much of these as is called for in ordinary practice, collating the parliamentary with the senatorial rules, both where they agree and where they vary.

You will observe that he collected precedents on both sides, setting down the rules that had been observed from time to time in the British Parliament whether they agreed with or varied from the Senate rules.

Skipping to the next page:

> For some of the most familiar forms no written authority is or can be quoted; no writer having supposed it necessary to repeat what all were presumed to know. * * * They have been, however, constantly advancing toward uniformity and accuracy, and have now attained a degree of aptitude to their object beyond which little is to be desired or expected. * * * But—

He said, and this is his concluding statement—

> I have begun a sketch, which those who come after me will successively correct and fill up till a code of rules shall be formed for the use of the Senate, the effects of which may be accuracy in business, economy of time, order, uniformity, and impartiality.

He recognized, if I read these words correctly, the fact that the rules of order are a growing system. He recognized the fact that the Constitution of the United States gives to each House the right to make its rules and to change its rules. There is scarcely a session of the Congress, certainly of the Senate, in which we do not have repeated example of the suspension of all rules so that we may proceed to act. There is a rule against attaching legislation to an appropriation bill; but over and over again Senators come here upon the floor and give notice of their intention to bring about a suspension of the rules, and put such an amendment upon the bill.

Jefferson was talking to us when he wrote this preface and collected the parliamentary rules. Among the various precedents which he had cited here, there are many from the British Parliament and from parliamentary authorities whose views he quoted. He cites them, not because they have any effect upon the Senate, I am bound to say. But he cites them to indicate what I conceive to be his view that it is the fundamental duty of a Senate to act, not merely to debate. In this citation on page 267, which is a quotation from the rule of another parliamentary body:

> No one is to speak impertinently or beside the question, superfluously or tediously.

THE ISSUE OF IRRELEVANT DEBATE

That, of course, was a rule at one time of the British Parliament. Why do I cite it here? Because I want to say to my distinguished colleagues upon this side of the aisle that that point of view expressed in Jefferson's Manual from the British Parliament was not very dissimilar from the point of view expressed by the late Senator from Arkansas, Joseph T. Robinson, for many years the majority leader of this body, who spoke in the city of Memphis, Tenn., on the 11th of November 1925 and there discussed the effects of the filibuster and what could be done about it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Just a moment. Mr. Charles G. Dawes was at that time Vice President of the United States. From the speech of the Honorable United States Senator Joseph T. Robinson I read:

> If Vice President Dawes, in a case where a Senator is abusing the privilege of debate by insisting upon speaking to irrelevant questions—

I stop here to say I have just been shown a computation of the subjects which have been discussed since this debate started on the 28th day of February. Thirteen Members of the Senate arose to speak upon the issue, the motion to take up, while 12 Senators spoke upon totally and completely irrelevant subjects. So here is the opinion of Joseph T. Robinson:

> If Vice President Dawes, in a case where a Senator is abusing the privilege of debate by insisting upon speaking to irrelevant questions, will hold the Senator out of order, he will be able to force a vote upon the correctness of his ruling, and, if a majority of the Senate sustain him, the Senator can only proceed upon a motion and with the consent of the Senate. So that extreme cases of filibustering may be met through the exercise of intelligence and courage on the part of the Chair, if supported by a majority of the Senate.

He concludes:

> Some of us, including myself, would like to see the absurd precedent, that a Senator is himself a judge of whether he is speaking to the subject, overruled.

So I say to my Democratic colleagues, a great and able Senator from the South, who was just as loyal as is any man now in this body, in my judgment, to the traditions and the desires and the aspiration of the South, said in his speech in Memphis that he would like to see this precedent shattered, and he hoped the time would come when we might have a courageous and intelligent chairman who would be willing so to rule. I am happy that the Vice President has shown the courage and the intelligence in his ruling to declare that the measure includes a motion.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Would the distinguished Senator from Wyoming discuss relevancy at this time, with respect to which he read so eloquently from the book?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. And might I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The relevancy is, those Senators who are arguing that the ruling of the Chair should not be upheld are saying they are bound by precedent. I am saying to Senators upon this side of the aisle that they are not bound by precedent, first, because the Constitution of the United States gives us the right to make our own rules; and, secondly, because a great, revered former leader of the Democratic Members of this body himself said he wanted to see some of these rules overruled.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Would the Senator discuss what is before the Senate?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am discussing it.

Mr. MAYBANK. I did not understand the Senator to be discussing it.

THE SENATE IS NOT THE SLAVE OF THE RULES

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am discussing whether or not we are the slaves of the rules or the masters of the rules. There are some Senators here who would like to make us the slaves of the rules. They may succeed; I do not know. But I say to the Senator from South Carolina, make the Senate a slave to these technical rules and impede the business of the Senate, and the day will come when that will be rued by those who did it. Let us not forget what is going on in the world.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I hope that the Senator will please bear with me and permit me to make my argument.

Mr. President, I was introduced to this body 32 years ago—not as a Member but as a spectator. I sat in the family gallery of the Senate during part of the famous filibuster on the measure to authorize the arming of merchant vessels. I heard the Senators in that debate, and I saw what was transpiring. I read in the newspapers the covenant which was read into the RECORD this morning by the junior Senator from Tennessee, signed by some 33 Senators. I read it the day it was published, on the 3d of March 1917. I read there the names of many a distinguished son of the South. Why did they make the covenant with themselves and with the country that in the next succeeding Congress they would move immediately to bring about a rule which would be capable of putting an end to debate upon any bill or question? On the 4th of March a new Senate came in. The distinguished Senator from Wyoming, Mr. Kendrick, to whom I had the honor of being secretary, entered this body on the 4th of March, and I then had access to the floor of the Senate. I heard the discussions on the floor and in the cloakrooms.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. I was in this body in November 1941, when the same question was raised. I ask this question of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming: Was there any filibuster in 1941 in connection with arming merchant ships, and was the legislation not passed? I ask that question to show how the Senate has been getting along since the date the Senator speaks of and since the date it was first mentioned here. I speak of November 1941, when the issue before the Senate was the arming of merchant ships. I simply ask whether there was any filibuster at that time?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the Senator's question is totally irrelevant. I

do not recall a filibuster at that time. But it has nothing to do with the thinking of the southern Senators who, on the 8th of March 1917, 5 days after their covenant in the previous Congress, voted for the cloture rule which is before us.

Mr. President, I want to enter in the RECORD at this point, as part of my remarks, the roll call in the Senate upon that date, so that there may be no doubt as to how the vote went at that time. It appears on page 45 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 8, 1917.

There being no objection, the roll call was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The result was announced—yeas 76, nays 3, as follows:

Yeas—76: Ashurst, Beckham, Brady, Brandegee, Broussard, Calder, Chamberlain, Colt, Cummins, Curtis, Fall, France, Frelinghuysen, Gerry, Hale, Harding, Hardwick, Hitchcock, Hollis, Hughes, Husting, James, Jones of New Mexico, Jones of Washington, Kellogg, Kendrick, Kenyon, King, Kirby, Knox, Lane, Lewis, Lodge, McCumber, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Myers, Nelson, New, Newlands, Norris, Overman, Owen, Page, Penrose, Pittman, Poindexter, Pomerene, Ransdell, Reed, Robinson, Saulsbury, Shafroth, Sheppard, Shields, Simmons, Smith of Georgia, Smith of Maryland, Smith of South Carolina, Smoot, Sterling, Stone, Sutherland, Swanson, Thomas, Thompson, Townsend, Trammell, Underwood, Vardaman, Wadsworth, Warren, Watson, Williams, Wolcott.

Nays—3: Gronna, La Follette, Sherman.

Not voting—16: Bankhead, Borah, Culberson, Dillingham, Fernald, Fletcher, Gallinger, Goff, Gore, Johnson of South Dakota, Phelan, Smith of Arizona, Smith of Michigan, Tillman, Walsh, Weeks.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this roll call shows that there were 76 Senators voting "yea" in support of rule XXII and three Senators voting "nay." There was not a single Democratic vote cast against that rule. The only three votes cast against it were those of Senator Gronna, of North Dakota; Senator La Follette, of Wisconsin; and Senator Lawrence Y. Sherman, of Illinois.

Only a moment ago I canvassed those 76 votes in order to get the names of the States whose Senators in this body voted for the cloture rule to put an end to debate. I ask any of my good friends upon this side of the aisle to challenge either their integrity or their intelligence, or tell me that they did not know what they were doing. The States were Arizona, Kentucky, Louisiana, Georgia, Tennessee, Virginia, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Missouri, Arkansas, Texas, South Carolina, Florida, Alabama, and Mississippi. That is a roll of distinguished States and of distinguished statesmen. Why were they moved to take that action? They were moved, Mr. President, because they felt the time had come in a great national crisis when the Senate should be able to legislate, when it should not be prevented by a minority from carrying out the very purpose for its existence. Some Members of the minority were willing to indulge in the sort of irrelevant debate which one of the Democratic majority, the late Senator Joseph Robinson, called an abuse of privilege.

PRESIDENT WILSON'S VIEW

The filibuster which I witnessed on the 3d and 4th of March resulted in the defeat of a bill which, in the opinion of the majority of the Members upon both sides, was necessary in the interest of the United States. The President of the United States, a Democrat, a native of Virginia, issued that famous statement of his which goes ringing down through history——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Permit me to read this, please:

In the immediate presence of a crisis fraught with much more subtle and far-reaching possibilities of national danger than any the Nation has known within the history of its international relations, Congress has been unable to act either to safeguard the country or to vindicate the elementary rights of its citizens. More than 500 of the 531 Members of the two Houses were ready and anxious to act. The House of Representatives had acted by an overwhelming majority, but the Senate was unable to act because a little group of 11 Senators had determined that it should not. The Senate of the United States is the only legislative body in the world which cannot act when its majority is ready. A little group of willful men, representing no opinion but their own, have rendered the great Government of the United States helpless and impotent.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Arkansas first asked me to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe the Senator said that filibuster went on for 2 days.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No, I said I saw it, or part of it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. How long?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not know; I came here toward the very end of February.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The bill was on the floor 4 days altogether. Is not that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not know.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is a fact. If the rule the Senator is supporting had been in effect at that time, it could not have brought the debate on that bill to an end, even under the cloture rule that is now proposed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is indulging in technicalities which, from my point of view, have nothing to do with this debate. The Senator may split hairs if he pleases; we are concerned here in 1949 with the salvation of free government. Make no mistake about that.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator can yield only for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the Senator to define free government. That is what I am for.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I know the Senator defines it as I do, and I hope he will defend it with his vote.

JEFFERSON ON ENDLESS DEBATE

Mr. President, in order that I may again bring to the minds of some of my distinguished brethren on this side a realization of what we are indulging in here, I wish to read a letter which was written by Thomas Jefferson from Monticello on January 17, 1810—Thomas Jefferson, whom we all honor and revere. This letter was written to John Wayne Eppes. It was not written about the Senate, but about the House of Representatives. But the letter clearly demonstrates what Thomas Jefferson thought about endless debate and about the desirability of bringing debate to an end, about action instead of talk. The words of Thomas Jefferson are these:

I observe that the H. of R. are sensible of the ill effects of the long speeches in their house on their proceedings. But they have a worse effect in the disgust they excite among the people; and the disposition they are producing to transfer their confidence from the legislature to the executive branch, which would soon sap our Constitution. These speeches, therefore, are less and less read, and if continued will cease to be read at all. * * * I observe that the House is endeavoring to remedy the eternal protraction of debate by sitting up all night—

As we are invited to do by Members on the other side who are unable apparently to get over the technicality of whether a motion can be included within the meaning of the word "measure."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to my distinguished friend from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Why can we not vote now?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator can vote in just a minute.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to vote now. I have been ready to vote for quite a while. [Laughter.] The other side is taking up all the time of the Senate. They are doing the filibustering and charging it to us. I am ready to vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator can yield only for a question.

Mr. McKELLAR. Vote.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I sat in the Senate this afternoon and listened to the able speech of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, and I was very much interested in it. I assure the Senator that he talked considerably longer than I intend to talk.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad to hear it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But I wish to make plain what Jefferson was thinking of this sort of thing. So I go back to his letter:

I observe that the House is endeavoring to remedy the eternal protraction of debate by sitting up all night, or by the use of the previous question.

As I said at the outset, Mr. President, are we in the Senate impervious to the rule of common sense? Shall the great majority of a body wear itself out because a small minority is willing to exercise its muscle and its lungs, as well as its brain, in protracted debate, in discussing irrelevant questions? Jefferson apparently did not think that was a sensible thing to do, so he said:

Both will subject them to the most serious inconvenience. The latter may be turned upon themselves by a trick of their adversaries. I have thought that such a rule as the following would be more effectual and less inconvenient.

And thereafter proceeds the rule which Thomas Jefferson suggested for terminating debate:

Resolved, That at ——— o'clock in the evening * * * it shall be the duty of the Speaker to declare that hour arrived, whereupon all debate shall cease.

I ask, Mr. President, that the entire letter may be printed in the RECORD at this point, though there will be some repetition.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONTICELLO, *January 17, 1810.*

DEAR SIR: * * * I observe that the House of Representatives are sensible of the ill effects of the long speeches in their House on their proceedings. But they have a worse effect in the disgust they excite among the people, and the disposition they are producing to transfer their confidence from the Legislature to the executive branch, which would soon sap our Constitution. These speeches, therefore, are less and less read, and, if continued, will cease to be read at all. * * * I observe that the House is endeavoring to remedy the eternal protraction of debate by sitting up all night, or by the use of the previous question. Both will subject them to the most serious inconvenience. The latter may be turned upon themselves by a trick of their adversaries. I have thought that such a rule as the following would be more effectual and less inconvenient: "*Resolved*, That at [8] o'clock in the evening (whenever the House shall be in session at that hour), it shall be the duty of the Speaker to declare that hour arrived, whereupon all debate shall cease. If there be then before the House a main question for the reading or passing of a bill, resolution, or order, such main question shall immediately be put by the Speaker, and decided by yeas and nays.

"If the question before the House be secondary, as for amendment, commitment, postponement, adjournment of the debate or question, laying on the table, reading papers, or a previous question, such secondary [or any other which may delay the main question] shall stand ipso facto discharged, and the main question shall then be before the House, and shall be immediately put and decided by yeas and nays. But a motion for ajournment of the House may once, and once only, take place of the main question; and if decided in the negative, the main question shall then be put as before. Should any question of order arise, it shall be decided by the Speaker instanter, and without debate or appeal; and questions of privilege arising shall be postponed till the main question be decided. Messages from the President or Senate may be received but not acted on till after the decision of the main question. But this rule shall be suspended during the [three] last days of the session of Congress."

No doubt this, on investigation, will be found to need amendment; but I think the principle of it better adapted to meet the evil than any other which has occurred to me. You can consider and decide upon it, however, and make what use of it you please, only keeping the source of it to yourself.

Ever affectionately yours.

REPUBLICAN AUTHORITY FOR LIMITATION

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have statements urging the overthrow of precedents, not only by distinguished Democrats, but also by distinguished Republicans, which I should like to recommend to the attention of my brothers on the other side who may think themselves ready to vote against sustaining the ruling of the Chair.

The late Henry Cabot Lodge, a Senator from the State of Massachusetts for many, many years, discussed the philosophy underlying the question of whether or not the Senate shall be the master or the servant of its rules, whether or not the hand of the dead past can be laid upon us so that we cannot meet the needs of the current present. He was writing in the North American Review in 1893. He said:

Of the two rights—

Of debating and of voting—

that of voting is the higher and more important. We ought to have both, and debate certainly in ample measure; but if we are forced to choose between them, the right of action must prevail over the right of discussion. To vote without debating is perilous, but to debate and never vote is imbecile.

As it is, there must be a change, for the delays which now take place are discrediting the Senate, and this is greatly to be deplored. The Senate was perhaps the greatest single achievement of the makers of the Constitution, and anything which lowers it in the eyes of the people is a most serious matter.

Heed these words, my friends upon the other side of this Chamber:

A body which cannot govern itself will not long hold the respect of the people who have chosen it to govern the country.

Those are words of wisdom, and I think that they should fall with particular force upon the ears of every Member of this body, the Republicans as well as the Democrats, when we recall the fact that ever since the end of the shooting war we have been involved in a campaign from Moscow designed to sabotage free government everywhere in the world. Such sabotage has proceeded in Italy; it has proceeded in France; it has been initiated here. There is nothing the leaders in the Kremlin would more dearly like to see than that the United States Senate should demonstrate before the world its incapacity to act when two-thirds of the Members of the Senate say the time has come to act.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. What is the date of the statement the Senator quoted from the late Senator Lodge?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Eighteen hundred and ninety-three.

Mr. STENNIS. Does not the Senator know that, in 1915, that same distinguished gentleman made a speech on the floor of the Senate in which he said he had changed his mind after serving here as a Member of the Senate, and was opposed to cloture? Does the Senator recall that?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think that may have been true, but I will say to the Senator that it detracts nothing from the correctness and the face of his first position.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. In view of the personal element injected into the debate by the colloquy which just took place, I will ask if it is not true that the Senator from Massachusetts, of whom the Senators have just spoken, voted in favor of rule XXII when it came up in 1917?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. He most certainly did. He voted in favor of that rule. Leaders upon both sides of the Chamber voted in favor of it. I have already placed the roll-call vote in the RECORD. But I want it clearly understood here again that Senator Martin, of Virginia, who was at that time the Democratic floor leader, the majority leader, voted for the rule. Senator Simmons, of North Carolina, who I think succeeded him, voted for the rule. Senator Robinson, who succeeded Senator Simmons, voted for the rule. Senator Lodge, on the Republican side, and Senator Cummins, of Iowa, Republican Senator from that State, and then President pro tempore of the Senate, voted for the rule.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to ask the Senator if he does not know that all the members from the South, including myself, are for Rule XXII exactly as it is now? We do not want to change Rule XXII. We agree with the Senator from Massachusetts.

CAN A MOTION BE A MEASURE?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Again, if the Senator will permit me to say so, he is indulging in hair-splitting. He wants us to believe that a motion is not a measure, that when a motion is the pending business, the Senate is handcuffed. If the Senator from Arkansas wants to indulge in that sort of technical hair-splitting, he may do so without any objection on my part, but I will say to the Senator that these times are too dangerous, in my opinion, to permit that sort of trifling with the effectiveness of democratic procedures in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I ask the Senator, Who started this trifling? Certainly I did not, nor did those who believe as I do bring up this matter in these serious times the Senator speaks of. The Senator from Wyoming knows that very well. If there is any trifling about it, we did not initiate it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The time has come to determine whether or not the Senate has a rule, a rule such as its authors thought they were writing, by which debate can be brought to an end.

If there were any doubt that when a motion is before the Senate it is the pending business, it is solved for me by the ruling which was made on February 4, 1946, by my distinguished friend, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], who spoke in this Chamber earlier today. In that ruling which he made as President pro tempore, at the

time a cloture petition was filed with respect to S. 101, entitled "A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry," which he held was not the pending measure, I find this interesting paragraph:

> The question arises, What is the business now pending before the Senate? At the present time, and since the Senate met on Friday, January 18, 1946, as appears from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the matter pending before the Senate is and has been the question of the amendment of the Journal of Thursday, January 17, 1946, save certain business transactions by unanimous consent.

So here is the plain declaration in the most recent ruling but one, save that of the Vice President yesterday, by the President pro tempore of the Senate, that a motion to amend the Journal was the pending business. Now let us split hairs on that. Can a motion be the pending business? The Senator from Tennessee said it was. The Senator from Michigan said it was not. The present Vice President says it is.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as the Senator has referred to the ruling I made, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senate by its action approved that ruling of the then President pro tempore.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have no doubt about that, but I will say to the Senator that when it did it agreed with him that a motion was the pending business.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will permit me to conclude. So many of these questions are, as I have said, just like the pure technicalities taken out of the common-law books, such as when there should be a comma rather than a semicolon, or when there should be a period instead of a semicolon.

We are facing fundamentals, not technicalities. Observe the splinter parties in France, where members of the legislative body, insistent upon having their own way, have frequently rendered it impossible for the Government of France to function. Time after time its governments have been changed. The great virtue of the Senate, as I have seen it operate, has been that it operates—most of the time—with reason and impartiality, and with good humor among all the Members. By unanimous consent over and over again we do various things. But here and now we know that Communist propaganda is based upon the conviction that democratic governments are unable to function because they do splinter, because minority division renders cohesive action impossible.

At this moment Members of this body on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Members of this body on the Committee on Armed Services, are wondering in their nightly hours whether or not the Russians are building the atomic bomb. They are wondering whether we are headed toward war. And we, by the almost unanimous action of this body, are spending billions of dollars to prepare ourselves so that democratic government may survive. But we find the Senate rendering itself incompetent by endless debate.

I say to you, Mr. President, the danger which confronts us now is greater by far than the danger which confronted the Senate in 1917, when the proposition before this body was the arming of merchantmen. Free government has been driven back and back until here in the United States alone we remain a free Government, with the representatives of the people still authorized and capable of doing business. But now we are asked, upon a technicality, to forego the right to do the business of the Senate. I say, Mr. President, that in my humble opinion the time has come when the Senate should demonstrate to the people of the United States and to the people of the world that it can function, and to do so it must support the ruling of the Vice President.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator, before he takes his seat, if the bill to arm merchant vessels was not finally passed?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. After the adoption of rule XXII.

Mr. GEORGE. It was finally passed, was it not, without further filibuster?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. After the adoption of rule XXII.

Mr. GEORGE. As it stands today?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I would not rise on this occasion if I did not feel it my duty to defend the father of my party. My distinguished friend from Wyoming—and there is no man for whom I feel a more genuine affection—also gave to him the honor of being the father, perhaps, of the Republican Party. Therefore I feel that I must rise to defend Mr. Jefferson, first, with respect to the letter written by Mr. Jefferson in which he called attention to the ordeal of spending the night in the House in order to end a debate, or else invoking the previous question. I call attention to the fact that Mr. Jefferson rejected both and proposed another remedy of his own. So Mr. Jefferson did not, even with respect to debate in the House, favor the previous question.

But that is not the particular matter to which I wish to call attention. We are very prone in our debates here to wander far afield. No doubt the Senator from Wyoming is correct in saying that much irrelevancy is brought into the debate. I rise for the purpose of calling special attention to Mr. Jefferson's Manual of Parliamentary Practice, on the importance of rules. The distinguished Senator from Wyoming read only the preface. Now let me read the first chapter. It ought to preclude debate on this question, because I take it that all Senators are open-minded on this particular question. It is not a question now of whether there should be a strict, rigid cloture rule, or whether the present rule is a good one or a bad one, or whether we ought to have any. The question is, What has happened to what rules we have, and is the ruling under those rules right or wrong, regardless of precedent?

I digress to say—because it has been emphasized by distinguished Senators—that when a precedent is wrong it is often corrected. Even our courts indulge in that practice, and properly so. That is not the question. If the precedents of the Senate were wrong, the distinguished Vice President was entirely correct in setting us on a proper course and disregarding those precedents. There is no question about that.

Coming back to Mr. Jefferson, in order that he may be properly defended against distinguished Members of my own party in this body, Mr. Jefferson's statement is in the Senate Manual. Senators do not need to go outside to get the facts, if they are looking for them. Mr. Jefferson said this:

> Mr. Onslow, the ablest among the Speakers of the House of Commons, used to say it was a maxim he had often heard when he was a young man, from old and experienced members, that nothing tended more to throw power into the hands of administration, and those who acted with the majority of the House of Commons, than a neglect of, or departure from, the rules of proceeding; that these forms, as instituted by our ancestors, operated as a check and control on the actions of the majority, and that they were, in many instances, a shelter and protection to the minority against the attempts of power.

That is the real Jefferson.

> So far the maxim is certainly true, and is founded in good sense; that as it is always in the power of the majority, by their numbers, to stop any improper measures proposed on the part of their opponents, the only weapons—

I hope the Republicans will note this—

> by which the minority can defend themselves against similar attempts from those in power are the forms and rules of proceeding which have been adopted as they were found necessary, from time to time, and are become the law of the House, by a strict adherence to which the weaker party can only be protected from those irregularities and abuses which these forms were intended to check and which the wantonness of power is but too often apt to suggest to large and successful majorities.

Do Senators want more?

> And whether these forms be in all cases the most rational or not, is really not of so great importance. It is much more material that there should be a rule to go by, than what that rule is; that there may be a uniformity of proceeding in business not subject to the caprice of the Speaker or captiousness of the Members. It is very material that order, decency, and regularity be preserved in a dignified body.

That is Thomas Jefferson. That is the Thomas Jefferson I have followed. That is the Thomas Jefferson that I shall follow to the end.

I have been shocked today by the suggestion made by a distinguished Member of this body, when he reminded us that the Senate was a political legislative body, and that really, and at last, rules were but shifting sand, and that the majority in control make and unmake them at will. I was shocked almost beyond utterance when the distinguished leader of my own party—and there is no man whom I hold in higher esteem than the distinguished Senator from Illinois, for whom I have also a personal affection—sought to inject into the debate of the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], when he was discussing an appeal from the ruling of the Chair affecting a rule of the Senate, the consideration of whether or not both political parties had not declared for civil-rights legislation. We do not need to go far to see where we are going. We do not have to go very far to see where we shall end, when we abolish our rules by convenient interpretation, and leave our destiny in the hands of the majority.

Thomas Jefferson was eternally right. Let me read his statement again. Nothing that I could say would be better.

> Mr. Onslow, the ablest among the speakers of the House of Commons, used to say it was a maxim he had often heard when he was a young man, from old and experienced members, that nothing tended more to throw power into the hands of administration, and those who acted with the majority of the House of Commons, than a neglect of, or departure from, the rules of proceeding; that these forms, as instituted by our ancestors, operated as a check and control on the actions of the majority, and that they were, in many instances, a shelter and protection to the minority against the attempts of power.

I shall not read more. It is all here in our manual.

Mr. President, the true liberal in America and in every other land is a man who seeks to build up the power of the minority to resist the majority. I commend that to some who describe themselves as liberals. There is but one test, finally, and that is whether we are building up or whether we are tearing down the power of the minority to protect itself and to prevent the administration from taking over and to prevent the overweening majority from overriding all the rights of the minority. Senators can find many other things in Mr. Jefferson's Manual, if they will examine it.

I wish to digress here to say that the distinguished Senator from Michigan this noon correctly stated the issue before the Senate. That issue is not whether we favor or whether we oppose cloture, rigid or loose or indifferent, but whether we are to have rules and whether we respect those rules and insist upon a fair interpretation of them.

But here in Mr. Jefferson's Manual, at page 327, Mr. Jefferson has something to say that we might well heed, especially those of us who call upon him every now and then in election years. He says:

> Section XXII. Motions.

And he discusses motions; and that is the issue before us now. The issue here is really, as the distinguished Vice President has ruled, when is a motion not a motion? According to his ruling, a motion is not a motion if there is no pending business; but if there is pending business, a motion is a motion.

No, Mr. President; it is either a motion or it is not; and it does not change its complexion because of what the Senate has previously done or because of what it contemplates doing. It is simply a motion, if it is a motion.

Mr. Jefferson, in the Manual, goes on to discuss motions. He says:

> When a motion has been made, it is not to be put to the question or debated until it is seconded.

That is a rule which, of course, we have long since discarded.

Then he says:

> It is then, and not till then, in possession of the House.

There you are, Mr. President. What is a motion? What is a motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill? A Senator can make it every day of the year if he can obtain recognition from the Chair; he can make it until someone has amended his motion or until the yeas and nays are ordered on his motion or until some step has been taken by the Senate so as to bring the motion in the control of the body itself; and then he cannot take it away, except by unanimous consent or by a vote.

But what is the situation here? What do we have here? We have a motion to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 15. That is all we have. Until something is done with that motion by the Senate, the mover may withdraw it or he may cancel it. It is nothing but his motion; that is all there is to it. It does not even become the property of the Senate until there is an amendment to it or until the Senate has ordered a yea-and-nay vote on the question of its acceptance or rejection. Until then, it is never in the custody of the body itself; it is never lost to the man who makes it. Yet the distinguished Vice President, with all respect for him, has held that that is the pending business before the Senate—not that it is a measure, but that it is the pending business. It is not business at all. It is merely an attempt of some Senator to have some business brought up. It does not make any difference whether one Senator is trying to get it up or whether 15 or 20 or 30 or 40 Senators are trying to get it up. It is merely a motion which some Senator wishes to bring before the Senate.

My good friend the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] says we are entirely too technical. That reminds me, Mr. President, of an old friend of mine whom I met on the streets of Atlanta one morning. He said, "You know, I was about to be married to a very wealthy lady, but I lost out on a technicality."

"Well," I said, "that is too bad. What was the particular technicality to which you attribute your undoing?"

He said, "Well, the lady declined to accept me." [Laughter.]

So here we are discussing technicalities, it is said.

Mr. President, there is no technicality about it, except to determine whether the Vice President was right or wrong in his ruling.

When we go to the Senate rules—and, by the way, most of them were really inspired by Mr. Jefferson; they were the outgrowth of Mr. Jefferson's activities and his great service to his countrymen—we find that a motion is dealt with in a specific rule of the Senate itself. Rule XXI speaks of motions, deals with motions, deals with nothing else but motions.

Then we come to rule XXII, the Senate rule dealing with the precedence of motions; and then in the plainest possible language it is said that—

> If at any time a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any pending measure is presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate—

And so forth; and then the further procedure takes place as stated.

Mr. President, I know as well, I think, as anyone——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, would it be convenient for the Senator from Georgia to yield for a question at this point?

Mr. GEORGE. I shall be glad to yield; but I shall yield a little later, if the Senator will permit me to do so. It will not be very long.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator was about to leave Jefferson's Manual, so I wished to ask him a question.

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, yes. I like Mr. Jefferson.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. So do I.

Mr. GEORGE. I like to read him.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. So do I. But I am——

Mr. GEORGE. I wish the Senator——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But I ask the Senator whether he is sure he was reading from Mr. Jefferson.

Mr. GEORGE. I was reading the first section of Jefferson's Manual.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator be kind enough to tell me the page from which he was reading?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes, sir; I was reading the page following the preface, which the Senator from Wyoming read to the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Very good; was it page 297?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Was it the page beginning with the words "Mr. Onslow"?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; I read that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Did the Senator read the italics at the end of that paragraph?

Mr. GEORGE. At the end of the paragraph?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, yes; Mr. Jefferson documents his statements very well.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I take it to be——

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, no; Mr. Jefferson is here, in his "Manual of Parliamentary Practice," telling what the practice is, and is documenting it as he goes along.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator answer another question, then?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; I shall be pleased to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I ask the Senator whether he has read that portion of the preface appearing on page 293, which I read, in which Mr. Jefferson described what he was doing:

These are the words:

> Considering, therefore, the law of proceedings in the Senate as composed of the precepts of the Constitution, the regulations of the Senate, and, where these are silent, of the rules of Parliament, I have here endeavored to collect and digest so much of these

as is called for in ordinary practice, collating the parliamentary with the senatorial rules——

Mr. GEORGE. Exactly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The sentence concludes:

both where they agree and where they vary.

Mr. GEORGE. I have read that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then I ask the Senator, Does he not agree with me that the language of the paragraph beginning "Mr. Onslow" is not the composition of Thomas Jefferson but what he quoted from a parliamentary authority named and set forth in the italic?

Mr. GEORGE. No; I do not so understand it, at all.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I so understand it.

Mr. GEORGE. Now the Senator is engaging in technicalities; he is hair splitting. I most respectfully submit that Thomas Jefferson is here setting out what he regards as correct and proper parliamentary practice, and he is documenting it as he goes along. He is not drawing it out of thin air. He does not pretend to do that at any point. But I said already that out of this manual of Jefferson's has come substantially the important rules of the Senate itself.

And now, since the Senator has drawn my attention back to Thomas Jefferson, I shall read from page 326:

Where the Constitution authorizes each House to determine the rules of its proceedings, it must mean in those cases (legislative, executive, or judiciary) submitted to them by the Constitution, or in something relating to these, and necessary toward their execution.

That goes rather to the merits of some of the problems we have been considering here. I repeat, it is not a question of whether I believe in cloture or whether I oppose it, and it is not a question of whether any Senator believes in cloture or opposes it. The question here is whether the Senate has the rules, and if so, what is the fair and proper interpretation of those rules? I do not want to repeat, but I do not care a whit about the precedents of the Senate if they are not right. The fact that all the precedents point one way and not one exists that points in the direction of the ruling made by the Chair on this question, is an important fact. But, after all, if precedents are wrong, the Vice President was right in overruling them.

Now, what is there to debate about? How can an axiom be debated? How can an axiomatic truth be debated? When the cloture rule provides for cloture on a pending measure, what is there left in doubt? It cannot be a mere effort to take up a measure. It cannot be a mere motion which is in the breast of the mover which can deal with as he wishes and as he pleases. Until the Senate has done something to make it its own, the mover himself may withdraw it, present it on the succeeding day, present it on another day, and present it on every day in the session. Then what does it amount to? I answer, nothing but an effort on the part of a Senator to get up a measure, or on the part of a group of Senators to get up a special measure. Does it make any difference that a political party has endorsed those measures? To admit it is to confess the validity of everything Mr. Jefferson condemns in that sort of procedure.

Mr. President, I was about to say I think all of us are conversant with the general rule that if there is any doubt of the meaning of a word or of a phrase or any ambiguity about it, extraneous evidence may be consulted for an explanation. The debates in the Senate at the time of the adoption of rule XXII may be consulted. One may listen to what Senators had to say and to letters they may have written, or any other evidence. But is there any ambiguity? Is anybody in doubt about the plain unmistakable language of the rule with respect to pending measure? It not only must be a measure, Mr. President, but it must be pending, before cloture may be invoked. That is the rule. The great primary question is, Is this a body of law, or are our rules to be accommodated to every shifting prejudice or every temporary majority, or to the pledges of political parties? Adopt that rule, and minorities are gone in this country, and although I have never sought to speak for them, I repeat——

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield for a question?

Mr. GEORGE. Not just now. I repeat, if the hands of the minority are not constantly strengthened, we are headed toward a form of government under which minorities will not have any rights. When I came to the Senate, by the way, there were about 20 more Republicans across the aisle than there were Democrats on this side of the aisle. And I remember another day when there were about 76 Democrats on this side of the aisle, and 19 or 20 Republicans on the opposite side. Tear down the rules, disregard the rules, neglect to enforce them, and the minority has no rights left that can be protected. And any administration, with a majority back of it, can work its will.

I do not want to bring up old scores, but in 1937 when we were asked to add to the Supreme Court of the United States by legislative act, and when the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, be it said to his eternal credit, was on the same side that I felt impelled to take, I then said—and I am perfectly conscious of the fact that I was right—if that recommendation had been carried out, there would have been a change in the form of this Government within 10 years.

Tonight I say another thing: I know the distinguished Senator from Oregon has severely lectured us about appeals to fear, but sometimes it is good to take counsel of one's fears, when there is some substance in them. I say tonight, if we adopt outright majority rule in the Senate of the United States it will be easily possible to change the form and the substance of the Government within 10 years. That is not an idle statement. That is a statement which may become historically correct, and may be verified.

What is the situation in this body at this moment? Here is a rule of the Senate. Textually it provides that the cloture rule is applicable only to pending measures. The distinguished Vice President has ruled that a motion to bring up a measure, there being no business before the Senate, is within the purview of the rule. From that ruling an appeal has been taken, and the appeal will be decided by a majority vote of the Senate. There is majority rule already, without doing any more about it, if we want to disregard the established rules which were made fundamentally to protect minorities and, of course, to give the majority a chance, in an orderly way, to function, but, at the same time, to give protection to the minority. That is what I plead for; and with all respect to the distinguished Vice President and the distinguished Senators who have argued or may argue about it, Jefferson's Manual, whether Jefferson wrote it, got it out of thin air, or collected it from all of the established precedents of Old England, is the eternal rule. The minority can have protection only through the constant and faithful application, interpretation, and enforcement of the rules of the Senate. If I had any doubt about the rules, I would not have made this speech. I shall not use the old Latin phrase, but in English it means "The thing speaks for itself." If it were not literally true, true beyond all doubt, I would not have raised my voice.

The only cloture provided under existing rules is cloture on a pending measure—a measure, not a mere motion within the keeping of those who make it.

However much debate may take place and however inconvenient it may be, there is nothing to prevent the majority leader's moving to proceed with other business and, in the course of this session, coming back to any unfinished business, or any business which, at the moment, he may be unable to get before the body. So, on this plain and unmistakable language, which does not admit of extrinsic or extraneous evidence, debates, or newspaper articles—if I may so suggest to my distinguished friend from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]—there can be no question that there is no pending measure before the Senate. There was none before it last evening, and therefore the cloture rule could not possibly apply.

I do not care to go outside of what is in the RECORD, but permit me to say that I came to Congress in November 1922, when President Harding called an extra session to consider a ship-subsidy bill. Congress convened, as I remember, on approximately the 20th or 21st of November, or sometime in the latter part of November, and on the 27th day of December a distinguished Senator who is not now with us, but who was then a Senator from California, moved to proceed to the consideration of bill 13, which was then on the calendar. The Democrats met in caucus. In that caucus was the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia, the Honorable Claude Swanson, who was one of the conferees on rule XXII. Also in that caucus was the distinguished Senator from Montana, Senator Walsh, who was later appointed by President Roosevelt to be the Attorney General of the United States but who, unfortunately, died before taking office, or at least before assuming

the duties of his office. He was a very able lawyer. In the caucus was the distinguished Senator from Missouri, James Reed—and I pause here to say that at that time I doubt whether there was a more able debater in any parliamentary body on this earth than was Jim Reed, of Missouri. There were many orators, including, I think, Senator Borah, of Idaho, who excelled in oratory. But no one could say that Senator Reed was not an able debater. He was in the caucus, as I have stated, and there were other distinguished Senators there.

Reference has been made to the distinguished Senator from Georgia, the late Senator Hoke Smith. In the corridor, beyond that door, Senator Smith said that had his view prevailed in the writing of rule XXII in 1917 there would then not be open to us motions to amend the Journal of this body. But he said that his view did not prevail in the writing of the rule, or in the writing of a rule of relevancy which he wished to have made a part of that rule.

The great Senator from Montana, Tom Walsh—and he was a great Senator—went into the caucus and said, in effect: "Senators, I regret that I cannot participate with you in resisting the consideration of bill 13, but you know my views."

His views were well known.

"I have always believed in a strict and rigid cloture," or at least, since he had come to the Senate. He said he had not believed it proper to resist proceedings in the consideration of any matter which might be properly brought before the Senate.

"Therefore," he said, "I must sit here as a silent participant, so to speak, and leave it to you."

Oscar Underwood was the chairman of that caucus, and I have known few more effective legislators in my life than Oscar Underwood. One might disagree with Senator Underwood, might not adopt all his policies, but I have known few more effective legislators. He knew all about rule XXII. He favored the previous question rule. He had come from the House of Representatives. He was experienced in the proceedings in the House. But he said, "Here is the rule. So long as this rule stands and I have enough Members of the Senate to call the roll, they will not take up this measure."

Now I have named the great leaders of our party who wrote rule XXII, had to do with it, and understood its operation. It is true, they might not have thought there would be any great difficulty at any time getting a bill before the Senate. That might be true; I do not know about that; but I do know that then we outlined the procedure which we would follow, and I know that Pat Harrison sat where I am standing, and that Oscar Underwood sat in his seat on the aisle, and he made that fight, and he said to the distinguished leader of the Republican Party at that time, the late Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, from Massachusetts, that there was no need to cover up, that he and all the world knew what we were doing, that we were resisting the placing before the Senate of the particular bill to which I have referred, and he invited Senator Lodge, the then leader of the majority, to break down the opposition if he could, but that if he could not, to withdraw the motion to take up the bill.

So the debate went on and on, and in a short time Senator Lodge, after a meeting of the Republicans, said to the minority, "We recognize that we cannot break your opposition under the rule as it stands."

Is there any doubt about the rule? None whatever. Was there any doubt in the opinion of Jim Reed? None whatever. Was there any doubt in the opinion of Oscar Underwood? None whatever. Was there any doubt in the opinion of Senator Hoke Smith? None whatever. Was there any doubt in the opinion of Senator Walsh, who opposed filibuster in every form? None whatever.

But now we indulge in a doubt, and in the face of plain, unmistakable and unambiguous language a ruling is invoked from the Chair, the Chair rules, and to uphold the Chair now is really to make effective majority cloture in this body. It comes down to that, Mr. President, in actual practice.

I regret the necessity for these remarks, but I could not feel that I would fully discharge my duty if I did not say what I said in the beginning of the debate on the merits, as I thought, of some of the measures which lie back of this motion, though I may have been indulging in technicalities. I also said that this was a memorable debate in this body, and I now repeat that statement.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have not been a Member of the Senate as long as has my distinguished friend the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] or my able friend the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. It is with some hesitancy that I even attempt to answer either of these two Senators, who have enjoyed long and distinguished careers in the Senate of the United States.

I feel rather flattered that I should have made an argument last night which would cause the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] to declare in one of the able forensic efforts which he usually makes that mine was an ingenious argument offered to the Chair on the question upon which he was to make a ruling; and, taking slight advantage, I thought, of the distinguished Vice President, who was not in a position to answer, made the same remark about the ruling of the distinguished Vice President last evening. If I deserve that much attention on the part of the Senator from Michigan, who has such a reputation throughout the United States of America and the world, and cause him to do me the honor of even noticing a remark I happen to make, or the argument I made in behalf of the honest position I was taking, I am very much gratified, even though it may have been characterized as ingenious.

Mr. President, I have the highest measure of respect for the Senator from Georgia, and I deeply regret that the Senator from Georgia saw fit to say that he was shocked at a question which the Senator from Illinois propounded to the able Senator from New York this afternoon respecting the plank in the Republican platform concerning civil rights. Again I am flattered that I am able to draw to the attention of the Senator from Georgia, able and distinguished as he is.

Mr. President, I do not have the forensic ability or the persuasive power of either the Senator from Michigan or the Senator from Georgia, but certainly their eloquence should not cause me to quake or quiver, if I am to discharge my duty as I see it. I did not bring the civil-rights question into this debate. I do say to the distinguished Senator from Georgia that he has made persuasive arguments germane to the issue before the Senate of the United States, but he is not the only individual who has discussed this question, and he had better look to some of his own brethren, who raised the question of civil rights in this debate. He had better be shocked at those Senators who were the first to raise the question of civil rights upon the floor of the United States Senate.

Mr. President, this is a memorable debate. I have conscientious convictions about what ought to be done under the circumstances. I assert that no one can fairly challenge my sincerity with respect to the position I took last evening when I made an argument on the point of order. There are other Senators who have convictions as conscientious as those of others who have spoken here, about what ought to be done and what ought not to be done.

Mr. President, I consider the vote which I shall soon cast as important as any I have cast since I have been in the United States Senate. I know of no more important issue to come before the Senate of the United States or before the Congress, since I have been in the Senate than the one before us at this particular time, unless it be the question of the reorganization of the Supreme Court, which was discussed by the Senator from Georgia a few moments ago, a proposal which the Senator from Illinois, who was at that time a Member of the House of Representatives, opposed.

Mr. President, all I can do in my humble capacity as a Senator and as majority leader in the United States Senate on all these issues, is to hope that I am right, and pray that God will give me the power to see the right.

I remind the Senator from Georgia, who talks about minority groups in the Senate being protected, that there are other minority groups involved in the issue before us, who ought also to be protected. There is not a Senator on this floor who does not know what lies behind the present debate. It cannot be hidden. I am going to talk about civil rights in this debate, and that is the issue, whether Senators like it or not. Everyone knows that is the issue.

Why all the filibuster, why all the talk by my friends from the South about civil rights, if civil rights are not involved in the Hayden-Wherry resolution? Why did they not address themselves strictly to the issue, which ostensibly was a motion to proceed to the consideration of the Hayden-Wherry resolution? Because I asked a question about civil rights I am taken to task by my friend the Senator from Georgia. He is shocked.

Perhaps it is well to shock great men once in a while, Mr. President.

There is something more in this issue than merely the amendment of the rule, or we would not have had a debate here for 10 days. Ninety-nine out of 100 motions which are made are agreed to, and the measures are taken up without any debate whatsoever. Yet for 10 days we have been struggling with a simple motion to take up Senate Resolution 15. And because our great Vice President, who has been consistent and honest from the beginning, made a ruling last night that the motion was a part of the measure, a continuous step from the time the motion is made until the consummation of action, it is said that he is all wrong.

The Senator from Michigan in referring to me said that I was being ingenious. He said we are trying to eliminate by a parliamentary device precisely what the Hayden-Wherry resolution would subsequently accomplish by due legislative process.

The Senator says this is an affront to due legislative process. Is it an affront because the Vice President disagreed with the distinguished Senator from Michigan in his ruling made last year? I undertake to say to the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Michigan that they cannot point to a single precedent, where the facts and circumstances before the Senate were the same as those upon which the able Vice President made a ruling last night.

The able Senator from Georgia talks about what great men had to say back in 1917 when the cloture rule went into effect. Long debate took place, occupying 26 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Throughout all that long debate there is not a single word to suggest that any one of the 88 Senators in favor of the resolution had any belief, or any reason to believe that the rule for which they voted contained gaping loopholes, or that any of those Senators favored the rule with the understanding that it would prove to be ineffective. It was debated from beginning to end as a rule to limit debate on any matter that might come before the Senate.

George H. Haynes, in his great work, the Senate of the United States, tells us that 33 Senators—as was mentioned by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] this afternoon—33 Senators, headed by Simmons, Robinson, Lodge, and Borah, made a public pledge in the following language, which I again quote, to show the real intention of those men who were responsible for rule XXII:

> To cooperate with each other in compelling such changes in the rules of the Senate as to terminate successful filibustering and enable the majority to fix an hour for disposing of any bill or question—

Any bill or question, mind you—

> subject to the rule of 1 hour to each Senator for discussion before or after the hour is fixed.

Did these men know what they were doing when they wrote that provision? I would suppose they did. They signed that pledge with the understanding that it involved any question. Do Senators think Joe Robinson did not know what he was doing? No, Mr. President; the proof of the pudding is in that pledge.

This expressed intention of the supporters of the resolution is strangely at odds with the special interpretation placed upon the rule last year by the distinguished Senator from Michigan when he said:

> In the final analysis, the Senate has no effective cloture rule at all.

But, Mr. President, that was not the basis upon which the Senator from Michigan made his ruling last year. That was his conclusion. Based upon what? Based simply upon the fact that the pending measure at that time was the aviation bill, sponsored by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], and in his opinion he so stated; but, Mr. President, after I called attention to that fact last night, not one word did the Senator from Michigan say in his explanation to this body today as to why it was he put that issue in his opinion if it was not the real, basic, fundamental point upon which he made his decision. And he talks about somebody being ingenious in an argument. If he had wanted to make a candid explanation to the Senate in the great effort he made today, he would have explained why it was he said the following last year in his ruling:

> What is the pending measure at this moment? The pending measure is Senate bill 2644, a bill to provide for the development of civil-transport aircraft adaptable for auxiliary military service, and for other purposes. What is the purpose of the motion made by the able Senator from Nebraska, to which it is now being attempted to attach cloture? It is to create a new "pending measure." That is exactly the objective which the pending motion has in view. In the view of the Chair, in a reasonable interpretation of the English language the Chair is unable to believe otherwise than that the pending measure at this moment in the forum of the Senate is Senate bill 2644. It is not the motion of the Senator from Nebraska to proceed to the consideration of House bill 29.

That is the language of the Senator from Michigan. Why did not the Senator from Michigan, in his defense of the opinion which he rendered at that particular time, explain to Senators today, and especially to new Members of the Senate, why he wrote that into his opinion last year? Why did he not go into that subject, instead of chiding the Vice President and the Senator from Illinois for not prosecuting the appeal?

I wish to comment very briefly on one or two things which the Senator from Michigan said. He is a great parliamentarian. He made a momentous ruling last year. Many Senators who are following him now were against him last year. Many of his own colleagues on the other side of the aisle who signed their names to cloture petitions to take up the very matter which I am now discussing are now with him.

The distinguished minority leader was the Senator who presented the petition for cloture at that time, but the ruling of the Senator from Michigan has changed his view. It changed the view of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], and others who were with him on that cloture petition, for some reason or other. I never understood before that the Senator had that much power; but he does have it. He has changed the view of many of his colleagues as a result of the opinion which he rendered.

I wish to comment briefly on one point. The Senator from Michigan made much of the argument that although an appeal was taken from his ruling of last August, that appeal was never pursued in the Senate, either by the Senator from Illinois, who was the Democratic whip at that time, or the then majority leader, who is now our distinguished Vice President. That appeal, he said, was never presented to the Senate for a vote. He argues from that fact that therefore his ruling was etched that much more deeply into the precedents of the Senate. He said that it was very significant that no appeal was taken, which, in my judgment, Mr. President, is anything but a kind implication.

It is perfectly true that the Senate never voted on the appeal from the ruling of the Chair in the case of the Vandenberg ruling, but the fact that no vote was taken does not add any strength whatever to the validity of that ruling, for a very simple reason. It is strange, indeed, that my distinguished friend, who made many rulings from the Chair, did not appreciate this point when he was preparing the great address which he delivered today.

Under the parliamentary situation established immediately after the ruling of the Chair, no vote on the appeal was possible. The cloture petition was filed while a motion to proceed to the consideration of the anti-poll-tax bill was being endlessly debated. A filibuster was in progress. The cloture petition was filed in an effort to end that debate. The President pro tempore ruled that the cloture petition did not apply to the motion to proceed to the consideration of the anti-poll-tax bill.

An appeal was entered by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. But, Mr. President, that appeal, just like the motion to proceed to the consideration of the anti-poll-tax bill itself, was subject in turn to unlimited debate. The only way of shutting off debate on an appeal, as we all know, is to move to lay the appeal on the table; but that is not a motion which can logically be made by those who oppose the ruling of the Chair, since if the appeal were laid on the table the Chair would be sustained. The Senator from Michigan knows that to be so.

Do Senators think that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who took an appeal from the ruling of the Chair last night is going to make a motion to lay that appeal on the table? That is exactly what the Senator from Michigan said to the then Democratic leader, Mr. BARKLEY, or the Senator from Illinois should have done last year; but that is not a motion which can logically be made by those who oppose the ruling of the Chair, since if the appeal were laid on the table the Chair would be sustained. So those who opposed the ruling of the Chair last August had no means by which they could show their

strength and avoid the ruling of the Presiding Officer.

The truth of the matter is that at that particular time the distinguished Senator from Georgia, when this question was called up, demanded the yeas and nays, and under the parliamentary situation it was impossible for the Senator from Nebraska to withdraw his motion thereafter.

Later the Republicans held a caucus and decided that they could not break the filibuster at that time in the special session, and they withdrew.

Mr. WHERRY. We moved to take up another measure.

Mr. LUCAS. They moved to take up another measure, which is the same thing as withdrawing. At any rate, they did not pursue the matter further.

In fact, when the Presiding Officer decides against the applicability of rule XXII, the majority of the Senate is helpless to reverse him or even to get a vote of the Senate, because Senators who support the ruling of the Chair are in a position, by unlimited debate, to prevent the appeal from ever being brought to a vote. A motion to lay the appeal on the table, the only way in which debate can be shut off on an appeal, is not a motion which Senators who oppose the Chair's ruling can make, because it is directed to sustaining rather than reversing the ruling of the Chair. If the motion to lay on the table is successful, the ruling of the Chair is sustained.

It seems to me, therefore, the argument that the ruling of the Senator from Michigan is a precedent which then had the backing of the Senate disappears completely under this analysis, which is strictly in accord with parliamentary law. The Senator from Michigan can find it out tomorrow if he will consult the Parliamentarian.

I think we all understand that if there had been any way to bring the appeal to a vote at that moment, the ruling of the Presiding Officer probably would have been reversed. I am sure that Senators who signed the petition for cloture at that time would have overruled the Presiding Officer at that moment, if they had had an opportunity to vote on the question; but many of the same Senators who signed their names to the petition for cloture at that time have now reversed themselves on the identical proposition, except that this question is even clearer than the issue raised on previous cloture petitions.

I have said a little about the ingeniousness, to which the Senator from Michigan referred in his argument. I think the ingenuity is all on the other side, Mr. President. When Senator Pat Harrison, to the surprise of most Members of the Senate, undertook to filibuster the Dyer antilynching bill in 1922 by the device of endlessly debating a motion to amend the Journal, he demonstrated a very extraordinary type of parliamentary ingenuity. He had to be ingenious to find his way around the plain meaning of rule XXII.

Who was being ingenious in August 1948 when an endless debate took place on a motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill, a motion which the Senate almost invariably agrees to without any debate at all?

The debate during the last 10 days shows that those who take refuge in the so-called loopholes in the rule have resorted to the most complicated devices for distorting, in my judgment, the plain meaning of the rule.

The senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] argues that the interpretation of the rule he laid down last August is the only reasonable interpretation of the rule under the precedents, and that the integrity of the Senate rules is involved here. But last year, when he made his decision when the same question was before the Senate, he never said anything about the integrity of the Senate rules being involved. Why is the integrity of the Senate rules involved today, when it was not involved a year ago? Is it because the Vice President happened to rule a little differently? Is the integrity of the rules of the Senate involved because of that?

The fact is that other Members of the Senate with an equal knowledge of parliamentary rules and with equal respect for the Senate rules are of an entirely different opinion. It was, in fact, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], chairman of the Republican policy committee, and certainly a great constitutional scholar, who took the appeal from the decision of the Chair last August. How more vividly could he have demonstrated that he disagreed completely and fundamentally with the ruling of the President pro tempore at that time?

Mr. President, let all of us acknowledge that there are honest differences of opinion on this issue and on many other parliamentary issues. It does not behoove any of us to assume that his position is unanswerable, and that those who oppose him are merely being ingenious in their opposition. No Member of this body has a deeper respect for the rules of the Senate than does the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I shall yield in a moment.

Mr. President, where do the Senate rules come from? They do not come from Mount Olympus. They do not come as edicts from on high. They come from the minds of men like ourselves. Under the Constitution, the Senate of the United States makes its own rules; and when Senators undertake to sign one cloture petition after another, we have a right to believe at least that they knew what they were doing at that time and that they were sincere in signing those cloture petitions.

Now I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan in his address today laid considerable emphasis upon the fact that last August an appeal was not prosecuted, although taken by the Senator from Ohio to the ruling of the President pro tempore. Had an appeal from what might be considered an unfavorable ruling of the Chair—that is, a ruling that rule XXII did not apply to a motion to take up—been made, is it not a fact that such an appeal would have been subject to unlimited debate?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Florida is correct, and that is exactly what I said a moment ago. There can be no question at all about that. The Senator from Michigan can find that out, if he will consult the Parliamentarian upon that matter tomorrow. That is exactly the situation.

Mr. President, does anyone believe that the Senator from Georgia, who today took issue with the decision of the Chair, is going to make a motion to lay the appeal upon the table? Today we are confronted with a situation exactly the reverse of the situation which existed 7 months ago, yet the Senator from Michigan lays great stress on the point that no one made such a motion at that time. That is the most fallacious argument I have heard in a considered opinion for a long, long time.

Mr. President, let me make one or two other statements which I think should be made in the course of this debate, notwithstanding what my good friend the Senator from Georgia has said.

I believe it is high time to clear away the fog of confusion which has surrounded this debate. I am going straight to the heart of the matter. Regardless of whether anyone likes it or does not like it, I am going to be plain and honest about this situation. Some can hide it if they wish to do so, but everyone knows why this rule was brought up. Everyone knows why this filibuster is on. If the civil-rights program were not involved, there would not be any filibuster here at the present time. So why hide it? Why try to say that nothing but a rule is involved, when other Senators have talked for days on the floor of the Senate about the FEPC and the anti-poll-tax bill and the antilynching bill?

Everyone knows that the basic question we are discussing here is not simply a question of a change in the Senate rules. First, it is a question of whether we mean to breathe life into the cloture rule, so that we can get along with the business of the Senate of the United States, instead of remaining here days and nights debating a simple motion to take up this measure. How ridiculous it is, Mr. President, when one thinks about it. What a spectacle we are making in the eyes of the people of this country. Yet there are Senators who wish to have the Senate remain in continuous session for weeks; in fact, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] has said he wishes to have the Senate stay in session for a month or perhaps 6 weeks or more, day and night, in order to break the filibuster; and yet he does not know for certain whether he is in favor of the Hayden-Wherry resolution. Mr. President, what shall we say of that?

The question whether we mean to breathe life into the cloture rule involves the question of clearing away the legalistic interpretations of the rule which in the past have defeated its fundamental purpose. It is a question of whether parliamentary government, now

under attack all over the world, can survive in this country. So long as a determined minority can block the Senate from taking imperative action on the domestic and international fronts, to my way of thinking this matter cannot be long delayed. In my studied judgment, it is a threat to the democratic process of the Nation.

If the Senate will take the steps necessary to bring to a close the debate on this motion, Mr. President, if the Senate will sustain the ruling of the Chair which was made last night, we shall have an opportunity to prove how sincere we were when we made the civil-rights pledges in the 1948 platforms of both political parties.

It is a question of whether we are going to enact a Federal law against lynching, and a Federal law on poll taxes, and a Federal law to protect all races from discrimination by unfair restrictions in employment.

The distinguished Senators who are conducting this filibuster have made no bones about their objectives. They are fighting our motion to apply cloture because they are determined to block any consideration of civil-rights laws in this Congress. They have said it over and over again.

There is an honest division of opinion in my party over civil rights. The whole country is well aware of the fact that we had a heated argument on this question at the last Democratic National Convention. The issue was brought to a vote, and a large majority of the delegates at that convention pledged my party to action in that field. How shall we get civil-rights action if we do not get it in the Congress of the United States? How are we going to get it if Senators can filibuster forever upon a motion to take up a simple resolution? Why is it so wrong for United States Senators to talk about this issue, Mr. President, when everyone knows that that is the real basis of this situation? Why should anyone be shocked?

As I have said, there is an honest division of opinion, and the whole country is well aware of it. I completely disagree with the able southern Senators, my friends, who have refused to abide by the majority decision of the Democratic Party. However, they are entitled to the utmost respect for their deep sincerity and their tenacity in defense of their position. There cannot be any question about that. When the cloture issue comes to a vote, I am confident that my Republican friends on the other side of the aisle will demonstrate as much sincerity and strength and tenacity in upholding the Chair as the Democratic friends of mine from the South are doing in maintaining their position. We who defend a common position should all be together upon this issue. I wonder if we are?

Mr. President, many of my Republican colleagues now in the Senate have already indicated by their signatures on cloture petitions and by their votes how they stand on this issue. I want to take this opportunity of congratulating and commending every Senator on the Republican side of the aisle who has worked to obtain signatures to the petition for cloture, and who has tried to convince some of his friends that they ought to sustain the Chair in his ruling, as the first step to break up this filibuster. I pay tribute to the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and other Senators who have worked indefatigably along with the Senator from Illinois and others in an attempt to do something to choke off the long-winded debate that has taken place on matters wholly irrelevant and immaterial to the issue before the Senate.

On February 4, 1946, 17 Republican Senators signed a cloture petition to close debate on a motion affecting the Journal, in order to proceed with a bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry. I think they will not object if I read their names into the RECORD, because many of the same men who signed that cloture petition then are now fighting to cut off this endless speechmaking and get down to the business of the United States Senate. They were the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. That cloture petition was filed while the Journal was under consideration. They thought cloture was so important, they would have shut off debate on the consideration of the Journal. They are all able men, all experienced and seasoned veterans in the Senate, who signed the cloture petition at that particular time.

On August 2, 1948, 17 Republican Senators, including some who had signed before, placed their names on a petition to end debate on a motion to take up a bill outlawing poll taxes. Here are the names: The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. Did they mean what they said at that time?

The following 24 Senators signed either one or the other of these petitions. Let me state who they are: The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

Now, let us compare this list of 24 with the list of Republican names on the present cloture petition. Some who signed the earlier petition have not undertaken to sign this one. Let us see who they are. I will read their names: The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

Mr. President, I have tried to understand the apparent reluctance of these Senators to sign the present petition. Two interpretations of their position have been suggested to me; one is that they oppose the adoption of the Hayden-Wherry resolution and therefore are prepared to have the filibuster run on endlessly. That is their position, and obviously I shall respect it, if it is. I must regretfully conclude that they are opposed to civil-rights legislation, which cannot be enacted, as everyone knows, without an effective rule to prevent a stubborn minority from thwarting the will of the Senate.

If that interpretation is wrong, and I am eager to be convinced that it is, the only other interpretation of their position which makes sense is that while they favor the resolution to give the Senate an effective cloture rule, they are more concerned with keeping the Senate in a position where it cannot act on the resolution, or on any other legislation now crying for action.

To each of these distinguished Senators I wish to speak very frankly across party lines. Knowing them as I do, I cannot believe they are taking a cynical or hypocritical position on this matter. Have I not the right to conclude that when they signed the petitions for limitation of debate under rule XXII of the

Senate, they knew what they were doing? I am sure they were not merely making gestures for the benefit of the public. I am sure they were asking for cloture because they were honestly convinced that rule XXII could be effective in bringing debate to an end, and that we could then enact civil-rights legislation.

Before they vote on the present issues which have occupied us for so many days, I urge them to follow the logic of their actions in 1946 and 1948, when they signed cloture petitions. Surely they will not bewilder the people by declaring they were wrong in 1946 and 1948, and are now bound to take refuge in a special interpretation of the Senate rule handed down by the distinguished Senator from Michigan. He merely wanted them to make up their own minds and use their own judgment. I know they are not ostriches, that they are not sticking their heads in the sands of parliamentary interpretation. I am sure they understood the parliamentary history of rule XXII when they put their names to the petitions.

I know they do not wish to seek to avoid their personal responsibility by pleading blind loyalty to a former Presiding Officer, the great Senator from Michigan. He has already declared he does not desire any Senator to vote out of a sense of loyalty to him or out of any pride of party.

We all know when issues come to a vote in the Senate the ultimate responsibility in every case rests with each individual Senator. Members of the Senate make the rules, not the man who happens to be in the chair as their Presiding Officer. The Presiding Officer simply gives form to our decisions. We are the ones solely responsible for the rules under the Constitution. We cannot escape that grave responsibility by taking refuge in a ruling of the Presiding Officer.

We are the supreme court, Mr. President. We bow to no one in the formulation and interpretation of the rules. If the proposed enactment of the civil-rights program is one of the reasons for the filibuster, and, in view of the fact that the senior Senator from Michigan last week saw fit to quote the Democratic platform upon civil rights in the course of the debate, I think it well at this juncture that the Republican platform on civil rights should also be quoted, because no one is deluded in this debate into believing that civil rights is not the issue here. Here is what they said:

> Lynching or any other form of mob violence anywhere is a disgrace to any civilized State, and we favor the prompt enactment of legislation to end this infamy.
>
> One of the basic principles of this Republic is the equality of all individuals in their right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This principle is enunciated in the Declaration of Independence and embodied in the Constitution of the United States; it was vindicated on the field of battle and became the cornerstone of this Republic. This right of equal opportunity to work and to advance in life should never be limited in any individual because of race, religion, color, or country of origin. We favor the enactment and just enforcement of such Federal legislation as may be necessary to maintain this right at all times in every part of this Republic.
>
> We favor the abolition of the poll tax as a requisite to voting.

That is the platform adopted unanimously by the Republicans in convention at Philadelphia. We did not get a unanimous endorsement in our convention, Mr. President, but we who favor civil-rights legislation won, just the same. I know that Republican Senators welcome the opportunity to measure up to those noble words that were expressed in that convention on the question of civil rights, and for the first time they have the opportunity to say whether or not they meant what they said by sustaining the Vice President. They cannot convince the people of the country anywhere that they rested their position on a technicality in the United States Senate.

When Senators return home the people will ask, "How did you vote? Did your vote to stop the filibuster, or did you vote to continue it?" The people will not listen to any explanation of technicalities and Jefferson's manual.

[Laughter in the galleries.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The occupants of the galleries will be in order.

Mr. LUCAS. I know Senators will not tell the people that they voted to keep the filibuster going. They cannot afford to do that. Many Senators are coming up for reelection in 1950. A political issue broader than the technical issue is involved here.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I decline to yield at this time. I am afraid the Senator from New Hampshire will ask me about frogs. I cannot yield now.

I remember, Mr. President, that on one occasion I had a conversation with the great and distinguished Senator from Arizona, former Senator Ashurst, upon this very question. He said, "I have yet to meet the first man who does not permit his political opinions to be interwoven with his technical, economic, and every other kind of opinion that he expresses in the United States Senate."

No, Mr. President, I know Senators will not tell the people that they had to override a ruling of our distinguished Vice President because they were driven by motives of partisan pride. They were very eager to get a resolution to amend the rules released from the Committee on Rules and Administration. Thirty-one Senators took the very unusual step of supporting a motion in the Senate to discharge the committee from further consideration of a rules change.

Ah, Mr. President, I know of many Senators who have been cooperating with me in connection with this legislation on this side of the aisle. They have done every possible thing they could do to convince the Republican Members to go along and stop this filibuster. But they will not be successful. They will permit it to go on. Some Senators want it to go on; they do not want it stopped.

Here are the names of the Senators who voted to discharge the committee, none of whom signed the cloture petition. They were so anxious to have the rule reported from the committee, so they could get civil-rights legislation to the floor, that they tried to discharge the committee almost before it began its hearings. They are: BRICKER, BRIDGES, CAIN, CAPEHART, CORDON, GURNEY, HICKENLOOPER, MALONE, MARTIN, SCHOEPPEL, VANDENBERG, WHERRY, WILEY, WILLIAMS, and YOUNG.

Some Republican Senators told the press and the public that they were extremely anxious to obtain action on civil-rights legislation. I know that they are still eager to do so. I know that they will follow the chairman of the Republican Policy Committee, the senior Senator from Ohio, who has declared that he will vote for a change in the rules so as to assure consideration of civil-rights legislation.

Mr. President, it was the distinguished Senator from Ohio who sensed the narrow interpretation made by the Senator from Michigan of the word "measure" a year ago. I shall never forget the occasion when the Senator from Ohio rose and said, "Mr. President, I take an appeal from the decision of the Chair." Yet, the Senator from Michigan chided the Vice President and the majority leader for not anticipating the action of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. President, the issue is now crystal clear in the eyes of the people. Our votes will be entered upon the RECORD, and the people will know whether or not we have kept our pledges. They will find out whether we mean what we say on this vote. They will find out whether or not the platforms of the Democratic Party and the Republican Party mean anything on the first opportunity we have to cast a vote.

When the people come to make their judgment in future elections, they will not ask whether we voted to sustain or repudiate a ruling of the Vice President; they will only ask, "Were you for or against ending filibusters in the United States Senate?"

Mr. President, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the Chair put the question.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Illinois to lay on the table the appeal of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] from the ruling of the Chair.

The motion is not debatable.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	McCarthy
Baldwin	Gurney	McFarland
Brewster	Hayden	McGrath
Bricker	Hendrickson	McKellar
Bridges	Hickenlooper	McMahon
Butler	Hill	Magnuson
Byrd	Hoey	Malone
Cain	Holland	Maybank
Capehart	Humphrey	Miller
Chapman	Hunt	Millikin
Chavez	Ives	Morse
Connally	Jenner	Mundt
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Donnell	Johnson, Tex.	Myers
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Downey	Kefauver	O'Conor
Eastland	Kem	O'Mahoney
Ecton	Kerr	Pepper
Ellender	Kilgore	Reed
Ferguson	Knowland	Robertson
Flanders	Langer	Russell
Frear	Lodge	Saltonstall
Fulbright	Long	Schoeppel
George	Lucas	Smith, Maine
Gillette	McCarran	Smith, N. J.

Sparkman	Thomas, Utah	Wherry
Stennis	Thye	Wiley
Taft	Tydings	Withers
Taylor	Vandenberg	Young
Thomas, Okla.	Watkins	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] to lay on the table the appeal taken by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] from the ruling of the Chair on yesterday in regard to the filing of the cloture petition.

Mr. RUSSELL and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the present occupant of the Chair, the Vice President, state for the benefit of all Senators the effect of the vote to be taken? If a Senator votes to lay the motion on the table, he votes to sustain the Vice President in his decision, does he not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. A vote to lay the appeal on the table is a vote to sustain the Chair. A vote not to lay the appeal on the table has the opposite effect.

Mr. WHERRY. That is as I understand it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GILLETTE (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent. I am advised that if he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote I should vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. MURRAY (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] who is absent by leave of the Senate on the sad mission of burying his son, whose remains have just been returned from North Africa. If the Senator from Arkansas were present he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "aye," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate and is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business and is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], who is absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would vote "yea," and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 46, as follows:

YEAS—41

Aiken	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Baldwin	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Kilgore	Pepper
Chavez	Knowland	Saltonstall
Douglas	Lodge	Smith, Maine
Downey	Lucas	Smith, N. J.
Ferguson	McCarthy	Taft
Flanders	McGrath	Taylor
Frear	McMahon	Thomas, Okla.
Green	Magnuson	Thomas, Utah
Hendrickson	Miller	Tydings
Humphrey	Morse	Wiley
Hunt	Myers	Withers
Ives	Neely	

NAYS—46

Bricker	Hayden	Maybank
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Butler	Hill	Mundt
Byrd	Hoey	Reed
Cain	Holland	Robertson
Capehart	Jenner	Russell
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Sparkman
Cordon	Kem	Stennis
Donnell	Kerr	Thye
Eastland	Langer	Vandenberg
Ecton	Long	Watkins
Ellender	McCarran	Wherry
Fulbright	McFarland	Young
George	McKellar	
Gurney	Malone	

NOT VOTING—8

Anderson	Martin	Wagner
Gillette	Murray	Williams
McClellan	Tobey	

So Mr. LUCAS' motion to lay on the table Mr. RUSSELL's appeal from the decision of the Chair was rejected.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. By reason of the fact that tomorrow is Saturday, would the Senator please, if he can, announce for the Senate what his intentions are respecting the sessions for tomorrow and tomorrow night? The reason I ask that is this: As minority leader, I felt, when the debate started, that we should keep the Senate in session and attempt to bring the Wherry-Hayden resolution to a vote.

[Cries of "No!" "No!" "No!"]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not want to suggest a program, but I do feel it would be helpful to Senators on this side of the aisle to know what are the intentions of the majority leader.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois give heed to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. LUCAS. I will take it under consideration.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator tell us whether——

Mr. LUCAS. I will tell the Senator the program before we finish. Some Senator asked me to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. LUCAS. On that I ask for the yeas and nays, Mr. President.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, is not the question debatable?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question on the appeal is debatable.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the distinguished Senator from Illinois desires to proceed tonight I shall claim the floor and address myself to the appeal.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois had started to make a motion to recess until some time.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator from Georgia will yield——

Mr. RUSSELL. I will yield, Mr. President, if it does not affect my rights to the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Well, the Senator has not made a speech yet on the appeal. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I will say to the Senate that what I propose to do is to take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock. I expected to make the motion to recess at the proper time. I do not expect to detain the Senate much longer tonight.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair should state that at whatever time the Senate resumes its session after recess the appeal will be the matter before the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, upon further consideration, I am perfectly willing to proceed to a vote on the appeal at this time, if the Senate desires to vote.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. LUCAS. Let us vote and get it out of the way. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate? Those who favor the decision of the Chair standing as the judgment of the Senate will vote "yea." Those who oppose will vote "nay." The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GILLETTE (when his name was called). Mr. President, I make the same announcement as I did on the former vote, respecting my pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. I am informed that if the Senator from New York were present he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. MURRAY (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], who is absent by leave of the Senate on a sad mission to bury his son, whose remains have just been brought to this country from north Africa. If the Senator from Arkansas were present he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea," and

the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate and is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business and is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], who is absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would vote "yea" and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 46, as follows:

YEAS—41

Aiken	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Baldwin	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Kilgore	Pepper
Chavez	Knowland	Saltonstall
Douglas	Lodge	Smith, Maine
Downey	Lucas	Smith, N. J.
Ferguson	McCarthy	Taft
Flanders	McGrath	Taylor
Frear	McMahon	Thomas, Okla.
Green	Magnuson	Thomas, Utah
Hendrickson	Miller	Tydings
Humphrey	Morse	Wiley
Hunt	Myers	Withers
Ives	Neely	

NAYS—46

Bricker	Hayden	Maybank
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Butler	Hill	Mundt
Byrd	Hoey	Reed
Cain	Holland	Robertson
Capehart	Jenner	Russell
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Sparkman
Cordon	Kem	Stennis
Donnell	Kerr	Thye
Eastland	Langer	Vandenberg
Ecton	Long	Watkins
Ellender	McCarran	Wherry
Fulbright	McFarland	Young
George	McKellar	
Gurney	Malone	

NOT VOTING—8

Anderson	Martin	Wagner
Gillette	Murray	Williams
McClellan	Tobey	

So the ruling of the Chair was not sustained.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared relative to the pending question.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, this debate has resulted in some very fine arguments on both sides of the issue. I have listened with profit and pleasure to such arguments. I want to briefly state my own conclusions in the matter.

1. The Senate is, of course, master of its own rule making.

2. In view of the changed geography and politics on this globe, it would appear, considering all the factors, that the word "measure" might well be interpreted to mean bill, resolution, motion, and any other legislative activity of the Senate.

3. In reaching this conclusion, I am not oblivious of the arguments made for the limited interpretation of the meaning of the word "measure."

4. Changing conditions sometimes require new rules or new interpretations. In following this suggestion, we have to make sure that we do not make rules that permit unthought-through action to damage the general welfare.

5. The legal conclusion reached by my distinguished associate, Senator VANDENBERG, no one can find fault with; and no one can find fault with the difference in opinion of the Members of this Senate. The logic or motivation or the activating factor in one mind may be dissimilar from the logic, the motive, or the activation in another human mind.

6. The important thing is that we maintain an adequate check and balance in Government and in each division of Government. The Senate itself must make sure that its rules operate equitably, but, above all, that such rules operate to the public welfare.

7. Therefore, rule XXII should be changed in accordance with Senate Resolution 15, which is ready for action, but I would amend this resolution so that there would be not only a proviso that when two-thirds of the Senate vote for closing of debate, it shall be applicable to all measures, motions, and legislative actions of the Senate but a provision that such resolution does not apply to the Senate rule. In such a case the right to filibuster shall be retained.

8. Now, what does this mean? It means that when and if two-thirds of the Senate have reached the conclusion on any such measure, motion, etc., that the debate should be closed, that a speedy vote on the measure will be had. It means further that if there should be an attempt at any time by less than two-thirds to close debate, that the rest of the Senators who will not have voted for closing debate, will not be shut off from continuing the same. It means also that if there should be an attempt at any time to change rule XXII from two-thirds to a greater or lesser number, that cloture can never be effective.

9. I feel this is a reasonable approach to this situation. The Senate must not strangle itself so that it becomes ineffective, neither must it strangle the rights of the minority. Rather, it must make sure that the rights of the majority and the rights of the minority are maintained. The principal purpose of the Senate is in the field of legislation. This does not mean simply passing measures—it means not passing faulty proposed legislation, as well as passing constructive laws.

10. It also means that the Senate is a forum for reason and logic where men of different economic, social, political, religious, racial, and geographic backgrounds will have ample opportunity to reason things out and meet on some constructive compromise basis. It means also that men with this diversity of background will have an opportunity to operate as a check and balance on each other so that neither excess nor stalemate will be the rule of this body. It means also that here is the forum for the clarification of issues, so that the people will not be confused with a lot of irrelevant matters, and that ample opportunity will be given for the clarification of every significant measure or issue pending in the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS obtained the floor.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, would the distinguished majority leader be willing to answer a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. BALDWIN. I noticed from his remarks that the majority leader laid great stress upon the fact that the Republican Party was pledged to a civil-rights program in its platform, and he appeals for Republican support. The Republican Party has no mandate in this election in any way, shape, or manner. I call attention to the fact that we have been reminded of that not once, but many, many times. The question which I wish to ask the majority leader is this: Does he intend to go forward now and debate the question of the change in the rules until we have a decision on it, or is he of a mind to lay it aside and take up something else?

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not believe that I have to give the Senator from Connecticut a quick answer on that question. We are going to meet tomorrow at noon. That ought to be satisfactory. If the Senator from Connecticut would like to meet a little earlier, I can accommodate him in this respect. I think when I get around to it I shall probably make a motion to take a recess until tomorrow at noon, as we have been doing.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

Mr. LUCAS. I do not think the Senator from Connecticut is critical. I hope he is not critical.

Mr. BALDWIN. Let me say to my distinguished friend that I am not critical. I have supported his position throughout.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate it very much.

Mr. BALDWIN. I have done so with the utmost sincerity. I have supported the ruling of the Chair in two votes. I have announced my intention, as have many other Republican Members, of supporting the change in the rules. I may say to my distinguished friend that many other Republican Members have taken the position that if they had an opportunity to do so they would vote to amend the rule. That is the position of the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and he made it crystal clear.

I merely wish to make this observation to my friend: In my mind there will be a feeling that there is an utter lack of sincerity in his position unless he now manifests his intention, or tomorrow manifests his intention, to go through with this matter until we come to a vote, if it takes night sessions all next week and the week following. That is my purpose in asking the question. I should like to know if we are going through with this thing to the end, because many of us have taken a very sincere and positive stand, and we want to see the question settled.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I can only say to my distinguished friend that I think he will agree with me that up to this point the Senator from Illinois, as majority leader, has done about everything that could be done within reason. We have this decision. Twenty-three Republicans voted against us. Had we had those 23 Republicans with us, we would now be much further along than we are.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, may I interrupt my friend a moment to say——

Mr. LUCAS. Just a moment——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, the Senator can yield only for a question, not for a statement.

Mr. LUCAS. I am speaking, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator does not have to yield; but if he yields, he can yield only for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, have I the floor?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Presiding Officer.

I do not know what my strategy is going to be. I do not believe that a good leader ever takes all the responsibility. I think a good leader is one who is led by his people. I intend to consult with a number of my friends on this side of the aisle. The Senator from Connecticut is very anxious, as I notice my distinguished friend the minority leader is, to get into the RECORD the statement that he wants all-night sessions. All the minority leader had to do was simply to vote with us.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, my name has been mentioned. I ask the Senator to yield at this point.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. LUCAS. I have not yet finished my statement.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me? I yielded to him a while ago.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois has not yielded, and cannot be interrupted. If he yields, he can yield only for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. Please give me a chance. We were defeated on the last vote. I do not yet know exactly what we are going to do, but we are going to control the situation on this side of the aisle. If we make a move in the direction suggested by the Senator from Connecticut, I know that he will be with us day and night, for weeks and months, if necessary. I know that he will bring a cot here——

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President——

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just one more question?

Mr. LUCAS. I know that the Senator from Connecticut will bring his cot here and sleep for weeks and weeks in order to break up the filibuster.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I shall not speak for weeks. I merely want the Senator to yield to me for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am delighted.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield for a question. I do not yield for a speech. I want to get the Senate away from here. The newspapermen are becoming tired.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I ask the Senator if his doubt about his future procedure is as firmly founded as was his question to me a while ago as to why I signed the cloture petition——

Mr. LUCAS. There is utterly no comparison between the two.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am glad the Senator so anticipated me that he could answer the question before I finished asking it.

Mr. LUCAS. I am surprised that the Senator would ask such a question at this point.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MYERS addressed the Chair.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I am sure the majority leader realizes that our sincerity has been questioned.

Mr. LUCAS. Oh, yes; I know that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair rules that the Senator from Pennsylvania cannot interrupt the Senator from Illinois to make a statement. He can only ask a question.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, does the Senator from Illinois recognize that many on the other side of the aisle have questioned our sincerity in this whole debate?

Mr. LUCAS. They certainly have, by implication. [Laughter.]

Mr. MYERS. Does the Senator from Illinois recall that on yesterday a question was addressed to me by the Senator from New York, during the course of which he stated that the Republican Party at its convention in Philadelphia voted unanimously for a civil-rights plank?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is eminently correct.

Mr. MYERS. And does the Senator from Illinois believe that the vote which was just had is the only vote we may have on civil-rights legislation?

Mr. LUCAS. I think there is a very good possibility that it is the only vote we may have.

Mr. MYERS. Does the Senator from Illinois know that 23 Republicans voted to override the Chair on that vote? I would say, then, Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator cannot make a speech; he can only ask a question.

Mr. MYERS. Does not the majority leader then think that that is the test of one's sincerity?

Mr. LUCAS. I am not going to question——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois renew his motion that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does the Senator from Illinois know how many of those who have adherence to the policy of President Truman voted against sustaining the President of the Senate?

Mr. LUCAS. Quite a few.

RECESS

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. WHERRY, Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. CHAVEZ, and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate, and is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—46

Byrd	Hunt	Miller
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Myers
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	O'Conor
Downey	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Eastland	Kerr	Pepper
Eaton	Kilgore	Robertson
Ellender	Long	Russell
Frear	Lucas	Sparkman
Fulbright	McCarran	Stennis
George	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Green	McGrath	Thomas, Utah
Hayden	McKellar	Tydings
Hill	McMahon	Withers
Hoey	Magnuson	
Holland	Maybank	

NAYS—38

Aiken	Gurney	Mundt
Baldwin	Hendrickson	Neely
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Schoeppel
Bricker	Humphrey	Smith, Maine
Bridges	Ives	Smith, N. J.
Butler	Jenner	Taft
Cain	Kem	Taylor
Capehart	Knowland	Thye
Chavez	Langer	Vandenberg
Cordon	Lodge	Watkins
Donnell	Malone	Wherry
Ferguson	Millikin	Young
Flanders	Morse	

NOT VOTING—11

Anderson	Martin	Wagner
Gillette	Reed	Wiley
McCarthy	Saltonstall	Williams
McClellan	Tobey	

So the motion was agreed to; and (at 10 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Saturday, March 12, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MARCH 11, 1949

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m., and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. MCCORMACK.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou who art the good Shepherd, who leads us into pastures of love by the still waters of restful quietness, waken in our waiting souls the peace of those who put their trust in Thee, who can live and serve in the midst of difficult problems.

For the facing of this hour give us a searching light that we may step fearlessly into the trackless ways of an unknown future. We ask not for ease, nor for the approval of men, but for Thy blessing upon every task. We pray Thee to merge our courage and our motives into Thine own will, that they may be forceful for good and uprightness. For our Redeemer's sake we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COMMISSIONED OFFICERS OF THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2572) to extend to commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey the provisions of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RIEHLMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include two editorials and two articles relating to a statement made by the Honorable KENNETH B. KEATING with respect to social security.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials on the reduction of excise taxes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a radio debate on the President's health program in which I participated. The Public Printer estimates the cost to be $230.75, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by George S. Benson. This is a new one on me. It is entitled "If Ever This Nation Needed an Economy-Minded Congress, It Is Now."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a magazine article.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. DENTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in connection with a bill he is introducing today.

Mr. NELSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution received from the City Council of the City of Auburn, Maine.

Mr. PATTEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

Mrs. DOUGLAS asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in five instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make today in the Committee of the Whole and include certain correspondence.

Mr. CLEVENGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two excerpts from newspapers.

Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. FERNANDEZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the Secretary of the Interior and a letter from the President of the United States with respect to the rehabilitation of the Navajo Reservation.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Post on the Butter Trust bill reported from the Committee on Agriculture, commonly called the oleo bill. It is not an oleo bill but a Butter Trust bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (H. R. 3347) to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and that members of that committee desiring to file minority views may have until the same time to file their report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 46) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That JOHN KEE, of West Virginia, be, and he is hereby, elected chairman of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Foreign Affairs.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, in each to include letters and newspaper articles.

HOUSING AND RENT CONTROL, 1949

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1731) to extend certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 1731, with Mr. GORE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

THE MOST POWERFUL MAN IN AMERICA TODAY

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, Woodrow Wilson had his Colonel House; Herbert Hoover was big enough to be his own man; F. D. R. had a succession of advisors, only two of whom—Justice Frankfurter and Judge Rosenman—lasted throughout Roosevelt's 12-year reign; now President Truman has his Leon Keyserling, the most powerful man in America today, and the most dangerous man in America today.

Leon Keyserling, as President Truman's economic adviser, is the author of the President's so-called Fair Deal, the architect of Truman's bold new world program, and the father of the concept now dubbed the welfare state. The idea of Government owned and operated steel plants is Keyserling's, and the social-welfare program now before Congress in the form of bills to extend and liberalize social security and to establish socialized medicine is another of his brain children. This social-welfare program will cost $20,000,000,000 per year when in full operation and will involve a pay-roll tax of 15 to 20 percent.

Who is this Leon Keyserling, and upon what red meat doth he feed? Because he has a passion for anonymity and directs the administration show from behind the scenes, not one American citizen in ten thousand has ever even heard of him.

Mr. Chairman, Leon Keyserling graduated from the Harvard Law School in 1931 and was hired immediately by the New Deal as an economist. He worked for the AAA for awhile; then helped draft the NIRA, the NLRA, the Railway Retirement Act, the Social Security Act, the Wagner Act, and other laws relating to public housing and public works. He then became chief counsel for USHA and helped draft the full-employment bill. Keyserling did all this while still an inexperienced youngster right out of school, without any actual experience in either the business world or the industrial world. Mr. Keyserling is only 40 years old, yet because of his influence with President Truman he is the most powerful and the most dangerous man in America today.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Obviously a

quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 25]

Bailey	Hart	Poulson
Blatnik	Jennings	Powell
Bonner	Karst	Richards
Buckley, N. Y.	Kennedy	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Bulwinkle	Kirwan	Short
Burke	Klein	Smith, Ohio
Byrne, N. Y.	Kruse	Somers
Celler	Lucas	Staggers
Chiperfield	McMillan, S. C.	Thomas, N. J.
Coffey	Macy	Wadsworth
Cole, N. Y.	Moulder	Whitaker
Davis, Tenn.	Murphy	Wigglesworth
Dawson	Norrell	Willis
DeGraffenried	Norton	Wood
Dingell	O'Konski	
Gathings	O'Toole	
Gilmer	Pfeiffer, William L.	
Hall, Leonard W.	Phillips, Calif.	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. GORE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1731), and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called when 378 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

Accordingly the Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON].

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, in order that I may make my position completely clear, let me state that I come from a normally democratic city and an industrial district with far more tenants than landlords. I came here 2 years ago realizing that we had to have an orderly release from rent control. I still believe that, but I cannot vote for this bill in its present form.

I should like to call attention to a few cases to illustrate just what is happening in my district.

An old colored woman, who can no longer support herself, with the aid of an FHA loan, plus her own funds, built a small home in 1945. Her payments for the home, furniture, some wiring, and so forth, amounted to $38.50 a month. Shortly after that she lost her health and could no longer support herself. First, she tried to rent the home and the OPA said, "Go ahead and rent it. When you and the tenant get together, we will come out and pass on it." She rented it for $32 a month, although her payments were $38.50. The OPA came out and cut that to $20 a month. So she was obliged to sell the property. She retained a portion of the lot next door with a garage, which she fixed up so that she and her grandchildren could live in it. She was soon forced to find some income, so she sold this lot and used the proceeds as a down payment on some rental property. She fixed up the porch on this property which she acquired so that she could live there herself. She knew nothing about the fact that the property had been registered. She furnished those rooms that had for some time been unfurnished, and rented the property. Then it was discovered some time later that the property had been registered, and the rooms that she was renting out by the week she was told she could get only $6 a month for, plus 5 percent, or $6.30. The tenants are suing her for $494, which she does not have in her possession. She left Louisville the day before yesterday with $2 of her own money and $10 which she had borrowed, in order to go to the regional office in Cleveland, Ohio, to plead her case. I hope she has had good luck.

There is a case of a 76-year-old widow, Mrs. George Phillips, of 2247 Date Street, in Louisville, Ky. Her husband died 22 years ago. She has made her living by renting a portion of her home to others. For this she received $13 per week. Everything was furnished. During the war the linens wore out. She was unable to replace them. She was required to cut the rent to $12 a week. She has never been able to get it increased.

Her budget for food today is $2.25 a week. She is a woman who has never been the object of charity and who owns her own property. Her tenants, a family of three, admit they are paying cheap rent. Her total remainder, after her direct expenses, is $28 per month for taxes, insurance, repairs, fuel, renewal of furniture, food, and all her personal requirements.

Tenants in my district are suffering under this law. Here is a picture of a property in which 22 people were living and the return to the owner of the property was $169.85 per month after direct expenses only. This is a picture of the property taken only a short time ago. The building is being torn down. The owner has leased the property. I wish I had a copy of the lease to show you, but the owner signed a 5-year lease, renting the ground, only the ground, as a parking lot, for $225 a month, while he received $169 a month for this property and gave shelter to 22 people in my community. He will get more money. He will no longer pay taxes on the building. The city is worse off, the tenants are worse off, the owner is worse off. I do not know where it leads us. It certainly is not contributing toward a healthy supply-and-demand situation when we prevent any rental vacancies from developing, by the administrative rent-control program. We have heard a lot in the last 3 or 4 months about a mandate; if it is a mandate that a colored grandmother in my district who has never been an object of charity shall now become an object of charity; that a 76-year-old woman who has been a widow for 22 years and has lived off of the income from the modest home which her husband left her, has now been reduced to $2.25 a week for her own food; if that is the mandate, so be it. If loyalty to that mandate means my continuance in this body, I can sell apples.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORTON. I yield.

Mr. MULTER. Is it not a fact that in Louisville, Ky., which I think is in the gentleman's district, 18,000 families are living doubled up; approximately 3,000 families are on an active list awaiting temporary accommodations in a project that houses only 567 families?

Mr. MORTON. Yes; I think those figures were submitted. I have some reason to doubt them. The reason for lack of vacancies, of course, is just what I have been pointing out here, that we have torn down so much of our property that we no longer have any facilities available for these people. It so happens that of the 22 who moved out of this building last week and the week before, all but one of them have found new quarters.

Mr. MULTER. In the last 12 months alone over 8,000 families have contacted your mayor's committee seeking rental accommodations in Louisville.

Mr. MORTON. That may be correct; and if the condition I have discussed continues there will not be any rental accommodations available.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORTON. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Not only in the case the gentleman has cited but the injustices of the rent-control law are causing the owners of property to do everything they can to get rid of their property, sell it, convert it to commercial purposes, do anything to rid themselves of the property because they cannot receive an adequate return. That is what is making the condition the gentleman from New York has just cited, in addition to what the gentleman from Kentucky has already stated. That is the condition in about every district of the United States.

Mr. MORTON. The gentleman is entirely correct, and I might add that in a local newspaper in my city 3 days ago I saw something which cheered me quite a lot, something which I had not seen for a long time. Do you remember the old days, back in the time when there were vacancies and the bait was 3 months' rent free if you took the property? Such ads are beginning to appear again in my city in spite of the affidavits before the mayor's committee.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that this Committee will adopt the Brown amendment and others needed to assure fair treatment for all under the act. None of us want permanent rent control. Let us without emotion or partisanship amend this bill so as to assure the provision of more rental property, either by new construction or conversion. In that way we can accomplish the orderly liquidation of wartime rental control. Such an amended measure I can in good conscience support.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, we agreed to yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA]. He consumed 5 minutes of his time yesterday. I therefore yield the gentleman 5 minutes at this time.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, as a new Member of this House, although in years considerably above the average age of my colleagues, I am as surprised as are the people back home by the character of the opposition to this bill. I look in the galleries and see the

owners of property who have been brought here to furnish the background for the speeches I hear from the Republican side of this House placing the sacred rights of property above human rights.

There are no rights as sacred as the right of honest men and women to have homes in which to live and in which to rear their families.

I say to my Republican colleagues that unless within the next year and a half they revise their concepts to include recognition of human rights as well as what they call the sacred rights of property the seats on their side of this Chamber in the Eighty-second Congress will be the most lonesome spots in all America.

And to my Democratic colleagues who by compromise with Republicans would lose for the plain people at home that which the plain people won by their own efforts and their votes in November of 1948, may I say that there is an end of patience.

Unless the Eighty-first Congress in the legislation which it enacts gives priority to human rights, always of course with proper respect for the legitimate rights of property, this Congress will go down in an ignomy deeper than that of the Eightieth Congress.

The plain people of America have a right to roofs over their heads. I have heard applied to them here today the term of parasites. I do not like that sort of name calling. But even if they were parasites, these decent and honest people who work hard but do want at night the security of homes in which to rest, I as a Member of this Congress would regard myself as derelict in every sense of duty if I voted to throw them with their wives and their babies from their humble homes out into the storm. A vote to end rent control means just that—and everyone in this Chamber knows it.

Unless rent controls are continued hundreds of thousands of American families, yes, millions of such families, will be left to barter, not collectively but individually, in an uncontrolled market during a time of unprecedented housing shortage.

Mr. Chairman, when every veteran organization in this country—the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled Veterans, all of them—has appeared before the House Committee on Banking and Currency and testified that the veterans of America are demanding a continuance of rent control, I am surprised when distinguished colleagues of mine on the Republican side of this House in contradiction of these veterans themselves say: "Oh, the veterans do not want continuance of rent control." The veterans who in my own city search in vain for homes within their means, the veterans who live doubled-up or in unsanitary temporaries, know that there is a grave housing shortage; but these Republican colleagues of mine tell us in this Chamber that there is no housing shortage and the veterans are all happy except those who own rental properties.

There are tenants back home who are not here. They thought they spoke on November 2 and they thought they sent to this Congress their representatives to speak for them here. They may not have had railroad fare, but they did have votes to give us, and we accepted those votes.

These landlords have come here, many of them mighty fine people. I met them from my home town of Chicago and some of them, I believe, honestly think they have complaints directed against the administration of this law but not the law itself. I say to those landlords in Chicago that if in the administration of this rent-control law, which I hope, trust, and believe this Congress will enact, they do not get a fair deal through its administration, I will be their champion to the extent of my humble ability. The bill is fair alike to landlords and to tenants; if there is failure in its just administration I have the faith that the President of the Fair Deal will take care of that in no uncertain way.

The members of the Banking and Currency Committee, every one of them, have had in mind a Fair Deal to these landlords.

Every member of our committee has thought to put into this enactment provisions that will adequately protect them. But if there be isolated cases, as so eloquently and graphically presented by my distinguished colleague from Kentucky, where injustice has been done, believe me, Mr. Chairman, there are thousands and thousands of other cases where tenants have suffered almost beyond human endurance when they have been left to be preyed upon and when there is no legislation to protect them. I have special reference to constituents of mine in the Second Congressional District of Illinois, thousands of mighty fine people, living in so-called apartment hotels and residential hotels. They too are entitled to a Fair Deal.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state to the Members on both sides of the aisle that there are, and there can be no human rights without property rights. The right of possession of that which is yours, of the necessities of your body and your comfort, are property rights. Let no one disturb those.

I am aware that there are two sides to rent control. There are rent hogs who charge all and more than the traffic will bear. Then there are tenant hogs who wish to occupy, damage, and destroy other people's property for less than taxes, maintenance, and repairs—to say nothing about a reasonable profit.

Fortunately for our Nation both of these classes are in a minority. Here we are asked to assist those who wish to get that which is not theirs and in many cases needlessly and recklessly damage or destroy it. I have no brief for either of these classes. I know that the great majority of landlords and tenants are reasonable and honest.

However, I do not believe that rent control is the remedy. I do not believe that it has improved the situation. In fact as has been stated by both proponents and opponents of this bill, after 12 years of this unlawful control, the situation is worse than when we began. In fact it has become worse because owners of rental property refuse to continue to rent at a loss.

In many localities there is no great shortage of housing. In many parts of the country there is competition again in rent—competition again among landlords. There are vacant houses and vacant apartments. I realize that is not true in all localities, but we must take the law of average. In fact rent control is destroying the goose that lays the golden eggs—homes and apartments.

It has been stated on this floor, and I challenge the accuracy of those statements, that the landlords and the real-estate men are spending $3,000,000 in lobbying. Such asserticns, unless proof is furnished, are misleading and dangerous. Being made on the floor here, they are taken as gospel truth by the public.

The only lobbying I have seen is through the mails by both landlords and tenants, and I am satisfied that the total expense of that lobbying on both sides would not exceed $40,000 or $50,000 throughout the Nation. That is far short of $3,000,000.

I am fully aware that witnesses appeared on both sides of this issue before the Banking and Currency Committee, but amendment 1 of the Constitution "prohibits Congress from interfering with the right of the people peacefully to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances." It depends upon whose ox is gored. Some of these landlords have a real grievance. They have been compelled to lease their property for less than taxes, maintenance, and repairs, in violation of the Constitution. Their property is in fact being confiscated.

Why should not these landlords appeal to Congress for redress? It is their property that is being taken unlawfully and unconstitutionally. Would you remain silent if the Government confiscated your home? If Congress should pass a law compelling you to take two or three families into your home would you remain silent? If by rent control you can confiscate city homes and property, then you can also through rent control confiscate farm homes and farm property. That is the Russian method, not the American. Rent control is a step in that direction.

I say without the fear of contradiction that this bill is unconstitutional. The war is over and only a person who is intellectually dishonest will deny that. Therefore, the Federal Government has no right to take property from you under the guise of a war power. The police power belongs to the States and not to the Federal Government. Amendment 10 of the Constitution says:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively or to the people.

Again it is unconstitutional under the provision in our Constitution prohibiting us from depriving a person of his liberty

or his property without due process. The fifth amendment says:

No person shall * * * be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation.

Just compensation, if it means anything, means taxes, maintenance, repairs, and a reasonable profit. Every Member of Congress has received letters showing that in many cases the landlord has been compelled to lease his property for less than taxes, maintenance, and repairs.

Every Member of this body took an oath to uphold the Constitution and the laws made pursuant thereto. You who are so fervently for this bill should stop and square your conscience with your oath to uphold the Constitution.

If you are not concerned with the Constitution, if you have no respect for your oath—and there are some who feel there is no longer any constitutional restraint—then may I ask you to square your conscience with the commandment "Thou shalt not steal," and to help deprive other people of their property is stealing. May I also ask that you square your conscience with the commandment "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house, nor his maidservant, nor his manservant, nor his ox, nor his ass nor anything that is thy neighbors." Maybe if you have no respect for the Constitution or your oath, you will respect your Bible and your religion.

I repeat that this bill is not only unconstitutional but it is mere lip service. It is not a remedy to the housing situation. Twelve years has proven that. It has prolonged the shortage of housing. If the Committee on Banking and Currency wishes to do something real to relieve the situation, then let them report H. R. 853, a bill that I introduced which makes it possible for the homeless whose incomes are in the lower brackets to either build or buy a home of their own, not only to build or buy it but to pay for it.

Under that bill the Housing Administration would loan to those who desire to buy or build a home up to $15,000 provided they match the amount they borrow by putting up 10 percent of their own money. It provides that this money would be loaned to the borrower for 40 years at 2 percent interest. That is about the average that the Government pays. There is no opposition to this bill. There is no lobby against this bill. Just why do they refuse to report that bill and to continue with make-believe legislation—rent control?

This bill further provides that the home should be tax exempt until paid by both State and Federal Governments. That would make it possible for the low-income people to pay for a home. It provides further that any payment on the home shall be deducted from his income tax. May I again ask that the committee report that or a similar bill?

The stability of our Government depends upon homes. Let us stop this lip-service stuff—rent control—and do something worth while, something befitting the great American Republic. This is long past due. This juggling back and forth, and fooling the people who want homes with rent control, is becoming obsolete.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this legislation in any form and I shall vote against it. The only reason why rent-control legislation is before the Congress today is because there are more tenants than there are landlords. Tenants have a numerical superiority and therefore a greater potency at the ballot box.

There are many reasons why I am opposed to rent control in peacetime. Above all others, it is because of the violence being done to our free-enterprise system through the continuation of rent control year after year. Every time such controls are extended we push our Nation further down the road to socialism.

The real reason for rent controls has ceased to exist. Rent controls were deemed necessary in wartime when we established training centers for our fighting forces and when industrial centers mushroomed because of the influx of labor into defense plants. Aside from one or two places where the Government is building and expanding facilities for the production of fissionable materials, there is no great mushrooming of communities today.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, rent controls were a wartime expedient that has no place in the peacetime economy based on the free-enterprise system. It completely nullifies the law of supply and demand as it relates to rental housing units available.

Following this line of thought, practically all of the rental housing in America came into being before there were any rent controls. Few rental units, comparatively, have been built since we have had rent control and these have been exceeded by the number of rental units that have been withdrawn from our economy. Proof of this statement can be found by anyone who cares to read the record of the hearings. With rent ceilings based on prewar prices without regard to the increased material and labor costs, the so-called landlords have been unable to properly maintain their property. As the result, much of it is becoming shabby and run down. Eventually, it will no longer be habitable.

Let me read into the RECORD at this point a letter which I received this morning from one of these so-called landlords, a widow:

MARCH 10, 1949.

Hon. PAUL SHAFER,
Congressman, Third District of Michigan, Washington, D. C.

DEAR PAUL: In view of the many reiterations by Housing Expediter Tighe Woods that the present rent-control law provides for handling of hardships I am attaching a memoranda from the Battle Creek branch rent office.

The memorandum refers to a petition for an increase which was rejected. The letter continues:

Last year we finally asked for our first increase in rent since the law went into effect. Our rents have always been very low. The property in question is the apartment house building on the old Kingman place with which you are familiar. We were obliged to put on a new roof in 1946. It cost $932.50. While we had to pay this on completion, in the figures for the rent-control office we had to spread it over a period of 15 years and compare it with the cost of the previous roof treated in the same way, which practically canceled out, of course.

The building must be painted and the windows puttied or they will fall out. We have simply not had sufficient money from our rentals to do it. With the rent control there is no hardship until you have gone into debt.

These figures were presented before the increase in city taxes last year. We were obliged to do them all over, one set for each of the six apartments in the building. The tax for 1947 was $296.16 and for the year 1948, $371.20.

Sincerely yours,

ANNA H. CALLAHAN.

Mr. Chairman, this is just one of hundreds of letters I have received which clearly indicate to me that this legislation is all one-sided, with the landlord holding the bag. In the first place, rents were frozen arbitrarily on a given date in 1941. The ceilings which were established did not take into consideration relationships between rentals then in effect and the value of the property involved. This has caused all manner of injustices and inequities as between so-called landlords in the same community. Some have fared better than others, but all, as I stated before, are holding the bag.

Let us remember that by abolishing controls in other fields the Eightieth Congress abolished shortages. Continued rent controls, however, have made the rental situation worse. There are hundreds of thousands of rental units in the country today that are not for rent because of controls. The Government, in this legislation, seeks to gain the authority to force landlords to rent such properties. That alone should cause the defeat of this legislation.

I hold no brief for the rental industry, but I do not believe these landlords make up a class of unscrupulous, miserly, heartless group, waiting for a chance to take advantage of every tenant sheltered under their roofs, and I do not believe that tenants, as a class, are underprivileged, impoverished individuals who are incapable of exercising independent judgment and who are wholly dependent on the Federal Government for the protection of their rights. I believe the great majority of tenants are self-reliant citizens and many of them are enjoying far greater increases in income than their landlords.

If the Congress today can legally discriminate against landlords—and I do not believe there is anyone in this House today who can say that this legislation is not discriminatory—Congress might well discriminate against tenants. It is a definite possibility which the tenants should recognize.

Definitely, Mr. Chairman, we in Congress should consider the plight of the tenants in the future when the present supply of rental housing, through lack of proper upkeep or withdrawal from the rental market, has either ceased to exist or become undesirable. One only needs

to read articles that have been reprinted from the Reader's Digest and the Saturday Evening Post relative to the deplorable state of rental housing in France, which resulted from rent controls, to vision what is happening here in America. By continuing rent controls here, we are merely repeating what happened in France. Tenants should be urging Congress to protect them from being forced to live in America in the future as tenants in France are now being forced to live today.

Mr. Chairman, rent controls have prevented the construction of rental housing. This is a known fact. I am wondering if the insistent demands for continuance of rent controls is not the result of a subtle campaign on the part of the administration to put through a great, expensive Federal housing program which will further increase taxes and provide more Government jobs.

Certainly rent control has not prevented inflation, as its proponents said it was supposed to do. It has held down the cost of housing for some, but that has only been accomplished at the expense of others. It has compelled many families to go into debt and pay exorbitant prices to buy or build homes which in the majority of cases they could not afford.

Rent controls are fundamentally wrong, unfair, discriminatory, and, as I said in the beginning, would not be considered today if it were not for the fact that there are more tenants than there are landlords whose potency at the ballot box blinds Congress to obvious facts.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, it is easy for me to understand why the Members of this body are being charged with suffering from an acute seizure of schizophrenia. To save you the time required to look that up, let me say that it is a type of psychosis characterized by loss of contact with environment and a disintegration of one's personality.

It might be a bit more charitable to let us off by just pointing out that politicians manifest a dual personality, with the inevitable overflow of double talk.

A friend of mine has pointed out that an examination of the history of human progress will show that the real achievements of a solid and enduring character have come through evolutionary growth, slow and gradual, working through methods of trial and error. Whenever we have tried planned economy, we have found ourselves involved in failures and disappointments.

Evolution has the quality of patience. Its process is almost automatic. But planned economy! Ah! It is always in a hurry, imbued with the complex of the reformer, bedeviled by the critical faculty, spurred on by an impetuosity calling for action now.

Abuses unquestionably should be corrected but planned economy, with its impulses for immediate results, has not been endowed with the constructive quality that would serve in building up a permanent system.

Mr. Chairman, in this fateful hour for the United States, almost 4 years subsequent to the cessation of major military hostilities, when the hopes of the majority of the Europeans and the fears of a loud minority alike are focused on the action of this Congress and the attitudes of our people, this great Committee on Banking and Currency reports to this House the bill under consideration.

This bill will, if approved, further promote domestic bickering and blundering. This bill will further promote class warfare, as between owner and tenant; as between owner and the administrators of this Government; as between owner and this Congress. This bill should not be on this floor at this time.

This country needs more productivity—and by this term I mean more service out of that which we now have. We need to have more living units occupied, instead of having the Congress sit here and debate a proposal which we well know will take more living units which now exist, out of use, simply because there is no law now on the books to force a citizen to sell his labor, in the form of a house, below cost.

This bill is designed to further featherbed those tenants who are receiving shelter below the cost to the owner of the property which is occupied by the tenant. To carry on such a program, to further extend such a philosophy with the approval of the Congress, naturally, and logically discourages those who have funds and who would use those funds with which to build more housing units, if the owner and builder believed the Congress was in favor of the owner receiving just a fair wage for his savings and investment in the form of a living unit.

This bill is specifically designed to discourage the private financing and building of homes and to thus prepare the way for public housing, financed by Federal funds, to be leased primarily to political pets, and below cost of the service rendered. This is an underhanded way of promoting political power and paying political debts.

Why did this great committee, why do Members of the House cringe under the propaganda barrage which continually portrays our free economy and constitutional-republic form of government as selfish, reactionary, and doomed to early collapse? Even if you and you and you do not believe this concocted and false propaganda, then why behave as if you did?

This Republic of ours, this economy of ours, this accomplishment of our individual citizens under the freedom and liberty which they have historically enjoyed may have some incidental faults: But let me remind you that it is all resting on some very basic virtues. And I for one, do not propose to throw these virtues away in exchange for a monetary—90 days or 15 months—satisfaction of the belly.

When any Member stands here and substantially argues that it is utterly impossible for us to have liberty and security at the same time; it is my firm opinion said Member engages in presenting to us the most mischievous fallacy that could possibly be spread among our good people.

This bill would promote hardened arteries of our economy.

Irrespective of to what extent Chet Bowles and his followers may argue that such proposals as are now before us are progress and liberalism, let me say to you that is only bedecking the approach with verbiage. This bill is reactionary: It is just a part of the whole scheme to further eliminate from our everyday vocabulary and life such terms as pioneering, invention, progress, opportunity, individual liberty and freedom.

Heretofore, down through our history, we have had a set of cherished and inspiring values, among which the freedom and dignity of the individual human being centered.

This totalitarian philosophy which runs rampant all through this bill calls for a further promotion of the welfare-state with the clear-cut understanding that the individual citizen who has lived simply, exercised thrift, invested his savings in the form of shelter beyond his individual needs must now, upon the adoption of this bill, become, in the realm of home renting, subservient to the police state.

Heretofore, the American ideology has held out the prospect of both plenty and freedom.

In the world's mart where the two products of Russia and the United States are now being offered, we should be bold enough to promote the sales of our own package of goods. If we cannot to some extent restore and protect the confidence of our own people in the American ideal here at home, upon what grounds, and by what line of reasoning do you expect the nationals of other countries to accept the philosophy being preached through such implementations as the Marshall plan?

If we are to continually adopt the ideology of Russia and other dictatorships as evidenced by the provisions of this bill now before us, why should others follow our leadership?

The very existence of this country, with its constitutional-republic form of government, its individual freedoms, its challenge to men to work, save, and invest are competitive forces and, within the framework of our constitutions as they have historically been interpreted, constitute the one bright social and economic light to the outside world which today struggles against dissolution.

But, Mr. Chairman, even our society must be invigorated. Adoption of this bill would destroy the faith of millions of our citizens.

This Congress has no moral or legal right to take away from one class of citizens the value of their property and give it to another class under the guise of rent control.

In the purchase of wartime or peacetime goods for the defense and use of the Federal Government, I know of no other program wherein the citizen must sell his goods below cost and thus dissipate his capital.

As politicians, dealing with this question, we have no right to impose the program here proposed, on our people.

Homes are built of the goods of commerce, such as brick, steel, lumber, cement, hardware, copper, brass, and hundreds of other items. To build or not to build is a decision to be made by the citizen. What the citizen will do is always primarily influenced by what his Government says the citizen's rights are to be. High policy of Government and top-level rights of citizens are here involved.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL].

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of rent control, real rent control.

The housing situation in Seattle has been cited as a reason for the end of rent control. I submit the facts in the Seattle housing situation present a compelling reason for adoption by this Congress of a much improved rent-control law. The legislation presented by the committee does improve upon the laws adopted by the Eightieth Congress.

Reference has been made here to figures in the Banking and Currency Committee testimony regarding Seattle, but I submit that the full facts in that testimony have not been presented.

I believe it pertinent to refer to page 661 of the hearings and quote a report of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce of January 15, 1949, which states:

> The supply—
>
> Of housing—
>
> is still short in the medium and lower income brackets both for sale and for rent.

And on January 14, 1949, Mayor Devin wrote in part:

> Progress has been made locally in the production of rental housing at rents from $85 per month upward.

But he stated further:

> It is my opinion that we still have a serious rental problem in the rent range up to, perhaps, $60 monthly, with the problem more serious as the rent gets lower. It is in this area that the real housing problem remains.

Mr. Donald C. Haas, representing the Apartment Owners' Association of Seattle, submitted a survey—pages 447 and 448—made by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, showing 502 housing units, houses, and apartments, advertised for rent in Seattle. But he did not cite that this survey really bears out the statements of Mayor Devin and the Seattle Chamber of Commerce, that housing at reasonable rentals is seriously deficient.

Of 346 apartments, furnished and unfurnished, only 78 rent for $61 or less.

Of 156 houses, single and duplex, furnished and unfurnished, only 16 rent for $61 or less, to which fuel costs must be added.

In a subsequent letter from the Veterans of Foreign Wars these additional important facts on Seattle are given that on February 18, 1949—

> The Seattle Housing Authority had an active waiting list of 944 families. For the 5 weeks preceding February 18, 1949, the authority received 120 new applications per week.

And the VFW adds:

> The afore-mentioned numbers represent veteran families only who are in need of housing and do not cover the nonveteran families seeking housing in this area.

When we consider efforts made here to indicate there is no housing shortage, it would be well to remember another Seattle survey cited by the VFW:

> In March of 1948 a survey was conducted among 2,781 families residing in temporary-housing projects of the Seattle Housing Authority. The over-all household income for these families was just a few cents below $225 per month. On this household income per family, the represented 2,781 families in the temporary projects can only afford a gross monthly rent of $45.

It is in the context of the need displayed in Seattle that we should review the strenuous efforts made to demonstrate that there is no housing shortage in the United States and that rent control is the cause rather than the consequences of the housing difficulties that confront the Nation. These demonstrations, in my opinion, affront the common sense and fly in the face of facts well known to the average family.

In the heat of controversy and debate over this problem, we sometimes forget that the welfare and comfort of human beings—of American families—are at stake. Housing is not only a commodity to be bought and sold in the market; housing is not only a field of investment and a source of income to property owners; housing is also a basic necessity which must be made available to every member of the community. Government in a civilized society cannot shut its eyes and allow people to scramble for a limited supply of shelter, with the poorest families taking the hindmost. Rent control is one aspect of the responsibility of government in a time of emergency, when the demand for housing runs far in excess of the supply.

Those who have asked for the removal of rent control on the ground that this sector of the economy should not be singled out for discriminatory treatment fail to recognize that housing fulfills a special need that cannot be deferred, that has no alternative means of satisfaction. Food and clothing and other daily necessities are infinite in their variety; high-priced as they are in most cases, at least there is some leeway to choose lower priced articles of clothing or cheaper cuts of meat. Wide consumer choice imposes some restraint on prices, and new supplies come to the shelves in a fair degree of responsiveness to demand.

With housing, it is otherwise. Housewives can go on a buyers' strike against steaks and chops, but they cannot go on a renters' strike against shelter. Families of moderate and low income have no choice today in selecting a roof over their heads.

Those who want rent control eliminated so they can charge what the traffic will bear are callous in their disregard of human welfare. They have fashioned for themselves a brutal philosophy that people will get along somehow, that the poor are always with us, and that the fruits of a free-enterprise economy are reserved for a favored part of the population. The president of the National Apartment Owners' Association expressed this brutal philosophy very clearly when he said to members of the Banking and Currency Committee during the hearings on rent-control legislation:

> I have never yet seen any time in the history of the country, so long as I have lived, when there were not some slums, when there were not some poor people, and when there were not some people sleeping in boxcars and by the side of the railroad tracks, and I see them today, sir, in this present economy, as I go from Los Angeles down to my ranch in the country, I see them sleeping alongside of the railroad tracks. They always do that. That is the kind of people they are.

It is my earnest hope that the landlords and property owners who are today confronted with the distasteful but necessary condition of continued rent control will take upon themselves a new and greater sense of responsibility in working toward the objective of more and better housing at prices that people can afford to pay. The sooner that this objective is on the way to being realized, the sooner will the necessity for rent control be removed and the less will be the interference of government.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, as we come to the end of a rather long debate on a very difficult and troublesome problem, I am convinced that we face the greatest crisis in the extension of rent control that this House has ever faced since it first became necessary to have rent control.

In other words, I do not think there is a single Member in this House, and that includes gentlemen on the Republican side as well, whose vote will not be absolutely vital in determining whether rent control is killed or whether we extend it. No Member can enjoy the luxury of a vote against the bill, thinking that perhaps it is going to be passed anyway, and thus not hear from the tenants who will be dispossessed.

As this debate has progressed, it has impressed me as to the difference in thinking on the two sides of the aisle. We have had a great deal of talk from the Republican side, and I grant you they are making a very good case for the protection of American investment. If this issue were the protection of so many hundred thousand bushels of wheat or so many hundred bales of cotton or ingots of steel, I think you probably could justify almost everything they have said against rent control.

But, Mr. Chairman, we are not talking solely about investments—about people's investments in houses. We are talking about 14,350,000 homes of American citizens and American families.

My distinguished colleague from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] has said the administration wants rent control to have a planned economy. I disagree. We have had rent control as a necessity because of the war, because home construction was shut off for five or six long years

while families accumulated and backed up in doubled-up housing accommodations.

So we face a condition that you could not possibly, in safety, end when the war stopped. We are not enacting rent control as a new policy in this country. We are trying to get out of rent control as fast as we can, without destroying the very basis of America itself; that is, the homes of America.

No, we are not advocating a planned economy. But, Mr. Chairman, I ask that you do not advocate planned chaos. If you pass the amendment that will be offered to this bill from the Republican side of this House today, to kill rent control after 3 months, you will get a planned chaotic condition in most of the metropolitan areas of this country.

I have heard a great deal from landlords, and I feel very sorry for many many hundreds of them. We have and have always tried to help adjust their genuine hardship cases. Less than a a thousand landlords appeared before this Congress reciting their hardship cases, but I know there are many more that should be adjusted.

I sympathize with the gentleman from Kentucky and others who have received hardship cases, but I know that all Members on both sides of the aisle have been as alert as I have to try to correct and adjust them.

But gentlemen, many hardship cases are bound to occur when you have 14,000,000 homes under rent control. There is no Solomon in the world who can make a decision that is going to please both the landlords and the tenants.

I have had a lot of complaints on these adjustments that have been made by rent-control administrators, from the tenants as well as from the landlords. In fact, every citizen who rents a home in my own community of Oklahoma City, a city of 300,000 population, had his rent raised 20 percent by the action of last year's rent bill.

That action for wholesale as well as individual adjustments is still possible in this bill. It is possible—not impossible—to get hardship adjustments made or area-wide adjustments to decontrol entire areas by local boards.

But it does not do Congress any credit at all in a callous disregard of the problem to say, "We are sick and tired of rent control."

Yes, my distinguished friend and colleague from Kansas on the Republican side said he was sick and tired of rent control. Well, Mr. Chairman, I am sick and tired of rent control; but I do not believe that earning $15,000 a year salary places me in the same need of rent control as the fellow who earns $1,500, or $2,500 a year.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a lot of complaints, we have heard a lot of reasons, why hardship adjustments were not being taken care of properly, and this bill is designed to help correct that situation.

In the month-long hearings this Congress and this committee spent over this subject there was no real evidence that convinced me that anything had improved in the supply of housing to make possible decontrol or abolition of rent control in most areas of this country.

The best proof that killing rent control now is dangerous is furnished by the local boards, a mechanism which the Republican Congress a year ago put into operation to try to give the very best possible determination, by local citizens, of the condition and need for continuing rent controls in that area.

These local boards have been in existence over a year now. Only 2 percent of the areas were recommended by these local citizen boards for decontrol. Yet, the Members on the Republican side with 98 percent of the areas being found, apparently, by these local boards to be too dangerous to decontrol, are now all going to be decontrolled by act of Congress. You can claim, if you wish, that your Republican bill provides for a 3-month extension. It provides for killing rent control, and make no mistake about it. The only advantage that you get by this amendment that you are going to have in your motion to recommit on this 3 months' extension is that the weather is going to be a little bit warmer in July when these people are moved out on the streets from the homes of America. Do not make any mistake, eviction is one of the terrible fears of 14,000,000 people in this country. It is very important, I think, not to unsettle this economy at this time.

I do not believe there is anything socialistic about continuing a war program until it is possible to get out of it safely, and I do not believe there is anything un-American about it. I do believe that 14,000,000 people might be turned away from democracy and disappointed in their Government itself, if they are turned out on the streets without any protection here, the 1st of April, or even on the 1st of July.

These people cannot find homes. Almost half of our population must rent; many of them are in low-income groups earning less than $2,500 a year, and there is no supply of housing available into which they can move when they get that dreaded eviction notice or a notice for an increase in rents that they cannot pay.

Consider also the fact that the children of America of these people who must rent cannot find many places in which they can be admitted to live. I am not going to question the landlords' right to prevent families with children coming in. I am stating that if you kill rent control, if you take away the rights of families who now have children, living under the protection of rent control, and make it possible for their automatic eviction or the rents to be greatly increased, I do not know where families with children can move. You can read some of the very best publications in this country that have personally canvassed the situation on housing availability, where families with children need housing, and you cannot find that they can get into very many places.

Mr. Chairman, the issue is rather simple. It is not a question whether you like rent control or not. I hate rent control; I do not think it can be smoothly administered, and I know there will always be some inequities in 14,000,000 rent-control operations as between the landlord and the tenant.

But I do not believe that the thousand or 2,000 cases that have been heard by our committee and the Senate, or letters perhaps numbering 10,000 or 15,000 that you and I heard from in these hardship cases, means that rent control has failed.

If this Congress turns tail and runs because of pressure from the landlords who have protested against the hardships they have felt, we do not deserve the title of being Members of the greatest legislative body in history.

I do know that with 14,000,000 renting there must be a lot of landlords and a lot of tenants who are willing to put up with the condition and not say it is un-American and not say it is socialistic. It is important for our economy that we do not do anything at this late hour when inflation has just about run its course to start another spiral of prices and wages chasing each other clear up to the ceiling, then dropping and ultimately collapsing in a mammoth bust.

Mr. Chairman, at stake in this issue is not the question of investment. I think it is the question of protecting those 14,000,000 people in American homes who must of necessity rent. These tenants are people, Mr. Chairman, they are human beings the same as the landlords from whom they rent these places, and I think we have got to protect the human beings of this country, both the landlords and the tenants.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, the very impassioned plea made by the previous speaker with reference to 14,000,000 people being turned out without a roof over their heads if rent control is not continued is probably about as responsible a statement as the statement made by a former speaker that the landlords are spending many millions of dollars to defeat this bill.

Now, let no one be deceived or moved in the close of this debate by any emotionalism. We are dealing with a problem here that will either get more rental units or less of them for the people.

In summing up this debate as I have listened to it for hours I have come to the opinion that the new rent-control bill, vastly increasing the power of the Government to punish the people and which will hold back building construction, should be defeated by this House.

When rent control was passed as a war measure, the Congress promised that it would be taken off as soon as possible. The recent speaker, the gentleman from Oklahoma who said he was anxious to get out from under rent control as rapidly as possible, at the same time recommends 4 years after the war is over, after hostilities have ceased, a bill that greatly expands the power to recontrol units that we promised the people we would

not control as an incentive to get them to build, and brings it to this House with the plea he wants to get out of rent control by an extension for 15 months with the toughest rent-control bill that has ever been written since the first bill was enacted.

Mr. Chairman, this bill should be defeated because it is unfair, is unconstitutional; because it singles out a certain class of property owners and in fact confiscates a part of the meager profits of the owners. Regardless of any court decisions it is morally unfair, unconstitutional, and confiscates their property without redress here in the free country of America, where we protect so carefully the constitutional rights in the writing of any bill pertaining to members of the Communist Party of this country who seek the overthrow of this Government by force and violence, yet we insist on having this bill, unfair and unconstitutional as it is, placed upon the backs of the property owners of this country for the next 15 months.

Mr. Chairman, this bill should be defeated because its passage breaks the word of Congress by bringing under recontrol much property that the prior legislation promised the people should be free from rent control in the future in an effort to get them to invest their money in new rental buildings.

Mr. Chairman, it should be defeated because it will continue to dry up the construction of new rental units and defeat the very purpose of increasing the building of rental units throughout the Nation.

It should be defeated because if this bill is placed on the statute books it will most likely never be repealed and will drive this country into a constant housing shortage in the future that will put us in a position that France finds herself in today, with all of her buildings old and run down, because private capital will not continue to invest its money in the construction of rental buildings. France today is a nation of slums with inadequate housing conditions throughout the nation because that nation put on strict rent controls after World War I, and has never lifted them.

When the Eightieth Congress revised rent controls and enacted the present bill that would furnish incentive for new buildings, new rental units through private enterprise more than doubled in the 2 years of the Eightieth Congress. This action during the past year brought into new construction almost 1,000,000 new rental buildings and statistics show that under the present bill written by the Eightieth Congress more houses and rental units were built in those 2 years than in any time in the history of the Nation. It is time now for the Government to get out of rent control as quickly as possible.

Mr. Chairman, the most liberal compromise with rent control this Congress can possibly justify is to kill the proposed bill and extend the present bill for 3 months, serving notice on the various State legislatures now in session throughout the Nation that rent control must in the future be the responsibility of the States thereafter, and be operated under State law, where deemed advisable; that the Federal Government by such action serves notice on the people of the Nation and the States that the Federal Government is through with rent control. We should let rent control expire now or within 3 months.

If the proposed bill with its vastly increased power to punish the people is passed, it is estimated that it will cost the Federal Government $35,000,000 each year for its administration. It will broaden and extend the power of bureaucracy over the people and will add probably a thousand new employees to the already tax-eating Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, this bureaucratic rent-control organization is fighting for its continuance and expansion as bureaucracy always does. The Congress has an opportunity to do away with this worse than useless bureaucratic department of Government and save to the taxpayers of the Nation approximately $35,000,000 a year. The Congress now has an opportunity to encourage and to obtain in the future constantly greater numbers of rental units and to prevent the drying up of building construction throughout the Nation by the defeat of this new proposed legislation.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, we have just listened to the gentleman from Illinois. My mind goes back to a time only several months ago, in the Eightieth Congress, when from the lips of the gentleman and others on the Republican side came the cry of "socialism" directed against the Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill. Today we hear them say that more houses is the solution of the predicament that exists in the urban or city districts throughout the country. When a housing bill comes up they will be raising the same opposition against such legislation. They use that bill now to try to defeat this bill, yet when the bill came up in the last Congress they were against the provisions that would really enable housing to be constructed throughout the country. When such a bill comes up again they will be making the same arguments against it.

I have before me a news item, carried widely throughout the country, which appeared in the Boston Post. It states, "GOP seeks early rent-law death."

While that is the headline of the one on the paper who wrote it, it carries a quotation from the minority leader, that the House Republicans "overwhelmingly favor junking Federal rent controls in the near future and turning the problem over to the States."

This bill is a well-considered bill. With the Brown amendment which will be adopted, and I urge its adoption when the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] offers it, it will be a bill that certainly meets any logical objection to the extension of rent control, having in mind the problem that exists throughout the country today.

The great majority of our landlords, particularly those owning two- or three- or four-family houses, accept rent control. Their record of compliance is outstanding and commendable. It is only from a powerful, highly organized small group with plenty of finances that we see this pressure against the passage of such legislation.

The same forces, not the same individuals but the same minds, have opposed every progressive piece of legislation. They opposed social security, they opposed the Tennessee Valley Authority, they opposed the construction of Boulder Dam, they opposed irrigation and reclamation projects, they opposed flood control, and they opposed the use for the benefit of the people of a community of power developed from flood-control projects. They were leading the fight only last year on one of the dams located in Georgia, but they did not dare to go through with it. If they had won the last election, you know what was going to happen in this Congress. They were going to complete the job all along the line.

It is estimated there are 3,000,000 families living doubled up. This means the family life of 6,000,000 families in America is adversely affected.

This unhealthy condition exists among the poor families and those in what might be termed the lower middle-income group. That is not a healthy situation, yet it exists. The lifting of rent control will aggravate that situation. I agree that the final solution will be the building of more houses, but we all know that that takes time. When that situation adjusts itself, and it will in the next 15 months, rent-control legislation thereafter will not be necessary. But until then a reasonable and proper rent-control law, such as this bill provides, is vitally necessary.

This is essentially, my colleagues, an urban or a city problem. Members from the rural districts should view the pending legislation from that angle. I realize that some of my colleagues representing rural or mainly rural districts might say, "This does not strictly or directly concern me, or the people of my district; why should I worry about it; I can vote against such legislation." That represents the local or the sectional consideration as against the over-all or national consideration.

The great majority of the Democratic Party has always represented the over-all or national consideration in all questions. There are some Republicans who do likewise, and I pay compliment to them for so doing. In referring to the Republican Party, as such, I want it understood that I separate them as individuals. But the Republican Party in the main responds to the dollar influence. That is their history, outside of Abraham Lincoln and Theodore Roosevelt. The dollar influence predominates and human values take a secondary place.

With all our weaknesses, the Democratic Party is still the party of Thomas Jefferson. We may have our internal disputes, but we are all in favor of those fundamentals that Thomas Jefferson created and gave to the American people as the foundation of the Democratic Party. With all our human weaknesses we are a party that serves the people directly, and the primary consideration in our minds in all legislation is the

human value, without destroying any economic group in our country.

The problem of rent control, as I said, is essentially an urban or city problem. It concerns the laborer, the factory worker, and the office worker; the State, city, and Federal employee, the person with a fixed income who lives in an urban or city district. It affects mainly them.

Tomorrow, or in the days to come, legislation will be considered by this body, as it has in the past, relating to rural districts or to agricultural districts. In case of a contest on such legislation, Members on both sides, and particularly my Democratic colleagues, may ask us from the urban or city districts not to view such legislation from a local or sectional angle. That argument will be sound. But, no matter what you do today, I am not going to react and obscure my national outlook. No matter what might happen on this or any other bill, I am going to do everything I can to look forward, no matter what legislation comes up. I am not going to look at a problem purely from a sectional or local angle merely because I can say it does not concern directly me or my people. I am not going to obscure the national considerations involved. That argument will be sound. It has been sound in the past and will be sound in the future. If it is sound when addressed to us by our friends from the rural or agricultural districts, then it is just as sound today for me and others to advance the argument to those who come from rural or agricultural districts.

I can remember only several days ago in this body when the fight on the steam plant for the TVA came up. Members from urban districts could easily have said, "This means nothing to us. We can vote against it." But the Democratic Members from the urban or city districts did not do that. They voted unanimously with our Democratic colleagues from the great section of the country so deeply affected. The urban Democratic Members marched through the tellers and defeated the practically solid Republican vote to prevent the appropriation that would build a steam plant at the Tennessee Valley Authority project.

What about the Tennessee Valley Authority years ago and the dramatic fights that were waged in this House? I spoke for it, as I spoke for the appropriation several days ago. I spoke for the TVA then. I spoke for Boulder Dam. I spoke for the first Bankhead Cotton Quota Act in 1933. All I knew was that our agriculture was in bad shape. Something had to be done. Whether it was the right legislation or not I did not know, but we had to experiment, and as a result of experiment and experience get proper legislative guides. That bill passed this body by six or seven votes. It was a fight between agricultural interests, Members of this body. Our urban friends then supported the South with its great economic problem in connection with cotton. In that dramatic fight I remember I took the floor and spoke for it. Other Members from city or urban districts did the same. There was a solid urban vote in support of the Bankhead Cotton Quota Act, and on all subsequent legislation, because we are imbued with the spirit of Jefferson. We view our problems nationally and not from a sectional angle.

I could go on and talk about many other bills, but the few to which I have referred are sufficient to convey to you the fact that when a bill comes up here concerning rural or agricultural districts in our country, it is my problem; it is a problem of Members from all parts of the country, and not say, "Oh, I can vote against it. Nobody in my district or very few in my district are concerned about it." That would be the wrong approach. It is the wrong approach today. One thing is certain, the great bulk of the Republicans will be against you on any bill. They will be against this bill today, and when you come in tomorrow with something else, they will have some alibi, some phony alibi, some crippling amendments which if adopted would destroy the bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Not now. The great bulk of them will be doing it. I can remember one of my friends on the Democratic side who had a hab't of making quite a few speeches that were discomforting to me as a Democrat—balling out the Republicans from time to time. Yet, when he had a matter of deep concern to himself, a matter of vital concern to himself and his district, when it was considered in this House only five Republicans voted with him. The rest of them voted against him. I turned to one of my colleagues then and I said, "See what happens. You can play with them all you want to, but when the time comes to support you or help you they always have a reason for not doing so."

This is an urban problem. We from the city or urban districts ask little. We freely give plenty. Rent control, I repeat, is essentially an urban or city problem. The condition is not only an economic one but it is a moral one. Fourteen million families, as the gentleman from Oklahoma said. As I have said 3,000,000 of these families live under doubled up conditions. That is not only an economic problem but it is also a moral problem. Housing is a moral problem today as well as economic. When people live under such conditions the natural operation of family life is interfered with, no matter how closely they may be related to one another; those who live together in doubled-up families, the normal family life is interfered with; and that is where the moral and spiritual aspects of it come into operation. I will agree that more housing is the answer, but we must first get through an effective housing act. Pending that situation however, we cannot let this economic condition facing over 14,000,000 families continue without some kind of control in their interest, and we cannot let this doubling up condition facing 3,000,000 families and constituting 6,000,000 altogether, continue. The least we can ask of Members who may be against the rent-control bill is that at least if one goes through is to see in good conscience that there ought to be an effective one—the least we can ask you to do is to vote against any crippling amendments that will be offered from the Republican side. You should vote for the bill. Conditions in the crowded areas of the country call for the passage of this bill; but, above all, let us look at it broadly and nationally; let my friends, particularly on the Democratic side from the rural or agricultural districts view this bill and the crippling amendments that will be offered from the Republican side in the same way that we from the urban or the city districts have supported your legislation, fighting shoulder to shoulder with you to prevent the Republicans from stopping the passage of the progressive legislation necessary to your interests.

This bill is necessary for the interests of over 14,000,000 families throughout the country. Let us pass it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired, all time available for general debate under the rule has expired.

Under the rule the Clerk will read the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That this act may be cited as the "Housing and Rent Act of 1949."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, let us get this question of rent-control legislation in perspective. In the first place, the statute under which rent control is now operating, in effect in 1947 and 1948, is a statute passed by a Congress with a Republican majority, reported out by a House Banking and Currency Committee with a Republican majority. It is also very important to remember that there is no monopoly on solicitude for human rights on either side of the aisle. That point may be best demonstrated by the fact that there is a filibuster in process on the other side of the Capitol from among Democratic Members, against legislation to protect one of the most cherished human rights—the right to be free from discrimination because of color; so let us be pretty careful when any of us try to arrogate to themselves alone the mantle of liberalism. Men on both sides of the aisle are proceeding sincerely, and they include proponents as well as opponents of this very legislation.

Mr. Chairman, there is a very urgent need for the further extension and strengthening of rent-control legislation. It has been truly stated that some—the exact figure is 15,789,225—housing units are under the jurisdiction of the Housing Expediter, and that the leases, the 15-percent leases which are permitted in the present law only apply today effectively to 522,744 units. The problem is of enormous magnitude. One-third of the counties of the United States are under the jurisdiction of the Housing Expediter for rent control. They include the most populous counties in the country.

Again exact figures: Two and one-half million married couples in April 1948, were living doubled up with others, as compared with 1,846,000 in April 1940, an increase of 35 percent.

On the question of whether any people are being expropriated of their property, by rent control, let us look at the facts. The facts show that in a survey made in New York as recently as 1947 it was found that the net operating income—not gross, but net—of landlords was 9.7 percent higher in 1947 than it was in 1943. Further than that, under the law, by which rent control is now operating, and which has at least given us basic-rent control, though it has serious weaknesses, any landlord can come in and get an increase in his rental if he shows he is not doing as well in net operating income, not gross, as he did in a preceding 2-year period—any 2-year period he picks—since 1939, long before rent control was in effect. The American system is that if you are in business, you should have a fair opportunity, but you take your chances on your own management.

Mr. Chairman, it has been said, and this is an extremely important fact, that this bill affects great urban districts. These are also the unspoken words of some 70 Republican Members who came from big cities and who are not here today. Those men want to run again, they want to be elected, and I think we on our side have to give some thought to their situation. It was the basis for the enactment of the 1947 rent-control law and the 1948 rent-control law and what, in my opinion, the public interest dictates must be the 1949 law, because the problem has not been solved. Housing construction figures show this. It appears this year that housing construction starts are likely to be less than they were in 1948 and certainly less than in 1947.

With that situation we have got to continue rent control. I do not believe either side can arrogate unto itself the mantle of the protection of human rights because I have already given a very clear instance where some Democrats are derelict right now in the effort to get legislation to protect human rights.

Mr. Chairman, I think the public interest demands the enactment of this law. I am going to vote for it myself and I trust and hope that I may be joined by a sufficient number of the Members of the House to pass it and pass it today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I was a little amused at the speech of the majority leader here. I have in mind that there are 264 members of the majority party in this House and only 171 of the minority party. Why was he worrying about the minority party?

You know, on this bill I am torn between two interests—one the public interest and the other my own personal interest. I am satisfied that if this bill is defeated, rental units will begin to come on the market very shortly. I know personally of many and I hear of more from all directions where people cannot afford to put them on the market, but they would come on the market at a reasonable price if the bill is defeated. I believe that the housing shortage would immediately be alleviated if we do not have the bane of this bill on the statute books.

On the other hand, I have a piece of real estate of my own coming on the market about the 1st of July. I am satisfied that if we continue rent control I would be able to sell it for $3,000 or $4,000 more than I can if we get rid of rent control and the housing shortage can be alleviated, as I am sure it will be.

Frankly, I intend to do my duty and vote against this bill. Housing construction has improved in the last few years. It has improved much since we got rid of the Federal housing construction program. It will continue to improve if we can stay rid of it and use what intelligence there is in the American people. I do not feel that it is possible in any way to continue this regimentation of the American people with unfair action on the part of the rent-control authorities facing us at every turn, and make any progress toward getting rid of the housing shortage in any such way as we should.

I hope that this bill will be defeated.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was amazed to hear the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] sing the praises of the rent law that was passed in 1948 by this Congress. Coming from the same city, and having the same experiences, he should know that that law has converted the office of the housing expediter of New York City into an annex of the real estate board. The office of the housing expediter has been granting increases in rents every day and in thousands of instances. The tenants have been given no protection. They are even deprived of an opportunity to come in and be heard.

To show to what extent rent increases have become a racket under existing law, I hold here an advertisement that appeared last December in the Real Estate News. It says:

RENT ADJUSTMENT SERVICE ON A WIN-OR-NO-PAY BASIS

The Rent Adjustment Service Co., of 1775 Broadway, offers members of the Greater New York Taxpayers Association an attractive proposition in connection with applications for adjustment of rents.

Without advance retainers or fees it will conduct a rental survey of a member's building, and if such study indicates a justifiable case under the hardship or inequity provisions of the rent regulations it will file all necessary applications with the Office of Housing Expediter and obtain proper increases to which the owner may be entitled.

If successful in obtaining rent increase orders from OHE, its compensation will be 50 percent of the aggregate rental increase in rents so obtained—

And so forth. This racket has been working successfully, and the rents have been going up with the cooperation of the New York office of the Housing Expediter. Now we are confronted with a tragic situation in this House with respect to the present bill. While it is somewhat of an improvement over the existing Rent Act, in that it removes the device for 15 percent increases, we are faced with the proposition of continuing many of the loopholes of the last act and also with the proposal of boring a bigger hole through rent protection by virtue of the Brown amendment to which, I understand, there is agreement. I, for one, will not support that amendment because in my considered judgment it is going to increase the number of escapes through which landlords can obtain rent increases. It will cause rent increases all along the line.

This bill offers no protection to thousands of tenants in Government subsidized housing projects who are facing evictions because of increases in their rents. Such a provision was contained in last year's rent bill. The failure to carry that provision in this bill, in the face of the existing housing shortage, will cause serious hardships to thousands of these tenants who have no place to go. The solution of this problem is more housing and not evictions.

This bill continues one of the most serious escapes which exists in the present law, the comparability escape. Through this escape a landlord does not have to show any books; all he has to establish is that the rent on the date determining the maximum rent was substantially lower than the rent generally prevailing in the defense-rental area for comparable housing accommodations on the maximum-rent date. The landlord who cannot obtain any increase on the basis of hardship, when he cannot make out an equitable case on the basis of hardship, can come in under this comparability escape and obtain an increase. He does not have to present any books; he does not have to show his operations; all he has to do is make out some kind of a prima facie case that his rentals are lower compared to the rentals in the same area. On that basis, without giving the tenant an opportunity to come in and be heard, rents are increased. That is permitted by the law of 1948, and that practice will be continued under the present bill.

When you add to that the Brown amendment, providing for a reasonable return on a reasonable value, just what is going to happen to the tenants in the cities such as mine?

The gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] praised the rent bill of last year, but I do not see how he can praise it in the light of how it has worked out. I am very, very apprehensive as to how this present bill is going to work out. We are confronted with the choice of having no controls at all or having this bill. We have to vote for it. However, I want to state my protest against the continuance in this bill of the loopholes of the present law, and the insertion of more loopholes.

Mr. Chairman, I have attempted to protect the interests of the tenants of my district before the Housing Expediter. My experience has been that the Real Estate Trust runs that office in New York City. Here in some detail is the story of how the rent law is administered in New York City.

The Emergency Price Control Act of 1942—Public Law 421, Seventy-seventh Congress—provided:

The Administrator may by regulation or order establish such maximum rent or maximum rents for such accommodations as in his judgment will be generally fair and equitable and will effectuate the purposes of this act. (Sec. 2 (b)).

It shall be unlawful * * * to demand or receive any rent for any defense-area housing accommodations * * * in violation of any regulation or order under section 2 (sec. 4 (a)).

The EPCA of 1942 was amended—Public Law 383, Seventy-eighth Congress—to provide:

And he shall make adjustments for such relevant factors as he may determine and deem to be of general applicability in respect of such accommodations, including increases or decreases in property taxes and other costs within such defense-rental area (sec. 2 (b)).

The Price Control Extension Act of 1946—Public Law 548, Seventy-ninth Congress—provided:

The Congress hereby affirms * * * (2) that unnecessary or unduly prolonged controls over prices and rents and use of subsidies would be inconsistent with the return to such a peacetime economy and would tend to repress and prevent the attainment of this and the other goals herein declared (sec. 1A (2)).

The Housing and Rent Act of 1947—Public Law 129, Eightieth Congress—provides:

The Congress hereby reaffirms the declaration in the Price Control Extension Act of 1946 that unnecessary or unduly prolonged controls over rents would be inconsistent with the return to a peacetime economy and would tend to prevent the attainment of the goals therein declared (sec. 201 (a)).

The Congress therefore declares that it is its purpose to terminate at the earliest practicable date all Federal restrictions on rents or housing accommodations. At the same time the Congress recognizes that an emergency exists and that, for the prevention of inflation and for the achievement of a reasonable stability in the general level of rents during the transition period, as well as the attainment of other salutary objectives of the above-named act, it is necessary for a limited time to impose certain restrictions upon rents charged for rental housing accommodations in defense-rental areas. Such restrictions should be administered with a view to prompt adjustments where owners of rental housing accommodations are suffering hardships because of the inadequacies of the maximum rents applicable to their housing accommodations, and under procedures designed to minimize delay in the granting of necessary adjustments (sec. 201 (b)).

The term "controlled housing accommodations" means housing accommodations in any defense-rental area, except that it does not include—

(3) any housing accommodations—

(A) the construction of which was completed on or after February 1, 1947, or which are additional housing accommodations created by conversion on or after February 1, 1947 * * *; or (B) which at no time during the period February 1, 1945, to January 31, 1947, both dates inclusive, were rented (other than to members of the immediate family of the occupant) as housing accommodations (sec. 202 (c)).

The Housing Expediter shall, by regulation or order make such adjustments in such maximum rents as may be necessary to correct inequities or further to carry out the purposes and provisions of this title: *And provided further*, That in any case in which a landlord and tenant, on or before December 3, 1947, voluntarily enter into a valid lease in good faith with respect to any housing accommodations for which a maximum rent is in effect under this section and such lease takes effect after the effective date of this title that expires on or after December 31, 1948, the maximum rent for such housing accommodations shall be, as of the date such lease takes effect, that which is mutually agreed between the landlord and tenant in such lease if it does not represent an increase of more than 15 percent over the maximum rent which would otherwise apply under this section (sec. 204 (b)).

The Housing Expediter is authorized to issue such regulations and orders, consistent with the provisions of this title, as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this section, and section 202 (c) (sec. 204 (d)).

The Housing and Rent Act of 1948—Public Law 464, Eightieth Congress—provides:

The term "controlled housing accommodations" means housing accommodations in any defense-rental area, except that it does not include—

(3) any housing accommodations;

(A) the construction of which was completed on or after February 1, 1947, or which are additional housing accommodations created by conversion on or after February 1, 1947; or (B) which for any successive 24-month period during the period February 1, 1945, to the date of the enactment of the Housing and Rent Act of 1948, both dates inclusive, were not rented (other than to members of the immediate family of the landlord) as housing accommodations (sec. 202 (c)).

The Housing Expediter shall, by regulation or order, make such individual and general adjustments in such maximum rents in any defense-rental area or any portion thereof, or with respect to any housing accommodations or any class of housing accommodations within such area or any portion thereof, as may be necessary to remove hardships or to correct other inequities, or further to carry out the purposes and provisions. Due weight shall be given the question as to whether or not the landlord is suffering a loss in the operation of the housing accommodations (sec. 204 (b)).

THE REGULATION ISSUED BY THE HOUSING EXPEDITER

Controlled housing rent regulations for New York City defense-rental area, issued pursuant to the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, Public Law 129, Eightieth Congress, provides:

SEC. 5. (a) Grounds for increase of maximum rent: Any landlord may file a petition for adjustment to increase the maximum rent otherwise allowable only on the grounds that:

* * * * *

(11) Inequitable rents: The rent on the date determining the maximum rent was substantially lower than the rent generally prevailing in the defense-rental area for comparable housing accommodations on the maximum rent date.

Section 5 (a) 11 is but one of 13 grounds on which landlords may seek increases under this regulation—section 5 (a).

One of the other grounds is "substantial hardship from increase in operating expenses"—section 5 (a) 12; and another is "landlord operating at a loss"—section 5 (a) 16. Under these two subdivisions no landlord can complain of hardship, particularly under section 5 (a) 12, since the Housing Expediter will by adjustment of the rents of the tenants restore the landlord to his operating position as of the maximum rent date. The word "hardship" has a different connotation under the rent regulation than it has in common usage. Under the regulation—5-a-12—an increase will be ordered if "the landlord is suffering a substantial hardship because his present net income for the property is less than his average annual net income for a prior base period due to an unavoidable increase in operating expenses." In other words, if a landlord's net income for a prior base period was $100,000, and his net income is now $50,000 because of increased taxes, payroll, etc., an increase in rents will be ordered so as to restore landlord to his former position, that is, a net income of $100,000. Consequently, every landlord who will open his books to the OHE auditors, and can substantiate his figures, has no fear of suffering decreased net income because of rent control.

However, for those landlords whose net income has increased since rent control became effective, because of the so-called voluntary leases, changes from residential to commercial or business occupancy with consequent limitless rentals, and other means, there is no need to submit books and records disclosing increased net income—they can apply for increases in rents of remaining housing accommodations in the building under Section 5-a-11 of the regulation; and in making such an application nothing more must be done than to submit a simple statement—typed onto the form supplied by the OHE, stating in the words of the regulation:

The rent on the date determining the maximum rent was substantially lower than the rent generally prevailing in the defense-rental area for comparable housing accommodations on the maximum rent date.

A copy of the application is then sent to the tenants who are given 5 to 15 days in which to answer the landlord's application. A proper answer should compare tenant's apartment, its facilities and equipment with (1) other apartments in the same building and (2) with other housing accommodations in the area—pointing out differences with respect to location in area, type of structure, services received, and facilities available in the various apartments.

It is a most difficult problem for even a lawyer. Tenants in tenements have a most difficult time in opposing such applications, even with the assistance of an attorney.

The landlord has made a simple unsubstantiated statement—and the area rent office does all of the work for the landlord, checking its files to find paper records of so-called comparable accommodations, and making allowances for the existence or lack of refrigerators and other equipment; and since it is the expressed policy of the Congress "to terminate at the earliest practicable date all Federal restrictions on rents on housing accommodations"—see section 201-b, Public Law 129, Eightieth Congress—the area rent director has taken advantage of this language and has readily granted increases. Generally the tenants are denied any opportunity to review these decisions.

The tenants are harried into quickly replying without adequate opportunity to obtain and correlate facts, either individually or jointly, and requests for extension of time in which to reply are now denied, although made in behalf of

the tenants of a building by their Congressman.

What has happened in some of the cases involving section 5-a-11, the so-called comparability section?

Former employees of the Office of the Housing Expediter and others are advertising for landlord clients. I have read to you the advertisement that appeared in Real Estate News, December 1948, organ of the Greater New York Taxpayers Association, an association of tenement-house owners. In the first place, the area rent office was flooded with such applications right after the 1st day of January 1948, as though by a signal. All types of structures were involved. High-rent as well as low-rent tenements were subject of applications on the ground set forth in section 5-a-11.

Landlords who were unable to justify prior applications under the hardship section 5-a-12 now came boldly forward, represented largely by former employees of the OPA or OHE, and simply demanded increases under section 5-a-11 without justification or substantiation, the area rent office supplying alleged substantiation from its files. The hush-hush attitude surrounding activities in the area rent office has resulted in a refusal to disclose factual basis for granting such applications. Why? This in and of itself warrants an investigation of the New York office of the Housing Expediter.

Under section 5-a-11, tenement rents have been increased in 1957 First Avenue, Borough of Manhattan, as follows:

Apartment 4, Tenant Walsh, $12 to $17—41 percent.

Apartment 7, Tenant Celli, $15 to $21—40 percent.

Apartment 10, Tenant Farina, $10 to $15—50 percent.

Apartment 11, Tenant Farina, $16 to $20.50—28 percent.

Apartment 12, Tenant Nardelli, $15 to $21—40 percent.

Apartment 12A, Tenant Tentine, $15 to $19—20 percent.

Apartment 15, Tenant Pilotti, $8 to $15—87 percent.

Apartment 17, Tenant Finamore, $16 to $21—25 percent.

Apartment 20, Tenant Arroyo, $8 to $14—75 percent.

Apartment 24, Tenant Quiles, $11 to $15—36 percent.

In that building, landlord and tenants were unable to negotiate voluntary leases for 10-percent increases.

In the four buildings at 1421-1431 Madison Avenue, landlord's application for an increase in rents under section 5-a-12 was denied. Landlord thereafter employed Maurice Whitebrook, Esq., former attorney for the regional office of the Housing Expediter, to file an application under section 5-a-11. The landlord's application simply stated:

This is a proceeding under section 5 (a) 11. All rents in this property (a group of four houses operated as one unit) located on Madison Avenue and Ninety-eighth Street, are substantially lower than the rents for comparable accommodations on March 1, 1943, because the property was then operated by a trustee whose sole purpose was to rent all apartments regardless of prevailing rental values. As a result, all rents are considerably below the bottom of the range for similar accommodations. Average rentals throughout this property are $8 per room. There are no rentals nearly as low as these on Madison Avenue or in the vicinity of this property.

The answer submitted in behalf of the tenants, signed by nearly all of the 78 tenants in the building, set forth in detail and under oath the following:

First. Landlord's application listed no comparables.

Second. Landlord's application misstated the facts, falsely attributing certain actions to a person now deceased.

Third. Landlord's application states that it is made under section 5 (a) 11; incorrectly stating, that rents in subject premises are lower than rents for comparable accommodations on March 1, 1943.

Fourth. Tenants' statement and supporting affidavit filed by me listed comparable premises.

Fifth. Tenants' statement and supporting affidavit described in detail the differences in services and equipment found in subject and comparable premises, showing partial lack of elevator service and complete lack of refrigerators in subject premises as compared with comparable premises, as well as general desirability of comparables as against subject premises as evidenced by successful competition waged by comparables on rent-freeze date;

Sixth. Tenants' statement and supporting affidavit described in detail the nature of the area in which subject premises are located, pointing out how that area in the vicinity of Madison Avenue, between Ninety-seventh and Ninety-eighth Streets, where subject is located, has changed in recent years and become a part of the vast slum area above Ninety-sixth Street with its prevailing overpopulated and congested houses of poor working-class families.

Seventh. Tenants' statement and supporting affidavit showed that subject could not therefore be compared with structurally similar houses located below Ninety-seventh Street or west of Madison Avenue; and

Eighth. Tenants' statement and supporting affidavit exposed the falsity of landlord's statement concerning prior management of subject premises.

The area rent office, however, increased rentals in 41 units, a total of $210 per month. In 10 units, the tenants' rentals were increased by more than 15 percent, despite the fact that landlord previously was unable to justify an increase under section 5-A-12. No reply has been received to a letter of December 11, 1948, written by me to the housing expediter in New York, asking for the data upon which such increases were granted.

The area rent office, without request from the landlord, has granted increases under section 5-A-11 where the OHE could not grant an application filed by landlord under section 5-A-12. For instance, increases were granted for premises 429 East Eightieth Street, as follows:

Apartment 1W, Tenant Lee, $20 to $25—25 percent.

Apartment 2E, Tenant Minich, $20 to $26—30 percent.

Apartment 2W, Tenant Birchman, $20 to $26—30 percent.

Apartment 3E, Tenant Zemko, $20 to $26—30 percent.

Apartment 4E, Tenant Kemmerer, $23 to $26—13 percent.

Apartment 4W, Tenant Vacant, $20 to $26—30 percent.

Apartment 5W, Tenant Baisle, $18 to $24—33⅓ percent.

Apartment 5E, Tenant Bittner, $18 to $24—33⅓ percent.

This matter was taken up with the Federal Housing Expediter. In answer to my protest to the granting of increases of 25 to 33⅓ percent in cases where landlords could not obtain increases of 10 to 15 percent, Mr. Woods advised me:

As you know, the regulations provide various grounds as a basis for adjustment in the event that landlords can qualify under any of these grounds for rent increases. Accordingly, in the event that a landlord files a petition with the area office for a rent adjustment under one specific subparagraph of section 5 (A) of the regulation, and although no relief is accorded to him under that specific provision, he is not thereby precluded from having his rent adjusted under any other applicable paragraph, provided that he actually qualifies for a rent increase.

This is the kind of deal the tenants are receiving in New York City. What I have related today merely touches on one aspect of rent control and its administration, but it is indicative of the attitude of the Housing Expediter and of the regulations promulgated by him under the act.

While the landlord's lobby shouts "Stop, thief," it is reaping huge profits at the expense of the tenants, and with the aid and assistance of the OHE. The New York Times report—March 4, 1948—of action taken by the House Banking and Currency Committee is revealing. It reports that the landlords were defeated in their efforts to substitute a fair-return provision for the comparability and hardship provisions. The landlords are very pleased with the double-barreled weapon of hardship and comparability increases which give them more than a fair return. See New York Times of March 4, 1949. Now, you are ready to give the real-estate trust the reasonable return on reasonable value provision in addition to the hardship or comparability provision. Is it any wonder that the Rent Act and regulations are still a Swiss cheese of loopholes for landlords. Here we have an opportunity to plug these holes. The emergency is still with us. The tenants must have protection. This can be done only by tightening the law. Anything less is a betrayal of the tenants' rights to the real-estate interests.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I voted for rent control during the war, as a war measure, when the population shifted and certainly was out of balance. It is now several years after the war, and I see no justifiable reason for us to begin to follow the line of least resistance and keep incorporating these invasions of property rights in the law under the heading of rent control that the American people have always enjoyed. I am opposed to this bill.

Personally, I can stand to wear a little poorer clothes, I can stand just a little more physical discomfort in my home, without some of the fixings and advantages, but I cannot stand to be without freedom.

I realize we have some bad situations, and I do not know how to correct them. Possibly if we could extend this on a temporary basis with genuine assurance that this would never become a permanent part of our economic life, we would be getting somewhere, but there is not a man within the sound of my voice who does not know that conditions in the towns of five, ten, and fifteen thousand people do not warrant this kind of legislation. But, of course, if they are eliminated, it will do away with a lot of the personnel in the Bureau.

When the Administrator forces the owners of fine homes of the kind referred to here—seven-room homes with nice baths, and with a garage—to rent them for $25 a month, the owner is not being treated fairly and the average fair-minded tenant does not advocate that kind of treatment. The Constitution protects both personal and property rights, and the invasion of one may result in either the disregard of or invasion of the other.

Mr. Chairman, if we are to legislate here, let us legislate for all the American people. One of the housing administrators told me in very frank terms, "This is a tenants' bill. We are not concerned with returns on property." If that policy is to be adhered to, then the small investor will be very reluctant to invest in rental property, which will soon bring about a worse condition than we now confront. Loans for home construction will encourage home ownership. Home ownership will relieve our present problems and contribute toward a stronger, thriftier people and a stronger America.

Now, I believe the average tenant and landlord in America wants to be fair. I believe it is dangerous to bring up a generation feeling that the Government is going to take care of them and is going to take from someone else that which is his, and give others the benefit of it. The two boys who figured in the recent train robbery, one is now in jail and the other in the hospital. Why? Because they tried to wrongfully take from someone else that to which they were not entitled and that to which the possessors were entitled. We might just as well be frank about this. One of the gentlemen who preceded me made the statement that this is an urban problem. He repeated it. He said it is essentially a city or urban problem. It is awfully difficult to cut the pattern of life in some rural districts to fit that of the big cities. The men in New York have their problems, and I would like to help them solve them. But there ought to be a better way to solve those problems than to say that the pattern or the prescription necessary for New York must be swallowed by the people who live totally different from those people in New York.

I have traveled around in Europe, and God forbid that I ever see any such illustrations of a police state over here. But if some communism or socialism must arise, I do not propose to be a party to bringing it about by legislation. It will arise through some other channels, and not by legislation to which I am a party.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to defend the proposed legislation which will extend rent control in the United States. I shall vote for this legislation and I shall be proud when I do so, because I want it written opposite my name that I have on all occasions sought to defend the weak against the strong. I come from a rural section where rent control is not a great problem. Still, if I voted to end rent control at this time I would be ashamed to walk down the streets of Springfield, Mo., after I had taken such action. I would not want to be pointed out by the soldier boys that I know in that city of 75,000 as the man who voted for a proposition which would force them out of their homes to live in a tent—and that would happen down there in the Ozarks of Missouri if rent control is not extended. I am not going to do it.

Some of the gentlemen who have decried this legislation said that it retards the building of new housing units. New housing units, when they are completed, are not controlled, and that argument falls flat on the floor of this House of its own weight. So much for that.

The proponents of repeal told me over in my office that landlords were being driven into bankruptcy. I have no doubt whatever that there are instances where landlords are being made the goat. But it is not the fault of the law. It is not the fault of the legislation; it is the fault of the administration by their local boards. I am of the opinion that when a landlord goes to his local board with a just case he will get a fair hearing and a just settlement of his claim.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. Under this new bill there will be a local person appointed by the local board, whose duty it will be to advise small landlords, prepare their papers for them, in order that they may get adjustments from the board. It is a forward provision that will be helpful.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I thank the gentleman very much for his comment. I am not sure that this law can be administered properly. But I do not want to be numbered as among those who ended rent control at this time when there are so many families that are doubled up, and so many others whose rents would be doubled or multiplied by three in many cases, because there is no way to determine the amount of hog in the human family.

This law with its adjustment provisions seeks to give a square deal to everybody.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER] has expired.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I occupy, as usual, a unique position in regard to this debate. I owe my election to nobody who contributed money, except my own political organization. I am free to do what I think is right and just, and I want to do that today.

I think it is a mistake for this Congress to ever think of abandoning rent control until our economic situation changes. I think you are making a mistake if you do it. I am speaking to Republicans more than I am to Democrats when I say that.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. If I could get some more time, I would yield all afternoon.

I think it is equally bad to continue this law as it is, unless we amend it. We cannot afford to destroy property, no matter how few those are whose property is destroyed. We must protect the least of everyone who is in distress. But I believe it is the duty of this Congress to keep some program on the statute books, and it is the duty of this Congress, in doing it, to make it as just as it is possible for the human mind to conceive.

You say the war is over. It is not. I hope you will think of that when you get into the next one. When war starts in America, democracy stops. Did you not know that? You cannot walk off and leave these 14,000,000 people, who are defenseless, because you say the shooting has stopped. No peace has been signed. This situation in time will be justly dealt with, but just the moment we take it off entirely, what about the American Legion in my country, 100 percent behind keeping this program? What about the labor organizations in my country who want this? What about the Veterans of Foreign Wars who write me to keep this on? I said to them, "I will vote to keep it on provided Congress amends the law so that a man whose property is being confiscated can get into some kind of a court or hearing and have rents established that are fair and just."

Now, I do not know anything about what amendments will be offered, but if you have an amendment that looks like anything I have in mind to deal out justice to those who want to fix rents that are fair and reasonable, I will vote for it, and I will also vote for the bill.

It is not the easiest thing in the world for me to take the position of a lone wolf in a political party. I do not believe I will be the only lone wolf here on this vote, but at least I must be honest with the members of my own party, and I must be honest with the Democrats when I point out my view of the situation. The situation is serious at this time. I have had experience, and plenty of it; I remember in my State when loan companies were foreclosing farmers, were driving them out onto the highways homeless, and we had to organize ourselves to prevent it. I was called a dictator; I was called everything under the sun, but we stopped the foreclosures. And now the businessmen who could not foreclose when they wanted to say that we performed the greatest service ever performed in North Dakota, because the creditors got their money, and these men who were kept on the farms by mere force and awkwardness are rich men today. Turn loose all these people through the processes of the courts by dispossesion, and if Congress is not in

session you will have another Congress called to meet an alarming situation.

Do not defeat the bill. Make it reasonable and keep it on the books until this country can get itself out of a situation due to an aftermath of war.

Many Members on and off the floor have expressed themselves as alarmed over the spread of communism in this country. I have tried time and again to state to this House that communism never develops anywhere unless the people are in want, in distress, or suffering. Should rent controls be withdrawn and an era of dispossessions ensue, you will have men, women, and children out in the streets and alleys, with no place to go. If these dispossessed people should mount into the millions, there will be just that many people in distress, in want, and suffering. We fought this last war for the four freedoms, and one of them was freedom from want, and another freedom from fear. These freedoms—both of them—will be denied to homeless people—people who have no place to go. Such a situation, if long continued, would make more Communists in the United States than all the Red organizers have ever convinced. It seems a strange paradox, but it is, nevertheless, a historical truth, that those who complain the loudest about the development of any radical movement always do the most themselves to bring about what they do not want.

Do we want to admit that we cannot write a bill that will be fair and just to tenants and fair and just to landlords? Write an amendment in this bill giving property owners the right and privilege of having something to say about what rates of rental are fixed—write a formula that will not take private property without due process of law, and I, like a great many others among the Republican Members, will support it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I come from a family of landlords; most of my friends are in the rental class. Through the last several years I have seen injustices on both sides, the landlord and the renter; I have seen in court some injustices. One case which is typical: A young husband was accused of assault and battery. He had taken his wife's shoe and with the heel had struck his wife in the stomach, and she was pregnant at the time. I took this case into chambers, and I had scarcely said a word when the young wife said: "Judge BOSONE, this is not my husband's fault; we have to live with my father and mother and my five brothers and sisters under a small roof. My husband is ordinarily a fine boy. I love him very much, but under the circumstances he is irritated beyond bounds at times, and this is the result of a housing condition."

I said, "Can you not find a place to live?"

And the young husband answered: "No; I make the average wage in Salt Lake City, and I cannot find a place to live, but," he said, "I am going out now and pitch a tent, if I have to, to make my marriage work." I told him to go out and pitch a tent—to get out from under the environment in which he was living with his young wife. That is exactly what he did.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote for this bill, even though my family do belong to the landlord class. They rent apartments; they rent homes and I can say that one of the homes, a four-room house, with an acre of land, is being rented for only $7 a month, which does not pay the taxes. Yet, I am voting for this bill because I see the great majority of the people in the renting class need low-income rentals, and I think it is only fair. I am going to vote for this bill with, of course, the amendment, which I understand will be introduced this afternoon.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I—AMENDMENT TO TITLE I OF HOUSING AND RENT ACT OF 1947, AS AMENDED

SEC. 2. Section 4 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. (a) In order to assure preference or priority to veterans of World War II or their families—

"(1) no housing accommodations designed for single-family residence, the construction or conversion of which is completed after June 30, 1947, shall be offered for sale or resale, or sold or resold, to persons other than veterans of World War II or their families, unless such housing accommodations have been publicly offered for sale exclusively to veterans of World War II or their families (a) during the period of construction or conversion and for 30 days thereafter prior to a sale or offering for sale to such nonveterans, and (b) for a period of 7 days prior to a resale, or an offering for resale, to such nonveterans; and

"(2) no housing accommodations designed for occupancy by other than transients, the construction or conversion of which is completed after June 30, 1947, shall be offered for rent or rerent, rented or rerented to persons other than veterans of World War II or their families, unless such housing accommodations have been publicly offered for rent exclusively to veterans of World War II or their families (a) during the period of construction or conversion and for 30 days thereafter, prior to a first renting or offering for rent to such nonveterans, and (b) for a period of 7 days prior to a subsequent renting, or offering for rent, to such nonveterans; and

"(3) no housing accommodations designed for single-family residence, the construction or conversion of which is completed after June 30, 1947, shall be offered for sale or resale, or sold or resold, to any person at a price less than the price for which it had been last offered for sale to veterans of World War II or their families; and

"(4) No housing accommodations designed for occupancy by other than transients, the construction or conversion of which is completed after June 30, 1947, shall be offered for rent or rerent, or rented or rerented, to any person at a price less than the price for which it had been last offered for rent to veterans of World War II or their families.

"(b) As used in this section—

"(1) The term 'person' shall include an individual, corporation, partnership, association, or any other organized group of persons, or a representative of any of the foregoing.

"(2) The term 'housing accommodations' shall include, without limitation, any building, structure, or part thereof, or land appurtenant thereto, or any real or personal property, designed, constructed, or converted for dwelling or residential purposes, together with all privileges, services, or facilities in connection therewith; industrially made or prefabricated houses, sections, panels, or their aggregate as a 'package,' designed or constructed for dwelling or residential purposes; and a certificate, deposit, membership, stock interest, or undivided interest in real estate, under a cooperative mutual ownership or similar plan, which carries with it the right of occupancy of individual dwelling units.

"(c) The Housing Expediter is authorized to issue regulations and orders prescribing the manner in which such housing accommodations shall be publicly offered in good faith for sale or rent to veterans of World War II or their families and such other regulations or orders as he may deem necessary in the public interest to effectuate the provisions of this section. The Housing Expediter is further authorized to grant such exceptions to the provisions of this section for hardship cases as he may deem appropriate.

"(d) Any person who willfully violates any provision of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to a fine of not more than $5,000 or to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or to both such fine and imprisonment.

"(e) This section shall cease to be in effect at the close of June 30, 1950, or upon the date that the President proclaims that the protection to veterans of World War II or their families provided by this section is no longer needed, whichever date is the earlier."

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOLLINGER: On page 25 line 13, strike out "1950" and in place thereof substitute "1951."

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I do not think I have to burden the House more than a moment with an explanation. I seek by this amendment to change the date to June 30, 1951, instead of 1950. I feel certain that the housing shortage is not going to change within a year or 15 months. Let us be realistic about it. The fault lies with our failure to build houses. Now we are not going to correct that condition for a year or for 2 years. I hope we can correct it by June 30, 1951. If, perchance, we can do that, then the bill has sufficient protective measures; the President could, by proclamation, eliminate controls, and the Housing Expediter would have the right, and we likewise. Must we go through this same procedure every year and hold hearings on proposed legislation to extend rent control and thereby make the tenants jittery over what will happen to them? Let us not dangle a sword over their heads. Let us make them feel that they have security. Let this thing correct itself. We all want to eliminate controls. The way to do it is to give us enough time to build new houses, and I believe we will then solve the problem.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, here is another argument which means, in substance, to make rent control a permanent part of our economy. The gentleman who just left the well of the House did not say that, but that is exactly what the amendment would mean; therefore I am opposed to the amendment. If I was a big, so-called, landlord, with lots of apartments rented, or lots of houses rented, I would advocate rent control. I would advocate rent control on the basis that a fair rent should be paid to me, which means to say that I would all the time be able to charge a price for rents which gave me a fair return on my investments, whether fully occupied or not. So I can understand why people stand in the well of this House and say they are landlords and they are for rent control.

Suppose you went out here with a proposition that you would pass a law fixing it so that all grocery men could sell goods at a price above their cost sufficient to give a fair return, what grocery man would not be in favor of that? He would not have to worry about depressions. He would not have to worry about a slump in business. Why, by the sanctification of his government, he could charge his customers a price which would give him a net return on his operation.

Now, you better do some pretty good, deep economic thinking on this question. Suppose I was in charge of the so-called one-seventh of the housing units for rent in this country, which I understand was presented before the committee that brought this bill to the floor, having under my supervision 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 50, or 100,000 apartment units in a great concentrated area, would I not be for rent control? I certainly would be if I was to be guaranteed a fair return on my investment. Of course, under those conditions, I would be for rent control. Suppose those great apartments in the metropolitan areas become inhabited by only 30, 40, 50, or 60 percent capacity, are they not going to be able to charge a rent which covers all their costs of operation, plus a little return, provided you give them a fair return on this proposition? If I undertsand the English language, and if I understand anything about economics, they would certainly be entitled to do that.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. The committee considered the amendment that the gentleman has offered.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I did not offer any amendment.

Mr. SPENCE. I mean that the gentleman from New York has offered. The committee rejected it and adopted in lieu thereof the extension of 15 months.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think the chairman has made my case. I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS: On page 23, line 1, after the word "nonveterans", insert the following: "*Provided, however*, That on housing accommodations constructed with the assistance of the Federal Housing Administration, or the Veterans' Administration, or on which the Federal Housing Administration, or the Veterans' Administration has insured or guaranteed loans, for 90 days thereafter, unless the seller shall offer to deliver during the aforesaid 30-day period a certificate to the purchaser that construction equals or exceeds the applicable minimum property requirements of the Federal Housing Administration or the Veterans' Administration, and that each item of material or equipment equals or exceeds that described or indicated in the application on which the appraisal of the Federal Housing Administration or the Veterans' Administration is based and such housing accommodations are as represented therein."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, title I of the bill relates not to rent control but to housing, and purports to deal with a situation affecting the veterans and the sale of property to veterans. It gives veterans a preferential right for 30 days to acquire any newly constructed housing.

I propose that the priority should be increased to 90 days unless the owner of the property—in answer to what is a crying need—gives the veteran a certificate that the materials which went into the property under construction equals or exceeds what he described in his application to the Federal Housing Administration or the Veterans' Administration from which he has gotten the loan aid in connection with the construction, and that the housing is exactly as represented in that application. An owner is required to describe to the Veterans' Administration or the Federal Housing Administration exactly what materials are going into new housing and what standards the construction will meet.

My amendment is designed to follow the terms of this bill. The most we can do under the terms of this bill, and I believe this amendment is properly inserted at this point despite the reservation of a point of order against it, is change the provision of the bill which gives the veteran 30 days priority on new housing and say to the landlord, "It is going to take longer than that to find out whether the cellar is going to fill up with water after a good rainstorm, or the walls are going to come apart"—instances of which we have had time and time again, in new construction, especially in outlying sections of New York City—"so we want you to give the veteran a preference for a longer period of time so that the house can stand a little weathering and the veteran can see whether or not this house is really going to stand up in accordance with the standards which you represented in your loan application."

A few of the facts on this are as follows:

The Housing Expediter, who has authority to receive complaints with respect to housing constructed in 1946 and early in 1947 under the veterans' emergency-housing legislation, which applies only to those periods, received 200,000 complaints of the type of difficulty, which my amendment would seek to reach. Of those 200,000 complaints, he had to dismiss 160,000 for lack of jurisdiction. Just think of it, 160,000 complaints had to be dismissed because he had no jurisdiction under the statute by which he could follow up these complaints of the veterans. In those cases in which he could retain jurisdiction he has already recovered a million dollars and is in a fair way to recover a total of $7,500,000. My amendment seeks a technique by which the Housing Expediter may gain some jurisdiction over all the complaints where an application has been made either to the FHA or the VA for loan aid, and that applies to most of the economy houses and other houses available to veterans which are being put up.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. It appears to me that the gentleman from New York has offered a very good amendment for the welfare of all the veterans of this country.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the gentleman and hope that the members of the committee, regardless of whether they are veterans or not, but who I know are sincerely interested in veterans' affairs, will support the amendment.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MULTER. Would your amendment require the Housing Expediter to take jurisdiction of these complaints and pass upon them?

Mr. JAVITS. As a practical matter he could do much because he would have jurisdiction over the veterans' priority and over the certificates to be issued by builders. If the landlord wants to shorten the period of 90 days veterans' priority, he would have to submit a certificate and whatever administrative problems arise under this act, the Housing Expediter will handle. I cannot give the Housing Expediter or the Housing Administrator specific authority to go after these complaints, because that would be beyond the purview of this bill.

Mr. MULTER. This authority should be vested with the Housing Administrator, rather than the Expediter, because he is the man who services these matters in the first place and gives the permits for the construction and reviews the plans and appraises the properties. He is best qualified to pass on those complaints.

Mr. JAVITS. That may be, but giving the authority to the Housing Expediter is the next best plan and the only thing that we can effectively do because this is the bill we have before us.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Under the gentleman's amendment, would taxes, interest on the mortgage, and fire-insurance premiums be suspended during that 90 days so that it will not be a complete loss to the property owner while he has to wait?

Mr. JAVITS. If the gentleman please, whether he has to wait 90 days or only 30 days is entirely up to the builder under my amendment.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I want to see if I understand the gentleman's amendment.

Under this amendment that you now propose, do you mean that if a citizen takes his savings and builds a house for rent that he must, if the necessity arises, by reason of a veteran not showing up to purchase the house, that the citizen who built the house has to wait 90 days before he completes the transaction of selling it?

Mr. JAVITS. He must not, sir. All he has to do is to give the buyer a certificate that he is honest and that he has actually put into the house what he has represented would be put into it, and then a 30-day priority is all that is required.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JAVITS) there were—ayes 36, noes 60.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II—MAXIMUM RENTS

SEC. 201. (a) Section 202 (c) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by striking out paragraph (1) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) any housing accommodations which on June 30, 1947, were located in transient hotels as distinguished from apartment or residental hotels; or."

(b) Section 202 (c) (2) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by striking out "trailer or trailer space" and inserting in lieu thereof "trailer, or trailer space, used exclusively for transient occupancy."

(c) Section 202 (c) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by striking out paragraph (3) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(3) any housing accommodations (A) the construction of which was completed on or after February 1, 1947, or which are housing accommodations created by a change from a nonhousing to a housing use on or after February 1, 1947, or which are additional housing accommodations created by conversion on or after February 1, 1947: *Provided, however*, That any housing accommodations resulting from any conversion created on or after the effective date of the Housing and Rent Act of 1949 shall continue to be controlled housing accommodations unless the Housing Expediter issues an order decontrolling them, which he shall issue if he finds that the conversion resulted in additional, self-contained family units as defined by regulations issued by him: *And provided further*, That contracts for the rental of housing accommodations to veterans of World War II and their immediate families, the construction of which was assisted by allocations or priorities under Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved May 22, 1946, shall remain in full force and effect; or (B) the construction of which was completed on or after February 1, 1945, and prior to February 1, 1947, and which between the date of completion and June 30, 1947, both dates inclusive, at no time were rented (other than to members of the immediate family of the landlord) as housing accommodations; or."

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAINS: On page 25, strike out lines 18 to 24, inclusive.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, by offering this amendment I do not want you to understand that I am opposed to the bill. For a great many years, as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, we have had before us the problem of rent control. I have voted for it in each particular instance, and, if the Brown amendment is adopted today, I will vote for it now. I voted for the Brown amendment in committee, and if that is adopted I intend to vote for the bill today.

In the committee there was great division of thinking, because you can observe the bill itself. We struck out the entire original bill and wrote a completely new bill after the enacting clause.

Among the things I think the committee failed to do was to go far enough with reference to decontrol, or I should say when the committee recontrolled hotels I think they went too far. In my judgment we are approaching the time when we will see the end of rent control. I am not one who can tell you, and I listened long to the committee hearings, that the rent-control picture is worse than it was a year ago or the year before, because the evidence before the committee does not bear out that statement. I look forward to the day when we can completely do away with rent control.

Frankly, I am of the opinion that one way to achieve that goal is to enact a fair and reasonable bill now. For that reason I offer the pending amendment. I do not believe it wise, practical, or possible to recontrol hotels that have heretofore been decontrolled. In my opinion—and I know this is true in my district, and that is the district for which I speak—the hotels today, instead of being full, are about 75 percent occupied. In the hotel business in my country the law of supply and demand is working admirably.

I want you to understand that I do not intend by this amendment to decontrol apartments. This amendment seeks only to keep the controls off of hotels, as it is under existing law. I do not believe that the adoption of this amendment will work a great hardship in any section of the country. I do say that to recontrol hotels will bring about an impossible situation, because if a man or a patron spent 1 night in a hotel, or 1 week, that would establish the rental rate under the present bill. It renders the hotel business completely and totally uncertain. If the law of supply and demand has been met in hotels, why reach out and recontrol those places?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. I would like to subscribe to what the gentleman is saying. I come from a district where we have probably more hotels proportionately than any other one district in the country. To recontrol these hotels would create a very unsettled condition and, in a sense, reverse the trend which we all hope for, to get rid of controls.

Mr. RAINS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINS. I yield.

Mr. KUNKEL. If the gentleman's amendment is adopted, the law will remain exactly as it has been up to now?

Mr. RAINS. That is correct.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINS. I yield.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Is it not a fact that the only hotels recontrolled under this bill are apartment and residential hotels? Is not that correct?

Mr. RAINS. There is not one word in this amendment or in the old law about controlling or decontrolling anything except hotels. If an apartment hotel is a hotel, it would be decontrolled, but if it is an apartment house, it would not be decontrolled; in other words, the definition of "hotel" is what determines whether or not this amendment should be adopted.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINS. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. The language which is stricken out by the gentleman's amendment comes under a clause in the present law which defines what the term "controlled housing accommodations" does not include. The statement of the gentleman from Michigan, I think, is correct, that the bill recontrols only apartment or residential hotels; it does not recontrol transient hotels.

Mr. RAINS. Oh, yes; it does if it is an apartment hotel. The old law defined "hotel." In this particular instance nothing is said defining a transient hotel. Whether a transient apartment hotel is decontrolled is not clear.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to clarify in my own mind the meaning of this amendment, if I may have the attention of the gentlemen from Alabama [Mr. RAINS]. As the law stands at the present time are rents in transient hotels controlled?

Mr. RAINS. No.

Mr. CRAWFORD. As the law stands at the present time are rents on apartments located in transient hotels controlled?

Mr. RAINS. As I recal. it, under the regulations, if it is 50-percent transient they are not controlled under the present law.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That has to do with the regulations, however.

Mr. RAINS. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wonder if the chairman of the committee can inform us exactly what the status of apartments located in transient hotels are under the present law?

Mr. SPENCE. It is based entirely upon service, both transient hotels and apartment hotels: If the ordinary services furnished by hotels is furnished it is decontrolled. Apartment hotels are under the same regulation under the same law: If they furnish bellboy service, maid service, telephone service, or desk service they are decontrolled. That was

the reason it was changed, because many of these apartment hotels furnished service which was entirely inadequate, yet enough to keep them under the law; and they were decontrolled. We have made it so that they must comply with the regulations of the Expediter.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I see the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE] on his feet; in a minute I shall yield to him, but I want to get straightened out in my mind on certain features. In my home town of about a hundred thousand population there is a very fine first-class hotel, a transient hotel, but a hotel where a number of the older citizens of the city take apartments through the winter months; they receive maid service, they receive telephone service, they receive bellboy service just like a transient customer. I want to know from someone on the committee if the gentleman's amendment proposes to control or decontrol that kind of hotel.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. I refer the gentleman to Public Law 129.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let us stick to the specific question.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. I am answering the gentleman's specific question.

Mr. CRAWFORD. All right.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Public Law 129 has a provision in it which reads as follows:

(1) Those housing accommodations, and any establishment which is commonly known as a hotel in the community in which it is located, which are occupied by persons who are provided customary hotel services such as maid service, furnishing and laundering of linen, telephone and secretarial or desk service, use and upkeep of furniture and fixtures, and bellboy service.

Mr. CRAWFORD. So if the gentleman's amendment prevails that kind of a hotel will not be under control?

Mr. COLE of Kansas. That is right. It will be decontrolled.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KUNKEL. If the gentleman's amendment is not adopted, under the present language of the bill if the hotel to which the gentleman refers is more than 50 percent transient it would be decontrolled anyhow. If you except this then the standard will probably be the one applied by the regulations of the Housing Expediter prior to the time of the enactment of the law which the gentleman from Kansas just read.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania this question? If he had in his town such a hotel as I have described where the apartment occupancy is not 50 percent and he did not want the institution controlled, would he vote for the amendment now before the committee?

Mr. KUNKEL. Sure.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman would vote for the amendment now before the committee?

Mr. KUNKEL. I would.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and do so in order to find out from the majority leader the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, Monday is District day and there are four District bills to be considered, namely, H. R. 3347, the sales-tax bill; H. R. 1757, rent-control bill for the District of Columbia; H. R. 2799, regulating the retent on contracts; and S. 135, involving daylight saving. Of course, I have no knowledge as to whether the chairman of the District Committee will call them up in that order or not, but those are the bills to be considered.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. You could not call a District bill up on Tuesday.

Mr. McCORMACK. Monday is District day.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. These are not all District bills?

Mr. McCORMACK. These could not go over until Tuesday. The District bills would have to be disposed of on Monday, but if the District bills are disposed of soon enough we will take up other legislation.

There is House Resolution 107, permitting the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to make investigations; H. R. 1437, involving personnel and composition of the Army and Air Force; Senate Joint Resolution 136, Arab and Jewish refugees of Palestine; House Resolution 137, permitting the Committee on the Judiciary to make investigations.

On Tuesday, of course, the first order of business will be the calling of bills on the Private Calendar.

On Wednesday we expect to call up the bill H. R. 2960, to amend the Rural Electrification Act to provide for rural telephones. If all of the above bills are not disposed of on Monday and Tuesday their consideration will go over until Wednesday.

Thursday, of course, is St. Patrick's birthday and there will be no business scheduled for that day.

On Friday the civil functions of the War Department appropriations bill will be called up for consideration.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is understood that if the pending bill is not finished today it will be concluded tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is my intention. I am in hopes it will be finished today because then we can adjourn over until Monday.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. I noticed the majority leader announced consideration of a resolution to give the Judiciary Committee investigatory powers but did not mention the one relating to the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. McCORMACK. The one involving the Committee on Agriculture was reported out today. I did not know about it yesterday when I made up the program for next week.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS].

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. O'HARA of Illinois: Amend title II, section 201, by substituting for lines 22, 23, and 24 on page 25:

"(1) Any housing accommodations in hotels, which accommodations were, on June 30, 1947, used exclusively for transient occupancy, that is for living quarters for nonresident upon a short-time basis; or."

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the language used in my substitute amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama is the original language in the Spence bill. I, as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, spoke and voted for the language in the original bill. The matter came to a vote in committee, and according to the reports in the newspapers the vote was very close.

The district that I represent has many people who live in apartment and residential hotels. As a result of the decontrol by the Eightieth Congress they suffered repeated and unjustifiable increases in rent beyond their means to meet. The resultant indignation against the Eightieth Congress, which had subjected them to such a plight, contributed in no small measure to the result of the election on November 2, 1948.

The people living in those apartment and residential hotels have been pretty badly treated, some of them victims of gouging indefensible by any rule of decency. I speak now duly weighing my words and with no desire to exaggerate. The great mayor of the city of Chicago, the Honorable Martin Kennelley, who has the respect of all the men and women, I believe, in that great city, and the corporation counsel of the city of Chicago, the Honorable Benjamin S. Adamowski, and other public officials and citizens, have asked me to present to this Congress the plight that the people of Chicago would be in if the decontrol of these apartment and residential hotels were continued.

I am telling you, my colleagues, that if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama prevails and these apartment and residential hotels are not recontrolled, there will be such a wave of righteous indignation in the city of Chicago that even the most reasonable person could find no word of praise for the Eighty-first Congress.

The substitute amendment that I offer places all housing accommodations used for permanent residence back under control.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. According to the way I read this, if a transient hotel has one or a few permanent occupants it would be recontrolled?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. As I read it, any permanent residential unit in any hotel is recontrolled, yes; that is, under the original language of the Spence bill

which my substitute amendment seeks to restore.

Mr. PATMAN. Just the units?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. The units.

Mr. PATMAN. In other words, the gentleman still holds transient hotels out, except the units used for permanent residence?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from Texas. Certainly. I do not wish to do anything at all to harm any honest-to-goodness transient hotel. I think it is an industry that is entitled to every support we can possibly give. But permanent residential units in transient hotels are housing accommodations and should be subject to the same controls as those elsewhere. My substitute amendment merely recontrols the housing units that were used for permanent residence.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GAMBLE. How does the gentleman intend to have these units that are going to be recontrolled pay back the over $2,000,000,000 that was spent redecorating and refurbishing these hotels since they were controlled? That is a pretty serious economic situation.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Yes. We had a very serious situation a number of years ago when the people of Chicago from their hard-earned savings paid out money through the purchase of real-estate bonds for the building of those hotels. They did not get any of their money back, or very little of it. When we had the Republican brand of free economy, and no controls on the exercise of the sacred rights we have been hearing so much about today, some $11,000,000,000 went into the building of most of the hotels and big apartment buildings in America—from the savings of the plain people—and under Republican economy the bonds went into default. The dean of the House the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], who worked so heroically for those impoverished bondholders, will support my words, I am sure.

As to $2,000,000,000 being spent in refurnishings since the decontrol of hotels, I am afraid the reports from the Second District of Illinois will not give any aid and comfort to the arithmetic of the gentleman from New York. Most of the reports from my district are in the minus column.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this amendment is good, and I rise in support of it. It presents a fair, reasonable, and workable middle ground between what the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] is trying to accomplish on the one hand and what the language of the bill before us would do on the other hand.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. When the gentleman says he rises in support of the amendment, he means the substitute amendment, not the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. JUDD. That is correct. I rise in support of the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

There are three sorts of rental accommodations in hotels and so-called apartment hotels. There are regular apartment houses that are under control on the same basis, and in my judgment should be, as houses that are rented are under control. At the other extreme are the regular transient hotels, like the Statler, the Washington, and so forth. There is no question about the propriety of their being decontrolled. Our problem here is the third group—those hotels where a considerable part of the hotel is regularly used by transient guests and the hotel provides all the services that are listed, but another section of the hotel has for years, and in many cases has always, been used by tenants who live in it on a permanent basis. They have a little kitchenette with a hot plate and perhaps a refrigerator.

I know in my district many people who have lived in such accommodations for as long as 20 years. If anybody is going to have the protection of rent control, they should have it, too. They are living in rental accommodations the same as tenants anywhere.

Under the Rains amendment we would have this kind of a situation. Here is a hotel with, say, 51 percent transients. Under the ruling the Expediter heretofore has made, that hotel would be called a transient hotel and be completely decontrolled. Even people who have lived there 10 or 20 years are decontrolled.

What do some hotels do under such conditions? Here is a sample. A retired school teacher has lived in a given small apartment for years. Her rent under control was $45 a month. The management understandably wanted to get rid of her so they could use the rooms for transient guests and get more income. So immediately when their apartments were decontrolled, they upped the rent, in this case to $145. They knew she could not pay it. The purpose was to force her to leave so that they could then take over the accommodations and use them for transients.

If you are going to recontrol for anybody, then people in such accommodations ought to have it along with the rest. But under the language of the bill, if 51 percent are transient, the whole hotel is decontrolled, whereas right across the street is another hotel where 51 percent are permanent and 49 percent transient guests, and all would be put back under control, which could bankrupt the hotel under present increased costs. I agree with the gentleman from Alabama that the language in the bill would create a completely unjust situation. The language in the committee bill actually compels injustice to someone, no matter how administered. It creates injustice either by putting the whole hotel, including transient accommodations, back under control; or, on the other hand, by taking out from control, or leaving out of control, those tenants who rent on a permanent basis. The language of the substitute amendment provides that those accommodations which were for transients shall remain decontrolled. Those accommodations which were for permanent occupancy under long-term rental terms are put back under control. It seems to me completely unreasonable to put anyone back under rent control unless we do the same for those who live in these so-called hotels on a permanent basis.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. May I ask the gentleman if he is familiar with this provision of the District of Columbia rent control?

Mr. JUDD. No; I am not.

Mr. HARRIS. As I understand it, for example, the Mayflower Hotel here in the District has transient rooms and also apartment units. The transient rooms, that is where an individual comes in and gets a room for the night or for several days, are not controlled. But the monthly residential apartment in that hotel is controlled. Is that exactly what is meant by the language of this bill?

Mr. JUDD. No; not of the bill. But it is precisely what the substitute amendment would do. It has worked in the District and is the best pattern for the Nation. I had prepared a similar amendment, but I was glad that the gentleman from Illinois offered it, because he is a Democratic member of the committee, and that demonstrates that this is not an attempt to be partisan or to destroy the rent-control bill.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. KUNKEL. Under the present law the test is whether ordinary hotel services, such as telephone, maid service, bellboy service, and things such as that are furnished. You can have a controlled apartment in a transient hotel today, but it is an apartment that was rented permanently and in which those services are not rendered.

Mr. JUDD. This changes present standards in existing legislation, by putting emphasis on the transient character of the guest.

Mr. KUNKEL. Not if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama is adopted.

Mr. JUDD. No; I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama. I am in favor of the substitute amendment which gives equity to both groups in these combination hotels.

Mr. KUNKEL. Are you going to see to it, then, that the people who left the hotel on June 30, 1947, because their rents were increased are going to get their accommodations back, or are you going to give the benefit to those people who came in and took their place?

Mr. JUDD. I do not see how we could make it retroactive. They left under the law as it existed then. I do not see how you can make it retroactive to tenants that have left.

Mr. KUNKEL. If you cannot make it retroactive, then you are not protecting the people that you say you are trying to protect.

Mr. JUDD. It cannot be done completely, that is perfectly true. But we can prevent this practice from going any

further. I recognize the difficulty the gentleman mentions.

Mr. KUNKEL. All you are doing is giving some future person an advantage.

Mr. JUDD. No; most of the tenants are still where they were in 1947. If the language which is in the present bill is kept it is bound to be in litigation from now until doomsday because it says "transient hotels as distinguished from apartment or residential hotels." Now how will those three terms be defined? It will require court decisions. There will be suits brought against the rulings and the regulations issued by the Expediter. By using for the dividing line the term, "housing accommodations used exclusively for transient occupancy," we can get around the trouble. I hope you will support the substitute amendment.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the gentleman from Minnesota in connection with residential hotels and transient hotels. There is a distinction, you must remember, between units occupied by permanent residents in hotels and guests who were permanent residents in a hotel.

Under the substitute amendment, I am afraid that we have not properly made this distinction. For instance, Mr. Jones lived in room 202 of the Blank Hotel under rent control and he moved. Under the substitute amendment, there arises some question as to whether or not room 202 is thereafter controlled, even though Mr. Jones does not occupy it and whether or not Mr. Smith comes in and occupies that room. It becomes a rather technical thing, and I do not believe that the substitute amendment reaches that particular situation. In connection with the recontrolling of these rents and the testimony which we had before our committee and the statement by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA], I want to read from page 780 of the hearings, in which the gentleman from Illinois said he has not heard any complaint from certain hotels in Chicago, but meanwhile, for instance, the faculty of the University of Chicago had not had their salaries increased and they live in that neighborhood. They might get a top salary of $5,000. Then were listed in the hearings the hotels about which complaints are made. I want to read to you a little about how much the rent in those hotels have been raised, starting on page 776. Here is a hotel where the legal maximum rent on June 30, 1947, was $10.50 a month. It has been raised $4.50 per month. Then on down the line, the next one, the legal maximum rent was $3.50 per week, and it has been raised $7 per week.

Here is another one, $9 per week, and it has been raised $5 per week.

Here is one, $13 per month, and it has been raised $4.50 per week.

Here is one, $4 per week, and it has been raised $5 per week.

I am taking them at random, whether high or low. Here is one at $6 per week, and it has been raised $2 a week.

Here is one, $50 a month, and it has been raised $40 a month.

Here is one at $57 a month and it has been raised $15 a month.

And so on down through this list of tabulation of controlled housing units.

The point I am making, referring to the statement of the gentleman from Illinois before the committee, is that these people are not suffering undue hardships by reason of these raises in rates.

We have three classes of people. Those suffering undue hardships as tenants; those suffering undue hardships as landlords; and those suffering undue hardships as the traveling public. So we must think of all of them. But I do not believe that the people who are occupying these residential hotels whose salaries are around $5,000 are suffering any undue hardship by reason of the tabulated increases shown in the testimony produced before our committee.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I wanted to comment on your distinction between accommodations that are used on a transient basis and persons who are transient guests. It seems to me the language of the O'Hara amendment is clear. It says "any housing accommodations in hotels, which accommodations were on June 30, 1947, used exclusively for transient occupancy." The emphasis is not so much on the tenants as on the basis on which the accommodations were rented. If they were rented on a transient basis they are decontrolled. If on a permanent basis they are recontrolled.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. You mean the unit itself is recontrolled, whether Mr. Jones lives in it or not?

Mr. JUDD. Yes.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. I do not agree with that. I do not believe it is sound policy of controlling accommodations in a hotel.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. It is my understanding that the average transient hotel in this country has an occupancy up to about 80 percent at this time. In those hotels are many permanent occupants. Does the gentleman think it is necessary to put those hotels back under control when they do not have 100-percent occupancy?

Mr. COLE of Kansas. No, I do not.

In closing, one thing I want this Committee to take carefully into consideration is the fact that if we adopt this amendment we will roll back prices on those hotels.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE] has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute amendment offered by my colleague from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. Chairman, for many years I have been familiar with the men who control and own these large apartment buildings and hotels, not only in Chicago, as my colleague stated, but all over the United States. It is a group of men who came into possession of many of these apartment buildings and hotels during the Republican financial crash and since the crash, due to the fact that the receivers and trustees of the vicious so-called protective bondholders' committees which I then designated as scheming and thieving committees, robbed the bondholders of nearly all of their rights and interests in these buildings, acquiring the properties, either directly or indirectly, at 20 to 40 percent of their original construction costs.

Mr. Chairman, I am personally aware of the existing conditions, not because I have read of them, but through personal experience. For instance, I have lived for over 16 years in an apartment hotel having approximately 200 suites and about 25 so-called transient rooms. Shortly after decontrol the management not only increased my rent over 100 percent, but raised that of all the permanent tenants who have lived there for many years from 100 to 150 percent. This was done for the purpose of forcing the old tenants out who were unable to meet the increased rent, and the vacated apartments were reconverted into two or three transient rooms and, therefore, brought a higher return for the same space as when rented as an apartment suite. Unfortunately, it has been disclosed, in the case of some of the smaller apartment hotels where reconversion to transient rooms has taken place, that the rental of such rooms has been highly profitable—they having been rented two or three times during the course of one day. This shameful practice, I am glad to say, has not taken place in the higher class or outstanding apartment hotels.

Mr. Chairman, it is my observation that while many old tenants are being forced to vacate or suffering by being compelled to pay higher rentals, the owners of these apartment hotels and hotels are sunning themselves down in Florida and paying $30 to $40 a day for rooms, all at the expense and suffering of their tenants. Some 2 or 3 months ago I attended a luncheon at a club in Chicago and met the new owners of several apartments and apartment hotels who told me that if Congress reenacted the rent-control act they would close their premises or such units as they became vacant. I cannot help but feel that their conversation at that time was an offshoot of the Oklahoma situation, but it has given me much food for thought. It is my belief that this Congress should have a little more courage, should have more interest at heart in the people who are compelled to rent than in many of these landlord racketeers, who acquired hotel-apartment buildings and apartments, as I have stated, during the Republican-created depression at 15 or 20 cents on the dollar.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SABATH. I will if the gentleman will not object to my having five additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. As far as I am concerned the gentleman may have ten.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to discuss the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] to recount my personal experience and observation of the operations and activities of some of these profiteering and racketeering landlords

and owners of apartments and apartment hotels in my city, and undoubtedly their practices hold true in other large and metropolitan cities of the country. I am constrained to yield to the gentleman from Michigan to take up the time of the House in view that these distressing conditions may not exist in his district and especially in consideration of the fact that other amendments are to be offered and other Members want to be heard.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I want to refer to the solicitude of some Members for the owners of recently acquired hotels and apartment hotels who have reconverted and remodeled them at an expense of hundreds of thousands of dollars. I say to them, and it is my honest opinion, that these landlords and owners have not made these expenditures to aid or help the tenants to obtain fair and reasonable rentals but to serve as an excuse in raising rents to obtain an unconscionable profit for themselves.

Mr. Chairman, this substitute amendment deserves the support and vote of the membership, and if they have the interest of the people at heart, they will vote for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan and Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS], a member of the committee.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that most of the Members of this body know that I have fought over a period of time for effective rent control and adequate housing legislation. As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee two years ago I opposed in that committee and on the floor of the House the so-called Fletcher amendment

The gentleman from Alabama and myself tried in every way possible to obtain effective, comprehensive legislation. So, in speaking for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama and against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois, I think I can speak without bias and with some little experience.

This is not a crippling amendment. It is a fair amendment and leaves the law where it is.

As I understand it, rent control is designed to protect the poor people, the people who if controls were removed would suffer terrific hardships. If controls are not maintained there will be a much larger percentage of the family income for food, clothes, and other necessities of life devoted to the payment of rents. That is why I am supporting this bill today.

In our hearings before the Banking and Currency Committee two years ago it was shown to my satisfaction, and I believe to the satisfaction of all of the members of the committee who approached this thing from an unbiased point of view, that there was little or no justification for the control of hotels, residential or otherwise. After all who, by and large, lives in these hotels? Are they streetcar motormen? Are they coal miners? My good friend from Illinois says that he had to pay $250 a month rent to live in a hotel in Chicago. Frankly, I do not think that is a terrific imposition upon the gentleman from Illinois, and I would not consider it a terrific imposition upon me. I do not know what the conditions are there, but I venture to say that it is probably a fair proposition.

The statement has been made here that people who run these hotels in our cities are racketeers, that they acquire their properties at 10 or 15 cents on the dollar, and so forth and so on. I doubt that. There may be some degree of truth in the statement, but certainly it could not be generally true. This is an industry which cooperates with practically every civil endeavor in every community in the United States. Most hotel operators are good citizens, and it is unfair to stand up here in the well of the House and talk about them as racketeers. The truth of the matter is that a hotel resident is just different from someone who lives in an apartment house or in some other accommodation because he lives in that establishment because of the services that he gets. The costs are different. The costs are adjudged on the basis of service. Everyone recognizes the fact that services have increased. Wages have increased, and necessarily so. It would be a terrible thing if the people who work in hotels, in the various and sundry employments provided therein, had a depressed wage, the same wage as that which prevailed in 1942.

What this amendment really does is roll back hotel-room accommodations not to 1947 but to 1942, because that was the level existing in 1947, when they were decontrolled. I sat on that committee, I listened to the evidence, I took part in the testimony, and at that time I could see no justification for the continuation of these controls, and certainly there can be no justification at this time.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. COMBS. It has been my observation that since rent controls were removed from our hotels, by and large and with the exception of a little gouging at certain times of crowded conditions, these hotels have cooperated 100 percent in keeping their rates reasonably well down throughout the country.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman for his observation. It is a very fair one.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, I, too, am a little peeved at this attack on our hotel people by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

When the rule was under discussion yesterday, he said that he hoped some of us would not find ourselves in the position of those who voted for the vicious real-estate lobbyists in the last session of Congress. Referring to Republicans, the gentleman further said:

> Some of them actually did intend to join us in passing a decent bill, but, unfortunately, due to the powerful influences of the great lobby that was then active here, they were forced in voting against their own desires and convictions.

That charge made yesterday—and you will find it on page 2179 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—is, so far as I know, entirely without foundation.

The gentleman further said that there was an effort to kill this legislation—and again I quote—"in the interest of a few thousand owners of these big apartment buildings and hotels, most of which were acquired under distress conditions at 10, 15, and 20 cents on the dollar."

I have not seen any lobbyists. The protests which I have received against this legislation come from the owners of small homes who rent a room or two, or from the owners of small apartment houses who have difficulty paying their taxes, keeping their buildings in repair.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has had not a little to say about vicious racketeers who were in the hotel business. At one time, he said he had been around the country, and he knew all about them and some of their operations. He said he knew these people.

Now I say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], he is one of the most powerful Members of the House. He is the head of the Committee on Rules. So why does he not get busy, put through a resolution and expose those whom he describes as the vicious, racketeering owners of hotels and apartment houses.

If his information, if his statements, are true and those men are exposed, public opinion will drive them out of business.

I cannot let his statements against hotel owners go without challenge. It happens that I personally know Mr. Bruce Anderson, who, representing the American Hotel Association, appeared last year before a House committee when an attempt was made by Mr. Denham, general counsel for the National Labor Relations Board, to extend the meaning of the term "interstate commerce," the term "affecting commerce."

Mr. Anderson operates the Olds Hotel at Lansing, Mich. He operates the Four Flags Hotel at Niles, Mich. It just happens that I know—and I use my words advisedly—that there is no racketeering in connection with either hotel nor are the rates of either unreasonable.

The rates of the Book-Cadillac in Detroit are undoubtedly higher than the rates of smaller hotels in other cities, giving less service, but I have been at all three of the hotels which I have named, as well as at others in cities in the Midwest, and I have found no reason to complain of the rates charged for the services rendered.

In every city in Michigan with which I am familiar a man can get the kind of accommodations he desires at a price that will fit his pocketbook.

It is most unfair and unjust—in fact, it is outrageous—to charge hotel and apartment owners and managers as a

class with charging an exorbitant price for the service they give. Perhaps the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] had in mind some places in Florida, operated by some of his friends, who may have overcharged some of his Chicago friends.

I wish to add something else for the benefit of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]. In my own district—the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan—we have a hotel in the city of St. Joseph, the Whitcomb Hotel. It is a well-built, commodious, comfortable hotel, operated at rates which fill it with guests throughout the year.

That hotel has an exceptionally well-appointed regular dining room; the meals are good; the prices are reasonable. It has another very large room overlooking Lake Michigan, as does the hotel, where banquets are held; where several hundred people frequently gather for meetings and dinners. The service rendered by the hotel is excellent.

It is in a resort area. All through the summer it is difficult to obtain rooms, accommodations. If you want to be a guest there during the summer you must get your reservations in early.

And from whence come these people? From various sections of the country, but mainly from Chicago, from the gentleman's home city.

They like it so well, the service rendered is so good and the rates are so low, that many of them stay practically all summer long. The surroundings are so peaceful and so enjoyable that they come as families. They come not only with their children, but with their grandchildren.

Why are they there? They are there because they are getting more for their money than they can get at any other place in that section of the country.

Nor is that all. Through the early spring and fall—yes, through the winter—the people from Chicago live at that hotel. Is the owner a racketeer or a profiteer? Or is he even taking unfair advantage of his guests? Certainly not. They patronize his hotel; they live at his hotel, because that hotel is to them a home, and because, as just stated, they not only get their money's worth—they think they are getting a bargain when they register at the Whitcomb Hotel.

I have no doubt whatever but that many of them find that they can live at the Whitcomb Hotel in St. Joseph, Mich., and live better, that is, more comfortably and for less money, than they can live in their own homes in Chicago.

Would the gentleman from Chicago [Mr. SABATH] put that man out of business with rent control? Would he deprive people of a place where the businessman may go or send his wife and children during the summertime?

Would he ask that they stay in Chicago and freeze in the wintertime when, for less money, they may go to Michigan and live in comfort and pleasant surroundings?

You know, over in my county, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has a son, or nephew, who has a farm and a big fine summer home on Dumont Lake. Are we, the people of that vicinity, gouging anybody? The gentleman's son and family and friends come over there during the summer because it is a good place to live, because the fishing is fine, and you get butter, not oleo; you get butter colored a deep, rich yellow, nutritious and all; milk and eggs and meat and bread and vegetables and fruit of all kinds for far less money than is paid in Chicago. Yes, and fish—fine, fresh eating fish—for the catching. The gentleman's son and his grandchildren—I hate to be personal about this—come over there because they get better food; better fishing; cleaner, purer air; purer water, all the things that a man likes and all he wants to enjoy, and all in pleasant, healthful, friendly surroundings for less money than can be found elsewhere. We and all our people are glad to have you come. We will take your money, give you more than you pay for, but do not kick about the price charged by Michigan hotel and apartment owners or managers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would appear to be something that the people from the city of Chicago are particularly devoted to, this adherence and support to the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] and the opposition to the original amendment that was offered. But we, in the city of Chicago, are no different than any other community—I believe, in the entire country. I believe the apartment hotel, the so-called residential hotel, is a phenomenon of all large urban communities. Furthermore, the apartment hotel strikes me as having no greater difference than other housing facilities at this particular time, as to the needs of the people for additional housing.

I dislike very much to disagree with the gentleman from Louisiana inasmuch as I have heard much in his favor. I understand that in the past he has been the champion of housing legislation and in support of the tenants in this monopolistic housing situation in which we find ourselves.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. I would like to say in furtherance and on behalf of the gentleman from Louisiana that he has evidenced his good intention to do right by the tenants when they are deserving of right, but at the same time he is not so narrow-minded and bigoted that he cannot change his mind when the opportunities are presented to him to show that a change is needed.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, and I want to state that I agree with him. None of us propose to be bigoted—our actions, of course, will show that fact best. But I want to go on further and say that I hold no brief for any argument which says the owners of these particular facilities are racketeers and such. The only argument I make is that under housing conditions as we find them today in the cities of this country the apartment hotel is just as much to be considered a permanent accommodation as any apartment building.

The very rich live in the apartment buildings just as they live in apartment hotels. The medium-class families, the so-called middle class, live in apartment buildings; so do they live in apartment hotels. The telephone operators in our large corporations, who work for a rather meager pittance these days, are gathered in these apartment hotels primarily, not because they like to get into these places and get the service about which the gentleman speaks so much, but because they cannot find other accommodations in which to live. I think that has to be considered at this time. Retired pensioners, school teachers, civil servants—certainly not a money class—live in these structures.

I think the amendment is fair. It will do away with the indecisiveness, with the evanescence of the law as it exists at the present time and to which the law would be returned in the event the substitute is defeated and the original amendment offered were voted back in the House.

I should like to read a few paragraphs from a University of Chicago Law Review article which will appear this spring. It states, and correctly so, that the definition of the present act is something which nobody can understand not even the courts, since it has been the subject of much litigation. It says:

> However, congressional failure more specifically to define the term "hotel" has raised serious doubt as to the controlled or decontrolled status of certain types of urban establishments. Urban centers are characterized by a type of multiunit dwelling, containing separate, furnished, permanent living accommodations, usually including kitchen facilities. Residents of these units receive certain special services as an element of their rental fee.
>
> Although these dwellings have become known as apartment hotels, they differ basically from the regular hotel in that they seldom accommodate any transient guests. Whether these units are hotels within the Housing and Rent Act is a problem that has affected thousands of urban dwellers and is at present a source of bitter litigation.

Furthermore, in answer to the gentleman from Louisiana, who stated that the prices will be rolled back to 1942, that the prices which were charged in 1942 took into consideration, first, the offering of the special services; and, second, that under the law that was passed in the last Congress the hardship provisions and the loss provisions should adequately take care of the increased cost.

As to the need for recontrol of these establishments, I wish further to point out the testimony that was given before the last Banking and Currency Committee. The testimony which was given to the committee was to this effect. Professor Finkelstein, a member of the New York Temporary City Housing Rent Commission, testified that increases in rents for permanent hotel units in New York City jumped from 25 to 400 percent of the former controlled rentals. That is why we want to return apartment hotels under control.

Mr. Alex Elson, chairman of the Temporary Community Housing Rent Commission of Chicago, presented figures for the period from August 1947 to February 1948, a brief period of 6 months following the decontrol, showing increases in rentals in 249 hotels in Chicago, ranging from 16 to 333 percent over former rentals. That is why we want to return apartment and residential hotels under control.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. The suostitute our colleague offered will not injure any decently conducted hotel or apartment building. They do not have to fear any danger from that amendment. In fact, the respectable hotel owners would be benefited by this amendment.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. Yes; that is true.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to try to understand precisely what is being done by this amendment and the substitute amendment. We are now dealing with the proposed definition of what will not be controlled, if this bill passes. Let us take the law as it exists at the present moment. Under existing law, any housing accommodation in any hotel, transient or otherwise, is not subject to control. The amendment as offered in the original bill—not the one before us, but as originally introduced—provided, as the substitute would provide, that housing accommodations in hotels which are used permanently, that is, permanent housing accommodations in any kind of hotel, would be subject to control. The amendment which was offered would seek to take hotels of any kind, whatsoever, transient or nontransient apartment, residential, or otherwise, out of control definitely and completely. I think the bill should be passed as presented by the committee. These amendments were considered in committee, and a majority of the committee were in favor of the provision as it now reads, which is:

> Any housing accommodation which was located in a transient hotel that was a transient hotel on June 30, 1947, should be exempt from control.

The gentleman from Florida referred to a situation in his State. In Miami Beach all dwelling accommodations in and out of hotels were decontrolled by court action. The local board recommended it. The Expediter did not go along with it, and the court ordered it.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I would like to mention that one Member told me that he had just come from Florida, and since the decontrol they have found prices were lower than they have ever been before, and there are more hotel rooms available. I am going to vote for the bill, but I just wanted to make that observation.

Mr. MULTER. The point I am trying to make is that where the court has decontrolled areas, as they have in Florida, this bill does not permit them to be recontrolled, under any circumstances. We set up a provision for local boards, and those local boards have the right to recommend increases in rent. They have the right to recommend decontrol of a complete area, or decontrol of a classification within an area. They can decontrol hotels in your area if hotels should be decontrolled, and if the local board's recommendation is not approved by the Expediter they can go to court and have it done by the court. You can take the bill as presented by the committee in this respect certainly and feel safe that you are losing nothing by it and that your area will not be adversely affected in any way whatsoever.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. The difference really is only whether the Expediter controls units or controls whole buildings. Did the Expediter tell the committee which he preferred administratively?

Mr. MULTER. The Expediter said that he prefers to control all permanent housing in hotels and out of hotels. He said there should be no distinction between permanent residents just because they are in a hotel. That is his view.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not know that the gentleman got my question. The difference in these amendments is that one says it will control separate units and the other says whole buildings. Which does the Expediter prefer to do? Does he prefer to control whole buildings or units?

Mr. MULTER. The Expediter proposed to control units. The amendment, as brought out by the committee, decontrols transient hotels. Permanent hotels and residential hotels are under control unless the local board or the Expediter says that that classification in the particular area should be no longer subject to control

Mr. JAVITS. And does the Expediter prefer it that way?

Mr. MULTER. That is right.

Mr. JUDD. Then the gentleman says that the Expediter prefers the substitute amendment to the committee language?

Mr. MULTER. That is what the Expediter said to us. The majority of the committee did not agree with him, and said that hotels which were transient on June 30, 1947, should no longer be subject to control. That does not mean rolling back rents to 1942, because you have a provision, and you will get a further provision, I believe, about getting an increase of rent so as to give you a reasonable return if you are entitled to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] has expired.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] has just said that the Administrator prefers the wording of the substitute amendment. I do not wonder. It seems to me that the impression has been created that what we are doing in protecting permanent residents in hotels is to protect the high-income groups who prefer to live in hotels rather than in homes. This is not true in the city of Los Angeles. For instance, we have 5,000 people living permanently in little hotels; not the Biltmore Hotel, not the Ambassador Hotel, but in little hotels.

A check was made by the city council when last year the decontrol bill—that was properly named decontrol—passed this House. You will remember that the Eightieth Congress removed all hotel quarters from rent control. These people living permanently in hotels who were taken out from under the rent-control program, found their rents were going to be raised not 10 percent, but 100, 200, and 300 percent. The city council had to act immediately in this matter in the city of Los Angeles to protect permanent residents in hotels. Rents were allowed a 25-percent increase and frozen. Those affected were not rich people. They were not young people. They were old people living on pensions, or on very small incomes, living in one little room and, as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] said, cooking on a hot plate. They have barely enough to get along on as it is without 100- or 200-percent increases in rent. The city council came to their relief and put rent controls on permanent residences in hotels.

I have here a letter from a little old lady, 80 years old, and she says:

> I am so heartened to see Mr. SPENCE's bill introduced. It will protect us when the city regulation expires on March 31, 1949. We are so glad Mr. Truman was elected. We are so glad a Democratic Congress will now come to our rescue.

I do not say this to be light in the matter. I say it as a most solemn reminder. The Democrats have promised those 5,000 old people in Los Angeles living in hotels that they will come to their aid and see that controls are reinstated.

I hope the substitute amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. I wish to say what applies to the 5,000 little hotels in the city of Los Angeles applies to about 250,000 of these small apartment buildings all over the United States that have been taken advantage of by unscrupulous owners. I do not mean that some of the owners are not decent, respectable, honest people, but there are a bunch of racketeers who came into possession of these places within the past few years that are taking advantage of these unfortunate people.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. And may I just add this. In the areas to which the gentleman from Florida referred, the Expediter has the power to remove controls. This amendment seeks to protect only permanent residents in hotels. The amendment does not affect those hotels in the country that make their money on the transient trade.

And remember, if old people are put out of hotels in Los Angeles because they can't pay higher rents, there is no place for them to go. The population of Los Angeles has doubled since the war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from California has expired.

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. McKINNON as an amendment to the substitute offered by Mr. O'HARA of Illinois: On page 1, after the word "basis", insert the following: "Provided said accommodations to be recontrolled are now occupied by the same tenants as of June 30, 1947, or."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I preface my remarks by saying I am most sympathetic with the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] in the conditions and problems that confront them and which they so well set forth. We realize, however, that many of the people dispossessed in 1947 will not be able to regain possession of the apartments they then occupied if these units are placed back under control.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKINNON. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. The gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] stated that the council in Los Angeles had passed regulations of its own. Is there any reason why other cities cannot do the same thing?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. They have not, and the Democrats were elected to do it.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKINNON. I yield.

Mr. YATES. I may answer with respect to the city of Chicago the city council attempted to do just that. When the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 was passed, it, in so many terms, decontrolled these units. But under the particular laws of Illinois, the supreme court of the State held the action of the council to be unconstitutional. So they cannot do it under Illinois State law.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKINNON. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. Obviously they cannot do it, because only the Federal Government can abrogate a contract; the State cannot; the city cannot.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKINNON. I yield.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. In answer to the gentleman from Florida I would say that the Democrats were elected to do certain things, one of which was to pass a rent-control act that would meet the needs of the American people.

Mr. McKINNON. The amendment to the substitute proposes simply that in recontrolling the permanent units of these hotels and returning them to the 1947 rental basis the present occupants of the units, who were not occupants in 1947 shall not benefit by this windfall; that rather than to allow them to inherit the windfall by coming in under the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] they would be excluded, because their condition would not be comparable to that of the people who occupied those particular units in 1947. It is simply a provision to do justice to both the hotel operator and the person who, living there today, also lived there prior to 1947 but whose rent, in the interim, has been increased.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto, including the substitute and all amendments thereto, close in 10 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps we can clear up in our minds what we are doing. The existing law provides that there shall be no control on housing accommodations in any establishment which is commonly known as a hotel in the community in which it is located, which are occupied by persons who are provided the customary hotel services, such as maid service, the furnishing and laundering of linen, telephone and secretarial or desk service, use and upkeep of furniture and fixtures and bellboy service. We predicated the decontrol of all hotel units upon whether these hotel services were rendered. So in the apartment hotels, the residential hotels and in the permanent units in transient hotels which did not provide these services, those accommodations are not now nor have ever been decontrolled.

Of course, it is just as reasonable to decontrol a unit in an apartment hotel or residential hotel which provides these hotel services as to decontrol a room, transient or otherwise, in a transient hotel which is in the same situation. Rooms in transient hotels which do not get these services were not decontrolled. Rooms in apartment hotels and residential hotels which did not get these services were not decontrolled, they never have been decontrolled and they are not decontrolled now, that is the law.

Mr. JUDD. There are court decisions in my city which have interpreted the law differently than that and they are decontrolled.

Mr. WOLCOTT. There is the law and the courts are bound by the law. So far as I know all courts in the United States at least are bound by this law.

What would you do by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama? You would restore existing law in that respect so that all units in all hotels, transient and apartment and residential, which gave the services would be decontrolled.

Under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] which you will find on page 16 of the report, which was in the bill originally introduced, you will notice that it provides:

> Any housing accommodations in hotels, which accommodations were, on June 30, 1947, used exclusively for transient occupancy, that is for living quarters for nonresidents upon a short term basis.

They will go back under control. These will be the only ones which will be controlled. So what we call the permanents in transient hotels on June 30, 1947, will go back under control regardless of whether they are now being rented to transients, regardless of whether they are or are not giving the same services to these units that they may be giving to a transient unit which is not under control right across the hall from it.

The reason we took the controls off in the first instance was to legislatively remove the inequities which had not been corrected by the Administrator in respect to these cases.

If the committee amendment which is found on page 25 of the bill prevails, then you will decontrol all of the units in a transient hotel regardless of whether the services are given. I would not think that any of you who have been talking here today about continuing controls would vote for that committee amendment unless you knew how many permanent accommodations there are in transient hotels that are not getting this service, because under the language of the committee amendment you would take out from under control all of the units in a transient hotel regardless whether they were getting hotel services or not.

To sum it all up, the sensible thing to do is to leave the law just as it exists today, predicating decontrol of these units upon whether they are giving these ordinary hotel services, and that means that we should vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the situation as it now exists is sort of betwixt and between. We have here three proposals offered to the committee amendment. The first one we shall vote upon is the one offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. McKINNON], so far as recontrol of units specifically is concerned. The next is the one offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA], and that would, of course, recontrol units as of June 30, 1947. The other is the one offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS], which would decontrol or return to the existing law.

When this matter was under discussion in the committee it was a question of going from one extreme to the other and trying to arrive at some fair and reasonable compromise whereby it would be fair both to the operators of hotels, not alone large hotels, but to those who are operators of small hotels, 25 rooms or above. While there is no solution that will satisfy the hotel owners nor the occupants, neither the permanent residents in transient hotels. Nevertheless, the committee amendment as agreed upon brings it within the shadow of reasonable fairness to as many people as possible under any provisions for recontrol. So, after very careful consideration and due deliberation of this matter, which was very carefully discussed in committee and in debate, we arrived at that particular solution in the committee amendment.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Does not the gentleman feel that the purpose of rent control, if there is to be rent control, is to protect people as contrasted with protecting one hotel against another hotel? The purpose of it is to protect people, wherever

they live, and if you want to protect people, then you have got to protect them in the permanent units in transient hotels as well as in regular apartments or individual houses that are under rent control.

Mr. BUCHANAN. We must also think in terms of protecting people who are owners and operators of small hotels. I agree that there is no reasonable solution that will satisfy all. One way or the other you are going to affect some people, you are either going to hurt the hotel owners or you are going to hurt the occupants.

Mr. JUDD. That is the difficulty with the gentleman's amendment. It is bound to hurt one side or the other in every single instance. If they are decontrolled, it hurts the tenants in the permanent units. If they are recontrolled, it hurts the owners. It could actually put out of business a lot of hotels.

Mr. BUCHANAN. By "the gentleman's amendment" does the gentleman refer to the committee amendment as adopted in committee?

Mr. JUDD. Yes, that is what it would do. I prefer the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA], which puts it on whether the unit is rented on a permanent or a transient basis rather than on whether the hotel is 51 percent of one type or 51 percent of the other type.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is why the committee arrived at the point where it thought it would be better to recontrol the structure rather than units, applying to transient hotels with a portion of permanent residents.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Is it not true that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA], as amended by the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKINNON] is preferable to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS], and the Rains amendment should be defeated because the committee's bill, which should stand as it is, decontrols those permanent units in transient hotels?

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is the opinion of the committee as reported here in the committee amendment.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KUNKEL. Is it not true that the Rains amendment neither recontrols nor decontrols any property?

Mr. BUCHANAN. The Rains amendment would continue existing law.

Mr. KUNKEL. It neither recontrols nor decontrols it?

Mr. BUCHANAN. The existing law as of June 30, 1947, decontrols transient hotels affecting permanent residents within those transient hotels.

Mr. KUNKEL. If you do not adopt the Rains amendment you are going to put yourself in the position of telling people whom you have decontrolled that you are going to go back and undo what was done earlier.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The reason for the committee's making this suggested change, of course, was to bring under the umbrella of protection those permanent residents who live as residents in transient hotels, who would otherwise have lost their protection by various devices entered into if the hotels were converted into transients.

Exclusion from control of transient hotel accommodations would, therefore, be based upon the character of a structure in its entirety, rather than, as under present law, upon units of housing accommodations within the structure.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKINNON] to the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

The amendment to the substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JUDD and Mr. YATES) there were—ayes 54, noes 112.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided; and there were—ayes 146, noes 83.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. PATMAN and Mr. RAINS.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 174, noes 98.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: Page 25, beginning in line 17, strike out all of titles II and III of the committee amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"TITLE II—MAXIMUM RENTS

"SEC. 201. Subsections (a) and (f) of section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, are each amended by striking out 'March 31, 1949' and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1949'."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment about which we have had some discussion in general debate. Its purpose is to continue the existing law without any change until June 30, 1949. You will notice that it does not in any manner amend or otherwise affect title I of the bill which has to do with veterans' preferences; it does however continue existing rent-control authority until June 30, 1949.

In the law as it now exists, and in the proposed bill there is a declaration of policy which I think we should have in mind. We should have in mind that the proposed bill which is before us for consideration does not in any way change the declaration of policy. The declaration of policy in part states:

The Congress therefore declares that it is its purpose to terminate at the earliest practicable date all Federal restrictions on rents on housing accommodations. At the same time the Congress recognizes that an emergency exists and that, for the prevention of inflation and for the achievement of a reasonable stability in the general level of rents during the transition period, as well as the attainment of other salutary objectives of the above-named act, it is necessary for a limited time to impose certain restrictions upon rents charged for rental housing accommodations in defense-rental areas.

That declaration of policy was written 2 years ago, at which time we announced to the country that we believed that rent controls should continue for a short period, and we referred to this period as a transition period; we said that rent controls in this modified form in which it was proposed should continue for the reasons given, among which was the prevention of inflation. Now, you can see how inconsistent it would be if we were to adopt the bill which was reported out of the Committee on Banking and Currency in the light of that policy. We are going through some sort of economic transition period now; we must admit that there are economic changes over which we have little or no control going on at the present time. I called attention in general debate to the fact that the Federal Reserve Board had taken cognizance of a decline in demand for goods in many lines by easing credit requirements. We must take cognizance of the fact that in many lines we have overproduced. The pipe lines are full to overflowing of certain commodities, especially in textiles, in leather, and some machinery. We have not only seen this production effort of ours fill the demand but it has been so great that it has created, even in the face of the high purchasing power and high demand, surpluses which are causing certain cutbacks of production and certain cutbacks in the use of labor.

So, summing all this up, there is a decline in national income, and let me repeat what I said in general debate, it is axiomatic that vacancies in rental properties increase almost proportionately as national income decreases. We do not have to be too old to remember that during these fluctuations how the vacancies of rental property increased and decreased as the economic line fluctuated. Even as late as a few days ago it was reported in the press, and I think he is absolutely correct in recommending it, that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] took cognizance of the fact that investment capital was not coming into the market, that investment capital was being frozen to a certain extent by what he alleged were excessively large margin requirements on stock transactions. As I understand the press reports, he advocates the reduction of marginal requirements from 75 to 50 percent, which is a further recognition of the fact that we

are going through this transition period and we ought to stop, look, and listen to what is happening in America before we continue any of these controls.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. Chairman, let us not deceive ourselves. This is an amendment to kill the bill. It seems many members would not dare kill it by direction but would kill it by indirection. We know the conditions which exist now with reference to housing. We know that housing is not like other commodities. It takes a long time to produce houses. We know today as well as we will know 90 days from now that housing at that time will be inadequate.

What advantage is there in continuing this for 90 days except to cast turmoil and trouble on all the people, landlord and tenant alike. There will be no stability of relationship, we will not know what the result will be and nobody can know the result.

The gentleman from Michigan stated that as national income decreases vacancies increase. Why is it that vacancies decrease when the supply of housing will not meet the demand? It is because the people of America have to double up with their in-laws or live in tents. It has no relation to the supply of houses. That statement of the gentleman clearly indicates what might happen. There might be vacancies if rent control were removed and rents were so high that the majority of the people could not pay them, but it would only mean discomfort and trouble to all people who desire houses at this time. I cannot see any purpose in the world in continuing rent control for only 90 days. Rent control ought to be considered by the committee after adequate hearings, and we ought to know what we are doing. We have held long hearings. We do know the conditions that exist now, and the evidence showed conclusively that housing is entirely inadequate, and that housing, by reason of the very nature of the thing, cannot meet that demand in 90 days or in a year. This is but a measure to kill the bill. Rent control was one of the issues in the last campaign, and this is an issue that is now important to the American people. Is it important that we should have a cohesive Democratic Party which should stand by the principles it advocates? Is it important that we should stand together, as the opponents on the other side of the aisle stand together, or must we be a discordant party affected by factions and discord?

I hope that we will in this vital time, in this great issue that confronts our people, stand together and vote down this amendment which would mean the destruction of all rent control and the betrayal of the pledges that we made to the people in the last election. Let not that happen.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, when I made my remarks earlier in the day, this was one of the amendments that I had particularly in mind. I recognize that there is merit to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] although I would not have gone as far as that. And, while I voted against that amendment, I want it understood that I did not consider that to be a crippling amendment, and I know the gentleman from Alabama did not offer it from that angle. So, I want to draw clearly the line of demarcation between that amendment and the present one.

I made some remarks earlier today that I feel very strongly about. I thought them out carefully. I sat down last night and I reflected, and I reduced some of my thoughts to writing. Most of you know that I am an extemporaneous talker, and I try to express thoughts that are well developed in my own mind. But, I wanted to be careful about what I said.

This is a crippling amendment to this bill. The gentleman from Michigan admits that there is necessity for extension of rent control by his very amendment, extending it 3 months. That is an admission. Well, if that is so, why should not we, the Democrats, and those on the Republican side who believe in effective rent control, accept the extension of 15 months? Fifteen months is a compromise. The recommendation was 2 years, and this was a compromise, and the reason 15 months was adopted in the committee was to bring it to the end of the fiscal year rather than have the year end in March of next year. That is the reason why 15 months was adopted by the committee, but as a compromise over the 2-year recommendation.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SADLAK. Does the gentleman deny that there is no growing unemployment in the United States today, and particularly in Connecticut and New England?

Mr. MCCORMACK. What does the gentleman mean, do I deny? There is seasonal unemployment, and that happens every year. But, there is no unemployment due to any basic disturbance of our economic system.

Mr. SADLAK. There are over 250,000 unemployed in the New England States. That is not seasonal.

Mr. MCCORMACK. We have seasonal unemployment there and throughout the country, and the gentleman from Connecticut knows it just as well as I do.

Is the gentleman in favor of this amendment?

Mr. SADLAK. I know the facts.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Is the gentleman in favor of this amendment?

Mr. SADLAK. Yes, I am.

Mr. MCCORMACK. All right. We will place this gentleman on record anyway. He comes from Connecticut. That places him on record. One Republican goes on record, anyway. The gentleman has admitted his state of mind.

Mr. Chairman, this is one of the crippling amendments I had in mind when I made my remarks this morning. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Wolcott warm-weather amendment, because, make no mistake about it, when you vote this amendment in the bill you have done the equivalent of striking out the enacting clause, or voting to kill rent control.

I should like to address the Members on my side of the aisle on this matter. I think if we are going to kill rent control, we ought to do it in an honest, above-the-board way, and not do it in such a way that we will try to destroy or hide the evidence.

I do not think we should give the members of the Republican Party the right to do as they did under OPA, kill OPA and then shift the blame to the Democratic Party for its loss. I plead with you today, as we have this amendment up, which, believe me, is destructive and destroys completely all hope of any continuation of rent control, to vote down this amendment. If you must vote against rent control, do it in an honest and forthright way, and stand up and be counted so that the people who are against rent control will know exactly how you stand, and the millions of tenants will also know exactly where you stand.

There is no sense in allowing this 90-day reprieve on the life of rent control unless it is to have warmer weather for people to be dispossessed in, and there is no excuse for continuing the expense of rent control for 90 days if you intend to kill it on June 30.

I have listened very carefully to the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan in general debate and I have listened to him just now.

If he would come out and say in a forthright way that he is against rent control, that he intends for it to expire on June 30, then I believe the members of the Democratic Party who might want to vote with him on this amendment might say there has been a forthright statement that rent control will die on June 30, but I have not been able to detect in his remarks to date on the floor whether he intends to let rent control die on June 30, and that, I think, will be in the RECORD.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman to clarify that subject.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I will be very glad to clarify it because the gentleman calls my attention to the fact that I had not made it clear in my statement. I stated that we are in no position today to determine whether we should continue rent control beyond June 30, 1949, because we do not know where we are going to be at the end of this economic-transition period. We will know in the next 90 days whether this depression or recession, or whatever you might call it, is a flash in the pan or whether it is going to be more or less permanent. At that time we can take another look at

rent control to determine whether we want to continue it. If we do continue it, we can write the standards into the law to fit any charges that have taken place in the meantime.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the gentleman for those remarks, because they are completely contrary to the published statements of the position of the Republican Party on the extension of rent control, which was that they were out to kill rent control by a 90-day extension.

You Democrats have heard this explanation. You know that if you vote for this amendment that that will be the excuse, that they were extending it for a 90-day look-see period.

Everyone within the sound of my voice knows that to vote for this amendment means to vote to kill rent control and end it forever. I cannot go along on the theory that simply because there has been some slight dropping off of employment and a slight recession in prices that we should throw our hats up in the air and say "Hurrah! there is a depression on the way and we do not need to face up to this hard proposition of extending rent control."

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. If we are starting in on a depression, then this is the time that we need to continue rent control. The less income a worker has, the less capacity he has to pay high rent.

Mr. MONRONEY. If, as my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] has said, it is axiomatic that the lower the income drops the less crowded housing conditions become, I wonder how he explains away the fact that our national housing plant in the Nation today was built to accommodate about a $100,000,000,000 income, while today the national income is about $225,000,000,000. I, for one, do not hope to see and do not believe that we will see the national income drop to $100,000,000,000 a year to the point where we will put our population and its income back into a housing plant which was designed to accommodate only $100,000,000,000 a year.

This housing situation will be just as tough in 90 days from now. If you pass up this chance to extend rent control, you are actually killing rent control by this vote, but you are destroying the evidence of the responsibility of those who are guilty of doing the act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, now that we have heard three of the distinguished Members on the other side crack the party whip, permit me to say that I am pretty discouraged about this whole business. I do not think it is quite cricket to tell us that just because this amendment was offered, it is a Republican move to kill rent control. I do not know what the Republican organization wants to do or intends to do. I only know that as one Republican, I have been listening. I have wanted to compromise and go along if I could. I have never been for rent control and I am not for rent control now. But I am willing to try to take a little dose of it out of courtesy to you gentlemen, thinking that you might know more about the subject than I do. I was willing to just go along a little way if I could find some good reason and when some say they are willing to vote to extend it to June 1949, then you say, "Why, that is an underhanded business. You just want to kill the whole thing." That grieves some—that hurts, that is unkind—and I think untrue.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] said that the offering of the amendment by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] was an admission that we must have rent control. Therefore we should take 15 months of it. As I get it, it is the purpose of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] to take a look at it, as he said, and see what happens, where we are in June, and what is going to happen after June next. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], in his argument, said if it is a good thing, why not take it for 15 months? Here is one answer: Any Member of the House might be willing to take one little drink of good liquor, but nobody—well not very many—want to take 15. Do you see the point? Even a little of a good thing may be enough to take at one time. When we, on this side, try to compromise you rebuff us and charge us with underhand practices. That is discouraging—very, very discouraging.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have been observing this discussion very carefully this afternoon. I have seen an atrocious attempt made, as many of my colleagues have said, to deliberately kill rent control. I listened to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] as he brought out the reasons why this should be extended for a 90-day period. I was just wondering where the distinguished gentleman got his philosophy. But on reflecting over the past few years, I have found some traces of the Hoover fever that yet prevails.

During Hoover's administration we were peeping around the corner. Yes. Looking for two cars in every garage. What did we get? Two families in every garage. We were looking for a chicken in every pot. What did we get? Not even a pot to cook our beans in.

I happen to be a carpenter by trade myself. How much can you build in 90 days? What can you do in that period? I recall when Franklin D. Roosevelt was first elected they were saying that grass would grow in the streets of New York. You cannot face your constituents in this battle after voting for this 90 days' extension. Your actions will rise to haunt you as sure as you are seated in this august assembly room.

Looking back into my own territory, in the last year we could not even buy a sack of cement to patch a piece of sidewalk or fix a foundation under a house. Why? Because the materials that go into the building of our homes were being purchased by speculators. When you drive through this community and see the great pieces of construction work going on and you look in the papers and see the prices of those homes from fifteen to sixty-five thousand dollars, I can readily see why the common man has not been able to buy a piece of real estate or to build within the reach of his ability to pay.

The people of this Nation will never stand for a discontinuation of this rent control, or allowing this 90-day period, which will allow them to be pushed out under the hot rays of the sun and make them think they are living in the comforts of well supplied homes.

You must not forget what you are doing today. I remind you, lest ye forget. Lest ye forget!

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CROOK] has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot agree on time to conclude the debate on this amendment.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that all debate on this amendment and amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved for the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] is recognized for a minute and a half.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JENSEN. How much time does this leave for each Member?

The CHAIRMAN. This will give a minute and a half to each Member whose name was called with 5 minutes reserved to the Committee to close the debate.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I will yield back my time and withdraw my name from the list. This will give more time to the others.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we may as well face the fact that rent control is necessary in the country today. This issue has been a bipartisan one, the Republicans as well as the Democrats voted for instituting rent control because of the necessity in this country. We all admit that as of this moment rent control should be continued because it is necessary. If it be necessary it should not have tenants hanging on to the edge of a 90-day precipice not knowing where they stand.

This issue does not divide the Congress by party, and I was certainly surprised to see such a raft of Democrats vote on the last amendment trying to obtain decontrol. This is a case where it goes by where you live, this goes by the wing of the party you are in. I am very proud that I am in the Republican Party and represent one of the largest industrial areas of the country, the southern part of the city of Pittsburgh, Pa. I represent steelworkers, miners, shipbuilders, and

white-collar people who work in heavy industry. We in Pittsburgh know that rent control is needed; we know that we need not less rent control and more evictions, but more and better housing, and we need the time to do it.

On the proposition that this problem should be returned to the States in 90 days, everybody in this House knows that 90 days is not time enough within which 48 States can make separate provisions to deal with the situation in the various States. They will have to make surveys to find what is the real housing need, and they cannot do that within such a short period. Therefore, as a Republican, I am going to support this proposed extension of rent control.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MCGRATH] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MCGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I thought that, being a first-year Member, I would be absolutely silent for the first year, but I recognize that this problem is so important that one must not be silent.

Mr. Chairman, I sat upon the bench of the City of New York for 13 years, and in the last six passed upon nothing but cases involving landlord and tenant problems, ex contractu and tort actions were forgotten. We turned our court into a welfare court.

There is no answer to this housing problem except more housing. This rent control bill is merely an effort to hold things in abeyance until more houses are constructed. The adoption of this amendment would destroy rent control. The whole housing problem is not a political one but it is an economic one and a moral one. I have heard people say in court: "We cannot have a family; we have no place in which to live." If you are going to say to those people already doubled up with other families, that they will have to go on the streets to live, then instead of having it said that grass will grow in the streets of New York, we shall see clothing and household effects piled up on our streets.

If you adopt this ninety-day amendment you destroy effectively and you destroy in toto the protection that you are giving now to the people of our city. I ask you to approach this problem not as Democrats—and I do not speak here, Mr. Chairman, as a Democrat—this is a problem that strikes at the heart of every home; and when you strike at the home you strike at the family, and the family according to my philosophy is the basic unit of all civilization.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS].

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, each of us has a right to his opinion and I express mine at this opportunity for what, if anything, it might be worth. I believe we ought to vote down this amendment. I intend to vote against the entire bill unless a certain amendment is adopted which will permit local units and the States to decontrol. I voted against Federal rent control in the last Congress. I think that if rent control is now justified at all it ought to be at the State level and not at the national level. However, I believe an amendment will be adopted, I hope it will be, to pretty well accomplish that particular purpose.

If that amendment is adopted I believe that I can vote for the bill. If it is not, I think I will vote against it. That is my present thought.

All of us, every one of us, ought to have courage in this House and we ought to welcome the proposition of going on record as to our positions. I do not think we ought to try to kill this bill by indirection or by any other than a direct method. We ought to stand up here and vote against the bill if we are disposed to vote against it, and conscientiously think we ought to vote against it, instead of voting for an amendment here which would have the effect of killing the bill by an indirect method.

I do not impugn the motives of the author of this amendment. I suppose he is as good a man as I am. I do not impugn the motives of any one or any group, but I think to adopt this amendment would be bad legislation and I do not think we ought to accept it. As I say, I do not challenge anyone's motives, yet I think it would be bad legislation to adopt it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, we are told that a democracy has within itself the seeds for its own destruction. We are told that when the liberties it cherishes and protects are permitted to become license, the exercise of those liberties themselves at such a time can destroy democracy. We have in the particular amendment before us an illustration of that situation.

We know there is a national emergency in connection with the shortage of housing accommodations and therefore in connection with rents. If we have not within our democracy the organic strength and the organic flexibility to deal with that emergency, and to deal with it without fear, knowing we are not going to sacrifice our essential liberties in the process, indeed the foundations of American freedom are in danger.

I believe the pending amendment must be defeated and it must be defeated on this very clear ground: Either the House wants rent control or it does not. Possible changes in economic conditions in 3 months have little to do with it. It is housing conditions and the housing shortage we are talking about here. If the committee wants to give this power of rent control back to the States and municipalities, a course with which I disagree, then face it firmly. But let us not make a mockery of our democracy and the democratic process by saying we are doing one thing—continuing rent control—and doing at the same time another—ending rent control.

I believe that the pending amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Banking and Currency for more than 4 weeks very carefully took a look at the rent situation in this Nation. We had under consideration a bill to extend rent control for 2 years. We felt that the period of 2 years was too long, that it did not bring the termination date as of the close of a fiscal year; therefore I personally in committee offered the amendment to curtail the time to 15 months, which amendment was adopted by the committee.

We did it for a dual purpose: First, to take a look at the work of the Housing Expediter in the more than approximately 600 areas under control in the country wherein there have been some very rapid shifts in population over the last 2½ to 3 years. We felt that in some of the rural and small town areas that these areas should have been decontrolled. I must compliment the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, because when we go behind closed doors in executive session I believe that that committee makes an attempt to analyze and to weigh all factors, and many times we split so far as partisan party lines are concerned.

The committee has been most considerate in recommending an extension of 15 months.

If this amendment is adopted—then just write off any rent control so far as this Congress is concerned.

I ask that it be voted down. This is the test.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK].

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the membership of the House is familiar with my desire, in connection with the first deficiency appropriation bill, to obtain sufficient funds to be sent back by us to the respective States to provide sufficient funds to hire personnel to handle the growing number of unemployment claims. I want to state now, as I have on previous occasions that I hope that the growing unemployment in the United States will very shortly reach its peak.

I would like to take the facts as they are reported to me, and I have particular reference to my own State of Connecticut. I would like to take the report of the commissioner of labor, who is the responsible authority for keeping his fingers on this situation. He has indicated in an article in the New Haven Evening Register of March 9 that there are now in Connecticut 60,239 claims for idle pay filed in the State. He reports a rise of 180 percent since the job drop began in mid-October. There is no tapering off of this unemployment. It seems to be on the upgrade, and as long as we have that situation I am convinced that we ought to adopt the Wolcott amendment. This procedure will enable us to determine more accurately the action to be taken as we shall then better know the extent of the developments, improbabilities and uncertainties that face us presently due to the serious fluctuation of our economy which is certified by the continued growth of unemployment.

have never been for rent control and I purchased by speculators. When you steelworkers, miners, shipbuilders, and

A continuation of the newspaper article from which I read a few moments ago follows:

SIXTY THOUSAND TWO HUNDRED AND THIRTY-NINE CLAIMS FOR IDLE PAY FILED IN STATE—EGAN REPORTS RISE OF 180 PERCENT SINCE JOB DROP BEGAN IN MID-OCTOBER

HARTFORD, March 9.—State Labor Commissioner John J. Egan reported today that claims for unemployment compensation in Connecticut have increased 180 percent since mid-October.

Egan said that idle pay benefits were asked by 60,239 during the week which ended March 5, as compared with 21,485 during the second week of October when the present rise in unemployment started.

During the week which ended February 26, he said, 56,120 persons asked for unemployment compensation.

New claims filed last week totaled 7,909, the labor commissioner added, as compared with 2,649 filed during the same week a year ago.

MANY PLANTS SLACKEN

Lack of work, Egan said, resulted in layoffs of from 100 to 350 in textile, hat, bearings, brass products, machinery, plastics, and electrical products plants.

Lay-offs of from 50 to 100 occurred in chain, silver products and rubber footwear factories for the same reason, he added.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to challenge the good faith of the gentleman who offered the amendment, which is not a crippling amendment; it is a destructive amendment. I am going to challenge the good faith of the Republican Party as to whether or not they want rent control extended. The only excuse offered for a 90-day extension is that they may want to look at the situation again in 90 days. Now, do not salve your conscience by the fact that this particular amendment does not apply to title I, which concerns itself with veteran preferences. Title II, which is affected by this amendment, concerns itself with veterans and with everybody in this country, who lives in rented dwelling accommodations.

If you must look at this situation 90 days from now you can do it without this amendment. There are three ways to do it. Everybody must admit there is no excuse for extending this law for 1 day unless we have a housing shortage. If there is a housing shortage today which will warrant us in extending this law, you cannot cure that housing shortage in 90 days. You will cure it only when you create more housing, and you are not going to do it in 90 days.

What are the provisions for looking at this situation 90 days from now if you should extend this law even for 2 years, and all we are asking for in this bill is 15 months?

There are two methods provided in the bill for examining the situation at any time within the 15 months, whether it be 30 days, 60 days, or 90 days from now. Look at the provisions of the bill.

The President by proclamation may say the emergency is ended and bring the law to an end. I know there are those of you here who will not trust the President, but surely you will trust yourselves. The second way to look at the situation is, by at any time offering a bill by which this House will act concurrently with the Senate and declare that the emergency is ended, and thus bring the controls to an end.

If you do not trust yourselves, maybe you will trust the United States Supreme Court. Anybody at any time from today on, even under the existing law as well as under the law that we will pass if we pass this bill, can go to the Court and adduce facts showing that there is no emergency, there is no housing shortage, and the Court, perforce, will be compelled to say that the emergency no longer exists as a matter of fact and, therefore, as a matter of law controls must end.

I have before me the decision of the United States Supreme Court in Brown against Feldman, reported in volume 256. There are any number of other decisions to the same effect by the Supreme Court, and this principle of law cannot be gainsaid:

If the prediction—

That is what we are doing now, we are predicting that this emergency will continue—

If the prediction does not square with the facts as they develop in the future, the courts can grant relief even if the legislature should neglect to do so.

That is the law of this land. You can do your looking now and give us this extension now. If you give us a 90-day extension instead of the 15 months extension you are hiding under a bushel. If you really want a test on this and dare to record yourselves, then I challenge the Republican Party to offer this amendment for a 90-day extension by way of a motion to recommit, and let us have a roll call on it. We will then see if you have the courage to kill this bill with a 90-day extension. This bill should be extended for 15 months. Give us a chance to perfect this bill now on the floor, and then offer your 90-day amendment on a motion to recommit, and be recorded, if you dare.

Mr. Chairman, I trust the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, if the Wolcott amendment is adopted, the bill will be considered as having been read and no further amendments will be in order to the bill, including the Brown amendment; is that true? The Committee will then rise?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] has not offered an amendment, and the Chair is not advised as to the place at which it would apply. However, the Chair may answer the inquiry of the gentleman by pointing out that the Wolcott amendment strikes out both titles II and III and, therefore, if it is adopted, no amendments which would apply to titles II and III of the bill would be in order, because those titles would be stricken out.

The Chair may say also that this is in the nature of a substitute, and amendments perfecting the language of the bill can be offered now, but if this amendment is adopted no amendments will be in order because titles II and III will be stricken.

Mr. MONRONEY. Further, Mr. Chairman, time for debate on this amendment has expired, so even though the Brown amendment were offered at this time no debate would be allowed on it?

The CHAIRMAN. The unanimous-consent request that was granted applied only to this amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOLCOTT) there were—ayes 165, noes 161.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. BUCHANAN and Mr. WOLCOTT.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 163, noes 178.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 202. Section 203 (b) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) On the termination of rent control under this title all records and other data (and the cabinets or containers holding such records and data) used or held in connection with the establishment and maintenance of maximum rents by the Housing Expediter, and all predecessor agencies, shall, on request, be transferred without reimbursement to the proper officials of any State or local subdivision of government that may be charged with the duty of administering a rent-control program in any State or local subdivision of government to which such records and data may be applicable: *Provided, however,* That any such records or data (and the cabinets or containers holding such records or data) shall be so made available subject to recall for use in carrying out the purposes of this title."

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, running through this debate one sees a distinct cleavage between the city and the country, between the urban Representatives and the rural area Representatives. This should not be.

There is no such thing as a rural economy unattached to city economy, nor vice versa. No part of the country can live in a vacuum. All parts of the country must be considered as a whole.

There is an emergency beyond question. Every hamlet has it, every village has it, every city has it. It may be that in certain farm areas there is no such thing as a housing emergency, but in order to have a proper economy in this land of ours we must have a balanced economy. One part of the country cannot go forward to the disadvantage of another part of the country. We all share the blessings of this land, we must all strive in sort of a brotherhood to solve the problems that affect the whole country. We all share the country's benefits. Why should we not share the solution of our difficulties? We in the

cities ask the support of those in the interior. The city problems, the question of housing shortage, slum clearance, the difficulty in finding homes for veterans, are problems for all of us and not merely problems for Representatives of the city.

Mr. Chairman, there is no such thing as a natural law of supply and demand with reference to housing units just because there are involved human relationships and when human relationships are involved you cannot have a law of supply and demand applying as you would with shoes, or ships, or sealing wax. There is a great deal of misery and a great deal of suffering because of this dislocation due to lack of housing and rental units. Those who suffer cannot wait until supply catches up with demand. Human suffering cannot wait.

There is no such thing as freedom of contract as to rental units and, therefore, the legislature must step in to create some sort of equality. That is what this bill does. There is no acceleration, and there has been no appreciable acceleration of building rental units for the ordinary wage earner, there has been no real building of apartments, no real building of tenements. Oh, yes, housing and building supplies have been used for the erection of houses, complete units, but most of them unfortunately for us are away beyond the purse of the average wage earner. Most of the homes that have been built were of the expensive type.

Where are the three-, the four-, and the five-family apartments that the average family must have. They do not want an entire house, these wage earners in my district and in yours. They want an honest-to-goodness apartment. My mail contains daily, prayerful, pleading letters anxiously asking for apartments, particularly for the veterans. We are told there are 7,000,000 veteran heads of families in rental units now under control. It would be catastrophic for those veteran heads of families if we decontrolled the units they occupy, as would happen if the amendment that was just voted down had prevailed. Any other similar crippling amendment would have a very disastrous effect upon the fortunes of those veterans.

I fear, and I am sure you fear if you know the facts, there will be great disturbances, particularly in the cities and in the congested areas if there is no rent control. Landlords would have a field day if they were permitted to elevate the rents without hindrance. Decontrol, I want to warn you, carries with it the threat of tenant strikes. Those facing dispossession because of inability to pay more rent or because of inability of finding other quarters would, with aid of neighbors, barricade themselves in their apartments. City marshals armed with writs of dispossession would be sorely put to it. The tenants sought to be ousted would fight to keep roof over the heads of their families, their dear ones.

In congested areas in cities like New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, and the like the situation might be freighted with much danger. Why court that danger?

I deprecate violence. I would punish violence, but I would deeply sympathize with those whose homes would be taken, whose hearths would be invaded so ruthlessly.

And I assure you many thousands would suffer—suffer immeasurably—if this bill fails or if it be emasculated by amendments.

We must therefore do all we can to prevent the causes of violence or threatened violence.

Defeat of this bill would be catastrophic. Removal of rent control is unthinkable.

Agitators and demagogs would relish decontrol. They thrive upon the discord and disorder and violence decontrol would usher in.

The bill as presented is fair and equitable. Landlords are not compelled to operate at a loss. There are hardship clauses that would rescue landlords suffering losses.

The bill is just to tenant and landlord—to the landlord there is security of occupancy while to the tenant there is provision of adjustment of maximum rents if found unjust.

There is continuation of local rent advisory boards to recommend increases under fair conditions with the approval of the Expediter. There are provisions for elimination of hardships and inequities.

I shall oppose the so-called Brown amendment for fair and reasonable return upon fair and reasonable investment. Such amendment sounds proper but it would be most upsetting. Under the formula there would spring up millions of proceedings to revamp and readjust rentals. Confusion would result. The present formula is adequate. No landlord under the present formula of rent adjustment has gone into bankruptcy. Under the Brown amendment much chicanery and deceit are possible. Clever lawyers and accountants could present figures in such a way as to greatly enrich the landlord at the expense of and misery of the tenant. If the Brown amendment prevails it must be voted down.

Finally I quote from the committee report:

The Housing Expediter testified that there appears to be a growing black market in overceiling rents. He cited a study which the Bureau of Labor Statistics recently made at his request, of a comparison of actual rents and legal rents in Philadelphia, Pa. An overceiling rent was found for one out of every four units compared. The average overcharge was 34 percent above the legal rent. The actual rents were those reported in the Bureau's regular November 1948 survey. These rents in this representative sample were compared by the Bureau of Labor Statistics with maximum legal rents on record in the area rent office of the Housing Expediter. A similar study made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in March 1946 showed overcharges for less than 1 out of every 12 units compared.

The committee believes that to have effective Federal rent control it is necessary to have strong eviction controls and adequate enforcement sanctions in the office charged with the administration of the law.

While the present law permits tenants to bring suits for overcharges and to defend themselves in local courts against illegal evictions, the facts are that these provisions have proven totally inadequate to secure reasonable compliance with the law. It is evident that tenants are paying overcharges without resort to court actions. Tenants are reluctant to report violations to area rent offices because of their fear of eviction. Despite widespread violations, the number of tenants' complaints filed and compliance actions started under the 1947 and 1948 acts is far less than the corresponding figures for the previous 12 months. Thus, the average number of tenants' complaints filed each month since July 1, 1947, was 34,000 as compared with a monthly average of 52,000 during the preceding 12 months. Similarly, the number of compliance actions averaged 17,600 per month since July 1, 1947, as compared with a monthly average of 40,300 during the preceding year. In surveys of military establishments, where violations were definitely established in interviews, 55 percent of the tenants refused to file a complaint and 60 percent of these gave fear of eviction as the reason. This is also the principal explanation given by tenants who refuse to supply area rent offices with evidence upon which action could be taken. The record reflects that many tenants have acceded to landlords' demands because of eviction fears. Given the alternative of paying black-market rents or being evicted, tenants choose to pay the overcharge without complaint. In some instances, of course, such fears may well be unfounded because the tenant could have successfully defended himself against illegal eviction in the local courts. Nevertheless, many tenants will not run this risk. In other words, the present system just has not worked. The result is a gradual break of the legal ceiling. The committee amendment would give the Housing Expediter authority to issue regulations governing the eviction of tenants from controlled housing accommodations. This will permit uniformity in the operation of eviction provisions. Such is not the case under existing law, and the variation between local courts in applying the provisions of the present law result in actions that are discriminatory as between tenants in different local court jurisdictions. As long as rent control is a national problem, the application of restrictions on evictions should be the same in every locality.

Existing law gives a tenant the right to sue for treble damages for rent overcharges in excess of the maximum rent within 1 year after the date of such violation. Provision would be made in the committee amendment that if the tenant fails to institute such action within 30 days from the occurrence of the violation, the United States may institute such action and thereafter the tenant would be barred from bringing an action for the same violation. The committee believes that such right to the United States in connection with suits on rent overcharges will be an effective deterrent to the growing black market in overceiling rents.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee may return to the consideration of section 201.

Mr. SPENCE. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman reserve his right to object for a moment?

Mr. SPENCE. I will.

Mr. WOLCOTT. We want to get along here just as rapidly as we can. The gentleman will have to admit that immediately after the teller vote there was a great deal of confusion. The gentleman from Kansas had been sitting here and had his amendment all prepared to offer to section 201 and the Clerk started reading section 202 before the confusion had subsided sufficiently so that the gentleman understood that he had not finished section 201. I wish the gentleman would not object to it. That is a very fair request.

Mr. LESINSKI. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I might say to the gentleman, if that is the way we are going to operate here this afternoon, that from now on it will be in accordance with the rules of the House strictly.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. DOUGLAS: On page 26, line 12, strike out beginning with the comma down through the word "further" in line 22, and insert——

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. We have passed page 26, line 12.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is well taken. The amendment applies to section 201.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 203. (a) Section 204 (a) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by striking out "March 31, 1949" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1950."

(b) Section 204 (b) of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) (1) Subject to the provisions of paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection, during the period beginning on the effective date of this title and ending on the date this title ceases to be in effect, no person shall demand, accept, or receive any rent for the use or occupancy of any controlled housing accommodations greater than the maximum rent established under the authority of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and in effect with respect thereto on June 30, 1947: *Provided, however,* That the Housing Expediter shall, by regulation or order, make such individual and general adjustments in such maximum rents in any defense-rental area or any portion thereof, or with respect to any housing accommodations or any class of housing accommodations within any such area or any portion thereof, as may be necessary to remove hardships or to correct other inequities, or further to carry out the purposes and provisions of this title. In the making of adjustments to remove hardships, due weight shall be given to the question as to whether or not the landlord is suffering a loss in the operation of the housing accommodations.

"(2) In any case in which a valid written lease with respect to any housing accommodations was entered into and filed in accordance with the provisions of this subsection (b) as then in effect, and such lease was in effect on the effective date of the Housing and Rent Act of 1949, such housing accommodations shall be subject to the provisions of this title and, until such lease is terminated or expires, the maximum rent for said accommodations shall be the rent set forth in said lease.

"(3) In any case in which a valid written lease with respect to any housing accommodations was entered into and filed in accordance with the provisions of this subsection (b) as then in effect, and such lease has heretofore terminated or expired or hereafter terminates or expires, such housing accommodations shall be subject to the provisions of this title and the maximum rent for said accommodations shall be the rent set forth in said lease, plus or minus applicable individual adjustments: *Provided, however,* That if such housing accommodations are in a defense-rental area in which a general increase in maximum rents has been or is hereafter granted, the maximum rent shall be said lease rent plus or minus applicable individual adjustments, or the maximum rent in the absence of a lease, whichever is higher.

"(4) If a lease entered into under this subsection has heretofore terminated or hereafter terminates, prior to the expiration date of such lease, the landlord shall file with the Housing Expediter a report of the termination of such lease, unless a report of such termination was filed with the Housing Expediter prior to the effective date of the Housing and Rent Act of 1949. Such report shall be filed within 15 days after the date of such termination or 15 days after the effective date of the Housing and Rent Act of 1949, whichever is the later date.

"(5) In order to help assure fair adjustments for tenants and small landlords the Housing Expediter is authorized and directed to designate for every defense-rental area an officer whose function shall be to assist tenants and small landlords by—

"(A) informing them concerning the conditions under which rent adjustments may be obtained;

"(B) helping in the preparation of applications for rent adjustments; and

"(C) providing them with such other information and services as may be necessary and appropriate."

(c) (1) Section 204 (e) (2) of such act, as amended, is amended by striking out the word "and" immediately preceding the words "stenographic assistance" and inserting a comma in lieu thereof and by inserting, immediately following the words "stenographic assistance", the following: "and reporting services for public hearings (including attendance fees)."

(2) Section 204 (e) (3) of such act, as amended, is amended by adding to the end thereof the following new sentence: "If the Housing Expediter disapproves any recommendation of a local board he shall promptly notify the local board in writing of such disapproval."

(3) Section 204 (e) (4) (A) of such act, as amended, is amended by striking out "interpleader" and inserting in lieu thereof "pleadings."

(d) The paragraph immediately following section 204 (e) (4) (E) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"If the Housing Expediter, within 30 days after the date of his receipt of such recommendation, either disapproves or fails to approve such recommendation, the local board may file a complaint with the Emergency Court of Appeals. Such complaint shall be filed within 30 days after the date on which the Housing Expediter notifies the local board of his disapproval, or the date of the expiration of such 30-day period, as the case may be. The clerk of the Emergency Court of Appeals shall notify the Housing Expediter in writing of the filing of any such complaint promptly after it has been so filed. Within 15 days after the receipt of such notice by the Housing Expediter, the Housing Expediter shall file such recommendation in the Emergency Court of Appeals, together with the record and statement of findings of the local board and such statement as the Housing Expediter may desire to make as to his views on the matter. The statement of the Housing Expediter may be accompanied by such supporting information as the Housing Expediter deems appropriate. Thereupon, the Emergency Court of Appeals shall have jurisdiction to enter, within 60 days after the date of its receipt of such recommendation from the Housing Expediter (or within such additional period of not more than 30 days as the court may find necessary in exceptional cases), an order approving or disapproving the recommendation of the local board. The recommendation, record, and statement of findings of the local board, together with the statement and supporting information filed by the Housing Expediter, shall constitute the record before the court. If the court determines that the recommendation is not in accordance with law, or that the evidence in the record before the court, including such additional evidence as may be adduced before the court, is not of sufficient weight to justify such recommendation, the court shall enter an order disapproving such recommendation; otherwise it shall enter an order approving such recommendation. The judgment and decree of the court shall be final. The powers heretofore granted by law to the Emergency Court of Appeals are hereby continued for purposes of exercise of the jurisdiction granted by this subsection. The court shall prescribe rules governing its procedure in such manner as to expedite the determination of cases of which it has jurisdiction, under this paragraph. The Housing Expediter, the local board, and representatives of the State or States involved shall be granted, to the extent determined by the court, an opportunity to be heard, by pleadings or otherwise, with right to be represented by counsel."

(e) (1) The proviso contained in section 204 (e) (5) (A) of such act, as amended, is amended by striking out "provisions of section 209" and inserting in lieu thereof "regulations and orders with respect to practices relating to the recovery of possession of housing accommodations issued under section 209."

(2) The first sentence of section 204 (e) (6) of such act, as amended, is amended by inserting a period immediately after the word "subsection" and by striking out the remainder of the sentence.

(f) Section 204 (f) of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(f) The provisions of this title shall cease to be in effect at the close of June 30, 1950, or upon the date of a proclamation by the President or upon the date specified in a concurrent resolution by the two Houses of the Congress declaring that the further continuance of the authority granted by this act is not necessary because of the existence of an emergency, whichever date is the earlier; except that as to offenses committed, or rights or liabilities incurred, prior to such termination date, the provisions of this act and such regulations, orders, and requirements shall be treated as still remaining in force for the purpose of sustaining any proper suit, action, or prosecution with respect to any such right, liability, or offense."

(g) Section 204 of such act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(h) For controlled housing accommodations which were not included within the definition of 'controlled housing accommodations' as such definition read prior to the effective date of the Housing and Rent Act of 1949, the maximum rent shall be the maximum rent last in effect for such housing accommodations under Federal rent control, plus or minus applicable adjustments; or, if no maximum rent was ever in effect for such housing accommodations, the maximum rent shall be the rent generally prevailing in the defense-rental area for comparable controlled housing accommodations within such area, plus or minus applicable adjustments.

"(i) Whenever in the judgment of the Housing Expediter such action is necessary or proper in order to effectuate the purposes of this title, he may by regulation or order establish maximum rents for any or all controlled housing accommodations in any defense-rental area, notwithstanding any administrative decontrol action taken since June 30, 1947, or hereafter taken, under this title: *Provided, however,* That he may not establish maximum rents for any housing accommodations in the case of which maximum rents have been heretofore or are hereafter removed as the result of approval by the Emergency Court of Appeals of a recommendation of a local advisory board. In the case of housing accommodations for which a maximum rent is established pursuant to this subsection, the maximum rent shall be the maximum rent last in effect for such housing accommodations under Federal rent control, plus or minus applicable adjustments; or, if no maximum rent was ever in effect for such housing accommodations, the maximum rent shall be the rent generally prevailing in the defense-rental area for comparable controlled housing accommodations within such area, plus or minus applicable adjustments."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that section 201 may be returned to with permission to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] to offer her amendment, and with permission to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE] to offer his amendment.

Mr. GREEN. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LESINSKI. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for consideration of an amendment which has been up at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOLLINGER: On page 26, strike out——

The CHAIRMAN. We have passed section 201. We are now considering section 202.

Mr. DOLLINGER. This is to section 202, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman that section 202 begins on line 9, page 27. The gentleman is evidently confusing a subsection on line 5, page 26.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Chairman, that amendment has been on the desk, and I had asked for the floor, but the Chair recognized another Member.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman the fact that an amendment has been on the desk gives no parliamentary recognition at all. The gentleman may only offer an amendment when he is recognized to do so.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to allow the member of the committee to present his amendment.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object——

Mr. KELLEY. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I did not hear anybody objecting.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not want the RECORD to show I objected, Mr. Chairman, because I reserved the right to object.

Mr. KELLEY. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GAMBLE. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GAMBLE. Where will the Clerk begin to read when he reads?

The CHAIRMAN. When the Clerk begins to read he will begin to read section 203, page 27, line 25.

Mr. GAMBLE. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of Georgia: Page 28, line 22, strike out beginning with the word "In" down through the period in line 25, and insert the following sentences: "In making and recommending individual and general adjustments to remove hardships or to correct other inequities, the Housing Expediter and the local boards shall observe the principle of maintaining maximum rents for controlled-housing accommodations, so far as is practicable, at levels which will yield to landlords a reasonable return (but not in excess of a reasonable return) on the reasonable value of such housing accommodations. In determining whether the maximum rent for controlled-housing accommodations yields a reasonable return on the reasonable value of such housing accommodations, due consideration shall be given to the following, among other relevant factors: (A) Increases in property taxes, (B) unavoidable increases in operating and maintenance expenses, (C) major capital improvement of the housing accommodations as distinguished from ordinary repair, replacement, and maintenance, (D) increases or decreases in living space, services, furniture, furnishings, or equipment, and (E) substantial deterioration of the housing accommodations, other than ordinary wear and tear, or failure to perform ordinary repair, replacement, or maintenance."

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, as I said yesterday, in the large cities of this country there is still some need for rent control. Rent control is to protect tenants from that class of landlords who are selfish. We must protect the other 90 percent of landlords who are not selfish.

I have endeavored by this amendment to give equal rights to tenants and landlords—to protect both. If my amendment is adopted, the landlords of this country are entitled, under the law, to a reasonable return on the reasonable value of their property.

This is just one more factor added to the hardship cases. Under the present law the Expediter has given in many cases only enough for the landlords to come out about even, without any return on their investment.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I appreciate how hard the gentleman has worked on this to try to bring out an equitable solution of this problem of hardship and inequity which confronts the landlords. However, is it not true that there is ample evidence before your committee that as a result of the lack of staff, the administration of the rent-control program was brought into sharp criticism? I am wondering, under your standards, assuming that your amendment is passed by this body, I am wondering what action will be taken by the Congress to implement the staffs so that they can make a proper estimate of reasonable return upon reasonable value. I think it is a very important question as to what this Congress is going to do to give them a proper staff.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I will promise the distinguished gentleman from Colorado that at every avenue, at every turn, I am going to do my utmost to get a fair return for the landlords and the tenants of this country, but not more than that so there will be no hardship on tenants or landlords. That is what I am trying to do.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. I may say that personally I am not opposed to the gentleman's amendment, and I am confident that a majority of the Committee on Banking and Currency are not opposed to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. In place of the phrases "reasonable return" and "reasonable value" would the gentleman be willing to substitute the phrase "just and reasonable rent"?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. No; I am sorry I cannot consent to it. There has been but one change made in this amendment and that was to change the phrase "fair return" to "reasonable return" at the request of one of the attorneys who studied the bill and thought perhaps that would be better; but personally I see no difference between "reasonable return" and "fair return," because to be fair it has to be reasonable.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman may have five additional minutes and then ask the gentleman if he will yield to me.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I understand by reading the testimony that the Expediter says he has the power now to include in his regulations the very thing the gentleman wishes to include. Will the gentleman, then, explain to the Committee why he desires to spell it out specifically?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I think the best evidence is the Expediter's own words. His testimony appears at page 63.

This is a part of the statement of Mr. Woods, the Housing Expediter:

Mr. WOODS. In discussing certain points raised yesterday about rent adjustments, which take into account the financial position of landlords, I neglected to make absolutely clear the distinction between the three different types of adjustments which were discussed.

I have written a statement on these and should like to read it so that there may be no misunderstanding.

The first type of adjustment is for financial hardship. The second type is for operating loss. The third is for fair return on fair value.

The first two types, hardship and operating loss, are now in our regulation. We have not been able to place the third, fair return, in our regulation because we have found no equitable and practicable method for such a provision.

Mr. Woods and everybody else realizes that you cannot justify this rent control bill without a reasonable return to the landlord based on reasonable value of his property.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for five additional minutes.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, in deference to my good friend from Georgia I will not press my objection this time, although I will say that I have not been treated too well by some of his colleagues.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. In deference to my friend I may say that I think everybody understands this amendment.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I think, under the circumstances, it would not be fair and in keeping with precedents which have been established here this afternoon in the last half hour, much as all of us respect the gentleman from Georgia and respect his position in this matter, to grant a request for continuing his time beyond the 5-minute period. The courtesy was not even shown a member of this Committee on the Minority side to offer an amendment in good faith to this bill, and I made a statement at that time that if that was the way we were going to operate here then we would operate in accordance with the rules of the House, and the rules of the House give a Member offering an amendment 5 minutes to debate it. For that reason I will have to object until there is some arrangement worked out whereby we may discuss the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I have covered the principal point of the amendment, anyway.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I shall be pleased to yield to the gentleman from Georgia since he has worked so arduously on this amendment and I feel that the House is entitled to the benefit of his knowledge on the subject.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I shall be pleased to yield, but first I wish to say that I was happy to hear the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of our committee, state that he had no objection to its inclusion in the bill. I hope very much that the amendment will be adopted; I think it does strengthen the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I introduced this amendment in the committee on the first day of the executive session. Every member had a copy of it, the Expediter knew what it was, everybody knew what it was. During the hearing I told them in substance what I was going to introduce. Everybody agreed that there should be a reasonable return to the landlords on a reasonable value. Nobody has offered anything else.

The only objection has been that the Expediter said he agreed with the principle of my amendment but that it might be difficult to enforce. That is the reason some of the members voted against the amendment, as I understand now.

Later on I had a talk with the attorney for the Expediter and I said, "Do you realize that we cannot have any rent-control law unless it is during war or an emergency and that emergency must be set out in the bill?" That is what we have done. You cannot enforce this law unless we declare in the bill there is an emergency. If the amendment is adopted the courts will uphold this amendment and certain other provisions of the bill in peacetime which they could not do unless the bill contained the emergency clause. The attorney for the Expediter told me, "From that viewpoint, I will have to agree with you. It will be legal and we can enforce it."

After this statement many members of the committee stated they did not understand it, but if it could be enforced they wanted to support it. I think we have found the main remedy to correct the injustice. The amendment may not be perfect but I think it is helpful and it is the only remedy offered that will improve the bill if it is adopted.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I agree with the gentleman from Georgia. I am not sure how the political cards would fall in this case. It is rather difficult for me to appear in support of rent control and plead for its extension for a 15-month period. Many of my people have felt its restrictions strongly and have resented them. I have been rather sympathetic with many of the complaints that have come out of my district. As a matter of fact, the rural areas generally, as has been suggested, do not have an immediate stake in the extension of rent control, but I came to the conclusion after hearing the testimony before our committee that it would be disastrous not only to the metropolitan areas for controls to be lifted at this time but because of the repercussions in our economy generally. It would be disastrous ultimately to the rural areas. Surely by this time we are convinced that our economic life is all bound up together.

I was very much impressed, as I am sure the members of the committee were, with the statements of Mr. Russell, for example, who appeared on behalf of property owners of New York City. He agreed under questioning that some controls are necessary and should be extended.

The committee has not done a perfect job, but we have greatly improved the legislation in the light of our experience. If we can have a 15-month control with the improvements that have been made in the committee bill and by the inclusion of the Brown amendment, to which no one should object, I believe the administration of rent control will be much more satisfactory in the remaining period. We must live with it for a little while longer. My conscience does not rest when I think of the results of abruptly ending OPA. It was unfair to let rental property owners' costs go up and not give them some relief. But we had to make that decision and the Congress made it. Now we have another one to make and it is like a decision of General Eisenhower in choosing between regiments as to which to send into battle. It meant casualties in either event.

At this stage, recognizing that the emergency is still on, it is necessary for us to have for a limited period some rent controls. I agree that we cannot live with them forever. We cannot limit the income of one group nor control rigidly one area of the economy for an indefinite period and leave the rest of our economy uncontrolled. I am sure of that, but the thought comes to my mind that it was the Congress not the States or the localities which declared that we were involved in war. That was our responsibility, and we must meet our responsibility now by dealing with conditions which the war produced.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT to the Brown of Georgia amendment; Strike out the words "so far as is practicable."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I think we better commune with ourselves and see how serious we are in wanting to give the landlords a reasonable return on fair values. You know that so long as it is left to the discretion of the Expediter they are not going to do anything of the kind. Under existing law the Expediter is mandated in this respect. The law provides:

That the Housing Expediter shall, by regulation or order make such individual and general adjustments in such maximum rents in any defense-rental area or any portion thereof, or with respect to any housing accommodations or any class of housing accommodations within any such area or any portion thereof, as may be necessary to remove hardships or to correct other inequities, or further to carry out the purposes and provisions of this title. In the making of adjustments to remove hardships due weight shall be given to the question as to whether or not the landlord is suffering a loss in the operation of the housing accommodations.

When the Expediter appeared before the committee he admitted that he had not been following that mandate. He, in substance, said that if a landlord was starving to death in 1942, he is no worse off now, and he must continue to starve to death. I refer you to the language on page 488 of the hearings. You can see for yourselves how the Expediter has defied the mandate of Congress to correct inequities and to prevent hardships, and has not taken into consideration costs. So long as it is left to the Expediter to determine whether it is practical or not to do it, this language in the Brown amendment is mere weasel words.

On page 93 of the hearings, after Mr. Woods had reviewed some of their problems, and in speaking on this question of fair return on reasonable value, he said:

We have not been able to place the third (category) fair return, in our regulation because we have found no equitable and practicable method for such a provision.

In other words, he forewarns us that he is going to find that this is impractical, and he is not going to put it into operation.

The former Rent Administrator, the Governor of Connecticut, appearing before the Senate committee, allegedly had this to say, and it is reported in the paper by a very responsible reporter. We have a right to assume that he is correctly quoted. Mr. Bowles had this to say, and I will quote from the paper: "Trying to fix a reasonable return on the fair value of the landlord's property could only result in administrative chaos."

Now, I think that we better be fair with ourselves; we, at least, should be honest with our constituents, and I know that this amendment right now is thrown out to many of you as bait to induce you to vote for this bill. You are led to believe that if this amendment is adopted you have done something for your landlords. The language appears in substance in existing law, mandating him to do identically the same thing, and it has not been done. Do not write any letters to your constituents telling them that you have voted them a reasonable return on fair value so long as you leave these words in here which leaves it to the discretion of the Administrator to determine whether it is practical or not, because he says it is impracticable. The former Administrator, Governor Bowles, says that it would result in administrative chaos.

I might say that one of the other objections to it was that it was impractical because you have to hire so many people, so many experts on land values to administer the law or to help the administration of the law, that the Committee on Appropriations probably would hesitate to give the amount of money to these appraisers, because of the short continuance of rent control, that would be necessary to do the job. So it is not holding out any hope whatsoever for anybody. Have that in mind when you write your constituents about it.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment, and likewise I am opposed to the substitute amendment because I think the substitute amendment is interposed only for the purpose of crippling rent control. I think both amendments will have that effect.

I had intended to offer an amendment to correct the hardship evil, because hardship cases are granted not as a result of an actual monetary loss but to give to a landlord the right to increase his profits. The landlord can pick his two best years, and if his current profits do not equal that period he will be granted an increase which will allow him the difference. These are emergency times. We must protect the tenant because of the emergency.

First of all I am opposed to this amendment because the enemies of rent control want this amendment to prevail. Suppose we adopt the amendment, what will be a reasonable return? Will the Expediter consider it on the original cost? Will he consider it on replacement value? Will he consider it on the sales price or on the assessed valuation? How will the Expediter fix a reasonable return? Will he consider present business conditions? Will he consider the earning power of the wage earner? Will he decide that a reasonable return in a period of emergency should be less than in normal times? Suppose the Expediter fixed a figure and he was in error, how would we correct it? We do not have the right of court review. Do you not think the tenant in a situation such as this should have the right to go before a court and jury to determine this very important matter?

Now is not the time to pass such legislation. After practically every landlord has applied for relief because of hardship or inequity or has received the so-called 15 percent voluntary increase, and every tenant in the country has in one form or another paid an increase, are we now to determine that because of some other angle or some other hocus-pocus theory we are to pay an additional rent increase on an over-all scale to the extent where the tenant will suffer extreme hardship?

We must realize now that the wage earner is not making as much as he made before. We are in no position to say to him, "You must pay more than you can afford to pay," and take away from him and from his family, out of their very mouths, the food and the other necessities of life. He cannot move from this apartment if the rent is too high. Yes, he can go without food, he can use some substitutes, but there is no substitute for housing. Let me conclude by saying that if we adopt this amendment there will be a backlog in the Administrator's office because every landlord will make an application. Every landlord thinks he is not getting enough. When those applications come before the Administrator, who will pay the cost of administration? Why not use that money for low-cost housing?

Let us be fair about it. You are going to cripple rent control. You know now that rent control is essential. Let us try to build houses and eliminate the shortage. Let us do away with rent controls in proper fashion, but let us not cripple it in this way.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLINGER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In view of what the gentleman has said about the impracticability of the proposed amendment, does the gentleman believe that if the House should approve this amendment it would remain in the bill when it goes to the President for signature?

Mr. DOLLINGER. Will it remain in the bill? If the House approves it, how can it get out of the bill?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. There is another body to be considered; and then there is a possible conference on the bill.

Mr. DOLLINGER. I think we are only responsible for our own body. Let us legislate for our own body. Let us give to the people real, honest-to-goodness legislation and tell them we mean it until this emergency is over.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Wolcott substitute and in support of the Brown amendment. During the 7 years that we have had rent control under consideration by the Committee on Banking and Currency, I know of no amendment that has been studied as carefully or as long, nor with the diligence that this so-called Brown amendment has been studied. I pay my respects to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia. He has consistently fought to get a good amendment which would be workable and which would help us in Congress to give a mandate to the Housing Expediter that he must adjust these hardship cases and give a reasonable return to the people who own property. When we heard testimony on rent control before our committee we did not hear evidence on the need for extending rent control. That only came up very, very occasionally.

Most of the time in those long sessions, some extending until 11 o'clock at night, was devoted to complaints by the dozens of hardship cases.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] strikes at the very heart of the question of adjustment of these hardship cases in a way which I am sure the Housing Expediter now realizes, after careful study, and after only slight modification, that this amendment will direct him to make these reasonable hardship adjustments. For whom?—for the small landlord who, to this good hour, has not been able to be properly represented in securing hardship adjustments.

It gives him a formula to work on which will help us to render this substantial equity which we want to give to the small individual property owner.

I yield to the distinguished author of the amendment.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. This provision was in the bill when it was introduced. It was in it when it was considered and was voted on by the members of the committee.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the gentleman. I think for 7 years the gentleman from Michigan has been approving this provision reading so far as practicable on all hardship adjustment cases and now at this late hour we are being asked to strike it out.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. In relation to the remarks made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], I think that we, who have served with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], know that he is not the type who use mere weasel words. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] is not the type who throws out bait for votes. I know something about this amendment. I know the amendment has been very carefully worked out. It has a proper place in the bill. I do not think the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] about weasel words and that the amendment is being offered as bait will have any influence on Members of the House, particularly on the Democratic side.

Mr. MONRONEY. I agree completely with the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. Chairman, if you want to give this relief to those individual cases—bear in mind that the big people are getting it, because they can hire attorneys—there are corps of attorneys taking these cases on contingent fees of 33⅓ percent or 50 percent in the big cities on 1,000-unit apartments and managing to prove their cases under the present hardship provision. The ones who are not getting these adjustments are the little people of America, who own one or two houses. As I say, if you want to give this relief to such people, they are the ones that Mr. Brown's amendment is designed to help.

I firmly believe if you strike out the words "so far as practicable" you make it possible for the courts to strike out the entire Brown amendment and you will therefore be defeating the entire purpose which is to give this reasonable return. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], is seeking to do something which is very important. This amendment is properly drawn and should be included in the bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. SPENCE. It seems to me that the words "so far as practicable" take care of the possibility of human error. It is impossible to attain exact justice. The Supreme Court knows that, and over the facade of the Supreme Court Building is written "Equal Justice Under the Law." That is all that can be attained. If you make it obligatory on the Expediter to attain exact justice and to ascertain a reasonable return on a reasonable value, it would be impossible for him to do so. The provision "so far as practicable" permits him to render justice as far as it is humanly possible to do so.

Mr. MONRONEY. You might have to calculate the value of the house down to the last screw or the last nail if you strike this out. It would nullify exactly what is needed in this bill; that is, adequate hardship adjustment.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The most outstanding lawyer that represents Congress, I think, and who knows little and cares less about politics, drew this amendment for me. He knew my idea and suggested the word "practicable," realizing the bill probably would not be workable without it. No one connected with the committee had anything to do with it except myself. The amendment states "a reasonable return but not beyond a reasonable return." He said that without the word "practicable" you might lack 1 cent of giving enough and that might involve endless litigation. Therefore, as he explained, you must have a little discretion for someone.

Mr. MONRONEY. Bear in mind you are dealing with 14,000,000 rents and not just 10 or 12. So you need this language.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], has expired.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I entertain the highest esteem for both the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] and for the able gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] has offered the following amendment to the bill we are now considering:

> In making and recommending individual and general adjustments to remove hardships or to correct other inequities, the Housing Expediter and the local boards shall observe the principle of maintaining maximum rents for controlled-housing accommodations, so far as is practicable, at levels which will yield to landlords a reasonable return (but not in excess of a reasonable return) on the reasonable value of such housing accommodations. In determining whether the maximum rent for controlled-housing accommodations yields a reasonable return on the reasonable value of such housing accommodations, due consideration shall be given to the following, among other relevant factors: (A) Increases in property taxes; (B) unavoidable increases in operating and maintenance expenses; (C) major capital improvement of the housing accommodations as distinguished from ordinary repair, replacement, and maintenance; (D) increases or decreases in living space, services, furniture, furnishings, or equipment; and (E) substantial deterioration of the housing accommodations, other than ordinary wear and tear, or failure to perform ordinary repair, replacement, or maintenance.

The gentleman from Michigan has offered an amendment to strike from the Brown amendment, the words "so far as is practicable."

I favor the Wolcott amendment. Unless Congress puts a legal bridle on Tighe Woods, the Housing Expediter and rent-control dictator, and unless we put a curb bit in his mouth, he will continue to violate the law this Congress writes. During the hearings on this bill Woods served notice on Congress that he has no intention to allow owners of controlled rental property a reasonable rent on their property. I quote his words:

> We have not been able to place the third, fair return, in our regulation because we found no equitable and practicable method for such a provision.

I favor the Wolcott amendment to strike out the provision that Mr. Tighe Woods shall not allow the owner of rented property a reasonable return on the reasonable value of his property, unless he, Woods, finds that it is practicable for him to do so. Woods tells us in advance that he has not allowed and will not allow the owner a reasonable rent on the reasonable value of his property.

If you were about to loan a person $100 and he offered you a note, promising to pay the loan on a given date provided it were practicable for him to do so, you, of course, would not let him have your money on a note like that.

It is a simple and easy thing for any honest man of ordinary intelligence to ascertain the fair and reasonable value of a room, an apartment or a house, and the services furnished by the owner to a renter, and upon the facts to set a reasonable and fair rental value on such property.

To do this is easy if you want to do right. Every lawyer who ever tried a lawsuit knows how to go about proving the reasonable rental value of a room, an apartment, or a house.

If the Brown amendment is amended by the Wolcott amendment, then you will have said to Mr. Tighe Woods, "You must quit robbing Peter to pay Paul; you shall no longer make fish out of one citizen and fowl out of another."

It is of small concern what the Supreme Court may have held during the war in upholding rent control as an emergency war measure. The war ended almost 4 years ago. We are now at peace.

The Federal Government has neither the moral nor the legal right to take the property of one citizen for the use of another. The Government is denied this power by the fifth amendment to the Constitution:

> No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation.

The founding fathers guarded as jealously the right of a citizen to own, enjoy, and bequeath property as they safeguarded his liberty and his life. They knew that our ancestors were never free until they wrung from their rulers the right to own and enjoy property. When your ancestors and mine first marked out a boundary of land, built upon it a home, claimed it as their own, and their title to it was recognized by their neighbors and by their Government, they began the journey to liberty and civilization. The right to own property is the time-honored badge of a freeman.

There is no such thing as a property right disassociated from a human right. If there were no human beings, there would be no property right. A property right is a human right.

This proposed measure is drawn with devilish cunning and had its origin in the minds of men who hate our free institutions. It is shrewdly drafted and designed to give the Government power over the property of our citizens, and thereby give it power over the lives of our people.

It is violative of the fourth amendment to the Constitution which provides that—

> The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable search and seizure shall not be violated.

The Housing Expediter and dictator set up under this act either himself, or through his minions, may by the power of subpena search, seize and ransack your place of business, your books, papers and effects, and hale you before himself or one of his satellites and may, if he has his will, burden you with a fine of $5,000 and a possible year in jail, all because you have been guilty of the crime of success and incur his ill will.

This measure erects a multitude of new offices and turns loose upon the people swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out their substance.

This is not all. If the tenant neglects or refuses to bring suit against a home owner whose premises he has occupied as a renter for an alleged violation not only of this act but of some rule or regulation promulgated by Mr. Tighe Woods, Woods himself, or one of his satellites at his direction, may sue you, Mr. or Mrs.

Citizen, for triple damages in the courts of the United States.

The act is more Russian than it is American. In Russia, which is a Communist, totalitarian, and police state, the government owns and controls all the houses, all the farms, all the railroads, every form of property, and controls human life from the cradle to the grave. This act is a step toward such a condition in this country.

Be not mistaken; be not deceived; the men back of this measure intend to rivet rent control forever upon the people of this country.

Chester Bowles, former head of the OPA, now Governor of Connecticut, stated publicly this week that we must have rent control from now on and also said that if this measure is not passed there will be riots and bloodshed in this country.

Let me read you a letter written me by a retired fireman of the city of KNOXVILLE, 67 years of age, whose wife is 66, and who are being robbed of the proceeds of their life earnings by the law now administered by Tighe Woods and which is not as vicious as this proposed measure:

> KNOXVILLE, TENN.
>
> Hon. JOHN JENNINGS, Jr.,
> *House of Representatives,*
> *Congress of the United States,*
> *Washington, D. C.*
>
> DEAR CONGRESSMAN JENNINGS: I am a retired city fireman, 67 years old and my wife is 66 years old.
>
> During my years of service to the city we have tried to be frugal and have managed to accumulate a small piece of property, located at 909½ Market Street, from which we had hoped to have an income for our old age.
>
> We live at 2219 Highland Avenue, which we also own.
>
> I want to take up with you the matter of the two apartments at 909½ Market Street, which are controlled by the OPA. In this building, there are three apartments, the third being the one which my wife and I occupied until March 2 years ago and which does not come under rent control.
>
> The two apartments are as follows:
>
> One three-room apartment with porch. Bedroom, dining room, and kitchen. These are furnished comfortable, with kitchen furnished with a $289 electric refrigerator (new), gas stove, and cinette equipment.
>
> The two-room apartment (with porch) is similarly furnished.
>
> For the three-room apartment I am allowed $35 per month, and furnish water (cold and hot) and stoker heat.
>
> For the two-room apartment I am allowed $27.50 per month and furnish water (cold and hot) and stoker heat.
>
> When the OPA went into effect coal was $6 per ton. I am now paying $12.75 per ton for the same coal—14 tons for each season for the three apartments.
>
> I have asked for an increase but can get no reply from the local rent-control office.
>
> I understand that the matter of the new rent-control laws will shortly come up before Congress.
>
> With increased costs in maintenance, repairs, taxes, I will appreciate your help not only in my behalf but for every other property owner in the country who is faced with situations which may destroy much that persons may have accumulated for their old age.
>
> Respectfully yours,
>
> E. L. MAPLES.

It is thus seen that these two decent American citizens can obtain from their property, under the present law, only $62.50 per month. The result is that when they have kept up the repairs, furnished these facilities, and paid the taxes, they do not have a dime income left for the support of themselves.

The pretense that this measure will aid the veterans is a delusion and a snare. It freezes the present renters in the property they now occupy to the exclusion of the veterans. It prevents people who otherwise would build new houses from building. There have always been those "who would steal the livery of heaven to serve the Devil in." And the effort made in this measure to use the veteran as a front will not fool anyone.

Not so long ago, a brokenhearted Gold Star Mother of my district called on me and related the heart-breaking abuse to which she had been subjected by the rent-control authorities of the Knoxville area. She put her complaint in affidavit form. Her son, Charles O. Irwin, while a member of the armed forces of the United States, in order to be permitted to go with his outfit, the Nineteenth Engineers, for combat service to Europe, submitted to a major surgical operation. This brave mother was an invalid who had been under the surgeon's knife a half dozen times in order that she might live. This brave boy stated to his mother, "I wish to be worthy of you. If you can undergo a surgical operation I intend to do so."

His operation was successful. He went with his comrades to Italy and was killed in battle in southern Italy on October 11, 1944. His mother purchased a home in Maryville, Tenn., for the sum of $4,500. After having repaired it and decorated it, she rented it for the sum of $40 per month, the rate fixed by the OPA. She purchased it for rental purposes upon the assurance from the OPA that she could rent it for $40 per month. Most of the money with which she purchased this house was money she received from insurance for the death of her son, and money he had sent to her while he was in the Army. The OPA reduced the rent on this property, which she purchased with the blood-soaked money of her hero soldier boy, to $22.50 per month. This was an eight-room house, with two baths, and is located on a paved street in the business district of Maryville, a city of more than 10,000 people.

There should be some precincts in this country too sacred for the foot of a small-bore Federal bureaucrat to enter. Mrs. Irwin, in her anguished statement to me, asked "Where is the liberty for which my boy died—and where will they bring him back to me?"

They can bring back his ashes—they cannot bring him back. But by abusing this invalid mother, they may send her to him sooner than she otherwise would have gone.

Our people are tired of this sort of thing. It is un-American. It is everlastingly wrong. I shall vote against this bill, even though it be amended in the particulars sought by my good friend from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], and my good friend from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]. The statement of Chester Bowles that we must continue rent control from now on in this country, and that if this Congress abolishes it we will have riots and bloodshed, is a slander on the people of this country and the people of Connecticut. Let us amend the bill in the particulars sought by these amendments and then vote it down when it comes up for final passage.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, in the discussion of this question we ought to be at least intellectually candid. I am going to vote for the Brown amendment with or without the Wolcott amendment. But we fool ourselves if we have even the inkling of a suspicion that there is anything in that amendment that protects the right of the landlord. The amendment, insofar as its promising a sort of protection, justice, or equity to the landlords, is not worth the paper upon which it is written. It seeks to lay down a rule to govern the determination of the question as to what constitutes a fair return, and then immediately by these three words which the Wolcott amendment seeks to eliminate cancels it all out by putting complete discretion in the Expediter.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that it is my profound conviction that rent control is an attack upon the spirit of the Constitution, upon the institution of private property and the contractual rights of members of a free society. It does not represent a legitimate political undertaking. It penalizes thrift and frugality. It is unjust. It takes from the citizen that which is his, not for the support of the State, but for the benefit of others who have contributed nothing to its development or creation.

I shall support the Wolcott amendment and I think, and if anything that this Congress might say in the use of language that would be a binding force upon the Expediter, it should be adopted. The law, from its very inception, has been administered in an atmosphere of mean and angry hostility to private ownership. Unless it is so written as to be binding upon the Expediter it will continue to be administered in that sort of manner. I believe that it is well to accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], and when we come to vote on the bill as amended to cast it down. A free society cannot live under this kind of treatment of public questions, and so important a segment of our whole economy, as that with which we deal, should not be frozen into this pattern of state socialism.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, with respect to the pending amendment, if it is to mean

anything at all certainly the Wolcott amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] should be adopted. If we are to put any responsibility on the Administrator to provide for a reasonable return then the language of the statute should say just that because the word "reasonableness" itself admits of a wide area of discretion.

Now, beyond that, a little while ago the very estimable majority leader referred to the matter of bait for votes. This morning in one of the local papers this story appeared and I hope the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency will pay attention to what I am about to read because I want him to say whether or not this story speaks the truth. It is written flat, as the newspaper people would say. The story is as follows:

> A confidential list of counties in 30 States which Rent Control Administrator Tighe E. Woods has promised to decontrol if rent control is extended was being circulated on both sides of the Capitol yesterday.
>
> Hard-pressed administration Democrats, fighting to push through rent-control extension before the March 31 expiration date of the present law, believed circulation of the list has swung enough votes to put over a 15-month extension in the House.

I would like to ask the gentleman if there has been any such list as that circulated?

Mr. SPENCE. As far as I know, there has not been. I know nothing about it. I want to say further that I have not used improper methods of any kind.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman has answered the question. He says he knows nothing about it. I may say, however, that the wire services are carrying a similar story and I just do not believe that reputable newspaper people here in Washington would write that in that fashion if it were not true.

Now, who is talking about bait for votes? What sort of operation is this? What sort of appeal to political expediency is this? To what depth of cynicism will the administration go to further its program?

Mr. SPENCE. I know nothing about it.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman has answered the question I asked him and I refuse to yield further.

Mr. Chairman, if that story is true, and I have no reason to believe it is not true because no one has risen here to deny it, it can only mean first, that it is a bait for votes by circulating a confidential memorandum to certain people whose areas would be affected and not showing it to others. Why was it not made public before the committee? Why are not all of us permitted to know about it?

Secondly, and as the gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. COX] just pointed out, what sort of administration can we expect from an agency that comes up here in this fashion to get votes for this measure? Why did they not decontrol these areas if they say they should now be decontrolled? Why have they not decontrolled them heretofore? What sort of business is it? They come here now in an effort to garner votes for this measure and say secretly to certain Members whose votes may be in doubt, "Oh, do not worry; if you will just give us this rent-control bill why we will see to it that your area is decontrolled."

The story goes on further, talking about votes and bait for votes. We all know that the committee voted against the Brown amendment. Now what do we see? Why, they are in here doing a complete flip-flop saying, "We are going to support the Brown amendment."

The writer of this story was smart enough to diagnose the situation by saying:

> Another factor in what House Democrats believe is the swing back of some 35 votes into their column—just enough to put the rent-control extension bill over—is a compromise on the return allowed the landlord.

Now, of course you on the majority side have been hard put. I have no doubt in my mind that except for these maneuvers, certainly in respect to the first one of circulating this confidential list which was reprehensible to say the least, the Wolcott amendment for a 90-day extension would not have been defeated. A handful of votes would have changed the result.

Let me say for myself in connection with this matter that I have been here through all of the time we have had rent control. I have supported all of the rent-control measures up to this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who has just spoken does not require much evidence to come to a conclusion. I know nothing about the report that was circulated as to the decontrolling of certain areas or certain properties, and I think the gentleman knows nothing about it except what he has seen in the papers. It does not take very much evidence for the gentlemen on the other side to accuse and convict the Democratic administration. He talks about the flip-flop in the committee. I only wish that our party was subject to the discipline and control that his party is. I have seen time and time again bills either defeated or voted up, and after the returns were about to be announced, 15 or 20 Republican Members under the party lash marched down the aisle and changed their votes. This frequently happens. When he talks about flip-flops I think he ought to consider his own condition. I think he ought to consider what they have been doing. They do not seem to get over the wounds that have been inflicted upon them. They talk all the time about the last election. Now, they talk about the last vote; that they would have won the last vote if this thing had not been circulated. They are very unfortunate, but they have not the philosophy to stand the gaff, and it is just too bad. I hate to see them suffer so much.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Would the gentleman state whether he has flip-flopped on the Brown amendment himself?

Mr. SPENCE. I have not stated anything about what happened in the committee, and you do not know anything about it. Whatever was done was in executive session. You on the minority side have all been advocating this Brown amendment right along. You all said you wanted it until we said we did not object to it, that we wanted it, and then you changed your opinion. I think that the amendment will be adopted and the bill will pass notwithstanding.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I might say to the gentleman from Indiana that on page 7 of the report on this particular bill there is this language, if he will read very carefully and follow with me the report concerning the so-called fringe portions of defense-rental areas.

> Existing law denies the Housing Expediter the right to recontrol any housing accommodations in any defense-rental area or portion thereof, or housing accommodations of a class, in the case of which maximum rent controls have been removed by administrative action. In taking decontrol actions, the Housing Expediter after making appropriate surveys must judge that the need for continuing maximum rents in these areas or class of accommodations no longer exists, due to sufficient construction of new housing accommodations or that the demand for rental-housing accommodations has been otherwise reasonably met. The Housing Expediter informed the committee that as a result of his surveys he believed that in many fringe portions of defense-rental areas, decontrol might be undertaken at this time if he had the power to step in and order recontrol should pressures for unreasonable rent increases threaten to again spill over into such portions of defense-rental areas.

There was continued interrogation of the representatives of the Housing Expediter's office by telephone and by conversation as to just what these particular fringe areas were. Of course, a list was compiled by the people interested. If there is any list circulating, I want to take the responsibility for being the author of such a list, because it was a compilation with those members who have talked with the various members of the Housing Expediter's office. So this is not any official list; it is not of a confidential nature. The answer is that we have a right to know just what the areas are and why the Housing Expediter asked for the right to recontrol particular areas.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I think things have come to a pretty pass in this Chamber when the former majority leader comes into the well of the House and practically accuses 30 Members of this body of subjecting themselves to what may be termed a bribe in order to vote for this bill, because to my mind that is what he intimated when he was on the floor of this House and said 30 Members practically changed their vote because they were assured their areas would be decontrolled. I say it is a shame that the former majority leader would make such a statement on the floor of this Chamber.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Does the gentleman know of such a list?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I believe I have made that statement very clear, that if there has been a compilation of any list——

Mr. COLE of Kansas. I did not ask that. I said, does the gentleman know if there is such a list?

Mr. BUCHANAN. If the gentleman followed my remarks very carefully, I stated that in the compilation of various conversations of members of the committee who were interested——

Mr. COLE of Kansas. I do not believe I asked that question. I said, does the gentleman know if there is such a list? That can be answered "Yes" or "No."

Mr. BUCHANAN. If the list exists——

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Does the gentleman know?

Mr. BUCHANAN. If the list exists, then it was compiled by the gentleman speaking.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Yes or no? The gentleman knows, or he does not know.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I think I made myself clear.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Is there such a list?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I do not believe I can make it any clearer to the gentleman.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time only to ask the author of the amendment, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], by whom and how will "reasonable" be defined and determined as it relates to return and to value?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I stated a minute ago that this is one more factor in regard to hardship cases. The local boards will obtain their evidence. They can go to the tax returns. If the tax returns are too low in that particular county or locality, they can go to the real-estate people and get at the true facts, just as the assessor does when a man returns this property for taxation. The law says he must return it at the reasonable value. Some people may not do that. The assessors have the right to find the facts, just as the Expediter does here. They must ascertain the real facts. It is analogous to the situation of the Expediter who through the local board will go into all the factors to establish the value or reasonable value of the property in the particular locality involved. One section of the bill says there is an emergency existing, and, therefore, you can go thoroughly into all the elements establishing a reasonable value of the property. The board can go into all the factors under this emergency section which will be held legal under the emergency provision of this bill.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That might answer in part the question as to value, but who is going to determine what is a reasonable return? Can you fix any percentage?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Percentages vary. Some would say 6 percent or 8 percent or 10 percent. In some sections of the country like New York, where they have many millionaires, a man making 2 percent or 3 percent on a million dollars thinks he is getting a pretty good return. In my section of the country where we have cities of only 5,000 or 10,000 population, it might be small. Therefore it is difficult to set a particular standard for every community in the United States. You must go into that on a local basis to arrive at the proper value and reasonable return for each community.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Who is going to determine that?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. This thing was looked into by many, many prominent lawyers. We came to the conclusion that this is the only way that we can get anything like a reasonable return for the landlords of this country.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I am not a prominent lawyer. I was going along with your amendment. I am trying to get some information. Who is going to make that determination?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The committees in the localities get the information.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Why do you not say so in your amendment?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I do say so. You will find it if you read the amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. SPENCE. I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 35 minutes, with 5 minutes reserved to the committee to close the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Was the unanimous-consent request with reference to this amendment and all amendments thereto or to the section?

The CHAIRMAN. It was with reference to this amendment and all amendments thereto.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, when the Housing Expediter came before our committee he asked for this unusual power to recontrol an area or a portion of an area that had been decontrolled. He had never had that power before. Many of us were curious about it. I was inclined to be against it, as I had been in the past. He said that if he had the power he could decontrol immediately one or two hundred places in the United States, because they were on the fringe, and he was not sure whether controls should be kept on or not, but he was afraid to take them off because he was afraid they would get out of control. Not having the right to recontrol them, he was reluctant to decontrol these one or two hundred places. So when he said that, the committee seemed to be favorable to it. I was favorable to it. It induces him to more quickly and more expeditiously decontrol an area. Then there is some responsibility on the people in that area—on the landlords. They know that if they do not treat the tenants fairly they can be recontrolled. So it is a fine thing, and it should be in this bill.

Now, with reference to lists: I called up Mr. Woods' office. I said there are places in Texas you could take controls off immediately, and he named them over to me. A number of Members did the same thing. Naturally there are several people who have lists of their own States. But that is all they have. There will probably be two or three times that many decontrolled when an investigation can be made and when they feel that they can safely let them go, with the understanding that they can be put back on if they do not act right.

Now, not so long ago the Republican Members had a conference, and the newspapers stated that the Republican leaders announced that they were for the Brown amendment. They were for the Brown amendment. The Democrat Members then commenced to have meetings, and for a week, night and day, we discussed the Brown amendment with the attorneys in the office of the Housing Expediter, and we finally agreed that we would be for the Brown amendment also. Now, when we come out for the Brown amendment the Republicans say there must be something wrong about it, and they do not want it. They want to strike out the phrase "insofar as practicable." That is an elastic phrase. We need it. We cannot do exact justice, as the chairman said. No one expects exact justice. We can only expect equal justice under the law. If you were to put the Housing Expediter in a strait-jacket and say that he had to administer exact justice, it would be absolutely impossible, and the law would be no good. So that phrase is very useful, as an elastic phrase, so that equal justice is done to everyone. As far as exact justice is concerned, take the 100-pound man, he stills pays the same fare on a railroad passenger train as the man who weighs 300 pounds. That is not exact justice. The person who buys a number 6 shoe pays the same price as the fellow who buys a number 12 shoe. That is not exact justice. It is not expected to be. The baldheaded man still pays full price for a hair cut. It is just absolutely impossible to administer exact justice. So we need that phrase, "insofar as practicable," which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] wants to strike out.

So I hope that the committee will vote down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], and then after voting down that amendment I hope they will vote for the Brown amendment. Then I hope they vote down all other crippling amendments that are proposed here, and that they will vote for this bill, because rent control will expire March 31, unless we do something now.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] is recognized.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the Brown amendment as well as the Wolcott amendment. I think I can safely state that with the adoption of the Brown amendment you are opening rent control so wide that within a few months the Members of this House will be informed of hundreds of thousands of complaints from the tenants of this Nation. As the law stands now, as it is being interpreted in New York City by the Office of the Housing Expediter, there exist eleven provisions under which a landlord can obtain rent increases; this adds the twelfth.

We are not dealing here with reasonable rent. It is significant that the author of the amendment asks for reasonable return; he will not accept the phrase "reasonable rent," and there you have the machinery which is going to put the tenants of this country into a tight squeeze by the real-estate interests. "Reasonable return" is going to mean that landlords will receive increases all along the line. This amendment will not establish reasonable rents, but will force the tenants to insure a reasonable return to the landlords. Do you see the difference?

It is likewise significant, may I say to the friends of rent control, that every enemy of rent control in this House is for the Brown amendment; bear that in mind. The enemies of rent control are making a tremendous advance by the adoption of this amendment. It is very bad policy for the friends of rent control to accept this amendment. It is this type of appeasement which is going to bring about the nullification of rent control.

As things stand now, the office of the Housing Expediter in New York City is an annex of the real-estate board. With this Brown amendment the partition is going to be knocked down and the real-estate crowd is going to take over completely. If you really believe in rent control, then you have no choice but to defeat both the Brown and Wolcott amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] is recognized.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I think the impression has been created today that nothing has been done for the landlords this last year. I wish to correct that impression. According to the Expediter, Mr. Woods, in testimony before the Banking and Currency Committee, more than one-half million individual petitions have been granted since July 1947, with an average rent increase of about 20 percent. He stated that he had granted about 73 percent of all landlord petitions filed.

This last year 35 different areas or parts of areas were decontrolled by the Expediter; 25 areas were given area-wide rent increases recommended by the local boards. They varied anywhere from 2 to 20 percent. We had a great number of houses—I have not been able to get the exact number, but it goes into very large figures—where the rent was increased 15 percent; there are the new houses that have no rent control at all; there are the thousands upon thousands of apartments decontrolled under the heading of conversions.

The Eightieth Congress decontrolled conversions last year as a ready solution to the housing crisis. This business of conversions has become a sordid chapter in the history of housing in this country. Families by the thousands have been evicted so that a four- or five-room unit could undergo some sort of alteration—in all too many cases a mere subterfuge for evading the law—and the space be rerented at excessive rents as one- or two-room units, inadequate for normal family life. It has not been Park Avenue 10-room apartments that have undergone these conversions.

Mr. Woods testified that many of these conversions have been phonies and asked for more authority so he could sort out the real conversions from the phonies.

We no longer ought to permit apartments to be taken out from under the rent-control program under the conversion provision.

Family life in America has already received a severe blow. Remember, it has been families with children that have been the first to be evicted. What we ought to be considering today is a rent-control bill that faces squarely the fact that we have not enough housing to meet family needs. We ought to be strengthening the rent-control bill that has been brought before us, not weakening it.

Any realistic survey of the housing situation shows that we are going to need rent control for another 2 years. If we are going to need a rent-control program for another 2 years, it must be equitable for landlords and tenants alike. The bill before us today is not such a bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON].

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be some doubt as to the existence of a list of areas which could be and might be decontrolled by the Expediter. Certainly the RECORD should be clear as to the facts. I want to read from a United Press dispatch that was issued at 11:08 this morning with reference to a list of 107 areas which the Expediter could and might move from rent control. This states:

> Rent Director Woods disclosed a list of 107 areas which he could—and might—remove from rent controls provided he can clamp restrictions on again if rents skyrocket.

Then there is this significant sentence from the dispatch of a reputable news agency:

> The list apparently was another move to obtain votes for rent-control extension.

The rest of the dispatch is as follows:

> Woods emphasized that he did not mean he would decontrol rents in the 107 areas. He said these areas were on his so-called doubtful list. But he indicated he would take such decontrol action in the areas, if he could restore controls.
>
> At present the rent administrator has no power to restore controls once they have been removed. He pointed out that rents might zoom upward unreasonably in the doubtful areas if the controls are ended. For this reason, he said, he should have power to recontrol such areas.

Because I had been asked to find out if any of those areas were located in New England, I immediately called the Expediter's office and talked with Mr. Montoux. He advised me that the list did not contain any communities in New England. He gave me the names of the 25 States on the list now in the Expediter's office. These States are as follows:

Arkansas, Arizona, California, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, New Jersey, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia.

I asked if there had been a press release containing the communities on that list. I was advised there was no press release as such but that there is a single copy of such a list in the Expediter's office. I understand the list of communities is a lengthy one.

In any event, there are no communities in 23 States on this list. The States omitted are:

Alabama, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Idaho, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Utah, Vermont, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, the story to which the gentleman refers is clear evidence of the fact and substantiates the story that was contained in the press this morning that such a list has been in circulation. Undoubtedly the release has been made and the whole thing made public after it appeared in the press.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] is recognized.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to the amendment at the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to offer it?

Mr. JACKSON of California. Yes, I should like to offer it at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it an amendment to the amendment?

Mr. JACKSON of California. It is an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman cannot offer that until the Wolcott amendment has been acted upon.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, in light of the fact that I cannot offer at this time an amendment to the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from Georgia, I will take this opportunity to explain it so far as time permits.

I think I have made it very clear on the floor of the House that I am opposed to the principle of rent control; however, that does not foreclose in any way my desire nor my right to try to write into the measure and try to put into the measure such things as will make it a better bill to my way of thinking than it would be without them.

For that reason I should like to ask the gentleman from Georgia whether or not there would be any considerable objection on his part to an amendment to his amendment. His amendment, as I understand it, indicates five criteria which are to be used by the Housing Administration which it must use as a criteria in deciding a reasonable return upon a fair value. May I ask the gentleman whether or not he would accept or would be very much opposed to the inclusion of a sixth, which would be lettered (f) saying: "The assessed valuation of the property in question." It seems to me that is a definite figure from which you can take a position, and I offer it in all good faith.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. In some sections of the country property is assessed on 40 to 50 percent of its value and in other sections of the country it is assessed at 100 percent. Therefore you cannot enforce that provision.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my support of the Brown and the Wolcott amendments at this time to provide that landlords are entitled to a reasonable return on a reasonable valuation of their property.

May I also bespeak my confidence in the Congressman from Allegheny County, Pa., my colleague, Mr. FRANK BUCHANAN. While it has been stated there is such a list of proposed decontrol areas in existence, I know that he is of the highest integrity and used it for only the legitimate committee purposes which he stated on the floor.

While some persons may or may not have misused the list for certain purposes, as a fellow Congressman of a different party in Pittsburgh, I know that he had no part in it and would have no such part in such misuse. I wanted to make sure that the House knew that on the Republican side there are many that have full confidence in the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Congressman BUCHANAN], and it is a pleasure to express such friendship and confidence, when a question such as this has arisen.

We must include a reasonable return in this bill for landlords, which is only fair under our economic system. If we do not have a reasonable return on investment, we have socialized housing. You cannot have one group profit at the expense of another group in this country. You have to have a balance between groups, between landlords and tenants, in an emergency as well as in ordinary times. Once the emergency exists, you need controlled housing. When you have controlled housing, Congress must see that there is protection given to both groups.

Congress should adopt the amendment to strike out the "as far as practicable" provision, because it does not define in the bill what that means. You cannot tell from reading the bill whether it is to be "as far as practicable" under the local circumstances outside of the local board's or the Expediter's office, or within the office, based just on practicability as to personnel and management. There is no way by which you can tell how the particular person to make the decisions on reasonableness will react on the outside practicability. If you, as someone said here, are going to retain the provision to avoid getting exact justice, you would then get inexact justice. So, in order to have exact justice you must do as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] says, and that is strike out the words "as far as practicable" and make it incumbent on the Administrator or the Expediter to make a reasonable decision.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO].

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, regardless of the motive of those who offer it, unquestionably is going to have one result. It will result in an increase in rents throughout the entire country.

What is reasonable value? What is reasonable return? Does anyone here know one single landlord who feels that he gets a reasonable return on the reasonable value of his property? Who is going to determine it? You are going to find out that instead of having a Government of laws under this amendment you will have a Government by men, the men who administer it. You will find that for the most part the philosophy of those men will be in line with the philosophy of those who oppose the rent-control situation all the way through.

If we are going to have rent control, we ought to have it. With this amendment, you will have landlord after landlord going before the proper authorities and establishing beyond question that they do not get a reasonable return on their property. That may be fair or unfair, it may be just or unjust, but in this situation you cannot have justice for all. It comes to a determination of whether you are going to have justice based upon property rights, which in this instance is the landlord, or whether you are going to have justice based upon human rights, which in this instance is the tenant. And remember, there is not only 1 tenant but the 14,000,000 families that have been referred to many times.

So the choice is plain. If you want to see a rent increase throughout the country you will vote for this amendment. If you do not want to see rents increased, you will vote to defeat this amendment. That is why I am voting to defeat this amendment.

I do not like to go against the majority leader of my own party, who has asked us to vote in favor of this amendment. I do not like to go against the committee of my own party. But as between the tenants of this country and them, I have to stand by the tenants of this country. I can do that only by voting to defeat the amendment.

If the amendment passes, the administrative burdens of the act will be burdensome beyond measure.

Secondly, rents will be increased all over the country—increased beyond all fairness and justice. Not just hardship cases will be increased—all rents will be increased.

I cannot in good conscience support such an amendment even though it is endorsed by almost all the Members present of both parties.

And, incidentally, let me point out that it is significant that this Democratic amendment is supported by the very same Republican members who have gone on record as opposed to rent control, and who have sponsored amendments crippling rent control. They are not changing their position. They are consistent in their attempts to kill or cripple rent control. If we are to be consistent in our attempts to have rent control, we must defeat this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for both the Brown and the Wolcott amendments, and I shall accept the Brown amendment either with or without the Wolcott amendment because I think it is fair. However, if this bill is going to be administered in the same spirit as the present rent-control law is administered, I fear all the good the gentleman from Georgia seeks to do, and I know he offers his amendment in good faith, will be completely nullified.

This afternoon not too many paid much attention to the statement made by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] when he quoted the Housing Expediter as saying, "This is a tenants' bill. We are not interested in return on investment." If that spirit is to prevail in the administration of this bill, if it becomes law, everything the gentleman from Georgia seeks to do, to obtain justice for the property owners of the country, who own rental units, will be completely nullified.

As some evidence of how rent control is administered in the Detroit area, let me give you an instance. Here are five houses appraised at a total value of $54,000. This comes from the owner's income-tax return to the Government for last year. The net income after repairs, taxes, and depreciation were taken out was $165 on the total of the five houses, or $2.75 per month on each house. That is the kind of thing that is bringing rent control into disrepute and forcing the 8,000,000 little property owners of the country to subsidize the tenants, thus taking away from our thrifty people by law what we put people in jail for doing if they stick a gun in your face.

Mr. Chairman, I am for the Brown amendment, and I hope it becomes part of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON].

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I am willing to give what little time I have to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], if he wants to ask a question. But everyone who appeared before our committee and I think I was there at every session, agreed that we should have some formula to give a fair return to a man who owns a piece of property. The Expediter does not want to write that formula. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I do not think he can write it, because when he was asked the question, Is a man allowed 1 percent return on his investment? he said, "I do not know." When he was asked if it was 2 or 3 or 4

percent, he said he did not know, and he has absolutely refused to write any formula to carry out a rent-control law. The gentleman from Georgia has put in something that they can hang their hat on. I believe, Mr. Chairman, and everybody else believes, that if a man has to pay his taxes, let us say $200, and he has to pay insurance and furnish heat and so forth, it all enters into the cost of operating the property and that would give us the amount as to how much he received.

I think the Expediter ought to do it himself instead of having the Congress do his work for him. Mr. Chairman, the people who appeared before our committee did not have too much confidence in the Expediter. They said everything would be all right if he knew how to administer it. I do not say whether he has administered it properly, or whether he is not administering it properly. But I think if we do accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan, the ranking minority member of the committee, it makes it a little clearer. Whether somebody has flip-flopped or not does not make any difference to me. Everybody has a right to see the light of day.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GAMBLE].

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, as I said yesterday, I voted for the Brown amendment when it was considered by the Banking and Currency Committee in committee, and I expect to support it today either with or without the Wolcott amendment. If a good many of those members of the Committee on Banking and Currency who have been extolling the virtues of the so-called Brown amendment this afternoon had voted for the amendment in the committee, we would not have had to spend 2 hours on it today.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAMBLE. I yield.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I wonder how many Members of the House have in mind at this moment the provisions of the fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States. Let me call it to your attention again: "Nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation."

There is not anything in that article of the Constitution about "so far as practicable." There is no limiting language. It fixes a firm and proper principle and imposes an obligation. If we mean business in this committee in the matter of affording landlords a fair and reasonable compensation, then we should certainly strike out the limiting language and leave the obligation one of fair and reasonable compensation without that limiting, restricting language, which the gentleman from Michigan would strike out by his amendment.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, perhaps we ought to add to the amendment "a fair and reasonable Housing Expediter."

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I am one of those Members of the House who wants to protect tenants and at the same time dares say that the landlord, too, has some rights. This amendment is intended to safeguard the rights of the tenant and to keep a roof over his head and at the same time protect those landlords who are protesting that there is nothing in the law under which their rights, too, can be protected.

Only today I received a telegram from one of the tenants in my district. He wires me:

> Ask that you do something to prevent rent control from being talked to death. Landlord of our building already rubbing his hands in glee over the death knell of rent control.

Let us disappoint that landlord and all other landlords who want to ring the death knell on rent control. At the same time, by this Brown amendment let us give them a fair deal. We are not looking to prefer one over the other, but we must protect the tenants against extortionate owners who seek to get oppressive rent from a man who has no place else to go.

At this time let us dispel all this mystery that has been injected here about a newspaper item referring to lists of areas that might be decontrolled. Tighe Woods, the Expediter, is painted as a terrible man. According to the landlords, he is the tenants' friend, and according to the tenants, he is the landlords' friend. He is a bad man to everybody.

He proved to our committee that he was trying to do a good job and an honest job. He frankly told us in committee that there were some hundred areas that he had surveyed and that he was ready to decontrol them. He did not dare do it unless he knew that if the landlords in those areas sought to extort oppressive rents, he could then come in and recontrol those areas. There is no secret about where those areas are. Any Member can get on the telephone and ask him.

When he was before the committee he said this:

> I urge that those who criticize our machinery suggest practical, workable improvements for our consideration.

The Brown amendment, without the Wolcott amendment which deletes part of it, is the amendment which we considered in principle in committee. It suggests a workable and practical method which the Expediter says he can use. He said to us in committee: "Give us a formula that we can use." This is the formula which the Expediter's office says they can follow and do justice to all, in accordance with the dictates of conscience and the dictates of the needs of the landlords as well as the requirements of the tenants. Give him what he is asking for. Give him what the majority of the committee feels he can use. Let us not take out these words, "insofar as practicable." A reasonable return upon a reasonable value as far as practicable is all you can ask for. No landlord has a right to ask for more and no tenant has a right to expect less. That is what we are trying to do here. That is what you should do.

Let me correct one statement that was erroneously made to you by the gentleman from Michigan who offered the amendment to the amendment. He said that the Expediter, in order to determine whether or not there is a loss, takes the worst year, and if there was a loss you cannot do better than bring yourself up to the point where you make up the excess cost even though you still suffer a loss and do not break even. That is not the regulation that was issued by the Expediter under existing law, and it is not what he is trying to do. But he says in addition to that, "If you will give me something like this, I can do a better job."

Mr. WOLCOTT. I may say to the gentleman that in the committee I read the law. I did not read the regulation.

Mr. MULTER. Then I misunderstood you. I thought you said that under the law he indicated he could not do anything on the subject. He has issued a regulation under that law which I think is proper. He has tried to do a good job, and I am sure if we pass this amendment as proposed by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] we will get a good, workable rent-control law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] has expired.

All time for debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto having expired, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOLCOTT) there were—ayes 126, noes 132.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. WOLCOTT and Mr. BROWN of Georgia.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 154, noes 158.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 226, noes 31.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COLE of Kansas) there were—ayes 167, noes 70.

So the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. MCCORMACK] having resumed the chair, Mr. GORE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1731) to extend certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

THE LATE WASHINGTON J. MCCORMICK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART].

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I rise to announce the death of a former Member of this House, Washington J. McCormick, 65, a former Montana Representative in Congress, son of western Montana pioneers, who died March 7 at a hospital after a long illness.

Mr. McCormick was born in Missoula January 4, 1884, and served in the State legislature from 1919 to 1921. He was a Representative in Congress from 1921 to 1923. He attended Montana State University and the University of Notre Dame, and received law degrees from Harvard and Columbia Universities. He was commandant of cadets at Montana State University during World War I and was an expediter in a California shipyard during World War II. He announced as Republican candidate for Governor in 1948, but withdrew.

He is survived by his widow, two daughters, a sister, and two nieces. The daughters are Angela, of Missoula, and Mrs. John Vance, Jr., of Chevy Chase, Md. The sister is Mrs. William Fitzgerald, of Missoula.

Mr. McCormick was a member of the New York and Montana bar associations, was the author of several books of poetry and historical articles. In recent years he made his home at the family ranch near Fort Owen at Stevensville. Because of his writings he was often referred to as the "Bard of the Bitterroots."

Mr. Speaker, I extend my own sympathy and, I am sure, also that of the House to Mr. McCormick's family in their loss of a loving husband and father. He was for years and until the time of his death an honored and outstanding citizen of the State of Montana. We of that State mourn his passing.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURDOCK and Mr. DAVENPORT asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LUCAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two letters which he received from a tenant on the subject of rent control.

Mr. JENNINGS asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and include a letter and other excerpts.

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and include a newspaper editorial, and also to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a proclamation reporting the vote of the people of the State of Connecticut in the recent elections on the World Government Referendum.

Mr. KELLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two resolutions.

Mr. GORSKI of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech made by a Lithuanian consul.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BLATNIK (at the request of Mr. MARSHALL) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MCCULLOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

Mr. FULTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on the steel industry.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, in each to include an article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 20 minutes.

COMMUNIST ART IN GOVERNMENT HOSPITALS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, most of the Members of Congress will readily remember the world-wide junket of left wing art which the State Department fostered in 1947. It was commonly reported that the State Department purchased 79 paintings of so-called contemporary and modern art for $55,000 of the taxpayers' money. These paintings were started on a tour through Latin America and Europe, and after being shown in Haiti and Prague the junket was stopped by Secretary Marshall because of the unfavorable publicity which the whole project received in American newspapers and other publications.

It has been revealed that the War Assets Administration subsequently sold these paintings of left wingers for the sum of $5,544.45, that is, the Government recovered about 10 cents on the dollar for its investment of the taxpayers' money. They did not recover any of the expenses incurred in financing the junket as far as it went.

The Members of Congress and the American public, recalling the positive action of Secretary of State Marshall in putting an abrupt stop to the State Department's venture into radical art, may be warranted in concluding that that was the end of the matter, but such is far from the truth. The Members of Congress should accept this basic truth—that radical, left wing art cannot survive of itself. It does not have merit, and its creators do not have the real talent to cause sufficient demand for their product from the public. If they had to live on what they can earn from their work, they would cease very soon to be a menace to some of our dearest traditions. The members of this left wing art movement are constantly scheming to get their hands on public funds, and even private philanthropies, in order to grow.

I want to call to the attention of the Members an article which appeared in the issue of the Art Digest, dated January 15, 1949. This will be found on page 16, under the heading "Gallery-on-Wheels":

> The United States naval hospital at St. Albans, N. Y., has an interesting innovation in its art program for the patients. The hospital fine arts exhibition, through its fine arts committee headed by Carroll Aument, of the Museum of Modern Art, is holding an exhibition in the ship's library. Many of the patients are unable to go to museums and galleries and some cannot even make the library. For the latter, works of art are brought to them in the wards on roller galleries. A new group will be shown each day with a different participating artist accompanying the gallery-on-wheels to explain the difference between the aims of the painters following the classical and modern trends of thought.
>
> Capt. William H. H. Turville, United States Navy, commanding officer of the hospital, feels that the patients will derive valuable educational and therapeutic benefits from the exhibit. He has great faith in the morale-building results derived through awakening a self-creative urge in his patients, and he expects this activity will be a valuable supplement to the art program already under successful progress at the hospital.
>
> Twenty-eight well-known contemporary artists are contributing their services, including Xavier Gonzalez, Yasuo Kuniyoshi, Jean Liberte, Ben Shahn, Jack Levine, Eugene Berman, Abraham Rattner, Reginald Marsh, Matta Echuarren, I. Rice Pereira, Louis Bosa, George L. K. Morris, Joseph Hirsch, Max Weber, Rufine Tamayo, Alexander Brook, and Arthur Osver.
>
> The exhibition begins January 17 and continues for 2 weeks. If the show proves to be as stimulating as is hoped, the art committee will take it to every large Government hospital in the country.

Now, this article would seem to refer to a project predicated on a kindly desire to do something for our disabled heroes, who may not be able to leave their beds. These artists are taking their art right to the bedside of the veteran. The artists are explaining to him in person, according to this article, their aims when they produced their paintings, that is, what they had in mind and what they wanted to show. Let us look with a little care, and see what this "gallery-on-wheels" exhibit really signifies. According to the article, 28 well known contemporary artists contributed their services, but only 17 of them are mentioned by name. Of these 17, 9 were among those from whom the State Department bought 79 creations for $55,000. Nine of these 17 were "junketeers." Of the 17, nearly all are individuals of known radical affiliation. Let me give you a little information about them, where I have no facts, I shall be frank to so state:

Xavier Gonzalez, Mexican: Article in New Masses, December 19, 1944; Picasso, written by Gonzalez.

Yasuo Kuniyoshi: Artists' Union; American Artists' Congress; American Group, Inc.; Artists' League of America; New Masses art auction, June 20, 1944; Artists League of America: New Masses art auction, June 26, 1944; keep-Wallace-on-the-air auction, October 17, 1948; State Department show.

Jean Liberte: Artists' Union; American Artists' Congress; Artists' League of America; State Department show.

Ben Shahn: John Reed Club; American Artists' Congress; Artists' Union; State Department show; ACA; New Masses art auction, March 24, 1942; National Council Arts and Sciences; Professions, We Are for Wallace, New York Times, October 20, 1948; assistant to Diego Rivera on Radio City mural later destroyed because of Lenin's figure.

Jack Levine: Illustrator for New Masses, examples, June 4, 1946, August 20, 1946; National Council Arts, Sciences, and Professions; sponsor for Wallace; State Department show.

Eugene Berman.

Abraham Rattner; New Masses plug review, January 26, 1945; keep-Wallace-on-the-air auction; State Department show.

Reginald Marsh: John Reed Club; cartoonist, New Masses, example, June 12, 1934; State Department show.

Matta Echuarren, Chile.

I. Rice Pereira: American Artists Congress; ACA; Artists Gallery, and Artists League of America; Protestant magazine auction; State Department show.

Louis Bosa: Plug review New Masses, November 7, 1944; keep-Wallace-on-the-air auction.

George L. K. Morris: Illustrator, New Masses, April 1, 1947; editor, Partisan Review; State Department show.

Joseph Hirsch: ACA; American Group, Inc.; sponsor, New Masses cultural award, January 9, 1945; cover, New Masses, August 27, 1946; Protestant auction.

Max Weber: American Artists Congress; ACA; Winner, New Masses cultural award, January 23, 1945; sponsor, New Masses, cultural award, January 9, 1945; New Masses permanent auction committee, Art Digest, February 15, 1947; Protestant auction; sponsor, National Council of American-Soviet Friendship; chairman, Committee on Manhattan Artists for Wallace, 23 West Twenty-sixth Street; State Department show.

Rufine Tamayo: Artists Union; ACA.

Alexander Brook: American Artists Congress; permanent auction committee of New Masses, Art Digest, February 15, 1947.

Arthur Osver: Very favorably reviewed in New Masses, February 18, 1947; Gallery-on-Wheels; Art Digest, January 15, 1949, page 16.

INDEX

New Masses; former Communist cultural magazine.

Artists Union, American Artists Congress, Artists League of America, American Group, Inc.: Communist's fronts, see page 6892, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 30, 1943.

John Reed Club: Revolutionary artists' and writers' club.

Protestant magazine: Robert Stribling said:

> We have seen publications cloaked in such disarming names as the Protestant become echoes of the Daily Worker.

Partisan Review: Red magazine, was started by John Reed Club, page 256, Un-American propaganda activities. H. S. 272.

National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc.: Termed "Communist and subversive," Justice Department.

National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions: Communist controlled, according to World-Telegram, February 28, 1949, page 3.

ACA Gallery: A definitely communistic place, 61–63 East Fifty-seventh Street. American Artists Congress was formed in ACA Gallery.

Interesting note: Nine of these artists were included in ill-fated State Department art show—9 out of 17. The NCASP is an outgrowth of Independent Citizens' Communist Association and was formed in the office of Budenz when he was editor of Daily Worker, September 18, 1948.

Now that I have shown the true affiliation of these persons who exhibited their art to the bedridden veterans in St. Albans Hospital, and who explained what they had in mind when they created their paintings, do you have any doubt that a great deal of explanation was necessary before anyone could understand why these paintings were produced at all? I do not know what explanation these left-wingers made, but I do know that these individuals—radicals all—spending 2 weeks in an important naval hospital explaining their theories to an audience who could not get away from them, had a great opportunity not only to spread their propaganda, but to engage in espionage, if they were inclined to do so. Furthermore, I cannot for 1 minute believe that they devoted all this time and energy as a pure philanthropy, and I would like to know how much they were paid, and by whom they were paid to put across this propaganda undertaking in a Government institution.

Is this only an isolated example of what these ex-State Department junketeers are doing? Certainly not. The article which I have quoted states very frankly: "If the show proves to be as stimulating as is hoped, the art committee will take it to every large Government hospital in the country." What the article does not show is that the "gallery-on-wheels" will be taken at the taxpayers' expense, or how much is being paid to spread this propaganda on a national scale. I am very anxious to find out how this group of radicals was able to put across this program on the Navy Department and, as they include all Government hospitals, on the Army and possibly the Veterans' Administration. How can these subversives keep lifting up their heads in our Government departments? Who gets them in, and why are not Government officials and Army and Navy officers more watchful and careful—so that these things cannot happen.

The Congress has been most liberal in making large appropriations to the armed forces. The Navy and the Army and the Air Corps have active intelligence units, and they have experienced intelligence agents in their respective Reserves. These intelligence officers are well-informed, in general, on the activities of subversive groups and Communist-front organizations throughout the United States. They are all in liaison with the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice. From these established intelligence groups any Government official or high officer of our armed forces can quickly and accurately ascertain the true character of any subversive group in the United States. Why was this not done by the authorities at St. Albans Hospital, and if this resurgence of radical State Department art junketeers on a national scale, to be paid for out of taxpayers' money, was authorized by the higher-ups, let us find out who they are.

Far from exaggerating the extent of infiltration of Communists and Communist sympathizers into our Government and into our public institutions, we have been too complacent for too long, and the Congress and the public does not yet realize the extent to which our prized inheritances and institutions are being undermined. In the arts and sciences the facts are startling, and I propose at an early date to give you additional facts, which I think will arouse your indignation, as they have aroused mine, and instill in you an enlarged determination to see that these subversive movements are thwarted, and that Americanism is permitted to continue its healthy growth.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. Does the gentleman know, perchance, that one of those pictures was a picture of a red herring?

Mr. DONDERO. I am not too familiar with the subject of red herrings.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 14, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3347. A bill to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia; with an amendment (Rept. No. 257). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PETERSON: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 2812. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain land at South Naknek to the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of North America; with an amendment (Rept. No. 256). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 3472. A bill to provide additional income-tax relief for supporting blind or

aged dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 3473. A bill to provide reduced annuities at age 55 after 15 years of civilian service for persons involuntarily separated from the Federal Service not by removal for cause; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 3474. A bill to restore the citizenship of persons who fought in Palestine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 3475. A bill to provide for the recording of the proceedings in one of the courtrooms of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia by sound-recording equipment; and for the reproduction of the sounds of such proceedings, in whole or in part, in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and in the Supreme Court of the United States upon the review of any such case; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H. R. 3476. A bill to promote the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians and the better utilization of the resources of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee:

H. R. 3477. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of Greeneville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 3478. A bill to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near a point between Delmar Boulevard and Cole Street in the city of St. Louis, Mo., and a point opposite thereto in the city of East St. Louis, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 3479. A bill to revise the law with relation to the Dental Corps of the Army and to amend certain laws herein named; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WHITAKER:

H. R. 3480. A bill to authorize the Commonwealth of Kentucky to use for certain educational purposes lands granted by the United States to such Commonwealth for State-park purposes exclusively; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mrs. WOODHOUSE:

H. R. 3481. A bill to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the founding of Stonington, Conn.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WORLEY:

H. R. 3482. A bill granting the consent of the Congress to the negotiation of a compact relating to the waters of the Canadian River by the States of Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 3483. A bill to facilitate the admission of certain alien minor children adopted by United States citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 3484. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the State to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 3485. A bill to amend National Service Life Insurance Act to allow lump-sum payments to beneficiaries; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 3486. A bill to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture be included as a member of the Advisory Board of the Export-Import Bank of Washington and as a member of the National Advisory Council of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 3487. A bill to authorize Federal aid for the construction of additional school facilities to school districts overburdened with school enrollments brought about by Government construction and defense programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 3488. A bill to reduce to prewar levels the excise taxes on automotive transportation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 3489. A bill to promote the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians and the better utilization of the resources of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 3490. A bill to establish a Federal Commission on Services for the Physically Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BOLTON of Maryland:

H. R. 3491. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey for the construction of a channel from the yacht basin at Havre de Grace to connect with the Oakington Channel; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 3492. A bill to amend the River and Harbor Act of 1948 to provide for reports by the Chief of Engineers with respect to national defense values of river, harbor, and waterway improvements; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

H. Res. 147. Resolution requesting the Secretary of State to investigate the domestic fishing industry; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for the maintenance by the Government of the Garrison Dam area; to the Committee on Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3493. A bill for the relief of Anne Robinson Norwood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 3494. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer a building in Juneau, Alaska, to the Alaska Native Brotherhood and/or Sisterhood, Juneau, Alaska, Camp; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 3495. A bill for the relief of Theodore Robert Fears; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARROLL (by request):

H. R. 3496. A bill for the relief of A. W. Estabrook; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARROLL:

H. R. 3497. A bill conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Vaso B. Benderach; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 3498. A bill for the relief of the Gluckin Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 3499. A bill for the relief of Mabel Colliver; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 3500. A bill for the relief of Karl Weyrauch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 3501. A bill for the relief of Nelson Bell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 3502. A bill for the relief of Severino Juanarena-Ituraide; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3503. A bill for the relief of Sabino Gonzalez-Baron; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 3504. A bill for the relief of Andrija Artukovic and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3505. A bill for the relief of Mary Arnovick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REGAN:

H. R. 3506. A bill for the relief of Luis P. Murphy, United States immigrant inspector, El Paso, Tex.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 3507. A bill for the relief of William Luttrell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 3508. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claim arising out of personal injuries sustained by Carl J. Freund and Pauline H. Freund, his wife, of Seattle, Wash.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

200. By Mr. BURDICK: Memorial of the Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota, petitioning Congress to continue adequate appropriations to the Farmers Home Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

201. By Mr. CANFIELD: Memorial of the city council of the city of Clifton, N. J., memorializing the Congress to pass and the President to approve the General Pulaski Memorial Day resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

202. By Mr. CARROLL: Memorial of the Colorado State Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide for the completion of the Leadville drainage tunnel; to the Committee on Appropriations.

203. By Mr. HOLMES: Memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, urging legislation covering shipments of cigarettes between States having different taxation laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

204. By Mr. O'TOOLE: Petition, consisting of 1,092 separate and individual protests, forwarded by the Ninth Assembly District Regular Democratic Organization, Brooklyn, N. Y., requesting an official and public denunciation by our Government of the unjust persecution of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty and requesting that he be liberated by requesting our delegates to the United Nations Security Council to present his case to that body; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

205. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, relative to the National Guard of the

United States and of the several States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

206. By the SPEAKER: Petition of E. J. Minges, president, Friendship Townsend Club, No. 1, Miami, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to taking immediate action on the consideration and enactment of H. R. 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

207. Also, petition of Mrs. Nellie Welch and others, Palm Beach, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to taking immediate action on the consideration and enactment of H. R. 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

208. Also, petition of Mrs. Hattie Erdman and others, Miami, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to taking immediate action on the consideration and enactment of H. R. 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

SATURDAY, MARCH 12, 1949

(Legislative day of Monday, February 21, 1949)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, we turn to Thee from the perplexities and uncertainties which daily beset us. We are bewildered by the confusion of the world. Often we lose the way of certitude and self-control.

Deliver us, we beseech Thee, from the inclinations of our own hearts to self-deceit. Drive from them all equivocation and pretense. Make us true servants of Thy will in this troubled time. We ask it in the spirit of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 10, 1949, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 198. An act for the relief of the city and county of San Francisco;

S. 279. An act to authorize the advance on the retired list of Lt. John T. McDermott, United States Navy (retired), to the grade of lieutenant commander; and

S. 307. An act for the relief of Engebert Axer.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Secretary of the Army, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE, UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of January 1949 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting pursuant to law, a report on regulatory commissions (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

EXTENSION TO AND REMODELING OF BUILDING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the construction of an extension to and the remodeling of the building located at Twenty-first Street and Virginia Avenue NW., in the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

RATIFICATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TERM OF OFFICE OF PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a certified copy of a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the term of the office of the President, which was ordered to lie on the table.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"House Joint Memorial 8

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States to protest the order of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs providing for the discontinuance of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Fort Logan, Colo.

"Whereas the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of the United States Government, the Hon. Carl R. Gray, Jr., has issued an order to the effect that upon the completion of the veterans' hospital now being constructed in the vicinity of Ninth and Clermont Streets in East Denver, Colo., the Veterans' Administration hospital at Fort Logan, Colo., shall be discontinued; and

"Whereas there is great need for the continuance of the Fort Logan hospital, particularly for convalescent veterans afflicted with tuberculosis, for domiciliary care and as a rehabilitation center, inasmuch as other veterans' hospitals in and around Colorado and the Western States cannot provide the necessary facilities for those veterans requiring long periods of time to be restored to health; and

"Whereas veterans' organizations in Colorado are greatly concerned over the order of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to discontinue the Fort Logan hospital, and believe it to be an unwise and unnecessary move: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring therein)*, That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully memorialized to protest the order of Carl R. Gray, Jr., Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, providing for the discontinuance of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Fort Logan, Colo., upon the completion of the veterans' hospital now being constructed in Denver, Colo., in the vicinity of Ninth and Clermont Streets, and to do all in its power to have such order rescinded; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Senators and Congressmen from the State of Colorado in the Congress, and to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the Hon. Carl R. Gray, Jr."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

"House Concurren' Resolution 22

"Concurrent resolution requesting the clerk of the house and the secretary of the senate to forward copies of the Detroit Free Press editorial 'Our Greatest Danger: Financial Rocks Ahead' to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives in Congress, to the Members of the Congress, and to the governors of the several States of the Union

"*Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring)*, That the clerk of the house of representatives is hereby requested to send to the President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Members of the House of Representatives in Congress, and the governors of the several States of the Union, and the secretary of the senate is hereby requested to send to the President of the Senate and the Members of the Senate of the Congress of the United States a copy of the Detroit Free Press editorial of February 23, 1949, 'Our Greatest Danger: Financial Rocks Ahead.'

"Adopted by the house March 7, 1949.

"Adopted by the senate March 8, 1949."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, protesting against the enactment of legislation affecting the Rural Electrification Administration; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See text of concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. LANGER on March 11, 1949, p. 2217, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, favoring the appropriation of funds in the form of grants in aid to the counties of North Dakota for constructing works for the prevention of floods; to the Committee on Appropriations.

(See text of concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. LANGER on March 11, 1949, p. 2217, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, favoring the appropriation of funds for the planning and construction of means to prevent the destruction of wildlife; to the Committee on Appropriations.

(See text of concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. LANGER on March 11, 1949, p. 2217, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, favoring the enactment of legislation providing for payment by the Federal Government of certain taxes, in lieu of local taxes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See text of concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. LANGER on March 11, 1949, p. 2216, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relating to the National Guard of the United States and of the several States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See text of resolutions printed in full when presented by Mr. LODGE (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL) on March 11, 1949, p. 2215, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by William T. White, president, Home Owners League, Inc., Schenectady, N. Y., relating

to housing, rent control, etc.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by a forum of German-American citizens under the auspices of the American Labor Party, Yorkville, N. Y., relating to the creation of an international council to control the Ruhr industries; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Resolutions adopted by the City Council of the city of Auburn, Maine; the Common Council of the city of Elizabeth, N. J.; and the Common Council of the city of New Kensington, Pa., favoring the enactment of legislation proclaiming October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A petition of Rosa L. Emerson and sundry other members of Negro Veterans of World War II, Montgomery, Ala., relating to cloture; ordered to lie on the table.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Holland	Myers
Baldwin	Humphrey	Neely
Brewster	Hunt	O'Conor
Bridges	Ives	O'Mahoney
Butler	Jenner	Pepper
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Chavez	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Connally	Kem	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Donnell	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Knowland	Sparkman
Downey	Langer	Stennis
Eastland	Lodge	Taft
Ecton	Long	Taylor
Ellender	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Flanders	McCarthy	Thye
Frear	McFarland	Tobey
Fulbright	McGrath	Tydings
George	McKellar	Vandenberg
Gillette	McMahon	Watkins
Green	Magnuson	Wherry
Gurney	Malone	Wiley
Hayden	Maybank	Williams
Hendrickson	Miller	Withers
Hickenlooper	Millikin	Young
Hill	Mundt	
Hoey	Murray	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. LUCAS to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 15, amending the so-called cloture rule of the Senate.

Mr. TYDINGS obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield that I may propound a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. TYDINGS. I can yield only for a question. I should like to accommodate the Senator, but I cannot yield without losing the floor.

Mr. President, I rise this morning with reluctance, because I do not wish to be put in the category of having engaged, directly or indirectly, in the debate which is now taking place, and which has been prolonged to this date. I do not rise to discuss primarily civil rights. That question is not before us. If it comes before us, I shall feel at liberty at that time to make my own position abundantly plain upon whatever measure may be pending.

Mr. President, I rise to discuss the security of the United States of America under the rules of the Senate under which we are at present operating. I rise to find fault with no rulings which have been made, or to discuss whether those rulings were right or wrong. I do think there is a matter connected with the proposed change of the rules which is of transcendental importance to the Senate, the country as a whole, and the civilized people of the world.

In the debate upon the proposed change of the rules it was stated that no limitation on debate worthy of the name had ever been made in the Senate up to 1917. Then, when much of the world was at war, and we ourselves were destined to become a participant in World War I in the very near future, a proposition was before this body to arm merchant ships. There was a great deal of resolution upon the part of each of those who supported and opposed the then pending measure. Because the safety of the country was involved, in the minds of a majority of the Senators then present, it was deemed wise, in the world which had evolved from the time our Government was first organized down to 1917, to take cognizance of the change which had come about in the affairs of nations and of men. So a rule was propounded, now known as rule XXII, to limit debate in this body whenever two-thirds of the Members deemed it advisable so to do.

Had we been living in the world of Jefferson and Washington, even of Lincoln, that cloture proposition would have been discountenanced and cast aside. In all the debate at that time even those who supported the cloture rule stated they did so with reluctance. But they grew up to the times in that memorable debate because the safety of the United States of America made it imperative that on a given occasion it must act if the Nation were to survive. That was in 1917.

The question now is, after two great world wars, with the invention of the atomic bomb and the intercontinental bombing plane, and flights continuous in nature around the world, whether we can grow up in 1949 to the exigencies of the occasion which now confront the Senate.

By virtue of the tolerance of my colleagues, I have been privileged to serve on three of the most important committees of the Senate, particularly with reference to the national security. I am a member of the Armed Services Committee, I am a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, and I am a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. In each of those committees and on all three of them I have been privileged to hear strategy and probabilities discussed on the various highest levels by the top men in our Government—State, military, and otherwise. There is no reason why every Member of the Senate should not have had the opportunity to acquaint himself with what many of us have been told, except that it has been deemed wise to acquaint fully in all of its ramifications some of the things involved in the international sphere only to those who have the primary responsibility of dealing with the subjects under consideration and as a safeguard to extreme secrecy.

From that background I today make bold to assert, first, that the rule of the United States Senate limiting debate, known as rule XXII, is inadequate to meet the challenge of this day and time.

Let me first demonstrate that very briefly before concluding what I hope will be a short address to bring the matter I have in mind to the attention of my colleagues.

We have already held, rightly or wrongly, in this body, that a cloture petition does not lie to a motion to consider a bill, to the approval or amendment of the Journal, and to various other enterprises of legislative mechanics. That being so, in 1917, on the mere motion to take up the armed ship bill, a handful of men could have defeated that proposition. In the future a handful of men can defeat a greater proposition by opposing a motion or debating at length a motion to take up some other bill that may have even greater import and significance than the armed ship bill had in 1917.

Now, with that brief recital of the facts as they relate to this rule—and I hope I have recited them accurately—let us look for a moment at the world situation which exists today. We have a good many boys in Europe and a good many boys in Japan. There are hundreds of thousands of them, to be exact. I do not know how many Senators or Representatives have boys over there. Fortunately I have not. Mine is home after serving abroad. But if we had boys over there, perhaps my remarks would find a little more poignancy in the hearts and thoughts of those in Congress than they might otherwise have.

It was not long ago when the Russians served notice on the American troops that our trains could no longer carry food into Berlin. The question was: How shall we feed our own men who are stationed in Berlin, and how shall we feed that part of the population of Berlin which comes under our military control? For a moment everything was at sixes and sevens. There was no solution. It seemed that we had reached an impasse and that in all probability, unless we could devise some means short of war with which to accomplish our objective, we had two, and only two, alternatives. One was to get out of Berlin, and thereby say that a former ally, now an unfriendly ally, had told us to get out and we had tucked our tail between our legs and gotten out with a loss of face all over the

world, and the hope of revitalizing western Europe would have gone, in my opinion, with that gesture and operation of acknowledged defeat.

The other alternative was to take the train and run it through the Russian zone, anyway; and if we had embarked upon that enterprise, the sparks of war would have been very close to the powder keg, and we might have inadvertently touched off another great world conflict.

Fortunately, there was still another alternative weighed and considered—doubtful, perhaps, at first, but finally tried, and of proved success when we adopted the air lift. And with our sons over there, a new method was found to hold our ground and discharge our obligations, and war was averted, or at least very serious consequences were for the time postponed.

Suppose we had not been able to have found the peaceful solution to what looked like a difficulty that could only be solved by retreat or by force of arms? There are strong men in Congress who do not want another world war. There are men who hate war so violently, so they assert, that they would almost submit to any alternative rather than plunge the world again in a bath of blood. Suppose that a measure had come before the Senate—if it had not been for the air lift—which required immediate action, and out of a strong conviction a small group of Senators, as was the case in 1917, had said, "We will filibuster this proposition to the very death before we will offer any resistance or take any measure whatsoever that might, perchance, lead us into war." And suppose that 90 percent of the Senate felt that the way to avoid war was to adopt the pending measure; then, whatever it might be, it could not be brought to a decision in this body for the simple reason there would be the parliamentary possibilities that a small group of Senators could employ to defeat the pending proposal.

I am unwilling to leave this question of what rule XXII should be in the hazy skies of divergent possibilities which in sum add up to the fact that the Senate possibly could not act in one of the darkest hours in the history of civilization and in the affairs of mankind.

When Thomas Jefferson wrote his manual he could not possibly foresee the atomic bomb. He could not possibly foresee the intercontinental bombing plane. He could not possibly see guided missles, which in the very near future, in my opinion, will fly from one continent to another through the stratosphere. He could not, perhaps, see that disease germs might be a weapon of offense and defense in bacteriological warfare. He could not visualize, perhaps, all the poison gasses, used and unused, discovered and yet to be discovered, which will be available in a war of extermination, which the next war will probably be—not only for those who wear the uniform but for the men, women, and children in the great cities from Maine to California and from Florida to Washington, and all over the world, if need be.

I am not making these remarks in any sense by way of personal criticism. When we go back to the precedents of more than 100 years ago and review the history of this country for its first 125 years of existence, we are using an outmoded yardstick to measure the exigencies of the day and hour in which we draw the breath of life on this planet. The Senate is in the horseback days, so far as the rules are concerned, when it comes to dealing with a probable or possible contingency in which the Nation's very existence may be at stake, so long as we say that by a mere motion 1 or 2 or 10 men can paralyze the entire Government and prevent it from meeting an emergency which will not be postponed for a day or a week, but may conceivably turn on a mere matter of seconds or minutes.

The two atom bombs which were dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, crude affairs, the first atomic bombs we had ever made, resulted in an official death toll of 78,150 at Hiroshima, with no wounded or missing, and a toll of between 35,000 and 40,000 killed or missing at Nagasaki, a total of 118,000 known killed or missing. What would one of them do to New York City or Chicago? In a fast bomber, such as many of us have seen with our own eyes, the speed and other capabilities of which have been published in the press, it is possible to fly from Siberia to Seattle in 3 hours, and, if it is carrying an atomic bomb, wreak havoc. It is possible to fly to Chicago in 4 hours. Nay, more than that. In a matter of 5 or 6 hours, it is possible to fly from Maine to Moscow; and if there is a plane over there, in the same length of time it can fly from Moscow to Maine.

We are only in the beginning of high speed, intercontinental bombers. We are just starting. Soon planes—perhaps bombing planes—will penetrate the sound barrier. Our great plane builders, such as Douglas, Boeing, Glenn Martin, and others, say that the day of the plane which will travel 1,500 or 2,000 miles an hour is just in the offing. When a plane is traveling even 1,000 miles an hour, if it is coming in this direction, it is no time for doubting Thomases to be arguing motions to take up bills on the floor of the Senate, or anywhere else.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the Senator what the Congress would do if one of those fast bombing planes took off from Moscow at midnight and started for Washington.

Mr. TYDINGS. I will come to that. I should like to say to my good friend, for whom I have not only great admiration, but a warm friendship and very great respect, that, as I stated in the beginning, nothing I am saying is any criticism of anything that has happened up to this hour. It is directed primarily to the need for a rule, without saying what the rule should be, in order that the Senate can function to the best of its ability to meet the exigencies of a new day, and not the day of Thomas Jefferson, or even the day of La Follette, Reed, Lodge, and others.

Mr. RUSSELL. My question was directed to the argument which the Senator is making. Even if Senators were all in Washington, like firemen, with their clothes hanging up so that they could jump into them and dash to the Capitol, it would be impossible for the Congress to do anything to prevent what the Senator outlines. It is my understanding that the radar network which we are planning to string around the country is not designed primarily to notify Members of Congress so that they can come from their homes to Washington. I was under the impression that it was to notify the operators of our jet planes so that they could meet the enemy. I do not believe that the Air Force would wait until Congress convened before trying to prevent atomic bombs from being dropped on Washington, D. C.

Mr. TYDINGS. I did not say that Congress could act with the speed necessary to intercept an enemy bomber carrying a bomb. I used that illustration only to paint the picture, to show the difference which exists between the world today and the world of yesterday. Today everything is predicated on speed which baffles the imagination of man, while we in the legislative process——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. No; I will not yield further.

Yes; I will yield, for fear that the titters which went through the room might make some feel that I am relinquishing my position. I will yield to any Senator, if Senators want a long discussion.

Mr. RUSSELL. I merely wish to ask the Senator if, in the last analysis, the argument he is making is not fatal to the preservation of any concept of democratic government in this country? We all know that the great advantage of a totalitarian state over a democracy is that it can act without consulting anyone. If the argument which the Senator is making is carried to its last analysis, does it not mean that we should have no Congress at all, but should entrust all powers to one man, who can make split-second decisions?

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not accept that thesis, even in part. I use as my best proof the events of 1917, when events were much slower than they are today. Even then, when no bomber was coming, the Senate found it necessary to cut off debate. So if we needed such a rule in an emergency of that kind, when we were not even at war, when we were not even threatened, when all that was under consideration was the question whether we should arm merchant ships, God knows the situation calls for more speedy action today than it could conceivably have called for in the year 1917.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not wish to say that the Congress has a magic wand, or that even if given the speed of Minerva in thought and action, it could handle all the difficulties which may overnight overcome us. What I mean to say—and I do not think it can be successfully contradicted—is that there are a multitude of exigencies with which Congress can deal successfully if it has the machinery which will permit it to deal with them

successfully. That is my whole point. I do not say that there might not be some extreme case in which, even though we could cut off debate in 1 minute, for example, that minute would not be sufficient to deal with an emergency which might occur in an instant.

What I am attempting to picture is the world in which we live. As the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and I have both said in public statements, we are dealing with realities, with the stark facts of life in the year 1949, and not with the stark realities of life in the year 1800 or 1917.

I now yield to the Senator from Arkansas, although I would appreciate it if Senators would bear with me and let me finish my statement.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am sure the Senator knows that there has been a war since 1917. We finished one more recently than that. Can the Senator cite one instance in which the rule was applied in the last war, or in which it should have been, and in which the country's defense suffered?

Mr. TYDINGS. I can only say that in 1917, when we were at peace, when the threat of war hovered over the horizon, Senators found it necessary for the first time in the history of the Senate to impose a limitation on debate.

I am not saying that the rule ought to be a majority cloture rule. I am not saying that the rule for two-thirds is wrong. What I am directing myself to is this: that the rule does not amount to a tinker's dam unless it is broad enough to encompass the reading of the Journal and to encompass motions aside from the pending question. That is my point in this debate: that so long as those two avenues of escape from cloture are open, there is no cloture to determined men who will do just what has been done here, namely, argue on the motion, against which cloture has been held on numerous occasions not to lie, as was reaffirmed last night, rather than permit the prime legislation itself to come before this body for decision.

Mr. President, we are spending about $20,000,000,000, all told, to try to save the civilization of western Europe. We are spending $15,000,000,000 or more this year on our own Army, Navy, and Air Force, not for the last war but to meet the contingency I have briefly alluded to in the remarks I have made so far. We are likely very soon to be confronted with a proposal to furnish arms and weapons, perhaps, to certain countries of the globe. Why? Because there is inherent in each of those propositions the idea, not that we are charitable, not that we are a big brother and love our neighbor as ourselves, but that our self-interest makes it wise for us to embrace and pursue these policies. In the last analysis, self-preservation is the greatest motivating force, rightly or wrongly, behind each of these proposals. Yet while we tax our people, take from them the fruits of their labor to do all of these things, we have left in our own legislative procedure a gap where a mere motion can frustrate the whole proposition of terminating a debate, even if the national safety and security are involved in the process.

If I could have voted my true convictions last night, it would not have been to tear down the two-thirds rule. I think there is ample justification in certain contingencies to put restraints and checks and balances upon the legislative processes up to a point. But I was confronted with the thoughts to which I am giving partial voice today: That even though I thought good arguments had been advanced by the eminent Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] to sustain the point of view which he supported, yet we might be caught in a situation where no change in the rule could be effected; and, thinking of the dire consequences that might lie in the offing if no change were made in the rule, I supported the position of the Vice President, because it was the best way that I could see, whether it be technical or whatever one may call it, to render the greatest service at the immediate moment in the way of protecting the interests of the Nation.

Mr. President, there is not a Member of this body who will deny that the cloture rule we now have on the books does not cover the reading of the Journal, does not cover motions of all manner and kind which are not essentially the pending motion, and does not cover even a motion to take up something and make it the pending measure. My plea here this morning is that whether we have civil-rights legislation or do not have it, let us at least change the rule so that if we are going to have cloture, we may actually have it; that we do not assume that we have it securely in hand, only to find that, like an eel, it slips out of our hand because we cannot have a firm and complete grip on the termination of debate in this body. I am afraid that in the exultation which may come to either the proponents or the opposition who are interested, not in the rule per se, but in the propositions which hang behind the rule, which are broadly called civil rights, they may take a temporary victory, one way or the other, and leave this rule as it is; and then some day we may be sorry.

Mr. President, I am not going to draw on my imagination to picture the things which might happen if we do not change the rule. I do believe that we may be confronted at some time in the future with the necessity of passing in a very short time a great deal of legislation having to do with our own survival. I would take it for granted that possible future enemies—and as I make this remark I hope to God we shall not have another war—may themselves be close to obtaining the atomic bomb, that in time they may have the atomic bomb, that in time they may have the intercontinental bombing planes. Whenever they do, Mr. President, I do not care how vivid our imagination may be at this good hour, it will not encompass the ideas pro and con that will seep through our heads when we are confronted with the stark realities of that situation, when it is a reality, and no longer merely a probability.

But if such a time comes, some Senator who does not view it as 99 percent of us might view it, could rise here on the floor of the Senate, and say, "This leads to war, if you propose any kind of a preparedness measure that amounts to very much"—just as some men said in 1917. That has been the classic example used by both sides here, so there is no reason why I should not use it. It is exhibit A-1 in this case. It has been relied on by all the speakers up to now. If it was relied on then, God knows it should be relied on a thousandfold more right now.

In the course of my service here on the Armed Services Committee with the eminent Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and some other Senators, I have had the privilege of going to Bikini and watching the atomic bomb dropped on the fleet; and I pictured in my mind what that bomb would have done to Baltimore or to Washington or to New York.

Yes, Mr. President; we never needed a cloture rule for over 100 years because we had two great oceans on either side of us, the Atlantic and the Pacific. In those days no one could come over the breast of those great waters and attack our own country; we could debate from now until doomsday, from Dan to Beersheba, we could cover the whole map in the course of our debates, and no one was going to bother us. We knew that.

Mr. President, those great oceans are becoming smaller and smaller; today they are only rivulets. At least 25 of my colleagues have flown the Atlantic, and many of them have flown the Pacific, and some of them have flown all the way around the world.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is the Senator taking the position that it would be necessary for Congress to take any steps whatever before the Army and the Navy of the United States could undertake to anticipate an attack upon the United States with an atomic bomb?

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator has answered that himself, when he referred to what happened in 1917. There was not an atomic bomb even in existence, and the Senate in 1917 found it necessary to apply cloture in order to arm ships when we were at peace, and it had to be done over and over again. Heaven knows, if it had to be applied in those days it is easy to see how much greater the necessity will be for doing it in the future, in the realistic world in which we are now living.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator did not answer my question. Is it necessary for the Congress to take any action before the armed services that we are now supporting at the great expense to which the Senator refers, would be permitted to defend the United States from attack?

Mr. TYDINGS. Is it necessary? Of course we could not take any steps if we thought an attack was not coming, because there would not be anything to consider.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am assuming an instantaneous attack, of which the Senator paints such a dire picture, and which has already frightened not only the Senate but all the American people,

as to whether or not, if such an attack were launched, it would be necessary for the Congress of the United States to take any steps whatever before the Air Forces could rise to shoot down the planes which were coming over.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes, it would, because I conceive in the day in which we live, modern intelligence being what it is compared with years gone by, that in most cases our people would be more alert than in the case of Pearl Harbor, when they did not have, perhaps, the intelligence, or if they did have it, did not analyze it, that the Japs were coming. I would assume that our intelligence service would know what was in prospect by the movement of troops up to the border, by the movement of airfields into Siberia, by the movement of airfields closer to London and the European coast, by an increase of military activity in Russia, and, if they have the bomb, by the movement of the bomb itself to the airfields in the east, and that it might be very, very necessary for us to take appropriate legislative action on a variety of subjects, such as the draft, universal service, civilian participation, as watchers, and generally for our protection. If we should have another war, let me say to my friend from Georgia, it would be necessary to organize the farmers, the school teachers, the policemen, the school children in the large cities, particularly when we know that other countries have the bomb. We are not going to let our cities remain like sitting ducks on a pond and wait for the bomb to come, and the subsequent confusion and disorder. And mark you, Mr. President, when the first bomb drops on an American city, we are going to have a lot of trouble keeping the populations of those cities in the cities.

If they have automobiles and an Aunt Molly living out in the country, they are going out for a little longer than the week end. The Senator can be sure of that.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield for a further question.

Mr. RUSSELL. Assuming our intelligence is not quite so efficient and infallible as the Senator suggests—and some of us perhaps have some doubt that our intelligence knows the exact movement of everything behind the iron curtain—assuming, and I do not think it a violent assumption, they did not know anything about it, but the radar screen we propose to put around America should pick up a strange four-motor bomber bearing down on the city of New York, does the Senator think it would require any action by the Congress before our fighter planes went up and sought to shoot down that plane?

Mr. TYDINGS. No. But there would be required much action of a legislative character after that, which the rule we now have would not permit us to take, unless it is amended.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield for a further question.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does not the Senator know that the War Between the States had been in progress for some weeks before the war was declared; and does he not know that when war was declared in 1917, the resolution stated that, a state of war had been existing for some months between this country and Germany, and that President Roosevelt did not even ask the Congress of the United States to declare war against Japan and Germany until 2 days after Pearl Harbor? So, with all the terrific speed of which the Senator speaks, we might just as well capitulate now, if we have got to wait on the Congress to take action to defend the United States from attacks from outside the country.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, the fallacy in the Senator's premise is that, by inference, he is saying we only need in 1949 the same legislative procedures we needed when the first Senate met. That is what it adds up to. And even in spite of that, while he is talking, he has himself used over and over again the example of 1917, when the Senate after a long debate on a mere arming of merchant ships, when we were not at war. The Senator has used that classic example to show that at times we do need legislative action, and when we do need it, we can get it under the rule.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will permit, I would challenge that statement and defy him to find in the RECORD where I ever used the 1917 instance in any way as an argument to that effect.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is a fair inference of the Senator's remark.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the Senator just how much debate he would permit, if we can be destroyed here in 2 seconds and must have Congress act before any action can be taken to defend the country. If all Members of Congress slept in their clothes and held themselves in instant readiness to dash to the Capitol, just how much debate would the Senator permit?

Mr. TYDINGS. I would allow very little debate, I may say, under the circumstances the Senator used as a predicate for his own question, to wit, that a Russian bombing plane was on its way to the cities of America. I should certainly want to have some curb on motions, and amendments to the Journal, while my life and the lives of my fellow Congressmen hung in the balance. But, according to the Senator's interpretation, even if such a plane were coming, he would then resist the right of the Senate to say that motions and amendments to the Journal shall not be precluded from cloture, because he would say "Well, we will take a month, or a year, if there be some men who want to do it, and we will go on with the debate, while our cities are destroyed."

Mr. RUSSELL. Does not the Senator know he has completely misinterpreted my position, and that, to the contrary, I hold that the United States Army and Navy could be set in motion without an act of Congress by the President, if an enemy were to attack our shores?

Mr. TYDINGS. There would be set in motion our one and one-half divisions in Europe. They would be set in motion against the 115 Russian divisions. They would be set in motion, and that would be the last motion any of them would take, and it would not be a motion to take up a bill or to approve the Journal.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I should like to ask him one other question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Russians were, within the next 10 minutes, to move into Berlin by force to eject our troops stationed there, and were to move into Vienna to eject our troops stationed there, and were to attack all along the border between Russian territory in Germany and our territory, would the Senator propose to require our troops to be set into instant motion or be slaughtered, or to be captured and sent to Siberia by the Russians, because, forsooth, the Congress had not acted? Or does not the Senator think that when the Russians moved our troops would start shooting, whether one division or a half division, or a battalion? The Senator need not reproach me with the scarcity of troops, there, because I have supported both universal service and the draft.

Mr. TYDINGS. The position of the Senator from Georgia is this, that of course our troops would start shooting, but he is not meaning they would win against a force that outnumbered them 100 to 1, does he?

Mr. RUSSELL. No.

Mr. TYDINGS. But, after they had been exterminated and a bill was introduced here, or 10 bills, to deal with the emergency situation, someone would say, "Oh, it is too bad. We should not have done that. We have lost 100,000 men. But, if we go to war, we shall lose more, and therefore I am going to hold the floor. I am going to say that the Journal should not be approved, because the semicolon in the second sentence has been put in the wrong place, and, furthermore, there is a verb there that does not agree with its subject or its number, and therefore I shall have to insist it is necessary that it be corrected before I will act." I will take just as extreme a case as the Senator from Georgia took.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator, of course, speaks up to par. I will ask the Senator if he thinks he is quite up to par on his usual sarcasm?

Mr. TYDINGS. I have to play golf according to the character of the fellow I am playing against. [Laughter.]

Mr. RUSSELL. Very well. I will ask the Senator this question, then: Does the Senator reproach me for the scarcity of troops?

Mr. TYDINGS. I am not reproaching the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes; the Senator is reproaching me.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator asked questions, and I am giving him an answer.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; and in doing so, I will ask the Senator if he did not reproach me for the paucity of troops in Germany. Does not the Senator, who is

the chairman of the distinguished Armed Services Committee of the Senate, charged with the responsibility in these matters, feel that he has some responsibility for those troops?

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course; and I should like to say to the Senator, in answer to his question, that there are already a half-dozen military bills on the calendar which we cannot reach because on a motion to take up a bill there is no check at all. One Senator can hold out as long as his health lasts. There are bills providing for the establishment of a radar screen. I do not want to be diverted from my argument, but that device cannot be built with one appropriation. All that is being done is to make a mere start. There are bills to protect the codes of the United States, which even now may be violated without any protection of law.

Mr. RUSSELL. When were those bills placed on the calendar?

Mr. TYDINGS. They came in a few days ago. I do not know whether they are on the calendar, but they have been reported unanimously from the Committee on Armed Services; and here we are, debating a mere motion to take up a resolution, and the debate has gone on for 10 days. I am not quarreling with the fundamental position of the Senator from Georgia. He has a perfect right to express his views and to express his opinion as to what the rules should be. What I am trying to do is to point out that the rule is no rule, that debate is unlimited, and unless this loophole is closed there can be in the future, as there was in 1917, and with more reason for it, the necessity of taking up bills of various kinds.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further for a question?

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall not yield further to the Senator. I have been courteous. There is a great deal of repetition apparent in his questions, without reflecting on him, and I do not think the questions are germane to the matter which I am attempting to discuss.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me conclude. What have we done here? We have used as a yardstick to measure the rules of the Senate the fact that the times of George Washington prove, first, that no cloture was needed for the first 100 years of our Nation's history. Then we have used a yardstick that goes back to 1917. Even at that time we said that the old Washingtonian yardstick was no longer long enough to measure the exigencies of 1917. So we established a new yardstick, which sufficed for 20 or 30 more years. Now we are at the point where we must have still another yardstick to measure debate in the Senate.

My plea today has nothing to do, pro or con, with civil rights per se. I am not even thinking of the civil-rights program; I am not attacking those who favor it or those who oppose it. I am saying that the rules of the Senate, as they stand and will stand until these loopholes are closed up, may conceivably put the security and the welfare of the Government and the people of this Nation into serious jeopardy. I am saying that until we plug up those loopholes, whether by a two-thirds majority vote or a three-fourths majority vote, or whatever kind of a plug we may use to put into those loopholes, there is no curtailment of debate in this body, and that in this day of the intercontinental bombing plane, the atomic bomb, guided missiles, disease germs, the speed and dispatch with which those weapons may be carried, and the devastation which will occur, once war comes, we should gear ourselves, as we ask the services, to gear themselves to meet the exigencies, whatever they may be, with all dispatch and promptness and without undue delay and debate.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield for a question.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, with much that the Senator says I find myself in complete agreement, as I have frequently indicated heretofore. It is as a matter of national security that I think it is essential to have an effective, reasonable cloture rule. This is the question I want to ask the Senator. He has indicated that in 1917, when the Senate found itself confronting a need in respect to national security, it proceeded as men of good will should proceed, and a group of Senators was created from both sides of the aisle to address themselves to the necessity, and they came out with an agreement, for the first time in the history of the Nation, in respect to a cloture rule.

We now confront a situation—and I ask the Senator if this is not true, since I must address him only in the form of a question—we confront a situation in which two great and fundamental necessities collide. I agree completely, as to the necessity which the Senator describes, that we must have a reasonable cloture rule which is effective. At the same time that necessity collides with another necessity which is very close to my heart, and evidently close to the hearts of a majority of the Senators, namely, that in reaching this result we must proceed by due process and protect what we believe to be the essential dignity of the rules of the Senate of the United States. I ask the Senator whether he thinks it is impossible for Senators in 1949 to proceed as Senators did in 1917—drop the atmosphere of bitterness, contention, and controversy with respect to this challenge and undertake, as Senators did at that time, to sit down together and find a common ground which does protect, so far as is reasonable or right, the freedom of debate, yet which, on the other hand, does protect the necessities of this Government if an emergency should arise.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am completely in accord with the suggestion made by the able Senator from Michigan, and my sole purpose in rising here today and making the preliminary remarks which I have made, and which I shall conclude, if not interrupted, in the next 5 minutes, was finally to make an appeal to my good friends on both sides of the civil-rights question and to ask them if they will not let it drop from their thoughts while fashioning a rule for over-all purposes.

I am sorry the Senator from Georgia has left the Chamber, because I had no intention of attacking his position in what I have said, or the position of others who disagree. My sole purpose was to try to picture in not too cogent terms, not with the amount of thought that I would like to have given it—this idea came to me last night—but to picture some of the possibilities of the present and the future as compared with 1917 and the centuries before, and to ask those on this side of the aisle and the those on the other side of the aisle if they will not attempt, in a spirit of fair compromise, to find some way of plugging up the loopholes in rule XXII so that in some conceivable national emergency we shall not be impotent to deal with it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TYDINGS. Just a moment, please. I believe there is a fundamental will in this body to accomplish that objective. As I said before, I am not attacking anyone. I am not criticizing the Senator from Georgia or the Senator from Illinois; or agreeing with them necessarily. This is an appeal, within reason, and confronted with the situation which exists, for representatives of both sides to sit down somewhere and bring out a fair rule, all things considered, which will, at least, in a moment of national disaster or possible disaster, operate to permit the Senate to do business with due dispatch.

I now yield to the Senator of Virginia for a question.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if he will give us his definition of a fair compromise. Does it mean, in his opinion, that those in the South who are trying to protect themselves from what they believe to be wholly unconstitutional measures, as well as from measures that would be practically disruptive to our social and economic conditions, must do all the compromising and accept what may be a majority or a two-thirds settlement, or would a fair compromise include a consideration of some other basis, possibly a little more liberal than two-thirds, to end debate when the national interest is at stake?

Mr. TYDINGS. I cannot give the eminent Senator from Virginia a specific answer to his interrogatory, but in my opinion, in a general way—and I think he will understand—unless there is going to be that degree of comity on the part of both sides of this question to reach a compromise, there is no point in meeting. I am hopeful, however, that by an exchange of views on the rule itself there can be a meeting of the minds of those who are on the two sides of this proposition.

I should not care to say what I think the compromise ought to be. I do not think it would be fair to my own proposition to suggest that there be a meeting, and then say what the meeting ought to bring forth. I am content to believe that if the approach is made, as it was made in 1917, and the gentlemen from the South say, "We cannot go beyond this point," and the other gentlemen say, "We cannot go beyond that point," somewhere in between can be found a middle

ground where, with a little give-and-take, the Senator and his associates can save whatever they want to save without giving undue hostages to fortune, and at least make it possible, under the conditions agreed upon, to terminate debate on matters other than a pending measure.

Mr. ROBERTSON. In the opinion of the distinguished Senator from Maryland, would consideration of a three-fourths majority be a proper item in a spirit of compromise?

Mr. TYDINGS. I would say to the Senator that that certainly ought to be one of the propositions which should be given due consideration. I am not going to agree to any proportion, for myself, but the very thought that the Senator propounds that himself, coming from a side of the civil-rights question upon which I know he feels strongly, is the best evidence that there is room for the agreement which I have requested.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to inquire of the distinguished Senator from Maryland if it is his opinion, as indicated by the entire trend of his argument, that all the votes against the ruling of the Chair came from Senators who are against the civil-rights bills?

Mr. TYDINGS. I will say to the Senator from Nevada, with his permission, that I would rather not pass an opinion in any way, shape, or form on the civil-rights matter, for the reason that I am here making a plea for a change in the Senate rules. I am not rising to argue the pro or con of civil rights at this time. The Senator from Maryland has engaged in such arguments before, and will do so again, if the question comes to the floor and he deems it necessary. My point is that, no matter whether the civil-rights question is decided, and every Senator votes for the decision that is made, there will still remain this loophole in the rule, and that is the thing I wish to see plugged.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I am trying to get the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield that I may ask a question?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator from Maryland contemplate, because of the remarks which have been made, making any such suggestion as he and the Senator from Michigan indulged in, in a colloquy relative to arriving, if possible, at some solution of the problem before the Senate?

If the Senator does not mind, before he answers, I should like to make an observation. It was the intention of the Committee on Rules and Administration to bring into the Senate, on the theory that a cloture petition did not lie on the motion, a rule which would permit that which Senators in the main would accept. The committee worked earnestly in that endeavor, and if we lay aside all politics and all questions of legislation, it will be admitted, I am sure, the committee has done that. We did it 2 years ago. We did it a year ago. We have brought the same kind of a rule before the Senate at this time.

I did not think the time had arrived when one might propose a unanimous-consent request to do what the Senator has suggested, because my feeling is we have not yet attempted to settle this matter in the one way in which we can settle it, that is, by breaking a filibuster. But if the Senator has that idea in mind, which is in harmony with the Senator from Michigan, and thinks that there could be any other effort made, other than what has been made by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and those of us on this side, while I cannot speak for the minority at this moment as to how they would all feel about such a solution, I want the Senator to know that, as the ranking member of the minority on the Committee on Rules and Administration, and as the minority floor leader, I will do my level best to have a solution worked out, and I am satisfied that in the mean this side of the aisle would like very much indeed to meet the situation in the way suggested, if it can be done.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator, and in answer to his question, very briefly, I may say I have talked with a number of Senators on both sides, with no particular proposition to submit, and I have found among those from the South and among those from the West and the North, an underlying desire to try to find common ground on the question raised. Therefore it was my hope that I might give some little momentum to that worthy objective by these remarks on the floor this morning.

To conclude, Mr. President, let me say once more that I have risen not to criticize those who are opposed to the civil-rights program, or those who favor it, or those who voted on the side of one ruling or the other from the Chair, but to try to show in a very humble way that we are living in a world that is not the world of George Washington or Woodrow Wilson, and knowing that the Senate is basically patriotic and alert to its duty, it is my hope that this little talk of mine may inspire some momentum which will help us to get out of an impasse which might, conceivably, in a dark hour of our destiny, be darker than it need be.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I wish to address myself briefly to the situation which is confronting us here today. I shall not rehash what happened in the Senate yesterday. I shall certainly not condemn any Senator who may disagree with me. I do feel that the question before the Senate is one which has very large implications indeed, and that no good purpose is served by making it the subject of partisan recriminations.

Mr. President, both our major political parties are involved in this subject in approximately the same way. If one reads the planks of the respective party platforms, as I have just done this morning, he finds they have substantially the same import. The fact is that the matter transcends any question of party, that there were many Senators last night who did not feel that their votes in any way related to the merits of having the Senate limit debate or not, and that therefore the cause is not yet lost. It is disheartening to me to see interviews in the newspapers today that the vote last night marked the end, for this session, of any effort to get a change in the Senate rules, and that it marked the end, for the session, of any attempt to secure civil-rights legislation. I cannot believe that that is true.

Although the cause is not yet lost, I think in all candor we must admit to ourselves that the spectacle that has been going on here for the last 10 days has not been an edifying one for the country as a whole. The American people do not understand how it is possible that in a group like the United States Senate there is not some way whereby, after everyone has had a chance to be heard, we would be able to vote on an issue that comes within the purview of the Constitution. I think the average citizen feels that what we have been doing here does not constitute a good performance. I believe that if we were to drop this matter now and go on to something else we would cause great disappointment and dismay in the country, we would hurt the whole institution of government, we would injure the office of United States Senator which we hold, and we would regret it all the rest of our lives.

I do not say that simply because this involves the issue of civil rights, although it does involve the issue of civil rights, of course, and that is a very broad issue. It is in all truth becoming broader all the time. There was a time when the question of civil rights was a political question and a social question, but now it has become also an economic question, it has become a military question, and in a very real sense it affects the whole solidarity of the American people. In fact it is hard to think of an issue that can come before us which means more to men and women in their inner life than a question which affects the individual worth of a human being.

This question of his individual worth and his standing in the community is more important than what he eats or what he wears or where he lives or anything else. I think we would have to look far before we could find an issue which in its urgency and insistency and immediacy surpasses this question of civil rights.

We know, for example, that we are not a country which has a great surplus of manpower any more. We used to think we did, but we know now that is not true. We know how during the war in our industries we had to do away with segregation in a great many places in order to get production for the war effort. The war also taught us the lesson that we can no longer afford, in the tragic event of another war, to continue the senseless, stupid, and cruelly destructive racial segregation that has gone on in our armed services in the past. It is unfair to the citizen who is segregated against. It is unfair for the other citizen because it means that he has to carry the whole load of the battle.

This question is changing, it is growing, it is getting broader all the time, and the sentiment is growing, I think,

in many parts of the country, that there must be no second-class citizens in America; that we simply will not stand for it.

I have lived in the South, and I have friends in the South, and I have never said, and I never will say, because I do not think it, that all the discrimination and all the segregation is in the South. I think there is just exactly as much unreasonableness, just exactly as much of a hateful attitude in other parts of the country as there is there, and I will say that to anybody. I think there may be an undue amount of sensitivity there as to the effect of some of these proposed laws. It has never been clear to me how the enactment of anti-poll-tax legislation or antilynching legislation could possibly injure the rank and file of citizens there whose well-being depends on the established order. I never could see that. I think that is unduly alarmist. So I am fair about this. I think no section is without blame. It is an issue that underlies all things.

You may think you have disposed of it for the session. When you refused to sustain the Vice President's ruling you may have thought you had heard the end of it, but, Mr. President, you have not heard the end of it, and, in my judgment, you will never hear the end of it until it has been solved.

Mr. President, there is not only the question of antilynching legislation and anti-poll-tax legislation. There is the question of segregation in housing, segregation in education, segregation in the armed services, fair-employment practices. Some of those things may require legislation, and some of them may not, but they are all thorny, burning issues which are of the utmost vitality to a very large segment of the American people, and I say that regardless of race, creed, or color. So we contemplate a challenge today of great breadth and depth and significance.

Apart from the civil-rights question, which heaven knows is broad enough, there is the enormous question of whether this Government is going to be able to cope with issues that come before it, whether the United States Senate is going to be able to meet the whole challenge of modern life. That is at stake here. The fact that this debate is holding up social legislation, in which I personally happen to believe is regrettable, but no more important issue can face us at this moment than the issue we are confronting, and there never will be a better time to come to grips with it than this time, because it is impossible ever to bring up a measure like this and have a prolonged debate like this without having some meritorious legislation pile up in back of us.

Those of us who were on the Committee on Rules and Administration did what we could to get this measure out as quickly as possible. I wish we could have gotten it up in January, when we were meeting only 2 days a week. We could not do that, but we got it out in February. We got it up as soon as possible so that the number of important bills which were pressing for Senate consideration were at a minimum.

This thing is now up. We ought to stay with it and see it through, and let no arguments, however appealing, as to the merits of other legislation, dissuade us from so doing.

Now, what is the practical course which is open to us?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LODGE. I yield for a question.

Mr. McMAHON. Assuming that the debate went on for a few days more, and got up to the deadline for rent control, would the Senator suggest that we should let rent control lapse?

Mr. LODGE. Well, I have always been in favor of rent control.

Mr. McMAHON. That is not the question.

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator let me answer his question? He interrupted me before I had a chance to answer.

Mr. McMAHON. I am sorry.

Mr. LODGE. I have got to answer the Senator in my own words. I cannot answer him in his own words.

I have always been in favor of rent control, and I still am. In Massachusetts the Governor has announced that he will press for State action in the event that Federal rent control is not extended, and if Federal rent control should lapse, of course, State action could, should, and in Massachusetts would be provided.

Now, Mr. President, the practicality is that if we want to bring this issue to a head and have a show-down on it, there is, as I see it, only one course left open to us. It is a very disagreeable course, one which no Senator enjoys contemplating. That is the course of having continuous night sessions and holding the Senate in session, as has been done in the past, until we wear out the filibuster and obtain a vote.

I realize the many objections to such a procedure. It is extremely fatiguing physically to everyone. It could be injurious to health. Those who are trying to promote the legislation are in a much more difficult position than those who are trying to stop it. At 3 o'clock in the morning when a Senator finishes his speech, for example, the absence of a quorum is suggested, and it is impossible to obtain a quorum. The Sergeant at Arms is sent out to bring in Senators and he cannot find enough to make a quorum. Then it is necessary to adjourn and we lose all we have accomplished by way of wearing down the filibuster.

But I believe there are enough Senators who are willing to agree to stay here all night. That is the test. I can see no other way out of the difficulty. If we start at once, we ought to be able to get a show-down on this issue in plenty of time to prevent any jeopardy to rent control.

This technique is so clear to the public, so clear to the press, and so much has been said about it that I believe that unless we do sit in continuous all-night session the public will feel that we are not really serious.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LODGE. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Did not the Senator from Massachusetts state, in committee meeting, that in his opinion a filibuster could not be broken if as many as 16 Senators were to engage in it?

Mr. LODGE. No; I did not say that. I said that was the indication.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President——

Mr. LODGE. Let me answer the Senator's first question before he asks me the second.

I am not a defeatist or a pessimist. I never give up. The fact that it is difficult to break a filibuster does not in the least discourage me from trying. The old saying is, "The difficult we do right away; the impossible takes us a little longer." I believe in making a real try to break the filibuster. Does that answer the Senator's question?

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut for a question.

Mr. BALDWIN. Am I to understand the Senator from Massachusetts to say that he personally would be willing to stay here as long as necessary in order to finish this job, and come to a determination of this question?

Mr. LODGE. That is correct. I am willing to stay here all day and all night, until we reach a decision on this question. I believe that a great many other Senators would be willing to do so. I feel that unless that happens, the public will feel that we have been trifling and toying with this question. I have been here since 1937, on and off. It is my judgment, based upon my experience, that it is not possible to break a filibuster by sitting until 9 o'clock every night. It is not tiring enough.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield for a question.

Mr. BALDWIN. Would it interest the Senator to know that he might have company? I, for one, would be glad to join him, and I am sure a great many other Senators would.

Mr. LODGE. I know that if the Senator from Connecticut were here, we would have good company.

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the Senator. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield for a question.

Mr. BALDWIN. Did the Senator read the RECORD this morning of the vote last night on the question of taking a recess? Does the Senator realize that in that vote practically every Republican then in the Chamber—I think every Republican, with one or two exceptions—voted, on a yea-and-nay vote, against the recess?

Mr. LODGE. I stated at the outset of my remarks that I was not going to try to inject politics into my discussion.

Mr. BALDWIN. I appreciate that.

Mr. LODGE. I think a good many Democrats would also be present.

Mr. BALDWIN. I think that is correct.

Mr. LODGE. I also believe that a number of Senators who voted against the Vice President's ruling would agree to go along with a program of this kind. A number of Senators who voted against the Vice President's ruling are in favor of the Hayden-Wherry resolution. Therefore, I do not believe that we ought to confine this effort to one party. It is a two-party question. It is a thing

which transcends party, just as the whole civil-rights question does.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks excerpts from the Democratic and Republican platforms bearing on this question.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Republican platform of 1948]

Lynching or any other form of mob violence anywhere is a disgrace to any civilized state, and we favor the prompt enactment of legislation to end this infamy.

One of the basic principles of this Republic is the equality of all individuals in their right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This principle is enunciated in the Declaration of Independence and embodied in the Constitution of the United States; it was vindicated on the field of battle and became the cornerstone of this Republic. This right of equal opportunity to work and to advance in life should never be limited in any individual because of race, religion, color, or country of origin. We favor the enactment and just enforcement of such Federal legislation as may be necessary to maintain this right at all times in every part of this Republic.

We favor the abolition of the poll tax as a requisite to voting.

We are opposed to the idea of racial segregation in the armed services of the United States.

[From the Democratic platform of 1948]

The Democratic Party commits itself to continuing its efforts to eradicate all racial, religious, and economic discrimination.

We again state our belief that racial and religious minorities must have the right to live, the right to work, the right to vote, the full and equal protection of the laws, on a basis of equality with all citizens as guaranteed by the Constitution.

We highly commend President Harry S. Truman for his courageous stand on the issue of civil rights. We call upon the Congress to support our President in guaranteeing these basic and fundamental rights: (1) The right of full and equal political participation; (2) the right to equal opportunity of employment; (3) the right of security of person; (4) the right of equal treatment in the service and defense of our Nation.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I conclude simply by saying that unless we really grasp this nettle and have continuous night sessions, and unless a number of Senators solemnly agree to stay here, the public will not feel that we have kept faith with them in giving effect to one of the most basic aspirations of the human spirit.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has a statement of a personal nature which he desires to make. I ask unanimous consent that he may be recognized.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I object to the unanimous-consent request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I desire the floor in my own right. I understood that the Senator had concluded.

Mr. LODGE. I understand that the Senator from Arkansas has a personal statement of a very sad and moving character to make. I wanted to give him an opportunity to make his announcement without having it count as a speech.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the majority leader objected.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I was on my feet before the majority leader was. I was seeking recognition. I should like very much to address myself to the Senate for a few minutes on a question which I think should be taken care of at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the Senator asking the Senator from Massachusetts to yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I ask for recognition in my own right. I was on my feet even before the Senator from Illinois was.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will not quarrel with the Senator from Nebraska about that.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall not enter into any quarrel with the distinguished Vice President, for whom I have the highest regard. I tried to obtain recognition last night and could not get it. I have tried a number of times today. Inasmuch as I was on my feet, and directly in line with the vision of the Vice President, I think I should be recognized.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask the Chair if the motion to take up Senate Resolution 15 is not the question before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is what the Chair was about to state, before he recognized another speaker.

Mr. WHERRY. I now ask that the yeas and nays be ordered on that motion.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to join in the remarks made by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] last night, or such remarks as he was permitted to make; also the remarks of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] today, relative to night sessions in the Senate, in order that, by a determined effort, through holding continuous night sessions, or at least night sessions, we may get a vote on the Hayden-Wherry resolution.

The suggestion has been made that we circulate petitions among a group of Senators who will agree to stay in session at night, and who will support the Hayden-Wherry resolution when the time comes.

However, I wish to say to Members of the Senate that if the majority means what it says, and will say what it means, it has it within its power to hold the Senate in session until we reach a vote on this question. I want the RECORD to be indelibly clear. We cannot blame Senators on this side of the aisle or on the other side of the aisle because they believe this or believe that. The administration has the power, because it has a majority of 54 Senators, to hold the Senate in session until we reach a decision. Furthermore, it has the responsibility of carrying out this program.

Mr. President, I want the Senate to know where I stand. I believe the time has come for us to agree by unanimous consent, if possible, as was so ably suggested by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], joined by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], that rule XXII shall be effective on a motion as well as on a pending measure, or else decide that it is not effective at all. We have to do either one or the other.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall yield in a few minutes.

Mr. President, I wish the Members of the Senate to know that, so far as I am concerned, I shall use my good offices to bring that about; but until that time comes, it is our duty as Members of this body not to have to sign petition after petition to be presented here; rather, it is our duty to cooperate with the majority leader, who should take the lead, and not be subject, as he said last night, to being led by this whim or that whim of some of the Members on his side of the aisle. He should take the lead, as he said, to direct the Senate into night sessions, and to make a fair trial to break the filibuster. Up to this moment, Mr. President, all we have had have been a couple of pink teas--two little night sessions not lasting even to near midnight, and then it is said that we have exhausted all the possibilities, and have made all possible efforts, and cannot get anywhere.

Mr. President, I do not agree with that suggestion. When we started on this legislation, I made a statement on the floor of the Senate that the thing for the Senate to do was to make up its mind that it would have to stay in continuous session if it ever were to have an opportunity to vote on the Wherry-Hayden resolution. I said that because the Senate was canvassed quite thoroughly by the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and myself as to whether an agreement could be entered into that we might vote upon the Wherry-Hayden resolution without amendment, without crossing a "t" or dotting an "i." I believe that the senior Senator from Arizona will agree with me that we came to the conclusion that that could be accomplished only by submitting the proposed legislation, debating the issue, and then attempting to get it to a vote when we reached the point where we could break a filibuster.

Mr. President, today I am not mentioning any particular proposed legislation, as was done last night. That is not what is involved here. There are on the calendar of the Senate many pieces of legislation that are just as important as those which were mentioned, those which the majority leader said we were hiding behind.

I recall a filibuster—one which was ended rather satisfactorily—on a piece of legislation which was not even connected with civil rights. So I am not mentioning what proposed legislation is in the mind of the Senate or would come before the Senate. My opinion is that until we perfect rule XXII so that cloture will apply upon a motion as well as upon a pending measure, we shall not get before the Senate the proposed legislation which some Senators would like to have come before it.

Mr. President, I want the majority leader to know that so far as I am concerned—and I believe I am speaking the sentiments of at least a majority of the Members of the Senate on this side of the aisle, although of course I am not pledging them—we are perfectly willing to stay here and debate this question; we are perfectly willing to have night sessions. I wish to state that it is more important to do that than to bring up any proposed legislation which might be brought up with the idea that it would displace this matter.

The most important thing now, if we mean what we say, is to continue this debate until, by unanimous consent or by some other means, we can obtain an opportunity to vote on the Wherry-Hayden resolution. If we can get that kind of leadership here—one that is decisive, one that is determined, one that does not just simply give this matter a sort of show, so that we can vote on cloture, but leadership that will actually make that determined effort—my prediction is that the time will come when, either by unanimous consent or otherwise, we can make an agreement to amend rule XXII so as to make it effective, or else an opportunity will arise when we can vote on a motion or measure similar to the Wherry-Hayden resolution.

Now, Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield to the assistant Republican leader. I tried to make these remarks last night; but unfortunately I was not able to obtain an opportunity to do so. I wish to say now that in my experience as acting majority leader I always yielded, when requested, to the leader across the aisle; and as long as I am minority leader, I shall always do so.

Now I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have listened to the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. I have listened to my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. Today I have listened to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and to the question which was propounded to him by the Senator from Michigan.

I should like to ask the minority leader a question; and if I am able to do so, either through unanimous consent or otherwise, I should like to ask the majority leader the same question in a moment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am quite satisfied that the Senator from Massachusetts can ask me any question he wishes to ask, and still I shall not lose the floor. But I do not wish to be forced into the position of having to request unanimous consent to permit the Senator from Massachusetts to ask a question of the majority leader in my time, because of the rule to which I have 100 percent subscribed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, just now I am about to ask a question of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. That is quite all right, and I shall be glad to answer it as best I can.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We have met all this week, Mr. President; we are meeting this afternoon, on Saturday; and if this situation continues, we shall meet long into the night. I am heartily in accord with the thought that if we cannot get together on this matter, then we must try our best to work it out through the parliamentory process of having long sessions and full discussion and all-night sessions, if necessary.

My question to the Senator from Nebraska is this: Based on what we have heard today, based on what we have heard from the Senator from Michigan, the Senator from Maryland, the Senator from Massachusetts, and the Senator from Nebraska, would not it be a helpful suggestion to have the majority leader and the minority leader agree with one or two other Senators to meet on Sunday and see if something could be worked out? If something cannot be worked out, then let them make a statement on Monday, and we shall be guided by the regular legislative processes as to what occurs thereafter in the course of long, long sessions.

But, Mr. President, it seems to me——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair must insist that the Senator from Nebraska yielded for a question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am asking a question, Mr. President.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well. I yield for a question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I want the Senator's opinion as to whether it would be possible for a few Members of the Senate, under the leadership of himself and the majority leader, this afternoon and evening and tomorrow to ascertain whether something can be worked out and some proposal brought back on Monday. If that cannot be done, then let us go through with the inevitable alternative of staying all night, if necessary.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in answer to that question, which I think is a highly intelligent one and deserves an answer, and I think it is made in the eternal hope that something can be done in keeping with the fine sentiments of the Senator from Massachusetts, who attempts to get these things done by agreement, and to eliminate all of the bitterness of a debate, let me say that I am in accord with the sentiments behind the suggestion, and I say to my colleague and assistant leaders on this side of the aisle that I shall be glad to work out any kind of a meeting between the majority leader and the minority leader or the senior member of the Rules Committee and the ranking minority member and any other appointees the majority leader might like to have.

However, my understanding would be that we would have to have unanimous consent, if the meeting were to be a meeting of a committee which is authorized by the Senate. Otherwise it would have to be done outside of the Senate.

So, if unanimous consent is required, I would agree to it. If the Senator's idea is to do it outside the Senate, I should be glad to enter into any agreement based on such a proposal, with the idea that if we could be helpful in working out the matter and bringing back a proposed solution on which we might have a vote, then such a vote would be had in the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the same question of the majority leader, but without causing the minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska, to lose the floor. I ask such uanimous consent.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I would have to be the one to make the decision in such case, because, after all, I would be yielding the floor for a purpose in direct contradiction of the rule we already have. Mr. President, in order that the Senator from Massachusetts may ask the question of the majority leader and not have to request such unanimous consent, I now yield the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the majority leader the same question I asked the Senator from Nebraska. My suggestion would be that the matter be discussed outside the Senate by an informal group, at a meeting to be arranged by the majority leader anc the minority leader.

Mr. LUCAS. Since the minority leader and the majority leader are together upon the question at the present time, it seems to me if there is any question of compromise it should come from some other source than merely the majority leader and the minority leader. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has been acting more or less as chairman of those who are opposed to the rule. I should think someone from his group should be taken into consideration in respect to any compromise that may be made. If we are to make a compromise, it would seem to me that probably members of the Rules Committee, who are responsible for reporting the amendment to the rule, should work it out. However, I should want to look rather closely at the compromise. I am always willing to compromise, but I would want to know what the compromise was, of course, as would every other Senator. If something can be worked out that is satisfactory to the Senate, of course the majority leader will be very happy about it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have the floor, have I not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has recognized the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My thought is, the group should include not merely the majority leader and the minority leader, but, as the Senator from Michigan said so clearly a few moments ago, it should include Senators on both sides of the question. My suggestion to the majority leader and the minority leader simply is that they select four or five or six other Senators to sit down over the week end, possibly on Sunday, to discuss a compromise. It seems to be a discussion of that kind would be more profitable than to continue the discussion in the Senate. Let us omit the word "compromise"; let us say the suggestion is that Senators get together to see what can be worked out, rather than remain here from a quarter to 2 until 10, 11, or 12 o'clock tonight to hear speeches that may become

more acrimonious as they proceed, making impossible an agreement on the subject which most Senators desire. All Senators want to get together on the matter, in order that the Senate may proceed in one way or another. It may be that such an agreement could be reached over Sunday. That is my suggestion. It is not merely that the majority leader and the minority leader get together, but that they as the leaders on both sides, arrange such a meeting.

Mr. LUCAS. I may say to the honorable Senator from Massachusetts the suggestion has merit, and, insofar as I am concerned, and as far as I can, I shall be glad to discuss the matter with anybody. I do not see how the Senate can take official action upon it. I think the suggestion is worthy of serious consideration, and I promise the Senator from Massachusetts—and I am sure the Senator from Nebraska will agree—that we will make an effort to see what can be done. But it seems to me it is a matter wholly outside Senate action. As I said a moment ago, it would have to be carried on perhaps by members of the Rules Committee who were responsible for bringing in the rule. I am sure there are those on both sides of the issue who would be in a much better position to talk about a compromise and bring something forward for consideration by the Senate than either the Senator from Illinois or anybody else who is not on the Rules Committee. The Senator from Nebraska is a member of the committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My suggestion is made to the majority leader, because the leadership would have to come from him, in the hour that the Senate recessed, in a suggestion that the Senate recess in order that such a meeting may be held. Such a meeting is of no value if held in the middle of the night. Such a meeting is of value when men are fresh, when their minds are clear, and when they have a will to get together in a discussion. That is why, at a quarter to 2, I make the suggestion to the able majority leader. I make it most humbly and most modestly. Oftentimes, fools step in where intelligent men fear to tread. I make the suggestion on Saturday afternoon at a quarter to 2, in the hope that it is the proper time to express such a thought to the majority leader, in order that he may guide the Senate in the way that is best.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 15.

Mr. LUCAS and Mr. RUSSELL addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois.

BEREAVEMENT OF SENATOR McCLELLAN

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has a very sad message to impart to the Senate. A few moments ago the junior Senator from Massachusetts made a unanimous-consent request, to which I objected. I did not know what was in the mind of the Senator at that time. I have since learned. I now ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Arkansas be permitted to make a brief statement without in any wise jeopardizing his own rights in the parliamentary situation with respect to the pending question, and that it may not be counted as a speech upon his time when the filibuster continues.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Senate knows that the senior Senator from Arkansas had left the Senate for his home at Sheridan, Ark., to bury his son Max, killed in action in 1943. I think the Senate ought to know that on Thursday, while the Senator was there, his other son, John, Jr., who was on his way to Sheridan to join his parents in the burial of his brother Max, met with an automobile accident, sustaining injuries from which he died this morning at Fayetteville. I thought the Senate ought to know the fact relative to the senior Senator from Arkansas.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. LUCAS to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 15, amending the so-called cloture rule of the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. RUSSELL. Has the Chair declared that the yeas and nays have been ordered on the motion to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 15?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair declared the yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Holland	Murray
Baldwin	Humphrey	Myers
Brewster	Hunt	Neely
Bridges	Ives	O'Conor
Butler	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	Reed
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Chavez	Kefauver	Russell
Connally	Kem	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kerr	Schoeppel
Dornell	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Downey	Langer	Sparkman
Eastland	Lodge	Stennis
Ecton	Long	Taft
Ellender	Lucas	Taylor
Flanders	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Frear	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Fulbright	McFarland	Thye
George	McGrath	Tobey
Gillette	McKellar	Tydings
Green	McMahon	Vandenberg
Gurney	Magnuson	Watkins
Hayden	Malone	Wherry
Hendrickson	Maybank	Wiley
Hickenlooper	Miller	Williams
Hill	Millikin	Withers
Hoey	Mundt	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. LUCAS rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I desire to make one or two announcements for the benefit of Senators with respect to what the program will be. I probably should have done so when I entered the room, but I yielded for the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] to make a speech which he thought was very important, and I agree with him that it was a very important speech which he made. I want Senators to know that the Senate will remain in session, for how long I am not sure, but at least, whoever is in charge of the dining room downstairs had better arrange to have a few sandwiches for dinner.

Mr. WILEY. For a midnight dinner?

Mr. LUCAS. Furthermore, Mr. President, I shall not permit any unanimous-consent requests to be entered; there will be no bills or resolutions of any kind introduced from now on; there will be nothing but speeches upon the pending measure which is before the Senate.

While I am on my feet, Mr. President, I think it is well to read to the Senate a memorandum which I have received from the Official Reporters' office. I have been charged with carrying on a pink-tea session——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls attention to the fact that the majority leader is speaking under the rules and may be charged with the time taken.

Mr. LUCAS. That is perfectly all right. I wish to make this statement——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LUCAS. I will yield only for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is the majority leader making two speeches on the motion which is before us?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is not aware of any other speech being made on this issue by the Senator from Illinois who now has the floor. He is putting the Senator from Nebraska and all Senators on notice.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Chair if it is not a new precedent, that a Senator is being charged with one speech if he makes a 2- or 3-minute statement as to the operation of the business of the Senate?

It is my understanding of the precedent that it has never been applied to the majority leader. There are times when it is absolutely necessary for him to rise and advise the Senate, in a 2- or 3-minute statement, as to the business of the Senate. I fear that by a vigorous application of the rule—and I am not protesting against its being applied to me—we may stall the deliberations of the Senate, and no Senator would be advised as to what is to take place. The majority leader should not be subjected to a strict interpretation of the rule in Jefferson's Manual if he rises and makes a 2- or 3-minute statement for the information of the Senate. I think that would be carrying the rules too far. Apply it to us, if that is the desire, but in order to let the Senate function in the ordinary way, the majority leader should be permitted to fulfill the duties

of his office. If he makes too long a statement, it should be charged to him, but I submit that it is going too far to apply that drastic rule when he is discharging his duties as majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In answer to the Senator from Georgia, the Chair finds nothing in the rule which states the period of time which a speech may or may not take. The Chair is unable, therefore, to say whether a speech of 1 minute or 2 or 3 minutes is or is not within the rule. Of course, when a Senator rises to address the Chair to make a speech, I think it would be only fair that the Chair, not having any knowledge of what the statement was to be, should advise the Senator who addressed the Chair what the rule was.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me to submit a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator for another question.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Illinois if he does not think it appropriate, in order that the Senate may not be completely bogged down under this ruling, that the Senator from Georgia be permitted to ask unanimous consent that brief statements made by the majority leader pertaining solely to the work of the Senate shall, during the remainder of this discussion on Senate Resolution 15, be considered outside the purview of the rule?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, before I grant that request——

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will not the Senator speak louder? We on this side would like to hear what is said.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to say that I perfectly understood what the Chair was attempting to do. The Chair was attempting to advise the Senator from Illinois that if he made a speech it would be charged against him. I have never understood heretofore—and I entirely agree with the Senator from Georgia—that if the majority leader of the Senate is rising merely for the purpose of explaining what is going to happen in the way of the transaction of the business of the Senate, solely for the purpose of informing the Senate, his remarks were to be charged to him as a speech. I think the Chair has to construe the rule with more or less liberality in deciding whether or not the majority leader does make a speech.

I am about to read into the record a letter which is tremendously important from the standpoint of transacting business in the United States Senate, and if it is charged to me as a speech I shall have to accept that ruling, because it must go into the record now. I shall have to take my chances on that.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I am in complete accord with the Senator from Georgia, and also with the feelings expressed by the majority leader. However, I do feel it is unnecessary for the Senator from Georgia to submit this unanimous-consent request, because I can assure the distinguished majority leader that if at any time he desires to make a statement relative to the program of the Senate, I, for one, and I am satisfied that I speak the sentiments of all Senators on this side of the aisle, will not object, and will not ask to have the time charged to him.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Nebraska can give no assurance on that question. We have been put on notice by the Chair. I ask the majority leader if the Chair did not propose to invoke the rule.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Illinois will yield further, it seems to me that to give the unanimous consent now would establish a new precedent, and we have not had a chance to think about it. I would much rather that the Senator withdraw his request, and permit the Senator from Illinois to proceed, in his official capacity, and not be charged with a speech, except when he makes a speech on the subject matter of some debate. I do not see how the Senate can proceed except under such precedents. If we enter into this unanimous-consent agreement it seems to me we would be doing something which might establish a precedent which we would not want to have in the future.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, since the Senator from Nebraska has indicated he will not object, I shall not submit the unanimous-consent request, but I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois if he would be interested in knowing that those of us who are charged with filibustering have no desire to muzzle the majority leader, and that no point of order will be made when the majority leader is in the discharge of the duties of his office and not engaged in making a speech.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, speeches have been made with respect to all-night sessions, and in order to set the RECORD straight, in order to demonstrate to the Senate and the country that the Senator from Illinois has not been derelict in his duty, I wish to read into the RECORD the letter I hold in my hand dealing with those who report our proceedings. This is a memorandum which came to me after a conference I had with the reporters on this question:

FEBRUARY 21, 1949.

Hon. SCOTT W. LUCAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LUCAS: The Official Reporters of the Debates and Proceedings of the Senate take the liberty of addressing you, as majority leader of the Senate, in regard to a prospect now looming on the horizon which fills them with misgivings and dread.

We stand ready, as always, to give our best to the work which we are privileged to do for the Senate, and to endure, without complaint, long hours, day and night, to the limit of our capacity. The prospect we dread is that of continuous sessions extending over a protracted period. Should the forthcoming debate on the pending cloture resolution be of this character, we hesitate to contemplate what the effect might be. No matter how long the Senate remains in session, all the reporters and the expert transcribers must remain on duty, without relief. At the close of the last regular session, which ended on June 20, 1948, there was a continuous session lasting from Friday morning until Sunday morning. During that period of almost 48 hours none of the reporters or transcribers had any sleep or opportunity to shave, bathe, or have a change of clothes, and they had to return to the office Monday morning and work all day in order to complete the transcript of the RECORD for the Government Printing Office. They were on the verge of a complete break-down when the session came to a close, and for some of them several weeks were required to bring about restoration to normal health.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to emphasize that that shows that the Eightieth Congress did a mighty lot of work, if the reporters found themselves in that condition.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes, Mr. President, they did it in the last 3 days of the session, which broke down the health of the individuals about whom I am reading.

It may be asked why we could not hire extra reporters and transcribers from the outside, so as to work on 12-hour shifts. Aside from the great difficulty of getting from the outside men who have their regular work and binding engagements, which, even if able to do so, they are strongly disinclined to forego for a limited period of Senate employment, it is true that no shorthand reporters, regardless of their skill, efficiency, and rapidity, can alone and by themselves perform satisfactorily the work of a parliamentary reporter in the Senate. Their unfamiliarity with names and governmental affairs, their total lack of knowledge of parliamentary forms and procedure, and their inability to undertake proper revision and editing, make it necessary that one of the official staff take notes with them and put their copy in shape for the printer. From long experience we have found that it takes a minimum of at least 1 year to break in a new reporter so that he can stand on his own feet, and we have known instances of 2 or 3 years being required. If the worst comes to the worst, we may be forced to the expedient of trying to get an extra force of both reporters and transcribers; but we do not know where to turn for this help, and, if it can be obtained, we shudder to think of the appearance of the RECORD.

If we could be afforded some idea of what lies ahead in the way of protracted continuous sessions, we should appreciate the information, which would enable us to try to do what seems to be practically impossible, namely, assemble extra reporters and transcribers. This would involve considerable expense, which we would have to pay out of our own pockets, unless in the future the Senate in its generosity should make provision for reimbursement.

Thanking you for the many courtesies received at your hands, and grateful for the great consideration always accorded us by the Senate, we are, with great respect,

Sincerely yours,

JAMES W. MURPHY,
JOHN D. RHODES,
Official Reporters of Debates, United States Senate.

Mr. President, I want to say, even though it is a speech, that, as a result of what happened last night, I am now asking the reporters to get extra reporters on the job, regardless of what the RECORD may look like, regardless of the

time it takes to get it out, regardless of the amount of money required to pay the extra reporters. Generous as the Committee on Rules and Administration is with other appropriations dealing with fiscal matters of the Senate, I am sure the reporters need not fear that they will have to pay anything out of their own pockets.

I merely present the letter now, Mr. President, to let the country know that the majority was not unaware of what was coming. I hoped we might be able to stave off this situation by the vote last night, which we could not do. Now we are up against the gun, and we shall meet it.

Mr. EASTLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me so I may address an inquiry to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield only for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. I think——

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield only for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Mississippi if he will yield so I may propound a question to the Senator from Illinois, and to ask unanimous consent that the Senator's rights may not thereby be prejudiced.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Nebraska may make a short statement.

Mr. WHERRY. No, just to ask a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. Or ask the Chair a question, without prejudicing my rights on the floor, or without it being counted as one of my speeches on the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that the Senator from Nebraska may direct an inquiry to the Chair, without depriving the Senator from Mississippi of his right to the floor. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the present occupant of the chair then address this question to the majority leader, the Senator from Illinois? Will there be a night session or a Sunday session, or what is the program going to be after tonight? We are entitled to know that. We have been led to believe that because of these added reporters—and the Senator from Illinois is now showing some leadership—we are going to get out of the pink-tea stage and we are going to make a real attempt to break the filibuster. All I want to know is: Are we going to go on here on Sunday? Are we going to go on here in continuous session? I think we are entitled to know the answer to that question.

Mr. LUCAS. We are going to continue, I do not know how long, until some time tonight, and when that is over we are going to take a recess, if I can get the Senate to agree with me, until Monday. In the meantime if there is anything that can be worked out with respect to the suggestion which was made by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, we will know about it by that time. On Monday, when we come back here with all the extra reporters, and extra beds and cots, and full of energy and enthusiasm for weeks and months of session, we will try to break up this filibuster.

I am very happy to know that my distinguished friend, the Senator from Nebraska, finally recognizes a leader when he sees him.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, statements have repeatedly been made on the floor that in 1917, when the present rule XXII, the cloture rule, was adopted, Senator John Sharp Williams, of the State of Mississippi; Senator James K. Vardaman, a Senator from the State of Mississippi, not only supported that rule but desired to go further and adopt a rule that would have provided for cloture by majority vote. The argument is therefore made, and the charge is hurled that because those two distinguished southerners in 1917 were in favor of cloture by a majority vote, we from the South also at this time should favor the pending resolution or should favor cloture by a majority of a quorum of the United States Senate.

Mr. President, to begin with, the position of the distinguished Senator, John Sharp Williams, one of the greatest Senators who ever sat in this body, and the position of Senator James K. Vardaman, shows that the matter of cloture, the matter of gag-rule in the Senate of the United States, is not a sectional matter. It shows that the principles involved, the great guaranty of the safeguard of human liberty which has protected the rights of minority groups, racial and religious minorities, throughout all the history of this country, has not been a sectional matter. But it goes further, Mr. President. Senator Williams and Senator Vardaman did favor cloture by majority vote. But now things are changed, and such a program would absolutely crucify the State which they represented with such distinction in 1917. These facts are a warning to every Senator in this Chamber, whether he be from New England or from the West, that conditions change, and that when an attempt is made to gag us, the rule under which it would be done will be turned to the destruction of other sections of the country in a few years.

Mr. President, those two distinguished Senators from the State of Mississippi 32 years ago were in favor of gag-rule in the Senate, which, if it had prevailed, would have resulted in the destruction of the social institutions of their State and of their people in 1949, and if conditions change in the next few years in the West or in the East the Senators from those sections who now favor the gag-rule will be the strongest defenders of the right of unlimited debate in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, I shall discuss briefly, first the Government of the United States, the powers of the United States Government, the rights which are inherent in citizenship in the United States, the powers of the States, the duties of the States, and the rights inherent in citizenship in the States, to show that the program recommended a year ago by the President of the United States, if enacted into law, would change the form of our Government. It would abolish the dual system of government. It would nationalize the thing which is the genius of Anglo-Saxon government—the power of the people in local communities to control their local affairs—and would centralize that power in the city of Washington. If that program were enacted it would not merely affect the Southern States, because when we take from the people in the local communities their police power and their power to regulate their own affairs, even though it comes in the guise of an anti-southern measure, the people of every single section of the country, on the Atlantic, on the Pacific, along the vast Canadian border, and along the Gulf of Mexico, will be deprived of their most precious rights and possessions.

So, Mr. President, in opposing a change in the Senate rules which would permit the passage of this program we are making a fight for the American system of government. We are making a fight for the protection of every citizen of America, in every State in the Union—every American of every race, and of every creed, whether a native-born or foreign-born citizen of this country.

I shall discuss our system of government to show the clear unconstitutionality of this program and how its enactment would change our form of government and would destroy the system which has built our country and made it great. Then I shall discuss the cloture rule, the right of unlimited debate as it has come down from the Greek senate through the Roman senate; how it has been responsible for making the United States Senate the greatest deliberative body in the history of the world, and how it is the greatest safeguard for the liberty of our people that has existed since this Government was founded. In fact, Mr. President, the right of unlimited debate in the United States Senate is a stronger safeguard to minority rights than is the Constitution of the United States, because we cannot count upon the Supreme Court scrupulously to interpret that document.

Mr. President, when President Truman asserted the power of the Federal Government to control civil rights, the relationship of man to man, the right of liberty, the right of life, the right to the pursuit and acquisition of happiness, and the rights to property, and declared that those rights were subject to the power of the Federal Government, he made the most far-reaching assertion of power for the Federal Government ever made by a President of the United States.

We are now engaged in a historic controversy. An attempt is being made to change the rules of the Senate, to deprive all the people of America of the protection provided by the right of unlimited debate, the right to the protection of life, liberty, and property, and the pursuit of happiness. It is an attempt to change our system of government. It is a program which, if enacted, would result in domination by the Federal Government of the internal and domestic affairs of the States. When we

attempt to do that, Mr. President, we go beyond any political considerations which should govern any Senator in deciding his position on these questions.

This question goes much further than any question of race or religion. Our system of government itself is at stake. If the program is successful, the States will be deprived of their primary powers and duties. They will be bereft of sovereignty. Our division of authority, our dual system of government, will become merely a hollow shell.

In the beginning there stretched along the Atlantic seaboard 13 sovereign, free, and independent States; States which only recently had won their freedom from Great Britain by virtue of bloody revolution. Those States possessed all the authority, all the power, of any sovereign State. In fact, the powers of those States were limited only by the restrictions placed upon them in their own constitutions. They possessed the power to control and regulate the lives and liberties of their citizens, if that power were given in their State constitutions; the power to control and regulate the right of their citizens to acquire and own property; the right of their citizens to engage in trade and commerce. Moreover, each of those sovereign States separately had the power to wage war, negotiate and conclude treaties of peace, set up their own postal systems, provide their own mediums of exchange—all the powers of any government.

There were loose in the world at that time three great imperialistic powers—France, Great Britain, and Spain. Our forefathers thought that because those predatory nations engaged in acquiring great empires were loose in the world, as a matter of protection it would be best to set up a national government, but a government of limited powers, a government of delegated powers, a government which would receive from the hands of the States which formed it the powers which those States thought would be better exercised or could be better exercised by a national government, rather than by each State acting individually. So delegates from those States assembled in the city of Philadelphia to confer and then to set up the Government of the United States. At that time there was no United States. The Government which was erected was a creature of the 13 sovereign States who created it; and it secured all its powers by delegation from the several States—powers which were not freely delegated, Mr. President, powers which were not willingly delegated, there being suspicion of a national government, and a desire to retain in the States all the powers which possibly could be retained by them.

As a result of that Convention, the United States Constitution was written, and was ratified by the States, and the United States was brought into being. Under it we have what is known as a dual system of government; and under this dual system of government, an American has dual citizenship—citizenship in the United States and citizenship in the State where he chiefly resides. An American citizen has certain rights by virtue of his citizenship in the United States, and certain rights by virtue of his citizenship in a State. Each of the governments—the United States Government and the State government—has certain powers which operate in separate and distinct fields, there being no overlapping.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question only?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the Declaration of Independence proclaimed to the world the American ideal; and is it not also true that when Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence spoke of certain inalienable rights, he meant rights which no government—neither the Federal Government nor any other government, for that matter—could take away from the individual citizen?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct. Let me tell the distinguished Senator from Alabama, who has been of monumental service in the great controversy in which we are now engaged, that under that system certain powers were delegated to the Federal Government. The Constitution says that all other powers are retained by the States, except four, which are prohibited to the States, and therefore are retained by the people. Those four powers, the only four which are prohibited to the States, are such that no decent government should exercise them.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not a fact that if that very specific reservation of powers to the States and to the people, respectively, had not been expressly written into the Constitution, there never would have been any Constitution, there never would have been any Federal Government?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is exactly correct.

Mr. HILL. I should like to ask the Senator this question: Will he enumerate the four powers to which he was about to advert when I asked my last question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I shall enumerate them a little later in my speech.

First, Mr. President, I desire to refer to the powers inherent in a citizen of the United States. In addition to enumerating the powers of the United States, I shall enumerate the rights which one acquires by virtue of citizenship in the United States; and then I shall enumerate the rights of the States, and then the powers which are prohibited to both the States and the United States—and those powers were prohibited, Mr. President, because they violated the genius of free government. So the founding fathers conceived a Government of the United States, which would be strong in certain particulars, but weak in others; and, in the great field of personal relationships, a Government whose acts would be void. They conceived a Government which could wage war; negotiate peace; control interstate commerce; control the relations of one State to another; control and limit the action of a given State in respect to a citizen who, though residing in it, was a citizen of another State; control foreign affairs; set up a medium of exchange; create post offices and post roads; provide a uniform system of bankruptcy; but which would have absolutely and utterly no control over the lives, the liberties, and the pursuit and acquisition of happiness of its people, and which would have absolutely no control in anywise over the personal rights of the individual; it being conceived by those wise men that if we in America were to remain free, the people in each community should regulate and control the affairs of their own people and do it in the light of their customs, their traditions; that this was a big country, a vast country, with conditions entirely different in one area from the conditions existing in another area, and therefore the rule of equity in our system required that the people in each area should control and regulate those great fundamental rights as they desired.

That, Mr. President, is the genius of our system. As I said, we have both State constitutions and a National Constitution. Thereby we have a dual citizenship—citizenship in the United States protecting one field of rights, citizenship in the State protecting another field of rights. Acts by the United States outside its field of delegated powers are absolutely void, as are the acts of a State outside the powers reserved to it in that great document. A great Justice of the United States Supreme Court, Chief Justice Waite, in the case of the United States against Cruikshank, wrote a great decision which has rung down through the years, and which even in 1949 commands respect as great as the respect it commanded when the opinion was delivered fifty-odd years ago. Touching the point now under discussion, he said:

> The people of the United States resident within any State are subject to two governments—one State, one National. The powers which one possesses, the other does not. They were established—

He meant the two governments were established—

> for different purposes and have separate jurisdictions. Together they make one whole, and as a whole they furnished the people of the United States with a complete government—

"A complete government," Mr. President—

> ample for the protection of all their rights at home and abroad.

Let me say in passing, when we consider the division of powers between the State and the United States, there was wisely given in the Constitution the additional power to the Federal Government that it shall be the final judge of its own powers. There went with that vast and important power of final judgment the duty upon the United States, upon its Supreme Court, upon its Executive, and upon its Congress, to judge carefully and impartially, not to usurp powers not granted; not to enter fields which were not granted to it; with the further duty not to abdicate powers which were delegated to it.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to my distinguished friend for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not, as the late Chief Justice Stone said, speaking of the Federal powers, and more particularly of the Supreme Court, that the only restraint on the Supreme Court is the restraint imposed upon members of the Court by their own consciences? Is it not true he was thinking then, and that he expressed the very thought the Senator from Mississippi is so ably expressing at this time?

Mr. EASTLAND. I thank the Senator. I thoroughly agree with him in that statement. Because of that, it is their duty, as it is our duty, to be careful, extremely careful, to make sure that we do not attempt to invade the fields of the sovereign States.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not also true that when Senators take an oath of office to support and defend the Constitution of the United States, the oath means not merely that we shall defend it from an enemy from without, so to speak, but also that we shall defend it from any attack from within, no matter how honest or sincere the attack may be, and that we shall live up not only to the letter but to the great spirit of the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. EASTLAND. I may say to the distinguished Senator, again I must agree with him. Under our oaths of office we must live up to the spirit, we must live up to the letter of our system of government. We must see to it because of the powers and responsible positions we hold in America that we retain inviolate the American system of government and do not deprive the people of any particular area of their precious God-given rights of human liberty, that we do not permit them to be nationalized, as might happen if the attempt to amend the rules of the Senate should succeed, or permit the States to be destroyed, and the great personal relationships, involving the rights of life, liberty, and property in the several States, to become nationalized.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi whether it is not a fact that the same Constitution to which he refers also gives to the Senate and the House of Representatives the rule-making power for their respective bodies. Is that not correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will the able Senator from Mississippi——

Mr. EASTLAND. Wait. Mr. President, I yielded only for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall only ask the Senator from Mississippi a question. I should also like to ask the Senator if he can explain to the Senate and for the RECORD how the Senate can exercise either its rule-making power or its power to legislate, so long as the unlimited use of the filibuster is permitted without restraint.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I am sorry the distinguished Senator, the very able Senator from California, was not listening attentively to the colloquy between the distinguished Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Mississippi. Had the Senator from California listened to that colloquy he would have known that it was agreed that it is the first duty of a Senator, under his oath of office and under the Constitution of the United States, to protect the American system of government. The best interests of the people of California, Mississippi, Alabama, New York, Massachusetts, and every other State are served when this division of powers, as outlined in the Constitution and as outlined in our system of government, is not violated. That is our primary duty; that is the foremost obligation upon us; and in opposing this resolution we are upholding the highest duty which devolves upon a Senator of the United States by virtue of his oath of office, which is to uphold the Constitution, protect the rights of the States, and protect and defend the liberties of the people of the Nation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield only for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi this question: Does he think that those of us who are on the other side of this question from the position being taken by the able Senator from Mississippi, are any less mindful of the oath which we, too, took to support the Constitution of the United States and protect it from its enemies, foreign and domestic? Does the Senator not recognize the fact that the same oath he took, we also took, and that we have just as deep an obligation to protect our constitutional form of government?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, of course, my friend from California, and every other Senator, has the same obligation the Senator from Mississippi has, the Senator from Alabama has, and every other Senator has. I know I have said nothing that would impugn the motives of any Senator; but again I say had the Senator from California listened to the colloquy between the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Mississippi he would have known that we consider it our duty to protect the Constitution of the United States, to protect our system of government, and that we consider that to be our first obligation. We believed it was being violated and, therefore, in our humble and feeble way, we would do what we could to protect the lives and liberties of all the people in the Nation.

Mr. President, the essential basis of the American system of government is the existence of sovereign States. The Federal Government is a creature of the States, and the retention of the State, with its powers and obligations, is absolutely and utterly essential to the existence of the United States.

The second premise is that this Government was founded upon the equality of the States, that all the States are equal in every respect. There was no disposition on the part of individual States to attempt to humiliate and badger other States when a measure came up, as does this measure, which asserts the overlordship of one State over another, which asserts that certain States are better than other States, which asserts that certain States protect life, liberty, and property of their citizens better than do other States. By the way, Mr. President, certain States which are gangster-ridden, in which banks must be closed because they cannot get police protection from robbers, States in which women cannot go out on the streets at night for fear of criminal assault, States which are rife with gangsters, rife with murderers, point their fingers at the States of the South and say, "You do not protect life, liberty, property, and the pursuit of happiness," when the crime tables show that life is safer and there is less crime and more liberty in the great States south of Mason and Dixon's line than in some other States.

Mr. President, every State of the Union is a great State, and I certainly would say nothing which would disparage any State. They have their problems as we in the South have ours. If the Nation is to endure, to remain great, States must look with charity on their sister States, and the people of the country must cooperate to solve, in a sane, sensible way, the problems which confront them. But, Mr. President, as I said, the States are the basis of the whole system of our Government. It cannot be said that the Government of the United States has the power to go into various communities and punish crime and exercise police powers reserved to the States. It was the great John Marshall, in his famous decision in the case of McCullough against Maryland, who said that no political dreamer was wild enough to dream of tearing down the States and compounding the American people as one common mass.

Mr. President, the people of the several States cannot perform any function or exercise at all any political power acting as a mass, acting in common, acting as American citizens. They cannot do that, under our system of Government, without revolutionizing the whole American system.

What is the general scheme of the American system of government? What was the scheme of the Constitution when it made us one people, with one common country, for all the great purposes for which it was established? What are the powers of the United States Government? Mr. President, I am endeavoring to show the patent unconstitutionality of a program which is sought to be adopted under an attempt to amend the Senate rules, and to show that if

that program were enacted it would detroy our system of government.

Mr. President, I wish to quote from a report of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary in 1887 whose author was a very distinguished United States Senator from the State of Mississippi.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question before he goes into that?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the founding fathers not only felt that all States should be equal, but that they sought to guarantee their equality when they put into the Federal Constitution the provision that every State, no matter how large or how small it might be, no matter what its population or its resources, should have two Senators in this body, and that they could not be deprived of their representation here except with their own consent?

Mr. EASTLAND. What the Senator says is exactly true. In fact, the whole basis of the American system of government is the equality of the States, and no State has a right to badger and point at another State, and especially no areas which are crime ridden, controlled by gangsters, where race riots occur, where people are murdered right and left, have a right to point to other areas and say, "We are better than you."

Mr. President, the report to which I refer was submitted to the Senate by Senator J. Z. George, one of the great constitutional lawyers of this country. Senator Platt, of the great State of New York, when he read it said that it was not only right, but the greatest work on the Constitution and the American system of government that was ever written.

I quote from Senator George:

> These great purposes are expressed in the Constitution itself in the powers delegated by it to the United States. These powers are exclusive as to all that concerns the people and the States in their relation with foreign powers, both in peace and in war, including the making of treaties, the receiving and sending of ambassadors, ministers, and consuls.

Mr. President, these are the duties of the Federal Government—not to control the fundamental rights of its people. I quote further from Senator George:

> Making war and conducting peace, intercourse and commerce with them, the protection of our people in foreign countries and outside the jurisdiction of any State and on the high seas.
>
> Secondly, the Federal powers extend to the regulation of relations between the States themselves and the citizens of each with the citizens of the others, and between each of the States and the United States, covering commerce among the States, compacts between two or more of them; the duty of surrendering fugitives from justice and labor; the force and effect in other States of public records and judicial proceedings in each State; the securing to the citizens of each State the privileges and immunities of citizens of the several States within the jurisdiction of any State of which they are not citizens, leaving, however, to each State to determine and define the rights and privileges of its own citizens, and securing only these same privileges so defined by a State to citizens of other States when they are within its jurisdiction.

Mr. President, discussing further the powers of the United States, the distinguished former Senator, the great and revered leader who led the State of Mississippi successfully through the rigors and debauchery of carpetbaggerism, said this in listing the powers of the Federal Government:

> Thirdly, the power and duty to guarantee to each State a republican form of government, and to protect it from invasion, or, on application of the State, from domestic and foreign violence. These were the great purposes for which the Constitution was formed, and adequate powers to obtain them were granted.

By that he meant that provision in the Constitution which says that the Federal Government has the powers incident to those listed which are necessary to effect the great purposes of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. President, where in those powers is there the right to enact an anti-poll-tax bill? Where in those powers is there the right to enact antisegregation statutes? Where in those great powers is there the right to pass a fair employment practices act? Cannot Senators see that if we adopted this resolution and amended the rules it would put the Federal Government into those personal relations of men which, if we are to remain a free people, must be controlled by all the people in the great communities, hundreds and thousands of them, scattered over the length and breadth of this great Nation?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to his colleague?

Mr. EASTLAND. For a question. I do not wish to be accused of filibustering.

Mr. STENNIS. Did the Senator have a chance to read a column by the writer Mark Sullivan which appeared in the Washington Post of March 5, 1949, on the question which the Senator is discussing now, the poll-tax bill?

Mr. EASTLAND. I did not have a chance to read it, but if the Senator will kindly leave it on my desk I shall read it into the RECORD a little later in this discussion.

Mr. STENNIS. To point out——

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I yield only for a question.

Mr. STENNIS. Will the Senator yield further for another question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator yields for a question only.

Mr. EASTLAND. Only for a question.

Mr. STENNIS. Will the Senator permit me to point out particularly one——

Mr. EASTLAND. No; I yield only for a question. I do not care to be accused of filibustering.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Mississippi yields to the junior Senator from Mississippi for a question only.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, this is a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. STENNIS. I want to ask the Senator if he agrees with the following short paragraph from the column written by the columnist Mark Sullivan——

Mr. EASTLAND. Ask me the question.

Mr. STENNIS. That is the question:

> When Southern Senators resist the poll-tax measure, it is not merely for the sake of the poll tax. That qualification is increasingly disapproved in the South, and some States have abolished it themselves. (Incidentally, the poll tax does not involve race discrimination; on this point there is widespread misconception.)

I continue to quote from Mark Sullivan:

> The resistance is for all the States, for the right of every State to fix its own qualifications. It is for a principle, the rights and integrity of all States, their very existence as units of government.

Does the Senator agree with the soundness of this famous columnist's conclusions as to that point?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I thoroughly agree with the soundness of those conclusions. Take the poll tax. The money acquired from the levying of a poll tax operates the school systems of various States in the Union. It is largely spent for Negro schools to educate the colored race. The South has accomplished much for Negro education, for the health of the Negro, for the economic progress of the Negro of the South. The South has made phenomenal progress in the past few years in this respect. There is nothing racial about the poll tax, because it is levied on everyone, both white and black.

Statements are made, which are utterly erroneous, that the poll tax keeps Negroes from voting. In my State the poll tax is not levied on one who is over 60 years of age. In some States it is levied on no one who is over 50 years of age. In others it is not levied on anyone who is over 45 years of age. It certainly could not limit suffrage, because people would vote without the payment of the poll tax after they had reached the age at which they became exempt.

Now, Mr. President, we of the South are not going to permit our institutions and our people to be destroyed by racial groups in northern cities who have raised Hitler's banner of racism in the United States. We have nothing like that in the South. In fact, in the South we have no racial discrimination. Our institutions, it is true, are built upon segregation, with equal facilities to all. The right of association is a personal right, and under the American system of government the control of those personal rights is vested in the States.

Mr. President, let me make this statement with respect to the resolution which would change the cloture rule. The books are full of statements from Jewish organizations, from influential Jews; from Negro organizations, from influential Negroes; from Catholic organizations, from influential Catholics; from Protestant organizations, from influential Protestants; that the right of unlimited debate in the Senate has been the great safeguard of minorities in this country. The labor organizations have adopted the same view.

I have a statement here which comes from the great American Federation of Labor. Back in 1925 Vice President Dawes, from that desk, attempted to lecture the Senate on changing its rules so that gag rule could be applied in the Senate and business could be expedited, as he said. This is the statement given out by the great American Federation of Labor dealing with the right of unlimited debate in the Senate. I read the statement from the American Federation of Labor:

For several months the Vice President of the United States has conducted an agitation for the purpose of abolishing free speech in the United States Senate, the only forum in the world—

Mr. President, get that. It is the American Federation of Labor which says this.

The only forum in world where cloture does not exist, and where Members can prevent the passage of reactionary legislation.

May all liberals hear that, Mr. President. May they hear what the American Federation of Labor said about the right we are defending in the United States Senate, this very right of unlimited debate.

The only forum in the world where cloture does not exist and where Members can prevent the passage of reactionary legislation.

The statement continues:

The railroad industry, the great oil industry, and other great industries in the United States want to make it possible for a handful of men in the United States Senate to control all legislation.

Now listen:

It is a vicious idea, a vicious purpose, to which the Vice President of the United States has loaned himself.

Mr. President, that is what one of the great labor organizations said about the right we are protecting here. They said it is a bulwark which has prevented the passage of reactionary legislation, and has prevented the railroad industry, the oil industry, and other great industries in the United States from dominating the Government and beating into the dust the man who labors for a living.

Mr. President, I say when we oppose a change in the rules we are in a holy cause to protect America, and to protect the right of all the people of this country, black or white, yellow or red.

I was reading from a great essay on the Government of the United States to show that under our system of government this program is beyond its powers, and the action of the Government in attempting to control it or to exercise control over these rights is void. I read on from what Senator George had to say:

All other powers delegated to the United States are merely ancillary to these great ends and for the support and maintenance of the common government, as they are such as can conveniently and properly be exercised only by a government common to all the States.

These auxiliary powers relate to the establishment of a uniform system of bankruptcy and naturalization laws; the power to coin money, to regulate its value, and the value of foreign coins in circulation here; to fix the standard of weights and measures; to grant patents and copyrights; to establish post offices and post roads; the power of taxation; to punish counterfeiting of the current coin and securities of the United States—

Mr. President, that is about as far as the United States can go in the field of criminal law. But I read on—

to punish piracies and felonies on the high seas and offenses against the law of nations; to raise and support armies and to support and maintain a navy; and certain powers over the militia.

These powers, in general terms, include all that are delegated to the United States. If we stop and consider them, we will see how few they are, great indeed in importance, unlimited in degree, but very limited in number. If we abstract from these powers all that relate to our intercourse with foreign nations—all that concern the relations of the States with each other, in their character as States, and their relations to the Union; all that relate only to giving force, efficacy, and support to the United States in their exercise of their other powers—we will see how infinitely small in number are all the remaining powers, which concern only the rights, privileges, and convenience of private persons—private citizens when in the jurisdiction of a State.

Where is the authority to go into a State and supplant the police power of the State? Where is the power to punish for murder or for crime within a State? Where is the power to regulate suffrage within a State? If we raise the banner of race in this country and think we can do it for one race, we deprive every citizen of America of certain rights. We deprive every State of this country of its principal and fundamental duties. In fact, we abolish State governments.

I continue:

These powers are:

1. The securing to the citizens of the several States the privileges and immunities granted by any State in whose jurisdiction they may be to its own citizens.
2. Jurisdiction over bankruptcy.
3. Jurisdiction over naturalization.
4. Jurisdiction over the currency.
5. The power to establish post offices and post roads.

Where is the power of the Federal Government to undermine the essential authorities of the great States of this Nation?

We look in vain to any of these powers for authority to do any of the things that are contemplated under the proposal to amend the rules of the Senate so as to permit the enactment of this program.

But along with these powers come provisions which show the soul and spirit of the Constitution, and without which the Constitution either becomes a lifeless corpse or, having energy and vitality, is an instrument only of oppression and wrong. These provisions recognize the absolute equality of the States, and secure fairness and impartiality in the exercise of the powers granted by the Constitution. Thus, direct taxes are required to be apportioned among the States according to their population; and all duties, imposts, and excises are required to be uniform throughout the United States; no preference is allowed in any regulation of commerce or revenue to the ports of one State over the ports of another; the levying of a tax on any article exported from any State is also prohibited, whereby the dangerous power of taxing articles produced mainly in one State or section and not in others, is denied to the Government.

And then there is the great provision of article V, which secures absolutely and forever the equal suffrage in the Senate of each State against even an amendment of the Constitution. Under this guaranty of equality Delaware, Rhode Island, and Nevada each have the same voice in this body as the great State of New York, and under it the six New England States, with a population entitling them only to 24 Representatives out of 325 allotted to all, have 12 Senators.

Those being the representatives of New England 50 years ago.

Mr. President, those are the powers of the United States. Those are all the powers possessed by the United States; and I look in vain for authority to enact this program. If the program violates the Constitution, if it would tear down the system of government, it is my sworn duty under my oath as a Senator of the United States to oppose it with every weapon at my command.

We hear much said about rights inherent in United States citizenship. We hear pressure groups say, "You must pass this bill. It protects a right guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States." Those groups—and a school of thought has grown up in this country which concurs with them—say that the Constitution of the United States provides that these personal relationships and personal rights come to one by virtue of citizenship in the United States.

Mr. President, here are all the rights which one has by virtue of United States citizenship; here is the United States Supreme Court talking in a famous opinion rendered when it was a great forum, the greatest court on which the sun ever shone. I read now from an opinion written when the United States Supreme Court was at the very zenith of its power and greatness, when it commanded the respect of the bench and bar of America and of all Americans, who revered it and looked upon it with respect. Here is what that Court says are the rights inherent in United States citizenship:

The right to come to the seat of government, to assert any claim a citizen may have upon the government, to transact any business he may have with it, to seek its protection, to share its offices, to engage in administering its functions.

(2) The right of free access to the seaports through which all operations of foreign commerce are conducted, to the subtreasuries, land offices, and courts of justice in the several States; the right to demand the care and protection of the Federal Government over the life, liberty, and property—

Listen to this, Mr. President; it is not the right to demand the care and protection of the Federal Government over the life, liberty, and property of Americans when in a State, but it is—

over the life, liberty, and property when upon the high seas or within the jurisdiction of a foreign government.

And that is all. That is the sole power the Federal Government has over the lives, liberties, and property of its citizens; and that is when they are upon the high seas or within the jurisdiction of a foreign government.

I read further:

The right to peaceably assemble and petition Congress for a redress of grievances; the right of writ of habeas corpus; the right to use the navigable waters of the United States, however they may penetrate the territory of the several States; all rights secured to citizens by treaties with foreign nations; the right to become a citizen of a State by residing in it.

Then the Court said:

There are certain rights which pertain to a citizen in his character of a citizen of the United States, and are therefore subject to Federal jurisdiction and power, which grow out of prohibitions in the Constitution of the United States on State action, of which is the right to be absolved from all the consequences of bills of attainder, ex post facto laws, and laws impairing the obligations of contracts enacted by the States; and the rights secured against prohibited State actions, as expressed in the three amendments to the Constitution.

The Court listed those as the sole rights inherent in one by virtue of citizenship in the United States.

Mr. President, where do we find the authority to enact this proposed program? I have just read to the Senate a statement of the rights and powers of the United States Government; and they are all the powers possessed by this Government. I say they show that an attempt is being made by the Senate of the United States to enact a program which, if approved by the Court, would destroy the American system of government and would destroy the United States itself; and therefore we are well within our rights when we oppose that program.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Alabama asked me a few moments ago to list the powers which are prohibited to the States, powers which remain alone in the people of the United States. I read those powers:

The scheme of the Constitution embraces not only a division of powers between the several States and the United States, by delegation of certain specific powers to the latter and a reservation of the powers to the States, but it includes also the prohibition of certain powers on both—

Speaking of powers prohibited to both the National Government and the States.

These powers, so far as they relate to persons—

I tell the Senator from Alabama—

were deemed despotic in their nature, unjust in their operation, and contrary to the genius of free government; and hence, while prohibiting their exercise by the Federal Government, the States also surrendered them as a pledge of their fidelity to the great principles of republican liberty.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question only?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not in the field of the powers the Senator from Mississippi is talking about that we refer to the citizen as the sovereign citizen?

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from Alabama is exactly correct.

Mr. HILL. Just as we have the Federal Government sovereign in a certain field of powers, and just as we have the States sovereign in a certain field of powers, there is also a certain field of powers in which the citizen is sovereign; is not that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from Alabama is absolutely correct, Mr. President; and I say it would be a sad day, indeed, for the United States if the powers which are retained to the citizen—powers prohibited to both the Federal Government and the State governments—and the powers which are retained by the States should be nationalized and vested in the United States.

But what are these powers? Three of them relative to the lives and liberties of the people—namely, bills of attainder, ex post facto laws, and the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus. One of them relates to property—namely, laws impairing the obligations of contracts. The other relates only to the equality of persons in a free government, namely, the bestowal of titles of nobility. These powers were retained to both, except, Mr. President, that the United States Government was authorized by appropriate legislation to pass laws that would invalidate the obligations of contracts, because the power of bankruptcy was vested in the United States.

There were some other prohibitions to the States, but they were manifestly introduced for the purpose of preventing conflict between State powers and Federal powers, which might but for the prohibition have been concurrent.

In all these there is not a pretense for the claim of the Federal Government—

I invite especial attention to this—

there is not a pretense for the claim of the Federal Government to intervene between a State and its citizens for the protection and security of the great fundamental rights of person and property and the pursuit and acquisition of happiness, all these being left to the care and protection of the States, except only in the four cases we have just mentioned. Of all the civil rights of men and all the rights of person and liberty, only those four, and no more, are entitled to Federal protection in favor of a citizen against the State. This protection extends only to the prevention of State action in violation of them, under the fourteenth amendment—

Which I shall hereafter discuss.

Now, Mr. President, what are the rights possessed by the States? What are the powers possessed by the 48 States of the Union? In fact, what are their duties—the duties which if taken from them would leave the States impotent and make them largely administrative agencies of the United States Government?

The Supreme Court many, many times has outlined the powers which are regulated and controlled by the States. I shall take the time of the Senate, because of its importance, to list those powers, and show beyond any peradventure of a doubt that the Federal Government cannot enter the field in which it is sought to place it by legislation proposed, without doing violence to our system and without destroying local self-government in every Western State of the Union, in every Eastern State of the Union, in every State and in every locality. But I read from my distinguished predecessor:

In this grant, jurisdiction thus reserved to or kept by the States, is the entire power over all contracts—who may make contracts and who are incapable of making them, from want of mature age or of mental capacity or of freedom of will; the form in which they must be made; the evidence to establish or defeat them; their nature and obligations; the consequences of default in complying with them, and the sole remedies to enforce them amongst citizens of the same State; the sole power over marriage—who can contract it, the forms to be observed in celebrating it, the relative rights, powers, and duties of husband and wife toward each other and in the community, the causes and manner of its disolution, and all the relations and mutual duties and powers and rights of parent and child, and superadded is the institution of the family—

Mr. President, the family, the unit, and basis of civilization—control of that is in the State—

with the right to control and hold against adverse fortune the homestead, for its shelter and conservation; the titles and tenures of all property of every kind—the modes and forms of its acquisition and transfer, how the right to it may be lost by neglect or acquiescence in wrong, what are the injuries to it, and the nature and the extent of redress of such injury, and by what rules it shall be enjoyed in life, and, on the death of the owner, how it shall descend and be distributed, and on what failure of blood it shall escheat to the State, the right to dispose of it by will, and by whom, and in what form wills must be made, whether entails or primogeniture shall be allowed, and to what extent property may be held in mortmain by corporations, and what rights, if any, corporations created in other States or in foreign nations shall enjoy in its jurisdiction; the civil status of all its people—as to legitimacy, or the contrary, as affected by their birth, their education in youth—

I invite particular attention, Mr. President, to this—

their civil rights, their qualifications to vote and hold office, and their conduct in life and their protection and security in life, liberty, property, and reputation; crimes against property—larceny, robbery, burglary, arson, malicious injuries, trespasses, cheats, embezzlement, forgeries, and the like; crimes against the person—assaults, batteries, mayhems, murder, seductions, false imprisonment, and all offenses against reputation and character—slander and libel, offenses against good order, good morals, and the health of the community. The great right of the free exercise of religious worship, the freedom of religious belief, the freedom of speech and of the press—all these and more of like character——

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. In a moment. Let me complete the sentence—

are wholly within the jurisdiction and the powers of the States and depend on State laws and governments for preservation and protection.

I now yield for a question only to my distinguished friend from South Carolina, a distinguished former Governor of South Carolina and a distinguished Member of this body.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from the great State of Mississippi if he heard the speech of the Senator

from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] this morning.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; I heard the speech of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MAYBANK. Did the Senator from Mississippi hear the Senator from Massachusetts refer to the poll-tax issue, at the beginning of his speech?

Mr. EASTLAND. No. I am sorry, but I did not hear that.

Mr. MAYBANK. Has the Senator, during his long tenure of distinguished service in this great body, ever heard of any Senator on the floor of the Senate opposing a constitutional amendment to repeal the poll tax, which is the constitutional method, according to the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, as a general rule, I would say that a great many Senators who oppose the passage of an anti-poll-tax bill would not oppose a constitutional amendment. But the Senator asked me if I had heard of anyone who opposed a constitutional amendment——

Mr. MAYBANK. On the floor of the Senate.

Mr. EASTLAND. On the floor of the Senate? I have to say that I have heard of no one who opposed it on the floor of the Senate. That is because such an amendment has not been submitted. If it is submitted to the Senate for debate, my information is—I hope I do not do my colleague an injustice—my colleague, the junior Senator from Mississippi, will oppose the adoption of a constitutional amendment, and I am certain the senior Senator from Mississippi will oppose the adoption of a constitutional amendment to repeal the poll tax.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. EASTLAND. For a question only. I do not want to be accused of filibustering.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does the Senator from Mississippi know that the Legislature of South Carolina this week passed a law to submit to the voters the question of abolishing the poll tax in South Carolina?

Mr. EASTLAND. No; I did not know that. But that is the proper way to handle such matters. In fact, it is the only proper way in which they can be handled, because it is something over which the State has complete control. I have no authority and no power, as the Senator knows, over the legislature of my State, though I have some friends in the legislature. I want to make it crystal clear to everyone that I am opposed to the repeal of the poll tax in my State. South Carolina can handle its own problems, Georgia can handle its problems, and other States can handle their problems, in their State control and State sovereignty, but, so far as my State is concerned, I am against the repeal of the poll tax. I favor the poll tax. I think it is a good tax. I think it is good law. I think that as a qualification for voting it is wholesome, and it makes for good government.

Let me say at this point, Mr. President, that I will put the government of Mississippi, for honesty and competence, on a par with the government of any State in the Union. I think the poll tax has contributed to clean elections and to wholesome, competent government.

If a bill providing for a repeal of the poll tax is introduced in the legislature of my State, if the legislators listen to its senior Senator, the bill will not pass. If it were submitted to the people for a vote—which I do not think could be done in my State—I might be induced to get into my car, travel around, and make some speeches against the repeal of the poll tax.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Mississippi how much the poll tax costs a year, whether it is retroactive, and who pays it?

Mr. EASTLAND. The poll tax is $2 a year. It must be paid by February 1, each year, for 2 years before an election. It has not disqualified one person from voting. Anyone who has not foresight enough to pay it for 2 years in advance of an election is not capable of casting an intelligent ballot.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MAYBANK. Did the Senator know that in South Carolina the poll tax was only $1 a year, and did the Senator know that all persons over 60 years of age were exempted from it, and did the Senator know that no women have to pay the poll tax?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; I knew that, and I also knew that it did not prevent anyone in South Carolina from voting.

Mr. MAYBANK. Did the Senator also know that anyone who does not have a dollar on election day can go to the polls and say he has not a dollar, and can vote?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, that shows that many people in this country have been fed on a lot of "bunk" to the effect that the poll-tax disfranchises persons. They have been fed on propaganda deliberately put out by organizations which are subversive, in order to change the form of our government and place the Federal Government in the field of suffrage—something which is abhorrent to our system of government. If such power should be concentrated in Washington it would be much easier for communism to control this Government. The greatest safeguard we have from communism and radicalism is the division of power all over this country in its different sections. I say to the Senator from South Carolina that that is behind the activities of private organizations which strive to have enacted such a program.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator was also speaking——

Mr. EASTLAND. I can yield only for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the Senator if he has a complete list of all the crimes which have been committed in the United States, and if he has the proportion of crimes in the larger cities as compared with those committed in rural areas of the country from which he and I come?

Mr. EASTLAND. I have seen such statistics, Mr. President. I should like to say that the senior Senator from Mississippi comes from the country. He lives a mile and a half out, on the bank of the river, from a great metropolitan area containing a population of 80 persons. He knows something about the conditions there, and he knows something about the conditions in metropolitan areas.

The senior Senator from Mississippi knows that womanhood is safer on the streets of Southern cities than on the streets of any of the great metropolitan areas of the North. When I read in the newspapers of the crimes which occur—rape, murder, robbery, and the like—in areas which point their fingers at the South and say, "We are more law-abiding than you. We are better than you," it makes me glad that I am from a rural district in the State of Mississippi. I know that conditions in the metropolitan areas in my State and the other Southern States are far superior to conditions in the city of Washington, or Baltimore, Philadelphia, or New York, areas whose culture is not American, and which today attempt to dominate the country.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the Senator if he would be good enough to give for the RECORD the proportion of foreign-born in Mississippi, as against New York, for instance.

Mr. EASTLAND. I could not give those statistics. There are a great many foreign-born in my State, and they are good citizens; they are good people. I think that they are a credit to us, and my State is not only proud of them, but we have a commission set up to bring in many displaced persons from Europe. Of course, we want those who can be assimilated, but we are glad to have them.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. EASTLAND. For a question only.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does the Senator know that in the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations it has been shown that so far only 6,000 displaced persons have been brought to the United States?

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not know what the figures are.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does the Senator further know that in Virginia and many other Southern States commissions are set up to handle displaced persons, and that they are unable to get them?

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not know.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does the Senator know that in the Displaced Persons Act provision was made that a certain percentage of the displaced persons had to be farmers?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct, but we are getting very few farmers from among them. The Displaced Persons

Commission has not followed the act. I think everyone knows that. In fact, it is more or less a joke. They take in whomever officials desire personally to bring into this country.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it the Senator's opinion that it is in the best interests of the country to import large numbers of displaced persons into the cities?

Mr. EASTLAND. No; I do not think it is good policy to bring large numbers of displaced persons into the cities, which are overcrowded, which have no available housing. So far as the displaced-persons law is concerned, if the Senator from South Carolina remembers, I voted as he did on that. In fact, I think both the distinguished Senator and I spoke at length against the passage of that bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. EASTLAND. Only for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator submit for the RECORD, during the course of his able address, the number of unemployed persons now living in the United States?

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not have those figures and cannot put them into the RECORD. If I can secure them at some later time, I shall be glad to put them into the RECORD.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. For a question.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Does not the Senator recall that in the issue last week of the United States Daily News figures were published which show that there are now 3,100,000 unemployed persons in the United States?

Mr. EASTLAND. I saw something to that effect; but I do not think we are going to have a depression.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. In connection with the point the very distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi made about the poll tax not disfranchising people, does he know that in my State of Louisiana it is a fact that after we repealed the poll tax within 2 years we had double the number of eligible voters in the State?

Mr. EASTLAND. I did not know the figures as to Louisiana, but regardless of the figures, those are questions solely for State decision. It is within the power of the State to regulate suffrage.

Mr. President, I quote further from the powers which have been listed as belonging to a State:

> In short, the State authority meets the child at his birth, and attends him through infancy, manhood, and old age, and to his death, and is sufficient, if wisely exerted, to secure him all the blessings which make life desirable in this world, and the opportunity of gaining for himself, in his free exercise of his religious belief, a blissful hereafter.

Mr. President, that is from an opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States, which lists all the powers of the United States, which lists the rights possessed by the citizens, which rights are inherent in United States citizenship; which lists those vast powers retained by the State governments, those fundamental powers, the regulation of life, liberty, and property and the pursuit of happiness.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. In a moment. I defy anyone to point his finger to one sentence which, under the Constitution and the American system of government, would authorize the adoption of the program now attempted to be enacted by changing the rules of the Senate, imposing gag rule, and depriving our people of their most elemental rights of liberty and justice before the law.

Now I yield to the distinguished Senator from Texas for a question.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is it not true that all governmental powers originally resided in the States, and that it is only those powers which the States have willingly and cordially transferred to the Federal Government that the Federal Government possesses?

Mr. EASTLAND. What the distinguished Senator says of course is exactly true. In the beginning there was no Federal Government.

Mr. CONNALLY. There was none.

Mr. EASTLAND. There were 13 separate, independent, and sovereign States——

Mr. CONNALLY. Nations, if one wishes to call them that.

Mr. EASTLAND. Stretched out along the Atlantic seaboard, possessing every power of sovereignty possessed by any government.

In addition to the other powers possessed by those States, each had the power to conduct war, negotiate peace, to conduct its own foreign relations, and to set up its own postal system; but in the field of foreign relations, in the field of waging war and negotiating peace, they believed the States could act better in unison rather than alone, so they delegated those powers to the United States.

The attempt to invade the great field of personal liberties and personal rights and place that power in Washington, if successful, would destroy the State, which is the basis of the American system, and, Mr. President, it would destroy our system of government itself. That is what we of the South are endeavoring to fight against here today.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to my friend from Louisiana for a question.

Mr. LONG. Does the distinguished Senator from Mississippi agree with me that the best government is that which is closest to the people, and does he further agree with me that insofar as possible——

Mr. EASTLAND. Wait a moment. Mr. President, I will answer the first question the Senator asked me, which is if I agree with him that the best government is the government which is closest to the people. What the Senator says is absolutely true. The best government is the government which is closest to the people and that is so because of the genius of the American system. This is a big country. Conditions in the East are different from conditions thousands of miles away in the West. So the great statesmen, the great men from Virginia and other States who created the Constitution, provided that the power to control the personal relationships of men and their intimate contacts, rested within the States.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield further to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield only for a question.

Mr. LONG. Does the distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi further agree with me that an ordinary citizen has much more say-so in his own local government than he has in the enormous over-all Federal Government?

Mr. EASTLAND. I think that is a very intelligent question, Mr. President, and I certainly agree with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. In fact, I go further than he has gone. The average citizen has no authority in his Government. The Federal Government today is largely controlled by pressure groups in eastern cities which control the publicity and the radio. So long as we retain the authority and control in the different localities and divide the powers, our country is safe. America then will remain free and, Mr. President, America will remain great.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does the Senator know that it has cost the Government $3,500,000 to carry out the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act for a year? The Senator from Mississippi spoke of that act awhile ago.

Mr. EASTLAND. No, Mr. President, I did not know that.

Mr. MAYBANK. Did the Senator further know that with that expenditure of money a little more than 6,000 persons have been brought in, although it was expected to bring in 35,000?

Mr. EASTLAND. I am not surprised. But I think we have to go carefully. We can get into trouble very easily if we try to expand and strengthen that act. The cry has gone out over the country that the Displaced Persons Act should be amended to prevent discrimination. But let me say that in the name of removing discrimination a great discrimination against other groups is being practiced by the Commission today, and the situation would become much worse if we were to expand the act and remove all restrictions. In fact, it is a trick, so say the organizations which spend millions of dollars for propaganda over the radio, in order to place a great discrimination against other groups who desire to come into this country, in favor of one group, and I say that advisedly because it is true.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. Did the Senator know that those on the Displaced Persons Commission have stated they were

unable to obtain farm labor to come to the United States?

Mr. EASTLAND. If they could not get farm labor or farmers to come to the United States, of course, if they carried out the provisions of the act, it would mean they could not bring in as many persons as were expected. That, however, does not justify bringing others in. But the point is, as the Senator from South Carolina well knows, that the cry has gone up for equity and justice, but groups in the East who cry out for equity and justice and spend money for what they say is that purpose, do not desire equity and justice. That is the last thing they want, because they desire to monopolize the quotas for their own people. Every Senator within the sound of my voice knows that what I say is absolutely true.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Does the distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi agree with me, in line with our earlier discussions, that when the Federal Government takes from the local government, from the city government, from the parish or the county government, and from the State government the rights those governments have, the Federal Government is in effect taking from the people the right to govern their own destiny?

Mr. EASTLAND. What the Senator says is absolutely true. I congratulate the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana. I see that he has a firm and fundamental grasp of the American system of government and the necessity to retain that system in order to protect and preserve the liberties of our people.

Mr. President, when the Constitution was adopted the people were so zealous to prevent the Federal Government from invading the dominion of the States, from usurping their liberties, from taking away their power to control their fundamental rights, through their own State governments, that they enacted the Bill of Rights, the first eight amendments to the Constitution of the United States. Those amendments were a checkrein, not on the States, but on the Federal Government and on the Federal Government alone.

Mr. President, the contention has been made that the Federal Government should have the right to go into a State and deprive it of its control of life, liberty, and the property of its people, and the privilege of protecting their rights, their liberty, and their property. When it was claimed a year ago by the President of the United States that the Federal Government should have such power it was the most far-reaching assertion of Federal power ever declared by any man who has occupied the Presidency of this great Republic.

Mr. President, I desire to discuss the general scheme of the Federal Government and the State governments. I am going to quote from my distinguished predecessor, one of the great men who have sat in this body. I shall read from a report which came from the Judiciary Committee as a minority report, but which was adopted by the Senate. I submit that it meets the acid test. I submit it to the intelligence and judgment of Members of the United States Senate. I read further:

And now, if we will take a survey of the whole, we see that this grand scheme of free government for the security of the rights and promotion of the welfare and safety and advancement of the happiness of the people of the United States is, in short, this:

First, a common government of all the States with exclusive jurisdiction and powers as regards foreign nations and all intercourse with them, with jurisdiction over the relations between the States as States, and over commerce among the States and between them and foreign nations; over certain very limited powers whose influence and force ordinarily extend beyond State lines and could more conveniently be exercised by the common Government—

That is the United States side of the dual government which is known as the American system—

over the securing to the citizens of each State, when in the jurisdiction of another State, the same great fundamental rights which the latter State grants to its own citizens; a denial to the States of certain despotic and arbitrary powers in respect to personal and private rights, which are incompatible with free institutions, and the denial to the common government, in the exercise of its granted powers, the authority to invade certain great rights of private persons, as we have enumerated them; that all the powers of the common government were delegated and enumerated, and all other governmental powers not prohibited were reserved to or kept back by the States; that the States—as they then existed, possessing all the power then reserved to them—were essentially the basis of the Federal system, without which it could not have the beginning of life, nor any subsequent existence; that these States were equal in power and dignity, and this equality is the essence of the whole scheme.

Mr. President, a truer statement was never made. The very basis of this country, a union of States, is founded upon the equality of States and their recognition by their sister States. I read further:

That each was adjudged to be capable of discharging its Federal functions and of exercising without control or restraint from any quarter its reserved powers.

Second, that in this great mass of reserved powers in the States were embraced not only the protection and security of all the rights of life, liberty, and property, and the pursuit and acquisition of happiness, but also the unrestricted power to define and determine what these rights are, their extent and limit, and all the processes of law for their vindication.

Mr. President, it is sought to nullify that great precept of the American Constitution. Senators are obligated under their oaths to fight to the last ditch a program which would destroy the sovereignty of the States and deprive the people in each community of the power to control their affairs.

I read further:

And in this mass of reserved powers are also all jurisdiction over the conduct of men, the conservation of morals, and the preservation of the public health. That as to all these, the reserved power of each State was and is absolute, without other restriction than it shall itself see proper to impose on its own government, so far as its own citizens are concerned, and the same rule prevails as far as concerned citizens of other States within its jurisdiction, except only that by the Federal Constitution it is so bound that the measure it metes to its own citizens, the same shall be meted to them.

This outline of these matters embraced within the reserved powers of the States would ordinarily be sufficient; but in this day, when there exists so great a tendency to belittle and obscure the powers, duties, dignity, and importance of the States, and to look to the Federal Government to rectify all wrongs, to remedy all evils, to supply prosperity and to check adversity, to bestow wealth and to remove poverty, and to these ends to invoke its powers over interstate commerce and its powers of internal and external taxation, in order to build up one interest at the expense of another, to break down one rival interest for the benefit of another, to take charge of sanitation and inspection in the States, to control all that pertains to the good order and morals of the people, * * * it may be well to specify in detail some of these great powers of government which, under our constitutional system, are reserved exclusively to the States.

A few moments ago I listed at great length the powers which were reserved to the States, to show the absurdity of the proposition that the Federal Government has the right and the power to intervene in the States to protect property rights and personal rights of the citizens who reside there.

I am going to trouble the Senate by reading what the Supreme Court of the United States says on this question. There can be no controversy about it. The courts always held the same thing. I was surprised to see the principle enunciated a year ago by the Supreme Court, when it decided the restrictive-covenants case, for the Court then said that under the fourteenth amendment or any other amendment of the Constitution the Federal Government could not go into a State and attempt to rectify an individual wrong committed on a person by another person.

In the Slaughterhouse cases the Supreme Court—and let me say that that is one of the greatest decisions ever rendered by the Supreme Court of our country—in referring to and quoting from the decision of Judge Washington, in the case of Corfield against Coryell, in speaking of the great and fundamental rights which, by the Constitution, are left under the sole guardianship and protection of the States, said they are comprehended under certain general heads. That case was decided back in the late seventies or early eighties, but it has been adhered to up to this time, and was endorsed by the present Court only a few months ago. I quote now from the decision in the Slaughterhouse cases:

Protection by the Government of the right to acquire and possess property of every kind and pursue happiness and safety, subject to such restraints as the Government shall prescribe for the general good of the whole.

Mr. President, the same Court in the same case, in referring to the case of *Ward v. Maryland* (12 Wall. 430), said:

This definition, above quoted, from Judge Washington, was in the main adopted there.

Listen, Mr. President:

It embraces nearly every civil right for the establishment and protection of which organized government is instituted.

Mr. President, please note that. Here is the Supreme Court of the United States speaking in a great decision, which was referred to and endorsed by the present Court less than a year ago:

It embraces nearly every civil right for the establishment and protection of which organized government is instituted. These rights are, in the language of Judge Washington, those rights which are fundamental; and they have always been held to be the class of rights which the State governments were created to establish and secure. It would be the vainest show of learning to attempt to prove by citation of authority that up to the adoption of the recent amendments—thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth—no claim was set up that these rights depended on the Federal Government for their existence.

Mr. President, I read that once more:

It would be the vainest show of learning to attempt to prove by citation of authority that up to the adoption of the recent amendments—thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth—no claim was set up that those rights depended on the Federal Government for their existence or protection, beyond which are the very few express limitations which the Federal Constitution imposes on the States, such as, for instance, the prohibition against expost facto laws, bills of attainder, and laws impairing the obligations of contracts; but, with the exception of these and a few other restrictions, the entire domain of privileges of citizens of the States, as above defined, lay within the Constitution and legislative powers of the States.

Mr. President, please note that all these lay within the Constitution and legislative powers of the States, and without the power of the Federal Government.

I shall quote again from what that distinguished Court said in the Cruikshank case. The Court, in denying the validity of a statute of the United States providing for the punishment of a conspiracy to murder and imprison within a State, said this, in the words of Chief Justice Waite:

The rights of life and personal liberty are natural rights of man.

Mr. President, I wish to repeat that:

The rights of life and personal liberty are natural rights of man. To secure these rights, says the Declaration of Independence, governments were instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. The very highest duty of the States, when they entered into the Union under the Constitution, was to protect all citizens in their jurisdiction in the enjoyment of these inalienable rights with which they are endowed by their Creator.

Listen to this, Mr. President:

Sovereignty for this purpose rests alone with the States.

Let me repeat that, please:

Sovereignty for this purpose rests alone with the States.

Mr. President, the protection of those rights is the fundamental duty of the governments of the 48 States. As I have repeatedly said, ours is a dual system of government; and when we deprive the States of their principal duties, we destroy the States.

I have said, further, that under our system the Federal Government cannot live without the sovereign States. It is based upon the States, and their equality is fundamental to our system. When we destroy that system, we have destroyed the system which has prevented tyranny and dictatorship in America, and has made this country free and great.

When the powers of the States are usurped by the Federal Government, as it is attempted to do here, the United States is on the high road to dictatorship; tyranny and oppression will be the fate of the average man and of minority groups, who now cry for the destruction of America, who now cry for the destruction of the system that has protected them and has permitted them to live and prosper in peace.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. STENNIS. I ask the Senator, in connection with his discussion relative to retaining the present form of government wherein the States are recognized, can he think of anything more certain to destroy the integrity of the States and our dual system of government than a Federal regulation of the qualifications of electors?

Mr. EASTLAND. I may say to my distinguished colleague, the regulation and control of elections, and the protection of life, liberty, and property, are fundamental. They represent the important fundamental power and duty in the State, the fundamental safeguards of the liberty of our people. If the people in each locality may regulate and control their own elections, then they may control the men they elect to high office and thus prevent the establishment of dictatorship and tyranny and oppression in this country.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. STENNIS. I ask the Senator whether he does not believe, as one experienced in government, that if the Congress ever takes over the power of regulating the qualifications of electors, it will prove to be merely a forerunner of the Congress taking over absolute control with reference first to electors and then to elections themselves?

Mr. EASTLAND. There can be absolutely no doubt about that. The process of the eating away and usurpation of powers by the Federal Government would go on and on. It would gain in momentum as it progressed, until we would have a Government along European or Asiatic lines. I may say here and now, that is one of the great issues before us, whether we are going to retain our Government of checks and balances, with control locally by the people of the great functions of domestic government, or whether we are going to concentrate in Washington a strong central Government; which is the only kind of government Europeans know. I wonder if the alien minority groups sponsoring the proposed legislation really grasp the meaning of American institutions.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. STENNIS. In view of what the Senator has said with reference to the Federal control of the qualifications of electors and Federal control of elections leading to a centralized government which would be European or Asiatic, is he not influenced in that conclusion by the fact that the United States is such a vast nation geographically, has so many different economic situations confronting its people, and is composed of so many different racial and religious backgrounds and political theories? In other words, summing up the question, is not the Senator's conclusion based in part on things peculiar to this Nation, which set it apart from England or from any other comparable nation in the world?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I think our system is best for the protection of all groups, for the protection of the personal liberty of every group, regardless of race or religion, and best adapted to give every group its rights, which every decent American wants to do. It is the American system. It was designed because this country has different conditions. It has met the test. But when authority is concentrated in Washington the result is a government along European or Asiatic lines, with a strong national government, a country peopled by subjects who know only the law of force. That is the fight that is being made in this country today. Many of the people who now attack our institutions recognize only one thing—brute force. They do not grasp the justice underlying American institutions.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. STENNIS. Does not the Senator think our dual form of government, with the government of the several States varying according to the nature of their people, their environment, their economies, is the main reason why as a Nation we have been so successful for the past century in applying the melting-pot idea—that is, growing into a strong and powerful Nation with the most diverse citizenship and economy and religions and political philosophies, all under one flag, the most outstanding of that type of thing in the world?

Mr. EASTLAND. I thoroughly agree with the Senator. I say "Yes" to his question. In fact, for a country of this kind with so many different racial and religious groups, and with economic conditions so different, we cannot be free,

we cannot give justice to the various groups of this country, unless we retain the genius of our system which permits the people in each locality to control under their laws their police power and to build their institutions in the light of conditions, because our country is so vast that for Congress to attempt to write a code of law or a code of ethics or a code of morals—or what is considered morals—for every section of the country, would result in vast injustice to great areas. The genius of the American system, as the founders so ably discerned, was to let the people in the light of their own conditions control their destiny, their own government, and their personal rights, protecting the lives, the liberties, and the property of the people, and to have a general government to handle, largely, only matters of public defense, and, because we then expected war with England or France or Spain, the imperialistic powers, to conduct foreign relations—those things which the States could do in union better than separately. If it had been mentioned, if it had been thought that a program would have been seriously proposed which would go into the States and undermine their power, their jurisdiction, and their dignity, and take from them their fundamental powers and duties, we would never have had the United States. The safe road, the best road to follow is that marked out by the American system, with its checks and balances, its division of powers and authority, and tell the people on the Connecticut River in the great State of Connecticut, and on the Columbia River in the great State of Oregon, and on the Missouri River in the great State of Nebraska, and along the great reaches of the Mississippi, "You are an American. It is best that you control your affairs, that you fix your own code of conduct, subject only to the limitations of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution."

Now, Mr. President, I shall discuss briefly the fourteenth amendment.

It is claimed that by authority of the fourteenth amendment we can undermine the authority of the States. It is the fourteenth amendment upon which the President, in his message, hangs the authority which, I say again, is the most vast claim of Federal authority ever made by a President of the United States. Let us see the meaning of it, and let us see if it undermines the State governments. Even in the heat of reconstruction, fanned by the flames of the war, when amendments were placed in the Constitution to persecute the Southern States, those amendments did not go so far as does this program by which it is attempted to amend a rule of the Senate and to institute gag rule here.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Does the Senator have before him the exact wording of the fourteenth amendment?

Mr. EASTLAND. I think I have it here.

Mr. ROBERTSON. When the Senator reads that amendment, I should like to have him say whether he agrees with me that it was specifically worded so as to apply only to actions by States, and not actions between individuals.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course. The Supreme Court, a year ago, in the restrictive-covenant case, specifically said that that was all the Federal Government could do, and it attempted to call a halt to the present drift to undermine State authority and concentrate it in Washington.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Will the Senator yield to me for a further question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That opinion, I believe, was written by the Chief Justice, was it not?

Mr. EASTLAND. I believe it was.

Happily for the Nation, the first case in which the construction and meaning of the thirteenth and fourteenth amendments came before the Supreme Court was one in which southern white men were seeking redress against one of the pernicious statutes then common in the Southern States, by which those possessed of the State government were making traffic and merchandise of their powers for the purpose of enriching themselves and their friends. I refer to the great slaughterhouse case. There was nothing in that case to excite or alarm or prejudice, so far as the colored race was concerned, and nothing to prevent a careful consideration of the amendment. It is remarkable, too, that a States' rights jurist of unequaled powers and great purity of character appeared before the Court pressing for a construction of the amendment; which, if adopted, would have been a fatal precedent upon which could have been built, and would have been built, a system of legislation which would have left the Southern States, at least, no other control over their internal affairs than it should please the Congress to give.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is it not true that in a decision handed down by the Supreme Court of the United States last year there was a quotation from the Slaughterhouse cases, to which the Senator has just referred, showing that the doctrine that the Federal Government has no control of actions between individuals is still recognized by our courts?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; and specifically in that case. There can be no dispute about it.

It is remarkable, too, that this construction was concurred in by the two Democrats who then held seats on the Supreme Court bench, and that it narrowly, yet plainly, through construction, was upheld by Republican judges and vindicated in an opinion of unsurpassed ability by one of the great Republican Judges of that Court.

In this opinion the Court Judge who drew it referred to the tendency created by the war in favor of more enlarged powers to the Federal Government. I wish to quote from the opinion, which shows the real meaning of the fourteenth amendment, on which it is attempted to hang this program and to seek authority for its enactment:

However pervading this sentiment, and however it may have contributed to the adoption of the amendments, we do not see in those amendments any purpose to destroy the main features of the general system. Under the pressure of all the excited feelings growing out of the war, our statesmen have still believed in the existence of States with powers for domestic and local government, including the regulation of civil rights, the rights of person and property were essential to the perfect working of our complex form of government, though they have thought proper to impose additional limitations upon the States and to confer additional powers on the Nation. The fourteenth amendment provides, among other things, that no State shall make or enforce any law which shall prejudice the privileges and immunities of the citizens of the United States; and the main effort in that case by the appellants was to bring within the scope of the Federal Government jurisdiction to protect citizens against the exercise by a State legislature of a power to grant to a corporation an unjust and odious monopoly in the business of slaughtering livestock for food and of receiving at their landing all livestock shipped to the parish in which the city of New Orleans is situated, a territory embracing 1,154 square miles. It was urged in their behalf that this right deprived over a thousand persons of the right to follow their vocation as butchers in the city of New Orleans, in the State of Louisiana, a right which they had as citizens of the United States.

Mr. President, there was asserted the right of certain butchers in the city of New Orleans to engage in the trade of slaughtering cattle, and the court said it was a right which they secured by virtue of being United States citizens. The question was whether such a right was a right inherent in citizenship in the United States, the right to engage in commerce, in a profession, in business, and the right to be protected.

The Court, however, denied this claim, holding that there were two citizenships in our system—

This is the United States Supreme Court. The Court just a year ago ratified this decision. I read further:

The Court, however, denied this claim, holding that there were two citzenships in our system, one of the United States, and one of the State in which a citizen of the United States resides; that these two citizenships pertain to all citizens of the United States who were also residents of any State; that the rights, privileges, and immunities of such a person as a citizen of the United States were separate and distinct from his rights, privileges, and immunities as a citizen of a State; that protection of the former alone was committed to the Federal Government and of the latter to the State government; that each citizen of the State owed a double allegiance, namely, to the Federal Government and to the State in which he resided; that he looked to the one for the security and protection of a part of these rights and to the other for protection in all the others; that both governments were parts of a complete whole, and both necessary to the protection and security of the citizen in all his rights, privileges, and immunities.

The Court then proceeds to enumerate the rights which pertain to a citizen in his character of citizen of the United States and

which we will here reproduce so that by considering the actual examples a clearer insight may be had into their nature than could come from definition and description only.

The rights are as follows:

The right to come to the seat of government to assert any claim he may have upon that government, to transact any business he may have with it, to seek its protection, to share its offices, to engage in administering its functions.

The right of free access to its seaports, through which all operations of foreign commerce are conducted; to the subtreasury; land offices, and courts of justice in the several States.

The right to demand the care and protection of the Federal Government over his life, liberty, and property when on the high seas or within the jurisdiction of a foreign government.

The right to peaceably assemble and petition (Congress) for a redress of grievances, and to the writ of habeas corpus.

The right to use the navigable waters of the United States however they may penetrate the territory of the several States.

All rights secured to citizens by treaties with foreign nations.

The right to become a citizen of a State by residing in it.

The Court then proceeds:

"There are rights which pertain to a citizen in his character of citizen of the United States, and are therefore subject to Federal jurisdiction and power which grow out of prohibitions in the Constitution of the United States on State actions; of such is the right to be absolved from all the consequences of bills of attainder, ex post facto laws, and laws impairing the obligation of contracts enacted by the States; and the rights secured against prohibited State action, as expressed in the three new amendments to the Constitution."

The Court in these principles refused to give relief against the legislation of the State of Louisiana complained of.

This great judgment (in the Slaughterhouse cases) was the first beacon light that flashed across the gloom and darkness of constitutional exposition produced by the events of the war. It recalled the great principles on which the Constitution was based, and pointed out the path of safety to be pursued. It is so clear in its argument, so convincing in its reasoning, that men wonder on reading it how they ever entertained any doubt about the true meaning of the Constitution as affected by the amendments.

This case was followed by others, in which the principles announced in the Slaughterhouse cases were followed to their logical conclusion in strict accord with the terms of these amendments. So far as the present argument is concerned it is only necessary to say that the power conferred on the Federal Government by these amendments was held to be the only power to enforce the prohibitions on State actions contained in them.

These amendments so far as they relate to the questions now involved consisted wholly of negations—prohibitions always on State action and sometimes on Federal action.

The language of the fourteenth amendment is as follows:

"No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States, nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

And the fifteenth amendment ordains as follows:

"The right of the citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude."

I quote further:

It is now firmly settled that these provisions are directed solely against State laws and State action, through persons or agents clothed with State authority. It is also settled that the power conferred on Congress to enforce these provisions is a power only to enforce the prohibition against State action. That the rights conferred on persons under them are not positive, original rights but the right only to exemption from, and protection against, the prohibited State action. And the power of Congress to interfere in any case is purely a power of correction, a power to give redress against a prohibited State action, that the exercise, the actual exercise of the efficient power by Congress, under the amendments presupposes State action of the kind prohibited, and until there be such prohibited State action, the power of Congress is wholly dormant and without such action really being taken, somewhere or at some time the power of Congress should sleep forever.

In no case under these amendments, so far as the present controversy is concerned, can the power of Congress be made to reach, for punishment or for correction, or for redress in any way, civil or criminal the acts of private individuals.

Mr. President, I repeat that the Supreme Court of the United States, the present Court, just a few months ago completely ratified that statement.

I shall quote briefly from other decisions of the United States Supreme Court to show that no such power as is proposed to be granted to the Federal Government under the present proposal can be granted. I shall show that such a program would destroy the States and destroy our system of government. I shall then discuss at great length the right of unlimited debate, the cloture rule, and what it means to the people of the United States.

Chief Justice Waite, in delivering the opinion of the Supreme Court in *United States* v. *Cruickshank* (92 U. S. p. 555), speaking of the provisions in the fourteenth amendment prohibiting the States from denying to any person within their jurisdiction "the equal protection of the laws," said:

"This provision does not, any more than the one which precedes it, and which we have just considered (namely, the provision prohibiting a State from depriving any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law)"—

Now get this, Mr. President—

"add anything to the rights which one citizen has under the Constitution against another."

The Court said the fourteenth amendment does not give one citizen any more or additional rights against another citizen.

"The equality of the rights of citizens is a principle of republicanism. Every republican government is in duty bound to protect its citizens in the enjoyment of this principle if within its power. That duty was originally assumed by the States, and it still remains there."

Get that, Mr. President.

"Every republican government is in duty bound to protect its citizens in the enjoyment of this principle (of equality) if within its power."

That duty was originally assumed by the States, and that duty remains in the States, said the Supreme Court.

"The only obligation resting upon the United States is to see that the States do not deny the right. The amendment guarantees this, but no more. The power of the National Government is limited to the enforcement of the guaranty."

On that ground the Supreme Court in that case held that the United States had no power to punish a conspiracy to commit murder, or to falsely imprison a citizen, and none to punish false imprisonment or murder itself. The case was decided in 1875, and was a logical outcome of the principles announced in the Slaughterhouse cases.

Another great decision by the United States Supreme Court is that in the case of Strander against West Virginia.

The case of *Virginia* v. *Rives* (100 U. S., 313), from which I shall quote, was decided at the same term of the Court the Cruikshank case was decided. The Supreme Court in that case remanded to the State court a criminal case which had been removed to the Federal court upon the ground that subordinate officers in violation of the laws of the State had discriminated against the accused, who was a colored man, in declining to summon on the grand jury which indicted him and on the panel which was to try him, any person of his own race. Justice Strong, speaking for the Court, and quoting all the provisions of the first section of the fourteenth amendment, said:

They all have reference to State action exclusively, and not to any action of private individuals. It is the State which is prohibited from denying to any person under its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws, and hence the statute above referred to is intended for protection against State infringement of these rights.

Mr. President, it can be seen from these decisions that the American Congress and the American Government cannot go into the field of the personal rights, the personal liberties of the individual, and stand between one citizen and another citizen, and give one citizen rights against another citizen in a State. If that were done it would undermine our entire system of government.

I read from another very important case, which shows that the Supreme Court of the United States has gone right down the line, and today still hews to the line and shows the patent unconstitutionality of the program for which it is attempted to amend the Senate rule. It shows that such action would destroy our system of government and deprive the individual in Minnesota, as well as the individual in Vermont, of his most essential rights as a citizen, and take from him that guaranty, that protection of his individual rights which he must have if he is to remain a freeman, and if we are to keep the American system of government, with its dual citizenship, and the sovereignty of the States, to protect and preserve those elementary rights.

I read from United States against Harris. In this case there was an indictment under the following words:

If two or more in any State or Territory conspire, and go in disguise upon the highways or on the premises of another, for the purpose of depriving, either directly or indirectly, any person or class of persons of the equal protection of the laws or of equal privileges and immunities under the laws, or for the purpose of preventing or hindering the constituted authorities of any State or Territory from giving to all persons within such State or Territory the equal protection of the laws, each of said persons shall be punished by a fine—

And so forth. We have a program here under which it is attempted to do that very thing.

The indictment charged certain private citizens of Tennessee of taking certain other citizens of the State from the custody of the sheriff who held them for trial on a criminal charge, and with beating, wounding, and maltreating them, and killing one of them, and thereby depriving them of an equal protection of the laws of the State. The Supreme Court, as if wearied by the compulsory reiteration of principles already well settled, delivered a very elaborate and learned opinion, drawn by Mr. Justice Woods, and again confirmed the true construction of the Constitution already fixed by the preceding cases. The Court deemed it necessary again to enforce the old maxim of constitutional construction by quoting from Judge Story that which, up to the war, had never been doubted as a fundamental canon of constitutional law.

What is that fundamental canon of constitutional law which Mr. Justice Story, the great learned justice of the United States Supreme Court, laid down? I quote from him:

Whenever, therefore, a question concerning the constitutionality of a particular power arises, the first question is whether the power be expressed in the Constitution. If it be, the question is decided. If it be not expressed, the next inquiry would be whether it be properly incident to an express power and necessary for its execution.

That is the end of the quotation from Judge Story.

I read further from the report:

The Court then, proceeding on this canon of construction, quote and discuss all the various provisions of the Constitution on which this legislation and the indictment founded on it could possibly have been based, namely, the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments, and section 2, article IV, which we have before noticed as guaranteeing to the citizens of the several States the privileges of citizens in each State, and find that none of them is a warrant for this legislation. Referring to the first section of the fourteenth amendment * * * and to the fifth * * * the learned judge quotes from the Slaughterhouse cases as follows:

"If the States do not conform their laws to its requirements, then by the fifth section of the articles of amendment, the Congress is authorized to enforce it by suitable legislation."

And he quotes and adopts the following expressive language of Mr. Justice Bradley in the Cruikshank case when it was tried in the circuit court:

"It (the fourteenth amendment) is a guaranty against the acts of the State government itself. It is a guaranty against the exercise of arbitrary and unconstitutional power on the part of the government and legislation of the State, not a guaranty against the commission of individual offenses; and the power of Congress, whether express or implied, to legislate for the enforcement of such a guaranty does not extend to the passage of laws for the suppression of crime within the States."

I emphasize that, Mr. President. Congress has no authority to legislate for the suppression of crime within the States. The Supreme Court affirmed that a year ago.

"The enforcement of the guaranty does not require or authorize Congress to perform the duty that the guaranty itself supposes is to be the duty of the State to perform."

And quoting from the same case, when in the Supreme Court, he again announced the doctrine that "the obligation resting upon the United States is to see that the States do not deny the right. This the amendment guarantees, and no more. The power of the National Government is limited to this guaranty." And he also repeated what was said in *Virginia v. Rives*, that "these provisions of the fourteenth amendment had reference to State action exclusively."

I quote further:

"A private person cannot make constitutions or laws, nor can he with authority construe them, nor can he administer or execute them. The only way, therefore, one private person can deprive another of the equal protection of the law is by the commission of some offense against the laws which protect the rights of persons, as by theft, burglary, arson, libel, assault, or murder. If, therefore, we hold that section 5519 is warranted by the thirteenth amendment, we should by virtue of this amendment accord to Congress power to punish every crime by which the right of any person to life, liberty, property, or reputation is invaded. Thus, under a provision of the Constitution which simply abolished slavery and involuntary servitude we should, with few exceptions, invest Congress with power over the whole catalog of crimes. A construction of the thirteenth amendment which leads to this result is therefore unsound."

Mr. President, Congress passed an antisegregation law which prohibited segregation in hotels, theaters, restaurants, places of public amusement or accommodation, or in transportation. The same cry has gone up now. We are trying to amend the rules of the Senate to pass such an act. When it was passed a number of cases went to the United States Supreme Court. In those cases certain persons were prosecuted for practicing segregation. Not one of those cases came from the South. They came from Northern States and from Western States. The Court, in the civil-rights cases, handed down one of its great decisions, which is the law today, and which says that when we try to enter this field and undermine the rights of the States, and take from them their fundamental rights, we undermine the entire American system of government.

Both classes of these—

Speaking, now, of the civil-rights cases—

came before the Supreme Court in December 1883.

The law which had passed Congress was described as a bill to enforce in public places, theaters and inns, on railroad cars, and on steamboats, a social equality between the two races.

The cry went up, and cases went to the Supreme Court from Northern States, which wanted to get rid of the law. Section 1 of that act—and we are trying to amend the rules so as to enact another one—provided:

SECTION 1. That all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States shall be entitled to the full and equal enjoyment of the accommodations and advantages, facilities, and privileges of inns, public conveyances on land or water, theaters, and other places of public amusement, subject only to the conditions and limitations established by law and applicable alike to citizens of every race and color, regardless of any previous condition of servitude.

Here is what the Court said:

It is State action of a peculiar character that is prohibited; individual invasion of individual rights is not the subject-matter of the amendment. It has a deeper and broader scope. It nullifies and makes void all State legislation and State action of every kind which impairs the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States, or which deprives them of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, or which denies to them the equal protection of the laws.

But, Mr. President, social rights and freedom from segregation were not privileges or immunities of citizenship of the United States.

In speaking of the fifth section, which gives Congress the power to enforce this, the Court says:

To enforce what? To adopt appropriate legislation for correcting the effect of such prohibited State laws and State action, and thus to render them effectually void and inoperative; this is the legislative power conferred on Congress, and this is the whole of it. It does not invest Congress with power to legislate upon subjects which are within the domain of State legislation, but to provide against State legislation and State action of the kind referred to.

It does not authorize Congress to create a code of municipal law for the regulation of private rights, but to provide modes of redress against the operation of State laws and the action of State officers, executive and judicial, when these are subversive of the fundamental rights specified in the amendment. Positive rights and privileges are undoubtedly secured by the fourteenth amendment, but they are secured by way of prohibition against State laws and State proceedings opposing these rights and privileges, and by power given to Congress to legislate for carrying such prohibition into effect; and such legislation by Congress must necessarily be predicated upon such supposed State laws and State proceedings and be directed to the correction of their operation and effect.

The minority report of 1887, from which I am reading, then says:

This is clear enough, but the Court emphasized the decision again in this extract:

"Until some State law has been passed, or some State action, through its officers or agents, been taken adverse to the rights of citizens sought to be protected by the fourteenth amendment, no legislation of the United States under said amendment, nor any proceeding under said amendment, can be called into activity; for the prohibitions of the amendment are against State laws and acts done under State authority."

And, again, the Court, in denying the power of Congress, under these amendments, to legislate on the subject of the violation by private persons of rights secured by them, use this language:

"Civil rights, such as are guaranteed by the Constitution against State aggression, cannot be impaired by the wrongful acts of

individuals unsupported by State authority in the shape of laws, customs, or judicial or executive proceedings; the wrongful acts of an individual unsupported by any State authority are simply a personal wrong, or a crime of that individual, an invasion of the rights of the injured party, it is true, whether they affect his person, his property, or his reputation; but if not sanctioned in some way by the State, or not done under State authority, his rights will remain in full force, and may presumably be vindicated by a resort to the laws of the State for redress. An individual cannot deprive a man of his right to vote, to hold property, to buy or sell, to sue in the courts, to be a witness or a juror; he may by force or fraud interfere with the right in a particular case; he may commit an assault against the person or use ruffian violence at the polls, or slander the good name of a fellow citizen; but unless protected in these wrongful acts by some shield of State law or State authority, he cannot destroy or injure the right; he will only render himself amenable to satisfaction or punishment, and amenable therefor to the laws of the State where the wrongful acts are committed."

Mr. President, I quote further from the report on that historic decision:

When the Constitution seeks to protect rights against the discriminative and unjust laws of a State by prohibiting such laws, it is not individual offenses but abrogation and denial of rights which it denounces and for which it clothes Congress with power to provide a remedy. The abrogation or denial of rights for which the State alone were, or could be responsible, was the great seminal and fundamental wrong which was intended to be remedied; and the remedy to be provided must be predicated upon that wrong. It must assume that in the cases provided for, the evil of the wrong actually committed rests upon State law or State authority for its exercise or perpetration.

Mr. President, there can be no doubt, under the decisions of the United States Supreme Court, that our system of government would be invaded if we amended the Senate rules so as to permit the passage of the program that is advocated here, and we would do violence to our system and would deprive our people of their fundamental rights, their privileges, and the great safeguard of human liberty. To reach that unconstitutional end, the demand is made to amend the rules of the United States Senate.

Mr. President, since the dawn of history, in all parliamentary bodies there has been a principle to protect human liberty, known as the right of unlimited debate. From the dawn of history it has been recognized that majorities are not always right, that great injustice comes from the use of brute force, and that if mankind is to remain free, it is necessary that majorities be curbed.

That was true of the Greek Senate, it was true, as I shall show in a moment, of the Roman Senate, and it has been responsible for making the United States Senate the great deliberative body it is today. The right of unlimited debate under our system is peculiarly fitting, is peculiarly appropriate to the United States Senate. It is a great American institution which has been interwoven into our governmental system for generations. It stands today as a great protector of the rights of the individual citizen, the rights of minority racial and religious groups. And let me say, when I speak of racial minority and religious groups, every single group in the country is a minority group. When I speak of them I speak of all of us. The Methodists are a minority; the Baptists are a minority; the Presbyterians are a minority; the Catholics are a minority; the Jews are a minority. The system is peculiar to the United States, because the United States is a union of States. The Congress gets its name from a word meaning "an assembling"; not an assembling of the people, but an assembling of the United States—an assembling of States that are united. The Senate of the United States is composed of two ambassadors sent to the Central Government to represent respectively the sovereign States. It is not strictly a legislative body. It is part of our duty of course to legislate, but also to advise, consult, and approve.

The very idea of gag rule in the Senate, applied to gag the ambassador of a sovereign State, is abhorrent to the American system, which, as I have stated, is built upon equality of the States.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, is it not a fact that the smallest State of the Union has the same representation in this body as the largest, and that, when the appointment of Senators from the various States was changed to an election, the election of Senators from those sovereign States was left to the will of the people, and under the articles of the Constitution, were they elected according to the laws of the several States?

Mr. EASTLAND. A Senator, as ambassador from a State, of course, could only be elected by the State in the manner prescribed by the State. Under the amendment to the Constitution Senators must be chosen in the States by popular vote. If they were not so chosen, we would not have an assembling in the Senate of ambassadors from sovereign States. Senators come to the American Congress, the word "Congress" meaning an assembling of united sovereign States, to advise with each other on problems of common interest to the several States. If one Senator can be gagged, or if a number of Senators can be gagged, quality can be denied to Senators and to the respective States of the American Union.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a further question.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the Senator whether there was any intimation or thought of a Federal law in connection with the election of Senators by popular vote in the several States, after the Constitution had been changed so as to provide for their election in that manner instead of by the legislatures of the States?

Mr. EASTLAND. None whatever. The State sets up its own rules and regulations, as provided in the constitutional amendment. It sets up its own qualifications for voters. But the point is, gag rule in the Senate is abhorrent to our system of government. We are representatives of sovereign States—we are sovereign; and a sovereign cannot be gagged.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not the opinion of the Senator that if we had gag rule, laws might be enacted, following the gag rule, such as the law that has been proposed for the Federal Government to repeal poll taxes; which in the end would be a law against the sovereign States in the election of their Senators. Is that not true?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I regret I did not hear the Senator's question. I have yielded merely for a question. May I have unanimous consent to request the Senator to repeat the question, without my losing the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. MAYBANK. My question to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi was, if a gag rule were imposed on the Senate, in the Senator's opinion would that be followed by legislation affecting State elections, and if so, would it not be in direct conflict with the Constitution with respect to the change in the manner of electing Senators?

Mr. EASTLAND. There is no doubt about that. But the point to the whole thing is, the sovereignty of one State cannot be destroyed without at the same time destroying the sovereignty of all States. Every State in the Union has as much stake in this controversy as does the State that sent the Senator from Mississippi to this body, and as do the States that sent to this body other Senators who now oppose the program.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, does the distinguished Senator from Mississippi deny that the largest States are protected in the matter of representation in the House of Representatives differently from the basis of their representation in the Senate?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a further question.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does not the Senator believe the power of life and the rights pertaining to it in the small States resides in the Senate of the United States?

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course it does.

Mr. President, as I have said, throughout all parliamentary history it has been

recognized that the right of unlimited debate is a valuable right for the protection of minorities, to check a ruthless majority, and that right in the Senate has done much to hold the United States together. Had it not been for the right of unlimited debate in the Senate, the American Union, in all probability, would have been broken up in 1812, when there was a serious controversy in New England, some of whose citizens desired to leave the Union because of the War of 1812. But, by the right of unlimited debate, when Senators from sovereign States, clothed with the robe of sovereignty, come here to counsel and debate together, such questions are resolved for the good of all. America has prospered. It has stood firm under the guiding principles on which the Nation was built.

Mr. President, why is it that almost all Senators who have served in this body any length of time, from the beginning down to the present time, have recognized the value of the Senate rule authorizing unlimited debate, and have striven to preserve and protect that right and have considered it essential to protect the people, in all areas of the country, from unbridled majorities? A bill can be debated in the House of Representatives, under their rule, only an hour. I have been there and have seen Representatives beg and plead for 5 minutes time. Under a gag rule, if a measure came to the Senate it could be rammed through by the power of a great lobby or great pressure group, and the people of the Nation would not know what was happening.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the Senator if he remembers the silver controversy—I do not wish to use the term "filibuster"—which affected some of the Western States?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes, I remember it. Was that the Senator's question?

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes, I remember that.

Mr. MAYBANK. Was it not the Senate of the United States that saved the West after the bill had been rammed through the House?

Mr. EASTLAND. It was a combination of western Republicans and southern Democrats that saved the West on that occasion.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a further question.

Mr. MAYBANK. If the western silver group had lost the fight, is it not the Senator's opinion that the East, which was so anxious to have the legislation passed, would have been the sufferers in the end?

Mr. EASTLAND. They would. I predict, Mr. President, that if this resolution is adopted it will hasten the day of socialism in this country, and it will aid the chances of the enactment of a capital levy in the United States. The people of the industrial East have a great stake in retaining the right of unlimited debate in the Senate of the United States.

Until 1806 there was the right in the Senate to move the previous question. Such a motion was debatable. Until 1917 there was the right of unlimited debate in the Senate. The statement has been made, time and time again, in this debate that the cloture rule was adopted at that time because of the filibuster on the armed-ship bill and because of the imminence of war with Germany. That rule provided that two-thirds of the Senators could invoke cloture on a pending measure. The right of unlimited debate on a motion to take up a bill was deliberately left out of the purview of that rule. If one will read the debates in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD when the resolution creating rule XXII was under consideration, one is bound to admit that it was the intention to resort to that rule only in cases involving the national defense, when war was imminent, and when cloture should be invoked in order to defend the country in a grave emergency.

The great Senators in this body practically unanimously have opposed cloture and have recognized the importance of unlimited debate. The conditions we have today are far different from those which the Senators who wrote the rule conceived would exist if cloture should ever be adopted.

Mr. President, unlimited debate is vital to the preservation of a republic, as is shown by the experience of Rome. For 450 years the Roman Republic had endured with no restrictions on debate in the Roman Senate. During all this period Rome had grown in greatness and power until hers was the dominant position in the ancient world. No ancient people enjoyed the freedom of a republic for so long a time as did the ancient Romans. But the golden age of Roman freedom was now drawing to a close. During the first triumvirate of Caesar, Pompey, and Crassus, pleadings before the judices selecti—senatorial judges trying criminal cases—were limited to 2 hours. Cicero, one of the most far-sighted statesmen of his day and a great champion of the Roman tradition of freedom, deprecated the effect of this cloture upon the cause of freedom, sensing that it foreshadowed the beginning of the end of the Roman Republic.

His premonition was correct; within a few years Rome was under the authoritarian despotism of its first Caesar.

Interestingly enough, Julius Caesar had himself insisted on unlimited debate in his earlier years. At the time of Cataline's conspiracy, when Julius Caesar was praetor, he was the only member of the Roman Senate who refused to vote in favor of inflicting capital punishment on the accomplices of Cataline. He insisted upon the right of unlimited debate until, tension mounting high, a group of Roman knights thrust at him with drawn swords, and only by the extreme efforts of his friends who drew their togas about him was his life saved.

Other Roman statesmen of note insisted on the right of unlimited debate. Cato the Younger, in his fight against the usurpation of power by Caesar and Pompey in later years, resorted to unlimited debate in a vain effort to preserve the Republic.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. For a question.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator pays tribute to the memory of Julius Caesar, of historical fame. In order to make the record accurate and complete, should he not also add that he was aided and abetted by one Cleopatra?

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not know about that. I have said that Caesar destroyed the right of unlimited debate in the Roman Senate under conditions similar to the conditions in this country today, and by the use of pressure groups such as those we now see around the Capitol, in order to make himself a despot; and he did it and destroyed the liberty of the Roman people.

When Cato persisted in talking after Caesar ordered him to desist, he was dragged from the rostrum and ejected from the Senate. So jealous was the Roman Senate of its prerogatives, that when Cato was ejected the entire Roman Senate walked out of the Senate chamber.

Cato and others resorted to unlimited debate only when the Republic itself and the freedom on which it was founded were at stake. There is a marked similarity today in the fight to preserve the freedom of the States from Federal usurpation—a freedom vital to the preservation of the American system. The American Republic has endured 160 years. The Roman Republic lasted nearly three times as long—450 years. Let us take a lesson from the observations of Cicero in the declining years of Rome's freedom, and preserve the sacred right of unlimited debate so essential now, as then, to the freedom we all want to preserve.

Mr. President, let us heed what Cicero said, that cloture in the Senate of a republic will destroy the republic. With what a prophetic eye he pictured what would happen in a few years to imperial Rome if Julius Caesar were listened to and cloture adopted.

Mr. President, history is the record of man's efforts to solve his social, economic, and military problems. It is often said that history repeats itself, but the very reason that history is written and studied in our schools is that the mistakes of history may not be repeated.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. For a question.

Mr. TOBEY. I might help the Senator out a little and strengthen his argument by quoting the words of the distinguished French statesman, Mr. Briand, who said that "the only lesson we learn from experience is that we learn nothing from experience." Does the Senator concur?

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not concur in that statement. I think the only way we can learn is by following experience.

The founders of the American Government were keenly aware of the fact that freedom in the Roman Republic had disintegrated as a result of factors which they sought to avoid in writing the Constitution of the United States.

Let me say that a reading of the notes of the Constitutional Convention will disclose that time and time again the

factors which caused the destruction of Rome were pointed to and discussed, and an attempt was made to set up a system in this country so that the thing which caused the decline and fall of Rome would not happen here.

I have just shown how the forces intent on destroying Roman freedom first attacked the right of unlimited debate. It would be interesting to go a bit further and to note how Julius Caesar, in his ambitious manipulation of the Roman mob to further his own acquisition of power, proceeded from this point to whittle down the power of the Roman Senate.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that previous to Caesar's imposition of cloture on the Roman Senate, the Roman Senate had enjoyed free and unlimited debate for some 450 years?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct. Caesar raised a cry to give vast lands to the poor people of Rome by taking the land away from its owners. When for years the Roman Senate refused to enact his proposal, he brought pressure groups, mobs, around the Senate, and by threatening Senators, by putting the heat on, by pressure, they adopted cloture in the Roman Senate, so that they could pass legislation taking away from their owners the lands in one area of the Roman provinces, and distributing them to members of the groups which surrounded the Roman Senate.

Mr. President, I think the similarity is striking. There are pressure groups in great numbers which come down to Washington from New York and other eastern cities and surround this Capitol, trying to intimidate the United States Senate to adopt a program which would undermine our whole system of government, just as happened in Rome.

Cicero, one of the great statesmen of all time, during that agitation warned the Roman Senate that if they adopted cloture it would mark the beginning of the end, that it would mark the decline of Rome, and that within a few years there would be despotism and tyranny there. He said that behind cloture the power of the Roman Senate would be whittled down, and a tyrant would then take its place and exercise its power. And, Mr. President, that is exactly what happened in Rome. Julius Caesar was a very ambitious man. He desired to make himself dictator of an imperial Rome. The thing that stood in his way, the thing which prevented him, was unlimited debate in the Senate of Rome. So he said, "We are going to distribute land among certain people." He brought those people to Rome and with their aid forced the Senate to change its rule of unlimited debate. Within 2 years he had destroyed the power of the Roman Senate. He became a tyrant. Rome lost her liberty and declined and fell.

Mr. President, the turning points of history are not always on the battlefield. Here was a great turning point of Roman history when Caesar broke the power of the Roman Senate, and, though the senate existed in name for another 500 years until it was dissolved and its members pensioned by Odoacer, the King of the Goths, from that time on it was always more or less of a rubber stamp for the Emperor of Rome.

How right the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] was when he said that with majority cloture in this body we would be a rubber stamp, that we would be controlled by the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. President, cloture was not in effect in the House of Commons for 1,000 years, or until 1882. The previous question could not be invoked in the House of Commons for 1,000 years. Let me say that during that time England, Great Britain, the British Empire, reached the zenith of its power and its glory. It was during that time that the statement remained true that the sun never set on England and her possessions. What happened? The British wanted to crush Ireland. The British Parliament, at the request of wealthy pressure groups in England, desired to crush the Irish. To do that they had to put gag rule in the House of Commons.

One of the black pages in history, Mr. President, is what happened to the brave Irish people as a result of the treatment they received from Great Britain. Thousands of our own good citizens in this country today were driven out of Ireland and to our shores because of the mistreatment they received there. It is interesting to note that some of them, our friends, would vote for cloture in this body, for gag rule here; when such a rule was adopted in the British Parliament in order to crush their parents and grandparents and actually drive them from their native land.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Louisiana for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator know exactly what year it was when gag rule was adopted in the House of Commons?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; in 1882.

I say, Mr. President, that gag rule there certainly marked the decline of England as a great power. She, with her possessions, did not begin to decline at first, but that rule certainly marked the beginning of her decline as one of the great governments of the earth. The treatment which the British meted out to the Irish after cloture had been forced in the House of Commons in order to crush the Irish has made Ireland a free state today. The hatred of the Irish toward Great Britain, or toward the British, was certainly justified.

It is interesting to note, Mr. President, that in these two great examples in history, Rome and Great Britain, when gag rule was adopted in their parliamentary bodies it was done at the request of groups which desired to force tyranny and oppression upon their fellow citizens. It was done in a desire to take away from a segment of their populations their freedom and their liberty.

I submit that today an attempt is being made to enforce gag rule on the Senate of the United States in order to undermine this Government and deprive the people of every section of our country of some of their elementary and most important rights and privileges.

The founders of the American Government were not unaware of the fragile nature of human freedom and sought to protect American liberty with certain safeguards. One of the most interesting statements to be found in the Journal of the Constitutional Convention kept by James Madison, who later followed Jefferson as President of our Nation, was the statement by Edmund Randolph on the purpose of the United States Senate. I wish to read this statement by Randolph from page 81 of Madison's Journal:

> Mr. Randolph observed that he had, at the time of offering his propositions, stated his ideas as far as the nature of general propositions required; that details made no part of the plan, and could not perhaps with propriety have been introduced. If he was to give an opinion as to the number of the second branch [the Senate], he should say that it ought to be much smaller than that of the first; so small as to be exempt from the passionate proceedings to which numerous assemblies are liable. He observed that the general object was to provide a cure for the evils under which the United States labored; that in tracing these to their origin, every man had found it in the turbulence and follies of democracy; that some check therefore was to be sought for, against this tendency of our governments; and that a good Senate seemed most likely to answer the purpose.

A Senate of long debate, not purely a legislative body but a body where these questions were reasoned out and agreed upon, with no group ruthlessly attempting to impose a program on another great section of this country.

Mr. President, we observe from this statement of Edmund Randolph that the founders of our Government, the creators of the American Constitution, who as a group probably had a greater understanding of political philosophy than any other group in the history of the world, established the United States Senate primarily as a protection for American liberty as a restraint upon the House of Representatives, as a bulwark against the enactment of hasty legislation, as a gyroscope to keep us on a fixed course insuring the continuance of American freedom.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that this very concept of the Senate was what moved the founding fathers to select the Senate as the body to share in the treaty-making power of the Government, and also to share in the appointment power of the Chief Executive?

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the Senate is a great deal more than what we might term an ordinary legislative body?

Mr. EASTLAND. The distinguished Senator from Alabama was not present when I said that the Senate is not a legislative body. The word "Congress" means an assembly of the States, an assembly of the United States. Senators are representatives of sovereign States. We are here clothed with the sovereignty

of those States. We are here to debate, to reason, to work out the common problems which confront all the States of the Union. As I stated earlier, the United States is basically a union of equal States, States equal in every respect; and it is abhorrent to that doctrine of equality to gag the ambassador of a sovereign State who comes here clothed with the sovereignty of the State which sent him here.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that a State is prohibited from entering into any kind of a treaty or agreement with a foreign power, but that the States do share in the treaty-making power and in the shaping of our foreign policy through their representatives on the floor of the United States Senate?

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. President, we need not more legislation but less legislation. The best government is still that which governs least—governs least because it governs so successfully that the enactment of numerous laws becomes unnecessary. Most of the legislation required today is legislation to undo the mistakes of yesterday. The historical function of the Senate, therefore, should not be altered to provide greater acceleration in the passing of legislation, but more deliberation, greater opportunity for the exercise of judgment, more time for wiser counsel to advise and inform public opinion.

When the American people are informed, they will do the right thing. I have always felt that we could trust the people. In fact, I think the people are more to be trusted than many political leaders think is wise. The right of unlimited debate to inform the people and let the issues sink in is a great safety valve which will do much to protect our people and to preserve our Republic. When, supported by powerful pressure groups, we rush through legislation, that is not the way to legislate. Some of those pressure groups control the radio, the newspapers, and other avenues of publicity. When we legislate in that manner, we deny the ambassadors from a sovereign State the right to debate at great length and to reason out these questions, inform themselves, and inform their people.

Mr. President, the system of legislation here proposed would be the death knell of this Republic. It is said that the proposal is only to close a loophole in the rules. If such a proposal is adopted, no one can tell me that in a very few years we shall not have majority cloture. Most of the leaders of this body today favor cloture by majority vote. The President of the United States, with all his vast power, favors majority cloture. Great organizations which control newspapers, magazines, and the radio are constantly spending many thousands of dollars on propaganda to drive the people to bring pressure on their representatives to change the rules and adopt cloture by majority vote in the United States Senate, under the theory that the Senate must be in a position speedily to transact its business.

Mr. President, the danger signals are out. If the proposal before us is adopted, within 5 years we shall have majority cloture in this body, and it will sound the death knell of the American Republic. This resolution would fundamentally change our system of government.

I am the ninth Senator who has spoken in opposition to that resolution. Yet, since the first Senator spoke in opposition to it, the newspapers, the radio, and many of the magazines have been full of the cry, "It is a filibuster, a filibuster, a filibuster! Shut off debate, shut off debate, shut off debate!"

Mr. President, the tyranny of the majority soon becomes the tyranny of one man who is clever enough and unscrupulous enough to use the majority as a ramp for his ascension to power. The Communist world dictatorship, whether it be Stalin or an individual or a secret group functioning in the background behind Stalin himself, today is moving in every country in the world through local figureheads, Trojan horses, Communist fronts of every kind, to seize world power for the Communist dictatorship. Every radical periodical and organization in America is bringing pressure to bear to curtail the right of unlimited debate in the United States Senate. They are raising a hue and cry about a minority in the Senate blocking the will of the majority. They set themselves up as the champions of democracy. In this regard it is interesting to note that all over the world, using their well-known techniques, they always refer to their own tyranny as democracy.

Mr. President, I say that the right of unlimited debate here has stood the test. I defy any supporter of this resolution or any Senator who advocates changing the Senate rule and invoking cloture, to point to one piece of worth-while legislation which the right of unlimited debate has defeated in this body. I deny the statement that the United States Senate cannot legislate, that the Senate cannot attend to its business, because of the right of unlimited debate. Under the present rules, the United States Senate has met every great test, and has legislated with expedition; and I submit that the rule has well served the cause of human liberty.

In 1925, when Vice President Dawes advocated a change in the Senate rules, many great Senators, both Democrats and Republicans, immediately made statements in opposition to his proposal. They showed the fallacy of the Dawes' argument, and pointed out that this country would be better off if the rules were not changed. I shall quote now from a letter to the New York Times written by Senator Key Pittman, United States Senator from the State of Nevada. The letter is dated May 13, 1925:

> The campaign of Vice President Dawes is exciting considerable interest in the West.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] may be permitted to place in the Appendix of the RECORD a proclamation issued by the Governor of his State; and that my right to the floor in no wise be jeopardized by yielding for that purpose; that the proposed insertion not count as one of my speeches on this resolution; and that my rights be in no wise affected by my yielding or by having the Senator from Connecticut place anything in the RECORD in this connection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard; the Senator from Mississippi will proceed.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I quote further from the letter by Senator Pittman:

> I have recently been requested to address several semicivic societies and public service clubs upon this subject. I hoped that the majority and minority leaders in the Senate would set forth the reasons for the attitude which I believe a majority of the United States Senate hold in opposition to the position taken by the Vice President.
>
> The subject is not only very interesting but, in my opinion, of vital importance to the proper functioning of the legislative branch of our Government.

Mr. President, I submit it is strange that all the statements and opinions of all the great leaders of this body seem to be ignored at this time. Evidently the present attitude of some persons is that in this case, history is worth nothing. Nevertheless all the great leaders of this body have shown the fallacy of having cloture here and the fallacy of such an amendment of the rules, and they have shown that unlimited debate is necessary. Men of vast experience are unanimously of that opinion; yet the cry goes forth that we must change the rules of the Senate so that the majority can function.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Louisiana for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Would it not seem entirely likely that once gag rule were installed here in the Senate, any time a majority were in a position to pass a certain measure, it would take advantage of the situation if it thought extended debate would defeat the measure—whether it were a bill or a resolution—and would force it to a vote before there was time for ample discussion and before the people of the country or perhaps the Senators themselves could learn all that was involved in the measure?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. President, I quote further from Senator Pittman's letter:

> Much may be said on both sides of the question. So far as I am aware, only one side has been presented to the public, and that by a very prominent and earnest advocate.

He was referring to Vice President Dawes.

> I believe I understand the feeling of impatience that actuates the Vice President.

> His life has been spent as an executive and largely in a position of command. There is no position of command in the legislative body.

I submit that that statement by Senator Pittman shows the necessity of unlimited debate in this body. There is no position of command in the United States Senate. Nobody may give orders here so long as we have unlimited debate. It has built the greatness of this body, and it has protected the country with all the varied interests of the different sections.

> Every legislator stands upon an equality with every other Member of this body. The States and districts of the United States, represented by Senators and Representatives, are as widely separated as the most divergent countries of Europe; and the conditions of life, commerce, and production are equally divergent. In the very nature of things, national legislation in a republic, therefore, must be accomplished through persuasion and compromise.

Mr. President, I submit, if in this country justice is to rule, legislation must be secured through persuasion and compromise, and should a time come when in a legislative body someone is in a position to command and give orders and to control the body, liberty itself will have been destroyed. Quoting further from Senator Pittman:

> Every beginner in national legislative life is a crusader.

Ah! How true that statement is. "Every beginner in national legislative life is a crusader."

On my entry—

Said Senator Pittman—

> into the Senate in 1913, I was classified as a fanatical crusader. For 3 years I fought for the same thing that Vice President Dawes now seeks to force upon the United States Senate. Experience, through long years of legislative practice, has forced me to the conclusion that I was in error.
>
> I am not in favor of unlimited debate in the United States Senate. Unlimited debate does not now exist in the United States Senate. At any time two-thirds of that body may limit debate on any question to the extent that a Senator may only speak once, and then for a period not to exceed 1 hour. This, in my opinion, is a reasonable limitation and is sufficient.

Senator Pittman said, therefore, the present cloture rule was a reasonable limitation and was sufficient. I submit it is sufficient. The business of the Senate is transacted quickly. Proponents of the resolution have failed, even though challenged repeatedly in the hearings to do so, to cite one single worth-while measure which has failed of enactment because of the right of unlimited debate. What is the necessity for the rule? What is the necessity for changing the rule, when there has been cited not one single worth-while bill which has ever been defeated by the right of unlimited debate under rule XXII?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator whether, on the contrary, almost inestimable good has not been worked by virtue of the rule, in that it has enabled all legislation to be scrutinized and analyzed here, and has prevented the passage of much legislation that would have worked great injury to the American people?

Mr. EASTLAND. The distinguished Senator from Georgia is certainly correct. It must be retained for another reason, as Senator Pittman says, namely, that in a legislative body no one should be in a position to demand and give orders. When we have that in the Senate of the United States, it will be found to have destroyed the Senate, just as Julius Ceasar destroyed the Roman Senate when he aspired to make himself dictator of imperial Rome.

> In the House of Representatives the cloture rule prevails.

I showed how it was applied in the British House of Commons in 1882 to crush the Irish. As a result of the tyranny there, thousands of people were driven from the country. Some of their children and grandchildren in this country today cry for gag rule in the Senate, the very thing that crushed their families in the old country.

Senator Pittman continued:

> In the House of Representatives the cloture rule prevails. The country has witnessed the result of such rule in the House. I expressly disclaim any desire or any intent to criticize that body. It is composed of 435 Members, while the Senate has only 96. It is possible that business could not be satisfactorily transacted in the House were it not for such cloture rule.
>
> Without regard to the necessity of the rule, it must be admitted that bills of great importance, containing thousands of different items, are passed within a few hours and without sufficient debate or consideration.

Think of that. We have bills here of great importance containing thousands of items, involving the expenditure of billions of dollars. For that reason it is necessary that we have the right to speak, to debate, and to reason at great length. No such bills have been defeated because of the right of unlimited debate in the Senate. But I submit the American people have been saved many billions of dollars during the life of the Republic because in the Senate the previous question could not be moved and such bills rushed through this body. I read further:

> It has been the extended and full debates in the Senate that advised the country with regard to vital legislation, and, through this information, molded public opinion.
>
> The Senate was founded as a part of our institutions—

As an American institution—

> For the protection of minorities, not alone minority parties, but minority populations and minority principles.

Ah, why, I ask those who love justice, who desire to protect the weak and the humble, give up that sacred tradition of the Senate, that great American institution, the right of unlimited debate? Every time that has happened in foreign legislative bodies it has resulted in crushing the minority groups in such countries.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. With reference to the House of Representatives, which we all greatly respect, is it not true, because of the necessities of the situation in the House, that the fundamental concept of the House is entirely different from the fundamental concept of the Senate?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; that is absolutely true. But I will say to the Senator from Alabama that, regardless of that, there was unlimited debate in the House of Commons for a thousand years, until in 1882 certain groups in England desired to crush Ireland. The Irish resisted through the right of unlimited debate. They were fighting to maintain their liberties and their homes. There were filibusters. Cloture was adopted. A rule to move the previous question was added, and as a result, Ireland was crushed; and, Mr. President, the treatment which the Irish received through the laws passed after that time is one of the blackest pages of Anglo-Saxon history.

I quote further from Senator Pittman:

> It has been the extended and full debates in the Senate that advised the country with regard to vital legislation, and, through this information, moulded public opinion.
>
> The Senate was founded as a part of our institutions for the protection of minorities, not alone minority parties, but minority populations and minority principles.

Mr. President, it is certainly necessary that in this country the principles and institutions of every section of the country must be protected.

> To establish a cloture such as they have in the House would nullify the very purpose of the United States Senate.

Get that, Mr. President. Senator Pittman said that the adoption of a cloture such as they have in the House—and that is what is being backed by the President of the United States, by many powerful Members of this body, by great organizations which have expended thousands of dollars on propaganda in this country—Senator Pittman said that such a thing would destroy the Senate of the United States. He says it "would nullify the very purpose of the United States Senate."

He said, further:

> It is true that legislation has been delayed by extensive debate, but when has such delay caused any serious harm to our Government?

I ask the question, Mr. President, as I asked the proponents of this resolution at the hearing, When has such delay caused serious harm to this Government? That question has not been answered on this floor. The proponents of the resolution have shown not one bill worth while to the protection or upbuilding of the Nation that has been defeated by the right of unlimited debate, and they have failed to show where unlimited debate has done any harm to the Government of the United States.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator a question. With respect to the Senator's able address

regarding minority groups, I wish to ask him this question: Does he believe that the Reorganization Act which was passed covers the ground for those who like such unconstitutional legislation as the Senator has suggested?

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator is exactly correct.

I continue reading from Senator Pittman's statement:

> Let those who contend for cloture point to particular instances, if they can, wherein the rules of the Senate have been destructive of the progress of our people.

Who can do that? Who can point to a single instance of the rules of the Senate having been destructive of the progress of the American people? I challenge any proponent, any supporter of the resolution, to point to one instance in which the rules of the Senate have delayed the progress of the American people. I defy them to point to one instance of the rules of the Senate having worked hardship on any segment of our population. That question was asked at the hearing, but the record is absolutely bare of an answer to it. Why, Mr. President, the necessity for this resolution?

Senator Pittman concludes:

> It is possible that our country suffers from too much legislation, rather than too little.

Mr. President, in that statement I fully concur.

I shall now read extracts from an article by Arthur Wallace Dunn, appearing in a great American magazine. The article is in reference to filibusters, and it appeared in the American Review of Reviews, the issue of December 1925. It gives the history of this matter and discusses the time when former Vice President Dawes made his assault upon the rules of the Senate. It is certainly gratifying to see how the great leaders in the political life of this Nation, without regard to party affiliations, come to the defense of the rules of the Senate, and show concretely how those rules have protected and preserved the liberties of the American people. Mr. President, the same reasons are valid today. That was before the time of pressure-group power in the United States. Let me read from this article, whose reasons in 1925 are certainly valid today:

> Filibustering is the weapon of minorities in the United States Senate to prevent the enactment of unwise and oftentimes vicious legislation.

This man was a student of the question. He says:

> Filibustering is the weapon of minorities in the United States Senate to prevent the enactment of unwise and oftentimes vicious legislation.

Mr. President, I state that, in my judgment, the right to filibuster is a wholesome right which has been of great benefit to the poor, the weak, and the oppressed in this country. Let me read further:

> Every successful filibuster has the support of public opinion and could not succeed without such endorsement. Filibustering in the Senate has been too infrequent for the public good.

Listen, Mr. President. It has been "too infrequent," says this authority, "for the public good."

> If a determined minority of sound and conservative Senators had more often exercised the privilege of unlimited debate to defeat measures sponsored by a majority, the country would be better off and there would have been less iniquitous and unenforceable legislation on the statute books. Majorities for bad legislation are often obtained by clamorous organizations and noisy propagandists.

Yes, Mr. President; that is correct. Majorities are often obtained in that way. The author is correct in saying that the right of unlimited debate frequently defeats vicious legislation which would tear this country apart.

> There are great and small filibusters. Those which achieve renown generally continue for days, and even months, while the lesser kind are those which defeat undesirable legislation by a simple threat. Hundreds of bills reach the calendar during a term of Congress; that is, they are reported from different committees and are ready for consideration by the Senate. Of these a large proportion never get farther than the calendar stage. Suggestion by a sponsor for a bill of doubtful character that it should receive consideration, causes an opposing Senator to remark, "That bill will lead to prolonged debate."

> The implied threat of a filibuster, for that is the meaning of the remark, is often sufficient to kill an objectionable bill. The sponsors of such questionable measures learn by inquiry among fellow-Members that their bills will be talked to death if brought forward and the proposals are therefore allowed to sleep quietly on the calendar.

> Real or important filibusters occur when a seeming majority is in favor of a bill. The word "seeming" is used advisedly—

With that statement I agree, Mr. President; the word "seeming" before "majority" is used advisedly—

> for it rarely happens that a genuine filibuster is conducted against a bill which is really favored by an actual majority of Senators.

In my judgment that statement is true and accurate, for it rarely does happen that a genuine filibuster is conducted against a bill which is really favored by an actual majority of the Senators.

> There may be a sufficient number of Members committed to a bill to pass it—Senators, who, for various reasons, feel compelled to vote for the bill if it reaches a vote—but among this majority there are a number who are secretly doing everything they can to prevent a vote. Such Senators may be actuated by a desire to avoid a party break with their President.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. I was just thinking why the word "compelled" was used there—that certain Senators were "compelled" to vote for a bill.

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not know what the motive is that compels any man to cast a vote. I would not impute any but the highest motives to any Member of the Senate.

Mr. MAYBANK. I did not mean that the Senator would do that.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator desire to ask a question? I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator previously spoke of minority groups.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course, they put on tremendous pressure.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. EASTLAND. For a question only.

Mr. KILGORE. Based upon the Senator's statement——

Mr. EASTLAND. Which statement?

Mr. KILGORE. The statement recently made; would the Senator be willing to accede to a majority vote of the Senate as to whether or not the Senate should consider the amendment to the rule?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I am sorry my distinguished colleague from West Virginia has not been present today. I cannot begin to recount at this time the reasons I have given against a majority vote on this motion. I have spoken for 5 hours and if the Senator will read my remarks in full I am sure he will find 1,000 reasons why the resolution should not be agreed to and why it is not only my privilege, but, as I consider it, my sworn duty under my oath to uphold my Government and my father's Government and my country to oppose it.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. KILGORE. That was not my question. My question was, Would the Senator agree to have a majority vote at the present time to pass on the motion to consider the new rule?

Mr. EASTLAND. Now, Mr. President, there is an example of gag rule. Actually, there is a Senator of the United States who would attempt to shut off debate to prevent an ambassador from another sovereign state, associated with him in the Government of the United States, from presenting his State's objections to a bill.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President——

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, there is an example——

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President——

Mr. EASTLAND. I have the floor, Mr. President. I refuse to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. EASTLAND. I refuse to yield. I have the floor.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I refuse to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Senator from Mississippi declines to yield for a point of order.

Mr. KILGORE. I can raise a point of order——

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I refuse to yield.

Mr. KILGORE. On the floor of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of the opinion that the Senator from West Virginia cannot take the Senator from Mississippi off the floor for that purpose. The Senator from Mississippi will proceed.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, to yield now for a vote on any motion would imply gag rule in this body. It would prevent me from presenting the case of my State and the case of my people in the only free forum in the world, and I say that an attempt to shut off debate now in line with the request——

Mr. KILGORE. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. For a question.

Mr. KILGORE. I was not implying, when I was asking the Senator——

Mr. EASTLAND. Wait a minute. I yielded for a question.

Mr. KILGORE. I was not implying——

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask the Presiding Officer to protect me in my rights. I yield for a question only.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi yielded to the Senator from West Virginia for a question.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I have a right——

Mr. EASTLAND. I decline to yield. I read further from this statement:

> Such Senators may be actuated by a desire to avoid a party break with the President, or they may be influenced by a sentiment that has been created in their States. A bill may be put forward as a party measure (most filibusters of note have been against measures of this kind), and every partisan is expected to stand by his party.

Then it proceeds to say, Mr. President, that the criticism of a filibuster which existed at that time has been removed at the present time. When there was a short session of Congress, when Congress convened in December and, under the Constitution——

Mr. President, let us have order.

Mr. RUSSELL. A point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators conversing in the back of the Senate Chamber will retire to the cloakroom. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the only reason against a filibuster with any semblance of validity was when there were short sessions of Congress, when Congress under the law had to adjourn by the 4th of March. At that time a determined minority could filibuster until the 4th of March and prevent the passage of legislation. The only reason, with any semblance of the validity to it, for changing the rule was that when we had the short sessions of Congress great opportunity was afforded to stifle legislation. Now, as the Presiding Officer knows, the Constitution has been changed. We have no more short sessions, and the very reason for changing the cloture rule died when the provision of the Constitution which established the short session of Congress was repealed.

I read further from the article:

> Filibusters never have defeated nor can they defeat a measure which the people want. In the very nature of things filibusters must fail when directed against bills which have been decreed as essential. The most notable instance bearing out this statement occurred in 1893, when a prolonged filibuster collapsed under pressure of public opinion; this was the filibuster against the bill to repeal the Silver Purchase Act, which provided that the Government should buy 4,500,000 ounces of the metal every month and coin 4,500,000 silver dollars. The addition of so much silver currency to the circulating medium of the country aroused the apprehension of the bankers, and through them all other businessmen. At the same time the country was suffering on account of a serious panic; Federal revenues fell far below expenditures; there were serious crop failures and a most deplorable condition. The bankers attributed the hard times to the silver purchases and the country seemed to accept that view.

> President Cleveland called Congress in extra session in August 1893 for the express purpose of repealing the Silver Purchase Act. All attention was focused upon the Senate when it became apparent that a filibuster had been organized to defeat the repeal. It soon developed that there was a determined majority in the Senate for the repealing bill. Under such conditions the minority was compelled to surrender. If they had persisted they would have forced a revolution and a change of the rules, which might at some future time prevent them from using the filibuster on a more vital occasion.

> In 1893 the filibustering minority was composed of western Republicans and southern Democrats.

Mr. President, I have heard much in the past few years about combinations of Republicans and southern Democrats which have exercised some influence in this body, and I find that it was in 1893 when that coalition was formed. It has continued down to the present time to resist the excesses in legislation which certain groups in the industrial East have sought to enact into law.

I continue to read:

> Silver was not important to the southerners, but Federal interference in their elections was most vital.

Mr. President, I wish right now that we had a strong silver question confronting the Senate.

> They could not afford to risk the possibility of Senate cloture—

> The article refers to the southerners—which might be used to put through another force bill, and so the threat of that forced them to abandon the filibuster, which speedily collapsed.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from South Carolina for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from South Carolina, the distinguished former mayor of the great city of Charleston, S. C., and a very distinguished former governor of that State.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, who has served here long, faithfully, and honorably, what happened to the force bill?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the force bill died a natural death, as some other proposals are now gasping their last.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a further question.

Mr. MAYBANK. Why did the force bill die?

Mr. EASTLAND. Through the right, the God-given right, of unlimited debate which we now have in this body.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Alabama for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator know of anyone who would today defend the force bill or say that that bill should have been put on the statute books?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, no one would defend the Force bill today or say that it should have been put on the statute books. I thank the Senator for his question. It raises a very telling point and shows the absolute importance of retaining the rule which has worked so well as a check upon the transient majorities of the moment and as a safeguard to the great fundamental liberties of our people.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the very authors of that bill themselves came to realize what a mistake it would have been to have jammed through that bill and put it on the statute books? Was that not admitted by them to be a fact?

Mr. EASTLAND. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Alabama. That again shows how well the rule has worked, how it has helped this country, how it has saved majorities from themselves.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. I ask the distinguished Senator from Mississippi if the author of the force bill, which was not passed because of the existence of the Senate rule, later changed his mind completely with respect to the right of freedom of speech and filibuster in the United States Senate?

Mr. EASTLAND. At first Senator Lodge said he thought debate should be limited in the Senate. Like many other great men who have been in the Senate, he, after long experience here, realized the importance of unlimited debate. I ask, Mr. President, why we should ruthlessly push aside the advice of all the great men who have sat in this body

throughout its history, who had experience as Senators for years, and who at first hand came to know how well the right of unlimited debate worked? Those who would change the rule would ruthlessly brush aside that great freedom and privilege as worth nothing.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. I ask the Senator if it is not true that the author of the force bill, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts, to whom the Senator has referred, said:

> The Senate, I believe, has never failed to act in any case of importance where a majority of the body really and generally desired to have action, and the full opportunity for deliberation and discussion characteristic of the Senate has prevented much rash legislation born of the passion of an election struggle and has perfected still more that which ultimately found its way to the statute books.

Are not those the very words of the author of the force bill, which was killed in this body, this very Senate of the United States, by free and unlimited debate?

Mr. EASTLAND. I thank the Senator. He has made a very valuable contribution by his question. It is true that Senator Lodge made that statement, and it shows further the importance of retaining the rule as it is.

We do not in reality have unlimited debate in the United States Senate now. A Senator on one legislative day, on any subject, can make only two speeches, and under that system, we have been debating here for several weeks. Only nine Senators have spoken against the resolution, yet from the very day the debate began the cry has gone up, "Cloture! Cloture! Cloture! Filibuster! Filibuster! Filibuster!" If those who have raised that cry could have inflicted cloture, the country would not have known what issues were involved.

Mr. President, I read further from this article——

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. HILL. Does not the Senator think that this debate has brought to the Senate and to its individual Members a better realization of the historic concept of the Senate and of the part the Senate was supposed to play in our system of government?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes. I will say to my friend from Alabama, who is one of the most distinguished Members of this body, and who before coming here was a very distinguished Member of the House of Representatives, that this debate has shown the American people the importance of the Senate. It has shown them the importance to them of their representatives being able to debate at length when their rights are involved. The distinguished Senator from Alabama, who served for a number of years in the House of Representatives, and certainly knows, by virtue of his service there, and the right to move the previous question there, how important it is, because of the House rules, that we retain the right to debate at length in the Senate.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true, with no disrespect for the House—in fact, with all appreciation of the House and the great part it plays in our Government—that with 435 Members of the House, when any measure is before that body perhaps 430 of them can speak only through the sufferance of the Member who is in charge of the bill, or perhaps the minority Member who is controlling the time for the minority side?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for another question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not also true that when the time comes for amendments to a bill, the amount of time a Member has a right to indulge in debate is at the most 5 minutes? He can have only 5 minutes of time on any amendment; is not that true?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Is it not also true that if the chairman of the committee sees fit to move the previous question, the House votes the previous question, as it does time after time, on nearly all bills? Then if a Member offers an amendment, he does not have one moment of time in which to explain the amendment.

Mr. EASTLAND. I agree with the distinguished Senator. My answer to his question is that he is correct. I mean no disrespect for the House. The House has a membership of 435. The only way it can function is under such rules; but because of that condition it is all the more vital that we have the right of unlimited debate here. I do not believe that any Member of the House would seriously state that the issues can be adequately presented in the time they have to debate a question; and because they cannot be adequately presented in the House, it is absolutely vital that we have the time here to present the issues.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. HILL. Under the rules of procedure of the House, may it not come to pass that all the Representatives from a particular State are denied any voice in the debate or discussion on a bill before that body?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes. That is true; and the viewpoint of the States cannot be presented.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. EASTLAND. Just a moment. That is a very important question, and I should like to comment on it. Under our system, in which we are ambassadors of sovereign States, it would be a monstrous thing for the two Senators from a State to be denied the right to present the viewpoint of the State on legislation. It is a sovereign State, and we here are clothed with the sovereignty of our States. To adopt a change in the rules of this body which would deny Senators the right to present the viewpoint of their States, and the objections of their States to legislation, would result in tyranny. It would result in oppression. It is fundamentally unjust and foreign to the American system of government.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. HILL. May it not well be that the only opportunity for the expression of the voice or views of a State is in this body, through the Senators from the State?

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course it is—that is, if Senators have the right of unlimited debate. But if cloture had been invoked in connection with the pending motion, as was attempted, more than half the States affected, and their Senators, would have been ruthlessly denied the opportunity to present the objections of their States to taking up the resolution. We have seen an illustration of that in the past day or two.

Under such a system, why talk about the United States being a country where justice dwells? Under such a system, the United States would not be a country where liberty dwells. Mr. President, if we should adopt such a rule, we would destroy our country.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MAYBANK. Did the Senator from Mississippi hear the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] speak yesterday?

Mr. EASTLAND. I did not.

Mr. MAYBANK. Did not the Senator hear the Senator from New Jersey speak about the southern Senators?

Mr. EASTLAND. No; I did not.

Mr. MAYBANK. When I asked the Senator from New Jersey why he mentioned southern Senators, the Senator from Michigan spoke——

Mr. EASTLAND. I did not hear that, Mr. President.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MAYBANK. What is the Senator's understanding of the cloture petition which was filed, when Senators from New England States, such as Connecticut, Rhode Island, and other States, signed the petition to cut off debate in the United States Senate? I wonder if the Senator could explain how a cloture petition——

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not remember the details of the cloture petition. I remember that it was signed and filed. The thing that was abhorrent to me about it, the thing that was unjust to me, was that it would prevent States from presenting in an orderly way their objections. I do not think that is sound. I do not think it is right, and I do not think it is just.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does the Senator realize that both Senators from Maine signed the petition?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; I remember that both Senators from Maine signed the petition.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does the Senator recall that one of the Senators from New Hampshire signed the petition?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; I remember that one Senator from New Hampshire signed it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does the Senator recall that both Senators from Massachusetts signed the petition?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; I remember that.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does the Senator realize that both Senators from Rhode Island signed the petition?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; I remember that.

Mr. MAYBANK. I ask the Senator if he can explain why——

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I yield for a question only.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished Senator from Mississippi to express his opinion as to why they signed it.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I do not know why they signed it, unless they wanted to shut off debate. But the point is——

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator from Mississippi answer this question: Why do most of the Senators who signed the cloture petition come from New England, not from the West or the Midwest?

Mr. EASTLAND. It is true that many of them do come from the New England States. Of course, they had a right to sign it; but what their motives or reasons were, I do not know. I can say this, however, that they are not going to get by with it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MAYBANK. The question I have to propound is this: Inasmuch as a former distinguished Senator from Massachusetts changed his mind regarding the rules of the Senate, how does the Senator from Mississippi explain the present attitude of the Senators from New England, as against the attitude of Henry Cabot Lodge, Sr.?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I do not know how to explain it. I think the Senator from Massachusetts should in his own time speak at length to the Senate and inform us why that has occurred. Certainly it is a matter which should be explained for the enlightenment of the Senate. But whatever his motives or reasons were, I am sure they were of the highest; I am sure he had a good reason for what he did.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, is the Senator speaking about me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi has the floor, and can yield only for a question, without losing the floor.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I refuse to yield except for a question.

Mr. LODGE. I have asked the Senator a question: Is he speaking about me?

Mr. EASTLAND. I was speaking about the Senator from Massachusetts; yes. I said, in answer to a question from the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], that I did not know what the Senator's reasons were for signing the cloture petition, but I judged that he had good reasons, and I judged that his motives were of the highest.

Mr. LODGE. I thank the Senator; he is entirely correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. One moment, Mr. President; I yield for a question only. I have to protect my rights to the floor.

I continue to read from the article on cloture and filibustering, appearing in the Review of Reviews:

> The southern Senators—

Says the article—

> were under terrific pressure. The country was suffering, and millions of men were out of employment. These Senators were standing out against a President of their party, and were being severely criticized by all the leading papers of the East and most of their home papers. Public opinion had decreed that the Silver Purchase Act should be repealed, and the well-organized filibuster against the repeal failed because of the force of public opinion in the United States.

Mr. President, there is one instance where a bill was killed by a filibuster in a short session, but was passed in the next Congress in a called extra session. The only reason for this rule ceased when short sessions of Congress were abolished. After all, the filibusters occurred during short sessions, which under the law had to expire by March 4. When the short-session provision was repealed, the danger of having filibusters prevent the passage of worth-while legislation was removed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that when there were short sessions of Congress, there was really very little time for the consideration of very much legislation except the important annual supply or appropriation bills?

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course.

Mr. HILL. Is it not also true that in those days Congress met on the first Monday in December, and then shortly thereafter the Christmas holidays came along, and following them Congress returned to its session about the 1st of January, and then had to end the session by the 4th of March?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. HILL. And is it not likewise true that most of that time was necessarily required for the passage of the annual supply or appropriation bills?

Mr. EASTLAND. What the Senator from Alabama says is exactly correct. There were filibusters then which prevented the passage of many bills, but we no longer have short sessions of Congress. The criticism against the rules occurred then. The mere fact that we have appropriation bills with hundreds or thousands of items, by which billions of dollars are appropriated, passed by the House of Representatives in an hour's time, when the leaders there know that the issues cannot be adequately presented, is clear proof that to shut off debate in the Senate would be a monstrous thing. How else can we inform ourselves about important matters? How else can the American people be informed as to the money we spend or what we do with their money, unless in the Senate there is the right of unlimited debate? I say in the presence of the guardian of the exchequer my distinguished friend the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] that this rule has saved the American taxpayers billions of dollars, in addition to preserving our Government itself.

But I read further:

> There is one instance where a bill was killed by a filibuster in the short session, and passed by the next Congress in a called extra session. In 1911 President Taft——

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the President of the United States can call the Congress into extra session whenever in his discretion or judgment he feels the Congress should be called into extra session?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Is it not also true that the history of our country is replete with instances when the President of the United States has called the Congress into extra session?

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly. The President can call the Congress into special session at any time. I say that if the cause is right and just, the power of public pressure will assure that a legislative proposal is enacted into law. We can trust the power of the people to see that right is done. We can trust the power of informed and mobilized public opinion in the United States.

What we oppose here is having gag rule applied, with the result that a bill will be rammed through the Senate before the people are really informed of its contents.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for another question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the Senator whether during the period in which cloture petitions for gag rule have been presented in the Senate—petitions which so many of the New England Senators have signed—the country has grown to the West and the Southwest and the far West?

Mr. EASTLAND. I agree that the country has grown to the Midwest, the Southwest, and the far West; and we have in those sections of the country large populations whose interests are just as much involved in the proposal here as are the interests of the people of the New England States.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask whether the Senator from Mississippi has any idea why so many New England Senators are so anxious to put gag rule upon the American people.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I do not know what are the reasons of the New England Senators in desiring to put gag rule on the American people. I know that at one time the right of unlimited debate in the Senate prevented several New England States from withdrawing from the Union, so in that case the right of unlimited debate saved the Union. That was at the time of the War of 1812.

Mr. President, it is interesting to note that in one generation, Senators from a certain section of the country are in favor of unlimited debate, but in a following generation the Senators from the same section sometimes advocate the ending of unlimited debate; yet when, in the next generation, the worm turns, and measures are proposed which would crucify the very States whose Senators have been advocating the abolition of unlimited debate, then those Senators immediately take a strong stand in opposition to a change which would permit gag rule. I say that situation shows the necessity for leaving the Senate's rules alone.

President Taft warned the filibusterers that he would call an extra session if the bill failed, and he carried out his threat. The result was that the bill was again passed by the House, and after a short time it passed the Senate. Canada refused to accept the reciprocity agreement, and it has never been revived.

DEFEATING THE FORCE BILL IN 1891

The most notable filibuster in half a century was against the force bill, so called because it proposed to use Federal force in elections in the South. It was brought forward in the Fifty-first Congress, coming up for final consideration in the Senate in the short session.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask the Senator, has he stated the date of the previous filibuster?

Mr. EASTLAND. In 1911 President Taft sent the Canadian reciprocity agreement to Congress to be enacted into law. The paragraph respecting the force bill, in 1891, continues:

The filibuster was led by Senator Arthur P. Gorman, of Maryland, and lasted for several weeks. While the filibuster was in progress an effort was made to change the rules of the Senate so as to bring the force bill to a vote; but the filibuster was turned on the new proposition with the same persistency, and after 6 days of fruitless effort it was abandoned. All the Democrats were against the force bill—

Get that, Mr. President—all the Democrats of that day were against the force bill, and all the Democrats of that day were against gag rule in the United Senate. The Democratic Party of that day was the party of liberty for the individual citizen, it was the party of freedom for the underdog. The article continues:

All the Democrats were against the force bill, and it was known that 8 or 10 Republicans disapproved but felt bound to vote for it if that stage was reached. Endurance tests in the way of all-night sessions were tried without result. Finally, the bill was set aside with the aid of eight Republican votes; and that was the last that was ever heard of it.

I submit such bills are killed by unlimited debate as a rule, and it is the last that is ever heard of them.

Mr. President, we can trust the American people. We can trust the power of public opinion to result in the right thing being done. What we oppose is not an educated, mobilized public opinion, but the proposal to change the rules which will permit gag rule in an attempt to cram through legislation before the American people are informed of the issues involved.

Mr. President, I have another speech. I understand a motion is to be made to recess. For that reason, I yield the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Before I move that the Senate stand in recess until Monday next, I desire to make a brief statement with respect to what we expect to do on Monday. I should like to advise Members of the Senate that during the day a number of Senators from both sides of the aisle have been in consultation with a view to attempting to reach some kind of amicable agreement satisfactory to the great majority of the Members of the Senate on the pending question.

It will be recalled that this morning the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] made inquiries of the minority leader, the able Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and the majority leader, with respect to obtaining some kind of agreement among the various controversial elements in the debate, in order that we might get along with the business on the calendar.

I may say, Mr. President, this afternoon the able Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who is chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and who has been working diligently upon the question, has been able to submit to various members certain proposals he believes might be agreed to by the Senate. The able Senator from Nebraska, the minority leader, who is also the ranking minority member of the Rules Committee, has also submitted a proposition which he believes has much merit. The two Senators, together with other Members of the Senate, have been working upon the matter in conjunction with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and other Senators opposed to taking up the resolution.

While I cannot say definitely that anything will be accomplished, yet we believe as a result of what has been done there is an opportunity to bring about a settlement of the issue between now and Monday. As a result of the very sincere, industrious attempt upon the part of many Members of the Senate to reach an amicable settlement of this very highly controversial question, it seems to me we should have an opportunity to work further over the week end, to see if that objective cannot be attained.

It is with that thought in mind that I am about ready to make the motion to recess. However, before I do that, I am sure my able friend, the Senator from Nebraska, desires to say a word. I yield to him.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I deeply appreciate the observations made by the majority leader. I commend him for the complimentary remarks he made about the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and all other members who have worked so industriously, not only on this particular occasion, but during the past 2 years, in an attempt to bring before the Senate an amendment to the cloture rule, Senate rule XXII, which would be acceptable to all the Members of the Senate.

I agree with the distinguished majority leader the result that might be obtained through work over the week end might not be acceptable to all the Members of the Senate; but, along with the plans that have been suggested and discussed, I am convinced the one particular plan that might be used has a basis upon which a final solution might be made.

It is for that reason that I feel the majority leader is justified in asking that the Senate take a rather early recess this evening, over Sunday, in the hope that this proposition, as a basis, might be used as a solution of the problem and may be acceptable to the Members of the Senate. For that reason, Mr. President, although I want to renew my statement with reference to keeping the Senate in session, beginning Monday, if we cannot bring about a solution, I am in hearty agreement with the statement that we ought to make the effort, and therefor, having in mind the prospect of a solution, I feel that the motion to take a recess is in order at this time.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I think there is a possibility, if we devote our minds to it, of arriving at an equitable solution of the problem, and I think it is entirely proper for the Senate to take a recess.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that the Senators associated with me in opposing the pending resolution are receptive to any reasonable compromise which will end this controversy and serve to protect the rights of Senators.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of

the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if there are no other Senators who desire to address the Senate, I now move that the Senate take a recess until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, March 14, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received March 12 (legislative day of February 21), 1949:

IN THE NAVY

The following-named midshipmen (aviation) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949:

John Abbott	Walter N. Haupt
Richard R. Allman	James R. Hoffman
Arthur H. Barle	John E. Huesgen
William H. Barry	Albert N. Into, Jr.
Frank C. Bonansinga	Don M. Isberner
Kenneth C. Bonine	Ralph A. Jenkins
Waldo L. Born	Jack E. Keller
Walter L. Brown	Francis J. Klinker
William L. Burgess, Jr.	Malcolm R. McCann
Edward J. Cosgriff, Jr.	Dwight A. Mahaffy
Robert E. Dobelstien	John E. Marshall
Orion J. Dussia	Ernest L. Masson, Jr.
George Dzamka	Victor E. Menefee, Jr.
Robert W. Fero, Jr.	William H. Mero
Bruce D. Fraites	James R. Messner
Bernard E. Goehring	Raleigh Miller, Jr.
William L. Hall	Charles P. Moore
Arthur D. Hamilton	Donald F. Munday
Kennard R. Hamilton	Leo A. Regan
Evan C. Harris	

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949:

John H. Carroll, Jr.	Robert A. Lewis
Charles W. Cates	Charles E. Swingle
Frederick W. Denton III	Harold R. Podorson
	William E. Rhoads

Thomas J. Moran (civilian college graduate) to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy (special duty officer).

Harvey L. Rittenhouse (civilian college graduate) to be a lieutenant in the Medical Corps of the Navy.

John H. Schulte (civilian college graduate) to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Medical Corps of the Navy.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949:

Junius C. Bell	James C. Protulis
Everette T. Brown, Jr.	John C. Walker III
Dominic V. Cefalu	John R. Waltrip
Thomas J. Ingram III	Anton L. Witte

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy):

Jonathan C. Brown, Jr.
Cornelius J. Griffin.

Howard B. Marble, Jr. (civilian college graduate), to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy.

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Patricia M. Clark	Shirley M. Riggan
Sophia H. Gormish	Esther M. Thomson
Florence R. Martin	Ethel J. Whitesell
Verna LaJ. Miller	Mildred L. Williams
Lillian A. Patsel	Marjorie R. Wilson
Marie A. Petrovitch	Marion E. Withers

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officer for appointment to the permanent grade of major general in the Marine Corps:

Field Harris

The following-named officer for appointment to the permanent grade of brigadier general in the Marine Corps:

Christian F. Schilt

The following-named officer for appointment to the temporary grade of brigadier general in the Marine Corps:

Clayton C. Jerome

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps:

James O. Appleyard	Jack F. McCollum
Paul E. Becker, Jr.	Martin E. W. Oelrich
Charles H. Cowles	Jonas M. Platt
Eugene A. Dueber, Jr.	Leon A. Ranch
William F. Frank	John T. Rooney
Joseph A. Gray	Nicholas A. Sisak
Walter Holomon	John W. Stevens II
Louis N. King	

The following-named officer for appointment to the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps Reserve:

John J. Capolino

The following-named officer for appointment to the permanent grade of captain in the Marine Corps:

Josef I. Reece

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Myrl E. Boys
Robert H. Porter, Jr.

The following-named citizens (civilian college graduates) for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

John R. Heppert, a citizen of Ohio.
John K. Stewart, a citizen of Kansas.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 14, 1949

(Legislative day of Monday, February 21, 1949)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor, Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou eternal God, we thank Thee for this new day. Grant that during all its hours we may be filled with a desire to serve our generation according to Thy holy will.

May the spirit of the Master fashion and permeate our character and conduct, our aspirations and hopes, our speech and actions, our attitudes and feelings toward one another and all mankind.

We pray that Thy servants may be guided in some special way by the eternal truth and righteousness of God as they formulate the policies and administer the affairs of government for our beloved country.

Help us to appropriate by faith the inexhaustible resources of divine wisdom which Thou hast placed at our disposal and may we meet our duties and responsibilities calmly and courageously.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORTS OF COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Department of Labor, and separately, in typescript, a memorandum on the Department by George W. Taylor, professor of labor relations, University of Pennsylvania, National War Labor Board (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on information services as a further addition to the supporting data which accompanied the Commission's report on general management of the executive branch, filed with the Congress on February 7, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a task force report on independent regulatory commissions (appendix N), as a supplement to the Commission's report on regulatory agencies as well as the Commission's report on Commerce (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Branch of the Government.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE—AMENDMENT

Mr. MUNDT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the resolution (S. Res. 15) amending the so-called cloture rule of the Senate, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	Malone
Anderson	Hickenlooper	Martin
Baldwin	Hill	Maybank
Brewster	Hoey	Miller
Bricker	Holland	Millikin
Bridges	Humphrey	Morse
Butler	Hunt	Mundt
Byrd	Ives	Murray
Cain	Jenner	Myers
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	O'Conor
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Cordon	Kem	Pepper
Donnell	Kerr	Reed
Douglas	Kilgore	Robertson
Downey	Knowland	Russell
Eastland	Langer	Saltonstall
Ecton	Lodge	Schoeppel
Ellender	Long	Smith, Maine
Ferguson	Lucas	Smith, N. J.
Flanders	McCarran	Sparkman
Frear	McCarthy	Stennis
George	McFarland	Taft
Gillette	McGrath	Taylor
Green	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Gurney	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Hayden	Magnuson	Thye

Tydings	Wherry	Withers
Vandenberg	Wiley	Young
Watkins	Williams	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is attending the funeral services of the son of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

AMENDMENT TO CLOTURE RULE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. LUCAS to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 15, amending the so-called cloture rule of the Senate.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Friday night, March 11, 1949, I placed in the RECORD a short statement in relation to the issue before the Senate. I had already talked to a number of Senators, among them being the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], cosponsor of the resolution the motion to take up which is pending before the Senate. I have talked with a number of Democrats, including the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. I personally stated that I would have no objection to fixing the percentage of Senators' votes that would close debate at the present two-thirds or three-fourths.

But Mr. President, I knew that this was but a part of the issue. Therefore, I suggested the ideas, which to everyone appeared absolutely new to them, and which I felt would do the job, to wit: That the resolution, once agreement was reached on the percentage, should contain the provision that the right to filibuster against any change in the rule relating to the percentage, assuming the resolution were adopted, should be retained.

This, as I stated, meant that if there should be an attempt at any time to change the amended rule 22 from two-thirds, or a greater percentage, to a greater or lesser number, cloture could never be invoked. Mr. President, I feel that it is important that we understand that basis.

Our problem is this: To maintain in our Government an appropriate check and balance and at the same time so to constitute the machinery of government that it can function efficiently as a world power. As I stated on Friday last in my statement:

> Changing conditions sometimes require new rules or new interpretations.

During the debate a number of instances have been cited to illustrate the truth of that statement. The Hoover Commission has clearly demonstrated that this conclusion applies not simply to Congress and it has made no recommendations with respect to Congress, but applies to all departments of the Government. It is a significant thing, Mr. President, that this Commission, on which are some of the best brains of our country, have recognized that the changing conditions require changing rules or new interpretations.

Modern inventions and ingenuity have not only made necessary this change, but an added reason is that as a world power, our activities are now far-flung throughout the globe. We have not only, on the one hand, a contracted globe due to our inventiveness and ingenuity, but for the first time, because of the exigencies of the new day, we have reached out and, everywhere on the globe we are in the picture. So we must have an efficient governmental mechanism not only in Congress, but, as stated by the Hoover Commission, in the administrative branch of the Government.

I repeat, the Hoover Commission has made it clear that all departments of Government are dragging their feet and not performing as they should. Therefore we in Congress must make sure we are on our toes, that we are not dragging our feet, that we have a mechanism which will do the job, whatever it is, and that, whatever emergency may arise, our work will be efficient.

Mr. President, if the suggestion I made on March 11 is adopted we will be able to carry through the business before us, and will not be accused of dragging our feet and, Mr. President—I wish to make this very clear—we will also protect the fundamental rights of the private citizens and the fundamental rights of the States.

Mr. President, on practically any measure that comes before this great body there is some misunderstanding at times. I am one of those who believe that the maintenance of checks and balances in Government is imperative, more so than ever in this period. I am not one of those who feel that we can get rid of checks and balances in Government. I want to make myself clear on that subject. I would not vote for the majority provision which has been suggested. I think it would be catastrophic. We shall need all the checks and balances that are fundamentally sound and correct, in the not too distant future, especially when we have to meet the impact of the administration's onward march toward socialism.

If the Senate of the United States had gone like the House in the recent national election, we would have bills in the hopper which would provide for the Government taking over insurance companies and banks. So, Mr. President, the maintenance of checks and balances in the Senate is imperative. It is important that we maintain them to stop the onward march that is in progress all over the world, which has taken over the European continent, and which would wipe out our American concepts which have been maintained by the checks and balances in government.

There is another reason why we should get along with our business. We shall soon have the North Atlantic Pact in our laps. Everyone else has talked about this pact. The newspapers have it. Apparently it has not been released, and yet it has been released. I feel that there should be a complete discussion of the pact, and that the people should be permitted to know the full implications thereof. This is the first time it has been proposed to violate in writing the ancient concepts of George Washington. I am not saying that we should not. Again I point out that we are living in a changed world with changed obligations, changed conditions.

But I am saying that the people of the country should be advised of the implication of the responsibilities and the liabilities. So I say that we had better get on with the big business before us. Let us maintain the checks and balances, and preserve the right in the Senate so that the President alone will not have the veto power, but we shall have the veto power in relation to acts of the President.

Approval of the pact would make it the fundamental law of the land. Mr. President, we do not break promises. The obligations of the pact, as indicated in the newspapers, are clear-cut and definite. We have become involved in two world wars without having any pact or agreement in relation to cooperation and collaboration with other nations. If we had had such an agreement, would the Kaiser have started? If we had had such an agreement would Hitler have started?

I repeat that the purpose of the pact is clear-cut. It says, in the ancient slogan of America, "Do not tread on me," and we add, "Or any of my associates. If you do, I will go to war." We went to war without having such pacts. Now we say to the world, "Do not start anything. You know what we will do."

So I suggest to our brethren who are seeking to find the way out of this legislative dilemma called a filibuster, that they consider the two suggestions, first, a two-thirds vote, and second, a three-fourths vote, and reach some agreement. Then I suggest that we write into the new rule the proviso that if at any time it is suggested that the percentage shall be changed that it shall be subject to filibuster. I believe that if that is done, in a few days we shall be under way. We shall give to the country a demonstration of efficiency, which we must have, and we shall have a mechanism which will work. If it works as it should, we shall wipe out the misunderstandings which are so prevalent, misunderstandings due not simply to ignorance, but due to propaganda which vicious people are sending through the country, the purpose of which is to do away with the legislative branch of government.

Mr. ELLENDER obtained the floor.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an insertion in the RECORD?

Mr. ELLENDER. I decline to yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President——

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question only.

Mr. DONNELL. I should like to ask the Senator if he has any objection to my asking leave to be excused from the Senate for a certain period?

Mr. ELLENDER. I have. I would lose the floor if I did so.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may not lose the floor——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator cannot yield for that purpose.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry——

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I decline to yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Chair rule——

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I decline to yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator cannot yield for anything but a question.

Mr. DONNELL. That was not my parliamentary inquiry. The parliamentary inquiry is——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator cannot yield for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DONNELL. Will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry if he does not lose his place on the floor?

Mr. ELLENDER. I cannot do that. As I understand the rule, if I did that I would lose the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator cannot yield for anything but a question.

Mr. DONNELL. I am asking unanimous consent that he may do so without losing the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is not a question within the rule.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I demand the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana declines to yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this debate involves a single issue: Will free speech continue as the outstanding characteristic of the United States Senate, or will it give way to gag rule? Will the Senate remain a place of last refuge to protect the rights of a free people, or will it become a mere rubber stamp for any political group in power, the majority for the moment?

For 143 years—since 1806—free debate in the Senate has served as a beacon light against tyranny. During that period our country has withstood six wars, including that supreme test of any government's sovereignty—a civil war. We have come through the strain and tension that accompany economic depressions, quick growth in population and area, and changes in political administrations.

Other governments have crumbled under these pressures. Ours remains free and strong. I believe that much credit for that condition results from the Senate's right of unlimited debate. It has operated as a most important element in the system of checks and balances that the authors of our Constitution so wisely provided.

In passing, let me say that I was glad to note the position taken a few moments ago by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] on that subject.

It is no mere accident that our Constitutional Government has endured through these years. There have been in the past, and there will be in the future, ambitious men who would compromise the rights and freedoms of Americans. They would readily exploit a legislative majority to run roughshod over the rights of some of our people. But always their attempts are frustrated in the Senate, where the voices of minorities can be heard.

Despite the high-sounding utterances we hear every day in the Senate about democratic procedure and majority will and efficiency of the Senate, I don't believe that anyone can honestly escape the conviction that this movement to change the Senate rules is dictated solely by the agitation of pressure groups to throw a political sop to certain minorities, particularly the Negro. There can be no other consideration, despite all the arguments advanced. It may be charged that the Senate is inefficient, but no Senator can seriously contend that the legislative process has broken down or is even near the breaking point. Senators may inject the issue of national danger, but there is no rational ground for their statements. We have only recently emerged from the most cruel war in history, and this body functioned efficiently throughout that period without surrendering its cherished heritage of freedom of speech. I repeat, Mr. President, there can be no consideration other than politics behind the demands for curtailing debate. This rules change is desired only as a means toward the passage of certain legislation, the President's civil-rights program. During this debate, our majority leader stated that to be the purpose in no uncertain terms. The laws are demanded by certain minorities as their price for political support. The advocates of these proposals would, in my judgment, destroy our most powerful protection against despotism; they would destroy our last citadel of freedom of speech.

It occurs to me, Mr. President, that this consuming desire, on the part of the leadership in both of our great political parties, for the political support of minority groups, has caused many men to lose perspective. I simply cannot understand it. During the 12 years I have been a Member of this body, I have developed a tremendous admiration for many Senators who have always been found in the front line of battle to preserve constitutional Government. I have watched them fight skillfully. I have heard them argue with appeal and effect that the trend toward centralized government must be checked. I have heard them say with force and conviction that executive power must not be allowed to assume a position of predominance. I have heard them warn that bureaucratic tyranny is about to absorb the rights of the individual. At the moment, the Senate has before it a proposal that is so dangerous to constitutional government and so capable of untold evil, that I should expect the instant opposition of these champions of freedom. I should think that these men would stand up again and, pointing to the danger, would give the Senate the benefit of their advice. Surely, they are not blind to the dangers lurking ahead, should they permit cloture to be imposed by a simple majority, as is now being advocated by none other than the President of the United States.

Mr. President, when the first Senate organized in 1789, it adopted, among others, the previous question rule. The rule remained in effect until 1806, when the rules were revised and the previous question rule was omitted. During the 17 years from 1789 to 1806, the previous question was moved only four times, and was invoked only three times. Like several other rules copied from other parliamentary systems, it was found unnecessary or obnoxious. The Senate soon rid itself of it.

From 1806 to 1917, the Senate operated entirely without a cloture rule, except for a brief interval during the Civil War when debate was limited to 5 minutes when the Senate was in secret session considering matters pertinent to the war.

It is interesting and significant that from 1806 until 1917, there were many attempts to impose a permanent cloture rule in the Senate, but they were always voted down.

In 1917, as the United States approached entry into World War I, a cloture rule was adopted as an amendment to rule XXII, and it is still a part of the Senate rules.

I do not think it can be effectively argued that adoption of this rule in 1917 was anything but an emergency, wartime measure. Only three Senators voted against its adoption. Does it stand to reason that for more than a hundred years the Senate, time and time again, rejected cloture proposals, and then, suddenly, in 1917, only three Senators opposed cloture? Very plainly it was a wartime measure, and should be so considered.

Mr. President, the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress recently issued a very interesting thesis, entitled "Limitation of Debate in the United States Senate." This document traces the history of debate in the Senate, presents a discussion of Senate rules, and gives a summary of arguments for and against the practice of filibustering.

One portion of the document has undoubtedly created a false impression. It purports to show a list of 37 measures defeated by filibuster; but as the Senator from Arizona and others have pointed out, this is an error. Only four proposals have thus far been defeated by filibuster. One of these was the obnoxious Force bill of 1890–91, and the other three are the so-called civil rights measures, which I contend are directed at the South, and are resented by the South. The remaining 33 bills listed as defeated by filibusters, although possibly delayed, were ultimately enacted into law.

This document includes some 14 arguments against filibustering. Perhaps the Senators supporting the pending rules change have not endorsed all these arguments. Nevertheless, they are commonly heard, and they have been placed in the RECORD. I want to discuss a few of them and attempt to reveal their false foundations and the fallacious reasoning that dictates them.

Here are two of the arguments; I quote:

Under the practice of filibustering, the basic American principle of majority rule is set at naught. Not only is the majority thwarted in its purpose to enact public measures, it is also coerced into acceptance of measures for which it has no desire or approval.

Filibusters are undemocratic, in that they permit one-third of the Senators present, plus one, to obstruct the majority. This group of Senators may be from only one section of the country, they may be from only one political party, and none of them may have been recently elected. It is a dubious argument to defend the filibuster on the ground that it protects the minority when actually its principal use, actual or potential, is to deny fundamental democratic rights to certain minorities. Most of the really undemocratic conditions in our country today exist because of the threat or use of the filibuster.

In connection with the pending resolution, we hear frequent mention of the term "will of the majority." We hear it argued, as set forth above, that the right of unlimited debate in the Senate thwarts or defeats the will of the majority and sets at nought the so-called principle of majority rule.

If there is a single lesson that should be taught us by a study of American history and by an inspection of the expressions of the men who framed our Constitution, it is, that complete majority rule, in its strict, literal meaning, has never been followed in the United States. The framers of the Constitution never intended it should be practiced. They clearly contemplated a limited majority rule. They devised elaborate controls and restraints designed to prevent the majority of the moment from altering the fundamental structure of the Government. They realized that human beings often act hastily and passionately, and they sensed that the time would come when a majority might seek to impair the freedoms for which they had fought. So they devised an elaborate system of curbs. The right of unlimited, unrestrained debate in the Senate is one of those curbs, and one of the most vital.

The filibuster is labeled an undemocratic practice. It is alleged that it thwarts the will of the majority. If that be true, then it can be argued that the entire Constitution under which we govern ourselves is undemocratic, because there are many devices contained therein which serve the sole purpose of thwarting or defeating the will of the majority. I shall discuss them in a moment.

What is the standard for measurement of the majority's will? How can we accurately determine the sentiments of the majority of the American people? As James Bryce wrote in his book the American Commonwealth, "the obvious weakness of government by opinion is the difficulty of ascertaining it." Senators sponsoring the change in rules say the majority will is being defeated. I wish they would tell us how they know a majority of our people favor one measure or another.

Do Senators determine the majority's will from the volume and content of their mail? That seems unlikely in this day, dominated by highly organized and well-financed pressure groups. Do Senators feel that a majority of the Senate is always an accurate reflection of the majority sentiment? Such a conclusion is patently wrong and unjustified. A majority of the Senate is merely a majority of States, which may or may not include a majority of the American people.

A combination of one-third of the 48 States contains two-thirds of the Nation's population. The remaining two-thirds of the States contain only one-third of the population. A combination of one-fifth of the States—nine States—contains one-half of the total population of the United States.

First. One-fifth of the States—nine States—contain approximately one-half of the population of the United States—1940 census:

New York	13,479,142
Pennsylvania	9,900,180
Illinois	7,897,241
Ohio	6,907,612
California	6,907,387
Texas	6,414,824
Michigan	5,256,106
Massachusetts	4,316,721
New Jersey	4,160,165
Total for 9 States	65,239,378
Total population United States (1940 census)	131,669,275
One-half of population	65,834,638

Second. One-third of the States—16 States—contain approximately two-thirds of the population of the United States—1940 census:

Total for 9 States as listed above	65,239,378
Missouri	3,784,664
North Carolina	3,571,623
Indiana	3,427,796
Wisconsin	3,137,587
Georgia	3,123,723
Tennessee	2,915,841
Kentucky	2,845,627
Total for 16 States	88,046,239
Total population United States (1940 census)	131,669,275
Two-thirds of population	87,779,516

The remaining States would account for the other one-third.

Perhaps some Senators feel that since the House of Representatives is constituted on a proportionate population basis, a majority vote on a measure in that body indicates that a majority of the American people favor a measure. Indeed, if the rules of the Senate are changed to abolish unlimited debate, I believe the Senate will eventually deteriorate until its only function will be to ratify House action. It will probably occupy the same status in our Government as the House of Lords now occupies in the British Parliament.

But let us examine further into the so-called principle of majority rule. Some say when Senators use their right of unlimited debate to prevent or delay legislative action they are guilty of defeating the will of the majority. Let us consider instances wherein the will of the majority is restrained or defeated, not by filibuster or other dilatory tactics, but by the constitutional functioning of our Government.

The House of Representatives can pass a bill by a large majority, a margin that may be so great as to indicate overwhelming popular approval by the American people, if House sentiment is to be judged a measure of the people's sentiment. The bill comes to the Senate, and after full inquiry by committee and after full debate, the Senate votes and rejects the bill. In rejecting such a bill, has not the Senate thwarted the will of the majority as reflected by the House vote? Is the Senate's right to disapprove wrong? Is it undemocratic? Is it a thoroughly democratic procedure for a majority of the Senate, representing possibly a minority of our people, thus to set at naught the so-called principle of majority rule? It happens at every session of Congress. What should we do about it? Amend the Constitution so that either house of Congress would be prohibited from rejecting action of the other?

In 1946 the Congress passed an act, by a preponderant majority in each House, quitclaiming all Federals rights to possession of our tidelands and recognizing full ownership thereof in the several sovereign States. I do not think any Senator will deny that the passage of this act met the approval of a majority of our people, as reflected by their elected representatives in Congress. But what happened? The President vetoed the bill. He exercised his constitutional right arbitrarily to obstruct the people's will. It is legal; it is constitutional. The veto power has been used since Washington's time as a check of majority rule. It has been used by 25 Presidents. All the President of the United States has to do under the Constitution is to state his objections to the legislation. His objections may be a well-reasoned argument that the bill is unconstitutional, or that it is not beneficial to the Nation, or his objection may be that he does not like the color of the paper on which the bill is printed. In the case of a pocket veto, he does not have to state any objections at all. Unless both Houses can muster a two-thirds majority to override the President, his objections are sustained. And in the case of a pocket veto, the Congress has to wait until a new session convenes in order to take corrective action. Is it undemocratic for one man, the President of the United States, with or without valid objection, to defeat the will of a clear majority of the Congress? Do Senators want to amend the Constitution and do away with this offending provision?

Consider another example, legal and constitutional, whereby the majority's will is obstructed by a minority: During the first session of the Eightieth Congress, a tax-reduction measure was passed. It was known as H. R. 1. The House passed it on March 27, 1947, by an exact two-thirds majority, 273 voting for the bill and 137 voting against it. It came over to the Senate, where it was passed on May 28. Voting for the bill were 52 Senators, more than 60 percent of those Senators voting. Would it not appear that such majorities in both Houses indicated that most Americans wanted the law? We all remember what happened. The President vetoed the bill on July 18, returning it to the House with a statement of his objections.

Within minutes after hearing the President's veto message, the House of Representatives voted to override the President. The vote was 299 to 108. Two hundred and ninety-nine House Members—73 percent of those voting—reaffirmed the sentiment of the majority.

When the Senate voted on the matter, 57 Senators voted to override and 36 Senators voted to sustain the President. The Senate, by a 61-percent margin, again announced that its majority favored enactment of the bill. But the Constitution requires a two-thirds majority in each House to override a Presidential veto, and the bill did not become law. This instance presents a clear-cut case: Approximately one-third, 39 percent of the Senate, very definitely frustrated and obstructed the will of 61 percent of the Senate and 73 percent of the House of Representatives. Let us examine the Senate vote on that matter and figure the population aspect. Both Senators from each of 19 States voted to override. They represented a total population of approximately 50,000,000. Both Senators from each of nine States voted to sustain. They represented a total population of approximately 15,000,000. Senators from 20 States split their vote, one voting to sustain and the other voting to override. These States contain approximately 60,000,000 persons. I do not argue this as an accurate estimate, but to be fair, let us assume that each Senator represented half his constituency. Let us suppose that 30,000,000 favored overriding the veto and the other 30,000,000 favored sustaining the President. Thus, we see that some 30,000,000 Americans, just about two-thirds, wanted to override and some 45,000,000 wanted to sustain. Is it not apparent that one-third of the people, with the help of the President and a few Senators, obstructed the will of the other two-thirds?

I do not hear any oratory condemning this undemocratic feature of our Government. I do not recall reading any books condemning this procedure. I do not know of any pressure groups fighting for its removal. It is reasonable to assume, however, that if Presidents should ever exercise their power to veto measures in which pressure groups are interested, the chances are that a clamor for a change would soon be resounding in our legislative halls.

Here is another example: The Congress may pass a bill, possibly without a dissenting vote in either House. The President approves it and it becomes the law of the land, yet a nine-member Supreme Court can nullify it. If the Court divides and renders a 5–4 decision, it might be said that one member of the Court defeated the will of the majority of the American people. There are some who deny that the Court has power of judicial review of congressional acts. They say such provision is not in the Constitution; they are correct. The power of judicial review is not explicitly provided in the Constitution, but it is clearly implied, and time and custom have established that power in the Supreme Court so firmly that it would take a constitutional amendment to remove it. The Supreme Court often defeats the will of the majority. Should we deny the Supreme Court that right?

These are merely a few examples of what the framers of the Constitution had in mind—evidence that they feared majority rule and deliberately wrote into the Constitution elaborate devices by which the dangers of complete majority rule could be eliminated.

Consider how difficult it is to amend the Constitution. Many steps are involved and considerable time is required. If our founding fathers had intended this country to be governed by simple majority rule, it occurs to me that they would have framed the Constitution to allow its change whenever sentiment among a majority of the people called for a change. By the same token, it seems to me that those people who want to change the fundamental character of our Government should first seek to change the Constitution itself by removing all these devices which defeat the majority's will.

To amend the Constitution, it is necessary for both the House and Senate to pass a resolution placing the proposal before the several States. The resolution must pass each House by a two-thirds majority—not a simple majority, but a two-thirds majority. Then the proposal is submitted to the several States. Three-fourths of the States—not a majority and not two-thirds—but three-fourths of the States must ratify the proposed amendment before it can be effective. Each State is free to ratify the amendment or to reject the amendment or to take no action whatsoever. There is no way for the Congress to impose cloture on the State legislatures. The Congress cannot command the State legislatures to vote on the proposition after 96 hours of debate or at 2 o'clock next Tuesday. States can act or they can fail to act. The Louisiana House of Representatives can ratify the amendment without a dissenting vote, the Louisiana Senate can reject it by one vote, and Louisiana's ratification is withheld. If the Louisiana Legislature desires, it can pigeonhole the proposition for 10, 15, 30, or 50 years before considering it, unless a time limit is provided in the proposal. This is a clear example of dilatory tactics. But it is legal; it is constitutional. Shall we change it?

This elaborate system of checks and balances did not just happen. Those safeguards were placed in our Constitution deliberately. They result from a deeply ingrained fear on the part of our founding fathers—fear that a strong executive, exploiting a simple but determined majority of Representatives and Senators, would override the guaranties of freedom unless checked.

Mr. President, as I read the debates that took place at the Federal Convention of 1787, it seems perfectly clear that the men who wrote our Constitution intended the Senate of the United States to be a place where majorities could be sometimes resisted, and not as a place where majorities were always to be accommodated.

At this point I want to read to the Senate a few paragraphs from that debate. I quote only from the remarks of James Madison and Edmund Randolph, but I believe that the fears and opinions they expressed were an accurate reflection of the general temper of the Convention. I quote from Debates in the Federal Convention of 1787 as Reported by James Madison, House Document No. 398, Sixty-ninth Congress, first session:

James Madison, page 169: "The use of the Senate is to consist in its proceeding with more coolness, with more system, and with more wisdom, than the popular branch."

James Madison, pages 162 and 163: "All civilized societies would be divided into different sects, factions, and interests, as they happened to consist of rich and poor, debtors and creditors, the landed, the manufacturing, the commercial interests, the inhabitants of this district or that district, the followers of this political leader or that political leader, the disciples of this religious sect or that religious sect. In all cases where a majority are united by a common interest or passion, the rights of the minority are in danger. What motives are to restrain them? A prudent regard to the maxim that honesty is the best policy is found by experience to be as little regarded by bodies of men as by individuals. Respect for character is always diminished in proportion to the number among whom the blame or praise is to be divided. Conscience, the only remaining tie, is known to be inadequate in individuals: In large numbers, little is to be expected from it. Besides, religion itself may become a motive to persecution and oppression. These observations are verified by the histories of every country, ancient and modern. In Greece and Rome the rich and poor, the creditors and debtors, as well as the patricians and plebeians alternately oppressed each other with equal unmercifulness. What a source of oppression was the relation between the parent cities of Rome, Athens, and Carthage, and their respective provinces: the former possession the power, and the latter being sufficiently distinguished to be separate objects of it? Why was America so justly apprehensive of parliamentary injustice? Because Great Britain had a separate interest, real or supposed, and if her authority had been admitted, could have pursued that interest at our expense. (We have seen the mere distinction of color made in the most enlightened period of time, a ground of the most oppressive dominion ever exercised by man over man.)"

This is still Mr. Madison speaking:

What has been the source of those unjust laws complained of among ourselves? Has it not been the real or supposed interest of the major number? Debtors have defrauded their creditors. The landed interest has borne hard on the mercantile interest. The holders of one species of property have thrown a disproportion of taxes on the holders of another species. The lesson we are to draw from the whole is that where a majority are united by a common sentiment, and have an opportunity, the rights of the minor party become insecure. In a republican government the majority, if united, have always an opportunity. The only remedy is to enlarge the sphere, and thereby divide the community into so great a number of interests and parties, that in the first place a majority will not be likely at the same moment to have a common interest separate from that of the whole or of the minority; and in the second place, that in case they should have such an interest, they may not be apt to unite in the pursuit of it. It was incumbent on us then to try this remedy, and with that view to frame a republican system on such a scale and in such a form as will control all the evils which have been experienced.

Now from page 196 I again quote Mr. Madison:

Mr. Madison considered 7 years as a term by no means too long. What we wished was

to give to the Government that stability which was everywhere called for, and which the enemies of the republican form alleged to be inconsistent with its nature. He was not afraid of giving too much stability by the term of 7 years. His fear was that the popular branch would still be too great an overmatch for it. * * * It was to be much lamented that we had so little direct experience to guide us. The constitution of Maryland was the only one that bore any analogy to this part of the plan. In no instance had the senate of Maryland created just suspicions of danger from it. In some instances perhaps it may have erred by yielding to the house of delegates. In every instance of their opposition to the measures of the house of delegates they had had with them the suffrages of the most enlightened and impartial people of the other States as well as of their own. In the States where the senates were chosen in the same manner as the other branches of the legislature, and held their seats for 4 years, the institution was found to be no check whatever against the instabilities of the other branches. He conceived it to be of great importance that a stable and firm government organized in the republican form should be held out to the people. If this be not done, and the people be left to judge of this species of government by the operations of the defective systems under which they now live, it is much to be feared the time is not distant when, in universal disgust, they will renounce the blessing which they have purchased at so dear a rate, and be ready for any change that may be proposed to them.

Those words, Mr. President, are not mine; they are the words of James Madison. I quote further from Mr. Madison, at page 279:

In order to judge of the form to be given to this institution (Senate), it will be proper to take a view of the ends to be served by it. These were first to protect the people against their rules; secondly, to protect the people against the transient impressions into which they themselves might be led. A people deliberating in a temperate moment, and with the experience of other nations before them, on the plan of government most likely to secure their happiness, would be first aware that those charged with the public happiness might betray their trust. An obvious precaution against this danger would be to divide the trust between bodies of men, who might watch and check each other. * * * It would next occur to such a people that they themselves were liable to temporary errors, through want of information as to their true interest, and that men chosen for a short term and employed but a small portion of that in public affairs, might err from the same cause. This reflection would naturally suggest that the government be so constituted, as that one of its branches might have an opportunity of acquiring a competent knowledge of the public interests. Another reflection equally becoming a people on such an occasion would be that they themselves, as well as a numerous body of Representatives, were liable to err also, from fickleness and passion. A necessary fence against this danger would be to select a portion of enlightened citizens, whose limited number and firmness might seasonably interpose against impetuous councils. It ought finally to occur to a people deliberating on a government for themselves that as different interests necessarily result from the liberty meant to be secured, the major interest might under sudden impulses be tempted to commit injustice on the minority. * * * How is this danger (of changing interests) to be guarded against on republican principles? How is the danger in all cases of interested coalitions to oppress the minority to be guarded against? Among other means by the establishment of a body in the government sufficiently respectable for its wisdom and virtue, to aid on such emergences, the preponderance of justice by throwing its weight into that scale. Such being the objects of the second branch in the proposed government he thought a considerable duration ought to be given to it.

That was Madison speaking, Mr. President.

I now shall quote a few passages from Edmund Randolph, of Virginia, as they appear on page 128 of the book to which I have just referred:

Mr. Randolph observed that he had * * * stated his ideas as far as the nature of general propositions required; that details made no part of the plan, and could not perhaps with propriety have been introduced. If he was to give an opinion as to the number of the second branch, he should say that it ought to be much smaller than that of the first; so small as to be exempt from the passionate proceedings to which numerous assemblies are liable. He observed that the general object was to provide a cure for the evils under which the United States labored; that in tracing these evils to their origin every man had found it in the turbulence and follies of democracy; that some check therefore was to be sought against this tendency of our governments; and that a good Senate seemed most likely to answer the purpose.

Mr. Randolph, page 196: "The democratic licentiousness of the State legislatures proved the necessity of a firm Senate. The object of this second branch is to control the democratic branch of the National Legislature. If it be not a firm body, the other branch being more numerous, and coming immediately from the people, will overwhelm it. The Senate of Maryland constituted on like principles had been scarcely able to stem the popular torrent. No mischief can be apprehended, as the concurrence of the other branch, and in some measure, of the Executive, will in all cases be necessary. A firmness and independence may be the more necessary also in this branch, as it ought to guard the Constitution against encroachments of the Executive who will be apt to form combinations with the demagogs of the popular branch."

Mr. President, I believe that unlimited debate in the Senate is an integral part of this system of checks and balances. I believe that the great and wise men who planned our Constitution intended that the Senate should be a forum where such a check should operate. Just as the power of the Supreme Court is implied as a part of the system of checks and balances, I believe they foresaw and intended that unlimited debate in the Senate should be a part of the system.

I deny that one or even several Senators can obstruct the legislative process, as some advocates of rules change say. I contend that free debate in the Senate has not been abused to an extent where our country has suffered or its interests jeopardized.

I believe that whenever 20 or more Senators from a dozen or more sovereign States are so unanimous in their belief that a measure is unconstitutional, impractical, and greatly injurious to the interests of their constituents, it is in order for the Senate to proceed carefully. Under such circumstances, they are not only justified under the Constitution, but they are duty bound to use every legal means at their command, specifically including the right of unlimited debate, to present their case to the American people.

I deem it highly unwise to attempt to force a law through Congress that would not have a chance of approval by the American people if it were submitted to them for decision. If it were possible to submit to the people of this country, as the sole issue, the President's civil-rights program, I know it would be snowed under.

Another argument that appears in the pamphlet prepared by legislative reference reads:

The constitutional provision that the yeas and nays of the Members of either House on any question shall, at the desire of one-fifth of those present, be entered on the Journal requires an immediate vote when the yeas and nays have been properly demanded.

This is a gross and deliberate misinterpretation of article I, section 5, clause 3 of the Constitution, which states:

Each House shall keep a Journal of its proceedings, and from time to time publish the same, excepting such parts as may in their judgment require secrecy; and the yeas and nays of the Members of either House on any question shall, at the desire of one-fifth of those present, be entered on the Journal.

The entire paragraph deals with the Journal—its keeping, publications, and form. The phrase "yeas and nays * * * shall * * * be entered on the Journal" has to do only with the recording and publication of the yeas and nays. It means only what it says—that whenever a vote is to be taken, one-fifth of Senators present can call for a record vote as distinguished from a voice vote. It does not mean, and cannot intelligently be stretched to mean, that one-fifth of Senators present can shut off debate and require a vote to be taken.

If any further clarification is needed, it is readily furnished in unmistakable form by the actual words of the men who framed the Constitution. The record is very plain that when they wrote this section, they had in mind only the clerical procedure of recording a vote.

On Friday, August 10, 1787, the Constitutional Convention considered this particular section for debate. At that stage of the proceedings, this language was section 7 of article VI, reading as follows:

The House of Representatives, and the Senate, when it shall be acting in a legislative capacity, shall keep a Journal of their proceedings, and shall, from time to time, publish them; and the yeas and nays of the Members of each House, on any question, shall at the desire of one-fifth part of the Members present, be entered on the Journal.

I quote now from Madison's journal:

Article VI, section 7, was then taken up.

Mr. Gouverneur Morris urged that if the yeas and nays were proper at all, any individual ought to be authorized to call for them; and moved an amendment to that effect. The small States may otherwise be under a disadvantage, and find it difficult to get a concurrence of one-fifth.

Mr. Randolph seconded ye motion.

Mr. Sherman had rather strike out the yeas and nays altogether. They never have done any good, and have done much mischief. They are not proper as the reasons governing the voter never appear along with them.

Mr. Elseworth was of the same opinion.

Colonel Mason liked the section as it stood. It was a middle way between the two extremes.

Mr. Ghorum was opposed to the motion for allowing a single member to call the yeas and nays, and recited the abuses of it in Massachusetts in stuffing the journals with them on frivolous occasions (and) misleading the people who never know the reasons determining the votes.

The motion for allowing a single member to call the yeas and nays was disagreed to (unanimously).

Mr. Carroll and Mr. Randolph moved * * * to strike out the words "each House" and to insert the words "the House of Representatives" * * * and to add to the section the words "and any Member of the Senate shall be at liberty to enter his dissent."

Mr. Gouverneur Morris and Mr. Wilson observed that if the minority were to have a right to enter their votes and reasons, the other side would have a right to complain, if it were not extended to them: and to allow it to both, would fill the Journals, like the records of a court, with replications, rejoinders, etc.

The Convention voted down Mr. Carroll's motion. Without any further debate on that part of the section, the Convention adopted it by unanimous vote on the following day, August 11, 1787. (P. 518 et seq., Debates in the Federal Convention of 1787 as Reported by James Madison, Documents Illustrative of the Formation of the Union of the American States, H. Doc. No. 398, 69th Cong., 1st sess. 1927.)

One of the arguments we frequently hear in support of changing the rules of the Senate is that the Senate is not operating efficiently. It is contended that the efficiency of the Senate could be increased if we had a gag rule to shut off debate.

Mr. President, I do not doubt that for a moment. I believe that it is well established and recognized that loss of efficiency is the price we have to pay for democracy. Almost anybody will admit that a dictatorship can operate faster, smoother, and with less waste than a free government.

One of the most efficient governments in history was the Third Reich. Hitler fashioned a government that was the smoothest piece of governmental machinery the world had ever seen. The government of Germany was too efficient to allow any legislative action that was not to the wishes of the majority. The Reichstag did not dilly-dally over legislative procedure. It did not waste time in debating issues or holding committee hearings. It was efficient to the point where it had only one duty—to roar approval of any measure "the majority" might request. The majority was none other than Adolf Hitler. No time was lost. No dilatory tactics were permitted. No expense was caused by filling the Reichstag Record with speeches. The Reichstag was a marvel of efficiency.

We all remember another great apostle of efficiency, Benito Mussolini. He came to power in Italy by promising to make the trains run on time. He created an efficient government in Italy, and under it the trains did run on time. The Italian legislature also ran on schedule—Mussolini's schedule—entirely unfettered and unhampered by freedom of debate.

I have no information about the Russian legislative body, but whatever it is and wherever it is we can be sure that it is a very efficient body. And I feel safe in asserting that it does not enjoy the privilege of unlimited debate.

If we accept this doctrine of efficiency in our country, what is it going to lead to? Will passage of this resolution alone bring about the millennium? If we curtail debate in the Senate, will that alone bring about the utopia wherein the Senate can do its business efficiently and satisfactorily?

I think not. I think instead that the day will come—and soon—when the leadership in the Senate will be impatient with the two-thirds rule. It requires too much time. It is wasteful. It is inefficient. It defeats the will of the majority. Having the power and the votes to do so, and an efficient two-thirds cloture rule to muzzle the opposition, the leadership will drive through a further change in the interest of efficiency. The rules will be amended whereby a simple majority can shut off debate at any time.

Surely that should be enough to satisfy the disciples of efficiency. If that situation comes about—and it most assuredly will if we vote this pending rules change—if that situation comes about, it portends the absolute finish of democratic government in this country. The system of checks and balances will come to an end. The more or less even keel upon which our Government has operated for so many years will be sharply upset. I think we will discover that unlimited debate in the Senate is the keystone of the system of checks and balances. Remove that keystone, and the whole structure will come tumbling down. The majority of the moment can control everything. The Constitution will be merely a piece of paper. The majority of the moment could revise the Federal courts to assure efficiency in the judicial branch. It could pass any kind of law it wanted. It could pass laws specifically violating the Bill of Rights and even removing the constitutional rights. Who or what is going to stop them? The Supreme Court? Not the Supreme Court. The efficiency experts would have long since taken steps to bring that institution into the orbit of efficiency. This is not preposterous fantasy, Mr. President. Every Senator in this Chamber—and there are few present at the moment—knows how easily the Supreme Court could be changed by a Senate majority. It almost happened a few years ago. The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] told us about this just the other day. He said that when the Supreme Court reorganization bill was first proposed it would have passed the Senate by a 3-to-1 majority if cloture had been applied to end debate. Only through free and unlimited debate in the Senate did the American people become aware of the dangers of the proposal. Only by unlimited debate were Senators convinced that the bill should not be passed.

These advocates of efficiency are not going to stop when they have a two-thirds rule, or the simple majority rule that will surely follow. They will soon find that the Senate is running far ahead of its committees. Senate action will be so easy that it will find itself caught up with its work, waiting for the committees to report more bills.

When that situation comes about, Mr. President, the efficiency experts of the Senate will decide that something must be done with the old-fashioned, outmoded, time-wasting, inefficient committees. They will decide that the committees are obstructing the will of the majority. The committees could be described as undemocratic. To remedy that loophole in democracy, the efficiency experts, using their new-found plaything, could easily shut off debate and vote on a proposition to limit the committees in the time they can have to consider legislation. They might provide that whenever a bill is committed it will be accompanied by an order to make a report on the bill within 1 week. They will argue that certainly a week is long enough for a committee to consider a bill. If 48 hours or 96 hours is long enough for the Senate to consider a measure, surely, it is a generous gesture to allow a full week for a committee. Of course, it will probably develop that a committee cannot hear all of its witnesses in a week; so, in the interest of efficiency, it will be necessary to limit the number of witnesses who may appear, and also limit each witness in the amount of time he can consume. Two hours should be sufficient. An efficient witness should be able to say all he has to say on a subject in 2 hours. If he is not an efficient witness, then the committee has no business hearing him at all. "Two hours—that's enough," they would say. And, of course, sooner or later, the efficiency experts will get together and decide that even 2 hours is too long, and they will chop that time down to 1 hour, and then a half-hour, and so on.

That may sound fantastic to Senators, Mr. President, but that is the doctrine, followed to its logical conclusion, we will hear in the interest of efficiency if we permit it to get a start.

Efficiency is a wonderful thing to contemplate. It will be a great and glorious day for the Congress when the efficiency experts get through. Congress will meet on the 3d day of January each year, just as the Constitution provides. There will not be any time lost. The bureaucrats will have a slate of legislation all ready for Congress. The assembly line will go to work immediately, and before the end of the week the Senate can start grinding out bills. This new-found majority power can probably finish everything by the 1st of February, and then all of us can go home. When we get home we may find some soldiers in our back yard to make sure that nobody harms the efficient Senators, but that will be all right. It will all be in the interest of efficiency.

Mr. President, the remarks I have just made may sound fantastic and far-fetched, but let the Members of this great body take heed. The movement to obtain a majority cloture rule is already well under way. It has support from both sides of the aisle, although I note considerable change in attitude among my friends on the Republican side as a

result of events of the past week. They have witnessed and felt the efficiency and ruthlessness of a majority voting strictly on party lines. They have seen the tactics employed by a majority in jamming a bill through committee. They have been further enlightened by a recent statement of the President of the United States asking for majority cloture in the United States Senate. They know the purpose behind the President's desire for majority. Their eyes have been opened, and their minds have been cleared of any false ideas or dreams they might have held about the so-called traditions of the Senate and the innate and everlasting spirit of fair play which, according to one of their membership, will always protect a minority group against roughshod tactics by the majority of the moment. As has been pointed out by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and by others, the rules of the Senate, and not the superior intellect or integrity of its Members, is what sets the Senate above and apart from any other legislative body in the world.

Mr. President, I fear that majority power will become a dangerous toy, an awful plaything that will be used to push and pull and bounce and destroy American freedoms and liberties. It is dangerous to give a majority unrestrained power. It is like letting little children play with matches. It is like giving whisky to the Indians. It is like giving a pistol to a drunken man.

Another argument advanced against the filibuster, in the pamphlet prepared by the Library of Congress, is that "experience abroad and in the State legislatures indicates that debate can be limited without undemocratic results."

This argument is easily dismissed because there is no basis for comparison between the Senate of the United States and any other legislative body in the world. The highly centralized governments of other countries have done away with the right of free and unlimited debate. No other nation in the world guards the rights of the individual as zealously as does the United States. As to State legislatures, we must remember that they operate in much different spheres of activity. Each of them legislates only on matters affecting a particular State. In addition to the restraints imposed on them by the Constitution of the United States, there are many others spelled out in each State constitution. Almost every State constitution goes into the greatest detail in describing what its legislature can and cannot do.

The United States Senate is unique in history. There is no basis or good reason to compare it with any foreign or State legislative body.

Another argument is that unlimited debate arouses "popular resentment and brings the Senate into disrepute at home and abroad." The term "popular resentment," like the word "majority," is a vague and fleeting term, Mr. President. I know that there are some citizens of our country who resent filibusters. I believe, however, that the persons who desire to amend the Senate rules so as to eliminate the filibuster are not fully cognizant of the far-reaching effects such a change would have on our system of government. I am equally certain there are other citizens who are resentful of efforts to curtail free debate. I am sure that all Senators have learned long ago to take the brickbats along with the roses. Speaking for myself, I have a great deal more fear of the resentment and criticism that may come from hasty, ill-advised legislation, than of criticism resulting from prolonged debate and consideration of a measure.

As to the feeling in foreign countries, I do not believe that should enter into our considerations in this Chamber. There are not many foreigners who care very much about the way the United States Senate functions. I do not expect to hear any foreign outcry against the evils of a filibuster unless it should interfere with the flow of ECA funds.

Another argument against the filibuster is that it costs the taxpayers thousands of dollars, consuming days and weeks of valuable time and many pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at $71 a page. If someone should undertake the job of counting the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD filled as the result of filibusters, and compare that figure with the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD filled with routine debate, proceedings, insertions in the Appendix, and the like, he would come up with a very disappointingly minute percentage. Of course, as is frequently pointed out by the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], lengthy discussion does not blossom into a filibuster until it is engaged in by a southern Senator.

I quote another argument. I repeat, Mr. President, these arguments are the ones included in the thesis to which I referred in the first part of my remarks. The thesis was prepared several weeks ago under the auspices of the Library of Congress and was supported by voluminous data on the subject. I quote another argument:

> They (filibusters) impose upon the Senate an indignity which would not be tolerated in any other legislative chamber in the world.

If the author of the statement terms the right of free and unrestrained debate an "indignity," then certainly it is a true statement, for no other country in the world tolerates unlimited debate. It is also true that no other country tolerates individual liberties as we do in America. I hope we can keep our country that way.

Another of the arguments against the filibuster, as set forth in the pamphlet heretofore referred to, asserts that free speech would not be abolished in the Senate by majority cloture because there would be adequate opportunity to discuss a measure both before and after cloture is voted.

Mr. President, curtailment of debate at any time, unless by unanimous consent, is a gag. It makes no difference whether the allotted time is 1 hour or 1 month. Freedom of debate is curtailed if there is any Senator who has anything further to say. A gag is a gag, regardless of how and when applied.

The word "adequate" is another vague and indefinite term. What is adequate in the mind of one Senator may be totally inadequate in the mind of another. "Adequacy of debate" is one of the most frequent arguments for cloture. I do not see how we can establish any time limit that will be adequate under any and all circumstances. A given number of hours may be adequate for debating a private bill or rank-and-file legislation, but totally inadequate for debating a great constitutional question.

When two-thirds cloture or majority cloture is available to the Senate leadership, the Senate rules can be changed at any time, by a two-thirds majority or a simple majority, as the case may be, so that the previous question can be moved, as is now the procedure in the House of Representatives. That point has been thoroughly covered by other Senators during the debates which have heretofore taken place, and I shall not dwell on it at any length at this time. However, I consider this one of the most urgent reasons for defeating any change in the rules of the Senate which curtails the right of Senators to engage in free, unlimited debate.

The proponents of the pending resolution charge that unlimited debate in the Senate permits minority rule instead of majority rule. There is no basis for that charge. The only power afforded a minority by the filibuster is to maintain the status quo of our organic laws. A minority can resist a change in the law under the present rules of the Senate, but it cannot bring about the enactment of new laws. Therefore, the charge that the filibuster permits a minority to rule the country is a gross misrepresentation of the issue.

It is argued that the filibuster prohibits the enactment of social legislation. The answer to that charge is that in the past 15 years the Congress has gone into the field of social legislation to an extent never dreamed of theretofore. We have enacted dozens of laws in this field. There may have been delays in the enactment of such laws, but by its own nature, does not social legislation demand delay and deliberation and investigation and the most careful study? Whenever a law seeks to change existing patterns affecting human behavior, is it not extremely wise to counsel delay until every aspect of the situation can be carefully surveyed and weighed? Is this not the proper approach?

I was not a Member of the Senate when the so-called Wagner Act was passed in 1935, but I understand its enactment came about after most extensive hearings before congressional committees and debate in the Senate. Whether we view the Wagner Act as a good law or a bad law, I think we can find unanimous agreement that the evils it sought to arrest and remedy were real—they existed—they had existed and grown worse during the years. Like a cancerous growth, defects in labor-management relations had grown from bad to worse. They presented a serious situation—a very real danger to the American economy and to domestic tranquillity.

This situation did not present itself for the first time in 1935. The need had been present for years, becoming progressively worse, and pleas for corrective action were made every year by those who advocated changes. But corrective legislation was delayed until the Congress was sure of its ground. The Wagner Act presented a sharp departure from existing standards—from existing patterns of behavior—from existing measurements of value. The Congress showed good judgment in delaying its enactment until it felt certain it was moving in the right direction.

The Taft-Hartley Act was passed in 1947, amid one of the greatest controversies ever witnessed in the Senate. The need for amendment of existing labor legislation did not arise in 1947; far from it. The need had built up during the years since enactment of the Wagner Act. Passage of such a measure as the Taft-Hartley Act was delayed for several years. I recall, Mr. President, when I first came to the Senate in 1938, we held hearings on a proposed amendment to the Wagner Act. The hearings lasted for a period of 6 months. At the end of those long and exhaustive hearings, the committee was not satisfied. A report was never made to the Senate by the committee recommending favorable action on the then pending amendments. Even in the Eightieth Congress passage of the Taft-Hartley bill was delayed for many months. Was it delayed by filibuster? I do not think anybody here can argue it was, although there was some trace of filibuster sentiment on the floor of the Senate.

The Social Security Act was a sharp departure from the thinking of Americans on the subject embraced in the law. There was no filibuster, but passage of the bill came about many years after its need first became apparent.

The area of public-housing legislation is a very controversial one. The first public-housing act was passed in 1937. The need existed long before that. Passage was delayed, not by a filibuster, but by the desire of Congress and the American people to survey carefully the situation before acting.

These are but a few examples. Without exception, one can single out any law bearing on social changes and discover that its passage was delayed for years and years, sometimes by filibuster, sometimes by threat of filibuster, but always by the Congress' desire to make certain that the country was ready for the change and that the law could be administered so as to achieve its purpose.

I think it should always be so. In matters proposing a sharp change from existing social patterns, Congress must not act hastily. The rights of the minority must be given full consideration. Bear in mind, Mr. President, once a program of social reform is undertaken, there can be no turning back.

Mr. President, whenever the Congress considers new legislation, the first question to be determined is: Is this law necessary? Congress should not legislate merely for the sake of legislating. It should not experiment. There should be no abridgment of the rights and freedoms of the people as guaranteed by the Constitution, except by constitutional amendment.

The filibuster has not delayed passage of social legislation. By and large, it has delayed only a certain type of legislation, classified by some persons as social legislation, namely, the FEPC, the anti-poll-tax bill, and the antilynching bill. The Legislative Reference Service has published a list of bills defeated by filibuster. However, as the senior Senator from Arizona pointed out, the account is erroneous. All but four of the bills listed ultimately became law. Of the four that have not been enacted, three of them are included in the President's civil-rights program. The fourth was the infamous force bill of 1890, designed to amend and enforce the election laws of the United States, especially in the South. I have not heard anyone complaining because the force bill was blocked, and I do not expect to hear complaints. So, for all practical purposes, we may concern ourselves only with the three so-called civil-rights bills.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Does the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana recall that in connection with the force-bill filibuster the move was made to attempt to change the rules of the Senate simply for the purpose of forcing the passage of the force bill, and that that move failed miserably because Senators realized that the real purpose was not to change the Senate rules, but to force through a piece of substantive legislation and to gain advantage in forcing it through?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. I am glad my distinguished colleague has made that point.

Mr. President, do the same standards apply to the civil-rights bills as apply to other examples of social legislation which I have mentioned? Are they fundamentally alike, and if they are not alike, how do they differ? It will be admitted by all fair-minded Senators that there are great differences between the two types of legislation. Social-security and labor legislation affect the population on a Nation-wide basis. They transcend sectional or State boundaries. There is not a State or county or city or village whose citizens are not concerned with such legislation. On the other hand, the civil-rights bills are aimed directly at the South. They will scarcely affect any section of the country other than the South. It is freely admitted by many that the purpose of these bills is to give the Negroes political and social equality with the white people of the South.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator of the opinion, and does he agree with me, that if persons from outside the South, who are proposing civil-rights legislation, should have occasion to live in the South and study the social pattern there, they would come to realize that the South is doing a good job in working out its problems, and that those persons would not favor a change if they realized the situation?

Mr. ELLENDER. I have talked with men and women from the North who visited the South and who departed with changed minds after having an opportunity to study the situation at first hand. For instance, as I shall point out further along in my remarks, we have a very serious problem in the South, in that in some States almost a majority of the citizens are colored. In a State such as Minnesota, on the other hand, less than one-half of 1 percent of the population is colored, and that one-half of 1 percent live in St. Paul and Minneapolis. In passing, I could point out in Louisiana any number of parishes in which the proportion of colored to white is one-third white and two-thirds colored, and in Mississippi, the proportion in some localities is as much as 4 to 1. So the problems are different. If ever the Senate again considers, or if any Senate committee considers, the anti-poll-tax issue, the anti-lynch-bill issue, or the FEPC question, my hope is that the committee considering the question will ask southern Negroes to appear, or, better yet, that the members of the committee themselves will visit that section and get first-hand information, and not accept information coming from pressure groups in New York, Washington, Chicago, and other cities. These people do not know what the problem is; they are merely playing politics with the entire issue.

I have heard some proponents of the measures, including my friend and colleague, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], state that the civil-rights measures are not sectional. I would like to believe those good people. But nobody can dispute the fact that the 13 Southern States, according to the 1940 census, have approximately 75 percent of the Negroes in the country. Forty-nine percent of Mississippi's entire population is Negro. Forty-three percent of South Carolina's population is Negro. Thirty-six percent of Louisiana's population is Negro. The burden of working out a satisfactory arrangement whereby the two races can live together in peace and harmony has fallen entirely on the South. We, in the South, are making good progress in our unceasing efforts to solve the problem. In the past, some of our greatest statesmen representing other sections of the Nation have recognized the existence of that situation, and have tried to help us. I should like to quote from the remarks of one of those great men, the esteemed late Senator from Idaho, Senator Borah. In a speech before the Senate in 1938, in opposition to the enactment of an antilynching bill, Senator Borah made these significant remarks:

> We in the North may be interested in the Negro politically. We care little about him economically. But he is an indispensable factor in the economic development of the South. They can and will do for him far better without our interference or advice than with it. * * * It is true, as is contended here, that at times he has suffered from mob violence in the South, but it is equally true that he has suffered from race riots in the North.
>
> Notwithstanding anything that has been said or that may be said to the contrary,

this is a sectional measure. It is an attempt upon the part of States practically free from the race problem to sit in harsh judgment upon their sister States where the problem is always heavy and sometimes acute.

That is the late Senator Borah speaking, not the senior Senator from Louisiana.

I reject the pending measure as fundamentally not in the interest of the white people of the South, not in the interest of the black people of the South, not in the interest of national unity, not of national solidarity, not in the interest of eliminating crime. History has proven that it will be a failure, and those who suffer most will be the weaker race.

Those are not my words; they are the words of the late lamented Senator Borah, of Idaho, who was an honored Member of this Chamber for many years.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MILLER in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to his colleague?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator of the opinion that a law can be enforced in a section of the country where the tremendous majority of the people are against that law?

Mr. ELLENDER. No, sir. I am in full accord with the sentiments of Senator Borah. In fact, I can make it a little stronger; any unpopular law is difficult of administration no matter where it is applied.

Mr. President, does the same need exist for the civil-rights bills as existed for passage of labor legislation and social-security legislation. Has the need for antilynching, antipoll tax, and FEPC legislation been clearly established? I challenge the Senators who support civil-rights legislation to produce proof that the southern Negroes, who are supposed to be the beneficiaries of this legislation, have asked the Congress for its enactment.

When the Senate has considered social legislation, such as I have previously described, it has heard from all sides. When it enacted the Taft-Hartley Act it heard testimony against the bill by labor leaders day after day. They came freely—they were anxious to come—and they presented their case very well. The labor leaders had a great interest in the bill; they stood to be deprived of certain powers and privileges and immunities if the bill became law. It was proper to allow them to present their case. Testimony was heard from big business, little business, and the public at large.

As I recall, Members of the Senate traveled out of Washington and visited industrial areas, and saw for themselves what was taking place. In other words, there was a very definite and careful investigation. Has such an investigation been made into the merits of the FEPC, the antilynching, and the anti-poll-tax bills? Senators may argue otherwise, but it should be apparent to all that this legislation is concerned only, or at least predominantly, with the colored people.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator know whether or not the FEPC laws as passed by the various States or municipalities have been effectively enforced?

Mr. ELLENDER. In the State of New York there has been an FEPC law on the statute books for some time. My understanding is that there have been very few offenders punished under the law, as the result of complaints against management. As I remember, the record shows that no serious effort has been made to use the sanctions provided for in the law. Instead, the administrators of the law have more or less tried to get the parties to conciliate their differences. They have not tried to enforce the law to the letter, as might have been necessary in some cases; they have preferred not to test the law. They simply get the parties together to compromise their differences so as not to bring the case to trial.

I do not know what has happened in New Jersey, where a similar law is now on the statute books, but I will say this to my distinguished colleague: in many other States efforts to enact an FEPC law have been badly defeated. I remember particularly the attempt in California, where a people's referendum on the question of an FEPC law resulted in an overwhelming vote against it. As I have said, the same sentiment exists in other States, and I am as certain as I am speaking here today that if the proposed FEPC measure were submited to the people of the United States, only a bare handful would vote for it.

Mr. President, before I was interrupted, I was saying that some 75 percent of our Nation's Negro population lives in the South. They work and own property and raise families there. This legislation is primarily concerned with that 75 percent of the Negro population. Have Senators made any effort to find out how this legislation would affect them? I have been in the Senate for 12 years, but I have yet to see or hear Negroes living in the South testifying before a committee and demanding these laws.

I now wish to digress, Mr. President. As a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I heard the testimony on the so-called Ives FEPC bill, which was introduced in the Senate during the Eightieth Congress. We heard many witnesses, but most of them came from the North, people who knew nothing about the situation in the South. So far as I know, absolutely no demand was made by southern colored people for an opportunity to testify. None of them were summoned, none of them were invited. The committee depended entirely upon witnesses, as I have said, who came from large cities, many of them heads of the pressure groups responsible for all this so-called civil-rights agitation.

Of course, I have heard representatives of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the National Negro Congress and other organizations testify before the committees. They say that every Negro in the South lives under constant fear of lynching, that many southern Negroes are prohibited from voting by the poll tax, and that southern Negroes are poor because they are discriminated against in the matter of employment. No doubt there are southern Negroes who are members of their organizations. But these men represent organizations quartered and largely financed in New York and Washington and Chicago. They do not represent the southern Negroes. Has any Senate committee ever visited the area to be affected by these bills and determined for itself the conditions there? It has not happened since I have been in the Senate.

As I have pointed out, in the consideration of other social legislation the Senate has heard evidence of need—long-established, long-aggravated need. Facts and figures and statistics were presented. The Senate has had to be convinced that the need for corrective legislation existed, and that the remedy sought after would cure, rather than aggravate, the situation complained of. The advocates of civil-rights legislation have failed to present a conclusive case to the Senate.

Where is the need for antilynching laws? Alone among American crimes, lynching stands on the threshold of extinction. In 1948 there were three lynchings—and one of those, I might say, was of a white man. In 1947 there was one lynching. Lynching has declined from 130 in 1901 to 1 in 1947 and 3 in 1948. Can any reasonable man, not politically inclined, argue that the South has not progressed in its campaign to eradicate lynching? Has not the South, by its own efforts and without Federal intervention, successfully controlled lynching until it is practically extinct? Can anyone assert, with sincerity, that lynchings in America are so frequent as to warrant Federal action? Does one criminal incident warrant changing the basic law of our land?

I hear it argued that every southern Negro lives in constant fear of lynching. The contenders for Federal laws become eloquent in their argument. With booming voices they tell Senate committees that every Negro in the South goes to bed at night unable to sleep for fear of what may happen in the night. These witnesses wipe tears from their eyes when they tell about wives and little children who weep and wail and complain with bitterness of the social system that will take their pappy away from them before daylight tomorrow morning.

We hear that argument, but can we obtain any proof? Have we heard any southern Negro come before a committee and say that these conditions exist? Have any Senators attempted to establish the truth by asking southern Negroes as to whether or not such a fear exists?

Let us examine the poll-tax issue. I will merely gloss over the subject at this time. I propose to cover the subject adequately later on in the course of my remarks. Without regard to its constitutional aspects, can any Senator stand here and sincerely assert that there is need for Federal action in this field? Even if it were admitted that State poll taxes are unjust, undemocratic, or unwise, can anyone deny that the need for corrective Federal action, if it ever exist-

ed, is rapidly diminishing? Only seven States retain poll-tax laws, and I understand there is much activity in each of those States for repeal. Certainly a few more years, a few more sessions of State legislatures, will eliminate the poll tax, without resort to a law openly violative of the Constitution of the United States. I may say to the Senate, Mr. President, that I propose to elaborate on that before I take my seat. Let the advocates of poll-tax repeal spend their time and efforts in those States where poll taxes exist and I know that they can more effectively accomplish their purpose.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at that point?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. As a matter of fact, is it not true that the senior Senator from Louisiana himself assisted in repealing the poll-tax law in the State of Louisiana?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am glad my colleague mentioned that. I happened to be the floor leader in the Louisiana House of Representatives at the time the proposal came up, and I handled the measure on the floor. The repeal measure was carried by a large vote. We took that action under our present laws. I am positive similar action will be taken in the other seven States in which the poll-tax law still exists. As a matter of fact, two States are now waiting for the time to elapse, under the provisions of their constitutions, so they may vote on the question. I believe those States are Virginia and Tennessee. But the point is, as I shall demonstrate to the Senate after a while, poll-tax laws existed from colonial days on up to the time of the formation of the Union. Poll-tax laws existed in the Thirteen Original States. Every one of those States had such laws. I shall show how and under what circumstances the changes in those laws were made.

Let us consider the subject of woman suffrage. That is a cause for which American women had battled for years. Women went to jail in their attempt to cast a ballot. They were denied that right by the States. State laws denied them the right to vote. Did the women of the country come to Congress and try to obtain the passage of a mere Federal act to give them the right to vote? No. They asked Congress to submit a constitutional amendment to the people. After due process that amendment was adopted. It is the nineteenth amendment. That is how woman suffrage came about. That is the process I am now advocating, rather than the passage of a mere act of Congress, as some pressure groups are seeking.

We come now to the FEPC proposal. There is discrimination in employment, just as there is discrimination by all people in all walks of life in all their everyday activities. Every person discriminates. Every person has his own tastes and likes. A man likes a certain automobile because it has certain features that appeal to him. A man buys a double-breasted suit of clothes because he feels he likes it better than another style. A housewife buys a certain brand of soap or bread or soup because she feels that the brand is better, that the merchandise is better suited to her family's needs and likes and tastes. In doing so she discriminates against other brands. By the same token, the grocer from whom she buys might stock her brands at the exclusion of other brands. He is discriminating. He buys and stocks certain brands of goods because he feels that those brands on his shelves will do more for his business than other brands.

There is absolutely no difference between a businessman stocking goods of his choice and employing personnel of his choice. When an employer hires a helper, he is making a purchase—he is purchasing the services of a person. He is motivated by the same desire as in buying goods—to get the most for his money and to get what is best suited for his business. He is under no obligation to give a man a job. No man has a legal or moral or constitutional right to a particular job or any job at all. When a man places his services in the labor market, he can only seek to sell his services to someone who needs them.

All of us would like to have everybody treated fairly in the matter of employment. We pass laws that seek to make jobs available for everybody. None of us likes to see a man denied a job and suffer the resultant hardships just because he is a Negro, or a Jew, or a Japanese, or for that matter just because he is white, Protestant, or a Catholic. But I deny the wisdom of the Federal Government attempting to force employers to buy services they do not want, or to pay for services they do not need, and that are not suited to their business. Men should be free to choose their own associates. Mr. President, more could be said on the subject, but I shall leave the details for further discussion.

Mr. President, it might be pertinent to register at this point of my remarks what a few leading southern Negroes think about the laws which precipitate all this discussion. I think Senators should find their views very important, because the southern Negroes are the ones primarily concerned with this legislation. I think Senators will find their views revealing and significant, because they should certainly know more about this subject than a few well-paid Negro agitators from New York City and Washington.

In December 1948 an outstanding American Negro wrote a magazine article wherein he briefly traced his life, as the son of a slave, through hard times and despair and handicaps to ultimate success. I believe the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] mentioned this man the other day and told of the respect and esteem he commands among both races. His name is Charles C. Spaulding. He is president of the North Carolina Mutual Life Insurance Co., which has $131,000,000 worth of life insurance in force. He is president of a bank which has $5,000,000 in resources. He is a director of a bonding company, a building and loan association, and a fire insurance company.

His success story is typically American, and his account of it is truly inspiring. Here is a southern Negro, born in the South, and living in the South. He has spent his lifetime trying to better conditions among his own people in the South and trying to foster cooperation and better feeling between the races. Here is a Negro eminently qualified to speak for southern Negroes. What does he say? Does he tell a story of fear and deprivation and cruel discrimination? Does he counsel young Negroes to leave the unfair South for the democratic North? No. His story speaks of confidence and progress and good will. Like another great Negro, Booker T. Washington, he tells young people of his race to "drop your buckets where you are." He tells them that their opportunity lies in the South. He tells them that their "fair share" of the rewards of life cannot be expected from an act of Congress. He tells them they must work out their own salvation and expect rewards in direct proportion to their hard work and character and integrity.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LANGER. Since the Senator is discussing Negroes and what they think about these proposed measures, let me ask him if he has received any letters from relatives of Negroes who have been lynched.

Mr. ELLENDER. No; I have not.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator believe that relatives of Negroes who have been lynched agree with him?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not recall ever receiving any letter from any relative of anyone who was ever lynched.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. As a matter of fact, is it not true that in the few cases in which persons have been lynched, the man who was lynched was actually a murderer, or a man who had raped some woman of the other race?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is true.

I may say further to my distinguished friend from North Dakota that there has not been a lynching in Louisiana for so many years that I do not remember when one ever happened. I know that there has been none since I have been a Member of the Senate. Therefore there has been no occasion for my constituents to send me letters on that subject.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. In a moment. I am as much against lynchings as is my good friend from North Dakota. I say to him, as I stated a moment ago in the course of my remarks, that today the crime of lynching is almost extinct. In 1901 there were as many as 130. Today the situation is entirely changed. Last year there were three, and there was only one the year before that. I should like to have the Senator, in his own time——

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator mean in Louisiana?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; in the United States. I should like to have the Senator from North Dakota, in his own time, not mine, point out to me any crime that has decreased to such an extent as has

lynching. Then we may be able to discuss the subject more intelligently.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LANGER. Last year there was more than one lynching in the State of Georgia alone.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question only, and not for a statement.

Mr. LANGER. I ask the Senator if it is not true that there was more than one lynching in Georgia last year.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I say, in 1947 there was only one lynching in the entire United States, and last year, 1948, there were three. One of those was a white man. That was in the entire United States. How many murders were there in Chicago, and in New York? I should like to have a capitulation of the number of killings that took place when some poor colored man in the State of New York, let us say, or the State of Illinois, tried to exercise one of the rights given to him under the laws of one of those States. During the debates that took place on the floor of the Senate in 1938, when the antilynching bill was under consideration, I pointed out that in many States laws were passed merely to appease the colored people, and for no other reason. In Pennsylvania laws were passed by the Legislature to permit Negroes to swim in pools where whites swam; and when the Negroes came there to exercise that right a mob started a riot, and many colored people were killed.

We never give to the Negro in the South a right which we do not expect him to exercise. What I am telling the Senator is that the policy in the North, so far as the Negro is concerned, is a policy of appeasement. The so-called civil-rights laws which are being suggested here are for no other purpose than to appease the colored voters, so that they may be persuaded to vote for the Republicans or Democrats in the next election, depending on who makes the most promises.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator know that in my State we have only 30 Negroes? So I could not possibly be asking this question for political purposes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; I am aware the Senator's State has few Negroes, and I am surprised that the distinguished Senator from North Dakota should try to impose his judgment on a problem with which he has limited concern and experience. He does not know a thing about the Negroes. What he ought to do is to go down to Louisiana and spend 2 or 3 years. He might then change his opinions somewhat.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LANGER. Does not the Senator know that I have been all through the South, and have studied the question?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator may have gone there on a short visit. That may be true; but I am satisfied that if the Senator should remain there for any length of time and study the problem, as we have, and witness the progress made and the advances made in education, he would reach a different conclusion.

I was in the Legislature of the State of Louisiana back in 1921. I was a member of the convention which drafted our present constitution. At that time the amount appropriated by the State of Louisiana to educate both colored and whites was not as much as we are now spending to educate colored people alone.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that in Louisiana 2 years ago only $5.12 was spent to educate a colored child and $51 to educate a white child?

Mr. ELLENDER. That statement is not correct.

Mr. LANGER. It is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let the Senator produce the evidence in his own time, and not in mine. He will have ample opportunity, and I invite him to do so.

Mr. President, as I previously stated, before I was interrupted—and, by the way, Mr. President, I do not mind interruptions; I invite Senators to ask me questions at any stage of this debate, because I really want the facts to be presented; and if I am unable to instantly produce the facts asked of me, I shall gladly produce them later and insert them in the RECORD.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator tell us how much the State of Louisiana spent for its white children, as compared to its colored children, in 1947?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not have the figures available at the moment, but I can obtain them for the distinguished Senator. They have been placed in the RECORD so many times, and I should be able to remember them. However, I wish to say to the Senator that Louisiana is making every effort possible in order to give to the Negro children, as well as to the white children of the State, the very best of education. During the course of this debate—I do not expect it to end today—I shall cheerfully present the facts to the Senator for his inspection, if he will be patient. I have the facts available in my office.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator know that in the last session of the Louisiana Legislature, all colored school teachers in the State were placed on exactly the same pay scale as the white school teachers; and does the Senator also know that Louisiana is the only State where every school child in the entire State has an opportunity to get free school lunches, and also that every school child in the State receives free school books?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; I know that. The trouble is that the Senator from North Dakota is asking for facts in regard to years gone by. However, I shall get for him the information he has requested.

Of course, Mr. President, I admit that Louisiana is a relatively poor State, and I admit that we were not able to give to all our people, including white people, the same school facilities that are provided in more fortunate areas. But all in all, considering our economic situation, I am satisfied that we have done for the children of Louisiana as well as could be expected under the circumstances.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. LANGER. Referring now to what the Senator——

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield for a question only.

Mr. LANGER. This is going to be a question.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not want any statement to be made in the guise of a question; I can yield only for a question.

Mr. LANGER. Referring to what the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] has said about furnishing free school lunches and free textbooks, and particularly about the equality of teachers' pay, is it not true that the equality of pay is entirely due to the bill which the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] introduced 3 years ago?

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course not. We have been progressively increasing the pay of Negro school teachers, as well as white school teachers, for a long time. We did not need a law or a court order or anything else to make us do it; we have been doing it within our means.

As the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana stated a moment ago, during the last year the Louisiana Legislature enacted laws which will enable the State of Louisiana to pay the teachers a fair, reasonable salary; and the yardstick established for the whites will apply equally to the colored, and the amount of money now being distributed for the education of children will be applied proportionately.

Of course, I admit that in previous years we were unable to do that; but I believe that in the course of a few years the difference between the money spent for white children and the money spent for colored children and the difference between the amount of money spent for white teachers and the amount of money spent for colored teachers will be entirely eliminated.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that the State of Louisiana is not a poor State at all, but on the contrary in 1947 had a surplus of $20,000,000 and in 1946 had a surplus of nearly $20,000,000, and in 1945 had a surplus of $15,000,000; but at that very time a black child was given an allowance of $5.12 a year for his education, and a white child was given $51.72 for his education?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator's question, I admit that Louisiana is a very rich State in point of natural resources. The only trouble is that the natural resources are

not owned by Louisianians. To the contrary, they are owned by large corporations in Chicago, New York, and various other places, which control all the wealth we have in the great State of Louisiana. The result is that we cannot tax it. All we have been able to do in the past has been to obtain a small pittance; but we have been unable actually to tax those who really make the money from our natural resources. For instance, the Texas Oil Co. is owned by capital located, I believe, in New York, Chicago, and various other large cities and States; the great Gulf Refining Co. is owned by the Mellons, of Pittsburgh; and the Standard Oil Co. is owned by John D. Rockefeller, one of the richest men in the world, at one time. Rockefeller has always been a resident of New York. There is no oil in New York. Yet with the oil he got from Louisiana and from other Southern States, he has been able to accumulate vast wealth.

Mr. President, in the past year, thanks to the present State administration, which now is in the capable hands of the Honorable Earl K. Long, the uncle of my distinguished colleague, we have imposed on these oil companies a somewhat heavier tax. Because of that, today, we are able to pay more to the poor people in the State. Now we are making it possible to give them $50 for old-age assistance. I may say that although the colored people comprise 36 percent of the population of the State and the white people comprise 64 percent, almost 52 percent of the recipients of the $50 old-age assistance are colored. Because of their position and because of these taxes, we have been able more or less to equalize the pay of the teachers, as between colored school teachers and white school teachers; and, moneywise, we have been able to improve the situation of the colored children. We shall be able to spend more money toward their education than we have been able to spend in the past for that purpose.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a further question.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator does not claim, does he, that North Dakota ever stole anything from Louisiana?

Mr. ELLENDER. I did not accuse anybody of stealing anything.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator not say that North Dakota receives but a fair price for the seed potatoes it ships to Louisiana?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know about that. But, since the Senator raises the question, I will say to him that I have been planting seed potatoes for about 26 years. I recall buying seed potatoes once from North Dakota, but I now buy most of my stock from Nebraska. I have found it very beneficial to me to buy seed potatoes from Nebraska rather than from North Dakota. Nebraska seed potatoes seem to be a good deal better than the North Dakota seed potatoes. But that is beside the question.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true the Senator bought Nebraska potatoes because the freight rates were lower from Nebraska than from North Dakota, the difference being 10 cents a hundred?

Mr. ELLENDER. No, indeed. It is because the Nebraska potatoes seem to be a little more prolific than the North Dakota potatoes.

Mr. President, let us get down to serious business now. Before I was interrupted I stated, and I repeat, that I invite interruptions at any time. I was about to quote from an article by Spaulding, a colored man, as I said, who was born and raised in the South, and who has made a great success.

Some of my people are embittered—

I am quoting Spaulding—

Some of my people are embittered and blame the white man in the South for all of their difficulties in life. I honestly can't see it that way, as there are two sides to all questions. Personally, I will never forget the help some of these white men gave us when we were struggling to launch our insurance company.

There has been a great deal of just criticism made about the South. While it may be America's No. 1 problem, I think it is America's No. 1 opportunity for men of good will, prudence, and character. Some of the northern newspapers report only episodes of violence and bitterness of the South, but the great news in the South today is that an increasing number of men of good will of all complexions are working together amicably for the greater prosperity and well-being of all. They are succeeding to a spectacular degree. One evidence of this is that for 10 years the South has led the rest of the United States every single month of every single year in gains in consumer buying. Not only in the South but throughout America my people are maturing and prospering—and launching their own enterprises. (In Durham alone they have more than 160.) During the past decade the number of my people who became managers, skilled craftsmen, and business executives has more than doubled.

What is more exciting to me is that many of the rising business leaders are emerging right here in the South. In Atlanta, Ga., for example, two Negroes operate a chain that includes some of the finest drug stores in the city. And I can take you to several spacious plantations in the Old South that are owned by people of my race whose own parents or grandparents worked there as slaves.

I have traveled through 15 European countries and am convinced that there is no place on this globe where people, whatever their background, can make such progress as right here in America, provided they demonstrate ability, character, and imagination.

Though life begins for me every morning, I am 74, with most of my career behind me. But if I were a young man starting out today I would be excited about the opportunities now opening up in America because of its expanding prosperity and its constant technological advances. The opportunities today are far greater than they were 50 years ago. In fact, there are more challenging careers looking for ambitious, qualified men than can be met. I, personally, would work for the chance to set up my own business, because I believe so firmly that enterprise is where the greatest opportunities lie and where the greatest service can be rendered.

Our capitalistic society in America depends for its growth upon bold young men willing to take a chance on pioneering new fields of service. And it bountifully rewards the skillful pioneer, whatever his origin.

As for myself, I shall always feel grateful that my ancestors were transplanted to North America. It is the best place in the world that I have found to live and leave one's mark.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand an editorial by Davis Lee, publisher of the Newark (N. J.) Telegram, which appeared following the election. In the editorial, the publisher had this to say:

President Harry S. Truman returned to Washington this week from a much deserved vacation at Key West, Fla. However, during his southern sojourn our Chief Executive held many conferences with important national figures, and during one of his confabs he announced that he intends to push his civil-rights program.

This causes one to question Mr. Truman's knowledge of the race situation in these United States. Again one wonders if the President hasn't misconstrued the victory which he received November 2. He says that his election was a mandate from the people to carry out the platform of the Democratic Party. Of course every right-thinking person knows that Mr. Truman was elected because the Republican Party's record was so rotten that the masses feared another depression if Dewey had gotten in. Many southerners who opposed most of the party's platform voted for Mr. Truman because they felt that the Democratic Party would do more for the people. The common man.

One is inclined to wonder if the President is sincere in his declaration of intention, or is he vindictive or just plain bullheaded? If he is sincere then he should familiarize himself with the facts. He should read Joe Louis' life story, which has been running in Life magazine.

Joe made a very significant statement which all advocates of civil rights should read. He declared that even though he was born in Alabama, he had never heard about segregation, discrimination, and Jim Crowism until his family moved to Detroit.

Does Mr. Truman and the advocates of civil rights know that millions of Negroes in the South are not affected by segregation and discrimination? Does he realize that by custom and choice the Negroes stay with their own and the whites do likewise? The southern white man has forced the southern Negro to do business with his own to the extent that in Georgia Negroes own $61,000,000 worth of business. This is not true in any Northern or Eastern State.

Does Mr. Truman know that Negroes in 15 Southern States own and control more cash and real property than the Negroes in the rest of the Nation?

And despite this glowing picture of Negro success and achievement, the South has many shortcomings—it still perpetrates many injustices upon the Negro, but a Federal civil-rights law will not correct these evils and cure its racial ills.

The South is still the poorest section of our Nation, and it is only human that southern whites will provide better schools, hospitals, etc., for their own than for Negroes. After all, they carry the bulk of the tax load.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator familiar with the fact that the State of Louisiana during the 1949–50 fiscal year is spending $15,000,000 for the construction of schools for Negroes?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am glad the distinguished Senator brought that to my attention. I know he is very familiar with all those figures, because as I recall he assisted very greatly, when the Legislature of Louisiana was in session, in the passage of the laws that are making such construction possible.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Does the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana know that in the 1940–41 fiscal year the State of Louisiana spent approximately $2,000,000 for colored education and $14,000,000 for white, and that in its present fiscal year the State of Louisiana is spending $14,000,000, seven times as much, for colored education, against $34,000,000 for white, which puts the pro rata expenditure just about in line for white and colored? Did the Senator know that?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what I was trying to depict to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota a moment ago when I made the statement that today Louisiana is spending as much if not more money for the colored than we spent 25 years ago for both colored and white.

Now, Mr. President, I desire to continue reading from the editorial written, after the election of Mr. Truman, by Davis Lee, publisher of the Newark (N. J.) Telegram:

If Mr. Truman would foster a program of financial aid to the South like he has to Europe, and with no more strings attached, in a decade it would become a paradise, the land of milk and honey. Ever since the War Between the States the rest of the Nation has criticized, condemned, and taken unfair advantage of the South. Northern agitators who have never been South, and who know absolutely nothing about the fine race relations which exist between the two races, persist in spreading false propaganda.

Mr. Truman's civil-rights program calls for a Federal FEPC, antilynch law, and the repeal of the poll tax. No Federal law is necessary to force southern whites to employ Negroes. They employ more Negroes than are employed by northern whites. In fact you can't find one creditable business in the South which does not employ Negroes.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it true that many businesses in the South employ Negroes exclusively, so that if there were an FEPC it would cost thousands of Negroes their jobs?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no question about that. In my home town there are not many large businesses, but there are almost as many colored persons employed as there are whites. The best painters and plumbers in my home town are colored. Recently I had my house painted, and I was glad to obtain the services of a colored painter, because he was the best we had in my home town. The idea that we shun colored persons and do not give them an opportunity is simply propaganda; it is nothing else.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. Are there sawmills and packing plants in Louisiana using exclusively Negro labor?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. They are established throughout my parish. There are not very many sawmills, because we have no more timber to cut, but there are several packing plants.

Mr. EASTLAND. Are there not sawmills in the upland section?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. I was speaking at that moment of my immediate locality. There are many sawmills located throughout the State. I may say that I do not know of any discrimination practiced in employment matters. Many colored persons are employed in the sawmills and in the sugar factories. There are many sugar factories in my immediate locality. Jobs, such as operating engines, are performed by colored employees. I do not know of any discrimination practiced there. I have a brother who owns a farm not far from where I reside. He has three tractors on the farm, and they are operated by colored employees. There are a number of white persons employed on the place who cut ditch banks, but the colored boys seem to know better how to run tractors than do the white boys, so that the operation of the tractors is performed by the colored boys. The same thing applies in connection with operating trucks that haul sugarcane to the mills. My brother has three or four trucks, as I remember, and I know that at least two of them are operated by colored boys, whereas some of the white boys cut cane and do work which is more menial and for which they receive less pay.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it not true that over the entire State of Louisiana, if an FEPC law were in operation and employers should have to hire white and colored employees on a proportional basis, it would cost thousands of Negroes their means of livelihood?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is absolutely no question about it, because many colored persons would have to be discharged in order to make places for white persons who might be in line for their jobs. I believe that would be especially true in Mississippi, where the proportion of colored to white persons is 49 to 51.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a further question.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it not true that many of those who would lose their jobs would simply have to migrate to the North?

Mr. ELLENDER. I assume that might happen. It would be a natural consequence. If they could not be provided with employment in the South, they would seek elsewhere for it.

Mr. President, I continue to read from the editorial written by Davis Lee:

Last week I was in North and South Carolina, where I saw thousands of buildings going up and I saw more Negro carpenters on the buildings than whites. This is true throughout the South, but it is not true in the North. It is hard for a Negro to get a job above that of a hod carrier in these parts.

Last week in the tidewater area of Virginia I saw more Negroes at work on the ferries than whites. The ferries from Cape Charles to Little Creek are without question the largest in the world, and the entire steward's department is manned by Negroes. These Negroes are so completely in charge that they decide what the white people must eat.

A few weeks ago, when I was in Mississippi, several white businessmen told me that they employ more Negroes than whites. Then what is the purpose of Mr. Truman's FEPC bill? Such a bill would no doubt anger the South to such an extent that millions of Negroes now employed would be thrown out of work.

As for the antilynch bill, it appears that we are getting ready to lock the barn door after the horse has been stolen. There are no lynchings now, and why pass a law to antagonize a people who seem to have the situation well in hand?

I don't believe that Mr. Truman is more interested in the repeal of the poll tax than the governors and many of the Representatives of the poll-tax States. Practically every newspaper in the South is for repeal of the poll tax, but all resent outside interference and northern pressure. The poll tax in the several Southern States does not deny unqualified Negroes the use of the ballot any more than it does whites who cannot qualify. Even southerners feel that while many ignorant Negroes and whites cannot use the franchise intelligently, that the law nevertheless should be repealed. And it will be repealed, but not by force.

Before attempting to force through a Federal civil-rights law to change the customs of the South, Mr. Truman should straighten out the liberal North. If he wants to end segregation and discrimination, why not start with the YMCA and YWCA and the Christian church?

Notre Dame is a religious university, but it will not accept Negro students. There are few summer resorts in the East or North that do not advertise that their places are restricted, which means no Jews are allowed.

Does Mr. Truman know that New Jersey has an FEPC and a civil-rights law, and that both are a joke. Hundreds of big companies still refuse to employ Negroes; that no white hotels in south Jersey will even permit a Negro to drink a coca-cola much less spend the night.

Not long ago the New Jersey State Elks held their annual convention in Salem, N. J., and every white restaurant in town closed up during the 3-day confab to keep from serving Negroes.

Someone should remind our Chief Executive of the existence of our Constitution and the Bill of Rights. The complete enforcement of existing laws will give everyone of us, little and big, full protection of our rights as American citizens.

If our President and the advocates of civil rights are in favor of changing the customs of this Nation, they will have to use a different approach. Congress can't do it. However, a well-rounded program of education will remove all racial barriers in about 200 years from now.

The language which I have just been quoting is not mine, but is the language of Davis Lee, a colored man, who is publisher of the Newark (N. J.) Telegram. I believe it should be read and reread by many Senators who are now advocating a change in our basic laws so as to permit by congressional fiat the elimination of poll taxes or the establishment of FEPC, or similar legislation.

I now yield to my distinguished colleague for a question.

Mr. LONG. Did the senior Senator from Louisiana know that as late as 1939–40 the average pay for a colored school teacher in Louisiana was $502.60, and that in the present fiscal year the average school teacher's pay has been increased to $2,800, which is about six times what it formerly was?

Mr. ELLENDER. I was aware that a considerable increase had been made. As I tried to state to my distinguished colleague from North Dakota, I admit that there was a wide discrepancy years ago, but if the records are studied, he will find progress, and particularly has that been true in the past 2 or 3 years. One of the main reasons is that today we have in Louisiana a governor who has been able to obtain a legislature willing to go along with him in the matter of taxing our natural resources to such an extent that we were able to obtain a sufficient amount of money to provide more for our public schools, and for many other worth-while endeavors in my State.

Mr. LONG. Is it not true that much of this great advance in the State of Louisiana has been due to the fact that the State was fortunate enough to have development of our natural resources which enabled us to find tax revenue sufficient to support such a program?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct; there is no doubt about it.

Mr. LONG. Is it not further true that if Senators who are advocating better opportunities for the colored would get behind the Federal aid to education bill and help the other Southern States to obtain sufficient funds so as to educate the colored people the effort would probably contribute more than any other one thing to the solution of the racial problem?

Mr. ELLENDER. That has been my contention for the past 12 years. I am coauthor of a bill for Federal aid to education, as is my distinguished colleague, and I am very hopeful that within the next few weeks we will be able to place that law on the statute books.

Mr. LONG. Do not the facts I have been citing to the Senator in the form of questions pretty well indicate that Southern States are ready and able to give good education to colored children when they have the money available with which to work?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no doubt about it. As I have pointed out during the course of my remarks, progress has been made in the South, and I do not want anything to occur here which may impede that progress.

Mr. President, I should now like to read from an issue of the Alexandria (Va.) Gazette, quoting in full an article by George S. Schuyler, associate editor of the Pittsburgh Courier, one of the largest Negro newspapers:

HERE'S WHAT SCHUYLER REALLY SAID

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following articles were written by Negro Associate Editor George S. Schuyler, of the Pittsburgh Courier, one of the largest Negro newspapers in the United States)

Here, word for word, is what the Pittsburgh Courier Associate Editor George S. Schuyler said about the changing South in his November 6 column, Views and Reviews:

"Now that we are through with the election, I think we should begin to give more attention to the South and the changes taking place there which are all for the better from the viewpoint of the nearly 11,000,000 Negroes who call it home. We should consider what are the opportunities for our people there and how they can be utilized to the best advantage, since over three-quarters of the Negroes live there and, from all appearances, always will.

"Certainly our people are not taking advantage of the available opportunities in that area where the majority of them elect to live. For all of its faults, it is a good country in which to live, and is getting better. After a recent turn through 14 States of the South (an area with which I have been familiar since 1926) it strikes me that, as elsewhere, the biggest handicap Negroes are encountering is themselves.

"Most of what is said and written about the South is untrue. Today it is not a place of terror and persecution, nor has it been in many decades. I am always amused when friends express fear and sympathy because I am going South, assuming wrongly that I am endangering my life. Actually I think no more of visiting the heart of Mississippi or Texas or South Carolina than I do about visiting Minnesota, Maine, or New Mexico.

"I have gone into large towns and small villages in every one of the Southern States and have always been treated as well as anywhere else by both white and colored people. True, there are Jim Crow laws, the existence of which I deplore, but I obey them, and their existence (which irks me) does not blind me to the opportunities Negroes have there. For all the faults of the South, it must be admitted that colored people are better off there than any other minority elsewhere with comparable background—and I believe I have more information about the position of minorities in other countries than most people.

"Right now the South is prosperous. Negroes everywhere can purchase homes and farms, and they are doing so. Nowhere is there studied insult or discourtesy within the social framework of the section, and everywhere Negroes tell me that persecution and police brutality are rarely encountered—and they should know.

"There is less opposition than ever to Negroes voting, and I think it will gradually disappear if Negroes are not misled into voting as a bloc. There is scarcely a city which does not have Negro policemen today. While there have been two or three fatalities and several threats to Negroes in connection with voting, the significant thing is not that they have occurred but that there have been so extremely few.

"Contrasted with the rock-ribbed prejudices and persecutions in comparable areas elsewhere, the tolerance on display in the South today is little short of amazing. Moreover, most southern white people of prominence in every State are apologetic about these shortcomings and the less timid are sincerely trying to better conditions. For this they should get far more credit than professional propagandists are wont to give them.

"There is little or no evidence that the Negroes anywhere in the South are terrorized and none that I have talked with say so. They don't like to be barred from public places or public activities, and there is deep resentment against color discrimination. But they are not hopeless and despairing, any more than the Negroes in the most of the areas outside the South who are subjected to racial proscription. Southern schools for Negroes are not up to the local white standards and certainly not up to the national standards but any honest observer who has visited Dixie periodically can see and must admit that there has been vast improvements in physical plants and teachers' quality and pay. Swarms of Negroes are graduating from high schools and colleges.

"While industrialism is increasing rapidly in the South it is still predominantly agricultural and so are most of the Negroes. Unfortunately our people are not acquiring as much land as they could and should, and too few of them are studying to be scientific farmers. That they could acquire wealth and security, to say nothing of gaining greater respect and power by doing so, is evidenced by the success of the minority that has applied itself to growing better crops and raising better cattle. In all these efforts they have the approbation and cooperation of the civilized minority of whites everywhere in the South.

"It is my sincere opinion that the more widely southern Negroes apply themselves to these economic fundamentals and become more firmly rooted in the southern economy, the easier will the socio-political problems be solved. I find no unanimity among southern whites on what should be done about these problems. In some areas I do not think it would be difficult even to get repeals of the Jim Crow laws regarding transportation—if the campaign were intelligently directed by Negroes in the areas concerned, with outside Negroes and whites staying far in the background.

"Other (and most) areas would be tougher to crack, but it is sounder strategy to work on the more tolerant areas first, and win over some, than to antagonize the whole South by loud, mudslinging campaigns directed from the East and North which accomplish nothing.

"Since most Negroes are going to remain in the South, their leaders will have to learn to act like it, and to push programs of gradualism with greater skill and statesmanship, unswerved by emotional claque from 'abroad.'"

Mr. President, those are not my words. They are the words of a Negro who wrote for the Pittsburgh Courier. I hope Senators who are not present will read that valuable editorial.

I now read a subsequent editorial by Mr. Schuyler, from the same publication, the Pittsburgh Courier:

WE SHOULD HAVE MATURED SUFFICIENTLY TO FACE AND ACCEPT THE TRUTH

The day after the recent Town Hall discussion on "What shall we do about racial segregation?" one of my African Nationalist readers telephoned me to say how much he deplored the fact that Hodding Carter, the Pulitzer prize-winning Mississippi newspaper editor, had quoted from my column of November 6, in confirmation of the improving interracial situation in the South.

I replied that there was nothing to deplore about this; that I had told the truth about the South today, and that Mr. Carter was to be commended for reading The Pittsburgh Courier and learning the truth. It is the men and women of intelligence, understanding, and goodwill, of all colors, in the South who can make that section of the country a better place in which to live.

Conditions in the South are vastly better than they were 20 years ago, and nobody who actually knows the score down there will deny it. They are not what they could and should be, of course, because human beings persist in being human beings. In other words they are petty, selfish, prejudiced, and envious, but at the same time they are kindly, charitable, and benevolent, too.

We have to recognize people for what they are and try to get along with them as they are. In our individual relationships we get along with people by making allowance for

their shortcomings, by avoiding topics on which they are touchy, by enlisting their sympathies, and by displaying goodwill and a give-and-take spirit. We certainly do not make friends and influence people by offending, insulting, threatening, and smearing them because we do not share their point of view. They have a right to their opinion as we have to our opinion. Almost anybody's opinion can be changed, but in order to do so we must render them amenable, which cannot be done by arousing their antagonism. This is especially true when those whose opinions we would change are in the majority and possess the predominant economic, political, and social power and influence.

As I have stated previously, the nearly 11,000,000 Negroes in the South today obviously wish to remain there, else they would have long departed from the section because no one has stopped them from doing so. It is an insult to these people to say that they are terrorized and persecuted, and nevertheless remain, when the price of bus or railroad coach fare would place them above the Potomac and Ohio Rivers. Since they elect to stay there, they must try to get along there and better their conditions there, which certainly cannot be done by antagonizing the people amongst whom they must live.

It is 85 years since the Negro slaves were emancipated in the South, and their social, economic, and cultural condition has rapidly improved since that time. They have been subjected to mass murder, torture, persecution, and insult since then (like other minority and underprivileged groups the world over), but they are subjected to little of this today. This is primarily due to the goodwill of liberal white people in the South, secondarily to the efforts of the Negroes themselves, and only thirdly to outside pressures.

I have stated here many times that the Negroes themselves in the South can tremendously improve their position through their own efforts and with the help of friendly whites. They can erase illiteracy themselves, they can increase home and farm ownership themselves, they can easily join or set up all sorts of cooperative societies for their economic advancement, they can strengthen themselves spiritually through their religious organizations, they can qualify as registered voters almost everywhere, and, in short, they have it within their power to attain the same cultural level as the whites, and even surpass that of most whites, thus erasing the obvious differences between the two groups.

And the more they succeed in doing this, the more easily will the onerous racial segregation be destroyed, especially as regards discrimination. Ultimately racial segregation will be destroyed with it, but no sane person expects that to occur overnight, as some of our more superficially minded people seem to expect.

Negroes need not expect the central government to force the white majority in the South to drop these barriers, and they are sadly deluding themselves if they think Mr. Truman or anybody else is going to do so. The white people of this country are not going to fight each other again over the Negroes, and the sooner we realize that, the better. Just as Northern whites have striven to settle their differences with Southern whites ever since the Civil War, so must Southern Negroes strive to establish rapport and unity with their Southern white neighbors. There are many ways of doing so but only a few prominent Negroes and whites are attempting them. Unfortunately, those few who are trying it are criticized, smeared, and condemned for doing so, mostly by people far from the scene who can offer no sound alternative.

Of course it is unpopular to say these things, but popularity must ever be sacrificed to truth by honest men with no axes to grind. By this time we Negroes should have matured sufficiently to face and accept the truth.

I repeat, Mr. President, those are not my words, but are the words of a Negro editor, from another of whose editorials I quoted a while ago.

I have before me another editorial by C. C. Carlin, Jr., president and editor of the Alexandria Gazette, of December 27, 1948. The editorial is entitled "How Is Segregation Working in the South?"

HOW IS SEGREGATION WORKING IN THE SOUTH?

The recent political campaign and President Truman"s support of the so-called civil-rights proposals plus the fact that these bills will meet with strong opposition in the next Congress has focused the spotlight on the important question: How is segregation working in the South.

Your editor who was born and has spent his entire life in Virginia has observed the progress of both races under our State laws. Likewise, he has observed the progress in other States of the deep South. This writer, seeking first-hand information, recently visited North Carolina, South Carolina, Kentucky, Georgia, Alabama, Tennessee, Mississippi, and Louisiana where he had an opportunity to study and observe existing conditions as well as the relationship between the two races.

We have never believed that any laws were perfect because they are laws but we feel that southern segregation laws, based on mutual understanding, provide the best possible approach toward the solution of the controversial race relationship.

In these days of abundant transportation, high wages, and full employment, it is self-evident that the majority of our American Negroes have chosen the South as a good place in which to live or 11,000,000 of the 14,000,000 in the United States would not reside here.

In each State we found the friendliest relationship between the two races. All busy working together for their joint benefit and for the most part law abiding and contented.

In the cotton States, where the dollar goes further, we were astonished to find that a cotton picker was paid $4 per 100 pounds and that an expert could pick four to five hundred pounds per day. In most places the picking season lasts 6 months. In fact during the picking season it is extremely difficult for others to obtain help because of the high earnings available in the fields.

Many of these Negro workers own their own homes, farms, profitable shops of all kinds, banks, newspapers, taxicab companies, as well as every conceivable kind of a business.

To top it all, we discovered the town of Mound Bayou, Miss., with a population of approximately 3,000 entirely colored, where white people come to trade but it is said that the sun never sets on a white person in that community. This is truly segregation in reverse.

In New Orleans, and other large southern cities, there are numerous Negro night spots and clubs and we have yet to find the first white man who was ever entertained in any of them. We know of a prominent white theatrical agent who tried every means to obtain admission to the Negro clubs, but who was politely told "this is a Negroes club, white folks are not admitted."

Many of the well-to-do Negro merchants will tell you that they prefer segregation and credit it largely for their success. They contend that if segregation were abolished that they would lose most of their trade to white competitors.

There are a few lower-class whites, usually newcomers to that locality, who are antagonistic to the Negro and who say they should all be sent back to Africa. Some Negroes are irked by segregation but their main complaint seems to be leveled at the school system where they say the white children have the best of it but most of these freely admit that colored schools in the South have greatly improved during the past 10 years and are still improving.

Very few Negroes are disturbed by the poll tax and those who want to vote are able to do so without difficulty.

We did not find any Negroes who were afraid of lynching, in fact we could not find a single Negro who had ever seen a lynching, or had a friend or acquaintance lynched. All told us that they believed the police officers treated them fairly and that when there was trouble with the law it was invariably the fault of the violator.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question only.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the poll tax, when used as a prerequisite for voting, disqualify people because of race?

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course not.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. What was the age limit when there was a poll tax in Louisiana?

Mr. ELLENDER. Twenty-one years.

Mr. EASTLAND. What was the limit at which the tax expired?

Mr. ELLENDER. Sixty-five. Persons above 65 could vote without having to pay the poll tax. I may say to the distinguished Senator, as was pointed out a while ago, that I led the fight in the Louisiana Legislature to repeal the poll tax. I believe the poll-tax law ought to be eliminated in every other Southern State, but it ought to be done by due process.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question only.

Mr. EASTLAND. What does the distinguished Senator mean when he says that it ought to be done legally and as the law provides?

Mr. ELLENDER. For example, I contend that determination of the qualifications of voters is a prerogative of the States. It is the States themselves and not the Congress that should pass upon the question. As I have pointed out in the course of my remarks—and I think it will bear repetition, because I see a few Senators present who were not present a while ago when I made the statement—the distinguished Senator from Mississippi well knows that at one time women were deprived of the right to vote. A famous case arose in the State of Missouri, the case of Minor against Happersett. I know that the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who is an able lawyer and a member of the Judiciary Committee of this body, is familiar with that case. In that case the question at issue was whether or not, by State law, a woman could be denied the right to vote. That case found its way to the Supreme Court of the United States, and the Supreme Court held in no uncertain language that the right to spell out the qualifications of voters is a prerogative of the States, denied the right of the fair sex to vote, and sustained the State statute

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question at that point?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question only.

Mr. EASTLAND. Was it not necessary to amend the Constitution of the United States to give women the right to vote?

Mr. ELLENDER. The distinguished Senator from Mississippi has anticipated me. That was the exact point I was coming to. If the State had the right to say that a woman could or could not vote, how much stronger a case is there for the States having the right to spell out other qualifications? In order to enable the fair sex to be in a position to vote, the ninteenth amendment was adopted, and it is now the law. One of the great leaders in that noble fight was none other than Susan B. Anthony, whose statue adorns this Capitol.

As I have pointed out during this debate, and at other times, most of us from the South favor the abolition of the poll tax, but we want to have it done legally. If the question is ever presented to the Senate, I shall vote in the negative. I want it to be done legally. That is my position, and that is my reason for opposition to the pending measures in the Eighty-first Congress. That was the reason for my opposition to such measures in practically every Congress since I have been a Member of this great body.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. If the poll tax does not disqualify people from voting, why is it not a wholesome tax?

Mr. ELLENDER. Some States—such as Vermont and Massachusetts, I believe; I wish to be corrected, if I am in error—require the payment of poll taxes, but not as a prerequisite for voting. They use such a tax as a means of raising funds. Of course, the poll tax which is obnoxious to the proponents of the anti-poll-tax measure is the poll tax required as a prerequisite for voting. That is where the rub comes, as it were, according to the proponents of the anti-poll-tax measure.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. Why should not a person be required to pay a tax in order to vote?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is a question of choice, Mr. President. Some of us think it should be, and others think it should not be. I presume that the distinguished Senator from Mississippi has his own views on the subject. I have mine. Personally, I believe that the imposition of a poll tax, although not as a prerequisite for voting, is a very good way to raise money. For instance, I believe it might be a good way to raise money if we were to put a big tax on bachelors, so that they could at least assist in paying for the education of children in our schools.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at that point?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. What is the Senator up to? Is he trying to get the women's vote?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; I am not trying to do that; but I am saying that the views of some Senators and the views of some other persons differ on the subject of why a poll tax should be imposed.

However, the main cleavage between the proponents and the opponents of a poll tax lies in the question of whether to utilize such a tax as a prerequisite for voting.

So far as concerns the imposition of a poll tax for the purpose, let us say, of raising funds in order to pay for schools or to operate city service or anything of that character, I do not know of much opposition to such a tax.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for another question.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does not the Senator think that voting is a privilege, as it was considered when this Government was adopted?

Mr. ELLENDER. Regardless of whether it is or is not a privilege, somewhat the same question is involved. I might say to the distinguished Senator. I would have no different answer.

For instance, I believe the tax could be imposed in such an amount that many poor people might be deprived of the right to vote, because of their inability to pay the tax; and under such circumstances, I can conceive of ways by which it would be possible for a man of wealth to assist in paying the poll taxes of many of his friends, and thereby obtain a large group of votes. To my way of thinking, that is one of the main objections to the imposition of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting.

However—and I do not wish to be misunderstood by the distinguished Senator from the State of Mississippi—I think the States have a right to impose a poll tax if they choose to do so, for the simple reason that, as I understand the Constitution of the United States and as I understand the jurisprudence on the subject, the prerogative of stating the qualifications of voters lies in the States, not in the Congress.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. What right has a man to vote if he does not care enough about the privilege of voting to pay a nominal sum toward the upkeep of the schools?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is an argument that has been advanced by the proponents of the poll tax. I may say to the Senator that the same argument permeated all the colonial assemblies, before we became a United States. I shall point out in a few moments to the Senator that many of the colonists thought that a man who was not willing to pay a certain poll tax or who did not own a certain amount of property or did not have a certain amount of education should be denied the right to vote. From all of that have come, of course, the various requirements which have been imposed by the different States of the Union. In a few moments—and I hope the Senator will bear with me—I shall point out all those differences; and during the course of my argument he will be able to note the many reasons advanced by the various States and by the various colonies as to why some of them imposed a poll tax qualification and some of them imposed a property ownership qualification, and some imposed an educational requirement; and of course there were many others. Does the Senator from Mississippi know that the great State of New York, where most of the Jews in the United States live, once prohibited Jews from voting? Think of that. Does the Senator know that at one time in the State of Georgia a Catholic was not permitted to vote? All those matters simply go to show how jealously and how sealously the founders of our Government guarded the right to spell out the qualifications of voters.

Before I conclude, I hope I shall have time to show to the Senate that the Constitution probably would not have been adopted by the Thirteen Original States if there had not been a specific provision—I shall show it historically—that the right to spell out the qualification for voters was to remain a prerequisite of the State, and not to be surrendered by the State.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. What are the voting requirements in Louisiana at the present time?

Mr. ELLENDER. To be 21 years of age and to be able to interpret certain passages of the Constitution. Those are the principal qualifications.

I may say to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Mississippi, that in the city of New Orleans alone from 12,000 to 15,000 Negroes are registered, and no efforts are made anywhere to prevent them from registering. If they come forward to register, they receive the same treatment as do the whites. There is no one to obstruct them. I believe that was ably demonstrated in the State of Mississippi when we held hearings with respect to the late Senator Bilbo. The Senator recalls I was chairman of the committee that held hearings there, and I know what my colleagues on that committee were impressed when they heard from the lips of many of the colored people there that there was no effort made to prevent colored people from registering in the State of Mississippi. We heard more than one colored man. As I remember, there was one who had signed a petition, taking part in the proceedings to oust Senator Bilbo, who came forward and admitted on the stand under oath that he could not point out any case where any colored people had come to apply to vote, who were denied, if they were qualified.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. Did the hearings show that the great number of those voted for him?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. In the city of Mound Bayou, I believe, in Mississippi, referred to as being an all-Negro city, it was shown that in one or two of the precincts, a large percentage of the voters, who were colored, voted for the late Senator Theodore Bilbo.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. Will the Senator please tell me whether or not they concurred in our institutions and in the racial principles of Senator Bilbo?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no doubt about it; absolutely no doubt about it. The record shows it. The record is available for anyone to read.

Mr. President, before I was interrupted I was reading, from the Alexandria Gazette, an editorial by C. C. Carlin. I continue to read:

In the light of our recent experience in the South, we sincerely wish that President Truman and the others who are urging the passage of the "Force Bills"—which in our opinion would put an end to the progress being made between the races in the South—would make a personal survey on race relations in the southern States. If the sponsors are sincere when they say that the purpose of these bills is to aid the Negro race, they should welcome the facts.

Senator J. J. SPARKMAN, of Alabama, has stated that he will introduce a bill in the next Congress to have an impartial committee make a competent and complete survey of racial conditions in the United States which would ascertain the facts prior to congressional consideration of the misnamed civil-rights bills.

The December, 1948 issue of the American Magazine carries a lead story, which every American should read, written by a Negro executive, son of a slave, entitled "What America Means to Me."

The author, Charles C. Spaulding, is president of the $131,000,000 North Carolina Mutual Insurance Co., and is also the president of a bank which has $5,000,000 in resources.

Mr. President, it will be recalled that I read quite an extensive excerpt from the article to which Mr. Carlin refers in his editorial.

In this article, he states in part.

"Some of the northern newspapers report only episodes of violence and bitterness of the South but the great news in the South today is that increasing numbers of men of good will of all complexions are working together amicably for the greater prosperity and well being of all.

"They are successful in a spectacular way. Anyone who still thinks of people of my race as Uncle Remuses will be startled to learn that last year they had a total income of $10,000,000,000 which I will wager would rival the entire income of the people of any one of several countries in Europe today."

Elsewhere on this page we are reproducing two articles which were written by George Schuyler, associate editor of the Pittsburgh Courier, one of the largest Negro newspapers in the country, who visited the South to secure first-hand information on conditions pertaining to the races. We are also reproducing a recent editorial dealing with the racial problem by Editor Davis Lee, publisher of the Newark (N. J.) Telegram, another Negro publication with a large circulation.

We believe these articles are unbiased and ably present the viewpoint of the well-informed Negroes of good will of our Nation.

I could read from many more editorials by eminent writers throughout the United States, but it would be simply clogging the RECORD and perhaps killing more time. I do, however, desire now to read a few quotations from a very interesting book written by a colored man by the name of Joseph Winthrop Holley, D. D., LL. D., founder and president emeritus of Albany State College. The title of the book is "You Can't Build a Chimney From the Top." I am not going to try to take the time of the Senate to read the whole book, although I should like to, because it is very interesting. But I shall content myself with reading a few excerpts from it touching on a few of the questions I have discussed during the course of my remarks. The book deals with the subject of lynching, poll tax, the FEPC, and many of the conditions in the South about which I have been reading. I am sure my good friend, my newly found friend, the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], could find a good deal of solace by reading the book. I am hopeful that some day in the not too distant future he will read the book and then pay us a long visit in the South, so as to learn by experience what are the problems that confront the South with respect to the Negro. In this book, as I have just indicated, the author deals with lynching. Permit me to quote a few passages or a few paragraphs on the subject of lynching:

As I said at the outset, lynching has been with us a good many years. Fortunately it is on the decline, and if we are patient I am convinced it will soon become a thing of the past.

What is the cause?

He asks.

What is the cure?

He asks.

In the early days a lynching was generally brought about by some vile crime committed against some innocent person, usually a woman, in the heat of passion and excitement; and aided and abetted in not a few cases by whisky, the fire is kindled, men lose their reason, and all the leader has to do is to give orders and they are almost certain to be executed.

The crime of lynching, like all other crimes, has a demoralizing influence upon those who engage in it, and almost invariably the lyncher suffers more than the lynched.

A father took his son to see a Negro hanged by a mob, and at the breakfast table next morning the child said, "Father, I've seen a Negro swung up and his body riddled with bullets; now I want to see one burned at the stake."

Every effort should be made by our moral, religious, and educational forces to prevent crime of all kinds, on the one hand; and every appeal made to the honor, the humanity, and the sense of justice of those entrusted with the making and enforcement of law, on the other.

Lynching should never have been made a political issue. It was during the second administration of President Theodore Roosevelt that lynching was brought to the attention of Congress, and the antilynching bill took the place of the old civil-rights bill, both designed to influence the Negro vote. I have noted, from time to time, that the Republican Party, which sponsored antilynching bills, would have control of both Houses of Congress and the President, and yet could not get an antilynching bill through. When the Republicans lost control of the Government, the Democrats took up the fight for an antilynching bill. They have controlled both Houses and the President, but still no antilynching law has passed.

After all, the main cure for the lynching evil is to remove the cause.

We have here, in Albany, Ga., one of the most outstanding and efficient fire chiefs in the country if not in the world. He teaches the art of preventing fires by the process of eternal vigilance. Houses are built strictly in accordance with the laws governing fire hazards; no materials likely to produce combustion are allowed, and every precaution is taken to protect human life and property when fires do occur, as they will in spite of all cautions. Our chief has the most efficient group of firefighters to be found anywhere and the best firefighting equipment that can be procured. The fire loss in the city for the past few years was 44 cents per capita. The fire insurance rate is lower in Albany than in any other city of its size in the country. Chief Bronsnan's remarkable success in fighting fires is due to his ability to put them out before they start.

With lynching, as with fire, we must prevent it at its source; and the source is the people. The people—black and white—must be taught respect for law and order. They must be taught the dignity and the sacredness of human life, and that no man nor group of men have any right to take that which they cannot give. When these truths are rooted and grounded in the lives of the youth of the Nation, it will be difficult to get them to join a mob to take the life of a fellow man, be he white or black.

Certainly this is not going to stop lynchings altogether—neither does teaching people how to prevent fires keep fires from occurring—but it does make the people antilynching conscious and hence makes it easier for the officers of the law to apprehend and punish those guilty of such deeds.

It should be noted that there has never been a lynching in this county (Dougherty), for the people here are opposed to that method of dealing with lawbreakers. A recent case may be cited as representative:

A young Negro GI who had recently returned from service overseas and had been reemployed by a large packing company at the same wages paid the whites doing the same work, went to a neighborhood store, remained until closing time, and then followed home the owner who lived next door to the store. As the man went up the steps to his front door, the GI demanded that he drop the box in which he carried the cash sales for the day. As the storekeeper turned, the young man shot and killed him.

By Monday (the killing was Saturday night) the boy was arrested, and it was a full month before he was brought to trial. At the trial the court appointed two of the best lawyers at the bar to defend him. He was eventually electrocuted. Throughout, there had been no threat of violence.

To some it may seem difficult, but I am convinced that our approach should be through the State rather than the Federal Government. And the approach should be straightforward, forthright, and manly. The appeal should be to the hearts and consciences and the sense of justice and fair play, to those responsible for making and enforcing the laws of the State. Our method of abuse, agitation, propaganda, and high-pressure politics does more harm than good.

Mr. President, that last sentence is directly in accord with the views of many of us. I recall, very vividly, that in 1938, when the antilynching bill was before this body, I used that thought many times in a discussion of the issue.

Moreover, it is my opinion that the Government at Washington is not going to pass an antilynch law, for such a bill has been before the Congress for 50 years, and I am

afraid it will be there as long as the Negro vote in the doubtful States is the unquestioned balance of power. Both of the major parties have taken us for monumental suckers.

Always I find myself turning from lawmakers and legislation back to the people themselves and to education. That is our slow but safe and sure trail out of the wilderness.

"Give light and the people will find their own way."

Who does not recall the life-long propulsion of the tales in his school readers? Why not begin in the nursery—in our earliest oral storytelling and first schoolbooks? Why not set an earnest, capable committee to create for the South, with an indirect but potent antilynching atmosphere, a human-relations primer?

Let stories lead our small Negro children to the strength of patience and endurance, so that they may not grow too bold or over-smart or mean or bitter between the friction of new hopes and old ill-treatment—such stories as that classic of its kind, the Crucifixion, about the cruelest and deepest of all injuries, and Christ's grandeur when he prayed, "Father, forgive them for they know not what they do." The Negro has so many opportunities to attain the stature of the Saviour in this respect. While first-class general instruction widens his information and exercises his intelligence, the parables and fables of a human-relations primer may revise and develop his native gentleness that so pleasantly disarms and wins his way, and spur him through industry to attain economic success and general respect.

Give the small white southerner credit for remembering from his earliest reading, stories that exhibit movingly the sameness of the human heart in all races.

A Chinese boy, attending a Christian school in China, earnestly searched in picture after picture of the Holy Family for some glimpse of Chinese visitors to Jesus. Finding none, he sorrowed. Afterward, when he grew up and became a distinguished artist, he devoted himself to the world's greatest story, painting all its scenes with Chinese backgrounds and the Apostles and others as members of the yellow race. Such tales as this one of the Chinese boy's hunger and the way in which he satisfied it have a pervasive influence.

Do you remember the story of the stoned frogs who cried out to the persecuting boys, "This may be fun to you but it is death for us?"

It is not impossible that in a decade or two a wisely planned human relations primer, with little or no mention of the problem at which it is aimed, might give us a generation of southerners who would be antilynching conscious.

However, lynching has become a thing of the past, and by the slow process of evolution. There was only one lynching in 1947 and 39 cases where officers of the law prevented them. So far this year (1948) two cases of prevention have occurred and in both cases Negroes were the victims of would-be lynchers.

Mr. President, as I pointed out a moment ago during the course of my remarks, there were three lynchings in 1948. Evidently the lynching of the one white person had been registered at the time this book was written, because, as I have just stated, this book records only two as having taken place in 1948. I continue reading:

During the forty-odd years I have lived and served in Georgia, I have witnessed a growing public resentment of this unfortunate method of dealing with lawbreakers and it is entirely probable that we have seen the end of this thing we call lynching. That is—in the South. Thank God and the good people of both races.

Mr. President, the same author has written a whole chapter on Jim Crow cars, and I propose to read several excerpts for the benefit of the few Senators who are present.

The greatest hardships I have experienced in traveling on Jim Crow cars have been the bad behavior on the part of my own people. During 1903 to 1919, when whisky was plentiful, it was positively unsafe for women to ride on the train on Saturdays and holidays as men would tank up on corn liquor, and the whole environment was surcharged with liquor. Conductors have repeatedly escorted colored women and children into the white coaches to protect them from the evil overtures of their own people. It was necessary for us to teach our school girls how to protect themselves from the approaches of the male of their own people while traveling. And if I had any desire to go into the white coach it would be for protection from my own people.

I quote further from this chapter:

However, as I have said, things have improved wonderfully in the past quarter of a century. Most lines have not only comfortable coaches, but little difficulty is experienced in getting seats and sleeping-car accommodations.

I quote further, Mr. President, from the same author at page 209 of his book, in the chapter Jim Crow Cars:

Only when a fellow who has been up North for a few months and comes back with a chip on his shoulder looking for trouble, is there likely to be trouble. I spent 2 years in Philadelphia and my work was such that I had to use the streetcars and busses to get to and from my work, and the behavior of Negro men, and women, too, on the public carriers was something terrible. And the situation seems to be getting worse.

The better class of colored people themselves are becoming alarmed over the increasing rude conduct of the newcomers from the South. Our Negro newspapers are constantly hammering away at these evildoers but to little avail.

I do not believe in lynching or mob violence. But I do believe that the good Negroes in the large centers, where their own people persist in making trouble for themselves and everybody else, should take these hell raisers out into the parks and fix them so they will not be able to sit down for 30 days.

That is his prescription.

I have known decent colored people to get off the car and take a taxi rather than ride with the rough class of their own people. And I have had these same people tell me that they do not blame the southern people for not wanting to ride in the same cars with colored people.

My own hope is that the Negro leaders, our newspapermen, our ministers of the Gospel, our school teachers, and all others who have the interest of the race at heart, will make up their minds that they will unite in a determined effort to make our people conform to the ordinary requirements of civilized life. For it is difficult to see how we can avoid having Jim Crow cars as long as we have Jim Crow people.

Mr. President, this author has written a very fine chapter on segregation. He has given his views, and I am going to take occasion to read them. I repeat, Mr. President, the book from which I am reading is entitled "You Can't Build a Chimney From the Top," and its author is colored, Joseph Winthrop Holley, D. D., LL. D., founder and president emeritus of Albany State College of Georgia. He starts at page 210 of his book, chapter 13, entitled "Segregation:"

TACT AND TIME ARE NECESSARY PARTS OF THE CURE

If the reasons for my attitude are given due consideration, there will be nothing startling in the fact that I, a Negro of some education, favor segregation in the Southern States for the time being.

The realness of my interest in southern Negroes and in the South, to whom I am happy and proud to belong by birth, and among whom I cast my lot for life by choice, will stand comparison with the interests of advocates and agitators of nonsegregation. My knowledge of conditions, both near and far, surely compares favorably. All my childhood was spent in South Carolina; 13 years of my youth I went to school in the eastern United States; and during the 44 years of my efforts to better my race in south Georgia, I have spent much time in the North, in Europe, and in Africa.

I do not turn from nonsegregation as an ideal; but in impatient and intolerant pursuit of it, I can see only trouble and even tragedy. Ideally, there should be brotherhood among human beings; God is our Father; we are adjured to love each other and be each other's keepers. Yet, Arabs and Jews are fronting each other today in Palestine, dealing out death and destruction, spurning cooperation. India, having gained the boon of independence, has its streets littered with the dead of its irreconcilables.

WELLESLEY COLLEGE,
Wellesley, Mass., June 2, 1947.

DEAR DR. HOLLEY: I am enclosing a letter which is being mailed to B. T. today. I read your letter to the members of the board of admission when B.'s credentials were discussed. I wish you might have been present to see the real interest which the members of the board expressed in Blossom and their very deep regret that she could not be included in our freshman class. If her credentials had been a little less good than those of our successful applicants, we would have accepted her quite readily, but, unfortunately, her scores were so low we felt that it would not be a kindness to her to subject her to the extreme academic competition and pressure which she would be under at Wellesley. I know that this news will be sad for you because of your real interest in B. and your desire to carry out Miss Hazard's wishes, but I am sure that we have done the right thing; and if you had been present at the meeting, I think you would agree.

You may be interested to know that Wellesley is anxious to increase the number of Negro students in this student body, and I am proud to write that this year we were able to accept 5 of the 12 Negro applicants, and that we would have been glad to accept more if their records had indicated that they could carry our work. I know it will be a source of pride to you, too, because we have not accepted such a high percentage of our white applicants this year. Thank you for your interest and understanding. I hope that some day Wellesley can accept one of the girls whom you recommend to carry on the important work in which Miss Hazard was so much interested.

Very sincerely yours,
MARY E. CHAMP,
Director of Admission.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question only.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it not true that the facts as outlined in the letter are duplicated in medical colleges all over the North, where colored students cannot stand the competition when they must compete with white students?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no doubt about that. In fact, many white persons are unable to enter certain colleges, such as Harvard, Yale, or Columbia,

whereas they might be able to enter other schools throughout the country. It is common knowledge that various universities have different entrance requirements. Dr. Holley exposes the truth. It is something we must recognize. Under the Constitution of Georgia, as I have just stated, I believe it is incumbent upon the State of Georgia to give to colored persons the same facilities as are provided for white persons. I believe the time is not far distant when the opportunity in Southern States for colored people, even under our segregation laws, will be virtually the same as for whites. I know that we have made marvelous progress in the State of Louisiana. Today we have four eminent Negro colleges in my State. There seems to be satisfaction on the part of the colored race.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question only.

Mr. EASTLAND. How could Negroes obtain an education unless it were in a segregated institution? Do not the facts show that they cannot compete with white students?

Mr. ELLENDER. In justice to the colored pupils, it may be possible that they did not have the same opportunity to obtain the necessary foundation.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is true.

Mr. ELLENDER. By the way, that same situation exists in our own schools in Louisiana. For many years I have been advocating a consolidation of the high schools in various parishes in my State. The parish in which I live, Terrebonne Parish, is the largest parish in the State of Louisiana. Instead of having a dozen high schools scattered throughout the parish, we have only one, and it is a good one. I am glad to say that the graduates of that high school can enter the portals of almost any university in the United States. In some parishes in Louisiana there are as many as 16 high schools. The money to educate the children in a parish where there are 16 high schools must be divided more or less into 16 pots. Many teachers have as many as two or three subjects to teach. I do not believe it is a reflection on any of those schools, but I do know that many of their graduates could not qualify to enter a number of colleges throughout the United States whose admission requirements are much higher than others. As the distinguished Senator from Mississippi pointed out, the same thing which occurs in our white schools applies also to the colored schools.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question only.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana——

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield only for a question.

Mr. ROBERTSON. This is preliminary to framing the question.

Mr. ELLENDER. I ask the Senator, please, to ask a question. I do not yield for a statement.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Does the Senator believe that we can put the spirit of brotherly love into a man's heart by legislative fiat?

Mr. ELLENDER. Not in the least. A moment ago I read from this book, and from various editorials, to the effect that it is taken for granted that it cannot be done. We cannot legislate tolerance, religion, or anything of the kind.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Does the Senator believe that if we are ever effectively and efficiently to solve the problem of giving better opportunities to the colored people in our midst, it must be done at the State and local level?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no question about that. I have argued that on the floor of the Senate when the antilynching bill was before us. On one occasion I spoke for six successive days. On five other occasions when the question was before us I made the same argument. I believe that if the Senators, especially those who favor such legislation, will take the trouble to study the record, they will conclude that legislation of that sort is not conducive to bettering the relationship in the South between the two races.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, is the Senator familiar with the civil-rights cases decided by the Supreme Court in 1882?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am familiar with some of them.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I refer particularly to the one called the Civil Rights Case, reported in One Hundred and Ninth United States Report, page 3.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not familiar with it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I ask the Senator if he agrees wholly with what the Court said in that case; and mind you, Mr. President——

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not yield for the purpose of permitting the Senator to make a statement; I shall yield only to permit the distinguished Senator to ask a question.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I ask this question: Does the Senator from Louisiana agree that this is a sound holding—as handed down by the Supreme Court in that case:

> It is absurd to affirm that because the rights of life, liberty, and property (which includes all the civil rights that men have) are by the amendment sought to be protected on the part of the States without due process of law, Congress may therefore provide due process of law for their vindication in every case.

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly. As I have just indicated from the various editorials and from the book from which I have been quoting, there is no question about that.

Mr. President, we cannot legislate morals; we cannot legislate tolerance. Yet that is what I claim the proponents of some of these civil-rights bills are advocating at the present time. It simply cannot be done.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Do the people of Louisiana have a real sympathy for the colored people of that State and a real desire to help them?

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly; and I know that their interest in that respect exceeds that to be found in the Northern States.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Does the Senator from Louisiana know of any Southern State——

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield only for a question.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Does the Senator know of any Southern State having a considerable proportion of Negroes in its population that does not have that sentiment toward them?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question only.

Mr. EASTLAND. What State has more segregation than Pennsylvania or New York or Illinois?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know. As was pointed out in one of the editorials, some colored man who was present actually saw this situation: There was a Negro convention in one of the New Jersey cities; and in order not to serve the colored delegates, all the restaurants closed while the convention there was going on. Yet New Jersey is one of the States which has passed the FEPC law and has been trying to appease the colored people.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question only.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the distinguished Senator know that the city council of Chicago recently voted for segregation in the housing there, under their housing program?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not familiar with that, I say to the Senator; but if he says so it must be true. I have no knowledge of it.

Mr. President, I read further from the book:

> The second difficulty that would face us, if we were permitted to enter the University of Georgia, would be our own inertia, or our inability to take advantage of the opportunities when they come.
>
> Harvard and Yale Universities have been open to our people for at least 80 years or nearly a century. And yet, there are hardly a dozen Negroes born and reared in Massachusetts and Connecticut who have graduated from Harvard or Yale. The Negroes who have gone to these great institutions have been from the South and what is true there is generally true from Maine to California.
>
> Then, too, there is Canada, with some of the finest universities on this western continent. Yet, of the many Negroes who found refuge in that country during slavery, few if any have taken advantage of the opportunity at their very doors.
>
> Were the colleges and universities of the South thrown open to him, would the Southern Negro react differently? In other words, would the Negroes in Georgia do what the Northern, Western, and Canadian Negroes have refused to do?
>
> The third obstacle is financial. It costs a full-pay student (and you may depend upon it, the Negro would be full pay plus) $2,000 a year. Where is the Negro family that is able to raise $4,000 a year to send Susie and Jimmy to the University of Georgia?
>
> The fourth hurdle is not external. And there is no hope of leaping it safely now. In entering the University of Georgia, a Negro would meet a hostile faculty and student body. The man may take the colt to the water but cannot make him drink. Frankly, no self-respecting Negro is going to send his sons and daughters to any college where the students and teachers do not want them and will not treat them like fellow human-beings. The faculties and students in our white colleges in the South are not ready to receive Negro students.
>
> Taken from any standpoint, the Negro as a group is not ready to profit by going to the white universities of the South. Let us insist instead that we be given our own schools, taught by the best trained men and women we can get. And let us make these colleges as fine as the finest. I am convinced that we can find Negro men and women who are capable of doing just that.
>
> Mixed elementary schools in the Southern States would not be happy places for any of the pupils, and they would be unsatisfactory for other races.
>
> For instance, if the children of both races were forced to attend the same schools, Negro teachers would have to find other forms of employment. Certainly the southern whites are not going to send their children to schools being taught by Negroes, any more than that is being done in the North. Here in Georgia, for example, we have 7,000 Negro teachers, mostly women, drawing more than half a million dollars a month for 12 months in the year and plans are being made to double that amount in the future. Mixed schools would mean that these faithful women would be turned adrift with nowhere to go for their support. And thus another field of opportunity for the young Negro would be closed.
>
> Mixed schools in the South would be wrecked by an inescapable superior and inferior complex. If the white teacher should run true to form, would she not say to the white child, "My little man, you are white," with all of its implications; and to the colored child, "Sammy, you are colored," with all that goes with it?
>
> No; it is best to let us work out our own problems under the guidance of "God, who made and loveth all."
>
> The position I have taken on this question of segregation in our State schools and colleges has had the full approval of some of the leading minds in the country, including Miss Caroline Hazard, who was informed of every step taken by me to get the Negro units divorced from the other units in the university system and have them set up under Negro faculties made up of the most outstanding men and women to be found, with salaries commensurate to the kind and character of work done. The best teachers in our colleges are none too good; for the sicker the patient, the more skillful ought the physician be.
>
> I wish to quote from a letter from Miss Hazard:
>
> "Your letter of August 1 interested me very much. I did see that the Governor had adopted your address as a part of his own message, and it seems to me that your address was a very fine one and entirely reasonable. I think you are right in accepting the segregation of the two races in the schools of the State. Here in my own kindergarten, I find a little pickaninny and she is received without question, but in the South that is too much to expect. If you can only insist upon equal accommodations and, at least in the graded schools, equal facilities, you will do very well. Do let me know how things turn out. Certainly you are a citizen of Georgia and you should exercise the rights and privileges of a citizen of that great State. Thank you for the clippings. Your most eloquent statement makes a very fine climax to the Governor's message."
>
> I not only had the approval of Miss Hazard but of some of the most distinguished and outstanding leaders and scholars of the race. For example, I have before me a letter, written on the day of the election in the heated governor's campaign of 1942 by Dr. Horace Mann Bond, then president of the Fort Valley State College, now president of Lincoln University. It was a source of encouragement and comfort to me:
>
> "Frankly, although it may seem funny, I think, on the one hand, it may be better for our schools if Mr. Talmadge is elected. I know you think this is funny, knowing as you do how much Rosenwald money we have had, but that can't last forever and the school, in the long run, will have to have State money to survive, and I'm really convinced that now is the best chance to make a change from private to public support, even at a temporary loss. Arnall might mean private money for awhile but the time for that is over. This I feel even if I would get lost in the shuffle."
>
> The movement to force the two races to worship in the same churches in the South is another direct and flagrant violation of individual rights. The Pilgrim Fathers came to these shores to find freedom. Neither the church nor the State has any right to interfere with the manner or place of worship of the two races here in the South. Such a coercive movement is fraught with grave danger to both whites and blacks.
>
> Neither race wants mixed congregations.
>
> Last year, when the YWCA was in annual session in Atlantic City, N. J., a vote was taken to do away with segregation in the YW and officials were instructed to establish no further separate units.
>
> I asked my 16-year-old daughter if she would like to join the YW (white) on Arch Street, Philadelphia. She promptly said, "No, I'll join the colored YW on Catherine Street but not the white Y. You know, Daddy, the right to worship where you please is one of the four freedoms for which the last world war was fought."
>
> That young girl expresses the sentiments of every normal youth, white and black, in the United States. You might find a few whites, like the followers of Father Divine, who prefer to worship with colored people, but they are not to be taken too seriously as they are not many in number.
>
> Colored people who are honest-to-goodness Christians and are really serving God with a clean heart are not the ones who seek admission into white churches. The few Negroes who would attend white services add no strength to their own churches and would add none to white churches. I pity the white minister who would be dependent upon the colored aristocracy for financial support.
>
> It is the common run of folk, the masses, who support Negro congregations and institutions, and these people would never go to white churches because the preaching of the white minister does not appeal to them. Besides, most colored people take the white man's religion cum grano salis. The white minister cannot dish the Gospel out to suit Aunt Nancy. She wants her preacher, when he gets up in the pulpit and takes a text, to start low, rise high, wax warm, and sit down in a storm.
>
> Negroes who are rightly constituted—and the great majority still are—do not wish to go where they are not wanted. They dislike to ride in motorbusses where there too often is only standing room for them and every lurch of the coach jostles them against someone who openly resents the contact. Some southern Negroes on account of this unpleasantness have given up riding on the busses and have taken to the trains, so they may have the mental comfort of segregation. They distinguish keenly the difference between recognition that is accorded from the heart and the kind invoked by law that tears down old-time consideration on both sides and kindles mutual hard feelings.
>
> I asked Monroe Trotter, editor of the Boston Guardian, "Why do you northern Negroes fight to get Negroes in white colleges when you do not attend them yourselves?"
>
> He replied, "We are fighting for a principle. We want the right to go places whether we go or not."
>
> May it not be questioned seriously whether this is principle and altruism or merely blind vanity? How much would it profit us southern Negroes (or the South, or the North, or the Nation) if these out-of-State individuals should gain for themselves by law their barren point, but lose for us the good will of our white neighbors with whom all of us must live? The northern Negro could, of course, go back North with his pride fattened, but we southern Negroes, to whom the victory meant nothing, would be left to endure the blazing antagonism that this shotgun union would arouse.
>
> Surely it is plain folly to obstruct and embitter our Southern States in their struggle with a painful evolutionary problem. They wish to take care of us, and they will. I had faith in southern men and women when I began my work in Albany, Ga., 43 years ago, and I still have the same faith in and love for the children of those whose aid I have experienced gratefully all these years.

Mr. President, let me repeat, the book from which I am reading is the book written by a Georgia Negro named Joseph Winthrop Holley, D. D., LL. D., founder and president emeritus of Albany State College. The title of the book is "You Can't Build a Chimney From the Top":

> Progress has been slow, but we have gone forward. Our difficulties have been primarily educational, based on lack of funds. As long as friends from the outside advanced southern efforts with their contributions our gain was steady, but since radicals, with or without money, began to try not to hasten but to overthrow the southern program there has been growing trouble and confusion and actual retrogression.
>
> Economic conditions are changing rapidly in this part of the country. The Southern States will have more money in the future; their prospects are rich. As they become more able they will wish increasingly to take care of their colored people. If the Nation feels it cannot wait and wants swifter results, Washington might wisely step in financially and speed up the efforts of the Southern States to help us.
>
> Our real and great need now is immediate and generous and understanding help to raise ourselves.
>
> "You cannot build a chimney from the top."
>
> The most effective influence for race tolerance and the most powerful compulsion toward nonsegregation will come as we lift our mass intelligence, skill, and industry into responsible citizenship and Christian character.

Since the above was written I have received some rather interesting and important information which I think will be well to add in this connection:

The Reverend Joseph Wilson Cochran, former secretary of the board of children education of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, a life-long friend of the author, was asked to read my work and to write frankly what he thought of it, and to make any suggestions he thought might improve my effort.

Dr. Cochran writes:

"Since receiving your letter and work only 2 days ago, I have spent much time and thought on the matter, reading carefully the story of your life, and your political, social and religious philosophy. I have been deeply moved by it all. And must confess that you have made out a stronger case for racial segregation than I had thought possible. I have a much clearer picture of what the Negro wants in the way of separate schools, churches, and hospitals and why you trust the southern white man to give you

believe that we can put the spirit of desire to help them?

entering the University of Georgia, a Negro

what you want rather than northern educational theorists. Your book is an extremely controversial document and is likely to meet the disapproval of that powerful and growing school of thought that believes the Negro will not get his rights until segregation is entirely eliminated. Your book will be scoffed at up North and praised down South. So what? That doesn't mean that your book would not do good in both areas. Be assured, my dear friend, that I entertain only the liveliest interest in your project and hope you will not abandon your desire to produce a worth-while contribution to a problem that is vexing the best minds of this generation."

In the Atlanta Constitution of February 25, 1947, John W. Clark, trustee of the University of North Carolina has this to say:

"The Julius Rosenwald Fund, working through the Federal Council of Churches, and the CIO is heading a drive to do away with separate schools, colleges, churches, and hospitals for the races in the South. There is good money in attacking southern people and southern traditions."

These statements by Dr. Cochran and Trustee Clark would equal the recommendations of the President's Civil Rights Committee and bring us face-to-face with the abolition of segregation in the South as the only hope for a satisfactory solution of the problem of the races in this section.

My own conviction is that the program is too utopian for the present; that the Congress is not likely to adopt such a radical measure; that if it is passed, it will be difficult to enforce and would do more harm than good in the end.

Not only are the Negro high schools doing work below the standard required for admission into white colleges, but according to reports of the dean of the medical college at Howard University, quite two-thirds of the applicants for the freshman class are utterly unprepared to pursue the courses as laid down, and what is true at Howard is true also at Meharry Medical College. If our people are not trained well enough to enter our Negro professional schools, how can we expect them to enter the white colleges for professional and graduate work?

There is all the difference in the world in the character of the work done by the early missionaries who established our Negro colleges and that done by these same schools today. There has been a steady lowering of standards in both high schools and colleges until we have reached the point where few graduates from our high schools are prepared to do effectively the freshman level of college work, and graduates from our colleges are not prepared for work in professional and graduate schools.

The president of Harvard University says: "Harvard receives Negro students in its medical college on the same terms as others, but the Negro colleges do not give their students enough premedical training for entrance."

In other words, the training in our Negro colleges is below the standard, so that to do effective professional and graduate work our Negro high schools and colleges will have to be equipped and manned to furnish this basic education without which all other will be vain.

I think it would not be amiss to call attention to sayings and doings of two of America's greatest statesmen and the Negroes' greatest benefactors. The reference is to a recent statement in the Atlanta Constitution and to an editorial appearing in the Macon Telegraph.

The statement from the Atlanta Constitution is by the martyred President Abraham Lincoln: "I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of bringing about, in any way, the social and political quality of the white and black races. I am not, nor ever have been in favor of making voters or jurors of the Negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office nor to intermarry with white people. There is a physical difference between the white and black races which will forever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality. Inasmuch as they cannot so live, while they do remain together there must be the position of superior and inferior; and I, as much as any other man, am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race."

From the Macon Telegraph: "I am glad to advise that the Franklin D. Roosevelt deed referred to in our editorial some weeks ago reads as follows: 'This indenture, made and entered into this 9th day of March 1929, between the Meriwether Reserve, Inc. (formerly the Georgia Warm Springs Foundation, Inc.), a corporation under the laws of Delaware, hereafter in this indenture known and designated as grantor, and Rebecca M. Hardaway, of Columbus, Muscogee County, Ga., hereafter in this indenture known and designated as grantee: Witnesseth that:'

"The fourth provision of this deed reads as follows:

"'Fourth. Neither the land herein conveyed, nor any part thereof, shall be sold, rented, or otherwise disposed of to any Negro or other person of African descent, or to a corporation or association owned or controlled by Negroes.'

"These excerpts are taken from a sworn, certified copy of the original deed, which deed is recorded in the Superior Court of Meriwether County, Ga., under date of November 21, 1945, record 25, page 215."

You can't build your chimney from the top.

Mr. President, I have been reading some very interesting quotations from this book. I intended to read more, but, instead, I now desire to devote a few hours to the poll-tax question.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the distinguished Senator for a question; yes.

Mr. GEORGE. Was the Senator reading from the book written by Dr. Holley?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. He is the head of a colored institution at Albany, Ga.; is he not?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. Has the Senator ever had an opportunity to know Dr. Holley or to visit him?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; I never had the pleasure of meeting him.

Mr. GEORGE. Has the Senator ever visited his institution?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; I have not.

Mr. GEORGE. Does the Senator know that the work of Dr. Holley's institution is comparable to the work done by Booker T. Washington at an earlier date?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what I understand, but I am not familiar with it. I have never visited it, but some day, on my way south from Washington, I propose to make a special trip to visit that institution, as I have done in the past to visit Tuskegee, in Alabama.

Mr. GEORGE. Does the Senator know that Dr. Holley is held in universal high esteem by the white men and women, as well as by the colored men and women, in Georgia.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is my understanding.

Now, Mr. President, as I indicated earlier in my remarks, I propose to deal at length with the question of poll taxes and the various qualifications imposed from colonial days to date. The history of this aspect of the case is most interesting. As I proceed I shall develop that the Colonies from their inception maintained qualifications for voters. When the Colonies formed the Thirteen States of our Union they still jealously and zealously guarded their right to prescribe qualifications for voting.

I propose to demonstrate to the Senate in detail what the provisions were as to the various Colonies, and then as to the States, and follow that by an analysis of many decisions that were rendered by the Supreme Court of the United States, holding conclusively that the right to prescribe qualifications for voters is within the States and not the Congress.

As several cases held, there are no Federal voters; they are all State voters, and their qualifications are prescribed by the States in which respective voters all over the country live.

As early as 1750 there were different qualifications for voting in the different colonies. I quote from Formation of the Union, 1750–1829, by Hart, page 15:

In each there was an elective legislature; in each the suffrage was very limited; everywhere the ownership of land in freehold or other property, or the occupancy of a house was a requisite, just as it was in England for the county suffrage. In many cases there was an additional provision that the voter must possess a specified large quantity of land or must pay specified taxes. In some Colonies there was a religious requirement.

Mind you, now, all these requirements I have just mentioned were prerequisites for the exercise of the voting privilege.

While there were few specific provisions concerning suffrage in the charters of the Colonies, popular elections existed in each of the Colonies from the earliest date down to the Revolution. Popularly elected assemblies carried on local government. Virginia had a House of Burgesses as early as July 30, 1619. And what was the first consideration of these colonial groups who were fiercely protective of their rights?

One of the first tasks of these colonial assemblies was to regulate the elective franchise. (See McCulloch, Suffrage and Its Problems, at p. 18.)

While the qualifications were vague and indefinite, there were many requirements, each a proof of the local regulation of voting qualifications. Even the Crown and the English Parliament made no serious attempt to modify or harmonize the various suffrage regulations. I quote from the same volume, page 19:

This left each colony practically free to pass its own laws providing for the franchise. By the time of the Revolution this practice became thoroughly established, thus allowing each commonwealth to make suffrage laws to fit its peculiar electoral problem.

Down to 1776 there were seven qualifications for the elective franchise. The outstanding one was the landed-property qualification, which probably arose because of the business corporation-like nature of the early Colonies. A piece of land was considered as giving a person the freedom of the company, as provided by Massachusetts in 1621, just as

a block of stock entitles its holder to vote in a corporation.

Porter, History of Suffrage in the United States, pages 3 and 4:

But this very simple test of property-holding could not long hold out alone, although it was the first and the dominating consideration for almost 200 years following. The population became so complex, the interests of colonists expanded so far beyond mere commercial enterprise, that other standards of fitness for participation in the affairs of the community were sought out and established. Strict limitations had been put upon the right to join the company, and after the companies ceased to exist and the Colonies became exclusively political institutions, the same limitations were carried over for the suffrage with some elaboration. They dealt with all the various things which are supposed to determine capacity to take intelligent interest in community affairs. Race, color, sex, age, religion, and residence were now investigated before the applicant was admitted to the suffrage. The theory was that only those who clearly had an interest in the colony—measured in terms of tried standards—should exercise the right of suffrage.

There we find a yardstick or a method of providing qualifications for voters during colonial days.

Virginia had varying requirements. In 1655 a voter had to be a habitant and a householder; in 1699 he had to be 21 years of age, a male habitant and freeholder, Papist barred. By 1762 this had been further refined by the freeholder being particularly required to own 50 acres, or 25 acres and house 12 by 12.

Massachusetts first required religious standards, Puritan and Orthodox, in 1631. By 1691 Massachusetts required a voter to be English and to own 40 shillings freehold or £40 of property.

Connecticut in 1638 required a voter to be a habitant, a Puritan, and a freeman, and varied this by 1702 to specify that he have 40 shillings freehold or £40 property.

Rhode Island, as early as 1665, required a competent estate and barred Christian Papists. By 1767 Rhode Island added to this the requirement of living in a town, plus owning 40 shillings freehold or £40 property.

New Hampshire in 1680 required that a voter be 24 years of age, English, Protestant, and have an estate of £20. By 1728 the last requirement was increased to £50 realty.

North Carolina in 1669 required a voter to be a deist and to have a 50-acre freehold. By 1760 this had varied. The qualifications were 21 years of age, 1½ years residence, British nationality, and a 50-acre freehold.

South Carolina in 1669 required a person to be a deist and to have 50 acres freehold. By 1759 a South Carolina voter had to be white and 21 years of age, Protestant, and have a settled freehold.

Georgia demanded a man to be 21 years of age and to have 50 acres of land, papists barred. In 1775 the land requirement took on a subtle change. It was replaced by the word taxpayer, plus ½ year's residence required, and papists barred.

Pennsylvania in 1683 required a voter to own 100 acres—10 cultivated—or 50 acres—20 cultivated—or pay taxes. In 1700 Pennsylvania required a man to be 21 years of age, a 2-year resident, English, and own 50 acres—12 cultivated—or £50 in property.

Delaware, in 1701, had a 2-year residence requirement, 21-year-age requirement, and land ownership of 50 acres—12 cultivated—or £50 in property. By 1733 British citizenship had been added to the list.

Maryland's only requisite in 1637 was that voters be freemen. In 1718 Maryland had barred Catholics and required 50 acres or £40 property.

New York in 1683 accepted a vote from any freeholder. In 1701 21 years age was requisite and £40 realty was necessary, and Papists and Jews were barred.

New Jersey in 1668 allowed any freeholder to vote. In 1725 that freeholder had to be a 1-year resident, and must own 100 acres or £50 property.

It is interesting to regard some of the varying reasons for the above requirements, keeping in mind that the very fact they have varied in each State, with the particular conditions of growth and the existing population, adds undeniable power to the case I am presenting for each State in the Union, for their own continued right to judge their own needs and provide therefor.

I read from Porter, History of Suffrage in the United States, pages 4 and 5:

Standards of character and fitness varied from one part of the country to another. In Massachusetts the Puritans believed that only by restricting suffrage to men in their churches could the future well-being of the colony be insured. The problem of the "right" to vote became distinctly subordinate. They restricted the suffrage for the good of the community. The fact that their standard of good character (church membership) was narrow is not at all surprising. The character of the man's employment was often considered a criterion of his ability to vote intelligently, and thus college men and clerical officers were presumed to be especially fit for the suffrage.

The philosophy of suffrage has always been more or less opportunistic, if the word is permissible. Suffrage qualifications are determined for decidedly materialistic considerations, and then a theory is evolved to suit the situation. In the early days riot and disorder might accompany an election. The authorities would thereupon fix the qualifications so that the disorderly people could not vote next time. Then would come the theory to justify it—only those owning a certain number of acres would be considered fit to vote, only those of a certain religious faith, and so on. Unquestionably this has happened in times of stress, for theory did not come to be the preliminary determining factor until complete peace and order prevailed, and even then theory was not uncolored by materialistic considerations. Suffrage limitations were bound to adapt themselves to social and economic conditions. In rural Virginia the freehold requirement of 50 acres excluded very few of the best type of men. But such a requirement in an urban community would have been intolerable. Obviously an absolute criterion could not obtain. It became necessary to adopt whatever criterion was calculated to embrace the best men.

Moral qualifications were restricted almost exclusively to New England. It was sometimes necessary for the voter to show proof of his good character. At other times if one were accused of improper conduct it would cost him his vote, although the particular offense was not mentioned in the law. In the South there were restrictions against men of certain race—foreigners and Negroes were excluded.

I read further from Porter History of Suffrage, bottom of page 5 and all of page 6:

All of the restrictions and qualifications can be seen to support one of two fundamental principles: One may be called the theory of right and the other the theory of the good of the state. Every qualification imposed had one of these two principles in view. Either it was established in order to fulfill the right which certain people were supposed to have, or else it was established simply in order to serve the best interest of the state. It might have been said that a man had a right to vote because he owned property, or because he was a resident, or because he paid taxes, or simply because the right to vote was a natural right. And this would be the guiding consideration without regard to the effect it might have on the well-being of the community. Thus in some places nonconformists were allowed to vote because their property right was recognized. Nonresidents were permitted to vote where they owned property solely because they were supposed to have a right to vote on account of their holdings. This theory of right was the first to appear and has always persisted. Each generation would seek to add a new subhead to the title, as it were, and base a right to vote on some new ground.

The other great principle or theory had to do with the good of the state. It developed as soon as the narrow business-corporation concept was abandoned, and it was most emphasized by the Puritans. It continues to the present day but has never been entirely divorced from the theory of right. Under this theory of the good of the state men were excluded because they were not church members, because they were criminals, because they had not been residents a long-enough time. It is not always possible to classify every restriction definitely, but it may be said that one of these two theories controls every modification of the suffrage.

In the North, there were no race qualifications, because the few free Negroes scattered through the northern Colonies seemed to have caused little alarm along suffrage lines. North Carolina, Georgia, South Carolina, and Virginia were the only Colonies which disfranchised Negroes before the time of the Revolution, showing that either very few of them tried to vote or there was little aversion to it, the former probably being correct. At any rate, there was no race issue injected generally into the suffrage regulations. Another generation saw a marked change.

There was in none of the Colonies except Pennsylvania the rigid residence requirement of 2 years. And why the particular need there, true locally, yet not present elsewhere? Probably because of the conservative proprietor's desire to limit the influence of the many recent immigrants.

The property test was the most frequent and weightiest qualification. The cheapness of land led to the requirement above stated, in some instances, that the land be worth a certain sum in money or produce a certain income. Again we see the ever-present variations in the different Colonies. In Georgia there

could not be the same money value requirement as in more thickly populated New England, and conversely, a voter in crowded New England could not have been required to own the same quantity of land as the voter in sparsely settled Georgia. In Virginia the varying standard of 50 acres of land, or 25 acres of land being worked and occupied by a house 12 feet square, or a town lot with a house of similar dimensions, was the answer to the rural versus urban problem. The city dwellers could not acquire land to a broad extent, and the rural dwellers resented a value fixation being set on the land to be held.

Five of the Colonies allowed the substitution of personal property for real estate.

This indicates a distinct concession of the urban communities, and it is significant that four of these States are in the small New England group, where the supply of real estate was limited. This adaptation of the suffrage qualification to the particular economic situation illustrates the willingness of men to adjust their ideas of what is fundamentally right to the needs of the dominant group. (Porter, History of Suffrage in the United States, p. 9.)

The next break-down in this type requirement is from personal property to taxpaying. As conditions change, a trend emerges, the picture alters, and the statutory machinery with which we are equipped permits each State to shift or vary its position with the times.

Religious tests were decisive in New England, and common everywhere except in Pennsylvania. In the South Papists were usually specifically barred. New York barred Jews. Maryland also barred Catholics. Massachusetts supplemented the religious tests by moral-character qualifications. Later a property qualification was inserted as an alternative. Later the religious test disappeared. South Carolina, with her requirement that a voter acknowledge the being of God, was the last State to have the statutory religious standards for suffrage and religion as a qualification for voting passed out with the colonial period.

Citizenship and residence were of comparatively little importance in a new county, predominantly British.

Before turning to the Articles of Confederation and our Constitution, the following words concerning voting qualifications in the Colonies seem particularly appropriate:

It is of moment to note that there were no efforts at uniformity in the regulation of suffrage. In each colony by charter, or more often by acts of the assembly, the elective franchise was controlled independently. This commonwealth treatment of suffrage was the natural result of colonial history. So thoroughly grounded was this policy that when the Colonies seized sovereignty and organized a Federal Government the suffrage program was undisturbed. It continued as the basic foundation on which all Federal elections must rest. (See McCulloch, Suffrage and its Problems at p. 29.)

The truth of the proposition that each State best knows its own conditions and is best equipped to handle them, is shown by the direction of the Continental Congress, on May 10, 1776, following the outbreak of the Revolution, to each of the Colonies to "adopt such governments as shall best conduce to the happiness and safety of their constituents in particular, and America in general." (Hart, Formation of the Union, 1750–1829, at p. 89.) Following these instructions, the Colonies had already begun, before July 4, 1776, to draw up written instruments of government. I now desire to read a few paragraphs from McCulloch on Suffrage and Its Problems. I read from page 30, the first paragraph:

With the separation from the mother country came very little change for the Colonies severally. The Union took the place of the Crown, while the various commonwealth governments went on very much as before. Therefore, suffrage regulations were not disturbed at all; each commonwealth continued to regulate the elective franchise independently. The several States sought directions of the Continental Congress as to framing constitutions to replace the old charters which had been granted by the King. But after this had been done, the two sets of governments moved along independently. The Central Government under the Articles of Confederation interfered with the States as little as possible, and they do not seem to have looked to it even for advice.

The only point at which the two governments could touch even indirectly on suffrage matters was article V, which provided that the delegates to the Confederation Congress should be "appointed in such manner as the legislatures of each State should direct."

Also, quoting directly from the Articles of Confederation, and to demonstrate the doctrines that remained ever uppermost in the minds of the founders of our country, I quote article II:

Each State retains its sovereignty, freedom, and independence, and every power, jurisdiction, and right which is not by this Confederation expressly delegated to the United States in Congress assembled.

I now read from the Federalist Articles of Confederation, article V, the first paragraph:

For the more convenient management of the general interest of the United States, delegates shall be annually appointed in such manner as the legislature of each State shall direct, to meet in Congress on the first Monday in November, in every year, with a power reserved to each State to recall its delegates, or any of them, at any time within the year, and to send others in their stead, for the remainder of the year.

Also:

In determining questions in the United States in Congress assembled, each State shall have one vote.

The above provisions show clearly that matters of voting qualifications were to be left strictly to each State. The Articles of Confederation were inadequate and hurried, and later proved insufficient to cope with the changing United States and its manifold problems. A new and far-sighted instrument was needed, a considered and well-debated structure built on a framework with a future. But, it is noteworthy, before we turn from the Articles of Confederation, that even though the country was in the midst of revolution, torn by varying doctrines and lacking in all organization at the time they were written, there was one thing that was not left out. Many important things were left out, much was left a blank, but even in a time of crisis these men who were struggling for a workable governing organ to suit their needs and their hopes, kept one thing before them, the inviolable right of each State to determine the qualification of its voters and to control its own elections. They did not fail to preserve this right in the articles they drafted.

When the Articles of Confederation, which were adopted in time of stress without full cognizance of the problems to be solved and with the States themselves ill defined geographically and politically, proved unsatisfactory and insufficient, it was suggested by Hamilton in 1780, and later by Tom Paine, that a convention be called to revise the Articles of Confederation, and to draft a Constitution of the United States of America.

Let us go back to that convention. There is drama in the air. Vital provisions for the constitutional structure of a new country are in the making. Each delegate has his own theories, his own pet beliefs to advance. All are filled with a desire for the best in government for their new country.

Maj. William Pierce, of Georgia, made some notes of the membership of the convention. Among those historically well known to us today who were prominent in drafting provisions affecting voting qualifications was Rufus King, about whom Major Pierce said:

Mr. King is a man much distinguished for his eloquence and great parliamentary talents. He was educated in Massachusetts, and is said to have good classical as well as legal knowledge. He has served for 3 years in the Congress of the United States with great and deserved applause, and is at this time high in the confidence and approbation of his countrymen. This gentleman is about 33 years of age, about 5 feet 10 inches high, well formed, a handsome face, with a strong expressive eye, and a sweet high toned voice. In his public speaking there is something peculiarly strong and rich in his expression, clear, and convincing in his arguments, rapid and irresistible at times in his eloquence but he is not always equal. His action is natural, swimming, and graceful, but there is a rudeness of manner sometimes accompanying it. But take him tout en semble, he may with propriety be ranked among the luminaries of the present age. (United States, Formation of the Union—Documents, p. 96, all paragraphs, starting "Mr. King.")

There was Nat Gorham, about whom it is said:

Mr. Gorham is a merchant in Boston, high in reputation, and much in the esteem of his countrymen. He is a man of very good sense, but not much improved in his education. He is eloquent and easy in public debate, but has nothing fashionable or elegant in his style; all he aims at is to convince, and where he fails it never is from his auditory not understanding him, for no man is more perspicuous and full. He has been President of Congress, and 3 years a Member of that body. Mr. Gorham is about 46 years of age, rather lusty, and has an agreeable and pleasing manner. (United States, Formation of the Union—Documents, p. 96, last paragraph, on Mr. Gorham.)

One of the high lights was Alexander Hamilton.

Colonel Hamilton is deservedly celebrated for his talents. He is a practitioner of the law, and reputed to be a finished scholar.

To a clear and strong judgment he unites the ornaments of fancy, and whilst he is able, convincing, and engaging in his eloquence the heart and head sympathize in approving him. Yet there is something too feeble in his voice to be equal to the strains of oratory; it is my opinion that he is rather a convincing speaker, than a blazing orator. Colonel Hamilton requires time to think, he inquires into every part of his subject with the searchings of philosophy, and when he comes forward he comes highly charged with interesting matter, there is no skimming over the surface of a subject with him, he must sink to the bottom to see what foundation it rests on. His language is not always equal, sometimes didactic like Bolingbroke's, at others light and tripping like Stern's. His eloquence is not so defusive as to trifle with the senses, but he rambles just enough to strike and keep up the attention. He is about 33 years old, of small stature, and lean. His manners are tinctured with stiffness, and sometimes with a degree of vanity that is highly disagreeable. (United States, Formation of the Union—Documents, p. 96, last par., "Colonel Hamilton," through paragraph, p. 99.)

From Connecticut came Oliver W. Ellsworth, who was on the Committee of Detail charged with forcing the provisions affecting elections:

Mr. Ellsworth is a judge of the Supreme Court in Connecticut; he is a gentleman of a clear, deep, and copious understanding; eloquent, and connected in public debate; and always attentive to his duty. He is very happy in a reply, and choice in selecting such parts of his adversary's arguments as he finds make the strongest impressions, in order to take off the force of them, so as to admit the power of his own. Mr. Ellsworth is about 37 years of age, a man much respected for his integrity, and venerated for his abilities. (United States, Formation of the Union, p. 96, 2d par., beginning "Mr. Ellsworth.")

From Pennsylvania, on this committee, came Mr. James Wilson:

Mr. Wilson ranks among the foremost in legal and political knowledge. He has joined to a fine genius all that can set him off and show him to advantage. He is well acquainted with man, and understands all the passions that influence him. Government seems to have been his peculiar study, all the political institutions of the world he knows in detail, and can trace the causes and effects of every revolution from the earliest stages of the Grecian commonwealth down to the present time. No man is more clear, copious, and comprehensive than Mr. Wilson, yet he is no great orator. He draws the attention not by the charm of his eloquence, but by the force of his reasoning. He is about 45 years old. (United States, Formation of the Union, p. 101, 5th par., beginning "Mr. Wilson.")

From Virginia came James Madison and Edmund Randolph:

Mr. Madison is a character who has long been in public life; and what is very remarkable, every person seems to acknowledge his greatness. He blends together the profound politician with the scholar. In the management of every great question he evidently took the lead in the convention, and though he cannot be called an orator, he is a most agreeable, eloquent, and convincing speaker. From a spirit of industry and application which he possesses in a most eminent degree, he always comes forward the best informed man of any point in debate. The affairs of the United States, he perhaps, has the most correct knowledge of, of any man in the Union. He has been twice a Member of Congress, and was always thought one of the ablest Members that ever sat in that council. Mr. Madison is about 37 years of age, a gentleman of great modesty, with a remarkable sweet temper. He is easy and unreserved among his acquaintance, and has a most agreeable style of conversation. (United States, Formation of the Union, p. 104, 1st par., beginning "Mr. Madison.")

Mr. Randolph is Governor of Virginia, a young gentleman in whom unite all the accomplishments of the scholar and the statesman. He came forward with the postulata, or first principles, on which the convention acted, and he supported them with a force of eloquence and reasoning that did him great honor. He has a most harmonious voice, a fine person, and striking manners. Mr. Randolph is about 32 years of age. United States, Formation of the Union, p. 105, 3d par., beginning "Mr. Randolph.")

Robert Morris, with James Wilson, Benjamin Franklin, Gouverneur Morris, and others, represented Pennsylvania:

Robert Morris is a merchant of great eminence and wealth; and able financier, and a worthy patriot. He has an understanding equal to any public object, and possesses an energy of mind that few men can boast of. Although he is not learned, yet he is as great as those who are. I am told that when he speaks in the Assembly of Pennsylvania, that he bears down all before him. What could have been his reason for not speaking in the convention I know not, but he never once spoke on any point. This gentleman is about 50 years old. (United States, Formation of the Union, p. 101, 1st par.)

On May 29, 1787, Edmund Randolph presented the following resolution:

"*Resolved therefore*, That the rights of suffrage in the National Legislature ought to be proportioned to the quotas of contribution, or to the number of free inhabitants, as the one or the other rule may seem best in different cases.

"*Resolved*, That the National Legislature ought to consist of two branches.

"*Resolved*, That the Members of the first branch of the National Legislature ought to be elected by the people of the several States every (blank) for the term of (blank)." (United States, Formation of the Union, p. 110, all of pars. 2, 3 and in par. 4 to semicolon after "term of.")

Then Mr. Charles Pickney laid before the House the draft of a Federal Government which he had prepared, to be agreed upon between the free and independent States of America. (United States, Formation of the Union, p. 119.)

By all these statesmen the United States was referred to as a Union of free and independent States, a group of varying entities with varying problems, soils, industries, populations, having in mind future additions of more States, united for the common good of all.

Article III of Mr. Pickney's draft reads: "The Members of the House of Delegates shall be chosen every (blank) year by the people of the several States; and the qualifications of the electors shall be the same as those of the electors in the several States for their legislatures." (Elliott, Constitutional Debates, vol. I (first edition), p. 146.)

Pinckney also provided in article 5 of his plan:

Each State shall prescribe the time and manner of holding elections by the people for the House of Delegates. (See III Records of the Federal Convention, p. 597, Appendix D.)

Alexander Hamilton's suggested provision was a general one:

III. The Assembly to consist of persons elected by the people to serve for 3 years (United States, Formation of the Union, p. 979.)

When Mr. Randolph's plan was considered, what was the feeling concerning the provision for election of Members of the first branch of the National Legislature by the people of the several States? The discussion is illuminating in showing the angles considered, which make clear the meaning of the provisions ultimately adopted.

Mr. Sherman opposed the election by the people, insisting that it ought to be by the State legislature. The people, he said, immediately should have as little to do as may be about the Government. They want information and are constantly liable to be misled.

Mr. Gerry—

These are his views—

The evils we experience flow from the excess of democracy. The people do not want virtue, but are the dupes of pretended patriots.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'CONOR in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Would the Senator not think that, due to better education and a more learned electorate today, perhaps some of that logic might not be as good today as it was at the time it was adopted?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no question about that, I may say to my distinguished friend. What I am reading now was stated in 1789 or 1779. I am reading from the Formation of Our Union, and the purpose of my reading is to show that not only did the Colonies maintain the right to prescribe who should or should not vote, but that the same right was maintained under the Articles of Confederation and when the Colonies became States under the Constitution. The right of suffrage and the right to prescribe the qualifications of voters was guarded zealously first by the Colonies and then by the States.

As I am going to point out in the course of the debate, if it had not been written into the Constitution that the right to prescribe the qualifications of voters was to remain the prerogative of the States, the Federal Constitution in all probability, would never have been adopted. I continue with the views of Mr. Gerry:

The evils we experience flow from the excess of democracy. The people do not want virtue, but are the dupes of pretended patriots.

That expression was made many years ago, and as my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Louisiana, has pointed out, that situation does not exist today. But it has the effect of demonstrating the extent to which the people of that time desired to go in order to preserve their right to declare who should vote and who should operate the Government.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the senior Senator from Louisiana yield to the junior Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Is not the logic expressed therein to some extent applicable today, however, to the extent that possibly it might be wise to consider certain educational qualifications for voters?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is true that very few States are without such qualifications. Many States, it is true, do not require payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite. But many of them require a person to possess certain educational qualifications in order to vote, and many of them today retain the same qualifications as those I have cited heretofore with respect to the Colonies. There have been, of course, certain slight changes.

In many States, as I pointed out a while ago, there was a requirement with respect to religious qualifications. Some prohibited Catholics from voting; in some States Jews could not vote. Some allowed only deists to vote, but those religious qualifications have gradually been eliminated. As I pointed out, South Carolina was the last State of the Union to dispense with religious qualifications.

To continue:

Mr. GERRY. The evils we experience flow from the excess of democracy. The people do not want virtue, but are the dupes of pretended patriots. In Massachusetts it had been fully confirmed by experience that they are daily misled into the most baneful measures and opinions by the false reports circulated by designing men, and which no one on the spot can refute. One principal evil arises from the want of due provision for those employed in the administration of Government. It would seem to be a maxim of democracy to starve the public servants. He mentioned the popular clamor in Massachusetts for the reduction of salaries and the attack made on that of the Government though secured by the spirit of the Constitution itself. He had, he said, been too republican heretofore: He was still, however, republican, but had been taught by experience the danger of the leveling spirit.

Mr. President, I may say the word "republican" as there used was spelled with a small "r", not with a capital "R".

Mr. Mason argued strongly for an election of the larger branch by the people. It was to be the grand depository of the democratic principle of the Government. It was, so to speak, to be our House of Commons—It ought to know and sympathize with every part of the community; and ought therefore to be taken not only from different parts of the whole Republic, but also from different districts of the larger members of it, which had in several instances, particularly in Virginia, different interests and views arising from difference of produce, of habits, and so forth. He admitted that we had been too democratic but was afraid we should incautiously run into the opposite extreme. We ought to attend to the rights of every class of people. He had often wondered at the indifference of the superior classes of society to this dictate of humanity and policy; considering that however affluent their circumstances, or elevated their situations might be, the course of a few years, not only might but certainly would, distribute their posterity throughout the lowest classes of society. Every selfish motive therefore, every family attachment, ought to recommend such a system of policy as would provide no less carefully for the rights and happiness of the lowest than of the highest orders of citizens.

Mr. Wilson contended strenuously for drawing the most numerous branch of the Legislature immediately from the people. He was for raising the Federal pyramid to a considerable altitude, and for that reason wished to give it as broad a basis as possible. No government could long subsist without the confidence of the people. In a republican government this confidence was peculiarly essential. He also thought it wrong to increase the weight of the State legislatures by making them the electors of the National Legislature. All interference between the general and local government should be obviated as much as possible. On examination it would be found that the opposition of States to Federal measures had proceeded much more from the officers of the States, than from the people at large.

Mr. Madison considered the popular election of one branch of the National Legislature as essential to every plan of free Government. He observed that in some of the States one branch of the legislature was composed of men already removed from the people by an intervening body of electors. That if the first branch of the general legislature should be elected by the State legislatures, the second branch elected by the first—the executive by the second together with the first; and other appointments again made for subordinate purposes by the executive, the people would be lost sight of altogether; and the necessary sympathy between them and their rulers and officers, too little felt. He was an advocate for the policy of refining the popular appointments by successive filtrations, but thought it might be pushed too far. He wished the expedient to be resorted to only in the appointment of the second branch of the Legislature, and in the executive and judiciary branches of the Government. He thought too that the great fabric to be raised would be more stable and durable if it should rest on the solid foundation of the people themselves, than if it should stand merely on the pillars of the legislatures.

Mr. Gerry did not like the election by the people. The maxims taken from the British constitution were often fallacious when applied to our situation which was extremely different. Experience he said had shown that the State legislatures drawn immediately from the people did not always possess their confidence. He had no objection however to an election by the people if it were so qualified that men of honor and character might not be unwilling to be joined in the appointments. He seemed to think the people might nominate a certain number out of which the State legislatures should be bound to choose.

Mr. Butler thought an election by the people an impracticable mode.

On the question for an election of the first branch of the National Legislature by the people:

Mass., ay. Conn., div. N. York, ay. N. Jersey, no. Penn., ay. Delaware, div. Va., ay. N. C., ay. S. C., no. Georgia, ay.

(United States, Formation of the Union, p. 125, starting "Mr. Sherman," all p. 126 and on 127 through words "Georgia, ay.")

In the final report on Mr. Randolph's plan the Committee of the Whole merely said:

3. *Resolved*, That the Members of the first branch of the National Legislature ought to be elected by the people of the several States for the term of 3 years. (United States, Formation of the Union, at p. 201.)

And nothing about voting qualifications, leaving this for specific provision in the States.

On Monday, August 6, the Committee of Detail reported finally the following provision:

(Art. IV, sec. 1). The Members of the House of Representatives shall be chosen every second year by the people of the several States comprehended within the Union. The qualifications of the electors shall be the same, from time to time, as those of the electors in the several States of the most numerous branch of their own legislature. (See United States, Formation of the Union, at p. 472.)

It is particularly interesting to turn to the reports of the work of the Committee of Detail to see through what stages article IV, section 1 (which is article I, section 2, of our Constitution today) progressed. The very regulations being proposed at this time in this body were suggested in 1787 at the Constitutional Convention and rejected at that time. On June 19 one draft was set forth. It provided:

That the Members of the second Branch of the Legislature of the United States ought to be chosen by the individual legislatures—to be of the age of 30 years at least; to hold their offices for the term of 6 years, one-third to go out biennially; to receive a compensation for the devotion of their time to the public service; to be ineligible to and incapable of holding any office under the authority of the United States (except those peculiarly belonging to the functions of the second Branch) during the term for which they are elected, and for 1 year thereafter. (II Farrand, Records of Federal Convention, p. 129 and 130).

The next step was as follows:

The qualification of electors shall be the same (throughout the States, viz) with that in the particular States unless the legislature shall hereafter direct some uniform qualification to prevail through the States. (II Farrand, Records of Federal Convention, p. 130).

(Citizenship; manhood; sanity of mind; previous residence for 1 year, or possession of real property within the State for the whole of 1 year, or enrollment in the militia for the whole of a year.)

Next:

The Members of the House of Representatives shall be chosen biennially by the people of the United States in the following manner. Every freeman of the age of 21 years—having a freehold estate within the United States—who has—having—resided in the United States for the space of one whole year immediately preceding the day of election, and has a freehold estate in at least 50 acres of land. (II Farrand, supra, p. 151.)

Then:

The Members of the House of Representatives shall be chosen every second year—in the manner following—by the people of the several States comprehended within this Union—the time and place and the manner of holding the elections and the rules. The qualifications of the electors shall be (appointed) prescribed by the legislatures of the several States; but their provisions—which they shall make concerning them shall be subject to the control of—concerning them may at any time be altered and superseded by the Legislature of the United States. (II Farrand, supra, p. 153.)

Mr. President, that was a proposal which was made at one time, and I am citing all these various proposals to show how the members of that Convention finally drifted to the provision of the Constitution which is now in that sacred document. In my mind any Senator who will take the time to read these excerpts, to read the history of the present article of the Constitution which gives to the States the right to prescribe qualifications of voters, will come unequivocally

to the conclusion that this was to be done by the States and not by the Congress.

I have taken much time and much effort in digging up this information, Mr. President. At this moment, approximately 6 o'clock, I have been talking almost 6 hours, and four Senators, including the Presiding Officer, have been listening to me.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the Senator this question: Did not the Seventy-seventh and Seventy-eighth Congresses confirm what our founding fathers did when the question before this body was that of reducing from 21 to 18 years of age the age limit of those eligible to vote, and did not the State of Georgia, and perhaps another State, reduce the age limit from 21 to 18 years?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Let me ask the Senator this question: Did the Federal Government, which drafted those boys, make any change in the qualifications?

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course the Congress did not undertake to prescribe qualifications, but it worked out a plan whereby those men could vote. The point which I am trying to stress is that if Senators would take the time to study all of the debates which took place when the Convention drafted our present Constitution, they would find, without any doubt, that it was the intention that the States themselves should have the right to define the qualifications of voters. Not only that, but our courts have so held. So I am satisfied that if Senators will open their minds and study the debates and consider Article 2 of the Constitution, and read it carefully, they will find that it is written, in language as plain as language can be, that the qualifications of voters are a prerogative of the States and not of the Congress.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Louisiana if that is not exactly what was worked out in the Seventy-seventh and Seventy-eighth Congresses for those who were in the armed services.

Mr. ELLENDER. Insofar as making facilities available is concerned, that is correct. But, they had to be qualified.

Mr. MAYBANK. By State laws?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct; except, as I remember, the poll tax. There was some exception made in that respect. Basically, I believe it was wrong to have done that. Congress had no authority in that respect to take the steps it did. But in an emergency I voted for it, though having doubt as to whether it was a violation of the Constitution. I voted for it so as to give soldiers the right and opportunity to vote. But the law itself did little except follow the State laws in the respective States except as to the poll tax, as I have said.

Again, see the next report:

The Members of the House of Representatives shall be chosen every second year, by the people of the several States comprehended within this Union. The qualifications of the electors shall be prescribed by the legislatures of the several States but these provisions concerning them may, at any time, be altered and superseded by the legislature of the United States—the same from time to time as those of the electors, in the several States, of the most numerous branch of their own legislatures.

That proposition was submitted in debate, and I cite it to show the varying views of the members of the Convention and the manner and method proposed by each of them. I cite it merely to show that I do not believe anyone overlooked any argument. In other words, there was free debate on the entire subject, and everyone knew what it was all about. After long debate the present amendment to the Constitution was finally adopted by the Convention, and later ratified by three-fourths of the 13 States.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not a fact that the same rule was adopted when provision was made for the election of United States Senators by popular vote? Is it not a fact that that provision is twice in the Constitution?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. Prior to 1913 Senators were chosen by the legislatures of the respective States, as provided by the Constitution. In 1913, when the Constitution was amended so as to make it possible to elect Senators by popular vote, the identical language is employed one-hundred-and-some-odd years previously, which, in effect, stated that the electors choosing Members of the House of Representatives should have the qualifications of electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. That language was copied, word for word, when the seventeenth amendment prescribed the new method of election of United States Senators.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not a fact that since that language was again placed in the Constitution, it showed that those who were here in the early twentieth century believed in the founding fathers and their conception of government?

Mr. ELLENDER. They must have. That goes without argument.

Every one of these suggestions was thought of long ago. They were discussed and wisely rejected by the framers of our Constitution, when they finally agreed on the form above set out; that is—

The Members of the House of Representatives shall be chosen every second year by the people of the several States comprehended within this Union. The qualifications of the electors shall be the same, from time to time, as those of the electors in the several States, of the most numerous branch of their own legislatures. (See Farrand, p. 178, art. IV, sec. 1.)

This point, as all others in the much-debated text, was discussed fully. It is interesting to note what such well-informed and brilliant men as Gouverneur Morris; James Wilson, who was a Justice of the United States; Oliver Ellsworth, who was later Chief Justice of the Supreme Court; Colonel Mason; Benjamin Franklin; John Rutledge, who was also a Chief Justice of the United States; and James Madison, thought of the proposed resolution.

I now quote from Formation of the Union, pages 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492:

Mr. GOUVERNEUR MORRIS moved to strike out the last member of the section beginning with the words "qualifications of electors," in order that some other provision might be substituted which would restrain the right of suffrage to freeholders.

Mr. FITZSIMMONS seconded the motion.

Mr. WILLIAMSON was opposed to it.

Mr. WILSON. This part of the report was well considered by the committee, and he did not think it could be changed for the better. It was difficult to form any uniform rule of qualifications for all the States. Unnecessary innovations he thought too should be avoided. It would be very hard and disagreeable for the same persons at the same time, to vote for representatives in the State legislature and to be excluded from a vote for those in the National Legislature.

Mr. GOUVERNEUR MORRIS. Such a hardship would be neither great nor novel. The people are accustomed to it and not dissatisfied with it, in several of the States. In some the qualifications are different for the choice of the Governor and of the Representatives; in others for different houses of the legislature. Another objection against the clause as it stands is that it makes the qualifications of the National Legislature depend on the will of the States, which he thought not proper.

Mr. ELLSWORTH thought the qualifications of the electors stood on the most proper footing. The right of suffrage was a tender point, and strongly guarded by most of the State constitutions. The people will not readily subscribe to the National Constitution if it should subject them to be disfranchised. The States are the best judges of the circumstances and temper of their own people.

Colonel MASON. The force of habit is certainly not attended to by those gentlemen who wish for innovations on this point. Eight or nine States have extended the right of suffrage beyond the freeholders. What will the people there say, if they should be disfranchised? A power to alter the qualifications would be a dangerous power in the hands of the Legislature.

Mr. BUTLER. There is no right of which the people are more jealous than that of suffrage. Abridgments of it tend to the same revolution as in Holland where they have at length thrown all power into the hands of the senates, who fill up vacancies themselves, and form a rank aristocracy.

Mr. DICKINSON had a very different idea of the tendency of vesting the right of suffrage in the freeholders of the country. He considered them as the best guardians of liberty; and the restriction of the right to them as a necessary defense against the dangerous influence of those multitudes without property and without unpopularity of the innovation it was in his opinion chemirical. The great mass of our citizens is composed at the time of freeholders, and will be pleased with it.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. How shall the freehold be defined? Ought not every man who pays a tax to vote for the representative who is to levy and dispose of his money? Shall the wealthy merchants and manufacturers, who will bear the full share of the public burdens be not allowed a voice in the imposition of them—taxation and representation ought to go together.

Mr. GOUVERNEUR MORRIS. He had long learned not to be the dupe of words. The sound of aristocracy therefore had no effect upon him. It was the thing, not the name, to which he was opposed, and one of his principal objections to the Constitution as it

is now before us, is that it threatens the country with an aristocracy. The aristocracy will grow out of the House of Representatives. Give the votes to people who have no property, and they will sell them to the rich who will be able to buy them. We should not confine our attention to the present moment. The time is not distant when this country will abound with mechanics and manufacturers who will receive their bread from their employers. Will such men be the secure and faithful guardians of liberty? Will they be the impregnable barrier against aristocracy? He was as little duped by the association of the words taxation and representation. The man who does not give his vote freely is not represented. It is the man who dictates the vote. Children do not vote. Why? Because they want prudence, because they have no will of their own. The ignorant and the dependent can be as little trusted with the public interest. He did not conceive the difficulty of defining freeholders to be insuperable. Still less that the restriction could be unpopular. Nine-tenths of the people are at present freeholders and these will certainly be pleased with it. As to merchants, etc., if they have wealth and value the right they can acquire it. If not they don't deserve it.

Colonel MASON. We all feel too strongly the remains of ancient prejudices, and view things too much through a British medium. A freehold is the qualification in England, and hence it is imagined to be the only proper one. The true idea in his opinion was that every man having evidence of attachment to and permanent common interest with the society ought to share in all its rights and privileges. Was this qualification restrained to freeholders? Does no other kind of property but land evidence a common interest in the proprietor? Does nothing besides property mark a permanent attachment. Ought the merchant, the monied man, the parent of a number of children whose fortunes are to be pursued in his own country, to be viewed as suspicious characters, and unworthy to be trusted with the common rights of their fellow citizens.

Mr. MADISON. The right to suffrage is certainly one of the fundamental articles of republican government, and ought not to be left to be regulated by the legislature.

When he spoke of the legislature he meant Congress.

A gradual abridgment of this right has been the mode in which aristocracies have been built on the ruins of popular forms. Whether the constitutional qualification ought to be a freehold, would with him depend much on the probable reception such a change would meet with in the States where the right was now exercised by every description of people. In several of the States a freehold was now the qualification. Viewing the subject in its merits alone, the freeholders of the country would be the safest depositories of republican liberty. In future times a great majority of the people will not only be without land, but any other sort of property. These will either combine under the influence of their common situation: in which case, the rights of property and the public liberty, will not be secure in their hands; or what is more probable, they will become the tools of opulence and ambition, in which case there will be equal danger on another side.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to his colleague?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question, yes.

Mr. LONG. Is it not a fact that since the writing of these papers there has been a great liberalization of all the qualifications for voting by all the States, or at any rate by most of the States that were involved at that time?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. I have previously pointed that out.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a further question.

Mr. LONG. Does not that further prove in historical retrospect that the Federal Government does not have to make the States liberalize their requirements for voting, but that as a historical fact the States have done it of their own accord?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. There is no doubt about that. If the Senator will be patient with me, I have before me data to show how each State, from the formation of the Union, made such changes. Congress did not do anything about it. But the States themselves did it through their own local governments.

The example of England had been misconceived (by Colonel MASON). A very small proportion of the representatives are there chosen by freeholders. The greatest part are chosen by the cities and boroughs, in many of which the qualification of suffrage is as low as it is in any one of the United States, and it is in the boroughs and cities rather than the counties that bribery most prevailed, and the influence of the Crown on elections was most dangerously exerted.

Doctor FRANKLIN. It is of great consequence that we should not depress the virtue and public spirit of our common people, of which they displayed a great deal during the war, and which contributed principally to the favorable issue of it. He related the honorable refusal of the American seamen who were carried in great numbers into the British prisons during the war, to redeem themselves from misery or to seek their fortunes, by entering on board the ships of the enemies to their country, contrasting their patriotism with a contemporary instance in which the British seamen made prisoners by the Americans, readily entered on the ships of the latter on being promised a share of the prizes that might be made out of their own country. This proceeded, he said, from the different manner in which the common people were treated in America and Great Britain. He did not think that the elected had any right in any case to narrow the privileges of the electors. He quoted as arbitrary the British statute setting forth the danger of tumultuous meetings, and under that pretext narrowing the right of suffrage to persons having freeholds of a certain value; observing that this statute was soon followed by another under the succeeding Parliament, subjecting the people who had no votes to peculiar labors and hardships. He was persuaded also that such a restriction as was proposed would give great uneasiness in the populous States. The sons of a substantial farmer, not being themselves freeholders, would not be pleased at being disfranchised, and there are a great many persons of that description.

Mr. MERCER. The Constitution is objectionable in many points, but in none more than the present. He objected to the footing on which the qualification was put, but particularly to the mode of election by the people. The people cannot know and judge of the characters of candidates. The worst possible choice will be made. He quoted the case of the senate in Virginia as an example in point. The people in towns can unite their votes in favor of one favorite, and by that means always prevail over the people of the country, who being dispersed, will scatter their votes among a variety of candidates.

Mr. RUTLEDGE thought the idea of restraining the right of suffrage to the freeholders a very unadvised one. It would create division among the people and make enemies of all those who should be excluded.

On the question for striking out as moved by Mr. GOUVERNEUR MORRIS, from the word qualifications to the end of the article III:

N.H. no. Mas. no. Conn. no. Penn. no. Del. ay. Md. divided. Va. no. N.C. no. S.C. no. Georgia not present.

Adjourned.

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 8, IN CONVENTION

Art. IV. Sec. 1 being under consideration—Mr. MERCER expressed his dislike of the whole plan, and his opinion that it never could succeed.

Mr. GHORUM. He had never seen any inconvenience from allowing such as were not freeholders to vote, though it had long been tried. The elections in Philadelphia, New York, and Boston where merchants and mechanics vote are at least as good as those made by freeholders only. The case in England was not accurately stated yesterday (by Mr. MADISON). The cities and large towns are not the seat of Crown influence and corruption. These prevail in the boroughs, and not on account of the right which those who are not freeholders have to vote, but of the smallness of the number who vote. The people have been long accustomed to this right in various parts of America, and will never allow it to be abridged. We must consult their rooted prejudices if we expect their concurrence in our propositions.

Mr. MERCER did not object so much to an election by the people at large including such as were not freeholders, as to their being left to make their choice without any guidance. He hinted that candidates ought to be nominated by the State legislatures.

On the question of agreeing to art. IV, sec. 1, it passed nem. con. (Quoted from United States, Formation of the Union, all pp. 487–491 to art. IV, sec. 2 on p. 49.)

How timely this discussion is today. How true and to the point. I have no need to search for reasons or to manufacture a logician's arguments. I need only take the very words of men whom history has stamped with greatness and foresight to prove my position.

I repeat some of these well-considered words, in fact, I delight to dwell upon their wisdom.

The right of suffrage was a tender point, and strongly guarded by most of the State constitutions.

The States are the best judges of the circumstances and temper of their own people.

A power to alter the qualifications would be a dangerous power in the hands of the legislature (referring to the National Legislature).

Particularly note what Benjamin Franklin, noted for his practical, earthy, common sense, said:

He did not think that the elected had any right in any case to narrow the privileges of the electors.

Turning now from the remarkable document of James Madison, recording the activities of the Constitutional Convention, to the notes of Rufus King, a delegate from Massachusetts to the Constitutional Convention, corroborating the Madison papers, here is King's record

of the debate over the clause, "electors to be the same as those of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

MORRIS proposed to strike out the clause and to leave it to the State legislature to establish the qualification of the electors and elected, or to add a clause giving to the national legislature powers to alter the qualifications.

ELLSWORTH. If the legislature can alter the qualifications, they may disqualify three-fourths, or a greater portion of the electors—this would go far to create aristocracy. The clause is safe as it stands—the States have staked their liberties on the qualifications which we have proposed to confirm.

DICKINSON. It is urged that to confine the right of suffrage to the freeholders is a step toward the creation of an aristocracy. This cannot be true. We are all safe by trusting the owners of the soil; and it will not be unpopular to do so, for the freeholders are the more numerous class. Not from freeholders, but from those who are not freeholders, free governments have been endangered. Freeholds are by our laws of inheritance divided among the children of the deceased, and will be parceled out among all the worthy men of the State; the merchants and mechanics may become freeholders; and without being so, they are electors of the State legislatures, who appoint the Senators of the United States.

ELLSWORTH. Why confine the right of suffrage to freeholders? The rule should be that he who pays and is governed, should be an elector. Virtue and talents are not confined to the freeholders, and we ought not to exclude them.

MORRIS. I disregard sounds and am not alarmed with the word "aristocracy," but I dread the thing and will oppose it, and for this reason I think that I shall oppose this Constitution because it will establish an aristocracy. There cannot be an aristocracy of freeholders if they all are electors. But there will be, when a great and rich man can bring his poor dependents to vote in our elections—unless you establish a qualification of property, we shall have an aristocracy. Limit the right of suffrage to freeholders, and it will not be unpopular, because nine-tenths of the inhabitants are freeholders.

MASON. Everyone who is of full age and can give evidence of his common interest in the community should be an elector. By this rule, freeholders alone have not his common interest. The father of a family, who has no freehold, has this interest. When he is dead his children will remain. This is a natural interest or bond which binds men to their country—lands are but an artificial tie. The idea of counting freeholders as the true and only persons to whom the right of suffrage should be confided is an English prejudice. In England, a Twig and Turf are the electors.

MADISON. I am in favor of entrusting the right of suffrage to freeholders only. It is a mistake that we are governed by English attachments. The Knights of the Shires are chosen by freeholders, but the members of the cities and boroughs are elected by freemen without freeholds, and who have as small property as the electors of any other country. Where is the crown influence seen, where is corruption in the elections practiced—not in the counties, but in the cities and boroughs.

FRANKLIN. I am afraid that by depositing the right of suffrage in the freeholders exclusively we shall injure the lower class of freemen. This class possess hardy virtues and great integrity. The Revolutionary War is a glorious testimony in favor of Plebeian virtue—our military and naval men are sensible of this truth. I myself know that our seamen who were prisoners in England refused all the allurements that were made use of, to draw them from their allegiance to their country—threatened with ignominious halters, they still refused. This was not the case with the English seamen, who, on being made prisoners entered into the American service and pointed out where other prisoners could be made—and this arose from a plain cause. The Americans were all free and equal to any of their fellow citizens—the English seamen were not so. In ancient times every freeman was an elector, but afterward England made a law which required that every elector should be a freeholder. This law related to the county elections—the consequence was that the residue of the inhabitants felt themselves disgraced, and in the next parliament a law was made, authorizing the justice of the peace to fix the price of labor and to compel persons who were not freeholders to labor for those who were, at a stated rate, or to be put in prison as idle vagabonds. From this period the common people of England lost a great portion of attachment to their country.

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 8. QUALIFICATIONS OF ELECTORS OF REPRESENTATIVES

GORHAM. The qualifications (being such as the several States prescribe for electors of their most numerous branch of the legislature) stand well. Gentlemen are in error, who suppose the electors of cities may not be trusted. In England the members chosen in London, Bristol, and Liverpool are as independent as the members of the counties of England. The Crown has little or no influence in city election, but has great influence in boroughs, where the votes of freeholders are bought and sold. There is no risk in allowing the merchants and mechanics to be electors; they have been so since time immemorial in this country and in England. We must not disregard the habits, usages and prejudices of the people (pp. 873, 874, 875, to top p. 876).

This debate, with the resulting provisions duly considered, was again recorded by Dr. James McHenry, delegate from Maryland. (See United States, Formation of the Union, pages 934 and 935.)

When all the views were aired, and the pros and cons of leaving the qualifications of voters for the National Legislature to be decided by the several States had been debated, the considered result was article I, section 2, of the Constitution of the United States, adopted September 17, 1787:

The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Every word of that provision had been torn apart in open discussion, until there can be no possible doubt that it was the intention of the framers of the Constitution to leave to State control the field of voting qualifications.

In submitting the Constitution, Dr. Samuel Johnson, the Delegate from Connecticut, added to it the following letter:

The friends of our country have long seen and desired that the power of making war, peace, and treaties, that of levying money and regulating commerce, and the correspondent executive and judicial authorities should be fully and effectually vested in the General Government of the Union; but the impropriety of delegating such extensive trust to one body of men is evident—thence results the necessity of a different organization. It is obviously impracticable in the Federal Government of these States to secure all rights of independent sovereignty to each, and yet provide for the interest and safety of all. Individuals entering into society must give up a share of liberty to preserve the rest. The magnitude of the sacrifice must depend as well on situation and circumstance, as on the object to be obtained. It is at all times difficult to draw with precision the line between those rights which must be surrendered and those which may be reserved; and on the present occasion this difficulty was increased by a difference among the several States as to their situation, extent, habits, and particular interest.

In all our deliberations on this subject we kept steadily in our view that which appeared to us the greatest interest of every true American, the consolidation of our Union, in which is involved our prosperity, felicity, safety, perhaps our national existence. This important consideration, seriously and deeply impressed on our minds, led each State in the Convention to be less rigid in points of inferior magnitude than might have been otherwise expected, and thus the Constitution, which we now present, is the result of a spirit of amity and of that mutual deference and concession which the peculiarity of our political situation rendered indispensable. That it will meet the full and entire approbation of every State is not perhaps to be expected, but each will doubtless consider that had her interest alone been consulted the consequences might have been particularly disagreeable and injurious to others; that it is liable to as few exceptions as could reasonably have been expected, we hope and believe; that it may promote the lasting welfare of that country so dear to us all, and secure her freedom and happiness, is our most ardent wish. (United States, Formation of the Union, p. 712.)

Thus we see that at a time when all rights of independent sovereignty could not be secured to each State, when the interest of each State alone could not be considered, when the greatest interest of every American was the consolidation of the Union, even then, when the line was drawn between the rights which had to be surrendered and those which would be reserved, the right to determine the qualifications of voters was reserved to each State.

A comment on this is found in McCulloch, Suffrage and Its Problems, at page 30:

When the more perfect union was formed under the Constitution of the United States, each State had the right to frame its own laws respecting suffrage. Hence article V was carried over into the new Constitution and became article I, section 2: The franchise for the election of the Members of the House of Representatives shall in every State be the same as for the "most numerous branch of the State legislature." The Constitution did not disturb the diversities of suffrage regulations existing in the several Commonwealths: It adopted them. For the Constitution to have been anything but silent on the regulation of suffrage would have been an innovation, and, as Viscount Bryce observed, the members of the Constitutional Convention were too sound political scientists to ignore precedents. Only in three amendments (and only directly in the fifteenth and nineteenth) has the Constitution trenched on the Commonwealth right to regulate suffrage—and even then under extraordinary circumstances. (McCulloch, p. 30, paragraph beginning "When" • • • through first paragraph on p. 31.)

These amendments I shall discuss later, when I have fully covered the formative period.

McCulloch, further commenting, says:

While there has been a revolution in the conception of citizenship, there was no such change in the regulation of suffrage, the determining and regulating power continued to rest with the States. However, much as publicists and reformers may desire a uniform national suffrage law, it is unattainable; expediency and constitutionality are both adverse. In fact such a plan was considered by the Constitutional Convention itself, but it received the vote of only one Commonwealth—Delaware. "The provision made by the convention appears to be the best that lay within their option." The "fathers" were satisfied for the States to continue to make their own suffrage tests, rather than to further prolong the convention and so further endanger the rather slim chances of ratification by the several Commonwealths. The prospect in the convention itself was anything but promising. Even Franklin moved to call in a parson that they might invoke the "assistance of Heaven."

The Constitution conferred the franchise on no one. Likewise citizenship does not bestow suffrage, either upon the natural born or the naturalized alien. The several States have the unqualified right to impose qualifications and regulate suffrage subject only to the limitations in the amendments referred to above. In handing down the decision in the case of *Corfield v. Coryell*, Judge Washington in enumerating the privileges and immunities that are usually associated with citizenship, said: "To which is to be added the elective franchise, as regulated and established by the laws or constitutions of the State in which it is exercised." (McCulloch, Suffrage and Its Problems, p. 32, paragraph starting "while" to end of paragraph, and on p. 33, starting line 6, word "The Const." through word "exercised" line 18, p. 33.)

Also note what Hart says in his Formation of the Union, at pages 136–37:

The real boldness of the Constitution is the novelty of the Federal system which it set up. This was the best of the few elaborate written Constitutions ever applied to a federation; and the details were so skillfully arranged that the instrument framed for 13 little agricultural communities works well today for 48 large and populous States. * * * The convention knew how to select institutions that would stand together; it also knew how to reject what would have weakened the structure.

It was a long time before a compromise between the discordant elements could be reached. To declare the country a centralized Nation would destroy the traditions of a century and a half; to leave it an assemblage of States, each claiming independence and sovereignty, would throw away the results of the Revolution. The Convention finally agreed that while the Union should be endowed with adequate powers, the States should retain all powers not specifically granted, and particularly the right to regulate their own internal affairs. (Formation of Union, p. 137, paragraph beginning "It was" through paragraph word "affairs.")

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the senior Senator from Louisiana yield to his colleague?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to my distinguished colleague for a question.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator not of the opinion, and does he not believe, that the elaborate discussions to which he has referred were with the view to protecting the States in their right to name their electors, and in prescribing their qualifications? Does he not believe that that was a device to prevent the Central Government from undermining and destroying the State governments themselves?

Mr. ELLENDER. I think there is no question about that. In other words, one of the things the 13 original States feared was that if the power of suffrage were lodged or fixed in the Congress, it could disfranchise many people and that it would place more power in the central government. As I shall point out from the discussions, it will be seen that the States guarded very jealously and zealously the right of suffrage. They saw to it that they retained the full power to spell out the qualifications of voters.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the senior Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator of the opinion that a Federal law to eliminate a poll-tax requirement would be completely unconstitutional?

Mr. ELLENDER. I may say to my colleague, that is what I have been trying to show here all day. There is absolutely no question about it. That is why I am giving this history, to show beyond doubt that the framers of the Constitution meant what they said when the suffrage article of the Constitution was adopted. As I tried to point out in the course of the debate, many other forms of procedure as to elections were considered. As I pointed out a while ago there were strenuous objections to letting Congress fix the qualifications. In other words the proposal now being made that Congress fix the qualifications was discussed and considered in the Constitutional Convention in 1787. The framers of our present Constitution in no uncertain terms made it clear that the States retained the right to prescribe qualifications, and that that power was not left in the hands of the Congress.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the senior Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. What would be the Senator's guess as to what would happen if a Federal antipoll tax were enacted and it were contested before the United States Supreme Court?

Mr. ELLENDER. I have no doubt the Supreme Court would declare it unconstitutional. That is my personal opinion. Aside from that, the Senator may have in his mind the question, Why not let it go to the Supreme Court? Every Senator takes an oath that he will obey, respect, and follow the Constitution, and will not violate it. I think it is incumbent on every Member of this body who wants to be true to his oath, indeed, it is his bounden duty, if he knows deep down in his heart that a proposal submitted to this body is unconstitutional to vote against it and do all in his power to prevent its passage.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to his colleague?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Do I correctly understand the Senator's position to be that he feels the Senate should regard itself as just as much the guardian of the Constitution as the United States Supreme Court?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no doubt about it. Of course, the United States Supreme Court was created for that purpose. It has that duty. In other words, the Supreme Court passes on laws enacted by the Congress. But I believe it is the duty of every Senator elected to this body to maintain the integrity of the Constitution and to observe his oath.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the senior Senator from Louisiana yield to the junior Senator?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a further question.

Mr. LONG. In view of the fact that the United States Supreme Court, especially in recent years, has been known to reverse itself on previous decisions, does the Senator not feel that the Supreme Court cannot always be depended upon to decide a question exactly as he thinks it should be decided?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is one reason why I want to exercise my own judgment in fighting and voting against any measure I think is unconstitutional. That is why I am taking certain steps now. I have no doubt the act would be unconstitutional, and I intend to do all in my power to prevent it from being brought to the Supreme Court.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is it not true that the oath taken by Senators requires them to do that? We take an oath to defend the Constitution. When we vote against a bill that is unconstitutional, we are defending the Constitution itself, in accordance with our oath are we not?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. There is no doubt about it at all.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a further question.

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask the Senator, Is it not true that we are under no obligation to follow the decisions of the Supreme Court if we conscientiously think the question we are voting upon is unconstitutional?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. Let me quote the oath for the benefit of Senators. I have taken the oath of office three times. I believe the distinguished Senator from Texas has taken it about

five or six times. I hope he takes it many more times.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. The oath reads:

I, TOM CONNALLY, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter: So help me God.

That is the oath that every Senator, now sitting in this Chamber, who is now serving in the Senate, took before he assumed his duties as a Senator.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Does not the oath mean that we will not only not vote for and will not support any bill we think is unconstitutional, but that we will do all we can to oppose the bill and to prevent its passage?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what I stated a moment ago in answer to questions from my distinguished colleague. That is why I am taking so long to make these explanations.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to his colleague?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. I ask, as a point of law, is it not true that when a statute is passed by the Congress, the statute carries a presumption of constitutionality until declared unconstitutional by the United States Supreme Court?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. That is the law.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Does not the Senator think that if the States and their representative or delegates in the State conventions which ratified the Constitution had not thought that the matter of suffrage and the question of qualifications of electors were left solely, entirely, and absolutely in the hands of the States, there never would have been any Federal Constitution?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no doubt about that. I expect to go more into detail regarding that, in the course of this debate. There is no question that it was one of the main points of discussion during the debates preceding the adoption of the Constitution. In the course of the next few hours I shall demonstrate that the conventions of the various States could never have ratified the Constitution except with the understanding that the right to spell out the qualifications of voters was a prerogative of the States and not of the Congress.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that there was no matter which came before the Constitutional Convention, or which afterwards came before the State conventions which ratified the Constitution, regarding which the delegates in the Constitutional Convention and the delegates in the several State conventions were so jealous and evidenced so much interest as in this very matter of the complete reservation to the States of all power and authority over the qualifications of electors?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no question about it.

Mr. President, history records that in 1788 there appeared the first edition of the now famous Federalist, a collection of essays written in favor of the new Constitution as agreed upon by the Federal Convention of September 17, 1787.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the fathers, in framing the Constitution, did not leave the matter open, did not leave it for the Congress possibly to widen it in some sort of way, but they specifically provided in plain, clear language in the Constitution, that the qualifications for electors for officers in the Federal Government should be the qualifications of those fixed by the States for their representatives in the house of representatives of the State legislatures?

Mr. ELLENDER. Not only is that true, Mr. President, but our own Supreme Court has so held, on many occasions, as I propose to demonstrate from a 30-page brief which I have in this envelope. I am now trying to demonstrate not only that the Colonies were jealous of their prerogative of fixing the qualifications of voters, but the Constitution would never have been ratified by the States unless that provision were placed in the Constitution. I shall further show that the highest court in our land has so construed the Constitution.

Mr. President, history records that in 1788 there appeared the first edition of the now famous Federalist, a collection of essays written in favor of the new Constitution as agreed upon by the Federal Convention on September 17, 1787.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Were not the Federalist papers written by Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Madison, and Mr. Jay, who had been in the Constitutional Convention and who had made the greatest contributions to the writing of the Constitution?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that no men could have spoken with greater authority on the Constitution than did those three men who had played such a large and conspicuous part in the drafting of the Constitution?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. I hope that Senators will take the time to read these extracts. I do not ask them to read the whole article, but only the pertinent parts. It required a great deal of work and research to obtain what I have here, and I am hopeful that many of the Senators who are not present at this moment will read, at least, these excerpts.

Mr. President, the authorship of the Federalist has been the subject of great research and argument. It is now conceded that a number of the papers were written by Alexander Hamilton, some by Madison, and a few by Jay. The distinguished Senator from Alabama has just mentioned those names. He anticipated what I had to say. I quote from an introduction to the work by Henry Cabot Lodge:

The Federalist, furthermore, was the first authoritative interpretation of the Constitution, and was mainly written by the two principal authors of that instrument. It was the first exposition of the Constitution and the first step in the long process of development which has given life, meaning, and importance to the clauses agreed upon at Philadelphia. It has acquired all the weight and sanction of a judicial decision, and has been constantly used as an authority in the settlement of constitutional questions. (The Federalist, Intro., p. XI 1st, 2nd para.)

In No. 45, by Madison, in a paper concerned with the question of whether the whole of the mass of Federal power would endanger the State's authority, the author said:

The powers delegated by the proposed Constitution to the Federal Government are few and defined. Those which are to remain in the State governments are numerous and indefinite. The former will be exercised principally on external objects, as war, peace, negotiation, and foreign commerce; with which last the power of taxation will, for the most part, be connected. The powers reserved to the several States will extend to all the objects which, in the ordinary course of affairs, concern the lives, liberties, and properties of the people, and the internal order, improvement, and prosperity of the State. (The Federalist, p. 290, paragraph beginning "The powers delegated.")

Next, let us turn to the Federalist, No. 52, by Hamilton, probably Madison. From the more general inquiries pursued in the four last papers, I pass on to a more particular examination of the several parts of the Government. I shall begin with the House of Representatives.

The first view to be taken of this part of the Government relates to the qualifications of the electors and the elected.

Those of the former are to be the same with those of the electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures. The definition of the right of suffrage is very justly regarded as a fundamental article of republican government. It was incumbent on the convention, therefore, to define and establish this right in the Constitution. To have left it open for the occasional regulation of the Congress would have been improper for the reason just mentioned. To have submitted it to the legislative discretion of the States, would have been improper for the same reason; and for the additional reason that it would have rendered too dependent on the State governments that branch of the Federal Government which ought to be dependent on the people alone. To have

reduced the different qualifications in the different States to one uniform rule, would probably have been as dissatisfactory to some of the States as it would have been difficult to the convention.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. For a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that some in the Constitutional Convention thought that the qualifications of the electors should be written into the Constitution?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that some thought that the matter should be more or less left open?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct; and some thought, I will say to my distinguished friend, that they should be spelled out by the Congress. I may say to the Senate that I do not know of any proposal which was more thoroughly discussed from all angles than was the one dealing with suffrage. So, there is no question that if a Senator desires to be reasonable himself and will study the question closely, he will have no difficulty in seeing that Congress has no right whatever to fix qualifications for the voters of any State.

As I pointed out on several occasions there are no United States voters. They are all State voters. Their qualifications are fixed by the States, and they have been so fixed ever since we have had States. The provision made by the Convention appears, therefore, to be the best that lay within their option. It must be satisfactory to every State, because it is conformable to the standard already established, or which may be established, by the State itself. It will be safe to the United States, because, being fixed by the State constitutions, it is not alterable by the State governments, and it cannot be feared that the people of the States will alter this part of their constitutions in such a manner as to abridge the rights secured to them by the Federal Constitution.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Could language be any clearer than this language in section 2 of article I of the Constitution:

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for the electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

I ask the Senator, could language be more specific than that?

Mr. ELLENDER. It could not be made clearer.

Mr. HILL. There is no way of misinterpreting it, is there?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that when we provided for direct election of United States Senators, we adopted the same language?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. CONNALLY. It occurs to me, as it has heretofore, that in addition to the arbitrary power of the Convention to write what it did about the electors for the most numerous branch of the State legislature having the same qualifications as those prescribed for electors for Members of the House of Representatives, there was a philosophy in that provision as well, in that an elector for a member of the State legislature having the same qualifications as the elector for a Representative, there could be no confusion between the qualifications of a voter in the Federal and the State election.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct; there is no doubt about it. All those points were brought out during the debate before that part of the Constitution was actually adopted.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. ELLENDER. For a question.

Mr. HILL. In other words, is it not true that when a citizen of a State becomes a qualified elector to vote for a member of the lower house of the legislature of the State, he then and there becomes a qualified elector to vote for Federal officers?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. I continue to read:

> The qualifications of the elected, being less carefully and properly defined by the State constitutions, and being at the same time more susceptible of uniformity, have been very properly considered and regulated by the Convention. A Representative of the United States must be of the age of 25 years; must have been 7 years a citizen of the United States; must, at the time of his election, be an inhabitant of the State he is to represent; and, during the time of his service, must be in no office under the United States. Under these reasonable limitations, the door of this part of the Federal Government is open to merit of every description, whether native or adoptive, whether young or old, and without regard to poverty or wealth, or to any particular profession of religious faith.

That is from the Federalist, No. 52, pages 327 and 328.

The provision in section 4, clause 1, of article I, provides that—

> The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof, but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the last section to which the Senator adverted applies only to the mechanics and does not apply at all to the qualifications of the man or the woman who is to go to the polls, mark the ballot, and drop it into the box?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. The matter here refers to the manner of holding elections. The Senator again anticipated me.

"Manner" here refers to manner of holding elections, the mechanics thereof. Obviously there is no bearing upon voting qualifications. The Congress treated the person of the elector in article I, section 2, and the form or procedure of the election in article I, section 4. That this power was only to be exercised in case of national emergency or failure of the State to provide for an election is made clear by Hamilton in his discussion in the Federalist, No. 59:

> They have submitted the regulation of elections for the Federal Government, in the first instance, to the local administrations; which, in ordinary cases, and when no improper views prevail, may be both more convenient and more satisfactory; but they have reserved to the national authority a right to interpose, whenever extraordinary circumstances might render that interposition necessary to its safety.
>
> Nothing can be more evident, than that an exclusive power of regulating elections for the National Government, in the hands of the State legislatures, would leave the existence of the Union entirely at their mercy. They could at any moment annihilate it, by neglecting to provide for the choice of persons to administer its affairs.

That is from the Federalist, page 369, line 22.

Even so, this procedural provision caused considerable objection and discussion in the State conventions which clarified its meaning by argument and emphasized its procedural application only, before they adopted the Constitution. I will discuss this fully in my treatment of the adoption of the Constitution by the various States, which I shall begin at this point.

I read from Formation of the Union, by Hart, pages 140 to 145:

> The text of the Constitution was printed and rapidly distributed throughout the Union. It was still but a lifeless draft, and before it could become an instrument of Government the approving action of Congress, of the legislatures, and of State conventions was necessary. On September 28, 1787, the Congress unanimously resolved that the Constitution be transmitted to the State legislatures. The Federal Convention was determined that the consideration of its work should not depend, like the Articles of Confederation, upon the slow and unwilling humor of the legislatures; but that in each State a convention should be summoned solely to express the will of the State upon the acceptance of the Constitution. It had further avoided the rock upon which had been wrecked the amendments proposed by Congress by providing these when nine State conventions should have ratified the Constitution, it was to take effect for those nine. On the same day that Congress in New York was passing its resolution, the Pennsylvania Legislature in Philadelphia was fixing the day for the election of delegates; all the State legislatures followed, except in Rhode Island.

Mr. HILL. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SMITH of Maine in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true, as the Senator has so well and ably brought out, that not only was this whole question of the qualifications of the electors thrashed out in the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, but that the question was also raised, discussed, considered, and thrashed out by the State conventions which met to determine whether or not the Constitution would be ratified by their States?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. I am coming to that. The Senator seems to anticipate me all the time. I propose to discuss what each State convention did, what each legislature did. Some actions were taken by conventions and some by legislatures. I believe I shall be able to demonstrate, without fear of successful contradiction, that the suffrage provision in the Constitution was one which caused more debate than almost any other.

Mr. HILL. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana again yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that these debates show clearly how jealous the States, through their delegates in the State conventions, were of too much concentration of power in the Federal Government?

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, I have answered that question two or three times on the Senate floor. That is the reason, to my way of thinking, why they thought they should prevent the creation of a too highly centralized Government. They felt that if they could maintain the right to fix the qualifications of electors it would accomplish the purpose.

Mr. HILL. Madam President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield for another question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that Patrick Henry and George Mason, two of the greatest of all our Revolutionary patriots, opposed in the Virginia Convention and before the people of Virginia, in many speeches——

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, the Senator, as I said before, is anticipating. I will bring that all out, if the Senator will just be patient.

Mr. HILL. Very well.

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, I continue to read:

> The next 6 months was a period of great anxiety and of national danger. The proposed Constitution was violently attacked in every part of the Union: the President, it was urged, would be a despot, the House of Representatives a corporate tyrant, the Senate an oligarchy. The large States protested that Delaware and Rhode Island would still neutralize the votes of Virginia and Massachusetts in the Senate. The Federal courts were said to be an innovation. It was known that there had been great divisions in the Convention, and that several influential members had left, or at the last moment refused to sign. "The people of this Commonwealth," said Patrick Henry, "are exceedingly uneasy in being brought from that state of full security which they enjoyed, to the present delusive appearance of things."
>
> As the State conventions assembled, the excitement grew more intense. Four States alone contained within a few thousand of half the population of the Union: they were Massachusetts, Virginia, New York, and North Carolina. In the convention of each of these States there was opposition strong and stubborn, one of them—North Carolina—adjourned without action; in the other three, ratification was obtained with extreme difficulty and by narrow majorities. The first State to come under the "new roof," as the Constitution was popularly called, was Delaware. In rapid succession followed Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Georgia, and Connecticut.
>
> In Massachusetts, the sixth State, there was a hard fight; the spirit of Shays' Rebellion was still alive; the opposition of Samuel Adams was only overcome by showing him that he was in the minority; John Hancock was put out of the power to interfere by making him the silent president of the convention. It was suggested that Massachusetts ratify on condition that a long list of amendments be adopted by the new government. The friends of the Constitution pointed out that this plan meant only to ratify a part of the Constitution and to reject the rest; each succeeding State would insist on its own list of amendments, and the whole work must be done over. February 6, 1788, the enthusiastic people of Boston knew that the Convention, by a vote of 187 to 167, had ratified the Constitution; the amendments being added not as a condition, but as a suggestion. Maryland, South Carolina, and New Hampshire brought the number up to nine.
>
> Before the ninth ratification was known, the fight had been won also in Virginia. Among the champions of the Constitution were Madison, Edmund Randolph, and John Marshall. James Monroe argued against the system of election which was destined twice to make him President. In spite of the determined opposition of Patrick Henry, and in spite of a proposition to ratify with amendments, the convention accepted. New York still held off. Her acquiescence was geographically necessary; and Alexander Hamilton, by the power of his eloquence and his reason, made clear the advantage of the Constitution to a future commercial state and the eleventh ratification was obtained.
>
> During the session of the convention in Philadelphia, Congress continued to sit in New York; and the Northwest Ordinance was passed at this time. Congress voted that the Constitution had been ratified, September 13, 1788; and that elections should proceed for the officers of the new government, which was to go into operation the first Wednesday in March, 1789.
>
> What, meantime, was the situation of the two States, Rhode Island and North Carolina, which had not ratified the Constitution, and which were, therefore, not entitled to take part in the elections? They had in 1781 entered into a constitution which was to be amended only by unanimous consent; their consent was refused. Had they not a right to insist on the continuance of the old Congress? The new Constitution, they considered, was flatly unconstitutional; it had been ratified by a process unknown to law. The situation was felt to be delicate, and those States were for the time being left to themselves. North Carolina came into the Union by a ratification of November 21, 1789. It was suggested that the trade of States which did not recognize Congress should be cut off, and Rhode Island yielded. May 19, 1790, her ratification completed the Union of the old thirteen States.

Keeping this summary in mind, let us consider in detail the proceedings and debates in the various States as they pertain to voting qualifications.

Delaware's ratification was the first one to be reported in general convention. Elliott's accounts of the constitutional debates contain nothing on Delaware's convention.

Pennsylvania was second to ratify the Constitution. In a speech by Mr. Wilson, on October 28, 1787, on behalf of the Constitution, he made the following observation:

> The legislative department is subdivided into two branches—the House of Representatives and the Senate. Can there be a House of Representatives in the General Government, after the State governments are annihilated? Care is taken to express the character of the electors in such a manner, that even the popular branch of the General Government cannot exist unless the governments of the States continue in existence.
>
> How do I prove this? By the regulation that is made concerning the important subject of giving suffrage. Article I, section 2: "And the electors in each State shall have the qualifications for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature." Now, sir, in order to know who are qualified to be electors of the House of Representatives, we are to inquire who are qualified to be electors of the legislature of each State. If there be no legislature in the States, there can be no electors of them: if there be no such electors, there is no criterion to know who are qualified to elect Members of the House of Representatives. By this short, plain deduction, the existence of State legislatures is proved to be essential to the existence of the General Government. (Elliott II, Constitutional Debates, p. 438.)

Concerning section 4 of article 1, Mr. Wilson, who was one of the members of the committee of detail, said:

> I will read it: "The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time, by law, make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators."
>
> And is this a proof that it was intended to carry on this Government after the State governments should be dissolved and abrogated? This clause is not only a proper, but necessary one. I have already shown what pains have been taken in the convention to secure the preservation of the State governments. I hope, sir, that it was no crime to sow the seed of self-preservation in the Federal Government; without this clause, it would not possess self-preserving power. By this clause, the times, places, and manner of holding elections shall be prescribed in each State, by the legislature thereof. I think it highly proper that the Federal Government should throw the exercise of this power into the hands of the State legislatures; but not that it should be placed there entirely without control.
>
> If the Congress had it not in their power to make regulations, what might be the consequences? Some States might make no regulations at all on the subject. And shall the existence of the House of Representatives, the immediate representation of the people in Congress, depend upon the will and pleasure of the State governments? Another thing may possibly happen; I don't say it will; but we were obliged to guard even against possibilities, as well as probabilities. A legislature may be willing to make the necessary regulations; yet the minority of that legislature may, by absenting themselves, break up the house, and prevent the execution of the intention of the majority. I have supposed the case, that some State governments may make no regulations at all; it is possible, also, that they may make improper regulations. I have heard it surmised by the opponents of this Constitution, that the Congress may order the election for Pennsylvania to be held at Pittsburgh, and thence conclude that it would be improper for them to have the exercise of power. But suppose, on the other hand, that the assembly should order an election to be held at Pittsburgh; ought not the General Government to have the power to alter such improper election of one of its

own constituent parts? But there is an additional reason still that shows the necessity of this provisionary clause. The Members of the Senate are elected by the State legislatures. If those legislatures possessed, uncontrolled, the power of prescribing the times, places, and manner, of electing Members of the House of Representatives, the Members of one branch of the General Legislature would be the tenants at will of the electors of the other branch; and the General Government would lie prostrate at the mercy of the legislatures of the several States.

I will ask now, Is the inference fairly drawn that the General Government was intended to swallow up the State governments? Or was it calculated to answer such end? Or do its framers deserve such censure from honorable gentlemen? We find, on examining this paragraph, that it contains nothing more than the maxims of self-preservation, so abundantly secured by this Constitution to the individuals States. Several other objections have been mentioned. I will not, at this time, enter into a discussion of them, though I may hereafter take notice of such as have any show of weight; but I thought it necessary to offer, at this time, the observations I have made, because I consider this as an important subject, and think the objection would be a strong one if it was well founded. (Elliott II, supra, pp. 440–441.)

Again:

The power over elections, and of judging of elections, gives absolute sovereignty. This power is given to every State legislature; yet I see no necessity that the power of absolute sovereignty should accompany it. My general position is, that the absolute sovereignty never goes from the people. (Elliott II, supra, pp. 464–465.)

Mr. Wilson leaves no doubt as to the meaning of the Constitution as he reiterates:

Permit me to proceed to what I deem another excellency of this system: All authority, of every kind, is derived by representation from the people, and the democratic principle is carried into every part of the Government. I had an opportunity, when I spoke first, of going fully into an elucidation of this subject. I mean not now to repeat what I then said.

I proceed to another quality that I think estimable in this system: It secures, in the strongest manner, the right of suffrage. Montesquieu, book 2, chapter 2, speaking of laws relative to democracy, says:

"When the body of the people is possessed of the supreme power, this is called a democracy. When the supreme power is lodged in the hands of a part of the people, it is then an aristocracy.

"In a democracy the people are in some respects the sovereign, and in others the subject.

"There can be no exercise of sovereignty but by their suffrages, which are their own will. Now, the sovereign's will is the sovereign himself. The laws, therefore, which establish the right of suffrage, are fundamental to this government. And, indeed, it is as important to regulate, in a republic, in what manner, by whom, to whom, and concerning what, suffrages are to be given, as it is, in a monarchy, to know who is the prince, and after what manner he ought to govern."

In this system, it is declared that the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. This being made the criterion of the right of suffrage, it is consequently secured, because the same Constitution guarantees to every State in the Union a republican form of government. The right of suffrage is fundamental to the republics. (Elliott II, supra, p. 482.)

In response to further objections to article I, section 4, Mr. Wilson said:

It is repeated, again and again, by the honorable gentleman, that "the power over elections, which is given to the General Government in this system is a dangerous power." I must own I feel, myself, surprised that an objection of this kind should be persisted in, after what has been said by the honorable colleague in reply. I think it has appeared, by a minute investigation of the subject, that it would have been not only unwise, but highly improper, in the late Convention, to have omitted this clause, or given less power than it does over elections. Such powers, sir, are enjoyed by every State government in the United States. In some they are of a much greater magnitude; and why should this be the only one deprived of them? Ought not these, as well as every other legislative body, to have the power of judging of the qualifications of its own members? "The times, places, and manner of holding elections for representatives may be altered by Congress." This power, sir, has been shown to be necessary, not only on some particular occasions, but even to the very existence of the Federal Government. I have heard some very improbable suspicions indeed suggested with regard to the manner in which it will be exercised. Let us suppose it may be improperly exercised; is it not more likely so to be by the particular States than by the Government of the United States?—because the General Government will be more studious of the good of the whole than a particular State will be; and therefore, when the power of regulating the time, place, or manner of holding elections, is exercised by the Congress, it will be to correct the improper regulations of a particular State. (Elliott II, supra, p. 509.)

Mr. McKean enumerated the arguments against the Constitution. Number four was that Congress could, by law, deprive the electors of a fair choice of their representatives by fixing improper times, places, and modes of election. He answered that argument as follows:

Every House of Representatives are of necessity to be the judges of the elections, returns, and qualifications of their own Members. It is therefore their province, as well as duty, to see that they are fairly chosen, and are the legal members; for this purpose, it is proper they should have it in their power to provide that the times, places, and manner of election should be such as to insure free and fair elections. (Elliott II, supra, p. 535.)

Obviously this text had reference to procedure only, and insures against the failure of a State to provide for an election; it had no bearing upon the qualifications of the electors, or voters, which was specifically left to the States in article I, section 2.

However, being zealous in their guard of their rights, a group of citizens of Pennsylvania gathered at a meeting in Harrisburg suggested a number of amendments to be submitted to the new Constitution. Among them was the following provision:

That Congress shall not have power to make or alter regulations concerning the time, place, and manner of electing Senators and Representatives, except in case of neglect or refusal by the State to make regulations for the purpose; and then only for such time as such neglect or refusal shall continue. (Elliott II, supra, p. 545, sec. 4.)

Pennsylvania ratified the Constitution December 12, 1787; New Jersey, December 18, 1787.

Connecticut was fourth on the list to come under the roof. I have found no argument specifically on the point of State control of voting qualifications, so I shall only note, in passing, the general observation of Governor Huntingdon, of Connecticut:

The State governments, I think, will not be endangered by the powers vested by this Constitution in the General Government. While I have attended in Congress, I have observed that the Members were quite as strenuous advocates for the rights of their respective States, as for those of the Union. I doubt not but that this will continue to be the case; and hence I infer that the General Government will not have the disposition to encroach upon the States.

On September 17, 1788, Connecticut ratified the Constitution. (Elliott II, supra, p. 199.)

Madam President, the Massachusetts Convention entered upon the consideration of the proposed Constitution on January 9, 1788. Here we find an extensive discussion of section 4, of article I:

Mr. Pierce (from Partridgefield), after reading the fourth section, wished to know the opinion of gentlemen on it, as Congress appeared thereby to have a power to regulate the time, place, and manner of holding elections. In respect to the manner, said Mr. Pierce, suppose the legislature of this State should prescribe that the choice of the Federal Representatives should be in the same manner as that of governor—a majority of all the votes in the State being necessary to make it such—and Congress should deem it an improper manner, and should order that it be as practiced in several of the Southern States, where the highest number of votes makes a choice—have they not power by this section to do so? Again, as to the place, continues Mr. Pierce, may not Congress direct that the election for Massachusetts shall be held in Boston? And if so, it is possible that, previous to the election, a number of the electors may meet, agree upon the eight delegates, and propose the same to a few towns in the vicinity, who, agreeing in sentiment, may meet on the day of election, and carry their list by a major vote. He did not, he said, say that this would be the case; but he wished to know if it was not a possible one.

Mr. Bishop rose, and observed that, by the fourth section, Congress would be enabled to control the elections of Representatives. It has been said, says he, that this power was given in order that refractory States may be made to do their duty. But if so, sir, why was it not so mentioned? If that was the intention, he asked why the clause did not run thus: "The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof"; but, "if any State shall refuse or neglect so to do, Congress may," etc. This, he said, would admit of no prevarication. (Elliott II, supra, p. 22.)

He proceeded to observe, that if the States shall refuse to do their duty, then let the power be given to Congress to oblige them to do it. But if they do their duty, Congress ought not to have the power to control elections. In an uncontrolled representation, says Mr. Bishop, lies the security of freedom; and he thought by these clauses, that that freedom was sported with. In fact, says he, the moment we give Congress this power, the liberties of the yeomanry of this country are at an end. But he trusted they would never give it; and he felt a consolation from the reflection.

The fourth section, which provides that the State legislatures shall prescribe the time, place, and manner of holding elections, and that Congress may at any time make or alter them, except in those of Senators, though not in regular order, under deliberation.

The Honorable Mr. Strong followed Mr. Bishop, and pointed out the necessity there is for the fourth section. The power, says he, to regulate the elections of our Federal Representatives must be lodged somewhere. I know of but two bodies wherein it can be lodged—the legislatures of the several States, and the General Congress. If the legislative bodies of the States, who must be supposed to know at what time, and in what place and manner, the elections can best be held, should so appoint them, it cannot be supposed that Congress, by the power granted by this section, will alter them; but if the legislature of a State should refuse to make such regulations, the consequence will be, that the Representatives will not be chosen, and the General Government will be dissolved. In such case, can gentlemen say that a power to remedy the evil is not necessary to be lodged somewhere?

Mr. J. C. Jones said, it was not right to argue the possibility of the abuse of any measure against its adoption. The power granted to Congress by the fourth section, says he, is a necessary power; it will provide against negligence and dangerous designs. The Senators and Representatives of this State, Mr. President, are now chosen by a small number of electors; and it is likely we shall grow equally negligent of our Federal elections; or, sir, a State may refuse to send to Congress its Representatives, as Rhode Island has done. Thus we see its necessity.

To say that the power may be abused, is saying what will apply to all power. The Federal Representatives will represent the people; they will be the people; and it is not probable they will abuse themselves. Mr. Jones concluded with repeating, that the arguments against this power could be urged against any power whatever.

Reverend Mr. WEST. I rise to express my astonishment at the arguments of some gentlemen against this section. They have only stated possible objections. I wish the gentlemen would show us that what they so much deprecate is probable. Is it probable that we shall choose men to ruin us? Are we to object to all governments? And because power may be abused, shall we be reduced to anarchy and a state of nature? What hinders our State legislatures from abusing their powers? They may violate the Constitution; they may levy taxes oppressive and intolerable, to the amount of all our property. An argument which proves too much, it is said, proves nothing. Some say Congress may remove the place of elections to the State of South Carolina. This is inconsistent with the words of the Constitution, which says, "that the elections, in each State, shall be prescribed by the legislature thereof," and so forth, and that representation be apportioned according to numbers; it will frustrate the end of the Constitution, and is a reflection on the gentlemen who formed it. Can we, sir, suppose them so wicked, so vile, as to recommend an article so dangerous? (Elliott II, supra, p. 23.)

The debate continued at length, while men sought to construe and interpret, to assure themselves that the State control of its elections was not superseded. The Honorable Mr. King, in the course of his speech, said:

The idea of the honorable gentlemen from Douglass, said he, transcends my understanding; for the power of control given by this section extends to the manner of election, not to qualifications of the electors. (Elliott II, supra, p. 51.)

Madam President, the temper of the convention is well illustrated by the words of Mr. Adams, speaking to the Chair, John Hancock presiding, of the convention.

Another of Your Excellency's propositions is calculated to quiet the apprehensions of gentlemen lest Congress should exercise an unreasonable control over the State legislatures, with regard to the time, place, and manner of holding elections, which, by the fourth section of the first article, are to be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof, subject to the control of Congress. I have had my fears lest this control should infringe the freedom of elections, which ought ever to be held sacred. Gentlemen who have objected to this controlling power in Congress have expressed their wishes that it had been restricted to such States as may neglect or refuse that power vested in them, and to be exercised by them if they please. Your Excellency proposes, in substance, the same restriction, which, I should think, cannot but meet with their full approbation. (Elliott II, supra, pp. 131 and 132.)

Mr. Mason was still worried over the possibilities of section 4. Said he:

We now come, sir, to the fourth section. Let us see: the time, place, and manner of holding elections, shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof. No objections to this: but, sir, after the flash of lightning comes the peal of thunder. "But Congress may at any time alter them," etc. Here it is, Mr. President, this is the article which is to make Congress omnipotent. Gentlemen say, this is the greatest beauty of the Constitution; this is the greatest security for the people; this is the all in all. Such language have I heard in this house; but, sir, I say, by this power Congress may, if they please, order the election of Federal Representatives for Massachusetts to be at Great Barrington or Machias; and at such a time, too, as shall put it in the power of a few artful and designing men to get themselves elected at their pleasure. (Elliott II, supra, pp. 135 and 136.)

On February 7, 1788, Massachusetts ratified the Constitution, and added to its report these words:

And, as it is the opinion of this convention, that certain amendments and alterations in the said Constitution would remove the fears and quiet the apprehensions of many of the good people of the commonwealth, and more effectually guard against an undue administration of the Federal Government, the convention do therefore recommend that the following alterations and provisions be introduced into the said Constitution. Thirdly, that Congress do not exercise the powers vested in them by the fourth section of the first article, but in cases where a State shall neglect or refuse to make the regulations therein mentioned, or shall make regulations subversive of the rights of the people to a free and equal representation in Congress, agreeable to the Constitution. (See Elliott II, supra, p. 177.)

With the qualifications of voters definitely to be regulated by the States under the Constitution, still the people of Massachusetts were so concerned with the possible abuse of the power of Congress over the "time, place, manner," or procedure of an election that they wished it clearly understood that Congress should assume the exercise of such power only in case of extreme necessity, where neglect of duty by a State compelled it.

As pointed out on several occasions, that part of the Constitution dealing with the times, places, and manner of holding elections and so forth dealt only with the mechanics of an election, not with the qualification of voters. That was reserved to the States, as I have been trying to demonstrate. The States themselves, in ratifying the Federal Constitution, saw to it that the right to spell out the qualifications of their electors should be a prerogative of the State, and was not to be exercised by the Congress under any condition.

No. 6 was Georgia, January 2, 1788.

No. 7 was Maryland. Among the amendments proposed to be suggested by the States was the following:

2. That the Congress shall have no power to alter or change the time, place, or manner of holding elections for Senators or Representatives, unless a State shall neglect to make regulations, or to execute its regulations, or shall be prevented by invasion or rebellion, in which cases only, Congress may interfere, until the cause be removed. (See Elliott II, supra, p. 552.)

However, so many amendments were suggested that, through fear of obtaining no security at all for the people, the Constitution was ratified.

In speaking to the Maryland House of Delegates, Mr. James McHenry, referring to the section in the Constitution providing that the qualifications of electors be the same as those of electors for the State legislature, said:

To this section it was objected that if the qualifications of the electors were the same as in the State governments, it would involve in the Federal system all the disorders of a democracy; and it was therefore contended that none but freeholders, permanently interested in the Government, ought to have a right of suffrage. The venerable Franklin opposed to this the natural rights of man—their rights to an immediate voice in the general assemblage of the whole Nation, or to a right of suffrage and representation, and he instanced from general history and particular events the indifference of those, to the prosperity and welfare of the States who were deprived of it. (Farrand III, Records of the Federal Convention, p. 146.)

Also concerning section 4, he said:

It was thought expedient to vest the Congress with the powers contained in this section, which particular exigencies might require them to exercise, and which the immediate representatives of the people can never be supposed capable of wantonly abusing to the prejudice of their constituents—convention had in contemplation the possible events of insurrection, invasion, and even to provide against any disposition that might occur hereafter in any particular State to thwart the measures of the General Government. (Farrand III, supra, p. 148.)

On May 23, 1788, Maryland ratified the Constitution.

South Carolina met in convention to consider the Constitution, May 12, 1788. Speaking of the much-debated fourth section of article I, giving Congress supervisory power over the time, place, and manner of elections, Mr. Pinckney, who was also one of the delegates to the Federal Convention, and in excellent position to know the intention of that body, said:

But if any State should attempt to fix a very inconvenient time for the election, and name (agreeably to the ideas of the honorable gentlemen) only one place in the State, or even one place in one of the five election districts, for the freeholders to assemble to vote, and the people should dislike this arrangement, they can petition the General

Government to redress this inconvenience, and to fix times and places of election of Represenattives in the State in a more convenient manner; for, as this house has a right to fix the times and places of election, in each parish and county, for the members of the house of representatives of this State, so the General Government has a similar right to fix the times and places of election in each State for the Members of the General House of Representatives. Nor is there any real danger to be apprehended from the exercise of this power, as it cannot be supposed that any State will consent to fix the election at inconvenient seasons and places in any other State, lest she herself should hereafter experience the same inconvenience; but it is absolutly necessary that Congress should have this superintending power, lest, by the intrigues of a ruling faction in a State, the Members of the House of Representatives should not really represent the people of the State, and lest the same faction, through partial State views, should altogether refuse to send representatives of the people to the General Government. (Elliott IV, supra, p. 303.)

When South Carolina ratified the Constitution, May 23, 1788, they added this observation, or recommendation, to the ratification:

And whereas it is essential to the preservation of the rights reserved to the several States, and the freedom of the people, under the operations of a general government, that the right of prescribing the manner, time, and places, of holding the elections to the Federal Legislature should be forever inseparably annexed to the sovereignty of the several States, this convention doth declare that the same ought to remain to all posterity, a perpetual and fundamental right in the local, exclusive of the interference of the General Government, except in cases where the legislatures of the States shall refuse or neglect to perform and fulfill the same, according to the tenor of the said Constitution. (Elliott I, supra, p. 323.)

New Hampshire acted ninth of all the States, and we find no discussion there of the sections involving voting qualifications. However, we do find New Hampshire, equally watchful, recommending the following amendment, among others, to the Constitution:

III. That Congress do not exercise the powers vested in them by the fourth section of the first article, but in cases when a State shall neglect or refuse to make the regulations therein mentioned. (Elliott I, supra, p. 326.)

On September 17, 1787, Virginia ratified the Constitution. The Virginia Convention was lengthy, the debates heated and protracted. Article I, section 2, providing that the electors of the delegates to the House of Representatives shall have the qualifications for electors of the more numerous branch of the State legislature, was read. Mr. George Nicholas spoke as follows—Elliott III, supra, pages 8, 9, 10:

Secondly, as it respects the qualifications of the elected. It has ever been considered a great security to liberty, that very few should be excluded from the right of being chosen to the Legislature. This Constitution has amply attended to this idea. We find no qualifications required except those of age and residence, which create a certainty of their judgment being matured, and of being attached to their State. It has been objected, that they ought to be possessed of landed estates; but, sir, when we reflect that most of the electors are landed men, we must suppose they will fix on those who are in a similar situation with themselves. We find there is a decided majority attached to the landed interest; consequently, the landed interest must prevail in the choice. Should the State be divided into districts, in no one can the mercantile interest by any means have an equal weight in the elections; therefore, the former will be more fully represented in the Congress; and men of eminent abilities are not excluded for the want of landed property. There is another objection which has been echoed from one end of the continent to the other—that Congress may alter the time, place, and manner of holding elections; that they may direct the place of elections to be where it will be impossible for those who have a right to vote, to attend; for instance, that they may order the freeholders of Albemarle to vote in the county of Princess Anne, or vice versa; or regulate elections, otherwise, in such a manner as totally to defeat their purpose, and lay them entirely under the influence of Congress. I flatter myself, that, from an attentive consideration of this power, it will clearly appear that it was essentially necessary to give it to Congress as, without it, there could have been no security for the General Government against the State legislatures. What, Mr. Chairman, is the danger apprehended in this case? If I understand it right, it must be that Congress might cause the elections to be held in the most inconvenient places, and at so inconvenient a time, and in such a manner, as to give them the most undue influence over the choice, nay, even to prevent the elections from being held at all—in order to perpetuate themselves. But what would be the consequence of this measure? It would be this, sir,—that Congress would cease to exist; it would destroy the Congress itself; it would absolutely be an act of suicide; and therefore it can never be expected. This alteration, so much apprehended, must be made by law; that is, with the concurrence of both branches of the Legislature. Will the House of Representatives, the Members of which are chosen only for 2 years, and who depend on the people for their reelection, agree to such an alteration? It is unreasonable to suppose it.

But let us admit, for a moment, that they will: what would be the consequence of passing such a law? It would be, sir, that, after the expiration of the 2 years, at the next election they would either choose such men as would alter the law, or they would resist the Government. An enlightened people will never suffer what was established for their security to be perverted to an act of tyranny. It may be said, perhaps, that resistance would then become vain; Congress are vested with the power of raising an army; to which I say, that if ever Congress shall have an army sufficient for their purpose, and disposed to execute their unlawful commands, before they would act under this disguise, they would pull off the mask, and declare themselves absolute. I ask, Mr. Chairman, is it a novelty in our Government? Have not our State legislatures the power of fixing the time, places, and manner of holding elections? The possible abuse here complained of never can happen as long as the people of the United States are virtuous. As long as they continue to have sentiments of freedom and independence, should the Congress be wicked enough to harbor so absurd an idea as this objection supposes, the people will defeat their attempt by choosing other representatives, who will alter the law. If the State legislatures, by accident, design, or any other cause, would not appoint a place for holding elections, then there might be no election till the time was past for which they were to have been chosen; and as this would eventually put an end to the Union, it ought to be guarded against; and it could only be guarded against by giving this discretionary power, to the Congress, of altering the time, place, and manner of holding the elections. It is absurd to think that Congress will exert this power, or change the time, place, and manner established by the States, if the States will regulate them properly, or so as not to defeat the purposes of the Union. It is urged that the State legislatures ought to be fully and exclusively possessed of this power. Were this the case, it might certainly defeat the Government. As the powers vested by this plan on Congress are taken from the State legislatures, they would be prompted to throw every obstacle in the way of the General Government. It was then necessary that Congress should have this power.

Another strong argument for the necessity of this power is, that, if it was left solely to the States, there might have been as many times of choosing as there are States. States having solely the power of altering or establishing the time of election, it might happen that there should be no Congress. Not only by omitting to fix a time, but also by the elections in the States being at 13 different times, such intervals might elapse between the first and last election, as to prevent there being a sufficient number to form a house; and this might happen at a time when the most urgent business rendered their session necessary; and by this power, this great part of the representation will be always kept full, which will be a security for a due attention to the interest of the community; and also the power of Congress to make the times of elections uniform in all the States, will destroy the continuance of any cabal, as the whole body of Representatives will go out of office at once.

Governor Randolph, although he would not sign the Constitution at the time it was designed, defended it in an impassioned address.

Mr. Henry was equally impassioned in his plea to turn down the Constitution. Note what he says of section 4, article I, as outlined in Elliott III, page 60, as follows:

What can be more defective than the clause concerning the elections? The control given to Congress over the time, place, and manner of holding elections will totally destroy the end of suffrage. The elections may be held at one place, and the most inconvenient in the State; or they may be at remote distances from those who have a right of suffrage; hence 9 out of 10 must either not vote at all, or vote for strangers; for the most influential characters will be applied to, to know who are the most proper to be chosen. I repeat, that the control of Congress over the manner, etc., of electing, well warrants this idea. The natural consequence will be that this democratic branch will possess none of the public confidence; the people will be prejudiced against Representatives chosen in such an injudicious manner.

From Elliott III, pages 110 and 111:

Mr. Corbin, answering Mr. Henry, in part, said "Do the people wish land only to be represented? They have their wish; for the qualifications which the laws of the States require to entitle a man to vote for a State representative are the qualifications required by this plan to vote for a Representative of Congress; and in this State, and most of the others, the possession of a freehold is necessary to entitle a man to the privilege of a vote."

Governor Randolph, also answering Mr. Henry, said:

The State will be laid off and divided into 10 districts: from each of these a man is to be elected. He must be really the choice of the people, not the man who can distribute the most gold; for the riches of Croesus would not avail. The qualifications of the electors being the same as those of the representatives for the State legislatures, and the

election being under the control of the Legislature, the prohibitory provisions against undue means of procuring votes to the State representation extend to the Federal representatives; the extension of the sphere of election to so considerable a district will render it impossible for contracted influence, or local intrigues, or personal interest, to procure an election. Inquiries will be made, by the voters, into the characters of the candidates. Greater talents, and a more extensive reputation, will be necessary to procure an election for the Federal than for the State representation. The Federal representatives must therefore be well known for their integrity, and their knowledge of the country they represent. We shall have 10 men thus elected. What are they going yonder for? Not to consult for Virginia alone, but for the interest of the United States collectively. Will not such men derive sufficient information from their own knowledge of their respective States, and from the codes of the different States? (Elliott III, p. 125, line 24, to line 5, p. 126.)

Mr. Henry retorted at length and resorted to bitter vituperative remarks.

He said:

I shall make a few observations to prove that the power over elections, which is given to Congress, is contrived by the Federal Government, that the people may be deprived of their proper influence in the Government, by destroying the force and effect of their suffrages. Congress is to have a discretionary control over the time, place, and manner of elections. The Representatives are to be elected, consequently, when and where they please. As to the time and place, gentlemen have attempted to obviate the objection by saying, that the time is to happen once in 2 years, and that the place is to be within a particular district, or in the respective counties. But how will they obviate the danger of referring the manner of election to Congress. Those illumined genti may see that this may not endanger the rights of the people, but in my unenlightened understanding, it appears plain and clear that it will impair the popular weight in the Government. Look at the Roman history. They had two ways of voting—the one by tribes, and the other by centuries. By the former, numbers prevailed; in the latter, riches preponderated. According to the mode prescribed, Congress may tell you that they have a right to make the vote of one gentleman go as far as the votes of 100 poor men. The power over the manner admits of the most dangerous latitude. They may modify it as they please. They may regulate the number of votes by the quantity of property, without involving any repugnancy to the Constitution. I should not have thought of this trick or contrivance, had I not seen how the public liberty of Rome was trifled with by the mode of voting by centuries, whereby one rich man had as many votes as a multitude of poor men. The plebeians were trampled on till they resisted. The patricians trampled on the liberties of the plebeians till the latter had the spirit to assert their right to freedom and equality. The result of the American mode of election may be similar. Perhaps I may be told that I have gone through the regions of fancy—that I deal in noisy exclamations and mighty professions of patriotism. Gentlemen may retain their opinions; but I look on that paper as the most fatal plan that could possibly be conceived to enslave a free people. If such be your rage for novelty, take it, and welcome; but you never shall have my consent. My sentiments may appear extravagant, but I can tell you that a number of my fellow citizens have kindred sentiments and I am anxious, if my country should come into the hands of tyranny, to exculpate myself from being in any degree the cause, and to exert my faculties to the utmost to extricate her. Whether I am gratified or not in my beloved form of government, I consider that the more she has plunged into distress, the more it is my duty to relieve her. Whatever may be the result, I shall wait with patience till the day may come when an opportunity shall offer to exert myself in her cause. (Elliott III, pp. 175 and 176.)

Such a piece of legislation as we are now considering in the Senate, if passed, would only vindicate the seemingly wild and hysterical conclusions of Mr. Henry.

Governor Randolph, further answering Mr. Henry, said:

His interpretation of elections must be founded on a misapprehension. The Constitution says, that the times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time, by law, make or alter such regulations, except as to the place of choosing Senators. It says, in another place, "that the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature." Who would have conceived it possible to deduce, from these clauses, that the power of election was thrown into the hands of the rich? As the electors of the Federal representatives are to have the same qualifications with those of the representatives of this State legislature, or, in other words, as the electors of the one are to be electors of the other, this suggestion is unwarrantable, unless he carries his supposition further, and says that Virginia will agree to her own suicide, by modifying elections in such manner as to throw them into the hands of the rich. The honorable gentleman has not given us a fair object to be attacked; he has not given us any thing substantial to be examined. (Elliott III, p. 202.)

Note here that Governor Randolph particularly observed that the "electors of one are to be the electors of the other"—a principle and result which the bill I am now opposing would seek to change unconstitutionally.

Mr. John Marshall, speaking in behalf of the Constitution, said:

If there be no impropriety in the mode of electing the Representatives, can any danger be apprehended? They are elected by those who can elect representatives in the State legislature. (See Elliott III, supra, p. 230.)

When article I, section 4 was read in its proper turn in the Virginia convention, having been previously discussed in general with the rest of the document—

Mr. Monroe wished that the honorable gentleman, who had been in the Federal convention, would give information respecting the clause concerning elections. He wished to know why Congress had an ultimate control over the time, place, and manner of elections of Representatives, and the time and manner of that of Senators, and also why there was an exception as to the place of electing Senators. (Elliott III, supra, p. 366.)

It was found necessary to leave the regulation of these, in the first place, to the State governments, as being best acquainted with the situation of the people, subject to the control of the General Government in order to enable it to produce uniformity and prevent its own dissolution. And, considering the State governments and General Government as distinct bodies, acting in different and independent capacities for the people, it was thought the particular regulations should be submitted to the former, and the general regulations to the latter.

Again, we see the framers of the Constitution intent on the protection of the provision for election by the States, in the event of their negligent failure to provide therefor. At all times they conceded the States' right to provide for voting qualifications in their own limits more suitably than Congress could.

When Virginia finally ratified the Constitution they added a list of amendments which they suggested and sought. Among these was the following:

16. That Congress shall not alter, modify, or interfere in the times, places, or manner of holding elections for Senators, or Representatives, or either of them except when the legislature of any State shall neglect, refuse, or be disabled, by invasion or rebellion, to prescribe the same. (Elliott III, supra, p. 661.)

Again we see a State convention desiring that the meaning of the framers be put into unquestionably plain language.

New York, the tenth State to act, ratified the Constitution July 26, 1788. Apparently, as in most of the State conventions, section 2 of article I, met with approval, as there was no fault to be found with the provision that the qualifications of the electors should be the same as for those of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. But again we find dissatisfaction with the possibilities of abuse latent in section 4 of article I.

Mr. Jones rose and observed that it was a fact universally known that the present Confederation had not proved adequate to the purposes of good government. Whether this arose from the want of powers in the Federal head or from other causes, he would not pretend to determine. Some parts of the proposed plan appeared to him imperfect or at least not satisfactory. He did not think it right that Congress should have the power of prescribing or altering the time, place, and manner of holding elections. He apprehended that the clause might be so construed as to deprive the States of an essential right, which, in the true design of the Constitution, was to be reserved to them. He, therefore, wished the clause might be explained and proposed, for the purpose, the following amendment: "*Resolved*, as the opinion of this committee, that nothing in the Constitution, now under consideration, shall be construed to authorize the Congress to make or alter regulations, in any State, respecting the times, places, or manner of holding elections for Senators or Representatives, unless the legislature of such State shall neglect or refuse to make laws or regulations for the purpose, or, from any circumstance, be incapable of making the same, and then only until the legislature of such State shall make provision in the premises."

The Honorable Mr. Jay said that, as far as he understood the ideas of the gentleman, he seemed to have doubt with respect to this paragraph, and feared it might be misconstrued and abused. He said that every government was imperfect, unless it had a power of preserving itself. Suppose that, by design or accident, the States should neglect to appoint representatives; certainly there should be some constitutional remedy for this evil. The obvious meaning of the paragraph was that, if this neglect should take place, Congress should have power, by law, to support the Government and prevent the dissolution of the Union. He believed this was the design of the Federal Convention. (Elliott II, supra, p. 325.)

Mr. Smith expressed his surprise that the gentleman should want such an explanation. He conceived that the amendment was founded on the fundamental principles of representative government. As the Constitution stood, the whole State might be a single district for election. This would be improper. The State should be divided into as many districts as it sends Representatives. The whole number of Representatives might otherwise be taken from a small part of the State, and the bulk of the people, therefore, might not be fully represented. He would say no more at present on the propriety of the amendment. The principle appeared to him so evident that he hardly knew how to reason upon it until he heard the arguments of the gentlemen in opposition.

Mr. Duane. I will not examine the merits of the measure the gentleman recommends. If the proposed mode of election be the best, the legislature of this State will undoubtedly adopt it. But I wish the gentleman to prove that his plan will be practicable and will succeed. By the constitution of this State, the Representatives are apportioned among the counties, and it is wisely left to the people to choose whom they will, in their several counties, without any further division into districts. Sir, how do we know the proposal will be agreeable to the other States? Is every State to be compelled to adopt our ideas on all subjects? If the gentleman will reflect, I believe he will be doubtful of the propriety of these things. Will it not seem extraordinary that any one State should presume to dictate to the Union? As the Constitution stands, it will be in the power of each State to regulate this important point. While the legislatures do their duty, the exercise of their discretion is sufficiently secured. Sir, this measure would carry with it a presumption which I should be sorry to see in the acts of this State. It is laying down as a principle that whatever may suit our interest or fancy should be imposed upon our sister States. This does not seem to correspond with that moderation which I hope to see in all the proceedings of this convention.

Mr. Smith. The gentleman misunderstands me. I did not mean the amendment to operate on the other States. They may use their discretion. The amendment is in the negative. The very design of it is to enable the States to act their discretion, without the control of Congress. So the gentleman's reasoning is directly against himself.

If the argument had any force, it would go against proposing any amendment at all, because, says the gentleman, it would be dictating to the Union. What is the object of our consultations? For my part, I do not know, unless we are to express our sentiments of the Constitution before we adopt it.

It is only exercising the privilege of freemen; and shall we be debarred from this? It is said it is left to the discretion of the States. If this were true, it would be all we contend for. But, sir, Congress can alter as they please any mode adopted by the States. What discretion is there here? The gentleman instances the Constitution of New York as opposed to my argument. I believe that there are now gentlemen in this house who were members of the convention of this State, and who are inclined for an amendment like this. It is to be regretted that it was not adopted. The fact is, as your constitution stands, a man may have a seat in your legislature who is not elected by a majority of his constituents. For my part, I know of no principle that ought to be more fully established than the right of election by a majority.

Mr. Duane. I neglected to make one observation which I think weighty. The mode of election recommended by the gentleman must be attended with great embarrassments. His idea is that a majority of all the votes should be necessary to return a member.

I suppose a State divided into districts. How seldom will it happen that a majority of a district will unite their votes in favor of one man? In a neighboring State, where they have this mode of election, I have been told that it rarely happens that more than one-half unite in a choice. The consequence is they are obliged to make provision, by a previous election, for nomination and another election for appointment, thus suffering the inconvenience of a double election. If the proposition was adopted, I believe we should be seldom represented—the election must be lost. The gentleman will, therefore, I presume, either abandon his project or propose some remedy for the evil I have described.

Mr. Smith. I think the example the gentleman adduces is in my favor. The States of Massachusetts and Connecticut have regulated elections in the mode I propose, but it has never been considered inconvenient, nor have the people ever been unrepresented. I mention this to show that the thing has not proved impracticable in those States. If not, why should it in New York?

After some further conversation, Mr. Lansing proposed the following modification of Mr. Smith's motion:

"And that nothing in this Constitution shall be construed to prevent the legislature of any State to pass laws, from time to time, to divide such State into as many convenient districts as the State shall be entitled to elect Representatives for Congress, nor to prevent such legislature from making provision that the electors in each district shall choose a citizen of the United States, who shall have been an inhabitant of the district for the term of 1 year immediately preceding the time of his election, for one of the Representatives of such State."

Which being added to the motion of Mr. Jones, the committee passed the succeeding paragraphs without debate, till they came to the second clause of section 6. (Elliott II, *supra*, pp. 327, 328, and 329.)

On July 26, 1788, the ratification of the Constitution was effected, accompanied by a number of suggested amendments, among which was the one specifically defining those occasions on which Congress might exercise any power over the "time, place, and manner" of elections.

North Carolina remained reluctant and refused to ratify the Constitution until a convention of States was called and certain proposed amendments adopted. Again no exception was taken to section 2 of article I.

The first clause of the fourth section was read.

Mr. Spencer. Mr. Chairman, it appears to me that this clause, giving this control over the time, place, and manner of holding elections to Congress, does away with the right of the people to choose the Representatives every second year, and impairs the right of the State legislatures to choose the Senators. I wish this matter to be explained.

Governor Johnson. Mr. Chairman, I confess that I am a very great admirer of the new Constitution, but I cannot comprehend the reason of this part. The reason urged is that every Government ought to have the power of continuing itself, and that, if the General Government had not this power, the State legislatures might neglect to regulate elections, whereby the Government might be discontinued. As long as the State legislatures have it in their power not to choose the Senators, this power in Congress appears to me altogether useless because they can put an end to the General Government by refusing to choose Senators. But I do not consider this such a blemish in the Constitution as that it ought, for that reason, to be rejected. I observe that every State which has adopted the Constitution and recommended amendments has given directions to remove this objection, and I hope, if this State adopts it, she will do the same.

Mr. Spencer. Mr. Chairman, it is with great reluctance that I rise upon this important occasion. I have considered with some attention the subject before us. I have paid attention to the Constitution itself, and to the writings on both sides. I considered it on one side as well as on the other, in order to know whether it would be best to adopt it or not. I would not wish to insinuate any reflections on those gentlemen who formed it. I look upon it as a great performance. It has a great deal of merit in it, and it is, perhaps, as much as any set of men could have done. Even if it be true, what gentlemen have observed, that the gentlemen who were delegates to the Federal Convention were not instructed to form a new constitution, but to amend the confederation, this will be immaterial, if it be proper to be adopted. It will be of equal benefit to us, if proper to be adopted in the whole, or in such parts as will be necessary, whether they were expressly delegated for that purpose or not. This appears to me to be a reprehensive clause; because it seems to strike at the State legislatures, and seems to take away that power of elections which reason dictates they ought to have among themselves. It apparently looks forward to a consolidation of the Government of the United States, when the State legislatures may entirely decay away.

This is one of the grounds which have induced me to make objections to the new form of government. It appears to me that the State governments are not sufficiently secured, and that they may be swallowed up by the great mass of powers given to Congress. If that be the case, such power should not be given; for, from all the notions which we have concerning our happiness and well-being, the State governments are the basis of our happiness, security, and prosperity. A large extent of country ought to be divided into such a number of States as that the people may conveniently carry on their own government. This will render the government perfectly agreeable to the genius and wishes of the people. If the United States were to consist of 10 times as many States, they might all have a degree of harmony. Nothing would be wanting but some cement for their connection. On the contrary, if all the United States were to be swallowed up by the great mass of powers given to Congress, the parts that are more distant in this great empire would be governed with less energy. It would not suit the genius of the people to assist in the government. Nothing would support government, in such a case as that, but military coercion. Armies would be necessary in different parts of the United States. The expense which they would cost, and the burdens which they would render necessary to be laid upon the people, would be ruinous. I know of no way that is likely to produce the happiness of the people, but to preserve, as far as possible, the existence of the several States, so that they shall not be swallowed up.

It has been said that the existence of the State governments is essential to that of the General Government, because they choose the Senators. By this clause, it is evident that it is in the power of Congress to make any alterations, except as to the place of choosing Senators. They may alter the time from 6 to 20 years, or to any time; for they have an unlimited control over the time of elections. They have also an absolute control over the election of the Representatives. It deprives the people of the very mode of choosing them. It seems nearly to throw the whole power of election into the hands of Congress. It strikes at the mode, time, and place, of choosing Representatives.

It puts all but the place of electing Senators into the hands of Congress. This supersedes the necessity of continuing the State legislatures. This is such an article as I can give no sanction to, because it strikes at the foundation of the governments on which depends the happiness of the States and the General Government. It is with reluctance I make the objection. I have the highest veneration for the characters of the framers of this Constitution. I mean to make objections only which are necessary to be made. I would not take up time unnecessarily. As to this matter, it strikes at the foundation of everything. I may say more when we come to that part which points out the mode of doing without the agency of the State legislatures.

Mr. Iredell. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to see so much candor and moderation. The liberal sentiments expressed by the honorable gentleman who spoke last command my respect. No time can be better employed than endeavoring to remove, by fair and just reasoning, every objection which can be made to this Constitution. I apprehend that the honorable gentleman is mistaken as to the extent of the operation of this clause. He supposes that the control of the General Government over elections looks forward to a consolidation of the States, and that the general word "time" may extend to 20, or any number of years. In my humble opinion this clause does by no means warrant such a construction. We ought to compare other parts with it. Does not the Constitution say that Representatives shall be chosen every second year? The right of choosing them, therefore, reverts to the people every second year. No instrument of writing ought to be construed absurdly, when a rational construction can be put upon it. If Congress can prolong the election to any time they please, why is it said that Representatives shall be chosen every second year? They must be chosen every second year; but whether in the month of March, or January, or any other month, may be ascertained, at a future time, by regulations of Congress. The word "time" refers only to the particular month and day within the 2 years. I heartily agree with the gentleman, that, if anything in this Constitution tended to the annihilation of the State governments, instead of exciting the admiration of any man, it ought to excite the resentment and execration. No such wicked intention ought to be suffered. But the gentlemen who formed the Constitution had no such object; nor do I think there is the least ground for that jealousy. The very existence of the General Government depends on that of the State governments. The State legislatures are to choose the Senators. Without a Senate there can be no Congress. The State legislatures are also to direct the manner of choosing the President. Unless, therefore, there are State legislatures to direct that manner, no President can be chosen. The same observation may be made as to the House of Representatives, since, as they are to be chosen by the electors of the most numerous branch of each State legislature, if there are no State legislatures, there are no persons to choose the House of Representatives. Thus it is evident that the very existence of the General Government depends on that of the State legislatures, and of course, that their continuance cannot be endangered by it.

An occasion may arise when the exercise of this ultimate power in Congress may be necessary; as, for instance, if a State should be involved in war, and its legislature could not assemble—as was the case of South Carolina, and occasionally of some other States, during the late war—it might also be useful for this reason—lest a few powerful States should combine, and make regulations concerning elections which might deprive many of the electors of a fair exercise of their rights, and thus injure the community, and occasion great dissatisfaction. And it seems natural and proper that every government should have in itself the means of its own preservation. A few of the great States might combine to prevent any election of representatives at all, and thus a majority might be wanting to do business; but it would not be so easy to destroy the Government by the nonelection of Senators, because one-third only are to go out at a time, and all the States will be equally represented in the Senate. It is not probable this power would be abused; for, if it should be, the State legislatures would immediately resent it, and their authority over the people will always be extremely great. These reasons induce me to think that the power is both necessary and useful. But I am sensible great jealousy has been entertained concerning it; and as perhaps the danger of a combination, in the manner I have mentioned, to destroy or distress the General Government, is not very probable, it may be better to incur the risk, than occasion any discontent by suffering the clause to continue as it now stands. I should, therefore, not object to the recommendation of an amendment similar to that of other States—that this power in Congress should only be exercised when a State legislature neglected or was disabled from making the regulations required.

Mr. Spencer. Mr. Chairman, I did not mean to insinuate that designs were made, by the honorable gentlemen who composed the Federal Constitution, against our liberties. I only meant to say that the words in this place were exceeding vague. It may admit of the gentleman's construction; but it may admit of a contrary construction. In a matter of so great moment, words ought not to be so vague and indeterminate. I have said that the States are the basis on which the Government of the United States ought to rest, and which must render us secure. No man wishes more for a Federal Government that I do. I think it necessary for our happiness; but at the same time, when we form a government which must entail happiness or misery on posterity, nothing is of more consequence than settling it so as to exclude animosity and a contest between the general and individual governments. With respect to the mode here mentioned, they are words of very great extent. This clause provides that a Congress may at any time alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators. These words are so vague and uncertain, that it must ultimately destroy the whole liberty of the United States. It strikes at the very existence of the States, and supersedes the necessity of having them at all. I would therefore wish to have it amended in such a manner as that the Congress should not interfere but when the States refused or neglected to regulate elections.

Mr. Bloodworth. Mr. Chairman, I trust that such learned arguments as are offered to reconcile our minds to such dangerous powers will not have the intended weight. The House of Representatives is the only democratic branch. This clause may destroy representation entirely. What does it say? "The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time, by law, make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators." Now, sir, does not this clause give an unlimited and unbounded power to Congress over the times, places, and manner of choosing Representatives? They may make the time of election so long, the place so inconvenient, and the manner so oppressive that it will entirely destroy representation. I hope gentlemen will exercise their own understanding on this occasion and not let their judgment be led away by these shining characters, for whom, however, I have the highest respect. This Constitution, if adopted in its present mode, must end in the subversion of our liberties. Suppose it takes place in North Carolina; can farmers elect them? No, sir. The elections may be in such a manner that men may be appointed who are not representative of the people. This may exist, and it ought to be guarded against. As to the place, suppose Congress should order the elections to be held in the most inconvenient place in the most inconvenient district; could every person entitled to vote attend at such a place? Suppose they should order it to be laid off into so many districts and order the election to be held within each district; yet may not their power over the manner of election enable them to exclude from voting every description of men they please? The democratic branch is so much endangered that no arguments can be made use of to satisfy my mind to it. The honorable gentleman has amused us with learned discussions and told us he will condescend to propose amendments. I hope the representatives of North Carolina will never swallow the Constitution till it is amended.

Mr. Goudy. Mr. Chairman, the invasion of these States is urged as a reason for this clause. But why did they not mention that it should be only in cases of invasion? But that was not the reason, in my humble opinion. I fear it was a combination against our liberties. I ask, when we give them the purse in one hand and the sword in another, what power have we left? It will lead to an artistocratical government and establish tyranny over us. We are freemen, and we ought to have the privileges of such.

Governor Johnston. Mr. Chairman, I do not impute any impure intentions to the gentlemen who formed this Constitution. I think it unwarrantable in anyone to do it. I believe that were there 20 conventions appointed, and as many constitutions formed, we never could get men more able and disinterested than those who formed this; nor a Constitution less exceptionable than that which is now before you. I am not apprehensive that this article will be attended with all the fatal consequences which the gentleman conceives. I conceive that Congress can have no other power than the States had. The States, with regard to elections, must be governed by the articles of the Constitution; so must Congress. But I believe the power, as it now stands, is unnecessary. I should be perfectly satisfied with it in the mode recommended by the worthy Meraber on my right hand. Although I should be extremely cautious to adopt any constitution that would endanger the rights and privileges of the people, I have no fear in adopting this Constitution, and then proposing amendments. I feel as much attachment to the rights and privileges of my country as any man in it; and if I thought anything in this Constitution tended to abridge these rights, I would not agree to it. I cannot conceive that this is the case. I have not the least doubt but it will be adopted by a very great majority of the States. For States who have been as jealous of their liberties as any in the world have adopted it, and they are some of the most powerful States. We shall have the assent of all the States in getting amendments. Some gentlemen have apprehensions that Congress will immediately conspire to destroy the liberties of their country. The men of whom Congress will consist are to be chosen from among ourselves. They will be in the same situation with us. They are to be bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh. They cannot injure us without injuring themselves. I have no doubt but we shall choose the best men in the community. Should different men be appointed, they are sufficiently responsible. I therefore think that no danger is to be apprehended.

Mr. M'Dowall. Mr. Chairman, I have the highest esteem for the gentleman who spoke

last. He has amused us with the fine characters of those who formed that government. Some were good, but some were very imperious, aristocratical, despotic, and monarchial. If parts of it are extremely good, other parts are very bad.

The freedom of election is one of the greatest securities we have for our liberty and privileges. It was supposed by the member from Edenton, that the control over elections was only given to Congress to be used in case of invasion. I differ from him. That could not have been their intention, otherwise they could have expressed it. But, sir, it points forward to the time when there will be no State legislatures—to the consolidation of all the States. The States will be kept up as boards of elections. I think the same men could make a better constitution; for good government is not the work of a short time. They only had their own wisdom. Were they to go now, they would have the wisdom of the United States. Every gentleman who must reflect on this must see it. The adoption of several other States is urged. I hope every gentleman stands for himself, will act according to his own judgment, and will pay no respect to the adoption by the other States. It may embarrass us in some political difficulties, but let us attend to the interest of our constituents.

Mr. Iredell answered, that he stated the case of invasion as only one reason out of many for giving the ultimate control over elections to Congress.

Mr. DAVIE. Mr. Chairman, a consolidation of the States is said by some gentlemen to have been intended. They insinuate that this was the cause of their giving this power of elections. If there were any seeds in this Constitution which might, one day, produce a consolidation it would, sir, with me, be an insuperable objection, I am so perfectly convinced that so extensive a country as this can never be managed by one consolidated government. The Federal Convention were as well convinced as the Members of this House, that the State governments were absolutely necessary to the existence of the Federal Government. They considered them as the great massy pillars on which this political fabric was to be extended and supported; and were fully persuaded that, when they were removed, or should molder down by time, the General Government must tumble into ruin. A very little reflection will show that no department of it can exist without the State governments.

Let us begin with the House of Representatives. Who are to vote for the Federal Representatives? Those who vote for the State representatives. If the State governments vanish, the General Government must vanish also. This is the foundation on which this Government was raised, and without which it cannot possibly exist.

The next department is the Senate. How is it formed? By the States themselves. Do they not choose them? Are they not created by them? And will they not have the interest of the States particularly at heart? The States, sir, can put a final period to the Government, as was observed by a gentleman who thought this power over elections unnecessary. If the State legislatures think proper, they may refuse to choose Senators, and the Government must be destroyed.

Is not this Government a nerveless mass, a dead carcass, without the executive power? Let your representatives be the most vicious demons that ever existed; let them plot against the liberties of America; let them conspire against its happiness—all their machinations will not avail if not put in execution. By whom are their laws and projects to be executed? By the President. How is he created? By electors appointed by the people under the direction of the legislatures—by a union of the interest of the people and the State governments. The State governments can put a veto, at any time, on the General Government, by ceasing to continue the executive power. Admitting the representatives or Senators could make corrupt laws, they can neither execute them themselves, nor appoint the executive. Now, sir, I think it must be clear to every candid mind, that no part of this Government can be continued after the State governments lose their existence, or even their present forms. It may also be easily proved that all federal governments possess an inherent weakness, which continually tends to their destruction. It is to be lamented that all governments of a federal nature have been short-lived.

Such was the fate of the Achaean League, the amphictyonic council, and other ancient confederacies; and this opinion is confirmed by the uniform testimony of all history. There are instances in Europe of confederacies subsisting a considerable time; but their duration must be attributed to circumstances exterior to their government. The Germanic confederacy would not exist a moment, were it not for fear of the surrounding powers, and the interest of the emperor. The history of this confederacy is but a series of factions, dissensions, bloodshed, and civil war. The confederacies of the Swiss, and United Netherlands, would long ago have been destroyed, from their imbecility, had it not been for the fear, and even the policy, of the bordering nations. It is impossible to construct such a government in such a manner as to give it any probable longevity. But, sir, there is an excellent principle in this proposed plan of federal government, which none of these confederacies had, and to the want of which, in a great measure, their imperfections may be justly attributed—I mean the principle of representation. I hope that, by the agency of this principle, if it be not immortal, it will at least be long-lived. I thought it necessary to say this much to detect the futility of that unwarrantable suggestion, that we are to be swallowed up by a great consolidated government. Every part of this Federal Government is dependent on the constitution of the State legislatures for its existence. The whole, sir, can never swallow up its parts. The gentleman from Edenton (Mr. Iredell) has pointed out the reasons of giving this control over elections to Congress, the principle of which was, to prevent a dissolution of the Government by designing States. If all the States were equally possessed of absolute power over their elections, without any control of Congress, danger might be justly apprehended where one State possesses as much territory as four or five others; and some of them, being thinly peopled now, will daily become more numerous and formidable. Without this control in Congress, those large States might successfully combine to destroy the General Government. It was therefore necessary to control any combination of this kind.

Another principal reason was, that it would operate in favor of the people, against the ambitious designs of the Federal Senate. I will illustrate this by matter of fact. The history of the little State of Rhode Island is well-known. An abandoned faction have seized on the reins of government, and frequently refused to have any representation in Congress. If Congress had the power of making the law of elections operate throughout the United States, no State could withdraw itself from the national councils without the consent of a majority of the Members of Congress. Had this been the case, that trifling State would not have withheld its representation. What once happened may happen again; and it was necessary to give Congress this power, to keep the Government in full operation. This being a Federal Government, and involving the interests of several States, and some acts requiring the assent of more than a majority, they ought to be able to keep their representation full. It would have been a solecism, to have a government without any means of self-preservation. The confederation is the only instance of a government without such means, and is a nerveless system, as inadequate to every purpose of government as it is to the security of the liberties of the people of America. When the councils of America have this power over elections, they can, in spite of any faction in any particular State, give the people a representation. Uniformity in matters of election is also of the greatest consequence. They ought all to be judged by the same law and the same principles, and not to be different in one State from what they are in another. At present, the manner of electing is different in different States. Some elect by ballot, and others viva voce. It will be more convenient to have the manner uniform in all the States. I shall now answer some observations made by the gentleman from Mecklenburg. He has stated that this power over elections gave to Congress power to lengthen the time for which they were elected. Let us read this clause coolly, all prejudice aside, and determine whether this construction be warrantable. The clause runs thus: The times, places, manner, of holding elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time, by law, make or alter such regulations, except as to the place of choosing Senators. I take it as a fundamental principle, which is beyond the reach of the general or individual governments to alter, that the representatives shall be chosen every second year, and that the tenure of their office shall be for 2 years; that Senators be chosen every sixth year, and that the tenure of their office be for 6 years. I take it also as a principle, that the electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures are to elect the Federal Representatives. Congress has ultimately no power over elections, but what is primarily given to the State legislatures. If Congress had the power of prolonging the time, and so forth, as gentlemen observe, the same powers must be completely vested in the State legislatures.

I call upon every gentleman candidly to declare, whether the State legislatures have the power of altering the time of elections for Representatives from 2 to 4 years, or Senators from 6 to 12; and whether they have the power to require any other qualifications than those of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures; and also whether they have any other power over the manner of elections, any more than the mere mode of the act of choosing; or whether they shall be held by sheriffs, as contradistinguished from any other officer; or whether they shall be by votes, as contradistinguished from ballots, or any other way. If gentlemen will pay attention, they will find that, in the latter part of this clause, Congress has no power but what was given to the States in the first part of the same clause. They may alter the manner of holding the election, but cannot alter the tenure of their office. They cannot alter the nature of elections; for it is established, as fundamental principles, that the electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature shall elect the Federal Representatives, and that the tenure of their office shall be for 2 years; and likewise, that the Senators shall be elected by the legislatures, and that the tenure of their office shall be for 6 years. When gentlemen view the clause accurately, and see that Congress has only the same power which was in the State legislature, they will not be alarmed. The learned doctor on my right, Mr. Spencer, has also said that Congress might lengthen the time of elections. I am willing to appeal grammatical construction and punctuation. Let me read this, as it stands on paper. (Here he read the clause different ways, expressing the same sense.) Here, in the first part of

the clause, this power over elections is given to the States, and in the latter part the same power is given to Congress, and extending only to the time of holding, the place of holding, and the manner of holding, the elections. Is this not the plain, literal, and grammatical construction of the clause? Is it possible to put any other construction on it, without departing from the natural order, and without deviating from the general meaning of the words, and every rule of grammatical construction? Twist it, torture it, as you may, sir, it is impossible to fix a different sense upon it. The worthy gentleman from New Hanover, whose ardor for the liberty of his country I wish never to be damped, has insinuated that high characters might influence the members on this occasion. I declare, for my own part, I wish every man to be guided by his own conscience and understanding, and by nothing else. Every man has not been bred a politician, nor studied the science of government; yet, when a subject is explained, if the mind is unwarped by prejudice, and not in the leading-strings of other people, gentlemen will do what is right. Were this the case, I would risk my salvation on a right decision. (Elliott, 4, supra, p. 50, starting the first clause of the fourth section, copy all pp. 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, to end par. words "right decision.")

Note particularly what Mr. Davie said: "They cannot alter the nature of the elections; for it is established as fundamental principles, that the electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature shall elect the Federal Representatives."

Mr. Davie said:

This clause, sir, has been the occasion of much groundless alarm and has been the favorite theme of declamation out of doors. I now call upon the gentlemen of the opposition to show that it contains the mischiefs with which they have alarmed and agitated the public mind, and I defy them to support the construction they have put upon it by one single plausible reason. The gentleman from New Hanover has said, in objection to this clause, that Congress may appoint the most inconvenient place in the most inconvenient district, and make the manner of election so oppressive as entirely to destroy representation. If this is considered as possible, he should also reflect that the State legislatures may do the same thing. But this can never happen, sir, until the whole mass of the people become corrupt, when all parchment securities will be of little service. Does that gentleman, or any other gentleman who has the smallest acquaintance with human nature or the spirit of America, suppose that the people will passively relinquish privileges, or suffer the usurpation of powers unwarranted by the Constitution? Does not the right of electing representatives revert to the people every second year? There is nothing in this clause that can impede or destroy this reversion; and although the particular time of year, the particular place in a county or a district, or the particular mode in which elections are to be held, as whether by vote or ballot, be left to Congress to direct, yet this can never deprive the people of the right or privilege of election. He has also added that the democratical branch was in danger from this clause; and with some other gentlemen took it for granted that an aristocracy must arise out of the General Government. This, I take it, from the very nature of the thing, can never happen. Aristocracies grow out of the combination of a few powerful families, where the country or people upon which they are to operate are immediately under their influence; whereas the interest and influence of this Government are too weak and too much diffused ever to bring about such an event. The confidence of the people, acquired by a wise and virtuous conduct, is the only influence the members of the Federal Government can ever have. When aristocracies are formed, they will arise within the individual States. It is, therefore, absolutely necessary that Congress should have a constitutional power to give the people at large a representation in the Government, in order to break and control such dangerous combinations. Let gentlemen show when and how this aristocracy they talk of is to arise out of this Constitution. Are the first members to perpetuate themselves? Is the Constitution to be attacked by such absurd assertions as these, and charged with defects with which it has no possible connection? (Elliott IV, supra, p. 66.)

Mr. Maclaine said:

Mr. Chairman, I thought it very extraordinary that the gentleman who was last on the floor should say that Congress could do what they please with respect to elections, and be warranted by this clause. The gentleman from Halifax (Mr. Davie) has put that construction upon it which reason and common sense will put upon it. Lawyers will often differ on a point of view, but people will seldom differ about so very plain a thing as this. (Elliott IV, supra, pp. 68, 69.)

And the remarks of Mr. Steele are today, 1949, as absolutely pertinent and as directly against the bill before this body as they were when entered by him in 1788:

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has said that the five Representatives which this State shall be entitled to send to the General Government will go from the seashore. What reason has he to say they will go from the seashore? The time, place, and manner of holding elections are to be prescribed by the legislatures. Our legislature is to regulate the first election, at any event. They will regulate it as they think proper. They may, and most probably will, lay the State off into districts. Who are to vote for them? Every man who has a right to vote for a representative to our legislature will ever have a right to vote for a Representative to the General Government. Does it not expressly provide that the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for the most numerous branch of the State legislature? Can they, without a most manifest violation of the Constitution, alter the qualifications of the electors? The power over the manner of elections does not include that of saying who shall vote: The Constitution expressly states the qualifications which entitle a man to vote for a State representative. It is, then, clearly and indubitably fixed and determined who shall be the electors; and the power over the manner only enables them to determine how these electors shall elect—whether by ballot, or by vote, or by any other way. Is it not a maxim of universal jurisprudence, of reason and common sense, that an instrument or deed of writing shall be so construed as to give validity to all parts of it, if it can be done without involving any absurdity? By construing it in the plain, obvious way I have mentioned, all parts will be valid. (Elliott, 4, supra, p. 71.)

These words should be italicized and underscored in our minds. They state absolutely, that under the Constitution as written, Congress can never constitutionally regulate the qualifications of electors. I agree.

The North Carolina convention suggested the amendment:

4. That Congress shall not alter, modify, or interfere in the times, places, or manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives, or either of them, except when the legislature of any State shall neglect, refuse, or be disabled by invasion or rebellion, to prescribe the same. (See Elliott, 4, supra, p. 249.)

The convention adjourned August 4, 1788.

On May 29, 1790, Rhode Island ratified the Constitution, and listed a number of proposed amendments; among these was—

That Congress shall not alter, modify or interfere in, the times, places, or manner, of holding elections for Senators and Representatives, or either of them, except when the legislature of any State shall neglect, refuse, or be disabled, by invasion or rebellion, to prescribe the same, or in case when the provision made by the State is so imperfect as that no consequent election is had, and then only until the legislature of such State shall make provision in the premisses. (Elliott, I, supra, p. 336, amendment II.)

What has become of our Constitution as regards the provisions on voting qualifications? We shall see that the words of the framers, and the thoughts and opinions of the men who debated its ratification have been adhered to. Those changes which have been enacted affecting voting qualifications have been done by amendment to the Constitution itself, the only legal way to change the States' own individual regulations on this matter. There have been several amendments touching this subject matter. Why did Congress, in the past, resort to constitutional amendment to effect changes in the qualifications of State electors if their end could have been accomplished by congressional act? Because Congress knew that was the only legal way they could regulate or infringe upon a field specifically delegated to State regulation by the Constitution itself.

I turn now to examine the amendments to our Federal Constitution as they affect section 2 of article I which says, again, that the electors of representatives to Congress shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Some amendments have affected suffrage problems. I shall first list the amendments and then discuss them.

Section 2 of article XIV says that as to any State which denies the right to vote to any male citizen over 21 years of age except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be proportionately reduced. This regulation in itself recognizes the right of the State to deny such right if it wishes.

Article XV, which deals with Negro suffrage, is as follows:

SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation. (Proposed by Congress on February 26, 1869, 915 Stat. L. 346), and ratified by three-fourths of the States by February 3, 1870.)

Article XV, Constitution of the States and United States, page 10.

Article XVII, election of Senators:

The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State,

can put a veto, at any time, on the General

It would have been a solecism, to have a gov-

the same sense.) Here, in the first part of

elected by the people thereof, for 6 years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

When vacancies happen in the representation of any State in the Senate, the executive authority of such State shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies: *Provided*, That the legislature of any State may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancies by election as the legislature may direct.

This amendment shall not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator chosen before it becomes valid as part of the Constitution.

Article XIX, woman's suffrage:

SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

SEC. 2. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation. (Proposed by Congress June 5, 1919 (41 Stat. L. 362), and ratified by three-fourths of the States by August 26, 1920.)

Article XV, as we all know, came on the heels of the Civil War, and as a result thereof. It is rather significant, to my mind, that, even at that time Congress made no attempt to interfere by legislation with the States and recognized that an amendment to the Constitution was the only method of attaining that right constitutionally. That is, with the Civil War a recent memory, and the subject of former slavery still a bitter topic, with the abolitionists riding high and the victorious North contending only with carpetbag governments of the worst type in the as yet unreconstructed South, Congress still knew its limitations sufficiently to realize that the qualifications of electors had been left to the State government entirely by the Constitution and the only way to vary such qualifications or affect them at all was to amend the instrument. The amendment itself is specifically self-limiting in scope and leaves the rest of the field in the State's hands.

Though the sovereignty is in the people, as a practical fact it resides in those persons who by the constitution of the State are permitted to exercise the elective franchise. The whole subject of the regulations of elections, including the prescribing of qualifications for suffrage, is left by the national Constitution to the several States, except as it is provided by that instrument that the electors for representatives in Congress shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature, and as the fifteenth amendment forbids denying to citizens the right to vote on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. Participation in the elective franchise is a privilege rather than a right, and it is granted or denied on grounds of general policy; the prevailing view being that it should be as general as possible consistent with the public safety. Aliens are generally excluded, though in some States they are allowed to vote after residence for a specified period, provided they have declared their intention to become citizens in the manner prescribed by law. The fifteenth amendment, it will be seen, does not forbid denying the franchise to citizens except upon certain specified grounds, and it is matter of public history that its purpose was to prevent discriminations in this regard as against persons of African descent. (Cooley, Constitutional Limitations, p. 752.)

While I shall discuss later some decisions on the subject of the fifteenth amendment, and also shall go into detail on the State Constitutions, I should like here to quote a general statement concerning conditions between 1812 and 1867 concerning the Negro vote:

Race: Increasing race prejudice had well-nigh eliminated the Negro as an elector. All but six States had written "white" in their constitutions: Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island, Maine, and New York. However, in the latter State, in order to vote, the Negro must own $250 worth of property on which he had paid the taxes and reside in the Commonwealth 2 years longer than was required of a white man. It is alleged that public opinion was so averse to his voting even in the New England States that the Negro was kept away from the polls in all but two. Chancellor Kent says that the Negro really voted in Maine alone. At least it is a significant fact that New Hampshire (1857) and Vermont (1858) found it necessary to enact laws that Negroes should not be excluded from the polls. Therefore, it fell out that just before the Negro was to have suffrage granted him as a special favor by the fifteenth amendment he was kept from the exercise of the elective franchise most completely. The aforesaid amendment was revolutionary in more ways than one; it struck the word "white" from the constitutions of over 30 States. As an indication of what was to become a local, though intensely bitter, race and suffrage problem about the middle of the following period, note that Oregon in 1857 disfranchised Chinese. Yet the general race test disappeared. (McCulloch, Suffrage and Its Problems, p. 47.)

Speaking of the period immediately following the Civil War, McCulloch says:

Period of problems: This period inherited three growing problems: The question of Negro suffrage, deadlocked in the preceding period, at once became paramount as a postwar measure; the agitation for woman suffrage, stilled during the time of civil strife, was renewed by its zealous advocates; the tendency to allow aliens to vote on mere declarations of intent to become citizens was increased notably. During the epoch some sort of solution is attempted for each of these problems.

At the outset of the period the elective franchise was secured for the Negro by constitutional amendment. The thirteenth amendment had made him a man instead of a chattel. The fourteenth amendment conferred citizenship upon him and incidentally endeavored to insure the ballot to him by providing that when any male citizens over 21 years of age were excluded from the elective franchise (except for crime) the basis of representation of said State in Congress should be proportionately reduced. This incidental treatment of the problem of Negro suffrage not promising satisfactory results, more direct and drastic means were found. The fifteenth amendment (1870) provided that the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. Therefore, the out and out race test for suffrage was displaced irrevocably. However, it should be noted that suffrage was still a commonwealth matter. The United States, through congressional action or court decision, could interfere in questions affecting the elective franchise only when the provisions of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments were violated. (McCulloch, supra, pp. 51 and 52.)

In the struggle to preserve the Union, which incidentally freed the slaves, the North experienced at least a partial change of sentiment. Especially as the difficult work of reconstruction wore on, the expedient of giving the newly made freemen the ballot gained ground. Yet even in 1865 the Republican Party was opposed to the extension of the franchise to the Negroes. Neither Lincoln nor Johnson proposed such a measure. But finally Sumner's plan prevailed as a party policy. Argument: The Negro was still in subjection, while the South had been freed from slavery; the ballot would make him free indeed. In fact, at that time, it seemed to be a choice between maintaining an army at the South or securing the ballot for the Negro; the latter was regarded as the lesser of two evils. The weapon proved a boomerang. (McCulloch, supra, pp. 80 and 81.)

The radical Republicans insisted on the Negro becoming an elector in the South, while he was disfranchised in the vast majority of the northern Commonwealths. The North threw theories and prejudices to the winds and sought to find a practical solution of the vexing question, "What to do with the Negro?" The thirteenth amendment destroyed slavery; the fourteenth made the Negro a citizen, but not a voter. Finally the fifteenth sought to secure the elective franchise for and to him, in spite of race prejudice and existing adverse and discouraging conditions. Shellenbarger, who proposed a substitute prohibiting any disfranchisement of males 21 years of age, except for crime, pointed out that this amendment would suggest other disqualifying tests than race, color, etc. Subsequent events have shown that this desperate expedient was futile. While the amendment secured temporarily the widest extension of the elective franchise to the Negro, it was extreme and unwise.

What was secured for the Negro by the fifteenth amendment? It did not confer suffrage upon him, nor upon anyone. The States were still left wide latitude aside from its inhibitions. It merely prevented discrimination on account of "race, color, or previous condition of servitude." However, it has been held to confer suffrage indirectly; in extending the franchise to any class of inhabitants, Negroes may not be excluded. To secure a decision under the fifteenth amendment it has been held that the indictment must specify that the elector was excluded because he was a Negro—just such an inference is not sufficient. While power is conferred upon Congress to legislate upon the subject of Commonwealth elections, this may not be done except when an otherwise qualified voter is denied that privilege because of "race, color, or previous condition of servitude." Hence, the redress formerly secured by this amendment was not so sweeping as would at first appear.

The suffrage issue was injected into a Mississippi case, but the Supreme Court upheld the decisions of the State courts; while in a Virginia contention the Court refused to assume jurisdiction. The decision in the case of an Alabama Negro, wherein it was held by the Supreme Court that that tribunal did not have jurisdiction, maintained that the offense, and hence a remedy, was political rather than judicial. The inference was that recourse must be had through Congress acting under the fourteenth amendment. There has been little likelihood of such action. However, the recent decision declaring the Oklahoma grandfather clause unconstitutional is a departure from precedent. It would seem that the fifteenth amendment is to become more effective. The disappearance of shifty and temporary expedients, used under the guise of legality to disfranchise the Negro in the South, should be welcomed. Even the South seems to accept his view of the matter.

The immediate result of the reconstruction policy was to put the Southern Commonwealths under negro rule. Led by political adventurers, the ignorant Negroes gave the

South such a government as has been a nightmare to that section ever since. The big offices were appropriated by the carpetbaggers—the little ones being left to the ignorant Negroes. There was a reign of fraud and extravagance. Preceding 1861 South Carolina's average annual stationery bill had been $400; for 1873 it was $16,000. Six million dollars went through fraudulent bonds. This shameless plundering of the South went on for a time unchecked. The estimated carpetbag deficit of the 11 Southern States totaled $298,020,641.80. They spell "pray" with an "e", and thus spelled they obey the apostolic injunction to "pray without ceasing." Such a state of misgovernment could not long endure. (McCulloch, supra, pp. 82, 83, and 85.)

It is interesting historically to note what some of the Nation's leaders thought of the fifteenth amendment.

Neither Lincoln nor Johnson wished universal manhood suffrage immediately extended to the freedman. Lincoln preferred that it be conferred gradually, first securing it to the very intelligent (those able to read and write) and to those who had served in the Union Army. Johnson advised a similar plan: extending the ballot to those Negroes owning a little property and those able to read and write. The evident purpose was to allow the southern commonwealths to solve the problem—the National Government insisting that those Negroes qualified be allowed to vote. Nor was this plan of solution vain or hopeless. While the South was deeply prejudiced against Negro suffrage, many of the leading men of that section took the same view of the matter. Wade Hampton and L. Q. C. Lamar may be taken as typical men of the South who saw the issue clearly. Wade Hampton of South Carolina wrote: "I realized in 1867 that when a man has been made a citizen of the United States, he could not be debarred from voting on account of his color. Such an exclusion would be opposed to the entire theory of republican institutions." But for the untoward events that preceded the adoption of the fifteenth amendment, the South might have been spared much of the bitterness of reconstruction and the Nation the vexing problems arising from indiscriminate Negro suffrage. The whole people lost their only freind in Lincoln; the troublesome times needed his great mind and greater heart. While the South was proud and unbending even in defeat, Congress was actuated by unstatesmanlike motives and forced upon the prostrate commonwealths an intolerable political situation.

The ablest men of the time were averse to conferring the ballot on the Negro irrespective of his fitness for it. Beecher in 1865 pointed out the futility of such a course and concluded: "You will never be able to secure the elective franchise for the Negro and maintain it for him, except by making him so intelligent that men cannot deny it to him." And so it has fallen out. But the cautious method of treatment was abruptly ended with Lincoln's death and Johnson's unfortunate quarrel with Congress. The extreme faction gained control with dire results for the great suffrage problem. As the hasty system inaugurated by the reconstruction policy of Congress began to bear fruit, even the Negroes deplored the increased degradation of their race. They realized that they were merely tools. The political adventurer from the North pulled the strings. (McCulloch, supra, pp. 91, 92, and 93.)

Mr. President, McCulloch says, and repeats, that this particularized provision for the Negro does not affect State control over every other voting qualification, including, certainly, the existence now of a poll tax as a prerequisite to the exercise of the voting privilege. State control is reaffirmed in article XVII which quotes word for word the tests for electors of Representatives in the first article, second section, of the Constitution, and makes that apply to the electors of Senators as well. In other words, the test that all electors qualified to vote for the most numerous branch of the State legislature shall be qualified to vote for Representatives, set out in 1787 at the Constitutional Convention, is reaffirmed and extended 150 years later.

The nineteenth amendment extends the right to vote to women.

I quote further from McCulloch:

The agitation for woman suffrage became more intense after the enfranchisement of the Negro and began to bear fruit in the multiplication of the number of States that granted school suffrage to women. Also municipal and bond suffrage was extended to women in a few instances. In the West a few commonwealths bestowed upon woman the full elective franchise. Wyoming led in this movement; her full suffrage law bears the date 1869. The number of such States gradually but very slowly increased, extending the movement eastward. Then came the World War and another suffrage revolution. Woman suffrage became a war measure of almost spontaneous proportions. Because constitutional amendments were too slow, a number of State legislatures followed the questionable expedient of granting women the franchise for nonconstitutional offices. Years before, an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, following the lines of the fifteenth amendment and thereby securing the ballot for women, had been offered; but such proposals usually died in a congressional committee. During the war this amendment was brought forward with marked difference in its reception. As the prospective nineteenth amendment it was passed by Congress and submitted to the several States for ratification in 1919 and received the endorsement of the requisite number of commonwealths in 1920. Like the former amendment (fifteenth), the nineteenth amendment disturbs the commonwealth regulation of suffrage as little as possible; it provides that the "right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on acount of sex." (McCulloch, supra, pp. 52 and 53.)

Until this period, in spite of the agitation of women suffragists, the elective franchise had been confined to males. The constitution of every State so specified. The sagebrush territory of Wyoming had granted women full suffrage in 1869; but this departure only emphasized the universality of the rule. Yet insistent agitation accomplished something. Following the chivalrous example set by Kentucky in 1838, other States allowed women to participate in school elections. While this was a sop thrown to the troublesome agitators for woman suffrage, there was also the idea in the minds of legislators that educational matters rather belonged in woman's sphere. This practice grew until 26 States had extended school suffrage to women. Along with this innovation came another, closely associated with the ownership of property: women were permitted to vote in municipal elections and in voting bonds. This extension of suffrage to women was not so general as that of school suffrage; only nine States saw fit to grant some sort of "municipal suffrage" to women. Meanwhile a few of the sparsely settled States of the Rocky Mountain region followed the pioneer, Wyoming, and extended full suffrage to women. In this section there were no large cities, and, equally significant, the number of men greatly exceeded that of women. However, the movement gathered weight very slowly and by 1910 but four States had taken this advanced stand: Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and Idaho. But, nothing having happened of startling nature because of woman suffrage in these commonwealths, and agitation becoming more widespread and more insistent, the movement spread; and at the outbreak of the World War the number of States in which women had full suffrage had more than doubled: Washington, California, Oregon, Kansas, and Arizona had fully enfranchised women. During the World War suffrage events moved rapidly: Nevada and Montana were early added to the list, and then the movement invaded the East. After the United States entered the war, New York, Michigan, South Dakota, and Oklahoma extended the ballot to women. This secured full suffrage for women in 15 States. But even a more significant thing was happening. Since constitutional amendments move slowly, the legislatures of 15 States proceeded to grant women suffrage for "nonconstitutional offices," this permitted women to vote for Congressmen and Presidential electors. Frankly, woman suffrage had become a war issue. Under this stress the Anthony amendment was revived and, with the help of the President, pushed through Congress—receiving the required extraordinary majority, June 5, 1919. Then began the ratification by States. Few State legislatures were to meet at an early date in regular session, hence it was necessary for the Governors to call extra sessions—if the amendment was to be ratified in time for women to vote in the election of 1920. With remarkable celerity 35 States ratified. All States west of the Mississippi, excepting Louisiana, had approved the amendment. Most Southern States had rejected it or their legislatures had not been convened; while some New England Governors had refused to call extra sessions. This was the situation in mid-summer. President Wilson, the chairman of central committees, and Presidential nominees brought great pressure to bear in the border States, which had neither ratified nor rejected the amendment; for each party was eager to secure the credit for ratification and thus have a catch appeal to women voters. Finally, after a bitter and close struggle, Tennessee ratified the nineteenth amendment, August 18, 1920; and the word "male" was stricken from the constitutions of 33 States. (McCulloch, supra, pp. 60, 61, and 62.)

In an academic sense, woman suffrage is as old as Plato. However, his dream of women sharing in the political burdens of the state was no more real than were his asses frisking along the highway in the exuberance of republican freedom. It is a far cry from Greek civilization to that of the twentieth century, and the enfranchised woman of today looks out on a vastly different world. The social position of modern women rests on a foundation laid far back in the past. It was for Christianity to give woman a new worth and dignity; she possessed an immortal individuality—a soul. Accordingly, the position of women has ever been the great and outstanding difference between pagan and Christian civilizations. However, it takes time for even religious truth to overcome fixed ideas and customs. Slowly and painfully the world achieved progress. The rise of the Puritan home in England marks the beginning of the highest position ever assigned to woman. Even then, with marked gains in individual liberty and social standing political equality for woman was far in the future. If the relative estimate of womanhood is a sure criterion of civilization, then America enjoys the highest in the world. Therefore, in the United States has come the first agitation for and the widest extension of sexless political equality.

The question of woman suffrage in the United States has been closely associated

with that of the Negro. The half dozen women delegates sent from America to the World's Antislavery Convention, which met in London in June 1840 were emphatically refused seats. Therefore, these women came home pledged to agitate for woman suffrage. Thus, in trying to free the Negro from the bonds of slavery, was the question of woman suffrage precipitated. After several years of local agitation, the first woman's-rights convention met in Seneca Falls, N. Y., in July 1848. Other sections of the country followed this example, and the woman suffrage question was fairly launched. The movement in England did not get under way until 1865. English women had enjoyed municipal suffrage, based like that of men on guild, freehold, and property bases. Thereafter the struggle was begun for parliamentary suffrage. The contest there has been long and bitter. The methods employed by the agitators, while quite British, would have been wholly out of place in America. Finally under stress of the World War, partial success was achieved: In 1918 parliamentary suffrage was extended to some 6,000,000 women, and in 1928 to all.

At the Declaration of Independence universal manhood suffrage was not even a future event in the minds of publicists. Certainly no one contemplated the extension of the ballot to women. Yet, soon thereafter women actually voted. The first instance of undoubted authenticity was in New Jersey in 1797. Women then voted under the Constitution of 1776, which declared that all inhabitants were electors—if otherwise qualified. This was clearly an oversight on the part of the lawmakers and was corrected by a more exact definition in 1807. In the History of Woman Suffrage it is asserted that women had voted in Massachusetts under the charter from 1691 to 1780 and under the Constitution from 1780 to 1785. However, this is mere conjecture. There were no further instances of women exercising the right of suffrage, during the early periods of our national history.

During the decade preceding the Civil War there was considerable agitation for woman suffrage, but the preponderance of the slavery issue kept it in the background. The only tangible result of this early agitation for woman suffrage appears to have been the action of Kansas in 1861, following the earlier example of Kentucky, granting school suffrage to women. When the Negro became a citizen and later an elector—both by amendments to the Federal Constitution—the women agitators for suffrage became impatient in their demands for the ballot. Some presumed to vote, claiming that privilege under the fourteenth amendment. A Mrs. Ricker voted without protest in New Hampshire in 1872. When Susan B. Anthony insisted on voting the same year, she was fined $100—which was never paid. Finally, in 1875, a decision was handed down by the Supreme Court of the United States asserting that the amendment had not contemplated women voting and that the regulation of the elective franchise was entirely within the province of the various States. This stopped women from voting a second time.

Meanwhile, the leaders of the movement were not idle. In 1869 what was known as the sixteenth amendment was urged upon Congress: The right of suffrage in the United States shall be based on citizenship and shall be regulated by Congress; and all citizens of the United States, whether native or naturalized, shall enjoy this right equally without any distinction or discrimination whatever founded on sex. This proposed amendment had two significant features besides its main intent: it would have invalidated at one stroke the declaration of intent tests in a number of States and it would have wrought a suffrage revolution by vesting in Congress the regulation of suffrage instead of leaving this function to the several commonwealths—which had been the custom from colonial days. The first vote obtained on the proposed amendment was in 1887, when the Senate refused to submit it to the States for ratification by a vote of 34 to 16. To have been constitutionally effective, this vote would have had to have been the reverse of what it was. Eleven favorable committee reports have been had on the proposition: five from the Senate and six from the House—the first in 1871, the last in 1893. Since the latter date attention has been directed principally to obtaining favorable action on the part of the States, through woman-suffrage amendments to the Commonwealth constitutions. However, the insistent agitation was bearing some fruit: school suffrage was being extended to women quite generally, and by the opening of the World War 26 States had made such a concession to women, while 9 had conferred either municipal or bond-voting suffrage.

The Territory of Wyoming was the first Commonwealth to grant full suffrage to women. This was done in 1869, while the Territory was not erected into a State until 20 years later. Yet even in 1889 the pioneer State stood alone. There seems to be some doubt as to the facts about the case of Wyoming. The action on 1869 appears to have been treated as a joke. There was no political significance in the measure. However, when the Territory was admitted as a State the opposition to woman suffrage had well-nigh ceased. In 1893 Colorado adopted an amendment to her constitution extending suffrage to women. The majority for the amendment was 6,347; a similar measure lost in 1877 by 5,844. Again it is difficult to get at the facts. Men outnumbered women in the Centennial State by 49,761. However, the measure seems to have been largely the result of the panicky and chaotic condition prevailing there then, and a sort of byproduct of populism. Idaho and Utah extended suffrage to women in 1896. The latter Commonwealth thus returning to its Territorial regulation, which had been annulled by the Federal Government because of the prevalence of polygamy. A woman critic attributed the adoption of woman suffrage in Wyoming to a political trick, in Colorado to populism, and in Utah to polygamy. Anyhow, there were no further concrete results for a number of years. In fact, since New York and Massachusetts had just rejected woman suffrage by overwhelming majorities there seemed little probability that other States would extend the franchise to women. In contrast to Colorado, in the latter State women outnumbered men by over 70,000. Frankly, it was an isolated western fad—ignored by the South and ridiculed by the North. For further advance of woman suffrage the time element was necessary.

Around 1910 the movement took on new life. A number of things contributed to this revival of interest in woman suffrage. Agitation, while persistent, was dignified; it took on more the nature of an educational propaganda. Also the novel suffrage venture of a few sparsely settled States had not caused either an upheaval of the social order or the moral downfall of woman. The rest of the Nation began to look with more respect on the whole question of woman suffrage. Other States began to adopt like amendments enfranchising women. In 1910 Washington gave woman the ballot, in 1911 California extended suffrage to women, and in 1912 Oregon did likewise, thus uniting the Pacific coast in the movement. The same year Arizona and Kansas granted suffrage to women. While the movement had reached beyond the West of high altitudes, it was still confined to the great West, where the States were not averse to trying experiments. The conservative North and South were content to remain on the side-lines. No ordinary course of events would have caused even the North to adopt woman suffrage by a mass movement, much less the ultraconservative South.

Then came the World War. At that time nine States had granted women the elective franchise. When the United States entered the conflict two more had extended political suffrage to women—Nevada and Montana, both in 1914. However, at once woman suffrage became a war measure; the unselfish and heroic war work of the women of America and elsewhere was an unanswerable argument. Whatever woman wanted she should have as a fitting reward for her patriotism. As Mrs. Medill McCormick put it: "We have sacrificed as you have in its defense." Events moved rapidly. The greatest suffrage victory came in New York in 1917. As recently as in 1915, woman suffrage had been lost in that State by an adverse majority of over 185,000. Two years later the women framed a monster petition with over a million signatures of women asking for the ballot and the suffrage amendment carried that year by over 100,000 votes. The advocates of woman suffrage were greatly encouraged and the movement gained momentum. The next year Michigan, South Dakota, and Oklahoma enfranchised women. Similar amendments were submitted in five other States; but, the amending process was too dilatory to suit aroused woman suffrage sentiment and more speedy methods were adopted. The unique plan was devised to enfranchise women by mere legislative action, allowing them to vote in elections for "nonconstitutional offices," such as electors for President and sometimes Members of Congress. Illinois had adopted this expedient in 1913. During the year 1917, Michigan, Nebraska, North Dakota, and Rhode Island enacted similar legislation. Two years later, Tennessee, Missouri, Iowa, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Indiana, Ohio, and Maine did likewise; while Arkansas in 1917 and Texas in 1918 permitted women to vote at primaries only. Therefore, at the close of hostilities women had acquired political suffrage in some form in 29 States—15 by amendments to the commonwealth constitutions and 14 by legislative enactment.

As great as was this victory for woman suffrage, an even more sweeping one was on the way.

Meanwhile the Anthony amendment to the United States Constitution had been urged upon Congress. President Wilson endorsed it as a war measure and brought his influence to bear upon the members of his party in Congress. While he had been uniformly successful in having his way with Congress, the proposed amendment failed of the necessary two-thirds majority in the Senate—though it had passed the House by a vote of 274 to 136, January 10, 1918. The succeeding Congress, while less obedient to the wishes of the President, took up and pressed forward the proposed amendment with such vigor that on June 5, 1919, it was passed by both Houses with the requisite majorities and submitted to the States for ratification. (McCulloch, supra, pp. 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, and 116.)

By September of 1920 a sufficient number of States had ratified for the amendment to become effective.

So what do we have? A Constitution which, since 1787, its inception, has given the control over voting qualifications to the States. This control has been twice abridged, once after the Civil War, in favor of the Negro, once after the World War, in favor of women. It took two wars and sweeping movements to accomplish these changes, and then they were accomplished by amendment to the Constitution. After the fifteenth amendment, the seventeenth amendment reaffirmed

the States' rights to control over voting qualifications. These rights are unchanged in the Constitution today and are absolutely prohibitive of any such abortive legislation as is now being considered in this House.

I have completed the first of three phases of my presentation—that concerned with the United States Constitution. The second phase, which I now approach is concerned with the original State constitutional provisions, and their changes. The third phase will treat many decisions on the subject of voting qualifications, interpreting various constitutional provisions.

Should Senators ask, Why go into all the State regulations to prove the unconstitutionality of the proposed measure abolishing poll tax by congressional act? I reply that the State regulations, stressing their variety and the causes therefor, are essential. I quote from Porter:

Of course, the basis on which a study of the suffrage must be founded would be the constitutional provisions in the various States. Altogether there have been about 120 constitutions drawn up and put in operation since the Declaration of Independence, and the suffrage provisions in these constitutions must be the structural work on which a history of suffrage may be built. They indicate the actual turning points and show in unembellished outline form the trend of thought on the matter of suffrage. But the question at once occurs: Is it necessary to take account of the acts of State legislatures and add statutes to the outline structure? However, a study of the constitutional law on the subject and a survey of statutory acts concerning suffrage lead to the conclusion that the legislative acts are of scarcely any importance and do not need to be added to the constitutional provisions in order to form an adequate basis for a history of suffrage. Writers on constitutional law and the law of elections dispel all scruples on this matter. (Footnote: M. H. Throop (Law of Public Officers, p. 129) says: "The power of the State to regulate the elective franchise is exercised universally by means of provisions in the constitution of each State." He goes on to point out that there is a very small field left for statute law. Acts are sure to be declared void if they prescribe further qualifications than the constitution contains, or if they grant suffrage to any person who does not possess the qualifications stipulated for. However, requirements not in conflict with the spirit of the constitution may be superadded, such as terms of residence in election districts, exclusion of certain public officers from the suffrage, etc. But anything the legislature may do is likely to be of small importance.) But it occasionally happens that the constitution permits the legislature to use discretion in the matter of enlarging the suffrage. Thus in recent years legislatures have been permitted to levy poll taxes as a prerequisite to voting and to impose literacy tests. But authority for these must always be positively found in the constitution itself. (Porter, History of Suffrage in the United States, pp. 14, 15, to top of p. 16.)

First, New Hampshire: In 1776, at the time of the Declaration of Independence, New Hampshire's congress drew up a constitution. It is said that congress was chosen and appointed by the free suffrages of the people of said colony—See Thorpe, 4, Charters and Constitutions, page 2451.

This was the first constitution framed by an American commonwealth. In 1784 a complete constitution was ratified for New Hampshire.

Article XI reads:

All elections ought to be free, and every inhabitant of the State having the proper qualifications, has equal right to elect, and be elected into office. (Art. XI, of Thorpe, 4, supra, p. 2455.)

The electors' qualifications are fully set out, as follows:

The Senate shall be the first branch of the legislature: and the senators shall be chosen in the following manner, viz. Every male inhabitant of each town and parish with town privileges in the several counties in this State, of 21 years of age and upwards, paying for himself a poll tax, shall have a right at the annual or other meetings of the inhabitants of said towns and parishes, to be duly warned and holden annually forever in the month of March; to vote in the town or parish wherein he dwells, for the senators in the county or district whereof he is a member.

And every person qualified as the constitution provides, shall be considered an inhabitant for the purpose of electing and being elected into any office or place within this State, in that town, parish, and plantation where he dwelleth and hath his home.

The selectmen of the several towns and parishes aforesaid, shall, during the choice of Senators, preside at such meetings impartially, and shall receive the votes of all the inhabitants of such towns and parishes present and qualified to vote for Senators, and shall sort and count the same in the meeting, and in the presence of the town clerk, who shall make a fair record in the presence of the selectmen, and in open meeting, of the name of every person voted for, and the number of votes against his name; and a fair copy of this record shall be attested by the selectmen and town clerk; and shall be sealed up and directed to the secretary of the State, with a superscription expressing the purport thereof, and delivered by said clerk to the sheriff of the county in which such town or parish lies, 30 days at least before the first Wednesday of June; and the sheriff of each county, or his deputy, shall deliver all such certificates by him received, into the secretary's office, 17 days at least, before the first Wednesday of June.

And the inhabitants of plantations and places unincorporated, qualified as this constitution provides, who are or shall be required to assess taxes upon themselves toward the support of government, or shall be taxed therefor, shall have the same privilege of voting for Senators in the plantations and places wherein they reside, as the inhabitants of the respective towns and parishes aforesaid have. And the meetings of such plantations and places for that purpose, shall be holden annually in the month of March, at such places respectively therein, as the assessors thereof shall direct; which assessors shall have like authority for notifying the electors, collecting and returning the votes, as the selectmen and town clerks have in their several towns by this constitution. (Thorp, 4, supra, beginning p. 2459, par. starting "The Senate, etc." to end second par. top p. 2460.)

All persons qualified to vote in the election of senators shall be entitled to vote within the town, district, parish, or place where they dwell in the choice of representatives. Every member of the house of representatives shall be chosen by ballot; and for 2 years at least next preceding his election shall have been an inhabitant of this State, shall have an estate within the town, parish, or place which he may be chosen to represent, of the value of 100 pounds, one-half of which to be a freehold, whereof he is seized in his own right; shall be at the time of his election an inhabitant of the town, parish, or place he may be chosen to represent; shall be of the Protestant religion; and shall cease to represent such town, parish, or place immediately on his ceasing to be qualified as aforesaid (Thorpe, 4, supra, last paragraph p. 2461 through second line top p. 2462.)

In 1792 this was modified somewhat.

SEC. XXVIII. The senate shall be the first branch of the legislature, and the senators shall be chosen in the following manner, viz: Every male inhabitant of each town and parish with town privileges, and places unincorporated, in this State, of 21 years of age and upward, excepting paupers and persons excused from paying taxes at their own request, shall have a right, at the annual or other meeting of the inhabitants of said towns and parishes, to be duly warned and holden annually forever in the month of March, to vote in the town or parish wherein he dwells for the senator in the district whereof he is a member. (Thorpe, 4, supra, p. 2479, sec. XXVIII.)

In 1902 the rather broadened viewpoint in some ways is shown by another amendment, which at the same time shows a rising feeling against aliens.

All elections ought to be free, and every inhabitant of the State having the proper qualifications has equal right to elect and be elected into office, but no person shall have the right to vote or be eligible to office under the constitution of this State who shall not be able to read the constitution in the English language and to write: *Provided, however*, That this provision shall not apply to any person prevented by a physical disability from complying with its requisitions, nor to any person who now has the right to vote, nor to any person who shall be 60 years of age or upwards on the 1st day of January, A. D. 1904. (Thorpe, 4, supra, p. 2493, pt. II, art. XI.)

In the New Hampshire Constitution of 1784 it was further provided that—

All persons qualified to vote in the election of Senators, shall be entitled to vote, within the (town) district (parish or place) where they dwell, in the choice of Representatives. (Art. XIII, p. 1039, Constitutions of the States and United States.)

And the qualifications remain as above set out.

Chafee sets out the qualifications in summarized form in his report:

Who may vote: Persons who have resided in the town 6 months and have paid all taxes assessed during the preceding year. Women are liable to tax.

Registration: No person shall vote whose name is not on the check list unless it was omitted by mistake and his right to vote was known by the supervisors when list was made.

Need not be renewed by voters who voted at the preceding election. Persons voting at the primary need not re-register for the following general election.

May be effected—how: By personal appearance before the supervisors.

When: 1. In Claremont and Newport last session October 31 when list is revised.

2. In towns with more than 600 voters, supervisors are in session October 27, November 2, and additional days if necessary.

Absent voting: Is permitted only in Presidential elections. Apply to city or town clerk during the 30 days before the election on a blank obtained from secretary of state, city, or town clerk. (Chafee, Summary of General Election Laws of the United States.)

New Hampshire was one of the first four States to set up a tax payment as the sole qualification, omitting the requirement of owning property. It is also of passing interest to note that while almost all States require an elector to be

a citizen, New Hampshire clings to the ancient word "inhabitant." However, the meaning probably is not changed. Also New Hampshire was one of the first to require the educational test, namely, that a voter must read and write English. Also, New Hampshire was one of the six States which never excluded the Negro—see Porter, History of Suffrage in the United States, page 90.

Delaware was chartered in 1701. At this early date the State had assumed control over the qualifications of electors. In article II there was this provision:

And that the qualifications of electors and elected, and all other matters and things relating to elections of representatives to serve in assemblies, though not herein particularly expressed, shall be and remain as by a law of this government made at Newcastle, in the year 1700, entitled "An act to ascertain the number of members of assembly and to regulate the elections." (See Thorpe, I, supra, p. 559.)

In 1776 the Delaware Constitution employed the "property test," then quite a general one.

ART. 3. One of the branches of the legislature shall be called "the house of assembly", and shall consist of seven representatives to be chosen for each county annually of such persons as are freeholders of the same.

ART. 4. The other branch shall be called "the council", and consist of nine members; three to be chosen for each county at the time of the first election of the assembly, who shall be freeholders of the county for which they are chosen, and be upward of 25 years of age. * * *

ART. 5. The right of suffrage in the election of members for both houses shall remain as exercised by law at present; and each house shall choose its own speaker, appoint its own officers, judge of the qualifications and elections of its own members, settle its own rules of proceedings, and direct writs of election for supplying intermediate vacancies.

Thorpe I, supra, page 562, articles 3 and 4, through words "25 years of age"; also article 5, page 563, through sentence ending intermediate vacancies."

In 1792, Delaware, in convention at Newcastle, drew up a new constitution. They provided:

SEC. 1. All elections of governor, senators, and representatives shall be by ballot; and in such elections every white freeman of the age of 21 years, having resided in the State 2 years next before the election, and within that time paid a State or county tax, which shall have been assessed at least 6 months before the election, shall enjoy the right of an elector; and the sons of persons so qualified shall, between the ages of 21 and 22 years, be entitled to vote, although they shall not have paid taxes.

SEC. 2. Electors shall in all cases, except treason, felony, or breach of the peace, be privileged from arrest during their attendance at elections, and in going to and returning from them.

Thorpe I, supra, article IV, page 574.

We see here the departure from the property test, which was replaced by the payment of a tax. In 1831 Delaware again changed its constitution:

SECTION 1. All elections for governor, senators, representatives, sheriffs, and coroners shall be held on the second Tuesday of November, and be by ballot; and in such elections every free white male citizen of the age of 22 years or upwards, having resided in the State 1 year next before the election, and the last month thereof in the county where he offers to vote, and having within 2 years next before the election paid a county tax, which shall have been assessed at least 6 months before the election, shall enjoy the right of an elector; and every free white male citizen of the age of 21 years, and under the age of 22 years, having resided as aforesaid, shall be entitled to vote without payment of any tax: *Provided*, That no person in the military, naval, or marine service of the United States shall be considered as acquiring a residence in this State, by being stationed in any garrison, barrack, or military or naval place or station within this State; and no idiot, or insane person, or pauper, or person convicted of a crime deemed by law felony, shall enjoy the right of an elector; and that the legislature may impose the forfeiture of the right of suffrage as a punishment for crime.

SEC. 2. Electors shall in all cases except treason, felony, or breach of the peace, be privileged from an arrest during their attendance at elections, and in going to and returning from them.

Thorpe I, supra, article IV, page 589.

It is interesting to note the variations in all the State laws. A mere reading of them shows their vital differences. Each State has suited its own peculiar problems and citizenry, perhaps even its own geographical position. This is entirely proper and to be expected, contrary to the uniformity proposed here to be imposed by unconstitutional legislation.

In 1897 there was another Deleware constitution, providing for the choosing of Representatives, among others, by qualified electors. While the various bills of rights always provide that elections are to be free and equal, it has long been accepted, as stated by many whom I have quoted heretofore, and as shown by decisions which I shall discuss later, that the right to vote is a privilege rather than an absolute right, which must be exercised in accordance with certain regulations set up by each State. In 1897 Delaware ruled:

SECTION 1. The general election shall be held biennially on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in the month of November, and shall be by ballot; but the general assembly may by law prescribe the means, methods, and instruments of voting so as best to secure secrecy and the independence of the voter, preserve the freedom and purity of elections and prevent fraud, corruption, and intimidation thereat.

SEC. 2. Every male citizen of this State of the age of 21 years who shall have been a resident thereof 1 year next preceding an election, and for the last 3 months a resident of the county, and for the last 30 days a resident of the hundred or election district in which he may offer to vote, and in which he shall have been duly registered as hereinafter provided for, shall be entitled to vote at such election in the hundred or election district of which he shall at the time be a resident, and in which he shall be registered, for all officers that now are or hereafter may be elected by the people and upon all questions which may be submitted to the vote of the people; provided, however, that no person who shall attain the age of 21 years after the 1st day of January, in the year of our Lord, 1900, or after that date shall become a citizen of the United States, shall have the right to vote unless he shall be able to read this constitution in the English language and write his name; but these requirements shall not apply to any person who by reason of physical disability shall be unable to comply therewith; and provided also, that no person in the military, naval, or marine service of the United States shall be considered as acquiring a residence in this State, by being stationed in any garrison, barrack, or military or naval place or station within this State; and no idiot or insane person, pauper, or person convicted of a crime deemed by law felony, or incapacitated under the provisions of this constitution from voting, shall enjoy the right of an elector; and the general assembly may impose the forfeiture of the right of suffrage as a punishment for crime. (Thorpe I, supra, p. 620, secs. 1, 2, of art. V.) Here a new refinement is seen—the "education test" is coming in at the end of the century. These are the prevailing qualifications today. Summarizing the qualifications for electors, plus certain administrative provisions concerning soldiers and absentees, see Chafee.

Who may vote: Persons who have resided in the State 1 year, in the county 3 months, and the election district 30 days.

Residents who leave to enter the Federal service or are temporarily absent because of the nature of their business.

Registration: General registration, 1940. Permanent as long as voter retains qualifications.

May be effected: How—In person only, before registrars of the election district. When—One day each week in April, May, and June. Board gives notice of days and hours.

Supplementary registration before registrar August 13 to October 17.

Absent voting: Civilian—The constitutionality of voting by mail is pending in the Supreme Court; nevertheless, the legislature at its last session passed a vote-by-mail law.

Any qualified elector absent from the State or election district, in Federal or State employ, or because of the nature of his work or business, may vote by mail at any general election. Apply to the Clerk of Peace not more than 20 nor less than 3 days prior to election for official ballot on form furnished by the clerk. The ballot will be accompanied by full instructions.

Armed forces: An election is held at the quarters of the commanding officer of each camp. The Governor sends two persons to deliver the necessary supplies, including the ballots. They collect and return the votes and all equipment at the close of the election to the State (Delaware, Chafee report).

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. LODGE. Has the Senator seen the bulletin as to the time when the Democratic leader is going to move to adjourn?

Mr. ELLENDER. How could I see it? If the Senator will bring it to me, I will read it.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. LODGE. Does not the Senator think that if that report is correct it will come as a very grievous shock to people all over the country who are hoping to see this Congress do something about bigotry and prejudice?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know what the situation is. I have been speaking for a little more than 10 hours, and I feel able to go 10 more, if necessary. I am not aware of what has happened. I understood that there might be some plan to end all this. I have not been advised, so I expect to continue to talk.

The problems each State has had to cope with can be seen by the nature of its laws concerning qualifications. Delaware was one of the first States to lengthen the period of residence required. The reason—increased immigration creating an alien problem. Such a problem would not and did not exist in many other States. Likewise, Delaware was one of the first States to allow women to participate in school elections, a phase which preceded women's right to vote generally—see McCulloch, Suffrage and Its Problems, pages 38 and 126.

Pennsylvania was chartered as a province in 1681. It is notable that even in this original instrument some consideration of elections and of who could vote was shown. In speaking of the power in William Penn to make laws, and so forth, it says, "according to their best discretions, by and with the advice, assent, and approbation of the freemen of the said country, or the greater part of them, or of their delegates or deputies," and so forth—see 5 Thorpe, supra, page 3037.

Further election laws are found in Penn's Charter of Liberties, 1682:

2. That the freemen of the said province on the 20th day of the twelfth month which shall be in this present year 1682 meet and assemble in some fit place of which timely notice shall be beforehand given by the Governor or his deputies and then and there shall choose of themselves 72 persons of most note for their wisdom, virtue, and ability who shall meet on the 10th day of the first month next ensuing and always be called and act as the provincial council of said province. (See 5 Thorpe, p. 3048, par. 2.)

A similar provision was in the frame of the government of Pennsylvania. See 5 Thorpe, supra, page 3055. Further we find there this provision:

III. That all elections of members, or representatives of the people and freemen of the province of Pennsylvania to serve in provincial council, or general assembly, to be held within the said province, shall be free and voluntary; and that the elector, that shall receive any reward or gift, in meat, drink, moneys, or otherwise, shall forfeit his right to elect; and such person as shall directly or indirectly give, promise, or bestow any such reward as aforesaid, to be elected, shall forfeit his election, and be thereby incapable to serve as aforesaid: and the provincial council and general assembly shall be the sole judges of the regularity, or irregularity of the elections of their own respective members. (See 5 Thorpe, supra, p. 3060, art. III.)

Here we see, in varied form, a provision similar to the bribery prohibitions of today.

In 1696 the following provisions are found in the frame of government.

For the electing of which representatives, it shall and may be lawful to and for all the freemen of this province and territory aforesaid, to meet together on the 10th day of the first month yearly hereafter, in the most convenient and usual place for election, within the respective counties, then and there to choose their said representatives as aforesaid, who shall meet on the 10th day of the third month yearly, in the capital town of the said province, unless the Governor and council shall think fit to appoint another place.

And, to the end it may be known who those are, in this province and territories, who ought to have right of, or to be deemed freemen, to choose, or be chosen, to serve in council and assembly, as aforesaid, be it enacted by the authority aforesaid, that no inhabitant of this province or territories, shall have right of electing, or being elected as aforesaid, unless they be free denizens of this government, and are of the age of 21 years, or upwards, and have 50 acres of land, 10 acres whereof being seated and cleared, or be otherwise worth 50 pounds, lawful money of this government, clear estate, and have been resident within this government for the space of 2 years next before such election. (See Thorpe, p. 3071, line 18.)

There is also a provision that any elector who receives a reward for giving his vote shall forfeit his vote. See 5 Thorpe, supra, page 3073.

The Constitution of Pennsylvania in 1776 was established by general convention in Philadelphia. In the declaration of rights thereof is the following provision:

VII. That all elections ought to be free; and that all free men having a sufficient evident common interest with and attachment to the community, have a right to elect officers, or to be elected into office. (See 5 Thorpe, supra, p. 3083.)

What constitutes an "evident common interest" is defined as follows:

SEC. 5. The freemen of this commonwealth and their sons shall be trained and armed for its defence under such regulations, restrictions, and exceptions as the general assembly shall by law direct, preserving always to the people the right of choosing their colonels and all commissioned officers under that rank, in such manner and as often as by the said laws shall be directed. (See 5 Thorpe, supra, p. 3084, sec. 5.)

In 1790 another constitution was framed. Article III provides as follows:

SECTION 1. In elections by the citizens, every freeman of the age of 21 years, having resided in the State 2 years next before the election, and within that time paid a State or county tax, which shall have been assessed at least 6 months before the election, shall enjoy the rights of an elector: *Provided*, That the sons of persons qualified as aforesaid, between the ages of 21 and 22 years, shall be entitled to vote, although they shall not have paid taxes.

SEC. 2. All elections shall be by ballot, except those by persons in their representative capacities, who shall vote viva voce.

SEC. 3. Electors shall, in all cases except treason, felony, and breach of surety of the peace, be privileged from arrest during their attendance on elections, and in going to and returning from them. (See 5 Thorpe, supra, p. 3095, art. III.)

In 1838 a new Constitution was ratified by a close margin. Article III thereof was:

SECTION 1. In elections by the citizens, every white freeman of the age of 21 years, having resided in this State one year, and in the election district where he offers to vote 10 days immediately preceding such election, and within 2 years paid a State or county tax, which shall have been assessed at least 10 days before the election, shall enjoy the rights of an elector. But a citizen of the United States, who had previously been a qualified voter of this State and removed therefrom and returned, and who shall have resided in the election district and paid taxes as aforesaid, shall be entitled to vote after residing in the State 6 months: *Provided*, That white freemen, citizens of the United States, between the ages of 21 and 22 years, and having resided in the State 1 year and in the election district 10 days as aforesaid, shall be entitled to vote, although they shall not have paid taxes.

SEC. 2. All elections shall be by ballot, except those by persons in their representative capacities, who shall vote viva voce.

SEC. 3. Electors shall in all cases, except treason, felony, and breach of surety of the peace, be privileged from arrest during their attendance on elections and in going to and returning from them. (See 5 Thorpe, supra, p. 3108–3109, art. III.)

Here for the first time, Mr. President, we find the significant word "white," indicating a new consciousness of the Negro problem even in the Atlantic States.

1873 saw another Constitution come into effect in Pennsylvania. The suffrage provisions are detailed:

SECTION 1. Every male citizen of 21 years of age, possessing the following qualifications, shall be entitled to vote at all elections, subject however to such laws requiring and regulating the registration of electors as the General Assembly may enact:

1. He shall have been a citizen of the United States at least 1 month.

2. He shall have resided in the State 1 year (or, having previously been a qualified elector or native-born citizen of the State, he shall have removed therefrom and returned, then 6 months) immediately preceding the election.

3. He shall have resided in the election district where he shall offer to vote at least 2 months immediately preceding the election.

4. If 22 years of age and upwards, he shall have paid within 2 years a State or county tax, which shall have been assessed at least 2 months and paid at least 1 month before the election.

SEC. 2. The general election shall be held annually on the Tuesday next following the first Monday of November, but the general assembly may by law fix a different day, two-thirds of all the members of each house consenting thereto.

SEC. 3. All elections for city, ward, borough, and township officers, for regular terms of service, shall be held on the third Tuesday of February.

SEC. 4. All elections by the citizens shall be by ballot or by such other method as may be prescribed by law: *Provided*, That secrecy in voting be preserved.

SEC. 5. Electors shall in all cases except treason, felony, and breach of surety of the peace, be privileged from arrest during their attendance on elections, and in going to and returning therefrom.

SEC. 6. Whenever any of the qualified electors of this commonwealth shall be in actual military service, under a requisition from the President of the United States, or by the authority of this commonwealth, such electors may exercise the right of suffrage in all elections by the citizens, under such regulations as are or shall be prescribed by law, as fully as if they were present at their usual places of election.

SEC. 7. All laws regulating the holding of elections by the citizens or for the registration of electors shall be uniform throughout the State, but laws regulating and requiring the registration of electors may be enacted to apply to cities only, provided that such laws be uniform for cities of the same class.

SEC. 8. Any person, who shall give, or promise or offer to give, to an elector, any money, reward, or other valuable consideration for his vote at an election, or for withholding the same, or who shall give or promise to give such consideration to any other person or party for such elector's vote or for the withholding thereof, and any elector who shall receive or agree to receive, for himself or for another, any money, reward or other valuable consideration for his vote at an election, or for withholding the same, shall thereby forfeit the right to vote at such

election, and any elector whose right to vote shall be challenged for such cause before the election officers, shall be required to swear or affirm that the matter of the challenge is untrue before his vote shall be received. (See 5 Thorpe, supra, pp. 3138–3139, art. VIII, first eight sections.)

Pennsylvania, like Delaware, felt the alien problem, and was one of the first to require a long residence period.

Pennsylvania was one of the few States in the North to have a taxpaying qualification.

As a matter of interest, Mr. President, showing that the privilege of suffrage has always been qualified by the State, according to its own needs and situation, I quote:

In the Pennsylvania Convention of 1789 all joined heartily in the following statement and had it printed in large bold type:

"All power being originally vested in, is derived from, the people, and all free governments originate from their will, are founded on their authority, and instituted for their peace, safety, and happiness; and for the advancement thereof; they have, at all times, an unalienable and indefeasible right to alter, reform, or abolish their government in such manner as they may think proper." (From Pennsylvania Convention, 1789, Minutes, p. 45.)

In spite of this acceptance of an abstract principle, a vigorous effort was early made in the Convention to establish a property qualification for suffrage. Almost feverish eagerness was manifest to get such a restriction in, and it was proposed almost before the business of the Convention was well under way. Eventually there was apprehension that it would not carry, and it did not; in its stead the usual compromise of a taxpaying qualification was introduced. Both these large States and their smaller neighbors were extravagant in formal announcements of the rights of the people. But Massachusetts considered the people to be the property owners. Pennsylvania was one step in advance of Massachusetts and considered the people to be the taxpayers. Abstract pronouncement sounded well until specific definition of the terms was sought, and when the radicals said that the people included all men 21 years of age the fight was on in earnest. (Quote Porter, History of Suffrage in the United States, p. 28, second paragraph to end first paragraph, p. 29.)

Also, there is a remark of interest on Pennsylvania's exclusion of Negroes.

In tracing out the story of the suffrage a year or two later, Pennsylvania looms up large, for in 1837 a convention was held in that State, the records of which filled more than a dozen large volumes, in which the suffrage question fills its share of pages. The property interests made a tremendous effort to come back, as the saying is, but they were only able to cling to the taxpaying requirement; the hot debate which bade fair to lead either side to victory concerned the right of the free Negro to vote. A new tone was struck in this convention in connection with the Negro problem. Heretofore it had been treated almost solely as a political problem; now the other phase of the question was presented with greater emphasis, and it was maintained that other than political considerations would inevitably determine the question despite any action the lawmakers might take. It was pointed out that public sentiment, even where the law was in doubt, arose above all law and the Constitution and would keep the Negro from the polls. It was very significant that men frequently asserted that to give the Negro suffrage would be to imply a promise that could never be carried out. It implied an equality that race characteristics belied. The Indian could not be elevated—he died out; the Negro could not be elevated? They did not undertake to answer the question, and it has not been answered yet, but they stuck tenaciously to the proposition that he could not be elevated and should not be incorporated into the body politic.

That was in the great State of Pennsylvania.

The prospect of Negroes sitting in legislatures, in the jury box, on the bench, at the bar, in all positions of respect and honor, repelled men with such force as to cause them to lose sight of all abstract political doctrine.

Up to about this time the Negro had not been a serious problem, for he was not present in sufficient numbers even to threaten to exercise any great influence in the Government. But the menace was growing. The slavery controversy was waxing hot; the abolitionists were carrying fiery brands wherever they went; in a word, the political situation over slavery was coming to a crucial point, and race prejudice was developing to a point it had never reached before. This race prejudice, or consciousness of racial distinction, was present in the Pennsylvania convention in a way that it was not in the earlier conventions. This accounts for the sort of argument outlined above. Arguments telling of the Negro's rights and extolling his virtues and good qualities could have no effect. No matter what was said men were conscious of a distinction between the races which they viewed with jealousy and growing alarm, and all the old arguments pro and con fell upon deaf ears. From now on men were likely to vote from prejudice one way or the other.

Much opprobrium was heaped upon those who were said to vote against the Negro simply because his skin was dark. But few men really did that; the dark skin was to them merely an outward indication of qualities which fostered the racial antipathy. But in the midst of this illogical prejudice it is satisfying to discover an argument based on expediency. One of the speakers in the convention pointed out that Negroes had all the rights and privileges of citizenship and that it was not expedient to let them vote. They were no more discriminated against than were minors, women, and nontaxpayers. The elective franchise should only be given to those through whom the peace and prosperity of society would be promoted.

The defenders of the Negro followed the usual line. One delegate struck a new chord when he opposed the exclusion of the Negro because the basis of exclusion was a fact over which he had no control—his color. A suffrage qualification, said he, should be such that any man could attain it. A high property test, a taxpaying test, a long residence, age, literacy, were qualifications which a man could acquire, but race or color violated sound principles of democracy and left nothing to strive for; such men were hopelessly disfranchised. This man invoked a new principle of democracy, but his principle would have included women too, although no one thought of that. It merely shows how inevitably both sides were driven to decide the whole proposition on the issue of expediency.

It may be well to consider briefly the question as to whether the Negroes as a group needed special representation. It has been characteristic of the political parties in this country since the break-down of the Federalists in the early part of the nineteenth century that they have cut athwart all social and economic groups. There has been no labor party, no capitalist party, no religious party, no conservative or radical party. All parties have appealed to all classes, rich and poor, East and West. But the advent of the Negro presented a very distinct group, and it was considered by some that such a group needed special representation that could not be attained through any existing parties. However, it is significant that, while the Republican Party has claimed most of the Negroes, there is no essential reason why they should not distribute themselves as the white men have done throughout the other parties. Fortunately no deliberate attempt was made to treat this group as deserving special representation, even though it was considered at this time.

Of course the usual compromises were suggested to let the Negro in, but they were all repudiated, and the Negro was denied the suffrage by a vote of 77 to 45.

I repeat, that was in the great State of Pennsylvania.

This denial of the suffrage to Negroes gave rise to considerable opposition throughout the State, where the abolition movement was relatively strong. The action of Pennsylvania in excluding the Negro marks a turning point in the development of the Negro-suffrage controversy. In a number of States Negroes had not been excluded in the past and never were excluded. There were some other States which had not excluded Negroes in the first place, but as time went on it was found desirable to do so. Pennsylvania was the last of these States. From this time on the actual Negro-suffrage situation did not change until the fourteenth amendment was in effect. (Quote Porter, supra, bottom of p. 85 through line 24, p. 89.)

I am attempting to show by the heterogeneous laws of the 48 States the diversified conditions underlying the variations, and the different peoples, different habits, different economic, industrial, and agricultural set-ups which make it a matter of prime necessity to "render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's" and cease this attempted unconstitutional meddling with States' affairs.

New Jersey, in the agreement of 1664, which was the concession of the province of New Caesarea, or New Jersey, provided as follows for elections:

That the inhabitants being freemen, or chief agents to others of the province aforesaid; do as soon as this our commission shall arrive, by virtue of a writ in our names by the governor to be for the present (until our seal comes) sealed and signed, make choice of 12 deputies or representatives from amongst themselves; who being chosen are to join with the said governor and council for the making of such laws, ordinances, and constitution as shall be necessary for the present good and welfare of the said province. But so soon as parishes, divisions, tribes, and other distinctions are made, that then the inhabitants or freeholders of the several respective parishes, tribes, divisions, and distinctions aforesaid, do by our writs, under our seals (which we engage, shall be in due time issued) annually meet on the first day of January, and choose freeholders for each respective division, tribe, or parish to be the deputies or representatives of the same: which body of representatives or the major part of them, shall, with the governor and council aforesaid, be the general assembly of the said province, the governor or his deputy being present, unless they shall wilfully refuse, in which case they may appoint themselves a president, during the absence of the governor or the deputy governor. (Quote 5 Thorpe, supra, p. 2537.)

In 1683 in the Fundamental Constitutions for the province of East New Jersey it was provided:

The persons qualified to be freemen, that are capable to choose and be chosen in the great council, shall be every planter and inhabitant dwelling and residing within the province, who hath acquired rights to and is

in possession of 50 acres of ground, and hath cultivated ten acres of it; or in boroughs, who have a house and three acres; or have a house and land only hired, if he can prove he have 50 pounds in stock of his own; and all elections must be free and voluntary, but where any bribe or indirect means can be proved to have been used, both the giver and acquirer shall forfeit their privilege of electing and being elected forever. (See 5 Thorpe, supra, p. 2575, par. 2, No. III first 10 lines.)

In 1776 came the first Constitution of New Jersey as such framed by convention. Article IV contains the voters' qualifications;

ARTICLE IV. That all inhabitants of this colony, of full age, who are worth 50 pounds proclamation money, clear estate in the same, and have resided within the county in which they claim a vote for 12 months immediately preceding the election, shall be entitled to vote for representatives in council and assembly; and also for all other public officers, that shall be elected by the people of the county at large. (See 5 Thorpe supra, p. 2595.)

In 1844 New Jersey drew up another constitution. Here we see the provisions closely following the previous ones.

Right of suffrage: Every male citizen of the United States, of the age of 21 years, who shall have been a resident of this State 1 year, and of the county in which he claims his vote 5 months, next before the election, shall be entitled to vote for all officers that now are, or hereafter may be, elective by the people; provided, that no person in the military, naval, or marine service of the United States shall be considered a resident in this State, by being stationed in any garrison, barrack, or military or naval place or station within this State; and no pauper, idiot, insane person, or person convicted of a crime which now excludes him from being a witness unless pardoned or restored by law to the right of suffrage, shall enjoy the right of an elector; and provided further, that in time of war no elector in the actual military service of the State, or of the United States, in the Army or Navy, thereof, shall be deprived of his vote by reason of his absence from such election district; and the legislature shall have power to provide the manner in which, and the time and place at which, such absent electors may vote, and for the return and canvass of their votes in the election districts in which they respectively reside.

The legislature may pass laws to deprive persons of the right of suffrage who shall be convicted of bribery. (5 Thorpe, supra, p. 2601, art. 11.)

This constitution was not changed substantially. Chafee summarizes the New Jersey rules today by saying all persons living in the State 1 year and county 5 months can vote; all voters in municipalities must have registered since December 20, 1941, and registration in rural sections to be by house-to-house canvas and personal appearance. At one time long before the nineteenth amendment women were allowed to vote in New Jersey for a short period—see Porter, History of Suffrage in the United States, page 67.

Woman suffrage was almost unheard of up to the middle of the nineteenth century. The exceptional case in New Jersey proves the rule, and the facts have been retold so many times that apologies should be offered for giving them here. In the New Jersey constitution of July 2, 1776, the privilege of voting for assemblymen was given to "all inhabitants of full age who are worth 50 pounds proclamation money." There was nothing to indicate that anybody expected women to take advantage of this clause, and it seems that they did not do so in sufficiently large numbers to attract any attention, for in 1797 the new constitution contained the phrase "all free inhabitants," etc. But some closely contested elections a few years later stimulated interest to such an extent that women did seek to vote, and no legal impediment could be discovered to prevent them. The action ultimately led to such disorders that in 1807 the legislature took proper steps to put a stop to woman suffrage for good and all. (Porter, supra, p. 136, first paragraph.)

New Jersey was one of the first States to allow women to vote in school elections.

In 1820 the Negro problem was felt even in New Jersey, and they altered their constitution to exclude Negroes by defining their qualifications in terms of "white males"—see Porter, supra, page 90.

It is also of interest to note the trend away from property requirements in the absence of the former one when the 1844 constitution was drawn.

Georgia was one of the early colonies which later fell heir to the problems of all southern States. Georgia was chartered in 1732. At a convention in Savannah, Georgia's first constitution was framed and agreed to in 1777. Article IX provided for the qualifications of voters.

All male white inhabitants, of the age of 21 years, and possessed in his own right of £10 value, and liable to pay tax in this State, or being of any mechanic trade, and shall have been resident 6 months in this State, shall have a right to vote at all elections for representatives, or any other officers, herein agreed to be chosen by the people at large; and every person having a right to vote at any election shall vote by ballot personally. (II Thorpe, supra, p. 779, art. IX.)

Here we find the exclusion of the Negroes in the first constitution because of their presence in that State in sufficient numbers at that time to raise the issue. The lack of that presence is reflected in northern and western States by their failure to make any such provisions.

In 1789 another constitution was framed. Here we find:

The electors of the members of both branches of the general assembly shall be citizens and inhabitants of this State, and shall have attained to the age of 21 years, and have paid tax for the year preceding the election, and shall have resided 6 months within the county.

All elections shall be by ballot, and the House of Representatives, in all appointments of the State officers, shall vote for three persons; and a list of the three persons having the highest number of votes shall be signed by the speaker, and sent to the Senate, which shall from such list determine, by a majority of their votes, the officer elected, except militia officers and the secretaries of the governor, who shall be appointed by the governor alone, under such regulations and restrictions as the general assembly may prescribe. The general assembly may vest the appointment of inferior officers in the governor, the courts of justice, or in such other manner as they may by law establish. (II Thorpe, supra, p. 789, art. IV, secs. 1 and 2.)

The "liable to tax" has changed to "have paid tax."

The electors of members of the general assembly shall be citizens and inhabitants of this State, and shall have attained the age of 21 years, and have paid all taxes which which may have been required of them, and which they may have had an opportunity of paying, agreeably to law, for the year preceding the election, and shall have resided 6 months within the country; Provided, that in case of an invasion, and the inhabitants shall be driven from any county, so as to prevent an election therein, such refugee inhabitants, being a majority of the voters of such county, may meet under the direction of any three justices of the peace thereof, in the nearest county not in a state of alarm, and proceed to an election, without having paid such tax so required of electors; and the persons elected thereat shall be entitled to their seats. (II Thorpe, supra, p. 800, art. IV, sec. 1.)

This is found in the 1798 Constitution.

In 1865, just after the Civil War, another constitution came into being. Again note the prominence of the Negro problem:

The electors or members of the general assembly shall be free white male citizens of this State, and shall have attained the age of 21 years, and have paid all taxes which may have been required of them, and which they have had an opportunity of paying, agreeable to law, for the year preceding the election; shall be citizens of the United States, and shall have resided 6 months either in the district or county, and 2 years within this State, and no person not qualified to vote for members of the general assembly shall hold any office in this State. (Thorpe II, supra, p. 820, art V. sec. 1.)

In 1868 Major General Meade called a convention in Atlanta and submitted a constitution to the people, which was ratified by a narrow margin.

SECTION 1. In all elections by the people the electors shall vote by ballot.

SEC. 2. Every male person born in the United States, and every male person who has been naturalized, or who has legally declared his intention to become a citizen of the United States, 21 years old or upward, who shall have resided in this State 6 months next preceding the election, and shall have resided 30 days in the county in which he offers to vote, and shall have paid all taxes which may have been required of him, and which he may have had an opportunity of paying, agreeably to law, for the year preceding the election (except as hereinafter provided), shall be deemed an elector; and every male citizen of the United States of the age aforesaid (except as hereinafter provided) who may be a resident of the State at the time of the adoption of this constitution shall be deemed an elector, and shall have all the rights of an elector as aforesaid: *Provided*, That no soldier, sailor, or marine in the military or naval service of the United States shall acquire the rights of an elector by reason of being stationed on duty in this State; and no person shall vote who, if challenged, shall refuse to take the following oath:

"I do swear that I have not given or received, nor do I expect to give or receive, any money, treat, or other thing of value, by which my vote, or any vote, is affected, or expected to be affected, at this election, nor have I given or promised any reward, or made any threat, by which to prevent any person from voting at this election."

SEC. 3. No person convicted of felony or larceny before any court of this State, or of or in the United States, shall be eligible to

any office or appointment of honor or trust within this State, unless he shall have been pardoned.

SEC. 4. No person who is the holder of any public moneys shall be eligible to any office in this State until the same is accounted for and paid into the treasury.

SEC. 5. No person who, after the adoption of this constitution, being a resident of this State, shall engage in a duel in this State, or elsewhere, or shall send or accept a challenge, or be aider or abetter to such duel, shall vote or hold office in this State; and every such person shall also be subject to such punishment as the law may prescribe.

SEC. 6. The general assembly may provide, from time to time, for the registration of all electors, but the following classes of persons shall not be permitted to register, vote, or hold office: (1) Those who shall have been convicted of treason, embezzlement of public funds, malfeasance in office, crime punishable by law with imprisonment in the penitentiary, or bribery; (2) idiots or insane persons.

SEC. 7. Electors shall, in all cases except treason, felony, or breach of the peace, be privileged from arrest for 5 days before an election, during the election, and 2 days subsequent thereto.

SEC. 8. The sale of intoxicating liquors on days of election is prohibited (Thorpe II, supra, p. 825, art. II, first eight sections).

A problem indigeneous to the particular State has arisen here in the prevalence of the custom of dueling. The State has taken this mode of discouragement, namely, deprivation of voting privilege.

In the Constitution of 1877 the provisions were slightly varied in form but not in substance.

By amendment, the Georgia constitution was made to read:

Article II, section 1:

PAR. I. Registration: After the year 1908, elections by the people shall be by ballot, and only those persons shall be allowed to vote who have been first registered in accordance with the requirements of law. (Added by an amendment adopted October 7, 1908.)

PAR. II. Qualifications of voters: Every male citizen of this State who is a citizen of the United States, 21 years old or upward, not laboring under any of the disabilities named in this article, and possessing the qualifications provided by it, shall be an elector and entitled to register and vote at any election by the people: *Provided*, That no soldier, sailor, or marine in the military or naval services of the United States shall acquire the rights of an elector by reason of being stationed on duty in this State. (As amended October 7, 1908.)

PAR. III. Residence—Poll tax: To entitle a person to register and vote at any election by the people, he shall have resided in the State 1 year next preceding the election, and in the county in which he offers to vote 6 months next preceding the election, and shall have paid all poll taxes that he may have had an opportunity of paying agreeably to law. Such payment must have been made at least 6 months prior to the election at which he offers to vote, except when such elections are held within 6 months from the expiration of the time fixed by law for the payment of such taxes. (As amended November 8, 1932.)

PAR. IV. Additional qualifications: Every male citizen of this State shall be entitled to register as an elector, and to vote in all elections in said State, who is not disqualified under the provisions of section 2 of article 2 of this Constitution, and who possesses the qualifications prescribed in paragraphs 2 and 3 of this section or who will possess them at the date of the election occurring next after his registration, and who in addition thereto comes within either of the classes provided for in the five following subdivisions of this paragraph.

1. Veterans: All persons who have honorably served in the land or naval forces of the United States in the Revolutionary War, or in the War of 1812, or in the war with Mexico, or in any war with the Indians, or in the war between the States, or in the war with Spain, or who honorably served in the land or naval forces of the Confederate States or of the State of Georgia in the war between the States; or

2. Descendants of veterans: All persons lawfully descended from those embraced in the classes enumerated in the subdivision next above; or

3. Good character: All persons who are of good character and understand the duties and obligations of citizenship under a republican form of government; or.

4. Literacy: All persons who can correctly read in the English language any paragraph of the Constitution of the United States or of this State and correctly write the same in the English language when read to them by any one of the registrars, and all persons who solely because of physical disability are unable to comply with the above requirements but who can understand and give a reasonable interpretation of any paragraph of the Constitution of the United States or of this State, that may be read to them by any one of the registrars.

5. Land ownership: Any person who is the owner in good faith in his own right of at least 40 acres of land situated in this State, upon which he resides, or is the owner in good faith in his own right of property situated in this State and assessed for taxation at the value of $500. (Constitution of the States and United States, p. 360, art. II, pars. 1–4.)

Here are a number of clauses which merit attention. We find the education clause so-called, the literacy tests, and good character clause. Also, it is odd to find a provision requiring property ownership in some form inserted as late as 1908. Georgia had abandoned the property qualification in 1789. See Porter, History of Suffrage in the United States, page 22. Georgia has recently amended its constitution permitting persons who have reached the age of 18 years to vote. Poll taxes have been abolished and I may add that they have been abolished as provided for by the constitution of the State of Georgia.

Connecticut was chartered early in the seventeenth century but it was 1818 before a constitution was drawn in convention at Hartford. Article 6 governed the qualifications of electors:

ART. 6. Of the qualifications of electors:

SECTION 1. All persons who have been, or shall hereafter, previous to the ratification of this constitution, be admitted freemen, according to the existing laws of this State, shall be electors.

SEC. 2. Every white male citizen of the United States, who shall have gained a settlement in this State, attained the age of 21 years, and resided in the town in which he may offer himself to be admitted to the privilege of an elector, at least 6 months preceding; and have a freehold estate of the yearly value of $7 in this State; or, having been enrolled in the militia, shall have performed military duty therein for the term of 1 year next preceding the time he shall offer himself for admission, or being liable thereto shall have been, by authority of law, excused therefrom; or shall have paid a State tax within the year next preceding the time he shall present himself for such admission; and shall sustain a good moral character, shall, on his taking such oath as may be prescribed by law, be an elector.

SEC. 3. The privileges of an elector shall be forfeited by a conviction of bribery, forgery, perjury, dueling, fraudulent bankruptcy, theft, or other offense for which an infamous punishment is inflicted.

SEC. 4. Every elector shall be eligible to any office in this State, except in cases provided for in this constitution.

SEC. 5. The selectmen and town clerk of the several towns shall decide on the qualifications of electors, at such times and in such manner as may be prescribed by law.

SEC. 6. Laws shall be made to support the privilege of free suffrage, prescribing the manner of regulating and conducting meetings of the electors, and prohibiting, under adequate penalties, all undue influence therein, from power, bribery, tumult, and other improper conduct.

SEC. 7. In all elections of officers of the State, or members of the general assembly, the votes of the electors shall be by ballot.

SEC. 8. At all elections of officers of the State, or members of the general assembly, the electors shall be privileged from arrest during their attendance upon, and going to, and returning from the same, on any civil process.

SEC. 9. The meetings of the electors for the election of the several State officers by law annually to be elected, and members of the general assembly of this State, shall be holden on the first Monday of April in each year. (Thorpe I, supra, p. 544, art. 6.)

Today this has been simplified.

Article VIII, qualifications for electors:

Every white male citizen of the United States, who shall have attained the age of 21 years, who shall have resided in this State for a term of 1 year next preceding, and in the town in which he may offer himself to be admitted to the privileges of an elector, at least 6 months next preceding the time he may so offer himself, and shall sustain a good moral character, shall, on his taking such oath as may be prescribed by law, be an elector. (Constitution of the States and the United States, p. 292, art. VIII.)

The good moral character requisite is present here. Chafee, in his summary, says, briefly:

Who may vote: Persons who have resided in the State 1 year and the town 6 months and are of good moral character.

Persons who are absent in the Federal service or in attendance at an institution of learning.

Registration: Is required of all voters.

Need not be renewed, but previously registered voters should see that their names are on the list by writing city or town registrars before October 6 giving their residence and the last year in which they voted. (Chafee, Summary on Connecticut.)

It also is interesting that Connecticut was one of three States in which male sex was not specified. Connecticut was one of the five States, with New Jersey, Rhode Island, Virginia, and Tennessee, which stuck to the property test, believing the landed man was most to be trusted.

Only property holders were deemed to have a permanent interest in the government and therefore to be the only safe repository of the elective franchise. (See McCulloch, Suffrage and Its Problems, pp. 36 and 39.)

Also, as the older property qualifications broke down, individuals began to be disfranchised for other reasons. As early as 1650 Connecticut—long before their constitution—provided in Andrus Code, that one publicly whipped was disqualified as a freeman and denied the franchise.—See McCulloch, supra, page 39.—Connecticut was one of the first States to allow women to participate in school elections.

The alien problem was felt in Connecticut, an Eastern State with industrial and manufacturing areas. In Connecticut:

A constitutional amendment was passed in 1855 prescribing that ability to read the constitution or statutes would be a requirement for exercising the right of suffrage. There is no doubt that this was aimed directly at the foreigners, although natives must have come under it also. (See Porter, History of Suffrage in United States, p. 118.)

Massachusetts was first chartered in 1620 by King James, under the charter of New England, which was surrendered in 1639 to King Charles. In 1780 was drawn up the first constitution or form of government for the commonwealth of Massachusetts. Part the first, article IX, provides:

All elections ought to be free; and all the inhabitants of this Commonwealth, having such qualifications as they shall establish by their frame of government, have an equal right to elect officers, and to be elected, for public employments. (Thorpe, 3, supra, p. 1891, art. IX.)

What these qualifications are we find in article II, chapter I.

II. The senate shall be the first branch of the legislature; and the senators shall be chosen in the following manner, viz.: there shall be a meeting on the first Monday in April, annually, forever, of the inhabitants of each town in the several counties of this Commonwealth; to be called by the selectmen, and warned in due course of law, at least 7 days before the (first Monday in April) for the purpose of electing persons to be senators and councilors (and at such meetings every male inhabitant of 21 years of age and upward, having a freehold estate within the commonwealth, of the annual income of 3 pounds or any estate of the value of 60 pounds, shall have a right to give in his vote for the senators for the district of which he is an inhabitant). And to remove all doubts concerning the meaning of the word "inhabitant" in this constitution, every person shall be considered as an inhabitant, for the purpose of electing and being elected into any office, or place within this State, in that town, district, or plantation where he dwelleth, or hath his home.

And the inhabitants of plantations unincorporated, qualified as this constitution provides, who are or shall be empowered and required to assess taxes upon themselves toward the support of government, shall have the same privilege of voting for councilors and senators in the plantations where they reside, as town inhabitants have in their respective towns; and the plantation meetings for that purpose shall be held annually (on the same first Monday in April), at such place in the plantations, respectively, as the assessors thereof shall direct; which assessors shall have like authority for notifying the electors, collecting and returning the votes, as the selectmen and town clerks have in their several towns, by this constitution. And all other persons living in places unincorporated (qualified as aforesaid) who shall be assessed to the support of government by the assessors of an adjacent town, shall have the privilege of giving in their votes for councilors and senators in the town where they shall be assessed, and be notified of the place of meeting by the selectmen of the town where they shall be assessed, for that purpose, accordingly. (Thorpe, 3, supra, p. 1895, art. II, p. 1896, art. II, p. 1896.)

The qualifications for voting for the House of Representatives is similar.

ART. IV. Every male person, being 21 years of age, and resident in any particular town in this commonwealth for the space of 1 year next preceding, having a freehold estate within the said town of the annual income of £3, or any estate of the value of £60, shall have a right to vote in the choice of a representative or representatives for the said town. (Thorpe, 3, supra, p. 1898, art. IV.)

This was amended to eliminate the property qualification.

ART. III. Every male citizen of 21 years of age and upwards, excepting paupers and persons under guardianship, who shall have resided within the commonwealth 1 year, and within the town or district in which he may claim a right to vote, six calendar months next preceding any election of governor, lieutenant governor, senators, or representatives (and all who shall have paid, by himself, or his parent, master, or guardian, any State or county tax, which shall, within 2 years next preceding such election, have been assessed upon him, in any town or district of this commonwealth; and also every citizen who shall be, by law, exempted from taxation, and who shall be, in all other respects, qualified as above-mentioned, shall have a right to vote in such election of governor, lieutenant governor, senators, and representatives; and no other person shall be entitled to vote in such elections). (Thorpe, 3, supra, p. 1912, art. III.)

Then the education requirement came in the form of another amendment.

ART. XX. No person shall have the right to vote, or be eligible to office under the constitution of this commonwealth, who shall not be able to read the constitution in the English language, and write his name: *Provided, however*, That the provisions of this amendment shall not apply to any person prevented by a physical disability from complying with its requisitions, nor to any person who now has the right to vote, nor to any persons who shall be 60 years of age or upwards at the time this amendment shall take effect. (Thorpe, 3, supra, p. 1919, art. XX.)

Then we see the arising of a definite alien problem in article XXIII.

ART. XXIII. (No person of foreign birth shall be entitled to vote, or shall be eligible to office, unless he shall have resided within the jurisdiction of the United States for 2 years subsequent to his naturalization, and shall be otherwise qualified, according to the constitution and laws of this commonwealth: *Provided*, That this amendment shall not affect the rights which any person of foreign birth possessed at the time of the adoption thereof: *And, provided, further*, That it shall not affect the rights of any child of a citizen of the United States, born during the temporary absence of the parent therefrom.) (Thorpe, 3, supra, p. 1920, art. XXIII.)

Upon further consideration this article was later specifically repealed by article XXVI. Also special consideration was voted to service or ex-service men by article XXVIII.

ART. XXVIII. No person having served in the Army or Navy of the United States in time of war, and having been honorably discharged from such service, if otherwise qualified to vote, shall be disqualified therefor on account of being a pauper, or, if a pauper, because of the nonpayment of poll tax. (Thorpe, 3, supra, p. 1921, art. XXVIII.)

It is interesting to note that article XXIII was adopted in 1859 and repealed immediately after the Civil War. Chafee says:

Who may vote: Persons who have resided in the State 1 year and the city or town 6 months. Male voters are subject to poll tax.

Persons who are absent on the day of the biennial State election. (Chafee's summary on Massachusetts, first section only, "Who may vote,")

Certain other details were added by further amendments.

ART. XXIX. Election law: The general court shall have full power and authority to provide for the inhabitants of the towns in this commonwealth more than one place of public meeting within the limits of each town for the election of officers under the constitution, and to prescribe the manner of calling, holding, and conducting such meetings. All the provisions of the existing constitution inconsistent with the provisions herein contained are hereby annulled.

ART. XXX. Residence requirements for voting: No person, otherwise qualified to vote in elections for governor, lieutenant governor, senators, and representatives, shall, by reason of a change of residence within the Commonwealth, be disqualified from voting for said officers in the city or town from which he has removed his residence until the expiration of six calendar months from the time of such removal.

ART. XXXI. Voting qualifications for ex-soldiers: Article 28 of the amendments of the constitution is hereby amended by striking out in the fourth line thereof the words "being a pauper," and inserting in place thereof the words "receiving or having received aid from any city or town," and also by striking out in said fourth line the words "if a pauper," so that the article as amended shall read as follows: "Article XXVIII. No person having served in the Army or Navy of the United States in time of war, and having been honorably discharged from such service, if otherwise qualified to vote, shall be disqualified therefor on account of receiving or having received aid from any city or town, or because of the nonpayment of a poll tax.

ART. XXXII. Taxpaying qualifications for voting: So much of article III of the amendments of the Constitution of the Commonwealth as is contained in the following words: "And who shall have paid, by himself, or his parent, master, or guardian, any State or county tax, which shall, within 2 years next preceding such election, have been assessed upon him, in any town or district of this Commonwealth; and also every citizen who shall be, by law, exempted from taxation, and who shall be, in all other respects, qualified as above mentioned," is hereby annulled. (Constitution of the States and the United States, pp. 788 and 789, arts. XXIX, XXX, XXXI, XXXII.)

In the last of these, the taxpaying qualifications were removed, by the State, as is proper. In 1924 amendment LXVIII was passed:

ART. LXVIII. Woman suffrage: Article III of the amendments to the constitution, as amended, is hereby further amended by striking out, in the first line, the word "male." (Constitution of the States and the United States, p. 799, art. LXVIII.)

In the early days Massachusetts had the property requirement frequently found in constitutions and later outmoded. Porter says:

Ideal starting points could readily be found in the abstractions of the Declaration of Independence. Here is a resolution passed in the Massachusetts constitutional convention

after his registration, and who in addition shall sustain a good moral character, shall, Code, that one publicly whipped was dis-

of 1779. "*Resolved*, That it is the essence of a free republic that the people be governed by fixed laws of their own making." This particular convention was perfectly honest in this declaration and still considered it thoroughly consistent to restrict "the people," who should govern the State, to property owners. Such resolutions as this were later turned against the very men who made them. Abstract propositions of right continually proved to be boomerangs and struck with telling force. "All elections ought to be free, and all the male inhabitants of this commonwealth, having sufficient qualifications, have an equal right to elect officers." The little phrase about having sufficient qualifications was weak indeed against the contention that all the male inhabitants had an equal right to elect officers. (Porter, History of Suffrage in United States, p. 28.)

In speaking of Massachusetts and Pennsylvania, "Massachusetts," says Porter, "considered the people to be the property owners."

The transition from the property-owner requirement in Massachusetts was a very slow one.

In Massachusetts the property qualification for suffrage had made its last stand in 1820, when a constitutional convention was called to amend the old constitution. Popular interest was aroused in the matter of suffrage extension, and there was every indication that property was going to be hard pressed to hold its own. The sentiment prevailed that every man who was subject to do service for the State or who contributed to its support in the way of taxes was entitled to a vote. The practical side of the issue was stressed much more than the philosophical. Why the ballot should have been looked upon as the only fitting reward for paying taxes it is hard to see. The State protects life, liberty, and property and performs all the obligations and functions implied thereby. But these seem not to have been recognized as a return for taxation. Suffrage extensionists seem to have blinded themselves to the many good things they have received from the State as citizens, not as voters.

The defenders of property tests quickly demolished the theory of right invoked by those seeking to extend the suffrage. The argument was then immediately shifted to the question of expediency. It was said that the property test encouraged industry, economy, and prudence and gave dignity and importance to those who chose and those who were chosen. Further, it was said that men who had no property should not act, even indirectly, on those who had, and exploit their wealth. To permit these things would work ruin to the State. Other men believed that the property qualification had a very salutary effect on young men, inducing them to practice industry and careful habits.

It is also interesting to note some perversions of the old democratic arguments. It was said that to let the unpropertied vote would surely mean their exploitation by employers, and then the State would have, not a free electorate, but one controlled by capitalists able to swing elections at will. Another perversion that had been used before was utilized to defend the taxpaying qualification. Instead of "no taxation without representation," it was declared there should be "no representation without taxation." The most talented statesmen of the country were present and defended the property test in one way or another. The venerable John Adams was there and painted dire pictures of what would happen if the franchise were extended. Daniel Webster and Joseph Storey gave ample support.

But in spite of all this talent, property tests did not stand a chance. The arguments were attacked sometimes with able retorts, more often with fallacious reasoning; but it made no difference, men had had enough of special privilege and were determined to get rid of discrimination on the basis of property. Men said that they had a natural right to vote, but it only took a few words to ruin that argument utterly. Men said that they should not be governed without their consent, but the others pointed to the Negroes. Men said that they should not be taxed without being represented, but the others pointed to women. Men said that universal suffrage was a glorious ideal, but the others pointed to minors. Men said that they should be permitted to vote in order to defend their rights, but the others pointed to manifold benefits received from the Government even by those who could not vote. Finally men said that they were going to vote anyhow, and the others threw up their hands in despair. The best talent in the country, profound arguments, historical evidence presented by the learned Adams, all the conservative forces of the State, could not stay the onward sweep of suffrage expansion. The only thing that accounts for it is a deep-seated, firm, but more or less unreasoning, conviction that all men should vote. Rude men from rural districts would stand helpless before the intellectual statesmen thundering at them in resounding periods. They would voice a few idle arguments and then vote on the strength of their inbred conviction. The most impressive thing about this entire movement toward broader suffrage is that men came to be filled with a fixed determination that as this country was a democracy all men should have a hand in running it. They were ready to argue, but were determined to have their way in any event. The political thought of the past 20 years had brought men to a realization that they were part of the Government, and now they wanted to get their hands in it.

But in Massachusetts the process had been very slow. It will be remembered that the normal progress was from real-estate property tests to a personal-property alternative, to taxpaying, and then to no limitation. Massachusetts had reached only the point of transition from the personal-property alternative to taxpaying, for this convention provided an amendment to the constitution that all who paid a State or county tax should vote. (Porter, History of Suffrage in United States, pp. 69–72.)

In 1853 a convention was held in Massachusetts and the taxpaying qualification came in for thorough debate. As it was the last time the question was discussed on the basis of the old standards it may be worth while to give the arguments some attention, although not much that was new appeared. The history of suffrage in Massachusetts had been typical. There had first been real-estate qualification, then the personalty alternative, then the substitution of taxpaying, and now even that was nearly worn out. The smallness of the tax was much dwelt upon. As it was only a dollar and a half, advocates thought that no objection should be made. But it was pointed out that whether or not the poor man could afford that small sum, or ought to afford it, he simply would not. It would seem to him like throwing money away, and he would prefer to lose his vote. This undoubtedly was true, and it was also true that the conservatives hoped that just that thing would happen.

It is unnecessary to review the old arguments. "All governments derive just powers from the consent of the governed. Nontaxpayers are part of the governed." "Men should be represented in government—not their dollars."

[FOOTNOTE.—Massachusetts Convention, 1853, Debates. A member said that he quoted Benjamin Franklin, as follows: "You require that a man shall have $60 worth of property, or he shall not vote. Very well, take an illustration. Here is a man today who owns a jackass, and the jackass is worth $60. Today the man is a voter and goes to the polls with his jackass and deposits his vote. Tomorrow the jackass dies. The next day the man comes to vote without his jackass and he cannot vote at all. Now tell me, which was the voter, the man or the jackass?" Fortunately, someone informed the gentleman that he was quoting Tom Paine and not the venerable Franklin.]

On the other hand, "Representation should only go with taxation"; "those who pay for supporting the government should have the exclusive right to control it." All these and other arguments were of course exploited. And the never-failing natural-rights philosopher was also present.

[FOOTNOTE.—Mr. Simonds spoke thus: "You have no right to deprive him of this privilege. And I ask if it is not time that we should assert this declaration of the Bill of Rights, that this is a right which belongs to every man—a right which we can neither give nor take away from him?"]

A strong effort was made to introduce a new sort of compromise. It was proposed to retain the taxpaying qualification for town meetings. Indeed, it was remarkable that so many were willing to grant full suffrage for everything except town elections. They seemed not to care so much who voted for President and Governor, but only the best men in the community should vote for hogreeve. It is a striking illustration of the reverence and jealousy men held for the time-honored town meetings. In the rural districts it was the most important thing in their lives.

The small-tax requirement hung on, however, for 10 years longer, and finally gave way in 1863. North Carolina abolished her requirement in 1868. That left Delaware, Pennsylvania, and Rhode Island. The first of these did not give it up until 1897, and it still holds in the other two States; but it must be remarked again that any kind of a tax requirement connected with suffrage since 1860 has been practically nothing but a registry fee, and several States accomplish the same end by requiring that men must pay their poll taxes before voting. The old-fashioned taxpaying test as a compromise with property qualifications was gone before the Civil War. (Porter, supra, p. 108–111.)

As immigration was heavier in Massachusetts and neighboring States than almost anywhere else, the antialien feeling ran higher.

In Massachusetts there was an even more determined effort to get rid of the foreigner, and more elaborate steps were taken there than anywhere else. In 1857 an amendment to the constitution was passed requiring that all voters must be able to read the constitution and write their own names. And in order to pacify a certain portion of the native element that would find such a test prohibitive, it was not to apply to anyone over 60 years of age or to anyone who already exercised the franchise. Two years later another amendment was passed requiring foreigners to remain in the State for 2 years after naturalization before they could vote. This seems to mark the highest point in the opposition to aliens, and it is worth noting that it was the ignorant, poverty-stricken, famished, unwashed Irish Catholic rowdy whom the country may thank for bringing forth literacy tests. They were applied freely to the Negro in future years and today are being used on general principles, but they originated practically for the benefit of the Irishman. (Porter, supra, p. 118–119.)

When the women's suffrage problem arose, the arguments advanced were the old ones turned to a new use:

There was no trouble in adjusting the old arguments to suit the new occasion. For

more than half a century the advocates of broader suffrage had been filling up their arsenal with weapons to use upon conservatives. Many of the liberals were shocked beyond expression and left speechless when the women raided their armory, took their weapons, and went forth to use them as they had seen them used by men. Natural, inalienable, inherent right. No taxation without representation. Government by consent of the governed. All that old-time revolutionary philosophy with its mixture of truth and abominations was revived once more and spread broadcast by the abolitionists and woman-suffrage advocates alike.

Characteristic of this sort of argument is a statement to be found in the records of the Massachusetts constitutional convention of 1853:

I maintain first that the people have a certain natural right, which under special conditions of society manifests itself in the form of a right to vote. I maintain secondly that the women of Massachusetts are people existing under those special conditions of society. I maintain finally, and by necessary consequence, that the women of Massachusetts have a natural right to vote.

That is the sort of argument that marked the beginning of the woman-suffrage movement. Once more the strange phenomenon appeared—the suffrage expanding on a wave of specious doctrine. But it caught the popular fancy and served to bring the issue forward. (Porter, supra, pp. 140–141.)

However, at that time Massachusetts voted the measure down by a large majority.

Maryland was chartered in 1632 by King Charles. In 1776 Maryland's constitution was formed. In the Declaration of Rights we find:

That the right in the people to participate in the legislature is the best security of liberty, and the foundation of all free government; for this purpose, elections ought to be free and frequent, and every man, having property in, a common interest with, and an attachment to the community, ought to have a right of suffrage. (Thorpe, 3, supra, p. 1687, art. V.)

The qualifications appear in article II of the Constitution:

That the House of Delegates shall be chosen in the following manner: All freemen, above 21 years of age, having a freehold of 50 acres of land, in the county in which they offer to vote, and residing therein—and all freemen, having property in this State above the value of 30 pounds current money, and having resided in the county, in which they offer to vote, one whole year next preceding the election, shall have a right of suffrage, in the election of delegates for such county; and all freemen, so qualified, shall, on the first Monday of October, seventeen hundred and seventy-seven, and on the same day in every year thereafter, assemble in the counties, in which they are respectively qualified to vote, at the courthouse, in the said counties; or at such other place as the legislature shall direct; and, when assembled, they shall proceed to elect, viva voce, four delegates, for their respective counties, of the most wise, sensible, and discreet of the people, residents in the county where they are to be chosen, one whole year next preceding the election, above 21 years of age, and having, in the State, real or personal property above the value of 500 pounds current money; and upon the final casting of the polls, the four persons who shall appear to have the greatest number of legal votes shall be declared and returned duly elected for their respective counties. (Thorpe, 3, p. 1691, art. II.)

In 1810 this was amended as follows:

ART. XIV. That every free, white, male citizen of this State, above 21 years of age, and no other, having resided 12 months within this State, and 6 months in the county, or in the city of Annapolis or Baltimore, next preceding the election at which he offers to vote, shall have a right of suffrage, and shall vote, by ballot, in the election of such county or city, or either of them, for electors of the President and Vice President of the United States, for Representatives of this State in the Congress of the United States, for delegates to the general assembly of this State, electors of the senate, and sheriffs. (Thorpe, 3, supra, p. 1705, art. XIV.)

In 1851 Maryland adopted a new constitution. In the declaration of rights we find the following:

ART. 5. That the right of the people to participate in the legislature is the best security of liberty, and the foundation of all free government; for this purpose elections ought to be free and frequent, and every free, white, male citizen having the qualifications prescribed by the constitution ought to have the right of suffrage. (Thorpe, 3, supra, p. 1713, art. 5.)

This is set out fully in article I:

Every free white male person, of 21 years of age or upward, who shall have been 1 year next preceding the election a resident of the State, and for 6 months a resident of the city of Baltimore, or of any county in which he may offer to vote, and being at the time of the election a citizen of the United States, shall be entitled to vote in the ward or election district in which he resides, in all elections hereafter to be held; and at all such elections the vote shall be taken by ballot. And in case any county or city shall be so divided as to form portions of different electoral districts for the election of Congressman, Senator, delegate, or other officer or officers, than to entitle a person to vote for such officer, he must have been a resident of that part of the county or city which shall form a part of the electoral district in which he offers to vote for 6 months next preceding the election; but a person who shall have acquired a residence in such county or city entitling him to vote at any such election, shall be entitled to vote in the election district from which he removed until he shall have acquired a residence in the part of the county or city to which he has removed.

SEC. 2. That if any person shall give, or offer to give, directly or indirectly, any bribe, present, or reward, or any promise, or any security for the payment or delivery of money or any other thing to induce any voter to refrain from casting his vote, or forcibly to prevent him in any way from voting or to obtain or procure a vote for any candidate or person proposed or voted for as elector of President and Vice President of the United States, or Representative in Congress, or for any office of profit or trust created by the constitution or laws of this State, or by the ordinances or authority of the mayor and city council of Baltimore, the person giving or offering to give, and the person receiving the same, and any person who gives or causes to be given an illegal vote, knowing it to be so, at any election to be hereafter held in this State, shall, on conviction in a court of law, in addition to the penalties now or hereafter to be imposed by law, be forever disqualified to hold any office of profit or trust, or to vote in any election thereafter. (Thorpe, 3, supra, pp. 1716, 1717.)

In 1864 a new constitution was ratified in Maryland by a slim plurality of 375 votes. Article 7 of the bill of rights provides:

That the right of the people to participate in the legislature is the best security of liberty and the foundation of all free government; for this purpose elections ought to be free and frequent, and every free white male citizen, having the qualifications prescribed by the constitution, ought to have the right of suffrage. (Thorpe, 3, supra, p. 1742.)

SECTION 1. All elections shall be by ballot, and every white male citizen of the United States, of the age of 21 years or upward, who shall have resided in the State 1 year next preceding the election, and 6 months in any county, or in any legislative district of Baltimore City, and who shall comply with the provisions of this article of the constitution, shall be entitled to vote at all elections hereafter held in this State; and in case any county or city shall be so divided as to form portions of different electoral districts for the election of Congressman, Senator, delegate, or other officer or officers, then to entitle a person to vote for such officer he must have been a resident of that part of the county or city which shall form a part of the electoral district in which he offers to vote for 6 months next preceding the election; but a person who shall have acquired a residence in such county or city entitling him to vote at any such election shall be entitled to vote in the election district from which he removed, until he shall have aquired a residence in the part of the county or city to which he has removed.

SEC. 2. The general assembly shall provide by law for a uniform registration of the names of voters in this State, which registration shall be evidence of the qualification of said voters to vote at any election thereafter held, but no person shall be excluded from voting at any election on account of not being registered until the general assembly shall have passed an act of registration, and the same shall have been carried into effect, after which no person shall vote unless his name appears on the register. The general assembly shall also provide by law for taking the votes of soldiers in the Army of the United States serving in the field.

SEC. 3. No person above the age of 21 years, convicted of larceny or other infamous crime, unless pardoned by the governor, shall ever thereafter be entitled to vote at any election in this State, and no lunatic, or person non compos mentis, shall be entitled to vote.

SEC. 4. No person who has at any time been in armed hostility to the United States, or the lawful authorities thereof, or who has been in any manner in the service of the so-called Confederate States of America, and no person who has voluntarily left this State and gone within the military lines of the so-called Confederate States or armies, with the purpose of adhering to said States or armies, and no person who has given any aid, comfort, countenance, or support to those engaged in armed hostility to the United States, or in any manner adhered to the enemies of the United States, either by contributing to the enemies of the United States, or unlawfully sending within the lines of such enemies money, or goods, or letters, or information, or who has disloyally held communication with the enemies of the United States, or who has advised any person to enter the service of the said enemies, or aided any person so to enter, or who has by any open deed or word declared his adhesion to the cause of the enemies of the United States, or his desire for the triumph of said enemies over the arms of the United States, shall ever be entitled to vote at any election to be held in this State, or to hold any office of honor, profit, or trust under the laws of this State, unless since such unlawful acts he shall have voluntarily entered into the military service of the United

States, and have been honorably discharged therefrom, or shall be on the day of election actually and voluntarily in such service, or unless he shall be restored to his full rights of citizenship by an act of the general assembly passed by a vote of two-thirds of all the members elected to each house; and it shall be the duty of all officers of registration and judges of election carefully to exclude from voting, or being registered, all persons so as above disqualified; and the judges of election at the first election held under this constitution shall, and at any subsequent election may, administer to any person offering to vote the following oath or affirmation: "I do swear (or affirm) that I am a citizen of the United States; that I have never given any aid, countenance, or support to those in armed hostility to the United States; that I have never expressed a desire for the triumph of said enemies over the arms of the United States; and that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States and support the Constitution and laws thereof as the supreme law of the land, any law or any ordinance of any State to the contrary notwithstanding; that I will in all respects demean myself as a loyal citizen of the United States, and I make this oath or affirmation without any reservation or evasion, and I believe it to be binding on me"; and any person declining to take such oath shall not be allowed to vote, but the taking of such oath shall not be deemed conclusive evidence of the rights of such person to vote; and any person swearing or affirming falsely shall be liable to penalties of perjury, and it shall be the duty of the proper officers of registration to allow no person to be registered until he shall have taken the oath or affirmation above set out, and it shall be the duty of the judges of election in all their returns of the first election held under this Constitution to state in their said returns that every person who has voted has taken such oath or affirmation. But the provisions of this section in relation to acts against the United States shall not apply to any person not a citizen of the United States who shall have committed such acts while in the service of some foreign country at war against the United States, and who has, since such acts, been naturalized, or may be naturalized, under the laws of the United States, and the oath above set forth shall be taken in the case of such persons in such sense.

SEC. 5. If any person shall give, or offer to give, directly or indirectly, or hath given, or offered to give, since the 4th day of July, 1851, any bribe, present, or reward, or any promise, or any security for the payment or delivery of money or any other thing to induce any voter to refrain from casting his vote, or forcibly to prevent him in any way from voting, or to procure a vote, for any candidate or person proposed or voted for as elector of President and Vice President of the United States or Representative in Congress, or for any office of profit or trust created by the constitution or laws of this State, or by the ordinances or authority of the mayor and City Council of Baltimore, the person giving, or offering to give, and the person receiving the same, and any person who gives, or causes to be given, an illegal vote, knowing it to be such, at any election to be hereafter held in this State, or who shall be guilty of or accessory to a fraud, force, surprise, or bribery to procure himself or any other person to be nominated to any office, national, State, or municipal, shall on conviction in a court of law, in addition to the penalties now or hereafter to be imposed by law, be forever disqualified to hold any office of profit or trust, or to vote at any election thereafter. (Thorpe, 3, supra, pp. 1746, 1747.)

The feeling in Maryland made evident by these provisions needs no clarification.

The year 1867 saw another constitution, with little change in the bill of rights. However, the end of the war and the readmission of Confederate States to the Union is reflected by the omission of certain noticeable prohibitions and exclusions in the 1864 constitution:

SECTION 1. All elections shall be by ballot; and every white male citizen of the United States of the age of 21 years or upward who has been a resident of the State for 1 year and of the legislative district of Baltimore City, or of the county, in which he may offer to vote for 6 months next preceding the election shall be entitled to vote in the ward or election district in which he resides at all elections hereafter to be held in this State; and in case any county or city shall be so divided as to form portions of different electoral districts for the election of Representatives in Congress, Senators, Delegates, or other officers, then to entitle a person to vote for such officer he must have been a resident of that part of the county or city which shall form a part of the electoral district in which he offers to vote for 6 months next preceding the election; but a person who shall have acquired a residence in such county or city entitling him to vote at any such election shall be entitled to vote in the election district from which he removed until he shall have acquired a residence in the part of the county or city to which he has removed.

SEC. 2. No person above the age of 21 years, convicted of larceny or other infamous crime, unless pardoned by the governor, shall ever thereafter be entitled to vote at any election in this State; and no person under guardianship, as a lunatic, or as a person non compos mentis, shall be entitled to vote.

SEC. 3. If any person shall give, or offer to give, directly or indirectly, any bribe, present, or reward, or any promise, or any security, for the payment or the delivery of money, or any other thing, to induce any voter to refrain from casting his vote, or to prevent him in any way from voting, or to procure a vote for any candidate or person proposed, or voted for, as elector of President and Vice President of the United States, or Representative in Congress, or for any office of profit or trust, created by the constitution or laws of this State, or by the ordinances, or authority of the mayor and City Council of Baltimore, the person giving, or offering to give, and the person receiving the same, and any person who gives, or causes to be given, an illegal vote, knowing it to be such, at any election to be hereafter held in this State, shall, on conviction in a court of law, in addition to the penalties now or hereafter to be imposed by law, be forever disqualified to hold any office of profit or trust, or to vote at any election thereafter. (Thorpe, 3, pp. 1783, 1784.)

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator yield the floor in order that I may make a motion to adjourn?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; I do not think I want to do that at the moment. If I may be permitted to make a motion and ask unanimous consent that I may go on with my speech tomorrow, without losing my rights, I shall be glad to do that.

A discussion of the prohibitions affecting citizens of the Confederacy, is found in the Self-Reconstruction of Maryland, by William Starr Myers:

The late autumn of the year 1864 found the Union men strongly entrenched in power in Maryland. Aided by the sympathy of the National Government—both active and passive—they had during the preceding 6 months elected a State convention, formed a new constitution which abolished slavery and made many radical changes in the government, and accomplished its adoption at the polls.

A narrow majority of 375 out of a total of 59,973 votes cast had been secured for the constitution only by the somewhat doubtful expedient of permitting Maryland soldiers in the field to vote on the question, their overwhelming approval altering the adverse result in the State at large. But the Union party leaders felt no uneasiness as far as the future was concerned, for the constitution of 1864 was designed, rightly or wrongly, not only to free the slaves but to secure a permanent hold of the party in power.

The element was known as the Union Party during the war, and was composed of the more loyal and active citizens of the State, who not only desired that Maryland should stand by the Union, but believed that the South should be conquered and that President Lincoln and the national administration should be given hearty and unswerving support. The party included men who had been of various political affiliations in times past, and it held together fairly well in spite of radical differences of opinion on many topics of State and National policy. The Republican Party did not exist under that name till at least a year after the close of the war, and the process of its formation will be shown in the events about to be narrated.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I will gladly yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. I could not hear exactly the colloquy——

Mr. ELLENDER. I will yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. May I ask the Senator if he would speak in louder tones so we could know what his answer was to the question of the majority leader? We could not hear over here.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, the majority leader asked me if I was willing to give up the floor in order that he might move to recess or adjourn. My answer to him was that if I could obtain unanimous consent to continue my speech tomorrow, without losing the rights I now have, I would do that; I would consent to it.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not want to be presumptuous, but my understanding is——

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not yield for anything but a question, Mr. President.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield further for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. What the Senator is saying is that——

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator, if he was assured that he could have unanimous consent to continue his

speech tomorrow when the Senate convenes——

Mr. ELLENDER. Under those circumstances I would yield for a recess, yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not know what is in the mind of the majority leader.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question, Mr. President. I want to be protected. I do not want to lose the floor.

I continue to read:

The Democratic Party in the State, defeated and discredited, still kept up all the active opposition of which it was capable. It condemned the policies of Lincoln and his administration, and more or less acknowledged the right of the Southern States to secede, though all the while protesting its loyalty to the Union, and its hope that Maryland would remain in the old federation.

The new constitution is worthy of careful attention. The Union party based their hopes on those provisions which were designed to exclude from the franchise all Southern sympathizers and other disloyal persons, and furthermore they intended so to carry out its mandate for a registration of the voters of the State that their opponents would be further rendered powerless at the polls.

Twenty-seven Johns Hopkins Studies, pages 9 and 10.

The constitution directed, in addition, that the legislature should pass laws requiring the voter's oath to be taken by the president, directors, trustees, or agents of corporations created or authorized by the laws of this State, teachers or superintendents of the public schools, colleges, or other institutions of learning; attorneys at law, jurors, and such other persons as the general assembly shall from time to time prescribe. Moreover, a very dangerous power was placed in the hands of the judges of election, who alone were permitted to decide as to what was conclusive evidence of the right of a person to vote. The sinister effects of this provision soon made themselves felt, and as we shall see, almost led to bloodshed in the exciting days that followed.

The aspect of military affairs in the South at this time could only add to the confidence of the Union men of Maryland. It was during the autumn of 1864 that Grant, after the awful slaughter of the Wilderness and Cold Harbor, was at last tightening his grip on Lee at Richmond and Petersburg. Sherman, by his masterful campaign from Resaca to Atlanta, overcame the brilliant strategy of Johnston and the reckless bravery of Hood, and entered upon his march to the sea. Sheridan defeated Early and drove him out of the Shenandoah Valley, and finally, to crown all, Thomas annihilated Hood's army at Nashville. Surely the Confederacy was in its death throes and the Union would be saved. This was no time to look for weak-kneed sympathy with rebellion.

An election for National and State officials was to take place on November 8, 1864. Governor Augustus W. Bradford on November 3 issued a proclamation or open letter addressed to the judges of election, giving it as his opinion that this would be the first election under the new constitution (by executive proclamation of October 29, it went into effect on November 1, 1864), and saying that it was obligatory upon the judges to observe the requirements and administer the test oath to all applying to vote.

A large number of these officials who were to conduct the election in Baltimore City, said to have been about one-third of the total for that district, held a meeting in the criminal court room on November 3, and unanimously decided to administer the oath to all voters. This oath was not to be taken as conclusive evidence of loyalty, but in addition citizens were to be sworn to give true answers to such other questions as should be propounded to them, in order to satisfy the judges of their right to the ballot. A second and more largely attended meeting of the judges was held in the same place on November 7 to consider the question which had arisen and caused some controversy, as to whether they had the right to commit for perjury, and if so, whether or not they should proceed to use it. After some debate, it was decided to leave this question to individual discretion, but to keep a list of the rejected votes for future action. This matter seems in the end to have made little trouble at the election, which was very quiet, many persons of doubtful patriotic status refraining from an attempt to vote. There were few arrests by order of the judges.

Great interest in this election was aroused by the fact that not only was a full State ticket to be voted upon, but electors for President and Vice President also were to be chosen. The Union Party ratified the national Republican nominations of Abraham Lincoln and Andrew Johnson, and held its State convention on October 18, 1864, in Temperance Temple, Baltimore. A very patriotic platform was adopted, declaring the determination to stand by the administration until this wicked rebellion has been crushed out, and every Rebel made to bow in submission to the Constitution and the laws of the land, and every foot of territory brought under the dominion of the Federal Government. Candidates were nominated for all the State offices, headed by Thomas Swann of Baltimore City for governor and Dr. Christopher C. Cox, of Talbot County, for lieutenant governor. The Democratic Party made its nominations through its State central committee, which met in Baltimore on October 27, and arranged a ticket including Judge Ezekiel F. Chambers, of Kent County, for governor, and Oden Bowie of Prince George's County for lieutenant governor.

The result of the election was, as had been expected, a victory for the Union Party, the vote being as follows: For governor, Swann, 40,579; Chambers, 32,068; Swann's majority, 8,511. For lieutenant governor, Cox, 41,828; Bowie, 32,178. Lincoln carried the State by 7,432 majority, and for Congress, Edwin H. Webster, of Harford County, Charles E. Phelps, of Baltimore City, and Francis Thomas, of Allegany County, were successful in the Second, Third, and Fourth Districts, respectfully. The Democrats, however, carried two districts, electing Hiram McCullough, of Cecil County, in the first, and Benjamin G. Harris, of St. Mary's County, in the fifth.

In the general assembly of the State the Union Party secured a large majority in the house of delegates, but the results of the election showed that the membership of the senate would stand: Democrats 13, Union Party 11. Fortunately for the latter, W. M. Holland, Democratic senator-elect from Dorchester County, resigned on November 15, saying that circumstances of a domestic character beyond his control made it extremely inconvenient for him to serve. A special election was held on December 23 to fill the vacancy and Thomas K. Carroll, the Union candidate, was elected by a good majority. This made a tie on a party vote, but the deciding vote would be cast by Lieutenant Governor Cox. In spite of test oaths, partisan judges of election, and the supporting influence of the National Government, the Democratic Party in Maryland had made a fairly good showing, and there was a possibility of the Union control being shaken, or even broken, at any time. This was evidently realized, and efforts were at once made by the leaders of the latter party to guard against any such contingency. An editorial in the Baltimore American on the preceding October 19 had said:

"It is of the utmost importance that the control of the affairs of Maryland should be in the hands of capable, honorable, and loyal men, who will administer them not only to the direct benefit of the State itself but with regard to the maintenance and prosperity of the entire Union. The fortunes of Maryland and of the Union are indissolubly linked together, and to fill the State offices with men who have the integrity of the whole Union at heart is the true way to advance the interests of the State itself."

This statement voices the opinion of the more sober and responsible leaders in the Union cause, and gives a very fair idea of the principles upon which they based their actions during the political struggles of the following 2 years.

The general assembly met at Annapolis on January 4, 1865. In his message Governor Bradford recommended for passage various measures designed to carry out certain provisions of the new constitution, and in addition he desired that action be taken looking toward the procuring of compensation from the National Government for slaves emancipated under the State constitution, in accordance with President Lincoln's message of March 6, 1862. Also, he argued sensibly that some other time and tribunal than the day and judges of election be provided, to determine who may vote under the new laws and regulations. The neglect on the part of the legislature of this common-sense matter of justice and order was another cause of the turmoil and trouble of the succeeding years.

According to article II, sections 1 and 2, of the new constitution, the term of office of Governor Swann and Lieutenant Governor Cox was to commence on January 11, 1865, but the new executive was not to enter upon the discharge of his duties until the expiration of the term for which Governor Bradford had been elected. The latter had been inaugurated on January 8, 1862, hence he held office till January 10, 1866, and continued the able administration he had given the State during the preceding years of trial and perplexity.

The inauguration of the new executive and his subordinate took place in the senate chamber at Annapolis on the appointed day. Governor Swann's inaugural address called upon the legislature to forget the dissensions and heartburnings of the past, and come together once more, in a spirit of conciliation and harmony, to give our best energies, as one party, to the work of reconstruction and reorganization upon which we are entering with such prospects of admitted and assured success. He favored foreign colonization of Negroes, recommended an attempt to procure national compensation for the slaves, and significantly closed as follows:

"It is not a very agreeable reflection to the State of Maryland, in looking back upon the past, that many of her citizens have entertained, and not infrequently expressed sympathies with the objects of this rebellion. Such evidences of disaffection at the South have been summarily dealt with heretofore, by the offer of the alternative of the oath of allegiance to the so-called Confederate States, or prompt expulsion beyond their lines. The recognition of such a rule here would doubtless have been received as in the righest degree tyrannical and oppressive. It is hardly reasonable to expect, however, that this Government will permit itself to be sacrificed by those upon whom it has a right to rely, and who have made their election to share the protection of its laws. In standing by the Union, Maryland will know how to discriminate between its friends and enemies, and the time has passed when those

who really desire its dissolution will be permitted to make a virtue of their disloyalty, or to claim participation in the political power of the State. Differences of opinion upon National and State politics may exist without treason; but the paramount obligation of loyalty cannot be compromised, and the citizen who turns away from his duty of allegiance to his Government—no matter upon what pretext—forfeits the privileges which it confers, and the protection which attaches to the rights of citizenship."

Lieutenant Governor Cox immediately entered upon his duties as President of the Senate, the office of lieutenant governor having been created by the constitution of 1864.

The senate on February 14, by a vote of 11 yeas to 10 nays, unseated, on the ground of disloyalty, Littleton Maclin, Democratic senator from Howard County, and Republican opponent, Hart B. Holton, was declared elected. Samuel A. Graham, of Somerset County contested upon the same grounds the seat of Levin L. Waters, the Democratic senator from that county, but the matter was deferred to the next session of the legislature in order that further testimony in the case might be taken, and was finally dropped, perhaps in consideration of the fact that a Union Party majority in the senate was now secured.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator now yield the floor in order that I may make a motion?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I understand the rules, if I myself should make a motion, I would not lose the floor. I therefore wish now to ask unanimous consent, should the Senate take a recess upon the granting of this unanimous consent, that when the Senate reconvenes at 12 o'clock noon today, I may retain the floor and not lose my rights.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon objects.

Mr. ELLENDER. I continue to read from Myers' account:

Turning our attention to the work of the legislative session, we find that on February 1 Governor Bradford submitted to both houses the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States. It was advanced to its third reading on the same day by the house of delegates, passing its second reading by a vote of 53 yeas to 24 nays. The Senate referred it to a committee and on February 3 finally passed it by a strict party vote of 11 affirmative from the Union Party, 10 negative from the Democrats. The house immediately passed it on its final vote, by acclamation.

Some little strife was stirred up over the question of the election of a United States Senator to fill out the unexpired term of the late Thomas H. Hicks, but John A. J. Creswell, of the Eastern Shore, was finally chosen by a large majority on March 9, his leading opponent, Lieutenant Governor Cox, having withdrawn from the contest.

Two most important bills were passed by the assembly at this session. One was the act dealing with the status of the colored population of the State and was voted by large majorities on March 24. "All the disabilities which had necessarily attached to the Negro as a consequence of the institution of slavery were removed, with two exceptions, one disqualifying Negroes from being witnesses in cases where white men were concerned, and the other authorizing Negroes to be sold for crime for the same period that a white man might be confined in the penitentiary for the same offense."

The other bill was to provide for the registration of the voters of the State according to the requirements of the new constitution. It was reported in the house of delegates, on March 8, 1865, and after a hard struggle against it on the part of the opposition it was passed on March 22, by the vote of 51 yeas to 23 nays. The Senate, after more vain opposition on the part of the Democrats, passed it finally on March 24, by a vote of 13 to 6. This act, famous in the history of the State, which formed a center for most of the political strife of the period, provided that the Governor was to appoint three citizens most known for loyalty, firmness, and uprightness as registers in each ward or election district, also three men to register the soldiers and sailors of the State, who were to visit the several regiments, camps, and hospitals, and have the results placed upon the books of the various districts. From these lists, entry on which was indispensable in order to exercise suffrage, they were to exclude all disloyal persons, and might even refuse to permit them to register, after taking the oath of allegiance.

To these officers of registration was further given power—

"To compel the attendance of witnesses for the purpose of ascertaining the qualifications or disqualifications of persons registered; they shall have power to issue summons, attachments, and commitments of any sheriff or constable, who shall serve such process, as if issued by a judge of the circuit court, or a justice of the peace, and shall receive the same fees and in the same manner as allowed by the law in State cases."

The intent of the act was well summed up in an editorial of the Baltimore Sun of July 11, 1865, as follows:

"It will be seen that the question of the right of suffrage under the Constitution and the law, is left entirely to the discretion and judgment of the various officers of registration, who are to be appointed by the Governor, in the city and counties, from which judgment there is no appeal—and the disqualification is perpetual unless the person is restored to civil rights through military service or a vote of two-thirds of all the members elected to each house of the general assembly."

The following clause included in the bill as originally reported to the House of Delegates was stricken out by a majority of only one vote in that body:

"Section 19, be it enacted. That the officers of registration for the purpose of ascertaining more fully whether any person is disqualified under the fourth section of article first (of) the Constitution, shall, if such person's right is challenged, or they have not personal knowledge, propound the following among other questions: Have you ever given aid to the rebellion by advice, by giving or sending information? Have you ever given or sent money, clothing, provisions, medicine, or any munitions of war to persons engaged in the rebellion? Have you ever given shelter or protection to persons engaged in the rebellion? Have you ever advised or encouraged any person to enter the rebel service? Have you ever assisted any one to enter such service by furnishing them with money, provisions, advice, letters, or information? Have you ever in conversation or by writing justified those engaged in entering into the rebellion? Have you ever expressed a wish or desire for the success of the rebel arms or for the defeat of the Union arms? Have you ever rejoiced over any of the successes of the rebel arms or defeat of the Union arms? Have you ever desired or wished that the rebel forces might defeat the Union forces?"

It would be difficult to imagine a more stringent or dangerous measure, one more hostile to the idea of a constitutional and orderly democratic government, or one more open to abuse.

After spasmodic attempts to pass a measure requiring the oath of allegiance of all officers of corporations, and another calculated to secure compensation for emancipated slaves from the United States Government, but from which nothing ever came, the legislature finally adjourned on March 27, 1865.

It is now necessary, in order to make our narrative complete, to retrace our steps a little in point of time. During this period the important question of the Negro population was agitating the people of Maryland. All slaves had become free on November 1, 1864, when the constitution went into effect, and there were now nearly 90,000 "freedmen" to be dealt with, besides a nearly equal number of Negroes who had been free when abolition was accomplished. When we think of this herd of human beings, little more than half civilized, poor, ignorant, and helpless, suddenly raised in legal status from a position of servitude to the proud estate of man, with all the attendant duties and obligations, we must realize that they still remain completely under the power of the white population. A few wished to treat them as being what they were in fact, children in intelligence with an almost unlimited potentiality of physical power, but the larger number naturally looked upon them with the contempt of former masters. Sometimes, at the other extreme, there was foolish talk about immediate social and political equality.

When the October election showed the adoption of the constitution, the major part of the people of Maryland loyally acquiesced in the result, but many of the more tenacious slaveholders speedily took advantage of an old provision in the "Black Code" of State laws that Negro slave children could be bound out for terms of apprenticeship without the consent of their parents. With the more or less open connivance of many of the court officials they had the slave and effectively the grand purpose of the people of the State of Maryland * * * (therefore) there should be remedies extraordinary for all their (i. e., the freedmen's) grievances—remedies instantaneous without money or reward—and somebody to have care for them, to protect them, to show them the way to the freedom of which they have yet but vague and undefined ideas.

The order provided further that all freedmen were to be considered under special military protection until the legislature should by its enactments make such protection unnecessary, that provost marshals in their several districts, "particularly those on the eastern and western shores," should "hear all complaints made to them by persons within the meaning of this order" and "collect and forward information and proofs of wrongs done to such persons, and generally * * * render Major Este such assistance as he may require in the performance of his duty." Finally, "lest the money derived from donations, and from fines collected, prove insufficient to support the institution in a manner corresponding to its importance, Major Este will proceed to make a list of all the avowed rebel sympathizers resident in the city of Baltimore, with a view to levying such contributions upon them in aid of the Freedmen's Rest as may be from time to time required."

Early in January, General Wallace abolished the Freedmen's Bureau in Maryland and made his report to the general assembly. A reading of this report and the documents submitted therewith should fill every fair-minded person of today with a deep sympathy for the Negroes in their helpless condition at this time. The details there disclosed of all the suffering, sorrow, and injustice which they endured render one heartsick, even though an allowance be made for the exaggerations of heated partisanship and an excited state of public feeling.

As we have seen, the legislature, in response to the report, passed a bill removing practically all the disabilities from the Negro population which had been laid upon them under the slave code, and affairs gradually settled themselves according to the new economic and social conditions which are still in existence today. This readjustment did not come all at once, but only after much injustice and many wrongs had been committed by both whites and blacks. (At as late a date as November 1, 1866, Gen. O. O. Howard, chief of the national "Freedmen's Bureau," stated in his report to the Secretary of War that "frequent complaints are received of outrages and atrocities without parallel committed against freedmen" in portions of Maryland.) Richmond fell before Grant's victorious army on April 3, 1865, and by the end of the month both Lee and Johnston had surrendered. This was the practical ending of the military operations of the Civil War. About 20,000 men from Maryland had taken service in the armies of the Confederacy, and the survivors were soon paroled and began to return home in large numbers. The Union men were much elated and joined in a hearty celebration of the national triumph of their cause, but as the ex-Confederates began to show themselves about the streets and to frequent their old haunts and a large immigration from the South, particularly from Virginia, began to set in, this feeling gave way to alarm, too often accompanied by signs of prejudice and vindictiveness. The party in power at once began to foresee and to fear what finally took place—an active coalition between the Democrats and the southern sympathizers and the eventual overthrow of the Union Party in the State. The Registration Act had been passed just in time, and when signs of opposition to it began to appear its advocates decided to fight to the last ditch to keep it on the statute books and in active operation.

The assassination of President Lincoln on April 14, 1865, threw the Union people for a time into a panic, and naturally increased hostility toward the ex-Confederates, whom they imagined to be undertaking a new method of warfare, by means of murder and secret criminal intrigue. Gen. W. W. Morris, for a short time in command of the Middle Department, issued orders on April 15, placing Baltimore under stringent martial law, and including a provision that "paroled prisoners of war (Rebels), arriving in this department are hereby ordered to report at once to the nearest provost marshal, in order that their names may be registered, their papers examined, and such passes furnished them as may be necessary for their protection. Such prisoners of war will not be permitted to wear the uniform of the army and navy of the so-called Confederate States, but must abandon their uniforms within 12 hours after reporting to the provost marshal, and adopt civilian dress."

General Wallace, who resumed command a few days later, extended these repressive measures, and was actively assisted by the officers of the United Stats Army stationed in various parts of the State. After the death of J. Wilkes Booth and the capture of the other conspirators, the military bonds were gradually relaxed, the National Government wisely leaving the settlement of the various difficulties in Maryland to the people of the State.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may make a motion to adjourn?

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice quite a number of Senators are desirous of leaving. I have now been on the floor for a little more than 12 hours. I feel that I could go on until 6 o'clock. But it seems as though some Senators want to recess. I should like very much to retain the floor, but I presume, if I were to renew my request to retain the floor by unanimous consent, there would be objection. It is not my purpose to keep Senators listening to my remarks. I do not feel very tired. I feel I could go on, but, in order to accommodate the majority and the minority, I will take my seat.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

During the delivery of Mr. ELLENDER's speech,

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, with the understanding that I shall not lose the floor and that none of my rights shall be impaired, I ask unanimous consent to make a unanimous-consent request. I understand that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] wants to absent himself from the Senate for a couple of days. I ask unanimous consent that, beginning at 4 o'clock this afternoon, he be excused from attendance on the Senate until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'CONOR in the chair). The Senator from Louisiana asks unanimous consent that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate beginning at 4 o'clock this afternoon until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday next. The Senator makes the request with the understanding that it will not impair his right to the floor. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. I also ask that this interruption may be placed at the close of my speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. LUCAS to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 15, amending the so-called cloture rule of the Senate.

After the conclusion of Mr. ELLENDER's speech,

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, before the Senator from Louisiana takes his seat, will he yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. My understanding was that the majority leader requested the Senator to yield in order that the Senator from Illinois might make a motion to adjourn.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair may say to the Senator from Louisiana and to others, if the motion to adjourn is made and carried, tomorrow will be a new day's business, and there will be nothing before the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I asked the Senator from Louisiana to yield the floor in order that I might make a motion to adjourn, for this reason——

Mr. ELLENDER. What was the request?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I thought I had the floor. Do I have the floor?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understood the Senator from Louisiana to yield the floor, and the Chair recognized the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. ELLENDER. If a motion is to be made to recess or to adjourn, very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I requested that the Senator from Louisiana yield the floor in order that I might make a motion to adjourn. As everyone knows, in the earlier part of the evening it was impossible for all groups who have been in conference to reach any agreement with respect to the compromise upon the rules. Since that time, however, it has been reported to me by the minority leader of the Senate that he still believes there is an opportunity for some amicable arrangement satisfactory to all parties in interest who can be reached. I have not received any information of that kind from the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] with respect to any compromise that might be acceptable to him. All the negotiations have come through the minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska. I presume he has been in touch with the Senator from Georgia, and probably with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] with respect to the matter; otherwise, the Senator from Louisiana probably would not have yielded the floor at this time.

Mr. President, I have been attempting in good faith to compromise the situation, and insofar as the Senator from Illinois is concerned, I am still willing to postpone action in the Senate in order that we may give a further opportunity for the various groups who are interested to see whether some arrangement cannot be made whereby we can set aside the pending question and go along caring for the backlog of legislation which is now on the calendar. During the afternoon, it seemed to me perhaps there was no opportunity for an agreement, and after conferring with a number of Senators on this side of the aisle who are vitally interested and concerned about our program, it was deemed advisable that at the first available opportunity the Senator from Illinois should move that the Senate adjourn, with a view to coming back tomorrow, if the motion could be agreed to, and immediately starting work upon the calendar and vital measures now ready for consideration.

However, as I have indicated, I am willing, and I am sure every other Senator is willing, further to postpone any action on the question of adjournment, and merely take a recess until tomorrow at noon, with a view of ascertaining, in the meantime, whether it is possible to reach the settlement which we all hope may be made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator will allow the Chair to make a suggestion, it is already tomorrow. A motion made at this time to adjourn or take a recess until tomorrow would carry us over until Wednesday.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Vice President for the suggestion. I do not want to do that. I want to move to adjourn or

take a recess until 12 o'clock noon today, Tuesday.

I now yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the action of the majority leader in yielding to me for an observation. He mentioned the fact that he had a conversation with me and that there was a possibility that we might continue our efforts to work out some solution which might be taken back to the respective caucuses or conferences and to the membership of the Senate. I was interested in some of the remarks which the majority leader made regarding our efforts. I think that inasmuch as the majority leader has mentioned it, and inasmuch as some statements have been made, especially by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH] relative to the conferences, it is only fair that time be given to those who took part in the conferences to make their own statements of what actually happened in them, so that the Members of the Senate may know what we attempted to do, not as a committee, but as individual Senators, attempting to arrive at a solution which we might recommend so that some action could be taken regarding a change of the rule. I think the majority leader should grant that request. I think we should individually make to the Senate statements of what took place, and set forth what the real facts are.

I say to the majority leader, and I say it as one who appreciates his duties and responsibilities, that this is a tremendous action that is about to be taken—an adjournment or a recess. There is so little difference between those who have been negotiating that I think another effort should be made to reach a solution. The differences are so slight that it seems to me those of us who wish to deal with men as men should meet once again. I am satisfied that we can resolve the differences.

I am not asking the majority leader to move to take a recess. He can use his own judgment as to what he thinks he should do. My opinion is that we should not adjourn until every effort has been made to resolve the differences. I say to the majority leader again that if he moves that the Senate take a recess, I shall cooperate to the very best of my ability to see if there is some way in which we can resolve the very small differences which exist between those Senators who are doing their level best to bring about a solution. Otherwise, if we adjourn, the pending motion, of course, will go out with the adjournment, and we shall have lost an opportunity of a lifetime to amend a Senate rule so as to make it possible to bring up legislation in an orderly fashion.

So, Mr. President, I leave it with the majority leader. I make the observation that I think every effort which can be made should be made. I have had a little responsibility in the past 2 years. I obtained acquiescence to unanimous-consent requests when most the Senators thought nothing could be done. I think we can reach a solution if we can have a good night's sleep, come back, and make up our minds that we are going to do our level best to go along. On the other hand, certainly if the majority leader feels that all efforts have been exhausted and that all that is left to do is to adjourn, he can make that decision. But once again let me say I am perfectly willing to do all I can if an opportunity is given to see if we can resolve the differences which lie between us.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I should like to know to what the Senator from Nebraska refers when he says that the Senator from Rhode Island has interfered with any plans to bring about a compromise.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the release which I read, which was issued by the Senator from Rhode Island, as the chairman of the Democratic National Committee——

Mr. McGRATH. As a Senator in this Chamber, sir, I have as much right to issue a release as has the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not objecting to the release. The Senator can issue all the releases he wants to so far as I am concerned. But inasmuch as a release was issued which contains statements which do not correspond with my opinion of the facts, I think every Senator has a right to express his reactions regarding what happened in the meetings and to express his individual views, in view of the references made by the Senator from Rhode Island in his release tonight. I do not have the release with me; but if we take a recess until tomorrow, I shall be glad to take the floor in my own right, bring the release with me, and compare it with the facts of the meetings, to the satisfaction of the Members of the Senate, indicating that there is a very small difference between Senators who want to resolve them. Up to this moment I have given my word that I would not say anything publicly as to what happened in the meetings, and I have not done so; but I think, now that it has been made an issue, we have a right to state what happened in those meetings, so that all Senators will understand what the program was and what we were trying to accomplish.

Mr. McGRATH. I think I should be permitted——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. McGRATH. I think I should be permitted to say that a brief review of the negotiations which have gone on since we adjourned on Saturday indicates that we were supposed to appoint a committee——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I make the point of order that the Senator from Rhode Island is not asking a question.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield the floor, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Rhode Island wish to take the floor in his own right?

Mr. McGRATH. Yes, Mr. President, I wish to take the floor in my own right.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I regret that the Senator from Georgia has seen fit to make a point of order against me.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does not the Senator from Rhode Island know that those Senators who are on the floor cannot open their mouths, except to propound an interrogatory, without being assailed on a point of order?

Mr. McGRATH. I realize that, but the Senator from Georgia did not raise a point of order against the minority leader who was expounding on the position he had taken.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. Was the Senator from Rhode Island in the Chamber a few days ago when the Senator from Georgia raised the point with the Chair, when he had sought to apply the rule to the majority leader, and that the Senator from Georgia expressed the thought that the rules applied to himself and to every other Senator, and that he thought the majority leader should have some latitude?

Mr. McGRATH. I was in the Chamber, and I recognized that the request was within the rules of the Senate. I also recognized the fact that the minority leader was addressing himself to this problem a few moments ago, and the Senator from Georgia was in his seat and did not raise the point of order which he has attempted to raise against me.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if he was in the Chamber when that statement was made?

Mr. McGRATH. Yes; I was in the Chamber.

Mr. RUSSELL. And if he did not hear me say I thought the same rules applied to the majority leader and the minority leader that applied to the other Senators on the floor?

Mr. McGRATH. The Senator said majority leader.

Mr. RUSSELL. I intended to include the minority leader, if I did not say it.

Mr. McGRATH. I heard what the Senator said. When the majority leader rose and some one attempted to make a point of order, the Senator rose and of course said a point of order should not be raised against the majority leader.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator was present, did he not hear me say that I asked unanimous consent that the majority leader be permitted to make such statements in his time, as the leader of the Senate, as he desired, without being charged with the time?

Mr. McGRATH. That is true, so far as the majority leader was concerned.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. McGRATH. May I finish my answer? The Senate could hardly function at all if it were the policy to silence the majority leader.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the Senator one further question, and then I shall desist.

Mr. McGRATH. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island if he does not think that the minority leader should also have some rights in connection with the operation of the Senate, and if he does not know if the rule had been applied to the present distinguished occupant of the Chair for the past 2 years, it would have permanently paralyzed the functions of the minority on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. McGRATH. I believe that to a degree, but I think it should be qualified to this extent, that when the minority leader or the majority leader makes references to another Senator such as have been made tonight, the Senator should be given the courtesy of making a reply.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does not the Senator know I made not the slightest objection to the Senator making a reply, that I am sitting here awaiting his reply, but that I merely objected to the Senator speaking in the time of the majority leader?

Mr. McGRATH. The Senator raised a point of order against the Senator for making his reply.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the Senator if it was not made because he was speaking in the time of the majority leader.

Mr. McGRATH. I do not know what was in the Senator's mind when he made his point of order. All I know is that he attempted to make a point of order which would have taken me off the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does not the Senator know that he had a perfect right to the floor if the majority leader was willing to yield the floor?

Mr. McGRATH. Yes; I know that.

Mr. President, I was about to review the procedings which transpired since last Saturday night, because the representation had been made by the superintending forces that there might be a chance of coming to some agreement and some understanding with respect to the matter which is now engaging the attention of the Senate.

Representatives of the three contending parties were appointed, and some time, some place, on some day, they had a meeting. I was not present at the meeting. I had no part in it. I know what transpired only by the reports which came to me—and I am sure they came to every other Senator who was interested from those who represented them—to the effect that some progress was being made, that it was possible that a compromise could be reached in this situation, and that nothing more was to be said.

I was not further informed until I read in the morning newspapers the so-called Wherry resolution, which proposed that the solution of our problem was that we should now adopt for all intents and purposes a three-quarter constitutional majority-cloture rule.

I said this morning, Mr. President, and I repeated today any number of times, and not more than 2 hours ago for the last time, that in my opinion as a Senator, as a spokesman for my party, and as a spokesman for the American people, this is not a compromise at all, but that it is a step backward, a step 30 years backward, Mr. President, because if such a rule were adopted, if the so-called Wherry compromise—and I understand the minority leader was very anxious to have his name associated with it—were adopted, it would mean that we could not apply cloture in the Senate unless we were able to get at least 4 and possibly 12 more names to cloture petitions in the future than we are required to get now under the rule, and therefore I said to the American people, as it was my right and duty to do, that this in my opinion was not a compromise.

Mr. President, I stand by that statement, both as a Senator and as the head of one of the great political parties, the great political party which won the last election, if you please, and I say here and now that any compromise that may come back to this Chamber will meet with high opposition on the floor, in the press, and in the country, if it attempts to take a backward step.

I am unashamed of what I said to the press, and I shall defend it to the end, here and elsewhere, the minority leader to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I had not intended to get into this debate this evening. I happen to be one of those on this side of the aisle who voted to sustain the ruling of the Vice President last Thursday night when it was made.

I think that from the time I came to the Senate, three and a half years ago, up to the present time, I have been as interested in the problem of getting an effectual cloture rule as has any other Member of the Senate, and have worked very diligently to see if we could not have an effective rule.

In January of this year the members of the minority party on the Committee on Rules and Administration endeavored to bring on to the floor of the Senate in the early part of the session a cloture rule, which could be amply debated at a time when the Senate was adjourning over 3-day periods. Both in the committee, and at the time a resolution was offered by the junior Senator from California to bring to the floor of the Senate for action a cloture resolution, it was pointed out time and time again that if the Senate ever was to change its cloture rule, it should be done in the first 30 or 45 days of a legislative session, but that the responsibility must rest upon the majority party. They did not determine to bring the cloture rule forward in the early part of this session, when we were adjourning for 3-day periods. They delayed until an accumulation of legislation began flowing down to the floor of the Senate.

I certainly endeavored, with others of my colleagues who felt as I did, to cooperate with the majority leader.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President——

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall be glad to answer questions after I conclude, but I decline to yield at this time.

I offered to cooperate with the able majority leader in trying to arrive at some reasonable compromise so that the Senate would not be at the mercy of a small handful of Senators, who could completely tie this body into knots and completely obstruct the legislative process.

Our whole representative system of government rests upon the willingness of the men who sit in this Chamber to make their views meet and finally come together with a reasonable compromise. There is not a single piece of legislation which has ever been proposed as to which we could not, if each individual Senator introduced a bill, find that there would probably be 96 different bills and 96 different points of view. But the American constitutional representative process makes for the meeting of minds and gradually getting a piece of legislation which will have the support of the majority of the Members of this body.

It was in that spirit that this informal committee was set up and met last Sunday. I think every member of that committee recognized that if everyone stood adamant we would have a deadlock, we would get no effective cloture rule, and in the final analysis, unless some reasonable compromise were reached, the Senate would be left absolutely without an effective cloture rule, and we would be in the position we have been in for the period since 1917, when our very ineffective cloture rule was adopted. Because of that situation there was a desire to give and take, and to try and arrive at a reasonable compromise.

Now just how unreasonable is this situation that was presented? The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH], apparently has charged that the minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], himself was proposing a three-quarters rule. That is not the fact. I believe the Senator from Rhode Island knows that it is not the fact. At least the Members who sat in committee know that it is not the fact. The Senator from Nebraska——

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will yield when I have finished my statement.

The Senator from Nebraska has consistently been for a two-thirds cloture. The Hayden-Wherry resolution itself, which was reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration in the Eightieth Congress—and precisely the

same resolution was reported in the Eighty-first Congress—provides, as every Member of this body who will examine Senate Resolution 15 can see, that we have the simple two-thirds requirement that is now in rule XXII, with the exception that the authors of that resolution and the members of the Committee on Rules and Administration endeavored to close the loophole. That has consistently been the position of the able Senator from Nebraska, the minority leader.

But, in order to get a meeting of minds, and because some of those from the South who had a different point of view had requested that he write into it as a basis of discussion the words "three-quarters," he did so, though he made it perfectly clear, and every man who attended that conference, if he will recollect, will have to testify to the fact, that he was not for a three-quarters rule, that he was not proposing it, that it was merely there because it was requested by some of the southern Senators.

On this issue I have disagreed with some of my friends and able colleagues from the South. But I want to pay them a tribute tonight. Though we have disagreed, I believe that they entered the conference with an open mind, attempting to find some middle ground around which we might gather and present to the Senate of the United States a reasonable compromise that could have the overwhelming support of a large number of Senators indeed, I believe an overwhelming majority of the Senate of the United States.

How different, as a matter of fact, is the present two-thirds rule from the constitutional two-thirds rule which was the basis of the compromise proposal? If there are 96 Senators in the Senate Chamber present, under the present two-thirds rule it requires 64 Senators to obtain cloture. Under the constitutional two-thirds proposal it requires the same 64 Senators.

If there is one absentee in the Senate of the United States, and there are only 95 Senators present, it requires 64 Senators, under the present two-thirds rule, and it requires 64 under the requirement of two-thirds of the entire membership of the Senate.

If there are 94 Senators present in the Senate, it will require 63 on the basis of two-thirds of those present, and 64 under a constitutional two-thirds, a difference of one Senator.

If there are 93 Senators present it will require 62 under the two-thirds of those present, and 64 under the two-thirds of the whole Senate.

Now as a practical matter, whenever there is a cloture vote history has shown that there has been an average of more than 90 Senators either present and voting or paired. Therefore the difference is a very small difference indeed between a two-thirds vote and a constitutional two-thirds vote. And I say to those on the majority side of the aisle, who have kicked over this possibility of compromise, that they assume a heavy responsibility when they do so, because they leave the Senate of the United States defenseless. The responsibility for any filibusters hereafter, the responsibility for blocking legislation upon a motion to take up a measure, regardless of what that measure may be, is going to rest squarely upon the shoulders of the majority leadership if they block this one fair effort at a reasonable compromise.

I do not know on what basis they intend to do this, but I do say—and I believe it can be said without fear of contradiction—that we had a fine opportunity of adopting in its original form the Hayden-Wherry resolution up to the time the President of the United States injected himself into this controversy. He was first injected into the controversy by the able majority leader when he came out of the White House and said that the President of the United States felt that the Congress should adopt a new cloture resolution. If he had stood on that, I still think we could have won the fight. But did he stop there? He did not. The President of the United States, going beyond his jurisdiction or his proper function as an executive officer of the Government, losing sight of the fact that we do have a separation of powers, again injected himself into the situation, and came out in favor of a simple majority. He completely left his own leadership in the Senate of the United States clear out on the end of a limb. Not even his leadership in the Senate of the United States could support him on that fantastic proposal.

When we had almost arrived at a reasonable solution, when every man who sat in that conference had a reason, when he left it on Sunday, to believe that in good faith the southern Senators would go to their conference, those of us on this side of the aisle representing two different points of view would go to our conference, and the majority leadership would go to their conference—and all of us, I think, had a reasonable idea that we would be able to work out this situation—then what happened overnight? I do not know what happened. I do not know whether telephone calls came in from Florida or elsewhere, but apparently overnight this situation was just kicked in the teeth, the props were kicked from under the only reasonable solution we might have.

I do not know why this is being done. It seems to me that we are losing the last best hope we have at this session of the Congress to secure an effective cloture. One almost gains the impression that on this matter, like the negotiations conducted by Molotov, they do not want any fair and reasonable solution to the problem. But I say that if this reasonable proposition fails, the responsibility must rest upon the shoulders of the majority leadership of this Chamber.

Mr. WHERRY and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I appreciate the observations made by the Senator from California. I do not mean in any way to inject vociferous arguments here at this point in the debate on the rule. But I certainly feel as I felt when I requested the conferences, that all those who attended the conferences should have a right to bring the facts to the Senat for the information of the Senate.

I appreciate very much the remarks of the Senator from California, who is one who has been constantly in favor of a constitutional majority, one who has given untiringly of his efforts to bring about a change in the cloture rule. He knows, and every other Member of his group knows, including the majority leader, that I was asked to put down on paper something that would be tangible, upon which all those who were present might have some basis for discussion.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know a single thing about the 75 percent majority proposal—how it got there in the beginning.

Mr. WHERRY. Did I not say I was only for a two-thirds majority only?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator said he was for a constitutional two-thirds after he got to the conference. I am talking about how the 75 percent proposal arose in the beginning. Do not associate me with that, because I had nothing to do with the resolution whatsoever until the Senator from Nebraska presented it to me in his office some time Saturday night. It was all prepared at that time.

Mr. WHERRY. That is true. I have no quarrel with that statement.

Mr. LUCAS. Just leave me out of the original 75 percent.

Mr. WHERRY. If the majority leader does not want to corroborate the statement I made when I presented this work sheet, when I stated to the group that I was attempting to put down the minimum which those who were interested would support, I shall have to do the best I can.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I decline to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I was trying to help the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate the Senator's help; but the way he is helping me is not very much assistance so far.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. I stated at the beginning that I was not for some of the provisions on the working sheet; that I was not for the three-fourths vote on the particular cloture proposal mentioned, either with respect to the rules, or with respect to everything besides the rules.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. I will not yield until I am through with this statement.

Mr. McGRATH. I merely wanted the Senator to yield for a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I said in the beginning, and I said half a dozen times in our discussions, and I stated at the close, that so far as I was concerned, I could never go along with the three-fourth's proposal; but there were those who said that the basis must depend on the minimum which was included in the work sheet for our discussion.

I handed those sheets to the Members, and when we got through I asked them to give them back to me. I was not in favor of some of the provisions. One or two Members said they wanted to keep them and submit them to their associates. I said, "If you want to keep them,

I want you to take a pencil and change every one of the 'three-fourths' to 'two-thirds.'" Mr. Trice was present, and he changed every one he could get his hands on.

Those are the facts about the work sheet, upon which we tried to set down in black and white what each faction would have to have as a minimum, to constitute a basis for discussion.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Let me finish my statement, please.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I left that meeting with the firm conviction that we were agreed on the principles of what we were trying to do. I should like to take 2 or 3 minutes to make a few observations as to what we tried to do, to use it as a basis——

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I will not yield until I am through.

We applied the Hayden-Wherry resolution to everything that could possibly be brought before the Senate, with the exception of the rules. That is the formula on which we started. There were those in the group who wanted to protect the rights they had under the rules. We said, "All right; we will try to give you protection on the rules, provided you will make the concession on everything else but an amendment of the rules." I think that is sound.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH] says in his statement to the press that—

> The administration forces, at a caucus, almost unanimously rejected a GOP proposal to limit debate on the vote of 64 Senators.

Mr. President, in the caucus this afternoon everyone present, with the exception of the majority leader, agreed on a two-thirds vote of the membership of the Senate. Everyone but the majority leader——

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Everyone but the majority leader agreed to take this proposal back to the respective conferences and put it up to the conferences to get further instructions.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I will not yield until I finish this statement. Then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. MYERS. Will the Senator yield to correct a statement of fact?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator declines to yield, and no Senator has the right to interrupt him unless he yields.

Mr. WHERRY. A genuine effort was being made by those of us who were interested in changing the rules. We said then, and I say now, that all the rights that ever have been gained because of precedents which have been established, and all the rights now available under the rules would be preserved so far as the rules are concerned. There would be no change. So there can be no quarrel with that proposal.

Mr. MYERS rose.

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment.

The proposal upon which there has been a basis of agreement is that the rules remain the same so far as the limitation of debate is concerned as relates to an amendment to the rules themselves. Every right in that respect which has ever existed would be preserved. Nothing would be taken away, with one exception, and that is that if and when a motion to amend the rules is finally taken up, if it ever gets that far—and in that respect there would be 100 percent protection against the motion to take up an amendment to the rules—but if it gets there, instead of the two-thirds vote, there would be a constitutional two-thirds. Every Senator present in that caucus, including the majority leader, agree to that. It was not a GOP plan.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. That much of the recommendation was agreed upon by every Member in that conference.

Mr. McGRATH and Mr. CHAVEZ addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. WHERRY. I will not yield until I finish my statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Rhode Island says tonight, "We are not going to compromise in any way that would make the rule stiffer than it is now."

I do not agree with that statement. It does not represent the facts. I feel that it does not carry all the information. I have a very high regard for the Senator from Rhode Island, but I speak as one who has studied the rules with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], one of the most able authorities on rules in the Senate. He has been here for a great many years.

This is the first time we have been able to obtain approval of a proposal under which cloture could be applied to a motion to take up a measure. We have never had it before.

Rule III relates to amending the Journal. This is the first time, notwithstanding rule III, and notwithstanding rule VI, that we have been able to obtain approval of a proposal to obtain cloture, so that if any Senator wanted to get a bill off the calendar and he should move to take it up, that motion, under the agreement which I should like to see brought to the floor of the Senate, would be subject to cloture. A cloture petition would apply to amending the Journal; and notwithstanding rule VI, it would be possible to obtain a vote on cloture so that legislation could be brought up.

We have never had such a thing before. That certainly is giving up, to my mind, a great deal of protection which has been insisted upon by those who do not want to give it up. I refer to Senators from the Southland.

The only concession we have made is with respect to the two-thirds rule, if and when a cloture petition is filed. The rule now is two-thirds of those present and voting. We agreed to the constitutional two-thirds. The only difference is the difference in the vote on a cloture petition, as between two-thirds of the membership voting, and two-thirds of the membership of the Senate. It was shown to us time and again that, based upon past votes, that difference did not amount to a vote and a half. I am sure that Senators will agree with that statement.

Mr. MYERS and Mr. CHAVEZ addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. WHERRY. I decline to yield at this time. I wish to complete my statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to inform Senators as to what happened at these meetings, and I should like to correct the impression that I ever favored a three-fourths rule. From the first I stated that I would not support it. The only concession I have made has been to go along with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and support the change from a vote of two-thirds of the Senators present to a constitutional two-thirds of the Senate. He himself has agreed with the group with respect to that change in the rule. The only one who has objected to the constitutional two-thirds is the majority leader; and he agreed to the proposal with respect to a change in the rules. So it comes down to one little difference. If it is desired to invoke cloture on a motion to take up a piece of legislation, whether it relates to the civil-rights program, or labor, or anything else, all that is necessary to do under the new proposal is to make the motion. If debate ensues on that motion and if Senators feel that the debate should terminate, under the proposed change a cloture petition would lie on that motion. That was never possible before. With the new rule, even the amendment of the Journal would be taken out of the picture. With the new rule, rule VI would be out of the picture, so that a cloture vote could actually be taken on a motion to take up proposed legislation, and then, after the proposed legislation were taken up, a cloture vote could be taken on the proposed legislation itself.

I did not inject the matter of civil rights into this picture. I made it plain that I was interested only in changing the rule. But I say that if any of the civil-rights measures—I will not say all of them—are attempted to be brought up under this new provision or rule, they will be able to be brought up, and Senators will have a chance to have them passed. That is something that has not been possible before. So I say to the Senator from Rhode Island in all sincerity that this proposal is not a stiffening of the rule.

I should like to see all of us agree on this proposal. I should like to bring it up as the Hayden-Wherry resolution came up, so that all of us can agree. Personally, I should like to have the two-thirds vote apply, and I say that again on the floor. But I am willing to go to the two-thirds constitutional vote, in order to get everything we need in connection with bringing about an amendment of the rule, because I think 90 percent of our need involves having this

new rule apply to everything but the rules themselves.

This is the first time that a change in the rules has been asked for in all the years I have been here, and of course it is under the cloture rule. Perhaps I should say that beginning 2 years ago was the first rule change attempt we have had made. But 90 percent of the things we bring up here are not rule changes; they are motions to bring up proposed legislation.

I say now, and I want to say it on the floor, that I am getting along with all groups. The majority leader has been very fair to us, and has expressed his own opinions. So far as I know, we are in complete harmony. I personally feel that he has gone a long way to try to compose these differences.

I also wish to pay my compliments to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. I tell the Senate that they are giving up an endless amount of rights when they agree to have a cloture petition applied to a motion to bring up proposed legislation; and every fair man will agree with that statement.

The only difference is between a two-thirds vote and a two-thirds constitutional vote; and the agreement was that that difference would run about a vote and a half.

Now I yield, first to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

Mr. CHAVEZ. No, Mr. President; I wish to speak in my own time.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well; then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska has said that he does not have the figures. I happen to have them. Does the Senator from Nebraska realize that the average vote on the last 18 clotures applied for in the Senate has been 83 votes, which means a difference of 12, or two-thirds means a difference of 8—not 1½?

Mr. WHERRY. I do not recall all the figures, but I know that on the four measures where cloture was applied, it would not have made one iota of difference. They were carried, as I recall, by votes of 76 to 3 or 81 to some other small number; so it would not have made a bit of difference whether it was a constitutional two-thirds or whether it was two-thirds of a majority; and I am talking about the votes on cloture which carried in the Senate.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. McGRATH. Does the Senator dispute the accuracy of the figures I gave, which are the actual figures of the experience in the Senate?

Mr. WHERRY. I do not know where the Senator from Rhode Island got the figures, and I do not know whether they are accurate.

Mr. McGRATH. I got them from the Office of the Senate itself.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator from Rhode Island says they are accurate, I take his word for it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Is it not true, however, that the fact that fewer than 90 Senators vote is not an evidence of what can be done if the Senators know they have to vote, but is only evidence that there were a large number of pairs on those occasions?

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly.

Mr. TAFT. In other words, there were pairs, by which Senators did not have to be present.

Under the rule proposed by the Senator, as I understand it, or by the conference, every Senator could be included in the vote, except Senators who were absolutely so ill that they could not get to the Senate. Otherwise the majority could always get every vote they had in the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the Senator to wait a moment, please.

Furthermore, Mr. President, if each Senator was in his seat, where he ought to be if he is living—I admit there are times when we have vacancies because of death—but if we have a full roster, as we have had for a month and a half, and if all Senators are in their seats, there is not a bit of difference between a two-thirds vote and a two-thirds constitutional vote. If Senators are here, they will vote; and if the matter is important enough that cloture on it is desired, Senators should be here. So in reality we would not be giving up a thing, unless there were a vacancy which was caused by death.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Nebraska is still interested in working out a compromise?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. MYERS. Then let me ask why the Senator is engaging in so much political debate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not yield for any more of that kind of political observation. The Senator can accuse me of being political if he wishes to do so; but I say I am only interested in changing this rule. I have the courage to stand here and take all the heat you want to pour on me; and when you get all through, I have nothing but a sincere purpose to apply cloture to a rule to take up proposed legislation. The Senator from Pennsylvania is the one man, along with the Senator from Illinois, the majority leader, who should be helping me, because they have to get their program before the Senate of the United States. If they will help us get this rule, they will be able to get most of their program before the Senate by means of a cloture rule; but if they do not, some of their programs will not get before the Senate, because they will not be able to apply cloture on a motion to take up a measure.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield, if the Senator does not get into a political discussion. I am not discussing this matter on the basis of a political angle.

Mr. MYERS. I know the Senator is not doing that so far.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MYERS. But why do we have such a long conversation at this hour in the morning; why these long speeches at this hour in the morning?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to state the case. The reason for that is that I merely requested of the majority leader that, inasmuch as the Senator from Rhode Island had issued a statement which I did not think conformed with the facts as I know them, each and every Senator should have a right to rise on the floor of the Senate and give his own version. Certainly we were there and took part in it, and I thought we should have a right to report to the Senate.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield for a brief question?

Mr. WHERRY. First, Mr. President, there is something else I want to say. In every one of these discussions, I want my colleagues to know that I have the highest regard for the work the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] have done. I could not ask for finer cooperation. I want everyone to know that we did not guarantee any agreement. All we said we could do was to have a possible understanding of this proposed solution, and that we would take it back to our conferences, and then would abide by the direction of the conference; we said that none of us was speaking in any way but individually, that there was no official or formal committee. I opposed having a committee organized. I thought the matter came in the right way, from the majority leader, who extended the invitation, and also from the majority whip or deputy majority leader or whatever the proper title may be. I am glad that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and all the other Senators were there.

Mr. President, we had reached the place where, with the exception of just one thing—and that is the difference between a two-thirds vote by the Senators present and a two-thirds constitutional vote—we were ready to take a step which to my mind would revolutionize the future of the Senate in respect to the bringing up of legislation. That does not stiffen the rule; it broadens it; and any fair man will agree with that statement.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly I yield. I thought the Senator from Pennsylvania wanted the Senate to take a recess.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to yield, except I am through with my main speech; and if Senators wish to have the Senate take a recess, I shall be glad to yield the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wish to make a speech in my own time, when I obtain an opportunity to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I think the difficulty at this hour in the morning is that both the majority leader and the minority leader take themselves too seriously. [Laughter.]

They appear to be worried about whether we change rule XX and rule XXII. What the American people are interested in is whether the Senate is going to function.

They are not interested in what the majority leader or the minority leader might think or any maneuverings made in accordance with their judgment and in the best of faith. They do not care anything about that whatever. The question before us now is this: Is the Senate going to do its duty, or are we going to wrangle as to whether the majority leader thinks the minority leader did something or the minority leader says that the majority leader did something? Now, we should be ashamed of ourselves. It is now 20 minutes to 2 o'clock in the morning, and the majority leader and the minority leader are arguing as to what happened in an impromptu meeting as to how to get together. Beautiful. A wonderful thing to tell the peoples of the world, when we are trying to prove that democracy really works.

Mr. President, I am for civil rights, but I am for orderly government first. I want this body to function. Yes, I am for FEPC; I am for antilynching legislation, and for other civil rights. I love all the Senators from the South. I do not agree with them in their philosophy. But, by the eternal! merely because we cannot get antilynching legislation or anti-poll-tax legislation or FEPC, are we to stop the work of the Senate? Are we merely going to argue about getting some Senators together in a meeting room? They think they are hot. They are not. I believe in the Senate of the United States. Senators were elected to do their duty in this body. The sooner we get together the better. If we are licked on civil rights, well, we are just licked. That is all there is to it. The majority leader could quit his effort right now. We cannot put the civil-rights program through. I want to, but we just cannot. Are we going to quit and not pass the deficiency bill? Are we not going to pass certain other bills which are necessary for the country? Are we going to argue forever about this thing? I think the majority leader and the minority leader had better get together and find some way to get the Senate functioning.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I hesitate to rise to speak at this hour of the morning, but there were some remarks made by the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from California with which I am in complete disagreement. Therefore, for the RECORD, and at the time the remarks are made, I wish to answer them.

As we all know, for a great many years prior to 1946 the Democrats were in control of the Senate. They did not take effective steps to adopt a cloture rule so as to make it possible to control filibustering in the Senate. So much, from the standpoint of the responsibility of the Democratic Party on this issue.

But during the Eightieth Congress the Republicans were in control of the Senate. What did the Republicans do about making that fight which sometime must be made if we are to check filibustering in the Senate? By and large, they did nothing. For a large part of that time the Senator from Nebraska was acting majority leader on the Republican side of the aisle. I want to say what I have said before, that the Republican Party cannot escape its responsibility between the years of 1946 and 1948 for not doing anything effective about checking the filibuster in the Senate. There is no question about the fact, at least in the cloak rooms, if they do not want to admit it on the floor of the Senate, that there is a general admission that a great deal of political strategy is taking place in regard to party position on this issue.

The responsibility of the Senate, Democrats and Republicans alike, who really want to do something about filibustering in the Senate, is to join forces and drive the filibuster off the floor of the Senate, by sitting here for as many hours and days and weeks as necessary to break it. I think we could break the present filibuster in 10 days if we were willing to sit here as Republicans and Democrats in continuous session to break it. Of course, it would cost a price; it would cost a price in respect to certain legislation; but the American people are never going to get rid of the practice of the filibuster in the Senate without paying a price, because whenever this fight is made, there is always going to be some important legislation backlogged as a result of it. I am willing to trust the American people on that issue, and I happen to hold to the point of view that an overwhelming majority of the American people want the practice of filibustering in the Senate stopped.

I also happen to hold to the point of view, contrary to that held by my good friend the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], for whom I have an exceedingly high respect, that the American people do not think it fantastic to make a fight for majority rule in the Senate. Why? It is the principle of majority rule that controls in the overwhelming majority of the State legislatures in limiting debate. It is majority rule that prevails in the House of Representatives in regard to a limitation of debate. Since when does it become fantastic to stand for the principle of majority rule in limiting debate in the Senate? The only thing fantastic about it is that there has been for many years a strong minority in the Senate from a section of our country that has taken the position it ought to have the right preserved to it to domineer the majority in the Senate by filibuster tactics.

They talk about our sitting here as ambassadors from our States. I say that notion of representation in the Senate died with Calhoun and with the War Between the States. We sit here, in my judgment, to do the people's business, and we cannot do the people's business, in my judgment, with any such pfoposal as I have heard from the lips of the Senator from Nebraska tonight, which he calls a compromise, that does not in effect involve a tightening of the cloture rule.

The statistics cited by the Senator from California and also by the Senator from Nebraska include pairs and dead pairs. Senators who have gone away and walked off the floor of the Senate cannot be included in any statistical analysis of what the effect of the proposal made by the Senator from Nebraska will be.

The Senator from Rhode Island is correct when he points out that in the last 19 cloture-petition attempts in the Senate, the average vote was 83. That means that in some instances the vote was down to 76. But what the Senator from California and the Senator from Nebraska are overlooking is that when there is a constitutional two-thirds requirement, men are encouraged to take "walk-out powders" in the Senate and let the Sergeant at Arms find them—if he can. Mr. President, if you will check up on the experiences of the attempts of the Sergeants at Arms over the years to find Senators who do not want to be found, I will tell you that the constitutional two-thirds majority will open the way, will open the door to some very unfortunate practices in the Senate if what we are actually trying to do is have an effective cloture rule against filibustering.

I said at one time that if I went along with anything other than a majority rule, I would go along with the Hayden-Wherry resolution. It does not make much difference whether I go along with it or not, because, for the present, I think the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], if they can get it to a vote, will get a majority vote for it in the Senate of the United States. But that will not solve the problem, because, in my judgment, time will show that it will not effectively check filibusters. We shall not check filibusters in this body until we come to majority rule. I am perfectly willing to let the last forum decide that, which will be the people of the Nation, if we have to take this issue to them in the next 4 to 6 years.

I desire to say, in closing, Mr. President, that I shall continue to fight for majority rule in the Senate, and I do not care what adjectives any colleague wants to attach to that fight for what I consider to be a basic tenet of American democracy. The Senator from California can call it fantastic if he wants to, but I will meet him anywhere in California, before his own constituents, and let them decide whether the issue I am fighting for in the Senate of the United States is fantastic, because I believe the people of America believe that the time has come to put majority rule into practice in the Senate. They will not reach the judgment, Mr. President, that it is fantastic.

I say to the Senator from Nebraska that I am not in the slightest degree interested in such a compromise as that which he has outlined tonight. The only way he will get it by me is by a motion by which I shall be outvoted. He will never get it by me on any parliamentary basis that requires unanimous consent.

I repeat what I have said several times since I have been in the Senate, that once again the time is here for Republicans to stand up and be counted before the minority groups of America who want to know whether we are going to protect their civil rights by meeting head-on this filibuster intimidation which is raised in this case, by continuous sessions for so long as it shall take to drive the filibusterers down in the fight which they are waging against the majority.

Mr. President, it was day before yesterday that a Senator stood up on the floor of the Senate and compared the fight which some of us are making for majority rule in the Senate with communistic tactics. Let me say that the commonest communistic tactic is to use minority devices to defeat the majority. That is my answer to that Senator who sought to spread on the RECORD the innuendo that those of us who are fighting for majority rule in the Senate of the United States are fighting for a communistic principle.

Once again I say, in closing, Mr. President, that I am willing at any time to let the American people decide whether the fight I have made, and which I shall continue to make, in the Senate for majority rule conforms to their idea of democratic processes.

Mr. HUMPHREY and Mr. TAYLOR addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I realize the lateness of the hour, but, as some Senator said a moment ago, there does not seem to be any great desire on the part of my colleagues to go to their restful homes. Apparently, every Senator has been properly excused by his beloved wife, and is permitted to have the evening out. On that basis, I should like to make a few remarks in reference to what I have just heard on the other side of the aisle from the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

I want the Senator from Oregon to know, referring to his comments of a few days ago in the Senate, that I took exception to one of his remarks in which he said he was the only Member of the Senate who upheld the position of the President of the United States as to the majority-rule principle in the application of cloture. I am sure that both of us, in discussing this subject in a friendly manner, realize that on this side of the aisle the junior Senator from Minnesota has stood for the majority-rule principle. I have stood for it, recognizing that there were not very many other adherents, but recognizing it was a sound principle; and I think I shall live to see the day when it is adopted in the Senate of the United States.

I have heard a great deal about compromise. I have attended some of the caucuses in which we have talked about compromise, and I have said, in no uncompromising terms, that I was not for any compromise beyond what has already been compromised in the Hayden-Wherry resolution. I submit to this body that the Hayden-Wherry resolution is compromise No. 1. Why do I say that? First of all, there are those of us who believe in majority rule. I gather from some of the remarks in this honorable body that it is almost subversive to favor majority rule in these days. But there are some Senators in this body who believe in unlimited debate, and between the poles of majority rule and unlimited debate, where there is no application of cloture, is a compromise which can be well termed a compromise of the Hayden-Wherry resolution. I am willing to support the Hayden-Wherry resolution—period. I am willing to support it because I recognize it to be a sensible, honorable compromise. I fully appreciate that we cannot all have our way, and I think it is about time we started talking about who gives when the giving needs to be done. It must come on both sides of a compromise, not simply on one side. There is not a single principle in American constitutional government which gives a minority an unrestrained right to obstruct the action of a majority.

I have heard tonight about a so-called constitutional two-thirds majority. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska that it is not a constitutional two-thirds majority; it is an unconstitutional two-thirds majority. I submit to the Members of the Senate that the Constitution of the United States, if it is based upon any one principle, is based upon the single principle of the ability of the majority of the Members of the House of Representatives and of the United States Senate to conduct the business of the Nation. I submit that in the Constitution, wherever there is any difference expressed, it is the exceptions which are outlined in the Constitution. The five particular exceptions in which a two-thirds vote is required—and not a two-thirds constitutional majority vote—we cannot find those words in the Constitution—are as follows:

A two-thirds vote is required for the submission of a constitutional amendment.

A two-thirds vote is required to expel a Member.

A two-thirds vote is required to pass a measure over the President's veto.

A two-thirds vote is required for the purpose of approving a treaty.

A two-thirds vote is required in the Senate when it sits as a court of impeachment.

Everything else in the Constitution is based upon the principle of the majority, all argument notwithstanding.

I should like to call something else to the attention of the Senate. We left the Articles of Confederation when we adopted the Constitution of the United States. The Articles of Confederation permitted a handful of States to place a veto upon the will of the majority. The Articles of Confederation provided, by their express terms, that 4 States out of the 13 could in many instances stop the whole processes of government. I submit to the Members of this honorable body that one of the reasons we abandoned the Articles of Confederation was because of the stalemate of government, the inactivity of government, the failure of government, because of the single fact that a willful minority could stop the onward progress of a majority.

Let me make a few other comments regarding majority rule. I have listened here, day in and day out, and I have attended the sessions of the Senate almost as attentively, and surely as patiently, as have most of the Members of the Senate. I have heard two terms bandied about in such manner that I could hardly believe my ears.

I was brought up to believe that there was no greater honor that could come to a man in this whole Nation than to be selected by his fellow citizens to serve in the greatest parliamentary body in the world, the Congress of the United States. I was likewise brought up to believe that human rights were far more important than property rights, that human rights were God-like in their nature.

I likewise was brought up to believe that a majority will make fewer mistakes in the long run than any selected minority. I never did believe in minority rule, nor do I now. I do not believe in minority rule in Europe. I do not believe in minority rule in America, even if it is by veto or negative action. Yet on the floor of the Senate I have heard repeatedly about the Constitution of this country, and the prerogatives of the Senate, that there is a great prerogative of the minority. If there is any prerogative in the Constitution it is the prerogative of the majority to conduct the business of the country, and not of the minority to obstruct it.

We have heard a great deal about the Constitution. That Constitution is a living instrument, it is an instrument which needs the full protection of every Member of the Senate. I did not take an oath to uphold the rules of the Senate; I took an oath of office to uphold the Constitution of the United States. I am not going to be a party to any kind of a compromise that will bind my hands, and the hands of others, as to changing the rules of the Senate by making it any more difficult to change them than it is now. Frankly I would much rather we would lose the fight on honest, decent principles than to go into some kind of a willy-nilly compromise which may prejudice us for the months and the years to come.

Mr. President, there are some other things I should like to say which have occurred to me since I have been a Member of the Senate. It used to be that back in the times of the feudal era the philosophers argued how many angels could dance on the point of a needle. Now it is getting to be wondered how many Senators can talk about a loophole in a rule.

We have heard much about the loopholes in the rules of the Senate. As has been so well stated by the Senator from Oregon, and as was so eloquently stated by the leader of my party, the Democratic Party, the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], the people of the United States of America are not really particularly concerned about some of the prerogatives of Senators. They are a great deal more concerned about some of the things which they want to see enacted into legislation.

At a time when we are trying to tell the whole world about the validity of constitutional government, at a time when we are trying to tell the world how American democracy works, at a time when we are trying to show to the people of Italy, who are under constant threat of totalitarian government, at a time when we are trying to show France that this Government will work, at a time when we are trying to pierce the iron curtain with our ideas, what are we doing here? We are making a circus out of the United States Senate. I say, as some other Senator said here tonight, it is indeed shameful, not shameful only because of what we do, but shameful because of some of the things that have been said.

I wonder what young boys and girls in the schools of America think when they hear distinguished Senators scorn the principle of majority rule. I wonder what young men and women think when they hear, it seems to me in a sort of indifferent manner, talk, and consideration of what we call civil rights.

Mr. President, I did not come here to pose any civil-rights legislation the first day, the second day, the first week, or the second week. I am not one of those who believe in priority legislation. I think all this legislation is important, and I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle think it is important. I think rent control is important; indeed, very important. I think the social-security program expansion is important, that Federal aid to education is important, that the Missouri Valley Authority and the Columbia Valley Authority are important, that the St. Lawrence waterway is important, that the ECA is important. But if we leave the rules of the Senate as they are now, or if we accept the so-called compromise—and I call it an unconstitutional compromise—there could be a filibuster on any one of these programs.

I am convinced, from what I have heard, that there are some who are not going to be too happy about the extension of rent control. How do I know we are not going to have a filibuster on that? I understand there are some not too happy about the North Atlantic Pact. Perhaps we will have a filibuster on that. I have heard there are some who are not too happy about the extension of ECA. I think it is about time we changed the rules in the way proposed, and I can believe, with the Senator from Oregon, that now, right now, is the time to change the rules.

Now just let me say one other thing. I said in our caucus the other day that there are some things I may not agree with, and let me give an example. There is flood control. We have had very few floods in the State of Minnesota. We have had minor overflows of creeks, and once in a while of a river. I do not know how some of my colleagues from the South would like to have the junior Senator from Minnesota stand up and conduct a filibuster on flood control. I know that would be absolutely ridiculous. Of course we need flood-control legislation and flood-control appropriations. That is giving to what we call the national welfare, giving to some people where they have not had a rain in 2 years, much less a flood.

How about support for cotton? I have not heard of any cotton being raised in my State, but I know the Government of the United States needs the Government support price for cotton, and I am going to try to go along with that kind of a program. If I wanted to stand up and say, "I believe in the right of the minority to have unlimited debate," we could stop that program, too. I have heard the Senator from Louisiana say he was not tired when he got through. I can assure him that my physique is fully capable of taking on as arduous a task as he has assumed, and take it on for possibly longer.

There are some not in favor of Federal aid to education. There have always been disputes as to that. Yet I submit that represented in this body are some States, more interested in education than others, that have been fighting this filibuster. In my State for every dollar we get we are going to give three. And so the program is not going to do me any good, and it would be the right of the minority to stand up and carry on the battle against it; but I take the national point of view.

That is not the way we built America. This is not 48 sovereign States; this is the United States of America. This is one Nation, indivisible, just one great United States, and the sooner we get it into our minds that we are living in the twentieth century, when everyone is important in every part of the country, the sooner we will get into our minds that every part of the country is dependent on the others. The sooner we make up our minds that we have to work together as a team and not singly, the sooner we will give America the kind of legislation it needs.

We have heard tonight of a constitutional two-thirds majority. I want the Senator from Nebraska to know that since 1917 only three times has there been, in 19 tries at the application of cloture, a constitutional majority. In only 12 out of 15 times, just 12, has there been even a simple majority. It does not seem to me that even the application of the simple majority principle would be too extreme.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Since 1917 has there been a single instance of an attempt to invoke cloture except in the case of the so-called civil-rights measures, as to which some Members of the Senate were willing not to be present when the voting occurred?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not have the facts as to that, but during the past 11 years there have been 6 attempts to close debate on the civil-rights bills, and the votes on none of those occasions were such that they would represent a two-thirds or constitutional majority. In six instances they did not even have a simple majority.

Mr. President, let me make my position clear. The fact that there was failure on civil-rights legislation then is no reason why we need to continue to fail. I am one of those who would like to meet with some of the gentlemen regarding this matter and see what we could work out. I heard the distinguished Representative from Arkansas, BROOKS HAYS, make a speech in which he had some very constructive proposals, not negative proposals, but positive, affirmative proposals, on civil-rights legislation. Whether we get civil rights in this session or not is not the issue. I submit to my friends who have been carrying on this filibuster that civil-rights legislation is just as inevitable as social-security legislation was. There were those who fought the social-security program in the same identical manner they are fighting the civil-rights program. We are not talking about civil rights here. We are talking about a rule in the United States Senate. Whatever it may be, that rule needs to be cleared up and made operative. I may say, Mr. President, that I did not write it. I have not been in the Senate long. Many other Senators have had much greater opportunity to deal with this matter than those of us who are freshmen Senators. But I can assure Senators that the people of the United States of America want the United States Senate to function, and they want it to function under the kind of rules by which they can secure the enactment of legislation.

They are not at all interested whether we are gentlemen to each other here. They are not at all interested whether we go around to each other and work these things out so we are all happy. The people of the country want to know that we are going to pass legislation about which they are going to be happy. We are the servants of the people, I remind the Senate. They are not our servants. The Congress belongs to the people. It does not belong to us. The rules of the Senate belong to the people. They do not belong to us. The Constitution is the mechanism by which the people of the United States can make their will felt in the processes of government. Sometimes I think we get so cozy, we become so secure when we get into our 6-year terms, that we forget that there may be some people out in the country who are expecting things to be done.

I should like to call to the attention of every Senator the brilliant address which was made on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]. Last night I read that address twice, once to myself and once to my family and friends. I asked the distinguished Senator from Florida how many of his colleagues were present to listen to him. He said, "A sizable number. Some came and some went." But I submit that there has been no address on the floor of the Senate which has more clearly presented the argument in behalf of the change of the rules than that which was made by the Senator from Florida. I think it should be must reading. Since we have prerogatives, let us have a prerogative on reading for each and every one of us, to apply ourselves just a little bit to reading that very important elucidation of the facts pertaining to this particular issue.

I wanted to say what I have said, Mr. President, because frankly I think it needs to be said. I think it has been said

by others, but I wanted it said from this side. I say to the Senator from Oregon, if he can talk his colleagues on his side of the aisle into favoring majority rule, we will work on our colleagues on this side, and I say to the Senator from Oregon that if he cannot, then let us adopt the Hayden-Wherry resolution. But, for goodness' sake, let us not permit ourselves to be talked into something that is called a compromise, which is not a compromise at all. Compromise was made in the Committee on Rules and Administration. That is where the compromise was made. That is all the compromise the junior Senator from Minnesota is going to stand for so far as his vote is concerned.

I think, if Senators go back to their people and ask them what they think about the matter, they will learn that the position which has been announced over here is the position that has pretty much public support. It might not be a bad idea if we all take that position.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate very much longer, but I feel that some brief remarks and observations are necessary to be made before a motion is made to take a recess.

When the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration came to me earlier in the evening and said he desired to talk to me about a further compromise with respect to the pending matter, we recalled that in the earlier part of the evening we found it impossible to reach an agreement. I gave the information to the press at that time that we could not reach an agreement; that I would return to the floor of the Senate and at the first available opportunity move to adjourn, and that I hoped I might be able to secure enough votes to carry the motion.

In the meantime I heard it rumored back and forth that I was not going to secure the votes to adjourn, which would have been perfectly all right with me. So far as the majority leader is concerned, I am willing to assume the responsibility for what has happened up to now. My good friend, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] has suggested that we are going to have to assume that responsibility, and I am willing to assume the responsibility for the move which has been made up to now.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the minority leader, said he wanted to talk to me, so the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and I went and talked to the minority leader. He said, "Senator LUCAS, I think there is an opportunity probably to compromise this thing and settle it yet, if you are willing to have the Senate take a recess rather than adjourn tonight." He said, "I will talk to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] about it."

I have not heard yet from either one of those Senators in the debate. I should like to know whether the arrangement is satisfactory to either the Senator from Virginia or the Senator from Georgia with respect to adjournment or the taking of a recess. Both Senators are just as vitally interested and probably more so with respect to this situation than are the Senator from Illinois or the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. President, I am an agreeable man, a sympathetic individual, but at the same time there comes a time for action, and I feel that that time has come. Never since I have been in the Senate has it been more necessary for the Senate to do one thing or another; either to accept the compromise which was proposed this afternoon by the Senator from Illinois or take some other action. As I told those with whom I conferred, I would have to come before my committee again, but I thought I could sell that idea to them, and I would be glad to try it, and that I was for it myself.

Mr. President, we have either got to fish or cut bait. The time has arrived for action. I see the log jam of important legislation there now is. Rent control is an extremely important matter. It must be considered by the United States Senate before the date of the expiration of the rent-control law. If we are going to have round-the-clock sessions, as some of my distinguished friends have suggested, it will simply mean that no legislation of any kind can be considered by a single committee of the United States Senate, because we have been given notice that under those circumstances no committee would be permitted to meet, and under those circumstances, Mr. President, as majority leader, I would refuse to permit any kind or character of unanimous-consent request to go through the Senate. So if round-the-clock sessions are to be the program, then there absolutely can be no action of any kind.

I know that some Senators would love that kind of a program. I know that some Senators would like to see everything presented by President Truman in his campaign last year go down to defeat. I know that there is a great deal behind this effort. Senators are not fooling the American people with this kind of a proposition. The trouble is that 9 times out of 10 the American people are far ahead of every individual Senator. They know what is going on. We cannot fool anyone.

Mr. President, I never expected to participate in this kind of debate tonight. I was under the impression that we were going to return to the Senate Chamber, that I would make a brief statement about adjourning, and that my friend from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] would say that he thought we could reach a compromise, and perhaps suggest a recess. But instead of that, the time had come for individual Senators who wanted to make certain speeches about what happened, and spread themselves on the floor of the United States Senate, to which I have no objection. But I did not quite have that understanding. It is perfectly all right to do that. I have enjoyed the speeches; especially did I enjoy the speech of my good friend from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], in which he chided the minority leader and the majority leader because we were arguing over who did this, and who did that. I think there was some merit in what he said.

After all, it does not make much difference. There may be a slight misunderstanding here and there. The question finally is, Are we going to get action or are we not? I do not want anyone to question my good faith with respect to any meeting which I attended.

Mr. President, I am about to make a motion that the Senate take a recess. I am going to keep that agreement. I do not know whether Senators will vote with me or not. I may not be able to carry the vote. I understand that the coalition is strong enough to keep us from either taking a recess or adjourning, if it wishes to do so. That is perfectly all right with me, if they want to do it. In the mean time, if we take a recess and can work out something in the morning before noon, I shall certainly be very happy to do it. But when we come back at noon tomorrow, if we cannot reach some agreement, I hope I can get the Senate to agree with me and adjourn in order that we may take up important measures which are now pending on the calendar.

Mr. President, I should like to ask my good friend the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] if he agrees with the arrangement which the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] has suggested, if he was a party to it, or if he knows anything about it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, would the Senator mind repeating his question?

Mr. LUCAS. I merely stated that the Senator from Nebraska came to me and said that if we would take a recess until tomorrow he thought there was an excellent opportunity to reach some compromise, and that he wished to make one further effort to do so. He stated that he would talk with the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Virginia to see if that plan was satisfactory. I wonder if he did talk with the Senator from Georgia, and whether or not the proposal is satisfactory to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska did consult with the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from Georgia, and asked us if we would not participate in one further conference. I want to be perfectly frank with the Senator from Illinois. In view of the attitude which has been taken, I think there is only a faint hope of accomplishing anything. I told the Senator from Nebraska that I would try to be reasonable, and would attend conferences on this matter to the end.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from Georgia. I have never questioned the statement made by the Senator from Nebraska, but I wanted to corroborate it on the floor of the Senate, because up to this time neither the Senator from Georgia nor the Senator from Virginia has said anything about the tentative agreement or understanding which they had with respect to further conferences tomorrow.

RECESS

Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon today.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 25 minutes a. m., Tuesday, March 15, 1949), the Senate took a recess until 12 o'clock meridian of the same day.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 14, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Holy Spirit, the divine presence in our lives whereby we find strength and help in time of need, come Thou to our waiting hearts and minds as we pray.

We bring to Thee our sins because Thou art willing to forgive; we bring to Thee our weakness because Thou art willing to strengthen; we bring to Thee our ignorance, even as the night brings its darkness to the morning; we bring to Thee our souls because Thou art willing to cleanse.

In hope and gladness, with free minds to serve and warm hearts to love, do Thou lead us on, and Thine shall be the glory forever. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 11, 1949, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

JEAN NESS

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 144) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Jean Ness, sister of Wm. M. Ness, late an employee of the House of Representatives, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death and an additional amount not to exceed $250 toward defraying the funeral expenses of said Wm. M. Ness.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE PRINTING ACT OF JANUARY 12, 1895

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 1579) to amend the Printing Act of January 12, 1895, as amended, with respect to the printing of extra copies of congressional hearings and other documents.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That so much of paragraph 4 of section 2 of the Printing Act of January 12, 1895, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 edition, title 44, sec. 133), as precedes the second proviso therein is hereby amended to read as follows:

"PAR. 4. Orders for printing extra copies, otherwise than herein provided for, shall be by simple, concurrent, or joint resolution. Either House may print extra copies to the amount of $1,200 by simple resolution; if the cost exceeds that sum, the printing shall be ordered by concurrent resolution, except when the resolution is self-appropriating, when it shall be by joint resolution. Such resolutions, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported: *Provided*, That the printing of additional copies may be performed upon orders of the Joint Committee on Printing within a limit of $700 in cost in any one instance:".

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 6, after the word "on", strike out the word "Printing" and insert "House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPOSITION OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE AIR FORCE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 148), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1437) to authorize the composition of the Army of the United States and the Air Force of the United States, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 137) authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction (Rept. No. 261), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct thorough studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI (1) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, and for such purposes the said committee or any subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

That the said committee shall report to the House of Representatives during the present Congress the results of their studies and investigations with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 25 minutes today following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday next following the legislative business of the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'NEILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. SIMS (at the request of Mr. HARE) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Post.

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances, in one to include three articles from the Chicago Sun-Times and in the other an article from the New York Times.

Mr. ELLIOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from two constituents and an article from the Washington Post; also, to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address by Mr. Kent Leavitt, president of the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, before the annual convention of the Mississippi Valley Association in St. Louis on February 7, 1949.

Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an

editorial from the Phoenix Star appearing as a guest editorial in the Monthly Press.

Mr. MACK of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a table of fish imports in recent years.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MACK of Washington addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution of the General Court of Massachusetts relative to the development of the waterways of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial and in the other a letter from a man in New York, a worker for the Western Union, who indicates how many people are out of employment through the excise taxes.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Gen. John Thomas Taylor, of the American Legion, and a short statement by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include newspaper articles.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the National Furniture Manufacturing Co., of Evansville, Ind.

Mr. RIBICOFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a proclamation by the governor of the State of Connecticut.

Mr. MONRONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the New York Times and an article from the Wall Street Journal.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

AMERICAN INDUSTRY GOING ABROAD

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. I noticed in the paper on Saturday that the Remington Rand Co., of Syracuse, N. Y., an organization which employs 1,200 people, is moving its plant over to Scotland. Why?

Mr. Speaker, I want the tariffs kept that were formerly placed on merchandise coming into our country for protection of American labor and industry. These reciprocal trade agreements are going to ruin this country; reducing tariffs without consent of Congress. The laboring people will have no work, the manufacturing plants will be closed down or move to some foreign country, and the people of the country will be in the bread lines again if we do not keep our tariff laws. It will be a sorry day if we do not do away with these reciprocal trade agreements for America, American industries, American labor, and the high standard of American living.

When we note that the Remington Rand Co. is moving to Scotland, when we see the Waltham Watch Co. closed down on account of watches coming in from Switzerland, and when we observe the woolen mills of Massachusetts being moved to Burma, it will result in the people of this country being unemployed. No work, no pay, no food; all living on the Government. Then the Government goes broke.

I say let us revise the tariff immediately. Before our industries move abroad in order to meet competition. Do away with the reciprocal trade agreements. It is time for us Americans to look after our own American business, our own American living, and our own high standard of living. Duty-free imports total $4,118,200,000 in 1948, an all-time high, and represents a 20-percent increase over 1947.

Dutiable imports into the United States amounted to $2,919,700,000 in 1948, an increase of 32 percent over 1947. These figures show you what I mean, when I say let us put our tariff laws into effect and, instead of cutting them down, raise them up before we lose our own markets for the American industries; before our labor is out of jobs; before our industries move to foreign countries where labor is cheap; a word to the wise is sufficient. Act and act now.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include certain excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

RENT CONTROL

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for the floor in order to say that on tomorrow an effort will be made to write a little self-determination, a little home rule, a little Americanism, into the rent-control bill. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] will offer an amendment which will provide that any municipality or other subdivision of government may get from under the law by simply resoluting to that effect.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is, in my judgment, a subtle approach to state socialism, and what fools we are to hug such a dangerous measure to our bosom when we know that they are sapping the lifeblood of the Nation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Altoona Tribune.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Secretary of Defense Forrestal.

RENT CONTROL

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I was glad to hear that the gentleman from Mississippi will offer an amendment to the rent-control bill that might put it back into local control. I have always felt that the best government is that which is kept close to the people. I also have an amendment which approaches it in similar language, except that I provide that when a State or political subdivision by a vote of the people decides that they do not want rent control, that will settle the matter. It would no longer be necessary for the officials in that community to come to Washington hat in hand and say, "Please. Our people decide they do not want rent control, can we follow their wishes?" It is done by the vote of the people. Is there anything wrong with that approach?

We ought to trust the people at home to handle their own affairs.

The amendment I propose is as follows:

Amendment to H. R. 1731:

Page 35, in line 18 strike out the quotation marks, and after line 18 insert the following subsection:

"(j) In any case where, in an initiative or referendum voted on at a general or special election held in any State, or in any county, municipality, or other political subdivision of a State, a majority of the qualified voters voting on such initiative or referendum vote in favor of termination of Federal rent control in such State, county, municipality or political subdivision, the provisions of this title shall be inapplicable to such State, county, municipality, or political subdivision after the tenth day following the date on which such general or special election was held."

RENT CONTROL

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I do not quite get this idea of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX]. If I am correct, he wants to let the States or the local communities decide whether they should have rent control. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] wants to let the people in certain smaller areas decide whether they want it or not. I would like to ask the two gentlemen to explain some time just where they get the idea that even the States, or the people in the community, say, in a township, by vote can take your property from you, your rent money, give it to me, or open your door and let me come in and squat in your house as a tenant for a certain sum as rent. I do not get that idea at all. I do not see how that can be done under our form of government.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. COX. I did not mean to be understood that I should vote for the continuation of the law under any circumstances.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COX. I am against it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I never could understand how it could be constitutional. I know the Constitution does not make much difference any more, but I cannot understand how the rent-control law is fair or just.

THE HONORABLE MARY T. NORTON

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the house for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, whenever any individual Member of the House of Representatives is honored, we all feel happy and we all feel proud, because in any individual Member of the House being honored, in its broader sense, the House itself is honored.

One of the most beloved and one of the most able and conscientious Members of this body, who has served in it for years, is the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON]. Whether one agrees with her political views or not—and I agree with all of them—we all have deep respect for her and a profound feeling of friendship of an abiding nature. MARY NORTON is an unusual lady. She is a great fighter and she has those sweet qualities of charity, love of God and love of neighbor, that makes her near and dear to all who know MARY NORTON. She has received many honors in the past, but recently, on March 6, she received a most unusual honor, a plaque awarded by the International Relations Club of St. Elizabeth's College in New Jersey for outstanding service in national affairs. This club has been in existence for 25 years, and this is the first award it has ever given to any person. It is one of many such clubs and colleges throughout the country that are studying and debating the problems presented to the United Nations and their relation to world peace. These clubs are organized for the purpose of supporting international relations and contributing toward establishing a future permanent peace.

We are all proud of MARY NORTON. The House, I know, will join with me in expressing to the International Relations Club of St. Elizabeth's College in New Jersey our congratulations on selecting this sweet lady, our outstanding Member, for this award. I also know all the Members of the House will join me in congratulating MARY NORTON on this latest honor she has received.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I rise simply to make the observation that this, the first honor bestowed by this organization, could not have been better bestowed.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate the observation very much. I might also say that some of the other honors MARY NORTON has received are as follows:

1930: The first degree of doctor of laws ever conferred by the College of St. Elizabeth, the oldest women's college in New Jersey, in recognition of service in welfare and Government.

1937: The degree of doctor of laws from Rider College, Trenton, N. J., for distinguished service to State and Nation.

1946: A citation from the Women's National Press Club, awarded for the most important contribution to Government in 1946.

1947: The siena medal of the Theta Phi Alpha Sorority (National Catholic University Women) conferred by Archbishop Cushing, of Boston, as the outstanding Catholic woman of the year.

These honors, as well as the latest one she has received have been conferred upon MARY NORTON because she has earned such splendid recognitions. We all rejoice with Mrs. NORTON in the happiness that is hers in the latest honor she has received.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Sunday Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RIVERS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SANBORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

RENT-CONTROL BILL

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an amendment I intend to offer to the rent-control bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] for the remarks he made just a moment ago about the amendment I intend to offer to the rent-control bill tomorrow. I intend to explain this matter thoroughly tomorrow on the floor, but in order that the Members may know what the amendment contains, I include it in my remarks at this time. It is as follows:

On page 35, line 18, strike out the quotation marks, and after line 18, insert the following subsection:

"(j) If the legislature or comparable governing body of any State, municipality, county, or other political subdivision declares by resolution that Federal rent control is no longer needed in such State, municipality, county, or political subdivision, and transmits a certified copy of such resolution to the Housing Expediter, the provisions of this title shall be inapplicable to such State, municipality, county, or political subdivision 15 days after such certified copy shall have been mailed by registered mail to the Housing Expediter."

DISTRICT DAY

The SPEAKER. This is District day. The Chair recognizes the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN].

PROVIDING ADDITIONAL REVENUE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3347) to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia; and pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not more than 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the ranking minority member of the committee and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3347, with Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask for this time to announce to the membership that the bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act and to provide for rural telephones which was put on this week's legislative program for Wednesday will not come up on that day, but

will follow the civil-functions appropriation bill on Friday. If there is no time to take it up on that day, it will come up on some later date, probably the following week.

There is also one other change in the program. A resolution to grant to the Committee on Agriculture the ordinary powers of a committee to investigate was reported out by the Committee on Rules after I had announced the program. I have conferred with the distinguished minority leader. If possible, that will come up sometime this week, either Monday, Tuesday or Wednesday.

Later in the day I intend to ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourn today it adjourn to meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock. I make this announcement now so that the Members may be aware of my intention and govern themselves accordingly.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. May I say to the gentleman that that is perfectly agreeable to me.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, we have before us for consideration today the revenue bill for the District of Columbia; that is the tax bill. It is a rather complicated bill and there are a great many questions to be asked and answered. I would like the House to have an intelligent knowledge of what is in the bill and will seek to give them that knowledge, but I cannot do it very well with a lot of conversation on the floor, and I hope that those gentlemen who desire or need to converse will do so outside of the Chamber, because a great many of the Members here are interested in this bill and it is a very controversial measure.

Mr. Chairman, we find that the budget for the District of Columbia is going to be short about $18,000,000 this year. It is going to be short $18,000,000 if the House and the other body agree to the retroactive pay raise for the District employees. You will remember that last year there was a general raise for civil-service employees. The bill for the District of Columbia employees was contingent upon the passage of the Revenue Act. The Revenue Act did not pass, and therefore they did not get that raise. The District Committee is of the opinion that they should have had that pay along with other civil-service employees and therefore they have again reported a similar bill.

It will cost $10,000,000 to carry that through. Aside from that, the budget is $8,000,000 in the red. The question has arisen before the Senate and House Committees on the District of Columbia as to how that fund shall be raised.

There is a minority report here which claims that we should tax somebody else and in some other way. Your committee has been struggling and struggling with this financial problem of the District of Columbia for a great many years. We proposed year before last what we thought was a fair and just income tax, and that is the proposal of the opposition today—that we have an income tax. Well, we tried that 2 years ago and the House flatly turned it down. We believe that the fairest and most equitable tax is a 2 percent sales tax, with certain exemptions, and which parallels, to a very large extent, the bill now in force in the adjoining jurisdiction of Maryland. If we do not do that, I do not know where you are going to get the money to carry on the business of the District of Columbia.

Some folks may think that we have an extravagant budget for the District. I want to say to you in that connection that the budget for the District of Columbia was cut to the bone this year. There is a crying need here for many capital improvements, such as schools and various and sundry other public institutions. This budget is $18,000,000 in the red and does not carry a single dollar for new capital improvements. The only thing in the budget for capital improvements is a continuation of certain projects already authorized and now under construction.

We are hopeful that if the House will agree with the committee which has put in a great deal of time and effort and hearings on this matter, we will have solved one problem that has consumed a great deal of the time of the Congress in late years, and put the budget of the District of Columbia on a sound financial basis.

I might say that this bill, with a few minor changes, was passed by the House last year. We went through all this struggle and all this fight last year, and the bill was, passed by a substantial majority. It was killed by a filibuster in the Senate on the part of one Member, in the closing days of the session, when there was no time to give it adequate consideration.

As I say, this bill is substantially the same bill that was passed last year. Last year, for the first time, we considered the matter by a joint committee of the Senate and House, and we held joint hearings. We heard everybody who desired to be heard. The hearings lasted for several weeks. This year again we held joint hearings with the Senate and House, and we heard everybody who asked to be heard, both for and against the measure. After hearing them all, this committee came out with a unanimous report in both the Senate and House, recommending the passage of this bill.

We have put in a great deal of hard work on this matter. I know that a sales tax is a controversial measure in some areas, but it is the only solution of the difficulty we see, and we do hope that the House will give some weight to the time and energy and hearings that have been put on by the joint committee that considers the fiscal affairs for the District in all of its ramifications.

I should like for the House to know what organizations in the District recommended this bill. You have heard a lot of talk around here about home rule, letting the people of Washington have what they want to have. That is what our joint committee tried to do, we tried to find out what the people of Washington wanted. There appeared before us and recommended the passage of this bill representatives of the Washington Board of Trade, the Washington Taxpayers' Association, the Fiscal Relations Committee of the Federation of Citizens Associations of the District of Columbia. The Federation of Citizens Associations of the District, as you know, represents all of the civic associations throughout the District of Columbia, and this bill had their full and complete approval. Those are the people who are going to have to pay this tax, and that is what they want. Now, if you wish the people of Washington in some measure to have what they want, why not give them the sales tax which the Citizens Association as a whole through their several organizations have recommended to this Congress? It was also recommended by the representatives of the Junior Board of Commerce, by the Federation of Business Men's Associations, by the Northwest Council of Citizens Associations, and by the Federation of Women's Clubs, the people who do most of the shopping and will have to pay the tax. Those organizations have unqualifiedly recommended the passage of this bill. It has also been editorially endorsed time and again, and again this year by the leading newspapers of Washington—the Washington Post, the Washington Star, and the Washington Times-Herald have all recommended it editorially.

It might be interesting, since I have said who recommended it, to say who came and opposed it. The wholesale liquor dealers of Washington came in and expressed their opposition to a sales tax.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Virginia two additional minutes.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The Central Labor Union opposed it. The Progressive Party of Washington, that is the Henry Wallace party, opposed the sales tax.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Not at the moment.

The Americans for Democratic Action——

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-seven Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 26]

Barden	Davies, N. Y.	Harrison
Barrett, Pa.	Dawson	Hart
Blatnik	Dingell	Hays, Ark.
Boykin	Ellsworth	Hébert
Buckley, Ill.	Engle, Calif.	Heffernan
Buckley, N. Y.	Feighan	Heller
Bulwinkle	Fogarty	Herter
Burnside	Fulton	Hoffman, Ill.
Canfield	Gathings	Horan
Carlyle	Gilmer	Javits
Celler	Gordon	Jenison
Chelf	Gorski, Ill.	Keating
Chudoff	Gossett	Kelley
Corbett	Granahan	Keogh
Coudert	Hale	Latham
Davenport	Harris	Lesinski

Linehan	Poulson	Smith, Ohio
McGrath	Powell	Smith, Wis.
Marshall	Quinn	Somers
Morton	Reed, N. Y.	Tackett
Murdock	Richards	Taylor
Murphy	Riehlman	Thomas, N. J.
Nelson	Sadlak	Trimble
Norrell	St. George	Walter
O'Konski	Scott, Hardie	Weichel
O'Toole	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	White, Idaho
Patterson	Shafer	Willis
Pfeifer, Joseph L.	Short	Wilson, Okla.
Philbin	Smathers	Wood
		Woodhouse

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 3347, finding itself without a quorum, he directed a roll to be called, when 324 Members answered to their names, disclosing that a quorum was present, and he submitted herewith a list of the absentees for printing in the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I was interrupted by the roll call. I had about completed my statement and was on the point of yielding to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] for a question, which I am now happy to do. I do not see him present. I therefore yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 25 minutes.

Mr. Chairman——

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a consent request?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD following the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the bill before the committee this afternoon is the so-called revenue bill for the District of Columbia; in other words, it is a revenue-raising bill that will provide means by which we can meet the obligations of the District government. As everyone knows, the operation of the District government is under the control of the Commissioners appointed by the President, yet the determination of how much money can be spent must be made by the Congress. The appropriation bill providing for those expenditures recently passed the House. That bill carried with it appropriations of approximately $99,000,000, after a cut of $4,000,000 in the budget estimates. At the present time, considering the financial condition of the District, I believe I may well say that perhaps there is no large city in the United States that is facing a more difficult financial condition than the District of Columbia. With a budget estimate submitted to Congress of $103,000,000, we find ourselves on the basis of present revenue sources approximately $8,000,000 short of the requirements of the District. At the present time several bills are pending before Congress providing for increases in salaries to all District employees, including the teachers, firemen, policemen, and all other civil employees, of $330 a year, which is the so-called cost-of-living bill increase that passed a year ago for all Federal employees but did not pass the Congress last year for District employees because there was not a sufficient amount of revenue available to meet the increases. If the salary increase of $330 is approved for the fiscal year 1950 for all District employees the same as it was for Federal employees, that will add $5,000,000 more to the deficit, making $13,000,000. If we make the salary schedules retroactive to July 1, 1948, another full year, then we will add $5,000,000 more; in other words, we shall have a total deficit of $18,000,000 facing the District if those salary bills are approved by Congress for the fiscal year 1950.

Mr. Chairman, I have been associated with municipal work for nearly 30 years; I have been in all ends of the work, municipal taxation, finance, and administration. Along with other Members of Congress, I have served on the District Committee for the reason that I want to make our contribution in a nonpartisan way to the welfare of the Capital City of the Nation. We give a great deal of time to that committee work in order to be helpful in maintaining a decent government for the District of Columbia and to see to it that the administration is proper from the standpoint of meeting the requirement of the people of the District as well as the many visitors.

We are facing a deficit of $18,000,000. The question arises as to how we are going to provide the revenue. I do not like a sales tax. I have consistently opposed the sales tax for 10 years on the floor of this House, ever since the so-called Pond report in 1939. I have been one of the spearheads against the sales tax for the reason I felt that perhaps from other sources we could meet the requirements of the District government without resorting to a sales tax. But when we are facing a situation where we need $18,000,000 more if the salary bill becomes law, then we must resort to some new source of revenue in order to meet those obligations.

It may be said that we ought to broaden the income tax. Well, along with my opposition to the sales tax for 10 years I have been consistently supporting, urging, and spearheading the drive in Congress to broaden the income tax so that we could have more money from that source, but the Congress every year has turned down that legislation.

In 1939 I offered the first District income-tax bill on the floor of this House. It was an amendment to the tax-revenue bill. It was approved that year and has been law ever since.

In the submission of a sales-tax bill for consideration of the House this year we are doing exactly what we did a year ago in a bill that passed the House but failed in the Senate because of lack of time and due to lack of time and nonpassage of the revenue bill a year ago all the District employees have suffered the loss of a so-called increase in salaries and wages.

The bill that we have before us today will provide nearly enough money within a limited degree to meet all the requirements of the District government. In other words, while this bill will not meet the entire $18,000,000 deficit it will raise $16,000,000 in itself and there are other sources that may be made available in order to make up the deficiency of $2,000,000.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KLEIN. Can the gentleman tell me how much it is estimated will be obtained from title IV which are the amendments to the income-tax act of the District?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. We will lose approximately $1,500,000 in additional income-tax receipts. We are changing the income-tax law from an exemption of $1,000 which prevails in the present law to an exemption of $5,000. The reason for that is we are recommending a sales tax which will be felt more severely by what we call the low-income group. In other words, we do not want to superimpose a sales tax on the low-income group and force them to pay not only an income tax but also a sales tax.

Mr. KLEIN. If we do not have those amendments we actually would be obtaining additional revenue which would increase the revenues to the District?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That is on the income tax but it is only $1,500,000 whereas our deficit is approximately $18,000,000 if we are to meet the payroll requirements.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LYNCH. I know the gentleman has been heretofore opposed to the sales tax and I assume it is only because of the stringent financial necessity that he is now in favor of it. But I refer particularly to line 24, page 3, pertaining to the sale of advertising space and sale of radio and television advertising. As we know, the power to tax is the power to destroy. If we are going to tax advertising in papers no matter for what purpose the advertising may be, or even advertising over the radio and television, does not the gentleman think that is a rather bad precedent to start?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Well, of course, what we are up against here is to find the most equitable way by which we can raise this $18,000,000. There was no substantial objection, in fact. I have heard of no opposition within the District

to the tax on advertising space or sales of radio and television advertising. It seems to me that that is a legitimate form of taxing. If we are to tax a million things that people wear and eat as they go to a restaurant, surely we should be satisfied that the tax on newspaper and radio advertising is not unjust. That will bring in, in that particular item, about half a million a year.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The gentleman, in giving us the estimated revenue from that section that imposes a sales tax on advertising through the newspapers, radio, and television, has answered the question I had in mind.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Now, then, of course, we have an amendment in committee by those who felt that the sales tax ought to be broadened and to include food; in fact, there was quite a heated discussion in the committee when an amendment was offered by a Member to make food taxable. But, we felt that because of the widespread criticism that would be leveled at a bill that would impose a tax on food for home consumption, we should eliminate food as an exemption from the bill.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. LYNCH. Of course, I appreciate the gentleman's position, but when you have any tax it is more or less a deterrent. Now, if you have a tax on advertising, I should think that it would be a deterrent for sales so that your real purpose would be defeated by preventing the advertising of other objects which, if taxed and brought before the public notice, would give you a better return than the tax on the advertising.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Of course, it has always been said, and I have probably used the language myself, that the sales tax in itself is perhaps one of the most deterrent taxes that we have. But we are forced into the situation where we either have to do one of three things: First, adopt the bill as we now have it before us; or, second, broaden the income-tax bill as we have attempted to do on recommendation of our committee for 10 years to include all people domiciled in the District; or, third, increase the real-estate tax, which was increased only 2 years ago 30 percent over and above what they paid the year before that.

If we meet these requirements from the real-estate tax, then the property tax itself will nearly double within a period of 2 years, and I do not believe that any member of the committee wants a thing of that sort to happen. So, we are trying to find some way out of this dilemma; if we could get an income tax in a broadened fashion, so that we could not only broaden the number available for taxation, but we also could increase the rate and bring it more in line with other jurisdictions.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I want to compliment the gentleman for his long and effective efforts here on behalf of the fiscal problems of the District of Columbia. I wonder if he could give us some idea as to the number of transient visitors in the District, on an annual basis, and the amount they possibly might spend?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Of course, I have heard many estimates of the amount of money spent in the District by visitors, up as high as sixty-five or more million dollars a year. But I think for the most part those are pure guesses.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. LYNCH. As I understand the gentleman's position it is this, that even if you had an income tax such as you have been in favor of previously, you would not have proposed this sales tax in this bill now?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I frankly say that the income tax that the committee has recommended down through a period of many years—myself and Mr. Dirksen have spearheaded the fight—for the establishment of a broader income tax in the District each year for 10 years, but without success, because of the domiciliary provisions in the bill that the Members of Congress did not like, and they defeated that legislation. That may have brought in around $10,000,000 on the basis of the present rates. If we double the rates, and that would bring them in line with the rates existing in other tax districts, it would meet the requirements of this budget.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. Is it not a fact that in the gentleman's proposal to decrease the exemption on income tax that actually what you are doing to the poor people you are talking about is this: You are trading them a possibility of paying 1 percent on income but you are throwing a burden on them of 2 percent with this sales tax?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Of course, there is no imposition of any tax on what we call poor people under the income provisions of this bill because in order to be assessed under the income-tax provisions of this bill one's net income must exceed $5,000 a year.

Mr. GRANGER. As I understood the gentleman, he said the reason this exemption is made is to let the poor people out from under so they would not pay, too, but what you are actually doing is making them pay 2 percent instead of the 1 percent they would pay as income tax.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That would be on the basis of total income, but they would pay no income tax under the present bill. The present law applies to all those receiving income in excess of $1,000. The income-tax rate applied under this bill applies to incomes of $5,000 or over. Everybody with a net income of under $5,000 is tax-exempt under the the provisions of this income-tax law, but, of course, they become subject to the provisions of the sales-tax law.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SCUDDER. I should like to clarify paragraph (g) of section 1 regarding foods that are sold for home consumption. A similar provision was in the California law and created a great amount of dissatisfaction. The legislature in its widom finally eliminated that feature. I believe that is a direct tax on the poor people, and so is not reasonable as a tax. I believe the inclusion of this provision will hamper the function of the bill.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman knows that the sale of food for home consumption is exempted under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. SCUDDER. I did not read it so.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Food for home consumption is exempted under the provisions of this bill. I say again that in most sales-tax jurisdictions food is taxed, and it is not under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. This is a tax applying in the District of Columbia. Does it have any exemption as far as diplomats and foreign visitors are concerned, or do they pay the same tax as we Americans are required to pay?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. They pay the same taxes we do here, as far as the sales tax applies.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I understand that some of the diplomatic corps avoid the excise tax in this country when they go down to buy things that have an excise tax on them, because they are foreigners and associated with the diplomatic corps.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The only ones exempted under the provisions of this bill are sales to the United States or the District or any instrumentality thereof, or sales to a State or any of its political subdivisions, if such State grants a similar exemption to the District. As used in this subsection, the term "State" means the several States, Territories, and possessions of the United States. There is no reference to the diplomatic corps. They pay the tax.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Then it is the gentleman's interpretation of the bill that the tax would apply to everybody who buys things in the District of Columbia.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. At retail; tangible personal property, yes.

As I said before, the only question is, What do we have as an obtainable alternative to the sales tax, the revision of the income tax, the use tax, and the excise tax, as contained in this bill?

The three alternatives that we have before us and I mentioned a moment ago. One is a very substantial increase in the real-estate tax in order to meet the requirements of the budget which, in substance, will nearly double the real-estate tax in the period of 3 years within the District. Secondly, to broaden the income tax which Congress on every occasion down through the past 10 years has

denied; and thirdly, whether or not we will adopt those sources of revenue included in this bill that will meet the District requirements.

It may be said, of course, that there is another alternative, that will meet in part the problem facing the District, and that is to borrow money for what we call capital outlay permanent improvement projects. In the bill this year we have about $15,000,000 for major capital improvements in the general fund, that is, for school buildings, municipal buildings, and so forth, the water fund for the construction and reconstruction of new enterprises in that department, and then in the highway fund for highway purposes. But this bill deals directly and entirely with one of the three funds, namely the general fund. It has nothing to do with the water fund, because the water fund is self-supporting, not only as to ordinary expenses, but on capital outlays. The highway fund is self-supporting, both for maintenance, operation, and capital outlay and is about $7,000,000 a year. But there is a deficiency of about $8,000,000 in what we call the general fund and it is from that fund that the sources of revenue are developed to run all the other activities of the District outside of water and highway activities.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr. KLEIN. The gentleman mentioned the fact that just 2 years ago the real-estate tax in the District was raised. Is it not a fact that in spite of that raise the tax rate on real estate in the District of Columbia is lower than in any other city of comparable size in the United States?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Of course the gentleman has answered that question on many occasions in the past because naturally he was interested in it. I believe that all of us will admit that through a period of many years Washington has enjoyed a very low tax rate and tax bill. But in order to meet the requirements of 2 years ago the assessors in the District of Columbia revalued all the properties on an average of about 20 percent. In addition to that we increased the tax rate from $1.75 to $2 per $100. The total percentage of increase in the tax bill of any taxpayer in the District of Columbia on real or personal property increased approximately 30 percent from 1947 to 1948. If we meet these requirements, of the present deficit of $18,000,000 through a property tax, the tax bill of 1937 will be nearly doubled in 1950.

Mr. KLEIN. In spite of that, and taking into consideration the increase in the assessed valuation, the tax paid by real-estate owners in the District of Columbia is still less than any other city of comparable size in the United States.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I think it is fair to assume that the tax bill, with the adjusted tax rate in the District of Columbia, is very much lower than most of the large cities in the United States. But I think we ought to permit property owners to become adjusted to the so-called increased tax burden, especially when we have rent control in the District and all the other elements of cost, such as maintenance and operation are going up sky high and at the same time the tax bill has increased 30 percent in a period of 2 years.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, a member of the committee.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. The gentleman would agree, would he not, that if the tax rate on real estate is increased, that added burden will fall largely on apartments and small residences which in turn will mean a greater burden upon the renter?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Naturally there will be an automatic increase in the rent of every tenant in the District because the rent-control law permits the rent-control board here to take into consideration increased costs due to increases in taxes which may occur within the District.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me to make an observation on the question of an alternative tax?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. There has been introduced in this Congress and there was introduced last year a proposal which I think was sponsored by Mr. Milton Kronheim to fix the price on the sale of liquor in the District which would raise about $20,000,000 a year additional from consumers which money is going into the pockets of the people who run the 350-plus liquor stores in the District of Columbia.

If this District would monopolize the sales of liquor, as my State of Michigan does and as a number of other States do, you could raise $20,000,000 revenue per annum at no additional cost to the consumers of liquor in this District, and meet this deficit and get rid of the sales tax and be on your way. For that reason I am against this bill and propose to vote against it if I get an opportunity.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Of course, that is very easily said, but certainly more difficult to accomplish, because the question of how you are going to regulate the liquor business in the District of Columbia has to be settled by the Congress. It is not a revenue-producing proposition. As we consider the revenue bill in the District, we must rely on what we consider to be the present sources of revenue and any new sources we are attempting to develop, as we have set out in this bill.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. KUNKEL. How much additional revenue did the increase in the valuation of the property in the District of Columbia, plus the increase in the tax rate, produce in round figures?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I do not know just at this moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes.

I have the figures here. I can quickly tell the gentleman what those increases were.

After that bill was put into effect in 1947 the real estate revenues increased from $24,000,000 in 1947 to $31,514,554 in 1948. Tangible property revenues, which also comes in for assessment at the local rate, increased from $3,705,933 to $5,274,614. In addition to that, we have motor vehicles that are also assessed on the personal property at the same rate. Those revenues increased from $1,676,480 in 1947 to $2,527,255 in 1948. So the increase in assessed value in 1947, plus the 25-cent increase in the rate, yielded about $9,158,256 additional revenue from property sources.

I hope that the Members will very carefully consider this bill, in the light of what we are experiencing in the District of Columbia. It must be kept in mind, as I close my statement, that there is not one cent in the budget this year for what we call construction of new school buildings, over and above those already authorized and for which appropriations are made in the budget this year. I trust that this bill, with perhaps one or two minor changes, will be approved by the House.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. I wonder if the gentleman knows that the subject which this bill seeks to tax on page 3, line 24, that is, advertising space in the newspapers, and so forth, also radio and television, has already been declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I have not heard of anything of that kind, and no opposition developed to that provision of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the remainder of my time.

WE LIVE IN A NEW WORLD

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, offhand, refueling of a giant bomber in the air may not sound as revolutionary as the atom bomb. Taken together, however, those two achievements have created a new world.

The splitting of the atom has destroyed matter. The ability to fly anywhere, any time, has destroyed space.

Two and a half years before the atomic bomb fell on Hiroshima, members of the House Appropriations Subcommittee for the Army and Air Force, in a super-secret hearing, learned the objectives of the Manhattan project. The secret was never broken.

Within the past 2 years, the same committee learned that refueling in mid-air had been successfully accomplished and that gigantic bombers were being designed and fitted to do the job. Last week, that became a secret no longer.

And, when a Minnesota boy by the name of Capt. James Gallagher recently piloted a big B-50 bomber on a flight completely around the world without once touching ground, he dropped an atomic bomb on a lot of arguments for big carriers and overseas bases.

For, now it is a demonstrated fact that not only can a bomber leave from the

Air Force base in Rapid City, S. Dak., for example, and deliver a bomb load on any part of the northern hemisphere in Europe and Asia, but it can return to that base—given only some flying tankers to escort it part way and meet it coming back.

It has been my consistent conviction that developments of this sort are far more important in stopping Stalin and company, than all the millions of words hurled in his direction and all the billions of dollars that could be poured into Europe.

Theodore Roosevelt said, "Speak softly and carry a big stick." To one Congressman, at least, that is still our best foreign policy.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, ever since I have been a Member of this House, for over 42 years, certain interests have always tried to impose a sales tax on the people of the Nation as well as the people of the District of Columbia.

Now, as to the District of Columbia, the gentleman stated that the valuation had increased 30 percent in the last 10 or 12 years. I know from my own experience that the actual valuation of real estate in the last 12 years has increased from 200 to 800 percent. Rents have increased, income has increased, business has increased for businessmen and property owners. They feel they can impose upon those who can least afford to pay a sales tax, including those perhaps 30 percent of the people who just cannot afford to have their own homes and who are obliged to live out in rooming houses and eat in public, medium- and low-priced restaurants where thousands of Government employees and workers must frequent. I do not hesitate to tax the people who live in large hotels, because they can pay the tax.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] adroitly called attention to those who were against the tax and mentioned the liquor dealers, the Progressive and Democratic organizations, and so on. He did not mention the fact that housewives and thousands of others affected were in opposition to the sales tax.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Chairman, I did not mention the Democratic organization; on the contrary, the President recommended it. I mentioned that the Americans for Democratic Action and the Wallace Progressive Party were opposing this bill.

Mr. SABATH. The Democratic organization is a progressive organization and is always with the people and for the people.

Now, of course, the gentleman from Virginia will not suffer; his people will not pay the tax.

This tax will not only be 2 percent, but it will mean 3 and 4 percent, because on small purchases, less than a dollar, they will still pay 2 cents, and on less than a quarter they will pay 1 cent, and so on.

The people will go to Virginia, to Arlington and neighboring towns, to make their purchases; naturally the gentleman from Virginia is for this bill, because it will help his district, and I do not blame him. But it will be against the best interests of the businessmen and the people of this city.

I know that real estate can stand an increase of at least 25 percent and still leave Washington as the lowest city in real estate taxes in the United States.

We have here also, it should be remembered, thousands of people who own a large number of securities, bonds, and personal property; why do we not tax them? If they were properly and honestly taxed, there would be no difficulty in raising the money that the District needs. We in Illinois during the Hoover time upped the sales tax, because the State and cities were practically broke and in debt. Nearly one-third of the money paid by the consumers never reached the State. Such will be the case here. It will never reach the treasury of the District. Consequently, I think it is an unfair tax and should not be imposed.

We had an election in the State of Illinois, and the Democratic candidate for governor, during the campaign, severely criticized the sales tax. That Republican-controlled State was carried by him by more than half a million votes because the people were sick and tired of various aspects of the sales tax. Consequently, I believe that the sales tax should be eliminated from this bill and a proper tax placed on those who can afford to pay and who should be made to pay.

To sum up, the provision in H. R. 3347, providing for a retail sales tax, for those residents of the District of Columbia, is unnecessary, unjust, and discriminatory. There are other and more practical means of meeting the fiscal needs of the District of Columbia than by the imposition of a tax burdensome on those who should not and cannot be taxed further.

Those in the lower-income brackets are already hard put to meet the necessary expenditures of home upkeep. The cost of adequate clothing and shelter for the poor man and his family represent a budget which, if he meets it at all, leaves him poor indeed. And this situation is well known and is admitted on all sides as truly existing. To add to his worries, to his growing inadequacies, the average resident in the District of Columbia finds that he is to be required to pay a retail sales tax, while those better able to pay are left unnoticed and alone to escape their fair and just obligations. As I said before, here in the District of Columbia, the values of real estate have advanced and increased many times their values during the past years. We have the admission that in spite of a 30-percent increase in real estate taxes since 1937, the tax rate in the District of Columbia is lower than any city of comparable size in the United States. Yet, and in spite of this truth, no attempt is made, no suggestion is offered, to require real estate to shoulder its obligations and help defray costs of the operations of the Government of the District of Columbia.

Is there a more discriminating legislation than that which relieves those who profit on the one hand, while inveighing upon those who profit not?

Today, in the District of Columbia, the owner and holder of real estate lives in comparative ease, in a modern Utopia, compared with the lot of his tenants—the average worker.

This proposed legislation is un-American, is badly thought out, and irrational. It should be given more constructive thinking. Other avenues should be traversed, such as taxing personal property, bonds and securities, for example. Also to be explored is the proper administration of an income tax, which places the responsibility properly upon those, who, with large incomes, are permitted to evade payment of an income tax, because as they claim, they are paying income tax in their home State. The adoption of this aspect of the bill would affect the purse of thousands of veterans, school children, their teachers, and visitors to our National Capital, from which visits they receive inspiration and patriotic impulses.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman from Illinois made a personal allusion to me in his statement to the effect that I was supporting this bill because it would favor Virginia merchants. I am afraid the gentleman from Illinois has done what he sometimes has done heretofore; namely, neglected to read the bill to which he refers.

If the gentleman from Illinois had read the bill that he undertakes to get up here and criticize on the floor of the House he would find on page 35, title II, the compensating use tax which requires all purchases outside of the District and brought in here for use to be taxed as they would be taxed if the sale took place in the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Will the committee explain why in the exemptions that they propose they exempt from this tax the sale of tickets for admission to places of amusement and sports, yet by the same bill it imposes a tax upon the meal that you eat when you go into a restaurant or hotel. Which of these does the committee think more essential, the meal or the ticket of admission?

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I think one of the advocates of this bill has the floor, possibly he might want to answer that. I do not think it ought to be taken out of my time. I am against the bill, so I want everything out of it.

Mr. Chairman, we are back to the same argument, the same debate, that we had in the last session of the Congress and the session before that, on the matter of whether an income tax or a sales tax is the answer to the fiscal problems of the District. At the outset I want to commend the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from Massachusetts, with whom I have served on the Subcommittee on Fiscal Affairs. It is a hard job to be able to find sources of revenue for the District. It is like a man out in the middle of the ocean. He wants a drink, but he cannot drink the water. It is "Water, water everywhere, but not a drop to drink." There is plenty of money here in the District and plenty of sources of revenue, but, unfortunately, many Members who do not live in the District all year may have their own personal axes to grind, and so we cannot pass legislation of this kind.

I think what is going on here today is a good argument for home rule in the District. If the District had elected Representatives who were responsive only to the people that elected them, they could have a sales tax if the people wanted it.

We have these questions of District legislation coming up time and time again. Members are opposed to some as, for instance, to daylight saving time, but for no reason other than the prejudices of their constituents back home, which should have no bearing on District legislation.

Mr. Chairman, it is elementary that a sales tax is the most unfair type of taxation imaginable. The essence of a fair system of taxation is taxing a person according to his ability to pay. That is why an income tax is fair. If a man makes a large amount of money, he should pay a large tax. If he makes little money he pays a little tax and if he does not make any money, he should not pay any tax at all.

What does a sales tax do? A sales tax taxes everybody equally whether they earn a lot of money, whether they earn little or no money at all. Even for the bare essentials of life, which are taxed by this bill, a poor man pays the same tax regardless of his ability to pay, as does the rich man. That, I say, is unfair.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman says this tax hits everybody. That is true. But what about all the other people who have property and have more ability to pay, do they not have other taxes to catch them?

Mr. KLEIN. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then what is the matter with it?

Mr. KLEIN. The gentleman from Michigan, who is well known as being a——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Let us skip all of that and give me an answer.

Mr. KLEIN. You pay the same tax as I would. That is why it is unfair.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, no. I pay the 2 cents or whatever it is on a sales tax. You have to pay on that big income you get. You see where they catch you in addition?

Mr. KLEIN. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not have to pay that.

Mr. KLEIN. But nevertheless, I think a man with more income ought to pay more taxes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, he does.

Mr. KLEIN. Now, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] has mentioned the alternatives, to this form of taxation and he has mentioned them as well and as fairly as anybody could. He has brought out the fact that the real-estate tax in the District has recently been raised, I think he said 30 percent since 1937, and just recently 2 years ago, the tax rate was raised and the assessed valuations were increased. But, that is no excuse for still having the tax rate too low. And, you heard him admit on the floor that in spite of that the tax rate in the District of Columbia is lower than any other city of comparable size in the entire United States. While I do not want the tax rate to be brought up where it is beyond the ability to pay, it seems to me that the property owners in the District should bear their fair share of the tax burden. Sixty-five million dollars per year is spent in the District by visitors to the National Capital. It seems to me, therefore, that these people who benefit by that ought to pay some part of the tax cost out of it.

The next point that we have here is the question of the income tax. I will offer an amendment, when the bill is being read, to take the sales-tax feature of this bill out. It would leave the income tax, but increase the rates. Now, look what they do in this bill, as regards the income tax. The rates are reduced, and the gentleman from Massachusetts admitted that they would lose money; that this is not meant as a revenue-raising measure. However, I have introduced a bill, in the last session and in this session, which I think would answer the problem. It would raise $15,000,000 a year; an income tax which would be a fair way of taxing the people, which would tax all wage earners in the District except those of very low income. Let me point out one loophole in our present income-tax law. We have income-tax laws in the District, but the people are able to escape paying their taxes, for this reason. Take my own State. We have a State income tax. It would not be fair for the residents of the State of New York, who work for the Federal Government down here, to pay local taxes here, because they pay them in the State of New York. However, they use that as a subterfuge. The people in the District can get an exemption in the District by claiming they pay the tax back in their home State. In their home State they do not pay it because they claim they paid it in the District of Columbia. That is a loophole that should be plugged up.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The gentleman refers to a situation which involves fraud. I do not see how you will ever pass income-tax legislation if it is left solely on the ground of fraud.

Mr. KLEIN. I think if it were written into the law it would be very specific. If a person pays taxes in his own State, he should be made to show a receipt and exhibit it for the purpose of exemption. This may be a question of administration. My point is that if you leave the exemption as it is and increase the tax rates, that would raise $15,000,000, which would be as much as we could expect from the sales tax. And, it is a fairer means of raising revenue.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, the sales tax became popular during the depression when many of the taxable elements disappeared and others were taxed almost to confiscation. Now times have gotten better. Eight of the States who imposed a sales tax during the depression have repealed it, and the State of Virginia recently refused to adopt the sales tax as a method of raising revenue.

If the District of Columbia were in a crisis I certainly would support the enactment of a sales tax, but the facts show that rather than being in a crisis the District of Columbia is sitting pretty. The District of Columbia is the most lightly taxed community for its size in the country. The per capita income is 90 percent above the average in the United States. The property tax is among the lowest. We have no sales tax. There is no income tax in this District, for all practical purposes.

How should we raise the necessary funds? One method is to pass the bill H. R. 1385, which would provide $15,900,000. That is the Klein bill. Another method would be to increase the ad valorem tax, which is now $2 per hundred. An increase of 25 cents in the ad valorem tax would bring an increase of $4,000,000.

Another method might be to increase the Federal payment, which is now $12,000,000. In 1925 the Federal Government agreed to pay 25 percent of the money needed to run the District. It is now 12 percent. Perhaps they could increase it to 16 percent, which would raise another $12,000,000.

Perhaps another technique would be to repeal the law of 1878, which forbids any indebtedness for this District. If that was done, we could get a lot of capital improvements made that are greatly needed.

If these four techniques were enacted, all on a small scale, they would bring about the necessary $16,000,000. I suggest to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] that this bill be recommitted and all of these possible means of raising funds could be explored. Instead of having a sales tax we could have

partially an increase in the ad valorem tax, partially an increase in the Federal payment, partially an increase in the bonded indebtedness, and partially an increase in the income tax along the line suggested by H. R. 3347.

The sales tax is most unfair. It puts the major burden on the people in the lowest income groups. I believe that with the suggestions we have made we could find a satisfactory solution to the problem of raising funds to pay for the District necessities.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I suppose the gentleman knows well that for the past 10 years, especially last year, we did attempt to get through the income tax of which he is speaking, but because of the domiciliary aspects of the bill the House overwhelmingly defeated it, amended it, and practically nullified the income tax law in the District. So today we receive only about $3,500,000 from personal income. If you will give us the bill we have recommended for 10 years here, we will get that revenue. If you do not give us that bill, then the bill before us is about the only reasonable alternative.

Mr. KENNEDY. What would the gentleman think of increasing the Federal payment, increasing the ad valorem tax by 25 cents, repealing the law of 1878 to allow bonded indebtedness so we could have more capital improvements, and increasing the income tax now in the bill?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Let us take No. 1, as to the Federal contribution. In 1937, when we were revising the tax structure here, I recommended and the Committee on Appropriations gave $4,000,000 over the $8,000,000 that was already given, an increase of 50 percent in the Federal contribution, which is now $12,000,000 a year. If you want to give more, it is all right with me.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, a good deal has been said about the lower rate of taxes on real estate in the District of Columbia. At $2 per $100 that is a low rate; but the rate is only effective when the valuation of the premises is considered. While the rate is low, the valuations in the District of Columbia are probably higher in proportion to the real value than any other place in the United States. It is the product of the rate multiplied by the assessed valuation that is of real importance.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. According to the Detroit Bureau of Economic Research, when divers tax rates were adjusted on the basis of 100 of the leading 10 cities Boston was at the top and Washington, D. C., was the lowest.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is what the gentleman may say.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman, but I would like to have another minute.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I will yield the gentleman additional time, if it is necessary.

Mr. Chairman, those figures of the Detroit Bureau were tabulated before the 1947 revision of property values in the District of Columbia.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is probably true. I have in my pocket a real-estate tax bill covering property in the District of Columbia and I know something about it.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional half minute to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, the valuations by assessment in the District of Columbia are exceedingly high. Another thing that ought to be pointed out is the fact that a very large proportion of the land in the District of Columbia is owned by the Federal Government and is not taxable. There are hundreds of eleemosynary institutions in the District of Columbia owning large parcels of land. There are all sorts of institutions here, religious and otherwise, which pay no taxes whatsoever. The taxable property in the District is limited to what remains after subtracting the tax-free property.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer briefly to the subject of the tax on radio advertising. On page 11 of the bill, line 15, section (b) we find exempted from the sales tax those things which the State would be without power to tax under the limitation of the Constitution of the United States. I think in all probability radio advertising is interstate commerce and would not be subject to tax in the District of Columbia, in spite of the fact that the committee has taxed it in the bill. I think it is an unconstitutional provision in the bill and I would be very glad to vote for its exclusion.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, this is my first year on the District Committee. We only had one meeting of the full committee before it passed this bill out with a favorable recommendation. I confess that I was not satisfied with the bill and I would feel derelict in my duty if I accepted any such important piece of legislation without further exploring and satisfying myself that there was no other way of raising the revenues for the District of Columbia except those methods suggested in the bill which includes a sales tax. I am very much opposed to a sales tax for reasons that have been stated here. I know the evils of the sales tax. To me it is discriminatory and repressive. I want to make it very clear that I realize the necessity for raising money and for keeping the budget of the District of Columbia in balance. I also feel that the pay raise for teachers, firemen, policemen, and all employees of the District of Columbia is long overdue and that it should be made retroactive to July 1, 1948. This requires the raising of about 10 additional millions of dollars. On the basis of the figures for 1946, which were the latest that I was able to obtain, I find that in Baltimore about 61 percent of the revenue necessary to run that city is collected from the ad valorem tax on real estate. In Boston about 60 percent is collected from the ad valorem tax on real estate. The same is true for Pittsburgh; in San Francisco 75 percent of the revenue comes from the tax on real property. In Milwaukee about 60 percent.

In Buffalo about 75 percent; while in the District of Columbia, as of 1946, we took only 43 percent of the revenue necessary to run the city, from taxes on real estate.

As of 1947 the rates of taxation within the District, compared with a number of other cities, showed that the average per $1,000 was about $29.13, while in the District they are paying about $20. To me that $10,000,000 can be readily raised by raising the tax rate on real estate in the District to $2.50 per $1,000, still well below the average of the major cities within its classification throughout the country.

I submit if we pay a higher rational ad valorem tax in other cities I can see no reason why the people who live in the District of Columbia should not be forced to pay that at a comparable level. To me the argument is fatuous that you say because for a long time the rate of tax was allowed to lag and that it was only last year that it was adjusted. This is no argument why it should not be brought into harmony with the taxes throughout the Nation in cities of comparable size. If we do that we are placing this tax more nearly where it belongs. Then there will be no excuse for changing the base for the income tax.

I again submit to you people of good will that it is pretty hard to justify to a man who is getting $50 a week where he is benefited by giving him an exemption of $5,000 on his income tax.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. Is it fair to say that the ad valorem tax in the District of Columbia is lower than in any comparable city in the United States and that the income tax is lower than any income tax in any State in the Union, and that the liquor tax is exceptionally low in the District of Columbia?

Mr. MILLER of California. As far as I know, from the data that has been furnished me—and I have every reason to believe that it is correct—I would be forced to agree that the matter of the ad valorem tax in the District of Columbia is exceptionally low.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may include in my remarks the tables from which this data was taken.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

1946

	General expenditures			Revenues			Percentage of property tax to general revenues
	Current	Debt retirement	Total	Property tax	Other local taxes	Total revenues	
Boston	$81,691,000	$13,562,000	$94,653,000	$62,420	$2,445	$89,762	0.60
Washington, D. C.	62,669,000	166,000	62,835,000	29,126	26,783	67,612	.43
Baltimore	60,662,000	5,102,000	65,764,000	42,045	3,306	65,971	.61
San Francisco	43,398,000	3,520,000	46,918,000	31,629	1,317	46,391	.75
Buffalo	34,763,000	9,779,000	44,542,000	30,776	1,044	44,650	.75
Milwaukee	35,035,000		35,035,000	24,331	1,102	40,900	.60
Cleveland	33,777,000	4,960,000	38,737,000	23,063	576	38,476	.60
St. Louis	28,052,000	4,266,000	32,318,000	19,831	9,619	34,510	.60
Pittsburgh	20,261,000	4,213,000	24,474,000	19,223	653	23,604	.60

Source: Bureau of the Census.

1947 comparative tax rates on property

	Actual tax rates per $1,000					Estimated rates of assessed to true value	Adjusted tax rate
	City	School	County	State	Total		
Boston	$33.25	$9.76	$2.27	$1.22	$46.50	$100	$46.50
Buffalo	22.01	7.50	10.81		40.32	100	40.32
Pittsburgh	20.13	11.75	8.38	None	40.26	100	40.26
Milwaukee	14.75	12.46	11.73	$0.24	39.18	84	33.41
Baltimore	29.60		None	1.00	30.60	100	30.60
San Francisco	42.55	13.67		None	56.20	50	28.10
St. Louis	17.70	9.00	None	$0.70	27.40	100	27.40
Cleveland	15.80	9.80	$4.10	None	29.70	75	22.28
Washington, D. C.	20.00		None	None	20.00	100	20.00
Average					34.28		29.13

Source: Compiled by Detroit Bureau of Governmental Research from data furnished by city officials and members of the Governmental Research Association. Published in the National Municipal Review, January 1948.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, the first time that I came to the well of this House to make a speech was for the purpose of supporting such a bill as the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] is now advocating.

We were unsuccessful, and by the O'Hara amendment we were precluded from imposing an income tax on a large segment of the people who reside in the District of Columbia and who are in the employ of the Federal Government. So when we took into account the great number of times we have been here to make an effort for a fair coverage by income tax and we have been defeated, for that reason we felt that this tax, the sales tax, was the tax of last resort. I assure you it was with a great deal of reluctance that we were forced to this conclusion. We took into account the ad valorem tax in the District of Columbia. During the Eightieth Congress we increased the ad valorem tax by 25 cents, from $1.75 to $2 per hundred.

During the period 1940 to 1948 the District of Columbia had the highest percentage increase of any city of comparable size in the United States. The tax increase during these years was 31.6 percent, or a total increase of $383,000,000. The next highest increase was the city of Baltimore; then followed St. Louis, Milwaukee, and Boston. Boston, incidentally, had an increase in ad valorem taxes of $62,210,000. So we felt that to make the tax less painful we would not impose any additional ad valorem tax at this time.

Another reason why we did not resort to an advalorem increase was that we found that an increase of ad valorem taxes necessary to raise the amount of $15,000,000 would cost the wage earner who is the head of a household an average of $52; whereas, to impose a sales tax would only increase his payment by $19. So you see by this sales tax we have worked a lesser hardship upon the small-income groups than had we imposed additional ad valorem taxes which would be reflected in the rent increases that would automatically follow.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. I notice the gentleman stated that an increase in ad valorem taxes would cost the average property owner forty dollars to fifty dollars.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Fifty-two dollars is the figure which was submitted to the committee.

Mr. MILLER of California. And the figure of $19 is based on a per capita estimate; is it not?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. No; the figures I have just given were based on the head of a household.

Mr. MILLER of California. Only a $19-a-year increase to the head of a household because of a sales tax?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That is the figure estimated, because we have been most liberal in making exemptions to take care of the basic requirements such as food and medicines.

Mr. MILLER of California. Our sales tax in California is a little higher than that, but I am astounded to hear that it is only $19 a year on the basis of the head of a household.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. As a matter of fact, the gentleman from Illinois stated as one of the organizations which supported an increase in the ad valorem taxes were the Americans for Democratic Action. As a matter of fact, this organization opposed any additions to the real-estate property tax for the simple reason that it meant that the rent payer would absorb the entire cost of the increase in ad valorem taxes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield one additional minute to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I wish to point out that last year, during 1948, the tourists visiting Washington spent something like $65,000,000. Under the sales-tax provisions of this bill the visitors to the District of Columbia would have paid approximately 7 percent of the entire revenues accruing under this bill.

I wish to impress upon the members of the committee that we have worked long and hard and realistically on this bill, knowing that we must provide the services and the necessities for the corporate enterprise of Washington to go along without serious injury. We felt an obligation to pay increases in wages similar to that afforded other Federal employees, and for that reason we have fashioned a bill that we believe will satisfy the great needs that are imposed by the various wants of the people of the District.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlemen from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I have very reluctantly come to the position of supporting a sales tax. I say that because the great State of Nebraska, where I come from, has neither a sales tax, an income tax or bonded indebtedness. That is something for some of your States to shoot at. We pay as we go, which I think is a good thing. It is a fine recommendation to all governments and political subdivisions.

I have come reluctantly to the support of a sales tax because after very careful consideration by the committees of the House and Senate, and after consideration by the Commissioners and other groups in the District of Columbia, the conclusion has been reached that a sales tax is necessary. I have been asked by several groups in the last few days to state my position on the sales tax. I prefer not to support it if we could raise the money some place else. In these groups that came to me I found there were two members of the families of two different groups who were employed in Washington and making a salary of from $6,000 to $8,000 between them. I asked them, "Do you pay an income tax?" "No, we do not pay an income tax." "Do you have children going to school?" "Yes, we send children to school."

I have come to my own conclusion that here is a group of people, a very large group in Washington, D. C., that have all of the advantages and privileges of good government and the schools but pay very, very litle for those privileges.

Then there are a large number of tourists that come here and spend upwards of $65,000,000 in Washington that require the District of Columbia to have extra policemen and extra facilities to handle those visitors. It does seem that

they ought to help just a little in paying some of this increased cost.

You either adopt a sales tax or you are going to have a larger Federal contribution to the District of Columbia, and I am not adverse to that. The Federal contribution, instead of being $12,000,000, with a million dollars for water, ought to be maybe $18,000,000 or $20,000,000. But you are going to have to raise that to $25,000,000 or $30,000,000 if you do not have a sales tax. So you will be saying to the people back home, "I do not think the people of the District ought to carry that burden; you back home ought to carry some of the burdens of the people of the District of Columbia."

Then, again, some of you want the employees of the District of Columbia to have an increase in pay. If that is going to come about, then you are going to adopt a sales tax.

I may say, too, that I have a definite feeling the property taxes are not as high as they should be. I think they ought to be $2.75 or even $3 a hundred. I think it has been too low in the past. I would write into this bill that the property tax should be at least $2.50 a hundred on actual valuation.

I would also point out that in the bill we are considering today the net income-tax reduction starts at $5,000, while over in the State of Virginia and Maryland the net-income reduction starts at $1,000. Most of the States have $1,000. I think that is going to cause some of the folks living in the District of Columbia to say, "Well, I am a resident now of the District of Columbia," particularly if they live over in Maryland or Virginia or some States that have a lower income-tax exemption. That is something to think about, too.

I am convinced there are a great many people enjoying the privileges of good government in the District of Columbia who are not paying a proper amount to support that good government. For that reason, I come very reluctantly to the question of a sales tax.

It seems to me the District of Columbia ought to be a model city; it ought to be a city to which the people of the world point with pride. At the present time it is not such a city. There are several reasons for that. One is lack of home rule. So I say to you folks who are objecting to a sales tax either accept it or place a bigger tax burden on the folks in the several States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I, too, think that Washington should be a model city so that the citizens of the United States, when they come here, would see a city run as it should be and not a city depending upon the sales tax for its revenue. I fear that if this District sales tax goes through the next step will be the imposition of a national sales tax. I feel also that insofar as the needs of the city and the District are both concerned, that we have a good alternative in the arguments offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. I have no hesitation whatever in being against a sales tax because there is no question in my mind but that it will be the poor who will pay it all the time and pay the most.

The sales tax is regressive. Instead of attempting to lessen inequality in incomes, as a sound tax system should do, a sales tax tends to defeat this objective. It reduces the consumption of the poor, but only the savings of the rich. Poorer persons spend a larger proportion—usually all—of their income on the necessaries of life, and thus pay a larger share of their income in taxes. The more children there are in the family, the more likely it is that the total income will go for the bare necessities. Persons on relief, the unemployed, student veterans, retired employees, all would be especially burdened by a sales tax. Instead of exempting amounts considered necessary for subsistence, as the income tax does, the sales tax exempts amounts saved and (instead) taxes what is spent for subsistence. The sales tax is in effect on income tax with no exemptions, except for the rich who are exempt on all they don't happen to spend.

Sales taxes tend to reduce effective purchasing power of the low-income groups which must be depended upon to buy the bulk of America's products. In periods of declining economic activity, the tax may help to speed the downward trend.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HUBER. I note with interest that the gentleman has mentioned the fact that he is opposed to the imposition of a general Federal sales tax. I quote from the Democratic platform: "We are opposed to the imposition of a general Federal sales tax." I agree with the gentleman that this would be the first step. Does he not agree?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I certainly do and I am glad that the gentleman from Ohio has called the attention of the House to the pledge of our party.

Often sales taxes so cut into the wages of those on whom they fall that they lower standards of living. They are based neither on the ability to pay nor benefits received. They seize upon the act of purchasing as the occasion for a tax. They exact the tax in bad times as well as in good times—because people must live. Tribute must be paid even when the unemployed draw on small savings for the needs of life. It is ironical that this very fact—stability of yield—is often urged by proponents of the sales tax as one of its major virtues.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Does not the gentleman feel that it would be a lot fairer to first give the people of the District of Columbia suffrage and let them decide the issue for themselves?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think that would be much more fair.

The great revenues produced by a sales tax, as well as the constancy of the yield—assuming the revenues are great and the yield constant—are arguments against the sales tax, rather than for it. They tend to increase the magnitude of the injustice. To argue for a tax on the ground that it exacts from the poor the same toll in depressed times that it does in good times seems to lack a sense of proportion. But what magic is there about one method of collection—the sales tax—that does these things that cannot be done by another method of collection—the income tax? The real measure of the amount of the tax that can be taken from the people is the amount that can be drawn from them without impairing their usefulness, and without interfering with the economy. If the tax—a sales tax—reduces consumption, as it inevitably must, then it becomes a tax which reduces production, and creates unemployment.

The fact that a few pennies at a time are taken by the retail sales tax, and that the consumer is unaware of the total burden he bears over the year, is hardly an argument for such a tax. Certainly taxpayer ignorance of burden is no virtue. Rather it is a fault. Any statements as to ease of administration and low cost of collection frequently overlook the fact that the retailer is forced to assume the role of unwilling and unpaid tax collector. The burden is especially heavy for the small firm. There will be times too when firms will not be able to pass on the tax to consumers, and so it will fall with unequal effect on all firms. And all firms will suffer from the activities of dishonest firms which are given an additional opportunity to chisel and defraud. The consumer has no way of knowing that the tax exacted from him ever finds its way into the coffers of the Government. Tax consciousness as an argument in support of a retail sales is very weak. It must be clear that there is little relation between interest in Government and taxes on consumption.

The retail sales tax, in addition to imposing a great burden on the retailer, also penalizes him to the extent that it encourages consumers to buy from stores outside the taxing jurisdiction. Purchases can be made of course either by traveling direct to the nontaxing jurisdiction, or by mail orders.

The use tax—tax on the use, storage, or consumption of property bought outside the jurisdiction for use therein—can be easily evaded in most cases. It can only be applied to goods that cannot be easily concealed. A substantial exemption has to be granted, and thus the local merchant is still at a disadvantage. The use tax, to the extent it is imposed, is in reality a burden and a barrier to interstate commerce.

Mr. Chairman, I shall vote to recommit this bill unless the sales-tax provision is deleted, and I shall vote against its final passage if the sales tax is retained therein. I hope we will have a roll call on this measure so everyone can stand up and be counted.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that the imposition of

taxes is one of the unpleasant legislative responsibilities we, as legislators, have. This sales-tax bill was considered for approximately 2 months of hearings last year, and at least several weeks of hearings this year. The joint subcommittees of the House and the Senate have unanimously prepared, and the House side of it has brought before you, what is the best judgment that can be produced in the way of a sales-tax bill.

I think any sales tax is a matter of nuisance. Personally, I think everyone in this country, whether rich or poor, should know what the payment of taxes is, and his responsibility as a citizen. I think it is unfortunate when we talk about this being a poor man's tax or a rich man's tax. I think it is both. It has to be.

Some who oppose this bill, and they were a minority in the committee, urged the increase of the income tax. I shall take up each of the arguments as they were presented. Let us say that you reduce the exemption on the income tax to $500 or $1,000. The poor people are going to pay proportionately more under that type of taxation than they will, I believe, under the income-plus-sales-tax provision of this bill.

Let us take the next feature that is talked about, particularly by some of the gentlemen who oppose this bill. They suggest that you increase the real-estate taxes. The poor person with an income of $2,500, $3,000, or $4,000, if real-estate taxes are raised, will pay considerably more either as rent or as taxes on his little home than he would be paying proportionately under this bill. It just adds up that way regardless of what may be said, because higher real-estate taxes mean higher tax payments by the little property owner and higher rent payments by the little renter.

It is argued here that we could avoid this tax bill by making a higher Federal contribution. Of course, one of the most painless methods and that which affords a opportunity for a little demagoguery is to come before the House asking for a higher Federal contribution. Consider the fact, however, that 49 percent of the real property in the District of Columbia is owned or occupied by the Federal Government and is exempt from taxation. Personally I favor a higher Federal contribution toward the expenses of running the District of Columbia, but I believe that that is only one of the items. We are approaching a situation where there is a tremendous shortage of schools in the District of Columbia for both white and colored children. We are having a terrific problem in meeting that expense. Personally I hate to see the District of Columbia going into a bonded indebtedness because sooner or later we, ourselves, or our children and the people who live in the District have to pay those bonds. They will keep on mounting and mounting, so that eventually you will have something approaching a tremendous debt in itself. Personally I feel very strongly that the only out we have and the fairest out we have is increasing tax revenues by a sales tax.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. REES. As I understand, the gentleman is certainly in favor of the proposition that owners of real estate in the District of Columbia should pay just as much taxes as they do in Minnesota, Kansas, and other States. While it has been argued that the tax rate is supposed to be 100 percent in the District of Columbia, there have not been any examples suggested by this committee except to show that it runs similar to those in other places. Of course, it may be a little different. But I ask the gentleman this question: the gentleman wants, does he not, the people who own property in the District of Columbia to pay the same taxes as they pay in Minnesota, Omaha, St. Paul, or whatever city or State it may be?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I would answer the gentleman by saying that the imposition of taxes should be on the same basis of fairness and that they should bear their fair share of the burden of taxation.

Mr. REES. So that all owners in the District of Columbia will bear their share the same as owners of property anywhere else.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I want to see the property owners in the District of Columbia bear their fair and proportionate share. Let me say to the gentleman from Kansas, in 1947 we increased the taxes both by raising the rate and increasing the valuations 20 percent in the District of Columbia. As I recall, the assessor says that the increase was about 32 percent over what the tax had been before.

Mr. REES. Of course, that depends on how high the tax was before.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. That is true.

Mr. REES. What you did was to increase the tax rate from $1.75 per $100 to $2 per $100 when across the country it is about $3 per $100 for an average city of comparable size.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Some of the cities have gone too high in the matter of taxation on real estate. I think there is a limit on the taxes that you can impose on real estate.

Mr. REES. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am for a sales tax for the District of Columbia. I am for an increase in the ad valorem tax in the District of Columbia. I am for an increase in the income tax in the District of Columbia. I am opposed to any further increase in the Federal contribution to the District of Columbia and hope that Congress may enact legislation which will raise the revenues which are payable by the residents of the District of Columbia which will enable us to reduce, not increase, the Federal contribution. I recognize that Congress has an obligation to the District of Columbia in providing revenue for this District, but I doubt if there are many Members of Congress—I have inquired, and I have been unable to determine to what extent the Congress does make contribution in the way that it supports the various recreational facilities, the park facilities, library facilities, and other facilities that are provided for the residents of the District of Columbia, through the various Federal agencies, to which my State of Missouri and the other States make their contribution. I come from the State of Missouri where we have had a sales tax since 1933. For the past 16 years that tax has been administered by the Honorable Forrest Smith, who last November was elected Governor of the State of Missouri. I think that is an indication that the people of Missouri are in favor of a sales tax.

I was a member of the State legislature that raised Missouri's sales tax from one-half percent to 1 percent and subsequently to 2 percent on a broad base. I intend to offer amendments to this proposed bill today, to further broaden the base of this tax. I do so because I feel that a sales tax is a fair tax. I feel that a sales tax offers an opportunity to every resident of the District of Columbia to make a contribution and to feel a responsibility in those benefits that they receive. Particularly do I refer to the schools. We all recognize the crying need in the District of Columbia, which also exists throughout each of our States. We do need better school facilities. I feel that regardless of the income of any person in the District of Columbia it is a privilege for them to contribute to the support of the public schools, as well as the other benefits within the District.

As I said before, I will vote for other increased taxes, but I feel a sales tax is a fair tax, and it is a tax which will help meet the needs of this District. I hope we can broaden the base in order that the people of the District may enjoy these benefits.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] has expired.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I am against a sales tax in the District of Columbia. I believe we have not exhausted all the alternatives that have been presented here today. It is my understanding that a sales-tax measure should be taken only after all other alternatives have been exhausted, and fully considered. Otherwise, we have the situation that it is a regressive tax and it does not take into consideration the ability of people to pay.

The history of taxation and government expenditures over the last 2,000 years has led economists to reach pretty well defined conclusions about desirable taxation principles. Here we have a direct violation of the accepted principle. We are legislating, as a congressional body, for a Federal city. We are setting a pattern that is apt to be copied in many of the States of this Nation. I believe we should take into consideration the fact that we have not exhausted other alternatives to their full extent.

Now, who is going to pay this tax? Let us take a look at just who pays and how much.

The family with an income of $2,000 a year will pay anywhere from $5 to $15 through a sales tax; the family earning between $2,000 and $4,000 will pay from $15 to $30; those earning between $5,000 and $6,000 will pay somewhere between $30 and $50; and those earning between $7,500 and $10,000 will pay anywhere from $50 to $70; those earning $10,000 or above will pay $100, approximately. To all appearances this seems to be a small tax, but when you take into consideration that while the consumer will pay a tax on the fuel he consumes, on the cost of oil and gas used in the home, the producer is exempt from a tax of this character; when you run down all the items of household consumption, soaps, beverages, and items of that sort which are included, you will cut down materially the income the little man has left available for other more necessary purposes. In other words, you put the squeeze on an already burdened lower-income-level group. The chief victims of inflation have been these people in the income levels below $4,000, and the bulk of this tax will be placed upon the people in that particular income level. While it is true that a good many people who have heretofore opposed this tax in the District are aware of the large number of transient visitors to the District and the large amount of money that will be spent in the District annually by transients, nevertheless, the very fact is that the people who live in the District have no right to voice their opinion by referendum and while they were represented by various organizations and appeared before the committee and registered their protest they have no say in the selection of their officials. I wonder if those who are proposing and supporting this legislation would take the same position in their home State? I know that in looking over the list of States that have sales-tax provisions and those that do not have, we find a very paradoxical situation. The sales tax has only one purpose—it provides revenue. I cannot in good faith support this tax proposal. We should recommit this bill to the committee and advance a plan for complete reform in the District fiscal system. Let us act in that direction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, we in the Congress should be happy that Americans, including millions of children, come to the Capital of their country every year, that they spend $65,000,000 per year here in the District; and we should not cast any burden upon them or do anything which would make it harder for the many millions of our citizens to come from all the States here to the Capital of their country. To compel them to pay a tax when they buy merchandise or eat a meal in a restaurant is to burden them unduly.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to that, a number of States have imposed sales taxes. If now the Federal Government succeeds in imposing this nefarious form of taxation here in the District of Columbia I assert that this will serve as an entering wedge for those who advocate a general Federal sales tax to be imposed upon all the people of the United States.

The obvious purpose of a sales tax such as is proposed for the District of Columbia and is embodied in this bill is to take little from those who have much and much from those who have little.

A sales-transaction tax burdens most heavily people in moderate circumstances. Surely real-estate taxes in the District of Columbia should be increased 25 percent. These real-estate taxes are exceedingly low. Taxes should be levied according to ability to pay. Let us not impose a sales tax that is stifling to business and is a tax on consumption and a nuisance to vendor and purchaser.

For example, those residing in the District who eat their meals at home would not have to pay a sales tax upon food purchases. This proposed sales tax is discriminatory in their favor. It is unfair and unjust to those who eat some of their meals in restaurants. For example, a clerk, stenographer, or anyone else who eats a light breakfast, say orange juice and coffee, at a cost in a drug store or a lower-price restaurant of only 15 cents, would be compelled to pay a tax of nearly 7 percent.

This is an unjust bill and it should be defeated.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS].

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman, before I say anything I want to compliment the members of the Committee on the District of Columbia who have done such hard work on this measure. I do not agree with the result of their work, but I have served with them on this committee for some time and I fully appreciate the sacrifices that they have made. The members of the special committee have gone into this question, which is a very difficult one, thoroughly, and I have no doubt they have explored every opportunity there is to balance the budget and to bring the mess of the finances of the District of Columbia into some order.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, a sales tax is a devastating tax and I am against it. If it is necessary to have a sales tax, then it is the last thing we should put on the people. I am really surprised at some of my Republican colleagues who continue to talk about taxation and taxation and spending and spending. The District of Columbia does not elect, so I cannot complete that phrase, but it is a sad commentary for us Members, who represent every State in the Union, who believe in liberty and freedom, to stand up here and decide how people who cannot have a voice in their government should be taxed.

I understand there are about $15,000,000 worth of capital improvements included in the District budget. Last year there were about $22,000,000 worth of capital improvements included in the budget to be paid out of current taxation.

Last year I had the privilege of making quite a study of the organization of the government of the District of Columbia. A subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia introduced a home-rule bill and during the study of that bill we looked into the matter of funding the capital improvements and permitting the District to issue bonds. The subcommittee that considered this measure was unanimous in the opinion that such a provision should be made. In our home-rule bill we inserted a provision that 3 percent of the assessed valuation of the taxed land in the District should be the limiting amount of any bond issue that might be made. That would raise about $67,000,000, which is only 3 percent of the entire assessed valuation of the taxable land.

If these capital improvements in last year's budget and in this year's budget, which amount in the aggregate to about $37,000,000, could be funded, and if bonds could be issued to take care of those capital improvements covering a period of say 20 years, there would not be any talk about increased taxation. There would not be any need of increased taxation and there would be every opportunity for a reduction in the payment by the Federal Government to the District of Columbia. Now, these bonds issued by the District of Columbia and sold to the public, the investors of this country, would be in great demand. They would sell at a very low interest rate, and I have no doubt that they would command a premium in the market. I believe a substantial premium would be realized from the sale of such bonds, and that premium would go a long way toward paying the expenses of any such bond issue. An amendment to this bill to permit such a bond issue, I understand, would not be germane, so it cannot be introduced or considered. But we can either refer this bill back to the committee for further consideration or pass it and instruct the committee to look into this question of bonded indebtedness for capital improvements.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER].

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, I find myself in somewhat the same position as my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES]. For a number of years in the Maryland senate and here I have opposed the sales tax. For reasons expressed here today—may I pause to compliment the committee on the District of Columbia for the hard and untiring work that they have done in an effort to establish the fiscal affairs of the District of Columbia on a substantial basis—I have decided to vote for this bill. The fiscal affairs of the Nation, the District of Columbia,

the States, and the various counties are interwoven and correlated to a great extent. I hope I am not approaching this matter provincially; I do not intend to, and that has not been my policy in the past. But I do believe that we must speedily come to the place where all these taxes must be considered in relation to each other. In certain fields Federal Government can explore and in others the State may operate with the rest left to the counties and towns. I would like to see a commission appointed representing the District of Columbia and the adjoining States in order that the tax structures of these adjacent areas might be synchronized as far as possible. We have Greater Washington; not just the District of Columbia. Over half of the population of this metropolitan section is in the environs. Today we have half of that area paying a sales tax and half not. Abraham Lincoln said that a nation cannot exist half free and half slave. The economy of a city or a greater area cannot prosper with a line drawn across it so that half of it pays a sales tax and half of it does not.

Thought was given to the question of establishing a commission to study these different taxes. If that were done many inequalities between areas could be worked out. Raising the income-tax exemptions develops one in this bill in relation to the adjacent areas. I am glad that the bill raises the exemption on the income tax to $5,000. To my mind that answers many of the arguments that have been made here on the floor today that this is a bill falling heavily upon the shoulders of those least able to pay it.

In line with that same thought of synchronizing, across the borders in Maryland and Virginia you have a $1,000 exemption. There is nothing we can do about that, but it is just one of many things to which thought can be directed for the purpose of coordinating these taxes.

At the proper time I am going to offer an amendment which I think in a minor way will improve this bill. It has been stated that we wish to exempt the necessities of life, food, clothing, and so forth. Certainly medicine is a necessity of life and should be exempted whether on prescription or not.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I know that every Member of the House realizes how important this bill is to the District, and I am fully aware that every Member also understands how imperative it is to develop revenue sufficient to meet the requirements of the District government.

There are several basic facts I hope you will keep in mind: First, in order to balance the District budget and meet the requirements for the increased salaries which are coming in here from the other committees of the House, we must find $18,000,000 over and above the present sources of revenue. There have been many suggestions made. Revising the income tax was suggested by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN]. For 10 years we have been trying to get that through. I mentioned that in my previous statement. However, the House, always by an overwhelming vote, has defeated that bill because, as I said, of the domiciliary provisions, where folks from back home in their own State, even though they live in the District 12 months of the year, will not have to pay an income tax. We have tried to rectify that without results.

The second fact in regard to the expansion of our so-called capital outlay for buildings of all descriptions, including schools, is that we are not permitted to raise funds for such purposes by bonding. That has been considered and will again be reviewed in the light of additional requirements for school construction needed by the District, even after this bill is passed, and I hope it will be.

In regard to the sales tax, none of us came to the thought that we could wholeheartedly support the sales tax, but again, let me say, there is no attainable alternative.

If we adopt the so-called Klein bill and we put in these domiciliary provisions and make everybody living here 7 months of the year subject to taxation, that will yield, as I say, $10,000,000, which is still $8,000,000 short of our requirement. We are spending only $7,000,000 a year for what we call capital outlay in the general fund. We may borrow for that, but that will not meet the requirements. On the other hand, we have to depend upon the substantial sources that we have recommended in this bill to meet the requirements. It has been stated that the District has a low real-estate tax. I admit that relatively speaking, compared with other cities, it is low. On the same basis 2 years ago, as chairman of the Committee on Fiscal Affairs of the District of Columbia, I recommended an increase be made in the real-estate tax for the first time in 10 years, and in addition to that a 20-percent increase in the valuations was made by the assessors. Let us consider, if you will, for a moment by way of explanation what that means to a given taxpayer. Let us say a man has a $10,000 assessment. At the old rate of $1.75 per $100, he paid $175 in taxes. With the revaluation of 20 percent, and an increase in the rate from $1.75 to $2, he now pays $240 taxes. If we are to raise $18,000,000 by a property tax, and that is the only substantial source that I can think of in the light of the opposition in the House to our income-tax-revision bill, that same man would have to pay $2.80 per $100 or an increased value of 20 percent, making the assessed valuation $12,500, and he would pay $336 taxes on that house, which is nearly double that which he paid 2 years ago. It seems to me we ought to be decent about this, especially in the light of rent control and the increases in the cost of maintenance. You just cannot put excessive costs on property owners or anyone else. It is unfair and unjust.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Is that not just about what everybody has had to do in almost all the States of the Union? We have had to pay that increased ad valorem tax.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I do not know what States the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman's illustration clearly demonstrates that as between property in my city and property in the District of Columbia, if you increase it by just the amount that you have said, you would be getting somewhere near what the citizen in my city has to pay for that type of property as against what they pay here in the District of Columbia.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Of course, we could discuss the matter of different tax bills and other communities of the country at great length. But when you double a tax bill in this or in any other city within a period of 3 years, then I say you are laying on those property owners an excessive burden to which they cannot possibly adjust themselves in such a short period of time. I have been associated with this kind of question for 30 years directly and indirectly, and I know something about property values, local administration and all related questions, and especially on the tax problem which is before us today.

If there were any other way by which we could raise this money through broadening the income-tax basis to enable us to raise a substantial part of this $18,000,000, I surely would be for it, but the House on a number of occasions said "No," so this is the only alternative that I know of that will raise a substantial sum of money.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. KLEIN. The gentleman left out one other source of income and that is the Federal contribution. Is it not a fact that if the Federal Government had to pay taxes in the District of Columbia on the buildings which it owns or occupies in the District of Columbia in 1949 at the tax rate of $2, which is what the rate now is, they would have to pay almost $16,000,000 a year?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That is approximately correct, but that is $4,000,000 more than the Federal Government now pays. In 1947, when we were revising the so-called tax structure of the District of Columbia, I recommended that the Federal contribution be increased from what it was then—$8,000,000—to $12,000,000. That recommendation was adopted.

Mr. KLEIN. That is correct.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. If all the buildings owned by the Federal Government in the District of Columbia are assessed at full value at what we call the unit cost of construction, at the rate of $2 per $100, it would give us $16,000,000. I do not know whether the Members of the House want to go along on such a program as that or not.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. KLEIN. Does not the gentleman think, if this bill were rejected, then it would be incumbent upon the members of the Appropriations Committee to get that money, and they would increase the Federal contribution?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. It is not a question of the Appropriations Committee getting the money. It is a question of the House today, in this revenue bill, developing the sources of revenue to meet the budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity to thank the members of the subcommittee for the fine work they have done in bringing this bill to the floor of the House for consideration. I do not believe the Members generally realize the difficult problem the Committee has in securing funds for the District of Columbia. I want to take this opportunity again to thank the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] and the other members of the committee for the fine work they have done.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I desire to propound a unanimous-consent request.

I ask unanimous consent that title I and title II of the bill, the sales-tax provision, be considered as read and printed in the RECORD at this point, and subject to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act divided into titles and sections may be cited as the "District of Columbia Sales Tax Act."

TITLE I—SALES TAX

SECTION 1. Definitions: For the purposes of this title and as used herein, unless otherwise required by the context, the following terms shall mean or include:

(a) "Person": Includes an individual, partnership, society, club, association, joint-stock company, corporation, estate, receiver, trustee, assignee, referee, or any other person acting in a fiduciary or representative capacity, whether appointed by a court or otherwise, and any combination of individuals acting as a unit.

(b) "Vendor": Includes a person selling property or rendering services upon the receipts from which a tax is imposed under section 2 of this title.

(c) "Purchaser": Includes a person who purchases property or to whom are rendered services, receipts from which are taxable under section 2 of this title.

(d) "Sale" and "selling": Mean any transaction whereby title or possession, or both, of tangible personal property is or is to be transferred by any means whatsoever for a consideration by a vender to a purchaser, or any transaction whereby services subject to tax under section 2 of this title are rendered for consideration to any purchaser by any vendor, and shall include, but not be limited to, any "sale at retail" as defined in section 1(f) of this title. Such consideration may be either in the form of a price in money, rights, or property or by exchange or barter, and may be payable immediately, in the future, or by installments.

(e) "Tangible personal property": Means corporeal personal property of any nature.

(f) "Retail sale" and "sale at retail": Mean the sale in any quantity or quantities of any tangible personal property or service taxable under the terms of this title. Said term shall mean all sales of tangible personal property to any person for any purpose other than those in which the purpose of the purchaser is to resell the property so transferred in the form in which the same is, or is to be, received by him, or to use or incorporate the property so transferred as a material or part of other tangible personal property to be produced for sale by manufacturing, assembling, processing, or refining. For the purpose of the tax imposed by this title, the term "sale at retail" shall include but shall not be limited to the following:

(1) The sale for consumption of any meals, food or drink or other tangible personal property for a consideration, at any restaurant, hotel, drug store, club, resort, or other place at which meals, food, drink, or other tangible personal property are sold.

(2) Any production, fabrication, or printing of tangible personal property on special order for a consideration.

(3) The sale or charges for any room or rooms, lodgings, or accommodations furnished by any hotel, inn, tourist camp, tourist cabin, or any other place in which rooms, lodgings, or accommodations are regularly furnished to transients for a consideration.

(4) Sales of advertising space and sales of radio and television advertising.

(5) The sale of natural or artificial gas, oil, electricity, coal, or steam, when made to any purchaser for purposes other than resale or for use in manufacturing, assembling, processing, or refining.

(6) The sale of material used in the construction, and of materials used in the repair or alteration of real property, which materials, upon completion of such construction, alterations, or repairs, become real property, regardless of whether or not such real property is to be sold or resold.

(7) The grant of the right to continuous possession or use of any article of tangible personal property granted under a lease or contract if such grant of possession would be taxable if outright sale were made; in such event such lease or contract shall be considered the sale of such article and the tax shall be computed and paid by the vendor upon the rentals paid.

(g) "Food": Cereals and cereal products; milk and milk products, including ice cream; meat and meat products; fish and fish products; eggs and egg products; vegetables and vegetable products; fruit, fruit products, and fruit juices; spices and salt; flavoring extracts and condiments, sugar and sugar products (other than candy and confectionery); coffee and coffee substitutes; tea; cocoa and cocoa products (other than candy and confectionery); and ice when used for household consumption: *Provided, however*, That the word "food" shall not include spiritous or malt liquors, beer, sodas, and any other beverages such as are ordinarily dispensed at bars and soda fountains or in connection therewith.

(h) "Price": Means the aggregate value in money of any thing or things paid or delivered, or promised to be paid or delivered, by a purchaser to a vendor in the consummation and complete performance of a retail sale without any deduction therefrom on account of the cost of the property sold, cost of materials used, labor or service cost, or any other expense whatsoever. "Price" shall be deemed to be the amount received exclusive of the tax hereby imposed provided the vendor shall establish to the satisfaction of the assessor that the tax was added to the price. "Price" shall not include the following:

(1) The consideration received for labor or services used in installing, applying, remodeling, or repairing the property sold if the consideration for such services is separately stated from the consideration received for the tangible personal property in the retail sale.

(2) The consideration received for professional services rendered in connection with the sale of any tangible personal property if the consideration for such services is separately stated from the consideration received for the tangible personal property transferred in the retail sale.

(3) The amount paid by any purchaser as, or in the nature of, interest or finance charges on account of credit extended in connection with the sale of any tangible personal property, if the interest or finance charges are separately stated from the consideration received for the tangible personal property transferred in the retail sale.

(4) The amount paid by any purchaser on account of any bona fide freight, delivery, and other transportation charges in connection with any sale of tangible personal property if said freight, delivery, or other transportation charges are stated or shown as a separate item from the price of the tangible personal property transferred in the retail sale.

(i) "Business": Includes any activity engaged in by any person or caused to be engaged in by him with the object of gain, benefit, or advantage, either direct or indirect.

(j) "Engaging in business": Means commencing, conducting, or continuing in business, as well as liquidating a business when the liquidator thereof holds himself out to the public as conducting such a business.

(k) "Retail establishment": Means any premises in which the business of selling tangible personal property is conducted or in or from which any retail sales are made.

(l) "Tax": Means the tax imposed by this title.

(m) "Purchaser's certificate": Means a certificate signed by a purchaser and in such form as the Assessor shall prescribe, stating the purpose to which the purchaser intends to put the subject of the sale, or the status or character of the purchaser.

(n) "Successor": Includes any person purchasing or succeeding to the business or a portion thereof or the whole or any part of the stock of goods, wares, or merchandise of a vendor quitting, selling out, exchanging, or otherwise disposing of his business.

(o) "Taxpayer": Means any person required by this title to make returns or to pay the tax imposed by this title.

(p) "Tax year": Means the calendar year, or the taxpayer's fiscal year if it be other than the calendar year when such fiscal year is regularly used by the taxpayer for the purpose of reporting District income taxes as the tax period in lieu of the calendar year.

(q) "Semipublic institution": Means any corporation, and any community chest, fund, or foundation, which is supported principally by either public subscriptions or endowment or principally by appropriation made by the Congress of the United States, and which is organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, or educational purposes, or for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals, to a substantial extent within the District, no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private individual or shareholder, and no part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting to influence legislation.

(r) "Return": Includes any return filed or required to be filed as herein provided.

(s) "District": The District of Columbia.

(t) "Commissioners": The Commissioners of the District or their duly authorized representatives.

(u) "Assessor": The Assessor of the District or his duly authorized representatives.

(v) "Collector": The Collector of Taxes of the District or his duly authorized representatives.

IMPOSITION OF TAX

SEC. 2. Beginning on and after the first day of the first month succeeding the sixtieth day after the approval of this act for the privilege of selling certain tangible personal property at retail as defined hereinbefore and for the privilege of dispensing certain selected services defined as sales at retail by section 1 (f) of this title, a vendor shall collect from the purchaser a tax in the amount specified in this section on the price of each separate retail sale made in the District on and after such date. The tax imposed by this section shall be paid by the purchaser and shall be computed subject to the terms and conditions of this title, as follows:

(a) On each sale where the price is from 14 cents to 50 cents, both inclusive, 1 cent;

(b) On each sale where the price is from 51 cents to $1, both inclusive, 2 cents;

(c) On each 50 cents of price or fraction thereof in excess of $1, 1 cent.

EXEMPTIONS

SEC. 3. The tax imposed by this title shall not apply to the following sales:

(a) Sales where the purchase price is less than 14 cents.

(b) Sales to the United States or the District or any instrumentality thereof.

(c) Sales to a State or any of its political subdivisions if such State grants a similar exemption to the District. As used in this subsection, the term "State" means the several States, Territories, and possessions of the United States.

(d) Sales to a semipublic institution: *Provided, however*, That such sales shall not be exempt unless (1) such institution shall have first obtained a certificate from the Assessor stating that it is entitled to such exemption, and (2) the vendor keeps a record of the price of each such separate sale, the name of the purchaser, the date of each such separate sale, and the number of such certificate.

(e) Sales of food for human consumption off the premises where such food is sold.

(f) Sales of motor-vehicle fuels upon the sale of which a tax is imposed by the act entitled "An act to provide for a tax on motor-vehicle fuels sold within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved April 23, 1924, as amended or as may be hereafter amended.

(g) Sales of tickets for admission to places of amusement and sports.

(h) Sales of transportation and communication service.

(i) Sales of property purchased by a utility or public-service company for use or consumption in furnishing a commodity or service: *Provided*, That the receipts from furnishing such commodity or service are subject to a gross-receipts or mileage tax in force in the District during or for the period of time covered by any return required to be filed by the provisions of this title.

(j) Sales of newspapers.

(k) Casual and isolated sales by a vendor who is not regularly engaged in the business of making sales at retail.

(l) Sales of livestock, poultry, seeds, feeds for livestock and poultry, fertilizers, lime, and land plaster used for agricultural purposes.

(m) Sales of food or beverages of any nature if made in any car composing a part of any train or in any aircraft or boat operating within the District in the course of commerce between the District and a State.

(n) Sales of goods made pursuant to bona fide contracts entered into before the date of approval of this act: *Provided*, That there is a contract in writing signed by the buyer and seller which imposes an unconditional liability on the part of the buyer to purchase at a fixed price subject to no escalator clause goods covered thereby, and an unconditional liability on the part of the seller to deliver a definite quantity of such goods at the contract price.

(o) Sales of natural or artificial gas, oil, electricity, solid fuel, or steam, directly used in manufacturing, assembling, processing, or refining.

(p) Sales which a State would be without power to tax under the limitations of the Constitution of the United States.

(q) Sales of motor vehicles and trailers.

(r) Professional, insurance, or personal service transactions which involve sales as inconsequential elements for which no separate charges are made.

(s) Any sale in which the only transaction in the District is the mere execution of the contract of sale and in which the tangible personal property sold is not in the District at the time of such execution.

That nothing contained in this subsection shall be construed to be an exemption from the tax imposed under title II of this act.

COLLECTION OF TAX

SEC. 4. Upon each taxable sale or service the tax to be collected shall be stated and charged separately from the sale price or charge for service and shown separately on any record thereof at the time when the sale is made or evidence of sale issued or employed by the vendor and shall be paid by the purchaser to the vendor as trustee for and on account of the District, and the vendor shall be liable for the collection thereof and for the tax. The vendor shall be personally liable for the tax collected or required to be collected under this title, and the vendor shall have the same right in respect to collecting the tax from the purchaser, or in respect to nonpayment of the tax by the purchaser, as if the tax were a part of the purchase price of the property or service and payable at the time of the sale: *Provided, however*, That the Collector shall be joined as a party plaintiff in any action or proceeding brought by the vendor to collect the tax.

SEC. 5. The tax hereby imposed shall apply and be collected by the vendor from the purchaser at the time the sale is made regardless of the time when the purchase price is paid and delivered; unless the Commissioners shall provide by regulation in the case of credit or installment sales for the payment of the tax upon collection of the price or installments of the price or at some other time.

SEC. 6. It shall be unlawful for any vendor to advertise or hold out or state to the public or to any customer directly or indirectly that the tax or any part thereof imposed by this title will be assumed or absorbed by the vendor or that it will not be added to the selling price of the property sold or the taxable services rendered, or if added to said price that it, or any part thereof, will be refunded. Any person violating any provision of this section shall upon conviction be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned for not more than 6 months, or both, for each offense.

SEC. 7. (a) Where a purchaser has failed to pay or a vendor has failed to collect a tax upon a taxable sale, then, in addition to all other rights, obligations, and remedies provided in this title, such tax shall be payable by the purchaser directly to the Collector, and the purchaser shall file a return thereof with the Assessor and pay the tax imposed thereon to the Collector within 20 days after such sale is made.

(b) The Commissioners may, whenever they deem it necessary for the proper enforcement of this title, provide by regulation that the purchaser shall file returns with the Assessor and pay directly to the Collector the tax herein imposed, at such times as returns are required to be filed and payment made by vendors.

SEC. 8. Whenever a vendor makes sales through vending machines or in any other manner making collection of the tax impractical as provided herein, the Assessor may—

(a) authorize such vendors to prepay the tax and waive collection from the purchaser;

(b) require vendors so authorized to furnish bond sufficient to secure prepayment of the tax and to print upon the property sold a statement to the effect that the tax has been paid in advance.

The terms and conditions of this section shall be inapplicable unless the vendor shall make application to the Assessor for the authority herein contained, and unless the Assessor, after hearing, shall find that the conditions of the vendor's business are such as to render impracticable the collection of the tax in the manner otherwise provided under this title.

SEC. 9. It shall be presumed that all receipts for the sale of tangible personal property and services mentioned in this title are subject to tax until the contrary is established, and the burden of proving that a receipt is not taxable hereunder shall be upon the vendor or the purchaser as the case may be. Unless the vendor shall have taken from the purchaser a certificate signed by and bearing the name and address of the purchaser and the number of his registration certificate to the effect that the property or service was purchased for resale, the sale shall be deemed a taxable sale at retail. The certificate herein required shall be in such form as the Assessor shall prescribe and in case no certificate is furnished or obtained prior to the time the sale is consummated, the tax shall apply as if the sale were made at retail.

SEC. 10. In order to permit the tax imposed by this title to be paid and collected on the basis of the total sales price on all sales made on the same occasion by the same vendor to the same purchaser, without regard to the value of the sales price of the separate items aggregating the total amount of the sale, any group or association of vendors are hereby authorized to establish appropriate rules and regulations to provide uniform methods of adding the average equivalent of the tax to the selling price in each sale or transaction subject to the tax. Such rules and regulations shall be valid and effective only if written approval of the Assessor is given thereto. Such rules and regulations, if they do not involve price fixing, shall not be deemed illegal as in restraint of trade or commerce. In the event appropriate rules and regulations are not submitted to the Assessor he shall formulate and promulgate appropriate rules and regulations to effectuate the purposes of this section. Any rules and regulations adopted by any group or association of such vendors, with the approval of the Assessor, and any rules and regulations, promulgated by him on his own initiative, may be repealed, modified, or amended by the Assessor, in whole or in part, from time to time, after reasonable notice of such action has been given those affected.

SEC. 11. The tax imposed by this title and interest and penalties thereon shall become, from the time due and payable, a personal debt of the person liable to pay the same to the District. An action may be brought

at any time within 3 years from the time the tax shall be due and payable in the name of the District to recover the amount of any taxes, penalties, and interest due under the provisions of this title, but such actions shall be utterly barred after the expiration of the aforesaid 3 years.

SEC. 12. Whenever the business or property of any person subject to tax under the terms of this title shall be placed in receivership or bankruptcy, or assignment is made for the benefit of creditors, or if said property is seized under distraint for property taxes, all taxes, penalties, and interest imposed by this title for which said person is in any way liable shall be a prior and preferred claim. Neither the United States marshal, nor a receiver, assignee, or any other officer shall sell the property of any person subject to tax under the terms of this title under process or order of any court without first determining from the Collector the amount of any such taxes due and payable by said person, and if there be any such taxes due, owing, or unpaid under this title it shall be the duty of such officer to first pay to the Collector the amount of said taxes out of the proceeds of said sale before making any payment of any moneys to any judgment creditor or other claimants of whatsoever kind or nature. Any person charged with the administration or distribution of any such property as aforesaid who shall violate the provisions of this section shall be personally liable for any taxes accrued and unpaid which are chargeable against the person otherwise liable for tax under the terms of this section.

SEC. 13. The taxes imposed by this title and penalties and interest thereon may be collected by the Collector in the manner provided by law for the collection of taxes due the District on personal property in force at the time of such collection; and liens for the taxes imposed by this title and penalties thereon may be acquired in the same manner that liens for personal-property taxes are acquired. If the Assessor believes that the collection of any tax imposed by this act will be jeopardized by delay, he shall, whether or not the time otherwise prescribed by law for making return and paying such tax has expired, immediately assess such tax (together with all interest and penalties, the assessment of which is provided for by law). Such tax, penalties, and interest shall thereupon become immediately due and payable, and immediate notice and demand shall be made by the Collector for the payment thereof. Upon failure or refusal to pay such tax, penalty, and interest, collection thereof by distraint shall be lawful.

RETURNS AND PAYMENT OF TAX

SEC. 14. (a) On or before the 20th day of each calendar month every vendor who has made any sale at retail, taxable under the provisions of this title, during the preceding calendar month, shall file a return with the Assessor. Such returns shall show the total gross proceeds of the vendor's business for the month for which the return is filed; the gross proceeds of the business of the vendor upon which the tax is computed; the amount of tax for which the vendor is liable and for such other information as the Assessor deems necessary for the computation and collection of the tax.

(b) The Assessor may permit or require the returns to be made for other periods and upon such other dates as he may specify: *Provided*, That the gross proceeds during any tax year shall be included in returns covering such year and no other.

(c) The form of returns shall be prescribed by the Assessor and shall contain such information as he may deem necessary for the proper administration of this title. The Assessor may require amended returns to be filed within 20 days after notice and to contain the information specified in the notice.

(d) Every purchaser who has failed to pay to a vendor the tax imposed shall file a return with the Assessor and pay the tax to the Collector, within the time prescribed by this title or by regulation.

SEC. 15. (a) At the time of filing his return as provided by sections 14 and 16 of this title, the taxpayer shall pay to the Collector the taxes imposed by section 2 of this title.

(b) The taxes for the period for which a return is required to be filed by a vendor under sections 14 and 16 of this title shall be due by the vendor and payable to the Collector on the date limited for the filing of the return for such period, without regard to whether a return is filed or whether the return which is filed correctly shows the amount of gross proceeds and taxes due thereon.

SEC. 16. On or before 30 days after the end of the tax year of each vendor required to collect and pay to the Collector the tax imposed by the provisions of this title, such vendor shall make an annual return for such tax year in such form as may be required by the Assessor. The Assessor for good cause shown may on the written application of a vendor extend the time for making any return required by this section.

RETURNS TO BE SECRET

SEC. 17. (a) Except to any official of the District, having a right thereto in his official capacity, it shall be unlawful for any officer or employee of the District to divulge or make known in any manner the amount of gross proceeds or any particulars relating thereto or the computation thereof set forth or disclosed in any return required to be filed under this title, and neither the original nor a copy of any such return desired for use in litigation in court shall be furnished where neither the District nor the United States is interested in the result of such litigation, whether or not the request is contained in an order of the court: *Provided, however*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to prevent the furnishing to a taxpayer a copy of his return upon the payment of a fee of $2.

(b) Nothing contained in section 17 (a) of this title shall be construed to prohibit the publication of notices authorized in section 30 of this title, or the publication of statistics so classified as to prevent the identification of particular returns or reports and the items thereof, or the publication of delinquent lists showing the names of persons, vendors, or purchasers who have failed to pay the taxes imposed by this title within the time prescribed herein, together with any relevant information which in the opinion of the Assessor may assist in the collection of such delinquent taxes.

(c) Nothing contained in section 17 (a) of this title shall be construed to prohibit the Assessor, in his discretion, from divulging or making known any information contained in any report, application, or return required under the provisions of this title other than such information as may be contained therein relating to the amount of gross proceeds or tax thereon or any particulars relating thereto or the computation thereof.

(d) Any violation of the provisions of section 17 (a) of this title shall be punishable by a fine not exceeding $1,000 or imprisonment for 6 months, or both, in the discretion of the court.

(e) Notwithstanding the provisions of this section, the Assessor may permit the proper officer of the United States or of any State or Territory of the United States or his authorized representative to inspect the returns filed under this title, or may furnish to such officer or representative a copy of any such return, provided the United States, State, or Territory grants substantially similar privileges to the Assessor or his representative or to the proper officer of the District charged with the administration of this title.

(f) All reports, applications, and returns received by the Assessor under the provisions of this title shall be preserved for 3 years and thereafter until the Assessor orders them to be destroyed.

DETERMINATION OF TAX

SEC. 18. If a return required by this title is not filed, or if a return when filed is incorrect or insufficient, the amount of tax due shall be determined by the Assessor from such information as may be obtainable. Notice of such determination shall be given to the taxpayer. Such determination shall finally and irrevocably fix the tax unless the person against whom it is assessed, within 30 days after the giving of notice of such determination, shall apply in writing to the Assessor for a hearing, or unless the Assessor of his own motion shall redetermine the same. After such hearing or redetermination the Assessor shall give notice of his final determination to the person against whom the tax is assessed.

REFUNDS

SEC. 19. (a) Except as to any tax finally determined as provided in section 18, where any tax has been erroneously or illegally collected, the tax shall be refunded if application under oath is filed with the Assessor for such refund within 1 year from the payment thereof. For like cause and within the same period a refund may be made upon the certificates of the Assessor and the Collector. Whenever a refund is made upon the certificates of the Assessor and the Collector, the Assessor and Collector shall state their reasons therefor in writing. Such application may be made by the person upon whom such tax was imposed and who has actually paid the tax. Such application may also be made by a vendor who has collected and paid such tax to the Collector: *Provided*, That the application is made within 1 year of the payment by the purchaser to the vendor, but no actual refund of moneys shall be made to such vendor, until he shall first establish to the satisfaction of the Assessor, under such regulations as the Commissioners may prescribe, that the vendor has repaid to the purchaser the amount for which the application for refund is made. In lieu of any refund required to be made, a credit may be allowed therefor on payment due from the applicant.

(b) Application for a refund or credit made as herein provided shall be deemed an application for a revision of any tax, penalty, or interest complained of and the Assessor may receive evidence with respect thereto. After making his determination of whether any refund shall be made, the Assessor shall give notice thereof to the applicant.

SEC. 20. (a) Appeals: Any person aggrieved by a final determination of tax as provided in section 18 or denial of an application for refund of any tax under section 19 may, within 90 days from the date of the final determination of the tax or from the date of the denial of an application for refund, as the case may be, appeal to the Board of Tax Appeals for the District of Columbia in the same manner and to the same extent as set forth in sections 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 of title IX of the act entitled "An act to amend the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, and for other purposes," approved August 17, 1937, as amended, and as the same may hereafter be amended. The remedy provided in this section shall not be deemed to take away from the taxpayer any remedy which he might have under any other provision of law, but no suit by the taxpayer for the recovery of any part of any tax shall be instituted in any court if the taxpayer has elected to file an appeal with respect to such tax with the Board of Tax Appeals for the District of Columbia.

(b) If it shall be determined by the Assessor, the Board of Tax Appeals for the District of Columbia, or any court having jurisdiction

over the subject matter, that any part of any tax which was assessed as a deficiency, and any interest thereon paid by the taxpayer, under the provisions of section 18 of this title, was an overpayment, interest shall be allowed and paid upon such overpayment of tax at the rate of 4 percent per annum from the date such overpayment was paid until the date of refund.

SALES IN BULK

SEC. 21. Whenever there is made a sale, transfer, or assignment in bulk of any part or the whole of a stock of merchandise or of fixtures, or of merchandise and of fixtures, pertaining to the conducting of the business of the seller, transferor, or assignor, otherwise than in the ordinary course of trade and in the regular prosecution of said business, the purchaser, transferee, or assignee shall at least 5 days before taking possession of such merchandise, fixtures, or merchandise and fixtures, or paying therefor, notify the Assessor by registered mail of the proposed sale and of the price, terms, and conditions thereof, whether or not the seller, transferor, or assignor has represented to or informed the purchaser, transferee, or assignee that he owes any tax pursuant to this title or whether he has complied with section 1 of the act entitled "An act to prevent the fraudulent sale of merchandise in the District of Columbia," approved April 28, 1904, or whether or not he has knowledge that such taxes are owing, or whether any such taxes are in fact owing.

(b) Whenever the purchaser, transferee, or assignee shall fail to give the notice to the Assessor as required by the preceding section, or whenever the Assessor shall inform the purchaser, transferee, or assignee that a possible claim for such tax or taxes exists, any sums of money, property, or choses in action, or other consideration, which the purchaser, transferee, or assignee is required to transfer over to the seller, transferor, or assignor shall be subject to a first priority right and lien for any such taxes therefore or thereafter determined to be due from the seller, transferor, or assignor to the District, and the purchaser, transferee, or assignee is forbidden to transfer to the seller, transferor, or assignor any such sums of money, property, or choses in action to the extent of the amount of the District's claim. For failure to comply with the provisions of this subdivision, the purchaser, transferee, or assignee shall be personally liable for the payment to the District of any such taxes theretofore or thereafter determined to be due to the District from the seller, transferor, or assignor, and such liability may be assessed and enforced in the same manner as the liability for tax under this title.

REGULATIONS

SEC. 22. In addition to the powers granted to the Commissioners in this title, they are hereby authorized and empowered to make, adopt, and amend rules and regulations appropriate to the carrying out of this title and the purposes thereof.

SEC. 23. In addition to the powers granted to the Assessor in this title, he is hereby authorized and empowered—

(a) to extend for cause shown the time of filing any return for a period not exceeding 30 days; and for cause shown, to remit penalties and interest in whole or in part except as provided in section 26 of this title; and to compromise disputed claims in connection with the taxes hereby imposed;

(b) to request information from the Bureau of Internal Revenue of the Treasury Department of the United States relative to any person for the purpose of assessing taxes imposed by this title; and said Bureau of Internal Revenue is authorized and required to supply such information as may be requested by the Assessor relative to any person for the purpose herein provided;

(c) to prescribe methods for determining the gross proceeds from sales made or services rendered and for the allocation of such sales into taxable and nontaxable sales;

(d) to require any vendor selling to persons within the District to keep detailed records of the nature and value of personal property sold for use within the District, and to furnish such information upon request to the Assessor;

(e) to assess, determine, revise, and readjust the taxes imposed under this title.

SEC. 24. The Assessor, for the purpose of ascertaining the correctness of any return filed as required by this title, or for the purpose of making a return where none has been made, is authorized to examine any books, papers, records, or memoranda, or any person bearing upon the matters required to be included in the return and may summon any person to appear before him and produce books, records, papers, or memoranda bearing upon the matters required to be included in the return and to give testimony or answer interrogatories under oath respecting the same, and the Assessor, or his duly authorized representative, shall have power to administer oaths to such person or persons. Such summons may be served by any member of the Metropolitan Police Department. If any person, having been personally summoned, shall neglect or refuse to obey the summons issued as herein provided, then in that event the Assessor, or the Deputy Assessor, may report that fact to the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, or one of the justices thereof, and said court or any justice thereof hereby is empowered to compel obedience to said summons to the same extent as witnesses may be compelled to obey the subpenas of that court. Any person in custody or control of any books, papers, records, or memoranda bearing upon the matters required to be included in such returns, who shall refuse to permit the examination by the Assessor or any person designated by him of any such books, papers, records, or memoranda, or who shall obstruct or hinder the Assessor or any person designated by him in the examination of any books, papers, records, or memoranda, shall upon conviction thereof be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned for not more than 6 months, or both, for each offense.

REGISTRATION

SEC. 25. (a) No person shall engage in the business of making of any retail sales subject to tax under the provisions of this title without having obtained a certificate of registration thereof. If two or more persons constitute a single vendor as defined in this title, such persons may operate a single retail establishment under one certificate of registration and in such case neither the death or retirement of one or more of such persons from business in such establishment nor the entrance of one or more persons thereinto shall affect the certificate of registration for a period of 60 days or require the issuance of a new certificate until the expiration of such period.

(b) Each applicant for a certificate required by this section shall, on or before the first day of the first month succeeding the approval of this act, make out and deliver to the Assessor, upon a blank to be furnished by him for that purpose, a statement showing the name of the applicant, each retail establishment where the applicant's business is to be conducted, the kind or nature of such business and such other information as the Assessor may prescribe. Upon receipt of such application the Assessor shall issue the applicant, without charge, a certificate of registration for each retail establishment designated in the application, authorizing the applicant to engage in business at such retail establishment. The certificate of registration shall be nontransferable except as otherwise provided in this title, and shall be displayed in the applicant's place of business. Except as otherwise provided in this title, the certificate of registration issued as herein provided shall continue valid until surrendered by the vendor or canceled for cause, by the Assessor. The form of such certificate of registration shall be prescribed by the Assessor.

(c) In the case of a vendor who has no fixed place of business and sells from one or more vehicles, each such vehicle shall constitute a retail establishment for the purpose of this title. In the case of a vendor who has no fixed placed of business and does not sell from a vehicle, the application for a certificate of registration shall set forth the address to which any notice or other communication authorized by this title may be sent to the applicant, and the place so designated shall constitute a retail establishment for the purposes of this title.

(d) Whoever engages in the business of selling tangible personal property at retail, or makes any sale which is subject to tax under the provisions of this title without having a certificate of registration therefor, as required by this section, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not less than $25 and not more than $100.

PENALTIES AND INTEREST

SEC. 26. (a) Any person failing to file a return or who files a false or incorrect return or who fails to pay or pay over any tax to the Collector within the time required by this title shall be subject to a penalty of 5 percent of the amount of tax due, plus interest at the rate of 1 percent of such tax for each month of delay excepting the first month after such return was required to be filed or such tax became due; but the Assessor, if satisfied that the delay was excusable, may waive all or any part of such penalty in excess of interest at the rate of 6 percent per year. Such penalties and interest shall be paid and disposed of in the same manner as other revenues from this title. Unpaid penalties and interest may be collected in the same manner as the tax imposed by this title. The interest provided for in this section shall be applicable to any tax determined by the Assessor as a deficiency.

(b) The certificate of the Collector or Assessor, as the case may be, to the effect that a tax has not been paid, that a return or registration certificate has not been filed, or that information has not been supplied pursuant to the provisions of this title, shall be presumptive evidence thereof: *Provided*, That the presumptions created by this subsection shall not be applicable in criminal prosecutions.

PENALTY FOR FAILURE TO FILE RETURNS, ETC.

SEC. 27. (a) Any person required to file a return or report or perform any act under the provisions of this title who shall fail or neglect to file such return or report or perform such act within the time required shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $300 for each and every failure or neglect. The penalty provided herein shall be in addition to the other penalties provided in this title.

(b) Any person required to file a return or report or perform any act under the provisions of this title who willfully fails or refuses to file such return or report or perform such act within the time required shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both. The penalty provided herein shall be in addition to the other penalties provided in this title.

ASSESSMENT, REASSESSMENT, FALSE AND INCORRECT RETURNS

SEC. 28. The Assessor shall determine, redetermine, assess, or reassess, any tax imposed by this title, except in cases where

the tax is correct as computed in any return filed with the Assessor, within 3 years after the filing of any return, except as follows:

(a) In the case of a false return, or a failure to file a return, whether in good faith or otherwise, the tax may be assessed at any time.

(b) In the case of an incorrect return which has not been prepared as required by this title and by the return and instructions, rules, or regulations applicable thereto, the tax shall be assessed or reassessed within 5 years after the filing of such return.

PROSECUTIONS

SEC. 29. All prosecutions under this title shall be brought in the municipal court for the District of Columbia on information by the Corporation Counsel of the District in the name of the District of Columbia.

NOTICES

SEC. 30. Any notice authorized or required under the provisions of this title may be given by mailing the same to the person for whom it is intended in an envelope, postage prepaid, addressed to such person at the address given in the last return filed by him pursuant to the provisions of this title or, if no return has been filed, then to the last address of such person. If the address of any person is unknown, such notice may be published in one or more of the daily newspapers in the District of Columbia for three successive days. The cost of any such advertisement in newspapers shall be added to the tax. The proof of mailing of any notice required or authorized in this title shall be presumptive evidence of the receipt of such notice by the person to whom addressed. The proof of publishing any notice required in this title in one or more of the daily newspapers in the District shall be conclusive notice to the person for whom such notice is intended.

EXTENSIONS OF TIME

SEC. 31. Where, before the expiration of the period prescribed herein for the assessment or redetermination of an additional tax, a taxpayer has consented in writing that such period be extended, the amount of such tax due may be determined at any time within such extended period. The period so extended may be further extended by subsequent consents in writing made before the expiration of the extended period.

SEC. 32. If any provision of this title, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of this title, and the application of such provisions to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

TITLE II—COMPENSATING-USE TAX

DEFINITIONS

SECTION 1. (a) For the purposes of this title and as used herein, unless otherwise required by the context, the following terms shall mean or include:

(1) "Retail sale," "sale at retail," and "sold at retail": Mean all sales in any quantity or quantities of tangible personal property, whether made within or without the District, and services, to any person for the purpose of use, storage, or consumption, within the District, taxable under the terms of this title. Said term shall mean all sales of tangible personal property to any person for any purpose other than those in which the purpose of the purchaser is to resell the property so transferred in the form in which the same is, or is to be, received by him, or to use or incorporate the property so transferred as a material or part of other tangible personal property to be produced for sale by manufacturing, assembling, processing, or refining. For the purpose of the tax imposed by this title, the term "sale at retail" shall include, but shall not be limited to, the following:

a. Any production, fabrication, or printing of tangible personal property on special order for a consideration.

b. The sale of natural or artificial gas, oil, electricity, coal, or steam, when made to any purchaser for purposes other than resale or for use in manufacturing, assembling, processing or refining.

c. The sale of material used in the construction and of materials used in the repair or alteration of real property, which materials, upon completion of such construction, alterations, or repairs, become real property, regardless of whether or not such real property is to be sold or resold.

d. The grant of the right to continuous possession or use of any article of tangible personal property granted under a lease or contract if such grant of possession would be taxable if outright sale were made; in such event such lease or contract shall be considered the sale of such article and the tax shall be computed and paid by the vendor upon the rentals paid.

(2) "Use": The exercise by any person within the District of any right or power over tangible personal property and services sold at retail as the term "sold at retail" is herein defined, whether purchased within or without the District by a purchaser from a vendor.

(3) "Vendor": Every person engaging in business in the District and making sales at retail as defined herein, whether for immediate or future delivery of the tangible personal property or performance of the services. When in the opinion of the Assessor it is necessary for the efficient administration of this title to regard any salesman, representative, peddler, or canvasser, as the agent of the dealer, distributor, supervisor, or employer, under whom he operates or from whom he obtains the tangible personal property sold or furnishes services, the Assessor may, in his discretion, treat and regard such agent as the vendor jointly responsible with his principal, employer, or supervisor, for the assessment and payment or collection of the tax imposed by this title.

(4) "Purchase": The acquisition for a price by any person of tangible personal property or services sold at retail as defined herein. A transaction shall be deemed to be a purchase if the acquisition of tangible personal property was effected by:

a. The transfer, either conditionally or absolutely, of title or possession or both of the tangible personal property.

b. The transfer or grant of a license to use, store, or consume the tangible personal property.

(5) "Purchaser": Any person who shall have purchased tangible personal property or services sold at retail as defined herein.

(6) "Engaging in business in the District": The selling, delivering, or furnishing in the District, of any activity in the District in connection with the selling, delivering, or furnishing in the District, of tangible personal property or services sold at retail as defined herein. This term shall include but shall not be limited to the following acts or methods of transacting business:

a. The maintaining, occupying or using, permanently or temporarily, directly or indirectly, or through a subsidiary or agent, by whatever name called, of any office, place of distribution, sales or sample room or place, warehouse or storage place, or other place of business.

b. The having of any representative, agent, salesman, canvasser, or solicitor operating in the District for the purpose of making sales at retail as defined herein, or the taking of orders for such sales.

(7) "In the District" means within the exterior limits of the District of Columbia and includes all territory within such limits owned by the United States of America.

(8) "Storage": Any keeping or the retention of possession in the District for any purpose of tangible personal property purchased at retail sale (as the words "retail sale" are defined herein).

(b) The definitions of "business," "person," "price," "purchaser's certificate," "sale," "selling," "tangible personal property," "retail establishment," "food," "successor," "taxpayer," "tax year," "return," "District," "Commissioners," "Assessor," and "Collector," as defined in section 1 of title I of this act, are hereby incorporated in and made applicable to this title.

IMPOSITION OF TAX

SEC. 2. Beginning on and after the first day of the first month succeeding the sixtieth day after the approval of this act, there is hereby imposed and there shall be paid by every person a tax on the use within the District of any tangible personal property or services purchased at retail sale. The tax imposed by this section shall be paid by the purchaser and shall be computed as follows:

(a) On each sale where the price is from 14 cents to 50 cents, both inclusive, 1 cent;

(b) On each sale where the price is from 51 cents to $1, both inclusive, 2 cents;

(c) On each 50 cents of price or fraction thereof in excess of $1, 1 cent.

EXEMPTIONS

SEC. 3. The tax imposed by this title shall not apply to the following:

(a) Sales upon which taxes are imposed under title I of this act.

(b) Sales upon which the purchaser would be exempt from the taxes imposed under title I of this act.

(c) Sales upon which the purchaser has paid a retail sales tax under the laws of any State or Territory of the United States.

(d) Sales of tangible personal property which property was purchased or acquired by a nonresident prior to coming into the District and establishing or maintaining a temporary or permanent residence in the District. As used in this subsection, the word "residence" means a place in which to reside and does not mean "domicile."

(e) Sales of tangible personal property which property was purchased or acquired by a nonresident person prior to coming into the District and establishing or maintaining a business in the District.

(f) The use or storage within the District of tangible personal property owned and held by a common carrier or sleeping-car company for use principally without the District in the course of interstate commerce, or commerce between the District and a State, in or upon, or as part of, any train, aircraft, or boat.

COLLECTION OF TAX

SEC. 4. The provisions of sections 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 of title I of this act are hereby incorporated in and made applicable to this title.

SEC. 5. Every vendor not engaging in business in the District who makes sales at retail as defined in section 1 of this title, and who upon application to the collector has been expressly authorized to collect the tax, shall, at the time of making such sales, collect the tax imposed by this title from the purchaser. A permit shall be issued to such vendor, without charge, to collect such tax in such manner and subject to such regulations as the Commissioners may prescribe.

RETURNS AND PAYMENT OF TAX

SEC. 6. The provisions of sections 14, 15, 16, and 17 of title I of this act are hereby incorporated in and made applicable to this title. Every vendor, including every vendor not engaging in business in the District who is expressly authorized to collect the tax, shall file returns and pay the tax in accordance with the provisions of such sections applicable to the filing of returns and the payment of the tax and as shall be prescribed by regulation. Every purchaser who has not paid the tax imposed by this title to a vendor required or authorized to collect the tax shall file a return and pay the tax in

accordance with the provisions of the aforesaid sections applicable to the filing of returns and the payment of the tax and as shall be prescribed by regulation.

REGISTRATION

SEC. 7. The provisions of section 25 of title I of this act are hereby incorporated in and made applicable to this title: *Provided*, That vendors and persons who have been issued certificates of registration under title I of this act shall not be required to have such certificates under this title.

REFUNDS, APPEALS, PROSECUTIONS, REGULATIONS, NOTICES, ETC.

SEC. 8. The provisions of sections 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, and 32 of title I of this act are hereby incorporated in and made applicable to this title.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 12, line 1, insert:

"(t) Sales of medicines, pharmaceuticals and drugs made on prescriptions of duly licensed physicians and surgeons and general and special practitioners of the healing art: *Provided however*."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, there are some corrective amendments from the committee. I offer the first amendment.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I have an amendment on page 3 of the bill which is a corrective amendment on which the members of the subcommittee generally have agreed. I wonder if we could consider that amendment before the other amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has recognized the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] to offer corrective amendments.

The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: On page 46, line 4, following the word "officer", insert the following: "Of the Government of the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: On page 4, line 17, after the dash insert the word "Means" after the dash, change the letter "C" in the word "cereals" to a small letter "c."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Delete subsection (q) beginning on page 7, line 17, and ending on page 8, line 3, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(q) 'Semipublic institution': Means any corporation, and any community chest, fund, or foundation, organized exclusively on a nonprofit basis for religious, charitable, or educational purposes, including hospitals, and operated on a nonprofit basis for such purposes. For the purpose of this title an organization or institution which does not embrace the generally recognized relationship of teacher and student shall be deemed not to be operated for educational purposes."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I may state that this amendment is in respect to the charitable and public institutions, and the only change from the bill is to insert the word "hospital" which means to apply to these voluntary hospitals. We were not sure that the bill was clear in that respect. It is just a clarifying amendment to make sure that voluntary charitable hospitals are included in the exemptions.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota: Page 3, line 20, after the word "furnished", insert "to transients."

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I may say that this is a clarifying amendment to get away from any question that taxation of transient rooms includes also those people who are permanent residents of an apartment hotel.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KLEIN: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That section 8 (s) of title I, article I, is amended to read as follows:

"'(s) The word "resident" means every individual domiciled within the District on the last day of the taxable year, and every other individual who maintains a place of abode within the District for more than 7 months of the taxable year, whether domiciled in the District or not. The word "resident" shall not include any elective officer of the Government of the United States or any officer of the executive branch of such Government whose appointment to the office held by him was by the President of the United States and subject to confirmation by the Senate of the United States, unless such officers are domiciled within the District on the last day of the taxable year.'

"SEC. 2. Section 2 of title III is amended by striking out all of the paragraph numbered (b) (10) and renumbering the succeeding paragraphs as (10) and (11), respectively.

"SEC. 3. Section 3 of title III is amended by striking out all of the paragraph numbered 3 (b) (5) and renumbering the succeeding paragraph as (5).

"SEC. 4. Section 3 of title VI is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 3. Imposition and rates of tax: There is hereby annually levied and imposed for each taxable year upon the taxable income of every resident a tax at the following rates:

"'Two percent on the first $2,000 of taxable income.

"'Three percent on the next $3,000 of taxable income.

"'Four percent on the next $5,000 of taxable income.

"'Five percent on the taxable income in excess of $10,000.'"

"SEC. 5. Article I is further amended by striking out all of title VIII and renumbering the succeeding titles as VIII, IX, X, XI, XII, XIII, XIV, and XV, respectively."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman reserve his point of order?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman I shall be pleased to reserve the point of order but I intend to make it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, this is the bill that has been referred to in general debate as the Klein bill, or the income-tax bill.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that if this bill were enacted into law there would be no necessity for a sales tax in the District of Columbia. While it is true that this bill may not raise enough money to cover all the needs of the District, yet in addition to an increase in the real-estate tax, if that were found advisable, it might raise the funds necessary. Nobody denies that the real-estate tax rate, in spite of the increase in the last 2 years and in spite of the increase in the assessed valuation, is still far lower than it is in any city of comparable size in the country, and I daresay many smaller communities, where the need is not as great. There is no excuse for it. It is true that the real-estate owner might feel it more keenly because the rates have only recently been raised, but these people have benefited, and it seems to me they should now make up for all the money they have saved in past years.

We also have the situation where the Federal Government makes a contribution to the District in lieu of taxation, and in lieu of other services performed by the District, for which they are not sufficiently compensated. It is not only the $16,000,000 in taxation that the District could get from the owners of this property if the Federal Government paid taxes, but there are other services, including utilities and things of that kind.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. It might be added that the passage of this bill with the so-called Klein amendment is the one recommended by those who signed the minority report on the committee.

Mr. KLEIN. I thank the gentleman. If we pass this amendment, which is in effect an income-tax bill, it would delete the sales-tax features, and if we would get an increase in the Federal contribution, also increase the real-estate taxation, we would have much more than could be raised by the sales tax alone and there would be no need for this inequitable, unfair tax that taxes all people alike, in violation of all principles of fair and equitable taxation. The theory of taxation is that people should be taxed according to their income and their ability to pay. This tax hits everybody equally. We do not need it and it is not necessary.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] said he would like to have a sales tax. He has always said that.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I cannot at this time.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman made a misstatement.

Mr. KLEIN. I will continue to make it, then the gentleman can correct it later. The gentleman continues to state that he is for an income-tax bill, but the reason he is for the sales-tax bill is that an income-tax bill cannot pass this House. That is the only reason he is for a sales tax.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman said I was in favor of a sales tax.

Mr. KLEIN. I am sorry. I meant an income tax. The gentleman says he is for a sales tax because this House will not pass an income-tax bill. We have new Members here, over 100 new Democratic Members, and I am sure they are not going to be swayed by what previous Congresses have done. If you will look at this situation you will see that what this bill would do is tax people who work in the District, who derive their income in the District, and who escape taxes at the present time because they claim that they pay it in their home communities, which actually many of them do not. It would increase the rates fairly and according to their income. It is a good deal less than we pay in the State of New York as a State income tax. There is nothing unfair about having the people taxed here and also by the Federal Government. Most of the States in the United States have a State income-tax law, yet the people have to pay the Federal income tax as well. That is all we want the people of the District to do. They earn their livelihood here, they owe some duty to the District government, and if they would do that we would not have to use this kind of a sales tax which most people are against and which we only turn to in desperation.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Where does your income tax start?

Mr. KLEIN. We are using the same exemptions that are in the present bill. I think it is $1,000.

Mr. NICHOLSON. From $1,000 up?

Mr. KLEIN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment because it is premature. This amendment relates to title IV of the bill, and under the unanimous-consent agreement, we have only read titles I and II. I think his amendment should be offered when we reach the proper title.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would strike all after the enacting clause, which is on page 1 of the bill, and insert in lieu thereof the amendment which was read, and therefore it is timely at this particuluar place.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is subject at this time to a technical point of order. However, if the gentleman from New York desires to revise his amendment and offer it in a different form, it would be in order at this time as a substitute for the bill.

Mr. KLEIN. Then I offer it in that form, Mr. Chairman, as a substitute for the pending measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to inform the gentleman from New York that he must prepare his amendment. He cannot offer it orally from the floor.

Mr. KLEIN. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Missouri: Page 9, strike out all of lines 1 to 6, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) On each sale where the price is from 4 cents to 64 cents, both inclusive, 1 cent;

"(b) On each sale where the price is from 65 cents to $1.14, both inclusive, 2 cents;

"(c) On each 50 cents of price or fraction thereof in excess of $1.14, 1 cent."

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, as one who favors the enactment of a sales-tax law, I am offering this amendment to H. R. 3347, which seeks to enact a sales tax in the District of Columbia for the purpose of raising additional revenue, which I believe is recognized as an urgent need if the District is to provide the educational facilities which are demanded by the people residing within the District.

As we consider this legislation, I find myself in the rather unique position of having joined with 6 other members of the committee in voting not to report this bill from the committee, yet at the same time being enthusiastically in favor of the passage of a sales-tax act for the District of Columbia.

Briefly, I would like to state my position on this bill. I believe that only through a sales tax are many of the residents of the District of Columbia given an opportunity to contribute to the cost of the services, particularly the educational facilities which are enjoyed by the residents of the District. Unless they have an opportunity to pay the small tax which would be imposed by this bill, thousands of residents of the District would be denied any participation in the cost of providing the many services and privileges they enjoy.

Coming from the State of Missouri, which has enjoyed the benefits of a sales tax since 1933, and having been a member of the legislature which increased that tax first from one-half cent to 1 cent in 1935 and later to 2 cents in 1937, I have had the experience of participating in the passage of legislation which has perfected the sales tax act in Missouri, and I have also had the opportunity to observe the operation of this law and to note the public's reaction.

I doubt if any State has enjoyed a happier experience in the operation of a sales-tax law and I doubt if any State has experienced less opposition to the law than the State of Missouri. I attribute this fact not only to the efficient administration of the act by the Honorable Forrest Smith who last November was elected Governor of the State of Missouri, after having served for 16 years as State auditor, directly charged with the administration of the sales tax law, but also to the fact that Missouri has very few exemptions included in that act, after which many States have patterned their sales-tax legislation.

While the Missouri act does provide for the use of tokens in 1- and 5-mill denominations, these tokens are not in general use except in the larger cities. Throughout most of the rural districts and smaller towns, merchants have generally adopted a bracket such as is suggested in the amendment I have proposed, and which was recommended by the State auditor's office. It has been found by experience over a long period of years that this bracket provides a most equitable basis for collecting the tax and comes as near collecting an average 2-cent tax as is possible without the use of tokens or coupons which are both expensive and annoying.

If this bill is passed with the bracket as provided in H. R. 3347, and if the proposed amendment is not adopted, I feel certain that this section will be vulnerable and subject to attacks by opponents of the bill who will use this as an argument that the merchant is collecting an excessive tax which does not conform to the original intention of those who have expressed themselves as being in favor of a sales tax as a means of raising revenue.

As a member of the committee, I am familiar with the reasons advanced for the adoption of the bracket included in this act. However, I am not in sympathey with—in fact, I am unalterably opposed to the avenue of approach selected by the authors of this bill.

In Report No. 257 accompanying this bill, the committee sets out that the tax imposed is predicated upon the same theory as the existing retail-sales-tax law in the State of Maryland.

Unfortunately, I cannot agree with the reasoning of a majority of the committee when they say that a District sales tax should be similar to the law of Maryland because of the proximity of that State to the District. To me this is a good example of the tail wagging the dog. If we follow this line of reasoning, and if Congress elects to turn over to the Maryland State Legislature the responsibility of enacting laws for the District of Columbia, I fear that we will find the Maryland Legislature charged with the obligation of passing laws for many other States.

Since so many States already have sales-tax legislation, I feel that Congress should profit by the experience in the other States before adopting for the District of Columbia what will be and should be considered as a model law. I think it is reasonable to assume that it will not be too long before the State of Virginia will be considering the adoption of a

sales-tax law, and surely if Congress elects to adopt the Maryland law, it will naturally follow, and the same arguments will be used in the Virginia State Legislature, that are being used here today by the District Committee.

As a new member of the committee, and as a new Member of Congress, and as the only member of the majority party serving on this committee who is also serving for the first time on any committee in Congress, I am somewhat reluctant to criticize the action of the committee, especially since I have such a high regard for all of the individual members of the committee, and appreciate the years of experience which they have.

As is generally known, the District Committee is often subject to criticism, and even before I was appointed to membership on this committee, I heard the charge that more often than not the members of the District Committee were not interested in the affairs of the District, and more often than not, members were placed on this committee because there was no other place for them.

I did not ask for membership on the District Committee, and frankly, had no desire to serve in that capacity. However, since my appointment, I have accepted the responsibility and expect to work as diligently as I know how, and to make whatever contribution and to perform any service to the best of my ability.

Throughout the hearings and during the debate on this bill within the committee, I have received the impression that the committee has approached this proposition with a defeatist attitude. Throughout the consideration of this bill, I have heard the argument that the committee must be careful to provide certain exemptions if the bill is to pass. Possibly those members who have served on this committee before and who have had the experience of having tried unsuccessfully to secure the passage of a sales-tax bill for the District of Columbia, are justified in their position. However, as stated above, as a new member, I have attempted to approach this legislation on the basis of what is fair and just, and as a member of the committee, I shall attempt throughout the consideration of this bill to offer amendments which I honestly and sincerely believe will make this bill a better bill, and I hope that I may have the cooperation of the other Members of this House who are interested in passing the best bill possible, irrespective of what the experience has been in the past or what has been done by the Maryland Legislature.

As long as this Congress has the obligation to legislate for the District of Columbia, I feel that each of us should accept this responsibility and endeavor to pass a bill which will accomplish the purposes of the act, namely, that of providing adequate revenue to finance the District of Columbia.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, no matter how thin you slice this question, it is still a sales tax. If I am the only Member of this House to vote against it, I expect to record my opposition to it when the vote is taken today.

The New York State Legislature has never approved a general State sales tax in New York State, and there are many other States that have not yet come around to it. It seems to me that the only fair method of imposing a sales tax in the District of Columbia would be first to bring in a bill to give the people of the District suffrage, to give them an opportunity to elect their representatives, and then to accord their council the privilege of voting the sales tax up or down.

For my part, I cannot be a party to voting for a sales tax for the District of Columbia, because the people have no way of expressing their opinions and their wishes and desires either way.

Then, the sales tax, federally or in any other way, represents a poor man's tax. You can vote to saddle a tax upon the shoulders of the poor man if you want to. As for me, I cannot bring myself to vote for it, even though the question has been brought up again and again, and I have been on record every time that we have had a chance to vote on this question as unalterably opposed to it.

There is no reason in the world why we have to saddle the people of the District of Columbia or of any other subdivision of this country or of the National Government with an unfair, autocratic tax of this kind. As I have said, it is a poor man's tax. It is the way to sock the poor man and to let the rich man get out of paying a tax. It is entirely unfair to the rank and file of the people of this country. It is entirely unfair to the rank and file of the people of the District of Columbia and should be resisted by whatever opposition we can muster here today at least until we give the people of the District of Columbia a chance to vote on the question. We have had this question up here again and again. We have had the subject of suffrage in the District again and again. We passed it and each time it has been waylaid. It has been thrown out by the other body. I say give the people a chance at the ballot box. They have the right to vote in the District of Columbia just as much as in any other part of the country.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Do I understand correctly that the gentleman has been advocating over a long period of time a general old-age pension bill?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman is correct, but that is beside the point here. We are not talking about anything but the District of Columbia sales tax. If the gentleman will look up all the utterances that I have made on the subject he will find that I have fought this sales tax ever since I first took a position on it.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman advocated a 2-percent sales tax and a general pension plan?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman has not advocated anything of the kind. I have advocated a gross income tax for the aged, widows, and crippled persons with a $250 monthly exemption from personal income.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Is the gentleman in favor of increasing the pay for firemen?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman is beclouding the issue. The issue here is the sales tax. We can get the money all right. But the sales tax is the issue here.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Where are you going to get the money?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The sales tax is the issue at this time. You have a chance to vote it either up or down.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I hope the gentleman understands that the purpose of the bill is to take care of those needs.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. There again the gentleman is beclouding the issue because the question simply is the sales tax, and if you are for it, you have the privilege of voting for it. I sincerely hope that we who are against it will have a chance to vote against the sales tax.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the gentleman explain to me what is the difference between a 2 percent sales tax and 2 percent transaction tax, except that a transaction tax applies to everything including sales?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I do not know how these questions of transaction and gross income taxes got into this discussion, but I shall repeat they are irrelevant here. The sales tax reaches every man and woman who buy the necessities of life. Can you justify voting to put a sales tax on the necessities of life? I cannot.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Do I understand correctly that the gentleman appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means this morning in favor of the Townsend plan?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman is correct but will he tell me what that has to do with the subject we are now discussing? We are talking about a tax on the necessities of life, which is wrong.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to becloud the issue. In response to the fears of the gentleman from New York who is apprehensive about the poor, unrepresented taxpayer of the District of Columbia, upon whom he does not want to impose any unwanted burdens, I think he may dry his tears when I tell him which organizations in the District of Columbia approved this bill. It has been approved by the Washington Board of Trade. It has been approved by the Washington Taxpayers' Association. It has been approved by the Federation of Citizens' Associations. Those are all your unrepresented taxpayers. It has been approved by the Junior Board of Commerce. It has been approved by the Federation of Businessmen's Association. It has been

approved by the Northwest Council of Citizens' Associations. It has been approved by the Federation of Women's Clubs. So I do not think the gentleman need weep about the poor, unrepresented taxpayers of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment proposes to raise the exemption. Under the present bill, 51 cents is taxed with the 2-percent tax. The gentleman proposes to raise it to 60 cents. As the gentleman very fairly stated, we have tried, because of the proximity of Maryland, where they have a sales tax, to parallel it as far as we fairly could. That is the ratio in Maryland.

The committee considered this proposal in the joint committee with the Senate, and, after due discussion, it was our conclusion that, in fairness to everybody, particularly to the merchants who have to collect this tax, this was the best way to do it.

For instance, the great store of the Hecht Co., which operates in Washington, has a branch store in Maryland. If we vary the rate of tax from the Maryland rate of tax, that store would have to keep two sets of books, one on the amount of tax collected on the Maryland sales and the other on the amount of tax collected on the Washington sales. There are a great many companies which operate both in Maryland and in the District of Columbia.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. A great many of the labor groups and veterans groups have opposed this bill, have they not?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes. I failed to state who opposed the bill. It was opposed by the Wholesale Liquor Dealers' Association. It was opposed by the American Federation of Labor. It was opposed by the Henry Wallace Progressive Party. It was opposed by the Americans for Democratic Action. It is opposed by the CIO and it is opposed by the United Public Workers of America.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. HUBER. Are not some of those very worth-while organizations?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I have no doubt they are, from the gentleman's standpoint.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Did the fourth major political party, the Dixiecrats, take any stand on this?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not know that. I might add something that I had not said. This sales tax was approved by the President and approved by the Budget.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. BIEMILLER. As I understand it, if a resident of Maryland makes a purchase in the District, let us say of a radio, the company selling that radio in the District charges the Maryland sales tax to the resident of Maryland. Would this bill add on the additional sales tax in the District?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No. There is a specific provision that exempts that. Every sales tax has that compensating-use tax to protect the sales tax.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. HUBER. Did I understand the gentleman to say the President was for this?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. HUBER. Will the gentleman also support all of the other proposals of the President?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. If I think they are right, yes. I always do.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Also, the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, who is chairman of the Senate District Committee in the District of Columbia, is in favor of this sales-tax bill. According to the reports in the paper yesterday the Democratic leader from my own State, JOHN MCCORMACK, is in favor of this bill. They realize this is the only opportunity we have, inasmuch as Congress has turned down all the other alternatives.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KLEIN: Strike out section 1 of the bill and insert the following as a substitute:

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 3 (s) of title I, article I, is amended to read as follows:

"'(s) The word "resident" means every individual domiciled within the District on the last day of the taxable year, and every other individual who maintains a place of abode within the District for more than 7 months of the taxable year, whether domiciled in the District or not. The word "resident" shall not include any elective officer of the Government of the United States or any officer of the executive branch of such Government whose appointment to the office held by him was by the President of the United States and subject to confirmation by the Senate of the United States, unless such officers are domiciled within the District on the last day of the taxable year.'

"SEC. 2. Section 2 of title III is amended by striking out all of the paragraph numbered (b) (10) and renumbering the succeeding paragraphs as (10) and (11), respectively.

"SEC. 3. Section 3 of title III is amended by striking out all of the paragraph numbered 3 (b) (5) and renumbering the succeeding paragraph as (5).

"SEC. 4. Section 8 of title VI is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 3. IMPOSITION AND RATES OF TAX.—There is hereby annually levied and imposed for each taxable year upon the taxable income of every resident a tax at the following rates:

"'Two percent on the first $2,000 of taxable income.

"'Three percent on the next $3,000 of taxable income.

"'Four percent on the next $5,000 of taxable income.

"'Five percent on the taxable income in excess of $10,000.'

"SEC. 5. Article I is further amended by striking out all of title VIII and renumbering the succeeding titles as VIII, IX, X, XI, XII, XIII, XIV, and XV, respectively."

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read. It is the same amendment that I offered in a different form a few minutes ago.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. It is H. R. 1385?

Mr. KLEIN. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. KLEIN. I am not going to speak on the amendment. I have already explained it. It was offered in the previous form. I am now offering it as a substitute for the sales-tax bill. I do not propose to take the time of the membership by going into it any further.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia has reserved a point of order against the amendment. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, we are considering titles I and II of this bill; that is a sales tax. It is an entirely different proposition from the income tax; in fact, it is usually put in a separate title or in a separate bill.

Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a substitute for a sales tax of an income tax is not germane to the pending bill at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has offered an amendment as a substitute to the pending bill. The Chair is constrained to rule that it is germane, because in the gentleman's substitute he proposes a method of taxation which though somewhat different from the method proposed in the bill, nevertheless, is a method of taxation, and it is germane at this point.

The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, because I think I am as familiar with this increase phase of the tax bill as perhaps anyone here, and that is with reference to the problem of taxation of the employees of the Government and our own employees who work in our offices.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would raise just about everything that could be done to fair taxation to our Government employees and our employees on our own staffs. It completely disregards the conditions which we have in the District of Columbia which applies to the very fact that our own employees are here because we are here, and the fact that many of our district employees or many of the employees, residents of our districts, are here for the reason that we are here, that they are employed by the Congress.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. If the gentleman will let me proceed a little further, I shall then be pleased to yield to him.

In 1947 it happened that I led the fight on an income-tax bill here which dealt with that problem and as a result overwhelmingly, by about a 3 to 1 majority, the House adopted the so-called O'Hara amendment which exempted those bona fide domiciliary residents of other States from taxation within the District. It was partly precipitated, let me say, by the over-zealousness of the tax collectors here in the District in even failing to recognize the decision of the circuit court of appeals in several cases.

In this tax bill we are giving consideration to our Government employees and our own staffs; we are giving them consideration because we are setting the exemption so that they do not pay taxes until a net income of $5,000 is earned. This is a compromise, Mr. Chairman, to the situation which has heretofore existed following the adoption of the O'Hara amendment, and I hope the House will not adopt the amendment offered, as I know, in good faith, by the gentleman from New York, because it has never been considered by the Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee; so far as I know, the gentleman from New York has not pressed for hearings upon it before the Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee.

Mr. KLEIN. I have not. I asked for a hearing, but I could not get one; and I never pressed the committee, thinking I could not get one.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. The gentleman desired me to yield to him; I yield to him now.

Mr. KLEIN. I wish to make this one point: Would the gentleman be willing to go along with the amendment excluding or exempting from the payment of this tax, using the wording of this particular bill, the members of the staffs of the Members of Congress? Would the gentleman vote for my amendment or my substitute if that language were used?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. No; I would not vote for the failure of consideration that is given, such, for example, as the imposition of a 2-percent tax on the first $2,000 of taxable income. That would be a tax of $40 upon the little clerk who earns $2,000.

Mr. KLEIN. No. There is an exemption. I am only amending that particular portion of the revenue act. The other portions of the revenue act remain in effect, so do the exemptions.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I do not know, but I think it would be a very complicated adjunct to this bill. The gentleman is for these retroactive pay increases and pay increases to the District employees.

Mr. KLEIN. That is right.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. The gentleman knows we cannot meet that burden with this bill, is that not a fact?

Mr. KLEIN. That is true. The gentleman knows I want to be fair.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I appreciate that.

Mr. KLEIN. Would the gentleman be willing and would the members of the committee be willing to vote for a motion to recommit the bill and have the committee go into my bill?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I may say in answer to the gentleman that after all of the time this committee has spent on this whole problem we could not agree to that. Of course, I am not in position to speak for the rest of the committee. I would not agree to send this bill back to the subcommittee. We have spent weeks on it and I think something has to be done. We are holding up the pay increases for the District employees which I think is unfair to them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there have been a lot of arguments here for a sales tax which on careful analysis will not stand up. A question was asked a little bit ago as to what protection the District would receive from adjacent territories not having a sales tax. The answer was given that there is a provision in the bill which would provide for a use tax. If anyone thinks that a use tax will collect a tax on items purchased in Virginia, he is very naive or else entirely unfamiliar with attempts of other States to enforce a use tax. It will take more money than the sales tax would bring in to try adequately to enforce the use tax provision. You just simply cannot do it.

A question has been asked about where you are going to raise this money. I have no particular interest in the liquor industry, but I was more than a little amazed to learn that the price of liquor in the District of Columbia is about 40 percent less than it is in my State due to the fact that there is very little tax on liquor sold in the District and without being facetious I might say, with the amount apparently consumed, if you would believe what you read in the papers and magazines in the District, you can raise the entire amount by simply increasing the liquor tax so that it might conform with the liquor tax in other States.

A point that has not been adequately made is the fact that on small items which the little-income man purchases one at a time, this bill goes far beyond the 2-percent tax. Many times it would amount to 10 percent.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. We could by increasing the ad valorem tax only 25 cents raise $4,000,000 additional, we could increase the Federal contribution the way it should be increased, we could put in an income tax that would raise $16,000,000 more, we could repeal the act of 1878 and raise funds for capital improvements through bonded indebtedness. There are any number of ways that the money could be raised. This is not the only way.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

There is another point I would like to make to the new Members of Congress. I am not very familiar with the District administration. As a matter of fact, the only contact I have had with any of the officials who administer the government of the District was at the Washington Board of Trade dinner when the President of the Board of Commissioners made a speech which I would say would insult the intellect of any Member of Congress. I think it was very unfortunate. I do not know what his motives were and I do not know why he did it, but if that is the kind of administration they have in the District I am just a little suspicious of any increase in taxation of any kind and as a new Member I would like to hear more about it, how the District is administered and where the money goes.

I would like to go back for a moment because I have had experience in Ohio with the problem of collecting this use tax. There is going to be a migration of certain groups of people to Virginia to buy certain articles especially if the tax saving is in any appreciable amount, say $2, $4, or $6. I would like to have somebody tell me just how you propose to collect hat tax from the people who can go over there and who can afford to go over there and buy those expensive articles. Personally I do not think it can be collected and I would be glad to yield to anybody who can tell me how it can be collected. What you are doing, gentlemen, is putting taxes on the people who are least able to pay and providing a loophole for those who care to dodge a tax on articles where the tax will amount to any appreciable sum on a given article. I submit to you that we should think twice before we pass that kind of legislation.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. It seems to me that the committee was very circumspect in trying to get out a bill that would cause the least amount of oppression to those low-income groups. As I said earlier, we came to the sales tax as a last resort, and if the gentleman had been here in the Eightieth Congress and the Congresses before that, he would have realized the difficulty of passing a revenue measure for the District of Columbia. So, we have presented the most liberal sales tax that has ever been presented to this Congress.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I think it is a very debatable question as to whether any form of sales tax is a liberal tax.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think the discussion that is going on here now will illustrate the difficulty of trying to write a revenue bill on the floor of the House. It is utterly impossible. For instance, take the proposed substitute here offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN]. Not even the gentleman himself has any conception of how much that would raise; whether it would balance the budget or whether it would not balance the budget. We all know that a similar proposal was offered here in the House which would have resulted in the taxation of District and Federal employees who are domiciled in their home States,

and the overwhelming sentiment of this House voted the income tax down.

Now we are getting a little bit tired in the Committee on the District of Columbia doing futile things. We have proposed all of these things to you, and you vote them down one after another. Well, how are you going to make a balanced budget for the District of Columbia? I know it is not a popular thing to vote for appropriations and tax measures, but we are still presented with the practical problem of where are you going to get the money to balance the budget for the District of Columbia and pay the expenses of the National Capital in which I know you gentlemen all take great pride?

Now, the gentleman who preceded me said that it was utterly impractical to enforce the use tax. I note that the gentleman is from Ohio. I note that Ohio has a sales tax, and I have no doubt that it is working to meet their financial situation. And I have not heard of any great effort in Ohio to repeal the sales tax. But as to this use tax which the gentleman says cannot be enforced, I want to say to him that this committee, which has given weeks of time to this thing, had before it all the doubts that have been expressed here today about various and sundry things. We undertook to resolve those doubts, and on the question of the use tax we sent over to Maryland and asked the Administrator of that tax and his two assistants to come over and tell us how the thing operated in practice, and they did so. We spent an afternoon with the administrator of the sales tax in Maryland. He told us that the use tax had worked in Washington when Washington had no sales tax. Now, why should it not work in Washington when Washington has no sales tax? You know many purchases are made in Washington by people who live in Maryland. They have a system worked out. They have a series of licenses to operate, and they have a method by which, they say, they have successfully operated it. I do not know just how they do it, and neither do you, but I think I know a little bit more about it than the gentleman who just preceded me, who has not had the benefit of the very extensive hearings we have had on this matter.

The gentleman says that liquor taxes are low in the District of Columbia, and all we have to do is raise them commensurate with other jurisdictions, and we will balance the whole budget. Perhaps the gentleman was not here when this discussion started. It will take $18,000,000 to balance the budget of the District of Columbia. The fact is that this same fiscal affairs committee has held hearings and now has before it a bill to increase the liquor taxes in the District; in fact, to double the liquor taxes. It is expected that that bill will come out in due course. We are trying to balance the budget. If the sales tax does not do it, we figure that the increase in the liquor tax will make up this deficit to the extent of a million or a million and a half dollars. Add that to the sales tax and the other measures which we hope to bring to you from time to time during the session, and we hope to balance the budget and put at least the Nation's Capital on a fair, sound fiscal basis.

I do hope the House will have some little confidence in the members of this subcommittee, who have really gone into the subject very thoroughly and spent a great deal of time on it.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I was sitting here correcting some remarks I made earlier this morning when I heard the gentleman say, "Where are we going to get the money?" My ears cocked up. I was surprised to hear the gentleman say that.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I was merely plagiarizing the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Then when I heard the gentleman say we would balance the budget, I almost did not know how to contain myself. I hope you on that side of the House do that.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, later I am going to offer an amendment. If we cannot have any tears shed here for the poor, maybe we can get some shed for those who are not so poor. The amendment I shall offer would exclude any article that now bears a so-called Federal excise luxury tax. It seems to me that attention should be directed to a tax that is unbearable, a tax that is a burden on the rich as well as the poor, and is such a burden that another 2 percent would be unbearable for all.

In general, I am opposed to the sales tax. I appreciate the work the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] have done, but I have not been convinced that all the avenues have been explored whereby sufficient revenue could be had from other sources.

It has been said here time and time again that the ad valorem tax is low, the liquor tax is low, and the income tax is ineffective. Why should not a study be made of those things? You say we have already had such studies. Of course, we have, but we should not weary of well-doing, because some day we shall pass some of these bills.

The thing that can cure all this business for the District of Columbia, and I hope the members of the committee will take into consideration the basic ailment we have here is once and for all to get rid of the District Committee and place its work in the hands of the people, so they can take care of their own tax laws and anything else they want to do. It seems to me that is the problem that should be met.

I know the gentleman from Massachusetts has been saying, "We have already raised the ad valorem tax 25 percent," but in the same breath he would tell you that they have raised the teachers' salaries 85 percent. Yet he is coming back with another increase for them of $330, which does not argue for consistency in this matter of taxation.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.

Mr. HAND. The ad valorem tax is at an extremely low point here in the District and is approximately one-third of the ad valorem tax on real estate which prevails in my State, and I dare say in the gentleman's State.

I would also suggest to the gentleman that there is no other place I know of in the country in which the operation and ownership of real estate is so profitable as it is here.

Mr. GRANGER. That is well said.

Mr. HAND. The gentlemen are talking about exploring new fields for taxation and we are entirely overlooking the question of a reasonable tax on real estate in Washington.

Mr. GRANGER. I thank the gentleman for his observation. The property owners of the District of Columbia are exceedingly blessed because every day of the year there is funneled into the District the pay rolls of the Federal Government, which is something that no other city in the United States enjoys. The people here ought to be willing to pay for that. As has been indicated here their assessed valuation on property has gone up. The thing that counts on a percentage basis is where you start. If you start at the bottom as was done in this instance, why you could raise it 100 percent and it would not mean a thing. I am opposed to this bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In addition to the advantages which the gentleman has pointed out, property owners and tradesmen enoy the unique situation here where in times of depression definite financing holds up the volume of business and even increases it.

Mr. GRANGER. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. So the people in the District of Columbia have a guarantee against depression which other sections of the country must suffer.

Mr. GRANGER. That is true. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to reemphasize once more the seriousness of this situation. The question before the Committee at the moment is the adoption of the Klein amendment to the income provisions of this bill. The Klein amendment, in the form of H. R. 1385, which has been offered to the House for its consideration, is in substance about the same kind of measure that we have been offering on the floor of the House for 10 years past, except in upping or doubling the present income-tax rate.

In 1939, when the sales tax was originally recommended after a survey made by one of the most outstanding tax experts in the country on fiscal matters, he recommended the sales tax along with an income tax. I opposed the sales tax that year. We adopted the income tax on a motion which I made on the floor of the House and seconded by our former colleague from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. That income-tax bill became law and is now the basic income-tax law of the District. The only difference between that law which is now on the books and which we had hoped during the past 10 years would be approved and would develop sources of revenue that would be adequate and equitable, and the Klein amendment, is with reference to the meaning of the word "resident," and whether one is domiciled in the District of Columbia regardless of where he claims his residence.

If a person is here in the District 7 months of the year as or on December 31, the last day of the taxable year, he or she would be subject to tax. That bill was defeated year after year. Again, 2 years ago, when I became chairman of the Fiscal Committee of the House District Committee, we recommended the inclusion in the definition of "resident," anyone who is here domiciled for 7 months of the year as of the last day of the taxable year. But the House, as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] said, defeated the substance of the bill by adopting the O'Hara amendment by a vote of 3 to 1. That was somewhat along the line of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] at this moment. Of course, if that was the attitude of the House, we could do nothing about it. But it was an important source of revenue. We had just increased the real-estate tax 30 percent in order to meet the obligations under the budgetary requirements of that year.

In order to meet the requirements of the District, we will have to increase the property bill to nearly double what it was 2 years ago. I illustrated the point where a man paid $175 in 1947. Under this bill, if we have to raise the property tax, he will have to pay $336. That is nearly double the amount of tax in a period of 2 years. Of course, there is an end to the road in what a property owner can pay. If we cannot broaden the income-tax base, if we cannot find some other substantial source of revenue, we have to go to a source which I have opposed for 10 years, but for which there is no alternative—namely the sales tax.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. I would like the gentleman to go into some detail as to how you will double the taxes in 2 years. You are getting $40,000,000 in property taxes now. You need only $12,000,000 more. According to my simple method of calculating, that would be an increase of 25 percent.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. It is easy to explain. We have a deficit of $18,000,000. It will take 80 cents more on the tax rate to meet that. That will bring the tax bill on a piece of property, assessed at $12,000, previously assessed at $10,000, up to $336. That is nearly double the tax bill in the period 2 years ago or 92 percent. That is clear mathematics. You cannot get away from it. Now, if you want to adopt the Klein amendment, it is all right with me, but the Members of this House, only a year ago, voted 3 to 1 that these poor folks, who live in Washington, several hundred thousand of them who claim their residence in Illinois or Texas or California or somewhere else, shall not pay any tax. That is what you said and that is why we have this bill before us today for this is the only reasonable alternative to develop large sources of revenue. A compilation of the revenue and expenditure situation from 1937 to 1950, inclusive, shows many interesting facts pertaining to the financial picture in the District prepared by the District auditor. The tables follow:

Actual revenues of the District of Columbia for the fiscal years 1937 to 1948, inclusive, and estimated revenues for the fiscal years 1949 to 1950, inclusive, based on current tax laws

Year	Realty tax rate	Assessed value	Taxes														
			Realty	Income	Personal tangible	Utilities, etc.	Alcoholic beverage	Insurance	Vehicle personal	Inheritance and estate	Beer	Intangible and business	Interest penalties	Rents and permits	ABC licenses	All other licenses
1937	$1.50	$1,144,457,150	$17,489,320	----------	$1,066,696	$2,024,925	$1,213,854	$514,239	$622,437	----------	----------	$2,686,117	$344,800	$816,910	$761,486	$540,496
1938	1.75	1,171,330,921	20,216,601	----------	1,437,381	2,299,577	1,187,405	610,925	740,591	$43,621	$6,749	4,821,979	325,738	386,409	726,872	983,894
1939	1.75	1,193,490,086	20,940,082	----------	1,526,437	2,138,167	1,212,930	833,747	620,429	430,642	164,170	4,695,396	319,832	280,378	715,161	758,896
1940	1.75	1,211,206,484	21,437,526	$2,275,748	1,485,466	2,210,635	1,421,084	828,506	985,937	842,537	174,668	426,783	308,525	261,898	714,947	711,802
1941	1.75	1,237,937,085	21,901,820	3,872,232	1,660,602	2,230,045	1,585,547	869,107	1,247,906	817,777	194,196	54,303	280,492	350,471	702,936	699,694
1942	1.75	1,267,288,429	22,483,025	5,584,902	1,950,951	2,548,626	1,930,940	922,571	1,228,514	1,008,329	227,819	98,919	321,852	400,912	700,680	776,985
1943	1.75	1,326,992,815	23,305,510	7,210,613	2,099,214	2,851,637	2,095,413	970,814	1,042,694	1,351,206	265,896	33,199	255,296	313,296	660,233	882,540
1944	1.75	1,354,348,720	23,846,726	8,675,602	3,095,008	3,234,141	1,819,369	1,001,348	963,912	1,772,293	294,340	26,073	328,309	400,540	690,041	790,879
1945	1.75	1,370,162,300	24,225,718	8,909,710	3,264,747	3,276,669	2,138,519	1,078,195	939,217	1,496,479	287,270	23,377	290,416	327,382	730,851	896,720
1946	1.75	1,391,881,052	24,630,732	9,221,728	3,472,047	3,225,498	2,397,646	1,142,463	1,040,209	1,133,221	290,537	1,830	284,217	542,998	775,384	1,100,611
1947	1.75	1,396,017,481	24,773,659	9,962,909	3,705,933	3,526,959	2,143,678	1,302,978	1,676,496	1,587,903	295,010	965	241,916	529,698	753,989	1,187,070
1948	2.00	1,372,527,304	31,314,334	[1] 10,740,803	3,274,614	3,805,617	2,066,453	1,444,756	2,527,253	2,101,663	301,465	832	255,588	449,820	790,919	1,406,646
1949	2.00	1,594,245,750	32,225,000	10,600,000	5,800,000	4,170,000	2,000,000	1,450,000	2,500,000	1,800,000	300,000	----------	225,000	400,000	795,000	1,659,000
1950 estimate	2.00	1,628,000,000	32,500,000	[2] 10,600,000	5,800,000	4,200,000	2,000,000	1,450,000	2,500,000	1,800,000	300,000	----------	225,000	400,000	795,000	1,705,000

Year	Court fines	Fees and forfeitures	Police and fire relief	Assessments	Care of insane	All other reimbursements	Sales products services assets	Direct deposits	Federal payment	Total general fund	Gasoline tax	Vehicle registration	All other	Total highway fund	Total water fund	Grand total
1937	$470,126	$801,445	$213,730	$331,666	$124,711	$19,893	$154,670	$29,982	$5,000,000	$34,906,457	$2,573,164	----------	$182,213	$2,757,477	$1,708,839	$39,372,793
1938	532,408	487,189	202,674	237,277	132,287	35,427	90,286	35,478	5,000,000	40,462,139	2,651,891	$1,283,383	492,003	4,428,277	2,353,894	47,225,030
1939	500,745	507,259	213,773	161,711	143,465	29,611	126,189	52,210	5,000,000	41,330,007	2,725,499	1,304,152	907,355	4,937,036	2,337,741	48,625,284
1940	524,368	551,915	220,107	122,966	162,949	77,197	137,221	60,305	6,000,000	41,943,130	2,943,796	1,325,073	778,120	5,046,989	2,115,048	49,105,167
1941	668,247	608,046	225,854	121,099	186,965	47,986	229,001	178,297	6,000,000	44,727,606	3,198,455	1,442,040	741,689	5,382,184	2,570,807	52,680,597
1942	918,628	562,481	216,653	132,554	203,398	114,742	268,384	285,443	6,000,000	48,881,756	4,245,639	1,360,804	889,253	6,354,398	2,896,595	58,072,439
1943	939,518	434,737	235,756	100,829	304,243	170,855	230,938	178,517	6,000,000	52,735,942	3,247,413	1,198,713	772,769	5,218,895	3,031,242	60,986,079
1944	891,339	424,749	222,328	93,617	314,397	198,989	271,540	215,595	6,000,000	55,686,104	2,896,153	1,098,273	656,322	4,650,748	2,911,699	63,242,551
1945	857,276	467,238	244,293	108,738	448,843	200,604	295,249	154,300	6,000,000	56,862,735	2,866,064	1,064,111	617,521	4,541,696	3,433,611	64,838,062
1946	1,119,593	527,883	270,080	123,151	544,410	99,469	317,375	110,982	6,000,000	58,481,074	3,680,768	1,158,532	641,858	5,481,158	3,442,929	67,405,161
1947	1,399,969	656,954	358,356	126,220	584,696	114,999	382,061	344,432	8,000,000	63,650,698	4,335,858	1,405,073	712,758	6,453,689	2,599,640	73,704,027
1948	1,203,227	667,692	350,200	116,150	652,836	230,018	499,753	827,301	11,000,000	78,193,205	6,032,897	1,551,100	903,846	8,489,843	[3] 5,304,940	91,992,690
1949	1,200,000	700,000	350,000	125,000	675,000	225,000	450,000	570,000	11,000,000	78,610,000	6,600,000	1,600,000	974,800	9,174,800	[3] 5,966,000	93,739,800
1950 estimate	1,200,000	700,000	350,000	125,000	675,000	225,000	450,000	570,000	11,000,000	[3] 78,950,000	6,800,000	1,625,000	970,000	9,395,000	[3] 5,976,000	94,321,000

[1] Includes corporation and unincorporated business taxes.
[2] Includes $1,000,000 Federal contribution, excludes $219,011 sale of securities.
[3] Excludes $10,000,000 estimated revenues from proposed sales tax.

Actual cash expenditures of the District of Columbia for the fiscal years 1937 to 1948 and estimated appropriations for 1949 to 1950 by functions

Year	General government			Protection of life and property, including street lighting		Health and sanitation		Public welfare and hospitals		Education		Recreation		Miscellaneous maintenance
	Maintenance	Capital	United States loan repayments [1]	Maintenance	Capital	Maintenance	Capital	Maintenance	Capital	Maintenance	Capital	Maintenance	Capital	
1937	$2,306,155	[2] $620,127	$1,000,000	$8,499,843	$168,900	$2,301,173	[3] $467,345	$8,652,682	$183,765	$10,953,941	$1,054,158	$1,484,550	$350,000	$201,230
1938	3,013,533	1,180,368	1,000,000	7,868,200	138,830	2,466,393	639,786	8,453,817	253,792	11,247,846	1,821,999	1,393,769	350,000	228,278
1939	2,812,377	152,685	1,000,000	7,983,911	115,994	2,604,248	585,805	8,757,074	182,513	11,261,725	2,696,046	1,407,531	463,248	336,847
1940	3,366,190	160,678	477,610	7,851,294	157,794	2,547,362	720,595	9,100,481	161,646	11,584,182	2,016,889	1,238,818	572,173	278,522
1941	3,378,629	114,574	800,000	8,423,861	1,404,087	2,752,353	813,141	9,902,786	414,774	11,991,674	1,635,918	1,209,186	366,000	391,509
1942	3,504,145	172,319	600,000	8,344,674	1,334,301	2,901,888	987,881	10,659,372	211,584	11,801,288	1,640,181	1,497,732	329,002	382,785
1943	3,941,604	85,453	2,500,000	8,932,691	202,032	3,669,069	780,121	10,983,367	122,550	11,698,402	1,526,789	1,625,330	304,531	219,638
1944	4,333,395	12,269	5,849,998	9,908,025	123,994	4,124,418	618,820	11,383,910	64,328	14,423,055	297,671	1,880,090	1,001,083	357,371
1945	5,404,271	[5] 5,043,911	5,035,849	9,346,731	106,037	4,101,440	715,508	10,982,112	65,440	13,352,578	631,893	1,991,127	57,390	17,279
1946	5,648,470	[5] 5,238,353	122,000	11,153,892	71,588	4,743,259	925,730	13,043,905	228,595	14,547,377	301,646	2,047,853	77,360	2,531
1947	6,511,023	438,885	649,997	13,588,287	85,062	5,675,140	2,070,587	17,954,382	201,402	17,872,330	637,158	2,401,422	375,706	55,056
1948	7,609,376	228,506	150,000	13,865,182	99,501	6,073,311	1,937,052	20,606,034	472,078	20,135,599	1,893,699	3,050,445	200,951	49,427
1949	8,054,100	80,000		14,709,000	365,700	6,459,000	2,561,000	23,360,500	411,600	21,416,000	4,965,683	3,140,100	281,000	52,238
1950 estimate	7,978,700			15,611,500	231,400	6,708,000	2,965,000	24,200,177	1,877,000	22,057,200	2,480,250	3,498,400	180,000	

Year	General fund				Highway fund				Water fund				Surplus [4]	Grand total
	Maintenance	Capital	Total	Surplus or deficit [4]	Maintenance	Capital	Total	Surplus or deficit (−)	Maintenance	Capital	Total			
1937	$34,368,974	$3,844,355	$38,243,329		(6)	(6)	$2,373,344		(6)	(6)	$2,142,459			$42,759,132
1938	34,672,136	5,386,769	40,058,905		(6)	(6)	4,520,295		(6)	(6)	[8] 2,554,938			47,134,138
1939	35,153,713	5,196,352	40,300,065		(6)	(6)	4,732,177		(6)	(6)	[8] 2,389,846			17,422,088
1940	35,996,849	4,207,385	40,174,234		(6)	(6)	5,607,122		(6)	(6)	[8] 2,535,214			48,316,570
1941	38,049,398	5,548,494	43,597,892		(6)	(6)	4,881,612		(6)	(6)	[8] 2,246,587			50,726,091
1942	39,091,864	5,385,868	44,477,732		(6)	(6)	5,716,500		(6)	(6)	2,885,199			53,079,431
1943	40,770,101	5,521,489	46,291,590		(6)	(6)	5,323,799		(6)	(6)	2,412,843			54,028,232
1944	46,610,234	7,968,163	54,578,397		(6)	(6)	3,495,126		(6)	(6)	2,861,883			60,935,405
1945	45,195,558	[7] 11,706,328	56,901,886		$2,379,679	$1,043,972	3,423,651	$81,811,253	$664,475	2,475,731	3,328,355			62,801,269
1946	50,967,289	[7] 6,965,202	57,582,491		2,780,429	[9] 1,708,515	4,488,944	2,128,482	[10] 1,199,877	3,884,287	4,478,603			65,399,790
1947	64,057,649	4,458,831	68,516,471		2,884,403	[9] 5,153,014	8,037,417	2,427,215	1,457,072	4,478,603	[11] 5,357,184			80,438,175
1948	71,479,574	5,091,790	76,481,364	$6,138,248	3,578,085	[10] 4,886,102	8,464,187	−$9,328	2,692,886	1,785,905	6,517,700			89,424,214
1949	77,190,928	8,694,983	85,885,921		4,032,200	5,250,000	9,282,200	[12] 23,804	3,320,700	3,197,000	6,270,000	[13] 912,668		101,655,821
1950 estimate	80,055,977	7,673,650	[14] 87,727,627		[11] 7,008,300	4,196,800	5,125,000	9,323,800	[12] 219,115	3,327,000	2,743,000	6,270,000	[13] 648,068	103,321,427

[1] The column represents repayments under PWA program for municipal improvements, act of June 27, 1934, providing for participation of $10,750,000, act of June 24, 1938, $19,150,000, act of July 11, 1940, $420,000, and Lanham Act repayments.

[2] Includes $161,902 for street improvements assessment and permit work, in subsequent years' expenditures for this purpose are included in the highway fund.

[3] Balances include $10,000,000 invested in Government securities on account of the public works investment fund.

[4] Balances include $1,773,000 invested in Government securities.

[5] No break-down of highway and water fund expenditures by maintenance and capital outlay is available for the years 1937 to 1944.

[6] Expenditures from the water fund for the years 1938 to 1941 include a total of $1,836,661 for investments in Government securities, par value $1,773,000.

[7] General fund capital outlay expenditures include $5,000,000 in 1945 and $5,000,000 in 1946 for investment in Government securities on account of the public works investment fund; for the purposes of this statement investments of $5,000,000 from the general fund and $2,000,000 from the highway fund authorized by sec. 8 of the act of June 30, 1945, are treated as part of available cash balances.

[8] Expenditures in 1946 for capital outlay from the highway fund and water fund include $44,000 and $242,594, respectively, for repayments of PWA loans.

[9] Includes $124,998 for repayment of PWA loan.

[10] Includes $52,951 for repayment of PWA loan.

[11] Includes $1,150,000 in 1949 and $1,700,000 in 1950 representing estimated appropriation balances to be returned to surplus.

[12] Includes $92,924 in 1949 and $171,719 in 1950 representing estimated appropriation balances to be returned to surplus.

[13] Includes $107,184 in 1949 and $30,000 in 1950 representing estimated appropriation balances to be returned to surplus.

[14] Excludes, $1,000,000 shown in the budget as "Other supplemental items."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

It would give me great pleasure to go along with the author of this bill——

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 9 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, it would give me great pleasure to go along with the author of this bill because I admire him so very much, but here is a proposition on which I cannot agree with the author. I hold in my hand H. R. 1386, introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN], who is the author of the amendment now before us. This bill has to do with revenue, as I see it. It proposes to give the District of Columbia Alcohol Control Board the right to govern the sales contracts on all liquor sold in this District. Based on statistics which I have obtained and conversations I have had with people in this industry, such as Mr. Milton Kronheim——

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman has the wrong bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It is not the wrong bill. I am going to tell the committee where you can get $20,000,000 much easier than you can by taking it out of the people on whom you propose to charge this sales tax, if instead of passing H. R. 1386 so that Milt Kronheim and his liquor stores can raise the price of liquor to the people in the District $1 per fifth which will give them about $20,000,000 additional revenue. If the District will take over the sale of liquor, such as in my State, for instance, and such as Virginia has done, and a number of other States, then the District of Columbia could pick up about $20,000,000 without raising the liquor price, through the profit it makes on the sale of liquor, and then the District could meet the budget and that would make unnecessary the income tax which the gentleman from New York proposes and would make unnecessary this sales tax here proposed.

This bill, H. R. 1386, while not before the House for consideration today, is to be put on the calendar; and when it comes up on the Consent Calendar I serve notice that if I get the chance I will kill it on the Consent Calendar as I did last year, because I am in favor of people getting along with what they have instead of continually raising taxes to pay the bills.

We can pay this deficit; we can make ends meet by changing the distribution methods of liquor in this District. Let the District handle the sale of liquor; let that revenue come to the District. Then you will not have to raise taxes. The poor man is entitled to his drink of liquor if he wants to spend money that way, the same as is the rich man, but do not let a liquor monopoly operated by men such as Mr. Kronheim come in here and pull the wool over your eyes on a bill such as H. R. 1386 when you can let the District take the revenue, pay the

deficit and make unnecessary these sales taxes.

These are the reasons why I cannot go along with the author of the bill on this proposition.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is one of the very things that was tried on the floor of this House, the very thing the gentleman suggests. When the last District tax bill was pending on the floor of this House I offered a substitute to have all liquor sold in District-owned stores and raise the revenue for the District of Columbia instead of for the liquor dealers; and this House voted me down.

Mr. CRAWFORD. We should have done it then, and we can do it now instead of putting on this sales tax.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Why not put the tax on the liquor and retain the sales tax? Why should the people back home have to spend money all the time to meet District needs?

Mr. CRAWFORD. My friend from Pennsylvania is a good businessman. It is unnecessary to put the tax on the liquor. Let the District make the distribution and take the profits being made from the sales, without raising the price.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE] is recognized.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that the committee has made an honest and sincere effort to write a tax bill that will take care of the District budget. The amendment that is before the House, as I understand it—and I wish to be corrected if I am wrong—is offered as a substitute for the section that provides for a sales tax and establishes a new definition for residents of the District who will pay an income tax. Of course I am in favor of a sales tax in the District even though I am not satisfied with the large exemption provided in the income-tax section.

It seems to me this amendment strikes out the new sales-tax provision from this bill entirely and I cannot subscribe to this. I do not believe the bill raises enough money in the present form. On the whole I think the members of this committee will be disappointed in the results of their bill, for in a later title of the bill, the income-tax exemption has been raised to $5,000, with $500 for each dependent. I believe the returns from this bill will not equal what the committee anticipates; I believe there will be a great many persons who will escape entirely the income tax and the final returns would be disappointing. The exemption is far above that of most of the States. While I am going to support the bill I believe it is going to be a disappointment to the members of the District Committee.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The only reason we increased the exemption from $1,000 as provided in the present law to $5,000 in the pending bill is because we are also recommending a sales tax.

Mr. LECOMPTE. We have a sales tax also in Iowa, Missouri, Illinois, Ohio, Indiana, and many other States; but I do not believe there is any such exemption as $5,000 in any of those States.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. May I say that the increased exemption was an attempt to offset the effect of double taxation.

Mr. LECOMPTE. We need the income tax, the sales tax, increased liquor taxes, and higher ad valorem taxes on real estate so that the budget of the District will be provided without so large a contribution from the Federal Government. We should not ask the taxpayers of the country to make an additional contribution to the support of the local District government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MCGUIRE] is recognized.

Mr. MCGUIRE. Mr. Chairman, I have been elected to office for the last 16 years in my State. I know every town in Connecticut. I have been Democratic State chairman and I am on record in Connecticut against the sales tax 2 years ago. Our party platform stated that we are against it this last time and I am still against it. I would not want to embarrass any of you people here who are getting $15,000 a year to raise your hand and tell me how much money you are putting in the bank at the end of each month. Consequently I do not know how anybody lives down here on two, three, four or five thousand dollars a year. For one, I would not want to have it said that I voted to burden anybody else.

Here is what Chester Bowles said in his message to the legislature in Connecticut:

> The sales tax is a particularly bad tax because it weighs most heavily upon the poorest families and the families with the largest number of children. It is a bad tax because it loads a heavy burden of compliance upon the merchants who must collect it. It is a bad tax because it imposes a comparative disadvantage upon businessmen who are forced to compete with merchants in neighboring cities or States.

Another thing, I think that these visitors who come down here should be protected. I really like to look up in the gallery and see high-school students here. It must be expensive enough for them to be here for two, three or four days and I do not think we ought to discourage these students from coming down here. We ought to encourage them because it is a beautiful city and if there is anything we can do to make them feel proud that they are Americans, I am for it.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KLEIN) there were—ayes 50, noes 100.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. HUBER: On page 10, line 1, strike out "off the premises where such food is sold."

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment simply exempts food sold on the premises. If you intend to cram this bill down the throats of the defenseless residents of the District of Columbia, you might at least provide some safeguard to these Government employees who are having a difficult time making both ends meet due to the high cost of living.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUBER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. When it comes to cramming it down the throats of the residents of the District of Columbia, owing to the fact they do not have the right of suffrage are we not cramming down their throats any bill we pass here regardless?

Mr. HUBER. Well, it so happens the citizens of the District are displaced persons. There are a lot of things that should be done in their behalf, and if we will get together as members of the Democratic Party and rise to our responsibilities we will be able to correct a great many of the existing inequities.

I hold in my hand a menu of the House of Representatives restaurant. The press throughout the country say that we eat T-bone steaks down here for 75 cents and that everything else is very cheap, but you and I know that is not true. Before OPA was scuttled milk sold for 7 cents, now 10 cents. On this menu a plate of soup is 20 cents. A cup of soup is 15 cents; pie is 20 cents and a hamburger sandwich 40. If these prices are low you can imagine how much it costs Washington citizens to obtain meals in the other sections of this District where they are not able to patronize Government restaurants. If a Government employee has an apartment somewhere they can take the food home tax free, but the other person who is unable to prepare his or her food at home is entitled to the same exemption as that afforded those fortunate enough not to take their meals in restaurants at any rate. Many little Government employees live in cheap quarters, if they are fortunate enough to find some that have not been decontrolled, and they wear shabbier clothes and make a lot of other sacrifices. But, at least, they are entitled to have sales-tax exemption on the food which is necessary to keep body and soul together.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUBER. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Did the gentleman ever go out here to Olney Inn or Normandie Farms and see four or five of these ladies under civil service walk in and order cocktails around about 70 cents a drink and then order $2.50 dinners and then come down here and hit the Congress for more money?

Mr. HUBER. I have never been in the places the gentleman mentioned and

would not know; however, I have heard that Members of Congress go to dinners put on by lobbyists and eat $10 filet mignon steaks and drink quantities of expensive liquor and still refuse to give the Government employees a break.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Missouri: Page 10, lines 1 and 2, strike out all of subsection (e) in lines 1 and 2.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio and myself are just alike, except we are just different. He wants to give further exemptions and I want to cut out the exemptions. As I said before, I am in favor of a sales-tax bill which will raise some revenue. I want to tell you that the more exemptions you put into this bill the more difficult the enforcement is going to be. As I said earlier in the day, I feel that all the people of the District should contribute to the operation of the schools of this District, particularly, as well as the other expenses of our Government. I feel that if you exclude food you are going to bring about great confusion due to the fact that in the grocery stores especially, you are going to exempt food for human consumption and yet you are going to tax many of the other items in that store. In other words, when the customer goes to the butcher department, the meat department, he will be asked whether he is buying that food for human consumption. A soupbone for a dog will be taxable; if for the table—not taxable. Think of the soap, the cleaning articles, and all the other small items that are handled by the grocery store that are not food. They are still subject to tax. I say, if you are going to have a sales-tax bill, let us have a sales-tax bill which will make it easy of enforcement. I would like also to make this observation in urging the adoption of this amendment. I offered an amendment here earlier in the day, and that was voted down. That amendment was not discussed; it was not debated. Instead, we debated on the merits and the demerits of this bill. I would like to see the debate on this amendment confined to the amendment, whether or not we want to broaden the aspects of this bill or whether we want to make further exemptions. I think that is the question before this body at this time and not whether you favor a sales-tax bill or whether you oppose a sales-tax bill. But, on the vote on this amendment we should decide one question: Do we want a broader sales-tax base or do we want to further exempt items from the bill?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the amendment. However, I should like to correct a few impressions about the Ohio sales tax which were left by the gentleman from Virginia. I happen to know something about the Ohio sales tax and how it operates, having been a member of various subdivisions of the government and of the State legislature in Ohio.

In the first place, we have a very peculiar provision in Ohio that many sections of the country would not understand. If the people are not satisfied with an action of the legislature they can initiate a movement to put the measure on the ballot and vote on it. This is true democracy and I like it. The people were not satisfied with the sales tax in Ohio and they exempted food, all food. They exempted all items bought by farmers for use on the farm, they exempted medicines, and they exempted this, that, and the other thing.

Then last year the legislature exempted all items below 45 cents. That is, on anything up to 45 cents you pay no sales tax at all.

I predict to the gentleman from Virginia that there will be an initiative amendment in Ohio proposed next year which will do away with the sales tax in its entirety. We have almost done away with it now. Why? Because the people of the State realize it is an unfair tax, and they do not want it.

I want to say in all fairness that Ohio does not have an income tax. The people of Ohio realize that the sales tax puts a burden on the low-income groups. We can raise plenty of revenue without it, and I think we will start in 1950.

Further, as to this business about a real-estate tax, I have not heard it explained exactly what valuation is put on property here. How do you arrive at it? Is it 100 percent of the true valuation in money? Is it 50 percent, is it 40 percent, is it 60 percent, or what is it? In Ohio we have a provision in the constitution providing for assessment of real estate at 100 percent of the true value in money. That is the law. Many of our cities have a much higher real-estate tax than the District.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. The gentleman did not quite mean what he said, I think, regarding the tax being taken off food in Ohio. The tax on food consumed off the home premises was not removed. If you go to a restaurant, you pay a tax on your food.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I thank the gentleman. I am sorry I did not make that distinction. All food consumed off the home premises is taxed; that is correct.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman inquired about the relation of assessed value to true value. Two years ago at my suggestion the chairman of the board of assessors made a spot check on several hundred sales in the District which probably would clear through his office, and the relation of assessment to the actual value received for the properties when sold. In the case of business properties, they were assessed at 76 percent of their actual value; apartment houses, 79 percent; and residential properties, 62 percent—an average of about 70 percent.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I thank the gentleman for his information. That clears up one point, but still leaves the statement unanswered that was made here that Washington is one of the most profitable places in the United States to own and operate real estate. I believe it is, from some of the prices you have to pay for rentals in Washington.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUBER].

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Virginia) there were—ayes 56, noes 102.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is on the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOBBS: On page 3, lines 24 and 25, strike out "(4) sales of advertising space and sales of radio and television advertising."

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAVALCANTE] gave notice that he had the Grosjean case which deals with the constitutionality vel non of this section of the bill. Therefore, I am going to let him argue that point.

On the other phase of the question as to section 4 I simply wish to ask the committee if they do not believe that the imposition of the tax on sales of advertising space in newspapers and sales of radio and television advertising which are designed and sold solely to boost the sale of other goods will not mean more money if that section is cut out?

In other words, I believe it is a fair question to be considered by the House as to whether or not the cancellation of the tax in this section would not produce more revenue if the advertisements were run, thus boosting the sale of goods and services, than if it were taken off? I am now going to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAVALCANTE].

A great many people in the radio, television, and newspaper games contend that this section violates the first amendment of the Constitution, guaranteeing freedom of speech and press.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Chairman, the Supreme Court, in the case of *Grosjean v. American Press* Co. (297 U. S. 233), definitely made it known that a tax on the business of selling advertising space by newspapers is a bad tax and offends against the Federal Constitution in that it abridges the freedom of the press in contravention of the due-process clause contained in section 1 of the fourteenth amendment; and it denies the press the equal protection of the laws in contravention of the same amendment. The Supreme Court struck down a statute of Louisiana which imposed a tax on the owners of newspapers for the privilege of selling or charging for the advertising therein.

I, therefore, submit, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment to the bill should

be allowed in compliance with our oaths to obey the Constitution.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am always glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. We were not familiar with that case when we adopted this. It was adopted in the joint committee of the Senate and House. I am sure we did not want to do anything which was unconstitutional, and so far as I am concerned, the committee will interpose no objection to the amendment which the gentleman has offered.

Mr. HOBBS. I thank you, sir.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Let the Committee vote, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

On page 4, subparagraph (g), strike out the words "other than candy and confectionery" in lines 22, 23, and 24.

Further amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

On page 4, subparagraph (g), line 21, add the words "bottled soft drinks" immediately following the words "fruit juices"; and on page 5, line 2, strike out the word "sodas."

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That is the matter that was discussed by the committee, and the light of the committee's recommendation a year ago, contained in the bill that passed the House, which contained the same language, it means only a small amount of revenue, and I understand the committee is in agreement with the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I so understand the situation to be as the gentleman from Massachusetts has stated.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. HUBER. To those of us who have not had the benefit of information that the committee has had, will the gentleman explain what this will do?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I will be glad to.

As far as the first amendment is concerned, that places candy and confectionery in the category of food. The bill which passed the House last year contained that provision and also contained the provision provided in the other amendment and places in the same category of food, bottled soft drinks, both of which are recognized as belonging in that category. As far as the revenue is concerned, this entire bill is calculated to raise approximately $16,000,000. The candy item, if it stays in the bill, will raise approximately $40,000. The bottled soft drinks would raise only $17,500, which are insignificant items insofar as the total amount is concerned.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. My impression was that we voted this down in the committee.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I think the members of the committee have seen their error since the vote was taken on it, and I understand they are agreeable to the amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. I would like to find out what members of the committee have changed their minds.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. For the benefit of the gentleman, I will say that the chairman of the committee is one of them. There are various others who voted against it in the committee who have so informed me.

Mr. KENNEDY. I would like to protest the procedure, because the committee voted against this amendment. It was never brought up again, so I do not think we can say the committee has changed its mind about it.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Of course I am not undertaking to speak for 100 percent of the committee, but you know that the committee members themselves stated their position on it this afternoon.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. BUCHANAN. What is the estimated yield on these particular items?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Seventeen thousand five hundred dollars on the soft-drinks item and $40,000 on the candy. They are both food items, and they were both exempted in the bill which passed the House last year.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. I want to commend the gentleman for treating candy the same as food in this amendment. That ought to be passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] has expired.

The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RIVERS: On page 11, line 21, after the word "made" insert "It is understood that this exemption is intended to include all professional services rendered by or on the order of a dentist in his professional capacity, including the construction, processing, and insertion of all types of dental restorations, whether fixed or removable."

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I believe the intent of this bill includes what I seek to do by this amendment, but I want to make certain that these services rendered by or on order of dentists are exempt, including the construction, processing, and insertion of all types of dental restorations, whether fixed or removable, the same as are the services rendered by doctors of medicine, that there shall be exempt all of these restorations, plates, and the like. I talked to the chairman of the committee about the amendment and he said he had no objection. I talked also to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] to whom I will yield right now, as I understand he has also discussed it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It was my understanding that the bill did include exemption of those services. If it does not, I think it should be made clear that such services and devices are exempt.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I hope the gentleman will not press his amendment. I hope that we can by a statement on the floor give to the District Commissioners what is understood to be the facts under this section of the bill.

The gentleman's amendment takes care of false teeth. There are a lot of other things that ought to be taken care of that are not mentioned.

Mr. RIVERS. Yes; it does take care of false teeth. I have some of them.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Under the general rules of construction, if we take care of false teeth and fail to mention, for instance, the artificial leg; artificial legs are included. I hope the gentleman will take a statement from the committee that the language of the bill as presently drafted is intended to exclude from taxation both false teeth, artificial limbs, hearing aids, and various and sundry things of that character. As I said before, if we start to enumerate things that are exempted and fail to enumerate all, then such things as are not enumerated, not specifically mentioned, will be subject to taxation.

Mr. RIVERS. With the gentleman's assurance that these things are intended to be covered by the exemptions of the bill and that the bill will be so construed, I will, of course, be delighted to withdraw my amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is our understanding.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment, with that explanation.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on titles I and II and all amendments thereto conclude in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Chairman, I object; I have three amendments at the desk.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on these titles and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts state whether his motion applies to the first two titles?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The first two titles.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves that all debate on titles I and II of the bill, and all amendments thereto, close in 15 minutes.

The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SASSCER: On page 12, line 1, after the word "drugs" strike out the words "made on prescriptions of duly licensed physicians and surgeons and general and special practitioners of the healing art."

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, an amendment which was offered by the committee and adopted, exempts medicines, drugs, and pharmaceutical supplies from the provisions of this act if prescribed by a physician. I am in accord with the thought of the amendment but feel that it should go a step further because under the committee amendment these medical supplies are exempted only if purchased with a doctor's prescription. If you do not have the doctor's prescription they are not exempt. The intent of this bill, as the sponsors have repeatedly claimed upon this floor, is to remove and exempt the necessities of life and to ease as far as possible places where the sales-tax provisions might work an undue hardship on those less able to pay. Is it consistent then, to say that if you can go to the drug store and get a bottle of syrup of figs or possibly a bandage for your wrist, cascara or some home remedy and that is taxed, then in the same breath say that if you have a prescription for those items they are not taxed, it is not only a great discrimination but veers far away from the declarations that the bill is exempting the necessities of life. My amendment attempts to correct this by removing the necessity for a prescription in order to get the exemption on home remedies.

What can be more necessary than these little home remedies that the mother sends up to the drug store for from time to time? It is inconsistent and unfair to exempt them if they have been prescribed by a doctor and not exempt them if they have not been prescribed. Medicine and home remedies are a necessity whether obtained with or without a prescription.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, is the time limited?

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman insists on recognition he is entitled to it. Time has been limited to 15 minutes on all amendments to these two titles.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. May I be recognized for 3 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I recognize what the gentleman is attempting to do, but I would point out that when you open the door to these exemptions you are going to have a difficult time administering the act. The amendment the committee adopted was an amendment suggested in the committee and I think that it agreed to adopt an amendment to exempt those prescriptions. An individual goes to a doctor's office and pays a fee for a prescription. These medicines he gets from a doctor are just as necessary or perhaps more so than food.

You open the door when you say "of a pharmaceutical nature." What is a pharmaceutical? The hair tonic that you might get to grow a little hair is a pharmaceutical, the face cream you might want to put on your face to shave with is a pharmaceutical. People sometimes buy Peruna, and I have no objection to it, but it is a pharmaceutical. Yes, canned heat and lemon extract would be exempt. I could name a hundred things that are ridiculous and they would be exempted under this bill. I think you are going entirely too far when you open the door to the exemption of anything that is offered in the drug store today. A drug store today will offer hardware items and because it is a drug store somebody might think it is a pharmaceutical.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. SASSCER. If the doctor should issue a prescription for this hair tonic or some of these items that might be termed pharmaceutical items, they would still be exempted from the tax, would they not?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes; I think if he gets a prescription for something that is of a pharmaceutical nature. But, I maintain that a great many things are sold in drug stores, including a lot of vitamin pills which do people more harm than good, should not be exempt from the tax. There are many luxuries which should not be exempted. If you open the door on one thing you are just going to open it wide open, and the sales tax is gone. It is my contention that you must limit these things. As I say, the language that the gentleman now proposes to strike from the bill is language that was adopted by the committee after due and careful consideration, and I hope this committee now does not proceed to strike it out, because you will make it almost impossible for administration by the Commissioners.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SASSCER) there were—ayes 47, noes 89.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAVALCANTE].

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CAVALCANTE:

Page 11, line 7, strike out the words "buyer and seller" at the beginning of said line 7, and insert "purchaser and vendor."

Page 11, line 8, strike out the words "buyer to purchase" and insert "purchaser to buy."

Page 11, lines 8 and 9, strike out the words "at a fixed price subject to no escalator clause goods covered thereby" and insert "the goods covered thereby at a price fixed and without escalator clause."

Page 11, line 10, strike out the word "seller" and insert "vendor."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I have examined the amendment, and it is merely clarifying. I see no objection to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAVALCANTE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CAVALCANTE:

Page 5, at the end of line 10 insert the following: "the tax hereby imposed."

Page 5, line 11, after the period, strike out the remainder of lines 11, 12, 13, and 14.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered to eliminate what I believe to be a very objectionable feature. This section attempts to define the term "price" and this is the way it defines it:

"Price": M means the aggregate value in money of anything or things paid or delivered, or promised to be paid or delivered, by a purchaser to a vendor in the consummation and complete performance of a retail sale without any deduction therefrom on account of the cost of the property sold, cost of materials used, labor or service cost, or any other expense whatsoever.

Then it continues in another clause to give another definition:

"Price" shall de deemed to be the amount received exclusive of the tax hereby imposed provided the vendor shall establish to the satisfaction of the Assessor that the tax was added to the price.

I am not ready to give the Assessor this latter power. When is the Assessor satisfied? What will it take to satisfy him? A friend may be more satisfactory to the Assessor than a stranger or a person not friendly to the Assessor. My amendment will clarify this situation and make it impossible for the Assessor to favor one taxpayer and not another.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER].

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHRISTOPHER: On page 10, line 8, strike out all of lines 8 and 9.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I am not particularly objecting to a sales tax. I have lived under and paid a sales tax for the last 15 years. I intended to vote for this bill and I probably will vote for this bill, but before I do so, I should like to have taken out of it lines 8 and 9 on page 10, that sales of tickets for admission to places of amusement and sports be exempted from taxation. I do not like to tax the items of clothing that a woman buys for her children and exempt admissions to movies, theaters, and other such places of entertainment.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Is there not a 20-percent Federal tax now on those items?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I do not care how much tax there is on them. If a man can afford to go to a show he can

afford to pay a 2-percent sales tax on his ticket, if the women of the District of Columbia can afford to be taxed for their babies' diapers. Take it or leave it.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The reason the gentleman from Nebraska gave was that there already is a 20-percent tax on amusement tickets. It seems to be unfair that we should add 2 percent.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. There is a Federal excise tax on liquor, too, and you argue that they should not pay this sales tax in addition to that.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The liquor comes under the provisions of this bill and is taxed 2 percent. It is in the bill, which applies to liquor the same as it does to everything else.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I hope everybody here who thinks these amusements ought to pay a tax will vote for this amendment. I invite Members on both sides of the aisle to vote for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and be subject to amendment at any point in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The remainder of the bill is as follows:

TITLE III—EXCISE TAX UPON ISSUANCE OF TITLES TO MOTOR VEHICLES

An act known as the "District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925," approved March 3, 1925, as amended, is hereby further amended by adding to section 6 thereof the following subsection:

"(j) In addition to the fees and charges levied under other provisions of this act, there is hereby levied and imposed an excise tax for the issuance of every original certificate of title for a motor vehicle or trailer in the District, and for the issuance of every subsequent certificate of title for a motor vehicle or trailer in the District in the case of sale or resale thereof, at the rate of 2 percent of the fair market value of such motor vehicle or trailer at the time such certificate is issued, as determined by the Assessor of the District of Columbia or his duly authorized representatives. As used in this section, the term 'original certificate of title' shall mean the first certificate of title issued by the District of Columbia for any particular motor vehicle or trailer. No certificate of title so issued shall be delivered or furnished to the person entitled thereto until the tax has been paid in full. The Assessor of the District of Columbia may require every applicant for a certificate of title to supply such information as he deems necessary as to the time of purchase, the purchase price, and other information relative to the determination of the fair market value of any motor vehicle or trailer for which a certificate of title is required and issued. The issuance of certificates of title for the following motor vehicles and trailers shall be exempt from the tax imposed by this subsection:

"(1) Motor vehicles and trailers owned by the United States or the District of Columbia.

"(2) Motor vehicles and trailers purchased or acquired by nonresidents prior to coming into the District of Columbia and establishing or maintaining residence in the District.

"(3) Motor vehicles and trailers purchased or acquired by nonresidents prior to coming into the District of Columbia and establishing or maintaining a business or businesses in the District. Except as hereinafter provided, it is not intended to exempt from the tax the issuance of certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers owned by nonresidents who are engaged in business in the District at the time of their purchase or acquisition of such vehicles and trailers and who use such vehicles and trailers in the conduct of their District business or businesses.

"(4) Motor vehicles and trailers owned by a utility or public service company for use in furnishing a commodity or service: *Provided*, That the receipts from furnishing such commodity or service are subject to a gross-receipts or mileage tax in force in the District of Columbia at the time of a certificate of title for any such vehicle or trailer is issued."

SEC. 2. The provisions of this title shall be applicable with respect to all certificates of title issued on and after the first day of the first month succeeding the sixtieth day after the approval of this act.

SEC. 3. Any person aggrieved by the assessment of any tax imposed by this title may, within 90 days from the date the person entitled to a certificate of title was notified of the amount of such tax, appeal to the Board of Tax Appeals for the District of Columbia in the same manner and to the same extent as set forth in sections 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 of title IX of the act entitled "An act to amend the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, and for other purposes," approved August 17, 1937, as amended, and as the same may hereafter be amended. The remedy provided in this section shall not be deemed to take away from the person entitled to such certificate of title any remedy which he might have under any other provision of law, but no suit by such person for the recovery of a tax, or any part thereof, imposed by this title shall be instituted in any court if such person has elected to file an appeal with respect to such tax with the Board of Tax Appeals for the District of Columbia.

TITLE IV—AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLE I OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REVENUE ACT OF 1947

Article I of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1947, approved July 16, 1947, as amended, is further amended as follows:

Paragraph lettered (s) of section 4 of title I of article I of said act is amended to read as follows:

"(s) The word 'resident' means every individual domiciled within the District on the last day of the taxable year, and every other individual who maintains a place of abode within the District for more than 7 months of the taxable year, whether domiciled in the District or not. The word 'resident' shall not include any elective officer or any employee on the staff of an elected officer in the legislative branch of the Government of the United States if such employee is a bona fide resident of the State of residence of such elected officer, or any officer of the executive branch of such Government whose appointment to the office held by him was by the President of the United States and subject to confirmation by the Senate of the United States and whose tenure of office is at the pleasure of the President of the United States, unless such officers are domiciled within the District on the last day of the taxable year."

SEC. 2. Paragraph lettered (u) of section 4 of title I of article I of said act is amended by adding thereto the following new subparagraph:

"(9) The spouse of the taxpayer, if living with the taxpayer on the last day of the taxable year."

SEC. 3. Section 2 of title III of article I of said act is amended by adding thereto the following new subsection:

"(c) Adjusted gross income: The words 'adjusted gross income' as used in this article mean gross income less deductions allowed under section 3 (a) of this title: *Provided, however*, That such deductions were directly incurred in carrying on a trade or business: *And provided further*, That in determining adjusted gross income, no deductions shall be allowed for charitable contributions, alimony payments, medical and dental expenses, an optional standard deduction, losses of property not connected with trade or business, or for an allowance for salaries or compensation for personal service of the person or persons liable for the tax."

SEC. 4. Section 3 (a) (1) of title III of article I of said act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Expenses: All the ordinary and necessary expenses paid or incurred during the taxable year in carrying on any trade or business (except as otherwise provided herein), traveling expenses (including the entire amount expended for meals and lodging) while away from home in the pursuit of a trade or business; and rentals or other payments required to be made as a condition to the continued use or possession, for purposes of the trade or business, of property to which the taxpayer has not taken or is not taking title or in which he has no equity."

SEC. 5. Section 3 (a) (4) (C) of title III of article I of said act is amended to read as follows:

"(C) of property not connected with a trade or business, if such losses arise from fires, storms, shipwrecks, thefts, or other casualty: *Provided, however*, That no such loss shall be allowed as a deduction under this subsection if such loss is claimed as a deduction for inheritance—or estate—tax purposes: *And provided further*, That this subsection shall not be construed to permit the deduction of a loss of any capital asset as defined in this article."

SEC. 6. Section 3 (a) (8) of title III of article I of said act is amended to read as follows:

"(8) Charitable contributions: Contributions or gifts, actually paid within the taxable year to or for the use of any religious, charitable, scientific, literary, military, or educational institution, the activities of which are carried on to a substantial extent in the District, and no part of the net income of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual: *Provided*, That such deduction shall be allowed only in an amount which in the aggregate of all such deductions does not exceed 15 percent of the adjusted gross income."

SEC. 7. Section 3 (a) (9) of title III of article I of said act is amended to read as follows:

"(9) Medical, dental, and so forth, expenses of individuals: Expenses in the case of residents, paid by the taxpayer during the taxable year, not compensated for by insurance or otherwise, for the medical care of the taxpayer, his spouse, or dependents as defined in this article. The term 'medical care,' as used in this subsection, shall include amounts paid for the diagnosis, cure, mitigation, treatment, or prevention of diseases, or for the purpose of effecting healthier function of the body (including amounts paid for accident or health insurance): *Provided, however*, That a taxpayer may deduct only such expenses as exceed 5 percent of his adjusted gross income: *And provided further*, That the maximum deduction for the taxable year shall not exceed $1,250."

SEC. 8. Section 3 (a) (13) of title III of article I of said act is amended to read as follows:

"(13) In lieu of the foregoing deductions, any resident may irrevocably elect to deduct for the taxable year an optional standard deduction of $500: *Provided, however*, That the option provided in this subsection shall not be permitted on any return filed for any

period less than a full calendar or fiscal year."

SEC. 9. Section 3 (a) of title III of article I of said act is amended by adding thereto a new subsection to read as follows:

"(15) Reasonable allowance for salaries: A reasonable allowance for salaries or other compensation for personal services actually rendered: *Provided, however*, That in the case of an unincorporated business the aggregate deduction for services rendered by the individual owners or members actively engaged in the conduct of the unincorporated business shall in no event exceed 20 percent of the net income of such business computed without benefit of this deduction: *Provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to exempt any salary or other compensation for personal services from taxation as a part of the taxable income of the person receiving the same."

SEC. 10. Section 4 of title IV of article I of said act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. Installment sales: If a person reports any portion of his income from installment sales for Federal income-tax purposes under section 44 of the Federal Internal Revenue Code and as the same may hereafter be amended, and if such income is subject to tax under this article, he may report such income under this article in the same manner and upon the same basis as the same was reported by him for Federal income-tax purposes, if such method of reporting is accepted and approved by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue."

SEC. 11. Subsections (a) and (b) of section 2 of title V of article I of said act are amended to read as follows:

"(a) Residents and nonresidents: Every nonresident of the District receiving income subject to tax under this article and every resident of the District, except fiduciaries, when—

"(1) his gross income for the taxable year exceeds $5,000; or

"(2) his gross sales or gross receipts from any trade or business, other than an unincorporated business subject to tax under title VIII of this article, exceeds $5,000, regardless of the amount of his gross income; or

"(3) the combined gross income for the taxable year of husband and wife living together exceeds $5,000 and each spouse has a gross income in excess of $500, or the gross sales or gross receipts received or accrued by such husband and wife from any trade or business, other than an unincorporated business subject to tax under title VIII of this article, in the aggregate exceeds $5,000. In such cases a separate return shall be filed by each spouse showing his respective portion of such gross income, gross sales, or gross receipts as the case may be, and no joint return of income or computation thereof by them shall be required or permitted under this article except such returns as are required under section 2 (c), 2 (f), and 2 (g) of this title.

"(b) Fiduciaries: Every fiduciary (except a receiver appointed by authority of law in possession of part only of the property of an individual) for—

"(1) every individual for whom he acts having a gross income for the taxable year of $5,000 or over, regardless of the amount of the individual's net income;

"(2) every estate for which he acts, the gross income of which for the taxable year is $5,000 or over, regardless of the amount of the net income of the estate; and

"(3) every trust for which he acts, the net income of which for the taxable year is $100 or over."

SEC. 12. Section 2 of title VI of article I of said act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. Personal exemptions and credit for dependents: There shall be allowed to residents the following credits against net income:

"(a) An exemption of $5,000 for the taxpayer.

"(b) An exemption of $500 for each dependent, as defined in this article, whose gross income for the calendar year in which the taxable year of the taxpayer begins is less than $500.

"(c) Beginning with the first taxable year to which this article is applicable and in succeeding taxable years, the amount allowed under subsection (a) of this section shall be prorated to the day of death in the final return of a decedent dying before the end of the taxable year, and as of the date of death the personal exemption is terminated and not extended over the remainder of the taxable year.

"(d) In the case of a return made for a fractional part of a year, the personal exemption and credits for dependents shall be reduced, respectively, to amounts which bear the same ratio to the full credits provided as the number of months in the period for which the return is made bears to 12 months."

SEC. 13. Section 3 of title VI of article I of said act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. Imposition and rate of tax: There is hereby annually levied and imposed for each taxable year upon the taxable income of every resident a tax at the following rates:

"One and one-half percent on the first $5,000 of taxable income.

"Two percent on the next $5,000 of taxable income.

"Two and one-half per cent of the next $5,000 of taxable income.

"Three percent on the taxable income in excess of $15,000."

SEC. 14. Section 4 of title VI of article I of said act is repealed.

SEC. 15. Section 5 of title IX of article I of said act is amended by adding thereto the following new subsections:

"(d) There shall be allowed to an estate the same exemption as is allowed residents under the provisions of section 2 (a) of title VI of this article.

"(e) There shall be allowed to a trust a credit against net income of $100."

SEC. 16. (a) Section 1 of title VIII of article I of said act is amended by adding thereto the following new sentence: "The rental of real and personal property shall be deemed a trade or business within the meaning of this article."

(b) Section 4 of title VIII of article I of said act is amended by striking out the figure "$10,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "$5,000."

SEC. 17. Section 10 (a) (4) of title XII of article I of said act is amended to read as follows:

"(4) For the purposes of subsections (a) (1), (a) (2), and (a) (3), a return filed before the last day prescribed by law for the filing thereof shall be considered as filed on such last day."

SEC. 18. The proviso to section 11 of title XII of article I of said act is amended to read as follows: "*Provided*, That if it shall be determined by the Assessor, the Board of Tax Appeals for the District of Columbia, or any court that any part of any tax which was assessed as a deficiency under the provisions of section 5 of this title was an overpayment, interest shall be allowed and paid upon such overpayment of tax at the rate of 4 percent per annum from the date such overpayment was paid until the date of refund, and in addition thereto any interest upon such overpayment which was paid by the taxpayer shall be refunded."

SEC. 19. Section 1 of title XIV of article I of said act is amended by striking out the period at the end of the paragraph, inserting a colon, and the following: "*Provided, however*, That any unincorporated business having a gross income for the taxable year of $5,000 or less shall not be required to obtain the license provided for in this title."

SEC. 20. Section 2 (b) of title III of article I of said act is amended by adding thereto the following new paragraph:

"(14) Dues and initiation fees in the case of any club organized and operated exclusively for pleasure and recreation, no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private individual or shareholder. As used in this subsection, the word 'dues' means only sums paid or incurred by members on a monthly, quarterly, annual, or other periodic basis for the privilege of being members of such club and any pro rata assessment made against the members as such; the word 'dues' does not include any sums paid or incurred by members or their guests for food, beverages, or other tangible personal property purchased or for the use of the club's social, athletic, sporting, and other facilities; and the term 'initiation fees' includes any payment, contribution, or loan required as a condition precedent to membership, whether or not any such payment, contribution, or loan is evidenced by a certificate of interest or indebtedness."

SEC. 21. The provisions of sections 1, 2, 11, 12, 13, and 14 of this title shall be applicable to taxable years beginning after the 31st day of December 1949, and the provisions of all other sections shall be applicable to taxable years or portions thereof beginning after the 31st day of December 1948.

TITLE V—SEPARABILITY CLAUSE

If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provision to the other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to clarify one or two questions which have arisen in my mind each year when this proposed legislation has come before the Congress from the Committee on the District of Columbia.

I have been here on the floor during the entire debate on this bill. I am one of those who heretofore has always opposed the imposition of a sales tax for what I conceive to be very good and sufficient reasons.

There are many present on the floor today who still continue to oppose a sales tax. The sponsors of this bill say they are not particularly for a sales tax, but that it is the only method by which they can see to raise money to lift the District out of its financial dilemma.

Other people have taken the floor and said, "You have not canvassed the other possibilities of taxation. You ought to raise the liquor taxes. You ought to raise the tax on gasoline. You ought to raise the tax on cigarettes. There are various and sundry avenues, including raising the ad valorem tax on real estate." And you say, or the members of this committee, "If you do impose a tax on liquor as suggested, or upon gasoline and on cigarettes, and so forth, it would in no way raise the amount of revenue necessary to take care of the prospective deficit."

Then somebody else stands up and says, "You are only assessing real estate in this city on the basis of fair value at 70 percent and your tax rate is only $2 per $100. You ought to increase the ad valorem tax rate on real estate." There are many people who agree with that. The gentleman from Massachusetts stands in the well of the House and says, "We tried

to raise the income tax and we were defeated. We tried to provide other methods of getting revenue and the House has always voted them down."

So here we are making laws as a legislature for the District of Columbia and the minds of many people are not clear on some of the things that are involved in this situation. One thing is not clear to me, and I ask the chairman of this committee to answer this question: What do we have, as Members of the Congress, to do with the matter of determining either the assessment rate on the tax rate in the District of Columbia? As presently handled, is that not an administrative function of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The authority to increase the rates or to reassess values is in the hands of the District Commissioners. If the budget, as passed by the Congress, is not backed up by a revenue bill sufficient to meet all the obligations, then there is no alternative for the District Commissioners other than to increase the tax rate and through proper legislation increasing the revenues to meet those requirements.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman then has answered the question to the effect that after all this argument about ad valorem tax rates in the District of Columbia, that the Congress sitting here discussing this thing this afternoon has no power to tell these people legislatively "Your ad valorem tax rate shall be $4 per $100 and your assessment shall be 100 percent of real value."

That is an administrative function of the Commissioners, did I understand you to say?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Under the present authority of law if there is any increase to be made to meet the requirements of the District budget, the Commissioners have authority within the law to increase it. We still have the authority, however, to make them increase it.

Mr. KEEFE. We do not have the authority to direct them to increase it under the present law.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. We have supreme authority.

Mr. KEEFE. I say under existing law there is no provision that takes care of that situation. Then the situation seems to me that if I vote for a sales tax I am by so doing saying to the Commissioners "You continue to base your assessment upon a $2 rate and keep your low ad valorem tax here in the District of Columbia and we will impose the tax on the people who buy in the District of Columbia." I agree that the Congress can by legislative action compel the Commissioners to raise the ad valorem tax. However, we are not doing it in this bill. We are, therefore, leaving the determination to the District Commissioners. It is fair to assume, therefore, that if a sales tax is enacted that will provide the money we may not expect action of the Commissioners in raising the ad valorem tax.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota who has given the problem considerable study.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Certainly the record ought not to be left with a possible interpretation that the Congress of the United States does not have authority to fix the tax rate for the District of Columbia. Under the Constitution, the final authority on District legislation rests exclusively with the Congress as the gentlemen who have spoken well know. This House and the Congress can act.

Mr. REES. Certainly. In answer to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], I believe it is understood that Congress does have authority and has used that authority to increase the tax rates in the District of Columbia. The Congress has used that authority and has increased tax rates from time to time.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, a member of the committee.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Under authority of law the District Commissioners must raise sufficient revenue to meet any deficit existing in the District. Of course, we have authority, and we did 2 years ago make it compulsory upon the District Commissioners to increase the real estate tax rate 25 cents.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I am in accord with those who spoke earlier in the day in support of legislation that would permit the people in the District to have a voice in the management of its affairs.

Now with respect to the question of taxes, I am not in favor of requiring people in the District of Columbia to pay any more than their fair share of taxes, but I do think they ought to pay taxes in line with the people who live in your district or mine.

For example, the entire tax against real estate and personal property in the District of Columbia is $2 per $100 value. The average in cities of similar size is about $3 per hundred, and in many cities it is much more. It has been said that taxes have been increased on real estate recently. That may be true, but they are still not in line with taxes in other cities of similar size.

The income taxes for the District of Columbia are much lighter than they are in many States where income taxes are imposed. Do you know of any State in the Union where an exemption of $5,000 is allowed before any income tax is charged at all?

Here is another thing that is quite significant. The tax on liquor in the District of Columbia is lower than anywhere else in the United States in a city of comparative size. As matter of fact they tell me only a few of the people in the District really control the sale of liquor. Anyway, you could raise $5,000,000 more in revenue if you would put liquor taxes in line with other States. If you would put liquor under control of the District government as they do in many States of the Union, you would have revenue that would run into the millions of dollars.

The tax on gasoline is lower here than almost any State in the Union, so why not increase the income taxes, liquor taxes, gasoline taxes, and taxes on real estate.

There is complaint today about a sales tax. I agree with those of you who say that it is another tax. Nevertheless, the legislation before us has a number of exemptions and is not nearly as severe as sales taxes in various States of the Union.

Let me repeat that if you would increase the taxes in line with the suggestions I have made, you would have enough revenue to take care of all of the needed expenses for running the Government without dipping into the Federal Treasury.

Please let us not be misunderstood. I am not in favor of charging more taxes against anyone in the District of Columbia than is charged in other areas, but I do think we ought to bring these tax charges in line with those of various States before we ask your people and mine to help contribute to the expenses of the District of Columbia.

Something has been said about the United States Government owning property in the District. It must also be said that it is by reason of the Government itself that the people who live here own property and make their profits. It is the spending of people employed in Government and who are here on account of the Government that the city of Washington enjoys the highest average income of cities of similar size.

Before closing I, too, want to pay tribute to the members of this committee for the great effort they have made and are making to solve a most difficult problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this measure do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia, [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3347) to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en grosse.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. HAND, Mr. HUBER, and Mr. KENNEDY rose.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize Members at the proper time to offer a motion to recommit.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HAND. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HAND moves to recommit the bill back to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, may I at this time ask for a reading of the engrossed copy?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman will find that we have already passed that point.

Mr. HUBER. The Chair said the Chair would recognize Members at the proper time. I thought I would be recognized.

The SPEAKER. The motion to recommit has been offered; the question of engrossing the bill has already been passed.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KENNEDY) there were—ayes 81, noes 105.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty-seven Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and; there were—yeas 163, nays 181, not voting 89, as follows:

[Roll No. 27]

YEAS—163

Addonizio
Allen, La.
Andersen, H. Carl
Angell
Auchincloss
Bailey
Baring
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Biemiller
Boggs, Del.
Bolling
Breen
Brehm
Brooks
Buchanan
Burnside
Cannon
Carroll
Case, N. J.
Cavalcante
Chesney
Coffey
Cooper
Crawford
Crook
Crosser
Cunningham
Davenport
Davis, Wis.
Delaney
Denton
D'Ewart
Dollinger
Dolliver
Donohue
Douglas
Doyle
Eberharter
Elsworth
Engel, Mich.
Engle, Calif.
Fenton
Flood
Fogarty
Forand
Ford
Furcolo
Gore
Gorski, N. Y.
Granger
Grant
Green
Gregory
Gross
Hagen
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hand
Harden
Hart
Harvey
Havenner
Hays, Ohio
Hedrick
Heselton
Hill
Hoeven
Holifield
Howell
Huber
Hull
Irving
Jackson, Wash.
Jacobs
Jensen
Judd
Karst
Karsten
Kearney
Kee
Keefe
Kennedy
King
Kirwan
Klein
Kruse
Kunkel
Lane
Lanham
Lemke
Lesinski
Lichtenwalter
Lynch
McCarthy
McConnell
McDonough
McGuire
McKinnon
Mack, Ill.
Mack, Wash.
Madden
Magee
Mahon
Mansfield
Marcantonio
Marshall
Martin, Iowa
Mason
Miller, Calif.
Mitchell
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Moulder
Multer
Murray, Wis.
Noland
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Neill
O'Sullivan
Pace
Patten
Perkins
Phillips, Tenn.
Poage
Price
Rabaut
Ramsay
Reed, Ill.
Rhodes
Ribicoff
Rodino
Rooney
Sabath
Sadowski
Sanborn
Secrest
Simpson, Pa.
Sims
Steed
Stefan
Sullivan
Taurielo
Thomas, Tex.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Towe
Van Zandt
Wagner
Walsh
Welch, Calif.
Welch, Mo.
White, Calif.
White, Idaho
Wier
Withrow
Wolverton
Worley
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—181

Abbitt
Abernethy
Albert
Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Anderson, Calif.
Andrews
Arends
Aspinall
Barrett, Wyo.
Bates, Ky.
Bates, Mass.
Battle
Beall
Bennett, Mich.
Bentsen
Bishop
Blackney
Bland
Boggs, La.
Bolton, Md.
Bolton, Ohio
Bonner
Bosone
Boykin
Brambletb
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Ohio
Bryson
Burleson
Burton
Byrne, N. Y.
Byrnes, Wis.
Camp
Carnahan
Case, S. Dak.
Chiperfield
Christopher
Church
Clevenger
Cole, Kans.
Cole, N. Y.
Colmer
Combs
Cooley
Cotton
Cox
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Deane
DeGraffenried
Dondero
Doughton
Durham
Elliott
Elston
Fallon
Fellows
Fernandez
Fisher
Frazier
Fugate
Gamble
Garmatz
Gary
Gavin
Gillette
Goodwin
Graham
Gwinn
Halleck
Hardy
Hare
Harrison
Herlong
Hinshaw
Hobbs
Hoffman, Mich.
Holmes
Hope
Jackson, Calif.
James
Jenkins
Jennings
Johnson
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N. C.
Kean
Kearns
Kerr
Kilburn
Kilday
Larcade
LeCompte
LePevre
Lind
Lodge
Lovre
Lucas
Lyle
McCormack
McCulloch
McGregor
McMillan, S. C.
McMillen, Ill.
McSweeney
Macy
Marsalis
Martin, Mass.
Merrow
Meyer
Michener
Miles
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Monroney
Murdock
Murray, Tenn.
Nicholson
Nixon
Norblad
Norton
O'Hara, Minn.
Passman
Patman
Peterson
Pfeiffer, William L.
Phillips, Calif.
Pickett
Polk
Potter
Preston
Priest
Rains
Rankin
Redden
Rees
Regan
Rich
Rivers
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Sasscer
Scrivner
Scudder
Short
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Va.
Spence
Stanley
Stigler
Stockman
Sutton
Taber
Talle
Teague
Underwood
Velde
Vorys
Vursell
Wadsworth
Werdel
Wheeler
Whitten
Whittington
Wickersham
Wigglesworth
Williams
Wilson, Ind.
Wilson, Okla.
Wilson, Tex.
Winstead
Wolcott
Woodruff

NOT VOTING—89

Andresen, August H.
Barden
Barrett, Pa.
Blatnik
Buckley, Ill.
Buckley, N. Y.
Bulwinkle
Burdick
Burke
Canfield
Carlyle
Celler
Chatham
Chelf
Chudoff
Clemente
Corbett
Coudert
Curtis
Davies, N. Y.
Dawson
Dingell
Eaton
Evins
Feighan
Fulton
Gathings
Gilmer
Golden
Gordon
Gorski, Ill.
Gossett
Granahan
Hale
Hall, Leonard W.
Harris
Hays, Ark.
Hébert
Heffernan
Heller
Herter
Hoffman, Ill.
Horan
Javits
Jenison
Keating
Kelley
Keogh
Latham
Linehan
McGrath
Morton
Murphy
Nelson
Norrell
O'Konski
O'Toole
Patterson
Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Philbin
Plumley
Poulson
Powell
Quinn
Ramsay
Reed, N. Y.
Richards
Riehlman
Sadlak
St. George
Scott, Hardie
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Sheppard
Smathers
Smith, Ohio
Smith, Wis.
Somers
Staggers
Tackett
Taylor
Thomas, N. J.
Thompson
Trimble
Vinson
Walter
Weichel
Whitaker
Willis
Wood
Woodhouse

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mrs. Woodhouse for, with Mr. Harris against.

Mr. Feighan for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Horan against.

Mr. Kelley for, with Mr. Herter against.

Mr. Dawson for, with Mr. Tackett against.

Mr. Keating for, with Mr. Plumley against.

Mr. Heller for, with Mr. Wood against.

Mr. Blatnik for, with Mr. Vinson against.

Mr. Buckley of New York for, with Mr. Whitaker against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Gorski of Illinois with Mr. Canfield.

Mr. Gordon with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.

Mr. Buckley of Illinois with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.

Mr. Linehan with Mr. Coudert.

Mr. Clemente with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Quinn with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania with Mr. Hardie Scott.

Mr. Chudoff with Mrs. St. George.

Mr. Gossett with Mr. Reed of New York.

Mr. Evins with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Murphy with Mr. Jenison.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.

Mr. Davies of New York with Mr. Corbett.

Mr. Chelf with Mr. Latham.

Mr. Richards with Mr. Morton.

Mr. Smathers with Mr. Nelson.

Mr. Trimble with Mr. Patterson.

Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Gathings with Mr. Poulson.

Mr. Barden with Mr. Riehlman.

Mr. Carlyle with Mr. Weichel.

Mr. Chatham with Mr. Hale.

Mr. Philbin with Mr. August H. Andresen.

Mr. McGrath with Mr. Curtis.

Mr. Walter with Mr. Sadlak.

Mr. FENTON, Mr. BREHM, and Mr. KEE changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. WERDEL, and Mr. HALLECK changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and; there were—yeas 166, nays 178, not voting 89, as follows:

[Roll No. 28]

YEAS—166

Abbitt
Abernethy
Albert
Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Anderson, Calif.
Andrews
Arends
Aspinall
Barrett, Wyo.
Bates, Mass.
Battle
Beall
Bentsen
Bishop
Blackney
Bland
Bolton, Md.
Bolton, Ohio
Bonner
Bosone
Boykin
Bramblett
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Ohio
Bryson
Burleson
Burton
Byrnes, Wis.
Camp
Case, S. Dak.
Chatham
Chiperfield
Christopher
Church
Clevenger
Cole, Kans.
Cole, N. Y.
Colmer
Combs
Cooley
Cotton
Cox
Dague
Davis, Ga
Deane
DeGraffenried
Dondero
Doughton
Durham
Elliott
Elston
Fallon
Fernandez
Fisher
Fugate
Gamble
Garmatz
Gary
Gavin
Graham
Grant
Gwinn
Halleck
Hardy
Hare
Harrison
Herlong
Hinshaw
Hobbs
Hoffman, Ill.
Holmes
Hope
Jackson, Calif.
James
Jenkins
Jennings
Jensen
Johnson
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N. C.
Kean
Kearns
Kilburn
Larcade
LeFevre
Lind
Lodge
Lovre
Lyle
McCormack
McCulloch
McGregor
McMillan, S. C.
McMillen, Ill.
McSweeney
Macy
Marsalis
Martin, Mass.
Merrow
Meyer
Michener
Miles
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Mills
Monroney
Murdock
Murray, Tenn.
Norblad
Norton
O'Hara, Minn.
Passman
Pfeiffer, William L.
Phillips, Calif.
Polk
Potter
Preston
Rains
Rankin
Redden
Reed, Ill.
Rees
Rich
Rivers
Rogers, Mass.
Sasscer
Scrivner
Scudder
Short
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Va.
Stanley
Stigler
Stockman
Sutton
Taber
Talle
Teague
Velde
Vorys
Vursell
Wadsworth
Werdel
Wheeler
Whitten
Whittington
Wickersham
Wigglesworth
Williams
Wilson, Ind.
Wilson, Okla.
Wilson, Tex.
Winstead
Wolcott
Woodruff

NAYS—178

Addonizio
Allen, La.
Andersen, H. Carl
Angell
Auchincloss
Bailey
Baring
Bates, Ky.
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Biemiller
Boggs, Del.
Boggs, La.
Bolling
Breen
Brehm
Brooks
Buchanan
Burdick
Burke
Burnside
Byrne, N. Y.
Cannon
Carnahan
Carroll
Case, N. J.
Cavalcante
Chesney
Coffey
Cooper
Crawford
Crook
Crosser
Cunningham
Davenport
Davis, Tenn.
Davis, Wis.
Delaney
Denton
D'Ewart
Dollinger
Dolliver
Donohue
Douglas
Doyle
Eberharter
Elsworth
Engel, Calif.
Fenton
Flood
Fogarty
Forand
Ford
Frazier
Furcolo
Gillette
Gore
Gorski, N. Y.
Granger
Green
Gregory
Gross
Hagen
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hand
Harden
Hart
Harvey
Hays, Ohio
Hedrick
Heselton
Hill
Hoeven
Holifield
Howell
Huber
Hull
Irving
Jackson, Wash.
Jacobs
Judd
Karst
Karsten
Kearney
Kee
Keefe
Kennedy
Kilday
King
Kirwan
Klein
Kruse
Kunkel
Lane
Lanham
Lemke
Lesinski
Lichtenwalter
Lucas
Lynch
McCarthy
McConnell
McDonough
McGuire
McKinnon
Mack, Ill.
Mack, Wash.
Madden
Magee
Mahon
Mansfield
Marcantonio
Marshall
Martin, Iowa
Mason
Miller, Calif.
Mitchell
Morgan
Morrison
Moulder
Multer
Murray, Wis.
Noland
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Neill
O'Sullivan
Pace
Patten
Perkins
Phillips, Tenn.
Pickett
Poage
Price
Rabaut
Regan
Rhodes
Ribicoff
Rodino
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney
Sabath
Sadowski
Sanborn
Secrest
Shafer
Sheppard
Simpson, Pa.
Sims
Spence
Staggers
Steed
Stefan
Sullivan
Taurielo
Thomas, Tex.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Towe
Underwood
Van Zandt
Wagner
Walsh
Welch, Calif.
Welch, Mo.
White, Calif.
White, Idaho
Wier
Wilson, Ind.
Wilson, Tex.
Withrow
Wolverton
Worley
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—89

Andresen, August H.
Barden
Barrett, Pa.
Blatnik
Buckley, Ill.
Buckley, N. Y.
Bulwinkle
Canfield
Carlyle
Celler
Chelf
Chudoff
Clemente
Corbett
Coudert
Curtis
Davies, N. Y
Dawson
Dingell
Eaton
Eberharter
Evins
Feighan
Fellows
Fulton
Gathings
Gilmer
Golden
Gordon
Gorski, Ill.
Gossett
Granahan
Hale
Hall, Leonard W.
Harris
Hays, Ark
Hébert
Heffernan
Heller
Herter
Hoffman, Ill.
Horan
Javits
Jenison
Keating
Kelley
Keogh
Latham
Linehan
McGrath
Morton
Murdock
Murphy
Nelson
Norrell
O'Konski
O'Toole
Patman
Patterson
Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Philbin
Plumley
Poulson
Powell
Quinn
Ramsay
Reed, N. Y.
Richards
Riehlman
Sadlak
St. George
Scott, Hardie
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Smathers
Smith, Ohio
Smith, Wis.
Somers
Tackett
Taylor
Thomas, N. J
Thompson
Trimble
Vinson
Walter
Weichel
Whitaker
Willis
Wood
Woodhouse

So the bill was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Harris for, with Mrs. Woodhouse against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Feighan against.

Mr. Horan for, with Mr. Dawson against.

Mr. Herter for, with Mr. Kelley against.

Mr. Wood for, with Mr. Keating against.

Mr. Plumley for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mr. Tackett for, with Mr. Whitaker against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Clemente with Mr. Canfield.

Mr. Quinn with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.

Mr. Chelf with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Carlyle with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.

Mr. Linehan with Mr. Latham.

Mr. Gordon with Mr. Morton.

Mr. Gorski of Illinois with Mr. Patterson.

Mr. Buckley of Illinois with Mr. Poulson.

Mr. Gossett with Mr. Coudert.

Mr. McGrath with Mr. Jenison.

Mr. Heller with Mr. Weichel.

Mr. Murphy with Mr. Sadlak.

Mr. Walter with Mrs. St. George.

Mr. Vinson with Mr. Curtis.

Mr. Richards with Mr. August H. Andresen.

Mr. Philbin with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.

Mr. Trimble with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

Mr. Gathings with Mr. Riehlman.

Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Corbett.

Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Hardie Scott.

Mr. Evins with Mr. Reed of New York.

Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. Hale.

Mr. JUDD changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

THE HONORABLE RICHARD B. RUSSELL

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, while I know it is a flagrant violation of the rules to speak in derogatory terms about the other body in the legislative branch of the Government, surely compliments are permissible.

The valiant fighters from the South, with other courageous Senators of like mind, have again stayed the hands of those who would destroy free government by the enactment of force legislation.

Dr. Nicholas P. Mitchell, a radio news commentator of my home town, has paid a well-earned tribute to Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, and to others of his kind, in the following words:

Signals in the fight against the President's civil-rights program are now being called by a gentleman from Georgia, Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, who is a master at the game. The 51-year-old lawmaker has led filibuster fights against antilynching and anti-poll-tax legislation four times before, and he has always come out a winner. That was a good reason for the southern Senators to draft him for the job again.

RUSSELL is something of a political wonder boy. He was the youngest man ever to be speaker of the Georgia House of Representatives, the youngest man ever to be Governor of Georgia, and in 1932 he became, at that time, the youngest United States Senator.

The quiet bachelor has been in the Senate ever since, without serious threat in any of his races for reelection. He won another term last year without any opposition at all.

When President Truman advanced his civil-rights program the junior Senator from Georgia chose his path with care. He ignored the bolters who formed their own party to run against the Democratic ticket in the 1948 Presidential election. But within the party he has been perhaps the single most effective opponent of the proposed program. It was RUSSELL who headed the caucus of southerners that defeated the program in the last Congress; it was he who drew the votes of most of the southern States at the Democratic National Convention last July. And he has continued in the present Congress as the captain of the southern bloc, heading the strategy conferences of Dixie Senators. Recently he needled northern members of his own party with a bill to relocate southern Negroes in the North at Government expense.

RUSSELL lives in the little town of Winder, Ga., and he likes his privacy when he's away from the Capitol battlegrounds. He doesn't even have a telephone at home. He was born in Winder in November 1897. As a youngster his deepest interest was in military tactics, and his father—for many years chief justice of the Georgia Supreme Court—enjoyed telling the story of the day 8-year-old DICK laid out a battlefield on the family farm. He used flags and markings to work out a problem posed by the Russo-Japanese

war. A passing farmer looked on for a few minutes. Then he stopped to sympathize with Judge Russell, saying, "I've got a weak-minded boy, too."

Well, the boy who looked weak grew up attend the Powder Springs Agricultural and Mechanical School, and in 1918 he obtained a law degree from the University of Georgia. He spent a short time in the Army in World War I and then began the practice of law in his home town. Soon he was into politics and in 1921 he began 10 years of service in the State legislature. In 1930, after serving as speaker of the Georgia House, he ran for Governor. He says it was the hardest race of his life. He traveled 47,000 miles and made 162 speeches. But he won that election, and he became so popular in Georgia that he has been unbeatable in that State's politics ever since.

Those who labor with RUSSELL say he has a talent for quiet, persistent work. While he is an effective orator, he specializes not in loud speeches but in committee-room plugging and after-hour persistence that gets things done.

On many issues Senator RUSSELL has gone right along with the administrations of Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Truman, more so, perhaps, than most other Democratic Senators from the South. But he has been a bulldog enemy of the civil-rights program. Time and again he has shown his conviction that it means an invasion of individual rights—that it would wreck the social make-up of the South and leave chaos behind.

A born leader, RUSSELL has been forceful but never violent. He is one of the new-model southern Senators who have given up the flowing tie and the spread-eagle oratory. In a sense, he has subordinated his personality to his convictions.

Short on so-called color, DICK RUSSELL is long on legislative talent.

The South could use more like him.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DAVENPORT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. FORAND and Mr. DOYLE asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the Appendix.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington (at the request of Mr. MILLER of California) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement by the Right Reverend Monsignor John O'Grady, secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Charities, before the Committee on Ways and Means, on the bill H. R. 2892, the Public Welfare Act of 1949.

Mr. BOYKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by Hon. J. Stuart Symington, Secretary of the Air Force.

Mr. SCUDDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement on a bill he introduced.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. McSWEENEY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 112) to authorize the Committee on Agriculture to make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 263) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct studies, investigations, and to inquire into any matter within its jurisdiction. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to make such inspections or investigations, to use such governmental facilities without reimbursement therefor, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses, and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee, or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses.

That the said committee shall issue such reports, including reports to the House of Representatives, with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise, as the committee deems desirable.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative program for the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. KEATING (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee and to include certain statistics in connection therewith.

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the New Hampshire Morning Union on the subject Town of Chichester Decries Communism.

THE LATE ALBERT F. DAWSON

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I announce the death of Hon. Albert F. Dawson, who represented the Second Iowa District in the House of Representatives from 1905 to 1911. The Second Iowa District at that time comprised Clinton, Iowa, Jackson, Johnson, Muscatine, and Scott Counties and Mr. Dawson's home during the time he served in the House of Representatives was Preston, Iowa, in Jackson County. He passed away March 9 in his drawing room aboard a Southern Railway train as it neared Cincinnati while he was being transferred from a hospital in St. Petersburg, Fla., to one in Akron, Ohio.

Mr. Dawson was born in Spragueville, Iowa, January 26, 1872. He attended the University of Wisconsin and Columbia University in New York. He married Phoebe R. DeGroat in 1893. He was editor of the Preston Advance in 1891 and 1892 and city editor of the Clinton Herald in 1894 and 1895. He then came to Washington, D. C., as secretary to Congressman G. M. Curtis from 1895 to 1899 and was secretary to United States Senator William B. Allison from 1899 until the beginning of his own service in Congress in 1905. During his tenure in Congress Mr. Dawson served on the following committees: Reform in the Civil Service, Pacific Railroads, and Naval Affairs.

After three terms in the House of Representatives his leadership was recognized by President William Howard Taft who tendered him appointment as his private secretary, but Mr. Dawson declined the appointment and also declined to seek reelection to Congress and he returned to Davenport, Iowa, as president of the First National Bank. He held that position until 1928 when he became president of the investment securities house of Dawson, Howe & Dawes. In 1929 he returned to Washington, D. C., where he served for several years as secretary of the Republican National Committee.

From 1932 until he retired in 1945 he was special representative of Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co. and lived in Cincinnati, Ohio. It was during this period that he last visited the House of Representatives and I enjoyed tremendously introducing him to my colleagues here on the floor of the House. At the time of his death he was living in Highland Park, Ill., with his son-in-law and daughter, Mr. and Mrs. L. L. Howe.

Mr. Dawson was very active in Iowa in a wide variety of civic work. During World War I he was chairman of the five Liberty Loan drives and was prominent in Red Cross work and was in great demand as a public speaker. He served on the public library board in Davenport and was an active member of the Rotary Club, the chamber of commerce, and the Masonic order. He will long be remembered for his great service to his home communities and to the State of Iowa and to our Nation during his long and active lifetime.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Boston Post of Thursday last in relation to the late Sol Bloom.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the

House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 120)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Attached hereto is a report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems covering its operations from April 1 to September 30, 1948, and describing in accordance with section 4 (b) (5) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for the above period.

Previous reports of the National Advisory Council were transmitted to the Congress on March 1, 1946, March 8, 1946, January 13, 1947, June 26, 1947, January 19, 1948, May 17, 1948, and August 3, 1948, respectively. In addition to the First Special Report on the Operations and Policies of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, submitted on May 17, 1948, previous reports on the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank were included in the reports of January 13, 1947, June 26, 1947, January 19, 1948, and August 3, 1948, respectively.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 14, 1949.*

REPORT BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE ON THE OPERATIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State on the operations of the Department of State under section 32 (b) (2) of Public Law 584, Seventy-ninth Congress, as required by that law.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 14, 1949.*

(Enclosure: Report from the Secretary of State concerning Public Law 584.)

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

MARCH 14, 1949.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In conformity with section 124 of Public Law 472, Eightieth Congress, I have this date appointed the Honorable JAMES P. RICHARDS to represent the Committee on Foreign Affairs on the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation for the Eighty-first Congress.

This appointment fills the existing vacancy.

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN KEE.

NATIONAL CAPITAL SESQUICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read:

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives, United States Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith submit my resignation as a member of the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission.

Respectfully yours,

HOMER THORNBERRY.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

COLUMBIA INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 4863, Revised Statutes of the United States, the Chair appoints as a director of the Columbia Institute for the Deaf the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY] to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HARRIS (at the request of Mr. MILLS), for today, on account of official business.

To Mr. NORRELL (at the request of Mr. MILLS) for Monday, March 14, 1949, on account of official business.

To Mr. GATHINGS (at the request of Mr. MILLS), for today, on account of official business.

To Mr. TRIMBLE (at the request of Mr. MILLS), for today, on account of official business.

To Mr. HAYS of Arkansas (at the request of Mr. MILLS), for today, on account of official business.

To Mr. TACKETT (at the request of Mr. MILLS), for today, on account of official business.

To Mr. CARLYLE (at the request of Mr. KERR), for March 14, 1949, on account of official business.

To Mr. PLUMLEY (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) for 2 days, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 15, 1949, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

362. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting its report on the independent regulatory commissions and, separately, an appendix N, the task-force report on this subject (pursuant to Public Law 906, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 116); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

363. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting to the Congress a study prepared for the Commission's consideration on the independent regulatory commissions of the Government. This task-force report is submitted as a supplement to the Commission's report on regulatory agencies as well as the Commission's report on commerce (pursuant to Public Law 906, 80th Cong.); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

364. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation in the amount of $1,380,000 and a proposed provision for the fiscal year 1950 for the Department of Justice in the form of amendments to the budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 117); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

365. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 in the amount of $1,500 for the Treasury Department (H. Doc. No. 118); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

366. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal that part of section 3 of the act of June 24, 1926 (44 Stat. 767), as amended, and that part of section 13a of the act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 166), as amended, relating to the percentage, in time of peace, of enlisted personnel employed in aviation tactical units of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

367. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to promote the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians and the better utilization of the resources of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

368. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 2, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on the coasts of the Great Lakes harbors of refuge for light-draft vessels with a view to providing harbor facilities for light-draft vessels at mouth of Tahquamenon River, Mich., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on July 18, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

369. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 24, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Barnegat Inlet, N. J., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on August 10, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

370. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of

Engineers, United States Army, dated September 27, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Dyer Creek, Mathews County, Va., and Harpers Creek, Mathews County, Va., authorized by the River and Harbor Acts approved on March 2, 1945, and July 24, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

371. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 27, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Lake Placid, Shore Acres, Anne Arundel County, Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on July 24, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

372. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 7, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Valley Creek, Ala., requested by resolutions of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on February 28 and September 18, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

373. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 24, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Murrells Inlet, S. C., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

374. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting its report on the Department of Labor and separately, in typescript, a memorandum on the Department by George W. Taylor, professor of labor relations, University of Pennsylvania, and former Chairman, National War Labor Board (H. Doc. No. 119); to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

375. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting to the Congress, in typescript, the report on information services which was prepared for the Commission's consideration. This material is a further addition to the supporting data which accompanied the Commission's report on general management of the executive branch, filed with the Congress on February 7, 1949; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

376. A letter from the Commissioner, Federal Housing Administration, transmitting the semiannual report of the Federal National Mortgage Association on its activities during the period July 1 through December 31, 1948; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 144. Resolution for the relief of Jean Ness; without amendment (Rept. No. 258). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. H. R. 1579. A bill to amend the Printing Act of January 12, 1895, as amended, with respect to the printing of extra copies of congressional hearings and other documents; with an amendment (Rept. No. 259). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 148. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 1437, a bill to authorize the composition of the Army of the United States and the Air Force of the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 260). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 137. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction; without amendment (Rept. No. 261). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PETERSON: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 1357. A bill to authorize the establishment of the St. Croix Island National Monument, in the State of Maine; with an amendment (Rept. No. 262). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McSWEENEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 112. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Agriculture to make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 263). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 3509. A bill to further amend the act approved August 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 864); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 3510. A bill to establish a Federal Commission on Services for the Physically Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McGUIRE (by request):

H. R. 3511. A bill to declare the waterway (in which is located the Brewery Street Channel) from Brewery Street southeastward to a line running south 33°53'36" west from the south side of Chestnut Street at New Haven, Conn., a nonnavigable stream; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 3512. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to authorize the exemption of certain employees of the Library of Congress whose employment is temporary or of uncertain duration; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3513. A bill to provide for the extension and application of the provisions of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to certain officers and employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in the Department of Justice; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 3514. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administration, as an adjunct to the Federal public-works program, to make loans and grants for the construction, remodeling, improvement, and extension of school facilities; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3515. A bill to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act (title VI of the Public Health Service Act), to extend its duration and provide greater financial assistance in the construction of hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 3516. A bill granting an exemption from income tax in the case of retirement pensions and annuities of policemen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 3517. A bill to provide for the construction, rehabilitation, expansion, conversion, and joint utilization of buildings, structures, utilities, and other facilities, including the acquisition of land, for the Reserve components of the National Military Establishment of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KARST:

H. R. 3518. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3519. A bill to provide for the rate of payment of compensatory time by amending the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employers of the postal service," approved July 6, 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 3520. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the citizenship status of citizens of the United States serving as members of certain armed forces, groups, or organizations established to maintain peace in Palestine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3521. A bill to exempt from certain penal provisions persons serving in armed forces of the United Nations or of certain other groups for the purpose of preserving peace in Palestine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 3522. A bill to establish a Missouri Valley Authority to provide for unified water control and resource development on the Missouri River, its tributaries, and watershed; to prevent floods, reclaim and irrigate lands, encourage agriculture, stimulate industrial expansion, develop low-cost hydroelectric power, promote navigation, increase recreational possibilities, protect wildlife, strengthen the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 3523. A bill to establish a Federal Commission on Services for the Physically Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

H. R. 3524. A bill to strengthen national security and the common defense by providing for the maintenance of an adequate domestic tin-smelting industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. J. Res. 192. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution with respect to the selection of electors of the President and the Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. Res. 149. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Public Lands to investigate certain matters relative to Guam, American Samoa, and other Pacific islands; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to protest the order of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs providing for the discontinuance of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Fort Logan, Colo.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the National Guard of the United States and of the several States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the

President and the Congress of the United States relative to the ratification of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America limiting the number of terms of the President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to appropriate and make available funds in the form of grants-in-aid to the counties of the State of North Dakota situated in the Red River Valley for constructing works for the prevention of floods and for drains adequate for the drainage of farm lands periodically flooded by waters of melting snows in the spring and by heavy rains in the summer of each year; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, expressing appreciation and gratitude to the Committee on Public Lands of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States for its action in recommending passage of legislation for statehood for Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 3525. A bill for the relief of the widow of Frank Winfield Burman, lieutenant, United States Naval Reserve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARDY:

H. R. 3526. A bill for the relief of Zbegniew Jankowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 3527. A bill for the relief of Gifford E. Moak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 3528. A bill for the relief of Frank R. Anderson; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3529. A bill for the relief of James P. Dudley; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 3530. A bill for the relief of Rita Berliner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE of California:

H. R. 3531. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Liu Pao Hsuing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3532. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sirvart Arsenian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 3533. A bill to provide for the extension for 7 years of patent No. 1,854,324, issued April 19, 1932, relating to tile; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 3534. A bill for the relief of Eleanor P. Simmonds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3535. A bill for the relief of William A. Cross; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 3536. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nora Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

209. By Mr. ASPINALL: Memorial of the Colorado State Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary to maintain the agricultural experiment station at Akron, Colo., and to designate said station as a Federal regional station; to the Committee on Agriculture.

210. Also, memorial of the Colorado State Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States to protest the order of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs providing for the discontinuance of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Fort Logan, Colo.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

211. By Mr. CARROLL: Memorial of the Colorado State Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to make Indians citizens of the United States in order that they may be able to vote; to the Committee on Public Lands.

212. Also, memorial of the Colorado State Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States to protest the order of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs providing for the discontinuance of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Fort Logan, Colo.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

213. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Petition of Fred E. Shearer, Mitchell, S. Dak., and 11 others, all veterans of World War II, asking enactment of legislation to correct injustices of Public Law 134, enacted in July 1945; to the Committee on Post Offices and Civil Service.

214. By Mr. HILL: Memorial of the Colorado State Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary to maintain the agricultural experiment station at Akron, Colo., and to designate said station as a Federal regional station; to the Committee on Agriculture.

215. Also, petition protesting the order of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs providing for the discontinuance of the Veterans' Administration Hospital at Fort Logan, Colo.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

216. By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature, relative to the National Guard of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

217. Also, resolutions of the Massachusetts Legislature, relative to the development of the waterways of the Commonwealth; to the Committee on Public Works.

218. Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature, relative to the Federal Unemployment Tax Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

219. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, relative to the National Guard of the United States and of the several States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

220. Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, relative to development of waterways of the Commonwealth; to the Committee on Public Works.

221. By Mr. NORBLAD: Memorial of the Forty-fifth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, petitioning the Congress to make available funds for the purpose of maintaining, on a defense standard, the airports and facilities which have been either constructed or taken over by the Armed Forces and which are of primary strategic value to said forces; to the Committee on Appropriations.

222. Also memorial of the Forty-fifth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact, by proper legislation, an act designating November 11 as Veteran's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

223. By Mr. TOWE: Petition of Bergen County Chapter, Knights of Columbus, Bergen County, N. J., protesting against the outrageous procedure employed in the alleged trial of His Eminence Josef Cardinal Mindszenty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

224. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Harold Williams, M. D., State Medical Association of Texas, Austin, Tex., stating their opposition to compulsory health insurance and commending the Texas delegation for their stand against legislation of this type; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

225. Also, petition of E. I. Thompson, vice president, Texas Independent Producers and Royalty Owners Association, Austin, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to limiting petroleum imports to any quantity that may be needed to supplement domestic production, and in no case permitting it to supplant domestic production; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

226. Also, petition of J. B. Harris and others, Miami, Fla., asking for the passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

227. Also, petition of Edwin M. Coe, Miami, Fla., asking for the passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

228. Also, petition of Mrs. G. B. McGowin, secretary, Associated Hillsboro Company Townsend Clubs, Tampa, Fla., asking for the passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

229. Also, petition of Mrs. Jennie M. Hoyt and others, Miami, Fla., asking for the passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

230. Also, petition of Mrs. L. R. Pfeiffer, Miami, Fla., asking for the passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

231. Also, petition of Edris A. Meisenhelmer and others, Miami, Fla., asking for the passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

232. Also, petition of J. H. Richmond and others, West Palm Beach, Fla., asking for the passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

233. Also, petition of E. M. Coe and others, Miami, Fla., asking for the passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

234. Also, petition of Mrs. Edna Russell and others, Miami, Fla., asking for the passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

235. Also, petition of Polish National Alliance of North America, Inc., Central Council, No. 19, Buffalo, N. Y., stating that they favor S. 311, a bill affecting displaced persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 15, 1949

(Legislative day of Monday, February 21, 1949)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor, Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who art the supreme and guiding intelligence, may every thought of our minds be brought into a glad and willing obedience unto Him who proclaimed himself to be the way, the truth, and the life.

Grant that daily we may be sensitive and responsive to thy voice when Thou dost say, "This is the way; walk ye therein," for Thy ways are ways of pleasantness and Thy paths are paths of peace.

Help us to hasten the dawning of that glorious day when men everywhere shall build the bridges of faith and friendship across the chasms of fear and hatred and all shall be walking "the road of the loving heart."

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 1579) to amend the Printing Act of January 12, 1895, as amended, with respect to the printing of extra copies of congressional hearings and other documents, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 1579) to amend the Printing Act of January 12, 1895, as amended, with respect to the printing of extra copies of congressional hearings and other documents, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hoey	Mundt
Anderson	Holland	Murray
Baldwin	Humphrey	Myers
Brewster	Hunt	Neely
Bricker	Ives	O'Conor
Butler	Jenner	Pepper
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Chapman	Kem	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kerr	Schoeppel
Connally	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Langer	Sparkman
Downey	Lodge	Stennis
Eastland	Long	Taft
Ecton	Lucas	Taylor
Ellender	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Flanders	McFarland	Thye
Frear	McGrath	Tydings
Fulbright	McKellar	Vandenberg
George	McMahon	Watkins
Gillette	Magnuson	Wherry
Green	Malone	Wiley
Gurney	Martin	Williams
Hayden	Maybank	Withers
Hendrickson	Miller	Young
Hickenlooper	Millikin	
Hill	Morse	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

AMENDMENT TO CLOTURE RULE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. LUCAS to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 15, amending the so-called cloture rule of the Senate.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, since the debate has extended over a considerable period of time it perhaps would be helpful to restate the issue. The issue presented to us has been clearly stated twice on this floor, by our distinguished majority leader [Mr. LUCAS], and by his distinguished majority whip [Mr. MYERS], as being an effort to amend the rules of the Senate in order that the Senate might consider and vote on the President's civil-rights program. There are many of us in this body, and the number is by no means confined to those of us from the South, who feel that we have been plunged into a fight not of our choosing, and if that fight should result adversely to substantive legislation it will not be our responsibility.

The distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] stated to the press yesterday afternoon that those of us who see no inherent necessity for any amendment of the Senate rules, in a spirit of compromise and cooperation have made all the concessions that honorable men should make, and perhaps more than prudent men should make.

The distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] pointed out in a cogent but brief speech last night the minor, in our opinion, differences that divide us and prevent us from reaching a friendly and proper settlement of our existing differences concerning a change in the rules.

I shall take the liberty of reminding Senators now on the floor, because some of them were not here when the words were spoken last night, what the Senator from California said in that connection:

> How different, as a matter of fact, is the present two-thirds rule from the constitutional two-thirds rule which was the basis of the compromise proposal? If there are 96 Senators in the Senate Chamber present, under the present two-thirds rule it requires 64 Senators to obtain cloture. Under the constitutional two-thirds proposal it requires the same 64 Senators.
>
> If there is one absentee in the Senate of the United States, and there are only 95 Senators present, it requires 64 Senators, under the present two-thirds rule, and it requires 64 under the requirement of two-thirds of the entire membership of the Senate.
>
> If there are 94 Senators present in the Senate, it will require 63 on the basis of two-thirds of those present, and 64 under a constitutional two-thirds, a difference of one Senator.
>
> If there are 93 Senators present it will require 62 under the two-thirds of those present, and 64 under the two-thirds of the whole Senate.
>
> Now as a practical matter—

He continued—

> whenever there is a cloture vote history has shown that there has been an average of more than 90 Senators either present and voting or paired. Therefore the difference is a very small difference indeed between a two-thirds vote and a constitutional two-thirds vote.

Bear in mind, Mr. President, that the proposal put forward by the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] on behalf of the group for whom he spoke, agreed to yield the time-honored privilege of unlimited debate on all motions to take up either a bill or a resolution, except a motion to take up a further change in the rules should the Senate at this session change the present provisions of rule XXII.

I have just pointed out in the words of the Senator from California that on any issue in which Senators are really interested—mark the words, "really interested"—and are not looking for an opportunity to stand aside on a question concerning which they may be politically committed, but which does not touch their hearts as a burning issue, there is a difference of only one or two, or possibly three, in the number required to impose cloture under our proposal and the number that would be required under the position now taken by the majority leader to impose cloture by two-thirds of those present and voting. But, Mr. President, we insisted upon the reservation with respect to future changes for very good and sufficient reasons. When the hearings started in the Committee on Rules and Administration, one of the original resolutions provided for majority cloture.

When this debate started our distinguished majority whip [Mr. MYERS], who speaks with no small authority on this floor, stated that when the resolution reached the amendment stage he proposed to offer an amendment to change the committee two-thirds provision to a majority provision. Shortly thereafter the distinguished head of our party stated that he favored cloture by a vote of the bare majority of those present, which vote may be as small a number as 25.

What happened last night when we were struggling to get together and reach a fair and just settlement so that the business of this great legislative body might go forward? First the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] rose, denounced the pending compromise, and said that he would never yield to anything that went beyond a majority cloture rule, because in his opinion nothing else would be effective. He was shortly followed by the brilliant new Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who, without unduly boasting, said that he had some felicity of expression and some physical endurance, and that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] was not the only Senator who could stand on this floor and express his views for 12 hours or more consecutively. The Senator from Minnesota stated that he was unalterably opposed to anything other than a majority cloture rule.

So it was, Mr. President, that we realized only too well that when we made the concession of applying cloture to a motion to take up a bill or resolution, we were inviting the next move concerning which the proponents had put us on notice that they would never rest content until a majority of Senators present and voting could control the minority and shut them off.

I was literally astounded, Mr. President, to hear the junior Senator from Minnesota say that he had always been trained to believe that we could not have a democracy unless the majority, in all matters except a few which he enumerated, could control what was being done. I asked him a question. I did not frame the question well, but what I meant to ask was this: "Is it not true that the only bills permanently postponed by a filibuster have been the civil-rights bills? He said he was not advised about that. It is true, Mr. President. Shortly after the unfortunate conflict of 1861–65, the force bill was permanently laid aside. Then, since 1917, we have had anti-poll-tax bills, antilynching bills, and FEPC bills. They have been permanently blocked by the right of free speech in this body.

The very Senators who have deliberately and emphatically put us on notice that they will never be content with anything short of cloture by majority vote are the same Senators who breathe by day and dream by night of a crusade for the Holy Grail, which is civil rights. They picture themselves standing before a great audience of so-called downtrodden people and saying, "We first maneuvered to get the Senate to agree to cloture by majority vote. We imposed cloture. Now we hand you this inestimable boon of antipoll tax, antilynch, and FEPC."

There are those of us in this body who are opposed to such measures, which we deem to be thoroughly unconstitutional as well as highly undesirable. There are those of us who see such a fundamental change in our form of government that no man could tell where the end would be.

Later in my remarks I shall pay my warmest tribute of affection and appreciation to the present senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. Senators know that I think he has a very worthy colleague in the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who has been doing so much to bring about a fair and reasonable settlement of the differences which now divide us.

In a remarkable speech on the floor of the Senate on the pending issue the senior Senator from Georgia, without knowing he was doing so, voiced the sentiments of another great Senator from Georgia at a time when we were in the throes of postwar conditions, when passions still ran high, when prejudice blocked the hearts of many of our citizens. I refer, Mr. President, to the speech made in the Senate on March 4, 1878, by Senator Benjamin Harvey Hill, who was born in Hillsboro, Jasper County, Ga., and served in the Senate from March 1877 until his death in Atlanta, Ga., on August 16, 1882.

In an 8-hour speech, which was not called a filibuster, Daniel Webster replied to the fears expressed by Hayne, of South Carolina, that if his northern colleagues did not quit pressing the South for higher and higher tariffs, forcing them to sell their cotton on world markets and buy their finished goods from the northern industries on a protected market, the time might come when Southern States would be forced to exercise their privilege, as they regarded it, of withdrawing from the Union which they had helped to create. Senators all remember the stirring words which Mr. Webster used:

> When my eyes shall be turned to behold for the last time the sun in heaven, may I not see it shining on the broken and dishonored fragments of a once glorious Union, on a land torn by civil strife and drenched, perhaps, in fraternal blood.

The War Between the States could have been prevented. It should have been prevented. But passion ruled the hearts of those who should have been able to find a peaceful compromise and settlement, and then came the struggle that split asunder the States. Senator Hill was speaking during what we know in the South as the tragic era, the era of reconstruction when we feared that the very Government which we had been so instrumental in creating would become an overpowering and destroying instrument in the hands of ruthless Federal operators. Facing that situation, Senator Hill said:

> But, sir, I have said I do not dread these corporations as instruments of power to destroy this country, because there are a thousand agencies which can regulate, restrain, and control them; but there is a corporation we may all dread. That corporation is the Federal Government. From the aggression of this corporation there can be no safety, if it is allowed to go beyond the bounds; the well-defined limits of its power. I dread nothing so much as the exercise of ungranted and doubtful powers by this Government. It is, in my opinion, the danger of dangers to the future of this country. Let us be sure we keep it always within its limits. If this great, ambitious, ever-growing corporation becomes oppressive, who shall check it? If it becomes wayward, who shall control it? If it becomes unjust, who shall trust it? As sentinels on the country's watchtower, Senators, I beseech you watch and guard with sleepless dread that corporation which can make all property and rights, all states and people, and all liberty and hope, its playthings in an hour and its victims forever.

Mr. President, Saturday before last, accompanied by the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], by the Chief Justice of the Court of Claims, Judge Jones, by a member of the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia, Judge Hood, and by a friend from Philadelphia, Mr. Fred Kissinger, I visited the historic battlefield of Gettysburg. There, brothers from the North and the South locked in deadly combat. The incident of that conflict was slavery, but it was not its true cause. The South claimed—and I shall always believe with a historically true conception of the Constitution—that as sovereign States they had voted to form a Union, and as sovereign States they had a right to withdraw from it, if they felt that the Union had become inimical to their future. Of course, Mr. President, I am glad that the Union was preserved. I repeat that the war over that issue was unnecessary and most unfortunate; but men on the battlefield of Gettysburg fought and died for a principle of government in which they believed. We stood on Cemetery Ridge and looked across at less than half a mile's stretch to the woods in the direction of Seminary Ridge from which the charge of Pickett's division was launched. We were near the little clump of trees on Cemetery Ridge which was Pickett's objective. We stood there and thought of the 15,000 men who started on that charge, and in less than half a day—in fact, it may have been within less than several hours—10,000 of those 15,000 had fallen. Yet modern soldiers tell us that in military conflict 10 percent of casualties is the breaking point. Those who opposed those men were just as brave as were the men from the South who engaged in that charge. It is true that the advantage was with Lee's Army the first day; it was about equal the second day; the third day Lee had lost. That was the turning point of the war.

Loving hands have erected many monuments, not only to the generals and the colonels and the other officers, but also to the privates—even to the privates in the rear ranks, who on that historic occasion laid down their lives in defense of a principle of government, namely, States' rights, human rights, and personal liberty, which they thought were being challenged and threatened by the wrongful action of the Central Government.

As I stood there, viewing that expanse of battlefield and the many monuments of stone and bronze which have been erected to heroism, I thought of the comment of that great Athenian statesman, Pericles, on the young men of Athens at the battle of Thermopylae, where he said:

> There no hearts grow faint because they loved riches more than honor; none shirked the issue in the poor man's dreams of wealth. All these they put aside to strike a blow for the city. Counting the quest to avenge her honor as the most glorious of all ventures, and leaving Hope, the uncertain goddess, to send them what she would, they faced the foe as they drew near him in the strength of their own manhood; and when the shock of battle came, they chose rather to suffer the uttermost than to win life by weakness. * * *
>
> So they gave their bodies to the Commonwealth and received, each for his own memory, praise that will never die, and with it the grandest of all sepulchers, not that in which their mortal bones are laid, but a home in the minds of men, where their glory remains fresh to stir to speech or action as the occasion comes by. For the whole earth is the sepulcher of famous men; and their story is not graven only on stone over their native earth, but lives on far away, without visible symbol, woven into the stuff of other men's lives.

Mr. President, I have said that we from the South feel that the pending proposal to change, first, one of the rules of the Senate which permits free and unlimited debate on a motion to take up, so as to provide cloture by a two-thirds vote, later to be reduced to a constitutional majority, and still later to be reduced to a majority of those present and voting, is the most serious threat to our conception of government as founded by our ancestors to the reserved sovereignty of the States and to the individual liberty and

freedom of the people that has confronted us since Manassas and Bull Run and Cold Harbor, where my grandfather fell, and Chancellorsville and Gettysburg and the Peninsula Campaign and that final battle at Sailors' Creek, where one-third of Lee's poor, ragged, hungry troops, unsupported by artillery, were wiped out in one day, and he was forced, as we know, to fall back to Appomattox. He fell back, realizing the struggle then was hopeless. Facing the conflict in his great heart as to what to do with those men who had followed him so loyally for 4 years, he said, just before he surrendered, "How easily I could be rid of this and be at rest. I have only to ride along the line, and all will be over. But it is our duty to live. What will become of the women and children of the South, if we are not here to protect them?" And so I say, Mr. President, those who are seeking to change our form of government for the express purpose of passing three so-called civil-rights bills underestimate the courage, the determination, the irrefragable spirit, if you will, of the descendants of those who followed Lee and Jackson, if they think we are going to surrender these precious rights without the very best fight of which we are capable.

So, as I said in the beginning of my remarks, this fight was forced on us. We believed it involved a serious issue, one of the most grave of our public lives. And if it blocks legislation in which other Senators are interested, let us put the blame where it properly belongs, on those who started the fight. They started it, for what? They started it for antipoll tax, antilynch, FEPC, and perhaps they will later add antisegregation. When we offer them such a reasonable settlement and proposal, yielding, as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] said, all that honorable men could yield, and possibly more than prudent men should yield, a right that has existed throughout the history of our Government, to stand up and argue whether there should be brought before the Senate bills which we think are unconstitutional, and highly undesirable, they come back to us, as they did last night, with the statement, "Our terms are unconditional surrender."

I was very much pleased to hear, and I assume I was correctly informed, that when our distinguished majority leader was given a general outline of the basis on which the issue could be settled, he is said to have replied that he did not believe he could get more than 15 of his supporters to agree to it. He did get more than 15. So far as I could tell here last night, there were but two who stood up and said, "under no circumstances" would they agree to it. But, for reasons best known to him, our majority leader says, "Our terms are unconditional surrender."

I have many fine friends on the other side of the aisle. They are deeply concerned in fundamental principles of government. They also have a proper and due concern for the orderly dispatch of business. Some of them started out thinking that a constitutional majority cloture rule would be a good change. Others thought a two-thirds majority cloture rule would be a better change. Some even would have been willing to accept the three-fourths majority.

I understand that in a spirit of brotherhood, of cooperation, and of compromise, which is the essence of all legislative action in any legislative body, they finally got together on a proposal to impose cloture on any motion, as well as any measure, except a motion to change the rules by two-thirds constitutional majority. Then up rose my distinguished friend from Oregon and said, "No; I will have no part of it. My terms are unconditional surrender." I want to know who is to take the blame, now, if we do not get anywhere? We of the South have made a fair proposition, to which all the Republicans, except one so far as I know, agreed to, which our distinguished majority leader was agreeable to, and which nearly every Senator on his side was agreeable to, except two, who have stood up and said "No." So here we are. Who is holding up the Senate? Who is responsible now, if we do not get rent control, ECA, and a deficiency bill?

Do Senators know that some agencies are going to run out of money? In less than 2 weeks they will not have a nickel left, if we do not pass the deficiency bill. It is ready to be brought to the floor. It can be placed before the Senate in half an hour, if opportunity is afforded to bring it up on the floor. I might also mention the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act which expires in June. Who is responsible if we cannot act on that? Who is going to tie up the Senate?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield for a question only.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand the Senator made some comment as to the fact that the junior Senator from Minnesota was only for the majority-rule principle. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is what I understood the Senator to say last night.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If the Senator will read the RECORD I am sure he will find that the junior Senator from Minnesota stated he would accept the Hayden-Wherry resolution, which he considered to be a compromise resolution.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Did not the distinguished Senator from Minnesota say there would never be any proper settlement of the issue without majority rule, and that from his infancy up he had been taught that was the right thing to do?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Has the Senator from Virginia read the RECORD of the proceedings as of yesterday evening?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I do not have to read the RECORD, I may say to the Senator, when I hear a Senator speak on the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Did the Senator hear the junior Senator from Minnesota say he would not accept the Hayden-Wherry resolution?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Oh, no; I heard him say he would accept it. But, in the 160 years of our Government, there has never been any cloture on a motion to take up. The Senator went before the Rules Committee, and it finally came out with cloture on that. The Senator said this was a compromise, and that it is as far as he would go; but he hoped to live to see the day when cloture could be invoked by a majority vote. Did not the Senator say that in effect?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The junior Senator from Minnesota did say that he hoped to see the day when majority rule would be adopted.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Oh, well; that is the same thing, and more of it. I am glad I did the Senator the injustice of not making his "as strong as horseradish" on getting antipoll tax, antilynch, and FEPC through this body, by the device of majority rule. I assume the Senator is for antisegregation, and that he wants all four of the bills. Is not that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. We are talking about the rule in the Senate, are we not?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senate——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia can yield only for a question.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I can yield only for a question.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota—I could not have quoted his exact words, as I did not read the RECORD, but I heard him—has confirmed in substance what I have just said.

The purpose of this fight is to change the rules. The Senator is willing to accept, as a temporary expedient, a provision for a two-thirds majority. He not only hopes to see the day when he can bring about majority cloture, but he hopes to put through the so-called civil-rights bills which he thinks are the burning issues of the day and are more important to the people than is anything else we have pending before us.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield for a question only; but please be brief, because I want to get into the technical portion of my argument.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator from Virginia feel that the proposal of the Committee on Rules and Administration is an unfair proposal?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I certainly do. It would leave us at the mercy of those who want to do what the Senator hopes they will be able to do. As soon as the Senator can get us hog-tied to that extent, he will put the hammerlock around our necks, and then ram these unconstitutional measures down our throats, no matter how much we protest.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is familiar, is he not, with the statistical fact that since 1917, of the 19 applications for cloture only 4 prevailed on a two-thirds basis?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I tried last night to bring out for the Senator from Minnesota the fact that the only bills which have been permanently blocked since 1917 by unlimited debate have been the three so-called civil-rights bills, the antipoll-tax bill, the antilynch bill, and the

FEPC bill. All the other business of the Senate has been transacted. For 160 years all the other business of the Senate has been transacted. The bills which I have mentioned are the only three measures which have not been passed. That is what all the shooting is about at this time. They are the bills which the Senator wants to put through. That is the reason for the proposal to change the rule. A two-thirds majority is not satisfactory to the Senator; it is not satisfactory to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] or to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS]. Those Senators want a majority rule, because they are afraid that if they do not get a majority rule they cannot persuade two-thirds of the Senators to go along with measures which, if we have an opportunity, we can explain are wholly unconstitutional, and no Member of this distinguished body will violate the oath which he took to support and uphold the Constitution.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I will yield for one more question, and then I must proceed, because my time is limited.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to ask the Senator from Virginia, since he has again stated that the junior Senator from Minnesota would not accept anything but a majority rule, despite the fact that he has stated repeatedly that he would accept the Hayden-Wherry proposal, whether the Senator from Virginia feels that the majority principle in our Government is a principle which should be looked upon as something which is understandable.

Mr. ROBERTSON. If my distinguished colleague will sit still in the boat during the next 2 hours, I shall answer his question and spend the whole time in answering it. If the Senator will just sit here, I shall answer the question very fully. That is what I propose to discuss, and I wish now to enter into that technical discusion.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief question?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Virginia if the frequent references to majority rule do not mean majority rule on the subject of applying a gag to the Senate, rather than with reference to a vote?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Of course, absolutely.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the Senator, further, if there has not been a misunderstanding of statements which have been made here repeatedly in debate when Senators referred to majority rule, in that they were referring to a majority rule to impose cloture, and not in connection with the final determinations of the Senate.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Of course. In the final vote on a bill the majority controls.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. ROBERTSON. In a moment. This is the most radical proposal which has ever been made to the United States Senate. If it should be adopted it would fundamentally change our form of government. As I proceed with my prepared remarks I hope to be able fully to demonstrate that fact.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS rose.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield to the majority leader, if he wants to ask a question.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator. I was just listening to his speech.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ROBERTSON. For a very brief question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Virginia, since he feels that this is a very serious and almost catastrophic proposal, whether he thinks the terms and the principles outlined in rule XXII, which apply to the business of the Senate, are equally obnoxious.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Absolutely not, because we have therein protection against unconstitutional and unwise bills. I am satisfied that those who framed the rule in 1917 deliberately left it that way, because the man who was in charge of that program was the distinguished Senator from Virginia, Thomas F. Martin, who was one of the greatest lawyers we ever had. He knew the English language, and he could put on paper what he had in mind. Do not tell me that he did not know the difference, after being a Member of the Senate for 20 years, and much of that time floor leader. If he had intended it to cover a motion, do not tell me that he would not have put the word "motion" in the rule. He framed it as he wanted it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator not know that the purpose of rule XXII, according to the authors of the rule, was to stop filibustering?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I do not know any such thing. The purpose of the rule was primarily to follow out the belief of President Woodrow Wilson that a national emergency was involved in connection with the arming of merchant ships. It did not turn out to be that way, because he actually armed them. I do not think that arming them had anything to do with preventing war; we got into the war just the same. But the purpose of proposing that rule in 1917 was to take care of a situation involving a real national emergency. With that I am in full accord. I have no fear, Mr. President, that the time will ever come in our national history when a small majority will stand on this floor and try to block the Senate from taking action necessary for our national security. The record proves it. I have stated repeatedly, but it does not seem to have registered, that from the days of the force bill, right after the War Between the States, down to the present moment, the only bills which have been permanently blocked have been the so-called civil-rights bills. Senators cannot tell me that this whole Nation is all steamed up over whether we have a poll tax in Virginia or do not have one. Senators cannot tell me, when, as was pointed out by the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], there was only one lynching in the whole United States, while there were thousands of murders, rapes, and other crimes, that one lynching has become a burning national issue because of which we must postpone all the business of this important session until we pass an antilynch bill. We have a good law in Virginia in connection with that matter. If the other States have any fear, all they have to do is to copy it. Most of them do not pay any attention to it. Who is there to say there is a burning demand for an FEPC law?

I say, Mr. President, that those three measures, and antisegregation measures, are nothing but political shibboleths to whip up a little furor, and if there were behind them the public sentiment that is claimed by their advocates, if they were so founded in right and justice, if they were so clearly within the province of the Federal Government, their proponents would not have all these fears about bringing them up and getting them to a vote. They know that the Members of the Senate are aware what the people at home are thinking about these measures. They are not the principal issues at home, and every Member of this body knows that to be true.

Mr. President, periodically throughout the 160-year history of our Nation under its present Constitution, efforts have been made to limit the full freedom of debate with which the founders of our Republic so wisely endowed the United States Senate.

The sum total of those efforts is almost zero. On those rare occasions when the self-discipline of some Members of this great forum has not seemed sufficient to prevent injury to our Nation in time of emergency, ways have been found to restrain them. But the Senate has steadfastly refused to place itself in the bondage of rules such as those which limit discussion in other parliamentary bodies and, despite the calamity howling of those who have predicted dire results unless some hastily conceived and irrationally supported measure were passed promptly, our Government has survived and our country has prospered.

The British Parliament and the Continental Congress permitted resort to the device of moving the previous question to cut off debate, and this was carried over into the rules which the Senate adopted at its first session in 1789. The previous question was moved only four times and used only three times in the first 17 years of the Senate's existence, however, and reference to it was omitted when the rules were revised in 1806. But even in those instances—and mark this comment—even in those instances in the Senate there was no limitation upon debate on a motion to close debate.

Our founding fathers, who were right in so many things they did in starting a new experiment in government in the Western Hemisphere, found that while limitation of debate was necessary in a House composed of several hundred Members, it was not wise in the smaller Senate, which was deliberately designed as a balance wheel and a check upon hasty and ill-advised legislation. They accepted the theory of the function of

the Senate, which is said to have been illustrated by George Washington when, in conversation with Thomas Jefferson, he poured hot tea into a saucer to cool and said that the saucer represented the Senate.

In 1841, 35 years after the change in rules to which I have referred, Henry Clay sought to revive the use of the previous question, but his proposal was abandoned after debate in which John C. Calhoun, of South Carolina, asserted that there never has been a body in this or any other country in which, for such a length of time, so much dignity and decorum of debate has been maintained.

Time after time in later years the Senate rejected proposals to limit debate, except temporarily to deal with an emergency situation, until 1917, when rule XXII was amended to its present form.

This rule, which it is now proposed to change, was amended only because of an emergency, and that fact should be kept clearly in mind, both in assessing its value to the Senate in the past, and in considering the merits of arguments favoring a further change. If the Nation had not been facing what President Woodrow Wilson called a crisis of extraordinary peril, even as much limitation as the amended rule XXII provides probably would not have been accepted in 1917. And if means have been found since then to carry on extended discussion of a subject in spite of that rule, it is merely indicative of the fact that the Senate still recognizes its obligation to preserve those rights which it traditionally has accorded to minorities.

As I shall point out later when I discuss rule XXII in more detail, attempts to obtain cloture under its provisions have been comparatively rare, and only four of those attempts have been successful over a period of more than 30 years.

I recognize, of course, that there is a rather widespread belief that debate in the Senate is a needlessly time-consuming and money-costing privilege, and that it should be drastically curbed. It is not unnatural that this view should be shared by a certain number of Members of the Senate itself.

Those of us who served in the House before coming to the Senate have found the unlimited privilege of debate, regardless of relevancy, a bit irksome at times. It is quite a contrast from the House, where we were accustomed to a rule limiting general debate, with time divided equally between the principal proponent and opponent of a bill, who cannot allot more than an hour to any one Member, and with all other debate limited to 5 minutes for each Member as the bill is being read for amendment.

It is notable, however, that longer experience in the Senate has convinced one Member after another that the privilege of unlimited use of the floor was originally granted for sound reasons, and that those reasons still are valid. This enlightenment, based on experience, supplemented by debate on the floor of the Senate and testimony at committee hearings, has led Members of the Senate to reject every radical proposal to change their rules, from Clay's proposal to restore the previous question, in 1841, to the several resolutions on cloture submitted to but left unacted on by the Eightieth Congress when it adjourned last year.

The reasons behind the Senate's refusal to change its rules is clear to any one who takes the trouble to read the transcript of the hearings conducted before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Rules and Administration from January 28 to February 18, 1947. The arguments so cogently presented at that time were repeated and reinforced at the hearings which the corresponding committee of this Congress held from January 24 to February 1 of this year. I commend that transcript to the attention of every Member of the Senate, and I wish it were possible to have it read by those persons throughout the country who remain critical of our methods of procedure.

But because those arguments have not been read and considered as widely as they deserve, I must ask the indulgence of my colleagues to review some of them here. I do this because I feel that vital principles are involved. If a privilege which I regard as precious is to be lost now through the insistence of those who are bent upon the passage of a so-called civil-rights program, I shall not surrender it until I have at least utilized it to make one final plea for a bulwark of our constitutional liberty.

Those familiar with the debates of the Philadelphia Constitutional Convention of 1778 will know that the toughest problem to be solved then was that of representation in the Senate and the method of selection of that representation. After agreeing upon a House of Representatives to be elected by the people every 2 years, and based upon a population ratio divided into congressional districts, the smaller of the participating 13 States frankly wondered how their minorities could be adequately protected from the capricious whims of a majority in the House.

Mr. President, I now intend to go into the answer to the question propounded to me by the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], but I regret to say that apparently he is now in the position of Pontius Pilate, about whom Lord Bacon made this comment in his Essay on Truth:

> What is truth? said jesting Pilate; and would not stay for an answer.

I regret the absence of my distinguished friend from Minnesota as I proceed to answer the question he asked me. I told him I could not answer it in one sentence, but that I had an answer of 2 hours if he would just stay here to hear me.

After long debate, which was at times so acrimonious that it threatened to disrupt the convention, the solution was offered by the wise and venerable Benjamin Franklin, namely, equal representation in the Senate for every State. This compromise was regarded as so important that the British historian, Lord Bryce, and others have said it alone made federation possible in the United States. Franklin's own feeling as to the difficulties which had to be overcome is indicated by a speech made before the Convention in which he said:

> In this situation of this assembly groping as it were in the dark to find political truth, and scarce able to distinguish it when presented to us, how has it happened, sir, that we have not hitherto once thought of humbly applying to the Father of Light to illuminate our understanding? In the beginning of the contest with Great Britain, when we were sensible of danger, we had daily prayer in this room for divine protection. Our prayers, sir, were heard, and they were graciously answered. All of us who were engaged in the struggle must have observed frequent instances of a superintending providence in our favor. To that kind providence we owe this happy opportunity of consulting in peace on the means of establishing our future national felicity. And have we now forgotten that powerful friend? Or do we imagine we no longer need His assistance? I have lived, sir, a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid?

Later, when he emerged from the conference, at the end of hearings on the Constitution, and was asked what had been done, Franklin replied:

> We have given you a Republic—if you can keep it.

To make sure that representation in the Senate would be of a character that would calmly consider and patriotically and unselfishly act on laws under which all the people would have to live, the Constitution originally provided that Members of the Senate should be selected by State legislatures rather than by popular vote and that they should be given terms of 6 years.

The constitutional amendment providing for the direct election of Senators was in theory right and in keeping with the progressive interpretation of democratic principles. But it must be observed that in practice it has made Members of the Senate more subject to group pressure than Members of the House because a given group with State-wide affiliations can be united against a candidate for the Senate and make his reelection both difficult and expensive. In other words, that change reduced the protection of minorities contemplated by the founding fathers and left as their last resort the weapon of debate by which the fallacies of a given proposal could be duly and adequately exposed and an appeal made to reason.

From the start our forefathers recognized that the minority was entitled to that protection which only established rules of procedure could provide.

Thomas Jefferson had this to say as to the necessity of protecting minority interests:

> Bear in mind this sacred principle, that though the will of the majority is in all cases to prevail, that will, to be rightful, must be reasonable; that the minority possess their equal right, which equal laws must protect, and to violate would be oppression.

I wish I had some way to underline those words as they appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with the hope that my distinguished friend from Minnesota

would at least glance over this and catch some of the high lights of the discussion of minority rights starting with the framers of the Constitution and, as I shall point out, coming down to us to this very day.

Jefferson also had something to say as to the means by which oppression of the minority might be prevented. In the preface to the Manual of Parliamentary Procedure, which he compiled for his own use and then deposited with the Senate and which has become the recognized guide for all our legislative bodies, Jefferson stated:

> Mr. Onslow, the ablest among the Speakers of the House of Commons, used to say it was a maxim he had often heard when he was a young man, from old and experienced members, that nothing tended more to throw power into the hands of administration, and those who acted with the majority of the House of Commons, than a neglect of, or departure from, the rules of proceeding; that these forms, as instituted by our ancestors, operated as a check and control on the actions of the majority, and that they were, in many instances, a shelter and protection to the minority against the attempts of power. So far the maxim—

Said Jefferson—

> is certainly true, and is founded in good sense; that as it is always in the power of the majority—

Mark this, Mr. President—

> that as it is always in the power of the majority, by their numbers, to stop any improper measures proposed on the part of their opponents, the only weapons by which the minority can defend themselves against similar attempts from those in power are the forms and rules of proceeding which have been adopted as they were found necessary, from time to time, and are become the law of the House, by a strict adherence to which the weaker party can only be protected from those irregularities and abuses which these forms were intended to check and which the wantonness of power is but too often apt to suggest to large and successful majorities.
>
> And whether these forms be in all cases the most rational or not, is really not of so great importance. It is much more material that there should be a rule to go by, than what that rule is; that there may be uniformity of proceeding in business not subject to the caprice of the Speaker or captiousness of the Members. It is very material that order, decency, and regularity be preserved in a dignified public body.

Note well that Jefferson said the only weapons by which the minority can defend themselves from the abuses which the wantonness of power is but too often apt to suggest to large and successful majorities, are the forms and rules of proceedings which have been adopted.

So, my first premise is that the rules of the Senate which allow full freedom of debate are designed for protection of the majority and this design is part of the warp and woof of our Constitution. You cannot remove it without damaging the whole fabric.

Therefore, before tampering with this right we should assure ourselves that what is lost will not be greater than what is gained.

We are told by the present proponents of a change in the rules that rule XXII was amended to prevent filibusters; that the amended rule still permits filibusters to occur and, therefore, rule XXII should be further amended.

In considering the reasonableness of that proposition we first must ask, What is a filibuster? We also should know what causes filibusters, and then weigh the evidence offered to prove that the damage they cause to our Nation as a whole is greater than the damage which might be done by the measures intended to abolish them.

The question of what constitutes a filibuster could be argued indefinitely. It is a point on which the Representatives of the Southern States are, justifiably, I believe, somewhat sensitive. We have seen some controversial issues debated on the floor of the Senate for weeks at a time with no reference made to anything except extended debate. On the other hand, we have had cases such as the one last year, when the anti-poll-tax bill was under discussion, when Senators making their very first speech on a matter vitally affecting their States were publicly branded as filibusterers.

At any rate, for the purpose of this discussion, suppose we assume that a filibuster is an extended discussion which has the effect of delaying action on a measure on which a majority of the Members might otherwise have been prepared to vote. Under that definition we need not concern ourselves as to whether those doing the talking had delay as their motive or whether the delay was merely incidental to their efforts to enlighten their colleagues and the Nation at large.

Let us, then, see when and why time-consuming debate usually has occurred in the Senate.

Public Affairs Bulletin No. 64 of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, on page 17, under the heading "Outstanding Senate filibusters from 1841 to 1948," lists 43 examples of the practice.

The first item mentioned—a bill to remove the Senate printers—seems at this distance somewhat trivial, and if all the others were of that character we might have to agree with those who contend that permitting unlimited debate is unjustifiable. But, in the same year, 1841, we find that the Senate was tied up for several weeks in debate over a bill introduced by Henry Clay relating to the Bank of the United States.

Senators will recall that from the time of the creation of the Bank of the United States in 1791 there was controversy over its constitutionality, leading to the celebrated case of McCulloch against Maryland, in which Chief Justice John Marshall in 1819 wrote the opinion upholding the constitutionality of the act establishing the bank.

So, it was over a subject which always had been regarded as involving constitutional questions that this filibuster occurred; and when the Senate rejected not only Clay's proposal to allow use of the previous question to stop debate but also his effort to establish an hour rule, we may assume that the Members felt then, as many of us do today, that on matters of policy we may compromise or even surrender as a matter of expediency; but we cannot forget that we have taken an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States, and when we honestly feel that the Constitution is under attack, we must oppose that effort to the limit of our ability and endurance.

This is the language of that oath:

> I, A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, do solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.

If that oath means anything it means that the responsibility for upholding the Constitution is a personal one which we have no right to sidestep by delegating it to the Federal courts, the members of which have taken the same oath.

Thus in 1863, Members of the Senate rightfully took their time in considering the implications of a bill to suspend the precious writ of habeas corpus. In 1876 there was a filibuster against an appropriation bill which lasted until the abandonment of a rider which would have suspended existing election laws. In 1890 there was the famous 29-day filibuster on the Force bill, providing for Federal supervision of elections, which was in plain violation of the Constitution. From 1922 on there have been recurring extended debates, usually characterized as filibusters, on the so-called civil rights bills, including antilynching, anti-poll-tax, and antidiscrimination legislation. All of these, in the opinion of those of us who oppose them, involve intolerable assaults on the Constitution.

So, it seems plain that the cause of a majority of filibusters is the firm determination of some Senators to fight to the last ditch in defense of some fundamental right or to prevent impairment of our basic written law. That is the cause of this debate—namely, a change in the Senate rules for the purpose of ramming down the throats of southern Senators an anti-poll-tax bill, an antilynching bill, an antisegregation bill, and a fair employment practices bill, all of which are clearly unconstitutional.

What, then, has been the net result of these filibusters, from the long-time point of view?

The Library bulletin to which I have referred contains much valuable factual information but it conveyed a misleading impression which, fortunately, was corrected by the diligence of the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The bulletin presented, on page 20, a list of 37 bills described as an incomplete list of legislation defeated by filibusters. A correction was made by the author of the pamphlet reducing the list to 35, but the full story was not told until, at the request of the Senator from Arizona, a supplemental study was made showing subsequent action by Congress on the same or similar measures. It then appeared that only nine of the bills listed as defeated by filibuster since 1890

were permanently prevented from becoming law. These were the infamous force bill, three antilynch bills, four poll-tax bills, and the FEPC bill. We of the South desire the privilege of full debate of such measures to the end that no distinguished colleague shall be permitted to close his eyes to constitutional law and thus rise above principle.

The bills I have mentioned as being the only ones permanently defeated by filibuster cover the period both before and after rule XXII was amended. As I previously mentioned, that amendment, sponsored in 1917 by my distinguished predecessor, Senator Martin, of Virginia, at the request of President Wilson, was proposed and adopted because of the emergency created by World War I. Wilson requested amendment of the rules because of the delay in passing his armed-ship bill, but he later disproved the necessity for the change by finding he had authority to arm the ships without passage of the bill.

In the 32 years since that amendment was adopted the Senate has voted 19 times on proposals to invoke cloture, but cloture was invoked in only four instances. In addition to indicating the reluctance of Members of the Senate to use such a device even when it is available, I think it is important to notice the type of issues involved when cloture was granted and when cloture was refused.

Cloture was invoked to curb debate on the Treaty of Versailles, the World Court, a branch banking bill, and creation of a Bureau of Customs and Bureau of Prohibition. Successful resort to rule XXII in the first two instances illustrates the ability of the Senate to act where international issues and natural security are involved. There may also be significance in the decision to come to grips with the issue involved in creating the Bureau of Prohibition because of the constitutional aspects. Defenders of the inviolability of the Constitution frequently have shown their willingness to fight to the last ditch for their principles; and from the time the eighteenth amendment was adopted until it was repealed there were those who insisted it involved an improper expansion of Federal power. But where enforcement was involved, those most opposed to the prohibition amendment united with those who favored it in arguing that so long as it was the law of the land it should be treated with respect. As defenders of the Constitution they could not justify a refusal to permit the Congress to vote on proposals to provide the means of upholding our written laws. That, I think, may be why the margin which permitted cloture in that instance was provided by Senators from Alabama, Arkansas, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia, who never would have approved cutting off debate on a question involving a weakening of our Constitution.

It should also be noted that in 6 of the 15 cases in which a Senate roll call failed to approve cloture as provided under rule XXII, the issue involved was one of the so-called civil-rights bills. In these instances the minority which insisted a violation of the Constitution was involved, found support from colleagues who, whether they agreed with them or not on the merit of a particular bill, were unwilling to have debate on such an issue restricted.

Before concluding this discussion of the causes and effects of filibusters, I desire to quote an apt statement made by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] in the course of the 1947 hearings on this subject:

> The general assumption that prolonged debate operates against the final passage of a particular measure is not in point of fact necessarily true. On the contrary, two recent notable exceptions may now be pointed out—the Lend-Lease Act and the British loan. These legislative measures grew in point of strength as the debate developed.

Considering the reverse angle—a bill which did not pass—Senator GEORGE recalled the proposal of the President of the United States made in 1937 for the reorganization of the judicial branch of the Federal Government. He pointed out that no effort actually was made to invoke cloture or to limit debate on this issue but, he added—

> if debate had been limited to 1 hour by each Senator on this bill as introduced by the chairman of the Judiciary in the early days of 1937, or if the present proposals to give to a scant majority of those voting or the constitutional majority of the whole membership of the Senate the power to limit debate had been the rule, the bill would probably have passed the Senate.

Emphasizing what such action might have meant to our Nation, Senator GEORGE said this measure, which often has been referred to as a court-packing bill, was—

> the most far-reaching and important legislative proposal considered by the Congress within the last quarter of a century, if not one of the most important proposals ever submitted to the Congress of the United States.

Certainly it requires no arguments now to show that the very genius of our American system of government is the judicial protection of the rights of the one man against the ninety and nine; certainly it needs no argument to demonstrate that the whole bill of rights is but a clear and unmistakable declaration that certain immemorial rights of freemen in America are above and beyond all government, general as well as local. How may those rights be maintained unless we retain a strong, independent, and coordinate branch of the Government—the judicial branch—to give them validity and life? As a Member of the Senate in 1937, I can assure you that those of us who opposed the reorganization of the judicial branch of Government were most anxiously concerned respecting our ability in the beginning to marshal even a scant one-third of the Senate against a powerful and popular President of the United States—a great leader not only of his party but of American thought.

It is such instances as Senator GEORGE was discussing, Mr. President, which force us to the conclusion that even a limited power to curtail Senate debate is dangerous.

That danger has been recognized and emphasized time and again by leaders of our national thought. For example, Woodrow Wilson asked for the limitation which we now have in the amended rule XXII, but he did it in the face of a wartime emergency.

His plea, couched in language which indicated the stress under which he was laboring, referred directly to—

> a crisis of extraordinary peril when only definite and decided action can make the Nation safe or shield it from war itself by aggression of others.

Mr. President, in 1912, I was elected as a Woodrow Wilson delegate to our State Democratic Convention. I admired and supported his type of liberalism, and I think it is best represented, not by the statement I have just quoted, but by the calm assertion made in his book on constitutional government when he wrote:

> An attempt was once made to bring the previous question into the practices of the Senate, but it failed of success, and so that imperative form of cutting off all further discussion has fortunately never found a place there. Still, though not much heeded, the debates of the Senate are of great value on scrutinizing and sifting matters which come up from the House.
>
> The Senate's opportunity for open and unrestricted discussion and its simple, comparatively, and unencumbered forms of proceeding unquestionably enable it to fulfill with very considerable success its high functions as a chamber of revision.

In another discussion of the importance of free debate in the same book, Wilson said:

> It is the proper duty of a representative body to look diligently into every affair of government and to talk much about what it does. It is meant to be the eyes and the voice, and to embody the wisdom and will of its constituents. Unless Congress has and uses every means of acquainting itself with the acts and the disposition of the administrative agents of the Government, the country must be helpless to learn how it is being served; and unless Congress both scrutinize these things and sift them by every form of discussion the country must remain in embarrassing, crippling ignorance of the very affairs which it is most important that it should understand and direct.
>
> The informing function of Congress should be preferred even to its legislative function. The argument is not only that discussed and interrogated administration is the only pure and efficient administration, but more than that, that the only really self-governing people is that people which discusses and interrogates its administration. The talk on the part of Congress, which we sometimes justly condemn, is the profitless squabble of words over frivolous bills or selfish party issues. It would be hard to conceive of there being too much talk about the practical concerns and processes of government. Such talk it is which, when earnestly and purposefully conducted, clears the public mind and shapes the demands of public opinion.

Woodrow Wilson, as governor and President, fought for the recognition and protection of the rights of minorities, and so did Robert M. La Follette, Sr., of Wisconsin.

During the debate which preceded adoption of the amendment to rule XXII in 1917, however, Senator La Follette found himself on the opposite side from Wilson. La Follette urged the Senate not to let the needs of the moment cause it to take action which would unduly bind it in the future.

He said:

> I realize how the hysteria of the moment may be driving Senators to acquiesce here in this procedure which at another time they would resist with all their force. But so far as I am concerned I will never by my voice or vote consent to a rule which will put an end to freedom of debate in the Senate. The adoption of this rule marks a decline in the influence of the Senate in the Government. I know that the majority are determined. I believe that a majority of that majority are in this matter yielding their judgments, and that the time will come when the men who are now clamoring for this change and who by their votes are imposing cloture upon the Senate will see that rule invoked to deprive them and their States of what they deem their rights. I cannot prevent the adoption of this rule, so I am content at this time to protest and vote against it.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PEPPER in the chair). Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Is not the very point made by Senator La Follette very well illustrated in the Senate today, where representatives of the very States whose predecessors had voted to impose cloture regret that that was done, and regret that they do not have the right to free and unlimited debate in many respects?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Oh, undoubtedly; and as the junior Senator from Louisiana pointed out in a splendid speech he made 10 days ago, it is the Southern States that are under the guns now. Who knows what State will be under the guns at some future day, if we break down the plan of the founding fathers to throw a proper protection around the rights of minorities?

At another point in the debate, Senator La Follette said:

> Mr. President, believing that I stand for democracy, for the liberties of the people of this country, for the perpetuation of our institutions, I shall stand while I am a Member of this body against any cloture that denies free and unlimited debate.

Mark you, Mr. President, we have been taken to task here in the last 2 or 3 days as being bull-headed reactionaries because we would not agree to anything more than a constitutional two-thirds majority to curb what has never been curbed in the history of the Nation. What was Robert M. La Follette, Sr.? Was he a liberal, or a reactionary? What was he? I remember very distinctly when he sat in the Senate. I knew him. I admired his ability. I did not always agree with what he advocated here, but he was known as the outstanding liberal of this body, of his day and time. Nobody on this floor can deny that fact. He was in the forefront. Yet he did not want a change in the fundamental rules. He fought against that, as far as rule XXII now goes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that there never has been a greater liberal on this floor, one who was a greater champion of the rights and welfare of the masses of the people, than Senator Robert M. La Follette?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I always thought so. In those days, Mr. President, I thought I was a liberal, too. I was elected to the State Senate of Virginia in 1915. I was burning up to do something for the people. I went down there and demanded a bill for workmen's compensation, to relieve workingmen of the harshness of the fellow-servant doctrine, to relieve them of the harshness of the rules of our courts making contributory negligence a bar to recovery. When they were injured and lost their arms or their legs or became blind they would be thrown into the discard. I worked to protect them. I worked to protect women and children in industry. I worked to have roads constructed for the benefit of the farmers, and to have better schools provided. I thought I was a liberal. Who knows today what a liberal is, if one cannot be a liberal unless he sponsors an unconstitutional act, upon the pretext of giving somebody some right which he thinks he ought to have and does not now possess?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield for a question only.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that when the first attempt was made to invoke cloture under rule XXII, that other great liberal, Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska, rose on this floor and made a point of order against the petition attempting to invoke cloture?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is my recollection. Certainly Senator Norris served here in such recent years that every Member of the Senate would still, I think, even under the changed definition of a liberal, call him a liberal.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield for a brief question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that in the great battle against the so-called antilynching bill in 1938, southern Senators, in their fight against the bill, were joined not only by the great liberal from Idaho, Senator Borah, but also by the great liberal from Nebraska, Senator Norris?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I recall the splendid speech Senator Borah made, and I hope to have opportunity before I complete my discussion on this phase of the matter to quote from it. I had frankly forgotten that Senator Norris likewise participated in that fight on the side of those who insisted the bill was unconstitutional. I am happy to have that reminder come from my distinguished colleague from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield for a question only.

Mr. SPARKMAN. While the Senator is talking about liberals and their attitude regarding certain matters, is the Senator familiar with the statement made by one of the greatest of liberals ever to serve in the Senate, Senator La Follette, of Wisconsin, regarding the question of cloture on debate?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am quite familiar with it. As a matter of fact I have just been referring to it. I thank my colleague. Senator La Follette said:

> Sir, the moment that the majority imposes the restriction contained in the pending rule upon this body, that moment you will have dealt a blow to liberty, you will have broken down one of the greatest weapons against wrong and oppression that the Members of this body possess.
>
> This Senate is the only place in our system where no matter what may be the organized power behind any measure to rush its consideration and to compel its adoption, there is a chance to be heard, where there is opportunity to speak at length, and where, if need be, under the Constitution of our country and the rules as they stand today, the constitutional right is reposed in a Member of this body to halt a Congress or a session on a piece of legislation which may undermine the liberties of the people and be in violation of the Constitution which Senators have sworn to support. When you take that power away from Members of this body, you let loose in a democracy forces that in the end will be heard elsewhere, if not here.

It was my pleasure to know the late Senator Overton, of Louisiana, during my service in the House. I shall always cherish the brief period I was permitted to serve with him in the Senate.

It is no disparagement of the other able lawyers in the Senate when I express the belief that Senator Overton was as able a lawyer as we have had in the Senate in recent years. Testifying before the Rules Committee in February of 1947, Senator Overton said:

> Speaking for southern Senators, our only recourse against legislation directed against our people for the purpose of attracting the support of the Negro voters and the CIO and other coagitators and collaborators above the Mason and Dixon's line is a resort to the filibuster. That is a frank statement but it is just as well to meet the issues.
>
> Today it is the South that is suffering. In a short while it may be New England or the West. The history of the filibuster shows that the Senators from various States and sections have resorted to it in order to protect their constituents from what they considered to be legislation adversely affecting their interests.
>
> A two-thirds vote is not an uncommon procedure in the Congress of the United States. The Constitution, as well as amendments thereto, impose the rule of a two-thirds majority in quite a number of instances. I shall refer to those instances briefly:
>
> No person shall be convicted on impeachment without the concurrence of two-thirds of the Senators present (art. 1, sec. 3).
>
> Each House, with the concurrence of two-thirds, may expel a Member (art. 1, sec. 5).
>
> A bill returned by the President with his objections may be repassed by each House by a vote of two-thirds (art. 1, sec. 7).
>
> The President shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur (art. 2, sec. 2).
>
> Congress shall call a convention for proposing amendments to the Constitution on the application of two-thirds of the legislatures of the several States (art. 5).
>
> Congress shall propose amendments to the Constitution whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary (art. 5).
>
> When the choice of a President shall devolve upon the House of Representatives, a

quorum shall consist of a Member or Members from two-thirds of the various States of the Union (amendment 12).

A quorum of the Senate, when choosing a Vice President, shall consist of two-thirds of the whole number of Senators (amendment 12).

The Constitution, therefore does not give recognition, in all cases, to the right of the majority to control.

By analogy it requires a two-thirds vote of the Senate to expel one single Member.

And yet here is an attempt made to prevent debate on matters vitally concerning various States, or a minority party, on some vital issue, to close the mouths of Senators, maybe 20 or 25 or 30 of them, by a majority vote. Now I think it would be infinitely bett r if we could dispense with the services of any Senator at any time in the history of the United States by expulsion than that we should so readily prevent freedom of debate on the part of Senators when it comes to a very vital issue. I think that is very worthy of consideration. * * *

We may also do well to recall the remarks made by the beloved Senator from Arkansas, the late Joseph T. Robinson.

Before I quote the late Senator Robinson, Mr. President, I should like to refer to something which I heard in debate on the floor, but I do not remember who said it or just when it occurred, but it was to this effect:

> Go back over the entire history of the Senate and you will find that the very ablest, the most conscientious, and most patriotic men who have served here from its inception down to the present time have stood on the floor and championed the right of free debate in this body.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. STENNIS. In reference to those who have stood on the floor of the Senate and championed the cause of free debate, is it not also true, according to the Senator's findings and observations, that many of those who came here in favor of cutting off debate, even by a majority vote, on further maturity and experience in the Senate entirely changed their minds, a number of them even to the extent of opposing cloture?

Mr. ROBERTSON. They certainly have. I shall quote, before I finish, if I have sufficient time, from some of those who did that. One of them was the distinguished Senator Lodge, Sr., who sponsored the force bill in the House. It was defeated in the Senate. He condemned the Senate for filibustering against it, but when he came to the Senate he fought to preserve the principle of unlimited debate.

A few moments ago we were talking about liberals. I was serving in the House during all of the Roosevelt administrations. The late Senator Joe Robinson was the majority leader of the Senate and handled all the President's bills. I assume that Franklin D. Roosevelt is still rated as a liberal. Some persons have gone a little further than he, since he died, but I do not think the statement that he was a liberal can be challenged. Senator Joe Robinson handled every bill passed by the Senate. I mean by that, he really handled them. I never saw a man with as much grasp of a wide variety of legislation. I used to come here, when I could get away from the House, to see him operate. He did not serve on a single committee, so far as I know, but when a bill reached the floor of the Senate, not a Member of the Senate knew more about it than he did. He participated in every debate on every important question, and guided the legislation through. He was a wonderful man. He was a lovely friend. I shall never forget the time I took him fishing, over the Fourth of July, in Virginia, on the Jackson River, in Bath County. Since he was interested in conservation, the State commissioner of game and inland fisheries had sent him a complimentary license. I joined him at the Methodist Building, where he was residing, and we went down Constitution Avenue nearly to the marble palace of the Federal Reserve Board, when Senator Robinson said, "Oh, I have forgotten my license." I said, "Do not let that bother you. I can testify, if the game warden comes around, that you have a license." "No, sir," he said, "I am not going to be accused of violating any law." He said to the chauffeur, "Turn around; we are going back to get that license." So we went back, he got the license, and then we drove down into Virginia.

Oh, how he loved the out of doors. He loved to fish. I have also hunted with him. What a great statesman he was. He was a wonderful man, a well-rounded man in every respect. I have never seen anyone who knew him either as a friend or as a legislator who did not have the greatest admiration for him. He stood foursquare, and one could say, "There is a man."

I make those preliminary remarks, Mr. President, because of the character of the witness I am calling. He said:

> The filibuster has been invoked comparatively few times in the history of the country, and every time it has been invoked and proved successful it has been justified in the judgment and in the conviction of the public. * * * The force bill would have become law but for the organized and persistent opposition of Senators who saw in its provisions the dangers to the fundamental institutions of this Republic. They defeated it by fighting and falling back and fighting again until the hosts which were assaulting them realized that the attack had failed. Never since has a Congressman or a Senator said that armed forces of the United States shall be planted about ballot boxes and men and women who exercise the power to vote shall be under the coercion and intimidation of men with bayonets in their hands. The force bill and all that was associated with it went by for all time and a filibuster in the United States Senate accomplished it.

We have, too, the testimony of the distinguished former Senator from Idaho, William E. Borah, to whom reference was recently made by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]:

> I have never known a good measure killed by a filibuster or a debate. I have known a vast number of bad measures, unrighteous measures, which could not have been killed in any other way except through long discussion and debate. There is nothing in which sinister and crooked interests, seeking favorable legislation, are more interested right now than in cutting off discussion in Washington.

Again, in 1938 the Republican leader, Senator McNary, stated his disagreement with the position of those who were conducting a filibuster on the antilynching bill, but refused to vote for cloture because, he said, "I am not willing to give up the right of free speech and full untrammelled opportunity for argument. That right is the last palladium, it is the last impregnable trench for those who may be oppressed or who are about to be oppressed. It might be the last barrier to tyranny."

That forthright statement was duplicated in 1946 by another leader of the opposition party, our colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], who said in a speech on this floor:

> The Senate of the United States is one of the few legislative forums in the world which operates on, and guards the right of, free speech. If my country were confronted with the horrible choice of surrendering all of the individual rights of its citizens under our Constitution save one to be selected by it, I should unhesitatingly counsel the preservation of the right of free speech, for so long as this right remains unimpaired all other rights, if lost, may be regained.
>
> History confirms this. Every dictator knows it well and selects free speech as the first victim of his aggression. * * *
>
> It is manifest that if a majority of one could end free speech in the Senate it would not be long until there would not be any free speech.
>
> The majority of any party in power would find the suppression of free speech a convenient method of expediting what it conceived to be useful and urgent legislation.

Mind you, Mr. President, I am now quoting from a distinguished Republican leader who is still a Member of the Senate. The past 2 years he was chairman of the great and powerful Committee on Finance of the Senate. He is now the ranking minority member of the committee. He comes from the western area of the United States, and we are told the West is for this change, but this Senator had the courage to stand on this floor and express his deep and unalterable opposition to a change in the rules which would permit a majority vote of the Senate to cut off debate. I continue to quote from him:

> It is always annoying to have errors exposed, and it would not be long until a majority of one decided that for political purposes it should retain the illusion of infallibility by preventing exposure here of its errors. And then it would not be long until corrupt and even more ominous legislation might be shepherded through this Chamber in enforced silence.
>
> It should never be forgotten, I respectfully suggest, that the rules of a legislative body in a country which understands, appreciates, and desires to conserve the principles of human freedom are adopted not to enhance or render unshakable the power of the majority of its members, but rather to protect those in the minority.
>
> The rights of the minority have not been imposed by a minority; they have been freely granted my majorities which realize that under natural or moral law the individual and minority groups have certain rights which should not be subjected to the caprice of others, no matter how numerous, that these minority rights by their nature and by the formal mandates and consents and relinquishments of power, by thoughtful, just, and civilized majorities, when they are engaged in laying out the long-term rules for the Government of all, are truly and deservedly unalienable.

In the 1918 debate on the Underwood resolution to limit debate during the war period, Senator Lawrence Y. Sherman, of Illinois, made this pertinent comment:

> Majority rule is something that is always very popular; but there is nothing that gives rise to more delusions in the common understanding than talking about majority rule in the United States Senate. Majority rule is a paradox in the Senate. What appears to be a majority rule in this body is in reality a popular minority rule. A majority of Senators does not mean a majority in the popular sense; it does not even mean a majority of votes, much less a majority of population.
>
> When the 13 States assembled, by delegates, to form the present Government under which we are operating, they had to ratify—at least 9 of them had to do so—the Constitution before it became applicable even to the 9. After the nine had ratified the Constitution others came in in due time, but even the nine who ratified the Constitution in the first instance were induced to adopt it in their local debates in the States because it was argued—and this portion of it was referred to very frequently—that the small States had an equal suffrage with the large States.
>
> The larger States, both in population and in material resources, and sometimes in territory, are entirely overwhelmed by the small States.

This is a great Republican leader speaking about the rights of minorities:

> This is an incident to the conditions under which our form of government was created; but because it was an incident, and an indispensable one, it is no reason why any further advantage should be given to the small States by changing the rules of the Senate.

That thought—about the Senate being deliberately planned in a way which would not promote majority rule—was emphasized again in the hearings this year when the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] pointed out that on the basis of 1940 census figures the smallest two-thirds of the States had a population of 43,623,036 and the largest one-third had 88,046,239. That means, of course, that two-thirds of the Members of the Senate might conceivably vote for a proposition and yet represent the views of only one-third of the Nation's population. Going a step further in his discussion, the Senator from Florida pointed out that a third of our entire population is represented by Senators from the five most populous States, so that a denial of full minority rights of discussion to a group of as few as 10 Senators might, in effect, be a denial to the representatives of a third of the people.

Going back to the 1918 debate on the Underwood resolution, I find cogency in this statement made by Senator Smith, of Michigan:

> The longer I stay here the less I speak. Some of the best men who ever served in this body have grown to dislike verbal controversy. Men get over the fascination of their own speech; but if the occasion should require, or if some injustice was sought to be done, unlimited debate would be a very desirable and potential weapon to reside in the senatorship.
>
> It is not that a Senator wishes to be heard at great length; it is the power to defend his State, which you are attempting to curtail. Take away the right of unlimited debate and you take away the one great distinguishing characteristic of senatorial procedure.

Senator Watson, of Indiana, also said in that debate:

> If this had been the rule of the United State Senate for the first 50 years of its existence John C. Calhoun would not have been able to thunder forth the doctrines in which he believed; Hayne could not have announced on the floor the ideas which he so eloquently espoused; Henry Clay would have been unable to deliver in full any one of the score of speeches that accomplished so much for his country; and Daniel Webster, imperious orator of American history, could not have blazed the pathway of the future in that historic utterance in which he announced the essential policies of the Republic if its institutions are to endure, for on the floor of the United States Senate and in the open forum of debate he in a sense shaped the destiny of the Republic and molded the future of the Nation.

Incidentally, it took Daniel Webster 8 hours to deliver the speech to which Senator Watson referred, while if I consume today as much as 4 hours many will refer to it as a filibuster.

An excellent example of how experience has taught Members of the Senate to respect its rules guarding freedom of debate is afforded by the late Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Sr., of Massachusetts.

As a Member of the House of Representatives the senior Senator Lodge introduced and fought for the force bill. It was defeated by filibuster in the Senate after an effort to invoke cloture had failed. Senator Lodge came to the Senate in 1893 with, according to his own statement, "a very strong prejudice in favor of vigorous and prompt methods of closing debate."

After 10 years of experience in this body Senator Lodge made a speech in which he recalled the defeat of his force bill by obstructionist tactics and then said:

> But, Mr. President, I had much rather take the chances of occasional obstruction than to put the Senate in the position where bills could be driven through under rules which may be absolutely necessary in a large body like the House of Representatives or the House of Commons in England, but which are not necessary here. I think here we should have, minority and majority alike, the fullest possible opportunity of debate.

That statement was made by Senator Lodge in 1903 when his own party had a large majority and was in firm control. Twelve years later, in 1915 he reaffirmed his faith in the right of free debate in the Senate when he asserted in another speech on the floor that—

> every Senator ought to think well before he makes a change of this sort in the very constitution of the Senate for the sake of passing, in a moment of heat and passion over a single bill, a measure which strikes at that quality which has been more distinctive of the Senate than any other body in parliamentary history and which today is the only refuge the people of this country have who desire to know something about the measures before their Representatives. The people of this country have the right to know the reasons for and against every important measure, for in no other way can they rightly judge.

Still later, after our present rule XXII had been adopted in 1917 Senator Lodge wrote an article for a magazine in which he discussed the operations of the Government and of the Senate.

In this article he recalled that before the adoption of the Constitution the States were all sovereign States and that while they agreed, through the Constitution, to surrender certain of their powers, they sought in the Senate to secure protection of their rights and insisted on the specific provision in article V of the Constitution that no State, without its consent should be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

Then Senator Lodge wrote:

> Except on some rare occasions the Senate has been the conservative part of the legislative branch of the Government. The cloture and other drastic rules for preventing delay and compelling action which it has been found necessary to adopt and apply in the House of Representatives have never, except in a most restricted form, been admitted in the Senate. Debate in the Senate has remained practically unlimited, and despite the impatience which unrestricted debate often creates, there can be no doubt that in the long run it has been most important and indeed very essential to free and democratic government to have one body where every great question could be fully and deliberately discussed.
>
> Undoubtedly there are evils in unlimited debate—

Senator Lodge wrote—

> but experience shows that these evils are far outweighed by the benefit of having one body of the Government where debate cannot be shut off arbitrarily at the will of a partisan majority. The Senate, I believe, has never failed to act in any case of importance where a majority of the body really and genuinely desired to have action, and the full opportunity for deliberation and discussion, characteristic of the Senate, has prevented much rash legislation born of the passion of an election struggle and has perfected still more which ultimately found its way to the statute books.

Again in 1926 in discussing a proposal to limit debate on appropriation and revenue bills, former Senator James A. Reed, of Missouri, had this to say:

> Cloture means the granting of a power. Whenever you grant a power you must assume that the power will be exercised. So, when we discuss this proposed rule, we must do so in the light, not of how it may be exercised so as to do no harm, but we must consider how it may be exercised to do harm.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield for a question only.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is the Senator from Virginia familiar with the statement by Senator Walsh, of Montana, a very distinguished Democrat, that if a power is to be denied because it may be abused, government must cease?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I cannot say that I am familiar with that statement; and if I were familiar with it I would not endorse it in toto. I would have to throw some restrictions around it, especially if the power the Senator refers to would be a majority vote of the Senate and of the Congress to undermine a clear provision of the Constitution to accomplish an end that might be thought at the time to be desirable. I certainly would

not say that unless that could be done, government must cease.

Mr. BREWSTER. Will the Senator further yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. ROBERTSON. For a question only.

Mr. BREWSTER. I ask the Senator whether or not the rather profound philosophical truth expressed in that statement is not peculiarly applicable to what the Senator from Virginia was just suggesting, that in determining whether a power should be granted, examination should be made as to whether or not it may be abused in order to accomplish an evil end. I should like to have the Senator from Virginia explain to us how it would be possible for the Congress to give any administrative agencies powers without incurring the human danger of their abuse.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I concede that when we enact a law and implement it with an appropriation and turn it over to the administrative branch of the Government to be executed, we incur the inherent possibility of inefficiency. But it is one thing to be inefficient in carrying out a worthy purpose, and it is another thing to confer power upon an agency which claims that it wants it for a good purpose, but which can use it for a very bad and harmful purpose. That is what I am talking about now. That is what Senator Reed, of Missouri, was talking about. I hope the Senator from Maine will listen to the rest of what Mr. Reed had to say before he asks me another question on the subject.

I submit that that statement is particularly applicable to the present situation. We are assured by those advocating the rule change now under consideration that it would not do any harm; that the right to cut off debate would be exercised only when discussion had reached the point of tedium. We cannot afford to forget, however, that there would be nothing to prevent an impatient majority from calling for cloture at the very outset of the consideration of a bill and thus strictly limiting each Member's opportunity to discuss it. That is the real issue which confronts us, and it is irrelevant to discuss how repugnant the sight of blood would be to a majority with throat-cutting power.

I now continue to quote from Senator Reed's speech in 1926:

There is justification for unlimited debate in this body. I am getting a little tired hearing about the sacred rights of the majority, that this country is ruled by the majority, and that the majority has the right to have its way. This is not a country ruled by the majority. This is not a country of majority rule. The Constitution of the United States was written, in large part, to prevent majority rule. The Declaration of Independence was an announcement that there are limitations upon majority rule.

The rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness were declared in the Declaration to be inalienable rights. They could not be given away by the citizen himself. Much less could they be taken away by temporary agents, sitting in legislative bodies, holding a limited authority of brief duration.

I am sorry that the distinguished Senator from Maine has been obliged to retire from the Chamber before I could finish my discussion of the question which he asked me, because I wanted him to hear all of what Senator Reed, of Missouri, had to say on the subject of conferring a right and considering how it could be abused as well as how it could be properly used.

I continue to quote from Senator Reed:

Majority rule: Where is the logic or the reason to be found back of majority rule except in the mere necessity to dispatch business? The fact that a majority of 1 or 10 vote for a bill in the Senate is not a certification that the action is right. The majority has been wrong oftener than it has been right in all the course of time. The majority crucified Jesus Christ. The majority burned the Christians at the stake. The majority drove the Jews into exile and the ghetto. The majority established slavery. The majority set up innumerable gibbets. The majority chained to stakes and surrounded with circles of flame martyrs throughout all the ages of the world's history.

I could continue to quote at length from that great speech in which the distinguished Senator from Missouri told of the things which have made this Nation great and argued that before any law to bind more than 100,000,000 people is passed it should be subjected, somewhere, to free debate, but I shall cite only the conclusion, in which he said:

As long as we can keep this forum free, as long as a vigorous and determined minority can prevent the passage of a statute, so long this country will be safe, at least, for no great act of treachery can ever be consummated where there are not some brave souls to stand in its resistance and to stand to the end.

But strike down this safeguard of public discussion, apply the gag, and imagine, if you please, that it is to be applied only to pass good measures, only to accomplish the virtuous and the wise and the holy, only to bring the thing of rectitude; imagine that, if you please. He is a fool, he is every kind of a fool, that has ever cursed this earth or cursed himself, who thinks that any power will always be used wisely and justly. Power is almost invariably abused.

Has there ever been one of those important measures discussed on the floor of the Senate when it was not found that many changes were necessary, when the proponents of the measure have not been willing to accept amendment after amendment? Why should there not be some place in this country where the virtues or the iniquities of proposed legislation could be exposed without gag, without rule, without limit; some place where every public act must come under the surveillance of men who have complete freedom of speech, so that the good that is in it may be properly exemplified and the evil that exists may be properly exposed?

Never has there been a time, Mr. President, when there was greater need than at present for us to examine the virtues and iniquities of proposed legislation without danger of a gag rule being imposed.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Virginia if he has seen the magazine Business Week for March 12, 1949.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am sorry, Mr. President, but I have not. I suppose I have it in my office, but I have been so concerned with the effort to change these rules and ram unconstitutional measures down my throat that I have not had an opportunity to do much collateral reading.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the Senator if, when he gets an opportunity, he will read the article entitled "The Trend—The Tyranny of the Majority," in Business Week for March 12, 1949.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I have no doubt about the trend. I feel it. I live with it. It disturbs me so that I cannot sleep at night. However, I shall comply with the suggestion of my distinguished colleague from South Carolina and read the article on the trend of an overpowering Federal Government to tyranny.

Mr. President, in my opinion there have been three major crises in the history of the world since the birth of Christ. The first occurred when the barbarians overthrew the civilization which through painful years had been developed by Greece and Rome and the world was plunged into what we now call the Dark Ages. The spark of Christianity, fortunately, survived and it burst into flame in the next critical period when the rebirth of the arts and sciences which we call the Renaissance was followed by a revolt against corrupt government and a new consciousness of religious and personal freedom culminating in the Reformation movement led by Martin Luther.

The third critical period began when the German Kaiser by force of arms attempted to impose his will and his form of autocracy first upon his European neighbors and ultimately upon the world. We are still in the struggle he commenced. After his defeat, it was renewed 25 years later by Adolf Hitler. Hitler's effort to destroy religious freedom, the rights of minorities, and democratic principles in general now is being carried on by some 24,000,000 Communists throughout the world.

Of all the forms of government man has ever instituted, our American system of representative democracy, under which 48 States have been united in one central government, with their rights and privileges duly protected by the provisions of a written Constitution, is the best equipped to resist the onslaught of communism, provided we preserve that Constitution.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the Senator from Virginia whether he believes that the extreme left-wing groups and those communistically inclined in this country are very anxious to have a change made in the Senate rules.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I have not heard any direct expression from them; but I think it would be very pleasing to them to have a change made in the Senate rules, because that would be directly in line with what they have done in other countries, and naturally they would like to see it done here. The more free speech is curbed, the more the activities of the legislative branch of the Government are curtailed, and the more the power of the central authority in the Government is increased, the more pleased such groups are, because they would like to see that done. Of course, they cannot take charge of 48 independent, sovereign States, each with its own rights; so, first, they must subordinate the States to one Central Government. They would also like to socialize industries, so the industries would be subordinate to the same Central Government; and then they would like to stamp out freedom of religion, so that the people could not have views of their own about the dignity of man. They would also like to take charge of education, and wind up by taking complete charge, body and soul, of the individual, and he would be their slave.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield for a question, Mr. President.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Virginia if it is his judgment that they would also attempt to subject the representatives of the States in this body—that is, the Senators, who in reality are the ambassadors of the 48 States?

Mr. ROBERTSON. My colleague is absolutely correct. This Government came into being, first, because the people delegated certain powers to the governments of the sovereign States. Their chosen representatives met in Philadelphia and formed a plan of union; and that plan came back to the people for ratification. As I shall develop in another phase of my discussion this afternoon—that dealing with one of the measures the proposed rule change is intended to bring up—the States were very jealous as to the amount of power the Federal Government would have and as to what would be reserved to them and what would be reserved to the people. They were so uneasy about it, that some of them said, "We will not ratify this Constitution unless we have your definite assurance that as soon as you meet, you will include amendments to give us what we call our Bill of Rights, and then conclude—regardless of the amount of assurance you give us—by saying that you will not encroach upon our sovereignty. We want it spelled out that all powers not conferred upon you, the Central Government, are retained by the State or by the people."

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, does not the Senator from Virginia believe that the provision of the Constitution prescribing the qualifications of electors, including the poll tax in such States as wanted it, was motivated by a desire on the part of the States to keep their Senators independent and enable them to act on the rules of the Senate in the best interests of the States?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Undoubtedly, Mr. President, for that is one of the most jealous rights the States insisted upon in framing the Constitution, namely, that they should have the right at all times to pass upon the qualifications of their electors, so that they would know who would choose the men to be sent to Washington to represent them in the Federal Government.

Mr. President, we were the first nation in the world to adopt a system of private enterprise, after the first settlers at both Jamestown and Plymouth Rock had tried communism and had found it to be a failure. They then turned to a system of private enterprise, and the Thirteen Original Colonies successfully operated under that system for many years before our Constitution was framed in 1787. In the drafting of that immortal instrument, as much thought and care were devoted to the preservation of property rights and a system of individual enterprise in a capitalistic system as to the protection of personal rights.

Mr. President, I am sorry my distinguished friend, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], is not now in the Chamber because he could tell me whether what I am about to say is a correct quotation of a remark he made in the Senate Chamber, either today or last night; the two have rather blended together, Mr. President, for when we have remained here until 3 o'clock in the morning we rather forget which part of the session was night and which part was day and just which part we are operating in. However, at some time during the last 24 hours, I remember very distinctly that the junior Senator from Minnesota said that, in his opinion, personal rights were away beyond property rights or anything else. That is my recollection of what he said.

I am taking the position, which I think is buttressed by a sound interpretation of the Declaration of Independence and of the Constitution, that as much care was devoted to the protection of property rights as was devoted to the protection of personal rights, for the simple and fundamental reason that they complement each other, and, in my opinion, neither can be preserved in perpetuity without the other.

In their great wisdom the founding fathers provided that the Constitution which they submitted to the States for ratification could not be amended without a two-thirds vote of both branches of the Congress, subsequently to be ratified by a three-fourths vote of the States. In my opinion, nothing could be more dangerous to our future than a Senate rule by which a majority of the Senate could enact into law provisions clearly repugnant to the Constitution, and in effect amend it by a simple majority vote of the two branches of the Congress.

Mr. President, that is no fanciful fear because in this debate we have repeatedly been given warning that the real, the major, the sine qua non objective of those who are proposing the change in the rules is to have the rules in such shape that a majority may impose its will upon us. That is the real fight. They also say the fight is to pass certain clearly unconstitutional bills, including the anti-poll-tax bill, the antilynching bill, the FEPC bill, and the antisegregation bill. That, in a nutshell, is why the whole business of the Senate is being held up.

We have offered them a fair compromise. We have gone as far as honorable men dare go—and, as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has said, perhaps we have offered to go beyond the point of prudence—in our efforts to reach a settlement which will afford some measure of the protection we have enjoyed in this Nation for 160 years. But they wish to sweep all of it away, so that we would take the chance of having our precious States' rights, our individual liberties, and our democratic institutions merged into a strong central form of government, the action of which we cannot now contemplate.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. I may ask the Senator, in the event a simple majority cloture rule is adopted, and if under a simple majority rule civil-rights legislation, mentioned by the Senator, involving measures that violate the Constitution, is enacted, does not the Senator believe the simple majority provision will be used to go further in the future than merely the enactment of the civil-rights program?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Oh, I think nobody could rest with any assurance that what is a matter of political expediency today will be the only political expediency of some future day. I have already pointed out that the direct election of Senators by the States has made us subject to pressure groups. Who can tell what the pressure-group demand will be in the future or what will then become the political expediency connected with legislation, to be rushed through over the protests of the minority by the simple device of a majority cloture rule?

In their great wisdom, the founding fathers, as I have already said, provided that the Constitution which they submitted to the States for ratification could not be amended without a two-thirds vote of both branches of Congress. Once we depart from that method of amendment, and undertake to amend the Constitution by merely a majority vote of the two branches of the Congress, we are in for no end of difficulty. Mr. President, only last year, when an antilynching bill was pending before the Judiciary Committee, a distinguished lawyer member of the committee invited me to submit to him the brief I had prepared on the subject of the unconstitutionality of the antilynching bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MAYBANK. I desire to ask the distinguished Senator from Virginia this question: If and when we adopt a majority rule, if we ever do, on these matters, does not the Senator from Virginia believe there will also be a movement toward a majority rule in the ratification of peace treaties and for legislation generally?

Mr. ROBERTSON. It is conceivable, but that would be much more difficult, because certain restrictions are spelled out in the Constitution. It is a little difficult for a man to get on this floor and, when the Constitution says "This is black," to say, "No, it is white." But, when one gets into the twilight zone, if he wants to violate the very clear intention of the Constitution, it is a little easier to say, "Well, under the general welfare clause, or the interstate-commerce clause, to effectuate the good of the public for which I am headed, the Constitution must not stand in the way"—and out goes the Constitution. But if the Constitution expressly provides that a two-thirds vote shall be necessary in order to ratify a treaty, it would be most difficult for anybody to stand on the floor of the Senate and say, "That merely means a majority vote."

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the Senator from Virginia whether he thinks poll-tax laws are in the twilight zone.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, with all due deference to the distinguished Senator who is now presiding, who does not agree with me, I think the language of the Constitution about the qualifications of voters is so clear that I do not see how anybody can get away from it. But, for fear they would try to get away from it, last June I spoke for four hours and a half to give the history of the provision, its background, its interpretation by those who wrote it, its interpretation by those who advocated that the States adopt the Constitution, and the decisions of the courts, from the first to the last, that had ever considered the problem. It took me four hours and a half to deliver that exposition of what I thought was a perfectly clear provision of the Constitution. Time after time there have been efforts to pass a bill abolishing poll taxes. Every time it has come up in the House it has passed in that body. Nothing except full debate has stopped it in the Senate.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the Senator from Virginia, a former distinguished Member of the House, whether he does not believe that the rules of the House, providing majority vote, made it possible for the poll tax to be passed in the House?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I may answer in this way: The last time I recall a vote in the House on an anti-poll-tax bill, there were, as I remember, 4 hours of general debate. I was very much concerned and very much interested. I was given, as I recall, 20 minutes. There were others from the South, just as much concerned as I, just as much disturbed, who did not get any time in general debate. When the bill was being read for amendment, they would hop up and say, "Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word." How long could they speak? Five minutes. They then had to sit down. That was all they could say.

As I say, Mr. President, I spent four hours and a half here last June on that very question. I did not even then fully cover it by any means. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana last night spent about 5 or 6 hours on that phase of the question. He admitted he had not fully covered it. But I was about to call attention to what happened to one of these unconstitutional bills last year, because I think it is very pertinent. I had prepared a brief on it, a brief which would take me at least 5 hours to present, because it analyzed all the Supreme Court decisions dealing with the right of Congress to legislate on the prosecution of individuals for crimes against other individuals within a State. The antilynching bill was pending before the Judiciary Committee. I was told that the subcommittee before which it was pending was about ready to report it. I went to a member of the subcommittee, an able lawyer, a fine lawyer, a man whom I knew to be very conscientious, and said to him, "If I give you my brief on the unconstitutionality of the antilynching bill, will you read it?" He replied, "I certainly will. I should like to see it." I gave him the brief. He held up the bill for 3 weeks. It took him that long. He did not accept my statements. I did not blame him for that. He was a careful lawyer. I opened his eyes. He was not prepared merely to accept the page references of my brief. He had to get down the law books in the library and check the citations, page after page, himself. I had checked it and double checked it. I knew I had it right. He checked it and I was glad to have him do so. It took him 3 weeks to do it. What happened? When he had finished reading my brief, he went to the subcommittee and emasculated the antilynching bill. The full committee sustained him. The bill they finally reported to the floor was a mere shadow of the bill which had been introduced.

What happened in the special session, at which the Republicans had planned to bring up antilynching legislation? They said, "It will not do to bring this bill up; there is nothing left in it." They would not touch it. Those able constitutional lawyers were willing to reject the measure after they had had time to see what it was and what the facts were. So the Republicans decided they would call up the anti-poll-tax bill. I had had no time to prepare a brief on it before the committee reported. The committee had been reporting bills right along, and apparently a good, sound political issue was involved. Under the rule which we are now considering, I had an opportunity to discuss the bill when it reached the floor, and I did discuss it for approximately 4 hours. After I discussed it and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] had made what he called an answer to my argument, they quit, and that was the end of the anti-poll-tax bill and the antilynching bill in the Eightieth Congress.

It is now proposed to bring those bills up again. I have been told, and I assume it to be true, that they will not even consider the amended, watered-down, and dehydrated bill which was reported last year. They want an antilynching bill as it was originally introduced. That is why they are holding us here and making us debate and fight for our rights. They want to amend the rules and ram these things down our throats.

Mr. President, as I have stated, under the existing rules of the Senate, when the motion was made to bring up the bill, each Member of the Senate enjoyed the privilege of unrestricted debate. I availed myself of that privilege, and, delivering a prepared manuscript as rapidly as I could, it took me approximately 4 hours to present a history of the suffrage clause of our Constitution and an analysis of Supreme Court decisions bearing upon the right of Congress to legislate on the subject of the qualifications of voters.

The same term was applied to the much shorter speeches made by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and other Senators from the South who shared my viewpoint concerning the unconstitutionality of the then pending bill.

During the 2 years it has been my coveted privilege to be a Member of the greatest legislative body in the world, I feel justified in saying that few, if any, Members of the Senate have spoken less frequently than I on any subject. In fact, the only extended speech that I made was my discussion of the unconstitutionality of the anti-poll-tax bill. Incidentally, I united with the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and other colleagues in presenting at this session a resolution to authorize the States to vote on a change in our Constitution to permit the Congress to legislate on the subject of poll taxes as a prerequisite to voting. Since a limited number of States now have such a provision in their laws, I am personally willing to present to the States of the Union the privilege of amending the Constitution in that respect if it be their will and desire so to do. But as long as I am a Member of the Senate, I shall do all in my power to prevent passage of any bill which I sincerely feel to be in violation of our written Constitution, and I would deplore any change in rule XXII which would deny to me or any other Member of the Senate that privilege.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I want to ask the distinguished Senator from Virginia if I correctly understood him to say that he believed in a constitutional amendment for the repeal of the poll tax, to be passed by the Congress of the United States?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I said this: I am a joint sponsor of a joint resolution of which the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] is the chief sponsor, to submit such an amendment to the people, to see if they want a constitutional amendment which would outlaw in a legal manner the poll-tax regulations of the seven States which now have poll-tax laws. I cannot believe it is a burning issue in the other 41 States. I think it is a matter of relative unimportance to the people of California, Michigan, New York, or any of the other States, as to whether we have a poll tax or do not have one in Virginia, in South Carolina, or in Texas.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a further question. Has the Senator seen in the newspapers, or has he heard that South Carolina, only last week, passed through its legislature a law permitting the people to vote on repeal of the poll tax?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes. I am sure my colleague is also aware that in the November election the people in Virginia will vote on the same issue. They will have the right to say whether they want the poll tax any longer as a means of contributing $1.50 a year to the schools. Many do not contribute any more than that amount. They can wipe out the poll tax by State action. The machinery is in order for the vote to be taken in Virginia next fall.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator some further questions. The first question is this: Is the Virginia poll-tax law similar to that in South Carolina where there is no poll tax levied on women?

Mr. ROBERTSON. No. The Virginia law is not similar in that respect. There is a poll tax on women.

I will ask the Senator to please make his questions brief.

Mr. MAYBANK. I shall defer asking any further questions at this time.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The majority report on Senate Resolution 15 states, on page 2, that the fact that over 5 years elapsed before a first flaw was found in rule XXII and a much longer time elapsed before a second serious flaw was discovered, indicates that Senators who voted to amend the rule in 1917 did so thinking they were voting for an enforceable rule.

Another interpretation might be, however, that those who accepted the change in our rules in good faith, as a means of dealing with a war emergency, did not visualize its being used in behalf of unconstitutional legislation.

It is notable that when rule XXII was circumvented for the first time, in 1922, by the offering of motions to amend the Journal, it was done by those opposed to an antilynching bill. A much longer period than 5 years might have passed before the rule was found defective if an effort had not been made then to corrupt it to an unworthy use.

Thus we might say that in first amending and then finding a way to circumvent rule XXII as amended, Members of the Senate showed, on the one hand, their willingness to do what might be necessary to protect the Nation by fast action in an emergency, and, on the other hand, a resourceful determination to defend our sacred institutions against hasty and improvident action which would jeopardize them.

I emphasize the charge, previously made, that there can be no question about the fact that this latest effort to change the Senate rules is simply a prelude to a drive for enactment of the so-called civil-rights program. That was brought out clearly in the hearings before the Rules Committee in January, when the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] asked the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], "Is it your opinion that this is an indirect way to get at the civil-rights issue?" and the Senator from Massachusetts replied, "I think one of the reasons why there is a desire to get the Senate so it can function is so that we can start dealing with the question of civil rights, which I think needs attention in all parts of the country."

Any possible doubt as to the purpose of this effort to change the rules was removed March 10, when the majority whip told the Senate:

> The debate now proceeding in the Senate of the United States is round 1 of the showdown on the issue of civil rights. Let us recognize it as being that, and let us not pretend otherwise.

This statement was reinforced on March 11, when the distinguished majority leader said:

> Regardless of whether anyone likes it or does not like it, I am going to be plain and honest about this situation. Some can hide it if they wish to do so, but everyone knows why this rule was brought up. Everyone knows why this filibuster is on. If the civil-rights program were not involved, there would not be any filibuster here at the present time. So, why hide it?

Mark you, Mr. President, that is the majority leader talking, and I am quoting:

> If the civil-rights program were not involved, there would not be any filibuster here at the present time. So, why hide it?

That was the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] speaking. If rent-control legislation is not passed, or any other subsequent legislation is not enacted, it will be the Senator from Illinois who is responsible. So why hide it? Do not let him come back to us and say, "You willful southern Senators have held up the essential program of this Congress." That is not true. This issue was forced on us, to change a rule which has been in existence for 160 years, by those who wanted to put cloture on a motion to take up. They are the ones who turned down a fair compromise we offered them. They are the ones who force us to speak around the clock, until we are physically exhausted, with the hope that they can beat us to our knees, as my old friend Lindsay Warren used to say, by tactics they adopt of keeping us here speaking hour after hour, without food, while they are getting food and rest, and thinking they can come back on us at 12 o'clock or 3 or 4 o'clock in the morning and force their will on us.

I am saying, Mr. President, as I stated in my opening remarks, this is a serious issue for us in the South, and we are expendable. So far as I am concerned, I am going to see this fight to the finish, and see that we are treated fairly.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the Senator if he intends to mention some of the other important legislation which is also being held up. He mentioned rent control. The distinguished Senator is a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations considering the deficiency bill. I should like to ask him if he is going to mention some of the other measures.

Mr. ROBERTSON. In answer to that question, I will say that I am a member of the subcommittee on deficiency appropriations. I know it has been testified to us that some of the agencies are practically out of money. I know the Navajo schools are going to be closed down this month if they do not get more money. I know more money is needed for flood control and disaster relief in the great West, where there were unprecedented snows. I know all those things are pressing, and I know that I and the other Senators from the South who think as I do about the proposed changes in the rules want to act on these measures of relief, and I wish to make crystal clear who is holding up the program, and why they are holding it up. They turned down a fair offer of settlement, when we had the advantage on our side. Some did not say no to the suggestion of ending the fight. Others said, "No, hold out for three-quarters majority." Finally, Mr. President, we authorized our spokesmen to go into conference and bind us on a gentlemen's agreement, after we had given up, given up, given up, with the hope we could have a proposition which would be acceptable to those who had different views.

What happened? As I have already outlined, we thought once they would have a chance to accept it. Probably every Senator on the other side of the aisle agreed to the proposal. Yet those on this side, those who were negotiating, came back at midnight last night and said, "Our terms are unconstitutional surrender." That is why we have to continue fighting. It is because we are not yet ready to surrender, and that is why I am trying to make it clear that if no legislation at all is passed at this session, it will be the fault of those who are trying by these strong-arm tactics to ram unconstitutional measures down our throats, and are preventing the legislation from coming up. We do not have to apologize for that, because we

are forced into a fight not of our choosing.

Mr. President, I wish to continue:

We must not overlook, either, the significance of a statement made in the hearings by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], who, in discussing the question of cloture by a majority vote or by a two-thirds vote, said:

Let me get myself straight as to yesterday, so there will be no misunderstanding. I said I definitely believe that every legislative body should be permitted and allowed to control its own actions, its procedures, its techniques, by a majority of its total membership. I said, however, I try to be fairly practical as an operator. Now and then I don't always succeed but I try. I realize the situation with which we are confronted. That is why I joined in this particular resolution, and if you gentlemen won't filibuster this, I will waive my demand at the moment for this majority vote until we get this disposed of.

Please notice those words "at the moment." It is only for the moment that the proponents of this change in the rules are content to continue the requirement of a two-thirds vote. Once that point has been gained and the main rampart of the opposition has been surrendered, they will be quick to press through the breach, if that be necessary, to achieve their purpose of ramming down our throats these unconstitutional civil-rights bills.

I repeat now what I said in closing my testimony before the Rules Committee. Unrestricted debate is at times irksome to me. But the danger to our fundamental institutions in making legislation subject to the passing whims of a temporary majority is so fundamentally dangerous that I can well afford to curb my impatience on those rare occasions when I feel that some colleague is abusing the privilege of freedom of debate.

Mr. President, if the rules of the Senate be changed as contemplated in the pending resolution, one of the measures to be crammed down the throats of southern Senators is a Fair Employment Practice Act. What a fine and noble sounding name. But, as the English poet Coleridge once said: "You pity the plumage but forget the dying bird," namely, American constitutional liberty. In a splendid speech delivered in the Senate on the second, the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] cogently discussed the FEPC bill from every angle, including its undesirability and unworkability as well as its unconstitutionality. I shall limit myself to an elaboration of what that distinguished colleague has said concerning the unconstitutionality of the measure.

A Federal statute seeking to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry is unconstitutional in the broadest sense of that word.

It is unconstitutional, from a negative point of view, because no adequate authority for its enactment can be found in the Constitution. It is unconstitutional from a positive point of view because it is violative not only of the whole spirit of that document but also is specifically in violation of the first, fifth, ninth, tenth, and thirteenth amendments.

The treacherous legal ground on which its sponsors find themselves is indicated by their effort in the proposed bill to create a constitutional right by declaration. The majority report made by the Senate committee on S. 984 in the Eightieth Congress contained this statement:

Section 2 (b) of the bill properly creates a Federal right to be free of discrimination in employment.

Eightieth Congress, second session, Report 951, page 18.

Here is a direct admission that such a right has not existed in the past and an effort is made to justify the act of creation by reference to the Railway Labor Act and the National Labor Relations Act, but no reference is offered to a place in the Constitution where the creation of such rights by act of Congress is authorized.

The supremacy of the Constitution and the limited powers of the legislative branch were stressed by our great Chief Justice John Marshall when he said:

The question whether an act repugnant to the Constitution can become the law of the land is a question deeply interesting to the United States; but, happily, not of an intricacy proportioned to its interest. It seems only necessary to recognize certain principles, supposed to have been long and well established, to decide it.

That the people have an original right to establish for their future government such principles as, in their opinion, shall most conduce to their own happiness is the basis on which the whole American fabric has been erected. * * *

This original and supreme will organizes the Government, and assigns to different departments their respective powers. It may either stop here, or establish certain limits not to be transcended by those departments.

The Government of the United States is of the latter description.

Mind you, Mr. President, I am still quoting from Chief Justice Marshall. He was close to the founders of our Republic and is known as the great interpreter of the Constitution. He is telling us now what in his opinion was the kind of government we had created.

The powers of the legislature are defined and limited; and that those limits may not be mistaken, or forgotten, the Constitution is written. To what purpose are powers limited, and to what purpose is that limitation committed to writing, if these limits may, at any time, be passed by those intended to be restrained? * * *

If an act of the legislature, repugnant to the Constitution, is void, does it, notwithstanding its validity, bind the courts, and oblige them to give it effect? Or, in other words, though it be not law, does it constitute a rule as operative as if it was a law? This would be to overthrow in fact what was established in theory; and would seem, at first view, an absurdity too gross to be insisted on.

That, Mr. President, was quoted by Thomas J. Norton in his preface to The Constitution of the United States.

The doctrine that the States alone can deal with civil rights except where power has been specifically delegated to the Federal Government was laid down clearly by the Supreme Court in the *Slaughter-House cases* (16 Wallace 36), in 1872, when it discussed article IV, section 2 of the Constitution and said it "did not create those rights which it calls privilege and immunities of citizens of the States. It threw around them in that clause no security for the citizens of the State in which they were claimed or exercised. Nor did it profess to control the power of the State governments over the rights of its own citizens" (p. 77).

I now come, Mr. President, to a case about which I asked my distinguished friend, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] last night. I am sure he will be interested at this point in my discussion of some quotations from the Civil Rights cases, because they are right in line with the splendid remarks he made last night on the powers of the Federal Government to go into a State and control the actions of individuals within it.

The decision I have just quoted from the Slaughter House cases—they happen to be Louisiana cases, by the way—has been reinforced by other decisions such as the Civil Rights cases (109 U. S. 3), decided in 1883 in which the Court illustrated the limitation of congressional powers by saying that although the Constitution prohibited the States from passing any law impairing the obligation of contracts "this did not give to Congress power to provide laws for the general enforcement of contracts, nor power to invest the courts of the United States with jurisdiction over contracts so as to enable parties to sue upon them in those courts"—page 12.

The Court went on to say that the implication of a power of Congress to legislate for the protection of fundamental rights "is based upon the assumption that if the States are forbidden to legislate or act in a particular way on a particular subject, the power is conferred upon Congress to enforce the prohibition"—page 15.

The Court said this assumption "is certainly unsound. It is repugnant to the tenth amendment to the Constitution which declares that powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States respectively or to the people"—page 18.

Referring then to the authority conferred by the fourteenth amendment—incidentally, my distinguished colleague from Louisiana in the discussion last night, stated quite fully what could and what could not be hooked onto the fourteenth amendment to take a free ride in this body.

The Court in the Civil Rights cases decision said:

It is absurd to affirm that because the rights of life, liberty, and property (which includes all the civil rights that men have) are by the amendment sought to be protected against invasion on the part of the States without due process of law, Congress may therefore provide due process of law for their vindication in every case (p. 13).

Later in this discussion I shall have occasion to quote at greater length from these famous cases as I trace the acceptance by the Supreme Court of the doctrine of States' rights, which is involved here, but I mention these particular decisions at this point to illustrate the weakness of the claim to constitutional support for this bill.

It is apparent that the effort is made to support Federal antidiscrimination in

employment legislation by its own constitutional boot straps, because no firmer foundation can be found.

The 1948 Senate committee report did not claim support for it under the thirteenth, fourteenth, or fifteenth amendments but sought to justify it under the interstate commerce clause in article I, section 8 of the Constitution and by broad reference to the treaty-making power and obligations assumed in connection with the Charter of the United Nations.

I hope my friend from Louisiana will get clearly in his mind the first point I make, that in reporting the fair employment-practices bill last year the committee realized that it could not hook it onto the fourteenth amendment, and did not try to do so. That is clearly shown in the report.

Most of this argument misses the mark because it cites cases, with which opponents of the bill need not quarrel, which have involved discrimination on the part of some official agency of the Government or some organization acting under governmental authority.

There can be no denial of the right and obligation of the Federal Government to avoid the practice of discrimination on racial or religious grounds in connection with its own employment policies or of its right to demand similar practices from those with whom it makes contracts. This, however, is quite different from authority to compel private individuals to pursue similar policies in their own business. In doing this the Government would be compelling citizens to enter into employment contracts without their consent and in contravention of the position taken by the Supreme Court in the case of *Baker* v. *Norton* (79 U. S. C. at p. 157) when it said "consent is the very essence of a contract."

The committee report states that—

Within the acknowledged field of Federal jurisdiction the courts have plainly indicated that action by the Federal Government to prevent discrimination on grounds of race or religion is as valid as action to prevent discrimination on grounds of union affiliation.

But the words to be noted in that assertion are "within the acknowledged field of jurisdiction."

Thus, when a union is protected by Federal law in its right to maintain a closed shop and when it relies on the power of the Federal Government exerted through the National Labor Relations Board to sustain its position, it naturally assumes certain obligations including that of submitting to Federal authority to prohibit discriminatory practices.

Taking this into consideration, we can oppose FEPC legislation as unconstitutional and still accept without quarrel the statement of the court in the case of *Steele* v. *Louisville and N. R. R. Co.* (323 U. S. 192) that—

Congress, in enacting the Railway Labor Act and authorizing a labor union, chosen by a majority of the craft, to represent the craft, did not intend to confer plenary power upon the union to sacrifice for the benefit of its members, rights of the minority of the craft, without imposing on it any duty to protect the minority (p. 199).

The part of the decision I have quoted was cited in the 1948 committee report. It might have gone further and quoted from the same decision the statement of Chief Justice Stone that—

The representative (the union) is clothed with a power not unlike that of a legislature which is subject to constitutional limitations on its power to deny, restrict, destroy, or discriminate against the rights of those for whom it legislates and which is also under an affirmative constitutional duty equally to protect those rights (p. 198).

The Court then added:

We think the Railway Labor Act imposes upon the statutory representative of a craft at least as exacting a duty to protect equally the interest of the members of the craft as the Constitution imposes upon a legislature to give equal protection to the interests of those for whom it legislates (p. 202).

Of course, recognition of the fact that the Court regarded the union as a quasi-public body would have weakened the usefulness of this case to sponsors of an effort to impose legislation on purely private employers.

The FEPC case is weakened still more if we go a little further into this decision and find that, although the Court held that the union was required to perform certain functions as a public duty, the Court did not hold that arbitrary exclusion from membership based solely on racial considerations was in itself an act of discrimination which violated the duty imposed on the union.

On this point the Court stated:

While the statute does not deny such a bargaining labor organization the right to determine eligibility of its membership, it does require the union * * * to represent nonunion or minority union members of the craft without hostile discrimination * * * and in good faith (p. 204).

In other words, in this case, relied on by advocates of FEPC, the Court affirmed the right of free association on the part of labor-union members—a right which this bill would deny to employers. It compared the union to a legislative body and said that any rules it set up, under protection of Federal law, must be fair to all employees involved. This, of course, is merely in line with the doctrine of the fifteenth amendment, which prohibits discriminatory action by the United States or by States but which makes no pretense of reaching individual action.

Again, we find in the 1948 committee report a quotation from the case styled as *Railway Mail Association* v. *Corsi* (326 U. S. 88) in which the Supreme Court upheld constitutionality of a civil-rights statute of the State of New York and said:

We see no constitutional basis for the contention that a State cannot protect workers from exclusion solely on the basis of race, color, or creed by an organization functioning under the protection of the State, which holds itself out to represent the general business needs of employees (p. 94).

The inapplicability of this citation to the issue now before us should be doubly plain. In the first place, the Court was talking about State action, not Federal action. The opponents of a Federal FEPC not only admit but insist that if any such plan is to be adopted, it must be on the State level. In the second place, the Court in this case, as in the case of Steele versus Louisville and Nashville Railroad to which I already have referred, stressed the point that it was dealing with an organization which was, in the language of the decision, "functioning under the protection of the State," and "which holds itself out to represent the general business needs of employees." The organization accepted State protection and, just as is the case with public utilities, acceptance of protection or a franchise necessarily involves being subjected to State control.

It is only too evident that if we accept the doctrine of FEPC and allow the Federal Government to intervene in hiring, firing, and promotion arrangements between individual employers and employees, we have yielded one of the basic principles of private enterprise, without which the others might be rendered useless.

But, we can go further than to say that a Federal FEPC cannot be justified by reference to the Constitution. Not only does it lack a positive foundation; it is in direct conflict with the letter and spirit of a large portion of those amendments which are known as the Bill of Rights.

The first amendment states that—

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

I yield to no man in my advocacy of the right to religious freedom which Thomas Jefferson did so much to establish in this Nation. If FEPC legislation were necessary to permit a man the freedom to profess and practice his religion without interference, I would support it; but just the opposite is true.

It is noble of the proponents of this political expediency legislation not to seek to destroy all of the Bill of Rights. In Senate bill 984 of the Eightieth Congress they included an exemption for religion, saying that the act shall not apply to any religious or sectarian corporation or association not organized for profit. That at least would prevent a Baptist from bringing suit if he should be denied employment as a teacher in a Catholic school, or a Jew from appealing to the law because he was not hired as a writer of International Sunday school lesson material now used by Protestant churches. But, presumably, no protection would be extended to the operator of a commercial enterprise which found it advisable for business reasons to limit its employees to those of a certain faith or to exclude employees of a particular faith. A merchant, for example, might want to keep his establishment open on Saturday, which is the Sabbath of the Seventh-Day Adventists, and he might object to hiring anyone who would be absent on his busiest week day. Or he might hire someone, but then pass him over for a promotion because of his unwillingness to be on duty on those occasions. That would

constitute a refusal to hire or a discrimination in terms of employment because of religion. The person refused employment or denied promotion could bring a charge, and could compel that employer to go before a commission or ultimately into court to defend himself.

Or suppose the same merchant made no discrimination in hiring, but as a favor to a few of his employees who belonged to a particular faith allowed them to take time off for religious holidays. All the other employees who were not given the time off might claim they were being denied a privilege of employment because of their religion, and they, too, could charge their employer with an unfair labor practice.

It seems evident that a law which could produce such results does constitute legislation by Congress "respecting an establishment of religion," and as such violates the first amendment.

The first amendment also forbids Congress to abridge the right of the people "peaceably to assemble." What is the right of assembly if it is not the right to gather for some purpose, or in other words the right to associate? Association is something which certainly happens between employer and employee. Therefore, to deny an employer the right to choose freely those with whom he will associate in his business is to infringe one of the rights guaranteed him under the first amendment. Later on, when I cite Supreme Court decisions, I shall recur to this point, and shall show that the right of association in business has consistently been recognized as a fundamental right.

This type of legislation—the FEPC bill, I say to the senior Senator from Georgia—also violates the fifth amendment.

When a man engaged in business is required to order his hiring and his promotion of employees in a way that may be unprofitable—and that can easily happen under the provisions of FEPC—he is being deprived of property without due process of law. The amendment says private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation; but this bill would go even beyond that, and would take property for private use without compensation. The employer also would be deprived of the liberty to pick his associates and to conduct his own business. Again, this arbitrary restraint on the freedom of association would violate another provision of the fifth amendment which says a person shall not be deprived of liberty without due process of law.

The protection against criminal prosecution without a trial by jury, which is guaranteed by the sixth amendment, would also be denied by the section of the proposed FEPC law which would authorize an administrative commission to fine an employer for refusing to hire a particular applicant for employment.

The clearest evidence of the unconstitutionality of this type of legislation is found, however, when we consider the ninth amendment which states:

> The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

And the tenth amendment which asserts:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

One of the witnesses at the hearings last year summed up the matter by saying:

> The right to choose employees, friends, associates, spouses, falls under the law of natural selection, a natural right, an unalienable right, a fundamental reserved to man by the tenth amendment and by the ninth retained to him.

As I have suggested previously, and as I shall emphasize again when I come to the citation of cases, the courts have repeatedly held that any power to create a civil right, unless specifically delegated to the United States by the Constitution, has been reserved to the States.

The proponents of public electric power have frankly conceded that the Congress has no power to build and operate a steam plant to serve the general public, if that steam plant has no physical connection with a hydroelectric plant, for the simple reason that the Constitution does not confer such a power upon the Congress. But here we have proposed congressional action of far more serious consequences to private enterprise than a steam plant, for the action here proposed not only has no constitutional authority, but plainly is in violation of that bulwark of our freedom.

Also, in denying the employer the right to choose his employees, and thus compelling him, against his will, to work with those he would not have picked otherwise, the employer is forced into involuntary servitude, in violation of the thirteenth amendment, which forbids involuntary servitude, except as punishment for a crime.

Proof that such an involuntary association in business as would be required under this proposed law might be interpreted as involuntary servitude under terms of the thirteenth amendment may be found in decisions of the Supreme Court. The Court, for example, has held unconstitutional a State law under which a person who was fined for a misdemeanor, and agreeing to do so, was allowed to work out the fine for the surety who paid it for him. This was in the case of *United States* v. *Reynolds* ((1914) 235 U. S. 133). The Court also knocked down, in the case of *Bailey* v. *Alabama* ((1911) 219 U. S. 219), a State law making it a misdemeanor punishable by imprisonment for a person to agree to perform a service and then refuse to do so after receiving a part of the consideration in advance.

Thus the right of an employee not to work unless he chooses to do so, even when he has obligated himself and accepted payment for work to be done, has been clearly established, and it is clear that he cannot be forced into an involuntary association with an employer.

If equal rights under the law is a term that means anything, it should mean that the employer has an equal right not to be coerced into association with an employee against his will. Yet we find that under terms of the proposed FEPC legislation an employer not only can be penalized financially for refusing to employ, but if he opposes, impedes, or interferes with the bureaucrats enforcing the act, he may subject himself to imprisonment.

The fact of the matter is that the type of legislation we are discussing is completely out of harmony with the spirit of the Bill of Rights, despite the effort of its sponsors to label it as "civil-rights legislation."

One of the supporters of Senate bill 984 at the hearings in 1947 referred to the purpose of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution as being to protect the rights of the individual and the States, and then added that the FEPC bill represents "a logical extension and implementation of the rights of the individual citizen safeguarded in the Bill of Rights." A review of the circumstances under which the Bill of Rights became a part of our Constitution will show how erroneous is that conclusion.

In the Virginia ratifying convention Patrick Henry was largely responsible for the assurance given by Madison that at the first session of the National Congress he would offer the first 10 amendments now called our Bill of Rights. He knows not his history who does not know that Patrick Henry was fighting to protect the States and the people from the encroachments of the Federal Government. To say that an FEPC bill will implement the rights for which Patrick Henry was fighting is pure tommy-rot.

The sketchy reports of the debates when the Constitution was being drawn clearly indicate that the arguments over whether a Bill of Rights should be included did not involve the question of the existence of such rights, but centered around whether it was necessary or advisable to set them out specifically in the Constitution. The division, in short, was between those who felt that the Federal Government in the future could be trusted to recognize and respect these individual rights and those who felt, as Jefferson did, that there is a germ of despotism in every government which may multiply if fed on unrestrained power until it corrupts the body politic.

If we go back to the Articles of Confederation, under which the States originally were united, we find article II, reading:

> Each State retains its sovereignty, freedom and independence and every power, jurisdiction and right, which is not by this confederation expressly delegated to the United States, in Congress assembled.

No comparable section is found in any of the plans or drafts for a Constitution submitted to the convention nor in the document which the convention submitted to the Congress on September 17, 1787, but in the convention's letter of transmittal this statement was made:

> It is obviously impracticable in the Federal Government of these States, to secure all rights of independent sovereignty to each, and yet provide for the interest and safety of all. Individuals entering into society must give up a share of liberty to preserve the rest. The magnitude of the sacrifice must depend as well on situation and circumstances as on the object to be obtained. It is at all times difficult to draw with precision the line between those rights which must be surrendered, and those which must be reserved; and on the present occasion this difficulty was increased by a difference among the several States as to their situation, extent, habits and particular interests.

The Congress, which received the Convention report on September 20, set September 20 as the day on which the new plan would be considered; and when the debate started on that day, objections immediately were raised.

Richard Henry Lee, of Virginia, quoted from a letter from George Mason and agreed with Mason that the Constitution ought to include a Bill of Rights. Lee then proposed a series of amendments.

The Constitution went out to the States without these amendments and ran into a new barrage of criticism. Mason and John Randolph, of Virginia, who submitted the most comprehensive plan on which the Constitution was based, but who had refused to sign the final draft, and Elbridge Gerry of Massachusetts, who also refused to sign, all said they were convinced that unless it could be amended at once it would be a threat to the liberties of America.

The debate in Congress continued into December 1787, with the anti-Federalists arguing that, lacking a Bill of Rights, the Constitution destroyed the sovereignty of the States, while the Federalists said—and this is the point I would emphasize—a Federal Bill of Rights was superfluous, since the States had their own and the States gave up their sovereignty only in matters which no one of them had a right to decide upon.

James Wilson, of Pennsylvania, arguing for the Federalists, said:

> My position is that the sovereignty resides in the people. They have not parted with it; they have only dispensed such portions of it as were conceived primarily for the public welfare. The Constitution stands upon this broad principle.

Wilson extended his argument to the point of saying that the power of the States was inferior to that of the people, who could delegate the supreme power as they saw fit; but he did not pretend that the Federal Government had or could have any authority except that which was specifically delegated to it.

Also, in the State ratifying conventions we find the argument recurring that a Bill of Rights was not necessary because the limited power of the Federal Government was obvious.

Thus, in Connecticut, Richard Law, chief judge of the State's superior court and mayor of New London, said:

> This General Government rests upon the State governments for its support. It is like a vast and magnificent bridge, built upon 13 strong and stately pillars; now the rulers who occupy the bridge cannot be so beside themselves as to knock away the pillars which support the whole fabric.

Ratification was obtained in Massachusetts and New Hampshire only after agreement that amendments to the Constitution would be submitted along with the notice of acceptance.

In South Carolina, Gen. Charles Cotesworth Pinckney met objections by assuring the legislature that the Convention had omitted a Bill of Rights only because these rights already belonged to the people and the power over them had not been granted to the Federal Government either to affirm or withhold.

In Virginia, the leading objectors to the Constitution urged that amendments be submitted and acted on by another Federal convention before ratification. Patrick Henry and George Mason warned of the danger of loss of State and individual rights unless changes were made to protect them. Thomas Jefferson indicated that he would like to see 9 of the 13 States ratify in order to assure the new Government, but that the remaining 4 should hold out for what he considered indispensable amendments, including a Bill of Rights. There was general agreement on the need for amendments, the chief difference being that Federalists in the convention argued that Virginia should ratify and then seek amendments in the manner provided by the Constitution, while the anti-Federalists insisted that amendments should be made before ratification.

When the Virginia convention finally voted for ratification it included in its action a provision that "in order to relieve the apprehensions of those who may be solicitous for amendments," they should be recommended to Congress to be acted upon according to the mode prescribed.

Similar debates occurred in the New York State convention and to aid their cause in that crucial struggle, Alexander Hamilton and John Jay, with the help of James Madison of Virginia, produced the famous Federalist papers to support the cause of ratification. When the final vote was taken it was stated in the motion that New York was ratifying in full confidence that until a second Federal convention should be called for proposing amendments, certain specified State rights claimed by New York should not be interfered with. A circular letter then was sent by the Governor to the Governors of all other States, recommending the calling of this convention. It was agreed by observers that without these concessions favorable action by New York could not have been obtained.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that without those concessions the Constitution would never have been ratified and there never would have been an American Republic?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Indubitably. The people would not give up their rights and the States would not give up their sovereignty, and for fear that some future Congress might reach out and grab the personal rights which they clearly intended to reserve to themselves, they insisted that the 10 amendments be adopted. If they had not been adopted there never would have been any American Government.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield for another question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that George Mason, who was the father of the Virginia bill of rights, which, of course, was the great document from which the Bill of Rights now in the Constitution was drafted, very vigorously opposed ratification, by Virginia, of the Federal Constitution because he was fearful that Congress, under the Federal Constitution, might in some way invade or do violence to those rights?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator is absolutely correct. Patrick Henry, as I have said, opposed it. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, the debate in Richmond lasted for days, and when the final vote came the proponents of the Constitution won by a majority of only eight votes. Two ancestors of mine were present, and I am glad to say that they voted to ratify. But there was a majority of only eight votes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. The Senator speaks of ratification winning by only eight votes in the Virginia convention. Is it not true that in most of the State conventions the vote was very close?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I so understand. It would not have been ratified at all but for the repeated assurances of Madison, Hamilton, and others that they would have a Bill of Rights spelled out. They did not want to call a new convention. They wanted to do it in the manner provided in the Constitution itself—for Congress to adopt the amendments and submit them to the States for ratification.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The truth is, is it not, that the Bill of Rights embodied in the first 10 amendments was, for all practical purposes, a part of the original Constitution?

Mr. ROBERTSON. At the first session of the Congress it was promptly ratified, and it is really part and parcel of the whole. It was not put in originally, according to the opinions of some persons in Philadelphia, because they did not think anyone would ever claim that the Federal Government would have a right to interfere with the rights of the States or of the citizens of the States.

Some of the arguments used in the Federalist papers to obtain favorable action on the Constitution in New York are especially significant when we examine the constitutionality of the type of legislation now under consideration.

In the Federalist No. 17, for example, Hamilton referred to fears that allowing the Federal Government to deal directly with individual citizens might render the Government of the Union too powerful and, as he said, "enable it to absorb those residuary authorities, which it might be judged proper to leave with the States for local purposes."

Hamilton then went on to say it was improbable that there would exist a disposition of the Federal councils to usurp such powers as regulation of the "mere domestic police of a state," or of—and note these words, "Private justice between the citizens of the same State," because, Hamilton said, "the attempt to exercise those powers would be as troublesome as it would be nugatory; and the possession of them, for that reason, would

contribute nothing to the dignity, to the importance, or to the splendor of the National Government."

Again, in the 39th Federalist Madison pointed out that the proposed government would be partially national and partially federal in its functioning. He said that although it would be national in the operation of its powers it would be federal in the extent of its authority.

He said:

The idea of a national government involves in it not only an authority over the individual citizens, but an indefinite supremacy over all persons and things, so far as they are objects of lawful government. Among a people consolidated into one nation, this supremacy is completely vested in the national legislature. Among communities united for particular purposes, it is vested partly in the general and partly in the municipal legislatures.

In the former case, all local authorities are subordinate to the supreme; and may be controlled, directed or abolished by it at its pleasure. In the latter, the local or municipal authorities form distinct and independent portions of the supremacy, no more subject, within their respective spheres, to the general authority, than the general authority is subject to them within its own sphere.

In this relation, then, the proposed government cannot be deemed a national one; since its jurisdiction extends to certain enumerated objects only, and leaves to the several States a residuary and inviolable sovereignty over all other objects.

An even more specific assurance that the powers of the Central Government would be strictly limited was given in the 45th Federalist, written by Madison, who said:

The powers delegated by the proposed Constitution to the Federal Government are few and defined. Those which are to remain in the State governments are numerous and indefinite. The former will be exercised principally on external objects, as war, peace, negotiation and foreign commerce; with which last the power of taxation will, for the most part be connected. The powers reserved to the several States will extend to all the objects which, in the ordinary course of affairs, concern the lives, liberties, and properties of the people, and the internal order, improvement and prosperity of the State.

It was in response to such arguments as these that the people of the various States, in their conventions, ratified the Constitution, but with a general understanding that it would be promptly amended.

The attitude of the time was well expressed in the North Carolina convention, which refused to ratify until acceptance by nine States already had made the Constitution effective. In that convention William Goudy is reported to have said:

I care not whether it (the Constitution) be called a compact, agreement, covenant, bargain or what. Its intent is a concession of power on the part of the people to their rulers. We know that private interest governs mankind generally. Power belongs originally to the people, but if rulers are not well guarded, that power may be usurped from them. People ought to be cautious about giving away power. * * * If we give away more power than we ought, we put ourselves in the situation of a man who puts on an iron glove, which he can never take off till he breaks his arm. Let us beware of the iron glove of tyranny.

And so I say to the Senate today, we should beware of the concealing aspect of the title of "Civil Rights" on this legislation, and recognize that it covers the mailed glove of tyranny.

Returning to the background of the Bill of Rights, we find that the amendments demanded by the various State conventions were proposed by the first session of the Congress which met in 1789, and some of the things said in the debate while they were under consideration may be illuminating to this discussion.

James Madison, urging immediate consideration of the amendments on June 8, 1789, was reported as saying that unless this were done the people "may think we are not sincere in our desire to incorporate such amendments in the Constitution as will secure those rights, which they consider as not sufficiently guarded."

Madison also referred to the "anxiety which prevails in the public mind," and said:

It appears to me that this House is bound by every motive of prudence, not to let the first session pass over without proposing to the State legislatures some things to be incorporated into the Constitution, that will render it as acceptable to the whole people of the United States, as it has been found acceptable to a majority of them.

He added:

I wish that those who have been friendly to the adoption of this Constitution may have the opportunity of proving to those who were opposed to it that they were as sincerely devoted to liberty and a republican government as those who charged them with wishing the adoption of this Constitution in order to lay the foundation of an aristocracy or despotism. It will be a desirable thing to extinguish from the bosom of every member of the community, any apprehensions that there are those among his countrymen who wish to deprive them of the liberty for which they valiantly fought and honorably bled.

Madison said there still were a great many who were dissatisfied with the Constitution, but who might join in supporting federalism if they were satisfied on one point, and "we ought not to disregard their inclination, but, on principles of amity and moderation, conform to their wishes, and expressly declare the great rights of mankind secured under this Constitution."

Enlarging on this point, he said:

I believe that the great mass of the people who opposed it (the Constitution), disliked it because it did not contain effectual provisions against encroachments on particular rights, and those safeguards which they have been long accustomed to have interposed between them and the magistrate who exercises the sovereign power.

Madison then outlined the proposed amendments, which at first were intended for insertion in the body of the Constitution itself. The original form of the proposals which eventually became the ninth and tenth amendments is particularly interesting, as indicating the thinking of Madison and others who helped to design the form of our Government.

Instead of the ninth amendment, as we know it, reading: "The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people," the proposal offered by Madison read:

The exceptions here or elsewhere in the Constitution, made in favor of particular rights, shall not be construed as to diminish the just importance of other rights retained by the people, or as to enlarge the powers delegated by the Constitution; but either as actual limitations of such powers, or as inserted merely for greater caution.

That language was not adopted, but I suspect that if Madison and his colleagues had realized the length to which the loose-constructionists would go in attempting to construe the rights of the Federal Government, under such parts of the Constitution as the interstate-commerce clause, as permitting control under a wage-and-hour law over every phase of business activity, they would have been more insistent on the original language, which spelled out the fact that the enumeration of certain rights must not be construed as enlarging powers delegated by the Constitution, but were intended to limit such powers.

In the case of the tenth amendment, changes in language were made to make more plain the fact that it was directed against the Federal Government. Thus, as proposed by Madison, this amendment read:

The powers not delegated by this Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively.

As adopted this was altered to read:

The powers not delegated to the United States by this Constitution—

Inserting the words "to the United States"—

nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

Adding the phrase "or to the people."

In his argument Madison said he had never considered a bill of rights so essential to the Constitution as to make it improper for the States to ratify the instrument without such an addition, but that he did think it would serve a useful purpose. He pointed out that the Magna Carta was designed to protect the British people against the power of the Crown, rather than the legislative branch of the Government and said:

Although I know that whenever the great rights, the trial by jury, freedom of the press, or liberty of conscience, come in question in that body (the British Parliament) the invasion of them is resisted by able advocates, yet their Magna Carta does not contain any one provision for the security of those rights, respecting which the people of America are most alarmed. The freedom of the press and rights of conscience, those choicest privileges of the people, are unguarded in the British Constitution.

But—

Madison continued—

although the case may be widely different, and it may not be thought necessary to provide limits for the legislative power in that country, yet a different opinion prevails in the United States. The people of many States have thought it necessary to raise

barriers against power in all forms and departments of government, and I am inclined to believe, if once bills of rights are established in all the States as well as the Federal Constitution, we shall find that although some of them are rather unimportant, yet, upon the whole, they will have a salutary tendency.

Mr. President, we should not forget that those who formed our Government were not too far removed from ordinary power to fear it. I have just been reading from James Madison, who probably knew more about what went into the Constitution and what it meant than anyone else connected with its formation. Certainly his contributions to the Federalist papers were the most valuable anyone made. Practically all we know about what went on in the Constitutional Convention was through his notes, which were merely memoranda he happened to keep. The official minutes were destroyed because the officials were afraid some reporter, some newspaper commentator, or someone else would find out what was going on and would put an account of it in all the newspapers, and the Colonies would never agree on it; that such a row would be stirred up in the Colonies they never could get together on anything. So all the notes of what was going on were destroyed. They would not let any of them go out. They would swear everyone to secrecy. But the point I want to emphasize is that those who framed the Constitution, and said that the Bill of Rights was not to be put into it because they did not believe anyone would challenge those rights, finally said, "Well, all the States have such provisions in their constitutions, and we will put the Bill of Rights in the Federal Constitution. It may never be necessary, but it certainly will do no harm and may do some good."

Mr. President, consider what that now means. Suppose they had not put the Bill of Rights into the Constitution. If they had not done so, we could not stop the FEPC with any power in the world. Brute pressure behind it would run right over us. Those sponsoring the FEPC would not ask for any specific grant of power. If we did not have the negative provisions of the Bill of Rights in the Constitution, those who favor FEPC would claim some fantastic rights and have Congress enact legislation to implement them. Thank goodness we have the Bill of Rights in the Constitution, which gives us freedom of religion, freedom of association, freedom to contract—all spelled out in the Constitution.

Mr. President, if the Members of this distinguished body will only examine the debates and take the trouble to read the cases I am now going to cite, I believe they will be impressed. Many Senators are not taking the trouble to remain on the floor, and I perhaps cannot blame them for that, but I hope they will read the RECORD. I am placing this discussion in the RECORD for a definite purpose. I do not want any Member of this body to say, "I did not know that was the law." I am placing cases in the RECORD which are the law, which have been checked and double checked, and I will vouch for the accuracy of the quotations and the accuracy of the style of the cases and the page numbers.

If Senators want to draw definite conclusions, let them try to do so, or if they want to find some other case which they claim hold differently from the case I shall cite, let them try to find them. But in all seriousness I ask the Members of this distinguished body at least to make a sincere effort to study the question of the unconstitutionality of FEPC before they try to rush us into a vote on that subject. If they make such an effort I am convinced they will agree with me that not only is there no authority in the Federal Government for Congress to take this action—and I have tried to make it plain that we should not undertake to take any action for which we do not have authority—but in a number of different respects our right to take it is absolutely denied, because we would be encroaching upon specific rights which the founding fathers definitely tried to leave to the people.

Discussing the nature of a Bill of Rights, Madison said:

In some instances they assert those rights which are exercised by the people in forging and establishing a plan of government. In other instances they specify those rights which are retained when particular powers are given up to be exercised by the legislature. In other instances they lay down dogmatic maxims with respect to the construction of government; declaring that the legislative, executive, and judicial branches shall be kept separate and distinct. Perhaps the best way of securing this in practice is to provide such checks as will prevent the enrichment of the one upon the other.

I pause to say that I think that is a rather apt phrase, because during my 16 years of service in the Congress I have observed more than one instance of the executive branch of the Government trying to enrich itself in power, influence, and prestige at the expense of the other two coordinate branches of the Government.

James Madison continued thus:

But, whatever may be the form which the several States have adopted in making declarations in favor of particular rights, the great object in view is to limit and qualify the powers of government.

Note, now, the contrast between the statement of proponents of FEPC that it is "a logical extension and implementation of the rights of the individual citizens safeguarded in the Bill of Rights," and the statement of Madison, sponsor of the Bill of Rights as proposed in the First Congress, who said "the great object in view is to limit and qualify the powers of government."

Continuing the quotation from the debate in Congress on the Bill of Rights amendments, Madison said:

The great object in view is to limit and qualify the powers of government, by excepting out of the grant of powers those cases in which the Government ought not to act, or to act only in a particular mode.

Continuing his discussion, Madison said:

In our Government it is perhaps, less necessary to guard against the abuse of the executive department than any other; because it is not the strongest branch of the system, but the weaker: It therefore must be leveled against the legislative, for it is the most powerful, the most likely to be abused, because it is under the least control.

That is what we are up against right now in this rules fight. It is to keep the legislative branch, which Madison said was the most powerful branch of the Government, from abusing power because, as he said, it is under the least control.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WITHERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. With reference to Mr. Madison's warning against encroachment of one department upon the other would the Senator mind giving us the benefit of his comparison of conditions then, when the Government was small, when the budget was small, when the Nation was small, with those of the present time, when the Government is operating under a $40,000,000,000 budget, when our country contains 145,000,000 people, and the distance between the west coast and the east coast is 3,000 miles. Does the Senator think Madison's warnings are more important now, in view of changed conditions, or does he think they are less important?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I will state to my friend from Mississippi that if Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and the other founding fathers could come back to this mundane existence they would be simply shocked at the size of our Government and they would marvel at the wisdom they had shown in starting that small experiment in representative democracy, in trying to balance the power of the judiciary, the legislative, and the executive branches, and in establishing the method of circumscribing through the medium of Congress, the overweening power of the Federal Government, to encroach upon the States, to limit and regulate the activities of the individual, to take about 25 or 30 percent out of all he earns, and say, "We know better what to do with it than you do. We are going to take it from you and we are going to spend it." Oh, if the spending were for defense, for the Post Office Department, and other activities which the Federal Government alone can undertake, it would be one thing.

Mr. President, I make the prediction that the 25 or 30 percent of nondefense spending which is now a small part of our present budget, can alone involve us if present trends are not stopped in an annual expenditure of from forty to fifty billion dollars a year, and break our backs financially, for the simple reason that there is a demand from pressure groups for the Federal Government to do this, that, and the other immediately affecting the individual—something which was never contemplated by Madison, Jefferson, or any of the other founding fathers. But it seems to be popular to do for the individual things which cost money. The tendency seems to be for liberals to

be liberal in the spending of other people's money. It seems to help win elections if promises are made to do this, that, and the other, which when it was organized it was never contemplated the Government would do, and then the heat is turned on Congress to come through with a performance of such promises.

We are facing here a political promise. The promise was, "We are going to give you antilynching legislation, anti-poll-tax legislation, and FEPC legislation," which is the one which I am now discussing, and which is the worst of all. Every one of these measures is unconstitutional. They are political promises born of political expediency, and involve a change in our rules for their passage, and ultimately the undermining of the primary functions, duties, and safeguards of a representative government.

Let me go back to what Madison said:

> In our government it is, perhaps, less necessary to guard against the abuse of the executive department than any other; because it is not the strongest branch of the system, but the weaker: It therefore must be leveled against the legislative, for it is the most powerful, the most likely to be abused, because it is under the least control.

Thus, according to Madison, we should look to our Bill of Rights as a fortress against the abuse of legislative power and not as a source of authority to invade the field of personal liberties with regulative authority.

Discussing, as he had done in some of the Federalist papers, the theory of our Constitution, Madison said that some had argued that a Bill of Rights was not necessary in the Federal Constitution—

> Because the powers are enumerated, and it follows that all that are not granted by the Constitution are retained; that the Constitution is a bill of powers, the great residuum being the rights of the people; and, therefore, a Bill of Rights cannot be so necessary as if the residuum was thrown into the hands of the Government.

Madison then said:

> It is true the powers of the General Government are circumscribed, they are directed to particular objects; but even if Government keeps within those limits, it has certain discretionary powers with respect to the means, which may admit of abuse to a certain extent, in the same manner as the powers of the State governments under their constitutions may to an indefinite extent; because in the Constitution of the United States there is a clause granting to Congress the power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution all the powers vested in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof; this enables them to fulfill every purpose for which the Government was established. Now, may not laws be considered necessary and proper by Congress, for it is for them to judge of the necessity and propriety to accomplish those special purposes which they may have in contemplation, which laws in themselves are neither necessary nor proper?

That statement is so appropriate to the subject under discussion that Madison might almost have been imagining the situation in which we find ourselves today. Members of Congress are interested in a laudable purpose, which is guaranteeing to every resident of the United States the civil rights to which he is entitled. Since this is an objective which is in itself justified by our Constitution, we find them resorting to the reserved powers of government which permit the making of all laws necessary to carry into execution the powers vested in the Government and its officers. But, as Madison foretold, we find them turning to laws, "which laws in themselves are neither necessary nor proper." On the contrary, these laws would in themselves violate the right of the States to control their internal affairs and the rights of individual citizens to associate and do business with one another.

Madison hoped that the limitations of the Constitution would be so clearly recognized that a Bill of Rights would not be necessary to deal with such a situation, but he also saw the danger, and so he advised that the Bill of Rights be adopted as an extra safeguard.

In the course of the debate from which I have been quoting, on June 8, 1789, Mr. Vining, of Delaware, said that a Bill of Rights was unnecessary in a government deriving all its powers from the people and said the matter was sufficiently covered by the statement in the preamble that "we the people do ordain and establish."

In contrast with this was the viewpoint of Mr. Gerry, of Massachusetts, who pointed out in the debate on July 21 that 7 of the 13 States had thought the Constitution very defective, yet, he said, "five of them had adopted it with a perfect reliance on Congress for its improvement."

The concern of the people of the United States at the time the first Congress was considering the Bill of Rights amendments also was indicated on August 13 when Mr. Lee, of Virginia, asked the House to consider the report of the committee to which they had been referred and Mr. Page said he hoped the House would agree to the motion of his colleague without hesitation, "because he conceived it essentially necessary to proceed and finish the business as speedily as possible; for whatever might be the fact with respect to the security which the citizens of America had for their rights and liberties under the new Constitution, yet unless they saw it in that light, they would be uneasy, not to say dissatisfied."

Madison agreed with his colleagues, asking, "Is it desirable to keep up a division among the people of the United States on a point in which they consider their most essential rights are concerned?"

Mr. Page then went further and said he "was positive the people would never support the Government unless their anxiety was removed." He begged the House to "consider the importance of the number of citizens who were anxious for amendments. If these had been added to those who openly opposed the Constitution," he said, "it possibly might have met a different fate."

Mark the meaning of those words. If those who were uneasy about the failure of the Constitution to spell out a Bill of Rights, and fearful that the promises that such a provision if inserted would not be carried out had been added to those who were openly and positively opposed to the Constitution for those and other reasons, he said he did not think the Constitution would have been adopted. So he begged his colleagues in the House, in the first session, when he was complying with the promise he had made to Patrick Henry, Madison, and others in the Virginia ratifying convention, "Let us adopt the Bill of Rights. Let us remove this anxiety, this uneasiness, for fear that we may stir up a sentiment throughout the Nation of hostility to the Government."

Mind you, the Federal Government was then weak. It was the States that were strong then, not the Congress, not the President, not the judiciary. It was the States that were strong. At the time those words were spoken Virginia was the largest State in the Union. Forty years after the Nation was formed Virginia had more Members in the House of Representatives on the basis of population than any other State in the Union. Madison knew the intense feeling in Virginia and that his State was essential not only to forming the new Government but making it successfully function for the preservation of personal rights, privileges, and freedoms. He left no stone unturned to carry out his promise to put the first 10 amendments into the Constitution, and he got them in. But here we are trying to change the rules of the Senate so as to lay a foundation for removing from the Constitution those pledges of rights to the people, as though we were going to make the people more loyal to their Government and make democracy function better. To please the fancies and whims of a relatively small minority, are we going to say to approximately 140,000,000 citizens, "You thought you had certain rights under the Bill of Rights and under the various provisions of the Constitution, but we have decided that we are not going to let you enjoy them, but we are going to give you a real taste of bureaucracy at the higher levels, and will tell whom you can employ and with whom you can associate and how you can transact your business."

Mr. President, how tragic it is to make any such proposals to the people of this country at a time when democracy all over the world is being challenged, and when our greatest hope for being able to meet that challenge successfully depends on two things: First, to remain solvent; and second, to make our democracy at home function successfully. I say those are the two things we need in order to meet this challenge. But the present proposal would make that impossible.

The quotation from Madison, to which I have just referred, is an assertion that, in effect, our Government owes its very creation and existence to the assurances given in the Bill of Rights. Those assurances were to protect the people against too much government and against the type of meddling which the FEPC represents.

Lee's motion to take up the amendments carried, and the first one coming from the committee proposed that—

> In the introductory paragraph of the Constitution before the words, "We the people," add: "government being intended for the benefit of the people, and the rightful establishment thereof being derived from their authority alone."

Here again we see the working of minds fearful of too much government, insisting that the very first words used in setting up our National Government specify unequivocably not only that it was intended for the benefit of the people, but that the right to establish it was derived from their authority alone.

As the debate continued the next day, August 14, Mr. Gerry objected to the wording "government being intended for the benefit of the people," because he said it held up an idea that all governments of the earth were intended to benefit the people. Gerry said:

> I am so far from being of this opinion, that I do not believe that one out of fifty is intended for any such purpose. I believe the establishment of most governments is to gratify the ambition of an individual who, by fraud, force, or accident, has made himself master of the people.

Mr. Page said he saw no need of changing the preamble because—

> The words "We the people" had the neatness and simplicity, while its expression was the most forcible of any he had ever seen prefixed to any Constitution.

He said he did not doubt the truth of the proposition brought forward by the committee, but he doubted the necessity for it in this place.

Mr. Sherman, of Connecticut, agreed with this viewpoint. He said:

> The people of the United States have given their reasons for doing a certain act. Here we propose to come in and give them a right to do what they did on motives which appeared to them sufficient to warrant their determination; to let them know that they had a right to exercise a natural and inherent privilege, which they have asserted in a solemn ordination and establishment of the Constitution. Now, if this right is indefeasible and the people have recognized it in practice, the truth is better asserted than it can be by any words whatever. The words "We the people" in the original Constitution are as copious and expressive as possible; any addition will only drag out the sentence without illuminating it.

There is a point which I think may also be applied quite directly to the proposed FEPC bill. As I previously pointed out, section 2 (b) of Senate bill 984 seeks to create by assertion a Federal right to be free of discrimination in employment. If such a right exists under our Constitution, it can, as Mr. Sherman said of the preamble phrases, be exercised without being spelled out in the bill. But, on the other hand, if such a right does not exist, no amount of wordage in a bill passed by the Congress can create it.

On August 15, 1789, the House took up another proposed amendment which, as it came from the committee, read:

> The freedom of speech and of the press and the right of the people peaceably to assemble and consult for their common good and to apply to the Government for redress of grievances shall not be infringed.

Mr. Tucker, of South Carolina, moved to insert the phrase "to instruct their Representatives," and touched off an extended debate on the proper role of legislators in our Government.

Mr. Jackson, of Georgia, opposed the Tucker proposal, saying he favored the right of the people to assemble and consult for the common good but not the power to instruct their Representatives. He said:

> If we establish this as a right, we shall be bound by those instructions; now, I am willing to leave both the people and the Representatives to their own discretion on this subject. Let the people consult and give their opinion; let the Representative judge of it; and if it is just, let him govern himself by it as a good Member ought to do; but if it is otherwise, let him have it in his power to reject their advice.

Now we are getting back to the question of mandate, Mr. President. In the last few months we have heard a great deal about who got what kind of a mandate. We see that that subject was being discussed in those early days; they were discussing the question of whether they would have a mandate from the people or whether as chosen Representatives they were to listen to them and then use their own best judgment in regard to what should be done.

Then the Representative from Georgia continued with an observation that is worthy of our particular attention today. He asked:

> What may be the consequence of binding a man to vote in all cases according to the will of others? He is to decide upon a constitutional point, and on this question his conscience is bound by the obligation of a solemn oath; you now involve him in a serious dilemma. If he votes according to his conscience, he decides against his instructions; but in deciding against his instructions, he commits a breach of the Constitution, by infringing the prerogative of the people, secured to them by this declaration. In short, it will give rise to such a variety of absurdities and inconsistencies, as no prudent legislature would wish to involve themselves in.

Mr. President, was not that rather good advice, away back in the First Congress? Here we are asked to change the rule so as to permit the passage of a civil-rights bill, so that someone can carry out a mandate, as he construed it, of his constituents—a mandate, in his opinion, for the passage of an FEPC bill, which thus would violate his oath to maintain the Constitution, because the bill would be unconstitutional.

Our leaders are attempting to force that on us in the name of democracy, and are charging us with delaying this matter and with keeping the rent-control bill and the other necessary bills from being acted upon. The absurdity of their position should be too apparent to require comment; but they will not stay here and listen.

O Mr. President, I see that the majority leader has just entered the Chamber. I thank him for coming in, and I hasten to add that I was just talking about him.

Madison reemphasized the point to which I just referred, asking: "Suppose they instruct a Representative, by his vote, to violate the Constitution, is he at liberty to obey such instructions?"

It is important for us to remember that this proposal to allow the people to instruct their Representatives in the Congress was not inserted in our Constitution.

We hear talk from time to time of a "mandate from the people," as a result of an election, for their Representatives to vote a certain way, and some of those who have supported FEPC and other so-called civil-rights legislation have claimed to be acting on such a mandate.

As Madison and others brought out so forcibly in their discussion more than a century and a half ago, when a man has taken a solemn oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States, there can be no such thing as a mandate to violate that oath. And the duty of supporting the Constitution cannot be brushed lightly aside on the ground that we can pass any law we choose and let the Supreme Court pass on its validity.

Abraham Lincoln put it bluntly when he said:

> No man who has sworn to support the Constitution can conscientiously vote for what he understands to be an unconstitutional measure, however expedient he may think it.

Going back to Madison and the debate from which I have been quoting, we find he said:

> My idea of the sovereignty of the people is that the people can change the Constitution if they please; but while the Constitution exists, they must conform themselves to its dictates. But I do not believe the inhabitants of any district can speak the voice of the people; so far from it, their ideas may contradict the sense of the whole people; hence the consequence that instructions are binding on the Representative is of a doubtful, if not a dangerous, nature.

Somewhat later in the debate, on August 21, when an amendment was under discussion that would have taken away the power of Congress to alter the time, manner, or place of holding elections, Mr. Gerry emphasized another point that has current application. He pointed to the possibility that the National Government, if in arbitrary hands, might abolish the secrecy of the ballot and order elections at remote places, and then said:

> Gentlemen will tell me that these things are not to be apprehended; but if they say that the Government has the power of doing them, they have no right to say the Government will never exercise such powers, because it is presumable that they will administer the Constitution at one time or another with all its powers; and whenever that time arrives, farewell to the rights of the people, even to elect their own Representatives.

That is the attitude we must take toward this proposal to allow a Government agency to pass on the propriety of every act of hiring, firing, or promotion, or demotion by an employer. It is said that a Federal fair employment commission would rely on persuasion and negotiation and education and conciliation. But, the fact remains, as Mr. Gerry said, that when we give any authority to the Government we must assume that at one time or another all its powers will be used and, when that

time arrives, "farewell to the rights of the people."

Thus, when we examine the thinking of the men who determined the phrasing of our Bill of Rights amendments, the wording of the amendments themselves that the Federal Government is prohibited from assuming powers where interference with personal liberty is involved becomes unmistakably clear.

The same attitude may be found in the words of the great justices of our Supreme Court who have interpreted the Constitution from the time of its adoption down to the present.

Some of the decisions bearing on the points at issue here have been briefly mentioned; I shall now show in some historical sequence the development and reiteration of the idea that ours is a government of strictly limited powers and that the limitations apply most forcibly where relations between individuals are concerned.

In doing this, I want to acknowledge my appreciation to Dean F. D. G. Ribble, of the University of Virginia Law School, and four student members of the Board of the Virginia Law Review, John Izard, Jr., of Biltmore, N. C.; Eugene B. Thomas, Jr., of Moodus, Conn.; Edward M. Selfe, Jr., of Huntington, W. Va.; and Robert F. Morton, of Teaneck, N. J., for their assistance in finding and checking some of the citations I shall use.

Mr. President, I have previously said, when my distinguished and beloved friend, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] was not present to hear it—I am so happy that he is here now—that the court decisions which I shall now quote, to show, as I believe, beyond the peradventure of a doubt, the unconstitutionality of the FEPC bill so ably sponsored by the Senator from Oregon, have been checked and double checked, and they are accurate. I hope the Senator will read them and that he will go over to the Library of Congress and check them for himself.

From the time our Government was established there have been, of course, two schools of thought as to the way the Constitution should be applied. At the beginning we had the Federalists, headed by Alexander Hamilton, who believed in a strong Central Government, and the anti-Federalists, headed by Thomas Jefferson, who saw the need for keeping the States as an effective buffer against encroachment on individual liberty.

On the Supreme Court, our great Chief Justice John Marshall took a broad view of the authority of the Federal Government as shown by his statement in summing up the case of *Gibbons* v. *Ogden* (9 Wheat. 1, 211) in 1824 when, in speaking of State powers which "interfere with, or are contrary to the laws of Congress," he said:

> In every such case, the act of Congress, or the treaty is supreme; and the law of the State, though enacted in the exercise of its powers not controverted, must yield to it.

But it also was Chief Justice Marshall who made the statement I previously quoted, and stressed the supremacy of the Constitution as guardian of the rights of the people, when he said:

> The powers of the legislature are defined and limited; and that those limits may not be mistaken, or forgotten, the Constitution is written.

Thus he asserted that regardless of the comparative authority of Federal and State governments in a particular situation, the limits of governmental authority are fixed by the Constitution itself.

A more restrictive view of the powers of the Federal Government than that taken by Marshall, especially in the field of regulating commerce, was taken by Chief Justice Taney, who in 1847 said:

> A State regulates its domestic commerce, contracts, the transmission of estates, real and personal, and acts upon all internal matters which relate to moral or political welfare. Over these subjects the Federal Government has no power.

That is good Maryland law, as well as Federal law.

> They appertain to State sovereignty as exclusively as powers exclusively delegated appertain to the General Government. (The *License cases*, 5 How. 504, 588.)

Now certainly if the theory of Taney—that a State acts upon all internal matters which relate to moral or political welfare—is accepted, there can be no question but what FEPC legislation would be invalid. It may be argued that Taney's doctrine has been vitiated by later decisions, but it was firmly grounded on the Constitution and, as I shall show by later citations, has been approved by many distinguished later occupants of the bench.

As a matter of fact, we find Chief Justice Marshall saying, in the case of *Ogden* v. *Sanders* (12 Wheat. 331, 356):

> Individuals do not derive from government their right to contract, but bring that right with them into society; that obligation is not conferred on contracts by positive law, but is intrinsic. This results from the right which every man retains to acquire property, to dispose of that property according to his own judgment, and to pledge himself for a future act. These rights are not given by society but are brought into it (p. 345).

Again, in 1852, in the case of *Philadelphia & Reading R. Co.* v. *Derby* (14 Howard 486, 487) we find the Court saying:

> The rule of "respondeat superior," or that the master shall be civilly liable for the tortious acts of his servants, is of universal application (p. 486). * * * Nothing but the most stringent enforcement of discipline, and the most exact and perfect obedience to every rule and order emanating from a superior, can insure safety to life and property (p. 487).

It is evident that if you take away from an employer, through some such device as FEPC legislation, the right to determine whom he shall employ, you deprive him of the freedom of selection which is necessary if he is to be held responsible for the acts of his employees.

In so doing, we would fly in the face of the Supreme Court, which stated in the case of *Baker* v. *Norton* (79 U. S. 157) that "consent is the very essence of a contract."

In 1872 the Supreme Court decided a group of cases which have been reported under the title of the *Slaughterhouse cases* (16 Wallace 36). I mentioned them earlier this afternoon. The rule laid down in these cases as to the limitations of the fourteenth amendment has been accepted by the Court ever since that time.

The State of Louisiana had passed a law to regulate slaughterhouses near New Orleans and suit was brought on the ground that this law discriminated against certain citizens who had previously engaged in business and that it, therefore, violated the fourteenth amendment.

In its analysis of the amendment, which occupies more than a hundred pages of the report, the Court discussed the meaning of the term "privileges and immunities," as used in article IV, section 2, of the Constitution, which says:

> The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privilegs and immunities of citizens of the several States.

It then said that the term "embraces nearly every civil right for the establishment and protection of which organized government is instituted," but added that these rights, "which are fundamental," have always been held to be "the class of rights which the State governments were created to establish and secure."

Please bear that in mind. Some persons get all steamed up over the question of civil rights. They want Congress to do something about the subject. But if they want to act in a constitutional way, if they will simply read the clear and unmistakable decisions of our Supreme Court, they will find that, straight down through the years, the Court has held that the Bill of Rights was a restraint upon the Congress and did not enlarge the rights of Congress; that the purpose of the Bill of Rights was to preserve our liberties and not to give them away. If there is to be any action of any kind by the Government to enforce rights between individuals, it must be at the State or local level. The Federal Government cannot legally do it.

The Court continued:

> The constitutional provision there alluded to did not create those rights, which it calls privileges and immunities of citizens of the States. It threw around them in that clause no security for the citizen of the State in which they were claimed or exercised. Nor did it profess to control the power of the State governments over the rights of its own citizens.
>
> Its sole purpose was to declare to the several States that whatever those rights, as you grant or establish them to your own citizens, as you limit or qualify, or impose restrictions on their exercise, the same, neither more nor less, shall be the measure of the rights of citizens of other States within your jurisdiction (p. 77).

Turning then to the fourteenth amendment, the Court asked:

> Was it the purpose of the fourteenth amendment, by the simple declaration that no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of the citizens of the United States to transfer the security and protection of rights which we have mentioned to the Federal Government? And where it declared that Congress shall have the power to enforce that article, was it intended to bring within the power of Congress the entire domain of civil rights heretofore belonging exclusively to the States? (p. 77).

Rejecting such an interpretation of the amendment, the Court said:

> The argument, we admit, is not always the most conclusive which is drawn from the consequences urged against the adoption of a particular construction of an instrument. But when, as in the case before us, those consequences are so serious, so far-reaching and pervading, so great a departure from the structure and spirit of our institutions, when the effect is to fetter and degrade the State governments by subjecting them to the control of Congress in the exercise of powers heretofore universally conceded to them of the most ordinary and fundamental character, when in fact it radically changes the whole theory of the relations of the State and Federal Governments to each other and of both these Governments to the people, the argument has a force that is irresistible in the absence of language which expresses such a purpose too clearly to admit of doubt (p. 78).

The Court said it did not see in the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments "any purpose to destroy the main features of the general system" of our Government.

The opinion concluded:

> Under the pressure of all the excited feeling growing out of the war, our statesmen have still believed that the existence of the States with powers for domestic and local government including the regulation of civil rights, the rights of person and of property was essential to the perfect working of our complex form of government, though they have thought proper to impose additional limitations on the States and to confer additional power on that of the Nation.
>
> But whatever fluctuations may be seen in the history of public opinion on this subject during the period of our national existence we think it will be found that this Court, so far as its functions required, has always held with a steady and an even hand the balance between State and Federal power, and we trust that such may continue to be the history of its relation to that subject so long as it shall have duties to perform which demand of it a construction of the Constitution or of any of its parts (p. 82).

Mr. President, I sat on this floor last year and heard a distinguished Senator argue for the passage of an anti-poll-tax bill in defiance of the clear language of the Constitution and contrary to all the decisions of the Supreme Court on that subject, and say, "If we put the weight of our decision behind the passage of that bill, the Supreme Court will not dare to turn us down," or words to that effect. I have just read from a decision of the Supreme Court which said it had a responsibility to do what? I am reading from the Court when they did turn them down, when they said they had a responsibility "to hold with a steady and even hand the balance between State and Federal power."

In 1875, 3 years after the Slaughter-House cases had been decided, the Court faced the question of State or Federal responsibility for action of one individual against another individual, and clearly indicated the unconstitutional nature of such legislation as that we are now considering.

In the case of *United States* v. *Cruickshank* (92 U. S. 542) the defendant was indicted for conspiracy under the Enforcement Act of 1870, which made it a crime for two or more persons to band or conspire together to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any citizen, preventing him from exercising rights secured to him by the Constitution. The particular right involved in this case was the right to vote in a Louisiana election, but the analogy to the claimed right to demand employment is clear. In the case of the statute involved in the Cruickshank case, as in the proposed FEPC bill, the purpose is to punish an individual for acts committed against another individual presumably when both are within the jurisdiction of the same State.

In rendering the decision of the Court in the Cruickshank case, Chief Justice Waite said:

> The fourteenth amendment prohibits a State from depriving any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, or from denying to any person equal protection of the law, but this provision does not add anything to the rights of one citizen as against another. It simply furnishes an additional guaranty against any encroachment by the State upon the fundamental rights which belong to every citizen as a member of society (p. 554).
>
> The duty of protecting all its citizens in the enjoyment of an equality of rights was originally assumed by the States, and it remains there. The only obligation resting upon the United States is to see that the States do not deny the right. This, the amendment guarantees but no more. The power of the National Government is limited to the enforcement of this guaranty (p. 555).

It might also be noted that when the Cruickshank case was tried in the circuit court—Federal Cases No. 14897—Mr. Justice Bradley said:

> It (the fourteenth amendment) is a guaranty against the acts of the State government itself. It is a guaranty against the execution of arbitrary and tyrannical power on the part of the government and legislation of the State, not a guaranty against the commission of individual offenses; and the power of Congress, whether express or implied, to legislate for the enforcement of such a guaranty does not extend to the passage of laws for the suppression of crimes within the States.

Nothing could be clearer than that, unless a man does not want to see.

> The enforcement of the guaranty does not require or authorize Congress to perform the duty that the guaranty itself supposes to be the duty of the State to perform (p. 710).

This statement was quoted with approval by Mr. Justice Woods, of the Supreme Court, 7 years later, when he delivered the decision in the case of *United States* v. *Harris* (106 U. S. 629). In this case the Court reaffirmed the doctrine that action by one citizen against another individual was not properly within the purview of the Constitution. Dealing with a case in which citizens of Tennessee were indicted under a Federal statute for the crime of lynching, the Court declared the statute was unconstitutional, and made this assertion:

> A private person cannot make constitutions or laws, nor can he with authority construe them, nor can he administer or execute them. The only way, therefore, in which one private person can deprive another of the equal protection of the laws is by the commission of some offense against the laws which protect the rights of persons, as by theft, burglary, arson, libel, assault, or murder. If, therefore, we hold that section 5519 is warranted by the thirteenth amendment, we should, by virtue of that amendment, accord to Congress the power to punish every crime by which the right of any person to life, property, or reputation is invaded.

Look where they are going to hit us. The Court has just said, "If you give them power to punish a man because he does not employ somebody according to the whims of a Federal bureaucrat, you have conferred on the Federal Government, by implication, the power to take charge of criminal action in any State between any persons." Certainly that would be an astounding change in our form of government. But this is the step which leads up to it, just as if it should be said that "hereafter every offense committed in every State and Territory of the United States is a crime against the Federal Government, to be punished only in a Federal court, prosecuted only by Federal prosecutors, heard by Federal judges, and handled by the Federal marshals and the FBI, and that hereafter no State court or local court or justice of the peace shall have any jurisdiction to step in and take over." It is just as logical as the FEPC, because that is what the Court has said. Are we going to give them the FEPC? God forbid. I do not think we are.

The Court proceeded to say:

> Thus, under a provision of the Constitution which simply abolished slavery and involuntary servitude, we should, with few exceptions, invest Congress with power over the whole catalogue of crimes. A construction of the amendment which leads to such a result is clearly unsound (p. 643).

If the Court was right in that statement, how much more unsound would be a construction of the Constitution or its amendments which would permit the Congress, as it proposed in the FEPC bill, to create a right by fiat, and then undertake to go into the sovereign States to protect that newly created right.

I think we can say of this proposal, as the Court said in the Harris case:

> The section of the law under consideration is directed exclusively against action of private persons, without reference to the laws of the State or their administration by her officers; we are clear in the opinion that it is not warranted by any clause of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution (p. 640).

The following year, 1883, another important decision which has a bearing on this discussion was given by the Court in the so-called *Civil Rights cases* (109 U. S. 3, 25). The statements made in this decision are particularly significant, because the Court was then composed almost entirely of men who were friendly to the fourteenth amendment, who had been appointed from States which did not secede. It could hardly be charged, therefore, that they had a bias in favor of States' rights or against the Federal Government.

In the Civil Rights cases the Court held unconstitutional a Federal statute passed in 1875 providing that anyone who

denied equal privileges in hotels, boarding houses, theaters, public conveyances, and public amusements to another citizen because of his race or color was guilty of a penal offense. That comes pretty close to the FEPC, or antidiscrimination, or something of that kind.

After raising the question of whether Congress had the constitutional power to make such a law, Mr. Justice Bradley stated:

Of course no one will contend that the power to pass it was contained in the Constitution before the adoption of the last three amendments. The power is sought, first, in the fourteenth amendment, and the views and arguments of distinguished Senators, advanced whilst the law was under consideration, claiming authority to pass it by virtue of that amendment, are the principal arguments adduced in favor of the power.

That, too, sounds a little familiar. If we pass an FEPC act, and it goes to the Court, as of course it will, the chief reliance of those who would sustain the act will be the arguments advanced by those who made a campaign issue of it and said, "You elect us and we will support FEPC." Those arguments will be advanced in that case, just as such arguments were advanced in the height of the reconstruction period, 10 years after the War Between the States was over, when the civil-rights statute was enacted, under which no one could deny a former slave service or accommodations in a hotel or a restaurant or anything of that kind.

Now listen to more of what the Court said:

We have carefully considered those arguments, as was due to the eminent ability of those who put them forward, and have felt, in all its force, the weight of authority which always invests a law that Congress deems itself competent to pass (p. 10).

I would like to emphasize those words of the Court, because they suggest the grave responsibility that rests upon us in this debate. We cannot simply say that we will pass the law because we approve of its objectives and let the Supreme Court determine whether or not it is constitutional. We must recognize that other Justices, as Mr. Justice Bradley said he did in the Civil Rights cases, will feel the "weight of authority which always invests a law that Congress deems itself competent to pass."

I continue to quote from Justice Bradley's decision in the Civil Right cases:

But, the responsibility of an independent judgement is now thrown upon this Court; and we are bound to exercise it according to the best lights we have. The first section of the fourteenth amendment (which is the one relied on), after first declaring who shall be citizens of the United States and of the several States, is prohibitory in its character and prohibitory upon the States. It declares that, "No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

It is State action of a particular character that is prohibited. Individual invasion of individual rights is not the subject matter of the amendment (pp. 10 and 11).

Note that, please:

Individual invasion of individual rights is not the subject matter of the amendment.

What amendment is being talked about? None other than the fourteenth amendment, which is relied upon when the claim is made that something should be done to break up discrimination.

Then the Court continued.

It has a deeper and broader scope. It nullifies and makes void all State legislation and State action of every kind which impairs the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States or which injures them in life, liberty, or property without due process of law, or which denies to any of them the equal protection of the law. To adopt appropriate legislation for correcting the effects of such prohibited State laws and State acts and thus to render them ineffectual, null, void, and innocuous. This is the legislative power conferred upon the Congress and this is the whole of it.

It does not invest Congress with power to legislate upon subjects which are within the domain of State legislation, but to provide modes of relief against State legislation, or State action, of the kind referred to. It does not authorize Congress to create a code of municipal law for the regulation of private rights, but to provide modes of redress against the operation of State laws and the action of State officers, executive or judicial, when these are subversive to the fundamental rights specified in the amendment.

Positive rights and privileges are undoubtedly secured by the fourteenth amendment, but they are secured by way of prohibition against State laws and State proceedings affecting those rights and privileges, and by power given to the Congress to legislate for the purpose of carrying such prohibition into effect; and such legislation must necessarily be predicated upon such supposed State laws or State proceedings and be directed to the correction of their operation and effect (pp. 11–12).

The Court cited several previous cases in support of this viewpoint and then continued:

An apt illustration of this distinction may be found in some of the provisions of the original Constitution. Take the subject of contracts for example. The Constitution prohibited the States from passing any law impairing the obligation of contracts. This did not give the Congress power to provide laws for the general enforcement of contracts, nor power to invest the courts of the United States with jurisdiction over contracts so as to enable parties to sue upon them in those courts. It did, however, give the power to provide remedies by which the impairment of contracts by State legislation might be counteracted and corrected; and this power was exercised (p. 12).

Remember that in this case the Court was considering legislation which was claimed, just as FEPC is, to be for the preservation of civil rights and to prevent discrimination against minorities.

The decision stated:

If this legislation is appropriate for enforcing the prohibitions of the amendment, it is difficult to see where it is to stop.

I cannot underscore that in the RECORD, but I can repeat it.

It is difficult to see where it is to stop.

Perhaps some do not want it to stop. I am satisfied that our safety and our defense is the absence of any such law as this. We do not want to let such a thing get started. If it does not get started we will not have to worry about where it is going to stop.

I read further from the decision:

Why may not Congress, with equal show of authority, enact a code of laws for the enforcement and vindication of all rights of life, liberty, and property? If it is supposable that the State may deprive persons of life, liberty, or property without due process of law (and the amendment itself does suppose this) why should not Congress proceed at once to prescribe due process of law for the protection of every one of these fundamental rights in every possible case, as well as to prescribe privileges of inns, public conveyances, and theaters? The truth is that the implication of a power to legislate in this manner is based upon the assumption that if the States are forbidden to legislate or act in a particular way on a particular subject, the power is conferred upon Congress to enforce the prohibition. This gives Congress power to legislate generally upon that subject, not merely power to provide modes of redress against such State legislation or action.

The assumption is certainly unsound. It is repugnant to the tenth amendment to the Constitution which declares that powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively or to the people (pp. 14–15).

Still further emphasizing its viewpoint of the restriction of Federal powers, the Court said in this decision:

Civil rights, such as are guaranteed by the Constitution against State aggression, cannot be impaired by the wrongful acts of individuals unsupported by State authority in the shape of laws, customs, or judicial or executive proceedings. The wrongful act of an individual, unsupported by any such authority, is simply a private wrong, or a crime of that individual; an invasion of the rights of the injured party it is true, whether they affect his person, his property, or his reputation; but if it is not sanctioned in some way by the State and not done under State authority, his rights remain in full force and may presumably be vindicated by resort to the laws of the State for redress (p. 17).

It is absurd—

Mr. Justice Bradley said—

to affirm that because the rights of life, liberty, and property (which includes all the civil rights that men have) are by the amendment sought to be protected against invasion on the part of the States without due process of law, Congress may therefore provide due process of law for their vindication in every case (p. 13).

This decision, from which I have quoted at such length, was delivered 66 years ago, but it is still sound doctrine, as is indicated by the fact that it was cited by the Supreme Court with approval in a 1948 case from which I shall quote before I have finished.

In the case of *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* (163 U. S. 537) holding that separate railroad accommodations for white and colored passengers were permissible, the Supreme Court said:

Legislation is powerless to eradicate racial instincts * * * and the attempt to do so can only result in accentuating the difficulties of the present situation (p. 551).

I cannot underscore that in the RECORD, but it is so fundamentally sound and true

that I can at least read it over again. I do not do so merely for the purpose of taking extra time, but simply to emphasize it:

Legislation is powerless to eradicate racial instincts * * * and the attempt to do so can only result in accentuating the difficulties of the present situation (p. 551).

The Court in this case cited the statement of Justice Bradley in the Civil Rights case that—

It would be running the slavery argument into the ground to make it apply to every act of discrimination which a person might see fit to make as to the guests he will entertain or as to the people he will * * * deal with in other matters of intercourse or business (p. 543).

That certainly seems to apply to what is proposed in the FEPC bill.

The Court also said:

In determining the question of reasonableness it is at liberty to act with reference to the established usages, customs, and traditions of the people (p. 550).

It said, too, in the Plessy against Ferguson case:

The argument also assumes that social prejudices may be overcome by legislation and that equal rights cannot be secured to the Negro except by an enforced commingling of the races. We cannot accept this proposition (p. 551.).

If any Member of this distinguished body can accept that proposition, let him go back to the RECORD of last week and read the fine speech by the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY]. He told how the State of North Carolina is taking care of the interests of the colored people of that State without intermarriage and without commingling of the races. He described the feeling of brotherhood and the aim of general welfare. He told how a certain colored man had gone into business and had become the foremost insurance man in North Carolina. He was president of a bank and in all sorts of businesses. The same man wrote an article, which will be found in the February or March issue of the Reader's Digest, telling how fairly he had been treated. To all other colored peoored people anywhere in the United States, he said:

There are greater opportunities in the South now than there were when I was a boy. Come down South if you want to be fairly treated and get ahead.

I return to what the Court said:

In determining the question of reasonableness it is at liberty to act with reference to the established usages, customs, and traditions of the people.

In deciding the case of *United States* v. *Joint Traffic Association* (171 U. S. 505) the Court emphasized the limitation placed by the Constitution as a whole on the rights growing out of the commerce clause. The Court said:

The power to regulate commerce has no limitation other than those prescribed in the Constitution. The power, however, does not carry with it the right to destroy or impair those limitations and guaranties which are also placed in the Constitution or in any of the amendments to that instrument (p. 571).

Another statement which seems most applicable in our present discussion was that made by Mr. Justice Holmes in the case of *Davis* v. *Mills* (194 U. S. 451) when he said:

Constitutions are intended to preserve practical and substantial rights, not to maintain theories (p. 457).

The idea that the considerations which cause a businessman to choose his associates can be limited or eliminated by a Federal statute without doing serious damage to our whole economic and social structure is a theory, and clearly it is damaging to those practical and substantial rights which our Constitution was intended to preserve.

Then, in 1908, we come to the case of *Adair* v. *United States* (208 U. S. 161) in which the Supreme Court upheld the right of an employer to contract with his employees or their representatives without governmental interference.

In this decision Mr. Justice Harlan made this quotation from Cooley on Torts:

A part of every man's civil rights is that he be left at liberty to refuse business relations with any person whatsoever, whether the refusal rests upon reason, or is the result of whim, caprice, prejudice, or malice; with his reasons neither the public nor the persons have any legal concern. It is also the right of the individual to have business relations with anyone with whom he can make contracts, and if he is wrongfully deprived of his right by others, he is entitled to redress (p. 173.)

Making his own comment on this point, Justice Harlan said:

The employer and employee have equality of right, and any legislation that disturbs that equality is an arbitrary interference with the liberty of contract which no government can justify in a free land (p. 175).

Certainly it cannot be successfully argued that there is equality of right under a law which may compel an employer to hire an individual whom he does not choose to hire, but which does not require the employee to accept employment from an employer who is not to his liking for reasons of race, religion, or anything else.

The Court in the Adair case also said:

It is not within the function of Government * * * to compel any person in the course of his business and against his will to accept or retain the personal services of another or to compel any person, against his will, to perform personal services for another (p. 174).

In discussing the applicability of the commerce clause in this case, Justice Harlan said:

We need scarcely repeat what this court has more than once said, that the power to regulate interstate commerce, great and paramount as that power is, cannot be exerted in violation of any fundamental right secured by other provisions of the Constitution (p. 180).

It must be admitted, of course, that the attitude of the court in its interpretation of the commerce power has changed during the last 30 years, and that the doctrine of the Adair case, as doctrine, has been largely destroyed.

But the statements made by Justice Harlan still stand as logical argument; and it must be remembered that in his dissenting opinion in the Adair case, Mr. Justice Holmes pointed out that the law prohibiting discrimination against union members involved a very limited interference with the freedom of contract.

In justification for this law, Holmes argued:

The section is in substance, a very limited interference with freedom of contract, no more. It does not require the carriers to employ anyone. It does not forbid them to refuse to employ anyone, for any reason they deem good, even where the notion of a choice of persons is a fiction and wholesale employment is necessary upon general principles that it might be proper to control (p. 191).

Thus, Mr. President, it cannot be assumed on the basis of this statement that the great liberal Justice Holmes would have approved a law such as FEPC which would result in requiring that an individual be hired, because this obviously is more than a very limited interference with freedom of contract.

To determine whether the commerce power is limited by the fifth amendment, we must balance the loss of individual liberty against the benefit resulting to interstate commerce. If the benefit to commerce is great and the loss of liberty quite small, it might logically be argued that the action is constitutionally justifiable, although we must remember, as the Chinese philosopher said, "One step begins a journey of a thousand miles." But if the benefit to commerce is small, and the loss of personal liberty to the employer great, the fifth amendment should be invoked to prevent the denial of due process of law.

I think it is notable that in the arguments for FEPC bills, although authority has been claimed at times under the commerce clause of the Constitution, no accompanying effort has been made to prove its value to interstate commerce.

Mr. President, I threw out that suggestion to the proponents of the FEPC measures. If they wish to defend it under the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution, they had better be prepared to show how much more prosperous and how much better off everyone would be because of the enactment of an FEPC law. It would not be sufficient to show that the minority in whom the proponents are interested would be better off, but the burden would be upon them to show that everyone—the employer and the general public—would be better off. If an FEPC law would help interstate commerce, let them show it if they can. But, Mr. President, they cannot do so, to save their lives.

Mr. President, there have been some generalized statements that discrimination in employment depresses wages for minority groups and, therefore, cuts mass-purchasing power and constricts the market for goods and services in general. It would be difficult to prove, however, that FEPC would not have an exactly identical result. When an employer denies employment, taking into consideration racial or religious grounds, he is not likely to do it simply for his own pleasure or through malice, but rather

because it seems to his economic advantage. If an employer is forced to hire persons who would lower the profit capacity of his business because of their disrupting effect on employee morale, or because of some other reason, it stands to reason that his ability to offer high wages will be decreased, along with his profits, and the total contribution to commerce will be less than if he were permitted to build his organization in the most efficient manner.

In connection with our discussion of the limited extent to which the Federal government might be justified in interfering with freedom of contract, as defended by Justice Holmes, it may be interesting to examine some statements made by an attorney who made a study of the court decisions from the standpoint of one who favored further extension of Federal powers.

Mr. President, now I shall quote from an attorney who tried to work up a case for the FEPC law; he is in favor of it 100 percent. Writing in the National Bar Journal, in the issue for June 1945, under the title "Individual Invasion of Individual Rights," Mr. Loren Miller, a member of the Kansas and California bars, and one of the board of editors of that journal said:

One of the anomalies of our constitutional system is the professed inability of the courts to find legal safeguards to protect individuals against invasion or deprivation of their rights by so-called private persons or groups.

Writing as one who obviously deplored this state of affairs, the author of the article recalled some of the statements which I have cited from the Civil Rights cases, and reviewed later decisions he had found supporting the same viewpoint.

Then he said:

It may be safely asserted that political subdivisions cannot bar Negroes from employment by law or ordinance but private employers, even when engaged on public works, may do so at will in the absence of legislation. Similarly, labor unions have long exercised the right of barring Negroes from membership on the basis of race even when by the device of closed-shop contracts this discrimination deprived Negroes of all opportunity to work or where their right to represent employees was regulated by legislation.

Mr. President, I think one of the familiar instances of what he was discussing was the attitude of the railroad brotherhoods. We in the South know that in the days when railroad engines were fired by the manpower method, and the firemen would have to stoop over and shovel coal into the hot fire every few minutes, there was no objection to having a colored man serve as fireman on a railroad engine. But he never was able to go any higher in employment; he did not get to be engineer or to be conductor on the train. That situation still prevails. But the proponents of FEPC would change all that, if we let them change the rules of the Senate so that they can then have these bills brought and considered.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at this point?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield for a brief question.

Mr. EASTLAND. The situation the Senator mentioned in regard to Negro firemen prevails in the North as well as in the South; does it not?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Absolutely; it is the case all over the United States. There can be no question about that. There are a number of unions that will not even let Negroes become members.

I am trying to argue, not that it is right for them to do that, but that if there is to be law on the subject, it must be a law enacted by the States; such a law is clearly beyond the jurisdiction of the Federal Government. I understand that New York has such a law, but that no serious effort is made to enforce it. I may be misinformed as to that, but that is what I have generally understood. I have been told that in New York they do not dare to enforce it vigorously; but even there it has caused some trouble and some dislocation. But I am not challenging the right of New York to have such a law; on the contrary, I am saying that if there are to be any regulations, that is where they must be. In other words, this writer went on to say:

The list of permissible discriminations under the individual-invasion-of-individual-rights doctrine could be extended, but enough has been said to indicate that, so long as the State remains silent and does not require a discrimination by reason of race, color, or other unwarranted classification, the citizen is without judicial protection and, even in the event the State does overstep bounds, all the courts can do, or will do, is to strike down the offending rule, regulation, or law.

In support of this statement he cited the 1914 decision of the Supreme Court in the case of *McCabe* v. *Atchison Ry. Co. et al.* (235 U. S. 151).

This writer found some comfort in recent court decisions forbidding discrimination by unions which had exclusive bargaining rights and concluded his article by advocating just such a dangerous doctrine as has been advanced in support of FEPC—that the broad and underlying social effects of contemplated discrimination be stressed and the courts be urged to look at the end sought to be achieved rather than ground their decisions on the means used.

In other words, our courts should admit that the end justifies the means, constitutional or not.

But, returning to our review of Supreme Court decisions, we find that in 1915 the doctrine of the Adair case, was affirmed in the case of *Coppage* v. *Kansas* (236 U. S. 1) and that in this case Mr. Justice Holmes expressed his approval of establishing "equality of position between the parties in which liberty of contract begins."

In the case of *Buchanan* v. *Worley* (245 U. S. 60), the Court said:

Property is more than the mere thing which a person owns. It is elementary that it includes the right to acquire, use and dispose of it. The Constitution protects these essential attributes of property (p. 74).

I wish my distinguished friend from Minnesota were present. I feel he needs a little education along this line. The question of civil rights and personal rights, has been dinned into his ears so long, that he needs to hear what the Court is saying. I hope the Senator will read it some of these days. I am afraid he will not; but I shall keep on reading what the Court says.

But, a man forced to hire an employee against his will is deprived of his right to use the property represented by his business.

In the Buchanan case, which dealt with property restrictions, Mr. Justice Day also said:

That there exists a serious and difficult problem arising from a feeling of race hostility which the law is powerless to control, and for which it must give a measure of consideration, may be freely admitted. But its solution cannot be promoted by depriving citizens of their constitutional rights and privileges (pp. 80–81).

The decision in this case was modified in part in the case of *Shelley* v. *Kraemer*, (334 U. S. 1) which was decided last year, but as I shall show when I come to that case the court still maintained the principle of preserving individual property rights.

Again, in the case of *Wolff Packing Co.* v. *Court of Industrial Relations* (262 U. S. 522) Chief Justice Taft said of the Kansas Industrial Court Act: I am happy the distinguished Senator from Ohio is on the floor. I hope he will do me the honor of listening to what his illustrious father said in this case:

It curtails the right of the employer on the one hand and of the employee on the other to contract about his affairs. This is part of the liberty of the individual protected by the guaranty of the due-process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. While there is no such thing as absolute freedom of contract, and it is subject to a variety of restraints, they must not be arbitrary or unreasonable. Freedom is the general rule and restraint the exception (p. 534).

And, in rendering the decision in the case of *Truax* v. *Corrigan* (257 U. S. 312) Chief Justice Taft also said:

The broad distinction between one's right to protection against a direct injury to one's fundamental property right by another who has no special relation to him and one's liability to another with whom he establishes a voluntary relation under a statute, is manifest upon its statement (p. 329).

Mr. President, I want to read that again to make sure the full import of what the great Chief Justice said is fully grasped:

The broad distinction between one's right to protection—

How is he to be protected? By an FEPC?

The broad distinction between one's right to protection against a direct injury to one's fundamental property right by another who has no special relation to him and one's liability to another with whom he establishes a voluntary relation under a statute is manifest upon its statement.

Continuing, Chief Justice Taft said:

The legislative power of a State can only be exerted in subordination to the fundamental principles of right and justice (p. 329). * * * Our whole system of law is predicated on the general fundamental principles of equality of application of the

law (p. 332). * * * The Constitution was intended—its very purpose was—to prevent experimentation with the fundamental rights of the individual (p. 338).

I am going to read that again for emphasis, because it was the pronouncement of a former President of the United States, made by him as the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. He said:

The Constitution was intended—its very purpose was—to prevent experimentation with the fundamental rights of the individual.

Oh, no, FEPC would not experiment any—oh, no. The sponsors say, "Just give us a chance to try it"; and then they use persuasive, smooth talk. They say, "We have never put anybody in jail; we never proceed against him criminally; we would never levy a fine. Oh, no; we merely want to put that in the law in case we had to deal with some really tough man. But in most of the cases we are merely going to talk to him nicely. Everything will be worked out. Just pass the law. We are not going to experiment with the fundamental rights of the individual."

In the case of *United States* v. *Wheeler* (254 U. S. 281), in which the successful argument was presented by Mr. Charles E. Hughes, who subsequently became Chief Justice, the decision of the Supreme Court cited once more, with approval, that part of the decision in the Slaughter House cases which asserted—

Mark you, Mr. President—

it would be the vainest show of learning to attempt to prove by citations of authority that up to the adoption of the recent amendments no claim or pretense was set up that those rights depended on the Federal Government for their existence or protection beyond the very few express limitations which the Federal Constitution imposed upon the States—such, for instance, as the prohibition against ex post facto laws, bills of attainder, and laws impairing obligation of contracts. But, with the exception of these and a few other restrictions, the entire domain of the privileges and immunities of citizens of the States, as above defined, lay within the constitutional and legislative power of the States and without that of the Federal Government (p. 298).

I wish to repeat that, because I am sure some of my distinguished colleagues do not follow that point in the recent decision, which says, "the entire domain of the privileges and immunities of citizens of the States, as above defined lay"—where?—"within the constitutional and legislative power of the States." And what authority does not have jurisdiction? I shall answer that merely by continuing the quotation of the exact language of the Court—"and without that of the Federal Government."

Again, in 1923, in the case of *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Raymond Bros.* (263 U. S. 573) the Supreme Court, citing a number of its previous decisions, said:

It is the right "long recognized," of a trader engaged entirely in private business, freely to exercise his own independent deal (p. 573).

That sounds very plain. The theory now is that we may pass legislation in conflict with that opinion, and put the weight of our influence behind it, send it to the Court, and the Court will wipe out that ruling. It is said the Constitution does not mean that any more, that it is entirely different from what we thought it was; it means something else entirely. That is the theory of some persons.

Three years later, in the case of *Corrigan* v. *Buckley* (271 U. S. 323) the Court, speaking through Mr. Justice Sanford, upheld once more the rule that the fifth and fourteenth amendments were inapplicable to individual action.

The Court said:

Under the pleadings in the present case, the only constitutional question involved was that arising under assertions in the motion to dismiss that the indenture or covenant which is the basis of the bill is void and that it is contrary to and forbidden by the fifth, thirteenth, and fourteenth amendments. This contention is entirely lacking in substance or color of merit (pp. 329–330).

The fifth amendment is a limitation only upon the powers of the General Government and is not directed against the action of individuals. The thirteenth amendment denouncing slavery and involuntary servitude—that is, a condition of enforced compulsory service of one to another—does not in other matters protect the individual rights of persons of the Negro race. And the prohibitions of the fourteenth amendment have reference to State action exclusively, and not to any action of private individuals (p. 330).

Mr. President, I have been quoting decisions from the earliest days of the Supreme Court, and I shall wind up with one of last year, which says, in effect, that if the Constitution means anything at all, it means that the Federal Government has not and cannot acquire the right to control actions between individuals. There is an unbroken line of decisions to that effect. I challenge any lawyer in this body or anywhere else to disprove that statement. Yet, Mr. President, some Senators urge Senators, who have so recently stood at the desk and taken an oath to support the Constitution, to vote for a bill which is clearly unconstitutional, as well as so disruptive of the mores of the South that I do not see how they can reconcile the two positions.

The Court, in the case which I have just cited, repeated and accepted the statement from the Civil Rights cases that "individual invasion of individual rights is not the subject matter of the—fourteenth—amendment"—page 330.

In 1930 the Court once more indicated the limited nature of interference with individual rights which it would approve when, in the case of *Texas, N. & O. Ry.* v. *Brotherhood* (281 U. S. 548) it said:

The Railway Labor Act of 1926 does not interfere with the normal exercise of the right of the carrier to select its employees or to discharge them. The statute is not aimed at this right of the employers, but at the interference with the right of employees to have representatives of their own choosing (p. 571).

Then, in 1937, in the case of *N. L. R. B.* v. *Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp.* (301 U. S. 1), the Court asserted:

The (labor relations) act does not interfere with the normal exercise of the right of the employer to select its employees or to discharge them. The employer may not, under cover of that right, intimidate or coerce its employees with respect to their self-organization and representation, and on the other hand, the Board is not entitled to make its authority a pretext for interference with the right of discharge when that right is exercised for other reasons than such intimidation and coercion (pp. 45–46).

In other words, the limited restrictions permitted are aimed at abuse of the employers' rights and not at negation of those rights.

As Mr. Justice Brandeis said in the case of *Senn* v. *Tile Layers Protective Union* (301 U. S. 468): "A hoped-for job is not property guaranteed by the Constitution" (p. 482).

And, Chief Justice Hughes, in the case of *N. L. R. B.* v. *Fan Steel Metal Corp.* (306 U. S. 240), spoke of a company's "normal right to select its employees" (p. 259).

Renewed emphasis was given to the Civil Rights cases, from which I have quoted, in 1940 when the Circuit Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit, cited them in the case of *Powe* v. *United States* (109 F. 2d 147) and stated:

Neither the fourteenth amendment nor any other part of the Constitution put the matters of conspiracies of individuals touching such matters within the power of Congress, but only gave power to correct wrong action by the State or its officers.

This was in 1940. We are getting down very close to what was said just 1 year ago.

The reasoning of these cases so opposed by some dissents is full and convincing, and the conclusion reached as to the effect upon Federal power of the fourteenth amendment has stood for more than 2 generations (p. 150).

Mind you, Mr. President, that was in 1940. I shall bring it up to date before I conclude.

The stamp of approval was placed on the circuit court's holding in this case when the Supreme Court denied certiorari by a memorandum decision (309 U. S. 679).

That became the law immediately.

In 1940, in the case of *Perkins* v. *Lukens Steel Co.* (310 U. S. 113), the Supreme Court, in upholding the Walsh-Healey Act, said:

Like private individuals and businesses—

Note well those opening words—

Like private individuals and businesses, the Government enjoys unrestricted power to produce its own supplies, to determine those with whom it will deal, and to fix the terms and conditions upon which it will make needed purchases (p. 127).

Thus the court recognized that private individuals and businesses do have the right of unrestricted power to decide with whom they shall deal.

Mr. President, I digress there to say that I think the court went pretty far when it sustained, as an incident of the right of the Government to do business, putting into effect a special labor law for the few who had Government contracts before the war, and then carried it further to all who received contracts during the war, when a man either did business for the Government or he went out of business. I now understand that the Walsh-Healey Act is to be further

amended so as to provide that no one shall have a contract with the Government unless he will guarantee an annual wage to every employee in his plant. That will be carrying the power of the Government very far. Fortunately, we shall have an opportunity to look that over and maybe talk about it a little bit, if the rules of the Senate are not changed too drastically before that becomes a part of the Walsh-Healey Act.

Now I shall return to the decisions of the court bearing directly on the point at issue.

The court then pointed out that the act's purpose was "to impose obligations upon those favored with Government business," but said:

> The act does not represent an exercise by Congress of regulatory power over private business.

That is what the Court says, but I do not agree with it.

> In this legislation the Congress did no more than instruct its agents who were selected and granted final authority to fix the terms and conditions under which the Government will permit goods to be sold to it (pp. 128–129).

Mr. President, I wonder what the Court will say if we pass a law requiring all employees, whether working on Government contracts or not, to be placed on an annual-wage basis, and whether we exercise any regulatory power over the business or not. I shall await the outcome with interest.

The conflict between the Bill of Rights and attempts to interfere with individual liberty was pointedly referred to by Mr. Justice Jackson in the case of *West Virginia Board of Education* v. *Barnette* (319 U. S. 624), in which he said:

> The very purpose of a Bill of Rights was to withdraw certain subjects from the vicissitudes of public controversy—

I am quoting one of the real liberals, and I hope every Senator will pay strict attention to what he says, because no one can challenge the statement that Mr. Justice Jackson is a liberal—

> to place them beyond the reach of majorities, and officially to establish them as legal principles to be applied by the courts. One's right to life, liberty, and property, to free speech, a free press, freedom of worship and assembly, and other fundamental rights, may not be submitted to vote; they depend on the outcome of no elections (p. 638). * * * If there is any fixed star in our national constellation, it is that no official, high or petty, can prescribe what shall be orthodox in politics, nationalism, religion, or other matters of opinion, or force citizens to confess by word or act their faith therein (p. 642).

Now, how shall we square that statement with a law which would permit petty officials to prescribe the way in which an employer should select those who will work for him?

In the Barnette case the Court also quoted Abraham Lincoln's query:

> Must a government of necessity be too strong for the liberties of its people, or too weak to maintain its own existence? (p. 636).

It then went on to say:

> Assurance that rights are secure tends to diminish fear and jealousy of strong government, and by making us feel safe to live under it, makes for its better support. Without promise of a limiting Bill of Rights it is doubtful if our Constitution could have mustered enough strength to enable its ratification. To enforce those rights today is not to choose weak government over strong government. It is only to adhere as a means of strength to individual freedom of mind in preference to officially disciplined uniformity for which history indicates a disappointing and disastrous end (pp. 636–637).

Finally, I would direct attention to the case of *Shelley* v. *Kraemer et al.* (334 U. S. 1), decided by the Supreme Court on May 3, 1948. In that decision, involving restrictive covenants designed to exclude minority groups from the ownership or occupancy of real property, Chief Justice Vinson referred to the case of Corrigan against Buckley, and said that case could present no issues under the fourteenth amendment, for—

> That amendment by its terms applies only to the States (p. 8).

The Chief Justice went on to say:

> It cannot be doubted that among the civil rights intended to be protected from discriminatory State action by the fourteenth amendment are the rights to acquire, enjoy, own, and dispose of property. Equality in the enjoyment of property rights was regarded by the framers of that amendment as an essential precondition to the realization of other basic civil rights and liberties which the amendment was intended to guarantee (p. 10).

He referred to the Slaughterhouse cases and continued:

> Since the decision of this court in the *Civil Rights cases* (109 U. S. 3 (1883)), the principle has become firmly embedded in our constitutional law that the action inhibited by the first section of the fourteenth amendment is only such action as may fairly be said to be that of the States (p. 13).

Then Justice Vinson significantly added:

> That amendment erects no shield against merely private conduct, however discriminatory or wrongful (p. 13).

After discussing in some detail the right and obligation of the Federal Government to prevent discriminatory action by States or by their agents, the Court's decision indicated that property owners could not come into court to demand enforcement of restrictive covenants and said:

> The Constitution confers upon no individual the right to demand action by the State which results in the denial of equal protection of the laws to other individuals (p. 22).

If this statement of the court, made only last year, be accepted, how, then, could we justify a law that would permit an individual to go to a fair employment commission, or to a court to demand action against another individual who refused to employ him? The would-be employee has the right to work or not to work for the prospective employer. If the employer is to have equal protection of the laws he must have a similar right to hire or not to hire.

The point involved here was well expressed by Mr. Donald R. Richberg in a discussion of the constitutionality of civil-rights proposals when he said:

> The great declared purpose of the Constitution was not to achieve an impossible equality among unequal human beings but to secure the blessings of liberty so that men could be free to be different and to realize their differing ambitions with their differing abilities. Every law which seeks to give a man a right to something which as a freeman he cannot gain for himself, must impose burdens and restraints on the freedom of other men. * * *

> Let us be watchful against every effort to create by law a right in one man to compel others to associate with him or to accept obligations to him in the domain of private enterprise or private life.

Let us remember the words of the late Mr. Justice Brandeis, who said:

> The makers of our Constitution undertook to secure conditions favorable to the pursuit of happiness. They recognized the significance of man's spiritual nature, of his feelings, and of his intellect. They knew that only a part of the pain, pleasure, and satisfactions of life are to be found in material things. They sought to protect Americans in their beliefs, their thoughts, their emotions, and their sensations. They conferred, as against the Government, the right to be let alone—the most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized man.

Next to Winston Churchill my favorite British statesman was Edmund Burke, who said in his speech on Mr. Fox's East India bill in 1783:

> The rights of men—that is to say, the natural rights of mankind—are indeed sacred things; and if any public measure is proved mischievously to affect them, the objection ought to be fatal to that measure, even if no charter at all could be set up against it. If these natural rights are further affirmed and declared by express covenants, if they are clearly defined and secured against chicane, against power and authority, by written instruments and positive engagements, they are in a still better condition: they partake not only of the sanctity of the object so secured, but of that solemn public faith itself which secures an object of such importance. Indeed, this formal recognition, by the sovereign power, of an original right in the subject, can never be subverted, but by rooting up the holding radical principles of government, and even of society itself. The charters which we call by distinction great are public instruments of this nature: I mean the charters of King John and King Henry the Third. The things secured by these instruments may, without any deceitful ambiguity, be very fitly called the chartered rights of men.

It is for the chartered rights of men that I am arguing today, and I urge that the Senate shall not give consent to any measure, no matter how enticingly labeled which would mischievously affect them.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. MAYBANK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WITHERS in the chair). The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have carefully observed the proceedings in the Chamber for the past two weeks with much interest. I have had very little to say; the reason for which I am sure most Senators know. Unfortunately, a few weeks ago I was involved in an automobile accident, but I am thankful to say I was not seriously injured. However, I suffered painful injuries which have to some extent slowed me down. For that reason I shall not speak at as great length as otherwise I would. Still I may speak for several

hours. I want to emphasize the importance of what is taking place in this, the greatest legislative assembly in the world.

At the very outset I pay tribute to the masterful leadership of the group of which I am honored to be a member, the leadership of the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. He has always shown real statesmanship, generalship, and leadership in matters of this kind. It is an honor to follow the pattern he has set by discussing these issues with vigor, but without bitterness.

Every member of this body is entitled to express his views and at such length as he sees fit. I think it was Voltaire who said, "I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it."

At the present time we have before us Senate Resolution 15. Let me read the resolution to the Senate so we will have clearly before us exactly what we are doing:

Resolved, That subsection 2 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, relating to cloture, be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"If at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but 1, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

"'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a two-thirds vote of those voting, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

It will be noticed that this provides for a two-thirds majority. But if this resolution is taken up, there will be other amendments. I notice an amendment by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], which reads a little differently. The McMahon amendment proposes to strike out all after the word "Resolved" and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That (a) subsection 2 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, relating to cloture, be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"2. If at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate pursuant to this subsection, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

"'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a two-thirds vote of those voting, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a two-thirds vote of those voting, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

(b) Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, relating to cloture, be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"3. If at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate pursuant to this subsection, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the eighth calendar day thereafter (exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays) he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without further debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

"'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"During the period intervening between the statement of the motion to bring debate to a close and the taking of the vote thereon, the time for general debate on such motion shall be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents thereof, and shall be controlled by one Senator designated by the Presiding Officer to control such time for the proponents and one Senator designated by the Presiding Officer to control such time for the opponents. Time available to, but not used by, either such side shall be yielded to the other side.

"If the question so submitted on the motion to bring debate to a close shall be decided in the affirmative by a majority of all Members of the Senate, including Members who are not present or who do not vote, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendment thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

That is another version of what is wanted.

I notice that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] has an amendment, on page 2, line 7, to strike out "two-thirds" and insert in lieu thereof "three-fifths."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] has an amendment, on page 2, lines 6 and 7, to strike out "and if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a two-thirds vote of those voting" and insert in lieu thereof "and if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a majority vote of the Members of the Senate, including Members who are not present or do not vote."

It will be noticed that we have several different slants on this question. So if the amendment to the rule ever comes up, I do not know what may happen.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] also has an amendment, on page 2, to strike out lines 6 through 10, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

> And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a two-thirds vote of all Members of the Senate who are affiliated with the majority party (including Members affiliated with the majority party who are not present or do not vote) and by a two-thirds vote of all other Members of the Senate (including Members not affiliated with the majority party who are not present or do not vote), then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

It will be seen by these amendments that no one knows exactly what will happen if this question ever comes before us. That is why Senators from the South want their views well expressed. I believe that the minority views from the Committee on Rules and Administration bring out very clearly the reasons why we oppose the proposed amendment to the cloture rule coming to a vote. So, Mr. President, I should like to read the minority views of the Committee on Rules and Administration on Senate Resolution 15:

MINORITY VIEWS

The United States Senate established a system of free and unlimited debate in 1806, when its Members agreed to discard the last of earlier rules which had been somewhat similar to the procedure of the House of Representatives.

These full and free debate privileges, differing from any other legislative body in the world have been changed only under the stress of the gravest of national emergencies—war. During the War Between the States a temporary rule was adopted restricting debate on war measures considered during secret session of the Senate.

In 1917, a filibuster (a term used here to mean extended debate and discussion designed to prevent action upon a measure) delayed the arming of merchant ships in the

diminish fear and jealousy of strong government, and by making us feel safe to live un-

The great declared purpose of the Constitution was not to achieve an impossible

speak at as great length as otherwise I would. Still I may speak for several

provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other

Senate, or the unfinished business, the

delayed the arming of merchant ships in the

period just prior to American entry into World War I. A determined Senate, intent upon preventing any similar action during the period of national emergency, adopted an amendment to rule XXII, which allowed two-thirds of the Members to vote to cut off debate upon a measure under discussion. This is the so-called cloture rule which Senate Resolution 15 seeks to amend.

Under the cloture procedure, a signed motion of 16 Senators to set a limit on debate must be brought to a vote without debate 2 days after being filed. If the motion is adopted by a two-thirds vote, cloture is invoked, limiting further debate on the measure to 1 hour for each Senator.

The cloture amendment to rule XXII was never used during World War I, and the Senate has actually reached a vote on invoking cloture only 19 times in the 32 subsequent years. Cloture has been invoked only 4 out of these 19 times that it came to a vote.

In 1922 it was ruled that a motion for cloture under rule XXII was not applicable to debate upon amendments to the Senate Journal. At a later date it was ruled that cloture was not applicable to debate upon a motion to take up a measure for consideration by the Senate.

The Senate Rules Committee has had under study five resolutions involving cloture. Three of them were designed to make ironclad the two-thirds cloture rule, and two proposed to amend the rule through the adoption of majority cloture.

COMMITTEE ACTION

The Committee on Rules has properly seen fit to reject the proposals which would have made it possible for a bare majority to shut off debate in the Senate. Despit this action, however, it is still clear that the forces which seek to broaden the cloture rule have as a goal the establishment of majority cloture. There is every reason to believe that the passage of Senate Resolution 15 would be regarded as just a step toward a system of control by a bare majority. This very evident attitude on the part of most of the sponsors of cloture proposals makes it more vital to oppose the adoption by the Senate of Senate Resolution 15.

Three of the sponsors of Senate Resolution 13, a measure identical with Senate Resolution 15, stated in their testimony before the committee that they regarded it primarily "as a step" along the path to majority cloture. Senator KNOWLAND, the fourth sponsor of the resolution, associated himself with the testimony of Senators SALTONSTALL, FERGUSON, and IVES, the three sponsors who made clear their belief in majority cloture.

With these factors in mind, opposition to Senate Resolution 15 becomes an obvious necessity, not only from the standpoint that passage of the resolution would impinge too greatly upon the historic freedom of debate of the Senate, but because it would also let the bars down for an early change to cloture by majority.

There is every reason to fear that the establishment of majority cloture would be only a transitory period in the rapid change in the fundamental nature of the United States Senate that might be inaugurated through tampering with the rules today.

TRANSITION TO PARTISANSHIP

The existence of a majority cloture rule would provide a source of great temptation to the party which happened to be in power. Without contending that such a course would be deliberately adopted, it is virtually certain that the rule would soon become a weapon in the hands of the partisan majority, used to shut off debate whenever the party program appeared to be bogging down in the face of determined opposition.

The leaders of the political party constituting the majority would first persuade themselves that they would be justified in using it for their own partisan purposes in some controversy where the opposition appeared to be using delaying tactics, but it would not be a far step from that point to become convinced that they were derelict in their duty if they did not use it on every occasion of partisan policy matter. They would be continually prodded and pushed into using this weapon by political pressure groups that do not belong to any party, have no responsibility to the people, and no obligation to uphold the organic law of the land.

It would not be a difficult step forward from the continuous application of majority cloture to restriction of the right of amendment, the second basic tenet of legislative freedom in the Senate. If the right of amendment were restricted or curtailed, the Senate would have lost its last major point of difference from the procedure of the House of Representatives. The differences between the two bodies would be no more pronounced than they are in the average State legislature.

In calm reflection or study it may be difficult for a Member of the Senate to conceive of such changes being effected, for it is unlikely that any Member of the body, as constituted today, would approve of such a sweeping plan were it presented in toto. It must be remembered, however, that few of the changes in the Senate rules or precedents have come in the process of calm deliberation. Virtually all of them have come at the height of partisan feeling engendered by bitter debate on highly controversial issues. Members of the Senate, of all parties and all shades of political opinion and background, have reached these highly partisan stages in the past, and there is no reason to believe that they would not be reached at some stage in the future.

An example of a type of partisanship that obscures calm thinking about this most serious change in our legislative procedure can be found in the recent efforts of Members of the minority party in the Senate to force hasty and pell-mell action upon the rules change. This effort could not have been planned without the knowledge that it would disrupt all activity of the Senate, and perhaps permanently block action on a general legislative program recently endorsed by the electorate of the country. Such a fundamental change in the very nature of our Government deserves consideration in an atmosphere much clearer of partisanship.

WASHINGTON'S WARNING

It was partisanship of this nature that was warned against by George Washington in his Farewell Address:

"I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the State with particular reference to the founding of them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

"This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind. It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed, but in those of the popular forum it is seen in its greatest rankness and is truly their worst enemy. Without looking forward to any extremity of this kind, which nevertheless ought not be entirely out of sight, the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit of party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it."

With this very pointed reminder of the dangers of partisanship and party government, it is worth reflecting upon the reasons which have enabled this country to avoid the pitfalls described. There is general agreement that the stability of our two-party system, with neither party drawn along class or geographical lines, has been a major cause of the stability of our Government. There has been bitter partisanship at times, and various periods when one party has overwhelmingly dominated one or both branches of the Congress, the most recent having been only 12 years ago, when 76 of the 96 Members of the Senate were Democrats.

What, in periods such as these, has prevented the partisan purposes of the majority party from completely crushing the opposition, running roughshod over efforts that might have been called attempts to delay or obstruct the will of the majority? The answer can be found in the rules of the Senate, with their provisions for free and unlimited debate, for the opportunity of full presentation to the people of the country of every point of view on legislative issues. Free debate in the Senate has become the bulwark of the two-party system during those periods when overwhelming sentiment in the country appeared to be threatening the institution. Debate in the Senate has made clear division over issues at times when it might appear that the minority point of view would be without a champion.

CHALLENGE

In the testimony favoring limitation on debate in the Senate presented to the committee, a great deal of theoretical handicaps and weaknesses of the present rules were presented, but the proponents of change failed to present one single example of any real injury to the American people caused by the delay on legislation due to extended debate. The opponents to change in the rules extend a challenge to the proponents to show such injury at any time since the free debate rule was instituted in the Senate in 1806. This challenge was made early during the hearings on this subject, and was unanswered throughout that period. It is now specifically renewed.

Very lengthy and detailed studies have been made in regard to so-called filibuster efforts down through the history of the Senate. These studies show that on a number of occasions legislation has been delayed by lengthy argument, but that in very few cases has a bill been to all purposes defeated without a vote after having been debated on the floor of the Senate. Legislation has been erroneously reported as having been defeated by filibuster when it has actually only been delayed, with passage usually coming in an amended form. There is general agreement that these amended versions have been better laws in each case.

The printed hearings of the Rules Committee on the debate limitation question provide on pages 25 and 26 a documentary listing of later action on bills which were the subject of extended debate or filibusters. Of the important measures which can be described as definitely defeated by filibusters, the list dwindles down to five:

1. The force bill of 1890.
2. The armed-ship bill of 1917.
3. Antilynch bills.
4. Anti-poll-tax bills.
5. The Fair Employment Practices Commission bill of 1946.

There is now general agreement among all schools of thought, no matter what the views about Federal supervision of election processes, that the famous force bill of 1890, with its provision for Federal control of elections in the South with the use of Federal troops, was unwise legislation. We now realize that it developed from the partisan feeling that remained following the War Between the States, and that its eventual defeat through the process of a filibuster has served the best interest of our Nation.

ARMED-SHIP CONTROVERSY

The armed-ship bill of 1917 was important to the defense program of President Woodrow Wilson in the period immediately preceding World War I. Opponents were able to block its passage during the lame-duck

session of the outgoing Congress, but immediately after this the President found authority to take this action without a new law, and our merchant ships were armed without any action being necessary by the special session of the war Congress that shortly convened. There is little doubt but that the bill would have been passed had the President desired it.

The three remaining bills that have been blocked by extended debate are part of the so-called civil-rights legislative program. There is ample reason to believe that their failure of passage is the motivating cause behind the present very extreme effort to change the time-tested rules of the Senate. Will the Senate be wise in taking such action to satisfy the temporary demands of a highly emotional pressure group? In the long legislative cycle, we know that this group will be succeeded in time by another group. Should the precedent be established for the amendment of Senate procedure whenever that procedure is considered a stumbling block in the face of demands of any powerful pressure bloc?

Each one of the so-called civil-rights bills that has reached the floor of the Senate has been of gravely doubtful constitutionality. Even some of the present most ardent sponsors of an antilynching law agree that the early Dyer Act and the later versions of this bill contained unconstitutional provisions. The extent to which the constitutionality of an anti-poll-tax bill is doubted can be best demonstrated by the fact that 10 Democratic Senators have submitted a constitutional amendment dealing with that subject, believing that to be the manner in which Congress should take action on a suffrage question. The FEPC proposal of 1946 contained provisions which have been universally decried as violating the constitutional requirements of a fair and impartial trial.

It would be superfluous to add that this type of legislation is conceded to be aimed at one section of the country, a type of action contradictory to the long-established American governmental principles first enunciated by President Washington. Have the American people suffered any injury through the defeat of these measures by use of prolonged debate?

BENEFITS OF DEBATE

Our recent legislative history offers very impressive testimony to show direct benefits that have been achieved through the system of extended and prolonged debate in the Senate. Two measures which were highly popular in the excited tempo of the times were defeated in the Senate because both the Members of the body and the citizens of the country as a whole had an opportunity to take a second and more detached thought on the matter.

In 1937, after the Supreme Court had ruled as unconstitutional several popular measures that were considered vital to the economic-recovery program, a plan was submitted to enlarge the Court and make other changes in its personnel—the so-called court-packing plan. It is generally conceded that this plan would have passed the Senate by a fair majority if it had come to an early vote. Instead, opposition leaders adopted the strategy of delay. After a few months a majority of the Senate came to the conclusion that most of them hold today—that such action would have changed the fundamental nature of our Government, to the disadvantage of all of us.

A more recent case was that of the railroad strike of 1946, when it was recommended that striking employees be conscripted into the military service. Legislation to this effect passed the House of Representatives within a few minutes after the recommendation had been made. In the Senate, however, traditional procedure prevented hasty action or the invoking of any type of cloture, and the conscription plan was soon discarded as unwise.

There have been recent cases where prolonged debate has been the major factor in the passage of bills that were at a doubtful stage when first brought to the floor of the Senate. Two cornerstones of our recent foreign policy, the Lend-Lease Act of 1941 and the loan to Britain of 1946, both gained important support during the process of a lengthy debate.

NATIONAL EMERGENCY

The question has been raised that recent international history, with its record of totalitarianism disrupting the world, introduces the possibility of some misguided or disloyal handful of Senators obstructing emergency action designed to protect the physical security of the Nation. The possibility seems remote, but it is well to be prepared for any remote possibility in planning for the security of our country. To take adequate steps for such a situation, two of the authors of this minority report submitted to the Committee on Rules the following proposed amendment to rule XXII:

"If at any time a motion, signed by 86 Senators, is presented to bring to a close the debate upon any measure on the Senate Calendar (and a Senator having the floor may be interrupted for this purpose), the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and declare the measure the unfinished business of the Senate. Two hours after the motion has been stated (unless the motion itself as filed shall specify a longer time for debate, which specification, if any, shall control), the Senate shall proceed to vote on the passage of the measure by a yea-and-nay vote. At least one-half of the full time allowed for debate shall be allotted to Members who do not sign the motion. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the motion has been filed. No dilatory motion shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

The committee saw fit to reject this suggestion, but it is still available for the consideration of all Members of the Senate who would like to make preparation for action on national emergency matters and at the same time not break down the traditional safeguards for free debate.

Every evidence available indicates that the present cloture amendment to rule XXII was adopted only because the Senate considered it as a formula which would allow action on national emergency matters. The President, the Senate, and the country were angry following the action against the armed-ship resolution. President Wilson asked for a cloture rule because there existed "a crisis of extraordinary peril." A bipartisan group of Senators wrote and adopted the resolution with this thought in mind, and there were only three votes in opposition. Many of the Senators voting in favor of the resolution, including several who had filibustered against the armed-ship measure, had participated in filibusters previously and were to participate in them later. They considered themselves dealing with a national emergency involving the physical security of the country, as evidenced by the debate and newspaper accounts of the time.

MAJORITY RULE

This momentous change in the rules has been supported on the theory that it will implement majority rule in the Nation. This is a plausible theory that has its attractions, until a check is made of the actual representation in the Senate. Senators represent States, and not proportions of our population. It is possible for various combinations of 49 Senators to represent anywhere from 20 to 80 percent of the population of the country. Would it be rule by popular majority to say that 49 Senators representing only one-fifth of the citizens should have the power to run roughshod over the wishes of 47 representing four-fifths of the population?

To carry the illustration even further, it would be possible under a two-thirds rule for 64 Senators, representing less than one-third of our population, to run a steam roller over the opposition of 32 Senators, representing more than two-thirds of our population.

The effort to preserve this vital representation to each State is one of the primary causes of the tradition of free and unlimited debate in the Senate. The very geographic boundaries of our States sometimes cause conflicts with neighboring States that can be resolved only by action through the Congress. It is vital that the representatives of these States in the Senate have full and free opportunity to present their case.

Our founding fathers recognized the vital issues that might develop with the representation of the States in the Senate, and it was because of this that they made this representation the only provision in the Constitution that could not be amended or deleted.

The number of Senators who have been recorded as changing their views on the subject of cloture after a period of service in the Senate is impressive. Many have been recorded against any type of cloture after having initially favored it, while others have changed from favoring majority cloture to a less restrictive pattern.

It is well enough to talk about streamlining the rules of the Senate and avoiding an alleged waste of time, but when it comes to materially altering one of the fundamental principles which has controlled the operation of the body for many decades, and around which the Senate's most cherished and valued tradition has been built, we can realize the gravity of the subject matter with which we deal.

Unlimited debate on the floor of the United States Senate has become one of the major safeguards of American liberty. Those who seek to change this rule in the name of liberty may well pause to consider the dangerous precedent they are considering. A procedure which is today used to protect the rights of the States may be used tomorrow to protect the right of the individuals of a minority race or religion. The gag rule which some labor and minority groups now seek could be used in the future to deprive them of fundamental rights for which they have fought so hard.

BULWARKS OF LIBERTY

The major bulwarks of our liberty are the Constitution, our common law, and the free debate of the Senate. All safeguards of liberty are designed to prevent undue and unjust actions against a minority, and Senate debate is certainly so designed.

Debate is man's greatest political invention. It is the mother of parliamentary law. Because the United States Senate is the only parliamentary body in the world that has retained unlimited debate, the prestige of the Senate has grown to overshadow all similar bodies throughout the world. It is important that this symbol of free exchange of ideas should not be disturbed.

There are naturally abuses of free speech in the Senate, just as there are abuses of free speech on the part of private citizens. We should retain this freedom by something other than rigid rules that can be bent to the will of partisanship.

We know all too well the waves of emotionalism that actually do sweep across an entire nation at times, threatening to impair or destroy man's heritage of political, economic, and even religious freedom that is the product of centuries of effort.

We can find all too recent evidences in American history of political prejudice run rampant. Only 100 years ago prejudice against one particular religious group became so strong that the Know-Nothings, the political party built around this prejudice, attained for a brief period the status of the second major party in the Nation. No more than a quarter century ago a secret group, feeding primarily on religious prejudice, succeeded in grabbing political control of several States of our Nation—and these efforts were most successful outside the South.

But, as can be found in no other nation in the world, if any of our political, social, or religious groups find themselves under serious, sustained attack, they know that they have, as a last and effective place of refuge, the floor of the United States Senate. This condition did not just happen—it is the result of the tradition of freedom that finds expression on this same floor.

If the Senate has a majority cloture rule, or it begins to whittle away, bit by bit, the freedom of expression that has flowered there for so long, we will have taken a long step away from our heritage of freedom.

JOHN C. STENNIS.
RUSSELL B. LONG.
LESTER C. HUNT.

Mr. President, it is not only in the Senate that we find this sentiment, but we find it prevailing among others throughout the Nation. I hold in my hand the magazine, Business Week, of March 12, 1949. In it there is an editorial on the subject we are now discussing. Listen to what the editorial writer has to say:

THE TYRANNY OF THE MAJORITY

Filibustering has become a horrid word in the American language. It has been described in the mildest terms of its critics as a technical evil connected with the machinery of law making.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ANDERSON in the chair). Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Mississippi for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question only.

Mr. EASTLAND. The distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina would certainly not engage in a filibuster, would he?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I may answer the Senator's question by saying that I do not know what he considers to be a filibuster. But I should like to explain in detail what I think of the proposed change of rule XXII. For that reason some may classify my discussion, because of is length, as being a filibuster. It is up to the newspapers or any individuals to classify it as they see fit. If I can do something for my people in an effort to try to keep legislation from being passed in the United States Senate which will be, as I think, detrimental to the people of the Nation, then I am willing for people to call what I do a filibuster, if they so desire.

I continue to read from the editorial:

It has been cursed and condemned as a device against democratic decision.

The sharpest criticism has been leveled at filibusters in recent times by those who carry the "liberal" label. They are good and mad at the southern Democrats. They lambast the southerners in the Senate for filibustering against all attempts to put civil-rights legislation on the Federal statute books.

Unconsciously, the zeal of the so-called liberals has befogged their minds. Unwittingly, they are sniping at democracy and liberty. They assert that what they are seeking is a further expression of democracy, and that they are going after it in the democratic way. But they obviously are not remembering their American history.

LESSONS OF HISTORY

A refresher course would remind them right at the beginning that this Nation's Government was framed to avoid tyranny in any form. The drafters of the Constitution put in safeguards against despotic power in any hands.

The founding fathers went to great pains to set up a system of checks and balances. They apportioned power among the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government. They determined to place checks on the powers of all—even the powers of the people who had the right to vote. Thomas Jefferson, for example, was convinced that government by a simple majority could be as despotic as the one-man tyranny of the British King.

This aversion to simple majority rule explains the make-up of the Senate. The upper House of Congress was designed deliberately as an offset to the popularly elected House of Representatives. Each State has an equal number of Senators, regardless of population. The Senators are elected for a term three times as long as the Representatives, and only one-third of the Senate comes up for election every 2 years. Obviously, the Senate was never intended to perform its functions and reach its decisions by snap judgments of temporary majorities. It is supposed to function only after the careful deliberation permitted by unlimited debate.

Through the years when slavery was the big national issue, there were great debates. The North sought to impose its will on the minority of States. The South clamored for States' rights. After a war was fought to preserve the Union, President Lincoln was moved to say:

"There is too much desire on the part of some of our very good friends to be masters, to interfere with and dictate to those (southern) States, to treat the people not as fellow citizens; there is too little respect for their rights."

The fundamental belief in the democratic rights of a substantial minority has never been successfully submerged. It has been the salvation, in turn, of both conservatives and liberals. The latter certainly can recall the power of the individual expressions of such liberals as the two La Follettes—expressions which took the form of filibusters more than once. In a speech against cloture, the elder Senator La Follette said:

"Believing that I stand for democracy, for the liberties of the people of this country, for the perpetuation of our free institutions, I shall stand while I am a Member of this body against any cloture that denies free and unlimited debate. Sir, the moment that the majority imposes the restriction contained in the pending rule, that moment you will have dealt a blow to liberty. * * *"

Full and free debate in the Senate is more than a precious heritage. It is more than an effort to protect the right of free discussion. It is an expression of the doctrine that no one group should be in a position where it could beat down all opponents mercilessly. The doctrine states that important minorities should be persuaded and must not be coerced. No one group should be able to impose its own opinions, its interests, its views on others if, by so doing, the vital interests of other groups are not at all respected. This is the practical core of American Government in operation.

LONG-STANDING TRADITION

The principle, of course, is not written down in black and white as a Government law. It is simply a tradition. There is serious doubt whether it could ever be made official. But it is workable nevertheless.

Any infringement of the right of unlimited debate in the Senate would lead to coercion of important minorities. Stifled debate would give to the majority free and careless sway over legislation. This would defeat the basic American idea that all absolute power must be limited—including the power of the majority of the moment.

As long as there are conflicts between the majorities and the minorities, there will be dilatory debate of some sort. And delay is not easy to accept. But an intelligent majority will be wise to accept some measure of delay if it is really convinced that its objective is basically sound.

Filibustering admittedly is a negative device. But so is a brake on an automobile. The brake can check the speed of the car if it gets out of control. Filibustering is useful when it checks the impulses of an unscrupulous or an inconsiderate majority. In the present situation, filibustering is not directed solely against the passage of civil-rights legislation. The filibuster is being employed to curb the headlong enactment of an ill-advised administration program fraught with great peril to a free society.

I could not express my way of thinking any better than that editorial from Business Week.

There have been attempts to bring into this debate many issues and isms which do not rightly belong there. The real and only question now before the Senate is the adoption or rejection of the resolution (S. Res. 15) which, if adopted, would limit the remarks of any Senator to not exceeding 1 hour during the entire course of the given measure. And, do not forget, Mr. President, that this drastic change in the time-honored rules of this Senate would apply not just to the much-talked-of civil-rights bill, but to any measure. Once we adopt Senate Resolution 15 we burn our bridges, we cross the Rubicon, and there is little chance of our getting back. I make the solemn prediction at this time that if this resolution is adopted there are many who are crying loudest for it who will deeply regret the difficulties in which they will find themselves in years to come and will rue the day when this rule of the Senate was changed. Let us, Mr. President, think carefully before taking such an important and possibly—yea I say, probably—dangerous step calculated to throttle free speech and freedom of thought in orderly legislation.

I can quote no better authority for what I am saying than a man for whom every Senator, whether on this or the other side of the aisle, has great respect. I refer to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. Debating this very resolution a few days ago the Senator from Texas said:

I am so strongly opposed to the invasion of the freedom of debate in the Senate of the United States that I lose no opportunity to express my opposition to changes in the rules of the character now being pressed upon us.

According to my conception, the Senate of the United States is the last great forum for debate in the world. It is the last great retreat for freedom of discussion of all public questions. It is free from the dictatorship of totalitarianism. It is free from the tyranny of partisan and group pressures upon the public opinion of the world.

The Senate of the United States ought to remain one place where public servants may stand and assert their views and their opinions for the benefit of their constituents, without impairment and without invasion.

Mr. President, it is much easier to lose a right than to gain it. I thought so then, and I have since felt, that one of the greatest mistakes of my party was in 1936, when at the Democratic National Convention at Philadelphia we abolished the two-thirds rule.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask my collegaue how South Carolina voted on the question of abolishing the two-thirds rule?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am glad to answer that question, for I was present at that time, and the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] also was present as a delegate. South Carolina cast its vote against the change of the two-thirds rule.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from South Carolina another question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield further to his colleague?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I shall be glad to yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to ask this question: In the magazine Business Week there appears an article entitled "Tyranny of the Majority"; and I wish to ask my colleague whether he has had an opportunity to read that article, despite the time he has had to take in preparing his speech.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to answer that question by saying that I have read the article; and at the very beginning of my speech I read it into the RECORD as a part of my remarks, and it will be incorporated in the RECORD in that way.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to ask my colleague whether he agrees with everything that is said in that article?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I agree with everything that is said in that article or editorial. It is very much to the point. It does not elaborate too much, and it is written in such a style that anyone can understand what the writer is discussing. As I see it, it is good political philosophy.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield further?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a further question.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the Senator this question: Does he believe entirely in the theory expounded in the Senate by the late Senator Bob La Follette, as referred to in the article to which I have just referred?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes, Mr. President. In my opinion, Bob La Follette was one of the great Members of the United States Senate. So far as this particular point is concerned and involved at the present time, he really knew what he was talking about; and if his advice were followed, it would be for the best interests of the people of the Nation.

Mr. President, returning to a discussion of the Democratic National Convention, let me say that at that convention I fought hard as a delegate—having gone there as Governor of my State—to hold the Democratic Party to the precepts of the Jackson way of thinking and the way of Woodrow Wilson.

Mr. President, let me go even further back in our history and say that from the very beginning of the Republic, safeguards have been placed around the protection of the smaller States. The founding fathers recognized this when Delaware, the first State to ratify the Constitution, was given the same representation in this body as was New York.

Too fast, Mr. President, have we permitted to slip away from us, sometimes with only feeble protest, sometimes without any protest whatever, a God-given right to protect the smaller from the greater. Yes; I believe in the right of a majority when properly exercised, but I protest most vigorously against having a majority run roughshod over the rights of the minority. We, of the South, have lived through these more than 150 years of our national existence as a minority part of our great Nation. We have suffered, at times very much; we have fought a bloody war with our brothers of the North on this very principle.

Mr. President, directly along that line, let me read from a statement which I made in Chicago on the 28th of January of this year, before the Executives' Club:

UNDERSTANDING THE SOUTH

Probably the South has more devoted friends and more enemies than any other region of the country.

Many people among both groups have given a distorted picture of the true South to people in other sections. The southerner who makes a profession of being a southerner would have you believe the South is a land of moonlight, magnolias, and roses, ladies of tender beauty and gallant, vigorous men, a wonderful climate and gracious, abundant living for all—without exerting any effort. [Laughter.]

On the other hand, visitors, outside novelists, and newspaper writers, have often pictured the South as a region of total ignorance, poverty, prejudice, and oppressed people. Somewhere between these two extremes we find the real South.

The South is a favored land, and today this country's greatest opportunities lie within her boundaries.

In order to understand the South and southern people we must have some knowledge of her economic and social history. Pioneer settlers found there fertile lands, long growing seasons, abundant rainfall—ideal conditions for the development of an agrarian economy. Thus the South rapidly became the plantation region supplying the indigo, rice, and fiber crops for the commercial markets of the world.

Northern slave traders—not everyone from that region which now calls all southerners cruel and brutal has always been humane and kindly toward the Negro citizen—found that the southern climate and cotton culture were adaptable to the use of Negro slave labor.

By 1860 the South was agriculture and agriculture was the South.

We know the history of the Civil War and how the South lost not only the war, but its finest manhood; its farms were devastated, factories leveled, transportation destroyed.

The South which but a few short years before was fabulously prosperous now lay prostrate. The women, the very young, the very old, and the few surviving veterans faced the task of reconstruction—without tools and without capital—and without the benefit of any UNRRA or Economic Cooperation Administration.

Our people did not even receive sympathetic treatment at the hands of the victorious North. They were humiliated, harassed, and pillaged.

Cotton was the only crop which we could exchange for money. Cotton was the only crop around which we could develop a new economy. Cotton was enthroned as King and he has been a benevolent but at times ineffective monarch.

It took 50 years to soften the shock caused by the terrible impact of that defeat—a half-century before our people could begin to recover. With no industry and a one-crop system and that crop heavily taxed to provide money to pay pensions to the victorious Union soldiers, is there any wonder that the people of the South—proud and noble in their heritage—have remained stubbornly independent?

OPPORTUNITIES IN THE SOUTH

At the turn of the twentieth century men of ability and vision began to accumulate some wealth and to become aware of our opportunities.

This awakening was early demonstrated in diversification of our farming. Today, cotton accounts for less than one-sixth of the South's agricultural income. The remainder we get from livestock, tobacco, vegetables, grain, and fruits—my own county of Spartanburg in the Piedmont section has more peach trees and ships more peaches than any other county in the United States. And for your further information, during the last 2 years that one county shipped more peaches than the whole State of Georgia, although Georgia is called "The Peach State." [Laughter and applause.]

From South Carolina's farms today we ship everything from shrimp and oysters to blue-mold cheese—and they come from opposite boundaries of the State.

An interesting sidelight which I might interject at this point is that blue-mold cheese—we formerly imported all of this product from France and called it Roquefort—is produced in an abandoned tunnel, which was started through the Blue Ridge Mountains for a railroad line during the Civil War.

Today, Chester County, S. C., is an unquestioned leader among Guernsey cattle producers.

Cotton is no longer King. Cotton is rapidly taking its rightful place in a balanced agricultural economy and an economy that is achieving its rightful balance of industry.

South Carolina leads the Nation in active textile-spindle hours. Last year we operated 26.8 percent of the Nation's spindle activity. Since January 1945—4 short years—South Carolina has built, or announced, new textile plants amounting to $163,200,000. This represents 169 new plants. Many of them are in the allied garment and clothing field, but the principal expenditure has been in the erection and equipment of plants directly involved in the main textile process of spinning, weaving, and finishing. And, by the way, I'm an expert, I think, when it comes to the textiles, for I have done everything in a cotton mill, from sweeping right on up. I started off as a sweeper, at 25 cents

a day, so you can see what has developed in South Carolina. Twenty-five cents a day! I checked up, and the average hourly wage in South Carolina in the textiles today is right around 95 cents per hour, showing a great increase in what they pay to the workers in the mills. So we have expanded greatly down there.

Mr. President, there is another thing I cannot refrain from calling to the attention of my colleagues at the present time. The impression is abroad among certain people that the colored population will continue to be a problem of the South alone. That is not true. In 1920 the population of South Carolina was 58 percent colored, 42 percent white. Today it is exactly the reverse—42 percent colored, 58 percent white. Where are the colored? Some of them will be found in Chicago, some in Philadelphia, some in Washington, D. C. The so-called problem, which I think we have handled very efficiently in the South, is therefore becoming a problem of other States, and it will become increasingly their problem in the future.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the junior Senator from South Carolina yield to his colleague for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am glad to yield for a question only.

Mr. MAYBANK. I ask my colleague, does he believe the textile workers of South Carolina, with whom he is well acquainted, believe in a change of the rules of the United States Senate?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think I can speak for the majority of them, for I believe I am close to them. I would say that practically 100 percent of them do not think the rule should be changed.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the junior Senator from South Carolina yield further to his colleague?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MAYBANK. The question I would ask the Senator is, If they do not believe in a change of the rule, then they are in thorough accord with the democratic principles of the United States Senate, under which they grew up, are they not?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I agree with everything the Senator has said. I also want to state that I have not received one letter, one telegram, one communication from any worker in South Carolina protesting that we should not go ahead and fight the change of the rule.

I noticed another thing. In reading, a few moments ago, I stated that somebody criticized the South for being uneducated.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the junior Senator from South Carolina yield to his colleague for a further question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. I want to ask the Senator a question about education. As Governor of South Carolina, did he not aid in every way possible, and, as Governor of South Carolina, did I not aid in every way possible, in the education of the underprivileged and of those who, it is thought, will be benefited by the rule change, but who really would be harmed by it, both black and white?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I commend the Senator from South Carolina for what he did for the South Carolina school system while he was Governor. Every year the appropriations were increased for both white and colored. I am also glad to state it will be found that during my term as Governor the educational appropriation was increased every year. The record will show that the appropriation during my administration was doubled for the colored people of my State.

Mr. President, I think that shows that we are trying to do the best we can. A great many Senators realize that South Carolina is not one of the wealthiest States in the Union, and that we are limited as to what we can do for our people, but we mean to continue to progress as more industries, more capital, and more taxes come in. We intend to move forward.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the Senator if he is familiar with the great housing progress we have made for colored people, and if he has read page 1767 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which shows telegrams sent to me as chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee in regard to the large number of houses which colored people have been afforded throughout the State? I ask the Senator if he remembers that it is shown in the RECORD that colored people have received more housing units than have the white people in Charleston and Columbia?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct. The two cities named by the Senator are the largest cities in our State.

Speaking of education, Mr. President, South Carolina is not the illiterate State which many people consider it to be. If one will read the census of 1940, he will find that South Carolina and Arizona led the Nation in the percentage of white persons 25 years of age or over who had completed 4 years of college training. Those two States were tied for first place, with 7 percent each. I think this is a wholesome index which I believe will aid in improving educational conditions of future generations of my State. We ask for nothing except to be permitted to run our State affairs, and we want other States to run their affairs.

Many years ago, a great jurist and a great American, while serving in this very body, expressed in more eloquent language than I can the very idea that I wish to get across. I refer to an address by the late Chief Justice Edward Douglass White, a great son of the South, a Confederate soldier, who when a Senator from the great State of Louisiana, in the debate on the option bill, House bill 7845, in 1890, and speaking in protest against the attempt to place unfair discriminatory measures against the cotton-growing States, made such a speech in this Chamber as to cause some to compare him to Gladstone. I shall quote only one brief statement therefrom:

Mr. President—

Said the then Senator White—

> I think we ought to be entitled to discuss this measure without sneer, without gibe, without reaching out the hand to stir up—I was going to say smouldering ashes of past conflicts; but, thank God, even the ashes of that conflict have passed away; I know the American people have forgotten it, except for the lessons which it has taught us all, that within the walls of the Constitution and by adherence and respect for it, united in a common brotherhood, lie alone our future hope of happiness and protection.
>
> The surest way, Mr. President, to destroy the very heart of constitutional government is to take short cuts and bypass those fundamental guaranties which were vouchsafed to us by the framers of the great Constitution which has been second only to the Bible in its sacredness to the American people. From time to time there are efforts made in this very assemblage to accomplish changes in our Government which can be done only if we are to respect and follow the Constitution by the methods set forth in the Constitution. I realize and recognize that there are some measures which my friends from other sections of this country want and which have merit but, Mr. President, let those who advocate the abolition of the poll tax do it within the framework, or, as Justice White so well said, the walls of the Constitution. There is pending in my State at this time a resolution to abolish the poll tax, and I can say, I think, without danger of contradiction, that the majority of the Southern States feel that whatever purpose this measure served in the past, with changing conditions there is no great need for it now, but we resent and we shall not submit to legislation designed by this Congress which singles out the South and seeks to punish it. Today, Mr. President, we of the South are in the minority even though a part of a majority political party. Would not any minority do what we are doing? We insist that the rules designed to protect the interest of a minority group remain unchanged. Again I wish to quote from the eloquent speech of Senator CONNALLY:

> Mr. President, the rules of the Senate have endured for a great many years. They were adopted for the orderly procedure of this body. What is this body after all? It is more than a city council. It is the Senate of the United States, and in the formation of the Union, it is my belief that the Senate was devised as a check and balance against the House of Representatives, and the House of Representatives in a measure was designed as a check and balance against the Senate of the United States. The basis of the selection of Senators and of Members of the House of Representatives is different. One is based upon population, the other upon State sovereignty, regardless of population, regardless of riches, regardless of any other consideration except the sovereignty of the individual State. Senators say, "We are satisfied with the law in our own States, but we are not satisfied with the law in some other States. We have a bill which we want to pass, and we cannot pass it comfortably, easily, and expeditiously unless we get rid of this obstacle. We want to regulate suffrage in other States.

Under the Constitution, of course, each State is empowered to regulate its own suffrage, and enact its own domestic laws. Senators should bear in mind that the Constitutional Convention which acted upon the Constitution was not a mass meeting; it was not a city-hall caucus. It was a meeting of representatives of the States, who assembled at Philadelphia to write the Constitution of the United States. That fact must always be borne in mind. It was not an act of individuals as such, but the act of representatives of the States of the Union.

Mr. President, we are reminded that in that Convention the States were jealous of their rights. They were anxious not to surrender their sovereignty and their rights, and they carefully guarded against merging all the States into one conglomerate mass.

Having talked a little while about the rights and safeguards of minorities and the constitutional guaranties for the smaller States, I want to come more directly to this proposed change in the rule, which would permit cloture to be applied to a motion or other proceedings before the Senate, the same as it can now be applied to pending measures.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question only.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Before the Senator gets away from the question of representation in the Constitutional Convention, may I ask this question: Is it not true that the men who were in that Convention representing the 13 sovereign States, by reason of their experience in carrying on the War of Independence against the strongly concentrated power demonstrated by the King of England in the repressive measures he took against the Colonies, were doubly insistent that any government they set up should avoid that centralization, and that the sovereignty which vested in the 13 States should remain intact, and that the Union which they formed should be a union of sovereign States bound together for the common good of all, but with sovereignty remaining in each individual State?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is true that the founding fathers, when they met in that Convention, took into consideration what they thought to be the best interests of the States and of the Nation, and they set up such form of government as they believed would protect the States against encroachment on the rights they had. To illustrate that point, it will be found that in setting up our form of government they divided the Government into the executive, the judicial, and the legislative, and the executive was not to infringe upon the rights of the judicial or the legislative. Then it will be found that in the legislative branch there were certain fields in which Congress could operate, and Congress was not supposed to encroach upon the rights of the other two departments. The same thing is true with respect to the courts of the land. It will be found also that it is specifically stated in the Constitution that all rights not delegated to the Federal Government are reserved to the States.

Mr. SPARKMAN. With reference to the point the Senator just made about the powers being specifically reserved to the States, is it not true that that is particularly set forth in one of the first 10 amendments, in fact, in the tenth amendment itself, and that before the States would agree to ratify the Constitution they had to have reasonable assurance that such amendments would be proposed in the very first session of the Congress? Is it not also true that in the very first session of the Congress which met those 10 amendments guaranteeing the various freedoms, the so-called Bill of Rights, and guaranteeing that the powers would remain lodged in the States, where they had always been vested, were offered, and were ratified by the several States soon thereafter?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is true that the first 10 amendments to the Constitution were adopted immediately after its ratification, and it is my understanding of history that if the States had not been assured of their adoption, it never would have been possible to get the States to ratify the Constitution which had been submitted to them. There was more or less an agreement that that would happen.

To hear some of the remarks in this Chamber about cloture, one would think that a great deliberative body such as the Senate cannot possibly operate without cloture, yet I would call your attention, Mr. President, to the fact that for 111 years, until as recently as our entrance into the First World War, in 1917, there was no cloture rule applicable to debate in the Senate. It was in 1917 that the present rule XXII was made a part of the Standing Rules of the Senate, subsection 2 of which it is proposed to change by the Hayden-Wherry resolution, Senate Resolution 15. Let us take a glance at the history of this drastic departure from a tried practice for more than a century.

The demand for the rule arose because toward the end of that session of Congress, a measure to authorize the President to arm merchant ships was defeated by use of the filibuster method. It was necessary for the Senate to adjourn without enacting this legislation. After the adjournment of the Senate there was found a method by which the effect could be realized and the ships armed without legislative authority. Nevertheless, as the result of the agitation, discussion, and delay brought about by that filibuster, the Senate, when it next met, adopted rule XXII and it has been our guiding rule on this subject for the past third of a century.

During these 32 years there have been 20 attempts to apply cloture to measures pending in the Senate, only 4 of which were successful. It is important to note that in the past 22 years no measure has had cloture applied while pending in the Senate. It seems to me if the Nation was able to conclude all the matters relating to World War I and, thus far, the intricate and delicate aftermath problems of even a greater war, without the necessity of a change in the rule adopted in 1917, we should go slowly and think carefully before changing it to accomplish the unworthy purpose of singling out one section of this great Nation for special attention and chastisement.

There is one thing this country needs to recognize and that is that we are not at war. Yes, I know the situation is serious, perhaps grave is a better word, but there is too much disposition to take away from our citizens rights sacred to them from the very beginning of our history, yea guaranteed to our forefathers at Runnymede in the Magna Carta, and it is sought to take away these God-given rights, bought with precious blood, under the pretext that the state of emergency calls for procedures never before attempted. Do not misunderstand me, Mr. President. I fought in the First World War, and if we were drawn into a third great world conflict, which God forbid, my great regret would be that my age would be such as to make me of little use as a doughboy, and I am afraid my size would make me too good a target for the enemy's bullet, but I want to say to the Senate that if our Nation were in peril, I would go just as far as our great majority leader, or any Senator on either side of the aisle, in taking measures necessary to safeguard the Republic.

But, Mr. President, we are not at war. No emergency in that sense exists. No crisis is actually at hand, the commentators to the contrary notwithstanding, which reminds me of a little story coming from my State of South Carolina where the finest potatoes in the world grow—I mean sweetpotatoes.

Mr. President, sometimes I feel it is almost disrespectful to the South Carolina yams to refer to them as plain potatoes. And that brings me to my story, with apologies to the Senators from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER and Mrs. SMITH] and my colleague from Idaho. It is said that on one occasion there was a romance between a Maine potato and an Idaho potato and in due time there was a little sweetpotato, but then the problem became acute for neither the spud from Maine nor the spud from Idaho would consent to its offspring marrying a common-tator.

So, Mr. President, I say let us stop listening so much to the commentators and those who are constantly crying wolf, and think soundly as to what is best not just for my beloved South, but for the entire Nation, for I say without hesitation that if Members of this body attempt to ram this thing down the throats of the South, the day will come when the chickens will come home to roost and Senators will in their own States, far removed from Dixie, suffer along with us.

Yes, Mr. President, no crisis is at hand to justify this thing. There is no great development in government requiring application of the rule or the changing of the rule in its application to measures before the Senate. Then, why all this fuss and furor about changing the rule? No Senator in this Chamber is fooled. It has been very clearly set forth that

the sole purpose is to enable those who are pressing for passage of the so-called civil-rights program to undertake to get those measures enacted by the Congress. I submit neither one of those matters involve an emergency. In times even more peaceful than today such measures have been proposed, only to be promptly and properly defeated. The right of freedom of speech and freedom to legislate in the orderly and constitutional manner is important, Mr. President. We have a real duty to defend and uphold it.

At this time I would like to quote parts of the very able address made before this body by my distinguished friend, the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY]:

There are many questions that come before the Senate with respect to which a two-thirds majority is required. I should like briefly to call the attention of the Senate to just a few of those questions.

First, a Senator cannot be expelled unless two-thirds of the Senators vote for his expulsion.

Second, no official can be impeached except by two-thirds of those voting.

Third, the President's veto can be overriden only by a two-thirds vote.

Fourth, all treaties must receive a two-thirds vote before they can be ratified.

Fifth, no amendment to the Constitution can be submitted to the several States for ratification until two-thirds of the Senators voting have approved, and then it is required that favorable action shall be taken by three-fourths of the States before a proposed constitutional amendment can become effective.

Sixth, no person shall be convicted on impeachment without the concurrence of two-thirds of the Senators present.

Finally, when the choice of President shall devolve upon the House of Representatives, a quorum shall consist of the Member or Members from two-thirds of the various States of the Union. Furthermore, a quorum of the Senate, in choosing a Vice President, shall consist of two-thirds of the whole number of Senators.

It is manifest from this that the founders of our Government and the framers of our Constitution thought it essential and necessary that two-thirds at least of the Senate should give their approval of any matter of vital importance before action could be concluded. Certainly there could be nothing of greater importance to either the Senate or to the country than the right of free and unlimited debate in the Senate. I am wondering what the Senate would be like if we should take away the right fully and freely to discuss measures pending before this body.

Mr. President, I need not repeat that the United States Senate is the only open forum in the world, the only place in which there is free and unlimited debate, the only place in which the rights of people may be adequately presented and endlessly proclaimed. I do not believe we should sacrifice that power of the Senate. I do not believe we should liquidate its prestige.

In the discussion of this matter it seems to me that we should very earnestly inquire as to why the necessity for this change of the rule. Can anyone point to any important public measure which has been denied adoption by virtue of the existence of this Senate rule? Can anyone point to any measure which would be in the interest of the American people which has been defeated because of the existence of this rule? Is the purpose of the proposed change in the rule to make the Senate more efficient in the transaction of its business? Is it the purpose to expedite the business in the Senate? If so, it will fail miserably in the accomplishment of that result.

The reason why I say that, Mr. President, is that very little time of the Senate has ever been consumed by filibusters. The time of the Senate is wasted by reason of numerous discussions over trivial matters, extended from day to day, to which the proposed rule would have no application.

What is behind the proposed change in the rule? It is a desire to pass what is known as the President's civil-rights bills. What are they? Let us scrutinize them and see just what they are all about. Most of the civil-rights proposals are embraced in three bills, the anti-poll-tax bill, the antilynching bill, and the FEPC bill. I should like to see the FEPC bill taken up first, or an effort made to take it up first, because I believe that Senators have become convinced that FEPC would not work in the United States.

Let us look at the various subheads—antilynch, antipoll tax, and FEPC. The proponents of the anti-poll-tax bill are throwing out a bait which will not catch many fish. Why do I make that statement? In my State—and I believe many other States are similarly situated—the proponents of the anti-poll-tax bill think they have fooled a great many people and made them believe that the poll tax is keeping people from voting. How many people do Senators think the poll-tax law keeps from voting in South Carolina? It might be news to some Senators to know that South Carolina does not require a poll tax in any of the primaries. Our Supreme Court recently decided, in a South Carolina case, that the primary in my State is everything. Why did it so hold? Because it will be found that in my State, in the primary there is a heavy vote; in the general election the vote is very light. There is a reason for that. If 100,000 persons vote in South Carolina in a general election, one party will receive 95,000 votes, and all other parties may receive 5,000 votes.

So it happens in my State that very few persons vote in the general election. Even those who are running for office sometimes forget to vote in the general election, because it is not important.

Mr. President, I should like to read a statement which I read before the committee on this very subject:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I appreciate deeply the generosity of this committee and your chairman in permitting me an opportunity to be heard on the pending measure—proposed changes in rule XXII of the United States Senate Rules. I think it highly important to the people of my State and the people of the South that I here and now state with bluntness, honesty, and complete candor that we with certainty recognize the reasons for this intense agitation for the procedural changes advocated at the present time.

The sole and primary purpose of the pending resolution is to "grease the legislative skids" in order that the President's so-called "civil rights" legislative program might glide to swift passage without providing ample time to deliberate and examine and scrutinize its probable drastic effects upon the social and economic system of this country.

If for no other reason than to continue my unswerving opposition to such a program—a program fostered upon the basis of misunderstanding or lack of understanding or else not put forward in good faith—I shall oppose this change. Any student of human relations, sociology, or psychology knows that you cannot legislate tolerance and understanding and you cannot force brotherly love, just as he knows that you cannot legislate decency and morals.

We cannot force or intimidate human beings—even by threat of prosecution and penalty of imprisonment under law—to have an affection or admiration or even a respect for persons with whom they have no desire to associate.

As I have said before, this problem is not one to be solved by legislative enactment, executive fiat, or decree. It is purely and simply a problem of education in understanding and tolerance. Education is a slow process, as we all agree. For any person or group of persons to realize its benefits, great patience is required.

I believe that we people in the South have made tremendous progress in the improvement of the race and color situation. And we have done it through patient, kindly, helpful treatment of the Negro within our midst. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that no people anywhere have made greater strides in a shorter period toward full enjoyment of the benefits of civilization than has the Negro in the 100-odd years since he was captured in the jungles of Africa by brutal, merciless, selfish slave traders of the East and sold in bondage to the cotton planters of the South.

Stories of violence in the South today—pathetically regrettable though they are—have been grossly exaggerated and distorted beyond their real significance. A few horrible isolated or infrequent instances of brutality are flashed in distorted version before the Nation in sensational headlines by the hate mongers who would commercialize on human misery in order to promote their own selfish and often sinister interests. I am certain that the tactics and techniques discernible in a great amount of this scare propaganda have been designed in the past, as they are being dictated today, by the insidious and vicious Fascist and Communist forces at work in the world.

When the United States Senate, recognized as the greatest forum, the most resounding sounding board in all the world, is allowed to become a siren of reeking hatred to stir up race against race, it is a blasphemy before God and man.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the path of education for tolerance and cooperative understanding, not the way of force and fear. I urge the Senate to review with honest minds and clean, clear lack of passion the progress that has been made, and not to mine the road ahead with dynamite that is certain to explode with great destruction when these opposite viewpoints collide.

Now, with the kind forbearance of your committee, Mr. Chairman, I should like to refer briefly to the historical aspects of this question from a standpoint of legislative mechanics. Other speakers before me have pointed to the fact that the framers of our magnificent and highly practicable Constitution—men of almost divine wisdom and remarkable vision—sought to establish for the first time a truly democratic legislative process.

A consideration of primary concern to that group of Founding Fathers was protection for minorities and adequate safeguards against hasty and ill-conceived legislation. We know that under the rules of the House of Representatives, legislation reported by a highly partisan committee, can zoom to passage under special rules and rapid-fire, decisive action by the Speaker. Our right to unlimited debate in the Senate, protected by

rule XXII is our only assurance that any and every measure before the Congress shall have a full and fair hearing.

Mr. Chairman, I reiterate the contention made before this committee by my distinguished colleagues, Senators STENNIS, of Mississippi, and ROBERTSON, of Virginia, which contention was ably supported by them and others—that no single piece of highly important and beneficial legislation has yet been prevented from passage by invoking a filibuster or threat of filibuster.

I do not consider it necessary to reiterate arguments so ably presented on previous occasions. If I were the only Senator in this body who believes as I do, thinks as I do, and talks as I do, on this question of limiting debate, then I might be inclined to alter my views. However, there is a sizable minority of extremely able and honorable gentlemen in whose company I find myself. I shall continue to fight this—or any similar proposal—to the bitter end, no matter how endless or bitter that end.

That was my statement before the committee.

I notice that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], appearing before the committee, had this to say:

I am now convinced that there is far more involved here than the mere technical changes as proposed in Senate Resolution 13, the Saltonstall resolution, which merely extends the present cloture rule and leaves the requirement of a two-thirds majority in order to invoke cloture. In these hearings on yesterday, the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. SALTONSTALL, the Senator from Michigan, Mr. FERGUSON, the Senator from New York, Mr. IVES, expressly stated that they favored the two-thirds majority rule solely because it was a step in the right direction; that their real position was that they favored a rule that would permit cloture to be invoked by a majority of the Senate. These statements and other considerations convinced me beyond all doubt that this movement to amend the Senate rules now, literally, is just a step, as these gentlemen say.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from Alabama for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the action taken here on Friday was an effort to amend the rules by majority vote? The Senate had five precedents. Our rules are to be found in the precedents as well as in the letter of the rules themselves. The effort was made to overrule all the precedents and to change the rules by majority vote, was it not?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I thank the senior Senator from Alabama for calling that to my attention. In my opinion it went even further than the Senator suggests. When the Vice President overruled all the precedents, it was then up to the Senate to overrule the decision of the Vice President. As the senior Senator from Alabama knows, the ruling, if sustained by the Senate, would have brought about a change in the rules of the Senate by a majority vote, and would have been contrary to the decisions of previous presiding officers. It was an attempt by majority vote to overrule the precedents and to change the rules of the Senate.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield for a further question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the majority leader himself has declared in favor of invoking cloture by a constitutional majority?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is true that the majority leader of the Senate has stated he favors the imposition of cloture by a constitutional majority.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the President of the United States has declared for cloture by a simple majority, or what might be termed a bare majority?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is true that the President has stated he favors a change in the rules whereby cloture could be forced upon us by a bare majority of the Senate.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question only.

Mr. HILL. Does that not mean, in its barest and most naked form, that cloture might then be invoked by a vote of only 25 Senators?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true. That could happen. I certainly thank the senior Senator from Alabama for calling these vital matters to my attention. I am further fully convinced that with a rule in force permitting cloture to be invoked by a majority, it would soon become a weapon in the hands of the party in power.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a further question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that it is most important to consider the fact that a number of Senators, some of whom are members of the Rules Committee, have frankly stated they look upon the resolution to provide for cloture by two-thirds vote as merely a step, so to speak, in what they feel is the right direction, leading to the invocation of cloture by majority vote?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true. I fear that not merely a few Senators have thus expressed themselves, but that the number of Senators who have made a similar expression constitutes probably a majority of the Senators. I think it would be dangerous for the Senate in the future to have a majority cloture rule.

Continuing with the reading of the statement by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] before the committee:

I am convinced that the next step will be the enactment of a rule whereby cloture can be invoked by the vote of a mere majority of the Senate. I am further fully convinced that with this rule in hand, that is, the invoking of cloture by a majority, it will soon become a weapon in the partisan hands of the party in power, and all too soon will be used to habitually cut off debate.

Now, there is no sectionalism in that. That is partisan politics, as I see it. That is the main threat with the majority rule in effect.

It will follow as certain as the night follows the day that once this power is placed in the hands of a mere majority, the political party that then constitutes that majority will first persuade themselves that they are justified in using it for their own partisan purposes, and soon will be convinced that they are derelict if they do not use it. I think that is what will be constantly shoved before them.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that in the event it were possible to invoke cloture by a mere majority, there would be tremendous pressure by certain groups to invoke cloture by such majority?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is true, I understand, at the present time, that certain groups are pressing very hard to get Members of the Senate to push a little harder in order to get majority cloture at the present time. If what I hear is true, they certainly have been trying to use pressure to obtain that. If they did not think they could make use of majority cloture in the future, I do not believe they would be pressing so hard for it at the present time.

And more than that, I am convinced that they will be pushed and prodded into using it by political pressure groups that do not belong to any party, have no responsibility to the people, and no obligation to uphold the organic law of the land.

I have just a few illustrations of what I mean by that partisan use of the rule. The historic debate in 1908 over the adoption of the Aldrich-Vreeland currency bill was an ominous example of how a disciplined majority, with frayed temper and short patience, could ride roughshod over previously established precedents and customs of the Senate.

At this time the great Senator Robert M. La Follette, of Wisconsin, was leading the opposition to what he believed to be a scheme of the privileged few to tighten their grip upon the money power of the Nation.

As the debate developed, the Presiding Officer of the Senate, Vice President Charles W. Fairbanks, acknowledged as partial to the majority who favored the Aldrich-Vreeland bill, made two precedent-shattering rulings and was immediately sustained. In the first he counted a quorum to declare that action on a vote had been taken even though the total vote was less than a quorum.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question only.

Mr. HILL. Is it not a fact that at that time there was no quorum present?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. HILL. Is not that an illustration of how a majority, actuated by great pressure from without, moved by some overwhelming passion or desire to work its will, can run roughshod over the minority when the minority is not properly and adequately protected?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The senior Senator from Alabama speaks accurately when he implies that we need the present rule of the Senate in order to protect the minority against the majority.

In the second ruling Mr. Fairbanks declared that debate in the Senate was not business, and that no quorum could be called when only debate had intervened since a previous call.

Regardless of the merits of these two precedents, the fact remains that they were both established without debate, and at the instigation of a disciplined majority led by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. Aldrich.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. For a question only.

Mr. HILL. In other words, what that language means, does it not, is that the majority simply steam-rollered and ran over the minority?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

The Aldrich-Vreeland bill debate not only provoked these two sudden, unpremeditated changes in the Senate rules—it also brought about one of the most patently unfair decisions of a presiding officer in the history of the Senate.

With Senator George Sutherland, of Utah, in the chair, Thomas P. Gore, of Oklahoma, moved the absence of a quorum. Sutherland held a call not in order, and then brazenly ruled that even an appeal was not in order. As one commentator has reported, "The majority was in no mood for the niceties of parliamentary procedure."

To my mind, this action of the majority on a highly partisan matter where discussion had reached an emotional state is illustrative of action that will very readily develop if we yield to pressure for the limitation of debate in the Senate. Despite all our protestations in regard to fairness and friendliness, we all realize that there are times when partisan interests supplant calm thinking.

The callousness with which Senator La Follette and his supporters were overwhelmed in 1908 points a clear warning to those forces arrayed against privilege today. It would be well for labor and minority groups who now support cloture legislation to remember that the day may come when only a small minority is available in the Senate to protect their interests, and that this gag rule being sought now may be used to deprive them of the rights for which they have fought so hard. I hope that the day will never come when any loyal element in our population has no powerful defenders in the Senate, but it has happened in the past, and it could happen in the future.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question only.

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator recall that when the then Vice President, Mr. Charles G. Dawes, urged a change in the rules of the Senate, a most ringing resolution was adopted by the American Federation of Labor condemning the proposed change in the rules?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a further question.

Mr. HILL. Then, it is a fact, is it not, that it was indeed a scathing resolution of condemnation which the American Federation of Labor adopted at that time, condemning the proposal of the Vice President, Mr. Dawes, for proposing changes in the rules?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct. I thank the Senator from Alabama for bringing out these interesting Senate occurrences of the past.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not a fact that the reason why the American Federation of Labor passed that ringing resolution was that they were sufficiently wise and experienced to know how truly the Senator was speaking when he said that they might be the ones who would need the protection and the bulwark of the Senate rules in the future?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct. I am warning labor that if the rules be changed it will not be many years before they, too, may suffer from the amendment of present rule XXII.

Mr. President, I read further:

I have not been impressed one bit with the assertion that present rules of the United States Senate are such that the Senate can hardly function unless they are changed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at that point?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question only.

Mr. HILL. Can the Senator cite one single piece of really beneficial, worthwhile legislation which has been defeated because of the rules of the Senate giving to the Senate free and unlimited debate?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am not able at this time to cite one piece of worth-while legislation which has been prevented from passing, unless we could so class the proposal to arm merchant ships, which arose at the close of the lame duck session to which reference has been made. I do not think that did any harm, because at that time the President had the power, under his own authority to do exactly what he was asking Congress to do.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that that was not a prevention of legislation, but was only a delay?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It was only a delay.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that President Wilson under his authority as the Chief Executive and Commander in Chief, armed the ships anyway?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

I certainly thank the Senator from Alabama again for bringing so forcefully to my attention what occurred in the Senate before I happened to be a Member of it.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question only.

Mr. HILL. I hope the Senator does not mean to imply that I was a Member of the Senate in those olden times. Does he wish to so imply?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I look upon the Senator from Alabama as being one of the older Senators, but I realize that he was not a Member of the Senate in 1917. I do not want anyone to think I am implying by my remarks that the Senator is that old.

Mr. President, I read further:

Now that impressed me when that charge was first made when I first came to this body. I heard the talk, "Why, it is just a crippled institution of government, sadly lacking in the power to function." It challenged me, and I was impressed with that charge, but on examination of the facts I have changed my mind about that.

I read with interest pages 20 and 21 of a pamphlet published by the Legislative Reference Service entitled "Limitation of Debate in the United States Senate." These pages are headed "Legislation defeated by filibusters" and list some 27 different bills. This is quite an impressive array of proposed legislation extending over a period of 81 years. It must not be accepted for all it implies, because on close examination it is found that of the 22 proposed bills listed as having been "filibustered to death" since the time of the Panama Canal debate in 1903, all of them became law soon thereafter, some within a few days thereafter, except the following:

1. The ship-subsidy bill, delayed from 1907 and 1923 until 1936.
2. The force bill of 1890.
3. The armed-ship bill of 1917. (In this instance the authorities went on and armed the ships on another law.)
4. Antilynch bills.
5. Anti-poll-tax bills.
6. FEPC bill.

Time has proved that the force bill was not necessary, and I submit that it was unsound; and the anti-poll-tax, antilynch, and the FEPC bills, with all deference to them, are most seriously questioned as to their constitutionality, and, in fact, are actually thought by a major part of the leading legal minds of America to be contrary to our organic law, which certainly is an explanation of at least a part of the vigorous opposition thereto.

Right along that line, I recall that last year the House of Representatives passed and sent to the Senate a bill providing a sales tax. I started to speak on it last year, but the bill was withdrawn, and so I did not have an opportunity to speak. But a great many of the newspapers in Washington said that by a threatened filibuster I killed the sales tax. But after thinking about the matter for a year, I noticed the House yesterday voted down the sales tax and killed it. So, after thinking about the matter for a year, they may have been led to believe that it was a bad measure. I hope that is the way they feel about it, and I hope the Senate feels that way about it, for I believe that a sales tax is not the best way to raise money. It is wrong in principle, and we should raise the money in another way to support the city government here in Washington.

Certainly, time has clearly demonstrated that only one of these bills could reasonably have been considered as dealing with an emergency of national importance, that is, the armed-ship bill; and its defeat in 1917 was most likely reflecting a lack of mental preparation on the part of the American people for the First World War, than it was a shortcoming of the Senate rules. This is overwhelmingly demonstrated by the splendid record of the United States Senate on these

subjects during the year prior to and during World War II, of which I have not heard serious complaint of delay in the passage of needful legislation by the Senate. I remember in that connection someone last year said to me, "Talk about the rules slowing things down. Why we appropriated here in one afternoon during the war $59,000,000,000 without even a roll call." That was a time of national emergency. That shows the trend.

I haven't heard any serious threat about any delay on any bill in the Senate affecting the preparation for war or preparedness prior to World War II or during the war or any since then that has to do with the aftermath of the war.

In this connection I gladly support proper provisions to always insure a vote on emergency matters affecting the physical security of the Nation.

I really think that ought to be done and worked out; it should be covered in some careful way.

I do not and shall not endeavor here to try to bring further factual information or historical references regarding this far-reaching subject, as the facts have been well presented by others appearing here.

Debate is man's greatest political invention. It is the mother of parliamentary law. While serving as a court official I appreciated the opportunity that each side had in presenting its cause. But here on the national scene, with all the contending forces seeking points of advantage, I appreciate it all the more. It is highly important that there should be some place left where, so far as possible, debate shall remain unlimited and unrestrained. If possible, let us allow it to be limited and restrained by something other than rigid rules.

One of the proponents of changing the rules who spoke here at this table with great eloquence this week, seemed to realize that he was taking something great out of the Senate when he proposed to invoke cloture by a bare majority vote. He, therefore, said that he was relying on the historic traditions of the Senate. He testified that through these traditions certain rights and principles would be protected and preserved. I agree that we have these great traditions in the Senate, and that is the very thing we seek to preserve. They did not come through generosity of parties or groups, nor do these traditions come from the hearts of the individual Senators. Certainly we Senators are no more elevated in our thoughts and impulses than are other men. These traditions, as I see them, have been built up, not in a day or in a year or in a decade, but over a period of 143 years, in which there has been a great freedom of debate, unparalled anywhere in the world, which has led to a great respect and tolerance and understanding of the other man and his problems. It has grown into a principle of government that is almost as much a part of our national thought as though it were a part of the Bill of Rights.

We know all too well the waves of emotionalism that actually do sweep across an entire nation at times, threatening to impair or destroy man's heritage of political, economic, and even religious freedom that is the product of centuries of effort. But, as can be found in no other nation in the world, if any of our political, social, or religious groups find themselves under serious, sustained attack, they know that they have as a last and effective place of refuge, the floor of the United States Senate. This condition did not just happen—it is the result of the tradition of freedom that finds expression on this same floor.

If the Senate has a majority cloture rule, or if it begins to whittle away, bit by bit, the freedom of expression that has flowered there for so long, then, except as to size and membership, in what way will the Senate differ from the House of Representatives?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEELY in the chair). Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi for a question.

Mr. STENNIS. Does not the Senator think that if the Senate were to make a change in the cloture rule which would further limit the right of debate by Senators on the floor, it would result in decreasing the influence of Senators? Would it not result in circumscribing their activities here? What is the Senator's idea on that subject?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I believe that if the Senate were to provide for cloture by a bare majority it would result in a great many instances that the majority of the Senate, and the majority party, would be able to ride roughshod over the minority, and therefore the minority might just as well stay at home.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question only.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from South Carolina used the expression "majority party." He has been very earnest——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina can yield only for a question.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question only.

Mr. STENNIS. I was going to base my question——

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Just a moment.

Mr. STENNIS. I wish to ask the Senator what he meant by the expression he used, "majority party." In that connection will the Senator discuss his idea as to whether cloture by majority would develop into mere rule by a partisan majority? Will the Senator give us the benefit of his ideas on that subject?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In the United States we have a two-party system. If there were a further restriction placed upon the right of debate, every Senator knows that if the majority party would put its foot down and say, "This is a party measure," the poor minority group or minority party would, in my opinion, be run over roughshod. The rule as it now is affords protection to the minority party in the Senate.

I wish to make a further observation. If there were further restriction placed upon the right of debate, when bills are reported from the various committees and come up for action on the floor of the Senate the party in the majority would be able to put things through as is done at the present time in the House of Representatives, and the first thing we know, instead of being limited to 1 hour of debate, after cloture had been invoked, we would find ourselves limited to 5 minutes, as Members of the House of Representatives are. I believe the present proposal is one step down the line toward a majority cloture rule, which is something new in the Senate.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield further?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am glad to yield for a question only.

Mr. STENNIS. Will the Senator explain whether or not he believes reliance for protection of the minorities could be placed on the plane of high ideals? Does the Senator believe we could rely upon what is called the traditions of the Senate? Will the Senator give his ideas along that line?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator is asking a question concerning the traditions of the Senate. If decision were to be left to a majority, as has been ruled by the Chair, and a majority of the Senators present sustained the Chair, it would be a dangerous thing for us. It would be very dangerous if we were to permit majority control of the Senate on the matter of rules.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I read further:

I warn some of the Members of the Senate who espouse the cause of this change in rules, that if they are successful, their stature in national affairs will be reduced. They will be the first victims of the rule that they now advocate.

Now, I feel that the present membership of the Senate is about to make one of the most far-reaching decisions that the body has ever made and one that can and will transform the entire character of the Senate as an institution. I urge the Members, both the veterans and the newcomers, to examine this great subject again as an original proposition. I cannot but feel that as an original proposition the great majority of the membership of the Senate will oppose any change in the rules because after viewing the entire picture, they will not feel any great need for a change and they will see that the chances for loss are greater than the chances for gain. I think that is what it comes down to, a measuring of the weight of the chances for loss with the chances for gain.

As Members of the Senate we are now the seated Members of the greatest deliberative body in the world—the last governmental forum left in the whole wide world where freemen can gather for free, unmolested, and unlimited debate. Let's keep that instrument of freedom, and then let's behave so that we shall not have to use it except in the most urgent, far-reaching and extreme cases. But let us keep it. It will be worth far more than it will cost.

I want to make this further observation, gentlemen. I have picked it up around the corridors and in the committee rooms that a great number of the men who come here as Members of the Senate have read articles about the slow and archaic rules of procedure, they have heard commentators discredit those rules, and they come here with considerable impatience.

However, after they stay here and get into the spirit of the thing and see the picture unfold itself, it is with a growing appreciation for the real spirit behind those rules after all.

I was attracted to what Senator WHERRY said in the hearings here 2 years ago as I read them. He said he came down here favoring a majority rule invoking cloture, but he

changed his mind and was in favor of a two-thirds rule.

I remember an experience, if you will let me give this, that I had as district attorney during five hard-working years. I fought those courtroom battles and was always being pressed and crowded because of defects in search warrants, and I actually convinced myself that that part of the Bill of Rights ought to be repealed.

Guilty men were going unpunished, and the law was not able to cope with the situation in individual cases, and I was fully convinced it was a mistake and should be stricken out of the law.

Now, after I have been away from that a while, I realize it is one of the most cherished possessions within the law, I think, that provision of the Bill of Rights providing against unreasonable search and seizure. I wouldn't have men prying around without that safeguard. It would be inviolable. Whereas, once before, while I was pressed with a problem and before I grew to realize the spirit behind it, I was in favor of a change in that provision.

I believe, if we reexamine this thing as an original proposition, although it is defective, I believe we will find that there is more to be lost than gained if we surrender this rule around which freedom of debate has been built.

Mr. President, I find that my colleague [Mr. MAYBANK] appeared before the committee and brought out some very good points, which I wish to read at this time:

Senator MAYBANK. Mr. Chairman, I thank you and the members of the committee for giving me the privilege to testify first this morning, although Senator BYRD was supposed to have been the first witness.

If I might ask the indulgence of the committee to do me a favor, I would appreciate it. Unfortunately for me, practically all of the legislation that is expiring is before the Banking and Currency Committee. That is, the various rent controls and export controls and voluntary agreements, and so I have a meeting at 10:30 and another at 11 o'clock; and, with your permission, I would like to file with this committee a statement that I filed with the Senate yesterday in connection with the Small Business Committee with our request for appropriation of funds and also a statement as to why we think it should be done. It is printed in the record, and unless you care for me to read it, I will just file it with the committee in support of Senate Resolution 33, a resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to make certain expenditures and employ temporary assistants and providing for the transfer of certain records to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the statement relative to the Senate Small Business Committee and in support of Senate Resolution 33 which Senator MAYBANK has submitted may be filed with the committee.

Senator MAYBANK. This is the situation in which we find ourselves in the Banking and Currency Committee; so, if you would consider this at your earliest convenience and let us know, we would appreciate it, because we have got to go ahead with these hearings and authorize these resolutions so we can take up with the appropriations. I would be very grateful.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in connection with the change in the rules, I would like to read this prepared statement, and I might add if and when the rules change should come about, if it should come up to the Senate, I will have more to say on it. I had to prepare this hurriedly because of the situation in the Banking and Currency Committee.

Twice within a generation this Nation has been forced to the use of armed might in order to protect its democratic freedoms. It seems incongruous to me that in view of two such mortal struggles within our lifetime we should now be forced to come here to protect those same freedoms in this body. Doesn't it seem out of keeping, Mr. Chairman, that while we seek to assure the various freedoms to all the world, we should have to pause in our deliberations of pressing legislation to protect freedom of speech in the Senate?

The Chamber of the United States Senate is the only remaining legislative body in the entire world where unrestricted debate may be held freely and openly. I am deeply concerned over this move which is designed to restrict this freedom of speech.

It may appear at times that this freedom of speech is being abused. On such occasions the common name for this device is called filibustering. Call it what you will, sir, the name is unimportant. It remains the right of a representative of the people of this country to make their wishes and desires known in this center of government through his voice. It is true, Mr. Chairman, that under the rules of the Senate filibuster is possible. It is also true that filibustering will recur again and again in the future, just as it has throughout the long history of the United States Senate.

Filibusters are possible in this body because we enjoy the privilege of unlimited debate. This privilege is one which I consider one of the most sacred rights guaranteed to every Member of this body. Without this right, any minority would be helpless and defenseless. They would be always, and under all circumstances, subject to the will of the majority. They would be left with not even a single weapon with which to fight in the defense of the sovereign States represented here in the Senate.

It is often said, Mr. Chairman, that the majority should always have its way. I think there is ample reason for denying the steadfastness of such a rule. I think we would point out a number of instances in which the majority was not always right. As a matter of fact, I suspect some of our Republican friends might point out a very recent instance in which they would refute the old rule. The throttling of debate is something which must never be allowed to come about in the Senate of the United States. For all practicable purposes, it would be the bitter end to this, not only the greatest but the only remaining, open legislative forum in the world—the only sounding board for the voice of free people where free and unlimited speech is an inherent right. The Members of this body have the right to outvote and defeat a Senator in his contentions, but they cannot and must not be allowed to do it as long as the Senator can and will speak. That is the basic doctrine of the filibuster.

It is my contention that sudden and frequent changes in the policy of the Government are harmful to all the interests in this country. I believe that hasty and imperfectly considered legislation is dangerous to the rights of the States and the people. What we do here in this body is of intense personal interest, not only to more than 150,000,000 people in this country but to a large segment of the entire population of the world.

Our actions here should reflect mature, deliberate, and sober second thought. Our deliberations should reflect the well-considered will of the people.

Absolute freedom of debate may be and undoubtedly is sometimes abused. But, Mr. Chairman, are there any privileges enjoyed by human beings that are not subject to abuse at one time or another? It is like the workings of democracy. For all of our great democratic policies and practices, there are still certain privileges for which we pay dearly. Mr. Chairman, I say we can better afford to submit to some abuse of the right of free speech than we can afford to allow the passage of legislation without full, mature, and deliberate consideration. When we act here, we are creating laws which reach into the homes and business of the people who sent us here. Their welfare must never be taken lightly.

On of the greatest evils that can possibly result from the abuse of the right of unlimited debate is the postponement of legislation to another Congress. However, I am confident that when such legislation is demanded by popular interest the people of our States may be relied upon to send men to Congress who will enact it into law. It would be far better if we made haste slowly than it would be if we disposed of great questions quickly but without the fullest, most mature, and deliberate consideration.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina for a question.

Mr. HOEY. Does the Senator know of any really meritorious proposed legislation which has been defeated by virtue of the impossibility of bringing it to a vote in the Senate, in all the time the present cloture rule has been in effect?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, in my opinion, no necessary good legislation has failed to pass at some later date because of the present cloture rule.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. HOEY. If we were able to finish the First World War, and then deal with conditions during the depression, and then pass through the whole period of the Second World War, and then meet all the responsibilities of the postwar period with the present rule in force, does the Senator see any reason why it cannot remain as it is, and still permit us to discharge the public business in an orderly manner and take care of the legislative needs of the country?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, in my opinion, the rule does not need changing at this time, and we can take up the consideration of necessary legislation which would be for the best interests of the people of the Nation without making any changes in this rule.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question.

Mr. HOEY. I should like to ask the Senator if it is true that the time when the change was made was following what was regarded as a period of emergency in 1917, and I wish to ask the Senator whether there is any such emergency now which would require a change of the rule in any respect?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. There is no such emergency in existence at the present time to call for or make necesary a change of the rule. But, Mr. President, as I stated before, in my opinion the main reason for the change or the attempt to change the rule is in order to permit the Senate to take up some legislation which in my opinion and in the opinion of a great many others is not for the best interests of the people at this particular time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from Illinois for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. Can the distinguished Senator from South Carolina advise the Senate how long he expects to speak?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to answer that question by saying that I should like to know just how long the Senate is going to stay in session tonight. That would probably answer the question.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LUCAS. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from South Carolina is ready to yield the floor at any time in the event the Senator from Illinois desires to make a motion that the Senate adjourn or take a recess?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. My answer to that question is that I cannot agree to yield the floor for a motion to adjourn. I will yield the floor if the Senator agrees to make a motion that the Senate take a recess. Otherwise, I shall retain the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, the Senator does not wish the Senate to adjourn?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. LUCAS. Very well.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, let me resume where I left off the reading.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, may we have order in the Chamber and in the galleries?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not hear the point made by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask for order in the Chamber and also in the galleries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; there will be order in the Chamber and also in the galleries. The occupants of the galleries are admonished that they must be in order or else the galleries will have to be cleared.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a parliamentary inquiry only.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, does the Senator from Georgia have any right to make the suggestion he did make without first obtaining consent from the Senator from South Carolina?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the duty of the Chair to preserve order, without requiring an appeal from any Senator for that purpose. The Chair will endeavor to preserve order.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina further yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LUCAS. And not for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I object to yielding for anything but a question. If the Senator from Illinois intends to go into some other matter—for instance, a parliamentary inquiry—and thus take me off the floor, I object. If the Senator from Illinois wishes to obtain unanimous consent of the Senate so as to permit him to ask some other question, that is up to the Chair. But so far as I am concerned, I yield only for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. Is the Senator taking advice and counsel from the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] as to what he should do in this situation?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to answer the Senator from Illinois: The Senator from South Carolina does not take any directions from anyone, but he is cooperating with the group on this side that is working, as I consider it, for the good of the people.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator from South Carolina recognize that the junior Senator from Georgia is sitting close to him and has been talking to him from time to time as to what he should do, and is now talking again, telling the Senator what to do?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to answer the Senator from Illinois by saying that, as he well knows, in matters of this kind I have sometimes seen some persons prompting the Senator from Illinois, and I have thanked God several times that they were there to help the Senator from Illinois out a little bit. [Laughter.]

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator from South Carolina agree with me, then, that what I said was correct, namely, that, notwithstanding the fact that I had it in the past, he is now having help in the present?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to answer the question the Senator from Illinois propounds by saying that I am delighted to have the junior Senator from Georgia over here, close by me, and I am glad there are so many Senators on the floor at the present time. Perhaps they will be enlightened by something I may say or something the junior Senator from Georgia may indirectly prompt me to say. [Laughter.]

Mr. LUCAS. I am delighted finally to get that answer from my good friend from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield only for a question. I am not yielding for anything else.

Mr. LUCAS. It took a long time to get that confession.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is hard to remember where I was reading, there have been so many interruptions. [Laughter.] But I shall begin where I left off reading the statement made by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], my colleague, at the committee hearings:

I cannot speak for other Senators, Mr. Chairman; I can only speak for myself and reflect to you the wishes of the people of my State. It would be a betrayal of their confidence in me if I were ever to lend my approval or support to any rule that would limit the right of free speech in the Senate of the United States. I would not jeopardize, in their eyes, the dignity of the Senate and civil liberty. In this body the right to free speech must necessarily be the rule. Every measure must be open to full discussion without restraint.

It is entirely unnecessary that I intrude on your graciousness by reviewing the long history of filibustering in the Senate. I do feel, however, that a brief reminder of the success and failure of this record is pertinent at this point.

Rule XXII was amended in 1917. An analysis of the 19 cloture votes since that amendment indicates that only 4 petitions have received the required two-thirds majority. In only seven instances did a majority of the entire membership of the Senate vote in the affirmative for cloture. On 12 occasions a majority was obtained on the part of those present and voting. Six cloture petitions obtained a minority of those present and voting, and one resulted in a tie.

The conference committee (composed of five Democrats and five Republicans) which drafted the cloture rule of 1917 stated that its purpose was to formulate a rule that would "terminate successful filibuster." As to the degree of success with which this cloture rule has terminated successful filibuster, I again invite your attention to the RECORD. It has failed to achieve its purpose in 15 out of 19 times. The RECORD also shows that a majority cloture rule would have failed 12 out of the 19 times. The RECORD further shows that even a simple majority cloture would have failed to stop successful filibuster in almost one-third of the cases in which cloture has been invoked since 1917.

At various times in the past, many remedies have been proposed for so-called obstruction to legislation in the Senate. I cannot help but note the repetition of the same basic suggestions for more than a century. They boil down to four proposals:

1. Majority cloture;
2. The previous question;
3. A rule of relevancy; and
4. More effective enforcement of existing rules.

If changes would be made in the present rules, Mr. Chairman, let me suggest that we first review some rules of the Senate already in effect. We have a rule requiring a speaker to remain standing and not sit or walk about.

We have a rule which would take a Senator "off his feet" for using unparliamentary language.

We have another rule which states that "No Senator shall speak more than twice upon any one question in debate on the same date without leave of the Senate, which shall be determined without debate."

We have a provision in Jefferson's Manual that "No one is to speak impertinently or beside the question, superfluously, or tediously."

Those are some of the rules which are already in effect, Mr. Chairman. Undoubtedly there are others.

It does seem out of order that the Senate could limit duration of debate on bills by special orders as the House does. It is done frequently by unanimous consent even now. There have been many instances where debate has been limited by setting a specific time for a vote on a given measure. But I would remind you, Mr. Chairman, that this device is always achieved by unanimous consent.

It has been rightly stated that filibusters have killed more bad bills than good ones.

I do not know of any important measure which has been defeated by filibuster and then enacted at a later date. Practically every proposal defeated by filibuster has been unregretted by the country and only rarely readvocated by its supporters. The only recurring bills which come to my mind are the antilynch bill and the anti-poll-tax bill. Antilynch bills were filibustered in 1922, 1935, and the Congress of 1937–38. Anti-poll-tax bills were filibustered in 1942, 1944, 1945, and in the special session of 1948. It is still my hope that the anti-poll-tax bill will be left to the several States in the form of a constitutional amendment. That is the way it should be handled.

I might digress, Mr. Chairman, and say that I took part in the filibusters against the anti-poll-tax bill in 1942, 1944, and 1946, and while I was Governor of South Carolina I recommended repeal of the poll tax, and I might say that the bill which was introduced successfully passed one branch of the legislature 1 year and also passed another year, and I still believe it will pass before very long.

I do not believe in the poll tax. I never have, but I do believe that it should be handled by the States or by constitutional amendment.

In speaking of the freedom of speech and unlimited debate, we cannot afford to overlook our governmental system of separate powers. It is the unique function of the Senate to act as a check upon the Executive. This responsibility alone could not be performed without full freedom of debate. Unrestricted debate in the Senate is the only check against bitter autocracy.

It would seem to me that many of our rules in the Senate are intentionally designed to guarantee this freedom. The Constitution's requirement for recording the yeas and nays is a protection of dilatory tactics. The provision of the Constitution which requires the yeas and nays to be recorded in the Journal at the desire of only one-fifth of the Members present is an intentional safeguard. Here is an example of constitutional protection of a minority in allowing a delay in proceedings. The House of Representatives allows 5 minutes for a Congressman to address himself to a particular measure. Majority cloture in the Senate would simply destroy its deliberative function and make it an annex of the House.

The term "filibuster" may be considered somewhat modern, Mr. Chairman. But the use of filibustering tactics is by no means a new legislative practice. The method was used in the Roman Senate and it was long known to the British Parliament. It was even practiced in some of the legislatures of the Thirteen Original Colonies. As a matter of fact the very ratification of the Federal Constitution resulted in a famous but unsuccessful filibuster in the Pennsylvania one-house legislature. Under our Constitution the filibuster found a place in the First Congress. Congress was meeting in New York when a wrangle occurred which would certainly be termed a filibuster.

To hear some people talk, Mr. Chairman, Senators have done nothing but waste time since the very beginning of our Government. It seems to me that what they consider to be a waste of time is more often a service and to the best interests of the country in the long run. It is not inconceivable that at some future time some southern Senator may introduce a bill which would be considered most obnoxious to the residents of some other section of our country. I am sure that the people of that section would be glad to know that their own Senators would have the legal right to fight with every conceivable parliamentary device in order to delay and ultimately kill such a bill. It may not seem so now but the time may come when Senators from other States may delight in using the various devices of unlimited debate which some of us are now accused of abusing.

During the early days of Congress the procedure known as previous question was a method by which debate could be limited in the Senate. That rule was abolished in 1807 and there were no other rules adopted by which debate could be limited until the so-called cloture rule was adopted in 1917. In other words, from 1789 until 1807 there was the "previous question" device which cut off all debate. That procedure was so disastrous and so ineffective in effecting legislation that in 1807 it was done away with. Until 1917, for 110 years, there was no rule, no method or regulation by which the discussion of a subject on the floor of the Senate could be stopped.

Mr. Chairman, I believe in free and unlimited debate. We do not know what is going to happen in this country in the future. The right of open debate has long been cherished in this body. The right of unlimited speech is a powerful weapon but it is a safeguard necessary to the preservation of the liberty upon which this Nation was founded.

Members of the Senate, to my mind, are ambassadors. We are ambassadors representing the sovereign States from which we are elected. We are sent here to uphold the sovereignty of our States. The privilege of unlimited debate gives us a method by which those rights may be protected from destruction. So long as this right remains, no majority may force its views upon a minority when the minority is on guard.

Mr. Chairman, there is no place where the absolute freedom of speech is more essential to the best interests of the people and to civil liberty itself than right here in the United States Senate. This is especially true when we remember that the Senate is the only legislative body where freedom of debate is permitted.

Look at the propositions, Mr. Chairman, and consider their implication. Suppose we allow the iron claw of the Federal Government to take control of the elections in the States—suppose we cut off the freedom of debate in the Senate. Mr. Chairman, as I think of the consequence of such moves, I shudder at the very thought of the monster we would have created. Why we would have created a despotism under which self-government would be but a name. The four freedoms would be nothing more than a faint memory of earlier days when we lived under the concept of government of, by, and for the people.

Let us not forget, Mr. Chairman, that the rules of this Senate are founded deep in human experience. They are the result of centuries of tireless effort to preserve the rights and liberties for which our forefathers, our fathers, our sons, and our brothers have bled and died. Is it not true that, by its own rules, the Senate fixes the limits of its own powers? By these very rules, throughout its history, the Senate has sought to preserve, without restraint, two essentials of wise legislation and of good government—the right of amendment and of debate. In my judgment, it would seem that far greater evils would result from hasty legislation than from a delay which follows full discussion and deliberation.

The freedom of debate is something which I have always thought to be a cherished possession of the Members of the Senate. The record on cloture votes which I mentioned earlier seems to bear this out. Senators, by the record, have always been reluctant to invoke the rule which has been on the books since 1917. Cloture is a gag rule. It shuts off debate. It forces all free and open discussion to come to an end.

The intent of the framers of the Constitution certainly seems clear on this point. There was a pointed and realistic attempt made to create an upper Chamber of the Congress which would represent a different point of view than that of the House. Senators were given a longer term. They are required to be of more advanced age. Their body is smaller in number and each State is given equal representation.

Mr. Chairman, I could go on at great length and point out objections to any rule which would limit or cut off debate in the United States Senate. However, I realize that you have heard a number of Senators already and will still hear more after I have finished. Some of them will call for the preservation of unlimited debate in far more eloquent terms than I am able to use. But, Mr. Chairman, none of them will be more sincere in their plea that we maintain this bulwark against any future despots who would impose an unjust will on any minority. When this happens in the United States Senate, a fatal blow will have been dealt to our liberties. You will have broken down the greatest weapon against wrong and oppression within the reach of the Members of this body. As long as I remain a Member of this body—an ambassador sent by the people of the State of South Carolina to the upper Chamber of the Federal Government—I shall stand against any rule which denies free and unlimited debate to each and every Member.

Mr. President, I should like for a few moments to give the Senate my point of view on one of the bills which it is intended to bring up in the Senate if the proponents are successful in adopting the proposed rule. I should like the Senators to listen to me in regard to the proposed anti-poll-tax legislation. I want to discuss that phase of the subject, for it is one of the measures which some Senators want to have passed; but I believe a great many Senators who are lawyers will agree that if an attempt is made to pass an anti-poll-tax bill without amending the Constitution of the United States, they will be acting counter to one of our basic laws.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator agree with me that most of the States which still have it, if they could consider only the tax which a poor man has to pay, would probably already have repealed the poll tax if it were not that the racial issue was involved?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I can speak only for my own State, but I think the same condition would be true in many other States. If people would stop the agitation, the poll-tax repeal could be adopted much more quickly, and probably would already have been adopted had there not been the agitation. My State already has under way a proposal to repeal the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting.

Mr. LONG. Would the Senator have any objection to the adoption of a constitutional amendment to repeal the poll tax?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Personally, I think that is the proper way to handle the question, not by Congress passing a law. I do not believe it would be constitutional if we passed a statute repealing the poll tax. I shall elucidate that to some extent in a few minutes. I have a brief on that particular subject.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. For a question only.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator feel that if there were an attempt to remove the poll tax by an unconstitutional statute the Supreme Court could be relied upon to declare the statute unconstitutional?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I am a lawyer, and I might have to go before the Supreme Court at some time, and I halfway hate to criticize them. I do not know what the Supreme Court would do if such a case were brought before it, whether it would act on this question as it has acted on some other questions of a similar nature.

Mr. LONG. Would the Senator be of the opinion that, in view of the fact that the Supreme Court has been reversing itself from time to time, we could not tell very well how the Court would decide this issue?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Supreme Court reminds me of our Vice President. He reversed a Senate precedent, and the Supreme Court is very apt to act likewise regarding its precedents. It seems as if the Court can always find some way to get around precedents and I fear that our present Supreme Court might decide the question a little differently from what most constitutional lawyers would think was proper.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator feel that, due to the fact that Senators are sworn to uphold the Constitution this body probably should not give the Supreme Court an opportunity of deciding whether a statute was unconstitutional, and should not pass an unconstitutional statute to begin with?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. We are sworn to uphold the Constitution, and, so far as I am concerned, I am one who means to do a little interpreting myself. I mean to try to uphold the Constitution to the best of my ability while I am a Member of the Senate. I do not care to violate my oath, and I intend to fight bitterly the attempt to put into effect anti-poll-tax legislation.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is the Senator opposed to FEPC?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have before me, for use if I need it, about an 8-haur speech I delivered against the FEPC, and I may have to turn to it tonight and read it again. I have here the speech I made in 1946, and I thought that the Senator from Mississippi would certainly understand that I was against the FEPC. I cannot see anything in it for the good of the Nation, or for the good of any individual, in the long run.

Mr. EASTLAND. Can the Senator tell me briefly how he could object to FEPC?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator from Mississippi has asked me how I could oppose FEPC. In the first place, the title "Fair Employment Practices Act," is a misnomer. I think it was the Vice President, when he was Senator from Kentucky, who asked me whether I was passing upon titles when I was discussing that very issue before the Senate, and I told him that when I was representing a client I was always looking for a defect in the title, that I certainly had found a defect and misnomer in this particular piece of legislation and was going so to announce to my clients, who are all the people of the United States, that I should tell them that it was not fair to anyone. It would place a hardship not only upon the man employed, but also upon the man trying to get employment for him.

If someone comes into the office of a Senator to be employed, the Senator is going to find out a little something about the applicant, to ascertain whether or not he will further his business and be able to assist him if he employs him. If there is an attempt to force somebody upon a Senator, the Senator will probably cut down on some employment, and if employment is cut down throughout the United States, there will be a great deal of unemployment, and I think we would have to pass a further full-employment law in order to employ people who were added to the ranks of the unemployed because of the FEPC. That would weaken the laboring man and others we are trying to help. It will never be possible to force people to employ others against their will.

Mr. EASTLAND. Do the people in South Carolina believe in white supremacy?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator knows they do. What makes the Senator from Mississippi ask me that question?

Mr. EASTLAND. Do any of the political leaders in South Carolina believe in white supremacy?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Certainly they do.

Mr. EASTLAND. Would that question enter into the Senator's position on FEPC?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It does not necessarily enter into the FEPC question, but the provisions of the bill caused me to be against it. I simply cannot at all see the fairness of the FEPC bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to ask if the Senator is opposed to the antilynching bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I will answer the Senator from North Dakota by saying that I am opposed to the antilynching bill which its proponents are trying to have passed by Congress. I shall briefly state my reasons for opposing it. I have a brief prepared on the subject, which I shall go into later this evening. But in a few words I will answer the Senator's question by saying that, during my life as a public servant, I have felt it my duty to try to do what I thought would bring the best results. What would be the effect if Congress should pass an antilynching bill, and if the Federal Government should undertake to go into South Carolina and enforce a Federal—and I emphasize the word "Federal"—antilynching law? We have had only one actual lynching in South Carolina in about 20 years. That was last year. Some people wondered why those who took part in the lynching were not convicted. I can tell the Senate the reason why.

When the Department of Justice came into my State and kind of halfway took over matters, and the FBI came in and took over matters, the sheriff stepped aside and said, "If you are going to run the case, take it. It is your baby."

Those who conducted the prosecution were not satisfied with the situation as it was. They brought in a lawyer from outside the county to prosecute. Then in order to make a big showing they threw out a net and raked in some 30 persons. Some individuals who were indicted were not anywhere near the lynching. One of those who was arrested was a taxicab driver who had driven his taxicab in the direction where the lynching occurred, on his way home. It was alleged that he had participated in the lynching; so he was arrested. They arrested many persons against whom they could not secure any evidence. That in a way confused the picture. Then the fact that they brought in a prosecutor from outside the county, and brought in Federal Government detectives, in my opinion, kept them from securing the evidence they would have secured had they left the matter to the sheriff of the county, our county, to work up the case. But they made a big showing. They arrested a great number of persons. But when they really undertook the presentation of evidence they found they did not have the evidence properly worked up.

What I am driving at is that if a Federal antilynching law is enacted, the sheriff's office will take the position, "The law under which the action is being taken is a Federal law. You Federal people work up the case." Therefore not as much evidence will be secured as could otherwise be secured by the local county officials if it were left to them. The jurors in either case would be State jurors. The situation, with Federal prosecution, however, would be more complex. Many persons would resent Federal action.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does not the Senator think that if the Federal Government is going into the field of crime detection and prosecution within a State the Federal Government should first turn its attention to gangsters in northern cities, and does not the Senator think that is where the need lies?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think the Government should go to

Chicago first, and do a little work around Chicago, and go to New York and some other cities where, as I have heard, gangsters do a little bit of machine-gun work occasionally. We might introduce a bill providing that the Government should have authority to do that. It might do some good. But I believe Senators would then hear a great deal of hollering about it.

I now want to say something about the anti-poll-tax proposal.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator was Governor of South Carolina for a long time, was he not?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I was governor for one full term and for part of another.

Mr. LANGER. For how many years?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. For 6 years.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. LANGER. I ask, Did the Senator do anything to permit the Negroes to vote during the time he was governor of the State?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I did not. In my State——

Mr. LANGER. Just a moment. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LANGER. We have been told on the floor of the Senate time and time again that if we would leave the Southern States alone they would work out their own salvation; that they would get the poll tax out of the way, and all that sort of thing. Yet I understand the Senator to admit that during the 6 years he was governor he never lifted a finger to wipe out the poll tax. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. So far as the poll tax in South Carolina is concerned, as I said a few moments ago, that does not keep anyone from voting in my State. I never heard of anyone who wanted to vote who was kept from voting by the poll tax.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question only.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is the payment of a poll tax a qualification for voting in the Democratic primary in South Carolina, which means election in South Carolina?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. No poll-tax payment is required in my State to vote in any primary election, State, city, or county.

Mr. EASTLAND. In reality does South Carolina have a poll tax in connection with its elections?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. By the ruling of the Supreme Court we have no poll tax as a prerequisite for voting in elections in South Carolina, for the Supreme Court said that the primary was everything, so far as elections are concerned in South Carolina. That is the statement of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator did not, during the 6 years he was governor, do anything to wipe out the poll tax. Yet the Senator is opposed to the Federal Government doing anything. Is not the conclusion inevitable that nothing is being done?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In answer to the Senator's question I want him to know that I am in favor of the State repealing the poll tax, and have so stated. I have always said that in my opinion, if the Federal Government or the Congress would leave the States alone they would pass anti-poll-tax legislation.

Mr. President, I submit that other substantial and logical grounds exist which may be presented against the passage of the anti-poll-tax legislation now under consideration. In fact, some of the grounds to which I refer have been heretofore presented. But being a lawyer by profession, and after careful study of the measure from a legal viewpoint, and thereby convinced that if enacted it would be unconstitutional and a clear invasion of States' rights, I shall confine my discussion and argument primarily to the legal and constitutional aspects involved.

May I state in the beginning, without any intention to reflect on the intelligence and ability of the Members of the Senate, that properly to discuss and vote on this measure I consider it necessary first carefully to study and know the historical background of the applicable provisions of the Constitution, in the light of the interpretation thereof by our courts, to determine the real intent and purpose of the framers of the Constitution in such provisions.

When this has been accomplished, then with an open mind, let us make a fair and impartial comparison with the intent and purpose of this proposed legislation.

This legislation, if enacted by the Congress, would prohibit and make it unlawful for any State to require the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in an election for national offices.

There is only one legal question involved in the consideration of this proposed legislation, namely, Has the Congress constitutional power to abolish the requirement for payment of a poll tax as prerequisite to voting in an election for national offices when such requirement or qualification has been fixed by the several States?

In considering the proposed measure, the following provisions of the Constitution are of immediate application:

ARTICLE I, SECTION 2

The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for the electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

ARTICLE I, SECTION 4

The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations except as to the places of choosing Senators.

In 1913 the seventeenth amendment became a part of the Federal Constitution, providing for the election of Senators in the same manner as Members of the House of Representatives. That is to say:

By the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for the electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

The proposed legislation is in direct conflict with sections 2 and 4, article I of the Constitution since it would deprive the several States of a right reserved and guaranteed to the States by the Constitution, and if enacted, would be in violation of the Constitution and beyond the authority of Congress.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LANGER. Is the Senator familiar with the Clawson case in the Supreme Court of the United States?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I know something about it.

Mr. LANGER. Then the Senator knows, does he not, that what he is now reading is entirely contrary to what the Supreme Court of the United States held in the Clawson case?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. No. I will explain that. The Senator is mistaken with respect to the qualifications for voting.

These sections are clear, concise, and not in the least ambiguous. The framers of the Constitution after careful deliberation intended and wisely decided that the qualifications requisite for electors of the House of Representatives should be determined and established by the States. The fact that the qualifications of the electors may not be uniform in the States show conclusively that the framers of the Constitution did not anticipate or desire uniformity in this respect, but left such qualifications entirely to the discretion of the several States.

Sections 2 and 4, article I, adequately define the qualifications of an elector voting for the Members of the House of Representatives. They are mandatory in this respect and consequently Congress is without power to legislate on the subject of qualifications of electors.

Let us review the decisions of the Federal courts for their construction of the applicable sections of the Constitution heretofore stated. The Supreme Court of the United States has judicially determined that a State has the right under the Federal Constitution to provide for the collection of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting without violation of the provisions of the Federal Constitution. In the case of *Nolen R. Breedlove* v. *T. Earl Suttles, Tax Collector* (302 U. S. 277–284; 82 L. ed. 252; decided December 1937) the Supreme Court of the United States upheld the right of the State of Georgia to collect a poll tax of $1 as a prerequisite to voting and specifically

held that such requirement did not violate the equal protection of the laws, nor did it abridge the privileges and immunities as guaranteed by the fourteenth amendment. In passing upon the question the Court said:

To make payment of poll taxes a prerequisite of voting is not to deny any privilege or immunity protected by the XIV Amendment. Privilege of voting is not derived from the United States, but is conferred by the State and, save as restrained by the XV and XIX Amendments and other provisions of the Federal Constitution, the State may condition suffrage as it deems appropriate. (*Minor* v. *Happersett* (21 Wall 162, 170 et seq.; 22 L. Ed. 627, 629); *Ex Parte Yarbrough* (110 U. S. 651, 664, 665; 28 L. Ed. 274, 275; 54 S. Ct. 152); *McPherson* v. *Blacker* (146 U. S. 1, 37, 38; 36 L. Ed. 869, 873; 13 S. Ct. 3); *Guinn* v. *United States* (238 U. S. 347; 362; 59 L. Ed. 1340, 1346; 35 S. Ct. 926; L. R. A. 1916 A. 1124).)

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator from South Carolina believe in white supremacy, and if so, why?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to tell the Senator from North Dakota that I believe that those best qualified to govern should govern. I should also like to state to the Senator from North Dakota that, as I understand, there are some Indians in North Dakota and in other States who, I believe, are not allowed to vote. Some of them are not allowed to hold property. They cannot sell a cow unless they get permission from the Commissioner to do it. Many things are going on in certain sections which ought to be changed. I believe those Indians ought to have a right to sell a cow without having to go to a Commissioner to get permission. I think they ought to have the right to buy and sell property, and own it.

Also I noted that up until last year they could not even buy a little drink. I am a prohibitionist, but I believe that everyone ought to have the same rights. I understand that the Indians could not buy any whisky unless they got permission to do so. We had better clean up around our own doorstep before we start talking about other people.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LANGER. Does not the Senator know that most of the Indians of North Dakota are graduates of Yale, Harvard, Princeton, or Columbia, or of the University of North Dakota? Does he not know that, as a matter of fact, they own a great amount of property? Is the Senator aware of that fact?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. They own property which the Federal Government gave them in many cases. I am glad to know that a great many of them have discovered that the land which was given to them, and which was not considered to be worth anything, turned out to be worth millions of dollars, because oil was found on it.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LANGER. Does not the Senator know that in the State of North Dakota all the Indians vote?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I have heard differently on the reservations.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator know that under a Republican President, Calvin Coolidge, every Indian in the United States who wanted to vote was given the right to vote?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I presume the reason I did not find it out was that Calvin never talked very much. [Laughter.]

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at this point?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. As a matter of practical politics, does it not work out that the payment of the poll tax has the effect of preventing a number of poor people from voting?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I shall answer that question by saying that in my State I have never heard of anyone who was kept from voting by it. We do not require the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting, except in the general election; and in the general election both white and colored vote.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Then if the poll tax is not required as a prerequisite for voting in the primary elections in the State of South Carolina, am I correct in understanding the situation to be that for all intents and purposes the State of South Carolina actually has no poll tax?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true. That is what I have brought out already on several occasions during this debate.

Mr. President, in the same case the Supreme Court of the United States said:

The payment of poll taxes as a prerequisite to voting is a familiar and reasonable regulation long enforced in many States and for more than a century in Georgia.

Mr. President, I should like to state that the poll tax has existed in my State for almost 100 years. In 1868, when we did not have white supremacy, a constitutional convention was held. Senators will find that we had written into our constitution then a provision for a one-dollar poll tax, and it has been there ever since. The money thus received is kept within the school districts where it is paid for school purposes

As to the constitutional requirement that evidence of the payment of the poll tax be offered as a prerequisite to voting, the Court said:

That measure reasonably may be deemed essential to that form of the levy. Imposition without enforcement would be futile. Power to levy and power to collect are equally necessary. And by the exaction of payment before registration the right to vote is neither denied nor abridged. * * * It is fanciful to suggest that the Georgia law is a mere disguise under which to deny or abridge the right of men to vote.

The Breedlove case, supra, is the final work from the Supreme Court of the United States with reference to the imposition of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting, and we see by that case that such a requirement is in harmony with the United States Constitution. This case has been followed with approval since 1937 in the following cases: 68 Federal Supplement 748; 164 Pennsylvania (2d) 169; 207 South Carolina 489; 183 Tennessee 370.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question only?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator realize that, based on the Breedlove case, a distinction can be drawn as follows: Under the Breedlove case the Court says that a State can levy a poll tax, but not that the Federal Congress can outlaw a poll tax, even though the State could not constitutionally levy it?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, if the Federal Congress were to pass a law regarding the qualifications for voting, after the Constitution has stated what the qualifications for electors shall be and has stated that that matter shall be left to the States, in my opinion such action by the Federal Congress would be unconstitutional.

Mr. President, again in 1941 the Supreme Court of the United States in an opinion by Mr. Chief Justice Stone, passing upon the meaning of section 2, article I of the United States Constitution, said in the case of *United States of America* v. *Patrick B. Classic* (313 U. S. 298; 85 L. ed. 1368):

Section 2 of article I commands that Congressmen shall be chosen by the people of the several States by electors, the qualifications of which it prescribes. The right of the people to choose, within its appropriate constitutional limitations, where in other respects it is defined, and the mode of its exercise is prescribed by State acts in conformity to the Constitution, is a right established and guaranteed by the Constitution and hence is one secured by it to those citizens and inhabitants of the State entitled to exercise the right.

It is argued by some that the Classic case, supra, to some extent overruled the principles enunciated in the Breedlove case, supra. This position cannot be maintained, however, when the language of the Court and the authorities cited therein are carefully analyzed. It is important to bear in mind that the statute involved in the Classic case regulated only the manner of holding elections.

The language used by the Court and relied upon by those who maintain that new and different legal principles were established by the Classic case is as follows:

While, in a loose sense, the right to vote for representatives in Congress is sometimes spoken of as a right derived from the States (citing cases), this statement is true only in the sense that the States are authorized by the Constitution to legislate on the subject as provided by section 2 of article I, to the extent that Congress has not restricted State

action by the exercise of its powers to regulate elections under section 4 and its more general power under article I, section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers."

To sustain this proposition the Court cited *Ex parte Siebold* (100 U. S. 271; L. ed. 717); *Ex parte Yarbrough* (110 U. S. 663, 664; 28 L. ed. 278; 4 S. Ct. 152); *Swafford* v. *Templeton* (185 U. S. 487; 46 L. ed. 1005; 22 S. Ct. 783); *Wiley* v. *Sinkler* (179 U. S. 58, 64; 45 L. ed. 84, 88; 21 S. Ct. 17).

All the authorities cited in the Classic case definitely hold that the several States have supreme power to prescribe the qualifications of the electors who are to vote for the most numerous branch of their legislatures, and consequently their Senators and Representatives in Congress. The first case cited, Ex parte Siebold, involves solely the question of the power of Congress to provide for the supervision of elections for representatives in Congress by Federal marshals and their deputies, and by supervisors appointed by the Federal judges. These Federal officers were required to be present at the voting places and it was made a crime by an act of Congress for anyone to interfere with them in the disposition of their duties. The opinion of the Court did not touch upon the question of qualifications for suffrage or even refer to section 2 of article I. It was restricted solely to the power to regulate the manner of holding the election, as appears from the language in the opinion. This language is as follows:

The clause of the Constitution under which the power of Congress, as well as that of the State legislatures, to regulate the election of Senators and Representatives is as follows: "The times, places, and manner of holding an election for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time, by law, make or alter such regulations, except as to the place of choosing Senators."

This expressly excludes the possibility that the Court considered section 2 relating to qualifications of electors as included in the power to regulate the "manner of holding elections." If this were not correct, reference would have been made to section 2 as well as section 4 of article I.

The second case cited in the opinion in the Classic case is Ex parte Yarbrough. In this case the Court expressly recognized the power of the States to prescribe such qualifications, saying that the States "define who are to vote for the popular branch of their own legislature, and the Constitution of the United States says the same persons shall vote for Members of Congress in that State."

If the language relied upon by those who did propose such legislation quoted from the Classic case had been intended to mean that Congress is empowered to "define who are to vote" at such elections, the Court certainly would not have cited the Yarbrough case in support of that proposition. In fact, the Yarbrough case is authority for the principle that Congress has no such power.

The next case cited by the Chief Justice in the Classic case is Swafford against Templeton, which involved the question whether a person qualified to vote under State laws, who is wrongfully denied that right, has a cause of action for damages arising under the Constitution of the United States. In answering the question in the affirmative the Court referred to the Yarbrough case, supra, and interpreted that opinion:

That is to say the opinion was that the case was equally one arising under the Constitution or laws of the United States whether the illegal act complained of arose from a charged violation of some specific provision of the Constitution or laws of the United States, or from the violation of a State law which affected the exercise of the right to vote for a Member of Congress, since the Constitution of the United States had adopted, as the qualifications of electors for Members of Congress, those prescribed by the State for electors of the most numerous branch of the legislature of the State (46 L. ed. 1007-1008).

It is significant to note that the Court says that the Constitution adopts the qualifications of electors prescribed by the State, not that Congress adopts same. Since the Constitution adopts them, it necessarily follows that Congress is without power to alter this adoption or in any manner change same.

The last case cited by the Chief Justice in the Classic case is Wiley against Sinkler which also held that the right of a person qualified under State laws to vote for the popular branch of the legislature is also qualified to vote for Members of Congress and such right is protected by the Constitution. The opinion quoted with the approval of the proposition laid down in the Yarbrough case that the States define who are to vote for the popular branch of their own legislature and the Constitution of the United States says that the same persons shall vote for Members of Congress in that State. The power of the several States to define these qualifications is supreme and paramount.

Certainly these cases cited in the Classic case should dispel any argument by the proponents of such legislation that the language in the Classic case was intended to overrule the principle long established in this country that the qualification of electors is to be prescribed by the several States.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LANGER. May I say that I looked up the matter with respect to the Indians——

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yielded for a question only.

Mr. LANGER. I find that the Indians can vote in every State except two Democratic States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina yielded for a question.

Mr. LANGER. Is the Senator familiar with that fact?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yielded for a question only.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator not know that Indians can vote everywhere except in the Democratic States of New Mexico and Arizona?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I do not know that.

Mr. President, the principles enunciated by the Supreme Court of the United States in the Breedlove case and in the Classic case were again affirmed on October 13, 1941, when the Supreme Court denied certiorari in the case of *Pirtle* v. *Brown* (118 Fed. (2d) 218; certiorari denied, 86 L. ed. 63; 62 S. Ct. Rep. 64). In Pirtle against Brown the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, in a unanimous decision based largely on the Breedlove case, held the poll-tax requirement constitutional. Thus, the Supreme Court again placed the stamp of its approval on the Breedlove case and approved it as the controlling authority to sustain the validity of the poll-tax qualification in elections solely for congressional members.

There are numerous State court decisions sustaining the validity of the poll-tax qualification. Time and space will not permit a review of all of these authorities. Suffice it to say that in the following States the courts are unanimous in holding that failure to pay a valid poll tax imposed as a condition of voting has the effect of disqualifying the voter and rendering his vote invalid. I notice it is not only Southern States, either. The States are: Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, South Carolina.

Mr. President, although I am prepared to go on, and I am feeling fine, I think, for the good of the cause, it may be best for me to cut my speech a little short. In closing, let me say that I am fully convinced that the Members of the Senate should not make any changes in rule XXII or open it so that amendments can be made to it, for if we should ever permit majority cloture rule in the Senate, I predict that not only may we suffer in the United States, but the effect may be so far reaching that even other nations will be affected by a change of the cloture rule. I am also convinced, as a Senator, that we must keep the right of unlimited debate which we now have in order to protect minorities against the majority. I hope that Senators listening to me tonight will please remember that today there may be a civil-rights question involved, but tomorrow there may be involved an entirely different matter affecting a different section of the United States. We should consider this question thoroughly. That is one reason I have taken so much time in trying to present the case to the Senate this evening. I hope nothing will be done which will in the future jeopardize our Nation.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	Maybank
Anderson	Hoey	Millikin
Baldwin	Holland	Morse
Brewster	Humphrey	Mundt
Bricker	Ives	Myers
Butler	Jenner	Neely
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	Reed
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Chapman	Kem	Russell
Connally	Kerr	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Downey	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Lodge	Sparkman
Ecton	Long	Stennis
Ellender	Lucas	Taft
Ferguson	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Frear	McCarthy	Thye
Fulbright	McFarland	Vandenberg
George	McGrath	Watkins
Green	McKellar	Wherry
Gurney	McMahon	Wiley
Hayden	Magnuson	Williams
Hendrickson	Malone	Withers
Hickenlooper	Martin	Young

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 15. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STENNIS (when his name was called). On this general subject matter I have a pair with the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. I am informed that if the Senator from Wyoming were present he would vote as I intend to vote on the pending question. I, therefore, feel at liberty to vote, and I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who are absent on public business, would vote "yea," if present.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], all of whom are necessarily absent, would vote "yea," if present.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] is absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], would vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 78, nays none, as follows:

YEAS—78

Aiken	Hill	Maybank
Anderson	Hoey	Millikin
Baldwin	Holland	Morse
Brewster	Humphrey	Mundt
Bricker	Ives	Myers
Butler	Jenner	Neely
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	Reed
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Chapman	Kem	Russell
Connally	Kerr	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Downey	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Lodge	Sparkman
Ecton	Long	Stennis
Ellender	Lucas	Taft
Ferguson	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Frear	McCarthy	Thye
Fulbright	McFarland	Vandenberg
George	McGrath	Watkins
Green	McKellar	Wherry
Gurney	McMahon	Wiley
Hayden	Magnuson	Williams
Hendrickson	Malone	Withers
Hickenlooper	Martin	Young

NOT VOTING—17

Bridges	Kefauver	Taylor
Chavez	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	Miller	Tobey
Flanders	Murray	Tydings
Gillette	O'Conor	Wagner
Hunt	O'Mahoney	

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this question the yeas are 78, and no Senator having voted in the negative, the motion is unanimously agreed to.

So the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 15) amending the so-called cloture rule of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution is now before the Senate and open to amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to Senate Resolution 15, in the nature of a substitute, which I offer on behalf of the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS], the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the junior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and myself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the resolving clause and in lieu thereof to insert the following:

Resolved, That subsection 2 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate relating to cloture, be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"2. Notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, except subsection 3 of rule XXII, at any time a motion signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day, but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote question:

"'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by two-thirds of the Senators duly chosen and sworn, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals

from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

SEC. 2. Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, relating to cloture, be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"3. The provisions of the last paragraph of rule VIII (prohibiting debate on motions made before 2 o'clock) and of subsection 2 of this rule shall not apply to any motion to proceed to the consideration of any motion, resolution, or proposal to change any of the Standing Rules of the Senate."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I desire to submit a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I correct in my understanding that this is a complete substitute for Senate Resolution 15?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is so submitted; yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. When it comes to voting, would perfecting amendments to the original text take precedence over the amendment in the nature of a substitute?

The VICE PRESIDENT. An amendment to the original text of the resolution takes precedence in the matter of voting before the substitute or any amendment to the substitute is voted upon. In other words, the original text for which the substitute is offered is open to perfecting amendments.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Is the substitute subject to debate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The substitute is subject to debate and amendment.

Mr. LANGER obtained the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may make a statement?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, there is apparently now before us a complete new substitute, which has many ramifications and many new phases of law which make it entirely different from Senate Resolution 15. This is the first time that at least about 40 Senators in the Chamber have heard very much about the substitute. It seems to me that in order to give all Senators a fair opportunity to look over this new provision we should take a recess now and come in perhaps tomorrow at noon. That will give every Senator an opportunity seriously to consider the matter and come here with some idea and knowledge of what we should or should not do.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from North Dakota has the floor.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to say that I rose to ask for that very privilege—of studying the substitute resolution—because I have not seen it. I think Senators are entitled to study it before they are called upon to vote on it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no intention not to give the Senate an opportunity to discuss the substitute and to become acquainted with all its provisions. I did not know whether it was the intention of the majority leader to recess now or to proceed with the discussion. Certainly it is the intention of all those who have joined in submitting the substitute that all Senators be given all information about it. I heartily agree with the suggestion of the majority leader that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow noon. I am in complete accord with the suggestion, and I hope he will make the motion.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 11 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 16, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 15, 1949

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our blessed Father in Heaven, we thank Thee that back of this world house, back of our joys and afflictions, our perplexities and problems, back of the universe itself, is a good God of infinite mercy and power. Let us not doubt the divine will, which keeps this troubled world steadfast and sure.

We thank Thee for the infinite tenderness with which Thou hast blessed us, for home and church, for food and shelter, for religious liberty and the love of truth and honor.

May our daily pledge be to our conscience, our country, and our God, believing that the glorious earth is one great land with Thee as ruler, and eternal truth the only sword. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

TAX REFUNDS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, this is income-tax day. It is the day in millions of homes when families are struggling with their final Federal tax returns for the calendar year 1948. For many it is a day of sweating and fretting as to where the money is to come from to pay the balance due the Government.

It is the one day in the year when the entire Nation should be keenly aware of the excessive cost of government in Washington, and of the burden of taxes, which today, in most families, takes almost as much out of the family income as the total rent bill every year.

And it is the day when tens of millions of families will compute for themselves the value of the tax-reduction bill passed by the Eightieth Congress, the Republican Congress which overcame and overrode three Presidential vetoes to give the American people a measure of tax relief.

Every day in recent months, the Federal Treasury has been mailing out an average of 100,000 tax-refund checks to people who have money coming back to them because of that tax cut passed over President Truman's vetoes in the Eightieth Congress. There are more than twenty-five million of these tax refunds going out between June 1943 and the end of the current fiscal year, June 30, 1949.

Mr. Speaker, those refund checks are substantial measures of relief today in millions of homes throughout America. They are in the mails only because the Republican Eightieth Congress enacted a tax cut. It may be the last tax cut given the American people in our times. If all the fabulous spending programs introduced in the present Congress were to be realized, Federal spending would be increased by $16,000,000,000 a year over the next 5 years.

Millions of families will be at least partially tided over 1949 by the tax refunds they are now getting because of the action of the Eightieth Congress. But next year there will be no such volume of refunds—for this Congress does not yet plan to give the American people a tax cut, as the last Republican Congress did. Next year the full burden of the Truman New Deal spending will fall upon the American people, for the Republicans have not the votes this year to overturn the administration's basic policy—to tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect.

Only the people can change this mania of Federal squandering.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY FAVORS ECONOMY

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I approve what the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has just said.

The Republican Party has traditionally been the party of economy and low taxes. If the Republicans had been returned to power by the last election our plan would have been to go much further with tax reduction and tax revision. We the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee had planned to present legislation that would repeal the excise tax on a number of commodities, such as

the tax on low-priced cosmetics and low-priced handbags. And also reduce materially the tax on telephone calls, telegrams, and transportation tickets. And also to make a substantial reduction in all excise taxes. These reductions should be made.

The Republicans in the Eightieth Congress were able to secure the passage in the House of a tax bill which is of tremendous importance. The bill was passed too late for the Senate to act.

For a number of years the Ways and Means Committee has maintained a very capable staff of experts. These experts, in collaboration with the experts of the United States Treasury, have for some time been working to relieve many inequities and inconsistencies that have developed in the tax laws of the country. They have found where nearly a hundred amendments to the general tax laws are absolutely necessary. They agreed on about 50, which they incorporated into the bill which I have just referred to. I was chairman of the subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee appointed to make a general revision of the tax laws, and this bill was the product of our efforts.

I have reintroduced this bill, and it should pass this session of Congress. Many people who have suffered by reason of these inequities need relief. This bill will not raise or lower taxes to any great extent, but it will correct many injustices.

T-DAY

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today, March 15, is an important day in the lives of millions of Americans. This is T-day—the last day during which 1948 income taxes can be paid.

So, Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to point out that in paying their 1948 income taxes today our citizens are finding—for the first time in many years—that their income-tax burden has been reduced.

In fact some seven million Americans, who, in previous years were required to pay taxes on their low earnings, do not have to pay any tax on their 1948 incomes. Millions of married couples are finding their income-tax assessments have been greatly reduced, in many cases by as much as 30 percent. All other Americans are finding that their income-tax burdens on 1948 earnings have been reduced.

This happy result is no accident, nor is it because of anything the administration in power has done.

The lower income taxes effective today are the legislation enacted by the Republican Eightieth Congress over the veto of the President. The Republicans in the Eightieth Congress, just as do the Republicans in the Eighty-first Congress, were and are strong believers in governmental economy and in the lower taxes to be gained by economy. The Republican Eightieth Congress cut both Government spending and taxes. The Republicans in this Eighty-first Congress are demanding reduced Government spending and repeal of wartime excise taxes. They are opposed to the President's program of heavier Government expenditures and greatly increased taxes on the people.

Today—T-day—is a good time for the people of the United States to stop and ponder a while over the financial situation and policies of our Government. Today is a good time for them to decide whether they want the economy and efficiency in Government—and lower taxes, under a Republican program—or the continuation of the New Deal policy of tax and tax and tax, and spend and spend and spend, which threatens both the solvency and the future of this Nation.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, "The good that men do lives after them"—of course, this saying should be amended and when applied to the Eightieth Congress should then read "The good that the men and women did in the Eightieth Congress lives after them."

One of such "do goods" which affects the very foundation of our country is the preservation of marriage and home. The Eightieth Congress, in passing the tax-reduction law of 1948 wisely included the community-property tax provision.

To confirm the good in this instance, I wish to include in my remarks an item from the Hartford (Conn.) Times of March 14, 1949, which in all likelihood, is only one example of many unreported reconciliations or strengthening of marital ties. Surely the full effect of this tax proviso is incalculable in the light of all the possible ramifications on the marital ties of the husbands and wives of America, not mentioning the inevitable fact that the provision had been an added strong reason for new marriages.

Mr. Fitzpatrick is the collector of internal revenue for the State of Connecticut, with offices at 460 Capitol Avenue, Hartford.

The newspaper item is as follows:

COMMUNITY-PROPERTY TAX PROVISO BRINGS RECONCILIATION

The revised Federal income-tax law can play the role of Cupid as well as that of the traditional ogre. Take the word of Collector John J. Fitzpatrick for it.

As the filing of returns mounted in volume today on the next to the last day, Fitzpatrick said that in several cases the new opportunity to file joint returns had apparently brought about reconciliations between separated couples.

Proof of one reconciliation appeared at Capitol Avenue internal revenue headquarters this morning. Fitzpatrick told it this way:

"Last month a taxpayer in a high-income bracket came in alone for help. Asked if he was married, he said he was, but that subsequent to December 31 he and his wife separated."

Under the new community-property law, it was pointed out to the taxpayer, he and his wife could file jointly, thereby saving money, if they had been living together December 31, last day of the taxable year. If on or before the last day of the year they were divorced or legally separated, they are considered single for the entire year for tax purposes.

The taxpayer, warned that if he and his wife agreed to file jointly they must both sign the return, went away to think it over.

Today he returned with his wife, both smiling, and sought help in filing a joint document. They explained that while getting together to talk over their tax they also talked over other things and decided on a reconciliation.

Collector Fitzpatrick believes that several other reconciliations in the State had been similarly effected.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Woman's Home Companion.

Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances: in one to include an editorial appearing in the March 19 issue of the magazine America, and in the other to include a speech to be made by him at Cleveland.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, and to include editorials and newspaper articles, and in one instance to include a statement made by him which was submitted to the Committee on Ways and Means on old-age pensions.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include newspaper articles.

Mr. MICHENER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances: in one to include an editorial; and in the other to revise and extend his remarks and include a magazine article in the remarks he intends to make today.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address made by a constituent, Mr. Kent Leavitt, president of the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article, Liberal or Conservative.

Mr. CLEVENGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. JENNINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. SANBORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a gentleman in Delaware.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement from the Selective Service System.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, to include newspaper articles and letters.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a certain magazine article.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter. I am informed by the Public Printer that the cost will be $159.75 but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the requests of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some excerpts from certain letters relative to Federal expenditures.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

EZRA BUTLER EDDY, JR., AND WIFE, MARIE CLAIRE LORD EDDY

The Clerk called the first bill on the Private Calendar, H. R. 1700, for the relief of Ezra Butler Eddy, Jr., and wife, Marie Claire Lord Eddy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the Immigration and Naturalization laws the Attorney General be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Ezra Butler Eddy, Jr., and his wife, Marie Claire Lord Eddy, as of February 3, 1945, the date upon which they were admitted temporarily to the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAMUEL FADEM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1993) for the relief of Samuel Fadem.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Samuel Fadem, who entered the United States lawfully at the port of New York on September 27, 1946. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall reduce by one the quota for Poland then current.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALASKA JUNEAU GOLD MINING CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 583) for the relief of the Alaska Juneau Gold Mining Co., of Juneau, Alaska.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Alaska Juneau Gold Mining Co., a corporation, of Juneau, Alaska, the sum of $80,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for crushed rock, building materials, and services furnished the United States for use in urgently needed defense projects, including construction of the subport of embarkation, air landing fields, and so forth, at Juneau, Alaska, and in the vicinity during the period from June 1, 1942, to February 1, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAMIE HURLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 594) for the relief of Mamie Hurley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions and limitations of sections 15 to 20, both inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 5, secs. 765–770), the Bureau of Employees' Compensation is hereby authorized and directed to receive and consider, when filed, the claim o Mamie L. Hurley for compensation under such act, within 6 months from the date of enactment of this act, on account of the death of her husband, Edwin L. Hurley, deceased, whose death on March 21, 1945, is alleged to have been the result of injuries, with consequent disability, received in August 1940, in the performance of his duty as a machinist in the Veterans' Administration at Kecoughtan, Va.; and the Bureau, after such consideration of such claim, shall determine and make findings of fact thereon and make an award for or against payment of compensation provided for in such act of September 7, 1916, as amended: *Provided*, That no benefits shall accrue prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF MATHEW C. COWLEY AND LOUISA COWLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 609) for the relief of the estate of Mathew C. Cowley, deceased, and the estate of Louisa Cowley, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the estate of Mathew C. Cowley, deceased, former owner of a certain farm consisting of 155 acres of land, more or less, near Camp Knox, in Hardin County, Ky.; and the estate of Louisa Cowley, deceased, former owner of a certain farm consisting of 150 acres of land, more or less, near Camp Knox, in Hardin County, Ky., are each, as such former owner or owners, hereby authorized to bring such suit or suits as each may respectively desire to so do against the United States of America, to recover damages, if any, for loss or losses, which they may have sustained or suffered, as such respective former owners, by reason of establishment, construction, or maintenance of Camp Knox in the State of Kentucky. Jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky to hear, consider, determine, and render judgments for the respective amounts of such damages, if any, as may be found to have been sustained or suffered by the said former owners of said farms, with the same right of appeal as in other cases, and notwithstanding any lapse of time or statute of limitation: *Provided*, That such action will be brought within 1 year from the date that this act shall become effective.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LORENZO H. FROMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 610) for the relief of Lorenzo H. Froman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Lorenzo H. Froman, former owner of a certain farm consisting of 165 acres of land, more or less, near Camp Knox, in Hardin County, Ky., is, as such former owner, hereby authorized to bring suit against the United States of America to recover damages, if any, for loss or losses which he may have sustained or suffered, as such owner, by reason of establishment, construction, or maintenance of Camp Knox in the State of Kentucky. Jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky to hear, consider, determine, and render judgment for the amount of any such damages, if any, as may be found to have been sustained or suffered by the said former owner of said farm, with the same right of appeal as in other cases, and notwithstanding any lapse of time or statute of limitations: *Provided*, That such action will be brought within 1 year from the date that this act shall become effective.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLAIMS OF PROPERTY OWNERS ADJACENT TO FORT KNOX, KY.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 611) to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of certain property owners adjacent to Fort Knox, Ky.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky to hear, determine, and render judgment for the respective amounts of such damages as may be found to have been sustained or suffered by landowners who owned land in the vicinity of Fort Knox, Ky., prior to the time the Government acquired that site: *Provided*, That no claims shall be considered by the court of any landowner who acquired the property after the acquisition by the Government of this military reservation: *Provided further*, That such action or actions will be brought within 1 year from the date that this act shall become effective.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third

time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. HARRIETT PATTERSON ROGERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 637) for the relief of Mrs. Harriett Patterson Rogers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,800, to Mrs. Harriett Patterson Rogers, of Forrest City, Ark., in full settlement of all claims against the United States as reimbursement for a judgment rendered against her and in favor of Jess L. Bell and others in the Circuit Court of Pope County, Ark. Such claim arising out of an accident on June 14, 1941, while the said Mrs. Harriet Patterson Rogers was on official business for the United States Agriculture Extension Service in the State of Arkansas: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOUISE PETERS LEWIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 683) for the relief of Louise Peters Lewis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any funds or property of the Government of Germany or of nationals of Germany in the possession or under the control of the Government of the United States or which may hereafter come into the possession or under the control of the United States, to Louise Peters Lewis of East Lynn, Mass., a native-born citizen of the United States, the sum of $10,000. Such sum represents the actual amount of the loss (without interest thereon) sustained by the said Louise Peters Lewis on account of the depreciation in value of certain First World War German securities owned by her and described in her claim (list No. 5242, Docket No. 7172) heretofore filed with, and dismissed by, the Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

J. W. GREENWOOD, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1137) for the relief of J. W. Greenwood, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to credit the accounts of J. W. Greenwood, Jr., former regional fiscal officer for the Central Administrative Services Division, Office for Emergency Management, Philadelphia, Pa., and he is hereby relieved from any liability to refund or pay to the United States the sum of $718.23, such sum being vouchers issued to enlisted personnel for travel expenses at the same rate as commissioned officers, whereas they were entitled to a lower rate under the Army regulations, and for other purposes.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid no the table.

L. J. HOUZE CONVEX GLASS CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1461) for the relief of the L. J. Houze Convex Glass Co.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LICHTENWALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

COHEN, GOLDMAN & CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1794) for the relief of Cohen, Goldman & Co., Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Cohen, Goldman & Co., Inc., out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $19,030.20, in full settlement of all claims against the Government growing out of contracts numbered 1325, .645, 2299, 3220, and 4519N, and contracts supplementary thereto, for the manufacture during 1917 and 1918 of overcoats and uniforms for the United States Army.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 11, after the word "Army", insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. FLORENCE BYVANK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2463) for the relief of Mrs. Florence Byvank.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay the amount of the insurance under the Government life insurance policy (No. K 720604) of Clarence A. Byvank to Florence Byvank, his widow and designated beneficiary, in accordance with the terms of such policy, beginning with the first calendar month following the month during which this act is enacted, notwithstanding the lapse of such policy in December 1931. The insured, Clarence A. Byvank, applied for reinstatement of such policy in February 1932 and transmitted payment for back premiums thereon at the time of application but died suddenly from monoxide gas poisoning on March 30, 1932, before a report of his medical examination had been filed with the Veterans' Administration.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACCEPTANCE OF CERTAIN GIFTS AND A FOREIGN DECORATION

The Clerk called the bill (S. 632) to authorize certain personnel and former personnel of the Naval Establishment to accept certain gifts and a foreign decoration tendered by foreign governments.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following-named members and former members of the naval service are hereby authorized to accept such gifts as have been tendered them by foreign governments as of the date of approval of this act: Rear Adm. Harold M. Martin, United States Navy; Capt. William R. Brust, United States Naval Reserve; Capt. Bennett W. Wright, United States Navy; Capt. George C. Wright, United States Navy; Capt. Richard W. Ruble, United States Navy; Commander Robert F. Carmody, United States Navy; Commander James I. Cone, United States Navy; Commander Jack Dean, United States Navy; Commander Gordon Fowler, United States Navy; Commander Richard L. Fowler, United States Navy; Commander John E. Hausman, United States Navy; Commander Draper L. Kauffman, United States Navy; Commander James A. Knowlton, United States Naval Reserve; Commander John P. Lunger, United States Navy; Commander Robert M. Milner, United States Navy; Commander Frank G. Raysbrook, United States Navy; Commander Frederick M. Steisberg, United States Navy; Commander William A. Stuart, United States Navy; Commander Richard S. Rogers, United States Navy; Commander George R. Lee, United States Navy; Lt. Comdr. Raymond A. Boyd, United States Navy; Lt. Comdr. Laurenca B. Green, United States Navy; Lt. Comdr. Melvin C. Hoffman, United States Navy; Lt. Comdr. Victor A. Moltoret, United States Navy; Lt. Comdr. John C. O'Connor, United States Navy; Lt. Comdr. Henry Nelson, United States Naval Reserve; Lt. Comdr. Norman L. Paxton, United States Navy; Lt. Comdr. Byron G. Sheppie, United States Navy; Capt. James J. Bott, United States Marine Corps; Lt. Irwin J. Vanderswag, United States Marine Corps; Lt. George H. Belk, United States Navy; Lt. Samuel Hopkins, Jr., United States Navy; Lt. Jack Scott, United States Navy; Lt. (jg) La Verne W. Brown, Jr., United States Navy; Lt. (jg) Leonard B. Di Napoli, United States Navy; Lt. (jg) Thomas L. Neilson, United States Navy; Lt. (jg) Horace A. Thomsen, United States Navy; Ensign Robert F. Armstrong, United States Navy; Chief Boatswain Anthony S. Ciccone, United States Navy; Boatswain Earl L. Hause, United States Navy; Joseph G. Pardovich, chief boatswain's mate, United States Navy; Robert D. Clendenon, chief musician, United States Navy; Carl F. Heine, chief machinist's mate, United States Navy; Gilbert H. Dobler, chief photographer's mate, United States Navy; Myrl A. Yeaman, chief photographer's mate, United States Navy; Crisanto Dolor, chief cook, United States Navy; Master Sergeant Lionel E. Simmons, United States Marine Corps; Willie F. Maquire, chief signalman, United States Navy; Donald K. Lobell, chief radioman, United States Navy; Gorman "T" Perry, motor machinist's mate, first class, United States Navy; Jack O. Montgomery, boatswain's mate, second class, United States Navy; Charles R. Dickinson, boatswain's mate, third class, United States Navy; Lawrence H.

Wasser, musician, third class, United States Navy; Gordon C. Wyman, fire controlman, third class, United States Navy; Robert Charles Vail, shipfitter, third class, United States Navy; Delmere B. Blackburn, private, first class, United States Marine Corps; Paul Hermann, seaman, first class, United States Navy; James E. McCall, seaman; first class, United States Navy; Charles H. Kilpatrick, seaman, first class, United States Navy; Clifford E. Kintner, seaman, first class, United States Navy; Bernard I. Landau, seaman, first class, United States Navy; Harold A. Master, seaman, first class, United States Navy; Kenneth Karl Hrabal, seaman, first class, United States Navy; Nicholas Vignovich, seaman, first class, United States Naval Reserve; Leonard Stanley Tur, fireman, first class, United States Naval Reserve; L. R. Weedle, fireman, first class, United States Navy; R. N. Young, fireman, first class, United States Navy; and Michael Strusinski, coxswain, United States Naval Reserve.

SEC. 2. The following-named members of the naval service are hereby authorized to accept such awards as have been tendered them by foreign governments as of the date of the approval of the act: Rear Adm. Edward W. Hansen, United States Navy; Capt. Albert E. Fitzwilliam, United States Navy; and Lt. (jg) John E. Nichols, United States Navy.

SEC. 3. Dr. Mina S. Rees, a civilian employee of the Navy Department, is hereby authorized to accept and wear the King's Medal for Service in the Cause of Freedom which has been tendered her by the Government of Great Britain.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALEX BAIL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 668) for the relief of Alex Bail.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel forthwith any outstanding warrant of arrest, order of deportation, warrant of deportation, and bond in the case of Alex Bail, and is directed not to issue any further warrants or orders in the case of the alien based upon such alien's membership in the Communist Party prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FREDA WAHLER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2704) for the relief of Freda Wahler.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Civil Service Commission is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the civil-service retirement and disability fund, to Freda Wahler, of Freeport, Ill., the widow of William F. Wahler, formerly a railway mail clerk, an annuity equal in amount to the annuity which she would have been entitled to receive had William F. Wahler been promptly and properly advised by the Civil Service Commission of his rights as to retirement and had he upon receipt of the proper information elected in writing to receive a reduced annuity equal to such reduced annuity payable after his death to the said Freda Wahler as surviving beneficiary.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JACOB A. JOHNSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 585) for the relief of Jacob A. Johnson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Jacob A. Johnson, of Kodiak, Alaska, the sum of $15,103.94, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for losses heretofore sustained, or which may hereafter be sustained, by the said Jacob A. Johnson, on account of damages heretofore caused, or which may hereafter be caused, to his fox farm, located on Crooked Island, Alaska, by military, naval, and air force activity in that area: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE A. KIRCHBERGER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 650) for the relief of George A. Kirchberger.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That George A. Kirchberger, of Chicago, Ill., is relieved of all liability to refund to the United States amounts paid to him for services as an employee of the Department of the Treasury, Bureau of Federal Supply, and as an employee of the Department of War during the period he was not eligible, because of citizenship requirements, to receive compensation from funds appropriated for such Departments. Any amounts heretofore (1) withheld from the said George A. Kirchberger (including any accrued salary for services performed and salary in lieu of accrued annual leave, but excluding the sum of $214.44, representing retirement deductions), and any sum withheld or required to be withheld pursuant to the provisions of subchapter D of chapter IX of the Internal Revenue Code, or (2) refunded to the United States by him, on account of such unauthorized payment to him, shall be paid to him out of any money available for the payment of salaries of employees of the Department of the Treasury. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, into the civil-service retirement and disability fund provided for in the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, such sum of $214.44 which shall be credited to the individual account of the said George A. Kirchberger who shall, for the purposes of such act, as amended, be held and considered to have been a citizen of the United States during the period of his employment by the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIO GENERAZZO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 681) for the relief of Mario Generazzo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mario Generazzo, Revere, Mass., the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, pain, and suffering of his son, George Generazzo, aged 5, who was injured as a result of being struck by a United States Army Red Cross ambulance on a public highway in the city of Revere, Mass., on October 18, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "appropriated", strike out the bill down to the colon in line 1, page 2, and insert in lieu thereof "to the legal guardian of George Generazzo, Revere, Mass., the sum of $750, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and pain and suffering sustained by the said George Generazzo as a result of his having been struck by a United States Army ambulance on a public highway in Revere, Mass., on October 18, 1943."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of George Generazzo."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL ENGINEERING & DRY DOCK CORP.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 709) for the relief of the General Engineering & Dry Dock Corp.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Navy Department be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to receive, consider, and pay the claims of the General Engineering & Dry Dock Corp. arising under Navy Department, Bureau of Ships contract NObs-10790 by reason of claimant's failure to comply with the provisions of article 5 (b) of said contract: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out lines 3 to 8, inclusive, and insert the following: "That the Navy Department be, and is hereby, authorized to waive compliance by the General Engineering & Dry Dock Corp. with the requirement of article 5 (b) of Navy Department, Bureau of Ships Contract NObs-10790, that estimates of the cost of performing change orders be submitted within 10 days of the receipt of such orders or within such further time as the naval inspector may allow in writing within said 10-day period."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF MRS. MINERVA C. DAVIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 738) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Minerva C. Davis.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

MEXICAN FIBRE & TWINE CO., INC.,

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1116) for the relief of Mexican Fibre & Twine Co., Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mexican Fibre & Twine Co., Inc., San Antonio, Tex., the sum of $435.20, in full settlement of all claims against the United States representing overcharge of customs duties on sisal twine on entry No. 115 of July 25, 1946, made at New Orleans, La., resulting from certain mathematical errors in the liquidation of the entry.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, after line 11, insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADOLPHUS M. HOLMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1121) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Adolphus M. Holman.

Mr. LICHTENWALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

HEIRS OF IDA LONDINSKY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1276) for the relief of the heirs of Ida Londinsky.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000 to the heirs of Ida Londinsky, who was killed as a result of being struck by a Government-owned truck of the United States Army in New York City, N. Y., on November 18, 1942. The payment of this sum will be in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$2,000."

Page 1, after line 11, insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AL W. HOSINSKI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2249) for the relief of Al W. Hosinski.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

JOEL W. ATKINSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2353) for the relief of Joel W. Atkinson.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

STATE COMPENSATION INSURANCE FUND OF CALIFORNIA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2922) for the relief of the State Compensation Insurance Fund of California.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the State compensation insurance fund of California the sum of $478.13. Such sum represents the total amount paid by the said State Compensation Insurance Fund of California, as follows:

(1) To Allen D. Cameron, California, and Earle P. Schouten, California, for compensation and medical treatment on account of injuries sustained on February 3, 1939, when the automobile in which they were riding was in collision on the State highway near Vacaville, Calif., with a truck operated in the service of the Civilian Conservation Corps. At the time of such accident, the said Allen D. Cameron and Earle P. Schouten were employees of the San Rafael Military Academy, San Rafael, Calif., and the sum of $382.10 was paid to them by the said State Compensation Insurance Fund under its workmen's compensation insurance policy with the said San Rafael Military Academy;

(2) To Officer Everett Ingram of the California Highway Patrol, for compensation and medical treatment on account of injuries sustained on August 25, 1941, when the motorcycle on which he was riding was in collision on the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, with a truck operated in the service of the United States Army, and the sum of $81.78 was paid to him by the said State compensation insurance fund under its workmen's compensation insurance policy; and

(3) To the State department of motor vehicles for damage to the motorcycle on which Officer Ingram was riding, the sum of $14.25: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF INTERIOR TO ISSUE DUPLICATES OF WILLIAM GERARD'S SCRIPT CERTIFICATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2853) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue duplicates of William Gerard's script certificates No. 2, subdivisions 11 and 12, to Blanche H. Weedon and Mattie Ward H. Harris, jointly.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to issue to Blanche H. Weedon and Mattie Ward H. Harris, jointly, duplicates of William Gerard's special certificate No. 2, subdivision No. 11 and subdivision No. 12, each originally issued for 40 acres of public land pursuant to the act of Congress approved February 10, 1855, upon satisfactory proof of ownership and loss of same and the execution of a bond with good and sufficient securities, in double the market value of the certificates so to be issued, to be approved by the Secretary of the Interior, conditioned to indemnify the United States against the presentation by an innocent holder of the alleged lost certificates. Such duplicates shall have all the legal force and effect of the original.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue duplicates of William Gerard's script certificates No. 2, subdivisions 11 and 12, to Blanche H. Weedon and Amos L. Harris, as trustees."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "Mattie Ward H. Harris, jointly" and insert in lieu thereof "Amos L. Harris, as trustees."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue duplicates of William Gerard's script certificates No. 2, subdivisions 11 and 12, to Blanche H. Weedon and Amos L. Harris, as trustees."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BANK OF KODIAK, KODIAK, ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 580) for the relief of the Bank of Kodiak, Kodiak, Alaska.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Bank of Kodiak, Kodiak, Alaska, the sum of $3,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement in the loss of mutilated currency of the United States aboard the steamship Yukon on February 4, 1946: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAYMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS AGAINST THE ARMY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 634) to authorize payment of certain claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property and personal injury arising from activities of the Army.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Henry W. Brooks, Warren, Vt., $360; to T. N. Carlton, Rural Free Delivery No. 1, Wauchula, Fla., $250; to Melvin B. Clark, Mankato, Minn., $32; to Paul A. Davis, Rural Free Delivery No. 3, Sylvan Hills, North Little Rock, Ark., $255; to Albert E. Drecoll, Libertyville, Ill., $63.25; to E. H. Ferguson, Rantoul, Ill., $64.68; to Harold L. Gavan, 229 Anderson Street, Hackensack, N. J., $24.79; to Francis E. Geagan, Hotel Vereen, Miami, Fla., $50; to John F. Gibbons, Jr., 1507 Robert Street, New Orleans, La., $155.30; to John J. Kutch, 7212 Harrow Street, Forest Hills, Long Island, N. Y., $34.57; to Mrs. Blanche Lebwith, Wyandanch, N. Y., $189.50; to Joaquin Quinones Lopez, Santurce, Puerto Rico, $600; to Mason D. Nesmith, Georgetown, S. C., $40.64; to Isadore Rosinsky, 1820 North Fifty-fourth Street, Omaha, Nebr., $706.50; to A. M. Smith, Rural Free Delivery No. 2, Columbia, S. C., $440; to Mrs. May V. Walsh, Montezuma, Ga., $35; to Herbert Grillmaier, care of Hermann Reitboeck, Clay Products Co., Panama, Republic of Panama, $190.31; and to Peter L. Feller, 125 West Sixteenth Street, New York, N. Y., $227. The payment of said sums shall be in full settlement of all claims of the above-named claimants against the United States for damage to or loss or destruction of property and personal injury caused by military personnel or civilian employees of the Army, or otherwise incident to noncombat activities of the Army, and determined by the Department of the Army to be meritorious, which are not payable either under the provisions of the Act of July 3, 1943 (57 Stat. 372; 31 U. S. C. 223b), entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities, of the War Department or of the Army", as amended, or under the "Federal Tort Claims Act," as codified by the act of June 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 983; 28 U. S. C. 2672): *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent of any claim shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RACHEL D. GATTEGNO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 633), for the relief of Rachel D. Gattegno.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Rachel D. Gattegno, of Salonika, Greece, the sum of $3,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of her husband, David Gattegno, who died on or about July 5, 1944, as the result of a wound caused by a rifle bullet accidentally fired by a guard at a United States Army military camp at Fedhala, French Morocco, on or about July 4, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN I. MALARIN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 594) for the relief of John I. Malarin, former Army mail clerk at APO 932, a branch of the San Francisco, Calif., post office, relative to a shortage in his fixed-credit account.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John I. Malarin, former Army mail clerk at APO 932, a branch of the San Francisco, Calif, post office, the sum of $916.78, the amount refunded to the United States by the said John I. Malarin as a result of a deficiency that developed during February 1943 in his fixed-credit account while he was Army mail clerk at APO 932: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in the act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWIN B. ANDERSON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 592) for the relief of Edwin B. Anderson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Edwin B. Anderson, a city letter carrier in the post office at Newton, Iowa, is hereby relieved of all liability to make refund to the United States of any amount received by him as a result of overpayment of salary from May 1, 1945, the date he was promoted from substitute postal employee to the position of regular city letter carrier by the postmaster at Newton, Iowa, to October 16, 1946, the effective date of his promotion to regular city letter carrier as authorized by the Post Office Department.

Any amount heretofore refunded to the United States by Edwin B. Anderson, or by any other person or persons on account of such overpayment of salary to Edwin B. Anderson, shall be refunded to him, or to such other person or persons, out of any money available for the payment of salaries to city-delivery carriers. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any postmaster or other designated disbursing officer of the Post Office Department or postal service, the salary payments to Edwin B. Anderson from May 1, 1945, to October 16, 1946, for service as regular city letter carrier shall be considered to have been authorized: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSE BABACE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 26) for the relief of Jose Babace.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

CERTAIN BASQUE ALIENS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 27) for the relief of certain Basque aliens.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

RICHARD KIM

The Clerk called the bill (S. 90) to provide for the naturalization of Richard Kim.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws Richard Kim, who served as a member of the armed forces of the United States, shall be considered to have been lawfully admitted for permanent residence as of the date of his last entry into the United States, upon the payment of the visa fee of $10 and the head tax of $8. The Secretary of State is directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that said quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to provide for permanent residence status of Richard Kim."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHUNG KWAI LUI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 315) for the relief of Doctor Chung Kwai Lui.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record Dr. Chung Kwai Lui as having entered the United States in 1936 for permanent residence, upon the payment by her of the visa fee and head tax.

SEC. 2. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any warrants of arrest or orders of deportation which may have been issued, and to discontinue any deportation proceedings which may have been commenced, in the case of Dr. Chung Kwai Lui. The Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Chinese quota for the first year that a quota number is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLARIS U. YEADON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 335) for the relief of Claris U. Yeadon.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration laws, relating to the issuance of immigration visas for admission to the United States for permanent residence and relating to admissions at ports of entry of aliens as immigrants for permanent residence in the United States, that provision of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 136 (c)), which excludes from admission into the United States "persons who have been convicted of or admit having committed a felony or other crime or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude," shall not hereafter be held to apply to Claris U. Yeadon (nee Claris U. Davis), the wife of Cecil S. Yeadon, an American citizen. If she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, an immigration visa may be issued and admission granted to the said Claris U. Yeadon under this act upon application hereafter filed.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIE E. WRIGHT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2231) for the relief of Marie E. Wright.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Marie E. Wright, of Gibson, N. C., the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of injuries to person and property and future medical expenses sustained by her when the United States Army vehicle in which she was a passenger was struck by another United States Army vehicle at Berlin, Germany, on March 19, 1946: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$4,528.83."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EWA PLANTATION CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2233) for the relief of Ewa Plantation Co., a Hawaiian corporation.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $120,831.27 to Ewa Plantation Co., a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the Territory of Hawaii, in full settlement of all claims listed herein against the United States for property damages caused by aircraft, gunfire, flares, and other acts of the armed forces of the United States from December 8, 1941, through June 20, 1945, upon lands held under lease by said company, resulting in the damage to or the destruction of the crops of sugarcane belonging to said company upon its lands adjacent to Pearl Harbor, on the Island of Oahu, Territory of Hawaii.

Claim No.	Date	Field No.	Amount
1	Dec. 8, 1941	61	$17,571.03
2	May 21, 1944	69, 72, and 64	7,963.12
3	June 12, 1945	47	21,403.06
4	June 20, 1945	81.2	3,326.35
5	Feb. 15, 1942	55	118.09
6	Mar. 8, 1942	75	5,509.19
7	Apr. 7, 1942	60	7,251.61
8	Jan. 30, 1943	67	1,792.23
9	Feb. 19, 1943	2.2	672.34
10	Mar. 6, 1943	74.1	78.57
11	Mar. 25, 1943	27	87.68
12	Apr. 6, 1943	1	5,746.48
13	May 26, 1943	20.1	607.68
14	June 10, 1943	71	3,392.79
15	June 19, 1943	45	625.25
16	Sept. 5, 1943	61	7,621.74
17	Nov. 29, 1943	12	655.57
18	Jan. 1, 1944	43.1	13,036.17
19	Apr. 15, 1944	1	62.09
20	July 29, 1944	76	32.24
20-A	Aug. 6, 1944	72	468.41
22	Sept. 2, 1944	67.1	542.01
23	Sept. 14, 1944	65.1	5,686.59
24	Nov. 21, 1944	67.1	8,423.59
25	Dec. 18, 1944	13	8,983.27
26	Jan. 15, 1945	27	106.74
27	Feb. 17, 1945	27	85.51
28	Mar. 6, 1945	63.1	Nil
29	Mar. 6, 1945	53	1,067.96
Total			120,631.27

Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection therewith, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. JULIA BALINT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 679) to authorize the admission of Mrs. Julia Balint to the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. WALTER. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RICH. I object to the consideration of the bill, Mr. Speaker; I should like to know something about it.

The SPEAKER. One objection is not sufficient.

There being no further objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the quota limitations now provided by law, a quota immigration visa may be issued to Julia Balint, provided she is otherwise admissible to the United States under the immigration laws, upon payment of the visa fee and head tax.

SEC. 2. Upon the issuance of the visa, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the first available quota for Czechoslovakia.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MAY K. Y. MOK, FREDERICK W. S. MOK, AND VINCENT W. C. MOK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1010) for the relief of Mrs. May K. Y. Mok, Frederick W. S. Mok, and Vincent W. C. Mok.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is directed to cancel forthwith any outstanding warrant of arrest, order of deportation, warrant of deportation, and bond, in the case of aliens Mrs. May K. Y. Mok and her two minor sons, Frederick W. S. Mok and Vincent W. C. Mok, all of Berkeley, Calif., and is directed not to issue hereafter any such warrants or orders in the case of such aliens. For the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the said Mrs. May K. Y. Mok, the said Frederick W. S. Mok, and the said Vincent W. C. Mok, who entered the United States on September 21, 1945, for a temporary stay, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted, as of such date, to the United States for permanent residence.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the aliens Mrs. May K. Y. Mok and

her two minor sons, Frederick W. S. Mok and Vincent W. C. Mok, shall be considered to have lawfully entered the United States for permanent residence on September 21, 1945, the date of their actual entry into the United States, upon payment by them of visa fees and head tax.

"SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct three numbers from the Chinese racial quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRAM B. TELLEKAMP

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1591) for the relief of Bram B. Tellekamp.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Bram B. Tellekamp, of Honolulu, T. H., shall be held and considered to have lawfully entered the United States for permanent residence on March 17, 1947, the date of his actual entry into the Territory of Hawaii, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax.

SEC. 2. Upon enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for the Netherlands for the first year that said quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "March 17, 1947" and insert "March 18, 1947."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RALPH MARTIN ELZINGRE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1876) for the relief of Ralph Martin Elzingre, also known as Ralph Seawell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the alien Ralph Martin Elzingre, also known as Ralph Seawell, of Mill Valley, Marin County, Calif., shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted at San Pedro, Calif., on May 2, 1945, to the United States for permanent residence.

With the following committee amendment:

In line 8, page 1, substitute a comma for the period and add the following: "upon payment of the visa fee and head tax.

"SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall authorize the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available quota for nationals of the Philippine Islands."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RALEIGH B. DIAMOND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1791) for the relief of Raleigh B. Diamond.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Raleigh B. Diamond, of Jacksonville, Fla., the sum of $6,539.10, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and loss of earnings sustained on February 6, 1944, while riding in a jeep attached to the naval mine-warfare test station, Solomons, Md.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES FLYNN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 731) for the relief of James Flynn.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to James Flynn, Clinton, Mass., the sum of $3,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said James Flynn against the United States on account of personal injuries received by him on December 9, 1945, as a result of an accident in which a motor vehicle of the United States post office, Pawtucket, R. I., was involved at Hamilton Square, Clinton, Mass.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$3,500" and insert "$2,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. HARRY E. HEWITT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 682) for the relief of Mrs. Harry E. Hewitt.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Harry E. Hewitt, of Peabody, Mass., the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries incurred by her minor son Elliott Hewitt, and for medical and hospital expenses resulting therefrom, as a result of being burned from a fire carelessly and negligently left unguarded by employees of the Works Progress Administration in February 1938, on sidewalk project on Lynn Street, Peabody, Mass.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Mrs. Harry E. Hewitt" and insert "the legal guardian of Elliott Hewitt."

Line 7, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$1,500."

Line 9, strike out "her minor son" and insert "the said."

Page 2, line 2, strike out "1938" and insert "1940."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Elliott Hewitt."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARVEY M. LIFSET

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 607) for the relief of Harvey M. Lifset, formerly a major in the Army of the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Harvey M. Lifset, formerly a major in the Army of the United States, is relieved of all liability to pay to the United States the sum of $1,497.89. Such sum represents Government funds stolen from him in France while he was acting as purchasing and contracting officer for the Eighty-second Airborne Division, United States Army. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, an amount equal to the aggregate of any amounts which have been paid by the said Harvey M. Lifset in partial satisfaction of the claim of the United States arising by reason of such theft.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRITZ BUSCHE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 602) for the relief of Fritz Busche.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is directed (1) to revoke vesting orders No. 7550, executed September 5, 1946 (11 F. R. 11092); 7561, executed September 5, 1946 (11 F. R. 11143); 7658, executed September 18, 1946 (11 F. R. 13444); and 8085, executed January 24, 1947 (12 F. R. 879); and (2) in the performance of his functions under Executive

Order 9788, issued October 14, 1946, to make no further claim against the property covered by such vesting orders. Such property is the property of Fritz Busche, a citizen of the United States and veteran of World War II, as a result of gifts made to him by certain relatives of German nationality prior to the declaration of war by the United States against Germany on December 11, 1941.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HAMPTON INSTITUTE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 593) for the relief of Hampton Institute.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Hampton Institute, of Hampton, Va., a private, nonprofit, educational institution, is hereby relieved of all liability to pay to the United States the balance, due on and after April 1, 1948, of the purchase price of certain property purchased from the United States by Hampton Institute pursuant to Supplement No. 6, dated December 1, 1945, of contract No. NOd 3041, dated August 5, 1942, between the United States of America and Hampton Institute. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Hampton Institute an amount equal to the aggregate of any amounts due and payable on and after April 1, 1948, under such contract, as supplemented, which have been paid by Hampton Institute to the United States. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized and directed to transfer to Hampton Institute all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the property purchased under such contract, as supplemented.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VICTOR R. BROWNING & CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 599) for the relief of Victor R. Browning & Co., Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $15,100, to Victor R. Browning & Co., Inc., of Willoughby, Ohio, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States under contract No. NOY-13693, dated , entered into by Victor R. Browning & Co., Inc., with the United States Government through the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks of the Navy Department, contracting for and providing for the construction of crane equipment for delivery to the Navy Yard at Charleston, S. C.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PHIL H. HUBBARD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 735) for the relief of Phil H. Hubbard.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Phil H. Hubbard, American consulate, Birmingham, England, the sum of $939.25. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Phil H. Hubbard against the United States for reimbursement of the expenses incident to the transportation, during June 1945, of his wife and children from the United States to Zurich, Switzerland, where he was stationed as American consul. Although such expenses would normally have been paid by the Department of State, the said Phil H. Hubbard was required to pay such expenses because of lack of funds available to the Department of State for such purpose: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN F. GALVIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 766) for the relief of John F. Galvin.

Mr. LICHTENWALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. LICHTENWALTER]?

There was no objection.

MRS. REBECCA LEVY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3077) for the relief of Mrs. Rebecca Levy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Rebecca Levy, of Seattle, Wash., the sum of $6,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Rebecca Levy against the United States arising out of the death of her husband, Isaac Levy, which resulted from his being struck by a United States Army vehicle in Seattle, Wash., on September 26, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JESSE A. LOTT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3234) for the relief of Jesse A. Lott.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., and Supp. V, title 5, secs. 765–770, inclusive), the Bureau of Employees' Compensation of the Federal Security Agency is hereby authorized and directed to consider any claim filed with the Bureau by Jesse A. Lott for compensation under such act, within 6 months from the date of enactment of this act, on account of alleged injuries incurred at the United States Maritime Shipyard, Brunswick, Ga., on or about May 16, 1918. No benefits shall accrue prior to the approval of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IVA GAVIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3254) for the relief of Iva Gavin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000, to Iva Gavin, of Muncie, Ind., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, and loss of earnings suffered and incurred by her when the automobile in which she was riding was struck by an Army Air Corps bus at or near Dayton, Ohio, on August 18, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNA MALONE AND RITA ANDERSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1101) for the relief of Anna Malone.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 19 (a) of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 889–890; 56 Stat. 1044; 8 U. S. C. 155), the Attorney General is authorized and directed to permit Anna Malone, of San Luis Obispo, Calif., to remain permanently in the United States if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws other than quotas.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all of page 1 and insert: "That the Attorney General is hereby directed to cancel the warrant of arrest, warrant of deportation, and any outstanding

bond or bonds in connection with existing deportation proceedings against Anna Malone and Rita Anderson, both of San Luis Obispo, Calif., because of violations of section 19 (a) of the Immigration Act of February 1917 (39 Stat. 889–890; 56 Stat. 1044; 8 U. S. C. 155). The Attorney General is likewise directed not to issue any further such warrants of arrest or warrants of deportation against the said Anna Malone and Rita Anderson because of the conduct upon which the present proceedings are founded."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Anna Malone and Rita Anderson."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RUSSIAN ORTHODOX GREEK CATHOLIC CHURCH OF NORTH AMERICA, SOUTH NAKNEK, ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2812) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain land at South Naknek to the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of North America.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That upon the filing of an application and the payment of $10 within 1 year from the date of this act by the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of North America, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Pennsylvania, the Secretary of the Interior shall issue a patent to said corporation for a tract of land at South Naknek near South Naknek village on the south side Naknek River, Bristol Bay area, Alaska, described as follows:

Beginning at corner No. 1 of United States survey 2675; thence east one hundred and one and four-tenths feet to corner No. 4 of United States survey 2675 on the west boundary of United States survey 1581; thence south one hundred and ninety feet along west boundary of United States survey 1581 to a point from which corner No. 1 of United States survey 1581 bears south one hundred and eighty and fifty-seven one-hundredths feet; then west one hundred and forty feet; thence north one hundred and ninety feet; thence east thirty-eight and six-tenths feet to the point of beginning, containing sixty-one one-hundredths acre.

SEC. 2. The patent issued under this act shall contain a reservation to the United States of all mineral deposits in said lands and the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 15, after the word "under", insert the words "applicable laws and."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 29]

Barden	Hoffman, Ill.	Simpson, Pa.
Blatnik	Howell	Smith, Ohio
Bulwinkle	Jenison	Smith, Wis.
Celler	Karst	Somers
Chiperfield	Latham	Tackett
Cox	Lesinski	Taylor
Crosser	Lucas	Teague
Dawson	Norrell	Thomas, N. J.
Dingell	O'Konski	Trimble
Ellsworth	Plumley	Wadsworth
Fulton	Poulson	Whitaker
Gathings	Reed, N. Y.	White, Idaho
Gilmer	Sadowski	Wood
Harris	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Woodhouse
Hays, Ark.		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 387 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

HOUSING AND RENT CONTROL, 1949

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1731) to extend certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 1731, with Mr. GORE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on Friday the Clerk had read through section 203 of the committee substitute.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is on the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of Kansas: On page 34 strike out lines 23 to 25, inclusive, and on page 35 strike out lines 1 to 18, inclusive.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer today new bait. This is more palatable bait than has heretofore been offered. As a matter of fact, it is the type of bait that members of both parties are more interested in than that which was offered before. This bait is such that it will permit you to understand what we are attempting to do in writing a new bill. The amendment which I offer today is one of a series of amendments. This amendment together with the other amendments will be offered clause by clause, phrase by phrase, section by section, to turn the bill as it has been introduced to present law.

Thus I hope to underscore what is happening to you in the so-called tightening of rent control.

The particular amendment which I have proposed today provides for striking out the right of the Expediter to recontrol those areas which have been heretofore or may hereafter be decontrolled in any defense rental area, notwithstanding any administrative decontrol action taken since June 30, 1947, except of course that he may not recontrol areas which have been decontrolled by the emergency court of appeal.

I see no reason to permit the Housing Expediter to recontrol areas which he has decontrolled. When the Housing Expediter appeared before the Committee on Banking and Currency in support of this provision, he said the reason for it was a possible need to establish control in a defense area, which might arise after it had been decontrolled. That was one reason.

Secondly, he said that conditions might change in any decontrolled area, that the supply of rental housing might become inadequate. He said under well-defined limitations he would recontrol those areas.

I have attempted to find the well-defined limitations or restrictions under which we have placed the Expediter in the event he would attempt to recontrol any area.

Going back to the original OPA law, I read from section 2 (b), that the Housing Expediter, or the Administrator at that time, may take such action as is necessary and proper in order to effectuate the purposes of this act. He may issue a declaration setting forth the necessity for and recommendation with reference to the stabilization or reduction of houses in any defense-rental area.

Mr. Chairman, that is the so-called well-defined limitation under which the Housing Expediter may desire to recontrol areas which have been decontrolled. In his judgment any necessity for recontrolling may be sufficient, and, in my opinion, that is it.

It has been said, and later was produced in the hearings before the committee, that this provision will give the Expediter a more lenient method of decontrolling. If he makes a mistake he may recontrol. But I point out again that the reasons that the Housing Expediter may desire to recontrol are economic conditions which may change, not emergency conditions, but economic conditions which may change, as the gentleman from Missouri said the other day. Conditions may change so that we find ourselves in a depression period so that the people of this country will not have adequate means to find satisfactory rental. If these conditions arise, then the Housing Expediter, in my judgment, under this provision, would be entitled to recontrol areas which heretofore have been decontrolled. Therefore, as we are facing a possible change in our economic situation, I suggest that we do not permit the Housing Expediter this additional authority to recontrol areas which have been heretofore decontrolled.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE] has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is a new provision in rent-control legislation; it has never been in a bill; it has never been in the law. The committee has always opposed it; we opposed it on the theory that we

did not want the Housing Expediter to have that much power, but this time I believe the committee while it is not unanimously for it, I believe a large majority of the Members are for this provision. The reasons are obvious: A lot of areas and portions of areas are on the fringe. The Housing Expediter is not willing to take the responsibility of removing an area or portion of an area entirely, although it looks like it is ripe to be taken off, for the reason that he had experience along that line that taught him that in some instances the people would take advantage of it and run the rents up not just 10 percent, but 50 percent, 100 percent, 500 percent.

This provision is to encourage the Expediter to run a risk, to go ahead and take it off; then if they do not act right he has the power under this law to recontrol. Therefore, you are encouraged and you have an incentive to remove just as many just as quickly and just as fast as possible. I think it is the finest thing in the bill in the direction of decontrol, and certainly we do not want to take it out.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. BUCHANAN. As I understand, originally about 660 areas were under control; at the present time 598 areas are under control.

Mr. PATMAN. That is right.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Would the gentleman care to state what the experience was according to the testimony before the committee, in those areas which were decontrolled?

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman knows more about that than I, but I know that the experience of the Expediter was not always a happy one; after he decontrolled an area he could not put it back, and the people could just do nothing they wanted to in trying to establish a limit as to rent; it has been rather unfortunate. I wish the gentleman would get 5 minutes' time and go into this subject as soon as my time is up; I think it would be a fine thing.

So this provision should be in this bill, this recontrol provision; if you want to encourage the Expediter to decontrol you should give him power to recontrol in the event there are abuses. Furthermore, it is notice to the people who own houses in these areas or portions of areas that they must not get unreasonable if they do not want the Housing Expediter to come back in and take action. It will caution them and cause them to be more discreet in their handling of the tenants. And remember that the power here is not just to remove a defense area; the Housing Expediter may remove a portion of that area. Suppose there are 10 counties in the area; he may remove 1 county, 2 counties, or the whole area of 10 counties; so, in that event, he is encouraged to decontrol the whole area or any portion of it. And, too, there is a restriction: If the Emergency Court of Appeals has held that an area to be decontrolled—which they have held in cases including the gentleman's city in Florida—it would be impossible for the Housing Expediter to recontrol it.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. If the local rent control board recommends decontrol, does the language carried in the bill, the provision the gentleman wants retained in this bill, give the Expediter the power to recontrol it even though the local board has recommended decontrol?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; the gentleman means if they had recommended decontrol, and if it had been decontrolled that the Housing Expediter under the present law has the power to put it back under control in the event it were necessary. But if the local board made a recommendation and it was not accepted by the Housing Expediter, but they appealed to the Emergency Court of Appeals and the Emergency Court of Appeals said it should be controlled; then, under this amendment the Housing Expediter cannot touch that area in any way in the world; it remains decontrolled.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, continuing the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] one step further, I hold in my hand here a weekly magazine issued out of the State of North Carolina. I am impressed with this very shocking statement on the enormous rise in the rent ceilings in the Greensboro, N. C., area. As the gentleman from Texas indicated, the Expediter has the right to decontrol a portion of an area. That is what took place in this particular area of Greensboro, N. C. A portion of the area was decontrolled and within a very brief period of time the rent in this decontrol area increased over 100 percent. I read from this news item:

Rent ceilings were taken off 14 dwelling units in Greensboro in the 3 months ended January 31, 1949. The area rent director said Friday the rapidity with which these rents have shot up following decontrol has been a shock to us. Rents climbed to a total of $776 a month compared to the previous ceiling of $426. The average rise was 105 percent above the previous ceiling. It was a part of a Nation-wide study ordered by the Housing Expediter.

Mr. Chairman, it does appear to me that the recontrol provision in the bill is a very timely provision. Not only would it tend to stabilize rents in these rental defense areas but, as the gentleman from Texas indicated, it would enable the Expediter to decontrol many fringe areas with the reasonable belief that this Greensboro situation would not arise.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEANE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. As I understand the law now, once an area is decontrolled the Expediter has no authority to recontrol it no matter how high they go with their rents, is that correct?

Mr. DEANE. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. As a result of that, there is a natural hesitancy to decontrol some areas. This particular provision would be as important in connection with the desire to have as many areas decontrolled as possible, which the Expediter will do; then if there is an unreasonable, abnormal increase or an abuse under decontrol he could recontrol under those circumstances?

Mr. DEANE. Would the gentleman feel that this rise of 105 percent in this Greensboro area is reasonable or unreasonable?

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, well, my impression of that would be that under the circumstances it is unreasonable. I say this provision here is a provision for more efficient operation of the law and for more satisfaction being meted out, is that correct?

Mr. DEANE. That is correct.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEANE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. In other words, your committee by the use of this language means to arm the Expediter with a loaded gun with which to bully and browbeat property owners?

Mr. DEANE. No, I cannot agree with the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, because, in my opinion, the Expediter has been trying to carry on a job under legislation which has been practically impossible to administer.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEANE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Is it not a fact that since April 1, 1948, under local area rent boards that have the power to make recommendations for decontrol they have only made 14 such recommendations, and is it not a fact further that those who are in touch with the situation locally are in a better position to make these recommendations?

Mr. DEANE. I do, and may I make this further observation: In my own Congressional district I asked for two surveys to be made by the Expediter. These surveys were made and the leading officials of these communities reported there was need for a continuation of controls. I contend these local boards are in the best position to know the needs of the local communities.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEANE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. Is it not a fact that if this is allowed to remain as it is, giving the Expediter the power to recontrol, it really means there will be an acceleration to decontrol?

Mr. DEANE. Yes.

Mr. SPENCE. And that was the reason the committee adopted it; because they thought of many instances, where he might decontrol them, he would be armed with power to recontrol if they did not violate the duty that the landlord owed the tenant or the tenant the landlord, and that was the very purpose of it, to accelerate decontrol.

Mr. DEANE. Indeed, it was.

Mr. SPENCE. That was the reason we adopted it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, those of you who may have some feeling that giving this right to the Expediter is giving him a loaded gun should have their attention directed to the fact that the local boards may still make recommendations, and if the Expediter does not go along with the local board, the local board can still take the matter to the Emergency Court of Appeals and have any mistakes of the Expediter rectified. In other words, the law now provides that if your local board, your local people, think that your area should get an increase in rent or should be decontrolled entirely, they make that recommendation. If the Expediter does not go along with it, you take it to the Emergency Court of Appeals and the Emergency Court of Appeals will do the right thing for you. If the Expediter should now go back and recontrol an area which has been previously decontrolled and, bear in mind, if the court has decontrolled it, the Expediter can do nothing about it—it permits decontrol permanently. But, if those areas where a local board should make recommendation and the Expediter does not go along with it, or he should recontrol it and the local board differs with him, the board can go to court and get it decontrolled if the facts require it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I understood the majority leader to say that where the decontrol had been recommended by the Expediter, that he could not then go back and recontrol. But I understand, in the bill, he can, unless the Emergency Court of Appeals has ruled upon the question. The Expediter may have decontrolled an area, but under this bill he can go back and recontrol that area; is that correct?

Mr. MULTER. There are two methods now for decontrol; one by the Expediter and the other by the Emergency Court of Appeals if the Expediter did not want to do it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. If the Expediter has decontrolled an area and the Emergency Court of Appeals has not acted upon it, can he go back and recontrol that area?

Mr. MULTER. He may recontrol that area, subject, again, to court review, as I have already indicated.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am inclined to think my friend misunderstood what I did say. I said under existing law, once he decontrolled as I understand, no matter how high the rents were, he could not recontrol it.

Mr. MULTER. Under existing law he cannot do anything about it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Under the proposed law he can?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Under the proposed law, though, there is no appeal to the Emergency Court of Appeals if the Housing Expediter recontrols an area which has been decontrolled.

Mr. MULTER. I do not agree with the gentleman because the local board, despite the recontrol by the Expediter, the local board can make the recommendation to decontrol thereafter and if he does not go along with it——

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Yes; thereafter.

Mr. MULTER. We are talking about changing circumstances. If an area is now decontrolled, we are not going to recontrol it unless the rents go sky high and the tenants have no place to go. If the local board recommends decontrol and the Expediter disagrees, you go to court and get it decontrolled.

I urge that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, last week when we had this matter up for discussion our distinguished friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], read a statement from the newspaper which indicated that about 100 sections or districts of the country have been agreed upon to be decontrolled. Later I saw several references to the same effect in the newspaper. I wonder if anyone has come forward with a list of those 100, or whatever number they were, because I would like to know what districts have been agreed upon.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, in answer to the gentleman's question I shall say this, that the list which he has referred to is a list of so-called fringe areas. It is not an official statement from the Housing Expediter's office to the effect that these areas would be decontrolled. It is merely a list of some number of areas that are considered fringe communities in some 26 States. It was not offered as bait. It was not offered in any manner to bring in votes to support this legislation. That has been known to the members of the committee for some time.

Mr. JENKINS. I do not yield further. The gentleman declines to furnish that information.

This statement said positively that a certain Member of this House had appeared before the newsmen and had put out that statement. This is what I want to know. I want to know what was said and what sections were thereby favored. I come from a district that has some fair sized city areas and some rural areas. I have appeared on the floor of this House repeatedly, when this rent matter was formerly up before us for consideration and tried to effect some decontrols. As I remember it I offered an amendment 2 or 3 years ago that I think was adopted. That amendment provided that the Expediter or the man in national authority at that time could decontrol the rural sections, if it was evident that rent control was not necessary. It never has been done in my section. I had one of the top men from the Washington office come to my office in my home city. I asked the Washington office to send with him a man with practical experience. This man with practical experience recommended decontrol, but the Washington man failed to follow his advice. If any secret agreements have been made as a bait or in any other way and done quietly, and done in favor of somebody, I want to know who did it and who profits by it. If somebody does not come forward with that information, then I say we ought to have an investigation. I want to know right now if the information can be given. If it cannot be given, someone surely can give us some information. I do not want any of this fringy business. Let us have "Yes" or "No."

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I do not want to mention any names, and I am not going to, but I do know that that list has been circulated among numerous Members of the House. They know what is in it. I cannot for the life of me see why it is so confidential that every Member of the House should not be entitled to see it. We raised that question the other day. As far as I know it is yet a confidential list available only to a select few. The gentleman from Pennsylvania may say that that does not constitute bait. I say that it does constitute bait. There is no reason why I should not see that list or the gentleman from Ohio should not see it or any Member of the House should not see it.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. No.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Does not the gentleman want information on this? He is asking for information.

Mr. JENKINS. I do not want the kind of information the gentleman gave last week when he talked a lot about this but furnished no information.

Mr. BUCHANAN. In other words, the gentleman is not interested in the facts.

Mr. JENKINS. I have the floor and I decline to yield. I repeat, I do not want any of this fringy business. I do not want information such as the gentleman gave last week, which was evasive and was in no way responsive or satisfactory. The gentleman evidently has the information and evidence; then why does he not produce it? If some sections been promised relief in such a way as that those who know about it refuse to give out the information, then I repeat that we should call for an investigation.

Mr. Chairman, apparently there is no one who will offer to clarify this situation. I shall keep this questioning up until we get some information.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COLE of Kansas) there were—ayes 86, noes 121.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMS: On page 35, line 18, strike out the quotation marks, and after line 18, insert the following subsection:

"(j) If the legislature or comparable governing body of any State, municipality, county, or other political subdivision declares by resolution that Federal rent control is no longer needed in such State, municipality, county, or political subdivision, and transmits a certified copy of such resolution to the Housing Expediter, the provisions of this title shall be inapplicable to such State, municipality, county, or political subdivision 15 days after such certified copy shall have been mailed by registered mail to the Housing Expediter."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I am not one of those who say that there is no need to have Federal rent control in certain areas of our country, nor am I one of those who believe that this should be a local proposition, locally enforced and locally instigated. I am a firm believer, of course, in maintaining the right of the States to order and control their own affairs; but the critical housing crisis which faces the country today was brought on by a war and a national emergency. On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, I favor granting to local authorities the right to decontrol in sections where decontrol is necessary and advisable. Certainly no one knows better than the elected local officials of any town, county, or legislature of any State whether rent control is needed within the area under their jurisdiction.

The adoption of this amendment, of course, will give some semblance of local control over rents. In areas where it is not needed, this amendment makes it mandatory that the Housing Expediter decontrol those areas upon receipt of a resolution duly passed by the duly elected officials of those areas.

This is in keeping with the division of powers under our Constitution between the States and the Federal Government. It is in keeping with the needs of our people by recognizing that those who are confronted with the situation know best how to take care of that situation themselves.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. COX. I am very strongly in favor of the gentleman's amendment, and yet I think I realize that the adoption of his amendment is not going to make this rent-control law a good law.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not think so, either.

Mr. COX. Because you cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear. However, the amendment ought to be adopted. The adoption of it would make the measure less sweeping in its operation. I believe the House, when it finally comes to vote upon the measure as amended, should vote it down.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will give the Federal Government the right to determine whether they are going to recognize the right and competence of local officials to govern their own affairs. By passing this amendment you will say that these people who are on the ground, these people who live in the cities, the States, and the counties know more about taking care of their own affairs than some appointed bureaucrat sitting behind a desk in Washington. You will recognize the dignity of the individual community. You will recognize the dignity of the county, the dignity of the State, the dignity of the municipality.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment would be destructive of the very purposes of the bill. We have adopted rent control because of a national emergency, and that is the ground upon which the courts have upheld it, including the Supreme Court of the United States.

There must be a national pattern if we are going to subserve the purposes for which rent control was adopted. That pattern would be utterly destroyed by the adoption of this amendment.

There is a principle in law by which you may classify property for taxation and for regulation, but the classification must be reasonable, and all persons similarly situated must be treated substantially the same. That ought to apply to rent control. Where do you place the power to decontrol property in this amendment? You give it to the legislatures of the States. You give it to the county commissioners of the counties and to the board of councilmen or the commissioners of a city affected. Of course, they will be under pressure all the time to decontrol, and, of course, the powerful interests are the landed interests. It would result in confusion worse confounded. It would gut the bill and destroy the purposes for which it was originally enacted.

I have great respect for the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], who offered this amendment. He was a distinguished soldier, and he deserves the consideration of this House, but I think his amendment would be destructive of everything we are trying to accomplish.

Suppose a city governing board refused to decontrol. Then they would apply to the county governing board. If the county governing board refused to decontrol, they would take it to the State legislature. It does not involve local self-government. We have to give up some of our rights when a national emergency exists. Primitive man was the only man who was absolutely free. When he entered organized society he gave up some of his rights for the general good.

Then I hear a lot of talk about the invasion of the Constitution, and crocodile tears are being shed over our lost liberties. The founders of our Government made but one constitutional court, the Supreme Court of the United States. The great Chief Justice, John Marshall, said that that Court would decide whether an act was constitutional or not. That Court ever since has held that jurisdiction. They used it in this case, and they said that rent control was constitutional, and that a national emergency existed. That is the reason it is on the statute books today.

If you do not want rent control, I hope you will vote against it and make the issue clear so the responsibility of its destruction, if that should happen, will be placed where it belongs.

I am tired of seeing perfecting amendments to destroy the bill. I know that this was introduced in all sincerity, but that is the effect it would have, and that is the effect most of these amendments would have: Utterly to destroy the bill and to destroy every purpose upon which it was enacted.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is the gentleman from Kentucky saying that he does not have faith in the judgment of his local officials?

Mr. SPENCE. I have not faith that the local people will keep the pattern of national rent control; no, I have not faith that they will do that. I have faith, of course, in their discharging the duties for which they were elected; but this is something different, this is not ordinary legislation, and I do not think we ought to impose these administrative powers on the local legislative bodies generally and then say to certain sections, "You may decontrol." What will the result be? One county will be decontrolled and another county similarly situated will be controlled.

I am also wondering whether or not the Congress has the power to delegate to these legislative bodies the power to decide when a Federal law shall operate and when it shall cease to operate, bodies over which the Congress exercises no authority of selection and over whose action it has no control.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not attempt to engage in a constitutional battle with the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], but it does occur to me that somewhere in the Constitution it is stated that all powers not given to the Congress are reserved to the States and to the people. Let us bring rent control into that pattern.

The argument which has been advanced by the gentleman from Kentucky brings to light the sorry thing that is involved in rent control; it is the suggestion that now, almost 4 years after the war is over, we should attempt to force into a national pattern, as he describes it, areas where the people best in position to know whether rent control is needed have no voice, to force them into that national pattern of rent control whether they believe it is needed there or not.

As the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN] said a while ago in connection with another amendment, the local people are the ones best in position to know. Why not let them have the decision?

I was impressed Friday by the argument of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] when he made the plea to the House that this was a problem of the big cities, and urged that the people in the rural areas or the people from the back parts of the country should give the city people a chance to have rent control,

that the rest of us should not impose our will upon them.

That was the argument of the gentleman from New York.

By the same token, the men from the cities who have this problem, who want rent control, should not attempt to say to the portions of the country which feel they do not need it, that they must have it or that they must place in the hands of some bureaucrat sitting in Washington the power to say whether or not it should be imposed upon the local areas.

I am perfectly willing for the gentleman from New York to have rent control in New York if he wants it; I am perfectly willing for some city in my district to have rent control if they want it; but by the same token, I say: Do not impose it upon the communities where the local governing authority says they do not need it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Sorry; I decline to yield.

Mr. Chairman, there are some unhappy aspects of this rent-control problem. I heard the gentlewoman from Utah the other day talk about some unit paying $7 a month in rent, which she said did not pay the taxes; and yet she was for rent control because she thought there was a need in some quarters. But I must say that in my honest opinion it is a rather sorry business we are dealing with when we say to certain segments of the people, to wit, those who happen to have their money invested in real estate, that they should be required to operate at a loss if someone in Washington says, "You must give your goods at a cost that will not even pay taxes upon it," and you do not impose that kind of rule upon the balance of the economy. The least we can do, it seems to me, is to give authority to these local communities such as is suggested in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi and let the wishes of the people who know most about it control the situation.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in reference to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi, I have some salient facts here regarding State laws so far as expiration dates are concerned.

The State of Connecticut has a State law which expires upon adjournment of the assembly. A new bill has been introduced to extend the time limit.

The State law of the State of New York expires on June 30, 1949.

The State of Virginia State law extends to July 1, 1950.

In the State of Wisconsin the State law expires on April 1, 1949.

In the State of Maryland they have enabling legislation for local governing body control which expires on June 1, 1949.

In the State of Illinois they have enabling legislation for local governing body control which expires on June 30, 1949.

In the State of New Jersey their State law has expired. A bill has been introduced to revive the authority.

In the States of Minnesota, Missouri, Louisiana, Michigan, and Rhode Island the State laws have expired.

Since April 1, 1948, when local boards were selected upon the recommendation of the governors of the respective States approved by the Housing Expediter, who are in immediate touch and have been over a period of years, who know the local rent situation, in less than 600 rent areas where there are 767 of these local boards, there have been but 14 recommendations by local boards for decontrol. In other words, the people who have been charged with the responsibility of reviewing these cases, who are familiar with the cases, who are familiar with the local rent situation in their areas, have recommended but 14 areas for decontrol.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to remind the gentleman that in the State of West Virginia we have no rent-control law. Our constitution limits the session of our legislature to 60 days. It meets on the second Wednesday of January. Our legislature has adjourned. Under this proposal we would be without rent control unless the legislature would meet again.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I may say in answer to the gentleman from West Virginia that situation is similar in my own State. The members who were elected to the legislature were not elected on this particular issue. They are not in immediate touch with this particular problem, and I dare say that in almost one-half of the States of this Nation the assemblies are not in session at the present time. They have made no provision in any appropriations to take care of the local situation, and I am certain that it would lead to nothing but a chaotic rent condition if the pending amendment were adopted.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. May I say to the gentleman from West Virginia that he has missed entirely the meaning of this amendment. The amendment does not decontrol. It gives the State legislature the authority to decontrol. It gives them the authority to decontrol if it is not needed. The State of West Virginia, therefore, would not be without rent control until such time as the State legislature determined there was no further need for rent control or until such time as an individual, county, or city determined there was no need for rent control within the area under their jurisdiction.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I may say that what the gentleman's amendment does is that it recommends that the legislature or a comparable local government, a municipality, city, or political subdivision, if it declares by resolution that rent control is no longer needed, then the area is decontrolled.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. Does not the gentleman have a much more effective provision for local control of these situations in the present law which we are continuing in this bill, to wit, the local board recommendations, which are the people in each locality who know their own situation in each district and make the recommendation?

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is the entire purport of my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi seeks to interject into rent control local determination for decontrol of areas. I think we owe the gentleman from Mississippi a good deal of credit for his fight made two years ago on this floor which resulted in the process which we now have which, I believe, puts local consideration of the problem directly where it belongs.

You men know that these local boards, now provided by present law, have to be nominated by the Governors of the States from that locality. They meet, and they can recommend, after due hearings, decontrol of their areas. It goes to the Housing Expediter, and if they are not satisfied with the action of the Housing Expediter then they have an automatic appeal to the Emergency Court of Appeals. This is a three-judge Federal court, assigned for the specific job of handling rent control.

Now, that delegates local control in an orderly and a constitutional way because these nominees by the Governor are automatically appointed by the Housing Expediter, and the review in case of dissatisfaction of his action is appealable to a Federal court.

Let us contrast the constitutionality of that process designed to give this local consideration power in decontrol—and incidentally in hardship adjustments by these local boards—to what the amendment today does.

This provides that no one group has the responsibility, authority, or right to decontrol, but any one of a number of governmental groups, your State legislature, your county commissioners, or other municipal subdivisions of that area all are possessed of this power.

This would allow very easily the county commissioners and the city commissioners to get into a fight over which should have their way on whether the area should be decontrolled or whether it should continue under control.

The State legislature might decide that they wanted to continue control for an entire State against the wishes of the city council. It would provide stretching of Federal authority a long, long way and to give to non-Federal officers great powers under Federal law. I believe it could even pass Federal power to a board of township governors under this amendment.

I believe it is unconstitutional. The authority of Congress to vote rent control is for the reason of a national emergency which Congress finds exists. This great power to determine a national emergency cannot be carelessly handed over clear down through 10 or 12 echelons of local governing bodies, and thus say that anyone of that group can decontrol any area by resolution.

Is there any standard? Is there any consideration of the rights that these groups have? Most of my city officials in my State, and I believe most of the county commissioners, have only well-defined powers under State law, and I do not know of any powers that they have to construe or determine Federal law. If you pass this on to them they have only informal powers to meet around the table some afternoon or evening and resolve that they are going to do away with rent control in that particular area. Yet you ask that the United States Congress would without procedures, standards, or hearings pass over to local government units this sole right to make the decision for us as to whether rent controls are necessary or not.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Would it not be much better to vote against the bill entirely, to have no national rent law? Let the State legislatures of the States, or the cities, decide if they want to be under rent control and not us select them. This cannot be enforced, because you have so many jurisdictional questions.

Mr. MONRONEY. I agree with the gentleman, and you would have this confusion of jurisdiction over who had the right to decontrol.

I think under present law we have put the local control into this thing in a legal and a constitutional way. I believe you gentlemen know that these local, self-governing bodies can appear at any time before these juries of local citizens who form these local boards, and recommend decontrol if they so desire.

One point more. There are dozens of areas under rent control that cover 5 or 10 counties, that cover 15 or 20 municipalities. When we pass this power on to the subdivisions of local government, we do not know who they will be, or who will exercise this vast grant of power, this right of determination over whether or not rent control will be continued.

I ask you to vote down the amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have always been under the impression that the best government was that which was kept close to the people. I am wondering what we want to do here today. Do we want to put in the hands of somebody in Washington enough power that they can say to these small communities, and I have several in my district, "You cannot decontrol your area, whether you want to or not"? Are you afraid of the folks at home?

The type of argument the gentleman from Oklahoma and the gentleman from New York have made is the type of argument that leads to the totalitarian state, that the Government knows best and you must follow what the big Government in Washington tells you to do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. May I say that the purpose of this amendment is to take the final authority out of the hands of an appointed bureaucrat responsible only to the person who appoints him and place it in the hands of local, elected officials, responsible to the people who will be affected by rent control?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think the gentleman is absolutely right. We must remember that these boards in the different districts are appointed with the approval of the rent director. They have to have his approval. Sure, they are recommended by the Governor, but they are not appointed unless they have the approval of the rent expediter. The county officials and city officials are elected by the folks back home.

I like the gentleman's amendment. If you do not adopt his amendment, I have another one that will let the area be decontrolled by a vote of the people. I wonder what you would say about that? Do you think the people back home ought to have the right to vote, and let the majority of them say, "We do not want rent control"? What argument would you make against that? Why, bureaucracy is nothing but representative government gone berserk. I think there is a schizophrenia that has developed. A dual personality. Bureaucracy thinks nobody back home knows anything about running their own business. It must be done by all-powerful central government—I maintain that is not always good government.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KUNKEL. The local rent boards at the present time are actually appointed by the Housing Expediter. The Governor submits a list from which the Housing Expediter has to choose, but the Housing Expediter is the man who actually makes the appointment in the last analysis.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GOSSETT. May I observe that the rent-control director often does not pay any attention to the recommendations of the local boards. I know of one board that urgently recommended decontrol, and he wholly ignored their recommendation.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is true. It has occurred a number of times. I think the reason we have had very few appeals to the courts is that you wear the local people out. The local boards that are appointed are just worn down by the red tape and delay that you must go through before you can possibly get the decontrol. This amendment is simply a democratic procedure.

I say to you who are opposing the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi that you are going to build up a big bureaucracy here in Washington that is going to grow bigger and bigger, and as it grows bigger and bigger it must grow and feed upon itself to survive, and you and your people back home will grow smaller and smaller. I should like to see this thing placed right back home in the laps of the people at home. If you do not like the gentleman's amendment, under which the elected officials will have the final control over rent control, then I am going to ask you to vote for my amendment, under which a majority of the people in the group can vote for decontrol. I do not know whether you will accept that or not. I expect not.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The difficulty in getting a concession from the advocates of this legislation that would amount to anything in the way of relief to the people is that back of the demand there is a purpose to completely federalize the whole subject of housing.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman is right, and it disturbs me no end, because here it is some three and a half years after the war and we say a national emergency is still on. The advocates of all-powerful bureaucracy are afraid to let the people at home run their own local business—just where are we headed—a totalitarian state—an all-powerful bureaucracy denying the rights of free people to run their own affairs? That is the road you travel if you reject this amendment.

I admit that there may be some areas where there is some need for rent control, but I also feel there are a great many areas where they do not need it and where the local boards have even advised that controls be taken off, but the Expediter pays no attention to them. Therefore, I am in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi to let the city officials and county officials and State officials say whether rent control should be ended in a certain area. I think that is democratic procedure and ought to be accepted with open arms.

Mr. COX. What possible sane argument can be advanced against the proposal to put this whole subject into the hands of local people? In other words, why be afraid of local control? Why be afraid of self-determination on the part of small or even large communities to determine what they want?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, when this amendment was first shown to me by the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, it appealed to me very much. It appeared to me to be a reasonable amendment and possibly the most logical approach to the

solution of this problem. But on thinking the matter over in connection with the national emergency and other matters, I have changed my mind. I do not believe that it is the right thing to do. Witness these facts: One, we the Members of Congress were elected when the rent-control question was an issue. The city council was not elected on that issue, and neither was the city council or county commissioners, and neither were the members of the State legislatures, except possibly in very few States. The easiest thing for us to do would be to pass this amendment and just pass the buck and throw this troublesome problem into the laps of people who do not know anything about it. As to whether or not that is the right thing to do, that, of course, is a question for each individual person to determine.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] a while ago said that the local board had made a recommendation that a certain town be decontrolled, and the Housing Expediter refused to decontrol it. There is no reason in the world why that town cannot go into the Emergency Court of Appeals. The Emergency Court of Appeals can decontrol that town or city. It has been done in the past. It was done in the case of Miami, Fla. It does not cost anything. The Emergency Court of Appeals will go to your town and do it quickly. They will do it right now. It will cost you nothing. You have three United States district judges on that court and in a very short time they will pass on the question. If they say that the town should be decontrolled, it is decontrolled and the Housing Expediter, notwithstanding the provision that we have in this bill, cannot decontrol it at all.

So I suggest that since this is an issue which is national in scope and since the city council has never given consideration to this problem, would it be fair to them to turn the problem over to them? In addition to that, in the ordinary county in Texas, I do not know how it is in other counties in the United States, we have four commissioners who compose a commissioners' court. If you have one big city in that county, one of the commissioners comes from the city and the other three from the county, so those four commissioners could get together and decontrol the city, which was located in that county. Very few legislatures have had anything to do with this problem, so why should we try to pass the buck and throw it into the laps of people who have never dealt with the problem and who do not know anything about it, who have never studied it and who are not elected on that issue? I do not think we should do it as nice as the amendment appears to be and as logical as it seems to be at first blush. I think it would be a serious mistake for us to put it into the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 10 words.

Mr. Chairman, in the city of Detroit there are two cities entirely contained within that city—two cities of substantial size. Under the terms of this amendment, if it were adopted, the Common Council of the City of Detroit could decontrol or not. The common council of one of the cities within the boundaries of the city of Detroit could control or not, opposite to the decision of the Common Council of Detroit, and the common council of the other city within the city of Detroit could act independently still. The board of supervisors of the county could make still another decision. I dare say the constables of one particular ward conceivably could make their own decision.

It is difficult enough to administer the problems of rent control, but this is piling difficulty onto difficulty so that the bill with the Williams amendment in it reduces itself to an absurdity.

There is talk of handing this back to the people. If the people wanted this kind of an amendment, if the officers of some city or some county or some State legislature wanted this kind of amendment, if the people of our community wanted this kind of amendment, do you not think that some one of them during the lengthy hearings on this bill would have come before the Committee on Banking and Currency and said, "We want the power to go to the townships to decontrol rent control, we want the power to go to the common councils of the cities to decontrol rent control, or we want the power to go to the State legislature."

While there were serious differences of opinion on rent control generally, during the lengthy hearings on this bill no citizen—no local official—ever asked for the provisions of the Williams amendment, and no State official or private citizen asked for such a thing. I am sure nobody could make such a proposition and keep a straight face because it is ridiculous.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In the instance which the gentleman has cited of Detroit, do those several councils have uniform ordinances or resolutions on other matters?

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Answering the gentleman, I want to point to the absurdity that would result if, one side of the same street, the same type of housing accommodations, had control, and the opposite side of the street, on the same block, had decontrol.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. MULTER. Under this amendment the State legislature might decontrol an entire State, despite the fact that some cities need control, while under the law as it exists you could decontrol the area outside the city and the city could still be under control. You would not have the confusion under existing law as you would get under this amendment, whereby a large area could be decontrolled when it should not be. Is that not so?

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. I agree with the gentleman. The possibilities of confusion that would be created by this amendment are almost infinite

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this would seem to me to be a happy solution of this whole problem. It will leave Federal control subject of course to the rights, the autonomy of the local people. Why should it not be that way? Why should we have any fear in our hearts about what the local people are going to do?

Something has been said about the local governing bodies not being elected on this issue. Well, they soon would be elected on this issue or would fail of election on this issue if jurisdiction should be conferred upon them to act. They would be accountable to their own people on this matter if they had power to act. And if the people did not like their actions, as to this matter, they could vote them in or out as the case might be. I think we may safely leave it up to them to determine whether or not it is necessary in the particular locality. One of the Members here argued that such an amendment would bring about confusion. Unless I am misinformed about this whole thing and am in error, new units are decontrolled now, are they not?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. Not at this time. I have the highest regard for the distinguished gentleman from Texas, but I do not yield at this time.

Mr. PATMAN. I merely wanted to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. MORRIS. I am sorry, but I cannot yield just now; if I have time later I shall be pleased to yield.

Mr. Chairman, this gets back to the proposition of keeping a thing that is good for those who want it and permitting those people who do not want it to do away with it; and why should not they have that right? Yes, it seems to me that it is a happy solution of the whole thing. As I recall, this same amendment went over in the last Congress; there is a slight change in it, but substantially the same amendment, known at that time as the Redden amendment, passed the House. It was taken out in conference or lost in the shuffle somewhere along the line, but it went over. I have the highest regard for the chairman of this committee and for the distinguished gentleman from Texas who spoke against this proposed amendment, and it is no pleasure on my part to oppose them in the matter, but as I observed once before in this House, I observe again, Mr. Chairman: Certainly there is nothing sacrosanct about the report of a committee in presenting a bill to the House. I realize we ought to give great weight to their suggestions; they have studied the matter more carefully ordinarily than we have when we are not on that particular committee, and we should not lightly adopt an amendment; I realize that. We should be

cautious in adopting amendments on the floor because quite often they are not well considered, but that does not mean they never are. I realize what the impact of this amendment might be, but this, to my mind, is clear and convincing, and so far no one has offered any logic or reason to dispel my feeling, that this is a happy solution of the whole problem.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mr. COX. Is it not the gentleman's feeling that the people of the home town, whether small or large, are better able to determine what is good for them than is Washington?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes; it is.

Mr. COX. And that if they do not want rent control which the advocates of this bill admit to be a vicious and wicked thing, a bureaucrat in Washington should not be empowered to impose it upon them.

Mr. MORRIS. I appreciate the suggestion of the gentleman from Georgia; I think we can always rely upon our own local home folks.

I now yield to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Is it not a fact there would be a lot of confusion in cities like my own and Bristol, Va., where half the city is in one State and half in another, where they have two city councils acting for two separate cities. The one half might be controlled and the other half decontrolled; would not that create confusion?

Mr. MORRIS. No; I do not think it would because the local council of each city or part of the city would know what their people wanted. The question answers itself.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mr. MULTER. I do not see how you would handle such a situation, say, as the Oklahoma State Legislature saying, "Let us decontrol," but the city of Oklahoma and its council saying, "We should not decontrol." What are you going to do about that? How would you handle that?

Mr. MORRIS. It would be handled very easily. The State legislature, of course, has power to make laws for the entire State, and that law would be supreme unless there were something to the contrary in the constitution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to see if we can agree to a limitation of debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Would the gentleman suggest a time?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, was the request on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto or on the section?

Mr. SPENCE. On the pending amendment and all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I think the language of this amendment might be somewhat improved. This can be done in conference or by the Senate at a later date. The purpose of the amendment is something for which I have fought for many years, local control of local affairs.

Since I first studied law in the State university at Baton Rouge, La., I formed the definite conviction that real estate was something which should be controlled by local laws. For instance, the form of a deed, mortgage or other instrument must conform to the laws of the State wherein the land or realty is located. Certain matters of proof and other instruments must likewise conform to local laws in almost every State. Real estate has been through the years considered, perhaps more than any other type of property, to be localized property. It cannot be moved from place to place or taken from State to State. It cannot be placed in interstate commerce. It is immobilized and is or should be controlled by local laws and ordinances.

This amendment seeks to give more local control over real estate. It seeks to give the local people who are acquainted with local conditions and local needs the power to control or decontrol rental property. It may be argued that this will result in irregularity in enforcement and in ceilings on rent. This may occur, Mr. Chairman; I will not dispute this position. It may result in one section of the country paying higher rents than in another section. But, Mr. Chairman, who can complain if this irregularity occurs? It is the local people. If some want rents which are somewhat higher than other sections, and prefer this to a rent-controlled economy, they are the ones to be satisfied—not the bureaucrats in Washington. Give the people full voice to decide locally their own problems; and whether the decision be right or wrong, they will be much better satisfied.

I am confident the local people can handle their own problems—even rent control. I am confident that given the full voice in this vexing matter, a better administration and a better regulation and control will come from State or local levels. As for myself, I am perfectly willing that the doctrine of "home rule" be given a chance to operate.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I think it ought to be clear what this amendment seeks to do as contrasted with the present law. Under present law you have local option but do not have local license. In other words, the local board can ask for decontrol. The Expediter then passes on it. If he does not agree, it goes to the court. At least that is what it should continue to be under this law, Mr. Chairman. Practically every argument that has been made in favor of the pending amendment is an argument against national rent control, rather than in favor of this amendment—it is an argument that the local communities shall have local option as to whether they want rent control or not, regardless of national policy, need, or emergency.

In the big cities there may well be population shifts should this amendment pass. Within the city of greater Detroit, for instance, as it has just been stated, one segment of the city may be decontrolled and other segments controlled. The same may occur in country counties contiguous to city counties.

There is a national housing shortage, there is a national housing emergency, and it is essential to have a regulating authority at the national level. There is local option in the law now but not to the point of local license; the power is in the Expediter who can look at the whole national picture, but if he acts improperly it is put up to the court. The court is the final authority.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN].

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted me be given to the gentleman from New York, [Mr. GWINN].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. The Bureau of the Census by joint resolution studied 34 metropolitan areas in reference to housing. This is a consolidated chart of those findings. I have 33 other charts of various metropolitan areas if anyone wants to ask questions about those areas.

This line reflects in proper scale the 1940 housing situation in those 34 big-city areas. Families renting are shown in green; families living in their own houses are shown in red; doubled-up families are shown in black. In 1940 there were 648,000 of them. That doubling-up was regarded as normal. It took in the servants, couples serving in a family or relatives living in the house. The census listed these as preferring to live doubled-up rather than in other space. Since there was in 1940 a 7-percent vacancy that would have housed all doubled-up families, we may treat 1940 doubling-up as entirely normal.

We had three classes of housing property unutilized then. The same is true now. First the wholly vacant houses built and suitable for occupancy in blue color. There is the red showing one-person-owner occupancy. And the green shows one-person-tenant occupancy. Both are abnormal and uneconomic because they were all built for family occupancy.

This long line is the 1947 picture. This includes the new housing built from 1940 to 1947. This black space represents all doubling-up, the normal doubling-up and the abnormal doubling-up, due to the shortage of rental space. Half of that black space is abnormal.

We then take that abnormal doubling up black space and compare it with the length of the line showing the space available in the Nation into which the doubled-up families could move. Here in blue is the vacant space, good housing, capable of being occupied, but taken off the rental market and listed for sale. The red shows property occupied by one person who owns his own house or apartment. He ought to have two or three persons in this house because they are all built for families and not for bachelors. The green shows the number of houses occupied and rented by one tenant. So, the abnormal number of families doubled up could move into this space if we could get rid of rent control. The space vacant or abnormally occupied would take care of two or three times the number of families needing space. In some areas it runs more than five times the requirements.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Who prepared those charts?

Mr. GWINN. These charts were prepared by an engineer named Usher in Chicago. They are absolutely according to scale and according to the Bureau of the Census figures.

Mr. PERKINS. My point is: Who had those charts prepared?

Mr. GWINN. They were prepared in Chicago for representation of the housing situation today.

Mr. PERKINS. Did the gentleman request the preparation of those charts?

Mr. GWINN. No; I just learned of them yesterday when they were brought to the Senate, and pending the Senate hearings I asked that they be brought over here so that I might present them to the House today.

Mr. PERKINS. What organization sponsored the preparation of those charts?

Mr. GWINN. I said that Mr. Usher, an engineer, prepared them; a very responsible man in Chicago. I have checked them and I can say that they are correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAMBLE. I believe the gentleman from New York has two or three other charts on individual cities which follow through on this matter. I wonder if the gentleman would take the time to explain those two charts. It is a most unusual situation.

Mr. GWINN. This is a very interesting chart of Seattle. Here is the abnormal or doubled-up population in Seattle. That is half of this black area here. At the same time Seattle has all of these vacant dwelling units all built for family occupation. It includes no old or unsuitable housing, no hotel rooms. They are complete family units, vacant, taken off the rental market and up for sale. Without rent control, this abnormal doubling up could move into that vacant space and still have plenty of space. In Seattle this area shows the number of houses now occupied by one person, either a surviving wife or husband or uncle or aunt that is still living in that space which they own. This great line of green here shows the one-person occupancy of rented property. So there is five or six times more space than is needed in Seattle that would be immediately available if we could get rid of rent control and operate a free economy. These are census figures.

Wilkes-Barre is even more interesting. Wilkes-Barre showed a falling off in population of 15 percent, but in spite of the reduction in population in Wilkes-Barre by 15 percent which left an abnormal increase in vacancies you still have this same old abnormal doubling up. The people who own rental property in Wilkes-Barre are doing exactly what they are doing everywhere else, taking their property off the rental market. They are vacant. People want to sell, to quit their business because Government forces a loss upon them. Here is the space, a tremendous space, occupied by single persons who own their places. Here is the space rented by single persons all because of rent control. The absurd consequences of rent control shutting people out of ample housing is demonstrated in every area examined.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I want to be fair in this thing, but if we stop to think at all, I do not see how this amendment could possibly work in my State or in any State where we have so many political subdivisions. As I understood the wording of the amendment, any political subdivision could decontrol. You would have simply a situation of hopeless confusion. Would the county commissioners, who are not essentially a legislative body in Ohio but are members of a political subdivision, have the power to decontrol? I think they would. The township trustees would have the power to decontrol, as would the village and city councils, and we have many villages and cities within two townships. Suppose the township trustees in one township decontrolled and the other township did not; who would have the jurisdiction, the city council, or the township trustees of the township that decontrolled, or the township trustees of the one that did not, or could the county commissioners step in and take jurisdiction?

I think this amendment if adopted would just tie this law into a mass of organized confusion and litigation, and in effect there would not be any rent control. I have confidence in local officials and local governments, but if you are going to give any kind of power to local governments you certainly are going to have to define and make some distinctions. You cannot just hand them out and let the chips fall where they may, with nobody knowing who has the power to do what. I submit to you that this amendment would simply confuse the issue in my State until we will not have any rent control and the whole matter will wind up in endless litigation in the courts.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the gentleman's argument is nothing but water coloring. He knows that a city is within a county and a county is within a State. If a city decontrols it applies to the city. If the county decontrols it applies to the county; and if the State decontrols, it likewise applies to the State.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Not necessarily under the wording of this amendment. The amendment is poorly drawn and defines nothing to show who has final authority. Neither does it show where control rests in subdivisions within two or more other subdivisions.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, out of this discussion arises the question which I desire to propound to my brethren: Are you afraid of the people who sent you here? Do you trust them to make a right determination of a matter that affects them in a local sort of way?

Mr. Chairman, a vote for this amendment is to answer "Yes." A vote against the amendment is to answer "No."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time may be allotted to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN], a member of the committee, a question, if he is on the floor. Or perhaps the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], can answer the question which has to do with local control. The question is, Does the local expediter have the power to absolutely select the local control board and put the board into operation?

Mr. PATMAN. Under an amendment put in the law, the last law that was passed, the governor of each State submits his recommendation to the Housing Expediter. I think the Housing Expediter has the power to select from that list.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the Housing Expediter have the power to refuse to select board members from the list of names submitted by the governor?

Mr. PATMAN. I am not in a position to answer that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], that question? Does the Expediter have the power to refuse to appoint from lists of names submitted by the governors?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The law says he shall appoint a board from the recommendations by the governor. If the governor fails to give him a list of nominees, then the Expediter on his own initiative can set up a board.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The Expediter can create a local board outside of the recommendations of the governor?

Mr. WOLCOTT. He can, if the governor refuses or fails to act.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What is the situation if, after the governor has submitted the list of names to the Expediter, he refuses to appoint anyone to that list?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I answer that question?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Just a moment. I gave the gentleman a chance to answer a question, but he did not seem to know the answer. May I ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] that question?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I assume that he would communicate with the governor and ask for the resubmission of names. But if the list was representative, then he would have to name the board from the list. Is that not right?

Mr. PATMAN. I believe that is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Suppose the governor has a request from the Expediter to submit a new list, and then the governor refuses to do so, then what can the Expediter do?

Mr. WOLCOTT. If the list is representative, he has to name the board from the list submitted by the governor.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is, the Expediter does?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. But if the governor refuses to submit another list on the assumption by the governor that his previous list was representative, then what can the Expediter do?

Mr. WOLCOTT. It is getting pretty technical and involved.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I know it is getting technical, and that is the reason I want to develop the matter here at this time.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not think there is any provision for a determination by the Expediter as to whether or not the list is representative. If the governor complies with the law and submits a list, it is presumed to be a representative list, and the Expediter has no alternative but to name from that list. If he has objection to the list, as I said, he probably would communicate with the governor and ask him to submit new names, but if the governor refused to do so, then he would be bound by the original list, if it were representative, under the law.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Are there any cases before the committee where the Expediter has refused to select names from the list submitted by the governor?

Mr. WOLCOTT. There might have been some.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman from New York [Mr. GAMBLE] answer that, please?

Mr. GAMBLE. My understanding is that in certain cases he has refused.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think you will find that under the present set-up there is no local control of material consequence and which is sufficiently effective to meet public necessity and convenience.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] has expired.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] may have the 2 minutes allotted to me.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a little time here. This is my first request this session; and I take time now only because I believe it important to acknowledge and approve the remarks made here last Friday by the majority leader, Mr. MCCORMACK.

He said then that the continuance of rent control is essentially an urban or city problem and he appealed to members serving rural districts to view it from that angle. He then reminded us that in the days to come we must bring here for your consideration, legislation relating to the rural or agricultural sections of the country, and which will be important to the standard of living and economic welfare of those who till the soil.

He urged that those Members particularly concerned with problems relating to agriculture give to the problems of our great cities the same degree of sympathy and understanding that we want and expect of those who seek to serve here the urban or city areas.

Certainly, Mr. Chairman, if we sincerely seek to protect and preserve the welfare of all sections and all groups, if we would build and maintain one great Nation, prosperous and united, if we would do unto others as we would that they do unto us, we must give our most sympathetic consideration to this appeal by our majority leader.

It is only a little while before we must bring here legislation of the most urgent necessity to the farmers of the Nation. I would not want the Members from the city districts to view our farm problems without sympathy or to cast their votes on a purely selfish basis.

I am sure, then, that those of us who serve farm districts will not be wanting in sympathy and understanding of the problems faced today by those who serve our great city districts.

I am sure we will not be unmindful of the fact that it is these millions in our great cities who provide the market for our farm commodities, and that we serve best the interests of the farmers when we seek to protect the economic welfare and a good standard of living for those who consume the products of the farm. There is a dependence of one upon the other—there is a community of interest which calls upon our most sympathetic consideration of the problems of each.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

The gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] on the 4-minute speech which he has just made. It is a timely reminder to some of the Members of this House whose problems are agricultural, that we in the cities have problems, too. I call the attention of my friends in the agricultural districts to the many times when Members from the cities, such as myself, have gone through the tellers and have gone down on the roll call in favor of agricultural policies when we could well have voted the other way. From a selfish standpoint, every penny that is taken out of the wage earners' pockets in the cities for increased rentals, is taken away from his purchasing power of the things that are produced in the factories and in the fields of this Nation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No; I have only 2 minutes; I regret that I cannot yield.

Every decrease in the purchasing power of the individual wage earner, which is limited mostly in the cities of the Nation, removes from his ability to purchase the food that goes on his table. That is why we are fighting so desperately against this last break in the dike of inflation; it is so that these wage earners who are the consuming buyers in the cities can go ahead and live decently, and in order to live decently they have to be able to buy food.

There is an old saying that "The parents have eaten sour grapes and the children's teeth are set on edge." We are faced today, in the consideration of the rent-control bill, with an attempt to correct an almost impossibly complicated situation. The sins of omission and commission of the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses have had their effect on today's impossible situation.

Rent control was just part of the attempt to prevent the tide of inflation from engulfing the common people of the United States. When the Seventy-ninth Congress and the Eightieth Congress wrecked price control almost in toto, they caused the inflation to occur, which has now risen to the point of danger to our economic structure. The Seventy-ninth Congress started the job of wrecking price control and laid the foundation for the present inflation when they destroyed the effectiveness of price control: First, by denying adequate appropriations for administrating and enforcing it; second, by the adoption of crippling amendments which made effective price control almost impossible. The Eightieth Congress was more direct in its action

and its purposes; it deliberately repealed many of the inflationary controls. It also reduced appropriations for administration of the remaining controls to the point where it was impossible to properly administer the weak laws which remained.

Many of us who have had business experience realized in the latter part of 1945, 1946, and 1947 that, while the war was over, the economic maladjustments which were caused by the war were still facing the American people. We realized the necessity of orderly transition to a normal peacetime economy. We fought to preserve controls over short supplies and we fought for adequate funds to properly administer and enforce such laws as remained pertaining to price control and the fight against inflation. We were unsuccessful. The slogan of the inflationists, "The war is over" and "Back to normalcy" was a popular one, and our voices crying against the destruction of wartime controls until peacetime normal conditions had been attained were voices crying in the wilderness.

Practically every control over short supplies in our economy has been removed. In practically every incidence we have seen inflationary rises in prices, which have now reached, in my opinion, their peak.

Prices on the necessities of life have risen to a point that a virtual buyer's or consumer's strike is beginning throughout the Nation. Inventories on the merchants' shelves are at an all-time high. Statistics on retail sales are beginning to show a decrease. Soft-goods manufacturers are beginning to curtail production. They are beginning to work short workweeks. They are beginning to discharge their employees. Unemployment is growing throughout the Nation. Once again the vicious circle of boom and bust seems to be approaching.

The average consumer has had a decrease in take-home wages. Although he has received a few cents in hourly wage increases in the last 2 or 3 years, the decreased purchasing power of the dollar has taken care of his monetary wage increases. Short workweeks and lack of overtime have decreased his take-home wages, and inflationary prices have decreased his consuming power. The last remaining defense against further decreases in the consuming power of the wage earner stands before us today in the form of the last remaining control law—the rent-control law. The millions of wage earners, already hard pressed by inflationary living costs and decreased take-home pay, are now facing a further blow if rent controls are removed. In my opinion, this last blow at the consuming power of America's working millions may be the straw which breaks the camel's back. It may be the last factor which will throw us into an economic tail spin.

Drastically increased rent can mean only one thing at this time. It means a larger slice out of the take-home pay of the workers who are the renters in America. If a larger slice is devoted to rent purposes, then there will be less remaining to expend for the goods which are produced in the factories and fields of America.

A lessened consuming power is inevitably reflected in curtailed production. Curtailed production means unemployment. Unemployment means depression.

Let me sound a note of warning before this last defense in consuming power is swept away. If we can at this time pass a reasonable rent-control bill, if we can, at the proper time, appropriate enough money for fair and equitable administration, for the correction of the maladjustment in the administration of rent control, of which we are all aware and which we all deplore, I say again: If we can pass a strengthened rent-control bill which will provide some protection for the consuming power of America, and at the same time provide for fair and reasonable adjustment to the landlord who is entitled to protection, we may halt the debacle. We may temporarily prevent what I believe will be an inevitable depression with all its fearful consequences.

A year ago today I stood on the floor of the House and condemned the rent-control bill of the Eightieth Congress. I predicted that the condition of chaos, which has occurred, would occur, because I knew that the bill was not an extension of rent control in the proper sense, but it was a weakening of the previous rent-control law by the amendments and provisions which had been provided for in the 1948 bill, and that it would create the present condition of chaos throughout the rental areas of America.

I voted against the 1948 rent-control extension bill because it was, in my opinion, a "political" bill; it was a dishonest bill. I hope that I will be able to vote for the bill which is to be presented to us today. I believe that it has been strengthened in some respects. I am apprehensive that there may not be enough funds appropriated to correct the maladjustments which now exist, or to review the inequities which I know exist at the present time.

The bill which we have before us, however, is a stronger bill than the 1948 bill. It does provide for some greater degree of protection to the renters, than was provided for by the Eightieth Congress bill, and it does provide for reasonable returns to the landlord, which in my opinion, they are entitled to.

In my opinion the Williams amendment to restore the determination for decontrol of rent areas to local political subdivisions is not only administratively unworkable but unconstitutional. Rent-control legislation rests upon the Supreme Court declaration of a national emergency. National legislation such as the rent-control bill is the only justifiable way to handle a national emergency.

It is my hope that the Senate will remove this amendment when their rent legislation is under consideration.

We are faced therefore with the practical problem of having to accept a bill which is far from ideal.

In the hope that the bill will be improved as it moves through the further legislative steps of Senate consideration and conference agreement, I must support the unsatisfactory measure now before us. I shall, therefore, reluctantly vote for the bill, in the hope that there will be adequate appropriations voted for effective administration, enforcement, and improvement by Senate and conference change.

I reserve the right to vote against the measure when it returns from conference, if such improvement does not occur.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE] is recognized.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I introduced a similar amendment in the House committee, but I wish to take this time to reply to two statements which have been made here on the floor in connection with local control. The first statement is that there having been only 14 local-board recommendations for decontrol was evidence of the fact that the local areas did not want decontrol. I want to point out to you, however, some of the things that the local board must do in order to secure decontrol. I made this statement in my original speech the other day but I want to call it to your attention again. Just remember that these local boards are voluntary boards of citizens working without pay.

First. They must put down the estimated population of the principal cities in the rental area.

Second. They must put down the anticipated increases or decreases in population.

Third. They must find out what the general trend of employment was during the past 6 months.

Fourth. They must put down the anticipated changes in total employment in the next 90 days. Think of the size of this task for instance, in the city of Chicago.

Fifth. They must make a list of all the students in the entire rental area. There may be many colleges, but they have to find out who the students are living with, whether they are living with their parents, with a wife, or with other members of their family.

Sixth. They have to find out approximately the number of families and individuals seeking housing accommodations in the area.

Seventh. They have to find out the extent of rent decreases, if any, during the past 6 months, and they have to specify just what those decreases have been and the various types of property in which they have occurred.

Eighth. They would have to put down the prospective trends in rent if rent control should be removed.

Ninth. They have to list all habitable, nonseasonal dwellings, of the class or classes affected by the recommendation, which are now vacant and offered for sale.

A local board might have a little difficulty in doing that. I think now it is probably better understood why we have not had many local-board recommendations for decontrol.

Then I want to reply to the argument with reference to the fact that the Housing Expediter can make a better survey of the situation than the local boards.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] is recognized.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I shall support this amendment. I have, earlier in the debate, expressed my views on this bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. Chairman, the merits and demerits of rent control as administered since the enactment of the original law have been ably presented through long hours of debate here on the floor of the House.

Our own country has gone through these years of experience; however, rent control is not so new in Europe. In France, rent control was invoked years ago. In France this innovation has had an opportunity to demonstrate success or failure. I have been much interested in an article in the February issue of the Reader's Digest and, pursuant to the permission granted to me by the House, I am calling the attention of the membership to that article, written by Bertrand de Jouvenel, noted French economist, and which reads as follows:

NO VACANCIES

A dollar a month pays a wage earner's rent in Paris; quarters adequate for a family of six cost $2 (equivalent to 11 packages of the cheapest cigarettes). Middle-class apartments of three or four main rooms frequently cost from $1.50 to $2.50 per month. Important officials or executives pay from $3.50 a month to $8 or $10 a month.

This may seem a desirable state of affairs, but there are draw-backs. There are no vacant lodgings, nor is anyone going to vacate, nor can the owners expel anyone. Young couples must live with in-laws. Practically no housing has been built for the last 12 years.

The only opportunity to get quarters is to watch for deaths. Tottering old people sunning themselves in public gardens are shadowed back to their flat by an eager young wife who strikes a bargain with the concierge to be first in at the death. Other apartment chasers have an understanding with funeral parlors.

There are two ways of obtaining an apartment made available by death. Legally, if you fulfill certain conditions which give you priority, you may obtain an order of requisition, but usually you find that the same order for the same apartment has been given to two or three other applicants. The illegal method is the surest—an arrangement with the heir that some pieces of your furniture be carried in immediately upon death of the tenant. As soon as you are in you are the king of the castle.

Buying one's way into an apartment will cost anywhere from $500 to $1,500 per room. Wage earners might as well give up hope of setting up house; they have to stay with their families or live in miserable hotels.

Paris has 84,000 buildings for habitation, almost 90 percent of them built before World War I. Even a very lenient officialdom estimates that 16,000 are in such disrepair that they should be pulled down. Nor are the others altogether satisfacory; 82 perent of Parisians have no bath, more than half must go out of their lodgings to find a lavatory and a fifth do not even have running water. Little more than one in six of the existing buildings is pronounced in good condition by the public inspectors.

Owners are not financially able to keep up their buildings, let alone improve them. To take an example of a very common situation, there is a woman who owns three buildings containing 34 apartments, all inhabited by middle-class families. Her net loss from the 34 apartments, after taxes and repairs, is $80 per year. Not only must her son take care of her, but he must also pay out the $80. She cannot sell; there are no buyers.

When the owner tries to milk a little net income from his property by cutting down the repairs, he runs great risks. One landlord postponed repairs on his roofs and rain filtering into an apartment spoiled a couple of armchairs. He was sued for damages and condemned to pay a sum amounting to three years of the tenant's paltry rent. Since 1914, rents at the most have multiplied 6.8 times, while taxes have multiplied 13.2 times, and repairs cost from 120 to 150 times the 1914 price.

An outsider may be tempted to think that only an incredible amount of folly can have led us to this condition. But it is not so. We got there by easy, almost unnoticed stages, slipping down on the gentle slope of rent control. And this was not the work of the Reds but of succeeding governments, most of which were considered rather conservative.

The story starts with World War I. It then seemed humane and reasonable to stabilize housing costs while the boys were in the Army or working for victory. So existing rentals were frozen. It was also reasonable to avoid disturbances at the end of the war lest the veterans' homecoming be spoiled by evictions and rent increases. Thus prewar situations hardened into rights. The owner lost—temporarily, of course—the disposition of his property.

When the situation was reviewed in 1926, retail prices had trebled, and it was plain that lifting controls would bring huge rent increases. The legislators shrank from this crisis and decided to confirm the tenant's right to stay in possession but to raise rents slightly. A new owner-tenant relationship thus took shape. The owner was powerless either to evict the tenant or to discuss the rent with him. The State took care of the price which rose slowly, while regulation was extended to bring in flats not previously regulated. Only buildings put up since 1915 were left unregulated, this to stimulate construction.

No systematic view inspired this policy. It just grew from the fear of a sudden return to liberty which seemed ever more dangerous as prices stepped up. And, of course, if one must control the price of rent, one could not allow the owner to dismiss tenants, because in that case he might so easily have stipulated secretly with the new tenants.

As rent-control lawmaking continued—no single subject has taken up so much of the time and energy of Parliament—the real income from buildings crumbled from year to year. Then came World War II. The return to liberty which had been devised for 1943 was, of course, abandoned, and all rents were frozen, including those of recent buildings which had till then escaped.

Since the liberation, new laws have provided for increases in rents, but retail prices increased much more. To put it briefly, owners of new buildings (built since 1914) have been allowed, in terms of real income, less than a tenth of what they got before World War II. Owners of old buildings, that is, nine-tenths of all buildings, have been allowed in terms of real income either 12 percent of what they got in 1939 or a little less than 7 percent of what they got in 1914—whichever is less.

If today a builder were to put up apartments, they would have to rent for prices from 10 to 13 times present rent ceilings, in order to break even. Thus, according to a report of the Economic Council, a wage earner's apartment of three small rooms and a kitchen now renting for $13 to $16 a year would have to be rented for $166 to $200 a year. Obviously, construction will not be undertaken. * * *

Such is the spread between the legal and the economic price of lodgings that even the most fervent advocates of freedom shudder at the thought of its return; the thing, they say, has gone too far, and the right to dismiss tenants, if restored, could not be executed. The whole Nation of tenant would go on a sit-down strike.

Hence the strange plans now being considered by the French Parliament, which would continue the tenant's right to retain his lodgings but would set a fair rent, part to come from the tenant and the rest from a special subsidy—an inflationary measure, of course, as are all subsidies.

Not all this fair rent would go to the owner. A slice to correspond with the cost of the upkeep would be paid to his credit in a blocked account, to make sure it did go for repairs. A much bigger slice for the reconstitution of the capital would not go to the owner at all but to a national fund for building. Thus the dispossession of the owners would be finally sanctioned; they would be legally turned into the janitors of their own buildings, while on the basis of their dispossession a new state ownership of future buildings would rear its proud head.

The French example may prove of some interest and use to our friends across the sea. It goes to show that rent control is self-perpetuating and culminates in both the physical ruin of housing and the legal dispossession of the owners. The havoc wrought in France is not the work of the enemy but is the result of our own measures.

Mr. Chairman, does the United States want to follow in the footsteps of France so far as housing is concerned? The enactment of this bill without amendment is a direct step toward that which France is now experiencing. Rent control does not produce more homes for our people. It produces less. If autocratic, discriminatory rent control is continued long enough, there will be no privately owned housing for rent. It necessarily follows that the Government must then provide homes for everyone, if the people are to have housing. When this happens socialism will reign supreme in the housing field.

Mr. Chairman, do we want that? Certainly not.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] is recognized.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, if rent control is necessary, I think this is a desirable amendment.

A few moments ago the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], made the observation that this amendment would produce absurdities in that we would have certain units within a county or State controlled and others, maybe just across the street, decontrolled. If that is true, I say there are under the present law comparable absurdities. I can best illustrate that by my own district. In the Fifth District of Michigan we have two counties. During the active part of the war, both counties were under rent control. Some time during 1945 or 1946, the Housing Expediter decontrolled one county. As a result we can walk across a county line and be in a decontrolled area. If we stay in the other county we have control. That condition may be absurd. In fact, I believe it is, but we will not amplify or enlarge such unfortunate situations under the present amendment. All such absurdities result from patchwork rent control, including all rent-control legislation since VJ-day.

I would like to say one thing about the previous comments of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE]. The local boards under the present law and this bill are not able to do a 100-percent job through no fault of their own. These

men and women are local civic-minded individuals who serve without pay. Because they have personal responsibilities and obligations they are not able to undertake the immense job required of them, as a board, to find out whether or not rent control should be continued in their local area. The locally elected officials, whether they be State legislators or city commissioners, have a responsibility because the people have put them in office; they are paid for the job. They are familiar with local conditions. They can undertake a determination whether or not there should be a continuation of rent control in their local area.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that the pending amendment is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong support of the pending amendment, although in all frankness I must say, of course, that I am opposed to the principle of Federal rent control. However, an amendment of this sort which seeks to place again in the hands of the people of this country and at the grass-roots level the matter of determination of the necessity or the absence of the necessity for continuing rent control does seem to me to represent the kind of action that is essential if Federal rent control is to be continued.

Much has been said about the chaos that would result if this amendment were adopted, but, Mr. Chairman, I can think of nothing in this great country that matches the chaos presently obtaining in most of the local boards. It is one of those things where if you intend to go down to a board to seek a small increase, you had best put up the storm shutters in the middle of the summer, stop the milk and all of the newspapers, and put the children out with some relatives because you are not going to be back for a long time to come. So, as far as chaos is concerned, I do not think it is fair to speak of the two types of chaos in the same breath.

Where are the local governments deficient? They are not deficient in providing adequate police and fire protection. They are not inadequate in assessing and collecting taxes. They are not inadequate in their legislative structures nor in the judicial powers vested in them. To my mind, the subdivisions of government are much more adequate and they are much better equipped to determine whether or not in their particular locality a need exists for continued Federal rent control.

Mr. Chairman, I shall support the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL].

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted me be given to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, two questions come up at this time that should cause us some concern. No. 1: Local officials are charged with certain duties and responsibilities by city charter. This will not be one of their duties. Local commissioners of the counties are charged with certain duties and responsibilities by State law. This cannot be one of their duties. They would not have to carry it out if they did not want to. State legislators have their duties defined by the constitution of their State or by the laws enacted by their legislature. This question of enforcing rent control or removing rent control is not a part of their duties, and they will certainly not be required to carry it out.

Furthermore, I doubt that the Congress will be doing a very good public-relations job if it puts upon the backs of these local officials the duty and responsibility which they cannot legally assume under the definition of their duties under State laws and city charters. We are just placing the duty on them which they do not want. It is possible they will resent it, not only the city officials but the county officials and the State legislature as well. It is possible they might even accuse the Congress, having this problem for a number of years, of lacking in courage, in failing to carry it on in peacetime as well as in time of war, and that criticism might become a rather potent criticism. For those reasons I think that we should be very careful about placing duties and burdens and responsibilities upon people who cannot be compelled to pay any attention to them or to observe them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, if there is one thing the patriotic, sound-thinking people of America are concerned about more than any one other thing, it is the ever-increasing tendency toward centralization of government here in Washington. We have an opportunity here under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] to place this matter right back home upon a local self-government basis, home rule, if you please. I hope I will not hear so much about this bureaucracy from some of these people who claim that they believe in home rule and keeping the Government close to the people and at the same time vote against this amendment.

The proponents of this legislation contend that this amendment is unworkable. They argued the same thing about the Brown amendment when they were before the Committee on Rules seeking a rule to bring this bill to the floor of the House, but, when they found that they needed the Brown amendment in order to make this bill more palpable, they agreed to the Brown amendment upon the floor.

I think this pending amendment could be improved upon. I recognize the difficulty of administration, as pointed out here on the floor of the House in the question of a conflict between a municipality and a county; but this is a simple matter which can be worked out in conference between the two bodies, should the Senate see fit to pass a bill.

It is rather difficult to reconcile the views of some of those opposing this amendment with their asserted opinions on other matters of States' rights and local self-government. Certainly they should vote for this amendment or cease prating about States' rights.

On the general question of rent control, however, Mr. Chairman, it is my considered opinion that we should remove this wartime control. That it was justified during the war is unquestionable, but the war has been over for four years. I venture the assertion that if this legislation is continued this year this bureaucracy will find ample and plausible argument and justification for its continuing many more years.

These Government agencies are human beings, just like you and I. They can never find a good time to abolish an agency or their jobs. With the assertion that it will work a hardship in some cases I find no fault; but, on the other hand, the same argument could be made for controls in all other phases of our economy. To my mind, the argument for the continuing of this control is in line with the arguments advanced for all other forms of the regimentation of our people, the socialization of America. Somewhere along the line we must call a halt on this. So far as I am concerned, regardless of what course others may pursue, I shall vote against giving further life to this unnecessary agency; but, if it is to be continued, with the enormous expense to the already overburdened taxpayers of this country, I should prefer to have it upon an optional, self-governing basis, as provided in this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, there is more involved in this bill and this amendment than meets the naked eye. This is the real test, the first test, as to whether we shall continue in an orderly manner to decontrol in an orderly fashion or whether we shall return to a fashion of chaos and imponderables.

Can you conceive of a situation in some 48 States, in thousands of local communities where a tight housing situation still exists, where more than 2,000,000 young people, young newly created families, who are living doubled up, where in the greater portion of these families are veterans and their wives? They are predominantly young people starting out in married life, rearing a family. He has since his discharge from the service faced the economic situation and the cold reality of having been squeezed in the inflation. If this situation were to prevail, I am sure there would be no uniformity, there would be confusion and chaos. I ask that you retain the committee amendment and vote this, the so-called Williams amendment, down.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'BRIEN].

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the text of this amendment as I read it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday stated that the power of de-

control shall be vested in a resolution by the State legislature or by any county, municipality or political subdivision. It does not use the words, "an act" of a State legislature, which would include action by the governor, who is the chief officer of the State, with State-wide responsibility, including both rural and urban populations. It does not say, "an act of the legislature." The text of this amendment says a resolution of the legislature, which has no constitutional effect to override a resolution of any of the other bodies named.

The gentleman who followed me in debate said that this confusion between governmental subdivisions would be cured because the act of the legislature would take precedence over every political subdivision. Under the text of this amendment decontrol does not lodge in an act of the legislature which would include the governor, but it lodges in a resolution of the State legislature or political subdivision, or county, or municipality which excludes the governor. Under the text of the bill which the committee has brought in, the governor is granted power of decontrol through appointments to rent-control boards which he initiates.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, from the point of view of any tenant residing in the city of New York it would be far better for the Congress to pass no Rent Control Act rather than to pass one that has been unduly weakened by crippling amendments. We should rely upon the information given by the local officials. The great mayor of the city of New York, Gen. William O'Dwyer, appeared before the Banking Committee of the other body and there presented his experienced views. He has drawn also from the experience of the able counsel of the New York City Rent Commission, the Honorable Nathan W. Math, with whom it has been and is my pleasure to work closely in the matter of solving such pressing problems as that which confronts our great city in the matter of the housing shortage. The present act should not be weakened but should rather be strengthened. Provisions should be made to afford the tenant an opportunity to be heard on any notice of application for increase. Present practice, apparently, gives to the tenant only notice of such application which is generally followed by what is locally known as the laundry ticket which is a notice of increase granted under the hardship provision. The inclusion in the law of such a hardship provision removes the need for any so-called reasonable return provision and rather than impede the administration of the act with the tremendous detail that will be involved in applying any such reasonable-return provision we might better consider strengthening such administration so as to afford the tenants an opportunity to be heard on any application for increase made by the landlord. This procedure not only will prevent hardship and insure reasonable return to the landlord but will strengthen the popular support of this measure which is now and will continue to be needed until the number of dwelling units begins to meet the great demand. The insuring of the foregoing is, in my opinion, necessary before any bill presented might properly be described as a Rent Control Act, and I hope that the committee and the House will act upon these suggestions.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL].

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I believe we are all agreed that so far as we attempt to exercise rent control authority, we must depend upon a finding by us, supportable by the Supreme Court, that there is a national emergency. I believe we are also agreed that in saying that there is an emergency we mean it is temporary and that the time will come when we will have to decontrol. It seems to me that gentlemen in opposition to this amendment have entirely failed to establish that there is now presently existing a national emergency. Rather they have shown that from 1,700 rent-control areas, the requirement has decreased until now they admit there are only 500 such areas, one-fifth of which are border-line areas. It seems to me, as a new Member, that if we are going to go through a period of decontrol we can ask for no better proposition than that offered by this amendment because it guarantees to the people in the country, who want rent control, supervision by an experienced agency and still grants them the right to have local legislatures declare whether or not the people of that area believe rent control is presently necessary. I say again it is incumbent upon us when we vote on this amendment to determine whether there presently exists a national emergency. Rather, what has been doubtfully shown in my opinion is presently existing local emergencies. The function has become a local problem under our Constitution. I therefore recommend that we adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WERDEL. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. What did these gentlemen who made the deal here to do away with decontrol in certain favored regions of the country do? What did they do with chaos and confusion when they made that deal?

Mr. WERDEL. The gentleman assumes that I admit there was a deal made. I do not know whether there has been or not. I do know that all of you gentlemen understand as well as I that men in public office, whether they be local or national, are inclined to want to perpetuate themselves in office.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WERDEL. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I hope the majority leader, when he speaks, will give us the list of communities to be decontrolled.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I am going to take just a moment to again indicate to the Members of the House that there is no mysterious list of areas that are likely to be decontrolled in the near future. I said on the floor of the House last week that if any Member wanted the information as to what those areas were or any details as to any part of the approximately 100 areas, all he had to do was to lift up the telephone and ask the Expediter for the information and he would get it. As a matter of fact, on Friday the entire list was released to the newspapers. This morning I asked the Expediter's office for a copy of the list. It was made available to me as it will be made available to any man who sincerely and in good faith asks for the information.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman indicates he has so much good faith, will the gentleman be faithful enough to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include the list so we can have it?

Mr. MULTER. May I have unanimous consent to extend the list at this point in the RECORD, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole is not empowered to give that consent. It must be obtained in the House.

Mr. MULTER. If any Member of the House wants to see the list, I have it here, and he can have the use of it. If you want one of your own, you can ask the Expediter for it and he will give it to you.

Now, a word as to this amendment.

This amendment will confuse and confound the entire situation. As has been said before, if you do not want rent control, at the right moment stand up and vote against it, but do not emasculate the bill with an amendment like this. There are any number of areas in this country where the legislatures of the States have concurrent jurisdiction with the local municipalities. By this amendment a State may eliminate rent control even where one of its municipalities needs it.

If the State takes it away from that municipality, there is no way of putting it back if this amendment should prevail. Under the bill, as presented by the committee, there is ample provision for decontrolling areas, large or small, as well as parts of areas.

The amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] has expired.

There are two other names that the Chair has called. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I made no request for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of the time allowed to the committee be given to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] is

recognized for five additional minutes, or a total of 7 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] has many apparent weaknesses. I say this, recognizing that my friend is offering the amendment with the finest of motives. Anything I say is in no way to be remotely construed as questioning the motives of my good friend.

If this amendment is adopted we have an anomalous situation on the part of political subdivisions, from the State down, having an alternative position to one that is already in the bill. We now have local boards appointed by the governors. They can make recommendations. That is written into the law. These boards cover rental areas. A rental area may cover anywhere from 2 to 10 counties. It may cover several municipalities, as well as some adjoining rural area. However, they have authority and jurisdiction within their powers, over the entire rental area that they are appointed as a board to function in.

Under this bill they continue to exist and they continue their powers. If they make recommendations for recontrol in whole or in part and they can function effectively for decontrol in whole or in part, if it is disapproved by the Expediter, then they can go to the emergency court of appeal. That right exists under the law as it stands now, and it will exist under the law if this bill, with that provision therein, is finally enacted into law.

Certainly there should not be both propositions. To my mind, the one that already exists is the soundest way to meet the considerations of decontrol problems. Let us examine the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. "If the legislature or comparable governing body of any State." What is a comparable governing body in any State comparable to the legislature? I know of none. What body exists in any State of the Union comparable to the legislative body of any one of the several States? What comparable body exists in the Federal Government to the Congress of the United States? That means legislative. The legislature or any comparable governing body of a State is one thing, but suppose it descends to any municipality, or county, or other political subdivision; in addition to the boards provided for by existing law in this bill they will have the right by resolution to bring about decontrol. Suppose, as in the case of Detroit, so ably described by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'BRIEN], there are three cities, for all practical purposes, embraced in one rental area; if the governing body of one of those cities passes a resolution for decontrol what effect will it have upon the others? What effect will it have upon the rental area? Take the case of an area of two or more counties—some of them as high as 10 counties I understand for some rental areas; does this mean the entire 10 counties in the rental area? Does it mean that there must be a majority of them? Or does it mean that any one county within the rental area that includes several counties can act independently of the others or of the duly elected officials of the other counties?

What is a resolution? We have concurrent resolutions in the Congress; we have joint resolutions; one has to be signed by the President, the President can veto it, and to make it effective we have to pass it over his veto as provided by the Constitution; the other does not have to be signed by the President but has the force of law when passed by both branches of the Congress. We have therefore two types of resolutions here from a legislative angle in the legislative processes of the Congress itself. What is a resolution in a State? Does a resolution call for action on the part of the Governor? Some resolutions do not; some resolutions may. Does the gentleman from Mississippi want to exclude the governor of a commonwealth from considering this question? And yet under this resolution in some States the governor may be excluded, and in some States the governor may not be excluded. What about a municipality? Under the local charter of a municipality a resolution might be the action of a city council, if that is the name of the body, and might not require the signature or approval of the mayor. In the city of Boston, under the city charter, unless the mayor approves it, the action of the city council does not become effective. There is no necessity of the mayor because the city charter of Boston was drafted by a Republican legislature along the lines of a corporation and not a public agency of the people.

The net result of the effect of this amendment, if adopted, will be to create such confusion that the very purposes of this legislation will be defeated. For the reasons I have expressed, recognizing the honesty of my friend's motive, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided and there were—ayes 191, noes 148.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. PATMAN.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 198, noes 150.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of Kansas: On page 31, strike out lines 11 to 25, inclusive; on page 32, lines 1 to 25, inclusive; and lines 1 to 9, inclusive, on page 33.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, this is another perfecting amendment. This in effect returns the bill to the present law, as it is now, with respect to appeals from the orders of the Housing Expediter concerning local board decisions. The present law provides that if the Housing Expediter does not approve a recommendation of the local board within 30 days after the receipt of it he shall file with the Emergency Court of Appeals the papers, and the appeal is perfected immediately. Under the proposed bill if the Housing Expediter fails either to approve or disapprove, the local board may file a complaint with the Emergency Court of Appeals. This amendment is not too critical or too important, but it does point out definitely what was meant by those people who said that they were trying to strengthen rent control. In other words, instead of requiring an appeal or requiring the Housing Expediter to definitely file the appeal with the Emergency Court of Appeals, it now leaves it with the local board.

You know after all the greatest statistics are public opinion, and public opinion has been displayed here this afternoon in the attitude of the House toward rent control. I want to read to you what appeared in our committee in the hearings in the form of a news column by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt. This news column appeared in the Washington Daily News of Thursday, February 17, 1949. She said:

Judging from the letters I have been getting from owners of real estate, there is a widespread feeling in this country that the present law under which rents are controlled is not fair to the owner. This would seem to indicate that from the point of view of the owner it is essential that we have a complete review of rent controls that are to be imposed. It is only fair that property owners get a reasonable return on the money invested.

Now, that is one person's idea.

I want to give you another group of statistics. In 1940 there were 16,000,000 rental units in the United States. In 1948 there were only 15,000,000 rental units, and during the time between 1946 and 1948 there were 2,500,000 housing units constructed. So instead of rent control providing new and additional units, rent control is restricting and contracting rental units. I want to leave one other figure with you. Twenty-two percent to 24 percent of the income of all families was used for rent prior to rent control. All families now pay about 12 percent of their budget for rent. The point I am making is that now is not the time to impose greater restrictions. Now is the time to loosen it. Now is the time to think about decontrol when conditions are such that we do not know where we are going in the economic picture. Now is the time to loosen rent control. So I have offered this amendment along with the others in order that we return this bill to the present law with reference to appeals. That the Housing Expediter shall file with the Emergency Court of Appeals any order or regulation he may make with respect to the local board's recommendation instead of permitting the local board, if they so desire, to file.

One reason why that should be done is in discussing recontrol of decontrolled areas you will recall that it was said the Housing Expediter might not recontrol an area which had been decontrolled by order of the court of appeals. He may recontrol any area which had been decontrolled by the local board. Under the law as proposed by this bill every local board must appeal whether they are satisfied or not in order to prevent the

Housing Expediter from recontrolling that area which had been decontrolled. So I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I object. I have other amendments to offer.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, would the chairman amend his request to apply to this amendment and not to this section?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, how many amendments are at the Clerk's desk?

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I have two amendments that are not at the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. There are four amendments at the Clerk's desk.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 40 minutes which would give 10 minutes to each amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Reserving the right to object, how many amendments are there at the desk?

The CHAIRMAN. There are four amendments at the desk.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. I have two others, Mr. Chairman. I am constrained to object. I do object.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section, and all amendments thereto, close in 50 minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman's motion relates to this section. Is that section 203 or 204?

The CHAIRMAN. Section 203.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is another one of those innocent, perfecting amendments that seeks to do no more than destroy the bill.

There was very little said by the gentleman from Kansas who offered the amendment to explain it. He did give you a lot of statistics that he says apply to the over-all situation of rent control. Let me in answer to that direct your attention to this very vital statistic: This is made much of by the real property owners of the country. The statement is attributed to the chairman of the Construction Industry Information Committee of the building industry of the country. He says that there are nearly 7,000,000 more nonfarm home owners in the United States than before the war, an increase of 60 percent.

Then he quotes from the Bureau of the Census to the effect that in April 1948 there were 17,025,000 nonfarm dwellings occupied by their owners, compared with only 11,000,000 in 1940. The number has increased by almost a million and a quarter in 1948.

Those who are opposed to rent control, because they contend it is stopping construction and not giving the tenant a chance to get a home of his own, are very wrong.

Now, with reference to this particular amendment: This amendment will strike out of the law a provision which requires the Housing Expediter to file his record with the Emergency Court of Appeals so that it may be reviewed in the event the Expediter has disagreed with a local board, either by disapproving or by failing to approve its recommendations for either a general increase in the area or decontrol in the area. This provision as it is in the bill, and as it will remain in the bill if you vote down this amendment, will permit the local board to file its complaint with the Emergency Court of Appeals and there get a complete and expeditious review of the local board's recommendation.

I urge you to vote down the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is on the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS: On page 28, line 22, strike out the period after the word "title" and insert a semicolon and the following: "*Provided, however*, That the landlord certifies that he is maintaining all services furnished on the maximum rent date, and that he will continue to maintain such services so long as the adjustment in such maximum rent which may be granted, continues in effect."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have proposed follows that part of the bill which relates to adjustments for purposes of removing hardships and inequities.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to hear that the chairman of the committee has no objection to the amendment. It is a very just one. I should like to explain it very briefly, if I may.

The purpose of the amendment, Mr. Chairman, is to provide that where a landlord gets relief from the Expediter due to a hardship or an inequity that at the same time he shall agree that he will perform for the tenants all the services, such as periodic painting and decoration, faithfully and honestly that he did perform for them on the date that maximum rents were established, and that it shall not then be necessary for the tenants to go to the Expediter's office to compel the landlord to perform those services. It seems just elemental fairness that when a landlord comes into court he should, as we lawyers say, come into court with clean hands and say he is fully prepared to do all that he is called upon to do by virtue of the laws and regulations as a condition for his getting the relief which he now seeks from the Expediter. That is the only thing this proviso does. I think it is eminently fair. It responds to a very factual need.

Many landlords in my area and other areas of the country have gotten relief under the hardship and inequity provision, but with some landlords the tenants, in order to get their apartments looked after in accordance with the regulations and the law, have had to start new proceedings before the Expediter. That has done two things: First, it has put on the tenants a very real burden which they should not necessarily have to carry; and, second it has given the Expediter's office a great deal of added work.

I should like to point out, too, the fairness of this amendment when considered in terms of the Expediter's regulations which provide that where money is spent for painting and decoration, plumbing, repairs, these expenses may be included in the application for the rent increase under the hardship and inequity provision, as amended. It seems only fair that the whole of the issues, both for the landlord and tenant should be cared for at one and the same time. It can be done by this amendment, to which the chairman of the legislative committee has stated he has no objection.

I hope the Committee will see fit to adopt the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CASE of South Dakota) there were—ayes 105, noes 24.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard all of the debate on this rent-control proposal. In previous sessions of the Congress I have supported rent control.

There are some questions that arise in my mind today that I would like to call your attention to and I would like to get one or two answers from those in charge of this bill.

First, is the District of Columbia included within the coverage of this bill?

Mr. BUCHANAN. The answer is "No."

Mr. KEEFE. Then we as a legislature have to legislate for the District of Columbia and adopt a separate rent-control law for the District of Columbia. That is true, is it not?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I may say in answer to the gentleman's question——

Mr. KEEFE. I do not want any long answer. The gentleman can answer "Yes" or "No." I want it for the record, that is all. I know what the answer is myself, I am not that dumb, but I want it for the record.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Does the gentleman want an answer?

Mr. KEEFE. What I stated is true, is it not? If the gentleman can say "No," say so.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The District Committee has recommended a rent-control bill and it was to be presented this week, but will be presented later.

Mr. KEEFE. We understand that. They have recommended a District rent-control bill, of course, and we have a District rent-control bill in the District of Columbia that has its own separate provisions recommended to this Congress by the Committee on the District of Columbia, not the Committee on Banking and Currency. Now, when they recommend that bill to the Congress and we as Members of Congress pass on that bill, we are acting exactly as a State legislature would act for any State.

The chairman of this committee has talked about a national pattern and that we must continue to have a national pattern, otherwise we would have chaos and confusion. That is what he said. The fact of the matter is we have a national pattern but it does not apply to the District of Columbia because we have seen fit to enact separate, specific legislation, for the District of Columbia.

Why is it, may I ask, that we thus legislate? I will answer that, because I have discussed it with the members of the Committee on the District of Columbia and with people connected with the Government of the District of Columbia. We have a model rent-control law in the District of Columbia. We have a magnificent administration of that law. The people here do not want to come under this general pattern. The people of the District of Columbia want their own rent-control law and we as the legislature for the District of Columbia give it to them in the shape of a special piece of legislation.

Now, then, I am asking you of faint heart what is wrong with permitting my State and the legislature of my State to do for the people of Wisconsin exactly what we are doing for the people of the District of Columbia?

We have a rent-control law in my State. The legislature is in session. They are waiting out there now to find out what you propose to do in this matter. We can handle the situation in my State and you can do it in yours, just as we as legislators for the District of Columbia are doing it for the people of the District of Columbia.

I am astounded that some people of intelligence cannot see that particular point. The fact of the matter is the District rent-control law is going to expire on March 31. The next day on which District of Columbia business may be considered is March 28.

What are you going to do about it? What are you going to do about rent control under this great national pattern for the District of Columbia, may I ask? Where are all these crocodile tears that are being shed for the people in Chicago and Pittsburgh and New York and Los Angeles? What are you going to do to protect the people in the District of Columbia, may I ask? You will not be able to do it in the 2 days and get that bill through the House and the Senate and make it law. There will not be any confusion if we turn this whole problem to the States; and if the legislature of any State enacts State rent control, then the Federal act will not apply.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of Kansas: Page 29, strike out lines 1 to 23, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) In any case in which a landlord and tenant, on or before December 31, 1947, in accordance with the provisions of this subsection as then in effect, voluntarily entered into a valid written lease in good faith with respect to any housing accommodations, such housing accommodations shall not be subject to any maximum rent established or maintained under the provisions of this title.

"(3) In any case in which a landlord and tenant (including any new tenant) on or before December 31, 1948, voluntarily enter into a valid written lease in good faith (at any rental agreed upon in the lease, but not in excess of 15 percent over the maximum rent which in the absence of a lease would be in effect with respect thereto on the date of enactment of the Housing and Rent Act of 1948) with respect to any housing accommodations for which a maximum rent is in effect under this section, and such lease takes effect on or after the effective date of the Housing and Rent Act of 1948 and expires on or after December 31, 1949, and if a true and duly executed copy of such lease is filed, within 15 days after the date of execution of such lease, with the Housing Expediter, such housing accommodations shall not be subject to any maximum rent established or maintained under the provisions of this title."

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, you will recall that with the Housing Act of 1947, and the act of 1948, this Congress provided for voluntary-lease agreements which might be signed by the landlord and the tenant. Those lease agreements provided that they might run for 1 year with a maximum increase in rental of not to exceed 15 percent. The present proposed law repeals that section and does not permit the landlord and the tenant to enter into these voluntary agreements. It is my idea, again, to call this to the attention of the House in order that you might know in what fashion we are strengthening rent control instead of loosening it. It may seem to some of you that my efforts here are a little futile, but I want to remind you that two amendments which I proposed to the committee have been adopted in this bill, so I do not feel so bad about it. Nevertheless, I think this is an important amendment. It is an amendment by which this Congress may present to the people of this country a proposition that a landlord and a tenant, as friends, might sit down together and determine how they might get together and agree upon a proper rental. The proposed law eliminates these leases and recontrols those units which this Congress promised would be decontrolled under the law of 1947.

Mr. Woods, in testifying before our committee, said that the voluntary-lease agreement was not necessary. He said it was based upon an assumption that rent control would be terminated, and gave the tenants the right to bargain for security with their landlords. He said that under the proposed law we would have 2 years of rent control, and in parentheses I say that it is quite possible we will have a permanent rent control if we continue it for 15 months or 2 years; but he said that we are continuing rent control for 2 years and, therefore, we do not need the present voluntary provision.

I believe it would be a healthy and proper thing if we permit the landlord and tenant to once again assume the relationship of neighbors, that they can agree one with the other that they might have a proper rental, that the landlord can go to the tenant and say, "I have had increased costs. I want to redecorate the apartment. I want to do this for you." The tenant then would have the opportunity to sign a lease and secure advantage of these benefits.

So again I offer a perfecting amendment, and suggest that we return the bill to the present law insofar as practicable.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, this would decontrol about 2,500,000 units and would weaken the rent-control law very materially. I hope it will not be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COLE of Kansas) there were—ayes 55, noes 102.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YATES: On page 29, line 11, after "any housing accommodations" insert "including housing accommodations in hotels."

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to clarify an ambiguity in the act which exists at the present time and to afford relief to a large class of tenants now unfairly discriminated against. In view of the attitude and sentiment of the House as expressed in this last vote, I think this amendment is particularly appropriate.

Under the so-called Rains amendment which was adopted last week the provisions of section 201 (a) (1) of this act are as they were in the old rent-control law, to the effect that any accommodations in hotels are not subject to control. My amendment would place controls upon and protect hotel tenants who in good faith signed leases with their landlords. Many of us conducted our fight last week to retain controls on permanent housing accommodations in residential hotels and permanent accommodations in other hotels. We believe they should be controlled. My amendment is not directed to transient hotels or transient accommodations of any type. It is not directed to resort hotels. It is not directed even to semitransient accommodations under any circumstances. This amendment is directed only to the return of controls to accommodations for which tenants entered into leases, leases which usually have extended from August of 1947 until December of 1948, under the terms of which in exchange for a 15-percent rent increase the tenant was given a lease. The Rains amendment removes controls from the accommodations even of these permanent tenants and works a distinct hardship upon them. The people affected by the amendment, the tenants of apartment hotels, are not different from people living in other quarters. It is a misconception to assert that only the rich live in these hotels. Stenographers, school teachers, retired civil servants, pensioners, comprise the bulk of residential hotel tenants. They can afford rent increases no more than any other member of the middle class and they should be given the protection of the rent law.

Why should these people be singled out? Why should their accommodations be singled out? They pay for extra service now, even for services which they do not receive. Linen service is infrequent, bellboys have been discharged, their quarters are in disrepair—they must remain because they have no place to move.

The point I should like to make is that the accommodations in these hotels are no different than accommodations in other permanent accommodations for which leases were given. Permanent accommodations in hotels are the same as accommodations in apartment buildings. They should be controlled. My amendment will clarify the act and will place permanent hotel quarters on a par with all other types of accommodations for which leases were entered into.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Would the gentleman explain exactly what this proposed amendment does? Does it nullify what the House did a few days ago in removing the decontrol provision for residential hotels?

Mr. YATES. It does not nullify the action of the House of a few days ago, except for permanent accommodations in hotels. The action of the House of a few days ago, looked to the decontrol of all accommodations within hotels, without drawing any distinction between residential hotels, semitransient hotels, and transient hotels. I understood the intention of that amendment to be directed against living quarters of a purely transient type and not dedicated to the type of accommodations which were permanent in their nature.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. The so-called Rains amendment adopted by the committee on Friday left the law exactly as it is now written.

Mr. YATES. That is correct.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Does this proposal change that situation any?

Mr. YATES. This proposal changes that situation only in one respect. It changes it only with respect to permanent accommodations for which a lease was given.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. There were no leases of the accommodations which had been controlled under the language of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 and 1948. The action taken by the committee last week will restore the language in respect to hotels to what it is at the present time. If the gentleman will look under definitions he will find housing accommodations defined and it does not include those accommodations in hotels which are giving ordinary hotel services. It does not make any difference whether a lease was entered into in respect to accommodations in any kind of a hotel which gave those services because they are not under the bill anyway. I think if we adopted your amendment, we would merely add to the confusion as to what our intent was with respect to hotels.

Mr. YATES. That is not true. If the gentleman will read section 3, on page 29, he will find:

In any case in which a valid written lease with respect to any housing accommodations was entered into and filed in accordance with the provisions of this subsection (b) as then in effect, and such lease has heretofore terminated or expired or hereafter terminates or expires, such housing accommodations shall be subject to the provisions of this title.

What my amendment does is to extend to permanent accommodations of hotels the same rights for comparable tenants as is accorded to tenants who are not living in apartment-hotels, who live in accommodations now recognized as requiring control, such as ordinary apartment buildings.

Mr. WOLCOTT. If the gentleman will look at section 202 of the existing law, he will find the definition of a housing accommodation and controlled housing accommodations. The housing accommodations referred to in this section do not include those accommodations in hotels where the hotel services are given so the Expediter or anyone else would not have any interest in leases on those accommodations except——

Mr. YATES. Except—if the gentleman will permit me, if he will read the proposed section 3 on page 29, he will see that this section applies to any housing accommodation where there has been a lease, and it makes no reference to controlled housing accommodations or any other kind of accommodations. That is why I say that the law in this respect is now ambiguous. I think it should include permanent housing accommodations in hotels as well.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The term "housing accommodation" is defined in the act. Any housing accommodation cannot refer to anything but the housing accommodation referred to in the act.

Mr. YATES. That is correct. That is why I think this section is ambiguous and that my amendment will do much to clear up the ambiguity and at the same time afford relief where relief is needed—to tenants of permanent accommodations in residential hotels.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

THREE MINUTES ON THE MARSHALL PLAN

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, in the 3 minutes permitted, I will attempt to give my view on the continuation of the Marshall plan.

Under it, we gave billions upon billions of dollars in an effort to stop communism and get the western countries of Europe back on their feet.

The theory was that, by the building up of the industries of western Europe, furnishing seed and fertilizer, people in those countries who were in need of food, of clothing, of housing, and of all of the things that folks must have if they are to be happy, contented, and prosperous—those countries would eventually become a barrier against any aggression planned by Russia.

Unfortunately, as some of us predicted, much of the billions of dollars advanced by this Government was wasted.

Instead of the United States handling the money and insisting that the people be fed, clothed, and housed—seed, tools, and fertilizer furnished the farmers; instead of rebuilding the industries of those countries, we turned the money over in lump sums to foreign governments and they, in turn, let altogether too much of it get into the hands of racketeers, profiteers, black-market operators.

Again, instead of building up industries in western Germany, we let France and Great Britain dismantle those industries, take out the machinery, and move it to other places. We permitted Russia to do the same thing in eastern Germany.

However, with our aid, some of the peoples of western Europe are getting back on their feet and we should help them all we can.

But now, instead of continuing to use our dollars to restore their factories and to help them to help themselves, there is substantial evidence that the plan, and the money appropriated, are being used to furnish a market in Europe for American products.

There are many indications that, as prices here recede and evidence of unemployment develops, efforts will be made to appropriate billions more, ostensibly to continue to fight Communists, to provide a barrier against Russia, but, in reality, to supply the funds to purchase farm surplus and the products of our factories, and ship them abroad.

In short, to make Europe a dumping ground for all sorts of surplus as created by the payment of subsidies, for the benefit of certain American interests and in violation of the over-all purpose of the Marshall plan.

Putting it in a different way, there is evidence that Mr. Truman and his administration, faced with the results of excessive taxation, excessive spending, and fearing that there may be a depression and unemployment here, are now endeavoring to lift themselves out of the mess by their own bootstraps—that is, by taxing Americans, giving the money to other nations, with a promise from them that they will spend it for American goods.

Sounds fine, but there is no real merit in it.

That program should not be, for there is no more sense to that idea than there

would be for you, if you were a storekeeper or a farmer, to give me a hundred dollars on my promise to buy what you had to sell. You would get your money back, but you would be giving away your goods instead of selling me something.

With the right kind of help, the Germans and the peoples of other lands will be back on their feet, but under no circumstances should we establish a worldwide WPA.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I distinctly remember the dire predictions which were made as to what would happen when we voted to terminate OPA and price control. When price control ended, prices zoomed up. Last fall the voters, and I included, were wondering if we had made a mistake, but prices leveled off and we know now that it was no mistake. If we terminate control, rents will go up, and necessarily so, because there are people who are being forced to rent their properties for less than the cost of operation and upkeep. Of course, there will be some suffering, but I have faith in the ability and the industry of the American people to work themselves out of any difficulty if given half a chance.

I sincerely regret that I cannot go along with the leadership of my party on this bill. But this raises a fundamental issue and I would not be true to myself if I did not vote my convictions. I do not believe in the confiscation of the property of one class of citizens in peacetime to serve—or to protect, if you please—another class of citizens, no matter how desirable. If the Eightieth Congress deserves the title of being the worst in history, it is because the majority Members who were then in control did not have the courage to end rent control when they had the power.

If you extend this bill now for 15 months, you might just as well extend it for another 2 years, because at the end of the 15 months, just before the 1950 primaries, you will vote to extend it again or the voters who are benefiting by this arrangement will cut your throats at the election.

I would like to read excerpts from a little article I read some weeks ago entitled "Equality Before the Law?":

EQUALITY BEFORE THE LAW?

What we call Americanism is based on the precept that all citizens stand equal before the law, equal in rights and equal in responsibilities.

Are we drifting away—or being led away—from this important, fundamental concept?

We will look at two citizens—any two citizens, from anywhere. These two citizens have worked hard, achieved a competency and made investments which they hope will bring them security. One invests in a farm and becomes a farmer; the other invests in houses, or an apartment house, and becomes a landlord. Both are prepared to serve the public in an honorable way, one with food, the other with shelter. They stand equal before the law.

But right here an incredible thing happens. The Government, though in honor bound to afford these men equal privilege and opportunity, suddenly begins using its vast powers to help and reward the farmer and to hinder and punish the landlord. Here is the record:

To the farmer parity is guaranteed; to the landlord parity is denied.

To the farmer direct subsidies bring high prices; to the landlord rentals are frozen at low, prewar levels.

The farmer is applauded and his prices skyrocket—often with the direct aid of Government buying—far above parity rates; the landlord is fined and even imprisoned if he accepts any raise in rental, even by agreement with the tenant.

The farmer, grown prosperous out of subsidies paid by all the rest of us, is hailed by the Government as a patriot and a hero; the landlord is denounced by the Government as avaricious and greedy and the tool of special interests if he protests and asks for relief to meet higher taxes and increased operating costs.

These two men, who might be you and I, are not equal before the law. If the Government can do this to them it can do it to us.

* * * * *

As long as these conditions continue, something valuable is slipping away from us, day by day. It is our equality before the law.

I say with regret that I cannot go along with the leaders of my party, but this is a fundamental issue that faces us today, just as fundamental as it was when it faced us a year ago. As has been stated on this floor, if rent control ends many properties will come out from hiding and many more houses will be built by private capital. I may be wrong about it, but I think rent control is the one thing that is keeping capital from being invested in housing. True, new construction is not under rent control, but so long as the rent-control system exists they may sooner or later be put under rent control. It is not fair to have one class under rent control, and another class free from it in the same locality. My opinion is it should be ended now. As someone has said, "don't extend it, don't amend it, you can't defend it, end it."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before the House should be, if properly titled "A bill to guarantee more slums and reduce employment," for that is exactly what it will do. True, it will create 600 jobs at good pay for local rent-control expediters; and, of course, each one of these 600 little dictators will need at least one assistant expediter and an office force of several people in addition to the present staff, all at the taxpayers' expense. To do what? To ride herd on good Americans, the proprietors and the tenants.

Let us look at this thing squarely and see just who will be hurt most if this bill is made law: the laboring men of America—carpenters, bricklayers, plasterers, painters, paperhangers, plumbers, and material suppliers of every kind; because the property owners cannot and will not spend money for remodeling and repairing. Because of this, additional hundreds of thousands of building mechanics will suffer by being forced to lay idle; the businessman will lose the trade, and our whole national economy will greatly suffer right at a time when unemployment rolls are mounting and business is falling off all over the country.

I ask, Mr. Chairman: What will it profit a laboring man to have a little cheaper rent if he has no earnings with which to pay rent or living costs? That is what the folks who labor are worrying about today, and make no mistake about it.

So, those who would force the property owners of America to take the rent rate which one man in each area dictates he must accept—or else—had best be thinking of the thousands upon thousands of good Americans who will suffer if the rent-control law is extended.

Mr. Chairman, America must not and will not follow in the footsteps of France, which still has her World War I rent-control law in effect. Today France is known as a nation of slums and unemployment.

Mr. Chairman, it is crystal clear by now that the bigwigs who dictate the policy of the party in power are determined to drive investment capital out of existence regardless of whom it hurts or how it affects labor or business or the prosperity and the security of the Nation. That program in time will also destroy their party, not save it, and that is a certainty.

I cannot believe that any Member of Congress would wittingly lend his or her support to any bill that it would appear might save or destroy any political party at the expense and detriment of the general welfare and the preservation of our priceless liberties.

Mr. Chairman, in my studied opinion, we should let rent control die the natural death it deserves.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, my Republican colleague from Iowa has made a dire forecast of unemployment and an economic depression.

My Republican predecessor immediately prior to his departure from Washington made an announcement, which was published in the newspapers, forecasting that an economic depression would descend upon our country not later than March 1 of this year. He further stated that he would be a candidate for reelection in the year 1950 to save our country from the economic collapse which, he stated, would surely result from the last election of a Democratic Congress. I have diligently attended all meetings of this illustrious body of lawmakers and day after day devoted careful attention and consideration to the frequent speeches of complaining defense of the Eightieth Congress made by our Republican Members on the left of this House. I am convinced that the Shakespearean quotation, "Me thinketh the lady protesteth too much," is an applicable theory of the guilt of the indictment presented against the Eightieth Republican Congress by our President during the last election campaign. However, I am fascinated by the clever

strategy adopted by the Republican Members of this House in first maneuvering by amendments, and by unanimously joining a few of the unsuspecting Democratic Members into a proposed defeat of progressive legislation so essential to the general welfare of the people of our great country.

Yes; the Republican leadership, in premeditated cooperation with the big vested business interests of our country, are attempting to scare the people into a false and jittery sense of economic depression and insecurity of the future, and the powerful subsidized Republican newspapers and the hired columnists and commentators, who have no more respect for the truth and welfare of the people than a rooster has for a marriage license—all embittered by their failure to defeat Democratic candidates at the last election—are striving to create confusion and sell the economic and prosperous condition of our great country short, and to rule or ruin, if necessary, to protect their selfish pride and partisan interests, and to defeat the legislative program which the people of our country voted for at the last election. For example, I quote from an article by David Lawrence, published March 14, as follows:

The Truman depression is here. Despite all the efforts of the administration to minimize it, camouflage it, and deny its existence, the fact remains that an economic readjustment of as yet undetermined proportions is in evidence and has been developing ever since the election last autumn.

Such poppycock articles are purely big-business Republican propaganda, published to discourage the Eighty-first Congress.

The real-estate lobby and vested real-estate interests are actively using the economic depression threat to defeat the proposed legislation now pending before the House. The time is ripe—rotten ripe—for the Democratic Members of this House to stand together and assume our responsibility of passing protective and progressive legislation for the benefit of all the people. If we fail to do so, we may be hereafter known, referred to, and condemned at the next election as the twin brother of the last Eightieth Republican Congress.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 204. (a) Section 205 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by striking out from the heading of such section the words "by tenants"; by inserting after the words "receives such payment", in the first sentence, the following: "(or shall be liable to the United States as hereinafter provided)"; and by changing the period at the end of the second sentence to a colon and inserting: "*Provided*, That if the person from whom such payment is demanded, accepted, or received either fails to institute an action under this section within 30 days from the date of the occurrence of the violation or is not entitled for any reason to bring the action, the United States may institute such action within such 1-year period. If such action is instituted, the person from whom such payment is demanded, accepted, or received shall thereafter be barred from bringing an action for the same violation or violations."

(b) The last sentence of section 205 of such act, as amended, is amended by striking out "plaintiff" and inserting in lieu thereof "person."

SEC. 205. Section 206 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 206. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person to demand, accept, or receive any rent for the use or occupancy of any controlled housing accommodations in excess of the maximum rent prescribed under section 204, or otherwise to do or omit to do any act, in violation of this act, or of any regulation or order or requirement under this act, or to offer, solicit, attempt, or agree to do any of the foregoing.

"(b) Whenever in the judgment of the Housing Expediter any person has engaged or is about to engage in any acts or practices which constitute or will constitute a violation of any provision of this act, or any regulation or order issued thereunder, the United States may make application to any Federal, State, or Territorial court of competent jurisdiction for an order enjoining such acts or practices, or for an order enforcing compliance with such provision, and upon a showing that such person has engaged or is about to engage in any such acts or practices a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order shall be granted without bond.

"(c) Any proceeding brought in a Federal court under section 205 or under subsection (b) of this section may be brought in any district in which any part of any act or transaction constituting the violation occurred, or may be brought in the district in which the defendant resides or transacts business, and process in such cases may be served in any district wherein the defendant resides or transacts business or wherever the defendant may be found. Any such court shall advance on the docket and expedite the disposition of any such proceeding brought before it. No costs shall be assessed against the Housing Expediter or the United States Government in any proceeding under this act.

"(d) No person shall be liable for damages or penalties in any Federal, State, or Territorial court, on any grounds for or in respect of anything done or omitted to be done in good faith pursuant to any provision of this act or any regulation, order, or requirement thereunder notwithstanding that subsequently such provision, regulation, order or requirement may be modified, rescinded, or determined to be invalid. The United States may intervene in any suit or action wherein a party relies for ground of relief or defense upon this act or any regulation, order, or requirement thereunder.

"(e) The principal office of the Housing Expediter shall be in the District of Columbia, but he or any duly authorized representative may exercise any or all of his powers in any place, and attorneys appointed by the Housing Expediter may, under such authority as may be granted by the Attorney General, appear for and represent the United States in any case arising under this act.

"(f) (1) The Housing Expediter is authorized to make such studies and investigations, to conduct such hearings, and to obtain such information, as he deems necessary or proper to assist him in prescribing any regulation or order under this act, or in the administration and enforcement of this act and regulations and orders prescribed thereunder.

"(2) For the purpose of obtaining information under this subsection, the Housing Expediter is further authorized, by regulation or order, to require any person who rents or offers for rent or acts as broker or agent for the rental of any controlled housing accommodations (A) to furnish information under oath or affirmation or otherwise, (B) to make and keep records and other documents and to make reports, and (C) to permit the inspection and copying of records and other documents and the inspection of controlled housing accommodations.

"(3) For the purpose of obtaining information under this subsection, the Housing Expediter may by subpena require any person to appear and testify or to appear and produce documents, or both, at any designated place. Any person subpenaed under this subsection shall have the right to make a record of his testimony and be represented by counsel, and shall be paid the same fees and mileage as are paid witnesses in the United States district courts. For the purposes of this subsection the Housing Expediter, or any officer or employee under his jurisdiction designated by him, may administer oaths and affirmations.

"(4) The production of a person's documents at any place other than his place of business shall not be required under this subsection in any case in which, prior to the return date specified in the subpena issued with respect thereto, such person either has furnished the Housing Expediter with a copy of such documents (certified by such person under oath to be a true and correct copy), or has entered into a stipulation with the Housing Expediter as to the information contained in such documents.

"(5) In case of contumacy by, or refusal to obey a subpena served upon, any person under this subsection, the United States district court for any district in which such person is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the United States, and after notice to such person and hearing, shall have jurisdiction to issue an order requiring such person to appear and give testimony or to appear and produce documents, or both; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.

"(6) No person shall be excused from attending, and testifying or producing documents or from complying with any other requirement under this subsection because of his privilege against self-incrimination, but the immunity provisions of the Compulsory Testimony Act of February 11, 1893 (49 U. S. C. 46), shall apply with respect to any individual who specifically claims such privilege.

"(g) The Housing Expediter shall not publish or disclose any information obtained under this act that such Housing Expediter deems confidential or with reference to which a request for confidential treatment is made by the person furnishing such information unless he determines that the withholding thereof is contrary to the public interest.

"(h) It shall be unlawful for any person to remove or attempt to remove from any controlled housing accommodations the tenant or occupant thereof or to refuse to renew the lease or agreement for the use of such accommodations, because such tenant or occupant has taken, or proposes to take, action authorized or required by this act or any regulation, order, or requirement thereunder."

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOLLINGER: Page 37, strike out, on line 10, all of "(C)", beginning with "any proceeding" and all that follows of the paragraph ending on line 21 with the period mark, and insert in lieu thereof a new paragraph "C", as follows:

"(C) Any person who willfully violates any provision of this act, or any regulation or order issued thereunder, and any person who makes any statement or entry false in any material respect in any document or report required to be kept or filed under this act, shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to a fine of not more than $5,000 or to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or to both such fines and imprisonment. Whenever the Housing Expediter has reason to believe that any person is liable for punishment under

this subsection, he may certify the facts to the Attorney General, who may, in his discretion, cause appropriate proceedings to be brought.

"The district courts shall have jurisdiction of criminal proceedings for violation of this act, or any regulation or order issued thereunder, and concurrently with State and Territorial courts, of all other proceedings under section 205 and subsection (b) of this section. Such criminal proceedings may be brought in any district in which any part of any act or transaction constituting the violation occurred. Such other proceedings may be brought in any district in which any part of any act or transaction constituting the violation occurred, or may be brought in the district in which the defendant resides or transacts business, and process in such cases may be served in any district wherein the defendant resides or transacts business or wherever the defendant may be found. Any such court shall advance on the docket and expedite the disposition of any criminal or other proceedings brought before it under this section. No costs shall be assessed against the Housing Expediter or the United States Government in any proceeding under this act."

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment attempts to put a criminal penalty in this bill for a willful violation. The original bill introduced by the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency had this provision in it, and the language I use in my amendment is the identical language. That provision was deleted by a majority vote of the committee. I do not know the real reason for its deletion, but I know if we do not reinstate the language we will in effect be telling the people of the United States that we will permit any unscrupulous landlord who wants to steal money from his tenant, that he can do so; that he has our blessing to commit the crime.

I disagree with many of the Members on this bill, but I do believe that you think you did the right thing when you passed the Brown amendment which gives landlords the right to obtain a reasonable return. If you want to give them the right to a reasonable return and you believe that the people you are giving that right to are honest people who will not take more than they are entitled to, why should we not have this provision in the bill to make certain that some dishonest individuals, against whom civil judgments are worthless, are covered? Why should we not have the right to prosecute them criminally if they violate the law willfully?

In the State of New York, where rent gouging is a crime, cases against landlords have brought shocking practices to light. We have instances where they have given people an apartment on condition that they bought furniture from them, at a price which was exorbitant, or they took money under the table. Are we to say today that we will permit that practice to go on? Why should we be afraid to leave the criminal penalty provision in? I say the honest man is not afraid of that provision. This is our only weapon against the dishonest person who will stoop to any low. It is a hold-up when one resorts to that kind of practice and any hold-up should be prosecuted criminally.

Let us at least put some teeth into the law. The law as it stands before us now is a control without controls. We have given the landlord every kind of a right without regard to the rights of the tenant. Let us be fair to the tenant and give him some protection.

If you adopt this provision you are only hitting at the dishonest man. I think it is our job to make certain that no dishonesty is permitted.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLINGER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GAMBLE. Does this criminal provision apply against a regulation or just against a law? The gentleman remembers we discussed that in committee.

Mr. DOLLINGER. It provides against the willful violation of the provisions in the act. If the regulation makes reference to that, and if it is willful, it will be covered by this amendment.

Mr. GAMBLE. It would cover a regulation, then?

Mr. DOLLINGER. Yes, if it violates any provision of this act or any regulation or order issued thereunder.

Mr. GAMBLE. By making it apply to regulations as well as to the law, you very much broaden the situation.

Mr. DOLLINGER. There is a 1-year statute of limitations. What would happen prior to 1 year is completely out of that.

Mr. GAMBLE. You do not go back to 1948?

Mr. DOLLINGER. We go back 1 year.

Mr. GAMBLE. Yes, from the date of its enactment.

Mr. DOLLINGER. From the date of its enactment; that is right.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am against placing any Gold Star Mother in jail because she violated some little regulation concerning her own property. That is all I have to say.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOLLINGER].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 206. Section 209 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 209. Whenever in the judgment of the Housing Expediter such action is necessary or proper in order to effectuate the purposes of this act, he may, by regulation or order, regulate or prohibit speculative or manipulative practices or renting or leasing practices (including practices relating to recovery of the possession) in connection with any controlled housing accommodations, which in his judgment are equivalent to or are likely to result in rent increases inconsistent with the purposes of this act."

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time, not to offer additional perfecting amendments which I have prepared, but rather to point out to the members of this committee what we are doing now in strengthening rent control, even after having adopted the amendments which have been adopted in this body. The rent-control bill as proposed by the majority members of this committee provide for eight additional strengthening and tightening provisions. I merely want to take this opportunity to point out to you what we are doing. First, we are permitting the Housing Expediter to recontrol areas which have been decontrolled. We are permitting him to do that under any circumstance that he may deem advisable. Secondly, we are tightening the appeals from the decisions of the local boards. Third, we are not permitting the landlords and tenants to enter into voluntary agreements. Fourth, under the present law only the tenant or that person involved in dealing with the landlord may now sue the landlord or his agent. Now we permit the United States Government to file suit for treble damages. Fifth, we have what I call the junior G-man clause, not junior Government man, but junior Gestapo man. The junior G-man who will snoop into the business of every individual that the Housing Expediter deems is essential. In this we have a new procedure which provides that the Housing Expediter may issue a subpena to any person—not to any person who offers for lease any property, but he may issue subpenas to any person in the United States and require that person to go any place in the United States to answer that subpena and to bring his books and papers before the Housing Expediter. It has nothing to do with the man who may or may not want to lease his property. Sixth, we have certain specific restrictions under which a man may evict a tenant under present law. Under the proposed law the Housing Expediter may make such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary to evict or restrict the eviction of tenants. Seventh, the proposed law recontrols converted units which have heretofore been decontrolled. People have spent thousands of dollars remodeling these units. Now we recontrol converted units. Last, but not least, we have done one other thing by recontrolling trailer and trailer space. I understand there is a situation in Connecticut about which somebody came down here to testify. No one else testified about it. But we have recontrolled trailers and trailer space. We have not recontrolled motor courts, but we have recontrolled trailers and trailer space. Absent, very interestingly, is the recontrol of new construction. That is very interesting that no one brought forth before the House an amendment asking for the recontrol of new construction. The obvious reason, of course, is that the majority has realized that controls do restrict production.

Mr. Chairman, because of these unnecessary added restrictions placed in the proposed bill, it is still unpalatable bait to those of us who believe in a return to peacetime economy.

I merely wanted to keep the record straight what we are doing here today. And if you vote for this bill you are voting for these tightened strengthening provisions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE] has expired.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I wish merely to say to my colleagues that in the House I shall ask for a separate vote on the Rains amendment.

This is the amendment that would operate to continue the decontrol of apartment and residential hotels.

The original Spence bill had a provision for the recontrol of permanent housing accommodations in all hotels. I think this is as it should be since there is no real difference between a permanent home whether it is in a cottage or in a room in a hotel—the test is whether the residence therein is on a permanent basis.

The committee, however, amended the original Spence bill to decontrol transient hotels as differentiated from residential or apartment hotels. That would return permanent housing accommodations in residential or apartment hotels to the protection of rent control.

If the Rains amendment—which leaves all hotels out of adequate control, exactly as at present—is defeated, the original Spence bill as amended by the committee will stand. That is, residential and apartment hotels will be back under rent control, where by all that is just and that is necessary they should be.

There is much real suffering—cruel and unnecessary suffering—being endured by the permanent tenants in apartment and residential hotels. They are people in modest circumstances. My mail is filled with letters from them asking that we in this Congress remember that in November we locked to them and that we do have an obligation not to desert them in their time of great trial.

I sincerely hope my colleagues on both sides of the Chamber will join in defeating the Rains amendment. There should be no partisan approach in the matter of giving relief where it is neded—no partisan division in applying a remedy to good citizens from intolerable conditions.

The sorry plight of tenants of so-called apartment and residential hotels—the victims in many cases of the extremes in gouging, all occasioned by the decontrolling features of the present law, which will be continued under the Rains amendment—is by no means confined to my district.

The district on the north side of Chicago represented by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Illinois, Judge JONAS, a Republican Member of this House, is suffering in exactly the same way. In order that my colleagues may have an accurate picture of what the situation is in Chicago from representatives of both parties, I will be very happy to yield some of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, my colleague, Judge JONAS.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I come from a district where the greater portion of the territory is inhabited by people who live in many residential hotels and apartment hotels. As I understand the bill now, everybody has been exempted from control, including transient hotels, residential hotels, and apartment hotels, and the only person that is left to be controlled is the man who owns an apartment building consisting of two flats or four flats or whatever it may be. That is the final climax of all this legislation.

There are about 30 hotels in my district on the north side of the city of Chicago which were residential hotels until they were decontrolled. They had tenants who had lived there 8 or 9 years. They had leases beginning with 2 or 3 years, then down to 1 year, and then finally they were denied leases at all. They were put on a 30-day basis and now they have no leases at all. Those are the people who have been the victims of this rent gouging. There are about 40 hotels on the north side of the city of Chicago which receive no protection under this bill.

I endorse the effort of my distinguished colleague in this House.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. My distinguished colleague from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] tells me that the situation in Kansas City is exactly as it is in Chicago, as I am informed it is in New York, and as the gentlewoman from California assures me it is in Los Angeles. It is really a serious problem in the large places of America, and is unjustly affecting a very fine segment of our population: school teachers, professional people, retired municipal and other public employees living on pensions, widows, men, and women on modest salaries. Corporation Counsel Adamowski, in his letter to me, which is in the printed record of our committee hearings, says that they pay—or did pay before the decontrol provision of the present law—an average of about $10 or $15 a week rent. I do hope that this presentment will reach the understanding of my colleagues and that those of us from the urban centers will have the support and understanding of our good neighbors of both parties in defeating the Rains amendment when the House reconvenes.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WAGNER: Page 41, line 8, insert "(a)" before "Whenever", and after line 16, insert the following:

"(b) Notwithstanding the fourth sentence of section 502 (b) of the Housing Act of 1948, the Public Housing Administration, or any State or local public agency administering a low-rent housing project assisted pursuant to the United States Housing Act of 1937 or title II of Public Law 671, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved June 28, 1940, shall not have the right to maintain an action or proceeding to recover possession of any housing accommodations operated by it if in the opinion of the administering authority such action or proceeding would result in undue hardship for the occupants of such housing accommodations, or unless in the opinion of such authority other housing facilities are available for such occupants."

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. Chairman, I shall not seek to address myself to either side, because I think this is a problem in which both sides of the House should be interested.

My amendment, in plain words, deals with so-called over-income families in the public-housing projects. As far as I am concerned, I think that in normal times housing projects such as these are intended for low-income families whose incomes are so low that private enterprise cannot properly house them in other existing or new housing. In normal times I am for requiring families whose income exceeds the established limits being forced to move, without exception. This has been the policy of the public-housing authorities and would, I am sure, continue to be, except for the extreme shortage of housing in which we have found ourselves for a long period of time. So, as long as this critical shortage exists I believe the local public-housing authorities should have discretion in order that they may not have to force families out in cases where it would cause great hardship to force them to move back into the slum areas. This is particularly harsh in the cases of the veterans whose families moved into these housing projects. The boys have come home and now because of some slight increase in income they would be forced to move out. Back in my home district we have approximately 1,007 of these so-called over-income families. Of this number over 70 percent earn incomes of less than $3,000. Fifty-four percent of the so-called over-income families are headed by veterans. It has been the policy in the past that when a person reached an over-income stage he was given a notice to move. I am in favor of that policy where they can find a place to go; but, Mr. Chairman, I have found in the projects back in my home district that these people are the backbone of the Nation. They are rearing large families. Since they have families and a large number of children, they have no place to go. Evictions will serve no purpose other than to put these families on the streets.

I have been urged to offer this amendment, not only by the Better Housing League of my district, which is a Red Feather, Community Chest organization supported by people of all creeds and of all political beliefs, but by my own city council, which is a bipartisan council. They have urged that the Congress give the Housing Authority some discretion to let these people remain in the project until they have some place to go to.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. LODGE. May I commend the gentleman on his statement. Although during normal times I believe that over-income tenants should make way for those whose incomes come within the limitation, I am very much in favor of this amendment. In my own district in Bridgeport, Norwalk, Stamford, and Stratford there are Federal public housing projects in which there are people living who have no place to go if they are evicted. Many of these people would suffer great hardship if evicted. Furthermore, the cost of living has risen so substantially since these maximum incomes were first fixed that the present maximum income rate is completely unrealistic. I shall vote for the gentleman's amendment, and I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. WAGNER. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

In closing I may say there are housing units available in my district if you are able to pay $125, $150, or $175 a month rent. Men with an income of less than $3,000 and raising a large family, such as these people are doing, cannot pay these rentals.

The Housing Authority, in which I have a lot of confidence, should be given

some discretion in cases where it will cause undue hardship. I think my amendment is a good one, and I ask the support of my colleagues on both sides of the House for it.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in my district we have 390 low-income rental units and up to this very moment over 200 of the families living in those units have received notice that they must vacate or that they must be out before April 1.

We have a very serious housing shortage. The housing shortage that has been so graphically presented to this House by the majority leader and other Members is very acute in my district. If the eviction of these families is carried out it is not going to help the housing situation, but, on the contrary, is going to make it more acute. Therefore, I favor the pending amendment, and I do implore the members of the committee who are advocating the passage of this bill not to be like the immortal 300 Spartans at Thermopylae or like the heroic French in the First World War at Verdun. They were defending the passes against their country's enemies. We who are here trying to pass along our opinions and amendments are the friends of the committee; we are not the enemies of our country at all, and we are sincere about this matter. I do implore the members of the committee to be lenient in this matter and consider the plight of Members who come from districts that have many of these low-rental units and who are faced with this problem. A man who earns $10,000 a year, as compared with a man who may earn $2,000, is not passed over by the housing shortage. When you talk about the housing shortage the family in the higher-income bracket is in need of a roof over its head just as much as the family in the lower-income bracket.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAVALCANTE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Is it not the purpose of this amendment to permit an orderly and temperate relocation of excess-income families within housing projects, a procedure which cannot be undertaken under Public Law 901, which is presently in existence, and which compels the eviction of a family whose income exceeds the limitation of the Housing Act? For instance, in the city of Chicago there are two housing projects within my own area. The income limitation is $2,600. Families whose gross income exceeds that figure are compelled to move. Will this not permit the Housing Authority discretion which it does not now have?

Mr. CAVALCANTE. The gentleman has precisely stated the purpose of this amendment.

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHUDOFF. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I have been sitting patiently in this hall for the past 3 days listening to threats of chaos and confusion and to so-called perfecting amendments, and after much time and much voting in my opinion we have a perfectly confused rent-control bill.

I want to speak in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio. I think that his amendment is the most worth-while amendment offered in the past 3 days. The talk of confusion and chaos is already borne out by what is happening to public housing units in Philadelphia and throughout the country. Gentlemen, this is a writ of possession, and under the present law the housing authorities of the country have no other alternative than to issue these writs of possession to families in subsidized housing projects who are earning over the maximum income allowed under the law. Now, the housing authorities know that these people have no place to go. This morning, coming down from Philadelphia on the train, I ran into the executive director of the Philadelphia housing authority. I told him about the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio. He agreed that it was absolutely necessary. If we want to stop chaos and confusion, if we want to take care of a condition that presently exists, not something that we think might happen, the only way to do it is to pass the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio. Let us prevent these conditions that exist in Philadelphia and other jurisdictions throughout the country where people are being put out on the street daily. As a matter of fact, these two families are already evicted. Where they have gone, I do not know. I have tried to locate one of them which consisted of a husband, wife, and six children, and I am advised that they are living in two rooms because they could not find any other place to live.

This is a present need, and the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and rise in support of the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

I represent a district in the city of Minneapolis that has an 8-blocks-square Federal Housing project called Sumner Field. At the present time I have on my desk a petition signed by 82 families who are threatened with eviction because they have an income that exceeds the Federal Housing limitation. So I want to join in, for the reason that in the city of Minneapolis we have a housing problem. There is no place for these people to move to when they get the final eviction notice.

These are not spinsters, bachelors, and so forth; these are people in the low-income group with families, and they will find absolutely no place to move to when they are evicted. I think the time has come with the increasing economy that has brought them beyond that limitation that a like increase in the present limitation ought to be granted, so I join in urging the adoption of this amendment to the rent-control bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment was never presented to the committee. It may be taken up in the housing bill when it is considered by the committee. It certainly seems to me there is no reason to freeze high-income people in subsidized low-rent housing. I do think the Housing Administration ought to try to secure some other accommodations for them, but certainly we do not want to pass any law that will freeze into these low-rent subsidized housing units people whose income has now gone far beyond the limit.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be defeated. We will take this up in the housing bill when we come to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WAGNER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WAGNER) there were—ayes 47, noes 97.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 301. Nothing in this act or in the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, shall be construed to require any person to offer any housing accommodations for rent.

SEC. 302. Section 303 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1948 is hereby repealed.

SEC. 303. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act, and the applicability of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 304. This act shall become effective on the first day of the first calendar month following the month in which it is enacted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee substitute, as amended, for the bill.

The committee substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GORE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1731) to extend certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 138, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MONRONEY. Under the rule, any amendments to the amendment may be voted on separately, may they not?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. Then, Mr. Speaker, if now is the proper time I ask for a separate vote on the so-called Williams amendment.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the Brown amendment.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the so-called Rains amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 35, line 18, strike out the quotation marks and, after line 18, insert the following subsection:

"(j) If the legislature or comparable governing body of any State, municipality, county, or other political subdivision declares by resolution that Federal rent control is no longer needed in such State, municipality, county, or political subdivision, and transmits a certified copy of such resolution to the Housing Expediter, the provisions of this title shall be inapplicable to such State, municipality, county, or political subdivision 15 days after such certified copy shall have been mailed by registered mail to the Housing Expediter."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, is it not the rule to vote on these amendments in the order in which they were adopted?

The SPEAKER. It has been the custom to put the question on such amendments in the order in which a separate vote has been demanded. The gentleman from Oklahoma rose first and asked for a separate vote on the so-called Williams amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 227, nays 188, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 30]

YEAS—227

Abbitt, Abernethy, Allen, Calif., Allen, Ill., Andersen, H. Carl, Anderson, Calif., Andresen, August H., Angell, Arends, Auchincloss, Barrett, Wyo., Bates, Mass., Battle, Beall, Bennett, Fla., Bennett, Mich., Bentsen, Bishop, Blackney, Boggs, Del., Bolton, Ohio, Bonner, Boykin, Brambletti, Brehm, Brooks, Brown, Ohio, Bryson, Burton, Byrnes, Wis., Carlyle, Case, N. J., Case, S. Dak., Chatham, Church, Clevenger, Cole, Kans., Cole, N. Y., Colmer, Cooley, Corbett, Cotton, Coudert, Cox, Crawford, Cunningham, Curtis, Dague, Davis, Ga., Davis, Wis., D'Ewart, Dolliver, Dondero, Doughton, Durham, Eaton, Ellsworth, Elston, Engel, Mich., Engle, Calif., Fellows, Fenton, Fernandes, Fisher, Ford, Fugate, Fulton, Gamble, Gary, Gathings, Gavin, Gillette, Golden, Goodwin, Gossett, Graham, Gross, Gwinn, Hagen, Hale, Hall, Edwin Arthur, Hall, Leonard W., Halleck, Hand, Harden, Hare, Harris, Harrison, Harvey, Hébert, Herlong, Herter, Heselton, Hill, Hinshaw, Hoeven, Hoffman, Mich., Holmes, Hope, Horan, Jackson, Calif., James, Jenison, Jenkins, Jennings, Jensen, Johnson, Jonas, Jones, N. C., Judd, Kean, Kearney, Kearns, Keating, Keefe, Kilburn, Kilday, Kruse, Kunkel, Larcade, Latham, LeCompte, LeFevre, Lemke, Lichtenwalter, Lodge, Lovre, Lucas, McConnell, McCulloch, McDonough, McGregor, McMillan, S. C., McMillen, Ill., Mack, Wash., Macy, Mahon, Martin, Iowa, Martin, Mass., Mason, Merrow, Meyer, Michener, Miles, Miller, Md., Miller, Nebr., Morris, Morton, Murray, Tenn., Murray, Wis., Nelson, Nicholson, Nixon, Norblad, Norrell, O'Hara, Minn., Passman, Patten, Patterson, Peterson, Pfeiffer, William L., Phillips, Calif., Phillips, Tenn., Pickett, Poage, Potter, Preston, Rankin, Redden, Reed, Ill., Rees, Regan, Rich, Richards, Riehlman, Rivers, Rogers, Fla., Rogers, Mass., Sadlak, Scott, George, Sanborn, Scott, Hardie, Scott, Hugh D., Jr., Scrivner, Scudder, Secrest, Shafer, Short, Sikes, Simpson, Ill., Simpson, Pa., Smith, Kans., Smith, Va., Stanley, Stefan, Stigler, Stockman, Taber, Tackett, Talle, Taylor, Teague, Thompson, Thornberry, Tollefson, Towe, Van Zandt, Velde, Vorys, Vursell, Wadsworth, Weichel, Werdel, Wheeler, Whitten, Whittington, Wickersham, Wigglesworth, Williams, Willis, Wilson, Ind., Wilson, Okla., Wilson, Tex., Winstead, Wolcott, Wolverton, Woodruff

NAYS—188

Addonizio, Albert, Allen, La., Andrews, Aspinall, Bailey, Baring, Barrett, Pa., Bates, Ky., Beckworth, Blemiller, Bland, Boggs, La., Bolling, Bolton, Md., Bosone, Breen, Brown, Ga., Buchanan, Buckley, Ill., Buckley, N. Y., Burdick, Burke, Burleson, Burnside, Byrne, N. Y., Camp, Canfield, Cannon, Carnahan, Carroll, Cavalcante, Chelf, Chesney, Christopher, Chudoff, Clemente, Coffey, Combs, Cooper, Crook, Crosser, Davenport, Davies, N. Y., Davis, Tenn., Dawson, Deane, DeGraffenried, Delaney, Denton, Dingell, Dollinger, Donohue, Douglas, Doyle, Eberharter, Elliott, Evins, Fallon, Feighan, Flood, Fogarty, Forand, Frazier, Furcolo, Garmatz, Gordon, Gore, Gorski, Ill., Gorski, N. Y., Granahan, Granger, Grant, Green, Gregory, Hardy, Hart, Havenner, Hays, Ark., Hays, Ohio, Hedrick, Heffernan, Heller, Hobbs, Holifield, Howell, Huber, Hull, Irving, Jackson, Wash., Jacobs, Javits, Jones, Ala., Jones, Mo., Karst, Karsten, Kee, Kelley, Kennedy, Keogh, Kerr, King, Kirwan, Klein, Lane, Lesinski, Lind, Linehan, Lyle, Lynch, McCarthy, McCormack, McGrath, McGuire, McKinnon, Mack, Ill., Madden, Magee, Mansfield, Marcantonio, Marsalis, Marshall, Miller, Calif., Mills, Mitchell, Monroney, Morgan, Morrison, Moulder, Multer, Murdock, Murphy, Noland, Norton, O'Brien, Ill., O'Brien, Mich., O'Hara, Ill., O'Neill, O'Sullivan, O'Toole, Pace, Patman, Perkins, Pfeifer, Joseph L., Philbin, Polk, Powell, Price, Priest, Quinn, Rabaut, Rains, Ramsay, Rhodes, Ribicoff, Rodino, Rooney, Sabath, Sadowski, Sasscer, Sheppard, Sims, Smathers, Spence, Staggers, Steed, Sullivan, Sutton, Tauriello, Thomas, Tex., Trimble, Underwood, Vinson, Wagner, Walsh, Walter, Welch, Calif., Welch, Mo., Whitaker, White, Calif., White, Idaho, Wier, Withrow, Woodhouse, Worley, Yates, Young, Zablocki

NOT VOTING—18

Barden, Blatnik, Bulwinkle, Celler, Chiperfield, Gilmer, Hoffman, Ill., Lanham, McSweeney, O'Konski, Plumley, Poulson, Reed, N. Y., Smith, Ohio, Smith, Wis., Somers, Thomas, N. J., Wood

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Chiperfield for, with Mr. Blatnik against.

Mr. Reed of New York for, with Mr. Somers against.

Mr. O'Konski for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Smith of Wisconsin for, with Mr. McSweeney against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Wood with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Barden with Mr. Poulson.

Mr. Lanham with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.

Mr. PASSMAN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 28, line 22, strike out beginning with the word "In" down through the period in line 25, and insert the following sentences: "In making and recommending individual and general adjustments to remove hardships or to correct other inequities, the Housing Expediter and the local boards shall observe the principle of maintaining maximum rents for controlled-housing accommodations, so far as is practicable, at levels which will yield to landlords a reasonable return (but not in excess of a reasonable return) on the reasonable value of such housing accommodations. In determining whether the maximum rent for controlled-housing accommodations yields a reasonable return on the reasonable value of such housing accommodations, due consideration shall be given to the following, among other relevant factors: (A) Increases in property taxes, (B) unavoidable increases in operating and maintenance expenses, (C) major capital improvement of the housing accommodations as distinguished from ordinary repair, replacement, and maintenance, (D) increases or decreases in living space, services, furniture, furnishings, or equipment, and (E) substantial deterioration of the housing accommodations, other than ordinary wear and tear, or failure to perform ordinary repair, replacement, or maintenance."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Fifty-three Members have arisen, not a sufficient number.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 311, noes 47.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 25, lines 18 to 24, inclusive, strike out lines 18 to 24, inclusive.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. O'HARA of Illinois) there were—ayes 231, noes 145.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 237, nays 175, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 31]

YEAS—237

Abbitt
Abernethy
Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Allen, La.
Andersen, H. Carl
Anderson, Calif.
Andresen, August H.
Andrews
Angell
Arends
Auchincloss
Baring
Barrett, Wyo
Bates, Mass.
Battle
Beall
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Bentsen
Bishop
Blackney
Boggs, Del.
Boggs, La.
Bolton, Md.
Bolton, Ohio
Boykin
Bramblett
Brehm
Brooks
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Ohio
Bryson
Burton
Byrnes, Wis.
Camp
Carlyle
Case, N. J.
Case, S. Dak.
Chatham
Church
Clevenger
Cole, Kans.
Cole, N. Y.
Colmer
Combs
Cooley
Cooper
Corbett
Cotton
Coudert
Cox
Crawford
Cunningham
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Davis, Wis.
DeGraffenried
D'Ewart
Dolliver
Dondero
Doughton
Durham
Eaton
Elliott
Ellsworth
Elston
Engel, Mich.
Engle, Calif.
Evins
Fellows
Fenton
Fisher
Ford
Frazier
Fulton
Fuller
Gamble
Gathings
Gavin
Gillette
Gorski, Ill.
Gorski, N. Y.
Granahan
Granger
Green
Gregory
Harrison
Hart
Havenner
Hays, Ohio
Hedrick
Heffernan
Heller
Hollifield
Howell
Huber
Hull
Irving
Jackson, Wash.
Jacobs
Javits
Jones, Mo.
Judd
Karst
Karsten
Kee
Kelley
Kennedy
Kerr
King
Kirwan
Klein
Kruse
Lane
Lanham
Lesinski
Lind
Linehan
Lucas
Lyle
Lynch
McCarthy
McCormack
McCrath
McGuire
McKinnon
Mack, Ill.
Mack, Wash.
Madden
Magee
Mahon
Mansfield
Marcantonio
Marsalis
Marshall
Miles
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Mitchell
Monroney
Morgan
Morris
Moulder
Murdock
Murphy
Noland
Norton
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Neill
O'Sullivan
O'Toole
Patman
Patten
Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Philbin
Polk
Powell
Price
Quinn
Rabaut
Ramsay
Rhodes
Ribicoff
Rodino
Rooney
Sabath
Sadowski
Sasscer
Secrest
Sims
Smathers
Spence
Staggers
Stigler
Sullivan
Sutton
Tauriello
Taylor
Thomas, Tex.
Thompson
Thornberry
Tollefson
Underwood
Vinson
Wagner
Walsh
Walter
Welch, Calif.
Welch, Mo.
Wheeler
White, Calif.
White, Idaho
Whitten
Wickersham
Wier
Willis
Wilson, Okla.
Wilson, Tex.
Withrow
Wolverton
Woodhouse
Worley
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—21

Barden
Blatnik
Bulwinkle
Celler
Chiperfield
Gilmer
Hoffman, Ill.
McMillan, S. C.
McSweeney
O'Konski
Plumley
Poulson
Priest
Reed, N. Y.
Sheppard
Smith, Ohio
Smith, Wis.
Somers
Thomas, N. J.
Velde
Wood

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Chiperfield for, with Mr. Blatnik against.

Mr. Reed of New York for, with Mr. Somers against.

Mr. O'Konski for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Smith of Wisconsin for, with Mr. McSweeney against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Wood with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Barden with Mr. Poulson.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

Mr. McMillan of South Carolina with Mr. Velde.

Mr. Priest with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOLCOTT moves that the bill H. R. 1731 be recommitted to the Committee on Banking and Currency with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 25 beginning in line 17, strike out all of titles 2 and 3 of the bill and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Title 2, maximum rents: Section 201, subsections (a) and (f) of section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, are each amended by striking out 'March 31, 1949', and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1949'."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, on that I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. SPENCE. I demand the yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 154, nays 260, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No 32]

YEAS—154

Abernethy
Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Andersen, H. Carl
Anderson, Calif.
Andresen, August H.
Angell
Arends
Barrett, Wyo.
Bates, Mass.
Beall
Bennett, Mich.
Bishop
Blackney
Boggs, Del.
Bolton, Md.
Bolton, Ohio
Boykin
Bramblett
Brehm
Brown, Ohio
Bryson
Byrnes, Wis.
Case, S. Dak.
Church
Clevenger
Cole, Kans.
Cole, N. Y.
Colmer
Cotton
Cox
Crawford
Cunningham
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
D'Ewart
Dolliver
Dondero
Eaton
Ellsworth
Elston
Fellows
Fenton
Ford
Gamble
Gathings
Gavin
Gillette
Golden
Goodwin
Gossett
Graham
Gwinn
Hale
Hall, Leonard W.
Halleck
Harden
Hare
Harvey
Herlong
Hill
Hinshaw
Hoeven
Hoffman, Mich.
Hope
Horan
Jackson, Calif.
James
Jenison
Jenkins
Jennings
Jensen
Johnson
Jonas
Kearns
Keefe
Kilburn
Kunkel
Latham
LeCompte
LeFevre
Lemke
Lichtenwalter
Lovre
McConnell
McCulloch
McDonough
McGregor
McMillen, Ill.
Macy
Martin, Iowa
Martin, Mass.
Mason
Merrow
Meyer
Michener
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Murray, Tenn.
Norrell
Nixon
Norblad
O'Hara, Minn.
Peterson
Pfeiffer, William L.
Phillips, Calif.
Phillips, Tenn.
Potter
Rankin
Reed, Ill.
Rees
Rich
Richards
Riehlman
Rivers
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Sadlak
St. George
Sanborn
Scott, Hardie
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Scrivner
Scudder
Shafer
Short
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Smathers
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Va.
Stanley
Steed
Stefan
Stockman
Taber
Tackett
Teague
Thompson
Thornberry
Tollefson
Van Zandt
Vorys
Vursell
Wadsworth
Weichel
Werdel
Wheeler
Whitten
Whittington
Wigglesworth
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wolcott
Wolverton
Woodruff

NAYS—260

Abbitt
Addonizio
Albert
Allen, La.
Andrews
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Bailey
Baring
Barrett, Pa.
Bates, Ky.
Battle
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Bentsen
Bland
Blemiller
Boggs, La.
Bolling
Bonner
Bosone
Brown, Ga.
Burke
Burleson
Burnside
Burton
Byrne, N. Y.
Camp
Canfield
Cannon
Carlyle
Carnahan
Carroll
Case, N. J.
Cavalcante
Chatham
Chelf
Chesney
Christopher
Chudoff
Clemente
Coffey
Combs
Cooley
Cooper
Corbett
Coudert
Crook
Crosser
Davenport
Davies, N. Y.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Deane
DeGraffenried
Delaney
Denton
Dingell
Dollinger
Donohue
Doughton
Douglas
Doyle
Durham
Eberharter
Elliott
Engel, Mich.
Engle, Calif.
Evins
Fallon
Feighan
Fernandes
Fisher
Flood
Fogarty
Forand
Frazier
Fugate
Fulton
Furcolo
Garmatz
Gordon
Gore
Gorski, Ill.
Gorski, N. Y.
Granahan
Granger
Green
Gregory
Gross
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hand
Hardy
Harrison
Hart
Hays, Ark.
Hebert
Heffernan
Heller
Herlong
Herter
Heselton
Hinshaw
Hobbs
Hoeven
Holifield
Holmes
Horan
Hull
Jackson, Wash.
Jacobs
Javits
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N. C.
Judd
Karst
Karsten
Kean
Kearney
Keating
Kee
Kelley
Kennedy
Keogh
Kerr
Kilburn
King
Kirwan
Klein
Kruse
Lane
Larcade
Lesinski
Lichtenwalter
Lind
Linehan
Lodge
Lucas
Lyle
Lynch
McCarthy
McCormack
McCrath
McGuire
McKinnon
Mack, Ill.
Mack, Wash.
Madden
Magee
Mahon
Mansfield
Marcantonio
Marsalis
Marshall
Miles
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Mitchell
Monroney
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morton
Moulder
Multer
Murdock
Murphy
Nelson
Noland
Norrell
Norton
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Neill
O'Sullivan
O'Toole
Pace
Patman
Patten
Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Philbin
Phillips, Calif.
Phillips, Tenn.
Pickett
Poage
Polk
Potter
Preston
Rabaut
Rains
Ramsay
Redden
Regan
Rhodes
Ribicoff
Rodino
Rooney
Sabath
Sadowski
Sasscer
Scott, Hardie
Secrest
Sikes
Sims
Smathers
Spence
Staggers
Stanley
Steed
Stigler
Sullivan
Sutton
Tackett
Tauriello
Taylor
Thomas, Tex.
Thompson
Thornberry
Tollefson
Trimble
Underwood
Vinson
Wagner
Walsh
Walter
Welch, Calif.
Welch, Mo.
Wheeler
White, Calif.
White, Idaho
Whitten
Wickersham
Wier
Willis
Wilson, Okla.
Wilson, Tex.
Withrow
Wolverton
Woodhouse
Worley
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—19

Barden
Blatnik
Bulwinkle
Celler
Chiperfield
Gilmer
Hoffman, Ill.
McSweeney
O'Konski
Plumley
Poulson
Reed, N. Y.
Sheppard
Smith, Ohio
Smith, Wis.
Somers
Thomas, N. J.
Whitaker
Wood

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Chiperfield for, with Mr. Blatnik against.

Mr. Reed of New York for, with Mr. Somers against.

Mr. O'Konski for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Smith of Wisconsin for, with Mr. McSweeney against.

Mr. Plumley for, with Mr. Whitaker against.

Mr. Barden for, with Mr. Gilmer against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Wood with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Poulson.

Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, on the final passage I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 261, nays 153, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 33]

YEAS—261

Abbitt
Addonizio
Allen, La.
Andrews
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Bailey
Baring
Barrett, Pa.
Bates, Ky.
Bates, Mass.
Battle
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Bentsen
Blemiller
Bland
Boggs, La.
Bolling
Bonner
Bosone
Breen
Brooks
Brown, Ga.
Bryson
Buchanan
Buckley, Ill.
Buckley, N. Y.
Burdick
Burke
Burnside
Burton
Byrne, N. Y.
Camp
Canfield
Cannon
Carlyle
Carnahan
Carroll
Case, N. J.
Cavalcante
Chelf
Chesney
Christopher
Chudoff
Clemente
Coffey
Combs
Cooley
Cooper
Corbett
Coudert
Crook
Crosser
Davenport
Davies, N. Y.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Deane
DeGraffenried
Delaney
Denton
Dingell
Dollinger
Donohue
Douglas
Doyle
Durham
Eberharter
Elliott
Engel, Mich.
Engle, Calif.
Evins
Fallon
Feighan
Fernandes
Fisher
Flood
Fogarty
Forand
Frazier
Fugate
Fulton
Furcolo
Garmatz
Gamble
Gordon
Gore
Gorski, Ill.
Gorski, N. Y.
Granahan
Granger
Grant
Green
Gregory
Gross
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hall, Leonard W.
Hand
Hardy
Harrison
Hart
Havenner
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Hebert
Hedrick
Heffernan
Heller
Herter
Heselton
Hinshaw
Hobbs
Hollifield
Holmes
Horan
Howell
Huber
Hull
Irving
Jackson, Wash.
Jacobs
James
Javits
Johnson
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N. C.
Judd
Karst
Karsten
Kean
Kearney
Kearns
Keating
Kee
Kelley
Kennedy
Keogh
Kerr
Kilburn
King
Kirwan
Klein
Kruse
Kunkel
Lane
Larcade
Latham
LeFevre
Lichtenwalter
Lind
Linehan
Lodge
Lucas
Lyle
Lynch
McCarthy
McCormack
McCrath
McGrath
McGuire
McKinnon
Mack, Ill.
Mack, Wash.
Madden
Magee
Mansfield
Marcantonio
Marsalis
Marshall
Martin, Mass.
Miles
Miller, Calif.
Mitchell
Monroney
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morton
Moulder
Multer
Murdock
Murphy
Nelson
Noland
Norblad
Norrell
Norton
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Neill
O'Sullivan
O'Toole
Pace
Patman
Patten
Patterson
Perkins
Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Pfeifer, William L.
Philbin
Polk
Powell
Price
Priest
Quinn
Rabaut
Rains
Ramsay
Rhodes
Ribicoff
Riehlman
Rivers
Rodino
Rogers, Mass.
Rooney
Sabath
Sadlak
Sadowski
St. George
Sasscer
Scott, Hardie
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Secrest
Sikes
Sims
Smathers
Spence
Staggers
Stigler
Sullivan
Sutton
Talle
Tauriello
Taylor
Thomas, Tex.
Thompson
Thornberry
Tollefson
Trimble
Underwood
Vinson
Wagner
Walsh
Walter
Welch, Calif.
Welch, Mo.
Wheeler
White, Calif.
White, Idaho
Whitten
Wickersham
Wier
Willis
Wilson, Okla.
Wilson, Tex.
Withrow
Wolverton
Woodhouse
Worley
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—153

Abernethy
Albert
Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Andersen, H. Carl
Anderson, Calif.
Andresen, August H.
Angell
Arends
Barrett, Wyo.
Beall
Bishop
Blackney
Boggs, Del.
Bolton, Md.
Bolton, Ohio
Boykin
Bramblett
Brehm
Brown, Ohio
Burleson
Byrnes, Wis.
Case, S. Dak.
Chatham
Church
Clevenger
Cole, Kans.
Cole, N. Y.
Colmer
Cotton
Coz
Crawford
Cunningham
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
D'Ewart
Dolliver
Dondero
Doughton
Eaton
Ellsworth
Elston
Fellows
Fernandes
Fisher
Ford
Gathings
Gavin
Gillette
Golden
Goodwin
Gossett
Graham
Gwinn
Hagen
Hale
Halleck
Harden
Hare
Harris
Harrison
Harvey
Herlong
Hill
Hoeven
Hoffman, Mich.
Hope
Jackson, Calif.
Jenison
Jenkins
Jennings
Jensen
Keefe
Kilday
Lanham
LeCompte
Lemke
Lovre
Lucas
McConnell
McCulloch
McDonough
McGregor
McMillan, S. C.
McMillen, Ill.
Macy
Martin, Iowa
Martin, Mass.
Mason
Merrow
Meyer
Michener
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Murray, Tenn.
Nixon
Norrell
O'Hara, Minn.
Peterson
Phillips, Calif.
Phillips, Tenn.
Potter
Rankin
Reed, Ill.
Rees
Rich
Richards
Riehlman
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Sadlak
St. George
Sanborn
Scott, Hardie
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Scrivner
Scudder
Shafer
Short
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Va.
Stanley
Steed
Stefan
Stockman
Taber
Tackett
Teague
Thompson
Towe
Velde
Vorys
Vursell
Wadsworth
Weichel
Werdel
Wheeler
White, Idaho
Whittington
Wilson, Ind.
Wilson, Okla.
Wilson, Tex.
Winstead
Wolcott
Woodruff

NOT VOTING—19

Barden
Blatnik
Bulwinkle
Celler
Chiperfield
Gilmer
Hoffman, Ill.
McSweeney
O'Konski
Plumley
Poulson
Reed, N. Y.
Sheppard
Smith, Ohio
Smith, Wis.
Somers
Thomas, N. J.
Whitaker
Wood

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs.

On this vote:

Mr. Blatnik for, with Mr. Chiperfield against.

Mr. Somers for, with Mr. Reed of New York against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. O'Konski against.

Mr. McSweeney for, with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin against.

Mr. Whitaker for, with Mr. Plumley against.

Mr. Gilmer for, with Mr. Wood against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Barden with Mr. Poulson.

Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

KEEP THE FARM INCOME AT PARITY! WHEN OUR FARMERS ARE PROSPEROUS AMERICA IS PROSPEROUS: THE NATIONAL INCOME OF THESE UNITED STATES IS ALWAYS SEVEN TIMES THE FARM INCOME

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein the names and addresses of the county and community agricultural program committeemen for each county of my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, agriculture is the basic industry of our country. The men who produce the fat, the food, and the fiber for this Nation are the producers of the indispensables of life.

Mr. Speaker, not alone do all the cities need the products of the farms to sustain life, but we in the cities also need the purchasing power of our farmers in order to keep the wheels of progress going in our city Industries.

Our farmers are entitled to receive for the things which they produce and sell a price commensurate with the cost of the products of industry which they buy. It was to effect such parity of price that the system of appointing farm committees was established.

These agricultural conservation committees, made up entirely of the farmers themselves, are appointed each year locally to administer the affairs of agriculture in their own districts with respect to the statutes and appropriations which we make in this House, both as to soil conservation benefits and such other subsidies as are voted.

Cuyahoga, Lake, and Geauga Counties in my district, the Twenty-second District of Ohio, are rich agricultural producing areas. Happy I am to say that they rank in the front ranks of all such producing areas in the United States.

I have just received a list of the agricultural conservation committees who are to serve this year. That list contains the names of some of the finest people in my district, and it is in order that I may make the complete list of these committees available to the farmers in my district that I ask to insert the same in the RECORD.

The list is as follows:

LIST OF CUYAHOGA COUNTY AND COMMUNITY COMMITTEEMEN, CUYAHOGA, OHIO

COUNTY COMMITTEE

Home address, Cuyahoga County Agricultural Conservation Association, room 203, 1276 West Third Street, Cleveland, Ohio.

Chairman, George W. Nichols, 89 Columbus Road, Bedford, Ohio.

Vice chairman, Joseph R. Shebanek, 1593 Sheffield Road, South Euclid, Ohio.

Member, Helen E. Gedeon, 9600 Ridge Road, Brecksville, Ohio.

Alternate, Lee C. Usher, Usher Road, Olmsted Falls, Ohio.

Alternate, Herman L. Christensen, 2867 Wooster Road, Rocky River, Ohio.

COMMUNITY COMMITTEES

Bedford district

Chairman, George M. Johnston, 1297 Alexander Road, Bedford.

Vice chairman, George L. Laing, Solon Road, Bedford.

Member, Joseph A. Benko, 669 Columbus Road, Bedford.

Alternate, Harold N. Athey, Walton Road, Bedford.

Brecksville district

Chairman, Ralph D. Mackey, 7 Dewey Road, Brecksville.

Vice chairman, Clair H. Bourne, Miller Road, Brecksville.

Member, Bert B. Hinckley, Wiese Road, Brecksville.

Alternate, John L. Schlund, 51 Fitzwater Road, Brecksville.

Alternate, Vera W. McCreery, 76 Mill Road, Brecksville.

Euclid district

Chairman, Albert P. Marous, Wilson Mills Road, South Euclid.

Vice chairman, Harry M. Lockemer, 640 S. O. M. Center Road, Gates Mills.

Member, James W. Vitek, 4839 Anderson Road, South Euclid.

Alternate, John P. Florian, 672 Trebisky Road, South Euclid.

Olmsted district

Chairman, Lee C. Usher, Usher Road, Olmsted Falls.

Vice chairman, David A. Barnard, Cook Road, North Olmsted.

Member, Franklin C. Bislich, Fitch Road, North Olmsted.

Alternate, George Rados, Ruple Road, Berea.

Alternate, Charles W. Stone, Sprague Road, Columbia Station.

Parma district

Chairman, Harold W. Selzer, Pearl Road, Route 1, Berea.

Vice chairman, Andrew H. Rosbough, Engle Road, Berea.

Member, Wilber C. Kaiser, 7261 York Road, Parma.

Alternate, Henry J. Wensink, Hummel Road, Route 3, Berea.

Alternate, Jacob C. Walters, Jr., Engle Road, Berea.

Solon district

Chairman, George J. Craemer, S. O. M. Center Road, Solon.

Vice Chairman, Albert E. Hennig, North Miles Road, Solon.

Member, Norman P. Herbell, Chagrin Falls.

Alternate, Robert L. Stern, Jackson Road, Chagrin Falls.

Alternate, Natt R. Davis, Holbrook Road, Chagrin Falls.

Strongsville district

Chairman, Harvey Uhinck, Howe Road, Brunswick.

Vice chairman, Noris A. Sperber, Drake Road, Strongsville.

Member, Fred W. Grosser, Route 3, Brecksville.

Alternate, Harold S. Jacque, Abbey Road, North Royalton.

Westlake district

Chairman, Herman L. Christensen, 2867 Wooster Road, Rocky River.

Vice chairman, Edward H. Lehman, 25057 Detroit Road, Westlake.

Member, Leonard H. Williams, 26207 Center Ridge Road, Westlake.

Alternate, Allen Deeks, 22591 Center Ridge Road, Westlake.

Alternate, Lawrence G. Borth, 1557 Canterbury Road, Westlake.

LIST OF GEAUGA COUNTY AND COMMUNITY COMMITTEEMEN, GEAUGA, OHIO

COUNTY COMMITTEE

Home address: Geauga County Agricultural Conservation Association, Old School Building, Burton.

Chairman, James D. Sidley, Thompson.

Vice chairman, Clifton Rossiter, Chardon, Route 2.

Member, Harry C. Evans, East Claridon.

Alternate, George C. Bliss, Novelty.

Alternate, Jack F. Kramer, Burton, Route 1.

COMMUNITY COMMITTEES

Auburn community

Chairman, Jack F. Kramer, Burton, Route 1.

Vice chairman, Robert G. Squire, Burton, Route 1.

Member, Lawrence J. May, Chagrin Falls, Route 2.

Alternate, Ernest L. Hall, Mantua.

Alternate, J. Lloyd Squire, Burton, Route 1.

Bainbridge community

Chairman, Cleon C. Taylor, Chagrin Falls, Route 1.

Vice chairman, Frank C. Marcus, Chagrin Falls, Route 2.

Member, Howard S. Taylor, Chagrin Falls, Route 1.

Alternate, Lester R. Haskins, Chagrin Falls, Route 2.

Alternate, Virgil A. Mitchell, Chagrin Falls, Route 1.

Burton community

Chairman, F. Ernest Kibler, Burton, Route 2.

Vice chairman, Burton Fish, Burton, Route 2.

Member, Robert A. Newcomb, Burton, Route 2.

Alternate, Lillian M. Walter, Burton.

Alternate, Frank J. Urbanowicz, Burton, Route 2.

Chardon community

Vice chairman, Ralph P. Dewalt, Chardon, Route 3.

Member, Harry L. Osborn, Chardon, Route 3.

Alternate, Jay M. Sage, Chardon, Route 3.

Alternate, Ernest A. Parker, Chardon, Route 3.

Chester community

Chairman, Raymond A. Craig, Chesterland.

Vice chairman, Charles A. Sweet, Chesterland.

Member, Clay B. Eddy, Chesterland.

Alternate, Lawrence Battles, Chesterland.

Alternate, Robert L. Barnes, Chardon, Route 2.

Claridon community

Chairman, Harlon E. Krum, Huntsburg.

Vice chairman, Bartlett Warner, Huntsburg.

Member, J. Ray Evans, Chardon, Route 1.

Alternate, John T. Rider, Chardon, Route 1.

Alternate, Paul W. McNish, Burton.

Hambden community

Chairman, Fredric C. Zikursh, Chardon, Route 4.

Vice chairman, Charles J. Koritansky, Chardon, Route 4.

Member, Jerry Blasek, Chardon, Route 4.

Alternate, Joe Veverka, Chardon, Route 1.

Alternate, Edward Vanac, Chardon, Route 4.

Huntsburg community

Chairman, Howard O. Barnes, Middlefield.

Vice chairman, Hilda A. Barnes, Middlefield.

Member, John S. White, Huntsburg.

Alternate, Frank H. Adams, Huntsburg.

Alternate, Vaughn Arnold, Huntsburg.

Middlefield community

Chairman, Harry W. Rosengreen, Middlefield.

Vice chairman, Merritt C. Lyman, Middlefield.

Member, Albert F. Faust, Middlefield.

Alternate, Glade R. Hoskins, Middlefield.

Alternate, George H. Stone, Middlefield.

Montville community

Chairman, James D. Sidley, Thompson.

Vice chairman, Marton A. Beardsley, Chardon, Route 4.

Member, Eldon L. Rhodes, Chardon, Route 4.

Alternate, Rudolph F. Meier, Montville.

Alternate, Hugh L. Leggett, Huntsburg.

Munson community

Chairman, Warren W. Arnold, Chardon, Route 2.

Vice chairman, Varon J. Warner, Chardon, Route 2.

Member, Harold L. Sanborn, Chardon, Route 2.

Alternate, Lloyd C. Herrington, Chardon, Route 2.

Alternate, Elmer A. Summers, Chardon, Route 2.

Newbury community

Chairman, Henry Povolny, Barton, Route 1.

Vice chairman, James J. Teichman, Novelty.

Member, Harold B. Thomas, Chardon, Route 2.

Alternate, Frank Sedivy, Novelty.

Alternate, Frederick W. Kieve, Novelty.

Parkman community

Chairman, Frank S. Cone, Middlefield, Route 3.

Vice chairman, Melbourn C. Owen, West Farmington.

Member, Roger M. Hoxter, Parkman.

Alternate, Pete Downs, West Farmington.

Alternate, Victor A. Hosmer, Garrettsville.

Russell community

Chairman, George C. Bliss, Novelty.

Vice chairman, Joe Klouda, Novelty.

Member, Francis H. Newyear, Novelty.

Alternate, Harry P. Modroo, Chagrin Falls.

Alternate, Mathew K. Goesting, Novelty.

Thompson community

Chairman, Paul M. Maier, Madison, Route 2.

Vice chairman, Lawrence Beckel, Thompson.

Member, John F. Strava, Thompson.

Alternate, Roy C. Andrews, Thompson.

Alternate, Paul W. Wilber, Thompson.

Troy community

Chairman, Arthur J. Kimpton, Garrettsville.

Vice chairman, Neil C. White, Burton, Route 2.

Member, Eldon H. Russell, Burton, Route 2.

Alternate, Melvin W. Wood, Burton, Route 2.

Alternate, Benjamin R. Bieger, Burton, Route 2.

LIST OF COUNTY AND COMMUNITY COMMITTEEMEN, LAKE COUNTY, OHIO, 1949

(Lake County Agricultural Conservation Association, 16 North Saint Clair Street, Painesville, Ohio.)

COUNTY COMMITTEE

Chairman, Hermon L. Mantle, Painesville, Ohio.

Vice chairman, Lynn Plaisted, Route 1, Willoughby, Ohio.

Member, H. Russell Adams, Perry, Ohio.

First alternate, Lloyd P. Christian, Perry, Ohio.

Second alternate, Edward H. Bucholtz, Route 3, Painesville, Ohio.

COMMUNITY COMMITTEES

Concord Township

Chairman, Edward H. Bucholtz, Route 3, Painesville, Ohio.

Vice chairman, Ralph D. Webster, Route 3, Painesville, Ohio.

Member, Fred A. Anderson, Route 3, Painesville, Ohio.

Alternate, Charles Hladik, Route 3, Painesville, Ohio.

Alternate, Clifford D. Webster, Route 3, Painesville, Ohio.

Kirtland Township

Chairman, John A. Maier, Route 2, Willoughby, Ohio.

Vice chairman, Samuel B. Schupp, Route 2, Willoughby, Ohio.

Member, James Horner, Route 2, Willoughby, Ohio.

Alternate, Albert H. Mueller, Route 2, Willoughby, Ohio.

Alternate, Harry Silvers, Route 3, Mentor, Ohio.

Leroy Township

Chairman, Carl E. Crellin, Route 2, Painesville, Ohio.

Vice chairman, Edward E. Lajnar, Route 2, Painesville, Ohio.

Member, Frank Berta, Route 2, Painesville, Ohio.

Alternate, Elias N. Harrison, Route 2, Painesville, Ohio.

Alternate, Henry Farnolz, Route 3, Painesville, Ohio.

Madison Township

Chairman, Charles L. Sohn, Route 3, Madison, Ohio.

Vice chairman, Horace C. Fuller, Route 1, Madison, Ohio.

Member, William T. Baster, Madison, Ohio.

Alternate, J. Taylor Baster, Madison, Ohio.

Alternate, Charles A. Greenman, Madison, Ohio.

Mentor Township

Chairman, Horace J. Wilson, Mentor, Ohio.

Vice chairman, Elea E. Shaw, Route 1, Mentor, Ohio.

Member, Charles Robertson, Route 3, Mentor, Ohio.

Alternate, Raymond E. Siegel, Route 2, Mentor, Ohio.

Alternate, E. Murray Kephart, Route 1, Mentor, Ohio.

Painesville Township

Chairman, William A. Youmans, Route 1, Painesville, Ohio.

Vice chairman, Ralph W. Taylor, Rural Delivery, Painesville, Ohio.

Member, Louis T. Curtis, Route 2, Painesville, Ohio.

Alternate, Joseph W. Patterson, Route 2, Painesville, Ohio.

Alternate, Rufus J. Cowle, Route 2, Painesville, Ohio.

Perry Township

Chairman, Lloyd P. Christian, Perry, Ohio.

Vice chairman, Herbert J. Langshaw, Perry, Ohio.

Member, Ralph E. Shepard, Perry, Ohio.

Alternate, Frank E. Brown, Perry, Ohio.

Alternate, Paul Brockway, Perry, Ohio.

Willoughby Township

Chairman, William R. Mahon, box 442, Willoughby, Ohio.

Vice chairman, Ronald S. Parsons, Erie Road, Willoughby, Ohio.

Member, Harvey Tanner, Lost Nation Road, Willoughby, Ohio.

Alternate, H. J. Stokes, Route 1, Willoughby, Ohio.

Alternate, John A. Kusar, Lakeland Boulevard, Willoughby, Ohio.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by paying tribute to the late Hon. Sol. Bloom.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio script.

Mr. PRIEST asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by his colleague the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. McKINNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech.

Mr. POAGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include telegrams.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a magazine article.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one a letter.

PAN-AMERICAN DAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 151) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives hereby designates Thursday, April 14, 1949, for the celebration of Pan-American Day on which day remarks appropriate to such occasion may occur.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to include a speech by Mr. Kent Leavitt.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 155, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the Committee on Plans for Reconstruction of the Ceiling, Redecorations, and Other Improvements to the House Chamber the gentleman from New York [Mr. HEFFERNAN] to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. CHIPERFIELD (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), indefinitely, on account of illness.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW AND PROGRAM FOR REMAINDER OF WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and of course, I am not going to object, can the gentleman tell us the program for Friday?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is not the intention that the House meet on Friday. That is the direct answer, without regard to the completion of the program tomorrow, except that if possible I should like to complete the program I had for this week up until tomorrow. That includes three resolutions giving the ordinary subpena powers to three committees, the Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on Judiciary, and one other. The consideration of those resolutions should not take long. They will come up first.

There is also a bill out of the Committee on Armed Services in connection with personnel of the Army and the Air Corps.

Further, there is the Arab-Palestine resolution, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

I am very hopeful that that program will be completed tomorrow, and that is why I am asking that the House meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow. Otherwise, there will be no further business for the rest of the week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 2 minutes.

VETERANS' HOSPITALS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a very fine statement by the American Legion before Senator PEPPER's subcommittee on the cut-back in the veterans' hospitals. I was privileged to hear this able presentation of the case by Gen. John Thomas Taylor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress, veterans' organizations, veterans, and the population generally were very much shocked when the news of the statement by General Gray came regarding the cut-back—I understand he was not responsible for it—of numerous veterans' hospitals. It was an administration cut-back. I am reliably informed that this morning before Senator PEPPER's committee the budget took the full responsibility for the cut-back. General Gray has stated that he was not responsible for it. Many persons are wondering if the budget had the right to cut those hospitals back. The Congress authorized the building of those hospitals, Veterans' Administration had approved, the appropriation was ready, and it is still in the appropriation bill that is coming up for action very shortly from the Committee on Appropriations, I ascertained today. I doubt if any further legislation is necessary to insure the building of these hospitals. It seems that the will and the authority of the Congress have been thwarted in this. The need is extremely great. We will have great suffering among the ill and injured veterans if they are not built. The veterans today cannot get beds in civilian hospitals. These buildings are all ready to be erected. They should be built without a day's delay.

STATEMENT BY T. O. KRAABEL, DIRECTOR, NATIONAL REHABILITATION COMMISSION, THE AMERICAN LEGION, BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, MARCH 10, 1949

LEGION POLICY ON HOSPITALIZATION

The American Legion believes in the hospitalization of veterans by or under the auspices of the Veterans' Administration. This belief and this advocacy refer to veterans who require hospital care, who apply for it, and who are eligible. At its first national convention in November 1919 the fourth and fifth points of a program for wounded and disabled service persons read as follows:

"4. Recommend to Congress the enactment of legislation making sufficient appropriation to provide adequate hospital and sanitarium facilities for the care and treatment of all persons discharged from the military and naval service of the United States, and to provide medical and surgical treatment to any of the persons mentioned above, irrespective of the service origin or aggravation of their disability for 1 year subsequent to the passage of the act, this in addition to the medical and surgical treatment now provided by law.

"5. Request that all disabled ex-service men and women of the military and naval service of the United States be permitted to go to the best hospitals; that they be treated by their own physicians if they so desire."

Similar expressions were passed at succeeding conventions, as follows:

1921—Recommendation No. 3, committee on rehabilitation: That Congress be urged to complete its hospitalization program in accordance with the recommendations of the White committee and with the end in view that, subject to needed exceptions, all disabled men receive treatment in Government hospitals.

1923—Recommendation No. 49, convention rehabilitation committee: That all facilities of the Veterans' Bureau for the treatment and hospitalization of present beneficiaries, including transportation to and from place of treatment, be made available to all honorably discharged veterans of the military or naval forces of the United States, without regard to service connection.

1926—Resolution 16: Section 202 (10), World War Veterans Act, be amended to provide hospitalization for officers and enlisted men of Army, Navy, and Marine Corps in retirement status.

1928—Resolution 13: Hospitalization of World War veterans under section 202 (10), World War Veterans Act, be mandatory, and additional facilities, if needed, be provided.

Resolution 15: Section 202 (10), World War Veterans Act, be amended to provide that a veteran of any war, military occupation or military expedition who presents evidence of service under other than dishonorable conditions shall be entitled to hospitalization.

1930—Resolution 339: Hospitalization under section 202 (10), World War Veterans Act, be mandatory, and adequate hospital facilities for this purpose be furnished.

1931—Resolution 32: Hospitalization under section 202 (10), World War Veterans Act, be mandatory, and adequate hospital facilities be furnished for this purpose.

Resolution 43: Amend World War Veterans Act eliminating the "pauper" or "need" clauses in said act.

1932—Resolution 20: Condemns "needs clause" in veterans' legislation.

1933—Resolution 382, four-point program: Point No. 2: Federal hospitalization be afforded all veterans not dishonorably discharged who require same and are not able to reasonably pay for their own treatment.

Resolution 154: Care and treatment of war veterans is the responsibility of the Federal Government.

1934—Resolution 284: The Legion is proponent for hospitalization in Federal hospitals for disabilities not service incurred only when it is actually necessary and in cases where the veteran is unable to pay for care privately. This is a privilege granted to all citizens in similar circumstances in private or public hospitals. The responsibility for the medical care of the civilian group is in the community; the responsibility for the care of the veteran who fought for the whole people is vested in the Federal Government.

1936—Resolution 524 reaffirms the Legion's policy that hospitalization of veterans is a responsibility of the Federal Government.

The above forms a foundation upon which this organization approaches the question before this committee today.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS, PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSION, 1921

The American Legion appreciates the opportunity of being heard on the crucial question of the Veterans' Administration hospital construction cut-back. We feel there is much involved, and for that reason we submit a historical summary of what the Congress, the Veterans' Administration, and the American Legion have done since the close of World War I.

The confusing and perplexing situation which existed in the years immediately following that war with reference to service to and treatment of veterans challenged not only the American Legion but also the Government itself. Early in 1921 the then President of the United States appointed a committee of prominent citizens to make a "thorough investigation and report with recommendations to the President as to what should be done to correct the entire situation." The members of that committee were: Charles G. Dawes, chairman; Theodore Roosevelt; Milton J. Foreman; John L. Lewis; F. W. Galbraith, Jr.; Mabel T. Boardman; T. V. O'Connor; Henry S. Berry; Mrs. Henry R. Rea; Thomas W. Miller; Franklin D'Olier.

The report of that committee contains the following significant and definite findings:

"Lack of provision for hospital construction to provide facilities commensurate with the proved and declared needs of the immediate future and for some years to come has been of such a degree as to prevent even the most willing cooperation among Government departments from providing hospital and medical care so distributed as to place and quality of service to accommodate the invalid wards of the Nation. It is clear that although additional beds in hospitals maintained by the several departments of the Government are available complete use of them has not been possible by reason of certain fundamental limitations, chief of which is the lack of legal authority to secure adequate medical, nursing, and other hospital personnel.

"The resources of the United States which were made available for the care of the men in the service have not yet been fully availed of or thoroughly mobilized so that the ex-service beneficiaries could have had at their disposal the best that the medical and associated professions could provide throughout the United States."

Upon the basis of these findings the committee unanimously offered seven specific recommendations, of which the fourth, fifth, and seventh read as follows:

"4. That an immediate extension and utilization of all Government hospital facilities be put into effect, together with the mobilization of such civilian medical services as may prove practical.

"5. That a continuing hospital-building program to provide satisfactory care for the disabled veterans of the World War be entered upon at once. The committee of hospital consultants appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury, in cooperation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, shall submit recommendations as to the type of buildings and the location of same, the necessary appropriations to provide for such permanent program to be passed at the next session of Congress.

"7. That the $18,600,000 appropriated by the Sixty-sixth Congress for the building of new hospitals and the enlargement of existing institutions be utilized for these purposes without any delay."

Congress acted with promptitude, and on August 9, 1921, passed the law which created and set up as an independent agency the Veterans' Bureau. In the matter of providing hospital facilities and treatment it had started, shortly after the armistice, and continued to appropriate funds in response to the need and analysis as supplied by the Director of the Veterans' Bureau and later the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

It might be noted here that by 1920 the United States Public Health Service was utilizing 52 hospitals with a capacity of slightly less than 12,000 beds. These institutions were classified as follows: 37 for general medical and surgical conditions, 8 for tuberculous patients, and 7 for the psychotic and mentally ill. In addition to these Government-controlled hospitals, contracts were made with many civilian institutions in both the United States itself and its island possessions. As of June 30, 1920, there were 9,590 veterans with service-connected disabilities being hospitalized in these contract hospitals.

In 1922 all of the dispensaries being utilized by the United States Public Health Service for the examination and out-patient treatment of veterans with service-connected disabilities were taken over by the Veterans' Bureau. On April 29, 1922, the President issued an Executive order transferring the hospitals administered by the Public Health Service also to the Veterans' Bureau. In 1923 the dispensary services of the Bureau were curtailed by transferring some of them to Bureau hospitals. About this same time it was decided to abandon some of the leased hospitals as well as the temporary hospitals of the cantonment type which had been taken over from other Government agencies shortly after World War I. The transition from the old to the new Veterans' Bureau hospital system moved ahead during 1923 so that by June 30 of that year there were 47 United States Veterans' Bureau hospitals in operation.

By June 30, 1924 the number of veterans hospitalized in contract institutions had been reduced to less than 4,000, and most of these were mentally ill and being hospitalized in State institutions.

WORLD WAR VETERANS ACT

The beginning of an expanding veterans' hospitalization program was signalized by the passage of Public Law 194, Sixty-seventh Congress, approved on April 20, 1922. Section 4 of that law provided that "all hospital facilities under the control and jurisdiction of the United States Veterans' Bureau shall be available for veterans of the Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, and the Boxer Rebellion suffering from neuropsychiatric and tubercular ailments and diseases." This was enlarged by section 4 of Public Law 542, Sixty-seventh Congress, approved on March 4, 1923, by the addition of the provision "* * * including transportation as granted to those receiving compensation and hospitalization under the War Risk Insurance Act."

Referring to this law, a Veterans' Administration official in 1933 said: "At the time of this legislative enactment it was found that existing facilities were sufficient to cope with the increased demand for hospital admission." However, this whole situation evidently changed with the passage of Public Law 242, Sixty-eighth Congress, approved on June 7, 1924. This is the famous World War Veterans Act. It repealed the provisions of the War Risk Insurance Act as amended and for the most part reenacted those provisions with certain liberalizations. The most famous of these probably is section 202 (10) relating to the privilege of hospitalization in a Veterans' Bureau hospital. It provided that the hospital facilities under the control and jurisdiction of the Veterans' Bureau should be available to every honorably discharged veteran of the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection, the Boxer Rebellion, or the World War suffering from psychiatric, tubercular, or certain other enumerated disabilities. It also provided "that the Director is further authorized, so far as he shall find that existing Government facilities permit, to furnish hospitalization and necessary traveling expense to veterans of any war, military occupation, or military expedition since 1897, not dishonorably discharged without regard to the nature or origin of their disability; *Provided*, That preference to admission to any Government hospital for hospitalization under the provisions of this subsection shall be given to those veterans who are financially unable to pay for hospitalization and their necessary traveling expenses."

An appraisal of the effect of this law, uttered 11 years after its passage by one of the high officials of the Veterans' Administration, was as follows: "This brought about a complete change of policy with regard to the construction of additional facilities. The Veterans' Bureau was forced to plan and launch a new program of hospital construction to take care of the enormously increased load, the result of the new legislation (section 202 (10) World War Veterans Act, second sentence). A large influx of veterans of all types into Government institutions taxed the capacity of existing facilities. It then became necessary to plan a program of hospital construction which would take care of a veteran population of approximately 5,000,000 men and women."

The development of this Government established program for the care of veterans during the decade from 1924 to 1933 is marked by additional liberalizing provisions in the law, and appropriations and authorizations for expansion of the hospital construction program.

As of June 30, 1932, Congress had appropriated the sum of $118,952,000 for the acquisition of hospital facilities for veterans; and there had been expended in addition thereto $15,000,000 for permanent improvements and extensions to veterans' hospitals. As of that date there were in operation 56 VA hospitals with a combined capacity of 29,833; and 10 VA homes with a combined capacity of 19,988 beds.

Before passing on it should be noted that Public Law 536, Seventy-first Congress, approved July 3, 1930, authorized the President by Executive order to consolidate and coordinate the Bureau of Pensions, the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, and the United States Veterans' Bureau into an establishment to be known as the Veterans' Administration.

ECONOMY ACT, MARCH 20, 1933

Public Law 2, Seventy-third Congress, approved March 20, 1933 (the so-called Economy Act) repealed all public laws granting medical or hospitalization treatment or domiciliary care to veterans who served in or subsequent to the Spanish-American War.

However, section 6 of that same law, as amended by section 1, Public Law 78, Seventy-third Congress, approved June 16, 1933, "authorized the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, under limitations prescribed by the President, to furnish to men discharged from the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard for disabilities incurred in line of duty and to veterans of any war, hospitalization or domiciliary care (for permanent and certain other disabilities) pursuant to which Veterans' Regulations No. 6 series, pertaining to eligibility for domiciliary or hospital care were promulgated by the President and, as amended by Congress are still in effect. Section 29, Public Law 141, Seventy-third Congress, March 28, 1934, further amended section 6 to authorize, subject to available beds, hospitalization or domiciliary care for war veterans unable to pay the expense, regardless of service connection."

On August 23, 1935, Public Law 312, Seventy-fourth Congress, was approved. This law further liberalized eligibility for hospitalization or domiciliary care by providing "that any veteran of any war who was not dishonorably discharged, suffering from disability, disease, or defect, who is in need of hospitalization or domiciliary care and is unable to defray the necessary expenses therefor (including transportation to and from the Veterans' Administration facility), shall be furnished necessary hospitalization or domiciliary care (including transportation) in any Veterans' Administration facility, within the limitations existing in such facilities, irrespective of whether the disability, disease, or defect was due to service. The statement under oath of the applicant on such form as may be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall be accepted as sufficient evidence of inability to defray necessary expenses." This basic law is still in effect.

The effect of the Economy Act upon the hospital program which became effective following passage of the World War Veterans Act of 1924 may be gaged from the fact that as of June 30, 1933, the total hospital load of the Veterans' Administration was 33,795, a decrease of 10,046 from the load at the end of the previous fiscal year. The expiration of the next fiscal year—1934—saw 40,059 veterans receiving hospitalization from the Veterans' Administration. Thirteen percent of these were hospitalized for tuberculosis; 56 percent for nervous and mental disorder, and 31 percent for various medical and surgical disablements.

DEVELOPMENT SINCE WORLD WAR II

As of June 30, 1941, Congress had specifically authorized and appropriated $165,574,267 for new hospital, domiciliary and out-patient dispensary facilities. In addition there had been expended from regular fiscal funds the sum of $25,705,721 for permanent improvements and extensions—a grand total of slightly more than $191,000,000.

As of the same date the VA was operating hospital facilities at 91 different locations in 45 States and the District of Columbia. The capacity of these institutions was 61,849 beds. In addition thereto the Veterans' Administration was utilizing 2,570 beds in Army, Navy, and Public Health institutions. The beds for domiciliary care number 18,747. Thus, shortly before World War II we find the VA with 80,596 hospital and domiciliary beds.

At this point mention should be made of the VA 10-year-construction program. This was proposed by the Federal Board of Hospitalization and approved in principle by the

President on May 8, 1940, with the understanding that the program would be reviewed annually and coordinated with conditions existing at that time. This program had as its goal the increase in total accommodations for veterans to 100,000 beds. It was estimated that this number would enable the Government to meet peak requirements for all types of institutional care. Had not World War II broken out and had this program proceeded along estimated lines, the goal would probably have been reached by 1948–49.

It was not until fiscal year 1943 that the impact of new veterans from World War II was felt in the total hospitalization load. On June 30, 1943, the distribution of Va patient load was as follows:

World War I	45,653
World War II	5,132
Spanish-American War	2,871
Other wars, expeditions, and occupations	65
Regular Establishment	2,920
Total	56,641

Just 3 months prior to the close of this fiscal year the Seventy-eighth Congress had passed Public Law 10 (approved March 17, 1943), which amended veterans' regulations so as to grant hospitalization and domiciliary care to World War II veterans on the same basis as granted to veterans of World War I.

FEDERAL BOARD OF HOSPITALIZATION

On August 1, 1943, the Executive Office of the President directed a new Federal Board of Hospitalization to serve as an advisory agency to the Bureau of the Budget. This Board was charged with the duties of analyzing and reviewing hospital, convalescent, and domiciliary activities, and programs developed and operated by all departments and establishments of the Government for the purpose of

(a) Preventing the overlapping and duplication of services and overbuilding of facilities;

(b) Ensuring the most efficient and complete utilization of the total services and facilities of the Federal Government by each department and establishment;

(c) Determining the need for existing or additional facilities of each department and establishment;

(d) Determining the area or locality in which additional facilities should be provided;

(e) Determining the extent to which non-Federal facilities may be utilized in the administration of the hospital activities or programs of any department or establishment;

(f) Developing a complete over-all program for providing hospitalization for the veterans of World War II;

(g) Furnishing recommendations with respect to such matters as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget may refer to the Board.

The above will be recognized as very significant in view of recent announcements in the press and developments otherwise. No less important is another instruction given to the Board at the time it was reestablished, so to speak, which reads as follows:

"No project for acquisition of additional beds by new construction, major alteration, or leasing of or contracting for existing facilities shall be undertaken by any department or establishment until it has been submitted to and reviewed by the Board as to need, location, type of construction, and any other factor which the Board may consider pertinent to the performance of its responsibilities, nor until the resulting recommendation of the Board has been transmitted and considered * * * as approved by the President."

VA MEDICAL PERSONNEL DURING WORLD WAR II

The hospital construction program during the war years ran head-on into those factors with reference to difficulties in getting men and matériel which definitely slowed up the production of beds. Another matter of great concern during those years which had a direct bearing upon the fullness of the veterans' hospitalization program was the recruitment and training of qualified medical and dental personnel. The Administrator's report for the fiscal year 1942 sets forth that the obligations and responsibilities of the Veterans' Administration in the care and treatment of disabled veterans have required that most positive action be taken to avoid any serious impairment of service. Accordingly, arrangements were made with the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy whereby qualified medical and dental officers of the Veterans' Administration might on application be commissioned in the services in an inactive status and remain with the VA. This step involved potentially about 1,800 men of medicine and dentistry, and was considered only temporarily helpful.

The report for fiscal year 1943 indicated that some of the VA physicians, despite this arrangement, had resigned and entered military service, and that appointment of physicians were made from time to time during the year but not to the extent of maintaining the required complement of personnel.

By the end of fiscal year 1944 arrangements with the Secretaries of War and Navy had developed so that qualified medical and dental officers of the VA were, on application, commissioned in those services in an active duty status and detailed to the Veterans' Administration. This arrangement also brought about the availability of services of commissioned personnel through detail from the War and Navy Departments of certain available officers qualified for duty with the VA in assignments on rating boards, etc.

SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944

The slowing up and impairment of services to veterans, particularly in the field of medical and hospital care, prompted the special committee of the American Legion which initiated and developed the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to set forth in the very first section of that legislation the designation of the Veterans' Administration as an essential war agency. This carried with it the entitlement, second only to the war and Navy Departments, to priorities in personnel, equipment, supplies, material, etc.

In the next paragraph of the law the Administrator and the Federal Board of Hospitalization were authorized and directed to expedite and complete the construction of additional hospital facilities for war veterans, and to enter into agreements and contracts for the use by or transfer to the VA of suitable Army and Navy hospitals after they were no longer needed by the armed services. Moreover, this act carried with it an authorization to have appropriated the sum of $500,000,000 for the construction of additional hospital facilities.

In the fall of 1944 the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs announced a greatly enlarged hospital construction program. Contained therein were 22 new hospitals and additional beds for 26 existing hospitals. The estimates were made for the fiscal year 1946.

Previously the Administrator had estimated that 300,000 beds would be required by 1975 on the basis of veterans coming from the two World Wars.

In May 1945 the National Rehabilitation Committee of the American Legion made certain observations in line with the famous Resolution 528 passed at the Milwaukee convention, 1941, which called for the reorganization of the medical division of the Veterans' Administration. Among these were the following:

1. The medical and hospital service of the Veterans' Administration is of such importance and proportions that it should be headed up by an outstanding man of medicine whose rank and status should be equal to that of Assistant Administrator.

2. There should be an inspired medical and hospital service, with more personal and bedside practice of medicine.

3. Chief medical officers and clinical directors should be given greater authority to run their hospitals.

4. There must be a revitalized program whereby the advancement and progress in medicine and surgery made by the armed services during this war shall be inherited and maintained by the Veterans' Administration to the end that war veterans shall have the best science has to offer for their care and treatment.

CHANGE IN ADMINISTRATORS

During 1945 Gen. Omar N. Bradley was appointed to the position of administrator of veterans' affairs to succeed Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, who was appointed Ambassador to Panama. General Bradley took over on August 15, 1945. Soon thereafter he made a new study of the 1946 construction program, made certain changes and revised it to become the 1947 hospital construction program.

In the spring of 1946 the American Legion through its national commander and the national rehabilitation committee advocated and supported the arrangement whereby military and naval hospitals no longer needed by the armed services, constructed and located so as to be of value to the VA, should be taken over by the VA. Such acquisition would be more readily accomplished than awaiting construction, and adjustments as to retaining some or all of these hospitals would be made later on as new construction was completed. Under that arrangement there are as of the present writing 36 former military hospitals taken over and being run by the Veterans' Administration. The number of authorized beds in these institutions approximates 27,000.

Under date of March 3, 1947, the American Legion medical advisory board recommended to the rehabilitation executive committee a proposed policy with reference to the location of Veterans' Administration hospitals. Our medical board pointed out the benefits that would accrue to the veteran as a result of Veterans' Administration hospitals being close to medical schools and medical centers. At the same time it was announced that this proposed policy should in no way adversely affect the arrangement of establishing smaller hospitals in well located communities so that less specialized hospital care where needed would be available.

The report on the combined 1947 and 1948 hospital-construction program as of December 31, 1948, showed only two new hospitals as having been completed during a period extending through World War II and up to the end of 1948. There were 88 new hospitals in various stages of progress, as follows:

Construction contracts awarded	31
Design completed but construction contracts not awarded	19
Design in progress	36
Design not started	2
Total	88

That was about the situation when the announcement was made that 24 projects are to be canceled and the bed capacity of 14 other new institutions is to be reduced. The reduction, as the committee well knows, amounts to 16,221 beds.

The records of the Veterans' Administration show that as of January 31, 1949, there were 126 hospitals with a standard bed capacity of 104,789 in operation. It is estimated that the projects now under construction—31 hospitals—and those in the planning stage not canceled by the Presidential order—35 projects—will produce an additional 35,246 beds. This number added to the number of beds in operation (104,789) and the approximately 2,500 to come in through additions to existing hospitals, would bring about a total of slightly more than 142,000 beds by 1952. This total, however, includes nearly 28,000 beds acquired when certain former Army and Navy hospitals were taken over. Among these are many in temporary construction which the Veterans' Administration says will have to be eliminated, so that the net total of beds of permanent or acceptable construction would be about 131,000 when the present revised program is completed. We have been told further that the elimination of these temporary beds may take anywhere from 6 to 8 years. If that takes place then there would be a period following completion of this program when we would actually witness the gradual reduction in the number of beds for veterans at a time when, according to the experience of American Legion service officers, the requests for hospitalization will be mounting.

BEDS FOR POTENTIAL LOAD

Reference was made above to the so-called 10-year construction program. This would have produced 100,000 beds at a time when the estimated population of potentially eligible veterans would have numbered 4,000,000. The bed ratio then would have been 1 bed per 40 veterans.

Another interesting item in calculating bed ratios is that supplied by the statistics available from the American Medical Association, to the effect that as of March 27, 1943, there were 1,383,827 beds of all classifications, descriptions, etc., available to the gross population of this country. This would mean both civilian and military, and would be approximately 1 bed per 100 people.

The present veteran population is given as 18,869,000, including peacetime veterans. Actuarial estimates so far available would indicate that as of January 1, 1952, there would be 18,800,000 potentially eligible veterans. If at that time the 131,000-bed program is functioning, we would have a ratio of 1 bed per 143 veterans, according to our own estimates.

If the full construction program originally approved and for which Congress had either appropriated or authorized funds were carried forth to conclusion, this country would have 145,000 beds in permanent construction for its veterans—the 1955 population of which has been projected to be approximately 18,200,000—a ratio of 125 veterans per bed. Surely this ratio is the minimum we could advocate and the minimum the Government should provide.

The American Legion wishes to point out that the Government's policy for constructing veterans' hospitals prior to World War II is evidenced by the approval of 100,000 beds by 1948–49 at a time when the number of potentially eligible veterans would have been 4,000,000—a ratio of 1 bed per 40 veterans. World War II intervened. Congress passed the law giving World War II veterans the same privilege of hospitalization as World War I veterans (Public Law 10, 78th Cong., March 17, 1943). Appropriations, authorizations, and approval for an expanded construction program were made. Now, if the present cutback is sustained and we come out with a completed program netting the country 131,000 permanent beds, the Government will have virtually added only 31,000 beds after World War II—a war in which the number of Americans participating is at least three times the number in World War I.

REASONS FOR CUT-BACK

Four principal reasons for cancellation of proposed construction were set forth in the press release of January 10, 1949. Two of these—viz, temporary hospitals taken over from the armed forces are remaining serviceable longer than estimated; and, the delay will give the Veterans' Administration better opportunity to develop a further program—are not considered basic to the essential and long-time program. The other two we wish to comment upon briefly:

1. Inability of the Veterans' Administration to fully staff its present hospitals and a further definite shortage of professional personnel to staff new hospitals

The American Legion is aware that there are a certain number of beds that are not being used because there are not doctors and nurses to run them. These reports have come to us from service officers and field representatives who periodically visit these hospitals. Statistical reports available to us from the Veterans' Administration show that as of January 31, 1949, 3,343 beds were not in use for this reason. Dr. H. D. Shapiro, our senior medical consultant, in exploring this question with medical men of the Veterans' Administration, was told that there is a shortage of approximately 400 physicians. This shortage is classified as follows:

Neuropsychiatric	200
Tuberculosis	40
Anesthesiology, pathology, roentgenology, neurosurgery, and other specialists	160

Although there is said to be no shortage in general surgeons, general medical specialists or ward surgeons, the Veterans' Administration holds that certain key specialists are necessary to run a hospital and to assure the best possible medical and hospital care.

The American Legion has long advocated the best there is in medicine and hospitalization for veterans. To that end it has contributed and will continue to contribute its best efforts. It is our considered judgment that there is opportunity for this and other organizations to find out how best they might promote the means or facilities by which more doctors will become available. In fact, the executive board of the National Rehabilitation Commission last week assigned such a study to this staff.

It is interesting to note that as of January 31, 1949, there were 2,572 full-time physicians in VA hospitals and centers. At the same time there were 1,258 medical men and women in regional, district, and central offices. There were also part-time doctors serving in the hospital program. Among these are 1,123 consultants and 2,273 residents. According to information which Dr. Shapiro received, two consultants will equal one full-time specialist, and two residents would equal one, or perhaps a little more than one full-time doctor. Applying that formula to the total number of full-time and part-time physicians, we note that the Veterans' Administration had the equivalent of 4,122 doctors as of December 31, 1948, attending and serving 88,873 patients in VA hospitals.

Here are the estimates Dr. Shapiro received as to the number of doctors needed to staff beds at the end of the current and next fiscal year:

One hundred and twelve thousand six hundred hospital beds: Needed to staff full capacity June 1949, 4,640.

One hundred and twenty-four thousand five hundred hospital beds: Needed to staff full capacity June 1950, 5,220.

Dr. Shapiro pointed out that in a number of places where VA hospitals were reduced in size or cancelled in this announced cutback there undoubtedly would be part-time consultants available, and a residency training program could be introduced which would go a long way toward recruitment. It would appear that outside of neuropsychiatry the Veterans' Administration might adequately staff beds in the larger medical centers. With reference to the NP hospitals, our senior medical consultant submits that they might well be set up adjacent to centers where NP specialists are available.

In connection with the plea that the Veterans' Administration is unable to staff all its hospital beds it would be well to keep in mind that the locations of hospitals in the construction program were studied by Veterans' Administration medical men and engineers and were approved presumably after analysis of such factors as availability of doctors, nurses, and other personnel. In fact experts not only of the Veterans' Administration but also of the Federal Board of Hospitalization and the Bureau of the Budget went over and approved these sites. In the words of our senior medical consultant, "It is not only a question of building beds but placing the beds where they can be staffed."

With reference to the statement above that the Veterans' Administration considers certain key specialties as necessary to assure the best possible medical and hospital care, we would want to point out that if a fuller utilization is made of available specialists in communities where many hospitals are located this need could be met.

Another factor that cannot be overlooked is the apparent uncertainty as to what the Bureau of the Budget or Congress might do with reference to additional beds for veterans and the personnel to run them. We submit that if that uncertainty is removed and reassurance given as to what Congress has done, is doing, and will do in providing for the hospitalization of veterans, the task of recruitment of doctors and other personnel will be facilitated and expedited.

2. Estimated possible maximum load of service-connected patients is 51,000, leaving more than twice as many other beds available to other veteran patients

The question has been asked many times, not by the American Legion but by others who seem to have some misgivings about the program, how far does the Congress want the Veterans' Administration to go in building hospital beds for veterans? Invariably one notes in the development of answers to this question that there seems to be no doubt as to the right of the veteran with service-connected disabilities to be hospitalized for such disabilements. Moreover, it seems to be conceded in most quarters by those who have considered the question that veterans suffering from tuberculosis and mental and nervous ailments should also be cared for by the Government. Private and State institutions for these afflictions are already filled, and there are no accommodations for these disabled veterans elsewhere. Out of the 65,829 so-called non-service-connected disabled veterans who were in VA hospitals on December 31, 1948, 58 percent were suffering from tuberculosis, psychotic, or neuropsychiatric ailments. Of the 28,000 general medical and surgical patients, 12,667 were World War II, 13,675 were World War I, and 1,491 Spanish-American War veterans. At this point it is suggested that there be obtained from the Veterans' Administration its most recent analysis of what percentage of patient-days is taken up by the non-service-connected general medical and surgical patients remaining 30 days or less. The last report made available to the Rehabilitation Commission was that only 8 percent was so utilized. As to the chronically ill, it is submitted that the screening of such cases would be of no particular value since most if not all of those patients are soon made medically indigent by their ailments. Can it be that all the agitation against the Veterans' Administration hospitalizing so-called non-service-connected cases is stimulated by the 8 percent, or thereabouts, of patient-days taken up by the non-service-connected general medical and surgical patients remaining 30 days or less?

Recently we asked our national field service to conduct a spot survey as to the percentage of general medical and surgical patients in VA hospitals who were there as the result of postwar accidents or injuries. The returns

indicated, depending upon the type of hospital, a percentage of less than 1 percent up to 22 percent.

Another point that American Legion service officers cannot overlook, and one which we would bring to the committee's attention, is that among the so-called non-service-connected disabled veterans requiring hospital care within 3, 4, or 5 years after the cessation of hostilities will be found many with damage to mind or body that can be traced to service. As of January 31, 1949, 48,862 new claims for disability compensation or pension were pending adjudication. Whether that represents 1, 2, or 3 months' work load in the Veterans' Administration, it does establish that at any given time there are many thousands of claims which have not been settled. As of the same date—January 31, 1949—there were 16,188 veterans awaiting hospital admission. This number represents those whose applications have been filed, acted upon, and approved. In addition to them there are many hundreds who have not filed because of the delays, or who have sought hospital care elsewhere.

Another spot survey conducted the first part of February among the 18 States affected by the proposed cut-back brought back estimates from that group alone of 17,108 in need of hospital care. Time and again have service officers had the experience of representing claimants and succeeding in establishing claims for service connection, thus changing their status from the category of the so-called non-service-connected to the service-connected. We submit that it is a precarious practice to pass upon the applications of World War II veterans especially on the basis of whether their ailments are service-connected or not when we consider the relatively short time most of them have been out of service, the varied and grueling circumstances of combat and training for combat in World War II, and the types of tropical and other insidious diseases to which they were subjected. It is our experience that currently and for some time to come the non-service-connected veterans at your doorstep today may be the service-connected ones tomorrow.

A SUMMARIZED STATEMENT OF THE POSITION OF THE NATIONAL REHABILITATION COMMISSION, THE AMERICAN LEGION, RELATIVE TO THE CUT-BACK IN THE VA HOSPITAL-CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM, MARCH 10, 1949

The national rehabilitation commission of the American Legion is opposed to the cancellation of VA hospital-construction projects and the reduction in the number of beds for the following reasons:

1. Shortly after World War I, Congress started and since supported a program of building hospitals for veterans.

2. Congress has passed laws setting forth eligibility provisions for hospitalization (e. g., Public Law 312, 74th Cong., August 23, 1935) and Executive orders have been issued establishing an order of preference (Veterans' Regulation 6 (c)). See also VA Regulations and Procedure 6047-48.

3. The Federal Board of Hospitalization proposed, and the President approved in principle, on May 8, 1940, a VA 10-year construction program which would have produced a total of 100,000 beds by 1948-49, when the estimated potentially eligible veteran population would have been 4,000,000—or a ratio of 40 veterans per bed.

4. World War II produced over 15,000,000 war veterans, and for them the Government is undertaking to construct only 31,000 additional beds, bringing about a net total of only 131,000 beds after the current program is completed and the temporary beds eliminated—a ratio of 142 veterans per bed.

5. The complete VA hospital-construction program, initiated after the passage of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, in section 101 of which Congress authorized and directed the VA to expedite construction of additional hospital facilities, was studied and laid out by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the Federal Board of Hospitalization, approved by the Bureau of the Budget and the President, and authorized with appropriations or contract authority by the Congress. This program should be completed without curtailment, thus bringing into being a minimum of about 145,000 beds for a potentially eligible veteran population of approximately 18,000,000—an estimated bed ratio of 124 veterans per bed.

6. The recruitment of doctors and other personnel to man these beds can be facilitated and expedited by the removal of any uncertainties as to what Congress has done, is doing and will do in authorizing hospitals for veterans; and through further utilization of specialists and other medical talent in communities where these hospitals are located.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 16, 1949, at 11 o'clock a. m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PETERSON: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3150. A bill to revise and repeal certain acts relating to rules of survey to permit departures from the system of rectangular survey when necessary on all public lands, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 264). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. S. 278. An act to prevent retroactive checkage of payments erroneously made to certain retired officers of the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 265). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. S. 629. An act to authorize the disposition of certain lost, abandoned, or unclaimed personal property coming into the possession of the Treasury Department, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 266). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 3537. A bill to amend section 3 of the Oil Pollution Act, 1924, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3538. A bill to terminate the wartax rates on certain miscellaneous excise taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEE:

H. R. 3539. A bill to amend the China Aid Act of 1948; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H. R. 3540. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 so as to permit payments to aunts and uncles of the insured where the insurance matured prior to August 1, 1946, and where the remaining proceeds of the insurance would otherwise remain unpaid; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MORTON:

H. R. 3541. A bill to amend provisions of the Internal Revenue Code and of the Tariff Act of 1930 to authorize the allowance of draw-back of tax paid on bottled distilled spirits and wines delivered in the United States to public international organizations, foreign embassies, etc., for consumption and use in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 3542. A bill providing for the construction of a Federal building at Scranton, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. R. 3543. A bill to amend paragraph 368 (a), section 1, title I of the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to include counting or registering devices, mechanisms, and instruments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 3544. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior from making any contract or lease relating to golf courses in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. R. 3545. A bill to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 3546. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide retirement benefits for certain former Members of Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 3547. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to announce the parity price of milk, and to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to immediately announce the support price of milk; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 3548. A bill making the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November, in every even-numbered year, a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. R. 3549. A bill to permit the Comptroller General to pay claims chargeable against lapsed appropriations and to provide for the return of unexpended balances of such appropriations to the surplus fund; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 3550. A bill to exempt carriers from statutory provisions requiring payments for compensation for customs overtime services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 3551. A bill to amend section 1101 (a) (1) of the Social Security Act, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3552. A bill to promote the general welfare through the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in providing more effective programs of public kindergarten or kindergarten and nursery-school education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 3553. A bill to permit the prosecution of lynching in Federal courts when the governor or attorney general of the State concerned lacks authority to direct the prosecution in State courts, or such prosecution is impaired by his refusal to do so; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. R. 3554. A bill to establish a Federal Commission on Services for the Physically Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3555. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the town of Marblehead, Mass.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 3556. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 (Public Law 106, 79th Cong.; ch. 212, 1st sess.); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3557. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 3558. A bill to increase to $600 the amount a dependent may earn without loss of exemption to the taxpayers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEE:

H. R. 3559. A bill to strengthen and improve the organization and administration of the Department of State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McKINNON:

H. R. 3560. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the State to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 3561. A bill to clarify the effective date of the repeal of the manufacturers' excise tax on musical instruments sold for the use of religious or nonprofit educational institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 3562. A bill to provide reimbursement of emergency medical expenses incurred by certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 3563. A bill authorizing acquisition and interception of communications in interest of national security; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. Con. Res. 48. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of 30,000 copies of the document entitled "Money Makes the Mare Go," and providing for distribution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. Con. Res. 49. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of 30,000 copies of the document entitled "Money Makes the Mare Go," and providing for distribution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H. Con. Res. 50. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of 30,000 copies of the document entitled "Money Makes the Mare Go," and providing for distribution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. Con. Res. 51. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of 30,000 copies of the document entitled "Money Makes the Mare Go," and providing for distribution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. Res. 150. Resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of the report made to the Appropriations Committee on the subject of Federal power policy; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, requesting an appropriation of not less than $2,000,000 to be made available to the United States Corps of Engineers for the completion of the Coos Bay improvement project, Oregon; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, requesting the enactment of proper legislation designating November 11 as Veteran's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 3564. A bill for the relief of George Schecter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 3565. A bill for the relief of Earl B. Hochwalt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H. R. 3566. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to convey to Lester S. Kortright certain real estate at Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pa.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 3567. A bill for the relief of Vassiliki D. Papadakou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. R. 3568. A bill for the relief of Elfrieda Seeger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey:

H. R. 3569. A bill for the relief of Lew Hirshman and Mrs. Essie Hirshman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 3570. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clara Raffoer Droesse; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

236. By Mr. LeCOMPTE: Petition of Mrs. Joseph Peek and Mrs. Domanic Blondi, chairmen, and other citizens of Colfax, Iowa, urging that any Federal aid to education bill which discriminates against non-public-school children by denying them health and welfare benefits be defeated; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

237. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of Lt. Robert P. Grover Post, No. 377, Jewish War Veterans of the United States, Jersey City, N. J., urging that the Congress of the United States eliminate discriminatory provisions of present laws admitting aliens to the United States by passing corrective measures; to wit, the proposed legislation of Senators McGRATH and NEELY and the bill of Representative CELLER; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

238. By Mr. HOLMES: Memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, relating to the relocation of secondary State Highway No. 11A through restricted areas of the Hanford Engineering Works; to the Committee on Public Works.

239. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Miss Frances Jacobson, president, Kings County Council Ladies' Auxiliary, Jewish War Veterans of the United States, Brooklyn, N. Y., urging the extension and strengthening of rent controls; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

240. Also, petition of E. S. Willoughby, chairman, Moiese Valley Grange Committee, Moiese, Mont., stating opposition to a Columbia Valley Authority or any other authority where the destiny of the people within the region is vested in a few men; to the Committee on Public Works.

241. Also, petition of H. C. Curtis and others, West Palm Beach, Fla., asking for the passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

242. Also, petition of William C. Knopp and others, St. Petersburg, Fla., asking for the passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

243. Also, petition of Mrs. Harry W. Putman, Malden, Mass., asking for the passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 16, 1949

(Legislative day of Monday, February 21, 1949)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor, Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art man's unfailing friend and the God of all wisdom, we pray that we may find a just and righteous solution to the problems of human relationships. In our plans and purposes may we have the interpreting and guiding light of Thy divine spirit.

May we be true, for there are those who trust us; may we be humble, for we know our weakness; may we be brave and strong, for there is so much to do and many members of the human family are finding the struggle of life so difficult and their burdens so heavy.

Grant that at the close of each day we may have a peaceful conscience and a heart that is happy with the blessed assurance that we also are having a part in the final triumph of the Kingdom of God.

To Thy name we ascribe all the praise. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 315. An act for the relief of Dr. Chung Kwai Lui;

S. 335. An act for the relief of Cleris U. Yeadon;

S. 592. An act for the relief of Edwin B. Anderson;

S. 594. An act for the relief of John I. Malarin, former Army mail clerk at APO 962, a branch of the San Francisco, Calif., post office, relative to a shortage in his fixed-credit account;

S. 632. An act to authorize certain personnel and former personnel of the Naval Establishment to accept certain gifts and a foreign decoration tendered by foreign governments;

S. 633. An act for the relief of Rachel D. Gattegno; and

S. 634. An act to authorize payment of certain claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property and personal injury arising from activities of the Army.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 90) to provide for the naturalization of Richard Kim, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 580. An act for the relief of the Bank of Kodiak, Kodiak, Alaska;

H. R. 593. An act for the relief of the Alaska Juneau Gold Mining Co., of Juneau, Alaska;

H. R. 585. An act for the relief of Jacob A. Johnson;

H. R. 593. An act for the relief of Hampton Institute;

H. R. 594. An act for the relief of Mamie L. Hurley;

H. R. 599. An act for the relief of Victor R. Browning & Co., Inc.;

H. R. 602. An act for the relief of Fritz Busche;

H. R. 607. An act for the relief of Harvey M. Lifset, formerly a major in the Army of the United States;

H. R. 609. An act for the relief of the estate of Mathew C. Cowley, deceased, and the estate of Louisa Cowley, deceased;

H. R. 610. An act for the relief of Lorenzo H. Froman;

H. R. 611. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of certain property owners adjacent to Fort Knox, Ky.;

H. R. 637. An act for the relief of Mrs. Harriett Patterson Rogers;

H. R. 650. An act for the relief of George A. Kirchberger;

H. R. 668. An act for the relief of Alex Bail;

H. R. 679. An act to authorize the admission of Mrs. Julia Balint to the United States;

H. R. 681. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of George Generazzo;

H. R. 682. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Elliott Hewitt;

H. R. 683. An act for the relief of Louise Peters Lewis;

H. R. 709. An act for the relief of the General Engineering & Dry Dock Corp.;

H. R. 731. An act for the relief of James Flynn;

H. R. 735. An act for the relief of Phil H. Hubbard;

H. R. 1010. An act for the relief of Mrs. May K. Y. Mok, Frederick W. S. Mok, and Vincent W. C. Mok;

H. R. 1101. An act for the relief of Anna Malone and Rita Anderson;

H. R. 1116. An act for the relief of Mexican Fibre & Twine Co., Inc.;

H. R. 1137. An act for the relief of J. W. Greenwood, Jr.;

H. R. 1276. An act for the relief of the heirs of Ida Londinsky;

H. R. 1591. An act for the relief of Bram B. Tellekamp;

H. R. 1700. An act for the relief of Ezra Butler Eddy, Jr., and wife, Marie Claire Lord Eddy;

H. R. 1731. An act to extend certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1791. An act for the relief of Raleigh B. Diamond;

H. R. 1794. An act for the relief of Cohen, Goldman & Co., Inc.;

H. R. 1876. An act for the relief of Ralph Martin Elzingre, also known as Ralph Seawell;

H. R. 1993. An act for the relief of Samuel Fadem;

H. R. 2231. An act for the relief of Marie E. Wright;

H. R. 2233. An act for the relief of Ewa Plantation Co., a Hawaiian corporation;

H. R. 2463. An act for the relief of Mrs. Florence Byvank;

H. R. 2704. An act for the relief of Freda Wahler;

H. R. 2812. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain land at South Naknek to the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of North America;

H. R. 2853. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue duplicates of William Gerard's script certificates No. 2, subdivisions 11 and 12, to Blanche H. Weedon and Amos L. Harris, as trustees;

H. R. 2922. An act for the relief of the State Compensation Insurance Fund of California;

H. R. 3077. An act for the relief of Mrs. Rebecca Levy;

H. R. 3234. An act for the relief of Jesse A. Lott; and

H. R. 3254. An act for the relief of Iva Gavin.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	Morse
Anderson	Hoey	Mundt
Baldwin	Holland	Murray
Brewster	Humphrey	Myers
Bricker	Hunt	Neely
Butler	Ives	O'Conor
Byrd	Jenner	Pepper
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Chavez	Kem	Saltonstall
Connally	Kerr	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Donnell	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Langer	Sparkman
Downey	Lodge	Stennis
Eastland	Long	Taft
Ecton	Lucas	Taylor
Ellender	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Flanders	McFarland	Thye
Frear	McGrath	Tydings
Fulbright	McKellar	Vandenberg
George	McMahon	Watkins
Gillette	Magnuson	Wherry
Green	Malone	Wiley
Gurney	Martin	Williams
Hayden	Maybank	Withers
Hendrickson	Miller	Young
Hickenlooper	Millikin	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent.

The junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

ANNOUNCEMENT AS TO PROCEDURE

Mr. HAYDEN obtained the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may make a short announcement?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in view of the fact that we are now in the third week upon the pending matter, and that no business of any kind has been transacted during that time, it seems to me that, under present conditions, as I understand them to be, in view of the amendment in the nature of a substitute, which was offered last night, which is apparently airtight and going to be adopted, the Senate should stay here today as long as possible in order that we may expedite this measure and get it out of the way if there is any possible chance of doing so. I do not mean to say that we on this side of the aisle are going to filibuster. So far as I am concerned, and from what I have learned in talking to my colleagues who are opposed to the substitute, I can say we are against filibustering and are not going to filibuster. We are going to try to argue the merits of the case and let the Senate make the decision accordingly. But if any Senator is planning on leaving town and should do so he may miss an important vote, because I hope to keep the Senate in session for some time, late tonight, in order to try to dispose of the pending resolution.

While I am on my feet I may mention another thing along the same line. We have been sitting here day and night. We have been holding night sessions, one of which lasted until nearly 3 o'clock in the morning. We have a tremendous amount of business upon the calendar. I hope I may have the cooperation of all Senators in staying as late as possible until we can clear that part of the log jam which now confronts the Senate. I do not want to take advantage of the situation, but the Senate is late in considering many measures which are ready for action. After we dispose of the pending resolution, if I can secure the cooperation of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I propose to request the Senate to work here in order to try to pass legislation which is now on the calendar and other legislation which will be placed on the calendar from time to time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In view of the situation, the Chair wishes to ask the Senator from Illinois whether he intends to ask that the Journal be approved?

Mr. LUCAS. I was going to make that request next, I will say to the Chair.

Mr. HAYDEN. Very well, proceed with that. I shall be glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I desire to join in the observations made by the majority leader. I appreciate the fact that the Senator from Illinois is intensely interested in pushing forward and getting the pending question out of the way. I assure him that I speak for every Senator on this side of the aisle when I say we will cooperate in every way. So far as having a quorum present, we will do our level best to have a full attendance of Senators on this side of the aisle, so

we can proceed with the work of the Senate. The Senator from Illinois can rest assured now that we will help to the very best of our ability to continue the debate on the pending question until it is finally concluded. I cannot say how long it will continue. Some Senators have asked me whether any votes will be taken today. I believe we are all well informed on the subject, and possibly, since we have an understanding of the situation, we have reached a stage when we may expect votes more rapidly than previously.

I want every Senator to remember that he has a perfect right, as all Senators know, to debate the issue as long as he wants to, on any phase of the question. But the thing to do is to be in attendance and help the majority leader by having a quorum present, so we may proceed to the orderly work of the Senate.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona again yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal from February 21 to March 15, inclusive, be dispensed with, and that the Journal be approved.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Journal from February 21 to and including the 15th of March will be approved.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSIONS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me to make one more unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, advises me that the rent-control bill will soon be reported. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency, and the subcommittee of that committee dealing with rent control, be permitted to sit during the sessions of the Senate this week.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield for the transaction of routine business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator cannot yield for that purpose.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that requests by Senators for submission of routine matters for the RECORD may be made at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Unless the Senate wishes to enter into the agreement which has heretofore prevailed respecting routine morning business, the Chair is compelled to hold that the Senator from Arizona cannot yield for that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] be permitted to retain the floor, but yield to Senators for introduction of bills and joint resolutions, submission of committee reports, and insertion in the RECORD of matters which are ordinarily placed in the RECORD at this time. I make that request with the provision that the Senator from Arizona not lose his rights to the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred, as indicated:

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Secretary of the Air Force for the fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

A letter from the Commissioner, Federal Housing Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Federal National Mortgage Association, for the period July 1, 1948, through December 31, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a memorandum on the Department of Labor which was prepared by George W. Taylor (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a general index of the report of the Committee on the National Security Organization (vol. IV) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Division of Statistical Standards of the Bureau of the Budget (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Division of Estimates of the Bureau of the Budget (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Division of Administrative Management of the Bureau of the Budget (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the statistical agencies of the Federal Government (pt. II) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

REPORT ON OPERATIONS OF STATE DEPARTMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State on the operations of the Department of State under section 32 (b) (2) of Public Law 584, Seventy-ninth Congress, as required by that law.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 14, 1949.*

(Enclosure: Report from the Secretary of State concerning Public Law 584.)

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS (H. DOC. NO. 120)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Attached hereto is a report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems covering its operations from April 1, 1948, to September 30, 1948, and describing in accordance with section 4 (b) (5) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for the above period.

Previous reports of the National Advisory Council were transmitted to the Congress on March 1, 1946; March 8, 1946; January 13, 1947; June 26, 1947; January 19, 1948; May 17, 1948; and August 3, 1948, respectively. In addition to the First Special Report on the Operations and Policies of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, submitted on May 17, 1948, previous reports on the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank were included in the reports of January 13, 1947; June 26, 1947; January 19, 1948; and August 3, 1948, respectively.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 14, 1949.*

CONVENTION WITH BELGIUM RELATING TO DOUBLE TAXATION—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The VICE PRESIDENT. As in executive session, the Chair lays before the Senate Executive I, Eighty-first Congress, first session, a convention between the United States and Belgium for the voidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, signed at Washington on October 28, 1948. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed, and the convention, together with the President's message, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the message from the

President will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the convention between the United States of America and Belgium for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, signed at Washington on October 23, 1948.

I also transmit for the information of the Senate the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the convention.

The convention has the approval of the Department of State and the Treasury Department.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 12, 1949.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report of the Secretary of State; 2. Convention between the United States and Belgium relating to taxes on income, signed October 28, 1948.)

TEXTS OF NOTES BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND CANADA RELATING TO TEMPORARY EMERGENCY DIVERSIONS OF WATER FROM NIAGARA RIVER—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The VICE PRESIDENT. As in executive session, the Chair lays before the Senate Executive J, Eighty-first Congress, first session, relating to the texts of notes exchanged at Washington on December 23, 1948, between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada providing temporary emergency diversions of water for power purposes from the Niagara River. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed, and the texts of notes, together with the President's message, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the message from the President will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the approval of the Senate, I transmit herewith the texts of notes exchanged at Washington on December 23, 1948, between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada providing for temporary emergency diversions of water for power purposes from the Niagara River. These notes amend in its application article V of the treaty signed at Washington, January 11, 1909, between the United States and Great Britain concerning boundary waters and questions arising along the boundary between the United States of America and Canada.

I also transmit for the information of the Senate a report by the Secretary of State regarding this exchange of notes.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 12, 1949.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report of the Secretary of State; 2. Texts of notes exchanged at Washington December 23, 1948.)

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 7

"Concurrent resolution memorializing and requesting the Congress of the United States to enact a bill to aid the State in the enforcement of the cigarette tax now evaded by use of the United States mails

"Whereas the State of Indiana has seen fit to impose a tax on the sale and use of cigarettes within its boundaries, and the revenues so obtained constitute an important portion of the funds available for its functions of government; and

"Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Indiana that a large and growing system of evasion of such tax law has developed; that the United States mails are flooded with advertisements and inducements to the citizens of this State to violate the law of this State; that in numerous instances such advertisers entice prospective customers with statements to the effect that the use of the United States mails is sufficient proof of the legitimacy of such business and such a system; that the mails of the United States are constantly flooded with cigarettes in the process of delivery within this State, and on which cigarettes the tax required by the laws of this State have not and will not be paid; that this State is seriously disadvantaged by such use of the postal offices and mails of the United States for the purpose of evading the laws of Indiana; and that Indiana faces and is now suffering serious losses of revenue as a result of such system of evasion; and

"Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the senate and house of representatives of Indiana that there is now pending before the Congress of the United States a proposed bill which would aid the States by requiring shippers of cigarettes in interstate commerce to furnish to the taxing authority of the State to which shipped a copy of the invoice on each shipment and the name and address of each person to whom shipped: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana (the house of representatives concurring):*

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States be and the same is hereby memorialized and respectfully urged to enact a bill requiring shippers of cigarettes in interstate commerce to furnish to the taxing authority of the State to which shipped a copy of the invoice on each such shipment; or to enact such other bill to the aid of the several States affected as may be proper.

"SEC. 2. Duly authenticated copies of this resolution shall be forwarded immediately to the presiding officers of the respective Houses of Congress and to the United States Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Indiana."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Joint Memorial 11

"*To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:*

"We, your memorialists, the senate and house of representatives of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas Coos Bay is located approximately 200 miles south of the mouth of the Columbia River, on the Oregon coast; and

"Whereas the Eightieth Congress, first session, authorized the improvement of Coos Bay by the deepening of the bar entrance thereof to a depth of 30 feet, mean lower low water, by the excavation of a ship channel, 30 feet in depth, mean lower low water, from the bar entrance to the upper harbor of Coos Bay, a distance of approximately 15 miles, all at an estimated cost of $5,689,000 for the project; and

"Whereas the United States Army reviewing officers have found and reported, in Document No. 236, to the Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, that the benefits to the public that will accrue from the completion of this deep-water harbor project at Coos Bay, Oreg., will amount to $1,224,200 per year; and

"Whereas the United States through its Corps of Engineers has commenced work on this project and to the present time has completed approximately 4½ miles thereof upstream from the bar entrance, at an expenditure of approximately $2,300,000 of Federal funds; and

"Whereas this project can be completed in 1950, provided that an appropriation of $2,000,000 be made available during the present session of Congress, for work during the 1949–50 biennium: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the house of representatives jointly concurring therein)*, That the Eighty-first Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized to consider this matter further and to make an appropriation in the amount of not less than $2,000,000 available to the United States Corps of Engineers, for the completion of the Coos Bay improvement project, and in all respects to give wholehearted support to the completion of this project; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be and he hereby is directed to send copies of this memorial to the President of the United States, to the President and the Chief Clerk of the United States Senate, to the Speaker and the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in the Congress from the State of Oregon.

"Adopted by senate March 3, 1949.

"WM. E. WALSH,
"*President of Senate.*

"Concurred in by house March 4, 1949.

"FRANK J. VAN DYKE,
"*Speaker of House.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Joint Memorial 4

"*To the honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:*

"We, your memorialists, the Forty-fifth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, convened in regular session, respectfully represent that:

"Whereas November 11 is now by statute designated as Armistice Day to commemorate the end of World War I; and

"Whereas there now exists no regularly designated day to commemorate the end of World War II; and

"Whereas proper observance and commemoration of the end of these wars can better be accomplished by designating November 11 as Veterans' Day: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the senate jointly concurring therein)*, That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized to enact, by proper legislation, an act designating November 11 as Veterans' Day; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be, and he hereby is, directed to transmit copies of this joint memorial to the President and Clerk of the

United States Senate, to the Speaker and Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each member of the Oregon delegation in the Congress of the United States.

"Adopted by house February 16, 1949.

"FRANK J. VAN DYKE,
"*Speaker of House.*

"Adopted by senate March 4, 1949.

"WILLIAM E. WALSH,
"*President of Senate.*"

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Works:

"House Memorial 5

"*To the President of the United States, Secretary of the Interior, the Department of National Defense, the Congress, and the Delegate from Alaska:*

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in nineteenth regular session assembled, respectfully submits:

"Whereas the necessity of immediate road construction in Alaska is obvious when the limited extent of the present Alaska highway system is noted. At the present time there are only 2,837 miles of road to serve the 586,400 square miles of the Territory. The development of Alaska depends upon the early linking of port cities with interior points; and

"Whereas the proposed Copper River Highway, extending from Cordova to Chitina, a distance of 131 miles, would serve as a connecting link between the United States and strategic military areas and major cities in Alaska while at the same time making available a wealth of valuable resources in a 53,000 square-mile area; and

"Whereas a segment of said route which is 15 miles of well-surfaced road from Cordova to the Federal Government airport has already been constructed, and the old road bed of the now abandoned Copper River Railway is available (with steel bridges) as a foundation upon which to build said road at a reduced cost; and

"Whereas in addition to its importance from a military standpoint, which importance is enhanced because it could easily be kept open the year around, said road would open up an area of scenic grandeur for enjoyment of tourists and others as well as industrial potentials in the fields of mining, lumbering, farming, trapping, etc.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, urges that the proposed Copper River Highway be given first consideration on the list of new Federal road projects for Alaska.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house February 16, 1949.

"STANLEY MCCUTCHEON,
"*Speaker of the House.*

"Attest:

"JOHN L. HEDDE,
"*Chief Clerk of the House.*

"Approved by the Governor February 19, 1949.

"ERNEST GRUENING,
"*Governor of Alaska.*"

"House Memorial 6

"*To the President and Congress of the United States, the Secretary of Interior, the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, and the Delegate to Congress from Alaska:*

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in nineteenth regular session assembled, respectfully submits:

"Whereas the Tanana River, immediately above Nenana, flows through a horseshoe bend which impedes the flow of ice and water during break-up time and obstructs the free flow of the river during other times of high water, resulting in floods throughout the townsite of Nenana and vicinity; and

"Whereas the currents that flow through the town at such periods damage property, pollute drinking water sources, and otherwise cause untold hardship upon the people of the community; and

"Whereas Federal Government installations such as the Civil Aeronautics Administration's airfield located 1½ miles south of Nenana, and the Alaska Railroad at Nenana would be protected against future erosion, if timely steps are taken to save the town; and

"Whereas the desired flood control could be effectuated through building of a short canal which would cut off the bend above mentioned and enable the river to approach the town and flow past on a straight line; and

"Whereas such project would also restore the river at Nenana to continuous use for marine ways and dock installations necessary to the operation of boats in supplying upper and lower Yukon settlements with cargo brought to Nenana by the Alaska Railroad.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist respectfully urges that immediate plans be made to effectuate flood control for the protection of Nenana and vicinity by means of a canal cutting off the bend of the Tanana River directly upstream from the townsite of Nenana, with the construction stage of the project to follow as soon as possible.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house February 16, 1949.

"STANLEY MCCUTCHEON,
"*Speaker of the House.*

"Attest:

"JOHN L. HEDDE,
"*Chief Clerk of the House.*

"Approved by the Governor February 19, 1949.

"ERNEST GRUENING,
"*Governor of Alaska.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Joint Memorial 10

"*To the President of the United States, Congress of the United States, the Attorney General of the United States, and the Delegate from Alaska:*

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in nineteenth regular session assembled, respectfully submits:

"Whereas there is only one United States district judge for the third judicial division, Territory of Alaska; and

"Whereas the population of said division has tremendously increased during the past 7 years to the point where it is now the most populous division in Alaska; and

"Whereas the judicial duties in said division have expanded beyond the capacity of any one judge, and now require and demand the establishment of a second judgeship in said division to meet the need:

"Now, therefore, your memorialist urges and recommends that legislation be enacted to provide for two United States district judges, instead of only one, for the third judicial division, Territory of Alaska, and that said additional district judge be located at Anchorage, Alaska.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house, February 15, 1949.

"STANLEY MCCUTCHEON,
"*Speaker of the House.*

"Attest:

"JOHN L. HEDDE,
"*Chief Clerk of the House.*

"Passed by the senate February 19, 1949.

"GUNNARD M. ENGEBRETH,
"*President of the Senate.*

"Attest:

"BONNIE JO GRONROOS,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*

"Approved by the Governor February 23, 1949.

"ERNEST GRUENING,
"*Governor of Alaska.*"

A resolution adopted by the Southern Governors' Conference, assembled in Savannah, Ga., on December 14, 1948, relating to the National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Dunbar Grange, No. 765, of Dunbar, Wis., favoring a Federal support price on butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution adopted by the Kings County Council, Ladies' Auxiliary, Jewish War Veterans of the United States, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the extension and strengthening of rent controls; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The memorial of John C. Burt, of New York, N. Y., remonstrating against the continuation of rent controls; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Petitions of the Friendship Townsend Club, No. 1, of Miami; the Boynton Beach Townsend Club, No. 1, of Boynton Beach; and the Associated Townsend Clubs of Pinellas County, all in the State of Florida, praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan to provide old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Retail Automotive Industry, of Ontario, Oreg., relating to United States membership in the International Labor Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Resolutions adopted by the Common Council of the City of Cudahy, Wis.; the Commission of the City of Dayton, Ohio; the Common Council of the City of Portsmouth, N. H.; the City Commission of the City of West Palm Beach, Fla.; and the Commission of the City of Alhambra, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation proclaiming October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Pendleton (Oreg.) Rotary Club, protesting against the enactment of legislation to socialize medicine; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter in the nature of a petition signed by Charles H. Villar, chairman, Federal Employees and Citizens of West Florida, Pensacola, Fla., relating to the positions of Government career employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. LODGE):

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Resolutions relative to the development of the waterways of the Commonwealth

"Whereas the General Court of Massachusetts favors and urges the development of the waterways of the Commonwealth, wherever feasible, for the production of hydroelectricity to free the Commonwealth from dependence on coal and other fuels which are scarce or nonexistent in the Commonwealth, to stimulate industrial enterprises in the Commonwealth, and to encourage the establishment of new enterprises in the Commonwealth: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts urges the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation and to take such other action as may be necessary to effect said development of waterways for the production of hydroelectricity to be distributed through private enterprise and municipal power and light plants; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts invites and urges the cooperation of the five other New England States and the State of New York in the development of waterways coming to the New England States and the State of New York; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the State secretary to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth, to the governor of each of

the five other New England States and the State of New York, and to the presiding officer of each branch of the legislature of each of said States.

"In house of representatives, adopted, March 2, 1949.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
"*Clerk.*

"In senate, adopted, in concurrence, March 10, 1949.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
"*Clerk.*"

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Public Works.)

By Mr. MILLIKIN:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, protesting the order of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs providing for the discontinuance of the Veterans' Administration Hospital at Fort Logan, Colo.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See text of joint memorial printed in full when presented by the Vice President on March 12, 1949, p. 2320, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Joint Memorial 9

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary to maintain the agricultural experiment station at Akron, Colo., and to designate said station as a Federal regional station

"Whereas the Congress of the United States 4 years ago enacted legislation providing that all Federal agricultural experiment stations in the Great Plains region, with the exception of three, be taken over by State experiment stations, and by this action the experiment station at Akron, Colo., is to be made a State-sponsored and supervised agency; and

"Whereas because of the central location of the Akron station, the large area the station serves, the varied agricultural problems peculiar to the high altitude territory of the area, and the meager funds with which the station has been forced to operate since Federal sponsorship was contemplated to be discontinued, it would be highly desirable that the Akron station be continued as such and that it be designated a Federal regional station; and

"Whereas many organizations of the Great Plains region, including the Denver Chamber of Commerce, county planning committees, and farm bureaus, all are of the unanimous opinion that the Akron station should be designated a regional station under Federal supervision and financing: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the house of representatives of the thirty-seventh general assembly (the senate concurring herein)*, That this general assembly hereby respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary to designate the agricultural experiment station at Akron, Colo., a regional station, to be supervised and financed by the Federal Government; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this memorial be forwarded to each of the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Colorado in the Congress of the United States, and to the Honorable Charles F. Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture of the United States.

"PAT MAGILL, Jr.,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*
"WALTER W. JOHNSON,
"*President of the Senate.*"

By Mr. MURRAY:

Two joint memorials of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"House Joint Memorial 5

"Joint memorial to the President of the United States, and to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY and ZALES N. ECTON, Senators from the State of Montana, and MIKE MANSFIELD and WESLEY A. D'EWART, Congressmen from the State of Montana, for appropriate action to alleviate the shortage of tubular goods and steel necessary for the development of Montana's oil and gas resources, and for the end of discrimination against Montana by the shipment of steel and tubular goods to foreign countries for the development of oil and gas resources in such foreign countries, and the end of the 'gray market' in steel

"Whereas there are vast undeveloped oil and gas resources as well as vast proven oil and gas fields in Montana; and

"Whereas during the past 3 years explorations for oil and gas in Montana have been seriously curtailed and hampered due to the difficulty, and sometimes impossibility, of obtaining the casing and pipe necessary and required for such development work in proven and wildcat oil areas; and

"Whereas this situation has resulted in what has been termed the 'gray market' and exorbitant prices for steel tubular goods; and

"Whereas the ratio of oil discoveries and development of new production has been in almost exact proportion to the amount of pipe and casing obtainable and used; and

"Whereas the steel industry is unable to furnish tubular goods in sufficient quantity to meet the needs and demands of Montana producers in the ordinary channels of trade because of the desire of certain interests to exploit foreign oil resources at the expense of development within the borders of the United States, and has permitted and caused the exportation of thousands of tons of vital steel for the use and development of the oil fields of Saudi Arabia and in other parts of the world outside of the borders of the United States, and

"Whereas the situation is retarding the explorations and development of Montana oil and gas resources: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Thirty-first Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana (the senate concurring)*, That we respectfully urge the President of the United States and Montana's representatives in the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to remove any discrimination which may exist against the oil operators of Montana, to the end that an adequate supply of tubular goods be made available in the regular channels of trade, and that conditions be corrected which retard the exploration for oil and gas within the borders of the United States and the State of Montana, so that the "gray market" in steel will not be necessary or possible; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the chief clerk of the house of representatives, to the President of the United States, and to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY and ZALES N. ECTON, Senators from Montana, and the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD and WESLEY A. D'EWART, Representatives in Congress from Montana."

"House Joint Memorial 9

"Joint memorial of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Montana, to the Congress of the United States, to the honorable United States Senators JAMES E. MURRAY and ZALES N. ECTON, and to the honorable Representatives in Congress, MIKE MANSFIELD and WESLEY A. D'EWART, relating to veterans' housing

"Whereas we have been informed that Raymond M. Foley, Federal Housing Administrator, has told you that the Nation needs some 18,000,000 new dwellings in the next 10 years; and

"Whereas a portion of that need for new housing exists among veterans in the State of Montana; and

"Whereas many of the citizens and the residents of the State of Montana believe that the need for furnishing assistance to these veterans in building homes for themselves and families is of paramount importance to the welfare of this State: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring)*, That this legislature respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to pass legislation at the earliest possible moment which will aid and assist veterans in building homes for themselves and their families; be it further

"*Resolved*, That immediately upon passage, a copy of this memorial be forwarded to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY, and the Honorable ZALES N. ECTON, Senators from the State of Montana, and the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD and the Honorable WESLEY A. D'EWART, Representatives in Congress from Montana, by airmail."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Joint Memorial 6

"Joint memorial to the President and Congress of the United States requesting the introduction and enactment of appropriate legislation for appropriation of funds by the first session of the Eighty-first Congress for the building of the Custer Battlefield Museum at Custer Battlefield National Monument, Mont.

"Whereas the Director of the Bureau of the Budget has recommended the sum of $96,000 be appropriated in the 1950 fiscal-year funds for a memorial museum to be erected on the site of Custer Battlefield National Monument; and

"Whereas Custer Battlefield is one of the most prominent patriotic shrines in American history, the site where General Custer and 262 men of his gallant regiment were slain at the Battle of the Little Bighorn River, June 25-26, 1876, also known as Custer's Last Battle; and

"Whereas the purpose of the Custer Battlefield National Monument is to preserve for all time the memorable ground of this great conflict and to present for public benefit the chapter it has to tell in the story of the westward advance of our settlements in the Northwest, it is necessary that a museum be erected on this battlefield site to properly care for, display, and maintain the many valuable historical artifacts, relics, and mementos pertaining to the battle that are now in storage awaiting the opportunity of proper care and display that only a museum can offer: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Thirty-first Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana (the senate concurring)*, That we respectfully urge the Congress of the United States that the act of August 10, 1939, 'to provide for the erection of a public historical museum in the Custer Battlefield National Cemetery, Mont. (Public, No. 362, ch. 634, 76th Cong., 1st sess.), signed by the President of the United States, to pass legislation for funds as mentioned in the 1950 fiscal-year estimates for the erection of this museum; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the chief clerk of the house of representatives, to the President of the United States, to the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY and the Honorable ZALES N. ECTON, Senators from Montana, and the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD and the Honorable WESLEY A. D'EWART, Representatives in Congress from Montana."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"House Joint Memorial 4

"Joint memorial to the Congress of the United States of America, to the honorable United States Senators JAMES E. MURRAY and ZALES N. ECTON, and to the honorable Representatives in Congress MIKE MANSFIELD and WESLEY A. D'EWART, requesting the Eighty-first Congress introduce and pass the Veterans' Economic Development Act which was embodied in H. R. 521 and S. 1652 in the Eightieth Congress

"*To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:*

"Whereas the Eightieth Congress of the United States had in mind legislation which would help both the veteran and nonveteran and which if passed would have brought new business to the State of Montana but which said legislation unfortunately was not passed: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the Thirty-first Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana (the senate of said assembly concurring), does most respectfully urge the Eighty-first Congress of the United States that the said Congress cause necessary action to be initiated whereby the Veterans' Economic Development Act which was embodied in H. R. 521 and S. 1652 in the Eightieth Congress will be again introduced as an act and passed by the Eighty-first Congress of the United States; be it further

"*Resolved*, That duly attested copies of this memorial be transmitted to both Houses of Congress, to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY and the Honorable ZALES N. ECTON, United States Senators for the State of Montana and the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD and the Honorable WESLEY A. D'EWART, United States Representatives in Congress for the State of Montana."

By Mr. KEM:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Senate Resolution 46

"Whereas there is now pending before Congress in both the Senate and House bills that propose the establishment of a United States Air Academy for the educational training of officers for the Air Corps, both Army and Navy, that would be comparable to the long-established Academies at West Point and Annapolis; and

"Whereas the United States Government now owns 2,500 acres of land known as Sedalia Air Field located 10 miles east of Warrensburg and 19 miles west of Sedalia, Mo.; and

"Whereas this site is already adequately equipped with a water supply, sewage disposal, surface drainage and storm sewers, four concrete runways, 7,200 feet long and 150 feet wide with 2,400,000 square feet of parkway aprons, railroad switch tracks from the main line of the Missouri Pacific Railroad, Federal Highway No. 50 and other connecting highways, 13 miles of black-top streets, electric-power facilities, and a pipeline system connecting a supply of natural gas; and

"Whereas this area is so located as not to be affected by intense heat or cold and thus is conducive to superior class-room work on a year-round basis and past flying operational records indicate at 97.8 percent flying weather; and

"Whereas this location has the strategic advantage in time of war of being situated equidistant from our east and west coasts and our north and south borders; and

"Whereas this location is midway between Kansas City and St. Louis making the metropolitan areas easily accessible; and

"Whereas the recreation facilities of the famous Ozark region, are easily accessible and Knobnoster State Park consisting of 3,441 acres with recreational facilities is adjacent to the Sedalia Airfield: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Senate does recommend to the Members of the United States Congress that careful and complete consideration be given to the facilities offered by the Sedalia Air Field as a suitable site for the proposed United States Air Academy; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That members of Missouri's congressional delegation be furnished with a copy of this resolution and asked to exert their best efforts toward securing congressional action for the selection of the Sedalia Air Field as the location for a United States Air Academy."

By Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. MCGRATH):

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations; ordered to lie on the table:

"Resolution requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to give immediate consideration to the passage of legislation repealing chapter 120 of the public laws, passed June 23, 1947 (Public Law 101), the short title of which is cited as the 'Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947'

"*Resolved*, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States be and they are hereby requested to give immediate consideration to the enactement of legislation repealing chapter 120 of the public laws, passed June 23, 1947 (Public Law 101), the short title of which is cited as the 'Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947'; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state be and he is hereby authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States."

By Mr. WATKINS:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Utah; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Resolution 4

"Resolution by the Utah State Senate memorializing the Congress of the United States not to pass certain legislation now pending before the National Congress which in effect provides for State medicine but rather to encourage private cooperative health insurance.

"*Be it resolved by the Utah State Senate:*

"Whereas there is now pending before the National Congress certain legislation commonly referred to as the Wagner-Murray-Dingell compulsory health-insurance bill; and

"Whereas this program of compulsory health insurance is offered to the people as a solution to a supposed problem of inadequate medical attention for the citizens of this country; and

"Whereas it is acknowledged and unquestioned fact that the general health of the Nation is higher than that of any other nation of the world; and

"Whereas free enterprise, individual initiative, and freedom from Government interference are the foundation stones upon which the practice of medicine and all other great enterprises of this country have been developed; and

"Whereas such Government interference and regimentation in the field of medicine will destroy the spirit of research and individual initiative and will eventually result in a break-down of the present high standards of competency now prevalent in the private practice of medicine in this country; and

"Whereas a program of compulsory health insurance as proposed has been in operation in other countries and has proven extremely cumbersome and expensive and has not resulted in a general improvement of the public health; and

"Whereas the proponents of compulsory health insurance continually stress complete medical service without cost to the patient which statements do not take into account the increased taxation which will result from the inevitable Government bureaucracy that will be established in administering such a program; and

"Whereas the best interest of the people of the United States can be served by continuance of the free-enterprise system with encouragement given to private cooperative health insurance and without Government domination and control in the field of medicine: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the Utah State Legislature*, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to defeat any legislation introduced into the Congress which provides for socialized medicine or national compulsory health insurance and which will result in a destruction of private initiative and the free-enterprise system in this country and that the Congress be urged to restrict its legislation to measures which will encourage private health insurance in cooperation with the private practice of medicine; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the State Utah, be, and he is hereby instructed to transmit forthwith a copy of this resolution to the congressional delegation from the State of Utah and to the Speaker of the House and President of the Senate of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Resolution 2

"Resolution urging the Congress of the United States to undertake immediately a study of the need for legislation for revision of repayment contracts of Federal reclamation projects, and urging that committees of both Houses of the United States Congress request the Secretary of the Interior to submit a report with recommendations on the projects where revision is desirable, that a special committee be set up to consider the report and report thereon and that upon the report of the special committee the United States Congress enact legislation authorizing repayment contract revision where such revisions are deemed necessary

"*Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Utah:*

"Whereas because of changes in economic conditions, largely a result of the Second World War, repayment contracts on some existing Federal reclamation projects contain inequities which need immediate adjustment; and

"Whereas existing laws providing for renegotiations of repayment contracts are inadequate to meet the need for contract revision and default in the payment of annual repayment installments in some projects is imminent unless new legislation is enacted for that purpose: Be it

"*Resolved by the house of representatives:*

"SECTION 1. That the house of representatives urges the Congress of the United States to undertake immediately a study of the need for legislation for revision of repayment contracts on projects in financial difficulties and, for that purpose, recommends that the appropriate committees of both Houses of Congress

forthwith request the Secretary of the Interior to submit a full and complete report, with his recommendations on all existing projects where such revisions of repayment contracts are desirable; that upon the submission of such report a special committee composed of Members of both Houses of Congress be established to consider such report and the recommendations of interested water users; and that, upon the report of the special committee, the Congress enact legislation authorizing repayment contract revisions where such revisions are deemed necessary.

"SEC. 2. That the secretary of state be directed to send a certified copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative of the United States Congress from the State of Utah."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Utah; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Senate Resolution 3

"Memorial to the Congress of the United States urging that national rent control be abandoned and that the jurisdiction of the same be returned to the people at the earliest possible date, and that during the interim action be taken to restore some degree of economic justice to the owners of rental property

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of Utah:

"Whereas the National Rent Control Act as originally passed was intended as a war emergency measure, and save for the Emergency War Powers Act this legislation would not be valid under any peacetime functioning of constitutional government; and

"Whereas if there is an emergency now existing in the housing industry, there is likewise an emergency in food and clothing and other commodities which are even more vital to life than shelter; and

"Whereas the American way of life is founded on the proposition that there shall be free commerce among and between all our people and to freeze any one segment of our economy is a violation of the basic principles of the free-enterprise system; and

"Whereas, the Congress' attention is respectfully called to the fact that other industries are now being subsidized by the Government through general taxation, and to force one segment of the population to subsidize another individually and directly, as is now being required from landlord to tenant, is unfair and grossly discriminatory; and

"Whereas the right now exercised by the Federal Government to control the property and income of one group of our citizens, carries with it the implied right to extend the same controls to other groups; and

"Whereas rent control, dealing as it does with the rights to our homes and personal property, is by its very nature a local or community problem and should be dealt with by local government; and

"Whereas the continual extension of this law under the guise of emergency is cause for alarm by the people as to the good faith of the Federal Government; and

"Whereas the Congress' attention is respectfully called to the fact that rent control was one of the first stepping stones used by nations of the world now experiencing state socialism and that rent control is one of the salient planks of the Communist Party here in America; and

"Whereas aside from all matters of law and discrimination it is contrary to the spirit of good American sportsmanship to take advantage of one segment of our population because of a numerical advantage held by the others: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Utah, That the Congress of the United States be urged in behalf of local government and in the interest of preserving the free-enterprise system that national rent control be abandoned at the earliest possible date, and that the rights of citizens of this country to control their own property be restored forthwith, and if the Congress is fearful that such a sudden and drastic action would result in undue hardship and inconvenience to the renting population, that legislation be enacted to gradually remove these Federal restrictions and that during the interim action be taken to restore some degree of economic justice to the owners of rental property; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the State of Utah be, and he is hereby directed to send forthwith copies of this resolution to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of the United States Congress and to each of the congressional delegations from the State of Utah."

JOSEF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY—RESOLUTION OF LEGISLATURE OF MINNESOTA

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a concurrent resolution adopted by the Minnesota State Legislature memorializing the Minnesota Members of the Congress to present to the executive department of the Government an official protest regarding the unjust prosecution of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, and other clergymen.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Minnesota Members of the United States Congress to present to the executive department of the United States Government an official protest regarding the unjust prosecution of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty and other clergymen

Whereas the recent trial and sentence of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty by the Hungarian court constitutes a wanton violation of the fundamental rights of man; and

Whereas the entire proceedings surrounding the arrest, trial, and sentence constituted a mask for a premeditated action against an innocent man; and

Whereas the case of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty and Bishop Lajos Ordass has now become a dramatic example of the persecutions the Hungarian Government has imposed upon courageous and God-fearing people of many religious faiths; and

Whereas the United States Government has played a leading role among the United Nations in establishing universal standards of human rights, which include fair and impartial trials and all the other basic guaranties to the accused; and

Whereas the action of the Hungarian Government in the Josef Cardinal Mindszenty case presents a challenge and a test as to the utility, purpose, and survival of the United Nations as an international instrument for world peace and human rights: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Minnesota (the house of representatives concurring), That the Minnesota representatives in the Congress of the United States be hereby urged to formally present our official protest of the Josef Cardinal Mindszenty case to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, and to the American representatives on the United Nations Council, so that the United States Government may continue her traditional role as the champion of human rights and take a position of leadership toward effecting a liberation of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty and the other hundreds of human beings who are victims of the same injustices.

C. ELMER ANDERSON,
President of the Senate.
JOHN A. HARTH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
Approved March 8, 1949.
LUTHER W. YOUNGDAHL,
Governor of the State of Minnesota.

POSTMASTER AT HAMPTON, IOWA—LETTER AND RESOLUTION OF GEO. A. ALDINGER POST, NO. 183, THE AMERICAN LEGION, HAMPTON, IOWA

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a letter from Jerome C. Scheckel, post adjutant and service officer, Geo. A. Aldinger Post, No. 183, Inc., the American Legion, of Hampton, Iowa, and a resolution adopted by that post, relating to the nomination of postmaster at Hampton, Iowa, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN LEGION,
GEO. A. ALDINGER POST, NO. 183, INC.,
Hampton, Iowa, January 13, 1949.
Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The inclosed resolution was adopted at a regular convened business meeting of the Geo. A. Aldinger Post, No. 183, at Hampton, Iowa, on the 6th day of January 1949. At this post meeting there were over 100 veterans present, 90 percent of whom were World War II veterans. They are very much disturbed, owing to the fact a veteran had, prior to the general election, been recommended for confirmation by the United States Senate, and now since the election, the professional politicians are attempting to block the ratification of his appointment.

It might be interesting, in view of this situation, to know that in my judgment, at least 75 percent of the members who were present at this meeting voted the Democratic ticket, and they are just as much disturbed over this situation as the Republican members.

We hope that your good offices will avail, so that the civil-service regulations will be enforced as they are suppose to be enforced, and that political pressure cannot be brought to bear to brush off a worthy and well-qualified veteran for this job.

It may be of interest to you, to know that the party who had the highest rating in the civil-service examination was a disabled veteran, the second a nonveteran, third a veteran of World War II, and the fourth a veteran of World War I.

Respectfully yours,
JAMES P. MANGO,
Post Commander.
By JEROME C. SCHECKEL,
Post Adjutant and Service Officer.

Whereas it has come to the attention of the members of the Geo. A. Aldinger Post, No. 183, of the American Legion, at Hampton, Iowa, that the nomination for postmaster at Hampton, Iowa, which was made by the President of the United States prior to the general November election, is now being recalled by political pressure of the local Democratic organization; and

Whereas members of this post have been informed that the four persons who took

the civil-service examination for this office, and who are eligible for said office, three of them are veterans; and

Whereas the first, third, and fourth highest ratings of this examination were obtained by veterans: Be it therefore

Resolved—

That we urge the appointment of a veteran to this job irrespective of politics, but in true compliance of the civil-service regulations in effect;

That we deeply deplore political inference with the civil-service regulations;

That the members of this post are resentful of the fact that professional political politicians are exerting their influence to prevent the appointment of a veteran to that office: Therefore be it further

Resolved, That we inform our United States Senators and the Congressman from this district concerning what is now occurring in this city, and that we respectfully ask our United States Senators and Congressman from the Third District of Iowa, to exert their influence toward seeing that the civil-service law is in fact, enforced, and that veterans are not kicked aside for purely political reasons.

GENERAL PULASKI'S MEMORIAL DAY—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF LYNN, MASS.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts, and myself, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Lynn, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation proclaiming October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress

Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

Whereas the 11th day of October, 1779, is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union, through legislative enactment designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and

Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated from October 11, 1929, to October 11, 1946, to be General Pulaski's Memorial Day in the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Lynn and the State of Massachusetts, That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION—RESOLUTION FROM CHARTIERS TOWNSHIP SCHOOL DISTRICT, WASHINGTON, PA.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Chartiers Township School District, Washington, Pa., supporting Federal aid to education.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At a regularly scheduled meeting of the Chartiers Township Education Association, the 44 members voted unanimously to adopt the following resolution regarding their opinions on the subject of Federal aid to schools:

"Whereas the inequality of educational opportunity has contributed to the virtual illiteracy of 10,000,000 adults in the United States; and

"Whereas since more than half of the 5,000,000 men who were rejected under selective service because of physical, mental, and educational deficiencies came from States with little ability to pay for education; and

"Whereas the shortage of qualified teachers is a matter of grave concern which can be alleviated by better working conditions and higher salaries; and

"Whereas the quality of our citizenship must be upheld and improved through persistent and uniform endeavor in educational needs; and

"Whereas the Chartiers Township Education Association believes that additional Federal funds will facilitate needed improvement in education: Therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Chartiers Township Education Association respectfully petitions the Honorable FRANCIS J. MYERS to support legislation granting Federal aid to education."

IRENE GRABLE,
President.
BEATRICE E. SHAW,
Secretary.

MINE SAFETY—RESOLUTION OF UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA, UNIONTOWN, PA.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a communication from President William Hynes and Secretary-Treasurer Michael Honus of the United Mine Workers of America, District 4, enclosing a resolution endorsing the principles of S. 1031, of which I am a cosponsor, which would empower Federal mine inspectors to act in shutting down unsafe mines.

There being no objection, the communication was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Uniontown, Pa., February 24, 1949.
Hon. FRANCIS MYERS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The following resolution was unanimously adopted at the convention of District No. 4, United Mine Workers of America, held Saturday, February 19, 1949, Marshall Hall, Uniontown, Pa.:

"Whereas, in the year of 1948 they claim that it was the safest year for some years in the casualty list of the bituminous coal industry; and

"Whereas, in this so-called safe year more than 1,000 members of the United Mine Workers of America were killed in the coal mines of this country and 50,000 men were injured in the bituminous industry: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That this convention of District No. 4 go on record demanding that Congress pass a law giving the Federal inspectors the right to enforce their recommendations on safety and giving them the power to shut the mines down when those safety regulations are not carried out; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to President Truman, to Vice President BARKLEY, and to our two United States Senators, and the Congressmen from the coal-mining districts."

DISTRICT NO. 4, UMWA,
W. J. HYNES,
President.
MICHAEL HONUS,
Secretary-Treasurer.

PROTEST AGAINST VETERANS' BONUS—OPEN LETTER FROM AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference an open letter from the American Veterans Committee, Inc., of Salt Lake City, Utah, protesting against the enactment of the so-called Rankin bonus bill for veterans, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE, INC.,
SALT LAKE CHAPTER,
Salt Lake City, Utah, February 28, 1949.

VERY CURRENT EVENTS

In Washington, D. C., AVC National Vice Chairman Joe Clorety, Jr., testified before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs that, according to calculations, if the total pension proposed and backed by Representative RANKIN, of Mississippi, were in one-dollar bills and placed end on end and side by side, none of the bills overlapping, it would pave a highway 40 feet wide, extending four times around the earth at its center, at a rate of $2,000,000 per mile. That would be 100,000 miles—over two-fifths of the distance to the moon. The word "lunacy" is derived from the Latin luna meaning, in this case, moonstruck. Every member of AVC is urged to write to his Congressman to defeat this bill, H. R. 1693. The old-age benefits alone of H. R. 1693 represent a total cost of more than nine times the estimated total cost of the Eurcpean recovery program. This veterans' pension plan, if adopted, would cost every living man, woman, and child in the United States $20 per year for the next 70 years. It would increase the taxes of a family of four by $80 per year for 70 years.

OPEN LETTER TO UTAH'S CONGRESSMEN

"To the Honorable Senators Elbert D. Thomas, Arthur V. Watkins, and the Honorable Representatives Walter K. Granger and Reva Beck Bosone:

"The American Veterans' Committee, Inc. (AVC), is a veterans' organization, but with a difference—we believe in the principle citizens first, veterans second. Furthermore, our primary aim, as stated in our organizational constitution, is to preserve

the Constitution of the United States * * * and to maintain full production and full employment in our country under a system of free enterprise in which labor, agriculture, and Government cooperate.

"We are opposed to bonuses and hand-outs by the Government to veterans as a special-interest group. We are in favor of legislation which will serve the specialized needs of the veterans.

"The veterans' pension legislation proposed by Representative RANKIN is special-interest legislation antithetical to President Truman's administrative policy, which received the mandate of the majority electorate of this Nation. Therefore, this veterans' pension legislation, objected to equally heartily by voters opposing the administration, is deemed dangerous legislation to the best interests of the United States.

"We, therefore, respectfully urge that you do everything in your collective power to influence Congress to defeat H. R. 1693.

"Respectfully yours,
"AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE,
"*Salt Lake City.*"

PROTEST AGAINST MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY—RESOLUTION FROM COURT HOUSE ROCK IRRIGATION CO., BRIDGEPORT, NEBR.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Court House Rock Irrigation Co., of Bridgeport, Nebr., protesting against the enactment of legislation relating to the Missouri Valley Authority.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas this meeting was duly called to order by the president, Ole Christensen, February 8, 1949; and

Whereas the matter of proposed national legislation similar to S. 555 introduced and defeated in 1945, came up for discussion; and

Whereas this body has previously gone on record as opposing S. 555 which would create and establish a Missouri Valley Authority and that a similar bill has been or will shortly be introduced in Congress; and

Whereas the proposed legislation was discussed at length by the stockholders and water users of this company, all of whom expressed their opposition to such legislation for the reasons that any such legislation would be undemocratic, unnecessary, and would work a severe hardship upon the farmers in the North Platte Valley and for the further reason that this body is satisfied with the present form of Government control in this section of the State; and

Whereas it was unanimously decided that this body is opposed to any Federal legislation that might conflict with the present status of the farmers and businessmen of this section and with the present States' rights: Therefore be it

Resolved unanimously, That the Court House Rock Irrigation Co., go on record as definitely opposed to the proposed Missouri Valley Authority bill or any other bill similar thereto by whatever name it may be known; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this meeting and that copies be sent to Senators, Congressmen, and all other interested parties.

Signed at Bridgeport, Nebr., this 10th day of March 1949.

OLE B. CHRISTENSEN,
President.
ORRIS V. COXMAN,
Secretary.

DRAINAGE ON CHIPPEWA RIVER AND SHAKOPEE CREEK—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF BENSON, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Benson, Minn., relative to a drainage problem on the Chippewa River and Shakopee Creek.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution asking Federal aid for flood-control project

Whereas the rate of flow of the Chippewa River is much slower through the city of Benson and for a distance of 8 miles southerly than it is northeasterly of said city and southerly of the entrance of Shakopee Creek into said river south of city of Benson; and

Whereas this slow rate of flow causes annual flood conditions in part of city of Benson during several months of the year, stopping the operation of the city sewage treatment plant and causing an abnormally high water table in residential areas; and

Whereas the dredging of sand bars formed during the drought years in parts of the river southerly of the city of Benson and straightening of course of river would tend to alleviate said flood conditions; and

Whereas the clogged-up condition of Shakopee Creek not only causes yearly flood conditions in a large farming area and makes much of this farm land worthless for crops, but also the present outlet of Shakopee Creek into the Chippewa River is designed in such a way that it tends to slow up the rate of the river's flow above said outlet and is a factor in creating flood conditions in the city of Benson; and

Whereas the cleaning out of Shakopee Creek would alleviate flood conditions over a large farm area, while a change in the Shakopee Creek outlet into the Chippewa River would tend to alleviate flood conditions in the city of Benson: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Benson, Minn., That the city of Benson petitions the Congress of the United States to authorize and direct the Engineering Corps of the United States Army to make a preliminary study of the feasibility of dredging the Chippewa River in the Benson area and of cleaning out Shakopee Creek and changing its outlet into the Chippewa River; and be it further

Resolved, That the city of Benson petitions United States Senators HUBERT HUMPHREY and and EDWARD THYE and Seventh District Congressman H. CARL ANDERSEN to take appropriate action in Congress to obtain such authorization and that copies of this resolution be forwarded to said Members of Congress.

Approved February 3, 1949.

LLOYD A. HUGHES,
Mayor.

FEDERAL COMPULSORY HEALTH INSURANCE—RESOLUTION OF DANE COUNTY (WIS.) DENTAL SOCIETY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution which I have received from Dane County Dental Society, representing the dentists of the capital area of my State.

This resolution presents a strong case against Senate bill 5, which would establish a system of Federal compulsory health insurance. I fully endorse, of course, the sentiments expressed in this resolution, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point and thereafter appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Dane County Dental Society is assembled at a regular meeting of its members this 10th day of March 1949; and

Whereas the membership of this society has been informed of the purpose and intent of proposed legislation pending before the Congress of the United States which adversely affects the public health and is thus of direct interest to the profession of dentistry, namely, bill No. S. 5, of the Eighty-first Congress, first session; and

Whereas this society desires that its duly elected Representatives in the Congress be advised as to the conclusions reached by this society upon the merits of bill No. S. 5, so as to enable them to cast a more informed vote thereon: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Dane County Dental Society hereby memorializes United States Senators ALEXANDER WILEY and JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, and Hon. GLENN DAVIS, Member of Congress, that it is unanimously and unalterably opposed to bill S. 5, and urges them to vote against said bill and to use their best efforts to persuade their fellow Senators and Representatives to do likewise, for the following reasons:

1. Neither this bill nor any other similar Federal legislation is necessary or helpful in providing better health care for the people of Wisconsin.

2. This bill is a wholly unjustified attempt to substitute the judgment of Federal bureaucrats for the judgment of the people of Wisconsin as to the nature and extent of health care needed and the conditions under which it shall be rendered.

3. The bill is obviously designed to appear to promise something it cannot deliver, and something the Federal Government cannot deliver, namely, the elevation of health standards.

4. The enormous expense required to administer the provisions of such a bill can be met only by increased taxes upon the citizens of this and other States at a time when the burden of State and Federal taxes is already oppressive.

5. The underlying philosophy of the bill is an abrogation of States' rights and an extreme form of socialism which strikes a death blow to the liberty and independence of the American citizen in the conduct of some of his most personal interests and judgments.

ADEQUATE HOSPITALIZATION FOR VETERANS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk communications which I have received from American Legion posts in my State on behalf of adequate hospitalization of our Nation's veterans and continued addition of new hospital facilities for them. The needs of our disabled veterans must, of course, and will, receive the continued attention of a Nation which was saved by the sacrifices of these men and this whole question of veterans' hospitals deserves, therefore, the earnest and careful attention of the Congress. For that reason, I ask unanimous consent for printing these communications in the body of the RECORD, and that they be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the communications were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CECIL TORMEY POST, No. 118,
AMERICAN LEGION,
Thorp, Wis., February 10, 1949.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

HONORED SIR: Members of Cecil Tormey Post, No. 118, The American Legion—300 strong—urge you to use your influence and vote, if necessary to rescind Executive order canceling all new construction of veterans' hospitals in the United States. Our Post membership feels that the veterans who bore the brunt of World War II should be given every facility for their care and comfort.

Respectfully yours,
NEWELL E. QUALLE,
Adjutant.

DOWNTOWN POST, No. 412,
THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Milwaukee, Wis., February 25, 1949.

Hon. ALEXANDER M. WILEY.

DEAR SIR: At the February meeting of the Downtown Post, No. 412, of the American Legion it was resolved to protest against the closing of the many veteran hospitals as requested by the Hoover Commission.

That's why it was resolved to send letters to our representatives in the Senate urging them to give the veterans all the help they can to keep the hospitals open.

Hoping to hear from you soon, I remain,
Yours truly,
RUDOLPH STEINER,
Post Adjutant.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 40. A bill for the relief of William D. Norris; with an amendment (Rept. No. 121);

S. 41. A bill for the relief of the city of Reno, Nev.; without amendment (Rept. No. 113);

S. 165. A bill for the relief of William P. Thomas; without amendment (Rept. No. 114);

S. 191. A bill for the relief of Louis J. Waline; with an amendment (Rept. No. 122);

S. 749. A bill for the relief of Ferd H. Gibler; without amendment (Rept. No. 115);

S. 850. A bill conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Vaso B. Benderach; without amendment (Rept. No. 116);

S. 937. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to effect the payment of certain claims against the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 117);

S. 981. A bill for the relief of John Clark Sharman; without amendment (Rept. No. 118);

H. R. 1870. A bill for the relief of Doris Marie Richard; without amendment (Rept. No. 120); and

S. J. Res. 12. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week in which June 6, 1949, occurs as Patrick Henry Week in commemoration of the sesquicentennial anniversary of the death of Patrick Henry; without amendment (Rept. No. 119).

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 900. A bill to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 125).

REGULATION OF TRADE PRACTICES IN INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (REPT. NO. 112)

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, submitted, pursuant to Senate Resolution 241, Eightieth Congress, second session, to investigate the impact upon consumers and business of recent Federal court decisions relative to the regulation of trade practices in interstate and foreign commerce, a report, which was ordered to be printed.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent to report an original concurrent resolution, relating to the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, and I submit a report (No. 123) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received, and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 21) was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each person hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

A-2185102, Acquavella, Antonio.
A-4011166, Aiello, Vincent.
A-4011184, Aiello, Lucia.
A-4453010, Aloia, Salvatore.
A-7740785, d'Amonville, Emanuel Marie Joseph Jean Francois.
A-7740786, d'Amonville, Christian.
A-4544994, Amoruso, Grazia (nee Grazia Pasqua di Bisceglie).
A-3722899, Anderson, Asta Emily Regine, or Asta Emilie Andresen (nee Ruud), or Asta Olafsen or Asta Andresson.
A-1648169, Assuncao, Manuel Joao.
A-5357948, Atha, Miles Milton.
A-6664996, Baquera, Ernesto, or Ernesto Vacquera or Ernesto Baquera Lozano.
A-6669933, Becerra-Gonzales, Jesus Ceriaco.
A-6727087, Becerra-Luna, Maria de la Paz.
A-6264273, Bileca, Fanica (nee Shunda).
A-6670872 Castaneda, Maria Dolores.
A-6670871, Castaneda, Maria del Socorro.
A-2574948, Castellanos, Eduardo, or Eduardo Lara-Castellanos aka Eduardo Lopez.
A-4815632, Cutaia, Antonio, or Tony Romano or Signor Cortez.
A-5142007, Dahl, Albert Guy.
A-4681069, De Oliveira, Manuel.
A-9767908, Didyk, Eugeniusz, or Eugene Didyk.
A-2032071, Dimitrakis, Georgias, or Georgias Dimitrios Dimitrakis or George D. Dimitrakis.
A-6317358, Dix, Joan Nicolae (alias Ioan Nicolae Dix).
A-3120753, Donakis, Angelo, or Evangelos Helidonakis.
A-4295490, Effrof, Edla Johanna Karjuner, or Edith Kari (nee Edla Johanna Karjunen) or Edla Johanna Virtanen or Virta or Stream.
A-7575699, Embiricos, Leonidas Nicholas.
A-7750757, Engvik, Hans.
A-4929077, Erdmann, Ernest August (alias Ernst Erdmann).
A-1330623, Fraser, Walter Frederick (alias Walter Fraser, alias Walter Frazar).
A-3176332, Fuchs, Fannie, or Fay (nee Kalichman).
A-1840024, Garza, Santiago.
A-3634312, Gerardes, James A., or Demetrios Antoniou Gerardea.
A-4795400, Glick, Simon Isaac (alias Simon Gleek or Simon John Gleek).
A-4457866, Goldman, Annie.
A-6758100, Gonzalez, Juanita.
A-6758101, Gonzalez, Tomas.
A-6758102, Gonzalez, Rosaura.
A-5679140, Guerrero, Gloria Maria (nee Jimines y Jansen).
A-5969421, Gurcke, Werner.
A-2181722, Hall, Henry Ellis.
A-4535822, Heffron, Pearl (nee Pearl Sheppard, alias Pearl Loftus, alias Pearl Venn).
A-5655944, Hiltunen, Muisto Olavi (alias Muisto Olavi Vihko).
A-3220432, Hoke, Abdul, or Abdul Hoque.
A-6171122, Imperato, Annunziata (nee Brunelli).
A-4365425, Isaac, Adolphus, or Sam Dolly.
A-5568523, Johnk, William Hans, or Willi Johnk.
A-6375521, Kelsey, Alison Mary, formerly Beaton.
A-1505330, Kinnersley, Edward; Edward Kinley.
A-5927617, Kitchens, Eileen Patricia Camacho, or Ryder or Rider.
A-9797134, Kourkoumelis, Gerasimos Andreas.
A-4745297, Kozigian, Shenorig (nee Hagopian Shenorig Baboian, alias Stran Kozigian).
A-3578205, Kramer, Heinrich Emil, or Henry Kramer.
A-3482730, Kwan, Shih Tsun (alias Kwan Shih Tsum or Steve Kwan).
A-5719776, Levinoff, Libby, or Libby Lee (nee Libby Feinbrook).
A-5719573, Levinoff, Elliott Ross (alias Elliott Ross Lee).
A-4197995, Madianitti, Guiseppe (alias Joseph Madianitti).
A-2366729, Mahler, Julius Arthur.
A-5686325, Marek, Karel Antonio, or Charles Antonio Marek or Karel Marek or Karel Demarchi.
A-1901066, Martinez, John Antonio, Juan Martinez; José Antonio Martinez.
55995/667, McKellar, Nettie Banks.
A-2582942, Mendoza, Juan.
A-2713177, Miah, Babu.
A-5483484, Minatos, Magda, or Magda (Magdalena) Bodnar (alias Katzarzyna Hirman).
A-3716761, Muehl, George Paul, or George Muhl.
A-4792616, Muzumdar, Natverlal Thakordas.
A-1648893, Myrovitch, Dina (nee Schwartz), or Dina Myers or Clubotarin.
A-1473785, Myrovitch, Sol, or Myrowitch or Myers.
A-3993212, O'Connor, Margaret Blanch, or Margaret Miller (nee Thomas).
A-4297753, O'Neill, Ruby Florence (nee Rollins).
A-6261585, Papademetriou, Vasiliki (nee Lykomatis).
A-6245752, Papageorge, Alexandra, or Alexandra Valasiou Evlogimenou.
A-2443286, Pare, Lorenzo Joseph, or Lorenzo Joseph Perry.
A-2704508, Pasternak, Sophie, or Sophie Gorzelany or Catherine Gorzelany.
A-3171910, Pateelas, Jacovos Pantelis, or Jacob Pateelas or Jacob Loizos.
A-5542627, Pavlinik, Milan, or John Pauer (alias Pavlinic).
A-9632212, Pelcic, Nikola.
A-5513435, Pereira, Jose Dias, or José or Joe Dias.
A-6684136, Peroulas, Demetrious Ioannou (alias Demetrious John Peroulas).
A-4284336, Petrolo, Francesco, or Frank.
A-4661066, Pisani, Clemente Salvatore (alias Salvatore Pisani or Salvatore Clemente Pisani).
A-4903760, Poulsen, Poul Borge (alias Paul Poulsen).

A-6343693, Procopis, Vasiliki (nee Vasilike Dountas).
A-4363045, Quintana, Benito, or Benito Quintana Seara.
A-6180043, Quintana, Enrique.
A-6180042, Quintana, Belia.
A-9512159, Rahaman, Abdul.
A-5868960, Rizzardi, Giovanni Lugi, or John Louis Rizzardi.
A-6505643, Roberts, Patrick Francis William, or Mickey Roberts.
A-9610837, Rocco, Alvaro.
A-6459201, Rosa, Jorge Antonio de la.
A-6610928, Salina, Isabel Maud (nee Isabel Maud Greenough).
A-4949886, Sanseverino, Guiseppe, or Joseph Sanseverino.
A-4428632, Scheinbaum, Abraham Louis, or Abe English.
A-5105914, Schjenken, Helen, or Nellie Rogers.
A-3761910, Schwartz, Edith Mary, or Edith Mary Warry (nee Teams).
A-5653442, Scognamiglio, Ciro.
A-4627147, Scott, Walter Clarence.
A-4002534, Semaria, Charles, or Simaria (alias Sabatai Semaria, alias Januarez Bennito or Juan Suarez).
A-5261007, Shever, Hanna Weston, or Anna Weston.
A-3335679, Shu, Enid Alicia.
A-6409906, Siewierski, Michael, or Michael Sedeski.
A-6437559, Siewierski, Vera, or Vera Sedeski.
A-6437558, Siewierski, Anne Justine aka Sedeski.
A-6437557, Siewierski, Angeline Mary Siewierski aka Sedeski.
A-4567423, Simms, Arthur Primrose.
A-3639654, Sugal, Penina Rita (nee Penina Rita Cohen).
A-6532969, Sullivan, Wendy Kay.
A-4368501, Tamm, Salme Alice.
A-4078861, Tsangaris, Anthony or Antonios.
A-2713770, Tschudi, Barbara, or Tschudy (nee Treumpy) or Babette Tschudi.
A-5132276, Tursich, Erminio (alias Herman Yursich).
A-2159905, Ulluh, Tomiz (alias Wasil Ali).
A-2734013, Vagianos, Angelos Michael.
A-6690302, Valenzuela, Aurelio, or Aurelio Valensuella.
A-6690304, Valenzuela, Tiburcio Benjamin, or Benjamin Valenzuela or Benjamin Valensuella or Benjamin Valesuella.
A-6690303, Valenzuela, Jesus, or Jesus Valensuella.
A-6409902, Vanderweerd, John.
A-6231341, Wajntal, Mojzesz (alias Mark Wein).
A-7522626, Wing, Laura Mei-Lan Yee.
A-7632267, Wong, Lin You, or Lin Yao Huang.
A-6446635, Wong, Helen (alias Quong Tung (Tong) Marr or Mah or Helen Marr or Mar).
A-1379566, Zamudio-Lemos, Hilario.
A-6229400, Zamudio-Soto, Ramon.
A-5397099, Zeid, Fanny.
A-5816226, Zeid, Max, formerly Zagdenwar.
A-7501012, Zetting, Mary Theresa, or Robertson, Robinson, Smith.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent to report an original concurrent resolution, relating to the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, and I submit a report (No. 124) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received, and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 22) was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each person hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

A-9771331, Aase, Aksel.
A-1669228, Arlinc, Mary Jean Hartley, or Jean Hartley.
A-1219242, Athansiu, George John, or Georgios Athanasiu or Athanasiou.
A-4354961, Attard, Emmanuele.
A-3320683, Barreiros, Manuel Lopes, or Manuel Lopes.
A-9858310, Blackstone, Harry Hyman.
A-2914281, Blohme, Christian.
A-5439241, Bruck, Charlotte (nee Grosz).
A-4522939, Buras, Kyriaki, or Kyreaki or Kyreai Buras or Moskos or Prokopios (nee Panagaki).
A-9545512, Canoura, José Davila.
A-3998473, Carreon, Juan.
A-6619105, Carrillo, Ramiro, or Ramiro Carrillo Ceniceros.
A-3767452, Astorga, Maria Del Refugio.
A-4609943, Cavanna, Santo.
A-6261650, Cortis, Maria (nee Papapangiotou), or Maria Athansiou Papapangiotou.
A-5916075, Donaghy, Patrick.
A-4439870, Collins, Alice Mildred Eileen (nee Copping).
A-6690300, Farkas, Stephen.
A-6690301, Farkas, Edith (nee Edith Tamasay-Czepan).
A-2970388, Franceschi, Sergio Constantino.
A-7655442, Geerts, Arjen Johan.
A-2801732, Granberg, Oscar Herbert.
A-4121781, Gregorio, Giovanni.
A-4163261, Guha-Thakurta, Leeabati, or Leela Rodman or Ranu Devi.
A-6214495, Gunn, Maria Lok.
A-5796741, Hall, Ida Ruth (nee Dorfman).
A-9706110, Hansen, Bjarne.
A-6261538, Jianakas, Marika (nee Papakostantinu aka Marika Giannakos) (nee Mary Johnson).
A-4226353, Johnson, Albert Nathan.
A-5780662, Jones, Edgar Robert.
A-3469233, Kaminski Stanley George (alias Stanislaus Wladislaw Kaminski).
A-3269191, Lausch, Eduard.
A-6249442, Lekas, Alexandra or Alexandra Lekkas (nee Bargi).
A-6425302, Lopez-Garcia, Alfredo.
A-6192536, Majia, Evangelina.
A-6054209, Maletis, Mary, or Mary Maletiou or Maria Pantelis or Maria S. Cholakedes.
A-5172340, Marmorato, Pasquale or Patsy.
A-6475719, Mary, Dorothy (nee Taylor Simpson).
A-5506972, McClave, Mary Agnes (nee Spence).
A-9632483, Miettinen, Kaarlo Vilho.
A-6246458, Nazaretian, Felice.
A-6070328, Newgord, Esther (nee Goldstein), alias Esther Haimovitch alias Esther Katz.
A-5414622, Nimeth, Margaret (nee Margaret Barta), alias Margaret Semon.
A-9740975, Olsen, Arnold Emmanuel (alias Arnold E. Olsen).
A-4552326, Parsons, Robert Joseph, or Robert Parsons.
A-4264159, Perivolaris Nicollaos, or Lignos or Nick Peris or Pares or Nick John Peres.
A-3334747, Philpin, Bridget, or Bessie or Bridget Gallagher.
A-2970069, Pina, Francisco, or Joao Andrade.
A-6285765, Plevritis, Constantine Elias.
A-6040048, Provo, Rose Marie, or Mary Margaret French or Margaret Franche.
A-1670564, Reifenkugel, Helene, or Helene Bergstraesser.
A-2493860, Roberts, Irene, or Irene Gluck.
A-1446003, Rodrigues, Joaquim, or Joaquim Rodriguez.
A-3183742, Rousku, Terho Otto.
A-4873047, San, Wong Siu, or Mrs. Mary Wong, or Wong Shee or Mrs. Chong (Cheung) or Wah Chuen.
A-2087806, Scialpi, Luigi, or Louis Scalpi.
A-9513664, Sobkowiak, Jan.
A-6645635, Spitzer, Blima (nee Hers).
A-5368957, Tabah, Jacob (alias Charles Belmonte).
A-4875571, Tabah, Esther or Belmonte (nee Mitrani).
A-4677697, Hecht, Dora or Donna (nee Tabah), or Belmonte.
A-9561362, Tellefsen, Harold Stefanus.
A-5406230, Thomopoulos, Demetrios or James, or James Moskos or James Thomas.
A-6151164, Tracy, Maria Pacita.
A-2755717, Tranoris, Eleftheri Constantinos.
A-6345270, Tushinis, Maria.
A-6659024, Vafias, Apostolos.
A-6057885, Vincencio-Abogado, Antonio, or Antonio Abogado Vicencio.
A-9568998, Vlachos, Theodore, or Theodore J. Blahos or Theodoros Vlachos.
A-4587936, Weiss, Hilda Edith (nee Billing).
A-5064038, Wheeler, Estefania (nee Bondad).
A-6360238, Whittle, Robert Albert (formerly Anderson).
A-6174003, Wojciech, Thaddeus.
A-6174056, Kowalski, Stanley Hubert.
A-7782660, Woodman, Flora Eileen Kathrine (nee McDonald).
A-4928605, Zarate, Jacoba Petronella (nee Fruin).

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

James Boyd, of Colorado, to be Director of the Bureau of Mines, terminating recess appointment, vice Royd R. Sayers.

By Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Alexander M. Campbell, of Indiana, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

By Mr. FERGUSON, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Edward T. Kane, of Michigan, to the United States attorney for the eastern district of Michigan, vice Thomas P. Thornton, elevated.

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

J. Frank McLaughlin, of Hawaii, to be United States district judge for the District of Hawaii;

Edward A. Towse, of Hawaii, to be second judge of the first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii, vice Albert M. Cristy, elevated;

William R. Hart, of Iowa, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Iowa, vice Maurice F. Donegan, term expired;

George F. Garrity, of Massachusetts, to be United States attorney for the district of Massachusetts, vice William T. McCarthy, elevated;

John F. X. McGohey, of New York, to be United States attorney for the southern district of New York;

John C. Pickett, of Wyoming, to be United States attorney for the district of Wyoming, vice Carl L. Sackett, retired; and

Virgil B. Stanley, of Oklahoma, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Oklahoma, vice John P. Logan, retired.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Edward R. Dudley, of New York, now Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Liberia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Liberia;

James Grover McDonald, of New York, whose recess appointment as special representative to the Provisional Government of Israel is pending confirmation by the Senate, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Israel;

Philip D. Reed, of New York, and Erwin D. Canham, of Massachusetts, to be members of the United States Advisory Commission on Information for terms of 3 years expiring January 27, 1952, and until their successors have been appointed and qualified; and

Mark Foster Ethridge, of Kentucky, and several other persons to be members of the United States Advisory Commission on Information.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CONNALLY (by request):

S. 1250. A bill to amend the Institute of Inter-American Affairs Act, approved August 5, 1947; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CAIN:

S. 1251. A bill authorizing flood-control works on the Uakima River and tributaries; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 1252. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider certain claims arising out of the Tariff Act of 1922; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 1253. A bill to provide benefits for the widows of certain persons who were retired or are eligible for retirement under section 6 of the act entitled "An act to authorize aids to navigation and for other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1918, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. KERR, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. LANGER):

S. 1254. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act to provide for rural telephones, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER:

S. 1255. A bill for the relief of Kostas Kallinikos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. THYE):

S. 1256. A bill providing tax incentive for the creation of additional farm storage facilities; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

S. 1257. A bill granting the consent of Congress to an interstate compact entered into by the States of Kansas and Colorado relating to the waters of the Arkansas River; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. SCHOEPPEL):

S. 1258. A bill authorizing the appointment of an additional judge for the district of Kansas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1259. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Lucillo Grassi;

S. 1260. A bill for the relief of Stefanos Stefanou;

S. 1261. A bill for the relief of Marie Louise Ardans; and

S. 1262. A bill for the relief of Juliana Mendiola Alastra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1263. A bill to authorize Federal aid for the construction of additional school facilities to school districts overburdened with school enrollments brought about by Government construction and defense programs; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1264. A bill to provide for the retirement of any holder of the Medal of Honor with the rank, pay, and allowances of a captain in the Army or Marine Corps, or of a lieutenant (senior grade) in the Navy or Coast Guard, and to provide for the award of adequate pensions to the widow and minor children of any such holder; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1265. A bill granting an increase of pension to Robert Blake; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1266. A bill for the relief of Hayward O. Brandon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1267. A bill to promote the national defense by authorizing a unitary plan for construction of transonic and supersonic wind-tunnel facilities and the establishment of an Air Engineering Development Center;

S. 1268. A bill to facilitate the acquisition of strategic and critical materials for stockpiling purposes;

S. 1269. A bill to convert the National Military Establishment into an executive department of the Government, to be known as the Department of Defense; to provide the Secretary of Defense with appropriate responsibility and authority, and with civilian and military assistance adequate to fulfill his enlarged responsibility; and for other purposes; and

S. 1270. A bill to repeal that part of section 3 of the act of June 24, 1926 (44 Stat. 767), as amended, and that part of section 13a of the act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 166), as amended, relating to the percentage, in time of peace, of enlisted personnel employed in aviation tactical units of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 1271. A bill for the relief of Dr. J. M. Dell, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1272. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia; and

S. 1273. A bill to amend the act of August 7, 1946, so as to authorize the making of grants for hospital facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1274. A bill to amend section 3944 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code relating to salaries of collectors of internal revenue; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. ECTON):

S. 1275. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McMAHON (by request):

S. 1276. A bill for the relief of Marta Faugno; and

S. 1277. A bill for the relief of Athanasios Elias Cheliotis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1278. A bill to fix the United States share of project costs, under the Federal Airport Act, involved in installation of high intensity lighting on CAA designated instrument landing runways;

S. 1279. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act so as to provide that minimum rates of wages need be specified only in contracts in excess of $2,000;

S. 1280. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act so as to lir it to 10 percent any increase of the amount stated as a maximum obligation under a grant agreement;

S. 1281. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act so as to make the United States share of costs for land acquisition the same as for other project costs;

S. 1282. A bill to authorize grants under the Federal Airport Act for minor projects at major airports;

S. 1283. A bill to authorize the use of State allotted funds for Federal airport projects in national parks, monuments, etc.;

S. 1284. A bill to amend section 6 of the Federal Airport Act; and

S. 1285. A bill to authorize progressive partial payments to contractors under the Federal airport program; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1286. A bill for the relief of Leung Yon Zee, Chin Bing Sing and Chin Bing Kwong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. J. Res. 61. Joint resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating Memorial Day, 1949, as a day for a Nation-wide prayer for peace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. WILEY (for himself and Mr. McGRATH) introduced Senate Joint Resolution 62, authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim June 20 of each year as Emblem Day, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ECTON:

S. J. Res. 63. Joint resolution providing for refunds in certain counties with respect to 1947 wheat crop insurance premiums; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. CAPEHART (for himself and Mr. JENNER):

S. J. Res. 64. Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the Grand Army of the Republic; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

EMBLEM DAY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH] I reintroduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim June 20 of each year as Emblem Day, and I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution together with a statement prepared by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and the joint resolution, together with the statement presented by the Senator from Wisconsin, will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 62) authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim June 20 of each year as Emblem Day, introduced by Mr. WILEY (for himself and Mr. McGRATH), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the bald eagle, commonly known as the American eagle, was on the 20th day of June 1782 selected by the Continental Congress as the official emblem of the United States of America; and

Whereas the bald eagle thus became the symbolic representation of a new nation

under a new government in a new world, imprinted on the great seal of the new republic, carried in brass effigy above the colors, and appearing on the President's flag; and

Whereas the American bald eagle, by the act of that Congress and by tradition and custom during the life of this Nation, has come to be recognized as a symbol of the American ideals of freedom; Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the 20th day of June of each year as Emblem Day, calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings on such day, and inviting the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies in commemoration of the American eagle, the official emblem of the United States, and of the great principles and ideals which it represents and symbolizes, and to renew and rededicate their faith in such principles and ideals.

The statement presented by Mr. WILEY was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

INTRODUCTION OF EMBLEM DAY BILL

I am reintroducing today on behalf of myself and Senator MCGRATH a Senate joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim June 20 of each year as Emblem Day. This date commemorates the memorable occasion on June 20, 1782, when the Continental Congress selected the American bald eagle as the official emblem of the United States of America.

Last year I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 195 for this same purpose. At that time, my good friend and able colleague, the Honorable FRANK KEEFE, of Wisconsin, also introduced an identical bill, and he has done so again this year. Already Congressman KEEFE has secured a hearing before a House Judiciary Subcommittee on this important resolution. At that time the subcommittee heard testimony from Judge Albert H. Schmidt, of Manitowoc, Wis. Judge Schmidt, who is in Washington today, has served as national chairman of the national emblem committee of the Grand Aerie of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, and he has ably pioneered toward the passage of the legislation which we are urging for consecration of Emblem Day. We, of Wisconsin, are proud of this legislation. We are proud of the Fraternal Order of Eagles which celebrated last year its fiftieth birthday, and which is the only organization in the world bearing the name "Eagles" and whose cardinal principles are symbolized by the eagle.

The eagle has always symbolized vision, strength, courage, and all of the other fundamental virtues of this great American people.

We feel that this resolution can help make an important contribution to patriotic understanding, particularly in our Nation's youth. It will help reconsecrate youngsters and adults to American ideals. It will help antidote all of the synthetic alien doctrines which are imported from abroad and which would destroy our American institutions.

The legislation calls for no appropriation. It does not call for a national holiday. All that it does is to authorize the President to proclaim Emblem Day each year.

The Fraternal Order of Eagles stands foursquare behind this resolution. We stand in turn for recognition of the American bald eagle and for an appropriate tribute to this great fraternal organization whose contribution to American communities and to the American Nation are so well known as not to require any further elaboration.

It is my hope that action on Congressman KEEFE's resolution and upon my resolution will proceed promptly and favorably, and I know that it will serve to benefit all of the things which we hold so dear.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS CORPORATION ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. MCCARRAN submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 54) to provide for the incorporation, regulation, merger, consolidation, and dissolution of certain business corporations in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE—AMENDMENT

Mr. DONNELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the substitute proposed by Mr. WHERRY (for himself and others) for Senate Resolution 15, amending the so-called cloture rule of the Senate, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 580. An act for the relief of the Bank of Kodiak, Kodiak, Alaska;

H. R. 583. An act for the relief of the Alaska Juneau Gold Mining Co., of Juneau, Alaska;

H. R. 585. An act for the relief of Jacob A. Johnson;

H. R. 593. An act for the relief of Hampton Institute;

H. R. 594. An act for the relief of Mamie L. Hurley;

H. R. 599. An act for the relief of Victor R. Browning & Co., Inc.;

H. R. 602. An act for the relief of Fritz Busche;

H. R. 607. An act for the relief of Harvey M. Lifset, formerly a major in the Army of the United States;

H. R. 609. An act for the relief of the estate of Mathew C. Cowley, deceased, and the estate of Louisa Cowley, deceased;

H. R. 610. An act for the relief of Lorenzo H. Froman;

H. R. 611. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of certain property owners adjacent to Fort Knox, Ky.;

H. R. 637. An act for the relief of Mrs. Harriett Patterson Rogers;

H. R. 650. An act for the relief of George A. Kirchberger;

H. R. 668. An act for the relief of Alex Ball;

H. R. 679. An act to authorize the admission of Mrs. Julia Balint to the United States;

H. R. 681. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of George Generazzo;

H. R. 682. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Elliott Hewitt;

H. R. 683. An act for the relief of Louise Peters Lewis;

H. R. 709. An act for the relief of the General Engineering & Dry Dock Corp.;

H. R. 731. An act for the relief of James Flynn;

H. R. 735. An act for the relief of Phil H. Hubbard;

H. R. 1010. An act for the relief of Mrs. May K. Y. Mok, Frederick W. S. Mok, and Vincent W. C. Mok;

H. R. 1101. An act for the relief of Anna Malone and Rita Anderson;

H. R. 1116. An act for the relief of Mexican Fibre & Twine Co., Inc.;

H. R. 1137. An act for the relief of J. W. Greenwood, Jr.;

H. R. 1276. An act for the relief of the heirs of Ida Londinsky;

H. R. 1591. An act for the relief of Bran B. Tellekamp;

H. R. 1700. An act for the relief of Ezra Butler Eddy, Jr., and wife, Marie Claire Lord Eddy;

H. R. 1791. An act for the relief of Raleigh B. Diamond;

H. R. 1794. An act for the relief of Cohen, Goldman & Co., Inc.;

H. R. 1876. An act for the relief of Ralph Martin Elzingre, also known as Ralph Senwell;

H. R. 1993. An act for the relief of Samuel Fadem;

H. R. 2231. An act for the relief of Marie E. Wright;

H. R. 2233. An act for the relief of Ewa Plantation Co., a Hawaiian corporation;

H. R. 2463. An act for the relief of Mrs. Florence Byvank;

H. R. 2704. An act for the relief of Freda Wahler;

H. R. 2922. An act for the relief of the State Compensation Insurance Fund of California;

H. R. 3077. An act for the relief of Mrs. Rebecca Levy;

H. R. 3234. An act for the relief of Jesse A. Lott; and

H. R. 3254. An act for the relief of Iva Gavin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1731. An act to extend certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 2812. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain land at South Naknek to the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of North America; and

H. R. 2853. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue duplicates of William Gerard's script certificates No. 2, subdivisions 11 and 12, to Blanche H. Weedon and Amos L. Harris, as trustees; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS—PROCLAMATION BY GOVERNOR BOWLES OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a proclamation signed by the Governor of the State of Connecticut, the Hon. Chester Bowles, announcing the vote of the electorate of Connecticut on a resolution to strengthen the United Nations Charter.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION BY HIS EXCELLENCY, CHESTER BOWLES, GOVERNOR OF CONNECTICUT

Whereas the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut, duly convened in special session at Hartford in August 1948, did enact the following act which was duly approved by the Governor on August 26, 1948:

"An act concerning question concerning Charter of United Nations. Section 1871 of the 1947 supplement to the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof: The following question shall be voted upon at the general election to be held on November 2, 1948, and the designation thereof hereinbelow provided may be placed on the same ballot or voting machine as the names of the candidates to be voted for at such general election: 'Do you, as a sovereign citizen of Connecticut and the United States of America, direct our representatives in the National Congress to urge the President and the Congress to take the lead in calling for amendments to the United Nations Charter strengthening the United Nations into a limited world federal government capable of enacting, interpreting, and enforcing laws to prevent war?" The designation of said question which shall be used on ballots and voting machine ballot labels shall be 'Question re Recommendation providing for strengthening of United Nations to prevent war, Yes' and 'Question re

Recommendation providing for strengthening of United Nations to prevent war, No,' and in voting-machine towns, shall be provided for use in accordance with the provisions of section 722 of the general statutes; and in towns which do not use voting machines, the vote shall be taken in the manner provided by section 106f of the 1941 supplement to the general statutes. Said question shall be voted upon in accordance with the applicable provisions of law concerning voting upon the acceptance of amendments to the constitution of this State," and

Whereas a copy of said question was, in pursuance of said act, transmitted by the secretary of the State to the town clerk in each town in the State, and said question was presented to the inhabitants thereof for their consideration, at a town meeting in each town, legally warned and held for that purpose on the second day in November 1948; and

Whereas pursuant to said act, the secretary, the treasurer, and the comptroller, as the board of canvassers, did, as provided by law, duly canvass said votes and did then transmit to the Governor their certificate under their hand in the words and figures following, to wit:

"To His Excellency JAMES C. SHANNON, Governor:

"We, the undersigned, having been designated by law to canvass the votes cast in favor of, and against the proposed World government referendum by the electors of this State at town meetings warned and held for the purpose of submitting said referendum to said electors, as specified by law, do hereby certify that we have duly canvassed said votes which were received from all the towns in this State as by law provided.

"The whole number of votes received and counted relative to said proposed world government referendum was 155,757, of which number 141,625 were in favor of the adoption of said referendum and 14,132 were against the adoption of said referendum.

"FRANCES BURKE REDICK,
"Secretary.

"JOSEPH A. ADORNO,
"Treasurer.

"FRED R. ZELLER,
"Comptroller."

And whereas it appears from said certificate that a majority of said votes are in favor of directing our Representatives in the National Congress to urge the President and the Congress to take the lead in calling for amendments to the United Nations Charter strengthening the United Nations into a limited world federal government capable of enacting, interpreting, and enforcing laws to prevent war,

I do, therefore, herein so declare; and I do herein declare that a majority of the electors present at the town meetings aforesaid have indicated their intention that our Representatives in the National Congress urge the President and the Congress to take the lead in calling for amendments to the United Nations Charter strengthening the United Nations into a limited world federal government capable of enacting, interpreting, and enforcing laws to prevent war.

In testimony whereof, I have caused the seal of the State to be hereunto affixed and have hereunto set my hand at Hartford on this 24th day of February in the year of our Lord, one thousand nine hundred and forty-nine, and of the independence of the United States the one hundred and seventy-fourth.

CHESTER BOWLES,
Governor.

By his excellency's command:

[SEAL] WINIFRED MCDONALD,
Secretary of the State.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MARTIN ON THE VICE PRESIDENT'S RULING

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement of my reasons for voting against the ruling of the Vice President that Senate rule XXII is broad enough to provide for cloture on a motion to take up a resolution or measure.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Vice President BARKLEY's ruling that Senate rule XXII is broad enough to provide for cloture on a motion to take up a resolution or measure reverses the ruling made by Senator VANDENBERG as President pro tempore of the Senate during the Eightieth Congress.

This, then, presents a question which comes before the Senate for determination—shall the ruling of Vice President BARKLEY be sustained by the Members of the Senate or shall the ruling of Senator VANDENBERG be sustained?

I shall vote to sustain the ruling of Senator VANDENBERG.

For years I have supported the doctrine of government by laws and not by men. I have opposed the philosophy of government which would warp and twist the Constitution and the laws of our land in order to gain temporary or transient advantage.

The rule as it is now written applies only to pending measures and not to motions to take up a proposed measure for consideration by the Senate. The wording of the rule is clear on its face. Senator VANDENBERG's ruling was in accordance with the present language of the rule.

If the Senate rule XXII is to be left to the interpretation of each succeeding presiding officer, we would then be contributing to a government by men and not a government by law. In coming to this conclusion, I want to make it entirely plain that I am not opposed to the right of the Senate to amend its rules so as to invoke cloture whenever it is necessary for the proper conduct of the Senate's business. I firmly believe that debate on any measure or motion or any other matter before the United States Senate should come to an end after a reasonable period.

I shall support and vote to amend the existing rule XXII so that it shall state clearly and specifically the matters to which it applies.

When confronted with this situation in the second session of the Eightieth Congress, Senator VANDENBERG felt so strongly about the ruling he was about to make that he said:

"The President pro tempore of the Senate does not have the authority, the power, or the means to do so except as he arbitrarily takes the law into his own hands. This he declines to do in violation of his oath. If he did so, he would feel that what might be deemed temporary advantage by some, could become a precedent which ultimately in subsequent practice would rightly be condemned by all."

I concur fully in that statement and in the argument presented on the floor of the Senate by Senator VANDENBERG today.

NOMINATION OF DR. JAMES BOYD TO BE DIRECTOR OF BUREAU OF MINES

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I have prepared as to the reasons why I shall vote for confirmation of the nomination of Dr. James Boyd to be Director of the Federal Bureau of Mines.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have decided to vote to confirm Dr. James Boyd as head of the Federal Bureau of Mines.

Up to a few days ago there were some doubts in my mind. But these were resolved when John L. Lewis sought to intimidate the Senate of the United States and to coerce it into rejecting Dr. Boyd's nomination.

The doubts that I had in mind were due to questions that have been raised about Dr. Boyd's lack of practical experience in coal mines. Pennsylvania is the Nation's only producer of anthracite and its second largest producer of bituminous coal.

But I shall never be browbeaten or influenced by such methods as John L. Lewis has resorted to. He seeks to set a precedent which is an invitation to pure anarchy.

Under this vicious Lewis formula, if large corporations should dislike the amount of taxes imposed by Congress, they could simply shut their gates and turn thousands out of employment. Why not? Lewis has done it to express an opinion to Congress.

Under this vicious formula, if the boys flying the Berlin airlift were given a new commander and did not like him, they could simply go on strike and refuse to fly. Lewis has done something very similar.

Under this vicious formula, also, any union which did not like any kind of legislation passed by—or even considered by—the Congress, would simply walk out of its shops across the Nation and paralyze industry.

In this latest demonstration of his lust to rule or ruin, John L. Lewis has ordered 437,000 men away from their jobs. He is causing a production loss of 20,000,000 tons of coal. He is costing these miners $68,000,000 in lost wages, and another $4,000,000 lost to the welfare fund.

On top of that, he has severely cut the freight tonnage of eastern railroads, forcing them to lay off approximately 62,000 men. These railroad men, as well as the miners, are completely innocent victims of John L. Lewis' attempt to run the United States Senate. Yet they must lose millions in wages.

And all for what?

Because John L. Lewis does not want Dr. James Boyd to head the Federal Bureau of Mines.

The Federal Bureau of Mines has many tasks besides mine safety work. Indeed, all of its activities in connection with coal—safety and otherwise—involve only 15 percent of its effort and budget. It has no enforcement authority in connection with mine safety. Merely the power to disseminate information on violations of the safety code, which it finds. As a matter of fact, under its contracts, John L. Lewis' United Mine Workers has full authority to shut down any mine the union, itself, believes unsafe.

The remaining 85 percent of the budget and effort of the Bureau of Mines is devoted to other things—development of synthetic fuels, work in connection with petroleum, iron ore, copper, bauxite, all largely of an experimental nature; production of helium gas, and even some experimental work with uranium ores.

All of this, Lewis wants to control by dictating who shall head the Bureau.

He has done his miners and the entire American labor movement a great disservice. He has struck a foul blow against his country. But he will not win this fight.

THE REPUBLICAN DEFEAT—AN OPPORTUNITY—ADDRESS BY O. K. ARMSTRONG

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an address delivered before the Missouri Republican Editorial Association in Springfield, Mo., on February 11, 1949, by O. K. Armstrong, a talented Missouri journalist, on the subject The Republican Defeat—An Opportunity.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Senator DONNELL, ladies and gentlemen, at this celebration of the birthday of the Great Emancipator, Abraham Lincoln, it is well that we Republicans in Missouri, as well as throughout the Nation, take stock and face squarely the reasons for our startling defeat of November 2, 1948.

Two reasons are immediately apparent: First, there was unprecedented prosperity, for which the party in power reaped the political benefit. Second, there was a lack of a constructive, fighting national campaign on our part.

This is no time for recrimination. Certainly the responsibility for our loss of Missouri in the recent election cannot be laid to lack of effort on the part of our national committeeman Howard V. Stephens, or our national committeewoman, Mrs. Estelle Tanner; nor to the State Republican chairman, William F. Phares, and his excellent campaign staff. And certainly you Republican editors, under leadership of your president, Frank H. Hollman, did your part, loyally and tirelessly, in carrying the banner of Republicanism before and during the campaign. So we are here tonight not to blame but to face the facts of our defeat. Thus we can more wisely plan for the future.

We Republicans believe in the two-party system. Under that system, our Nation has maintained political stability, with a proper voice for both the majority and the minority. We Republicans got licked in the recent election. We are now the minority. But we still have a duty to perform. We still have the huge responsibility of speaking for nearly 22,000,000 voters out of the 48,363,000 total who went to the polls to select a President of the United States for the next 4 years. Our party also must speak for some unnumbered millions who were not sufficiently aroused by anything said or done in the campaign to come out and vote at all, yet who traditionally are Republicans.

The election of 1948 was an upset. Had it been held early in September instead of November, it would have gone heavily against Mr. Truman and his party, over the Nation and in most of our States. But every day that went by during the active campaign lost votes for the Republican standard bearers.

Prosperity was the major factor. The President and his advisers, knowing very well that a business recession would spell their certain defeat, were able to insure that there would be no recession by having the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress pass the aid-to-Europe measure virtually as he asked for it. Regardless of its undeniable value in helping to stem the tide of communism, the aid-to-Europe program was, and is a spending device, increasing the scarcity of already scarce articles and commodities of all kinds, and thus holding up their price.

The great irony of the situation is that after inducing the Republicans in a spirit of bipartisan cooperation to carry through his inflationary program, President Truman then took to the country and denounced the Congress as the worst in history. He blamed its Members for the high prices, and in the absence of sufficient refutation of this slander, he beat them over the head with the very weapon he had asked them to fashion.

Experiencing the best markets and business activity in many years, citizens generally were inclined to give the administration credit for them. This was particularly true of the farmers. It was the farmers who said, "We are prosperous now. We are getting our parity checks. We feel sure that Truman will continue them. We don't know what the Republican candidate will do. We'll vote for Truman."

All during September and October they were making up their minds. In fact, they were changing their minds, for most farmers would have put national interest before the overriding consideration early in the campaign. As the campaign progressed they silently decided differently.

Let me give you some illustrations. I spoke over most of rural Missouri during the campaign. I covered 45 of the 114 counties of Missouri, in all sections of the State. By mid-October large numbers of the farmers and their families began staying away from the Republican rallies. County chairmen and their leaders were perplexed at this, but not alarmed. They felt that the farmers were too busy to come to meetings. It is a fact that not many of them went to Democratic meetings, either. They simply stayed away from politics. Many have since admitted that they were ashamed to say they were going to vote for Truman, particularly those that had voted Republican in previous years. So they just kept silent—and by November 2 the tide had risen high for the man they considered responsible for their prosperity.

Let me give you another example. Down in southeast Missouri during the campaign the cotton growers were harvesting one of the biggest and richest crops in history. The cotton stalks were so high you could barely see the heads of the pickers. I stopped at a cotton gin with our candidate for Congress, and we watched the long line of trucks bringing in the cotton to be ginned. The Republican candidate said to me, "It will be hard for these fellows to vote against prosperity."

After the election a rural banker, once a Democrat but now an ardent opponent of New Deal socialism, said, "I should not have been surprised at the result of the election when I reflect how many Federal checks I cash every day."

So long as seeming prosperity is maintained by Government grants for whatever purposes this feeling will be hard to overcome. But true prosperity depends upon production and distribution of goods and not distribution of income. What will happen if events bring disillusionment to those who voted in such numbers for President Truman and his party? We shall wait and see.

Now for the second major reason for our defeat: Nationally we Republicans failed to make a constructive, fighting campaign. The most outstanding and tragic mistake our party ever made was to continue the "me, too" policies begun several campaigns ago.

It should be apparent by this time that unless our party presents some clear-cut, constructive alternatives to what the people now have, we will continue to get licked. And unless we do present them, and then fight for them with all our hearts and souls, we deserve to get licked.

Specifically our national candidates did not rise to any vigorous and spirited defense of the record of the Eightieth Congress, which was Republican controlled, and which had written its record. I do not say that all its record was good. I can offer one criticism here and now: Our party leaders in the Eightieth Congress, with a majority in both Houses, made a mistake in not opening up to public view the ghastly mistakes of the administrations since 1933. To cite a specific example, our Missouri Senator JAMES P. KEM offered a resolution which would have authorized a sweeping investigation of the attempted revival of the notorious Pendergast political machine of Kansas City and Jackson County. Attorney General Tom Clark, speaking, of course, for a dues-paying member of that political organization, President Truman, used his full influence to prevent that investigation. Senator KEM had Clark over a barrel—and squirming. But the Republican-controlled Congress did not pass his resolution.

Nevertheless the Eightieth Congress wrote a record of achievement. And it is a simple fact that this record was not given sufficient defense in the campaign. The Eightieth Congress passed adequate legislation for veterans. But not much was said about that. It had passed numerous measures for the increased welfare of farmers and their families. But no one told the world about it. The Eightieth Congress had made an attempt to bring about justice for employers, employees, and the public with a fair labor law. This achievement was given the barest mention, although the big majority of all American citizens, including laboring men, had gone on record as favoring its major provisions.

We Republicans fell into the mortal error of assuming that because sentiment seemed overwhelmingly against the inept and bungling administration of Harry Truman it would stay that way. We assumed the smug and complacent attitude that the election was in the bag. We should have been presenting our side of the case, and to do so we should have defended all that was good in the record of the Eightieth Congress with all the power we possessed.

The Republican Party has a tremendous opportunity for public service in the present and future. To take advantage of it we must do three things:

First, we must champion the cause of American cooperative enterprise, against the erosion of our freedoms by an ever-increasing, bloated Federal bureaucracy. We hear much talk of the free-enterprise system, but there is no such thing. No enterprise is free to follow the old methods of laissez faire. All enterprise is controlled for the public good, through taxes and regulations. The American system is one of cooperation, whereby capital, management, labor, and the public's interest are all taken into account, and where all work together to produce more and more goods.

The big job of the Republican Party is to maintain our fight for American cooperative enterprise, free of needless political restrictions but controlled for the public good. We should stand against further encroachments on the rights and liberties of the people by a centralized government that seeks more and more power. We should rise and fight the continued expansion of a bureaucracy that has more than doubled its jobholders and tripled the burden of cost since 1939.

We should begin anew and with determination the protection of that greatest single group of Americans, the taxpayers, against the steady drift toward bonuses, pensions, and hand-outs for special groups. We should insist that the money now thrown down the rat holes of waste and politics be saved for the schools, roads and highways, genuine public welfare, and the building of good citizenship.

Our party should work to bring order into the vast machinery of Government on all its levels in the United States. The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branches, headed by former President Herbert Hoover, has made an excellent start with such a program. Surely the party which Mr. Hoover once led will want to swing its enthusiastic support back of the sane, sensible suggestions for reorganizing the executive agencies of the Federal Government along lines of greater efficiency and economy. We should advocate a streamlining of all the administrative offices, the employment of only such personnel as are actually needed in the public service, and the spending of less money in the civilian activities at Washington.

Second, we should raise the banner of a consistent, strong, American foreign policy, in contrast to the improvised, makeshift, inadequate foreign policy of this administration.

The biggest single political mistake ever made by our Government, since the Republic began, was the appeasement of Soviet communism, during the fighting of the recent war and since the end of hostilities. Agreements made by the President at Teheran, at Yalta, at Moscow, and at Potsdam, literally turned over one-fourth of the globe to Soviet domination. These agreements, made in secret, pulled our fighting men out of central Europe and eastern Germany and lost us the fruits of the victory our boys had won at such great cost.

Be it said to our eternal shame that those agreements allowed "good old Joe Stalin," Molotov and company, who were Adolf Hitler's partners in the crime of starting the great war, to take control of the little Baltic countries, have a free hand in the Balkans, in Poland, in Czechoslovakia; and more recently, to overrun China, to control Manchuria, dominate most of Korea, and threaten to take Japan right out of our hands. If ever an administration dismally failed, if ever it was vulnerable in foreign affairs, it was this administration.

Were these disastrous policies denounced during the recent campaign? No, we were admonished that we had to go along with a bipartisan foreign policy.

What we Republicans need to learn is that no policy is right just because it is bipartisan. We need to begin to map policies that are right, for us and for our peace-loving neighbors, and stand on them regardless of the blundering of the administration.

Specifically, for the immediate future, our party needs to announce that once again it is to be the champion of freedom. We once announced freedom in this country. Now we should announce it to the world. The keystone of our foreign policy should be the freedoms of the Atlantic Charter, which we permitted the administration to throw into the wastebasket because Soviet Russia did not like our freedoms.

We should call for reexamination of all the treaties that have been written, with Italy and the satellite countries of Russia, and demand that they be tightened to protect peoples from totalitarian tyranny. We denounce the Soviet-controlled government of Hungary for its infamous persecution of a cardinal of the church; we ought also to lay bare the fact that we invited the Communists to come and play a dominant role in the new government of Hungary, in the peace treaty we signed with that country.

If we took the kind of firm stand that Theodore Roosevelt would be taking against further Soviet aggression, if that great American were with us, we wouldn't have to spend so many billions of our taxpayers' money in the aid-to-Europe plan.

We should move boldly to demand reform of the United Nations Charter, so that free and peace-loving peoples will not be continually harassed and frightened by Soviet tyranny.

Third, to continue as a vital force in American life, and to be ready for national leadership again, the Republican Party must grow. Backed by policies that meet the demands of the modern age, our party should go out resolutely for new members to fill its ranks. Those ranks have been depleted by successive defections of large groups of citizens who formerly alined themselves with the party of Abraham Lincoln, William McKinley, and Theodore Roosevelt. No effort should be made to recruit voters whose only allegiance is to selfish and class interests. The new recruits of the Republican Party can be won by showing how the true interests of any citizens, any economic, social, or racial group, are the interests of all. If the Republican Party is to win back the confidence and support of a comfortable majority of the citizens of all groups, it must champion the cause of better living—not by a system of statism but working by and through our free economy.

Clearly, farmers and their families had not been assured that their interests would be sufficiently considered in event of Republican victory last November. Yet farmers and their dependents constitute the very backbone of our national structure. Our party should champion the policy that never again should agriculture be permitted to be shortchanged in our American economy. This is important, not only because it is fair to farmers, but it is also a safeguard against depressions in our economic system. Specifically, we should advocate that floors be maintained to safeguard the income of the family-sized farm, and to stimulate production. Coupled with this, there must be a continuous soil-conservation program and research in new uses for agricultural products, new varieties of seed, adequate reclamation and water conservation.

Veterans and their families constitute one of the major groups in our Nation. To date, most appeals made for their political support have smacked of bribery. "Vote for us and we'll give you something!" Self-respecting veterans do not like that. They are still as patriotic, as willing to sacrifice for the public good, as when they wore the uniform of their country. Let the Republican Party offer to veterans a chance to participate, by labor and planning, to break the housing log-jam, and to solve all the other major problems that harass the country. Let our Government offer to veterans an expanded program of self-help, rather than of cash hand-outs and doles. Let that program include greater opportunities for specialized education in trades, businesses, and professions.

Can organized labor be won to the Republican Party? I do not profess to know, but I am sure that our party should embrace a policy that is fair and just and maintains a balance between individually managed capital and free organized labor. We should build upon the concept that the overwhelming majority of the working men and women of America are loyal and faithful to their country as are any other citizens. Standing for a policy of protection of both management and organized labor, as well as the public, our next move should be to sponsor a sound, workable policy of greater participation by labor in the profits of industrial production.

Finally, the Republican Party must appeal to the youth of our Nation. From the new voters—the nearly 4,000,000 who become eligible to take part in public affairs every 2 years—must come its members of the future.

But young people are becoming less and less moved by ancient glory or outworn mottoes. They may respect the accomplishments of past statesmen but they will not vote for present leaders merely because they belong to the past statesmen's political party. American young people are increasingly independent of party labels and party control. This presents an opportunity for the Republican Party to win their support by proving to them that it is abreast of the times, that it is alive to the present and laying its plans for the future.

A whole new generation has come to maturity in the last 17 years, during which time the Republican Party has been out of power nationally. The impression has been carefully cultivated by our opponents that it is the party of youth. A glance at the vital statistics of its leaders in the executive and congressional branches of the Government should dispel that myth. A survey of the stagnation into which many of its major policies have fallen indicates how eagerly young people will welcome the fresh air of needed political change if that change means an opportunity to participate in forward-looking programs for a prosperous, vigorous, and peaceful America.

The Republican defeat of 1948 will prove a blessing—if it awakens us to our great opportunity.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which subcommittee consists of only three members, dealing with veterans' hospitals, be permitted to meet while the Senate is in session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission is granted.

ADDRESSES ON THE OCCASION OF THE CONFERRAL OF THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF HUMANITIES ON THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES BY ROLLINS COLLEGE

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the addresses delivered by the President of the United States, Gov. Warren Fuller, of Florida, and Dr. Hamilton Holt, president of Rollins College, at the convocation at Rollins College, Winter Park, Fla., on March 8, 1949, which appear in the Appendix.]

MINNESOTA—THE SAGA OF THE NORTH STAR STATE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Minnesota—The Saga of the North Star State," delivered by him on the occasion of the ceremonies at the Library of Congress opening the exhibition celebrating the establishment of the Territory of Minnesota, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHAT ATOMIC ENERGY MAY MEAN TO INDUSTRY—ADDRESS BY WALKER L. CISLER

[Mr. VANDENBERG asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "What Atomic Energy May Mean to Industry," delivered by Walker L. Cisler, executive vice president of the Detroit Edison Co., at the Harvard Business School Club of New York, at New York City on February 21, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

PEACE THROUGH AIR POWER—ARTICLE BY MAJ. ALEXANDER P. DE SEVERSKY

[Mr. NEELY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Peace Through Air Power," written by Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky and published in the Reader's Digest for February 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR GREATEST DANGER: FINANCIAL ROCKS AHEAD—EDITORIAL FROM DETROIT FREE PRESS

[Mr. FERGUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our Greatest Danger: Financial Rocks Ahead," published in the Detroit Free Press of February 23, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

TROUBLE AHEAD—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. DONNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled, "Trouble Ahead," dealing with the suspension of coal mining east of the Mississippi, from the Washington Post of March 14, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

RICE W. MEANS—EDITORIAL FROM VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS MAGAZINE

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Rice W. Means," published in a recent issue of the Veterans of Foreign Wars magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHAT CONSTITUTES "SECURITY"?—EDITORIAL FROM THE EPHRAIM (UTAH) ENTERPRISE

[Mr. WATKINS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "What Constitutes 'Security'?" from the Ephraim (Utah) Enterprise of March 4, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEDICATION OF MISSISSIPPI RURAL CENTER

[Mr. STENNIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Mississippi Rural Center Formally Dedicated," published in the Columbia (Miss.) Sunday Mirror, which appears in the Appendix.]

FARM LEGISLATION—EDITORIAL FROM OMAHA DAILY JOURNAL-STOCKMAN

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Difficult To Get Action," published in the Omaha Daily Journal-Stockman of March 10, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN ADMINISTRATION IN GERMANY—EDITORIAL FROM ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Shame on America," published in the recent issue of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONFIRMATION OF ROUTINE NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, that numerous routine promotions in the armed services, now on the calendar and unanimously reported from the committee, with no objections against any, be immediately confirmed, and that the President be notified forthwith.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, as I understand, these are routine promotions in the various branches of the Military Establishment, and the Senator from Maryland is making this request to save printing. I understand that there is no objection in the committee to any of the nominations, and that they were unanimously reported. I am sure that the minority member of the committee, if he were present, would agree to that statement.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland in regard to the routine nominations in the Military Establishment? The Chair hears none.

Without objection, the nominations are confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR THOMAS P. GORE

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me for about 2 minutes to announce the passing of a distinguished citizen of my State, and a former outstanding Member of this body?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I yield for that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, does the request require another unanimous-consent agreement?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It does.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma be permitted to make a statement without prejudicing the rights of the Senator from Arizona, who now has the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Oklahoma may proceed.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I regret to announce the passing of former Senator Thomas Pryor Gore.

His death occurred at about 10 o'clock this morning at his home here in Washington.

He was born in Mississippi. Had he lived to December 10th of this year, he would have been 79 years of age.

Senator Gore, as he has been designated and known for almost half a century, was one of the marvels of modern times.

At the early age of 8 years he lost his left eye by being accidentally struck with a stick by a playmate, and at the age of 11 he lost his right eye by an arrow from a cross bow.

With such a handicap—the complete loss of sight—he sought and secured an outstanding education.

He was graduated from the normal school at Walthall, Miss., with the degree of B. L. in 1890; and was graduated from Cumberland University in 1892, and was honored by that university with the degree of LL. D. in 1921.

He studied law, and was admitted to the bar in 1892.

Senator Gore taught school, practiced law, and became active in politics at an early age.

Thomas Pryor Gore secured his first title as Senator by being elected to the Oklahoma Territorial Senate in 1903.

Upon the admission of Oklahoma and Indian Territory to statehood in 1907, he, along with Robert I. Owen, became one of the new State's first United States Senators.

Senator Gore served in this body from 1907 to 1921, and from 1931 to 1937.

He was a delegate-at-large to the Democratic National Conventions in 1912, 1928, and 1936.

Senator Gore was an orator of unusual ability, and was in great demand as a political speaker, as well as a Chautauqua and lyceum lecturer.

Senator Gore devoted a large share of his vast talents to the assistance of those afflicted like himself with the loss of sight.

In this era of keen competition for places of preferment in the political, legal, and business world, Senator Gore was not content to take less than top rank among his peers.

He was a success as a lawyer; he attained his goal in public life; and he prospered in business.

Out of the remnants of some 50 tribes of Indians, together with cowboys, cattlemen, and pioneers from every State in the Union, Senator Gore helped plan, develop, and convert the Territory of Oklahoma and the Indian Territory into the now great and prosperous State of Oklahoma.

Today, two and a half million loyal Oklahomans, without regard to politics, race, or creed, are saddened at the passing of this remarkable man.

For over 40 years Senator Gore, as an able Senator and an outstanding citizen, was a familiar figure upon this Senate floor.

The United States Senate may not see his like again.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, in 1904, Thomas Pryor Gore cast his lot with the people and the area which is now Oklahoma. His was the spirit of the pioneer and the builder. His was the broad vision that looked ahead to the time when the two territories would unite and become a living, moving part of a mighty nation.

He helped create the new State of Oklahoma. He helped steer it along the high road of progress and success. For nearly a half century he gave generously of his time and his means, and of himself, in making a glorious reality of his own dreams and of those of his people.

Today he has laid his burdens down. Throughout all the tomorrows he will sleep in the soil he loved, as his memory will live in the hearts of the people he served.

AMENDMENT TO CLOTURE RULE

The Senate resumed the consideration of Senate Resolution 15, amending the so-called cloture rule of the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement with respect to the amendment in the nature of a substitute for Senate Resolution 15, which now is pending before the Senate.

The substitute is a compromise; and it must be a good compromise, because I have yet to find any Senator who entirely agrees with it.

It has one supreme virtue which overcomes all its deficiencies, in that for the first time in over 140 years, it will be possible, by the adoption of this substitute, to bring debate to a close on any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate.

The substitute does not satisfy me. I favored a two-thirds majority of the Senators present and voting. Senators with whom I talked who favored what is called a constitutional majority—that is, two-thirds of all the Senators—will testify that I argued with them that there was so little difference between the two that they should yield and should allow the normal two-thirds majority to apply.

I argued with those who were in favor of the so-called constitutional majority that the records of the votes taken on the 19 previous cloture petitions which have been acted upon by the Senate show between 84 and 85 Senators present, on an average; and at the same time the records show that there were between 6 and 7 Senators paired at the time, which together made approximately 90 Senators. Of course, two-thirds of 90 is 60. This proposal requires 64. In short, the maximum difference between the two would be four Senators. I tried to persuade the Senators with whom I talked that there was not enough actual difference to quarrel about, and that they should accept a two-thirds majority of those present and voting. But they would not do so.

Now, we come to the present situation. I doubt whether at any time in the future there will be less than 90 Senators present in the Chamber whenever a cloture petition comes before this body for decision. I say that because of the existence of instantaneous communication of intelligence and the ease with which Senators can reach the Senate Chamber. When I first came to Washington, I traveled 4 nights on a sleeping car to get here. If I had been a Senator at that time and had received telegraphic notice that a cloture petition had been filed, it would not have been possible for me to have reached here in time to vote on such a petition. But today, because of the airplane, it is just an overnight journey from here to Phoenix, Ariz. One can leave Seattle, Wash.; or Portland, Maine; or Miami, Fla.; and be in Washington in a day. One can come to Washington from Paris, France, or Honolulu, T. H., in 2 days. So it is certain that from now on there will be a greater attendance of Senators on such occasions than ever before. The greater the number of Senators present, the less will be the margin between the number of Senators constituting an ordinary two-thirds majority and the number of Senators required to constitute a two-thirds majority of the total membership of the Senate. That is the actual situation as I see it.

The text of the substitute was written 2 days ago. It was prepared by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and myself. However, I wish to explain to the Senate why I would not press this substitute or have it given any consideration so long as there was any possibility of arriving at an agreement—with the result that this text was kept entirely in the background. Even on yesterday, when Senators began to secure signatures to this proposal, I insisted that I would have nothing to do with it so long as there was any possibility of arriving at an agreement; and no word of the circulation of this so-called round robin, or gentlemen's agreement, was given to anyone engaged in any kind of a conference until the conferences were entirely over.

When each and every meeting of groups of Senators was over and when there was no other possibility of coming to a conclusion, then the substitute proposal was proceeded with. We now have before us the text as prepared by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and myself; and that is what we have agreed to support. There are one or two clerical errors in it, but of course they will be corrected.

Some Senators have worried about Senate Resolution 15, and probably will continue to worry about the substitute, because of the question of whether it will actually plug up all the loopholes in rule XXII.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I received the impression that it was only after the conferences finally adjourned and after we saw that there was no use of having any further conferences, and after the petitions were circulated and the signatures of Senators to them were obtained, that the Senator from Arizona joined in the presentation of this substitute.

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly, because that was the only way out of an impasse.

Mr. WHERRY. And I understand that the Senator from Arizona did so on the theory that unless this course were taken, nothing would be done on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes, because the filibuster was on, and was damning up all other legislation; and this was the only practical thing to do.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, it has already been shown by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], by the newspaper accounts which he has placed in the RECORD, that a similar procedure was adopted in 1917 as the only possible course to follow at that time. There was a round robin, or covenant, at that time, signed by Senators pledging themselves to get some action, so a cloture rule might be adopted. Since it was found possible for a majority of the Members of the Senate to join in sponsoring the pending amendment, we have assurance now that action will be taken. As to the rule itself——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is talking about plugging loopholes. I think we are all interested in that. Let me ask the Senator, has he conferred with the Parliamentarian about plugging loopholes with respect to a filibuster on the Journal, on the motions to take up, and so forth? That situation is also involved.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have, and I propose now to discuss that matter. The original rule that gave us all the trouble provided that if at any time a motion, signed by 16 Senators, "to bring to a close debate upon any measure"—

Let us stop there. Two years ago, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], having in mind the origin of these words, went to the Parliamentarian and asked him what language should be used in order to make it certain that cloture could be applied on any and all occasions. Two years ago the Senator from Massachusetts introduced a resolution containing the words I am now reading, that is to say, "close debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate." I believe it was at the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] that the words were subsequently added, "or the unfinished business." That is the substance of the resolution which was referred to the Committee on Rules 2 years ago. That is the resolution which was reported to the Senate. A duplicate of that resolution was the one reported to the Senate at this session.

The question with respect to the Journal particularly disturbed Senators. What ordinarily happens is that following an adjournment the majority leader moves to approve the Journal. Apparently there is nothing in the rules that requires that to be done, but from time immemorial it has been done, so the Parliamentarian says. As far back as any of us know, it has always been done. So a motion by the majority leader to approve the Journal is the first motion made, and he is the first to be recognized by the Chair for that purpose. If a Senator should want to amend or correct the Journal, a motion to that effect would follow, and if on the motion to approve the Journal a cloture petition, which would carry with it all amendments, could be filed, that would be one way of meeting the situation with respect to the Journal.

The other way, and the most practical way, to get around any trouble with the Journal is that if it is the desire of the Senate or of the majority leader to take up a measure at any time, and that is done, the Senate does not adjourn, but merely recesses; for following a recess there is no morning business, and no requirement that the Journal be approved.

We stand today in the legislative day of Monday, February 21. Why? Because if the Senate had adjourned, we would have had trouble with approving the Journal. The Senate has not adjourned, and therefore we are still in the legislative day of February 21. Any able parliamentarian, any able majority leader, would not make the mistake of adjourning. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] has not made the mistake of adjourning. The former majority leader, the Senator from Maine, Mr. White, never made the mistake of adjourning. Neither would the minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. No majority leader worth his salt would get himself in a position, if he desired that the Senate proceed to the consideration of a measure, of allowing the Journal to be a factor in it.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield for a question.

Mr. PEPPER. Do I correctly understand the Senator to say that if a motion to correct the Journal should be made and should be subjected to such debate as to cause 16 Senators to feel that cloture might be applied, under the substitute rule, supposing it to be adopted, the cloture petition could apply to the whole matter of the correction of the Journal, and would not have to be applied to each separate motion to correct the Journal which might be successively made?

Mr. HAYDEN. The parliamentary situation would always be this: The majority leader would have previously moved to approve the Journal as a whole. Then if an amendment to correct or amend the Journal should follow, the amendment and the motion to approve the Journal as a whole would all be in one package and would be disposed of by one cloture petition. That is the mechanics of it.

Mr. PEPPER. So it is the clear intent of the substitute resolution to make one cloture petition applicable to the whole subject of the correction and approval of the Journal; is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly; it is not the intention of the substitute rule to require a multiplicity of cloture petitions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Arizona yield to permit the Chair to ask a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I shall be glad to answer the Chair's question to the best of my ability, or, if I cannot do so, to call upon able Senators to answer it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair announced the other day, and the Senator from Arizona has stated now, there is nothing in the rule that requires approval of the Journal. The rule is that the Journal shall be read for corrections and amendments. It is unnecessary to make a motion to approve the Journal, in order that the motion to amend it or to correct it may be made.

Mr. HAYDEN. But the Chair will agree with me that such a motion has been made from time immemorial.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has been. It is customary to do that. But suppose the majority leader, or any other Senator, moves to approve the Journal, instead of moving to correct it and amend it, and the point of order should be made that the rule does not require or authorize the motion to approve the Journal. The Chair should hold under the rule that that is true. Then a cloture petition to the motion would fall. It would lie, the Chair assumes, under the substitute to the motion to amend or to correct. But if the original motion the Senator is speaking of, to approve the Journal, would be held not to lie, then what would the situation be?

Mr. HAYDEN. A cloture petition could not be filed on a motion that is not authorized.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Could it be filed on a motion to amend or correct the Journal?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I shall ask the Senator from Nebraska, an able parliamentarian, to answer the question.

Mr. WHERRY. No. The cloture petition would lie, not only on the motion, but on any amendment thereto, or to all the amendments. Debate on them all could be closed by one cloture petition. The approval of the Journal comes up on a motion. If there were any question about the motion we could go on to the next word, "matter," if it is necessary to make the interpretation.

So, when it comes up as a motion—and the Parliamentarian has advised us it always has been done by motion, and that is the tradition, at least, under the rule we have—if the motion were not amended, of course, there would be no need for a cloture petition. But if a correction is proposed, or two corrections, or half a dozen corrections, and there are amendments to the original motion, one cloture petition as I understand the rule—and I should like to have it interpreted, that is the way I interpret it, and that is what I think we are doing—would apply, so the whole thing could be gotten out of the way by one cloture petition on the motion, or one amendment, or any succeeding amendments to correct the Journal.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is true, because of the phrase, "or other matter pending before the Senate." The matter pending before the Senate is the approval of the Journal and the amendments thereto, cleaning up that particular piece of business.

Mr. LUCAS, Mr. FLANDERS, and Mr. SALTONSTALL addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield? If so, to whom?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois, for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. A moment ago, the Senator said he did not desire to see a multiplicity of cloture petitions filed. Does the Senator contemplate there will be a multiplicity?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. I am trying to say that the rule does not contemplate anything of the kind, that everything can be tied up in one package, in order to get rid of whatever the matter is that is pending before the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield for a further question.

Mr. LUCAS. We come into the Senate each morning and unanimous consent is asked to have the Journal approved. The Chair holds that is unnecessary, but through custom and immemorial usage, it has become necessary, in my opinion, So if objection is made to the request, then as I understand, the Journal will be read. Is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. Any Senator can require that the entire Journal be read.

Mr. LUCAS. And the Journal is approved the following day, after the measure is passed. In reality, until the Journal is approved, the measure is still before the Senate. My query is, assuming that a Senator rises at that time and demands that the Journal be read, what can be done? Further assuming that a Senator moves to amend the Journal at that point, to strike out the word "and" and to insert in lieu thereof the word "but", that is debatable, is it not?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is.

Mr. LUCAS. And a cloture petition would have to be filed on that?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator just referred to a measure. It would apply to any measure, still pending from the day before, as to which cloture petitions could be filed.

Mr. LUCAS. Assuming that could be done, suppose that a Senator who wants to file a cloture petition for the sole sake of dilatory tactics moves an amendment to the Journal, as suggested a moment ago; that is a debatable question. So we start on the debate, and a cloture petition, as I understand, could not only be filed to the amendment offered to the Journal, but could also be filed to the bill itself. Is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. And that would close it up?

Mr. HAYDEN. It would be in one package.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me ask the Senator this question: Would that end debate on the approval of the Journal?

Mr. HAYDEN. The cloture petition would cut off debate, and the Senate would vote on approving the Journal.

Mr. LUCAS. Assuming another Senator said there was a very critical error in the Journal and he desired to offer a further amendment to it?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Journal having already been approved, a Senator could not offer any further amendment except by unanimous consent.

Mr. LUCAS. I hope the Senator is correct, and I hope that all the loopholes are plugged with respect to that situation. The only reason I asked the questions was because the argument has been made throughout the debate that Senators in 1917 did not know what they were doing when they adopted the cloture rule at that time.

Mr. HAYDEN. We do not want to make that mistake.

Mr. President, I should be pleased to have Senators who are able parliamentarians comment on the subject.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the senior Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, it seems to me that whether a motion is made to approve the Journal or whether the Journal is simply read for correction, the substantive matter is the correction of the Journal as a whole, and upon the most trivial amendment that might be conceived, if cloture is applied, then all amendments which any Senator wishes to offer to the Journal must be filed before the vote on cloture comes. When the vote does come, the same procedure is taken as would be taken with reference to cloture on any other matter, and would foreclose everything that could be construed or held to be in the nature of perfecting the Journal itself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the Chair ask the Senator from Arizona a question, with the desire to be helpful in the matter. A motion to correct or amend the Journal is on the same basis as an amendment offered to a bill. Only one amendment to a bill is in order at any time before another amendment can be offered. The same would apply to the Journal. In other words, if the Senator from Georgia should move to correct the Journal in one respect, that amendment would have to be disposed of before the Senator from Florida could move to correct the Journal in another respect. Does the rule as it is now drawn mean that one cloture motion can encompass amendments which have not and cannot be made to the Journal so long as another amendment is pending?

Mr. GEORGE. Undoubtedly, Mr. President, if I may be permitted to say so, because the rule itself says that all amendments which have not been offered and have not been read, except by unanimous consent, before the vote is taken are cut off, and the substantive matter here, in the case of correcting the Journal, would be as in the case of a bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I think it would be helpful to the Chair to have some comment from the former President pro tempore on this question.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. It seems to me that the logic of the situation is quite clear. An amendment offered to correct the Journal follows a motion that the Journal be approved. If it does not follow it literally or in words, at least it follows it in sequence. The Senator from Michigan would say that the question before the Senate, if an amendment to the Journal were offered, would be the approval of the Journal, and that a cloture applied to the question respecting the approval of the Journal would carry all amendments to the Journal with it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to develop a little further the point made by the Chair a moment ago. Assuming there were half a dozen critical errors in the Journal and a Senator wanted to have the Journal amended by offering one amendment after another, which could be done in the ordinary course, if there were no opposition, how could the Journal be amended if we could not vote on the amendments in some way? If cloture were filed on the Journal, apparently no vote by the Senate would ever be taken on any single one of the amendments.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That was not my concept.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to know. There are half a dozen amendments to the Journal, which are debatable. How are we going to reach a decision on those amendments if they are all thrown in at one time? Here are six different propositions, six different views which six Senators hold upon various amendments to the Journal. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that a cloture petition can shut off the debate on all those controversies with respect to the six highly technical amendments, all being valid, all having merit to them, and no debate could be had upon any of them at all?

Mr. HAYDEN. That would be my opinion.

I should like to hear from the junior Senator from Georgia as to that.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am rather amazed that this kind of a question should be raised, because the rule is very clear as to any matter to which cloture is applicable. It matters not that there may be 85 or 100 amendments, I may say to the Senator from Illinois, pending to a bill when cloture is filed. There is not a cloture petition to each and every one of those amendments. When cloture is filed to a bill, by the express terms of the rule, it applies to all amendments thereto.

I invite attention to the language on page 3 of the amendment, which is identical with the language in the present rule which is found in our parliamentary manual. It says that after cloture has been filed and after Senators have spoken for 1 hour—

> Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time.

If there is cloture applied to the Journal and there are six grievous errors, as suggested by the Senator from Illinois, and there are six amendments offered for the purpose of correcting those errors, and the Senate imposes cloture on the Journal, we take up the first amendment that has been read prior to cloture, and vote on it; we take up the second amendment and vote on it, without debate, and we take up the third amendment and vote on it, and then the fourth amendment, and vote on it. I say, without debate. Under my construction of the rule, if a Senator had not spoken for an hour he could debate it, but his total debate could not exceed 1 hour. It is exactly as it is now, and I do not see how there can be any question about it. Seventy-five or eighty amendments may be proposed to a bill, but it would not be necessary to file 75 or 80 cloture petitions on the amendments in addition to cloture on the bill. When the Senate votes cloture on a bill as a whole, or the Journal as a whole, it has to proceed to vote on all the amendments pending at the time the cloture vote is had, and by the express terms of the rule no amendment can be offered, save by unanimous consent, after cloture is voted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Arizona permit the Chair to ask the Senator from Georgia a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair may have to rule, and desires to have his view of the situation verified. In the matter of bills, when amendments are offered in advance, they are printed and are lying on the table. In the matter of the approval of the Journal, or amendments to the Journal, that is not customary. An amendment may be offered verbally from the floor. Therefore it has not been printed and read in advance by the clerk. Does the Senator feel that, notwithstanding the absence of any printing in advance of an amendment to the Journal, it would take the same status as that occupied by an amendment that had been printed in advance to a bill and was lying on the table?

Mr. RUSSELL. An amendment to a bill does not have to be printed. It can be written out with a pencil or a piece of paper.

The VICE PRESIDENT. But it must have been offered.

Mr. RUSSELL. It must have been offered. The rule specifically requires that no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close—and that means that the amendment cannot even be considered "unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time." That means the time of the vote to bring the debate to a close.

When we read the proposed rule, with all its restrictions, including the reference to "other matter pending before the Senate," it seems to me to be obvious that all amendments are carried along under the cloture, just as in the case of any amendment to a bill. I do not see how there could be any other interpretation.

The Chair states he may have to rule. I wish to associate myself with what the Senator from Arizona has said; it is inconceivable to me that any majority leader would be so inept as ever to allow the Journal to be interposed between a motion to bring up a bill, which motion is made the subject of cloture for the first time under this rule, and the final determination of cloture on it. When the Senate is in recess, it is not necessary to have any action on the Journal; approval is required only after an adjournment. Therefore, so long as the majority leader wished to carry on the business of the Senate, and avoid the delay he would himself invite, I am sure the Vice President would never have an opportunity to rule on the question raised.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. What we are attempting to do is to extend cloture beyond the pending measure to a motion to take up, or to any other matter. If amending the Journal is the subject of a motion, very well. After we get to that hurdle, then we proceed on whatever the question may be, either a motion or a matter, and the procedure would be exactly as is provided in the rule at present. There is no change in the rule as to that.

Mr. RUSSELL. Exactly.

Mr. WHERRY. It is treated in exactly the same way. The only difficulty is that we are becoming confused over the Journal and a motion. What we are attempting to do is to extend cloture to a motion for the first time. When once a question is raised and amendments are offered, they become subject to the same disposition that is made in regard to a pending measure. If there are one or two or three amendments, they receive identical treatment under the rule.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I share the apprehension that is suggested by the Senator from Illinois, and also, I think, by the Senator from Florida. I should like to ask a few questions along this line.

Suppose no motion is made to approve the Journal, but a Senator secures the floor and moves to correct a given mistake in the Journal, the debate upon that proceeds, and then a cloture motion is presented and is disposed of. Then suppose an entirely different Senator rises and says, "I have another distinct point, and I move that there be a change made in the Journal, a correction in this respect, and my matter is entirely different and was not foreclosed by the action on the previous question." Does the Senator think that the language in the proposed amendment to the rules would preclude the second Senator from bringing up his entirely different point, as he contends it to be, of correction of the Journal?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; I do not. As many amendments or points of view in the form of amendments can be offered as may be necessary, but the matter pending before the Senate is the approval of the Journal. If there were extended

debate, there would be only one cloture petition.

Mr. DONNELL. I shall have to ask a series of questions, if the Senator will indulge me.

Suppose, however, that the second Senator to whom I have alluded says, "The motion before the Senate was not to approve the Journal. A motion was made to correct the Journal in item A, to change 'and' to 'but', and that was disposed of, and that was the only matter before the Senate, because there had been made no motion to approve the Journal." Assume the second Senator offers a second amendment and says, "This is a brand new matter"——

Mr. HAYDEN. Assuming the Senator to be correct, we would have also to assume that there was a majority leader present who did not have quick enough wit to move to approve the Journal.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

Mr. DONNELL. Will the Senator yield? May I continue for a moment?

Mr. TAFT. May I suggest, however——

The VICE PRESIDENT. To whom does the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I should like to have the Senator from Ohio answer for me.

Mr. TAFT. The matter before the Senate is the approval of the Journal of January 15, or whatever the date may be. That is the matter before the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the subject matter.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me the cloture motion applies to that matter and takes with it all amendments. Not only the amendment already offered, but any other amendment that is offered, must be offered before the cloture petition is voted on.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield for a further question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator from Georgia pointed out a few minutes ago that it is provided on page 3, in line 8, and following that—

> Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time.

I submit to the Senator this observation. I presume that everyone recognizes that during the interim before the vote to bring the debate to a close, after the presentation of the original motion to amend or correct the Journal, the very rule we are proposing to adopt recognizes that not only one but a thousand amendments could be presented individually, and under the language in lines 8 to 11 of the very amendment before us, every one of them could be properly considered thereafter, because in this provision an exception is made when it says:

> Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time.

Assume I am one of those who present 50 different amendments, we will say, during the interim between the filing of the cloture petition and the time of the vote thereon. As to each of those amendments that is presented, the proposed rule, as I see it, recognizes, by the very use of the word "unless," that each one of them can be considered, and I see nothing that would apply cloture to any one of the amendments, because the rule recognizes that all of them are properly offered if they have been presented between the time of the presentation of the cloture petition and the vote thereon. Does not the Senator agree that that is the result of this language?

Mr. HAYDEN. Not at all.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask the Senator from Missouri if he will read the language immediately preceding that which he read, commencing on line 3. In the paragraph preceding it is indicated that cloture has been voted. Then follows the language:

> Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same—

So that absolutely prohibits any Senator from speaking more than an hour on amendments if they are pending. I might say to my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Missouri respecting the matter of amendments, that getting them in and having them read is a very difficult thing to do. One objection I have always had to the present cloture rule—and I may say that this language was taken verbatim from the present cloture rule XXII—is that Senators who have amendments which are meritorious, not dilatory but meritorious, which will help the measure, ofttimes have difficulty in getting them in because they have to be read. Simply sending an amendment to the desk does not mean that it will be considered. It must have been read to the Senate by the clerk. The language on line 6 is "the amendments thereto." Cloture applies to everything that is on the clerk's desk. Of course, if the Senator wishes to use his 1 hour in debating an amendment he may do so. If he wishes to use his 1 hour in debating the bill itself he may do so. But he has only 1 hour. He has it under the present rule. The substitute does not diminish or add to or change in any wise the rule with respect to amendments. It means all the amendments that have been presented and read prior to the vote to bring the debate to a close. Otherwise the Senate would deny itself the right of amendment. But it does not enable any dilatory procedure whatever, because a Senator's right to debate has ended when he has spoken his hour. The amendment has to be voted on if there is no debate on it.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Georgia for his very illuminating and helpful suggestion. I see his point very clearly, and I am not all sure but that he is correct. I am very glad he has answered the inquiry I made.

I should like to ask the Senator a further question. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has indicated that the matter under discussion, and the matter that is referred to in the proposed amendment, is the approval of the Journal. The case I cited first was a case in which Senator Jones rises and presents simply a motion to correct the Journal before any Senator has presented a motion to approve the Journal. That motion presents obviously the question of the correction of the Journal, it would seem to me. The matter of the approval of the Journal has not yet been presented to the Senate. The only thing presented to it is the motion made by the Senator who seeks to correct it. I therefore fail to see in the contingency I have suggested that the matter that is pending before the Senate would be the matter of the approval of the Journal.

Mr. HAYDEN. The whole matter pending before the Senate is the approval of the Journal.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me that whether we say the approval of the Journal or whether we say the amendment and correction of the Journal of January 15, it is still one matter.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think, therefore, it makes much difference whether the motion to approve the Journal is presented first or whether it is presented later. That would be my view of the situation.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I should like to have the Senator from Georgia make further reply to the Senator from Missouri. I yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to point out to the Senator from Missouri that the question is all cleared up, if he will look at line 4, on page 2, where it is stated:

> 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of rule III.

Rule III is the rule dealing with the correction of the Journal. That very clearly ties it in with the word "matter," in line 4, on page 3, to show that it was contemplated and specifically intended "notwithstanding any provision of rule III," which is the rule requiring the reading of the Journal. It is perfectly clear, if we consider the fact that it specifically repeals anything in rule III when it says "notwithstanding the provisions of rule III," that it means it repeals anything in rule III that would exempt the Journal from cloture.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further inquiry?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. It appears to me that the question is, What does the word "matter" in line 8, of page 2 of the proposed substitute, mean. Let Senators put themselves in this situation. Five years from now a situation may arise similar to that we have here today, and Senator Jones makes a specific motion. A Senator on the other side of the aisle may not agree with the motion at all. He may not think that the Journal should be corrected in that respect at all. He may, however, desire to offer another motion to correct the Journal. If the conclusion of the Senator from

Georgia is correct, the Senator on the other side of the aisle, whom we may call Senator Brown, will be virtually precluded from any substantial debate whatever on his motion. Within the period between the presentation of the cloture petition and the final vote thereon he is, according to the construction Senators now are putting on this proposed change in the rules, virtually precluded from having any adequate consideration of his motion. Might he not very properly rise on the floor and proclaim the right to unlimited debate upon his proposition? He might say the matter that was pending before the Senate day before yesterday was Senator Jones' motion to make a correction changing "and" to "but" in the Journal. He might say, "My motion is much more important and much more difficult and involved, and is an entirely different consideration, and I should not be precluded by the fact that the cloture petition was presented respecting the other motion." May he not very properly say that the real matter which was involved in the preceding motion, in the first one, to correct the Journal, is not his matter at all, and was clearly not the entire subject matter of the approval of the Journal, because "I have here something which is an entirely different proposition, which I wish to present." Would not that be a very valid argument?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I may say to the Senator that in the illustration he has just given Senator Brown would have an exactly equal opportunity with Senator Jones to present his correction of the Journal of the Senate. If Senator Brown debated his motion, and Senator Jones made his motion and discussed it and debated it, and the cloture petition was filed respecting the correction of the Journal, or if the cloture petition was filed at the very instant the motion was made to proceed, both Senator Brown and Senator Jones would have the right to debate. The Senator on the other side would have the same right as the Senator who has debated his amendment. He would have a perfect right to speak to his motion even after cloture is voted. After cloture is voted Senator Jones and Senator Brown have 1 hour to explain their matters, if perchance one of them has not previously had a chance to be recognized. Both have an hour each to discuss their motions to correct the Journal. Both would have exactly the same time, under the cloture rule as it stands now, and as proposed to be amended.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Is it not true, I will ask the Senator from Georgia, in the case I have suggested, that if Senator Jones makes his motion, and Senator Brown will not have a right to have his motion voted on until after Jones has had his acted on, may not Brown properly say that consideration of the Jones' motion has occupied substantially all the time? While he had a theoretical right to rise at the same time, yet physically it is impossible for two persons to be recognized at the same moment, and the Jones motion has precluded Brown from having his considered at all. Is not that a proper and valid argument which Brown can make in support of the position that the matter that was before the Senate was the Jones motion to correct, and not the entire subject matter of the correction of the Journal?

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator from Missouri will consider the hypothetical case he has raised—what is the motion to amend the Journal? It is an amendment of the Journal. Every amendment that is offered here is a motion. It makes no difference whether it applies to the Journal or to a bill or a resolution. It is a motion to amend.

Mr. DONNELL. The language of the rule is, "and any mistake made in the entries corrected." There is not anything about an amendment in the rule III.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no way a bill or the Journal can be corrected without offering an amendment to correct it. It has exactly the same effect as an amendment to a bill. It is a motion to correct or perfect just as when an amendment is offered to a bill. Both Senators whom the Senator from Missouri used as illustration would have identically the same opportunity. Of course if Jones' amendment were offered first it would be voted on first. The amendment which applied to the first section of the Journal that was reached in the reading of the Journal, would be voted on first.

If no amendment to the Journal is pending there would be no occasion to file a cloture petition, because the Journal must be approved unless an amendment in the nature of a correction is offered. If amendments are pending a cloture petition may be filed to the whole Journal. Jones and his cohorts might occupy all of the time until the cloture petition is voted upon, but if cloture is approved there is no way under the rule to deny Brown the right to speak for 1 hour on his amendment. Brown and Jones would both have 1 hour after the vote on cloture to discuss their amendments.

Mr. DONNELL. If the Jones amendment were presented, and Jones and his adherents were to obtain the floor and consume the 48 hours, Brown would never have an opportunity to be heard. Moreover, it is possible that more than one Senator might wish to make a motion to correct the Journal. There might be as many as 25 or 50 Senators who might wish to make similar motions to correct the Journal.

I defer with great confidence to the opinion of both Senators who have spoken, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. But, if the judgment of the Senator from Georgia is correct, that would mean that Mr. Jones, on the other side of the Chamber, by a debate involving 48 hours in which he and his adherents would consume all the time, would prevent perhaps 26 other Senators from having their amendments adequately considered. Perhaps one Member might have a dozen amendments to offer. As a practical proposition, other Senators would be prevented from having their amendments considered at all.

That leads me to this further question: Does not the Senator think that under the circumstances I have supposed, namely, Mr. Jones offering a motion to correct the Journal, and 25 or 50 other Senators, each with 10 motions to correct the Journal, and desiring to present them, each of those 25 or 50 Senators could take a perfectly valid position in saying that the matter before the Senate was the Jones proposition, and that all the other 50 Senators were not barred; that the matter before the Senate had not been the approval of the Journal, but simply the one proposal presented by Mr. Jones?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I agree with all that the Senator from Missouri has said except the conclusion which he has reached. He has made more eloquently than I the arguments against cloture in any form on any bill.

Undoubtedly, under hypothetical cases which could be assumed, the Presiding Officer, if he were so disposed, and a handful of Senators could on any bill, under the present rule, deny Senators who might wish to amend the bill the right to speak at all, except in their 1 hour after cloture had been voted. That right cannot be taken away under the cloture rule; but I can assume a hypothetical case under the present cloture rule which would do more violence to my sense of justice than the one which the Senator has supposed.

It is entirely possible for a Senator to make a motion to take up a bill during the morning hour, when it is not debatable, and immediately offer a cloture petition. If there were a majority of Senators willing to take such a high-handed course, he could move, if the cloture petition were submitted on Monday, that the Senate stand in recess until 12:55 on Wednesday. If he should do that, he would absolutely preclude any amendment whatever. That is true under the present rule as relating to bills. I think the Senator will agree that bills affecting all the people of the United States are much more important than a mere amendment to the Journal of this body.

Under the hypothetical case, I assume, under the present cloture rule, a majority leader and a ruthless majority could deny any Senator the right to offer any amendment. He could not offer it and have it read, if the Chair were disposed to recognize the majority leader before recognizing anyone else.

That is one of the reasons why I am opposed to cloture in any form. That is one reason why we have been opposing any extension of it. But it is undoubtedly the sense of the majority that we are to have a cloture rule to apply to all collateral issues, except a motion to proceed to the consideration of a change in the Senate rules. Senators will therefore have to take their chances under the rule.

If we are to assume hypothetical cases, I can assume a case of a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States. If a majority favored it, and

two-thirds were willing to vote for it, it could be submitted without Senators having any opportunity to be heard on the floor, or any opportunity to amend it, except that they could be heard for 1 hour after cloture was voted. I do not know that that would amount to a great deal, in this day of standardization of transmission of news, and almost standardization of the views of commentators, at least on some subjects. After cloture is voted, no one is going to pay much attention to what a Senator says, in my opinion. The issue will be decided. The headlines will be "Issue decided; bill passed." A Senator could never get his case before the country.

If we are going to assume hypothetical cases, I can assume much more violent cases under the present cloture rule.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I do not wish to consume an undue amount of time, but I think this is highly important and we ought to know where we stand.

I ask the Senator from Georgia if he does not think this is a valid conclusion:

If we adopt the rule as now presented, namely, the one submitted yesterday in the nature of a substitute to Senate Resolution 15, it leaves an ambiguity—perhaps a necessary one. I am not sure how it could be cured. It leaves an ambiguity as to what the word "matter" means. It seems to me that, under the circumstances I suggested, it is entirely possible that Mr. Brown, or any one of 25 or 50 Senators, might rise and say, "The word 'matter' is not defined in the rule. I contend that the word 'matter' means the specific subject or proposal submitted by Mr. Jones." It seems to me that Mr. Brown could reasonably argue, "It could not apply to what I have in my pocket and have not yet presented, or to the 50, 100, or 500 amendments which no one has presented."

So he could argue—and I think with considerable force, and perhaps with ultimate merit—that the matter which was under discussion was the Jones amendment, rather than the complete question of approval of the Journal; and therefore Mr. Brown and all the other Senators would claim—and perhaps properly—that they were not precluded from presenting and arguing their amendments.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I think the Senator best qualified to answer——

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me for a moment, does not the Senator from Georgia feel that even though the Senator from Ohio, the Senator from Arizona, or some other Senator may today confidently express the opinion that the word "matter" under the suppositious case I have suggested means approval of the Journal as an entirety, nevertheless there may be valid ground for a contrary opinion, that the word "matter" is confined to the specific subject, or the specific proposal submitted by Mr. Jones, and cannot bar other amendments from being considered?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, perhaps the Senator best qualified to answer is the author of this particular provision, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. I yield to him.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Missouri that it is my understanding that when this change in the rule was suggested, the word "matter" was put in specifically to cover any other question which could not be specifically defined by the word "motion," or "unfinished business," or anything else. The words "other matter" were inserted to cover any subject which might come up. It cannot be defined. It is not intended to be defined. Obviously it may be subject to different interpretations by different Presiding Officers. It is an attempt to be all-inclusive.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I take it the Senator from Massachusetts shares the view that there is a necessary ambiguity. But would it not be entirely possible for Senator Brown, or any one of the 50 Senators, as I suggested a few moments ago, to rise, under the suppositious case I have cited, and appeal from the ruling of the Chair if it had declared that "matter" was all-inclusive and meant approval of the Journal; and would not that appeal be subject to debate? Would there not, therefore, be at least a plausible probable ground for sustaining the view, on the broad basis of justice, which would be presented by Mr. Brown when he and 50 other Senators were being cut off from adequate consideration of their amendments because consideration of the Jones amendment took all the time?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I associate myself with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] in his answer to the Senator from Missouri on that question. I can speak from only one personal experience, in 1946, when the Chair gave various Members of the Senate the opportunity to present their amendments and have them read, even though there was no time for debate before cloture would apply.

It is a question of fairness in the Presiding Officer and in the majority leader. If that is so, then Mr. Jones will have at least an hour after cloture is applied to debate his amendment; and I hope that would be sufficient.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, let me say that certainly an hour might or might not be sufficient. Furthermore, does not the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts concede, by conceding the ambiguity of the word "matter," that there would at least be a plausible ground for Mr. Brown to rise and say that the "matter" referred to in the rule was simply Mr. Jones' motion to correct one entry in the Journal, rather than the entire subject matter of the Journal? Does not the Senator agree that there is at least a plausible ground for making such a contention?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would answer by saying that there is a ground for such a contention, but I would not agree that it is a plausible ground.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Along the line of the question raised by the Senator from Missouri, let me ask, in the first place—and I address the Senator from Arizona as the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and I ask the question as a member of that committee—it is not likely, is it, that a cloture petition would be filed, in the normal course of the Senate's business, on a question of amending the Journal; but it would be only in the event that amendment of the Journal were being used in a capricious way to conduct what we might term prolonged debate or a filibuster? That is my first question.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. There would be no advantage to anyone otherwise.

Mr. KNOWLAND. My second point or question is this: It is likely, is it not, that even if debate opened up on the question of approving the Journal, there would be a considerable period of discussion before 16 Senators would sign a cloture petition to bring the matter to a head; so there would be ample opportunity for any Senator who wished to make a legitimate correction of the Journal to get his amendment or correction to the desk? Furthermore, is it not also correct, I ask the Senator from Arizona, that if there were found to be a necessity for making a correction—for instance, where an entry "no" appeared in the Journal, whereas it should have been "yes"—by unanimous consent, in the case of any such bona fide typographical or other error, the Senate still would have in its own hands the power to make that type of correction?

Mr. HAYDEN. There can be no question about that.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me make this statement, because I think it may be a proper one to make, in view of the fact that question has been raised on the floor of the Senate and we have had a rather prolonged discussion of the meaning of the word "measure." As a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration in two sessions of the Congress—in both the Eightieth Congress and the Eighty-first Congress—when this situation has been considered, and as one of those who sat in the conferences and tried to bring about a harmonious settlement, and as one who has been interested in this subject matter for some time, I say that the desire of everyone was to frame all-inclusive language, and the word "matter" was used as being all-inclusive.

When the cloture petition is filed, if a filibuster is being conducted on the Journal itself, it is the intent—there is no question in my mind, and I do not believe there is any question in the mind of anyone who had anything to do with the drafting of this proposal—that this new rule shall be all-inclusive. It is meant to take in a motion to correct the Journal; it is meant to take in all amendments which might be offered in connection with the same, because unless that is done, the Senate would have no means whatsoever of protecting itself against an unlimited filibuster on the Journal. It is the intent of everyone who has been interested in this situation that the Senate of the United States shall have an effective and iron-clad means, one in

which there is no loophole of any type or character, of finally getting a vote in any situation.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona permit me to ask a question of the Senator from California?

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly.

Mr. DONNELL. In connection with the use of the word "matter," as set forth in the proposed rule, under a supposed case where Mr. Jones might make a motion to correct the Journal by changing the word "and" to the word "but," does not the Senator from California agree that Senator Brown and 50 other Senators might properly have a just ground for complaint, if their right to argue their motions, which we must assume would be presented in good faith, were cut off by the fact that Senator Jones used a large part of the 48 hours, or perhaps all of it was used by several of his adherents and associates? Does not the Senator agree that on a basis of justice, Senator Brown and the other 50 Senators might properly say that the matter being discussed was the Jones amendment, and not the entire correction of the Journal, because they would have 50 other amendments to present for corrections of the Journal?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in specific answer to the able Senator from Missouri, for whom, as he knows, I have the highest regard, let me say I do not believe that type of statement would be fair or could be made by any of the Senators, because I do not believe they would lose any of their reasonable rights under the rule, and I am sure there is no ambiguity as to what the committee meant. Unless the Senate does have available to it this proposed process, effective cloture in the Senate of the United States can never be obtained.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, does not the Senator agree that there certainly is ground for argument on the question of whether the word "matter" would include approval of the entire Journal, or only the approval of the Jones amendment?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That might be one of the "Answer 'Yes' or 'No' " questions, along the line of the question, "Have you stopped beating your wife. Answer 'Yes' or 'No.' "

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask the Senator to pardon me; I did not mean to present a question which the Senator would not desire to answer by either "Yes" or "No."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course I realize that.

Mr. President, obviously there is ground for argument, because the Senator from Missouri is quite properly arguing on one side of the question, and some of the rest of us are arguing on the other side. So it is obvious that at this point there is some ground for argument.

The only thing I think it is important to show in the RECORD of the Senate on this day when this matter is under consideration, is that the point in the minds of the members of the committee—and it was in the minds of the members of the Committee on Rules and Administration in both the Eightieth Congress and the Eighty-first Congress—is that they have endeavored to make this rule all-inclusive, so that there can be no doubt in the minds of anyone in the future, if this question should be raised, just as the Senator from Missouri is now quite properly raising it, and so that the legislative intent will be clearly shown before the Senate of the United States casts its vote on this matter. I do not deny that the Senator from Missouri has some reason for raising a query here on the floor of the Senate—and quite properly so, for 5 or 10 years from now, perhaps, his successor or the successor of some of the rest of us might raise that question. But since he has raised it, I think it also fair to say specifically to the Senate that there is no ambiguity in the minds of those responsible for it. Is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. Absolutely.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to yield first to my friend the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], who has to leave the Chamber.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I rise for information in regard to what is to me an ambiguity in this proposed substitute for the resolution. I refer first to line 3 on page 3, to see what it is to which the limitation of debate is to be applied:

> Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour—

On what?—

> on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks.

I raise the question as to whether there may be limitless oratory on completely extraneous matters under that rule.

So I go to line 11, to see if there are other restrictions:

> No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate.

I have difficulty, I may say to the Senator from Arizona, in finding that there is anything in it which limits oratory on purely extraneous matters not connected at all with the matter before the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, as the Senator from Vermont well knows, there is no rule of relevancy in discussion in the Senate. At the present time any Senator can rise at any time he wishes, and if there is a subject before the Senate relating to a sales tax in the District of Columbia, if he wants to deliver himself of a speech on the subject of the high price of cheese in Borneo, or any other matter that appeals to his imagination, he has a perfect right to do so. Not having any rule of relevancy in the Senate, the Chair never undertakes to rule on the germaneness of the remarks. Therefore if there is a statement that he shall not speak more than 1 hour on the subject, he is speaking on the subject regardless of whether he discusses wholly extraneous matters. That has always been the rule of the Senate, even under the unanimous-consent agreements. If there is a unanimous-consent agreement to arrive at a vote at a time certain on a particular bill, I have seen the time consumed with discussion of matters that had nothing whatever to do with it. But because extraneous matters were discussed and irrelevant matters brought in, it did not defer the time of voting on the bill under the unanimous-consent agreement. There is no rule of relevancy in the Senate. The pending rule allows each Senator 1 hour. Whatever the Senator may desire to devote his time to, is within his own power. But he cannot speak more than 1 hour on any and all subjects.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. FLANDERS. Just a moment. I should like to pursue this question a step further. The assurance given by the Senator from Georgia seems to me to lie somewhere else than in the wording of the resolution.

Mr. RUSSELL. I merely wish to state to the Senator from Vermont that the language he has read is, verbatim, word for word, that of the cloture rule which has been on the books of the Senate since 1917, and to my knowledge this is the first time in all those 30 years any Senator has ever raised the question that there is any procedure in the Senate that would permit a Senator discussing an irrelevant matter to have greater rights and privileges than one discussing a relevant matter.

Mr. FLANDERS. Nevertheless, I may say to the Senator from Arizona, who is in charge of the resolution, I should very much prefer to see the matter spelled out than to have it left vaguely hanging in the air as it seems to be doing at the present moment.

Mr. HAYDEN. That may be true, but it seems inconceivable to me that any Presiding Officer would ever rule, or that the Senate would ever sustain a ruling, that a limitation upon debate having been imposed, because the Senator talked about something entirely different and far afield, the debate could not be limited. The purpose of the rule is to limit debate. One hour is allowed, during which a Senator may talk about anything under the sun he wants to. He has but 1 hour, after which he is through.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont to read line 3 on page 3, where the last two words are "in all," which makes it absolutely conclusive that "thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all"—in all—"more than 1 hour."

Mr. FLANDERS. On what?

Mr. RUSSELL. On any "measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, * * * the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same." In my judgment, the words "in all" make it absolutely conclusive that a Senator cannot speak longer than 1 hour.

Mr. FLANDERS. No; that relates to time, not to matter.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think there can be the slightest doubt that if the cloture petition is adopted and a Senator speaks at all, he speaks on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate. He may talk wholly irrelevantly, but he is speaking on the motion, or on the measure.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. There can be no question about that. The Senator from Vermont can be entirely reassured that it can mean nothing else. If a Senator speaks at all, he must be considered to be speaking on the motion. It might not sound like it, to those who sit in the Senate, but that is what he is speaking about, so far as the interpretation of this rule is concerned.

Mr. HAYDEN. I may point out to the Senator from Vermont that we have had pending a motion to proceed to the consideration of a resolution, and during the debate 13 speeches were made on totally different subjects; but they were all on the motion.

Mr. LANGER and Mr. LUCAS addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield? If so, to whom?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield first to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I am very much interested in seeing that the rights of minorities are protected. Therefore I want to ask the Senator from Georgia a concrete question, citing a definite example. The other day, the Senator from Ohio said that in all his experience he had never seen such a high-handed proceeding as that which occurred in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. He stated that a majority rode roughshod over the opposition. I want to ask the Senator from Georgia, assuming that—of course not in this Congress, but 5 years from now—a similar situation should exist, under the example he cited a while ago, after the morning business, could debate be stopped and the minority gagged by a gag rule?

Mr. RUSSELL. It could be done under a certain rule. If the Senator will refer to the second paragraph of rule VIII, which I think is on page 14 of the manual, he will find that at the present time "all motions made before 2 o'clock to proceed to the consideration of any matter shall be determined without debate." In the proposed new rule, we do relax that rule as to a motion to change the rule. But that is the rule now, and has been for a long time. I may say to the Senator from North Dakota, who is of course as much interested in protecting the rights of minorities as I am, or anyone else, that there is no question that under a hypothetical case, ruthless majorities here can ride roughshod over the rights of the minority under the rules, and under this cloture rule. I am not standing here as an advocate of cloture. I do not believe in any restriction of debate, except that imposed in Jefferson's Manual, of two speeches on the same day. That has been construed to be a legislative day. I think Jefferson meant it to be a calendar day, but it has now been established as a legislative day by the precedents of the Senate. But we are going to have some kind of a rule, and we have saved in this proposal the right to oppose further changes in the rules designed to impose a limitation on debate by a majority of those present and voting, which in some instances could be 25 Senators. But if there is to be a rule, I think this does protect us at least from other rule changes that would further impinge upon the rights of minorities in this body.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like to pack up my troubles in my old kit bag, and so I ask whether the assurances that have been given by distinguished leaders on both sides of the aisle do not lead to the question as to whether lines 3 to 8 might not be amended to read thus:

> Thereafter, no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks.

What is the matter with that?

Mr. HAYDEN. It would be equally effective. There is no question about that.

Mr. FLANDERS. It would seem to be not merely effective, but incapable of misunderstanding.

Mr. LUCAS, Mr. HOLLAND, and Mr. DONNELL addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to inquire of the Senator with respect to an entirely different question. I wholly disagree with my friend, the Senator from Vermont, because I do not think it possible to write any language that would be any plainer than that which is to be found on page 3, and which we have been discussing. But I want to get back to paragraph 2 again, and make this suggestion: It may be slightly technical, but we have been dealing with technicalities in the Senate for quite a while. Some very weighty and responsible decisions have been made based on technicalities. I merely want to add something more in order to eliminate what might be termed a technicality. I hope the Senator will take into consideration adding, on page 2, line 7, after the word "motion", the word "question." The Senator will recall that in 1917 when the present cloture rule was adopted by the Senate, the word "question" was used a great number of times. While it does not appear in the present rule at all, which refers only to "pending measure," yet a great argument can be made that a pending measure includes everything, because many Senators used the word "question" in discussing the "pending measure."

Mr. HAYDEN. It has always been my assumption that the word "motion" and the word "question" mean one and the same thing.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not think there is any doubt about it, but I wanted to plug up any loophole which might arise.

Mr. HAYDEN. A motion is made, and the Chair announces that the question before the Senate is so and so. So the word "motion" and the word "question" mean one and the same thing.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator agrees that any question which might arise is included within the language, I have no objection, but I wanted it cleared up.

I have one other question. A question has been raised by the Senator from Missouri with respect to the Journal. I still contend that there will be flaws found by some Senator who has more ingenuity, after 25 years, than we have at the present time, perhaps. That is exactly what happened after the last cloture rule was enacted in 1917. There were all kinds of ingenuous methods found to get around the plain, unequivocal meaning of those who framed the resolution in 1917.

I suggest that following the word "matter" on page 2, line 8, this language be inserted "and for the purpose of this rule the term 'matter' shall include a motion to approve the Journal."

I should like to have the Senator from Arizona consider that suggestion.

Mr. HAYDEN I shall be glad to give it consideration.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I should like to ask the Senator from California a question which I was about to ask him when the Senator from Vermont, who had to leave the Chamber, desired to be heard. I was discussing with the Senator from California a few minutes ago, on the floor, a suppositious case in which Mr. Jones, on one side of the aisle, presents a motion to correct a mistake in the Journal, and Mr. Brown, on the other side of the aisle, and also each of 50 other Senators has amendments to correct the Journal which have not yet been offered. Suppose Mr. Jones presents his motion and it is argued in extenso; a cloture petition is filed, and the time has elapsed for it to be voted on, and it is then voted on. Then Mr. Brown rises and offers a motion to correct an entry in the Journal in another respect. The Chair would, of course, be called upon to rule, would he not, as to whether the previous motion had exhausted the whole matter, and whether Mr. Brown was in order? The Senator would agree that the Chair would be called on to make such a decision, would he not?

Mr. KNOWLAND. He might.

Mr. DONNELL. Would not an appeal lie from the decision of the Chair?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. DONNELL. I recognize the fact that in the resolution there is this language:

> Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the presiding officer, shall be decided without debate.

But supposing Mr. Brown rises and says that applied to the Jones motion to correct the Journal and the Chair has ruled with respect to the Jones matter without debate. "But," says Mr. Brown, "I now present a separate and distinct matter. The Chair has ruled against me and has held that the matter has been exhausted, because the matter previously before the Senate was the entire approval of the Journal." Mr. Brown says, "I want to debate fully the appeal from his ruling." Suppose all the other 50 Senators join in and say, "We do not propose to be precluded because one motion has taken up all this time. We want to present our argument as to whether any such interpretation of the word 'matter' as would preclude us should be indulged in by the Senate."

Would not the appeal from the ruling of the Chair, in the case I have described, open up immediately unlimited debate on the part of the Senate?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Missouri, in my opinion, no; because a motion would be in order to lay the appeal on the table.

Mr. DONNELL. Yes, certainly; a motion to lay any appeal on the table is in order at any time; but the appeal is itself fully debatable, unless the motion to lay on the table shall be agreed to. Is not that correct?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I believe that is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. I take it to be true that any matter presented here is at any time subject to a motion to lay on the table, is it not?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. So the point the Senator makes does not at all answer my argument. It simply means that a motion to lay on the table could be considered and acted upon. Suppose the motion to lay on the table is not sustained. Suppose Mr. Brown proceeds with his debate. Is he not entitled to unlimited debate on the appeal?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I want to assure the distinguished Senator and able parliamentarian from Missouri that I am in accord with his criticism of the basic idea of cloture——

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, may I say to the Senator that I have not been discussing the merits of cloture. I am discussing whether this particular resolution is so free from ambiguity and uncertainty as to avoid the danger which is sought to be avoided by this particular resolution.

Mr. RUSSELL. I want to say that the hypothetical case which the Senator has just suggested could not possibly occur, because it requires a two-thirds vote to impose cloture, and unless there were a two-thirds vote there would be no limit to debate. Otherwise, it could work a hardship on the minority, just as the present cloture rule can. It takes two-thirds to impose cloture, and, therefore, if two-thirds of the Senators vote to impose cloture, those two-thirds would vote against any appeal entered after the cloture petition had been approved by the Senate.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Georgia, with the permission of the Senator from Arizona, this question: Is it not true that a motion to lay on the table would have been applicable to the motion which has been pending here for some days, the motion to take up for consideration Senate Resolution 15?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no question about that. It would lie to any question before the Senate.

Mr. DONNELL. We have been delayed for 2 or 3 weeks on the motion to take the matter up, even though a motion to lay on the table could at any time have been presented.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no question that a motion of that kind could have been presented, and I assure the Senator from Missouri that it would have been presented if there had been any idea of how many votes there would be in favor of laying it on the table. I would have been delighted on Monday, 2 weeks ago, to have had the motion laid on the table, but I knew that there were not enough Senators who would vote in favor of the motion. The Senator is eminently correct, in my judgment, that a motion to table will lie to any proposition before the Senate except a motion to adjourn or a motion to take a recess.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator not consider, in the case which I have supposed, the Jones and Brown case, that there is at least an ambiguity in the proposed resolution as to whether the word "matter" includes the entire question of the approval of the Journal, or simply the motion made by Mr. Jones to correct an entry by changing the word "and" to "but"?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have the greatest respect for the Senator's parliamentary opinion, as he knows. I have told him that I admired his keen parliamentary mind; but I regret to have to differ with the Senator and say that I do not think there is any ambiguity as to its application to the Journal. It applies in two places. We do not depend on the construction of the word "matter." The language in line 4, on page 2, says:

> Notwithstanding the provisions of rule III—

That relates directly to the Journal, because that is the Journal rule of the Senate.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator think that the language "Notwithstanding the provisions of rule III" in any sense defines what the word "matter" means, four or five lines later?

Mr. RUSSELL. I certainly do, because otherwise what would be the purpose of bringing the Journal rule into the resolution? There is nothing covered in rule III except the matter of the Journal and the matter of approving the Journal. Certainly when we bring it in by saying that "notwithstanding" any provision of the Journal rule, and then use the word "matter" to define it, that concludes it, in my opinion.

Mr. DONNELL. Does not the Senator share my view that in the case I have described, where obviously Mr. Brown and his associates, 50 Senators, each one in good faith, presents a motion of the same kind to correct an entry in the Journal, there would be sound reason on his part and on the part of the 50 Senators were they to say, "Injustice would be perpetrated if it were to be held that the application of cloture to Mr. Jones' amendment on an entirely different matter than ours operates to cut us off from an adequate presentation of our matter."

Mr. RUSSELL. Cloture would not be voted if 50 Senators had an amendment to the Journal, and each of them thought that he was being treated unjustly. Fifty votes against cloture would defeat any gag rule. It is true that, as a hypothetical case, 32 Senators could have amendments to the Journal on which they would be absolutely denied any right, except of speaking 1 hour to protest, after cloture was voted. The same rule applies to a bill, and the Senator can apply the same hypothetical case he has so ably raised and discussed this morning to any bill, because if 32 Senators, it is true, under the hypothetical case, can be denied the right to offer an amendment, they can me denied the right to explain an amendment, they can be denied the right to oppose an amendment, except in the 1 hour they are allowed, under the rule, after cloture is voted. There can be no doubt about that, and that has been the case for 30 years, under the existing cloture rule whenever a measure was made the pending business. That is why some of us in times past, and in this case, were opposed to the pending rule, because 32 Senators could be absolutely cut off from discussion, from amendment, from any right as Senators, except to protest their treatment for 1 hour after cloture was voted.

Mr. DONNELL. Then I take it that the Senator would agree that in the case I have described, if Jones' motion referred to page 1 of the Journal, changing "and" to "but," and Mr. Brown's applied to something 25 pages further away in the Journal, relating to something entirely different, a matter of great concern, and he urged that there had been gross distortion of the record, Brown and all his associates would be practically cut off, in fact, from an adequate discussion, because the word "matter" would have been construed to mean the entire approval of the Journal, and because Mr. Jones' amendment as to one little simple word on page 1, 24 pages away from the Brown correction, would have occupied all the time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Under the hypothetical case the Senator from Missouri assumes, if Brown and his associates numbered 32 or less than 32, the Senator is absolutely correct, and the same would be true as applied to a bill, under the existing cloture rule.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator think any such rule as could lead to a result such as I have described, and as he has conceded could occur, is a proper and just rule for our adoption?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, the Senator from Missouri knows that the original cloture rule was adopted in 1917.

Mr. DONNELL. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. And it would apply to any bill exactly the same condition he has described. I regard bills as being much more important than the Journal. I dare say that I am the only Senator on

this floor who has ever read the Journal through from end to end. I know there are many Senators who have never heard the Journal read, except on two occasions in years past, when I demanded that it be read. Under the rule, any argument about the Journal, in my judgment, would be almost a moot question, because the Journal has not been read on the floor of the Senate in 3 years, to my knowledge, and the amendments which were offered were, of course, for the purpose of giving Senators an opportunity to state their case before they suffered the dire consequences of treatment such as the Senator from Missouri has pointed out.

It has been true during all these years that under rule XXII, a hypothetical case such as that the Senator from Missouri stated regarding the Journal, could be cited which is not as important in my opinion, as a bill, insofar as rule XXII is concerned. The Senator is right, in the hypothetical case, that an unfair Presiding Officer and a ruthless majority leader, with a majority of one in the Senate as to procedural matters, and two-thirds as to the imposition of cloture, could deny Senators their right to speak except for 1 hour.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). The Senator from Arizona has the floor.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield that I may ask a further question of the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. Does not the Senator from Georgia agree that under the language of the proposed rule, where the word "matter" is used, Mr. Brown, in the suppositious case I have presented, has at least good ground, which can be legitimately urged, to the effect that the word "matter" includes only the Jones motion, and does not include the entire approval of the whole Journal?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Missouri knows that a point of order can be made against any proposition that is submitted.

Mr. DONNELL. But he might have a legitimate ground, might he not?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the only point of disagreement between the Senator and me. In my judgment, the word "matter," tied in with the provisions of line 4, page 2, where it refers specifically to the Journal rule, makes it conclusive that it does refer to the Journal. I can conceive of cases where a Senator might be very badly treated under this rule. He can be badly treated today under the present cloture rule. That is why I have been opposed to cloture, and that is why we have been fighting for 2 weeks, and that is why, believing this is the very best that could be salvaged to keep free debate in the Senate, I and the Senators associated with me in favor of free and unlimited debate have reluctantly come to the conclusion that the proposition we are considering is the best that could be had, and comes nearer to reaching a meeting of minds of Senators who have labored on this problem for a number of weeks. It does not preserve the rights of all Senators, neither does the existing rule, but it does give us a weapon which enables us to oppose a further change in the rule which would impose a gag rule in the Senate in the suppositious case of a combination by 25 Senators to absolutely stifle any right of expression on the part of minorities.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, with the consent of the Senator from Arizona, may I conclude by simply making one observation? It appears to me it is entirely proper for the Senate at this time to adopt any rule it desires to adopt. If it desires to adopt a rule under which the Jones resolution would be considered to have raised the entire matter of the correction of the whole Journal, it can do so at this time, and I might be in favor of that. I am not arguing against cloture. What I am arguing about at this time is whether the resolution we are considering, by the term "matter," helps, or whether it simply leaves the matter in the same ambiguous situation which many of the Members of the Senate thought resulted from the use of the word "measure." I do not consider that there was an ambiguity caused by the use of the word "measure," because to my mind clearly the word "measure" does not include a motion to take up; but it seems to me the word "matter" might leave the matter in ambiguity, so that it would be possible for appeals to be taken from the ruling of the Chair, and indefinite debate result.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Missouri and I are in agreement except as to there being any ambiguity.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to propound to the Senator from Arizona, if I may, four questions based upon certain portions of the printed substitute which is now being debated. I call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Arizona first to lines 4 and 5 on page 2 of the printed substitute. As to the words "notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI"—rule III being the rule dealing with the commencement of the daily sessions, and rule VI being the rule dealing with the presentation of credentials—is it the understanding of the distinguished Senator that the words "notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI" will effectively bring within the proposed new cloture rule all parliamentary procedure to be taken under rules III and VI?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; because the way the rule now reads the question of approving the Journal is a matter of the highest privilege. And this wipes out that high privilege and makes it possible to apply cloture.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The observations which have just been made by the distinguished Senator with reference to rule III are also equally applicable to rule VI, are they not?

Mr. HAYDEN. There can be no question about that.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly.

Mr. HOLLAND. As to the next words that come immediately after "VI" "or any other rule of the Senate, except subsection 3 of rule XXII," said subsection 3 being the new proposed subsection which the Senator has mentioned heretofore—my understanding of the words "any other rule of the Senate," as included in this proposed substitute rule, would mean that any other rule of the Senate now adopted or hereafter to be adopted, unless such new rule should specifically exclude itself from application of the cloture rule, would be made, by this wording, subject to the provisions of the proposed cloture rule? Is that understanding correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is my understanding; yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. The next question I should like to propound to the distinguished Senator, if I may, is one which grows out of the words on lines 3, 4, 5, and 6 of page 3. Those words are:

> Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same.

It is my understanding that the words "the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same," do not solely relate to the words "the unfinished business," but that they also relate to the words "the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate." Is that understanding correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. That would be a perfectly reasonable conclusion and that is the way I understand that provision.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I want to join in corroborating the answers which the Senator from Arizona has given to the Senator from Florida. I am in complete accord with the answers the Senator from Arizona has made, because he has stated the intention of those who drafted the language. We want to extend cloture to a motion, to a measure, to a matter, or anything, and bring them within the provisions of the substitute rule from which the Senator from Florida has been reading, so there will be no doubt that, so far as limitation of debate is concerned, as the present cloture rule applies to the pending measure, the substitute rule will apply to the pending measure, question, motion, or other matter.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Before asking this question, I will say that I think the distinguished Senator from Nebraska has been a little more general in his last statement than he intended to be. The Senator is not intending to eliminate subsection 3 from his discussion, is he?

Mr. WHERRY. No. That is the provision relating to the morning hour. With that qualification, my statement stands. I thank the Senator for correcting me. But in a general way the point is simply this, that we want cloture ex-

tended to the measure, motion, question, or other matter, except as provided by subsection 3.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have only one additional question if the Senator will permit me to make it.

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly.

Mr. HOLLAND. This question relates to the words "amendment not germane," as they appear in line 12, on page 3. It is the understanding of the junior Senator from Florida that the correct interpretation of those words would require the application of the question of germaneness to not only an amendment that might be offered after cloture, but to all amendments, whether offered before or after cloture. Is that understanding correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes, it would apply all the way through, from the time the motion was filed until the last amendment was disposed of and the Chair finally put the question.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. In order to make this point entirely clear in the RECORD, Mr. President, do I correctly understand now from the answer just made by the distinguished Senator from Arizona that all amendments, regardless of when filed, to the measure to which cloture has been applied, shall have applied to them, under these words, the requirement that they must be germane in order to be in order for discussion after the application of cloture?

Mr. HAYDEN. There is the question of germaneness generally. I should like to know the Senator's opinion on that.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the opinion of the Senator from Florida is that it has been his understanding in the interpretation of the present cloture rule, and, as I understand, the identical words on this point are included in the proposed substitute cloture rule, that the requirement of germaneness shall be made and extended to all amendments which may be considered after cloture, regardless of the time at which they were offered.

Mr. HAYDEN. That would be true, of course.

Mr. HOLLAND. And it was my intention, and my hope that the distinguished Senator, in answering these questions, would make it crystal clear for the RECORD that it is his intention and the intention of those who sponsored the proposed substitute rule, that the requirement of germaneness shall be applied in the event of the adoption of the substitute rule, to all amendments pending after cloture, regardless of what time in the proceedings they may have been offered.

Mr. HAYDEN. There is no change in this text over the rule that has been in effect for the past 30 years, and the adoption of this proposal would in no manner affect the decisions of the Chair that have been made, particularly on that point, which are, as I understand, completely in accord with what the Senator from Florida now contends.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. On the question of germaneness, do I understand from the last answers, that it will apply to amendments made prior to the filing of cloture? It does not purport to cover that. There is no rule of germaneness in the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senate has no rule of germaneness, as I have stated.

Mr. FERGUSON. The only point where germaneness would apply would be after cloture was obtained?

Mr. HAYDEN. That was obviously the intention of those who wrote the rule some 30 years ago, because they were not dealing with any other question than how the time between the filing of the petition and the vote would be disposed of.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. That is where germaneness applies.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. But not to amendments offered prior to the filing of cloture?

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, no; it could not apply in that way.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not understand that the Chair would have any right to rule on the question of germaneness if during the debate, but before the filing of the petition, a Senator submitted an amendment and had it read. Germaneness would not apply to that. Germaneness would only apply, as I read the language of the substitute, after the cloture petition has been filed and the Chair has ruled.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me ask the coauthor of the substitute measure, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], what is his opinion with respect to the question of the germaneness of an amendment offered before cloture petition is filed. Does it have to be germane?

Mr. RUSSELL. There can be no doubt about it. The line before that refers to an amendment offered at any time, because it says specifically, in line 8:

> Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time.

The language in line 12 relates to amendments which are presented and read prior to that time, because after that time no such amendments can be offered. It must relate to amendments offered prior to that time.

Mr. FERGUSON. In other words, if a bill is pending and amendments are offered, with no thought of cloture, some of them may not be germane. Then after cloture is asked, all those amendments, which in the opinion of the Chair, are not germane can be stricken out on a point of order without debate. Is that what we are doing?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no doubt about it. That is the present rule. That language is taken verbatim from the present rule XXII. There is a very obvious reason for it. Members of the Senate who were opposed to cloture might offer a great many amendments which were not germane, to which other Senators were opposed; and Senators would hesitate to vote for cloture for fear that same other bill, to which they were opposed, might be offered as an amendment. It is only after the cloture is invoked that the rule of germaneness applies. In the absence of cloture, the Senate has no rule of germaneness as to amendments. However, the authors of this rule evidently were of the opinion that a great many amendments might be offered which were not germane, to frighten Senators from voting for cloture for fear that they might not be able, after the cloture vote, to discuss amendments to which they were opposed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Let me put it this way: In case cloture is obtained in the Senate, then the rule of germaneness applies, and the Chair can rule on a point of order, without debate, on the question of germaneness, and strike out the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Unless he is overruled by the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. It would not be allowed to come to a vote.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Chair can rule on a point of order, but he cannot strike out anything that is germane.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator please explain for the RECORD what would happen if the Chair were of the opinion that a certain amendment was not germane? What would he do on a point of order?

Mr. RUSSELL. The amendment would be subject to a point of order; and the Chair's ruling is subject to an appeal.

Mr. FERGUSON. For all practical purposes, it would be stricken out, because we would not be able to vote on it.

Mr. RUSSELL. No. The Senate is still master of its own destiny in that situation. Suppose we had before us a very involved bill relating to interstate commerce, and an effort were made——

Mr. FERGUSON. To offer the poll-tax bill as an amendment, let us say.

Mr. RUSSELL. Very well, if the Senator wants to use that illustration. I thought perhaps he was interested in some other legislation, but if that is all he is interested in, we will use that.

Mr. FERGUSON. That question might arise.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall try to find some other illustration in which the Senator might be interested.

Let us suppose that the so-called poll tax bill is pending in the Senate and a cloture petition to the bill is presented. Let us further suppose than an amendment had been offered to the poll tax to repeal the authorization for establishing harbor facilities or other public works in Michigan, and that a number of other amendments of this nature had been offered to the bill in order to deter Senators from voting for cloture. Unless the rule barring amendments which are not germane were in effect, it would be exceedingly difficult to ever obtain cloture if Senators thought that they would be gagged, and thereby prevented from explaining amendments not relevent to the bill sought to be subjected to cloture. In my opinion all amendments which are not germane to the original bill are subject to a point of order after a vote imposing cloture on the main bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Chair would then rule, subject of course, to the point of order being reviewed on appeal to the Senate itself, that the amendment which would interfere with appropriations for Michigan could not be voted upon.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct; but, of course the Senator from Michigan would not be entirely out of danger, because an appeal might be taken, and a majority of the Senate might hold that the amendment was germane. Then the Senate could proceed with its business. The majority of the Senate is still the master of its own destiny. However, the Chair can rule that an amendment is not germane, and submit the question to the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to address a question to the Senator from Arizona. Does all the colloquy engaged in since the last question asked by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] relate to the present rule under which we operate, and which in this respect we are not attempting to amend in any way, shape, or form?

Mr. HAYDEN. I so stated——

Mr. WHERRY. If we are not satisfied with the present cloture rule, that is something else. However, this language is identical with the language of the present rule. It is not new language. So whatever the present rule is, it is not being touched at all in that respect. I know that the Senator from Michigan understands that, but I want the record to show that if there is any question about the present rule, that is another question. We are not attempting in this substitute to change the present rule at all with respect to the rights of any Senator under the present cloture rule, which has been in operation for many years.

Mr. HAYDEN. I so stated to the Senator from Florida. This proposal involves no change in the rules in that regard; and whatever the precedents of the Senate have been during the past 30 years, there is no attempt here to change them.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate that. However, notwithstanding the fact that no attempt is being made to change the present rule in that respect, I think it is well at this time to understand what the present rule means, because we have had trouble with the interpretation of the present rule. Even though we are reenacting the present rule in large part, I think it is well for those in charge of the resolution to place in the record their interpretation. It may be of some aid to the Senate in the future in determining what we are attempting to do.

Is it fair to state that all debate on a motion to take up something, whether it be a bill or resolution, is subject to cloture, except as regards a proposal to change the rules of the Senate?

Mr. HAYDEN. Everything except a proposal to change the rules.

Mr. FERGUSON. That refers to any amendment to the Senate rules, and not merely this particular rule. The language in paragraph 3 of section 2 reads as follows:

> 3. The provisions of the last paragraph of rule VIII (prohibiting debate on motions made before 2 o'clock) and of subsection 2 of this rule shall not apply to any motion to proceed to the consideration of any motion, resolution, or proposal to change any of the standing rules of the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is intended to give complete exemption, and I believe it does.

Mr. FERGUSON. But it covers every other debate in the future.

Mr. HAYDEN. The exception is a change in the rules of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. What the Senator from Michigan means is that, with the exception of a change in the rules of the Senate, it cover everything else.

Mr. HAYDEN. There is no doubt whatever about that. It is so designed. It is the intention of the authors of the proposed rule to cover everything except a change in the rules of the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The language used in line 6 on page 2 is—

> at any time a motion signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate—

I should like to have an interpretation of the words "at any time." We have discussed this question before, but I do not think we have ever had a ruling on it. Does that mean that a motion can be prepared before the matter is called up for debate? Sixteen Senators might sign the petition in advance, and the moment the debate starts the motion could be made, and then and there it would have to be considered.

Mr. HAYDEN. The language "at any time" relates to the presentation of the petition. The language is:

> at any time a motion signed by 16 Senators * * * is presented to the Senate—

In other words, we cannot go into the question of when and where the 16 signatures were obtained. All we can say is that at any time Senators desire to present such a petition they may do so.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is what I am getting at. The procedure to obtain cloture could be started at the moment the debate started on the pending matter, pending motion, or whatever it might be called.

Mr. HAYDEN. The signatures might have been obtained weeks before. No one has a right to inquire as to that.

Mr. FERGUSON. Let us take a hypothetical case. Suppose that such a motion has been filed, and that the Senate has voted on it, or that on an appeal from the decision of the Chair the Senate does not stop debate. Could a new motion be immediately filed and taken up, and a new vote ordered, under this wording?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is apparent that "at any time" means at any time, afterward as well as before.

Mr. FERGUSON. So any number of motions to terminate debate could be brought up in connection with the same debate.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think there is no question about that. I think there have been instances in which a cloture petition was filed at one time, defeated, and then the debate continued, and later another cloture petition filed and debated, if the Senate so desired. The language "at any time" means at any time.

Mr. FERGUSON. As I undrstand, there is nothing in the language of this proposal to alter or change the rights under rule V, on an appeal from the decision of the Chair. It is my understanding that this does not purport in any way to interfere with such rights on the question of cloture.

Mr. HAYDEN. The situation is to remain exactly as it has been in the past. I can see nothing in the proposed rule which would change anything, or which would require any different interpretation from the way the rules have been interpreted for the past 30 years.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I was absent from the Chamber for a few moments. My question has probably been answered. I invite the attention of my colleague to paragraph 3 of section 2, on page 3 of the printed amendment. Am I correct in my understanding of the interpretation of that provision, that under no circumstances hereafter could cloture be obtained in connection with any proposal to change any rule of the Senate? If it were desired to change a rule, it would not be possible to get cloture on it.

Mr. HAYDEN. The language is as follows:

> 3. The provisions of the last paragraph of rule VIII (prohibiting debate on motions made before 2 o'clock) and of subsection 2 of this rule shall not apply to any motion to proceed to the consideration of any motion, resolution, or proposal to change any of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

It would not be possible to obtain cloture on such a proposal.

Mr. LUCAS. At the present time cloture can be applied in such a case. We tried to obtain cloture in connection with the proposal now before the Senate to change the rule. If we adopt paragraph 3 of section 2, from now on, until this rule is changed, the Senate will be forever denied the right to consider a petition for cloture in connection with an amendment to any rule of the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. That was undoubtedly the intention of those who wrote this paragraph.

If I may have the attention of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Illinois is directing his inquiry only to section 2 of the proposed rule.

Mr. LUCAS. I am propounding this question: Is it not the interpretation of the meaning of that language that under no circumstances hereafter can the Senate ever consider a petition for cloture in connection with the amendment of any of its rules?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not so interpret the language. I think the Senator from Arizona must have misunderstood the question, from the way it was put. As I read paragraph 3, it says:

> The provisions of the last paragraph of rule VIII—

Which is the one relating to bringing up something during the morning hour, before 2 o'clock—

> (prohibiting debate on motions made before 2 o'clock) and of subsection 2 of this rule, shall not apply to any motion to proceed to the consideration of any motion, resolution, or proposal to change any of the standing rules of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Is not that the only——

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me finish.

In other words, the rights under rule XXII are preserved, unless the difficulty in connection with the parliamentary situation which we faced has been surmounted. We could not get agreement to a motion to proceed to the consideration of a change in the rule. Once the filibuster has been broken, and the first hurdle is passed, it is my interpretation that cloture may be applied to the resolution itself amending the rules. The language which I have read applies only to the motion to take up the proposal to change the rules.

Mr. LUCAS. I hope the Senator is correct in that interpretation, because that question becomes very important.

Already some Senators are interpreting that language to mean that under a strict interpretation a petition for cloture could never be filed at any stage in connection with a proposal to change the rules, and that the rules could not be amended until everyone had been finally worn down by a physical struggle.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think it is very important to clear up this point.

Mr. LUCAS. It certainly is important. We have been struggling with it for 3 weeks.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is not only my interpretation. As I pointed out earlier, I was present at these meetings. I have just consulted with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] about it, and I have also just consulted with the Parliamentarian of the Senate, who was consulted as to this language. The only thing it applies to is a motion to proceed to consider the proposal to change the rule. But once that hurdle is crossed, cloture will lie against an amendment to the rules.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, then I should like to ask the Senator from California if I understand him correctly, that as to any rule of the Senate of the United States, a Senator can use any parliamentary device we have at the present time by way of obstruction?

Mr. KNOWLAND. On a motion to proceed to the consideration of it; yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. Not only on a motion, but I would say on any other procedure any existing parliamentary device to obstruct debate could be used. In other words, Senators could filibuster as long as they want to, until they finally were worn down; and when finally they were worn down, a petition of cloture could be obtained. Is that the point?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; the situation is precisely as it is in the Senate of the United States today, under the circumstance in which we find ourselves. That is, Senators can conduct unlimited discussion on a motion to take up a resolution to amend the rule. That position is no better and no worse for those who wish to conduct a filibuster than it is for those of us who wish to prevent a filibuster; but once we have crossed that bridge, then the same constitutional two-thirds, or two-thirds of the membership of the Senate, chosen and sworn, may invoke the rule which applies to all other legislative procedures.

Mr. LUCAS. That is something new, so far as two-thirds is concerned; is it not?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Pardon me?

Mr. LUCAS. The constitutional two-thirds is something new; is it not?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Oh, yes. It is thoroughly understood that a constitutional two-thirds is different from a simple two-thirds of the Senate. It is not different if all Members of the Senate are present.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand that.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It is not different if 95 of the 96 Senators are present; but it does differ in other circumstances.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall go into that matter, for I think there is much difference. That is one point where the Senator from California and I have disagreed, and where we had to part company in connection with the conferences.

I wish the Members of the Senate to understand clearly what we are doing with respect to these rules: We are tightening the rules to the point where no rule, in my opinion, will ever be changed again, as a result of what we are proposing to do.

Mr. President, under the Senator's theory, it is first necessary to wear out the opposing Senators on the motion to take up; they can filibuster as long as they wish on the motion to take up.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Only on a change of the rules; nothing else.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes, on a change of the rules. But if after 3 or 4 weeks, Senators are worn down on that, then they can take up a motion of some other kind and can filibuster on it.

So it would be necessary to wear them out on several motions, before an opportunity to have a vote by the two-thirds could be reached.

Mr. KNOWLAND. There cannot be two motions, of course, as the distinguished Senator from Illinois, who is an able parliamentarian, well knows; a second motion cannot be presented until the Senate has had a chance to act on the first motion.

Mr. LUCAS. I know that; but cloture does not apply to the first motion—a motion to take up—or to an amendment to the motion or to the resolution or to anything of that sort that is not actually pending. I maintain that those who were seeking to keep the rules from being amended could talk endlessly upon any of those propositions, before cloture could ever be invoked. Then, when it comes to cloture, it is being made more difficult than ever before, by inserting in the rule the two-thirds constitutional majority provision.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I merely want to say to the able Senator from Illinois, with the great respect I have for him, I thoroughly disagree with him that it is being made more difficult. To the contrary, in the situation in which the Senate today finds itself there is no cloture of any kind, not only on a motion to proceed to the consideration of a change in the rules, but there is no cloture on a motion to proceed to the consideration of any legislation. Consequently the Senate might never have a chance to reach the point of action, even though an overwhelming majority, not only a two-thirds majority, but a three-fourths majority, might want a particular bill. I shall not discuss the kind of bill, but any kind of bill in the public interest. At the present time, the Senate is helpless to proceed to the consideration of any kind of legislation so long as a filibuster is being conducted on the motion to take it up.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The proposed new rule gives the Senate of the United States, I think, a material improvement. It puts back into the hands of the Senate control over its own proceedings. It not only does that. Many times, the people back home have no way of knowing how a Senator may stand on an issue, and so long as the debate is being conducted on the motion to take up, they may never get a chance to know how he stands on an issue. Under this rule, if we adopt it, a cloture petition can be filed which will give some indication. A vote on the cloture can be had, which will certainly be somewhat of a test, though not necessarily a conclusive test on the situation. If the cloture petition is carried, we then have the matter before the Senate for another test vote. So I think we have made a tremendous advance, the greatest advance in this field that has been made in the Senate during its whole history.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, I completely disagree. I shall discuss the matter further when I get the floor in my own right.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to state that beginning in line 21, page 3, after the parenthesis, appear these words: "and of subsection 2 of this rule shall not apply to any motion to proceed to the consideration of any

motion, resolution, or proposal to change any of the Standing Rules of the Senate."

That leaves a proposal to amend the rules exactly as it is today. There can be no question about it. That preserves for the future every right any Senator now has. We are not making any change in it.

Mr. LUCAS. Why then is the language written into the resolution?

Mr. WHERRY. I will tell the Senator why we placed it there.

Mr. HAYDEN Mr. President, I should like to yield the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask the floor in my own right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. WHERRY. The answer to the Senator is, because cloture is extended to everything except a change in the rules, to every motion, every matter, and every piece of unfinished business. Having done that, we have inserted subsection 3, having to do with the rule VIII, under which the Senate operates in the morning hour. But it only applies to the morning hour. The last sentence of rule VIII reads:

All motions made before 2 o'clock to proceed to the consideration of any matter shall be determined without debate.

What is done by the new rule with reference to the provisions of the last paragraph of rule VIII, prohibiting debate on motions made before 2 o'clock, I may say to the majority leader, is simply this: We have applied cloture to almost everything, including amendments to the Journal. If a motion to change a rule is made before 2 o'clock, the new rule permits debate on it until 2 o'clock. That is what it means. It does not take away a rule we have today, but if, for example, the Journal were approved, and a Senator should move to take up an amendment of the rules, then there is the right, under the provision we have written into paragraph 3, to debate that issue until 2 o'clock. After 2 o'clock, Senators would have any other right they now have. I hope I have made that clear.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Nebraska has been trying to close up loopholes.

Mr. WHERRY. That will close them.

Mr. LUCAS. But it closes the loopholes just the other way.

Mr. WHERRY. No, Mr. President——

Mr. LUCAS. Let me conclude. The Senator knows that since 1888 we have had on the Senate books the rule the Senator is now trying to eliminate.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, no.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator certainly is trying to do so, or the provision would not be written into the resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am not trying to eliminate rule VIII at all. All I am saying is that notwithstanding rule VIII, Senators will have a right to debate in the morning hour—what? Only an amendment to the rules. The remainder of subsection 2 preserves every right that Senators now have relative to amending the rules. The talk about tightening up the amendment to the rules is all beside the question, with one single exception. That is, once the motion is taken up, after it has passed that hurdle and the question is on the pending measure, such as it is today, under the provision of the substitute, a two-thirds constitutional majority is required. That is exactly what the Senator from Illinois has already approved in his discussions with us, as to how far he would go. In fact he has said, if I understood him correctly, that Senators could write their own ticket so far as he was concerned in order to protect what they have in the rules. All we are doing is protecting what they already have in the rules today. It is not proposed to take anything away from them, and nothing is being added. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia, who was conferring——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator has made an incorrect statement.

Mr. WHERRY. All the statements I have made were correct.

Mr. LUCAS. No.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia if he does not concur in the observation I made. Then I will yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I just came on the floor. I did not hear the observations made in full. I understand the Senators were discussing the provisions of subsection 3.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think the language is capable of but one construction. It provides that under any of the rules of the Senate the right of limiting debate now applicable shall be retained, excepting only as to motions to change the rules of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct. I agree with that.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is, on any motion to proceed. In other words, it is not applicable now. We have an illustration of it at the moment. We have been debating for several days a motion to proceed to the consideration of a resolution to bring about a change in the rules of the Senate. The same right adheres at this moment to any piece of legislation that might be suggested. This rule closes that right on the motion to proceed in all cases save and except a motion or an amendment to the Standing Rules of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. When the Senator says "closes that right," does he mean by that that cloture is applicable in all other cases except amending the rules? If so, then instead of closing the right, the whole field is being broadened.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think it is being narrowed, because the right of unlimited debate is being taken away.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with the Senator, if that is the way he wants to write the language. But what the Senator is doing is extending cloture to every other motion that can be made except a motion to change the rules.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator may use his own language, but it extends cloture throughout the whole field, I think. That is what we intend to do, with the exception of the rules.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, at that point, when the Senator says "with the exception of the rules," he means except to a motion to proceed to the consideration of the rule, does he not?

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Except to a motion to proceed to the consideration of a rules change. Once the bridge of the motion to proceed has been crossed, the application of cloture by a constitutional two-thirds vote applies in the same manner that it does as to any other bill, resolution, or constitutional amendment, or whatever it may be, that is presented.

Mr. RUSSELL. Once a motion for a change in the rules becomes the unfinished business, it becomes subject to the cloture provision of section 2, just as would any other piece of legislation.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think all the Senators on the floor are familiar with that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not desire to speak at this time. I understand that the debate will be lengthy, though we are told it will not be a filibuster. I shall listen to the debate.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, does the Senator from Illinois have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska had the floor.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois desire the floor?

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to have the floor. I will yield for a question.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like, if I may, to ask a question. It seems to me it has been indicated that the language which has just been discussed, in section 2, to the effect that the provisions of the last paragraph of rule VIII prohibiting debate on motions made before 2 o'clock, and of subsection 2 of this rule shall not apply to any motion to proceed to the consideration of any motion, resolution, or proposal to change any of the standing rules of the Senate, does not in any way worsen the situation which now exists.

I wish to call attention to this fact: This is the first time, is it not, if this rule is adopted, that the Senate has, in many years, in a specific rule, excluded the applicability of cloture to a motion to proceed to the consideration of a change in the rules? Is it not true that rule XXII, as it now exists, did not, by its own words, exclude its applicability to a motion to proceed to the consideration of a change in the rule? In fact, we have been debating for days, if not weeks, as to whether a pending measure might not include a motion to take up a proposed rule change. The Vice President of the United States held that it did apply, and the former President pro tempore of the Senate, on August 2

of last year, stated there was no specific precedent to the contrary, when he made his first ruling that it did not apply. An appeal was taken last Saturday from the ruling of the Vice President, and the Senate, by a close vote of 46 to 41, by only a majority of 5, held that rule XXII, as it now exists, did not apply to a motion to take up a resolution proposing to amend the Senate rules. Some subsequent Senate, if it is not precluded to the contrary by specific rule adopted by the Senate, with full knowledge of the effect, may, by the decision of a Presiding Officer of the Senate, hold to the contrary. It might be held, if this specific language is not in it, that the other portion of the rule would apply.

Mr. President, this is the question I wished to ask, and I am sorry to have taken so long in arriving at it: Is it not a fact that this is the first time, if this rule is adopted, that a rule of the Senate has specifically provided that the rule of cloture shall not apply to a motion to proceed to the consideration of a proposed rule change?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois permit me to undertake to answer that question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think a categorical answer would be "Yes"; but there are a number of reasons back of it. I have always heard, when I was a country lawyer in Georgia, that any lawyer who lost a case was entitled to 2 weeks' time within which to cuss the court. I suppose that any Senator who disagrees with the majority ought to be allowed 2 weeks in which to criticize his colleagues in the Senate for differing with him. But there is a more substantial reason than that for putting this language into the rule. It is the first time it has been written into the rules that the Journal is subject to cloture. An attack upon the perfection of the Journal in the morning hour has been the means ordinarily used to permit a Senator the right of unlimited debate against a motion to proceed. Therefore, the door having been specifically closed to that right by express language, it was necessary to use express language to preserve the right which exists under the present rules of the Senate. We struck down a precedent of the Senate when we provided that the Journal should be subject to cloture. That was just a precedent. We wrote it down in express language. When we did that, it became necessary, to carry out our understanding, to write in the express language of preservation of the right which existed under that precedent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois permit me to give my answer to the question the Senator from Florida asked?

Mr. PEPPER. I shall be glad to hear the Senator's answer. I do not want to impose on the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I think there is another answer to the Senator from Florida, that up to this time cloture has applied only to a pending measure. I assume the Senator has in mind the question of interpreting the words brought in to include a motion to take up. If we adopt this rule, in whatever form we adopt it, trying to include the words "motion," "measure," or other matter, the Chair will not have an opportunity to rule on the same question as in the past.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield further?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I should like to address this question, also, to the attention of the Senate: The Constitution of the United States does not say anything specifically regarding the legislative power which it confers upon each House, but it does specifically say each House may determine the rules of its proceedings. I raise the question whether the Senate can proscribe the power of future Senates to do what the Constitution says may be done, namely, to determine the rules of procedure, and does this rule, if it be adopted, preclude the Senate, whenever it may wish to do so, from determining its rules as the Constitution allows it to do? In other words, by adopting this rule, will we preclude the Senate, tomorrow, or another Senate, 5 or 10 years from now, from saying it is fundamental that the Senate must have the power to determine its rules, and what was done in a certain year cannot deny it the exercise of its authority under the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Illinois will yield, I should be glad to give my answer to that question, because I have heard it discussed at length.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand, the Senate itself can change its rules, by majority vote, at any time. The only question is whether a rule can actually come before the Senate for a change. As I understand, the purpose of this section is to give all the freedom of debate on a motion to bring up which now exists by interpretation, under the present rule, and the Senate can amend its rules. A resolution to amend the rules can be subject to cloture if and when the resolution is actually before the Senate, and then the rule itself can be changed by majority vote.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I rise to present at this time my objections to the proposed substitute for the Hayden-Wherry resolution, which provides for cloture by a so-called constitutional two-thirds majority. A motion to proceed to the consideration of the original Hayden-Wherry resolution, which was reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration and which came to the calendar for action, has been the subject of debate for some 16 or 17 days. During that time there was a determined effort on the part of those who opposed the change of the rules to keep the Senate from taking any action whatsoever upon that important question.

During that time those who were as much responsible as anyone else for bringing that measure to the floor of the Senate indicated to the Senate and to the country that they were willing to have round-the-clock sessions in order to break the filibuster that was going on at that time. I heard from the other side of the aisle a number of expressions to the effect that Senators on that side stood ready to remain here from now on, night and day, for the purpose of engaging in physical combat, so to speak, with those who were delaying action to determine which could wear the other out. It was the able minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska, who charged on the floor of the Senate one day that the majority leader was carrying on a pink tea filibuster, and that he stood ready, with all his power and all his might, to carry on until he put through his resolution, which was reported out by the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Arizona. He charged the Senator from Illinois with failure. The Senator from Nebraska said he wanted to stay here day and night until final action was had. But at the first opportunity that comes along he abjectly surrenders and capitulates, and comes in with something that is much worse, from the standpoint of ever getting action upon civil rights, than what his original measure would have provided to those who are interested in civil rights.

The Senator from Nebraska is leading the coalition; he is leading the fight here for a change, not a liberal change in the resolution; he does not seek to liberalize the rule; he seeks to tighten the rule so far as ever being able to use cloture as a means for getting action on contested legislation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. LUCAS. Just a moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator declines to yield now.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I make the statement I have just made because of what has been said on the floor of the Senate in these debates. I have been charged, directly and indirectly, with bad faith throughout the 3 weeks of debate. I have been charged by the opposition with not conducting an honest attempt on this side of the aisle to break the filibuster. But when we see what has happened, when we see this coalition in action closing the door to the liberalizing of the rules, I am forced to make these statements.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the able and distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Illinois, if it is not a fact that on the pending proposal, on which people have different points of view, but which we felt was the most effective cloture procedure that could be passed through the Senate, if it is not a fact that on this substitute amendment there appear the names of 12 northern and western Democrats and 18 southern Democrats, or a total of 30 of the Members of the majority party, of which the able Senator from Illinois is the leader, which constitutes a majority of the Senator's own party in the Senate, not from

the South alone but from the South, from the East, from the North, and from the West, and if there is a coalition—as there is not—it is with the Members of the Senator's own party, and if the amendment is not an amendment of the Members of the Senator's own party representative of every geographical section of the country?

Mr. LUCAS. What is the question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am asking the Senator if that is not correct, since he is making these charges about the minority leader, who does not happen to be present in the Chamber.

Mr. LUCAS. I cannot control the minority leader it is all I can do to control myself. I am very glad the Senator from California asked the question. I anticipated it would be propounded.

One thing is certain, I may say to the Senator, that whatever has been done upon this side of the aisle with respect to the position taken now by the Senators he has mentioned, and with respect to the position they took on the ruling of the Vice President, in my judgment they were absolutely sincere, and they took the action with all the conviction they possess. I respect my friends from the South, although I violently disagree with their position on the question, and have consistently disagreed with their stand on this proposition. But the Senator will not find the name of any individual he has cited, from the North, the South, or the West, on one of the cloture petitions to bring civil rights to an issue, as he will find the names of various of his Republican colleagues. One Republican group after another, along with certain Democrats, who today are just as firm on this question as they were then, signed these cloture petitions for the sole purpose of trying to get some action on civil rights.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield for a question, but I am not going to yield for a long-winded speech.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator well knows the Senator from Oregon does not make that kind of speeches.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not so sure about that.

Mr. CORDON. The question I address to the majority leader is this. The Senator from Oregon would like to know whether the Senator intended to say what he just stated, that a majority of the Democratic Party is opposed to a civil-rights program.

Mr. LUCAS. I can hardly keep track of the majority over here, and certainly I cannot keep track of the minority, especially the Senator from Oregon, as he flits around from one side to another on these cloture petitions, in contrast with the votes he has cast. I cannot answer that question. I do not know what our majority will do.

Mr. CORDON rose.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield for another question.

Mr. CORDON. I thank the Senator. Was it the Senator's intention to say that a majority of the members of the Democratic party in the Senate were opposed to cloture?

Mr. LUCAS. I did not say anything of that kind at all. I do not know about the majority. I do know that sitting on the other side of the aisle is the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. The Senator was the chairman of the resolutions committee at the Republican Convention in Philadelphia last year, and he was responsible for writing a magnificent platform upon civil rights. It was a noble document. It rang with true statesmanship, Mr. President. It came out of that convention unanimously as the Senator from Oregon well knows. Probably the Senator was there and helped write it. But the first opportunity that the Republicans who were responsible for writing that platform got to uphold that position, 23 Republican Senators on the floor of the United States Senate by voting against the ruling of the Vice President failed to uphold the position they took at Philadelphia.

Can you convincingly say, "We stood on a technicality." Can Senators say, "We stood behind the rules of the great Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]." Senators can take that position if they wish. Senators have been talking in the Senate about technicalities ever since I have been a Member of this august body, but I never have seen a Senator who, if he wanted to, did not throw technicalities to the four winds—either through conscientious convictions or political expediency.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois, the majority leader, if it is not a fact that on the cloture petition filed prior to the ruling of the Chair there were contained 17 names from the majority side of the aisle and 16 names from the minority side of the aisle?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from California is absolutely correct. I have congratulated those 16 Senators, and I do it again here openly, before the Senator from California and the Senate and the world. I was happy that it was a nonpartisan proposition to put into effect what I have always believed to be the true intent and meaning of the rule 22 as adopted by the Senate in 1917.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Michigan for a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not also a fact that when the ruling by the Vice President was made and the appeal taken from that ruling, 16 Members on this side of the aisle voted to sustain the ruling of the Chair?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct. I am glad the Senator mentioned that fact. I again commend those 16 Senators. I commend them to the country, regardless of politics. But I am talking about other Senators, not about the 16 who upheld that ruling.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator from Illinois maintain that a Senator should vote against his convictions as to what a rule means, simply because of his views on civil rights, a matter which has no connection with this particular question, or does he not?

Mr. LUCAS. Oh, tut, tut, Mr. President. The Senator from Ohio says the amendment of this rule does not have any connection with the question of the civil rights. I am surprised at the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I ask the question: Does the Senator from Illinois say that although a Senator thinks a rule means one thing he ought to vote that it means something else, because of his views on civil rights, or some other legislative question?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Ohio makes the suggestion that the question of civil rights is not involved in the proposed change in the rule. The Senator from Ohio knows that if it were not for the civil-rights program Senators on his side of the aisle would not have been urging the change in the rule from the first day of the present session of Congress. Senators on the other side of the aisle could hardly wait until they got the resolution out of committee in order to bring the civil-rights program before the Senate of the United States. From the way some have voted I am certain that with them their sole purpose was to embarrass the Democratic Party, hoping to put us in a hole. The Senator from Ohio voted with us, but he did not live up to the reputation for work and energy in our cause—that he had exhibited in the early part of the session in pushing this legislation for action.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator from Illinois maintain that a Senator should vote that a rule means something he does not think it means because of his views on civil rights or any other legislative question?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not. But I maintain, and the Senator from Ohio knows it, that any time a man wants to avoid taking a position, by availing himself of a technicality here in the United States Senate he can do it very well, and it will not bother his conscience very much when he does it.

This question of conscience in the United States Senate always amazes me and amuses me. I am amazed and amused to find someone getting up on the floor and talking about conscience in connection with a technicality. I have got a conscience on fundamental questions. But when Senators take the distinguished Vice President's ruling one way and the distinguished former President pro tempore's ruling another way, as they have done on this matter, it is difficult for me to understand how they can talk about having a deep and abiding conscience respecting that matter. I say that Senators could go either way and be right. But the Senators I am talking about are those who went the other way first and then changed their minds afterward for political reasons, as I have charged.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to my friend from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Would the Senator be of the opinion that there would be anything insincere in the position taken by the six nonconfederate Democratic Senators who voted not to uphold the ruling of the Vice President, namely, the Senators from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN and Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]? Would the Senator be of the opinion that they voted anything but their sincere convictions?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Louisiana may not have been present when I made the statement, but I said none of those Senators signed a cloture petition involving civil rights. That is the point I am making.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. If any one of those six Senators had believed the ruling of the Vice President was right, is there any doubt in the Senator's mind that those six Senators would have voted with the Democratic majority?

Mr. LUCAS. I cannot tell what is in their minds, sir, any more than I can tell what is in the mind of the Senator from Louisiana.

If the Senate approves the amendment submitted by this coalition 'or a constitutional two-thirds majority, it will be more difficult than ever to obtain action upon any civil-rights program we may desire to launch in the future. Mr. President, the adoption of this amendment will be immediately interpreted by the people of America as a sign that civil rights legislation is practically dead in the Eighty-first Congress. I hope that such is not the fact, and I can assure them now that as majority leader I shall never overlook an opportunity to get action on that very important, fundamental question, in this session of Congress.

Mr. President, as I said before, I never believed I would see the time when the distinguished minority leader would be leading the fight against his own resolution, against the liberalizing of the Senate rules.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not a fact that the Senator from Illinois, in the conference we had just before the final conference, agreed that we should leave the rules the way they are, and the Senator from Illinois would let us write our own ticket relative to the protection of those rules, and that the Senator from Illinois said he would go along with the two-thirds constitutional majority provision? Did not the Senator say that?

Mr. LUCAS. Oh, no; the Senator is so wrong. That is the trouble with respect to these conferences we have been in. I have been misquoted. I have always been against the two-thirds constitutional majority.

Mr. WHERRY. On the rules?

Mr. LUCAS. Not on the rules. I said the Senator from Nebraska could write——

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct; on the rules.

Mr. LUCAS. No; wait a minute.

Mr. WHERRY. Did not the Senator say that?

Mr. LUCAS. Just one minute.

Mr. WHERRY. Did the Senator say that——

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator from Nebraska have the floor or do I have the floor?

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator, but he made some statements about me in my absence.

Mr. LUCAS. Now, Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Very well. If the Senator does not wish to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. What I said was that if the Senator left the two-thirds with respect to cloture just as it is in the Wherry-Hayden resolution he could tighten up the rules. Of course I said that. That was a give-and-take proposition. But since the Senator did not tighten them up from both ends, then I am against any compromise. I was willing to compromise. Of course I was.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield for a question, not for a statement.

Mr. WHERRY. In all sincerity there is no use for the majority leader and the minority leader to have any dispute about the words we used, nor about the truthfulness of our statements. I respect the majority leader. But I am being charged here with bringing in a measure on which there is not agreement. I was not present in the Chamber when the Senator said some things that have been reported to me. I simply want to get the RECORD clear. Let us let the public know what our differences are.

I ask the majority leader if he does not agree that so far as rule changes were concerned he and his conferees would agree to the two-thirds constitutional majority in a vote on cloture if and when a vote was finally had?

Mr. LUCAS. We agreed definitely in our Democratic conference of northern and western democrats that we would accept the two-thirds constitutional majority in connection with a change in the rules, but not the two-thirds proposal generally. That is the big difference, and that is the real difference.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the majority leader. I should like to have the RECORD show that we are in total agreement as to what he said. What he said was this——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to clarify the RECORD.

Mr. LUCAS. I have just told the Senator what I said. The Senator can clarify the RECORD in his own time.

Mr. WHERRY. I am asking for a clarification now.

Mr. LUCAS. I am making a speech now. Does the Senator wish to ask a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I will frame it as a question.

Mr. LUCAS. I ask the Senator not to make it too long. I respect my friend. I do not want him to start filibustering. A little while ago he wanted to filibuster all day and all night. Now that is over.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I can only ask a question in response to that observation.

I ask the majority leader if he did not report to the conference, to those who tried to solve this difference, and who worked so faithfully with him, and even reported to the press, that the conference which he represented, which was the administration Democrats, would accept a compromise in which, with respect to a change in the rules, he would support the two-thirds constitutional majority vote on the rules, and on everything else a straight two-thirds?

Mr. LUCAS. I certainly said that, and I stand by it. I would be willing to go to that today. But, Mr. President, when something is tied on the other end of it, that takes me out from everything.

We were making a compromise. We were going beyond what the Senator had in his own resolution with respect to the so-called constitutional two-thirds on taking up a proposal to amend the rules. We went beyond the Senator's own resolution in the latter part of it, too. So instead of liberalizing it, the Senator has tightened it up.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator say that if this proposal were adopted, the field open for the filing of a cloture petition would be tightened?

Mr. LUCAS. I certainly do.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. LUCAS. I will convince the Senator before I am through, and he will probably vote with us. I am sure that he will vote for the original Hayden-Wherry resolution before we are through with this debate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator would not have had an opportunity to vote on anything if it had not been for the men who agreed that because of the small difference between a two-thirds vote and a constitutional two-thirds, which amounted to an average of only a vote and a half, they would accept that proposal. We would not be here voting on anything today if we had not tried to save the country and extend cloture to every motion, matter, or business coming before the United States Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I am surprised that my friend should make that sort of statement after standing here and declaiming about holding all-night sessions. He said, "We must go into this thing with vim and vigor and power. We cannot carry on a pink tea. We must do it right. We must bring in cots. We will break this filibuster. I want my rule to pass." Yet he is the first to capitulate, after making the fine-sounding statement which rang throughout the country from Maine to California, and from the Lakes to the Gulf, as to what he was going to do.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. After that futile effort, what the Senator did was to give up the ghost and state that he was about to make a motion to adjourn.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Illinois agree with the junior Senator from Oregon that it would be much better for the Senate and for the country if we did not vote on any proposal at all, if our only choice is to be the Hayden-Wherry resolution?

Mr. LUCAS. I am certainly going to vote against it. The Senator will have to use his own judgment. I am not going to filibuster against the resolution, because I do not believe in it. But apparently many Senators did not do much to help us break up the filibuster.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. Is the Senator satisfied that the only real difference between the proposed substitute and the original proposal for a two-thirds majority is only 1½ votes?

Mr. LUCAS. No; I am certainly not satisfied with that statement.

Mr. MYERS. I wish the Senator would address himself to that question. We have heard much about the difference being 1½ votes. I am convinced that the difference is much greater than 1½ votes.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is absolutely correct. I shall tell him why.

Under the present cloture rule, cloture petitions succeeded in only 4 out of 19 attempts to end debate. An analyses of these four cases reveal how hopelessly inadequate and futile this cloture rule has been. These four successful petitions show conclusively that the only time the Senate will adopt cloture by a simple two-thirds is when the Senate is almost unanimously in favor of the measure with respect to which cloture would be imposed.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I ask the Senator to let me finish this point first, please.

In other words, a detached view of cloture, distinct from the views held on the measure to which the cloture petition is to be applied, has not been taken. In three of the four cases where cloture has been applied, the final vote in favor of the measure itself was overwhelming. In no case were there less than 71 votes in favor of the measure. In practical terms, this has meant that under the simple two-thirds requirement we never have had successful cloture unless both parties overwhelmingly approved and supported the measure.

Almost invariably under the two-party system we do not get anywhere near unanimous approval of proposed legislation. Practically, then, the simple two-thirds rule was not successful in avoiding obstructionist tactics. In fact it has been harmful, for it gave the appearance of some form of cloture; and we did have cloture, as I have said before, in four different cases.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Is it not true that three times out of the only four times when cloture has been successful, there was a constitutional two-thirds voting in favor of cloture?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. LONG. Judging by the history of this matter, then, there has been only one time out of the four when the constitutional two-thirds rule would have prevented cloture from succeeding.

Mr. LUCAS. Whatever the Senator says, I shall agree with it.

Mr. President, I wish to discuss briefly the cloture votes from 1919 to 1948. During that time there have been 19 cloture votes. On the yea-and-nay votes in that connection there were 1,606 Senators who answered to their names. The "yeas" were 869; the "nays" were 715; not voting were 234; the pairs were 123; and not paired were 111.

So, Mr. President, the fact that 234 Senators did not vote when cloture was the question before the Senate is the important fact involved in this instance; and when we take the average of the votes on the 19 roll-call votes on cloture, we find that the difference between a constitutional two-thirds and a simple two-thirds is eight votes. Eight is the difference, on the general average—not a difference, of one, two, three, four, or five votes, as some Senators have been saying.

Let me further illustrate this point. I dislike to be talking about civil-rights measures constantly; but I am an honest man, and I know what is back of all this matter. I know why the situation arose here. I know why the Republicans had this matter on the calendar 2 years ago, but did nothing with it for 17 months. We cannot get away from the civil-rights issue in this matter, Mr. President. That is why we had the filibuster. It was not because of the rule. The Senators from the South knew what was in the wind.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. The Republicans did as much as the Senator from Illinois would have done if he had adjourned the Senate the other night; is not that true?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska comes back to that point again. He has mentioned it twice. He came to me, and did not want me to move to have the Senate adjourn—why? He said he had a plan which he thought could be worked out—a plan, so I was told by a very distinguished Senator, along the line of the two-thirds majority, not a plan along the line of a constitutional two-thirds.

Mr. WHERRY. Except on rules.

Mr. LUCAS. Except on rules; yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. In just a moment.

Under those circumstances, Mr. President, I was willing to move that the Senate take a recess, and take another chance on trying to work out the problem, upon that basis.

But when I got into the conference, there was no one there who ever had heard of that kind of proposition. One of the most able Members of the Senate and one of the most able Senators who was present in all of the discussions of this matter from the beginning was presumed to have been the one who said it could be worked out on that basis. Otherwise, I would have asked for a vote to adjourn, because the business of the Senate of the United States had to get along, and I knew that the Republicans and the Democrats together had sufficient votes either to keep me from adjourning the Senate or to keep me from recessing the Senate. I was in a parliamentary vise between my friends on both sides of the aisle, and I simply did the best I could.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree as to that.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Because 12 or more of the signers of this petition are Senators who come from the Democratic conference.

So the matter is not a partisan one. Two years ago it was the Hayden-Wherry resolution, and now it is the Hayden-Wherry resolution; and the Senator from Illinois himself said he would support the original Hayden-Wherry resolution, and he complimented us on bringing it out. And we tried our best to get it. The Senator from Illinois knows that in every conference I have attended, I have said time and time again that I wanted to get a vote on the two-thirds rule if I could get it; but if we could not get anything else but a two-thirds constitutional rule, it was my opinion that the time had come when we should get a rule which would permit cloture to be applied on a motion.

So I humbly ask the distinguished Senator from Illinois: If we do not get this rule through now, certainly we will not, will we, have an opportunity to file a cloture petition or motion on a motion to bring up a measure? If we cannot do that, it will be simply futile to try to bring up proposed legislation which a group of the Members of the Senate do not wish to have brought up—whether it be civil-rights legislation or any other kind of legislation; is that correct?

Mr. LUCAS. No; I would not say that.

Mr. WHERRY. Well, the Senator from Illinois says that a cloture motion cannot be filed on a motion to bring up; does he not? The present rules do not permit the filing of a cloture motion on a motion to proceed with the consideration of a measure.

By means of the substitute now under consideration, the rule will be extended so as to apply to everything; so at least we shall have an opportunity to file a cloture motion on a motion to bring up a measure.

The only difference between the majority leader and the minority leader is that even though I could not get the original two-thirds, I am willing to compromise on a constitutional two-thirds, in an effort to arrive at a situation in which we may be able to bring up the very legislation the Senator from Illinois is talking about, and help this administration put forth its program.

Mr. LUCAS. That is marvelous; I am certainly interested in knowing that the Senator from Nebraska is interested in the Truman program. That is a proposition in which I am very much interested, and I hope the Senator from Nebraska will go along with us.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. I wanted to go along with him on the resolution he reported, but I did not get a chance to do so.

Mr. WHERRY. Neither did I.

Mr. LUCAS. And so I wanted to do the next best thing.

Mr. President, I wish to refer to the chart I have in this connection. I also wish to refer again to the civil-rights questions.

On vote No. 12, 88 Senators answered the roll call; and there were 37 yeas and 51 nays. There were eight Senators not voting.

On roll call No. 13, another antilynching bill, there were 88 Senators voting, with 42 yeas and 46 nays.

On roll call No. 14, on the anti-poll-tax bill, there were 78 Senators voting, with 37 yeas and 41 nays.

On roll call No. 15, on the antilynching bill, there were 80 Senators voting, with 36 yeas and 44 nays.

On roll call No. 16, on the FEPC bill, there were 84 Senators voting, with 48 yeas and 36 nays.

On the last one, No. 19, on the anti-poll-tax measure, there were 72 Senators voting, with 39 yeas and 33 nays.

So, Mr. President, on the average, if the rule now proposed is adopted, we shall lose a little better than a fraction of eight votes, if that average continues, under a constitutional two-thirds rule, rather than under a plain two-thirds rule which the original resolution calls for.

Here is an example: It takes 64 votes, under a constitutional two-thirds, to carry the question. If there were 75 Senators voting, two-thirds of that number would be only 50 votes. Under the present rule, cloture would carry in that case. But under the constitutional two-thirds rule, it would be necessary to obtain 14 more votes, so as to have a total of 64 voting "yea."

So, Mr. President, that is the real difference; and it is significant, regardless of whether anyone believes it or not. I say it is most significant. As between a constitutional two-thirds rule and a simple two-thirds rule, of course there is no difference if every Senator is present and voting. But that is not the case, and never will be. When it is necessary to get the votes of 64 Senators in favor of invoking cloture on any measure, those who are opposed to it can simply go fishing. They do not have to do anything here in the Senate in those circumstances; they do not even have to vote.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. BALDWIN. I am very much interested in the point the Senator from Illinois is making. My question is this: Will the Senator tell me what authority the Senate has to compel the attendance of a Member? Is it not true that a Senator cannot be absent from the Senate without the permission of the Senate?

Mr. LUCAS. Strictly speaking, the Senator is correct.

Mr. BALDWIN. Is it not true that when the absence of a quorum is suggested, if a quorum is not present or if there are any other circumstances which require the attendance of an absent Senator, the Sergeant at Arms can be directed by the Chair to require the attendance of absent Senators?

Mr. LUCAS. That is true; and if it is not possible to obtain a quorum, the absent Senators may be arrested.

Mr. BALDWIN. Is it not also true, under the rules, that if a Senator fails to attend the meetings of the Senate, or is absent without leave, the rules provide that his pay can be docked for that reason?

Mr. LUCAS. I think that is true; but I should like to have the Senator from Connecticut point out one instance when that rule has ever been invoked.

Mr. BALDWIN. Is not that one of the virtues of this situation?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. BALDWIN. Because I am quite sure that if a Senator were absent and failed to attend or refused to attend, and if under pressure, his pay were docked, he really would be the laughing-stock of the country. It would be an unusual case. So would not tremendous pressure be placed upon him to attend?

Mr. LUCAS. I should say that probably there would be 96 Senators who would be guilty.

Mr. BALDWIN. Be that as it may, if the Senator will yield for a further question——

Mr. LUCAS. We would have to employ another force around here to watch Senators when they go and come.

Mr. BALDWIN. That is not beyond the range of possibility; is it?

Mr. LUCAS. No; I suppose not, if some persons had their way.

Mr. BALDWIN. If the Senator will further yield, Mr. President, I wish to say that I was one of the Senators on this side of the aisle who supported the position the majority leader has taken.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; I appreciate it, and I commend the Senator.

Mr. BALDWIN. And I have used the same argument which I am using now, in trying to get some of those who wanted a two-thirds constitutional rule to see that there was not a great deal of difference between the two.

Under all the circumstances, it seems to me that we may have arrived at the best we can get, for is it not true that the present cloture rule is completely and utterly ineffective?

Mr. LUCAS. I would say positively that the proposal now before us, in the nature of a substitute, is certainly no improvement, in my opinion. That is my own opinion of it.

If we adopted constitutional two-thirds rule, we would not get two-thirds of the entire membership of the Senate to vote in favor of invoking cloture, except when the two political parties were practically in agreement on the proposition in question. It would be an almost impossible undertaking to attempt to get 64 votes in favor of invoking cloture under such circumstances.

As I have previously stated, if the rule provided for a simple two-thirds, and if there were only 60 Senators in attendance, cloture might be invoked, for two-thirds of the 60 would be 40 votes. Senators on both sides of the aisle who are interested in such a matter would be present and voting, if there were a simple two-thirds rule. But if there were a constitutional two-thirds rule, Senators who knew they were opposed to what was being attempted in the way of invoking cloture would simply go fishing. They would absent themselves from the floor; they would not have to do anything until the favorable votes of 64 Senators were obtained. Those who were opposed would not even have to vote. Such procedure encourages absenteeism.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. Would we have to let them go fishing? Or would we have to let them continue to fish if they had gone fishing? Has not the Senate sufficient power—all the power it needs—to compel the attendance of its Members?

Mr. LUCAS. Very well. Then let me ask the Senator from Connecticut a question: If the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] were to ask to be excused from the Senate for 1 week, would the Senator from Connecticut object?

Mr. BALDWIN. No; I think not. But I think——

Mr. LUCAS. All right, that is the answer.

Mr. BALDWIN. But if a cloture petition were pending, would we not have the power, under those circumstances, to say, "I do object; a Senator should be here to attend to this business"?

Mr. LUCAS. I want to be around when that happens, when some Senator asks to be excused for 2 days or a week, and when the Senator rises at his desk and says, "Mr. President, I object."

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just one further question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. I should like to say at this point, I would have much preferred the Hayden-Wherry resolution, and would like even now the possibility of voting upon it. I know it is not going to carry, because 52 Senators have proposed the substitute, and it will become the rule.

Mr. LUCAS. Some of the Senators might change. That might happen rather rapidly.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have noted that the Senator and others have used the expression "constitutional two-thirds."

Mr. LUCAS. There is no such thing.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think we ought to be explicit in the RECORD.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is absolutely correct. The phrase is "two-thirds of the Senators chosen and sworn." That is really the proper term. The expression "constitutional two-thirds" is really an improper term, I thank the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. The time might come, when new Senators were to be sworn in, when there might be but 60 Senators.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is absolutely correct. There might be a time when there would be three Senators absent, and it would be necessary to have a majority of those chosen and sworn to do business, which would be two-thirds of 93.

Mr. FERGUSON. So that, while the Constitution at the present time provides for 96 Senators, it is a misnomer to speak of a "constitutional two-thirds."

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct. I thank him for interrupting and making these timely observations.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The language of the amendment provides for the definition just given by the Senator from Michigan, does it not?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes. I have misused the term.

Mr. WHERRY. So, when the Senator is using the number 64, if and when a vacancy once occurs, and a Senator is not duly sworn, the number would be reduced to the then membership of the Senate. So the emergency is taken care of.

Mr. LUCAS. I pointed out——

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment. These are important points. The Senator well knows I worked as hard as any one else to have the Hayden-Wherry resolution reported, requiring two-thirds. But what would the Senator do in a case like this? Of course, I realize it is not always the case, but if we had the attendance of every Member of the Senate, the Senator would agree with me there would be no difference between two-thirds of those in the Senate ready to vote, and two-thirds of the membership of the entire Senate, would he not?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is absolutely correct. But let me answer him by saying that, in the 19 cloture petitions heretofore filed, it has never happened.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I have a table here with respect to previous cloture petitions. I submit to the Senator that questions such as those referred to are of major importance. Let us take the four times that a cloture petition was applied. On ratification of the Treaty of Versailles with 94 Senators present, the vote was 78 yeas, 16 nays. On the World Court Treaty in 1940, a great issue, the vote following the submission of a cloture petition was 68 yeas, and 26 nays. The question on the Branch Bank was one of the big questions, a tremendous one. On cloture, the vote was 65 yeas and only 18 nays. The next was the bill to create a Bureau of Customs and Bureau of Prohibition, on which the yeas were 55, the nays 27. The last one is the only one on which there was a full attendance in the Senate. I mean, there were 96 Senators; there were no vacancies. That is the only case in which a two-thirds majority of the Senate failed. So that out of the four times cloture has been applied to great issues, it has carried. It would not make any difference whether it was a majority of two-thirds or a majority of two-thirds of the Senators of the Senate sworn and serving. So I respectfully ask—I know there are other questions, but my question is this—does the Senator not, as majority leader, agree with me on this? While I agree there is absenteeism in the Senate, that absenteeism it seems to me would not make any difference whether we had this rule or whether we had a rule providing for a two-thirds majority. If a Senator is not going to vote, because he refuses to vote, what difference would it make whether the rule called for two-thirds or for a "constitutional two-thirds"?

Mr. LUCAS. I answered that a moment ago. For instance, if 60 Senators were present, and two-thirds of them voted for a measure, it would pass by 40 votes. That is the answer.

Mr. WHERRY. But does it not work just the other way? On an important issue, there is not a Senator of the United States today who could go home to his constituents, if he did not attend the Senate and vote on that great vital issue. Let us take for example the United Nations——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not want the Senator to take too much of my time.

Mr. WHERRY. I am sorry. I appreciate the fact that the Senator has yielded. I was trying to clarify the matter. I realize there are two sides to the question. I agree we may take the 19 cases cited. I think there are times when there is not such great interest in pending measures. On the question of ratifying the agreement for the United Nations Organization, as I recall, there were but two negative votes. I do not have the total vote before me. I cannot give it now. I believe there were more than 90 yeas. It was a tremendous issue. Had cloture been invoked and had a Senator gone fishing or refused to vote, he could not have returned to his home to face his constituents on such an issue as that. After a study of the rules, I humbly appeal to the majority leader to say whether there is not a difference between cloture as applied to a great issue, and cloture as applied to a minor subject? And should we not——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will pardon me one more moment. Should there not be a difference as between great issues and small ones, in the matter of cloture? Knowing the Senator from Illinois as I do, who is present and voting on these measures, I feel sure he would not be absent from the Senate. He would be here to vote. Believe me, I think the entire membership of the Senate would be here, if they could get here. Only illness would keep them away. I submit that is a very important point in the discussion of what the vote might be on cloture.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. Just a moment. My answer to the Senator is that the last cloture petition that was submitted was in connection with an anti-poll-tax bill. I think there was about as much interest in that as on any other bill that I know of. There were only 74 votes cast at that time.

Mr. WHERRY. Was not that the case of a rider on the bill?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know what it was, but it was an important bill. It had to do with the poll tax. It makes no difference whether it came up on a rider or not.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. Just a moment. If there was such interest as the Senator describes, on one of these vital questions, Senators certainly could be here. On another anti-poll-tax bill there were only 80 votes. At another time there were 78 votes; 84 votes another time. It ran from 72 to 84 votes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not have the record. I wonder if the majority leader does have the record, and whether he can state whether those were on riders to other bills.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know. I know they were not all riders.

Mr. WHERRY. At this time, as the Senator from Illinois knows, it is impossible to get up a civil-rights bill, because cloture cannot be effectively applied to a motion.

Mr. LUCAS. That has nothing to do with what I am talking about.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. Bearing in mind the discussion which occurred earlier in the day as to the possible ambiguity in the use of the term "matter" as it would pertain to a situation of which the Senator spoke, a motion to correct the Journal, and therefore, to preclude other motions, would the Senator permit me to send to the desk at this time, not for present discussion, but so it may be before the Senate, a proposed amendment, which is designed to clarify that?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator cannot yield for that purpose. The Senator can yield only for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Missouri for the purpose of his offering the amendment, without losing the floor.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator. The amendment reads as follows:

On page 2, line 8, of the substitute proposed by Mr. WHERRY (for himself and others) for Senate Resolution 15, amending the so-called cloture rule of the Senate, after the word "matter", insert the following:

"(and, for the purpose of this rule, the term 'matter' shall include a motion to approve the Journal, which shall be in order at any time as a privileged motion)."

I may say, if the Senator will permit me, that today, or after the discussion this morning, I chanced to be at the side of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] who told me the Parliamentarian, Mr. Watkins, had prepared a brief amendment. I have since talked with Mr. Watkins, who thinks this amendment would cure the ambiguity to which reference was made. I send the amendment to the desk. I appreciate the Senator's courtesy in permitting me to do so.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator, because I am in favor of correcting every ambiguity, every bit of uncertainty which may be in the resolution at this time, because I hope we shall never again be compelled to be divided on a question as serious as was the ruling of the Vice President, on a technicality, as to which one presiding officer held in one way and another presiding officer held in another way.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask a question?

Mr. LUCAS. Certainly.

Mr. DONNELL. I take it the Senator agrees there may be a difference of opinion as to whether it was a technicality. In my mind the word "measure" is clear. I shall not enter into a discussion of it, but I think it was not a technicality.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator. It is clear in my mind. I think it was the most narrow interpretation that could have been made as to the meaning of a word.

Mr. DONNELL. There was a difference of opinion as to the meaning.

Mr. LUCAS. But I shall not go into that, because, if I did, I might take up a long time, and I am about ready to close now.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator for his courtesy.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, this debate has been fought in full view of the public. The words and the deeds of those fighting for civil rights and those fighting to prevent any progress have been spread upon the pages of the press throughout the Nation, and broadcast hour after hour by the radio stations to every corner of the United States. When the roll is called upon the amendment and the substitute, the people will note the names of those who have embraced a cloture rule which makes it nearly impossible to make any progress in civil rights.

Mr. President, those near funeral services for civil rights are not being held in some dark and secret place. They are being held beneath the pitiless light of public observance in a public place, within the knowledge of all the people.

Because I know that the people will demand the rebirth of civil rights, I am ready to carry on this fight in the months and years to come. The call for civil rights comes from the heart of the people and cannot be forever denied. You never settle anything unless you settle it correctly. It may take time, Mr. President, but the day will come when the people of America will interpret the Constitution as was intended by the founding fathers. There will be the right of equal opportunity of employment, the right of security of person, the right of full and equal political participation, and the right of equal treatment in service and defense of our Nation, regardless of race, creed, or color.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at the outset of this speech I wish to say that I am addressing my remarks principally to those Members of the Senate who have not signed the Wherry substitute for Senate Resolution 15. I say I am addressing my remarks to those Members of the Senate who have not signed that resolution, because it is my understanding, and I wish I could believe it is a mistaken understanding, that those who signed the Wherry substitute have, in fact, committed themselves in advance of this debate to vote in accordance with the terms of the substitute, and, therefore, nothing that any of us can say in this debate in regard to what we consider to be the serious limitations of the substitute measure could possibly open their minds. That is the understanding which has been given to me, Mr. President. Unfortunately, one of the conditions which were exacted for the ending of the filibuster last night was that definite commitments be made not to accept amendments. Over half, at least, of the Members of the Senate were in favor of the resolution, and over half of the Senators in favor therefore of the Wherry substitute amendment pledged themselves to vote for the subject matter of that amendment, in advance of debate. If I am not correct in regard to that, with respect to any Senator who signed it, that any Senator who did sign it is open to conviction upon this matter, I should be glad to be so advised. But in the absence of such advice, let me say, as the second point in my introduction, that I shall not yield even for a question from any Senator who signed the Wherry substitute, because if those Senators have closed their minds, as I believe they have by way of a commitment to vote for the Wherry substitute, I do not care to discuss any of the questions I intend to raise in regard to this resolution with any of them, because it would be a waste of my time. I like to carry on discussions only with men who are not committed and who have their minds open at least to what I consider to be serious facts.

I shall not talk at any great length, Mr. President, because I think from this point on those of us who are opposed to the position which has been taken by those who have committed themselves to the Wherry substitute must, from now on, take it to the people of America and not to the Senate of the United States. I am satisfied that the people of America will not share the point of view and the philosophy of those who have signed the amendment in regard to cloture in the Senate of the United States.

I repeat today what I said a few days ago, that I am satisfied that an overwhelming majority of the people of the United States believe that the principle of majority rule ought to govern not only the passage of legislation in the Senate, Mr. President, but also the rules which make possible our getting into a position in which it is difficult to pass legislation.

The next point I want to make by way of introductory remarks to my speech is that I think, in fact, a new de facto political party in America was formed on the floor of the Senate last night. I think the new policital party, in fact, is a coalition of Democrats and Republicans who stand not only for the principles of the Wherry substitute, but we shall see whether the future voting record in the Senate does not also indicate that in a large measure, Mr. President, this coalition predicts what will happen to great pieces of social legislation in the Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. President, I am going to stick with the Republican Party, because I am firm in my conviction that there is hope for a liberalization of the Republican Party without any coalition with the southern Democrats. I am going to continue firm in the conviction that the overwhelming majority of the registered Republicans want the Republican Party to pursue an independent legislative course of action, without coalition with the southern Democrats.

Mr. President, the time may come when political developments in America in the years ahead may require the formation of a new political party. If that time ever comes, I hope it will be labeled the "American Party," and I hope that if that time comes, in the formation of the "American Party," if we have to come to a new one, we will see to it that it is so organized as to keep out the leftists—those who do not believe in majority rule, and the leftists do not, because they believe in a totalitarian government—and to keep out also the reactionaries because I am satisfied the evidence is overwhelming that they do not believe in majority rule, either. They, like the leftists, believe in those obstacles which prevent a majority from ruling in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, I shall continue to hope that the leaders of my party will give heed to what I am satisfied are the clear wishes of not only the overwhelming majority of registered voters, but I think the great majority of the independent voters of this country. I say to my party from this desk today that 1950 and 1952 are not so far ahead, that we have the greatest opportunity that has been presented to the Republican Party in the last 20 years to satisfy the majority of Republicans, and a majority of independent voters, that they can look to the Republican Party for a program which will protect the interests of the people as a whole. But I say today out of deep conviction, and deep sadness, that the action taken in offering the Wherry substitute resolution to the Senate of the United States will be no encouragement to the great mass of Republican voters and independent voters in the country. When they come to understand what I think are the clear implications of that resolution, they will realize it represents

a step backward for the Republican Party, and not a step forward.

It has been interesting to note the propaganda which has been set afoot in America in regard to the evils of majority rule and in regard to the desirability of filibustering on the floor of the Senate. There is a force in America which I shall characterize as a spirit of financial fascism, which has the audacity these days to tell the American people that the practice of filibustering on the floor of the Senate should be protected. It is clever, but not too subtle, propaganda.

I hold in my hand a copy of Business Week for March 12, 1949, containing an editorial entitled "The Trend." Note the title of the editorial. The Tyranny of the Majority. I ask unanimous consent to have published as a part of my remarks this editorial in full at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TYRANNY OF THE MAJORITY

Filibustering has become a horrid word in the American language. It has been described in the mildest terms of its critics as a technical evil connected with the machinery of lawmaking.

It has been cursed and condemned as a device against democratic decision.

The sharpest criticism has been leveled at filibusters in recent times by those who carry the liberal label. They are good and mad at the southern Democrats. They lambast the southerners in the Senate for filibustering against all attempts to put civil-rights legislation on the Federal statute books.

Unconsciously, the zeal of the so-called liberals has befogged their minds. Unwittingly, they are sniping at democracy and liberty. They assert that what they are seeking is a further expression of democracy, and that they are going after it in the democratic way. But they obviously are not remembering their American history.

LESSONS OF HISTORY

A refresher course would remind them right at the beginning that this Nation's Government was framed to avoid tyranny in any form. The drafters of the Constitution put in safeguards against despotic power in any hands.

The founding fathers went to great pains to set up a system of checks and balances. They apportioned power among the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government. They determined to place checks on the powers of all—even the powers of the people who had the right to vote. Thomas Jefferson, for example, was convinced that government by a simple majority could be as despotic as the one-man tyranny of the British King.

This aversion to simple majority rule explains the make-up of the Senate. The upper House of Congress was designed deliberately as an offset to the popularly elected House of Representatives. Each State has an equal number of Senators, regardless of population. The Senators are elected three times as long as the Representatives, and only one-third of the Senate comes up for election every 2 years. Obviously, the Senate was never intended to perform its functions and reach its decisions by snap judgments of temporary majorities. It is supposed to function only after the careful deliberation permitted by unlimited debate.

Through the years when slavery was the big national issue, there were great debates. The North sought to impose its will on the minority of States. The South clamored for States' rights. After a war was fought to preserve the Union, President Lincoln was moved to say:

"There is too much desire on the part of some of our very good friends to be masters, to interfere with and dictate to those (southern) States, to treat the people not as fellow citizens; there is too little respect for their rights."

The fundamental belief in the democratic rights of a substantial minority has never been successfully submerged. It has been the salvation, in turn, of both conservatives and liberals. The latter certainly can recall the power of the individual expressions of such liberals as the two La Follettes—expressions which took the form of filibusters more than once. In a speech against cloture, the elder Senator La Follette said:

"Believing that I stand for democracy, for the liberties of the people of this country, for the perpetuation of our free institutions, I shall stand while I am a Member of this body against any cloture that denies free and unlimited debate. Sir, the moment that the majority imposes the restriction contained in the pending rule, that moment you will have dealt a blow to liberty. * * *"

Full and free debate in the Senate is more than a precious heritage. It is more than an effort to protect the right of free discussion. It is an expression of the doctrine that no one group should be in a position where it could beat down all opponents mercilessly. The doctrine states that important minorities should be persuaded and must not be coerced. No one group should be able to impose its own opinions, its interests, its views on others if, by so doing, the vital interests of other groups are not at all respected. This is the practical core of American Government in operation.

LONG-STANDING TRADITION

The principle, of course, is not written down in black and white as a Government law. It is simply a tradition. There is serious doubt whether it could ever be made official. But it is workable nevertheless.

Any infringement of the right of unlimited debate in the Senate would lead to coercion of important minorities. Stifled debate would give to the majority free and careless sway over legislation. This would defeat the basic American idea that all absolute power must be limited—including the power of the majority of the moment.

As long as there are conflicts between the majorities and the minorities, there will be dilatory debate of some sort. And delay is not easy to accept. But an intelligent majority will be wise to accept some measure of delay if it is really convinced that its objective is basically sound.

Filibustering admittedly is a negative device. But so is a brake on an automobile. The brake can check the speed of the car if it gets out of control. Filibustering is useful when it checks the impulses of an unscrupulous or an inconsiderate majority. In the present situation, filibustering is not directed solely against the passage of civil-rights legislation. The filibuster is being employed to curb the headlong enactment of an ill-advised administration program fraught with great peril to a free society.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to comment on certain paragraphs from the editorial from Business Week. I hasten to add that I just do not believe that the views of the writer of this editorial represent the views of 95 percent of the businessmen of America. The businessmen with whom I talk, at least at a percentage rate of 95, are just as devoted to the principle of majority rule in a democracy as is the junior Senator from Oregon.

But there are at work in the business fraternity of this country, just as there are at work among other pressure groups, certain propagandists who are seeking in their subtle way to undermine the basic tenets of democracy. I consider this editorial in Business Week a serious undermining of what I think are very elemental principles of our constitutional form of government with its guaranties.

The editorial says:

Filibustering has become a horrid word in the American language. It has been described in the mildest terms of its critics as a technical evil connected with the machinery of lawmaking.

It has been cursed and condemned as a device against democratic decision.

The sharpest criticism has been leveled at filibusters in recent times by those who carry the liberal label. They are good and mad at the southern Democrats. They lambast the southerners in the Senate for filibustering against all attempts to put civil-rights legislation on the Federal statute books.

Unconsciously, the zeal of the so-called liberals has befogged their minds. Unwittingly, they are sniping at democracy and liberty.

Mr. President, as one of those liberals, according to the editor of Business Week, I am sniping at democracy and liberty because I stand on the floor of the United States Senate and defend what I am satisfied the founding fathers had clearly in mind, namely, that our constitutional form of government should operate on the basis of a majority-rule principle, save and except in those specific instances in the Constitution where a two-thirds vote requirement was specifically set forth.

Let me say, Mr. President, as has already been pointed out in this debate, that the two-thirds requirement, where it is set out in the Constitution of the United States, was not a so-called "constitutional two-thirds" requirement, as the defenders of the Wherry amendment contend in this debate, but a requirement of a two-thirds vote of those present and voting.

At the time the Constitution was adopted, when the two-thirds vote was used in a parliamentary body it was used on the basis of a two-thirds vote of the Members present and voting, and in the Continental Congress a majority vote meant a majority vote of those present and voting. When a vote was taken on a motion for the previous question, the issue was determined by a majority of those present and voting. Now in the year 1949, more than a century and a half after the founding fathers wrote into the organic laws of this country these precious tenets of democracy, the Senate of the United States proposes to adopt a two-thirds-vote requirement more stringent than our founding fathers themselves used in connection with their own parliamentary bodies.

Someone, if my ears serve me right, said that the amendment is a step forward. Well, if going back more than 150 years is a step forward, then it is a forward-looking resolution, but only on the basis of such a premise.

I say to the editor of Business Week that when he says that those of us who are liberals in the Senate of the United

States unwittingly are sniping at democracy and liberty when we defend the principles of majority rule, he confesses either his ignorance of democratic principles or he deliberately seeks to propagandize the American people by way of falsehood.

He continues in his editorial:

They assert—

Referring to the liberals—

They assert that what they are seeking is a further expression of democracy, and that they are going after it in the democratic way. But they obviously are not remembering their American history.

Now let us see what aspect of American history the editor of Business Week wants us to remember.

A refresher course would remind them right at the beginning that this Nation's Government was framed to avoid tyranny in any form. The drafters of the Constitution put in safeguards against despotic power in any hands.

Ergo—standing for majority rule in the Senate of the United States is then playing into the hands of despotic power, according to the editor of Business Week. Nonsense. Why does not the editor at that point in his editorial start talking about specific checks and balances set out in the Constitution to protect us from the tyrannical will of a majority when a majority seeks to follow a tyrannical course of action?

No, his conclusion, which he would have us adopt, is that the very practice of majority rule, putting it into application, would constitute tyranny. Is it tyranny when we pass legislation by majority rule? Why, no, Mr. President, because we have those precious safeguards in our Constitution that check the Senate of the United States. Whenever a majority passes legislation that in fact violates constitutional guaranties, there is the veto power, and when that power is exercised by the President, then the Constitution provides that two-thirds of those present and voting shall be required to override the veto.

The second check which apparently the editor of Business Week has never heard about, though we know better—we know he knows about it, but in this slanted writing of his he did not tell his readers about it—is the Supreme Court. And if this body, practicing the majority-rule principle, passes a piece of legislation which is unconstitutional, the check is in the Supreme Court, not in a right under the Constitution of the United States for a minority to filibuster and prevent a majority from passing legislation that it, the majority, believes is constitutional but which the minority believes to be unconstitutional.

The editor says:

The founding fathers went to great pains to set up a system of checks and balances. They apportioned power among the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government.

But he failed, as I have just pointed out, Mr. President, to tell how it operates, and how it operates consonant with the application of a majority-rule principle.

They determined to place checks on the powers of all—even the powers of the people who had the right to vote. Thomas Jefferson, for example, was convinced that government by a simple majority could be as despotic as the one-man tyranny of the British king.

Oh, what a blot on the memory of Thomas Jefferson, to take out of context one observation and seek to give the impression that that great defender of human and social rights, were he in the Senate of the United States today, would be voting to protect the filibuster technique.

This aversion to simple majority rule—

Says the editor of this Business Week—

explains the make-up of the Senate. The upper House of Congress was designed deliberately as an offset to the popularly elected House of Representatives.

In respect, Mr. President, I ask, to the operation of a majority rule? Clearly not. Because article 1, clause 5, section 2, of the Constitution gives to each House the right and privilege of devising its own rules for carrying on its proceedings. The founding fathers did not put on any check, which by implication and innuendo the writer of this editorial seeks to give the impression they intended, that the Senate of the United States should operate on a voting principle other than majority rule.

Each State has an equal number of Senators, regardless of population.

Correct. But what has that got to do with the application of a majority rule? Nothing.

The Senators are elected for a term three times as long as the Representatives, and only one-third of the Senate comes up for election every 2 years.

Correct. But what has that to do with the question as to whether or not we ought to have a rule in the Senate whereby majority-vote principles can prevail? Nothing.

Obviously, the Senate was never intended to perform its functions and reach its decisions by snap judgments of temporary majorities.

Why, the editor apparently is not aware of how legislation passes in the Senate of the United States, how it has to go through committees, how it is subjected to committee hearings, and to debate on the floor of the Senate. He, apparently, is not aware of the safeguards of minority rights that have been set out in every proposal offered to the Senate which I have read, that provides for any form of majority rule for limiting debate in the Senate of the United States.

The editor of Business Week ought to know, if he does not, that every resolution we have offered seeking to outlaw the filibuster through the application of the principles of majority rule provides, first, that 16 Senators must sign the cloture petition; provides, second, that it must lie on the table, as under the present rule, for a day; provides that thereafter 96 hours of debate is possible, which amounts, as we usually operate in the Senate, to more than a week of debate if we follow our ordinary meeting schedule of the Senate.

What more protection has the minority the right to ask for? What the minority seeks in the Senate of the United States is a continuation of its protection to block the majority by minority tactics through the filibuster.

I contend, Mr. President, that the Wherry substitute is not to any appreciable extent, going to injure in any way the effectiveness of a southern filibuster, or a northern filibuster, or the filibuster of any other minority group in the Senate that wants to organize under the Wherry substitute for a filibuster.

To say that I am at a complete loss to understand how the editor of a magazine such as Business Week could write such a slanted and propaganda editorial against the democratic system of majority rule in America is to put it mildly, Mr. President.

The editorial goes on to say:

Through the years when slavery was the big national issue, there were great debates. The North sought to impose its will on the minority of States. The South clamored for States' rights.

Mr. President, I think great debates in the Senate of the United States still are carried on in regard to social slavery. I think the great debates in the Senate on issues of civil rights are basically debates on whether or not large groups of minorities in this country are to be held shackled to the will of a minority in the United States Senate, or whether my party, the party of Lincoln, the Great Emancipator, whom the editor of Business Week quotes in the next paragraph, is going to put into effect and practice the true meanings of the liberties and freedoms of the Constitution, which the War Between the States was fought to settle. I sometimes wonder who won that war. Certainly the Negroes of America, who are denied their civil rights, must say that the North did not win it so long as filibustering tactics in the Senate are allowed to prevail and deny the passage of civil-rights legislation.

Let us see what the editor of Business Week took out of context from Lincoln's statement:

After a war was fought to preserve the Union, President Lincoln was moved to say:

"There is too much desire on the part of some of our very good friends to be masters, to interfere with and dictate to those States, to treat the people not as fellow citizens; there is too little respect for their rights."

What has that to do with the debate in the United States Senate over the question whether or not majority rule shall govern our proceedings here? Absolutely nothing. We can all agree that the carpetbag days carried along with them human abuses and injustice and tryannical conduct; but that chapter in our history has nothing to do with the issue as to whether or not the Senate of the United States ought to adopt a rule of procedure which will make certain, as the Wherry resolution does not, of driving out of this body control by a minority.

The editor continues:

The fundamental belief in the democratic rights of a substantial majority has never been successfully submerged. It has been the salvation, in turn, of both conservatives and liberals. The latter certainly can recall the power of the individual expressions of such liberals as the two La Follettes—expressions which took the form of filibusters more than once.

He then proceeds to quote the elder La Follette. Let us quote him; and let us recognize that that quotation was based upon the clear understanding of the Senator from Wisconsin that in 1917 it was the intention of this body to prevent filibustering by way of cloture, with respect to any and all business of the Senate.

The distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] said in effect the other day, in his notable speech, that he did not know what was in the minds of Senators in 1917 when they adopted rule XXII, but he did know what they said 2 years later. Mr. President, I think it is very clear, as was so ably pointed out by the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] in his exceedingly able speech, that if we search the record of 1917 even in a cursory manner, it is prefectly obvious that Senators thought they were debating a cloture rule to apply to all matters of business.

One cannot read the speeches of the elder La Follette, as I have, without being completely satisfied that Bob La Follette, who believed in filibustering—in respect to which belief I am in complete disagreement—believed, as this quotation, I think, clearly implies, that the attempt was being made to adopt a cloture rule which would apply to all matters of business before the Senate. Thus he voted against it. He did say, as the editor of Business Week states:

> Believing that I stand for democracy, for the liberties of the people of this country, for the perpetuation of our free institutions, I shall stand while I am a Member of this body against any cloture that denies free and unlimited debate. Sir, the moment that the majority imposes the restriction contained in the pending rule, that moment you will have dealt a blow to liberty.

That was the view of the then senior Senator from Wisconsin, based, I submit, if we check his record, upon his conviction that in 1917 an attempt was being made to apply cloture to all items of business before the Senate.

On the merits of his opposition to giving effect to majority rule in the Senate of the United States subject to those safeguards and checks which will protect minority rights to adequate debate on the merits of the issue, I am in complete disagreement with the record of the senior Senator from Wisconsin, just as, as a citizen of Wisconsin in those days, I was in complete disagreement with the record of the senior Senator from Wisconsin with regard to the war issue.

Mr. President, in my judgment any argument on the part of the editor of Business Week, or of any Member of this body, past or present, that we destroy any liberties to which we are entitled under a democracy by adopting a rule which would permit of majority limitation of debate in the Senate of the United States so long as the minority has adequate time to discuss the merits of the issue, flies in the face of the whole theory of our system of checks and balances under our Constitution. I cannot read that document, or the constitutional debates, or any chapter of American history and reach the conclusion that the people of America ever intended, at any period of our history, to set up a Government under which minorities could rule.

I repeat what I said on this floor about 2 o'clock the other morning. When those in this body argue that fighting for a principle of majority rule in the Senate follows communistic tactics, I say that the contrary is true. Basic to the whole theory of communism is the adoption of a governmental system under which small groups of men can dictate to the majority. Those of us in the liberal camp, fighting the leftists on the one hand and the reactionaries on the other, bottom our case for democracy upon putting into practice in all branches of our Government the principle of majority rule.

We follow it in our courts and our court decisions determining the very interpretation of the Constitution itself. That is done on the basis of the majority-rule principle. The House of Representatives functions on that basis. The Senate passes legislation on that basis. We are limited by the Constitution to majority rule, save and except in respect to the specific requirements for a two-thirds vote as definitely set out in the Constitution.

I think it is rather sad in the year 1949 to have contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a charge that those of us who are fighting for majority rule in the Senate of the United States are standing for the tactics of communism. I am sorry if I seem to express some resentment about it; but there is no Member of the Senate who makes such a charge to whom I will yield, so far as my patriotism and my devotion to a political democracy and to a capitalistic economy are concerned. I assert today that the members of my party are coming to living up to the principles of majority rule in the Senate, some day. Believe me, Mr. President, they are coming to it, because the American people are going to drive them to it, and are going to drive them to it by first driving some of them out of the Senate. Just wait and see, Mr. President. The American people will never take this lying down. They will not and should not tolerate a coalition which seeks to prevent majority rule in the Senate. Some of us may be defeated in the meantime, while fighting for majority rule; but we shall take our chances on that; and if defeat comes, we shall go down in it with a smile on our face, knowing that at least we stood firm in our devotion to what I think is one of the principles which is of the very essence to a society of freemen operating in a democratic system—namely, majority rule.

Thus, before I close my remarks, I shall offer as a substitute for the Wherry amendment, my resolution, Senate Resolution 12, which calls for majority rule; and I shall ask for the courtesy of a yea-and-nay vote on it, because I want the Members of the Senate to stand up and be counted on the question of whether they are willing to vote for, or whether they will oppose, majority rule in the Senate. I am perfectly willing to let future events take care of themselves, so far as my political future and theirs may be concerned.

The editor of Business Week says:

> Full and free debate in the Senate is more than a precious heritage. It is more than an effort to protect the right of free discussion. It is an expression of the doctrine that no one group should be in a position where it could beat down all opponents mercilessly. The doctrine states that important minorities should be persuaded and must not be coerced.

Mr. President, just see the clever, subtle innuendoes which the editor of the magazine works into his writing, and the idea which he seeks to implant, that if we wish to have the principle of majority rule observed in the Senate, with adequate time for debate on the merits of the issue, and with a check by the President and a check by the Supreme Court of the United States, in some way we favor coercing minorities. Mr. President, that is vicious propaganda, and it is such proganda that is undermining the faith of our people who are attempting to follow the basic tenets of democratic government.

The editor of Business Week further says:

> Any infringement of the right of unlimited debate in the Senate would lead to coercion of important minorities.

In what way? It would lead to putting into effect and into law what the elected representatives of the people of the United States believe to be the desire of the country, and that law, in turn, as I have said, would be subject to the checks and safeguards of the reviewing bodies, as provided by the Constitution.

The editor further says:

> But an intelligent majority will be wise to accept some measure of delay if it is really convinced that its objective is basically sound.

Mr. President, is it delay that he wants us to accept? The operation of our normal procedure is pregnant with delay, so that full opportunity can be given to the minority to make its case on the merits. We provide for hearings, the printing of reports, debate on the floor of the Senate. How many times do we hold up action until we can obtain the full report and have it before us for study? Then there is the delay which occurs in the case of a veto, if a veto comes; and then there is the delay which finally goes along with the eventual application of the law, through judicial processes, ending in the decision of the highest court of the land.

Mr. President, I repeat that so much of this editorial is nonsense—to seek to give the American people the impression that if the majority-vote principle is adopted in the Senate, minority rights will be destroyed.

The editor almost made one confession, when he said in the editorial that—

> Filibustering admittedly is a negative device. But so—

He says—

> is a brake on an automobile. The brake can check the speed of the car if it gets out of control.

Of course, Mr. President, if the brake freezes, it simply stops the car from moving at all. In my judgment that exactly will be one of the results of the Wherry amendment. It will function as a frozen brake, upon what ought to be a forward movement on the part of the Senate.

I read further from the editorial:

> In the present situation, filibustering is not directed solely against the passage of civil-rights legislation. The filibuster is being employed to curb the headlong enactment of an ill-advised administration program fraught with great peril to a free society.

Mr. President, it is with that sentence that the editor of Business Week lets the cat out of the bag. In my judgment, in those words he represents the type and spirit of financial fascism in America which wishes to stymie legislation that is needed in order to make the capitalistic system work for the benefit of all our people. He represents the spirit of financial fascism which believes we can best preserve capitalism by denying to great groups of people in our country the full fruits of a capitalistic system. He represents the type of selfish interest in America that is selling the capitalistic system short. I will have none of his philosophy. I happen to be so devoted to the capitalistic system as the only economic system that can possibly preserve for us political democracy that I say we, the representatives of the people, must keep ourselves in position at all times so we can pass whatever legislation is necessary to make democracy work. That is our job. That is the job of the Eighty-first Congress. I am of the opinion that too many Republicans in the Eighty-first Congress have completely forgotten that our job is to pass legislation which will promote the social, economic, and political welfare of the American people. It is our job to pass those reforms necessary to make the capitalistic system work. Instead of carrying out that great responsibility, too many Republicans are forming coalitions with southern Democrats who appear to be determined to defeat such legislation in the Senate. I am willing to suggest here and now, Mr. President, most of those Southern Democrats will be just as opposed to most of the major provisions of the President's legislative program as they are opposed to civil rights.

Mr. President, I do not swallow the President's legislative program hook, line, and sinker. If I have not made that clear already in the Eighty-first Congress, if I did not make it clear in 70 major speeches across the country in the last campaign then nothing I would say now could make it any clearer. However let me put this in the throats of a few of my Republican colleagues to swallow, right now. I do not know how many of them can stand up and be counted as having made 70 major speeches in behalf of the Republican Party in the last campaign. But the junior Senator from Oregon did. He would do it again, and he intends to do it again in 1952, for his party. But at the same time he is not going to endorse the mistakes of the Republican Party, either. Where he considers the Republican Party wrong on an issue, he is going to tell his audiences in what respects he thinks the Republicans are wrong, and let the voters decide then who is right. That is democracy put to work.

But I want to say that, whether we Republicans like it or not, the fact is that, as between the program we offered in the last campaign—and I speak here not of our platform, because we heard so little about our platform during the campaign, from so many of our speakers—but as between what our Republican political speakers in the last campaign, for the most part, offered the American people, and what the Democratic speakers in support of the President's program offered, we can find part of the explanation of the Republican defeat. I am satisfied the people made a choice favorable to the general over-all proposals of the President of the United States in contrast to the evasion, the noncommittal program which characterized the Republican campaign. I tried in my way to convince the voters that our program was based upon our excellent platform. I talked about that Republican platform which, by and large, was one of the most progressive platforms we have adopted in the last quarter of a century. What did I find by way of voter reaction? I found that audience after audience and group after group expressed to me by questions from the floor and discussions from the floor a clear indication that if the voters could be sure we would carry out the pledges of our platform the people would support the Republican Party. Some way, somehow, I believe they developed a fear, that they could not count on us to carry out the pledges of the Republican platform. I have seen little evidence in the Eighty-first Congress showing that their lack of confidence was a mistake. So I am going to watch, Mr. President, I am going to watch for the voting records of Republicans on great pieces of social legislation, to see whether or not we as a party are ready to implement the major planks of the Republican platform.

I say, Mr. President, it is such leaders of business as the editor of Business Week who are selling capitalism short when in the last sentence of his editorial he said:

> Filibuster is being employed to curb the headlong enactment of an ill-advised administration program fraught with great peril to a free society—

With these words he confesses as to why certain reactionary forces in America are supporting the retention of a filibuster in the Senate. Representatives of financial fascism certainly want to keep the minority strong and the majority weak in all our governmental processes.

Mr. President, I think it is most unfortunate that the decision of the distinguished Vice President applying the cloture rule to motions was not sustained by the Senate. I think it is most unfortunate that a majority of the Republicans did not sustain that decision.

I say that, Mr. President, with these observations. I think that when the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] a year ago or thereabouts handed down a decision holding that under the facts and circumstances existing before him at the time cloture did not apply to the motion then before the Senate he was right on the precedents. If he wanted to follow those precedents, he was right. I said so at the time, and I say so now. But I want to make two points about his decision.

In the first place, there was a clear distinction between the facts and circumstances, or, as we lawyers say, between the operative facts presented to the distinguished Senator from Michigan, and the facts presented to the distinguished Vice President. On the basis of that distinction alone, one could vote to sustain the Vice President, and one could have voted, if it had come to a vote, to sustain the distinguished Senator from Michigan at the time of his ruling.

The second point I want to make, Mr. President, is that the first precedent and all the other precedents upon which the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] based his ruling were wrong. The first precedent, as I think has been brought out so clearly in this debate and as I have satisfied myself since the Vandenberg ruling, was wrong because the first precedent went contrary to the clear intent of those who passed the cloture rule in 1917. There has been a great deal of talk about the value of precedents, but no mention yet have I heard of the clear duty of a court, once it decides that a precedent is wrong, to reverse the precedent by handing down a decision that the court feels is right and sound as a matter of law. Thus I say, Mr. President, that although the Senator from Michigan could justify following precedents based on facts, similar to the facts which were before him when he ruled he likewise could have justified a refusal to follow those precedents. He would have been just as right, in fact more so, had he taken the position that the first precedent did not conform to the spirit and the intent of the framers of the cloture rule because they thought they were providing for limitation of debate on all matters of debate or business which might come before the Senate. Finding that the precedents violated the spirit and intent of the Senate when it passed rule XXII, he could have refused to follow the bad precedents which always make bad law. He did not follow the course of action which many courts follow, of not accepting as binding upon him a precedent in this case which violated the intent of rule XXII. In comparable situations before a court which adopts a liberal construction of a statute in order to carry out the intent of Congress we find many decisions reversing unsound precedents.

So, on the basis of my analysis of the distinction between the cases, Mr. President, I had no hesitancy a few days ago in refusing to follow the precedent established by the ruling of the Senator from Michigan. I satisfied myself on the basis of study, in my preparation for speeches on this subject in this term of Congress, that the first precedent handed down in the Senate after the passage of the cloture rule and upon which the Senator from Michigan relied was an erroneous one. I decided that we should

overrule it at the first opportunity. So I say, if the operative facts before the Vice President had been identical with the operative facts before the Senator from Michigan, I would still have voted to sustain the Vice President, because my study had convinced me that the first precedent which the Senator from Michigan had followed was unsound in that it violated the intent of the cloture rule. Therefore, it should have been reversed by the Senator from Michigan. Most certainly the Republicans should have sustained the Vice President because of the different facts presented by the situation which arose on this matter this year.

Mr. President, I wish to register my deep opposition to the compromise resolution which has been proposed by the minority leader for himself and 51 other Senators. This substitute has been called a compromise, but, in my judgment, in actual fact and truth, it represents a surrender. If it is adopted there will be less likelihood of curbing the filibuster, I believe, than there is under the existing rule of the Senate. I say the people of America should know that what is labeled a reasonable compromise and a step in the direction of more effective controls on obstructionist tactics in the Senate, is, in reality, a long stride backward from which it will be extremely difficult to recover.

The first part of that substitute resolution would permit cloture to be invoked on any measure, motion, or other matter save and except any motion to consider a proposal to change any standing rule of the Senate. It is argued that this will close the loophole in the present rule which permits filibustering on the Journal or on a motion to take up a bill. That is correct, Mr. President, but on paper only. I repeat, that is correct, Mr. President, but on paper only. If there are no vacancies, it means 64 Senators must vote affirmatively to bring debate to a close, as contrasted with the present rule which requires only two-thirds of those present and voting.

As I said earlier in my remarks, the present rule, in regard to the two-thirds requirement, carries out the general practice in respect to the application of two-thirds rules in any phase of the business of most parliamentary bodies. It is the rule which prevails where a two-thirds vote is required in most of the legislative halls of this country. It is the rule which is set forth in the Constitution in respect to any two-thirds vote requirement designated in the Constitution. Yet here, in 1949, in order to stop a filibuster we Republicans are asked to make a compromise, or a deal, or a trade, or whatever one may wish to call it, with a group of men who have made clear that they will not enter into a compromise unless they are assured that they are adequately protected in what they consider is basic in this fight, namely, the right to filibuster on their terms. They agree to this deal because they are satisfied it will enable them to prevent the passage of legislation which they do not want passed. In order to carry out such a trade we have this proposal which seeks to establish as a rule of the Senate a so-called, but miscalled, "constitutional two-thirds" majority requirement to stop a filibuster. This deal is a poor horse trade. It is a surrender of even the simple two-thirds majority vote requirement we have under the present rule XXII.

Let us consider, Mr. President, whether this difference in size of the vote is, as the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] told us, a very small difference indeed. On the 19 occasions on which cloture has been invoked since 1917 the average total vote has been 83. Two-thirds of that number is 56. It is obvious, therefore, that the difference between the average vote in the past and the required vote under this substitute is eight. That is scarcely a very small difference, to use the language of the Senator from California, Mr. President. That difference of eight votes is an increase of 14 percent. Do not tell me, Mr. President that this substitute proposal involves only a small difference between its operation and the operation of the existing cloture rule.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at this point?

Mr. MORSE. I am sorry, but, in view of the fact that the Senator from Louisiana was one of the signers of the round-robin resolution about which I am speaking, and for the reasons I have already given, I decline to yield.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, does the Senator refuse to yield for a question as to the accuracy of his own figures?

Mr. MORSE. I refuse to yield to the Senator on any point, because I do not know of a single argument that I could make to the Senator from Louisiana which would in any way change his viewpoint on this subject. He signed a round-robin resolution pledging his vote on this matter in advance of floor debate on it. Under those circumstances I do not care to exchange viewpoints with him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. MORSE. The argument is made by the Senator from California that cloture-vote history shows an average of more than 90 Senators present and voting, or paired. I say, Mr. President, that reference to pairs means nothing in this discussion. What counts under the procedure of the Wherry substitute is votes actually cast for and against, assuming a quorum. However, under the substitute proposal a Senator who is paired or absent, is, in effect, voting against cloture. Hence, a premium is placed upon absenteeism in the Senate of the United States. We are making the same sort of a mistake in this respect as that which we made on a provision of the Taft-Hartley law under the so-called union-shop election system, whereby we put in a provision which resulted in counting absentees as votes against the union shop.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. I should like to ask the able Senator from Oregon if he was not one of those Senators who supported that provision in the committee bill in 1947?

Mr. MORSE. I have told the Senator from New York before, not only on the floor of the Senate, but in public speeches in this country, that the union shop election was one of the compromises I made in committee in order to get the seven votes we needed to report to the floor of the Senate a reasonably acceptable bill. The Senator from New York is well aware of the fact that if the Ives group and the Morse group had not joined forces so as to get the best compromise we could get out of committee, we would have had a bill reported to the floor of the Senate much worse than the committee bill. The committee bill was generally referred to as the Ives-Morse bill. But I am sure the Senator from New York agrees with me—in fact, the record is clear, from at least one of his speeches on the floor of the Senate—that he thought the time had come to change the requirement in the Taft-Hartley bill which counts an absentee as a vote against a union shop. The Senator is correct about the need for correcting that mistake. I am also sure that the Senator from New York knows me well enough to know that I shall not knowingly make the same mistake a second time.

I think the principle we adopted in that compromise on the Taft-Hartley bill in regard to counting absentees as votes against the union shop was a mistake, and I admit it. But I am not going to adopt with my vote in the Senate a cloture proposal which will put a premium on absenteeism in the Senate.

As I said the other morning on the floor of the Senate, some of the great dangers of the Wherry substitute are the parliamentary devices which are permitted under the Wherry substitute. It will encourage the development of some clever strategy, on the floor of the Senate in order to keep a filibuster going. It will encourage men to take what I call a walk-out powder, absenting themselves from the Senate, and letting the Sergeant at Arms engage in a hide-and-seek contest with them. We know that if men want to hide themselves away, and if that is going to help along in a filibuster fight—and that is what it will get down to—they are going to hide themselves away, and we will be frozen here by a requirement that we have to garner 64 of them in order to get a single roll-call vote. It is unfair for the signers of the round-robin Wherry resolution to impose such an unreasonable rule upon the Senate.

Mr. President, that is not my conception of a new cloture rule which will be more effective in harnessing filibustering in the Senate of the United States. That is not my conception of a cloture rule which will prevent domination of the Senate by a minority group of willful men, as Woodrow Wilson referred to filibusterers. It places a premium on absenteeism. It will make filibustering more effective, not less effective, in the Senate of the United States.

I repeat, Mr. President, that what counts, under present procedure, are the votes actually cast for and against cloture assuming a quorum. However, under the substitute proposal a Senator who is paired or absent is in fact voting against cloture.

Mr. President, I have had prepared a table on all cloture votes since 1917, showing the yeas and nays and pairs, the number of voting present and the number absent, starting with November 15, 1919. These are in connection with those votes in which cloture was attempted since 1917.

November 15, 1919. Treaty of Versailles. Yeas, 78; nays, 16; absent, 1. It will be noted that the opposition in the present debate makes great point of the fact that because in this particular case only one person was absent, therefore we need not fear the danger of having a larger number absent under a rule which freezes a requirement of 64 Senators being present in order to get the action which I thought we were after, namely, the elimination of the filibuster on the floor of the Senate. However, their argument is fallacious. Their rule requires 64 Senators to ban cloture and it stands to reason that when there are only 65 or 70 or 75 or 80 Senators present it is more difficult to get 64 Senators to vote for cloture, mathematically speaking, than when a larger number of Senators are present. Senators who want to duck a vote and still help their friends who may be filibustering will be encouraged to take that "out" under the Wherry amendment. The proponents of the Wherry amendment are kidding themselves and the public if they think that 90 or more Senators will always be here on the Senate floor when a cloture vote is up.

Let us look at some of the other votes that have occurred on cloture petitions in years gone by. February 2, 1921. Emergency tariff. Yeas, 36; nays, 35; paired, 14 for, 8 against; absent, 3. Do not forget that as to most of those pairs, they were either a dead pair, which meant that both Senators were absent, or a live pair, with one Senator absent.

July 7, 1922. Fordney-McCumber tariff. Yeas, 45; nays, 35; paired, 10 for, 6 against; none absent.

January 25, 1926. World Court. Yeas, 68; nays, 26; absent, 2.

June 1, 1926. Migratory bird refuges. Yeas, 46; nays, 33; paired, 5 for, 4 against; absent, 8.

February 15, 1927. Branch banking. Yeas, 65; nays, 18; paired, 6 for, 3 against; absent, 3.

February 26, 1927. Retirement of disabled emergency officers of the World War. Yeas, 51; nays, 36; pairs, 2 for; 2 against; absent, 4.

February 26, 1927. Colorado River development. Yeas, 32. Nays, 59. Four absent.

February 28, 1927. Public buildings in the District of Columbia. Yeas, 52; nays, 31; paired for, 3; against, 2; absent, 7.

February 23, 1927. Creation of the Bureau of Customs and Bureau of Prohibition. Yeas, 55; nays, 27; paired for, 5; against, 3; absent, 5.

January 19, 1933. Bank Act. Yeas, 58; nays, 30; paired for, 4; against, 2. One present and not voting. One absent.

January 27, 1938. Antilynching. Yeas, 37; nays, 51; paired for, 2; against, 1; absent, 5.

February 16, 1938. Antilynching. Yeas, 42; nays, 46; paired for, 2; against, 1; absent, 5.

Thus, Mr. President, I could continue to read what the actual statistics show in regard to those voting "yea" and "nay", and paired for and against and absent, in all the instances in which cloture has been attempted since 1917. But rather than take the time to do that, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire table printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate cloture votes since 1917, including pairs, absentees, and nonvoters

Date	Subject	Yeas	Nays	General pairs		Special pairs		Voting present	Absent	Present but not voting[1]
				For	Against	For	Against			
Nov. 15, 1919	Treaty of Versailles	78	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Feb. 2, 1921	Emergency tariff	36	35	2	2	12	6	0	3	7
July 7, 1922	Fordney-McCumber tariff	45	35	2	2	8	4	0	0	4
Jan. 16, 1926	World Court	68	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
June 1, 1926	Migratory bird refuges	46	33	3	3	2	1	0	8	1
Feb. 15, 1927	Branch banking	65	18	0	0	6	3	0	3	1
Feb. 26, 1927	Retirement of disabled emergency officers of the World War	51	36	2	2	0	0	0	4	0
Feb. 26, 1927	Colorado River development	32	59	0	0	0	0	0	4	0
Feb. 28, 1927	Public buildings in the District of Columbia	52	31	1	1	2	1	0	7	0
Feb. 28, 1927	Creation of Bureau of Customs and Bureau of Prohibition	55	27	1	1	4	2	0	5	1
Jan. 19, 1933	Banking Act	58	30	0	0	4	2	1	1	0
Jan. 27, 1938	Antilynching	37	51	0	0	2	1	0	5	1
Feb. 16, 1938	Antilynching	42	46	0	0	2	1	0	5	1
Nov. 20, 1942	Antipoll tax	37	41	0	0	6	3	0	9	0
May 15, 1944	Antipoll tax	36	44	1	1	4	2	0	8	0
Feb. 9, 1946	FEPC	48	36	0	0	6	3	0	3	0
May 7, 1946	British loan	41	41	0	0	0	0	1	13	0
May 23, 1946	Labor disputes	3	77	0	0	0	0	0	16	0
July 31, 1946	Antipoll tax	39	33	0	0	8	4	0	12	2

[1] Because paired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on the basis of those statistics, let us consider some of the possibilities under the substitute proposal. It does not convince me that there is any merit in the argument of the opposition when they say that these suppositions may not happen. I submit that these suppositions are very probable, and their probability is greatly increased by the fact that the Wherry substitute will encourage, as a matter of strategy, absenteeism from the floor of the Senate. Thus I say that if 65 Senators are present and voting, and this number is a substantial quorum, just two Senators could defeat cloture by voting "nay." Ninety-seven percent, in that case, would be in favor of cloture, and 3 percent would be opposed, but the 3 percent would control.

If this rule had been in effect when cloture was carried in 1927 on the creation of the Bureau of Customs and the Bureau of Prohibition, cloture would have failed by nine votes, since the vote then was 55 to 27.

Only three times in history has a favorable two-thirds vote of the entire Senate been obtained, not four times, as has been said, but three times—in 1919, on the Versailles Treaty, in 1923, on the World Court, and in 1927, on the branch banking bill. In other words a "constitutional two-thirds" vote of the entire Senate membership has been obtained on a cloture petition only three times. On one additional occasion a two-thirds vote of those present and voting was secured to pass a cloture petition thus making the four times that a cloture petition has ever passed the Senate.

That is why I have been heard to say so frequently that even the existing rule, with its mere two-thirds requirement, is not an effective check against filibustering, because as it has worked out seldom have we been able to obtain a two-thirds vote to support a cloture petition. That is why I say that if we want an effective check against filibustering in the Senate we must come to a majority vote rule.

Instead of that we move in the opposite direction under the Wherry amendment with a proposal to freeze a 64 vote requirement, whereas in 1927, in the case of the branch banking bill, a so-called constitutional two-thirds vote requirement could not have been obtained, and the measure would have fallen. Thus on one of the occasions when cloture succeeded in the Senate, it would have fallen 9 votes short, had there then been in effect such language requiring a so-called constitutional two-thirds vote as is provided by the Wherry substitute. Thus instead of having the situation that in the 19 times cloture has been attempted it has been successful only 4 times, the situation would have been worse under the Wherry substitute because under it cloture could have been obtained only 3 times instead of 4.

Mr. President, I dislike to reiterate unnecessarily, but this point must be emphasized for the RECORD. Looking at the record of cloture since 1917, if the Wherry substitute had been in existence and applied to the cases where the Senate attempted to apply cloture, success would have been less rather than more, because in the same number of cases the vote of 64 Senators, as required under the Wherry substitute, could not have been obtained, because in the case involving the Bureau of Customs and Prohibition, in which the Senate was successful in bringing about cloture under the existing rule, the vote was 55 to 27.

Mr. President, if we propose to strengthen the antifilibuster rule it should be obvious that progress lies in reducing rather than in increasing the

percentage of the Senate required to close debate. Assurance that a cloture petition will lie against a filibuster to take up a bill is an empty assurance and of no comfort if it is a foregone conclusion that when put to a vote the petition will fail to receive 64 affirmative votes, even though the actual votes in favor may be a two-thirds vote or more of those voting.

I am exceedingly disturbed, Mr. President, over that effect of the Wherry amendment. I am at a loss to understand why the Senate of the United States here today, having the power to change its rules by majority vote, would now use that majority vote—and 52 Senators have committed themselves by way of a round-robin petition on the Wherry substitute—to fasten upon themselves and the rest of us a frozen two-thirds, so-called constitutional majority of 64 votes.

Well, Mr. President, I am going to stick by the majority-rule principle even when it licks me. Therefore I shall be sportsman enough to say that if that is what the will of the majority is today I am going to have to take it. I will cast my vote against. I shall proceed to do all I can to see to it that in the not too distant future we have enough Members of the Senate of the United States who will reverse that action and bring us back, not to a principle of increasing the votes required for cloture by a so-called "constitutional two-thirds" vote, but by reducing the votes required in the direction of what I consider to be the ideal—a majority vote. That is why I say, whether we like it or not, this matter is now a great political issue. We are not going to get the politics out of this matter, if I understand some of my friends on the Democratic side correctly, as far as the Democratic Party is concerned. We are not going to get the politics out of it, I can assure the Senate, so long as it is my privilege to represent my people in the Senate in the Republican Party, because it is being made a political issue by the action which is being taken here.

I take the position that we must carry the fight of civil and human rights to the American people in the form of making clear to them that if they want protection in the legislative form that those rights ought to be protected, then they must send to the Senate of the United States men who will adopt an effective check against filibusters. I am of the opinion that the Wherry amendment is not an effective check against the filibuster.

So I say, the proposal, insofar as it relates to the size of the vote required to invoke cloture, is definitely a backward step.

I have said before, Mr. President, that the American people want majority rule in the Senate and are in favor of abolishing the filibuster technique. New evidence in support of this position is found in the recent public-opinion polls, published in the Washington Post for March 11, 1949. That poll shows that, among voters who know what a filibuster is, 54 percent were in favor of changing the rules to permit cloture by a simple majority rather than the present two-thirds majority. Only 35 percent disapproved, and 11 percent had no opinion.

Oh, I know, Mr. President, there will be those who will say, "After the experiences of the last election, does the Senator from Oregon believe in polls?" I hasten to answer by saying, "Yes, I do." And I hasten to add further, Mr. President, that I think by his conduct throughout the campaign, the President of the United States showed that he believed in polls. I say that because I think the campaign technique of the President of the United States throughout that campaign indicated he was giving great weight to the polls. I think the changes in his technique from the time when those first adverse polls started coming in, to the final day of the campaign, shows that the polls were right in the first instance, but the polls never caught up with the President until the campaign was over. They lagged behind his campaign. He was ahead of the polls. Once he recognized early in the campaign that the polls made clear that as of then he was doomed for defeat—and he was—he went to work on specific issues and convinced the people that his record on those issues was better than the record of the Republicans.

I cannot speak for the President, but I would be the most surprised man in the world, if, should he get off in a corner and have an off-the-record discussion with us, he himself would not say that at the beginning of that campaign he also recognized that the trend as shown by the polls was against him.

I want to say something else about polls, Mr. President. Politicians throughout the country may make critical remarks about polls, but I think it is no secret that the American people know that these politicians watch the polls very carefully. The voters know that politicians frequently change their campaign techniques because of what the polls show concerning changes in public sentiment and opinion.

I am not taking the position that polls do not make mistakes; but by and large, I think they are an index of public opinion which we politicians not only do heed in determining for ourselves the question of what is public opinion on an issue, but should heed. I wish to make perfectly clear that I do not mean by that statement to say that we should vote in accordance with polls. I do say that if we think public opinion is wrong on a question due to the fact that we believe the public does not have all the facts, then our obligation of political leadership is to take the facts to the people and try to change their opinion in accordance with the facts.

If my colleagues do not think that existing public opinion in respect to majority rule in the Senate is right, they ought to try to take some facts to the American people to convince them that majority rule should not prevail in the Senate. I shall await with interest and some amusement, Mr. President, those great public discussions in which Senators go before a constituency and tell their voters that they think we ought to retain a filibuster rule in the United States Senate which will permit a minority successfully to block the action of the majority on needed legislation. I should like to be present in those minority-group audiences when my colleagues tell them that, and at the same time tell them that they want the votes of the members of those minority groups. If Senators are going to recognize that minority groups are composed of American citizens they should recognize right now in the Senate before this vote is taken the legislative rights of minority groups.

Unfortunately in some sections of the country they do not have the right to vote unless they pay a tax to vote. That is one reason for part of the civil-rights fight. They ought to have the right to vote. There ought to be a free franchise in America, so that when men come to the Senate of the United States their election will be by all the adults of their State who exercise a free right to vote. The fact is that many of them come to the Senate of the United States from States where many people are not even eligible to vote because of a poll-tax requirement. Such Senators are among those who are now taking the position that we ought to retain a rule in the Senate which would permit them to further their minority-rule principles by being protected in their claim to filibuster as the Wherry plan protects them. Count me out on that one.

I leave it to my colleagues speaking before those minority groups to justify that sort of minority domination in the United States Senate. But they had better be sure, before those audiences, that they are talking to adults who do not have the right to vote, because if they make that argument before audiences composed of members of minority groups entitled to vote, they will not get a vote out of the audience, and by all means should not, whether they are Democrats or Republicans.

We are in this unfortunate position in America today politically, as I see it: Some of us will have to exercise exceeding discretion when we go out to campaign for our party. May I say to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] that my observation is true whether we are a Democrat or a Republican, because it is pretty difficult for a liberal to support a candidate, be he a Republican candidate or a Democratic candidate, who is willing to aid and abet what I consider to be a very effective program to prevent the passage in the Senate of needed civil-rights legislation.

With those comments on polls, and with the frank statement that I believe in scientific polls as one way of measuring public wishes in a democracy, I repeat that the recent poll published in the Washington Post for March 11 shows that among voters who knows what a filibuster is, 54 percent were in favor of changing the rule to permit cloture by a simple majority rather than the present two-thirds majority. Only 35 percent disapproved, and 11 percent had no opinion. It would be very interesting to see what the results would be with a similar poll conducted on the proposition of a requirement of a frozen "constitutional two-thirds" majority of 64 Senators as proposed by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, an article from the Washington Post of March 11, 1949, in regard to the poll which was taken on the subject of filibusters.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOST VOTERS LIKE TRUMAN'S PROPOSAL TO CURB FILIBUSTERS

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N. J., March 10.—Although President Truman's proposed method to curb filibusters proved too drastic for many of the Senators to accept, the principle suggested by the President has considerable support from the public.

The President's idea given at his press conference last week was that the Senate amend its rules to cut off debate on any subject by a simple majority vote. This plan has support from voters in all sections of the country except the South.

Among voters who know what a filibuster is, the vote by sections on the proposal is as follows in the latest institute survey.

"It has been suggested that the Senate change its rules so that a simple majority can call for an end to discussion instead of a two-thirds majority as is now the case. Do you approve or disapprove of this?"

Vote of those who know what a filibuster is

	Approve	Disapprove	No opinion
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
New England and Middle Atlantic	56	32	12
East Central	51	38	11
West Central	62	29	9
South	43	50	7
Mountain and far West	51	37	12
Total United States	54	35	11

It should be borne in mind that the above division of sentiment is based on the total number of people in each section who know what a filibuster is. The proportion of informed voters varies from 51 percent to 58 percent in the individual sections. As reported last month 54 percent throughout the Nation as a whole correctly answered the poll question, "Will you tell me what the term 'filibuster' in Congress means to you?"

The dictionary definition of filibuster is any attempt by a deliberative body to obstruct action by the use of delaying tactics such as speaking to consume time.

Many southern voters questioned in the survey expressed fears that a change in Senate rules would clear the way for passage of the civil-rights bill.

Two years ago, after southern Senators had used the filibuster in the fight to seat Senator Theodore Bilbo of Mississippi at the opening of the Eightieth Congress, a group of Senators led by WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, and WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, of California, both Republicans, introduced bills to curb the practice.

Public reaction at the time was tested by the institute, which found that 78 percent of those familiar with the issue thought Congress ought to do something about filibusters, with the weight of sentiment in favor of ending debate by majority vote.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this point an editorial appearing in the New York Times for March 13, entitled "A Fight That Must Go On." I ask the Presiding Officer to withhold ruling on the request until I check to make certain that the editorial falls within the rules of the Senate. I have read many editorials on this subject which I should like to place in the RECORD, but I have thrown them aside because to have placed them in the RECORD would have violated the rule of senatorial courtesy of the Senate which I think is a good rule, and which I shall always respect. I shall never knowingly or intentionally violate it. I wish to make certain that my recollection that this editorial is perfectly proper is correct.

Mr. President, I am satisfied after examining the editorial that it is proper, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FIGHT THAT MUST GO ON

When the Senate upset Vice President BARKLEY's cloture ruling on Friday, it was, as it seems to us, making use of a technicality to prolong the obstructive powers of a small minority. Mr. BARKLEY had argued convincingly that rule XXII, adopted in 1917, was intended to make it possible to limit debate by a two-thirds vote at any stage of actual legislation. Senator VANDENBERG, whose opinions we ordinarily respect and whose motives everyone respects, thought otherwise. His influence was enough to produce a majority of five for overruling. A result of this action is that the privilege of filibustering can only be abolished by a long struggle in which physical exhaustion will be the means of pressure. Such a struggle at this time will hold up urgently necessary legislation. This is the southern Senators' ace in the hole.

We may now lay aside parliamentary technicalities. What we have is a situation. As this situation now exists, the southerners, themselves a minority, will be able to defeat any attempt, by Federal law, to give fuller protection to the Negro minority in the South and elsewhere. The southerners will be able to say no to important planks in the platforms of both major parties. Nor is this all. So long as the practice of filibustering exists, any small group of Senators from any section will be able to block legislation. The filibuster can be used in the special interests of any special group. It can be used by spokesmen for farmers, by spokesmen for labor, by spokesmen for industry, and by spokesmen for isolationism. By narrowly construing the existing power the Senate has paralyzed its own power.

The pride of unlimited debate in the Senate is a long-held tradition. Nobody proposed to limit this right unduly or to ride roughshod over the opinion of a minority. All that was seriously suggested on the floor of the Senate was to make it certain that a 30-year-old tradition for closing debate might be applied at any time within the discretion of the Senate. We think that minority rights were adequately protected by the fact that this discretion could be exercised only with the approval of two-thirds of the Senate.

It seemed yesterday that the administration, though still fighting, might have to reconsider its immediate strategy. But this is not a fight in which final defeat can be accepted. The end is not yet. Whatever may be the opinions of the present Senators, the Nation cannot tolerate indefinitely a situation in which a small minority may defy not only a majority in the Senate, but a majority in the country at large.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial appearing in the New York Times for March 14, 1949, entitled "Compromise Is No Solution."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPROMISE IS NO SOLUTION

While some provisional progress has been made the administration has not as yet been able to work out a filibuster compromise which the southern Senators, inflated by their victory last Friday, would accept. The Republicans, whose votes helped the southerners to overrule Vice President Barkley's decision that a motion to take up a measure was subject to cloture, attended yesterday's 2-hour session which failed to produce any decisive result.

The compromise may come today. The southerners are in a strategic position because they are willing to hold up all business until their special desires are met. The legislative program includes action on foreign aid, rent control, reciprocal trade, and other measures to which the administration Democrats are committed. It also includes—or did include—Federal guaranties of certain civil rights, which both major parties have promised. On their record the southern Democrats are willing to expose their country to whatever risks are involved in delaying the main program rather than permit the Senate even to vote on a civil-rights program. Whatever the outcome of this controversy, that is how history will judge them.

Yesterday's conference, scheduled to be resumed today, is as good an example as could be found of the present power of a Senate minority. President Truman, with all the prestige of his remarkable victory last fall, is at the moment helpless to get his legislative proposals even considered in the Senate. He and his Senate spokesmen are therefore driven to negotiate on less than even terms with a southern minority, including Senators from four States which in November repudiated the Truman ticket. These Senators are saying to the majority of their senatorial colleagues, to the majority of the House of Representatives, and to the Nation at large: "You shall not have the legislation you desire until you have obeyed our orders."

If there is a compromise the southern Senators will condescend to let the legislative wheels turn again. But compromise merely postpones decision. It is intolerable that this Nation should long permit a few arrogant men, in these times of peril and crisis, to retain the power to tie up the public business. Those men, and all Senators, should realize that they are not a society of demigods but servants of the people of the United States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial appearing in the Washington Post of March 14, entitled "Too High a Price."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOO HIGH A PRICE

Compromise is in the air on Capitol Hill. Apparently the leaders of the Senate have concluded that they must pay a price for the right of pressing their program, including several emergency measures, to a vote. The necessity of action this month for extension of rent-control authority is generally recognized. The real question is what the price of ending the filibuster will be. If we are correctly informed as to the compromise that came to the front in yesterday's closed conferences, the price would be excessively high.

Senate leaders are said to be contemplating acceptance of an amendment to the

Hayden resolution. As reported out of the Rules and Administration Committee, that resolution would permit the closing of debate on any kind of motion, measure, or other items of business before the Senate by a two-thirds vote. The amendment now brought forward, however, would attempt to preclude any future change in the cloture rule itself, except by an affirmative vote of a three-fourths majority. Obviously, the purpose is to assure the southerners that President Truman's proposal for closing debate by a simple majority vote will not be pressed.

It is clear that there is no chance of inducing the Senate to accept majority cloture at present. But this suggested compromise seeks to close the door to the adoption of a more liberal rule on the limitation of debate. That would unreasonably mortgage the future. The time may come when it will be imperative for the Senate to limit debate by majority vote to transact its ever increasing load of business. The only thing to be said for the proposed amendment is that it probably could not be made effective. For any future Senate may change its rules regardless of what the present Senate decides. Even so, this proposal seems to us shortsighted, and by no means the best way of ending the filibuster.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am completely at a loss to understand the reasoning of my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] in regard to his substitute. In reporting to the Senate on his compromise efforts on March 14, 1949, at page 2416 of the RECORD for that date, the Senator from Nebraska stated that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] "are giving up an endless amount of rights when they agree to have a cloture petition applied to a motion to bring up proposed legislation."

I humbly inquire, what rights? Only the right to engage in endless debate, the right to defeat the will of an overwhelming majority, the right to block legislation which, if I read the Democratic platform correctly, the Democratic Party is pledged to pass in the Eighty-first Congress.

In my judgment these so-called rights, as referred to by the Senator from Nebraska, are not rights at all. I think they represent an abuse of the legitimate right of full debate on the merits of legislative proposals.

The minority leader also stated that the only difference between a two-thirds vote and a constitutional two-thirds vote was about a vote and a half.

Actually, the average affirmative vote on the 4 occasions when cloture carried was 66½: Versailles Treaty, 78; World Court, 68; branch banking, 65; Customs and Prohibition Bureaus, 55. Following what appears to be his line of reasoning, it could be argued that a so-called "constitutional two-thirds" is more liberal than the simple two-thirds vote by an average of two and one-half votes. Of course the Senator from Nebraska would not attempt to sustain such a fallacious argument; but his argument fails to point out that the absolute figure of 64 would not have been obtained on one of these occasions, the vote on the Customs and Prohibiton Bureaus. Moreover, on those four occasions the average total vote, including the "yea" votes and the "nay" votes, was 88. Consequently, the average two-thirds vote was 58—or 6 votes less than the proposed requirement of 64, which the Senator from Nebraska establishes in his substitute, and which he would have us freeze as a requirement for cloture in the Senate. Can the Senator from Nebraska tell me that on the basis of those statistics he is making a proposal which on the average means a difference of only about one and one-half votes? I simply say that the figures I have submitted cannot be argued with. The addition and subtraction are either right or wrong. I submit them as correct addition and subtraction.

The result is that had this substitute been in existence over the years, we would not have been able to get any such result as the Senator from Nebraska contends for in this debate.

What is especially alarming about the proposed substitute is that it would guarantee, by specific language, that no cloture petition could be filed against debate on a rules-change proposal. The Senate would, in effect, be saying to the country: "In the future, any motion to change any rule may be the subject of endless discussion; obstructions can be overcome only by a test of physical endurance."

Furthermore, even assuming that the obstructionists were worn down and the motion to take up the proposal to change the rules were carried by a majority vote, which is all that would be required, a further filibuster on the proposal itself would be in order, and 64 affirmative votes would be required to close debate. As an added protection to the obstructionists, any motion for a rule change taken up before 2 o'clock—which under rule VIII should be determined without debate—is debatable without limitation.

Last Friday, 41 Senators voted to sustain the ruling of the Vice President that a cloture petition was in order on the motion to take up Resolution 15. It is a fair inference, I think, to conclude that they were then of the view that the present rule XXII, though arguably ambiguous, nevertheless permits of the interpretation placed upon it by the Vice President, namely, that cloture can be invoked on a motion to take up.

What do we find when we compare the list of sponsors of the proposed substitute resolution with the list of those voting to sustain the Vice President's able ruling? We find that 13 Senators who on Friday were of the view that cloture could be invoked on a motion to take up a resolution to amend the rules, on Tuesday were sponsoring a substitute resolution which would in clear terms guarantee that cloture shall not apply to such a motion. Of course, that is their right, Mr. President; they can change their minds if they want to. But, so far as the junior Senator from Oregon is concerned, he will continue to follow a consistent course of action in this body in respect to controlling and eliminating from the Senate the filibuster tactic which permits of minority rule. He will continue his fight for the adoption of a resolution which will permit cloture by a majority vote, in respect to any and all business coming before the Senate. I know I shall not win on this issue this time. I hope I can get a vote, let me say somewhat facetiously, so as to discover whether there are now five or six of us who favor such a rule. Some of my colleagues have been trying to engage me in a wager as to whether five or six Senators favor my proposal, and I am suspicious that probably there are only five of us.

So I am going to offer my resolution as a substitute for the Wherry amendment, in order to get that little informal matter settled, and also in order to make a formal record, if my colleagues will permit me to have a yea-and-nay vote on the issue. Also, through the vote on my resolution I wish to serve notice to the American people that, so far as I am concerned, I consider this issue so basic to the preservation of democratic principles in the Senate that I am perfectly willing to make it one of the issues in my campaign in 1950. Further, I shall always be willing to make it one of the issues in any campaign in which I may ever engage, so long as the people and God Almighty give me the privilege of serving in public office.

Therefore, Mr. President, in closing these remarks, I here and now offer as a substitute for the Wherry amendment, my resolution, Senate Resolution No. 12. I request that it be read by the clerk, and I move its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution offered by the Senator from Oregon for the Wherry amendment in the nature of a substitute will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In lieu of the language proposed to be inserted by the so-called Wherry substitute, it is proposed to insert the following:

Resolved, That subsection 2 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, relating to cloture, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"If at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but 1, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

"'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a majority vote of those voting, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 2 hours on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same; except that any Senator may yield to any other Senator all or any part of the aggregate period of time which he is entitled to speak; and the Senator to whom he so yields may speak for the time so yielded in addition to any period of time which he is entitled to speak in his own right. It shall be the duty of the Presiding

Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. What is the pending question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on the amendment just offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and other Senators.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I desire to speak on the substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. IVES. At this time I do not wish to go into a discussion of the position which I am very likely to take on the so-called Wherry proposal, which is now before the Senate for consideration. I do want to speak regarding the substitute proposal to the Hayden-Wherry resolution, as offered by the able Senator from Oregon. It so happens that I personally favor cloture by what is termed a "constitutional majority"; that is, 49. That is another proposal now before the Senate, which I understand has already been submitted by at least one Member of the Senate.

We seem to have all kinds of proposals before us. We seem to have all kinds of attitudes regarding them. There are those who are opposed to any kind of cloture whatever, I assume, and who will be inclined to vote against any kind of cloture proposal which may be presented. There are others who will be opposed to the resolution that seems certain to come before us—I am not talking about the amendment; I am talking about the Wherry resolution—for reasons which I think have been well presented by the able Senator from Oregon. They think it ties the matter up too tightly. They think the question of cloture can more easily be resolved at a later date during the Eighty-first Congress, instead of yielding at this time to a condition which in all likelihood will mean that very little, if any, of the civil-rights program which has been proposed can be passed in the Senate.

I may discuss the Wherry resolution more fully later on. But at the present time it is not my plan to favor that kind of resolution. I do not think it is in every sense of the word a step forward. I admit it may be an improvement to the extent that under it cloture may be possible, or would be possible, in the matter of motions; but at the same time I would point out that cloture by a "constitutional two-thirds," or 64, would thereby be applicable also to measures themselves—bills—and that definitely is not a step forward; that is a step in the opposite direction.

It seems to me that rather than yield on this question at this particular time and take any position which in any way can be construed as a step backward, we might far better wait until later on when a more favorable opportunity may be presented for the consideration of something which more nearly will meet the desires of what I assume to be a substantial majority of the Senate, as expressed in the Hayden-Wherry resolution. I still think that resolution probably more nearly reflects the attitude and the opinion of more Members of the Senate than does any other proposal which may be before us.

While I am on that subject, I want to point out that this attempt to resolve the problem has been brought about by a combination of circumstances. I do not join with those who would criticize what has been termed a coalition in the Senate in order to propose the Wherry resolution, although I do not favor it. They have every right to their ideas, and I do not join in criticizing them. But I think the condition which has forced us into this impasse in which we find ourselves, and by which the Wherry resolution is now before us sponsored as it is, has been produced primarily by the dilatory tactics which have been carried on in this body in handling the matter. I do not say that those dilatory tactics should be any real excuse for the Wherry resolution, but I think they are the ones that have produced it. Instead of getting busy here at the start, as we should have been doing, and as was pointed out at one time or another in the Senate, by reporting a resolution out of the Committee on Rules and Administration without delay, or at least with as brief a delay as possible, we dilly-dallied. During the early part of January those who presumably are as anxious as anyone to resolve the question of civil rights were far more interested in celebrating an election than they were in resolving this question by taking care of the rules as they should have been taken care of at that time. We all know what has happened here since the Hayden-Wherry resolution was favorably reported, one delay after another, until finally we are faced as we are at the present time with the expiration of rent control and other pressing matters; so something has to be done or we must abandon the whole thing temporarily.

Again I say, Mr. President, rather than to accept something as a compromise in which I personally do not believe, I should rather abandon this effort at this time.

The fact remains, however, that we have got to take some action here, because the matter is before us. The fact remains that we have already a substitute in the form of a resolution just offered by the able Senator from Oregon. As I said, when I rose to speak, that is what I primarily want to speak about, because as I have said, I favor operation of a legislative body by a majority of its total membership; except where constitutional and statutory provisions may otherwise determine. But I do not join those who are talking about the majority of 64 and objecting to it, claiming that it would afford a great opportunity for Senators to run away and hide. I have had a little experience in operating a legislative body where there is a requirement that in order to pass any bill, not alone amend a rule, there must be a majority of the total membership in favor of it. And, Mr. President, I want to say this is a good idea. Legislation is not passed haphazardly very often by that kind of process; though I am not advocating it here. But let me say this: My observation in connection with that matter and with the assertion which has been made, that where there is a so-called constitutional requirement of that nature, either of 64 or 49—as I desire—it gives those who do not want to be recorded a great opportunity to run away, is not supported by the facts. Of course it gives Members an opportunity to run away. They can go just as far as they want to go. But they are recorded just the same—in opposition to whatever measure may be before the body. No; I realize the vote is not recorded anywhere, there is nothing in the RECORD about it. They are just absent. However, I tell you that a great many of them, who have tried to follow that course in legislative bodies with which I am acquainted, have done so to their own great embarrassment. It has been a tremendous job for them later to try to explain why they were absent, why technically speaking they were in the negative; and that is exactly the status of an absentee under conditions of that nature.

With respect to the proposal propounded by the Senator from Oregon, I want to say that I am opposed to his plan for the exact opposite reason that I am opposed to the idea of the 64-vote requirement. That requirement goes too far in one direction; the proposal of the Senator from Oregon goes too far in the other direction, however, just as, technically, it is necessary to obtain 64 votes under the Wherry proposal by which to impose cloture in the Senate, so, under the proposal of the Senator from Oregon, by the same kind of technicality, we could impose cloture in the Senate by 25 votes. I grant, Mr. President, that would not happen; it probably never would happen. Generally speaking, if it came to cloture by 64 votes, there might be more than 64 Senators who would vote for cloture in some instances in which cloture would be obtainable. The fact remains that those technicalities and possibilities do exist; and I object to continuous control by any minority in any circumstance. I can see, under the able Senator's proposal, there is a possibility of a minority controlling, at some time, perhaps by accident only, but there is the possibility of a minority in the Senate obtaining cloture. I would be opposed to that.

So, Mr. President, in view of that situation, I shall vote against the proposal offered by the able Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. IVES. In just a moment.

I favor the other proposal, as I have indicated, which I believe will be offered by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], which is in line with what I have indicated in my remarks. It provides cloture by a majority vote of the

total membership, which is sometimes called a constitutional majority.

I now yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator knows I have a very high respect for his opinion, but it is true, is it not, that very frequently in the Senate of the United States we pass legislation by 25 or 30 or 35 votes?

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, in answer to that question, I would say it depends on what the Senator means by passing legislation by that number of votes. On a roll call, I do not recall an instance in which a vote for a bill or a resolution in the Senate, since I have been a Member, has been as small as 25. We might pass a bill here with only one Senator present. It could be done if no Senator were around to object, or to say anything about it, or to suggest the absence of a quorum. Certainly it could be done—but not by roll-call vote. Moreover, I do not know of any instance during my period of service here in which a bill has been passed by the Senate by 25 votes on a roll call.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. IVES. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator recall any instance in the Senate in which a bill has been passed by a majority vote of 30, 31, or 35?

Mr. IVES. Yes. I can remember instances in which the majority vote was in the thirties, so far as that is concerned.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree that it is possible, statistically possible, to pass a major piece of legislation by a vote of a majority of 25?

Mr. IVES. Yes. I want to point out, in that connection, in making my position as clear as I can make it in regard to the question of cloture, my ideas concerning cloture by a majority of the total membership. I pointed out that it might be a good thing if legislation had to be passed by a majority of the total membership of both Houses. I do not quarrel with the Senator from Oregon on the point he is making, and I do not think the idea which I suggest will ever be adopted in the Congress of the United States. But that does not alter the fact that we should accept the idea of simple majority when it comes to cloture on any motion or bill which may be before us, or on amendment to a rule which may be before us.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. I will yield for a question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the Senator has stated that he is against the simple majority and against the two-thirds majority. He has stated he is in favor of a constitutional majority. He voted in the committee in favor of the two-thirds majority. My question is, How does he feel with regard to a change in the rules, if he is willing to stretch his vote in the committee to include a so-called constitutional majority on a question involving a change in the rule?

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I am very glad the Senator has raised that question, because that happens to be the next point I was about to make before sitting down. I want to indicate what I did in the Committee on Rules and Administration in regard to the matter. It so happened that there was before the committee a proposal requiring cloture by a so-called constitutional majority, a majority of the total membership of the Senate. It so happened that a vote was had on it, and it so happened that the junior Senator from Pennsylvania and I voted in favor of it.

I realize the difficulties in operating a legislative body. I realize the necessity for give and take. I shall never be found taking any arbitrary position to the detriment of the operation of the Senate.

In making that statement, I have realized, that the sentiment in the Senate is overwhelmingly against any such proposal as I favor. That is why I have not been able fully to understand why our friends from the South have been objecting to the Hayden-Wherry resolution. I had understood their opposition was largely because they were fearful that an amendment would be offered on the floor to provide for cloture by a majority. We all know that such an amendment would not come anywhere near prevailing in the Senate.

I have stated my position clearly, but I would not hold out simply because I might be defeated on it. I am not against the kind of reasonable change in the cloture rule which will provide the necessary machinery by which to close debate under certain circumstances. Naturally, therefore, I turn as a compromise to the Hayden-Wherry resolution, to which an amendment has been offered by the junior Senator from Pennsylvania. I have agreed to that, and I have been perfectly willing to do so. I might even stretch a little bit further, but not much further, may I say to the able senior Senator from Massachusetts, in the matter of compromise, because the moment we go as far as does the proposal in the Wherry resolution, that same moment we may find ourselves in a situation in which it may be impossible to obtain action on vital legislation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. IVES. I yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from New York understand that if majority cloture is defeated, as it most certainly will be, the junior Senator from Oregon intends to vote, if he is given the opportunity, for a constitutional majority, and, thereafter, for the original Wherry-Hayden resolution? Does the Senator from New York understand that?

Mr. IVES. I did not understand that. I am glad to have it brought to my attention.

Mr. MORSE. I thought the Senator had been informed of that, but I am glad to inform him at this time.

Mr. IVES. I trust the able Senator from Oregon will not construe anything I said about action in a legislative body as reflecting against himself.

Mr. MORSE. Not at all.

Mr. IVES. I in no way intended to make those remarks as any reflection against any Senator. I did not even have the Senator from Oregon in mind when I made them.

Mr. MORSE. My questions do not imply that I thought the Senator did. I have another question, if the Senator will yield further.

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from New York understand that after the junior Senator from Oregon has compromised by agreeing to go along with a constitutional majority, after the simple majority resolution is defeated, and then after he has compromised by agreeing to go along at the present time with the Hayden-Wherry resolution, he will not, under any circumstances, compromise further by going along with the Wherry substitute?

Mr. IVES. I have gathered that idea as the course of questioning has proceeded, but I would surmise that even the Senator from Oregon, with the broad-mindedness which he inevitably is bound to exercise finally in matters of this kind might be willing to go along just a little bit further than the Hayden-Wherry resolution.

Mr. MORSE. The Hayden-Wherry resolution will be the last compromise on this issue with which I would go along, because I think one of our trend of thought would call it an unconscionable compromise of principle.

Mr. IVES. Of course, whether it is an unconscionable compromise of principle is something for individual determination. I hope that was not a reflection against me.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator yield for an assurance that I mean no reflection upon anyone? I agree with him that the time comes when one has to satisfy himself as to when further compromise would violate what he thinks is a basic principle.

Mr. IVES. I quite agree in that, and I am glad that the two of us have that idea. It is very interesting to know that we can thus proceed together. Apparently, however, I can go along a little bit further than can the Senator from Oregon. But I wish to point out that we have not had before us any such proposition as has been suggested by the able Senator from Massachusetts. There may be no such alternative before us, as I understand, and it would do us little good if one were before us, because there are 52 Members of the Senate who are committed to the Wherry resolution. So why talk about an alternative proposition?

The fact remains that we must face the situation as we find it. The fact remains that certain of us have certain convictions, and certain of us are going to stand by our convictions as we view this matter.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, someone has said that variety is the spice of life, and we have before us a great variety of proposals to meet the situation with which we are faced, a situation which has bothered the Senate for a great many years.

I wish to offer an amendment in behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. In section 2 on page 2 of the so-called Wherry substitute, in line 20, after the words "duly chosen and sworn," it would add the words "in the case of any motion, resolution, or proposal to change any of

the standing rules of the Senate, and in all others by a two-thirds vote of those voting."

The effect is simply to provide for a simple two-thirds as distinguished from a so-called "constitutional two-thirds" majority for cloture in every matter that would come before the Senate, excepting a matter pertaining to a change of the rules. In that case it would substitute, in place of a simple two-thirds, a constitutional two-thirds majority.

Mr. President, I think we are all aware of the fact that talk is a very common and a very fine thing in American life. Our history is replete with discussions in constitutional and legislative bodies. In the Continental Congress of the United States there was a great deal of talk while the Revolution went on, and I find from a recent reading of a new biography of George Washington, written by a man named Freeman, which I commend as an excellent work, that even in the House of Burgesses in the ancient Colony of Virginia there was much talk, in fact, so much that it delayed the activities and the effectiveness of the Colonial forces in their efforts to drive the French out of the Ohio Valley, just as the talk in the days of the Revolution greatly hampered the armies of Washington and the other generals of that day. I take it that it was for that reason that the Senate in 1917 adopted the cloture rule which proved, through experience, to be practically ineffective.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that with a possibility of vacancies in the Senate, and with the probability of difficulty at times in requiring a full attendance of the membership, although the Senate does have broad powers in that direction, it would be wise, in the light of the experience we have had of legislation being adopted by a small majority, to relax the Wherry proposal just a little in matters pertaining to all measures except changes in the rules. The records show that it would not do great violence to the two-thirds constitutional principle. At the same time, I think it would more nearly meet the views of many of us.

I recognize that that proposal is not going to secure a majority vote, because I understand that those who have offered the Wherry substitute have decided to go through with it, and I think there is nothing wrong in that. However, Mr. President, it was my hope, while the negotiations were going forward, that the simple two-thirds principle would be applied as to all measures and questions and subjects excepting changes in the rules.

I think that so far as changes in the rules are concerned, it would be highly wise to make the requirement somewhat stricter, because I believe, as has been indicated already by a majority vote of the Senate—and I agree with that, although I am frank to say that I did not vote that way at the time—that in matters affecting the rules we should not change them for light and transient reasons or causes, to adopt the phrase of a great patriot. I believe they should be stable. I believe it should be difficult to change them. I think it is a matter of some regret that after a series of precedents, or claimed precedents, developed over a period of years, we found the necessity the other day of voting either to sustain or overrule a decision of the Chair which did, in fact, as claimed by many, upset those precedents.

So, Mr. President, I believe that in the case of proposals to change the rules we should be more strict in our requirements. However, I believe that in all other matters a two-thirds majority is all that should be required, and I think that that would be in keeping with our traditions, and would be in keeping with reasonable requirements of protecting minorities, which I concede on many occasions must be protected.

Mr. President, this has been an interesting debate, and I think the subject has been thoroughly discussed from all sides. I felt a little bad that at the very beginning, when the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] opened the debate, the press immediately took occasion to label the discussion a filibuster. I wish at this time to congratulate the Senators who have differed with me in this matter for the able debate they have made, and I think it can fairly be said that only within the past 48 hours has the discussion really taken on the nature of a filibuster. Even that discussion, as I listened to it, could be labeled as fairly germane to the question before us, although it was carried on to great length.

Mr. President, I think it is unfortunate that, while this discussion was in progress, the President should have taken occasion to say that he agreed with the proposal for a simple majority. That was bound to have a poor reaction in quarters where no doubt he hoped it would have a good reaction. As a law student I was always given to understand that a man was presumed to know the reasonable and probable consequences of his acts. I do not want to attribute to the President any improper motive in saying what he said, but it was not calculated to help the situation.

Furthermore, I think it was unfortunate that while we were in the stage of negotiations the majority leader let it be known that he intended to move to adjourn, or to move to take a recess, a motion which we on this side of the aisle were inclined strongly to resist. I think the effect of that on those who were trying to hold out for all they could get, and rightly so, and sincerely so, as they believed, was to raise the query in their minds, "After all, this fight may be over; why should we give in on anything?" I think it is a tribute to their willingness to find some common ground to compromise that, under those circumstances, they continued the negotiations and finally arrived at a settlement.

Mr. President, I am not in complete agreement with the settlement. From the beginning of the negotiations, or as they developed, I thought the proposal, as contained in the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and myself, more nearly met the situation, and much of the time I had great hope that it would be accepted.

I want to have an opportunity to vote upon it, and I have a hope, perhaps a rather vain one, that in this conflict of minds it may have some possibility of success. I believe it would give to those who want to uphold the rights of minorities, and I am one of them, every fair opportunity they should have. On the other hand, I believe it would give to the majority a fair opportunity to present its side and not to be obstructed by the willful activity of one or two or even a very small group of men.

So I move the adoption of the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). Is the amendment offered to the Wherry substitute?

Mr. BALDWIN. Yes; the amendment is offered to the Wherry substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 20, of the Wherry amendment, after the word "sworn," it is proposed to add the following: "in the case of any motion, resolution, or proposal to change any of the standing rules of the Senate and in all other cases by a two-thirds vote of those voting."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I prefer not to be interrupted while I speak to my colleagues on this side of the aisle.

First of all I want to compliment the Democrats, on the other side of the aisle, on the very magnificent job they have done in getting my colleagues on this side of the aisle to support a portion of their party, so that the Republicans apparently are hopelessly divided. This division, I am satisfied from what the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has said, will be continued into the next campaign.

I call attention, Mr. President, to the Republican platform of 1932. It was adopted when the Republican Party was looking for votes. In 1932 the Republican Party said in its platform:

> For 70 years the Republican Party has been the friend of the American Negro. Vindication of the right of the Negro citizen to enjoy the full benefits of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness is traditional in the Republican Party, and our party stands pledged to maintain equal opportunity and rights for our Negro citizens. We do not propose to depart from that tradition nor to alter the spirit or letter of that pledge.

Again the Republican Party in 1940 said:

> We pledge that our American citizens of Negro descent shall be given a square deal in the economic and political life of this Nation. Discrimination in the civil service, the Army, Navy, and all other branches of the Government must cease. To enjoy the full benefits of life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness universal suffrage must be made effective for the Negro citizen. Mob violence shocks the conscience of the Nation and legislation to curb this evil should be enacted.

Again, in 1944, when my Republican colleagues on this side of the aisle were looking for votes, this is what they said in their platform:

> We pledge an immediate congressional inquiry to ascertain the extent to which mistreatment, segregation, and discrimination against Negroes who are in our armed forces are impairing morale and efficiency, and the adoption of corrective legislation.

We pledge the establishment by Federal legislation of a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission.

The Republican platform continued:

ANTIPOLL TAX

The payment of any poll tax should not be a condition of voting in Federal elections and we favor immediate submission of a constitutional amendment for its abolition.

ANTILYNCHING

We favor legislation against lynching and pledge our sincere efforts in behalf of its early enactment.

The 1948 Republican platform, which I have before me, substantially reiterates what was said in 1932, 1940, and 1944.

Mr. President, seven Senators who sat on this side of the aisle a few brief months ago are gone. Seven more Democrats sit on the other side. Mind you, Mr. President, those seven Republican Senators were warned by the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon, not once, not twice, but time and time again, when he told them that the people of this country were going to hold the Republican Party responsible for either the lack of legislation or for legislation which was discriminatory.

But, Mr. President, the great Republican Party had a few leaders who had been here for a long time, who knew much more about politics than did the junior Senator from Oregon, or others of us who have come in more recently. Of course Republicans were not listening to the voices of the newer Senators. On the contrary, they were listening to the voices of their leaders. That is what they are doing this very day.

At that time there was a Republican policy committee, which consisted of nine members. Was the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] a member of that committee? He was not. Was the great GEORGE AIKEN, perhaps the leading liberal progressive friend of the farmer, on that committee? He was not. Was the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] on that committee? He was not. Was my distinguished colleague [Mr. YOUNG] on that policy committee? He was not.

The Republicans said they had all the votes they needed for their election. So today, when they are making the same kind of mistake, I tell my colleagues on this side of the aisle that if they adopt the Wherry-Hayden resolution, at least three Republican Members who will be up for election the next time will not be elected.

I see some of the same smirks of satisfaction that I saw on the faces of some of my Republican colleagues when we warned them on a previous occasion. So I wish to read a portion of a speech which I delivered on a former occasion. I hope that my Republican friends will listen. I said on that occasion:

Mr. President, I have sent to the desk and now offer as a substitute for the anti-poll-tax bill an amendment that will give every Member of the Senate an opportunity to vote for or against all three major items of civil-rights legislation—antilynch, antipoll tax, and FEPC—and to do so now, before the political conventions and campaign.

It seems to me that every Member should welcome this opportunity to make the record clear before we go to the citizens of the Nation to ask for votes for the next two, four, and six years for Congressmen, Senators, and President.

The voters are entitled to know where both parties stand on this issue of civil rights, and where each member of each party stands.

These three bills—FEPC, antipoll tax, and antilynch—comprise a bare minimum program for justice in the field of civil rights. They are the three bills selected by a conference of representatives of national Negro organizations at a conference last March 27, called by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

My own party, the Republican Party, has endorsed every one of these three reforms. We have endorsed them in our party platforms; our candidates have endorsed them again and again during political campaigns and between campaigns.

* * * * *

Mr. President, the enactment of these three essential parts of a civil-rights program is an absolute must for my party and for any Member of the Congress who intends to face members of minority groups and ask for their votes in the coming elections.

It has been freely said that the Republican Party, with the cooperation of members of the Democratic Party, has planned to pass one bill alone and call it a day, leaving the others to die on the calendar.

Why?

Well, in hard-boiled political terms it is said that this year the Republican Party does not need the votes of Negroes and other minority groups, even in the doubtful Northern States and congressional districts.

Why?

We are given two reasons. First, because President Truman, by advocating enactment of a complete civil-rights program, has split his party. Second, because he is a weak candidate anyway. Third, and most important, because Wallace is going to take large sections of the minority vote and split off large chunks of the Democratic vote in the northern industrial States, thereby making a Republican victory an absolutely sure thing in 1948.

Mr. President, I have been in politics a long time and it is my observation that in politics there is no such animal as an absolutely sure thing.

It can easily happen that Mr. Truman will be a strong candidate by November 1948 and that he will have the solid support of the normal Democratic vote, plus the so-called labor vote, plus the solid support of Negroes and other minority groups who will respect him for his stand on civil rights.

In that statement I only confirmed what my distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Oregon had said time and time again when he warned the Republicans.

I stated further:

Republicans who are counting on Henry Wallace and his Communist Party collaborators to do our work for us by taking enough votes away from the Democrats to insure the election of a complete Republican ticket on any platform and with any sort of record of performance and nonperformance in this Congress are making a big mistake.

Mr. President, the words of my colleague, the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and my own words fell on deaf ears. The fact that we had made a fine record—in his case in Oregon, and in my case in North Dakota—did not make any difference at all to our colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle. In the last election, the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and I were exceedingly active. Incidentally he, too, voted for civil rights; and at that time only seven other Senator on this side of the aisle supported us. The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] was one; the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] was another.

What happened in the last election? To the east of our State of North Dakota is Minnesota, when a United States Senator running for reelection was defeated. He himself said he would not follow the platform of our party, and seven times he voted "no."

To the west of our State, in Montana, a Democratic Senator was seeking reelection. Six years before he had been elected by a majority of only 1,400 votes; but in the last election the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] swept the State of Montana.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from North Dakota and I helped elect every Republican who was elected to our State legislature in the last election. Of 49 State senators, the Democrats elected only one. Of 113 members of the North Dakota House, the Democrats elected only two; and in our State, Mr. Dewey received a larger vote for President than he received 4 years before, because the junior Senator from North Dakota and the senior Senator from North Dakota lived up to the Republican platforms which had been adopted in 1948 and 1944 and away back in 1932.

I say to the Republicans who have joined with the Dixiecrats that, in my opinion, after making all these promises in their platforms, they now are sabotaging the Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights, and they are telling the wide world that in the opinion of a majority of this great deliberative body of democracy, a Negro has no rights that a white man is bound to respect.

Mr. President, if this resolution as proposed to be amended by the so-called Wherry substitute is adopted, this Senate Republican group will, in my opinion, kill forever—at least, for years and years to come—all chances for the enactment of civil-rights legislation by the Congress. Their action may be likened to what Gen. Ulysses S. Grant would have done if he had passed the sword of victory at the Battle of Appomattox back to Robert E. Lee, and had joined the Americans who were Confederate rebels.

So, Mr. President, when my distinguished colleague the Senator from Oregon says he is not going to form a new party, but is going along as a Republican, and is going to make 70 speeches in the next campaign, just as he made 70 in the last one, I can only say that in the last campaign I went into every State of the Union but three; and, in fact, for 3 weeks in Jesse Jones' own newspaper in Houston, Tex., I prophesied that Harry Truman would be elected President of the United States, because as one went among the common people it was unmistakable that the Republican Party had lost the confidence of the people who cast the votes.

Mr. President, a few days ago I was in Chicago, and there I met a great group of the common people. A few days before I was in New York City, and there I met an even larger group. I know the thinking of those people.

I repeat what I said a while ago: Let Senators who wish to adopt this resolution go right ahead; but I shall write on a slip of paper, which I shall put in an envelope, the names of three United States Senators who will be running for reelection 3 years from now; and I prophesy that following the next election, they will not be returned here. Last year there were seven Members of the Senate who sat here with sneers on their faces when the junior Senator from Oregan was trying to tell them what was going to happen, and they have not returned to this body.

So far as the senior Senator from North Dakota is concerned, I shall vote against the Wherry-Hayden resolution. I shall vote against it because I am satisfied that the Republicans of the United States will feel that we are betraying their trust if we do vote for it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	Morse
Anderson	Hoey	Mundt
Baldwin	Holland	Murray
Brewster	Humphrey	Myers
Bricker	Hunt	Neely
Butler	Ives	O'Conor
Byrd	Jenner	Pepper
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Chavez	Kem	Saltonstall
Connally	Kerr	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Donnell	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Langer	Sparkman
Downey	Lodge	Stennis
Eastland	Long	Taft
Ecton	Lucas	Taylor
Ellender	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Flanders	McFarland	Thye
Frear	McGrath	Tydings
Fulbright	McKellar	Vandenberg
George	McMahon	Watkins
Gillette	Magnuson	Wherry
Green	Malone	Wiley
Gurney	Martin	Williams
Hayden	Maybank	Withers
Hendrickson	Miller	Young
Hickenlooper	Millikin	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to make a few comments on the proceedings which have been taking place in this body during the past few days; or possibly I could extend the time and say for the past few weeks. This afternoon I have listened very attentively to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]; I have listened very attentively to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN]; I have listened very attentively to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and to the remarks of the equally distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]. Each of those Senators has brought to our attention the reasons why he is in opposition to the so-called compromise proposal which came into worldly existence as of last evening.

I heard the junior Senator from Oregon point out that in the recent campaign he had made approximately 70 speeches in behalf of the Republican candidate for President. I do not think anyone can doubt the fact that he has worked overtime in behalf of the Republican Party. He has tried to give guidance to that party. He has spoken his mind. He has expressed his honest convictions. Of course it would be somewhat inappropriate for a Senator on this side of the aisle to suggest that the advice and counsel which he has extended should be readily accepted by his colleagues. I suppose if I should express sentiments similar to those uttered by him, someone would say, "Well, that proves all the more that we should not accept advice given by the Senator from Oregon."

But after hearing the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] speak and having him recount some of the prophecies he made on the floor of the Senate, it appears to me it would be wise and prudent on the part of all of us to listen to advice that is being given by men who are close to the public and who seem to have that sensitivity to it which enables them to ascertain what is public sentiment.

I should like to say a word to my good friend and distinguished colleague, the Senator from Oregon. The 70 speeches which he made in behalf of the Republican candidate were undoubtedly well received; but they did not produce much fruit. I suggest that he would find much more agreeable and social environment if he would deliver the next 70 speeches he may feel moved to make in behalf of some of the liberal causes of the Democratic Party. At least I may say I know I can depend upon him to give the next 70 speeches in behalf of the liberal program.

I should like to make one distinction, however, between my position and that of the Senator from Oregon. The Senator said in his early remarks that he declined to yield to those who signed the Wherry substitute, or the so-called compromise resolution which was offered last evening. I want to make the distinction quite clear that I do not decline to yield, because, after looking over the names of the Senators who signed the petition last night, and after seeing people and hearing the general buzzing going on in the corridors, the lobbies, and on the floor of the Senate, I should like to feel that possibly some of the remarks this evening might change the minds of some of the individual Senators who have placed their names upon the resolution. I think we are still of open mind, or we would not be debating. I feel that some of the Senators who have signed and have indicated their preference for the Wherry substitute are at this very moment wondering why they did it and wondering whether or not it would be a good idea to withdraw as conveniently and adroitly as may be possible. I may say we shall not make it difficult for them to do so. There is more rejoicing in heaven for the repentance of a single sinner than there is, may I say, for all the acclaim of the righteous. So there is plenty of room for repentance and plenty of opportunity for Senators to come back to the original proposition before the Senate of the United States, which I said only a night ago was the real compromise, the Hayden-Wherry resolution, Senate Resolution 15—the original proposition of which some Senators have said they were in favor, even though some of them voted against the ruling of the Vice President. To me it is amazing to see how many Senators are in favor of something, and then when something else comes along are in favor of that. They were for what they considered to be a reasonable compromise. It was a compromise; there is not a shadow of a doubt about that.

But now, all at once, a Senator comes along with a brand-new compromise which compromises things with much more difficulty. There are those who say, "I am not for that. We have not had a vote on the first one yet, and before we change our minds as to its validity it would seem to me we should find out how we stand on it."

Mr. President, I should like to review for a few moments the position of the two major political parties on this basic issue which faces the country. It has been said by Senators on both sides and in the argument of our friends from the South that they are now undoubtedly getting colleagues from some areas of the North to fight those of us who call ourselves the Truman Democrats, the New Deal Democrats, the Regular Democrats, and the Liberal Republicans. It has been said that the issue behind the whole fight is civil rights. I do not think that is the only issue, but apparently that is the one which some Senators want to use as the issue, and I accept it for the purpose of the argument.

Mr. President, both major parties in the campaign—and there were more, I may say, than two political parties in the campaign—made complete, frank, candid, pointed statements as to their position on civil rights. Both major political parties indicated in the Eightieth Congress and in the Eighty-first Congress their position as to amending the rules of the Senate. It did not just happen after November 2. In the Eightieth Congress the Committee on Rules and Administration felt that rule XXII needed to be tightened so that cloture could be applied to motions and the amending of the Journal. In the Eighty-first Congress the Committee on Rules and Administration again reported a proposal, and this time sought action upon it. The Republican Party and the Democratic Party have stood, apparently, theoretically, in the public mind, united in favor of changing the rule.

Mr. President, let no one tell me that 22 Senators out of 96 can drive the entire Senate to cover. I hope none of us will admit that 22 Senators are so wise, so good, so clever, so omnipotent that the other 74 of us will run for the bushes, capitulate and collapse simply because 22 Senators do not want the rule to be changed. There is always someone against something. One of the privileges of being an American is to be against something as well as in favor of something. In this great Nation we have

known of decisions much closer than 74 to 22.

Why do I use those figures? Because some of my friends on this side of the aisle did not go along with the Democratic platform, and have said so. I cannot accuse them of a single thing except to say that I think they are wrong. To say that a man is wrong in honest debate is only expressing a difference of opinion. But I say to my friends on this side of the aisle, who stood with the President in the campaign, and to my friends on the other side of the aisle, who stood with the Governor of New York as the candidate of the Republican Party, we told the people of America that we were for civil rights and that we would fight and die for the cause.

My friends from Mississippi did not say that. They did not fight with Harry Truman. My friends from Alabama did not say that. I cannot accuse them of being anything but wrong, and that may not be too bad an indictment. I shall simply say that, to my mind, they are wrong. But I can say to those who accepted the majority will of the Democratic platform and those on the other side who accepted the unanimous vote of the Republican Party, that we had a chance to get out of the so-called box we were in, and that chance was on the ruling of the Vice President of the United States.

I respect the words I heard from the distinguished Senator from Ohio. Of course a man ought not to vote against his deep conviction. Every Senator in this body has the right to express his point of view. That is one thing that I have been told repeatedly. I have been told, "You do not have to sacrifice your point of view here, Senator. Even though we may disagree with you, we will accept your right to stand up and say what you believe." I can say that no Member of this body has ever tried to coerce or intimidate me. We use the art of persuasion here, and I hope that we shall always continue to do so.

But there was reasonable doubt as to the application of rule XXII. The distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] standing on this side of the aisle with papers from the Congressional Library containing all kinds of history and information, pointed out that the purpose of the rule was to stop and put an end to filibustering. Senator after Senator testified that that was the purpose of the rule. Then some one discovered a loophole and conceived the idea of gnawing at the rule and finding out the weak spots in its armor, and so it was found that it did not apply to motions to take up a measure, in spite of the fact that a measure has been defined in every dictionary as a means to an end, an expedient, a method, a step.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator recall the very eloquent address he delivered an evening or two ago on the omniscience of the majority?

Mr. HUMPHREY. What is that, sir?

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator recall the eloquent address he delivered on the omniscience of the majority, that this is a Government by majority, and we should be bound by the majority? I understand the Senator now seems seriously to question that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Maine that I never talked about the omniscience of the majority. I simply said I believed in majority rule, and I still believe in it. I may also say that one of the basic privileges we have in his country is to rise up as a part of the minority and try to make a majority out of a minority.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator agree that perhaps we have had a great deal of discussion on the question of the Senate rules during the past 2 weeks?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would say that not only have we had a great deal of discussion, but we have had almost too much.

Mr. BREWSTER. Would the Senator agree that if it has not exhausted him, certainly the subject of the debate has been exhausted.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, I would not.

Mr. BREWSTER. Would the Senator challenge the idea that if a Senator has arrived at some other conclusion as a result of these discussions, he perhaps has given the subject mature consideration?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sure of it.

Mr. BREWSTER. So that if 52 Members of this body, a real majority, have determined on a course, it would be entitled to somewhat respectable consideration under the Senator's theory of a majority?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would say that it certainly would be deserving of respectful consideration. But I may add that I am one of those who believe, along with the President of the United States, that until the vote is taken the election is never lost, and I am quite convinced that the vote has not been taken on this question, and I want to fight for every single vote we can get in this body.

Mr. BREWSTER. I may say that I voted with the Senator on the Barkley ruling, so I may put myself in the category of the minority, and would not the Senator agree that it was unfortunate that this matter was delayed for 2 months while the Senate was comparatively inactive?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I certainly do. I am not partisan about this matter. I am sure it would have been much better had we started this debate the very first week, if we were going to start it, at the very beginning of this session of Congress. But we did not, and since we did not, we now have a battle upon our hands, and I believe in fighting.

Mr. BREWSTER. How did the Senator vote some 4 weeks ago when there was a question about taking the matter up?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I voted to sustain the committee, because I have respect for the chairman of the committee, because I had a sincere belief that the chairman of the committee was going to bring it up.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator's respect for the chairman of the committee goes to the extent of leading him to support the proposal which the chairman of the committee now sponsors, does it?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I said, a few evenings ago, that while I stood for the principle of majority rule, I was not going to be accused of being one of those who would stand here as obstructionists, that I would go along with the Hayden-Wherry resolution as it was originally presented, even though I felt it did not go far enough, that I realized that on any resolution and any legislation we must compromise. I was willing to accept an honorable compromise; I would support an honorable compromise of an honorable committee that held honorable hearings, presented its evidence, and, on the basis of those hearings, voted to report a resolution.

Mr. BREWSTER. When it comes to the question of honorable action, the Senator would accord to others the same privilege of determining what might or might not seem to them honorable, would he not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed I would. I do not want to say I would be magnanimous, but I accord to every person in this fine assembly, to every Member of the United States Senate, the right to make any kind of determination he wishes to make. I also accord to myself the right to try to convince and persuade any Senator who apparently has already been on many sides of the question, in the hope that he might light on the right side of the question before the vote is taken.

Mr. BREWSTER. Am I correct in the impression that the majority leader, who finally led us into this fight, and whose position on the Barkley ruling I supported, gave us the very definite understanding that 3 weeks additional would be required to obtain a vote, and he did not think it possible to proceed with the matter at this time? Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. If the majority leader had had the unqualified type of support he should have had in this fight, which is a bipartisan fight, according to the program of our platforms, we would not be in the situation in which we now are. We would have resolved the question as of Friday night last week. I thank the Senator for his vote, but he did not get a sufficient number of his colleagues on his side of the aisle to go along with him.

Mr. BREWSTER. Perhaps there was a little shortage on the Senator's side, as well.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Ours were predetermined. There was not any doubt in the mind of anyone what votes we were going to lose on this side. The great question mark, the uncertainty, the realm of the speculative, unfortunately, was on the Republican side of the aisle, and we were outspeculated when the chips were down.

Mr. BREWSTER. Were Senators on this side of the aisle consulted by anyone the Senator knows of, at any time during the 2 months which preceded the present, as to whether they could cooperate with the program of the majority leader?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It would be a bit presumptuous on my part to say that

I was in the business of consultation, but I might observe that one thing that has not been lacking in the Senate since I have been a Member is the matter of consultation, the matter of dealing, the matter of caucuses, and the matter of going around and whispering in the ears of Senators as to what was going to be done and what deals were going to be made. What the majority leader did, I do not know. I hope he did talk with some. I heard the other night that apparently the majority leader had been meeting with the minority leader, and that the minority leader had been meeting with the majority leader. In fact, it seemed to me that they were doing a good deal of meeting. The point was that the majority leader could not get the kind of commitments from the minority leader and from the minority in the Senate necessary in order to have the Hayden-Wherry resolution adopted.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is there any question that for eight long weeks before this matter was finally presented, many Senators on this side of the aisle were constantly publicly and privately urging that the matter should be brought up, in anticipation of the very debacle we were finally compelled to witness?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I greatly appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Maine. I realize the real sense of sincerity he has in this fight on the civil-rights question, and before I get through, I am going to give him an opportunity to prove his sincerity again and again and again, because I have a proposal on my desk which once and for all will separate those really on the civil-rights side and those merely on the talking side of it, and I am anxious to see how gentlemen are going to vote on that proposal.

Mr. President, I shall not yield for more questions. I wish to go along and continue with the material which I have here.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator answer the question I asked him?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I said I would yield for no more questions at this particular time, but I am not going to duck a good question. I will ask the Senator please to ask his question.

Mr. BREWSTER. The question I asked the Senator was whether or not the majority leader finally made it clear that 3 weeks additional would be required to clear this matter up, but he did not feel he could do it, and therefore proposed to move adjournment, after the time when those of us on this side of the aisle decided that we would not join in that. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not know what the majority leader has said to each and every Member on the minority side. I have an idea what he said to Senators on this side. But there was no doubt about what he was doing last night or the night before, and if on the night of Friday, when the Vice President's ruling was the subject before the Senate, those who were so certain as to how they were going to vote had stood up and voted, the Hayden-Wherry resolution would have been adopted, this debate would have been terminated, and we would have been on our way into the important legislation which awaits us. For 2 years, not 3 weeks, the Eightieth Congress considered a similar resolution, and since there seems to be some great pressure for getting things done, why was the resolution not acted on in that period of time? It seems to me the only issue we need to consider is whether or not we really want to get this thing done.

Mr. President, I know many people say they believe in the institution of marriage. Some believe in it just as some believe in the closing of debate. But some of those who believe in the institution of marriage would never accept a proposal. They would not even take a good Leap Year offer, and would not permit themselves to be involved in marriage itself. But they loved marriage and a family. It is hardly honorable to have a family without marriage, and I would likewise submit that it is hardly honorable to talk about trying to close debate when it is known that there are Senators who can carry on a filibuster, and it was known that they could carry it on, and I knew they could carry it on indefinitely, with 22 ready to go on. They did not even exhaust half their time. They had more speeches yet to be delivered, and somehow or other we were chinning ourselves on the technicalities of some kind of a cloture trapeze or ruling, when we could have cleaned the question up all at once.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I understood the Senator a few minutes ago to give a definition of the term "measure." I do not have it jotted down in black and white, but I understood it to be substantially this, "A step or definite part of a course or policy; a means to an end."

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to correct the Senator, so that he will not think I could have been so ingenious as to concoct this definition myself. I quoted from page 1534 of Funk and Wagnalls New Standard Dictionary, and this is the definition:

> Measure: A specific act or course of procedure designed as a means to an end; an expedient; method; step.

That is why, I may say, I have felt that rule XXII did apply to a motion to take up what might be called a measure.

Mr. DONNELL. Which leads me to the question which I desire to ask the Senator: Is there not something further in the definition which the Senator has not read, namely this language: "Specif.," which is, I take it, an abbreviation meaning "specifically"—"A legislative bill; as foolish measures; a party measure." And did not the Senator from Minnesota hear the full definition given on the floor of the Senate on the 11th day of March 1949?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I did. I may say that I would not want the synonyms which the Senator has used for "measure," that is, "foolish measures" and "a party measure," used all in the same breath. It seems to me that what we are talking about here is an honest difference of opinion as to what we mean by "measure." All I want to say is that we had our chance, and we lost it, and we lost it because we did not get the votes. The vote was 41 to 46, and, if I recall, the distinguished Senator from Missouri—and I respect his judgment a hundred percent—did not vote to uphold the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield again for a very brief question, and then I shall not ask him to yield further at this time?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Do I correctly understand the Senator therefore, to say that at the place he has mentioned in the Funk & Wagnalls New Standard Dictionary of the English Language, the word is defined as follows:

> A specific act of Congress or procedure designed as a means to an end; specif., a legislative bill; as foolish measures; a party measure.

Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. And if the Senator will continue he will find the definition to include "an expedient; a method; a step."

Mr. DONNELL. Yes, I remember that. That comes in between the words "a means to an end" and the word "specif.," as abbreviated. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. I thank the Senator.

Now the situation which exists is that we have before us a substitute which, for all practical purposes, throws out the window the motion which has been made for a simple majority, the motion which has been made for a constitutional majority, and, at least as the resolution was reported, the proposal for a simple two-thirds majority. I want to list those aagin.

The Senator from Oregon has asked for a simple majority. I know we will vote upon that, and I shall first vote for it.

Secondly, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] has proposed to this honorable body a constitutional majority, 49 of the Senators.

The Hayden-Wherry resolution asks for the simple two-thirds majority.

Now these apparently are out the window. Fifty-two Senators have apparently signed up on the dotted line to put into effect the new Wherry substitute. I say this despite the positive words of the Constitution. I have heard a good deal said about the Constitution on the floor of the Senate, and a good deal said about it over the radio, and have heard much said about it all over the country.

Let us take a look at the Constitution. I know we have eminent constitutional lawyers here. There is not one single requirement in the Constitution of the United States that calls for two-thirds of all Senators chosen to vote on a single issue. Not one. There is not a single requirement in the Constitution of the United States that necessitates a vote of two-thirds of all the Senators chosen at an election, or sitting in the Senate of the United States, in order to conduct the business of the Senate.

Every one of us as we came into this honorable body took an oath that we

would uphold the Constitution, and when we took that oath I imagine it was presupposed that we had read the Constitution, and I imagine it was presupposed that we knew its purpose, its objectives, and its intent.

I am not going to base my arguments upon the realm of fantasy. I base my arguments on the Senate of the United States getting back to the Constitution and talking about what is constitutional. I have heard a good deal about what is constitutional and what is not, in terms of civil-rights legislation. Now, let us take a look at what is constitutional in terms of the procedure to consider civil-rights legislation. How about the Constitution? The Constitution of this country says that a majority shall be sufficient to conduct business. And it applies to all business, the making or changing of rules, as well as the passing of bills and the adoption of motions.

The constitutional history of our country proves it. Back in the days of the Articles of Confederation we had a system whereby approximately two-thirds—the so-called constitutional two-thirds—was required to get something done. Nine out of thirteen States were required to pass a measure, and if there was any one single factor which brought down and destroyed the Government under the Articles of Confederation, which made it helpless, which tied it up into a knot of hopelessness and helplessness, it was the fact that 9 of the 13 States were required to pass any kind of a measure. If there is any one bit of testimony that should prove clearly to us how we can tie ourselves up into some kind of a legislative no man's land, it is what happened in the days of the Articles of Confederation, when two-thirds were required to pass a measure.

We have heard that the Wherry substitute is a fine program. We have heard, of course, that it is a fine program for many reasons. It is said that it will get us out of some sort of impasse, enable us to proceed with the business of the day, and afford us an opportunity to pass legislation.

We have also heard, as I have said in my previous remarks, that it really provides for action by a constitutional two-thirds majority. I brand it as I branded it the other night. It is an unconstitutional two-thirds majority, and I am not going to dignify it by calling it a constitutional majority.

Let me call to the attention of Senators what happened at the Constitutional Convention. I ask the distinguished Senator from Nebraska if he would have liked to have had his rule apply at the time the Constitution was written? Seventy-seven men were invited on that occasion. Fifty-five came. Thirty-nine stayed. That was only one more than a simple majority. Thirty-nine stayed. If it had taken a "constitutional two-thirds"—I put the words in quotation marks—we never would have had the Constitution of the United States. Did the founding fathers go around and say, "Well, we cannot adopt anything here in Constitution Hall. We do not have a constitutional two-thirds." I submit, Mr. President, that the Constitution of the United States in its very inception was born in the cradle of majority rule. At no time did anyone talk about such things as blocking the will of the majority through such a procedure as two-thirds of the total membership.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am sure from the Senator's argument and his recent statement about the Constitution that he implies that the Constitution was adopted by the group that drafted it and submitted it to the States. That group was merely assembled, if I read my history correctly, to determine what should be the draft of Constitution which had to be submitted to the States in order to have it go into effect. So in my opinion the question the Senator is discussing is irrelevant. They submitted a draft, but the States had to pass on the Constitution before it became effective.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall first reply to the Senator from New Jersey, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. President, it is perfectly true that the Constitution had to be submitted to the States, but it is likewise unalterably true that out of the 77 men who were invited, 55 came, 39 stayed, and 38 signed. And without their signatures, and without the Constitution being what it was, they could not have had a vote on the part of the States. Is the Senator going to stand on the floor of the Senate and say that the Constitution is unconstitutional?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I rose to take issue with the implication the Senator had left with the Senate.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Does the Senator remember what number of States were required to adopt and make operative the Constitution?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Nine.

Mr. STENNIS. That is almost three-quarters.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. And does the Senator from Mississippi recall that if we had had a two-thirds requirement at that particular time of all eligible voters we never would have had the Constitution? Let us not forget that only 6 percent of the eligible voters in many States, according to the constitutional history of the country, voted upon the Constitution of the United States. American constitutional history has been written in many volumes. Let me say that if it had been necessary to rely upon a two-thirds constitutional majority to adopt the Constitution we still would be under the Articles of Confederation, if we had survived at all.

May I ask the honorable Members of this honorable body how they would like to be elected under a rule which provided that they could not serve in this body unless they received two-thirds, not only of the votes that were cast, but two-thirds of the votes of all the adult eligible voters in their States? It does not make much sense to me. I say that the Virginia plan was based upon the principle of majority rule. The small-States plan was not based upon the principle of majority rule. The so-called New Jersey plan was based upon the idea of equal votes for each State. In the Constitutional Convention the Connecticut compromise, which gave us the great bicameral system of the House of Representatives and the Senate, was a compromise predicated basically upon the principle of majority rule. Majority rule was accepted as the only basis for popular government. Each State was given its two Senators, but the people themselves were to be represented in the House of Representatives on the basis of population.

The other night I stated that whenever "two-thirds" was written into the Constitution, it was written expressly, as the distinguished Senator from Oregon pointed out this afternoon. I repeat that any time the expression "two-thirds" appears in the Constitution, or any time a two-thirds vote was required by either House, the House of Representatives or the Senate, it was written out. It was not left to parliamentarians or presiding officers. It was not left to the caprice of any elected group. It was written into the great document known as the Constitution.

First of all, in each House two-thirds is necessary to propose a constitutional amendment. Is there anything more basic to the future of the country than a proposal to amend the Constitution? Does the Constitution say that it shall require 64 Senators to propose a constitutional amendment? It does not. It requires a simple two-thirds to propose an alteration of the basic law of the country.

The Constitution of the United States provides that each House, in order to expel a Member elected by the people, can do so only by a two-thirds vote. A simple two-thirds is enough. I submit that there could hardly be any act on the part of any governmental body that could be more serious than for a group of Representatives to make a decision to expel one of the Members of the body.

The Constitution says that it shall require a simple two-thirds vote in each House to pass a measure over the President's veto. That was considered to be another block in the system of checks and balances. Two-thirds was considered to be a very effective block.

The Constitution provides that a two-thirds vote is all that is necessary in the Senate to approve a treaty. I ask, is there anything today that Senators can think of that is any more serious for the days to come than a treaty, such as the North Atlantic Pact? Treaties which are brought to the attention of this honorable body may prejudice our lives for years to come. They may determine whether or not we shall live as a free people. I can think of nothing more important today than a treaty for the security of the free peoples of the world. Did the Constitution require a vote of 64 Senators to approve a treaty? Not at all. It provided that two-thirds of the Senators present and voting, if there is a quorum present, could approve a

treaty. Two-thirds of a quorum of 49 is enough to do the job.

When the Senate sits as a court of impeachment, is it necessary to have 64 votes to convict? It is not. Sitting as an impeachment court, the Senate could try the President of the United States. Did the Constitution provide that there must be a vote of two-thirds of the whole number of Senators? It did not. It provided for a vote by a simple two-thirds.

Will any Senator try to tell me that James Madison, George Washington, and Benjamin Franklin did not consider the difficulties which might beset a parliamentary body such as this? Can anyone say that they did not have the wisdom, the intelligence, and the insight to know how to protect the public welfare?

Mr. President, to my mind the Constitution of the United States is the greatest single document which was ever presented to a people, possibly exceeded in importance only by the Ten Commandments themselves. Even in the Ten Commandments, I do not recall that a constitutional two-thirds is required.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the Chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator through with citing precedents from the Constitution, or has he some more?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have a few more. I see that I am going to have some difficulty with my neighbor and friend.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask this question in all sincerity, in order that we may be able to have a program. How long does the Senator think he will speak?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should say for another 30 minutes. I shall try to bring my address to a conclusion in 30 minutes. In that connection, I may say that I prefer not to yield further, until I have concluded what I consider to be my prepared remarks.

Mr. President, I point out these things because they are exceptions to the rule. We have often heard it said axiomatically that the exception proves the rule. The exception has proved that it was the intent and purpose of the framers of our Government to provide in the Constitution for a majority rule.

Let me make my position perfectly clear. I do not want a majority to be able to control the Senate to the extent of eliminating debate. I want the rules of the Senate to provide time for debate. I want the people of the country to know what is going on in this body. I want days of debate. I am perfectly willing to see written into the rules of the Senate any period of time that is reasonable for debate—a week, 2 weeks, a month, or 6 weeks, or whatever is required to present the case to the people.

There is one further precedent which I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues. There was no filibuster in the Senate for 45 years after the adoption of the Constitution. Only now, for the first time in the history of the Senate, is it proposed to tie the Senate down by a rule which would give the minority an even stronger whip-hand over the majority than it has held up to date.

What is involved in this new proposal? There can be no cessation of debate. There is no way to provide for the transaction of business unless two-thirds of all the Senators—64 of the 96—approve. I submit, Mr. President, that that is unconstitutional. The Constitution, in article I, section 5, provides that a majority shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of doing business. I submit that a rule which would prevent the closing of debate without the approval of 64 Senators is a violation of article I, section 5, of the Constitution.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. What about the constitutional provision that each House, the Senate and the House of Representatives, has authority to make its own rules? Is not that constitutional?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I fully recognize that; and I realize that the House and Senate have the right to make their own rules. But those rules must be within the terms of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does not the Constitution provide that the Senate and the House shall have the power to make their own rules? Is not that constitutional?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed it is; but when there is an express provision in the Constitution that a majority shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of doing business, I submit that there is no rule that this body or any other body can make that can deny the validity of that provision, or the authority or prerogatives of that majority.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not care what the majority is; it still runs into that constitutional provision.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. PEPPER. Am I correct, first, in assuming that the Constitution of the United States does not prescribe the exact vote by which a measure may be passed in this body?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. PEPPER. Suppose the Senate were to make a rule that a measure falling in a certain category could not be passed in this body except by a vote of 64 Senators voting affirmatively. Would the Senator say that that would be a constitutional rule?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should say that it would be unconstitutional. I do not think there is a shadow of a doubt that if the Congress of the United States, or the Senate, should say, for example, that on matters of social security, which affect persons 60 years of age or over, no law pertaining to such persons shall be enacted unless 60 Senators vote for it, the courts would say that it was a violation of article I, section 5, of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed, I do.

Mr. HOLLAND. If I correctly understand the thesis of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, is not he maintaining that the cloture rule of 1917, which has been observed and invoked frequently since that time—the rule requiring that the votes of two-thirds of the Senators present shall be required in order to close debate—is unconstitutional?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, I am not; because two-thirds of those may be two-thirds of the majority which is required under article I, section 5.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will, indeed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Then is the Senator, under his thesis, holding that the cloture rule of 1917 is unconstitutional if so applied in any given situation as to require a two-thirds vote, which would be more than a simple majority of the Senate?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; I would not say that at all, for the simple reason that so long as we do not prescribe a certain definite number, the assumption is that it will be a majority under the terms of article 1, section 5, and that is all that is necessary. At least, that is my honest, considered judgment.

Mr. President, I shall now proceed as quickly as possible, because of the request of the minority leader and, I know, of other Senators, that we expedite this matter. There are many other things which I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate, but I must cut my remarks short, in order to expedite the business of the Senate.

Mr. President, deep concern has been manifested by Senators over the Constitution. I say without fear of successful contradiction that the Constitution is on the side of a simple majority, a constitutional majority, or a simple two-thirds majority. We have heard much said here about the precedents and traditions of the Senate. I submit that from the beginning of the traditions of the Constitution itself, from the time of the adoption of the Constitution, in the first 45 years of our Government, when members of the Constitutional Convention served in the Senate and in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, a proposal for a simple majority, a proposal for a constitutional majority, or a proposal for a simple two-thirds majority has been, and still is, within the traditions and precedents of the Senate.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. In line with the point about a constitutional majority, I wish to ask the Senator whether it is true that in connection with the ratification of an amendment to the Constitution, an amendment to the Constitution is valid if three-fourths of the States ratify it,

and that is a constitutional three-fourths, because until all of them have acted, they are considered as having voted against it?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct, according to the system of federalism upon which the Government of this country is predicated, and that is expressly written into the Constitution.

But I am trying to say that every time Senators violate the majority rule principle under our constitutional system, they violate a principle which is expressly outlined and written into the Constitution of the United States; and I say that the theory and premise on which the American constitutional system is built is that of majority rule. Whenever that theory is in any way violated, it is violated contrary to the express language of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. President, I have heard deep concern expressed here for the rights of the minority. I say that the rights of the minority in the Senate—and believe me, I wish to respect the rights of the minority—are not in danger. I think all of us are men of good faith. I have not heard any Member of the Senate try to choke off another Senator. Even in these debates we have been gracious to each other, and have recognized that there are honest differences of opinion. I do not think the history of the Senate indicates that there have been in the Senate men of ill will who would use every conceivable device in order to trip up their colleagues.

I have deep concern for the rights of the minority, but I have an equally deep concern for the responsibilities and obligations of the elected majority. This country will not make progress simply by being concerned over the rights of the minority in the House and the minority in the Senate. Concern over the rights of the minority in the House and the rights of the minority in the Senate will not result in the passage of legislation. Legislation is passed as a result of the responsibilities and obligations of the majority.

So long as we are of a mind to recognize that under our great constitutional system we do have respect and obligation for minority rights, then I think it is important to realize that we have the same respect and obligation for majority rights.

Mr. President, great concern is manifested by some of our colleagues over minority rights; but I say the same minority rights, which we wish to have, of unlimited political participation—that is what it amounts to—and of unlimited debate, the right not to be gagged or choked off, also should extend to the people of the United States, those outside the Halls of Congress, and not simply to the Members of the Senate. They should extend to every citizen. Every citizen should have the right of unlimited debate and the right of full political participation and the right of full economic participation. The rights of a minority in the Senate are secure only when every American citizen is secure in the framework of our democracy. The rights of the minority in the Senate will never be secure until every minority member in this country feels himself a part and parcel of the great American system. That is what we are talking about here.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator from Minnesota feel that any minority in the entire United States would be safe in its rights so long as minorities on the floor of the Senate were being run over roughshod?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would not make the assumption that that would occur. There is no intent on the part of anyone to run roughshod over any minority. I have said that I am perfectly willing to have written into the rules of the Senate, or provided by Congressional enactment or by constitutional amendment, a provision that debate in the Senate cannot be stopped for 2 weeks or 3 weeks or 6 weeks or 2 months. All I wish to know is that debate can be stopped in the Senate—not with mathematical precision, but on the basis of a simple majority, a constitutional majority, or a simple two-thirds majority.

Mr. President, I am not going to be stubborn about this matter; but I am not going to be in favor of either unlimited debate, on the one hand, or a proposal which requires the votes of 64 of the Members of the United States Senate in order to apply cloture. I do not believe that such a provision or rule would be an advance. It seems to me that here we propose to operate in reverse, to go backward, to go downhill. By this proposal we shall not be making progress.

We have shown a great deal of concern over the Senate rules. I wish to appeal to my colleagues to have a little concern over the Golden Rule, for a change—the rule of doing unto others as you would have them do unto you—or to make it apply to this situation, the rule of considering a measure on its merits. I know my colleagues are convinced of the merit of their position, and some of them have advanced rather convincing arguments. Some of them have said, "Senator, you simply cannot believe in an FEPC bill; and as for anti-poll-tax legislation, it is not needed, for we are eliminating it." I wish to congratulate them for that, for many States are eliminating it; and I say, more power to them.

I have heard other Senators say, "Senator, you do not believe we should have antilynching legislation, do you?" Of course, Mr. President, I believe we should have all these things; but I point out that Senators who take the position I have just indicated do present a case and do present their arguments. So all I ask is that we meet these issues on the merits of the case. If the case is sound and if Senators have the facts and figures and evidence and testimony to support their case, I submit that no reasonable group of men will ride roughshod over them.

In other words, I do not wish to be denied the opportunity of fighting for a principle or for a piece of legislation in which I deeply believe, by some kind of technicality which denies me the right to talk about it or to fight for it.

Mr. President, it is a singular thing that in this debate we have to talk about civil right when we do not even have civil-rights legislation before us. But I say that if the rule now proposed is adopted, if the Wherry compromise sell-out is agreed to, this will be the only time when I shall have a chance to talk about civil rights, for, in that case, civil-rights bills will not come before us. Of course, I do not know whether we could pass the civil-rights bills even if the Senate adopted the proposal advanced by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], namely, a rule that a simple majority could close debate; but at least such an arrangement would let me know that we could argue the proposed civil-rights legislation and could have hearings and evidence and testimony on those measures. We could have hearings about civil rights. We could have evidence and testimony. I ask, is there any honest, decent man who can say we ought not to argue about it? Is there anyone who will say to me we ought not to have a chance to discuss it, and to discuss it, not for academic purposes, but for purposes of trying to enact legislation? I am willing to be defeated; I have been defeated before. But I also want all to know that when I get into a struggle, it is not merely for exercise, but it is for the opportunity of solid accomplishment and solid achievement.

No; I must say to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, who with his colleagues came forward with the proposal; no, no, no; I shall never vote for it; and I shall do everything within my legitimate power to convince other Senators they should not vote for it. I should rather lose this fight, and I say it again—lose it 100 percent now and come back another day under the free processes of American elections. I know that some Senators do not want to lose this fight, but want to be able to go forth and tell the people, "We got cloture." I say to them, "No, you did not. You had some kind of manufactured concoction that perhaps will deceive somebody into thinking it is cloture; but it is not cloture." That is not what we are talking about, when we seek the right to bring debate to an end under the established laws of the country and under the precedents of the Senate.

There are, I repeat, three constitutional precedents—majority, constitutional majority, and simple two-thirds. That gives certain alternatives. I do not care to take the time to go all through the debates which have taken place since 1917. They have been gone through. But do not let anybody say there is only a difference of one and a half votes, or one vote, between the Wherry substitute and the Hayden-Wherry resolution. Let nobody try to tell me that. I took simple courses in mathematics, and, let me say, extended ones, sufficiently so to be able to make some type of division, some use of fractions. I am here to say, on the basis of the Wherry compromise, there is a difference of 8 votes. On the 19 roll calls under cloture petitions from 1917 to 1948, the average attendance was 84; the average not voting, 12. All anyone would have to do, to find out what would happen, is to take a "constitutional

two-thirds" majority and apply it to the 84 votes; and he will find that 8 votes will be lost.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator. I wanted to ask the same question before. Is it not true that on occasions when cloture has been applied, three times out of four, there were present 94, 94, and 93; that the first three times, it was not successful at all, but on the three occasions when it was successful there were more than 64 votes in favor of cloture; that the third time it was applied, there were about 80 votes, with a vote of 55 to 27; but that even in that case, if the majority leader had not obtained his two-thirds vote, he could have renewed his efforts the next day and gotten nine Senators back in their seats, and probably could have applied cloture?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will answer the distinguished Senator from Louisiana by facts, not by my opinion. Since 1917 there has been a simple majority 12 times out of 19. It can be seen, therefore, that the proposition of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is not too extravagant. Only 12 times out of 19 were Senators stampeded into some sort of foolish action. There was a constitutional majority, as proposed by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, only 7 times out of 19. There was a simple two-thirds majority 4 times out of 19; a "constitutional two-thirds" majority 3 times out of 19. What were the occasions upon which there were three-fourths majorities, simple and constitutional? First, the Treaty of Versailles; in other words, a treaty to conclude the peace. On that one occasion the vote was 78 to 16 to close debate. After a war, it would be perfectly obvious that that would be quite an issue. Second, the World Court, in 1926. The vote was 68 to 26 to close debate. That, of itself, was a big issue, as Senators will recall. The last one was the branch-bank bill in 1927. When we got down to the branch-bank bill, there was involved the whole banking structure of the country, the whole banking system. The vote was close, 65 to 18. With a change of one or two votes, we might have had a different banking structure in the United States of America.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I want to conclude, if the Senator will permit me. I mentioned the Democratic and Republican platforms. I say that what has happened in this coalition which has taken place, what has happened under the terms of the Wherry resolution, is as clear as anybody could possibly make it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. There is some slight misunderstanding of the analogy drawn with respect to the vote of 65 to 18. I think what the Senator means is that it was so close to the required 64 votes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. Some of the Senators did not understand the Senator's statement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It was so close to the 64 that if the Wherry substitute had been applied, and one vote changed, or two votes changed, we would not have had the branch-bank law.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. Had the so-called substitute been in existence, requiring 64 votes, in view of the fact there was a difference of only one or two votes, does the Senator not believe there would have been plenty of persuasion and coercion and conversation around the Capitol on that margin of one or two votes necessary to change the situation?

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is no doubt in my mind that the Wherry compromise puts a premium upon coercive action of all kinds upon Senators either to absent themselves or to be out of the way at the time of a critical vote. I do not think that is the major issue. I am not arguing on the basis of that issue. I argue on the basis that it simply is not an appropriate type of cloture rule, that it violates every precedent, every tradition, and the very purpose of our constitutional system.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If I have followed the Senator correctly, he apparently would have approved the constitutional-majority provision.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Why is there any more pressure applied, if the definite number 64 is set, than there would be if the definite number 49 were set?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I repeat to the distinguished Senator from Alabama, the Constitution of the United States requires a constitutional majority of Senators in order to transact business. On the basis of the precedents, article I, section 5, requires 49 Senators in order to transact business. That is entirely in line with the concept of our Constitution, in fact, 100 percent, in line with it. Obviously we can see that an effort would be made to try to keep Senators away from the Senate, so the Senate could not do business. But the Constitution prescribes that it takes 49 of the Senators in order to transact business. I say to you, Mr. President, if it takes 49 Senators to transact business, then 49 of the Senators can make sure that we do business here by stopping a filibuster, because a filibuster is a device to see to it that the Senate does not transact business.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course, the requirement in the Constitution is that 49 Senators must be present in order to transact business. It does not mean that 49 must vote on any particular measure. But if I understood the Senator correctly, I want to ask him this question: He stated that if a definite number were set, such as 64, there would be tremendous pressure in order to get Senators to absent themselves, so the 64 votes would not be available; is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I ask the Senator, what is the difference, if the number required to vote a certain way is set at 49? Would there not likewise be pressure in order to get Senators to absent themselves, assuming the Senator's premise to be correct in the first place?

Mr. HUMPHREY. There would be pressure today to see that Senators did not attend. I said I did not think it would accomplish its purpose. I want to make it crystal clear that I am not one of those who believe Senators can be shanghaied and taken off somewhere. I believe every Senator wants to be here to do his duty, and that he is going to be here, unless there is tragically important business or circumstances to keep him from being here. I believe in the integrity of every Senator of the United States, and of everyone who serves here. All I am saying is simply that the basis of my support of a constitutional majority is that it is within the terms as I understand of our system, which requires at least a constitutional majority of both Houses of Congress to meet for the purpose of transacting business.

Let me point out a few other factors. I want to say a word to my colleagues on the Democratic side, to my colleagues who are not going to vote with me on any of these proposals. I want to speak to my colleagues from the South and say to them that the Wherry compromise involves a frontal attack upon the Fair Deal. They know that to be so. I say they are going to win this fight; at least, that is the way it now looks. But I want to call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that we have TVA, we have the kind of flood-control programs and the kind of social legislation that developed from the inspiration and the philosophy and the political program of the Democratic Party. Let no one make any kind of unholy alliance or coalition here that will cause in any way, shape, or form a diminution of the President's program.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not want to yield at this time.

President Harry Truman's program, as set forth in the Democratic platform which was adopted at Philadelphia, is a minimum program for America. I submit to my friends on this side of the aisle that if that program is not enacted into legislation within the 4-year period, they can well rest assured that there will be a type of political movement in this country that will proselyte upon every prejudice, upon every weakness, upon every little bump and boil on the entire face of our economy. I can think of nothing that has been done by the Senate of the United States that plays more definitely into the hands of persons who appeal to minority groups in order to get them into some subversive organization. I do not take a back seat for anyone in fighting

subversives and battling against those who would destroy our way of life. I know that the greatest appeal which communism and fascism have is to the ignorance, the bigotry, the prejudice, of people who have been denied opportunity. I know that if the resolution is adopted, it will mean, for all practical purposes, no civil rights for at least 2 years. I submit, Mr. President, that the same persons who only a while ago said that if this country were involved in war they would not even fight for us will be going up and down the line appealing to every minority group in America and saying, "Look at the Republicans, look at the Democrats. They sold you down the river."

Mr. President, we are arming them with the truth this time. They will have the truth on their side when they say that, because we have sold them down the river. It is the biggest sell-out that this country has ever known, and I deeply resent it.

I can hear now the criticisms we shall receive from millions of persons in this Nation who feel there ought to be fair-employment-practice legislation, that there should be an antilynch law, that there should be an eradication of the poll tax, or any other kind of a mechanism which denies people the right to vote. Mr. President, the strength of America's democracy is the cleanness of her hands. Can we go to those people with clean hands?

If we did not intend to pass such legislation, why did we pledge it in the platform? There is one thing I can say about my party, and that is that we had a knock-down-and-drag-out battle about putting it into the platform. I know something about that fight. My friends on the other side adopted such a platform plank unanimously. We put it in our platform after a bitter fight which almost cost us the victory in the election. I shall not stand up, after working my heart out in a campaign, and seeing things denied that I believe to be right, and see such legislation not even given a chance to be debated and voted on in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, I want to send a resounding call to the labor leaders of the country, and ask them, "Do you think this kind of a coalition and the Wherry resolution are the things you want? Do you think it is just something with regard to civil rights?"

I have in my pocket the telephone numbers of two prominent labor leaders, and I shall call them as soon as I am through and tell them that I think they had better get down to Washington and find out what is happening to them. They should not have everything they want, but it seems to me they will not get anything they want. Look at what has happened in connection with rent control. What is happening to some of the President's appointments? This is merely the beginning. We are beginning to kick them around again. I submit, Mr. President, that this is only the first blow to the Truman program and to the Fair Deal. I believe in that program. I remind some of the Senators that it is not going to be easy going, from here on, because if this alliance can be formed and can be made to stick, we shall have a great deal of trouble.

I appeal to my colleagues from the South. Let us not make such an alliance. I hope I have convinced some Senators and changed their minds, but I doubt it. Do not think that some of the Senators who signed this petition, and who fought along with the Senators from the South, are in favor of a minimum-wage increase. Do not think they will vote for Federal aid to education. We know that it is needed. We know that we need legislation on public health. That is a part of the civil-rights program. We know we need better pensions for our old people. We know that we shall have to develop the regional river valleys as was done in the case of the Tennessee River Valley. We know we must take the shackles off labor and give it a chance to develop and grow as an honorable, responsible organization. Our farm folks will have to have more help.

In looking over the names on the resolution I find many who will not vote for some of the things which I have mentioned. I hope to see the Senators on this side of the aisle voting for a better housing program. I say to the Senator from Louisana that some of the Senators who signed the resolution are not going to vote for the housing program. But I am, I will work for it. I know that such a program is needed in Minnesota and Louisiana. I know, too, that a public-health program is needed, as is also help for the children of America.

Let us not lose the faith we should have.

If Senators want to talk about civil rights, they will have an opportunity to do so. I have heard on the floor of the Senate that there are Senators who feel that the junior Senator from Minnesota is a little extreme on these matters. I have heard the same thing about some of my colleagues. I have heard it said that there are other Senators who are a way off on the other side. Let us get together. I think there are some things we can work out. I shall not sell out my principles. I believe in the elimination of the poll tax. How it may be eliminated is a subject of debate. Some Senators think it should not be eliminated by the passage of a Federal law, but by a constitutional amendment. Very well; let us argue that, but let us get a bill before the Senate so that it can be argued. We cannot pass any legislation in the lobbies. Let us get a bill up.

My southern friends say they do not believe in mob violence. I do not believe in mob violence, either. I do not believe in lynching; they do not believe in lynching. The question is, How far should the Federal Government go? Is not that the issue? Let us get together and talk it out. I am open-minded; I am willing to see to it that the Federal Government does not use gestapo tactics and methods. But I want to say that we shall not work these things out if some play "footsie" with the rules, if we never have a chance to debate these things. Some Senators have got to believe that we came here in good faith and that we are just as interested in the future of America as are other Senators.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Minnesota did not sign the Wherry amendment, and neither did I. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. When it comes to the rules of the Senate, will the Senator from Minnesota join with me and others who are just as much interested in civil-rights matters, to see that the new rule is effective?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I assure the very distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, a gentleman whom I hold in the highest regard, that I shall be one of the first to join with him to see if we can pass legislation under the terms of that rule. We still have not voted on it. I am working to see if I cannot pick up another vote.

Mr. President, I asked some persons this afternoon the name of the old bird which flies backward when it thinks it is going forward. Various names were given me, such as the "tillyloo" bird, the "filliloo" bird, and I have even heard it called the "paprika" bird and the "whiffenpoof" bird. I think the Wherry substitute is sort of a "paprika" proposition. It flies backward and cannot be sure where it has been. It is not going ahead. It is the kind of a resolution which had its future yesterday and its promise for tomorrow in its failure in keeping the promises of the past.

A number of sheets of paper have been passed around the Senate. I want to find out how many of my colleagues really believe in their platform. I am not going to my friends who did not subscribe to the platform. I am not going over to someone who said, on the very first day the campaign opened up, that he did not like President Truman's civil-rights program and told the people and his constituents he did not like it. That man told what was in his heart. But I know that in the Senate there are those who supported Harry Truman according to the party platforms. I am not talking of those who supported Thurmond or Wallace, but those who supported Harry Truman and supported Thomas Dewey. They accepted those candidates and their plaforms. Are they willing, then, to give some assurance concerning those platform pledges, as they have given assurance of settling this debate? They have seen a little slip of paper. They said they were going to unite and bring this debate to a conclusion. Very well. I want to bring something to a conclusion. I want to assure 16,000,000 American Negroes that we are going to do something. I want to assure Catholics, Protestants, and Jews who suffer from discrimination in community after community that we are not going to forget the evils of our society, that we are going to do something about it.

I have before me a resolution literally in the form of a petition, and I wish to read it, and I want Senators to line up on the right, and I will furnish the pencils for them to sign it. This is the test:

We, the undersigned Senators, hereby pledge ourselves to vote against adjournment

of the present session of the Senate until the civil-rights program as set forth in the platforms of our parties shall be voted upon by the Senate.

I do not say "passed," I say "voted upon." I hope it will be passed, but I wanted it voted on.

2. We will support a Senate resolution to place the Senate officially on record as favoring the extension of the present session so as to dispose of civil-rights legislation.

In other words, if we arrive at that date when we are supposed to adjourn and we have not been able to get the civil-rights legislation through, I want the Senate to remember that we were hired for 12 months, we are on a full-year pay roll, full employment, full check, full expenses. We made solemn pledges in our platforms, and those pledges are going to become mere scraps of paper unless we start to live up to them, and here is the chance.

Senators all believe in civil rights. I started my address, and I conclude it, by saying that we owe it to America, we owe it to the world, we owe it to ourselves here on the floor of the Senate, to assure ourselves, our friends, and our fellow citizens that we are not playing footsie, that we are playing for keeps, and that every one of us who took an oath to supoprt our party, that every one of us who went out to support the platforms, will live up to what we promised. I am not asking those who did not support my platform—those who left their party; I am talking to those of us who voted for the Democratic candidate for President and supported the Democratic platform, and those who voted for the Republican candidate for President and supported the Republican platform. Line up now and be counted, and let us find out how sincere we are.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I am about to move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow, but before doing that, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). Reports of committees are in order. If there be no reports to be submitted, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Walter Lee Dunham to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of David J. Coddaire to be a member of the United States Maritime Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast Guard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Lorin F. Woodcock to be lieutenant in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Frank C. Squire to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc, and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of all confirmations of today.

RECESS

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m., tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, March 17, 1949, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 16 (legislative day of February 21), 1949:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Edward R. Dudley, of New York, now Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Liberia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Liberia.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Jordan B. Royall, of Florida, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Florida. Mr. Royall is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired December 7, 1948.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 16 (legislative day of February 21), 1949:

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Walter Lee Dunham to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for a portion of the term expiring June 30, 1950.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

David J. Coddaire to be a member of the United States Maritime Commission for the term expiring April 15, 1954.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Frank C. Squire to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board for a term of 5 years from August 29, 1948.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

REAR ADMIRALS, TO RANK FROM JUNE 1, 1948

Joseph F. Farley
Merlin O'Neill
Ellis Reed-Hill

REAR ADMIRAL, TO RANK FROM FEBRUARY 1, 1949

Louis B. Olson

REAR ADMIRAL, TO RANK FROM APRIL 1, 1949

Joseph Greenspun

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE), TO RANK FROM NOVEMBER 15, 1946

Raymond J. Evans
Willis G. Partridge
Allen E. Armstrong
James McMenamin

ENSIGN, TO RANK FROM JANUARY 15, 1947

Hardy M. Willis

LIEUTENANT, TO RANK FROM OCTOBER 1, 1942

William R. Sayer

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE), TO RANK FROM AUGUST 1, 1944

Lloyd M. Logan

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE), TO RANK FROM JANUARY 1, 1947

Charles R. Leisy

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE), DATE OF RANK TO BE COMPUTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE REGULATIONS

Dono W. Moore
Bruce N. Jensen
Robert E. Foley
John E. Riddell, Jr.
Gordon L. Bates
Ray J. Campbell
George C. Steinemann
Jack S. Thuma

ENSIGN, DATE OF RANK TO BE COMPUTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE REGULATIONS

Samuel R. Early

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Lorin F. Woodcock to be a lieutenant in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, effective February 3, 1949.

UNITED STATES ARMY

COMMANDING GENERAL, PACIFIC

Lt. Gen. Henry Spiese Aurand, O3784, commanding general, United States Army, Pacific, with the rank of lieutenant general.

DIRECTOR OF LOGISTICS

Maj. Gen. Thomas Bernard Larkin, O3785, Director of Logistics, United States Army, with the rank of lieutenant general.

DIRECTOR, PERSONNEL AND ADMINISTRATION

Maj. Gen. Edward Hale Brooks, O6657, Director, Personnel and Administration, United States Army, with the rank of lieutenant general.

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Floyd M. Harvey, Adin.
C. B. Childers, Arvin.
Harry Bergseid, Bell.
Edna Stratton Hamilton, Bolinas.
Anita V. Reid, Burrel.
Florence E. Kahmar, Camino.
Cecilia A. George, Castroville.
Clive B. Hubbell, Challenge.
Frank J. Norton, Chula Vista.
Frederick G. Zittleman, Cloverdale.
Catherine C. Schultz, Colfax.
Keith L. Tobin, Cutler.
Ruth Pugh, Cypress.
June R. Dolcini, Davis.
Lloyette Osborne, Earlimart.
Edythe Burgett, El Segundo.
Evelyn K. Hodge, Florin.
Viola S. Pambianco, French Camp.
Cleo A. Mollring, Galt.
Paul R. Todd, Garberville.
Beatrice K. Geiger, Herlong.
William Howard O'Brien, Hollister.
Grace R. Aldridge, Joshua Tree.
John L. McKindley, Lockeford.
Oscar Ditmanson, Lodi.
Blanche I. Dunn, Los Alamitos.
Lois M. Hartwell, Loyalton.
Horace C. Coe, Lynwood.
Margaret S. Cooper, McKittrick.
Joseph J. Joaquin, Madrone.
Pearl C. Kehlet, Meeks Bay.
Raymond R. Dingle, Middletown.
John E. Mixer, Midway City.
Fenton E. Watson, Mira Loma.
Jared W. Moore, Modesto.
William J. Wasley, Nevada City.
Louise H. Blanchard, Occidental.
Ella A. Dominguez, Olive.
Puella E. Forbes, Orcutt.

Mary E. Bailey, Piru.
Lillie E. Connor, Richvale.
Harry H. Lauritzen, Rio Vista.
Kenneth W. Dyal, San Bernardino.
James W. Kern, Santa Susana.
Velma E. Mackey, Santa Ynez.
Raymond E. Ledford, Talmage.
Henry S. Fager, Waterford.
LaVerna N. Strawbridge, Westminster.
Ernest D. Robinson, Willow Creek.
Adelaide C. Byrn, Windsor.

COLORADO

Dorothy F. Mullen, Bayfield.
Eldora F. Giberson, Dillon.
R. Terrell Ellington, Grand Junction.
Betty R. Ingram, Nederland.
Raymond H. Talbot, Pueblo.
Dean S. Hainey, Ridgway.
Elmer Glen VanScoy, Westminster.

FLORIDA

Myrtle Clare Booth, Cantonment.
Earl L. Williams, Lady Lake.
Evan D. Mixon, Ruskin.

ILLINOIS

Kenneth V. Mason, Albion.
Fred D. Knaus, Arcola.
William A. Goetz, Bethany.
Lloyd O. Huff, Blandinsville.
Daniel J. Boyd, Blue Island.
Clifford A. Walsh, Bourbonnais.
Gilbert R. Gish, Buda.
Margaret Carlson, Bureau.
Pearl H. Collins, Catlin.
William K. Armstrong, Chandlerville.
Ray B. Brockhouse, Chapin.
Eula McCawley, Chesterfield.
Albert J. Buehler, Chestnut.
Donald L. Doan, Claremont.
Monroe A. Lawson, Clay City.
Andrew J. Rogers, Jr., Cordova.
Louis Sloter, Crescent City.
G. Stewart Allen, Crete.
Harry A. Osman, Cypress.
Leland Adams, Dieterich.
Fred H. Popp, Jr., Dundee.
Joseph J. Holloway, Elmhurst.
Ruth Sartain, Fithian.
John C. McKinstra, Freeport.
Glen W. Seaton, Glen Carbon.
John J. McCaughey, Gurnee.
George A. Fraser, Hamilton.
Lester A. Binder, Hinckley.
Russell M. Shoaf, Homer.
Russell E. Snyder, Hull.
Mary E. McCarl, Kinderhook.
Richard R. Atkins, Kinmundy.
Ralph D. Waddell, Latham.
James O. Brown, Long Point.
Albert O. Ledbetter, Marion.
George M. Farrell, Marseilles.
C. Lincoln Guernsey, Mechanicsburg.
Helen F. Gleich, Menard.
Arthur E. Maloney, Mooseheart.
Evans R. Pratt, Morrison.
James T. Malley, Mounds.
Adam A. Munsterman, Nameoki.
John W. Bosaw, New Haven.
Ellwyn Barnett, Oakland.
Charles J. Murphy, Oak Park.
S. Jay Thomas, Oregon.
Emmett P. Hayes, Rochelle.
Charles H. McGough, Secor.
Frank C. Spengler, Shannon.
Hazel M. Wolf, Sidney.
Francis L. Weghorst, South Pekin.
Michael A. Bernasek, Sparta.
Bessie M. Hewitt, Steward.
Frank C. Niemeyer, Stockton.
Herbert M. Bowman, Thompsonville.
Wilbur K. Reader, Thomson.
Orville L. Glasford, Trivoli.
Beatrice E. Reck, Winslow.

INDIANA

Bernice Sigman, Castleton.
Lloyd B. Helms, Centerville.
Dale M. Sands, Claypool.
Adrian M. Morrison, Cloverdale.
George W. Horan, Collegeville.
Walter H. Fried, Corydon.
Harry G. Thomson, Danville.
Marion E. Maxwell, Darlington.
Elizabeth May Reiff, Deputy.
Margaret A. Horseman, Dublin.
Henry O. Kipfer, Grabill.
Omer D. Hendricks, Hartford City.
Everett J. Laun, Kingsford Heights.
Arthur C. Welch, Lapaz.
Geneva K. Gant, Laurel.
Lowell Odom, Medaryville.
Robert D. Long, Millersburg.
Henry Claude Steininger, Monticello.
Marion L. Garstka, New Haven.
Pearl L. Smith, New Market.
Roy L. Strange, Plainville.
Dow Haimbaugh, Rochester.
John V Pinegar, Rockville.
Sherman L. Wright, Rushville.
Joseph C. Renie, Sharpsville.
Frank C. Kettring, South Bend.
Arnold B. Rhodes, Tippecanoe.
Sylvia Swanson, Twelve Mile.

KANSAS

Albert H. Sauvain, Agenda.
Earle F. Hill, Altamont.
Charles G. Persinger, Canton.
Francis K. Darr, Centralia.
Howard C. Cain, Delphos.
Frank L. Robinson, Eskridge.
Harry C. Brooks, Fort Scott.
Harold D. Vernon, Goff.
Charles W. Parker, Highland.
Harry Lang, Jetmore.
Alvin A. Pfeiffer, Linn.
Marline L. Ames, Long Island.
Leslie A. Leochner, Ludell.
John F. Buche, Mulberry.
Una V. Shoemaker, Perry.
Patrick J. Jolly, Scammon.
Richard D. Wiley, Sedgwick.
Ruth H. Berrigan, Solomon.

MAINE

Howard Mills Martin, Kennebunk Port.
Delmar C. Ellinwood, North Windham.

MASSACHUSETTS

Francis A. Crowley, Boston.
Maurice R. Savage, Buzzards Bay.
Thomas P. Hallinan, Chicopee Falls.
Donald P. Steele, Gloucester.
Malcolm W. Chase, Princeton.
Hazel F. Tenney, West Townsend.
Thomas J. Gilgun, Winchester.
John A. Marshall, Worcester.

MICHIGAN

Perry F. Frownfelder, Adrian.
Elias W. Lyons, Armada.
Samuel Somora, Sr., Baroda.
Gerald D. Swanson, Bear Lake.
Frank A. Prais, Belleville.
James L. Milliron, Benzonia.
John J. Redmond, Bloomfield Hills.
Roland F. Duff, Buckley.
Alexander S. Lynch, Carney.
Archie W. Visnaw, Cedarville.
Franklin L. Erickson, Central Lake.
Arthur F. Newman, De Witt.
Horace J. Lickly, Dexter.
Richard L. Price, East Tawas.
Woodrow L. LaLonde, Felch.
Keith Adams, Fountain.
Clarence F. Allen, Fowlerville.
Mary M. Blower, Grand Blanc.
Clarence F. Goerner, Howard City.
Robert J. Buller, Interlochen.
Joseph Thomas Kaderabek, Irons.
Reuben S. Eddy, Lake Linden.
John E. Dooley, Linden.
Emerson E. Dufina, Mackinac Island.
Lovatus A. Butler, Milan.
Court R. Houghmaster, Millersburg.
Bruce A. Lee, Millington.
Otto F. Wormsbacher, Mount Clemens.
Charles L. Kaltenbach, New Haven.
Collins H. Luth, Niles.
Charles J. Bal, Norway.
Russell C. Scott, Pittsford.
Charles K. Guy, Rapid City.
Darwin H. Van Houten, Sixlakes.
Vester E. Mock, Springport.
William H. Mullens, Trout Lake.

MINNESOTA

Walter L. Franti, Coleraine.
Bertha H. Avenson, Dorset.
Anna C. Hite, Emily.
Edna K. Gerding, Greenwald.
Raymond B. Sullivan, International Falls.
George A. Schultz, Ottertail.
Evelyn McGivern, Staples.
James Monroe Cunningham, Sturgeon Lake.

NEVADA

Renee C. Gibson, Beatty.
Teresa A. Mahoney, Beowawe.
Thelma R. Studer, Gabbs.
Edward L. Gregory, Goldfield.
Josephine Roberts, McGill.
Beatrice E. Hinds, Smith.
Carolyn W. Parshall, Stewart.
Alice I. Strieby, Wellington.
Ray E. Hepworth, Wells.

NEW MEXICO

Carl J. Dagostino, Socorro.

NORTH DAKOTA

John J. Murray, Mandan.

OREGON

Ardis E. Bradley, Aumsville.
Farley J. Elliott, Bend.
Victor Carl Black, Dallas.
Joseph Omlin, Jr., Gold Beach.
Loyal E. Smith, Sherwood.

PUERTO RICO

Domingo Lopez, Maricao.
Georgina M. Lamas, Roosevelt.
Roberto Ortiz Colon, Vega Baja.
Josefa G. Lorenzi, Yauco.

TENNESSEE

D. Naomi Anderson, Madison College.
Lewis E. Moore, Sr., Nashville.
Edgar W. Marshall, Surgoinsville.

UTAH

Riley W. Goodfellow, Bountiful.
C. Henry Nielsen, Brigham.
Ted R. Mower, Fairview
Claud M. Glazier, Kanab.
Edward W. Vendell, Ogden.
John T. Adams, Tooele.

WEST VIRGINIA

Frederick C. Page, Beechbottom.
William G. Meredith, Dailey.
Maude L. Copeland, Elk Garden.
Clara Marie Hess, Farmington.
Elizabeth L. Williams, Glen Rogers.
Alice L. Maschal, Glen White.
Charles H. Callison, Hillsboro.
Hazel O. Harbert, Lumberport.
Athaline H. King, Mabscott.
Vincent A. Johnson, Man.
Henry E. Chapman, New Martinsville.
Andrew J. Nemeth, Osage.
Marietta Walker, Peach Creek.
Marie N. Fox, Prenter.
Josephine G. Bryant, Raysal.
May H. White, Roderfield.
Jane B. Graham, Thurmond.
Troy R. Swecker, Valley Head.
Walter S. Bambrick, Weirton.
Mary L. Vance, Whitmans.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 16, 1949

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who dwellest in eternal light, give us power of will to forsake the dark things of mind, evil appetites, the spirit of envy and hate. In Thy sight no life is common or worthless; create within

us that type of manhood that is well balanced, spiritualized, and strong.

Enable us to bear the yoke of service without complaint and to perform our duty in the spirit of a high privilege. O sustain and encourage every plan and act which means greater stability to our free institutions, and richer blessings to all our people.

Thou Prince of Peace, we pray not only for our own country but for the lands of the whole earth. So extend our vision that we shall take into our sympathy the welfare and safety of every nation, contending against whatever worketh wrong between man and man, nation and nation. In Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 152) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That LOUIS B. HELLER, of New York, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION TO STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 153) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That OMAR BURLESON, of Texas, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Foreign Affairs.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE]?

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 178.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Government of the United States joins in the invitation of the United States Olympic Association to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1956 Olympic games in the United States at Detroit, Mich.; and expresses the hospitable hope that the United States may be selected as the site for this great enterprise in international good will.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is directed to transmit a copy of this joint resolution to the International Olympic Committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman state whether or not this has the unanimous support of the committee?

Mr. KEE. It is a unanimous report from the committee. I have consulted with the minority leader and also the majority leader.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the action of the House in passing House Joint Resolution 178 just acted upon be vacated and that an identical Senate resolution (S. J. Res. 56) be substituted.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Government of the United States joins in the invitation of the United States Olympic Association to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1956 Olympic Games in the United States at Detroit, Mich., and expresses the hospitable hope that the United States may be selected as the site for this great enterprise in international good will.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is directed to transmit a copy of this joint resolution to the International Olympic Committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

By unanimous consent, the proceedings by which House Joint Resolution 178 was passed were vacated and that resolution laid on the table.

THIRTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago yesterday, in the city of Paris, France, the American Legion was born.

The 30 years of its unselfish service to not only veterans but also to the community, State, and Nation, has earned the American Legion the confidence of this Nation.

"For God and country," as its preamble states, veterans of World War I and World War II have joined together in the greatest service organization, except the churches, in our history.

Its blue and gold emblem signifies honorable service under the flag of the United States in war and peace.

The American Legion has always led the way with its program of preparedness, but its advice and warnings were not always heeded.

So, to the American Legion on its thirtieth anniversary, many happy returns of the day.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, minority leader, broadcast over Mutual network on Tuesday, March 15, 1949.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday I secured permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter. I am informed by the Public Printer that it is in excess of the amount allowed under the rules, in the amount of $159.75. I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the additional cost it may be printed.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a statement and a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. McDONOUGH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

INJUDICIOUS PRESS RELEASES

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I arise to protest the action of military officials in permitting release to the press and our potential enemies of important military information. Secret discussions before the Joint Chiefs of Staff, alleged information as to how we expect to hit 70 vital Russian targets, information as to the content of top-secret maps in the Pentagon is recklessly bandied about in the press. The fact that some of the information is garbled is no defense.

In my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Army, Navy, and Air Force, I have registered emphatic protest with officials. They advise that no authorized statements have been made, and they express concern over unauthorized press reports.

I wish the people who are apprehensive about war would quit giving away important military information to our potential enemies. It is not an exaggeration to say that America is giving away a billion dollars' worth of information each year to potential enemies. The fact is that with the information which is being made public about the details of our Military Establishment and as to our

future plans, potential enemies can conserve their expenditures and make the best possible application of their funds. Smart football quarterbacks do not give the opposing team all the signals and strategic plans before the game is played.

Military people are not the only offenders. In some instances Congress has not been blameless. The Atomic Energy Commission has recently made available to the people and our potential enemies what could appropriately be called a bombardier's map showing the exact location of all our atomic installations. Time does not permit references to ill-advised statements as to biological warfare developments and the recitation of other indiscretions within and without the Government.

Mr. Speaker, all of this reckless disregard of our national security must stop. I hope my colleagues will join me in calling a halt.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

THE LATE HONORABLE THOMAS PRYOR GORE

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sorrow and regret that I rise to announce the death this morning of a great Oklahoma statesman, the Honorable Thomas Pryor Gore, one of the first United States Senators from Oklahoma. He passed away this morning after having a cerebral hemorrhage.

Senator Gore served the State of Oklahoma as its first Senator. He came to the United States Senate in 1907 and served with great distinction until 1920. He returned to the United States Senate in 1926 and served until 1932. He was accidentally blinded as a child. Despite this almost insuperable handicap he managed to write a record of great and distinguished service in the political life of his country and in his State.

Oklahoma deeply mourns and regrets the death of this truly great and courageous statesman. His sense of humor, his sense of fairness, his courage to face defeat for a principle in which he believed without compromise, sets him apart and sets him forward with the great statesmen who have served the United States of America.

Senator Gore was 78 years of age when he passed away at 9:50 a. m. today.

I would like to incorporate here excerpts from the Washington Evening Star announcing Senator Gore's passing:

Thomas Pryor Gore was of the breed that turns handicaps into assets.

When he was 8 years old, a stick thrown at a cow by a playmate blinded his left eye. Three years later, accidental discharge of a toy gun destroyed the other eye.

For the next 5 years, until he was 16, young Tom Gore was without formal schooling. But during those years he was developing the qualities that served him well through three Senate terms—a retentive memory, an independence seldom found in the handicapped and a bright philosophy that penetrated the walls of darkness.

Before the darkness closed in Mr. Gore had been a page boy in the State senate of his native Mississippi. It was then the germ of politics was planted. It was nurtured along the way, such as the day when he was 16 and found a CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He memorized the name of every Senator, and from that time on he knew by heart every congressional roster.

WON DEGREE IN 1892

After winning a law degree from Cumberland University in 1892, Mr. Gore moved to Texas. Here he began moving into the political arena, exercising an oratorical skill that later stood out even in the Senate, and winning over a young woman who was later to be his eyes and his inspiration.

He married her, Miss Nina Kay of Palestine, Tex., in 1900, and the next year they moved to Lawton, Okla.

Up to then he had been a Populist, but William Jennings Byran's ascendancy turned him into what he called a regular Democrat. He practiced law and helped write the budding State's constitution, and when statehood came in 1907, his friends urged him to run for the House.

Mrs. Gore would have none of it. She insisted on the harder road, and Mr. Gore declared for the Senate. He won the honor along with Oklahoma's other first Senator; Robert L. Owen, on his thirty-seventh birthday.

Mr. Gore served until 1921, then after a lapse of 10 years, returned for the term ending January 1, 1937.

KNOWN FOR HUMOR, WIT

Husky, erect, white-haired, Mr. Gore was impressive in the Legislature. He became known for his infectious humor, sharp barbs of wit, and for a forthright single-mindedness that often carried him off the administration track.

He was one of the few who opposed President Wilson's recommendation for a declaration of war in 1917. After the war, he fought veterans' bonuses, but finally yielded to them. He opposed United States entry in the League of Nations.

Most of his lawmaking interest centered around the farmer and Indian. Once he was credited with saving $30,000,000 in oil royalties for the Osages by filibustering against a resolution giving private individuals lease rights.

Running fourth in an effort for reelection in 1936, he blamed his defeat on New Deal antipathy. But he had a "feeling of satisfaction that I did not sacrifice my principles."

With the help of his wife, secretary, and friends, Mr. Gore kept abreast with the times by having newspapers, magazines, and books read to him. He had a 50,000-book library of his own, and often would spend hours in the Library of Congress perfecting an erudite speech crammed with historical tid-bits.

PREDICTED COMEBACK

After he was satisfied all pertinent facts had been read to him, the Senator would retire. Several hours later he might emerge, completely prepared for a full-length, factual speech for the Senate.

When he was retired in 1921, Senator Gore predicted he would make a comeback. He not only forecast his return orally, but was so confident he wrote it on a slip of paper and dropped it into a crack of his Senate desk. One of his first acts on returning 10 years later was to retrieve the penciled prediction.

His constant companion and behind-the-scenes adviser, Mrs. Gore, accompanied the Senator on an inspection trip of the Panama Canal. On his return he made a thorough report to the Senate, suggesting legislation to equalize tolls.

Mrs. Gore also was largely responsible for his decision to try a comeback. But she always defended and supported his independence of thought, even when it was apparent that antiadministration tenets would defeat him in 1921.

PRACTICED LAW HERE

After his defeat in 1936, Mr. Gore entered private-law practice here. He had been active up to the time of his fatal illness, working at home when sickness forced him to remain away from his office in the Union Trust Building.

Surviving are Mrs. Gore; their daughter, Mrs. Robert Olds, of 3110 Dumbarton Avenue NW.; and son, Robert N. Gore, with Civil Aeronautics Administration at El Paso, Tex.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, no news the gentleman from Oklahoma could have brought to us would have caused me more regret than that of the passing of my distinguished, lifelong friend, Thomas P. Gore, who was born and reared in Mississippi in an adjoining county to the district I have the honor to represent. I have known him ever since I grew up. He was one of the ablest men I have ever known.

He was accidentally blinded when he was about 10 years of age, but regardless of that handicap he became one of the ablest lawyers of the Nation and one of the greatest statesmen who ever graced the United States Senate.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] spoke of Senator Gore's sense of humor. I am sure that Senator Gore, if he were with us today, would not object to my telling of this amusing incident, which bears out what the gentleman just said about his sense of humor.

He was debating with a very distinguished Senator many years ago, before he ever left Mississippi, when he was only about 21 years of age. The Senator became infuriated and said, "I cannot afford to take advantage of the gentleman's handicap. I realize he is blind. But if he was on an equality with me in that respect, I would beat the face off of him."

Mr. Gore quietly rose and said, "Mr. Chairman, just blindfold the Senator and lead him around here."

The laughter that followed almost broke up the meeting.

He was not only quick, he was not only witty, he was not only brilliant, but he was one of the most patriotic men who ever graced the Senate of the United States.

I join the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma in mourning the loss of this great and glorious American.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, it is only because of my personal friendship with Senator Gore that I rise at this moment and having known him, though he was

blind, he could see so much farther than many of us with vision clear.

O world, thou closest not the better part!
It is not wisdom to be only wise,
And on the inward vision close the eyes,
But it is wisdom to believe the heart.

Columbus found a world, and had no chart,
Save one that faith deciphered in the skies;
To trust the soul's invincible surmise
Was all his science and his only art.

Our knowledge is a torch of smoky pine
That lights the pathway but one step ahead
Across a void of mystery and dread.
Bid, then, the tender light of faith to shine
By which alone the mortal heart is led
Unto the thinking of the thought divine.

Tom Gore had the faith, he had the courage to live out his long span of life and render a great service to the State of Oklahoma as well as the Nation. He was my neighbor, he died an honorable man.

God bless him.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for his remarks.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege when I first came to this House to meet a man whom I considered to be one of the greatest Americans with whom I have ever had the pleasure to be associated. Senator Thomas P. Gore and I lived at the old Congress Hotel for a long time. I was well acquainted with his charming wife and daughter, but above all I knew him and his praiseworthy, noble sentiments and manly conduct for which he stood and for which he fought.

He was, indeed, a real progressive, a true liberal while a Member of the Senate. I followed his endeavors very closely. I admired his accomplishments. I do not know of any man who has served his country more faithfully and well than Senator Thomas P. Gore. He served the Nation to the best of his ability, ably and well, for many, many years. I regret exceedingly his passing. The State of Oklahoma has lost a great and useful citizen, and the country a great statesman. At this time I express my very deep and profound sorrow to those dear ones whom he has left behind.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the dean of the House for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, Oklahoma and the Nation have lost a man of sterling character, a man of courage and wisdom, an honest, capable, courteous and cooperative public servant, one who gave the major portion of his life to the service of a new State and to the country. He exemplified that true, patriotic and pioneer spirit of the State of Oklahoma. I regret the great loss to the State and to the country due to the passing of former Senator Thomas Pryor Gore.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the late Senator Thomas P. Gore from Oklahoma had a great handicap as had our late President Roosevelt. The life he lived and the service that he performed is truly a challenge as well as an inspiration to the youth of this land. They should and will understand from the fine records of these great men that in our land, the land of the free, there is an opportunity to rise to great heights. In so rising Senator Gore had beside him his family, his wife and his daughter. To them we extend our deepest sympathies and sorrow. They led him through his affliction. They were with him constantly. They read to him, they counseled him, and they shared in his triumph and rewards in the august body of the Senate of the United States. It is truly fitting that this challenge at this time goes out to America from this great statesman from Oklahoma. All this shall be a monument to his memory. I join these remarks with those of my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the remarks of the gentlemen from Oklahoma about the great, revered, late Senator Tom Gore. I had the pleasure of knowing and admiring him very highly. I think he was one of the greatest minds of our generation. His affliction caused him to have a phenomenal memory. I had occasion to note how he could remember in the minutest details some of the smallest things which we are called upon to remember in our daily lives. I, too, truly regret his passing and extend my sincere sympathies to his family.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members who desire to do so may be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I had known Senator Gore for many years. His wife was born in the district which I represent. Her courage, her loving care helped Senator Gore bear his great infirmity. She deserves much credit. Senator Gore was a good American, a man of splendid ability and served his day and generation well.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, on December 10, 1870, Thomas Pryor Gore was born in Webster County, Miss., which county is a part of my congressional district and is also my native county. Like the family from which he came, he was a man of great ability and high intellect.

No man had more grit and determination than did Senator Gore. At 8 years of age he had the misfortune to lose the sight in one eye due to a flying splinter and only 3 years later he lost the other in the accidental discharge of a toy gun. Ordinarily this would have been sufficient to destroy the morale of any man, but not of Tom Gore. Even though he had lost the greatest of all senses—that of vision—he had the determination and will power to advance himself to a position in public and political life that to this day has been unequaled by anyone similarly handicapped. He developed the qualities that served him well through four terms in the United States Senate—a retentive memory, independence of thought and action, and a cheerful philosophy that cast off the darkness in which he lived for more than 67 years.

He was a great debater which is characteristic of the family from which he came. Long before he heeded the call to "go West," he developed into an orator of note and frequently was found on the stump in his native State of Mississippi debating the issues of the times with those whom others would dare not meet. With eloquence seldom equaled by men of his day he drove home his points and needled his opposition with sharp barbs of wit.

Tom Gore came from the common people. He devoted his time, energy, and great intellect to their cause. He builded his life upon a rock. He left a mark which will weather the ages. He served his people with loyalty and his God with a deep and abiding faith.

The people of Webster County, Miss., were proud of Tom Gore as their son; and he was proud of the county of his nativity. Although he moved away more than a half a century ago he never lost interest in his native State and the friends of his boyhood days. In the many conversations he and I have had since my coming to Washington he never failed to inquire, "How are things down in Webster County?" He was always inquiring of many of the older settlers down there and expressed deep interest in their welfare.

I deeply mourn the passing of this great man and am sure that I bespeak the sentiment of the people of my State.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply shocked to learn only a few moments ago of the death of a great Oklahoman, a great American, a statesman and leader of men, my friend, the Honorable Thomas P. Gore.

In 1908, Senator Gore was the youngest Member of the United States Senate, representing the youngest State in the Republic. The Oklahoma story since that time is well known. In a single generation a frontier Territory has blossomed into a land of industry and culture. Tom Gore was part and parcel of that illustrious history. Every chapter is stamped with his fingerprints. Every page reflects the luster of his name.

Senator Gore possessed qualities rare even among great men. It has sometimes been said that he was too often the victim of his own courage and of his loyalty to his convictions. It has also been said that a great legislator is one who votes with an eye on the next generation rather than on the next election. Measured by this test, Senator Gore is certainly entitled to take his place among the great legislators of all time.

He was one of the great orators of our time. His speeches are classics of wit and eloquence. They are what wit and eloquence ought to be. Yet there is never in them a suggestion of eloquence for its own sake. He used his rhetoric only as a tool, to tell the story better or to make the picture more complete. He was a

great story teller, but he never trimmed his speeches to fit his tales. The Honorable Josh Lee, who succeeded Senator Gore in the United States Senate, described what I am trying to say so well in his book How To Hold an Audience Without a Rope, when, speaking of Senator Gore, he said:

He illustrated his points with wit and humor, not just cut and dried jokes, but humor woven into the warp and woof of his address.

Senator Gore was a great orator, a great statesman, a great man. He served his day and generation well. More than all that to me, though, he was my friend. Since boyhood I have had the honor of knowing him. For many years I have had the benefit of his wise counsel. I shall miss him sorely. The loss is a personal one to me, which I feel I share with his beloved and devoted wife and loving children. I can conclude only by saying: Oklahoma has lost one of its greatest citizens; I have lost one of my finest friends.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I was indeed shocked and grieved to learn a few minutes ago of the death this morning of Hon. T. P. Gore, former United States Senator from Oklahoma.

In recent years I have become well acquainted with Senator Gore, but, of course, have known of him since I was a small boy. Almost everyone knew of him because of his great prominence.

He was truly a great man. He possessed so many qualities in such a superlative degree that make for greatness. He was possessed of indomitable will and great courage. A will to live the life abundant, and he lived it. A will to serve his countrymen, and he certainly served them well. In my home city of Lawton, Okla., is a most prominent street known as Gore Boulevard. It was named in his honor, for him. He served that city well. It was also his permanent home. In addition thereto he served the great State of Oklahoma and the whole Nation with great distinction. Yes; his courage was indeed outstanding. I believe I never knew a man in public office in whom I had greater confidence in his being able to withstand so-called political pressure than he. He was a political Rock of Gibraltar against which the winds of expediency wasted themselves. He stood, almost divine like, on a number of occasions, in his political career and fought for what he believed to be the best interest of this country, definitely, in my judgment, with no thought nor concern for his own political welfare. My admiration for him in this regard is unbounded. I truly believe that he will live in the history of this great country—and he helped to make a considerable portion of that history—as one of the immortals of the United States Senate. His ability, his great will and courage, his fidelity to trust, place him among the giants of that great body, in my judgment.

Senator Gore was an eloquent man. When it comes to forensic oratory I doubt seriously if he has been surpassed in this country. In a world he could not see, with physical sight, he moved his audiences to great heights of thinking and emotional reaction by sight of his heart, his mind, and his soul, and pictured to them what he there saw more plainly and beautifully than meets the physical eye. Over a period of many years I heard him speak from time to time. Never have I listened to him without feeling that I was listening to a voice that spoke from a great mind and a great heart. In one respect at least, concerning his ability as an orator, I feel certain he had no equal. He would take a popular song or a popular expression that currently was on the lips of the whole people and use it, or part of it, in connection with a thought of his own, in such a way that all could understand and that all would remember. He was also a past master in the use of humor. He truly belongs, I believe, to the list of the world's great orators.

Many other things could be said sincerely and truly in eulogy of this great man who had so recently stepped off the stage of action, but I must close, and in closing, I wish to add that he was not only a great man with an indomitable will and great courage and possessed of renowned eloquence and ability, but he was a good man as well. Yes, he was truly good. He loved and fought for his fellow man. Handicaps could not embitter him, unjust criticism could not dismay him, fear could not sway him, but he ever moved forward seeking an opportunity to serve. This day we have lost a great American statesman. May God comfort and bless his good wife and other loved ones who mourn his passing.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TEAGUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

THE WORLD METROPOLIS, NEW YORK CITY

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the House to the fact that the entire April issue of Holiday magazine is devoted to what it calls the world metropolis, New York City.

In presenting this graphic cross-section photograph of New York City, the editors of Holiday have done a great service, not only to New York but to people everywhere, for they have documented how the foreign-born and native, the black and the white, the Jew and the gentile, and many other diverse groups of people have not only learned how to live together amicably but also how to build a great city. It is a lesson that I wish could be shown throughout the entire world.

In analyzing New York City, this magnificent magazine offers 188 photographs of New York scenes and contains separate articles describing the city's government, its restaurants, hotels, and night clubs, its world-famous garment center, Wall Street, Greenwich Village, China Town, Harlem, Yorkville, Little Italy, and the Bowery. The ballet, opera, music, and art which are exhibited in New York are dramatically described in text and photograph, with the prediction that New York is becoming the artistic center of the world.

I am glad that Holiday magazine realizes that the story of New York is a complicated one, that its people and interests are interwoven like a giant fabric, and that it could not be done adequately in a single article or story. In dedicating the entire April issue to New York City, Holiday has been able to cover thoroughly a subject which until now has been dealt with only partially. The writers, illustrators, and editors of Holiday have done a great job, and I congratulate them.

NEW YORK CITY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN], has just called the attention of the House to the April issue of Holiday telling the story of New York.

Some people would have us think of New York as a "foreign" city. But this magazine issue shows that New York is truly America, not only of today but of tomorrow. New York is a city of neighborhoods, Greenwich Village, Harlem, Yorkville, the lower East Side, Park Avenue, and my own Washington Heights, each with its own broadly distinctive character and quality. We are really a collection of small towns, not an amorphous mass of people and masonry. There is as much good will, kindness, hospitality, and consideration per square foot in New York as in any other part of America, town or country.

New York's millions of friendly citizens, its rapid transit, its restaurants of many nationalities, its magnificent shops, its unmatched theater and music, the sheer tempo of its movement, are the joy of invention, the passion for freedom, and the drive for progress which is America.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Members will be inspired by this magazine issue and will visit us in New York and share its wonders with us.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mark Sullivan.

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. SIMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a report. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will take four pages of the RECORD and cost $284, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

INJUDICIOUS PRESS RELEASES

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I want to second the concern which was expressed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] over the unusual publication of classified military and Air Force information which we have been witnessing in the last few days. If the Army and the Air Force are disclaiming responsibility for it, then certainly somebody should determine who is responsible for its being released. Associated with the gentleman from Texas on the Appropriations Subcommittee for the Army and the Air Force for a great number of years, I have been shocked as he has been by the amount of information that has been released within the past few days, which previously has been discussed only in executive sessions with requests for supersecrecy to avoid saber-rattling on the one hand and toss off vital secrets on the other.

With respect to the pictures published by the Atomic Energy Commission, which he mentioned, may I say that I recently asked the Atomic Energy Commission for a statement about those pictures, and they have supplied me with a complete set of the prints that were used in their annual report. In each instance they have pointed to the fact that they were previously released by the Army or had been published in the Smythe report or elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, this whole situation calls for a definite investigation and very careful consideration. I do believe in making information public whenever security is not involved, and in particular that information which is helpful in determining the soundness of national policies. I cannot believe, however, that it either aids our security or contributes to peace to make public information that would be helpful to any foreign power in the event of war between us or which might give schemers and mongerers fuel for the flames of fear and war.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], both responsible Members of the House, both men of years of service, and both serving on the Committee on Appropriations, one a chairman of the Subcommittee on War Department Appropriations. I cannot sit idly by and listen to the remarks of two such gentlemen without realizing that there is a situation that calls for serious attention. These two gentlemen are serious Members. They would not take the floor to make the observations they have unless they both feel very seriously concerned about the disclosures that are being made and which are against the national interest of our country. In view of the statements coming from such responsible sources, I hope the appropriate committees will make inquiry to find out if any publicity is being given out which is against the national interest of our country. Further, the press of the country ought to be very careful in using matters they may ascertain which are against the national interest. Fortune magazine had an article in last month's issue carrying pictures of our atomic plant. I do not know what they mean, but I understand they gave them an exact photograph, giving information to the Soviet Union.

OUR NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I am happy and gratified that the distinguished and able majority leader has made the statement that he has. I do not know how this information leaks out, but certainly it is something that should concern us all. As the ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, charged with the responsibility of the security of this Nation, I feel certainly those things should not happen. If we tighten our belts and be very careful about our statements to anybody anywhere, I think we will all be better off.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I believe I am the only member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on the floor. I beg your pardon, I see the gentleman from North Carolina, vice chairman of the committee. Perhaps I should not have taken the floor, but permitted him to do so, instead. In all events, I might say to the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas, the gentleman from South Dakota, and the gentleman from Missouri, that the subject under discussion concerning the actions of the Atomic Energy Commission in publishing a book containing a great many photographs of installations of the Atomic Energy Commission has been a subject of inquiry by our committee. I think that is the proper committee to conduct such an inquiry. That inquiry is being conducted and whatever action may be taken at this late date, I am sure will be taken by our committee.

I believe the gentleman from North Carolina will agree with me on that.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. SHAFER. May I observe that that investigation was started almost a year ago by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], concerning the same matter before this book was even issued.

Mr. HINSHAW. That may be, but I think the proper agency to investigate this subject is the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, the matter that has been brought up on the floor of the House by two members of the Committee on Appropriations, and also by the majority leader as well as the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW], a member of the joint committee of which I am vice chairman, concerns a report by the Atomic Energy Commission to the Congress.

The joint committee has held hearings recently on this very problem and the Military Liaison Committee informed the committee as stated by the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] that they interposed no objection to this report. Reports are submitted to the Congress by the departments. I think it is an over-all picture which is the responsibility, not alone of the departments of Government, but also of Members of the House. It concerns me deeply because I feel that some of this information should not be given publicity. I am not one of those who believes in suppressing the scientific developments to the point where the public is not informed on matters of importance to them in the development of science, but I do believe that many things at the present time, which are being released in the scientific field, not only by the Atomic Energy Commission, but in the other departments of the Government, should be scrutinized very carefully.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ADDONIZIO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

THE FEPC IN OHIO

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I was very much surprised the day before yesterday to hear the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] giving some unsolicited advice to the Ohio State Legislature on the handling of the FEPC bill pending before that legislature. I find that Mr. RANKIN's district has 263,000 population, 16,300 of whom are privileged to vote for him for Congress. I hardly think that is any mandate for him to

advise the Ohio Legislature on any pending legislation. I would predict, that, if they are having any trouble passing the FEPC bill in Ohio, that a little more unsolicited advice from members of the political party of the gentleman from Mississippi, which is apparently not the Democratic Party, will insure its passage without any trouble.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

INCREASED PER DIEM FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman asked for a democratic speech of 1 minute. That is all right with me. But let us have a little economy. I want your help. I am just worried half to death. I am always worried. Ever since the first Roosevelt day.

There will be before the Committee on Expenditures shortly a bill to increase the per diem of Federal employees from $6 to $10 a day. Those folks are just suffering as Congressmen suffer. None of us is getting enough money. So we say. But I wonder if you will be kind enough to explain to me why it is that that per diem must be increased by $4 a day because the Federal employees when they travel on official business cannot get along with the money, $6 per day, they are getting, and still there are so many that with all they have are striving body and soul, to get on a Federal job. That is what I want you to tell me about when the issue of increasing the subsistence allowance by $4 per day comes up.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

CUT-BACK ON VETERANS' HOSPITALS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the Budget took an amazing position a few months ago regarding the cut-back on veterans' hospitals. Those are hospitals that were authorized by the Board of Hospitalization; authorized by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; authorized by the Congress. Millions of dollars had been spent in the plans for those hospitals. In some instances ground had already been broken, the land had been purchased and appropriations made. Yet the Budget took it unto itself to cut back those hospitals. Veterans in the districts of every Member of Congress will not be hospitalized unless those hospitals are built. They should be built at once.

I believe the Budget Director far overstepped his authority, and I understand that there is in the Veterans' Administration appropriation bill the money for the building of those hospitals. All the service organizations are making a vigorous effort to have the buildings constructed. I have seldom seen them more upset over what they consider a lack of adequate care of their sick and disabled.

There seems to be plenty of money of the United States to be sent to other countries for hospitals and yet here our veterans' hospitals are cut out. Such discrimination against our veterans is outrageous. Every Member of Congress has the interest of the disabled at heart and will refuse to see him suffer.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 107 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction. For the purpose of making such investigations the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The SPEAKER. There is one suggestion the Chair has to make with reference to resolutions submitted by committees.

The pending resolution provides that this committee or any subcommittee thereof may sit anywhere within the United States or outside of the United States whether Congress is in session or not.

Somebody in some committeee ought to look into the matter to see whether or not that is a wise provision.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELANEY. I yield such time as he may need to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I fully appreciate the vast powers given under this resolution; however, I have genuine confidence in the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER], and I have faith that he will proceed carefully and expeditiously. This committee has made many worthwhile investigations on many important matters, and I feel, in view of the broader jurisdictional powers, the committee may find it necessary to investigate matters outside the territorial limits of the United States.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I think the observation which has just been made by the chairman of the Committee on Rules is well-founded. It should be borne in mind that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has such jurisdiction over such subjects that they are necessarily international in character. The jurisdiction, as the title of the committee indicates, "Interstate and Foreign Commerce," is broad; and when we consider the several subjects under its jurisdiction, aviation, for instance, Federal communications, and all the rest of them, it has that aspect that we cannot overlook.

Mr. SABATH. That is the point I made. I regret that the gentleman did not understand what I stated for the information of the House, namely that this committee has extremely broad jurisdiction, and it may become necessary for it to investigate matters of international importance; consequently, I believe that the Committee on Rules in granting this rule had reason to believe that the power would not be abused and that, at the same time, investigations which might be ordered and conducted would be carried on in the interest of our commerce and in the interest of our Nation.

That is all that I wish to say. I feel that the gentleman from New York should yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my remarks to the distinguished dean of the House the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], who is always eminently fair on the Rules Committee. It seems to me that the Speaker has raised a very reasonable question whether or not the committee is to sit here or outside of the United States. I do not know how far you are going to extend your authority or what you bring back here and report to us. I wonder if the findings are going to be obligatory on us.

Mr. SABATH. The Rules Committee believes this is necessary in view of conditions that exist and that is the reason, although I agree with the Speaker that we should not grant greater power to some of the committees. In this instance I believe this committee should have that power because of its vast jurisdiction and the power which it has.

Mr. SHORT. You are making this permanent law. Committees change.

Chairmen change. You will not always have these eminent gentlemen present.

Mr. SABATH. That is only for the present Congress.

Mr. SHORT. Oh. There is a time limitation. That is satisfactory.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I think we might bring into discussion the fact that under the Reorganization Act the Senate committees have this authority without the necessity of presenting a special resolution. We are merely asking that authority which every Senate committee has in these matters.

Mr. SABATH. That is right.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WORLEY). The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, to make my position clear, I am not speaking about the jurisdiction of this committee. I know more about the jurisdiction of this committee than most people in the House since Clarence Lea left because I was a member of it for 24 years.

There was one investigation conducted in this Congress, namely the railroad holding companies and the utilities all over the United States, and nothing was said about it in the papers until the report of that very able Dr. Splawn was laid upon the desk of the chairman of the committee. That was a demonstration of how to conduct investigations, not in the newspapers but to get information.

I am not saying this committee does not have jurisdiction to investigate commerce, foreign and domestic. I am talking about committees having the right during the sessions of the Congress to pick up and go over the United States when they ought to be here attending to the job they are elected to do.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE TO CONDUCT INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 112.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct studies, investigations, and to inquire into any matter within its jurisdiction. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to make such inspections or investigations, to use such governmental facilities without reimbursement therefor, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses, and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee, or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses.

That the said committee shall issue such reports, including reports to the House of Representatives, with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise, as the committee deems desirable.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 137, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct thorough studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI (1) (*i*) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, and for such purposes the said committee or any subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories and possessions, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

That the said committee shall report to the House of Representatives during the present Congress the results of their studies and investigations with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resolution is agreed to and a motion to reconsider is laid on the table.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be heard on the resolution. The chairman said he would grant me some time.

The SPEAKER. But the resolution has been passed.

Mr. PATMAN. I know, but I ask the chairman of the committee now. I am not against it, but I just want to say a word about it. I was on my feet.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the proceedings by which the resolution was passed and the motion to reconsider was laid on the table will be vacated.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What is going on here?

The SPEAKER. The resolution was passed and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table, but the gentleman from Texas said that the chairman of the committee had agreed to yield him time, and he was on his feet, and the proceedings were vacated.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Whose fault is it that he was not allowed time?

The SPEAKER. Perhaps the Chair was a little fast. If we are going to do these things, we should pass them as expeditiously as possible.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I would like to have at least 3 or 4 minutes on this resolution, if it is permissible.

The SPEAKER. If those in charge of the resolution will yield time to the gentleman, that can be done.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HERTER. I asked the chairman of the committee for time in this resolution and that time was not granted, so there will be no opportunity whatever to speak on this side.

The SPEAKER. Well, the gentleman will have as much time as the chairman will yield to him. Now the gentleman from Illinois has an hour.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I shall later on, yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] 30 minutes. I did not wish to deprive him of that time. Of course, I realize that the Speaker is trying to expedite the business of the House by not having the resolution explained, since it is one of the usual resolutions giving power to the Committee on the Judiciary to sit and make investigations and granting to it the power of subpena. But, in view of the situation the gentleman from Texas, having asked for time, and realizing that under the rules the gentleman from Massachusetts is entitled to one-half of the time, I, of course, do not wish to deny him that privilege and that right. It was due as I stated, to the fact that the Speaker wanted to save the House some time.

The power of the Committee on the Judiciary has been broadened due to the reorganizations. The Committee on Rules felt that that committee is entitled to have the power of subpena and also the power to make some investigations, because in addition to other jurisdictions they have jurisdiction over immigration, revision of laws, claims and patent matters.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute, for the purpose of asking the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary whether or not the purpose of this resolution is to give the chairman of that committee the right to institute investigations into insurance companies. There has been a great deal of discussion that that is the purpose of this resolution, and I think the House ought to be clear as to whether or not it is true.

Mr. WALTER. No, that is not the purpose. The principal reason for the

resolution is to give the Committee on the Judiciary the power that was formerly in the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization before the functions of that committee were absorbed by the Committee on the Judiciary under the reorganization law.

Mr. HERTER. Can the gentleman give us any assurance that this power is not going to be used for the conduct of an insurance investigation, which I understand one member of the committee is very eager to pursue?

Mr. WALTER. Speaking for myself and, I believe, for a majority of the members of the committee, nobody has any idea that the power given by this resolution will be used for that purpose. It is my understanding that another resolution has been introduced for that purpose and that, if an investigation is to be made, it will be made after the adoption of that other resolution.

Mr. HERTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I feel it is the function of Congress to make these investigations. I agree with the Speaker that there is some question about permitting these investigations to proceed when the House is in session. I question also the scope of the resolutions that permit investigations outside of the United States while the Congress is in session.

My purpose in speaking at this time is to make several suggestions to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the Committee on Agriculture as to some avenues they might investigate. It would be interesting to know why the Government has bought so much coconut oil from all over the world and found it necessary to store that oil so close to the soap factories. Is it true that this oil is turned over to the soap factories after 3 years and at a very low cost? How much does the Government lose on these transactions? Does Secretary Sawyer or any one in the Department of Commerce have any connection with a soap factory?

Why not raise the question on the importation of meat. Has 419,000 head of cattle come from Canada this last year? I understand that the importing of meat is 3 times more than the 10-year average. What caused the price of hogs to break? Was it export controls on lard? How much meat did our Government buy from Argentina? Was lard sold to other countries who in turn raised the price 11 cents and sold the same lard to Marshall-plan countries? I would like the Agriculture Committee to investigate the huge amount of poultry and eggs now being imported. The Government recently bought 144,000,000 eggs, took them off the market to support the price of eggs and at the same time we are importing more eggs and poultry than at any time in our history. Does this mean that the farm wife must compete with eggs from all over the world? Why does the administration fail to support the price of milk as the law provides?

It would be important to inquire why the Government has permitted Canadian seed potatoes to come in and they are being sold at less than the support price. The potatoes coming on the market today from our own growers must be bought at the support price. There is a fertile field for these investigating committees. Find out, if you can, why the big spread between what the producer gets and the consumer pays. I feel some of the practices carried on by this Government have reacted against the interests of the people of this country. There is a fertile field for action. Get the truth and be not afraid to tell the people.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN.]

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to this resolution. I am strongly in favor of it. We have a good committee on the Judiciary. I have confidence in the members of that committee. I am anxious for them to have the vehicles and the weapons to do their job. This committee has an enormous job before them. They are entitled to the support of the House in their important undertakings.

The responsibility for carrying out some of the major parts of our Democratic platform of 1948 is on this committee. When the Committee on the Judiciary presents bills to correct the evils in our economic system that are complained of or discovered the House and Senate should support these bills.

Our pledges to the people are:

The Democratic platform, 1948, contains the following excerpts:

We recognize the importance of small business in a sound American economy. It must be protected against unfair discrimination and monopoly, and be given equal opportunities with competing enterprises to expand its capital structure.

We pledge an intensive enforcement of the antitrust laws, with adequate appropriations.

We advocate the strengthening of existing antitrust laws by closing the gaps which experience has shown have been used to promote the concentration of economic power.

We pledge a positive program to promote competitive business and to foster the development of independent trade and commerce.

The Republican platform of 1948 contains the following language:

Small business, the bulwark of American enterprise, must be encouraged through aggressive antimonopoly action, elimination of unnecessary controls, protection against discrimination, correction of tax abuses, and limitations of competition by governmental organizations.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN PROMISES ACTION

At Louisville, Ky., September 30, 1948, in a radio broadcast, President Truman stated:

Profits, after taxes, of all corporations were running at the rate of twelve billions a year in the spring of 1946, before price control was ended. Two years later, in the spring of 1948, they were running at the rate of $21,500,000,000—an increase of 70 percent in corporation profits.

There are some people whose incomes have gone up faster than prices, even if yours hasn't. One of America's largest corporations reports that it paid its top 10 executives $865,000 in 1946.

Now, let's just take another example. Look at the record on monopoly. The plain facts on monopoly are these:

Two hundred giant industrial corporations own nearly half of all our industrial assets.

One hundred commercial banks control one-half of all the bank deposits in the United States.

Three steel companies own 59 percent of all the ingot capacity of the United States.

Two corporations produce 83 percent of all the tin cans.

These facts shout a warning to all of us. They mean that big business can manipulate prices and production at its own discretion, regardless of the public good. That's not healthy for this country—it's the biggest threat there is to our free-enterprise system.

President Truman also stated in the same speech the following:

My administration has been doing what it could to break up monopolies through the antitrust laws. And we asked the Republican Eightieth Congress to strengthen those antitrust laws to plug up some of the loopholes.

Studies by the Federal Trade Commission have shown that big corporations have been gobbling up small businesses faster than ever during the past few years. And this process cannot be stopped until the Congress passes legislation to stop up these loopholes.

Did the Republicans give us unity in our fight against monopoly? Well, of course not. That's not the kind of unity they believe in.

Instead of strengthening the antitrust laws, the Republican Congress passed—over my veto—an act which exempts one whole segment of industry from those laws. Under this act the railroads no longer have to worry about antitrust laws when they set rates. The Republican Congress fixed that for them.

That's what I mean when I say the Republican Party is willing and eager to listen to the voice of big business and special privilege.

Give us a Democratic Congress and we will take action against monopoly. That will be a change.

CHALLENGE

This is a great challenge to the great Committee on the Judiciary.

President Truman, for the Democratic Party, has his promises out to the people that substantial changes will be made and the people protected from monopoly and greedy economic power.

It is my sincere hope that the Committee on the Judiciary will give early attention to the promises made by our Democratic Party and by our great President concerning these important questions.

TOO MANY LOOPHOLES AND TOO FEW NOOSES IN ANTITRUST LAWS

There are many loopholes in our antitrust laws. Every loophole should be taken out and a noose inserted instead so that any time any person, firm, or corporation attempts to frame up on the public and create a monopoly or to fix prices against the public interest, there should be effective ways of preventing it.

President Harry S. Truman, in his speech to the Congress, January 5, 1949, stated:

Small business is losing ground to growing monopoly.

President Truman also stated in a Jefferson-Jackson Day speech February 24, 1949:

The special interests are on the job year in and year out—7 days a week, and 24 hours

a day. They work through their lobbies and pressure groups, through the editorial pages and the columnists and commentators they control. They twist and misrepresent the measures the people voted for. They are again trying to frighten the people with the old, worn-out bugaboo that socialism is taking over in Washington.

February 17, 1949, the Honorable Herbert A. Bergson, Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, delivered an address entitled "Current Problems in the Enforcement of the Antitrust Law," before the Association of the Bar in the city of New York on Trade Regulation. In this speech, Mr. Bergson stated:

Another important monopoly problem is the elimination of competition through mergers and asset acquisitions. Section 7 of the Clayton Act was designed to forbid the acquisition by one corporation of the stock of competing corporations where the result would be substantially to lessen competition. In 1914 when the Clayton Act was passed stock acquisition was the usual device for effectuating mergers. Today the prevalent merger device is asset acquisition. The Supreme Court has held that section 7 of the Clayton Act does not prevent the acquisition of assets, nor does it provide authority for the Federal Trade Commission to order divestiture of assets acquired as a result of an illegal acquisition of stock. Thus, two loopholes exist by means of which the basic purpose of section 7, to arrest the creation of monopolies, is defeated.

Since 1929 the Federal Trade Commission has unsuccessfully urged the Congress to amend the Clayton Act to prohibit certain acquisitions of assets as well as stock. This year the President mentioned this problem in his state of the Union message and urged the Congress to cure the anomalous situation.

EFFORTS MADE SINCE 1929

It will be noticed that Mr. Bergson says that the Federal Trade Commission has been trying to get the Clayton Act amended so as to plug up this enormous loophole in our antitrust laws since 1929. During that time we have had 20 regular sessions of Congress and many special sessions.

It is true that the present Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives has reported this bill out more than once. The last time it was reported out unanimously, but for some unknown reason it was stopped before it got to the floor of the House for consideration. It is my hope that the Committee on the Judiciary will again report this bill out and insist on its early passage.

SECTION 7 AMENDMENT NOT COMPLETE ANSWER

In addition, something should be done to break up these big combines that have a monopoly. If the bill to amend section 7 becomes a part of the law of the land, it will merely freeze the situation as it is. In other words, the concerns the past 20 years that have bought out their competitors and run their competitors out of business and acquired huge additional facilities through unfair practices will be allowed to keep everything they have and will not be punished at all. The amendment will merely prevent future mergers and combines.

DIVESTITURE AND DIVORCEMENT

Further remarks of Mr. Bergson in his New York speech were as follows:

With regard to the future, it is our purpose to intensify our activities against monopolies and attempts to monopolize. In this connection, we have encouraged the application of the remedies of divestiture and divorcement. We believe that where appropriate these remedies are the most expeditious means of eradicating the economic consequences of monopoly.

In addition, we shall continue our efforts to prosecute illegal conspiracies in food, clothing, and housing. We shall also bring selected cases involving restraints wherever the facts justify.

We must not allow our system to be imperiled through ignorance or disregard of the antitrust laws.

The American people and the enlightened leaders of American business are determined that we shall preserve the fundamental principles of free enterprise.

ECONOMIST OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION TESTIFIES

During the last session of Congress, Dr. John M. Blair, Assistant Chief Economist, Federal Trade Commission, Washington, D. C., testified before the Select Committee on Small Business concerning the concentration of wealth and economic power in the United States. His testimony presented some amazing facts about concentration in different industries. He points out that 113 large corporations at the end of 1947 held 43 percent of the total assets of all manufacturing corporations in the United States. He also discusses the earliest movements toward consolidations, combinations, and concentration, as well as the necessity for the amendment of section 7 of the Clayton Act. In addition, he discusses the disappearance of 2,500 companies between 1940 and 1947 caused by mergers.

Only a part of Dr. Blair's testimony is included.

STATEMENT OF DR. JOHN M. BLAIR, ASSISTANT CHIEF ECONOMIST, FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. BLAIR. John M. Blair.

Mr. BALLINGER. You are the Assistant Chief Economist of the Federal Trade Commission?

Mr. BLAIR. That is right, sir.

Mr. BALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I have known Mr. Blair for many years. He is quite an authority on the concentration of wealth and economic power in America. I asked him to appear before the committee and give his conclusions as to the extent of this concentration.

Mr. BLAIR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin my testimony with the submission of some new facts on the extent of concentration in manufacturing industry. These new facts consist of figures which have been developed by the Federal Trade Commission. They are presented in the form of balance sheets in which the proportion of various items on the balance sheet held by large corporations, as a percent of the total, is clearly set forth. With your permission, I would like to offer for the record these new figures on the extent of concentration.

Mr. STEVENSON. I would suggest that you just offer them.

Mr. BALLINGER. Do you wish to comment on them?

Mr. BLAIR. I would like briefly to comment on them, if it meets with the pleasure of the committee.

Mr. BALLINGER. It is accepted for the record, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. STEVENSON. All right.

Mr. BLAIR. Thank you.

(The document referred to follows:)

Concentration in manufacturing as measured by the holdings of 113 corporations with assets of $100,000,000 and over

CONDENSED BALANCE SHEET

	113 corporations with assets of $100,000,000 and over		Total, manufacturing corporations (millions of dollars)
	Millions of dollars	Percent of total	
ASSETS			
Cash	4,340.3	39	11,178.5
U. S. Government securities	3,433.0	50	6,840.1
Other marketable securities	127.3	18	703.4
Accounts and notes receivable—net	4,155.2	34	12,110.1
Inventories	10,175.1	38	26,472.7
Other current assets	140.9	20	703.8
Total current assets	22,371.8	39	58,008.7
Property, plant, and equipment—net	16,093.4	50	32,321.3
Other assets including deferred charges	3,732.1	52	7,234.0
Total assets	42,197.3	43	97,564.1
LIABILITIES			
Bank loans payable within 1 year	545.2	20	2,785.8
Other notes and accounts payable	3,088.6	40	7,716.3
Federal income taxes accrued	2,610.2	37	7,101.0
Other current liabilities	1,549.8	38	4,107.9
Total current liabilities	7,793.6	36	21,711.4
Long-term debt and other liabilities	5,070.0	58	8,730.7
Stockholder's equity	29,333.9	44	67,102.6
Total liabilities	42,197.3	43	97,564.1

Concentration indexes for petroleum industry, 1947

CONDENSED BALANCE SHEET

	6 largest corporations [1]		4 largest corporations [2]		Industry totals (millions of dollars)
	Millions of dollars	Percent	Millions of dollars	Percent	
ASSETS					
Cash	557	52	427	41	1,052
U. S. Government securities	419	60	475	68	695
Accounts and notes receivable—net	668	57	523	45	1,165
Inventories	1,022	58	843	48	1,742
Other current assets	53	74	85	74	115
Total current assets	2,811	59	2,353	49	4,771
Property, plant and equipment—net	4,629	62	3,449	46	7,517
Other assets, including deferred charges	1,037	76	870	64	1,361
Total assets	8,477	62	6,671	49	13,649
LIABILITIES					
Bank loans payable within 1 year	2	5	2	5	38
Other notes and accounts payable	606	76	511	47	1,077
Federal income taxes accrued	229	51	180	40	446
Other current liabilities	222	62	144	40	360
Total current liabilities	1,062	55	837	44	1,920
Long-term debt and other liabilities	942	56	710	44	1,595
Stockholders' equity	6,472	64	5,123	50	10,135
Total liabilities	8,477	62	6,671	49	13,649

[1] Texas Co., Socony-Vacuum Oil, Standard Oil of Indiana, Standard Oil of New Jersey, Standard Oil of California, Gulf Oil Co.

[2] Texas Co., Socony-Vacuum Oil, Standard Oil of Indiana, Standard Oil of New Jersey.

Concentration indexes for linoleum industry, 1947

CONDENSED BALANCE SHEET

	4 largest corporations [1]		3 largest corporations [2]		Industry total (millions of dollars)
	Millions of dollars	Percent	Millions of dollars	Percent	
ASSETS					
Cash	11	70	10	68	15
U. S. Government securities	7	88	7	88	8
Accounts and notes receivable—net	18	90	17	89	19
Inventories	40	95	39	92	42
Other current assets	1	97	1	97	1
Total, current assets	77	88	75	87	87
Property, plant and equipment—net	67	95	65	92	71
Other assets, including deferred charges	22	98	22	97	23
Total assets	166	92	163	90	180
LIABILITIES					
Bank loans payable within 1 year	0	55			0
Other notes and accounts payable	9	88	9	86	10
Federal income taxes accrued	12	87	12	85	14
Other current liabilities	3	92	3	91	3
Total current liabilities	24	87	24	85	28
Long-term debt and other liabilities	1	50			2
Stockholders' equity	141	94	139	93	150
Total liabilities	166	92	163	90	180

[1] Armstrong Cork, Congoleum Nairn, Paraffine Cos., Delaware Floor Products.
[2] Armstrong Cork, Congoleum Nairn, Paraffine Cos.

Concentration indexes for tire and tube industry, 1947

CONDENSED BALANCE SHEETS

	Four largest corporations [1]		Industry total (millions of dollars)
	Millions of dollars	Percent	
ASSETS			
Cash	164	85	194
U. S. Government securities	61	89	68
Accounts and notes receivable—net	257	85	303
Inventories	477	87	548
Other current assets	1	81	1
Total current assets	960	86	1,114
Property, plant and equipment—net	362	85	424
Other assets	37	80	46
Total assets	1,359	86	1,584
LIABILITIES			
Bank loans payable within 1 year			8
Other notes and accounts payable	113	83	137
Federal income taxes accrued	70	83	84
Other current liabilities	96	88	109
Total current liabilities	279	83	338
Long-term debt and other liabilities	304	96	317
Stockholders' equity	775	83	929
Total liabilities	1,359	86	1,584

[1] Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., Goodrich Tire & Rubber Co., Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., United States Rubber Co.

Concentration indexes for wool carpet and rug industry, 1947

CONDENSED BALANCE SHEET

	4 largest corporations [1]		2 largest corporations [2]		Industry total (millions of dollars)
	Millions of dollars	Percent	Millions of dollars	Percent	
ASSETS					
Cash	20	64	12	39	31
U. S. Government securities	13	59	11	49	22
Accounts and notes receivable—net	18	55	12	37	32
Inventories	56	60	34	36	93
Other current assets	0	13	0	6	1
Total current assets	108	59	69	38	182
Property, plant, and equipment—net	35	58	22	36	61
Other assets, including deferred charges	7	65	5	50	10
Total assets	150	59	96	38	254
LIABILITIES					
Bank loans payable within 1 year					3
Other notes and accounts payable	11	54	7	37	20
Federal income taxes accrued	11	51	6	28	22
Other current liabilities	5	63	3	37	8
Total current liabilities	27	50	17	31	53
Long-term debt and other liabilities	1	20	1	20	5
Stockholders' equity	121	62	79	41	194
Total liabilities	150	59	96	38	254

[1] Bigelow-Sanford, Alexander Smith & Sons, Lees & Sons, Mohawk.
[2] Bigelow-Sanford, Alexander Smith & Sons.

HALF OWNED BY 113

Mr. BLAIR. The first of these sheets refers to concentration in manufacturing as a whole by very large corporations, those with assets of $100,000,000 and over. At the end of 1947, there were 113 manufacturing corporations which could be classified in this giant category. As you will notice from the first sheet, these 113 corporations with assets of $100,000,000 held 50 percent, an exact half, of the Nation's manufacturing property, plant and equipment; that is, its net capital assets—in other words, half of the manufacturing productive power of the United States at the end of 1947.

Mr. BALLINGER. Where does that show on your sheet?

Mr. BLAIR. That is shown in the eighth item down, just below "Total current assets." Then "Property, plant and equipment, net," the 113 largest corporations holding $16,930,000,000 out of a total of $32,321,000,000.

Mr. BALLINGER. These are manufacturing corporations?

Mr. BLAIR. These are manufacturing corporations.

Mr. BALLINGER. Then what is the total number of manufacturing corporations in the United States?

Mr. BLAIR. The total number of manufacturing corporations depends somewhat upon the definition of what constitutes a manufacturing corporation. Some agencies include certain printing establishments, for example, that are not included by others; but, as a rough estimate, there are approximately 70,000 manufacturing corporations in the United States. That does not include partnerships.

Mr. BALLINGER. How many partnerships and individual proprietorships would you add to that?

Mr. BLAIR. That, of course, again has to be a matter of very rough estimate. The latest figures that I have available are presented in the study by the Senate Small Business Committee, "Economic Concentration in World War II," which was printed as a Senate document. If you will pardon me, I will look that up.

Mr. STEVENSON. What is the purpose of your questions?

Mr. BALLINGER. I would like to know just what the extent is. There are so many corporations, there are so many individual proprietorships and there are so many partnerships. I want to get the total number of firms. I will ask him another question to determine the concentration in manufacturing.

Mr. BLAIR. In 1939 there were 184,230 establishments, and 95,187 corporations. Some of those establishments were parts of multiplant corporations, but taking corporations as compared to the individuals, partnerships and other forms of business enterprise other than corporations, one has a comparison of 95,187 in 1939, representing number of corporations, as compared to 89,043 individuals, partnerships, and so forth, in manufacturing.

Mr. BALLINGER. What percentage of manufacturing is accounted for by the corporations compared to the others? Are there any figures on that?

Mr. BLAIR. In 1939—and I might interpolate there and state that we hope to have more recent figures——

Mr. STEVENSON. I was going to say that 1939 has no bearing on 1948.

Mr. BALLINGER. I wonder if he could bring them up to date.

Mr. STEVENSON. Instead of taking our time, let us try to answer the question and bring that in later.

Mr. BLAIR. In 1939, the most recent date for which we have the figures, 92 percent of the business in the manufacturing field was done by corporations. Now, we hope to have more recent data for the year 1947, but that will not be available until the census of manufactures for 1947 is tabulated. At best, all I can say is that probably there are in the vicinity at the present time of 150,000 business enterprises in the field of manufacturing, of which probably somewhat more than half are corporations, and those corporations probably account for more than 90 percent of the business done in manufacturing.

Mr. BALLINGER. That sums it up perfectly.

Mr. STEVENSON. That is very satisfactory.

Mr. BLAIR. I would like to call your attention also to another item on this balance sheet, that is the proportion of total assets held by these 113 giant corporations, as distinct from the property, plant, and equipment. At the end of 1947, to which all of these figures refer, forty-two billion out of a total of ninety-seven and six-tenths billion of assets were held by the 113 large corporations. In other words, they held no less than 43 percent of the total assets of all manufacturing corporations in the United States.

Economic power, however, is not merely a matter of productive plant and equipment. In times of stress the extent to which a corporation maintains a liquid position may be of critical significance. Therefore, I would suggest that two indexes of liquid position might be examined. Clearly, the two leading indexes of liquid position are cash and holdings of United States Government securities, and both of these reflect economic power—power to go out and buy up other firms, power to expand plant and equipment, power to engage in any of a vast number of different activities.

At the end of 1947 the 113 largest corporations held approximately 40 percent of the total cash held by all manufacturing corporations, and their position was even more outstanding with reference to holdings of United States securities. The 113 corporations possess no less than half of all the United States Government securities held by

all manufacturing corporations in the country.

I think that is a rather interesting point. The 113 largest corporations hold half of the productive power as measured by plant and equipment, and they also hold more than half the Government securities, which represent an enormous concentration of what might be termed "available economic striking power."

Mr. BALLINGER. You made the statement that they hold 40 percent of the liquid financial power, is that it, these 113 corporations?

Mr. BLAIR. They held 40 percent of the cash and 50 percent of the United States Government securities. Those are the two most liquid forms of current assets, obviously.

Referring to the liability side of the tables, we find that the stockholders' equity reveals almost the same degree of concentration as does total assets. In other words, the 113 largest corporations at the end of 1947 held 44 percent of all the stockholders' equity in all manufacturing corporations in the country.

Attached to this first table there are four other tables which refer to different industries, specifically, petroleum (that is, refining), linoleum, tires and tubes, and wool carpets and rugs. These industries have been selected for the purpose of showing concentration in industries of quite dissimilar character. For example, the petroleum industry is one of the largest and most fundamental industries in the country. It has a long record of mergers, acquisitions, expansions, and cartel activities, to which I will refer later.

In contrast, the linoleum industry is a relatively small segment of the American economy, and yet it is one of the most highly concentrated fields in America.

The rubber tire and tube industry has long been characterized by a high degree of economic concentration and by mergers, acquisitions, price discrimination on the part of the large companies, and a general disappearance of smaller tire and tube manufacturers from the field.

Finally, the wool carpet and rug industry has been included as an example of an area where a high degree of concentration exists notwithstanding the widespread impression to the effect that the textile field is one in which small business generally predominates.

Summarizing briefly the data shown on those tables, we find that the largest four petroleum manufacturers control 49 percent of the assets of their industry; the largest four producers of wool carpets and rug control 59 percent of the assets in their industry; the four largest tire and tube companies control 86 percent; and the four largest linoleum producers control 92 percent of the assets in their respective industries.

Generally a similar high degree of concentration is shown by the other measures presented on the table.

So much for the existing high degree of economic concentration which prevails in manufacturing industry as a whole and in certain specified industries.

I might say in that connection, Mr. Chairman, that a year or so ago a staff committee report of the House Small Business Committee was issued, and that staff report indicated or stated that one of the most fundamental functions which the Federal Trade Commission could perform would be that of preparing and maintaining a continuing index of concentration for the various industries of the country. The purpose of such indexes of concentration would, obviously be that of providing the committee, the Congress as a whole, and the Commission with a current idea or picture of where changes in economic concentration are taking place, where concentration is rising, remaining stable, or falling.

It would more or less perform the function of serving as a red light, of danger signal, calling the attention of Congress and the Commission to those particular fields in which changes in concentration appear to be significant.

We do our best to perform that function with the resources that we have. Frankly, our resources are not sufficient to prepare current indexes of concentration for all of the basic manufacturing industries. We hope that sometime in the future the Commission will be in a position to be able to provide on a current and regular basis information of this type for practically all of the basic manufacturing industries.

The question of course then arises, after one dwells a moment upon these figures, which reveal such a high degree of concentration in American industry, as to how we reached this condition. How did it come about? What is the history of this movement toward a greater and greater control of the American economy by a smaller and smaller number of larger and larger corporations? I am sure that the committee does not wish me at this time to present an extensive history of the whole trend toward economic concentration, but if it pleases you, I would like just briefly to set forth a few highlights in the historical development.

Mr. STEVENSON. Go ahead.

Mr. BLAIR. The earliest precursors of the movement toward consolidation, combination, and concentration were the so-called gentlemen's agreements and pools which developed shortly after the Civil War. They were followed in turn by the trusts, of which of course the Standard Oil trust was the most outstanding example. Then the State of New Jersey enacted a law which permitted intercorporate stockholding and thus legalized something which had theretofore been illegal, namely, the holding company. With the legality of the holding company thus established, there developed a tremendous consolidation movement running from 1896 to 1903 which saw one giant combine after another created, the most outstanding example of which was the United States Steel Corp.

In that connection, Mr. Andrew Carnegie, who, of course, was very active in the steel industry prior to that time, referred to this great consolidation movement by stating that "They throw cats and dogs together and call them elephants." The period was marked by the flotation of enormous amounts of watered stock. A common saying had it that the watered stock of the United States Steel Corp. was sufficient to float the combined navies of Great Britain and the United States. Actually, the Commissioner of Corporations was somewhat more explicit, finding that the real value of the corporation's stock was about half of that which had been issued.

That early movement had another characteristic which later became of uncommon and unusual significance. Most of those consolidations during that great period consisted of the purchase of stock rather than assets. Why? For one thing it was much easier to buy up the stock. For another, by buying up the stock one had a base to issue great quantities of securities. Also, the former owners of the companies that were brought together could be paid off with the stock, the newly issued stock, of the newly formed combine. From every point of view it was the easiest, the most profitable way to promote combines and consolidations.

It was with that historical background in mind that Congress in 1914 enacted the Clayton antitrust law. Section 7 of that law gives the Commission the power to prohibit the merger of competing corporations when that merger is accomplished through the purchase of stock. But the law said nothing about assets, thereby creating a devastating loophole in the law, particularly since certain Supreme Court decisions were handed down during the 1920's and the early thirties.

The net effect of leaving out assets in that bill, an omission which can be readily understood and visualized when viewed against the past history of that great consolidation movement at the turn of the century, was to make the law virtually a dead letter. The Commission at the present time whenever it tries—and it has tried on many occasions—to enforce section 7 of the Clayton Act, to prevent the consummation of mergers through the acquisition of stock, usually finds that before it can get through its case the companies have bought up the assets and thus the matter is in effect removed from the jurisdiction of the Commission.

After the great consolidation movement of the turn of the century, the next great impetus to the growth of economic concentration came during World War I. We have very little information on that subject. What we do have indicates that there was a very high degree of concentration of contracts within a small number of corporations. Inasmuch as that evidence, such as it is, is fully set forth in this document of the Senate, I will not bother you here with it at this time.

The next great movement toward concentration of control took place during the merger movement of the twenties, which saw the disappearance of a great number of firms.

Then came the depression. During the depression of the thirties the only marked developments and a serious one was the growth of economic concentration through attrition, that is, through the disappearance of small firms which did not have the financial staying power to last out the depression.

Then we come to World War II, which gave a tremendous impetus in the long run toward the rise and growth of economic concentrations.

The facts are that from June 1940 to September 1944 prime contracts awards amounting to $175,000,000,000 were made to 18,539 corporations. No less than two-thirds of this vast amount, $117,000,000,000, went to the top 100 corporations. Nearly half of the total, 49 percent, went to the top 30 corporations.

The list of the 100 corporations receiving prime contracts is presented on page 30 of Senate document to which anyone may refer.

Then after World War II we have the development of this current merger movement, which is presently taking place throughout the country. The characteristics of that merger movement are set forth in some detail in the recent report of the Commission, which has just come off the press, entitled "The Merger Movement, a Summary Report," a copy of which I would like to submit to you, sir.

Mr. STEVENSON. Do you want to make it a part of the record?

Mr. BLAIR. It is a rather extensive report. I doubt whether you would wish to do that. I doubt whether that would be feasible. I can, if it pleases you, try to high light some of its major findings and conclusions.

Mr. STEVENSON. Don't high light it too much, because we want to get through this afternoon.

Mr. BLAIR. There are 134 pages of it. If I high lighted it extensively, we wouldn't finish until quite some time tomorrow.

Mr. STEVENSON. Why don't you just refer to it and let it go?

(The document referred to is on file with the committee.)

Mr. BLAIR. The major result of this movement, I might say in passing, has been the disappearance of roughly 2,500 companies between 1940 and 1947. The major characteristics of it are revealed in charts which are to be found on pages 26 and 27 of the merger report. On page 26, chart 3 shows the size of the acquiring concerns. It will be noted from that chart that the greater part of the acquisitions have been made by larger companies. Of the more than 2,000 acquisitions made during that period: 604 have been made by 125 very large corporations, with

assets of over 50 millions of dollars; 590 have been made by 259 corporations with assets ranging between 10 and 50 million dollars. At the other end of the scale the small corporations with assets of under $1,000,000 have made only 239 or approximately one-tenth of the total number of acquisitions.

In chart 4, which presents the picture of the size of the company acquired, the exact opposite picture is revealed. Thus, as chart 4 of the merger report indicates, nearly 1,500 of the over 2,000 acquisitions have consisted of smaller companies with assets of less than $1,000,000.

By and large, the outstanding characteristic of this current merger movement, therefore, is the purchase of small firms by large corporations. It is definitely not a movement of small companies combining in order to more effectively compete against large firms.

So much, Mr. Chairman, for the broad trend of the movement toward greater economic concentration. I have mentioned the consolidation movement at the turn of the century, the effect of World War I, the merger movement in the twenties, the effect of World War II, and now this current merger movement which presently exists.

The net result of these developments is this extremely high level of concentration with which we are confronted today.

In discussing the subject of the prevailing high level of concentration, Mr. Ballinger asked me to do something which has required a certain degree of research, and that is to get away from broad generalities concerning concentration in industry as a whole, and, rather, to present information in terms of specific industries. It was Mr. Ballinger's feeling—and I agree wholeheartedly with him—that one can best grasp the problem posed by the existence of concentration when one examines the situation which exists in individual industries. In such an analysis the probabilities of error resulting from dealing with broad-scale aggregates are largely washed out. Therefore, I have prepared very brief digests, or synopses, showing the level of concentration in a number of the Nation's major industries.

I would like to mention briefly the iron and steel industry. The basic iron and steel industry is dominated by a small number of huge, integrated companies performing all the operations from mining raw materials to manufacturing finished steel products. In 1945 the 15 fully integrated steel companies held 91 percent of the pig iron, 88 percent of the steel, and 86 percent of the finished hot-rolled production capacity.

The top three alone—that is United States Steel, Bethlehem, and Republic—accounted for nearly 60 percent of the Nation's total steel-ingot capacity.

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include certain statements and extracts.)

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, perhaps I created an erroneous impression by my statement with respect to the immigration functions of the Committee on the Judiciary. One of the other very vital questions that the committee will inquire into is the advisability of reviewing all the antitrust laws. Significantly enough there are approximately 120 different sections of the law relating to illegal combinations in restraint of trade. It is the purpose of the committee to make a complete study of that subject and if our investigation indicate it is necessary, to write the appropriate legislation to meet the situation.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. I assume that it is the object of the committee to try to strengthen out antitrust laws and not permit the weakening of them in any way, shape, form, or fashion.

Mr. WALTER. It is the purpose to strengthen the antitrust laws and to make certain what the laws and the decisions of the courts and the rulings of the administrative bodies really mean, because today under the various decisions of the courts and of the Federal Trade Commission, it is very difficult to know just exactly what the law is.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman, of course, will keep in mind that it takes about 25 years to get words and phrases defined by the different courts, including the Supreme Court. Certainly the gentleman does not contemplate, nor does this committee contemplate any changing of those words and phrases, so as to have those big concerns start back on a court ride again for another 20 or 25 years. I know he does not intend that.

Mr. WALTER. Of course not.

Mr. RANKIN. It may have taken 25 years for the old courts to get such words straight, but it only takes about 25 minutes for the present courts to wipe them out.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address myself to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]. When the bill comes to the floor of the House providing appropriations for the Department of Justice, I recommend that these gentlemen read the hearings of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for that Department. In those hearings you may find some suggestions from the Department of Justice for changes in our antitrust laws. I call your attention to the fact that last year your committee increased the funds for the Anti-Trust Division in the Department of Justice substantially over what was allowed by the budget.

You will also find if you read the President's budget this year, that the Budget Bureau again has reduced the amount requested by the Department of Justice.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Why did you increase it a million the year before, over and above the budget?

Mr. STEFAN. Because the Antitrust Division indicated that the funds approved by the budget were not sufficient.

Mr. RICH. Did they use all the money they had?

Mr. STEFAN. I am sure it was used to good advantage.

Mr. RICH. Well, did they use it wisely?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] 1 minute.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article. I understand that it will cost $159.75 additional. Notwithstanding the cost, I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding and without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, this resolution simply gives the Judiciary Committee inquisitorial powers, the right to investigate generally, but it does not provide for any specific investigation. The power still remains in the Judiciary Committee to determine if, when, where, and how any investigations will be conducted.

I was chairman of that committee for a short time, and I investigated the prerogatives of the chairman. The chairman has no power or right to institute an investigation. It must be done by a resolution of the committee, so that any investigations carried on by the Judiciary Committee, by virtue of this resolution, will be determined by a majority vote of the committee as a whole.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I am very much interested in the statement made by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] about increasing the appropriation for the Antitrust Division $1,000,000 during the Eighty-first Congress. The thing that bothers me is this, that the President of the United States went all over the country last year saying that the antitrust laws should be enforced, and when the committee increased the amount allowed them by $1,000,000 over what it was the year before, and they did not do anything, then it was the fault of the administration and not the fault of the Eightieth Congress about which he was doing so much talking. Now he has eliminated $100,000 over and above what they asked the year before, or an increase of $900,000. Now he has got the money in his hands. Let him do something. Instead of going down to Florida and sitting in the sunshine, he ought to be up here doing some work, stopping these great trusts, great business from absorbing little business. It is about time for him to either fish or cut bait. It looks as if he will fish and try to catch more suckers.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

ARMY AND AIR FORCE ACT OF 1949

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 148 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1437) to authorize the composition of the Army of the United States and the Air Force of the United States, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and the amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the consideration of an extremely important bill, H. R. 1437, to authorize the composition of the Army of the United States, the Air Force of the United States, and other, many other, purposes. I feel that the Members should familiarize themselves during these 4 hours of debate, with the far-reaching provisions of the bill. After the general debate, the bill will be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The gentleman from Georgia, the chairman of the important Committee on Armed Services [Mr. VINSON], on reporting this bill, stated that it was unanimously reported. Naturally, having confidence in him I knew he did not misstate the fact that the bill was unanimously reported. In his winning way, and with superficial explanation, he appeared before the Committee on Rules, and without further ado, the Committee on Rules granted this rule. But I venture to say that very few members of our committee realized the full importance of this bill. I voted to grant this rule because I have always believed that the House should have the right and privilege of passing upon any and all important matters; but of all the important matters it has been my duty to debate and vote on, I think this is the most important, because it gives the Army an unusual amount of power and jurisdiction to do nearly everything and anything without limitation. The Chairman stated that it was merely an authorization bill, to authorize an Army, I think of 837,000, and an additional Air Force of 530,000; but in addition to that it authorizes the Army to acquire and purchase materials and supplies. If that authorization included just their needs, naturally, I would not say anything about it, but I have followed the practices of our brass hats—I mean Army officers—and I am well aware of their methods of purchasing and doing business. Cost to them means nothing, quantity means nothing; they spend money recklessly, although this bill does not provide for the Navy. And in that connection, I wanted to know why there should not be unification in appropriations and why the Navy should not also be included in this bill. I cannot understand why we do not adhere to the position of unification of all the services. Here we provide for appropriations only for two branches of the service, namely, the Army and the Air Force and their respective reserves.

We are told that the Navy has been taken care of heretofore; that we do not need any provision for the Navy since the Navy has all the tonnage and personnel it needs as far as authorization is concerned.

It appears to me that we are legislating piecemeal—one day for the Navy and at another later date for the Army and Air Force. Is this procedure in keeping with the unification idea which requires joint action at one and the same time upon the needs of the armed forces? Evidently we did not mean what we said when we declared by law that we insisted on doing away with duplication of effort and waste of public monies. While it is stated that in this bill the functions and obligations of the Secretary of Defense are not impaired, yet it cannot be denied that when we establish the framework and the character of the Army and Air Force we should at the same time do the same for the Navy and its land forces, the marines. We cannot accept the argument that the Navy has not been included herein due to the reason that for the last 15 or 16 years at various times the Congress has secured the necessary authorization for its personnel and material.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to delay the House with a speech, because I know that after the gentleman from Georgia takes the floor and explains the bill, all will be said that can be said, for there is no man in this House who can explain an important bill better, more cleverly, and shrewdly than the distinguished gentleman from Georgia. I have the utmost confidence in his ability to answer the perplexing questions herein involved, and those that will henceforth be asked. Consequently I shall not take a great deal of the time to go over the bill, although I have prepared a statement that I thought I would read. Rather than read, however, I would rather speak from my heart and from my knowledge and experience that I have gained during my years in Congress.

The Army has unnecessarily spent many millions of dollars, and according to my understanding, the broad powers given the Army under this bill will cost the Government millions upon millions of dollars. That is the reason I am going to ask the membership of the House, all of whom are interested in our Nation, in the Treasury, and in the taxpayers of the Nation, to examine closely, obtain information, and see whether we can somehow and in some way hold down the vast expenditures that are herein contemplated and requested for our defense by the spenders in the War Department, as has been their custom heretofore.

Mr. Speaker, during the years I have noticed that they come to this House and will get an authorization and an appropriation far greater than they possibly can use or need. The result is that during the last 3 or 4 months of the fiscal year they will devote themselves to the important task of seeing how they can spend the unexpended balances that the Congress has voted them.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. Does the bill that this resolution makes in order contain the 70 air group?

Mr. SABATH. Yes, it contains that and a number of other provisions.

Mr. GRANGER. In connection with what the gentleman says about the Army spending money, we had a disaster in the West, as the gentleman well knows, and I praise the Army for doing a good job out there; but they tell me now that the hay which they dropped to the livestock out there cost $100 a bale and that they spent $30,000,000 or thereabouts.

Mr. SABATH. I am mighty glad that the gentleman has called my attention to that, because it really bears out my point on what I have contended for many years. The Army is a reckless spender of the taxpayers' money, and that is true not only with reference to the hay to which the gentleman refers, but it is also true of everything they acquire and purchase. They buy in huge quantities. Money means the same as hay to these brass hats. If you have noted the vast surpluses of the last few years which were placed on the market for sale by War Assets Administration and other agencies, you would appreciate this more fully. It involves goods that the Army has purchased which the Army never had any use for and could not have any use for. I fear that this bill gives them vast powers that will result in tremendous expense and burden upon the Treasury and the taxpayers.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SABATH. I myself would like to know how the money will be provided. That is what I am worring about, where will it come from, except from the pockets of the taxpayers?

Mr. RICH. I was wondering about this $100 a bale for hay, which is pretty bad, but they fed the cattle that were out in the West. I want to ask the gentleman about this $5,000,000,000 you want to spend and give to foreign countries. Are we going to take care of the American people or are we going to give it all to foreign countries and have nothing left for ourselves? You have some very great decisions to make pretty soon, one of which involves whether you gentlemen on that side of the House are going to give away everything we have to these foreign countries and not look after America. If we give it all away, God help us. I do not know who is going to look after us then.

Mr. SABATH. When it comes to giving away on this side, let me say that I am satisfied that your side exceeds the liberality of this side, because your party has been for all those great big appropriations, donations, contributions, and gifts far exceeding the desire on this side. I have observed that all this spending has been upon the recommendation mostly of your leaders on that side, under the leadership of Mr. Hoover.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Wait a second, I refuse to yield.

Mr. Speaker, I am not asking the kind of protection that the gentleman from

Pennsylvania favors because I do not desire to delay the House. It is difficult for any man to answer some of the questions that the gentleman propounds, although I feel that some of them should be answered. I say this to the gentleman, I myself am in favor of contributing the money that is necessary and to give the money to help feed the people in Europe now, so that we do not have to continue to do so for the next 5 or 10 years. But, I do not approve furnishing millions of dollars to them for war material. For food and things that they need, yes, but for war materials I do not believe that we should spend such vast sums of money that we have been asked for.

Mr. RICH. I agree with the gentleman on that, and I think that is a good statement. Let us get the fellows on both sides of the House to vote that way when it comes to spending our money.

Mr. SABATH. All right. Now I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the Civil Air Patrol is an auxiliary of the Air Force and has about 130,000 active people in it.

The postwar organization of the Civil Air Patrol is set up along lines as provided in section 2, paragraphs (a) and (b), Public Law 476, Seventy-ninth Congress:

(a) To provide an organization to encourage and aid American citizens in the contribution of their efforts, services, and resources in the development of aviation and in the maintenance of air supremacy, and to encourage and develop by example the voluntary contribution of private citizens to the public welfare;

(b) To provide aviation education and training especially to its senior and cadet members; to encourage and foster civil aviation in local communities and to provide an organization of private citizens with adequate facilities to assist in meeting local and national emergencies.

In line with the authority as provided in the public law, the Civil Air Patrol, operating as a recognized auxiliary of the United States Air Force, has established emergency programs throughout the various wings in the United States, Hawaii, and Alaska, which are most suited to the needs of the respective communities.

In addition to the emergency activities, and even more important in the long-range effect, is the cadet training program. The Civil Air Patrol cadets, just as the senior members of the Civil Air Patrol, are all volunteers. The cadet training program embraces virtually every phase of air-age education except for actual flying training. The cadet program, just as all emergency activities, is administered by the volunteer members of the Civil Air Patrol itself. There is no expectation of any pay or compensation by the individuals. Under certain conditions when specific activity is requested by the United States Air Force Air Rescue Service, there is provision for fuel and oil for aircraft.

The total expenditures in time and personal funds by volunteer members of the Civil Air Patrol cannot be fully calculated. There are thousands of hours utilized in preparing training programs, instructing classes, maintaining equipment, and accomplishing all of the other necessary activities for which an accounting will never be made. Not all Civil Air Patrol members are financially able to contribute appreciable financial support; however in certain notable instances members of Civil Air Patrol, some of whom are wing commanders and others who are lesser members, do contribute substantial sums of money when the occasion so requires. For instance, the action of units of the various Civil Air Patrol wings on the itinerary of the recent European student forum tour of the United States is typical. There were 36 high-school students in the group representing the 17 Marshall-plan countries and the United States. When the students arrived in Texas, the Civil Air Patrol wing commander had organized a full day's activity including a game dinner which consisted of bear, moose, elk, venison, and domestic beef and pork, and all the students were presented with 10-gallon Texas hats. The expenses for this were personally borne by the Texas CAP wing commander. Then, due to a heavy sleet storm, the entire group was held over for an extra day and the party was further entertained and housed by the individual members of the Dallas CAP unit. In Arizona the group was entertained and all expenses assumed by members of the Arizona CAP wing staff. In California the personal expenditures by Civil Air Patrol personnel was not required since there are excellent relations with the movie industry and other civic groups. However, there was a great deal of time spent by Civil Air Patrol members arranging the very elaborate program. On the return trip at Albuquerque, N. Mex., the student forum group again encountered an unscheduled extra day's delay and the expenses of the entire group were again assumed by the CAP wing staff. In Denver, Colo., and at Detroit, Mich., Civil Air Patrol members again provided expenses for fine entertainment and housing from their own personal funds.

There are many instances when Civil Air Patrol personnel do provide generously from their personal funds for such worth-while youth or community activities. In many other instances the voluntary expenditure of time is an even more important element for the benefit of the community. The recent snow season in the Rocky Mountain States is another typical example of Civil Air Patrol activities during times of emergency. As soon as the snow had quit falling the Civil Air Patrol units throughout the blizzard area were organized and concentrated in the areas of greatest hardship. Many hundreds of flights have been flown by CAP members who volunteered their time. Thousands of pounds of food, many emergency deliveries of medicine, and thousands of miles of patrol and search flying have been accomplished by CAP members who were ready and willing when the emergency arose.

In light of the widespread activities and the forward-looking aspects of the complete Civil Air Patrol program, the contribution by the United States Air Force in the nature of surplus matériel is well spent. The utilization made by Civil Air Patrol units throughout the country of surplus property, maintaining it in working condition, and utilizing it in many peacetime endeavors certainly qualifies the Civil Air Patrol for continued United States Air Force support and continually increasing recognition by the United States public.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, as far as I know there is no objection whatever to this resolution, and I hope it will pass.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GRANGER) there were—yeas 114, noes 1.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 368, nay 1, not voting 64, as follows:

[Roll No. 34]

YEAS—368

Abbitt	Coffey	Green
Abernethy	Cole, Kans.	Gregory
Addonizio	Combs	Gwinn
Albert	Cooley	Hale
Allen, Calif.	Cooper	Hall,
Allen, La.	Corbett	Edwin Arthur
Andersen,	Cotton	Hand
H. Carl	Coudert	Harden
Andrews	Cox	Hardy
Angell	Crawford	Hare
Aspinall	Crook	Harris
Bailey	Crosser	Harrison
Baring	Dague	Hart
Barrett, Pa.	Davenport	Harvey
Bates, Ky.	Davis, Ga.	Havenner
Bates, Mass.	Davis, Wis.	Hays, Ark.
Battle	Deane	Hays, Ohio
Beall	DeGraffenried	Hébert
Beckworth	Delaney	Hedrick
Bennett, Fla.	Denton	Heffernan
Bennett, Mich.	D'Ewart	Heller
Bentsen	Dollinger	Herlong
Biemiller	Donohue	Herter
Bishop	Douglas	Heselton
Blackney	Doyle	Hill
Bland	Durham	Hinshaw
Boggs, Del.	Eaton	Hobbs
Boggs, La.	Eberharter	Hoffman, Mich.
Bolling	Elliott	Holifield
Bolton, Md.	Elston	Holmes
Bolton, Ohio	Engel, Mich.	Horan
Bonner	Engle, Calif.	Howell
Bosone	Evins	Huber
Bramblett	Fallon	Hull
Breen	Feighan	Irving
Brehm	Fellows	Jackson, Calif.
Brooks	Fenton	Jackson, Wash.
Brown, Ga.	Fernandez	Jacobs
Bryson	Fisher	James
Buchanan	Flood	Javits
Buckley, Ill.	Fogarty	Jenison
Buckley, N. Y.	Forand	Jensen
Burdick	Ford	Johnson
Burke	Frazier	Jonas
Burleson	Fugate	Jones, Ala.
Burnside	Fulton	Jones, Mo.
Burton	Furcolo	Jones, N. C.
Camp	Garmatz	Judd
Canfield	Gary	Karst
Cannon	Gathings	Karsten
Carlyle	Gavin	Kean
Carnahan	Gillette	Kearney
Carroll	Golden	Kearns
Case, N. J.	Goodwin	Keating
Case, S. Dak.	Gordon	Kee
Cavalcante	Gore	Keefe
Chelf	Gorski, Ill.	Kelley
Chesney	Gorski, N. Y.	Kennedy
Christopher	Gossett	Keogh
Chudoff	Graham	Kerr
Church	Granahan	Kilburn
Clemente	Granger	Kilday
Clevenger	Grant	King

Kirwan	Noland	Sikes
Klein	Norblad	Simpson, Ill.
Kruse	Norrell	Sims
Kunkel	Norton	Smathers
Lane	O'Brien, Ill.	Smith, Kans.
Lanham	O'Brien, Mich.	Smith, Va.
Larcade	O'Hara, Ill.	Smith, Wis.
Latham	O'Hara, Minn.	Spence
LeFevre	O'Neill	Staggers
Lemke	O'Sullivan	Stanley
Lesinski	O'Toole	Steed
Lichtenwalter	Pace	Stefan
Lind	Passman	Stigler
Linehan	Patman	Stockman
Lodge	Patten	Sullivan
Love	Patterson	Sutton
Lucas	Perkins	Taber
Lyle	Peterson	Tackett
Lynch	Pfeiffer,	Taurielle
McCarthy	William L.	Taylor
McConnell	Philbin	Teague
McCormack	Phillips, Calif.	Thomas, Tex.
McCulloch	Phillips, Tenn.	Thompson
McDonough	Pickett	Thornberry
McGrath	Poage	Tollefson
McGregor	Polk	Towe
McGuire	Potter	Trimble
McKinnon	Poulson	Underwood
McMillan, S. C.	Preston	Van Zandt
McMillen, Ill.	Price	Velde
Mack, Ill.	Priest	Vinson
Mack, Wash.	Quinn	Vorys
Magee	Rabaut	Wagner
Mahon	Rains	Walsh
Mansfield	Ramsay	Walter
Marsalis	Rankin	Weichel
Marshall	Redden	Welch, Calif.
Martin, Iowa	Reed, Ill.	Welch, Mo.
Martin, Mass.	Regan	Werdel
Mason	Rhodes	Wheeler
Merrow	Ribicoff	White, Idaho
Meyer	Rich	Whitten
Michener	Richards	Whittington
Miles	Richlman	Wickersham
Miller, Calif.	Rivers	Wier
Miller, Md.	Rodino	Wigglesworth
Miller, Nebr.	Rogers, Fla.	Williams
Mills	Rogers, Mass.	Willis
Mitchell	Rooney	Wilson, Ind.
Monroney	Sabath	Wilson, Okla.
Morgan	Sadlak	Wilson, Tex.
Morris	Sadowski	Winstead
Morton	St. George	Withrow
Moulder	Sanborn	Wood
Multer	Sasscer	Woodhouse
Murphy	Scrivner	Woodruff
Murray, Tenn.	Scudder	Worley
Murray, Wis.	Secrest	Yates
Nelson	Shafer	Young
Nicholson	Sheppard	Zablocki
Nixon	Short	

NAY—1

Marcantonio

NOT VOTING—64

Allen, Ill.	Dawson	Murdock
Anderson, Calif.	Dingell	O'Konski
Andresen,	Dolliver	Pfeifer,
August H.	Dondero	Joseph L.
Arends	Doughton	Plumley
Auchincloss	Ellsworth	Powell
Barden	Gamble	Reed, N. Y.
Barrett, Wyo.	Gilmer	Rees
Blatnik	Gross	Scott, Hardie
Boykin	Hagen	Scott,
Brown, Ohio	Hall,	Hugh D., Jr.
Bulwinkle	Leonard W.	Simpson, Pa.
Byrne, N. Y.	Halleck	Smith, Ohio
Byrnes, Wis.	Hoeven	Somers
Celler	Hoffman, Ill.	Talle
Chatham	Hope	Thomas, N. J.
Chiperfield	Jenkins	Vursell
Cole, N. Y.	Jennings	Wadsworth
Colmer	LeCompte	Whitaker
Cunningham	McSweeney	White, Calif.
Curtis	Macy	Wolcott
Davies, N. Y.	Madden	Wolverton
Davis, Tenn.	Morrison	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Barden with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Dawson with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. White of California with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer with Mr. Jenkins.
Mr. Gilmer with Mr. Chiperfield.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Auchincloss.
Mr. Somers with Mr. Macy.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Reed of New York.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
Mr. Byrne of New York with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Chatham with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Murdock with Mr. Hoeven.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Anderson of California.
Mr. Davies of New York with Mr. Hardie Scott.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Dondero.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Jennings.
Mr. Doughton with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mrs. BOSONE and Mr. GRANGER changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA EMERGENCY RENT ACT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Monday next to consider under the general rules of the House the bill (H. R. 1757) to extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, and that there be not to exceed 1 hour of debate to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ARMY AND AIR FORCE ACT OF 1949

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the committee substitute for H. R. 1437, a bill to authorize the composition of the Army of the United States and the Air Force of the United States, and for other purposes, be considered as the original bill in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the purpose of amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1437) to authorize the composition of the Army of the United States and the Air Force of the United States, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1437, with Mr. LYLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 35 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, whether we like it or not, we are today a world power.

Insofar as democracy is concerned, we are the world power.

In attaining this position in world affairs we have fallen heir to a tremendous responsibility. It is the responsibility of preserving democracy throughout the world and preventing the spread of political concepts antagonistic to our national interests. In order to meet this obligation we must have the military equipment and manpower required for us to fulfill our destiny and our world responsibility.

Weakness in our armed forces is an open invitation to disaster. This, therefore, means that for the foreseeable future we must maintain a strong modernized Army, a Navy equal to any upon the seas, and an Air Force second to none. We are not an aggressive nation. We do not aspire to world domination. Nor do we seek to impose our will upon others. But we must stand ready at all times to preserve our free form of government in this Nation and to deal effectively with threats to our national interests in all parts of the world.

This bill now before you deals with the composition of the Army and the Air Force. Its sole purpose is to give a charter specifically stating their authorized personnel strengths and their organization. It goes to the very core of our national defense planning. It will become the statutory anchor of the Army and the Air Force for many years to come.

What it amounts to is, that by this bill we are creating a legal framework which will be the long-time foundation for these two branches of our armed forces.

Now, this measure does not apply to the Navy in any way. That service has for some time had specific statutory authority for its personnel and matériel. But I feel about this bill now before the committee as I did about the various Navy laws previously passed to establish the composition of the Navy. That is, I deem it only fitting and proper that the Congress express clearly in law just what it considers must be the peacetime structure of those agencies of our Government which hold the grave responsibility of protecting the American people in this troubled and uncertain world.

Every year or two during the past 15 years, the House has passed legislation that has fixed the size of the fleet, or the strength of the Navy's various personnel groups, or the Navy's research authority, and so on, until Navy law is now adequate to the job the Navy is expected to perform.

But not so with the Army and the Air Force.

The Congress has not gone thoroughly into the fundamentals of the Army since the National Defense Act was enacted in 1916 and amended in 1920, and we today appropriate for the Army which does not have in law its own authorized Regular personnel strength. It lacks a clearly defined composition. It lacks specific research authority. In short, the Army has a foundation that shifts back and forth, up and down and round according to appropriations. We have no long-range mandate for peacetime operations anywhere in Army law that meets the present national defense needs.

And now, what about our Air Force?

We divorced it from the Army only a year and a half ago. We have not yet taken time to create an adequate body of law that sets out clearly what the Air Force should consist of, how large it

should be in time of peace, what kind of authority it should exercise, and so on.

It will be a default of congressional responsibility, and it is assuredly unsound from the national defense standpoint, to leave these matters unresolved.

No longer should we leave the Army without a clear-cut expression from the Congress as to how many Regular officers it may have, how many Regular warrant officers, and how up to date it should keep itself.

No longer should we leave on the statute books a prewar ceiling of 6,000 aircraft for the old Army Air Corps and consider that we have acted adequately for the new Air Force.

The composition, both in matériel and personnel, of these two services must be firmly and separately established—it is incumbent upon the Congress to do so in the interest of constructive planning for national defense over the years ahead.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I have every reason to believe that the committee will react to this legislation in the same favorable manner as it has to the same type of basic Navy legislation that I had the honor to sponsor before the House time and time again in the past. Certainly legislation of this nature is not unusual.

The bill establishes by law the basic authorization of the Army. It authorizes an over-all active duty Army of 837,000 officers and enlisted men, plus several special categories, of whom 33,500 may be Regular officers. To arrive at this Regular strength we took the present proposed budgetary strength of 677,000, then provided that one-half of the 67,000 officers normally required by an Army of that size should be Regulars. Thus, we keep at least half of the officer corps of the Army open for Reserves and and guardsmen. This keeps the Regular Establishment at a low enough level to permit reduction in Army strength in the future without excessive difficulty, should international conditions make such reductions advisable.

Further the bill authorizes 750,000 officers and enlisted men for the National Guard, and 980,000 for the Army Reserves. These strengths have the endorsement of the Army, the guard and the Reserve. Actual strength and the degree of training these civilian components will attain hinge, of course, upon appropriations. But, for present plans, these figures are required and were, therefore, written into the proposed law by the committee.

In addition to the personnel strengths proposed, the bill sets forth for the Army procurement authority, research and development authority, and certain appropriation authorizations.

Thus, the bill gives the Army a continuity of development and planning both for the Regular forces and for the civilian components. Once the bill is enacted, the Army and the Air Force can proceed logically and steadily with their national defense planning.

Now, let me summarize some of the Air Force provisions of the proposed bill. This bill does for the Air Force about the same things I have outlined for the Army.

An authorized Air Force active duty strength is set at 502,000, plus several special groups, the same basic figure as we approved last year in the draft bill. This strength is necessary to man the 70-group program. Of the 502,000, we authorize 27,500 to be Regulars, arriving at the figure as one-half of the number of officers the Air Force will have on active duty under the present-proposed appropriated strength. Therefore, we plan that the Air Force, like the Army, will keep at least one-half of its officer strength open for the training of Reserves and guardsmen.

Then the bill proposed 70 air groups. This number of groups will require at least 7,000 first-line aircraft. There will be about 5,500 more for the Air Reserve, a little over 8,100 in war reserve, and about 3,400 second-line aircraft. This gives us the total of 24,000 provided in the bill.

The bill goes on to say that the Air Force may procure up to 5,200 aircraft a year, within the 24,000 authorized. The purpose of this is to keep the Air Force modern, up-to-date, and equipped to defend the United States with the latest aerial weapons. This air strength will keep the United States reasonably prepared for any emergency requiring the use of air power.

Now, there has been much talk about the 70-group air force. Just what does it consist of? Let me give it to you in detail. The groups now contemplated, each such group consisting of three squadrons, will be as follows:

Four groups of heavy bombers.
Sixteen groups of medium bombers.
Six groups of strategic reconnaissance.
Five groups of light bombers.
Twenty-five groups of fighters.
Four groups of tactical reconnaissance.
Four groups of heavy troop carriers.
Six groups of medium troop carriers.

In addition, there will be 22 separate squadrons rounding out the 70 groups. These squadrons will be air-sea rescue squadrons, MATS squadrons, and so forth.

In each of these groups the number of airplanes varies according to the type of group. Now, let us take a heavy-bomber group. It has three squadrons of six B-36's each. That gives us a total of 18 B-36's in one heavy-bomber group. Since the 70-group program contemplates four heavy-bomber groups, the committee will see that the 70-group program will have 72 B-36's in the first-line element.

Medium bomber groups will have 30 aircraft per group; light bomber, 48; day fighters, 75; all-weather fighters, 36; strategic reconnaissance, 36; heavy troop carrier, 36; medium troop carrier, 48; and tactical reconnaissance, 54. From these figures we can tell exactly how many first-line airplanes are in 70 regular Air Force groups under present conditions of aerial warfare, and I include this information in these remarks to bring down to earth a great deal of vague discussion which has occurred on this subject in the past.

I invite the attention of the committee to the fact that the proposed bill authorizes the Air National Guard to have a strength of 100,000 officers and enlisted personnel. This is considerably above the present level in the Air National Guard. But this was intentionally provided so as to permit upward revision of the present Air Guard strength as circumstances require without requiring successive amendments of the proposed law in the future. The proposed authorization has the complete indorsement of the National Guard interests and of the Air Force, as well as the indorsement of the Reserve Officers' Association.

Also, the bill proposes a strength of 500,000 officers and enlisted persons for the Air Force Reserve. This does not mean that all of these 500,000 will receive full or part-time training; the figure includes the inactive Reserves as well as those who are to be active in the Air Force Reserve. However, it was necessary to authorize 500,000 to take care of the present Air Reserve strength and still leave enough leeway for the additions to this strength which will come along in the future.

Now let me suggest that the committee read section 207 of the proposed bill. It provides that the present status of the Air National Guard is not to be impaired in any way by this legislation. This was included in the law because of great concern on the part of guard interests lest this legislation be used as a means by which to federalize the Air National Guard. The Committee on Armed Services received detailed testimony on the magnificent performance of the Air Guard to date. It was our unanimous conclusion that this particular piece of legislation must not be used in any way to upset the present operations of the Air Guard; and to insure that, we wrote it into the bill.

I mention this point intentionally. Because I want to allay any similar concern any member of this committee may have in respect to the effect of the proposed law on the Air National Guard.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I know that many members of the committee are asking the question, "How much will it cost the Nation to get this 70-group program under way?" Before answering this, let me explain what has already been done for the Air Force in the way of appropriations.

Last year the Congress appropriated $1,957,000,000 for the procurement of aircraft for the Air Force; $392,000,000 of this was for plan improvement and production changes. So, the Air Force actually had for aircraft procurement about $1,545,000,000 in the 1949 budget. This was enough to contract for about 2,437 aircraft.

Now, the President's budget this year provides $1,480,000,000 for aircraft procurement. This would let the Air Force contract for about 1,668 aircraft. So what has happened? Well, the budget sets aside less money—$65,000,000—this year for the procurement of aircraft than was appropriated last year, and because of the emphasis on larger airplanes a much smaller number of aircraft will be purchased this year if no addition is made to the President's national defense budget.

As of December 31, 1948, the Air Force had 59 air groups, although not all of these groups were fully operational. Under the President's budget these groups

will be cut to 48. In other words, unless more money is appropriated for the Air Force, the 70-group program is stopped dead, at least for this year.

And so, it is my hope thtat the Appropriations Committee and the Congress will add at least $800,000,000 to the President's budget for the Department of the Air Force. And, I might add, this can be done without increasing the over-all budget by one cent, by using the funds now earmarked in the budget for universal military training. It can be done, in fact, with less outlay in direct expenditure than is now proposed in the national defense budget for this fiscal year. For, most of the $800,000,000, if allocated to the Air Force, will be used for contract authorization which cannot be expended until 1951 or 1952 when the completed aircraft are delivered.

Now, what can the Air Force get done with this $800,000,000? It could build 57 effective groups instead of the 48 proposed in the national defense budget. This would be a substantial step—once again, like we took last year—in the direction of the 66 groups planned originally in the 1949 fiscal year.

But what does the $800,000,000 mean in numbers of aircraft? Well, suppose all of it were spent for airplanes. It would buy 1,116 more than the 1,668 planned for in the new budget. But there is no point in having the airplanes without the pilots to fly them or the men to keep them in flying order. So, instead of the 412,000 men required to man the proposed 48 groups, 450,000 would be needed by the end of the fiscal year to man the 57 groups. This would be an increase of 38,000 men over the budgeted strength. So, of the $800,000,000, $365,000,000 would have to be used to balance out the additional groups with men, materials, and equipment.

The balance of the $800,000,000, or $435,000,000, could be used for aircraft procurement. Adding this to the $1,480,000,000 proposed in the 1950 budget, we would have the total sum for aircraft procurement of $1,915,000,000. This would give us 702 more aircraft. That would raise the total of 1,668 planes now provided for in the budget to 2,370. This compares adequately to the 2,437 aircraft we authorized to be procured in 1949.

I may add that if we provide this additional $800,000,000 this year to the present budget and annually thereafter grant the Air Force the present budget plus an additional $800,000,000, the 70-group program will not be in operation—on an aircraft basis alone—until 1954, at least.

Of course, now all members of the committee understand that this is an authorization bill only. The question of appropriations is an entirely separate subject. But I feel that in discussing this authorization the committee should know something of the costs involved.

Now, Mr. Chairman, just what is the factor that underlies this legislation? It is preparedness—the need for keeping our armed forces in a state of readiness at all times for the protection of this Nation. But we must never lose sight of the relation of our military preparedness to the preservation of peace, to American foreign policy, to the morale of freedom-loving people throughout the world.

Certainly, no fair-minded person can characterize the United States as an aggressive Nation. As I mentioned previously in these remarks, it is not our practice or desire to impose our will upon others. Nor do we fifth-column our way into power in foreign countries. But despite all this, we have an extremely powerful deterrent effect upon other nations which might do any one or all of these things.

Now, why is this so?

We deter such nations only because of the existing and potential force our great Nation can apply in the event we are embroiled in war.

And how strong is that influence?

Well, it ebbs and flows as our actual and potential military strength advances and recedes over the years. But the foreign reaction is not confined to the amount of force we can exert. It is also related to what this Congress does—now and in the future—in respect to other matters involving our armed forces, because that is gaged throughout the world as a measure of our determination to adhere to or renounce our principles under hostile pressure.

Mr. Chairman, surely there can be no question in the mind of any member of this committee that so long as international relations remain in a state of anarchy the measuring of force against force between nations in time of peace as well as in time of war will continue. Under such conditions—and so long as those conditions continue—certainly it is evident that military weakness in our armed forces invites abuses and contempt on the part of those with aggressive designs. So that, conversely, reasonable military preparedness is today the most effective deterrent to war.

I am not unmindful of the disillusionment that normally follows war. And certainly I share with all other Americans their great hope and desire for peace. And I, too, look forward to the day, if it ever comes, when our people can safely reduce our armed forces or dissolve them and turn to an international regulatory body for the maintenance of peace among nations.

Yes, and I am 100 percent behind the United Nations, as are all thinking Americans.

But it is not enough that our whole aim and effort is to preserve peace. Neither is it enough to place all of our confidence in the presumed success of the United Nations. Providing adequate protection to this Nation takes precedence, in my view, over all our hopes, all speculation, all theory, all eagerness for peace.

So, as I have said many times before this Congress, and as the history of our country has so consistently borne out over the years, we cannot safely scuttle our armed forces or reduce them materially until the state of the world becomes far more stable than it is now, or than it can possibly become during the next few years.

Neither can we today default the world leadership we have inherited as a result of the recent war. If we do default, by failing to provide adequately for the national defense, ours shall be the responsibility for the catastrophe which will be heaped upon our children and their children for generations to come.

I shall continue to maintain in this House that our Nation's deep longing for peace must be accompanied—for the foreseeable future—by the strength to insure it.

I shall continue to maintain that fairness in international relations and a spirit of cooperation cannot, of themselves, deter a nation bent on aggression.

Now, I have dwelled to this extent on this phase of the problem before us today, Mr. Chairman, for a very specific reason. This possibility of the Nation relying upon meekness of spirit and upon good works in international and military matters is not idle speculation.

Our Nation has followed this path before.

Our Nation has followed that path after every war in its history.

After the Revolutionary War—the War of 1812—the War with Mexico—the War Between the States—the Spanish-American War—and up to the very brink of World War II—it has been our national characteristic to starve and severely limit our armed forces, to ignore their counsel and advice, and to place our faith instead in the presumed protection afforded by the great oceans on either side of us.

Perhaps this scuttling of preparedness was more readily defensible in the days of sailing vessels. Perhaps it could be maintained without excessive danger before the time of blitz, aerial, submarine, atomic, and bacteriological warfare, before Nation-wide fifth-column activities, before the time of guided missiles and rocket weapons.

But it is certainly not true today.

We know now that the world can no longer isolate a war that involves one of the great powers. We know now that our world leadership thrusts us in one way or another into any fracas that may bob up anywhere. We have found that these great oceans on either side of us have become avenues of war, not protection against it. And we know now, that when a modern war starts, this Nation can no longer indulge itself in 2 or 3 years of getting ready to fight.

I shall always believe that had the United States sufficiently increased its military strength to deter those madmen of the thirties bent on aggression, war could have been averted. I believe that had Italy known action would be forthcoming, with military power adequate to the job, the League of Nations would not have been defied—that Japan would not have waged war on China—and that Hitler would eventually have been consumed by his own ghastly war machine.

It is because of all these considerations, Mr. Chairman, that I have no question in my mind that the House will approve this bill by an overwhelming vote. For I am sure that the entire Congress will recognize that the bill proposes but the minimum Army, Navy, and Air Force necessary for our own national defense and for a war deterrent throughout the world.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Armed Services will recall that a year ago when he and some of the rest of us thought something should be done to work toward the 70-group air force, that in a supplemental bill we provided funds over and above the budget. Congress could do the same thing again. Is that the gentleman's idea?

Mr. VINSON. Exactly; and the facts justify it today just as much as they did last year. I hope the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota who played such a conspicuous role last year will continue to perform in that faithful manner in this instance.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman from Georgia need have no fear of the gentleman's desire.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. I note on page 15, section 205, the caption "Research and development, authorization for the Secretary of the Air Force to conduct and engage in this particular phase of the development of air craft, and so forth." I just want to ask the very learned, distinguished, and capable chairman of the committee, whom we all know is most effective in getting legislation through, does he not think that in this ever-changing development of the Air Force, the modern trend toward ever-increasing speed in new planes, and so on, that a great deal of the funds appropriated by this Congress, certainly a reasonable amount, should go to research? I know the gentleman has a very good answer, but I want to lay the premise before he replies. Does he not agree that we should emphasize and stress the laboratory and experimentation in order to get the most modern planes rather than expend all of our resources in a large fleet of planes, the B-36 or whatever they may be, that would be obsolete next year?

Mr. VINSON. May I ask the gentleman from Mississippi, what benefit would it be to the defense of the country if we had an emergency on hand and if all of our defense was in research stage? You have got to have a certain amount of development and production going on.

Mr. COLMER. I am glad the gentleman asked me that question because he gives me an opportunity to at least give him the benefit of my views. Being a practical-minded man, I would not say for a moment that we should not have an adequate Air Force in view of existing circumstances to defend this country from any emergency attack. On the other hand, the learned chairman of this committee, who always studies these things through to the end, realizes I am sure, as some of the rest of us realize, that so far as the foreign situation is concerned now we are not in danger of an imminent war, that Russia does not want war any more than we do, that Russia is hoping that our economy will break down in this country and they can take us over through infiltration, espionage, and the other things they rely on rather than actual warfare.

What I am trying to say to the very distinguished gentleman, and I want him to respond to it, and I am saying it, of course, in no obstreperous mood but rather to be helpful, is that the planes of today, the B-36, the most modern thing we have, and possibly the most moder.. thing the world has, a year from now may be as obsolete as the 17 is now. Therefore, research and laboratory experimentation with the ability to produce when and if the time comes is one of the things that ought to be stressed. I am not opposing this legislation, and I do not want to leave that impression. I am merely trying to stress the need for emphasis on modernization of our air power all along the line.

Mr. VINSON. I think everyone understands the gentleman's question and his observations. Of course, there must be a balance between research and production. We must not depend altogether on the boards and the drawings and the blueprints. We must have hatched out and ready for national emergency some of the results of the blueprints and the experimentations.

Let me call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that it took 7 years to design, construct, and develop the B-36.

Mr. Chairman, I was here in 1916 and 1917, I was here when World War II started, and in my judgment nothing contributed more to bringing on those two wars as far as this Government is concerned than our failure to be well prepared and to have a strong Army, Navy, and Air Force. In my opinion, nothing will do more to bring about world peace and stabilize the unsettled conditions prevalent throughout the nations of the earth than for us to have a 70-group air force, a Navy equal to meet any emergency upon the seas, and a strong, modern, up-to-date, well-rounded Army.

If you want to bring about peace and let the apprehension of war die out, let the world know that America is going to be prepared at all times to meet any emergency.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. Is it not a fact that if Congress appropriated every dollar necessary for a 70-group program, it could not be completed before the year 1952?

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is absolutely correct. If today we would increase this appropriation sufficiently to bring it from 57 groups up to 70 groups you could not build them for at least 2 years, and it might run to 1953.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. I have enjoyed the gentleman's remarks. I was called from the Chamber when the gentleman evidently got to that part of his address dealing with air sea rescue. I would like to have the gentleman answer this question: What is the purpose and intent of the Air Corps or the Navy in peacetime in carrying out sea rescue which is delegated under law to another agency of the Government?

Mr. VINSON. I will have to state to the gentleman from North Carolina that I am uninformed on that subject. I have never investigated it. I do not know a thing in the world about it.

Mr. BONNER. That is something that has given me concern recently.

Mr. VINSON. I do not know a thing about that.

Mr. BONNER. I want to know if the Air Corps or the Navy is going into this function during peacetime.

Mr. VINSON. There may be some members of the committee who can answer the gentleman's question. I cannot answer it.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I can tell the gentleman that the air sea rescue activities of the Air Force and the Navy are part of the responsibility that goes along with military flying. The majority of the flying today is done by the military, and for that reason they maintain their own air sea rescue. Many times they are called upon to aid the civilian branch of the Government—the Coast Guard in its air sea rescue work.

Mr. BONNER. That is the point I wanted to develop, whether or not it was thought that the Coast Guard had not sufficiently developed in this branch of our service and that it was evidently becoming the function of the Navy or the Army to take over.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is right. That is simply a part of the military operation.

Mr. VINSON. I want the committee to understand that there are 33 members of the Armed Services Committee, and we work as a team. If one member cannot catch the ball, the other member can, so I am thankful to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] for answering the question.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. I just want to leave this thought in connection with the gentleman's very splendid statement about preparedness. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that I have voted for every dollar of preparedness that this Congress was ever asked for, and have sometimes taken a lead in it. But the point I am making is that I have tried to be helpful in the defense of this country, that I wanted the gentleman himself to emphasize the necessity for research and advancement in our Air Force.

Mr. VINSON. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman.

Mr. COLMER. With this I am going to finish. I dare say that neither the gentleman himself nor any member of his committee nor any member of the Air Force would care to travel in one of these B-36's in an attack on Moscow, for instance, on a bombing mission, if they

knew that they were going to be intercepted by jet fighters. That is what I am trying to emphasize.

Mr. VINSON. Of course, I am not traveling in any of them. I am trying to keep my feet on the floor of the House for the time being.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman always does that.

Mr. VINSON. I am trying to say it would be an unwise policy to depend altogether on research and never to carry out some of the fine inventions and conclusions of research. We have large sums of money appropriated for research. A great deal of that is being carried on by the various agencies conducting research, but at the same time let us build something that we can use in case of national emergency. Of course, the B-36 2 years from today might be obsolete, but it has a military mission today, and the military mission it is performing is quite effective. It helps to maintain stable conditions throughout the world.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. So is the B-17 obsolete.

Mr. VINSON. Certainly, but that is no reason why we should not have built them. A man goes out today and buys a new automobile, but the automobile he had last year can carry his wife to the hospital or serve his purposes in other ways.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true that the Air Corps has performed a wonderfully fine service with its air lift in Germany?

Mr. VINSON. Of course it has.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It has saved thousands of dollars and thousands of lives.

As I understand, this appropriation will not be for the Navy at all. That will be a separate proposition.

Mr. VINSON. The Navy is not involved in this bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Or the Naval Air Corps.

Mr. VINSON. The brilliant gentlewoman from Massachusetts long years ago helped write the composition of the Navy.

Let us see what is going to happen. I said that we can take $800,000,000 for universal military training out of the President's over-all budget for the National Military Establishment, and we can use that for the Air Force and by doing so not increase the over-all cost of the budget one penny. So when the Air Force appropriation bill comes here, I hope the Committee on Appropriations will have augmented the procurement and the authorization of aircraft by the amount of $800,000,000. If they do, then what happens? This is what happens: If we get this $800,000,000, and if all of it is spent for airplanes, we could then have 1,116 more airplanes than the present budget authorizes, which is 1,668, but it would be folly to use all the money for aircraft procurement if you did not have the pilots and the men to operate the planes. So at least $365,000,000 of the $800,000,000 increase in the appropriation would have to go to servicing and taking care of the additional number of planes that would be made available by the $800,000,000. Therefore, only $435,000,000 of the $800,000,000 could be used for procurement of new aircraft. That would provide 702. Add that 702 to the 1,668 that are now provided for in the budget and you have 2,370 airplanes, which would compare favorably with what Congress did last year, 2,437.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I trust that this authorization bill will be unanimously approved, and that unless the Committee on Appropriations takes care of this 70-group air force, when that appropriation bill is submitted an amendment will be adopted to increase the Air Force by $800,000,000.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, and honorable Members, after the comprehensive, exhaustive, clear, and analytical exposition of this bill that has been delivered by our distinguished and able chairman, there is little that I, or any other Member, of our committee or of this House, could add.

Modern science, new methods of rapid transportation and communication have rendered our modern world to a miniature province. Three years ago, coming back from Australia, I was cordially invited by our very genial Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. FARRINGTON] to address the chamber of commerce at Honolulu. I spoke to them at noon and the next evening I was having dinner with Mrs. Short here in Washington. We stopped at San Francisco to refuel. Recently I had breakfast in Bermuda; I had lunch here in Washington, then spent 5 hours in my office, and on the same evening I had dinner with my family down in the Ozarks in southwest Missouri, near the Kansas-Oklahoma line. We were traveling in an oxcart. It was a lumber wagon—a C-54, the old reliable. But that is nothing.

Only a few days ago the Boeing X-B-47 strato-jet bomber flew from Moses Lake in Washington State to Andrews Field, just outside the District of Columbia—2,289 miles in 3 hours and 46 minutes at an average speed of 607.2 miles per hour. I take time to recite these facts merely to show you that we are living today in a very small world. Today it is actually closer from Washington, D. C., to London, Berlin, Paris, Rome, or even Moscow, than it was from Washington to New York or Richmond during the Civil War. So, whether we like it or not, we are going to have to live and get along together.

This bill for the 70-group air force came out of our committee with a unanimous report. It was carefully considered, delved into, criticized, and if I might repeat what I said only a few days ago, it is only because of the wisdom, the tact, and the knowledge not only of issues but of human beings, of our able chairman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], that it comes to you today by unanimous report.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. The gentleman also might add that it was endorsed not only by the committee but by the Department.

Mr. SHORT. That is right. It has received the approval of everybody who has considered it. I thank the very distinguished and able gentleman from North Carolina who has contributed so much to our committee for that observation.

It is true that airplanes quickly become obsolete. It will shock some of you today to know that not one single plane that we had on the drawing boards before December 7, 1941—prior to Pearl Harbor—was ever used in this last conflict; not one of them.

It takes time, and that is the reason that we members of this committee, charged with the security of this Nation, have to look ahead. We cannot say everything in public which we know. We are agreed, not only in the Committee on Armed Services, but in the Committee on Rules, that this is one of the most fundamental and necessary things confronting the Nation at this hour. We have no secrets to hide and any Member can talk to us and find out anything he pleases.

We are going to continue to keep strong on land and sea and in the air. We are going to make ourselves invincible to attack from any quarter. We shall still continue to trust God, but we will keep our powder dry. We shall speak softly, but we will carry a pretty big shillalah. If we are wise, we will, because the only language that some marauders, robbers, and bandits in this world understand—and we have them in practically every country; I am not singling out any individual country—the only language they know is force. They respect strength but they have contempt for weakness.

You would not want to live in Washington, D. C., without a police force or a fire department. Certainly you would not in Kansas City. The hoodlums would take it overnight, and in Chicago they would take it in 3 hours.

It costs money, but it is pretty good protection. It is necessary insurance.

After traveling all over the world and seeing all kinds of people with different cultures, languages, different states of civilization, even in the higher ones, I am convinced that, after all, man can be a pretty mean animal. It is disheartening, it is disillusioning, it is sad, but it is true.

Now, I am not fearing outside attack on this country by Russia, or any other imaginable enemy, so much as I fear weaknesses within. In the few minutes that I have, I am going to conclude by saying this:

Lincoln once said, in substance, if this Nation is ever destroyed, it will be not from without but from within. I want a strong Army, Navy, and Air Force, but the first line of defense of any country is its financial solvency, a strong economy, and a thriving industry. We must also possess moral and spiritual strength.

It was America's industrial might, after all, that won the last war. Nimitz and Eisenhower, Marshall, Arnold, and Vandergrift, all of them will tell you so.

A quarter of a century ago I visited Cairo. I rode camels around the great Pyramid of Giza. I looked at the Sphinx and I dreamed of Napoleon addressing his men: "My soldiers, 40 centuries are looking down upon you." I wondered, if you could speak, what secrets you could tell, even of Mark Antony and Cleopatra. I walked through the remains of the temple at Thebes. I went up the Nile to Luxor and Assouan, to the tombs of Tutankhamen and Egypt's other great, and when I returned to Cairo I walked through the national museum, cluttered with a bewildering collection of archeological discoveries, telling of the ancient Ptolemys and Pharaohs, the great builders whose works astonish men in the twentieth century, and I asked myself the question: "Oh, Egypt, as you grew rich and powerful, why has your great civilization crumbled and lies buried today beneath centuries of sand?" And I had to answer: "As Egypt grew rich and powerful, she grew corrupt and tyrannical." She was not defeated by a foreign foe but she crumbled because of moral decay and spiritual disintegration within herself. She once had a vision, but she lost it; and, as the Old Testament puts it, "Where there is no vision, the people perish."

Then I went down the Tigris and Euphrates Valley, down to Baghdad, and I dreamed of that ancient rival civilization of Babylon, and I cried out, dreaming of Hammurabi, who was second only to Moses as a lawgiver, Hammurabi, Babylon, why hast thou perished? And I had to answer: Because as Babylon grew rich and powerful, she, too, grew corrupt and tyrannical; and she, like Egypt, perished.

Then I came to the classic land of Hellas, glorious Greece, the land that I have visited a half-dozen times in the past quarter of a century; and I climbed the Acropolis and walked through the ruins of the Parthenon and looked out where St. Paul addressed the Athenians on Mars Hill, where he said, "Oh, men of Athens, I observe in all things you are most religious"; and I thought of the golden age of Pericles from Anaximander down to Homer and Phidias to this present hour; of Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle, the great triumvirate of ancient philosophers; and I asked, "Oh, Greece, Greece, that has given the world beauty, and music, and philosophy, and art, and poetry, why have you, Greece, with your stately columns"—after which the Lincoln Memorial is copied—"why have you with all your learning and ancient grandeur and glory perished and now come with hat in hand asking for help from America; Greece, now one of the saddest lands in all the world, weak and impotent?" And I had to answer, "Oh, Greece, you had an Alexander who at the age of 33 wept because there were not more worlds to conquer; yes, you, too, were rich and glorious." I could hear the Muses and I could see the works of Phidias—you have perished, and, like Egypt and Babylon, you lie buried today in ruins beneath the earth; and why? Because as you grew rich and powerful, you became weak and corrupt.

You know prosperity and power are more difficult to endure than poverty and hardship. That is the history of civilization. Greece perished because she turned her back on the teachings of Socrates, of Plato, and of Aristotle, abandoned the teachings of her fathers to give herself up to hedonistic ethics, an epicurean philosophy of "Eat, drink and be merry, for tomorrow we will die." And Greece did die.

And then came Rome. "Rome, Rome, mother of dead empires," I cried out with Byron as I walked along the Appian Way toward the Catacombs of St. Calixtus over the bridge across the Tiber, up to the castle of Hadrian and St. Angelo, toward the ruins of Romanum Forum, and I stood under the arch of Septimius Severus, under the arch of Constantine and stood in the center of the Colosseum, big as the Yale Bowl—almost as big as the Rose Bowl at Pasadena, I suppose—but there they were: Beautiful women, gorgeously gowned, bedecked in jewels, welcoming the death of the gladiators who were vanquished.

Rome gave us law, order, and government and through England we have inherited that. Rome with the legions of Caesar conquered north Africa. "Carthago delenda est," Carthage must be destroyed. It was. Rome extended her far-off dominions into Britain and this mighty Roman empire, with its wealth, its glory, its luxury, that gave to the world law and order in government, crashed and went to pieces. Why? She was not sacked by barbarians. Rome broke and went to pieces on the rocks of materialism, selfishness, and greed. Caracalla and Caligula followed Augustus and Marcus Aurelius.

Then Nero came along and he fiddled while Rome burned. He gave them free bread, free circuses, free entertainment. He was a Santa Claus who took care of everybody. Oh, the state was everything. He gave them security and full employment while he lighted up the city with blazing martyrs. That is why Rome fell, through her own internal political disintegration and moral decay, which proved that Lincoln spoke words of truth when he said, "If this Nation is ever destroyed it will be not from without; it will be from within."

I think Edward Markham had the same idea in mind when he wrote certain words a quarter of a century ago. He was the greatest poet of our age, of this century. I knew him. I visited with him when I was a professor of philosophy at Southwestern College out on the plains of Kansas. He died on Long Island a few years ago. He wrote these words a quarter of a century ago, Mr. Chairman, before this last war; this is what he said:

> I fear the vermin that shall undermine
> senate and school and citadel and
> shrine;
>
> I fear the worm of fraud, the fatted worm
> of ease, and all the crawling progeny
> of these;
>
> I fear the vermin that shall honeycomb the
> walls and towers of state in unsus-
> pecting hours.

We do have vermin, we have rats in this country who are undermining the senate, the school, the citadel, the shrine.

We have the worms of fraud, the fatted worms of ease, who want something for nothing. Gimmie, gimmie, gimmie, and we have all the crawling progeny of these. Markham feared, and God knows I fear it, and I hope you do. Let there be no criticism of the Committee on Un-American Activities. They have made mistakes and will make more but they have done an unwelcomed but an invaluable and necessary job.

Then we come to modern Germany. Egypt, Babylon—Greece—Rome—Germany. We live long, but we learn so little. I thought I knew Germany. As a student at Oxford, Heidelberg, and Berlin, following the First World War, I lived, talked, and broke bread with my German friends. Any one who has flown over Germany will tell you it is the most beautiful country perhaps he has ever seen. They were a great and mighty people. I admired their knowledge of science, philosophy, music, and art. I knew the Germany of Kant, of Luther, of Goethe, of Schiller, of Hegel; I knew the Germany of Bach and Beethoven and Wagner. I have returned several times to see it a heap of rats, rubble, and ruin, just what Hitler promised, and just exactly what they deserved.

You can go from Mannheim and Ludwigshaven down the Rhine to Darmstadt, to Cologne, Dusseldorf, Bremen, Hamburg, on to Berlin, Leipzig, and Dresden, back to Halle, or down to far-off Stuttgart, Karlsruhe, and even Munich. And what is it? A shambles. Why the Germans in the past scorned peace. It was not altogether their fault, but I will not enter into that. It would open up a vast subject which we could debate all night. But, during the past two decades the German people, whipped and browbeaten down to the earth, listened to a paperhanger, an ex-corporal, Adolf Schickelgruber, who turned his back on the teachings of their fathers, who accepted the philosophy of one Friedrich Nietzsche, "the will to power," the superman, "might makes right," and adopted the tactics of Bernhardi, Von Bethman-Hollweg, and Treitschke, "necessity knows no law." So, modern Germany, with all of her science and power and might, is no more. God knows, anyone who faced those Krauts knows what they had on the ball. In spite of it, all she is today is a shambles of ruin.

I am sorry to have trespassed upon the patience, the endurance and indulgence of the Members of this House for the past 10 or 15 minutes. I am for this 70 air group bill. It has got to be. It was unanimously reported. It is necessary. But God help us to think just a little of America as we contemplate any foreign or imaginary enemy which I do not think can possibly attack us in the near future, and would not dare. They do not have the steel, the oil, the rubber or the resources to do it. How well they know it. While we are thinking of these foreign enemies, let us think just a little about America. All your railroad wrecks, your fires and explosions that are going on today—you read it every day in your paper—are not accidental.

I fear the vermin that shall undermine senate and school and citadel and shrine. I fear the worm of fraud, the fatted worm of ease, and all the crawling progeny of these. I fear the vermin that shall honeycomb the walls and towers of state in unsuspected hours.

God help us to hang together or we will hang separately.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, it is always a privilege to listen to the gentleman from Missouri when he discusses the history of the world and the various philosophies which have affected it. This is not the first time that I have found myself in the uncomfortable position of following the gentleman from Missouri. I fully appreciate my limitations and that my remarks must be entirely practical and as to the bill itself.

Still, I do want to say sincerely how much I did appreciate and enjoy the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri.

I believe that our chairman has covered the points of this bill most thoroughly. I do want to say, however, that a few days ago a remark was made on the floor in connection with another bill pending here that this bill was coming in and was in the nature of an emergency, or that it indicated the continuance of an emergency of the United States. That does not conform to the facts. This bill does not have any of the elements of an emergency in it. It refers entirely to peacetime conditions and to a continuing program. I was here when we first began preparation for the recent war. At that time our National Defense Act provided that the total over-all strength of the Army and the Air Force would be 280,000. The permanent law today does not increase that 280,000.

I recall that when we passed the first Selective Training and Service Act we did not repeal the 280,000 limit but only suspended it for the time being. I have always felt that we made a very serious mistake when we finally removed all ceilings on the number who could be taken into the armed forces or be in the armed forces at any one time. We originally approached it cautiously and provided that no more than 900,000 could be in training at any one time under the Selective Training and Service Act. We increased it from time to time, but finally removed the ceiling. So the Congress lost entire control over the number of people who could be taken into the armed services, and lost entire control of the number who would hold the status of veterans after the war. I doubt sincerely if we would now have the Veterans' Administration reporting that 18,000,000 and more Americans now have the status of veterans and the rights to veterans' benefits had the Congress of the United States had the control which we previously had and the control which we should always hold.

At the present time there is some question, it is true, as to whether there is permanent legislation authorizing the strength of the Army and the Air Force. There can be no doubt, however, that that authorization is in a negative manner and that it appears, of all places, in the last extension of the Selective Service and Training Act. So actually, rather than being an authorization, it constitutes a ceiling.

We come now to the first occasion upon which we have attempted to do anything as to the permanent organization of our Army and Air Force since the revision of the National Defense Act of 1920. This bill will provide the over-all strength of the Army at 837,000 and the over-all strength of the Air Force at 502,000. As our chairman has said, the over-all strength of the Navy was fixed some time ago, at the time that our present chairman of the Committee on Armed Services was chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, and always saw to it that the naval legislation was promptly provided, and probably well in advance of the need. We are very glad indeed that our chairman is now also handling the Army and the Air Force, and that we can maintain what he referred to as balance.

I agree thoroughly with the gentleman from Mississippi and all those others who advocate research, but when you speak of research you are mentioning only half the problem. The other half is development. After your original research has taken place, then you must have the development.

Those of you who served in the Air Force know what a far different plane the B-17 was at the end of the war compared to what it was at the outbreak of the war, the improvements which were made in it as time went on and service conditions showed the justification for those changes and the nature of the changes needed or desirable.

Recently we were all thrilled at the flight of the B-50 around the world. After having followed those matters carefully in the press during the war, I am sure that the B-50 seemed to be something new to those who had followed such matters only in the press.

Of course, the B-50 which flew around the world was nothing other than the B-29 which bombed Japan, but a far different plane from the B-29 which bombed Japan because of the development which had taken place in intervening years. So research, laboratories, drawing boards, and blueprints are fine. But we must have the actual plane in existence so that the development based upon experience may be brought into that plane so that it may be of a type which will really serve our purpose. In addition, you do not take men fresh out of college and put them into a new plane and have them constitute an efficient crew. Our men must become acquainted with these planes and learn their efficient operation and their maneuverability and all things having to do with tactical or strategic operation of the planes. Therefore it is time for us to authorize on a permanent basis and over a long period of time what we regard as being the minimum necessary for an Air Force as well as an Army in peacetime.

There has been some reference made especially in the consideration of the rule as to the vast authorities granted here. There is no novel authority of any great degree granted by this bill. It is true, in connection with procurement, that we have lengthened the time, provided the appropriation bill on the particular subject is not limited. In other words, we have now come to the realization that you cannot have research, development, and procurement on a long-range basis by having funds available for 1 year only. So that we do grant here the right for funds to be available for disbursement for a period of 2 years, in the case of research and development, until expended. That will give us the ability to plan for these planes which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] so properly stated we need, and which point he brought out so clearly when he said that no plane—the design of which began after Pearl Harbor—ever took part in the recent war.

Mr. Chairman, there is a question as to constitutionality that may arise in the minds of some with reference to the provision that appropriations for the Army shall not exceed a period of 2 years. A good many years ago it was held that that provision applied to raising and supporting an Army and applied only to equipage, food, and what not, and did not apply to its munitions or posts and stations. It has never been construed to apply to the Navy. The Constitution, of course, makes no reference to the Air Force, and our legal department of the Government, the Attorney General, has held that in equal measure it does not apply to the Air Force. I believe that the best thinking of the legal minds today is that it does not apply to the Air Force and that there is no question as to the constitutionality of this provision.

I mention it to the end that it might not be thought that it has been passed over here without calling to the attention of the Congress the fact that we do have here something which is a little new on the question of procurement and appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, I doubt if there will be much opposition to the passage of this bill. While it appears that it will not be unanimous, I hope the vote will be comparable to that on the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, this bill has been covered in its entirety, in my opinion, by the chairman, who made one of the finest explanations that I have ever listened to, and also by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY]. There is very little that I can add to what they have already said. Probably some of the Members might be interested in what this bill does in regard to the National Guard. That was not explained in detail. Although the National Guard has had statutory authority in the National Defense Act, my experience on the committee has always been that we have had difficulty in working out proper recognition for the National Guard in the armed services. The National Guard officers appeared before us; also the Reserve officers, and there was full agreement before this measure was finally adopted by the committee. That is something that has not happened since

I have been a member of the Armed Services Committee for the past 10 years.

It does raise the actual strength of the National Guard at the present time. It also raises the strength of the Reserve officers. The over-all allotment to the National Guard would give each congressional district about 800 members.

Something has been said about the research activities authorized in this act. I think all of us who have served in this body for the past few years and those of you who served in the Army during the last war, have seen the most phenomenal developments take place in regard to the development of weapons for national defense. A few days ago we witnessed at Andrews Field the modern developed plane, with jet engines and all the other things. It is amazing how fast this has developed in the way of items going into our national defense picture. That not only applies to the planes but it applies to the delivery of weapons, which are today the most powerful in the history of the world.

There are many other developments which, of course, cannot be talked about on the floor of this House. We are faced with them every day, especially those who are serving on the Armed Services Committee and the Atomic Energy Joint Committee. We have become amazed at the developments that have taken place since the end of the last war.

So this whole bill is designed as a striking force. We hope and pray there will not be any conflict; because we know that, if there is a conflict, the next war is going to be more destructive than any previous conflict.

Within the last few days we have flown a plane around the world, and we know that it can deliver missiles, of whatever type we decide to use, at most any spot in the world.

When we began the last war we thought only of the protection of our own country. Then we entered the war and we immediately began to develop planes and other things of a military nature that placed us in a position to finally win the war.

This bill at the present time authorizes a total of 837,000. Our present force is about 690,000. So we are not up to the authorization in this bill. It will be necessary, of course, if we move up to 837,000, that we have additional appropriations over the budget allowance this year. The Air Corps has 400,312. The authorization is 510,000, which is quite an increase.

I am hopeful that the Committee will act favorably on this bill, because I feel it is much safer for the Congress to control the over-all top ceiling in our Air Force and Army. I served on the old Military Affairs Committee when we took the lid off; and many, many times we regretted that.

So, in my opinion, this is a safe measure for the country. The bill H. R. 1437 authorizes a 70-group Air Corps and I have spoken in support of the 70 group on former occasions and advocated that we proceed to establish this striking force as early as possible. It provides us with a minimum striking force with which at least we could operate, and from which we could expand our forces into a much more effective one, that we could not do without this authorization.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to be misunderstood as a result of what appeared in debate on the rule to be opposition to the consideration of this legislation. Like all of you, I, too, was thrilled by the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT]. He can even get applause when he is wrong. I had sort of commissioned him as my watchdog on the Committee on Military Affairs, as I thought his views on military matters were pretty much the same as mine. But evidently he has succumbed to the suave, effective leadership of his distinguished chairman. He also told the House the cause of the rise and fall of these great empires that have gone before. Let me say here that history records that every one of those empires depended in the last analysis on armed force, and it brought them to destruction. I wish only to call to the attention of the House the fact that no matter how much we build up our military forces it is not going to be any assurance of peace in the world; it may even aggravate war. I wish most sincerely and humbly that some time we could generate as much enthusiasm in behalf of peace and pursuing the things that will lead to peace as we do for conflict. What we need in this country more than anything else is a Christian and moral rearmament. Maybe that is too much to expect, inasmuch as we have few people who will not agree with that; but, certainly, we have, as a result of our own efforts in our own country, attempted to establish a tribunal which would finally at least point the way to where we might cooperate with the nations of the world in establishing a peaceful world. It seems to me that we have rather soon forgotten that great objective and instead of following through, in my humble judgment, we have done much to destroy the effort that has already been made.

I know that the voice of anyone who speaks against this bill is but a small voice in the wilderness. The other day we had a controversy here over a measly little item of $18,000,000 for the District of Columbia. Today we are dealing with billions of dollars. I wish someone would tell me how this Nation can survive over a long period of time, such as this bill contemplates, when we are going to have to spend 75 cents of every taxable dollar either on military installations, paying for past wars, or rehabilitating the maimed and disabled of other wars. Those are the things I am concerned about and that is what I wanted to say at this time.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I think the gentleman has rendered a valuable service in making this observation. However, there is not anything incompatible in the viewpoint that he represents; that is, that our greatest need is a spiritual rearmament and support of this bill if we do not place our reliance exclusively upon physical and material defenses. I am glad the gentleman has made the observation, because in the debate upon a measure of this kind it is well for the world to be reminded that our goals are identified with world peace and not domination through any military power.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Utah.

Mrs. BOSONE. I am very proud of the comments that my worthy colleague has made and I want him to know that I am 100 percent in accord with what he has just said. It is alarming when 76 percent of our tax dollar goes to the military part of our Government without some forethought. Do we want a military government? We should ponder long and well. I want my country protected, so I am going to vote for this bill. I am very pleased to think my worthy colleague, who has always been such a worthy legislator since I served with him in Utah, has expressed himself so ably and so nobly on this particular bill.

Mr. GRANGER. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON].

Mr BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, during the past several weeks we have had the privilege of listening to testimony presented before the Committee on Armed Services by the Secretaries of the Army and the Air Force, and the Chiefs of Staff of their respective services or at least have read their testimony. We also know former Secretary of Defense, Mr. Forrestal, testified on H. R. 1437, a bill to authorize the composition of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes. I am sure that every Member of this House appreciates the intent of this bill, which has now been approved unanimously by the Armed Services Committee. In addition to the Regular Establishments of the Army and the Air Force, certain Reserve components are necessary to guarantee the security of the United States. In these days of continuing tension in Europe, of increasing discord in China, and of uncertainty in many other parts of the world, we cannot jeopardize our future security by neglecting any aspects of our defenses. We must have a strong Military Establishment, prepared for any emergency.

I am sure also that every Member of this Congress who had the opportunity to read the statements and the testimony of the Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. W. Stuart Symington, and of the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, must have been impressed, as I was, by the sincerity, the earnestness, and the capabilities of these men to whom have been entrusted in a very large measure the air phases of our defense. Mr. Symington and General Vandenberg are dynamic

leaders, with most distinguished records in the service of the United States and in particular with the Air Force. Each saw service—the one in civilian capacity, the other as commanding general of a tactical Air Force—in World War II. Each has seen a good deal of Europe since the war. Each is thoroughly familiar with the strength, the readiness, and the needs of our present Military Establishment. I feel that we cannot afford not to listen with attentiveness, with respect, and with deep seriousness to the testimony of these air leaders.

In his statement read before the Armed Services Committee, Secretary Symington stated succinctly the purpose of the proposed legislation when he said it is "to authorize an Air Force capable, in conjunction with the other armed services, of meeting whatever international crisis might be forced upon this country."

I should like to point out that in these days when we hear so much about bickering among the services, and of the failure of unification, it is reassuring to find the Secretary of the Air Force voicing in unequivocal language his endorsement of an Air Force that will serve not alone but "in conjunction with the other armed services." Mr. Symington believes in unification. Mr. Symington has worked earnestly and untiringly to make unification in the armed services a fact. And Mr. Symington has seen unification at work, has—moreover—seen unification applied to the meeting of an international crisis forced upon this country. I refer to the Berlin airlift, which Mr. Symington and General Vandenberg have inspected personally, and which I too have had the privilege of observing.

I am quite sure that when Mr. Symington spoke of meeting whatever international crisis might be forced upon this country, he had in mind the very acute crisis that was forced upon this country last June, and the success with which air power was used to meet it. In his statement before the Armed Services Committee Mr. Symington went on to say:

> In the atomic age of lightning attack, air power instantly capable of defense and sustained effective retaliatory attack is a basic need of the Nation. Without such capacity, when within a few years one group of countries capable of attacking the United States will possess in quantity the absolute weapon, the lives of our people will be in daily jeopardy. That would not seem to be the proper heritage to leave our children.

To give us the Air Force necessary, Mr. Symington urges passage of the bill which would authorize statutory military personnel strength for the Army and the Air Force and which would authorize research planning for and procurement of aircraft on a long-range basis. Of the three armed services, the Navy alone at the present time has a statutory personnel ceiling; and by stipulation in the Constitution of the United States, only the Navy is permitted to expend its funds over a period of more than 2 years.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Symington concluded his testimony by stating with the forthrightness which has always characterized his utterances:

> I consider the passage of this authorization act essential to the security of the United States.

There is no mincing of words in that statement. There is no prophecy of doom, no hysterical cry for larger appropriations. It is the well-considered judgment, the balanced opinion, the unqualified conclusion of a man who has weighed all aspects of the question, who is familiar with the international situation, who understands the implications of aviation progress in this atomic age.

I consider the passage of this authorization act essential to the security of the United States—

Mr. Symington said, and rested his case with that straightforward statement.

It was my privilege to read a statement from General Vandenberg, as well as by Mr. Symington, before the Armed Forces Committee. The Secretary spoke of the over-all need for air power to guarantee national security. The general spoke in detail of the authorization act, and how it answers the requirements of the Air Force program.

Legislation embodying the intent of Congress, with respect to composition of a military service—

The general said—

> is necessary as guidance for those who administer that service, and is a means of insuring continuity in the development of the service. Such legislation also provides a broad long-term authorization upon which the service may base its periodic estimates of requirements.

General Vandenberg made it very plain that H. R. 1437 is a long-term authorization plan for maximum efficiency in operating an Air Force capable of carrying out the tasks assigned to it in these times of unsettled peace. The plan is as modern as jets, as forward-thinking as our combination of civilian genius and military proficiency can formulate for the years immediately before us.

The plan for an Air Force in being calls for an Air Force with three major tasks:

First, in event of attack, of delivering an immediate and powerful strategic air offensive against the basic sources of our enemy's war-making capacity.

Second, of defending the United States and our essential bases against air attack.

Third, of furnishing tactical support to both Army and Navy in exploitation of the opportunities presented through prosecution of the first two tasks.

To provide for an Air Force capable of performing these tasks of delivering, defending, and supporting is the basic purpose of H. R. 1439. The enactment of this bill into law will enable the Air Force to plan not for one year or two, but for several years ahead of each fiscal year. It is the first authorization for the nature, scope, and composition of the Army as well as the Air Force. The Navy already has an authorized strength under a 1946 statute.

I need not remind the Members of this House that authorizations and appropriations are two separate and distinct items and must not be confused with each other. Authorization implies the acceptance of a broad plan for the strength of the Air Force upon which year to year funds must be made available toward the achievement of the ultimate objective. The authorization plan of H. R. 1437 may be conveniently referred to as the 70-group air force, which is the core of our long-range plan. It is the plan presented and endorsed by the President's Air Policy Commission and by the Congressional Aviation Policy Board, of which Senator OWEN BREWSTER was the chairman, and our able and distinguished colleague from California, Representative CARL HINSHAW, was the vice chairman.

Appropriations, on the other hand, are the amounts made available in a fiscal year for the operations of the Air Force during that year. The appropriations proposed for the fiscal year 1949–50 have been set up by the President and sent to the Congress and are under consideration now. The funds tentatively planned for the Air Force for 1949–50 as presented in the national defense budget would permit the operation of a 48-group air force. I am not at the moment concerned with appropriations but with authorizations.

Specifically, the enactment into law of H. R. 1437 would, among other matters, set up authorization for the following:

First. Seventy Regular Air Force groups.

Second. Twenty-two separate Regular Air Force squadrons.

Third. Sixty-one National Guard and Reserve groups, together with supporting elements.

Fourth. A personnel strength for the Regular Air Force of 502,000.

Fifth. An aircraft strength of 24,000 serviceable aircraft to meet the requirements of the Regular National Guard and Reserve components as well as provide a war reserve to replace early combat losses.

Sixth. An annual replacement of 5,200 aircraft.

Seventh. A more intensive program of research and development.

Eighth. Authority to use money beyond the period for which originally appropriated.

The outline I have just given is for the entire 70-group air program in its final stage, the program which we want Congress to authorize this year so that the Air Force can plan not only for 1949–50 but for the next year and other years ahead.

We do not have such an air force today, but what we have comes up to the finest traditions of our military service. Our United States Air Force is performing missions in peace with that same fortitude and skill that it exhibited in combat. Our National Defense Establishment is a team, and a strong team on which the Air Force plays forward.

Mr. Chairman, we have already had the privilege of hearing the Honorable FRANK W. BOYKIN, of Alabama, speak on the first annual report of the Secretary of the Air Force, on the progress made by the Air Force in one year of autonomous existence. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN] paid high tribute to this report, which he characterized as "just such a statement as one would expect a modern business executive in private industry to make to the stockholders at the annual meeting of

his concern." The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN] read from the report some extremely interesting paragraphs on what the Air Force has done to improve efficiency and economy in the organization. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN] also called attention to the frank and candid report of "Unsatisfactory Progress" referring to the things that we in this Congress might do to further increase the national security and do so with a minimum of expenditure of the taxpayer's dollar. I do not care to read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD lengthy quotations from this section of the Secretary's report, because every member of this Congress has received a copy of the report, and has undoubtedly read the report himself.

I do wish, however, to point out that the Air Force has needs other than those indicated by the legislation now under consideration, H. R. 1437. Foremost among these is an aircraft control and warning system to detect the approach of hostile aircraft at long range and to control our own intercepting aircraft in flight, so that interception is possible. Such a system would require extensive radar and radio installations, complex control centers, and a high state of training of technical personnel. Because of its critical importance to our national security, such a system is provided for in other bills.

A second requirement is additional quarters for Air Force personnel, both family quarters and barracks. The shortage has a bad effect on Air Force morale. Airmen who think enough of their families to consider the suitability of family quarters are by and large airmen of a quality the Air Force cannot afford to lose. The general lack of suitable or even available family quarters is causing the Air Force to lose an alarming number of highly trained and experienced mechanics, technicians, and combat crewmen. The problem of housing is not peculiar to the armed forces, but the vital nature of its mission entitles the Air Force to urge priority consideration of this critical need.

What is true of quarters, is likewise true of other Air Force installations. At the end of fiscal year 1949 the Air Force had only two-thirds of those base facilities necessary for its existing units, and more than half of existing available bases have temporary World War II type construction, built 6 or 7 years ago for a 5-year life. Such installations are worn out, and need to be improved to meet the changing needs of improved aircraft, when they do not need to be replaced altogether. Runways, taxiways, aprons, and other structures must be kept suitable for larger, heavier, more advanced types of aircraft as they appear from the proving grounds and the aircraft factories.

These are only some of the requirements of the Air Force that will in due course become matters of discussion and consideration by Congress. I am not one of those who believe that the future security of the United States depends solely upon the air power we maintain. But I do believe that the air power we maintain is our most potent deterrent to war today. That enemy nation or group of nations that knows we are prepared to meet air attack with instant retaliatory air attck may well decide not to risk humiliation and defeat at the hands of our strong democracy. Japan and Germany learned slowly but effectively that with American production know-how, American resources, and American planning we could gain air superiority over them in spite of the fact that initially they enjoyed air superiority over all their enemies.

The hopeful democracies of Europe today have seen in our airlift to Berlin proof of our instant readiness to meet any international situation that may arise and to maintain an isolated, blockaded city of two and one-half million people by means of air power. When Operations Vittles began last June even the most hopeful advocates of air power thought of it as an expedient designed to postpone war. Today the whole world knows that Operation Vittles has proved to be an instrument as strong as an armed garrison, more potent than diplomacy for maintaining peace. It has kept Berlin alive. It has not only maintained the American position in western Europe, it has contributed beyond evaluation to the success of the Marshall plan. It has given prestige to our position of world leadership that not even the victories of war could give us. The Berlin airlift has proved to the world the intention and the capacity of the United States, not merely to mobilize for the successful conclusion of a war when attacked but to mobilize for the maintenance of peace.

A few days ago Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Chief of Staff of the United States Army, in a speech in Boston before the industrial leaders of the country, called air power essentially a first priority weapon.

Responsible leaders of the country agree with General Bradley, that capable, efficient, and honest Administrator of our Veterans' Administration, that distinguished soldier of World War II, the respected and admired Chief of Staff of today's Army, in assigning first priority to the Air Force, in considering the needs of the military services.

We dare not overlook the needs of any of the services. We dare not neglect to provide a balanced defense. But we dare not give to our first priority weapon less of its requirement than air leaders, than the President's Air Policy Board, than the Congressional Aviation Policy Board have indicated.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from Utah remains because I would like to discuss this bill in a way that I think will please him.

When we look at this bill and consider all it provides, it looks like a rather fantastic situation. Several years ago we authorized a Navy of 666,000 men. In this bill we authorize an Army of 837,000 men and an Air Force of 502,000 men, making a total of 2,005,000 men in our armed services. This includes officers and enlisted personnel.

Almost 4 years have elapsed since the close of the war. Many of us, measuring the situation by what happened after the First World War, thought that by this time we would be somewhere near normalcy. We thought that our armed forces would decline rapidly. We thought the military forces would rapidly be demobilized and that we would have but a small standing Army, Navy, and Air Force 3½ years after the shooting stopped. We thought the treaties of peace would be signed promptly and rapidly and that they would bring stability to the war-torn countries of Europe and Asia. But that has not happened and that is the reason why, in my opinion, we now must have a rather strong military force. The sweet and hopeful words of some of our allies about peace and world harmony that would follow victory over our enemies have turned out to be illusions and disappointments.

This is due to the chaotic and fearful situation in which the world finds itself. Also, it is convincing evidence of how all-pervading and all-consuming the wars of today are. The recovery and return to a normal situation is much slower than it was after the First World War. It indicates what a future one might be. All wars are now total war and no part of our economic or social or political life remains untouched. Another war might destroy civilization itself and plunge us into another Dark Ages from which recovery might take centuries. That points up the basic essential of trying to avoid another war. If we cannot do that, nothing much matters. We argue and get into almost a state of hysteria over rent control, reciprocal trade agreements, changes or regulations in our management-labor relations. But all these are of minor importance when we consider the overpowering problem of establishing stability and peace in the world.

The matter becomes more awesome to us when we realize that we are the key nation that must lead the troubled and chaotic world of today out of the wilderness of sorrow, uncertainty, and chaos into the world of peace.

This bill has great significance to that situation. I think it can be the key that may open the door to the world of cooperation, hope and peace that our soldiers fought and died for and that we are all hoping for.

I am convinced that we must travel the road to peace through our strength. A strong powerful nation able to meet any aggressor and defeat him will bring respect. Strength will act as a stabilizer in an uncertain world and maintain at least the status quo while the machinery to make peace can be perfected and while the will to have peace may be strengthened among the nations.

It is curious—and I believe everyone who has traveled to the troubled spots of the world, as many members of our committee have, will agree with me—but the world is living in fear. The people in Italy, France, Persia, Turkey, Egypt, and other countries in other continents live in constant fear of what might happen—basing their fears on what has happened to neutral and peace-loving countries in the recent war. They are building up their defenses, they are joining pacts, they are feverishly trying to prepare for the assault that might be visited upon them. Yet they are now

exhausted in manpower, wealth, and military organization.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Does the gentleman advocate that this country furnish airplanes and guns and ammunition of war to foreign countries?

Mr. JOHNSON. I do not; at least for the present. It may be that we should help some nations in the event that the proposed Atlantic Pact is entered into. That should merely be done if our judgment tells us that such help will bring more security to us.

The only way that situation can be handled is through organization. The organization must build on its strength and solidarity. It must be one that can insure the peace through the combined strength and unity of the group. That is where the symbol of strength of our armed forces, and our productive capacity can be a big help. It will be the spearhead of this effort—in fact it must be the driving force to accomplish it.

But I want to add a note of warning here. We must realize that our ultimate salvation and a peaceful world cannot be built alone on armaments. It must have a base of moral and legal authority. We must be sure that the very strength that I am talking about will be the vehicle which will awaken and stimulate the moral and legal conscience of the world, so we may build a world of law and order. That very world of law and order must be based, to an extent, upon force. It must have as an integral part of the organization the force to make its determinations binding and conclusive. It must have the force to stop any outlaw who may wish to override and trespass upon the rights of others in the family of nations. That kind of a world is slow in building. That kind of a job will need the continued support—in symbol form only—that our present and proposed military organization furnishes. But we must never lose sight of the fact that this strong symbol of military power is only for the one purpose of building and protecting a peaceful and a free world.

Consequently, you can see why we of the Armed Services Committee are anxious to have you approve of our recommendations as found in the bill before us. We gave serious and thoughtful consideration to it. We realized, for instance, that in addition to the regular professional Military Establishment, we needed a reserve group, part of which, could be mobilized instantly. This world is so small and an aggressor can strike so quickly that we must be ready at any time to defend ourselves. But if we have the power to strike back quickly and with a knock-out punch, then the attack which we hope will never come, probably will not come.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I was going to ask the gentleman if he does not believe that our thinking and policy should be slanted toward peace rather than our thinking and policy being slanted toward war.

Mr. JOHNSON. I agree with the gentleman. That is what I want to develop by this discussion.

We must be careful to see that our strength in the military does not result in an armament race, in which finally some incident or provocation may occur which will light the spark that can flare into war. We hope and pray that mistakes that have been made in negotiating and dealing with our allies and which now act as roadblocks to peace can be overcome. It is little use now to dwell on them except as unfortunate incidents in history. It is for the historian to objectively appraise their damage. What we want now is a way to get peace, despite the handicaps. We cannot go on forever in the state of uncertainty in which we now find ourselves. We cannot forever have a Berlin airlift, a nervous Trieste, a shaky Korea and an Austria that must be guarded and protected by us. The fronts and the trouble spots of this struggle are all over the world. China may be the key spot where we must do something to stop the relentless "peaceful" penetration which is now going on and which has resulted in 12 countries coming under almost complete slavery, as far as the individual is concerned.

The military strength which we provide by this bill should give our representatives at the conference tables much help. We hope they have the skill to use it to harness the moral and legal conscience of the world and thus bring lasting peace and the mechanisms to maintain it. That is the kind of security we must ultimately have if the world is not to be destroyed. Military strength during this transition period will help bring security based on morals and law. Remember that without security—military or legal—there can be no real personal freedom.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to note in the committee report on this bill references to the work done by the President's Air Policy Commission, sometimes known as the Finletter Commission, and also the work done last year by the Congressional Aviation Policy Board of the Eightieth Congress.

I am glad to note also that the committee referred to the fact that the results of our studies in these two separate groups, one created by the President and the other by the Congress, came out to approximately the same score. Those of you who have read the report of the Congressional Aviation Policy Board of the Eightieth Congress will remember that we set up two plans for the Air Force, one known as plan A and the other known as plan B.

Plan A, as established by our committee, would provide that initial strength necessary to mount promptly an effective, continuing, and successful air offensive against a major enemy. That program would require, among other things, an annual procurement of aircraft for the Air Force at the rate of 86,000,000 pounds of air frame. Plan B, which was based on other concepts, but from the same sources of information, was designed to plan the strength necessary to prevent the loss of a war at the outset of hostilities.

I would like to call the attention of the House to the fact that the plan set forth in this bill, and the strength of the air forces as established in this bill, in relation to the number of air-frame pounds which were to be produced as a maximum annually, namely, 85,000,000 pounds, is approximately the requirement under plan A. In other words, this is the production strength that would be required to mount an offensive which could be continued and successful. That, to my judgment, is the very minimum which we should authorize in this Congress. I trust that the committee itself, having studied the question, likewise is on notice that it will be necessary to increase the present actual procurement program by not less than 30,000,000 pounds of air frames annually and to do it at once in order to bring production up to plan B as we are now lagging in the production of enough aircraft even needed to prevent the loss of a war should we be attacked. There is a reason for this. The reason for it is that it takes a considerable length of time for the aircraft industry of the United States to build up its production rate to the point where it can meet attrition losses and from there on to build an air force that can keep going. We remember, before World War II, when the British ordered aircraft in the United States in the year 1938, I believe. They also, at the same time, provided funds for the increase of the plant capacity in the United States. They did this through private contracts and private manufacturers. I venture to say, and I do not think any one will disagree with what I say, that if it had not been for those initial orders by the British several years before we became involved in World War II, that the plant capacity of the aircraft industry of the United States would have been wholly unable to meet the needs of our own Air Force and Navy during the war and the war itself would have been prolonged by perhaps a year and a half to 2 years, if not altogether lost. From that fact, and from the figures of casualties, you can see how many lives it saved the United States for our industry to have had a head start on the requirements which ultimately came for our air forces.

As the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] was talking a few moments ago, on the subject of research and development, I would like to remark briefly that, of course, it is vitally necessary that we carry on an active program in research and development. Major funds should be expended in that direction in order that we may be on top when it comes to the best possible design of aircraft. But, if we did nothing else but research and development, of course we would have no aircraft—no defense. It would be a potential defense, but not a real defense. Hence, it is necessary to cut off in the research and development program about every so often and to start ordering aircraft from the status of research and development in which we find ourselves at that time.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am very glad to have the gentleman from California bring out the two points which he is making—one as to the necessity of keeping productive capacity in being in the country, and also to give some application to such research as we have accomplished, by the actual creation of some planes. The gentleman may recall that a year ago, when the House took the initiative in providing funds for the 70-group air force, we were confronted with that precise question as to whether or not we should go ahead and place some procurement orders, or whether we should wait and get the benefits of some later research. But the question was resolved in this way: We felt that we have to start some time, and that it was possible to proceed with a formula of calculated risk. So, in the supplemental appropriation bill, where we provided the money for the 70-group air force, we wrote in some language and required that there should be certain—that the planes which were contracted for should incorporate the latest design and the latest improvements consistent with the needs of the Air Force and the risks of the situation at the time. That is a question that always must be answered, to try to get the most we can, and to maintain productive capacity for turning out planes, and also to have an air force in being, in case you need it.

Mr. HINSHAW. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from South Dakota. I remember the language which was written into the bill. Of course, the gentleman understands it is difficult for the executive office of the Government, either the President or Secretary of National Defense, to state whether or not anything is the most modern, because right behind that comes something else which is a little more modern, and it depends entirely in what state of development the most modern thing is, as to whether or not it may go into a given aircraft at a given time.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is true, but what we were trying to do to meet the practicalities of the air-force situation is also to meet the practical difficulties of getting some funds made available, and we had to try to find a formula upon which we could get an agreement to appropriate funds. That is what we did. That started the money for the 70-group air force.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think the committee is to be highly complimented for having taken the desired action. Now I want to speak on one more subject rather lightly for the time being. That is the subject of the Reserves and the National Guard. I presume that in my necessary absence from the floor someone may have discussed that subject, but I would like to add a word.

In the first place, the Continental Defense Command of the United States is implemented very largely by 20 or 21 National Guard groups, as an air-defense organization for our own country. It is a matter of vital necessity that we do have this continental defense. It is not necessary that the entire continental defense be on duty 24 hours every day, but it is necessary that they be made available for duty on relatively short notice. The National Guard set-up is appropriate to that purpose. Whether or not it should be federalized is a subject to be discussed at some other time. There are arguments both pro and con on that subject. But when it comes down to the matter of reserves, I desire to call the attention of the committee, and any members of the Appropriations Committee present, to the fact that the Air Force Reserves have received very scant attention, either from the Congress or the National Defense Establishment, over the past several years. They have practically no quarters at all from which to operate. They have a very limited budget. Training time is exceedingly limited, and facilities available to them, including aircraft, are exceedingly limited. Now, it is expected that the reserve force attached to the Air Force will become the immediate replacement, in the event of hostilities, for those who are in the regular, active service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] has expired.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield three additional minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. It is, however, of vital importance that the Reserves be given proper training just as is the National Guard and just as, I say with some compliments, is the Naval Reserve Establishment. I think a better job has been done in the Navy in respect to its Air Reserve than has been done by any means, by any stretch of the imagination, by the Air Force. Whether that is a lack of attention, whether it is a lack of appropriations, whether it is due to the fact that the Air Force is a relatively new organization and has not yet been able fully to orient itself and organize all of the various devices necessary to provide training, I am unable to state; but I do state emphatically that it is highly important that these Reserve forces as well as the National Guard be given the best possible training that we may give a civilian group which works with the armed forces, such as our Reserve.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I may say that the committee looked into the Reserve problem, studied it from all angles. We recognized that the Air Force was still in its infancy. While they have a program, yet they did not expend all the money appropriated for their Reserve activities.

Mr. HINSHAW. I should like to point out also that the Navy, even before hostilities had ended, used some of the funds that had not been recaptured by the Congress for the purpose of providing Naval Reserve armories all over the United States. The National Guard had its own organization and saw to it that it was properly cared for in the various stations around the country that were available to the National Guard; but the Air Force Reserve had no particular organization, and no one was especially interested. They have practically no quarters today from which to operate and have but very few aircraft on which to train, and the enlisted Reserve of the Air Force is almost nonexistent.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The House Committee on Armed Services now is considering legislation that will provide armories for not only the National Guard but all other Reserve components of our armed services.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am glad to hear that. I would, however, like to see them trained together.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. I should like to state in addition that our committe proposes to start hearings at the end of next week for the purpose of providing adequate support to all these segments of our armed reserves.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that. I know he is interested and will lend every possible effort to it. Because of his interest I suggest that the gentleman visit the nearby air fields at the present time and inspect the Reserve installations which are supposed to be available for them. Then he and his associates will come back to the Congress with a factual report, having seen at first hand the scanty quarters, the scanty office space even, that is allocated to the Reserve force of the Air Force.

Mr. RIVERS. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman. That is one reason why we are going into this thing so immediately and so thoroughly.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman can start right over here at Bolling Field, then go out to Andrews Field, and so on down the line.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, has the gentleman any further requests for time?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I have no further requests for time.

Mr. VINSON. I have one request. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], 5 minutes, or such time as he may need.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Georgia yield for a consent request?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, VJ-day in Japan found scores of divisions and millions of the finest seasoned troops in the Mikado's army entrenched, fully trained, battle tested and equipped—ready to fight to their death in the defense of the Japanese homeland.

At the same time, and at that very hour, the great Navy of these United States, the most powerful naval force that ever sailed the seas—stood ready, willing, and able to make a successful

but without doubt—a costly and bloody landing in Japan.

Likewise, the Army of the United States, as well as the Marines—men who had fought their way across bloodstained fields and from island to island—was ready with scores of highly battle trained and equipped divisions of American soldiers also readied and willing to make the costly and bloody invasion which then seemed requisite to bring the Japanese to their knees but—in the words of Jimmie Doolittle of Tokyo fame:

> Then came the United States Air Force, a force which, when it went into action—made both that bloody and costly landing and invasion of Japan—wholly unnecessary.

Mr. Chairman, could any words more forcefully, more eloquently or more bluntly bespeak the reason why this House should today take favorable action with respect to H. R. 1437 which is a bill to authorize the composition of the Army and the Air Forces of these United States. I want to speak this afternoon of the Air Force.

Mr. Chairman, truly, we have traveled far and traveled fast since VJ-day in Japan. Some 18 months ago this Congress in its wisdom saw fit to establish the Air Force of our Nation as an armed service coequal with the Army and Navy of these United States. The history of the progress made by the United States Air Force in military aviation from the time of its inception has completely changed the picture of the national security since that memorable date.

Out of the developments which have been wrought, the United States Air Force guardedly reports that we now have planes that fly faster than the speed of sound—"hundreds of miles faster."

Just a few short months ago 50 United States Air Force bombers took off from bases on the other side of the globe carrying payloads of bombs that landed within minutes of the planned schedule time—at cities in these United States scattered all the way from Alabama to Minnesota and from New York to California.

Only last week a United States Air Force B-50, refueled by aerial tankers, also carried a payload of bombs at an average speed of more than 4 miles a minute all the way—encircling the earth and returned to her home base within 2 minutes of its return schedule landing.

Mr. Chairman, no longer are battleships and tanks the prime weapons of either military offense or of defense.

No longer will enemy forts or escarpments be prime military objectives. Instead, it is now the destruction of the little factory next door which makes some delicate instrument necessitous to the operation of a jet plane or a guided missile traveling at 10,000 miles an hour.

It is the mill down at the end of the street where ponderous presses are rolling out sheets to be fabricated in the airships which our men are now flying 8 miles above the earth and where high in the heavens they are now secure against antiaircraft artillery. Armed with veritable cannons pointing in all directions, they now travel at speeds which render them reasonably safe from both fighter and pursuit attack.

An air force, Mr. Chairman, consists of all the equipment, light, medium, heavy bombers, reconnaissance fighters, pursuit ships, transports and all other accouterments of aviation coupled with the men who fly them in the air.

Air power is an air force supplemented by the men, jobs, and the national resources that supply the military might of the air force. Cripple these and army divisions and battle fleets would stand helpless in the face of an enemy.

The national security of this Nation depends on congressional establishment of an air power in such strength as will enable us to immediately stand any attack from abroad and immediately strike back and destroy the ability of any potential enemy to wage war against us.

Mr. Chairman, the Joint Congressional Aviation Policy Board, after exhaustive fact finding, reported back to this House that—"Air power is the one thing most likely to discourage an aggressor attack upon this Nation."

We are here today legislating with respect to the most important bill that will come before us this session. It has to do with the strength necessary to insure the security of this Nation and our American way of life.

Two of the most deliberative bodies specifically concerned with our national survival in this air age of power, speed, destruction, and even possible annihilation of our great cities, have recommended to this Congress that for peacetime security we must have an air power based on a minimum of 70 air-force combat groups.

These two bodies were President Truman's Air Policy Commission and our own Joint Congressional Aviation Policy Board.

The same intensive studies that led to the recommendation for a regular United States Air Force of 70 groups determined that the Reserve components themselves should comprehend a minimum of 27 Air National Guard groups and 34 units of air Reserve, fully manned, trained, and equipped.

Mr. Chairman, the 70-group air force, however, is more than a slogan or a descriptive phrase. It is what the Air University and the staff of the United States Air Force has recommended to the Congress as the minimum number of aircraft and groups of divers aircraft that should be supported by annual appropriations made by this Congress. Moreover, it is the initial number of aircraft the replacement and replacement parts of which are necessary to insure an economically and factually sound operating aviation industry—capable—at once—of being expanded to meet any war emergency that might come.

Can we then, in this, the Nation's Congress, do less than take the advice of those charged with the defense of our national security when they come to tell us in their official capacities just what is the minimum force that is necessary to insure that defense?

There is no Member of this House that does not respect and revere the beloved Robert P. Patterson who served his country with enviable distinction as the Secretary of War during World War II.

In his testimony before the President's Air Policy Commission that eminent jurist and statesman, Secretary Patterson, said in part:

> We don't need the strongest standing Army in the world or the strongest standing Navy in the world, but we do need the strongest Air Force, because a powerful Air Force will cause any present or future aggressor to stop, look, and listen, and what's more, he will stay stopped.

Now, Mr. Chairman, with further respect to the 70-group long-range program, the Honorable Robert A. Lovett, the Acting Secretary of State, and who from 1940 to 1945 served as Assistant Secretary of War for Air, spoke in part as follows:

> This country has got to make up its mind whether it will be the leading air power. There is nothing more pathetic than a second-rate air power, because while you have a sense of security there is no security—as far as I know it is the cheapest way of buying security that there is.

Mr. Chairman, let me remind you, sir, and my colleagues what Gen. Carl A. Spaatz said in his testimony given to the President's Air Policy Commission, when he summarized his statement by saying:

> We need 6,869 aircraft for the 70 groups, including training; 3,212 for the Air National Guard; and 2,360 for the Air Reserve. The total amounts to 12,441 airplanes. To keep this force modern and up to date, we require an annual procurement of about 5,200 planes, amounting to approximately 46,414,000 pounds of air-frame weight.

And, then, again let me read from the report of Carl A. Spaatz, Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, to the Secretary of the Air Force in which he states:

> The requirements for a 70-group air force have been carefully examined and verified both by the President's Air Policy Commission and by the Congressional Aviation Policy Board. It cannot be overemphasized that this is the minimum force that can be kept in being without jeopardizing the security of the United States.

Now, let us hear what the Honorable Stuart Symington said in his testimony to President Truman's Air Policy Commission:

> The 70-group program was conceived as an expression of a minimum. * * * The continuing appraisal which this subject has received has tended more and more as time goes on to confirm the validity of the original concept of 70 groups as the minimum below which we cannot go without unacceptable risk. * * * It is a program which encompasses military air in all its phases, civil air, and the air industry of this country—all interrelated and interdependent.

And still further, Mr. Chairman, let me read from a statement made on May 26, 1948, by Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, in which he declared:

> The Air Force has maintained since 1945 that the minimum air force we could afford to have was 70 groups. I want to emphasize two things: First, our program is not a new program, generated by present world uncertainties and apprehensions.
>
> Second. It is a peacetime program.

The recommendations for the initiation and establishment of the 70-group long-range program has been carefully examined, verified, and concurred in by the President's Air Policy Commission as

well as by our own Congressional Aviation Policy Board.

Mr. Chairman, I would have you know and emphasize to my colleagues that the 70-group-air-force program is in the conscience of those charged with the defense of this Nation as being the minimum force that should be kept constantly in being—regardless of cost—so as not to find in jeopardy the security of these United States.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Congress of the United States and the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the Army, the Navy, and the United States Air Force have assigned to the United States Air Force its roles and missions.

The 70-group-air-force program, with its complement of personnel and equipment, is designed to carry out those delegated roles and missions on a basis of air strength and with an air force in being that will be feared by any potential enemy. Such a force will give us not alone the best chance of averting war but failing to avoid war, it will best and most economically provide the nucleus and basis for a potential air strength that will surely win the war.

Let me here quote, Mr. Chairman, from the recommendations made by President Truman's Air Policy Commission, wherein they reported:

> What we need * * * is an integrated Military Establishment—
>
> I. Capable of atomic attack.
>
> II. Stronger in air power than that of any other country.
>
> III. Capable of a self-sustained and powerful air counteroffensive, either directly or by the way of intermediate bases.

In the unsettled state of the world today we must constantly keep in mind the necessity for strengthening our Military Establishment if we are to continue our interest in world affairs. That situation has been candidly discussed both by the President's Air Policy Commission and the Congressional Aviation Policy Board.

In the defense of the Nation, each of the armed services have been given its mission.

Those assigned the Air Force include the following primary functions:

First. To be responsible for the defense of the United States against air attack, in accordance with the policies and procedures of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Second. To gain and maintain general air supremacy.

Third. To defeat enemy air forces.

Fourth. To control vital air areas.

Fifth. To establish local air superiority.

Sixth. To formulate joint doctrines and procedures, in coordination with the other services, for the defense of the United States against air attack, and to provide the Air Force units, facilities, and equipment required therefor.

Seventh. Most important of all—to be responsible for strategic air warfare.

The 70-group air force with its complement of personnel are the tools which we in this Congress must provide.

Mr. Chairman, I would like you to picture a 70-group air force, not as so many aircraft of various models, sizes, or uses, but rather as a tremendous force that files the air. Nor is it an air force made up solely of men wearing insignia of different ranks some of whom work on the ground while others fly the ships.

All planning for the implementation of the 70-group air force is predicated on a stabilized and specially tooled aviation industry. By a stabilized industry, I mean one that is operating—and each day furnishing a complement of aircraft and replacement parts from a production line manned by skilled workers who are trained in the production of the more than 60,000 component parts, which when assembled within the skin of an airplane, go to make up such a plane as a B-36.

Mr. Chairman, I would have you know that these 60,000 components are the products of more than 10,000 separate factories, of other plants which make up American aviation and allied industries.

I feel it unnecessary to say that all Air Force planning, as should be, is predicated on the assumption that our aircraft and equipment will be technically superior to that which any country is now—or will in the foreseeable future—be able to produce in quantity.

On the other hand, I would not be candid if I did not inform you that the bulk of the aircraft presently in our military service has been in use for some years and is now either obsolete or will be obsolescent before the procurements which we have asked for are delivered.

Mr. Chairman, military airplanes are not stock items.

The long-time lag of 5 years necessary to the planning, development, and perfection of modern aircraft therefore precludes the use of any but long-range procurement programs.

Therefore, the aircraft and equipment with which our units are supplied must be renewed and replaced by the latest up-to-date material at a rate which will not alone constantly insure a modern Air Force—but an Air Force capable of carrying out sustained wartime air operations—on short notice.

First and foremost of all the platform issues advanced by President Truman in the last campaign was his pledge to go all out for world peace. There is no man sitting on either side of this House that would not also give of his all to reestablish peace to this troubled world.

We in this body have legislated with respect to the Greco-Turkish program—we have voted billions for the Marshall plan and other programs—to insure world peace.

Only yesterday our State Department concluded conversations and negotiations with eight other nations with respect to concluding the historic North Atlantic defense pact.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before this House today will not alone complement but will implement every precedent action looking to peace.

It will insure not alone peace to our own United States but it will insure peace to the world.

Moreover, it will—at long last—insure to our Nation a stabilized aircraft industry. An aviation industry especially tooled, manned by a small complement of highly skilled workers on a production line producing the most modern and latest developed aircraft of every type.

The workers will find continuous employment in producing the minimum number of airplanes that will at the one time support a stabilized aviation industry and an Air Force in being, both of which can be expanded immediately to meet any and all foreseeable emergencies—and do so with the minimum expenditure of the taxpayers' dollar.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. I wish the ranking and majority members would assure the committee—the chairman has already done it—that in this bill in no way whatever have we tried to federalize either the National Guard or the Air National Guard.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time now to largely summarize what has already been said. This is an extremely important bill, extremely important to the future of this Congress and extremely important to the future of the United States.

This really marks the first time when we have gone to work legislatively and made a definite decision as to the size of our defense establishment. Someone has mentioned the fact that our distinguished chairman, when he was chairman of the old Naval Affairs Committee, made the point of having a legislative definite objective to which the Navy would work were it necessary for the defense of the country. But it is a matter of common knowledge that we have not done the same thing in reference to the Army and the Air Force.

I was a member of the old Committee on Military Affairs, and I can recall over the years, as far as the Army was concerned, we did at one time set an objective. I can recall when the war was coming on our legislative objective was set at the ridiculous figure of 280,000 men for the United States Army. A great world war was in the offing. When the war actually broke over Europe we had enlisted in our Army 265,000 men as the bulwark of protection for this great Nation in a tense time such as that.

So this bill does assume the responsibility legislatively of saying this is what the country needs. We have known what it needs from a Navy viewpoint. Now we know, under the terms of this bill, what it will need from the viewpoint of the United States Army and from the viewpoint of the Air Force.

A 70-group air force is nothing new. Four or five years ago the Committee on Military Affairs of the House was advised that if we were going to protect this country properly, we must have a 70-group air force, nothing less than that would guarantee the reasonable air protection that the country had a right to expect from its legislators. We delayed taking action on that matter, we delayed working out a definite formula and placing it in a bill to present to this Congress to be declared the legislative will of the Congress as to the size of the Air Force. In the meantime, we saw the new Air Force branch out, assuming new objectives and taking on new responsibilities. We saw it reaching out and expanding to greater size and greater accomplishment.

I like to think this year of the accomplishments of our Air Force in Europe. I do not refer to the new planes of supersonic speed and to the remarkable exploits so spectacular in their nature which we have recently seen in the papers; but I rather think of the exploits of our airlift in Berlin. I wonder what the history of the world would be today if our Air Force had not been ready to step into the breach and keep open the avenues and the lanes and the highways from our occupied territory into Berlin? I wonder what our situation would be in Europe? I know it would be precarious. I wonder what it would be today if our Air Force had not been able to take in by airlift needed supplies to Berlin, to keep our forces in Berlin going and to keep the population supplied with food during the critical winter weather?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. The gentleman will remember in the last Congress we passed the 70-group bill. I note in the report here it says, "In addition there will be a program of 22 separate squadrons." Is that in addition to the 70-group air force?

Mr. BROOKS. That is a part of the 70-group air-force program. That is the program.

Mr. CARROLL. There will be no increase in appropriation because of the 22 separate squadrons?

Mr. BROOKS. The whole thing will result in an increase in appropriations, of course, because a 70-group air force contemplates that by the year 1953 the cost will run something like six and one-half to seven billion dollars. That will be a considerable increase.

Mr. CARROLL. Just one further question along that line because it was not clear to me. In the 70-group air force, as I remember, we debated the cost of it and the expansion of it, and I wonder now if this bill adds something new of 22 separate squadrons. That is the real purport of my question.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, of course, at the time we were considering the additional appropriation to inaugurate the 70-group program in the last Congress we did not have all this spelled out, but we did speak of the 70-group program and that contemplated the additional squadrons that are now carried out in this language. It is the same program that we talked about when we increased the appropriation last year.

Mr. CARROLL. Based upon our action last year and the appropriation of money, how much of an increase is this program over our legislation of last year?

Mr. KILDAY. There is not any addition to that. This was then a part of it.

Mr. CARROLL. It is the same cost?

Mr. KILDAY. It is the same cost; the same program. This is supplemental to the 70 group as it was then and as it is now.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KILDAY. It is sea-air rescue and things of that kind.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank the gentleman very much. May I add this to what has been said. This is the same identical 70-air-group program. Since we first brought that before the House the Air Force assumed additional responsibilities over what they had last year, and the importance of the Air Force is beginning to rest more heavily upon the mind and the conscience of the people of the United States who want to see us develop a full grown-man's-size air force of 70 groups.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. As I read these hearings—and I wish the gentleman would correct me if I am wrong—the estimate of the number of men necessary for our armed services is predicated upon the 70-group air force, is that correct?

Mr. BROOKS. Well, for the air force, yes. Of course, we reach our legislative objective also for the United States Army.

Mr. YATES. Is it correct to state then that the 70-group air force was the groundwork, the basis, upon which the entire military estimates were made both with respect to the Air Force itself and for the Ground Forces?

Mr. BROOKS. I think it would be more nearly correct to say that what the committee had tried to do is to get a balance between the different branches of the service rather than to say we will arbitrarily set a 70-group air-force program as our objective in the air and then balance the other with that. I think the whole bill presents an over-all balance for the three branches of the armed services of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I thought it appropriate that I make a few remarks about this bill and the functioning of the Committee on Armed Services, of which I am a Member. I frankly say to the House that I have been very, very much pleased with the attitude of the witnesses who have appeared before us. I say that because I want it to appear on record, both in your minds and in our record of the proceedings of this House, that I find no attitude of mind—by any of the witnesses appearing before our committee to build up a strong military force of any sort having in mind either aggression or military power or aggrandizement of territorial rights, or anything of the sort. I find the attitude and the testimony to be that of a necessity of keeping strong enough, if needs be, to see that the peace of the world is not jeopardized or destroyed by warmongers or territorial aggressors.

The other statement I wish to make and emphasize to the attention of you, my colleagues, is this, that I likewise am pleased to see the increase of statements, made and the frequency of evident cooperation, and expression of purpose of the armed forces that there can be and should be a closer unit of coordination. This, I think, is imperative in the interest of the taxpayers of the country. I think also it is imperative that the armed forces of our great Nation more and more think in terms of operating as economically as possible, yet without jeopardizing the efficiency of our military forces or responsiblities. Their responsibility is tremendous.

Also, may I say that it is imperative that the armed forces of our Nation be kept strong enough until the world settles down to settle up so as to have sense enough, if you please, to live in terms of world peace and understanding. To me, it is radically inconsistent with our American philosophy of life or the heritages we have that any other objective shall be ours. We shall never be an aggressor nation. The only justification for our military strength is world leadership in peace.

I wish to emphasize that as I see the Armed Services Committee function; as I hear the witnesses come before us, my conclusion to date is that their sincere objective is to the end military, that the defense of our Nation and the military defense of the world is not for the purpose of agrandizement: It is not for the purpose of territorial expansion. It is not for the mere purpose of having force or military power, except insofar as we shall and must remain strong enough, if needs be, to protect democracy and the democratic way of life for our own Nation and for freedom-loving people to not be trampled under the feet of military aggression.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from California, my colleague.

Mr. JOHNSON. I wish to compliment the gentleman on his speech. I also want the record to show that the gentleman lost a distinguished son in this war, and paid a terrific price for our victory. His son was a first lieutenant in the Army Air Force and served with distinction throughout the Aleutian campaign.

Mr. DOYLE. In view of the fact that my distinguished colleague from California has made that remark about my own son, may I just say that we Members of the House and of the Senate who have given of our blood in times of war possibly sense, I think, more than anyone else, that the price of civilization is sacrifice, and likewise that the price of progress is unselfish devotion to the absolute necessity of the world's coming to its knees in terms of peace. Peace is indivisible; prosperity is indivisible; security is indivisible, and, therefore, our Nation must remain militarily strong enough that the peace of the world shall not be shattered by the aggression of any Nation.

While I was a Member of this House during the Seventy-ninth Congress, I voted for and strongly supported the United Nations organization, and I am glad that I did. I feel very strongly that the United Nations is our first hope

of an enduring world peace and understanding. It may be that the possession of our Nation and other nations in the world, now or in the future, of the knowledge of atomic energy or other processes will force the world to its knees as a result of fear of destruction. I pray God that that fear of destruction will not be the determining factor for world peace. Instead, I humbly pray that a common design for mutual progress and prosperity shall draw all men unto a high and common purpose for world-wide good will, and, Mr. Chairman and colleagues, there is no other way provided whereby the peace of the world can be made permanently secure. In the interim, and until there is clear and convincing proof to the world that no nation intends to aggrandize unto itself either territory or human beings, for the purpose of military or economic control thereof, we shall, Mr. Chairman, be obligated to ourselves, to our children and grand children, and to the rest of the world also, to remain sincerely and in good faith strong enough, but only strong enough, for the high purpose of remaining humble and at the same time militarily strong enough to do our full portion of preserving the peace of the world against any aggressors who might appear.

Therefore, let us pray and work unitedly to the cause of strengthening and supporting the processes of the United Nations. Therefore, let us do our utmost to the end that the world shall come to its knees and stay there in terms of world agreement. There is no other way whereby man can be saved.

My last comment is that I consider it a high honor, as well as a terrific responsibility, to be a member of the Armed Services Committee of this great Congress. I find myself sitting under a most distinguished and able chairman, together with a committee membership which appears dedicated to the proposition that the committee will do its utmost along the lines of the propositions and objectives which I have hereto stated.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, there being no more requests for time, I ask that the bill be read for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the previous order of the House, the Clerk will read the committee substitute as an original bill for the purposes of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. That this act may be cited as the "Army and Air Force Act of 1949."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the committee substitute, which is now being considered as the original bill, be dispensed with, and that the bill be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The remainder of the bill is as follows:

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. In enacting this legislation, it is the intent of Congress to provide an Army of the United States and an Air Force of the United States capable, in conjunction with the other armed services, of preserving the peace, security, and providing for the defense of the United States, its Territories, possessions, and occupied areas wherever located, of supporting the national policies, of implementing the national objectives, and of overcoming any nations responsible for aggressive acts imperiling the peace and security of the United States.

TITLE I—ARMY

AUTHORIZED COMPOSITION

SEC. 101. The organized peace establishment of the Army of the United States, including the Regular Army, the National Guard of the United States, the National Guard while in the service of the United States, and the Organized Reserve Corps, shall include all of those divisions and other military organizations, with their installations, and supporting and auxiliary elements, including combat, training, administrative, and logistic, and all personnel, including those not assigned to units, necessary to form the basis for a complete and immediate mobilization for the national defense in the event of a national emergency.

AUTHORIZED PERSONNEL STRENGTH

SEC. 102. (a) There is hereby authorized for the Army of the United States an active duty personnel strength of 837,000 officers, warrant officers, and enlisted persons, exclusive of such 1-year enlistees as are or may be authorized by law, officer candidates, personnel of the reserve components on active duty for training purposes only, persons paid under the appropriations for the National Guard and Organized Reserve Corps, and personnel and units of the reserve components ordered to active duty in an emergency hereafter declared.

(b) Of the active duty personnel strength authorized in subsection (a) of this section, not to exceed 33,500 may be active list commissioned officers of the Regular Army, exclusive of the numbers authorized by law for the Army Nurse Corps and the Women's Medical Specialist Corps, and 9,000 may be active list warrant officers of the Regular Army. Section 501 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 863) is hereby amended by striking out the words "fifty-one thousand" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "thirty-three thousand five hundred"; and hereafter the active list commissioned officer strength authorized in said section shall apply to the Regular Army, exclusive of the United States Air Force.

(c) There is hereby authorized for the National Guard and the National Guard of the United States a personnel strength, to be distributed among the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, of 750,000 officers, warrant officers, and enlisted persons, excluding those serving on active duty in the Army of the United States who are counted within the personnel strength of 837,000 authorized in subsection (a) of this section.

(d) There is hereby authorized for the Organized Reserve Corps a personnel strength of 980,000 officers, warrant officers, and enlisted persons, excluding those serving on active duty in the Army of the United States who are counted within the personnel strength of 837,000 authorized in subsection (a) of this section. Persons may be appointed as warrant officers in the Officers Reserve Corps under such regulations and in such numbers as the Secretary of the Army may prescribe.

MATERIALS AND PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to procure the materials and facilities, including guided missiles, necessary for the maintenance and support of the Army of the United States and its divisions and other military organizations, and their installations and supporting and auxiliary elements, including but not limited to (1) the supply of modern standard items of equipment; (2) the replacement of equipment as it becomes obsolete or unserviceable; (3) the provision of necessary spares and spare parts; and (4) the maintenance of such reserves of supplies and equipment as are necessary for the Army to perform its mission.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 104. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to conduct, engage, and participate in research and development programs related to activities of the Army of the United States and to procure, or contract for the use of, such facilities, equipment, services, and supplies as may be required to effectuate such programs.

APPROPRIATION AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 105. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such sums of moneys as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title. Except as may otherwise be provided in the appropriation act concerned, (1) any moneys appropriated to carry out the purposes of section 103 of this act shall remain available for obligation during the fiscal year for which appropriated and for the succeeding fiscal year, and shall remain available for expenditure for a total of 5 years; and (2) any moneys appropriated to carry out the purposes of section 104 of this act shall remain available until expended.

TITLE II—AIR FORCE

THE AIR FORCE OF THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 201. (a) The Air Force of the United States shall consist of the United States Air Force (the Regular Air Force), the Air National Guard of the United States, the Air National Guard while in the service of the United States, and the United States Air Force Reserve; and shall include persons inducted, enlisted, or appointed without specification of component into the Air Force of the United States; and shall further include all of those Air units and other Air organizations, with their installations and supporting and auxiliary combat, training, administrative, and logistic elements, and all personnel, including those not assigned to units, necessary to form the basis for a complete and immediate mobilization for the national defense in the event of a national emergency.

AUTHORIZED COMPOSITION

(b) The Air Force of the United States shall have an authorized strength of 70 United States Air Force groups, 22 separate United States Air Force squadrons, and 61 Air Force Reserve groups, together with necessary supporting and auxiliary United States Air Force and Reserve units.

AUTHORIZED PERSONNEL STRENGTH

SEC. 202. (a) There is hereby authorized for the Air Force of the United States an active-duty personnel strength of 502,000 officers, warrant officers, and enlisted persons, exclusive of such 1-year enlistees as are or may be authorized by law, officer candidates, aviation cadets, and personnel of the Reserve components on active duty for training purposes only, persons paid under the appropriations for the Air National Guard and United States Air Force Reserve, and personnel and units of the Reserve components ordered to active duty in an emergency hereafter declared.

(b) Of the active duty personnel strength authorized in subsection (a) of this section, not to exceed 27,500 may be active list commissioned officers of the United States Air Force and 4,800 may be active list warrant officers of the United States Air Force.

(c) There is hereby authorized for the Air National Guard and the Air National Guard of the United States a personnel strength, to be distributed among the several States, Territories, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia, of 100,000 officers, warrant officers, and enlisted persons, including those members of the Air National Guard of the United States serving on active duty in the Air Force of the United States who are not counted within the personnel strength of 502,000 authorized in subsection (a) of this section.

(d) There is hereby authorized for the United States Air Force Reserve a personnel strength of 500,000 officers, warrant officers, and enlisted persons, including those members of the United States Air Force Reserve on active duty in the Air Force of the United States who are not counted within the personnel strength of the 502,000 authorized in subsection (a) of this section. Persons may be appointed as warrant officers in the United States Air Force Reserve under such regulations and in such numbers as the Secretary of the Air Force may prescribe.

AIRCRAFT AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 203. The Air Force of the United States is hereby authorized 24,000 serviceable aircraft or 225,000 airframe tons aggregate of serviceable aircraft, whichever amount the Secretary of the Air Force may determine is more appropriate to fulfill the requirements of the Air Force of the United States for aircraft necessary to carry out the purposes of this act: *Provided*, That guided missiles shall not be included within the number of aircraft or airframe tons herein authorized.

PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 204. The Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to procure (1) 5,200 aircraft or 42,500 airframe tons annually, whichever amount the Secretary of the Air Force may determine is more appropriate, to provide the number of aircraft or airframe tons authorized by section 203 and to replace such aircraft as he may determine to be unserviceable or obsolete, (2) guided missiles, and (3) spares, spare parts, equipment, and facilities necessary for the maintenance and operation of aircraft and guided missiles herein authorized.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 205. The Secretary of the Air Force is hereby authorized to conduct, engage, and participate in research and development programs related to activities of the Air Force of the United States and to procure, or contract for the use of, such facilities, equipment, services, and supplies as may be required to effectuate such programs.

APPROPRIATION AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 206. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such sums of money as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title. Moneys appropriated to carry out the purposes of sections 204 and 205 of this title shall remain available until expended.

SAVING PROVISION

SEC. 207. No provision of this title shall be construed as modifying the existing status of the Air National Guard of the United States as a reserve component of the Air Force of the United States, or as amending or modifying in any way section 60 of the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended.

REPEAL OF EXISTING LAW

SEC. 208. Section 8 of the act of July 2, 1926 (44 Stat. 780), as amended by section 1 of the act of April 3, 1939 (53 Stat. 555), is hereby repealed.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SAVING PROVISION

SEC. 301. The provisions of this act shall be subject to the duties and authority of the Secretary of Defense and the departments and agencies of the National Military Establishment as provided in the National Security Act of 1947 (Public Law 253, Eightieth Congress).

SEPARABILITY PROVISION

SEC. 302. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCORMACK: Page 11, line 10, after the period insert the following sentence: "If the Secretary deems such action necessary to effectuate such programs he may procure or contract for the use or construction of a research laboratory, and for such purpose he may acquire necessary land by purchase or otherwise."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. The purpose of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts applies to section 104 regarding research and development authorization. Section 104 reads as follows:

The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to conduct, engage, and participate in research and development programs related to activities of the Army of the United States and to procure, or contract for the use of, such facilities, equipment, services, and supplies as may be required to effectuate such programs.

Now the gentleman from Massachusetts would add to that the following language:

If the Secretary deems such action necessary to effectuate such programs he may procure or contract for the use or construction of a research laboratory, and for such purpose he may acquire necessary land by purchase or otherwise.

In other words, the gentleman's amendment merely gives to the Secretary, if he determines that it becomes necessary to have a research laboratory, the authority to acquire one. But, of course, he will have to get the money from the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, so far as I am concerned individually, I have no objection to it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Would it be the gentleman's understanding that, under the language he has proposed, it would be possible for the Secretary to contract for the acquisition of land in advance of a specific appropriation?

Mr. McCORMACK. No, that would not be so.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, may I address a question to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Does your amendment provide for a Quartermaster laboratory?

Mr. VINSON. I think it would. It merely permits, according to the language of the gentleman's amendment, that the Secretary may decide that a research laboratory is necessary if the facts justify it. In other words, we are leaving it to him to locate one.

Of course, the Committee on Appropriations will control the whole matter. I am perfectly willing to leave it to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman knows, of course, there is pending at the moment before the Committee on Armed Services of the House several bills concerning a research laboratory. Extensive hearings were held by the House Committee on Armed Services during the Eightieth Congress and undoubtedly the good chairman will hold hearings during the Eighty-first Congress. To bring this matter up at this time is not fair to those Members who advocate the location of this research laboratory in their sections of the United States. Frankly, if this amendment is insisted upon, it is my intention to make a point of order that a quorum is not present so we may have a good representation on hand to discuss the matter from all angles.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the gentleman realizes that this amendment bears no relation to the matter which is pending before the committee. That is about the Quartermaster's. The amendment relates only to this provision which refers to the authority given to the Secretary of the Army. It seems to me that, with the tremendous interest and importance of research work and development work, the Secretary of the Army should be given authority, if necessary, to construct the building for that purpose. There is nothing here which says that he shall make this selection. There is nothing as to that at all. That is not included in the amendment. It has absolutely nothing to do with the matter which the gentleman from Pennsylvania refers to. It seems to me that we would certainly be failing in an important respect in the passage of this bill if we did not include this amendment in it.

Certainly it seems to me that the Secretary of the Army should be given authority, and wisely so. There is nothing in the amendment which directs any particular place. The gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] was chairman of a subcommittee last year which heard evidence. This amendment should be agreed to by both sides, to get it out of the way, and then leave the question with the Army as to just what recommendation it would make to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. Just to make plain exactly what the amendment provides, is this a correct statement: That if your amendment is adopted, then the Secretary of the Army can place the laboratory where he thinks it will best serve the Army?

Mr. McCORMACK. Where it will best serve the Army, in his judgment. Yes. Provided, of course, the Congress appropriates the money.

Mr. JOHNSON. Of course, I assume that. In other words, he is going to have the discretion to make studies and determine where it is best suited to carry on the work?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman knows this matter has been before our committee all last year and there was considerable controversy about it. May I ask the gentleman why he did not come before the committee and present the proposal he is presenting today, to give the committee an opportunity to pass on it and give it some consideration, without bringing it in here and expecting us to accept it immediately.

Mr. McCORMACK. I might ask the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON], how many weeks' hearings were held during the last Congress.

Mr. GAVIN. There is legislation now that is being considered. Why inject it into this bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. Here is a bill that covers the entire subject, to authorize the composition of the Army and the Air Force of the United States. This is the proper place to put it.

Mr. GAVIN. Why did you not bring it before the committee, then?

Mr. McCORMACK. It has been before the committee for months. Hearings were held for weeks before a subcommittee, and the subcommittee unanimously reported it out. This simply gives to the Secretary of the Army discretion, without stating what particular place. This is a fair amendment and both sides and everybody should agree to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the indication that there may be some debate on this, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I then move that all debate on this amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 10 minutes.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that this is a matter of some difference between members of the committee, I am going to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] if he will withdraw his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] withdraw the point of no quorum?

Mr. SHAFER. I will withdraw it, yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, in view of the attitude taken by some Members—and I thoroughly respect their right to do so—and with the understanding that the chairman will give an early hearing to this matter——

Mr. VINSON. Oh, yes. We will start on it just as soon as we finish three bills which we are considering now. We will then take this matter up and dispose of it.

Mr. McCORMACK. With that understanding, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

Mr. GREEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a statement. I am in perfect agreement with the other Members of the Pennsylvania delegation on this matter. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts to withdraw the amendment?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I believe there are no further amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee substitute.

The committee substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. LYLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1437) to authorize the composition of the Army of the United States and the Air Force of the United States, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 148, he reported the same back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 35]

Allen, Ill.	Dawson	Morrison
Anderson, Calif.	Dingell	O'Konski
Andresen, August H.	Dolliver	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Arends	Dondero	Plumley
Auchincloss	Ellsworth	Poulson
Barden	Fogarty	Powell
Barrett, Pa.	Gathings	Ramsay
Barrett, Wyo.	Gifmer	Reed, N. Y.
Bland	Gore	Rees
Blatnik	Hagen	Rich
Bonner	Hall, Leonard W.	Scott, Hardie
Boykin	Halleck	Simpson, Pa.
Brown, Ohio	Heffernan	Smith, Ohio
Buckley, N. Y.	Heller	Somers
Bulwinkle	Hinshaw	Stanley
Byrne, N. Y.	Hoeven	Talle
Byrnes, Wis.	Hoffman, Ill.	Taylor
Carroll	Holifield	Thomas, N. J.
Celler	Hope	Wadsworth
Chiperfield	Klein	Whittaker
Cole, N. Y.	LeCompte	White, Calif.
Cox	Lynch	Wickersham
Cunningham	McSweeney	Wilson, Ind.
Curtis	Macy	Withrow
Davenport	Madden	Wolcott
Davis, Tenn.	Miller, Md.	Wolverton

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and fifty-five Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

ARMY AND AIR FORCE BILL OF 1949

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a reading of the engrossed copy of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The bill must be laid aside until it is engrossed.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VINSON. After the engrossed copy is on the desk when will it be in order to call it before the House?

The SPEAKER. When it is engrossed.

Mr. VINSON. When will that be, Monday?

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot answer that.

Mr. VINSON. The reason of my parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker, is that I propose to ask for a roll call vote on the passage of the bill when the engrossed copy is presented to the House; and for that purpose I desire to announce it now.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HINSHAW (at the request of Mr. CASE of South Dakota) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from today's Star.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a letter.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from the American Legion and a resolution by that organization.

Mr. SCUDDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution of the Utilities Commission of the State of California.

Mr. McCULLOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks on the rent-control bill and include therein extraneous matter.

Mr. BURDICK, Mr. MITCHELL, and Mr. MANSFIELD asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in four separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the Railroad Trainman.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes tomorrow following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

BRADLEY UNIVERSITY, PEORIA, ILL.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to say just a few words about one of the smoothest-working machines of the day and what it has done to focus attention on Bradley University, Peoria, and the Eighteenth Congressional District of Illinois. I refer to the Bradley Braves basketball team, which yesterday was seated in the balcony.

Their sportsmanlike play, and unparalleled performance of precision, accuracy, and speed displayed thus far in the National Invitational Tournament now being held in Madison Square Garden is, indeed, a tribute to the excellent guidance of their young coach, Forrest Anderson, and to one of our country's youngest, most progressive and energetic university presidents, David B. Owen.

Bradley University has grown from a technological college enrolling 900 students in 1940 to a full accredited university of some 3,500 students from all over the world. It is regarded as one of the country's finest medium-sized universities.

We are proud of Bradley and proud to say that all the members of the present basketball squad are from the great State of Illinois. These boys truly represent the cream of American youth and in them we see exemplified the very best in clean sportsmanship and fair play.

My best wishes go with the team in their further venture toward their championship drive in the National Invitational Tournament.

SPECIAL CONTRIBUTION FOR RELIEF OF PALESTINE REFUGEES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 139 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 36) for the authorization of a special contribution by the United States for the relief of Palestine refugees. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 36, which authorizes an appropriation of $16,000,000 to aid the Arabian people. The total sum of $32,000,000 is required to adequately and fully aid them, $16,000,000 of which is the share of the United States. The other half of the $16,000,000 in pursuance to the United Nations agreement is being contributed or will be contributed by the other nations. Several other nations have already contributed their share.

I appreciate that the share of the United States is as much as the other nations that are called upon to contribute. That is because fortunately or unfortunately we are the richest Nation in the world and have as much as all the rest of them combined. I hope we will even increase that advantage in years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I realize also there are a great many gentlemen who will say that at least part of the $16,000,000 that the other nations contribute will come from the United States anyway. This includes France, Great Britain, and other nations. But that is our lot. We are not directly responsible for the conditions that confront us and we are trying to aid the nations of the world to safeguard democracy against the danger of communism.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which has given a great deal of time and study to this matter. It was because of the fact that the resolution was unanimously reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and there being no opposition, that this rule was granted. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, after which the bill will be read under the 5-minute rule.

I think it is in the interest of our country that we comply with the United Nations action because it will also place us in a favorable position with over 500,000 Arabs that need this help, and it will create a friendly feeling toward us not only with the Arabs but with other peoples of the nations in the Near East. It is a humane act and will not only inure to our benefit but will come back to us manyfold. At least that is what has been stated to the Committee on Rules by the gentlemen who urged action on this resolution. I know that the new chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE], and the members of the committee will clearly explain the provisions of the bill, the last bill reported by the late distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Sol Bloom, so I shall not take up any more time.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution came before the Committee on Rules, as has been stated by the chairman, with the unanimous approval of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I also would like to call attention to the fact that the matter before us is a joint resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 36, which was favorably enacted by the other branch on the 21st of February and has been pending here since that time. It has come to us as the result of a very unfortunate situation which developed in the Middle East as the result of the dislocations accompanying the establishment of the new state of Israel. Some 500,000 Arabs were driven from their homes and their usual places of employment.

The initial recommendation to have the nations of the world assist in taking care of these Arabs who have lost their possessions and lost their homes came from Mr. Bunche, who was then the mediator trying to establish a state of peace in the Middle East; and taking care of this very large group of refugees is an extremely important element in trying to secure peace in an area of the world which is of the utmost strategic importance to the United States. It is for that reason, sir, that I favor both the resolution before us and the passage of the joint resolution.

There is, however, one comment that I would like to make in regard to this type of legislation. It raises a point that I think is likely to become a more difficult one to handle in the future. The United States, for better or worse, has become a member of a great many different international organizations, many of them directly connected with the United Nations; others collaterally connected with the United Nations. Those organizations hold meetings in various sections of the world, sometimes to deal with emergencies, but more often to deal with matters that they believe to be of world-wide interest. At those meetings the United States is represented, as was the case in the particular matter that is now before us, and a proposal was made for joint international action requiring the expenditure of a considerable amount of money.

The American representative takes the position, as he did in that particular case, of approving the resolution for requests for voluntary contributions from the different nations of the world totaling some $32,000,000. Then the American representative agreed that a proper share, in his opinion, of that total was one half, a different percentage from that usually used in United Nations distribution of funds, and agreed to recommend to his Government that the sum of $16,000,000 be paid by this Government.

Now, what actually happens? That particular individual in the field cannot commit the Congress of the United States, but again we run into that problem that we have run into over and over again, that other nations believe that we are committed because of the statements made by our representatives abroad. Some $5,000,000 has already been paid

into this particular fund by different nations, all assuming that the United States was committed to its share of the total.

You can read in the press that the United Health Organization, that has just been meeting in Geneva, has been discussing a very much enlarged program for the future. Again, we shall probably be called upon to pay for a considerable proportion of that program.

It seems to me the fundamental question that is raised here is the relationship between the Executive and the Congress. The Congress quite naturally, not being able to follow in detail many of these things that are happening, resents the apparent commitment that is made by representatives of the Executive at these meetings. Other nations do not understand our situation. As far as I know, we have no mechanism by which the Executive discusses in advance with responsible members of the legislative branch whether or not it would be wise for the Executive to make these implied commitments at the time they are made. I feel very strongly that some mechanism stronger, perhaps, than the watchdog mechanism, but something worked out by the leaders, must be instituted unless we are going to find ourselves in serious embarrassment in our international relations.

In this case there is a large sum of money involved. It is a sum of money that I do not believe 10 percent of the Members of Congress have the vaguest idea we were committed to.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman has put his finger on something that has been worrying committees of this House for a long time. As long as you authorize legislation setting up international organizations, the Committee on Appropriations is duty bound to appropriate money for the functions of those organizations.

We have held hearings year after year, with the State Department coming before our committee complaining that it is impossible for them to reduce appropriations for international organizations because Congress has authorized the formation of these organizations in which we participate, and today there are a score or more of international organizations in which we have representation, in which we pay the major cost.

It is a problem that is disturbing to us and it is a problem that is disturbing the State Department. Of course many of these organizations are necessary. The gentleman's contribution to this subject is very valuable. The Congress should be placed on notice that something should be done immediately to go over this entire vast number of international organizations in order to get them down to a real basis of necessity. There are just too many of them.

Mr. HERTER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I repeat, however, that insofar as this particular legislation before us today is concerned, someone might feel that this is a good time to make an issue, for the Congress to take a stand and oppose this particular commitment, but I feel that it would be highly unfortunate if we took this particular case on which to make a stand, because at best the good will we possess in the Arab world and the Moslem world today is pretty small. Those areas are of the utmost strategic importance to us in the global warfare, cold, if you want to call it that, that is going on in the world. I can think of nothing that would be more unfortunate than for us to refuse to help these refugee Arabs in their particular plight.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. Is it not particularly important at this time—when there is a meeting coming up on Monday on the refugee problems of the Arab nations in Beirut?

Mr. HERTER. That is only one of the considerations. There are others that are taking place, including negotiations with Saudi Arabia at the present time, which are equal in importance.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. MORGAN. This is only a temporary organization which will expire in August 1949, and is not like the World Health Organization.

Mr. HERTER. The gentleman is quite right. It was created because of an emergency.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, if there are no further requests for time, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 36) for the authorization by the United States for the relief of Palestine refugees.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 36, with Mr. ROONEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the joint resolution was dispensed with.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I call the attention of the House to the fact that this is the first time a bill has come from the Committee on Foreign Affairs under the able and distinguished leadership of the gentleman from West Virginia as chairman. He is a good chairman, and I know that all Members of the House wish him well, as do the members of his committee.

Mr. KEE. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his flattering contribution.

Mr. Chairman, the measure we have before us today has already passed the other body. This measure authorizes an appropriation of $16,000,000 as the contribution of the United States Government, as stated in the resolution, to the United Nations for the relief of Palestine refugees.

Incidentally, I might remark that the title is somewhat of a misnomer, since it indicates that it is a Jewish relief measure. As a matter of fact, there are only 7,000 Jewish people included in the provisions of the measure, while there are 500,000 Arab refugees who are to be assisted. As a further matter of fact, our latest information is to the effect that instead of 500,000 Arabs, there are at the moment 700,000 Arab refugees to be relieved. This fund of $32,000,000 has been set up by the United Nations. I believe I am safe in saying that this constitutes a precedent in the work of the United Nations, for it is the first time, so far as I am advised, that the United Nations has attempted to set up a general fund for relief of peoples throughout any quarter of the world. The fund is set up because of the fact that in September 1948 the then mediator for Palestine, Count Bernadotte, reported to the United Nations that a tremendous number of refugees scattered throughout the Arab countries, were in need of immediate assistance. No cognizance was taken of that report at once, but in September or October of the same year Mr. Ralph Bunche, who had succeeded Count Bernadotte as mediator, also made a report with reference to these refugees, filing that report with the United Nations. In the report he stressed the condition of those refugees, who were scattered all over the area adjoining the new State of Israel, and opened the way for a request by the United Nations of all membership countries throughout the world to make contributions.

In speaking of the share of the fund to be contributed by the United States, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] mentioned that such share was allocated by reason of a statement made by our representative before the United Nations. I believe I can supplement that by saying that President Truman, in December I believe, made a public statement that we would be willing to contribute to the fund for the relief of these refugees, provided that fund did not exceed $16,000,000. Therefore, the resolution does not directly authorize a total of $16,000,000, but authorized the appropriation of funds which shall not exceed a total of $16,000,000.

This situation in respect to the Palestine refugees arose as you all probably know without my telling you, through the hostilities that took place in Israel's efforts for the establishment of a separate state. During the fight there were countless thousands of Arabs who were residents of that portion of Palestine that now comprises the State of Israel. There was an exodus of thousands from that State into adjoining Arab territories. They left behind them their homes, their possessions, everything they had, and fled for sanctuary to the adjoining countries. They are there now. They are in Iraq. They are in Lebanon.

They are in all the countries of the Near East contiguous to Israel. As I stated, they are without homes, without food, without clothing, without shelter, and without occupation.

The effort to relieve these refugees has been going on ever since this fund was established by the United Nations in November 1948. For the first time in the history of the United Nations, it dipped down into its own treasury, on account of the critical condition of affairs and the necessity of those people, and contributed to this fund $5,000,000 from its working capital.

The Arab countries have so far contributed out of their meager resources over $4,000,000 to the fund. Twelve other countries in the world have, since the establishment of the fund, contributed a total of $5,256,000. That is where they have been getting the money to carry on the relief that is now in progress.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEE. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. Will the gentleman name the countries that have contributed the $5,000,000?

Mr. KEE. Australia, $100,000; Belgium, $432,000; Canada, $726,000; Denmark, $130,000; Egypt, $166,000; France, $253,100; and I might remark in passing that France has announced her intention of contributing 600 million francs, or $1,600,000 to the fund; India, $60,770; New Zealand, $95,000; Norway, $60,000; Pakistan, $30,000; Sweden, $270,000; Turkey $44,000; Union of South Africa, $31,000; and the United Kingdom, $3,629,000. That constitutes the list of countries so far contributing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, on the evidence before us there is no question about the need for this relief. It has been made doubly evident to us. Not only is there a need for the relief from a humanitarian standpoint, but also there is need for us to go to the relief of these people from an economic and a political standpoint. There are from five to seven hundred thousand Arabs without employment, without food, without clothing, homeless and shelterless.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEE. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Does this apply to all refugees in Palestine? I know the gentleman is aware of the fact there are many Christian refugees in Palestine who also have suffered. Will they be taken care of under this resolution?

Mr. KEE. It is our presumption that it will apply to all refugees with the possible exception of the 7,000 Jews mentioned, for whom the United Nations may not be required to furnish aid. They can participate, however, and if they need it, it will be given them; but we understand that Israel itself has been taking care of about 20,000 Jewish refugees a month, and resettling them in proper safe locations.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. And all of the refugees would have equal rights under this resolution?

Mr. KEE. I would so interpret it. It is under the administration of the United Nations.

Mr. Chairman, I hope there will be no question about passing this meritorious measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has again expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I favor the pending resolution and I hope the House will pass it. It is an elementary, humanitarian measure in the great American tradition to help the innocent victims of war in a turbulent area of the world—an area critically important to our national security.

These Arab refugees left their homes because of the war situation and the urging of misguided Arab leaders. They are now encamped in the Arab areas of Palestine and in the surrounding countries notably in Syria, Lebanon and Transjordan, which just cannot support them. Their distress is very grave. The United Nations has undertaken their relief as a part of its general effort to bring about stability and peace in the Middle East between Israel and the Arab states. The Palestine Conciliation Commission created by the United Nations of which the United States, France and Turkey are the members, will deal with this problem of the Palestine refugees as one of the problems in the peace. In order to forward the work of the Commission and give it conditions under which it has a fair chance of success, these Arab refugees must be succored. The whole Middle East will appreciate the cooperation and generosity of the United States in relieving the distress of these refugees. It will also enable a resettlement program to be proceeded with in an orderly way. The Congress by enacting this resolution will be making a real contribution to the final settlement, with justice, which we all so fervently desire for the Middle East.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, the United States is a member of the International Refugee Organization under the United Nations. We have assumed the legitimate obligation to take care of refugees under the United Nations. This problem of the Arab and Jewish refugees has come up in a strategic area that affects our safety and calls for our humanitarian judgment.

I believe it is necessary to pass this bill today because on Monday there will be a meeting of the Arab nations with our representative to work out the refugee problems. We will greatly strengthen the hands of our representative if we pass this bill at the present time.

In addition, we have negotiations going on with various of these countries that, if we act as we should and take the responsibility for that area as we have taken it for others, will be very much to the advantage of the United States. I believe, too, that because this is an area where both Jews and Arabs are involved and we have taken care of the Jewish displaced persons under the International Refugee Organization, in all equity, we should extend the same assistance to the Arabs who are likewise displaced. Let us be just and friendly to the distressed of these two great peoples.

May I finish by complimenting the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from West Virginia, Judge KEE, for a very fine, full, and complete statement on this matter. It is a pleasure to serve with him for the best interests of our good country on the distinguished Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I heartily concur in all that has been said in support of this resolution. It is another step forward along the path of peace. We are putting into effect the Biblical teaching that we are our brother's keeper.

No powerful lobby pressures us to pass this bill. None of the poor people to be helped by it can vote for or against us. In the spirit of friendship and good will we hold out a helping hand to those who cannot help themselves.

May I, at this time, point out to this body a most regrettable incident that was reported yesterday by radio from Bagdad. Seven Iraqi Jews have just been condemned to death by the Iraqi Government for no other reason than their espousal of the cause of zionism.

The incident is the more regrettable because it comes on the eve of the meeting of the Conciliation Commission of the United Nations.

I am proud of the fact that I was among the first to raise my voice in this House against the inhuman and unconscionable treatment of Cardinal Mindszenty. I trust that the Members of this House will be aroused to the same extent to voice their disapproval of the inhuman conduct of the Iraqi Government. Membership in the United Nations carries with it the obligation to support in practice all human rights and any state that violates any provision of the Charter of the United Nations should be instantly and severely condemned.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON].

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the question, where are they going to put these 500,000 or 750,000 Arabs? Are they going to be in Africa next year; then we will have a million Africans to take care of?

Mr. VORYS. The United Nations Assembly has passed a resolution providing they should be repatriated or compensated and as a result of the settlement as shown in the report most of them will probably settle down in the Arab part of the world.

Mr. MORTON. They are not going to become displaced Arabs in Arabia to give us an Arab problem?

Mr. VORYS. No. This whole thing runs only to the next crop in September. It is contemplated that the settlement

which we all fervently hope and pray will take place will dispose of this problem for good.

Mr. MORTON. The next crop of what? Displaced persons or what?

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. The next harvest.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, it was brought out previously that eleven nations had contributed but I did not hear of any contribution or proposed contribution by Russia. Can any explanation be made why this condition prevails?

Mr. KEE. I cannot answer for Russia. I may say that the contribution is made by the United Nations.

Mr. FORD. In the past has Russia made contributions comparable to ours in other similar situations?

Mr. KEE. None that I know of.

Mr. FORD. Is there any explanation as to why that is so?

Mr. FULTON. Russia is not a member of the particular organization of the United Nations dealing with refugees and has never joined. She has recently gone out of the Health Organization and she has not come into these other organizations. So on this particular level she is not cooperating or joining.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are not other requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, not to exceed $16,000,000 as a special contribution by the United States to the United Nations for the purposes set forth in the resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations of November 19, 1948, providing for the relief of Palestine refugees.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the sum "$16,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$12,764,800."

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, regardless of the merits of the pending measure I am very much disturbed at hearing the remarks made by the gentleman from Massachusetts, when he was discussing the rule, in which he said that this is one of perhaps other items which have happened in the past and will happen in the future unless we put a stop to it; that there are commitments made, without any congressional authority and without any limitation or any standard, proposing to spend money, which it is the constitutional duty of the Congress to spend and appropriate as they see fit, and not as some agent who is not authorized sees fit.

The gentleman from Massachusetts mentioned that this commitment was made by Mr. Bunche or some other agent of ours in connection with a conference held on this problem. I was not too much impressed with the reply that was made to that by the gentleman from West Virginia, who indicated that there was some sort of a newspaper statement by the President indicating that we ought to contribute not to exceed $16,000,000. The President has no authority to commit us; no more authority than anyone else.

In order to protect the principle involved here, and to protect the congressional right to limit these appropriations and not to respond to these commitments which are made without authority, my amendment proposes merely that the appropriation of $16,000,000 as proposed in this bill be reduced to $12,764,800, which, if my rather hurried arithmetic is correct, represents 39.8 percent of a total of $32,000,000, which is the standard heretofore set up for this country as our share of general UN expenses.

I call your attention further to the fact that in reading the list of nations which are contributing that the Soviet Union is not contributing. I call your attention further to the fact that in these contributions made before, many of the contributions indicated to be made by other nations have been welched on, so that we are usually left holding the bag anyway. I call your further attention to the fact that the contribution, as I remember it being read, from India, that fabulously rich country, although a new nation, was, I think, about $60,000, as I understood the gentleman from West Virginia.

Regardless of the fact that our share is probably in excess of what should be borne by us, regardless of our great wealth, we are still only 1 of 40 or 50 Members in this situation, and I still think that we ought to preserve some standard for our contributions. I therefore urge the committee to at least reduce the $16,000,000 proposed to be appropriated without our authority to the standard heretofore set of 39.8 percent, which would make it, as I figure, $12,764,800.

I see no reason for taking more of your time. It seems to me that the purpose of the amendment is perfectly plain, and I ask the support of the committee. Incidently, it will effect a saving of $4,000,000. I would like to hope that we treat our millions with more respect.

Mr. Chairman, I have supported all measures providing for our equitable participation with other countries in our joint effort for peace and order, which we call the United Nations. But I object to our country assuming the whole burden, or more than our share of the burden. That is the essential purpose of the amendment.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman's amendment is based on a misunderstanding of what the contribution of the United States has been in other foreign relief measures. He based his figure on the assumption that the contribution of the United States to the United Nations has been about 39.89 percent. As a matter of fact, the 39.89 percent figure has been our contribution to the administrative expenses of the United Nations—I said administrative expenses. The proportion of operative expenses of the United Nations paid by the United States has been something over 45 percent. The United States has contributed, in organizations such as UNRRA as much as 72 percent. The 72 percent figure was arrived at on the basis of relative national income. Since that time we have been attempting to get other contributing nations to increase their contributions to world relief programs. On this occasion, which was considered an extraordinary occasion, it was felt by all concerned that 50 percent would be a fair contribution on the part of the United States.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the distinguished chairman of our committee.

Mr. KEE. I also wish to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that our contribution to the IRO, that is, the refugee organization, is 45.5 percent, and our contribution to the International Children's Fund is 50 percent.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman is correct. In the Children's Fund it is 50 percent, and in the IRO it is 45 percent plus. In the case of UNRRA it was 72 percent plus. So this figure of $16,000,000 is fair.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HAND. The gentleman stated that this figure was agreeable to all concerned. Who does he mean by all concerned?

Mr. RICHARDS. Maybe the gentleman misunderstood me. I do not know that I said this figure was agreeable to all concerned, although I assume it was.

However, the 39.89 percent figure the gentleman mentioned came from the calculations of our proportionate share of the administrative expenses of UN.

Mr. HAND. Does not the gentleman feel that that is a fair and reasonable, and even a generous, standard?

Mr. RICHARDS. No, I do not think so.

Mr. HAND. Does the gentleman feel we ought to contribute five times as much as the United Kingdom?

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I want to make the distinction, if I may, that this is an operative budget, as distinguished from an administrative budget, and that it will be the Red Cross and private agencies that will administer this, so that this is operative and not administrative. The previous budget that has been spoken of, with a smaller percentage, was an administrative, over-all budget, while this is operative.

May I add, too, that on the children's fund, when other nations put in money to the children's fund under the United Nations, it goes up as high as 72 percent for the United States' contribution, and 28 percent for the other participating countries. So this is actually a very small participation in an operative budget.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman is correct, and I thank him for his contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. What right does the representative of the American Government have to commit us to any appropriation without first securing congressional approval?

Mr. RICHARDS. The representative of the American Government did not commit us to anything. The representative of the American Government, Dr. Bunche, requested the United Nations to call for voluntary contributions from contributing nations. That is what happened. Nobody committed the United States to anything.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I think it is important to get into the RECORD that the 72 percent that the United States contributed to UNRRA was based upon the national income of the United States as compared to the national income of other countries. That contribution was made on the basis of each contributing nation giving 1 percent of their national income.

This 1 percent from the United States equaled 72 percent of all contributions made.

Mr. RICHARDS. That is correct. I thank the gentlewoman. I tried to say that just now, but she stated it much better than I could.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Is it not a fact that the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which recommends this amount and brings this bill to the floor, have unanimously reported it out of committee?

Mr. RICHARDS. That is correct. I hope very much that this figure of $16,000,000 will not be cut down. If we contribute anything, I think we should con- $16,000,000.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. FELLOWS. Does the nation of Israel make any contribution?

Mr. RICHARDS. I understand that Israel is already contributing 100 percent of relief to 250,000 displaced Jews who have already gone there. But this is primarily an Arab relief bill. I assume that Israel will also contribute to this fund.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot sit idly by and see these internationalists continue to drag America down toward bankruptcy, and build up ungrateful enemies for us throughout the world. Ten years ago they were hammering at me because I was trying to induce the administration to take a course which would have kept us out of this last World War. I was convinced then, and I am convinced now, that by pursuing the proper course, the administration could have kept England, France, and the United States out of this war and let Germany and Russia fight it out between themselves. But our wild-eyed internationalists were determined to get us into the war on the side of Soviet Russia. I am like the old fellow who said that his friend would not go to purgatory for a dollar, but that he would fish around the edge until he fell in. We finally fell into the war backwards, through some kind of stupidity that the American people do not understand, because no intelligent American can understand how our leaders went to sleep and let the Japanese come 5,000 miles and destroy our fleet at Pearl Harbor.

We have gone through that war. It has cost us more than $300,000,000,000. In it we sacrificed a million of the finest men the world has ever seen, to say nothing of the maimed and otherwise disabled. It has burdened us with a national debt that is so great that our great-great-grandchildren will not live to pay it.

We hear men howling to high heaven because we want to take care of our own veterans of the First World War, yet they are voting $5,400,000,000 to pour into the sinkholes of Europe, Asia, Africa, and Israel. The other day they had a broadcast coming from over there and here is what the Communist leader in Israel, Meir Willner, had to contribute. He said:

Nobody in Israel will raise his hand against the Red army if and when the world plunges into war.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I cannot sit idly by and see the people I represent, and the American people as a whole, further dragged into the quagmire of international bankruptcy without a protest.

They tell us that our national debt exceeds the combined national debts of all the other nations of the earth.

Here we have displaced a group of people and set up a government which, in my opinion, is nothing but a satellite of Soviet Russia.

After our boys had fought and won the war, somebody seems to have sold us down the river, by turning both Europe and Asia over to Communist Russia.

Now we are called on to feed and clothe not only the people that we are supposed to have displaced to make way for communism, but we are spending untold billions of dollars to feed and clothe our former enemies. We are said to be spending $400,000,000 a year to feed and clothe the Japs, whose brutality to American prisoners surpassed in brutality anything humanity has ever seen from the standpoint of inhuman beastiality.

Four hundred million dollars a year, in addition to the expense of our military occupation of Japan.

But when you propose to pension our old World War veterans who are now past their earning capacity, they threw up their hands in holy horror.

Keep this movement up, and you will drag America down to international bankruptcy. That is what our enemies, both at home and abroad, are working for.

I shall vote against this measure, and against every other one to further burden the American people with foreign obligations and drag us down into the international quagmire of bankruptcy and destruction.

I hope this bill is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I have been sitting here for years listening to that same speech before Pearl Harbor, and I am hearing it now. I have just about reached the end of my endurance. Before Pearl Harbor the gentleman was opposed to every bill necessary for the defense of our country.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, there is not a word of truth in that statement.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not yielding to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. You will not get away with that kind of stuff.

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, sit down. I refuse to yield, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I demand that those words be taken down. He is not going to get by with that stuff here.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlemen will take their seats.

The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I have been sitting here for years listening to that same speech before Pearl Harbor and I am hearing it now. I have just about reached the end of my endurance. Before Pearl Harbor the gentleman was opposed to every bill necessary for the defense of our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. ROONEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration Senate Joint Resolution 36, for the authorization of a special contribution by the United States for the relief of Palestine refugees, certain words used in debate were objected to, and on request were taken down and read at the Clerk's desk, and he herewith reported the same to the House.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I have been sitting here for years listening to that same speech before Pearl Harbor, and I am hearing it now. I have just about reached the end of my endurance. Before Pearl Harbor the gentleman was opposed to every bill necessary for the defense of our country.

The SPEAKER. The present occupant of the chair has had questions of this kind arise on many, many occasions. They are always to be regretted; but this occupant of the chair has always been in favor of a wide range of discussion and debate and expression of opinion.

The Chair would think that objection was made to this language:

Before Pearl Harbor the gentleman was opposed to every bill necessary for the defense of our country.

The Chair interprets that not as a statement of fact, but as the opinion of

the gentleman from Massachusetts as expressed in debate. The Chair would therefore hold that the language, expressing an opinion in debate and not stating a fact, was not a violation of the Rules of the House.

The Committee will resume its sitting.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts will proceed.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman had said on various occasions that appropriating $5,600,000,000 was like throwing it down the ratholes of Europe, Asia, and Africa. I do not take off my hat to the gentleman from Mississippi, or anyone else, in my loyalty to my country; and no one else in this Chamber need do so either.

I do not question his sincerity, his motives, or his patriotism, but I have a right to disagree with his judgment. On the one hand we hear him talk about communism, and yet those of us who vote on this legislation do so because we recognize that if Italy, France, Sweden, Norway, Finland, the Netherlands, all the countries of Europe get under the domination of Communist regimes it would not in our opinion be for the best interest of our country; certainly, it would not be for the national interest of our country.

There are some of us who believe we have got to take forward action, affirmative action, in order to prevent Europe's becoming dominated by Communist regimes; and we believe that such action on our part is for our national interest. I think we cannot have a world dominated by communism, and feel free as a nation ourselves. For several hours today we had under consideration a bill, one of whose purposes was the development of our own power as a means of conveying to any potential enemy, the fact that America has power and that others must respect that power. The words of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] in his eloquent speech aptly described my state of mind. Now, we have been hearing these innuendoes. I do not like them, I resent them. I have no feeling against anyone because of accident of birth. I was not consulted when I was brought into this world, neither was anyone else and I do not think accident of birth should operate against any one. In my consideration of them a person's view is his own right and I respect his religious view. All I ask is that my conscience be respected. I have no difficulty getting along with my fellow men, any of my fellow beings, because I have no feeling against anyone because of accident of birth. A man's racial origin means nothing to me, a man's color means nothing to me, a person's name means nothing to me. A person's religion I respect. But what does mean everything to me is a person's mind. When I find nice persons, I do not care what their name is or what their racial origin is or their religion, which I respect. If I meet a person with a poor mind, a bad mind, a low mind, and a bigoted mind I am meeting a person I do not like, a person that I do not consider nice; a person I have nothing but contempt for.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The CHAIRMAN. Such a point may not be raised in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, yes; where the offense is committed in the Committee of the Whole, it is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The proper remedy is to have the words taken down.

Mr. RANKIN. The words have been taken down and were read by the Clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. I may say to the gentleman from Mississippi that the Speaker of the House has already ruled on that.

Mr. RANKIN. I mean they were read by the Chairman, in which the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] deliberately and falsely accused me of opposing every measure for the defense of my country prior to Pearl Harbor. I rise to a question of personal privilege to brand that statement as an infamous falsehood.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to demand the taking down of the words of the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Take them down.

Mr. McCORMACK. Do not do that because they do not bother me at all.

Mr. SABATH. I know they do not bother the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], and I have no quarrel with him, without revision leaves in the RECORD the remarks he just made, especially the last few sentences, I hope he will reread them tomorrow morning, and if he does I am sure his usual sense of fairness will cause him to withdraw them. In view of the Speaker's ruling, I hope every Member of the House will read those remarks, particularly the last five or six sentences, especially that statement of the gentleman that "I think my words are clearly understood." Much as I dislike to differ, I think the preceding description of the kind of person the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] dislikes, viewed in the light of what had previously been said by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], coupled with the last sentence uttered by the gentleman from Massachusetts was a violation of the rule, and under precedents, raised a question of personal privilege, for the remedy of having a Member's words taken down is not exclusive.

I have only been here a short time, having come down in 1935. I have heard the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] many, many times speak on the floor of this House.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], referring to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], said, "It has been hard for me to endure. I cannot endure it any longer," or that in substance.

Well, it has been hard for me sometimes to listen to the gentleman from Mississippi when he talked about the TVA, because I have no use for it, but I did not resign because I did not like it or because I could hardly sit on the floor and listen to him. That, however, was my remedy if I wished to use it. I stayed here, and I am going to stay if I can, and I will not ask anyone to cease talking just because what he says is distasteful to me. I hope the day will never come when in this House a Member cannot state his honest, sincere opinion without having his loyalty, his intelligence, his fairness, his judgment challenged by his colleagues.

I may be entirely wrong, but I know of no man in this House who has been on the floor of the House since I have been here who has fought communism more vigorously, more effectively, or more persistently than has the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. He has, week after week, year in and year out, here in Congress in spite of the smearers—defying them, fought the good fight of his constituents, for the people of this country, and for his Nation. He has fought so hard and so successfully against the Communists that it has become and is politically embarrassing to some who are not Communists but who are willing to accept communistic support.

I say, I know of no man, who, in the opinion of many Members of the House—and I have heard them express their opinions—made a greater effort to keep us out of war, and who after we were in more vigorously supported the war effort, than did the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. I know that whatever may be the feelings or the words of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], deep down in his heart he is not for one moment questioning the patriotism or the sincerity of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. I know that. The gentleman from Massachusetts has been talking, but he knows as I know and as we all know that our colleague from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has had to take a beating time and again, from certain groups, minority groups in this country, not once, but day after day, and I, for one, feel honored to be permitted to sit in the House with him. I may not like some of his words—some of his philosophy—but I do know that he is a true loyal American, ready to fight, anyone, anything, anytime, or place when he thinks his country calls.

On this matter which is before us now today, if I understood the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] correctly, he said that a certain faction in Palestine had driven some of another faction out into the desert and therefore we must take care of those who are now in need. I assume that is true. Then the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] said—and this was his point; he did not say it but he made the point that down through the years we in Congress have permitted—because we created agencies—our agents to go out all over the world and without authority make promises which later we have been called upon to fulfill. We know very well that in the debates over the last few years while the war was on and after the war was over we were told from the well of the House by men who were sincere and honest

that we had made commitments that we must go through with. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] suggested that there must sometime be a halt to that procedure. I do not know whether this is the time to call a halt to that practice. I do not know whether this is the time to do it or not, but I am thoroughly convinced that soon, unless this Nation is to be bankrupt, not only financially, we will have to put an end to creating agencies—permitting those in the executive departments to go all over the world and make promises which later we must fulfill. I hope the day will come, and that right soon, when the Congress will have the courage to lay down a policy on matters of that kind, and to cut the assumption of power of those who year after year commit us to a policy which is absolutely ruinous, not only to our financial condition, but morally and intellectually, and to our standing in the world.

We are promising other peoples, other nations, altogether too much. I am thinking, as I am sure the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] is thinking, of some of our folks at home, hundreds of thousands of the older people, millions of those who served us in foreign wars. We have not done enough for them. We have not buildings for the tenants; and so yesterday we passed a rent-control law. We have not housing for the veterans and others and soon will be called to adopt and finance a housing bill. But we have billions for those abroad. In this case, some sixteen millions.

When, oh, when will we begin to think of the folks at home?

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the question is, What is the amount in which we should contribute to this emergency-relief fund for the Arab refugees? It has been recommended, and recommended only, by the representative of the United States, that we subscribe $16,000,000 out of the total necessary fund of $32,000,000.

I have said earlier that we in this Congress should not overlook the strategic necessity and the strategic importance of this area in the Near East. We, of course, are looking at it from a humanitarian view but we should not also overlook what there is of vital strategic significance in this area. If we pass the European recovery program with billions without cutting a nickel out of it, if we pass the International Refugee Organization appropriation for Europe by millions without cutting it a nickel, and then with the Arab world, start cutting pennies in our dealings, we are not being fair or sensible. It would be strange when, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] said, we have little enough credit laid up in the Arab world as it is today. We need these people. They are our allies in war and our friends in peace.

After the development of the State of Israel and our assistance to the development of the Israeli Government, the least we can do, is to contribute our legitimate share to the assistance of these refugees until the next harvest comes in. The meeting next Monday in Beirut of all the Arab nations with our own representative, is for the purpose of working out a just solution of the problems of these refugees, and of redistributing among the Arab nations these unfortunates. Unless we back that representative of the United States and show him that we are trying to solve the problem, it may be necessary in the future to spend millions and billions in protecting this strategic area. Justice and humanitarian principles, as well as our own national interest, require the passage of this bill.

If we do not give adequate consideration and friendly cooperation to these Arab friends, the next legislation may be done not through the Foreign Affairs Committee.

May I explain to you that on page 2 of the report it is stated that $5,500,000 of this amount is simply for transportation to get these people to some appropriate place in the Arab States where they can be resettled and taken care of by their own people.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to my friend on the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I call the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to the fact that the original request for this assistance was made by Count Folke Bernadotte; that later that request was again made by Dr. Ralph Bunche, and the sum of $32,000,000 was requested. Something like $11,000,000 has already been put into this particular problem by the Arab States themselves. Something like $4,000,000 has been voluntarily allocated by European nations. The supervision of this program is purely in the hands and under the supervision of the United Nations or independent relief agencies, the League of Red Cross Societies, the International Red Cross, and the Society of Friends. They are the ones who are actually doing the job at the present time in behalf of approximately 700,000 Arabs who are destitute and on relief.

Mr. FULTON. May I comment there, too, that Mr. Stanton Griffis, our Ambassador to Egypt, has been the one chosen by the United Nations to administer this relief. If this Congress wants any guaranty that it will be taken care of well, it is budgeted closely on evident need, and there is only $2,500,000 in administrative expenses to be spent.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HAND. Will the gentleman tell me how any of this is relevant to the purpose of my amendment? I am simply seeking to establish a standard on which we can make a fair and not ultra-generous contribution.

Mr. FULTON. I would be very glad to answer that.

Mr. HAND. Where would the gentleman stop, 70 percent, 80 percent, or 90 percent? Are we to bear the entire burden of the world by ourselves?

Mr. FULTON. As the gentleman knows, in the adaption of the ECA program, the budgets of European countries are not made up on a percentage of contribution by us, but we are meeting a need. That same principle was used here. As the gentleman knows, too, under the United Nations children's emergency fund, the United States gave 50 percent as our contribution to any participating country that was a recipient of funds. On contributions by countries other than the United States, to countries beyond their borders, we gave as assistance, 72 percent as our share. As to the international refugee organization, we have given 45 and 75 one-hundredths percent. As the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] has brought out, on the UNRRA we gave 72 percent as our contribution, based on our national income. So this authorization is really a nominal, fair contribution, concerning our vital interest in this area.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman offered his amendment I had written out a similar amendment. I am not opposed to some relief being given by the people of this country. I am opposed to the Congress of the United States being continually compromised by the State Department and agencies of this Government who go out and make so-called moral commitments and then have the fact brought in here, and I am told that I must support that commitment made, when I am supposed to help take care of the obligations of the taxpayers of my district. I am in favor of the Congress starting now. I say now because of the argument that was made that if you do not pay the $16,000,000 you may upset the whole Arabic and Moslem world. I do not give any credit to that kind of argument because 2½ or 3 or 4 million dollars is not going to upset that world. It is not going to buy much credit for us or create much good will. A good strong sensible policy with the control of the monetary and fiscal affairs of this Government in the hands of the Congress of the United States and not in the hands of the State Department or other agencies of this Government, or even agencies of the State Department, will create good will among our people and among the peoples of the earth, because they will then know that we have some sense as to the direction in which we are traveling.

So I would certainly support this amendment, not so much because I think the amendment is going to carry, but because I think the hour has arrived when we should get rid of the idea that we are going to pay 72 percent or 59 percent or 45 percent of the operating expenses or administrative expenses of these great international organizations. Why are we afraid to tell our people who vote for us and send us here, what the specific formula on these things is going to be? Why do we so distrust those people who vote for us? The people in my district send me here, not the people in other parts of the world. For those basic reasons I am for this amendment to set a pattern.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. HAND. I should like to say to the gentleman that he has precisely ap-

prehended the point I have in mind. It is not so very important to save $4,000,000, although to me that is still a considerable sum, despite the way that we throw it around.

Mr. CRAWFORD. No, it is the principle of laying down the pattern.

Mr. HAND. The point is that they cannot make a commitment to the extent of 50 percent or 70 percent or 80 percent, without the Congress scrutinizing what is being done.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The way this argument has gone on here this afternoon, it would appear that some of the members of our Committee on Foreign Affairs propose to commit us up to 72 percent contribution in these various things.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. I wish to call to the attention of the gentleman the fact, as has just been stated, that the administrative expenses of this sum runs over $2,000,000.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Two million five hundred thousand dollars. It is set forth in the committee report.

Mr. JENNINGS. Two million five hundred thousand dollars. That is an outrage. Fifty thousand boys and girls from my section of the country went into this last war. It cost us millions of dollars. I am not afraid to tell my people that I am not going to be rushed into commitments in the way of money by somebody that I never heard of or that they never heard of. I think it is an insult to the Congress.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is the way I feel about it.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think there is a misapprehension as to our relationship with the United Nations. The United States is a member of the United Nations today because the Congress of the United States felt that it was in the best interest of this Nation to join it. The United States joined the United Nations with the full support of the American people. The Congress of the United States passed legislation to join the United Nations in the hope that by sitting around the council table we could gradually ease the tensions in the world which lead to war.

Most of the legislation that has come before the Foreign Affairs Committee has dealt with the tragedies and devastation resulting from the last war. In this transition period it has also been necessary to appropriate large sums of money for arms. To the degree that we can succeed in the negotiations around the council table in easing the tensions around the world, appropriations for arms can be cut.

Our representatives who have been sent to the United Nations by the Congress of the United States do not finally commit us to any program. We have authorized our representatives to negotiate for us, which they have done in their best judgment. The programs to which they agree must be submitted to the Congress for approval. They are sent to the proper committee where they are studied in detail, and then they are presented to the House as a whole.

We do not have to give any money to anyone. However, the final responsibility is ours and it is a grave one. We are morally committed to the American people to follow through on any program that is reasonable and will lead toward peace. We do not now have to contribute $16,000,000 toward the relief of Arab refugees but we must view this contribution in the proper light.

The reason for our giving 50 percent is, as I said before, based on the national income of the contributing nations.

To date other nations have already contributed what we are now asked to give.

Although 50 percent seems very large in relation to the total amount of money that will be contributed, namely $32,000,000, yet when viewed in the light of our economic condition and the economic condition of other countries in the world, then it is not so great. That is the point I tried to make with reference to UNRRA. In that program each contributing country gave 1 percent of its national income. And may I point out that each country made good its pledge. The United States contribution, because of our wealth, amounted to 72 percent of the total contribution. Yet each country was making, according to what they had, as great a contribution as we made.

Because of the disturbance in the Near East, the members of the United Nations have unanimously agreed that relief is needed. Our Government believes that the United States should contribute its share. The Foreign Affairs Committee and the other body believe that we ought to go along with the other members of the United Nations in this relief program. All the other nations have not made their contributions in money. They have made them in kind, and it amounts in some instances to more than we have estimated in dollars.

The Foreign Affairs Committee after study believes that bringing relief to the Arab refugees at this time will hasten a peace settlement in the Near East. We hope that this contribution will be repaid many times over, which it will be if peace comes to this area. It is hoped that by the end of this year the Arab refugees will be resettled. The people in my district are a cross section of the American people. They have their problems but they want peace above everything else. The American people look to us for the statesmanship that supports those programs which will make huge arms appropriations in the future unnecessary.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HAND. To some extent the gentlewoman has missed the point. The point is only with respect to the proper share of the contribution. Can the gentlewoman inform me the share of India, in this pending measure? How much is India putting up, that rich, fabulous, huge subcontinent?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. To date, India has put up $69,770.

Mr. HAND. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not also true that when this emergency arose, relief action was taken immediately by the countries in the area involved?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Immediately.

Mr. JUDD. And they have already spent a great many millions of dollars before we even get started. If we put in the full 50 percent of this projected program for the future, we still put in less than 50 percent of the total amount to be spent on the program, past as well as future.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. The gentleman is quite correct.

Mr. JUDD. This UN effort is an attempt to get enough together at one time to end the problem in the next few months. Actually, in view of the share that the United States had in developing the situation which has produced the tragedy, I do not know just what percentage would be fair. Probably we are responsible for more than 50 percent. But whoever else is responsible, these homeless, hungry, half-naked refugees are not responsible. Their plight developed from an action initiated by the United Nations, partly at our urging. We all ought to share in helping them as we have similar unfortunate people elsewhere. Even those who opposed American support of the UN partitioning of Palestine must recognize our Government did take such action and we have a moral obligation as well as humanitarian urge, to do all we can for these people no matter on which side they are.

Besides, when one considers the kind of world conflict in which we are engaged, and that there is a continuous band of Moslem peoples from Casablanca to Java, occupying an exceedingly important strategic area, it seems short-sighted indeed to refuse to extend a few million dollars of aid to these Arabs after all the hundreds of millions we have given and are still giving for the relief of similar victims elsewhere. We ought to defeat this amendment and pass the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from California has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time and for permission to speak out of order because the Joint Commitee on Atomic Energy has just now adjourned its meeting with the military liaison committee, which works with the Atomic Energy Commission. Among other things discussed was the matter discussed earlier today on the floor of this Chamber, concerning the release of certain photographs of atomic energy installations, as contained in the fifth semiannual report of the Atomic Energy Commission. I am authorized to say that the military liaison committee has no objection to the publishing of

such photographs, from the security angle of the United States.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Did the committee discuss information contained in the paper yesterday concerning atomic weapons and submarines?

Mr. HINSHAW. The committee did not discuss that with the military liaison committee. We were discussing the subject of the photographs that were contained in the fifth semiannual report of the Commission. The gentleman from North Carolina, the vice chairman of the committee, was present and is here on the floor; and the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], and several others among us were present at that meeting.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provision of any other law, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed, until such time as an appropriation shall be made pursuant to section 1, to make advances to the President, not to exceed in the aggregate $8,000,000, to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution. From appropriations authorized under section 1, there shall be repaid to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, without interest, the advances made by it under authority contained herein. No interest shall be charged on advances made by the Treasury to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in implementation of this section.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROONEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 36) for the authorization of a special contribution by the United States for the relief of Palestine refugees, pursuant to House Resolution 139, he reported the same back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the third reading of the Senate resolution.

The resolution was read the third time.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the reading of the engrossed copy.

The SPEAKER. This is a Senate joint resolution, the Chair will say to the gentleman from Mississippi, and is already engrossed.

The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 160, noes 18.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will have to count all over again. [After counting.] Exactly 218 Members are present, a quorum.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

THE NEED FOR A SINGLE SUPPLY CATALOG SYSTEM FOR THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few remarks on my bill, H. R. 321, the National Defense Catalog Act that will have a great effect on the ultimate composition of the armed forces.

The Hoover Commission report states as follows:

The numbering, identification, classification, and describing of items of supply and their inclusion in a catalog appear at first glance to be matters only of academic interest. They are, on the contrary the "key" to an efficient supply system for the Government, and the adoption and use of a standard nomenclature is the very essence of an efficient supply system.

Without such common language, an effective program of personal property management borders on the impossible in an operation so vast as that of the Federal Government. With it, order can replace the current disorder in computation of requirements in relation to inventories and operating programs; in procurement; in storage and issue; in disposal; and in other phases of the supply function.

Development of standard nomenclature and classification is also important for our national defense and for the successful administration of our aid to foreign countries. Preparedness and order demand that appropriate tools should be ready for use in a national emergency.

I doubt if there has ever been so much agreement on the need for anything, as exists today on the need for a single supply catalog for the armed forces.

Everyone has heard of the work of the new Secretary of Defense, Mr. Louis Johnson, who more than any one man may be given the credit for seeing that the resources of this Nation were mobilized when Pearl Harbor precipitated us into World War II. While serving as Assistant Secretary of War he recognized and attempted to correct the condition that the Hoover Commission described as—

Extravagance in military budgets and waste in military expenditure show a serious lack of understanding of the effect of military costs and spending upon the total economy. True national security depends more upon economic stability and political strength than upon military power.

Mr. Kenney, Under Secretary of the Navy, in a recent speech made these statements:

A wartime Navy cataloging project with the accompanying inventory control for the engine parts of one airplane company saved in 1 year over $275,000,000. That is enough to pay the operating costs of the Aviation Supply Depot at Philadelphia for over 30 years.

Due to estimated inventory reductions through cataloging, 500 fewer employees will be needed at 2 naval supply depots. Resulting annual pay-roll savings will be about $1,000,000.

Various committees of the Hoover Commission have made careful studies of the operations of all phases of Government. It has been discovered that cataloging is the key to the efficient operation of almost all functions in the Government. Their recommendation is that a single catalog system be adopted and its use made mandatory for all Departments of the Federal Government. The armed forces use practically every item that is used by the Federal agencies; those few that are not used by the armed forces, but are used by the civilian agencies exclusively could be included in the National Defense Catalog. Every type of supply function performed by the civilian agencies is performed by the armed forces. Furthermore, the armed forces perform many more supply functions in greater magnitude and complexity than that performed by the civilian agencies. The estimated obligations for supplies, materials, and equipment for the National Military Establishment for fiscal year 1948 are over six times as great as the total estimated obligations of all the civilian agencies for the same items and the value of stocks carried in military warehouses is hundreds of times the value of all the stocks carried in the warehouses of all the civilian agencies.

Thus it is apparent that if a single supply catalog system could be developed and operated by the armed forces, the catalog produced and published for their use could be used as well by the civilian agencies of the Federal Government. In this way the recommendations of the Hoover Commission relating to a single supply catalog system would be achieved.

The economies that will result from the use of a single catalog system as described in H. R. 321 will increase economic stability, lessen the load on every taxpayer, provide more national security at less cost and will enable our military leaders to act with speed and decision in an era when speed and decision may be the determining factors whether this country is to continue a Nation of free peoples.

Again, the Hoover Commission states:

World War I pointed out the need for a common language in supply and a uniform system of identifying, numbering, describing, and classifying the myriad items used in preparedness and combat. World War II demonstrated their indispensability. A third world war, should it come, will not be a war of plenty; it will be a war of scarcity. We cannot afford once again to waste our resources and our productive capacity by purchasing duplicate stocks of the same item under varying names and descriptions; and later destroying or disposing of them as surplus and scrap.

A uniform system of cataloging commodities is also important to the civilian agencies. Unless a given article is known throughout the Government by the same number and name, transfers of excess supplies and equipment between agencies, or their disposal as surplus, become difficult and costly processes.

The results of now having 17 different catalogs and cataloging systems, each sufficiently different from all others as to make their

common use impossible, are elaborated upon in the Storage and Issue section of this report on preceding pages, and have been the subject of so many official reports and pronouncements that they need not be discussed at length at this point.

If the necessary authority is properly vested and is exercised, a Federal Commodity Catalog (such as that proposed for the armed forces in H. R. 321) can be completed and put into use for much less than has been spent in past years on scattered effort. The 5-year program and budget estimate presented to Congress, under the aegis of the United States Standard Commodity Catalog Board in July 1947, was predicated upon a total cost for preparing and publishing the catalog of a little more than $56,000,000.

I might say right here that figures have been given to me by the National Military Establishment that indicate expenditures over the 4-year period 1947-50 of over $100,000,000 for the uncoordinated catalog activities now being carried on in the armed forces.

The need for congressional legislation was recognized for many years and in July 1945, a recommendation was made by the United States Standard Commodity Catalog Board as follows:

That enactment of the required legislation authorizing the development and maintenance of a Federal catalog system be requested by the Congress.

We may question why the experiences gained in two world wars has not resulted in the armed forces having in operation today a single supply catalog system. The Hoover Commission lists some of these reasons:

(a) A uniform catalog system, when applied to supply operations, means that all existing catalogs with their numbers, names, and descriptions will be replaced. This naturally engenders great and stubborn resistance from supply officials to the taking of action that will lead to changes in purchasing, storing and other supply processes—which would follow the development and use of the Federal commodity catalog.

(b) The absence of glamour and front-page-news qualities in such highly technical matters as item identification, classification, description patterns, alphabetic indexes, numbers and symbols. It is, as a consequence, difficult to convince the policy-determining officials of the extreme importance of a standard commodity catalog to efficiency in supply operations.

(c) Inability or unwillingness of the several interested agencies and their technical staffs to reach decisions and to agree on the basic elements of a catalog system.

(d) The lack of badly needed congressional action.

Then the Hoover Commission report states:

The present program of the Munitions Board Cataloging Agency would, however, move ahead more rapidly with the removal of a number of serious defects in organization and methods, which can be accomplished as follows:

1. The Agency should have an adequate permanent staff and be financed from the budget of the Munitions Board; as long as it has to rely upon allocation of funds from the three constituent departments of the National Military Establishment, it will not be able to operate as an impartial and uninhibited group;

2. The Secretary of Defense should, in terms which are unmistakable, serve notice on the bureaus and technical services that a standard catalog shall be speedily prepared and adopted; after its preparation, that it must be used in all supply operations of all bureaus and technical services without modification and that each bureau and technical service must assist in the preparation of the catalog by accepting and promptly completing cataloging assignments by the Agency in whatever commodity classes it is made the cognizant body; and

3. The organization should be radically simplified. The Secretary of Defense is now separated by seven strata of authority from the civilian staff to whom are assigned the technical details. If the staff seek top-level approval of a phase of cataloging operations, or of a budgetary request, it must have clearance by the executive group, by the technical group, by the Agency group, by the procurement section, by the procurement policy council, by the Executive Committee of the Munitions Board, and by the Board itself, before it reaches the Secretary of Defense and his immediate staff. Although an extreme example of the channels of authority in Munitions Board operations, it illustrates a general situation. Simplification can undoubtedly be achieved; and it must be, if this undertaking, universally recognized by military authorities as of crucial importance to national defense, is to be completed and made effective within the work schedule of 4 years.

The recommendations of the Hoover Commission are carried out insofar as they relate to the armed forces in the provisions of H. R. 321. And in solving the problem for the National Military Establishment we are solving the problem for the entire Federal Government.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. KEOGH (at the request of Mr. MULTER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the New York Times of Tuesday, March 15.

Mr. IRVING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement from the Jackson County Press on the Reorganization Act.

Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Detroit Free Press.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Cincinnati Inquirer entitled "The Truth About Free Medicine."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 17, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

377. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the sixth quarterly report required under the Second Decontrol Act of 1947, dealing with export control and allocation powers; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

378. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 27, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of channel from bridge at Bradenton, Fla., to deep water in Gulf of Mexico (Tampa Bay), authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

379. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 4, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Little Pee Dee River, S. C., from junction of the Lumber River to the Great Pee Dee River, with a view to removing logs, debris, and other obstructions, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

380. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a request that the case of Gladys Dawson, file No. A-6208468, CR 21985, involving suspension of deportation, be withdrawn from the cases now pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

381. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a request that the case of Abrus Ullah, file No. A-9573640, CR 22208, involving suspension of deportation, be withdrawn from the cases now pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

382. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report relative to the payment of furlough travel allowance to certain enlisted men of the Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

383. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the Annual Report of the Exchange Stabilization Fund, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

384. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Panama Railroad Company for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (H. Doc. No. 121); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

385. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting to the Congress, in typescript, a general index of the report of the Committee on the National Security Organization; to the Committee on Armed Services.

386. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting to the Congress, in typescript, a memorandum on the Department of Labor which was prepared for the Commission's consideration by George W. Taylor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

387. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting to the Congress, in typescript, a study on the Division of Statistical Standards, Bureau of the Budget, which was prepared for the Commission's consideration by the task force as a supplement to their summary report on budgeting and accounting; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

388. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting to the Congress, in typescript, a study on the Division of Estimates of the Bureau of the Budget which was prepared for the Commission's consideration by the task force as a supplement to their summary report on budgeting and accounting; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

389. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting to the Congress, in typescript, a study on the Division of Administrative Management in the Federal Bureau of the Budget which was prepared for the Commission's consideration by the task force as a supplement to their summary report on budgeting and accounting; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

390. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting to the Congress, in typescript, a study on the statistical agencies of the Federal Government, part II, which was prepared for the Commission's consideration by the task force as a supplement to the Commission's report on budgeting and accounting; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

391. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a list of ordinances enacted by the Public Service Commission of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Public Lands.

392. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting lists or schedules, or parts of lists or schedules, covering records proposed for disposal by the Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Education and Labor. H. R. 3190. A bill to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 267). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 3571. A bill concerning common trust funds and to make uniform the law with reference thereto; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 3572. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 3573. A bill to provide for the more efficient use of personnel employed in national parks, national monuments, and other areas administered by the National Park Service during periods of greatest seasonal public use of such areas; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 3574. A bill to provide for the purchase of private lands enclosed by Rocky Mountain National Park; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 3575. A bill to provide pensions for disabled unemployable veterans who served in a war, campaign, expedition, or insurrection beyond the continental limits of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 3576. A bill to repeal certain obsolete laws and parts of laws relating to the sale of public lands; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. R. 3577. A bill to provide for the acquisition of site and preparation of plans and specifications for a new Federal building and post office in Vergennes, Vt.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3578. A bill to provide for the acquisition of site and preparation of plans and specifications for a new Federal building and post office in Bradford, Vt.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3579. A bill to provide for the acquisition of site and preparation of plans and specifications for a new Federal building and post office in Burlington, Vt.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 3580. A bill to repeal certain restrictions on cotton acreage reports; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3581. A bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, to provide reimbursement for fines paid and for lost pay and other benefits upon correction of military and naval records, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 3582. A bill to authorize the negotiation, approval, and ratification of separate settlement contracts with the Sioux Indians of Cheyenne River Reservation in South Dakota and of Standing Rock Reservation in South Dakota and North Dakota for Indian lands and rights required by the United States for the Oahe Dam and Reservoir, Missouri River development; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. IRVING:

H. R. 3583. A bill to repeal the excise taxes on toilet preparations sold to any person operating a barber shop, beauty shop, or similar establishment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3584. A bill to provide free mailing privileges for patients in or at veterans' hospitals; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3585. A bill to increase travel allowances for civilians employed by the Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 3586. A bill to provide that farmers may deduct from gross income for income-tax purposes expenses incurred for the purpose of soil and water conservation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H. R. 3587. A bill authorizing a modification of the project for improvement of Brazos Island Harbor, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 3588. A bill to establish a Federal Commission on Services for the Physically Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 3589. A bill to convey to the city of Miles City, State of Montana, certain lands in Custer County, Mont., for use as an industrial site; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 3590. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to provide absolute preference in retention, reemployment, and reinstatement for veterans having a disability of 10 percent or more; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WERDEL:

H. R. 3591. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the State to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 3592. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administration, as an adjunct to the Federal public-works program, to make loans and grants for the construction, remodeling, improvement, and extension of school facilities; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho (by request):

H. R. 3593. A bill to create the Unemployed Service Association, to operate farms and industries cooperatively, to provide work for the unemployed, to provide necessary shelter and general relief to needy adult persons, and to promote the general social and economic harmony and security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. Res. 154. Resolution for a survey of the San Francisco Bay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, requesting an appropriation of not less than $2,000,000 to be made available to the United States Corps of Engineers for the completion of the Coos Bay improvement project, Oregon; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to House Joint Memorials 3 and 14, respectively, to appropriate moneys for use in emergency flood-prevention work in New Mexico and to establish a synthetic liquid fuels plant in New Mexico; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, calling attention to an editorial by the Detroit Free Press entitled "Our Greatest Danger: Financial Rocks Ahead"; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, requesting the enactment of legislation designating November 11 as Veteran's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, urging the appointment of two United States district judges instead of one for the third judicial division, Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, urging that plans be made for flood control for the protection of Nenana, Alaska, and vicinity; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the development of the waterways of the Commonwealth; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Indiana, requesting the enactment of legislation to aid the State in the enforcement of the cigarette tax now evaded by use of the United States mails; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, urging that the proposed Copper River Highway be given first consideration on the list of new Federal road projects for Alaska; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 3594. A bill for the relief of Cleo C. Reeves, Floyd L. Murphy, and Fabian P. Durand; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIES of New York:

H. R. 3595. A bill for the relief of Mr. Svetozar Mandukitch, Mrs. Kosara Mandukitch, and Mr. Ivan Mandukitch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 3596. A bill for the relief of Davis Hospital; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 3597. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lucy T. Harris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 3598. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Katherine Gehringer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 3599. A bill for the relief of the heirs of William G. Raymond; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 3600. A bill for the relief of Miss Teresa Vancheri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 3601. A bill for the relief of Patrick J. Logan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H. R. 3602. A bill for the relief of Antonio Garcia Jiminez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACY:

H. R. 3603. A bill for the relief of Michael Palazotta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 3604. A bill for the relief of the Fort Pierce port district; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3605. A bill to provide for the documentation of the Canadian-built vessel *North Wind*, owned by a citizen of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

244. By Mr. BREEN: Memorial of the City Commission of Dayton, Ohio, memorializing the Congress to pass the General Pulaski's Memorial Day Resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

245. By Mr. CANFIELD: Petition of the Paterson (N. J.) Kiwanis Club, protesting against the sentencing of 15 Protestant ministers by tribunals of Communist-dominated countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

246. Also, petition of 135 residents of 21 northern New Jersey communities, protesting against the trial and conviction of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

247. By Mr. GATHINGS: Resolution on amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 17, 1949

(Legislative day of Monday, February 21, 1949)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock antemeridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor, Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who hast made us for Thyself, grant that we may be numbered among the seekers and finders of God, for we need Thee so greatly in all our deliberations and decisions.

We pray that we may open wide the door of our heart unto our blessed Lord. May we give Him the place of preeminence in order that our lives may be transformed by His spirit and touched to finer issues.

Inspire us with those same lofty aspirations which filled Thy servant whose memory many are honoring today.

"Christ be with me, Christ within me,
Christ behind me, Christ before me,
Christ beside me, Christ to win me,
Christ to comfort and restore me,
Christ beneath me, Christ above me,
Christ in quiet, Christ in danger,
Christ in hearts of all that love me,
Christ in mouth of friend and stranger."

Thine shall be the praise and the glory. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

On March 12, 1949:

S. 630. An act to amend section 19 of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), so as to remove the upper age limit for appointment to commissioned grade in the Supply Corps of the Navy.

On March 15, 1949:

S. 29. An act to authorize payment of claims based on loss of or damage to property deposited by alien enemies;

S. 593. An act for the relief of certain postal employees; and

S. J. Res. 22. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the three hundredth anniversary of Annapolis, Md.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following joint resolutions of the Senate:

S. J. Res. 36. Joint resolution for the authorization of a special contribution by the United States for the relief of Palestine refugees; and

S. J. Res. 56. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1956 Olympic games at Detroit, Mich.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Downey	Holland
Anderson	Eastland	Humphrey
Baldwin	Ecton	Hunt
Brewster	Ellender	Ives
Bricker	Ferguson	Jenner
Bridges	Flanders	Johnson, Colo.
Butler	Frear	Johnson, Tex.
Byrd	George	Johnston, S. C.
Cain	Gillette	Kefauver
Capehart	Green	Kem
Chapman	Gurney	Kerr
Chavez	Hayden	Kilgore
Connally	Hendrickson	Knowland
Cordon	Hickenlooper	Langer
Donnell	Hill	Lodge
Douglas	Hoey	Long
Lucas	Murray	Taft
McCarran	Myers	Taylor
McCarthy	Neely	Thomas, Okla.
McFarland	O'Conor	Thomas, Utah
McGrath	O'Mahoney	Thye
McKellar	Pepper	Tobey
McMahon	Reed	Tydings
Magnuson	Robertson	Vandenberg
Malone	Russell	Watkins
Martin	Saltonstall	Wherry
Maybank	Schoeppel	Wiley
Miller	Smith, Maine	Williams
Millikin	Smith, N. J.	Withers
Morse	Sparkman	Young
Mundt	Stennis	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, before the debate proceeds I remind the Senate that, of course, today's session follows a recess. I ask unanimous consent that Members of the Senate be permitted to introduce bills and joint resolutions, submit petitions and memorials, and place in the RECORD other matters of a routine nature which are usually presented during the morning hour.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without debate?

Mr. LUCAS. Without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REPORT ON MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO GREECE AND TURKEY (H. DOC. NO. 123)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Transmitted herewith is the sixth quarterly report on United States military assistance to Greece and Turkey. This report covers the period from October 1 to December 31, 1948. Military assistance to Greece and Turkey was inaugurated under the authority of Public Law 75, Eightieth Congress, and was continued under the authority of title III of Public Law 472, Eightieth Congress, known as the Greek-Turkish Assistance Act of 1948. Responsibility for United States assistance in the economic rehabilitation of Greece begun under Public Law 75 was transferred to the Economic Cooperation Administration on July 1, 1948, pursuant to Public Law 472, title I.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 17, 1949.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED PROVISION PERTAINING TO CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION, FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY (S. DOC. NO. 29)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed provision for a contract authorization, amounting to $1,200,000, for the Federal Works Agency, fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON EXCHANGE STABILIZATION FUND

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Exchange Stabilization Fund, together with a summary of operations of the fund from its establishment to June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

Two letters from the Attorney General, withdrawing the names of Gladys Dawson and Abrus Ullah from reports relating to aliens whose deportation he suspended more than 6 months ago, transmitted by him to the Senate on February 1, 1948, and March 1, 1948, respectively; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON EXPORT CONTROL AND ALLOCATION POWERS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, his sixth quarterly report on Export Control and Allocation Powers (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ORDINANCES OF PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF PUERTO RICO

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of ordinances enacted by the Public Service Commission of Puerto Rico (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

INCLUSION OF PUERTO RICO IN MINIMUM WAGE AND OTHER SOCIAL LEGISLATION

A letter from the Director, Division of Territories and Island Possessions, Department of the Interior, transmitting a resolution adopted by Union Factoria, No. 1, Central Plata, San Sebastian, P. R., urging the Congress to extend to Puerto Rico any minimum-wage law which may be enacted, and to include Puerto Rico in other social legislation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT ON PAYMENTS OF FURLOUGH TRAVEL ALLOWANCE TO CERTAIN ENLISTED MEN OF THE NAVY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report concerning payments of furlough travel allowance to certain enlisted men of the Navy (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 801 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fourteenth annual report of that Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Department of the Interior (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Natural Resources (appendix L) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Agriculture Activities (appendix M) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Public Works (appendix Q) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Natural Resources Activity of the Federal Government (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

APPOINTMENTS TO VACANCIES ON COMMISSIONS AND JOINT COMMITTEES

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the law and under certain resolutions it becomes the duty of the Chair to fill vacancies on commissions and joint committees. The Chair announces certain appointments which he asks the clerk to read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

On the Special Committee on Reconstruction of the Senate Roof and Skylights: The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR].

On the Senate Office Building Commission: The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

On the Board of Visitors to the Military Academy: The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY].

On the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy: The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

On the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy: The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS].

On the Board of Visitors to the Merchant Marine Academy: The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND].

To be Director for the Columbia Institution for the Deaf: The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR].

To be Director for the Columbia Hospital: The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

On the Washington and Lee University Bicentennial Commission: The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

On the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission: The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH] and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH].

On the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission: The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN].

On the United States Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission: The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in connection with the announcement by the Vice President of appointments to fill certain vacancies on commissions and joint committees I should like to make an observation or suggestion.

Mr. President, I suggest that the appointments to the Special Committee on Reconstruction of the Senate Roof and Skylights be again read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read the appointments.

The CHIEF CLERK. Special Committee on Reconstruction of the Senate Roof and Skylights: The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR].

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished majority leader whether there was any intention to omit the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Public Works?

The VICE PRESIDENT. These appointments are to fill vacancies.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I happen to be the only Republican member on that committee. The action of the Chair would place four Democrats and one Republican on the committee, which I think was probably not the intention of the Chair.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. Just a moment. Let me say that the majority leader has no responsibility for these appointments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair did not consult any Senator about these appointments. The majority leader has no responsibility. The Chair did not intend to make the proportion four Democrats to one Republican. The Chair acted on the advice of the Secretary and the Parliamentarian as to the vacancies and the present members of the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. Would it be possible to increase the membership by including the ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN]?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will withdraw the appointments to that committee.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in connection with the appointments to the Senate Office Building Commission, may I suggest that perhaps the Chair made the same error as in connection with the Special Committee on Reconstruction of the Senate Roof and Skylights? I am the only Republican on that commission. The proportion would be four Democrats to one Republican. Prior to this time it has always been three to two.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair might extend a compliment to the Senator from New Hampshire by according him greater influence than four other Senators. The Chair did not intend to

bring about that proportion. These appointments were made after consultation with the Secretary and the Parliamentarian, as to the number of vacancies.

Mr. WHERRY. I merely wished to bring the matter to the attention of the Chair. In view of the observations of the Chair, I suggest that he might review the appointments to both these committees.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has no objection to reviewing the appointments. The Chair will withhold appointments on this commission also.

The VICE PRESIDENT subsequently said: The Chair appoints the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] on the Special Committee on Reconstruction of the Senate Roof and Skylights.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 8

"Concurrent resolution requesting immediate review of recent cuts in the veterans' hospital program

"Whereas the Veterans' Administration has recently announced the cancellation of plans for the construction of a 200-bed general hospital at Grand Rapids, a 500-bed tuberculosis hospital at Detroit, and a 1,000-bed neuropsychiatric hospital at Toledo, Ohio, from which beds were to be allotted to Michigan mental and nervous cases; and

"Whereas it appears that needs of veterans will not be adequately cared for as a result of such action; and

"Whereas the citizens of Grand Rapids are now engaged in the conduct of a drive for approximately $4,000,000 to add to the hospital facilities of Kent County and neighboring counties and that such facilities have been shown by survey to be badly needed, regardless of what facilities are provided by the proposed veterans' hospital; and

"Whereas the action of the Veterans' Administration has caused great confusion and uncertainty and has endangered the welfare of veterans and of all other citizens of the community interested in the development of hospital facilities in the area; and

"Whereas the interests of veterans and other citizens generally throughout the State of Michigan are adversely affected by the action of the Veterans' Administration with respect to hospitals at Grand Rapids, Detroit, and Toledo; and

"Whereas budget cuts should not be made at the expense of sick and disabled veterans while we are spending much larger sums abroad: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring)*, That the President, Congress, and the Veterans' Administration be memorialized and requested to reopen and reexamine the decisions previously made with respect to these hospitals, and to determine without delay the need for veterans' hospitals at Grand Rapids, Detroit, and Toledo, Ohio; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That if such need be established as now appears to exist, the Veterans' Administration be requested to reverse its earlier decisions and to continue with its program as originally determined upon; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to President Truman, to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Michigan Members in the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress.

"Unanimously adopted by the senate February 4, 1949.

"Unanimously adopted by the house of representatives, March 4, 1949."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Joint Memorial 3

"Joint memorial by the Nineteenth Legislature of the State of New Mexico memorializing the Congress of the United States, and the New Mexico representatives therein, to appropriate moneys for use in emergency flood-prevention work in New Mexico

"*Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico:*

"That whereas an unprecedented amount of snow has fallen in Colorado and in the mountains that feed the various streams flowing through New Mexico; and

"Whereas in the past difficulties have been experienced in New Mexico when the run-off from winter snows takes place in the spring; and

"Whereas no adequate means are available for preparing against the reasonably foreseeable floods which, in all likelihood, will result from the large amount of precipitation in the watershed of these streams; and

"Whereas the State of New Mexico and the various areas directly affected are not in financial position to effectively combat the danger; and

"Whereas the only means of preventing great loss of property and possible loss of life in New Mexico in the spring of 1949 lies through any assistance which might be received from the Government of the United States.

"Now, therefore, the Congress of the United States, and the Members thereof from New Mexico, are hereby respectfully memorialized and urged to take immediate action to provide funds to the State of New Mexico, and the proper authorities thereof, to be used along the streams in New Mexico for flood-prevention work prior to and during the spring run-off in 1949, in order that flood danger in New Mexico may be minimized and losses to life and property prevented; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from New Mexico, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Chief of Army Engineers.

"Approved by me this 11th day of March 1949.

"THOMAS J. MABRY,
"*Governor, State of New Mexico.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Joint Memorial 14

"Joint memorial by the Nineteenth Legislature of the State of New Mexico memorializing the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to establish a synthetic liquid-fuels plant in New Mexico

"*Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico:*

"Whereas water in adequate amounts for the proper and efficient continued operation of a synthetic liquid-fuels plant is available in San Juan County, N. Mex., as shown by the fact that seven-thirteenths of all surface water in the State of New Mexico flows through said county; and

"Whereas the United States Geological Survey figures show that there is available in San Juan County, N. Mex., over 250,000,000,000 tons of coal of proper quality and so situated that it may be mined by the stripper or open-pit process, all of requisite grade for the purpose of a synthetic liquid-fuels plant; and

"Whereas much of said coal lies within the exterior boundary of the Navajo Reservation; and

"Whereas it is a matter that has received national recognition of the necessity of the Navajo people; and

"Whereas the establishment of such a plant will provide royalties that will be received for the benefit of the Navajo people and provide jobs for the benefit for both the Navajo and other people in this general area of the United States; and

"Whereas the creation of this project would provide trade facilities for the Navajo people in addition to the other benefits, such as the receipt of royalties for the alleviation of the Navajo problem; and

"Whereas the establishment of such a plant in this portion of the United States to open up the almost unlimited reserves of coal for this purpose will be of benefit to the entire United States: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico*, That the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States be and they are hereby petitioned and memorialized to establish a synthetic liquid-fuels plant in San Juan County, N. Mex.; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and the Members of Congress from New Mexico, and to such other officials as the Governor of the State of New Mexico shall deem advisable.

"Approved by me this 11th day of March 1949.

"THOMAS J. MABRY,
"*Governor, State of New Mexico.*"

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, relating to an editorial from the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press, February 23, 1949, entitled "Our Greatest Danger: Financial Rocks Ahead" (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

(See text of concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by the Vice President on March 12, 1949, p. 2320, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A resolution adopted by the board of commissioners of the city of Newark, N. J., favoring the enactment of legislation proclaiming October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Dewie J. Gaul and Dale J. Schmitz, of Dubuque, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the issuance of a commemorative stamp in honor of the city of Earling, Iowa; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring the repeal of the Taft-Hartley labor law; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. McGRATH (for himself and Mr. GREEN):

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; ordered to lie on the table:

"Resolution requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to give immediate consideration to the passage of legislation repealing chapter 120 of the Public Laws, passed June 23, 1947 (Public Law 101), the short title of which is cited as the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947"

"*Resolved*, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States be and they are hereby requested to give immediate consideration to the enactment of legislation repealing chapter 120 of the Public Laws, passed June 23, 1947 (Public Law 101), the short title of which is cited as the 'Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947,' and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state be and he is hereby authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States."

TEXTILE INDUSTRY IN MASSACHUSETTS—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF NEW BEDFORD, MASS.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague the junior Senator from Massachusetts and myself, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of New Bedford, Mass., favoring an investigation of the textile industry in Massachusetts.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas approximately 5,000 textile workers have been laid off or are working short time in New Bedford: and

Whereas Governor Dever has suggested at a conference of management and labor that a State investigation be made of the textile industry in Massachusetts: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the City Council of New Bedford record itself as urging Governor Dever to undertake immediately this investigation; and be it further

Resolved, That the city council, through the clerk of the council, communicate with Senators SALTONSTALL and LODGE and Congressmen NICHOLSON and MARTIN to the end that the textile industry of Massachusetts be protected from the inroads of textile imports.

In city council, March 10, 1949.

CHARLES W. DEASY,
City Clerk.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 2546. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish land-based air-warning and control installations for the national security, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 126).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 1287. A bill to amend the act approved September 7, 1916 (ch. 458, 39 Stat. 742), entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. LODGE):

S. 1288. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of the town of Watertown, Mass., for the loss of taxes on certain property in such town acquired by the United States for use for military purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMAHON (by request):

S. 1289. A bill for the relief of Collins Sterling Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1290. A bill to establish and effectuate a policy with respect to the creation or chartering of certain corporations by act of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH:

S. 1291. A bill to authorize the appropriation of such sum as may be necessary to prevent a deficit in the District of Columbia in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 1292. A bill to amend section 32 (a) (2) of the Trading With the Enemy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 1293. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps to acquaint the people of the United States and of foreign countries with the beauty and grandeur of the carvings on Mount Rushmore in the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEM:

S. 1294. A bill for the relief of John S. Kinsella;

S. 1295. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Emily Wilhelm; and

S. 1296. A bill for the relief of Murphy and Wischmeyer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself and Mr. MARTIN):

S. J. Res. 65. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the Grand Army of the Republic; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

INVESTIGATION OF FISCAL AFFAIRS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McGRATH submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 89), which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the fiscal affairs of the District of Columbia, including its tax structure and deficits in operation. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT OF 1948—AMENDMENT

Mr. MORSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1209) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained permission to be absent from the Senate for one week, beginning tomorrow.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE

Mr. McKELLAR asked and obtained permission for the Committee on Appropriations to meet this afternoon from 3 o'clock on.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—RADIO BROADCAST BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the text of a radio broadcast entitled "A Four-Point Program To Break the 'Filibuster' Against the St. Lawrence Seaway," delivered by him on March 13, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

SENATE DEBATE LIMIT NOT NEEDED FOR SECURITY—ARTICLE BY GOULD LINCOLN

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Senate Debate Limit Held Not Needed for Security," written by Gould Lincoln and published in the Washington Evening Star of March 15, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

KEEP THE RED CROSS FLAG FLYING—ARTICLE BY HARRY H. SCHLACHT

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Keep the Red Cross Flag Flying," written by Harry H. Schlacht and published in the New York Journal-American of March 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

APPOINTMENT OF LOUIS JOHNSON AS SECRETARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—ARTICLE BY DORIS FLEESON

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Johnson's Fight for Preparedness Is Found 'Startling' in Retrospect," written by Doris Fleeson, and published in the Washington Evening Star of March 10, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESSES MADE AT THE CHRISTENING CEREMONY OF THE "CLIPPER AMERICA"

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD addresses delivered during the christening ceremony of the *Clipper America* on March 5, 1949, which appear in the Appendix.]

COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the conference report on House bill 128.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 128) to provide that acreage planted to cotton in 1949 shall not be used in computing cotton acreage allotments for any subsequent year.

(For text of the conference report, see p. 2227 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 11, 1949.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to be certain that the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is advised of the fact that this matter is coming up for consideration before I agree to its consideration.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, there is no division of sentiment in the committee. The point is this: The Secretary of Agriculture requested the cotton planters to decrease their cotton acreage to be planted in 1949. In order to stimulate that request, he recommended a bill which, if passed, would disregard the acreage planted in 1949 in future allocations and quotas. All the members of the committee agreed to the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I may say to the distinguished Senator from Ohio that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is entirely in accord with what has been done.

Mr. TAFT. That is all that concerns me. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration to the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

AMENDMENT TO CLOTURE RULE

The Senate resumed the consideration of Senate Resolution 15, amending the so-called cloture rule of the Senate.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I expect to speak very briefly on the subject matter before the Senate. As my colleagues will observe, I have no books of reference and no prepared address. That will insure that my remarks will be brief.

It had not been my intention to participate in the discussion of this question, measure, matter, motion, proposition, or proposal which is before the Senate. I expected merely to answer when my name was called, either "yea" or "nay." I was impelled to that decision principally because I am not a lawyer, but a farmer, and I could contribute very little to the discussion, and also because, as a neophyte Senator, I realized the customary injunction of self-effacement. But when self-effacement becomes protective coloration, then it is time for me to announce my position.

When my name is called on the pending proposal, whatever it may be called—the so-called compromise substitute—I expect to vote "nay"; and I think I owe it to those whom I represent in part here, as well as myself, to give some of the reasons therefor.

Mr. President, at the outset of these discussions about 2 weeks ago we found two forces alined: One of them was the so-called southern bloc, not large in numbers as compared to the rest of the Senate, but a cohesive bloc, cemented together by a depth of conviction honestly reached, sincerely held, and cogently presented. The rest of us formed another group, not so cohesive by any means, but the majority of them, including the present speaker, convinced that anything that obstructed the legislative processes of the Senate should be removed.

Let me say to some of my friends on this side of the aisle and some on the other side of the aisle that an obstruction to the legislative processes of democracy in action can be an obstruction to the reaching of a vote to implement a conclusion, but also, as has been very clearly presented in the debate, it can be an obstruction against the free interchange of opinions and adverse holdings of conclusions, from which would crystallize the finding which makes up democracy.

I am opposed to obstruction of debate, for we should enable that first step to be taken. I am opposed to obstruction to implementing the conclusion of debate. Let me say to my friends—my southern colleagues—that to a large extent they have fulfilled the prophecy which was made by the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] that this would be a historic debate. In the Committee on Rules and Administration, of which I have the honor to be a member, I have heard marvelous presentations by members of his group. I have heard presentations of their viewpoint on the floor of the Senate. I am constrained to say that I thought they were unnecessarily long; I thought the conclusions could be presented very forcefully with an elimination of many of the words which were used, and with no diminution of the force. But, be that as it may, this debate has been carried on in good spirit and with dignity. However, we have reached a point where it seems to me there has been lack of cohesion on the part of those who felt that the present rule of the Senate ought to be amended so as to close up certain loopholes which it was agreed existed and for the purpose of tightening the rule.

In my opinion, the present compromise is not such a conclusion. In a moment I shall state what, in my opinion, it does. As soon as the group who were in favor of a correction of the rule started to fall apart, losing sight of the goal, then the difficulty commenced; then and there we began hurrying to and fro. Recently we have learned that the fission of certain materials generates energy, but the fission in that group did not generate energy, or, if it did, it was uncontrollable.

Almost immediately, Mr. President, there started a series of conferences, caucuses, confabs, in the corridors, in the cloakrooms, in the conference rooms. They were bulging with Senators running to and fro, but the second battle of the bulge is now over and we are about to vote on the result. I shall vote "no." I am ready for any compromise on procedure, but I am not now or at any time in favor of a compromise of principle. That has never been successfully done in this body or in any other body.

So we found ourselves in a position, unfortunately, where confusion was thrice confounded. Perhaps we were in the attitude of the classic example of confusion—the squid that, by his own emanations which he emits in his struggles, beclouds his attempts to escape.

Mr. President, yesterday when I sat in the chair which you now grace—I did not fill that chair or adorn it, but I sat there. I observed that for one-half hour by the clock the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] stood in a group in the center aisle, all talking at once. It was not a credit to me as a presiding officer that I did not stop them. They were discussing the definition of "matter," trying to clear it up so that future Senators could determine what was meant by "matter." I could not break it up; but I was forced to state to the Parliamentarian that I hoped as a result there would finally be a triumph of mind over "matter." [Laughter.] But it was not reached.

I am not criticizing the procedure, the methods by which any of my colleagues reached their conclusions, even though their conclusions may be different from the one that I hold. The only thing I can do is to criticize the end product in the legislative process; and the end product bids fair to be the substitute which was filed here with sufficient names to adopt it.

Please understand, Mr. President, that I am not criticizing the rectitude, the purpose, the sincerity, the honesty, or the desire to reach a conclusion. I am simply saying that I cannot support the conclusion. Why? When all is said and done, it must be admitted that if the compromise becomes the rule of the Senate, whereas under present rules cloture can be imposed by any number of the Members of the Senate from 32 to 64, depending on the number who are in attendance at any particular time, when the rule now proposed is adopted, cloture cannot be imposed except by 64 Senators. Of course, 49 Senators can do business in the Senate. Through the processes of the Senate, 49 Senators can involve our Nation in war.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. Of course.

Mr. TAFT. Is it not a fact that under the present rule cloture cannot be imposed at all on any motion to take up a measure?

Mr. GILLETTE. Oh, no. I wish I could agree with the Senator from Ohio on that point, but I cannot. If other Senators are ready to take the position that the Senate has manacled itself and has entangled itself in its own rules, at least I am not ready to concede that. I think the Senate can be in a position to carry on its legislative processes.

Incidentially, Mr. President, I say to the distinguished Senator from Ohio that we brought to the Senate from the Committee on Rules and Administration, by a vote of 10 to 3, a proposal which would make it more possible to impose cloture. But the compromise makes cloture impossible, if less than 64 Senators are in attendance. As I say, it is possible to ratify a treaty involving a subject of most intricate international affairs, theoretically, by the vote of 32 Senators; it is possible to declare war; it is possible to appropriate billions of dollars of the people's property. But it will be impossible to impose cloture, if the compromise is adopted, with less than 64. No sophistry, no casuistry, no specious argument will change that situation.

I may compliment my brothers of the South for one of the most notable victories, when the compromise is adopted, that has ever been attained in the United States Senate. I said I would not talk long, but merely try to present my views. I want to say in somewhat of a facetious way that I was reminded of another matter. Back in my younger days, "in the dear dead days beyond recall," we had, as older Members will recall, a very notable author by the name of Peter Finley Dunne, who created a great fictional character known as Mr. Dooley, a barroom philosopher. At that time there was a popular song composed, which ascribed to Mr. Dooley credit for everything that was accomplished in the public welfare. One of the verses ran:

Napoleon had an army of a hundred thousand men;
He marched them up the Alps,
And they marched them down again.

The chorus ended:

Though Napoleon marched them up,
Who was it marched them down?
'Twas Mr. Dooley.

Paraphrasing that a little bit, when I think of the effort that was exerted by some of my friends on the other side of the aisle, on the Committee on Rules and Administration, and the attempt that was made to take the question away from the Senate after it came to the floor—and I say this in all kindness; I say it, though I shall mention some of the Senators by name; I say it in love, not in laughter; in laudation, not in lyric—

KNOWLAND had an army of a hundred thousand men;
He marched them up the Alps,
But they marched them down again.
And though Mr. KNOWLAND marched them up,
Who was it marched them down?
'Twas Mr. WHERRY, 'twas Mr. RUSSELL—and the others.

I want to apologize to the Senator from Georgia. He was not connected with the "army" that I am using figuratively, but was a party to the compromise.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield, of course.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator need not apologize. I have no apologies to make for anyone with whom I have been associated in this contest.

Mr. GILLETTE. May I associate myself, Mr. President, with that declaration on the part of "General" RUSSELL? [Laughter.] And may I express the honest hope that other legislative cohorts will be as tenacious and successful and adroitly led as the cohesive army the Senator is about to lead to victory. The battlefield we are about to leave. There will perhaps be nothing but the fluttering light from the wolf-scaring fagots that guard the slain. I do not care to be one of the slain. I am ready to vote now or at any time to remove obstruction from legislative processes. In my humble opinion, as a farmer, I do not believe that the proposed compromise does other than—what? To make it all but impossible ever to impose cloture on a measure, motion, proposition, question, proposal, or a matter before the United States Senate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Senate now has before it a substitute for the Hayden-Wherry resolution presented by the minority floor leader the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], providing for cloture on motions to take up legislation and closing loopholes which have heretofore existed to permit unlimited filibuster against such motions and the blocking thereby of any legislation intended to be taken up. I shall vote for the substitute, because it seems to me the only practicable method available in this Congress for ending the power of unlimited debate on legislation which may be vital to the welfare, or even the safety, of the Nation.

I feel that the able Senators who have represented the Republicans in these recent difficult negotiations have done the best possible job they could, and I desire to compliment the minority floor leader the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] on their exceptional work.

Mr. President, I have had some experience I think in meeting the problems which are involved in cloture and in the conduct of the business of the Senate. I should like to review briefly what happened in the Eightieth Congress.

In 1917 the Senate adopted a cloture rule, but between that time and 1947, when the Republican Party took control of the Senate, loopholes were found and methods developed by which the cloture rule was nullified. After we had organized the Senate in 1947 and outlined a program which included various civil-rights bills, we found ourselves confronted every time we desired to take up such a bill with the threat of unlimited filibuster. We always had pending on the calendar measures of great international or national importance, and we could never see our way clear to take the 6 to 8 weeks which apparently would be necessary to end a determined filibuster by many Senators. In the summer of 1948, after the conventions, we made one more effort and suggested that possibly cloture could be applied to a motion under the rules as they stood, contrary to the opinion of the Parliamentarian and some previous precedents.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] at that time decided that he could not do otherwise than follow the prevailing parliamentary opinion and the former precedents. An appeal from the decision of the Chair was taken, but that appeal was open to unlimited debate. After 3 days of such debate and the prospect of unlimited filibuster, we were compelled to take up the housing and anti-inflation measures which had been then recommended by our committees.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at that point?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Do I correctly understand the Senator is making clear that the reason we did not have a vote on the Senator's appeal from the Vandenberg ruling in 1948 was because the appeal itself was being filibustered, and we never possibly could have gotten to a vote on the appeal until we first broke the filibuster?

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is entirely correct. We would have had to spend 6 weeks in August and September, and perhaps right down to the 2d of November, engaged in that effort. Possibly we Republicans might have been better off if we had done so.

Mr. MORSE. I agree.

Mr. LANGER. I agree with that, too.

Mr. TAFT. The conference of Republican Senators then, in August 1948, decided that the only time at which a filibuster could be broken was at the beginning of a new Congress when there were no other matters prepared for action. We therefore announced that immediately upon convening of the Eighty-first Congress, we would, if in control of the Senate, take up a proposal to change the rules to apply cloture to all incidental matters.

The people in their judgment gave control of the Senate to the Democratic Party, and we were not in a position to direct procedure in this Congress. We urged upon the majority leader that this rule be taken up immediately. On his insistence it could have been taken up by January fifteenth instead of March first, since the whole subject had been thoroughly canvassed 6 months before. During the 6 weeks between these dates, when the Senate had nothing to do the filibuster, in my opinion, could have been broken. When the motion was finally made by the majority leader on February 28 to take up the rule, we urged that every possible method be employed to bring the motion to a vote, and we were, of course, always prepared to furnish plenty of Republican votes to maintain a quorum at all times of day and night.

The Republicans have been blamed because a majority of them did not support the ruling by Vice President BARKLEY which undertook to reverse the very scholarly and logical ruling the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] made last August. A rather trivial attempt was made to distinguish the case from that of last August, but the question was really exactly the same. I happen to agree with the Vice President's interpretation of the rule, but most of the Republicans agreed with the President protempore [Mr. VANDENBERG]. This is no question of a technicality. If we ever admit that Senators, in voting on rules, should permit their opinion on proposed legislation to determine their vote instead of the meaning of the rules, there would be no rules in the Senate, and we would be subject to the arbitrary wishes of a presiding officer and a majority of those present.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield for a question.

Mr. MYERS. Is it not a fact that when the time came the Senator's conscience did not bother him sufficiently to lead him to vote to sustain the Vice President's ruling on the question?

Mr. TAFT. It is not, at all. I voted to sustain the Vice President. When the cloture petition was prepared last August no Senator had thought about the matter. It was a matter which had in no way been investigated or studied by anyone. It was a suggestion of a possible way to break a filibuster. When it was examined, and examined particularly by the distinguished President pro

tempore of the Senate in August, a ruling was made, which was convincing, I think, in many ways. I can easily see how those who signed the cloture petition might change their minds and come to a different conclusion.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TAFT. I yield for a question.

Mr. MYERS. Does the Senator think that the Senators who signed the petition for the Wherry substitute might change their opinion on the subject also?

Mr. TAFT. I did not quite understand the Senator's question. I think a Senator may always change his opinion.

Mr. MYERS. Does the Senator believe that any number of the 52 Senators who signed the petition to bring the Wherry substitute to the floor might change their opinion, or would their consciences prohibit changing their opinion?

Mr. TAFT. Of course, if a Senator promised to vote a certain way and had obtained thereby certain other things, it might not be easily done.

Mr. MYERS. After hearing the discussion, as the Senator says, those who heard the discussion on the original cloture petition determined to change their minds and change their position.

Mr. TAFT. If I made a promise to vote a certain way, I shall keep that promise.

Mr. MYERS. Does not the Senator believe that the signing of the cloture petition was, in effect, a promise that the signers of the petition would sustain the Chair, and not only would sustain the Chair, but that they actually believed a point of order should not lie against such a cloture petition?

Mr. TAFT. I do not think that constitutes a promise. I think it is merely a statement of intention, and it is not necessarily to be relied upon.

The effort to take up the Hayden-Wherry resolution, however, was greatly handicapped by the President's declaration in favor o cloture by a majority of a quorum. This made the position of the southern Senators still more unyielding, because the adoption of the Hayden-Wherry resolution would have provided cloture to support a later effort to change further the rules to meet the President's demands for 50 percent cloture.

The result of the delay in taking up the motion soon brought the majority leader into the same dilemma in which the leaders of the last Senate found themselves. Both the ECA and the rent-control measures must be enacted before April 1. Other important measures, including the public housing bill, the bill for a National Science Foundation, the bill amending the labor law, and the bill extending the reciprocal trade agreements, are now pending on the calendar. Apparently, the majority leader came to the conclusion that he must set aside the matter of changing the rules, and he announced to the press that he would make a motion to adjourn, which would have killed his own motion and would have been a complete surrender to the filibuster. I read from the New York Times of March 15:

> Senator SCOTT W. LUCAS, of Illinois, Democratic floor leader and the administration spokesman, announced surrender under compulsion to the southern filibuster, which has been going on since February 28. * * * After the collapse of all negotiations for a compromise, Senator LUCAS declared that he would move, possibly not before tomorrow, to put aside the center of all the controversy. * * * "We are going to move to lay this matter temporarily aside," Senator LUCAS told reporters after the last of 2 days of conferences by various leaders seeking some solution of the issue created by the filibuster. "We realize that the filibuster can go on for weeks. They have the manpower to do it. Meantime, rent control would go out the window." Senator LUCAS noted also that other major bills, such as those to continue the European recovery program, to restore the reciprocal trade program, and to repeal the Taft-Hartley Labor Act, were lagging in the legislative process. There was thus, he declared, a logjam that could not be allowed to continue. His decision was to put the filibuster struggle aside by a parliamentary action, simply to move to adjourn. An adjournment, as distinguished from a recess, would take the pending issue off the Senate Calendar.

Of course, the southern wing of the Democratic Party would also have supported that motion to adjourn unless some compromise had been reached with them. If the motion to adjourn had carried, it meant that there would be no further successful effort to change the rules in this Congress and no possibility of enacting any civil-rights measure opposed by the southern Senators. The Republicans, or practically all of them, would have voted against adjournment, but in vain. Politically, it might have been better for the Republican Party to accept that defeat, but a majority of the Republican Senators felt so strongly that the Senate should have an effective weapon against unlimited debate that they preferred to take the more dangerous political course of sponsoring progressive legislative action. I sympathize with their motives and their desire to bring this question to a settlement now, whether it can be done, and make civil-rights legislation possible in this Congress.

It has been suggested that we might abandon a change in the rule now and then come back in the summer or autumn for the special purpose of amending the rule. May I suggest, with the tremendous program proposed by President Truman, some of which I intend to support and a large part of which I intend to oppose, there will never be a time during 1949 or 1950 when we do not have important, pressing matters in the international field and in the national field calling for prompt consideration by Congress. Therefore the majority floor leader will find himself in the same position in which we Republicans found ourselves in the Eightieth Congress—and with the same result.

Sincere efforts have been made by all parties to reach a unanimous compromise on the rule. It was thought that a general agreement had been reached, but the majority leader finally determined that he could not agree to the proposed compromise. Last night an amendment was filed signed by 30 Democrats, a majority of the Democrats in the Senate, including 12 northern, western, and border-State Senators, and by 22 Republicans, a majority of the Republicans in the Senate, proposing a compromise change in the rules. I am told that all the Senators signing the amendment did so with the understanding that they would vote for that amendment and would vote against amendments thereto. With that understanding many Senators voted to adopt the motion to take up Senate Resolution 15 which they would otherwise have opposed. Therefore we have today only a choice between the compromise amendment and no changes in the rules at all.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. In a moment.

The new amendment provides that cloture shall apply to motions to take up legislation, that it shall not apply to motions to take up a change in rules, and that, when applied, cloture in all cases shall be by the vote of two-thirds of the Senators duly chosen and sworn, instead of by two-thirds of those voting.

I should have preferred cloture by two-thirds of those voting, and so stated to the Republican conferees. They found it impossible to secure a compromise on that basis. But I realize there is no difference between two-thirds of those chosen and sworn and two-thirds of those voting if the majority can get all their Senators to be present. Since this is usually possible, except in cases of extreme illness, the difference will seldom be more than one vote. There has been much discussion of the votes on past efforts to obtain cloture.

With due respect to the distinguished Senators who have done research on this matter, the statistics prove nothing unless we know all the circumstances in each case. If a majority of the Senate really desires to have in their seats all of the Senators who will vote on their side, they can assure the presence of every Senator who is not detained by serious illness. We find the best parallel in the last Congress when we had to get every vote possible to override the President's veto of the Labor-Management Relations Act, and the President's veto of the bill reducing taxes. In the case of the Labor Relations Act, we had in his seat every Senator who would vote to pass the bill over the veto, namely, 68 Senators. In the case of the tax-reduction bill, we had in his seat every Senator who would have voted to pass that bill except one who was detained by the serious illness of his wife. At the present moment, in my opinion, we could have in his seat for a vote on cloture every Senator who would vote in favor of cloture, except one.

I recognize, therefore, that the difference between the existing rule and that now proposed is not important in any serious crisis, in any matter involving a substantial and vital issue.

I did not sign the amendment because of my hesitation to approve this last change in the cloture requirement, but today we are confronted with the alternative of accepting this amendment or no amendment at all. The amendment will bring to an end the possibility of unlimited filibuster against measures which two-thirds of the Senators desire to bring to a vote. That is the vital point at issue, and this result is attained by the Wherry substitute, just as it would be attained by the original Hayden-Wherry resolution.

Motions to take up further changes in the rule will be no more difficult after the adoption of this amendment than they are today. The slight difference in the cloture requirement on legislation and on changes in the rules themselves will, in my opinion, be of minor importance compared to the great gain in applying cloture to motions to take up legislation.

Senators might consider for a moment the number of matters which are affected. In the Eightieth Congress there were introduced some 3,531 bills and resolutions. There were submitted resolutions providing for only 17 changes in the rules. Three thousand five hundred and thirty-one measures, therefore, would be subjected to the possibility of cloture on motion to take up, whereas under the rule as it now reads they could be blocked by filibustering the motion to take up.

Under the proposed new rule 66,000 nominations would be subject to cloture. Nominations have never been subject to cloture, and could be indefinitely debated by those opposed to particular nominations.

Mr. President, I think the misunderstanding on the subject of the proposed rule must be apparent when a great newspaper like the New York Times, which opposes the substitute amendment, advances the kind of argument contained in an editorial today.

It says at the end of this long editorial:

> Let us suppose that some day soon the new Atlantic Pact comes before the Senate for its approval. And let us suppose—what is not at all unthinkable—that a handful of determined isolationists (they still exist) decide to filibuster against a motion to bring this question up for debate. No matter how great the need of prompt action, no matter how alarming the spectacle of a hamstrung Senate would appear to our European allies and no matter how much capital Moscow would make of this situation, there is nothing the Senate could do—so long as present rules prevail—to put an end to such a filibuster except to wait for the physical exhaustion of the minority that staged it.

The Times states correctly the exact condition under the present rule, but it does not point out, that contrary to its own conclusion, if the substitute amendment is agreed to, that condition can no longer exist and there can be no filibuster against an effort to take up the Atlantic Pact, or any other security measure, or any civil-rights measure, so far as that is concerned if cloture can be obtained.

Let me repeat, therefore, Mr. President, in answer to the argument of the distinguished majority floor leader, that if this compromise is not adopted and the majority floor leader succeeds in adjourning the Senate, there will be very little chance of the enactment by this Congress of any civil-rights legislation. If the compromise shall be adopted conditions for civil-rights legislation will be to all intents and purposes as favorable as they would be under the Hayden-Wherry resolution, under which a cloture petition may be filed on a motion to take up. I believe that important features of that legislation can be adopted if the majority leader presses it for consideration. I repeat, the adoption of the substitute, far from killing civil-rights legislation, is the only practical way in which such legislation can be brought to a vote in the Eighty-first Congress.

I quite agree that the possibility of obtaining cloture by a majority vote is somewhat reduced by this action, and it is significant that those who are protesting most vigorously against the substitute, such as the forces of President Truman, the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the able Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], are really for majority cloture. Since an overwhelming majority of all Senators, including myself, are opposed to majority cloture, this argument does not affect my conclusion.

Because the only alternative to the substitute as now presented is the continuation of the right of unlimited filibuster, and because I think the right of unlimited filibuster should be brought to an end now, I shall vote against all amendments proposed to the substitute, and I shall vote for the substitute itself.

The compromise rule was adopted on March 17 by a vote of 63 to 23, the Democrats voting 29 to 15, the Republicans, 34 to 8. Cloture by a majority of the Senators chosen and sworn was rejected by a vote of 69 to 17. Cloture by a majority of a quorum, the Truman proposal, was rejected by a vote of 80 to 7.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as a freshman Senator, with, I hope, some sense of modesty, I had not planned on speaking before this body for some time, and then to speak only on substantive questions, and not on procedural matters. The Wherry amendment, however, will be used to kill so much legislation in which I believe, and for which the country voted last November, that I feel compelled to speak. Since, however, each page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD costs the taxpayers $71, and each day which the Senate is in session costs approximately $30,000—and I may say, parenthetically, that this filibuster to date has cost the taxpayers of the country approximately half a million dollars—I shall try to be very brief and not touch on points which have been so well developed by other Senators, and I shall try to conclude within 15 minutes. I ask only one favor from my colleagues, namely, that since I am endeavoring to be brief, I should appreciate their withholding any questions which they may have to propound until I conclude.

The proposal on cloture advanced by the Republican leader, the Senator from Nebraska, is a surrender to filibustering. It gives to a comparatively small minority the power to prevent the great majority of the American people from carrying their will into law.

If one analyzes the nature of the so-called Wherry resolution and examines the list of its 52 sponsors and the personnel of the 46 Senators who last Friday voted to overrule Vice President BARKLEY, it is obvious that this coalition represents, with certain exceptions, a marriage of the most conservative sections of the Republican Party with the most conservative sections of the Democratic Party. By giving to any 33 Senators the power to make it possible to talk any bill to death, it enables the northern Republicans to let the southern Democrats kill civil rights. The southern Democrats on their end can then permit the northern Republicans to filibuster rent control to death, since the rent-control law will expire on the 31st of this month, and we must do much work in the remaining 2 weeks if we are to get it extended. A filibuster of 33 Senators from the North, aided possibly by some from the South, can kill rent control.

The isolationists are not in the majority of the Senate, but they still form a small minority, and, if they can muster 33 votes, they can filibuster ECA to death because it will expire on April 3. Housing and Federal aid to education, which have determined minorities in opposition, can also possibly be filibustered to death. In fact, a small—a determined—minority of this body can, under the Wherry substitute, kill almost any bill it wants to kill.

In general, this is a marriage, as has been pointed out, of the conservatives of both parties to defeat the progressive program which was victorious at the polls last November, and this marriage is supported by the vast majority of the conservatives in all sections, and not merely in the Middle West, although it was primarily middle western Republicans who have joined with the southern Democrats, as well as the conservative Republicans in the East.

Since this point has perhaps been sufficiently covered, I should now like to address myself to a point which has been little discussed, namely, the way which the Wherry resolution will strengthen the sectionalism which has always cursed American political life by the fact that it greatly increases the already great power of the small States.

As we all know, one of the fundamental compromises which was made by the framers of the Constitution was to give the States with small populations the same number of votes in the Senate as were given to those which had large populations. I want to make it clear that we of the large States do not want to alter this provision. We are willing to abide under it. It was the price we had to pay in the beginning for the formation of the Union, and the Union is sufficiently precious to us that we are willing to pay the price of not having much voice in the United States Senate. But I think we should recognize the power already given to the small States and to certain sections of the country by this original compromise in the Constitutional Convention.

The original constitutional compromise already enables a minority of the voters, and a small minority of the voters at that, to elect a majority of the United States Senate. Thus the 25 smaller States in the country with 50 seats in the Senate—a majority of the Senate—had in 1940 a total population of 25,000,000, while the 23 larger States, with only 46 Members of the Senate, had a total population in that year of 106,500,000. In other words, a majority of the Senate is now elected by 19 percent of the population, while the remaining 81 percent of

the population are represented by a minority in the Senate.

Let me emphasize that point again. One-fifth of the population already controls the Senate, even on those matters which are decided by a simple majority vote of the Senate, while the remaining four-fifths of the population are represented by a minority, even in cases where a simple majority of votes is required.

Thus far I have been analyzing the control which the small States already have over the Senate. Since some of the smaller States are in New England and in the Great Plains region, it may be well to show these results on a sectional basis. Let us take the 24 States of the South Atlantic, East South Central, West South Central and Mountain regions. The Senators from these regions form exactly half the total membership of this body. But the population of these regions in 1940 was only 45,100,000 or 35 percent of the population of the country.

In other words, sections of the country with 35 percent of the population now elect as many Senators as the Northern, Midwestern, and Pacific States that have 65 percent of the population. The people who live in these regions, therefore, now have approximately twice as much per capita representation in the Senate as those who live in the more populous States.

I digress here for a moment to say that the eight Mountain States, with a total population of only a little more than four million have 16 seats in the United States Senate. Eight States, with a population of only 4,000,000 have 16 seats, whereas my own State of Illinois, with a total population twice as great as all of these eight States together has only two seats. The eight larger States have a total population of 60,000,000, and yet they have only the same representation as the eight Mountain States with a population of only 4,000,000. I hope my friends from the Mountain States will excuse me if I bring this out. There is no group of Senators who are more companionable or more lovable than the Senators from the Mountain States, but we should recognize the population facts as they exist.

Now let me repeat that we of the larger States do not complain about this fact. We recognize that it was the price which the larger States had to pay to get the smaller ones to join the new Nation in the beginning, and the blessings of that union are so great that we are glad the price was paid.

Nor is this all. We of the 24 States of the North, the Midwest, and the Pacific coast pay 80 percent or four-fifths of the personal-income taxes of the Government while the remaining 24 States pay only 20 percent or one-fifth of the total. The two States of New York and Illinois alone pay approximately a quarter of the entire income taxes of the country or more than all 24 of the States of the South Atlantic, West, and East South Central, and the mountain regions combined. We do not complain about this. Our per capita incomes are larger than those of the South and it is only proper that we should pay more taxes. Moreover, we of the large industrial States of the North and Midwest are open-handed in the appropriations which we make for the people of the South and the Mountain States. We alone are giving in excess of a billion and a half dollars in the form of Federal aid to the States. The South and the Mountain States are getting more than their proportionate per capita share in this. Although a small segment of my own people in Illinois may resent this, I will say that I favor a continuation of the assistance we give to the South and the Mountain States, because the people there are economically poorer than we are and need more aid. Inside the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, we are considering Federal aid for education and for school health services, and I have insisted in that committee that we use a formula which will give to the poorer States a much larger per capita share in the Federal grants than we are going to get in the North and in the industrial States. We are also working to reduce the share which the poorer States have to put up—as against the larger share which we of the northern and North Central States have to put up—in order to get each dollar of Federal money.

We are doing this in the case of hospitals, and we intend to do it in the case of education and health measures. In the interest of national unity, we of the more prosperous States are pouring our money into the Southern and Mountain States in order to help the people of those sections and I repeat, for the third time, we are glad to do it for we recognize that our fellow-Americans are our brothers even though some southern spokesmen in the heat of passion sometimes refuse to think similarly of us.

It is much the same with public works. We of the North and the Middle West somehow never get much of these appropriations. When the pie is passed around we get only a thin slice. But we gladly pour billions into protecting the Southern and Western States from floods, into harnessing the waters of the Tennessee and the Columbia Rivers for the benefit of the people of those regions, into power projects in Texas, Arkansas, and the Mountain States, into the arid deserts of New Mexico, Colorado, Arizona, and into the valleys of California. I am pushing for the development of the Missouri Valley, although my own State does not stand to benefit directly by a single penny because of it. I mention all this to show that those of us from the North and Midwest who regard ourselves as liberals and progressives are trying to put the national interest first and that we are trying to help the people of other regions who need our help. We are taxing ourselves to help these regions because we believe it will help the United States of America. I regret to say that though I have listened for years, I have failed to hear any appreciable recognition of this fact from the spokesmen of those regions who are at the receiving end of this help.

Similarly, we progressive Democrats of the North and West have been generous in the organization of the Senate. Of the 15 committees of this body, all but 1, and that the least important nationally, namely, the Committee on the District of Columbia, are headed by southerners or Senators from the Mountain States, namely 8 from the South and 6 from the Mountain States. We of the North, the Midwest, and the Pacific coast regions who win the national elections for the Democratic Party come to the Senate to find ourselves treated as poor relations, and almost as interlopers, and prevented from defending either the legitimate interests of our sections or advancing the interests of the country as a whole.

I have said enough to indicate that ever under our present system of majority voting we of the North and the Midwest are the suppressed classes and second-class citizens in the Senate and in the Nation. We pay the taxes and what we do decides whether we win or lose the elections. But after winning an election, we find it almost impossible to get anything for ourselves or for the Nation. We do not ask for position as individuals, but we do want to further the welfare of the people of the United States, most of whom live in our regions.

But as though all this were not enough, the regions which profit so much from us insist on using the filibuster. Not content with having a minority of the people control a majority of the Senate, they would go further, and have a minority of a minority control the Senate, despite the fact that the very composition of the Senate is at present more than adequate protection for the minority about whom so much has been said in the last 3 weeks. But these gentlemen go on to take the further step of filibustering, an act designed to prevent the Senate from even considering matters of vital interest.

What does the filibuster do? As I have said, it permits a minority of the Senate, and in reality a minority of a minority, to defeat the will of the majority of its Members by never-ending talk. The filibuster is a veto which a few men with strong lungs and sturdy constitutions can impose upon the overwhelming majority of the people of the United States. If we continue along this line, the great qualification which a Senator will need will be his ability to speak for 24 hours without stopping; that will be said to be the type of person whom the States should send to the Senate. Everyone in his heart knows that this is a disgrace. The events of the past 3 weeks have discredited representative government at a time when above all times it needs to be strengthened. So long as the filibuster can continue, the people's will is thwarted.

The Wherry resolution gives to 33 Senators, now and almost forevermore, the power to kill any measure. This means that 17 States can now act to preserve a filibuster. This means that a combination of the 17 smaller States, with less than 8 percent, or one-thirteenth of the population, and paying less than 7 percent, or one-fifteenth, of the income taxes, can tie up the Senate and the country and defeat the will of over 90 percent of the people.

If we consider the situation on a sectional basis, the 17 smaller States in the South and the mountain regions will now have the power to impose a filibuster, although they have only 15 percent of the population. They cast only

10 percent of the votes, and they pay only 10 percent of the total personal income tax. They can now exercise control, if they stick together, over the rest of the country.

There were virtually as many votes cast in Illinois last November, namely, 3,900,000, as in all the 17 States combined. I do not wish to make any personal reference or indulge in personal boasting, but even the majority which I received in Illinois last November, namely, 408,000, is greater than the total sum of the votes cast in at least three or four of these States. I say that because the majority which I received was not a majority for me personally. It was, instead, a majority vote for the measures for which I stood, and for which the American people voted.

Who then is behind the Wherry resolution? Of its 52 sponsors—and I suppose they will pick up more votes—20 are southern Democrats, 4 are border Democrats, and 6 are from the Mountain States. I regret that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is not present. He used a classification of 10 being from border States, Northern States, Western States, and so forth.

I wish to point out that no northern or midwestern Democrats signed the Wherry resolution. They were border and southern Democrats, and mountain Democrats; but there were no midwestern, eastern, or northern Democrats.

On the other hand, of the 22 Republicans, only 5 are from the Atlantic seaboard, and 17 are from west of the Alleghenies. Two of them, I believe, are from mountain regions. Judging from the vote last Friday, it is probable that there will be more Republicans from the mountain regions who will vote for the Wherry resolution, even though they did not sign it. Sectionally, this is a union of southern Democrats, midwestern Republicans and—and I am going to say something which many Senators may not like, something which has not been observed thus far—most Senators, though not all, of both parties from the Mountain States.

Let me say a word about the Mountain States, although this may be a somewhat injudicious remark to make. They have great political power in the Senate, because they have 16 votes. Personally they are as fine a group of men as could possibly be assembled. They are lovable. They are open-hearted. They are personally generous. They are generally progressive in their views. But they work pretty hard for their States. They want to see large Federal appropriations for public works, for irrigation, and for other purposes. They are interested in a tariff on wool, in a tariff on sugar, and in high prices for silver. I think on occasion they have carried on flirtations with those who are interested in the prices of cotton and tobacco.

This may be hard to accept, but it is the literal truth. If we of the large industrial States did not pay the cost of the tariffs on sugar and on wool; if we did not pay high prices for silver; and if we did not pour our money into public works, a large proportion of the population of the Mountain States would either have to leave that region or go on relief. The Mountain States are greatly indebted to the rest of the country.

But we find them here—not all of them, thank the Lord, but a great many of them—in this alliance of midwestern conservative Republicans and southern Democrats. The Wherry resolution would increase the great power which they already hold over the Senate. Now, with 16 Senators out of a total of 33 who can talk a measure to death, they will have much greater strategic importance than they now have. This may possibly account for some of the names which appear on the Wherry resolution.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does the Senator not recognize that there is at least one Mountain State both of whose Senators signed the original cloture petition?

Mr. DOUGLAS. All honor to the Senators from New Mexico, neither of whom joined in sponsoring the Wherry resolution, and who are standing shoulder to shoulder with those of us from the large industrial States. All honor to other Senators from mountain regions who are standing with us.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. KERR. Is the criterion of honor for a Senator dependent on whether his name is or is not on a petition before this body?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course I did not mean that. I am not attacking any Senator whose name is on the petition, but I am giving extra praise to Senators from the regions which would benefit from the Wherry resolution, and who, in spite of that fact, did not sign it.

Mr. HUNT, Mr. KNOWLAND, and Mr. TAYLOR addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, if the junior Senator from Illinois will yield to the junior Senator from Wyoming, I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois if he is aware of the fact that if the suggestion of one of the western Senators—and a junior western Senator—had been followed and accepted, the Senate would never have gotten into this filibuster?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was not aware of that.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. HUNT. I should like to say that at the very first meeting of the Committee on Rules and Administration, the situation into which the Senate would be thrown was very evident, very clear.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am very glad to yield for a question, but I do not wish to yield for a statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator can yield only for a question, not for a statement.

Mr. HUNT. Then I should like to restate the question, if I may: Does the Senator from Illinois know, since he has commented on the votes of the western Senators, that if the suggestion of the junior Senator from Wyoming had been followed, the Senate would not have gotten into this filibuster at this time?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was not aware of that fact.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Apropos of the question just raised by the Senator from Wyoming, does the Senator from Illinois know that had the suggestion of the junior Senator from Wyoming been followed, the question of trying to amend the rules would never have been before the Senate, and therefore the Senate would have been subject, for the entire session, to an unlimited filibuster?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not aware of what went on in the secret places of the Committee on Rules or in the various caucuses which were springing up like mushrooms all over the Senate building. At some time I should like to have the Senator from Wyoming make a very full statement on this point. I shall read it with interest and with great affection.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I understood the able junior Senator from Illinois to say that the Wherry substitute to the original Hayden-Wherry resolution was an abject surrender to the filibuster. My question is this: Is it not a fact that due to the procedures in which he found himself the majority leader himself was about to move to adjourn the Senate, which would have been an abject surrender to the filibuster, if an alternative had not been presented? Is not that also a fact?

Mr. DOUGLAS. My very good friend and colleague, the senior Senator from Illinois, is well able to speak for himself, but I should like to suggest, inexperienced as I am in parliamentary matters, that if we had adjourned then we would not have had fastened into the rules of the Senate a provision under which cloture could only be obtained by the votes of two-thirds of all Members of the Senate. A precedent would have been established because of the vote to overrule the Vice President, but that precedent could itself have been overruled by later votes of the Senate. We were not abandoning the fight; we merely wanted to adjourn the battle.

But the Senator from California and the Senator from Nebraska would put the handcuffs on our hands and the ball and chain around our leg, so as virtually to prevent us from ever changing the rules of the Senate after this present change in the rules goes through.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois if, in his judgment, it would be better to wait until a later date.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think it would.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Until the next election will be held, when one-third of the Members of this body and all Members of the House of Representatives will appear

before the voters. Is that the Senator's judgment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the elections of 1950 and 1952 will, in part, be referenda on what has been going on.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. TAYLOR. Does not the Senator from Illinois admit that one of the reasons for the sorry economic plight of some of the Western States is absentee ownership, the fact that the ownership of our resources is concentrated in the North and in the East?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I not only admit that, I assert it. It is quite true that—I hesitate to use a cliche—the big banks, insurance companies, and industrial interests of the North and Midwest control the major portion of the industries of the South and of the mines and many of the companies of the West. I wish to tell the Senator from Idaho that I am not speaking for those big industrial and financial interests. I do not represent them; I am not making a case for them. In fact, I think it will be found that we progressive Democrats of the North and of the Midwest are more willing to help the South and the West in the matter of freight rates than are a great many of the Senators and Representatives from those regions themselves. We will join the Senator in a fight on freight rates. We will join the Senator in a fight to get decent Federal aid for those regions. But we do not wish to be put in the position of always paying, paying, paying, and never being given a voice in the affairs of the United States.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. TAYLOR. I wish to say to the Senator from Illinois that I am not one of those who have become the sponsors of the measure which is before the Senate, but I wish to plead guilty to being one who tries to get things for my little Western State which is exploited by absentee ownership; and I shall keep that up until, some day, I hope, we can be the masters of our own destiny.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois can yield only for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. MORSE. Did the junior Senator from Illinois hear the speech made in this Chamber this morning by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I did.

Mr. MORSE. Did the Senator from Illinois hear the Senator from Ohio say, in effect, that in his opinion the difference in votes between the original Wherry-Hayden resolution and the present Wherry substitute would be only about one vote?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I heard him say that, and I marveled at it.

Mr. MORSE. Has the Senator from Illinois listened to the statistics which have been placed in the RECORD during this debate by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], from which it is found, upon analyzing the past cloture cases in the Senate, that the vote difference would be eight, not one, as the Senator from Ohio stated this morning?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Oregon is completely correct. As has been said time and time again, the average vote on the 19 motions for cloture which have occurred in the past has been a little over 83. The two-thirds provision of the original Hayden-Wherry resolution would have permitted cloture, on the average, therefore, by the votes of 56 or 57 Senators. The requirement now to be imposed on us by the substitute would necessitate the votes of 64 Senators. That means that, whereas it would ordinarily require the votes of 56 or 57 Senators to free the Senate from a filibuster under the original proposal, it now will take the votes of 64 Senators. Those seven extra votes are of tremendous importance, particularly in view of the great possibility of absenteeism, which the junior Senator from Oregon has so well pointed out.

Mr. MORSE. Did the Senator from Illinois hear the Senator from Ohio this morning gloss over the statistics which have been placed in the RECORD—to which I have referred—by saying that unless we knew all the facts about the situations existing at those times no weight should be given to those statistics?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is familiar, no doubt, with the famous quotation about the three definitions of terminological inexactitude. Statistics are wonderful.

Mr. MORSE. Did the Senator from Illinois hear the Senator from Ohio attempt to explain away Republican inaction on filibusters during the Eightieth Congress by an assertion to the effect that some very important legislation was pending in the Eightieth Congress, and we know that we could not break the filibuster unless we took from 6 to 8 weeks to do so?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I heard him say that.

Mr. MORSE. In the opinion of the Senator from Illinois, does he consider that the explanation or alibi or rationalization by the Senator from Ohio on that point in any way changes the fact that the Republican Party did not defeat the filibuster in the Eightieth Congress when it had control for 2 years?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course not. If I am correctly informed, the motion to change the rules lay before the Senate for something like 16 months, during which time no action was taken. It was only in the special session that the matter was brought up, possibly to defeat the program which the President had called the special session to consider and enact.

Mr. MORSE. Did the Senator from Illinois hear the Senator from Ohio this morning in his speech state that it was his understanding or impression or belief—I do not quote him verbatim, but in effect, I think I quote his meaning accurately—that he felt that the 52 Senators who signed the round-robin resolution known as the Wherry substitute in effect committed themselves to vote in accordance with that resolution, irrespective of what facts or information might come out in the debate?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I listened to that statement by the Senator from Ohio with great interest, because apparently behind the round robin is an agreement to vote down all amendments. I should like to add this point, too: If the Republicans, and particularly the midwestern Republicans found it difficult to compromise with the southerners and felt they could only get an agreement by giving in to them, that this was the only thing they could do, and so they yielded reluctantly, but nevertheless yielded, why did they not come to the northern Democrats and agree with us on the Hayden-Wherry resolution, which we were always willing to support as a last resort to secure agreement? If they wanted to have it adopted, why did they have to rush into the arms of our good friends from the South? Why did they not come to us? But no: They refused to do that. They were more interested in trying to put us in a hole than in improving the rules of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a further question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Has the Senator from Illinois heard the rumor that a part of the understanding that exists, at least among some Senators, Republicans and southern Democrats, is that to save the face of some Republicans, the southern Democrats must agree to yield on some form of anti-poll-tax legislation in the Eighty-first Congress, so the Republicans can say, "Why, we did get an anti-poll-tax law through under the Wherry substitute amendment"?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I certainly never came within a hundred yards, so far as I know, of the secret places where the caucuses were being held, and I of course do not know what went on there. But I read with interest the statement by the floor leader of the Republican Party, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] this morning, in which he said that now he thought we could get anti-poll-tax legislation through. When I read that I thought he was either gifted with foolish and false optimism, or that possibly some such arrangement as the Senator from Oregon suggests had been made. What the future holds may perhaps reveal whether or not such an agreement was arrived at.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Illinois agree with me that the real test of Republican good faith in the field of civil rights, once they get the Wherry amendment—many of them having advanced that idea in debate and having already committed themselves—the real test of their good faith is whether or not in the Eighty-first Congress they will go down the line in an all-out fight for a complete civil-rights program?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think that is correct. And I can say, if they line up in that fight, we shall be glad to fight with them. I want to say to my friends from the South that this does not mean in any sense that we of the North want to be cruel to the people of the South, or want

to impose measures upon them which would cripple them. We want to help the South. I may add that we of the North recognize that we, too, have sinned in this matter. We have sinned grievously. I am not looking down my nose at the people of the South. We have made terrific failures in the North. We want these civil-rights programs for ourselves as well as for the country as a whole, and we are not intent on merely forcibly driving them down the throats of one section of the country.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield, certainly. I started out, Mr. President, to make a very short speech, and I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that I am not remaining on my feet to complete my speech, but merely to answer questions other Senators have asked.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator can decline to yield to any Senator if he desires to do so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I should be very glad to yield, but I want to make it perfectly clear I am not prolonging the debate of my own will; that is all.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to the junior Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator feel it is fair in analyzing the historical votes in order to ascertain how many votes were necessary to impose cloture, to analyze the 12 times when the cloture failed, and in many cases failed miserably, in which case there would have been no point in trying to have a full attendance of Senators present?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Senators did not know they were going to fail miserably.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. In the case of the labor-disputes proposal, for example, where there were only 3 votes in favor of cloture, and 77 votes against it, would it not seem reasonable that Senators would have known on that occasion that cloture would fail by a miserable vote?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Possibly.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly I yield.

Mr. LONG. Is it not true that in passing on cloture, even under the two-thirds rule, in the three times out of four, when cloture has actually been effectively imposed, there were 65 or more votes in favor of cloture, and on the fourth time, there were 55 votes, so that, if the majority leader had not had the two-thirds, he could have simply come back the next day with his cloture petition all over again, see that his men were in their seats, and obtained their votes?

Mr. DOUGLAS. One of those cases, I believe perhaps the original case, was that when debate was shut off in 1917 on a war measure; is that not true?

Mr. LONG. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That was a period of grave national emergency, and naturally there would be a large vote. What I am saying is merely that it is very easy to hide out when 64 votes are necessary, so that 33 Senators, whether they are on the floor, or whether they are away, can defeat cloture. What I am trying to point out is that the South and the mountain regions, with midwestern allies, if they seek again, can always, under the proposed new rule, tie up the United States Senate.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Referring to the only case historically in which cloture has been successfully imposed, in the absence of 64 votes, namely, the creation of a bureau of customs in 1927, in which the vote was 55 to 27, if the majority leader in that case had failed for lack of 64 votes, would there have been anything at all to keep him from coming back the next day with another cloture petition, and if need be, even arresting the nine Senators who were not present, have them in their seats and make them vote?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator refers to a new cloture petition. Could there not have been filibustering between the two cloture petitions?

Mr. LONG. Could not the majority leader have come in the very next day, or even earlier, and himself filed another cloture petition, and have had a vote on that second cloture petition, when he had his men in their seats? But in this case, was it not true that the majority leader had plenty of votes, he had his majority present, the motion carried, and so he did not have to get the other Senators in their seats?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not acquainted with the facts in that particular case, I may say to the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield with a great deal of trepidation, as I face one of the subtlest men, and one of the most able of the field generals I suppose who ever appeared on the floor of the United States Senate; and, though my knees are knocking, I am very glad indeed to yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I suppose I am now completely disarmed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; the Senator does not have to be disarmed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Nevertheless, I have a question I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Illinois. The Senator, having embarked on the civil-rights program, as many other Senators do, stated he wanted to help the South.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator also admitted that those in other sections had sinned grievously?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course the Senator knows that one of the most controversial of all the civil-rights measures is that which seeks to abolish segregation of the races. The Senator's criticism, it seems to me, would fall with great violence upon the head of the distinguished mayor of Chicago, if the newspaper accounts can be believed, which state that he went before his council and personally defeated a resolution which would have prohibited segregation of races in public-housing projects in the city of Chicago. Does the Senator propose to compel the Democratic mayor of Chicago to reverse his position and to support all measures which would destroy segregation of the races in housing projects and elsewhere?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Georgia has asked a very penetrating question, but, unfortunately, the Senator, in this case, is not so thoroughly prepared on his facts as he customarily is. The ordinance which was recently voted on by the Chicago City Council did not deal primarily with public housing. So far as public housing in Chicago is concerned, we do not have segregation. But the proposed ordinance provided that on land which was cleared by the city and upon which private housing was to be constructed there should be a municipal provision forbidding segregation. That ordinance was opposed by the mayor of the city in the belief that it would deter private insurance companies from making large investments in private housing, and he did not wish to impose this regulation upon private concerns, although he is against segregation in public housing.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it seems to me that the Senator's argument cannot possibly be consistent if he is willing to permit the city of Chicago, in order to promote the building of public housing, to impose a pattern of segregation which was denounced when we of the South sought to prevent in our cities race riots and bloodshed such as marked Chicago a few years ago.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say that I did not willingly stir up the hornet's nest on this question. I wanted to discuss the power of the small States and of sections, and I wanted to avoid the question of civil rights, if possible, because I know that would warm the emotions. But since the Senator has asked the question, I feel that I should reply to it.

We have already had before the Committee on Banking and Currency a resolution, presented by the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] calling for the abolition of segregation in every public-housing project in every city of the Nation, including the South. I do not wish to impute motives to any Senator. I highly respect and like the junior Senator from Ohio. I can say, however, that he has not been a conspicuous advocate of public housing or of slum clearance. The thought at least crossed my mind that the resolution he sponsored might be intended so that if it were included in the housing bill southern Democrats would vote against it and the northern conservative Republicans, who are opposed to public housing, would also vote

against it, and that, therefore, it was a measure designed to prevent any housing program going through. I will say to the Senator from Georgia that I voted against the proposal of the Senator from Ohio and that I am taking some criticism from many of my friends in Chicago because of my vote.

I want to say to the Senator from Georgia that we are not proposing to abolish segregation in the South, and I am glad to make that point clear.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to follow that up for a moment, if I may.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We are not proposing to abolish segregation in the South. We are not proposing to abolish it in housing, or in the Federal aid for education bill. We are not proposing to abolish it in the schools. We are doing two things: We are saying we should give equal opportunity to all the people in the South, black and white; and we are for housing for that purpose, for Federal aid to education for that purpose, and for health care for that purpose. In the North, by local decisions in most cases, we have decided that this barrier between the races should be diminished.

But I want to make this point clear, because it has been unintentionally, I am sure, exaggerated in the South. The Senators from the South are seeing ghosts. We do not want to impose rules against segregation on the South. We want to help the people of the South, black as well as white. Speaking for myself, I believe that so far as providing jobs is concerned, so far as a chance to earn a living is concerned, it should not be denied to any man because of his race, his creed, or his color. He should have a chance to develop in industry according to his ability. I am not insisting, however, that in the social relations which men have with each other they must be forced to mingle. That is an individual matter, and, in many cases, a matter for local decision.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to thank the Senator from Illinois for his very frank and forthright statement. I do not think he and I are so far apart in this case. We might have some difference in the approach, but in our basic feelings we are the same.

Has the Senator read the report of the President's Commission on Civil Rights?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. And does the Senator think that we in the South are seeing ghosts, when that Commission, appointed by the President, demands that all Federal aid to Southern States, old-age assistance, aid to schools, and all social-security benefits be denied to the Southern States unless they abolish segregation in their schools, unless the Southern States abolish laws which permit segregation in any place, including restaurants? We are to be denied any benefits that flow from the Federal Government unless we pass laws on that question. Does the Senator think that is a ghost? The Commission has solemnly reported that that is the kind of tactics which should be used on the South to force us to bend to the will of the Commission and accept its views in regard to the abolition of segregation of the races. Does not the Senator know that that is a part of the program? The people of the South are concerned by the fact that the report recommends going to such drastic, punitive measures as withholding from them any benefits unless they abolish segregation of the races in every relation of life.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would say to the very able Senator from Georgia that that is not the program of the Democratic Party, as it was adopted in Philadelphia. I subscribed to the program of the party in Philadelphia. Our civil-rights program contains merely four planks. The first is the abolition of the poll tax. I think all States should abolish property qualifications so that poor people may have a chance to vote.

Second, a Federal antilynching law, so that mob violence can be controlled. I will say that there has been such violence in the North as well as in the South, and the law should apply to us as well as to the people in other regions. Mob violence should be made a Federal offense and tried in the Federal courts.

Third, equal treatment in the armed services, which merely means that colored troops should be given a chance to shed their blood as combat soldiers instead of being relegated to supply and enginering units.

Fourth, an FEPC law. I should like to see if we cannot sit down together and work out an arrangement which will protect people of all races, creeds, and colors and which, at the same time, will give the maximum of local self-government.

Mr. PEPPER and several other Senators rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McMAHON in the chair). The Chair wishes it to be understood that Senators must confine themselves to questions.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I read in the newspapers this morning that the filibuster was all over and that Senators were merely talking, now. I did not think that rule applied.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The rule was laid down and reiterated in the past 10 days or 2 weeks, and it will be enforced. The Senator from Illinois can yield only for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. LUCAS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Georgia be able to make the observation he desires to make, in the time of the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Georgia may proceed.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois. I assure him the observation will be very brief.

I merely wish to get back to the original statement I made, or question I propounded to the junior Senator from Illinois, and to take this occasion to say that I am greatly gratified at his apparent understanding of the question we are discussing, judging by the statements he has made. But does he not think that it is more than a ghost that is confronting the South on the question of segregation when we have seen how those who have promoted the first bills, if they secured the enactment of one of them, immediately came in with another, in their effort to destroy the segregation of the races in the South?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Life is a process of change, and great changes do not come suddenly. We should have slow and gradual change, but we can move much faster on the question of civil rights than we are now doing.

If the Senator will forgive me for saying this, if he can free himself from this obsession which is not held by any large section in the North, we can make progress on this question of fair employment practices, and the right of people to earn their living by the sweat of their brows on the basis of individual ability, not being discriminated against because of their religion, race, or color.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator disarms me again by moving to another illustration which was not encompassed within my question. It certainly is not an obsession when we are confronted with the very real fact that the Commission the President appointed, though it sat in star-chamber sessions and did not permit any southerner to be heard, regardless of his good will, unless his views were known in advance, has come out with the recommendations which I set forth a few moments ago, and which have been approved in principle by the President of the United States in his letter transmitting the report to the Congress. I think that is much more than a ghost. If it is only a ghost at present, it is a ghost which will be living and breathing and working in this body in a very short period of time, at the behest of the minority groups which have brought all the political implications into the debate which has been proceeding in the Senate on this subject.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We of the North are only urging the Democratic platform which was adopted in Philadelphia. We are not urging the program of the President's Commission on Civil Rights. What is wrong with the four planks in the Democratic platform to which I have referred, for which, I believe, the Senator from Georgia has something less than a burning enthusiasm?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have no great enthusiasm for them, but if the platform were all construed as the Senator from Illinois is construing it, I should feel much better about the future. However, I happen to know that the construction the Senator from Illinois has put upon the provision, for example, respecting discrimination in the armed services, is far different from the interpretation of those who really started the agitation, and who presented and had the plank written into the platform. Certainly no one would deny a man of any race or creed the privilege of fighting for his country.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But he is denied it, under the present organization of the Army, and of my own beloved Marine Corps, because in those services the Negroes are relegated to the supply and engineering units, and are practically not permitted in the combat outfits.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator well knows that the purpose back of the movement is to cause an intermingling of the races down to the squad level, and certainly that is not necessary to enable a man to fight and die for his country.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is not necessary at all. The Democratic platform says "equality of treatment." There can be separate battalions and separate regiments.

Mr. PEPPER and Mr. KNOWLAND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield first to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to ask this question: Is it not a fact—and the Senator has already amplified the Democratic platform—that, except with respect to denying private transportation companies authority to enforce segregation in public carriers crossing State lines, there is not a recommendation in the President's civil-rights program to abolish segregation of races in any part of the country?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should have read the report of the President's Commission this morning before I came to the Senate, but I did not have time to do so, and when the Senator from Georgia made the definite statement that it did advocate the abolition of segregation, since I know he is ordinarily very accurate, I felt I could not say that he was in the wrong. But I should be glad to have the Senator from Florida correct the Senator from Georgia if he is wrong.

Mr. PEPPER. In his message to the Congress, as distinguished from a message transmitting a report, which report I now have in my hand, the President said, on page 3 of the civil-rights program message to the Congress, Document No. 516:

> I recommend, therefore, that the Congress enact legislation at this session directed toward the following specific objectives:
>
> 1. Establishing a permanent Commission on Civil Rights, a Joint Congressional Committee on Civil Rights, and a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice.

Mr. President, there is nothing there that breaks up any practices or ordinances or statutes of segregation in any part of the country, is there?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad for the aid which has been given me in time of trouble by my friend from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will allow, I shall continue reading these recommendations:

> 2. Strengthening existing civil-rights statutes.

I will ask the Senator if the President had not in mind, and did he not amplify further in this message, covering the kind of a case which happened in my State. A constable, as the court decision reported it, had a personal difficulty with a Negro and finally got him on the Suwannee River bridge and made him jump off into the river, his body being later found, down the river, caught in the bushes. The grand jury indicted the constable, and he was later indicted in the Federal court under the Federal statute relating to depriving any citizen of his rights guaranteed by the Constitution, and the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit upheld the conviction in that case. But what was the punishment? It was a sentence of 1 year, because the statute permitted a punishment of only 1 year's duration. I ask if the President, in speaking about strengthening the penalty in civil-rights statutes, did not refer to the guaranty of life, liberty, and property in the Federal Constitution, and if that does raise a question of segregation in the several States.

The third point is:

> 3. Providing Federal protection against lynching.

I ask, Mr. President, if the President was not aiming at the protection of life of citizens of the United States, as well as citizens of a State, in cases where an attempt was made to take life improperly, and if it is not a fact that the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate reported a measure, after careful scrutiny of the subject, which provided that such Federal authority should not apply except to common carriers where a sheriff or his deputy or a marshal or his deputy had conspired with a lynch mob.

I read further:

> 4. Protecting more adequately the right to vote.

When the President was talking about the abolition of the poll tax there, I will ask the Senator if that has anything to do with breaking down requirements as to segregation in any part of the country.

> 5. Establishing a Fair Employment Practice Commission to prevent unfair discrimination in employment.

I ask if that is not what the able Senator said it was, a desire to give the right to work to an American citizen without regard to race, creed, or color. There is nothing about whether the white people work in one part of a factory, the brown in another, and the black in some other part.

> 6. Prohibiting discrimination in interstate transportation facilities.

It can be claimed that the question of segregation does arise under that, because it simply proposes that private carriers cannot do what the United States Supreme Court has said States cannot do, namely, impose segregation upon passengers, all paying the same price for their transportation, when they are crossing State lines. But that does not apply to passengers on carriers within the States.

> 7. Providing home rule and suffrage in Presidential elections for the residents of the District of Columbia.
>
> 8. Providing statehood for Hawaii and Alaska and a greater measure of self-government for our island possessions.
>
> 9. Equalizing the opportunities for residents of the United States to become nationalized citizens.
>
> 10. Settling the evacuation claims of Japanese-Americans.

Does the Senator find anything in that series of recommendations by the President to break down the practices or the requirements of segregation of the races in any part of the country?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. I should think that probably the very able Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] confuses the report of the Commission with the recommendations of the President. I may say to the Senator from Georgia that I did not launch the discussion of civil rights. I started to speak on the fact that the Wherry resolution gives greater power to the small States than to the large States. I did not start that discussion——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask my able friend from Georgia if he will not defer to me so I may ask the Senator from Illinois another question.

Mr. RUSSELL. Very well.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield briefly to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I will ask if the Senator from Illinois knows of any decision of the Supreme Court of the United States which holds that the Congress of the United States, except in respect to the conditioning of the acceptance of public money has authority to break down segregation practices in things other than might affect interstate commerce—such as a swimming pool, a residence used as a school, as a church, or by a social organization, and that sort of thing?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am not a lawyer, and certainly not an authority on the Constitution, but I try to read the decisions of the Supreme Court. My memory may not be worth a great deal, but I cannot remember any such decision.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall not infringe on the Senator's time. I had intended to listen to the whole of the Senator's speech, and did hear the first 5 minutes of his speech, but I was called off the floor, and when I returned the Senator was engaged in a discussion purely of civil rights with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE.]

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think I was drawn into that by the discussion.

Mr. RUSSELL. I had no intention of making any suggestion about civil rights during the Senator's speech. As a matter of fact, I have tried to keep away from it, because it is my belief that, while the matter of change of the rule is brought up as a spearhead, it does not relate to the question of civil rights.

The Senator from Florida has read from the message of the President. I am sure that even the Senator from Florida will admit that the report of the Commission embraces recommendations and demands by the President, as I have described to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say to the Senator from Georgia that I think he is confusing the report of the Commission with the recommendations of the President. I want to say that we Democrats of the

North stand by the Philadelphia platform. There was a hymn I used to sing in church as a boy—I will say to the Senator from Georgia that, though I went to a Protestant church, I used to sing a hymn by a great Catholic churchman, Cardinal Newman, called "Lead, Kindly Light." Let me give two of its lines:

Lead, kindly light, * * * I do not ask to see
The distant scene—one step enough for me.

I think it is a mistake to refuse to take a step which is good because one thinks it may lead in the future to something one does not like. Let us legislate on the proximate issues which are before us and not trouble ourselves with the hobgoblins of what may happen 60 or 100 years in the future. There are some things, Mr. President, that our children and our grandchildren can settle for themselves.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I shall not proceed further in this debate, out of deference to my distinguished friend, who is making a very able speech, other than to say that we do not consider this a matter which relates to 60 or 80 years in the future. The recommendation made by the Commission appointed by the President is upon us now. But even if it dealt with something 60 or 80 years in the future, so far as I am concerned, I would still oppose breaking down the segregation of the races in the South, where we have more than 200 counties which contain more Negroes than white people, where our States have more than two-thirds of all the Negro population in the United States. We have a problem. Gentlemen from other sections have a theory. The report seeks to apply the theory of the Commission to a problem of which the authors of the report had no knowledge.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I had intended to conclude long before now. If I had not been interrupted, I would have finished in 15 minutes. I have been on my feet for this long period of time simply because my southern and my western friends have given me a baptism of fire.

I should like to conclude with one very simple statement, if I may. It is interesting to recognize that our friends from the South are helping to impose upon the United States Senate an infinitely more severe cloture provision than they observe in their own State legislatures.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at that point?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to develop the material upon which my statement is based, and then I shall yield for a question.

I have had looked up for me the facts respecting the rules concerning cloture in the legislative bodies of the seven southern States—Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Texas. I speak of both houses of the seven States, or 14 legislative bodies in all.

In 11 of these 14 legislative bodies, if my information is correct—and I believe it to be—a simple majority can shut off debate by voting to move the previous question. In no case is there a requirement of as many as two-thirds of the entire membership.

In the Senate of the South Carolina Legislature—from whence comes the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], a former Governor of that State, and the other distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], also a former Governor of that State, so two former Governors of the State of South Carolina are in the Senate, who will correct me if I am wrong—only two-thirds of a quorum is required, not two-thirds of the entire body.

In Virginia—and we have a distinguished former Governor of the State of Virginia present [Mr. BYRD], who will correct me if I am wrong—while the lower house of the legislature requires only a simple majority on some issues, it can require two-thirds of a quorum for a few other items of business. I have had some trouble in determining precisely what the rules of the Senate of Virginia are on this point, so I shall leave that matter out.

But I will say that in 11 of these 14 southern legislative bodies cloture can be secured by moving the previous question by majority vote, and in no case is two-thirds of the entire membership required.

Now I hope the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] will forgive me if I bring up Louisiana. The Constitution of Louisiana provides that the senate—I am not speaking of the lower house—may at any time by a majority vote limit debate.

I may point out that while filibustering may be an article of export in Louisiana, I do not believe it is permitted to be an internal practice. [Laughter.]

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at that point?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad to yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. While assuring the Senator that in the Louisiana Legislature a majority can shut off debate at any time, does not the Senator know that it is a good practice in the Louisiana Legislature to move to shut off debate before the minority gets a chance to convert the majority? The same thing would be true in any legislature where the previous question can be moved when the majority is losing in the debate.

Does not the Senator know that in the Legislature of Louisiana there is a requirement for a "constitutional two-thirds" majority to propose a constitutional amendment, which means that if a constitutional amendment is proposed it is necessary to keep two-thirds of all members of both houses in their seats to vote for it. In the Louisiana Legislature we succeeded in getting that constitutional two-thirds majority 41 times in the last legislature.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Now, Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me for a question?

Mr. LONG. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not also true that the Constitution of the United States requires a two-thirds vote for a constitutional amendment? We do not object to that. But we say, Do not impose a gag provision of two-thirds of the entire Senate on us for ordinary legislation when you yourselves in your own legislatures do not have it. Why do you tie our hands when you will not tie your own?

Mr. LONG. I may point out to the Senator, in answer to his question, that when I mentioned a two-thirds majority in the Louisiana State Legislature, I meant to say that is a constitutional two-thirds. Two-thirds of all members are required to vote for any measure in order that it may be passed. We succeeded in getting two-thirds 41 times in the last State legislature, which shows that it is not impossible.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, like most debates, this is ending on a minor note. I think perhaps I should sit down. But before I do I want to make a final appeal.

I urge the Senators to think very carefully before they vote for the Wherry resolution. I urge my good friends from the Mountain States to realize that we love them and want to help them, but that they should not drive too hard a bargain with us.

I urge our friends from the border States to realize that we love them, and that they should realize that they are at least partly northern.

I urge my southern friends to realize that though we may differ, we of the North are not self-righteous. We in the North have many grievous sins and faults which we have not removed to the degree which we should. We love our southern friends as individuals. We have no bitterness in our hearts toward them. And I urge my Republican friends on the other side of the aisle not to tie up the United States of America for a little cheap partisan advantage.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 315. An act for the relief of Dr. Chung Kwai Lui;

S. 335. An act for the relief of Claris U. Yeadon;

S. 592. An act for the relief of Edwin B. Anderson;

S. 594. An act for the relief of John I. Malarin, former Army mail clerk at APO 932, a branch of the San Francisco, Calif., post office, relative to a shortage in his fixed credit account;

S. 632. An act to authorize certain personnel and former personnel of the Naval Establishment to accept certain gifts and a foreign decoration tendered by foreign governments;

S. 633. An act for the relief of Rachel D. Gattegno; and

S. 634. An act to authorize payment of certain claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property and personal injury arising from activities of the Army.

AMENDMENT TO CLOTURE RULE

The Senate resumed the consideration of Senate Resolution 15, amending the so-called cloture rule of the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in commenting on the very able address of the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], which is his maiden address in this body, and a very good one, I merely wish to say that I rather gained the

impression that, so far as he was concerned, he was repudiating the report of the President's Civil Rights Commission. I noted that with some alacrity the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] rose, and I think somewhat to his own amazement, pressed the point as to whether the junior Senator from Illinois was in fact repudiating the President's Commission on Civil Rights. It rather seemed to me that at that moment the able junior Senator from Georgia and the able junior Senator from Illinois were approaching a coalition of the same general sort as that which some of us on this side of the aisle who happen to have agreed on a compromise are being chastised for having approached.

I wish to say again, because I think this point needs to be reiterated, that no compromise such as the Wherry substitute, signed by 52 Members of this body, was offered so long as there was any other possibility of getting an effective cloture at this session of the Congress, or indeed at the Eighty-first Congress during any period of its life.

I also wish to point out that I have no quarrel with my colleague the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who sincerely believes in a simple majority, or the able Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], who believes in a constitutional majority, because I am frank to admit that there is a considerable difference in the number of votes required as between a simple majority and a constitutional majority, or a so-called constitutional two-thirds. But I should like to try to narrow this issue so that not only the Senate but the American people may clearly understand what is at issue at the present time.

So far as the rules changes themselves are concerned, on both sides of the aisle and on both sides of the question we have gained nothing and we have lost nothing in regard to the rule. I wish to underscore that point and to point out that certainly no Senator on the other side of the aisle, or no Senator who is opposed to the substitute which has been presented, can with very great force object to it when the very able majority leader himself, not once, not twice, but several times within the hearing of all of us who served on that committee, said, speaking primarily to those representing the southern point of view, "Gentlemen, insofar as this applies to a change in the rules, you can write your own ticket." He apparently did not object to a "constitutional two-thirds." Apparently he did not even object to the suggested three-fourths. He said, "Gentlemen, so far as a change in the rules is concerned, you can write your own ticket." So I submit that, insofar as the question pertains to an amendment to the rule, there is no issue in regard to the substitute which we are pressing.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to state, inasmuch as the Senator has gone into the question, that the Republicans who met in these negotiations were much more restrictive in their views with respect to measures to effect changes in the rules than was the distinguished Democratic leader. He said we could write our own ticket. I took that to mean that he would agree to a provision that cloture would not even be applicable to a motion to change the rules, or a resolution to change the rules. However, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] refused to accede to that point, and in that respect they were more restrictive than was the majority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is absolutely correct.

We now come to the question of the basic difference, if any, between the present two-thirds cloture under rule XXII, and two-thirds of the Members chosen and sworn, as provided in the substitute. This is the fundamental issue, the difference between us. I think we have a right to examine that situation very fully, so that everyone may fully understand just what is presented.

If the substitute is not adopted, we shall have no effective cloture whatsoever. At any time civil-rights legislation is presented, or legislation relating to a national emergency, and the distinguished majority leader moves for consideration of a bill, a resolution, or a constitutional amendment, immediately a filibuster can start at that point, and the Senate can be tied in knots. Not two-thirds, not three-fourths, not nine-tenths of the membership of the Senate can proceed until, by sheer physical exhaustion, the filibuster is worn down.

So the choice we have here today is not as between two-thirds of the Members of the Senate voting and two-thirds of the entire membership of the Senate. The choice is as between two-thirds of the Members chosen and sworn, and nothing at all. I say that that is a very material advance in the ability of the United States Senate to function as a legislative body.

Let us examine the actual votes which have been taken. Nineteen times since 1917 the United States Senate has had presented to it cloture petitions on which a vote has been taken. Four times cloture has carried, under the existing rule XXII. I may say in passing that the development of the filibuster on a motion to take up is a more recent development in the history of the Senate, and probably the Senate would not have been able to vote on cloture 19 times had the loophole been found earlier. But based on the facts and on the record itself, 19 times the Senate has had a cloture petition presented to it. Four times cloture has carried. Of the four times cloture has carried, on one occasion the affirmative vote was 78, on another 68, and the third time it was 65. So on three of the four occasions when cloture carried in the Senate, it would have carried under the proposal we are urging upon the Senate at this time, and only once out of those four times would it not have carried.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point for a question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Do not those figures prove that, although on three of those four occasions a "constitutional two-thirds" was in favor of invoking cloture, so that cloture would have been invoked even under the proposal now before us, and although on the fourth occasion when cloture was actually invoked, it would not have been invoked under the present proposal, actually cloture might have been invoked on that fourth occasion, under the rule now proposed, for if cloture had not been invoked when first attempted, because of the lack of the favorable votes of 64 Senators, the majority leader could have filed another cloture petition on the following day; and when it came up for vote, 2 days later, he could if necessary, have required the attendance of all Senators—by arrest, if necessary—and thus might have obtained the necessary number of votes?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is entirely correct. Even if the floor leader had failed to obtain cloture that time, after the additional day's debate he could have presented another cloture petition, and under the 2 days' rule the matter would have had to come before the Senate for a yea-and-nay vote; and if necessary he could have sent out for the absent Senators and could have had them brought in.

Mr. President, I submit that the duty of a Senator of the United States is to be in his seat in the Senate, voting on controversial public questions. There are some instances—for instance, in case of sickness or death in the family or some extreme situation—when a Senator is justified in being absent; but basically there are only two of us representing each of the States in the Union; so when one Senator from a State is absent, his State is deprived of 50 percent of its representation in the Senate; and if both Senators from one State are absent from the Senate, that State is entirely deprived of its representation in the Senate. If the question before the Senate is an important public one, of such importance that the Senate is justified in invoking cloture, then I say there is a mandate upon the majority leader, who sits in the chair across the aisle from where I stand, and upon the minority leader, who sits in the chair which I temporarily occupy today, to send out, if need be, and have every Senator brought into this Chamber to vote on that basic question. If every Senator is in his seat, there is not one iota of difference between the spirit of the present rule XXII and the substitute proposal we are presenting here today.

Mr. President, in the other 15 cases in which a cloture petition has been presented in the Senate, the cold, hard facts from which no one can escape, are these: In all 15 of those cases, cloture would not have carried if the Senate had merely retained the simple two-thirds majority rule, and I believe that in all but three of those cases it would not have carried even with a constitutional majority rule.

Mr. President, outside of the gain I have mentioned—by which we have proceeded from having nothing to having something, so that the Senate has effective control over its own deliberations, and in case of a great national emergency cannot be hog-tied so that it cannot operate—we have made another gain, one of tremendous importance. For 16 years the New Deal administration had control of the Government of the United States.

At one time more than two-thirds of the Members of the Senate of the United States adhered to it. For 16 years that administration had an opportunity to enact civil-rights legislation or almost any other legislation it desired, and to present cloture petitions in regard to such proposed legislation, if it desired to have such measures enacted. In fairness I think it can be said that the reason why cloture petitions were not presented more often during that period when that administration had control, or the reason why these matters were not more often brought up in the Senate, is that there existed then the same situation which confronted the Republican leadership during the last 2 years, when the Republicans had control of this body, namely, the fact that rule XXII as it now stands is so full of loopholes that a measure cannot even be brought before the Senate for consideration, regardless of how many signatures one might obtain on a cloture petition. Regardless of that, the Senate is basically helpless so far as bringing a measure before it is concerned. However, under the constructive proposal which we have presented here, we have eliminated that helplessness.

Mr. President, the present proposal does not go as far as I would like to have gone. In the Committee on Rules and Administration I supported the so-called Hayden-Wherry resolution, which would merely close the loopholes and would retain the present two-thirds rule. But, Mr. President, after diligent work, night and day, day after day, sitting down with the majority leader, sitting down with able Senators representing the South, and sitting down with Senators on this side of the aisle who have different points of view, it was apparent to everyone who sat in those conferences that there was no chance whatsoever of obtaining any effective legislation or change in the rules at this session of Congress unless we could get a meeting of minds of at least a majority of the Members of the Senate. Now we have done that.

I have no apologies, either on behalf of myself or on behalf of any of the Senators on either side of the aisle, for trying to present to the Senate a constructive, moderate alternative to the chaotic situation with which the Senate was faced.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point for a question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I prefer not to yield just now, if the Senator does not mind.

I wish to point out that regardless of the political charges which may be made, this is no alliance between Republicans as such and southern Democrats as such. It is no alliance between one wing of the Republican Party—and I deny that the Republican Party is divided into wings—and one wing of the Democratic Party as such, because on this side of the aisle Senators have conflicting points of view, and Senators on the other side of the aisle have conflicting viewpoints. But this is a moderate attempt to arrive at a compromise.

I make no apology for the use of the word "compromise," for we would not have the Republic which we represent today in the Senate of the United States if men far abler than those of us who sit here now had not been willing to sit together and make compromises on the basic questions which confronted them during the Constitutional Convention. Mr. President, I am amazed at some of my friends on the other side of the aisle and at some of my friends on this side of the aisle who say that under no conditions must they accept the Wherry substitute, which is signed by 52 Senators, because it seems to make a change of the rules a little harder to achieve. Mr. President, it does not prevent the making of a change in the rules if there is a will and a need to change them. Since the general theory seems to have been criticized by the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I call their attention to the fact that the small States have equal representation in this body with the large States; that finally, in order to be able to get this Union formed, the delegates at the Constitutional Convention inserted in the Constitution of the United States one provision which cannot be amended under any conditions: the provision that no State shall be deprived of its equal representation in the Senate without its own consent. No matter whether two-thirds of the Members of the Senate favor making a change in that provision, no matter whether three-fourths of the States favor making a change in that provision, it simply cannot be changed or amended without the consent of the State or States concerned. It was a compromise in order to form the Republic and to guarantee to the small States that they would not be overridden by the large States. I personally think it is a good system. Although I represent one of the larger States, even if I could amend that section of the Constitution, I would not vote to amend it.

But the fact remains that by the Constitution the small States are given a guaranty which no one can take away from them without their own consent. In short, Mr. President, in the parlance of the Senate, what they did was to provide that, except by unanimous consent, that provision of the Constitution could not be changed.

Mr. President, is it an unreasonable provision that our colleagues who represent some of the Southern States have asked in the matter of changing the rule? On the rule question only, they gave up nothing and we gave them nothing. All they asked, if they gave up the very weapon they had, to discuss for an unlimited period of time any measure, bill, resolution, constitutional amendment, or what not, on the floor of the Senate before it actually becomes the pending business—if they gave up that very effective weapon which they had, they merely wanted to be sure that, insofar as the rules are concerned, an effort would not be made to slip in here a little later and try then to get simple majority cloture or constitutional majority cloture, and thus upset the situation. I do not think the request they made was unreasonable. I should have preferred personally if we could have gotten them to accept our point of view; but we could not. As I pointed out once before, the very nature of a legislative body—and I have served for 6 years in both houses of my own State legislature and for 3½ years in the Senate—the very nature of a legislative body is such that there must be reasonable compromise; true, not on principle, but where there is an opportunity to get a meeting of minds. I dare say no matter what public question of a controversial nature is raised, if the Chair could, under our rules, request each Member to write his solution to the problem, we would have 96 different ideas as to what form the legislation should take. In the parliamentary legislative process our job, by filtering proposed legislation through the committees, by bringing it out on the floor, by debating it, and by amending it, is finally not to have 96 bills but to have one bill upon which a majority of the Members of the Senate can agree; or, in the case of a constitutional amendment, on which two-thirds of those present and voting can agree.

So I want to say, Mr. President, I do not think that, in the final analysis, this is an unreasonable compromise which has been presented.

Mr. RUSSELL rose.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not intend to take much more time of the Senate, but because there has been some misunderstanding, I want to again state why I believe the compromise represents a very material improvement. After I have made my next point, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Let us take the civil rights, take national emergency legislation, take anything that may be desired, because I do not think this proposal is tied to any one type of legislation. At the present time, a number of Senators who are determined to prevent the Senate from acting can start a filibuster on the majority leader's motion to make a given bill the pending business. What about Senators as to whom the charge has been made that they may want to be absent and may not want to go on record? At the present time, under existing rule XXII, all a Senator has to do is to sit quietly in his seat, and not open his mouth, and let the filibuster be conducted until the majority leader, torn to distraction, finally has to give way and adjourn the Senate, in which event there is never a test of any type or character, so that the people back home may know where Senators stand.

But, Mr. President, what is the situation under the substitute signed by 52 Members of this body, representing both wings of the Democratic Party, 12 from the North and the East and the West, and 18 from the South, a majority of the majority leader's own party, and by 22 Members on the Republican side? What is the situation under the substitute? Very simply, it is this: A measure, regardless of what it is, is brought up. If a filibuster is initiated on the motion to make it the pending business, after a reasonable length of time a cloture petition can be filed. The circulation of the cloture petition itself is one indication of where Senators stand at the time. As soon as 16 signatures are secured, after the lapse of one intervening day, by a yea-and-nay vote, open to the public record, the public press, and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and the people of the United States, there is at least some sort of test vote to see if there is sufficient will to make the matter the pending business before the Senate. There is no means of any type or character whatever under existing rule XXII by which it is possible to obtain such a test. So I say again we have made a very material improvement.

The second thing is that after having made such a test, if a test is desired, and winning it, the legislation is then before the Senate, where amendments can be offered and the people back home can see how their Senators stand. There is a chance to vote on it, which Senators will never have under rule XXII as it exists today. So the people back home can again get a chance to see where Senators stand on public questions.

So I say, Mr. President, with all the sincerity I possess, that, while the substitute does not go as far as I personally should have liked to have it go, I believe it has unshackled the Senate and placed it in a position where it cannot be hogtied and prevented from acting. I believe we have made a major step forward; that we have lost nothing by doing so; and that if there is a will and a necessity for making a change in the rules, it can still be made. I call the attention of those who so complacently talk about the ease of breaking a filibuster to the fact that they were not able to break this one; that, as a matter of fact, the majority leader—and he has my deepest sympathy—had to surrender to it because of the pressure of parliamentary business. If we were to amend the rule as proposed in the substitute, he will not be faced with that question in the future.

With all the facts before us, Mr. President, I cannot but believe that in the history of the Senate of the United States, it is the first time that reasonable men, moderate men, willing to give and take, willing to make an honorable compromise, have presented to the Senate, with 52 signatures, a majority of this body, a proposition that will give to the Senate of the United States control over its own deliberations. I now yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from California has referred briefly to the charges of venal politics that have been injected into the debate. The Senator from California should be peculiarly qualified to clear up a point that has been confused in my mind ever since I have been a Member of the Senate. I am confused as to the difference between a bipartisan group of statesmen engaged in a holy crusade and a group of venal politicians who have effected a political coalition.

The Senator was on the floor on February 28 when the motion was made to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 15. He was most diligent in his attendance and efforts to get action on the motion. He stated to the Senate it was his view that the loopholes in rule XXII must in all events be plugged. After debate had been in progress for some time, the Senator from California circulated on his side of the aisle a cloture petition in order to end the debate. He secured the signature of some 16 Republicans. During that period the Senator from California was called an outstanding statesman. Tributes were paid to him from day to day on the floor for the diligence with which he pursued his efforts to get action on the proposal to close the loopholes in the rules. The effort at cloture failed. Unable to get the original resolution to a vote in the Senate, the Senator from California, still pursuing his announced intention of closing the loopholes in the rule, finally agreed to the compromise he as so ably described. He then circulated another paper for signatures. The second effort was not exactly in accord with the views of the majority leader as the first had been.

At that second of his deviation from those views the descent of the Senator from California from the lofty position of pure statesmanship to the low level of a member of a venal political coalition was faster than the fall of Lucifer from the heavens.

I wish the Senator from California would describe for me the difference between a bipartisan group and a coalition. He is peculiarly qualified, because, in pursuing the same aim, he has within a period of days been described as a lofty statesman and a member of a political coalition. I should be very gratified if the Senator would explain the difference to me. Having been praised and condemned within a period of hours for pursuing the same purposes, he should be able to explain the transition from statesman to politician.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I will say to the able Senator from Georgia that I very diligently, as the Senator knows, worked with the majority leader on the other side of the aisle because I felt that on this issue the aisle should not divide us. I helped to secure 16 signatures of the 33 which were on the petition when it was filed. The minority contributed 16 signatures and the majority contributed 17 signatures. So far as the signatures are concerned, I think the contribution from this side of the aisle was greater, proportionately, than it was from the other side of the aisle. I joined with the able majority leader in trying to get the so-called Hayden-Wherry proposal through the Senate, so long as I felt there was any hope to do so. I sat with him and met with him in the conferences, as the able Senator from Georgia knows, trying to aid in getting a meeting of minds, so that we could get something that would be of support to the able majority leader. Finally negotiations broke down, and it was not until the majority leader himself had given up the fight by publicly announcing that he would adjourn the Senate, that some of us who felt that the question was still an issue which needed to be met, an issue which was important enough to give one more last try, and we would not abandon hope while there was a spark of life, finally got enough signatures on this side of the aisle, plus 12 from the northern, eastern, and western Democrats, plus 18 from the southern Democrats, to present to the Senate a proposal, with the support of 52 Senators of the United States, to make a considerable forward step at least in this very controversial subject.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am afraid the Senator has not completely cleared up in my mind the question. He has not relieved me of my suspicion that those who denounce a coalition believe that all who agree with them are statesmen but any Senator who might disagree is a miserable coalitionist.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, in view of the fact that it was stated here yesterday by the junior Senator from Minnesota that the Hayden-Wherry resolution was a compromise, is it not true that in the Committee on Rules and Administration there were Senators opposed unalterably to the Hayden-Wherry resolution and never offered to compromise on it?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, for 16 days I have been here in the Senate day and night, along with other Senators, taking part in a determined effort to maintain freedom of speech in this body. I have given my every effort to this one cause. It has been necessary to hold up vital legislation in the committees and on the Senate calendar while this business was debated on the floor.

Many of us have been in almost constant meetings making a determined effort to effect an acceptable compromise. Finally, on Tuesday of this week, an agreement was reached and immediately indorsed by a majority of the Senate. That agreement, Mr. President, is the one for which I shall cast my vote.

It is unthinkable that after all this work we should be forced to delay the business of the Senate still further while we wrangle over proposals other than the one already accepted by the majority.

Mr. President, it is now 5 minutes of two. The Senate has given unanimous consent to the Banking and Currency Committee to meet at 2 o'clock to consider rent control. The Senate also gave unanimous consent to the Appropriations Committee to bring in, at 3 o'clock, the first supplemental appropriation bill.

I will say, Mr. President, that the vital legislation which the Senate has held up through these days consists not only of rent-control legislation, but the supplemental appropriations for all the departments of the Government. This appropriation includes $25,000,000 for the Army engineers to carry on relief work in the snow and sleet stricken Midwest; flood-control bills; money to pay employees of the Department of Commerce who are charged with import and export controls; money for the Indians; and money necessary for the operations of nearly every department of Government. This afternoon we are still debating what we agreed upon on Tuesday, while vital pieces of legislation such as these are still being held up.

I came in with a lengthy speech, Mr. President, but for the reasons I have mentioned I shall not deliver it at this time, because I wish to attend the meeting of the Banking and Currency Committee. I

shall go from there to the Appropriations Committee for another meeting with the hope that something can be accomplished by the Senate.

Now, before concluding these few remarks, Mr. President, I want to say for myself, and I am sure I speak for many of my colleagues, I shall continue to stay here as long as necessary to oppose any change other than the accepted "constitutional two-thirds." I have been in constant attendance at these sessions and have joined in the debate in many instances.

It was my understanding on Tuesday night that we had worked out an acceptable compromise amendment to the resolution. I believe that compromise to be fair and just to all parties. That was the amendment to which I agreed, and I want to make it known that I am prepared to remain here to oppose any rules change other than the one presented to the Senate on Tuesday night.

Let there be no mistake, Mr. President. So long as I have a voice in the Senate, I will never vote for majority cloture. I intend to oppose every amendment except the one requiring a "constitutional two-thirds."

Now, Mr. President, in order that I may attend the meeting of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following my remarks, two editorials.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Danville (Va.) Register]

A NORTHERN NEGRO PUBLISHER LOOKS AT CIVIL RIGHTS

It is unfortunate that most of the news discussing race relations comes from professional agitators who have, or think they have, something to gain from creating animosity while talking rabidly about discrimination and, in the same voice, good will.

As a publisher of a newspaper with large circulation and a corresponding influence, Davis Lee, Negro publisher of the Telegram, of Newark, N. J., which has some 500,000 Negro readers in the Southern States, grew less willing to accept the preachments of agitators concerning racial relations in the South. He decided to do a bit of investigating personally. Last Sunday he reported to his readers in a comprehensive article on the editorial page. Some excerpts which reflect his objective approach to the problem and provide sound counsel were called to our attention by the Bedford Democrat, which also was impressed by Publisher Lee. Keeping in mind that the comment is that of a distinguished champion of Negro advancement, and that it was printed in New Jersey, the Telegram editorial takes on added significance.

"I have just returned from an extensive tour of the South. In addition to meeting and talking with our agents and distributors who get our newspaper out to the more than 500,000 readers in the South, I met both Negroes and whites in the urban and rural centers.

"Because of the personal observations, studies and contacts, I feel that I can speak with some degree of authority. I am certainly in a better position to voice an opinion than the Negro leader who occupies a suite in downtown New York and bases his opinions on the South from the distorted stories he reads in the Negro press and in the Daily Worker.

"The racial lines in the South are so clearly drawn and defined there can be no confusion. When I am in Virginia or South Carolina I don't wonder if I will be served if I walk into a white restaurant. I know the score. However, I have walked into several right here in New Jersey where we have civil rights laws, and have been refused service.

"The whites in the South stay with their own and the Negroes do likewise. This one fact has been the economic salvation of the Negro in the South. Atlanta, Ga., compares favorably with Newark in size and population. Negroes there own and control millions of dollars worth of business. All of the Negro business in New Jersey will not amount to as much as our race has in one city in Georgia. This is also true in South Carolina and Virginia.

"New Jersey today boasts of more civil rights legislation than any other State in the Union, and State government itself practices more discrimination than Virginia, South Carolina, or Georgia. New Jersey employs one Negro in the motor vehicle department. All of the States above mentioned employ plenty.

"No matter what a Negro wants to do, he can do it in the South. In Spartanburg, S. C., Ernest Collins, a young Negro, operates a large funeral home, a taxicab business, a filling station, grocery store, has several houses, runs a large farm and a nightclub.

"Young Collins couldn't do all that in New Jersey or New York. The only bus lines operated by Negroes are in the South. The Safe Bus Co. in Winston-Salem, N. C., owns and operates over a hundred. If a Negro in New Jersey or New York had the money and attempted to obtain a franchise to operate a line he would not only be turned down, but he would be lucky if he didn't get a bullet in the back.

"The attitude of the southerners toward our race is a natural psychological reaction and aftermath of the Civil War. Negroes were the properties of these people.

"Certainly you couldn't expect the South to forget this in 75 or even 150 years. That feeling has passed from one generation to another, but it is not one of hatred for the Negro. The South just doesn't believe that the Negro has grown up. No section of the country has made more progress in finding a working solution to the Negro problem than the South. Naturally southerners are resentful when the North attempts to ram a civil-rights program down their throats.

"The entire race program in America is wrong. Our approach is wrong. We expend all our energies and spend millions of dollars trying to convince white people that we are as good as they are, that we are an equal. Joe Louis is not looked upon as a Negro but the greatest fighter of all time, loved and admired by whites in South Carolina as much as by those in Michigan. He convinced the world, not by propaganda and agitation, but by demonstration.

"Our fight for recognition, justice, civil rights, and equality should be carried on within the race. Let us demonstrate to the world by our living standards, our conduct, our ability and intelligence that we are the equal of any man, and when we shall have done this the entire world, including the South, will accept us on our terms. Our present program of threats and agitation makes enemies out of our friends."

The findings of Publisher Lee are just what any well-informed southerner, white or colored, has known all along. The only difference is that Publisher Lee has chosen to state plainly facts which agitation distorts, and which any Negro leader of lesser standing could not declare without subjecting himself to vituperation and charges of being "a white man's Negro."

Both white and colored people of the Nation must come to understand, and quickly, that much of the agitation attempting to break up their friendship and cordial relations is inspired by persons at home and abroad who have no interest whatever in seeing southern whites and Negroes march toward a firmer economic base and to higher standards of living for both races.

[From the Washington Sunday Star of February 29, 1948]

DANGEROUS LEGISLATION

Favorable committee action in the Senate on a bill to outlaw the poll tax and in the House on an antilynching bill marks the first step in the process of enacting the substance of the civil-rights program advocated by President Truman. It is a dangerous step and, if it should be followed up by final enactment of the program, the stage will be set for developments that can be extremely serious.

There is no valid excuse for the passage of these bills, and if they become law there will be ample justification for the inference that the motivation behind enactment was on a low political level.

The poll tax is on its way out in the South. It is effective today only in seven States—Virginia, South Carolina, Alabama, Tennessee, Arkansas, Mississippi, and Texas. Initial steps have been taken to give the people of Virginia opportunity to vote on repeal of the poll tax, and there is strong sentiment against it in Tennessee.

Much the same thing is true of lynching. There were 231 lynchings in 1892. But the total has been going down steadily, with the result that there was one lynching in 1945, six (including the mass murder of four Negroes in Georgia) in 1946, and again only one in 1947. Thus, while other crimes of violence, including murders not classed as lynchings, have been increasing in number, the crime of lynching is approaching the vanishing point.

One objection to these bills is that, in certain aspects at least, they probably are unconstitutional. There are those who are indifferent to this, who think the Constitution can and should be stretched to cover almost any situation. But even these people should hesitate a bit and reflect on the implications of the statement made by Senator MORSE in connection with his lynch bill: "I think we are entering a field of constitutional law that requires giving to the Constitution applications not previously given."

When the Constitution was adopted it was supposed that only limited powers were being conferred on the Federal Government, and that all other powers were reserved to the States. But over the years the Congress by legislation and the courts by a tortured process of interpretation have been steadily enlarging the Federal powers at the expense of the State powers. The so-called civil-rights program, if enacted and sustained, would be another big push in this direction.

Aside from the constitutional aspects, however, these bills are dangerous because they would project an unsettling Federal power into a situation which is being well handled, though not perfectly handled, by the States. Even a single lynching is one too many. There is no reason to believe, however, that enactment of a Federal lynch law would end all lynchings, while there is more than a little chance that it would aggravate rather than improve the situation. And this most certainly would be true of the Fair Employment Practice Act if that proposal should become law.

The Southern States are making real progress in the elimination of abuses of civil rights. They have a long way to go, but that does not justify Federal intervention which is of dubious constitutionality and even more dubious wisdom. It will be better if none of these measures is passed.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I rise to make a few comments, not only with regard to the question with which we are confronted in the Senate, but with regard to many of the problems with which we are confronted in this Nation. For that reason I want to make mention of the fact that I signed the first cloture petition for the purpose of bringing an end to the debate, in order that we might have the Chair's ruling on that very important question. The Chair ruled contrary to the ruling of the Chair in the Eightieth Congress. I listened to all the discussion and debate as to the merits of the Chair's ruling in the Eightieth Congress and as to the merits of the Chair's ruling in the Eighty-first Congress, realizing full well that I had signed the cloture petition, and realizing full well that there was before us a very important measure in the Hayden-Wherry resolution, yet my conviction was that the Presiding Officer in the Eightieth Congress had ruled correctly and that his ruling should stand, and that the ruling of the Chair in the Eighty-first Congress should not stand. Much as I desired the debate to be completed, I could not concur in the ruling of the Chair in the Eighty-first Congress, and, much as I regret that decision, I voted not to sustain the Chair. There has been a great deal of argument and a great deal of intelligent discussion on this floor in the course of the debate.

I realized full well, however, Mr. President, that a Presiding Officer in the Eightieth Congress made a ruling on a question, and that there had been no challenge other than debate as to whether it should stand or not, but it had, in a sense, been laid on the table, to lie there. It was for that reason that I wanted this question entirely cleared up for all time to come. I felt that with the recent ruling of the Chair in the Eighty-first Congress standing as the rule of the Senate, some future Presiding Officer might be confronted with the necessity to rule on a question, when this Nation might well be confronted with a very grave crisis, a very serious situation, because modern warfare is very mobile, missiles can pass through the air at a speed even far beyond the imagination of man, as planes can travel faster than sound. The mobility of the Army, tanks, and trucks, and all types of vehicles, is such that we could not afford to find ourselves engaged in a debate on the Senate floor that might involve several days. Even though men desired to bring debate to an end, in the event the Chair's ruling in the Eighty-first Congress stood and was accepted, it was contrary to the ruling of the Chair in the Eightieth Congress, and some future Presiding Officer would have a precedent to look to and to stand on when he might have to rule on another question which would be extremely grave and serious insofar as a prolonged debate was concerned. So I wanted to bring this question to an immediate discussion, and to have it clarified.

The majority leader talked about adjournment, and it was with exceedingly great regret that I saw the debate coming to an end, because I have strong convictions that we have to have a rule in the Senate which cannot be filibustered indefinitely, because the war clouds are not too far distant, and if they should spread across the United States of America we could not sit here as a body while a few men might exhaust themselves physically in order to delay action on the part of our forces to meet the enemy wherever they might be or how they might be coming toward us.

It is for these reasons that I put my signature on a cloture petition. It is not a question of doing what we like. While I was Governor of Minnesota, recognizing the differences of opinion between groups of people—the oppressed and the underprivileged people in my State—I brought some of the most able leaders into my office one day and said to them, "Ladies and gentlemen, we are at war. I do not want to see one group pitted against another group. I do not want to see ourselves in this State weakened by the fact that we might have racial problems, and for that reason I want to establish an interracial commission in the State. I want you men and women to serve, and if you find difficulties amongst groups in any of the war plants, or on any of the streets and avenues in our cities, I want you to find out what the difficulties are and correct them."

The interracial commission we set up functioned in a manner that was most commendable, and in a later legislative session they were recognized by statute. I recognize the need of civil-rights legislation, and I recognize the need of just laws to protect minorities, and to give rights and privileges to all mankind, to insure equality in every class, rank, and creed.

However, in spite of all this, I felt that I could not compromise my convictions when the Chair ruled in a manner that was contrary to the ruling of the Chair in the Eightieth Congress, which ruling had not been challenged and found to be incorrect. I, therefore, signed my name to an amendment yesterday to bring this question forward, and, as I have stated, it is not exactly what I would have desired, but it is a step in the right direction to rule that a group of men definitely can say when debate must come to an end.

Some will say they might not be present on the floor of the Senate. Every one of us has taken an oath of office to fulfill our duties in the Senate, and if when there is such an important measure as one imposing cloture upon a question and upon debate Senators would find their way into the Senate Chamber just as fast as they possibly could, and the speed of modern transportation will bring them from almost any quarter of the earth in less than the time it will take to bring about a vote under a cloture petition.

I say, Mr. President, that there are many here who have argued the question ably. The senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] delivered an address which I wish all men and women in the United States would read. The able senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] made an address which I ask every man, woman, and child in the United States to read in order that they may fully appreciate the great problem and responsibility of the Members of the Senate in making a decision of such great importance.

I do not want to see debate continue indefinitely in the Senate, and it was for that reason that I affixed my signature to the amendment. As Senators so well know, there are important legislative measures pending in committee and on our calendar. The junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], now presiding in the Senate, serves on a committee of which I am a member, and we have before us, awaiting our final action, the question of storage of farmers' commodities. The months are passing speedily by. The harvest will soon be on in the Southwest, the crops will be piled on the streets and in the fields unless the Senator and I, as members of the Committee on Agriculture, are able to act soon. There are many other aspects of the agricultural legislation which need to be examined in view of the way commodity prices, farm prices, and livestock prices have fallen in the last few months. We should not be tied up indefinitely by filibuster tactics, neglecting such important legislation as that with which we are confronted on our calendar today, regarding rent control, continued appropriations for European recovery, and other matters I could name which are indeed important.

I was a Member of the Senate in the Eightieth Congress, and I know how we did try to reach a solution regarding legislation pertaining to civil rights; we were not able to find one. But, above all, we must not take short cuts in Senate rules. We must act in accordance with rules and regulations and laws, or future generations may not know the privileges which we have enjoyed in this great United States of America.

Our forefathers exhibited much wisdom in their preparation for the building of a great Nation. Our forefathers argued and debated, but they came to a final decision. During most of the last 18 long years this body has been under the control of the Democratic Party; yet these rules have not been changed. We endeavored to change the rules in the Eightieth Congress. We are now endeavoring to change them in the Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, at various times in history, we learn, great inventions have been almost simultaneously conceived in great minds. The fact that they were simultaneous may have been due to some strange sort of mental telepathy between men in different areas, or, indeed, in different parts of the world. Sometimes things happen that way. But sometimes when we find things happening in different places and the occurrences have a similar character there is usually some connection between them.

Some things have happened in the Senate and in the House of Representatives in the last few hours, and in the past 2 or 3 days, which may or may not have any relationship one with the other.

In the Washington Post of yesterday, March 16, the headline is:

GOP-Dixie coalition takes over control of Senate in 16-day rules filibuster.

In the first column of the same newspaper the headline is:

House passes local option rent-control bill 261 to 153.

The sub-headline is:

Southerners join GOP to turn over reins to States, counties, or cities.

Many individuals construe that action in our sister body as meaning for all practical purposes the death-knell of rent control.

Farther down in the article about action taken in the House concerning rent control appears the following paragraph:

Representative CHARLES E. HALLECK, Republican, Indiana—

Senators will recognize Representative HALLECK as the former Republican leader in the House of Representatives in the Eightieth Congress—

said, "This sets the pattern for what is going to happen from now on out. The administration will find its plans for minimum wage, Taft-Hartley-law revision, and similar measures will be greatly changed when they reach the floor of this House."

Mr. President, whether there is any connection between the group that found itself working together in the House of Representatives and the groups which have established a liaison in the Senate I do not know and I do not say. But the inference is possible that, as Representative HALLECK said, as quoted from yesterday's newspaper, coming events sometimes cast their shadows before them.

Mr. President, in three prominent newspapers of today we find reference to what has happened in the Senate.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. NEELY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator cannot yield for that purpose without yielding the floor.

Mr. NEELY. Very well, I withdraw my suggestion.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from West Virginia.

In the Times-Herald of this day the headline is:

Coalition to kill off civil rights today.

I repeat that headline:

Coalition to kill off civil rights today.

I did not write the headline, Mr. President. I merely read it for the information of the Senate. The sub-headline is:

Truman may stump country to combat GOP-Southern bloc.

A further sub-headline is:

President to insist on filled pledges.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield for a question.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is the Senator from Florida prepared to accept at face value everything the Times-Herald publishes?

Mr. PEPPER. No, I do not; and it would be a very dangerous admission for me to make if I were to say yes, but sometimes even the Times-Herald is right. I suspect that this is one of the instances that will help build up the record of the Times-Herald for accuracy.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, is it the case that when the Times-Herald agrees with the Senator from Florida those are the occasions when the Times-Herald is right?

Mr. PEPPER. I am always with the Times-Herald when it is right, and against it when it is wrong.

Mr. President, the Washington Post of this day has as its first headline:

LUCAS—

Of course, referring to our distinguished majority leader—

LUCAS gives up hope on civil rights.

The next headline in the last column on the right hand side of the page is:

Senate move on filibuster kills plan, leader says.

And the sub-headline is:

Coalition holds whip hand in day of angry debate over compromise.

It looks, therefore, Mr. President, as if the Washington Post also thought there was a coalition, and it seems to give recognition to the statement of the leader of the majority of this body that the effect of that coalition would be just what the Times-Herald headline says, namely, to kill civil rights today.

The New York Times of this day, in the last column on the right of the front page is:

Rights—

Referring of course to civil rights—

Rights bill's doom conceded by LUCAS in cloture debate.

He says he will try to bring them up at session but with virtually no hope.

Mr. President, it is indicated, therefore, first, that in our sister body—although I have no right to make other than observations about that body, which we all esteem and honor—there was a coalition which will have killed rent control, if their action should become the law of the land. Congress abdicates the power to protect the tenants of this country, surrenders it, as Pilate tried to wash his hands of guilt, into the hands of State or local authorities. And the appearance of the thing is, Mr. President, that a coalition in the Senate not dissimilar to what which cohered in the House, in the opinion of many, including the leader of the majority in this body, has sounded the death knell of even the right to vote upon the civil-rights program.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Maine for a question?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield for a question.

Mr. BREWSTER. Which would the Senator feel was more informed regarding the rent problem, regarding conditions in Jacksonville, Fla., the Congress of the United States or the City Council of Jacksonville, Fla.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I know of no constitutional way that the Congress of the United States can abdicate its duty. We have assumed jurisdiction over this subject. Let us either discharge our responsibility or abandon it entirely and say we will have nothing further to do with it, because there is no further need for the exercise of the Federal power. Then leave it up to the States and the municipalities to pass such regulations as they in their own good judgment may propose. But, Mr. President, we do not have to give authority to the States and the local communities of government to impose rent control so long as we retain jurisdiction over the subject matter, and no court can retain jurisdiction over a subject, a case, and then impose upon some other judge the authority to rule, to make the effective decision in the case.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield for a question.

Mr. BREWSTER. Am I to understand that the Senator is challenging the constitutional propriety of this action, or its expediency?

Mr. PEPPER. I think, as a practical matter, there should be serious question as to whether Congress can designate the State of Florida or any political subdivision thereof as its agent to legislate when the Constitution of the United States imposes that duty, once assumed by the Congress, upon the Congress until it has withdrawn from that field. But whether my impression as to constitutionality is correct or not, certainly from the standpoint of what we ought to do, it is an impropriety and a gross evasion of our duty to say that we will not be courageous enough to act, but will delegate to branches of the local government the authority and duty and opportunity to act.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield for a question.

Mr. BREWSTER. Did not the Senator from Florida support the rent control hitherto existing, which was determined to a material extent by the local advisory boards, as to whether it should be effective or not?

Mr. PEPPER. I reluctantly supported the best bill I could get on rent control, after endeavoring to vote for something stronger. But the Senator from Maine will recall that the boards of local character had only an advisory function to discharge, whereas the final administrative authority reposed in agents of the Federal Government, subject to final action by an emergency Federal court of appeals.

Mr. BREWSTER. Would the Senator contend that it would not be equally proper to determine our action by the action of the local municipal body rather than by the action of the advisory council which we set up?

Mr. PEPPER. If the local authorities merely make advisory recommendations to the Federal administration, well and good; but if we abdicate to them the authority to act, the final authority to remove controls, that is an abdication of the duty of the Congress to act through Federal instrumentalities.

Mr. President, I wish to get on to what is really involved in this question. We are discussing whether or not the so-called coalition rule change, signed by 30 Democrats and 22 Republicans, shall be adopted by the Senate. What we are

to determine, as the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has so well stated, is whether or not the Senate is agreeable to have shackles forged around its hands and weights fastened to its feet in the making of its own rules in the years ahead, and whether the Senate is willing to make even more severe the requirement for closing debate on a pending measure than the requirement which has prevailed in the past.

It is well known by Senators that this coalition proposal is a recommendation that there be cloture upon any pending matter, question, or motion, but only if 64 Senators shall be present and vote for the imposition of such cloture—a rule heretofore unknown to the Senate and to the Constitution of the United States, and, of course, to our sister body, the House of Representatives. This proposal would also remove from the Senate the power even to bring up for consideration a future rule change with respect to closing debate, or filibustering, unless it should so happen that no Member of the Senate had the effective power to filibuster upon such a proposed consideration of a possible rule change.

Briefly, to advert to what has been the history of the filibuster, let me read a few lines from page 208 of volume 1, 1947, of Editorial Research Reports. I read from an article entitled "Majority Cloture for the Senate," written by L. B. Wheildon, of the staff of Editorial Research Reports:

During the first 15 years of the present century, virtually every session of Congress ended with a filibuster in the Senate and a large number of the filibusters accomplished their purpose. During 1914 alone there were six major filibusters, and the Senate was kept in almost continuous session to overcome them and transact its business. Although many of them were directed against important and controversial measures, at least three of the successful filibusters were frankly aimed at forcing the Senate to approve additional appropriations personally desired by the obstructionists.

The talking to death of the administration's armed neutrality bill by a 12-man bloc in the closing days of the Sixty-fourth Congress in 1917 led President Wilson to issue his famous pronouncement that "a little group of willful men * * * have rendered the great Government of the United States helpless and contemptible." This demonstration of power to defeat the will of the majority by a group which numbered only one-eighth of the Senate resulted in adoption of the present cloture rule.

The Versailles Treaty was brought to a vote under the cloture rule in 1919, but only after long delays, engineered by enemies of the treaty, had permitted the mustering of enough votes to defeat ratification. President Harding's ship-subsidy bill was filibustered to death in the closing days of the Sixty-seventh Congress in 1923.

We are told in the same bulletin, on page 206, how in 1863 a different type of dilatory tactic was resorted to in an effort to break a filibuster. Senator Trumbull, then a Member of the Senate, said:

Motion after motion was made here last night to lay on the table, to postpone indefinitely, to adjourn, to adjourn, to adjourn, and to adjourn again, and the yeas and nays called on each occasion.

Similar tactics were employed by Senator Sumner in 1865 to postpone the readmission of Louisiana. He felt so strongly on the issue that he declared himself "justified in employing all the instruments that I find in the arsenal of parliamentary warfare."

One other case was the famous filibuster of 1881. I am now reading from page 207 of the pamphlet referred to:

The famous filibuster of 1881, whereby the Democratic minority prevented the Republicans from organizing the Senate until the resignations of two Senators—Conkling and Platt of New York—gave the Democrats numerical control, can hardly be said to have saved the country from peril, but it did prevent the upper Chamber from taking action on any legislation from March 24 to May 16 of that year. Nine years later a successful Senate filibuster against the Blair education bill consumed 26 legislative days.

It has been said, "Hold their feet to the fire; keep the Senate in session around the clock." That was what was done in 1891. I read from page 207 of the pamphlet mentioned, in respect to a filibuster on the so-called force bill:

After 7 weeks of debate, an attempt was made to put through a rule for majority cloture. When this failed, the Senate was held in continuous session for 4 days and nights in an effort to exhaust the filibusterers. Eventually the bill was dropped to permit enactment of necessary appropriation bills before the Fifty-first Congress expired on March 3, 1891.

Senators will recall that in my remarks the other day I mentioned the subject of filibusters in the past. Briefly to repeat the subjects upon which there evidently was such prolonged debate that it was felt that an effort should be made to obtain cloture, they were:

The Treaty of Versailles, in 1919; the emergency tariff, in 1921; the Fordney-McCumber tariff, in 1922; the World Court, in 1926; migratory bird refuges, in 1926; branch banking legislation, in 1927; retirement of disabled emergency officers of the World War, in 1927; Colorado River development, in 1927; public buildings in the District of Columbia, in 1927; creation of the Bureau of Customs and the Bureau of Prohibition, in 1927; the Banking Act of 1933; antilynching, in 1938, twice; antipoll tax, in 1942, and again in the same year; antipoll tax in 1944, and again in the same year; FEPC, in 1946; the British loan, in 1946; labor disputes, in 1946; antipoll tax, in 1946; and antipoll tax again in 1948. This information is taken from the bulletin Limitation of Debate in the United States Senate, issued in 1948 by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. The information which I read appears on page 22 of that bulletin.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I noted that the item which has appeared most frequently in the past few years in the list the Senator from Florida has been reading, is the anti-poll-tax item. Is such a measure now pending?

Mr. PEPPER. Such a measure is now pending in the Rules Committee, and it is my bill. Whether there are other bills on the subject, I do not know. My bill is not now on the calendar, but I have no doubt it will be on the calendar, at a reasonably early date.

Mr. BREWSTER. It has been reported from the committee hitherto, in other sessions; has it not?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; it has been reported in other sessions.

Mr. BREWSTER. If we may assume that that bill will shortly be on the calendar, what is the idea of the Senator from Florida as to the number of the Members of the Senate on his side of the aisle who would be prepared to sign a petition for cloture, to terminate discussion on that measure at an appropriate time?

Mr. PEPPER. I am confident that a substantial majority of the membership of the Senate on this side of the aisle will support this effort to abolish the poll tax; and if a majority of the Members on the other side of the aisle will vote with us, instead of voting against us, as they did on the Barkley ruling, no doubt at this session of Congress we may be able to pass a bill outlawing the requirement of the payment of a poll tax as a condition precedent to voting in Federal elections.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator from Florida quite means to say that, because assuming that this rule is adopted, a mere majority in favor of the imposition of cloture would not be adequate. It would be necessary to have somewhat more than that, and I speak as one who has contributed what I could to that end.

Mr. PEPPER. I feel that if the Republicans will support this measure this time, as they have told the country they favor and believe in it, with their help, together with the support which we shall give them from the Democratic side, we shall be able to pass the bill, provided the Senate does not raise the requirement for cloture so high that it will be impossible to achieve cloture—which is what this coalition resolution attempts to do. It makes it even more difficult to secure cloture on a pending measure than the present rule.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I was asking the rather specific question as to how many Members of the Senate on the side of the aisle on which the Senator from Florida has his seat, he expects would be prepared to sponsor cloture at a proper time on proposed anti-poll-tax legislation.

Mr. PEPPER. I can only say that it was a Republican President pro tempore, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who ruled that the poll-tax bill could not be brought up for consideration in the Eightieth Congress, under rule XXII. It was the Republican policy committee chairman, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who in the Eightieth Congress, took the appeal—but never prosecuted it—from the ruling of the Chair. It was a majority of the Republican Members of the Senate who recently voted against the ruling of the Chair which would have given us the power to bring up any measure by a two-thirds vote of Senators present and voting, for 16 Republican Members of the Senate voted to support the ruling made by Vice President BARKLEY, and 23

Republican Senators voted to overturn that ruling, while 23 Democratic Members of the Senate voted against sustaining the Vice President's ruling and 25 Democratic Members of the Senate voted to sustain his ruling.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, as one of the Republican Senators who voted with the Senator from Florida——

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; and I commend the Senator from Maine. I wish his party had followed him.

Mr. BREWSTER. As one of the Republican Senators who voted with the Senator from Florida, I feel that there does not need to be too much heat, so far as he and I are concerned, in connection with my seeking very earnestly to get the Senator's estimate of the numbers of Members on his side of the aisle who would support an attempt to invoke cloture on the consideration of an anti-poll-tax measure. I have asked the question three times.

Mr. PEPPER. I will say to the Senator that, if more of them should not live up to my expectations in respect to that matter than Republican Senators who had previously signed petitions for cloture and voted in accordance with those cloture petitions on the Barkley ruling, we would not get very many.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I evidently seek in vain for an answer.

Does the Senator from Florida have any doubt that many more Republican Senators than Democratic Senators will support a cloture petition at that point?

Mr. PEPPER. I do not know. It depends, of course——

Mr. BREWSTER. It would be very easy to find out.

Mr. PEPPER. Of course, it depends on how effective the coalition is—the new party that has been formed in the Senate by some—not all—of the rather conservative Members on this side of the aisle who are joining hands with Senators on the other side of the aisle and are saying that, for all practical purposes, they will determine what the Senate does, because if every time one of these controversial measures comes along, the same group which took the leadership on this matter out of the hands of the majority leader and the majority party, get together and form a 52-bloc vote in the Senate, of course, practically they will have the power to do whatever they please to do. I cannot speak for what they might accomplish.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am sure the Senator from Florida does not mean to challenge the proposition of majority rule, to which he has long been devoted.

Mr. PEPPER. It is not the Senator from Florida who has been challenging the principle of majority rule here for over 2 weeks; it is most of the Senators who have joined in the coalition movement, and who have taken over the leadership of the Senate, who have been challenging the question of majority rule—but not the Senator from Florida.

Mr. BREWSTER. If the Members of the Senate on this side of the aisle should furnish more signatures to a cloture petition for ending debate on an anti-poll-tax measure than would be furnished by Senators on the other side of the aisle, would the Senator from Florida think that would acquit us in some measure of the suggestion that there was some mysterious coalition?

Mr. PEPPER. No; I will say to my able and fine friend, the Senator from Maine, that nothing can acquit those who have proclaimed from the housetops their belief in the abolition of the poll tax, from not taking advantage of the opportunity afforded them last Friday by the Vice President of the United States to vote to adopt the only way that is now foreseeable by which they might have had an opportunity to have practiced what they have been preaching.

I say this to my able friend: Senators who have made it clear since they have been in the Senate that they are against a Federal law to abolish the poll tax, certainly will not have to explain their vote, because everyone expected that kind of a vote from them. They knew that if they voted to sustain the Vice President's ruling, it would be possible for the majority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], later on to move to bring up the anti-poll-tax bill and to bring up the antilynching bill, and to bring up the FEPC bill and other legislation—of which the measures named are only a part—of vital interest to the country, and now ready on the calendar, or soon to be on it, for consideration by the Senate. So it was not to be expected that they would vote to sustain the ruling of the Vice President. But I can hardly bring myself to explain why it is that similar action was taken by Senators belonging to a party which unanimously in its national convention declared itself for all those things. They allowed themselves to vote as they did by virtue of a technicality for which there was only one precedent in the past, and that precedent had been overturned by a Presiding Officer no less in dignity; for although the able senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] was President pro tempore, elected by the Senate, in the Eightieth Congress, the Vice President of the United States was Vice President elected in his own right by the people of the United States. Yet, in spite of the fact that the Vice President had overturned the one precedent of the past, which was established by the President pro tempore in the Eightieth Congress, and although Senators who had professed allegiance to those principles knew that if they did not sustain the ruling of the Vice President, either we would have no way at all to bring debate to a close and to bring these matters before the Senate for consideration, or eventually we would get such a paradoxical proposal as the one we now have, nevertheless they allowed themselves to be blinded by a technicality to the substance of the issue which was involved and has been involved in this debate from its inception, and they voted against sustaining the ruling of the Vice President, and therefore they voted to make it impossible for them to keep the pledges and promises they had made.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me once more for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I yield once more to the Senator from Maine, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BREWSTER. My very great respect for the intellect and the intelligence, and I might even say the legal training of the Senator from Florida——

Mr. PEPPER. I thank my able friend. I hope he is not going to condition his compliment.

Mr. BREWSTER. Those considerations make it very difficult for me to believe that the Senator from Florida would challenge—and I am asking him whether he does challenge—the sincerity of those on either side of the aisle who voted to overrule the decision of the Vice President. I speak as one who joined with the Senator in Florida in the vote. But to have the motive or the sincerity of Members of either side questioned, as would seem to be almost implicit in what the Senator from Florida is saying, seems to me to present at least a grievous challenge to the Members of this body.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am very glad the able Senator from Maine asked that question. Of course, the Senator from Florida would not impeach or impugn the integrity or right of any Senator who voted not to sustain the Vice President. But I may say that when on one hand there is the shield of a technicality, and behind it a living, vital principle, I think there is a most persuasive argument that we should tear down the shield of the technicality and embrace the living vital form of a meaningful principle. I say that even a judge sitting on the bench who has not the courage to cut through the maze of ambiguous technicalities, to try to see to it that justice is done on his bench, in my humble opinion, fails to meet the full duty of a judge. But, Mr. President, I know it is said "hard cases make bad law." Why do hard cases make bad law, as we say? It is because when judges have sat on cases where the technical rules or even the precedents of the past, if literally observed, seemed to require them to give a decision which was wrong, or which did an injustice to people or to property, the courts have exerted themselves, they have used their ingenuity to get around such barriers, in order to dispense justice which they felt to be the supreme obligation of the bench.

Mr. HUMPHREY rose.

Mr. PEPPER. I am going to go into it just a little bit further. I should like to amplify the point if I may, but I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Florida whether the Wherry substitute, the resolution now before us, because of the fact that there must be 64 votes in order to apply cloture and stop debate does not automatically require 64 votes for any poll-tax measure?

Mr. PEPPER. Certainly it does. Though we have never been able in the past to get two-thirds of those voting, able advocates of the poll tax, as it were, to hear them speak, now tell us we are going to pass the anti-poll-tax bill because now it will be necessary to get only 64 votes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator recall anything in the Republican platform which said that in order to fulfill the campaign promises it would be necessary for them to be able to deliver in the Senate 64 votes?

Mr. PEPPER. I do not recall any 64-vote qualification in the platform of either the Republican or the Democratic Party, both of which committed themselves to the country on the issue of civil rights. I may say that the President of the United States and the Democratic leader of the Senate have faithfully tried to keep those campaign pledges.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Has the Senator ever heard of a provision in either the Republican or Democratic platform which went out to the American people in an election, which said that in order to accomplish business in the Senate 64 votes were necessary?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, on the contrary, such a proposal as would require 64 Senators to vote affirmatively before debate could be closed, before filibuster could be stopped, would have been shouted down in the national conventions of both the major political parties.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to ask the Senator from Florida in view of his remarks if he does not think it will now be well-nigh impossible to get civil-rights legislation out of the Eighty-first Congress?

Mr. PEPPER. It was obviously that conclusion, I may say to the able Senator from Minnesota, which led the Democratic leader to make the statement quoted in the headlines of the morning Post, "Lucas gives up hope on civil rights," and the Times-Herald to say, "Coalition to kill off civil rights today." It was the fear that it would not be possible to get 64 Senators difficult as it has been in the past to get a majority, or two-thirds of those voting, a number less than 64.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may remind the Senator from Florida of the old saying, "By their fruits ye shall know them"—not by their words. With respect to the Wherry substitute resolution, which was spawned and created in the secret cabals or conference meetings of the coalition, does the Senator feel that it puts a death warrant upon civil-rights proposals or the possibility of considering civil-rights proposals?

Mr. PEPPER. For all practical purposes. As the majority leader indicated with the requirement that 64 affirmative votes must be obtained in order to stop a filibuster, I feel that that is true.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would the Senator say, then, that the obligation to prove to the American people that there is no insincerity in the Wherry resolution rests squarely upon the leadership of the Republican Party and their newly found friends, if you please, on our side of the aisle?

Mr. PEPPER. I think it is unmistakably the obligation of those who have professed an advocacy of civil rights to explain to the people of the country how, when they could not get cloture by less than 64, they now can assure them that they will pass the civil-rights program by being able to get 64 votes for cloture.

Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. BREWSTER, and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the Chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota again for a question, after which I shall yield to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. HUMPHREY. In view of what has been heard here about the great enthusiasm our colleagues on the other side have for civil rights—and I think no one can deny that we have equal enthusiasm—in view of the difficulty there is in respect to the Wherry resolution, if we could not get a civil-rights proposal, or a series of proposals called up in the normal routine of business in the Eighty-first Congress, in the first session, does the Senator think it would be unfair to ask those who now profess great love for civil rights to sign a petition pledging themselves to keep the Congress in session, or at least to keep the Senate in session, until civil-rights proposals can be voted upon?

Mr. PEPPER. Undoubtedly those who signed such a petition as the Senator from Minnesota has in mind, and in hand, on which I think he will find the name of the Senator from Florida——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed, yes.

Mr. PEPPER. Undoubtedly those who signed such a petition would certainly be disposed in the future to dispel any query in the minds of those who favor such measures that those who were parties to the coalition had not done something the inevitable effect of which would be, as the majority leader said, to crush or to doom the civil-rights program in this session of the Congress.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. PEPPER. I promised to yield next to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I simply wanted to ask the Senator from Florida, in view of what the Senator from Minnesota has said, if it is not true that on Tuesday, before this wicked coalition petition or round robin appeared, it was announced over the teletype, and is it not true, that the majority leader was trying to get the floor, so that he could offer a motion to adjourn, before the round robin came before the Senate? Is that not true?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; I think that is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. What about the abandonment, then? What about giving up hope at that time of getting civil-rights legislation?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. PEPPER. I should be very glad to attempt to answer the question, but the majority leader is on the floor, and I could not answer it nearly so well as the majority leader. So, if I may, I will yield to the Senator from Illinois to answer the question of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall be delighted to answer the question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I want to say, before the Senator answers the question, that I was back of the majority leader in that proposal, because I realized, as did almost every other Senator—there were a few exceptions—that we were up against a stone wall. There was no relief in sight. We realized that the filibuster might continue for several months and destroy the whole program of legislation which the Congress had before it. So I was supporting the majority leader when he was endeavoring to adjourn the Senate, call off the filibuster, and proceed to work on the problems which are so extremely important to the Nation.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator from Colorado has said. He was associated with me in the motion which I was trying to make before the Senate, to adjourn the Senate late in the evening, although I doubted whether I had the votes necessary to bring about an adjournment, because the coalition was still working at that time, and I was practically served notice that I would not be able to have the Senate adjourn or to take a recess, if I made such a motion. But I was willing to adjourn the Senate at that time for the same purpose as that with respect to which the Senator from Colorado has been speaking. I realized that rent-control legislation would expire on March 31. To my mind, because of the date line, it is one of the most important pieces of legislation, awaiting action by Congress, but the Senate would not be prepared to legislate on it. I realized that the ECA program will expire on April 3. I think there is no more important piece of legislation, from the standpoint of the peace of America and of the world, than is the continuation of ECA. Therefore, being faced with that situation, I was willing to adjourn the Senate at that time, but I was never willing to give up the intention to fight, at a later time in the session of the Senate, for the purpose of carrying on the civil-rights program pledged by both Democratic and Republican Parties in their convention platforms.

So far as the Senator from Illinois was concerned, he would have been willing to ask the President of the United States to call a special session of Congress after we finish with the legislative program before us, which is so vital to the economy of the country and to the peace of the world, the special session to assemble after July 31, which under the Reorganization Act, is the date we must adjourn, and then fight it out all summer long and up until Christmas, and possibly beyond that time, if necessary, in order to secure the kind of civil-rights program which is necessary for the American people. But, as my able colleague said this morning in the debate, this resolution shackles and hog-ties us and prevents, in my opinion, any possibility of passing legislation along civil-rights lines.

Those who do not think civil rights are involved in this question, as the Senator from Ohio is attempting to tell the American people at the present time, simply do not know what they are talking about, because civil rights have been involved in this question from the 3d day of January, when Congress convened. The Senators on the opposite side of the aisle insisted, day after day, on the floor of the Senate and before committees, that some action be taken on a cloture resolution. Why? For the purpose of discussing civil rights, of course.

When my able friend from Ohio told the Senate that the majority leader could have gotten action on the program on January 15, I was surprised and amazed to think that the Senator from Ohio would make such a statement. He undoubtedly believes that the Senator from Illinois can dominate the committees. He undoubtedly believes that I should have gone to each and every one of the members of the committee and said, "Either do this, or else." Mr. President, coming from some Senators, I would not be amazed or shocked, but I was amazed and shocked at such a statement coming from the scholarly Senator from Ohio, who seems to think that I could dominate a committee and insist that a bill be reported within only 5 days after the committees of the Senate were organized.

Mr. President, it was the same Senator from Ohio who insisted on holding weeks and months of hearings on the Taft-Hartley law, and who, when the Democratic Senators closed him off, went to the country and said it was the most high-handed proceeding he had experienced since he had been a Member of the Senate. Yet he wants me, as the majority leader, to dictate, dominate, and insist that the committees report a proposal, or else. Oh, inconsistency, thou art a jewel.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, it will also be remembered that when the majority leader made the announcement that he would seek the consent of the Senate to adjourn, we had already, at the end of the previous week, had a vote of the Senate upon the ruling of the Vice President, and the Senate, by a vote of 46 to 41, had overruled the decision of the Vice President, making it impossible for this motion ever to be brought to a vote of the Senate. So it was then a question, I can well see, for the majority leader to decide, whether he would tie the Senate into a legislative and physical knot, which would possibly jeopardize the lives of Senators on both sides of the aisle, and not only jeopardize the lives and health of Senators, but would strangle and paralyze the whole program which was awaiting consideration by the Senate, and, moreover, prevent the program from being brought out by committees, because it had already been announced that Senators would not allow, by unanimous consent, committees to meet in the mornings or at any other time, when the Senate was in session, so that the program could not even have been a-borning. Faced with those conditions, it is only reasonable to anticipate that the majority leader would have taken the action which he took. But sometimes discretion is the better part of valor. Sometimes he who temporarily disengages in the battle is better qualified to return to a victorious attack later.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield further to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, that is exactly the program which we had considered—withdrawing our troops for the moment, and getting along with important legislation and returning to the battle later on, and then attacking, even if it required a special session of the Congress to accomplish it. The Senator will agree with me that the majority leader did not take that responsibility alone. The majority leader called together the northern and western Democrats in a meeting, and it was unanimously agreed that I make the motion to adjourn. At least, there was only one Senator in the whole group who thought we should continue. It was understood that the resolution would be temporarily laid aside for the purpose of getting along with important legislation and returning later to fight it out.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I want to ask the Senator if it is not a fact that not only had the majority leader indicated he had surrendered by announcing he would make a motion to adjourn, but now, for the first time, the administration conference also joins in surrender, so we not only lose a chance to perfect the rule, but we lose a chance of bringing up this important legislation. It is the responsibility of this administration, which has the control of everything in the Congress.

Mr. PEPPER. That is a strange epithet to apply to him who is defeated by an overwhelming combination of superior forces. Evidently the Senator from Nebraska uses a different dictionary from that which the Senator from Illinois uses. He will remember that when the Vice President was overruled 23 Republicans joined 23 Democrats, to make 46, against 41 supporting the Vice President, consisting of 25 Democratic Senators and only 16 Republican Senators.

What do we have? A majority by 7 of the Republican Senators joining a minority of the Democratic Senators to defeat the majority of the Democratic membership and the leadership of the Senate, to overturn the ruling of the Vice President of the United States, and to make withdrawing the motion for the time being imperative to the Democratic leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I wish to finish what I started a moment ago. I want to keep the record completely straight in this whole matter. It is perfectly all right with me for any Senator who cares to condemn or find fault with any position I have taken to do so—and the Senator from Florida has not done that.

Mr. PEPPER. I have not intended to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I appreciate that. It does not make a particle of difference to me whether any other Senator likes what I have done or not: I have to live with myself, and have to do the best I can.

There were several questions we had to meet in this whole controversy. We had the vote of last Friday which the Senator has mentioned, of 46 to 41. That is when the defeat came, and that was a defeat for those who wanted to bring up the civil-rights program. Very well. Then, as has been said, the Senator from Illinois was willing to surrender—no, not surrender——

Mr. PEPPER. Withdraw.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Let us call it what it was; he was willing to adjourn and give up the filibuster, and go on to other pressing legislation, on last Tuesday. That was blocked. We were blocked on Friday, we were blocked, on the other hand, on Tuesday, and if we were going to get any kind of legislation, if the Senate was going to function, we had to find some way out. So I joined in the round robin which came along, and I joined for the practical purpose of proceeding with legislation.

Fault was found with that, and if the Senators who are opposing that sort of thing want to do so, they can continue to filibuster from now on, if they do not like that action. That is their privilege. That is their right under the Senate rules, and they can continue it. If they do, I do not know what will happen to us; I do not know how we will get out of it. The Senator from Colorado desired only to do his best in the situation which confronted the Senate. I think I was entirely justified, and so long as I think that way, that should be satisfactory to others.

Mr. PEPPER. No one respects the integrity and the conscientiously high purpose of the Senator from Colorado more than does the Senator from Florida. It has been a subject of great pleasure to me that we have been associated together so long.

Mr. President, I am not condemning anyone. I think it is only fair to know who signed the coalition agreement—of course, that is a matter of public information—and I think the Senator from Colorado might also have included a statement of who prevented the adjournment which the Senator from Illinois proposed to achieve. It seemed to me that it was essentially a great many, at least, if not all——

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It was not the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. PEPPER. I am sure of that; but, at least, I think that the major part, the great part if not the major part, of the obstruction to the adjournment came from the other side of the aisle, from my honored friends. At least, there must have been a good many on the other side of the aisle, because when the leader on this side proposed it, with the number which ordinarily supports the

leader, certainly as to motions for recessing or adjourning, and when it became impossible to get an adjournment, the minority on this side of the aisle must have had strong support on the other to have defeated a motion to adjourn made by the majority leader of the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Does not the Senator realize that it was a majority on the other side of the aisle who wanted to go on and do something? Does not the Senator realize that 30 out of 54 Democrats have signed this agreement and prefer to go on and do something rather than adjourn?

Mr. PEPPER. Because it appeared to those gentlemen that with Republicans in such large numbers, as they have been, joining those who were participating in the filibuster, or sympathetic with it, there was nothing else that could be done.

Napoleon is said to have negotiated his peace treaties after his greatest victories. Why was it that Senators were not willing to adjourn? Why was it that Senators would not allow the majority leader to break off the contest which he had initiated? It was his motion, a motion made by the majority leader, instead of the Senator from Arizona, to proceed to consideration.

There was a rule adopted during the course of the debate, when suddenly one day from the other side of the aisle Senators began to demand "Roll call! Roll call, Mr. President!" which is not subject to debate. Senators on the other side thrust their hands into the air. The Vice President, looking out upon the Chamber, said "Obviously a sufficient number," and the Republicans had achieved a tactical victory. They had made it impossible for the Senator from Illinois to withdraw the motion he had made, which would have been possible had not the Senate ordered a roll call.

Why was it done on the other side of the aisle save to embarrass the Democratic leadership, save to take it out of the power of the majority leader to control the calendar of the Senate, to take it out of his power to handle this matter in the way he thought best, for all interests involved or affected?

Mr. President, why did they seize that tactical advantage? Why did they later oppose the motion of the majority leader to adjourn the Senate? I recall having seen such a thing happen but one other time in more than 12 years I have had the honor to sit in this body, and that was one afternoon, I believe, in 1938, when there was in progress an anti-lynching-bill filibuster. The Senate did refuse to the majority leader, the present Vice President, the right to adjourn the Senate. I shall never forget some of the striking ejaculations, if not words of stronger character, which were emitted in private by the then Vice President of the United States, the Honorable Jack Garner, who inquired if the time had come when the majority leader could not adjourn the Senate of the United States.

Yet, Mr. President, those who have participated in the coalition refused to the majority leader the right to adjourn the Senate. Why? They were evidently determined to press home to its finality the victory they had previously gained in overriding the Vice President's ruling. In other words, Mr. President, when the enemy is in retreat it is time to inflict the coup de grâce—thrust home—finish the struggle so it cannot be revived. I cannot escape feeling—and I say this with every intention, certainly, to refer only with the greatest respect and deference to my colleagues—that that is the behind-the-scenes strategy which was endeavored to be pursued.

Mr. President, of course, the objective sought appears to have been reached provided this coalition resolution, this unconditional surrender which has been forced upon the majority leadership, is consummated by a vote of the Senate. Fortunately for the gentlemen who are authors of the proposal they do not have to have it adopted, I believe, by 64 votes. I wonder if they would accept an amendment, a simple little amendment down at the bottom providing, "The proposed change in the rules shall take effect upon 64 Senators voting in the affirmative." I will support it then. Where would they be if we now had in effect the rule they propose?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the able Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Much as I wish the Senator from Florida were right, I am afraid that he is wrong about this proposition. Personally I hated to go into this compromise. I had grave doubt about it for exactly the opposite reason, fearing that it would be only too easy to acquire the 64 votes.

Let me ask the Senator from Florida this question: Is it not completely within the power of the majority to compel the attendance of Senators at the session of this body, and if such attendance were compelled would not the result under the proposed substitute be exactly the same as under the Hayden-Wherry resolution?

Mr. PEPPER. I know of no way of compelling the attendance of Senators except through the raising of the point of no quorum. The majority of the Senate has the power to adjourn the Senate, and the majority has the right to bring in Senators to constitute a quorum. But I do not know of any authority being possessed by the Senate to compel any more than a quorum of Senators to come here.

Mr. LONG. Does not the Senate have the right to compel the attendance of all Members of the Senate?

Mr. PEPPER. I do not know of any such authority. I have never heard of it. While it is customary to secure permission of the Senate for a Senator to absent himself, it is not obligatory. In 12 years I have never heard of anything being done about that. If a Senator wants to go away, that is his responsibility. He is not answerable to us at all, not answerable to his colleagues, except when they require a quorum to transact business. Then they adopt a motion directing the Sergeant at Arms to try to round up enough Senators to make a quorum. When a quorum is present, Senators are not concerned about the absence of other Senators.

If my able friend from Louisiana is frightened, if he has any fears about any of the things he dislikes being adopted, if this coalition rule goes into effect, he is timid to the extent that he would quake before the waving of a sparrow's feather in the mild agitation of a summer's day. I know the Senator from Louisiana is not built of that sort of stuff. I can assure the Senator that the cooing of a dove is more dangerous, is more to be feared by him, than the power of a majority of the Senate, if this coalition revolution—perhaps I should have said resolution—if this coalition revolutionary rule should be adopted by the Senate of the United States. The Senator can say requiescat in pace insofar as those measures are concerned, because there is no danger that they will ever be passed so long as this rule is in effect.

The Senator from Louisiana is candid about the matter. He does not want these measures passed. But the inconsistencies are pointed upon the part of our brethren on the other side of the aisle who unanimously came out for civil rights, who shout so loudly that they want civil-rights measures passed. I do not think anybody would say the Democratic Party unanimously came out for civil rights. I believe there was what might be called a difference of opinion on the Democratic side on that subject, which has been manifest here. I have never heard of any Senator who got up on the other side of the aisle and denounced civil rights. Senators on the other side are always for them until they get an opportunity to cast an effective vote for them, and then a great many of them are conscientiously and sincerely deterred from following that course, and somehow never get around to it at the right time. I am afraid that is just one of those universal coalitions that seem to go off centrifugally in a 360-degree circle.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course I do not think the Senator from Florida was very much surprised—I was not—at the action of Republican Senators, after serving with them for the 2 years through the Eightieth Congress when they were in control, and when nothing was done about civil rights. Yet 3 weeks after they left this body they went to Philadelphia, after having been in control of the Eightieth Congress, during which time they could have acted on this program, and in their platform said to the people of the country, "We are for civil rights." I think such tactics, together with similar tactics respecting other matters, is the reason why the Democrats now have a majority in the Congress.

Mr. PEPPER. I am afraid I must agree with my able friend in his conclusion.

Mr. President, I read an article in a Sunday newspaper the last week end about the abused ostrich. The ostrich, as Senators know, has the reputation of sticking his head in the sand when danger approaches and trying to hide his

eyes so he cannot see the danger, and therefore feel that he is safe. The article said the ostrich is a very unhappily and unfairly treated bird. The article says that as a matter of fact, he is a shrewd bird, and possesses a lot of tricks. When he hears danger he will stretch and spread his feathers and, apparently put his head under the sand, but he will always leave the eyes up enough so he can see, while he has so arranged his distorted feathers as to make his body take on the appearance of a bush or some foliage the nature of which the enemy will not be able to understand.

Now I was thinking of the ostrich a little bit more in the way that is generally thought of this unhappy bird. I was going to say that I am afraid that our friends on the other side of the aisle are behaving a little like the ostrich is supposed to act. They are going to say, "Why we felt Senator VANDENBERG was right when he ruled on that matter about a motion not being a measure."

I can just see a man out on the stump speaking to a large crowd on a fine day, just when the crowd is waiting to have a fish fry or barbecue. I can hear him say, "Now my friends and fellow citizens, I want to speak to you about a world-shaking subject. I want to tell you about a matter that is going to excite and thrill you. I am going to draw the distinction between a motion and a measure to this great audience of my fellow citizens." I can just imagine how the farmers who are there, how the good housewives, the returned veterans, the merchants, practically everybody but the lawyers sitting out there will say, "Is that all he came down here to talk about?" In a little while you would see a sort of spitting and moving away. [Laughter.] We know how a crowd will move off and scatter. Here will be a mother picking up her little baby and carrying it off. Another will be moving off leading a child. The first thing you know the speaker will have just a handful of people listening to him. Perhaps the other speakers will remain to hear the speaker discuss the question of motion and measure. If there was anyone in the crowd interested in civil rights he might remain and wait for the speaker to explain why, if he got a chance to vote on that subject, he did not take advantage of it. If the speaker thinks he is going to convince those folks that his conscience would not permit him to vote for the program under those circumstances, even though he were devoutly in favor of it, I am afraid he is more sanguine about his power of persuasiveness than I am.

I am merely making an idle reference to people listening to some good Republican explain why he did not vote to sustain the Vice President. Let me read from today's New York Times. Here is an editor who knows the difference between a motion and a measure. He could no doubt discuss the question learnedly. This is what the New York Times of today has to say, in an editorial entitled "The Filibuster:"

No mistakes of judgment or attitude on the President's part, however, justify in our opinion the part played in this affair by a majority of the Republican Senators. At Philadelphia last June the Republican Party, in a bid for votes, pledged itself to abolish the poll tax, adopt an antilynching law and guarantee equal opportunity to employment, regardless of race. The men who gave these pledges were grown men. They knew that it would be utterly impossible to enact a Federal program of this kind without calling a halt to an inevitable southern filibuster. Yet when an opportunity to do precisely this presented itself on the occasion of Vice President BARKLEY's ruling—a wholly reasonable and strongly persuasive ruling which did not even involve the necessity of overturning a prior decision on the part of Senator VANDENBERG, since the circumstances of the two parliamentary situations differed—the Senate Republicans backed away from this opportunity and voted, 23 to 16, to let the filibuster carry on. They will have a hard time squaring this action with the brave promises made last year at Philadelphia.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at that point?

Mr. PEPPER. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. I am reading what the New York Times editorial of this day says, not about southern filibusters. Everyone knew their position. The New York Times editorial is discussing Senators who professed to believe in civil rights, and who would not support the Vice President of the United States when he gave them an opportunity to vote for civil rights, and when as against the Vice President's ruling, there was in the language of the former President pro tempore himself, only one precedent in the past.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Florida, one of the 16 Senators who signed the cloture petition, and who also voted to uphold the Vice President's ruling, since he has read a part of the New York Times editorial, whether he would mind reading to the Senate the last paragraph of the New York Times editorial at this point, because I have a question which I would like to address to him.

Mr. PEPPER. The last paragraph reads as follows:

It is not difficult to imagine an even more critical situation arising. Especially in times like these it is hazardous for a democratic parliament to tie its own hands with such stubborn knots.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the able Senator from Florida, since he has quoted the New York Times as expert testimony on this question, the New York Times being one of the great newspapers of the world, if the point raised by the New York Times in the last paragraph of the editorial is not amply covered by the substitute resolution offered on behalf of 52 Senators.

Mr. PEPPER. I will answer "No" to the question of the able Senator. I recognize the brilliant fight which he individually has made in this matter, and I wish to come directly to the reasons why I answer "No."

As I stated a moment ago, of course I do not question the sincerity or integrity of any Senator who is a Member of this coalition. I think it is a mistake. Let me tell the Senate why I respectfully submit that it is a mistake to adopt this coalition resolution.

First, there are only five instances wherein the Constitution of the United States requires more than a majority vote.

First, when a proposed constitutional amendment is to be voted upon, two-thirds approval in the Senate and the House is required, although the House uniformly has majority rule for the passage of legislation and for closing debate.

Second, to expel a Member requires two-thirds.

Third, to override a Presidential veto requires two-thirds.

Fourth, to convict an impeached officer requires two-thirds.

Fifth, to ratify a treaty requires two-thirds.

But, Mr. President, two-thirds of what? of the whole Senate? Does it require 64 votes? No; two-thirds of those voting, a quorum being present. Yet we are about to adopt a two-thirds rule for the passage of bitterly controversial legislation, legislation upon which there would be a filibuster unless two-thirds of all sitting Senators should vote to close debate. That does not mean two-thirds of those voting, but two-thirds of all qualified Senators. Ordinarily that means 64 Senators, unless some Senator's credentials happen not to have been approved. The substitute resolution says two-thirds of all qualified Senators. The Constitution of the United States, in respect to the important matter of a constitutional amendment, expelling a Senator elected by the people, overriding a veto of the President of the United States elected by the people, convicting an impeached officer, disgracing him as well as taking away his perquisites, or the ratification of a treaty, which may for all practical purposes, commit us to war, requires a vote of two-thirds of those voting. When the constitutional fathers framed a two-thirds rule, they made it two-thirds of those voting, not two-thirds of the total membership of the Senate.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

Yet in providing for a rule to close debate, it is proposed to require 64 votes, when no such requirement is made in the case of any of the five supreme prerogatives which the Senate possesses.

I now yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. I have heard the Senator chide the Republicans for their position. I have also heard from that side of the aisle a great deal of kidding about the last election. I know that a platform is supposed to be a sacred thing; but the people of this Nation turned down my party in the last election, and, therefore, they more or less repudiated the platform. They did not want our platform. They did not want the Republicans in.

At the same time, I wonder what the people were thinking about when they were voting for President Truman, knowing what his attitude on civil rights was, when they knew that the platform upon which Harry Truman stood could not possibly give them civil

rights, because Harry Truman could not lead his own party on that single issue.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is overlooking the fact that he led a majority of it to support the Vice President of the United States; and the Democratic leader led a majority of it——

Mr. JENNER. I am not overlooking that point; but I am saying that the President knew, when he stood on that platform, that he could not deliver civil rights to the people. Now suddenly the Republican platform seems paramount to many Senators on the other side of the aisle. Earlier in the day the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] went to great lengths in speaking about the Republican platform. Let me refresh the memory of the Senator from Florida with regard to platforms.

We had a man who was the beginning of what we now call the New Deal, which has developed into the Fair Deal. Personally, I am a little tired of having the cards shuffled around; but that man was named Franklin Delano Roosevelt. He had a platform. O Mr. President, it was a sacred platform; it was a beautiful platform. But after he became President of the United States he categorically repudiated every pledge of the platform on which he was elected. I am sick and tired of this talk about platforms.

I think a lot of politics is being played with the colored people of the Nation. So long as they want to support Harry Truman, knowing that he cannot lead his party to give them civil rights, we might as well let the matter stand right where it belongs.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Indiana would have considerable difficulty in convincing the people of the United States who voted four times to elect Franklin D. Roosevelt their President, over bitter and sometimes acrimonious Republican opposition, that he violated every plank in the platform obligations he assumed.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator permit me to finish my reply, before I yield?

Mr. JENNER. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator might, however, ascribe to President Truman at least the hope that if he came out manfully for this program and if a majority of his party supported him in that policy, the Republicans who had professed to believe in the same thing would not line up with the minority of the Democratic Party and defeat it. I think perhaps the President would have been justified in assuming that if he could get the majority of his party to go with him the Republican Party would not line up with the Democratic minority, to whom, upon this matter at least, they have professed themselves to be so bitterly opposed, and thus defeat the policy of the President and of the majority party. But that is exactly what happened. We needed only three more votes. We had 41, and if we had obtained 3 more, we could have gotten sufficient votes to sustain the ruling of the Vice President, last Friday evening, and that would have made it possible to bring up in the Senate, through cloture, any measure that could command the support of a majority of the Senate.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. My charge that a lot of politics is being played in this matter is further fortified by the fact that President Roosevelt had an overwhelming majority for 16 years—and what the Senator from Florida wants is majority rule—in both Houses of the Congress, and the same civil rights, about which the Senator from Florida yells so loudly today, were being denied the same 16,000,000 people during those same 16 years, but nothing was done about it.

Furthermore, the present President of the United States was a Member of this august body; and he is a late convert to civil rights, because I can find no determined effort that he made for 10 years as a Senator from Missouri to lead the fight for civil rights.

After all, the Senator from Florida is speaking about the appeal from the decision of the Chair. But that had nothing to do with civil rights, and any honest man knows it.

I do not care what is published in the New York Times. The last paragraph of the editorial in today's New York Times is utterly false. Furthermore, a great deal that is going out over the air waves and that is appearing in the newspaper columns is not telling the true story about this situation.

My vote and the vote of the other Senators who voted against the Barkley ruling was a vote far more basic than anything that has been talked about in this debate. It was a vote primarily, in my heart and mind, on whether we would have a government of men or a government of laws. I stand by the latter, Roosevelt and Truman to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. PEPPER. President Roosevelt was known to have been very much in favor of civil rights.

Mr. JENNER. Then why did he not do something about them?

Mr. PEPPER. I was going to mention that point. There were too many Republicans in the Senate.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, President Roosevelt had great majorities in both Houses of the Congress during all the time he was President. It is a falsehood to say that there were too many Republicans in the Senate at that time.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, in 1938 President Roosevelt was President of the United States. The then Senator from West Virginia, Senator NEELY, who today is again an honored Member of this body, was the author of a motion for cloture. Thirty-seven Senators voted in favor of invoking cloture and 51 Senators voted against invoking cloture. Does not the Senator from Indiana suppose that a good many of the Senators who voted against cloture were Republicans?

Mr. JENNER. I do not know. In 1938 there were only 17 Republican Senators, out of the 96 Members of this body, so there could not have been many Republican Senators voting among that group of 51.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the Senator from Indiana is a little in error in regard to how long it has been since those unhappy days prevailed.

Mr. JENNER. Thank God they are over. [Laughter.]

Mr. PEPPER. Those days will be over, depending upon the conduct of both of the parties in the discharge of their duty to make democracy work in this country.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask the Senator to stop playing politics.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I decline to yield until I finish presenting these figures.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] was the author of a cloture motion, also in 1938. On the question of invoking cloture at that time, there were 42 "yeas" and 46 "nays." Is it not probable that a good many of the Senators voting "nay" were Republicans?

In 1942, the then majority leader, Senator BARKLEY, of Kentucky, made a motion to invoke cloture on the debate upon the anti-poll-tax measure. In the vote on that question, there were 37 "yeas" and 41 "nays." Would it not be supposed that a good many of the Senators voting "nay" at that time were Republicans?

In 1944, in middle May, the majority leader made another motion to invoke cloture upon the debate on an anti-poll-tax measure. In the ensuing vote, there were 36 "yeas" and 44 "nays." Would not one suspect that a good many of the Senators who voted "nay" at that time were Republicans?

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. In 1946 the then majority leader, Senator BARKLEY, of Kentucky, again filed a cloture petition. In the ensuing vote, there were 48 "yeas" and 36 "nays"; and I suspect that some of the Senators voting "nay" at that time were Republicans. In fact, I remember that they were.

Again in 1946, Senator BARKLEY, of Kentucky, the Democratic leader, filed a cloture petition. In the ensuing vote, there were 39 "yeas" and 33 "nays"; and I recall that a good many of the Senators then voting "nay" were Republicans.

In 1948, in the Eightieth Congress, when the Republican Party controlled the Congress, and controlled this body by a substantial majority, and when a Republican President pro tempore sat in the chair, and when, according to his own statement, he had no binding precedent before him, and when it was a matter that honest men can honestly differ about, the Republican President pro tempore felt it was his duty to rule that a motion to take up the anti-poll-tax bill would not be subject to cloture under rule XXII; and then it was that the Senator from Ohio, the chairman of the Republican conference committee, took the appeal from the ruling of the Chair, be it said to his credit. That appeal was never prosecuted before this body; however, I do not quarrel too much with that failure to act, because such an appeal would have been subject to debate, and the opposition could have debated it interminably, and therefore

there was no way by which a motion to lay the appeal on the table would result in bringing about the applicability of rule XXII, so as to bring debate to a close by means of cloture.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. But I say now, as I said then, the precedents did not impel the ruling of the Chair, and that Senators in the exercise of their discretion could have differed with the Chair, should they have chosen to do so; there was no appeal. Later on, on the Barkley ruling, where a man equally honest, equally able, equally conscientious, equally believing in the rule of law over men; a man whose career will stand in history no less illustrious than that of the able Senator from Michigan——

Mr. BALDWIN and Mr. JENNER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield? If so, to whom?

Mr. PEPPER. When I have finished my statement, I shall be glad to yield. When the Vice President made that ruling, and Senators could have supported it, and through their support of it have moved on to the effective exercise of the authority the Constitution gives the Senate to make its own rules, which was otherwise impossible except upon such surrender as the coalition proposal would have us assume, then, Mr. President, a majority of the Democratic Party sustained the Vice President. But a majority, by seven, of the Republican Party did not see fit to sustain the Vice President.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. Does not the Senator agree that under the substitute, the things about which the Senator has been talking can no longer be forestalled by a filibuster, and that when, for example, an anti-poll-tax bill—I assume the majority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], is sincere and that his party is sincere—is brought before this body, under the substitute rule, a filibuster cannot be carried on, because we will have an effective measure whereby the cloture petition may be filed? Does the Senator agree that the substitute resolution actually does that?

Mr. PEPPER. No. The substitute resolution does make it theoretically possible to bring debate to an end by cloture, providing 64 Senators vote in the affirmative. But I want to point out certain other weaknesses in the rule. If we had been going to revise rule XXII, then it should have been done by the Committee on Rules and Administration, or by a bipartisan conference of Senators, who would have gone thoroughly into the whole subject of the Senate rules in that respect and would have clarified and simplified the rules so the Senate could effectively, by at least a reasonable preponderance, control the calendar and the business of the Senate.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator will excuse me just a moment. I decline to yield for the present. I want to answer the Senator from Indiana.

Why do I oppose the coalition? First, because I think it lessens the chance of getting controversial legislation through the Senate. Why does it do that? It raises the number of votes required above what has ever been required before. In the past only two-thirds of those voting have been required. A quorum being present—that is, 49—it would only be necessary to get two-thirds of the 49. It is now necessary to have 64. I say that in one of the instances where cloture was obtained in the past, would it not have prevailed if it had been necessary to get 64 votes? I want to show what difference that makes upon various measures.

In 1919, when the Treaty of Versailles was subjected to cloture, it would have made a difference of two votes. I realize that more than two-thirds voted for cloture, but in that case there were 94 Senators voting. The difference between two-thirds of the total vote and 64 is 2. When in 1921 a cloture petition was filed on the emergency tariff measure, against which there was a filibuster, the number present was 71. This rule would have required 64 in order to get cloture, whereas on that measure at that time 46 could have gotten cloture if it had been possible for two-thirds of those voting to get cloture. The difference is 16. On the Fordney-McCumber tariff of 1922, the difference is 10. On the World Court, the difference is two. On migratory-bird refuges, in 1926, the difference is 10. On the branch-banking issue of 1927, the difference is 8. On the retirement of disabled emergency officers of the World War, the difference is 6. On the Colorado River development, in 1927, the difference is 3. On the public buildings in the District of Columbia, in 1927, the difference is 8. In 1927, on the creation of the Bureau of Customs and the Bureau of Prohibition, the difference is 9. On the Banking Act of 1933, the difference is 5. On the antilynching bill of 1938, the difference is 5. On the second antilynching bill of 1938, the difference is 5. On the anti-poll-tax legislation of 1942, the difference is 12; in 1944, the difference is 10. On FEPC in 1946, the difference is 8. On the British loan in 1946, the difference is 9. On the Labor Diputes Act in 1946, the difference is 10. On the anti-poll-tax fight in 1946, the difference is 16.

So, Mr. President, I say we should not impose an arbitrary number required to vote affirmatively in order to get cloture in the Senate. That is the first thing. That makes it more difficult to bring debate to an end, to stop filibustering, to get controversial measures through the Senate.

Secondly, it puts utterly beyond the power of the Senate the changing of its own rules, so far as I can speculate. I do not see how, with this rule saying that cloture shall not apply to a motion to proceed to the consideration of a rule change, with that explicitly being excluded, with the Senate knowing that it was excluding that when it adopted the rule, if it adopts the coalition rule, I do not see how anybody could ever argue hereafter that we did not intend at this time to exclude from rule XXII, as it is proposed to amend it, the application of cloture in respect to a motion to proceed to the consideration of a rule change.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the able Senator if he believes that under the present parliamentary situation the Senate, by sitting in day and night sessions, could break a filibuster?

Mr. PEPPER. No. I am not advocating that. I realize that Senators have sat here, stood on the floor, and called for sessions round the clock. I am not so sure that a filibuster can be broken when conducted by so many able and determined Senators as have been participating in this debate, in opposition to taking up the measure. I do not believe it is possible physically to break that filibuster.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator. I should like to ask one additional question.

Mr. PEPPER. I am proceeding to the next point. That does not mean that under the parliamentary situation and under the rule and the precedents as they now exist, before the adoption of the coalition resolution, it would not be possible to bring debate to a close. I want to address myself to that, after I yield further to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask one additional question. The able Senator from Florida has discussed the civil-rights question. I may say during the 3½ years I have been in the Senate I have noticed that the able Senator has taken quite a keen interest in that matter, and, as the result of doing a little research, I am of the opinion the Senator has been consistent in his attitude running back in the days before I came to the Senate. I wonder if the able Senator recalls that on the question of poll tax, which is one of the important civil-rights bills, in the Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, when a vote was had on the amendment proposed by the then Senator from Illinois, Mr. Brooks, to do away with the poll tax insofar as it related to men who were serving in the armed services of the United States, the vote on that motion, which was adopted by the Senate was, yeas 33, nays 20. The able Senator from Florida voted for that elimination of the poll tax. I think the Senator is to be congratulated on it. Does the able Senator recall that the two distinguished leaders of his party who were then Members of this body, the present President of the United States, then a Senator from Missouri, and the present Vice President of the United States, then a Senator from Kentucky, both voted against eliminating the poll tax in the case of men serving in the armed services of the United States.

Mr. PEPPER. The principal thing I recall about that particular instance is

the fact that the then Senator from Illinois, Mr. Brooks, took the amendment of the Senator from Florida that was already printed. I do not like to say this in the absence of the former Senator from Illinois, and I would not, if I had not said it in his presence on the Senate floor. But the Senator from Florida had prepared that amendment. It was lying on Senators' desks, printed, to be offered in the course of discussion of that measure. The Senator from Florida was somewhat shocked a little later to hear his amendment being read from the desk, and then to discover later that the then Senator from Illinois had taken a pencil or a pen and stricken out the name, "PEPPER" and inserted "Brooks" in the amendment and sent it to the desk. Naturally, I voted for it. [Laughter.]

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I shall be glad to yield for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the able Senator from Florida a question. Necessarily, I do not know the antecedents of this particular matter, because I was not in the Senate at that time, but in case the Senator should desire in the future to refer to the RECORD, if he will refer to page 6971 of the permanent RECORD of the Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, August 25, 1942, he will find the names of the Senators who voted yea and those who voted nay.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator from California. I do not recall whether that was the final vote upon that matter. Of course, the President and the Vice President will be better qualified to speak for themselves than I am qualified to speak for them. I think, however, that the RECORD shows, so far as I know, without a single exception, unless what the Senator from California has in mind is an exception, the Senator from Kentucky, who is now our able Vice President, uniformly supported anti-poll-tax bills. I have a RECORD here showing that at least twice, once on November 23, 1942, and again on May 15, 1944, Senator BARKLEY filed a cloture petition to bring debate to a close on an anti-poll-tax measure; on February 9, 1946, he filed a cloture petition on an FEPC measure, and again on July 31, 1946, he filed a cloture petition on an anti-poll-tax bill. I do not know that he was uniformly in favor of those measures. I have always understood that the President of the United States was in favor of them. I know he would have avoided a lot of heartache and pain if he had not been so favorable to them in his campaign. I think the country is fully persuaded that the President has spoken for himself on the subject.

Mr. BALDWIN and Mr. JENNER addressed the Chair.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I see two able Senators on the floor. I am supposed to preside over a hearing in one of the committee rooms at 4 o'clock, and I should appreciate it if Senators would permit me to conclude my remarks. But I shall yield to both Senators if they will ask questions and not make speeches.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I should like to preface my question with a brief sentence. The sentence is that in his argument the distinguished Senator from Florida has found considerable fault with the Republicans in connection with this matter. Does the Senator know that there are three States in the Union which, under Republican administrations with Republican governors and Republican-controlled legislatures, have passed fair employment practices commission bills? One is the State of New York, under the governorship of the distinguished Gov. Thomas E. Dewey; another is the State of Connecticut, under the then distinguished Governor McConaughy, and the third is the State of New Jersey, under the distinguished Gov. Alfred E. Driscoll. Can the Senator name any other State in the Union, under any kind of administration, Democratic or Republican, which has enacted such legislation?

Mr. PEPPER. I do not profess to know the record of every State. It is my recollection, however, that Pennsylvania, in the administration of a Democratic Governor, Governor Earle, passed such a law. I think it still exists. I have heard, which of course is not technical proof, that while there is a civil-rights statute in New York, the Governor, or someone, has handled it in such a way that it does not amount to much. I do not know whether that is a just criticism. At least, in a great many visits to New York, I have never seen that the situation is very different from what it is in the South, for that matter. Whether this is one of those cases in which there was more noise than there was light about the matter, I do not know. I am not qualified to pass judgment on it. But I have heard that criticism made. I have heard that the laws are not enforced in certain States, but I do not know whether the language of the laws is clear.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut for a question.

Mr. BALDWIN. I should like to preface it with a brief statement, so as to make it connected. The Senator was questioning the reason why Republicans did not support the ruling of the distinguished Vice President that cloture applied to a motion. I think I am well qualified to answer that question of the Senator, because I was one of the Republicans who voted to sustain the ruling of the Chair. I should like to ask the Senator if he would question the integrity and the high purpose of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], who voted against the Vice President's ruling; and would he question the integrity and high purpose of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] who now occupies the Chair and who was paired against the ruling. I am sure the Senator would not question their high purpose, would he?

Mr. PEPPER. Of course not.

Mr. BALDWIN. Would the Senator not attribute the same sound reasoning and good purpose to those Republicans who did not support the Chair's ruling, many of whom said that when they had an opportunity to vote on the Hayden-Wherry resolution they would support it?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes. But if the Senator will allow me to say so, he has named four or five Democratic Senators, whereas 16 Senators on his side of the aisle voted to sustain the Vice President, and 23 Senators on his side of the aisle, none of whom came from southern States, voted not to sustain the Vice President's ruling. I do not know whether any of them came from border States, but they came from parts of the country in which they always profess a militant advocacy of civil rights.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question on that point?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield for a question.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator knows that consistency is a jewel. I now hold in my hand a RECORD of the United States Senate of January 27, 1938, showing the vote on the cloture motion of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] to close debate on House Resolution 1567, the so-called antilynch bill, and I find that there were 51 votes on the floor against the cloture petition and there were only 12 Republicans among the 51 names. But the startling thing is that I find—I believe the Senator said there was more noise than anything else around here—I find that the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] voted against cloture in 1938 on the antilynching bill. Consistency, thou art a jewel.

Mr. PEPPER. I am glad the Senator has given me an opportunity to discuss that. The "Consistency, thou art a jewel" quotation must be put alongside the quotation of, I believe, Emerson, who said:

> A foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds, adored by little statesmen and philosophers, and divines.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. No; if the Senator will allow me, I do not yield.

In other words, a man who cannot change his mind, a man who perhaps does not learn if he has made a mistake, might be one of those who prizes consistency more than principle.

The Senator has been lacking in diligence in his research not to have discovered that I participated also in a filibuster, but in 1938, not in 1949, 1948, 1947, 1946, 1945, 1944, 1943, 1942, 1941, 1940, or 1939. I come from a State where it hurts, not where it helps, as it does in Indiana, to stand up for civil rights.

I made up my mind in 1938 that I would never again participate in a filibuster, and I have supported every cloture petition in recent years. All the Senator needs to do is to go back and examine the names on the petitions.

I do not know whether the Senator from Indiana has signed the petition

which was held up in the Senate last night by the Senator from Minnesota, to be signed by those who will agree to stay here until we get a vote. I do not say I will vote for every provision; I say I am for anti-poll-tax legislation, I am for antilynching legislation, but I have not made up my mind on an FEPC bill. And that hurts at my home, and, since the personal element has been injected, I say that if the Senator from Florida, from a State where it hurts, can stand up and say, "Yes, I signed the cloture petition," my devotion to civil-rights legislation should not be doubted. I have been written up sometimes as the only southerner who did not go to the southerners' conference; last night I signed as the third name the petition of the Senator from Minnesota to say sponsors of civil-rights measures are entitled to be heard—to present their matters. When I take that stand, coming from a State where it hurts, I think perhaps Senators on the other side of the aisle who make such claims for those principles at home might show a little greater fidelity than the 23 who voted against Vice President BARKLEY's ruling displayed by their stand.

Mr. President, I would rather leave this matter as it is than to adopt this coalition substitute. I believe that if we leave the rule as it is, with the rulings of the Chair equally divided, it will be better. On August 2, 1948, the President pro tempore, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], ruled a motion to take up a measure not subject to cloture within rule XXII, so that filibuster might continue. We got another ruling subsequent to that, by the Vice President of the United States, one of the most respected men who ever sat in this body. He said, "I have examined this rule, I have examined the precedents, and I think the present case is distinguishable from the one the Senator from Michigan ruled upon in 1948 as President pro tempore."

Mr. President, what about the Senate? The Senate vote on the Vice President's ruling was 41 to sustain him and 46 to overrule him. A difference of three votes in the Senate would have reversed the verdict.

With that parliamentary situation before the Senate, I would rather wait and let the leader of the majority, as he stated here today he would do, at a time when he deemed it propitious, make a motion to bring up any of these measures, and then again put the question to the Chair, to be decided on another cloture petition under existing rule XXII, when there is an anti-poll-tax bill under discussion, for example, and then let the Senators in this Chamber, if an appeal is taken, decide again, if the Chair rules as he did formerly, the applicability of rule XXII to the cloture petition.

Mr. President, why do I say that? Because I believe that if we could have gotten another vote on the ruling of the Chair after the vote of last Friday night, the Chair would have been sustained. I have heard the able Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], now presiding over the Senate, and whom there is no Senator in this Chamber I honor more, make a speech this afternoon against the pending coalition proposal. He indicated he would rather see the situation remain as it is. He was paired when the question arose before, but he might vote, if the matter came up again, differently from the way he would have voted before; that is, he might vote to sustain the Chair.

I could name Senators now sitting on this floor who have told me they believed that if the Barkley decision were again brought to a vote in the Senate, the result of the vote would be different; that if somehow or other we could get it up again, some Senators would change their votes, feeling that the Vice President's decision was, technically, probably the right one, and having discovered that other Senators were shielding themselves behind the technicality to accomplish a thing which some of those Senators did not aspire to achieve. Senators have told me there were Senators on this floor who told them they would change their votes if we could get the matter up again. The majority leader said he and his associates considered all sorts of ways to get the matter before the Senate again, but parliamentarily, the vote having been taken as it was, we could not get to that situation; but the majority leader possibly had in mind that later he might move to take up the anti-poll-tax bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. In view of the fact that the Senator has made the statement that I had tried various ways to get another vote on the ruling of the Vice President, on which there was an adverse vote, I may say to the able Senator from Florida that I had circulated another cloture petition which the Parliamentarian said would be in order to give us another test vote upon this very question. But before presenting that cloture petition, and even before I would do anything with respect to attempting to adjourn the Senate again, I agreed with my Republican colleagues on the other side of the aisle to give them time to see what they could do in their conference. In other words, Senators went along filibustering all afternoon while the Republicans were in conference making a determination to do what they finally did, namely, to go along with the coalition.

When that came about, and it was understood that they were going to take up the measure, and that they had the votes, of course the filing of another petition for cloture was unnecessary, because they were going to accomplish through the coalition the same thing I was attempting to do, namely, get the resolution up by a cloture petition.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask the majority leader, responsible for legislative leadership in this Chamber, whether he deems the chances of getting, say, an anti-poll-tax bill through the Senate at some future time, better by leaving the rules as they now are, and leaving the bringing of cloture upon a two-thirds vote of those voting, and upon a possible majority vote of the Senate to sustain a future possible Vice Presidential ruling, than if this coalition rule were actually in effect.

Mr. LUCAS. In response to the inquiry of my able friend I will say that I am not a prophet or the son of a prophet, but I am willing to speculate as to what will happen after this rule is adopted, when an anti-poll-tax bill comes to the floor of the Senate, as it will before July 31. I am going to say now in my studied opinion there is not a chance to pass the anti-poll-tax measure when it comes to the floor of the Senate if this rule is adopted. We will test it, Mr. President; we will test the new rule after they fasten it on us, and then at that time we will see who was right. We will then see if the minority leader is correct in his assertion to the press that the adoption of this measure practically insures the passage of the anti-poll-tax bill. I hope he is right. But I want to see the 64 votes it will be necessary to obtain under this new rule before I will believe it. I know that it cannot be done, I will say to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, that is the reason why the Senator from Florida made the statement he did. I would rather rely for the passage of controversial legislation in the future upon a possible favorable ruling of the Chair and a majority of the Senate supporting such a ruling, than to tie ourselves down now for the first time to an arbitrary requirement of the affirmative vote of 64 Senators before we can bring debate to a close. I would rather rely on that than to tie the Senate down now to what I deem to be the impossibility of bringing debate to a close upon a proposal to reduce that 64 requirement down to a working two-thirds, or down to a constitutional majority, or down to a simple majority of the Senate.

Mr. President, we could argue, as some of us tried to do, before the Vice President, before the President pro tempore, with one another, that a motion to take up a measure is included within the authority of rule XXII. We previously cited a round robin signed by 33 Democrats in 1917, when the present rule XXII was adopted. We showed, I believe, how 7 other Senators were favorable—that made 40 Senators. The first 33 said they were going to work together to bring out a rule that would stop filibuster upon any bill or measure. Seven other Senators said that while they were not signing the round robin they subscribed to its objective. We cited that circumstance. We cited statements by other Senators in the debate of 1917. At least honest men can honestly differ about what the rule did intend. And a Senate majority has the right and the power to hold that "measure" includes "motion."

So, Mr. President, I say I would rather take my chances of getting the Senate eventually to clarify the matter upon the present state of the record, even with respect to a rule change, than go along here and adopt this coalition proposal which for the first time in language says that it will not hereafter be possible by majority to bring debate to a close if the subject happens to be a proposed amendment to the Senate rules.

Mr. President, to be perfectly frank, I do not know how it will be possible for any subsequent Senate, unless it simply throws over the rules, to amend the rules

of the Senate. Not only rule XXII, but section 3 of the coalition rule says "any rule of the Senate." It will hereafter be possible for a willful or determined minority to prevent the Senate from changing any rule by which the Senate is governed.

Mr. President, the Constitution of the United States gives the Senate the right to prescribe its rules, just as it gives the same right to the House of Representatives. Can we accept an unconstitutional ultimatum that will make us barter away the power of future Senates to be untrammeled in the exercise of the constitutional power and duty the Senate possesses to prescribe its rules? That is the reason, Mr. President, I say it is a mistake to take the action now proposed to be taken.

Oh, Mr. President, we have lost a battle, but, as the Senator from Illinois has said, we have not lost a war. But if we adopt the proposed rule we have lost a war as well.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to say, in regard to the point the able Senator from Florida has been making, that it has been 31 years since rule XXII was adopted with the loopholes it contains. So far as the junior Senator from California is concerned, he does not know whether 31 years from now he will even be alive, much less a Member of the Senate.

The able Senator from Florida may be willing to go through futile motions for the next 31 years before he secures an effective cloture, but the Senator from California is not willing to take that risk. All I want to say to the able Senator from Florida is that I find it very difficult to follow his reasoning. I understand he is for a majority rule so far as the rules are concerned, but I cannot follow his reasoning when, although he says there is great virtue in the majority of the Senate being able to reach a determination, yet, when a majority of the Senate, in fact, considerably more than a majority of the Senate, 52 Senators, have signed the substitute, with the likelihood that the vote in favor of it will be considerably greater, the Senator from Florida reverses his position, and apparently feels that a small minority of the Senate has all the virtue on its side, and that in this case the virtue of the majority is nonexistent.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator overlooks the fact that the coalition has taken advantage of a parliamentary situation, and until they secured a 52 vote the coalition refused to allow the majority leader to adjourn the Senate, and refused to accept any amendment upon it.

Mr. President, they have tried to make it impossible for subsequent successors of theirs to determine this matter. Oh, if Senators would only bring forward the change in the rule the way it should come to us and let the Senate vote upon it the way it should vote, I certainly will interpose not the slightest suggestion. But 52 Senators got together and prescribed a 64-Senator minimum requirement, and included language which would make it impossible to conclude debate, hereafter, upon a rule change. What I am saying is that they are attempting by a small majority to deny to the Senate the right to prescribe its rules, hereafter by less than 64 and to change its rules, possibly, at all. They did not bring this matter up here and give us fair opportunity to debate it and consider it. The minority would not even allow the matter to be brought to the calendar until there could be a coerced coalition that would bring about, if possible, this result.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield for a question.

Mr. NEELY. I should like to ask the able Senator from Florida a question. In the event of the adoption of the so-called Wherry proposal, and 64 Members of the Senate were present and 63 of them desired to end debate, could they do it or could the sixty-fourth Senator who opposed it prevent the imposition of cloture?

Mr. PEPPER. He could not only prevent it by opposing it, he could prevent it by walking out of one of these doors.

Mr. NEELY. May I ask the Senator further if, in his opinion, when all 96 Members of the Senate were present, if 95 of them would agree to amend the rules of the Senate, could one Senator under the Wherry resolution prevent that action by the 95?

Mr. PEPPER. So long as he could by filibuster delay a vote, he could.

Mr. President, I wish to conclude my remarks.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I shall have to decline to yield to the Senator, because I wish to conclude my remarks.

Mr. BREWSTER. The point deals with the figures to which the Senator referred, and in which he indicated some interest, as to the Democratic and Republican vote. I have the figures, which would be very helpful if the Senator would permit them to be read into the RECORD at this point.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator can place them in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks if he wishes to do so. I shall be glad to yield to him at that point. If the Senator wants to put them in the RECORD, I have no disposition to keep any facts out of the RECORD. I do not wish to yield to him to read all of them, because I wish to conclude my remarks.

Mr. BREWSTER. It will take only a moment. This is a tabulation which I have had made.

The first instance, to which reference has already been made, was on February 16, 1938, when 34 Democrats and 10 Republicans voted "nay."

On November 23, 1942, 31 Democrats and 10 Republicans voted "nay."

On May 15, 1944, 31 Democrats and 13 Republicans voted "nay."

On February 9, 1946, 28 Democrats and 8 Republicans voted "nay."

On May 7, 1946, 22 Democrats and 19 Republicans voted "nay."

On May 25, 1946, 41 Democrats and 35 Republicans voted "nay."

On July 31, 1946, 26 Democrats and 7 Republicans voted "nay." So the record seems to be clear.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator from Maine very much.

Mr. BREWSTER. May I ask the Senator from Florida if he did not at one time entertain the idea that rule XXII required amendment to accomplish this result?

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator from Florida talked with the Parliamentarian and listened to various expressions of opinion. Taking into consideration what appeared to be the superficial effect of some of the precedents—although the Senator from Florida never regarded them as binding—the Senator from Florida believed that the subject could best be clarified by introducing a resolution, which I did in 1942, I believe—if that is what the Senator has mind. I compliment the Senator's researchers for having dug up the information which he has given us if he considers it valuable.

Mr. BREWSTER. Did the Senator feel at that time that an amendment along the lines indicated would be helpful in clarifying the situation?

Mr. PEPPER. I certainly wanted to see the rule clarified, and I was afraid the only way to get it clarified was to make it clear by a vote of the Senate. I did not anticipate that we would obtain a favorable ruling such as we obtained last Friday night from the Vice President of the United States. If I had known that, I would have had confidence that a majority of the Democrats would have supported the Vice President, as they did, and that a majority of the Republicans would have supported him, as they did not. So probably it was well that I had in mind the amendment of the rule itself.

Mr. BREWSTER. Throughout all this period, with the exception of 2 years, there was a Democratic incumbent in the chair.

Mr. PEPPER. But many Republican Senators in the Senate.

Mr. President, it is no secret that there is a division of opinion in the Democratic Party. But the Republicans do not come from the South. I hope the South will be spared that experience for a long time. That is naturally not one of the calamities to which I look forward in the future. But they do not come from the South. If they do not have those influences and associations, why is it that after they go to their convention and unanimously adopt the platform saying that they favor these proposals, 10, or 19, or 30, or any number of them vote in the way which has been indicated?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey rose.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator from New Jersey feel that he would suffer if I did not yield to him?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, a moment ago the Senator from Florida expressed his desire to leave to attend some meeting. The Senator from New Jersey is hoping to obtain recognition in his own right.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I shall ask for a quorum call as soon as I have concluded. I understand that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] wishes to address the Senate, and I had said that I would suggest the absence of

a quorum at the conclusion of my address. I should like to conclude my remarks very briefly.

It has been said that so far we have not had a ruling, until we got one from the Vice President the other night, that a cloture petition applied to a motion to take up a measure. Mr. President, the Senate is beginning to realize the awful responsibility which rests upon it. Formerly questions relating to foreign policy came before us only infrequently. Today this Nation almost holds up the world. Our calendar is jammed, or will soon be jammed, with scores of measures of world importance.

The vote the other evening, when only three votes were lacking to sustain the ruling of the Chair, shows that the Senate of the United States is beginning to realize that we cannot discharge our duty in this troubled world unless this body has authority to legislate and to perform its constitutional duty.

Emerson said, "I cannot spend the day in explanation." Eventually we must act. May our actions be wise and pure; but eventually the Senate must have power to act upon these world-shaking, momentous problems. Ahead of us is ECA. Ahead of us is the North Atlantic Pact. Ahead of us is a peace treaty. Ahead of us is the question of arms to Europe to defend democracy in a part of the world where it is peculiarly under attack. Ahead of us is the unknown. Can this body very much longer allow a few men, over some domestic difference, to paralyze and strangle the power of this body to function. I do not think so, Mr. President. I do not believe that any Presiding Officer can long sit in that chair and not recognize that the rules of a body are designed not to obstruct, but to expedite the business of that body. I do not believe that Senators can long sit in this Chamber and see debate dragged out to such a ridiculous extent that it becomes obvious obstruction and willful paralysis, rather than debate in an effort to persuade the minds of men.

Mr. President, I am not afraid of the Senate. I am not afraid that it will not find a way to meet this challenge. I know that it will if it is left free, if it is not shackled, if we do not put it behind blinders, if we do not chain its hands, if we do not make it impotent, at this most serious point in our history, to meet the challenge of duty and of destiny.

Earlier in the day the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] stated that the majority in the coalition had made a promise. I believe I quote him with substantial accuracy when I say that he stated that if they had made a promise, it ought to be kept—a promise to go through, word for word, with the coalition resolution. I infer that it is intended that there shall be no amendments to the coalition resolution. I understand that debate is useless, discussion impotent.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Is he Senator under the impression that no amendments are to be offered to the pending resolution?

Mr. PEPPER. It is my understanding that amendments will be offered, but from what has been said, I should be very much surprised if a single member of the coalition of 52 should feel himself free to vote for any amendment.

Mr. DONNELL. I may say to the Senator that I have an amendment to offer, for which I shall earnestly argue, in the hope that it will be adopted. I desire the Senate to know that.

Mr. PEPPER. Is the Senator one of the signers of the coalition agreement?

Mr. DONNELL. No.

Mr. PEPPER. I am speaking only of Senators who have committed themselves to a rule which is like the law of the Medes and Persians, unchangeable by amendment on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Ohio was talking about those who have a conscience with respect to technicalities or with respect to fundamental principles; and yet they agree blindly upon a proposal to vote down every amendment, without knowing what the amendments are before they see them, and irrespective of the merit of any amendment. It was. They do not want to know anything about it. They are going to vote it down. Yet they talk about having a conscience with respect to legislation.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Is the Senator from Florida aware of the fact that the only way a cloture rule was ever written in the Senate was by the action of caucuses of Republican and Democratic Senators, who agreed that they would support such a rule, that they would oppose every amendment, and that when that rule came up they would vote for it? Except for that agreement, there never would have been any cloture rule in the Senate. That was the method pursued in 1917, and under the circumstances it is the only way by which a compromise can be reached.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I deny the validity of the assumption that the only way the Senate may have the power to prescribe its rules and to transact its business is to adopt this coalition resolution. Last Friday night there was a chance for the Senate to take control over its affairs. If the ruling of the Vice President had been sustained, one of the only two loopholes would have been privileged motions with respect to the credentials of new Senators; and once new Senators were sworn in, that would have been out. The only other loophole would have been a motion to amend the Journal. As was pointed out, when the leadership was getting ready to bring up a matter of controversial import, it could have been done so during a session following the taking of a recess, and then, instead of having a morning hour, which would have allowed debate on the question of approving the Journal, such debate would have been avoided.

So, Mr. President, if the Senate had sustained the ruling last Friday night, we already would have an effective cloture rule in the Senate, and a majority of the Members of the Senate in following rule XXII would have had a right to prescribe what was the unfinished business of the Senate.

It can be done again upon a ruling of the Chair and a vote of a majority of the Senate. We do not have to have 64 votes under those circumstances and we do not have to have unlimited power of debate with respect to a change of the rule. That is why I say it is better to leave the rule as it is, rather than to attempt to change it.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President——

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I shall have to decline to yield further.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President——

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am very sorry to decline to yield further. I have already explained that there is a meeting which I must attend, and I have yielded generously.

Mr. BREWSTER. The record is magnificent.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator from Maine is very kind, and I appreciate it.

Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio said that a promise was made, and should not be broken, but should be kept. I wonder whether Senators remember the Biblical story of the time when the beautiful Salome persuaded Herod to give her the head of John the Baptist. She danced before Herod—no doubt alluringly—and in her appealing way she persuaded Herod to promise her the head of John the Baptist. As usually happens when a promise is made, there came a time to make a performance, and Salome demanded John's head. I imagine Herod was in a hot spot. He liked Salome; he felt that he was indebted to her; he wanted to keep his promise; but there was old John, there was his head, and in a little while he and his head would be separated, if Herod kept his promise.

Herod kept his promise; a little later the gory head of John was paraded on a platter to Salome. Herod kept his promise.

I do not know whether it was a good thing or not for Herod to keep his promise. Suppose one finds out he has made a bad promise, and suppose to keep it would be a mistake—because Herod's keeping his promise was at least fatal to John. I believe that for Senators who have entered this coalition, to keep their promise will be fatal to many of the measures to the enactment of which Senators profess ardently to aspire. That is why I suggest we had better pause and consider and examine the effect of this coalition proposal. When we do that, I humbly submit to my colleagues that, to rephrase the quotation a little, it were better to risk the ills we have, than to fly into the certain penalties of those that are proposed for us.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hoey	Mundt
Anderson	Holland	Murray
Baldwin	Humphrey	Myers
Brewster	Hunt	Neely
Bricker	Ives	O'Conor
Bridges	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	Reed
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Capehart	Kefauver	Russell
Chapman	Kem	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kerr	Schoeppel
Connally	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Donnell	Langer	Sparkman
Douglas	Lodge	Stennis
Downey	Long	Taft
Eastland	Lucas	Taylor
Ecton	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	McFarland	Thye
Flanders	McGrath	Tobey
Frear	McKellar	Tydings
George	McMahon	Vandenberg
Gillette	Magnuson	Watkins
Green	Malone	Wherry
Gurney	Martin	Wiley
Hayden	Maybank	Williams
Hendrickson	Miller	Withers
Hickenlooper	Millikin	Young
Hill	Morse	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

(By order of the Senate, the following remarks by Mr. BREWSTER were transposed to this point in the RECORD:)

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my statement, which will be comparatively brief, may be placed at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]. I spoke to him and asked him about putting in two paragraphs of his remarks on a former occasion. I wish to proceed to read those remarks, but I ask unanimous consent for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I desire to do this, not because I wish to associate myself with the sentiments therein expressed nor to challenge the propriety of the Senator from Florida in changing his position on a very momentous question, but simply to illustrate the depth of emotion which has governed men at various times, and particularly the extremity of utterance which, as it seems to me, the Senator from Florida used upon the occasion of denouncing antilynching legislation.

It might well temper the extent of his denunciation of those who disagree with him upon this or any other question, since it may also occur to him that in his denunciation of those with whom he has more recently differed in the matter of upholding the ruling of the Chair in the recent appeal from the Chair, perhaps he should afford them the same charity which he must seek regarding the expressions to which he then gave voice.

I read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 24, 1938, when the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] was conducting a 50-page filibuster against antilynching legislation. I read the introductory paragraph of his remarks:

> Mr. President, it is my considered opinion that the bill now pending has the following objectionable characteristics—

This is on page 973 of part 1 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Seventy-fifth Congress, third session, on January 24, 1938.

> It is designed as a piece of legislation intended to be and having the consequence of being offensive to the South. It is in violation of the express provisions of the Federal Constitution. It is contrary to the dual system of government established by our forefathers and specifically recognized and provided for in the Federal Constitution. It is contrary to all democratic principles. It is out of harmony with the spirit of that philosophy which has prevailed in the national life of this country since the 4th of March 1933, known under the terminology of the New Deal.

He is speaking with regard to an antilynch bill.

> It is contrary to the principles of true liberalism. It is a tragic prostitution of the processes of government which ought at this time be employed for the alleviation of suffering and the betterment of the condition of the whole American people.
>
> Believing that this proposal possesses the vices I have named, being a descendant of a family of the South of long before the Revolutionary War; being by my oath bound by the Federal Constitution; being both by inheritance and by inclination a Democrat; being not only an advocate of but a believer in the principles of the New Deal; being concerned about the preservation of the fundamentals of our system; being of a political faith which associates itself with the philosophy of progressive democracy, which may otherwise be called liberalism, and believing in my heart that the processes of government should not be prostituted to the regard of this measure when matters of national import involving human suffering and human despair are clamoring at the doors of the Government for attention—believing those things and entertaining those sentiments, I am one who has solemnly resolved and covenanted, not only with my own spirit but as well with my colleagues, that the pending bill shall not pass unless the proponents are prepared not only to abolish the right of self-government and to destroy American institutions, as this bill would do, but likewise rob this body of its inalienable characteristic as the last citadel of free speech in the territorial limits of the United States.
>
> I do not suppose anyone could mistake the significance of these utterances. I think it is fair to our colleagues that these thoughts be at this stage of the controversy distinctly known and understood. Did I not feel that the most fundamental of possible questions is involved, I certainly would never utter such a sentiment upon the floor of this body. I would not be willing to jeopardize my personal fortune and the progress of legislation did I not entertain sentiments of that degree of seriousness. But all of us come to periods in our lives when we have to make decisions, and I believe that the principles embodied in the proposed legislation are so vital to the future of this country that those who have taken the position to which I have given expression have taken a patriotic, yes, an essential course.
>
> No one regrets more than I that we find ourselves in this lamentable situation. No one has tried harder, in his humble and immature way, in counsel, in suggestion, in earnestness of endeavor, to avoid this crucial controversy and contest than have I, and no one regrets more than I the failure of that effort. Likewise no one is sterner in his determination to adhere to the resolve I have just expressed than I.

Mr. President, I could read, following that, 50 pages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD expressing similar sentiments, including voluminous quotations from all the founders and fathers of democracy throughout the history of the country from the days of Thomas Jefferson down to the time of Woodrow Wilson, all of which is calculated to show that the position which some of the Senators on the other side have taken is exactly comparable with that of the Senator from Florida. I would not wish to change his mind, but I would wish that he would accord similar latitude to all those who differ with him in his present position and who may still find themselves unable to follow the logic of his change or the logic of his present position, and to those who regard the rules of the Senate as something which have a certain solemnity and a certain consistency.

I speak as one of those Senators who, on a recent occasion, voted with him to sustain the ruling of the Presiding Officer. But I do not care to have the good faith or the devotion to their oath of office of Senators on either side of the aisle challenged because they found themselves unable to violate, as they conceived it, the rules in order to attain the end which the Senator from Florida now so earnestly urges upon us.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President—

> Once to every man and nation comes the moment to decide,
> In the strife of truth with falsehood, for the good or evil side;
> Some great cause, God's new Messiah, offering each the bloom or blight,
> Parts the goats upon the left hand, and the sheep upon the right,
> Then it is the brave men chooses, while the coward stands aside,
> Doubting in his abject spirit, till his Lord is crucified.

The Senate is about to make a choice and a decision, the ultimate consequences of which may prove to be as momentous as those of the bloodiest of Sir Edward Creasy's famous Decisive Battles of the World, which began at Marathon 490 years before Christ and ended at Waterloo in the year of our Lord eighteen hundred fifteen.

The decision that necessity compels us to render will answer the burning question which has consumed 18 days of senatorial time and gained front-page headlines in every newspaper in the United States. In substance this is the question, Will the Senate so amend its antiquated rules as to make it impossible for a minority to prevent the majority from transacting Senate business?

The public should not be blamed for asking, "Why has there been prolonged day and night debate or unlimited sound and fury about such a simple matter as a rule of the United States Senate? Who cares whether the Senate has any rules; or, if it has, what they

provide?" But such an inquiry would be the equivalent of the question, "Who cares whether Federal laws are ever made or modified, whether Federal money is ever appropriated for public improvements, or whether the general welfare is ever promoted by the Senate?" Thus simplified, the matter before us sufficiently attests its importance and indicates the duty of those who shall determine its fate.

Our present situation is similar to that which existed in this body in 1830. In that year the Foote resolution concerning the public lands was generally considered unimportant. But it became the storm center of the historic Senate debate, known as the battle of the giants, in which Gen. Robert Y. Hayne, for the South, and Daniel Webster, for the North, made imperishable contributions to both the constitutional and dialectical history of the Nation.

Let us hope that notwithstanding the present dearth of Websters and Haynes the long debate that is now obviously nearing a close will, in some mysterious manner not yet revealed, contribute something of value to Senate procedure and human progression.

A proper rule of the Senate is a sword with which to protect and prosper the right. An improper rule of the Senate is an atomic bomb with which liberty may be harassed and the rights of the people may be impaired.

The dinosaur and the mammoth perished because of their failure to adjust themselves to the changing conditions of the world around them. Let us not emulate their folly by failing to amend the rules of the Senate in conformity with the demands of the perilous age in which we live. Prudence dictates that we should have enough courage and statesmanship to free the greatest legislative body in the world of its self-imposed shackles so that it can promptly and greatly increase its service to the people and its contribution to the welfare of the world.

If the substitute offered by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] should be adopted, thereafter, if 64 Senators were present and 63 of them desired to end debate and vote on the question then pending, the lone sixty-fourth Senator could indefinitely delay the 63.

Similarly, if the 96 Members of this body were all present and 95 of them should unite in a demand that debate end and the Senate at once proceed to amend one of its rules, the ninety-sixth Senator, for as long as he was able to stand on his feet and talk or read about anything in the universe, could make the demand of his 95 colleagues as ineffectual as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal, and for the same length of time render the Senate—

As useless as a painted ship
Upon a painted ocean.

The opponents of the liberalization of the rules have voiced their fear that an uncurbed majority might tyrannically exercise its power. To a lover of liberty—especially American liberty—tyranny is loathsome and intolerable, regardless of its origin, objective, or the number who inflict it or are afflicted by it.

But if we, unfortunately, must choose between the tyranny of the many and the tyranny of the few, let us, by all means, choose the lesser of the two evils and adhere to the democratic principle that the rights of the majority are superior to the rights of the minority. In the present contest between the supporters of majority rule, on the one hand, and minority rule, on the other, put me down on the majority side—first, last, and all the time.

Neither the Democratic nor the Republican platform adopted in 1948 contains a specific promise to amend the Senate rules. But no Senator on either side of the aisle is naive enough to deny or doubt that highly important pledges of both the Democratic and Republican platforms would be completely annihilated if the Wherry resolution should be adopted, or if, regardless of the fate of the resolution, the Senate should fail to liberalize its rules so as to free the majority from the minority's power of fatal obstruction and effectual control.

Let me remind Republican Senators of some of the observations and promises contained in their party's national platform:

Lynching or any other form of mob violence anywhere is a disgrace to any civilized State, and we favor the prompt enactment of legislation to end this infamy.

One of the basic principles of this Republic is the equality of all individuals in their right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This principle is enunciated in the Declaration of Independence and embodied in the Constitution of the United States. It was vindicated on the field of battle and became the cornerstone of this Republic. This right of equal opportunity to work and to advance in life should never be limited in any individual because of race, religion, color, or country of origin. We favor the enactment and just enforcement of such Federal legislation as may be necessary to maintain this right at all times in every part of this Republic. We favor the abolition of the poll tax as a requisite to voting.

Mr. President, who that understands unambiguous English language is base enough to deny that the foregoing from the Republican platform solemnly obligates the Republican Party, through its representatives in the Senate, to support antilynching, anti-poll-tax, and fair-employment-practices legislation? Does any Senator on the other side of the aisle fail to realize that if the Wherry resolution becomes a rule of this body, the Republican and Democratic Senators, who favor human-rights legislation, will be rendered powerless to achieve it?

With high hope and much charity but no exuberance of faith, I now venture to remind conservative Democratic Senators of certain provisions of the platform adopted by their historic party in nineteen hundred forty-eight. In that memorable document the following clearly appears:

We again state our belief that racial and religious minorities must have the right to live, the right to work, the right to vote, the full and equal protection of the laws on a basis of equality with all citizens, as guaranteed by the Constitution.

Is anyone base enough to deny that the language just read pledges the Democratic Party, at least, to enact a fair-employment-practices law and an anti-poll-tax law?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. NEELY. I gladly yield to the able Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from West Virginia whether he thinks his party and those on this side of the aisle who are in favor of the same program to which he refers are in any better shape to get any single piece of that legislation before this body under the loopholes in the existing rule XXII, than they are under the proposed substitute, which at least will give a number of test votes as to where Senators stand?

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from California asks, in effect, which I consider better, the existing rule, which enables a minority to defeat the majority, or that proposed by the Wherry resolution which, if adopted, would end neither minority obstruction nor minority control. Let me answer illustratively instead of categorically. Boswell, in his veracious biography of Samuel Johnson, relates that on a certain occasion a man named Morgann said to the learned doctor: "Do you reckon Derrick or Smart the better poet?" Johnson retorted: "Sir, there is no settling the point of precedency between a louse and a flea." In my opinion, it is just as impossible to determine the point of precedency between the present antiquated and unsatisfactory rule of the Senate in question and that proposed by the Wherry resolution as it would be to determine the superiority in the matter to which Dr. Johnson referred.

The Senator from California will never be able to effect adequate reform of senatorial procedure under either the present rule, or the rule specified in the Wherry resolution even if the Senator should continue to be a Member of this body to the end of his days.

Let me irrelevantly observe that I certainly do not wish the Senator from California or any other liberal any ill luck in the matter of a continuation of service. But I trust it will not be considered an unpardonable asperity for me to add that it would not break my heart if the voters should, at the earliest opportunity, elect enough liberal Senators, regardless of their politics, to redeem every existing platform pledge and implication in favor of human-rights legislation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I yield to the eminent Senator from Minnesota, who has ably and eloquently contributed to the present debate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. I should like to ask my colleague and friend, the Senator from West Virginia, in view of what he has heard from the other side of the aisle, from the proponents of the Wherry substitute, whether or not, in order to prove their good faith as to the intent and purpose of the substitute, they should not bring before the Senate anti-poll-tax, anti-

lynching, and fair-employment-practices legislation, ask for a cloture petition, and obtain the necessary number of votes to be able to close debate and to have a vote upon those particular issues?

Mr. NEELY. The answer is, a hundred times, yes, and they ought to do something else. They should follow the greatest apostle of the immortal George Norris now on the Republican side of the Chamber—the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. The Republican membership is urged to join the Senator from Minnesota and me in supporting the Morse amendment to the pending resolution. The adoption of that amendment would make majority rule in the Senate a supreme sovereign instead of an impotent slave.

But I fear that few on the Republican side will improve the present opportunity to translate the human-rights provisions of the Republican platform into law. The great Senator from Oregon knows, as all others who yearn to end this filibuster in a decisive victory for the people know, that the Wherry resolution, if adopted, would render it practically impossible to redeem the most important human-rights promises of either the Republican or the Democratic platform.

Only by the cooperative, vigorous action of liberal Democrats and Republicans can the Senate be freed from its shackles. Only by the united action of Republican and Democratic conservatives can the progressives of the Senate be prevented from so liberalizing the rules that antilynching, anti-poll-tax, and fair-employment-practices legislation can be enacted during the present session of the Congress in conformity with the solemn platform promises and implications of both the great political parties.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. NEELY. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that the only way the proponents of the resolution can get themselves off the hook they are on before the public, standing openly now as the enemies of civil-rights legislation, is to come clean and propose legislation, and back it wholeheartedly, with the loyal support of the other side of the aisle, and have the planks in the platforms unanimously translated into reality? Is not that the only way it can be done?

Mr. NEELY. Undoubtedly, and according to some of the newspapers the Senator from Minnesota and I are not the only ones who hold that opinion. For a week or more the press of the entire country has charged, as the Washington Post today—March 16—proclaims, that "G. O. P.-Dixie coalition takes over control." Control of what? Control of the Senate, control of the civil-rights program which Democrats and Republicans, through their national conventions and by means of their respective platforms, promised they would enact into law.

During the prevailing mood to "tell truth and shame the devil," it should be good for our political souls openly to confess that neither the Democratic Party nor the Republican Party has lived up to its opportunities or its obligations in the important matter of amending the archaic shackling rules which control procedure in the Senate.

A golden opportunity to atone for past neglect, render a great service in the present, and assure the unlimited benefits of liberal legislation in the future is at hand. Duty demands that we improve this opportunity by voting for every available meritorious proposal to modernize and liberalize the rules of the Senate, regardless of the political affiliation of the author of the proposed reform.

In the early days of the present session of the Congress liberal Democrats had high hopes that Republican Senators would almost unanimously vote to amend the rules in order that civil-rights legislation might be enacted. But unhappily those hopes have been put to flight by the matrimonial coalition that the conservative Republican Members have, with consummate skill, made with the Democratic Senators from the South who believe that racial conditions in their States are such that they and their constituents would be injured if the rules of this body should be modified so as to render possible the enactment of anti-lynching and other civil-rights legislation.

Never have I believed that Senators from the Deep South, except the great liberal from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and possibly two others, would vote for any measure that would directly or indirectly make it possible to redeem the Democratic platform pledges relative to civil-rights matters. As a consequence of this fact, I found great comfort in hoping that at least a majority of the Republican Members would support whatever procedural reform might be necessary to enable them and other liberals to redeem the civil-rights pledges of the platforms of both the major parties.

But now I have little hope of the desired consummation which a moment ago was portrayed by the able Senator from Minnesota. Indeed, practically all my sanguine expectations of effectual Republican cooperation have been swallowed up by fear generated by the second most miraculous wedding in the annals of time. The first was in Cana of Galilee. There the miracle consisted of the turning of water into wine. The second of these matrimonial ceremonies was quite recently held in the Senate wing of the Capitol. There was no wine. Mental exhilaration and gratification, instead of intoxication and temporary impairment of the reasoning faculties, were the crowning achievements of this famous event. And famous it was. It beggars description.

The distinguished Republican floor leader from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] was the bridegroom. His numerous attendants were conservative Republican Senators. The many brides and bridesmaids, whom I refrain from naming, were obtained on the Democratic side of the Chamber in a manner resembling that in which the ancient Roman soldiers obtained their Sabine wives.

Among all those who participated in this connubial performance, joy has manifestly been unconfined. It has been seen in the faces of all the Republican, Democratic, and Dixiecratic Members who, for better or for worse, have entered into the most extraordinary bonds of political matrimony ever conceived by the mind of man. On Capitol Hill the air has been filled with nuptial music. Senators, attachés, and gallery habitués have been compelled to harken to the words of that famous American who put "poe" in poetry:

Hear the mellow wedding bells,
Golden bells—

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. Not while I am quoting poetry. A little later I shall gladly yield.

Hear the mellow wedding bells,
Golden bells!
What a world of happiness their harmony foretells!
Through the balmy air of night
How they ring out their delight!

From the molten-golden notes,
And all in tune,
What a liquid ditty floats
To the turtledove that listens, while she gloats
On the moon!

Mr. President, this tintinnabulation went on and on, while the American people were probably thinking of what Senator Thomas of Colorado said many years ago concerning a filibuster such as we have had during the last 2 weeks. This was his vigorous deliverance:

If Senators were any place else than in the protection of this Chamber, they would be arrested for lunacy.

Mr. President, the Senate should not by action or inaction, provoke such criticism or comment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I yield to the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the Senator from West Virginia if the idea he is trying to impress on the Senate and the country is that so long as 12 northern, eastern, and western Democrats, and 18 southern Democrats, are supporting the substitute before the Senate, they are more or less beyond the pale, and that it is an evil coalition which has been brought about. Yet, when the same Democrats from the same States, the same individuals, are joined with the majority leader in putting across the administration's program, it is no longer an evil coalition, but it is a very fine and noble gathering of compatriots of the same political party.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, the charge or implication of evil coalition is the Senator's and not mine. No matter what my opinion on that point may be, I shall temper my language so that it will violate no Senate rule. If I am ever impelled to voice my judgment on the pending subject matter in unparliamentary language, I shall make my observations in a forum in which Senate rules do not prevail and points of order do not lie.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. NEELY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator mean he would use language he could not use on the Senate floor?

Mr. NEELY. It is barely possible that elsewhere the Senator from West Virginia might be provoked to use words more vigorous than senatorial rules permit or senatorial propriety approves. But notwithstanding what might be said in other places, or may be said by others here, the Senator from West Virginia will, in this forum, use no unparliamentary phraseology even in attempting to express his deep regret caused by the failure of certain Republican and Democratic Senators to help liberalize the rules so as to make possible the enactment of civil-rights legislation.

Mr. President, except the 16 Republican Senators who voted right on the acid test of sustaining the Vice President's important ruling earlier in the debate and except possibly two additional Members on the other side of the Chamber Republican Senators are running true to form and are now simply repeating their long and unbroken history of opposing effectual cloture in this body.

The attention of the Senate is invited to page 1166 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the 27th day of January 1938. It shows that the vote on a cloture petition which I had personally prepared and circulated and on which I had obtained the necessary number of names and had on the 25th day of January filed in accordance with the rules of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. NEELY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is that the cloture petition which was mentioned a while ago against which the Senator from Florida voted? Is that the petition which was inserted in the RECORD, the petition circulated by the Senator from West Virginia, but on which the Senator from Florida voted against cloture on civil-rights bills?

Mr. NEELY. The Senator from Nebraska has correctly identified the petition. But I do not recall whether the Senator from Florida voted for or against it.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is on that cloture petition. He is one of the group of which the Senator from West Virginia is now a member, but who voted "nay" after that petition had been circulated and filed?

Mr. NEELY. Let us see whether the name of the Senator from Florida is on the petition. According to the RECORD, it was signed only by the following: Neely, La Follette, Wagner, Clark, Van Nuys, Minton, Brown of New Hampshire, McGill, Schwellenbach, Truman, Bone, Bulkley, Hitchcock, Copeland, Thomas of Utah, Guffey, and McAdoo.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the anti-lynching-bill petition which the Senator from West Virginia circulated?

Mr. NEELY. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator read how the Senator from Florida voted on that matter?

Mr. NEELY. At the moment I am discussing Republican Senators exclusively. Later the Senator from Nebraska may, if he wishes, have my ancient copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and from it read the names of the Democratic and also of the Republican Senators who defeated cloture on the antilynching bill on the occasion in question.

Let me continue my sermon to Republican Senators who should vote for cloture instead of aiding some Democratic Senators who are striving to defeat it.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, very well.

Mr. NEELY. Manifestly, it would be utterly useless for me to appeal to certain Democratic Senators from the Deep South to support any measure designed to enable the Senate promptly to vote on antilynching and fair-employment-practices legislation and other kindred measures. But Republican Senators who are unembarrassed by the racial problems with which southern Senators believe they are confronted could vote for the entire civil-rights program without losing a jot of their personal popularity, or a tittle of their political power. There is no blinking the deplorable fact that if Senators from various Southern States should vote for civil-rights legislation, their constituents would retire them from office at the earliest opportunity.

This circumstance should be duly considered in judging southern Senators for opposing the extension of civil rights.

Republican and Democratic Senators from other sections of the country who are imperiled by no racial issue, but nevertheless habitually oppose civil-rights legislation promised by their respective party platforms deserve the reproof of all the progressives in the Senate and the opposition of all their liberal constituents at the polls.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator is lecturing the Republicans, I will ask him if he has examined my record as to how I voted on every civil-rights bill which has been introduced since I have been a Member of the Senate.

Mr. NEELY. No, Mr. President, I have not checked the Senator's record, but his intimation as to the manner in which he has voted is cheerfully accepted as entirely correct. Yet even if the Senator's previous voting record on civil-rights matters is faultless, he has marred it by sponsoring and supporting the measure before us, which, if adopted, would so shackle 95 Members of this body that they could not, over the ninety-sixth Member's objection, amend the rules. Under the Senator's proposal if 64 Senators were present 63 could not, over the objection of the sixty-fourth, proceed to transact Senate business.

The Senator, by sponsoring and supporting his resolution, has placed himself in a situation similar to that of little Matilda, who is immortalized in the fourth of the famous McGuffey Readers, in a poem which contains these lines:

> Oh, how one ugly trick has spoiled
> The sweetest and the best!
> Matilda, though a pleasant child,
> One grievous fault possessed,
> Which, like a cloud before the skies,
> Hid all her better qualities.

I do not charge the Senator from Nebraska with bad faith or evil motives. I only regret that by offering his resolution and battling for its adoption he has, after the manner of little Matilda, hidden his record of support of civil-rights legislation, or considerably dimmed its luster.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the Senator through with poems?

Mr. NEELY. The Senator from Nebraska is so much like a poem that he is entitled to preferential consideration. Therefore, regardless of whether I am through with poems, I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. WHERRY. Let us go back to a question which I think is very important. The Senator is lecturing the Republicans, and he complains of those of us who are now sponsoring a compromise which we feel is the best we can obtain without surrendering our chance to get up civil-rights legislation or other extremely important legislation which we think should come before the Senate. I ask the Senator if he is going to lecture me for what I have done, and whether he has examined my record as to how I voted each and every time a cloture petition respecting civil-rights measures was filed?

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, let me again inform the Senator that I have not examined his record. But if the Senator says that he voted for the cloture petitions to which he referred, I accept his statement as true beyond the shadow of a doubt.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; but the Senator is now lecturing me and saying I am trying to kill civil-rights legislation. I tell the Senator with all the sincerity in my heart that I believe that what we are doing will bring the civil-rights legislation before the Senate for consideration. I have a right to make such an interpretation of what we are proposing. The Senator from West Virginia says that what we are proposing would result in killing civil-rights legislation. I want the Senator from West Virginia to know that there is no one in the Senate who has tried harder in the past 6 years to bring up civil-rights legislation than I have. My record is that on all occasions I have voted "yea" on cloture petitions dealing with civil-rights legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from West Virginia has yielded for a question only.

Mr. WHERRY. I asked the Senator if he knew that.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I have answered the Senator's question. It is my hope that the Chair will not restrict the Senator from Nebraska to inquiries alone, because I shall be interested in any observation he cares to make.

Mr. WHERRY. I asked the Senator a question.

Mr. NEELY. To the best of my ability, I have answered the question. Let me assure the Senator that if, as he has indicated, he believes I have lectured him, he has either misunderstood my intentions, or misconstrued my language. I have only endeavored to indicate my belief that the Senator from Nebraska and all others who have agreed to support his resolution are pursuing the wrong

course. It appears to me that if the Senator and his followers succeed in adopting the Wherry resolution, they will thereby render impossible the fulfilment of vital pledges contained in the platforms of both the Democratic and Republican Parties, to the disappointment and prejudice of the American people.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from West Virginia agree with me that if it be true that on January 27, 1938, the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] voted against cloture on an anti-lynching bill, the fact that since 1938, and in the year 1949 he has taken the position he now takes in regard to the matter of cloture in the Senate is a change in the right direction as contrasted with a change in the wrong direction that some Republicans have taken in the Senate?

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, the eminent Senator from Oregon is, as usual 100 percent right. Let me add that, in my opinion, the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] deserves more credit than any other Member of this body for his long-continued, unsurpassable liberal attitude toward civil-rights measures that have come before either the Senate or the country. The Senator from Florida is from the Deep South where it is likely to cost a public official toil, trouble, and even defeat, to be for antilynching, anti-poll-tax, and other similar humanitarian measures.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I gladly yield to the distinguished Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Would not the Senator be wise not to exclude others of our southern brethren from possible redemption in view of the success he has achieved in the case of the Senator from Florida, who certainly took as extreme a position as anyone else did at that time?

Mr. NEELY. Let me assure the able Senator from Maine that I would not exclude anyone from the South or the North from redemption, or hope of redemption here or hereafter. In my hymn book,

> While the lamp holds out to burn
> The vilest sinner may return.

That blessed assurance applies to Republicans as well as to Democrats. It is my fervent hope that all sinners will eventually return and reform, and that in every legislative body on earth the members will unitedly advance to the tune of Onward, Christian Soldiers, until all wrongs shall have been righted, and justice, happiness, and peace shall have been achieved for all mankind, regardless of race or color or creed.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wonder if the Senator has recently read the language which the Senator from Florida used at that time. I have before me a paragraph stating his position, which demonstrates very conclusively that he was in the extreme position of so-called States' rights. Would the Senator permit me to inquire whether he had read this language?

Mr. NEELY. Whether I have read the language of the Senator from Florida?

Mr. BREWSTER. Language which I shall now read.

Mr. NEELY. I do not yield for that purpose. Let the Senator read the remarks of the Senator from Florida at the conclusion of my address.

Mr. President, I shall now read the names of the Republican Senators who voted against the petition for cloture on the antilynching bill on the occasion to which I referred before I was interrupted.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I shall yield until midnight although I had hoped to read, without further interruption, the names of the Republican Senators who made it impossible to obtain cloture on an antilynching bill in 1938. But I again yield to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Suppose we could all join in the fine sentiments—in which I concur—relative to doing what we can for our fellow men. How would the Senator do it under the present cloture rule? How could he get such a measure up for consideration?

Mr. NEELY. Is that the Senator's entire question?

Mr. WHERRY. That is it.

Mr. NEELY. The desired result cannot be obtained either under the existing rule, or under that proposed in the Senator's resolution. Therefore, if I had been the leader of the Republican minority in the Senate and had desired to liberalize the rules, and redeem my party's platform pledges, I should have gone to the majority leader [Mr. LUCAS] and said to him, "History teaches me that no important battle was ever won without a fight."

Mr. WHERRY. That is right.

Mr. NEELY. And I should have added, "You and I yearn for the liberalization of the rules. Your forces, like my own, are divided on this question. Neither of us has enough on his own side of the aisle to win. Therefore, let us combine our followers and unitedly fight this filibuster day and night until we finally obtain a vote on the matter before the Senate." In my opinion, if the Senator from Nebraska had pursued that course, liberal Republican and liberal Democratic Senators would now be on the road to success.

Mr. WHERRY. If we reduce to simple language the Senator's answer to my question, as I understand, he feels that the only way it could be done would be to break the filibuster.

Mr. NEELY. That is correct. I believe that we should have adopted General Grant's slogan, "I propose to fight it out on this line if it takes all summer." Human liberty—the stake in this contest—is worth fighting for all summer and all winter. Indeed, it is worth fighting for here and everywhere every day in the year.

Our forefathers died for liberty, and with their latest breath bequeathed it to us with their benediction, and their admonition to defend it against all enemies—foreign or domestic.

An opportunity to express our gratitude for the heritage we have received stares us in the face. Unlimited courage, unselfish cooperation, and unstinted devotion to duty can yet win this battle for human rights, make democracy, with its majority rule, work in the Senate and transform apparent defeat into a victory so glorious that it would make liberals rejoice around the world. Senators should rise to the heights which the occasion requires and perform the service which the people who elected them earnestly desire, and for which they devoutly pray.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. NEELY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Having assured the majority leader, as the minority leader, that I was in complete sympathy with his procedure, and would stay here as long as he would stay to break the filibuster, what else would the Senator have done under the present rule if the majority leader had moved to adjourn?

Mr. NEELY. I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. WHERRY. He did not even make the motion to adjourn, but he said he was going to move to adjourn.

Mr. NEELY. I informed a number of my friends, of whom I believe the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is one, that I intended to vote against adjournment.

Mr. WHERRY. I am in agreement with the statement the Senator has made.

Mr. NEELY. In a caucus of liberal Democratic Members who discussed the question of adjournment, I expressed my opposition to it in no uncertain language.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. NEELY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Did not the administration conference adopt a resolution to adjourn?

Mr. NEELY. I left the caucus after I had stated my position. It did not vote on the question while I was present. But I have been unofficially informed that it agreed to the resolution or motion indicated by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me ask the Senator this question: The majority leader, under the instructions of the administration Democrats, came to the floor instructed to move an adjournment. How could the Senator have accomplished anything under those circumstances, and under the present rules? How could he have done the thing with which I am in sympathy, unless some compromise could have been reached?

Mr. NEELY. If the Republicans who signed the agreement to vote for the Senator's substitute resolution had assured the Democratic leader that they would loyally support the Democratic liberals in this fight, neither the administration forces nor their leader would, in my opinion, have even considered the matter of moving to adjourn.

Mr. WHERRY. Was there any time during the past 2 weeks when the majority leader did not have absolute assurance from this side of the aisle that we would stay here all summer to break the filibuster?

Mr. NEELY. I do not know what assurance he had from the other side.

Mr. WHERRY. Was it not the minority leader who proposed to the majority

leader not to adjourn, that we might try once more to solve our difficulties? Is not that the record?

Mr. NEELY. I do not know what proposals were made by either the minority or majority leader.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the record.

Mr. NEELY. Again the Senator's statement is accepted as correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question? I shall not ask him to yield beyond that point.

Mr. NEELY. I hope that the Senator will not restrain himself. I gladly yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask one further question. Inasmuch as the Senator and I are in complete accord with respect to bringing civil-rights legislation before the Senate for consideration, does he not feel that if the door is closed under a rule which has been in operation for 100 years, and a cloture petition cannot be filed in connection with a motion, we are making headway if we at least get that opportunity, regardless of what the prospects are to take it up for consideration?

Mr. NEELY. I regret that the decision of the Republican Presiding Officer created the dilemma to which the Senator refers. I voted to sustain Vice President Barkley's recent ruling which nullified that decision. If all other liberal and near-liberal Senators had followed suit, we would have escaped the difficulties that now beset us.

May I, for a moment, turn the tables and ask the Senator from Nebraska a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator cannot yield to another Senator to answer a question which the speaker himself is asking.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to ask the Senator from Nebraska a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I will yield for a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska does not have the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from West Virginia may ask me a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. NEELY. The Senator says that we are in agreement. It is my hope that we are. But by way of verification, let me ask the Senator from Nebraska whether he will join me in supporting the Morse amendment in behalf of majority rule?

Mr. WHERRY. No.

Mr. NEELY. Will the Senator urge his Republican colleagues to vote for the Morse amendment?

Mr. WHERRY. No. I will tell the Senator why I will not do it. He has asked me a question. Let me answer it. I will tell him why I will not do it. I am for cloture by a two-thirds vote.

Mr. NEELY. Then we certainly are not in agreement.

Mr. WHERRY. When the majority leader is smart enough to obtain consideration by a motion to proceed to the consideration of such a measure, if he can get it before the Senate under the rules, I shall be glad to support a proposal for a two-thirds vote. As minority leader now, and majority leader previously, under this procedure I know that it is impossible to bring up such a measure on motion unless we can break the filibuster. If there was anyone who surrendered, it was the Democratic administration conference and the majority leader in seeking to adjourn, which would have cut off that attempt and destroyed, during this Congress, the opportunity to get any civil-rights legislation at all.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I refuse to debate what either the majority or minority leader has or has not done. But I most emphatically assert that I participated in no surrender.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator asks me——

Mr. NEELY. The Senator is again informed that in the caucus to which he has referred I opposed every motion and suggestion that was made in behalf of an adjournment of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I will not debate observations or conjectures. Let the Senator discuss the alleged surrender with someone who favored it.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well; I thank the Senator for his courtesy.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I once more return to the weary task of reading the names of the Republican Senators who voted against cloture on an anti-lynching bill in 1938. At that time, there were 17 Republican Members of the Senate. Senator La Follette, listed as a Progressive, and Senators Lundeen and Shipstead, listed as members of the Farmer-Labor Party, occupied seats on the Republican side of the Chamber. These two Farmer-Labor Senators habitually voted with the Republicans. Of those listed as Republican, Senator Capper alone voted for cloture. But out of an extravagance of liberality, credit for Senator La Follette's vote in favor of cloture is entered on the Republican side of the ledger.

Republican Senators voted against the cloture petition as follows: Austin, Borah, Bridges—and Senator BRIDGES is still here——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I fear that those on the other side of the aisle do not wish to hear how they or their Republican predecessors voted on antilynching legislation. But notwithstanding either the past or present attitude of Republican or Democratic Senators toward cloture, they are now cordially invited to support the Morse amendment which, if adopted, would make it possible promptly to obtain a vote on all civil-rights matters and also provide numerous Senators an opportunity to improve their records by helping to outlaw lynching and other similar evils.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, resuming at the point at which I was interrupted, I now read the names of the other Republican Senators who voted against cloture on the antilynching bill.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator give the date?

Mr. NEELY. The date of the vote in question was January 27, 1938.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I decline further to yield to anyone until after I have completed the reading of the names of the Republican Senators who voted against cloture on the antilynching bill. In addition to Senators Austin, Borah, and Bridges previously named, the following Republican Members also voted against the antilynching cloture petition: Frazier, Gibson, Hale, Johnson of California, Lodge, McNary—who, at that time, was the Republican floor leader—Norris, Steiwer, Townsend, and Vandenberg—13 in all. In the matter of civil-rights legislation, both Maine and Oregon have, in my opinion greatly improved their representation in this body.

With deep regret, it is noted that Mr. Mellett, in a recent issue of a Washington newspaper, characterized the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]—one of the Republicans who voted against cloture in 1938—as the "chief sinner" in the creation of our present deplorable parliamentary situation. Of course, I disclaim any joinder in such a characterization or in any other expression that would violate either the letter or spirit of the rules or the proprieties of the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. BREWSTER addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. NEELY. I yield first to the able Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, can the Senator from West Virginia advise the Senate how long the debate had been going on when that particular cloture petition was filed?

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, to my regret, I cannot tell the able Senator from Michigan how much time the debate had consumed. But, to the best of my recollection, it had dragged on more than 10 days before 17 Senators became so tired of it that they signed a cloture petition to end it.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. How many Republican Members of the Senate voted against the invoking of cloture on that occasion?

Mr. NEELY. Thirteen. One Republican and one Progressive voted for it. Three Republican Senators failed to vote.

Mr. BREWSTER. And how many Democratic Senators voted against invoking cloture?

Mr. NEELY. I have not counted them.

Mr. BREWSTER. Well, I have.

Mr. NEELY. They were quite numerous—entirely too numerous from my point of view. Those from the Deep South, except the Senator from Florida

[Mr. PEPPER], who probably was not here at that time——

Mr. BREWSTER. Oh, yes; he was. I have the list. Would the Senator from West Virginia permit me——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield for a question?

Mr. BREWSTER. Would the Senator from West Virginia permit me to read the list?

Mr. NEELY. The Senator from Maine is correct. The record shows that the Senator from Florida was here and voted against the petition. That means, as the able Senator from Oregon has impressively pointed out, that the Senator from Florida has had a change of heart, and that the change has been for the better. How blest should we be if we could say as much for the other Senators who voted against cloture 11 years ago. For example, I wish we could similarly speak of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who has rendered great public service. It is doubtful whether any other Member of this body has, in recent years, gone before the able Senator from Michigan in contributing to the success of our foreign policy. To me it is a matter of deep regret that he did not follow the shining example set by the eminent Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] a few days ago by voting to sustain the decision of the Vice President, and thereby speed us on our way to the reformation of senatorial procedure.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Would the Senator be surprised to find that although there were 13 Republican Senators who voted against cloture at that time, there were 37 Democratic Senators who voted against the cloture motion?

Mr. NEELY. The fact that 37 Democrats voted against the cloture petition on the antilynching bill is not as surprising to me as the fact that more than six times as many Republicans voted against the same petition as voted for it. But for the generosity with which Senator La Follette has (contrary to the fact) been classified as a Republican, the record would show that the Republican Senators voted against cloture on the antilynching bill by the extraordinary majority of 13 to 1.

For well known reasons previously indicated, Senators from the Deep South will, subject to very rare exceptions, always vote against limiting debate on antilynching or other civil-rights legislation. Despite the unpopularity of repetition, the fact is once more stressed that Senators from the South are constantly confronted with a racial problem which does not exist in any State north of Mason and Dixon's line. Consequently, only Democratic Senators from the South have a reason, or an excuse for their opposition to the liberalization of the rules of the Senate in favor of civil-rights legislation.

Mr. BREWSTER. Let me inquire how many Senators the Senator from West Virginia would classify in that category?

Mr. NEELY. I have not counted those southern Senators. They are well known. They have never been cowardly, hypocritical, or reticent about their opposition to objectives, the attainment of which would be facilitated by the establishment of majority rule in the Senate.

Mr. BREWSTER. Let me ask how many Democratic Senators voted against it?

Mr. NEELY. Too many, as I have frankly admitted.

It is a self-evident fact that one might as well play a flute to a deaf adder as to appeal to certain Senators on either side of the aisle to change their attitude toward such questions as antilynching, antipoll tax, and fair-employment practices.

Mr. President, let me appeal to all Senators to keep the faith pledged by the platforms of their political party. Let me entreat Republican Senators to vote on the question of majority rule in the Senate as the immortal Lincoln would have voted and thus, at once, honor his memory, honor themselves, honor the Republican Party, and render an everlasting service to their country.

And now a word to the Democratic Senators who have become parties to the Wherry agreement.

Mr. President, the soothing music of the golden wedding bells which we have mentioned has long since degenerated into the blast of the bugle and the roll of the drum—into the wild, weird music of war. The band is playing not Dixie but Marching Through Georgia. This harsher music is highly appropriate to the present circumstances of the case because the distinguished bridegroom, numerous brides and attendants have, one and all, doffed their wedding garments, donned their military uniforms, and transformed themselves into a unified army of fighting parliamentarians.

The able and vigorous groom, the eminent Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], has become the general of this army. He is commanding not only his reactionary Republican warriors, but also the descendants of the gray-clad veterans who immortalized themselves on countless fields of battle during the bloody war between the North and the South.

Mr. President, what would Gen. Robert E. Lee think if he could look down from the battlements of heaven and see this general from Yankeeland, General WHERRY, leading his commingled southern Democrats, Dixiecrats, and Republicans against the progressive Democratic forces headed by Democratic President Truman and Democratic Majority Leader LUCAS?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. NEELY. What would Gen. Jubal Early think if he could see the Senator from Nebraska leading his united southern and northern commandos in an attack on the fortress now precariously held by Democratic and Republican liberals who are battling for human rights?

Mr. WHERRY. With General Lee.

Mr. NEELY. What would Stonewall Jackson have said just before he fell at Chancellorsville if he could have seen through a long-range telescope the descendants of Confederate generals marching under the leadership of the famous Yankee—General WHERRY—mounted on a cornstalk horse, galloping off in every direction, brandishing his wooden sword, and commanding the grandsons of those who stood like a stone wall at the Second Battle of Manassas and shouting at the top of his voice to reduce all Senate liberals—Democratic and Republican—to such parliamentary helplessness that they would never again be able to enact or attempt to enact an antilynching law?

Had the great General Stonewall Jackson beheld this desolating situation, he would probably have cried out, "Why hast thou forsaken me?"

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I should like to conclude without delay, but I nevertheless once more yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. No.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I have yielded and I urge the Senator to ask his question.

Mr. WHERRY. I merely want to thank the Senator for elevating me to such a high position that I can be classed with such distinguished men as General Lee and Stonewall Jackson. [Laughter.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is not a question. [Laughter.]

Mr. NEELY. The Senator has just demonstrated how utterly impossible it is for a Republican who is not for the redemption of his party's platform pledges——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. Or who is not cooperating——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. Not until I have uttered one sentence without interruption.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from West Virginia declines to yield.

Mr. NEELY. The Senator has demostrated how utterly impossible it is for a Republican who is opposed to the redemption of his party's platform pledges to be right about anything under the sun.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have just accepted nomination to a generalship. That is all I was endeavoring to say.

Mr. NEELY. I did not elevate the Senator to an exalted generalship such as that held by Lee or Early or Stonewall Jackson. I simply asked what those real generals [laughter] would think if they should see General WHERRY on his roughshod cornstalk horse leading an expeditionary force of Confederate soldiers against the liberal Democratic and Republican Members of the Senate, who are striving to establish democratic majority rule?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, on the 16th of February 1938, the Senate again voted on a petition for cloture on the

antilynching bill. On the roll call 3 Republican Members voted for it, while 11 voted against it.

In view of devastating Republican opposition to cloture in the past, we should rejoice in the fact that during the present filibuster 16 liberal Republicans joined liberal Democrats in an effort to amend the rules in behalf of human progress and senatorial reform. There is reason to hope that General WHERRY and the conservative Democratic, Dixiecratic, and Republican forces he commands will not forever be able to prevent the establishment of democratic majority rule in the United States Senate.

Mr. President, I trust that the less reactionary of those who joined in the Wherry agreement will be warned by the signs of the troubled times in which we live that democratic government is in peril throughout the world, and that our democratic way of life and its innumerable blessings can be preserved only by making democracy and its beneficent majority rule work to the satisfaction of the American people. As long as majority rule is denied in the Senate, it will be in danger in the Nation. If it should be lost here, it would be lost everywhere. Such a calamity would mean weeping in every nation, wailing in every country, and distress in every land.

Before it is too late, let those on the wrong side of the pending question repent, and unite with the Senate liberals who are striving to make the world brighter, the Government better, and the people happier than they were in the olden days when their grandmothers were babes in arms. Those who signed the Wherry agreement and purpose to seek reelection in 1950 should "beware the Ides of November" in that year. It is my prediction that if the Senators in this category persist in their opposition to the reformation of senatorial procedure, their seats will become vacant on the 3d of January 1951. On the night of the next election, the only music they will hear will be the melancholy strains of the old familiar hymn:

Hark, from the tombs a doleful sound!
My ears attend the cry,
'Ye living men, come view the ground
Where you will shortly lie.'

The Senate will presumably some time adopt the principle of majority rule. Recently the necessity for this reform was eloquently demonstrated by the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] in a remarkable address delivered in this Chamber. Our action on the measure before us should be in harmony with that demonstration.

Mr. President, the world is filled with apprehension and fear. Turmoil is sweeping over the Eastern Hemisphere like a tornado. There is no assurance that it will not, sooner or later, reach our shores. It is not impossible that without an hour's warning the Senate might be called upon to take drastic action to save the Nation from destruction by atomic bombs, disease germs, or other horrifying instrumentalities of annihilation. In view of such a possibility, patriotism, prudence, and common sense demand the immediate establishment of majority rule in this body.

A few days ago, the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] expressed fear that it might be necessary in 1950 and in 1952 for the voters to substitute progressives for those who have so far prevented this consummation. If present and future events justify the Senator's fear, it is my hope that, regardless of politics, senatorial candidates who unconditionally pledge themselves to keep the faith in this vital matter will soon replace, in the world's greatest legislative body, those members who habitually obstruct progress and constantly oppose reform. If I should be compelled to choose between a candidate of my own party who is opposed to this democratic principle and a candidate of the opposite party, upon whom I could confidently depend to support it, I should unhesitatingly, unapologetically and unregretfully vote for the latter, and thereby keep my conscience clear, and gain the comforting assurance that I had rendered a service to my State, my country, and the world.

If the present Members of the Senate prevent democracy from working in this body, let the voters, regardless of party politics, elect to the Senate thoroughly qualified, liberal-minded men and women who are more solicitous about present welfare and future progress than they are about the fetishes and fallacies of the past; men and women who, like the great apostle, will cast off the works of darkness and put on the armor of light; men and women who will leaven their official service with the lofty spirit of Lowell's stirring lines:

My soul is not a palace of the past,
Where outworn creeds, like Rome's gray
Senate, quake,
Hearing afar the Vandal's trumpet hoarse,
That shakes old systems with a thunder-fit.
Then let it come: I have no dread of what
Is called for by the instinct of mankind;
Nor think I that God's world will fall apart
Because we tear a parchment more or less.

Liberal Democrats and liberal Republicans, we may lose this battle. But we will not lose this war. The democratic ideal around which the present controversy is raging is worth all that it may cost to establish it in this body upon a foundation as enduring as the everlasting hills. American progress, American liberty, and the hope of the world which America must do much to save are, to an extent of which the thoughtless are wholly unaware, dependent upon the outcome of the present struggle to amend the rules of the Senate. Therefore, with unlimited hope in our hearts and unsurpassable courage in our breasts, let us, with increased energy and augmented zeal, continue our efforts to set the Senate free. Humanity's command is, Forward, march! Its battle hymn should be:

O man bowed down with labor!
O woman young, yet old!
O heart oppressed in the toiler's breast
And crushed by the power of gold!
Keep on with your weary battle
Against triumphant might;
For no question is ever settled
Until it is settled right.

PERMISSION TO REPORT RENT-CONTROL BILL

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to report the so-called rent bill tonight.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a statement by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] in that connection may also be filed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT TO CLOTURE RULE

The Senate resumed the consideration of Senate Resolution 15 amending the so-called cloture rule of the Senate.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, it is with great hesitancy that I rise at this time. I hesitate first because of my junior status as a Member of the Senate, and, secondly, because I dislike to add, by any repetitious matter, to this already too voluminous record. But, Mr. President, there has been so much said on this floor which by way of implication, if not directly, questions the motives of those who joined in the Wherry substitute, that I feel constrained to make my position clear.

To begin with, may I say that I am not one of those who considered that in the issue immediately before us, namely, rule XXII and the proposed amendments, there was any other issue. Much has been said about civil rights, from my point of view, much too much. On this subject my record back in the State of New Jersey speaks for itself. In New Jersey we have written into our constitution an antisegregation provision, and I take pride in the fact that I had some hand in the writing and establishment of that constitution, so I have no apologies to make on the subject of civil rights. I stand openly for the civil-rights program, and if the debates which have been raging here for the past 16 days had been addressed to civil rights rather than to cloture, then let me say that my signature on the cloture petition of March 10 should in itself prove where I stand on that issue. Not only did I sign the cloture petition, but I voted twice with the administration Democrats to sustain Vice President BARKLEY's ruling. I wanted to see repetitious and useless debate brought to a close.

I feel very much like the author of the letter which I hold in my hand, which I shall read. It is from a young mother in New Jersey about 22 years of age. The letter reads:

WOOD-RIDGE, N. J., *March 15, 1949.*

DEAR SENATOR HENDRICKSON: This is the first time I have availed myself of the privilege to write to a man who represents me in our Government. This is probably due to the fact that I am 22 and have voted only twice.

I am a wife and mother of a 1½-year old son. Being a high-school graduate who ranked ninth in a class of approximately 150 students, I pride myself on being a person with a better-than-average amount of intelligence.

Before I go any further please do not get the impression that I am scolding you. That is most definitely not the case. I merely have something to say and feel you are the most logical person to whom to say it.

Now to get to my point: I have been watching with disgust, annoyance, forthright anger, and most of all fear the sad exhibition taking place in this session of Congress the past few weeks. How men and women, who have been blessed with a brain and have been given the privilege to use it in aiding our country to become a better place, can act so childishly is rather horrifying to say the least. I'm referring, of course, to the wrangling over the bill concerning the power of the filibuster.

I am not going to decide whether or not the filibuster is a good practice. I'm sure it has both good and bad points, but it is rather a frightening sight when a man can get up on the floor and by talking for hours on end keep a whole body of men from passing vital and necessary legislation. In other words if someone doesn't back down you gentlemen may spend the whole duration of the session doing nothing but talking about nothing with the result being nothing.

If the issue itself were so important to the men who are creating such a revolting exhibition because it would harm our country to have the bill drawn up or forgotten, I would have no quarrel with the gentlemen concerned. But the main issue seems to be the southern Democrats are angry with the northern Democrats while the Republicans are in the middle and everyone's angry with the President and vice versa. Why they cannot forget who was or was not elected and remember who elected them is beyond me.

It is the sad misfortune of this country to be governed by politicians instead of statesmen. When a man is elected to represent the people he should remember just that, and not let the fact that they may or may not be affiliated with his particular party have anything to do with his decisions. The question of whether a bill is good for New Orleans or bad for New York should never enter the mind of a Senator or Representative, whichever the case may be, the question should always be, "Is it good or bad for the welfare of our country." I'm afraid not many of the men ever put that question first.

Now that I have vented my grievances on you let me say that I'm writing for my son more than for myself. I want his future to be happy and above all, secure. We the people of today have the grave responsibility of preparing the futures of today's children.

If you are one of those who have always thought of our country first, may I say, "Thank you and God bless you," for all those people who have put their trust in you.

I'm sure a position such as yours must be very trying. Important decisions are hard to make when they concern personal problems so decisions concerning national problems must really be a difficult task. But if you are always fair and just, you may rest assured that I and all the people like me will vote for you and most of all love you for the good you are doing.

But better than that the nicest way to say thank you will be to teach our children to say * * * and God bless Senator HENDRICKSON.

Sincerely,

MRS. DORIS MARINE.

Actually, Mr. President, the reason why my name appears on the Wherry substitute is because I desired, above all things, to see the shackles of the filibuster broken so that the Senate of the United States could proceed to the important business which is before it. It was obvious to me, as it must have been to every Senator in the Chamber, that there was manpower enough in the southern wing to carry on the filibuster indefinitely. Even the majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Illinois, was ready to move for an adjournment, which would have ended the filibuster and put us right back where we were on February 28. But he, as the leader of the administration forces, gave up and admitted defeat, which to me meant complete surrender.

It was shocking to me to sit here day after day realizing that grave and important issues were awaiting attention, but as the days passed it became clearer and clearer to me that nothing constructive was being done to bring an end to the impasse.

Then, when the Wherry substitute was proposed, and it appeared that we would get a chance, through it, to meet some of the major issues "head on" rather than hide behind a legalistic fiction, my course of duty seemed clear. So, Mr. President, I shall support the Wherry substitute, and because of the nature of the honorable compromise—and I say it is an honorable compromise—which is involved in that substitute, I shall vote against all amendments proposed thereto.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I want to say that I have resented, personally resented, many of the implications which have been so much a part of some of the addresses which have been made on the question before the Senate. My action has been prompted solely by a patriotic urge to see this great body meet its obligations—all of them—fully and squarely.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, we are nearing a vote on the compromise substitute, which, for the first time in congressional history, will give us an effective means to limit debate and prevent filibustering in the United States Senate. Before we vote, I wish to clear up some of the misinformation that has been spread in the Senate and across the country through the press and over the radio.

In all my experience in the Senate, I have never seen such a campaign of misrepresentation. It is plainly an effort by those who have surrendered to the filibusterers to cover their tracks and attempt to justify their actions.

But the whole story will get out. When it is told, there will be no escape by the administration Democrats from their responsibility for, first, failing to make a determined effort to break the filibuster; and, second, for trying to block a fair, reasonable, workable compromise, giving the Senate a bullet-proof, solid cloture rule.

The record shows that it was the majority leader who hoisted the white flag of surrender to the filibusterers.

The record shows that it was the Republican leadership that fought to prevent scuttling of the cloture resolution.

At this point I want to compliment the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration for his untiring efforts during the past 2 years to bring to the Senate a cloture rule which could be adopted by the Senate and which would give us the very thing for which I am now pleading.

I also wish to compliment him for the courageous stand he has taken in the negotiations for compromise, and the fact that he, too, believes that, instead of adjourning and surrendering, the thing to do is to take the only course we now have left to take, that is to adopt the compromise which would finally, after 100 years, give us an opportunity to file a cloture petition on a motion or any other business of the Senate, stop the debate, bring up the legislation for consideration, and for passage, if the Senate so desires.

Mr. President, the record shows that it was the Republican leadership which finally succeeded in obtaining from the filibusterers agreement on a compromise that will work and do the job.

And, I want to point out with all the emphasis at my command that the Senate today has no effective cloture rule.

I should like to repeat that over and over again so the public will understand. I should like to have the woman, who wrote the letter to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], know that the reason we are attempting to put into effect a new rule is to correct the very wrong she writes about. We have no effective cloture rule. We cannot stop debate on a motion to bring up until we have an effective cloture which will permit us to stop debate on a motion. Thousands of people throughout the United States, yes hundreds of thousands, want this kind of an effective cloture rule that will limit debate, so the Senate can get on with its work. It is to them I am especially talking this afternoon.

Any comparisons that are made between the Wherry substitute and the present cloture rule are totally beside the point, because the present cloture rule is full of holes and everybody knows it. Everybody knows that filibusters can be waged because of these loopholes. We all agree upon that.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] regaled the Senate with a most eloquent address, in which he quoted from the Bible and during which he quoted poems, and made his presentation upon a very high plane. The Senator from West Virginia pleaded for the adoption of civil-rights legislation. But, Mr. President, the Senate cannot do anything along the lines he suggested unless such a compromise as we now propose be adopted, for under present procedure, the civil-rights bills cannot be brought up.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to yield at the conclusion of my speech.

The truth is that the only way a filibuster could be broken, in view of these loopholes, would be through round-the-clock sessions and wearing down the filibusterers. The majority leader made such a statement, and I agree with him.

At this point I wish to say that I have great sympathy for any leader who attempts to break a filibuster. It is a difficult thing to do. But I am sure the able

majority leader will agree with me that stopping the filibuster would have been the only way in the world to adopt the Wherry-Hayden resolution. I am satisfied of that, and the Republicans gave the majority leader every assurance that we would go along with him in an attempt to do that very thing. So I believe every one in the Senate agrees that filibusters can be waged because of the loopholes which exist in the present rule.

Mr. President, I leave it to anyone who has witnessed the pink-tea efforts of the majority leadership to break the filibuster, to answer whether a determined effort was made to break the filibuster. That is a question of opinion, I know. But filibusters cannot be stopped unless we have continuous sessions. I think I can speak with authority on that point because we had some all-night sessions during the Eightieth Congress in an attempt to break filibusters, and we accomplished much in that line.

The power to break the filibuster was in the hands of the majority leader, and he failed. He failed abjectly.

The proof of this was the action of the majority leader, about midnight last Monday, when he took the Senate floor and said he was about to make a motion to adjourn, and thus surrender to the filibusterers, and thus to leave the Senate with no cloture rule. Senators on my side of the aisle then swung into action to prevent so calamitous an act, for it was a complete surrender.

The majority leader put this question to the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], as appears on page 2408 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator yield the floor in order that I may make a motion to adjourn?

The Senator from Louisiana at that time refused to yield the floor, though later he did yield the floor to the majority leader, and he then made his statement that the prospects for a satisfactory compromise were not good, and that the Senate must get on to other business.

I pleaded for a recess so that we could try again; try some more, to get an agreement.

It was obvious that the majority leader had indicated that he was determined to scuttle and run out on any determined effort to break the filibuster.

If the Senate had adjourned, we would have been left without any effective cloture rule, and the Senate would be prevented from bringing up any controversial legislation, passage of which would be threatened by a determined minority.

Therefore, the only course left for us who wanted an effective cloture rule was to ask the majority leader if he would not yield once again so we could continue our efforts to work out a compromise. The majority leader consented to a recess. I publicly acknowledge his great service in yielding to our request for a recess, because we were thereby enabled to keep this thing alive. We would not have been here today in the position we now are if we had not gone along with that procedure. He consented with the understanding that we were to make one more effort to effect a compromise. And a compromise, as Senators know, is not made on an all-or-nothing basis. It must be a give-and-take proposition.

Certainly, when the majority leader yielded to the wishes of the Senator from Nebraska, it was my intention that all of us who were to meet again to seek a compromise, would go into the matter on that basis.

Time will prove the wisdom of our action in causing the recess to be taken. Time will disclose this when Members, desiring to bring up legislation, can do so without fear of running into a filibuster.

Time will prove that the abject surrender of the administration's leadership was a blunder—a tragic mistake.

Either this cloture rule will work or it will not work. The way to find out is to test it. We know, or at least it should be known by this time by the press and radio, and the country, that today, as I have previously said, the Senate does not have an effective cloture rule.

We can test the Wherry substitute if the majority leader will join in that effort. I think he will. I think this will become a great means in his hands to help in obtaining consideration for legislation which the administration is very desirous of bringing before the Senate. I am sure that when it is adopted we shall have his cooperation. So I go back to my point that we can test the Wherry substitute if the majority leader will join in that effort. He has been making statements to the press that civil-rights legislation will be dead when the Senate adopts the Wherry substitute.

I challenge the majority leader to bring to the floor of the Senate anti-poll-tax legislation after this rule has been adopted. Let us stop talking about the substitute cloture rule being no good and give it a test. That is the only way finally to get the answer.

I can assure the majority leader that we on the Republican side will do our part in making such a test. We will gladly do it if we have the opportunity.

If all of us who believe in anti-poll-tax legislation do our part and muster our votes, we will pass an anti-poll-tax bill.

The time has come for action and not double talk. The time has come to prove our sincerity and let the people see by our votes who it is that is always talking about civil rights and then runs up the white flag when there is an opportunity to do something. These people have promised much, but they are short on delivery.

I serve notice now that it shall be my purpose from time to time to remind the majority leadership of my willingness—yes; my eagerness—to have a vote on civil-rights legislation.

The majority leader, for whom he knows I have the highest respect, personally, referred to me as the leader of what he termed "the pack" that drafted the Wherry substitute.

The majority leader and the minority leader both came from the wide-open Midwest. We know what is meant by a pack. It is a strange thing. I am the leader of a pack, according to the majority leader, and yet this afternoon the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] had me riding on a white horse with General Lee. What a contrast.

But let me assure the majority leader now that this pack, as he refers to us, has rescued the Senate from destructive leadership on this cloture issue, and everyone who knows the facts as to what has been happening in the past few years, if he is fair and reasonable, knows that statement to be true.

Let us just briefly review what has happened relative to this matter. Action toward reaching a compromise was suggested by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], by the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and by many other Senators, both on the floor and in the cloakrooms. All seemed to be desirous of one thing, and that was to bring in something which would forever give us a cloture rule which would apply against a motion.

Every thinking person who knew the situation knew that an honorable compromise that would give us some kind of a cloture rule was the only sensible course. On the floor of the Senate pleas were made from both sides of the aisle to take the course of reasonable men and compose our differences along honorable lines.

From the start of our negotiations to the final meeting, progress was made. To the credit of every member of the committee, I have no doubt that progress was made.

Mr. President, I should like to have an opportunity to vote for the Hayden-Wherry resolution. It was a solution. After 2 years of hard work, we would like to vote for the Hayden-Wherry resolution. But remember that when we who favor the Hayden-Wherry resolution for a two-thirds cloture by Members present began these compromise negotiations we were confronted by opposition from the leaders of the filibusterers to a "constitutional two-thirds" majority.

Senators who know the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] will agree when I say that they are not easily pushed around. They have their convictions. They expressed their convictions, and voted them in all the meetings which we held. If Senators could have heard some of the talks made not only by them but by other Senators, they would know how those men felt in attempting to reach a compromise so that we could bring back to the Senate something on which they could all agree as honorable men. We know that they held deep convictions in this matter, and that they had much at stake. Likewise, the majority leader knew at all times the position of southern Senators.

In my discussions with the leaders of the filibuster, I found them willing to go as far as they possibly could to effect a compromise. I say that unhesitatingly. After many conversations, day and night, they yielded to a constitutional two-thirds vote to invoke cloture on legislation, provided protection was given in the rules against majority cloture.

Some of us spoke for Republican Senators. We only spoke for them. We could not bind any Republican Senator. We could only carry back the recommendations; but those of us who spoke for Republican Senators consented, only as a last resort, to yield from a single two-thirds to a "constitutional two-thirds" on clotures for legislation. I feel that the difference was too small to permit it to cause a complete break-down and collapse, which would have left the Senate with its present ineffective cloture rule.

Again I wish to point out that the present cloture rule, standing rule XXII, is totally ineffective and full of loopholes. So when comparisons are made between the Wherry substitute and the present rule, they are comparisons between the Wherry substitute and the provisions in standing rule XXII, which are excellent, provided they can be put into effect. That is the only basis on which an honest and fair comparison can be made by reasonable men.

This is the catch in the argument which administration Democrats are making in order to escape from their present dilemma. They say that they cannot vote for the Wherry substitute because it is not as effective as the present cloture rule, and that to adopt the Wherry substitute would be a step backward. By a step backward I assume they mean stepping down from two-thirds of the Senators voting to a "constitutional two-thirds," or two-thirds of the Members duly chosen and sworn.

I agree that there is a very slight step backward in that respect. But, Mr. President, it is a step which provides holeproof, bulletproof cloture under cloture motions in the future. It stops up the holes and permits an opportunity to file a cloture petition on a motion or any other pending business, or any matter, so as to get legislation before the Senate.

The other day there was a great deal of discussion about what would have happened during the past 32 years in connection with four votes in which cloture carried and 19 votes when it did not carry. Comparisons were made. I agree with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] in his statement that we may cite all the statistics we wish, and argue that there is a difference of a vote and a half, an inch and a half, or a mile and a half; but when we get through, whether or not we are to have an effective cloture rule depends upon the attendance of Senators. That is the final test. That is all there is to it.

I wish to say a word or two about what would have happened in the cloture test. I use the civil-rights legislation as an illustration, although I am speaking of all legislation.

For their consideration I wish to address these remarks to those who believe in either a simple two-thirds cloture or a "constitutional two-thirds" cloture. I do not say it proves anything, but I do say that when some Senators are objecting to a two-thirds straight-across-the-line cloture, or a simple two-thirds cloture on proposed legislation, as compared to a "two-thirds constitutional" vote on cloture, it seems to me it would not make any difference in the case of most of the votes which have been had on cloture in the Senate.

Let me read the record of the five cloture votes which have been had in the 6 years since I have been in the Senate, not including the one we had the other day:

Senator BARKLEY, of Kentucky, filed a cloture petition on the anti-poll-tax bill on May 15, 1944. Let me give the record on that occasion: Yeas, 36; nays, 44; not voting, 16.

Mr. President, please note that the "nays" were 44; so it would not have made any difference whether there was a two-thirds rule or a "two-thirds constitutional" rule, for there were more than sufficient Senators to defeat the cloture petition in any event. One-third of 96 is 32, so Senators can see what I mean when I say the petition was defeated in any event. It would not have made any difference whether there was a two-thirds rule or a "two-thirds constitutional" rule, because there were too many Senators who were opposed to invoking cloture.

Let us consider the next case. By the way, it occurred as recently as February 9, 1946. At that time the question was on the permanent Fair Employment Practices Act, as proposed. Once again, Senator BARKLEY, of Kentucky, circulated the cloture petition. The result of the vote was: yeas, 48—not even a simple majority; nays, 36; not voting, 12. So it would have made no difference at all whether there had been a two-thirds rule or a "two-thirds constitutionl" rule.

Later on in that year there was another vote on the question of invoking cloture. It developed on the question of ending debate on an anti-poll-tax bill, and the vote occurred on July 31, 1946. By the way, Mr. President, Senator BARKLEY, of Kentucky, circulated that petition, or at least he filed it. The result of that vote was as follows: Yeas, 39; nays, 33; not voting, 24. So it would have made no difference whether there had been a simple two-thirds rule or a "constitutional two-thirds" rule.

I simply call that situation to the attention of Senators who now state that they cannot support the proposed "two-thirds constitutional" rule which would require the favorable votes of two-thirds of the Members of the Senate present, sworn, and serving, as compared to a rule requiring the favorable votes of two-thirds of the Members of the Senate present and voting.

Of course, Mr. President, now the situation has changed; but if a time comes when we again have a situation similar to that which existed when the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] made his ruling as President pro tempore—and I have the highest regard for his philosophy and belief—if Senators at that time wish to deny the correctness of his position, and wish to affirm the correctness of the position taken recently by the Vice President, they may do so. The time may come when the Senate will desire to do that; but if the Senate becomes overwhelmingly in favor of that, 2 years or more hence, there will be no difficulty in getting a cloture petition filed, because the trouble is not, as some have said, because of the votes opposed to cloture; that is not the trouble; the trouble is in bringing out those who wish to have cloture invoked, and in getting them to vote for the record. That is the trouble.

Referring again to the record of the past votes, we realize that in one case, 33 would not have been a majority, but there were only 33 "yeas" on that vote; again, 48 would not have been a majority, but those were all the "yeas" on that vote; and, again, 36 would not have been a majority, but those were all the "yeas" on that vote.

In other words, as the parliamentary situation now stands, a vote against the Wherry substitute will be a vote against cloture, and will be a vote against a chance for civil-rights and other controversial legislation to be considered without running into a filibuster.

Mr. President, I wish to state my record on all civil-rights measures:

On the cloture petition filed on May 15 to limit debate on the anti-poll-tax bill, I voted "yea."

I want the RECORD to show that on the vote on cloture to limit debate on the permanent Fair Employment Practices Act, on February 9, 1946, I voted "yea."

I wish the RECORD to show that on the vote on invoking cloture to limit debate on the anti-poll-tax bill, on July 31, 1946, I voted "yea."

Mr. President, I wish the RECORD to show that I favor the enactment of these bills. I wish the RECORD to show that I believe in my heart today that the only chance we shall ever have to get the civil-rights bills before the Senate is by adopting the Wherry substitute, so that we may somehow get the Senators whose votes are needed in order to obtain a "two-thirds constitutional" majority, to vote to bring that legislation before the Senate. The Wherry substitute will give us an opportunity which we do not have today, and all Senators know it.

Mr. President, there has been considerable talk about what happened in the conference meetings. I agreed not to say anything about what occurred at those meetings, and I did not say anything about them until to my mind they were made public by the Democratic National Committee chairman, as I stated the other evening.

I wish to clear up some misunderstandings about those meetings. I wish to state what I am sure is the truth about them; but if what I state is not in accordance with the facts, as others may view them, I shall be glad to have anyone correct me.

At the meetings, after our negotiators representing the Republican side had obtained from leaders of the filibuster the concession to support a "two-thirds constitutional" majority, all of us met with the majority leader. The majority leader at first refused to budge from his stand for a cloture rule of two-thirds of the Members of the Senate present and voting on cloture. Bear in mind, Mr. President, that involved in that decision was a question of a mere two or three votes, I think—and, by the way, no votes at all, if all Senators were present on the

floor of the Senate, where they should be when a cloture motion is up.

At that meeting the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] finally was asked whether he would go back to the conference of administration Democrats and recommend a "two-thirds constitutional" majority cloture rule for legislative matters, treaties, and on questions of the confirmation of nominations by the President.

He replied, "No."

Then he was asked the question: "Will you take this proposition back to the administration Democrats' conference; and if they approve it, will you approve it and support it?"

He said, as I recall, "If a majority of the administration Democrats are for it, I will vote for it."

That was the last meeting held by the group over which the majority leader had been presiding.

The next important development was a statement to the press and radio by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] that he was going to move for an adjournment of the Senate. That was when the administration surrendered to the filibusterers. That was when the scuttle-and-run strategy was adopted. That was when the compromise efforts were near the rocks. And that was when the country was flooded by a lot of statements by administration Democrats that were misleading, and that sought to escape responsibility for their weak-kneed surrender; for, after all, they are in power, they have the majority, and this is their responsibility.

Those of us who believed that a failure to adopt an effective cloture rule would be a tragedy, had no other course than to fight on. We had reached a compromise with the southerners, and we moved on for its adoption by the Senate. That is what is before us now.

The surrender of the majority leader and his followers was formalized when the majority leader asked the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], as I have already stated, to yield the floor of the Senate so that the majority leader could make a motion to adjourn the Senate.

We do not need to refer to newspaper files for the record. It is all written in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—enough so that posterity will know the details of this remarkable episode in American history.

Just think of it, Mr. President, by the majority leader's own statement, there are 28 administration Democrats. Their ranks have been reduced by a steady drift away from the administration's scuttle-and-run program, and to the worthwhile business of getting a cloture rule that will work, even though it is not all that we who favor cloture in some form had hoped for.

Is it any wonder that those who have supported the administration in its pink-tea efforts to break the filibuster, and in its amazing stand against the compromise, are now rushing to the press and the radio with a mass of misinformation in order to confuse the people? It reminds me of that old saw—"Stop thief."

Another smoke screen that has been raised by the majority leader is worthy of answer, because it has been widely publicized. That is, that there is a wide difference between a two-thirds vote of Senators present, and two-thirds of Senators duly chosen and sworn—the "constitutional two-thirds" that I mentioned a moment ago.

Let me answer that, once for all: On any motion to take up a piece of legislation so controversial as civil rights, under the Wherry substitute, a cloture petition can be filed. It is in order, and the only question is whether or not there are sufficient Senators present to apply cloture.

As to specific legislation—civil rights—there certainly would be no doubt that those against cloture would be sure to have their votes on hand; and, certainly, those who believe in civil-rights legislation would make a determined effort to have their votes on hand, when the cloture petition came up.

Someone has said we do not live in the horse-and-buggy age any more. The senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] told us the other day that when he first came to Congress, he rode 4 nights on the train to get here. Now, he can make it in a few hours by airplane. Senators absent from the country, halfway around the world, can get back here in 24 hours or so. So there is no excuse other than illness for failure to be in attendance on the Senate. Let me also remind Senators that the Senate rules compel the attendance of Members who are physically able to be here, or, who are not excused by the Senate for good reasons. The Sergeant at Arms can be directed to go out and bring us in. Of course, honorable Senators never require that kind of attention. Nevertheless, the power to bring us in is vested in the Senate.

So, it should be apparent by now that in this contest there have been a lot of fantastic claims—a lot of beating around the bush.

Another erroneous argument has been broadcast by the administration Democrats in their scuttle-and-run strategy: They have asserted that the compromise plan would freeze the rules, whereas under the present cloture rule no such freeze exists. That is the claim.

The fact is that on motions to change the rule, under the Wherry substitute, there would be no change in the present rule. Filibusters could be waged against motions to consider changes, under the present rules, but if the Senate under strong leadership wants to break such a filibuster it can do it, and once the motion is adopted, the Wherry substitute provides for cloture upon the pending resolution to amend the rules or to provide a new rule. I am against majority cloture. I said so when I presented this particular rule in the opening speech explaining what its provisions were. But there may come a time when the Senate desires majority cloture. There is no freeze in the Wherry substitute to prevent a future Senate so minded from effecting its will.

So it is, one by one, we can destroy and expose the untruths that have been spread across the country through the press and over the radio.

A serious, fair-minded consideration of the Wherry substitute will, I think, satisfy anyone that it provides the most important reform in Senate procedure in the entire history of our country.

Through its adoption, Senate procedure will be revolutionized. We will be able to do our work more efficiently. We will be able to debate and deliberate—and we will be able to legislate.

We have been talking a great deal about civil rights. Let me remind Senators that for the first time in a hundred years the Senate will have an effective, workable cloture rule to limit debate on treaties, legislation, and Presidential nominations for public office. We know not what emergency may develop in the future, in which an overwhelming majority of the Senate, in response to the will of the people, may seek to enact legislation deemed necessary for the security of the Nation, as so well put forth by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] a few days ago. It is reasonable to feel that the very life of our Republic may rest in the balance in such a situation. The risk is too great in these troubled times not to be prepared for any contingency. We who support the compromise substitute, I believe, fulfill our constitutional obligations in that respect when we vote for the substitute and afford an avenue whereby we can get up for consideration legislation of a national emergency nature and character.

I make one more plea to the administration Democrats, all of them, to give this matter one more thorough exploration and to join with us in putting over this rule. How wonderful it would be if we could do it on a bipartisan basis, as we attempted to do with the Hayden-Wherry resolution. I urge Senators to join us. The new rule is a great step forward, long overdue, and plainly demanded by the people, as so clearly demonstrated by the letter read by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] this afternoon.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I desire to complete my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska declines to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Let us adopt the resolution, so the Senate may function and fulfill its responsibility.

The American people are not especially interested in the technicalities of our rules of procedure. What the people want is action—affirmative, constructive action. They want the Senate to function and not remain at the mercy of any obstructing, small minority.

A two-thirds cloture is safe, and constitutes a bulwark against pressure groups.

A two-thirds cloture is imperative if we are to meet our responsibilities in domestic affairs and in carrying forward our responsibilities in a troubled world.

Messrs. LUCAS, MYERS, and DONNELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. LUCAS. I ask the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I feel genuinely flattered that the Senator from

Nebraska, the able minority leader, should devote himself so vigorously to an attack on me and to a defense of the Nebraska compromise. I agree with him that the time for double talk has passed, and all I am going to say is this: Everything the Senator from Nebraska has said has been repeated in the course of the debate heretofore in one way or another. The American people know what has been going on in the Senate. Through the radio and the press they have obtained the information, and they are not interested in what the majority leader says at this moment, nor are they interested in what the minority leader says. They are interested in action, once more, and the American people in the future are going to be interested only in the votes which have been cast upon the question since the Republicans came into power in the Eightieth Congress, and what has been done since the Democrats took over in the Eighty-first Congress.

In other words, Mr. President, it is not what some Senator has said on the floor of the Senate, but it is the record that will count vitally. The votes that are cast upon the pending question and all other votes heretofore will be the ones that will be scrutinized and analyzed by Americans everywhere who are vitally interested in the question of civil rights.

Mr. President, I am anxious to get along with the voting on the various amendments before the Senate and also on the resolution. I sincerely hope we may finish in the next 2 hours, if possible. I now yield the floor.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated, after which I desire to address the Senate with respect thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 8, of the substitute proposed by Mr. WHERRY (for himself and other Senators) for Senate Resolution 15, amending the so-called cloture rule of the Senate, it is proposed to insert, after the word "matter", the following: "(and, for the purpose of this rule, the term 'matter' shall include a motion to approve the Journal, which shall be in order at any time as a privileged motion and to it every motion, whenever it shall be or have been presented, relative to the Journal shall be deemed an amendment)."

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the amendment to the amendment; and, as indicated, I desire to be heard with respect thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a pending amendment which takes precedence.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, may I ask unanimous consent that my amendment may take precedence, unless the Senator who offered the previous amendment desires to proceed. I have no objection to his proceeding.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator who offered the other amendment is not now on the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I inquire what is going on at this time?

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Nebraska, seeing that there are very few Senators now on the floor, would like to suggest the absence of a quorum so that the Members of the Senate may know what is in the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. LUCAS. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	Millikin
Anderson	Hoey	Morse
Baldwin	Holland	Mundt
Brewster	Humphrey	Murray
Bricker	Hunt	Myers
Bridges	Ives	Neely
Butler	Jenner	Pepper
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Chapman	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kem	Schoeppel
Connally	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Donnell	Knowland	Sparkman
Douglas	Langer	Stennis
Downey	Lodge	Taft
Eastland	Long	Taylor
Ecton	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	McCarthy	Thye
Flanders	McFarland	Tobey
Frear	McGrath	Tydings
George	McKellar	Vandenberg
Gillette	McMahon	Watkins
Green	Magnuson	Wherry
Gurney	Malone	Wiley
Hayden	Martin	Williams
Hendrickson	Maybank	Withers
Hickenlooper	Miller	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ninety Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, there was read a few minutes ago by the clerk an amendment which I have offered to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] for himself and other Senators, which is in the nature of a substitue for Senate Resolution 15. The parliamentary situation, as I understand it, is that the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] to the so-called Wherry substitute is the pending question. At the conclusion of my remarks, unless my intention shall change, I shall request unanimous consent that a vote may then be taken upon the amendment which I have proposed. Should I fail to obtain such unanimous consent, I shall at the appropriate time thereafter renew my request or make a motion for the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. President, I rise, as indicated, to speak in favor of the amendment which I have offered to the so-called Wherry substitute. Before proceeding to a discussion of the amendment, I shall very briefly mention one other proposition, namely, that in my vote against the ruling made by the Vice President, first, the question whether it is desirable that cloture be made applicable to a motion to take up a resolution for consideration was not involved. Second, the question whether the exercise of civil rights should be guaranteed by Federal legislation was not involved.

The Barkley ruling held that cloture applies, under rule XXII, to a motion to take up a resolution for consideration. I voted against that ruling because, first, a motion to proceed to the consideration of a resolution is in my opinion not a measure. Second, therefore, since the cloture rule, rule XXII, applies only to measures, the rule does not apply to the motion to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 15.

I proceed now, Mr. President, directly to the consideration of the amendment which I have offered. In order that there may be no confusion as to which amendment it is to which I refer, I call attention to the fact that on yesterday, as appears at pages 2590 and 2591 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I then offered an amendment which is set forth in full at pages 2590 and 2591. I have, however, somewhat altered the amendment which I presented yesterday, and the amendment in favor of which I now rise to speak is not that which is set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, but is that amendment of which a mimeographed copy has been today distributed to the desks of Senators. If any Senator desires a copy and does not now possess it, I trust he will make it known to a page so that he will have it on his desk.

The amendment in favor of which I rise to speak reads as follows—and I shall call the punctuation:

On page 2, line 8, of the substitute proposed by Mr. WHERRY (for himself and other Senators) for Senate Resolution 15, amending the so-called cloture rule of the Senate, after the word "matter", insert the following: "(and, for the purpose of this rule, the term 'matter' shall include a motion to approve the Journal, which shall be in order at any time as a privileged motion and to it every motion, whenever it shall be or have been presented, relative to the Journal shall be deemed an amendment)."

It will be observed, Mr. President, that if the amendment in favor of which I am arguing shall be adopted, the earlier portion of that part of the Wherry substitute which begins at line 4 of page 2 will read as follows:

2. Notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, except subsection 3 of rule XXII, at any time a motion signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter (and, for the purpose of this rule, the term "matter" shall include a motion to approve the Journal, which shall be in order at any time as a privileged motion and to it every motion, whenever it shall be or have been presented, relative to the Journal shall be deemed an amendment) pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate—

And so forth.

Mr. President, the reasons this amendment is offered are that in my opinion the provisions set forth in section (2) of the Wherry substitute for Senate resolution 15 inadvertently contain a loophole through which Senators desiring to escape the operation of cloture can by a skillful parliamentary maneuver successfully bypass and avoid cloture, and,

in my judgment, that loophole would be closed by this amendment.

Because the term "measure" in the presently existing rule XXII does not include either a motion to proceed to the consideration of a resolution or a motion to correct entries in the Journal, rule XXII has proved ineffective.

The purpose of the Wherry substitute measure is, of course, to include within the cloture procedure not only all motions to take up for consideration any bill or resolution, but also all proceedings for the correction of alleged mistakes made in the entries of the Journal, and any motion for the approval of the Journal, and also to prevent an interminable delay through the device of a successive series of amendments to the Journal being offered, which might be offered ad infinitum. It appears that the Wherry substitute measure successfully accomplishes the inclusion within the subjects to which cloture applies all motions, including those applicable to correction of entries in the Journal and the motions to approve the Journal.

It is exceedingly doubtful, however, whether the Wherry substitute measure would accomplish the further desired and essential result of eliminating the possibility of a lengthy series of motions to correct alleged mistakes in the Journal being offered one after the other, day after day, with an ensuing debate on each such separate motion.

If the Wherry substitute measure leaves open the possibility of the introduction of an infinitely great number of motions to correct alleged mistakes in the Journal, the Wherry substitute measure would, of course, totally fail in its purpose. It is, therefore, of greatest importance to be as certain as is humanly possible that the Wherry substitute measure is so worded that the possibility of prolonged debate on such an indefinite and extensive series of amendments, seriatim, should be destroyed.

In yesterday's discussion on the floor the point in my mind was one to which the majority leader [Mr. LUCAS] alluded in certain remarks of his which preceded my own. Before mentioning this evening a hypothetical occasion which might arise a year or 5 years from now, let me first recall to the attention of the Senate the fact that, although a motion to approve the Journal of the Senate is customarily made, there does not exist at any place in the standing rules of the Senate any mention of a motion to approve the Journal.

Suppose that at some future time an occasion making it desirable in the minds of some Senators that a filibuster shall ensue, shall arise. Suppose that Senator Jones, alertly quick to take every possible advantage of all parliamentary maneuvers, succeeds in offering to the Senate a motion to correct a mistake on page 1 of the Journal—for example, a motion to change the word "and" to "but"—and that through his alertness and diligence Senator Jones shall succeed in presenting that motion before any motion to approve the Journal shall have been made.

Suppose that the motion of Senator Jones with respect to the substitution of the word "and" for "but" shall be argued extensively; that 16 Senators, under the provisions of the Wherry substitute measure, endeavor to bring to a close the debate upon Senator Jones' motion; and that by action pursuant to the Wherry substitute measure, or two-thirds of the Senators duly chosen and sworn, it shall be decided that the debate shall be brought to a close. Suppose that the debate on Senator Jones' motion does come to a close and his motion is defeated. I take it that the authors of the Wherry substitute measure have endeavored through their measure to insure that upon the defeat of Senator Jones' motion and such, if any, amendments to his motion as have been presented, no further motions relative to a correction of any parts of the Journal, or approval of the Journal, could be debated.

Suppose, however, that following the defeat of Senator Jones' motion, Senator Brown rises and offers a motion to correct a mistake which he asserts exists on page 2 of the Journal, namely, that the word "wherefore" should be the word "therefore." The point is thereupon made by a Senator who seeks to prevent further debate that by the action on Senator Jones' motion Senator Brown is precluded from proceeding with his own motion on the "wherefore-therefore" issue. The argument in opposition to a continuation of debate on Senator Brown's motion would doubtless be that the matter which had been before the Senate on Senator Jones' motion was the whole subject of the approval of the Journal, and that therefore, inasmuch as disposition has been made of Senator Jones' motion, no further proceedings relative to the Journal may be had.

Senator Brown answers, however, that the "matter"—to use the word which appears in the Wherry substitute measure—which had been disposed of by the defeat of Senator Jones' motion was only Senator Jones' motion; that the Jones motion was not one which involved the approval of the Journal in its entirety; and that the matter embraced in Senator Jones' motion therefore does not include the matter in Senator Brown's motion.

Perhaps 20 other Senators might at this point indicate that they, respectively, each desire to introduce a motion or motions to correct subsequent entries in the Journal, which prospective motions those 20 Senators contend are to be on an entirely different matter than that to which Senator Jones' motion had been addressed.

Obviously Senator Brown would possess much of equity in his contention, and could argue with much force that it is unjust that through the consumption by argument on Senator Jones' motion of nearly all the time allotted for the debate on the subjects relating to the Journal, he, Senator Brown, is to be precluded from adequately presenting the argument in support of his motion. Similar arguments could be advanced by each of the other 20 Senators who desire to present motions to correct mistakes in Journal entries.

The Presiding Officer will be called upon to rule where the matter involved in Senator Jones' motion was the approval of the Journal in its entirety or was only the subject of changing the word "and" to "but."

If the Presiding Officer should rule that Senator Jones' motion is limited to the "and-but" question, and does not apply to the approval of the Journal as an entirety, Senator Brown and all other Senators would, of course, be permitted, in the absence of action by the Senate itself overruling the Presiding Officer, to debate his motion on the "wherefore-therefore" question. This debate by Senator Brown and those interested for or against his motion could not be stopped without invoking another cloture proceeding.

If the Presiding Officer should rule that Senator Jones' motion on the "and-but" question did apply to the approval of the Journal in its entirety, an appeal would lie from that ruling, upon which appeal debate would ensue.

Obviously, Mr. President, under the hypothetical case which I have supposed, the cloture which had been invoked on Senator Jones' motion would not have prevented debate relative to Senator Brown's motion, and consequently the purpose of the Wherry substitute measure would have been thwarted by the existence of a loophole which that measure has inadvertently and unintentionally left within it.

Should the Presiding Officer, after the disposal of Senator Brown's motion, elect to recognize, not a Senator who moves to approve the Journal in its entirety, but another Senator who offers, or a number of Senators who offer, substitute motions to correct successive alleged mistakes in the Journal entries, it is obvious that debate of a length which could be bounded only by infinity could be carried on notwithstanding the Wherry substitute measure.

Mr. President, in order to remove the possibility that such a successive series of amendments relative to the Journal may be used in the future for the purpose of a filibuster, I have offered the amendment in advocacy of which I am now speaking.

It will be noted that on yesterday, as shown at page 2591 of the RECORD, I stated that after the discussion early in the session yesterday I chanced to be at the side of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], who told me that the Parliamentarian, Mr. Watkins, had prepared a brief amendment. Mr. Watkins merely prepared it in memorandum form. I further said, as shown in the RECORD for yesterday at page 2591, that I had since talked with Mr. Watkins, who thinks the amendment I presented yesterday would cure the ambiguity to which reference was made.

I have subsequently participated in the preparation of the amendment now being argued, which includes not only the language of the amendment I offered yesterday but certain additional language designed to close as tightly as we are able to do the loophole to which reference has been made.

My present amendment provides for the insertion in line 8, on page 2 of the Wherry substitute measure, following the word "matter", the following: "(and, for the purpose of this rule, the term 'matter' shall include a motion to approve the

Journal, which shall be in order at any time as a privileged motion and to it every motion, whenever it shall be or have been presented, relative to the Journal shall be deemed an amendment)."

Mr. President, although the word "matter" now appearing in the Wherry substitute undoubtedly in my opinion includes a motion to approve the Journal, it is not at all certain, in the hypothetical case I have presented relative to Senator Jones' motion to change "and" to "but," that the matter included in that motion either would or should be ruled by the Presiding Officer to be the approval of the Journal. If the matter embraced in Senator Jones' motion should not be considered to be the approval of the Journal in its entirety, it is clear that subsequent motions by Senator Brown and other Senators on distinct and separate matters in the Journal could not properly be considered to be amendments to the matter which was disposed of by the cloture petition filed to Senator Jones' motion. Consequently, neither the respective motions of Senator Brown and the other 20 Senators nor the length of debate allowable thereon could properly be considered as having been respectively affected or determined by the action on the cloture petition which had been filed to Senator Jones' motion.

Mr. President, the amendment I propose, after distinctly stating that the term "matter" shall include a motion to approve the Journal, specifies two things: First, it specifies that said motion to approve the Journal shall be in order at any time as a privileged motion. Second, it provides that to said motion to approve the Journal, every motion, whenever it shall be or shall have been presented relative to the Journal, shall be deemed an amendment.

If the amendment I proposed be adopted, it will operate in the following manner in the hypothetical case I mentioned: First, even though Senator Jones were to present his motion on the "and-but" matter before a motion to approve the Journal were made, such motion to approve the Journal could be made at any instant thereafter, the language of my amendment providing that a motion to approve the Journal "shall be in order at any time as a privileged motion"; second, after the motion to approve the Journal had been offered, every undisposed-of motion, including any motion previously presented, as well as any motion thereafter presented relative to the Journal, would be deemed an amendment to the motion to approve the Journal; third, when, therefore, presentation of a motion to bring to a close the debate on the motion to approve the Journal resulted in a decision, under the terms of the Wherry substitute measure, that the debate be brought to a close, the motion of Senator Brown and those of each of the other 20 Senators would be deemed to be amendments to the motion to approve the Journal; and all such amendments and the motion to approve the Journal would be subject to the limitation provided by the Wherry substitute measure, namely, that after said cloture decision no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the matter, the amendments thereto, and so forth.

Mr. President, it is respectfully submitted that the proposed amendment is exceedingly important and should be adopted in the interest of closing the loophole which otherwise will exist in the Wherry substitute measure.

Mr. President, I have been informed generally—inasmuch as I was not in attendance at the conference at which the action to which I now refer was had, I cannot state this from personal knowledge, but only from what I have heard—that some, at any rate, of the 52 Senators who have joined in sponsoring the Wherry substitute feel themselves morally obligated to vote for it without any change whatsoever in it. Of course, I shall not ask any Senator to violate what he considers in his own good conscience his obligation, whether legal, moral, or otherwise. Indeed, I am not asking any Member of the Senate to vote for the amendment which I present. I have presented it and the reasons for it in the sincere belief that it is important that it be adopted, and that without its adoption there will exist in the Wherry substitute a loophole which may utterly thwart the purpose of that measure if shrewd and quick and alert parliamentarians upon the floor of the Senate indulge in the parliamentary procedure to which I have referred.

Mr. President, let no one be lulled into a false feeling of security by the thought that from now on, in all the future history of the United States, no Member of the Senate will ever think of starting a filibuster. I take it that human nature probably will remain as it is fifteen, twenty, a hundred years from now, just as it remains much as it was back in the Bible times to which the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] referred this afternoon.

Mr. President, we may confidently expect that some clear-headed, energetic, alert, active Member of the Senate will in the future, as in the past, undertake to see whether there is some loophole still left in the rule. As has been pointed out, it was only a comparatively short time ago, only last year I believe it was, that it was ascertained in the Senate by many of us that by the use of the word "measure" there had not been included in rule XXII a motion to take up for consideration, or motions affecting the Journal. It may well be, Mr. President, that despite all the care that has been bestowed upon the preparation of the Wherry substitute measure and with all the precautions which may be taken, there may at some time develop a defect. The proposed new rule may fail to take into consideration some series of facts or some parliamentary procedure that we would have covered had we thought of it at the moment.

We now have before us, as I see it, that which I have no doubt is a difficult matter to explain in language clearly at the moment, because of its technical nature. We have here to my mind a clear, unmistakable loophole, which the Wherry substitute measure possesses within it. I feel that the Senate—and again I am not asking any Senator to vote for my amendment—would make a bad mistake in failing to adopt a provision such as I have here presented, or some other one that may cover the situation, which I have not seen from any other source, that would close the loophole while we have the opportunity to close it.

Addressing myself to the situation in which the 52 Senators find themselves, I do not know, and I do not propose to cross-examine any one of those 52 to find out, where was the understanding. My general impression and understanding is that there was no document signed, nothing which said in haec verba, "we hereby agree to vote for this resolution, this substitute, without a change, without the dotting of an 'i' or the crossing of a 't'." But I am conscious of the fact that some, at any rate, as I have indicated, of those who sponsored the Wherry substitute feel themselves morally obligated by the fact that they have joined in the resolution.

I trust I shall be pardoned and not be considered unduly critical of any Member of the Senate, for indeed among the signers of the amendment, the Wherry substitute, are many of my closest friends. Not all of my closest friends have signed it. My good brother here, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], is one of the closest friends I have in the Senate. His name is not on it. But there are some of my very close friends, including the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, who is now advancing to his seat, who are on it. I do not want to offend any Member of the Senate, but to my mind it is highly opposed to sound public policy for any situation to be allowed to call on a Senator to permit himself to be placed in such a position that by either a legal, written, oral, moral, or any other obligation he shall preclude himself from considering amendments, changes, additions to, or deductions from a measure pending before the Senate.

Mr. President, suppose, for illustration, that someone were to find here tonight in this very amendment, the Wherry substitute measure, some grossly erroneous statement, something that obviously would not represent the desire of the Senate or of any Member who shall have joined in this particular enterprise, namely, the promulgation of the Wherry substitute measure. I ask you, Mr. President, what should be the attitude, with a matter here to be decided which has been declared by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] perhaps to be as important as any measure that can be conceived, or words to that effect, with an amendment here which has a bearing not merely upon our ordinary routine legislative process, but which may have a vital bearing upon the very functioning of our Nation as a result of an outbreak from some foreign enemy, because, if the business of the Senate could be tied up by a loophole in the new cloture rule, it might be we would be unable to protect ourselves in the quickness of time requisite for protection against the designs of foreign enemies? I ask, Mr. President, is it a sound public policy for Members of the Senate, in advance of seeing even the amendments that may be or shall be proposed to the measure, to tie themselves up in a knot, so to speak, so that they must, because of their obligation,

go forward and adopt a rule which may be iniquitous and harmful, and may lead to evil results beyond those that can be contemplated by the human mind?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield for a question.

Mr. BREWSTER. I appreciate what the Senator says, but I take it he realizes that at some time or other we must all make up our minds and cast a vote. Lacking omniscience we are apt to make mistakes. We have for 10 days debated the essence of the problem here, as to whether we should determine a rule in this manner, have we not?

Mr. DONNELL. I do not think so. I think the motion that has been before the Senate for 10 days or more has been a motion to take up for consideration the Hayden-Wherry resolution. I may say to the Senator that I know of no one who has presented an amendment even remotely resembling that which I have presented here today. I know of no consideration that has been given to it. In answer to the Senator's further question, relating to the fact that we must eventually arrive at a time when we must decide, I may say that I do not think the correct time at which we should make up our decision should be at a time before that at which we have considered all the amendments and proposals which may be presented by Members of the Senate.

Mr. BREWSTER. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Missouri would never favor cloture?

Mr. DONNELL. I have not expressed myself on that subject in what I have said here. I may say to the Senator I do favor cloture——

Mr. BREWSTER. And does the Senator——

Mr. DONNELL. If the Senator will permit me—and yet I will not, and I have not expressed myself to a living soul—in fact, I do not propose to do so—as to whether I shall vote for this measure, until I shall have heard the arguments and until the last moment before I cast my vote. I may say further, if the Senator will permit, that I have had the experience of changing my mind on the floor of the Senate within a very few seconds indeed before I cast my ballot. I trust the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] will not object to my mentioning an incident which he has doubtless forgotten. One afternoon, a year or two ago, I was seated in the lounge in the exterior of the Senate Chamber. I was considering a vote which was to take place within a few moments thereafter. And I must confess, I may say to the Senator, that I had not at that moment, determined how I should vote. At that moment the distinguished Senator from Georgia came along and, while I do not think he said quite as definitely as I did that he had not decided, he expressed what to my mind was a very strong indication that he had certainly not long since that made up his mind. And I am not so sure whether he had made it up even at that moment.

I cite that to my friend merely as an illustration of the fact that, to my mind, certainly on a matter of such tremendous consequence as is the matter of cloture, involving all the considerations to which reference has been made, it is premature for any Member of the Senate to bind himself by an obligation, moral, legal, implied, or otherwise, as to voting for a measure without a change in the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t", or without consideration of an amendment which may be presented by a fellow Senator who may be just as desirous of accomplishing the result which is sought to be accomplished as are those Senators who have entered into an agreement without having heard his amendment.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, does the Senator recall an occasion within the past year in which he stated to the Senator from Maine that within 1 hour after he had cast a vote he decided that he had made a mistake?

Mr. DONNELL. I do not recall it, but I do not doubt that there are plenty of mistakes which I have made.

Mr. BREWSTER. I would have to look at the RECORD to ascertain when it occurred, but I recall the episode, and I thought it was a great compliment that the Senator would indicate it.

The Senator speaks of the fact that we are tying ourselves up into a knot. Would it not be fairer to say that we are trying to untie the knot in which we have been involved for the past 10 days, or extricating ourselves from the utterly impossible parliamentary situation in which we were involved?

Mr. DONNELL. I may say to the Senator that I fully appreciate, or at least partially appreciate, the difficulties, though not so well as did those who participated in the conference. I happened to be out of the city on the day of the conference. I think I appreciate, at least in part, the tremendously difficult problem which confronted the 52 Senators who signed the substitute. I have confidence in the Members of the United States Senate; their judgment, many times, is better than my own, and their integrity is equal to mine. But I return to the thesis that, regardless of the difficulty, to my mind it would be a mistake for those 52 Senators, regardless of what may develop, regardless of the danger to the United States, regardless of the possibility that the result might be the destruction of the Nation, to bind themselves, before hearing everything, to support the measure intact, without the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t."

Mr. BREWSTER. Will the Senator agree that if the rule which is now proposed is adopted, at any rate there will be an effective way by which it will be possible for this body to legislate, whereas heretofore it has been impossible, without the expenditure of more time and effort than the Senate has found it possible to afford?

Mr. DONNELL. I fear that the Senator was not in the room at the time I developed most of my argument upon this proposition, or else I failed to develop it with sufficient clarity to make it clear to the distinguished Senator. I know the clarity of his own mentality, and the fault probably lies with me.

The Wherry substitute leaves a loophole under which it may be possible, through a quick, effective parliamentary maneuver, to accomplish a purpose which it is intended to prevent. It is solely for the purpose of closing that loophole, of annihilating it and making the measure as nearly perfect as we can, that my amendment has been offered.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a few questions, and permit me to preface them with a statement?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I have the profoundest confidence in the sincerity and ability of the Senator from Missouri. First of all, let me ask the Senator if the same infirmity, as he sees it, which he is pointing out in the Wherry substitute, is not also textually in the original Hayden-Wherry resolution?

Mr. DONNELL. I may say to the Senator that I have not read the Hayden-Wherry resolution.

Mr. GEORGE. I think the Senator will find that it is in the same language.

Mr. DONNELL. It may well be.

Mr. GEORGE. The distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute. If the Senator will examine it, I think he will discover that the identical language which he now thinks should be made more specific is used. In other words, what I am trying to say is that the Senator's objection goes not merely to the Wherry substitute, but to the original Hayden-Wherry resolution, to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon, and also to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], because he does not offer a complete substitute, but offers merely to amend the original Hayden-Wherry proposal. I do not think there can be any question about that.

Mr. DONNELL. May I answer the Senator at that point?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. DONNELL. As I have stated, I have not read the original Hayden-Wherry resolution, nor have I read the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], but each of them may be subject, and possibly is, to the same infirmity. I may say that they are doubtless subject to the same infirmity as is the Wherry substitute.

Mr. GEORGE. I think I can assure the Senator that the same language is used in both substitutes.

Mr. DONNELL. I may say to the distinguished Senator, for whom, as he well knows, I have not only a great admiration, but as I told him on one occasion, I feel almost a sense of awe when I come into his presence, because of my great respect for his ability—and that is not flattery at all——

Mr. GEORGE. I did not rise to ask any embarrassing questions.

Mr. DONNELL. I know that.

Mr. GEORGE. I am trying to ask questions which I think may be helpful.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator is so generous and kind, I know that is true. I wish to say to the Senator that although I highly respect his judgment on any

point which he presents, I respectfully submit that even though there be a like or identical infirmity in the Hayden-Wherry proposal, the Morse proposal, and the Baldwin proposal, that does not alter the fact that the infirmity exists in the Wherry substitute, and does not obviate the importance of the Senate's considering a measure which proposes to remove the defect from the Wherry substitute amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. I was simply pointing it out for the purpose of emphasizing that if the amendment is pertinent, proper, and necessary to the Wherry substitute, it is equally applicable to all the others, the original resolution, and subsequent substitutes which have been offered. I was merely inviting the Senator's attention to that point.

I now come to what I wished to submit to the Senator, in all candor, because I know him to be a lawyer of great ability. He has demonstrated that here, and his capacity to reason about matters of this kind is well understood by all his colleagues on both sides of the aisle. That is not flattery. I am appealing to the Senator on the basis of a well-recognized principle of construction.

The Senator is fearful that the language "matter" or "other matter" is not explicit enough, and he wishes to insert an amendment declaring that it covers amendments to the Journal.

I call the attention of the distinguished Senator to this almost fundamental and elementary principle of construction, that enumeration in any statute weakens it, whereas a general term, if it is comprehensive and embracing, gives strength to it. I invite the Senator's mind for the moment to the long, long effort made by distinguished jurists and lawyers in the Anglo-Saxon speaking world, at least, to define "fraud." Always there was a final decision that to define "fraud" would fix some limits to the word and to the concept, and therefore rascals would be able to get around it.

Mr. President, I am earnestly appealing to the Senator, because I know his purpose is trustworthy and altogether commendable, and even praiseworthy, but when he undertakes to define what is embraced in the word "matter" does he not run the risk—and this is the question—of weakening the general term "other matter," because he is confining his definition to things which may be done to the Journal of the Senate?

Mr. DONNELL. Has the Senator finished his question?

Mr. GEORGE. That one; I have two or three more. Would the Senator like to have me ask those?

Mr. DONNELL. No; I should like to take them up one at a time, if I may.

Mr. GEORGE. I am merely asking the Senator now if he does not feel that when he attempts to define the words "other matter" or "matters" he is running the risk of having a narrow technical construction given to that term in subsequent proceedings before the Senate, on the broad general principle that enumeration weakens, whereas general and embracing terms are all-inclusive.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's stating so clearly the rule of construction to which he refers and as to which I have no dispute with him. I have not, however, made my point clear to the Senator. I am not disputing that the language of the Wherry substitute includes within it, by the very general term "matter," all subject matter of motions relative to the Journal. I think it does. Indeed, I said in my remarks that it appears that the Wherry substitute measure successfully accomplishes the inclusion, within the subject to which cloture applies, of all motions, including those applicable to correction of entries in the Journal and motions to approve the Journal.

What I have attempted to do in the amendment I have suggested is not to make it clear that the word "matter" includes motions to correct the Journal. I may say that it is true that my amendment does say "for the purpose of this rule, the term 'matter' shall include a motion to approve the Journal," but I shall point out to the Senator in a moment the purpose behind that. I think it is unnecessary, in order that the word "matter" shall include a motion to approve the Journal, that there should be any statement to that effect in the amendment or in the resolution. I think that is covered.

Let me elucidate the point I have in mind, and perhaps I can illustrate a little more simply than in what I have previously stated. Suppose when the Senate opens tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon, after an adjournment which would have taken place tonight, we will say, so that a new legislative day is to begin, and a desire to institute a filibuster exists in the minds of some of the Members of the Senate.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the Senator is anticipating my further questions.

Mr. DONNELL. It may not be necessary to ask them, then.

Mr. GEORGE. Very well.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senate convenes, and before the majority leader makes the customary motion—which, by the way, is not, as I pointed out, a motion that is even referred to in the Senate rules, namely, a motion to approve the Journal—some other Senator possessing alertness, like our good friend, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], rises instantly and moves, not that the whole Journal be approved, but moves that on page 1 of the Journal the word "and" be substituted for the word "but," and debate ensues for 2 or 3 days over that particular motion. Let us suppose then that cloture is invoked with respect to the motion made by this alert Senator, which has preceded the presentation of a motion to approve the Journal. After cloture has ensued, the motion made by the alert Senator to whom I have referred is defeated, let us suppose.

Then, again before the majority leader shall rise to move the approval of the Journal as an entirety, or perhaps even simultaneously with such a motion, suppose the Chair shall observe another Senator, the one to whom I have referred as Senator Brown, who rises and gets his attention and recognition, and who moves, before any motion had been made by the majority leader with respect to approving the entire Journal, that the word "heretofore" on page 2 of the Journal be changed to "wherefore."

Then the point is made by some Senator at that time that we have already passed on that question, on the entire approval of the Journal, and Senator Brown is out of order, and has no right to have his motion heard, because the approval of the whole Journal has occurred.

My point is—and I shall in a moment show the applicability to the amendment—that there should be some way so that even though the majority leader shall not have presented a motion to approve the Journal—and he is not obligated to do so—and even though the Presiding Officer shall recognize some other Senator before he recognizes the majority leader, the majority leader, or some other Senator, may have the right, as a privilege, to move the approval of the entire Journal. Then, Mr. President, there comes into effect this amendment of mine. I say, "and for the purpose of this rule, the term 'matter' shall include a motion to approve the Journal."

I have no objection, I may say, to inserting some language indicating that it does not exclude other motions, if the Senator feels that should be done. The amendment says, "and for the purpose of this rule, the term 'matter' shall include a motion to approve the Journal, which shall be in order at any time as a privileged motion."

In other words, after Senator Brown had risen, or after the Senator who first had proved himself so alert had risen and made his motion, the majority leader or any other Senator may have risen, and, as a matter of privilege, moved to approve the Journal.

Then my amendment says "to it," that is to say, the motion to approve the Journal, "every motion, whenever it shall be or have been presented"—in other words, the motion made by the Senator on the other side whom I have called Senator ELLENDER, and the motion which was made before the presentation of the motion made by the distinguished majority leader, and this motion by Senator Brown over on this side, which may not have been made until after the motion made by the majority leader—my amendment reads:

To it—

That is to say, the motion to approve the Journal—

every motion, whenever it shall be or shall have been presented, relative to the Journal, shall be deemed an amendment.

What is the effect of that? The effect is that when the motion has been made by the majority leader to approve the Journal as a whole, the other motions, whenever presented, fall in as subsidiary and subordinate to that main motion, and when cloture has been applied and the main motion put to approve the Journal as an entirety, then the other motions are likewise embraced within the cloture procedure and are subject to the 1-hour provision. That is the reason for the amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I think I understand the distinguished Senator's

argument. I am not propounding these questions for the purpose of additional argument, but I am trying to illustrate what the situation here is.

I now call the distinguished Senator's attention to the fact that when you begin to enumerate in the statute then you begin to give yourself trouble. If the Senator's amendment should be adopted, which emphasizes the Journal under the head of "matter," there will be many eloquent and distinguished Senators on the Senate floor who will argue that only the Journal was in contemplation. I have called the Senator's attention to the well-known rule of construction. I respectfully suggest that you cannot escape the force of it when you undertake to enumerate under "matter" the various things which might be covered. The confirmation of a Presidential nomination to some office in Alaska might be a "matter." But when you enumerate the Journal, and put your emphasis there, many alert and very astute minds will say, "Here is what the Senator meant, because he elaborated upon this point."

Now I come to the other point.

Mr. DONNELL. May I answer that?

Mr. GEORGE. No; the Senator has already answered, and I understand his argument.

Mr. DONNELL. I respectfully submit that having the floor I should like to have the opportunity of answering the Senator.

Mr. GEORGE. Very well.

Mr. DONNELL. I will say that I shall have no objection, as indicated a few moments ago, to including within the amendment language after the word "shall," so it will read, "the term 'matter' shall, without exclusion of any other motion," or if the Senator wants to say, "any other motion, or any other matter, or subject," or whatever it might be, "including a motion to approve the Journal." I think that would completely answer the point the Senator has made.

Mr. GEORGE. I respectfully ask the Senator if I am not correct in saying that when the ablest lawyers of the English-speaking world have sought to define "fraud" they have finally abandoned the effort, because every definition would make it possible for something else, which was clearly a fraud, to come in. Therefore they have said, "We will denounce it as a fraud, and let the courts determine whether under all circumstances in a given case fraud exists or not."

Mr. DONNELL. May I say to the Senator——

Mr. GEORGE. May I suggest, Mr. President——

Mr. DONNELL. May I not answer the Senator's question? Mr. President, I respectfully submit that I have yielded for the purpose of a question, and I should like to answer the question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri has control of his own time.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator from Missouri has control. I asked the Senator if he would yield, with the explanation that I was seeking light.

Mr. DONNELL. I was going to suggest this: The Senator from Georgia is of the opinion that, by the language that "the term 'matter' shall include a motion to approve the Journal," I have descended to particularity which might be subject to the dangers he mentions. I think that could be well covered by eliminating that part of this particular amendment, because the definition is not the purpose of my amendment. I think the word "matter" certainly includes a motion to approve the Journal. The point I wanted to cover in this amendment was that "for the purpose of this rule," a motion to approve the Journal shall be in order at any time as a privileged motion. I would have no objection in the world to doing what the Senator suggests. I do not think it is necessary, but it might improve the language on the point the Senator from Georgia makes. It would read then in this way:

> and, for the purpose of this rule, a motion to approve the Journal shall be in order at any time as a privileged motion and to it every motion, whenever it shall be or have been presented, relative to the Journal shall be deemed an amendment.

I am perfectly willing to make the amendment read that way, I will say in answer to the point the Senator makes as to particularity.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the Senator is very kind. I again assure him that I am asking for light upon the question. I know the Senator from Missouri is a very careful student of the question he is discussing. I respectfully suggest, before asking the next question, that the Senator's purpose in making a motion to approve the Journal a privileged matter, with the results following which he has enumerated, might be more appropriately placed in the general rules of the Senate rather than in this cloture rule, because in this cloture rule it would be confusing. I again ask the Senator if he does not think that the effort specifically to include the Journal weakens the whole broad purpose of those who have framed this amendment. The phraseology "all motions, measures, pending business, and other matter"—I am not using the words in the sequence in which they are stated—is sufficiently comprehensive.

But now I come to what I should like to ask the Senator.

Mr. DONNELL. May I answer that question? It is a separate question and I should like to answer it. I am perfectly agreeable at any time to having a further amendment to rule III which makes specifically for all the purposes a motion to approve the Journal a privileged motion. Indeed, I think it would seem proper from many standpoints, one of which is that I think there should be a finality to the transactions of the Senate, and the procedure of having the Journal of the Senate run along perhaps for weeks before there is a final determination of what the action of the Senate may be, might prove very injurious to the country.

Mr. GEORGE. I agree.

Mr. DONNELL. I have no objection to that. But my point is that I do not understand that we are now, in respect to the Wherry substitute, engaged in the attempt to amend rule III. We are working on rule XXII. It would appear to me, with all respect to the Senator from Georgia, that it can do no harm to put in the amendment that I have proposed to rule XXII, and I am very willing at any time to present and urge the adoption of an amendment in the general rule III. I should be glad to do so.

Mr. GEORGE. I will say that I would not be in disagreement with the distinguished Senator, but I am respectfully asking him, as a lawyer of great ability, the question, if his enumeration of what is comprehended under the term "matter" does not weaken rather than strengthen?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I say with all respect that I have not enumerated in my amendment what is comprehended under the term "matter," and to the extent that it might be considered that I have done so by saying that, "for the purpose of this rule, the term 'matter' shall include a motion to amend the Journal," I have offered to make the amendment read as follows:

> And for the purpose of this rule, a motion to approve the Journal shall be in order at any time as a privileged motion and to it every motion, whenever it shall be or have been presented, relative to the Journal shall be deemed an amendment.

I respectfully submit that that removes every possible ground on which the Senator has presented his view as to the effect that by having mentioned the Journal I have undertaken to define the scope of the word "matter." I have not. I had no intention of doing so. I do not think I did so. But in order that there may be no possible objection to it, I have offered to remove that language, and I think my amendment is just as strong without it as with it.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I think the Senator has answered my question. I do not care to argue about the answers. But that question was preliminary to the other question I should like to ask the Senator.

I ask him to bear with me until I preface with a statement because otherwise the question would be unintelligible. Until 16 Senators contemplate filing a cloture petition, the questions we are discussing here in the Wherry substitute, or indeed in the Wherry-Hayden resolution, and indeed in the substitute offered by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], do not become material because if there is no cloture and no intention to invoke cloture any Senator might rise on the floor and ask the President of the Senate to permit him to offer a motion to perfect the Journal.

Mr. DONNELL. Certainly.

Mr. GEORGE. The question I ask is this: Is not that essentially a request for unanimous consent to consider the Journal, if the Journal has not been placed before the Senate?

Mr. DONNELL. I do not think so. Had the Senator completed his question?

Mr. GEORGE. I have completed that one.

Mr. DONNELL. I do not think it is equal to or synonymous with a motion

to approve the Journal, and I base that in part upon the language of rule III. Rule III refers distinctly to—

> Any motion—

I interpolate the word "which"—

> shall be made to amend or correct the Journal.

As the Senator may recall, under rule III, any such motion is deemed a privileged question and shall be proceeded with until disposed of. I am told upon excellent authority—and I trust that Mr. Watkins, the Parliamentarian, will have no objection to my quoting him—that there is nothing in rule III, or anywhere else in the rules, which refers to a motion for approval of the Journal. Therefore, I should say that if a Senator rose and asked for the correction of an error in the Journal, that would not be equivalent to a motion to approve the Journal, and would not encompass the breadth of such a motion.

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to ask the Senator one further question. This is the point toward which I have been driving. I ask the Senator if he thinks a Senator could bring before the Senate a thing such as the Journal and separate it into segments, paragraphs, and phrases.

Mr. DONNELL. Not only do I think so, but I think it has been done in the Senate.

Mr. GEORGE. I prefaced my statement with the assumption that no cloture motion was contemplated. If any Senator contemplates the filing of a cloture petition, the Senator may be reassured by the statement that every Senator who wants to amend the Journal will be on his toes and ready to offer amendments. But I do not want to go into that question.

The point I am getting at is this: Whether a Senator rises and asks to correct the Journal, or moves that the Journal be approved, or asks that the Journal shall stand approved without objection, necessarily each and every one of those requests must bring before the Senate the Journal of the previous day. It cannot be brought before the Senate in segments, phrases, paragraphs, or words, because the moment such a request is made, every Senator has a perfect right to say, "I have a suggestion to make about a correction of the Journal."

Therefore I now submit to the Senator my final question——

Mr. DONNELL. I should like to answer the Senator's previous question, if it is a separate question.

Mr. GEORGE. It is; but I do not wish to delay the Senator.

Mr. DONNELL. It is a little difficult for me to retain several questions in mind. If I may be permitted to do so, I should like to answer briefly the suggestion of the Senator.

Mr. GEORGE. Very well. I have no doubt the Senator will answer the next question which I was about to ask.

Mr. DONNELL. I hope I may be able to do so. I shall try.

To my mind it is entirely possible to bring before the Senate one segment of the Journal by itself.

For illustration, suppose the Journal should show the enactment of a bill relating to an allowance of $14,000 to someone. A Senator might say, "The Journal is mistaken. It was an allowance of $140,000." He would say, "Mr. President, I move that the Journal be corrected by changing '$14,000' to '$140,000.'" I respectfully submit that that is not at all bringing before the Senate anything except that specific proposal.

Mr. GEORGE. And I submit to the Senator, in all candor, that that is exactly and completely equivalent to a unanimous-consent request to consider that one item in the Journal.

I do not wish to quibble with the Senator, but I do not see how it would be possible to amend the Journal, or to move its approval, without bringing the entire Journal before the Senate for whatever any Senator might wish to do with it. I do not say that unanimous consent cannot be given to consider a particular suggestion or a particular amendment. That can be done, and it often is done. But if there were any cloture proceeding in contemplation, the Senate, of course, faces the facts of life, and Members of the Senate would know it. If there were any cloture proceeding pending, or petition about to be filed, or imminent, undoubtedly every Senator who wanted to amend the Journal then must either offer his amendment before the cloture motion is voted upon, or he would be foreclosed.

Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the Senator longer, but I most respectfully suggest to him that when he enumerates approval of the Journal he is narrowing a broader definition which in my opinion is all-comprehensive. I am now speaking against the interests which we on this side of the aisle, in the narrow segment which is supposed to be the southern bloc, represent. I am speaking against my own interest, but I am suggesting to the Senator, in the form of an inquiry, that whenever he undertakes to emphasize, within the definition of the word "matter" or the words "other matter" the Journal or anything with respect to the Journal, he is narrowing a broader and more comprehensive definition.

I thank the Senator for permitting me to interrupt him.

Mr. DONNELL. I appreciate very greatly the interruption of the Senator from Georgia, and the very valuable contribution which he has made. I should like now to answer the concluding portion of what he has said, which I trust will answer all that I have not previously attempted to answer.

In the first place, in this amendment, I am not attempting to define anything. I am not attempting to define what "matter" is. I think the word "matter" is comprehensive enough to include a motion to approve the Journal, to approve a segment of it, to correct the Journal, or any other item of business in the Senate. For illustration, I believe that the matter of confirmation of nominations is included within the term "matter."

I can quite readily see the point which the Senator has made as to the danger of particularizing. With that in mind, I ask leave to perfect my amendment by changing it to read as follows——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has the right to modify his own amendment.

Mr. DONNELL. I modify it to read as follows——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will say to the Senator from Missouri that the Senator's amendment is not now pending.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, may I have leave——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator may indicate that he will offer it in the modified form.

Mr. DONNELL. I shall offer it in this language:

> And, for the purposes of this rule, a motion to approve the Journal shall be in order at any time as a privileged motion, and to it every motion, whether it shall be or has been presented, relative to the Journal shall be deemed an amendment.

Mr. President, I believe that I have completely answered by this change the very suggestive point made by the Senator from Georgia, which may have more merit than I first thought it had. I think I have fully met the point.

A moment ago the Senator from Georgia said, in substance, "How can it be that a Senator could move the approval of the Journal without bringing all the Journal before the Senate?" I thoroughly agree with the Senator's suggestion. I should say that if a Senator made a motion to approve the Journal in its entirety, even though he did not use the words "in its entirety," if he moved to approve the Journal, he would bring the entire Journal before the Senate.

But I take it that is very different from the procedure which I have cited, one to which, to my mind, alert parliamentarians, men who are on their toes in a filibuster, could readily resort, and could be expected to resort, with a very high degree of success. Instead of moving to approve the entire Journal, which could, of course, lead to the result that if cloture should be invoked it would be interposed not only against that motion but to every other amendment, I should say that a man who was on his toes and able to handle the situation would move to amend by striking out "and" and substituting "but." If I am not mistaken, that was the procedure followed a year ago. Many instances could be cited in which that was done.

My point is that if a Senator made a motion simply to substitute "and" for "but," there is nothing in the Wherry substitute which either directly or indirectly or inferentially would say that the motion confined to the two words "and" and "but" would be even the equivalent of a motion to approve the Journal. Indeed, quite to the contrary, it is a motion pro tanto to disapprove the Journal, by making a correction in it, rather than approving it as it stands.

Mr. President, to my mind there is a clear loophole in the Wherry substitute. I think we should close that loophole, and that is the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. My first question is this: If a loophole does exist in the amendment offered as a substitute by the Senator from Nebraska and 51 colleagues, and if the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri is not adopted, will the net result of 3 weeks of debate in the Senate and the adoption of the Wherry substitute be to make it more difficult to apply cloture to any motion which happens to be before the Senate?

Mr. DONNELL. I am glad the Senator asks that question. I should say the effect would be that after all this work and all this thought, we would have adopted a rule which, when the critical occasion arose, would be very likely to prove totally ineffective. That is my answer.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask one other question.

Mr. DONNELL. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. If the loophole which has been pointed out by the Senator from Missouri does not exist, would any violence be done to the purposes of the 52 sponsors of the Wherry substitute by adopting the modified amendment presented by the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. DONNELL. I do not see that it would do any violence at all. It would merely be a precautionary measure which could do no harm; and if it has any effect at all, as I think it does, it would have a good effect.

However, I do not wish my answer to be regarded as a request on my part that any Senator violate any pledge he may have made to support the Wherry substitute without amendment. I repeat, since there now seem to be in the Chamber some Senators who were not here when this matter was mentioned initially, that I think it highly unfortunate and undesirable that any procedure should be indulged in by any Member of the Senate in respect to coming to an agreement with any other Senators which would create a moral obligation which would preclude any member of the group from considering and acting in his best judgment, based on the circumstances at the moment, on an amendment which might later be submitted.

Mr. AIKEN. But the Senator from Missouri is sure, is he, that no violence would be done to the purposes of the 52 sponsors of the Wherry substitute if his amendment as modified were approved?

Mr. DONNELL. Yes; that is my best judgment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield for a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. In connection with the question asked by the able Senator from Georgia, I should like to read rule III, and then ask a question, to see whether we can arrive at a conclusion.

Rule III contemplates the commencement of a session after an adjournment. It read as follows:

The Presiding Officer having taken the chair, and a quorum being present, the Journal of the preceding day shall be read—

I take that to mean that it shall be entirely read; then the rule provides—

and any mistake made in the entries corrected. The reading of the Journal shall not be suspended unless by unanimous consent; and when any motion shall be made to amend or correct the same, it shall be deemed a privileged question, and proceeded with until disposed of.

My question is this: When we begin a session here and when the Journal is read, the motion is to approve the Journal. That is one motion. Any proceedings to correct the Journal would be made after that and would be part of that motion. When cloture was obtained on that motion, on the day following, excluding one, the entire debate on that motion would be closed, and a vote would have to be taken on that motion, which would cover all corrections; and the corrections would have to be moved in between or during that period.

So is it not correct to say that the able Senator from Georgia has in mind that this does cover everything that can be done in regard to the Journal, in one motion and in one cloture petition, and it is privileged?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I am happy to have the Senator ask the question. The fallacy of the conclusion at which I gather he has arrived arises from the fact that there is nothing in rule III which even remotely refers to a motion to approve the Journal.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then where is it?

Mr. DONNELL. It cannot be found anywhere. If Senators will look through the rules—and the Parliamentarian, Mr. Watkins, will corroborate me on this, and I judge that the distinguished Vice President will also corroborate me on this—no mention will be found in the rules, from beginning to end, of a motion to approve the Journal.

I do not at all mean that it is improper to move to approve the Journal. Of course that is perfectly proper.

It was suggested to me this afternoon by one Senator, and I rather gather that the suggestion was approved by another Senator, that there should be in the rules a mandatory provision requiring approval of the Journal to be had. I think there is much of definite merit in that suggestion, although I do not wish to pass on it finally at this time.

But suppose we had a session lasting 3 days or 2 weeks or even 30 days, and suppose in the meantime business had been transacted on the calendar day March 1. If by March 10, only recesses had been taken, rather than adjournments, the legislative day would still be the legislative day of March 1. If on March 10 an importer in New York were to write to the Secretary of the Senate and request a certification as to what the Senate did with respect to a certain bill, all the clerk could do would be to send to the New York importer a copy of the language in the Journal; but on the 15th day of March, let us say, after that inquiry had been made, and after the importer had received that answer, and thought it represented the action of the Senate, any Senator might arise on the floor of the Senate, after the motion to approve the Journal had been made, or even before that, and might say, "Mr. President, there is an error in one of the entries in the Journal. The figure '4' should be changed to '8'; instead of reading '$40,000,' the Journal should read '$80,000.'" I say there is a wholesome reason to finalize the proceedings in the Journal as soon as possible, rather than to leave that matter to a later date.

Let me say that the Senator speaks about a motion to approve the Journal as embracing everything. I thoroughly agree with him. I thought I made clear in my initial presentation, or perhaps in response to questions asked by the Senator from Georgia, that of course if a motion is made to approve the Journal or, as the distinguished Senator from Georgia said, both in that language and in somewhat similar language, if, as he said, "a motion that the Journal stand approved" is made, of course that motion is all-comprehensive, and embraces everything.

Therefore, inasmuch as the motion to approve the Journal is all-comprehensive, if there shall be any subordinate motions and amendments, such as motions to change "and" to "but" or to change "wherefore" to "therefore," or anything else, all those are comprehended within the general subject matter of the original motion. If a cloture petition shall be filed to the comprehensive motion to approve the Journal, and the cloture petition is sustained by the constitutional two-thirds majority, under the Wherry substitute measure, or under the existing rule if the matter of the Journal had been included in it—as it is not, and so I had better confine myself to the Wherry substitute—if under the Wherry proposed substitute there shall be cloture applied to the comprehensive motion to approve the Journal, to my mind that attaches to every amendment, if there be a thousand amendments or 5,000 amendments with respect to "ands", "buts", "therefores", and "wherefores", and so forth. It applies to all of them, and they are all comprehended within the great comprehensive motion. Cloture, if granted as to the comprehensive motion, includes all the subordinates, and the 1-hour provision applies as set forth in the provision of the Wherry substitute.

I may state further, however, that if, on the other hand, instead of a motion being made to approve the Journal, or that it stand approved, or anything to that effect, the Senator should rise and move that on page 1 "and" shall be changed to "but," to my mind; that cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, be made synonymous with a motion to approve the entire Journal. And even though "and-to-but" changes shall be authorized and made by the Senate, or even though cloture be applied, and then there shall be a restriction to 1-hour future debate by each Senator on that subject, after the cloture is invoked, and the vote has been had and the motion has been carried, or defeated, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] might arise and say, "On page 2, I move that the word 'windowpane' be substituted for the word 'drawing room'."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. But has it not been the practice of the Senate that the Journal is always brought before this body for approval, for correction, by a motion to approve? As I read the rule, finding the provision for approval at no other place except in rule III, that when it is read——

Mr. DONNELL. It is not in rule III.

Mr. FERGUSON. But, if the Senator will wait, the rule says the Journal shall be read. It has been the practice of the Senate to waive the reading in the great majority of cases. Now and then it has been the practice not to waive it. But if it is read in its entirety, it is before the Senate upon the motion of a Senator to approve the Journal, is it not?

Mr. DONNELL. Certainly. That is precisely what I have said. But——

Mr. FERGUSON. Therefore, further proceedings to correct the Journal are within the inclusive motion, under the so-called Wherry amendment, and a cloture of debate on that will require a vote on the approval of the Journal; and, if approved, all other motions to correct are defeated.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, certainly the Senator is correct in that. But that is not the situation I have presented, nor would it be the situation that would be presented in the case of a prospective filibuster. Can the Senator imagine, if a Senator wanted to filibuster—I point to the other side of the aisle, as if Senators on that side were the only ones who ever wanted to filibuster; perhaps those on our side do, too—but at any rate, can the Senator imagine that if he were in charge of a filibuster and wanted to conduct it along the line of amendments to the Journal, he would advise that the motion which should be made would be to approve the Journal? Of course, one cloture would wipe out the filibuster, and the Senate would pass on to the next order of business; the filibuster would be gone.

But the Senator from Michigan, with his keen legal mind, would say, "No; the thing to do is to start in with a multiplicity of amendments. First, move to change 'and' to 'but', then, after that has been argued 2 or 3 days, and cloture has been invoked, and it has been decided that the amendment should or should not be made, turn over then to the next paragraph, and move to change 'wherefore' to 'therefore', or 'four' to 'eight,' or whatever it may be." In that multiplicity of motions, each one of those motions, as I see it, is a separate matter, and by no possible stretch of the imagination can a motion to correct the Journal, which thereby negatives the idea of approving, for example, a motion to correct as to one word or one page, be deemed the equivalent of a motion to approve the entire Journal of 100 pages.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield for a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. Before any motions to correct or amend the Journal can be made, the Journal has to be read, and does not the rule anticipate, before it is read, that a motion to approve the Journal is to be made?

Mr. DONNELL. There is nothing in the rule that either directly or indirectly suggests the making of a motion to approve the Journal.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Missouri yield, so that the Chair may refer to a decision?

Mr. DONNELL. Certainly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair refers to a decision made on the 16th day of December 1942, rendered by Senator La Follette, who was in the chair, in regard to the approval of the Journal. The controversy arose apparently over the question as to whether the Journal had to be approved by the Senate. It seemed that the Senator from Kentucky, then acting as majority leader, propounded a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair, the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. La Follette, as to whether the Journal would have to be approved. Senator La Follette, as Presiding Officer of the Senate at the time, ruled that there was no requirement that the Journal be approved by the Senate; that if any Senator objected to the reading of the Journal being dispensed with, then the Journal must be read. If no amendments were offered, the Journal stood automatically approved. If amendments were offered or corrections suggested, and the reading dispensed with, then, without further action, the Journal automatically stood approved. So that the decision was—and it seems to have been in line with the absence of any requirement of the rule—that the positive, affirmative approval of the Journal is not required. That raises a question whether a motion to approve it might be required to be ruled to be not in order.

Mr. DONNELL. If I may address myself to that, Mr. President, I should say it certainly is in order. It has been the practice of the Senate. The Senate has, by a uniform recognition of the propriety of it, established very clearly the view of the Senate that such a motion is in order. But it is not mandatory, and it is not required.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair, having consulted the Parliamentarian on that point, is advised that such a motion would not be in order if a point of order were made against it. The fact that the Senate has been in the habit of asking approval without reading does not mean there is any requirement that it be approved. But habits sometimes create practices. There is a question of whether the approval of the Journal may be made without reading, the proper request being that the reading of the Journal be dispensed with. The Chair is sure many Senators are surprised, and the Chair also himself was surprised, after himself having indulged the practice for years of asking that the Journal be approved without reading, to find that the appropriate request should have been that the reading of the Journal be dispensed with, instead of a request that the Journal be approved.

Mr. DONNELL. I may say that while I am very greatly surprised at that observation by the Vice President and by the opinion of the Parliamentarian, to my mind that makes my position far stronger than I ever anticipated it was. It shows that there not only is no requirement of a motion to approve the Journal, but that on objection it would be declared improper, as the Vice President has stated, to move that the Journal be approved. That leads me to the conclusion that certainly a motion to change "and" to "but" could not be considered as a motion to approve the Journal, when, according to the instruction we have just so interestingly received from the Vice President, there is no such thing as requiring the approval of the Journal.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield for a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the ruling read by the Chair indicate that there is always an implied motion to approve the Journal, because if nothing is done the Journal stands approved. Therefore there is a motion, in effect, to approve the Journal.

Mr. DONNELL. I do not think that follows at all. I think the very fact, as indicated in the decision, that there may be motions made to amend or correct the Journal, plus the fact that the rule itself distinctly says that any mistake made in the entries shall be corrected, and so forth, indicates clearly that mistakes can be taken up one at a time, and the mere fact that the Senator from Michigan may move that mistake No. 1 be corrected does not mean there is a motion pending to approve the entire Journal as such.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire for a question.

Mr. TOBEY. May I ask the Senator from Missouri—and I, as do other Senators, pay tribute to his ability and understanding in connection with these legal points—if the Senator implies that as to the amendment signed by 52 Members of the Senate, from both sides of the aisle, the Senator from Missouri, in his wisdom, believes he has discovered a loop-hole which leaves it in a weak position, and he is offering an amendment to change it? What the Senator is deprecating is that the 52 Senators may have foreclosed themselves in their minds to the wisdom which has become manifest through the Senator from Missouri or some other colleague, and they, by agreement, have foreclosed themselves from being free agents to vote on the subject-matter as brought out by the Senator from Missouri. Is that correct?

Mr. DONNELL. That is correct. I will answer the Senator in full.

Mr. TOBEY. If my premise is correct, and it squares with the principle expounded by the Senator from Missouri, is it not a fact that however well intentioned the Senator from Nebraska and his colleagues may be in connection with the amendment signed by 52 Senators, the fact remains that their minds are foreclosed against any points which may be made apparent by distinguished Senators in this body, and the result is that the mountain has labored and brought forth a mouse. Is that correct?

Mr. DONNELL. Approximately a third of a mouse, I should say.

Mr. President, I should be obliged if the Senator from Michigan would give me his ear for a moment. I want to say, in response to the question asked by the Senator from Michigan, that I should like to give it further thought. Perhaps my answer may have been too quickly given. I have never seen the decision to which reference has been made, and I should not want to undertake to answer the question without a most careful study of it, to see if it was a carefully thought out decision or whether it was a momentary answer without a careful, detailed study. But even if it be true, as the Senator from Michigan has suggested, that there be such an implied motion, I take it that the wiser course is to put in this amendment. It certainly can do no harm, and anything it does do is for the good of closing the loophole.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield for a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. If that be true, would it not be better to put the amendment somewhere else than following the words "other matter"?

Mr. DONNELL. That is correct.

Mr. President, I should like to amend my amendment along the line which the Senator from Michigan has suggested, so it will read as follows:

> That on page 2, line 7, of the substitute proposed by Mr. WHERRY (for himself and other Senators) for Senate Resolution 15, to amend the so-called cloture rule of the Senate, after the word "motion" insert the following: "(and, for the purpose of this rule, a motion to approve the Journal shall be in order at any time as a privileged motion, and to which every motion, whenever it shall be or has been presented, relative to the Journal, shall be deemed an amendment)."

Mr. President, before yielding to any Senator, may I inquire if the Senator from New Hampshire has left the floor?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes; very promptly.

Mr. DONNELL. I take this opportunity, even in his absence, to say that I think he has put his finger on a point of tremendous importance, that by the action of the 52 Senators, no matter how well esteemed and highly regarded——

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. Not yet. By agreeing, morally, or in any other way, that they will not support an amendment without regard to its merits or demerits, without the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t", that they will vote for the Wherry substitute, I say they are making a bad mistake, unsound from the standpoint of public policy, and one which the people of the United States are entitled not to have them make, now or at any future time.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I should like to ask the able Senator from Missouri who informed him that the so-called 52 were under no obligation to vote for any perfecting amendment to the measure. As one of the signers, I wish to inform the able Senator from Missouri that at least one-fifty-second of the 52 Senators will vote in accordance with his belief.

Mr. DONNELL. I am very happy to know that. One-fifty-second is approximately 1.9 percent.

I do not want to violate any confidence, but I am wondering whether I might ask the distinguished Senator from Nebraska if he would be willing to inform the Senate at this time as to what was done with respect to joining in this proposition to propose his amendment, and what, if any, moral obligation either he or any other of the 52 Senators, so far as he knows, he feels has been accepted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has heretofore ruled that the Senator who has the floor cannot yield to another Senator to ask a question.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Missouri may, without relinquishing his rights to the floor, ask a question of the Senator from Nebraska.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, it was not an intentional breach on my part. I overlooked it.

Do I correctly understand that I have unanimous consent to ask the question of the Senator from Nebraska?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has consent.

Mr. WHERRY. I am speaking only for myself. I shall support the Wherry substitute as it is, because I think it entirely covers the point which the Senator has been attempting to make. I do not disagree with him. I suppose I could talk here until doomsday and the Senator from Missouri would still feel that it is necessary to spell out what he thinks should be spelled out in the amendment. If any other Senators feel it should be in the amendment, it is up to them to decide. That is their privilege. So far as I am personally concerned, as the one who has offered the substitute, and as coauthor of the resolution, I shall not vote for the Senator's amendment. I do not agree with the Senator as to its importance. I think it is a perfecting amendment. I do not believe any such case as he suggested in his suppositious case would occur. For example, the Senator says that an alert Senator would get on his feet immediately. When? It would have to be after the prayer. He might say that "141,000" in the Journal ought to be "140,000." The minute he says that he is not in order until the Journal is read, and he would not know what was in the Journal until it was read, therefore the Journal has to come before the Senate before it could even be corrected, and when a mistake is found in the Journal any amendment a Senator desires to offer takes the same procedure as an amendment to a bill or resolution on which cloture would be filed.

I am glad the Senator has taken out the definition of the word "matter" at the suggestion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. I think it would have been a mistake to have left that in, because it would have set up a definition in the amendment explaining the word "matter," and it would have been narrowed, and there would have been all kinds of controversy.

I wish to make it clear that I did not circulate this amendment. I cannot say what anyone said who did circulate it. But certainly I am going to vote for the Wherry substitute. It contains language which has been worked on for 2 years. I do not see why it is necessary to change it now on the argument made by the Senator from Missouri, but if any other Senator feels that it should be changed, that is for him to decide. But I am not going to vote for the amendment.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I will ask unanimous consent that I may ask the Senator a series of questions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. DONNELL. I should like to say to the Senator, first, that I do not think he has answered the question which I asked or intended to ask. I wanted to know what was the understanding and what was said to those who signed this amendment, the Wherry substitute.

Mr. WHERRY. I have already answered the question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. DONNELL. I should prefer to have the Senator from Nebraska, whose name the substitute bears, answer.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not circulate the amendment on this side, and the only ones who can answer that——

Mr. DONNELL. Who were they?

Mr. WHERRY. I am going to tell the Senator. The Senator from California circulated the amendment, and I think the Senator from Kansas, if I am not mistaken, did also. How can I say what they said when they circulated it?

Mr. DONNELL. May I ask the Senator—I understand unanimous consent has been granted——

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Missouri may ask me a question without losing the floor.

Mr. DONNELL. A series of questions.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not want a series of questions.

Mr. DONNELL. I wish to ask the Senator from Nebraska what was said to him and what he said when the amendment in the nature of a substitute for the Wherry-Hayden resolution was presented to him for signature.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it was my amendment; I am the first signer on it, and that is all there is to it. I am the first signer. I am going to vote for my amendment, and I hope other Senators will vote for it, and I hope every Member of the Senate will vote for it. I am serious about that. If I felt for one moment there was any loophole, I would agree with the Senator, but I do not think so. I cannot think of any majority leader who would be denied the right, as the majority leader, to be recognized without someone jumping up ahead of him and saying, "I say '140,000' should be '141,000,'" or "I believe 'and' ought to be changed to 'but.'"

If such suggestion were made, there would not be anything before the chair until the Journal was laid down, and

when it was laid down, the only question would be what the Journal contained. When the Journal came up for approval, such an amendment might be only one of a number of amendments; but the Journal would have to be read, its reading could not be dispensed with, and from there on it would take the same status as that of any piece of legislation under cloture. Every amendment would have to be offered, and when the cloture petition was voted, on those amendments would be given their time right along in order. That is all there is to it. It is just as simple as that.

Mr. DONNELL. I wish to ask some further questions of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I have to ask unanimous consent.

Mr. DONNELL. I have a series of questions.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not going to ask unanimous consent that the Senator may ask me a series of questions.

Mr. DONNELL. I shall ask one more.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Missouri may ask me one more question.

Mr. DONNELL. The question is——

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President——

Mr. DONNELL. I decline to yield at the moment. Does the Senator from Nebraska find himself under what he considers a moral obligation to vote for the Wherry amendment in the nature of a substitute; and, if so, why?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I find myself under a moral obligation to agree with myself to vote for my own amendment. [Laughter.]

Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. KNOWLAND addressed the Chair.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, may I have unanimous consent to ask the Senator from California, who has been on his feet for some time, a question, or does he desire to make a statement?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Before the Senator asks me a question—and I agree thoroughly with the able Senator from Georgia in regard to the situation—I should like to refer at this time to pages 2573 to 2577 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, March 16, at which time the able Senator from Missouri first raised the question, and a discussion took place, both on the part of the able chairman of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and other Senators who have participated in the adoption and the presentation of the rule by the Committee on Rules and Administration, and also by the able Senators who participated in the joint conferences which went on at the time this rule was under consideration, as well as a statement of the viewpoint of the junior Senator from California, as a member of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration during the Eightieth Congress and the Eighty-first Congress, to the effect that it is the clear legislative intent of all those who presented the Wherry-Hayden resolution in the first place from the committee that the word "matter" was all-inclusive; that it was the intent at the time it was discussed with the Parliamentarian that all loopholes would be closed so that cloture would lie not only against all motions to take up a bill, but so that rules III and VI, which are covered in the Wherry-Hayden original resolution and the pending substitute, would give an all-inclusive method by which the Senate of the United States would have control over its proceedings; and that if a cloture petition were filed on the question of the Journal, it would take all amendments with it. I merely wished to make that statement for the sake of the RECORD. Now I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. May I have unanimous consent to ask a few questions of the Senator from California?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. DONNELL. Did the Senator take around the proposed amendment for signature?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to say——

Mr. DONNELL. Will the Senator tell what happened?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I gathered 19 of the 22 signatures on this side of the aisle.

Mr. DONNELL. What was said, in substance, to the signers?

Mr. KNOWLAND. They signed no pledge; we merely took the substitute amendment around for their indication of support, but it was made perfectly clear that I certainly would not sign it unless I was prepared to support it, because of the very obvious situation, that the filibuster would not have ended had there been danger of a multitude of amendments coming in which would have changed the purport of what was necessary to be understood in order to get the resolution to a place where it could be acted upon by the Senate of the United States.

I wish to say to the able Senator that so far as those on this side of the aisle were concerned, they signed no pledge; but I would expect that all those who indicated their support of the substitute, knowing full well the legislative implications of what the situation was, would support the Wherry substitute in the form in which it now finds itself.

Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator that even if a pledge had been signed as such, which it was not, but even if a pledge had been signed, I would not have considered it improper by reason of the parliamentary situation in which this body found itself, because in 1917, when the Senate of the United States was faced with a similar situation in trying to adopt a cloture motion, which they thought at least was going to be effective, Members on the majority side of the aisle and Members on the minority side of the aisle, after a committee of conference had been appointed to work out the problem, themselves signed in effect what was a round robin indicating that they would support precisely the measure as agreed upon, without amendments, so that they could have, in the Senate of the United States, an opportunity to change the rules in the form of the present rule XXII.

Mr. DONNELL. I shall not and would not care to cross-examine the Senators upon the floor as in the case of a witness upon the witness stand, but I should like to get at the actual facts and views of Senators. I do not question the statement of the Senator. But I want to ask him a further question. As the Senator has surveyed the situation, does he consider that those who signed on the Republican side are under a moral or any other kind of obligation to vote in favor of the Wherry substitute without change?

Mr. KNOWLAND. It is my judgment that as coauthors of the substitute measure, and being mature men and a mature woman, and knowing the parliamentary situation with which the Senate is confronted, they would all support the substitute resolution as it is now before us. That is my statement on my own responsibility as a Senator of the United States.

Mr. DONNELL. May I respectfully say to the Senator that that was not the question I asked him? I now ask the question whether the Senator, from what he knows in circulating the substitute resolution, would consider that the gentlemen who signed and the lady who likewise signed the substitute resolution are under an obligation of a moral nature to vote in favor of the Wherry substitute without amendment? I should like to get the answer to that question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am not trying to evade the Senator's question on that subject.

Mr. DONNELL. Will the Senator please answer it?

Mr. KNOWLAND. But I have tried as nearly as I have been able to on this floor to say that no pledge was signed as a pledge.

Mr. DONNELL. I understood that.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senators who signed are coauthors of a substitute resolution. They all know the parliamentary situation facing the Senate. It was made clear to all of them—without any question of doubt in my own mind—that they should not become joint authors of the substitute unless they were willing to go through so that we could get an effective cloture rule, and I personally would be very much surprised if they did not support the substitute resolution in its present form.

Mr. DONNELL. I understand the Senator to mean by the term "go through" that he understood that the gentlemen and the lady who signed on the Republican side, after they had signed, were going to vote for the Wherry substitute, without amendment thereto. Is that correct?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; that is my general understanding.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. Yes; I yield to my good friend, the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. As one of those who was asked if he would sign the amendment, I want to state that I read the amendment carefully. I thought I understood what it meant. But it was clearly understood that the amendment would not be submitted unless there were at least enough signers to secure its adoption. Otherwise, the Senators from the South who were willing to sign it and to go through with it, would not have gone along. I ask the distinguished Senator from Missouri whether he would not have felt a moral obligation to fulfill that entire responsibility if he had signed it?

Mr. DONNELL. If the substance of the conversation was such that I should be under a moral obligation, I think I would feel that I was. But I may say that I thoroughly disagree with the advisability or soundness of public policy which places Senators under such a moral obligation.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I may say that I was not asked to make any commitment of any kind, but my own implication was that unless we had at least a majority of the Senators who would sign, there was no purpose in circulating the petition or amendment. I said to the distinguished Senator from California, "If my signature will make the necessary majority of Senators so that this will go through, I am glad to be a party to it. If we do not get the necessary number of signatures I do not want the substitute resolution submitted in my name." Therefore I feel there is definitely a moral obligation.

If the Senator from Missouri will permit, I think——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey cannot make a statement.

Mr. DONNELL. I may say to the Senator I am not asking him to say anything unless he wants to. I am perfectly willing however that he should. May I ask if I understood the Senator to say something to the effect that he understood, when the substitute amendment was presented to him, that it was not the purpose of submitting it unless there were enough Senators who would sign it so as to assure its adoption as it was written? Is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I should like to say to the Senator from Missouri that my preference from the beginning was the Wherry-Hayden resolution. But I realized that the filibuster had brought about such a situation that it would not be possible to adopt it. We were left in the position either of having the filibuster continue and of holding up what I thought was vital legislation, including the ECA authorization, in which I was much interested, or, of accepting the decision of the majority leader and have an adjournment and give up the whole step toward amendment of the cloture rule. Therefore there was an option up to me. When it was suggested that as reasonable individuals we should sit down and stop this long night bickering, in which we were getting nowhere, and see if we could not find a way of agreement, which seemed to be the statesmanlike thing to do, I gave up my preference for the Hayden-Wherry resolution and said, "If this other adjustment can be brought about and we can secure enough signatures to assure the adoption of the measure, I will sign." I think it was the proper thing to do.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to ask the Senator from New Jersey a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to get along with the debate.

Mr. DONNELL. I take it there is objection. I withdraw the request.

I have presented this matter. If there are any other questions I pause for them.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. DONNELL. I do.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am sure we understand the extremely conscientious approach of the Senator from Missouri; but does he not understand the dilemma with which the rest of us found ourselves faced the other day, after 10 days of debate, with the Senator from Missouri absent, when we called a conference to try to determine what to do? There was extended debate, not only during the 10 preceding days on the floor of the Senate but in the conference, where we were without the benefit of the views of the Senator from Missouri, and we tried as earnestly and honestly as we could to reach a solution. Will the Senator not at least bear with us in the thought that we, at any rate, were trying to do our best?

Mr. DONNELL. I have in substance already answered the same question that was presented by the same Senator. I can fully appreciate the dilemma. I fully appreciate what I regard as a very great mistake if there was any feeling on the part of the Senators as to the circulation of this petition.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. Not yet, Mr. President. If there was any feeling, justified by the presentation of this document, the substitute amendment, on the part of the signers that there was a moral or other obligation to fight for that measure without change, I say it was bad public policy and a mistake.

The Senator has referred to my not being present. I appreciate the compliment. I certainly would have added little, if anything, to the wisdom of the gathering.

I want to say, so the RECORD will show that it was not by reason of negligence on my part that I was absent—I hope it was not negligence on my part—that I was absent by leave of the Senate from 4 o'clock on last Monday afternoon until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday. The purpose of my being absent—I say this with some fear that someone might think it might be tooting my own horn, so to speak—was that I had an engagement to speak on the Town Hall on the Air program in Boston, Mass., on the subject of the adoption of the administration's labor bill. I may say that the speakers were of a character that I think will show that the program was dignified. The Secretary of Labor, Mr. Tobin, and Mr. Gerhard P. Van Arkel, former counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, took the affirmative, and Mr. Fred Hartley, coauthor of the Taft-Hartley bill, and myself, were on the other side. I was there in attendance in Boston to fulfill that engagement. I do not think I have any apologies to offer to the Senate for my absence, because leave was asked and secured by me, and during part of the time my friend the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] was involved in the making of a rather extensive address.

I now yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. The able Senator from Missouri understands, does he not, that the action taken in the circulation of this petition was not action resulting from any determination by the conference itself?

Mr. DONNELL. My answer to that is that I have been so informed, and I have no doubt that it is correct.

I observe also that while I was absent for a moment the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], who made the same statement earlier, stated that he would not support the amendment. I have been told by one of my good friends on this side that although in spirit he is with me, he does not intend to support this amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to ask the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] a question as to who it was who circulated the petition on the Democratic side.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the Senator from Missouri asking that question of the Senator from California?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. DONNELL. If objection is made, I withdraw the request.

Mr. President, I shall not take more of the time of the Senate. I greatly appreciate the courtesy of Senators. If any other Senator has a question to ask, I shall be glad to try to answer it.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield for a question.

Mr. LANGER. I invite the Senator's attention to page 2627 of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, the bottom paragraph in the second column, where the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] said:

> I join heartily in all the Senator from Missouri has said except the conclusion which he has reached. He has made more eloquently than I have the arguments which I have used against cloture in any form on any bill since I have been a Member of the Senate.

I take it that the Senator from Missouri is just as much interested in protecting the minority as he is in seeing that cloture exists.

Mr. DONNELL. Yes. I believe that the interest of every Member of the Senate should be protected; but may I say to the Senator that, as I pointed out in the discussion with the Senator from Georgia—and I can turn in a moment to the place in the colloquy—I was not arguing the question of cloture in my presentation, and I am not arguing it now. I am not stating my position on that question at this moment. That is not the subject now. My vote will indicate my position with respect to this amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield for a question.

Mr. LANGER. I ask the Senator this direct question: Is he or is he not in favor of gag rule?

Mr. DONNELL. Of course, the term "gag rule" has a somewhat obnoxious significance. I am not inclined to say that I am in favor of anyone being gagged; but I can see very well the advisability of cloture under some circumstances. While I am holding my

mind open as best I can until we vote upon amendments to the resolution itself, I may say that I have had a strong inclination to vote for cloture of some type. I have no hesitancy in stating that while I do not believe in undue restrictions, and while I should certainly not favor the granting of cloture upon a mere majority of 51 percent of Senators present, I think there is much merit in the argument that under some circumstances cloture should be employed.

I may add—perhaps I am going a little further than I should—that while I propose as best I can to hold my mind open until I cast my vote, nevertheless, if I were required at this moment to vote I should vote for cloture of a certain kind. I would have to go into the details of it. I am willing to do so if it is desired that I should. I shall vote upon the Wherry substitute, and my action will indicate my then view as to its contents.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. DONNELL. Let me say before yielding that I am not saying that if my amendment shall not be adopted it necessarily follows that I shall vote against the Wherry amendment, although I think the Wherry substitute is badly defective, and may prove to be fatally defective. However, it may be better to vote for it because it is what is before us, than not to do so.

I now yield to the Senator from North Dakota for a question.

Mr. LANGER. I invite the attention of the distinguished Senator to the debate at the place which I indicated. I call attention to the fact that at that time I brought to the attention of the Senate the statement of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] that in all his experience he had never seen a minority treated as the minority had been treated by the majority in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. DONNELL. I was present at the time and know what transpired.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will have to rule that that is not a question.

Mr. LANGER. I did not have an opportunity to finish it.

Mr. DONNELL. I yielded only for a question. I ask the Senator to ask me a question, and not do anything else.

Mr. LANGER. Carrying it a step further, I invite attention to the statement of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] on page 2627 of the daily RECORD——

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, does the Chair consider this a question or not?

Mr. LANGER. I have not finished it.

I invite the attention of the Senator to the statement of the Senator from Georgia, in which he said that under certain conditions——

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I do not want to lose the floor by impliedly consenting to something other than a question. I am perfectly willing to answer any question I can answer.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I shall seek the floor in my own right at the conclusion of the address of the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I assume there are no further questions. I pause for a moment.

If there are no further questions, I earnestly submit that if the Wherry substitute is to be made the best measure possible and be relieved from the possibility of being fatally defective, the amendment which I offer should be adopted.

Mr. President, I wish to submit a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DONNELL. Although the Baldwin amendment is the pending question, may I ask unanimous consent, either now or after further debate on my amendment, if that is desired, that my amendment be considered the pending question, and that a vote be had upon it?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That can be done only by unanimous consent. The Baldwin amendment is the pending amendment. Does the Senator make that request now?

Mr. DONNELL. Yes, Mr. President; I make the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, as the Chair has already stated, the Baldwin amendment is the pending question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Baldwin amendment is the pending question.

Mr. WHERRY. If the request of the Senator from Missouri is granted, would the Baldwin amendment be temporarily displaced, and the amendment of the Senator from Missouri be voted upon?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator restate the question?

Mr. WHERRY. As I understand, if the request of the Senator from Missouri is granted, the Baldwin amendment would be temporarily held in abeyance, and the amendment of the Senator from Missouri would be voted upon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If unanimous consent is given to vote on the amendment of the Senator from Missouri, notwithstanding the priority of the other amendment, the position of the other amendment would not be affected.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I assume that I shall have the right to ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

The absence of a quorum being suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ellender	Johnson, Colo.
Anderson	Ferguson	Johnson, Tex.
Baldwin	Flanders	Johnston, S. C.
Brewster	Frear	Kefauver
Bricker	George	Kem
Bridges	Gillette	Kerr
Butler	Green	Kilgore
Byrd	Gurney	Knowland
Cain	Hayden	Langer
Capehart	Hendrickson	Lodge
Chapman	Hickenlooper	Long
Connally	Hill	Lucas
Cordon	Hoey	McCarran
Donnell	Holland	McCarthy
Douglas	Humphrey	McFarland
Downey	Hunt	McGrath
Eastland	Ives	McKellar
Ecton	Jenner	McMahon
Magnuson	Reed	Thomas, Utah
Malone	Robertson	Thye
Martin	Russell	Tobey
Maybank	Saltonstall	Tydings
Miller	Schoeppel	Vandenberg
Millikin	Smith, Maine	Watkins
Morse	Smith, N. J.	Wherry
Mundt	Sparkman	Wiley
Myers	Stennis	Williams
Neely	Taft	Withers
Pepper	Taylor	Young

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Let the Chair ascertain whether objection was made to the request of the Senator from Missouri that his amendment be voted on first.

Is there objection? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays can be ordered at any time before the vote is taken.

During the delivery of Mr. DONNELL's speech,

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I will yield if the Senator insists. I should like to present my argument entirely because I think it would be much more clearly understood if I could make it without interruption.

Mr. FERGUSON. If the Senator will yield to me, I shall ask unanimous consent that this interruption may be placed at the end of the Senator's speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield for the purpose of the question.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the word "motion," the last word in line 7 on page 2 of the Wherry substitute, as the Senator has indicated, mean a motion to amend the Journal?

Mr. DONNELL. I think it does.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then would it not be well to modify that word "motion" rather than to qualify the words "matter pending," for by so doing the Senator might exclude other matters from the words "matter pending"?

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator for his suggestion. I do not at the moment think it advisable to adopt the suggestion, but I shall certainly give it consideration as we proceed, and I have made a note so that my attention will be called to it. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the interruption in the Senator's speech may be placed at the end thereof, so as not to disturb its continuity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator and appreciate his thought upon this matter.

After the conclusion of Mr. DONNELL's speech,

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I propose to delay the Senate only a few minutes, but I cannot refrain from making a few comments, in light of the debate which has occurred since the amendment has been offered to the so-called Wherry substitute.

Any Senator who believes that the Senate should have a majority cloture rule will no doubt vote in opposition to the Wherry substitute. That is a perfectly reasonable position to take, although I do not join in that position. Of course, the issue is between those who favor a majority cloture rule and those who favor a two-thirds cloture rule.

I wish to review briefly the position of some of us who consider the adoption of a constructive rule on this matter to be of the first importance, and who wish to move along as rapidly as possible with the business of the Senate, because of the imminence of April 1. Of course I have in mind the Economic Cooperation Administration bill, because I am a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, and I realize that we must promptly provide that authorization, and then have the Appropriations Committee act on it, if we are to continue in that important field. I mention that bill to illustrate the urgency of prompt action in the matter now before us.

Mr. President, as I considered the situation we were facing, before the Wherry substitute was presented, it seemed to me that the filibuster could well continue for 3 or 4 weeks. When the recent ruling of the Vice President—a ruling which I supported, because I hoped we could approach a settlement of this matter by that route—was overridden by the Senate, with the result that it was definite that we had no effective cloture rule and no effective way to stop the filibuster, it seemed to me to be of vital importance that the Senate take some constructive step leading to effective cloture if we were to proceed with the Nation's business in the way I think the country wanted us to.

The only alternative then was one which I had been advised had been suggested by the majority leader, namely, that the Senate take an adjournment, and thus put aside this entire matter. Mr. President, in the 4 years I have served in the Senate, I have consistently tried not only to have cloture invoked when necessary, but also to do everything in my power to have the Senate amend the present cloture rule so as to eliminate the loopholes in it. So it seemed to me that adjournment at that time would have been a bad step, a step backwards.

Then I asked myself what would be the reasonable thing to do under the circumstances. I plead guilty to then talking to some of my friends on the Democratic side, who were engaged in the filibuster; and I asked them the question, "Is there not some reasonable way by which Senators who differ on this question can compose their differences and reach a conclusion in this situation, rather than to make the Senate a spectacle before the country by having Senators engage in a physical contest to see which Senators can talk the longest?" It seemed to me imperative that we reach some reasonable conclusion in this situation.

Let me say briefly that when I faced that problem and when it seemed possible for us to get together as reasonable persons and arrive at an effective amendment to the present cloture rule, it seemed to me that was the proper and reasonable thing to do.

I am shocked by the implication which has been made by some of my friends on this side of the aisle, including my good friend the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], to whom I am devoted, that there was some kind of a deal between the GOP and the Dixiecrats, and that a new party was being formed, and that the deal would go further than what he then mentioned. I wish to say that, so far as I am concerned, there was no deal, no discussion of a deal, and no purpose to have a deal, but only a purpose to have the Senate transact the Nation's business and a purpose to try to find some way to improve the present cloture rule, inasmuch as practically all of us know it is impossible to obtain cloture under the present rule or to get majority cloture in the Senate this year.

So I have tried to do what I could to have the Senate take action on the civil-rights legislation. I believe in it; I think it is a pressing issue before the country. I believe we must solve the problem we confront in that connection, and I think we can solve it.

Mr. President, I am not at all afraid of the requirement, under the Wherry substitute, for 64 votes in order to obtain cloture. I think there is no way at all to tell that cloture cannot be obtained under the Wherry substitute; in fact, I think cloture can be obtained under it, if sufficient action is taken far enough ahead of time.

As I had said, I favored the Hayden-Wherry resolution when it was first reported from the committee, and I felt that we should have adopted it in the first place.

But now that that is impossible, rather than to have no effective cloture rule at all, it seemed to me perfectly proper to sign the petition. Having signed the petition, I say to my friend the Senator from Missouri that I do feel morally bound to support the Wherry substitute without amendment, because of the position given up by other Senators in order to permit the substitute to go through.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I had intended to make a 10-hour speech tonight; but a few hours ago I had some hot consomme in the Senate Restaurant, and it burned my tongue. Therefore I can speak for only about 5 minutes. I recommend the hot consomme to some of my colleagues. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I rise tonight simply to state that I shall try to form in the Senate of the United States—and I believe that 90 percent or more of the Members of the Senate will join it—an organization of Senators who never do any talking because they never have an opportunity to talk. I am going to recommend that we who never do any talking and who never have an opportunity to talk form some sort of organization, because, frankly and honestly, we are being discriminated against. The people of Indiana are getting worried about at least one of their Senators, in that they have not heard a word from him on the floor of the Senate now for 2 or 3 weeks. The reason is that I simply cannot get the floor.

I was amused a moment ago when someone said the rules called for a reading of the Journal—or perhaps it was the RECORD—the first thing after the Senate meets following an adjournment on the previous day. Imagine the United States Senate having to sit here, let us say, all day tomorrow and listen again to that which they have listened to today. In that event, Senators would never get any work done. Evidently, when our forefathers adopted such a rule Senators were not so long-winded as they are now.

Mr. President, I am serious about this matter. I represent the quiet Senators, of whom I am one. Frankly I do not know how we are ever going to be reelected. I do not know how we are ever going to get our message back to the folks at home, because we never get a chance to talk.

For example, I observed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday something which I think happens almost every day, but I shall speak about yesterday's RECORD, because it is before me.

I find, according to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, when no filibuster was under way, that two Senators, the able Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the able Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] spoke at considerable length. The able Senator from Oregon used up about 10 pages of the approximately 59 pages of the RECORD of yesterday, the able Senator from Minnesota used up about 8½ pages, their total being about 18 pages, or about 30 percent of the RECORD. There are 96 Senators. Therefore each Senator would be entitled to less than 1 percent of the time or of the RECORD.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I decline to yield at the moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana declines to yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am very serious about protecting the quiet Senators—those who sit and think. [Laughter.] But I find that on yesterday two most able Senators consumed in the RECORD about 30 percent of the time, or about 30 percent of the RECORD. There are 96 Senators, so the proper allocation would be about 1 percent to each Senator. But here are two Senators that consume almost 30 percent of the time.

I have further observed—and I have my staff working on the RECORD—that those who are the most strongly opposed to filibuster and most ardently opposed to a long debate are the ones who talk the most. I find particularly one of my able colleagues who yesterday took great delight, of course, in berating the Republican Party. I find—and I am going to have the RECORD before long; it takes considerable effort to figure up how much time some Senators consume—that to a large extent the same Senators who are

against unlimited debate, the same Senators who always are against letting the other fellow talk, are the ones who repeatedly, constantly, and continuously talk on the floor of the Senate at almost every session.

I do not know what we who like to think and not to talk are going to do. It is unfair, Mr. President. We are being discriminated against. Unfortunately, we are not a minority, because there are many more of us than there are of those who do the talking. My observation in a little over 4 years in the Senate is that less than 2 or 3 percent of the Senators do 90 percent of the talking. How are we going to protect the Senator who likes to sit and work and think, who likes to get his job done? To me, he is like the millions and millions of other Americans who toil at their tasks every day, who mind their own business, who work and work and work, who think, and who contribute most to the progress of America.

Where I was born, in Indiana, we always had a lot of talkers. They were always talking on every subject; it did not make any difference what the subject was. We used to refer to them as fellows who were windy, fellows who wanted to talk and talk and talk. [Laughter.] How are we going to handle that problem, Mr. President? How are we, who do not want to talk, who want to get some action, to be protected?

Suppose each of the 96 Senators should decide that he would like to talk an hour each day. Or suppose each of the 96 Senators should decide he would like to talk an hour on each subject. That would take 96 hours. If we worked approximately 10 hours a day, that would take 10 days on each bill. Perhaps we quiet fellows who want to see legislation passed and do not consider ourselves as expert on every subject, who do not know everything there is to know—perhaps we quiet fellows are perfectly willing to have the fellow who knows everything about everything do the talking. It does not make any difference what the subject is; he knows it all; and he jumps to his feet and talks and talks and talks, and takes the time of the Senate.

I am serious about this matter. [Laughter.] Very serious about it. I believe the American people should be serious about it. I do not believe the American people have thought this thing through, because if they had, and if they were to read the RECORD and figure the space used by some of their own Senators, and would multiply that by 96, they would come to one conclusion, and that is that it is simply impossible to do anything in the United States Senate except to talk.

Now, if all of the nontalkers, those who like to think and work and get things done, would like to join me in forming an organization, I shall be very happy to meet with them when we adjourn or recess tonight, whichever we are going to do.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] to the so-called Wherry amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thoroughly enjoyed the remarks of the Senator from Indiana. I have tried to discover many times, when I have been talking on the floor, what a certain kind of grinding noise was that I sometimes heard. I have concluded after listening to his speech tonight it must be the Senator from Indiana in his thought processes, interrupting me while I talked. I want to say that I think his speeches are usually as meritorious as the one I just listened to. The Senator expressed one thing, however, in his speech about which I also am very much concerned. The Senator said there was some little concern about how he was going to get reelected in Indiana. I have that concern, too. I am sure I cannot give him any assurance of his reelection on the basis of his voting record, at least to date, in the Senate.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am not one of those who have entered to any extent into the discussions of this issue.

A great American philosopher said, "Never explain. Your friends do not need it, your enemies will not believe you any way." So I am not going at this time to explain again the position I have taken on the question now pending before the Senate. Neither shall I make any extended remarks. I am reminded of two homely bits of American wisdom. It is current property in our thinking in America. One statement is, that no conversions are made after the first 15 minutes.

I do not think any Senator will be converted or affected by anything I have to say. I think we have had some remarkable enlightenment in the Senate. I am grateful to Senators on both sides of the aisle for what I think has been an illuminating debate. I am grateful that we have not violated the rules of the Senate more than we have.

Mr. President, I pause for a moment to call attention to a rule which I think is very important, if we are to carry on business in the Senate:

> No Senator in debate shall, directly or indirectly, by any form of words, impute to another Senator or to other Senators any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator.

I rest on that, Mr. President, because we are only at the beginning of a Congress whose consequences I think will be as far-reaching, perhaps, as any in our history.

I mentioned one bit of wisdom. I bring to the Senate's attention an incident, which contains some more wisdom. I think it was Mark Twain who said that on one occasion he went to hear a missionary make an address. After the missionary had talked most dynamically for 15 minutes or so, regarding the condition of the heathen, Mark Twain reached into his pocket and took out a $20 bill with the intention of putting it on the collection plate. But the missionary continued talking and talked for another half hour. Mark Twain then put his $20 back into his pocket and took out a $10 bill. The missionary talked for another half hour. Mark Twain put the $10 bill back into his pocket and took out a $1 bill. The missionary continued speaking. Then Mark Twain put the $1 bill back into his pocket, and when the plate was passed he took a dollar off the plate.

I am reminded also of a historical fact. As I stepped into the elevator last evening one of the newer Members of the Senate was commenting on the tremendous flow of the American language that he had heard in the Senate. He commented on how the words gushed forth without impediment and how the sentences and periods flowed out in great volume. Just then my mind went back to the historic fact that Thomas Jefferson was not able to make a speech without using a manuscript. On one occasion, when he attempted to speak before the University of Virginia, he broke down. But, Mr. President, Thomas Jefferson was a thinker. He so used the written word that what he wrote sang the spirit of freemen, free people, and great principles. What is more, Mr. President, he lived to a ripe old age. He could not make a speech, but he could think. Every time he spoke he read from a manuscript. His was not fluidity of expression; his was a mind with judgment, with cogent ideas, a mind that could reason, think, and look through the mist of the present into the problems of tomorrow. So, Mr. President, the thought I would leave in connection with this last incident is that it is not the long peroration, it is not the extended sentences, the multitude of paragraphs or pages printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that really count. It is wisdom, sane judgment, and the vision of the people's representatives here, registered by their votes, arrived at after consideration and judgment.

Mr. President, camouflage is found not only in animals, in nature, or in the work of man by the use of the paint brush. It is found in the utilization of words, in the confusion of thought, in the statement of false conclusions. I personally feel that there is a great responsibility upon every man who stands as the representative of a great commonwealth to guard his words and to see, when he comes to a conclusion, that his conclusion is based on facts. All the oratory and all the words uttered here cannot camouflage the fact, Mr. President, that the Senators from the South have acted squarely, fairly, and have given up something that is vital to them. That is the right to filibuster on a motion to take up a bill, and the right to filibuster on a motion to approve the Journal.

If the Wherry substitute is agreed to, let the country know, let the people know, that we, as reasonable men, have arrived at a conclusion, after due consideration and have not been swayed by partisan political considerations but by the larger interest—the welfare of the Nation. Let the people know that we feel—the 52 of us—and at least 10 more who have said they would vote for the substitute—that we have reasoned our way through to this conclusion.

I shall not go into the history of this debate. It has been covered very clearly and factually by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and other Senators. Anyone

who wants to read the truth will find it, but if he attempts to read all that has been said he will have to wade through a mist of political camouflage and cloudy statements.

What are the actual facts? We start out, Mr. President, with no rule that will give us cloture. That is the situation. History has demonstrated that. The Wherry-Hayden resolution was offered. I stated on the floor of the Senate that I would vote for it, but, Mr. President, there are 96 Members of the Senate, men with different religious, economic, social, political, racial, and, what is more, geographic backgrounds. They look from different mental perspectives. Thank God they do. We are not all in one mental channel, where men think alike and feel alike. If we were, we would have a Cromwell or a Hitler or a Mussolini to take charge. Consequently, Mr. Chairman, when the original resolution could not be taken up, we had to find the way by using judgment and reason and give and take. It is a question of mind getting into action to see the way.

I heard it stated on the floor of the Senate that majority rule applies in the courts. Mr. President, under the common law of England a person must be judged by his peers, and all the peers must agree. It is only in modern times, since the law has been modified in some States, that there can be a verdict of 10 out of a jury of 12. I do not think that argument is very relevant. At least 62 Members of this august body have come to the conclusion that this is no time to place absolute power in the hands of a majority.

Mr. President, we have arrived at a conclusion—an honest conclusion—that the substitute is the way out of this impasse. We criticize no one who differs with us. Every newspaperman, however, knows that much of the talk has been political camouflage. The people know it is camouflage. They have been fooled time and time again. Lincoln said, "You can fool all the people a part of the time, but you cannot fool all the people all the time."

Mr. President, we are about to make a decision—arrived at by reasonable men thinking through a problem which involves the very safety of the Nation—and those who would criticize Senators from the South may thank God in our tomorrow that we have not gone all the way so that one section can impose upon another section its versions of life, economics, and politics.

Mr. President, in my State we have no poll-tax requirement; we have a fair employment statute. I suggest that some of us who have wanted to travel around the world might well take a vacation, charter a train, travel through all the sections of this country, meet the common people, hear what they say, and get their reaction—get their heartfelt views on vital issues. We will find considerable wisdom in the grass roots.

If the complexion of the Senate were changed so that it would be like the House, tomorrow there would be thrown into the lap of this country a proposal to take over the insurance companies, with 80,000,000 policyholders and $50,000,000,000 of assets. There would be those who think the Government should take them over, and take over other institutions, such as the banks. That is all in the wind in the nations of the earth. But, Mr. President, we do not want to do it quickly or suddenly or without contemplation and thought. I do not want to do it at all.

Mr. President, this is an ominous time, and we should not criticize our brethren who see things differently, who live under different conditions. Let us reason together, as the Good Book says. I have been told it was quoted today, so I do not think I am violating the rules of the Senate. Let us reason together about our problems and that is just what we have done in this matter. But I said I was not going into the history of this debate.

A great President once said—and the Democrats know whom I mean—that the only thing we have to fear is fear itself, and if our friends of the New Deal were not fearing that they would be plagued with not having fulfilled all their pledges, they would never have put on this campaign of camouflage. But they made those pledges. They actually seduced group after group with them, without argument or consideration of the facts.

What do we hear today? Do we hear the Taft-Hartley Act argued? No, when the Taft-Hartley Act is mentioned we hear "Slave labor." But when one sends out questionnaires and asks individuals as to the particular provisions of the act, they return approving replies. It is similar to the use of the term "liberal." The word "liberal" has been prostituted by men who said they were liberals, and would turn back the pages of history to put into effect old, obsolete customs and laws. Would we apply the term "liberal" to centralized government in the hands of a group, as in the case of England?

England has no checks and balances, she has no court that can say that a law is unconstitutional. She has no executive with executive power; he is a figurehead. But England is different from us. England has not had an infusion into her bloodstream since the days of the Norman conqueror. But we are a composite of all the bloodstreams of Europe. We need checks and balances lest we go too far to the left or too far to the right.

The situation is very plain. The majority leader, under the present rule, has been faced with the alternative of insisting that our southern friends should go on with the filibuster and he with his friends should seek to break it, or that he should concede victory to the South. The evidence is conclusive that the majority leader felt that for the time being he would have to concede victory to the South.

What then happened? When that situation became apparent, some of us in the Senate came to the conclusion that a stalemate is not what we want or what the country is entitled to—a stalemate, accomplishing nothing after 2 or 3 weeks. We felt that the rule of America was the rule of progress. So after a number of conferences—and I was not in on any of them—between the representatives of the Republicans, members of the filibuster group, and members of the New Deal or Fair Deal group, a substitute was arrived at. But the substitute would have had no chance for a hearing before this body—get this, now, it would have had no chance for a hearing, unless the signing of the petition by 52 Senators had been brought about. Mind you, 52 signers constituted a majority of the Senate. That is what gentlemen have been arguing for. A majority have said we want this rule, and there will be 64 before we are through. Fifty-two men on both sides of the aisle signed this petition, which is in accordance with what was done a number of years ago.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield for a question.

Mr. TOBEY. Fifty-one men and one lady.

Mr. WILEY. I accept the correction with an apology. And what a lady she is. I am very happy to have the correction. But I am sure the lady is the equal of any one of the 51 men.

Fifty-one men and one woman, 52 Senators, signed this petition, and I have heard others say, "I will vote for it."

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. WILEY. Let me conclude, and then I shall be glad to yield.

Let us ask ourselves this simple question: Why was this petition signed? First, it would do away with the possibility of a filibuster on a motion to take up a bill. Second, it would do away with a filibuster on a motion to approve the Journal. Third, it would provide for all time a definition of "two-thirds."

Mr. President, let me say—without violating the rule of the American philosopher who said, "Don't explain; your friends don't need it, your enemies won't believe you anyway"—that in my humble opinion 60 and more Senators believe they are doing a constructive thing if they approve this substitute resolution.

Mr. President, as one of its sponsors, the original Wherry-Hayden resolution, I was willing to abide by, but we were unable to secure action upon it. What we did succeed in obtaining was a vast improvement over the rule as it now is.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Did I understand the Senator to say that the 52-Senator coalition, being a majority of the Senate, was simply applying the majority rule principle which some of us advocate?

Mr. WILEY. No, Mr. President; I did not use the word "coalition."

Mr. PEPPER. Shall I say "combination," or would the Senator from Wisconsin suggest some other term? I simply referred to the number "52."

Mr. WILEY. That is better.

Mr. PEPPER. That is what I intended, although coalitions have often been good as well as bad.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator from Florida should know.

Mr. PEPPER. That will depend upon what history says about it.

Mr. WILEY. No, Mr. President; it will not depend upon what history says about it. It will depend upon what the fact is, and no camouflage that may be attempted to cover it will, I am sure, disguise the fact.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Is it not a question as to how what is done by this combination works out that will determine whether its action turns out to be good or bad? Do the 52 Senators who are changing the rule, amending the rule, leave it within the power of 52 Senators in the future to change the rule, should they be disposed to do so, or leave it within the power of two-thirds of the Senate to change the rule in the future if they should be disposed to do so?

Mr. WILEY. That, Mr. President, is a double-barreled question. The Senator from Florida knows very well what the intent of the substitute is. I say to him that the South has given up a tremendous thing when it gave up what it did. What the Senators from the South have done here and now is to my mind one of the finest omens of a better tomorrow. They have said to the Senate and to the people of the United States, "We will give up something we think is vital. By the action we have taken, it will not be possible for us hereafter to filibuster on a motion to take up a bill or on a motion to correct the Journal." I think that is a tremendous concession. At the same time, Mr. President, I can understand their position. They have faith in America; they have faith in the people; and faith that we will not be stampeded by mere words such as "civil rights" or by the word "liberalism." They have faith that before we pass any measure which is camouflaged by those terms, we will strip off the camouflage to see whether there is something hidden beneath it that is liberal or is not liberal. They believe we will look into the measure and see what its real purpose is.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] to the substitute offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] for himself and other Senators. The clerk will state the amendment to the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 7, of the substitute proposed by Mr. WHERRY (for himself and other Senators) for Senate Resolution 15, amending the so-called cloture rule of the Senate, after the word "motion," it is proposed to insert the following "(and, for the purpose of this rule, a motion to approve the Journal shall be in order at any time as a privileged motion and to it every motion, whenever it shall be or have been presented, relative to the Journal shall be deemed an amendment)."

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TAYLOR (when his name was called). Mr. President, on this question I have a pair with the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who is absent on public business. If he were present he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote I should vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], both of whom are absent on public business, would vote "nay," if present.

I announce further that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would vote "nay," if present.

The result was announced—yeas 14, nays 72, as follows:

YEAS—14

Aiken	Kefauver	McGrath
Bridges	Kem	Morse
Donnell	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Green	Langer	Tobey
Ives	Lodge	

NAYS—72

Anderson	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Baldwin	Hill	Mundt
Brewster	Hoey	Myers
Bricker	Holland	Neely
Butler	Humphrey	Pepper
Byrd	Hunt	Reed
Cain	Jenner	Robertson
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Downey	Long	Sparkman
Eastland	Lucas	Stennis
Ecton	McCarran	Taft
Ellender	McCarthy	Thye
Ferguson	McFarland	Tydings
Flanders	McKellar	Vandenberg
Frear	McMahon	Watkins
George	Magnuson	Wherry
Gillette	Malone	Wiley
Gurney	Martin	Williams
Hayden	Maybank	Withers
Hendrickson	Miller	Young

NOT VOTING—9

Chavez	Murray	Taylor
Fulbright	O'Conor	Thomas, Okla.
McClellan	O'Mahoney	Wagner

So, Mr. DONNELL's amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. WHERRY and other Senators was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and other Senators. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 20, of the amendment proposed by Mr. WHERRY (for himself and other Senators) as a substitute, after the word "sworn", it is proposed to insert the following: "in the case of any motion, resolution, or proposal to change any of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and in all other cases by a two-thirds vote of those voting."

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MYERS. After the vote on this amendment, may I offer a perfecting amendment to the substitute for Senate Resolution 15?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Other amendments will be in order after this one is disposed of.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, just a very brief word of explanation on this amendment.

I join with the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] in submitting the amendment. The effect of it is this: Under the so-called Wherry substitute a constitutional two-thirds is required on cloture with respect to a change in the rules as well as on cloture in connection with a bill or resolution which does not concern a change in the rules. This amendment would change the constitutional two-thirds requirement on matters not involving a change in the rules. In other words, on any matter in which a change in the rules is not concerned, only two-thirds of those voting would be required, instead of the requirement in the Wherry compromise of two-thirds of the Senators duly chosen and sworn.

Mr. President, as one who filed a cloture resolution in 1946, and again in 1947, and who joined with others in filing such a resolution in 1949, let me say that those resolutions ultimately led to the Hayden-Wherry resolution. I believe that we should make a change in the rule. I believe that we should make cloture more effective. It is the feeling of the junior Senator from Connecticut and myself that this simple amendment to the Wherry compromise would make cloture more effective, more workable, and more practicable on the many matters which come before the Senate with respect to which it may be desired to invoke cloture.

Changes in the rules come very seldom. It seems to us that the constitutional requirement is satisfactory in that respect, but in the case of bills which may come before the Senate from year to year, with respect to which we may want to invoke cloture, we believe that a two-thirds vote of Senators present and voting is preferable. I hope the amendment to the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wish to say just one word. I rise to support this amendment, because it is the identical amendment upon which a great number of Democrats from the North and West could have settled this controversy and were willing to do so. I shall support the amendment, and sincerely hope that other Senators who were with me in the various Democratic conferences will go along with it.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I cannot support this amendment. If the Wherry substitute had not been offered, we would not have an opportunity to vote on this amendment tonight. I think that is clear, and I hope the Senate will react in the same way.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut

[Mr. BALDWIN] to the so-called Wherry substitute.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TAYLOR (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] who is absent on public business. If he were present and voting, he would note "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] has requested me to announce his position on this vote. He is paired with the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] who is necessarily absent. I understand that if the Senator from Arkansas were present, he would vote "nay." I further understand that if the Senator from Montana were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] is absent because of a death in his family.

On this vote the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] who are absent on public business are paired. If present and voting the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 57, as follows:

YEAS—29

Aiken	Humphrey	McMahon
Anderson	Hunt	Magnuson
Baldwin	Ives	Morse
Donnell	Kefauver	Myers
Douglas	Kilgore	Neely
Downey	Langer	Pepper
Ferguson	Lodge	Saltonstall
Flanders	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Gillette	McCarthy	Tobey
Green	McGrath	

NAYS—57

Brewster	Hill	Mundt
Bricker	Hoey	Reed
Bridges	Holland	Robertson
Butler	Jenner	Russell
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Chapman	Kem	Sparkman
Connally	Kerr	Stennis
Cordon	Knowland	Taft
Eastland	Long	Thye
Ecton	McCarran	Tydings
Ellender	McFarland	Vandenberg
Frear	McKellar	Watkins
George	Malone	Wherry
Gurney	Martin	Wiley
Hayden	Maybank	Williams
Hendrickson	Miller	Withers
Hickenlooper	Millikin	Young

NOT VOTING—9

Chavez	Murray	Taylor
Fulbright	O'Conor	Thomas, Okla.
McClellan	O'Mahoney	Wagner

So, Mr. BALDWIN's amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by Mr. WHERRY for himself and other Senators, was rejected.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, to the so-called Wherry substitute I offer and send to the desk an amendment which would provide for a constitutional majority.

Before a vote is had on the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, I wish to say that it occurs to me that many of us in this Chamber are wearing green today, and yet I do not believe I have heard the name of St. Patrick mentioned here today.

Probably the greatest affront the United States has made or ever will make to the memory of the great St Patrick, in whose honor and memory so many of us are adorned here this evening, arises from the fact that this long fight is to be brought to an end on St. Patrick's Day of 1949. That we of Irish ancestry should be compelled to give up this battle today is rather paradoxical. I am sure that the spirit of St. Patrick must be somewhat disturbed, not because the fight has ended, but because the end result has been surrender and defeat for some of those who have championed the cause of human rights and also the cause of civil rights.

But, Mr. President, defeat in this instance is not to be condemned, for although the Irish were defeated many times in their fight for freedom over the centuries, they never surrendered, they never gave up. They may have retreated, but it was only a tactical retreat in order that they might fight again another day; and they did fight another day, Mr. President; and finally they won their freedom.

But what annoys me and what worries me is that it will take us some time to reach a vote on the issue of civil rights, although not so long as it took the sons of the Emerald Isle to win their freedom over the long centuries.

Mr. President, I regret that many of us were delayed this evening, so that we could not participate in the St. Patrick's celebrations which are being held in our own States and throughout the country. I had to cancel a long-standing engagement to speak before the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, in my native city of Philadelphia—the oldest such society in the United States. In fact, Mr. President, I was to give the toast, and was to address myself to the subject The United States of America, at the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick dinner in Philadelphia.

So I ask unanimous consent that the remarks which I had intended to make this evening at that dinner may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am happy to have this opportunity to meet with you tonight—not because I intend to make a political speech—but because, like many of you, I too am a Philadelphian and an Irish-American.

In all frankness, however, I do intend to talk about politics tonight. Not about the kind of two-party politics we here in America know so well, but about a one-party kind of politics we are learning painfully much about—and which none of us holds in very high regard.

I am sure all of you know what one-party system I have in mind.

Communism has thrived in an atmosphere of confusion, of bitterness, of poverty, and of hatred. Frequently, that atmosphere has been created deliberately by Communists who knew full well their greatest opportunities for success lay in the use of tactics designed to stir up strife.

It is not surprising that communism has spread in Europe since VE-day. Europe was spent and broken by 6 years of war. Hunger, poverty, and confusion lay heavy on the land. It was thus that communism had won its foothold in a Russia which had been beaten and impoverished in a war against Germany almost 30 years earlier. Once more the soil of Europe was ripe for effective Communist agitation, for the generation of class hatred, and for the destruction of men whose convictions opposed the spread of Communist oppression.

Americans of every creed and ancestry have been shocked by Communist tactics. Russia and the Communists have declared war on religion. I scarcely need recall to any of you the infamous conviction of Cardinal Mindszenty, the incessant attacks leveled at religion in every country behind the iron curtain. And I do not have to particularize to call to your mind the swallowing up by Russia of the governments of eastern Europe and the Communist-inspired uprisings which from time to time have tried to paralyze France and Italy.

It is my personal belief that the iron curtain of today represents the high-water mark of communism's rise in Europe. I believe the tide of communism will recede from that shore line. And I believe we have discovered how to stop Russia and the Communists dead in their tracks.

Russia and communism can be stopped and are being stopped this day and this hour by a frontal attack on the very conditions upon which communism depends for its life blood. We have referred to this attack by a number of names. We knew it first as the Marshall plan, in the name of its great sponsor who first announced it to the world less than 2 years ago. We have also known this attack as the European recovery program, and as the European Cooperation Act. But these names all refer to the same attack and to the same fundamental philosophy.

Communism has absolutely nothing to offer anyone who is secure in his home, secure in his mind, and secure in his heart. And, simply stated, the philosophy of our attack is to achieve that kind of security.

Alone, the Marshall plan cannot achieve that security, nor, by the same token, can that security be attained without carrying through the Marshall plan. Our attack is being planned and must be directed along a broad front. Fighting on that front must be the North Atlantic Pact, the European recovery program, the continuing and heartening development of a United Nations Organization, and a secure economy here in the United States and in the areas of the world where we intend to stop communism.

The European recovery program occupies a central position on that front, and I should like to review briefly just a bit of quite recent history. Secretary George Marshall, speaking before the graduating class at Harvard University on June 5, 1947, announced the plan. That was less than 2 years ago. From that instant, speed and success have characterized the program. The nations of western Europe were quick to respond. The Soviet Union refused to play any part in the program, and was successful in blocking the efforts of eastern European countries when they sought to participate. Within 6 weeks after Secretary Marshall's announcement, the

western nations had formed a voluntary Committee for European Cooperation. This committee of cooperating nations performed yeomen's service in the months that followed. The committee drew up a master plan of what Europe would require in order to achieve economic recovery by 1952.

This was not a plan for relief or dole. It was much deeper. It was direct, and it was constructive. The planning developed along the lines of integrating the economy of Europe, of stabilizing currencies, of making best use of the total resources, of stimulating trade, and upping production.

While the nations of western Europe were working out their part of the plan, top figures in American industry, labor, and government were bringing together the plans which culminated in the passage by Congress of the Foreign Assistance Act on April 3, 1948. That act was the basis of American participation in the recovery program. The European Cooperation Administration was quickly formed thereafter, with the top position going into the capable hands of Paul G. Hoffman. At the same time, the cooperating European countries formalized their temporary committee—and it became known as the Organization for European Economic Cooperation.

Once the European Recovery Act had been passed, action really got started. The first boatload of goods actually left Galveston, Tex., for France just 12 days after the act had passed. That was less than 1 year ago.

Travelers long familiar with Europe who have recently returned to this country can scarcely believe what they have seen. Western Europe is making an amazing come-back. They tell us what has been accomplished by the $3,000,000,000 worth of goods which we have shipped during this first year. Production in Europe was substantially greater in 1948 than in 1947. Great strides have been made in stabilizing finances, and in stimulating trade. Most important of all, however, is the new spirit emerging in the people of western Europe. There is a new energy, a new self-confidence, and a new willingness to cooperate among themselves and with the world. These are the surest guaranty we have that the European countries will achieve economic security by 1952. And they are sure signs that we are moving toward a free world, and a world to which Communism can offer nothing.

I have no intention at this time to recite for you the endless statistics which prove that Europe is on the road to self-sufficiency. But one figure in particular has caught my attention as I have gone through the reports on European progress: Gross investments in European business proceeded at the rapid rate of $30,000,000,000 in this fiscal year. This is more than six times the amount provided in the same period by the American contribution under the recovery program. The meaning of this figure is significant. It does not mean that western Europe has already recovered economically. And it does not mean that the Marshall plan can be discontinued this year or before 1952. But it does signify that western Europe has a new confidence, and a proven ability to make a major contribution to its own recovery with the continued support of America during the period set out for the operation of the recovery program.

I realize there are still among us those who denounce the Marshall plan. Many of these are people who see clearly the menace of communism. Yet they say we are throwing good American dollars down a rat hole, that we are depriving America of goods and resources. There is a compelling answer to those who hold this belief. What these people fail to see is this: Mere military might, or mere isolation, is not a sufficient answer to communism. Communism has proven that it can breed underground where people are hungry, bitter, and frightened. Where want and fear exist, security cannot be maintained at gun point.

The European recovery program does not impose an excessive drain on the American economy. The amount we spend for this is only about 2 percent of our national income. This is a good investment in America's future prosperity. If Europe were to collapse, the largest foreign market for our goods would be lost. But if we help Europe get back on its feet, we will greatly increase our overseas market. By making a small sacrifice today, we assure ourselves of great benefits in the future.

I have recounted this history of the Marshall plan because of its importance in our concerted program to bring peace, freedom, and security to a troubled world.

Tomorrow the details of the North Atlantic Pact will be announced, and this will come before the Senate shortly. This pact is designed to bring about a companion security—security from fear of military aggression. It visualizes a strength and a unity which will stand as an immovable buttress against any Russian schemes for world domination. The pact does not contemplate the abrogation of the Constitution, as some of its critics have argued. It does not operate to declare war in the stead of Congress. What this pact will do is fortify us—and the nations of western Europe—in our unbending determination to assure the kind of world in which all men are free, and secure in their beliefs, their homes, and in their physical well-being. This pact tells Russia that we—and those who sign it with us—do not intend to have the kind of world which the Communists want.

The Marshall plan, the Atlantic Pact, a strong military, and a healthy economy are our front-line elements in the cold war. And we are going to win the cold war—as a cold war and not as a shooting war.

We are going to win because we are attacking communism at its heart. We are attacking affirmatively and constructively, all along the line. We are going to end the poverty, the uncertainty, the confusion, and the bitterness on which communism thrives. We are going to put an end to Communist efforts to create those conditions by force and violence, by intimidation and terror, by intrigue and brute strength. We are going to show the world by example that our way of life, our way of freedom, is the only way.

The Russian Government today does not dare tell the Russian people the truth about America. It does not dare tell its people of the great progress already made by the people west of the "iron curtain"—progress made without resort to a one-party political system—progress, without stamping out freedom—progress, without attacking religion.

Russia and the satellites she occupies today by force cannot continue to live in a vacuum. The truth can penetrate their shield of censorship. That is one of the many virtues of the truth. The Communists have accused us at times of distorting the truth. At least it is the truth we distort.

The ultimate truth which underlies our cause and our strategy in the cold war is also our ultimate weapon. It is not a secret weapon. It is the weapon which will bring freedom to all men. It is the weapon which avoids a shooting war, which assures our victory in the cold war, and which will create a world where all men may live in dignity and peace.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I conclude the toast to the United States of America: May she ever prosper; may St. Patrick's Day of 1950 find all of us in America firmly united in the cause of freedom—political freedom and economic freedom—for all our people, regardless of race, color, or creed; may we have this day a year hence, Mr. President, a more united America, an America which may eventually bring to all our people and to other peoples all over the earth contentment and happiness and peace; and may some future St. Patrick's Day at long last enable us to say truly that we have achieved peace on earth and good will among men.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania to the so-called Wherry amendment in the nature of a substitute will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the so-called Wherry amendment in the nature of a substitute for Senate Resolution 15, it is proposed, on page 2, in line 20, to strike out the word "two-thirds" and to insert in lieu thereof the words "a majority"; and on page 3 it is proposed to strike out lines 16 to 24 inclusive, being section 2.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania desire to have the two parts of his amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute considered en bloc?

Mr. MYERS. Yes; I do.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that will be done.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senate is tired and I am tired; but I feel in duty bound to make a brief statement here, before the record of this debate is closed.

In the welter of the political charges and recriminations which have been made here, many extravagant statements have been made—statements calculated to cause confusion in the minds of the American people as to the effect of the amendment we propose.

Mr. President, the majority leader had made a statement which was calculated to leave in the minds of the American people the impression that the program that is euphemistically called the "civil-rights program" was forever dead, by virtue of the adoption of this amendment to the rule. The same thing has been stated in numerous editorials.

Mr. President, I would that I could believe that statement. This would indeed be a day of complete and perfect rejoicing for me if I could. But I shall not delude myself, Mr. President; neither shall I attempt to deceive the people of the South, who are most affected by that program. In reaching the agreement that is found in the proposed substitute, Mr. President, those of us who believe in free, indeed, in unlimited debate in the Senate of the United States, have made some concessions of great consequence. We have conceded the right of unlimited debate on a motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill. We have yielded the right to use the Journal, when the Senate stands in adjournment, as a means of delaying a vote on a bill, in the meantime using the limited facilities at our command to convince the country of the righteousness of our cause. There can be no question that the proposed substitute tightens the rule of cloture in this body, and I do not desire to be placed in the position of trying to convince those whom I seek to represent here to the contrary. I refuse to claim the hollow victory

that was conceded in advance by those who are really seeking majority cloture. The majority cloture advocates sought to becloud the issue and delay or prevent the compromise, in the hope they could attain their end.

The adoption of this rule does mean complete defeat for those who would create a condition which could permit 25 Senators to gag and silence their colleagues.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am tired and prefer not to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question only?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I will yield for one question. I have never refused to yield to any Senator, but tonight I am tired, and I hope the Senator will be brief.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator omitted executive sessions, both closed and open, as being included within the rule. Is it the understanding of the Senator that all matters in executive session are included in the rule?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there can be no question about that. When the executive calendar is called, when the name of a person nominated is called, it becomes the unfinished business of the Senate in executive session, and this rule applies to executive sessions on matters other than nominations as well.

Mr. President, as I was saying, we did make considerable concessions. Oh, it was not a complete, an abject surrender, such as the forces of the administration demanded of us. We did retain some rights and advantages. We obtained one great substantial advantage in that we wrote into the measure, if it be adopted by this body, that the rules of the Senate hereafter are not subject to cloture on a motion to proceed to the consideration of a change in the standing rules.

Mr. President, in this day of shift and change and pressure, it is well to know that in that one important respect we are protected from an arbitrary ruling of one who might be the Presiding Officer. We are safe from the danger that some Presiding Officer might be capricious in changing rules long settled by precedent or from being gagged by a mere majority in the Senate. It will be impossible for any Presiding Officer to impair the rules as could be done at present by overruling when the point of order raised against cloture on the motion to proceed to the consideration of the rules. Any motion to proceed to a change in the rules is now clearly subject to unlimited debate. That is something we have saved. But the Senate gains in that matter, as much as any section or as much as those opposed to any bill, because it permits Senators who have the courage to do so to protect the parliamentary integrity of this body from assaults that will come in the days that lie ahead.

I do not attach as much importance as some of those who wish to have majority cloture and were not able to secure it, to the increase from the straight two-thirds to the two-thirds of the Senators chosen and sworn. I hope it will be of benefit in the future, but I am not deluding myself with the hope that it will mean anything like eight votes on any future cloture votes. It may mean one or two votes, but no more than that.

Mr. President, we were faced here with a situation where the rules of the Senate established by precedent were under constant attack. We were faced with the condition in this country when many people, people of good will, were being deceived by the attacks that were being made upon this body, and the parliamentary practices which have obtained here since the foundation of the Republic. I cannot but believe that all those who seek sudden and violent changes in our form of government, indeed those who seek change for the sake of mere change, were feeding that sentiment and building up the idea in this country that it was necessary to do something immediately to reform the rules of the Senate.

Senators are not impervious to political pressure. That pressure would have made itself manifest here. The rule of the Senate was only sustained by five votes, on the vote that occurred last Friday night. On another such occasion if three men had bent their knee to that pressure when another cloture petition was presented, it would have meant that the rules of this body could have been changed at any time at the demand of a partisan majority relentlessly set on forcing its will upon the remaining Members of this body. That was a victory in a sense, but it was as much a victory for the Senate, indeed it was as much a victory for the country, for the future rights and liberties of all our people, as it was to those of us from the South.

Mr. President, this rule will not be as sure to impose cloture as some of its proponents say, but it lacks much of being as defective as is claimed by those who are seeking to impose majority cloture upon the Senate. I hope, Mr. President, in the years that lie ahead this rule will stand men of courage in good stead when the assaults that I can see in the future are made upon the rules of this body. There will be demands that the Senate yield immediately to a mere majority temporarily holding the advantage, without adequate consideration of the rights of the minority and without opportunity for them to present their case to the people of the country and get a fair decision based on facts. I hope that in the years that lie ahead it will serve as a weapon to defend the Senate of the United States, defend its distinctive characteristics, and permit it in turn to be that bulwark of rights and liberties that it has been down through all the years.

Mr. President, I do not claim the victory that has been attributed to us. I do say we have salvaged as much out of this situation as we possibly could, in view of the fact that there were only some 21 of us to oppose the entire remaining membership of the Senate who were bent on changing the rule in one form or another. As I stated when I came out of the last conference on this matter, we yielded as much as men of honor could, and perhaps more than men of prudence should. Only the future can determine the full effect of this rule in actual operation. But I do not think—I know it is not as weak as claimed, and I hope it may not be as readily used as an instrument of oppression, as has been indicated by some of those who have supported it here in this body.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] to the so-called Wherry amendment.

Mr. MORSE and other Senators demanded the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, this is the constitutional majority amendment, and I shall oppose it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RUSSELL (when Mr. MCCLELLAN's name was called). I desire to announce the pair of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]. If the Senator from Montana were present and voting he would vote "yea." If the Senator from Arkansas were present and voting he would vote "nay."

Mr. TAYLOR (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who is absent on public business. If he were present and voting the Senator from Arkansas would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on public business. I understand that if present and voting they would both vote "nay" on the pending amendment.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] is absent because of a death in his family.

I announce further that the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "yea," if present.

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 69, as follows:

YEAS—17

Douglas	Langer	Morse
Downey	Lucas	Myers
Green	McCarthy	Neely
Humphrey	McGrath	Pepper
Ives	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Kilgore	Magnuson	

NAYS—69

Aiken	Byrd	Eastland
Anderson	Cain	Ecton
Baldwin	Capehart	Ellender
Brewster	Chapman	Ferguson
Bricker	Connally	Flanders
Bridges	Cordon	Frear
Butler	Donnell	George
Gillette	Knowland	Schoeppel
Gurney	Lodge	Smith, Maine
Hayden	Long	Smith, N. J.
Hendrickson	McCarran	Sparkman
Hickenlooper	McFarland	Stennis
Hill	McKellar	Taft
Hoey	Malone	Thye
Holland	Martin	Tobey
Hunt	Maybank	Tydings
Jenner	Miller	Vandenberg
Johnson, Colo.	Millikin	Watkins
Johnson, Tex.	Mundt	Wherry
Johnston, S. C.	Reed	Wiley
Kefauver	Robertson	Williams
Kem	Russell	Withers
Kerr	Saltonstall	Young

NOT VOTING—9

Chavez	Murray	Taylor
Fulbright	O'Conor	Thomas, Okla.
McClellan	O'Mahoney	Wagner

So, Mr. MYERS' amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. WHERRY for himself and other Senators was rejected.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I desire to make an announcement at this time with respect to the program for tomorrow. When the Senate adjourns or takes a recess tonight, we will return at noon tomorrow, when it is hoped that we may go through the morning hour, and then take up the calendar. After the calendar has been called for the consideration of noncontroversial measures, we will take up the rent-control bill, make it the unfinished business, and then adjourn until next Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to the so-called Wherry amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The amendment was to strike out all after the resolving clause and to insert:

That subsection 2 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, relating to cloture, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"If at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

"'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a majority vote of those voting, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same; except that any Senator may yield to any other Senator all or any part of the aggregate period of time which he is entitled to speak; and the Senator to whom he so yields may speak for the time so yielded in addition to any period of time which he is entitled to speak in his own right. It shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. On what amendment are we about to vote?

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the Morse substitute for the Wherry substitute.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it is a simple majority amendment, and I shall oppose it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TAYLOR (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] who is absent on public business. If he were present and voting he would vote "nay." Inasmuch as I intend to vote the same way, I am at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are both absent on public business. If present and voting they would both vote "nay".

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] is absent because of a death in his family.

The result was announced—yeas 7, nays 80, as follows:

YEAS—7

Humphrey	Magnuson	Thomas, Utah
Kilgore	Morse	
Langer	Neely	

NAYS—80

Aiken	Hendrickson	Miller
Anderson	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Baldwin	Hill	Mundt
Brewster	Hoey	Myers
Bricker	Holland	Pepper
Bridges	Hunt	Reed
Butler	Ives	Robertson
Byrd	Jenner	Russell
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Connally	Kefauver	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Kem	Sparkman
Donnell	Kerr	Stennis
Douglas	Knowland	Taft
Downey	Lodge	Taylor
Eastland	Long	Thye
Ecton	Lucas	Tobey
Ellender	McCarran	Tydings
Ferguson	McCarthy	Vandenberg
Flanders	McFarland	Watkins
Frear	McGrath	Wherry
George	McKellar	Wiley
Gillette	McMahon	Williams
Green	Malone	Withers
Gurney	Martin	Young
Hayden	Maybank	

NOT VOTING—8

Chavez	Murray	Thomas, Okla.
Fulbright	O'Conor	Wagner
McClellan	O'Mahoney	

So, Mr. MORSE'S amendment in the nature of a substitute for the so-called Wherry amendment was rejected.

Mr. MCMAHON. Mr. President, some days ago I prepared an amendment in the nature of a substitute. In view of the votes which have already been taken I see no use at this hour in pressing the amendment, and I therefore shall not present it for a vote, but I commend it to our sons and our grandsons, for while I think the idea contained in the amendment is good, in my opinion, it will take that long, under the rule the Senate will finally adopt tonight, to consider an amendment like this on its merits.

I ask that the amendment be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment was, to strike out all after the resolving clause and to insert:

That (a) subsection 2 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, relating to cloture, be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"2. If at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate pursuant to this subsection, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

"'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a two-thirds vote of those voting, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer shall be decided without debate."

(b) Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, relating to cloture, be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"3. If at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate pursuant to this subsection, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the eighth

calendar day thereafter (exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays) he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without further debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

"'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"During the period intervening between the statement of the motion to bring debate to a close and the taking of the vote thereon, the time for general debate on such motion shall be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents thereof, and shall be controlled by one Senator designated by the Presiding Officer to control such time for the proponents and one Senator designated by the Presiding Officer to control such time for the opponents. Time available to, but not used by, either side shall be yielded to the other side.

"If the question so submitted on the motion to bring debate to a close shall be decided in the affirmative by a majority of all Members of the Senate, including Members who are not present or who do not vote, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] for himself and other Senators, in the nature of a substitute for Senate Resolution 15.

Mr. WHERRY and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RUSSELL (when Mr. MCCLELLAN's name was called). Repeating the announcement I have heretofore made respecting the pair of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], I wish to announce that if the Senator from Arkansas were present he would vote "yea" and if the Senator from Montana were present he would vote "nay."

Mr. TAYLOR (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who is absent on public business. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I again wish to announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who are absent on public business, are paired on this vote. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

I announce also that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] is absent because of a death in his family.

I announce further that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 63, nays 23, as follows:

YEAS—63

Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Brewster	Hill	Mundt
Bricker	Hoey	Reed
Bridges	Holland	Robertson
Butler	Hunt	Russell
Byrd	Jenner	Saltonstall
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Connally	Kefauver	Sparkman
Cordon	Kem	Stennis
Donnell	Kerr	Taft
Eastland	Knowland	Thye
Ecton	Long	Tydings
Ellender	McCarran	Vandenberg
Flanders	McCarthy	Watkins
Frear	McFarland	Wherry
George	McKellar	Wiley
Gurney	Martin	Williams
Hayden	Maybank	Withers
Hendrickson	Miller	Young

NAYS—23

Aiken	Ives	Malone
Anderson	Kilgore	Morse
Douglas	Langer	Myers
Downey	Lodge	Neely
Ferguson	Lucas	Pepper
Gillette	McGrath	Thomas, Utah
Green	McMahon	Tobey
Humphrey	Magnuson	

NOT VOTING—9

Chavez	Murray	Taylor
Fulbright	O'Conor	Thomas, Okla.
McClellan	O'Mahoney	Wagner

So the amendment, in the nature of a substitute for Senate Resolution 15, proposed by Mr. WHERRY for himself and other Senators was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to Senate Resolution 15, as amended by the substitute.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

RENT CONTROL

Mr. LUCAS obtained the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. As I understood the majority leader, the rent-control bill, reported earlier tonight, will be on the calendar tomorrow and will be taken up on Monday?

Mr. LUCAS. It will be taken up tomorrow and made the unfinished business for the Monday following.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the session of the Senate tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate the remainder of the week because of illness in my family.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STUDY OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION PRICING POLICIES

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I desire to announce, for the information of the Senate, that pursuant to section 2 of Senate Resolution 76, which was agreed to on February 28, 1949, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has transmitted to the Committee on the Judiciary an interim report (S. Doc. No. 27) on the bill (S. 236) to clarify and formulate a consistent and coordinated national policy with respect to transportation costs in interstate commerce; to strengthen the antitrust laws of the United States and to provide for their more effective enforcement; and to promote competition by permitting sellers to have access to distant markets; and on the bill (S. 1008) to provide a 2-year moratorium with respect to the application of certain antitrust laws to individual, good-faith delivered price systems and freight-absorption practices.

The report was printed as a Senate document, under the terms of Senate Resolution 76. I ask unanimous consent that Senate Resolution 76 may be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 236) to clarify and formulate a consistent and coordinated national policy with respect to transportation costs in interstate commerce; to strengthen the antitrust laws of the United States and to provide for their more effective enforcement; and to promote competition by permitting sellers to have access to distant markets, and the bill (S. 1008) to provide a 2-year moratorium with respect to the application of certain antitrust laws to individual, good-faith delivered price systems and freight-absorption practices, and that said bills be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SEC. 2. That there shall be transmitted to the Committee on the Judiciary an interim report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on said bills and the same shall be printed as a Senate document.

SEC. 3. It is understood the Committee on the Judiciary will give such prompt attention to the bills as will permit early consideration of the subject matter by the Senate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of James Grover McDonald, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Israel.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Edward R. Dudley, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Liberia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations to the United States Advisory Commission on Information.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Hon. Alexander M. Campbell, of Indiana, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of James Boyd, of Colorado, to be Director of the Bureau of Mines, terminating recess appointment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have been asked to request, on behalf of the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], who is not present, that that nomination go over. He wants to make a statement concerning the nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nomination will be passed over.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Hon. J. Frank McLaughlin, of Hawaii, to be United States district judge for the district of Hawaii.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Edward A. Towse, of Hawaii, to be second judge of the first circuit, Territory of Hawaii.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of United States attorneys.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Virgil B. Stanley, of Oklahoma, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Oklahoma.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Without objection, the President will be notified in all cases.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LUCAS. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 11 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 18, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 17 (legislative day of February 21), 1949:

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army of the United States:

Maj. William George Easton, O20656, United States Army.

Maj. Tom Bryson Hembree, O29789, United States Army.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 510 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion.

To be colonels

Stephen Wilson Ackerman, O15708.
Thomas Harrison Allen, O15865.
James Grafton Anding, O15677.
Charles Francis Baish, O9309.
×Russell Andrew Baker, O15745.
George Huston Bare, O12957.
Raymond Clay Barlow, O12379.
Oliver Malcolm Barton, O15724.
Clarence William Bennett, O15618.
Logan Carroll Berry, O15752.
William Harry Bertsch, Jr., O15759.
Raymond Thomas Beurket, O15543.
Bruce Woodward Bidwell, O15552.
Leonard Lawrence Bingham, O15534.
Wendell Blanchard, O15528.
George Louis Boyle, O14862.
Perry William Brown, O15649.
Harold Albert Buck, O39502.
Walter Allen Buck, O15665.
×Vonna Fernleigh Burger, O15667.
George Raymond Burgess, O12311.
Henry Coates Burgess, O15778.
×Joseph Rogers Burrill, O15680.
George William Busbey, O15639.
Frank Faron Carpenter, Jr., O15870.
Edward Amedee Chassl, O15791.
Clarence Clemens Clendenen, O12725.
James William Clyburn, O15762.
Samuel Glenn Conley, O15707.
Victor Allen Conrad, O15546.
Raymond Hendley Coombs, O15561.
Paul Cooper, O15749.
William Leo Coughlin, O15776.
Malin Craig, Jr., O15908.
George Dakin Crosby, O15512.
Daniel Bernard Cullinane, O6061.
Emerson Leroy Cummings, O15500.
Charles Dwelle Daniel, O15668.
Clarence Keith Darling, O15645.
Francis Marion Day, O15614.
Reginald Langworthy Dean, O15507.
Kenneth Negley Decker, O15789.
Oswaldo de la Rosa, O15774.
Lawrence Russell Dewey, O15575.
Wolcott Kent Dudley, O15799.
Augustine Davis Dugan, O15610.
George Emmert Elliott, O15858.
Eugene Barber Ely, O15565.
David Griffith Erskine, O15766.
William John Eyerly, O15628.
Edward Hern Farr, O39501.
Samuel Henry Fisher, O15835.
Ovid Thomason Forman, O15590.
Louis Chadwick Friedersdorff, O15732.
Andrew Allison Frierson, O15587.
Bjarne Furuholmen, O15725.
Harold Phineas Gard, O15585.
Philip Robison Garges, O15509.
×Gerald Goodwin Gibbs, O15637.
Francis Edwin Gillette, O15693.
Ralph Irvin Glasgow, O15576.
Victor Zalamea Gomez, O14876.
John Boyden Goodell, O28771.
Sanford Joseph Goodman, O15635.
Lynell Frank Gordon, O28769.
Francis John Graling, O15826.
Rupert Davidson Graves, O15794.
Peter Conover Hains 3d, O15657.
Sarratt Thaddeus Hames, O15845.
Adna Chaffee Hamilton, O12469.
Stephen Smith Hamilton, O15934.
Donald Quitman Harris, O15007.
Paul Americus Harris, O14624.
Edwin Henry Harrison, O15573.
Martin Frank Hass, O15889.
Wallace Howard Hastings, O15498.
Daniel Francis Healy, Jr., O15742.
Frederic Allison Henney, O15531.
Donald Charles Hill, O15504.
John Gillespie Hill, O15797.
John Ismert Hincke, O15539.
Walker Wesley Holler, O15905.
James Frederick Howell, Jr., O15625.
Daniel Harrison Hundley, O15662.
Cary Brown Hutchinson, O15644.
Wynot Rush Irish, O11227.
Emerson Charles Itschner, O15516.
×Washington Mackey Ives, Jr., O15696.
Thomas Allen Jennings, O15793.
Howard Jehu John, O15802.
Leonard Marion Johnson, O15921.
Harold Dean Jones, O28772.
William Henry Kendall, O15714.
Howard Ker, O15518.
Howard Everett Kessinger, O15692.
Francis Elmer Kidwell, O15563.
Cary Judson King, Jr., O15574.
Edward Arthur Kjelnman, O15003.
Ralph Arthur Koch, O15830.
Stephen Stanley Koszewski, O15654.
James Barry Kraft, O15800.
Charles Raeburne Landon, O15592.
Philip Stueler Lauben, O39500.
Ernest Orrin Lee, O15817.
Amel Thomas Leonard, O15550.
Willard Koehler Liebel, O15722.
Russell Layton Mabie, O15626.
William Henry Maglin, O15812.
Howard Alexander Malin, O15821.
Darwin Denison Martin, O15678.
Murry John Martin, O28775.
Earl Mattice, O15602.
Robert Joseph McBride, O15756.
John Alfred McComsey, O15687.
Glenn Bruce McConnell, O15556.
Otis McCormick, O15527.
Thomas George McCulloch, O15727.
James Edward McGraw, O15672.
Donald McGrayne, O28762.
Harry Dillon McHugh, O15758.
Winfield Rose McKay, O8450.
Robert Douglas McLeod, Jr., O15901.
Charles George Meehan, O15545.
Claron Wager Meldrum, O41365.
Ernest August Merkle, O15597.
Benjamin Schultz Mesick, O15505.
George Alvin Millener, O15740.
Virgil Rasmuss Miller, O15647.
Richard Tonkin Mitchell, O15833.
Dennis Milton Moore, O15836.
Zachery Winfield Moores, O15647.

David Albert Morris, O14666.
Allen Milton Murphy, O28764.
Hobart Amory Murphy, O15811.
Humbert Orazio Nelli, O38586.
Daniel Peter Norman, O15467.
George Wesley Palmer, O15593.
Emil Pasolli, Jr., O28777.
Emil John Peterson, O15523.
Paul Albert Pickhardt, O15772.
Nunez Christian Pilet, O15931.
Richard Givens Prather, O15698.
Carl William Albert Raguse, O15598.
Arthur Cecil Ramsey, O15497.
John Wesley Ramsey, Jr., O15824.
Joris Bliss Rasbach, O15918.
William Joseph Reardon, O15631.
Augustus Jerome Regnier, O15720.
John Held Riepe, O15515.
Thomas Du Val Roberts, O15529.
Raymond Rodney Robins, O15866.
Gordon Byrom Rogers, O15620.
Clarence Everett Rothgeb, O15612.
Chester Archibald Rowland, O15924.
Charles Harold Royce, O15769.
Wellington Alexander Samouce, O15562.
Peter Sather, Jr., O15867.
William Herbert Schaefer, O15616.
Jean Dorbant Scott, O15885.
Charles Edward Shepherd, O15904.
Joseph Peter Shumate, O15537.
Peter Wesley Shunk, O15622.
Cleland Charles Sibley, O15671.
Leslie Earl Simon, O15567.
Douglas Byron Smith, O15699.
John Clair Smith, O15656.
Mark Edward Smith, Jr., O15796.
Samuel Wayne Smithers, O15829.
Lewis Stone Sorley, Jr., O12483.
Merrow Egerton Sorley, O15508.
Charles Rexford Stark, O28773.
Albert Kellogg Stebbins, Jr., O15695.
Richard Warburton Stephens, O15569.
Vernum Charles Stevens, O15526.
Marcus Butler Stokes, Jr., O15613.
Kenneth Crawford Strother, O15738.
Albert Newton Stubblebine, Jr., O15768.
Charles Pelot Summerall, Jr., O15726.
Henry Ignatius Szymanski, O28754.
Fremont Swift Tandy, O15521.
Harry Jordan Theis, O15549.
Frank Jay Thompson, O15609.
Jesse Thomas Traywick, Jr., O15818.
Frank Glover Trew, O15711.
William Samuel Triplet, O15815.
Frank Anthony Valente, O28768.
Charles Ward Van Way, Jr., O15757.
Harry Van Wyk, O15655.
George Walter Vaughn, O15747.
Herbert Davis Vogel, O15520.
Vern Walbridge, O15915.
Everett Chalmers Wallace, O15525.
Jesse Bernard Wells, O15580.
Lucien Francis Wells, Jr., O15832.
James Stewart Willis, O15607.
Ovid Oscar Wilson, O15887.
George Spence Wise, O38589.
Charles Edward Woodruff, Jr., O15283.
George Edmund Wrockloff, Jr., O15781.
George Edmund Young, O15659.

To be colonels, Judge Advocate General's Corps

George Wiltz Gardes, O28840.
John Amos Hall, O16173.
George William Hickman, Jr., O16420.
John Wilson Huyssoon, O16088.
Irvin Schindler, O16305.

To be colonels, Medical Corps

Arnold Archibald Albright, O18273.
Samuel Howard Alexander, O17830.
×Ellis McFerrin Altfather, O17816.
Kincheon Hubert Bailey, O15489.
Charles Lewis Baird, O16299.
Rollin LeRoy Bauchspies, O17819.
Daniel John Berry, O17806.
Herbert Theodore Berwald, O17831.
Robert Eugene Bitner, O17371.
John Frederick Bohlender, O17814.
Aubrey LeVerne Bradford, O17817.
×Clyde Lemuel Brothers, O17824.
Victor Allen Byrnes, O18303.
Walter Atwater Carlson, O18266.
Thomas William Ellsworth Christmas, O16955.
Harold Eastman Coder, O18302.
Samuel Leonard Cooke, O18301.
Henry William Daine, O17804.
Elbert DeCoursey, O17813.
Robert Reeve Estill, O17836.
James Hedges Forsee, O18265.
James Donley Gardner, O18280.
×Leon Lloyd Gardner, O16016.
Robert Cabaniss Gaskill, O18275.
William Smith George, O18304.
Howland Allan Gibson, O15496.
Paul Crump Gilliland, O17430.
Hugh Richmond Gilmore, Jr., O16555.
Carlton Duncan Goodiel, O16951.
Alexander Otis Haff, O18260.
Clarence Woodson Hardy, O17835.
Gilles Edward Horrocks, O17428.
George Horsfall, O17827.
John Alexander Isherwood, O18297.
Milford T. Kubin, O18278.
Dwight Moody Kuhns, O18294.
Robert Edward Lee, O17796.
Charles Laurn Leedham, O17838.
George Edward Leone, O18287.
Russell Samuel Leone, O18293.
David Ernest Liston, O17820.
Emmett Bryan Litteral, O18281.
Austin Lowrey, Jr., O18282.
Harold Bradley Luscombe, O18298.
Clinton Stone Lyter, O18291.
Lawrence Abraham Matternes, O18295.
Olin Foster McInay, O17829.
Charles Scott Mudgett, O17815.
Roary Adlai Murchison, O17808.
Hubert Maurice Nicholson, O15493.
Dan Clark Ogle, O18276.
Thomas Neilson Page, O18300.
Nuel Pazdral, O18285.
Walter Lee Peterson, O18292.
Robert Edwin Peyton, O18263.
John Edward Pluenneke, O18279.
Roger Gaylord Prentiss, Jr., O17825.
Crawford Fountain Sams, O18261.
Harold Edward Schneider, O17828.
Jack William Schwartz, O17823.
Albert Henry Schwichtenberg, O18288
Warren Mimms Scott, O17360.
Clement Franklin St. John, O18258.
William Spencer Stone, O18277.
Arthur Lyman Streeter, O18296.
Duran H. Summers, O17794.
Carl Willard Tempel, O18284.
Ralph Matthew Thompson, O17429.
Edward Joseph Tracy, O18272.
James Harvey Turner, O17361.
Harold Hanson Twitchell, O18327.
Wendell Axline Weller, O18290.
John Ruxton Wood, O17821.
James Elmo Yarbrough, O17348.

To be colonel, Dental Corps

Leland Stanford Mabry, O17034.

To be colonels, Medical Service Corps

Seth Overbaugh Craft, O16036.
Edward Martin Wones, O16028.

PROMOTIONS IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of sections 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (*) are subject to examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion.

To be first lieutenants

Luther Ewell Adair, Jr., AO56711.
Frank Joseph Augustyn, AO50537.
Thomas James Barr, AO41359.
Sam Bridgers, Jr., AO41357.
Donald William Bryan, AO56716.
*Lee Aubrey Burcham, AO56718.
Bill Carroll, Jr., AO56706.
Thomas Lee Carroll, AO56722.
Charles Earl Cathcart, AO56714.
Harold Newark Crisp, Jr., AO38530.
Arthur Sylvester Cunningham, Jr., AO50536.
Louis Jefferson Dean, AO56701.
Max Eugene Ellis, AO56700.
*Ralph Duane Gibson, AO50533.
William John Grossmiller, AO56720.
Charles Wayne Heringlake, AO50534.
Cedric Vernon Hunter, AO56705.
*James Lee Hurn, AO56708.
Richard Graham Immig, AO50538.
Harold Roger Jewell, AO56710.
Arthur Meriwether Jones, AO56703.
Adolph Davis Joseph, Jr., AO56713.
Milton Louis Kult, AO38529.
*Jack Ray Lindeman, AO56723.
John Victor Mackie, AO56712.
Robert Louis MacKinnon, AO29484.
Eugene John Messmer, AO56704.
*Alex Young Mutch, AO56709.
Earl William O'Neil, Jr., AO41358.
Dave Seale Shackelford, Jr., AO56721.
Rex O. Thomas, AO56707.
Ross Holmes Weatherford, Jr., AO50535.

NOTE.—The officers nominated for promotion to first lieutenant will complete the required 3 years' service for promotion during the months of April and May. Dates of rank for those officers will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 17 (legislative day of February 21), 1949:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

James Grover McDonald to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Israel.

Edward R. Dudley to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Liberia.

UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

Mark Foster Ethridge to be a member for a term expiring January 27, 1951.

Mark A. May to be a member for a term expiring January 27, 1950.

Justin Miller, of California, to be a member for a term expiring January 27, 1950.

Philip D. Reed to be a member for a term expiring January 27, 1949.

Erwin D. Canham to be a member for a term expiring January 27, 1949.

Philip D. Reed to be a member for a term of 3 years expiring January 27, 1952, and until his successor has been appointed and qualified.

Erwin D. Canham to be a member for a term of 3 years expiring January 27, 1952, and until his successor has been appointed and qualified.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Hon. Alexander M. Campbell to be an Assistant Attorney General.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

J. Frank McLaughlin to be United States district judge for the district of Hawaii.

CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Edward A. Towse to be second judge of the first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

William R. Hart to be United States attorney for the southern district of Iowa.

George F. Garrity to be United States attorney for the district of Massachusetts.

Edward T. Kane to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Michigan.

John F. X. McGohey to be United States attorney for the southern district of New York. (Mr. McGohey is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 16, 1949.)

John C. Pickett to be United States attorney for the district of Wyoming.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Virgil B. Stanley to be United States marshal for the northern district of Oklahoma.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 17, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of The Americas and World Affairs, Carrollton Manor, Md., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

Heavenly Father, source of light, life, and all righteousness: Look down with favor upon the Speaker of this House and all the Members of the Congress of the United States.

Bless with Thy graces the President of our country and those who counsel him.

Grant, on this happy festival of St. Patrick, those gifts of imagination, good humor, poetry, and song which have made the sons and daughters of Ireland ambassadors of God to all the world.

In an age of confusion and strife, help us Thy children to remember that, in other dark hours, the devotees of St. Patrick brought holiness and learning to struggling peoples.

Keep us ever mindful, dear Saviour, that this mission of salvation was the fruit of brotherly love, under God.

Since our need is dire, vouchsafe, in Thy divine goodness, those gifts of understanding, affection, and virtue which can yet unite a divided world. This we ask in the name of Thy Divine Son, our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members on the part of the Senate of a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers to consider the matter of the disposal of certain records of the Government, lists or schedules of which, pursuant to law, were submitted to the Congress by the Archivist of the United States under date of March 16, 1949.

ADJOURNMENT OVER AND PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I am not going to object, will the gentleman tell us the program for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. On Monday the Consent Calendar will be called, and then the District of Columbia rent control bill will be taken up.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. May I ask either the Speaker or the majority leader if there are to be any suspensions on that day?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has had no requests for suspensions, and expects there will be none.

Mr. McCORMACK. On Tuesday the final vote will be taken on the bill H. R. 1437, which relates to the personnel and composition of the Army and Air Force.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. For the benefit of the House, may I say that I understand there will be a roll call on that bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; that is my understanding.

Following that, on Tuesday, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is going to call up his bill, H. R. 2681. He and I discussed it about 10 days ago, and we agreed on taking up the bill on next Tuesday. I am accordingly reserving that day for the action that will be taken on that bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. It was also understood, if I remember correctly, that we would meet at 11 o'clock on Tuesday in order to finish the bill on that day.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. I was going to make that statement.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is the purpose to try to finish the bill on that day?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes. That is the veterans' pension bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. I discussed that with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. I am glad he mentioned it now, because I was leaving it to his judgment whether we should meet at 11 or 12 on Tuesday.

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman will yield further, the first business when the House meets will be the vote on the 70-group air force bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. Then the veterans' pension bill will be taken up?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

For the purpose of flexibility, I am bracketing for consideration on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, the final vote on the bill H. R. 1437, the bill H. R. 2681, and on the completion of that bill, the War Department civil functions appropriation bill. I am bracketing these bills for the 3 days rather than listing them for specific days so that we can take them up in order. If the Rankin bill is disposed of on Tuesday, or even if it takes a part of Wednesday, we will then take up the War Department civil functions appropriation bill, if it is available.

The program for the remainder of the week is undetermined now.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY NEXT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday next it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ASSISTANCE TO GREECE AND TURKEY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 123)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Transmitted herewith is the sixth quarterly report on United States military assistance to Greece and Turkey. This report covers the period from October 1 to December 31, 1948. Military assistance to Greece and Turkey was inaugurated under the authority of Public Law 75, Eightieth Congress, and was continued under the authority of title III of Public Law 472, Eightieth Congress, known as the Greek-Turkish Assistance Act of 1948. Responsibility for United States assistance in the economic rehabilitation of Greece begun under Public Law 75 was transferred to the Economic Cooperation Administration on July 1, 1948, pursuant to Public Law 472, title I.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 17, 1949.*

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, it affords me great pleasure today to join with many of my colleagues in commemorating this great Irish holiday, St. Patrick's Day. In all of the large American cities, the Irish are today gathered at religious ceremonies in the morning, parades and games in the afternoon, luncheons and banquets, as well as at dances in the evening, all in celebration of the occasion.

As a part of this general recognition of this day, I am happy again to have the privilege of presenting to the Members of the House, green carnations in honor of the occasion. This touch of Irish green has been made possible through the courtesy of the American League for an Undivided Ireland, an organization of American citizens, representing most of the Irish societies of the country, which are banded together with a view to aiding in bringing about the reunification of all of Ireland, under one government.

The celebration of St. Patrick's Day this year carries with it particular significance because it has been announced that 1 month from today the final link of control of the British Government over Ireland will be terminated and the Irish Republic will, in fact, become a free and independent nation. After centuries of foreign control and domination,

this will be the last time that St. Patrick's Day will find the Irish people in any way subject to outside control and lacking their full freedom and independence.

However, it is to be regretted that the Irish Republic does not encompass all of Ireland. Only 26 of the 32 counties in Ireland will witness on April 18 the cutting of the last ties between Great Britain and Ireland which are not voluntarily created by the Irish Government itself. Unfortunately six counties in the north of Ireland were cut off from the rest of the country by an act of the British Parliament in 1922 against the expressed wishes of more than 80 percent of the Irish people, voting in a national election under British jurisdiction.

It is to be hoped that before long the British will withdraw their troops and their subsidies from these six counties, and that they may be permitted to rejoin the rest of Ireland in the full enjoyment of their natural freedom and their own independent government, which is one of the few nations in the world where no money has been appropriated to find out whether the people are Communists or loyal to their country. Being a natural part of the whole of Ireland, it is to be regretted that they were ever cut off from the adjoining counties of Ireland, like the stems of these carnations, and for the past 27 years have been pinned down by foreign control and foreign domination.

It is my prayer that next year, when we will again be wearing the green, that it may bear witness to the full freshness of freedom and the flower of liberty for all of Ireland, and that these six counties may once more be united with the other 26 so that the Republic of Ireland may encompass the full extent of the Emerald Isle.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA]?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, this is a special occasion and a special day—St. Patrick's Day. It is a great day for the Irish. It is with great joy that I announce to the assembled Irish this morning that after considerable research I have definitely come to the conclusion that St. Patrick was a Republican. So, from the Republican Irish, I bring greetings to all of you and particularly to the following Members of the House: The Barretts, the Bates, the Bennetts, the Breens, the Buckleys, the Burkes, the Byrnes, and the Byrneses; the Carnahans, the Corbetts, the Cunninghams, the Delaneys, the Dollivers, the Donohues, and the Doyles; the Fallons, the Feighans, the Fogartys, the Gavins, the Goldens, and the Granahans; the Harts, the Heffernans, the Horans, the Kearneys, the Kearnses, and the Keatings; the Keefes, the Kelleys, the Kennedys, the Keoghs, the Kilburns, and the Kildays; the Kirwans, the Lynches, the McCarthys, the McConnells, the McCormacks, the McCullochs, and the McDonoughs; the McGraths, the McGregors, the McGuires, the McKinnons, and the McMillans; the McSweeneys, the Maddens, the Mahons, the Martins, and the Millers; the Monroneys, the Murphys, the Murrays, the Nixons, the Nolans, and the Nortons; the O'Briens, the O'Haras, the O'Neills, the O'Sullivans, and the O'Tooles; the Pattersons, the Philbins, the Quinns, the Regans, the Rogerses, and the Rooneys; the St. Georges, the Sullivans, the Walshes, the Welches, and the Werdels; and also to Eugene Worley from Shamrock, Tex.

Mr. Speaker, from the O'Abbitts to the O'Zablockis, special greetings to each of you and to you all an "Erin go bragh."

"TOP O' THE MORNIN'"

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, the top of the morning from the bottom of my heart.

I am not aware whether all of you know the little story about the discovery of America. Things might have been different if the Irish had had their way.

On the day that the New World was sighted, there was an Irishman on watch on Columbus' ship. He told the captain he was heading for the wrong place, that he was heading for the islands in the West Indies. The Irishman suggested that the captain head for the mainland, which could be seen. He said that a relative of his, an uncle on his father's side, five generations back, St. Brendon, had visited what is now the United States. In fact, he thought he had a couple of relatives there, and if Columbus would only land at Savannah he would find those relatives on the police department. However, the captain was a foreigner and did not understand him, so they went down to the islands and it took quite a few years to get up to New York, where the Irish first settled.

We who are of Irish blood today join with all of the people of the earth in celebrating Ireland's great festive day. All around the globe—in New York, in Paris, in London, in Berlin, in Shanghai, Hong Kong, all through the Central American and South American countries and in every town and hamlet in the United States—the cups will be lifted to St. Patrick and the Irish.

Everywhere in the civilized world the Irish people have left their mark on the history of each country. In France there was McMahon who reached the Presidency. There was O'Boyle, the great revolutionist of Central America; and there was Barry, the founder of our own Navy. Ireland gave to England its literary scholars, its doctors, lawyers, and field marshals. It gave England the Irish Guard that saved the day at Waterloo.

In these United States they came as immigrants and were forced to live in the hovels, the tenements, and on the wrong side of the tracks. With their fierce determination they drove their way forward and upward, not seeking Government aid, not seeking help from their neighbors or from organized charity. They became pillars in the community life where they lived. They produced the policemen and firemen, the hotel owners, doctors, lawyers, priests, cardinals, diplomats, mayors, and governors. They loved this country and loved it well. They gave unstintingly of their blood and lives in all of its wars. In the War Between the States there was an Irish brigade on each side that faced one another in the battle of Shiloh and fought the most bloody engagement of that war despite the fact that they came from the same towns and the same parishes in the old country. They gave their all for the cause that they espoused and believed in.

When the railroads started to stretch out across the country, it was the Irish laborer and contractor who took upon themselves this great toil that made the development of our country possible. Mile after mile they drove across the plain and prairie, mountain and valley. After the completion of their labor they settled across the breadth of this great land. Wherever they settled they established their churches and schools, their colleges and hospitals, their homes for the aged and homes for the blind and the indigent ones, again without the assistance of any government. Wherever they settled they took an active part in the life of the town and showed a deep regard which they taught to the children for the fourth commandment which includes respect for constituted authority. They did not become faddists, or Communists, or Fascists. They were too proud of their Americanism and too grateful to the country that gave them freedom of thought, freedom of speech, and the right to worship God untrammeled and unrestrained.

So today, we of the Congress of the United States open that little section of our hearts that we have always reserved for the old land and we say to the world, "Erin go bragh!"

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it has been well said "everybody is Irish on St. Patrick's Day."

Mr. Speaker, the many expressions of understanding, the many expressions of compliment and congratulations that we who are Members of the House of Representatives, who have in our veins the blood of Irish ancestry, have received from our friends and colleagues in this House, well proves that statement. And we appreciate and are proud indeed that our friends, who are not of the Irish race, in the true spirit of Americans, extend to us today the hand of praise and fine words of great sentiment, joining with us in honoring the patron saint of Ireland, St. Patrick.

Mr. Speaker, we Americans of Irish ancestry, with foresight and with a true

sense of our democratic responsibilities to the great Nation that is America, and with whom Ireland has so many ties of love and friendship, use this saint's day to again declare our love forever of America, our country.

Well did our ancestors from Ireland know the enemies of hunger, poverty, and economic insecurity, that in the early days faced a struggling America and that in many nations of the world today are again the great signposts of trouble, uncertainty, and despair. Let us then be prepared that in America we shall forever be free with God's help from these evils and from this scourge.

In performing our work here in this great democratic forum, let us remember that upon our shoulders rests the responsibility of preventing another world cataclysm. In our country we believe that in addition to the material aspect of economic recovery, it is essential to build on Christian, social, and economic principles. We believe that this should be done not in any sectarian spirit, but by adherence to an ideal which recognizes that the function of society is to secure for man economic independence and security so that his personal liberty, his individuality, and his dignity may be assured with his God and his country.

Mr. Speaker, I can say with pride and complete certainty that every Member of this House, who today speaks from his heart in praise of St. Patrick and the Irish, does so in the spirit of these remarks that I have just made, and guided by these principles we will cooperate and assist to the extent of our ability in the work that lies ahead.

And throughout this world today, yes; even in our own beloved America, there is a struggle of ideas.

In Ireland four centuries ago there was perhaps we might say an invasion of Ireland that took place, but it was not an invasion by force. It was an invasion of ideas and of ideals. In A. D. 432 Patrick and his little band of Christian missionaries landed in Ireland. Then and there began a struggle of ideas and ideals from which emerged the modern Ireland of the spirit. It is important to see what that spirit was, and what it is, for Irishmen from that day have carried it to the uttermost corners of the earth. Every St. Patrick's Day celebration in the world is a tribute to that spirit. And it is this facet of Irish life and this character that we understand so well, and it is one of the things that the Irishmen who have come to America brought with them and one of the things they have contributed and are still contributing to the American way of life.

The earliest legends of the Irish people are stories of invasions and resistance to invasions of Ireland. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that here in America to the forefront in resisting what might be described as an attempt to invade the spirit of America, the attempt by those who are atheistic Communists to break down all that is beloved and dear to Irish hearts, will be resisted by the descendants of the Irish immigrants as valiantly and as bravely to the death as did Ireland resist invasions of similar and like kind for thousands of years. There are many fine things said of the Irish, and any Irish speech and any Irish celebrations on St. Patrick's Day touches upon Ireland's contribution to the culture of America. And so we sing great praises of Irish paintings, of Irish music, and of the Irish art, but always do we tell of Irish stories and we never fail to recite an Irish poem, and so I recite this one, and I quote:

The story of St. Patrick is a story told before
Of how he banished all the snakes from Ireland's sunny shores.
But whether we believe the tale or think it very odd
His name is one that represents the men who honor God.
For he spread Christianity wherever he appeared
And his divine Creator was the only one he feared.
He spread the Gospel freely that everyone might live
In all the love and charity the world would ever give.
And so no matter what his creed or how he chose to pray
He honored God and that is why we honor him today.

Other peoples in the world will admit that they are descended from a cave man, but you have yet to find an Irishman who denied that he was descended from a king. And now that I bring that up, it reminds me that my dear mother's name, God rest her soul, was McCarthy and the McCarthys were the descendants of the McCarthy-Moors who were the kings of Munster, and the greatest jumpers in Ireland.

It is fine and comforting, indeed, to know that in this year of our Lord 1949 Ireland has declared herself a free and independent and sovereign power. This is heartening to people who for so long were not a nation.

And as was said by that great American statesman and that great Irishman, Jim Farley, "for this reason here and everywhere they have always devoted their talents to the establishment and protection of every nation to which they have given their loyalty."

The Irish from the dawn of history have been concerned with the problem of making a living from the earth, or with their hands, and with the problem of learning how to live in the light of their spiritual insight and faith. That is the burden of the Irishmen's message to the world and that is the task of every Irishman worthy of the name, be he an Irishman at home or an Irishman exiled in a foreign land. It is his to make the labor and pain the living, and making a living on the earth worthy and respectable. And it is his to try to discover how to live so that the human spirit may be at reasonable peace with itself and with the eternal spirit of the universe. The Irishman is of the earth, earthy, and of the heavens, heavenly.

Mr. Speaker, from the very bottom of my heart I know that looking down from his high place in Heaven today, St. Patrick smiles upon the United States of America and says to us in Gaelic "Beir, buadh, agus beannacht"—success, victory, and best wishes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HALE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "The Menace of Red China," by Louis Bedenz.

Mr. PLUMLEY (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech made before the Legislature of the State of Vermont.

OUR SUBSTITUTE FOR ST. PATRICK

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in the books—or one book—which I read as a child, there was a picture of St. Patrick leading the snakes out of Ireland by playing sweet music on a fife or a flute.

I know you all honor St. Patrick, and the Irish, and so do I, not only for their industry and their thrift, but for their willingness to carry, and their ability in carrying, on a fight.

While Ireland has its St. Patrick, who reputedly led the snakes out of Ireland, the Congress of the United States and the United States has the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] who, by substituting music for harsh words, accurate descriptions, and persistency, has for the past 10 years been driving the Communists out of the Federal Government and the administration here in Washington.

The individual who is supposed to have cleaned the Aegean stables had no more smelly or difficult task than has had the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. Without cessation, he has fought against overwhelming odds against influence in high places—frequently in his own party.

It is doubtful if there is any man in Congress who has ever waged a more persistent or a more successful fight against the Communists, and that with as great success as has the gentleman from Mississippi.

So once more I say that, even though I cannot subscribe to all of the gentleman's political philosophy, I feel honored to serve in the House with him.

But what I wish to talk about this morning is the political situation and the coming election in Michigan.

MICHIGAN CIO AS POLITICAL BOSS

On Monday, April 4, next, the people of Michigan will elect a highway commissioner, a superintendent of public instruction, two regents of the State university and two supreme court justices.

The CIO intends to capture and then hold as political captives these six public officers.

The purpose of labor organizations is to get higher wages, better working conditions—in short, those things which can be obtained—and mark this—from the employer, which will give more of everything desirable to the worker and his family.

Labor organizations are not political organizations, for there are men and women of all political faiths in every labor organization. Unfortunately, the CIO is not only in politics nationally, but

has now taken over the Michigan—home of the sit-down strikes—Democratic Party.

Last fall, Michigan's CIO politicians backed G. Mennen Williams, scion of a wealthy family, who will ultimately inherit the millions made by so-called "industrial royalists," for Governor and he was elected, though Dewey carried the State.

The CIO has been dictating Governor Williams' policies and appointments and recently Mr. August Scholle, State CIO president, announced that never again will the CIO support a Republican, regardless of his liberalism, ability, or honesty.

That means that, if successful, not only Republicans but Democrats who know that employers, not union officials, create jobs and furnish the money for pay checks, will be blacklisted. That means we will have a Government by CIO officials, who will run it with the taxpayers' dollars not for the benefit of all the people or of members of independent labor organizations or for the good of the A. F. of L., but for the benefit of CIO politicians and officers.

If they follow the usual course, they will increase taxes, take over industry, and try to operate it by and for the benefit of their own little clique, to the detriment of the individual union member.

Now, there are thousands upon thousands of loyal, honest working people in the State of Michigan who are entitled to consideration, who are not members of the CIO, who belong to the A. F. of L., the brotherhoods, the independent unions, or no union at all. But they, in Scholle's vocabulary are all scabs.

In Scholle's book, they are not eligible to be elected in Michigan nor to hold a State or county job.

I have not heard where Scholle publicly condemned the recent CIO goon-squad raid and rioting, malicious destruction of property, and beating of defenseless workers at Kalamazoo, Mich. With his crowd in power—and many CIO officials will not sign anti-Communist affidavits—what can we of Michigan expect?

DO NOT BE DECEIVED

What Scholle wants to do is, by the election of a highway commissioner, through the use of highway funds, establish a tight, all-powerful political machine through the highway department.

By electing a superintendent of public public instruction and regents of the university, the trend would be to open the University of Michigan and Michigan State Agricultural College not only to the so-called liberals, but to the Pink and the Red teachers.

Do not forget that it recently became necessary to set on Pink teachers in one of Michigan's colleges, at the university and to condemn a Red cell at the agriculture college.

If the CIO could finally elect supreme court justices who were favorable to the CIO, the interpretation of the law in Michigan might be influenced, just as New Deal Justices have changed the political philosophy of the United States Supreme Court.

If Michigan citizens do not go to the polls and turn back Mr. Scholle and his cohorts on April 4, they will learn, but too late, that their State government is being operated in the interests of the officials of one group—the CIO—not for the benefit of the people as a whole.

We do not need a political boss or machine in Michigan.

THE CIO AND ELECTIONS IN MICHIGAN

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I join with my Irish friends in this, their holiday. We of Polish descent who migrated to this country were in the same position as the Irish, and we have taken the same stand. I will say that anyone of Polish blood, the same as those of Irish blood, will always fight for free America.

Now, to answer the gentleman from Michigan. To say that the CIO has taken over the Democratic Party sounds to me on a par with a statement that the Communists had taken over the Republican Party.

THE "Y" AT THE END OF "CASE"

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I rather hesitate to inject myself into all these remarks about the Irish today, but as the gentleman from Minnesota was reading the list which mentioned so many of Irish names in the House, I wondered just how I could associate myself with such a distinguished list. Then I recalled that some years ago, when I was a small boy in Iowa, one frosty morning there came a man to the back door who apparently had fallen on a little bit of hard luck. He seemed to be hungry and my father invited him in. Mother filled him up with a pretty good breakfast of pancakes, bacon, and coffee. When he got through he said to my father, "You say your name is Case?"

My father said, "Yes."

He said, "Faith, sir, and was there niver a 'y' on the ind of your name?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an address by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower before the First Columbia Forum of Democracy; and in the other to include a record of appropriations of the Eightieth Congress on the subject of transmission power lines.

ST. PATRICK

Mr. GORSKI of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORSKI of New York. Mr. Speaker, today, March 17, the Irish race at home and throughout the world celebrates the feast of its apostle and patron saint, St. Patrick. It is not only a day when green becomes the most popular color but a day when we recall with pride the splendid contribution made by successive generations of Irishmen and Irishwomen to our great Nation. In these times also it is especially fitting that we remember with pride the part played by Irish missionaries in the spread of learning and civilization among the barbarians who in the Dark Ages overran western Europe, knowing as we do that Ireland by her wholehearted participation in the Marshall plan and the Council of Europe is demonstrating that today again she is fully conscious of the part she must play in the economic and spiritual rehabilitation of the Continent. Let us recollect, too, that as Ireland has long been the bulwark of the Christian way of life in the west, her role is paralleled by that of Poland in the east. Both nations have suffered and endured much, both have had great defeats, both have been apparently crushed and conquered. But as Ireland has emerged vigorous and independent from the dark night of slavery, may we not hope that, sooner perhaps than we can dare expect, Poland, too, will regain her freedom and take again her honored place among the nations of the Christian world.

NO-CAN-DO EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, nearly 3 months of the Eighty-first Congress have passed and we have yet to enact to completion one piece of major legislation. Is this session to be recorded as the "No-can-do Eighty-first Congress"?

Last November 2 the people elected us to do a job for them. It is the people who, through their taxes, pay our salary. It is to them we are responsible.

There are major legislative jobs to be done and done now. Aid to education, fair labor legislation, adequate social-security revisions, proper coordination and development of our resources, basic civil rights, and others. These are matters far too important to be subjected to petty political bickering between factions within a party and between the two parties themselves. These measures should be considered solely on the basis of their respective merits.

We have seen a majority in Congress prevented from passing legislation which the people want. We have witnessed as outrageous a violation of the democratic principle of majority rule as one could imagine. Again, I repeat, our first responsibility is to the people who elected us. It is time for us to discontinue this

political bartering of human rights and human needs.

Let us, without delay, tackle the problems we face with honesty and with courage.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KILBURN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Prof. Andrew S. Ormsby.

JOHN C. CALHOUN

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, by proclamation the Governor of South Carolina has designated March 18 as John C. Calhoun Day. Since the House will not be in session tomorrow, I take this opportunity to call attention to the fact that on March 18, 1782, one of South Carolina's great statesmen was born in Abbeville district, S. C., and died in Washington, D. C., March 31, 1850.

It is fitting that we pause to observe the birth dates of those who made everlasting contributions to the stability and form of this, the greatest Nation known to history.

A century ago the South listened to Calhoun's ideas with a confidence which bordered upon idolatry, and the North, while not always agreeing with his views, listened with respect. Today the tendency is to emphasize Calhoun's views upon nullification and to ignore the fact that in his day he was one of the most influential men along many other lines. Few men in our history have held so many positions as capably as Calhoun. For 40 years he was a public servant, and in an age of great men his actions stamped him as one of the greatest. Only Clay and Webster were considered his equal in ability and influence, and today we look back upon those three as one of the greatest triumvirates of American history.

John Caldwell Calhoun had little formal education until the age of 13, then he was instructed for a year by the great Presbyterian minister and educator, Moses Waddel. On November 28, 1947, in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A4426, I paid tribute to this great pioneer teacher, Moses Waddel. From the ages of 18 to 20 Calhoun was again instructed by Waddel, and it is both a tribute to Waddel's teaching ability and to Calhoun's intelligence that he went directly into the junior class at Yale University and in 2 years was graduated with distinction. He studied law for one more year in Connecticut under two eminent jurists then returned to South Carolina, where he was soon admitted to the bar. All of the evidence points to the fact that he could have become a great lawyer, but his main interest lay in politics, and he soon turned to that field. At the age of 25 he was elected to the State legislature, where he served capably. Three years later he was elected to the National House of Representatives. From that time until his death in 1850 he was prominent in national affairs.

His first important post was as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. At that time in our history the United States was not recognized as a great power and was constantly being subjected to insults and humiliations by other great powers, especially Great Britain. Our greatest complaint against that country was her practice of stopping our ships and impressing any seaman who was suspected of being a British deserter. Through the efforts of Calhoun and Cheves, another South Carolinian, a state of war was proclaimed against Great Britain. In the resulting war, known as the War of 1812, we suffered more defeats than we gained victories, but we demonstrated forever that our country would tolerate no aggression from any source and lifted our country to its rightful place as an independent power.

After the war Calhoun was made head of the Committee of the Currency. In that position he framed and carried through the bill which provided for the establishment of a Federal bank and regulated the currency, which was in a high state of disorder. He also was prominent in the efforts to construct a system of roads and canals by the Federal Government and to expand the Navy as an adequate means of national defense.

President Monroe appointed Calhoun to his Cabinet as Secretary of War, and he held that position from 1817 until 1825. During his administration he made an entire reorganization of the War Department. He formulated and set up the system of bureaus by which the Department was to be governed; he reduced the unliquidated debts of the Department from $40,000,000 to $3,000,000; he reduced the annual expenditures of the Department from four millions to two and a half millions without reducing either the pay of the men or the supplies which sustained them; and in general he ran the Department by means of a series of enlightened, yet practical policies which proved he had acute business sense as well as a keen sense of general analysis.

Calhoun was elected Vice President in 1824 and reelected in 1828. It was during this period that he conceived many of the ideas and the doctrine for which he was to become most famous—the doctrine of nullification. It was a series of tariffs and proposed tariffs which forced him to bring forth these ideas. In 1816 Calhoun had favored a tariff to protect the newly formed manufacturing industries. In 1824 the tariff was raised a considerable extent, and the South commenced to suffer from the effects. When a still higher tariff was proposed the South protested vigorously. Calhoun expressed the belief that the Constitution is merely a compact between the States in their sovereign capacity as States and that when the Federal Government infringes upon the rights reserved to the States, they have the right of interposition or nullification. He did not propose to annul the Constitution nor to resist laws made in pursuance thereof, but insisted that laws made without the authority of the Constitution were null and void. These ideas are the essence of the nullification doctrine. These ideas and views are not entirely Calhoun's own. They had been expressed before in the Kentucky and Virginia resolutions and at the Hartford convention. During the period when the debate over this subject waxed hottest Calhoun resigned as Vice President and was appointed to the Senate. A compromise tariff bill was introduced by Clay which was acceptable to Calhoun, and the matter of nullification was temporarily dropped. Nevertheless, from that time on Calhoun was considered the leader of those who advocated State's rights or the doctrine of State sovereignty.

In 1843 he resigned from the Senate to recover his health and to take care of his private affairs which had suffered during his career as a public servant. Less than a year later, however, he was offered the post of Secretary of State, which he accepted. He was instrumental in securing the annexation of the Republic of Texas as a State in the Union during his administration. Upon the election of President Polk he resigned as Secretary of State but was soon appointed to fill a vacancy in the Senate. Some historians are of the opinion that Calhoun could have been elected President had he actively supported the Mexican War. He refused to lay aside his principles even to gain that end, and so he remained a Senator until his death. There was one more important affair for him to handle. Our country was engaged in a dispute with Great Britain over the extent of the Oregon boundary and likewise was on the verge of war with Mexico. We could ill afford a war with both, and Calhoun was pushed to the fore to settle the difficulty with Great Britain. He offered resolutions that the conflict as to the boundary of the Oregon Territory be settled by treaty rather than by force, and when the British Minister offered the forty-ninth parallel as the northern boundary, Calhoun's influence led to the acceptance of those terms. Less than a week later our country was at war with Mexico, and we can only speculate upon the disastrous consequences which a war with two separate countries might have brought about.

Calhoun lived only a few more years, and his death found him opposing with all of his vigor those policies which he felt would ruin his beloved South. For more than 40 years he had stood firm in his convictions and had fought courageously and resolutely for those principles which he thought right. Few men in the entire history of our country have rendered greater service than Calhoun.

But a mere recitation of his deeds and even of his ideas does not give a sufficiently true picture of the man. His methods and his philosophy must be examined to gain a true insight. In his speeches, which were clear, concise, and brilliantly analytic, he addressed the intellect rather than the emotions. He sought to reduce any complicated problem to its simplest elements rather than

to lose his listeners in a blaze of dazzling oratory. He did not lower himself by indulging in personalities or in disrespectful language. He attacked the views opposed to his own with a clear and icy logic which was almost impossible to refute. He was universally respected even by his opponents, and Daniel Webster, his greatest opponent, paid him tribute in the following words: "He was a man of undoubted genius and commanding intellect, of unspotted integrity, of unimpeached honor. He has lived long enough, he has done enough, and he has done it so well, so successfully, so honorably, as to connect himself for all time with the records of his country." Henry Clay made reference to his "transcendent talents; clear, concise, compact logic; his felicity in generalization surpassed by none."

Both in his own time and today there are many who fail to understand what Calhoun was attempting to do in his support of the doctrine of nullification. Some are of the opinion that he wished to destroy the Union, but that was the last thing he desired. He understood the danger of attempting to sustain certain abstract principles and attempted to point out those dangers. He felt that it was his duty to point out policies which could lead to disunion, and he always did his duty as he understood it. In an address in the Senate he stated: "For many a year, Mr. President, I have aspired to an object higher than the Presidency, and that is to do my duty under all circumstances." This statement closely parallels Clay's famous remarks that he would rather be right than be President, and it is interesting to note that Calhoun made his remark before Clay did.

Calhoun has occasionally been criticized for changing his policy in regard to the tariff. There was nothing inconsistent in that change, however. He favored the tariff of 1816 as a means not only to protect the newly formed industries, but also as a means of reducing the public debt. When the tariff was continually increased until the South was becoming impoverished, while the manufacturing sections were becoming enriched, it was natural that he should favor a change. Changing conditions bring changed viewpoints, and Calhoun was not one to allow his section of the country to suffer when he saw a means of deliverance.

His great moral courage and his reliance on truth have seldom been equaled. However unpopular his opinions were at any given moment, he carried out his convictions and generally saw his own ideas adopted by the majority at a later date. He was a leader, not a follower, and he constantly sought to mold opinion rather than follow opinion after it had formed.

If Calhoun were alive today, he would resist with all of his brilliant logic that form of government which neglects the rights of the individual and has power over his very life. In reviewing Calhoun's life, nothing seems clearer than the fact that he was an advocate of States' rights in order to protect the people from too great a centralization of power which could deprive them of their rights. His broad view, his loyalty to his convictions, his integrity, and his personal honor have won him a place in the democratic tradition. The name of John C. Calhoun is indelibly inscribed in history, and to all of history's students that name will live on as one to be revered and honored.

South Carolina does herself honor by observing this, the one hundred and sixty-seventh birth date of one of her most illustrious sons, John Caldwell Calhoun.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HARE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE COLORADO RIVER

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, there is before this Congress proposed legislation to settle an interstate controversy that has been continuing for more than a quarter of a century.

I refer to the Colorado River controversy between the States of California and Arizona.

The State of Arizona for nearly 30 years has consistently refused to permit peace on the Colorado River, refused to negotiate, refused to arbitrate, refused to litigate, but the State of Arizona has steadfastly held to its demands that only on its own terms will the problems of the river be resolved.

Today the State of Arizona is continuing to use each and every means it can to prevent a settlement of problems which have kept peace from the Colorado River Basin for more than a quarter of a century.

Today, at the same time, while pursuing a course of obstruction, the State of Arizona is attempting to take water from the Colorado River to which Arizona has no legal right—water which Arizona desires for a questionable billion-dollar project.

These are not idle charges. They are founded upon historical facts, they are substantiated in the records of this Congress and the courts of the land, and they are supported by events transpiring at this very time.

Let us look at the record.

There are seven States in the entire basin of the Colorado River. They are Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, Nevada, Arizona, and California. The first four named form the upper division, the last three the lower division.

In 1921 delegates from the seven States began a series of meetings in an effort to formulate an agreement which would permit the development of the Colorado River on a sound and secure basis. For months these delegates diligently worked, and at last they found themselves in accord on a fundamental compact. This historic document, the Colorado River Compact, was signed on November 24, 1922, by the authors and was then submitted to their respective States for approval.

The compact was unconditionally approved in 1923 by all the States of the basin, except Arizona.

In Arizona, political factions got into a fight among themselves, while the other States waited. At last the Arizona House passed a resolution agreeing to ratify the compact, but only if Arizona received a royalty of $5 per year forever for each horsepower produced on the Colorado River, no matter who produced the power or who paid for it. As the installed horsepower will ultimately be over 1,800,000, this would have meant over $9,000,000 of tribute annually, about twice as much as the Government's gross revenues from the project now. Another reservation in the Arizona House resolution excluded the Gila River and its tributaries from the provisions of the compact. The Gila is the river that provides water for the great irrigation area around Phoenix. It is an important tributary of the lower Colorado River, and the compact was written to include without exception all tributaries of the Colorado. But Arizona did not want her uses on the Gila River taken into consideration; she did not want to count the Gila's water in Arizona's share of the Colorado River.

No other State made such requests to exclude its uses from the compact. No other State demanded unearned and undeserved royalties. No other State wanted to share in the compact without being required to account for the water from its own streams.

Although the Arizona House approved this resolution, which was so grossly unfair to the other States, it died in the Arizona Senate. Thus, Arizona remained out of the compact.

By this unreasonable action, Arizona blocked development and peace on the Colorado River, just as these long-sought goals were in sight.

The compact could not become operative without ratification by all seven basin States and approved by the Congress.

But the six States which had ratified the compact were not to be thwarted by the dog-in-the-manger attitude of one State. Therefore, machinery was set in motion to have the compact given life as a 6-State agreement; that is, without Arizona.

It took 6 years to accomplish this, with Arizona a disrupting force throughout the long negotiations. At last Congress, after Arizona filibusters had blocked action in two sessions, passed the Boulder Canyon Project Act, which authorized construction of the largest dam in the world, provided, however, that six of the basin States ratified the compact and California enacted a limitation act.

The States of Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, Nevada, New Mexico, and California quickly ratified the compact, and California swiftly enacted the required limitation act, which pertains to the amount of Colorado River water California may use.

On June 25, 1929, President Herbert Hoover proclaimed the Boulder Canyon Project Act effective, and so the Colorado River Compact also became operative.

Arizona's efforts to block the compact had failed. The compact was now the basic law of the river.

But Arizona had not given up the fight.

The Secretary of the Interior at that time, Ray Lyman Wilbur, was faced with the problem of allocating the electric power to be produced by Boulder—now Hoover—Dam. Contracts for the power had to be secured from users, and under the law these contracts had to be signed before Congress appropriated the first money to build Hoover Dam.

The Secretary called hearings. All major parties interested in Hoover Dam power were present except Arizona.

Arizona refused to attend, saying she did not admit the validity of the Project Act. She seized upon this situation as another opportunity to prevent progress on the Colorado River.

Secretary Wilbur delayed his decisions in the hope that recalcitrant Arizona could be brought into line.

Said the Secretary:

I propose not to complete these (power) contracts (now) in the hope that we can bring Arizona into the picture.

The Secretary pleaded for a united front, declaring the real interest was "in this country and its development."

But Arizona remained adamant, ignoring all pleas of the Secretary and the other basin States. Arizona maintained its hostile attitude despite the fact that 18 percent of Hoover Dam power would be reserved for Arizona's use at any time within 50 years.

At last the Secretary proceeded to sign the power contracts with the communities and companies that would use it.

The way now was cleared for Congress to make the first appropriation for building Hoover Dam. This amounted to $10,660,000.

Again Arizona rushed out to do battle, opposing the appropriation. Arizona fought in Congress and filed its objections with United States Comptroller General. But progress was not to be halted. The appropriation was passed by Congress.

Still determined to prevent the building of the dam, which was so vital to the growth of the lower basin, Arizona now turned to the courts.

On October 13, 1930, Arizona filed suit in the United States Supreme Court against the Secretary of the Interior and the six States of the Colorado River Basin to stop construction of Hoover Dam. Arizona also asked the Court to declare the Colorado River Compact and the Boulder Canyon Project Act unconstitutional.

What did the Supreme Court tell Arizona? The Court said this:

(a) Authority to construct Hoover Dam was a valid exercise of congressional power.

(b) The Boulder Canyon Project Act did not abridge the water rights of Arizona.

(c) There was no threat to Arizona by Secretary Wilbur or the six basin States.

(d) The Arizona suit was dismissed.

Twice more did Arizona appeal to the highest tribunal of justice on other phases of the controversy, and twice more Arizona's suits were denied.

Still determined to stop progress on the Colorado River, Arizona adopted desperate means. Arizona threatened the use of military force.

At this time—1934–35—Parker Dam was being built, 155 miles downstream from Boulder Dam. Parker Dam creates the reservoir—Lake Havasu—from which water begins its long trans-desert journey through the great Colorado River aqueduct to Los Angeles and 27 other cities some 400 miles away on the coastal plain of southern California. This dam was built with money contributed to the United States by the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California.

Arizona did not want these thirsty cities to have this river water, and so Arizona physically prevented continuance of Parker Dam construction. She sent her militia, with machine guns, to stop construction, and they did so. Work ground to a stop.

In January 1935, the United States Government brought action in the Supreme Court to halt Arizona in these acts of violence, asking an injunction.

The Court did not grant the injunction because the complaint of the Government failed to show that construction of Parker Dam was authorized by statute. However, Congress subsequently reauthorized the construction of the dam, work was resumed, and the dam was completed.

The foregoing is only a partial recitation of Arizona's unpleasant record in the years when the people of six great Western States were struggling to progress, to develop their God-given natural resources, to make secure their homes and shops and farms, and to build on a solid foundation for the security of their children.

Now, what is Arizona doing today?

Let us look at events of the moment.

The Colorado River controversy still rages in the lower basin. On one side stands the State of Arizona, still defiant, still demanding settlement on its own terms, or none at all. On the other side the other two States of the lower division, California and Nevada, stand together, still struggling for the peace that will let development proceed in an orderly and legal way. They have offered to negotiate or to arbitrate. Arizona has refused.

There are three main issues in this quarter-century-old fight.

Here they are in brief form:

ISSUE NO. 1

Under article 3, paragraph A, of the Colorado River compact, the lower basin States of the Colorado River watershed are apportioned in perpetuity "the exclusive beneficial consumptive use" of 7,500,000 acre-feet of river water a year. An acre-foot is the amount of water necessary to cover an acre of land with water 1 foot deep.

The States of the upper basin receive a similar amount of water under the compact.

This is known as 3 A water.

Article 3, paragraph B, of the compact states:

In addition to the apportionment of paragraph A, the lower basin is hereby given the right to increase its beneficial consumptive use of the Colorado River waters by 1,000,000 acre-feet per annum.

This is known, as "3 B water," and this million acre-feet is in controversy.

As I have stated, Arizona refused to ratify the compact when it was created, but the six other States did ratify. With these six ratifications and enactment of the California Limitation Act, the compact became operative.

This is what the California Limitation Act says:

California agrees to limit its use of Colorado River water to 4,400,000 acre-feet of the waters apportioned to the lower basin by paragraph A, plus not more than one-half of any excess or surplus waters.

Thus California agreed to take 4,400,000 acre-feet of 3 A water, and not more than one-half of the excess or surplus waters unapportioned by the compact. California maintains that the term "excess or surplus" includes all 3 B water.

Does California share equally in this million acre-feet of 3 B water? California says "Yes." Arizona says "No."

ISSUE NO. 2

In a state of nature, the Gila River in Arizona was a wasting tributary of the Colorado River. Especially in the last 100 miles before it joins the Colorado its bed is wide, sandy, and subject to the intense heat of the desert.

The Bureau of Reclamation estimates that in a state of nature the Gila emptied approximately 1,300,000 acre-feet of water into the Colorado a year. The Gila River is an important tributary of the Colorado, a part of the Colorado system, and drains into the main stream near the Mexican border.

Water from the Gila is used chiefly now in the Phoenix area of Arizona, and there about 2,400,000 acre-feet of water are taken each year from the Gila, and beneficially consumed.

The difference between these figures, about 1,100,000 acre-feet, was lost before development of the Phoenix area. It was lost by evaporation, deep seepage, and other causes, as the Gila flowed in its course from the Phoenix area to the main Colorado River.

The words "beneficial consumptive use," as used in the compact, are important here, for the compact apportions water for beneficial consumptive use. Arizona contends that Arizona should be charged only for 1,300,000 acre-feet of Gila River water—the amount that emptied into the Colorado from the Gila in a state of nature, before development of irrigation in the Phoenix area and other places.

California contends that Arizona actually takes, uses, and beneficially consumes 2,400,000 acre-feet of Gila River water and, therefore, should be charged with that amount. All of this 2,400,000 acre-feet of Gila River water that Arizona takes is being beneficially consumed in Arizona.

Where and how must Arizona measure the amount of water it uses from the Gila River?

California says this water must be measured where it is actually beneficially consumed. Arizona says the water she actually uses is not to be measured at all. She wants to measure only the outflow of the Gila.

But the Gila does not even flow into the main Colorado as it did in prehistoric days. Today the Gila is all used up—beneficially consumed—in the Phoenix area.

ISSUE NO. 3

Lake Mead is the immense reservoir behind Hoover Dam.

California limited itself to taking 4,400,000 acre-feet of 3 A water, plus not more than one-half of the excess or surplus, of which California claims the 3 B water is a part.

There are large evaporation losses in Lake Mead, as there are in other reservoirs of the basin.

Arizona says that California must deduct these losses from its apportioned water. California says that the water to which it is entitled is a net amount, and therefore the quantity of 3 A water to which California limited itself is a net quantity.

Is the amount of 3 A water to which California is entitled a net quantity, or is it subject to reduction by reason of evaporation and other losses in Lake Mead and elsewhere?

In all the years California and Arizona have failed to agree on these three important problems. California has repeatedly offered to negotiate or arbitrate, and Arizona has repeatedly refused.

In the face of this stalemate, California and Nevada have now proposed that the issues of the controversy be placed before the United States Supreme Court for final settlement.

Will Arizona agree to this? Arizona will not. Arizona still says these issues will be settled her way or not at all.

So California and Nevada have introduced resolutions in the Congress asking permission to carry the controversy before the high Court. The permission of Congress for this litigation is necessary, because the United States Government must be a party to the action, and the United States can be made a party only with the consent of Congress.

These resolutions are affected not at all by political considerations. Each of California's 23 Congressmen, Democrats and Republicans, and Nevada's Congressman, have introduced identical measures. In the Senate, the four Senators from California and Nevada have introduced a joint resolution of the same kind.

With every force at its command Arizona is fighting to prevent passage of these resolutions.

Now, what else is Arizona doing today?

As it fights passage of the Supreme Court resolutions, Arizona is asking Congress to authorize construction of a $1,000,000,000 reclamation and power project to rescue a few thousand acres of land in central Arizona.

Now, Arizona, the State that fought to prevent the authorization and construction of Hoover and Parker Dams and development and progress on the Colorado River, wants to take an additional 1,200,000 acre-feet of water from the Colorado for the proposed Central Arizona project. She wants water stored by Hoover Dam and diverted from Parker Dam's Reservoir.

There already is a deficit of water in the lower Colorado. There is not enough water to meet the obligations of existing and authorized projects. This is due primarily to the Mexican Water Treaty, which guaranteed to Mexico nearly a million acre-feet per year more than Mexico was using before Hoover Dam was built. Without Hoover Dam's control of the wild river, Mexico could never have increased her uses. Arizona supported that treaty on the selfish assumption that she was giving away California's water. Now she finds that perhaps she gave away her own. The Mexican treaty chickens have come home to roost on the central Arizona project.

How can Arizona get this additional 1,200,000 acre-feet?

Only one way: By taking it away from California. She cannot get it back from Mexico.

But California has contracts with the Federal Government for 5,362,000 acre-feet of Colorado River water. That does not stop Arizona. Break these contracts, says Arizona; the Government had no right to sign them. California is not entitled to this water.

That has a familiar ring. It sounds like the Arizona of 28 years ago. And it is.

Now President Truman, and a number of Federal bureaus, including the Bureau of the Budget, have spoken out against the proposed central Arizona project. It would be, they say, not feasible. It would not be practical. It would not pay for itself, as the reclamation laws require.

Nor does that stop Arizona. If the project cannot be built under present reclamation laws, then Arizona would have the laws changed so that the project can be built.

Under the plans for the proposed billion-dollar central Arizona project, it would cost Arizona virtually nothing. It would be an obligation of the taxpayers of the Nation, and the power users of southern California. Arizona would get a billion-dollar project, paid for by people of other States.

I wish to tell the Members of this House of this most serious situation, a situation that is a menace to progress and development in the States of the Colorado River Basin.

This is not simply an interstate squabble. This is more than a fight over some water. It is a fight for life by the people of California for the security of their homes, for their own future and that of their children.

I most earnestly ask that the gentlemen of this Congress give this matter their unqualified attention, and that they support the resolutions of California that will bring peace to the Colorado River, the lifeline of the great Pacific Southwest, a river that has never known peace.

ST. PATRICK

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include copy of a recent radio broadcast.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to Americans of Irish descent who through the years, acting in the spirit of St. Patrick, have contributed so much to the social fabric of our country.

The Americans of Irish descent have traditionally understood that vigilance is the price of liberty. So I want to call the attention of the Members of this body to the fact that on March 25 at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York a 3-day meeting of the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace will begin. The local press and radio have for several days called the attention of the American public to the fact that the State Department has approved 23 visas for Communist delegates from Russia and 4 of her iron-curtain satellites. The Assistant Secretary of State is reported to have said:

> The American Government entertains no illusions as to the manner in which the Communists will attempt to use and manipulate the conference.

Yesterday afternoon in this Chamber I listened with great interest to the remarks of several of my colleagues with respect to injudicious comments in connection with our national security. I agree with the general tenor of these statements. Under our system of government, the people have a right to be informed. I believe in free speech. But secrets vital to our national security, and hence to our freedom of speech, should not be disclosed and no person or group of persons enjoying our precious freedoms should use these freedoms to destroy freedom. I cannot understand why, when the State Department was fully aware of the close relationship between the conference opening in New York on March 25 and the World Congress of Intellectuals held in Poland last summer—which was used as a stage for Communist attacks on the United States—the Russian delegates were granted the visas necessary to attend.

It is reported that at the conference in Wroclaw eastern Europe's cultural leaders were not free to express anything but the Moscow line. We can expect that the Moscow line will again be presented at the New York conference.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that if the American Government entertains no illusions as to the manner in which the Communists will attempt to use and manipulate the conference, then the visas of these Russian delegates should have been denied.

GENERAL PROPERTY OFFICE

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 10 I introduced a bill, H. R. 3447, which would establish a General Property Office to exercise management control over the procurement, utilization, and disposal of Government property. In scope, this bill is far more comprehensive than H. R. 6965, which I introduced at the last Congress, but it is identical in approach.

The bill conforms closely to the recommendations of the Hoover Commission with reference to administrative organization and goes on to establish comprehensive and uniform policies and procedures with respect to property utilization, procurement, contract termination, surplus-property disposal, contractual claims and disputes, and civil and criminal liabilities relating to these matters.

Overemphasis of organizational improvement may, in my opinion, obscure an equally important feature of the Commission's report. To permit efficient management control, a single law, uniform in application, must be substituted for the maze of unrelated laws under which the various executive agencies presently operate. This aspect of the problem is of utmost importance and it is fundamental.

The entire reorganization would center in the Property Officer who would preside over the General Property Office. In tying the reorganization in with uniform policies and procedures, the bill would establish a broad framework within which the Property Officer and the executive agencies must operate. The Property Officer, within these limitations, could issue regulations to effectuate the organizational changes and the policies and procedures which the bill would authorize. The bill consists of seven titles, as follows:

First. Administrative organization: The Property Officer would be authorized to coordinate the supply functions of the various executive agencies, impose uniform policies and procedures, and take over, assign or reassign responsibilities. The General Property Office would be his operation medium. This new agency would absorb the Public Buildings Administration, War Assets Administration, Bureau of Federal Supply, and the Office of Contract Settlement.

Second. Property utilization: The Property Officer could operate or assign the responsibility for operating any and all public office buildings, warehouses, plants—producing primarily for governmental use or consumption, supply centers, repair shops, fuel yards, and other similar facilities. Furthermore, he could assign space in public office buildings and warehouses, redistribute excess supplies and equipment, forbid the purchase of particular supplies and equipment until the excess has been utilized, and impose regulations concerning inventory control and accountability systems.

Third. Procurement: The Property Officer would be authorized to take over or reassign any procurement responsibilities now being exercised by the executive agencies, issue regulations to govern executive agencies in their procurement operations, establish uniform policies and procedures, and prescribe a Federal stock catalog system, standard forms and specifications.

Fourth. Contract termination: Here again the Property Officer is authorized to prescribe policies and methods together with standardized forms and procedures.

Fifth. Domestic surplus property: The Property Officer is responsible for any and all surplus property and the executive agencies operate by delegation of authority from him.

Sixth. Foreign excess property: Because of the peculiar problems involved, the executive agency in possession would have the primary responsibility for care, handling, and disposal, but the Property Officer, if he desired, could exercise active supervision even to the extent of assigning the job to the General Property Office.

Seventh. Contractual claims and disputes: The ultimate authority over claims would remain in the Comptroller General and the General Accounting Office. Factual findings by contracting agencies would no longer be binding upon the General Accounting Office or the courts. In addition to bringing suit, the contractor would have a right to appeal to the General Accounting Office in the event a contracting agency held against him in a dispute. To assure fair treatment, the Comptroller General wold be directed to establish an appeal board in the General Accounting Office which would review claims prior to disallowance and offer the contractor an opportunity to state his case at an informal hearing.

Eighth. Civil and criminal liabilities: To protect the public purse, extensive civil and criminal liabilities are imposed upon those who would enrich themselves by dishonest practices.

In conclusion I feel that the bill would be inapplicable to the armed services. Presently they are trying to handle simultaneously a far-reaching unification program and a record-breaking peacetime preparedness program. This has presented enough problems of interagency coordination and consolidation. To impose additional controls from another source might slow down unification and inhibit the defense program. The armed services can cooperate to the extent practicable considering defense needs but they should not be burdened with any superimposed restrictions at this time. When unification has been completed, the Congress can dispose of such coordination problems as may then remain.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. In tribute to the thousands of citizens in my district whose ancestors were Irish, I append hereto the fine editorial of the New York Times commemorating St. Patrick's Day. Our celebration of this day should inspire us to help in the unification of Ireland and in the admission of Erie to the United Nations. These are tangible ways of showing our interest in and support of the Irish people and our recognition of the vast contributions to our nation's cultural, social, and economic development and to our governmental system made by Americans of Irish descent.

[Editorial, New York Times, March 17, 1949]

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

It may be significant that St. Patrick, though he loved the Irish, was not, according to the available authorities, born in Ireland. In this he resembles most of the rest of us. But the Irish took St. Patrick to their hearts and he took them to his heart. There was warmth in him and warmth in them, and the combination has made St. Patrick's Day something more than was originally contemplated. The Irish haven't lost their saint, but a lot of other people have taken him on, people of many races and people of more than one religion. When the bands come along playing "Killarney" or "The Kerry Dances," when the green badges flower in Fifth Avenue's early spring, who is there who doesn't want to cheer for the good and great man?

We may ask ourselves why St. Patrick has attained this position, and there may be any number of answers. He was serious, but the Irish made him gay, too. He was a crusader who wou.dn't put up with paganism or any sort of wrong doing, but he was human and understanding, too. The personality of him comes down the centuries, cheerful and lovable, and one believes he would have enjoyed the parade and the music and the sight of people having a good time. We like to think that the Irish are generously willing to share their day and their saint.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, with the parade in New York and the banquet in San Francisco, today is acclaimed throughout the land as the great feast day of the Irish. The celebrations held here are but a part of the universal commemorations of St. Patrick that are to be found today in every section of the world, wherever so many as a handful of the Irish can be found.

Throughout Irish history this day has always begun with the religious festivities in the morning and has closed with the dinners and dances in the evening. However, there is just one spot where today no celebration of the occasion will be permitted; where parades and assemblies have been banned; and that spot is, strangely enough, in Ireland itself.

This year, as was also done last year, the city of Londonderry is denied the right to hold any public celebration of this occasion. The Stormont government of the six counties in Northern Ireland has issued an edict which bans assemblies and processions in this city alone in all the world. The excuse for this strange edict is that there would be apprehension of grave disorder if assemblies were allowed, according to Edmond Warnock, Minister of Home Affairs in the Belfast Government.

The issuance of this edict is but a confession of the inability of the six-county government to maintain law and order within its jurisdiction, and is but one of many samples of the repressive legislation imposed upon the people in northern Ireland. The mere holding of a public gathering or a public parade would not of itself be a threat of grave disorder. The threat of disorder comes from those who would break up the parade or disrupt the meeting, and these people are the very people, who are the supporters of the six-county government and who should be subservient to the orders of the government's police forces or the commands of the British troops within the area. Yet rather than restrain these people in their efforts to disturb the public peace, the holding of parades and meetings is instead prohibited. In place of restraining the lawbreakers, the peaceable citizens are denied the exercise of their rights.

That such a system should be employed is not surprising in view of the manner in which the government of these six counties is selected through undemocratic processes and gerrymandered election districts. The result is that the government is not truly representative of the people and consequently the rights of a democratic people are denied the residents who must live in the area subject to such a government.

Unlike the six-county area, the rest of Ireland is today celebrating this occasion in the full enjoyment of their liberties and free from any traces of rioting or bigotry. They have particular reason to celebrate this day, for it will undoubtedly be the last to witness an Ireland which is not completely free from all outside domination and influence. On the 18th of April this year, the old External Relations Act will be terminated, and the Republic of Ireland will be freed from all remaining restrictions and ties with Great Britain that are not of Ireland's free choosing. For the first time, the Republic of Ireland will be able to stand amongst the other nations of the world and act in its own behalf without being controlled or directed by any outside or foreign power.

While a new era is about to dawn upon Ireland, it is to be regretted that it will not encompass all of Ireland. Unfortunately six counties will remain cut off from the rest of Ireland and will continue to be subject to the domination, dictation, and control of Great Britain. The partition of Ireland is the last remaining hold to which England clings in its centuries-long conquest of the Irish people. In this day of the recognition of the rights of small nations and small peoples everywhere, this condition cannot long continue. England must soon recognize that the subjugation of a neighboring people or the coercion of an adjoining nation cannot be suffered at a time when all the peoples of the world are engaged in the great fight for freedom and the preservation of individual liberty. The suppression of democratic principles in the six counties of northern Ireland is just as wrong as the same conditions in distant Indonesia.

The world protested the attempt to subjugate once more the natives of Indonesia, yet for 27 years the people of the six counties of northern Ireland have been subjected to British domination in opposition to the will of the vast majority of the Irish people. While one protests the maintenance of this alien control through subsidies and force of arms, it is to be hoped that when the next St. Patrick's Day is celebrated there will have been an end to the partition of Ireland and all 32 counties of this small island will have been united into one nation and one people as they were intended to be in the design of nature when the Irish race was placed on the Emerald Isle.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. FURCOLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

WASHINGTON POLICE

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, as a Scotchman, I may be a little out of place even appearing here on St. Patrick's Day. But, I want to say a few words about an organization in the District of Columbia, largely composed of good Irishmen and headed by a good two-fisted Irishman, one of the finest cops in America, Bob Barrett. Yesterday I read comments made by one of our Members to the effect that Washington policemen are tough on Congressmen. I do not entertain any such opinion. I do not think the people generally form the impression that there are any differences between the Washington, D. C., police force, the Park Police, and the Members of Congress. In every instance that has come to my attention since I have been here, the policemen have leaned over backward to be accommodating and kind and courteous and helpful in assisting with many problems that arise, not only through the conduct of affairs of our office but other problems presented to us by our constituents. Washington is the Capital of the world. It is the show window of our Nation. I think here we have established a police force second to none in America, and I, for one, do not feel that they are tough on Congressmen. I praise them rather than criticize them.

ENTRY OF 27 U. S. S. R. PUPPETS

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker and all of the Irish. I should like to associate myself with the greetings which have been extended today to the sons and daughters of the auld sod. I should also like to comment on the remarks made by the gentleman from Connecticut relative to the State Department's action in approving entry into this country of 27 puppets of the arts and sciences from behind the iron curtain. Mr. Shostakovitch is undoubtedly a great composer and a great artist, yet one who is sacrificing his rights to honor and distinction by walking uncomplainingly with the other prostitutes of Soviet art completely demeaning himself and art alike. Mr. Shostakovitch and his kind have the same right in this land of freedom as has rattlesnakes in a Baptist Church. To come here and to cloak himself with the rights and dignities of a freeman only to use the cloak of our liberties to destroy the very things that we hold sacred should bring a storm of protest from this Congress and from the people of this great country.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include an article in each.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

IRELAND

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this is the day on which someone should write the epitaph of the great Irish patriot and martyr, Robert Emmet, who just before he was executed, asked that it never be written until his country attained her independence.

I was very much impressed with what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] said a while ago about Poland under communism. I remember that it was a great Irish poet, Thomas Campbell, who said:

Hope, for a season, bade the world farewell,
And Freedom shriek'd as Kosciusko fell.

Never on earth has human freedom been in a worse predicament than it is in Poland today. God speed her delivery.

I received my first information about St. Patrick's day in a most disastrous manner, the day that Bob Fitzsimmons knocked out Corbett, the great Irish boxer, out in Carson City. I will not tell you how long it has been, but we boys were all in Corbett's corner.

I am reminded that more than 100 years ago, during the famine in Ireland, one of the greatest orators who ever occupied a seat in this House was from my State, Sergeant S. Prentiss, in a speech in behalf of the people of that unfortunate country said:

There lies on the other side of the broad Atlantic a beautiful island, famous in story and in song. It has given to the world more than its share of genius and of greatness. It has been prolific in warriors, statesmen, and poets. Its brave and generous sons have fought successfully all battles but their own, while its harp, like its history, moves to tears with its sweet but melancholy pathos.

One of the sweetest songs that came out of Ireland runs something like this:

There came to the beach a poor exile from Erin,
The dew on his thin robe was heavy and chill;
For his country he sighed, when at twilight repairing
To wander alone by the wind-beaten hill,
But the day-star attracted his eye's sad devotion,
For it rose o'er his own native isle of the ocean,
His heart beat anew with its youthful emotion,
As he sang the bold anthem of Erin go bragh.

He had come to America to help make this country great.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I fully realize my inability to pay proper tribute on this great day to the great man whose feast day the world should continue to celebrate because of what he did to bring the teachings of Christ not only to Ireland, but to the entire world as well. I am obligated to my Irish friends in this country because they were responsible for my entering politics.

It has been my pleasure to serve them in many ways and to work with many of them. I know of their contributions to our country, and I know what they have achieved on behalf of the freedom of others, because I recollect their fights for freedom in supporting the aspirations of many other nations.

Consequently, in 1917 I introduced a resolution in the House of Representatives expressing the desire and hope of Congress for Irish freedom, which I helped to pass.

I rejoice on this St. Patrick's Day that I have been able to continue to advocate freedom for all other nations and I hope in the near future, that Ireland will be united into one country under a single administration, and that it will continue to set an example for all others who are striving for religious freedom and liberty. America is grateful to the distinguished Americans of Irish stock and descent for their huge contributions to this country. I hope they will continue in the future as they have in the past to work for the betterment of humanity, for liberty and freedom to which every individual should aspire.

And in conclusion let me state that we are taking time from our momentous labors today to honor the memory of St. Patrick, a patron saint of the Irish. It is unnecessary to narrate the story of his life and the fine endeavors which are so prominently associated with his fine spirit and character, and yet his humility of nature, and his keen understanding and advocacy of love of fellow man, stamp him as an exalted leader of his time.

His watchword was service to humanity and he went wherever duty called him. The poor, the suffering, the persecuted and oppressed besieged him on all sides, but he never failed to minister to their wants, and supply them with the spiritual and material food which they so acutely needed.

It was certain, therefore, that as he lived so would his accomplishments after his death entitle him to a high place among the souls of the faithful departed.

I treasure highly today the personal tribute which I have received from the Irish Government, in the nature of some real Irish shamrocks, extending to me the best wishes of the Irish Government on this St. Patrick's Day. I shall prize it highly along with the loyal and close friendship of my numerous American friends of Irish descent.

Mr. BUCKLEY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCKLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCKLEY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, and my Irish colleagues: Being an Irishman myself I certainly have to rise to the occasion and think back to the country our forefathers came from. The Irish have been a people easy to get along with, and much easier to start a fight with. But they are among the greatest citizens in the whole world. Certainly they have proved themselves to be the finest diplomats on earth. When we stop to think on this great day, the 17th of March, we cannot help but realize that they have suffered a lot in past years.

It is my wish, and hope, and prayer, that in the near future Ireland, by her own efforts and make-up, will enjoy as much freedom as the Irish who live in this country. There is not much more that I can say except that "Ireland must be Heaven, because my mother came from there."

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHESNEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Speaker, today, here and everywhere throughout the world Irish hearts are happier and Irish eyes are smiling more appealingly in the fellowship inspired by our love for the little island from whence our fathers came—where, long, long ago lived and dwelt and preached and taught the saint whose feast day we celebrate on this occasion.

I wonder if ever in the history of the world any one man had such a dominant and such a lasting effect on the lives and habits of a whole nation as did St. Patrick on the lives of the Irish. On this day, fourteen and one-half centuries from the date of his death, the Irish and their friends everywhere are celebrating the memory of a man through whose life work the culture and civilization of the Roman world was saved; for, not only was Patrick an apostle of religion, but it was through his instrumentality that there sprang up all over Ireland those convents and monasteries which were the seats of learning and of culture that enabled the Irish to send back to Europe monks and nuns from Sweden through to Italy to light again the torch of learning, the light of culture that had been extinguished by the barbarian invasions of that ancient day. Other races may have their sagas of heroes who led their armies to conquest, fame, and booty; but the most famous heroes and heroines of the Irish are the Columbanuses, the Columbkilles, the Brides, who journeyed to other lands to bring them the culture and the enlightenment, along with the faith, that the Irish had received and had cherished in the centuries immediately after Patrick's reign, thereby establishing the example that has caused Irish men and women, down the ages, to journey to far countries, where always they have contributed to the enrichment of their adopted lands.

Sometimes I wonder if the Irish in St. Patrick's day were very much different from the Irish of our day, and I can only conclude that every man was a leader, and each was a king in his own domain. The kings who gathered at Tarra's Hall would have more than taxed the capacity of this spacious room—even when the roads were bad and the rains made travel difficult. And if in Napoleon's army, according to legend, every soldier carried in his knapsack a general's signs of rank just in case they ever would be needed, there is, I think, in every Irishman the feeling, that if the occasion required he could prove, not only his direct descent from one of those kings, but that he could also prove that he is just as good or a better man than his ancestor, the first of his line, the particular King of Ireland from whom he descended. In Italy one marvels at the fact that there are bishoprics so close together at times that with an ordinary pair of opera glasses one bishop could watch what the other had for dinner. In ancient Ireland it must have been very much the same situation with the kings. And, if at times, the Irish find themselves glowing with feelings of elation, of happiness and well-being, and wonder at the cause, know that it is inspired by the stimulation of the rich, royal blood of their ancestors coursing through their veins and not, as their wives might infer, to other liquids at all.

For me to list the achievements of the Irish race today would be to list the accomplishments of outstanding men in every field—in religion, in science, in literature, in warfare, in government, and in industry. It would be to cover the list of the occupations of the great throughout the world. One thing, though, that I feel that they have accomplished, and one thing in which I feel the Irish are predominant, is in salesmanship. Just between ourselves, there are other races, like the Poles, who are just as stanch as the Irish in their adherence to the faith of their fathers. There are other races, like the French and the Italians, that have brought great men in literature, in science, and in diplomacy; in fact, you can take any one of the achievements of which the Irish are so proud, and you can duplicate it in some other race, in some other place.

But—show me any race, or any place, that has been able to convince the rest

of the world of its greatness, as have the Irish. Show me another national saint as well known as St. Patrick. For every man who knows his name, even among his own people, I will show you a hundred more of every nationality wearing today the green of old Ireland and celebrating with the Irish, St. Patrick, and with him the greatness of the Irish.

CADOC THE WISE

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the House today of another great member of the Gaelic people. Of course, this great man was not as great as St. Patrick, but sometimes the greatness of a man is shown in the actions and sayings of his followers. It is thus that I hope to give greater honor to St. Patrick.

I want to tell the House today about Cadoc the Wise. He was a noble Celtic abbot who lived in the sixth century after Christ. Like all the Gaels, Cadoc had a great love for freedom and for poetry and song, and often, among his disciples, to the accompaniment of his harp, he sang verses in which he gave full utterance to the things that were in his mind and in his heart. One of his greatest poems was known as The Hate of Cadoc. I commend it especially to all men as a guide in private life, and particularly in political life.

This was The Song of Hate which Cadoc sang:

I hate the judge who loves money, and the scribe who loves war, and the chiefs who do not guard their subjects, and the nations without vigour; I hate houses without dwellers, lands untilled, fields that bear no harvest, landless clans, the agents of error, the oppressors of truth; I hate him who respects not father and mother, those who make strife among friends, a country in anarchy, lost learning, and uncertain boundaries; I hate journeys without safety, families without virtue, lawsuits without reason, ambushes and treasons, falsehood in council, justice unhonoured; I hate a man without a trade, a labourer without freedom, a society without teachers, a false witness before a judge, the undeserving exalted to high position, fables in place of teaching, knowledge without inspiration, sermons without eloquence, and a man without conscience.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted to me for next Monday may be continued until next Friday.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the gentleman from Texas, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in honoring St. Patrick today as the patron saint of Ireland, we honor him in a broader way than merely as the patron saint of Ireland; he is really the patron saint of the Celt, and that includes not only the Irish but also the Scotch and the Welsh, because the people of Ireland, Scotland, and Wales are all people of the same racial strain.

Mr. Speaker, nearly fifteen hundred years ago today, the mortal remains of St. Patrick, the glorious apostle of Ireland, were wrapped in a shroud woven by St. Brigid and laid to rest in the soil of the land that he had won to the love and heart of God.

Over the intervening years, perhaps no individual in the calendar of the saints has grown larger in stature, or won greater popular affection and devotion.

Patron of the land where he labored, revered by Christians everywhere, an illustrious example of religious zeal and patriotic fervor to all men in all ages, the slave boy who became a saint is universally acknowledged as one of the ideal characters in all recorded history.

The centuries that have passed since his death have served only to add luster to his name and fame to his achievements.

Because of the outstanding part in it played by St. Patrick, the history of the conversion of Ireland to Christianity should be required reading for all who aspire to the role of statesmen. For of all his accomplishments, none distinguished this missionary bishop more than his political acumen and his astute diplomacy.

As a roman provincial from Britain undertaking a mission in a pagan land, he could easily have courted failure and disaster. But his passionate love for the Irish people and his sympathy with, and respect for, native Irish culture and tradition assured his success. Apart from the working of the grace of God, his deeply sympathetic attitude to native institutions greatly facilitated his task of conversion.

While his primary motive was the winning of souls to God, his way was that of the mild, sincere, and persuasive diplomat. He made friends and converts among Irish lawyers, poets, and chiefs of clans, and with their help, he strove to conform native legislation with Christian ethics so that all that was lawful in the former might be retained.

He respected Irish social conventions, and Irish manners and customs, insofar as they did not conflict with the principles of the philosophy which he preached.

As a result, while he did meet with difficulties, he enjoys the rather unique distinction of converting a whole people without persecution, strife, or bloodshed.

"O Patrick mild, of the sweet voice" was the salutation he received from Oisin, the Bard of Finn, and this greeting is the best tribute to his diplomacy.

He came to the people of Ireland not as a disdainful representative of a foreign culture, not as a dictator to enforce his ideology by coercion, but as a friend bringing the gifts of his friendship, the hope of his doctrine, and the faith of a religion hitherto unknown in that pagan land.

The tribal nation to which he had come as a missionary was a land of warlike people. The Ireland to whose embracing soil he was committed at his death was known to the world as the "island of saints and scholars." This tremendous and significant change had been brought about by the heroic life and labors of one man—St. Patrick, the ambassador of God to Ireland.

How well he succeeded in his task is attested to by the fact that, from his day to this, the great religious and political traditions of his establishment have been so perpetuated that Ireland is recognized among all nations as a land of faith, liberty, and democracy.

The lesson from the life and work of St. Patrick is one of singular application to the world of today. It deserves emulation by men and nations regardless of creed, race, or color. It is the lesson of brotherhood under the fatherhood of God.

It means respect for the dignity of man.

It means understanding the views, customs, and attitudes of others out of a sense of genuine charity for our fellow men.

It means compassion and sympathy for the poor and suffering after the manner of Patrick, whose disinterestedness in his own regard was completed by a great generosity toward others.

It means devotion to the virtue of freedom, inspired with the same fervor as that which fired St. Patrick to fight so fiercely against the horrible slave system of pagan Ireland.

It means patience to achieve what we are convinced to be the right ordering of society—not by force, not by stooping to the terror of those who know no other way—but by the firm and tactful diplomacy of a Patrick whose gentle persuasion turned a lust for war to a burning desire for righteousness and peace.

It means good neighborliness—a shining virtue which is the crying need in the international world today.

On this St. Patrick's Day anniversary, therefore, it would not be amiss for each and every one of us to learn from the study of his character the reasons which have ennobled him in the eyes of God and man. While it is true that the historical picture of St. Patrick confounding the druids on Tara Hill presents a man of awesome and terrible dignity, it is also true that his own writings reveal a simple man—a friendly Patrick—direct, patient, tolerant, and so utterly conscious of his own failings.

Accompanying the self-realization of his shortcomings, however, was a reliance upon a faith in man and God that convinced him that great deeds could be wrought with the spirit. With such a faith, he brought a whole pagan nation into the fold of Christendom without coercion or tyranny.

With the same faith and in the same spirit we should emulate that nobleman of God, St. Patrick, and bend every effort toward the establishment of concord among nations.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two newspaper articles regarding manganese.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I always look forward with great eagerness to St. Patrick's Day. The day for the wearing of the green is always such a happy day. Today the name of Ireland's patron saint has been venerated and good wishes have been exchanged upon an occasion symbolized by the greenery which adds its glowing color to the scene.

This holiday is a tribute to a great man. At 16 years of age, St. Patrick became fired with a Christian zeal, and as he later said "I felt no evil, nor was there any laziness in me, because as I now see, the spirit was burning within me." Beckoned by the call of the Irish mission, St. Patrick entered into the service of the Lord, was made a deacon, and finally consecrated a bishop for the Irish.

The mission founded by St. Patrick was eminently successful. He founded churches, schools, and monasteries. He converted the kings of Munster, Dublin, and Connaught to the faith.

The work carried on by St. Patrick has been ineradicable. The movements he started were picked up and carried on virtually without interruption.

One of the things which has always made such a great impression upon me in connection with the life of St. Patrick has been the undying love which St. Patrick had for his people and for the land which has come to be known as his own.

At the same time St. Patrick's Day gives us cause to remember the contributions which Irish men and women have made to the progress of the world and more particularly to our own United States.

What are those contributions? I think first there is the Irish faith. They are fighters for the right. The strong Irish faith in righteous causes has made it possible for them to throw themselves into battles for freedom of the individual and his essential dignity and value, the equality of all individuals and nations.

The Irish have brought love of family, devotion to home, obedience to law and constituted authority, love of God, and love of liberty to the United States. They have brought loyalty to America, loyalty to freedom and democracy, loyalty to American institutions, tolerance and justice toward their fellow man. The Irishman knows on the basis of his 700 years of tragic struggle for liberty that when man surrenders personal freedom he thereby turns himself over to the whim and caprice of dictators and soon he will lose his freedom. He knows that if men expect to receive tolerance, they must be tolerant themselves and that bigotry, racial and religious persecution are but the means to ultimate self-destruction, as well as the betrayal of democracy's basic rights.

Truly all Irishmen and all other loyal Americans rejoice together today in honor of St. Patrick. The magnificent poetic prayer of St. Patrick's binds all of us together:

I arise today
Through God's strength to pilot me.
God's might to uphold me,
God's wisdom to guide me,
God's eye to look before me,
God's ear to hear me,
God's word to speak for me,
God's hand to guard me,
God's way to be before me.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

ASTOUNDING REPORT ON STEEL BY CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE SHOWING HOW UNFAIRLY SCARCE STEEL IS DISTRIBUTED BY FAVORING 8 STATES AND DISCRIMINATING AGAINST 40—TEXAS SUFFERED MOST EXTREME FORM OF DISCRIMINATION CAUSED BY BASING-POINT SYSTEM RECENTLY OUTLAWED BY SUPREME COURT BUT EFFORTS MADE TO RELEGALIZE IT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include certain statements and extracts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, American citizens of Irish descent have made a great contribution to the building of our wonderful country in time of peace and to the saving of our country in time of war.

NO MORE HYPHENATED NAMES FOR AMERICANS

When I first came to Congress 20 years ago it was not unusual for one to refer to individuals as Irish-Americans, German-Americans, and Polish-Americans, but now you never hear those hyphenated phrases. That is principally by reason of the fact that the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOHN McCORMACK, our distinguished, able, and fair majority leader, has always admonished us against using such phrases because we are all American citizens and should be referred to as Americans.

Although I happen not to be on the honor roll of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA], I am glad to be known as a descendant of an Irish-English immigrant who came to this country a long time ago. But because he came here more than 300 years ago does not mean that I will be a better American citizen because of that, or any better than one who came here much later. In fact, one of the best and most patriotic American citizens I have ever known is the dean of this House, the gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable ADOLPH SABATH, who was not born in this country. No one appreciates and tries to do more for the United States than the gentleman from Illinois, Judge SABATH. And I know a lot of other good Members of this House just as patriotic and loyal as an American citizen could possibly be and just as helpful to our country both in time of war and in time of peace whose fathers came here as immigrants. So, it does not make any difference how long we have been here or how long it has been since our ancestors came. That is not the test of loyalty of an American citizen. Although I doubt that all the American citizens of Irish descent ever agree on any major economic question, I am going to discuss today an economic question, I believe, that most of the Irish are interested in, and that is the question of monopoly and the trend of monopoly and unfair practices and discriminations and similar matters. I know that the Irish people are against monopolies; they are against unfairness of all kinds; they are against undue privileges. They are in favor of the Golden Rule. They believe in justice; they believe in equality and for that reason I believe they will be interested in what I have to say about monopoly.

Contrary to the general rule of one Democrat commending the actions of another Democrat, I am going to commend the actions of two of our Republican colleagues, Members of the other body.

I should like to call the attention of this body to a most important report, released on February 10 by the Special Committee of the Senate to Study the Problems of American Small Business. This report has a very pointed bearing upon the economic well-being of the Nation and more particularly, upon the economic life of most of our individual States and regions. And it has a very crucial bearing upon an issue with which this body will soon have to cope.

REPUBLICAN COLLEAGUES IN SENATE PRAISED

The report to which I refer is entitled "Changes in Distribution of Steel, 1940-47." It was prepared by two of our distinguished Republican colleagues in the Senate, Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY, chairman of the special committee, and Senator EDWARD MARTIN, chairman of the Steel Subcommittee of the special committee. These gentlemen are to be congratulated, first, for their success in prying loose from the giant steel corporations some actual facts and figures bearing upon questions which have been of wide concern, and second, for the frank and objective manner in which they have treated and presented the material.

This report analyzes in detail the so-called tight steel products, and particularly, the tightest product, hot-rolled sheets, which represents the most important single class of steel, and the product most widely used by manufacturing firms, small and large alike. According to this report, the total output of hot-rolled sheets for domestic use increased by 19 percent between 1940 and 1947.

As the hearings before the Small Business Committee have abundantly revealed, this rise in output fell far short of meeting the increased demand. Now the question arises as to how these short supplies were distributed among the various

States and industrial centers in 1947. Did each State get a pro rata share of the increased supply? Did the steel companies allocate to each State 19 percent more than it had used in 1940? Did they base their allocation on the relative degree of industrial expansion which has taken place in the various States since the outbreak of the war? Or did they use some other basis in deciding this crucial question—a question which has proved to be a matter of life and death to thousands of small businesses.

HOW UNFAIRLY SCARCE STEEL DISTRIBUTED

This report provides the answer to that question. It shows that almost all of the increased supplies between 1940 and 1947 were shipped to customers located in the immediate vicinity of the few major steel-production centers. Shipments of this steel product to the 12 traditionally surplus producing centers increased by 44 percent, while shipments to the rest of the country rose less than 3 percent.

The subcommittee regarded this situation as alarming, stating:

The power to govern the distribution of steel is the power of life and death in the economic world. The way in which it is exercised determines which businesses grow and which do not, which industries expand and which do not, which States and regions prosper and which do not. Yet, despite its overwhelming importance, the power appears to have been exercised, for example, so that the 12 areas which happened to be the major centers of steel production received nearly half as much again as their prewar shipments of hot-rolled-steel sheets, while the amount flowing into the entire remainder of the country stood practically unchanged, rising only 2.7 percent.

This means that in these other parts of the country which comprise by far the vast majority of our States and cities, their expanded steel-consuming facilities either had to be closed down or operated at considerably less than their full capacity. It means that in these areas both small and large firms were unable to secure their fair share of postwar market expansion. It means a further centralization of productive activities in a few greatly congested industrial centers.

EIGHT STATES FAVORED—FORTY STATES DISCRIMINATED AGAINST

Actually the figures can be stated in somewhat simpler terms. Considering States as a whole, a mere 8 States received all of the increased supplies while the other 40 States, plus the District of Columbia, received in total no more than they obtained in the prewar year of 1940. This should be a matter of great concern to all of us since in most States there has taken place a great expansion of businesses dependent upon steel as a raw material. During the war, plants to produce munitions and other essential wartime items were constructed on an enormous scale. Then with the end of the war, many new small manufacturing businesses were established, particularly by returning veterans. Thus, great strides in industrialization have been made, particularly in those regions which have sometimes been referred to as industrially undeveloped.

Yet, despite this widespread expansion in industrial capacity in most parts of the country, the increased supply of steel sheets has been so distributed that many States not only have failed to receive a pro rata share of the 19-percent over-all increase in supplies but actually have received less in aggregate quantities than they obtained before the war. These States which have thus been grossly discriminated against are Maine, Vermont, Rhode Island, New Jersey, New York, Michigan, Wisconsin, Idaho, Georgia, Louisiana, Texas, Nevada, and Arizona.

This is an absolute minimum list of States which have been discriminated against. To it would also be added those States that received an increase in supply which, however, was less than the national average of 19 percent. Or alternatively, it could include those States which received an increase which was more than the national average but was still less than the amount needed to meet the needs of their expanded steel-consuming facilities.

TEXAS SUFFERED MOST EXTREME FORM OF DISCRIMINATION

It happens that my own State of Texas is among those States which were subjected to the most extreme form of discrimination—that is, those States which received less in actual amount in 1947 than in 1940. To be specific, shipments of hot-rolled sheets to Texas were cut back by no less than 11 percent in 1947 as contrasted to 1940—a curtailment which took place despite the tremendous gains which Texas has made in industrial expansion and despite the obvious need of our Texas plants for greater, not less, steel supplies.

This discrimination against Texas has not been confined to just one product—hot-rolled sheets. Although between 1940 and 1947 the total output of the three basic hot-rolled products combined—hot-rolled sheets, strip and bars—rose 30 percent in the Nation as a whole, the amount of these products flowing to Texas declined by 1 percent.

It is true that we received a somewhat greater supply of the cold-rolled products—sheets, strip, and bars. But this resulted from the simple fact that this type of steel commands a premium from the mills of $20 to $25 a ton, and, as the report shows, the steel companies have greatly increased the production of cold-rolled steel, making many customers who would prefer the hot-rolled types purchase this premium-priced steel or do without.

But even including the higher-priced substitutes, Texas customers still did not receive a fair share of the steel supply. The total output of hot-rolled and cold-rolled sheets, strip and bars, combined, increased between 1940 and 1947 by 47 percent in the country as a whole, but the amount going to Texas rose only 15 percent. Thus the percentage rise in supplies made available to Texas buyers was less than one-third of the increase for the country as a whole.

Only in the case of pipe and tubing was there an increase in supplies for Texas—as would certainly be expected from the fact that Texas accounts for about half of the country's production of petroleum. Yet even here, the record of the Senate Small Business Committee indicates that, unlike the major oil companies, the independent oil producers and small refiners in Texas and elsewhere have experienced tremendous difficulties in trying to secure the pipe and tubing which is essential to their operations.

CAUSE OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST TEXAS

Now what is the cause of this gross discrimination against Texas and, indeed, against practically all States which are not among the great centers of steel production? The answer is to be found in the operation of the basing-point system, which of course was in effect during the period, 1940–47, covered by the report. The report, in citing the complaints of small business, summarizes the workings of the basing-point system which have resulted in this discrimination as follows:

Of all the complaints made before this committee, none was voiced so insistently by so many small-business men as the contention that steel producers have withheld steel from distantly located customers and diverted disproportionately large supplies to their nearby customers.

Practically all of these complaints advanced as the reason for the withdrawals the reluctance of producers to absorb freight under the basing-point system * * *

Under the basing-point system, as it was followed in the years covered by the survey, each customer has one official delivered price, which is the sum of the base price at the basing point nearest the customer, plus rail freight from that basing point. Thus when one mill ships into the territory of another mill located at a basing point, the shipping mill must absorb sufficient freight to make the delivered price the same as if the steel had been purchased from the nearer mill.

It was argued that since the mills can during a period of shortage sell most of their output to nearby customers without absorbing freight, they would naturally tend to do so rather than ship to distant customers from whom they would receive a lower mill net price. In short, it was held that one of the inherent features of the basing-point system was a centripetal movement of shipments in toward the steel mills during a period of shortage, a movement which would only be reversed when the shortage had disappeared.

Some of the small-business men who voice this complaint contended that they had offered to buy steel f. o. b. mill and pay the cost of transportation themselves, thereby obviating any necessity on the part of the mill to absorb freight. In each case the witnesses stated that the mills had refused to sell steel on this basis, apparently for the reason that they did not wish to deviate in any way from the basing-point method of pricing.

After quoting a number of representative complaints of this type made by individual, small-business men, the report then presents the findings of the committee's survey, which I have briefly summarized above and which, in general, corroborate this complaint of small business.

BASING-POINT SYSTEM HARMS CONSUMERS

Perhaps I can best describe the way in which the basing-point system has discriminated against so many States, if I take the State with which I am most familiar as an example.

Under the basing-point system, which prevailed in steel until shortly after Cement decision of the Supreme Court handed down in April 1948, delivered prices for steel in Texas were computed as the sum of the base price at the United

States Steel Corporation's plant in Birmingham, and the all-rail freight charges from Birmingham to the point of delivery. This was true even though the steel was, in many cases, shipped by the cheaper water rates. Because of this basing-point system, the delivered price was so high in Texas before the war that the steel corporations could sell their surpluses by shipping to Texas from such distant places as Pittsburgh and Chicago, absorbing some of the freight in the bargain.

OUTLAWING OF BASING-POINT SYSTEM HELPS DISTANT CUSTOMERS

As a matter of fact, since under this system the steel mills both near and far all agreed to sell at the same delivered price in Texas, the Texas customers did buy a large part of their supplies from these distant centers. This practice of buying from distant sellers is a characteristic of the basing-point system in normal times. Since each location has one fixed delivered price from all sellers, or to put it another way, since the delivered price to any buyer is the same, regardless of whether he purchases from nearby or distant mills, there is normally no incentive for buyers to purchase from nearby producers. Hence, under the basing-point system, there develop such ridiculous situations as customers in Pittsburgh buying from mills in Detroit, with customers in Detroit buying from mills in Pittsburgh.

Not only has the steel industry used this system which fosters dependence upon the established centers of production, but in addition, whenever local business interests, such as those in Texas, have endeavored to establish their own mills to serve their own territories, the steel industry has threatened and coerced them into abandoning the projects, a matter which I shall discuss later.

PERIOD OF SHORTAGE THE TEST

Then, after having made practically all customers everywhere beholden to them, when a period of shortage develops and buyers in the outlying areas such as Texas try to obtain steel from the established mills upon which they have come to depend, they find that the mills have drawn in their shipments around their own areas, selling only to nearby customers. The mills have done this because under the basing-point system they are unwilling to absorb freight charges, since they can sell all or most of their output in their home areas. This means that frequently the historic base-period quotas held by distantly located buyers are meaningless. Yet, while on the one hand, the customer has been informed that he cannot be supplied because the mill would have to absorb freight, on the other hand he has been told, when he has asked the mill to let him pay the freight, "No; this would be against the rules of the basing-point system."

STEEL TRUST FEARS REAL AMERICAN COMPETITION

Texas customers, like those of other States, would have been glad to pay the full freight charges and, as the record shows, have repeatedly urged the steel corporations to let them do so. They have, of course, felt that it is better to pay a somewhat higher delivery charge for essential supplies than to be denied these supplies altogether. Accordingly, they have urged the steel corporations to set prices at the steel mills which would be equally available to all buyers and let the buyers pay the freight. But until the Supreme Court ruled against the system, the steel corporations have refused to do this. They insisted upon safeguarding their monopolistic basing-point system against the day when the shortages disappear and they might—in the absence of this system—have to cope with that terrible danger which they have been avoiding for over half a century—the danger of honest, American competition.

They have been particularly fearful of the emergencies of competition in areas which are undergoing a great industrial expansion. The State of Texas provides a striking illustration of the lengths to which they have gone in order to prevent the development of competitors in such areas.

INDUSTRIAL PROGRESS IN 40 STATES RETARDED

We Texans are well aware of our recent industrial progress and of our determination to make greater strides in the future. We are also aware that our progress has been made in spite of every use of monopoly power by the steel corporations to prevent our progress. The only things done for Texas by the steel industry have been, first, to retard our progress with high prices for steel; second, to kill off every attempt that local capital has made to develop our own steel-making resources, and finally, after keeping us dependent upon them for steel, they now divert scarce steel items to their local markets and starve out our own industry in these crucial times of shortages.

IMAGINARY FREIGHT CHARGED

Let me be specific. For almost two generations, the steel corporations have charged the Southwest and the West prices for steel which included some imaginary freight charge from distant eastern mills. For a full quarter century after the United States Steel trust was organized, under the so-called Pittsburgh plan basing-point system, Texas was charged prices which included imaginary freight from Pittsburgh. In the second quarter of the present century—up until the Supreme Court's decision last year—the steel corporations, under the multiple basing-point system, charged delivered prices to Texas which included rail freight rates from United States Steel's plant at Birmingham, although they frequently shipped the steel at the cheaper water rates. Not only have these corporations charged to Texas prices which included rail rates, but they have connived and pressured to make and keep these rail rates artificially high and discriminatory against all western industry.

THREATS STOP PROGRESS

Yet, whenever Texas businessmen have endeavored to set up a mill which might produce low-priced steel in Texas, they have been threatened and coerced, with the result that Texas, and the Southwest in general, still does not have anything like adequate steel-making facilities to process its own resources and supply its own local markets. Several years ago, when a group of Texas businessmen formed a company expecting to produce steel rails, they were told by eastern steel interests that if they did not cancel their plans for constructing a mill they would find rails made in the East being sold in Texas for less than the cost of production.

Even during the war when steel shortages threatened the Nation's military efforts, Texas businessmen were blocked in their attempts to produce steel in Texas. Early in the war a group of Texas businessmen raised capital and drew up plans for building a steel mill at the present iron-producing facilities near Daingerfield and Hughes Springs, but this plan never materialized because the eastern steel interests running the WPB steel program would not authorize this plant construction, although the blast furnace was completed by the end of the war and is now producing premium pig iron at the rate of a thousand tons a day. A steel plant is badly needed, and efforts are now being made to get one.

TRUMAN COMMITTEE TESTIMONY

These problems which have invariably confronted western businessmen generally, who have had long histories in trying to establish steel plants, were succinctly summarized by Mr. Henry J. Landahl, secretary-treasurer of the Pacific-American Steel Iron Corp., Bellingham, Wash., who testified before the Truman committee on August 6, 1942, as follows:

Historically the effort to create an iron and steel industry on the Pacific coast has been undertaken on many occasions in the last 30 years, efforts in which the officers and directors of our corporation have participated and in which they have invested substantial sums of money and a great deal of time and effort. There has never been a question of the feasibility of an iron and steel industry in this area, but on each occasion when the efforts have been made to establish an industry the planning and work of those engaged in the project has been frustrated through connivance and intervention on the part of existing steel corporations and existing financial combinations. (Hearings before the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program (Truman committee), pt. 14, p. 5829.)

MONOPOLISTIC BASING-POINT SYSTEM

But throughout the years the most pernicious obstacle to the development of a steel industry in Texas has been the basing-point system itself. The keystone of this system is the old monopolistic practice of local price cutting which now has the bright new name of systematic freight absorption. Under this practice local businessmen would be perpetually forced, as long as this monopolistic practice was permitted to continue, to share a major part of their local market with the big eastern producers.

No matter how low such a local mill may have reduced its price, the giant eastern mills could have, and by the rules of the system, would have, absorbed freight to meet this low price until, finally, the local mill would be forced to raise its price again. And the result would

have been a local mill doomed to a high-priced, low-volume business, with no hope of attaining volume production except by absorbing costly freight charges in order to ship to Birmingham, Chicago, Cleveland, and other places which already produce more than enough steel to meet their local demand.

GIANT CORPORATION WINS

In the battle of absorbing freight charges, as in any other form of local price cutting, the giant corporation can always win over the small company, since it can outlast the smaller firm, and absorb whatever losses it may incur in the struggle with profits made elsewhere. And when the battle involves several giants ganged up against one or two small companies, the latter have no chance at all.

ANTITRUST LAWS CONTAIN ANSWER

Thanks to the antitrust laws, including the Robinson-Patman Antidiscrimination Act which I introduced in the House of Representatives, the basing-point method of price fixing has been stopped in both the steel and cement industries. And thanks to their effectiveness in finally stopping this oppressive practice of the really powerful monopolies, the antitrust laws are now under attack by one of the most vicious, skillful, and determined lobbies the country has ever seen.

POWERFUL LOBBY ON SCENE

For almost a year now this lobby has bombarded the country with propaganda from the grass roots up. It has flooded the country with press releases, speeches, statements, and other propaganda, in newspapers, magazines, and over the air. It has traveling representatives touring the country, drumming up witnesses to come and testify before a committee in the United States Senate. It has threatened steel buyers with a curtailment of supply unless they testify before the committee. It boasts the highest paid lobbyist registered under the Lobbying Act in the land. Its technique has been that of the "big lie" as developed by Adolf Hitler. The lobby, in all seriousness, is trying to put over on the American people the fantastic big lie that something which has been found by the Supreme Court to be a conspiracy to fix prices is actually true and genuine competition.

LOBBY BROADCAST FROM DALLAS

The lobby has gone so far as to endeavor to convince citizens of great and expanding regions that what is good for the steel corporations is good for them. Thus, a few weeks ago the Nation-wide network program of the United States Steel Corp. was broadcast from Dallas, Tex. There was at the time no apparent reason why this regular weekly radio show should have visited Texas, except to lend some flimsy excuse for a high-powered radio propagandist to cite statistics on the Southwest's recent industrial progress, to say many flattering things about Texas, and last but not least, to make some very bold claims for the corporation's assistance and part in the Southwest's industrial growth.

PURE BRASS AND GALL

To the people of a great State which for two generations have been victimized by the monopolistic practices of the steel corporations, this new particularized propaganda attempt to win friends and influence people just about takes the prize for pure brass and gall. There can be little doubt but that it is part of the lobby's propaganda drive designed to lull Texas to sleep while it pursues its campaign to have Congress change the antitrust laws so that the giant monopolies can again shackle us with their basing-point system.

PHONY ARGUMENT PRESENTED

The clarion call of the lobby has been confusion and the need for clarification of the law. But the fact of the matter is that despite all the efforts to create confusion, the law is clear—and that is the trouble, it is all too clear for the comfort of the monopolies. The plain fact of the matter is that the basing-point system as used in the cement industry, has been declared to be illegal.

BILL PRESENTED NOT NECESSARY

Nevertheless, the strength of the lobby is so great that I have no doubt but that we shall soon be asked to pass a bill to unclarify the law under the guise, of course, that we are really clarifying it. The truth is that for many, many years we have had laws which are effective against small crimes. Small crimes have never been a great problem to law makers in any history. But now we have a law which is in part at least, effective against a great crime. Our problem is to see if we can keep it.

MANY PEOPLE MISLED

That, however, is going to be a formidable task. The propaganda campaign has been so widespread and so effective that many small businesses have been sincerely convinced that their interests would best be served if the law were changed. And several Members of Congress have in turn been sincerely convinced that the interests of their constituents would best be served if it were changed, and a number of them have already introduced bills for this purpose.

ANTITRUST LAWS SHOULD NOT BE TAMPERED WITH

But before the members of this body start voting to tamper with the antitrust laws, they ought to give the matter serious consideration and carefully weigh the consequences of their actions. This basing-point matter is not a simple problem. It is, rather, the most sophisticated and effective means of monopoly control ever devised by the mind of man. Members of Congress who are importuned by persons seeking a change in the law should bear in mind the facts as revealed in the Senate Small Business Committee report to which I have referred—facts which show that under the basing-point system, shipments of steel have been sharply drawn in around the centers of steel production, thereby penalizing the rest of the country. Members of Congress who come from the many States which have not received their fair share of steel should think twice before they vote for the reestablishment of that very pricing system which was responsible for the failure of their own State to obtain a fair and equitable share of the increased supplies available.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I want to commend the gentleman on his very excellent presentation and on his long work in this particular field. I hope that in succeeding months the committee he heads will be able to bring in legislation that will correct many of these abuses.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

ST. PATRICK

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, throughout the whole world, wherever men and women of Irish blood may be on this great day, they pause in their day's occupation to render their heartfelt tribute of affection and reverence to the great saint, scholar, and patriot, St. Patrick, and to thoughts of the virtues of Old Erin, the matchless courage of her sons and daughters who have served every noble cause, to its beautiful poetry and music, to its glorious history, its proud heritage, and its magnificent contributions to civilization.

That no race has ever excelled the courage of the Irish few men would care to deny. No people have every exceeded the Irish in their love of God, their loyalty to Christianity, their fierce and burning love of liberty. No race has paid a higher price for freedom than the Irish.

We could not possibly measure the contributions of the Irish race and people of Irish blood to our beloved America. The blood of their sons has saturated the battleground of every American war. Irish-American war heroes are legion. Their devotion and loyalty to our Nation have known no bounds. They have been in the vanguard by the hundreds of thousands, yes; by the millions whenever our country and its institutions were in danger. It is not possible for anyone to measure the great gifts of life, treasure, energy, and ability which people of Irish blood have unselfishly bestowed in order to promote the building of America and to enhance our national welfare.

Broad, tolerant, and just, devoted to democratic ideals, the Irish have ever defended the faith of Christ and the political truths of our American forefathers. They have striven and fought for toleration and justice and equal opportunity for all and have been willing always to lay down their lives and spill their precious blood to realize these great aims. They will continue to do so as the years go on and we build a greater and more glorious America.

Even now as the forces of godless communism and destruction stalk through the world and infiltrate into our own country, the Irish-American and the faith he embraces constitute an impassable barrier against the penetration of the evil ideology which would corrupt and poison the lifestream of the American Republic. The Irish-American will never surrender to atheism or communism, or any other un-American concept. Like his ancestors of old, he will fight and die, if necessary, in defense of the precious principles of freedom to which he is so passionately attached, and which he has lived by throughout the centuries. His Americanism is unexcelled.

It is appropriate, therefore, that on this day hallowed in the minds and hearts of every true Irishman, we pause to pay brief tribute to the great patron saint who has inspired Irish devotion and heroism throughout the ages, and who will, in the time to come, God willing, continue to strengthen the determination of those who revere him, to labor and fight for God and country and the sacred principles of American freedom.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SHEPPARD, for 10 days, on account of official business.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 315. An act for the relief of Dr. Chung Kwai Lui;

S. 335. An act for the relief of Claris U. Yeadon;

S. 592. An act for the relief of Edwin B. Anderson;

S. 594. An act for the relief of John I. Malarin, former Army mail clerk at APO 932, a branch of the San Francisco, Calif., post office, relative to a shortage in his fixed credit account;

S. 632. An act to authorize certain personnel and former personnel of the Naval Establishment to accept certain gifts and a foreign decoration tendered by foreign governments;

S. 633. An act for the relief of Rachel D. Gattegno; and

S. 634. An act to authorize payment of certain claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property and personal injury arising from activities of the Army.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 21, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

393. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting to the Congress a study prepared for the Commission's consideration on aspects of agricultural functions and organization in the United States. This task-force report is submitted as a supplement to the Commission's report on interior as well as the Commission's report on agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

394. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting its report on the Department of the Interior and separately, as appendixes L, M, and Q, the related task-force reports on natural resources, agriculture, and public works (H. Doc. No. 122); to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

395. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting to the Congress a study prepared for the Commission's consideration of organization and policy in the field of natural resources in the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

396. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting to the Congress a study prepared for the Commission's consideration on various aspects of public works in the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

397. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting to the Congress, in typescript, a study on the natural resources activity of the Federal Government which was prepared for the Commission's consideration by a member of the task force, J. R. Mahoney, of the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, as a supplement to the Commission's report on the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Public Lands.

398. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 3, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Gulf Intracoastal waterway to determine if existing project should be modified by constructing the waterway from Carrabelle, Fla., to Lanark, thence to Turkey Point, Alligator Harbor, Tide Creek, and Panacea, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

399. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 10, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on the Intracoastal Waterway from Cape Fear River, N. C., to Winyah Bay, S. C., at and near Singleton Swash, S. C., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on June 20, 1940; to the Committee on Public Works.

400. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 11, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on the Intracoastal Waterway from the Cape Fear River, N. C., to the St. Johns River, Fla., with a view to determining the cause of silting and remedial measures therefor between the Savannah River and the confluence of the Skidaway River and Wilmington River, requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on June 7, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

401. A letter from the assistant secretary, National Institute of Arts and Letters, transmitting the official report of the National Institute of Arts and Letters for the year ending December 31, 1948; to the Committee on House Administration.

402. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report showing claims paid under the Federal Tort Claims Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

403. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize construction of buildings for the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 271. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the middle district of Georgia; without amendment (Rept. No. 268). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 3606. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to the apportionment of the acreage allotment for peanuts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 3607. A bill to change the name of Mosquito Creek Dam on Mosquito Creek in the State of Ohio to "Kirwan Dam"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CAVALCANTE:

H. R. 3608. A bill authorizing an appropriation of $1,219,600 for the Redstone Creek flood-control project near Uniontown, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 3609. A bill to clarify the application of certain excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 3610. A bill to grant the consent of the Congress to the Arkansas River compact; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 3611. A bill to provide for the preparation, printing, and distribution of a list of all persons who died at any time after May 26, 1941, and before September 3, 1945, while serving on active duty with the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 3612. A bill to change the name of Mosquito Creek Dam on Mosquito Creek in the State of Ohio to Kirwan Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 3613. A bill to increase to $60 per month all pensions payable to former members of the armed forces or their dependents under private laws, where the existing rate thereof is less than $60 per month; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3614. A bill to declare the public policy of the District of Columbia to be opposed to the segregation of persons of different race, color, creed, national origin, or ancestry; to provide for the operation of the public schools of the District of Columbia on a nonsegregated basis; and to provide for the denial of business licenses to persons who fail to conform to the aforesaid policy; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 3615. A bill to promote the settlement and development of the Territory of Alaska by facilitating the construction of necessary housing therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 155. Resolution to investigate costs of production on domestic and foreign fresh and frozen groundfish fillets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 156. Resolution to provide funds for the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. Res. 157. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 107; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, requesting immediate review of recent cuts in the veterans' hospital program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 3616. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Lulu Two Spears Iron Bird; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FURCOLO:

H. R. 3617. A bill for the relief of Silvana Serra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 3618. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Frances M. Carroll (deceased) and Charles P. Carroll; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 3619. A bill for the relief of Miriam Martin Dahlstrom; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 3620. A bill for the relief of Leslie A. Harber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER:

H. R. 3621. A bill for the relief of Antonio DeAngelis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 3622. A bill for the relief of Mario Figlioli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

248. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Porfirio Herrera, president of the Chamber of Deputies of the Dominican Republic, expressing condolences and sympathy at the death of the Honorable Sol Bloom; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

249. Also, petition of the Director, Division of Territories and Island Possessions, Department of the Interior, urging the Congress to extend to Puerto Rico any minimum-wage law which may be enacted and to include Puerto Rico in other social legislation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

250. Also, petition of Dr. Joseph J. Tronolone, city clerk, Buffalo, N. Y., relative to the immediate repeal of the Taft-Hartley law; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

251. Also, petition of Central-Northwest Citizens' Association, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enacting into law an all-inclusive income tax for the District of Columbia and disapproval of proposed sales tax for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

252. Also, petition of the Pendleton (Oreg.) Rotary Club, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposing legislation as proposed in the bills S. 5 and H. R. 783; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MARCH 18, 1949

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor, Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, in this moment of prayer wilt Thou grant unto us a clearer vision of those ideals and principles of brotherhood and good will which Thou hast ordained for the welfare and happiness of all mankind.

May we never feel that they are merely illusions and that they lie beyond the sphere of practical realization, but may our vision be so constraining and commanding that every noble capacity within us shall respond with a fervent desire to bring them to fulfillment and fruition.

We pray that the chosen representatives of our beloved country, whom we trust and respect, may be inspired with faith and fortitude, with clear judgment and wise decision, as they lead us in the glorious task of building a better world.

Hear us in the name of the Saviour. Amen.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	Morse
Anderson	Hoey	Mundt
Brewster	Holland	Murray
Bricker	Hunt	O'Conor
Bridges	Ives	O'Mahoney
Butler	Jenner	Pepper
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Capehart	Kefauver	Russell
Chapman	Kem	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kerr	Schoeppel
Connally	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Knowland	Sparkman
Donnell	Langer	Stennis
Douglas	Lodge	Taft
Downey	Long	Taylor
Eastland	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Ecton	McCarran	Thye
Ellender	McCarthy	Tobey
Ferguson	McFarland	Tydings
Flanders	McGrath	Vandenberg
Frear	McKellar	Watkins
George	McMahon	Wherry
Gillette	Magnuson	Wiley
Green	Malone	Williams
Gurney	Martin	Withers
Hayden	Maybank	Young
Hendrickson	Miller	
Hickenlooper	Millikin	

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

THE JOURNAL

The VICE PRESIDENT. The first order of business is the reading of the Journal.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. MUNDT asked and obtained leave to be absent from the Senate Monday and Tuesday next.

Mr. FLANDERS asked and obtained leave to be absent from the Senate Monday next.

AUTHORIZATION TO FILE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Appropriations I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to file a report from that committee on the deficiency appropriation bill during the recess of the Senate this week.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. CONNALLY asked and obtained consent for the Committee on Foreign Relations to sit during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY TREASURY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by the Treasury Department under authority of the Federal Tort Claims Act, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTRUCTION OF BUILDINGS FOR BUREAU OF OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize construction of buildings for the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

AUDIT REPORT OF PANAMA RAILROAD COMPANY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Panama Railroad

Company, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORT OF COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, stating "The Commission has completed certain reports, which will be submitted to the Senate from time to time"; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 20

"Joint resolution relative to the establishment of an Air Force Academy

"Whereas recognition of the necessity of training competent officers for the defense forces of the United States has been manifested through the establishment and maintenance of West Point and Annapolis; and

"Whereas it is clear that competent officers should be trained for the United States Air Force, one of the three major components of the defense forces of the United States; and

"Whereas the geographic and climatic conditions in California are such as to permit study of every conceivable condition of aerial warfare: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, jointly*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes Congress to enact legislation to provide for an academy in California for the training of officers for the United States Air Force; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative of Congress from California."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California, relating to the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See joint resolution printed in full when presented today by Mr. KNOWLAND.)

The petition of Richard F. Ware, Jr., president, and Lula B. Patterson, secretary, of the Central-Northwest Citizens' Association, of Washington, D. C., praying for the enactment of an all-inclusive income-tax law for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of Cushing Memorial Hospital, Leavenworth, Kans., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by Local Union No. 28, Pressmen and Assistants' Union, of Louisville, Ky., protesting against an increase in postal charges for publications; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter in the nature of a petition signed by V. A. Cartwright, business manager, Pipe Fitters Local Union No. 522, of Louisville, Ky., relating to age limits of retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Memorial 4

"*To the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress Assembled:*

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas there are certain inequalities in the old-age and survivors' insurance law as now enacted especially with relation to married women, and those not fully qualified under the law to receive the benefits though contributions have been made therefor; and

"Whereas at present prices the amount of all social-security benefits are inadequate.

"Now, therefore, your memorialists respectfully pray that the Congress of the United States speedily pass legislation:

"1. To include among the classes within the purview of social-security legislation public employees, employees of religious and charitable organizations and all self-employed persons including those in the professions, in commerce, in agriculture, and other groups; and to grant to the several States the full option of placing their employees and the employees of their political subdivision under Federal old-age and survivors' insurance;

"2. To provide that persons over 60 who are severed from their employment before reaching age 65 and would have been eligible at the time of the severance of their employment had they been aged 65, shall upon reaching the age of 65 be eligible to their pension as though the severance had then occurred;

"3. To provide that the pensioners shall be entitled to additional pension for a dependent wife upon her reaching the age of 60, and that widows of persons, who at the time of their death, had they been 65, would have been pensioners, shall be entitled to a widow's pension upon reaching the age of 60;

"4. To provide that no deduction in pensions shall be made for income from other sources including salaries and wages;

"5. To provide for increase in the amount paid in all categories by at least 50 percent; and

"6. To provide for the refunding to those not eligible to pension all contributions made by them therefor; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, and to Members of the United States Senate and United States House of Representatives from this State.

"Passed the house February 1, 1949.

"CHARLES W. HODGE,
"*Speaker of the House.*

"Passed the senate February 23, 1949.

"VICTOR A. MEYERS,
"*President of the Senate.*"

"House Joint Memorial 31

"*To the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled:*

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas the State of Washington imposes a tax upon the sale and use of cigarettes within its boundaries, and the revenues so obtained constitute an important portion of the funds available for its functions of government; and

"Whereas it has been brought to the attention of your memorialists that a large and growing system of evasion of cigarette taxes has developed through the use of the United States mails; that advertisements and inducements are being sent through the United States mails to the citizens of this State and other States, which advertisements and inducements encourage violations of the cigarette taxes imposed by the various States; that in numerous instances such advertisers entice prospective customers with statements to the effect that the use of the United States mails is proof of the legitimacy of such business and such a system; that the mails of the United States are actually being used for the purpose of making deliveries into this State and other States of cigarettes on which the tax required by the laws of such States have not and will not be paid; that this State is seriously affected by such use of the mails of the United States for the purpose of evading the laws of this State, and faces substantial losses of revenue as a result of such system of evasion; and

"Whereas it has been brought to the attention of your memorialists that there is now pending before the Congress of the United States certain proposed bills which would aid the individual States in the enforcement of their cigarette-tax laws by requiring shippers of cigarettes in interstate commerce to furnish to the taxing authorities of the State to which the merchandise is shipped a copy of the invoice on each shipment and the name and address of each purchaser: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That your memorialists hereby respectfully petition and memorialize the President and the Congress of the United States to enact and approve a bill requiring shippers of cigarettes in interstate commerce to furnish to the taxing authorities of the States to which the merchandise is shipped a copy of the invoice on each such shipment and the name and address of each purchaser, or to enact such other legislation in aid of the States affected as may be proper; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Washington is hereby directed to forward certified copies of this joint memorial to the President of the United States and to the presiding officers of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and to each Senator and Representative in Congress from the State of Washington.

"Passed the house February 22, 1949.

"CHAS. W. HODGE,
"*Speaker of the house.*

"Passed the senate March 4, 1949.

"VICTOR A. MEYERS,
"*President of the senate.*"

By Mr. MILLER:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Joint Memorial 9

"*To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:*

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that—

"Whereas the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, pursuant to an authorization of the Committee on Commerce of the United States Senate, adopted September 24, 1943, have completed a review report of the Columbia River and its tributaries; and

"Whereas the Department of the Interior has completed a report on the comprehensive development of the water resources of the Columbia River Basin as authorized by the United States Congress in the act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto; and

"Whereas the plans of the Corps of Engineers and of the Department of the Interior both contemplate the construction of multipurpose dams and other improvements on the Columbia River and its tributaries in the interest of irrigation, flood control, navigation, power, and other beneficial uses, and, as reported in a joint announcement, the technical differences in the two plans have now been or are to be reconciled and the two plans complement each other; and

"Whereas there is an immediate and urgent need for certain of the projects recommended for immediate authorization in both reports: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Idaho (the house of representatives concurring), That we most respectfully urge that all steps possible be taken immediately to the end that a unified, integrated, and well-coordinated plan for the development of the natural resources of the Columbia Basin endorsed and recommended by both the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Army Engineers be presented to Congress for early adoption and authorization for construction by said agencies and that insofar as practical funds be appropriated therefor; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, directed to forward copies of this memorial to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to all of the Senators and Representatives of the States of Idaho, Wyoming, Oregon, and Washington.

"This senate joint memorial passed the senate on the 24th day of February.

"DONALD S. WHITEHEAD,
"President of the Senate.

"This senate joint memorial passed the house of representatives on the 3d day of March 1949.

"JOHN HOHNHORST,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

By Mr. HUNT (for himself and Mr. O'MAHONEY):

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Finance:

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 5

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to consider and pass legislation to amend and broaden the coverage of the Social Security Act

"Whereas there still remain inequalities in our social-security system which require readjustment to assure a fuller life for all our citizens; and

"Whereas there are over 20,000,000 Americans still excluded from the benefits provided by the National Social Security Act; and

"Whereas, in view of the increased cost of living, present provisions are inadequate to provide our elderly citizens with a decent standard of living: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Thirtieth Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be memorialized to enact legislation for the extension of the Social Security Act to all deserving Americans not otherwise so protected, and broadening social security to provide an increase in aid for elderly citizens; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to United States Senators JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY and LESTER C. HUNT and Congressman FRANK A. BARRETT.

"HERMAN D. MAYLAND,
"Speaker of the House.

"GEORGE BURKE,
"President of the Senate.

"Approved February 25, 1949.

"A. G. CRANE,
"Governor."

Three joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Joint Memorial 4

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to abolish the Jackson Hole National Monument

"Whereas the creation and existence of the Jackson Hole National Monument is contrary and inimical to the inherent rights and interests of the citizens of the State of Wyoming: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of the Thirtieth Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to adopt legislation abolishing the said Jackson Hole National Monument and that copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, United States Senators JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY and LESTER C. HUNT and Congressman FRANK A. BARRETT.

"HERMAN D. MAYLAND,
"Speaker of the House.

"GEORGE BURKE,
"President of the Senate.

"Approved February 19, 1949.

"A. G. CRANE,
"Governor."

"Senate Joint Memorial 4

"Joint memorial memorializing the President and Congress of the United States that all presently proposed Federal irrigation projects and all such which are proposed in the future, for construction in the State of Wyoming, be continued in all stages under the direct supervision of the United States Bureau of Reclamation

"Whereas the United States Bureau of Reclamation has had many years of, and the only, experience in initiation, construction, maintenance, and development of all Federal irrigation projects in the West and in such matters has been and is required by laws of the Nation to comply with all affecting State laws: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Thirtieth Wyoming Legislature (its house of representatives concurring), That the President and Congress of the United States be and they are hereby memorialized, to promptly and effectively enact such legislation as may be appropriate to vest in said Bureau beyond any possibility of judicial doubt or Executive direction concerning congressional intent, continued and direct supervision of the initiation, construction, maintenance, and development of all Federal irrigation projects wholly or partially within the State of Wyoming, now or in the future proposed, consistent with objectives of the so-called Pick-Sloan plan, and opposed to objectives of such plans as the Columbia Valley Authority and Missouri Valley Authority; be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this joint memorial be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of the United States Congress, and to the Honorable JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, the Honorable LESTER C. HUNT, and the Honorable FRANK A. BARRETT, Senators and Representatives, respectively, in said Congress, from Wyoming.

"GEORGE BURKE,
"President of the Senate.

"HERMAN D. MAYLAND,
"Speaker of the House.

"Approved February 25, 1949.

"A. G. CRANE,
"Governor."

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 3

"Joint memorial memorializing the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States of America to retain jurisdiction of the land management of the public domain in the Department of the Interior

"Whereas the Department of the Interior of the United States has been the custodial agent of the public domain lands of this Nation since the foundation of the Republic; and

"Whereas the Department of the Interior, as the managerial agent of the public domain, has performed its functions in a creditable manner; and

"Whereas the functions of the Department of the Interior in the continental United States are confined almost entirely to the public-land States, and said Department has generally shown a sympathetic interest in the problems of the Western States, as was evidenced by the prompt, efficient, and diligent manner in which the Department of the Interior assisted the people of this State and of the West in opening roads and trails during the current storm disaster; and

"Whereas it is reliably reported that the Hoover Commission on the Reorganization of the Executive Department of the Government has recommended that the functions of the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior, except as to minerals, be transferred to the Department of Agriculture; and

"Whereas such recommendation, if adopted by the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States, and approved by the President of the United States, will strike a mortal blow to the welfare of the people of the West: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Thirtieth Legislature of the State of Wyoming (its house of representatives concurring), That the President of the United States and both Houses of the Congress of the United States, be memorialized to oppose said recommendation of the Hoover Commission; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States and to the President of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to United States Senators JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY and LESTER C. HUNT and Congressman FRANK A. BARRETT.

"GEORGE BURKE,
"President of the Senate.

"HERMAN D. MAYLAND,
"Speaker of the House.

"Approved February 25, 1949.

"A. G. CRANE,
"Governor."

By Mr. LUCAS:

Two resolutions adopted by the city council of the city of Chicago, Ill., relating to rent-control legislation; ordered to lie on the table.

AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM—JOINT RESOLUTION OF VERMONT LEGISLATURE

Mr. FLANDERS. On behalf of the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and myself, I present a joint resolution adopted by the Vermont Legislature requesting Members of Congress to support the agricultural conservation program, and I ask that it be appropriately referred and printed in the body of the RECORD.

The joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution requesting Members of Congress to support the agricultural conservation program

Whereas we believe the preservation of the soils of this Nation is the responsibility of us all; and

Whereas we believe that the agricultural conservation program carried out for the past 13 years by the United States Department of Agriculture has gone a long way toward making farmers and others conscious of the need for preserving soils; and

Whereas for the past 13 years this agricultural conservation program has given assistance to some 12,000 Vermont farmers in restoring fertility to the soil; and

Whereas Vermont farmers have matched Government funds dollar for dollar in carrying out soil-building practices; and

Whereas the program has developed farm leadership through its administration by farmer-elected county and community committeemen; and

Whereas we believe that farmers will again be forced to exploit their soils if the agricultural conservation program is curtailed: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives:

1. That the Congress of the United States be respectfully urged to support an adequate agricultural conservation program;

2. That our United States Senators, GEORGE D. AIKEN and RALPH E. FLANDERS, and our Representative in Congress, CHARLES A. PLUMLEY, be asked to support the agricultural conservation program and to vote to continue the annual appropriation of $300,000,000; and

3. That an adequate amount be set aside from the above appropriation to make it possible to administer the program through duly elected farmer county and community committeemen; and

4. That the secretary of state be directed to transmit duly attested copies of this memorial to be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the chairmen of the Senate and House Committees on Agriculture, to the chairmen of the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations, to the Secretary of Agriculture, and to our congressional delegation.

J. HAROLD STACEY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

HAROLD J. ARTHUR,
President of the Senate.

Approved March 11, 1949.

ERNEST W. GIBSON,
Governor.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Vermont, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

SLUM CLEARANCE AND LOW-COST HOUSING PROJECTS—RESOLUTIONS OF MASSACHUSETTS LEGISLATURE

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and myself, I present resolutions adopted by the Massachusetts Legislature memorializing Congress to provide for slum clearance and low-cost housing projects.

I give notice that at the conclusion of the consideration of the bills on the calendar I shall seek recognition for a 10-minute statement.

The resolutions were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolutions memorializing Congress to provide for slum clearance and low-cost housing projects

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States to pass legislation providing for greater allocation of funds for slum clearance and low-cost housing projects; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

In house of representatives, adopted March 8, 1949.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

In senate, adopted, in concurrence, March 14, 1949.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

GENERAL PULASKI'S MEMORIAL DAY—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF WORCESTER, MASS.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Worcester, Mass., relating to General Pulaski's Memorial Day, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress

Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

Whereas the 11th day of October 1779 is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union, through legislative enactment designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and

Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated from October 11, 1929, to October 11, 1946, to be General Pulaski's Memorial Day in United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Worcester and State of Massachusetts:

SECTION 1. That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

SEC. 2. That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, and each of the United States Senators and Representatives from Massachusetts; be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be, and is hereby, requested to designate October 11 as General Pulaski's Memorial Day to honor the memory of Gen. Casimir Pulaski, a Polish nobleman, who was commissioned by Congress to organize the Cavalry Corps for the American Army in the Revolutionary War, and who gave his life for the cause of freedom; and be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk be, and he is hereby, requested to cause this resolution to be sent to the proper officials in Washington, D. C.

OLEOMARGARINE—RESOLUTION OF LOCAL UNIONS OF INTERNATIONAL TEAMSTERS' UNION

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a resolution adopted by members of many local unions of the International Teamsters' Union, whose members are employed by dairy companies east of the Missouri River, have an organization, the Mid-States and East Coast Dairy Conference, which meets twice yearly. At the most recent meeting of this group, comprising officers of the local unions, in Chicago, Hotel Morrison, on February 28, 1949, a resolution was adopted in support of legislation to prevent yellow coloring being added to oleomargarine in imitation of butter, and the removal of Federal excise taxes on the production and sale of oleomargarine.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas in response to a widespread demand of the people, the Congress of the United States is considering measures to repeal the so-called oleomargarine tax; and

Whereas such repeal will meet with the favor of American citizens in the low-income brackets since it will bring this commodity down in price, thereby reducing the cost of living to persons who need it; and

Whereas there is danger that oleomargarine, if there be no regulatory legislation, could easily be sold as a butter substitute of the same color as butter; and

Whereas the dairy industry furnishes steady employment at good wages for many thousands of union employees throughout the Nation, engaged in the procuring, processing, and distribution of butter, as well as the building of motortrucks, equipment, and supplies used in the dairy industry; and

Whereas there are more than 3,500 local creameries and 40,000 dairy plants located

in thousands of small communities in every State, both in the North and South, whose employees' welfare is involved in protecting butter against unfair competition; and

Whereas yellow oleomargarine resembles butter so closely that it cannot be distinguished from butter by consumers and therefore invites substitution and fraud, making it necessary that the consumers be protected by prohibiting oleomargarine to be colored yellow; and

Whereas any such substitution or fraud would benefit approximately 28 large corporations in the United States who manufacture oleomargarine and would so benefit at the expense of consumers; the millions of dairy farmers who produce butter; and thousands of families of union employees in the dairy industry: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Mid-States and East Coast Dairy Conference, comprising officers of local unions of International Brotherhood of Teamsters, whose members are directly engaged in procuring, manufacturing, and distributing butter and other dairy products, in regular session assembled in Chicago on February 28, 1949, respectfully urges upon the Congress, in its consideration of the repeal of existing oleomargarine taxes, that it enact at the same time regulatory measures to prevent the sale of oleomargarine colored as butter, so that the public may distinguish between these two products; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be submitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Representatives and Senators in Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That this Congress send representatives to appear before the House and Senate Agriculture Committees to emphasize the importance of protecting the dairy industry, and its employees, by proper legislation.

CHIEF JOSEPH DAM ON COLUMBIA RIVER, WASH.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Washington State Grange concerning Chief Joseph Dam on the Columbia River in my State. I call the attention of all my colleagues to this resolution. Personally, I heartily endorse the Grange's stand on this matter.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Pacific Northwest needs for power and water from the Columbia River have reached a crucial point with no relief in sight for several years, particularly with regard to electric power; and

Whereas the proposed Chief Joseph Dam should be constructed with the greatest possible haste to help meet the emergency; and

Whereas as it is presently set up by Congress as a single-purpose dam with only a small appropriation for commencing preliminary work, which means that there will be unnecessary delays in completing it, and that little or no benefit will be derived from the dam by farmers and others living adjacent to it; and

Whereas it has been the established policy of Congress in authorizing other hydroelectric projects to allow a portion of the surplus power revenues to help pay the high cost of irrigation of farm land, thereby making it possible for GI's and other settlers to make a living where it would probably be otherwise impossible to do so: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the executive committee of the Washington State Grange hereby earnestly petitions the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, to recommend that the authorization for Chief Joseph Dam be immediately amended to make it a multipurpose dam, and to increase the current appropriation for it to at least $15,000,000.

HENRY P. CARSTENSEN, *Master*.
K. T. KNUTSON, *Secretary*.

Adopted February 1, 1949, at Grange headquarters, Seattle, Wash.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I also present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Malott (Wash.) Grange No. 948, regarding Chief Joseph Dam on the Columbia River. The resolution asks that the dam be established as a multiple-purpose project. This undertaking is a vital one to the State of Washington and the proposals set forth in this resolution are necessary for the people of my State.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPOSAL TO CONSTRUCT CHIEF JOSEPH DAM FOR MULTIPLE PURPOSES

Whereas the Army engineers' estimate show that Foster Creek Dam, now known as Chief Joseph Dam, will produce the cheapest electric power of any dam on the Columbia River; and

Whereas the present shortage of power in the Northwest makes it imperative to begin the vigorous construction of said dam at once; and

Whereas no official recognition has been given of the irrigation and reclamation possibilities of said dam; and

Whereas some 45,000 acres of irrigable land in the immediate Columbia and Okanogan Valleys will be below the crest of said dam; and

Whereas much of the irrigation of said land will come at floodtide of the Columbia River: Therefore be it

Resolved by Malott Grange No. 948 in regular session assembled this 25th day of January 1949, That we ask Congress to establish Chief Joseph Dam as a multiple-purpose dam and authorize the Reclamation Bureau to begin at once surveys of all lands adjacent to said dam for the purpose of determining their possibilities and value for irrigation; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Columbia Basin Commission, to the congressional delegation and to Bureau of Reclamation, to the Okanogan County Fonoma Grange, and the Washington State Grange; and be it further

Resolved, That we ask all local granges in Okanogan, Chelan, and Douglas Counties to endorse similar resolutions.

SINCLAIR MACKIE, *Master*.
VIOLET CRANDALL, *Secretary*.

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION COMMITTEE ON LABOR LAW AND SOCIAL-SECURITY LEGISLATION

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the report and recommendations of the New York State Bar Association Committee on Labor Law and Social Security Legislation dated February 26, 1949, which deals with the association's legislative recommendations with respect to the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947.

While I may not agree with all the conclusions contained in this report, I believe it to be of sufficient merit to take this means to call it to the attention of the Senate and have it referred for the consideration of the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the report and recommendations were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION COMMITTEE ON LABOR LAW AND SOCIAL SECURITY LEGISLATION, FEBRUARY 26, 1949

This committee, during the past year, has continued its study of the problem of the statutory regulation of labor unions in the public interest, especially the Taft-Hartley law, and, as a result of such study, has agreed upon and submits certain recommendations for the amendment of the Taft-Hartley law and of other statutes affecting the regulation of labor unions.

No perfect or permanent solution can be found for a problem as complex and dynamic as the regulation of labor unions. The best that can be hoped for is fair and workable regulation, based at all times on the paramount public interest. We hope that our recommendations will help the members of the bar and the public to achieve such regulation.

For the purposes of study, the committee divided the Taft-Hartley law into three parts, to each of which a subcommittee was assigned as follows:

1. The subcommittee dealing with the substantive provisions of the law was composed of Eugene C. Gerhart, chairman; George G. Coughlin, John E. Lynch, William H. Mandeville, Whitney North Seymour, Arthur L. Stern, Howard A. Swartwood, John Van Sickle.

2. The subcommittee dealing with the procedural and administrative provisions of the law was composed of Morrell S. Lockhart, chairman; George W. Alger, J. Gordon Baxter, I. Lawrence Broadwin, Frederick H. Rohlfs, Burton A. Zorn.

3. The subcommittee dealing with the mediation and arbitration provisions of the law was composed of Herbert W. Haldenstein, chairman; Laurence R. Goodyear, Albert F. Strasburger, Eugene Untermyer.

The recommendations of the committee represent the final conclusions of its members, who first approached the problem with divergent views. It was hardly possible for us to achieve unanimity on all of our recommendations. As a matter of procedure, it was agreed that the minority viewpoint on two important issues should be stated herein. It was also agreed that the committee would suggest, by way of illustration and for clarity in detail, the statutory form for most of its major recommendations. The chief exception, made in the recommendations relating to arbitration, seemed advisable because the detailed statement of what should be embodied in statutory form is complete.

ISSUES DEALT WITH IN THIS REPORT

1. Union-shop elections.
2. The "Communist affidavit."
3. Certain forms of picketing as unfair labor practices.
4. Recognition strikes.
5. Featherbedding practices.
6. Merit increases as a subject for collective bargaining.
7. Protection for employees in their jobs under union-membership requirements.
8. Welfare funds.
9. Use of injunction against unfair labor practices.
10. Labor unions and the antitrust laws.

11. Compulsory arbitration of labor disputes endangering the health and safety of a community.
12. Compulsory arbitration of labor disputes arising under an existing contract.
13. "Freedom of speech."
14. Proper notice of termination of contract.
15. Redefinition of "collective-bargaining unit."
16. Clarifying amendments to the Taft-Hartley law relating to procedure.
17. Federal and State jurisdiction of labor disputes.
18. New York State labor laws.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Union-shop elections

The present requirements of the Taft-Hartley law for the conduct of an election by the National Labor Relations Board and for the vote of the majority of the bargaining unit before a union is empowered to bargain for a union shop have proved to be impractical and unnecessary. Both management and labor are generally agreed that the union-shop election serves no useful purpose. The result is a foregone conclusion in 99 percent of the cases and the holding of such elections has proved a heavy burden on the calendar of the National Labor Relations Board. Moreover, we believe that the requirement of a majority vote in the bargaining unit rather than that of those actually voting is an undemocratic procedure.

We therefore recommend that the present requirement for union-shop elections be repealed and that labor unions be permitted to bargain for a union shop if the filing requirements of the act have been complied with and if, during the preceding year, the majority of the employees in the bargaining unit have not voted to rescind authorization of a union shop.

2. The Communist affidavit

One of the most provocative provisions of the Taft-Hartley law has been the so-called Communist affidavit requirement, which is now applicable only to the officers of labor unions. This requirement has undoubtedly proved effective in removing Communists from high office in labor organizations. However, the restriction of this requirement only to labor-union officials lends support to the criticism that a stigma or at least a shadow has been unjustifiably cast upon the unquestionable patriotism of the great majority of American labor-union officials. The effectiveness of the present provision should be preserved, but the reasonable ground for criticism should be removed.

We therefore recommend that the Communist affidavit provision should be extended to include not only each officer of a labor organization but also the bargaining representatives of both the employer and the union.

3. Certain forms of picketing as unfair labor practices

Peaceful picketing as a form of free speech and as a method of advertising a union's position should not be prohibited, but mass picketing causes labor unrest, is unfair intimidation of the employer and of workers who want to work, and is frequently an incitement to lawlessness and violence.

We therefore recommend that an additional unfair labor practice be listed in section 8 (b) of the Taft-Hartley law and that the National Labor Relations Board be directed to seek a temporary restraining order under section 10 (1) of the law for violations thereof, and we suggest that the provision be as follows:

"8 (b) It shall be an unfair labor practice for a labor organization or its agents * * * (7) to engage in, or to induce or encourage the employees of any employer to engage in, picketing where (A) the object or result of such picketing is to prevent by force or intimidation any person from entering or leaving the premises of any employer; or (B) such picketing interferes with the right of any employee to work free from any harm to himself or his family."

4. Recognition strikes

One of the outstanding abuses of labor unions which contributes to labor unrest and is harmful to the public interest is the strike to force recognition when the union represents only a minority of the employees.

We therefore recommend that it should be an unfair labor practice for a union to strike to force recognition by an employer unless the union has been previously certified as a bargaining agent. We suggest that section 8 (b) (4) (B) of the Taft-Hartley law be amended to read as follows:

"8 (b) It shall be an unfair labor practice for a labor organization or its agents * * * (4) to engage in, or induce or encourage the employees of any employer to engage in a strike or concerted refusal in the course of their employment to use, manufacture, process, transport, or otherwise handle or work on any goods, articles, materials, or commodities, or to perform any services where the object thereof is: * * * (B) forcing or requiring any employer to recognize or bargain with any labor organization as the representative of his employees unless such labor organization has been certified as the representative of such employees under the provisions of section 9."

5. "Featherbedding" practices

Section 8 (b) (6) of the Taft-Hartley law was intended to make unlawful the "featherbedding" practices of labor unions. However, it has not been entirely successful in accomplishing its purpose. Labor unions should be prohibited from dictating the number of employees to be hired as well as from seeking payment for services not performed or not to be performed.

We therefore recommend that the law be amended, and suggest that section 8 (b) (6) of the law shall read as follows:

"8 (b). It shall be an unfair labor practice for a labor organization or its agents * * * (6) to cause or attempt to cause an employer to pay or deliver or agree to pay or deliver any money or other thing of value in the nature of an exaction (i) for services which are not performed or not to be performed, or (ii) for services which the employer does not desire, or (iii) for more employees than the employer considers necessary for any work or at any time."

6. Merit increases as a subject for collective bargaining

As a result of recent court decisions, employers have been directed to cease and desist from refusing to bargain concerning merit increases. We believe this to be a grave encroachment on the proper functions and rights of management. The future and prosperity of the United States still depend primarily upon the character and ability of the individual worker whose worth has been and can be best determined by management, which has the experience, the intimate knowledge, and the qualifications necessary to judge and to reward unusual merit.

We therefore recommend a statutory provision specifically relieving the employer from the present requirement to bargain about merit increases.

7. Protection for employees in their jobs under union-membership requirements

The protection of the individual employee in his job, if denied membership in, or if unreasonably expelled from, a labor organization, is one of the most constructive as well as one of the less well-known provisions of the Taft-Hartley law. We believe, however, that this congressional purpose can be achieved more successfully by enlarging the scope of the present provision in the law so as to give protection against inordinately large dues.

We therefore recommend that the law be amended for this purpose. We suggest that section 8 (b) (5) of the Taft-Hartley law be amended to read as follows:

"8 (b) It shall be an unfair labor practice for a labor organization or its agents * * * (5) in respect to employees covered by an agreement authorized under subsection (a) (3), (i) to require the payment, as a condition precedent to becoming a member of such organization, of a fee in an amount which the Board finds excessive or discriminatory under all the circumstances, or (ii) to require, as a condition of membership in such organization, periodic dues and initiation fees in excess of those uniformly required as a condition of acquiring or retaining such membership. In making any such determination as to whether an initiation fee or dues are excessive or discriminatory hereunder, the Board shall consider, among other relevant factors, the practices and customs of labor organizations in the particular industry, the wages currently paid to the employees affected, and whether the rules are reasonably designed to protect labor organizations in the exercise of their just and proper functions; and"

8. Welfare funds

There is an immense variety in the welfare plans now in successful operation throughout the country. The present provision of the Taft-Hartley law does not seem to be sufficiently flexible to bring within its permission many successful welfare plans, the legality of which should not be ambiguous. The narrow statutory pattern should be abandoned and more general and flexible terms adopted for the present and future needs of management and labor alike.

We therefore recommend that section 302 (c) (5) be amended for this purpose, and we suggest that it read as follows:

"(5) With respect to money or other thing of value paid to a trust fund for the sole and exclusive benefit of all of the employees of such employer for whom the employee representative is acting as such, and for families and dependents (or of such employees' families and dependents jointly with the employees of other employers making similar payments, and their families and dependents), pursuant to the terms of a written agreement made by such representative and the employer: *Provided, however*, That such agreement shall contain provisions for an annual audit of the trust fund and for the inspection of the report of such audit by the employees and the employer. No payments shall be made out of such a fund to any person to compensate for or in recognition of services performed for the union."

9. Use of injunction against unfair labor practices

We have carefully considered the explosive problem of the use of injunction for the prevention of unfair labor practices, and in whom the power to seek injunction should be vested. Sanctions, if any, should be imposed by the public, against which the wrong is done, and in no event should injunctive relief become a weapon, as in the past, in the sole determination of the employer. Nor should it become a device for increasing the power of the union.

We recommend that the Taft-Hartley law should be amended to permit the filing of a petition in any district court of the United States by the National Labor Relations Board or by any person who claims to be injured by the illegal conduct of an employer or of a union, upon proper notice to the General Counsel's Office, and the court shall have power, but only with the concurrence of the General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, to grant temporary relief or a restraining order. We suggest that section

10 (j) of the Taft-Hartley law be amended to read as follows:

"(j) The Board shall have the power, upon the issuance of a complaint as provided in subsection (b) charging that any person has engaged in or is engaging in an unfair labor practice, and any person who claims to be injured by illegal conduct of an employer or of a union shall have the right upon reasonable notice to the General Counsel's Office of the National Labor Relations Board, to petition any district court of the United States (including the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia), within any district wherein the unfair labor practice in question is alleged to have occurred or wherein such person resides or transacts business, for appropriate temporary relief or restraining order. Upon the filing of any such petition by the Board or by any aggrieved person as aforesaid upon proper notice to the General Counsel's Office, the court shall cause notice thereof to be served upon such person allegedly engaging in such unfair labor practice or practices, and thereupon shall have jurisdiction to grant, with the concurrence of the General Counsel's Office of the National Labor Relations Board, such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper."

10. Labor unions and the antitrust laws

The majority of the committee believes that the injury to the public interest resulting from the exercise of the monopoly power of some labor unions should be corrected and prevented by removing, to a large extent, the present exemption of labor unions from the operation of the antitrust laws. Labor unions, which in the past were gravely handicapped in dealing with employers, in recent years have grown in power as a result of legislation, administrative action, court decisions, and through their own organizational efforts, to a point well beyond a fair balance in the bargaining power of labor and management, and the paramount public interest has been unfortunately affected. In a period of rising costs many employers have been forced to make terms at the expense of the public. They may either make concessions which require the passing on of their increased costs to the consumer or refuse to make such concessions and thereby precipitate a Nation-wide shut-down. An obvious escape—and an escape which is injurious to the public—is the collusive agreement between labor and management. Recent examples of Nation-wide strikes in essential industries have shown the need for statutory action.

We believe that the antitrust laws, on balance, have had a healthy and beneficial influence in controlling business monopoly, and although brought into operation in relatively few instances, the mere existence of these laws on the statute books has had a salutary effect. It is reasonable to assume that if such laws were made applicable to labor they would have a similar beneficial effect, even though such laws would not be brought into operation except in extreme situations.

We do not believe, however, that it would be in the public interest to deprive labor unions of their hard-won achievements in preventing the abuse of injunctions in labor disputes. Barring the remedy of injunctions, the antitrust laws made applicable to labor organizations could be made effective by criminal prosecutions and suits for treble damages.

Nor do we think that national labor organizations should be ruled illegal because of the inherent monopoly power due solely to their size, as is the rule in the case of business organizations. Several of the largest labor unions are not organized on an industry-wide basis and their members work in a great variety of industries. It is the exercise of monopoly power through restraint of trade, at the expense of the public, that is sought to be controlled.

The minority viewpoint, vigorously expressed by Mr. Broadwin, is in substance that the removal of the present exemption of labor unions, to the extent favored by the majority of the committee, from the operation of the antitrust laws, runs contrary to the long-established doctrine embodied in the Clayton Act that "the labor of a human being is not a commodity or article of commerce." In Mr. Broadwin's words, "Repeal of the Clayton Act and its declaration that the labor of a human being is not a commodity will not effect a change of labor into a commodity or article of commerce to which the Sherman Act is applicable. Subjecting labor unions to the operation of the Sherman Act will not restore the balance in the bargaining power of labor and management. The attainment of even an approach to such balance may be hoped for only if the problem is faced realistically and not by resort to subterfuge, which is what the attempt to convert labor into an article of commerce subject to the Sherman Act amounts to."

The majority recommends that the antitrust laws be made applicable to labor unions, but also recommends that the present restraints against injunctions contained in the Clayton and Norris-LaGuardia Acts be not disturbed and that any statute removing the exemption of labor unions from the present antitrust laws shall specifically provide that size alone be not considered a violation of such laws. To accomplish the foregoing objectives, we suggest the following statutory changes:

"The act entitled 'An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraint and monopolies, and for other purposes,' approved October 15, 1914, as amended (Clayton Act), be amended as follows:

"1. At the end of section 6 thereof (15 U. S. C. A., sec. 17), add the following: '*Provided*, That nothing in this paragraph shall be construed in any proceeding, civil or criminal, under the antitrust laws, to make lawful any contract, combination, or conspiracy among labor organizations, or affiliates thereof, or any individual members or representatives thereof, or any combination of the foregoing, in restraint of trade or commerce, but no labor organization shall be held to be an illegal combination or conspiracy in restraint of trade merely because of its size.'

"2. At the end of section 20 thereof (29 U. S. C. A., sec. 52), add the following: '*Provided*, That nothing in this paragraph shall be construed in any proceeding, civil or criminal, under the antitrust laws, to make lawful any contract, combination, or conspiracy involving labor organizations or their affiliates or any members or representatives thereof, or any combination of the foregoing, in restraint of trade or commerce'."

"The act entitled 'An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes,' approved March 23, 1932 (Norris-LaGuardia Act), to be amended by adding at the end of section 5 (29 U. S. C. A., sec. 105) the following: '*Provided*, That nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to otherwise limit the application of the antitrust laws in any proceeding, civil or criminal, to persons participating or interested in a labor combination or conspiracy'."

"The 'Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947' to be amended by adding at the end of section 7 (29 U. S. C. A., sec. 157) thereof the following: '*Provided*, That nothing in this section shall be construed in any proceeding, civil or criminal, to limit the application of the antitrust laws.'"

11. Compulsory arbitration of labor disputes endangering the health and safety of a community

Certain strikes endanger not only the prosperity but also the health and safety of the community. The majority of the committee has come slowly but firmly to the conclusion that in these extraordinarily unstable times, when we are confronted with problems of national survival such as we have never known in our history, these strikes should no longer be permitted. Such strikes in the past have been avoided not by consideration of the merits of the dispute involved but by desperate, last minute, helter-skelter methods involving, in practically every case, Government intervention. The settlements reached have been determined very largely by the fear of political reprisal. The cost of such major crises is great; the danger of them to our national security is increasingly obvious; and the necessity for an orderly and mandatory settlement, based primarily on the merits, has become imperative.

Much as we regret the necessity for any form of Government intervention, such intervention is inevitable in any case, and we believe that it should be in accordance with methods specifically defined by law. It should not be left to the kind of Government intervention from which we have suffered in the past. Nor should it be left to the exercise of any "implied powers" in the President of the United States. Under some future President, the doctrine of "implied powers" could have sinister implications and disastrous consequences.

The minority viewpoint is, in substance, that compulsory arbitration is another step in the direction of Government intervention in private industry, and that, in the words of our fellow member, Mr. Strasburger, "arbitration is too often merely another name for dividing by two." Mr. Strasburger suggests that "if a work cessation in the industries of transportation, communications, food processing, fuel production, etc., so threatens the public well-being I think the only honest course is a direct prohibition of the use of the strike weapon. When strike threatens in such industries it seem to me the status quo should be maintained for 60 to 90 days while the public becomes educated to the issues, either through some commission of inquiry or otherwise, and that after that the employees should be free to act, but if they struck they would lose their status."

The majority of the committee recommends that—

1. The Taft-Hartley law should be amended requiring the arbitration of labor disputes, by competent arbitrators, so selected and of such caliber as to command public confidence in the impartiality of their decisions, in those cases where the President has, by proclamation, found that the health or safety of the community or a substantial part thereof will be endangered if a work stoppage is permitted to occur or to continue.

2. The arbitration should be conducted by such members of the national labor-management panel (constituted as we recommend) as the President may designate for such purpose.

3. The national labor-management panel should be reconstituted and the Board of Inquiry provided for by section 207 of the Taft-Hartley law should be eliminated since a permanent and qualified body should be available for the performance of the highly important arbitration functions.

4. The national labor-management panel should consist of persons conversant with labor-management problems but unbiased in viewpoint. The panel should have all the duties presently delegated to it and in addition should be subject to the call of the President to arbitrate the special emergency cases above described.

5. Concurrently with the President's proclamation invoking arbitration, the Attorney General should be obligated upon the direction of the President to petition any Federal district court for an injunction against a strike or lock-out pending the award in arbitration, which injunction shall be granted if the facts necessary for the issuance of the proclamation are found by the court to exist.

6. The arbitration award should be enforceable by court order and its injunctive decree, and any violation thereof shall constitute a contempt of court and be punishable accordingly. The award should be retroactive to the date of the injunction.

7. The injunction should not prohibit the resignation of a worker from his job as an individual act.

8. Pending an arbitration, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service should continue its efforts to effect a settlement since it is desirable that a negotiated settlement be effected whenever possible.

12. Compulsory arbitration of labor disputes arising under an existing contract

The Taft-Hartley law does not provide for compulsory arbitration even in the grievance or interpretation cases arising under an existing contract. Section 3 of the Railway Labor Act, which established the National Railroad Adjustment Board, conferred jurisdiction upon the Board to determine disputes between employees and carriers "growing out of grievances or out of the interpretation or application of agreements * * *." In many, if not most, contracts between employers and labor unions there is a clause for the arbitration of grievances or interpretation. Both parties are entitled to the protection of such a clause.

We therefore recommend that even in the absence of an arbitration clause any dispute as to the interpretation or the application of an existing contract shall be arbitrated, and that the law should be amended accordingly.

13. "Freedom of speech"

In some recent decisions the National Labor Relations Board has set aside elections to determine the collective bargaining agent because of expressions of opinion which the Board itself recognizes could not give rise to unfair labor practice charges. Such decisions substantially limit the freedom of speech of the employer.

We therefore recommend that the Taft-Hartley law be amended to prevent the National Labor Relations Board from invalidating or setting aside an election because of expressions of opinion by an employer which would not be deemed an unfair labor practice under the law, and we suggest that section 8 (c) of the law shall be amended to read as follows:

"The expressing of any views, arguments, or opinion or the dissemination thereof, whether in written, printed, graphic, or visual form, shall not constitute or be evidence of an unfair labor practice under any of the provisions of this act, nor be the basis of invalidating or setting aside any election held under the provisions of this act, if such expression contains no threat of reprisal or force or promise of benefit."

14. Proper notice of termination of contract

Under the present law, if no notice of termination of a contract has been given by either party 60 days prior to the expiration date, such contract apparently continues thereafter on a 60-day basis. This places both parties in a position where advantage can be taken of the other party by timing the cancellation demand; for example, in the retail trades, a union could wait until August or September before giving such notice of cancellation, which would bring on the negotiations for a new contract in the middle of the Christmas peak season.

We therefore recommend that if neither party has served notice of termination of any contract 60 days prior to its termination date, the contract should be deemed automatically renewed for a period of 1 year, and we suggest that section 8 (d) (1) be amended by adding at the end thereof the following words:

"In the absence of such notification, if the contract has a termination date, such contract shall be deemed to be automatically renewed for a period of 1 year, irrespective of any inconsistent provision contained in such contract."

15. Redefinition of "collective bargaining unit"

We believe that the extent of organization should not be a controlling factor in the determination of a collective-bargaining unit. Nor do we believe that it should be given any consideration. The bargaining unit should include all employees whose conditions of work are governed by the same consideration, and no unit should be set up, except on a craft basis, which does not include all of such employees.

We therefore recommend that the Taft-Hartley law be amended for this purpose, and suggest that section 9 (c) (5) be amended by striking out the last word, "controlling," and substituting therefor the words "given any weight."

16. Clarifying amendments to the Taft-Hartley law relative to procedure

We recommend that the law be amended so as to make clear that the National Labor Relations Board, in determining whether a craft unit is appropriate, can take into account the fact that a different unit has previously been established, and we suggest that section 9 (b) (2) shall read as follows:

"Decide that any craft unit is inappropriate for such purposes on the sole ground that a different unit has been established by a prior Board determination, unless a majority of the employees in the proposed craft unit vote against separate representation."

The law should also be amended so as to make it clear that no objections can be urged on appeal which have not been set forth in a statement of exceptions.

We therefore recommend an amendment for this purpose, and suggest that the third sentence of section 10 (e) of the law shall be amended to read as follows:

"No objection that has not been urged before the Board, its member, agent, or agency, and which has not been set forth in a statement of exceptions filed with the Board as provided in section 9 (c), shall be considered by the court unless the failure or neglect to urge such objection or to set forth such exception shall be excused because of extraordinary circumstances."

17. Federal and State jurisdiction of labor disputes

Under the present provisions of the Taft-Hartley law, not only is a State statute required to be consistent with the Federal statute in order that the State labor relations board may acquire jurisdiction, but it is also required that the interpretation of the State statute by the State board be consistent with the interpretation by the National Labor Relations Board. This provision for consistency in interpretation would seem to reduce the State board to a branch of a Federal agency, and does not permit the desirable or necessary flexibility of interpretation and application required by different local conditions. We believe that there is room for a difference in interpretation by State boards which can adapt themselves to the needs of their communities.

We therefore recommend that the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law for consistency between Federal and State laws shall be limited to statutory consistency, and that consistency of interpretation should not be required. We suggest that the Taft-Hartley law be amended by inserting a new section 6 (a) to read as follows:

"The jurisdiction given to the Board by this act shall not be affected by any other means of adjustment or prevention that has been or may be established by agreement, law, or otherwise: *Provided*, That the Board is empowered by agreement with any agency or any State or Territory to cede to such agency jurisdiction over any cases in any industry (other than mining, manufacturing, communications, and transportation except where predominantly local in character) even though such cases may involve labor disputes affecting commerce, unless the provisions of the State or territorial statutes applicable to the determination of such cases by such agency are inconsistent with the corresponding provisions of this act. Consistency of interpretation shall not be required."

We further suggest that section 10 (a) of the law be amended by striking out everything after the first sentence.

18. New York State labor laws

We recommend that the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law (amended in accordance with these recommendations), as far as applicable, should be enacted into law by the New York State legislature so as to render the provisions of the New York State labor laws consistent with the provisions of the Federal laws.

LAWRENCE HUNT,
Chairman.

UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN COMPACT

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a joint resolution adopted by the California Legislature in its 1949 session, together with a copy of a letter written to the Honorable Harry W. Bashore, representative of the United States, Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, negotiations, by Representative CLAIR ENGLE, and a copy of Mr. Bashore's reply, all dealing with the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact.

There being no objection, the matters were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Assembly Joint Resolution 24

Joint resolution relative to the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact

Whereas by the Colorado River Compact of November 24, 1922, the seven States of the Colorado River Basin agreed to an apportionment of water of the Colorado River system as between the upper basin and the lower basin of the river, as therein defined; and

Whereas the five States of the upper basin of said river, on October 11, 1948, signed an Upper Colorado River Basin Compact apportioning among themselves the water apportioned to the upper basin by the Colorado River Compact, and said Upper Colorado River Basin Compact has been ratified by the legislatures of the said five States; and

Whereas there has been introduced in the Congress of the United States S. 790, by which said Upper Colorado River Basin Compact would be approved; and

Whereas said Colorado River Compact makes provision for the apportionment of water as between the upper basin and the lower basin on the basis of beneficial consumptive use; and

Whereas said upper basin compact contains certain provisions for the determination of quantities of water apportioned among the upper basin States by the inflow-outflow method in terms of man-made depletions of the virgin flow at Lee Ferry: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California jointly, That the State of California—

1. Approves the action of the upper basin States in reaching and ratifying a compact for apportionment of Colorado River system

water among them, and heartily congratulates said States for so doing;

2. Considers that the formula for determination of consumptive use of water set out in said upper basin compact, as above quoted, is indeterminate and is not in consonance with the relevant terms of the Colorado River Compact;

3. Declares that it has no objection to the adoption by the upper basin States, as among themselves, of any formula they may choose for distribution of water among them;

4. Declares further that the adoption by the upper basin States of said upper basin compact, or its approval by the Congress, does not and cannot amend nor affect the meaning of the Colorado River Compact, nor affect, nor impair the interests of States of the Colorado River Basin which are not a party to said Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, and for that reason,

5. Urges the Congress of the United States to provide in any act whereby the Congress consents to said upper basin compact that nothing in said act, nor said compact, shall be deemed to amend or affect the meaning of the Colorado River Compact, nor to affect, nor impair the interests of any State which is not a party to said Upper Colorado River Basin Compact; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Senators and Representatives from the State of California in the Congress of the United States.

Approved March 14, 1949.

Hon. HARRY W. BASHORE,
Representative of the United States,
Upper Colorado River Basin
Compact Negotiations,
Roger Smith Hotel,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BASHORE: There is pending before the Eighty-first Congress H. R. 2325, which, if adopted, will give congressional approval to the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact signed at Santa Fe, N. Mex., on the 11th day of October 1948 by commissioners of the five States of the Upper Colorado River Basin.

In studying the proposal certain questions have arisen which I assume you can answer. It is my duty and purpose to protect the interests of the lower basin of the Colorado River, particularly in the matter of determination of quantities of surplus water available for service of the Mexican treaty, and possibly available for additional apportionment in 1963, and to protect the deliveries of water guaranteed by article III (d) of the Colorado River Compact. It is not my thought that there has been any deliberate attempt to affect the rights of the lower basin under the Colorado River Compact. I feel it necessary, however, to receive assurances on certain points. For that reason, I submit to you the following questions:

Question No. 1: Article I of the proposed compact refers to the apportionment of the "use" of the water of the Colorado River system, the use of which was apportioned in perpetuity to the upper basin by the Colorado River Compact.

(a) Is the word "use" to be taken as synonymous with the phrase "beneficial consumptive use" as it occurs in the Colorado River Compact?

(b) In this connection, note that the phrase "consumptive use" occurs frequently in the pending compact. Is there any difference in meaning between the phrase "consumptive use" as used in the pending compact and "beneficial consumptive use" as the phrase is used in the Colorado River Compact?

Question No. 2: In article II the term "virgin flow" is defined to mean "the flow of any stream undepleted by the activities of man."

(a) Is it proposed to determine "virgin flow" with respect to each year or to use averages?

(b) If on an annual basis, how will "virgin flow" for any particular future water year be determined?

Question No. 3:

(a) Will consumptive uses in each of the States, under article III, be determined with reference to each water year?

(b) Or, are these quantities to be determined on long- or short-term averages?

Question No. 4: Article IV speaks of curtailment of use of water in order that flow at Lee Ferry shall not be depleted below that required by article III of the Colorado River Compact.

Does the word "use" mean the same thing as the phrase "consumptive use" as determined pursuant to article VI of the compact?

Question No. 5: Article V, subsection (c), provides that: "In the event the Commission finds that a reservoir site is available both to assure deliveries at Lee Ferry and to store water for consumptive use in a State of the upper division, the storage of water for consumptive use shall be given preference."

Does this mean that the Commission may exonerate any reservoir or reservoir capacity from the obligation of article III (d) of the Colorado River Compact? If not, what is meant by the "preference" for consumptive use?

Question No. 6. Article VI provides that the Commission shall determine the quantity of the consumptive use of water for the upper basin and for each State of the upper basin, by the inflow-outflow method in terms of man-made depletions of the virgin flow at Lee Ferry, unless the Commission, by unanimous action, shall adopt a different method of determination.

(a) Outflow from the upper basin apparently would be measured at Lee Ferry. Where and how would inflow to the upper basin be measured?

(b) It is my understanding that a large part of the use of water in the upper basin will be made possible by over-year and cyclic storage. The impounding of water in storage reservoirs would be reflected by depletion at Lee Ferry during the water-year in which water is impounded. Does article VI mean that consumptive use will be measured by water stored, as distinguished from the withdrawals from storage and application to use on land?

(c) How is it proposed to account for water stored in 1 year and applied to use in another and later year? Specifically, would consumptive use be considered as occurring in the year in which water is impounded, or in some later year when it is withdrawn from storage and applied to use?

Question No. 7. Article VIII provides for an "Upper Colorado River Commission." Among other things, the Commission is authorized to (article VIII (d)):

"(6) Make findings as to the quantity of water of the upper Colorado River system used each year in the upper Colorado River Basin and each State thereof;

"(7) Make findings as to the quantity of water deliveries at Lee Ferry during each water year;

"(8) Make findings as to the necessity for and the extent of the curtailment of use, required, if any, pursuant to article IV hereof."

Subdivision (g) of the same article provides that:

"Findings of fact made by the Commission shall not be conclusive in any court, or before any agency or tribunal, but shall constitute prima facie evidence of the facts found."

It has been held that, in addition to its contractual character, under such circumstances a compact approved by the Congress is a public law (*Missouri* v. *Illinois*, 200 U. S. 496–519; *Pennsylvania* v. *Wheeling, etc.*, 54 U. S. 518–566). Is it intended that subdivision (g) above shall be binding on any State not a party to the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, or on the United States?

Question No. 8. Will the ratification by the several States and the approval by the Congress, of the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact in any way amend or affect the meaning of the Colorado River Compact, whatever that document may mean?

Question No. 9. I note that in article XVIII the States of Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah have reserved their respective rights and interests under the Colorado River Compact, as States of the lower basin. Will the ratification and approval by the Congress of the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact impair or in any way affect the rights of States of the lower basin not signatory thereto?

Your early response to the questions submitted herein will be deeply appreciated.

Very truly yours,

CLAIR ENGLE,
Member of Congress.

MARCH 16, 1949.

Hon. CLAIR ENGLE,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. ENGLE: Your letter of March 12, 1949, addressed to Hon. Harry W. Bashore, representative of the United States, upper Colorado River Basin Compact negotiations, has been given consideration by Mr. Bashore and by the representatives of the upper basin States now assembled in Washington. The answers herein given to your specific questions are the answers of the representatives of the compacting States and of Mr. Bashore.

In this letter the statements made by you in connection with each question and the questions themselves will be underlined. The answers will follow each question.

QUESTION NO. 1

Article I of the proposed compact refers to the apportionment of the use of the water of the Colorado River system, the use of which was apportioned in perpetuity to the upper basin by the Colorado River Compact.

(a) Is the word "use" to be taken as synonymous with the phrase "beneficial consumptive use" as it occurs in the Colorado River Compact?

Answer. The word "use" as it occurs in article I of the upper river basin compact is synonymous with the phrase "beneficial consumptive use" as it appears in article III (a) and article III (b) of the Colorado River Compact.

(b) In this connection, note that the phrase "consumptive use" occurs frequently in the pending compact. Is there any difference in meaning between the phrase "consumptive use" as used in the pending compact, and "beneficial consumptive use" as the phrase is used in the Colorado River Compact?

Answer. In all instances where the phrase "consumptive use" occurs with reference to the apportionment made to the upper basin by the Colorado River Compact, such phrase is synonymous with the phrase "beneficial consumptive use" as it occurs in article III (a) and article III (b) of the Colorado River Compact. This is because of the paramountcy of the Colorado River Compact. When such phrase is employed in connection with internal matters relating to the rights of the upper basin States as among themselves to the water available to them under the Colorado River Compact, the phrase "consumptive use" is not necessarily synonymous with the phrase "beneficial consumptive use" as used in the Colorado River Compact. In this connection it should be pointed out that in each of the compacting States a beneficial use is essential to the acquisition of a firm water right. Also attention is directed to article III (b) (2) of the upper basin compact which provides that "beneficial use is the basis, the measure and the limit of the right to use."

QUESTION NO. 2

In article II, the term "virgin flow" is defined to mean "the flow of any stream undepleted by the activities of man."

(a) Is it proposed to determine "virgin flow" with respect to each year, or to use averages?

Answer: "Virgin flow" will be determined with respect to each water year. In the actual administration of the upper Colorado River Basin Compact, the Upper Colorado River Commission may make use of averages and necessarily will do so when hold-over reservoirs are constructed and placed in operation.

(b) If on an annual basis, how will virgin flow for any particular future water year be determined?

Answer: An index of the virgin inflow will be determined by the summation of the discharge measured at a series of key gaging stations located around the rim of the basin above the major development, the recorded discharge past each station to be corrected for man-made depletions, if any, above that station. The virgin outflow at Lee Ferry will be determined by a correlation curve developed by the historic relationship between recorded inflow at such key gaging stations, corrected for upstream man-made depletions, if any, and recorded Lee Ferry flows, together with the historic man-made depletions above Lee Ferry.

QUESTION NO. 3

(a) Will consumptive uses in each of the States, under article III, be determined with reference to each water year?

Answer: Consumptive uses in each of the upper basin States will be determined with reference to each water year. In making an administrative determination of such consumptive uses the Upper Colorado River Commission will necessarily make use of averages when holdover reservoirs are constructed and placed in operation. While the compact leaves such determination to the Commission, it is considered that the Commission may make use of 10-year progressive averages.

(b) Or, are these quantities to be determined on long or short term averages?

Answer: See answer to question No. 3 (a) above.

QUESTION NO. 4

Article IV speaks of curtailment of use of water in order that flow at Lee Ferry shall not be depleted below that required by article III of the Colorado River Compact.

Does the word "use" mean the same thing as the phrase "consumptive use" as determined pursuant to article VI of the compact?

Answer: The word "use" as it so occurs includes "consumptive use" as such use is determined pursuant to article VI. "Use" is a broader term than "consumptive use." It is employed in article IV in order that there may be no argument as to the power and obligation of an upper division State to curtail any "use" which it determines should be curtailed in order to assure full compliance with article III (d) of the Colorado River Compact.

QUESTION NO. 5

Article V, subsection (c), provides that: "In the event the Commission finds that a reservoir site is available both to assure deliveries at Lee Ferry and to store water for consumptive use in a State of the upper division, the storage of water for consumptive use shall be given preference."

Does this mean that the Commission may exonerate any reservoir or reservoir capacity from the obligation of article III (d) of the Colorado River Compact: If not, what is meant by the "preference" for consumptive use?

Answer: The answer to the first part of this double question is: No. The States, and not the Commission, determine what uses must be curtailed in order to comply with the obligation of article III (d) of the Colorado River Compact. By "preference" is meant that each upper division State has a superior right to use a storage site for consumptive uses within that State and it may not be deprived of that right by the desire of other upper division States to utilize the same site for the impoundment of water which will be released to meet the Lee Ferry delivery obligations of the upper division States. The exercise of such a preference right must not violate or have the effect of violating the delivery obligation imposed by article III (d) of the Colorado River Compact.

QUESTION NO. 6

Article VI provides that the Commission shall determine the quantity of the consumptive use of water for the upper basin and for each State of the upper basin, by the inflow-outflow method in terms of man-made depletions of the virgin flow at Lee Ferry, unless the Commission, by unanimous action, shall adopt a different method of determination.

(a) Outflow from the upper basin apparently would be measured at Lee Ferry. Where and how would inflow to the upper basin be measured?

Answer: Inflow to the upper basin will be determined by a series of key-gaging stations located at strategic points and designed to be an index of the inflow to the upper basin. The recorded discharge past these key-gaging stations will be corrected for all man-made depletions, if any, occurring above each station.

(b) It is my understanding that a large part of the use of water in the upper basin will be made possible by overyear and cyclic storage. The impounding of water in storage reservoirs would be reflected by depletion at Lee Ferry during the water-year in which water is impounded. Does article VI mean that consumptive use will be measured by water stored, as distinguished from the withdrawals from storage and application to use on land?

Answer: The measurement of use by the inflow-outflow method prescribed by article VI automatically takes into account the storage and release of water from reservoirs. Hence the measurement, in terms of stream depletion at Lee Ferry, is by water stored as distinguished from withdrawals from storage and applications to use on land.

(c) How is it proposed to account for water stored in one year and applied to use in another and later year? Specifically, would consumptive use be considered as occurring in the year in which water is impounded, or in some later year when it is withdrawn from storage and applied to use?

Answer. The necessity for hold-over storage to enable the upper basin to utilize the apportionment made to it by the Colorado River Compact and at the same time to comply with the obligation for Lee Ferry deliveries imposed by article III (d) of the Colorado River Compact requires that consumptive use resulting from the storage of water in reservoirs be determined on the basis of progressive averages. While the compact leaves such determination to the Commission, it is considered that the Commission may make use of progressive averages

QUESTION NO. 7

Article VIII provides for an Upper Colorado River Commission. Among other things, the Commission is authorized to (article VIII (d)):

"(6) Make findings as to the quantity of water of the upper Colorado River system used each year in the upper Colorado River Basin and each State thereof;

"(7) Make findings as to the quantity of water deliveries at Lee Ferry during each water year;

"(8) Make findings as to the necessity for and the extent of the curtailment of use, required, if any, pursuant to article IV hereof."

Subdivision (g) of the same article provides that:

"Findings of fact made by the Commission shall not be conclusive in any court, or before any agency or tribunal but shall constitute prima facie evidence of the facts found."

It has been held that, in addition to its contractual character, under some circumstances a compact approved by the Congress is a public law (*Missouri* v. *Illinois* (200 U. S. 496–519); *Pennsylvania* v. *Wheeling, etc.*, (54 U. S. 518–566)). Is it intended that subdivision (g) above shall be binding on any State not a party to the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, or on the United States?

Answer. Article VIII (g) of the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact does not bind any State which is not signatory to that compact and does not bind the United States.

QUESTION NO. 8

Will the ratification by the several States and the approval by the Congress of the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact in any way amend or affect the meaning of the Colorado River Compact, whatever that document may mean?

Answer. The Upper Colorado River Basin Compact is an interstate compact between the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. Article I, section 10, of the Constitution of the United States requires that before a compact or agreement between States is effective the Congress of the United States must consent thereto. The purpose of H. R. 2325 is to give such congressional consent to the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact. H. R. 2325 does not, nor does the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, alter, amend, modify, or repeal the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057) or the Colorado River Compact signed at Santa Fe, N. Mex., on November 24, 1922. It is recognized that the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact is binding only upon the States which are signatory thereto and does not impair any rights of any State not signatory thereto, and that the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact is subject, in all respects, to the provisions and limitations contained in the Colorado River Compact.

QUESTION NO. 9

I note that in article XVIII the States of Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah have reserved their respective rights and interests under the Colorado River Compact, as States of the lower basin. Will the ratification and approval by the Congress of the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact impair or in any way affect the rights of States of the lower basin not signatory thereto?

Answer: All that is sought by H. R. 2325 is the consent of the Congress to the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact so that the limitation imposed by article I, section 10, of the United States Constitution upon the power of any State to enter into any agreement or compact with another State may be removed. The lower basin rights of Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah were reserved in order

to avoid any questions that might arise if they were not specifically reserved. No implication can be drawn from this reservation with respect to the rights of States not parties to the compact. They are not bound and their legal rights are not and cannot be impaired by a document to which they are not parties.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. CARSON,
Commissioner for the State of Arizona.
CLIFFORD H. STONE,
Commissioner for the State of Colorado.
FRED E. WILSON,
Commissioner for the State of New Mexico.
L. C. BISHOP,
Commissioner for the State of Wyoming.
CLINTON D. VERNON,
Attorney General of Utah.
J. A. HOWELL,
Special Assistant Attorney General of Utah.
HARRY W. BASHORE,
Representative of the United States, Upper Colorado River Basin Compact Negotiations.

RENT CONTROL—REPORT OF COMMITTEE FILED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under the order of the Senate of the 17th instant,

Mr. MAYBANK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1731) to extend certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes, reported it on March 17, 1949, with an amendment, and submitted a report (No. 127) thereon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 851. A bill to promote the settlement and development of the public domain in the Territory of Alaska by facilitating the construction of necessary housing therein, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 129).

By Mr. O'CONOR, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 498. A bill to increase rates of compensation of the heads and assistant heads of executive departments and independent agencies; with amendments (Rept. No. 130).

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL-BUSINESS ENTERPRISES—ADVERSE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report adversely Senate Resolution 29, authorizing the appointment of a Special Committee To Study the Problems of American Small-Business Enterprises, and I submit an adverse report (No. 128) thereon.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator identify the resolution?

Mr. MAYBANK. It is the so-called Murray resolution or small-business resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. It is the resolution relating to small business; is it?

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes. I may say to the Senator that it is the resolution which we assured him we would make some report upon as soon as possible after the hearings which he and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] attended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed, and the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 18, 1949, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 315. An act for the relief of Dr. Chung Kwai Lui;

S. 335. An act for the relief of Claris U. Yeadon;

S. 592. An act for the relief of Edwin B. Anderson;

S. 594. An act for the relief of John I. Malarin, former Army mail clerk at APO 932, a branch of the San Francisco, Calif., post office, relative to a shortage in his fixed credit account;

S. 632. An act to authorize certain personnel and former personnel of the Naval Establishment to accept certain gifts and a foreign decoration tendered by foreign governments;

S. 633. An act for the relief of Rachel D. Gattegno; and

S. 634. An act to authorize payment of certain claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property and personal injury arising from activities of the Army.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 1297. A bill for the relief of Harry H. Winternitz and his wife, Jenta Winternitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1298. A bill for the relief of Harry J. Martin; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1299. A bill to provide a system of transcontinental superhighways; to the Committee on Public Works.

(Mr. O'MAHONEY introduced Senate bill 1300, to conserve and increase the Nation's water resources, for promotion of irrigation in arid areas, by research and demonstration of practical means of producing, from sea or other saline waters, water suitable for beneficial consumptive use, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 1301. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to William Bow a patent in fee to certain land; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 1302. A bill for the relief of Dino Constantin Alimanistianu and his family;

S. 1303. A bill for the relief of Vintila Bratianu and his family;

S. 1304. A bill for the relief of Nicolae G. Caranfil and his family;

S. 1305. A bill for the relief of Theodore Constantin Trancu and his wife; and

S. 1306. A bill for the relief of Mihail Farcasanu and his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1307. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Fort Atkinson National Monument, in the State of Nebraska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1308. A bill for the relief of Gardi Bourell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. CONNALLY (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CHAVEZ, and Mr. ANDERSON) introduced Senate bill 1309, granting the consent and approval of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of New Mexico and Texas relating to the waters of the Pecos River, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 1310. A bill for the relief of Pierre E. Lefevre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAIN:

S. 1311. A bill authorizing the construction of a dam and reservoir on the Green River in Washington for flood control, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1312. A bill to provide for the payment of traveling and hotel expenses of the parents and/or wife to attend funeral of servicemen whose remains must be buried in a mass grave because of inability to identify same; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1313. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Washington to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Cox Bros.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1314. A bill to authorize the issuance of a commemorative stamp in honor of the one hundredth anniversary of the landing of the first white settlers in the city of Seattle, Wash.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(Mr. WILEY introduced the following bills, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appear under a separate heading:

S. 1315. A bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948;

S. 1316. A bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948; and

S. 1317. A bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1318. A bill to increase annuities under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 by 20 percent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(Mr. BRIDGES introduced Senate Joint Resolution 66, favoring centralization by the respective States of their records pertaining to marriages and divorces, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

CONVERSION OF SEA WATER FOR INDUSTRIAL AND IRRIGATION USES

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the Department of the Interior to develop methods for conversion of sea water on a large scale for public, industrial, and irrigation uses, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement by me be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1300) to conserve and increase the Nation's water resources, for promotion of irrigation in arid areas, by research and demonstration of practical means of producing, from sea or other saline waters, water suitable for beneficial consumptive use, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. O'MAHONEY, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONVERSION OF SEA WATER FOR INDUSTRIAL AND IRRIGATION USES

The arid West, where reclamation is essential to the cultivation of agricultural land, is not the only area of the country in need of new sources of water supply. Water shortages already exist or are threatened in a large

number of industrial and urban areas throughout the Nation, Senator O'MAHONEY explained in commenting on his bill which calls for construction and operation of demonstration plants to discover the most feasible means to convert sea water for industrial, domestic, and agricultural use.

The situation is acute not only for arid regions of the West, such as those through which the Colorado River flows, but also for large metropolitan areas throughout the country. So great has been the drain on underground water supplies in the East that industrial use of ground water in Brooklyn and in Queens County has been limited by law ever since 1934. The consumption of water in that area has been so great that the water table has been rapidly falling, and sea water has been flowing into the source of supply for domestic use.

The long struggle which has been waged over the distribution and use of the water of the Colorado River system is an illustration of the need for legislation of this character. There is not enough water in the river for all present and contemplated uses by the people of the States in the Colorado River Basin. Not only is this true with respect to irrigation and power, but it's true with respect to industrial and municipal use.

More than that, the Los Angeles-San Diego-San Francisco-Oakland areas, which are among the fastest-growing industrial and metropolitan regions of the Nation, are experiencing serious water shortages. This is a condition which will seriously limit the expansion of industrial development unless a solution is found.

Similar conditions exist in the Virgin Islands and in other insular possessions of the United States. If a feasible method for converting sea water is developed, it will be an untold blessing to all parts of the country.

Our oceans, with their limitless quantities of water at our doorsteps, are a national resource. The legislation I am introducing would permit American scientific and industrial genius to develop this great resource to meet existing and expanding needs for national security, public health, and economic development.

INTERSTATE COMPACT REGARDING WATERS OF THE PECOS RIVER

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I introduce a bill on behalf of myself, the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], relating to a compact entered into between the States of New Mexico and Texas with regard to the utilization and proper division of the waters of the Pecos River. Senators will recall that at the last session there was a great deal of controversy in the Senate between the representatives of Texas and New Mexico over legislation of this character. Fortunately, the representatives of the two States have been able to adjust their differences, and have signed a compact, which has been ratified by the respective States, but now must be ratified by the Federal Government. So I am introducing the bill.

The bill (S. 1309) granting the consent and approval of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of New Mexico and Texas relating to the waters of the Pecos River, introduced by Mr. CONNALLY (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CHAVEZ, and Mr. ANDERSON) was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENTS TO DISPLACED PERSONS ACT OF 1948

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference three bills to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, and I ask unanimous consent that the bills, together with an explanatory statement by me, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bills and statement presented by the Senator from Wisconsin will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bills introduced by Mr. WILEY were severally read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1315

A bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 (Public Law 774, 80th Cong.) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) During the four fiscal years following the passage of this act a number of nonquota immigration visas not to exceed 400,000 may be issued to eligible displaced persons and eligible displaced orphans as defined herein: *Provided*, That a number not exceeding 10 percent of the visas issued under this act may be made available for displaced persons and displaced orphans as defined in section 2, subsection (b) of this act (with the exception of those persons defined in annex I, part I, section A, paragraph 1 of the constitution of the International Refugee Organization) who are outside of the geographical areas defined in subsection (c) of section 2 of the said act and have not been permanently resettled.

"(b) The Commission shall insure that, in the administration of this act, there shall be no discrimination in favor of or against any eligible displaced person or eligible displaced orphan because of race, religion, or national origin of such eligible displaced persons."

S. 1316

A bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (c) of section 2 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 (Public Law 774, 80th Cong.) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) 'Eligible displaced orphan' means a displaced person who (1) was under the age of 21 years on the effective date of this act; and (2) is qualified under the immigration laws of the United States for admission into the United States for permanent residence; and (3) who is an orphan because of the death or disappearance of both parents; or (4) a child whose parents are unable to accompany it to the United States (a) because of inability to meet standards of mental or physical health, or (b) because they are permanently separated from the child by abandonment, repatriation, or otherwise, or (c) who are incapable of providing care for such child and agree to release it for immigration and adoption; and (5) who on or before January 1, 1949, was in Italy or in the American sector, the British sector, or the French sector of either Berlin or Vienna or the American zone, the British zone, or the French zone of either Germany or Austria and for whom satisfactory assurances in accordance with the regulations of the Commission have been given that such person, if admitted into the United States, will be cared for properly."

S. 1317

A bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (c) of section 2 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 (Public Law 774, 80th Cong.) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) 'Eligible displaced person' means a displaced person as defined in subsection (b) above, (1) who, between September 1, 1939, and January 1, 1949, was in Italy or the American sector, the British sector, or the French sector of either Berlin or Vienna, or the American zone, the British zone, or the French zone of either Germany or Austria and has not been firmly resettled; or a person who, having resided in Germany or Austria, was a victim of persecution by the Nazi Government and was detained in or was obliged to flee from such persecution and was subsequently returned to one of these countries and has not been firmly resettled, and (2) who is qualified under the immigration laws of the United States for admission into the United States for permanent residence, and (3) for whom assurances in accordance with the regulations of the Commission have been given that such person and the members of such person's family who shall accompany such person and who propose to live with such person shall not become public charges.

"As used in this act, eligible displaced person includes the spouse, dependent parent or parents, and the unmarried dependent child or children, including stepchildren and adopted children, of such an eligible displaced person, if such person is otherwise qualified for admission into the United States for permanent residence. All contrary or conflicting provisions of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 are hereby repealed."

The statement presented by Mr. WILEY was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY ON AMENDMENTS TO DISPLACED-PERSONS LAW OF 1948

On February 23, 1949, I issued a statement on 15 major changes which I felt were necessary in the displaced-persons law. On that day I introduced Senate bill 1055, revising the eligibility date under the law, so as to make eligible some 175,000 persons otherwise excluded from the provisions of the law. I indicated that at a later date I would introduce other amendments to apply each of the principles which I set forth.

At this time, therefore, I am introducing three amendments in fulfillment of that promise. The first of the amendments is phrased so as to make available a number of nonquota immigration visas (under the 400,000 over-all limitation) which number, not exceeding 10 percent, would be reserved for displaced persons residing outside our occupation zones in Germany and Austria.

I am only going to touch upon the high spot of that particular amendment and the other two amendments which follow.

The second amendment is to raise the limitation on the age of eligible orphans from the age of 16 years to 21 years. This amendment also liberalizes the definition of orphans in order to cope with some of the many circumstances which have arisen already under the displaced-persons law in connection with bringing orphans to our land.

The third amendment is to help preserve family unity in displaced persons coming to our country. Thus it clarifies eligible displaced person to include dependent parents of displaced persons and unmarried dependent children including stepchildren and adopted children of displaced persons.

I feel that all of these amendments are consistent with the high humanitarian ideals of Senate bill 311 which has been introduced

by my colleagues, the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH] and the junior senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. Taken together with S. 311, I believe that my amendments provide a workable basis for revision of the present statute—a statute which was only a temporary stopgap mechanism which must now be overhauled.

I want to express a brief word of congratulations to all of the many church and lay organizations which have been cooperating magnificently in coming to agreement on the general principles of my own amendments and of Senate bill 311. Their cooperation, which is a welcome factor on the American scene, has, I believe, facilitated the job of Congress immeasurably in its work toward revision of the present statute. The Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons (if I may name the over-all organization which has been working on this problem, without detracting in any way from the other splendid organizations which have been working on it) the Citizens Committee itself is to be congratulated for its yeoman work in securing interfaith cooperation.

I do want to express a word of congratulations, too, to the many State committees on displaced persons, like the Wisconsin Committee on Resettlement headed by Prof. George W. Hill, at Madison, which has been working with might and main toward the prompt resettlement of displaced persons.

It is essential, of course, that until the present statute is revised there be the finest possible administration of it in order that the present trickle of displaced persons entering our country can be increased.

Finally, there is attached to this statement an editorial published in the March 9, 1949, issue of the newspaper, the Eau Claire Leader. This splendid newspaper, which is published in the adjoining city to my own home town, has commented most graciously on my February 23 statement. I ask that it be included in the RECORD not because of its personal praise of myself but rather because I believe it helps clarify the issues at hand, irrespective of myself or any other factor. (See page A1562 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

RECORDS PERTAINING TO MARRIAGES AND DIVORCES

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have the pleasure to introduce for the American Association of Registration Executives a joint resolution by the terms of which the Congress would call upon the respective States to centralize their records pertaining to marriages and divorces. I was requested to introduce this joint resolution by Miss Marion Maloon, who is president of the association and registrar of the division of vital statistics of the New Hampshire Department of Health.

I ask that the text of the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD and that there follow the attached explanatory statement along with a resolution adopted by the American Public Health Association with respect to the problem the joint resolution would treat.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the joint resolution, the explanatory statement, and the resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 66) favoring centralization by the respective States of their records pertaining to marriages and divorces, introduced by Mr. BRIDGES, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas adequate systems of registration of records of marriages and divorces are of great value to individuals who need and seek such records for a variety of personal and legal uses; and

Whereas such registration systems make possible the compiling of information that is essential to those charged with responsibility in the fields of health, education, child welfare, housing, and many other aspects of the general welfare; and

Whereas the principal countries of the civilized world recognize the necessity for such systems of records and information; and

Whereas the necessary information concerning occurrences of marriages and divorces is now readily available only for parts of the United States, in particular those States and larger cities which have provided for some system of central registration of the records of marriages and divorces like that established for records of births and deaths; and

Whereas it is most important that registration of marriage and divorce records should be conducted under laws and procedures that will insure a practical comparability and uniformity in the character and amount of information available from the several States; and

Whereas the American Association of Registration Executives and many other organizations and individuals have been striving to this end and have made known to the National Office of Vital Statistics, in the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency, their concern with the need for adequate records and information relating to marriages and divorces in the United States, and the desirability of extending the benefits of State registration of marriage and divorce records and of promoting its efficiency: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States hereby express approval of this movement for establishing integrated systems in the several States of records of marriages and divorces, and requests the favorable consideration and action of the State authorities, to the end that the United States may attain a complete and adequate system which will serve the needs of individuals and will yield necessary and comparable information concerning the vital statistics of marriages and divorces in the United States.

The explanatory statement and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT BY SENATOR BRIDGES

The American Association of Registration Executives for several years has been concerned with the need for registration of records of marriages and divorces in State offices, both to provide greater accessibility to individuals who have valid need for the records and to provide useful statistical information about such occurrences which will be comparable among the several States. Vital statistics of marriages and divorces can most feasibly be handled in essentially the same manner which has proven successful for vital statistics of birth, deaths, stillbirths, etc. A few States have operated an integrated system of handling all vital statistics for many years; other States have done so more recently. But we are far from achieving a situation where every State has provided such integration. Individuals seeking copies of records of marriages or divorces for their legal and personal uses, and investigators seeking information about the numbers and trends of such occurrences, are confronted with a maze of different record systems and with the sometimes hopeless task of searching among hundreds of county and other local offices.

A similar situation once existed with respect to records and information concerning births and deaths. Recognizing the seriousness of the situation, the Fifty-seventh Congress of the United States wisely passed a joint resolution (Public Resolution 7, February 11, 1903) pointing out that efforts were being made to achieve complete and comparable registration and records in the several States, expressing approval of this movement, and requesting favorable consideration and action of the State authorities. Undoubtedly this 1903 joint resolution had significant influence, in the years following 1903, in the successful drive to obtain consideration and passage in the various State legislatures of the necessary laws for State centralization of birth and death records. Such centralized systems are now in operation in all the States and have made possible the compilation of useful and comparable national statistics of births and deaths in the National Office of Vital Statistics (formerly in the Census Bureau and now in the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency), through well-established Federal-State cooperative relationships.

The American Association of Registration Executives, at a meeting on March 18, 1948, voted to direct its officers to request the Congress of the United States to pass a joint resolution, along the lines of the 1903 resolution, recognizing the need for and expressing approval of the movement for State systems of registration of marriage and divorce records from which adequate comparable information for the Nation could be obtained, and requesting favorable consideration and action of State authorities. The association also directed its officers to implement this decision by preparing a draft of such a proposed joint resolution, with appropriate supporting documents; and by making known to the proper authorities the support of the American Association of Registration Executives for such action, and soliciting support of other interested organizations.

RESOLUTION APPROVED AT THE SEVENTY-SIXTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN PUBLIC HEALTH ASSOCIATION, NOVEMBER 10, 1948

Resolution of marriage and divorce statistics

Whereas the American Public Health Association recognizes the need for more adequate marriage and divorce statistics, to provide much-needed information on many aspects of the health and well-being of the family, community, State, and Nation; and

Whereas these vital statistics of marriages and divorces can most feasibly be developed through the same channels as have proven effective for vital statistics of births and deaths, as part of the public-health programs of the several States, with development of national statistics through cooperative State-Federal relationships: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Public Health Association expresses its support for State centralization of marriage and divorce records and statistics and their integration with other vital records and statistics, and urges all States not yet operating such an integrated system to effect this urgently needed change at the earliest possible time; and be it further

Resolved, That the American Public Health Association calls upon the National Office of Vital Statistics, in the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency, to take all steps possible for encouraging the development of systems of marriage and divorce records and statistics in every State that will make for maximum uniformity, comparability, and prompt availability of data, and for developing a program of detailed national statistics of marriage and divorce, based on national registration areas for marriages and divorces, adequate to meet the pressing needs for such vital statistics.

RENT CONTROL—AMENDMENT

Mr. CAPEHART submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1731) to extend certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT OF 1948—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], my colleague the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the senior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and myself, I submit two amendments intended to be proposed by us, jointly, to the bill (S. 1209) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948. I ask that the amendments be printed and lie on the table for the information of Senators.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Washington.

AMENDMENT OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION CHARTER AND STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS STOCK PILING ACTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. BUTLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 900) to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS TO DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. GURNEY submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 2632) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 10, after line 5, insert the following:

"MOTOR CARRIER CLAIMS COMMISSION

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For expenses necessary for the Motor Carrier Claims Commission established by the act of July 2, 1948 (Public Law 880), including personal services in the District of Columbia, travel expenses, printing and binding, and services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), $50,000: *Provided*, That section 6 of the aforesaid act of July 2, 1948, as amended, is further amended by striking out the words '9 months' and inserting in lieu thereof the words '15 months,' and section 13 of said act, as amended, is further amended by striking out the words '9 months' period' and inserting in lieu thereof the words '15 months' period.'"

Mr. GURNEY also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 2632, making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. FERGUSON submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 2632) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: After the paragraph under the caption "Tennessee Valley Authority" insert the following:

"Any Federal taxpayer or any consumer of electric energy, neither of whom is supplied with electric energy produced by the Tennessee Valley Authority, may, and is hereby authorized to, institute and maintain an action against the Tennessee Valley Authority in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia to enjoin the expenditure of any funds herein appropriated for the construction of any steam electric generating plant by the Tennessee Valley Authority and to enjoin the construction of said plant or plants as being contrary to law: *Provided*, That such an action shall not be maintained unless the complaint is filed within 3 months from the date when the act making the appropriation becomes effective. Service may be made upon the Tennessee Valley Authority by delivering a copy of the summons and of the complaint to any officer or agent of the Tennessee Valley Authority at the office of said Authority in the District of Columbia or by sending a copy of the summons and of the complaint by registered mail to the Tennessee Valley Authority at Knoxville, Tenn. The provisions of sections 1253, 2101, 2282, and 2284 of new title 28, Judiciary and Judicial Procedure, shall be applicable to such an action.

"2. It is the intention of this provision to vest in such Federal taxpayers and consumers of electric energy the private substantive right to be protected against unlawful expenditures of Federal funds and the unlawful construction of steam plants by the TVA, and to permit the action herein authorized for the protection of the public and for the protection of such private substantive right."

Mr. FERGUSON also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 2632, making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

DOMESTIC ECONOMIC ISSUES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MARTIN

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him on March 17, 1949, before the Manufacturers' Association of Delaware County, Pa., at Chester, Pa., which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL COMMENTS ON ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY BEFORE NEW YORK STATE BANKERS ASSOCIATION

[Mr. GEORGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD editorial comments on the address delivered by Hon. James A. Farley before the New York State Bankers Association in New York City on January 24, 1949, which appear in the Appendix.]

IN STALIN'S FOOTSTEPS—ARTICLE BY FELIX MORLEY

[Mr. JENNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "In Stalin's Footsteps," written by Felix Morley, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNESCO AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING—ADDRESS BY WALTER H. C. LAVES

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "UNESCO and the Development of International Understanding," delivered by Walter H. C. Laves, Deputy Director General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, before the National Farm Institute at Des Moines, Iowa, February 18, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

SHALL AMERICA OR RUSSIA RULE THE AIR?—ADDRESS BY COL. ROSCOE TURNER

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Shall America or Russia Rule the Air?", delivered by Col. Roscoe Turner, November 4, 1948, at the national meeting of the Society of Automotive Engineers at Tulsa, Okla., which appears in the Appendix.]

NOMINATION OF COL. E. W. PALMER AS OUTSTANDING BUSINESS LEADER OF THE SOUTH

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Lawrence J. Linck, executive director of the National Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Inc., to Col. Hubert F. Lee, editor and founder of Dixie Business, relating to the nomination of Col. E. W. Palmer, of Meredith, N. H., as one of the outstanding leaders of the South which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR NATIONAL FLAG—ESSAY BY LT. COL. ARTHUR M. EDWARDS

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an essay entitled "Our National Flag," by Lt. Col. Arthur M. Edwards, United States Army, retired, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEMOCRACIES CAN SOLVE THE GERMAN PROBLEM BY ATLANTIC UNION—EDITORIAL FROM THE MEMPHIS PRESS-SCIMITAR

[Mr. FLANDERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Democracies Can Solve the German Problem by Atlantic Union," from the Memphis Press-Scimitar, which appears in the Appendix.]

DISPLACED PERSONS—EDITORIAL FROM THE EAU CLAIRE LEADER

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Displaced Persons," from the Eau Claire Leader of March 9, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

LETTERS COMMENDING FRANCIS LLOYD JONES AND JOHN N. KOSTELNIK FOR HEROISM

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two letters written by the Yale Association of Washington State commending Mr. Francis Lloyd Jones, of Seattle, and Mr. John N. Kostelnik, of Renton, Wash., for their courage in saving the lives of Yale students who were victims of an airplane disaster last January in Seattle, which appears in the Appendix.]

RICHARD KIM

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 90) to provide for the naturalization of Richard Kim, which was to amend the title so as to read: "An act to provide for permanent residence status of Richard Kim."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator explain the purpose of the amendment?

Mr. McCARRAN. The House has merely amended the title of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to.

RELIEF OF CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO—INDEFINITE POSTPONEMENT OF BILL

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 1509) for the relief of the city and county of San Francisco.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on February 21, 1949, the Senate passed Senate bill 198, for the relief of the city and county of San Francisco, and on the same day the House passed House bill 1509, identical with the Senate bill. Subsequently Senate bill 198 was passed by the House and has been approved by the President. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that House bill 1509 be indefinitely postponed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BOARD OF REGENTS OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 89) providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. HAYDEN. This joint resolution provides for filling a vacancy to which the House is entitled on the board. The House has filled the vacancy. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 89) providing for the filling of a vacancy on the Board of the Smithsonian Institution, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, be filled by the appointment of Jerome C. Hunsaker, a citizen of Massachusetts, for the statutory term of 6 years, to succeed Frederic C. Walcott, retired.

THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next order of business is the call of the calendar under rule VIII. The clerk will proceed to state the business on the calendar.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 130) to provide for the demonstration of public-library service in areas without such service or with inadequate library facilities was announced as first in order.

Mr. TAFT. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN COMPACT

The bill (S. 790) to grant the consent of the United States to the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I do not intend to object—I should like to address an inquiry to the able Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, relative to this bill.

The particular point upon which I desire reassurance by the chairman of the committee, so that the intent of Congress may be clearly expressed in the legislative history of this measure, is this: That—

Congress by giving its consent to the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, does not commit the United States to any interpretation of the Colorado River Compact expressed in, or implied from, the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact and expresses neither agreement nor disagreement with any such interpretation.

The language I have just used is taken from the report of the Public Lands Committee of the House, which I understand was agreed upon March 17, by that committee and assented to by the compact commissioners representing the five States signatory to the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact. May I ask the chairman of the committee whether the language which I have quoted represents also the intent of the Senate committee?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this bill was unanimously approved by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. After that action was taken and the bill went on the calendar, the House Committee on Public Lands held a hearing at which all persons who were interested in the Colorado River system were present.

Yesterday, on the 17th day of March, that committee adopted a report which contains a statement with respect to the purpose and effect of the bill, with which we completely agree. Let me say that I think the 17th day of March was a very excellent day upon which to settle a controversy. I am very glad, therefore, to read into the RECORD this language from the House report, and say that it meets the concurrence of members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

MARCH 17, 1949.

STATEMENT TO BE INCLUDED IN THE REPORT OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS ON H. R. 2325 (S. 790), GRANTING THE CONSENT OF CONGRESS TO THE UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN COMPACT

The Upper Colorado River Basin Compact is an interstate compact between the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. Article I, section 10, of the Constitution of the United States requires that before a compact or agreement between States is effective the Congress of the United States must consent thereto. The purpose of S. 790 (H. R. 2325) is to give such congressional consent to the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact. S. 790 (H. R. 2325) does not, nor does the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, alter, amend, modify, or repeal the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057) or the Colorado River Compact signed at Santa Fe, N. Mex., on November 24, 1922. It is recognized that the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact is binding only upon the States which are signatory thereto and does not impair any rights of any State not signatory thereto, and that the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact is subject, in all respects, to the provisions and limitations contained in the Colorado River Compact. It is further recognized that Congress, by giving its consent to the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, does not commit the United States to any interpretation of the Colorado River Compact, expressed in, or implied from the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, and expresses neither agreement nor disagreement with any such interpretation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator for his statement, and I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of the Congress is hereby given to the compact, signed (after negotiations in which a representative of the United States, duly appointed by the President, participated and upon which he has reported to the Congress) by the Commissioners for the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, on October 11, 1948, at Santa Fe, N. Mex., and thereafter ratified by the legislatures of each of the States aforesaid, which said compact reads as follows:

"UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN COMPACT

"The State of Arizona, the State of Colorado, the State of New Mexico, the State of Utah, and the State of Wyoming, acting through their commissioners,

"Charles A. Carson for the State of Arizona,

"Clifford H. Stone for the State of Colorado,

"Fred E. Wilson for the State of New Mexico,

"Edward H. Watson for the State of Utah, and

"L. C. Bishop for the State of Wyoming, after negotiations participated in by Harry W. Bashore, appointed by the President as the representative of the United States of America, have agreed, subject to the provisions of the Colorado River Compact, to determine the rights and obligations of each signatory State respecting the uses and deliveries of the water of the upper basin of the Colorado River, as follows:

"ARTICLE I

"(a) The major purposes of this compact are to provide for the equitable division and apportionment of the use of the waters of the Colorado River system, the use of which was apportioned in perpetuity to the upper basin by the Colorado River Compact; to establish the obligations of each State of the upper division with respect to the deliveries of water required to be made at Lee Ferry by the Colorado River Compact; to promote interstate comity; to remove causes of present and future controversies; to secure the expeditious agricultural and industrial development of the upper basin, the storage of water and to protect life and property from floods.

"(b) It is recognized that the Colorado River Compact is in full force and effect and all of the provisions hereof are subject thereto.

"ARTICLE II

"As used in this compact:

"(a) The term 'Colorado River system' means that portion of the Colorado River and its tributaries within the United States of America.

"(b) The term 'Colorado River Basin' means all of the drainage area of the Colorado River system and all other territory within the United States of America to which the waters of the Colorado River system shall be beneficially applied.

"(c) The term 'States of the upper division' means the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming.

"(d) The term 'States of the lower division' means the States of Arizona, California, and Nevada.

"(e) The term 'Lee Ferry' means a point in the main stream of the Colorado River 1 mile below the mouth of the Paria River.

"(f) The term 'upper basin' means those parts of the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming within and from which waters naturally drain into the Colorado River system above Lee Ferry, and also all parts of said States located without the drainage area of the Colorado River system which are now or shall hereafter be beneficially served by waters diverted from the Colorado River system above Lee Ferry.

"(g) The term 'lower basin' means those parts of the States of Arizona, California, Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah within and from which waters naturally drain into the Colorado River system below Lee Ferry, and also all parts of said States located without the drainage area of the Colorado River System which are now or shall hereafter be beneficially served by waters diverted from the Colorado River system below Lee Ferry.

"(h) The term 'Colorado River Compact' means the agreement concerning the apportionment of the use of the waters of the Colorado River system dated November 24, 1922, executed by Commissioners for the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, approved by Herbert Hoover, representative of the United States of America, and proclaimed effective by the President of the United States of America, June 25, 1929.

"(i) The term 'upper Colorado River system' means that portion of the Colorado River system above Lee Ferry.

"(j) The term 'Commission' means the administrative agency created by article VIII of this compact.

"(k) The term 'water year' means that period of 12 months ending September 30 of each year.

"(l) The term 'acre-foot' means the quantity of water required to cover an acre to the depth of 1 foot and is equivalent to 43,560 cubic feet.

"(m) The term 'domestic use' shall include the use of water for household, stock, municipal, mining, milling, industrial, and other like purposes, but shall exclude the generation of electrical power.

"(n) The term 'virgin flow' means the flow of any stream undepleted by the activities of man.

"ARTICLE III

"(a) Subject to the provisions and limitations contained in the Colorado River Compact and in this compact, there is hereby apportioned from the upper Colorado River system in perpetuity to the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, respectively, the consumptive use of water, as follows:

"(1) To the State of Arizona the consumptive use of 50,000 acre-feet of water per annum.

"(2) To the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, respectively, the consumptive use per annum of the quantities resulting from the application of the following percentages to the total quantity of consumptive use per annum apportioned in perpetuity to and available for use each year by upper basin under the Colorado River Compact and remaining after the deduction of the use, not to exceed 50,000 acre-feet per annum, made in the State of Arizona.

"State of Colorado, 51.75 percent; State of New Mexico, 11.25 percent; State of Utah, 23 percent; State of Wyoming, 14 percent.

"(b) The apportionment made to the respective States by paragraph (a) of this article is based upon, and shall be applied in conformity with, the following principles and each of them:

"(1) The apportionment is of any and all man-made depletions;

"(2) Beneficial use is the basis, the measure, and the limit of the right to use;

"(3) No State shall exceed its apportioned use in any water-year when the effect of such excess use, as determined by the Commission, is to deprive another signatory State of its apportioned use during that water-year: *Provided*, That this subparagraph (b) (3) shall not be construed as:

"(i) Altering the apportionment of use or obligations to make deliveries as provided in articles XI, XII, XIII, or XIV of this compact;

"(ii) Purporting to apportion among the signatory States such uses of water as the upper basin may be entitled to under paragraphs (f) and (g) of article III of the Colorado River Compact; or

"(iii) Countenancing average uses by any signatory State in excess of its apportionment.

"(4) The apportionment to each State includes all water necessary for the supply of any rights which now exist.

"(c) No apportionment is hereby made, or intended to be made, of such uses of water as the upper basin may be entitled to under paragraphs (f) and (g) of article III of the Colorado River Compact.

"(d) The apportionment made by this article shall not be taken as any basis for the allocation among the signatory States of any benefits resulting from the generation of power.

"ARTICLE IV

"In the event curtailment of use of water by the States of the upper division at any time shall become necessary in order that the flow at Lee Ferry shall not be depleted below that required by article III of the Colorado River Compact, the extent of curtailment by each State of the consumptive use of water apportioned to it by article III of this compact shall be in such quantities and at such times as shall be determined by the Commission upon the application of the following principles:

"(a) The extent and times of curtailment shall be such as to assure full compliance with article III of the Colorado River Compact;

"(b) If any State or States of the upper division, in the 10 years immediately preceding the water-year in which curtailment is necessary, shall have consumptively used more water than it was or they were, as the case may be, entitled to use under the apportionment made by article III of this compact, such State or States shall be required to supply at Lee Ferry a quantity of water equal to its, or the aggregate of their, overdraft or the proportionate part of such overdraft, as may be necessary to assure compliance with article III of the Colorado River compact, before demand is made on any other State of the upper division;

"(c) Except as provided in subparagraph (b) of this article, the extent of curtailment by each State of the upper division of the consumptive use of water apportioned to it by article III of this compact shall be such as to result in the delivery at Lee Ferry of a quantity of water which bears the same relation to the total required curtailment of use by the States of the upper division as the consumptive use of upper Colorado River system water which was made by each such State during the water-year immediately preceding the year in which the curtailment becomes necessary bears to the total consumptive use of such water in the States of the upper division during the same water-year: *Provided*, That in determining such relation, the uses of water under rights perfected prior to November 24, 1922, shall be excluded.

"ARTICLE V

"(a) All losses of water occurring from or as the result of the storage of water in reservoirs constructed prior to the signing of this compact shall be charged to the State in which such reservoir or reservoirs are located. Water stored in reservoirs covered by this paragraph (a) shall be for the exclusive use of and shall be charged to the State in which the reservoir or reservoirs are located.

"(b) All losses of water occurring from or as the result of the storage of water in reservoirs constructed after the signing of this compact shall be charged as follows:

"(1) If the Commission finds that the reservoir is used, in whole or in part, to assist the States of the upper division in meeting their obligations to deliver water at Lee Ferry imposed by article III of the Colorado River compact, the Commission shall make findings, which in no event shall be contrary to the laws of the United States of America under which any reservoir is constructed, as to the reservoir capacity allocated for that purpose. The whole or that proportion, as the case may be, of reservoir losses as found by the Commission to be reasonably and properly chargeable to the reservoir or reservoir capacity utilized to assure deliveries at Lee Ferry shall be charged to the States of the upper division in the proportion which the consumptive use of water in each State of the upper division during the water year in which the charge is made bears to the total consumptive use of water in all States of the upper division during the same water year. Water stored in reservoirs or in reservoir capacity covered by this subparagraph (b) (1) shall be for the common benefit of all of the States of the upper division.

"(2) If the Commission finds that the reservoir is used, in whole or in part, to supply water for use in a State of the upper division, the Commission shall make findings, which in no event shall be contrary to the laws of the United States of America under which any reservoir is constructed, as to the reservoir or reservoir capacity utilized to supply water for use and the State in which such water will be used. The whole or that proportion, as the case may be, of reservoir

losses as found by the Commission to be reasonably and properly chargeable to the State in which such water will be used shall be borne by that State. As determined by the Commission, water stored in reservoirs covered by this subparagraph (b) (2) shall be earmarked for and charged to the State in which the water will be used.

"(c) In the event the Commission finds that a reservoir site is available both to assure deliveries at Lee Ferry and to store water for consumptive use in a State of the upper division, the storage of water for consumptive use shall be given preference. Any reservoir or reservoir capacity hereafter used to assure deliveries at Lee Ferry shall by order of the Commission be used to store water for consumptive use in a State, provided the Commission finds that such storage is reasonably necessary to permit such State to make the use of the water apportioned to it by this compact.

"ARTICLE VI

"The Commission shall determine the quantity of the consumptive use of water, which use is apportioned by article III hereof, for the upper basin and for each State of the upper basin by the inflow-outflow method in terms of man-made depletions of the virgin flow at Lee Ferry, unless the Commission, by unanimous action, shall adopt a different method of determination.

"ARTICLE VII

"The consumptive use of water by the United States of America or any of its agencies, instrumentalities or wards shall be charged as a use by the State in which the use is made; provided, that such consumptive use incident to the diversion, impounding, or conveyance of water in one State for use in another shall be charged to such latter State.

"ARTICLE VIII

"(a) There is hereby created an interstate administrative agency to be known as the Upper Colorado River Commission. The Commission shall be composed of one Commissioner, representing each of the States of the upper division, namely, the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, designated or appointed in accordance with the laws of each such State and, if designated by the President, one Commissioner representing the United States of America. The President is hereby requested to designate a Commissioner. If so designated the Commissioner representing the United States of America shall be the presiding officer of the Commission and shall be entitled to the same powers and rights as the Commissioner of any State. Any four members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

"(b) The salaries and personal expenses of each Commissioner shall be paid by the government which he represents. All other expenses which are incurred by the Commission incident to the administration of this compact, and which are not paid by the United States of America, shall be borne by the four States according to the percentage of consumptive use apportioned to each. On or before December 1 of each year, the Commission shall adopt and transmit to the Governors of the four States and to the President a budget covering an estimate of its expenses for the following year, and of the amount payable by each State. Each State shall pay the amount due by it to the Commission on or before April 1 of the year following. The payment of the expenses of the Commission and of its employees shall not be subject to the audit and accounting procedures of any of the four States; however, all receipts and disbursement of funds handled by the Commission shall be audited yearly by a qualified independent public accountant and the report of the audit shall be included in and become a part of the annual report of the Commission.

"(c) The Commission shall appoint a secretary, who shall not be a member of the Commission, or an employee of any signatory State or of the United States of America while so acting. He shall serve for such term and receive such salary and perform such duties as the Commission may direct. The Commission may employ such engineering, legal, clerical, and other personnel as, in its judgment, may be necessary for the performance of its functions under this compact. In the hiring of employees, the Commission shall not be bound by the civil-service laws of any State.

"(d) The Commission, so far as consistent with this compact, shall have the power to:

"(1) Adopt rules and regulations;

"(2) Locate, establish, construct, abandon, operate, and maintain water-gaging stations;

"(3) Make estimates to forecast water runoff on the Colorado River and any of its tributaries;

"(4) Engage in cooperative studies of water supplies of the Colorado River and its tributaries;

"(5) Collect, analyze, correlate, preserve, and report on data as to the stream flows, storage, diversions, and use of the waters of the Colorado River, and any of its tributaries;

"(6) Make findings as to the quantity of water of the upper Colorado River system used each year in the upper Colorado River Basin and in each State thereof;

"(7) Make findings as to the quantity of water deliveries at Lee Ferry during each water year;

"(8) Make findings as to the necessity for and the extent of the curtailment of use, required, if any, pursuant to article IV hereof;

"(9) Make findings as to the quantity of reservoir losses and as to the share thereof chargeable under article V hereof to each of the States;

"(10) Make findings of fact in the event of the occurrence of extraordinary drought or serious accident to the irrigation system in the upper basin, whereby deliveries by the upper basin of water which it may be required to deliver in order to aid in fulfilling obligations of the United States of America to the United Mexican States arising under the treaty between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, dated February 3, 1944 (treaty series 994) become difficult, and report such findings to the Governors of the upper basin States, the President of the United States of America, the United States Section of the International Boundary and Water Commission, and such other Federal officials and agencies as it may deem appropriate to the end that the water allotted to Mexico under division III of such treaty may be reduced in accordance with the terms of such treaty;

"(11) Acquire and hold such personal and real property as may be necessary for the performance of its duties hereunder and to dispose of the same when no longer required;

"(12) Perform all functions required of it by this compact and do all things necessary, proper, or convenient in the performance of its duties hereunder, either independently or in cooperation with any State or Federal agency;

"(13) Make and transmit annually to the Governors of the signatory States and the President of the United States of America, with the estimated budget, a report covering the activities of the Commission for the preceding water year.

"(e) Except as otherwise provided in this compact the concurrence of four members of the Commission shall be required in any action taken by it.

"(f) The Commission and its secretary shall make available to the Governor of each of the signatory States any information within its possession at any time, and shall always provide free access to its records by the Governors of each of the States, or their representatives, or authorized representatives of the United States of America.

"(g) Findings of fact made by the Commission shall not be conclusive in any court, or before any agency or tribunal, but shall constitute prima facie evidence of the facts found.

"(h) The organization meeting of the Commission shall be held within 4 months from the effective date of this compact.

"ARTICLE IX

"(a) No State shall deny the right of the United States of America and, subject to the conditions hereinafter contained, no State shall deny the right of another signatory State, any person, or entity of any signatory State to acquire rights to the use of water, or to construct or participate in the construction and use of diversion works and storage reservoirs with appurtenant works, canals, and conduits in one State for the purpose of diverting, conveying, storing, regulating, and releasing water to satisfy the provisions of the Colorado River Compact relating to the obligation of the States of the upper division to make deliveries of water at Lee Ferry, or for the purpose of diverting, conveying, storing, or regulating water in an upper signatory State for consumptive use in a lower signatory State, when such use is within the apportionment to such lower State made by this compact. Such rights shall be subject to the rights of water users, in a State in which such reservoir or works are located, to receive and use water, the use of which is within the apportionment to such State by this compact.

"(b) Any signatory State, any person or any entity of any signatory State shall have the right to acquire such property rights as are necessary to the use of water in conformity with this compact in any other signatory State by donation, purchase, or through the exercise of the power of eminent domain. Any signatory State, upon the written request of the Governor of any other signatory State, for the benefit of whose water users property is to be acquired in the State to which such written request is made, shall proceed expeditiously to acquire the desired property either by purchase at a price satisfactory to the requesting State, or, if such purchase cannot be made, then through the exercise of its power of eminent domain and shall convey such property to the requesting State or such entity as may be designated by the requesting State; provided, that all costs of acquisition and expenses of every kind and nature whatsoever incurred in obtaining the requested property shall be paid by the requesting State at the time and in the manner prescribed by the State requested to acquire the property.

"(c) Should any facility be constructed in a signatory State by and for the benefit of another signatory State or States or the water users thereof, as above provided, the construction, repair, replacement, maintenance, and operation of such facility shall be subject to the laws of the State in which the facility is located, except that, in the case of a reservoir constructed in one State for the benefit of another State or States, the water administration officials of the State in which the facility is located shall permit the storage and release of any water which, as determined by findings of the Commission, falls within the apportionment of the State or States for whose benefit the facility is constructed. In the case of a regulating reservoir for the joint benefit of all States in making Lee Ferry deliveries, the water administration officials of the State in which the facility is located, in permitting the storage and release of water, shall comply with the findings and orders of the Commission.

"(d) In the event property is acquired by a signatory State in another signatory State

for the use and benefit of the former, the users of water made available by such facilities, as a condition precedent to the use thereof, shall pay to the political subdivisions of the State in which such works are located, each and every year during which such rights are enjoyed for such purposes, a sum of money equivalent to the average annual amount of taxes levied and assessed against the land and improvements thereon during the 10 years preceding the acquisition of such land. Said payments shall be in full reimbursement for the loss of taxes in such political subdivisions of the State, and in lieu of any and all taxes on said property, improvements, and rights. The signatory States recommend to the President and the Congress that, in the event the United States of America shall acquire property in one of the signatory States for the benefit of another signatory State, or its water users, provision be made for like payment in reimbursement of loss of taxes.

"ARTICLE X

"(a) The signatory States recognize La Plata River Compact entered into between the States of Colorado and New Mexico, dated November 27, 1922, approved by the Congress on January 29, 1925 (43 Stat. 796), and this compact shall not affect the apportionment therein made.

"(b) All consumptive use of water of La Plata River and its tributaries shall be charged under the apportionment of Article III hereof to the State in which the use is made; provided, that consumptive use incident to the diversion, impounding or conveyance of water in one State for use in the other shall be charged to the latter State.

"ARTICLE XI

"Subject to the provisions of this compact, the consumptive use of the water of the Little Snake River and its tributaries is hereby apportioned between the States of Colorado and Wyoming in such quantities as shall result from the application of the following principles and procedures:

"(a) Water used under rights existing prior to the signing of this compact.

"(1) Water diverted from any tributary of the Little Snake River or from the main stem of the Little Snake River above a point 100 feet below the confluence of Savery Creek and the Little Snake River shall be administered without regard to rights covering the diversion of water from any down-stream points.

"(2) Water diverted from the main stem of the Little Snake River below a point 100 feet below the confluence of Savery Creek and the Little Snake River shall be administered on the basis of an interstate priority schedule prepared by the Commission in conformity with priority dates established by the laws of the respective States.

"(b) Water used under rights initiated subsequent to the signing of this compact.

"(1) Direct flow diversions shall be so administered that, in time of shortage, the curtailment of use on each acre of land irrigated thereunder shall be as nearly equal as may be possible in both of the States.

"(2) The storage of water by projects located in either State, whether of supplemental supply or of water used to irrigate land not irrigated at the date of the signing of this compact, shall be so administered that in times of water shortage the curtailment of storage of water available for each acre of land irrigated thereunder shall be as nearly equal as may be possible in both States.

"(c) Water uses under the apportionment made by this article shall be in accordance with the principle that beneficial use shall be the basis, measure, and limit of the right to use.

"(d) The States of Colorado and Wyoming each assent to diversions and storage of water in one State for use in the other States, subject to compliance with article IX of this compact.

"(e) In the event of the importation of water to the Little Snake River Basin from any other river basin, the State making the importation shall have the exclusive use of such imported water unless by written agreement, made by the representatives of the States of Colorado and Wyoming on the Commission, it is otherwise provided.

"(f) Water use projects initiated after the signing of this compact, to the greatest extent possible, shall permit the full use within the basin in the most feasible manner of the waters of the Little Snake River and its tributaries, without regard to the State line; and, so far as is practicable, shall result in an equal division between the States of the use of water not used under rights existing prior to the signing of this compact.

"(g) All consumptive use of the waters of the Little Snake River and its tributaries shall be charged under the apportionment of article III hereof to the State in which the use is made; provided, that consumptive use incident to the diversion, impounding or conveyance of water in one State for use in the other shall be charged to the latter State.

"ARTICLE XII

"Subject to the provisions of this compact, the consumptive use of the waters of Henry's Fork, a tributary of Green River originating in the State of Utah and flowing into the State of Wyoming and thence into the Green River in the State of Utah; Beaver Creek, originating in the State of Utah and flowing into Henry's Fork in the State of Wyoming; Burnt Fork, a tributary of Henry's Fork, originating in the State of Utah and flowing into Henry's Fork in the State of Wyoming; Birch Creek, a tributary of Henry's Fork, originating in the State of Utah and flowing into Henry's Fork in the State of Wyoming; and Sheep Creek, a tributary of Green River in the State of Utah, and their tributaries, are hereby apportioned between the States of Utah and Wyoming in such quantities as will result from the application of the following principles and procedures:

"(a) Waters used under rights existing prior to the signing of this compact.

"Waters diverted from Henry's Fork, Beaver Creek, Burnt Fork, Birch Creek, and their tributaries, shall be administered without regard to the State line on the basis of an interstate priority schedule to be prepared by the States affected and approved by the Commission in conformity with the actual priority of right of use, the water requirements of the land irrigated and the acreage irrigated in connection therewith.

"(b) Waters used under rights from Henry's Fork, Beaver Creek, Burnt Fork, Birch Creek, and their tributaries, initiated after the signing of this compact rhall be divided 50 percent to the State of Wyoming and 50 percent to the State of Utah and each State may use said waters as and where it deems advisable.

"(c) The State of Wyoming assents to the exclusive use by the State of Utah of the water of Sheep Creek, except that the lands, if any, presently irrigated in the State of Wyoming from the water of Sheep Creek shall be supplied with water from Sheep Creek in order of priority and in such quantities as are in conformity with the laws of the State of Utah.

"(d) In the event of the importation of water to Henry's Fork, or any of its tributaries, from any other river basin, the State making the importation shall have the exclusive use of such imported water unless by written agreement made by the representatives of the States of Utah and Wyoming on the Commission, it is otherwise provided.

"(e) All consumptive use of waters of Henry's Fork, Beaver Creek, Burnt Fork, Birch Creek, Sheep Creek, and their tributaries shall be charged under the apportionment of article III hereof to the State in which the use is made; provided, that consumptive use incident to the diversion, impounding or conveyance of water in one State for use in the other shall be charged to the latter State.

"(f) The States of Utah and Wyoming each assent to the diversion and storage of water in one State for use in the other State, subject to compliance with article IX of this Compact. It shall be the duty of the water administrative officials of the State where the water is stored to release said stored water to the other State upon demand. If either the State of Utah or the State of Wyoming shall construct a reservoir in the other State for use in its own State, the water users of the State in which said facilities are constructed may purchase at cost a portion of the capacity of said reservoir sufficient for the irrigation of their lands thereunder.

"(g) In order to measure the flow of water diverted, each State shall cause suitable measuring devices to be constructed, maintained and operated at or near the point of diversion into each ditch.

"(h) The State engineers of the two States jointly shall appoint a special water commissioner who shall have authority to administer the water in both States in accordance with the terms of this article. The salary and expenses of such special water commissioner shall be paid, 30 percent by the State of Utah and 70 percent by the State of Wyoming.

"ARTICLE XIII

"Subject to the provisions of this compact, the rights to the consumptive use of the water of the Yampa River, a tributary entering the Green River in the State of Colorado, are hereby apportioned between the States of Colorado and Utah in accordance with the following principles:

"(a) The State of Colorado will not cause the flow of the Yampa River at the Maybell gaging station to be depleted below an aggregate of 5,000,000 acre-feet for any period of ten consecutive years reckoned in continuing progressive series beginning with the first day of October next succeeding the ratification and approval of this compact. In the event any diversion is made from the Yampa River or from tributaries entering the Yampa River above the Maybell gaging station for the benefit of any water use project in the State of Utah, then the gross amount of all such diversions for use in the State of Utah, less any returns from such diversions to the river above Maybell, shall be added to the actual flow at the Maybell gaging station to determine the total flow at the Maybell gaging station.

"(b) All consumptive use of the waters of the Yampa River and its tributaries shall be charged under the apportionment of article III hereof to the State in which the use is made: *Provided*, That consumptive use incident to the diversion, impounding, or conveyance of water in one State for use in the other shall be charged to the latter State.

"ARTICLE XIV

"Subject to the provisions of this compact, the consumptive use of the waters of the San Juan River and its tributaries is hereby apportioned between the States of Colorado and New Mexico as follows:

"The State of Colorado agrees to deliver to the State of New Mexico from the San Juan River and its tributaries which rise in the State of Colorado a quantity of water which shall be sufficient, together with water originating in the San Juan Basin in the State of New Mexico, to enable the State of New Mexico to make full use of the water apportioned to the State of New Mexico by

article III of this compact, subject, however, to the following:

"(a) A first and prior right shall be recognized as to:

"(1) All uses of water made in either State at the time of the signing of this compact; and

"(2) All uses of water contemplated by projects authorized, at the time of the signing of this compact, under the laws of the United States of America whether or not such projects are eventually constructed by the United States of America or by some other entity.

"(b) The State of Colorado assents to diversions and storage of water in the State of Colorado for use in the State of New Mexico, subject to compliance with article IX of this compact.

"(c) The uses of the waters of the San Juan River and any of its tributaries within either State which are dependent upon a common source of water and which are not covered by (a) hereof, shall in times of water shortages be reduced in such quantity that the resulting consumptive use in each State will bear the same proportionate relation to the consumptive use made in each State during times of average water supply as determined by the Commission; provided, that any preferential uses of water to which Indians are entitled under article XIX shall be excluded in determining the amount of curtailment to be made under this paragraph.

"(d) The curtailment of water use by either State in order to make deliveries at Lee Ferry as required by article IV of this compact shall be independent of any and all conditions imposed by this article and shall be made by each State, as and when required, without regard to any provision of this article.

"(e) All consumptive use of the waters of the San Juan River and its tributaries shall be charged under the apportionment of article III hereof to the State in which the use is made: *Provided*, That consumptive use incident to the diversion, impounding or conveyance of water in one State for use in the other shall be charged to the latter State.

"ARTICLE XV

"(a) Subject to the provisions of the Colorado River compact and of this compact, water of the Upper Colorado River System may be impounded and used for the generation of electrical power, but such impounding and use shall be subservient to the use and consumption of such water for agricultural and domestic purposes and shall not interfere with or prevent use for such dominant purposes.

"(b) The provisions of this compact shall not apply to or interfere with the right or power of any signatory State to regulate within its boundaries the appropriation, use and control of water, the consumptive use of which is apportioned and available to such State by this compact.

"ARTICLE XVI

"The failure of any State to use the water, or any part thereof, the use of which is apportioned to it under the terms of this compact, shall not constitute a relinquishment of the right to such use to the lower basin or to any other State, nor shall it constitute a forfeiture or abandonment of the right to such use.

"ARTICLE XVII

"The use of any water now or hereafter imported into the natural drainage basin of the upper Colorado River system shall not be charged to any State under the apportionment of consumptive use made by this compact.

"ARTICLE XVIII

"(a) The State of Arizona reserves its rights and interests under the Colorado River Compact as a State of the lower division and as a State of the lower basin.

"(b) The State of New Mexico and the State of Utah reserve their respective rights and interests under the Colorado River Compact as States of the lower basin.

"ARTICLE XIX

"Nothing in this compact shall be construed as:

"(a) Affecting the obligations of the United States of America to Indian tribes;

"(b) Affecting the obligations of the United States of America under the Treaty with the United Mexican States (treaty series 994);

"(c) Affecting any rights or powers of the United States of America, its agencies or instrumentalities, in or to the waters of the upper Colorado River system, or its capacity to acquire rights in and to the use of said waters;

"(d) Subjecting any property of the United States of America, its agencies or instrumentalities, to taxation by any State or subdivision thereof, or creating any obligation on the part of the United States of America, its agencies or instrumentalities, by reason of the acquisition, construction or operation of any property or works of whatever kind, to make any payment to any State or political subdivision thereof, State agency, municipality or entity whatsoever, in reimbursement for the loss of taxes;

"(e) Subjecting any property of the United States of America, its agencies or instrumentalities, to the laws of any State to an extent other than the extent to which such laws would apply without regard to this compact.

"ARTICLE XX

"This compact may be terminated at any time by the unanimous agreement of the signatory States. In the event of such termination, all rights established under it shall continue unimpaired.

"ARTICLE XXI

"This compact shall become binding and obligatory when it shall have been ratified by the legislatures of each of the signatory States and approved by the Congress of the United States of America. Notice of ratification by the legislatures of the signatory States shall be given by the Governor of each signatory State to the Governor of each of the other signatory States and to the President of the United States of America, and the President is hereby requested to give notice to the Governor of each of the signatory States of approval by the Congress of the United States of America.

"In witness whereof, the Commissioners have executed six counterparts hereof each of which shall be and constitute an original, one of which shall be deposited in the archives of the Department of State of the United States of America, and one of which shall be forwarded to the Governor of each of the signatory States.

"Done at the city of Santa Fe, State of New Mexico, this 11th day of October 1948.

"CHARLES A. CARSON,
"Commissioner for the State of Arizona.
"CLIFFORD H. STONE,
"Commissioner for the State of Colorado.
"FRED E. WILSON,
"Commissioner for the State of New Mexico.
EDWARD H. WATSON,
"Commissioner for the State of Utah.
L. C. BISHOP,
"Commissioner for the State of Wyoming.
GROVER A. GILES,
"Secretary.

"Approved:

"HARRY W. BASHORE,
"Representative of the United States of America."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 206) relating to the immigration status of the lawful wives and children of Chinese-treaty merchants was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

Mr. BYRD. Over.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I have been requested to have this bill passed over.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia withhold his objection so that an explanation may be made?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] asked me to object in his name.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS OF CERTAIN PERSONS EMPLOYED IN FEDERAL PENAL INSTITUTIONS

The bill (S. 30) to provide for the settlement of claims of persons employed in Federal penal and correctional institutions for damage to or loss or destruction of personal property occurring incident to their service was announced as next in order.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on some occasions when there have been breaks or riots in penal institutions under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, where Federal prisoners were detained, the guards and employees of the institutions have been deprived of their personal property. In other words, property has been taken from their persons by the rioting inmates of the institution. This bill would merely reimburse those who had lost their personal property. There is a limitation on the amount involved.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, may I inquire whether heretofore claims of this character have been paid through individual bills passed by the Congress, or otherwise?

Mr. McCARRAN. I think we have paid a few. The purpose of this bill is so that there may be a statute on the subject so that such claims may be taken care of without being brought to Congress, in cases in which the amount is less than $1,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the word "claims," to insert "not exceeding in any case the sum of $1,000"; and on page 2, after line 10, to insert "Acceptance by any claimant of an award hereunder shall release the United States, its agents or employees, from any further claim by such claimant arising out of the same incident", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General, and such other officer or officers as he may designate for such purpose, are hereby authorized to consider, determine, adjust, and pay claims, not exceeding in any case the sum of $1,000, of persons employed in Federal penal and correctional institutions for damage to or loss or destruction of personal property occurring incident to such employment. No claim shall be allowed under this act unless (a) the property claimed to be damaged, lost, or destroyed is determined to be reasonable, useful, necessary, or proper under the attendant circumstances; (b) such damage, loss, or destruction shall not have been caused in whole or in part by any negligence or wrongful act on the part of the claimant, his agent, or employee, and shall not have occurred at quarters occupied by the claimant which are not assigned to him or otherwise provided in kind by the Government; and (c) such claim shall have been presented in writing within 1 year after the occurrence of the accident or incident out of which such claim arises. Acceptance by any claimant of an award hereunder shall release the United States, its agents or employees, from any further claim by such claimant arising out of the same incident.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 88) to amend section 60 of an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. DONNELL. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

JAMES G. SMYTH—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 196) for the relief of James G. Smyth was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, it seems to me that this claim is in an unusually large amount. It appears to be a personal claim. I wonder if we may have an explanation. I am not saying that I am opposed to the bill, but it seems to me that it should be explained. The allowance is rather large.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, there is a very complete report on this bill. The Committee on the Judiciary had the bill before it and made a very complete study.

This claim arose out of the loss of stamps, which appeared to have simply disappeared. No one received any benefit from them. The Government lost nothing, but the individual was charged with the stamps, and the purpose of the bill is to relieve him from that charge.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I should like to inquire further, if I may. Does the Senator from Nevada believe that in a case of this kind, when an official of the Government has been negligent, he should be relieved of his obligation?

Mr. McCARRAN. We can only deal with these cases individually. There might be cases in which there was negligence, but in this instance no negligence whatever was shown.

Mr. CORDON. I invite attention to the report of the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, which indicates that the stamps were taken out of the vault and that substantially no attention was paid to them. They were dumped in with some other papers. As the Acting Secretary says:

All evidence points to the fact that through some quirk of fate, the envelope was associated with the shipment wrappings which were deposited in a wastebasket after verification of their contents.

I cannot quite understand how fate could come into that picture if there was not negligence in handling the Government's property.

Mr. McCARRAN. So far as the record shows, whatever negligence there may have been was on the part of subordinate employees, and is not at all traceable or chargeable to the individual with whom the bill is concerned.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I shall ask that the bill go over, so that there may be a little more investigation on the part of the Senator from Oregon, and then I shall communicate with the Senator from Nevada.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

WILLIAM S. MEANY

The bill (S. 782) for the relief of William S. Meany was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to credit the accounts of William S. Meany, postmaster at Greenwich, Conn., in the sum of $17,573.80, representing the amount due the United States on account of the embezzlement of post-office funds by Joseph W. Delaney, the former assistant postmaster at the Greenwich, Conn., post office.

WAR-DAMAGE COMPENSATION TO SWISS GOVERNMENT—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 612) to provide for the payment of a sum not to exceed $10,607,000 to the Swiss Government as partial compensation for damage inflicted on Swiss territory during World War II by United States armed forces in violation of neutral rights, and authorizing appropriations therefor, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WATKINS. Let the bill go over.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Utah to permit me to make a brief explanation of the bill before the bill goes over, if he will withhold his objection.

Mr. WATKINS. Very well; I withhold it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I should like to say that a similar bill was passed by the Senate last year, but died in the House of Representatives when the session closed. The matter here involved is not in controversy. A claims commission has been working for 3 years on this problem, and the amount involved has been definitely cleared by the War Department and the Secretary of Defense and other officials who are anxious to settle this claim of the Swiss Government.

I have had it considered by the Attorney General and by other agencies to see whether we had any counterclaims or offsetting claims against the Swiss Government in this connection. The State Department is anxious to have this matter disposed of.

The Swiss Government has claimed compensation of $19,000,000, and we have agreed to compensation of $16,000,000 as our obligation. However, this measure provides for definitely liquidated claims of approximately $10,000,000.

I hope the bill can be passed by unanimous consent today.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Is it not true that this measure represents compensation for damage which was done on Swiss soil by accidental bombings by American aircraft who dropped their bombs on Swiss soil by mistake, and is it not further true that all of these damage claims have been carefully analyzed and proved, and there is no question that the United States does owe the money?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts is entirely correct. The bill as amended and now before us breaks down the various instances in which crash landings, and so forth, caused damage. I think this is an appropriate measure for us to deal with promptly.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. As chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee I wish to say that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has done a very outstanding and careful job with regard to these particular claims. A bill covering them passed the Senate last year without any objection whatever. This is an international obligation which we admit we owe. It has been cleared by the departments affected, and it seems to me we have no legitimate reason for not going ahead and paying at least the amount carried in this bill. This matter has been under thorough consideration, both at this session and at the last session; and there is no suggestion of any offsetting claims or anything of the kind with regard to this particular sum. Is not that true?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is correct; this sum has been carefully screened.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator from New Jersey tell us whether Switzerland will receive all this money?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from New Jersey has expired, under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, is it in order for me to reserve the right to object, and then to speak for a moment on this matter?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator may do so in his own time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should also like to reserve the right to object and make a brief statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington has already reserved the right to object.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; Mr. President.

Reserving the right to object—although I shall not object to this measure, because I believe the United States should pay its obligations—I wish to call the attention of the Senate to another matter, one involving the same type of

war claims. In the Pacific theater of war literally thousands of American boys who were prisoners of war suffered the tortures of hell in Bataan and in the Japanese prison camps. Moreover, as a result of war activities thousands of American civilians also suffered a great deal of damage. I refer to American citizens, including missionaries and officials of parochial churches.

Last year the distinguished Senator Cooper, then a Senator from Kentucky, and I went into this matter in detail. We decided that all three groups had some claims because of the ravages of war.

The Senate passed a bill to that effect. However, we could not even get an appropriation for the administration of the claims.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, is the Senator from Washington familiar with what the deficiency appropriation bill contains this year?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. But last year we could not even get an appropriation for the administration of the claims of all those boys, most of whom are from the State of New Mexico, and served in the New Mexico National Guard, although civilians and priests, all of them American citizens, are also involved.

I understand from the Senator from South Carolina that this year we do not have a single appropriation for these administrative purposes.

I merely wish to say that, although I believe we should pay our bills to Switzerland, at the same time it seems to me that before we pay $10,000,000 to a foreign government, to pay our bills to that government, we should at least pay the claims of our own citizens who suffered war damage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota has objected; and the bill goes over.

RELIEF OF OWNERS OF CERTAIN GOLD MINES—BILL PASSED OVER

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

The bill (S. 45) for the relief of the owners and operators of certain gold mines which were closed or the operations of which were curtailed by War Production Board Limitation Order L-208 was announced as next in order.

Mr. DONNELL. Let the bill go over.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri withhold his objection until I can make an explanation?

Mr. DONNELL. I do.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the War Production Board issued an order known as L-208. It was the only order of its kind issued against any industry in this country during the war. Order L-208 closed all the precious-metal mines in the United States. The theory of that order was that the miners in the precious-metal mines would go to the strategic-metal mines—copper and zinc and lead mines, and the like.

The order was adhered to, and the precious-metal mines of the United States were closed. In many instances the order closed whole communities. In other instances it closed mines which had been working for years, and they became watered, so that some of them have been unable to be opened, even to the present time.

This bill provides that those who were injured by Order L-208 may present their claims to the Treasurer of the United States, who in turn may use any of the Government facilities to determine whether such persons have legitimate claims; and, if so, the amount of the legitimate claims which should be paid; and then the claim would come to the Congress.

The bill relates only to those who were put out of business by Order L-208, affecting the precious-metal mines, many of which were closed without any necessity whatsoever, because the men did not go from the precious-metal mines to the strategic-metal mines.

They went into the ship industry, or to some other activity, or they did nothing. For instance, let me illustrate by saying that the city of Lead, S. Dak., was closed down completely. The Old Home Stake Mine was closed completely, to its great detriment. That was one thing. Other mines in California were closed, to their great detriment. If they have a legitimate claim, they could, under the bill, present the claim with the proofs sustaining it, to the Treasurer of the United States, who in turn could call upon the Bureau of Mines or any other agency to determine whether or not the claim was legitimate, and if so, how much should be paid.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. DONNELL and Mr. TAFT. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT TO THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT—BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 255) to amend section 205 of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to joint boards, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. CORDON. May I request an explanation of the bill, with particular reference to whether there are adequate safeguards in it to protect the hearings to be had under the Commission therein established from capricious one-man action since there are only two members of the Board?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, when the Motor Carrier Act was passed provision was made for a joint board composed of the representatives of three States to act with the Interstate Commerce Commission in the establishment of motor-carrier rates. Subsequently an amendment was made to provide two representatives on the Board. It so happens that occasionally one State has its representative present, so the bill would permit that State to make a report. Let me say to the Senator from Oregon that the so-called joint board does not make an order, nor does it make a final finding.

Mr. CORDON. It acts in the capacity of a referee, does it not?

Mr. REED. All it does is to make a report and recommendation to the Interstate Commerce Commission. Some of the State commissions and the Interstate Commerce Commission desire the passage of the bill as an administrative measure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, my attention was diverted in another direction, and I did not hear the discussion. Would the Senator from Kansas allow the bill to go over temporarily in order to enable me to examine the bill?

Mr. REED. Which one?

Mr. HILL. I believe the Senator has two bills.

Mr. REED. Three.

Mr. HILL. Three? I desire to examine the reports in order that I may distinguish one from the other—not to hold them up. I think we can return to them later, but I desire first to look at them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. REED. I am willing to let them go to the end of the calendar, to be called up later. These are as near noncontroversial bills as we will ever get.

Mr. HILL. I merely want to look at them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will go to the foot of the calendar.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 256) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. I understood the Senator from Alabama wanted all three bills, Senate bills 255, 256, and 257, to go to the end of the calendar.

Mr. HILL. I ask that those bills go to the foot of the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 257) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide limitations on the time within which actions may be brought for the recovery of undercharges and overcharges by or against common carriers by water, and freight forwarders, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the same subject matter. This bill, with the preceding two bills, will go to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. DOUGLAS subsequently said: Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. I inquire what was the action on Calendar 68, Senate bill 257.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It went to the foot of the calendar with two other bills.

AUTHORIZATION FOR ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 32) authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which had been reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment, to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, for the purpose of making a study and investigation of any matter referred to such subcommittee, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Eighty-first Congress, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1070) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public-housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

ACQUISITION OF SITES FOR FEDERAL BUILDINGS—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 714) to provide for comprehensive planning, for site acquisition in and outside of the District of Columbia, and for the design of Federal building projects outside of the District of Columbia; to authorize the transfer of jurisdiction over certain lands between certain departments and agencies of the United States; and to provide certain additional authority needed in connection with the construction, management, and operation of Federal public buildings; and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. LODGE. Over.

Mr. HOLLAND. I did not hear which Senator it was who objected.

Mr. LODGE. I do not object, but I think the bill is so important that I should like to know a little more about it, so as to understand what the plan is going to be and to get some idea of what is contemplated. I think the whole lay-out of the National Capital is a matter of great interest to the entire country, and I should like to hear an explanation from the Senator in charge of the bill, and to see some pictures, in order that I may get some idea of what is contemplated.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wonder if it would be agreeable to the Senator to let this bill go to the foot of the calendar, in order that he may examine the report in the meantime, and if the Senator will then permit it to come up, I shall be glad to make a short explanation. The bill has unanimous approval of the Public Works Committee. It was approved in the last Congress. I do not believe the distinguished Senator will find anything objectionable whatever in the program. If he will let it go to the foot of the calendar, I shall be glad to bring it up at that time, after he has had a chance to look at the report.

Mr. LODGE. I do not know that that will give me time to prepare the questions I should like to ask. I should rather have it go over for a week, until we have the next call of the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts objects. The bill will go over.

Mr. LODGE. I do not know that I want to object, but I should like to have certain things elucidated about it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator must either object or not object.

Mr. LODGE. I object, then, without prejudice, and ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will go over.

DISASTER AND EMERGENCY LOANS

The bill (H. R. 2101) to authorize the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., to make certain disaster or emergency loans, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRD. I should like to have an explanation.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, this is a bill for the relief of farmers, ranchers, and others who were caught in the extremely heavy snowstorms which recently covered most of the western and northwestern sections of the country. The proposal is to allow the Secretary of Agriculture to make quicker loans than otherwise would be available to individuals affected. The bill was very carefully considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The committee substituted for certain loose provisions of the House bill, some rigid regulations proposed by the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BYRD. Is it limited to the recent disaster? Is it limited merely to the one case?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; it is not.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator discuss the part of it that gives continuing authority?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. There has been a desire on the part of the Agricultural Department to make available the type of quick emergency loans in the case of livestock disasters. The Department of Agriculture consolidated the Farm Seed Division into the Farmers Home Administration. It is a type of credit that is somewhat easy to obtain, or relatively easy, compared to the farm land banks, but instrumentalities are still needed. It was felt better, instead of dealing with each disaster as it came, to transfer the powers that had been in the RACC to the Department of Agriculture under the jurisdiction of the Secretary. It is a long-time recommendation, in order to keep from creating new agencies.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am in sympathy with every effort made to provide disaster loans. What is the difference between a loan by what I call the "old barnyard agency"—which is what it is, the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation, and the loans made under the provisions of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], which were discussed before the Appropriations Committee the other day? What is the difference in the type of loan? Why could not the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation make both types of loans?

Mr. ANDERSON. The Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation has but two employees. There has been a desire for more than 6 years to liquidate it, and the desire now is to use the regular loan agency.

Mr. WHERRY. But we have carried the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation along all during the years, with the idea it could be expanded immediately to take care of loans that were necessary. All I am asking is, Why cannot both types of loan be made by one administration?

Mr. ANDERSON. They are.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not see why we have to have two governmental lending agencies to make loans for the same purpose. I take it that the loans made under the amendment offered by the Senators from Wyoming—and I agree with the purpose of it—possibly are loans which have to be established, or the borrower could not obtain credit. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. They are of that type. Let me say to the Senator from Nebraska that the very thing he desires is being accomplished. The Farm Credit Corporation made loans, and other agencies of the Government made loans, and they could not be consolidated in one place. Under this bill, all the activities will be brought under the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly; but there will still be two agencies, will there not?

Mr. ANDERSON. No. The RACC will disappear completely.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico a question regarding RACC. Under this proposed legislation could the type of loan ordinarily made in the apple areas be made?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, it could.

Mr. MAGNUSON. So there will be a broader agency to which to go; is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. They will be able to use the regular agency.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It seems to me that is important.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from New Mexico as to whether, in his opinion, under the terms of the bill—and I refer to

had been working for years, and they

Commerce Commission desire the pas-

ing a study and investigation of any matter referred to such subcommittee, is author-

lines 24 and 25 on page 4, and line 1 on page 5, providing:

Such loans shall be made at such rates of interest and on such terms and conditions as the Secretary shall prescribe—

That would permit the Department of Agriculture, given exactly the same conditions in two applications for loans, to make one rule for one borrower and another rule for another borrower?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I think not.

Mr. CORDON. I cannot see any language in the bill which would prevent that. If the Senator from New Mexico will call any such language to my attention, I shall appreciate it.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Secretary can prescribe the same conditions for all loans.

Mr. CORDON. I think it should be required in the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. The bill will have to go to conference, and there will be an opportunity to include such a provision. I agree with the Senator's point.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. CORDON. Yes, certainly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask the Senator from Oregon to direct his attention to the language to which he has just referred, on page 4, line 25. May I ask the Senator, if the word "general" should be inserted between the word "such" and the word "terms", would it not meet his objection? I know the purpose of the bill was to provide that the terms should be general, and on no occasion would there be one rate and conditions for one and a different rate and conditions for another.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, the insertion which has been referred to by the Senator from Wyoming would cure the situation which I had in mind.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment cannot be offered so long as there is any objection or reservation to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I suggest inserting this language after the word "prescribe" at the top of page 5:

For such area or region.

Or some such language as that, so that we can distinguish between them.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the Senator's suggestion is a very good one.

Mr. TAFT. The language suggested by the Senator did not seem to me to reach the point.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I have one more inquiry to address to the Senator from New Mexico. In section 2 (a) the Secretary is authorized to make loans to farmers and stockmen for any agricultural purpose in any area or region where he finds that a production disaster has caused a need for agricultural credit not readily available from commercial banks, and so forth. Does the Senator think that makes the absolute unavailability of local credit a condition precedent for the loan?

Mr. ANDERSON. I would suggest that would require an investigation of all sorts of lending agencies. I would not object to a change which leaves out the word "readily," but the present language is preferable.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I withdraw my objection if that correction is made.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I want to ask the Senator from New Mexico one further question. If there should occur in the Wenatchee area a similar situation, could the same type of loan be made, under the terms of this bill, as was made under RACC?

Mr. ANDERSON. Exactly.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask a question. Did I correctly understand the Senator from New Mexico to say that RACC would go out of existence with the passage of this bill?

Mr. ANDERSON. The functions which that agency has been performing would be transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Corporation, as such, would go out of existence.

Mr. FREAR. Under what department would it come?

Mr. ANDERSON. Under the Farm Credit Administration.

Mr. FREAR. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2101) to authorize the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., to make certain disaster or emergency loans, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That (a) there are hereby transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the Secretary) all the functions of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., including but not limited to functions with respect to—

(1) loans to bona fide fur farmers as provided for in the last proviso in the paragraph headed "Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C.," in title II of the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1949 (Public Law 860, 80th Cong.):

(2) loans under authorization by the Secretary for the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., to reenter an area or region where a production disaster has occurred, as provided for in the proviso in section 2 of the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1949 (Public Law 712, 80th Cong.); and

(3) the liquidation of all other loans heretofore made by the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., and of all assets, contracts, property, claims, rights, and liabilities relating thereto.

(b) There are hereby transferred to the Secretary the functions of the Farm Credit Administration and the Governor thereof with respect to the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C.

(c) The Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., is hereby dissolved. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cancel the outstanding certificates of stock of the Corporation.

(d) All assets, funds, contracts, property, claims, and rights, all records, and all liabilities of the Corporation are hereby transferred to the Secretary. The revolving fund created by section 84 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1148a), shall be available to the Secretary for the performance of the functions specified in paragraphs (a) (1), (2), and (3) of the section, including administrative expenses in connection therewith: *Provided*, That for the fiscal year 1949 the limitations on the administrative expenses of the Corporation with respect to the said functions shall be applicable to the Secretary.

(e) All personnel of the Corporation (excluding personnel of the Farm Credit Administration serving as directors or officers of the Corporation), and such of the personnel of the Farm Credit Administration as are engaged principally in the work of the Corporation, shall be transferred to the offices or agencies designated by the Secretary to carry out the functions herein transferred, to the extent that he determines that such personnel are qualified and necessary therefor.

(f) The Secretary may carry out the functions herein transferred and the authority conferred upon him by this act through such officers or agencies in or under the Department of Agriculture as he may designate.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary is hereby authorized to make loans to farmers and stockmen for any agricultural purpose in any area or region where he finds that a production disaster has caused a need for agricultural credit not readily available from commercial banks, cooperative lending agencies, or other responsible sources. Such loans shall be made at such rates of interest and on such terms and conditions as the Secretary shall prescribe. The Secretary may utilize the revolving fund created by section 84 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1148a), for making such loans and for administrative expenses in connection with such loans.

(b) The funds transferred to the Secretary under section 1 of this act, and all sums received by the Secretary from the liquidation of the assets, contracts, property, claims, and rights transferred to him under section 1 of this act, from the liquidation of loans made under section 2 of this act, and from the liquidation of any other assets acquired with funds from the said revolving fund shall be added to and become a part of the said revolving fund; and the revolving fund as so constituted shall remain available to the Secretary only for the purposes specified in sections 1 (d) and 2 (a) of this act.

SEC. 3. (a) No suit or other judicial proceeding instituted by or against the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., shall abate by reason of this act, but the Secretary may be substituted as a party in place of the Corporation upon motion or petition filed within 6 months after the effective date of this act.

(b) This act shall become effective 10 days after its enactment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I suggested in the colloquy with the Senator from Oregon, as modified by the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], so that the sentence beginning on line 24, page 4, shall read as follows:

Such loans shall be made at such rates of interest and on such general terms and conditions as the Secretary shall prescribe for such area or region.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so to read: "An act to abolish the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., and transfer its functions to the Secretary of Agriculture to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make disaster loans, and for other purposes."

Mr. ANDERSON subsequently said: Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. YOUNG conferees on the part of the Senate.

PROMOTION OF THE PROGRESS OF SCIENCE

The bill (S. 247) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "National Science Foundation Act of 1949."

ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

SEC. 2. There is hereby established in the executive branch of the Government an independent agency to be known as the National Science Foundation (hereinafter referred to as the "Foundation").

MEMBERSHIP OF FOUNDATION

SEC. 3. (a) The Foundation shall have 24 members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The persons nominated for appointment as members (1) shall be eminent in the fields of the basic sciences, medical science, engineering, education, or public affairs; (2) shall be selected solely on the basis of established records of distinguished service; and (3) shall be so selected as to provide representation of the views of scientific leaders in all areas of the Nation. The President is requested, in the making of nominations of persons for appointment as members, to give due consideration to any recommendations for nomination which may be submitted to him by the National Academy of Sciences, Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, the National Association of State Universities, Association of American Colleges, or by other scientific or educational organizations.

(b) The term of office of each member of the Foundation shall be 6 years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term; and (2) the terms of office of the members first taking office after the date of enactment of this act shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, eight at the end of 2 years, eight at the end of 4 years, eight at the end of 6 years, after the date of enactment of this act. Any person who has been a member of the Foundation for 12 consecutive years shall thereafter be ineligible for appointment during the 2-year period following the expiration of such twelfth year.

(c) The President shall call the first meeting of the members of the Foundation, at which the first order of business shall be the election of a chairman and a vice chairman.

POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE FOUNDATION

SEC. 4. (a) The Foundation is authorized and directed—

(1) to develop and encourage the pursuit of a national policy for the promotion of basic research and education in the sciences;

(2) to initiate and support basic scientific research in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences, by making contracts or other arrangements (including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance) for the conduct of such basic scientific research and to appraise the impact of research upon industrial development and upon the general welfare;

(3) after consultation with the Secretary of Defense, to initiate and support scientific research in connection with matters relating to the national defense by making contracts or other arrangements (including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance) for the conduct of such scientific research;

(4) to grant scholarships and graduate fellowships in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences;

(5) to foster the interchange of scientific information among scientists in the United States and foreign countries;

(6) to correlate the Foundation's scientific research programs with those undertaken by individuals and by public and private research groups; and

(7) to establish such special commissions as the Foundation may from time to time deem necessary for the purposes of this act.

(b) In exercising the authority and discharging the functions referred to in subsection (a) of this section, it shall be the objective of the Foundation to achieve the results of scientific research in the most efficient manner possible and to strengthen basic research and education in the sciences, including independent research by individuals, throughout the United States, including its Territories and possessions; and to avoid undue concentration of such research and education.

(c) The members of the Foundation shall meet annually on the first Monday in December and at such other times as the Chairman may determine, but he shall also call a meeting whenever one-third of the members so request in writing. A majority of the members of the Foundation shall constitute a quorum. Each member shall be given notice, by registered mail mailed to his last-known address of record, not less than 15 days prior to any meeting, of the call of such meeting.

(d) The first Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Foundation shall be elected by the Foundation to serve until the first Monday in December next succeeding the date of election, at which time a Chairman and Vice Chairman shall be elected for a term of 2 years. Thereafter such election shall take place at the annual meeting occurring at the end of each such term. The Vice Chairman shall perform the duties of the Chairman in his absence. In case a vacancy occurs in the chairmanship or vice chairmanship, the Foundation shall elect a member to fill such vacancy.

(e) The Foundation is authorized to appoint from among its members an executive committee, and from time to time to appoint from among its members, or otherwise, such other committees as it deems necessary, and to assign to such executive committee or other committees such powers and functions as it deems appropriate for the purposes of this act.

(f) The Foundation shall render an annual report to the President for submission on or before the 15th day of January to the Congress, summarizing the activities of the Foundation and making such recommendations as it may deem appropriate.

DIRECTOR OF FOUNDATION

SEC. 5. There shall be a Director of the Foundation who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, after the members of the Foundation have been appointed and qualified. He shall serve as an ex officio member of the Foundation. In addition thereto he shall be the chief executive officer of the Foundation. The Director shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum and shall serve for a term of 6 years unless sooner removed by the President.

DIVISIONS WITHIN THE FOUNDATION

SEC. 6. (a) Until otherwise provided by the Foundation, there shall be within the Foundation the following divisions:

(1) A Division of Medical Research;

(2) A Division of Mathematical, Physical, and Engineering Sciences;

(3) A Division of Biological Sciences; and

(4) A Division of Scientific Personnel and Education, which shall be concerned with programs of the Foundation relating to the granting of scholarships and graduate fellowships in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences.

(b) There shall also be within the Foundation such other divisions as the Foundation may, from time to time, deem necessary.

DIVISIONAL COMMITTEES

SEC. 7. (a) There shall be a committee for each division of the Foundation.

(b) Each divisional committee shall be appointed by the Foundation and shall consist of not less than five persons who may be members or nonmembers of the Foundation.

(c) The terms of members of each divisional committee shall be 2 years. Each divisional committee shall annually elect its own chairman from among its own members, and shall prescribe its own rules of procedure, subject to such restrictions as may be prescribed by the Foundation.

(d) Each divisional committee shall make recommendations to, and advise and consult with, the Foundation and the Director with respect to matters relating to the program of its division.

SPECIAL COMMISSIONS

SEC. 8. (a) Each special commission established by the Foundation pursuant to section 4 (a) (7) shall consist of 11 members appointed by the Foundation, 6 of whom shall be eminent scientists and 5 of whom shall be persons other than scientists. Each special commission shall choose its own chairman and vice chairman.

(b) It shall be the duty of each such special commission to make a comprehensive survey of research, both public and private, being carried on in its field, and to formulate and recommend to the Foundation, at the earliest practicable date, an over-all research program in its field.

SCHOLARSHIPS AND GRADUATE FELLOWSHIPS; REGISTER OF SCIENTIFIC PERSONNEL

SEC. 9. (a) The Director, with the approval of the Foundation, is authorized to award, within the limits of funds made available pursuant to section 13, scholarships and graduate fellowships for scientific study or scientific work in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences at accredited nonprofit American or nonprofit foreign institutions of higher education, selected by the recipient of such aid, for stated periods of time. Persons shall be selected for such scholarships and fellowships from among citizens of the United States, and such selections shall be made solely on the basis of ability; but in any case in which two or more applicants for scholarships or fellowships, as the case may be, are deemed by the Director and the Foundation to be possessed of substantially equal ability, and there are not sufficient scholarships or fellowships, as the case may be, available to

grant one to each of such applicants, the available scholarship or scholarships or fellowship or fellowships shall be awarded to the applicants in such manner as will tend to result in a wide distribution of scholarships and fellowships among the States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia.

(b) The Foundation shall maintain a register of scientific and technical personnel and in other ways provide a central clearinghouse for information covering all scientific and technical personnel in the United States and its possessions.

AUTHORITY OF FOUNDATION

SEC. 10. The Foundation is empowered to do all things necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, and without being limited thereby the Foundation is specifically authorized—

(a) to prescribe such rules and regulations as it deems necessary governing the manner of its operations and its organization and personnel;

(b) to make such expenditures as may be necessary for administering the provisions of this act;

(c) to enter into contracts or other arrangements, or modifications thereof, for the carrying on, by organizations or individuals in the United States and foreign countries, including other Government agencies of the United States and of foreign countries (without legal consideration, without performance or other bonds, and without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes), of such basic scientific research activities as the Foundation deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this act;

(d) to make advance, progress, and other payments which relate to scientific research without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C., sec. 529);

(e) to acquire by purchase, lease, loan, or gift, and to hold and dispose of by sale, lease, or loan, real and personal property of all kinds necessary for, or resulting from, scientific research;

(f) to receive and use funds donated by others, if such funds are donated, without restriction, other than that they be used in furtherance of one or more of the general purposes of the Foundation;

(g) to publish or arrange for the publication of scientific and technical information so as to further the full dissemination of information of scientific value consistent with the national interest, without regard to the provisions of section 87 of the act of January 12, 1895 (28 Stat. 622), and section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (40 Stat. 1270; 44 U. S. C., sec. 111);

(h) to accept and utilize the services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel and to pay the actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses (including, in lieu of subsistence, per diem allowances at a rate not in excess of $10 for such personnel incurred in the course of such services); and

(i) to prescribe, with the approval of the Comptroller General of the United States, the extent to which vouchers for funds expended under contracts for scientific research shall be subject to itemization or substantiation prior to payment, without regard to the limitations of other laws relating to the expenditure of public funds and accounting therefor.

PATENT RIGHTS

SEC. 11. (a) Each contract or other arrangement executed pursuant to this act which relates to scientific research shall contain provisions governing the disposition of inventions produced thereunder in a manner calculated to protect the public interest and the equities of the individual or organization with which the contract or other arrangement is executed: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the Foundation, by any contractual or other arrangement, to alter or modify any provision of law affecting the issuance or use of patents.

(b) No officer or employee of the Foundation shall acquire, retain, or transfer any rights, under the patent laws of the United States or otherwise, in any invention which he may make or produce in connection with performing his assigned activities and which is directly related to the subject matter thereof: *Provided, however,* That this subsection shall not be construed to prevent any officer or employee of the Foundation from executing any application for patent on any such invention for the purpose of assigning the same to the Government or its nominee in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Director may establish.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

SEC. 12. (a) The Foundation is hereby authorized to cooperate in any international scientific research activities consistent with the purposes of this act and to expend for such international scientific research activities such sums within the limit of appropriated funds as the Foundation may deem desirable.

(b) The Director, with the approval of the Foundation, may defray the expenses of representatives of Government agencies and other organizations and of individual scientists to accredited international scientific congresses and meetings whenever he deems it necessary in the promotion of the objectives of this act.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 13. (a) To enable the Foundation to carry out its powers and duties, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Foundation, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

(b) The funds hereafter appropriated to the Foundation, as herein authorized, shall, if obligated during the fiscal year for which appropriated, remain available for expenditure for 4 years following the expiration of the fiscal year for which appropriated. After such 4-year period, the unexpended balances of appropriations shall be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 14. (a) The Director shall, in accordance with such policies as the Foundation shall from time to time prescribe, appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. Such appointments shall be made and such compensation shall be fixed in accordance with the provisions of the civil-service laws and regulations and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended: *Provided,* That the Director may in accordance with such policies as the Foundation shall from time to time prescribe, employ such technical and professional personnel and fix their compensation, without regard to such laws, as he may deem necessary for the discharge of the responsibilities of the Foundation under this act. The Deputy Director hereinafter provided for, and the members of the divisional committees, and special commissions, shall be appointed without regard to the civil-service laws or regulations. Neither the Director nor the Deputy Director shall engage in any other business, vocation, or employment than that of serving as such Director or Deputy Director, as the case may be; nor shall the Director or Deputy Director, except with the approval of the Foundation, hold any office in, or act in any capacity for, any organization, agency, or institution with which the Foundation makes any contract or other arrangement under this act.

(b) The Director may appoint, with the approval of the Foundation, a Deputy Director who shall perform such functions as the Director, with the approval of the Foundation, may prescribe and shall be Acting Director during the absence or disability of the Director or in the event of a vacancy in the Office of the Director, and who shall receive compensation at a rate not to exceed $12,000 per annum.

(c) The Foundation shall not, itself, operate any laboratories or pilot plants.

(d) The members of the Foundation, and the members of each divisional committee, or special commission, shall receive compensation at the rate of $25 for each day engaged in the business of the Foundation pursuant to authorization of the Foundation, and shall be allowed actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses (including, in lieu of subsistence, per diem allowances at a rate not in excess of $10) when engaged, away from home, in the duties of their offices.

(e) Persons holding other offices in the executive branch of the Federal Government may serve as members of the divisional committees, and special commissions, but they shall not receive remuneration for their services as such members during any period for which they receive compensation for their services in such other offices.

(f) Service of an individual as a member of the Foundation, of a divisional committee, or of a special commission shall not be considered as service bringing him within the provisions of section 109 or section 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 18, sec. 198 and 203) or section 19 (e) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, unless the act of such individual, which by such section is made unlawful when performed by an individual referred to in such section, is with respect to any particular matter which directly involves the Foundation or in which the Foundation is directly interested.

(g) In making contracts or other arrangements for scientific research, the Foundation shall utilize appropriations available therefor in such manner as will in its discretion best realize the objectives of (1) having the work performed by organizations, agencies, and institutions, or individuals in the United States or foreign countries, including Government agencies of the United States and of foreign countries, qualified by training and experience to achieve the results desired, (2) strengthening the research staff of organizations, particularly nonprofit organizations, in the States and Territories and the District of Columbia, and (3) aiding institutions, agencies or organizations which, if aided, will advance basic research, and (4) encouraging independent basic research by individuals.

(h) The activities of the Foundation shall be construed as supplementing and not superseding, curtailing, or limiting any of the functions or activities of other Government agencies authorized to engage in scientific research or development.

(i) Funds available to any department or agency of the Government for scientific or technical research, or the provision of facilities therefor, shall be available for transfer, with the approval of the head of the department or agency involved, in whole or in part, to the Foundation for such use as is consistent with the purposes for which such funds were provided, and funds so transferred shall be expendable by the Foundation for the purposes for which the transfer was made, and, until such time as an appropriation is made available directly to the Foundation, for general administrative expenses of the Foundation without regard to limitations otherwise applicable to such funds.

(j) The National Roster of Scientific and Specialized Personnel shall be transferred from the Department of Labor to the Foundation, together with such of the personnel, records, property, and balances of appropriations as have been utilized or are

available for use in the administration of such roster as may be determined by the President. The transfer provided for in this subsection shall take effect at such time or times as the President shall direct.

(k) The Foundation shall not support any research or development activity in the field of atomic energy, nor shall it exercise any authority pursuant to section 10 (e) in respect to that field, without first having obtained the concurrence of the Atomic Energy Commission that such activity will not adversely affect the common defense and security. Nothing in this act shall supersede or modify any provision of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946.

(l) The Foundation, after consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall establish regulations and procedures for the security classification of information or property (having military significance) in connection with scientific research under this act, and for the proper safeguarding of any information or property so classified.

COORDINATION WITH FOREIGN POLICY

SEC. 15. (a) The authority to enter into contracts or other arrangements with organizations or individuals in foreign countries and with agencies of foreign countries, as provided in section 10 (c), and the authority to cooperate in international scientific research activities as provided in section 12 (a), shall be exercised in such manner as is consistent with the foreign policy objectives of the United States as determined by the Secretary of State after consultation with the Director.

(b) If, in the exercise of the authority referred to in subsection (a) to carry out the purposes of this act, negotiation with foreign countries or agencies thereof becomes necessary, such negotiation shall be carried on by the Secretary of State in consultation with the Director.

IMPORT TAXES ON COPPER

The bill (H. R. 2313) to suspend certain import taxes on copper was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. MALONE. Over.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will withhold his objection, because I should like to make a statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Nevada withhold his objection?

Mr. MALONE. Certainly.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, in the Eightieth Congress the ad valorem duty on copper and copper ores, and so forth, was suspended for a period of 2 years; that is to say, the suspension will run through March 31, 1949. The House has passed a bill further suspending the ad valorem duty for an additional 2-year period, and I call attention to the fact that since the present act will expire on the 31st day of March 1949, this is one of the bills which has a deadline. The bill is of no small consequence because of the fact that the copper supply in the United States is below the domestic requirements, and particularly is below the 15,000 pounds now being added monthly to the stock pile.

I hope that the Senator from Illinois will permit a motion to be made to take up the bill at the conclusion of the call of the calendar. I realize that it cannot be discussed under the 5-minute rule, and objection has been made. I should like to have the bill considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands the Senator from Georgia to ask that the bill go to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois withhold his objection?

Mr. LUCAS. I am not objecting to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection was made by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I may say that this is an emergency matter, and when the call of the calendar is concluded, I hope the Senator from Georgia will move to take up the bill and have the Senate act on it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not necessary for the bill to go to the foot of the calendar in order that a motion may be made to take it up.

Mr. GEORGE. I did not ask that it go to the foot of the calendar. I merely asked for permission to bring the bill up, or make a motion to bring it up.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 110) to broaden the cooperative extension system as established in the act of May 8, 1914, and acts supplemental thereto, by providing for cooperative extension work between colleges receiving the benefits of this act and the acts of July 2, 1862, and August 30, 1890, and other qualified colleges, universities, and research agencies, and the United States Department of Labor, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

PAY AND ALLOWANCES TO OFFICERS OF THE NAVAL ESTABLISHMENT

The bill (S. 779) relating to the pay and allowances of officers of the Naval Establishment appointed to permanent grades was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Over.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection to permit an explanation?

Mr. McCARRAN. Certainly.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to prevent the creation of claims for back pay and allowances due to the readjustment in lineal precedence of officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and their Reserves required by the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. There was an ambiguity in the act of 1947, and the purpose of the bill is to clear up the ambiguity so that claims will not be filed for back pay and allowances.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Does this bill see to it that these rates of pay are thoroughly harmonized with the rates of pay in the Army and the Air Force?

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. It does not promote any inequalities or inequities?

Mr. BYRD. In fact, it would correct inequalities by clearing up an ambiguity which existed in the act of 1947.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, does the bill deal with an increase in pay all the way through the military forces?

Mr. BYRD. Not at all; it has just the opposite purpose. It would prevent claims for back pay and allowances.

Mr. McCARRAN. Is that all there is in the bill?

Mr. BYRD. That is all there is in the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. I withdraw the objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That permanent appointments issued after August 7, 1947, to officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Reserve components thereof, incident to the transition from temporary to permanent grades, shall in no case be effective for pay purposes prior to August 7, 1947, irrespective of the date of rank assigned for precedence purposes and notwithstanding the provisions of section 312 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, and the provisions of the act of March 4, 1913 (37 Stat. 892, 34 U. S. C. 870).

NATIONAL SURVEY OF FOREST RESOURCES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 979) to amend section 9 of the act of May 22, 1928, as amended, authorizing and directing a national survey of forest resources.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota for an explanation of the bill.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, this is a bill to amend an act which has been on the statute books since 1928, and the purpose is to continue a survey of our forests to ascertain the growth, the cutting, the diseases, and all information relating to our natural forest resources. The act carried an appropriation, on the first passage of the measure, of $3,000,000. Then it was increased to $6,500,000. Then, because of the war, there was a general delay in the work, and now we ask for an increased appropriation because of increased costs, and also because the work has been delayed so long, in order that we may have complete information about natural forest resources. There is a desire to speed up the investigation and study of our forest resources. The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and has behind it the recommendation of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, can the Senator give us an idea as to the approximate cost?

Mr. THYE. The amendment to the law calls for a total appropriation of $11,000,000, for the whole purpose, but only $1,000,000 is to be appropriated annually to continue the study.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I have no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to complete and keep current the forest survey authorized by section 9 of the act of May 22, 1928, as amended (45 Stat. 699, 702; 58 Stat. 265; 16 U. S. C. 581h), so that a continuous and comprehensive timber inventory will be maintained as part of the forest-conservation program, said section is amended (1) by striking out "$750,000" and inserting "$1,000,000"; (2) by striking out "$6,500,000" and inserting "$11,000,000"; and (3) by striking out "$250,000" and inserting "$1,500,000."

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 213) to provide benefits for members of the reserve components of the armed forces who suffer disability or death in active-duty training for periods of less than 30 days or while engaged in inactive-duty training was announced as next in order.

Mr. GILLETTE. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 53) to provide for the reforestation and revegetation of the forest and range lands of the national forests, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be passed over.

TRANSFER OF LAND TO CRAWFORD, NEBR.

The bill (S. 314) authorizing the transfer of a certain tract of land in the Robinson Remount Station to the city of Crawford, Nebr., and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Over.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection?

Mr. MORSE. I will.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask my colleague, the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], if this bill does not provide for the transfer of only a small tract of land to the city of Crawford, Nebr.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the bill provides for the transfer of approximately 43 acres of what was Fort Robinson, now the Robinson Remount Station. The 43 acres have been in the possession of the city of Crawford for a great many years. In anticipation of the remount station perhaps being taken out of the possession of the Government and falling into other hands, whereby the city of Crawford may lose title to the pipe line which brings water into the city, the bill provides that the city of Crawford may get title to the pipe line, and a small park area which adjoins the city.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not true that this tract is a small portion of several thousand acres of land, that it is not very valuable, but would be of interest to the city of Crawford?

Mr. BUTLER. It covers 43 acres of a tract of approximately fifteen or twenty thousand acres.

Mr. WHERRY. Did not the Senate pass the bill last year, but because of the time element it failed to get through the other House and become a law?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, there are many cases like this in all the States of the Union, where there is Federally owned property which the Federal Government no longer needs. So that this is of interest to all Senators.

Mr. BUTLER. The city already has this land. All they are asking is a quitclaim deed from the Government.

Mr. LODGE. For what use does the city want the land?

Mr. BUTLER. The acreage which adjoins the city of Crawford is used for park purposes, and this land is a part of the city.

Mr. LODGE. Is it being used now?

Mr. BUTLER. It is being used, and has been for years, and a pipe line brings water from a source many miles out of the city into the city.

Mr. LODGE. Does this bill affect the pipe line?

Mr. BUTLER. It gives the city of Crawford title to land occupied by the pipe line.

Mr. WHERRY. It is also a part of the water system, is it not? Part of the water which comes into the city comes from water on this 43 acres, and has for years, has it not? This is not merely an outgrowth of the Surplus Property Act. The negotiations for this land have been carried on for a considerable period of time.

Mr. LODGE. How did it happen that the bill went to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and not to the Committee on Armed Services?

Mr. WHERRY. Because the Remount Service has been transferred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, this is the old Army remount station transferred to the Department of Agriculture last year, and the land has some of the water mains and some of the pipes of the city lying across it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to say that I am reasonably confident that we can and will work out a satisfactory understanding in regard to this matter between now and the next call of the calendar. But the whole remount issue is pending with the Department of Agriculture, and I want to consider this measure along with the whole issue at the time. Therefore I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon objects and the bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT RELATING TO JOINT BOARDS

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. For what purpose does the Senator from Kansas rise?

Mr. REED. When Senate bill 255, Calendar No. 66, was reached on the call of the calendar the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] asked that it go over in order that he might have an opportunity to look into it. I have conferred with the Senator from Alabama. He has no objection to the passage of Senate bill 255, Calendar No. 66, or the passage of Senate bill 256, Calendar No. 67, but he does object to Senate bill 257, Calendar No. 68. I am willing to have Senate bill 257 go over, and have the other two bills passed at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The order was that the three bills should go to the foot of the calendar. They are now at the foot of the calendar and will be called when the call of the calendar is completed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate may proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 255, Calendar No. 66.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 255) to amend section 205 of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to joint boards, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (b) of section 205 of the Interstate Commerce Act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) Whenever there arises in the administration of this part any matter that the Commission is required to refer to a joint board, or that the Commission determines, in its discretion, to refer to a joint board, the Commission shall, if no joint board eligible to consider said matter is in existence, create a joint board to consider the matter when referred, and to recommend appropriate order thereon. The Commission shall prescribe rules governing meetings and procedure of joint boards and may, in the event of legal proceedings preventing reference to a joint board, determine the matter as provided in section 17. Except as hereinafter provided, a joint board shall consist of a member from each State in which the motor carrier or brokerage operations involved are or are proposed to be conducted. The member from any such State shall be nominated by the board of such State from its own membership or otherwise; or if there is no board in such State or if the board of such State fails to make a nomination when requested by the Commission, then the governor of such State may nominate such member. The Commission is authorized to appoint as a member upon the joint board any such nominee approved by it. If both the board and the governor of any State shall fail to nominate a joint board member when requested, then the joint board shall be constituted without a member from such State, if members for two or more States shall have been nominated and approved by the Commission. All decisions and recommendations by joint boards shall be by majority vote: *Provided, however*, That in any matter where only one member shall participate in a hearing such member shall constitute a quorum and make recommendation of an order thereon. If the board of each State from which a member of a joint board is entitled to be appointed shall waive action on any matter referred to such joint board, or if any joint board fails or refuses to act, or is unable to agree upon any matter submitted to it within 45 days after the matter is referred to it or such other period as the Commission may authorize, or if a member shall not be nominated for more than one State (except only when the operations proposed shall be into or through territory foreign to the United States), then such matter shall be decided as in the case of any matter not required to be referred to a joint board. The failure of a duly appointed member of a joint board to participate in any hearing on a matter referred to such joint board, after notice thereof, shall be considered to constitute, as to the matter referred, a waiver of action on the part of the State from which such member was appointed, but shall not

affect the duty and power of the remaining members or member of said joint board, if any, to proceed with said hearing, to consider such matter, and to make recommendation of an order thereon. When any proceeding required to be referred to a joint board shall involve operations of a motor carrier conducted or proposed to be conducted into or through territory foreign to the United States, if a single State shall be involved, or if only one State shall make nomination of a joint board member through its governor or State board, then the Commission, in such case, may receive from that State the nomination of not more than three members and may appoint such nominees to constitute the joint board. Members of joint boards when administering the provisions of this part shall receive such allowances for travel and subsistence expenses as the Commission shall provide. A joint board shall continue in existence for the consideration of matters referred to it by the Commission until such time as its existence may be terminated by the Commission. A substitution of membership upon a joint board from any State may be made at any time by nomination and appointment in the same manner as an original nomination and appointment."

AMENDMENTS TO VARIOUS SECTIONS OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I make the same unanimous-consent request with respect to Senate bill 256, Calendar No. 67, the next bill on the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 256) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph (5) of section 1 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended by striking out "(a)"; and is further amended by striking out "(b)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(5½)."

SEC. 2. (a) The first sentence of paragraph (2) of section 3 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) No carrier by railroad and no express company subject to the provisions of this part shall deliver or relinquish possession at destination of any freight or express shipment transported by it until all tariff rates and charges thereon have been paid, except under such rules and regulations as the Commission may from time to time prescribe to govern the settlement of all such rates and charges and to prevent unjust discrimination: *Provided*, That the provisions of this paragraph shall not be construed to prohibit any carrier or express company from extending credit in connection with rates and charges on freight or express shipments transported for the United States, for any department, bureau, or agency thereof, or for any State or Territory or political subdivision thereof, or for the District of Columbia."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall take effect 6 months after the date of the enactment of this act.

SEC. 3. The second sentence of subparagraph (b) of paragraph (2) of section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "If the Commission shall consider it necessary in order to determine whether the findings specified below may properly be made, it shall set said application for public hearing; and a public hearing shall be held in all cases where carriers by railroad are involved unless the Commission determines that a public hearing is not necessary in the public interest."

SEC. 4. (a) Paragraph (10) of section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subparagraph as follows:

"Nothing in this section shall be construed to require the approval or authorization of the Commission in the case of a transaction within the scope of paragraph (2) where the only parties to the transaction are street, suburban, or interurban electric railways, none of which is controlled by or under common control with any carrier which is operated as part of a general steam railroad system of transportation."

(b) Paragraph (13) of section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(13) As used in paragraphs (2) to (12), inclusive, the term 'carrier' means a carrier by railroad and an express company and a sleeping-car company, subject to this part; and a motor carrier subject to part II; and a water carrier subject to part III."

SEC. 5. Paragraph (5) of section 6 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(5) Every common carrier subject to this part shall also file with said Commission copies of all contracts, agreements, or arrangements, with other common carriers in relation to any traffic affected by the provisions of this part to which it may be a party: *Provided, however*, That the Commission, by regulations, may provide for exceptions from the requirements of this paragraph in the case of any class or classes of contracts, agreements, or arrangements, the filing of which, in its opinion, is not necessary in the public interest."

SEC. 6. Paragraph (5) of section 16 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a colon and adding thereafter the following: "*Provided*, That in such proceedings service of notice of the suspension of a tariff or schedule upon an attorney in fact of a carrier who has filed said tariff or schedule in behalf of such carrier shall be deemed to be due and sufficient service upon the carrier, and service of notice of the suspension of a joint tariff or schedule upon a carrier which has filed said joint tariff or schedule to which another carrier is a party shall be deemed to be due and sufficient notice upon the several carriers parties thereto. Such service of notice may be made by mail to such attorney in fact or carrier at the address shown in the tariff or schedule."

SEC. 7. Paragraph (1) of section 20 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(1) The Commission is hereby authorized to require annual, periodical, or special reports from carriers, lessors, and associations (as defined in this section), to prescribe the manner and form in which such reports shall be made, and to require from such carriers, lessors, and associations specific and full, true, and correct answers to all questions upon which the Commission may deem information to be necessary, classifying such carriers, lessors, and associations as it may deem proper for any of these purposes. Such annual reports shall give an account of the affairs of the carrier, lessor, or association in such form and detail as may be prescribed by the Commission."

SEC. 8. The second sentence of paragraph (5) of section 20 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended by striking out "carriers and lessors" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "carriers, lessors, and associations."

SEC. 9. Paragraph (8) of section 20 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(8) As used in this section, the words 'keep' and 'kept' shall be construed to mean made, prepared, or compiled, as well as retained; the term 'carrier' means a common carrier subject to this part, and includes a receiver or trustee of such carrier; the term 'lessor' means a person owning a railroad, a water line, or a pipe line, leased to and operated by a common carrier subject to this part, and includes a receiver or trustee of such lessor; and the term 'association' means an association or organization maintained by or in the interest of any group of carriers subject to this part which performs any service, or engages in any activities, in connection with any traffic, transportation, or facilities subject to this act."

SEC. 10. Paragraph (1) of section 20a of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(1) That as used in this section, the term 'carrier' means a common carrier by railroad (except a street, suburban, or interurban electric railway which is not operated as a part of a general steam railroad system of transportation) which is subject to this part, or any corporation organized for the purpose of engaging in transportation by railroad subject to this part, or a sleeping-car company which is subject to this part."

SEC. 11. The first two sentences of subsection (a) of section 220 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Commission is hereby authorized to require annual, periodical, or special reports from all motor carriers, brokers, lessors, and associations (as defined in this section); to prescribe the manner and form in which such reports shall be made; and to require from such carriers, brokers, lessors, and associations specific and full, true, and correct answers to all questions upon which the Commission may deem information to be necessary. Such annual reports shall give an account of the affairs of the carrier, broker, lessor, or association in such form and detail as may be prescribed by the Commission."

SEC. 12. The third sentence of subsection (d) of section 220 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "The Commission or its duly authorized special agents, accountants, or examiners shall at all times have access to and authority, under its order, to inspect and examine any and all lands, buildings, or equipment of motor carriers, brokers, and lessors; and shall have authority to inspect and copy any and all accounts, books, records, memoranda, correspondence, and other documents of such carriers, brokers, lessors, and associations (as defined in this section), and such accounts, books, records, memoranda, correspondence, and other documents of any person controlling, controlled by, or under common control with any such carrier, as the Commission deems relevant to such person's relation to or transactions with such carrier."

SEC. 13. Subsection (e) of section 220 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(e) As used in this section, the words 'keep' and 'kept' shall be construed to mean made, prepared, or compiled, as well as retained; the term 'lessor' means a lessor of any right to operate as a motor carrier; the term 'motor carrier', 'broker', or 'lessor' includes a receiver or trustee of any such motor carrier, broker, or lessor; and the term 'association' means an association or organization maintained by or in the interest of any group of motor carriers or brokers subject to this part which performs any service, or engages in any activities in connection with any traffic, transportation, or facilities subject to this act."

SEC. 14. (a) The third sentence of subsection (a) of section 221 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the word "registered".

(b) The last sentence of such subsection (a) is amended to read as follows: "In proceedings before the Commission involving the

lawfulness of rates, fares, charges, classifications, or practices, service of notice of the suspension of a tariff or schedule upon an attorney in fact of a carrier who has filed said tariff or schedule in behalf of such carrier naming the rates, fares, charges, classifications, or practices, involved in such proceedings shall be deemed to be due and sufficient service upon the carrier and service of notice of the suspension of a joint tariff or schedule upon a carrier which has filed said joint tariff to which another carrier is a party naming the rates, fares, charges, classifications, or practices involved in such proceedings shall be deemed to be due and sufficient service upon the several carriers parties thereto, but such manner of service shall not be considered as excluding service in any other manner authorized by law."

SEC. 15. Section 222 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(h) Any motor carrier, broker, or lessor, or other person, or any officer, agent, employee, or representative thereof, who shall fail or refuse to keep, preserve, or forward any account, record, or memorandum in the substance, form, or manner prescribed in this part or in any rule, order, or regulation prescribed under this part; or who shall fail or refuse to comply with any requirement of this part with respect to the filing with this Commission or with any agency, office, or representative of the Commission, as prescribed by the Commission, any annual, periodical, or special report, or other report, tariff, schedule, contract, document, or data or with any rule, order, or regulation prescribed with respect to such filing; or who shall fail or refuse to make full, true, or correct answer to any question required by the Commission to be made under the provisions of this part, shall forfeit to the United States the sum of $100 for each such offense, and, in case of a continuing violation, not to exceed $50 for each additional day during which such failure or refusal shall continue. All forfeitures provided for in this paragraph shall be payable into the Treasury of the United States and shall be recoverable in a civil suit in the name of the United States, brought in the district where the motor carrier or broker has its principal office, or in any district in which such motor carrier or broker was, at the time of the offense, authorized by this Commission, or by this part, to engage in operation as such motor carrier or broker; or in any district where such forfeiture may accrue; or in the district where the offender is found. All process in any such case may be served in the judicial district whereof such offender is an inhabitant or wherever he may be found. It shall be the duty of the various district attorneys under the direction of the Attorney General of the United States to prosecute for the recovery of such forfeitures. The costs and expenses of such prosecution shall be paid out of the appropriation for the expenses of the courts of the United States."

SEC. 16. The first two sentences of subsection (a) of section 313 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Commission is hereby authorized to require annual, periodical, or special reports from water carriers, lessors, and associations (as defined in this section), and to prescribe the manner and form in which such reports shall be made, and to require from such carriers, lessors, and associations specific and full, true, and correct answers to all questions upon which the Commission may deem information to be necessary. Such annual reports shall give an account of the affairs of the carrier, lessor, or association in such form and detail as may be prescribed by the Commission."

SEC. 17. The first sentence of subsection (f) of section 313 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended by inserting after "lessors," the following: "and of associations (as defined in this section),".

SEC. 18. Subsection (h) of section 313 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(h) As used in this section, the words 'keep' and 'kept' shall be construed to mean made, prepared, or compiled, as well as retained; the term 'lessor' means a lessor of any right to operate as a water carrier; the term 'water carrier' or 'lessor' includes a receiver or trustee of such water carrier or lessor; and the term 'association' means an association or organization maintained by or in the interest of any group of water carriers subject to this part which performs any service, or engages in any activities, in connection with any traffic, transportation, or facilities subject to this act."

SEC. 19. (a) That the third sentence of subsection (a) of section 315 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the word "registered."

(b) The last sentence of such subsection (a) is amended to read as follows: "In proceedings before the Commission involving the lawfulness of rates, fares, charges, classifications, or practices, service of notice of the suspension of a tariff or schedule upon an attorney in fact of a carrier who has filed a said tariff or schedule in behalf of such carrier naming the rates, fares, charges, classifications, or practices involved in such proceedings shall be deemed to be due and sufficient service upon the carrier and service of notice of the suspension of a joint tariff or schedule upon a carrier which has filed said joint tariff to which another carrier is a party naming the rates, fares, charges, classifications, or practices involved in such proceedings shall be deemed to be due and sufficient service upon the several carriers parties thereto, but such manner of service shall not be considered as excluding service in any other manner authorized by law."

SEC. 20. The first two sentences of subsection (a) of section 412 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"(a) For purposes of administration of the provisions of this part, the Commission is hereby authorized to require annual, periodical, or special reports from freight forwarders and associations (as defined in this section), and to prescribe the manner and form in which such reports shall be made, and to require from such forwarders and associations specific, full, true, and correct answers to all questions upon which the Commission may deem information to be necessary. Such annual reports shall give an account of the affairs of the freight forwarder or association in such form and detail as may be prescribed by the Commission."

SEC. 21. The first sentence of subsection (d) of section 412 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended by inserting after the words "documents of freight forwarders" the following: "and of associations (as defined in this section)."

SEC. 22. Subsection (f) of section 412 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(f) As used in this section, the words 'keep' and 'kept' shall be construed to mean made, prepared, or compiled, as well as retained; and the term 'association' means an association or organization maintained by or in the interest of any group of freight forwarders subject to this part which performs any service, or engages in any activities, in connection with any traffic, transportation, or facilities subject to this act."

Mr. REED. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I now renew my objection to Senate bill 257, Calendar No. 68.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not necessary to renew the objection. The bill remains at the foot of the calendar.

The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 249) to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1209) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 969) to transfer the Pomona station of the Agriculture Remount Service, Department of Agriculture, at Pomona, Calif., was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIONS ON LANDS CONVEYED TO CHARLESTON, S. C.

The bill (S. 1219) removing certain restrictions and conditions imposed by section 2 of the act of May 27, 1936, on certain of the lands conveyed by such act to the city of Charleston, S. C., and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of that bill?

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, this land is part of a large tract of land. It is 243 acres in extent, I believe. The purpose of the bill is to remove certain conditions and restrictions which were imposed by the act of 1936 on this specific tract of land. During World War II this piece of property was not recaptured by the Federal Government, and it is not foreseen by the Army that it will have any possible future use. In the meantime, the city of Charleston had leased the property on a long-term lease to a corporation, which corporation has effected extensive plant construction thereon. This corporation is desirous of expanding its facilities, but is reluctant to do so as long as the title to the property remains restricted under the terms of the 1936 act. It can very properly be argued, inasmuch as the Government did not reenter the property during World War II, and that the Army does not foresee future use, that these restrictions can safely be removed at this time. Therefore the committee unanimously recommended passage of the bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I concur in the statement made by the Senator from South Dakota. The lands in question were conveyed to the city of Charleston, S. C., with certain restrictions and conditions imposed by the act of May 27, 1936. The Army foresees no future value to it of the land. If the bill shall be passed the Army will retain what is

necessary in the way of communications and roads and other things needful to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1219) removing certain restrictions and conditions imposed by section 2 of the act of May 27, 1936, on certain of the lands conveyed by such act to the city of Charleston, S. C.; and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) with respect to the restrictions and conditions required by section 2 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to convey the Charleston Army Base Terminal to the city of Charleston, S. C.," approved May 27, 1936 (prohibiting the city of Charleston from transferring title to the property conveyed under such act and reserving a right to the United States to retake such property in the event of a national emergency), to be included in the deed executed pursuant to the provisions of such act the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to release to the city of Charleston, S. C., by an appropriate written instrument, such restrictions and conditions so far as they pertain to the area designated as "tract numbered 2—part 1," comprising approximately two hundred seventy-eight and ninety-two one-hundredths acres, on the map on file in the office, Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, entitled "Tract No. 2, portion of Charleston Ordnance Depot, North Charleston, S. C., date: February 2, 1949, drawing No. RE-1/372 (Rev.), as further revised February 9, 1949."

(b) In executing the written instrument referred to in subsection (a) the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to make provision for reservation and/or conveyance to the United States of all easements and rights-of-way (including use of water and sewer mains) that are now enjoyed by the United States with respect to such tract and are deemed necessary for retention by the Secretary of the Army, subject to the provision that any such easements and rights-of-way (including use of water and sewer mains) as may at any time in the opinion of the Secretary of the Army, be no longer required for governmental use may be abandoned, and upon such abandonment will automatically terminate. Such instrument shall recite that with respect to that certain water main which intersects the northwesterly corner of the above-described premises, the city council of Charleston, S. C., its successors, or assigns, may with the written consent of the Secretary of the Army, relocate at its sole cost and expense such water main on other lands and that in such event all rights and privileges now enjoyed by the United States with respect to such water main shall cease and terminate.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to convey by quitclaim deed to the city council of Charleston, S. C., all or any part of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to so much of that certain tract of land comprising one and two hundred and five one-thousandths acres, more or less, and designated as tract 5, exception "C," on the drawing described in the first section of this act, as the Secretary of the Army determines is no longer needed for military purposes. Any conveyance executed pursuant to the authority contained in this section shall be made upon payment by the city council of Charleston, S. C., of the fair market value of the property to be conveyed.

TRANSFER OF POMONA, CALIF., REMOUNT STATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to Senate bill 969, Calendar 84, and reserve my objection to the bill while the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] makes a statement in regard to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon asks unanimous consent to return to Senate bill 969, Calendar 84. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Committee on Agriculture held some hearings on this measure. In 1922 W. K. Kellogg established the Pomona Remount Station in California. The purpose of it was to breed Arabian horses. In 1932 the remount station was transferred to the University of California. It was managed by the university for some time, but it became so expensive to operate that some effort was made by the university to transfer it back to Mr. Kellogg. So an arrangement was made whereby Mr. Kellogg transferred the entire property, as a patriotic duty, to the Army, and the Army tried to handle it for some time, but was not very successful with it, and therefore transferred it to the Department of Agriculture.

During last year the Department of Agriculture spent $425,000 in order to try to operate this station, but could not do so with that amount of money. The purpose of this bill is to transfer the entire remount station back to the Kellogg Foundation, which will operate it as a remount station with its own resources. We gathered from the representative of the Kellogg Foundation that it may be transferred to some college there and a large endowment made to the college so that the entire area can be operated as a remount station.

The committee was unanimous in recommending the transfer.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to thank the Senator from Louisiana for his explanation.

For the RECORD I want to make this brief statement, which applies also to my objection to Senate bill 314, Calendar No. 81. I do not know of anyone in the Senate who is working any harder to try to solve the remount problem than is the junior Senator from Oregon. However, I feel that as of this day the Department of Agriculture has not kept faith in what I consider to be some very definite understandings we had with the Department last year when we reached an agreement with respect to the Remount Service. Therefore, until the Department of Agriculture proceeds along the lines that several of us have requested, namely, that it would at least give us the benefit of a conference in regard to our demands for an explanation from the Department for not handling these matters all together, I am going to continue to object to these individual bills.

I am sure that a week or 10 days' delay is not going to be disastrous in regard to this particular matter. As of this time, if in the last analysis we could not do anything else but simply get this bill, I would finally vote for it. But I think the Department of Agriculture has an obligation for carrying out the agreement which I believe the two Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and a group of other Senators had with the Department of Agriculture last year, and the Department of Agriculture has not carried out its side of the agreement to date. Therefore, until it does so, or gives us cause for believing that there is good reason for not doing so, I must object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon objects.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon has already objected.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator from Oregon withhold his objection long enough to enable me to propound a question to him in my time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon withhold his objection?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the Senator from Oregon if it is not also true that the junior Senator from Nebraska has also cooperated with him in the efforts to work out a solution in which the Senator from Nebraska also is interested, with respect to the agreements made with the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. MORSE. Not only the Senator from Nebraska, but many other Senators.

Mr. WHERRY. We are very hopeful of working out with the Department something that will be just, in order to continue the breeding of the class of horses which will be lost if the remount services are terminated.

Even though I have energetically cooperated 100 percent with the Senator from Oregon, yet I feel that the very nature of this particular bill will indicate that it should be passed.

Moreover, I am satisfied, after talking with the junior Senator from Oregon, that because of the nature of Senate bill 314, Calendar No. 81, it will not in any way interfere with the conclusions or the program which will be worked out to his satisfaction, as well as the satisfaction of the rest of us.

Mr. MORSE. I am satisfied that we will reach an agreement with respect to Senate bill 969, Calendar No. 84; but we need a conference so that we may know where we are going.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection?

Mr. MORSE. I will withhold it if I may do so under the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator may withhold his objection, but his 5 minutes have expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that while I appreciate the fact that under the rules the able Senator from Oregon has every right and privilege to object, as I understand, he merely wishes an opportunity to look into the subject further. I hope that when the bill next comes up, he will have satisfied himself.

I believe that this bill is in a little different category from other bills of this nature.

As the able Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has pointed out, the Kellogg Foundation first made this land available to the University of California. Then, at the specific request of the War Department during the war, it was transferred to the War Department, I believe for the sum of $1. It was a gift, not a sale.

When the War Department transferred the Remount Station at Pomona, Calif., to the Department of Agriculture, and the Department felt that it could not continue with the program, those in California who were interested in the horse-breeding program wanted it continued. Finally, after many negotiations, the Kellogg Foundation agreed to continue the program. The program meets with the approval of the University of California. I am very fearful, if there is too much delay, that we may lose the opportunity of having the Kellogg Foundation continue this program.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish to subscribe to and endorse everything the Senator from California has said. The Kellogg Foundation was more than generous in the first instance. It does not like to see this land subdivided and turned into a city section. It has generously offered to take it back, something which I never believed it would do. I think it would be too bad if it were blocked from that purpose. I hope that when the bill comes up again the Senator from Oregon will withdraw his objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next business on the calendar.

UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

The bill (H. R. 2216) to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to provide for an Under Secretary of Defense was announced as next in order.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], or whoever is in charge of the bill. As one who believes that strengthening and unification of the Department of National Defense is our most urgent single problem, I ask the Senator whether he believes that this bill represents the total solution to that problem.

Mr. BYRD. No; it does not. It is not the entire solution. It is merely a temporary solution.

Mr. LODGE. It is only one step of a number considered to be necessary; is that correct?

Mr. BYRD. That is correct.

Mr. LODGE. I am certainly in favor of this as one rather minor step of a great many which need to be taken.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I shall not object, but I express the hope that we shall not attempt piecemeal action in implementing the recommendations of the Reorganization Commission, headed by former President Hoover. I should like to see those recommendations considered in one package, at least as to each major departmental recommendation. I think we shall go further and have better legislation if we follow that policy.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, ordinarily I would agree with the Senator from Oregon, but I believe that in this case we have almost an emergency condition. I know of no one heading a department in the Government who is in a more unenviable position than is the Secretary of National Defense. It is true that he has a Secretary of Air, a Secretary of War, and a Secretary of the Navy under him, and they have assistant secretaries under them, but they are not wholly responsible to him. They can go over his head at any time. They have certain authority which they may exercise, for which he is responsible, but which, under the law which was passed 2 years ago, he has not sufficient authority to control.

I think it is almost a physical impossibility for the Secretary of National Defense to get along without an under secretary. He cannot take time out if he is sick. He cannot take time out to go anywhere, because there is no one to whom he can turn over his work while he is away. While I should like to see the entire reorganization plan for the National Defense Establishment taken up at one time and acted upon, I think we have almost an emergency condition in this instance. I have arrived at that conclusion after being engaged in studies of the Hoover Commission report during the past few months. I think the present Secretary, Mr. Forrestal, has done an almost superhuman job in being able to keep going as long as he has.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I think as the matter now stands the RECORD shows a little more as to the real intent and purpose of this bill.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to relieve the terrific congestion of work upon the shoulders of the Secretary of National Defense. He is simply unable to do the work, and he wants an under secretary appointed so that he may do the things which should not be assigned to anyone else but an under secretary.

This is what the Secretary of National Defense is required to do: He must attend Cabinet meetings. He is a member of the National Security Council. He is a member of the National Security Resources Board. He is a member of the War Council. He is a member of the committee of four secretaries. He is now a member of the Hoover Commission. He is a member of the Research and Development Board, which operates under the direction of the Secretary. He is a member of the Munitions Board.

The purpose is to give the Secretary temporary relief, because he is simply unable to cope with the vast duties which rest upon him at this time. The bill is not to be regarded as a solution of the reorganization of the Military Establishment. It is merely one part of the recommendations made by the Hoover Commission.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I understand all that. I merely wanted the Senator from Virginia to explain the bill for the RECORD, because I think it is important. I hope the Committee on Armed Services will further consider the unification program, so that the Secretary of National Defense will ultimately have the power in his hands to do what I believe is necessary for the purpose of carrying on efficiently the work of the military service.

Mr. BYRD. That will certainly be done. Legislation will shortly be ready and will receive very full consideration.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as I understand, this bill would permit the Secretary of National Defense to become a secretary for policy matters, and the Under Secretary would take over much of the administrative load.

Mr. BYRD. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ATTENDANCE OF UNITED STATES MARINE BAND AT ENCAMPMENT OF GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC

The bill (H. R. 2485) to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the Eighty-third and Final National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held in Indianapolis, Ind., August 28 to September 1, 1949, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 2663) to provide for the administration of the Central Intelligence Agency, established pursuant to section 102, National Security Act of 1947, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

PUNISHMENT FOR DISCLOSURE OF CERTAIN INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 277) to enhance further the security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information concerning the cryptographic systems and the communications intelligence activities of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, this bill is rather limited, and is quite narrow in its scope, but it will protect a very important link in our national security. The bill would make it a crime for an individual to reveal information concerning the intelligence activities of the United States or to divulge information concerning the methods, techniques, and equipment used by the United States in transmitting secret messages. We feel that the present laws are not adequate in this particular respect.

The bill would not control in any way the free dissemination of information which might be transmitted in code or cipher. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Ohio that the officials of the American Society of Newspaper Editors have indicated approval of the bill as it was amended in the committee. The amendment inserted in line 3, on page 1, simply adding the words

"knowingly and wittingly," thereby puts the burden of proof on the Government of convicting individuals under the law.

As the distinguished Senator realizes, there were during the war a great many persons who of necessity became familiar with our system of sending secret code messages. Many of them are no longer in the armed services, and it might be that, for purposes of personal gain, some of those persons might reveal the information, and that would be very costly to correct.

I should like to say that both the State Department and the National Defense Establishment recommend the enactment of the bill, and it was unanimously reported by the committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator give us an explanation of the language on page 3, in lines 20 to 23:

SEC. 3. Nothing in this act shall prohibit the furnishing, upon lawful demand, of information to any regularly constituted committee of the Senate or House of Representatives of the United States of America, or joint committee thereof.

Why are the words "upon lawful demand" inserted at that point? Is a subpena meant?

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I do not remember that that was discussed in the committee. I assume that those words might have been inserted as an assurance that any of those entitled to the information could secure it, regardless of this measure.

Mr. FERGUSON. If it were a regularly constituted committee, would there be any necessity for the language "upon lawful demand"? Would the committee be compelled to issue a subpena? Would there be any necessity for a committee to issue a subpena for evidence in such case?

Mr. HUNT. I would not think there should be.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question about this measure, but in the meantime I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

TRANSPORTATION OF IRON ORE BETWEEN UNITED STATES PORTS BY VESSELS OF CANADIAN REGISTRY

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 52) to authorize vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore between United States ports on the Great Lakes during the period from March 15 to December 15, 1949, inclusive, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD, at this point, a very brief statement on the joint resolution and also a letter from the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, I am not going to object to this resolution. However, I do wish the record to show that the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported the resolution favorably—with considerable reluctance.

This is emergency legislation, to permit vessels of Canadian registry to carry iron ore on the Great Lakes to and between United States ports. This represents a waiver of coastwise shipping laws. Similar waivers have been granted by the Congress, covering each season since 1941. In view of existing circumstances, I think the only logical action Congress can take is to grant the waiver again this year by approving Senate Joint Resolution 52.

I am firmly convinced, however, that we should put the Great Lakes' operators on notice that this is the last time an extension will be granted. The operators must come forth with a definite program to bring the supply of ore ships flying under the United States flag into balance with demand. To put the operators on notice officially, the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee recently sent a letter to Mr. Gilbert Johnson, general counsel, Lake Carriers Association, Cleveland, Ohio, asking a number of pertinent questions. The first of these questions gives the general tenor of the chairman's inquiry. Let me read it:

"What plans have been formulated by the steamship and ore interests to bring the supply of United States' vessels into conformity with demand, to the end that emergency legislation such as House Joint Resolution 143 and S. 52 will not be needed in 1950?"

I would like at this point to place the chairman's letter in the record.

MARCH 17, 1949.

Mr. GILBERT JOHNSON,
General Counsel,
Lake Carriers Association,
Cleveland, Ohio.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: On Wednesday, March 9, Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported favorably on Senate Joint Resolution 52, the Senate counterpart of House Joint Resolution 143. These resolutions, on an emergency basis, authorize vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore between United States ports on the Great Lakes during a period of March 15 to December 15, 1949.

The committee reported this legislation with great reluctance. That reluctance stems from the fact that Congress has been extending this emergency provision since 1941.

As you probably know, the Senate committee intends to make an over-all study of merchant marine problems, as provided in Senate Resolution 45. To assist us in this study, the committee would like answers to the following questions:

1. What plans have been formulated by the steamship and ore interests to bring the supply of United States vessels into conformity with demand, to the end that emergency legislation such as House Joint Resolution 143 and S. 52 will not be needed in 1950?

2. What is the current status of such plans?

3. Are any United States flag ore carriers currently slated to be removed from service? If so, what plans are being made to replace them?

4. What United States flag vessels, if any, have been transferred to Canadian registry during the period 1945–49? Under what circumstances and authority?

5. Thirty-nine Canadian vessels participated in carrying ore under this waiver of the coasting laws last year. What companies own these 39 vessels? Do American steel companies have any financial interest in the companies which own these vessels?

The committee will appreciate answers to these questions at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely yours,

_____,
Chairman.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 52) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 27 of the act of Congress approved June 5, 1920 (41 Stat. 999), as amended by act of Congress approved April 11, 1935 (49 Stat. 154), and by act of Congress approved July 2, 1935 (49 Stat. 442), or the provisions of any other act of Congress or regulation, vessels of Canadian registry shall be permitted to transport iron ore between United States ports on the Great Lakes during the period from March 15 to December 15, 1949, inclusive.

UNITED STATES VETERANS HOSPITAL AT WILMINGTON, DEL.

The bill (S. 928) to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital now being constructed at Wilmington, Del., as the William L. Nelson Veterans Memorial Hospital, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the United States Veterans' Administration hospital now being constructed at Wilmington, Del., shall be known and designated on the public records as the William L. Nelson Veterans Memorial Hospital.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 1211) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. CORDON. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

APPOINTMENT OF POSTMASTERS UNDER CIVIL SERVICE

The bill (S. 1174) to amend the Act of June 25, 1938, relating to the appointment of postmasters under civil service, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. LANGER. The bill provides that in the case of a person appointed a fourth-class postmaster, if the receipts of his post office increase to such an extent as to justify changing it to a third-class post office, he shall not be required to be reappointed—and vice versa.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1174) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act entitled "An act extending the classified civil service to include postmasters of the first, second, and third classes, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1076), as amended, is amended by striking out the following after the word "*Provided,*": "That postmasters now serving may continue to serve until the end of their terms, but they shall not acquire a classified civil-service status at the expiration of such terms of office except as provided in section 2 hereof," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "That postmasters of the fourth class, appointed in the classified civil service, whose

offices advance to a higher class, and postmasters of other classes, appointed in the classified civil service, whose offices are relegated to the fourth class, shall continue to serve under their original appointment until a vacancy occurs by reason of death, resignation, retirement, or removal, in which event the appointment shall be made as provided in section 2 of the act."

RELIEF OF THE CITY OF RENO, NEV.

The bill (S. 41) for the relief of the city of Reno, Nev., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the city of Reno, Nev., the sum of $1,620, representing the amount which would have been assessable for street improvements against property owned by the United States, and used by the Forest Service, in such city if such property had been privately owned; such property being more particularly described as follows: Commencing at the intersection on the north and south line on the east side of the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 12, township 19 north, range 19 east, and the south side of Second Street as extended, through the east city limits of Reno, Nev.; thence southerly along the east line of the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 12, for seven hundred and twenty-six feet; thence westerly paralleling said Second Street for three hundred feet; thence northerly paralleling the east line of the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter, section 12, for seven hundred and twenty-six feet; to the south side of said Second Street; thence easterly along the south side of said Second Street for three hundred feet; to the place of commencing, containing five acres, more or less, three hundred front feet.

WILLIAM F. THOMAS

The bill (S. 165) for the relief of William F. Thomas was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to William F. Thomas, of Orlando, Fla., the sum of $15,000, in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States (1) for compensation for the personal injuries he suffered when involved in an accident with an Army truck on August 2, 1943, and his disability resulting from said injuries; (2) for reimbursement of medical and hospital expenses incurred by him as a result of said injuries; and (3) for compensation for loss and damage to his personal property as a result of such accident: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

FERD H. GIBLER

The bill (S. 749) for the relief of Ferd H. Gibler was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General is authorized and directed to credit the accounts of Ferd H. Gibler, postmaster at Freeport, Ill., in the sum of $9,812.28, representing the balance due the United States on account of the embezzlement of postoffice funds by Harry J. Seachrist, former assistant postmaster at the Freeport, Ill., post office.

VASO B. BENDERACH

The bill (S. 850) conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Vaso B. Benderach was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Vaso B. Benderach, a Yugoslav flier, who served honorably with the Fifteenth Air Force of the United States, and who died on May 7, 1948, while a patient at Fitzsimons General Hospital, Colorado, shall be held and considered to have been a citizen of the United States at the time of his death.

PAYMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

The bill (S. 937) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to effect the payment of certain claims against the United States was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum as may be necessary to effect full and final settlement of the following claims against the United States:

(a) Claim of the Government of Great Britain in the sum of £750 ($3,024.38) on behalf of John Bailey of H. M. S. *Orion* arising as a consequence of personal injuries inflicted upon him by John Ittner, United States Navy, at Seattle, Wash., on July 16, 1939;

(b) Claim of the Government of Great Britain in the sum of £3,000 ($12,097.50) on behalf of the parents of the late J. D. Wiggins of the British vessel *Sambre*, arising out of the death of the latter as a consequence of shots fired by John B. Coyne, United States Navy, an armed sentry aboard the U. S. S. *Carter Hall* at Shanghai, China, on November 23, 1945;

(c) Claim of the Government of Great Britain for reimbursement in the sum of £721.0.5 ($2,907.52), representing the pro rata share of the United States of the sum paid to the Government of Spain by the Government of Great Britain, as a consequence of damages caused in the bombing of the Spanish vessel steamship *Christina* at Sete, France, in an attack by joint air forces of the United States and Great Britain, respectively, on June 25, 1944; and

(d) Claim of the Government of Norway in the sum of 19,650 patacas ($5,354.63) on behalf of Trygve Jorgensen, arising out of personal injuries sustained when the ship *Masbate*, of which he was captain, was attacked in the harbor of Macao by United States military aircraft on February 25, 1945.

In all, $23,384.03; together with such additional sums due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in the foreign currencies as specified in the claims.

JOHN CLARK SHARMAN

The bill (S. 981) for the relief of John Clark Sharman was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That John Clark Sharman, the son of Hilda Hartwell Sharman, a native-born citizen of the United States who lost her United States citizenship by voting in a foreign election on July 5, 1945, but who reacquired it on May 1, 1947, shall be held and considered to have acquired United States citizenship at birth under the provisions of section 201 (g) of the Nationality Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1138–1139; 8 U. S. C. 601).

PATRICK HENRY WEEK

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 12) authorizing the President to proclaim the week in which June 6, 1949, occurs as Patrick Henry Week in commemoration of the sesquicentennial anniversary of the death of Patrick Henry was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the week in which June 6, 1949, occurs as Patrick Henry Week, inviting the people of the United States to observe such week, and particularly the day June 6, 1949, as the one hundred fiftieth anniversary of the death of Patrick Henry, in accordance with their religious faith, with appropriate ceremonies which will serve to recall his great contribution to the cause of our national independence and to the establishment of the liberties of the people of the United States.

DORIS MARIE RICHARD

The bill (H. R. 1870) for the relief of Doris Marie Richard was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM D. NORRIS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 40) for the relief of William D. Norris, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, in line 5, before the words "Las Vegas", to insert "715 North E Street", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to William D. Norris, of 715 North E Street., Las Vegas, Nev., the sum of $6,760, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for loss of earnings and for pain and suffering as a result of personal injuries sustained on December 19, 1942, near Boulder Dam, when a United States Army vehicle collided with an automobile driven by the said William D. Norris: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LOUIS J. WALINE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 191) for the relief of Louis J. Waline, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Louis J. Waline, of Lincoln, Nebr., the sum of $2,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United

States on account of personal injuries sustained by him on October 26, 1943, at the Lincoln Army Air Field, Lincoln, Nebr., when he was struck by an airplane operated by a member of the Civil Air Patrol on business for the Army Air Forces: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any subrogee: *And provided further*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 21) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. TAFT. May we have an explanation of this measure and the next measure on the calendar, and of the procedure as to deportation?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, last year the Senate passed a bill providing that the Attorney General could suspend the deportation of certain aliens in cases when their deportation would place in jeopardy the financial or economic interests of the United States or of any one business, corporation, or person. However, we required that when the Attorney General does so, he shall submit to us, for affirmative action, the names of those as to whom he has suspended deportation.

Both concurrent resolutions contain the names—I think one has about 20 names and the other has about 15—of the persons as to whom deportation has been suspended on those grounds, in carrying out the provisions of the law passed at the last session of Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 21) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each person hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

A–2185102, Acquavella, Antonio.
A–4011166, Aiello, Vincent.
A–4011184, Aiello, Lucia.
A–4453010, Aloia, Salvatore.
A–7740785, d'Amonville, Emanuel Marie Joseph Jean Francois.
A–7740786, d'Amonville, Christian.
A–4644994, Amoruso, Grazia (nee Grazia Pasqua di Bisceglie).
A–3722899, Anderson, Asta Emily Regine, or Asta Emilie Andresen (nee Ruud), or Asta Olaifsen or Asta Andresson.
A–16481169, Assuncao, Manuel Joao.
A–5357948, Atha, Miles Milton.
A–6664396, Baquera, Ernesto, or Ernesto Vacquera or Ernesto Baquera Lozano.
A–6609933, Becerra-Gonzales, Jesus Ceriaco.
A–6727087, Becerra-Luna, Maria de la Paz.
A–6264273, Bileca, Fanica (nee Shunda).
A–6670872, Castaneda, Maria Dolores.
A–6670871, Castaneda, Maria del Socorro.
A–2574948, Castellanos, Eduardo, or Eduardo Lara-Castellanos aka Eduardo Lopez.
A–4815632, Cutala, Antonio, or Tony Romano or Signor Cortez.
A–5142007, Dahl, Albert Guy.
A–4681069, De Oliveira, Manuel.
A–9767908, Didyk, Eugeniusz, or Eugene Didyk.
A–2032071, Dimitrakis, Georgias, or Georgias Dimitrios Dimitrakis or George D. Dimitrakis.
A–6317358, Dix, Joan Nicolae (alias Ioan Nicolae Dix).
A–3120753, Donakis, Angelo, or Evangelos Helidonakis.
A–4295490, Effrof, Edla Johanna Karjuner, or Edith Kari (nee Edla Johanna Karjunen) or Edla Johanna Virtanen or Virta or Stream.
A–7575699, Embiricos, Leonidas Nicholas.
A–7750757, Engvik, Hans.
A–4929077, Erdmann, Ernest August (alias Ernst Erdmann).
A–1330623, Fraser, Walter Frederick (alias Walter Fraser, alias Walter Frazar).
A–3176332, Fuchs Fannie, or Fay (nee Kalichman).
A–1840024, Garza, Santiago.
A–3634312, Gerardes, James A., or Demetrios Antoniou Gerardes.
A–4795400, Glick, Simon Isaac (alias Simon Gleek or Simon John Gleek).
A–4457066, Goldman, Annie.
A–6758100, Gonzalez, Juanita.
A–6758101, Gonzalez, Tomas.
A–6758102, Gonzalez, Rosaura.
A–5679140, Guerrero, Gloria Maria (nee Jiminez y Jansen).
A–5969421, Gurcke, Werner.
A–2181722, Hall, Henry Ellis.
A–4535822, Heffron, Pearl (nee Pearl Sheppard, alias Pearl Loftus, alias Pearl Venn).
A–5655944, Hiltunen, Muisto Olavi (alias Muisto Olavi Vihko).
A–3220432, Hoke, Abdul, or Abdul Hoque.
A–6171122, Imperato, Annunziata (nee Brunelli).
A–4365425, Isaac, Adolphus, or Sam Dolly.
A–5568523, Johnk, William Hans, or Willi Johnk.
A–6375521, Kelsey, Alison Mary, formerly Beaton.
A–1505330, Kinnersley, Edward; Edward Kinley.
A–5927617, Kitchens, Eileen Patricia Camacho, or Ryder or Rider.
A–9797134, Kourkoumelis, Gerasimos Andreas.
A–4745297, Kozigian, Shenorig (nee Hagopian Shenorig Baboian, alias Siran Kozigian).
A–3578205, Kramer, Heinrich Emil, or Henry Kramer.
A–3482730, Kwan, Shih Tsun (alias Kwan Shih Tsum or Steve Kwan).
A–5719776, Levinoff, Libby, or Libby Lee (nee Libby Feinbrook).
A–5719573, Levinoff, Elliott Ross (alias Elliott Ross Lee).
A–4197995, Madianitti, Guiseppe (alias Joseph Madianitti).
A–2366729, Mahler, Julius Arthur.
A–5686325, Marek, Karel Antonio, or Charles Antonio Marek or Karel Marek or Karel Demarchi.
A–1901066, Martinez, John Antonio, Juan Martinez; José Antonio Martinez.
55695/867, McKellar, Nettie Banks.
A–2582942, Mendoza, Juan.
A–2713177, Miah, Babu.
A–5483484, Minatos, Magda, or Magda (Magdalena) Bodnar (alias Katzarzyna Hirman).
A–3716761, Muehl, George Paul, or George Muhl.
A–4792616, Muzumdar, Natverlal Thakordas.
A–1648893, Myrovitch, Dina (nee Schwartz), or Dina Myers or Ciubotarin.
A–1473785, Myrovitch, Sol, or Myrowitch or Myers.
A–3993212, O'Connor, Margaret Blanch, or Margaret Miller (nee Thomas).
A–4297753, O'Neill, Ruby Florence (nee Rollins).
A–6261585, Papademetriou, Vasiliki (nee Lykomatis).
A–6245752, Papageorge, Alexandria, or Alexandria Valasiou Evlogimenou.
A–2443266, Pare, Lorenzo Joseph, or Lorenzo Joseph Perry.
A–2704506, Pasternak, Sophie, or Sophie Gorzelany or Catherine Gorzelany.
A–3171910, Patselas, Jacovos Pantelis, or Jacob Patselas or Jacob Loizos.
A–5542627, Pavlinik, Milan, or John Pauer (alias Pavlinic).
A–9632212, Pelcic, Nikola.
A–5513435, Pereira, Jose Dias, or José or Joe Dias.
A–6684136, Peroulas, Demetrious Ioannou (alias Demetrious John Peroulas).
A–4284336, Petrolo, Francesco, or Frank.
A–4661066, Pisani, Clemente Salvatore (alias Salvatore Pisani or Salvatore Clemente Pisani).
A–4903760, Poulsen, Poul Borge (alias Paul Poulsen).
A–6343693, Procopis, Vasiliki (nee Vasilike Dounias).
A–4363045, Quintana, Benito, or Benito Quintana Seara.
A–6180043, Quintana, Enrique.
A–6180042, Quintana, Bella.
A–9512159, Rahaman, Abdul.
A–5068980, Rizzardi, Giovanni Luigi, or John Louis Rizzardi.
A–6505643, Roberts, Patrick Francis William, or Mickey Roberts.
A–9610837, Roco, Alvaro.
A–6459201, Rosa, Jorge Antonio de la.
A–6610928, Salina, Isabel Maud (nee Isabel Maud Greenough).
A–4949886, Sanseverino, Guiseppe, or Joseph Sanseverino.
A–4428632, Scheinbaum, Abraham Louis, or Abe English.
A–5105914, Schjenken, Helen, or Nellie Rogers.
A–3761910, Schwartz, Edith Mary, or Edith Mary Warry (nee Teams).
A–5953442, Scognamiglio, Ciro.
A–4627147, Scott, Walter Clarence.
A–4002534, Semaria, Charles, or Simaria (alias Sabatai Semaria, alias Januarez Bennito or Juan Suerez).
A–5261007, Shever, Hanna Weston, or Anna Weston.
A–3385679, Shu, Enid Alicia.
A–6409906, Siewierski, Michael, or Michael Sedeski.
A–6437559, Siewierski, Vera, or Vera Sedeski.
A–6437558, Siewierski, Anne Justine aka Sedeski.
A–6437557, Siewierski, Angeline Mary Siewierski aka Sedeski.
A–4587423, Simms, Arthur Primrose.
A–3639654, Sugal, Penina Rita (nee Penina Rita Cohen).
A–6552969, Sullivan, Wendy Kay.
A–4368591, Tamm, Salme Alice.
A–4076861, Tsangaris, Anthony or Antonios.
A–2713770, Tschudi, Barbara, or Tschudy (nee Treumpy) or Babette Tschudi.
A–5138276, Tursich, Erminio (alias Herman Yursich).
A–2159905, Uluh, Tomiz (alias Wasil Ali).
A–2734013, Vagianos, Angelos Michael.
A–6690302, Valenzuela, Aurelio, or Aurelio Valensuella.

at Freeport, Ill., in the sum of $6,812.28, rep-

States citizenship at birth under the provi-

of Lincoln, Nebr., the sum of $2,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United

A-6690304, Valenzuela, Tiburcio Benjamin, or Benjamin Valenzuela or Benjamin Valensuella or Benjamin Valesuella.
A-6690303, Valenzuela, Jesus, or Jesus Valensuella.
A-6409902, Vanderweerd, John.
A-6331341, Wajntal, Mojzesz (alias Mark Wein).
A-7522626, Wing, Laura Mei-Lan Yee.
A-7632267, Wong, Lin You, or Lin Yao Huang.
A-6446635, Wong, Helen (alias Quong Tung (Tong) Marr or Mah or Helen Marr or Mar).
A-1379566, Zamudio-Lemos, Hilario.
A-6239400, Zamudio-Soto, Ramon.
A-5397099, Zeid, Fanny.
A-5316226, Zeid, Max, formerly Zagdenwar.
A-7501012, Zetting, Mary Theresa, or Robertson, Robinson, Smith.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 22) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each person hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

A-9771331, Aase, Aksel.
A-1609228, Arline, Mary Jean Hartley, or Jean Hartley.
A-1219242, Athansiu, George John, or Georgios Athanasiu or Athanasiou.
A-4854961, Attard Emmanuele.
A-3520682, Barreiros, Manuel Lopes, or Manuel Lopes.
A-9658310, Blackstone, Harry Hyman.
A-2914281, Blohme, Christian.
A-5439241, Bruck, Charlotte (nee Grosz).
A-4523939, Buras, Kyriaki, or Kyreaki or Kyreai Buras or Moskos or Prokopios (nee Panagaki).
A-9545512, Canoura, José Davila.
A-3998473, Carreon, Juan.
A-6619105, Carrillo, Ramiro, or Ramiro Carrillo Ceniceros.
A-3767452, Astorga, Maria Del Refugio.
A-4608943, Cavanna, Santo.
A-6261650, Cortis, Maria (nee Papapangiotou), or Maria Athansiou Papapangiotou.
A-5916075, Donaghy, Patrick.
A-4439870, Collins, Alice Mildred Eileen (nee Copping).
A-6590300, Farkas, Stephen.
A-6690301, Farkas, Edith (nee Edith Tamasay-Czepan).
A-2970263, Franceschi, Sergio Constantino.
A-7655442, Geerts, Arjen Johan.
A-2801732, Granberg, Oscar Herbert.
A-4121781, Gregorio, Giovanni.
A-4103261, Guha-Thakurta, Leelabati, or Leela Rodman or Ranu Devi.
A-6214495, Gunn, Maria Lok.
A-5796741, Hall, Ida Ruth (nee Dorfman).
A-9706110, Hansen, Bjarne.
A-6261538, Jianakas, Marika (nee Papakostantinu aka Marika Giannakos) (nee Mary Johnson).
A-4226353, Johnson, Albert Nathan.
A-5780662, Jones, Edgar Robert.
A-3469233, Kaminski, Stanley George (alias Stanislaus Wladislaw Kaminski).
A-3269191, Lausch, Eduard.
A-6240442, Lekas, Alexandria or Alexandra Lekkas (nee Bargi).
A-6425302, Lopez-Garcia, Alfredo.
A-6192538, Majia, Evangelina.
A-6054209, Maletis, Mary, or Mary Maletiou or Maria Pantelis or Maria S. Cholakedes.
A-5172340, Marmorato, Pasquale or Patsy.
A-6475719, Mary, Dorothy (nee Taylor Simpson).
A-6506972, McClave, Mary Agnes (nee Spence).
A-9632483, Miettinen, Kaarlo Vilho.
A-6246458, Nazaretian, Felice.
A-6070328, Newgord, Esther (nee Goldstein), alias Esther Haimovitch alias Esther Katz.
A-5414622, Nimeth, Margaret (nee Margaret Barta), alias Margaret Semon.
A-9740975, Olsen, Arnold Emmanuel (alias Arnold E. Olsen).
A-4552326, Parsons, Robert Joseph, or Robert Parsons.
A-4264159, Perivolaris, Nicolaos or Lignos or Nick Peris or Pares or Nick John Peres.
A-3334747, Philpin, Bridget, or Bessie or Bridget Gallagher.
A-2970069, Pina, Francisco, or Joao Andrade.
A-6285765, Plevritis, Constantine Elias.
A-6040048, Provo, Rose Marie, or Mary Margaret French or Margaret Franche.
A-1670564, Reifenkugel, Helene, or Helene Bergstraesser.
A-2463860, Roberts, Irene, or Irene Gluck.
A-1446003, Rodrigues, Joaquim, or Joaquim Rodriguez.
A-3183742, Rousku, Terho Otto.
A-4873047, San, Wong Siu, or Mrs. Mary Wong, or Wong Shee or Mrs. Chong (Cheung) or Wah Chuen.
A-2087806, Scialpi, Luigi, or Louis Scalpi.
A-9513664, Sobkowiak, Jan.
A-6645635, Spitzer, Blima (nee Hers).
A-5368957, Tabah, Jacob (alias Charles Belmonte).
A-4875571, Tabah, Esther or Belmonte (nee Mitrani).
A-4677697, Hecht, Dora or Donna (nee Tabah), or Belmonte.
A-9561362, Tellefsen, Harold Stefanus.
A-5406230, Thomopoulos, Demetrios or James, or James Moskos or James Thomas.
A-6151164, Tracy, Maria Pacita.
A-2755717, Tranoris, Eleftheri Constantinos.
A-6345270, Tushinis, Maria.
A-6659024, Vafias, Apostolos.
A-6057885, Vincencio-Abogado, Antonio, or Antonio Abogado Vicencio.
A-9568998, Vlachos, Theodore, or Theodore J. Biahos or Theodoros Vlachos.
A-4587936, Weiss, Hilda Edith (nee Billing).
A-5064038, Wheeler, Estefania (nee Bondad).
A-6360238, Whittle, Robert Albert (formerly Anderson).
A-6174003, Wojciech, Thaddeus.
A-6174056, Kowalski, Stanley Hubert.
A-7782660, Woodman, Flora Eileen Kathrine (nee McDonald).
A-4928605, Zarate, Jacoba Petronella (nee Fruin).

GRAIN-STORAGE FACILITIES—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 900) to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let the bill go over.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection for just a moment, please?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will not indefinitely postpone action upon this measure. This bill contains a provision for storage facilities for grain, a matter which was quite prominently featured in the recent political campaign. The bill has been thoroughly studied by the Committee on Agriculture. It follows to a large degree the suggestions made a year ago by the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], although of course not all of the provisions of the bill are of his making.

The bill has been subjected to a great deal of compromise; but the time for the storage of grain is upon us, for the harvest will be beginning in a short time. This matter is of particular concern to the farmers of Minnesota and North Dakota; and the Senators from those States, I am sure, will agree that the farmers need these facilities for storing their grain.

So I am very sorry that there is any objection to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, let me say that, in view of the recent political campaign, I am surprised that the bill has not been on the calendar before.

Mr. ANDERSON. There has been some disturbance in the Senate for about 3 weeks.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, it will take the former Secretary of Agriculture, the present Senator from New Mexico, and some of his colleagues longer than 5 minutes to explain satisfactorily some of the loose statements made by President Truman and Secretary of Agriculture Brannan during the recent campaign regarding the question of inadequate grain-storage facilities.

I do not think it will take me more than 20 minutes to prove that the charges upon this question against the Republican Eightieth Congress were without any foundation whatsoever.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator object to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from New Mexico, who is the author of this bill——

Mr. ANDERSON. No, I am not its author. I am a sponsor, along with other Senators, but merely presented to them a draft of the bill in which all of us have joined.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand, but the Senator from New Mexico has been one of the chief members of the Agriculture Committee who has been insisting that a bill of this kind should reach the calendar. I hope the Senator from New Mexico, at the close of the call of the calendar, after the Senator from Georgia disposes of his bill, will then move to take up this bill. In that event, we shall remain here until we pass it.

Mr. ANDERSON. I certainly shall do that.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Delaware has objected.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER subsequently said:

Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity of clarifying the RECORD with respect to the Commodity Credit Corporation bill report, which I signed, but with reservations as to one provision of the bill as reported. That provision concerns unlimited authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire real estate throughout the United States.

I have been assured that there is a good possibility that that situation can be reconciled, and I did not want the unanimous and unqualified endorsement as reported.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished Senator from Illinois whether he intends to bring the bill up later today. If so, I have no objection.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to have the bill considered this afternoon, when it can be explained.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I understood it was the intention to bring up the rent-control bill, and I was wondering whether it was the intention to replace it by this bill. I have no objection to bringing this up. I should like to have had notice a day or two ago.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has objected; therefore, further discussion is out of order.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am claiming the floor in my own right for about 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator cannot do that, under objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I withhold my objection.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not care, Mr. President, whether Senator withholds his objection or not.

The VICE PRESIDENT. After an objection is made to a bill——

Mr. LUCAS. Very well; let the next bill be called, then.

Mr. WILLIAMS. All right; I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois may take 5 minutes on the next bill.

The bill (H. R. 2546) to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish land-based air warning control installations for the national security, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, returning now——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is reserving the right to object to this bill, is he not?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes. I reserve my right to object to this bill.

Mr. President, I wish Senators would let me alone for a few minutes. I think I can get along, if I do not receive too much advice from Senators.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order. Those in the rear of the Senate Chamber will cease conversing.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, returning for a moment to Calendar 108, Senate bill 900, which is the bill which has just been discussed by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], I may say the bill has been reported favorably, unanimously, by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. To my way of thinking it is one of the most important measures from the standpoint of emergency that the Congress is called upon to consider.

In view of the unanimous report, it seems to me it should not take too long to pass the bill. I thought perhaps we might get the bill out of the way this afternoon before taking up rent control. In the event it appears that it is going to take a long time for debate or discussion, obviously I would move to lay it aside in order to make rent control the unfinished business for Monday. In view of the emergency nature of the bill, it seems to me we ought to get some action as quickly as possible.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am wondering whether I may address an inquiry to the distinguished majority leader, in view of the announcement made by him last night. I am in total sympathy with having the Commodity Credit Corporation bill considered as quickly as possible, but in view of the announcement made that at the end of the call of the calendar, the majority leader would move to make the rent-control bill the unfinished business. Certain Senators who would like very much to participate in discussions of the calendar number on which the Senator is now speaking, might not be here.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the bill, it is true, came before the committee and was reported unanimously. I fear that some people probably are thinking about the bill in its original form. There was certain opposition to the bill in its original form in the committee, but all the differences of opinion in the committee were ironed out and the amended bill was agreed upon. I believe if the Senator from Delaware will read the bill, with the amendments, he will withdraw the objection.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. Reserving the right to object, I may say I happen to be a member of the committee that had under consideration this bill. I was unavoidably absent from the last meeting of the committee and did not participate in the final consideration of the bill or in the vote on the bill, so in that sense the report of the committee is not unanimous, although I did not vote against it. I did not vote at all. I am in sympathy with the position taken by the Senator from Delaware that the bill should have further more detailed consideration.

Mr. LUCAS. In view of the last suggestion made, of course, I shall not press it. I was under the impression the Senator from Missouri had also voted along with other Senators for the bill.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. May I finish my statement? I hope the able Senator from Missouri in the meantime will examine the bill and confer with the Senator from Delaware, to see whether we cannot get the bill out of the way the next time the calendar is called.

Mr. KEM. For the information of the Senator from Illinois, I should like to say, it is not the provisions of the bill to which he has referred, with reference to the storage of grain, about which I am in doubt, but it is the provisions of the bill that place in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture the exclusive right to appoint directors of this tremendous business corporation. Heretofore there have been two outside directors, two outside members of the Board of Directors. The bill will do away with that and provide that all members of the Board of Directors shall be appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture. An Advisory Council is set up, composed of members from the outside, but under the provisions of the bill, I understand the Advisory Council will have no authority, but will merely have the privilege of meeting four times a year and expressing their views. I do not mean to say I am against the bill, but I mean to say I should like an opportunity to consider it further before we reach a decision.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator would withhold his objection long enough for me to clarify the RECORD made thus far, in respect to certain statements.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if I understood correctly, we are now on the next bill. The other bill went over. The Senator may get the floor in his own right.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That bill has already gone over. The Senator from Illinois is speaking on the next bill, which will be stated again.

LAND-BASED AIR WARNING CONTROL INSTALLATIONS

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2546) to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish land-based air warning control installations for the national security and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2546) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 1731) to extend certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. TAFT. Over.

Mr. VANDENBERG and Mr. HICKENLOOPER addressed the Chair.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

The VICE PRESIDENT. This is the rent-control bill. The Chair understands it will be made the unfinished business before the day is over.

ACQUISITION OF SITES FOR FEDERAL BUILDINGS

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to ask consent to return to Calendar No. 72, Senate bill 714, the Senator who objected to its consideration

having withdrawn his objection, and I did not want Senators to leave the Chamber under the impression that I would not make the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill to provide for comprehensive planning, for site acquisition in and outside of the District of Columbia, and for the design of Federal building projects outside of the District of Columbia; to authorize the transfer of jurisdiction over certain lands between certain departments and agencies of the United States; and to provide certain additional authority needed in connection with the construction, management, and operation of Federal public buildings; and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to get a few questions answered in the RECORD with regard to Senate bill 714. Am I correct in my understanding that the bill has received unanimous committee endorsement?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct.

Mr. LODGE. Am I correct in my understanding that the only part of the bill which applies to the District of Columbia is that which relates to certain lots on Virginia Avenue?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct in his understanding as to any major feature of the bill. There is a minor feature of the bill which has to do with the names of buildings, with authority to change them with the consent of the Bureau of the Budget. They are buildings which are now being used by agencies other than the ones for which they were originally intended.

Mr. LODGE. Are those provisions of the bill which relate to the District endorsed by the Planning Board and the Fine Arts Commission?

Mr. HOLLAND. It was so stated during the hearings, I will say to the Senator, by the Public Buildings Administrator.

Mr. LODGE. I have no objection, in that case.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if I may make a brief statement——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 714), which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments, on page 2, line 12, to insert:

Whenever the Federal Works Administrator shall determine such action to be necessary, such investigations, studies, preparation of plans, sketches, working drawings, and specifications, may be undertaken prior to the approval of title to the sites by the Attorney General.

On page 2, lines 18 and 19, to strike out "under regulations to be prescribed by him"; on page 3, line 7, to strike out "the revised" and to insert the word "such"; in line 8, at the end of the line, to strike out "the", and in line 9, to insert, at the beginning of the line, the word "such";

On page 10, line 25, to strike out "seventy-ninth" and insert "seventy-sixth".

On page 11, line 9, after the word "law", to insert:

(except the act of May 20, 1932, 47 Stat. 161).

On page 12, line 16, to strike out, "however", and insert, "further."

On page 14, in section 301, to strike out:

SEC. 301. The Commissioner of Public Buildings is authorized to formulate, undertake and prosecute a program for the renovation and improvement of federally owned buildings for which funds are not otherwise provided, including appurtenances, accessories, and approaches thereto, that are under the control of the Public Buildings Administration for repair and preservation.

And to insert:

The Commissioner of Public Buildings is authorized to formulate, undertake, and prosecute a program for the renovation and improvement of federally owned buildings outside the District of Columbia, for which funds are not otherwise available, including appurtenances, and approaches thereto, that are under the control of the Public Buildings Administration for repair and preservation: *Provided*,

On page 14, line 25, to insert, "Provided further"; on page 15, line 25, after the word, "agency", insert "Provided"; on page 16, line 4, after the word, "employed", insert:

Provided, further, That nothing contained in this section shall relieve the Commissioner of Public Buildings or any other duly authorized contracting officer of the Public Buildings Administration who shall execute a construction contract from the responsibility of interpreting such contract, of passing on the acceptability of materials and workmanship supplied pursuant to such contract, of approving changes in such contract during the construction period, of certifying vouchers for payments becoming due the contractor, or of effecting final settlement of the contract.

On page 16, strike out, in section 402:

SEC. 402. Section 5 of the Public Buildings Act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 630), is hereby amended to delete the following words which appear at the end thereof: "and to charge against the total sum of $150,000,000 hereinbefore authorized only the respective net excess cost, if any, over and above the proceeds of such sales, or providing such new sites and buildings", and after the words "miscellaneous receipts" change the comma to a period.

On page 17, line 3, strike out "SEC. 403."

On page 17, line 21, after the word, "for", insert, "provided"; and strike out, "reserve or"; on page 18, line 1, after the word, "receipts", insert, "provided further"; and insert:

SEC. 403. Section 5 of the Public Buildings Act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 630), is hereby amended to delete the following words which appear at the end of the last paragraph thereof: "and to charge against the total sum of $150,000,000 hereinbefore authorized only the respective net excess cost, if any, over and above the proceeds of such sales, or providing such new sites and buildings," and after the words "miscellaneous receipts" change the comma to a period.

On page 18, in line 20, strike out "projects" and insert "project"; and in line 25, after the word "on", strike out "a reasonable basis" and insert "the basis of full reimbursement"; on page 19, strike out:

SEC. 407. The Commissioner of Public Buildings is authorized to procure space in the District of Columbia by lease, except for the Post Office Department, for such periods not in excess of 5 years as he may deem in the public interest.

And insert:

SEC. 407. The Commissioner of Public Buildings is authorized to procure space in the District of Columbia by lease, upon such terms and for such period, not in excess of 1 year, as he may deem in the public interest, for the housing of any Federal agency or agencies, except the Post Office Department, and to assign and reassign such space. As used in this section, the term "Federal agency" means any executive department (except the Post Office Department), independent establishment, commission, board, bureau, in the executive branch, or other agency of the United States, including wholly owned Government corporations.

On page 21, strike out:

SEC. 410. The Federal Works Administrator is authorized to develop and institute a system for the designation and identification of buildings in the custody and jurisdiction of the Federal Works Agency for which purpose he is empowered, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to discard and abandon the name or designation of any building and to designate it by such name, number, symbol, or other device as he shall stipulate: *Provided*, That such name, number, symbol, or device may likewise be changed and rechanged from time to time by appropriate action of said Administrator.

And insert in lieu thereof:

SEC. 410. The Federal Works Administrator with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget is authorized, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to change or rechange the name or designation of any building in the custody and jurisdiction of the Federal Works Agency.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Public Buildings Act of 1949."

TITLE I—COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING OF FEDERAL PUBLIC BUILDINGS OUTSIDE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

SEC. 101. The Federal Works Administrator is authorized to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, donation, exchange, or otherwise, lands or interests in lands as sites or additions to sites for Federal public building projects previously authorized and for such new projects as may be selected in the manner designated in this section, to make investigations and studies and to prepare plans, sketches, working drawings, and specifications for such projects. Whenever the Federal Works Administrator shall determine such action to be necessary, such investigations, studies, preparation of plans, sketches, working drawings, and specifications, may be undertaken prior to the approval of title to the sites by the Attorney General. When buildings to be use in whole or in part for post-office purposes are involved, the Federal Works Administrator shall act jointly with the Postmaster General in the selection of towns or cities in which buildings are to be constructed, and in the choice of sites therein for such projects. The Federal Works Administrator and the Postmaster General shall submit to the Congress a comprehensive report of all eligible projects and their limits of cost when in excess of $200,000, without regard to the time in which they may be undertaken, which report shall be printed as a public document. When the estimated cost of a project does not exceed $200,000 the

limit of cost shall be determined by the Commissioner of Public Buildings. Selection of projects for the purposes of this title shall be made by the Federal Works Administrator and the Postmaster General from such report and they may also select such other projects not included in such report which in their judgment are economically sound and advantageous to the public service: *Provided*, That in making such selections they shall endeavor to distribute the selected projects equitably but not necessarily uniformly throughout the country with due regard to the comparative urgency of projects in various sections of the country.

SEC. 102. For carrying out the purposes of this title, including administrative, supervisory, traveling, and other expenses in connection therewith, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $40,000,000 to remain available until expended.

TITLE II—ACQUISITION OF SITES AND TRANSFER OF JURISDICTION OVER SITES BY VARIOUS AGENCIES AND DEPARTMENTS OF THE GOVERNMENT

SEC. 201. The Federal Works Administrator is authorized to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, donation, exchange or otherwise, land situate in the northwest section of the District of Columbia designated as squares 11, 19, 20, and 32, said land to be used wholly or in part together with other Government-owned land adjacent or in close proximity thereto as the site or sites for a departmental building or builders project authorized to be constructed thereon.

SEC. 202. In order to provide a more suitable site for the new San Diego, Point Loma, Calif., quarantine station, the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized and directed to transfer to the control and jurisdiction of the Federal Works Agency, without reimbursement, a parcel of land in the city of San Diego, county of San Diego, State of California, described as follows:

Commencing at an old stone monument marked "U. S. M. R.," on the northerly boundary line of the naval fuel annex, said point being the true point of beginning; thence from said true point of beginning north eighty-nine degrees thirty-one minutes thirty-five seconds east one hundred and eleven and six one-hundredths feet, more or less, to a point on the mean high-tide line of San Diego Bay; thence south five degrees twenty-two minutes fifty seconds west along the mean high-tide line three hundred and ten and eleven one-hundredths feet; thence south one degree fifteen minutes forty-five seconds west along the mean high-tide line one hundred and three and fifty one-hundredths feet; thence leaving said mean high-tide line south eighty-nine degrees thirty-one minutes thirty-five seconds west five hundred and eighty-seven and nine one-hundredths feet; thence north one degree thirty-eight minutes twenty-five seconds west two hundred and one and forty-three one-hundredths feet; thence north twelve degrees twenty-four minutes forty-five seconds east two hundred and sixteen and nine one-hundredths feet to a point on the northerly boundary line of the naval fuel annex; thence along said northerly line of the naval fuel annex north eighty-nine degrees thirty-one minutes, thirty-five seconds east four hundred and sixty-six and seventy-four one-hundredths feet to the true point of beginning, containing five and six-tenths acres, more or less;

And the Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized and directed to transfer to the control and jurisdiction of the Department of the Navy, without reimbursement, all the land comprising the present quarantine station site lying and being in the city of San Diego, county of San Diego, State of California, bounded on the south by First Street, on the west by San Antonio Avenue, on the north by Colorado Street, and on the east by San Diego Bay.

SEC. 203. The Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized and directed to transfer to the jurisdiction and control of the Department of the Army, without reimbursement, for use for military purposes all the land comprising the present quarantine station situated on Quarantine and Sand Islands, Honolulu, Oahu, T. H., described as follows:

Beginning at the southwest corner of tract C transferred to the Commerce Department by the War Department by Executive Order Numbered 6584, dated February 6, 1934, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station "South Base, Sand Island" being two thousand three hundred and fifty-nine and ninety-three one-hundredths feet north and one thousand three hundred and forty-six and five one-hundredths feet west, and running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south (1) one hundred and five degrees thirty minutes thirty seconds five hundred feet along Sand Island Military Reservation to a pipe in concrete; thence (2) along the arc of a curve to the right having a radius of four hundred and ninety feet a distance of one hundred and one and eighteen one-hundredths feet to a plate in concrete, the direct azimuth and distance being seventy degrees twenty minutes twenty seconds one hundred and one feet; thence (3) continuing along the arc of said curve a distance of seven hundred and eighty-four and forty-nine one-hundredths feet to a pipe in concrete the direct azimuth and distance being fifty-nine degrees six minutes no seconds seven hundred and three and thirty-five one-hundredths feet; thence (4) one hundred and five degrees no minutes no seconds one thousand five hundred and twenty feet to a pipe in concrete; thence (5) along the arc of a curve to the right having a radius of seven hundred and thirty feet a distance of two thousand five hundred and twenty-five and eighty-eight one-hundredths feet, the direct azimuths and distances being one hundred and ninety-five degrees no minutes no seconds seven hundred and thirty feet to a concrete monument and two hundred and thirteen degrees fifteen minutes no seconds seven hundred and thirty feet; thence (6) three hundred and three degrees fifteen minutes no seconds one thousand six hundred and seven and forty-seven one-hundredths feet to a pipe in concrete; thence (7) two hundred and thirty degrees thirty minutes no seconds five hundred and twenty-three and eighty-eight one-hundredths feet to a pipe in concrete; thence (8) three hundred and four degrees thirty-three minutes no seconds six hundred and fifty-two feet along Reserved Channel and Honolulu Harbor and passing over a pipe in concrete at fifty-two feet; thence (9) along tract C hereinbefore cited (transferred to Commerce Department by the War Department by the aforesaid Executive Order Numbered 6584, dated February 6, 1934), thirty-three degrees thirty-seven minutes thirty seconds five hundred and fifty-six and sixty-six one-hundredths feet to the point of beginning, containing an area of eighty-one and ninety-four one-hundredths acres, more or less, together with the improvements thereon;

And the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to transfer to the jurisdiction and control of the Federal Works Agency, without reimbursement, for use as a quarantine station at Honolulu, Hawaii, the following described land:

That portion of the Fort Armstrong Military Reservation, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, particularly described as beginning at the north corner of the land herein described on the southeast side of Channel Street, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station "Punchbowl" being four thousand four hundred and twelve and twenty-three one-hundredths feet south and five thousand six hundred and seventy-eight and thirty-nine one-hundredths feet west and running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south (1) three hundred and nine degrees three minutes no seconds one hundred and sixty-seven and one one-hundredth feet along other lands of Fort Armstrong Military Reservation, and along the southwest side of Buford Avenue; (2) thirty-eight degrees fifty-seven minutes twenty seconds ninety-six and seventy one-hundredths feet along said other lands of Fort Armstrong Military Reservation; (3) three hundred and eight degrees forty-eight minutes thirty seconds twenty-five and ninety-eight one-hundredths feet along said other lands; (4) thirty-eight degrees forty-eight minutes thirty seconds two hundred and thirty-one and sixty-one one-hundredths feet along said other lands; (5) three hundred and eight degrees fifty-nine minutes thirty seconds one hundred and thirteen and ninety-three one-hundredths feet along said other lands; (6) thirty-seven degrees eight minutes no seconds seventy-seven and twenty-five one-hundredths feet along said other lands; (7) three hundred and nine degrees no minutes forty seconds one hundred and seven and ninety-four one-hundredths feet along said other lands; (8) thirty-eight degrees fifty-seven minutes no seconds five hundred and twenty-two and ninety-eight one-hundredths feet along said other lands and along the northwest side of Pleasanton Avenue; (9) thirty-nine degrees no minutes two thousand three hundred and eighty-two and ninety-one one-hundredths feet; (10) one hundred and forty-five degrees no minutes ninety-eight and thirty-one one-hundredths feet; (11) one hundred and eighty-nine degrees twenty-five minutes one thousand two hundred and six and eighty-seven one-hundredths feet; (12) two hundred and nineteen degrees no minutes one thousand seven hundred and five and fifty-five one-hundredths feet; (13) three hundred and nine degrees no minutes two hundred and seventy-one and sixty-four one-hundredths feet to a brass plate set in concrete, passing over a brass plate set in sea wall at two hundred and ten and ninety-four one-hundredths feet; (14) two hundred and nineteen degrees no minutes five hundred and twenty-nine and twenty-eight one-hundredths feet along the southeast side of Channel Street to the point of beginning, and containing an area of thirty-nine and sixty-five one-hundredths acres, together with all riparian, littoral, and shore rights thereunto belonging or in anywise appertaining, and all improvements thereon except the gun emplacement and foundations, the space enclosed in which is in use and is to be continued in use by the Department of the Army for telephone terminals and exchange until June 30, 1969, the foundations to be thereafter removed by the Department of the Army before possession of the land on which same are situate is finally made available to the Federal Works Agency for quarantine-station purposes: *Provided*, That said date of June 30, 1969, may be either anticipated or deferred by mutual agreement of the Department of the Army and the Federal Works Administrator.

SEC. 204. The Federal Works Administrator, with respect to buildings and the sites thereof acquired by him under titles II and IV of the act of October 14, 1940 (Public Law 849, 76th Cong.), as amended, together with the furnishings and equipment located therein and the appurtenances thereto, which in his determination are suitable for use by the Public Buildings Administration in performing its functions, is hereby authorized to transfer jurisdiction and control over such buildings, sites, furnishings, equipment, and appurtenances to the Public Buildings Administration, without reimbursement therefor.

SEC. 205. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law (except the act of May 20, 1932, 47 Stat. 161), upon the request of the Federal Works Administrator, any department, agency, or independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government, including any corporation, all of the capital stock of which is owned or controlled directly or indirectly by the Government and any real property disposal agency, may, in its discretion, transfer jurisdiction and control over any real property, in whole or in severable part, including improvements, if any, located thereon, which is under the jurisdiction and control of, or title to which property is in, any such department, agency, or independent establishment, to the Public Buildings Administration or to the United States for the use and benefit of the Public Buildings Administration, as the case may be, without reimbursement or payment therefor: *Provided*, That the Federal Works Administrator shall have made a determination that the property to be so transferred is suitable for use by the Public Buildings Administration in performing its functions. In the case of any real property transferred to the Public Buildings Administration, pursuant to this section, by a corporation, all of the capital stock of which is owned or controlled directly or indirectly by the Government, a conveyance to the United States of America, without representation or warranty, of all right, title, and interest of such corporation therein shall be made, and thereupon the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to cancel notes or otherwise discharge the indebtedness to the Treasury of such corporation in an amount equal to the fair market value of the property at the time of the transfer of jurisdiction and control to the Public Buildings Administration, which fair market value shall be determined by the Federal Works Administrator and the head of such corporation: *Provided further*, That in the event the Federal Works Administrator and the head of such corporation shall fail to agree, the fair market value of such property shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury.

(b) The Federal Works Administrator shall report to the Congress not later than April 1 in each year on transfers or conveyances made pursuant to this section during the preceding calendar year.

SEC. 206. The Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized to assume permanent custody and control for the use of the Public Roads Administration, without reimbursement, the property located within the area known as Vancouver Barracks, in Vancouver, Wash., consisting of two buildings numbered 689 and 698, and five and three-tenths acres, more or less, of land described as follows:

Beginning at a point on the east line of West Reserve Street and the north line of East Fifth Street in the southeast quarter of section 27, township 2 north, range 1 west, Willamette meridian, in the city of Vancouver, county of Clark, State of Washington, which point is a bronze disk monument, said point being north twenty-two degrees thirty-seven minutes east, a distance of one thousand four hundred and seventy-four and seven-tenths feet; thence south eighty-three degrees ten minutes east, a distance of exactly forty-eight feet from the southeast corner of Amos Short donation land claim; thence north twenty-two degrees thirty-seven minutes east, a distance of two hundred and sixty-eight and three-tenths feet; thence south eighty-three degrees ten minutes east, a distance of eight hundred and sixty and six-tenths feet; thence south twenty degrees seventeen minutes west, a distance of two hundred and seventy-eight and eight-tenths feet; thence north eighty-five degrees twelve minutes west, a distance of exactly seventy-three feet; thence north eighty-three degrees ten minutes west, a distance of two hundred and eighty-four and five-tenths feet; thence north sixty-eight degrees twenty-three minutes west, a distance of sixty-one and five-tenths feet; thence north eighty-three degrees ten minutes west, a distance of four hundred and fifty-one and nine-tenths feet to the point of beginning.

TITLE III—IMPROVEMENT OF EXISTING BUILDINGS

SEC. 301. The Commissioner of Public Buildings is authorized to formulate, undertake, and prosecute a program for the renovation and improvement of federally owned buildings outside the District of Columbia, for which funds are not otherwise available, including appurtenances, and approaches thereto, that are under the control of the Public Buildings Administration for repair and preservation: *Provided*, That where necessary or desirable in carrying out the program herein authorized, additional land may be acquired to accommodate equipment or special appliances and devices proposed to be installed or to provide working areas to accomplish the objectives sought in this title: *Provided further*, That no project, the estimated cost of which is less than $25,000 shall be deemed to be eligible for the program authorized by this title.

SEC. 302. For carrying out the purposes of this title, including administrative, supervisory, traveling, and other expenses in connection therewith, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $30,000,000 to remain available until expended.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS AND GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. (a) In addition to the authority conferred upon him by any other law the Commissioner of Public Buildings, whenever he deems it desirable or advantageous, is authorized to employ, by contract or otherwise and without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, or to the civil-service laws, rules, and regulations or to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, the services of established architectural or other professional or technical corporations, firms or individuals, to such extent as he may require for any public building project which the Public Buildings Administration is authorized by Congress to construct, or for any such project, funds for which are transferred by another agency to the Public Buildings Administration for construction of the project, regardless of specific legislation governing such other agency: *Provided*, That this authorization shall not apply to the employment of such corporations, firms or individuals on a permanent basis, but their services shall be limited to the individual project for which employed: *Provided further*, That nothing contained in this section shall relieve the Commissioner of Public Buildings or any other duly authorized contracting officer of the Public Buildings Administration who shall execute a construction contract from the responsibility of interpreting such contract, of passing on the acceptability of materials and workmanship supplied pursuant to such contract, of approving changes in such contract during the construction period, of certifying vouchers for payments becoming due the contractor, or of effecting final settlement of the contract.

(b) The Commissioner of Public Buildings is hereby authorized, whenever he deems it to be in the public interest, to hold a competition for the design of any project, to stipulate the terms, scope, and the conditions of each such competition and to make awards in pursuance thereof.

SEC. 402. The third paragraph of section 5 of the Public Buildings Act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 630), as amended, is hereby deleted and the following is hereby substituted therefor:

"With respect to sites or additions to sites acquired under this act, the Commissioner of Public Buildings is hereby authorized, in his discretion to rent, until they are needed for construction purposes, such sites or additions to sites and any improvements located thereon not reserved by the vendors, at a fair rental value and upon such terms and conditions as he may deem to be in the public interest. Such rentals may be deposited into a common fund account or accounts in the Treasury, and notwithstanding the provisions of the act of June 30, 1932 (40 U. S. C. 303b), shall be available to pay the cost of such maintenance, repair and alterations of any improvements located on such sites or additions to sites as is necessary to keep them in rentable condition and for the establishment of necessary reserves therefor: *Provided*, That except for such necessary reserves, as determined by the Commissioner, the unobligated balances of rentals so deposited into the Treasury shall be covered at the end of each fiscal year into miscellaneous receipts: *Provided further*, That with respect to improvements on such sites or additions to sites which are suitable for residential purposes only and the estimated anual rentals of which will not exceed $1,200, the Commissioner may enter into leases without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended."

SEC. 403. Section 5 of the Public Buildings Act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 630), is hereby amended to delete the following words which appear at the end of the last paragraph thereof: "and to charge against the total sum of $150,000,000 hereinbefore authorized only the respective net excess cost, if any, over and above the proceeds of such sales, or providing such new sites and buildings", and after the words "miscellaneous receipts" change the comma to a period.

SEC. 404. The Federal Works Administrator, together with the Postmaster General where his office is concerned, is authorized to accept on behalf of the United States unconditional gifts of real, personal, or other property in aid of any project or function within their respective jurisdictions.

SEC. 405. The provisions of section 601 of the Economy Act, approved June 30, 1932, as amended, are hereby extended to authorize the Public Buildings Administration to furnish services in the continental United States on the basis of full reimbursement, at the request of the State Department, to any international body with which the United States Government is affiliated.

SEC. 406. The Commissioner of Public Buildings is authorized to contract for seeding, planting, or landscaping the grounds of any public building constructed or acquired by the Public Buildings Administration in an amount not exceeding $1,800, without reference to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes.

SEC. 407. The Commissioner of Public Buildings is authorized to procure space in the District of Columbia by lease, upon such terms and for such period, not in excess of 1 year, as he may deem in the public interest, for the housing of any Federal agency or agencies, except the Post Office Department, and to assign and reassign such space. As used in this section, the term "Federal agency" means any executive department (except the Post Office Department), independent establishment, commission, board, bureau, in the executive branch, or other agency of the United States, including wholly owned Government corporations.

SEC. 408. The Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized to enter into such agreements with the city of Chicago, Ill., as he shall deem necessary and in the public interest, in connection with the construction by the said city of a superhighway through the Congress Street Post Office located in said city. For the purposes of this section there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sum as shall be necessary to defray such cost, if any, which said Administrator shall determine should be borne by the United States as an incident to the construction by the said city of the superhighway through said post office.

SEC. 409. The Federal Works Administrator and the Postmaster General shall submit to the Congress promptly after the convening of each new Congress, reports showing the location and the approximate accommodations of such public-building projects throughout the United States, its Territories and possessions, as they shall find eligible to be constructed in accordance with applicable statutory provisions. Such reports shall indicate the limit of cost of each project when in excess of $200,000. When the estimated cost of a project does not exceed $200,000 the limit of cost shall be determined by the Commissioner of Public Buildings. The report herein provided for shall supersede the report required by the Public Buildings Act of 1926 (44 Stat. 630, as amended).

SEC. 410. The Federal Works Administrator with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget is authorized, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to change or rechange the name or designation of any building in the custody and jurisdiction of the Federal Works Agency.

SEC. 411. All acts and parts of acts inconsistent or in conflict with the foregoing provisions are hereby repealed to the extent of such inconsistency or conflict.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that that concludes the calendar?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I gave notice before the calendar was called, that I would request recognition for 10 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct, but inasmuch as the Senator from Missouri had the floor assuming that the calendar had been completed, he may proceed.

Mr. LODGE. I gave notice before that.

NOMINATION OF DR. JAMES BOYD TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE BUREAU OF MINES

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, after careful consideration I have decided to support the confirmation of Dr. James Boyd to be Director of the Bureau of Mines. I have approached the matter in the first instance from the standpoint of the welfare of the workers involved in the basic industries which are under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Mines. I believe Dr. Boyd's demonstrated ability, training, and experience give assurance that under his administration the various functions of the Bureau of Mines will be conducted honestly, efficiently, and along sound and constructive lines.

The Senate may be interested to know what some citizens of my State, who are in a position to appraise the personal qualities and professional qualifications of Dr. Boyd, think of him. I have received many letters concerning him, and I should like to quote from three of them, one of which is from Edward L. Clark, Missouri State geologist. Mr. Clark says:

Many of us in the mineral industries are becoming quite concerned with the failure of the Senate to confirm Dr. James Boyd, of Colorado, as the Director of the United States Bureau of Mines. I am personally acquainted with Dr. Boyd and am confident that he will make us an excellent Director. It is my opinion that he will be far superior to the former Director, Dr. Sayers.

It is my understanding that Dr. Boyd's confirmation is being delayed because of efforts on the part of Mr. John L. Lewis, who insists that the Director come from the coal industry. As a matter of fact, the activities of the coal industry constitutes less than 10 percent of the program of the United States Bureau of Mines. It will be a mistake to permit Mr. Lewis to dictate who is to be the new Director. I am confident that Dr. Boyd will not neglect the coal industry should he be confirmed.

Here is another letter, from George M. Fowler, consulting geologist, of Joplin, Mo. Mr. Fowler states:

The appointment of Mr. James A. Boyd as Director of the United States Bureau of Mines is before the Senate for their decision, and I earnestly hope that the Senate will confirm Mr. Boyd's appointment, as he is very well fitted by education, experience, and ability to serve as Director.

I have no direct financial interest in any mining property. My work for more than 30 years has been as a mining consultant in seeking and developing new mining properties in all parts of the United States and in Mexico and Canada.

As you know, our developed ore reserves are being depleted very rapidly. We can again be self-sufficient in many important minerals if Government and industry give their best efforts. The Bureau of Mines is a very important unit in this work.

Here is a letter from Ewart L. Petley, vice president and general manager of the Fredericktown Lead Co., of Fredericktown, Mo.:

I recently read a dispatch from Washington under date of February 25, in which it was stated that the United Mine Workers have resumed their activity to block the appointment of Dr. James Boyd as Director of the Bureau of Mines.

John L. Lewis uses as an excuse for his opposition to the appointment of Dr. Boyd the fact that he has not had any personal experience in coal mining. Dr. Sayers, who was a previous Director, was a protégé of John L. Lewis, and from my friends who are employed in the Bureau of Mines, I know that Dr. Sayers did not do a good job for the mining industry of this country as a whole. His chief qualification had to do with health and safety. I realize that the coal-mining industry and the safety factor in mining is a very important one, but I do not think that an engineer should become Director of the Bureau of Mines whose only experience has been in coal mining, for, after all, that is only one segment of our mining industry, and it will be impossible to find a man who has had experience in all types of mining operations. I know Dr. Boyd personally, and also know him by reputation for what he has accomplished in his life in the mining industry. I am thoroughly convinced, as I know is the mining industry as a whole, that Dr. Boyd will make one of the best Directors, if not the best, that the Bureau of Mines ever had. He is mindful of the importance of the coal-mining industry and of the importance of the health and safety factors, but his outlook is one which covers the entire mining field in all of its departments. Frankly, I have very strong feelings in regard to this matter. * * * I think this country has had enough of its John L. Lewis and his dictatorial attitude.

My decision in this case was arrived at after consideration both of the arguments which have been advanced against Dr. Boyd's confirmation, as well as those advanced in his favor. Some, at least, of the arguments against Dr. Boyd appear to have had their origin in the mind of one man, Mr. John L. Lewis. Unfortunately Mr. Lewis has a propensity for flying into a rage over any governmental action with regard to the mining industry which he himself does not initiate. In this instance, as in others in the past which are too well known, Mr. Lewis has been acting in a fit of pique. He attempted to dictate this nomination. Failing in that, he launched into a campaign which can be interpreted as nothing less than an effort to coerce the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, this is an appropriate time to inquire just how far this sort of thing may be carried. If Mr. Lewis were to be successful in the present instance, what might we expect of him next time? Suppose Mr. John L. Lewis did not like, for example, the new Secretary of State, or the Secretary of National Defense. Suppose Mr. Lewis did not approve of a President or a Congress chosen by the people. Following his course of conduct in the present instance, he would call out a vast number of mine workers and keep them out until he obtained a Secretary of State, a Secretary of National Defense, a President, or a Congress to his own liking.

The time to stop this sort of thing is right now before it goes any further. The time has come to let Mr. John L. Lewis know he is not the dictator of the United States, and incidentally to advise him in no uncertain terms that he cannot intimidate the Senate of the United States.

We have in the present instance the spectacle of some 425,000 mine workers and an additional 56,000 railroad employees directly affected by the whim of this one man. Of course, many additional thousands are affected indirectly.

Indications are that the present strike action will not result in any great calamity, except perhaps in the loss of wages of certain individuals. It just so happens that the stocks of coal are high. But suppose the stocks of coal were not adequate and the Nation were suffering from a shortage of coal. Let us be sure that we do not set a dangerous precedent that may arise later to plague us.

Mr. President, I do not always see eye to eye with the Truman administration. When I do it is a pleasure to say so. I hope the Senate will proceed promptly to confirm the nomination of Dr. James Boyd to be Director of the Bureau of Mines.

IMPORT TAXES ON COPPER

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 75, House bill 2313, to suspend certain import taxes on copper. I do not think the consideration of the bill will take any time, in view of some conversations I have had with the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], who raised objection to the bill when it was reached on the call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill

(H. R. 2313) to suspend certain import taxes on copper, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment; on page 1, line 5, after the word "sulfate," to insert "and other than composition metal provided for in paragraph 1657 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, which is suitable both in its composition and shape, without further refining or alloying, for processing into castings", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the import tax imposed under section 3425 of the Internal Revenue Code shall not apply with respect to articles (other than copper sulfate and other than composition metal provided for in paragraph 1657 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, which is suitable both in its composition and shape, without further refining or alloying, for processing into castings) entered for consumption or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption during the period beginning April 1, 1949, and ending with the close of March 31, 1951.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I may say, in connection with the amendment, that it was found that certain copper products were coming into the United States in avoidance of the tax imposed on them, and in a form in which they could be used as castings without further fabrication, and it was thought to be fair to American labor that this exception be made. That is the only committee amendment.

Mr. President, it is agreeable to me as chairman of the Committee on Finance to accept the amendment which the Senator from Nevada wishes to offer, that is, an amendment limiting the lifting of the copper ad valorem tax from 2 years to only 1 year. That would of course necessitate the return of the bill to the House, and if the House did not concur in the amendment, we would be compelled to go to conference on it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the able chairman of the Committee on Finance if the bill came from the committee with a unanimous report.

Mr. GEORGE. My recollection is it did. There was no objection to it in the committee, and none from the consumers or the producers in this country.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator whether lead and zinc would be affected by the amendment he has just read.

Mr. GEORGE. No; lead and zinc would not be affected, nothing but copper. The one amendment was made in order to protect labor against a product that was coming in almost ready for use, where the labor had already been performed on it in other countries.

If the Senator from Nevada will offer the amendment limiting the operation of the act to 1 year rather than 2, I should be glad to accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question first is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, my concern is for the small miner and prospector, and the investor backing them in their work, who finds the deposits in the first place, and that is my reason for asking the distinguished Senator from Georgia to permit the extension to be amended so as to make it 1 year instead of 2, my feeling being that the emergency in the world today will probably keep the price of copper above the cost of domestic production for that period of time.

I intend to debate this whole proposed three-part free-trade program at the proper time, which will affect all production and the workers of this country through the importation of the products of cheap foreign labor.

The real danger to the discovery and development of additional deposits is that when the Congress of the United States continually interferes with the import fee protection against the low-cost foreign labor, then a prospector or small investor feels that he may after 2 or 3 or 4 years' work and expenditure of hard-earned cash in the location and development of a new deposit lose out entirely through the whim of Congress doing away with the import fee or cushion making up the difference between a lowered world price and the domestic cost of production.

Continual meddling with the protection afforded by a tariff or import fee from the foreign low-cost labor, by Congress instills a fear or lack of confidence in the whole principle of protection and slackens interest and efforts of the prospectors and miners in the locating and developing of new minerals.

I thank the Senator from Georgia. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point my testimony before the Committee on Finance, of which the distinguished Senator from Georgia is chairman, and, in addition, the record of the domestic production and imports of copper for the years 1940 to 1948, inclusive.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE GEORGE W. MALONE, A UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF NEVADA

Senator MALONE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to say first in a general statement that copper is in the same category of other products involved in the general reciprocal trade program. The three-part free-trade program applies equally to copper as to other American products.

Free trade in copper, while international copper is selling at as great or a greater price as in the United States, the tariff or the import fee has little or no effect.

But by having that cushion for it to drop back on, as it has many times before, and will again when world production makes it a plentiful metal, then the cushion is there to the extent of the tariff or import fee. It is 4 cents now, and under any flexible arrangement it could be increased or decreased as the differential of cost, due mostly to the standards of living, changed.

When the prospector, who finds these mines to start with, knows that there is no cushion and there is no protection from the low-cost labor in Chile or the Argentine or any other South American nation which produces large amounts of copper, then he does not prospect for copper, since when the world price decreases below the cost of production in this country there is no protection, and he could not sell a prospect or mine if he found it.

To understand the mining business—I have come from a mining country—you only hear of the copper mines; you do not hear of the prospectors who die broke, and the companies that go out of existence because their stockholders either refuse to put in more money or are broke, and about the promoters that are trying to promote and finance mining prospects and trying to develop a mine. I would say, roughly, to give you some idea of the job in developing a mine, that perhaps 150 or 200 prospects must be examined by an engineer to find one or two that warrant a spending of investors' money for development. Of those 150 or 200 prospects found by prospectors—and they are not found by engineers—only one or two and perhaps none will develop into a large mine. Engineers do not discover mines; they turn them down. But every prospector thinks he has, of course, a bonanza, so he sells the idea to an engineer who looks at it, and most of the time, as I have said, turns it down.

Out of perhaps 200 of them he will recommend that a few hundred or a few thousand dollars be expended on one or two of them, from step to step, he follows it as long as he thinks it is a good bet. Then out of the class of the 1 or 2, perhaps 1 out of 50 of them make a mine.

In other words, it is a long, laborious, expensive process to find a mine in this or any other country. So the people you put out of business through free trade are the people who comb the hills to find prospects and the engineers who comb the prospects to find something that they can spend a little money on, and then the ones who have put up the money to try to make a mine.

When there is no cushion to rest on, to stop the price going below the cost at which you can afford to operate a mine in this country, then the prospectors and developers will lose interest, and you have lost the interest of the men who find the mines in the first place in this country.

In that connection I am going to submit for the record a wire that I have just received from the Copper Canyon Mining Co., Robert H. Raring, general manager. He is just one out of several men of this type in my State who labored day and night and stayed with a prospect until it started to pay. There are other metals coming into his mine now enabling him to stay in business.

This is what he says:

"Strenuously oppose extension duty-free copper imports. Present arrangements permit dumping foreign metals on home markets at expense of small industries and stifles exploration and development of new mines. Instead of living off gratuity of foreign nations for metal we should redouble efforts for development of new mines at home. Only by such means will our Nation be free and strong for generations ahead."

The telegram is signed "Robert Raring, manager, Copper Canyon Mining Co."

There are other considerations. For example, take some of our metals like tungsten. They have lowered the tariff from 50 cents to 38 cents a ton, and shut down every tungsten mine in the United States except one. I will point out that in the beginning of the war we were producing about 45 percent of the tungsten that we used in the United States. Now we are producing a very small part of our domestic needs.

The important part is not altogether the taxable property and the employment which Senator MARTIN speaks of in Pennsylvania, and which is a very important part of building up the States of this Nation, but the national security is paramount.

It will be remembered that when they hit Pearl Harbor and cut us off from the tungsten of the world, it left us in a spot. China and Burma furnish most of the world's production and labor there is 40 to 50 cents per day. You can take our machinery there

and shut any mine in the country on a free-trade basis because you pay $10 or $12 a day in this country.

The strategic point was that when we were cut off from China and Burma sources of tungsten we immediately raised the price of tungsten a few points, and within 6 months we were nearly self-sufficient in the production of that important metal. We could have lost the war if we had not been in the business and able to do that.

Once you go out of the mining business and the miners scatter, you cannot gather them together again in time to save you from any war or other emergency; and you cannot develop a mine quickly no matter how many prospects you have.

The Department of the Interior has long advocated that we should save our prospects in oil and other minerals and import what we need. In addition to losing the taxable property and the employment which is very important in this country, and will become more important soon, we would lose that national safety, that national security which is so important, because you cannot possibly get back in the business, once the men have been lost from this specialized field, in time to do any good.

I want to call your attention to one other thing which will stand an analysis by this committee. There is a bill introduced to suspend the tariff on zinc, and I want to show you just one thing that also applies to copper.

You will understand that there are three or four companies that own practically all of the copper properties in the United States, all of the larger copper pits. My State has one of the largest copper pits in the world, there is one in Utah, one in Arizona, and one in Montana. Of course, Chile and Africa are great producers of copper, and these same companies own a large proportion of these foreign deposits.

Understand that I am not talking against these companies. I think they have done a wonderful job, and it was simply through the laboratory work that was done by them and their predecessors that they were able to operate large-scale mining properties and to produce a profit on one-half of 1-percent copper. That is the way the large copper pits were developed and it takes a large operating company to do it. I am all for them, but there are some additional points to be considered. For example, these same companies own or control about 80 percent of the fabricating industry in this country and sometimes when you take this tariff off you are not benefiting the people you believe you are benefiting. Let me read what they say about zinc in a resolution passed by the Colorado Mining Association:

"The elimination of duty on zinc as contemplated under H. R. 561."

And the reason I am mentioning this is because this parade for free trade has just begun. They will come in one or two at a time, and it is often benefiting some certain group, and may not be benefiting the group that you think you are helping. And reading from a resolution passed by the Colorado Mining Association, "would not increase the supply of zinc as the foreign price of zinc is currently $10 per ton higher than our domestic price. Further, the current price of zinc would not be decreased by making zinc imports duty-free as the present supply is less than the demand.

"At the present time, the supply of zinc concentrates exceeds the reduction capacity of the United States. The elimination of the duty on zinc would result in an estimated loss of $5,000,000 per year to the American taxpayer, and only reward wealthy, foreign mining companies and governments.

"We emphatically disapprove the elimination of the duty on zinc. To let down the bars for a possible increase in cost seems rather futile."

Now, just a paragraph from a letter from Mr. Edward H. Snyder, of the Combined Metals Reduction Co. in Salt Lake City:

"In addition, it should be noted that the suspension of the duty for any period would also create a windfall for all of the smelters who have purchased foreign zinc concentrates in bond, as the option under these bonds would immediately be exercised to eliminate any duty on the concentrates already received."

In other words, what you do then, whatever the duty is, it is a windfall to the companies that have imported them in bond, where the duty has not been paid.

That completes my statement, except to say further that copper and zinc and every other mineral is affected just the same by the three-phase free-trade program that I outlined, Mr. Chairman, and I hope that you will carefully consider this entire matter. I intend to debate it at further length on the floor of the Senate, because I feel that it is the heart of America and the only real subject before the American people and the Congress of the United States at this time. There is no other subject confronting this Senate so important today as this long-range free-trade plan to level the living standards of this Nation with the low living wage standard countries of the world, instead of holding our own wage-living standard, to the best of our ability, up where we can help such foreign nations and at the same time progress favorably in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Senator MALONE.

	World production	Domestic mine production	United States percent of world production	Imports	Exports	Consumption
1940	3,000,000	873,086	30	491,342	427,650	1,008,785
1941	3,000,000	958,149	32	735,545	158,893	1,641,589
1942	3,100,000	1,080,061	35	764,393	210,518	1,678,091
1943	3,038,000	1,090,818	36	716,596	294,450	1,502,000
1944	2,843,000	972,549	34	735,211	237,015	1,504,000
1945	2,425,000	772,804	32	853,196	132,555	1,415,979
1946	2,023,000	608,737	30	393,275	97,475	1,391,000
1947 (estimated)	2,450,000	846,400	35	413,890	196,099	1,290,000
1948	(1)	826,000	(1)	452,416	146,000	1,202,000

[1] Not available.

COPPER ORE AND FABRICATED GOODS TARIFFS

Copper acetate and subacetate (verdigris): Free plus 4 cents a pound on copper content (Internal Revenue Code).

Copper concentrates—for smelting or refining and export: Free.

Copper concentrates—product of Cuba: Free.

Copper concentrates (taxable): Free plus 4 cents a pound on copper content (Internal Revenue Code).

Copper: Cuprous oxide; 35 percent ad valorem 3 cents per pound (Internal Revenue Code).

Copper in rolls, sheets, or rods: 2½ cents per pound plus 4 cents per pound on copper content (Internal Revenue Code).

Copper ore and concentrates—product of Philippine Islands: Free.

Copper ore—for smelting, or refining and export: Free.

Copper ore (taxable): 4 cents per pound on copper content.

Copper ore—product of Cuba: Free.

Copper, other than ore and concentrates—product of Philippine Islands: Free.

Copper oxides, n. e. s.: 25 percent ad valorem plus 3 cents per pound (Internal Revenue Code).

Copper: Refined, in ingots, plates, or bars—for smelting or refining and exports: Free.

Copper—refined in ingots, plates, or bars (taxable): Free plus 4 cents per pound (Internal Revenue Code).

Copper sulfate (blue vitriol): Free plus 4 cents per pound on copper content (Internal Revenue Code).

Copper tubes, brazed: 11 cents per pound plus 4 cents per pound (Internal Revenue Code.)

Copper tubes and tubing, seamless: 7 cents per pound plus 4 cents per pound on copper content (Internal Revenue Code).

Copper: unrefined black, blister, and converter, in pigs, or converter bars—for smelting or refining and export: Free.

Copper: unrefined black, blister, and converter, in pigs, or converter bars, free for United States Government: Free.

Copper: unrefined black, blister, and converter, in pigs or converter bars (taxable), free plus 4 cents per pound on copper content (Internal Revenue Code).

Copper wire, not specially provided for: 25 percent plus 4 cents per pound on copper content (Internal Revenue Code).

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, it will be noted that the workers in fabricated copper products are protected from the low-wage living standards of foreign labor—but by congressional action we are denying the prospectors, miners, and producers of the ore the same protection.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I suggest that on the last line of the bill the numerals "1951" be stricken and the numerals "1950" be inserted in lieu thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). The Chair understands that is the Malone amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. It is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 11, it is proposed to strike out "1951" and insert in lieu thereof "1950."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GEORGE. The effect of that is to extend the act for only 1 year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 2313) was read the third time and passed.

LOBBY ACTIVITIES TO EXEMPT THE ARMY ENGINEERS FROM PROPOSED REORGANIZATION ACT

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I now ask to be recognized so I may make a statement which will occupy only 8 or 9 minutes. The matter concerning which I desire to speak is of great importance. I

want the floor in my own right. Have I the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on February 17, 1949, I called the attention of the Senate to well-authenticated reports that had reached me regarding lobbying activities aimed at preventing the terms of the proposed Reorganization Act from applying to the Army engineers. That is a matter of great concern to the Congress, because last year Congress passed unanimously, without a single dissenting vote, the bill of which I was the Senate sponsor, setting up the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, and the Congress has shown its great interest in that subject ever since.

When I heard of these lobbying attempts I cited the fact that if exemptions were granted to one Government agency it would be difficult, if not impossible, to prevent exemption being granted to others, and then the whole reorganization scheme, which, let me point out, is the first over-all reorganization ever attempted in the history of the United States Government, would fail.

About 10 days ago, my attention was called by the well-known newspaperman and war veteran, Col. Robert S. Allen, to an unsigned, undated, two-page release which, so I was advised, was distributed in large numbers to and by employees of the San Francisco District, Corps of Engineers, in the last week of January and the first week of February, 1949. I was advised that this release was typed on Government paper, on Government time, on a Government machine, and in a Government office. I was also told that as this release was being distributed the employees were told that if the Corps of Engineers' civil works activities were included in the proposed Government reorganization, these employees would lose their jobs.

Think of it, Mr. President. The release was as follows, and I read it:

The Congress is again being asked to delegate its authority to the executive branch of the Government. The Senate Committee on Expenditures will hold hearings on the bill (S. 526) to consolidate Government agencies. One part of the bill, as submitted by a committee headed by Robert Moses, New York City Planner, proposes the establishment of a mammoth Public Works Department. Mr. Moses is reported to head the new department if created. To be included under one head will be all work and authority of the following: The Bureau of Reclamation, the Geological Survey, the Public Roads Administration, the Public Buildings Administration, the Coast and Goedetic Survey, the National Park Service, the Panama Canal, rivers and harbors, flood control.

The last three strip the Corps of Engineers of all their civil works.

I am quoting, Mr. President, from this anonymous release. I continue to read:

A similar bill was introduced in 1945 but the Congress wrote in the following exemption:

And here comes the quote within the quote; this is what they want the Congress to do:

"No reorganization plan shall provide for any reorganization affecting any civil function of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, or its head, or affecting such Corps or its head with respect to any such civil function. No reorganization plan shall take effect if the reorganization plan is in violation of this subsection."

That is the end of the quotation within the quotation. Then the release goes on to say this:

It is believed that a similar exception will be written into the present bill if the chairman can be assured of public support.

We know what those words mean, Mr. President. They mean if pressure can be put on. I continue to read:

He will welcome telegrams about as follows—they should be paraphrased:

In other words, those who send in telegrams should word each one a little differently from the other, so it will not appear that they are form telegrams. And here they give the type of telegram they want to have sent:

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Strongly urge you specifically exempt civil-works activities of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, from being affected by any plan to reorganize the executive branch of the Federal Government. Public interest fully justifies these activities remain responsibility Corps of Engineers in Department of the Army.

In other words, these anonymous individuals have gone ahead and disregarded all the studies of the Hoover Commission, all the studies of that great roster of human ability which made these recommendations. They are attempting to have them disregarded.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I will yield in a moment, but not just now.

Exemption should be equivalent to similar action taken by Seventy-ninth Congress in Public Law 263 known as Reorganization Act of 1945.

That concludes the release which was circulated on Government time in the San Francisco office in this very tendentious and unfair manner, which urges support for continuation of the control over civilian activities by the Corps of Army Engineers.

I now yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Massachusetts has spoken of all the work which has been done by the Hoover Commission. Does the Senator realize, with all the razzle-dazzle which has surrounded the work of the Commission, and the alleged savings which will be made if its recommendations are put into effect, that that Commission has not submitted any proof that there will be a saving of 5 cents by taking the civil functions away from the Army engineers? We are asked to prepare a bill which would put into effect the recommendations of the Commission, without our knowing what savings will really be effected in this connection. It would include the adoption of a great many other recommendations, 90 of which might be good and 4 or 5 bad. That is what we are asked to do.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, was the Senator asking me a question?

Mr. LONG. I am asking the Senator a question. I believe if he will read the record, he will find it to be a question.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator has asked me four questions at once. But I will say to the Senator from Louisiana that I cannot believe that he can possibly endorse the proposition that the Army engineers or any other group of public servants should seek to apply political pressure and anonymous pressure upon Members of the Senate.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Perhaps the Senator from Massachusetts would be interested in knowing that the Senator from Louisiana has seen no such release as the Senator has referred to. But the Senator from Louisiana feels the engineers should be permitted to present their views on the subject.

Mr. LODGE. The people are entitled to have that information. But that is entirely different from those who are ostensibly public servants going ahead and conducting these lobbying activities.

Insofar as savings which would be accomplished by putting into effect the recommendation of the Hoover Commission are concerned, I am sorry the Senator from Louisiana has not read the reports. The Senator perhaps has not had time to read them, because the report of the Hoover Commission is very voluminous. I do not criticize any Senator for not having read all that material which has been released up to the present time. The Senator from Louisiana has been busy here helping out in the filibuster and in other matters, and he probably has not had the time to study the report. But there is no question at all that the report of the Hoover Commission, if put into effect, would save about $3,000,000,000, and $3,000,000,000 is "real sugar" even in these times.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I can assure the Senator from Massachusetts that the Senator from Louisiana has been attending the hearings and listening to the testimony which has been given. We are given some arbitrary figure taken out of thin air to the effect that $3,000,000,000 may be saved. But is the Senator from Massachusetts familiar with the fact that when the representatives of the Bureau of the Budget came before the committee they would not assure us that adoption of the recommendations contained in the report would save two bits?

Mr. LODGE. Perhaps they do not want to give such assurance; perhaps they do not want to make a promise; but the fact of the matter is that this is the most extensive attempt at Government economy ever made. It is the only full-scale reorganization of the Government that has ever been attempted, and I am sure, whether or not the Senator from Louisiana agrees that it will save $3,000,000,000 he will agree with me that it is most improper for those who are on the Federal pay roll, as the Army engineers are, to seek to use their influence to

lobby the Congress. I am sure he would agree with me as to the obvious impropriety of that.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Although I agree with the Senator with respect to the facts which he is citing, I may suggest to him that the Senator from Louisiana has heard a great deal of argument against such a proposal. I do not believe that anyone should be prevented from expressing his legitimate objections.

Mr. LODGE. I am glad the Senator from Louisiana does not disagree with me as to the basic impropriety of the Army engineers, the Air Force, the Navy, or any other similar group lobbying for its own selfish advantage. I am glad that we have made that much progress, because it may have a good moral effect throughout the country.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator regard the factual information in regard to the lobbying activities of the Army engineers which he has presented to the Congress as something plucked out of thin air?

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no; it is not plucked out of thin air at all.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the Senator believe that, inasmuch as we have now arrived at a situation in which 250 men who comprise the Army engineers are controlling the operations of nearly 40,000 civilians, when there are rumors afloat concerning the Army engineers they ought not to be afloat unchallenged?

Mr. LODGE. The Senator is quite correct. There are some ugly rumors.

Mr. AIKEN. That is true of rumors against any Federal agency. Does not the Senator believe that a full scale, detailed investigation of the operations of the Army engineers is entirely in order?

Mr. LODGE. I believe that such an investigation would be in order; and I am quite confident that the heads of the Army engineers, for whom I have great regard, would welcome such an investigation.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Does not the Senator realize that the effect of this proposal is to turn flood-control work over to the Bureau of Reclamation? The Bureau of Reclamation may be doing a little lobbying behind the scenes to get control of that function.

Mr. LODGE. If I run into any lobbying by the Bureau of Reclamation, I shall be just as relentless in exposing it as I am in trying to expose this situation. I do not think it is the business of the Bureau of Reclamation, the Army engineers, the Navy, the Air Force, or any other Government agency to seek to put pressure on the Congress for something which affects their own selfish personal interest.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Is the Senator from Massachusetts agreed that the allegations against the Army engineers which he has just set forth—and in so doing I think he has performed a public service—should be taken up and considered by the Armed Services Committee of the Senate?

Mr. LODGE. I think it would be a very appropriate thing to do.

Mr. MORSE. Let me say to the Senator from Massachusetts that as one member of the committee, at the next meeting of the Armed Services Committee I intend to raise the issue, based upon the Senator's presentation this afternoon.

Mr. LODGE. I thank the Senator from Oregon. That is typical of his forthright and courageous way of doing things.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to my good friend of many years from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I wholeheartedly agree with the Senators as to the impropriety involved in the activities which the Senator has disclosed. Does the Senator see any similarity between such activities and the activities which we have noticed over the period of years since the Senator and I first came to the Senate together in January 1937? Whenever there has been any major attempt to reduce expenditures, or to cut down on the great bureaucracy which has grown up in Washington, there has been an attempt on the part of the divisions, departments, or agencies concerned, or upon the part of individuals in those agencies, to lobby and bring pressure. Does the Senator see the similarity?

Mr. LODGE. I see it. I agree with the Senator from New Hampshire that it always happens. If we exempt one agency, we lose our argument with respect to the others. If we exempt one, we are called upon to exempt another, and another, and another; and in the end we have no reorganization at all.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one last question?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Will the junior Senator from Massachusetts agree with the junior Senator from Louisiana that the only way to save any substantial amount of money is to get someone off the pay roll?

Mr. LODGE. That is one of the best ways to save money. It is not the only way.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. If we should find that the agency which is supposed to take over the functions of the Army engineers has an overhead three times as great, proportionately, as that of the Army engineers, does it seem to the Senator that we would save any money by turning the work of a very efficient organization over to a less efficient organization?

Mr. LODGE. I am not sufficiently well informed on all the details to answer that question. What I say is that we must not make exemptions. We must trust someone. I think the person we must trust is the President of the United States. He is the Senator's President, and my President, and the President of all the American people. If we give him a reorganization act with many exemptions in it, we shall never get off the ground at all. That is the basic point to which I am addressing myself, rather than the detailed merits of particular reorganization schemes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Two or three years ago, in company with the late Senator Overton, I opposed on the floor of the Senate turning over to some other agency the civil functions of the Army engineers. I am not in favor of such action. Does the Senator realize that the Federal Reserve Board has been exempted?

Mr. LODGE. I did not know that any agency had yet been exempted.

Mr. MAYBANK. The House exempted the Federal Reserve Board.

Mr. LODGE. I am opposed to that.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wanted to call it to the Senator's attention. I believe the Senator will agree with me that if the Federal Reserve Board, in charge of the big banks is to be exempted there is no reason why we should place an agency such as the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which is helping the smaller banks, into the reorganization.

Mr. LODGE. I am sure I do not know. I am not standing here defending the House bill. I say that we ought to make no exemptions at all. We ought to give the President a free hand, under his solemn responsibility, to carry out this program according to the dictates of his best judgment. That is all we can do. It is physically impossible for Congress to attempt to effect hundreds of detailed reorganization schemes. We cannot do it. The only way we can do it is to get a good plan and give the President power, and give him an opportunity to do it. Then, if he does not do it, we still have the opportunity to veto it later. We are not giving up our power for good.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts a question. Before I ask the question, let me say that I am thoroughly in accord with the statement of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], that a committee—either the Armed Services Committee or some other committee—should investigate the distribution in the San Francisco area of the circular referred to.

I should like to know if the Senator from Massachusetts now has information as to whether or not that statement was circulated by the Army engineers themselves, by the civilian employees of that district, or by someone else. What information does the Senator have on that subject?

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will bear with me, I should like to read the letter which I sent to the Secretary of the Army, and the letter which I received in reply, because they bear on that point.

Mr. GURNEY. I shall listen with interest. I wondered if the Senator from

"No reorganization plan shall provide for any reorganization affecting any civil func-

good and 4 or 5 bad. That is what we are asked to do.

Federal pay roll, as the Army engineers are, to seek to use their influence to

Massachusetts had brought the question to the attention of the Army authorities.

Mr. LODGE. I did.

Mr. GURNEY. And if they had attempted to make an investigation. Have we any facts in that connection?

Mr. LODGE. The information which I received relative to the situation at San Francisco is, of course, supplementary to the information which I received in the middle of February with respect to another large American city.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. With reference to our responsibility for taking all the recommendations or none, or making no exceptions——

Mr. LODGE. I did not say that we ought to take all the recommendations or none. I said that we ought to give the President power to put the scheme into effect, retaining, of course, our veto on his scheme when it comes before us for consideration.

Mr. STENNIS. That is the point I wish to raise.

Mr. LODGE. That is not the same as taking all the recommendations or none.

Mr. STENNIS. In connection with an item so large and so vast in its scope as the civil functions of the Army engineers, does not the Senator feel that we ourselves have some responsibility to go into the merits of these proposals?

Mr. LODGE. Oh, yes.

Mr. STENNIS. If in our judgment certain agencies should be exempted, does not the Senator believe that it is our responsibility to say so?

Mr. LODGE. I think we have a responsibility. I believe that when we exercise our own free and unfettered judgment, we do not do so badly. I am addressing myself to the question of pressure being put on Senators and Representatives by selfishly interested individuals or agencies. I do not believe the Senator from Mississippi condones such action.

Mr. STENNIS. I am entirely in sympathy with the viewpoint of the Senator with respect to any alleged pressure. My point is that we have a responsibility to consider this question on its merits.

Mr. LODGE. We have a responsibility to consider the question on its merits; and I contend that if we enact a reorganization act which has no exemptions in it, we do not give up our power, because the plan will come back to us later for approval.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator a question. Is he aware that practically all of the departments involved in the reorganization process or study are, in one way or another, attempting to make overtures to the committee to exempt them from the Reorganization Act?

Mr. LODGE. Is that true? The Senator from Kansas is on the committee, of course.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I am.

Mr. LODGE. And the Senator has great experience in government. I am very much interested in hearing that statement from him.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I wonder whether the Senator from Massachusetts is aware that considerable effort of that sort is being made.

Mr. LODGE. Is it being made by various agencies of the Government?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. It is being made in favor of excluding certain governmental agencies from the reorganization. I do not know whether the effort is coming from the agencies themselves.

Mr. LODGE. But, Mr. President, if we were to exempt one agency from reorganization, the fact that it had been exempted would be used as an argument of almost irresistible effect for the exemption of other agencies; is not that correct?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I think that is entirely correct.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, let me read from a letter which I sent to the Secretary of the Army on March 10:

> You will observe that this statement—
>
> Referring to the statement circulated by the Corps of Engineers office in San Francisco—
>
> is a bare-faced request that Members of the Senate be lobbied and that political pressure be placed upon them in order to give special privilege and consideration to the Army engineers.
>
> I have already publicly brought out the fact that in another city a similar activity was engaged in. All my life I have had the greatest regard for the Army engineers, who number in their ranks such eminent men as Gen. Robert E. Lee and a host of other distinguished soldiers. I say to you candidly that these tactics will inevitably result in a great loss of prestige for the Army engineers and that in their own interests as well as in the interest of the country these ignoble pressure tactics should stop.
>
> The Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch has completed the first study of the reorganization of the Government in the history of the United States. The reason for the downfall of popular government in Europe is because those governments were not effective and were no longer able to translate into action the aims and aspirations of the people. To seek to oppose a measure to make government effective is, therefore, in effect, to seek to destroy our democratic government.
>
> I urge you, as Secretary of the Army, to take every step you can to see to it that this lobbying be immediately discontinued.

Mr. President, I am glad to report that on March 15 I received a reply from the Secretary of the Army, which I shall now read:

> By your letter of March 10, 1949, you bring to my attention a copy of an undated, unsigned release reported to have been distributed to and by employees of the San Francisco district, Corps of Engineers, for the purpose of encouraging recipients to exert political pressure to gain special privileges for the Corps of Engineers in the current consideration of the reorganization of the Government. It is further reported that this release was prepared on Government time and with Government materials.
>
> I thoroughly agree with your reaction to the reported distribution of this release under the alleged circumstances, and know that you realize that any action of this kind is in direct contradiction to the policy of the Department of the Army. As an indication of my policy on this matter, I issued instructions on February 19, 1949, which emphasized the standing policy of the Department and directed that officers of the Corps of Engineers would not engage in such activities.
>
> After receipt of your letter, I immediately issued instructions to include a similar prohibition on such activities by civilian employees of the Corps of Engineers. I have also initiated a thorough and expeditious investigation toward determining the person or persons responsible for this release, and will take appropriate disciplinary action if such is indicated.
>
> Please consider this as an interim reply to your letter of March 10, as I will make a further report to you after the investigation of this matter is completed.

That is the end of the letter, which was signed by Kenneth Royall, Secretary of the Army. I think the attitude of the Secretary of the Army, as expressed in that letter, is beyond reproach. I hope he will be vigorous in promoting his investigation.

Mr. President, this is all I care to say about the matter. I simply reiterate my hope that these pressure tactics will cease, and that democracy in America may be strengthened by enacting a reorganization plan which will make democratic government really efficient. That is what is at stake in the present reorganization.

EXTENSION OF RENT CONTROL

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 1731, the bill to extend certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1731) to extend certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement at this time. The rent-control bill is now before the Senate, as I advised the Senate last evening, before the adjournment, I would move to do today. Of course, I also advised the Senate last evening that it was not anticipated that there would be debate upon the bill today, but that we would simply make the bill the unfinished business, so that when we return on Monday the bill will be before us. Of course, it is before us now.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in commencing these remarks, I wish to say most facetiously that I have not asked the permission of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] to speak today. I judged from his remarks last night that he seemed to imply that there should be some procedure by which freedom of speech on the floor of the Senate, as contrasted to limitation of debate, should be curtailed. In order that there may be no doubt as to where I stand or will always stand upon any proposal to seek to

discipline a Republican Senator on the floor of the Senate, as the Republican conference of ours is so capable of doing in caucus, I wish to assure my good friend, the Senator from Indiana, that here is one place where he and his cohorts will never succeed in disciplining me in the sense of ever silencing me. At least that will be true so long as freedom of speech is retained on the floor of the Senate.

I also wish to say, most facetiously, to my good friend, the Senator from Wisconsin, that I want him to note that I am not reading from manuscript. It is my common practice not to read from manuscript, although I say good-naturedly that in spite of his comments last night as to what he thought was the relationship between a manuscript and sound thinking, such as Jefferson engaged in, I observed that the Senator from Wisconsin did not read from a manuscript last night. I shall let the RECORD speak for itself as to whether on that occasion there was any relationship between a lack of manuscript and the absence of sound thinking in the Senator's speech.

Mr. President, my good friend, the Senator from Wisconsin, in the course of his remarks last night read from rule XIX, paragraph 2, of the Rules of the Senate:

> No Senator in debate shall, directly or indirectly, by any form of words impute to another Senator or to other Senators any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator.

Mr. President, I shall never intentionally, knowingly, or wilfully violate either the letter or the spirit of that rule. Nevertheless, I wish to say to my good friend the Senator from Wisconsin that, judging from what I think would be general agreement as to the innuendoes and implications of personal criticism against me contained in his speech last night, I shall always be perfectly willing to enter into a contest with him or with any other Senator in going just as far as the rule will permit us to go in expressing our disrespect for each other's views, if we reach the point where there is a wish on the part of any Senator that such a challenge be issued. I shall never issue such a challenge, because I do not like that type of debating; but I shall never run away from one, Mr. President, because I not only can "take it," but I can "dish it out," too, and I am always willing to take it. I am perfectly aware of the fact that no one can follow a liberal course of action in the Senate without being subjected from time to time to the type of speeches which the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from Wisconsin delivered last night. I realize that the Senator from Wisconsin objects to the use of the word "liberal," and I think I know why. I am going to give him a definition of it, or, at least, of its needed application to Republican policy, before I get through this afternoon.

I want to say I am perfectly aware of the fact that a liberal in the Senate of the United States, particularly on the Republican side of the aisle, because they are such rare Members of the Senate, will always have to be willing to take it when it comes to the type of criticism and discipline which has always characterized for decades past the general attitude and policy of the Republican Party toward liberals within its ranks.

When I speak of discipline, Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that this is not the first time on the floor of the Senate I have made perfectly clear to my party in the Senate that I do not propose to be disciplined on the floor of the Senate. I am disciplined constantly in respect to the organization of the Republicans in the Senate. I have been ever since I came to the Senate, for the simple reason that so many of them in charge of the policies of the Republican conference do not like the type of Republican philosophy which I intend to pursue and fight for within the Republican Party so long as it is my privilege to serve in public office.

But I do notice, Mr. President, that, come campaign time or come some other Republican Party emergency on specific issues that may confront the Republican Party, the Republicans in charge of our party organization not only do not refuse my assistance, but they frequently ask for my assistance.

I would refresh the memories of some of my Republican brethren. They not only welcomed my assistance in 1946 in that congressional campaign, but asked for it. They not only welcomed my assistance in the 1948 campaign, but asked for it, as I think they should have, and they had a right to do. Within the last 30 minutes a representative of the National Republican Committee called me on the telephone and asked me to take a May 20 speaking engagement in Pennsylvania, because, surprising as it may seem to some Republicans in the Senate who are not of the liberal Republican group, there apparently is a Republican organization in Pennsylvania that specifically wants me to talk to it in regard to some of the views I hold as to what I think the future policies of the Republican Party should be. I accepted the invitation because, whether all people in Republican groups agree with me or do not agree with me, I think it important that within the Republican Party we at least discuss and study and debate some of the great issues which I want to mention here this afternoon.

Before I mention those issues, I want to repeat that we had better have a very definite understanding that any attempt to restrict the freedom of speech of any Member of the Senate, even through the type of psychological discipline which was implied in the speech that my good friend from Indiana gave last night, will be resisted by me. In that speech he attempted by way of ridicule, as I interpreted it, to give the impression that the rights of other Members of the Senate were in some way being impaired, because some of the others of us made a good many speeches on the floor of the Senate.

I say that the implication of that type of psychological discipline is dangerous, in my judgment, to the preservation of what I think is so important on the floor of the Senate, namely, the right of a Member of this body, even if the 95 others in the body do not agree with him on the subject matter he discusses, to come before the people of the country and from his desk in the Senate speak his mind on the issue. When we speak in the Senate, we address the country as well as the Senate. Each one of us must have the right preserved to himself to come before the people of the country, on the floor of the Senate, and make whatever statements each Senator thinks should be made, and then be willing to be judged by those statements. That is the course of action which the junior Senator from Oregon has followed, and that is the course of action which the junior Senator from Oregon intends to follow so long as he is in the Senate, whether the junior Senator from Indiana or any other Senator likes it or not.

Mr. DONNELL. Now, Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I should like to say it has been my privilege to know the Senator who is now speaking since very shortly after the two of us met in Washington in 1945. It has been my observation that while on many subjects he and I have differed, he has shown fine, outstanding courage and integrity; and not only that, a tremendously strong ability. I for one welcome the fact that he has given to the Senate so generously of his time and of his thought and of his expression upon the floor of this great body. I merely wanted to take the opportunity to say those few words with respect to my warm, intimate, personal friend, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. Although, as I say, I have many times differed with him and cannot claim to share all his views, any more than he does mine, I pay tribute to his sterling patriotism, his integrity, and his ability.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri is very kind, but I am afraid he stands in the status of a biased friend. I appreciate his bias. After all, it is the biases of friendship that I think so frequently make friendships beautiful, and I think we do have a beautiful friendship between us. I assure him that our respect and friendship for each other is mutual.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I should like to comment as a Senator on this side of the aisle about the worth to this body of the junior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am not going to yield for that purpose. It would be embarrassing to me to yield for that purpose. I yield only for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon declines to yield except for a question.

Mr. McMAHON. I had not expected, in view of our old friendship, dating from

some 15 years past, that the Senator would invoke the rules of the Senate to keep me from paying him a compliment that a friend of mine passed to me the other night. He said, "You know, MORSE, of Oregon, is contributing to making the Senate function as a deliberative and legislative assembly." I thought that was indeed a high compliment, and I want to compliment the Senator on it.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate that, but I am sure he, on the other hand, will realize that I am not seeking a testimonial meeting here this afternoon. My friendship for the able Senator from Connecticut is a very deep and devoted one. However, I am afraid that if I yielded for the purpose of his expressing his feelings of friendship for me some people might think me rather immodest. I merely want to talk about some Republican policies, that is all, because I think this is the time to talk about them. I want to say, Mr. President, that last night I did not have any intention of making a speech today, but after I heard my good friend from Indiana, every one in this body ought to have known that for a certainty I would speak today, in order to make perfectly clear that I had the right to speak. It was the speech of my good friend from Indiana which has prompted these observations on Republican policy.

(At this point in his address, Mr. MORSE yielded to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] for an insertion in the RECORD.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think it is too bad that some Senators on the floor of the Senate do not speak oftener than they do, either with or without manuscript, because even if they read a manuscript which possibly somebody else wrote for them, we could at least attribute to them responsibility for the views therein expressed.

I think it would be very helpful to the voters to have more Senators record their views on more issues. It might have some more desirable effects on elections. The voters could better judge the political philosophy of the Members of the Senate. So I am one who does not hold to the view that silence is necessarily a virtue in political life. Certainly not in the Senate. I do not know how we shall ever succeed in American democracy in enlightening the people as to differences of political viewpoints which exist among Senators unless the Members of the Senate are perfectly willing to put themselves on record on various issues as to just where they stand.

It is true, Mr. President, that I talk on a considerable number of issues on the floor of the Senate, but I do not talk without study of them. I would not dare to because some of my colleagues would welcome a chance to challenge my facts. I am perfectly willing to let the contents of my speeches be the best proof of my preparation. Even though I speak without manuscript on many of the political, social, and economic issues involved in proposed legislation, I do not come to the floor of the Senate and speak on any issues without being thoroughly prepared for my speech. I have worked in the classroom for too many years, Mr. President, ever to walk onto the floor of the Senate and be guilty of what I thought was an implication, in the speech of the Senator from Wisconsin last night, of just talking. I would say to the Senator from Wisconsin that when he talks about camouflage, he needs to learn the lesson that calling either a proposition or its advocate names proves nothing against the proposition or the advocate.

Mr. President, why do liberals find it necessary, and why have they always found it necessary, on the floor of the Senate, to make a great many speeches on the various issues which come before the Senate? For the simple reason, Mr. President, that usually they can make, in caucus, little dent on the political organization of their party in the Senate. They always have found it necessary to take their case to the people. It is very interesting, Mr. President, over the years, to find how, by that process, they have been able sometimes to help their party lift itself by its own boot straps.

It has been very interesting to me to see that on various liberal issues, since I have been in the Senate, the Republican Party is much closer to some agreement on those very issues than it was even four short years ago. Take, for example, the general consensus of opinion developing in the Senate that we ought to do something about the Army Reorganization Act. It is very interesting to hear men on both sides of the aisle, who were obviously not in favor of a true reorganization and unification program in fact as well as in name, talking now in terms of the necessity for an Under Secretary of Defense, and for giving to the Secretary of Defense the authority he should have been given in the first place. Such a change in the law is necessary if we are to have a true unification of our armed services, in order to eliminate the petty jealousies, rivalries, jurisdictional disputes, and lobbying on the part of the separate agencies for greater appropriation of funds. It must be more than 2 years ago that some of us who consider ourselves liberals in the Congress of the United States introduced an armed forces unification and reorganization bill. It will be very interesting to take that proposed unification and reorganization bill which was introduced by liberals, and which I reintroduced this year, and lay it alongside of some of the proposals being made by those who have not shared our point of view on this as well as on other issues, and see how close they are now to the position we took on the issue 2 years ago.

I remember very clearly, Mr. President, the opposition on the floor of the Senate when I first introduced that bill and spoke about it at some length. I felt that coldness of silence and lack of acceptance of my proposal on the part of some of my colleagues. But now many of them are coming around to some of the features of it. As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I say, again, that if my party wants to make one of the greatest contributions it can make to the security and the defense of this Nation, it will proceed without further delay to adopt as a major policy a proposal for an effective unification and reorganization of the armed services along the lines of the bill which I introduced 2 years ago. I again assert, as I did 2 years ago, that confusion, inefficiency, departmental jurisdictional strife, and lack of effectiveness characterize the administration of the armed forces of America and will continue to characterize that administration so long as we have a unification law that is neither fish nor fowl. It is only a truce between and among the Army, Navy, and Air Forces, with a Secretary of Defense lacking in effective power to knock heads together at the Pentagon Building and the Navy Department in an attempt to give the American people a well coordinated, unified armed services organization operating under a single Secretary of Defense with an Under Secretary, a single Chief of Staff, and operating also under a single procurement office.

Mr. President, as I said 2 years ago—and the evidence has mounted and mounted ever since I said it—there is no question about the fact that any suggestion for a single procurement office covering the procurement for our armed forces stirs up tremendous fears not only in certain vested interests within the armed services, but also stirs up fears within the circles of certain vested economic groups in America.

Thus, once again, I say, convinced as I was 2 years ago, and more convinced than ever today because of additional evidence which I did not have 2 years ago, that section of my bill which calls for a single procurement office would save us at least $3,000,000,000 a year out of the armed services appropriation.

Mr. President, I have the advice of men well informed in regard to the operation of our armed forces administration that my figure of $3,000,000,000 is too low, possibly to the extent of another $2,000,000,000. I prefer to make the understatement as to the possible saving. But I desire to repeat that I think the duplication, I think the waste, I think that what amounts to very questionable practices in the procurement policies of the armed forces of this Government, ought to be stopped, in the interest of national security and defense. It ought to be stopped in the interest of making a contribution toward the establishment of a sounder American dollar, because everything we can do to save without sacrificing the welfare of our country, either from the standpoint of security through the armed forces, or its social and economic stability, such as would be effected by various pieces of social legislation on which I shall comment later, ought to be done. It ought to be done quickly, and the Republican Party ought to make it one of its major endeavors in the Eighty-first Congress.

Thus, Mr. President, I again invite my Republican colleagues in the Senate of the United States to consider a few of these liberal issues, because I would say to my good friend, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], that the only definition of liberalism for which I stand is that definition which relates to a man's voting record on specific issues. Let me see that record, let me see it in its entirety, and I am not going to have any

difficulty, and the Senator from Wisconsin will not have any difficulty, nor will any other Senator in this body have any difficulty, in deciding in his own mind and heart as to whether or not the specific voting record of any Senator is a liberal voting record or a reactionary one.

But for the Senator's consideration I would call his attention again to another facet of my definition of liberalism, namely, that I consider it an obligation on the Republican Party to go forward with what I deem to be one of the fundamental tenets of the political philosophy of the great Lincoln. The tenet I refer to is that there does rest upon our party the solemn obligation to carry out a legislative program under a representative form of government and a capitalistic economy, which always seeks to protect the politically and economically weak from the politically and economically strong, but does it within the framework of a private property economy, and in accordance with the legal guaranties and principles of the Constitution, including may I say to my southern friends in the Senate, the Bill of Rights.

Mr. President, that tenet frames, about as accurately as I can frame it, the liberalism on legislation of the junior Senator from Oregon. That framework of liberalism, I assert to my Republican colleagues, sets forth a legislative tenet which I am satisfied the overwhelming majority of the registered Republican voters of this country want my party to carry out.

For a long time I have been of the opinion that the registered Republican voters, plus the independent voters, have been more forward looking, more modern in their point of view, more desirous of legislation which will protect the weak from the exploitation of the strong, than has been the case with so many of the leaders of my party who have controlled the organization of the party nationally.

I observe the views of the American voters as I go across the country—and I do not confine my many speeches, I may say good-naturedly, to the floor of the Senate. I know of no one on the Republican side of the aisle who speaks to more audiences in America during a year than I do, and I intend to continue to do that, because it is the only way I have of carrying this cause of Republican liberalism to the people of this country in an endeavor to save the Republican Party from itself. That is what the party needs; it needs to be saved from itself. It needs to be saved from those tendencies within the party and those advisers within the party who would take us back to the 1920's. They want to go back to the 1920's because they are scared to death, apparently, politically speaking, that if they do not go back to the 1920's, someone may accuse them of being a "me too" party. If they go back to the 1920's they are going to be a "has been" party, there is no doubt about that.

They have not many years left, in my judgment, in which to make up their minds as to whether or not they are going forward or backward. The American people are not going to let them stand still. The American people have demonstrated that in one national election after another. The American people did demonstrate it in 1948, when by every possible conjecture and prophecy in which one had a right to engage, as early as March 1948, victory seemed assured in November, yet we suffered a defeat. If the lesson of that campaign has not taught my party anything, then certainly the movement of the party is doomed to be backward and not forward.

As to the duty of the Republican Party to move forward rather than backward, I wish to insert at this point in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, a short article I wrote for Parade magazine on February 13, 1949, entitled "GOP Liberals." In the course of that article it will be seen that I discussed the criticism that the Republican liberals propose a "me too" program, in these words:

Republicans need to remember that competition is the dynamic force of a free-enterprise system. Dynamic competitive principles must also be applied by the two major political parties in the contest for votes. The criticism directed at those of us who are fighting for a more modern, forward-looking Republican Party, to the effect that we are proposing a "me too" political course of action, overlooks some basic principles of competition.

In the economic life of our free-enterprise system, a successful businessman is always alert to the public's interest in and approval of the merchandise of his competitor. He does not refuse to stock more up-to-date goods when he discovers such goods are filling his competitor's store with purchasers. Rather, he tries to secure better-quality goods that will fill more economically the needs of the buying public.

The analogy has its limitations, but does help to focus attention on the fact that the supporters of reaction in the Republican Party need to learn much from business if they hope to satisfy the voters' wants. Their "me too" charge against liberal Republicans is but an alibi for their own lack of appreciation of the needs of our people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire article printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOP LIBERALS—IN THE SENATE THEY HAVE A PROGRAM FOR ACTION

(By WAYNE L. MORSE, United States Senator from Oregon)

The great American classic—the quadrennial race for the Presidency—has been concluded. President Truman, fighting against odds that all but he and a few others considered hopeless, won a victory last November which restored the Democratic party to the complete control of the Government. But now that the race has been run and the victory gained, the President and his party have the job of delivering on their platform promises and campaign pledges.

What role should liberal Republicans—and there are many of them—play in Congress, now settling down to the serious business of considering vital legislation on domestic and international affairs?

Some of the advice coming to me through the mail suggests that we join the Democrats because on some basic issues we have no significant differences with the Truman administration. Others blame us for losing the election because of this so-called "me too" attitude, and urge us to fall in line with the ultraconservative elements in the Republican Party.

Either course would spell ruin to the two-party system as we know it today, and would certainly relegate the Republican Party—whose first great standard-bearer was Abraham Lincoln—to oblivion.

The task of modern, liberal Republicans in the present Congress is twofold: to revitalize the party and to mobilize its forces behind a forward-looking program; secondly, to guard against unsound legislative proposals or existing devices endangering the rights of free Americans and our free enterprise system. Let me explain why I feel that this is so.

Republicans need to remember that competition is the dynamic force of a free-enterprise system. Dynamic competitive principles must also be applied by the two major political parties in the contest for votes. The criticism directed at those of us who are fighting for a more modern, forward-looking Republican Party, to the effect that we are proposing a "me too" political course of action, overlooks some basic principles of competition.

In the economic life of our free-enterprise system, a successful businessman is always alert to the public's interest in and approval of the merchandise of his competitor. He does not refuse to stock more up-to-date goods when he discovers such goods are filling his competitor's store with purchasers. Rather, he tries to secure better quality goods that will fill more economically the needs of the buying public.

The analogy has its limitations, but does help to focus attention on the fact that the supporters of reaction in the Republican Party need to learn much from business if they hope to satisfy the voters' wants. Their "me too" charge against liberal Republicans is but an alibi for their own lack of appreciation of the needs of our people.

Significant steps have already been taken by a group of forward-looking Republicans in the Senate to modernize the party.

One of their first moves was the attempt to revamp the party leadership in the Senate so that it would no longer stand as a symbol of reaction and defeatism. In that fight I was happy to join with Senators AIKEN, TOBEY, IVES, LODGE, SALTONSTALL, KNOWLAND, PLAISTED, SMITH of New Jersey, BALDWIN, YOUNG, GURNEY, and THYE in the effort to inject new blood into the party organization.

CANDIDATE LOSES, BUT LIBERALS GAIN

While Senator LODGE, our candidate for the position of chairman of the Republican Policy Committee in the Senate, was beaten 2 to 1, two encouraging facts should be noted: the composition of the policy committee was revised to give representation to the more modern point of view, and clear notice was served that the liberals would stand united as a general policy in the effort to shake off the cloak of reaction in which the Old Guard would garb the Republican Party.

We gained our point that contests for party office in the Senate should be decided by secret written ballot. We agreed that for the next 2 years the Republicans in the Senate should devote their major effort to making a record which will permit them to go to the people in 1950 without apology.

We recognize that the greatest organizational need of the party is to change the trend of registration among young people from the Democratic to the Republican Party. This means that the liberal forces shall insist that the national and State party organizations alike give increased opportunities for party positions and public office to young Republicans.

LIBERAL WING UPHOLDS BASIC FREEDOMS

On the broader front, the role of the Republican liberals is also beginning to take

definite shape. Let us list some of the measures already dropped into the legislative hopper by Senate members of this group, bearing in mind that the following catalogue is made well in advance of its publication.

A glance at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the first few days of the present session of Congress makes it clear that the liberal wing of the Republican Party is actively sponsoring bills which make more secure the basic rights and freedoms of the American people.

Four members of this group joined with other Senators in proposing that the Congress prohibit discrimination because of race, color, faith, national origin, or ancestry—a measure that has had the overwhelming approval of Members of Congress but has failed of passage because of a Democratic minority.

Three of them sponsored a bill to raise the minimum wage to 75 cents an hour. Others again introduced the Federal aid to education bill. No less than four of them are active in backing the bipartisan effort to amend the Constitution so that the voters of this country may have a more direct voice in the election of President and Vice President.

Several of us, in keeping with our pledge to reform the rules of the Senate so that majority rule may prevail, introduced resolutions calling for amendments which would eliminate the filibuster; and we have continued to press for the earliest possible consideration of these proposals.

Among other measures that might be mentioned as part of the liberal program are bills to expand the coverage and benefits of the Social Security Act, to liberalize the admission of displaced persons, and to provide facilities for a labor-extension service.

Labor legislation that is fair to both employers and unions, and in the public interest, will be supported by the liberal Republicans. As this is written, it is encouraging to read that the administration appears to agree with those of us who urged the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and the simultaneous enactment of a revised Wagner Act.

In these early days of the Eighty-first Congress it is no visionary prediction to assert that Republican liberals will be found initiating and supporting additional legislation that will, in the best Lincoln tradition, place human rights above property rights. As constitutional liberals, they will fight against reactionaries on the one hand and leftists on the other.

They will support Government aid for improved health facilities and medical services, without adopting the socialistic principle of making the doctors employees of the State. Better housing legislation will be high on their list. Aid t scientific research is another objective liberal Republicans will sponsor.

Inflation controls, a tightening of the laws regulating monopolies, a more equitable Federal tax policy, a farsighted program of development and conservation of our natural resources, a long-range program of farm-price supports which will remove the causes of consumer criticism but at the same time protect farmers from violent price fluctuations—all are matters which Republican liberals will work for.

Many Republicans—but not enough to outvote the reactionaries in their own and the Democratic Party—have sponsored these reforms in the past. More of them will be found on the liberal, the human side of these issues in the days ahead.

In the field of international relations, every effort will be made to maintain a strong bipartisan foreign policy, so ably fostered by Senator VANDENBERG, for the past 2 years the Republican chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The United Nations must be strengthened, for without a strong world organization the armament race will mushroom to such proportions that essential domestic legislation will have little chance of being realized.

The Senate Republican liberals are receiving increasing support. More and more registered Republicans and independent voters are appreciating that the way to make progress on domestic issues and on the international front is to make our capitalist economy and political democracy work through the safeguards of our constitutional form of government.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Apropos of what the Senator is saying, what is his thought as to the reason why 45,000,000 Americans eligible to vote, practically half of the electorate, stayed away from the polls? They did not swallow the New Deal, apparently, with Santa Claus, and they did not swallow the bait the Republican Party offered. What does the Senator think those people were thinking about?

Mr. MORSE. I shall come to the Senator's question in a moment. First, let me say that I think the number of people who turned out for that election was not particularly out of line with past elections.

Mr. BREWSTER. Oh, yes; it was the lowest percentage, I believe, in some 50 years.

Mr. MORSE. I think that whenever we can get in round numbers forty-five to fifty million people going to the polls in America, out of a population of 145,000,000 or 150,000,000, it is a pretty good turn-out.

Mr. BREWSTER. The people who are eligible, according to the census, are about 95,000,000.

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is the Senator familiar with the figures in Canada? Seventy percent of the eligible voters turned out there, and in England it was 75, in France 80 percent, and in Italy in the last election it was 89 percent. Does the Senator mean to say that he, as a believer in democracy, is contented when one-half of the electorate stays away from the polls?

Mr. MORSE. Of course not, and for many years I have expressed publicly my sadness and my concern about the fact that more Americans do not make perfectly clear to the politicians at all times that they appreciate the great privilege they have in the use of the ballot by going to the polls and voting. I agree that it is most unfortunate that more of them do not vote, but I do not agree with the conclusion which the Senator from Maine apparently has reached, that in the 1948 campaign the percentage of voters who went to the polls, in contrast with the percentage of voters who have gone to the polls in the past, shows anything more alarming than that his party and mine and the party of the opposition apparently filled too many people with either disgust or a feeling of hopelessness. Apparently too many of them reached the conclusion that there was not anything they could do about it at the polls, or they took the attitude, as I think the Senator from Maine has implied, "Well, my vote does not count anyway." They showed that they do not appreciate the fact that each and every vote does count.

But I will say to the Senator from Maine that the job of the Republican Party, it seems to me, is to go forward with a campaign which, in my judgment, we did not go forward with in 1948, which will so enlist and elicit the interests of the people of this country that they will see the relationships between the ballot box and their future liberties and rights.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I hope the Senator will satisfy himself, as I have from the figures, that the steadily declining interest in our country in exercising the franchise, particularly in contrast with other countries, such as Italy, where there was such an amazing turn-out of the voters, indicates a lethargy which is disturbing, I think, to both political parties. I quite agree that it is a very serious reflection upon them.

Second, I do not know whether the Senator is familiar with the statement of Lord Bryce in the American Commonwealth that the great danger which the American Republic would face eventually—and he wrote this 75 years ago—a danger which would ultimately develop, is what he called a mob fatalism; that each individual would say that in a great country such as ours, with a population then of 75,000,000, and now nearly 150,000,000, "It does not matter what I do. I do not count."

Finally, I want to inquire of the Senator from Oregon whether he feels that the party which won the last election could justly claim a mandate when it produced, I think the exact percentage is, about 26 percent of the eligible vote? It was sufficient to win the election, but the suggestion that it was any overwhelming mandate for anything in particular would seem to me rather fantastic.

Mr. MORSE. I do not think the Senator from Maine was on the floor one day when I gave one of the many speeches to which the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] alluded last night, in which I discussed the very point the Senator from Maine now raises. In that speech I said that I think the last election could not be cited as a mandate on issues, and I discussed it in terms of labor legislation. I said on that occasion that it could not be cited as a mandate for any specific action on labor legislation in the form of bill A as contrasted with bill B. I think all we can say about it with respect to that issue is that in a good many States the Taft-Hartley law was an issue, made so in the campaign as far as State elections were concerned, and as far as the President was concerned, by his references to it. It undoubtedly had its effects on the election. But I certainly think one would be making a misstatement of fact and drawing a false conclusion if he stated and concluded that the election

was a mandate given to the Democratic Party for a repeal of the Taft-Hartley law. I say that as one who believes the Taft-Hartley law should be repealed. Good Republican policy dictates its repeal. But I do not believe the election was a mandate on the subject, nor do I believe it was a mandate given to the Democratic Party for specific action on any specific bill on any issue. But I hasten to add to my statement to my good friend from Maine that, taking the campaign of the Democrats as a whole, and the issues which they raised in their campaign, in contrast with what I think was a paucity of issues raised in the Republican campaign as far as specific stands on issues were concerned——

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. Permit me to finish.

Mr. BREWSTER. May I suggest that is a masterpiece of understatement?

Mr. MORSE. I always try to understate. I always tried to teach my students in the law school that they had a better chance, I thought, to persuade either court or jury if they did two things: One, not overtry their case by overstatement, and, two, try to state the other fellow's case better than he stated it himself. I always try to make an understatement in advancing my arguments, I may say to my good friend from Maine.

I repeat, that taking the two campaigns in comparison, I think the conclusion must be reached that a majority of the people who did vote expressed a preference for the general program as offered by the Democratic Party in contrast with the program offered by the Republican Party. I say that was the view of a majority of those who voted, keeping in mind the fact that the Democratic Party, as far as the Presidential race is concerned, did not get a majority of the votes, but they got more than we got. So to the extent that they got more votes than we got I am inclined to attribute it to the fact that it represented a greater approval of those voters for the general program of the Democrats, and a tendency on the part of the voters to express a general disapproval of our program.

I may also say to my good friend from Maine—and I am sure he will not object to my citing a little election experience—that I sat in Eugene, Oreg., one night in the living room of a university faculty professor just before the election. There was a group of faculty members present. Most of those who were there were members of the university faculty and, interestingly enough, all Republicans. And interestingly enough, I think most of them would have considered themselves conservative Republicans or at least more conservative than I am.

It was illuminating to me to get their observations about the campaign that was to close the next Tuesday with an election. Here was their consensus of opinion after listening to one of the major speeches over the radio of the campaign: "Why, there was not anything in that speech that would cause me to vote for the Republican Party if it were not for the fact that I am already a Republican."

I would not overgeneralize from it, but there was a group of very intelligent people, and if that was the reaction of that group—and I have heard the same thing expressed by many others in other parts of the country—I wonder what the reaction of the independent voter in the country was of our campaign. I think we know now.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should not, of course, reflect on the Oregon electorate which exercised a substantial voice in the nomination of our candidate, but I think the election in the State of Oregon perfectly exemplified precisely what the Senator from Oregon said, because, if we remember correctly, our candidate in that instance conducted an affirmative and aggressive campaign, and carried it to every cross road, and apparently aroused considerable interest; and I think we agree that if he had carried through in that manner during the remainder of the campaign, at any rate the people would have known that we were having an election.

Mr. MORSE. Let me say that in the Oregon campaign he was fighting, in my judgment, for his political existence, and he went out and put on a personal campaign and did a magnificent job.

Let me say to the Senator from Maine that I am not one of those Republicans who blame the loss of the election upon Thomas E. Dewey. I am not one who blames the campaign strategy upon Thomas E. Dewey. I happen to be one who believes that what happened was that he followed what he considered to be a composite point of view, consensus of opinion of the wishes of the Republican leaders, which I think was a mistake. He apparently believed that he should follow that composite opinion for the sake of his party. He has been criticized—I think unfairly and unmercifully—because he did not campaign from coast to coast, issue by issue, in defense of the Eightieth Congress. I ask, Why should he? I think the main responsibility in defending the Eightieth Congress rested upon the Republican leaders in the Eightieth Congress; and I say most respectfully that I think most of them made too few speeches in the campaign in defense of the Eightieth Congress. I know the explanation of some of them is that they were not invited to do so.

I have the notion that at campaign time, when we are out fighting for our party, so long as we do not take a position which injures our party—and that frequently becomes a matter of judgment, I admit—there rests upon each of us the responsibility of getting in there and pitching with all the energy we have in an effort to convince the American people that if they place their confidence and trust in us, we will lead them to a sound representative government in the public interest.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator heard the expression of the leadership principle from the other side, that a leader is one who is led by his people. I gather that the Senator does not subscribe to that philosophy.

Mr. MORSE. It is like most general rules and general tenets. There is great truth in it; but we cannot consider it separate and distinct from many other rules, obligations, and duties which rest upon one in a campaign. I know of no evidence that the great leader of our party during the last campaign did not welcome every bit of help that he could get. I know of no evidence that he would not have welcomed every Republican in the Senate going out and campaigning from the beginning to the end of the campaign in regard to the Eightieth Congress issue, because I think it was our job to make the Eightieth Congress issue clear. However, to make it clear it was necessary to admit some failures of the Eightieth Congress, and I fear there were too many Republicans in that Congress who did not want to admit its mistakes and failures.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator from Maine did not intend to raise the question of whether our candidate was responsible, wise, or otherwise. I entirely associate myself with the comments of the Senator from Oregon that he did what nearly everyone thought at the time was perhaps a proper course. In retrospect, the Monday morning quarterbacks can see that it was a mistake. He, above all others, suffered most.

But I come back to the original point which I made, that perhaps we have all learned a lesson and that we must first have issues which seem calculated to serve the national welfare; second, we must see that those issues are eloquently and earnestly presented to the people through all the media of modern communication.

Mr. MORSE. On that point we are in agreement. It is with respect to some of those issues that I desire to address the Senate this afternoon. Before I enumerate some of the issues upon which our party in the Eighty-first Congress ought to make a very specific record, I wish to make a few comments to clear up what I think were some misunderstandings which were indicated in the remarks of the two Senators from New Jersey last night.

On page 2699 of the RECORD the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] stated:

> In conclusion, Mr. President, I want to say that I have resented, personally resented, many of the implications which have been so much a part of some of the addresses which have been made on the question before the Senate. My action has been prompted solely by a patriotic urge to see this great body meet its obligations—all of them—fully and squarely.

I assure the junior Senator from New Jersey that it was not my intention in any of my speeches to implicate him in any way in any course of conduct which would cause him to make a statement which, in turn, would cause some of my colleagues—as has been the case—to infer that the Senator from New Jersey was referring to my speeches in opposition to the Wherry substitute amendment. The junior Senator from New Jersey in private conversation has

assured me that he did not have me in mind. I am glad to have that assurance, but I want to make this statement for the RECORD, so that he will definitely understand that any remarks I made were certainly not made with the intention in any way of creating any resentment on the part of the junior Senator from New Jersey. I do not resent his feeling of resentment, as set forth in that paragraph, because I do not think there is any basis for his resentment, at least so far as anything I said is concerned.

However, the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] did specifically refer to me, so there is no doubt as to what he meant. He said:

> I am shocked by the implication which has been made by some of my friends on this side of the aisle, including my good friend the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], to whom I am devoted, that there was some kind of a deal between the GOP and the Dixiecrats, and that a new party was being formed, and that the deal would go further than what he then mentioned. I wish to say that, so far as I am concerned, there was no deal, no discussion of a deal, and no purpose to have a deal, but only a purpose to have the Senate transact the Nation's business and a purpose to try to find some way to improve the present cloture rule, inasmuch as practically all of us know it is impossible to obtain cloture under the present rule or to get majority cloture in the Senate this year.

I am sorry that the Senator from New Jersey is shocked, but I wish to address myself for a moment to what I think is a very serious fact in regard to what transpired in the debate over the cloture vote. There may be certain differences between us over the definition of the word "deal." If he wishes to substitute the word "accommodation" or "arrangement," it is all right with me. I do not deny the right of Members of the Senate who participated in that agreement, accommodation, arrangement, coalition, round robin, or whatever one may choose to call it—I will accept any word which describes it—to enter into such a coalition so long as they understand the point I am trying to make. I do not deny their right to enter into such an arrangement; but I do not feel that they gave full consideration to the effect of their action upon the position of some of their Republican colleagues in the Senate who were opposed to it. I say that because whether they want to admit it or not, the fact is—and one has only to read the press to see the interpretation of their action which is being given to the public—that the arrangement which they entered into was publicly interpreted as being official Republican policy. I know that they deny that they intended to speak for the Republican Party in the Senate. I know that they had no intention of taking a step that would be subject to the public interpretation that official Republican policy had been established by way of the agreement or arrangement or coalition principally with the southern Democrats which they entered into. But what they did to the rest of us on the floor of the Senate as Republicans was to put us in the position where, no matter what we said, as the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] pointed out so clearly last night, we could not possibly persuade them to change their votes. I say that because at least the signers of the so-called arrangement who have talked to me—and I think the statements of others on the floor of the Senate indicate that I am absolutely right about it—considered themselves committed to the Wherry substitute, no matter what the rest of us established by way of proof against it on the floor of the Senate. In fact, I am satisfied that if it had not been for the commitment on their part, the amendment of the Senator from Missouri would have been adopted last night, because at least one Republican in the group has told me that he thought the Senator from Missouri had a good case, and he was sorry he could not vote for it. I believe many others in the group would express similar views if asked.

I appreciate the fact that these Republicans who formed the coalition with the Democrats believed that a duty to perform what they thought was a great service rested upon them, and that they acted out of the highest of motives and the best of purpose and intent. Apparently they believed the only way they could possibly change the Senate's cloture rule was to take what amounted, in fact—I do not care what it is called—to a round-robin procedure on the floor of the Senate.

I would call their attention to the round robin in the Senate in 1917 and to the statement made in the Senate on that occasion by Senator Vardaman, of Mississippi. He said that some 40 Senators had favored cloture by majority vote, but that they felt bound by the two-thirds-vote provision of the round robin. In other words, Mr. President, after they had time to give further consideration to the matter, further argument apparently caused them to change their minds, so far as the personal beliefs of some 40 of those Senators were concerned. This led Senator Vardaman to say that some 40 of them would have preferred a majority-vote provision. I do not say that all of them changed their minds after they signed the round robin; perhaps some of them had that view in the beginning, when they signed the round robin. But I cite the round robin of 1917 to show that it has been used before, but that does not change the fact that it is a very bad practice.

I can only express the hope that in the future if any of my Republican colleagues feel they must work out, on any coalition basis with any group, whatever it may be, some understanding in regard to a compromise, they will do what the Senator from Illinois heard us do in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare this morning in regard to some very important pieces of legislation which we voted to report to the Senate. We agreed that although we would vote to report the legislation to the Senate, we wished it understood that our minds would be open on the floor of the Senate to consider any amendments and any suggestions anyone might wish to make on the floor of the Senate for changes in the proposed legislation. I do not think that a rule against round robins should be a rule of the Senate, for I recognize that this is not the type of matter which should be subjected to a rule, because that would infringe upon what I think is the freedom of action of the Members of the Senate. But this afternoon I make a plea that we should never again find ourselves, as Republicans on the floor of the Senate, in a position where a group of our colleagues, without formal party conference action approving the specific proposal they bring forth, have committed themselves to such an extent that the rest of us cannot possibly change their opinions, no matter what we bring in by way of argument and fact to justify a change of opinion.

Mr. President, if what we are trying to work out is a maximum of teamwork on our side of the aisle, in order to present to the American people the type of forward-looking program which I think we need in the Republican Party, I think the practice of a round robin or a commitment by a group of Republicans, under any arrangement or agreement, with a group of Democrats, ought not be based upon any commitment or moral obligation to vote for that arrangement no matter what takes place on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I was going to inquire of the able Senator from Oregon whether he was under any impression that the so-called round robin, or whatever it may be termed, had any effect upon the Members of the Senate on this side of the aisle or upon Members of the Senate on the other side of the aisle, for that matter, in respect to their casting their votes against the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon, which provided for a simple-majority-of-a-quorum cloture rule.

Mr. MORSE. Oh, I am sure it did not.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Because I was going to say to the able Senator from Oregon that long before the so-called substitute had been presented, informal surveys which had been made on both sides of the aisle had indicated that there probably would not be more than two votes on this side of the aisle and five or six votes on the other side of the aisle in favor of a simple-majority-of-a-quorum cloture rule. So at the time when the President of the United States made his statement in regard to majority cloture, it was obvious that he had no chance whatever of obtaining it, and he did not even have the support of the majority party leadership in the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Oh, I am sure that the round robin, or whatever label we may wish to give to the arrangement about which I am speaking, had no effect on the proposal of the junior Senator from Oregon for majority-vote cloture.

I am happy to say, however, and I wish to recall this to the Members of the Senate, that in 1917 some 40 Members of the Senate apparently would have agreed with the position now taken by the junior Senator from Oregon. The passage of time is not necessarily an indication of what has happened to the progress of a party; but in this particular instance I would say—speaking from the standpoint

of my own personal conviction on this matter—that I think my party has taken a long step backward since 1917, on this issue.

I wish to assure the Senator from California that I am very proud to stand on my record for majority rule in the Senate of the United States, because I am convinced that again, on this issue, I am standing for a progressive principle which a majority of the American people will support, once they come to understand the issue. I am never going to feel very bad whenever I find myself standing for what I believe a majority of the American people stand for, because I have the old-fashioned idea that under our elective system we should seek to stand for the crystallized, carefully thought out, permanent opinion of the people of the country. I hold to the view that whenever we think their opinion is wrong we should seek to take the facts to them, to change their minds if we can. Of course, if we think they are wrong on enough issues and if we fail to take the facts to them, so as to change their minds on enough issues, we know what will happen to us and what should happen to us: We shall be retired from public life.

So I am perfectly willing to have those Members of the Senate who are opposed to majority rule in the Senate, to take their case to the American people, just as I propose to take my case to the American people; and we shall let time determine whether they are right or I am right—or, should I say, whether the President of the United States and the junior Senator from Oregon and the six other Senators who last night voted in favor of majority rule are right.

The other day I said I had a little informal matter to settle in regard to the majority-rule fight here on the floor of the Senate—in short, a wager with another Senator as to whether the number of votes in support of my amendment would be five or six. I said there would be five; the other Senator said there would be six. However, both of us were wrong, for there were seven votes in favor of it. There were eight Republicans against the substitute Wherry amendment, and seven of the total membership of the Senate in favor of my proposal for majority rule. That is one more than the number that the Senator who challenged me to the wager thought my resolution would receive, and two more than I thought I would get for my own resolution. So I wish to say to the Senator from California that I had no doubt as to what the outcome would be.

I was perfectly confident I was going to take a whale of a licking on my proposed amendment, but I am used to it. If there is one thing I can take it is a licking; and I am going to get licked for a period of time on a lot of these other things I am talking about today. But until the Republican Party comes to some of them, I am satisfied it is going to continue to take some lickings, too.

But let me go back to this matter I want to raise in regard to the comment by the senior Senator from New Jersey. I merely want to say that the deal or the arrangement or the agreement or the understanding or the coalition that he entered into along with 51 others, I think is an unsound arrangement as a matter of parliamentary policy in the Senate of the United States. I fully recognize that those men who signed the round robin or the agreement will not agree with me. Had they agreed with me, they would not have signed it in the first place. But I can express the hope that the Republican Party will not be faced with another day as it is today, where the press of the country, with remarkable uniformity, has given the impression or has made the interpretation that the arrangement amounts to a deal, to a coalition. I know that denials that the arrangement had anything to do with anything else other than this particular cloture matter are made in good faith. I accept the word of those who say that the arrangement was limited to the cloture issue. But I want to say there are a great many doubts about that in the minds of many people. I think one of the dangers of the round-robin policy is that, having signed or agreed to a particular resolution, there is a strong pull to go along together on other issues. Feelings of gratitude are likely to be created. Thus if and when, if ever, most of the Republicans on such a round-robin resolution find themselves in agreement with the Senators on the other side of the Senate who joined with them in it, the charge will be made that the coalition is again standing together. At least such a charge will be made, and I do not see how there is any escape to it, untrue though it may be.

Mr. KNOWLAND rose.

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am sure my able colleague from Oregon will recognize the fact that there was no deal of any type or character for any other type of legislation involved. I am sure the Senator will bear me out that when the roll is finally called on the dozens of issues that will be before the Senate, whether they be the North Atlantic Pact or the ECA or labor legislation, or housing, or a dozen other issues that will be before this body, there will be found Senators on both sides of the aisle voting in different proportions on all those issues, and on some of them some of the southern Democrats will be joined with the northern Democrats. I do not think the Senator will then charge that there has been some kind of an alliance or deal for that purpose.

But in the normal course of legislative activity the Senators are going to vote their own convictions, and I think the facts will be amply demonstrated as the session proceeds.

Mr. MORSE. I am sure that what the Senator from California says is the fact, and is certainly exactly what the Senator from California had in mind when the arrangement was made. If the Senator from California has the slightest doubt about my view, let me remove the doubt from his mind right now. The junior Senator from Oregon does not have the slightest feeling that the Senator from California would at any time bind himself to a legislative program involving many issues. He may bind himself on one issue, but I know the Senator from California would not enter into any legislative trade whereby he would bind himself to vote for one particular proposal such as the Wherry substitute amendment, in return for a pledge that he would also vote for certain other pieces of legislation that may arise in the future.

I want the Senator from California to understand my position on that. But I am simply saying to the Senator that whenever a group of Republicans enter into what amounts in fact to a round-robin coalition with a group of Democrats, they run the danger of the public believing that such an arrangement probably is behind the scene, and one has only to read the press to know that such a danger has materialized in this instance.

Let me say this in regard to what I have heard on the floor of the Senate and read in the press concerning a possible future civil-rights bill. I shall be very much interested in whether or not, in the Eighty-first Congress, the Republicans, including the Republicans who joined with the Senator from California on the Wherry substitute, as well as other Republicans, really press forward, for example, for the types of civil-rights legislation which will make it possible to put the Bill of Rights into practice, such as the fair-employment-practices bill. Of course, if the program should be an anti-poll-tax bill or an antilynch bill by way of constitutional amendment, I may say I think that will do great damage to the Republican side of the aisle. I think the Negro groups in America, the minority groups in America, are looking to the Republican Party to pass Federal legislation by way of establishing a Federal policy for the courts to pass on in respect to civil rights. They want the Republicans to pass specific bills and then let the courts say as to whether or not the legislation falls within the confines of the Constitution on the subjects of antilynching, antipoll tax, and anti-discrimination and not leave such matters to the several States by way of constitutional amendments. I fear that if constitutional amendments should be our strategy, we almost guarantee that there will be no antilynch or anti-poll-tax or antidiscrimination protection for the Negroes of the country for many, many, many years to come, if ever. I think the power of Southern States to block such constitutional amendments is sufficient to make it certain we are not going to protect civil rights through constitutional amendments.

I may put it this way. I have talked to a considerable number of my friends among the southern Democrats since I have been in the Senate. They have said to me, and they keep saying to me, "Wayne, now, do not worry about this poll-tax business. We are getting rid of it. We are getting rid of it just as fast as we can. We have got a little more persuading to do in the South. Just let us alone, and we will get rid of the poll-tax requirement." They say that in perfectly good faith, and I want to give due

credit to those southern leaders who have in many Southern States succeeded in getting rid of the poll tax. But I want to hasten to add that I think the rest of them have had plenty of time. I think the time has come now when the Federal Government must make perfectly clear that under Federal policy by way of legislation and not by constitutional amendment, there shall be no poll tax as a condition precedent to the exercise of what ought to be a free franchise in America. The courts may find us wrong; I do not think so; but honest men may differ on that. I am perfectly willing to let it go to the courts, but I am not going to vote in the Senate, I may say, for any proposal for a constitutional amendment either on an anti-poll-tax law or an antilynch law, or on a fair-employment-practice law. I am going to urge that we proceed as rapidly as we can, and I should like to make a test of cloture on it, Mr. President, in this session of Congress, for a fair-employment-practice law, along the lines of the very sound piece of legislation which the junior Senator from New York introduced in the last session of the Congress, and which he has reintroduced in behalf of several of us in this session of Congress. Incidentally I may say I think that the introduction, the mere introduction, of that piece of legislation in the Eightieth Congress, and the clear record that was made in the Eightieth Congress of the determination on the part of a substantial number of us over here to make that a matter of Republican policy, is one of the things which more speakers should have stressed in the late lamented campaign. I left no room for doubt in that campaign as to where I thought the Republican Party should and would stand in the field of civil rights if the voters of the country would place sufficient confidence in it to give it the privilege of serving them in both the Congress and the White House.

Mr. President, I hope I have made myself clear in my reply to the senior Senator from New Jersey concerning my position in regard to the alleged deal which is supposed to have been made with reference to the coalition which took place in connection with the Wherry substitute.

What are some of the issues on which I think the Republican Party should commit itself in the Eighty-first Congress? I think it should vote for legislation on these issues, and I think it should try to get a record vote of every Republican in the Eighty-first Congress on those issues, because, I repeat, we are no more liberal than our voting record. What we say is of value, Mr. President, only to the extent that we back up with our votes what we say in the Senate of the United States. That is the reason why I am always willing to submit my position on liberalism to the people of the country through my voting record.

Let us for a moment consider social security. I think with regard to that, the Republican Party has, to a great extent, failed to demonstrate to the people of the Nation that Republicans believe in an adequate self-supporting social-security program. When I say "self-supporting," I do not mean that there shall not be substantial public contribution to it. Certainly the public's duty to pay its share of the benefits which should be given to persons who reach an age at which they cannot support themselves in health and decency, rather than have those persons relying on charity for the rest of their years is open to little if any argument. All I can do is to give my interpretation of what has been the general attitude of the Republican Party on social security. There has been some lip service to the idea of social security. There has been no proposal, may I hasten to add, of repealing any social security we already have; at least, there has been no responsible Republican representation to that effect in the sense that our party, through its political platforms has ever proposed repeal. In fact, I am interested in the argument of those who charge some of us as following a me-too program.

We may ask them, "What is it you want us to repeal?" But when it comes to basic social and economic reforms, they have little to say when we ask them to cite specifically the great pieces of social legislation which have been passed in the past 20 years which they would like to see repealed. I go back 20 years, Mr. President. In fact, I could go back 25 years, because many people do not seem to realize that much of the foundation for some of this legislation was laid during Republican administrations. I have said before, and I repeat now, that if Herbert Hoover had been reelected in 1932—and I well understand why he was not reelected—some of the same principles of legislative reform which were adopted under a Democratic administration would have had to be adopted under a Republican administration. There was no possible way of stopping that trend; and of course it should not have been stopped. There is no way of stopping the present trend on the part of persons demanding that our Government recognize that it must pass that legislation which is necessary to protect the common good. My disagreement with the Democrats on social legislation has been in part a disagreement over administrative powers and policies rather than over objectives.

I ask the Republican Party today if it is willing to extend the coverage of social security. I find in the councils of the Republican Party, shall I say by way of understatement, a general hesitancy, if not open opposition, to extending the coverage of social security.

Mr. President, as a liberal Republican, I say to my party that it ought to extend the coverage of social security. I say to my party, I think there is a growing demand, and it will increase with intensity, that the Republican Party recognize that the strength of the capitalistic system is to be found in the fact that it can be made to work in the interest of protecting the welfare of all our people. A capitalistic system does not mean, according to my mind, that we have to have several millions of people living under a capitalistic economy, in conditions of underprivilege, of poverty, or disease. When there is any substantial number of people in the citizenry living under those conditions and circumstances, we have a hothouse bed of social unrest and we have fertile ground in that bed for the planting of seeds of ideologies which would seek to overthrow and destroy the capitalistic economy and the political democracy upon the joint operation of which I think is dependent the freedom and the liberty of every American.

I am not giving blanket endorsement this afternoon to any kind of social-security bill that may be thrown into the legislative hopper, but I say the objective of the Republican Party in regard to social security, Mr. President, ought to be in the direction of extending its coverage, so that persons living under a capitalistic system shall not have to live in fear when they reach old age and cannot get employment they will have to sell pencils, or pass their hat, or plead for charity. That does not build up a citizenry of people characterized by personal dignity and patriotic confidence in democratic government and a capitalistic economy.

Oh, I keep saying to the businessmen of the country as I talk to them, "It is up to you to help save the capitalistic system. It is up to you at least to help save the capitalistic system by helping the officials of Government make it work in order to remove this ever-gnawing fear which disturbs so many American people because of the apprehension that after they have given their all to the economic life of this country in their declining years, they may have to live on charity."

That is related to the problem of broader coverage, and when I say broader coverage, I mean adequate pensions for the aged. My confidence in the capitalistic system is such that I do not think that a pension system in this country should involve such a small amount that it is perfectly obvious that an old person who has to accept it cannot possibly live on that pension amount. Of course there is much work which needs to be done from an actuarial basis to see to it that over the producing years of the individual he does make a substantial contribution to a pension fund so that he can accept his pension check in his declining years in self-respect. I have never shared the notion that self-respecting old people believe that they have the right to a pension check without having during their producing years made the contributions which justify their accepting social security in their old age. I say we should make more rapid strides and progress toward this end than we are making. The first thing we should do is to work out the problem of coverage, and the second thing is to increase the amount of pension. One hundred dollars a month on existing values would not be an unreasonable amount to aim for.

Closely related to that is the question of the minimum wage. I wish to see my party take a specific stand on minimum-wage legislation in this session of Congress. I do not consider the increase in the amount the most important facet of the minimum-wage problem. We all know that there are few employers—

there are some but there are few employers in this country—who are paying a minimum wage of 40 cents an hour. We know that in most manufacturing industries today most employers are paying at least 75 cents an hour. So I say that the amount of the increase of the wage is not the most important factor in this controversy over the minimum wage, but I do say that the coverage of minimum wage is the most important factor.

I recognize that there is a need for a clarification of a great deal of ambiguity in regard to interstate and intrastate commerce in regard to the Wage and Hour Division's interpretation of whether or not a given industry is affected by or affects interstate commerce. We should face that problem of definition, and the Republican Party in the Eighty-first Congress should come forward, I think, with a piece of legislation which can clear up that ambiguity. The need for this clearance is certainly manifested by the testimony of the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, Mr. Denham, when he appeared in the hearings of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee on the so-called administration Thomas labor bill. I hope the Members of the Senate, when we get to the matter of eliminating the powers of the general counsel under the new labor bill, will turn to the reference I now make. At those hearings I read into the record the testimony of Mr. Denham which he gave back in July 1947, I believe it was, before a subcommittee of the House committee, as to how broad he thinks the so-called legal criterion of an industry affecting interstate commerce is. As I read his testimony I came to the conclusion that he might even go so far as to include a barber shop because in it the barber shaves and cuts the hair of traveling men. I speak of that facetiously. He did not say that, but he did by example after example of businesses in this country indicate that he finds it very difficult to name any business which might not possibly come within the jurisdiction of the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board to issue complaints, on the ground that the business affects interstate commerce.

I am sure I betray no confidence, in fact, I only refer to statements the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] made in the record at the time the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board expounded this remarkable theory of his as to the meaning of the phrase "business affecting interstate commerce." The distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] commented on Mr. Denham's conclusions. I think his exact language was that he totally disagreed with the observation of the general counsel on that point. Irrespective of what the exact language might have been, there is no doubt about the fact that the senior Senator from Ohio expressed great concern over the fact that the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board labors under the belief that practically all businesses in this country fall within the legal phrase "affecting interstate commerce." Of course, if that is true, as far as the operation of the National Labor Relations Board is concerned, it should be true as far as the operation of the Fair Labor Standards Act is concerned.

I therefore invite my Republican colleagues in the Eighty-first Congress to direct their attention to the problem of what the coverage should be under any minimum-wage act, and if they are going to do a statesmanlike job on it, they should clear up, for the benefit of American businessmen, this ambiguity and uncertainty which exists in respect to the meaning of "interstate commerce" and "intrastate commerce."

Mr. President, I think we also have to have the courage to tell the various pressure groups which are putting on so much heat these days to get an exemption of their employees from the Fair Labor Standards Act, even though those employees are engaged in a business which affects interstate commerce; that we of the Republican Party—and I hope the Democrats, too—will make clear that we think that, as a matter of public policy, it is unfair to discriminate between and among employees on the basis of the many exemptions we are asked to grant in connection with the minimum-wage law. It is either the public policy of this country or it is not to have a minimum-wage law. If we are to have one, we ought to have a minimum-wage standard protecting American workers generally. If that is the public policy—and I say it should be the public policy and it should be good Republican policy, too—then let us stand up and be counted against the many proposals for exemptions in a minimum-wage law.

I have never seen produced any satisfactory proof in any of our hearings which convinced me that a fellow who works in X shop, the employer of whom thinks the shop should be exempted from the Fair Labor Standards Act, even though he admits it affects interstate commerce, gets any less hungry, or has any less need, or is any more free from fear of insecurity for his loved ones, than the fellow who works in Y shop, for an employer who does not seek an exemption, and to which shop the Fair Labor Standards Act applies a minimum wage coverage.

Mr. President, to me it is a very simple matter, and it is a point I keep making to employers who want me to vote for this exemption and that exemption and the other exemption. The purpose, as far as this feature of the Fair Labor Standards Act is concerned, is to set out what we consider to be a floor on wages below which employers should not be allowed to go, because it would be bad public policy to subject free American workers to a lower wage scale.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does the Senator subscribe to the view that the basis for this type of legislation is the interest the Federal Government has in interstate commerce?

Mr. MORSE. Well, we have to put it on that basis in order to get Federal jurisdiction.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is what I mean.

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The question that always bothers me about it is just where is that line to be drawn, dividing that work which is in interstate commerce or affects commerce to the extent that it may be considered within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government from that which is outside the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, that is outside of interstate commerce.

Mr. MORSE. I may say to my good friend from Alabama that although I am prepared to discuss that matter in great detail it would take a detailed discussion of not less than an hour for me to go into it this afternoon. Therefore, I am going to reserve that discussion for the Senate when the minimum-wage bill comes up. All I am seeking to do this afternoon is to make a record here which I hope will be an encouragement to the Republicans in the Senate to meet head-on this question as a matter of Republican policy calling for an extension of minimum-wage legislation for workers who, in fact, as a matter of legal definition, work in industries affecting interstate commerce.

I do not say here this afternoon that I close my mind to any evidence that may be offered which will show that some exemption can be justified, but I do say to the proponents of any exemption, "The burden of proof is clearly on you to show a set of facts which will justify an exemption, and to show that the public interest will not be jeopardized, and the interest of the workers involved will not be jeopardized if we grant you the exemption."

Mr. President, the next item I am going to mention, and I am going over it very quickly, is veterans' legislation. I think the Republican Party still owes much more to those veterans who were disabled, who suffered as the result of their participation in the armed services of this country, than it has yet granted to them. I am sitting these days on a subcommittee on veterans' hospital problems. I want to support what the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] said the other day in the committee, that the issue which ought to determine this hospital matter is the answer to the question: What is the need for hospitalization for the veterans? And whatever that need is, then I say to the Republican Party we ought to go forward with legislation in the Eighty-first Congress which will provide the hospital facilities and services to meet that need for our veterans.

Next, we have the question of Federal aid to education. The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare this morning voted out a Federal aid to education bill, Mr. President, and also a bill to provide Federal aid to health service for school children. I recommend those two bills to my Republican colleagues as sound, liberal Republican legislation, and I hope they will line up in support of the majority of the Committee on Labor and

Public Welfare which reported the bills this morning.

I have already commented, Mr. President, in regard to the whole national security program, insofar as the organization of our armed forces is concerned.

Now let me say a word in regard to the relationship of the support of our armed services to the maintenance of peace in the world. I have not had an opportunity as yet to study in detail the North Atlantic Pact, but I want to dissociate myself here and now with those Republicans who propose as Republican policy the point of view that if we enter into the North Atlantic Pact, we do not undertake what I think are very definite moral obligations to defend freedom when it is attacked or aggressed against by Russian communism.

I want to repeat that in other words, Mr. President, because I think we will be deluding and deceiving the American people if we think we are even going to have time to declare the next war. If it comes, it will be on us with no warning whatsoever. It certainly will come, Mr. President, if we do not make perfectly clear now to the Soviet Union that we have no intention of standing by and letting her diminish by territory after territory those parts of the world in which personal freedom and self-government prevail today.

Oh, I have no misunderstanding of the interpretations and the possible misinterpretations that will be made of that statement. But I am not one who ever kids the American people, and I do not believe they want to be kidded.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Upon what assumption does the Senator base what the Republican Party's view is going to be on this European pact the Senator has just referred to? I would like to be enlightened.

Mr. MORSE. I have made no assumption as to what it is going to be.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I rather gathered the Senator did when he said he wanted to disassociate himself with them, however.

Mr. MORSE. "Those Republicans," I said.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. I will let the RECORD speak for itself. I am sure I said "those Republicans." And I want to repeat it. I here and now disassociate myself with those Republicans who seem to hold to the view that if we enter into the North Atlantic Pact we are not entering into any moral obligation to protect freedom and self-government from Soviet aggression. We cannot escape it. I do not believe in form over substance. I think we ought to come to the substance of this matter. The substance of this matter is the question of whether or not the American people are willing to recognize that our national self-interest, our own skins, if you will, depend upon our making clear now that we are going to stand out against aggression of totalitarian ideologies against freedom whenever that aggression takes the form of an act of war against a free people.

I do not share the opinion that the issue means that other people will declare war for us, and we shall be thrown into it through the back door. To the contrary, I am satisfied that because of the understandings and machinery which will be set up under any pact, and because of the machinery of the United Nations, the American people have no need to fear that they will not be protected from any possible coalition or devices or strategy that would throw us into war against our will. No Member of this body will vote more quickly than I will against any attempt on the part of any combination of people to take advantage of the United States in respect to any professed aggressions against their rights. But when I say that I am not going to kid the American people in regard to the world security problems which confront us I wish to make it clear that I believe that if we do not keep ourselves strong enough to defend ourselves against Russian aggression and make it perfectly clear to the Soviet Union that we are going to help other people defend themselves against Soviet aggression, we have not a chance of stopping a third world war. But I think we can win the peace, Mr. President, if as a people we make clear that we went into World War II in support of freedom—in support of freedom for keeps, and not just for the war.

Thus I happen to hold to the point of view that the best evidence we can give to the Soviet Union that she must be willing to live in peace with us and the other countries which join with us in the North Atlantic Pact is to make clear that we will not permit of any aggressions against the peoples who join in that pact.

Mr. President, there are many other international issues upon which I shall comment at a later date; but I wish to reiterate here this afternoon that I think it is good Republican policy to make very clear to the signatories to the United Nations Charter that we expect the principles of the United Nations Charter to be lived up to by the signatories thereto. That means, of course, that we expect the signatories to the United Nations Charter to live up to the decisions of the Security Council. In my opinion that means specifically that the Dutch cannot justify ignoring the decisions of the Security Council in Indonesia, and then, by a turnabout, say to us that they are entitled to funds under the ECA.

These things must work both ways. Good faith cannot be limited to Europe in this modern day. A nation either acts in good faith around the world in her relations with all the world, or she does not act in good faith at all.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. What would the Senator say to the argument which has been presented to the Senator of Maine, that we must disregard the defiance of the Security Council's directives by the Netherlands because unless we give them the $300,000,000 or $400,000,000 they are asking this year under the ECA, they will not join the North Atlantic Pact?

Mr. MORSE. I think the argument is unsound. I think we must make clear that it is Republican policy that we intend to do our part, along with the Democratic Party, in making the United Nations work, but insisting that all signatories to it live up to their obligations under it.

I close by saying that in addition to the issues I have mentioned there are many others with respect to liberal legislation, some of which I have already introduced, and some of which my colleagues have introduced, to which I think my Republican brethren in the United States Senate need to give most serious attention in this session of Congress, if they have any hope of going before the voters in 1950 and asking for the election of a majority of Republican Senators in that election, or going to the voters in 1952 and asking them to elect a Republican administration not only in the Congress, but in the White House.

Mr. President, I hope I have succeeded in making clear one further point in these remarks. Any time any of my colleagues—be it my good friend from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] or my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]—wish to make a suggestion by implication, even, that Senators be restricted in their right of free speech on the floor of the Senate on the merits of issues as they see them that I shall at the next and first opportunity make a speech in preservation of our right as Senators to speak on any issue we desire to. I shall also join in a cloture petition any time a Senator or group of Senators attempt to turn the right of free speech in the Senate into license to filibuster.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). The Senator can yield only for a question, not a statement.

Mr. MORSE. I am yielding only for a question.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it possible to conceive of anything more hypocritical than for our representatives in the Security Council to avow their devotion to its decrees, to demand their observance, and then to give $400,000,000 to the Nation which is defying those decrees?

Mr. MORSE. My good friend from Maine uses language stronger than I ever liked to use, when he uses the word "hypocritical." I should like to answer his question by saying that I think it is a mistake for them to reach the conclusion on this particular subject which they have reached.

Mr. BREWSTER. Do I gather from that that the Senator from Oregon would be inclined to support an amendment which would provide that money should not be granted under the ECA to countries which refused to observe the decisions of the Security Council?

Mr. MORSE. I think it is one of the obvious inhibitory measures which we

have the right to use against any organization which refuses to carry out what I consider to be the law of nations established by the United Nations Charter.

THE NORTH ATLANTIC SECURITY PACT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the people of the Nation, and particularly Members of the Senate, read with interest the text of the North Atlantic Security Pact. All of us are hopeful, of course, that if and when the pact is ratified it may fulfill the aims and ambitions of the participating nations and of the people of the world by giving us real security in the North Atlantic region, and bringing together for peaceful purposes the people of the democracies which have joined in the pact.

In connection with the pact, I feel that the most encouraging prospect for an eventual North Atlantic security arrangement that will really work for the maintenance of peace and world stability is found in the announcement of the formation of the Atlantic Union Committee for a Federal Convention of Democracies. The announcement of the formation of this committee was made on Tuesday, March 15. In my opinion, the formation of this committee represents great vision and force in the furtherance of a permanent plan which will strengthen the possibility of preventing a third world war and enable the people of the world to have peace for generations to come.

The Atlantic Union Committee, headed by former Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts, includes many important and influential citizens—Robert P. Patterson, Will L. Clayton, Clare Luce, Herbert Agar, Edmund Orgill, Gardner Cowles, Elmo Roper, Harold Urey, and other influential men and women. The program of the committee is a bold step, and, in my opinion, it is the one that must be taken eventually if we are to realize the dreams and ambitions of the peace-loving peoples of the world.

I agree with the committee in its stated view that the alliance provided for in the Atlantic Pact will be an immediate step to prevent war, and will bring the democracies closer together; but I do not think it will be enough to insure permanent peace.

The Atlantic Union Committee was organized recently as a result of a meeting of citizens and community leaders from all over the country. At that meeting the following resolution was adopted:

Resolved, That an action committee be formed for the purpose of (a) enlisting public support for a resolution to be introduced in Congress inviting the other democracies, with whom the United States is forming an alliance, to meet American delegates in a federal convention to explore possibilities of uniting in a federal union of the free; and (b) continuing this support until such a federal union of democracies becomes an accomplished fact.

Mr. President, in order that Members of Congress and the people generally may consider this proposal, which I think is the one means that we have of really securing peace and stability during the years to come, I wish to quote from statements made by the three principal officers of the Atlantic Union Committee, which were released on Tuesday:

The purpose of the Atlantic Union Committee is to bring about a union of the democracies signing the Atlantic Pact.

He expressed belief that the alliance provided for in the Atlantic Pact would be an immediate step to prevent war, and would bring the democracies closer together; but he declared that it would not be enough to insure permanent peace.

He said:

After Congress has acted on the pact, this Committee will ask Congress to pass a resolution calling for an international convention to explore how far the United States and the other democracies could wisely go at this time in forming a true federation of the Atlantic democracies. Such a federation would be formed within the framework of the United Nations.

Such a federation would offer three immediate benefits. It would strengthen the United Nations. It would raise the standard of living and lower the cost of military security for all. When organized, the union would admit other nations which protect individual liberty by law, and practice representative government. In the meanwhile, it would make democracy so powerful that the Kremlin could not hope to start a war with any prospect of success.

The Honorable Robert Patterson stated:

A union of the democracies will convince the Kremlin that the democracies mean business. The Kremlin will immediately see that the creation of a federal defense force for a union of nations would be far stronger than any staff agreements between separate nations.

Yet nothing could be more in the spirit of peace symbolized by the United Nations, than for some of its members to reach the ultimate degree of understanding involved in formation within the United Nations of a federal union by mutual consent. The calling of a federal convention of Atlantic nations to discuss union would immeasurably strengthen the United Nations.

The Honorable Will Clayton declared:

The preservation of peace and freedom is the only thing that counts in the world today. Russia is on the march, determined to communize the world. Russian communism opposes the civil freedom and the religious freedom which democracy holds dear. There is only one way to stop Russia short of war. Democracy must be made to work in all those lands which are still free. In economic terms, democracy works when people have more to eat, more to wear, and better homes in which to live. This rising standard of living can only be realized in the modern world by releasing the world's productive capacities through striking off the shackles of economic nationalism, and by reducing armaments. This calls for an economic merger of the democracies. I favor union of the free, believing it to be the only road to world freedom, world prosperity, and world peace. I believe such a union is the next step forward in the spiritual, economic, and social development of the human race.

Mr. President, among officers of the committee, besides Justice Roberts, Robert Patterson, and Will Clayton, are: Herbert Agar, Gardner Cowles, Elmo Roper, Dr. Harold C. Urey, and William L. White. Earl E. Hart is executive director.

This movement, Mr. President, in my opinion, is another step toward the realization of the inspired plan for a union of the free peoples of the North Atlantic region. It is difficult for us to recognize that history is being made by this movement; for although we can appreciate to some degree the immediate effect of it, few of us are aware of the great potential that it holds.

I hope this proposal will be discussed fully in Congress and throughout the Nation. The high standing of the sponsors of the Atlantic Union Committee justifies its being given full consideration. Mr. Clarence Streit, who has devoted unselfishly of his wisdom and energy for so many years for a federation of democracies, is advocating adoption of the program of approving the Atlantic pact first and then securing consideration of a resolution for a constitutional convention.

This is a bold step, Mr. President; but in an age like this, vision and boldness are necessary if we are to maintain unity in the interest of peace. Alliances may be satisfactory over short periods of time, but we know that in the long run a federation of democracies presents the best opportunity for halting the spread of communism and preventing war. In order to have unity for the prevention of war there must be cooperation not only on a military basis but in economic matters and in the formulation of foreign policy. These are possible only through a federation of democracies.

Mr. President, I am very pleased on my part to note in the text of the North Atlantic security pact that, in addition to the provisions for military requirements, the signatory nations realize and appreciate that there must be economic cooperation and some cooperation in the making of foreign policy with the same objectives in view. I am also pleased to note that in article 9 of the proposed pact the parties agree to establish a council which shall consider matters concerning the implementation of the pact. I believe that is a step toward the ambition of a federation or a limited federation which over a period of years and generations would represent the best chance of having real security in the Atlantic region and of preventing wars in the generations to come.

WITHHOLDING OF SPEECHES FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the majority leader will permit, I wish to ask unanimous consent to have the transcribed observations and statements made yesterday by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], together with his entire speech and colloquy with the other Senators, printed in the body of the RECORD.

Mr. LUCAS. Pardon me, but is it not in the RECORD now?

Mr. WHERRY. No; it is not in the RECORD now.

I call to the Senator's attention the following statement appearing on page 2747 of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[Mr. NEELY addressed the Senate. His speech will be published hereafter in the Appendix.]

What I should like to do is to obtain unanimous consent from the majority leader——

Mr. LUCAS. I have no objection.

Mr. WHERRY. If there is no objection, then the speech in its entirety, together with all the colloquy which was engaged in at that time, as taken down by the Official Reporters, will be printed in the body of the RECORD.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. What could possibly be the reason for placing the speech in the Appendix, rather than in the RECORD itself?

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to discuss that for a moment. I now have obtained the unanimous consent I requested, and I deeply appreciate it.

I am bringing this matter to the attention of the majority leader because I wish to cooperate in every way in helping to expedite the work of the Senate.

I have made a considerable check on this subject. This morning I was asked about some remarks I made in that colloquy; and I went to the RECORD to ascertain the exact words I used in answer to some of the questions the Senator from West Virginia propounded to me. But all I find in the RECORD is this statement:

[Mr. NEELY addressed the Senate. His speech will be published hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, the present occupant of the Chair was not in the Chair at that time, but may I ask whether the Parliamentarian remembers what took place then?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from West Virginia is withholding his remarks for revision, which is privileged.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I will not yield further, if that point is going to be injected into this discussion. I did not propound a parliamentary inquiry as to what the Senator from West Virginia was doing with the speech. I simply requested unanimous consent, and now I have obtained it; my request was not objected to. Was not that the order of the Chair?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not have any objection, but I should like to know the reasons back of this. As suggested by the Senator from Louisiana, I do not quite understand why the Senator from West Virginia would place the speech in the Appendix of the RECORD. I do not understand it at all.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, what is the ruling of the Chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. May we wait for an opinion in this matter from the Parliamentarian?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. President, as I understand the situation, the majority leader has said he has no objection. I am asking for the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. LUCAS. I have no objection to it.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

Mr. LUCAS. But it seems to me——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LUCAS. Reserving the right to object——

Mr. WHERRY. Oh.

Mr. LUCAS. Reserving for a moment the right to object, please, let me say I do not quite understand what all this is about. Perhaps the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] should be here when the request is made. It would not be very difficult to delay it until the coming Monday. I still do not understand why it should be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, when there was a colloquy on the floor of the Senate between the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from West Virginia. That is what I cannot understand.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to make a statement at this time?

Mr. WHERRY. I will, but I want to get it straightened out as to who has the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor; there is no question about that.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Having heard the debate yesterday, I would simply state that the Senator made a speech, and there was an exchange of repartee, none of which seemed to be particularly out of the way so far as I noticed. To me it is inconceivable that it should not have been reported and printed in the RECORD.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. LUCAS. Was there any unanimous consent given?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair was not aware of it.

Mr. LUCAS. Was unanimous consent given at the time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator mean at the time the Senator from Nebraska made his request?

Mr. LUCAS. No. Was unanimous consent given at the time, yesterday, for the Senator from West Virginia to place his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD instead of in the body of the RECORD?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair was not in the Senate Chamber at the time the Senator from West Virginia made his speech. It is the understanding of the Chair that no consent was given, but that the Senator has a right to withhold his remarks for a stated period of time for revision.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. LUCAS. How can the Senator from West Virginia withhold his remarks for further revision and yet the remarks be found in the Appendix of the RECORD?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I can answer a good many of those questions.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to have the advice of the Parliamentarian.

Mr. WHERRY. I think I can explain the rules of the Senate. I have examined them rather closely. In order to get away from any altercations, or, if there is a desire to recess, if I could get unanimous consent—and I thought I had it from the majority leader—that all the remarks of the Senator from West Virginia, including the colloquies in his speech, be transcribed and placed in the body of the RECORD, that is all I am asking.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. After consulting the head of the Corps of Official Reporters of Debates and the Parliamentarian, it is the opinion of the Chair that, as stated, a Senator has the right to withhold his remarks for a stated period of time for revision, and that then they can be printed. When withheld, the only place they can subsequently be printed obviously is in the Appendix, for the RECORD of the day on which the speech was delivered has already been issued. In this case the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 17 has already been printed and delivered. When the permanent RECORD is published, some 30 days from now, the remarks of the Senator from West Virginia will be transferred from the Appendix, in which they will appear within a few days, to the permanent RECORD, at the point at which they were made on March 17.

Mr. LUCAS. Under those circumstances, Mr. President, I think I shall have to object to the unanimous-consent request, until the Senator from West Virginia returns. If he has not corrected or revised his remarks and is merely withholding them until such time as he can revise them for the permanent RECORD, I think I should not take advantage of the Senator from West Virginia by agreeing to the request. I think the Senator from West Virginia should be here to argue that out with the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to suggest to the Senator from Nebraska that, of course, he can look over the copy before it is sent to the printer as to the colloquies in which the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from West Virginia participated, to make certain that the statements ascribed to the Senator from Nebraska are correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Now, Mr. President, you are in the chair, and you are not arguing as a Senator with me on the floor. I simply asked for unanimous consent. Since then you have brought in the Parliamentarian and the Official Reporters, and in the colloquy between you and the Senator from Illinois, you

are attempting to build a case as to why the Senator is not here, and what he should have done under the rules. At first, I had unanimous consent, and nobody objected. Now, when I ask for it, the majority leader comes in and says, "I want to withdraw consent." If you had put the unanimous-consent request, then I would have had it, and I was entitled to it. All in the world I am asking—and I had unanimous consent—is that the speech the Senator from West Virginia made and the colloquies he had, be printed in the body of the RECORD, and I would have had that unanimous consent if it had been put. But you withheld it, and now as a Senator in the chair you are arguing with me, after you got information from the Official Reporters and the Parliamentarian, what I should do. That is for me to decide.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is not arguing with the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield for no purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. But the Chair may say that, as the Chair understands it——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not yield the floor for any purpose.

Mr. LUCAS. The Chair has a right——

Mr. WHERRY. No; I have the floor, not the Chair. The Senator from West Virginia yesterday made a speech of about an hour's length, and in that speech, which was a very forceful speech, he made many statements about this man and about that man, and indeed three or four or five Senators engaged in a colloquy. I feel that inasmuch as colloquy was engaged in, those who entered into that colloquy should have everything they said in the RECORD.

I want to read the rules, because I believe that the Senator from West Virginia is within the rules in following the procedure he did. Certainly, I have no complaint at all with the Official Reporters who took the speech down; they did what they should have done. But I want to say for the first time in the 6 years I have been here a new course is being taken, even though it is within the rules, of holding out of the daily RECORD, the only RECORD I care particularly about, because by the time 30 days is up and the permanent RECORD is published, who cares then about what was said on a previous day when the subject was current? The speech is not available. It will not be available for 30 days, and then, unless I take the pains to go over and correct the copy, so far as my colloquy is concerned, it is printed in the RECORD as furnished by the Senator from West Virginia.

Now, Mr. President, we have a rule which is entitled "Return of Manuscript," reading as follows:

When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m., in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning—

That is the provision, in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning—

and if all of the said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

It is my contention that under that rule the Senator from West Virginia had the right to keep the manuscript out till 9 o'clock, and if he did not return it then, it is my interpretation of the rule that the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day.

The reason for that is that all of us, when we engage in colloquy or debate, have a right to revise our own remarks. That precedent has been established in the Senate. The majority leader well knows that very often we engage in colloquies, and we feel that the questions we ask and the answers which are made are in the RECORD, and we depend upon it. In the colloquy we have made our position clear. If the procedure is followed of withholding remarks from the RECORD, it means practically that we delete them, for the colloquies in which occurred the remarks are not available in the RECORD at all, until the end perhaps of a 30-day period. I cannot find any record showing that a Senator has to return manuscript at the end of 30 days. There is no penalty involved. It is simply not printed in the RECORD if it is not returned within 30 days.

The second rule provides that if manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings of a given day the Public Printer will insert the words:

Mr. —

In this case, the Senator from West Virginia—

addressed the Senate. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.

Will they, or will they not? Under the rule there is a 30-day limit on printing the remarks, and if they are not returned the speech will be completely deleted and no one can know what the RECORD is. I have been told that that occurred in the House many years ago. I wanted to bring the matter to the attention of the Senate for its own information.

I can conceive of the Senator from West Virginia becoming ill; I can conceive of his rushing away from the Capitol without correcting his remarks. He may have had the intention of coming back, but he failed to do so. I am not talking about that. But going to West Virginia, as I understand he did, from which he will not return until next week, means that his remarks will not be corrected within the 1 day allotted to him, and that they may not be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD within the next 30 days. If he does not want them printed, they will not be printed at all, and whatever the RECORD would have indicated as to my remarks and those of my colleagues on this side of the aisle will be completely deleted. Apparently that is a rule of the Senate.

Mr. President, I did not intend to make a speech at all. I only asked the majority leader to permit the remarks of the Senator from West Virginia and the colloquies in connection with them to be printed in the body of the RECORD. If that cannot be done, I have a right to get the transcript of the notes and read it into the RECORD.

I am not charging that the Senator from West Virginia acted in bad faith. He may be ill; I do not know; but can the Senator decide that he does not want his speech in the RECORD at all? Can he withhold his remarks until 9 o'clock or 1 o'clock, or not have them printed in the RECORD within 30 days? It has been said that they will appear in the permanent RECORD. That RECORD is one thing, and the daily RECORD is another thing. Even if they are printed in the permanent RECORD, there may be difficulty in getting it done. If such a course is to be pursued, and if 95 Senators indulge in it, we will not have any RECORD at all.

I am not charging anyone with bad faith. There was no objection when I requested unanimous consent. I think the Presiding Officer should have submitted the request. I say, in all sincerity, that all I want is a complete record of the Senator's remarks printed in the body of the RECORD. If a speech can be absolutely deleted from the RECORD, I think it is a bad policy.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that I am not charging any Senator with bad faith, I respectfully submit that the Senate should grant my unanimous-consent request, so that we may not start a new system which might be followed and which, I think, would cut out speeches, which certainly none of us intend to do.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to address myself to the minority leader for a moment. I came in when the Senator was practically through with his remarks, and I have two observations to make. It seems to me, in reference to the remarks made by the Senator from West Virginia yesterday and which do not appear in the RECORD, there is a manifest unfairness in the procedure. For instance, if I make a speech and refer to another Senator in words of praise, or words of condemnation, or of cynicism, or of sarcasm, it might be that I would want to see those words the next day. If a Senator makes a speech in which he refers to me in a disparaging manner, a sense of righteous indignation might rise in my breast because of the Senator's disparagment of me. But in this case perhaps there is a kind and disposing providence that overrules things, and it may be that it is doing all of us a favor in not publishing the remarks to which the Senator has referred. It is manifestly unfair for me to make a speech and not allow it to be printed in the RECORD. I am told there is a custom of 30 days withholding from the RECORD, which I do not think is fair. I point out that if we are condemned or even praised we have a right to see what has been said about us.

Mr. WHERRY. I want to thank the Senator from New Hampshire for his observations. I completely agree with them.

Mr. TOBEY. Most Members of the Senate are very human, and we rush to the RECORD to see what we have said and

how it looks in print. Is not that correct?

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator from West Virginia is a modest man; he shrinks from that sort of thing, and he does not want it to appear in the RECORD, mirabile dictu.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am also a very modest man, and I shrink from these things. I take the same position as that taken by the Senator from New Hampshire. I made it plain when I started that I was not charging the Senator from West Virginia with bad faith, but I cannot understand why he took the action he did. After an examination of the rule I think it can be shown that I am not saying he took any unfair advantage of the rule. I went to the RECORD to find out what the Senator had said, because I was told that in a colloquy he had paid me a very high compliment, and I wanted very much to have it in the RECORD, right in the body of the RECORD, so far as that is concerned.

Mr. TOBEY. He called the minority leader a general.

Mr. WHERRY. I asked unanimous consent. Perhaps I was treated fairly. I do not want to charge any unfairness to my colleague from Illinois. I highly respect him. I hope that in less than 6 years we shall become fast friends.

Mr. LUCAS. We are friends now.

Mr. WHERRY. I want it said about me that I have tried to be fair and that I get along with my colleagues. I would rather have that said about me than anything else. The reason why I raised the question, Mr. President, is that I do not think we should start such a procedure in the Senate as would permit a Senator to make a speech and rely upon the rule that if he does not have the transcript of his remarks back to the Public Printer by 9 o'clock they will not be printed that day, and he can keep his speech for 30 days and, at the end of that time, if he does not want it printed at all, he can keep it out of the RECORD altogether.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. So that there may be no misunderstanding or unjust criticism in all of this, inasmuch as I did at one time get unanimous consent from the majority leader, I am going to renew the request that the speech that was made be printed in the RECORD. I wanted the Senator from West Virginia on the floor when I made the request. He has good reasons for being absent, no doubt on official business, or for some good reason he is in West Virginia, and I understand he will not be back until next week. I did not want to let this go until next week. I would at least like to have that speech included in the official RECORD as it comes out tomorrow. I think that is not unreasonable. So I ask, Mr. President——

Mr. HAYDEN. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not like to grant unanimous consent unless I have some word from the Senator from West Virginia. My understanding is—and all it is based on is a conversation with the Official Reporter—that the Senator from West Virginia was greatly fatigued yesterday evening, and did not feel that he had the strength, or the disposition, at least, to go over his remarks. I assume he considered that what he had said was a rather important matter, and he wanted to be careful about it. If there was some disposition on his part to withhold the speech completely, and he so declared, that would be a different matter. If it went over only for a day, or another day, I cannot understand how my good friend from Nebraska could complain.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me make one observation. The Senator was not in the Chamber when I asked unanimous consent.

Mr. HAYDEN. No.

Mr. WHERRY. I have a high regard for my colleague from Arizona, the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration. I think it is highly important that if this speech has any value, it be printed now. So far as that is concerned, it finally will be printed in the permanent RECORD, after the 30 days has passed. I would not be particular about it then. If it has any value, it has it now. It has been asked on the floor by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana whether there was any particular reason for the rule. I found the speech was informing. I cannot see any reason in the world why the Senator would want to withhold it.

Mr. HAYDEN. I cannot, either.

Mr. WHERRY. If it was because of fatigue, there is good reason; but why anyone should object to giving unanimous consent to my request I do not know. But if unanimous consent is not to be granted, then I am going to take whatever course I can to see that my rights are protected, as well as the rights of other Senators who engage in colloquies, because I think a Senator may feel that is one way he makes his own record, when he asks question and they are answered.

Mr. LUCAS and Mr. HAYDEN addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT Does the Senator from Nebraska yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield first to the minority leader. I beg pardon; I should have said the majority leader.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is so used to feeling that he is the majority leader that he keeps referring to me as the minority leader, and I can understand how the Senator feels about it and how disappointed he is over the situation, but that is perfectly all right.

Does not the Senator think now that if he waits until Monday, when the Senator from West Virginia returns, he can accomplish what he desires? I know the RECORD will come out in the morning, and the Senator would like to see it and see about himself and the Senator from West Virginia, and would like to have the time to read it, but can he not do that on Monday or Tuesday?

Mr. WHERRY. Why should I wait? Why should I not have unanimous consent? The majority leader gave it to me once.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; I gave it to the Senator. He just sort of slipped up on me and I gave it to him. [Laughter.] I did not realize what the Senator was trying to do. I am learning more about the position of majority leader as I go along. I have had many conferences recently, and the more I take part in them and the longer I act as majority leader, the more I am learning. From all I can learn, the Senator from West Virginia apparently left without editing his remarks, and I do not think there is a Senator here, unless it is the Senator from Nebraska, who does not edit his remarks, to see whether he has split any infinitives, or made grammatical errors, and has checked up on them. Last night the Senator from West Virginia was very vigorous and very enthusiastic about the whole situation, and it is very possible that at that time he may have made a couple of grammatical errors and wanted to look the remarks over, wanted to edit them, and was going to withhold the speech until he could get back here so that he could take a look at it. I do not think that is unfair. I still do not know why, if he does withhold, the speech has to be put into the Appendix of the RECORD. Perhaps that is the rule.

Mr. WHERRY. It is.

Mr. LUCAS. Why it should be put in the Appendix, I do not know. I do not see why it should not be in the body of the RECORD. If the Senator corrects his remarks for the permanent RECORD ultimately, he satisfies himself in that respect, but when the RECORD goes out to the people of West Virginia, the chances are they read more in the Appendix than in the body of the RECORD. That has been my experience.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not agree with the Senator. I have the floor——

Mr. LUCAS. I thought the Senator yielded.

Mr. WHERRY. I did. Just let me make one observation.

Mr. LUCAS. I was trying to make one myself.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has made a very good one. One thing the Senator said was that all the Senator from West Virginia wanted to do was to correct a couple of grammatical errors. It is my opinion that among the things he said were some he probably would rather not have in the RECORD, just to be frank about it.

Mr. LUCAS. He called the Senator a "general." He may want to take that back.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not want him to take it back. I want it in the body of the RECORD. I am not charging the Senator from West Virginia with bad faith, if a man is ill he might have the best of intentions, but the majority leader has raised the very question I have raised, namely, Why should these speeches be printed in the Appendix; why should they not go in the body of the RECORD?

Mr. LUCAS. I will refer——

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment. The majority leader says they should not go in the Appendix of the RECORD. If a

Senator withholds his remarks, does not publish them for 30 days, there is no record at all. I want it in the body of the RECORD. That is why I asked unanimous consent today.

I am not criticizing the Official Reporters. I have never seen a better group of men in my life. They are just as fair as they can be. The Senator from West Virginia asked that he might look over his remarks, and when he did not return them by 9 o'clock, he had another day to return them. He did not return them then, and went to West Virginia. The only procedure that can be followed from here on is that some time within 30 days he might have them printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, and there is not any penalty if he does not have them printed at all.

It is true that sometime we can find the speech in the permanent RECORD. When some historian wants to find what was said, he will go to the Congressional Library and find it in the permanent RECORD. I am interested in the daily, the current RECORD. And let me tell the majority leader that if he wants to carry on the program of the Senate, and 95 Senators do what this Senator has done, he will not get very far with the program.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator has asked unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. WHERRY. In the body of the RECORD.

Mr. HAYDEN. Tomorrow morning.

Mr. WHERRY. In the next issue.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me assume that the Senator from West Virginia, being fatigued, took the transcript with him to West Virginia. How is it to be printed?

Mr. WHERRY. It is right out here in the Official Reporters' office.

Mr. HAYDEN. How could the Senator get it?

Mr. WHERRY. I could go to the reporters and have the notes transcribed. I want a copy of the RECORD, because if the speech the Senator places in the permanent RECORD finally is not that speech, I am going to direct it to the attention of the American people.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator would not think the Senator from West Virginia——

Mr. WHERRY. I would not charge the Senator from Arizona with anything or the Senator from West Virginia with anything. I have said time and again that I am not charging the Senator from West Virginia with bad faith. All I did was submit a very simple request. It was so simple and so reasonable that the majority leader granted my request, and if the Senator presiding at the time had put the request, I would have received permission. It was very fair and very reasonable. All I want is what the Senator from West Virginia said. Certainly he is not ashamed of what he said, which has already been said before the people of the country. All I want is that it be placed in the body of the RECORD. That is all I ask.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I wonder whether the Senator does not have in mind that the speech made by the Senator from West Virginia last night is probably the maiden speech he has made, and that he might be very careful to see to it that all the commas and periods and other punctuation appear in his speech.

Mr. WHERRY. That is all right. He has the punctuation in his speech now. I think he has had the RECORD long enough so probably it is correct, from his point of view.

Mr. President, I should like to see this session end in complete harmony. I am again going to ask the majority leader, the Senator from Illinois, if he will consent to my unanimous consent request that the speech of the Senator from West Virginia be printed in the body of the RECORD, together with the colloquies which occurred between him and other Senators at that time so we may have it all in the RECORD for tomorrow morning. That is all I ask, and it is a very simple request.

Mr. LUCAS. Under the circumstances, I do not think I can consent. I will say to my friend from Nebraska that I still cannot see the necessity for doing this on the spur of the moment.

Mr. WHERRY. On the spur of the moment?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; without the Senator from West Virginia being present.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator refuses to give his consent?

Mr. LUCAS. I think I would be compelled to refuse.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well. Then I will conclude my speech.

Mr. LUCAS. I must refuse, with all due deference to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Later on I am going to make an exhaustive research of the rules. I have made a hasty search. I shall engage in exhaustive research. I thought I knew what the rules were. I think I understand them. I will say to the Senate now that we are establishing a precedent here which I do not like.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Is the Senator from Nebraska willing to associate himself with the junior Senator from Oregon in proposing a new rule so we can get civil-rights legislation adopted more quickly than under the rule we adopted last night?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator had better be very careful about that.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to have the Senator from Oregon associated with me as the proponent of a new effective rule, because we could then get the legislation through much faster than we secured action on the resolution which finally was adopted last night, which had been under discussion in the Senate during the past several weeks.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Is the Senator proposing another coalition now?

Mr. WHERRY. I will go along with anyone to make possible the adoption of rules which will be best for the United States Senate, even with the Senator from Illinois, if he wants to join.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator from Nebraska aware that each page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD costs the taxpayers $71, and that the Senator from Nebraska has already cost the taxpayers $200 since he got up?

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Illinois, as I understand, is a man who has conducted exhaustive researches and the result of his researches has been to enlighten the American people. I will say to him that if during the next 6 years he will confine his remarks on the floor of the Senate to a time equal to that used by the Senator from Nebraska in speaking on the floor of the Senate, he will save the taxpayers of the United States a great deal of money.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to conclude my speech. Is the Senator going to agree to my unanimous-consent request?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I will yield if the Senator will agree to give me unanimous consent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska either yields or does not yield, and not on condition.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Do I understand from the answer the Senator from Nebraska just made to my colleague from Illinois, that he has joined the Capehart Club?

Mr. WHERRY. No, I simply submit to the majority leader that if the admonition of the Senator from Indiana is taken honestly and truly by the junior Senator from Illinois who asked the question, money of the taxpayers will certainly be saved to the extent of many hundreds of dollars during the 6 years to come. In that respect I would suggest that he very seriously consider joining the Capehart organization. I think it would be a fine thing for the Senate. I think it would be a fine thing for the people of Illinois. I think it would be a fine thing for the people of America.

Now, Mr. President——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the Senator from Illinois once more: Is he going to agree to my unanimous-consent request, which he agreed to at first?

Mr. LUCAS. I am constrained to say to my friend from Nebraska that I will have to decline, in view of the absence of the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. WHERRY. I want to make a concluding statement. In all seriousness——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. I have the floor.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. No, Mr. President. I am sure objection will be heard to my request, so there is no use of asking for unanimous consent again.

Mr. HAYDEN. Will the Senator yield to me a moment? I can tell the Senator a way to get the matter in the RECORD.

Mr. WHERRY. No, Mr. President, I have been refused unanimous consent by the majority leader on a very simple and a very humble request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That ends that.

Mr. WHERRY. That ends that.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator will yield to me——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I address the Chair?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes, but objection is made. That ends the matter.

Mr. WHERRY. May I address the Chair?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is, of course, free to address the Chair.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not address the Chair, did I?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not remember.

Mr. WHERRY. No. I am on the Senate floor, and as minority leader I have the right to make a unanimous-consent request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has made it, and objection has been made to it.

Mr. WHERRY. Just a minute. I have not addressed the Chair. I have the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. All right; go ahead and use it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I appreciate the observations made by the Presiding Officer. Perhaps I am wrong about that. I feel that when I address the Chair and ask for something, I am entitled to make an observation in connection with it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands. The Senator made a unanimous-consent request and it was objected to.

Mr. WHERRY. But the observation the distinguished Vice President made that "that ends that" was not in response to any question I asked.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It does end it. When request is made and it is objected to, it does end that request.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. I think I realize that. I certainly do now.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senator from Nebraska will allow me——

Mr. WHERRY. Just a minute. I am going to finish my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Objection has been made, and I feel the objection is made for reasons other than objection to the simple request I made. So I am going into this thing quite fully. If the Senator from West Virginia withdraws from the RECORD the remarks which he made, we are going to find out about it. Objection is made on the serious ground that a Senator takes a speech out of the Official Reporter's office and keeps it and may not have it printed in any form. I say that we should have rules to protect against that kind of action, even though it might be within the rules at this time. I believe we had better start amending some more of our rules if that kind of procedure is to be followed in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to make a suggestion?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly the colloquy between the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from West Virginia should appear in the RECORD. It is beyond my belief that the Senator from West Virginia would keep it out of the RECORD for any great length of time. But in case he should decide completely to eliminate his speech from the RECORD, I believe the Senator from Nebraska would be entirely within his rights to obtain from the reporter of the Senate a transcript of what he and the Senator of West Virginia had to say, and in his own time read it to the Senate. Now there is no way in the world that it can be kept out if the Senator wants to exercise that right.

Mr. WHERRY. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Arizona that I knew that, and I made such a statement. That is the reason I asked unanimous consent to have the matter printed in the RECORD anyway. I know my rights. I know I have a perfect right to read the matter into the RECORD, and I certainly will read it into the RECORD if unanimous consent is granted.

Mr. HAYDEN. The only possible objection I could have would be that the Senator from West Virginia is not here. If the two Senators will get together and allow me to be the mediator we will settle this very quickly.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I just came on the floor. I did not know what the controversy was about, but it seemed to pertain to the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. I only want to say that I know that the junior Senator from West Virginia, who has served in this body long and honorably, has not intentionally done anything in violation of the rules of the Senate. I know that he is an honorable gentleman, an able Senator, and that if his failure to correct his remarks is responsible for them not being included in the RECORD, it is an unintentional act, and that in due course his remarks will appear in the RECORD. As one of his colleagues I want to say that there is no Senator I esteem more highly than I do the junior Senator from West Virginia. There is no Senator I believe to be more disposed to honor all the obligations of a Member of this body.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator from Nebraska need worry about the Senator from West Virginia taking his remarks out of the RECORD and never finally getting them into the RECORD somewhere. The Senator from West Virginia is just not that kind of a person. He is not trying to hide anything or evade anything.

The only point I made a moment ago—and I made it seriously, and repeat it now—is that the Senator from West Virginia is not present. He ought to be present when the Senator from Nebraska makes such a request. Let the Senator from West Virginia answer for himself as to why he took this course of action, rather than have the Senator from Nebraska attempt to remove the remarks from the Appendix of the RECORD and place them in the body of the RECORD at this time.

It is not a very serious matter, one way or the other. The Senator from Nebraska has made a mountain out of a molehill with respect to the Senator from West Virginia, in the absence from the Senate of the Senator from West Virginia. Let the Senator from Nebraska take on the Senator from West Virginia on this question when he returns next week. It is not very serious at all.

The VICE PRESIDENT. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, March 21, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.